Copyrighted Material

"Translation Is Required"

The Septuagint in Retrospect and Prospect

Edited by Robert J. V. Hiebert

LXX
Septuagint and Cognate Studies

Copyrighted Material

SBL

Society of Biblical Literature

Septuagint and Cognate Studies

Melvin K. H. Peters
Series Editor

Number 56

"TRANSLATION IS REQUIRED"

"TRANSLATION IS REQUIRED"

The Septuagint in Retrospect and Prospect

Edited by

Robert J. V. Hiebert
with the assistance of
colleagues in the Septuagint Institute
Trinity Western University

Society of Biblical Literature
Atlanta

“TRANSLATION IS REQUIRED”
The Septuagint in Retrospect and Prospect

Copyright © 2010 by the Society of Biblical Literature

All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying and recording, or by means of any information storage or retrieval system, except as may be expressly permitted by the 1976 Copyright Act or in writing from the publisher. Requests for permission should be addressed in writing to the Rights and Permissions Office, Society of Biblical Literature, 825 Houston Mill Road, Atlanta, GA 30329 USA.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Translation is required : the Septuagint in retrospect and prospect / edited by Robert J.V. Hiebert.
p. cm. — (Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and cognate studies ; no. 56)
Proceedings of a conference held Sept. 18-20, 2008 at Trinity Western University.
ISBN 978-1-58983-523-8 (paper binding : alk. paper) — ISBN 978-1-58983-524-5 (electronic)
1. Bible. Greek—Versions—Septuagint—Congresses. I. Hiebert, Robert J. V. (Robert James Victor)
BS744.T73 2010b
221.4'8—dc22
2010037174

Printed on acid-free, recycled paper conforming to
ANSI/NISO Z39.48-1992 (R1997) and ISO 9706:1994
standards for paper permanence.

The Fellows of the Septuagint Institute of Trinity Western University
dedicate this volume to
John William Wevers
and
Albert Pietersma
Outstanding Septuagintalists
Professors Emeriti of the University of Toronto
and
Scholarly Benefactors of the Septuagint Institute

ἐμπειρίαν ἔχοντας τοῦ νόμου, καὶ δυνατοὺς ἑρμηνεῦσαι
(*Aristeas to Philocrates*, 39)

After this volume was submitted to the publisher, we received the sad news of the death of Professor Wevers on July 22, 2010 at the age of ninety-one. In addition to being a world-renowned scholar with numerous achievements and honours to his credit, he was a gifted teacher, a dedicated humanitarian, and an enduring friend. May he rest in peace.

Contents

CONTENTS	vii
ABBREVIATIONS	xi
INTRODUCTION	xv
Robert J. V. Hiebert	
PART ONE: CONFERENCE PAPERS	1
BEYOND LITERALISM: INTERLINEARITY REVISITED	3
Albert Pietersma	
1. Introduction	3
2. The Interlinear Paradigm as Produced	4
3. Interlinearity beyond NETS	9
4. The Interlinear Paradigm as Received	11
5. Interlinearity: Heuristic Tool versus Theory of Origins	16
6. Conclusion	19
MOVING BEYOND TRANSLATING A TRANSLATION: REFLECTIONS ON *A NEW ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF THE SEPTUAGINT* (NETS)	23
Benjamin G. Wright III	
1. Introduction	23
2. The Nature of Translations	24
3. The Methodological Framework of NETS	26
4. The Intended Position of NETS	27
5. The Textual-Linguistic Makeup of NETS	29
6. Translation Strategies Employed in NETS	30
7. The Systemic Function of the Septuagint according to *Aristeas*	34
8. The Inadequacy of *Aristeas*'s Portrayal of the Septuagint	36
9. The Sociocultural Context of the Septuagint	37
10. Conclusion	38

The Semantics of Biblical Language *Redux* 41
Cameron Boyd-Taylor
1. Introduction 41
2. Word and Concept 42
3. Semantics in Biblical Research 44
4. The Semantics of Hope in the Greek Psalter 45
5. A Rhetoric of Hope 51
6. Toward a Theology of Hope 52

Translating the Untranslatable:
Septuagint Renderings of Hebrew Idioms 59
Jan Joosten
1. Introduction 59
2. Idiomatic Expressions 61
3. Observations regarding Idiomatic Renderings 66
3. Conclusions 68

Ruminations on Translating the Septuagint
of Genesis in the Light of the NETS Project 71
Robert J. V. Hiebert
1. Introduction 71
2. Principled Translation 74
3. Conclusion 86

"Glory" in Greek Exodus: Lexical Choice in Translation
and Its Reflection in Secondary Translations 87
Larry Perkins
1. Introduction 87
2. The Motif of δόξα in Greek Exodus 88
3. Concluding Observations 102

Some Reflections on Writing a Commentary
on the Septuagint of Leviticus 107
Dirk Büchner
1. Introduction 107
2. Some Remarks on Greek Grammar and Syntax 108
3. The Lexicology of Pentateuchal
Technical Vocabulary 111
4. The Septuagint Pentateuch and Greek Religion 115
5. Ptolemaic Alexandria 116
6. Final Remarks 117

Translating a Translation: Some Final Reflections on the Production of the New English Translation of Greek Deuteronomy 119
Melvin K. H. Peters
1. Introduction 119
2. NETS Deuteronomy 120
3. Deuteronomy *Vorlage* 121
4. On the Hegemony of the St. Petersburg Codex 132
5. Conclusion 134

The Elihu Speeches in the Greek Translation of Job 135
August H. Konkel
1. Introduction 135
2. Elihu in the Book of Job 136
3. Job in Greek Translation 138
4. Elihu the Arbiter (32:1–33:13) 141
5. Words of Correction (33:14–33) 144
6. The Work of Justice (34:1–37) 145
7. The Watcher of Humankind (35:1–16) 151
8. Lessons of Justice (36:1–37:24) 153
9. Elihu in Old Greek 156

At the Beginning: The Septuagint as a Jewish Bible Translation 159
Leonard Greenspoon
1. Introduction 159
2. Highlights in the Scholarly Careers of Max Margolis and Harry Orlinsky 159
3. Different Perspectives on the Relationship between the Septuagint and the Masoretic Text 161
4. Jewish Bible Translations and the Problem of Septuagint Origins 163
5. Conclusion 168

The Role of the Septuagint in the New Testament: Amos 9:11–12 as a Test Case 171
Wolfgang Kraus
1. Introduction 171
2. Amos 9:11–12 MT 173
3. Amos 9:11–12 LXX 176
4. Amos 9:11–12 in the Acts of the Apostles 183
5. The Quotation from Amos and the Ecclesiology of Luke-Acts 187
6. Conclusion 189

A Well-Watered Garden (Isaiah 58:11): Investigating the Influence of the Septuagint 191
Alison Salvesen
1. Introduction 191
2. Text and Exegesis "Downstream" of the Septuagint? The "Daughter" Versions 191
3. Conclusion 207

A New English Translation of the Septuagint and the *Orthodox Study Bible*: A Case Study in Prospective Reception 209
Brian Anastasi Butcher
1. Introduction 209
2. The Orthodox and Byzantine-Rite Catholics as a Potential Audience for NETS 209
3. The Criteriology of Orthodox Biblical Translation 211
4. The OSB and the Challenges of Confessionalism 215
5. The Interstices of a Liturgical Hermeneutics 219
6. Excursus: Liturgical Translation of the Septuagint in the Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Church 221
7. Select Passages from NETS and the OSB 223
8. Conclusion 228

PART TWO: PANELISTS' INTRODUCTORY STATEMENTS 231

NETS and the "Upstream–Downstream" Metaphor 233
Albert Pietersma

The Textual-Linguistic Character and Sociocultural Context of the Septuagint 235
Benjamin G. Wright III

La Bible d'Alexandrie and How to Translate the Septuagint 239
Jan Joosten

Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D): The Value of a German Translation of the Septuagint 243
Wolfgang Kraus

Abbreviations

AASF	Annales Academiae scientiarum fennicae
AB	Anchor Bible
ABD	*The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992
AGJU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums
AnBib	Analecta biblica
ANF	*Ante-Nicene Fathers*
ATD	Das Alte Testament Deutsch
BBB	Bonner biblische Beiträge
BDAG	W. Bauer, F. W. Danker, W. F. Arndt, and F. W. Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000
BDB	F. Brown, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1952
BDF	F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961
BETL	Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium
BHT	Beiträge zur historischen Theologie
Bib	*Biblica*
BIOSCS	*Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*
BKAT	Biblischer Kommentar, Altes Testament. Edited by M. Noth and H. W. Wolff
BN	*Biblische Notizen*
BWANT	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
CahRB	Cahiers de la Revue biblique
CATSS	Computer-Assisted Tools for Septuagint Study
CBET	Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
CBQMS	Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series
CCSL	Corpus Christianorum: Series latina. Turnhout: Brepols, 1953–
CD	Cairo Genizah copy of the *Damascus Document*
ConBOT	Coniectanea biblica: Old Testament Series

CSCO	Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientalium. Edited by I. B. Chabot et al. Paris, 1903–
CRINT	Compendium rerum iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum
DJD	Discoveries in the Judaean Desert
EKKNT	Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
EPRO	Etudes préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'empire romain
EvT	*Evangelische Theologie*
FAT	Forschungen zum Alten Testament
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
GKC	*Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*. Edited by E. Kautzsch. Translated by A. E. Cowley. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1910
GNT	Grundrisse zum Neuen Testament
GV	Hebrew *Vorlage* of Greek Deuteronomy
HTR	*Harvard Theological Review*
HUCA	*Hebrew Union College Annual*
ICC	International Critical Commentary
IOSCS	International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JJS	*Journal of Jewish Studies*
JNSL	*Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages*
Josephus	
A.J.	*Antiquitates judaicae*
Joüon	P. Joüon, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. Translated and revised by T. Muraoka. 2 vols. Subsidia biblica 14/1-2. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1991
JPS	Jewish Publication Society
JSJ	*Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Periods*
JSJSup	Supplements to Journal for the Study of Judaism
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series
JSS	*Journal of Semitic Studies*
JTS	*Journal of Theological Studies*
Justin	
Dial.	*Dialogus cum Tryphone*
KAT	Kommentar zum Alten Testament
KEK	Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament (Meyer-Kommentar)
L	Leningrad/St. Petersburg Codex
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
LSJ	H. G. Liddell, R. Scott, and H. S. Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon*. 9th ed. with revised supplement. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996
LXX	Septuagint

LXX.D *Septuaginta Deutsch: Das griechische Alte Testament in deutscher Übersetzung*. Edited by Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2009

MSU Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens

MT Masoretic Text

Nestle-Aland[27]
Novum Testamentum Graece, post Eberhard et Erwin Nestle editione vicesima septima revisa. 27th ed. Edited by Barbara and Kurt Aland et al.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1993.

NETS *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*. Edited by Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2007

NewDocs *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity*. Edited by G. H. R. Horsley and S. Llewelyn. North Ryde, N.S.W.: Ancient History Documentary Research Centre, Macquarie University, 1981–

NIV New International Version

NJPS *Tanakh: The Holy Scriptures. The New JPS Translation according to the Traditional Hebrew Text*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1985.

NKJV New King James Version

NPNF[1] *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Series 1. On-line, www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf

NPNF[2] *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Series 2. On-line, www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf

NRSV New Revised Standard Version

NTS *New Testament Studies*

OBO Orbis biblicus et orientalis

OG Old Greek

OrChr *Oriens christianus*

OrChrAn Orientalia christiana analecta

OSB *Orthodox Study Bible*

Philo

- *Conf.* *De confusione linguarum*
- *Her.* *Quis rerum divinarum heres sit*
- *Leg.* *Legum allegoriae*
- *Migr.* *De migratione Abrahami*
- *Mos.* *De vita Mosis*
- *Somn.* *De somniis*

Plato

- *Apol.* *Apologia*
- *Crit.* *Crito*
- *Leg.* *Leges*
- *Phaed.* *Phaedo*

PO Patrologia orientalis
PRSt *Perspectives in Religious Studies*
Pseudo-Plato
Def. *Definitiones*
RBL *Review of Biblical Literature*
SANT Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
SBL Society of Biblical Literature
SBLCS Society of Biblical Literature Commentary on the Septuagint
SBLSCS Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies
SBS Stuttgarter Bibelstudien
SBT Studies in Biblical Theology
SecCent *Second Century*
SP Studia Patristica
TDNT *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich. Translated by G. W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–76
TDOT *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Edited by G. J. Botterweck, H. Ringgren, and H.-J. Fabry. Translated by J. T. Willis, G. W. Bromiley, D. E. Green, and D. W. Stott. 15 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974–2006
TLG *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae.* On-line, http://www.tlg.uci.edu
TLZ *Theologische Literaturzeitung*
t. Meg. *Tosefta Megillah*
TOTC Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries
TU Texte und Untersuchungen
TWNT *Theologische Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*. Edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich. Stuttgart, 1932-1979
TynBul *Tyndale Bulletin*
UGCC Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church
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
ZAW *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*
ZNW *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche*

Introduction

Robert J. V. Hiebert

The citation in the title of this volume, "Translation is required," is derived from the reply, as reported in the *Letter of Aristeas*, by Demetrius of Phalerum to Ptolemy Philadelphus, who wanted to know what was preventing the transcription of "the laws of the Jews" (τῶν Ἰουδαίων νόμιμα) so that they might be included in the king's famous library in Alexandria, Egypt. Demetrius's answer, in part, was: Ἑρμηνείας προσδεῖται.[1] On September 18–20, 2008, the Septuagint Institute of Trinity Western University (TWU) hosted an international conference whose focus was the Old Greek version of the Jewish Scriptures, the product of what was likely the first major translation project involving religious literature in history. The conference theme was "Septuagint Translation(s): Retrospect and Prospect," and taking part in this event were prominent Septuagintalists, scholars in other disciplines, and graduate students from France, Germany, England, the United States, and Canada. Among the distinctive features of the conference was the fact that participants included scholars who have worked on three modern-language translations of the Septuagint: *A New English Translation of the Septuagint* (NETS), *La Bible d'Alexandrie*, and *Septuaginta Deutsch*. The papers that they and others presented and the contributions to a panel discussion in which some of the speakers were involved are incorporated in the present volume.

Part 1 of this volume contains thirteen of the papers that were presented at the conference. The first two are the contributions by the editors of NETS, who talk about the theoretical framework and methodology of that project. More specifically, Albert Pietersma discusses the so-called interlinear paradigm of NETS, and Benjamin Wright probes the translation implications of the sociocultural context and textual-linguistic makeup of the Septuagint.

Next are two studies that deal with matters of relevance to any part of the Old Greek version with a Semitic *Vorlage*: Cameron Boyd-Taylor's exploration of semantic issues that pertain to working out a hermeneutics of translation for this

1. *Aristeas to Philocrates (Letter of Aristeas)* (ed. and trans. Moses Hadas; Jewish Apocryphal Literature; New York: Ktav, 1973), §10.

version, and an investigation of the different approaches to rendering idioms in the Septuagint by *La Bible d'Alexandrie* translator, Jan Joosten.

The preceding studies are followed by five papers that focus on topics associated with the translation of individual books in the Septuagint corpus: Genesis (Robert Hiebert), Exodus (Larry Perkins), Leviticus (Dirk Büchner), Deuteronomy (Melvin Peters), and Job (August Konkel).

The final four essays in part 1 touch on various aspects of the reception history of the Septuagint: Leonard Greenspoon's discussion of the problem of Septuagint origins in the light of the history of Jewish Bible translations; an examination of the New Testament's use of the Old Greek version by *Septuaginta Deutsch* coeditor Wolfgang Kraus; Alison Salvesen's survey of the influence of the Septuagint's daughter versions on the communities in which they circulated; and Brian Butcher's comparison of NETS and the *Orthodox Study Bible* and his assessment of the prospects for the reception of the former version in English-speaking Orthodox churches.

Apart from the conference sessions at which speakers presented papers, there was also a panel discussion on the first day of this event. Albert Pietersma, Benjamin Wright, Jan Joosten, and Wolfgang Kraus read prepared introductory statements, the printed versions of which are included in part 2 of the present volume. Alison Salvesen was a respondent to these presentations and participated in the informal interaction that followed. Panelists reflected on their own experiences as Septuagintalists and translators and revisited some of the topics raised in conference papers.

A conference such as this cannot be a success without the participation and support of many individuals and institutions. The Fellows of the Septuagint Institute (Dirk Büchner, Peter Flint, Robert Hiebert, and Larry Perkins) would like to acknowledge those who made key contributions of various sorts.

First on the list of people to whom we express heartfelt thanks are, of course, the ones who presented papers and participated in the panel discussion. Besides the above-mentioned Fellows, they are: Albert Pietersma, Benjamin Wright, Jan Joosten, Wolfgang Kraus, Alison Salvesen, Leonard Greenspoon, Melvin Peters, Cameron Boyd-Taylor, August Konkel, Christopher Morrissey, Brian Butcher, Jason Hess, John Barry, and Abi Ngunga.[2] In addition to the scholarly contributions that they made, the speakers also interacted willingly and spontaneously with conference attendees and TWU students in various venues during the three days of this event, providing a much-appreciated personal touch to the proceedings. Furthermore, those whose contributions are included in the present volume worked patiently with this editor to shape the print versions of their papers into their present form.

2. Mr. Ngunga submitted a paper but was unfortunately unable to travel to the conference to present it in person because of visa complications.

Second, we are very grateful to the following institutions and entities for their generous financial support, without which it would have been impossible to host such an event: the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, the Priscilla and Stanford Reid Trust, the TWU Master of Arts in Biblical Studies program, the TWU Graduate Student Association, and Oxford University Press.

Third, Robert Hiebert and Larry Perkins in particular express their sincere gratitude to Dr. Elsie Froment and Ms. Sue Funk in the TWU Office of Research for assisting them in the preparation of grant funding applications. Sue also rendered valuable service in handling financial matters associated with the conference.

Fourth, to the TWU staff and students who provided cheerful and energetic service in the planning and hosting of the conference, we, the Institute Fellows, convey our genuine appreciation: Sandee Jerome, Jamie Field, Judy Swanson, Dianne Gleave, Aaron Martens, Loren Warkentin, Daniel Schafer, Joan Van Dyck, Tom Kobelt, Glenn Hansen, Bryan Thiessen, Diane Froese, Monica Kobelt, Jonathan Numada, Jeff Chan, Aaron Richert, Ian McLoy, Dohnson Chang, Nathaniel Dykstra, Tom Ford, Margaret Hebron, Chelica Hiltunen, Justin Soderquist, and Kollin Baskoro. We are also appreciative of the various contributions made in this regard by TWU administrators and faculty and by guest clergy: Drs. Jonathan Raymond, Dennis Jameson, Dorothy Peters, Ken Radant, John Auxier, and Frs. Michael Gillis and Lawrence Farley.

Fifth, we are thankful to Melvin Peters, editor of the Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies series, for accepting this volume for publication, and to the SBL publications team, especially Leigh Andersen, Managing Editor, for her encouragement and expertise in bringing this volume to press.

The 2008 conference was the third such event sponsored by the Septuagint Institute since its inauguration in 2005. The Institute Fellows continue to be deeply involved in Septuagint research and in developing a Septuagint Studies program at Trinity Western University. The Institute serves as a base from which to coordinate research resources, specific learning initiatives, scholarly colloquia, symposia geared to the larger university community and the general public, applications for research funding, and publication projects. It provides a context for both resident and visiting scholars to explore issues of textual criticism, translation, semantics, intertextuality, and hermeneutics. For more information on the Septuagint Institute, see the Web site at http://www.twu.ca/sites/septuagint/.

Part One
Conference Papers

Beyond Literalism: Interlinearity Revisited

Albert Pietersma

1. Introduction

November 2007 saw the publication of *A New English Translation of the Septuagint* (NETS) by Oxford University Press, New York,[1] and simultaneously its posting in digital form—courtesy Oxford University Press—by the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies (IOSCS) on the NETS Web site (http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/nets/).

Since at the Leuven Specialists' Symposium on Septuagint Translation (2006) I presented a step-by-step retrospective account of how NETS came into being,[2] I shall limit myself here to one specific facet of NETS, namely, the so-called interlinear paradigm, which informs both NETS and the commentary series Society of Biblical Literature Commentary on the Septuagint (SBLCS) to follow. To do so would seem the more appropriate in light of the paradigm's brief but interesting reception history, which, since 1998, has taken it in a direction somewhat different from what its authors envisioned and intended.

Elsewhere I have argued that, according to modern hermeneutics or text interpretation, a distinction is to be made between *text production*, on the one hand, and *text reception*, on the other.[3] Here is how André LaCoque and Paul

---

My thanks to Robert Hiebert and the Septuagint Institute at Trinity Western University for inviting me to speak at this conference and to Cameron Boyd-Taylor for his astute critique of this paper.

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

2. See Albert Pietersma, "Translating a Translation: With Examples from the Greek Psalter," in *Translating a Translation: The Septuagint and Its Modern Translations in the Context of Early Judaism* (ed. H. Ausloos, J. Cook, F. García Martínez, B. Lemmelijn, and M. Vervenne; BETL 213; Leuven: Peeters, 2008), 169–82.

3. For example, "Messianism and the Greek Psalter: In Search of the Messiah," in *The*

Ricoeur put the distinction in the preface to their jointly authored book, *Thinking Biblically*:

> we do hold that the meaning of a text is in each instance an event that is born at the intersection between, on the one hand, those constraints that the text bears within itself and that have to do in large part with its *Sitz im Leben* [the text as produced] and, on the other hand, the different expectations of a series of communities of reading and interpretation that the presumed authors [or translators] of the text under consideration could not have anticipated [the text as received].[4]

Interestingly, the *production* of the interlinear paradigm differs somewhat from the norm, seeing that its authors are still alive and can therefore be consulted on what they had in mind, in an attempt to get the train, seemingly derailed, back on the tracks. I begin here with the interlinear paradigm *as produced*—at least according to its authors.

Moreover, to get the train back on track is no incidental matter, since (1) the paradigm not only informs NETS, but will, as well, inform its sequel, SBLCS, under the joint editorship of Robert Hiebert and Benjamin Wright,[5] and more importantly (2) the paradigm is capable, as a heuristic tool, of playing a key explanatory role in Septuagint studies,[6] notably in lexicography and grammaticography, and thus by extension in exegesis.

2. The Interlinear Paradigm as Produced

At the panel discussion on modern translations of the Septuagint (Oslo 1998), the interlinear paradigm was formally introduced in the following terms:

> for the vast majority of Septuagint books this linguistic relationship [of dependence on and subservience to the source text] can best be conceptualized as a

---

Septuagint and Messianism (ed. Michael A. Knibb; BETL 195; Leuven: Peeters, 2006), 49–75. The same distinction is axiomatic for text criticism and Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS).

4. André LaCocque and Paul Ricoeur, *Thinking Biblically: Exegetical and Hermeneutical Studies* (trans. David Pellauer; Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1998), xi. For an application to translation literature, see Albert Pietersma, "Text-Production and Text-Reception: Psalm 8 in Greek," in *Die Septuaginta—Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten: Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 20.–23. Juli 2006* (ed. Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus; WUNT 219; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 467–81. Though not immediately apropos in the present context, it should be borne in mind that, since "production" here refers to a text rather than to a physical object, it includes both "author" and "implied reader."

5. For the prospectus of the series, see *BIOSCS* 31 (1998): 43–48 and http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/ioscs/commentary/prospectus.html.

6. For a book-length treatment of the interlinear paradigm, see Cameron Boyd-Taylor, *Reading between the Lines: Towards an Assessment of the Interlinear Paradigm for Septuagint Studies* (Leuven: Peeters, forthcoming).

> Greek interlinear translation of a Hebrew original. Be it noted immediately, however, that the term “interlinear” is intended to be nothing more than a visual aid to help us conceptualize the linguistic relationship that is deemed to exist between the original and its rendition into Greek. In other words, “interlinear” is a metaphor and as metaphor it points not to the surface meaning of its component parts but to a deeper, less visually accessible, linguistic relationship of dependence and subservience. It should be emphasized further, that the deeper linguistic reality, which the metaphor attempts to make more tangible, is in no way contingent on the existence of a physical, interlinear entity at some point in the last three centuries B.C.E.[7]

Three points bear underscoring. (1) Interlinearity, according to the above statement, is not intended to be viewed from a historical perspective. In other words, its authors did not have in view a Hebrew-Greek diglot of sorts, arranged in tandem, the Greek made to match the Hebrew. (2) While the statement asserts an exclusively linguistic relationship, it describes that relationship in terms of extralinguistic realities (dependence and subservience). (3) Based on linguistic considerations, it is intended as a metaphor and, therefore, as a heuristic tool.

Allow me to take you back briefly to autumn 1997, when the interlinear paradigm for NETS was born. As an illustrative text I select, for reasons of simplicity and brevity, Ps 7:7b. The textual phenomenon in question occurs throughout most of the Septuagint, with varied distribution.

Psalm 7:7ab

באפך 1c	יהוה 1b	קומה 1a
צוררי 2c	**בעברות** 2b	**הנשׂא** 2a
ἐν ὀργῇ σου 3c	κύριε 3b	ἀνάστηθι 3a
τῶν ἐχθρῶν μου 4c	**ἐν τοῖς πέρασι** 4b	ὑψώθητι 4a

ἀνάστηθι κύριε ἐν ὀργῇ σου // ὑψώθητι ἐν τοῖς πέρασι τῶν ἐχθρῶν μου

NRSV (7:6): Rise up, O LORD, in your anger;
lift yourself up **against the fury of** my enemies;
NETS: Rise up, O Lord, in your wrath;
be exalted **at/(in) the deaths(?)**[8] **of** my enemies,

In explanation I will be brief. Exactly *why* the Greek translator did not translate Hebrew עברה (“overflow/arrogance/fury”) in line 2b by θυμός or ὀργή as he

7. Albert Pietersma, “A New English Translation of the Septuagint,” in *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Oslo, 1998* (ed. Bernard A. Taylor; SBLSCS 45; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001), 215–28, here 219.

8. According to LSJ, πέρας in extrabiblical Greek can refer to the end of human life.

did four times elsewhere (θυμός: 78[77]:49; 90[89]:11; ὀργή: 85[84]:4; 90[89]:9), we may never know or understand. The fact is that he did not so translate it in Ps 7:7, even though he was evidently familiar with the Hebrew word in question, and even though ἐν ὀργῇ σου in the preceding stich might have directed his choice.

How he ended up with ἐν τοῖς πέρασι is clearer. As F. W. Mozley noted more than a century ago,[9] the translator here derives Hebrew *ʿayin*, *beth*, *resh* from עֵבֶר, adverbially meaning "across, on yonder side" and commonly rendered in the Septuagint by πέραν. So via πέραν/πέρας he ends up with the text we have: ἐν τοῖς πέρασι. But what does ἐν τοῖς πέρασι mean? Does it mean "at the ends, that is, at the deaths (of my enemies)?" Does it mean "in the geographical limits (of my enemies)"? Does it mean "in the utmost boundaries (of my enemies)" (so Brenton), or "in the borders (of my enemies)" (so Thomson)? The fact is we do not really know what the translator had in mind, since he appears to have withheld that information.

Descriptively what happens is that the source text overrides the target text at the expense of the latter's context. One might also say that the *vertical* dimension of the Greek text eclipses its *horizontal* dimension, since the choice of πέρας is determined by the source text rather than by the context of the target text. The question then becomes how best to *conceptualize* what has happened. Interlinearity is capable of doing so.

One might of course demur if Ps 7:7 were an isolated instance. In that case, one might argue that, even though Rahlfs's edition lists no variants to ἐν τοῖς πέρασι, it must nevertheless be an error in transmission. In passing let me note something to which I will return later, namely, that since there is every reason to believe that the translator knew what עברה meant, what he does in Ps 7:7 is apparently not due to ignorance.

The Septuagint's aspect of unintelligibility is scarcely controversial and should therefore not be swept under the carpet, the less so when it is not based on ignorance. To be sure, some books have a higher degree of unintelligibility than others, but there are few that are without it. Moreover, it occurs at all levels of constituent structure (word, phrase, clause, discourse). Therefore, unless all such items are ascribed to the vicissitudes of transmission history, they must belong to the text as produced, that is, produced by the translator and reflective of the implied reader. It is, therefore, for good reason, it would seem, that the general introduction to NETS speaks of unintelligibility as one of the *inherent,* therefore *constitutive*, characteristics of the translated Septuagint.[10] It should further be emphasized that unin-

9. F. W. Mozley, *The Psalter of the Church: The Septuagint Psalms Compared with the Hebrew, with Various Notes* (Cambridge: University Press, 1905), 15.

10. NETS, "To the Reader of NETS," xv. Cf. Emanuel Tov, "Did the Septuagint Translators Always Understand Their Hebrew Text?" in *De Septuaginta: Studies in Honour of John William Wevers on His Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (ed. Albert Pietersma and Claude Cox; Mississauga Ont.: Ben-

telligibility is here intended to be descriptive, rather than evaluative. Hence there is no suggestion here that the translators were somehow deficient.

I entitled my paper "*Beyond Literalism*: Interlinearity Revisited," and that for a reason. Nearly thirty years ago, James Barr, in *The Typology of Literalism*, addressed the thorny issue of "literal" versus "free" as popular labels for biblical translations. [11] Not only, as Barr shows in his study, do both terms require numerous qualifications to be of any descriptive use at all, but within any given unit of translation the two are often intermixed at various levels of constituent structure. Furthermore, since in ancient translations of the Bible the so-called literal mode is what Barr calls the *base line* definition,[12] it is this rather than the "free" mode that stands in need of special explanation in a modern context, which tends to take for granted that all translation is ipso facto intelligible and that translation by definition is interpretation.

While it is highly probable, as Barr suggests, that ancient translators of the Bible often proceeded in an ad hoc manner rather than according to a predetermined policy, this should scarcely be taken to mean that, *qua* human behavior generally, their translational behavior was without norms, and thus not subject to description after the fact.[13]

What interests me here is not so much Barr's six modes of literality based on linguistic criteria—important though his delineations are—but rather *that* diverse group of items that is difficult to accommodate under any mode of literalism, since those items lie beyond literalism itself. Hence the phrasing of my title: "*Beyond* Literalism." If literalism, as Barr acknowledges, is commonly understood to refer to a mode of translating that is intelligible though not necessarily felicitous, it becomes difficult to accommodate unintelligibility under any mode of literalism, unless it be stretched beyond its popular limits. To use the example of Ps 7:7, had Hebrew בעברות been rendered by either ἐν θυμῷ/θυμοῖς or ἐν ὀργῇ/ὀργαῖς, it would still have been a literal translation, falling within Barr's third mode of literality,[14] which has to do with X = Y lexical consistency between the source text and the target text. Of course, one might also refer ἐν τοῖς πέρασι to Barr's fifth mode,

ben, 1984), 54–70. Whether the translators always understood their source is here, of course, not the basic question; rather, it is what they did with the text when they failed to understand it.

11. James Barr, *The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations* (MSU 15; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979).

12. Ibid., 7.

13. See Cameron Boyd-Taylor, "Toward the Analysis of Translational Norms: A Sighting Shot," *BIOSCS* 39 (2006): 27–46. See also Theo A. W. van der Louw, "Linguistic or Ideological Shifts? The Problem-Oriented Study of Transformations as a Methodological Filter," in *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo* (ed. Anssi Voitila and Jutta Jokiranta; JSJSup 126; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 107–25.

14. Barr, *Typology*, 20: "Consistency or non-consistency in the rendering, i.e., the degree to which a particular versional term is used for all (or most) cases of a particular term of the original."

which deals with mimicking etymological connections in the source language.[15] Be it noted, however, that neither lexical consistency nor etymologizing per se results in unintelligibility.[16]

To illustrate, let me draw on an example cited and commented upon by Barr.[17] As he notes, in the books of Judges, Samuel (1–2 Reigns) and Kings (3–4 Reigns), the Hebrew particle בי, thought to mean "please," is rendered by the Greek phrase ἐν ἐμοί, which might be glossed as "by me/in me." Hebrew בי is therefore segmented as though it were the preposition ב plus the first singular suffix. Not surprisingly ἐν ἐμοί, characterized as an "extreme literalism" by Barr for good reason, semantically does not fit its context in such cases. Barr comments,

> What they [the translators] are saying to their readers is: "there is a word here the form of which is identical to that of the common Hebrew expression 'in me'". How far they realized that this expression, though homonymic, must have entirely different semantic content, the translation does not inform us. Literalism of this kind does not reveal the translator's basic understanding of the meaning.[18]

Though one might at first blush attribute what the translator is doing to ignorance of the relevant item in the source text, Barr questions this conclusion, and that seemingly for a good reason. We have already seen that, in Ps 7:7, ἐν τοῖς πέρασι cannot be so accounted for. Similarly, an item such as a finite verb followed by ἐγώ εἰμι (e.g., ἐποίησα ἐγώ εἰμι, "I did, I am"), which occurs in the same books as does ἐν ἐμοί for בי, cannot be so explained. And lest one assume that so-called *kaige* texts are *sui generis* and thus qualitatively (rather than quantitatively) different from the mainstream, Barr cites as well, *inter alia*, with reference to Martin Flashar,[19] קנים > νοσσιά, "nests," in Gen 6:14, and Boyd-Taylor adds יקום > ἐξανάστασις, "a rising up," in Gen 7:4b cited from Robert Hiebert.[20] Other items like it exist aplenty throughout the Septuagint with the

15. Ibid.: "Coded 'etymological' indication of formal/semantic relationships obtaining in the vocabulary of the original language."

16. For an excellent exposition of Barr's typology in relation to interlinearity, see Cameron Boyd-Taylor, "Who Is Afraid of Verlegenheitsübersetzungen?" in Ausloos et al., *Translating a Translation*, 197–210.

17. Barr, *Typology*, 19. See also Jan Joosten, "Reflections on the 'Interlinear Paradigm' in Septuagintal Studies," in Voitila and Jokiranta, *Scripture in Transition,* 163–78, here 173–74. Whether the Greek reading is due to ignorance or deliberation does not take away the fact that it does not fit the context in which it is placed.

18. Barr, *Typology*, 19.

19. Martin Flashar, "Exegetische Studien zum Septuagintapsalter," *ZAW* 32 (1912): 81–116, 161–89, 241–68, here 94–95 where he speaks of Verlegenheits-übersetzungen.

20. Robert J. V. Hiebert, "Translation Technique in the Septuagint of Genesis and Its Implications for the NETS Version," *BIOSCS* 33 (2000): 76–93, here 83.

apparent exception of Job and Proverbs.[21] One final citation from Barr will have to suffice. Says he,

> far from it being the case that every translation is also necessarily an interpretation, there could be points in some ancient translations of the bible where one of the main motives was, if we may put it paradoxically, to avoid interpreting. This was often the case with literal renderings. The concern of the translator was not to take the exegetical decisions but to pass on to his readers . . . the semantic raw material upon which a decision might later be built. The more the complications of possible interpretation, the more numerous the layers of meaning that might be discerned, and the more obscure the language of the original, the more a translator might withdraw from the task of interpreting.[22]

Barr speaks here of "low-level" interpretation,[23] which Anneli Aejmelaeus, in reference to Barr, appropriately characterizes as interpretation on the level of decoding.[24] One might further speak of "representation" in distinction from "translation," of a deferring of meaning or a withdrawing by the translator of his own understanding.[25] In the final analysis, it matters not whether the items in question are based on ignorance or on reasons beyond our reach; they are an *inherent* and thus a *constitutive* characteristic of the translated text all the same. Since they are, they need to be accounted for, at least linguistically. How can what happens best be conceptualized? NETS opted for interlinearity, since interlinearity evokes an appropriate response on the part of the modern reader. I do not know what else can do a better job of conceptualizing such translational phenomena.

3. Interlinearity beyond NETS

Before turning to the penultimate section of my paper, namely, the interlinear paradigm in its own reception history, I would briefly like to take note of the use

---

21. While Barr includes Job and Proverbs in his determination that literality forms the base line of Septuagint Greek, it is noteworthy that the telltale translation-isms are absent from these books. *That* this is so tells us something about them as Greek documents. *Why* this is so is irrelevant from a descriptive point of view (*contra* Ronald L. Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation: The Strategies of the Translator of Septuagint of Isaiah* [JSJSup 124; Leiden: Brill, 2008], 64).

22. Barr, *Typology*, 18.

23. Ibid., 17.

24. Anneli Aejmelaeus, *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays* (rev. and exp. ed.; CBET 50; Leuven: Peeters, 2007), 297. For levels of interpretation, see also Albert Pietersma, "Exegesis in the Septuagint: Possibilities and Limits," in *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures* (ed. Wolfgang Kraus and R. Glenn Wooden; SBLSCS 53; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), 33–45, here 39. That is to say, decoding instead of decoding followed by recoding.

25. See Boyd-Taylor, "Who Is Afraid," 199.

of the term "interlinear" in secondary literature on ancient biblical translations beyond the confines of NETS.

Best known is perhaps what Joseph Reider had to say about Aquila in his *Prolegomena . . . to Aquila*: "There is no gainsaying the pedantic literalness of Aquila's version imparting to it, as it does on the whole, the character of an interlinear."[26] Reider, however, does not have in mind a Hebrew-Greek diglot of sorts; rather, the linguistic relationship that exists between Aquila's text and its Semitic source bespeaks *the character of* an interlinear. As Barr notes, Aquila and his mode of translating have had a bad press from modern scholars, and after citing a sample of negative reactions, he observes, "But of course our present question is not to see Aquila or anyone else 'from the standpoint of the modern translator' [and thus to be censured], but to understand what was the standpoint of the ancient translator himself."[27] Characteristically, Barr's comment hits the nail on the head. As students of the Septuagint, it is our job, first and foremost, to *describe* the translated text and then to *characterize* it, not to *judge* and *dismiss* it. Furthermore, since it is difficult to conclude that Aquila's so-called pedantic literalness was based on ignorance rather than design, and since Barr makes the same point for similar phenomena in the Septuagint, in both cases we seem forced to conclude that this mode of representing the source text is part of the target text's constitutive character and as such must be accounted for. Perhaps the chief difficulty in all of this is the widespread assumption that translation *must be* interpretation and thus *must be* intelligible.

Hermann-Josef Stipp has recently used the term in an article on Micah, where he writes, "Man muß nur wissen, daß das griechische Michabuch—wie viele andere Teile der LXX—nahezu durchgängig die Wortfolge der hebräischen Vorlage nachahmt. Es gehorcht also weithin den Regeln einer Interlinearübersetzung."[28] It is quite clear, however, that Stipp too is not speaking of a Hebrew-Greek diglot, hence not of a theory of Septuagint origins, but yet finds the term useful for conceptualizing the linguistic relationship between target text and source text.

Dieter Böhler, commenting on the Greek of 2 Esdras (Ezra and Nehemiah), writes, "2Esdr dagegen [in distinction from 1Esdr] scheint in den einzelnen hebräischen Wörtern und ihrer Stellung zueinander theologisch Bedeutsames zu vermuten. Er fühlt sich verpflichtet, auch hierin der *hebraica veritas* treu zu bleiben. Schönheit interessiert ihn nicht. Er liest sich wie eine moderne Interlinearübersetzung, die in ihrer hebraisierenden Art bleibend auf den hebräischen Text verweist."[29] For Böhler as well, interlinearity is a heuristic tool rather than a theory of origins.

---

26. Joseph Reider, *Prolegomena to a Greek-Hebrew and Hebrew-Greek Index to Aquila* (Philadelphia: Dropsie College, 1916), 18–19.

27. Barr, *Typology*, 9.

28. Hermann-Josef Stipp, "Bemerkungen zum Griechischen Michabuch," *JNSL* 29 (2003): 103–32, here 115.

29. Dieter Böhler, "'Treu und schön' oder nur 'treu'"? in *Im Brennpunkt: Die Septuaginta,* Band 3, *Studien zur Theologie, Anthropologie, Ekklesiologie, Eschatologie und Liturgie der Griechi-*

Lastly I note that in a sister discipline Steven Fraade has proposed interlinearity as an appropriate interpretive tool for the constitutive character of targum.[30]

All in all, it seems clear that interlinearity as a heuristic tool is deemed useful—at least by some beyond NETS circles—in Septuagint studies. Whether it might then be resorted to as an occasional tool or might better, as NETS has done, be made into a paradigm, that is, a web of assumptions undergirding the theory and methodology of a particular discipline, becomes an interesting question.[31] *Qua* paradigm, the "interlinear assumption" is intended to challenge what we might call the "compositional assumption," under which the Septuagint is treated as if it were a straightforward product of Hellenistic Judaism.

4. The Interlinear Paradigm as Received

Along the way, I have had occasion to refer to the axiomatic distinction between text production and text reception, but also to the fact that the interlinear paradigm, in its own reception history, has come to stand for something quite other than what Boyd-Taylor and I had in mind back in 1997. Why the paradigm has been refigured as a theory about the historical *circumstances* of the Septuagint is not immediately clear but might possibly be due to inadequate exposition on the part of its authors. Perhaps a pejorative interpretation of "interlinearity" played a role as well. Whatever the reason, the paradigm as produced (or as envisioned) might best be revisited.

In this brief survey of comment on the paradigm, I shall not aim at completeness. This seems justified the more, since the critiques I have read tend to boil down to two basic issues: (1) the construal of the paradigm as a theory of Septuagint origins rather than as a metaphor or a heuristic tool, and (2) the failure to recognize that interlinearity as a theory of origins and interlinearity as a heuristic tool are mutually exclusive, since a metaphor is by definition different from what it focuses on. One might thus posit interlinearity either as a theory of origins or as a heuristic tool, but not both at the same time or as one propaedeutic to the other. "Interlinear" refers to linguistic relationship, not to a historical entity.

Natalio Fernández Marcos and Marguerite Harl in their contributions to the Panel on Modern Translations of the Septuagint (Oslo, 1998) reject the interlinear

---

schen Bibel (ed. Heinz-Josef Fabry and Dieter Böhler; BWANT 174; Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 2007), 97–105, here 104. See also R. Glenn Wooden, "Interlinearity in 2 Esdras: A Test Case," in Kraus and Wooden, *Septuagint Research,* 119–44.

30. Steven D. Fraade, "Rabbinic Views on the Practice of Targum, and Multilingualism in the Jewish Galilee of the Third–Sixth Centuries," in *The Galilee in Late Antiquity* (ed. Lee I. Levine; New York and Jerusalem: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1992), 253–86.

31. On this, see Cameron Boyd-Taylor's forthcoming volume, *Reading between the Lines*, where he begins with Aquila and from there proceeds to the LXX.

paradigm.[32] Fernández Marcos notes that, in his judgment, such a Hebrew-Greek diglot never existed physically, and he wonders as well whether it ever existed "at a deeper level." Harl, on the other hand, thinks that the "hypothesis might be interesting and plausible for the origins of the LXX," but "is not supported by any evidence sufficient to make it a basis of a translation procedure."

Jennifer Dines recognizes interlinearity as a metaphor but finds it "only approximately helpful and not to be pressed."[33] She believes the model to be based on *circumstantial* evidence (i.e., on the analogy to Aquila or Homer) rather than on *direct* evidence (i.e., linguistic makeup of the translated text). When Dines, however, attributes to the interlinear model the assumption that "the Hebrew text used by the translators was essentially the same as the MT,"[34] she confuses interlinearity with what, in my judgment, is standard procedure in the discipline, namely, that the consonantal MT is assumed to be the parent text of the Septuagint until proven otherwise.

To T. Muraoka's wide-ranging critique[35] I have responded at some length at ccat.sas.upenn.edu/nets/discussion/pietersma-re-muraoka.html. Muraoka takes no note of interlinearity as a metaphor and interprets it, furthermore, as a pejorative (as opposed to descriptive) characterization of Septuagint Greek.[36] His focus, as his title indicates, is on the paradigm and its implication for Septuagint lexicography. Central in his critique is the seemingly fictitious "tolerant reader," who magically transforms the text as produced into a normal Greek text. While "tolerant readers" might conceivably make light of the text's stylistic shortcomings, they can scarcely change it semantically by their tolerance. Muraoka does, however, correctly raise the question of whether the translated text warrants interlinearity as a paradigm.

---

32. Natalio Fernández Marcos, "Reactions to the Panel on Modern Translations," in Taylor, *X Congress,* 233–40, here 236 (in his Jeremie lecture [Cambridge, 2008] he repeats his misconstrual of interlinearity); Marguerite Harl, "La Bible d'Alexandrie I. The Translation Principles," in Taylor, *X Congress,* 181–97, here 185. It might be of interest to note, however, that, according to Harl, *La Bible d'Alexandrie*—to use the "production"/"reception" distinction—focuses on the text as received.

33. Jennifer M. Dines, *The Septuagint* (Understanding the Bible and Its World; London: T&T Clark, 2004), 52. For a more extensive critique of Dines's position, see Benjamin G. Wright, "The Septuagint and Its Modern Translators," in Karrer and Kraus, *Die Septuaginta*, 103–14, here 107–9.

34. Dines, *Septuagint*, 53.

35. T. Muraoka, "Recent Discussions on the Septuagint Lexicography with Special Reference to the So-called Interlinear Model," in Karrer and Kraus, *Die Septuaginta*, 221–35.

36. My suspicion is that a pejorative view of interlinearity more often plays a part in its rejection. See, e.g., Aejmelaeus, *On the Trail,* 300: "the Septuagint, in general, does not *deserve* to be called interlinear" (emphasis added). Cf. also Böhler's comment above. For NETS the term is strictly descriptive of linguistic relationship.

More recently the interlinear paradigm has been critiqued at some length by Ronald Troxel, who views it primarily from a historical perspective.[37] Thus, *contra* Sebastian P. Brock, he believes that third-century B.C.E. Alexandria knew no options in modes of translation, as a result of which translators perforce translated in a literal manner. Though a freer mode in Job and Proverbs, in distinction from the Pentateuch, is not denied, it is attributed to a difference in literary genre. That a difference in genre resulted in a difference in translation mode is thus posited despite other wisdom books like Ecclesiastes and Sirach.[38] Troxel would therefore seem to subscribe to the proposition that the translators of the Septuagint translated in the way they did, because they could not do otherwise.[39]

The educational comparison with Homer Troxel thinks specious, since the school version of Homer is said not to be a translation, and cribs are said to be exercises *by* students rather than aids written *for* students. Troxel's statement, however, is called into question on both counts by the fact that Raffaella Cribiore regularly uses "translate/translation" for the school text of Homer, albeit in quotation marks, and that the text of Homer in vulgar Greek was supplied by the teacher.[40] Moreover, according to Troxel, we have no evidence that a system of Jewish schooling existed, and in any case no educational milieu is needed to explain the Septuagint's literal mode of translating. While this is correct in essence, it is scarcely adequate to say that the literal mode was the default mode, except perhaps on Troxel's belief that no translational options existed in the third century B.C.E.[41]

Since early Hellenistic Jewish writers like Demetrius cite the Septuagint, we can, according to Troxel, infer that the Septuagint text was freestanding and authoritative from its inception rather than having achieved this status at a later date.[42]

The historical considerations above are clearly not without interest if one seeks to find a sociolinguistic milieu for the kind of text we find in most of the translated Septuagint, based on descriptive analysis and *communis opinio*. They do not, however, address the issue of interlinearity as a theoretical model.

While Troxel agrees that Septuagint studies needs an articulated paradigm of "*how* translators worked,"[43] he disagrees with what he believes to be an assumption

---

37. Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah,* 62–72.

38. Ibid., 65–66. As is well known, Sirach is "literal" and Ecclesiastes "hyper-literal" to the point of unintelligibility.

39. One may well wonder if it matters at all whether translators had translational options, since it is the text as they produced it that really matters.

40. On the former, see Raffaella Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), 142, 207, 211; on the latter, see ibid., 129–42, 191.

41. Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 68–70.

42. Ibid., 69. See also Joosten, "Reflections," 171.

43. Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 69 (emphasis added). For a beginning on normativity, see Boyd-Taylor, "Toward the Analysis of Translational Norms," 27–46.

on the part of the interlinear paradigm, namely, that it is possible to "construct a theory that explains all the features in their [the translators'] work."[44] Be it noted, however, that the interlinear paradigm does not presume to explain all features. Not even a full-scale descriptive analysis of the entire Septuagint would be capable of doing that. Similarly, Troxel thinks that it would be great if we knew "*why* [emphasis added] the translators proceeded as they did."[45] Moreover, though my attempt at articulating an explanatory framework is deemed laudable, according to Troxel, our present sources are inadequate "to reconstruct the origins of the LXX and the philosophy of the translators that bestowed its distinctive text-linguistic texture." I would fully agree if Troxel has in mind historical information (i.e., *circumstantial* evidence) bearing on the Septuagint. But since interlinearity does not aim to be a theory of Septuagint origins but instead a theoretical model, a heuristic tool, the absence of such sources is quite irrelevant. What we do have, however, is (1) the Greek translation itself, (2) by and large the source text from which this translation derives, and (3) compositional literature in Greek from the historical period in question. Thus, if our aim is to determine what sort of text the Greek translation is, as a basis for our interpretive framework, we would seem to be rather well off!

Finally, when Troxel dismisses Jonathan Smith's call for a "theory of translation" as irrelevant to the interlinear paradigm on the grounds that Smith, following Barr, protests the semantic freight assigned by scholars to Septuagint lexemes, he appears to overlook the fact that it is precisely a model of translation, a theoretical framework, a paradigm, that assigns semantic freight to Septuagint lexemes. Thus, while neither Barr nor Smith can be cited in support of the interlinear paradigm, both see a need for an interpretive framework in place of prevailing "ad-hockery," that is, unprincipled or undisciplined use of the translated text.[46]

Most recently, Jan Joosten has written a judicious critique of the paradigm. Though Joosten duly recognizes interlinearity as a heuristic tool, he nevertheless classifies it in the first instance as a hypothesis of Septuagint origins.[47] Moreover, as Joosten explicitly states, he marshals his critique from a historical rather than from a linguistic perspective. So he writes, "The criticisms to be voiced in the present paper all concern the historical side of the interlinear theory."[48] By "historical" he apparently has in mind historically based explanations other than physical inter-

---

44. Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 69.

45. Ibid., 71.

46. The fundamental reason for Troxel's rejection of the paradigm would seem to be that, since he construes it as a theory of origins, it relates to the *circumstances* of the LXX's production, and the circumstances of a text's creation, in his view, are part of production. In fact, the same might be true for others who so construe the paradigm.

47. Joosten, "Reflections," 163–64. The interlinear paradigm is placed alongside of (1) Ptolemaic interest in things Barbarian, (2) code of law for Egyptian Jewry, and (3) liturgical needs of Egyptian Jews.

48. Ibid., 168.

linearity. Thus, what is apparently at issue is not the linguistic character of the Septuagint per se but how one accounts for it historically. In fact Joosten writes, "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."[49] Instead, writes Joosten, "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?"[50] He then concludes, "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, for Septuagint lexicography and for the analysis of possible theological tendencies in the Greek version."[51] Given that, at the *descriptive* level, Joosten appears to have no problems with "potential interlinearity" (i.e., linguistic interlinearity), it is difficult to see how the use of the label "interlinear" can alter any given linguistic phenomenon—unless, of course, "interlinear" is understood to make a claim regarding "prospective function." Admittedly, we know nothing more regarding "prospective function" than what is reflected in the Septuagint's textual-linguistic makeup.

By the same token, when one undertakes to do a *descriptive analysis* of the translated Septuagint, which then informs the theoretical model, does it really matter whether one *begins* with the Pentateuch, as Joosten insists one must do, or *ends* with it? As I see it, descriptively a translational phenomenon is what it is regardless of the label one attaches to it, hence regardless of *why* the translator employed it. To illustrate, I use one of Joosten's own examples, Ezek 40:48b: "he measured the *ʾayil* [Heb. אל, "pillar"] of the *ʾêlām* [Heb. אילם, "vestibule"]" (διεμέτρησεν τὸ αιλ τοῦ αιλαμ). As Joosten notes, the text *qua* Greek text makes no sense and can be understood only in the light of its Hebrew source text. But it lacks semantic transparency no matter what label one attaches! The best one can do is to conceptualize the *linguistic* relationship between the Greek and the Hebrew. And that is where interlinearity comes in. But *why* the translator does what he does remains unknown. We can infer a reason, but no inference alters the fact of target–source linguistic relationship. That the transliteration might not be of benefit in an educational setting, as Joosten suggests,[52] might be the case but is scarcely a refutation of interlinearity as a theoretical model.

---

49. Ibid. By "potential interlinearity" Joosten apparently has in mind the LXX's historical realization, not its linguistic character.

50. Ibid. (emphasis added). Joosten overlooks, however, that "interlinearity" is descriptive of a linguistic relationship (of target text to source text), not of a historical reality.

51. Ibid.

52. Ibid., 173.

Moreover, no translation equivalent *automatically* becomes institutionalized as part of the living language simply because it is used by more than one translator, even if its first occurrence happens to be in the Pentateuch.[53]

All in all, Joosten seems to perceive the label "interlinear" to function as a kind of straitjacket that precludes legitimate interpretation.[54] Yet he later writes, "The interlinear hypothesis is not incompatible with the presence of exegetical elements in the Greek texts."[55]

It might be argued, however, that it does the exact opposite, since, if the translators did what they did because that is how they saw fit to do it, modern apologias for their inexperience in translating, their lack of literary skill, their linguistic incompetence in Hebrew or Greek or both, their misfortune of having to work with a corrupt source text, and so on, miss the mark.[56] I will return to this point in my conclusion.

5. Interlinearity: Heuristic Tool versus Theory of Origins

Interlinearity as a theory of Septuagint origins deserves to be questioned for the simple reason that, as some critics have rightly noted—Joosten included[57]—we have no evidence that an actual or virtual[58] Hebrew-Greek diglot ever existed. This is not to say that it *could* not have existed but only that we have *no evidence* that it did, either direct or circumstantial in the form of some ancient literary reference. That being the case, the question that remains is whether the Septuagint might be said to *behave like* an interlinear, that is to say, that its textual-linguistic makeup gives it the *character of* an interlinear, as Reider suggested for Aquila and as Joosten seems to grant for the Septuagint.[59]

53. Be it noted, for example, that T. Muraoka began his *Lexicon* not with the Greek Pentateuch but with the Twelve Prophets. Moreover, if translation equivalent were understood to equal Alexandrian Jewish Greek, how could we not conclude that the translated LXX reflects Jewish patois?

54. Since this perception appears to be more widespread, it should be noted that it presupposes a routine negation of one of NETS's fundamental directives, namely, to translate idiomatic Greek by idiomatic English, and vice versa. *Quod demonstrandum est*.

55. Joosten, "Reflections," 175.

56. See John A. L. Lee, *A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch* (SBLSCS 14; Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1983). For some of the apologias, see Joosten, "Reflections," 172.

57. Joosten, "Reflections," 170–71.

58. That is to say, the *actual* use of the translation as an ancillary text to the Hebrew.

59. Joosten insists, however, that even "incomprehensibilty . . . does not mean non-independence. The oracles from Delphi, too, were incomprehensible, yet they were freestanding!" ("Reflections," 174). The analogy would seem rather far-fetched. Moreover, if one admits that at times the Greek text is incomprehensible, as Joosten does, and that, in such cases, the Hebrew is needed to ascertain what is going on in the Greek, as Joosten does as well, is one then not

As noted above, NETS has in fact adopted interlinearity as a heuristic tool for the translated Septuagint. More particularly, for NETS interlinearity is a metaphor, a working hypothesis made into a paradigm. The interlinear paradigm, as a working hypothesis, is based on the text's constitutive character, arrived at through descriptive analysis of the translated text in relation to its Hebrew source, on the one hand, and compositional Greek literature, on the other. If Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS) has taught us anything, it has taught us to *describe* the precise linguistic relationship between source text and target text. In other words, it directs us to be painstakingly *inductive* rather than *deductive*, *descriptive* as opposed to *prescriptive* and thus to shun preconceived notions, based on *circumstantial* evidence of what constitutes "translation."

If continued descriptive analysis proves that the requisite linguistic phenomena are *not* in fact to be found in the Septuagint in sufficient numbers, interlinearity as a working hypothesis will not have been verified. The hypothesis is thus not immune to falsification.

To the extent, however, that the rejection of interlinearity, whether as a theory of origins or as a heuristic tool (or both), promotes a renewed interest in the *Letter of Aristeas* as a document on the historical origins of the Septuagint and therefore as the starting point for linguistic investigation, I am alarmed, for the simple reason that *Aristeas*, though of great importance for reception history of the Septuagint, has nothing to do with descriptive analysis of the text and therefore cannot tell us anything about its constitutive character.

What is needed more than ever before, as I see it, is the direct evidence furnished by the text itself as mapped onto its source, in other words, systematic, descriptive analysis. Even the sociolinguistic question about Septuagint origins in the wake of descriptive analysis might best be held in abeyance until much more analysis within the framework of DTS has been accomplished.

Since it is not interlinearity as a theory of Septuagint origins that is being promoted by NETS, but rather interlinearity as a metaphor and therefore as a heuristic tool, two questions are in order: (1) What is a metaphor? and (2) What are the conditions for the use of interlinearity as a heuristic tool made into a paradigm, a working hypothesis, in Septuagint studies?

First, what is a metaphor? I cite here Max Black in *Models and Metaphors:*

> A . . . metaphor has the power to bring two separate domains into cognitive and emotional relation by using language directly appropriate to the one as a lens for seeing the other; the implications, suggestions, and supporting values entwined

---

implicitly saying that, at least at such a point, the Greek text is *linguistically* dependent on and *linguistically* subservient to the Hebrew source text, and therefore tantamount to an interlinear—in whatever form?—which is *not* to say, of course, that the Greek functioned as a de facto crib to the Hebrew.

> with the literal use of the metaphorical expression enable us to see a new subject matter in a new way.[60]

According to Black, a metaphor is thus not a fancy but unrealistic manner of speaking but is, on the contrary, an essential tool for understanding one domain by using another domain as a lens. In our case, the domain to be understood is the linguistic relationship of the Septuagint to its source text, while the domain to function as a lens is an interlinear diglot. Be it noted, however, that while knowledge of interlinearity is presupposed on the part of the modern reader of the Septuagint, the existence of a Hebrew-Greek diglot is not, nor for that manner is familiarity on the part of the Greek translators of the Septuagint with any bilingual diglots.

As for the importance of metaphor in biblical interpretation, consider but the anthropomorphic metaphor applied to biblical language about God. Rather than being simply a fancy manner of expression, it is surely deemed essential by most for conceptualizing what God shows himself to be in his actions.

A second observation to be made is that just because we use anthropomorphism as a heuristic tool in understanding the Bible, this is *not* to say that the entire Bible should be understood metaphorically or allegorically—unless metaphor be made into a paradigm.[61] But it *is* to say that metaphorical language is an *inherent*, that is, a *constitutive* characteristic of the Bible. One might call "metaphor" the baseline definition of biblical language but only if metaphor, from being an occasional heuristic tool, is made into a paradigm—that is to say, only if a given metaphor becomes a working hypothesis.

What conditions for use might then be delineated for interlinearity as a metaphor made into a paradigm? I would suggest the following:

1. A relatively high degree of isomorphic transfer, some of it resulting in contextual lack of semantic transparency. That is to say, a given morpheme in the target text so closely mimics an item in the source text that it may fail to fit its Greek context. For example, a Hebrew preposition might be given a Greek article as counterpart, which then may interfere with standard Greek discourse.
2. A relatively high degree of lexical transfer, some of it resulting in contextual lack of semantic transparency. That is to say, a given lexeme in the target text so closely mimics a lexeme in the source text that it may fail to fit its Greek context. For example, a Hebrew lexeme might be given an etymologized counterpart in Greek, which interferes with semantic coherence.

60. Max Black, *Models and Metaphors: Studies in Language and Philosophy* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press), 236.

61. Cf., e.g., Philo Judaeus.

3. A relatively high degree of segmentation (word order) that mimics the source text, some of it resulting in contextual lack of semantic transparency in the target text.

It seems clear, then, that the warrant for interlinearity as a working hypothesis lies one step beyond literality. The implied reader of such a text is evidently expected to cope not only with a relatively high degree of isomorphic and lexical consistency between the target text and the source text as well as with formal correspondence in word order, but also with unintelligibility.

The above criteria can be met in Aquila, in the so-called *kaige* materials, as well as in most of the remaining translated corpus of the Septuagint. Just what constitutes "a relatively high degree" might best be left to pragmatic considerations. One uses interlinearity as a heuristic tool as long as it makes sense, that is, as long as it retains its explanatory power. Whereas one might use this tool heavily in Aquila and the *kaige*-related books in the Septuagintal corpus, one might have little use for it in Isaiah and possibly none at all in Job and Proverbs. To use or not to use this tool is therefore contingent on its explanatory power in any given unit of translation.[62]

Since interlinearity as a heuristic tool does not presuppose the existence of a Hebrew-Greek diglot, and since what lies beyond literalism belongs to the constitutive character of most texts in the corpus, there is good reason to consider (linguistic) interlinearity, rather than literalism, the baseline definition of Septuagint Greek. Differently put, I would suggest that we approach the Septuagint with the working hypothesis of linguistic interlinearity, since the fundamental issue here is one of where the burden of proof must lie. That working hypothesis, then, makes the metaphor of interlinearity into a paradigm. Moreover, while interlinearity can accommodate literalism, literalism cannot accommodate interlinearity.

6. Conclusion

I noted earlier that the interlinear paradigm—as produced albeit not as received—has great explanatory power, notably in lexicography and grammaticography and, thus, by extension for exegesis. I close with two quite arbitrary examples from these two areas.

For lexicography the reference is Gen 12:5, a verse discussed by John Lee[63] in his critique of the 1968 *Supplement*[64] to the Liddell-Scott-Jones lexicon nearly forty years ago.

62. See Boyd-Taylor, *Reading between the Lines*, where he analyzes selections from Aquila; OG of 3 Reigns; *kaige* of 4 Reigns; Psalms; Genesis; Deuteronomy; Job.

63. John A. L. Lee, "A Note on Septuagint material in the Supplement to Liddell and Scott," *Glotta* 47 (1969): 234–42.

64. H. G. Liddell, Robert Scott, H. Stuart Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon. A Supplement* (ed. E. A. Barber; Oxford: Clarendon, 1968).

LXX: καὶ ἔλαβεν Αβραμ τὴν Σαραν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸν Λωτ υἱὸν τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ καὶ πάντα τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτῶν ὅσα ἐκτήσαντο καὶ πᾶσαν ψυχὴν ἣν ἐκτήσαντο ἐν Χαρραν, καὶ ἐξήλθοσαν . . .

NETS: And Abram took his wife Sara and his brother's son Lot and all their possessions that they had acquired and every person [ψυχή] whom they had acquired in Charran, and they departed . . .

As a semantic component for ψυχή the *Supplement* adds "slave" on the basis of the standard lexicographical principle that context determines meaning. Since the context makes clear that the ψυχή in question is a bought one, the addition seems warranted. But as Lee points out, two considerations suggest otherwise: (1) ψυχή here and elsewhere in the Septuagint is the standard gloss for Hebrew נפשׁ and is not attested in compositional literature with the sense of "slave," and (2) the *Supplement* confuses "sense" with "reference," a basic distinction to be made in lexicography. Whereas the "sense" of a word is based on common usage in the speech community and is thus conventional, "reference" denotes the entity referenced by the specific context. Thus, while it is true that in Gen 12:5 ψυχή references a bought individual—and bought individuals are commonly called "slaves"—*lexicographically* it would be quite wrong to assign a new semantic component to ψυχή in light of Gen 12:5 for the simple reason that Gen 12:5 does not provide us with straightforward use of language. The presence of ψυχή is not due to contextual appropriateness but, instead, is brought about by the standard equivalence of נפשׁ = ψυχή, irrespective of contextual appropriateness. One might thus say that the vertical dimension of the Greek text to its source interferes with its horizontal dimension, the semantic relationship among its constituent parts. But how can one justify that a central principle in lexicography be set aside in Gen 12:5? Obviously, because the nature of the text demands it. How can it be done in a principled manner? By using interlinearity as a heuristic tool. What is at issue here, therefore, is not that interlinearity creates a new semantic component but rather that the lexicographer is delivered from falling into a lexicographical trap.

My example on grammar is from Psalms. The verb הגה ("moan, growl, utter, speak, muse") occurs eleven times in Psalms, five times with a prepositional phrase in ב as complement (1:2; 63[62]:7; 77[76]:13; 115:7[113:15]; 143[142]:5) and six times with a direct object (2:1; 35[34]:28; 37[36]:30; 38[37]:13; 71[70]:24; 90[89]:9). When the Hebrew has a prepositional phrase, the Greek mimics it with a prepositional phrase in ἐν (or once εἰς: 63[62]:7), for example, ἐν τῷ νόμῳ αὐτοῦ, "on his law he will meditate" (1:2). But when the Hebrew features a direct object, the Greek follows with an accusative of direct object, for example, ἡ γλῶσσα μου μελετήσει τὴν δικαιοσύνην σου, "my tongue will contemplate your righteousness" (34:28).

Whether the difference in grammatical construction reflects a semantic difference in the source text is not obvious and is, in any case, irrelevant. What matters is that in Greek usage μελετάω takes the accusative. We seem compelled, therefore,

to conclude that μελετάω + ἐν is due to interference from the Hebrew source text. But what does one do with this item when writing a grammar of Septuagint Greek? Since writing a grammar, like doing lexicography, is to record conventional usage in the language, it will not do to record that in the Septuagint μελετάω can take one of two constructions, either with the accusative or with an ἐν-phrase as complement, any more than that one can record that "slave" is a semantic component of ψυχή. Greek μελετάω + ἐν is, as best we can tell, an instance of negative transfer from the source language, and thus an instance not of living language but of translationese. Thus, when writing either a lexicon or a grammar of Septuagint Greek, we seem to be faced with one of two options: either one assumes that the Septuagint is written in Alexandrian Jewish Greek and, accordingly, one accepts both instances of translationese as living language or, if one is intent on doing corpus-based lexicography or grammaticography, one marks translationese or translation equivalence distinctively.

In rejecting interlinearity as a heuristic tool in the guise of just another theory of Septuagint origins, one might just be throwing out the proverbial baby with the bathwater.

Moving beyond Translating a Translation: Reflections on A New English Translation of the Septuagint (NETS)

Benjamin G. Wright III

1. Introduction

The completion of NETS in 2007 brought to fruition one stage of an anticipated two-stage project. Over the course of the almost thirteen years that I worked with Albert Pietersma as one of the coeditors, I learned as much as anyone about the nature of the Septuagint/Old Greek (LXX/OG) and the current state of Septuagint studies. Certainly the road to NETS's appearance had its potholes, and I admit at some moments I thought it might never see the light of day. Indeed, I would be remiss if at this conference, celebrating the appearance NETS, I neglected to thank all those involved in the project, from the translators to those at Oxford University Press, without whose work NETS would not have been possible. Many thanks to all of you. Of course, I want to single out my coeditor, Al Pietersma, with whom I have worked so closely for all these years. Al brought tireless energy and intellectual leadership to this project, and beyond our professional collaboration, I cherish the friendship that developed out of our work.

As I have thought about my own intellectual journey with the NETS project, I realize now how unprepared I was for this undertaking when I was asked to become one of the coeditors. It is probably a good thing that I did not comprehend that in the early 1990s. If I had, I might well have declined the position. Sometimes ignorance *is* bliss. But serving both as an editor and as a translator of NETS forced me to confront a range of issues from which I could not shrink. With NETS's appearance, and in anticipation of the Society of Biblical Literature Commentary on the Septuagint (SBLCS), it seemed that this interim period and this conference would be a good time to reflect critically on NETS. What I have in mind here, now that NETS has indeed become *a fact of its target culture*, is to direct some theoretical questions at NETS *as a translation*. After all, NETS emerged out of a particular set of methodological questions and theoretical perspectives, and looking at NETS via those perspectives should shed light on both the translation and the theoretical framework on which we depended.

The framework I employ in this paper is one that has gained some currency in Septuagint studies, primarily because of NETS, and it has certainly generated a lot of scholarly discussion. It owes a great deal to the work of the Israeli translation theorist Gideon Toury, who, in his book *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*, argues that all translations are facts of their target cultures and that the intended position of a translation, its textual-linguistic makeup, and the translator's particular strategies "do not constitute a series of unconnected facts."[1] These three "facts" of translations "form one complex whole whose constitutive parts are hardly separable from one another for purposes other than methodical."[2] But, Toury maintains, since translation is a "*teleological* activity by its very nature, its systemic position, and that of its future products, should be taken as forming constraints of the highest order."[3] So, for Toury, the interconnections inherently move in one direction—"the prospective systemic position or function of a translation determines its appropriate surface realization (= textual-linguistic makeup), which governs the strategies whereby a target text (or parts thereof) is derived from its original, and hence the relationships which hold them together."[4] This is as true for NETS as it was for the translators of the LXX/OG.[5] In fact, the introduction to NETS, "To the Reader of NETS," although it was not constructed intentionally to exemplify Toury's claims about translations, provides a good example of how these facts connected with one another in the NETS project. Unfortunately for modern scholars, the ancient translators did not provide a similar introduction, "To the Reader of the LXX/OG," to accompany their translations.

2. The Nature of Translations

One of the important implications of Toury's work, and the one I want to highlight in this paper, is the essentially *sociocultural* and *historical* nature of translations. Cameron Boyd-Taylor makes the following observation about Septuagint studies:

> For the Septuagint scholar, the task of interpretation is inextricably bound up with questions of a historical nature. Thus there has long been a felt need within the discipline to provide historically motivated guidelines and constraints for the interpretation of the text, but in the absence of a theoretical framework such controls have tended to remain *ad hoc* in scope. By tentatively delineating the place

1. Gideon Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond* (Benjamins Translation Library 4; Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins, 1995); quotation from 24.

2. Ibid., 11.

3. Ibid., 14.

4. Ibid., 13.

5. For the use of the title LXX/OG, see Benjamin G. Wright, "The Septuagint and Its Modern Translators," in *Die Septuaginta—Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten: Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 20.–23. Juli 2006* (ed. Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus; WUNT 219; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008) 103–4.

> of a text within the institution that produced it, one gains a strong measure of control over the interpretive task.[6]

Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS) offers such a theoretical framework. If, as Toury maintains, translations are facts of target cultures and ultimately both the textual-linguistic character of a translation and the strategies employed to achieve its surface realization relate directly to the systemic position that the translation is intended to occupy, then the linguistic performances that constitute the activity of translation are inextricably rooted in the sociocultural realities and historical circumstances of the translators. The historical and the linguistic, then, are knotted together in an uncuttable Gordian knot. So, to give just one example important to Septuagint studies, if we do not know the exact intended systemic position (or function, terms that Toury uses synonymously) for a translation, as we do not for the Septuagint (here meaning the Septuagint proper, the translation of the Pentateuch), its textual-linguistic makeup and the strategies evident in the translation should provide some indication of this otherwise unknown intended function. That position will then be either consistent or inconsistent with particular (and hypothetical) intended uses for a translation. I have argued elsewhere, for instance, that Toury's position-product-process model can serve as a touchstone for trying to assess the claims made in the *Letter of Aristeas* about the intended position and textual-linguistic character of the Septuagint. More on that below.

As a heuristic example, keeping in mind that Toury's arguments are aimed at constructing a methodology for describing translation as an activity as much as they are intended to describe any individual instance of translation, I want to look at NETS and at "To the Reader of NETS," but here I want to consider them as historical documents, as evidence for the investigation of the position, product, and process of NETS. Unlike the LXX/OG, we can know at least what the editors intended NETS's function to be. Of course, what information we might glean from translators themselves (or in this case the editors) constitutes only a partial picture. If position, product, and process are interrelated facts, then the textual-linguistic makeup of the translation along with its attendant translation techniques complete the picture.[7] Consequently, we need to look at both the translation and its introduction.

---

6. Cameron Boyd-Taylor, "Reading between the Lines—Towards an Assessment of the Interlinear Paradigm for Septuagint Studies" (Ph.D. diss., University of Toronto, 2005), 31 (forthcoming from Peeters). Boyd-Taylor's dissertation is an extended argument for the use of the interlinear paradigm to determine a translation's constitutive character, providing the analytical tools to engage in the interpretive task he writes about in this passage.

7. Boyd-Taylor demonstrates this last point well in his example of Henry Scott Riddell's Scottish translation of the Bible, based on the Authorized Version. See "Reading between the Lines," 73–83.

I should note here that by function or position, Toury does not mean *Sitz im Leben*. That is, rather than what a translator intends to do with a translation once it is produced, position refers to the cultural location, the systemic value, of a translation, which is structural. It can perhaps be best thought of in certain binary formulations, such as central/peripheral, literary/nonliterary, or monolingual/bilingual.[8] Although perhaps a bit more complicated than thinking about translation of an original source language composition, we can look at NETS and think about its intended position or function.

3. The Methodological Framework of NETS

At the very beginning of the project, the translation committee understood that NETS required a theoretical basis on which to stand, particularly because we were translating a corpus that was itself a translation. How might that differ from translating a work composed originally in Greek? In short, we sought a methodological framework that would guide the project. The language we fixed upon was that of dependence on the source text, and the model that we ultimately adopted was what has come to be known as the "interlinear paradigm."[9] This approach, which has generated much debate in Septuagint studies, has been explained in a range of publications, including Pietersma's paper for this conference, and so I will not rehearse it here. One can find it in its most succinct form in "To the Reader of NETS."[10]

But first some brief history. The methodological questions that led to the interlinear paradigm were initially worked out in Pietersma's NETS translation manual, which was published in 1996 and was distributed to all the translators in the project.[11] In 1997 and 1998 the interlinear paradigm emerged from this initial thinking about how to translate a translation. In 1998 at the Oslo meetings of the IOSCS, Pietersma set out the paradigm for the first time.[12] The next major step in

---

8. See Boyd-Taylor, "Reading between the Lines," 61; and my discussion in "The *Letter of Aristeas* and the Reception History of the Septuagint," *BIOSCS* 39 (2006): 47–67 (reprinted in Benjamin G. Wright III, *Praise Israel for Wisdom and Instruction: Essays on Ben Sira and Wisdom, the Letter of Aristeas and the Septuagint* [JSJSup 131; Leiden: Brill, 2008] 275–96).

9. 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: Brill, 2002) 337–64; and "To the Reader of NETS" (see n. 10).

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

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

12. Albert Pietersma, "A New English Translation of the Septuagint," *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Oslo, 1998* (ed. Bernard A. Tay-

the process was the first version of "To the Reader of NETS" that accompanied the initial product of NETS, Pietersma's translation of Psalms published in 2000.[13] The fullest articulations of this approach have come in Pietersma's paper "A New Paradigm for Addressing Old Questions: The Relevance of the Interlinear Model for the Study of the Septuagint," published in 2002, and most recently in Cameron Boyd-Taylor's Ph.D. dissertation (University of Toronto, 2005), "Reading between the Lines—Towards an Assessment of the Interlinear Paradigm in Septuagint Studies." The first place I can find Toury's work documented within NETS-oriented scholarship is in Pietersma's article "A New Paradigm," but DTS came to form an important theoretical nexus for understanding and, in some cases, reconfiguring ideas that had been central to NETS from the beginning.

4. The Intended Position of NETS

With DTS as the theoretical perspective used to frame both the interlinear paradigm and NETS, we can make several observations about NETS as a translation of the LXX/OG. "To the Reader of NETS" offers several indications of its intended position. First, the interlinear paradigm provides the foundation for using the NRSV as a base for NETS. As Boyd-Taylor notes, the interlinear paradigm is an expression of the notion that the Greek translators of the so-called Septuagint intended their product to have a relationship of dependence on their source text. That is, they did not intend to produce translations meant to be independent of those sources.[14] Dependence was central to their intended function. As such, it also informed NETS so that just as the Greek translators intended to lean on the formal features of the Hebrew—to bring the reader to the original, so to speak—the editors determined that what was needed was a product that would reflect "general compatibility of translational approach with that of the LXX itself."[15] Thus, the principle of interlinearity guided the process of translating a translation inasmuch as the English of NETS was itself based on an English translation. Working with the general maxim of "retain what you can, change what you must," NETS operated with a notion of dependence, of bringing the reader to the original. As the editors point out, though, two conflicting goals lie at the heart of NETS: "(1) to give as faithful a translation of the Greek as is possible, both in terms of its mean-

lor; SBLSCS 45; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001), 217–28. The material quoted in Pietersma's paper for this conference was adapted and included in "To the Reader of NETS," xiv.

13. *A New English Translation of the Septuagint: The Psalms* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000).

14. Boyd-Taylor, "Reading between the Lines," 96–101.

15. "To the Reader of NETS," xv. Of course, the idea of interlinearity or dependence in NETS excludes those works that were not translations, such as the Wisdom of Solomon, but it includes "assumed translations" such as 1 Maccabees. For the notion of assumed translation, see Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies*, 31–35.

ing and in terms of its mode of expression and (2) to create a tool in English for the synoptic study of the Hebrew and Greek texts of the Bible."[16] Time will tell how well scholars think we accomplished those goals.

Although identifying an intended readership does not equal intended function, in the case of NETS what gets said about that audience points to some important aspects of its intended position. Using Eugene Nida's and C. R. Taber's three audiences for biblical translations, NETS identifies its prospective audience as "a biblically well-educated audience," since "most probably this audience has a more than passing interest in traditions of biblical literature other than their own."[17] From this description, one can see that NETS is primarily intended to slot into a monolingual context. Yet, although NETS was intended to function on its own in an English environment, it might be interesting to ask whether NETS *actually* functions in the target culture as it was intended. Given the social and cultural location of its production, the scholarly study of the Septuagint, it could conceivably be perceived to target a setting such as a postsecondary school where people (students or teachers) have knowledge of the source language.

Second, although the phrase "Bible translation" occurs once in "To the Reader of NETS," NETS is not conceived of as a translation of the Bible. In this sense, the project was not intended for liturgical or religious use, although it does not really preclude the latter, but rather for study. Thus, the scope of the works translated in NETS does not accord exactly with any contemporary canonical corpus. The NRSV, which is a translation intended for religious use, was selected as an English base text for methodological reasons, as I indicated. Practical concerns also played an important part in its adoption, particularly (1) the approach taken to translating the Hebrew—"as literal as possible, as free as necessary"[18]—which seems at least to privilege the source text, and (2) its widespread use in university classrooms as well as in ecclesiastical settings.

If we look, then, at the explicit information given in "To the Reader of NETS," the editors describe a translation whose prospective systemic position and function could be characterized by dependence or transparency, both with respect to its Greek source text and in relation to an already existing English translation of the Hebrew. Thus, it was intended to possess some of the characteristics of a diglot.[19] In a manner analogous to that of the LXX/OG, NETS brings the reader to the original, although not to the degree that it utilizes ungrammatical Eng-

16. "To the Reader of NETS," xvi. Over the course of the project, however, the maxim "retain what you can, change what you must" and the attendant goals of NETS were likely modified somewhat from the earliest ideals as expressed in the translation manual.

17. "To the Reader of NETS," xiv.

18. Preface to the NRSV. See Harold W. Attridge, ed., *The HarperCollins Study Bible* (rev. ed.; San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 2006), xxiii.

19. The image of the LXX/OG as one-half of a Hebrew-Greek diglot is used in "To the Reader of NETS," xiv.

lish. In addition, within literary systems the adjectives "central" and "peripheral" might also be applicable here. The adjective "central" indicates that a translation is intended to conform to the standards of a well-formed literary text in the target language. One aspect of NETS's intended function might, then, be called peripheral, since an emphasis on dependence and transparency with the source text would not lead one to expect NETS to have the character of a well-formed literary text in English. And indeed, when one looks at NETS itself, as we will briefly, this expectation is confirmed.

5. The Textual-Linguistic Makeup of NETS

Within Toury's target-oriented scheme, the intended position determines the appropriate textual-linguistic makeup of the translation. What kind of textual-linguistic makeup is best suited to the intended position of NETS outlined above? In discussing translation as a norm-governed activity, Toury speaks about the degree of adherence to source norms and/or target norms on a spectrum between two poles: "adequacy," adherence to source norms, and "acceptability," adherence to target norms.[20] Boyd-Taylor has argued that methodological problems related to the term "adequacy" can be overcome by focusing on the extent to which a translation "is judged to be an acceptable translation (or not) within the target culture," that is, on assimilation to or deviation from acceptability.[21] One element of paramount interest in the concept of acceptability is the extent to which the textual-linguistic makeup of a translation displays either positive or negative interference, that is, the degree to which the features of the source language govern the translator's selection of target language features. Positive interference occurs when a translation exhibits a distribution of target features at odds with the conventional distribution of those features in the target language. Negative interference occurs when a translator allows the formal features of the source language to determine the selection of target-language features to the extent that the translation results in an ill-formed text by the standards of the target language.[22] Since no translation is a straightforward performance in the target language, all translations display interference, and the extent to which they do is a significant indication of their target-culture acceptability.

If we consult "To the Reader of NETS," we can see what kind of textual-linguistic makeup might be expected. The first sentence of the section, entitled "NETS: Its Character and Extent," reads, "Though NETS is based on the NRSV, it is not intended to be the-NRSV-once-over-lightly but rather a genuine representa-

20. Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies*, 56–57.

21. Boyd-Taylor, "Reading between the Lines," 67. This idea is part of an extended discussion of the idea of translation equivalence.

22. On interference, see Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies*, 274–79.

tion of the Greek, reflecting not only its perceived meaning, but also, to the extent possible in an English translation, its literary nuggets, as well as its infelicities, pleonasms, problems and conundra."[23] Since the LXX/OG, except for a few books, is not compositional Greek, for NETS it made little sense to give a fully literary, that is, a highly acceptable, translation into English. Instead the rule was where the Greek is nonidiomatic (which is much of the time) the translation should reflect the character of the Greek, warts and all; where the Greek is idiomatic, NETS should have idiomatic English. Thus, one would expect the textual-linguistic makeup of NETS to exhibit a relatively high degree of accommodation to the source text, and a relatively high degree of interference, with the idea of producing a translation in which the nature of the Greek is transparent. This textual-linguistic makeup, then, is one of dependence of a particular sort. Although informed by the idea of interlinearity, it does not result in an interlinear translation in the same manner as the LXX/OG, since NETS does not contain nonsensical English, and in cases where the translation is fully idiomatic English, NETS will probably not map directly onto the fully idiomatic Greek that it translates. Thus, we see the concern that *both* the meaning and character of the Greek find their way into NETS's English.

With the intended function of NETS determining its textual-linguistic character, that surface realization governs the strategies that any individual NETS translator might use to carry out the actual translation. So what might these strategies be? Of course, in any translation unit, the translator was constantly negotiating his/her understanding of the required textual-linguistic makeup, and I certainly cannot provide even a semicomprehensive list of strategies, but several examples of how translators achieved NETS's desired transparency should suffice.[24]

6. Translation Strategies Employed in NETS

In most cases, the LXX/OG translators clearly translated at the word level rather than at the clause or discourse level. Indeed, if one can generalize, this seems to be the primary translation approach. This isomorphism often leads to representations in Greek of Hebrew lexemes or grammatical and syntactical conventions that look decidedly un-Greek, even if they might not necessarily violate Greek rules (although they sometimes do that). So in Gen 2:17, the end of God's command to the first man not to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil is expressed in Hebrew as מות תמות, translated in the NRSV as "you shall die." The Greek translator renders this emphatic phrase into Greek as θανάτῳ ἀποθανεῖσθε, literally "by death you shall die." The translator misses the meaning of the Hebrew,

23. "To the Reader of NETS," xviii.

24. A number of NETS translators have published studies discussing how they understood and rendered the kinds of problems that I am highlighting here. For detailed remarks on each book in the LXX/OG corpus, see the individual introductions in NETS.

even though he tries to keep something of the same root in Greek to mirror the use of the same root in Hebrew. Recognizing this unidiomatic Greek, NETS has for the last part of the verse, "on the day that you eat of it, you shall die by death." A similar circumstance shows up in Leviticus in the discussion of illegitimate sexual relations. Leviticus 18:6 says, "None of you shall approach anyone near of kin to uncover nakedness" (NRSV). The initial phrase "none of you" in Hebrew is expressed with the distributive איש איש and a negated verb. The Greek translation has the verb negated as well, but represents איש איש as ἄνθρωπος ἄνθρωπος, a decidedly non-Greek expression. NETS, understanding that the translator was working isomorphically, glosses the phrase, "Person by person shall not approach."

One of the more difficult areas of translating the LXX/OG involves lexical equivalences. Specifically, when should one ascribe to a Greek word the meaning of the Hebrew word it presumably renders? NETS translators employed a specific method for determining the meaning of Greek words, using a scale ranging from contextual renderings to isolate renderings.[25] One had to keep one eye on the Hebrew text and one on the Greek text, since the Hebrew might prove to be the arbiter of meaning, but normally Greek words in the LXX/OG mean what they meant in the Greek of the period. For instance, in Ps 7:10(9), the psalmist exclaims, ובחן לבות וכליות, which the NRSV renders "you who test the minds and hearts," employing the figurative "minds" for the Hebrew word "kidneys." The Greek translator does not transfer the meaning of the Hebrew into Greek but simply uses the word νεφρός, which in Greek does not have this figurative meaning. Thus, NETS has in this place, "God is one who tests hearts and kidneys."

NETS translators faced the persistent problem of how to render function words, such as articles, conjunctions, and prepositions. The NETS translation manual says of prepositions, "take semantically seriously only marked (i.e., nonstandard) instances."[26] A good example comes in 1 Supplements (= 1 Chronicles) 20:8. The Hebrew has ביד דויד וביד עבריו, "by the hand of David and his servants" in the NRSV. Whereas Hebrew normally repeats the preposition phrase ביד in compound expressions like this one, Greek normally does not. Yet, the translator of 1 Supplements rendered this phrase ἐν χειρὶ Δαυιδ καὶ ἐν χειρὶ παίδων αὐτοῦ, "by the hand of David and by the hand of his servants." NETS not only repeats the preposition but retains the singular of "hand," which produces the awkward English phrase "by the hand of his servants."[27] We see a similar phenomenon in the very isomorphic translation of Song of Songs. In 1:8 the Hebrew, אם לא תדעי לך, rendered "if you do not know" in the NRSV, becomes in Greek, ἐὰν μὴ γνῷς σεαυτήν, "if you do not know yourself," creating, as the NETS translator notes, "a misleading resonance with the ancient Greek adage 'Know yourself.'"[28]

25. See "To the Reader of NETS," xvii–xviii; and Pietersma, *Translation Manual*, 12–15.

26. Pietersma, *Translation Manual*, 15.

27. See the introduction to Supplements, NETS, 343.

28. NETS, 659.

Thus far I have given examples of one aspect of NETS's intended transparency, that is, in giving the reader access to places where the Greek translator has accommodated the translation to the norms of the Hebrew source text. The second aspect of transparency or dependence is cluing the reader in to places where the Greek translator has held to the norms of standard Greek. Assimilating a translation to various target-language norms does not necessitate rejecting the model with which NETS works.[29] A translator can both work in accordance with an isomorphic approach, at the word or short phrase level, which is fundamentally interlinear, and still use normal Greek in the translation. Three examples illustrate the point.

The first example comes from Ps 48(49):3. The Hebrew of 3a is גם בני אדם גם בני איש, which the NRSV translates, "both low and high." The phrase בני אדם would seem to be ripe for negative interference in Greek, especially since the default translation of this Hebrew phrase elsewhere in Psalms is υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου, "son of a man." Yet here the translator resorts to a contextual lexical rendering, γηγενεῖς, "earthborn," in NETS, and the Hebrew גם . . . גם construction appears in translation as τε . . . καί, the usual Greek for what NETS renders by the idiomatic English "both . . . and."[30] We could argue about whether γηγενεῖς catches what the Hebrew means, but the critical point is that the translator, although clearly working at the word/short phrase level, opted for a good Greek word and a normal Greek syntactical construction to render the Hebrew, even though that was not his practice elsewhere.

The second example occurs in Lev 13. In v. 3, rendering a Hebrew comparison that involves the preposition מן, the translator maps the Greek directly onto the Hebrew, producing a phrase that bears little resemblance to sensible Greek, ταπεινὴ ἀπὸ τοῦ δέρματος, which the NETS translator glosses "low in the skin." Just a few verses later in vv. 30 and 31, the translator is presented with two more instances of the same Hebrew phrase. In these places, however, he resorts to the usual Greek manner for expressing comparison, employing a comparative adjective with the genitive case, thereby producing a perfectly understandable Greek phrase, ἐγκοιλοτέρα τοῦ δέρματος, which in NETS is good idiomatic English, "more hollow than the skin."[31]

The final example is found in Josh 6, where we find in v. 13 the normal Hebrew phrase, ותקוע בשפרות, "the trumpets blew," which always has the preposition ב before the object. In this instance, the translator renders the phrase with a cognate accusative in Greek, employing the dative case to represent the Hebrew preposition, ἐσάλπισαν ταῖς σάλπιγξι, "[the priests] sounded with the trumpets,"

29. Toury does not use the language of accommodation and assimilation. Boyd-Taylor develops these categories in his refinements to Toury's work, but specifically as linguistic processes. That is how I intend them here. See Boyd-Taylor, "Reading between the Lines," 71.

30. For the example, see NETS, 544.

31. For the example, see NETS, 84.

which results in a pleonasm, since the Greek verb does not require an object. Only a few verses later in v. 16, the same Hebrew phrase occurs. This time, however, the Greek translator allows the verb alone to do the work, which makes for more normal Greek. Here NETS renders "trumpeted."

In each of these passages, even though the LXX/OG translators employ an interlinear approach and continue to translate at the word or phrase level, they can resort to normal, idiomatic Greek. In these types of cases in NETS, transparency, as a characterization of its expected textual-linguistic character, does not result in hyper-literalism in English but rather idiomatic English. The textual-linguistic character of NETS indicates to the reader that the Greek translator here has made his translation conform to normal Greek conventions.

On the whole, if we look at NETS's textual-linguistic makeup and at its translation strategies, they do indicate the intended position of the translation. The textual examples that I discuss above point to NETS's peripheral value (from the standpoint of a literary system), its dependence, and probably a nonreligious context as well. To highlight just one NETS feature in this connection, the nature of the English that one finds in NETS, particularly the practice of glossing nonidiomatic Greek with nonidiomatic (although grammatical) English, would make it a poor fit for any sociocultural setting that required a well-formed literary text. Of course, if we did not know the use for which NETS was intended, we would have to look at the possible sociocultural contexts where such a translation might fit. Fortunately, we have such information for NETS. As we will see, the lack of such information for the LXX/OG creates a set of problems and questions for that corpus. The agenda of transparency/dependence in NETS's textual-linguistic makeup and the use of the NRSV as a base would further imply a monolingual context that works to inform the reader about the original rather than the other way around. We also learn from submitting NETS to a short position-product-process analysis that the NETS translators were working with a particular paradigm for their translations that stemmed from NETS's intended systemic function, one that emphasizes transparency of the source text. We cannot conclude, then, since their product often displays nonidiomatic English, indeed often uncomfortable English, that they did not know English well or that they did not know Greek well or that they were not very good translators. None of these conclusions, as sociohistorical conclusions based on the NETS translations, is warranted, and they are not valid precisely because of the holistically interrelated nature of position-product-process. Only by examining the translations themselves, together with whatever other information we might possess, can we determine the sociocultural slot or slots that a translation was intended to fit and then draw whatever sociohistorical conclusions are consistent with that analysis.

7. The Systemic Function of the Septuagint according to *Aristeas*

If we look at how the *Letter of Aristeas* portrays the intended systemic function of the Septuagint, the sociocultural and historical value of Toury's target-oriented approach becomes clearer. *Aristeas* has played a central role in thinking about the originating context of the Septuagint, because it tells the only story we have of the circumstances surrounding the translation.[32] But, if a target-oriented approach offers any assistance, it should be able to help us assess what *Aristeas* tells us. That is, the LXX's intended position as *Aristeas* constructs it should comport with the evidence of the textual-linguistic makeup and translation strategies of the LXX itself. So, what does this very familiar story communicate? When we look at *Aristeas*'s story, we discover one basic contention—the Septuagint, although as a translation it derived its prestige and status from the Hebrew it rendered, was meant to be independent from its source text and to serve as the sacred Scriptures of Alexandrian Judaism. If we were to describe what *Aristeas* claims for the Septuagint in the language of systemic position, of sociocultural niche, we would use terms such as independent, central, philosophical, prestigious.

Aristeas employs a number of narrative strategies to substantiate such a characterization, and, given the limited space available, I can only summarize them here.[33] Prestige and centrality are assured in two ways. First, the motivation for the translation is said to be Ptolemy II's desire to have the Jewish Law in his library.[34] Thus, the Septuagint would reside in a prestigious and central cultural institution in the finest literary collection of the ancient world. Moreover, the manuscripts from which the translation should be made must benefit from royal benefaction, and thus they must be highly prestigious (§30). Indeed they arrive in Alexandria on fine parchment written in gold letters, and the king bows before these documents "about seven times" (§§176–77).[35] *Aristeas*'s author describes the resulting translation in terms that suggest it has inherited the prestige of its parent text. Thus, when Demetrius gives his report to the king about the completed translation

32. In Septuagint studies, *Aristeas* has elicited various levels of trust, all the way from dismissal as fiction to confidence in its version of events, and almost everything in between. So, for example, although she argues that *Aristeas* offers us a "charter myth" for the LXX, Sylvie Honigman still wants to preserve royal patronage as a motivating factor for the translation of the Pentateuch (*The Septuagint and Homeric Scholarship in Alexandria: A Study in the Narrative of the Letter of Aristeas* [London: Routledge, 2003], 102–5).

33. For the complete argument, see Wright, "*Letter of Aristeas*."

34. Ptolemy's love of books was famous in the ancient world. See P. M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (3 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1972), ch. 6.

35. All translations of *Aristeas* are my own, prepared for an upcoming commentary on the book in the series Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature (Walter de Gruyter).

"he [i.e., the king] bowed and ordered that great care be taken of the books and that they be preserved reverently" (§317).

The philosophical nature of the translation just as clearly communicates centrality. As Demetrius makes his case for translation of the Jewish Law, he says to Ptolemy, "Now it is necessary that these (manuscripts), having been brought to perfection, be with you [presumably in a translation] because this legislation is both very philosophical and flawless, inasmuch as it is divine" (§31). In order to carry out the translation, Ptolemy requests translators from the Jewish high priest Eleazar in Jerusalem. He requires that they "have lived exceedingly good lives and are eminent, skilled in matters pertaining to their own Law" (§32). After these men arrive in Alexandria, Ptolemy entertains them at a series of banquets during which they respond to his questions about the nature of kingship. The king approves of every answer given, and even the king's own philosophers admit to the philosophical superiority of the Jewish scholars (§§201, 235). These expert philosophers are the same people who are capable of transferring the philosophical quality of the source text to the target text. Thus, *Aristeas* claims that the Septuagint occupies a central position in Hellenistic literature, since the translators have presumably made their translations conform to the target conventions of philosophical texts; that is, they have created a well-formed literary text.

Finally, the independent nature of the translation is most clearly asserted in the scene narrated in §§308–11. Here the translation is read out loud to the assembled Jewish community, which approves of it. Then the leaders affirm, "Since the translation has been made well and piously and accurately in every respect, it is good that it remain as it is, and there be no revision at all" (§310). They then pronounce a curse on anyone who might change any aspect of the translation. As Harry Orlinsky has shown, this entire scene has the character of the Jewish community adopting the Septuagint as sacred Scripture.[36] As a scriptural corpus, which is endowed with all the qualities and character of its parent text, the Jewish community has no need for the Hebrew from which the Septuagint derived. In this scene, we find the suggestion that the adoption of the Septuagint is in effect a second giving of the Law.[37] Almost two hundred years later, what is implicit in *Aristeas* will become explicit in Philo's retelling of the story.[38]

---

36. Harry M. Orlinsky, "The Septuagint as Holy Writ and the Philosophy of the Translators," *HUCA* 46 (1975): 89–114. See also Wright, "*Letter of Aristeas*," 57.

37. The *Letter of Aristeas* also has much in common with, and some sections are even patterned after, events in the exodus narrative. See Honigman, *Septuagint and Homeric Scholarship,* 53–59; and A. Kovelman, *Between Alexandria and Jerusalem: The Dynamic of Jewish and Hellenistic Culture* (Brill Reference Library of Judaism 21; Leiden: Brill, 2005), chap. 3.

38. See my article, "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. Glenn Wooden; SBLSCS 53; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006) 47–61 (reprinted in *Praise Israel*, 297–314).

8. The Inadequacy of *Aristeas*'s Portrayal of the Septuagint

This brief summary of elements of the *Aristeas* legend should suffice at least to indicate the slots in the target system that the work's author claimed for the Septuagint. When we look at the textual-linguistic makeup of the Septuagint itself, we encounter a very different text. First of all, it is not good literary Greek. Its frequent Hebraisms, its overall character, its periodic impenetrability do not lend themselves to almost any of the characterizations derived from *Aristeas*. As I noted above, the development of the interlinear paradigm emerged out of thinking about the relationship between the Hebrew source text and the Greek target text, which exhibits a high amount of negative interference and thus a high level of "accommodation of target conventions to features of the source text."[39] In short, the Septuagint is not what *Aristeas* cracks it up to be.

If we return to a target-oriented approach to translation, the disjunction between how the Septuagint's intended position is represented in *Aristeas* and what we can observe of the textual-linguistic makeup of the Septuagint, which suggests a paradigm of dependence, allows us to conclude that the intended position assigned to the Septuagint in *Aristeas* was in fact not its originally intended position. At this juncture, it is important to note that to say that the intended position of the Septuagint as indicated by its textual-linguistic makeup is not what *Aristeas* claims for it is *not* to suggest any specific social context for the Septuagint. In a way it is a more modest claim than that. The disparity between the two intended functions would at least allow us to conclude that the Septuagint did not originate in a social or historical context in which we would expect a central, literary, and independent translation. In this respect, the evidence of the Septuagint itself at the very least casts doubt on the story transmitted in *Aristeas* as a genuine reflection of the Septuagint's origins. On the flip side of the coin, the intended function of the Septuagint as we derive it from its textual-linguistic makeup will, within the framework of Toury's target-oriented approach, have a connection with social and historical contexts for which that intended function makes sense. We might hypothesize several possible sociocultural and/or historical contexts that satisfy such an intended position, and we would then need to argue for any one of them. In this sense, then, the interlinear paradigm as it is used in NETS and as it is situated within a target-oriented theoretical framework is not a theory of Septuagint origins as some have contended. It does allow us a means to assess the story of origins offered by *Aristeas* and to look for what places might produce a translation like the Septuagint. The descriptive model enables us some purchase on the possibility of discovering something about the Septuagint's origins.

---

39. This descriptor comes from Boyd-Taylor, "Reading between the Lines," 72.

9. The Sociocultural Context of the Septuagint

Appreciation of ancient translations and the Septuagint *as a translation* that was situated in a particular sociocultural context and in specific historical circumstances has become much more evident recently in scholarly studies. Three illustrate this recent interest, one of which I have already mentioned. Cameron Boyd-Taylor's 2005 Ph.D. dissertation, "Reading between the Lines," specifically places the interlinear paradigm into the framework of DTS and at the same time suggests several refinements of Toury's theoretical work. In this study, Boyd-Taylor explicitly argues that scholars cannot separate the social and historical context of a translation from the study of it. At the very beginning he frames his study in specifically sociohistorical terms. He writes:

> And yet the Seventy, if I may refer to them as such, pioneers though they may have been, were, like most translators, engaged in a socially significant undertaking. Their work was informed by shared expectations which defined both its limits and its possibilities. This is not to deny the Seventy their due; it is rather to contextualize their achievement. Translation is after all a socio-cultural phenomenon and it is appropriate to think about this phenomenon in a socio-cultural way.[40]

Boyd-Taylor thus links together relevant social, historical, and linguistic considerations, and his study offers the most detailed articulation of, and arguments for, the interlinear paradigm.

Theo A. W. van der Louw in his Ph.D. dissertation, published as *Transformations in the Septuagint*, engages translation studies of various methodologies in an effort, as he says, to examine how translators *do* their work, not how they *should* do their work.[41] Although he draws on several different approaches, including DTS, van der Louw's focus on description puts the emphasis where it ought to be, on the actual work of ancient translators. I am sure that his study will prompt discussion and debate about how best to apply the methods of translation studies to Septuagint studies. The bulk of his work focuses on specific examples of different types of translation within the LXX/OG corpus. By keeping our focus on the description of translations, we are certainly better positioned to make historical judgments. In his conclusions, however, van der Louw spends more time on what he believes he has discovered about translation universals (362–67) than on any sociohistorical conclusions about the translations or translators (361–62). That these two dissertations have appeared in the last three years, however, testifies to

40. Ibid., iv.

41. The dissertation was written under the supervision of Arie van der Kooij and L. J. de Vries at Leiden University (2006). Its published form is *Transformations in the Septuagint: Towards an Interaction of Septuagint Studies and Translation Studies* (CBET 47; Leuven: Peeters, 2007); here see p. 57.

the growing realization of the importance of translation theory to the work that we do in Septuagint studies. They have built a solid foundation for future thinking about this relationship.

Naomi Seidman, in her book *Faithful Renderings*, takes a decidedly different tack.[42] She treats the Septuagint as part of a larger project having to do with writing "translation narratives"; her work is indebted to postcolonial translation studies. She intentionally distinguishes between translation as a linguistic performance and what she sees as the bigger payoff, that "[t]ranslation narratives are . . . temporal narratives, drawing our attention to the fact that translations unfold within time, paralleling and part of our mortal lives."[43] As to the relation of the two, she writes,

> Such an approach would insist that translation stories are not merely epiphenomena to the true stuff of translation, the relationship between source and target texts, methods of achieving equivalence, obstacles to achieving equivalence, and so on. The narrative approach to translation would insist rather that translation cannot be separated from the material, political, cultural, or historical circumstances of its production, that it in fact represents an unfolding of those conditions.[44]

Seidman's project, then, is not a study of biblical translation, or even ancient translation generally, but of translation discourse, translation "as religious and political rather than 'purely' linguistic."[45] Her focus on the "material, political, cultural, or historical circumstances" of translation, albeit from the standpoint of an analysis of translation discourse, nonetheless raises questions of how one reconstructs/recreates the circumstances of translation. If translators have been "invisible," as Seidman claims, how do we give them substance again? Seidman opts for a method that centers on discourse and narrative about translation rather than on the linguistic performances of translations. Toury and others, however, would argue that linguistic performance is deeply rooted in, and "unfolds from," these circumstances and that this deep-rootedness is essential to any investigation of translations.[46]

10. Conclusion

It is indeed an exciting time to be involved in Septuagint studies. With several modern translation projects completed or under way, the LXX/OG corpus will

42. Naomi Seidman, *Faithful Renderings: Jewish-Christian Difference and the Politics of Translation* (Afterlives of the Bible; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006).

43. Ibid., 10.

44. Ibid., 9.

45. Ibid., 31.

46. For an in-depth review of Seidman's book, see Cameron Boyd-Taylor's review in *RBL* (May 2008), www.bookreviews.org/bookdetail.asp?TitleId=5658&CodePage=5658).

be more available than ever before to a general audience instead of remaining, for the most part, the preserve of a relatively circumscribed group of specialists. Current scholarly research has foregrounded the importance of the Septuagint for historical study. With NETS now completed, the scholarly focus will now shift to the commentary series (SBLCS), in which the full implications of DTS and the interlinear paradigm can be worked out in individual translation units. As we continue to move beyond translating a translation, I look forward to what I anticipate will be a range of new approaches to the study of this corpus and the conversations that they will engender.

The Semantics of Biblical Language Redux

Cameron Boyd-Taylor

1. Introduction

It was in 1961 that James Barr published *The Semantics of Biblical Language*, in which he laid the foundations for a linguistically oriented approach to biblical lexicography.[1] Most biblical scholars have encountered this seminal work in one way or another and have no doubt profited accordingly, so there is no need for me to rehearse the main lines of Barr's argument. My intention in this paper is to revisit a number of key points and relate them to the semantics of the Greek Bible.

The burden of my argument is that the field of Septuagint studies has yet to work out the implications of the biblical semantics movement pioneered by Barr. I attribute this lag to the fact that Barr's criticisms were leveled primarily at biblical theology as it was practiced at the time;[2] it is only very recently that much sustained work has been done on the so-called theology of the Septuagint. Hence, some of the problems Barr was addressing are only now arising. At the same time, the task for Septuagint studies must be distinguished from that of biblical theology proper. What is required, I suggest, is an approach to the Septuagint that squarely addresses the semiotic opposition between translational and nontranslational literature,[3] an opposition that I take to be axiomatic for the field.

---

1. James Barr, *The Semantics of Biblical Language* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961).

2. See James Barr, *The Concept of Biblical Theology: An Old Testament Perspective* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999), 232: "As is clear, the faults in the use of linguistic evidence which I detected and criticized were for the most part located in 'biblical theology' as it was practised at that time, and I said so."

3. See Gideon Toury, "The Meaning of Translation-Specific Lexical Items and Its Representation in the Dictionary," in *Translation and Lexicography: Papers Read at the EURALEX Colloquium Held at Innsbruck 2–5 July 1987* (ed. Mary Snell-Hornby and Ester Pöhl; Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins, 1989), 45–53, here 45; see also Gideon Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond* (Benjamins Translation Library 4; Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins, 1995), 274–79.

This, for me, was the signal lesson of the NETS project: the realization that the critical study of a translation, any translation, raises hermeneutic issues of a different sort from those occasioned by an original composition. To the extent that we are able to speak meaningfully of a theology of the Septuagint, if indeed we can, the manner in which we proceed will be very different from our discussion of the Hebrew Bible. I shall take up this theme presently. For now I return to Barr, who, more than anyone else, has shown the way forward. To focus the discussion, I shall consider the semantic field marked out by the English word "hope," with specific reference to the use of the verb ἐλπίζω in the Greek Psalter.

2. Word and Concept

A central tenet of Barr's approach is the distinction between word and concept.[4] While a word may, in a given context, express a specific concept, it does not follow that its semantic field reflects the structure of that concept.[5] Of course, in theology we frequently use words as a shorthand for key biblical themes. We may, for instance, speak of a theology of *hope*. Here the word "hope" does double duty as a label for a complex discursive structure, though this is not in itself problematic. Barr's point is that if we carry this practice over into the analysis of biblical language, we risk all manner of conceptual confusion.

The problem is compounded when we turn to the language of the Septuagint. For here there is a temptation to assume that through the process of Hebrew–Greek translation *concepts* expressed in the source language somehow passed over into *lexical meanings* within the target language. A celebrated instance of this phenomenon is the Greek verb ἐλπίζω. Ceslas Spicq, for instance, claims that "a veritable semantic revolution is effected by the LXX," which gives the word "a strictly religious meaning."[6] In Attic Greek, ἐλπίζω carries the near universal meaning of expectation in relation to the future—the expectation in question may be good or bad as the case may be.[7] But in the Septuagint, particularly the Greek Psalter, a very different attitude is evident. As Spicq writes, "Hope, which is always directed

4. David Alan Black, *Linguistics for Students of New Testament Greek: A Survey of Basic Concepts and Applications* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1995), 123.

5. James Barr, *Biblical Words for Time* (SBT 33; London: SCM, 1962), 110: "In other words we once again repudiate the treatment of a word as a 'concept' in the way which has been normal in modern biblical theology. Such a method normally leads naturally to an attempt to regard the location of the various items on the vocabulary grid of a particular language as reproducing the essential elements of a thought structure in the typical mind of the members of the speech group concerned."

6. Ceslas Spicq, *Theological Lexicon of the New Testament* (trans. and ed. James D. Ernest; 3 vols.; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1994), 1:485, s.v. ἐλπίζω.

7. Walther Zimmerli, *Man and His Hope in the Old Testament* (SBT 2/20; London: SCM, 1971), 2.

toward God, is no longer any expectation whatsoever, but a sure and certain confidence in YHWH."[8]

In the background of Spicq's remarks lies the influence of Gerhard Kittel's *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (*TDNT*), the prime target of Barr's critique. In his contribution to the entry for ἐλπίζω, Rudolf Bultmann had written that, in the Septuagint, "The righteous are always referred to what God will do, so that hope is not directed to anything specific, nor does it project its own view of the future, but it consists rather in general confidence in God's protection and help."[9] This attitude is to be distinguished from the Greek habit of associating hope with uncertainty, fantasy and folly.[10]

How did this supposed semantic change come about? The underlying assumption of the *TDNT* article is voiced by Nigel Turner: ἐλπίζω derived its biblical meaning from בטח.[11] The Hebrew verb is often found in prayer and song formulae, where it describes security in God. In the Psalter it regularly occurs in contexts which assume that "in times of distress there is no way for man to survive but to take refuge in Yahweh, to trust in him, and to have confidence in him."[12] Since בטח is typically rendered by ἐλπίζω in the Greek Psalter, Turner implies, the latter took up the theological sense carried by its Hebrew counterpart.

This, then, is the locus of the semantic revolution to which Spicq refers. The word ἐλπίζω has shed the garments of Greek pessimism and put on the splendid raiment of a theology of hope. Hope, writes Spicq, is now "a matter of finding one's refuge in YHWH; of having full and complete confidence in him."[13] The principal heir of this language, this lexicon, and this faith, Spicq continues, is the Apostle Paul, for whom hope pertains to "the whole economy of the new covenant."[14] In this respect, the object of hope is now decidedly eschatological. Bultmann expresses this idea with characteristic force: "Christian hope rests on the act of salvation, and since this is eschatological, hope is itself an eschatological blessing."[15]

And so it is. But, as James Barr taught us, when we speak this way we are talking about a concept, not a word. There can be no doubt that the Pauline corpus is characterized by a theology of hope.[16] That its distinct verbal texture is indebted, at least in part, to the language of the Septuagint is also not in question. What is

---

8. Spicq, *Theological Lexicon*, 1:485.

9. Rudolf Bultmann, "ἐλπίς, ἐλπίζω," *TDNT* 2:517–33, here 522–23.

10. In classical Greek literature, it is a truism that the hopes of mortals are uncertain and misleading: in a word, hope is blind (Bultmann, "ἐλπίς," 517–19). See also Zimmerli, *Man and His Hope*, 2–3; and Michel Despland, *The Education of Desire: Plato and the Philosophy of Religion* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985), 281.

11. Nigel Turner, *Christian Words* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1981), 214.

12. Alfred Jepsen, "בטח," *TDOT* 2:88–94, here 91.

13. Spicq, *Theological Lexicon*, 1:485.

14. Ibid., 489.

15. Bultmann, "ἐλπίς," 532.

16. For Paul, hope is based on the gospel and centered in God; it is a present endowment of

questionable is the idea that underlying this language is a fundamental change in the semantics of the word ἐλπίζω. Yet this assumption has made its way uncontested into both the lexicography and the exegesis of the Greek Bible. It needs to be closely examined.

3. Semantics in Biblical Research

If semantic analysis is to escape the pitfalls identified by Barr, a number of principles need to be observed. In his monograph on semantics in biblical research, John Sawyer identifies four.[17]

1. An adequate definition of context must precede every semantic statement.[18]

As Sawyer indicates, contextualization is a key factor in semantic description. This poses something of a challenge to biblical scholars, since Scripture, whether taken as a whole or in separate units, may be contextualized in so many different situations.[19] The first step in any semantic study is thus to make clear which situation has been chosen.[20] For a lexical study of the Greek Psalter, I would suggest that the context of its *production* as a translation commends itself for two reasons: first, most exegetes are interested in precisely this situation; and, second, it is a context over which some degree of methodological control may be exercised. It should be noted, however, that other situations are also defensible.

2. Semantic statements must be primarily synchronic.

This is to say that diachronic statements regarding semantic change can be made only after an adequate synchronic description has been completed.[21] How this is undertaken will depend in part on the context one is describing. Since I have selected the *translation* of the Greek Psalter as the situation under description in this study, my semantic analysis must take into account the fact that two sets of linguistic norms are at work: those proper to the lexicon of Hellenistic Greek as such, and those underlying the process of Hebrew–Greek translation that gave rise to the text.[22]

---

the faithful, something not shared by the unbeliever; in hope we believe despite appearances and look ahead to the life beyond; in hope we rejoice (Turner, *Christian Words*, 214–15).

17. John F. A. Sawyer, *Semantics in Biblical Research: New Methods of Defining Hebrew Words for Salvation* (SBT 2/24; London: SCM, 1972).

18. Ibid., 112.

19. Ibid., 113.

20. Ibid., 114.

21. Ibid.

22. See Cameron Boyd-Taylor "Toward the Analysis of Translational Norms: A Sighting Shot," *BIOSCS* 39 (2006): 27–46.

3. Semantic universals operate in biblical languages as much as in any other language.

Although Sawyer deals exclusively with Hebrew, his third principle applies with special force to biblical Greek—it is not to be treated as a special case. This raises a fundamental point. Since the Greek Psalter is a translation, Sawyer's third principle directs us to view its language in relation to the universals described by translation theorists. One such universal is the phenomenon of *interference*, which is to say, a signal feature of all translation literature is linguistic interference from the source language.[23] Forms and structures occur that are seldom if ever encountered in original compositions. The Greek Psalter, like any other translation, cannot be taken as a straightforward sample of the target language.

4. A structural approach is required.

When Sawyer was writing, structuralism was in vogue. We now find ourselves in a post-structuralist world, but the basic point stands. Semantic change should be understood in terms of shifting forms and relationships.[24] To capture this, we want an appropriate semantic model. Like Sawyer, I take the proper focus of a lexical study to be *intralingual*, that is, it should describe the relations between words.[25]

To my mind Sawyer's four principles neatly capture the core implications of the biblical semantics movement. Using them as guidelines, I shall now consider the semantics of ἐλπίζω. What follows constitutes not a comprehensive analysis but a sketch propaedeutic to such a study.

4. The Semantics of Hope in the Greek Psalter

In the field of biblical semantics, most are agreed that the pioneering work of Johannes P. Louw and Eugene A. Nida represents a major step forward. Their Greek-English lexicon classfies the vocabulary of the New Testament according to semantic domains,[26] and although the analysis has a number of limitations, it

23. See Cameron Boyd-Taylor, "Calque-culations: Loanwords and the Lexicon," *BIOSCS* 38 (2005): 79–99, here 83. Cf. Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies*, 275.

24. It is misleading to treat a word on its own, as semantic shifts are typically the result of complex processes disseminating across whole networks of words. Tom McArthur, ed., *The Oxford Companion to the English Language* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), 913.

25. Sawyer, *Semantics in Biblical Research*, 115. On this view, it is the relations *between* words that matter, relations such as incompatibility, antonymy, hyponymy, consequence, and synonymy. The meaning of linguistic items is thus defined without reference to extralingual features. This is not to deny that denotation is crucial for definitional purposes, but simply to say that it must follow a description of sense relations. I do not, however, intend to be doctrinaire about this and will address various aspects of word meaning as the need arises.

26. Johannes P. Louw and Eugene A. Nida, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains* (New York: United Bible Societies, 1989).

provides a useful point of departure for the present discussion, for it is an excellent example of the sort of structural approach favored by Sawyer.

Louw and Nida distinguish three types of semantic features: shared, distinctive, and supplementary. Shared features are those elements of the meaning of a lexeme held in common with other lexemes; distinctive features separate meanings one from another; and supplementary features are those that are relevant only in certain contexts or play a primarily connotative or associative role. Analyzing lexemes according to these features gives rise to a taxonomy of the lexicon. Lexemes are classified according to higher-order domains, such as plants, animals, and kinship terms. Each domain is then divided into sets of subdomains, which are related to one another largely in terms of greater and lesser degrees of specificity.

The verb ἐλπίζω appears twice in Louw and Nida's taxonomy. In the first instance, it occurs in domain 25, *attitudes and emotions*, subdomain D, *hope*, *look forward to*. Two other New Testament verbs are found in subdomain D, ἀπεκδέχομαι, in the sense, *to await eagerly or expectantly for some future event*; and προελπίζω, *to hope in a prior manner*. Subdomain D clusters with that of *desire*, *love*, *willingness,* and *eagerness*.

The second occurrence of ἐλπίζω is located in domain 30, *to think*, subdomain C, *to think concerning future contingencies*. Also in this domain is προσδοκάω, in the sense, *to expect something to happen*, *whether good or bad*, and ἐκδέχομαι, in the sense, *to expect something to happen, often implying waiting*. Subdomain C clusters with the following subdomains: *to think about*, *to intend or purpose*, and *to decide or conclude*.

Louw and Nida's analysis represents a very good start. Of course, it can—indeed, it must—be improved upon.[27] But a perusal of the standard Greek lexica indicates that their classification of ἐλπίζω, although based on a small corpus, is nevertheless consistent with the results of Greek lexicography to date. But if we turn to what is undoubtedly the most linguistically sophisticated lexicon of the Septuagint, that of Takamitsu Muraoka,[28] we find two distinct senses of ἐλπίζω that do not appear in the other lexica. For present purposes, I need address only one of them, no. 1, "to put trust (in), to count (on)".

This meaning locates ἐλπίζω in domain 31 of the Louw-Nida taxonomy, *to hold, believe, trust*, subdomain I, *to trust or rely*. It groups ἐλπίζω with πείθω (perfect stem only), in the sense *to believe in something or someone to the extent of placing reliance or trust in or on*, and πιστεύω, in the sense, *to believe to the extent of complete trust and reliance*.

---

27. First, the evidence of the New Testament should be analyzed against the background of contemporary Greek usage. Second, a wider array of semantic relations needs to be considered.

28. Takamitsu Muraoka, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint: Chiefly of the Pentateuch and the Twelve Prophets* (Leuven: Peeters, 2002).

Now this classification of ἐλπίζω is consistent with the theological dictionaries of Bultmann and Spicq, whom Muraoka cites. But, as these scholars were aware, it implies semantic change in the biblical lexicon. Not to put too fine a point on it, Muraoka's sense number 1 lacks both the prospective and affective force identified by Louw-Nida; on his analysis, ἐλπίζω is no longer bound up with future contingencies and our attitude toward them. To place trust in someone obviously has a future reference: my trust anticipates your good faith. But the attitude of trust is primarily oriented to the continuation of present realities, that is, one's *belief* in the reliability, truth, ability, or strength of someone else. The verb ἐλπίζω, on the other hand, picks out a state of *expectation* rather than one of belief. It looks to an anticipated future, whether desired or dreaded, and may be used in opposition to τὰ παρόντα, "present circumstances" (e.g., Philo, *Leg.* 3.86). Pseudo-Plato defines the noun ἐλπίς as προσδοκία ἀγαθοῦ, "expectation of (a) good" (*Def.* 416a).[29]

Is there any evidence in the Greek Psalter for a shift away from this prospective sense? Muraoka gives eleven examples of contexts in which his suggested meaning seems plausible enough.[30]

1. LXX Ps 32:20–21: Our soul waits for the Lord, because he is our helper and protector, (21) because in him our heart will be glad, and in his holy name we hoped/*trusted* [בטח].
2. LXX Ps 41:6: Why are you deeply grieved, O my soul, and why are you throwing me into confusion? Hope/*trust* [יחל] in God, because I shall acknowledge him; my God is deliverance of my face.
3. LXX Ps 117:9: It is better to hope/*trust* [חסה] in the Lord than to hope/*trust* [חסה] in rulers.
4. LXX Ps 61:11: Put no hope/*trust* [בטח] in wrong, and do not long for what is robbed; wealth, if it flows, do not [a]add heart[a] [[a–a] possibly *set your heart on it*].
5. LXX Ps 77:21–22: Therefore, the Lord heard and was put out, and a fire was kindled in Iakob, and anger mounted against Israel, (22) because they had no faith in God nor did they hope/*trust* [בטח] in his saving power.
6. LXX Ps 118:42: And I shall have a word for those who reproach me, because I hoped/*trusted* [בטח] in your words.
7. LXX Ps 51:10: But I am like a fruitful olive tree in the house of God. I hoped/*trusted* [בטח] in the mercy of God forever, even forever and ever.
8. LXX Ps 146:11: The Lord is pleased with those who fear him and with those who hope/*trust* [יחל] in his mercy.

29. See Bultmann, "ἐλπίς," 518.

30. In this list of readings, apart from alternative renderings that are signified by italics, the English translation is that of NETS (*A New English Translation of the Septuagint* [ed. Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright; Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2007]).

9. LXX Ps 43:7: For not in my bow shall I hope/*trust* [בטח], and my sword will not save me.
10. LXX Ps 7:2: O Lord my God, in you I hoped/*trusted* [חסה]; save me from all my pursuers, and rescue me . . .
11. LXX Ps 12:6: But I hoped/*trusted* [בטח] in your mercy; my heart shall rejoice in your deliverance. I will sing to the Lord, my benefactor, and make music to the name of the Lord, the Most High.

If we substitute the word "trust" for "hope," the resulting English gloss works well enough in each context. But as Moisés Silva has argued, contextual fit is not an altogether reliable semantic criterion; it is by no means sufficient for establishing semantic change in a word.[31] We must proceed to ask whether the contextual meaning characterizes the word *as such*, and, conversely, whether the word *as such* introduces this meaning into the context. To answer this question we must investigate the precise relationship between word and context. In the case of the Greek Psalter, this relationship is bound up with the fact that the text is a translation.

Let us consider the examples given by Muraoka. In each instance the special biblical meaning "to trust" that he has assigned to ἐλπίζω is, arguably, a reflex of the underlying Hebrew context. Do we assume that in each case the Greek verb carries the meaning of its Hebrew counterpart? Or has Muraoka read a Hebrew meaning into a Greek word? To paraphrase James Barr: unless we know why the translator made the choices he did, we can hardly draw semantic inferences.[32] This means taking into account translation technique.[33]

As it happens, the translator of the Psalter tends to replace Hebrew words with Greek equivalents according to certain default lexical matches, much in the manner of an interlinear translation.[34] This means that in any given instance there may be considerable semantic tension between a Greek word and its larger context, the result of interference from the Hebrew. The verb ἐλπίζω is no exception.

It occurs 73 times in Rahlfs's edition of the Greek Psalter and renders seven different Hebrew verbs. Three of these matches underlie the texts identified by Muraoka: בטח, "to trust," occurs 46 times in the Psalter and is rendered by ἐλπίζω 37 times; חסה, "to seek refuge," is rendered by ἐλπίζω 20 out of 25 times, and יחל, "to wait or await," is rendered by either ἐλπίζω or its cognate ἐπελπίζω 18 out of

31. Moisés Silva, *Biblical Words and Their Meaning: An Introduction to Lexical Semantics* (rev. and exp. ed.; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994), 199–200.

32. James Barr, "Common Sense and Biblical Language," *Bib* 49 (1968): 377–87, here 379.

33. See Barr, *Words for Time*, 119: "We may however add a reminder that the language of the LXX occupies a peculiar place; it is a translation register, which varied in important respects from the actual speech of the Hellenistic Jews, and which at certain points and in certain respects can be understood only in relation to the translation techniques being used in the various sections."

34. Albert Pietersma, "Psalms: To the Reader," in NETS, 542–47, here 542.

18 times. For each of these Hebrew verbs, therefore, ἐλπίζω serves as a preferred rendering, a kind of default. Hence, in any given context one does not want to read too much into its occurrence: quite often the Greek word has been selected by the translator simply because its Hebrew counterpart is present.

There are exceptions, however, and these can prove telling. We may take the translator's rendering of בטח as a case in point. As Walther Zimmerli observed in his Göttingen lectures, the use of ἐλπίζω as a default is somewhat surprising.[35] All else being equal, we might have expected πείθω. The translator often follows the lead of the Pentateuch,[36] and in Deut 28:52 בטח is rendered by the perfect of πείθω. Of course, on the assumption of semantic change, ἐλπίζω and πείθω have become near synonyms, which would neatly account for the usage of the Psalter.

But does the translator actually use them as such? Interestingly enough, in the seven instances where he decides against matching בטח with ἐλπίζω, he supplies πείθω. They are not, however, free variants, for if we look at the contexts in which πείθω is used instead of ἐλπίζω, a pattern emerges that tells against this idea. In four out of the seven cases, the object of בטח is something people mistakenly place their trust in or rely upon, whether wealth (49:6, LXX 48:7), idols (115:8, LXX 113:16; 135:18, LXX 134:18) or mere mortals (146:3, LXX 145:3). Conversely, when ἐλπίζω renders בטח, the object of hope is either God or it is unspecified (with God being implied). The one exception proves the rule, for here ἐλπίζω and πείθω are used in contrastive stichs (118:7–8, LXX 117:7–8). There is no indication, then, that ἐλπίζω and πείθω are interchangeable; in fact, their distributions are quite distinct. Clearly we have no reason to posit a new meaning for ἐλπίζω and must assume that it continues to carry its conventional sense.[37]

When we look at the other two matches underlying Muraoka's list, we find nothing to disconfirm this. As in the case of בטח, the translator's rendering of חסה is somewhat unexpected. In Deut 32:37 the Hebrew verb is rendered by the perfect of πείθω, a match taken up by other translators—including, on four occasions, the one responsible for the Psalter. Given that the Hebrew verb is used regularly as a formula of trust, this is not a surprising equivalency. What is interesting is that the Greek psalmist has recourse to πείθω so rarely. Judging by his rendering

35. Zimmerli, *Man and His Hope*, 9.

36. See Emanuel Tov, "The Impact of the Septuagint Translation of the Torah on the Translation of the Other Books," in *Mélanges Dominique Barthélemy: Études bibliques offertes à l'occasion de son 60e anniversaire* (ed. Pierre Casetti et al.; OBO 38; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981), 577–92; Jan Joosten, "The Impact of the Septuagint Pentateuch on the Greek Psalms," in *XIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Ljubljana, 2007* (ed. Melvin K. H. Peters; SBLSCS 55; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008), 197–206.

37. It is interesting to note that while Zimmerli (*Man and His Hope*, 9) accepts this conclusion, he argues that the Greek translator has stressed that aspect of hope which involves personal surrender, that is, trust. Yet surely this is to get things backwards. What the psalmist has done is stress that aspect of trust that involves expectation.

of חסה as σκεπάζω in 61:5 (LXX 60:5), where it is used in a metaphor of being sheltered by God's wings, the translator was not altogether deaf to the claims of context. Yet, as we have seen, in the vast majority of contexts, where it represents an expression of confidence in YHWH, he renders it by ἐλπίζω. Here again the translator favors the equivalent that carries the prospective sense.

Finally, there is the match with יחל, for which Gen 4:26 may have provided the model. Here the source item carries a prospective sense, "to wait," so there is semantic overlap with ἐλπίζω. This, incidentally, confirms that the Greek word is carrying its conventional meaning. In every single context the translator supplies either ἐλπίζω or ἐπελπίζω. The verb πείθω is never used as a match, even though there are numerous contexts in which it might fit.

Obviously there is more to be said about the translator's use of ἐλπίζω. Having identified the default matches, one ought to consider all the exceptions and examine the linguistic context of each in detail. Then one should examine the translator's handling of words in related subdomains. In a fine lexical study, Anneli Aejmelaeus goes some way to doing all of this. I quote her conclusions, with which I concur for the most part.

> [T]he frequent use of ἐλπίζω in the Greek Psalter is in several respects unique among the books of the Septuagint. The verb was clearly a conscious choice by the translator—this is implied by its frequency—and it was used in a very pregnant sense. . . . In the Psalms it is obvious that ἐλπίζω is used with positive connotations: "to expect good things from," "to put one's hope in."[38]

This is to say that in the Greek Psalter ἐλπίζω carries the sense located in domain 25 of Nida and Louw's taxonomy, *attitudes and emotions*, subdomain D, *hope*, *look forward to*. As such it is a close neighbor of the verb ἀπεκδέχομαι, in the sense *to await eagerly or expectantly for some future event*. By downplaying the prospective and affective senses of ἐλπίζω, Muraoka and Zimmerli do violence to the plain meaning of the Greek Psalter. For the translator clearly favored the word as a match for a number of Hebrew verbs that characterize the relationship of the psalmist to YHWH. By glossing it as "trust" we obscure this fact and read the Greek as if it were Hebrew. In so doing, we lose sight of a truly remarkable development—not a change in semantics but a change in piety: the advent of a distinctive religious language.[39] This is an idea that I would like to develop further.

---

38. Anneli Aejmelaeus, "Faith, Hope, and Interpretation: A Lexical and Syntactical Study of the Semantic Field of Hope in the Greek Psalter," in *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, and the Septugint: Presented to Eugene Ulrich* (ed. P. W. Flint, E. Tov, and J. C. Vanderkam; VTSup 101; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 360–76, here 370.

39. Similar conclusions are drawn by Anneli Aejmelaeus, "Levels of Interpretation: Tracing the Trail of the Septuagint Translators," in *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays* (rev. and exp. ed.; CBET 50; Leuven: Peeters, 2007), 295–312, here 303.

5. A Rhetoric of Hope

What is the significance of the translator's use of ἐλπίζω? I have stressed that we cannot read too much into any given context in which the word is used since it is a default match for three Hebrew verbs. But as Aejmelaeus points out, these matches are themselves significant. The translator has consistently used ἐλπίζω where he might well have used other Greek verbs. Furthermore he has favored the noun ἐλπίς, "hope," in a similar manner.

This preference for ἐλπίζω and ἐλπίς is of decidedly thematic import, yet we must stop short of speaking of a theme of hope in the Greek Psalter. It is not a compositional text. Again we come back to its textual linguistic makeup. Given the translator's reliance on formal equivalency, he was not in a position to introduce and develop themes.

That said, there is no denying that deliberate choices on the translator's part give rise to a Greek liturgical language in which the dominant note is one of expectation. I think, then, that we might without contradiction talk about a *rhetoric of hope*. By rhetoric I simply mean language calculated to have a persuasive effect. The verbal makeup of the Greek Psalter, I would suggest, is such as to make a certain impact on the piety of the implied reader, namely, to focus it on a desired future.[40]

A signal feature of this rhetoric is the frequent occurrence of ἐλπίζω in the imperative mood, construed with ἐπί and either κύριος or θεός, as in "Hope in God!" (41:6, MT 42:6) or "Let Israel hope in the Lord!" (130:3, MT 131:3). To borrow a happy phrase from Walther Zimmerli, the implied reader of these verses, the one who turns to the Lord, is cast as a "creature of expectation."[41] We cannot say much more. Dealing as we are with a formal translation, one that leans heavily on the form of the Hebrew source, we simply do not know how the translator understood the object of Israel's hope, the desired future. As I have stressed, there was no opportunity for him to develop it as a theme. The Greek Psalter is jealous of its secrets, and withholds any further insight into the matter. Such is the nature of interlinear translation.

We cannot fathom the mind of the translator, but having identified a rhetoric of hope in the text, we might go on to describe its larger literary context, and perhaps even hazard a few guesses as to the sociocultural milieu in which it arose. The goal here would be to provide a *thick description* of the rhetoric, that is, a descrip-

---

40. It is important to appreciate that the Psalter's rhetoric of hope stands in stark contrast to typical treatments of the theme in Hellenistic literature. See Despland, *Education of Desire*, 281. The tendency of Greek authors is to counsel against hope, which, bound up as it is with desire, is delusional, and a temptation to be resisted. Hence the language of the Psalter is decidedly marked in this respect.

41. Zimmerli, *Man and His Hope*, 30. Note, however, that Zimmerli is speaking in reference to the Hebrew text.

tion of the cultural context in which it was meaningful to the implied reader of the text.[42] The semantic horizons of such an inquiry would ideally remain focused on textual relations rather than reconstructed histories.

Of course, the Psalter's rhetoric of hope is not merely of literary significance; it is arguably of theological import as well. The question thus arises as to where this aspect of the text might fit in a thick description. In the next section I shall consider this problem. Having begun with Barr's early work on semantics, it is fitting to close with a brief glance at biblical theology, a topic with which he wrestled in his later years.

6. Toward a Theology of Hope

There have in recent times been many calls for a theology of the Septuagint, but we must proceed with caution. Biblical theology, James Barr warned us, is itself an inherently problematic undertaking. If we define theology as a reflective activity in which the content of religious expressions is abstracted, reformulated, and subjected to discussion, then as Barr observed, much of the Bible does not have this character: "Religious opinions, expressions and aspirations, however strongly expressed, are not thereby theology."[43] So, without denying that they imply theology, the question must be raised whether, properly speaking, biblical texts contain theology.

Yet Barr himself readily admits that a movement can be traced whereby the biblical religion reformulates itself as something closer to theology. One major catalyst, he suggests, was life in the Hellenistic world. He agrees with Gerhard Ebeling's proposal that, above all, it was contact with Greek thought and language that brought biblical religion to the threshold of "theology."[44] On this view, apocryphal books such as the Wisdom of Solomon contain theology. What about the Greek Psalter?

It is indeed tempting to think that the process of translation from Hebrew into Greek involved the translator in theological inquiry, which, in turn, is itself reflected in the translation. And with books such as Proverbs or Job this may in fact be the case, for in both instances the translators reformulate the Hebrew source. The problem in talking about a theology of the Greek Psalter is the model of translation underlying it. Here, as I have stressed, the translator has adopted a method of formal or isomorphic translation; he is very tolerant of interference

42. The term "thick description" originates in the work of the Oxford philosopher Gilbert Ryle. Its use in cultural anthropology stems from Clifford Geertz, "Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture," in *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays* (1973; repr., New York: Basic Books, 2003), 3–30.

43. Barr, *Concept of Biblical Theology*, 249.

44. Ibid.

from the source.[45] The result is what we might call fractured discourse: it often lacks both coherence and cohesion. The translator frequently declines to provide us with a well-formed text—again and again he falls back on the structure of the Hebrew parent. So it is very difficult to identify theological propositions that may credibly be attributed to him.

But what if we construe the task of biblical theology as primarily exegetical? In other words, can we engage in a theological exegesis of the Greek Psalter? This, as Barr suggests, would involve relating specific biblical texts to theological themes.[46] We need not thereby impute such themes to the author, but in identifying them we would hope to gain some insight into the theological meaning of the text for its implied reader.

A potentially fruitful theological background against which to read the Greek Psalter's rhetoric of hope, I would suggest, is the Torah piety that had entered Jewish wisdom literature by the early Hellenistic period. James Luther Mays describes it as follows:

> The two primary problems with which it lived were wickedness in self and society and the arrogance and power of the nations. The questions with which it wrestled were the incongruity of conduct and experience and the hiddenness of the purpose of God in history. Its way was faithfulness through study and obedience and hope through prayer and waiting.[47]

The origins of Torah piety are not clear, though it has been suggested that it emerged under Hellenistic influence, reflecting the Socratic view that the soul is ennobled and made virtuous through the pursuit of knowledge.[48] Stephen Geller notes that such piety is in one sense profoundly inward-looking: subjective states such as waiting and expectation are dominant themes.[49] While there is no single Hebrew word with the same semantic range as ἐλπίζω, we find that a variety of linguistic resources are mustered to express a personal piety characterized by hope. This is particularly true in Hebrew Ps 119,[50] one of the most fully developed

---

45. Pietersma, "Psalms: To the Reader," 542–44.

46. Barr, *Concept of Biblical Theology*, 251.

47. James Luther Mays, *The Lord Reigns: A Theological Handbook to the Psalms* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994), 134.

48. Shaye J. D. Cohen, *From the Maccabees to the Mishnah* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1987), 72.

49. Stephen Geller, "Wisdom, Nature and Piety in Some Biblical Psalms," in *Riches Hidden in Secret Places: Ancient Near Eastern Studies in Memory of Thorkild Jacobsen* (ed. I. Tzvi Abusch; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2002), 116.

50. Leslie C. Allen (*Psalms 101–50* [WBC 21; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2002], 183) argues that, given the presence of Aramaisms and terms characteristic of late or postbiblical Hebrew, a postexilic date for Ps 119 is inescapable.

expressions of Torah piety.[51] As Walther Zimmerli has shown, it is dominated by the theme of hope.[52]

Meditation on God's Law, Zimmerli points out,[53] constitutes the Hebrew psalmist as a "creature of expectation." He bids God, "Remember your word to your servant, in which *you have made me hope* (יחלתני)" (v. 49). The divine word that speaks to him and guides him also opens him to the future; it awakens his expectations and promises help.[54] "My soul languishes for your salvation," he declares, "*I hope* (יחלתי) in your word" (v. 81). This hope is not merely private; it is a source of inspiration for others. "Those who fear you shall see me and rejoice, because *I have hoped* (יחלתי) in your word" (v. 74).

What is particularly interesting about Ps 119 is that it constructs what we might call a soteriological context for Torah piety. The ideal situation proposed at the beginning of the Psalm, that prosperity is guaranteed to the righteous, is challenged throughout.[55] But the psalmist can persevere in his adherence to Torah, even in the face of personal failure and persecution, because God's word *nourishes a hope*, that is, the promise of salvation. Whether this soteriological context has an eschatological horizon, as Mays would argue,[56] is unclear. It is certainly a hope for some kind of renewal of life.

I would suggest that the recourse of Jewish wisdom to *hope* as the characteristic attitude of the Torah-centered sage is reflected in the verbal texture of the Greek Psalter.[57] In a third-century Hellenistic context, it is altogether possible that this

---

51. Hans-Joachim Kraus (*Psalms 60–150: A Commentary* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993], 414) describes Ps 119 as "a collection of statements of the individual Torah piety of postexilic times that originated from elements of the study of Scripture, of Deuteronomic theology, of cultic Torah instruction of an individual and of the stimulus of wisdom teaching." Walter Brueggemann (*Reverberations of Faith: A Theological Handbook of Old Testament Themes* [Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2002], 219) characterizes the psalm as "a summary of Torah piety."

52. Zimmerli, *Man and His Hope*, 29–31.

53. Ibid., 30.

54. Ibid.

55. Dianne Bergant, *Israel's Wisdom Literature: A Liberation-Critical Reading* (Liberation-Critical Reading of the Old Testament; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997), 63.

56. Mays, *Lord Reigns*, 134. Cf. Jerome F. D. Creach, *The Destiny of the Righteous in the Psalms* (St. Louis: Chalice, 2008), 140: "Together Psalms 118 and 119 put torah piety in an eschatological context. Hope for the coming kingdom, for God's reign, is a hope for realization of the truth that is proclaimed in the torah psalms."

57. Jerome F. D. Creach (*Yahweh as Refuge and the Editing of the Hebrew Psalter* [JSOTSup 217; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996], 33) likewise finds it interesting that, while the Greek translator evidently knew the difference between בטח and חסה, he nevertheless rendered both by ἐλπίζω *when they refer to reliance on YHWH*. Creach goes on to suggest that the translator may have understood these terms in reference to a "refuge piety," evident in late Hebrew psalmody (and the focus of Creach's study), which viewed personal reliance on YHWH as the supreme virtue. Since, according to Creach, "the most concrete way of expressing such reliance

hope for renewal was understood eschatologically, perhaps in terms of a resurrection of the dead, as Joachim Schaper and others have suggested, though one cannot say for sure.[58] It is true that members of the Orphic movement had long distinguished themselves from other Greeks in claiming to have *a hope*.[59] For Orphism, the gods are good, and pious men and women may hope to fare well in the afterlife, even though they now suffer on account of their virtue.[60] Plato had reconstrued this hope as the reasonable expectation of the virtuous and, in particular, of those who embraced the philosophical life. In his portrait of Socrates, the philosopher expresses the self-assurance of the man who is of *good hope*;[61] that Socrates has a hope in the afterlife is stressed.[62] This form of hope is encountered in 2 Maccabees, where it is refigured as the hope of resurrection.[63] Just such a hope may well be the

---

was in the study of Torah" (48), it is clear that what he is describing is a special case of Torah piety. This being so, there is a pleasing congruence between his reading of the Greek Psalter and my own.

58. Joachim Schaper (*Eschatology in the Greek Psalter* [WUNT 2/76; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995], 50) discovers in Ps 15(16):9–10 "one of the first, if not the first" instance of the promise of "personal, physical resurrection." In support of this claim, Schaper appeals to the rendering of the prepositional phrase לבטח ("in security") by ἐπ᾽ ἐλπίδι ("upon hope"), and שׁחת ("pit") by διαφθοράν ("destruction *or* physical corruption"). Yet the Greek expressions do not strike one as sufficient in themselves to carry the interpretative weight Schaper wishes to place on them. See the discussion in Cameron Boyd-Taylor, "In a Mirror, Dimly: Reading the Septuagint as a Document of Its Times," in *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures* (ed. Wolfgang Kraus and R. Glenn Wooden; SBLSCS 53; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), 15–31.

59. Despland, *Education of Desire*, 132.

60. Ibid., 132–33.

61. Ibid., 132.

62. E.g., *Phaed.* 63b4–c7. "I not only do not grieve, but I have great hopes [εὔελπις] that there is something in store for the dead, and, as has been said of old, something better for the good than for the wicked" (63c; Benjamin Jowett, *Dialogues of Plato: Translated into English, with Analyses and Introduction,* vol. 1 (Cambridge Library Collection; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010). For a stimulating philosophical discussion of Socrates' hope for an afterlife as expressed in the *Phaedo* (a hope shared by his companions in the dialogue), see Peter J. Ahrensdorf, *The Death of Socrates and the Life of Philosophy: An Interpretation of Plato's Phaedo* (Albany: State University of New York Press Press, 1995), 35–37.

63. See 2 Macc 7:14 where reference is made to τὰς ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ προσδοκᾶν ἐλπίδας πάλιν ἀναστήσεσθαι ὑπ᾽ αὐτοῦ. In 2 Macc 7:20 the phrase διὰ τὰς ἐπὶ κύριον ἐλπίδας implies the expectation of resurrection. Jonathan A. Goldstein (*II Maccabees: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* [AB 41A; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1983], 285) observes that no educated Greek reading the characterization of Eleazar at 6:18–31 could miss his resemblance to Socrates: both hold that it is better to go to the underworld maintaining obedience to the laws (6:23; *Crit.* 54b–d); both hold that though one may escape human punishment, one cannot escape divine punishment (6:26; *Apol.* 39a-b); both trust in supernatural judges (6:26, 30; *Apol.* 41a).

key to understanding the rhetoric of the Greek psalmist. But, as I have said, the eschatology of the Greek text eludes us; the semantics of the translation are such that we may never know.

Nevertheless, through his use of ἐλπίζω and ἐλπίς, the translator of Psalms has undoubtedly made *hope in a God who saves* the leading motif of the Greek Psalter. This fact has interesting implications for theological anthropology. The dominant note struck in the Hebrew Psalter, observes Brevard Childs,[64] is that of human frailty and vulnerability. However, in spite of this emphasis, an important dimension of being human for the psalmist is our capacity to hope. As we have seen, this dimension of the text is foregrounded in the Greek version. This may reflect in part the Hellenistic assumption that humanity is characterized preeminently by its reliance on hope. As mortals we are denied certainty regarding the future—we can only hope.

What distinguishes the picture of our common condition found in the Greek Psalter, if I may put the matter theologically, is its conception of hope as the yearning for a life renewed by God. I use the word "conception" advisedly. We are no longer talking about the lexical meaning of ἐλπίζω or ἐλπίς, but the meaning of hope as such. Yet a concept may subtly alter the semantics of the words used to express it, especially in terms of their supplementary features, that is, those that are relevant only in certain contexts or that play a primarily connotative or associative role. That this was the case for ἐλπίζω and ἐλπίς is, I would suggest, not unlikely in Philo, and almost certain in the Apostle Paul.

In *Quod deterius potiori insidiari solet (That the Worse Attacks the Better)*,[65] Philo takes up a distinction made in Stoic anthropology between the πάθη, or "passions," which dog the wretched man, and the corresponding "states of blessedness," the εὐπάθεια, enjoyed by the one who seeks after virtue. Yet he departs from Stoic theory in including ἐλπίς as one of the εὐπάθεια. The expectation of achieving virtue produces *hope*, writes Philo, "that food of souls which makes us cast away hesitation and attempt with hearty alacrity all noble deeds." Later in the same treatise Philo characterizes the human being as a soul so constituted as "to hope on the God that really is [τὸν ὄντως ὄντα θεὸν ἐλπιζούσης]" (139). I do not want to attribute Philo's anthropology to the Greek Psalter, but clearly both place a *theological* value on our capacity to hope.

I close with Paul and, in so doing, end where I began, for in one respect Spicq was right. Paul was indeed one of the principal heirs of *the language*, *the lexicon*, and *the faith* expressed by the Greek Psalter.[66] Spicq's mistake was to infer that this involved a fundamental change in the Greek lexicon, whereby Greek words had taken on Hebrew meanings. New Testament ἐλπίς, Spicq writes, "is sure and

---

64. Brevard S. Childs, *Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments: Theological Reflection on the Christian Bible* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 573.

65. Philo, *Det*. 120 (Colson and Whitaker, LCL).

66. Spicq, *Theological Lexicon*, 1:486.

certain by virtue of its semantic origin in the LXX, where it means essentially having confidence, being assured."[67] On the contrary: what Paul inherited was a Greek meaning put to the service of a distinct *theologoumenon*, hope in the God who saves. The prospective and affective elements of ἐλπίς/ἐλπίζω remain. To read Paul otherwise, I would suggest, is to lose sight of the "tension and emotion" in his thought.[68] As Herman Ridderbos writes, Pauline hope directs itself toward the invisible things of the future that are eternal and derives its strength from them.[69] To quote the apostle: "For in hope we were saved. Now hope that is seen is not hope. For who hopes for what is seen? But if we hope for what we do not see, we wait for it with patience" (Rom 8:24–25).

67. Ibid., 490.

68. See Herman Ridderbos, *Paul: An Outline of His Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975), 249. For Paul, hope is indissolubly bound up with faith: "[O]n the other hand, they both represent no less the provisional revelation of the new life and of the new man, and it is striking how much the apostle alternatively places the emphasis on the one and then the other. In this way there enters into the concept of faith the strong tension and emotion that are so characteristic of the manner in which Paul, often in the most personal passages in his epistles, gives expression to his own experience of faith."

69. Ibid., 248.

Translating the Untranslatable: Septuagint Renderings of Hebrew Idioms

Jan Joosten

1. Introduction

It is universally agreed that translating is impossible. All those who have tried their hand at it see the truth of the Italian proverb: *traddutore traditore*—"the translator is a traitor." When one translates a piece of discourse, one changes it. On a purely linguistic level, the words and the grammar of one language are never precisely equivalent to those of another language: meaning cannot be expressed in exactly the same way in two different languages. And on a more general communicative level, the transposition of a text from one language into another cuts it off from its original situational context and puts it into an entirely new situation. Since meaning is essentially determined by pragmatic context, this cutting-off is bound to affect the text profoundly.

In everyday life, although the problems are real enough, the limitations of translation can often be accommodated. Translation is the art of the feasible. In the religious realm, however, the merely feasible is not good enough. When ancient texts are regarded as the word of God, as they are in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam, betraying their meaning in translation amounts to sacrilege. Rabbi Judah states: המתרגם פסוק כצורתו הרי זה בדאי והמוסיף הרי זה מגדף, "He who translates a verse literally is a liar, and he who adds to it is a blasphemer" (*t. Meg.* 4.41).

In light of these reflections, the Septuagint stands out as a remarkable achievement, not only for what the translators did, but even more for the very fact of doing it. From our modern point of view, the decision to translate Scripture may seem unremarkable. The Septuagint is merely the first in a very long series. To this day, the Bible has been translated into over two thousand languages. In its own historical context, however, the production and publication of a translation that would stand in for the original Hebrew and be used in its stead, in teaching and liturgy and perhaps other connections too, are truly momentous events. In later times, rabbinic Judaism rejected this model of translation, adopting instead the targumic model characterized by the conjoint presence of source text and

translation: the Targum does not replace the Hebrew but accompanies it—much as a musical counterpoint. Islam went one step further and denied the very possibility of translating the Qur'an: any translations of the Qur'an are regarded as *tafsir*, "commentary."[1]

How can one explain the distinctive stance reflected in the Septuagint? What is the background of the decision to translate? Did the Greek translators fail to think through all the implications of their actions, rushing in like fools where angels would fear to tread? Or perhaps to them the text they were translating was not sacred Scripture but merely the traditional lore, and law, of the Jews? These possibilities can hardly be excluded—we just do not know. It is equally possible, however, and on balance much more likely, that the Septuagint translators did regard their source text as divinely inspired, and that they knew what they were doing—or at least thought they did. Perhaps they were motivated partly by a desire to manifest their independence from Palestinian Judaism. God had spoken in Hebrew to their ancestors, but now he was speaking to them, in Alexandria, in a language they could understand. An explicit statement going somewhat in this direction is made by Philo—admittedly some three hundred years after the event—when he calls the Septuagint translators prophets inspired by God (*Mos.* 2.37). Or perhaps one should not stress the translators' desire to affirm their own identity: they may merely have been pragmatists, thinking that God's word would effect the purpose for which it had been sent, even in translation. Conscious of the limitations of translation, they would nevertheless have been confident that the essential message of the biblical text could be transposed into a different language.

It would be presumptuous to pretend to answer these deep and difficult questions in a brief study. The Septuagint is an enigmatic literary corpus from a period about which almost nothing is known. Even such elementary questions as that of the provenance of the translators—were they Jerusalemites or Alexandrian Jews—remain hotly debated. To identify the essential nature of the Septuagint, the "philosophy of the translators,"[2] is an almost impossibly complex undertaking. Nevertheless, it would be regrettable not to set such important questions on our agenda. The way forward is to analyze single features of the Septuagint's translation technique in depth and to try to relate the results to larger issues.

In the present paper I would like to contribute to this discussion with an analysis of some expressions illustrating the impossibility of translation with particular clarity. Translating is always difficult, but some things are harder to translate than others. Borderline cases may prove to be diagnostic. Where translators come to the

---

1. See A. L. de Prémare, "Coran et langue arabe: quelques réflexions," in *"Dieu parle la langue des hommes": Études sur la transmission des textes religieux (Ier millénaire)* (ed. Béatrice Bakhouche and Philippe Le Moigne; Histoire du Texte Biblique 8; Lausanne: Zèbre, 2007), 93–100.

2. See H. Orlinsky, "The Septuagint as Holy Writ and the Philosophy of the Translators," *HUCA* 46 (1975): 89–114.

end of their wits, they reveal what "makes them tick." One might retort that hard cases make bad law and that exceptions do not prove the rule. If so, let the proof of the pudding be in the tasting!

2. Idiomatic Expressions

Idiomatic expressions have often been singled out as constituting a category that is particularly difficult to translate. Idiomatic expressions can be defined with Eugene Nida as combinations of words whose semantic and grammatical structures are radically different.[3] Although they are constructed on normal syntactical patterns, the meaning of the whole is not simply the sum of the meanings of the parts. In English, "to have a chip on one's shoulder" does not mean that something is actually situated on one's shoulder but, according to one definition, to have "a harboured grievance or sense of inferiority and being quick to take offence."[4] More technically, the endocentric meaning, that is, the meaning of the words making up the expression, differs from the exocentric or global meaning.[5]

The precise import of idiomatic expressions is often hard to pin down. For instance, according to the dictionaries, "to cry wolf" means "to give a false alarm".[6] The contexts, however, in which one uses the former are not necessarily the same as those in which one uses the latter. Idioms are somewhat akin to metaphors in this respect: they express meaning in a roundabout way laden with connotations.[7] If I say "So-and-so was previously unknown and is now prominent," I communicate something different than when I say "So-and-so is a dark horse." Idiomatic expressions are usually limited to one single language and culture. For all these reasons idiomatic expressions are a translator's nightmare.

The Hebrew Bible is full of idiomatic expressions.[8] For some reason, most of them consist of a verb and a noun referring to a part of the body.[9] Many of them,

---

3. Eugene Nida, *The Theory and Practice of Translation* (Helps for Translators 8; Leiden: Brill, 1982), 45-46.

4. http://www.english-for-students.com/Chip-On.html.

5. Much more extensively, Jean-Marc Babut, *Les expressions idiomatiques de l'hébreu biblique: Signification et traduction. Un essai d'analyse componentielle* (CahRB 33; Paris: Gabalda, 1995), 21–59.

6. See, e.g., E. Cobham Brewer, *Dictionary of Phrase and Fable, Giving the Derivation, Source, or Origin of Common Phrases, Allusions, and Words That Have a Tale to Tell* (new ed.; Philadelphia: Altemus, 1898).

7. Idiomatic expressions also relate more directly to metaphors when their meaning is linked to the metaphorical meaning of one of its components. The semantic analysis of idioms, even when they are well understood, is often rather involved, however. See, e.g., Babut, *Les expressions idiomatiques*, 89–90.

8. See, e.g., J. C. Lübbe, "Idioms in the Old Testament," *Journal for Semitics* 11 (2002): 45–63.

9. See Edouard Dhorme, *L'emploi métaphorique des noms de parties du corps en hébreu et*

such as the expression "to lift up one's eyes," are easily understood, though some, such as "to recognize someone's face," are more difficult, and a few, like "to speak to someone's heart," are entirely opaque.[10] But the difficulty for translators is not one of understanding only. Rather, the problem arises from the discrepancy between form and meaning. If one follows the words, one may miss the meaning completely; and if one aims at the meaning, one may take all the savor from the text.

In the Septuagint, one encounters different ways of dealing with this problem. To begin with, the Hebrew may be rendered literally, which is often to the detriment of the global meaning. Thus, the Hebrew expression "to put one's life in one's hand," meaning "to risk one's life," is rendered word for word:

1 Sam 19:5

> For he [Jonathan] did **put his life in his hand** [וישם את־נפשו בכפו], and slew the Philistine.[11]
> **καὶ ἔθετο τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ** καὶ ἐπάταξεν τὸν ἀλλόφυλον
> And he **put his life in his hand** and smote the allophyle.[12]

The extent to which the idiomatic meaning of the Hebrew would be clear to a Greek reader is uncertain.[13]

A second approach is to render the Hebrew expression freely, keeping the global sense but sacrificing the wording. Thus, the expression "to soften (?) the face of so-and-so" is translated "to appease" in the Minor Prophets:

Zech 7:2

> The people of Bethel had sent Sharezer and Regemmelech and their men, **to entreat the favor** of the Lord [לחלות את־פני יהוה].
> καὶ ἐξαπέστειλεν εἰς Βαιθηλ Σαρασαρ καὶ Αρβεσεερ ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ οἱ ἄνδρες αὐτοῦ τοῦ **ἐξιλάσασθαι** τὸν κύριον
> And Sarasar and Arbeseer the king and his men sent to Baithel **to appease** the Lord.

This translation captures the meaning of the Hebrew well, but makes no effort to follow the wording.

---

en akkadien (Paris: V. Lecoffre, 1923).

10. See Babut, *Les expressions idiomatiques*, 21–41.

11. English translations of the Hebrew are given according to the KJV because it is often more literal than more recent translations. English translations of the Septuagint generally follow NETS.

12. The Hebrew expression is found also in Judg 12:3; 1 Sam 28:21; Job 13:14 (compare Ps 119:109). In all these passages the Greek rendering is literal.

13. The expression ψυχὴν παρατίθημι is used in Homer with a meaning close to that of the Hebrew expression (see LSJ, 2026, s.v. ψυχή).

A third possibility often chosen by the Greek translators is to combine a free rendering of the global meaning with a literal rendering of the form. A nice example is the way the Hebrew expression "to lift so-and-so's face," meaning "to show respect to so-and-so," is rendered in a number of passages:

Gen 19:21

> And he said unto him, See, **I have accepted thee** [נשאתי פניך] concerning this thing also, that I will not overthrow this city . . .
> καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Ἰδοὺ **ἐθαύμασά σου τὸ πρόσωπον** καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ ῥήματι τούτῳ τοῦ μὴ καταστρέψαι τὴν πόλιν . . ....
> And he said to him, "Look, **I have indulged your person** also in reference to this matter, not to overthrow the city . . ."

The Greek verb θαυμάζω, "to honor, to show respect," by itself corresponds rather satisfactorily to the idiomatic expression used in the Hebrew; it certainly does not render the lexical meaning of Hebrew נשא alone. The words ἐθαύμασά σε would have sufficed to give an adequate, free translation. The addition of the word "face, person" has no motivation except to reflect the word of the same meaning in the Hebrew text. The rendering of the idiomatic expression is a mixed one, combining adequate translation of the global, exocentric meaning with a degree of subservience to the wording of the Hebrew.

One would expect the three techniques to depend on the degree of transparency of the Hebrew expression: idioms that could be readily understood by the Greek reader might be translated literally, while idioms that were entirely foreign to the genius of Greek might be rendered freely. This is not what happens, however. In reality, the three techniques are rather frequently applied to one and the same Hebrew idiom.

2.1 ישר בעיניו, literally, "it was straight in his eyes" = "it pleased him"

A. Literal Translation: 1 Samuel 18:26

> It pleased David well [וישר הדבר בעיני דוד] to be the king's son in law
> καὶ **εὐθύνθη** ὁ λόγος **ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς** Δαυιδ ἐπιγαμβρεῦσαι τῷ βασιλεῖ
> And the matter was **made straight in the eyes** of David to become the king's son-in-law.[14]

In this case, the expression was rendered word for word. Since in Greek, it is not idiomatic to say that something was made straight in the eyes of so and so, a reader with no Hebrew could gather the meaning of the phrase only from the context.

14. NETS has: "and the matter was right in the eyes of Dauid . . ."

B. Free Translation: 1 Kings 9:12

Hiram came . . . to see the cities . . . and they pleased him not (ולא ישרו בעיניו).

καὶ ἐξῆλθεν Χιραμ . . . τοῦ ἰδεῖν τὰς πόλεις . . . καὶ οὐκ **ἤρεσαν αὐτῷ**

Hiram came . . . to see the cities . . . and they did not **please him**.[15]

In this second example, the expression has been decoded and its global sense has been given in the translation. The target text expresses the meaning of the phrase correctly, as far as we know, but the wording of the Hebrew has been abandoned.

C. Mixture of Literal and Free: Judges 14:3

She pleaseth me well [היא ישרה בעיני].

LXX A ἤρεσεν ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς μου

She was pleasing *in my eyes*. [16]

Here the expression has been decoded in the same way as in the second example, but an element of the wording of the Hebrew has been added. "To be straight in the eyes of so and so" is rendered "to please—in the eyes of so and so".

The three basic approaches to idiomatic expressions are applied to many different Hebrew expressions. Contrary to what one may expect, renderings of type A are not limited to literal translation units, nor do free translation units systematically prefer renderings of type B. All three types of renderings are found in both free and literal translation units. Moreover, there is much variation even within one and the same translation unit. Note the following.

2.2 נשאו לבו, literally "his heart has lifted him up" = "he was moved" (?)

A. Literal Translation: Exodus 35:21

And they came, every one whose heart stirred him up [אשר נשאו לבו]

καὶ ἤνεγκαν ἕκαστος ὧν **ἔφερεν αὐτῶν ἡ καρδία**

And they brought, every one of those whose **heart carried them**[17]

B. Free Translation of the Global Meaning: Exodus 36:2

every one whose heart stirred him up [אשר נשאו לבו]

πάντας τοὺς **ἑκουσίως βουλομένους**

all those who **freely desired**

C. Combination of Literal and Free: Exodus 35:26

And all the women whose heart stirred them up [אשר נשא לבן אתנה]

15. NETS has: "Chiram departed. . . ."

16. NETS has: ". . . in my sight." In slightly different form, this type of translation is found, for the same Hebrew expression, in Jer 18:4 and 34:5.

17. NETS has: "And each one whose heart was inclining brought." This is hardly a faithful translation of the Greek.

καὶ πᾶσαι αἱ γυναῖκες, αἷς **ἔδοξεν τῇ διανοίᾳ** αὐτῶν
And all the women to whose ***mind*** **it seemed good**

The words "to their mind" have no justification except to reflect the presence of "their heart" in the source text. Indeed, αἷς ἔδοξεν, "to whom it seemed good," would have sufficed as a free rendering of the Hebrew. In this example, all three approaches are found in the same passage.

Other examples can be found of Hebrew expressions rendered literally, freely, and in a third way combining the former two.

2.3 חרה אפו, literally "his nose/anger burned" = "he became angry"

A. 2 Samuel 24:1

And again the anger[18] of the Lord was kindled [ויסף אף־יהוה לחרות]
καὶ προσέθετο **ὀργὴ** κυρίου **ἐκκαῆναι**
And the **anger** of the Lord added **to blaze**

B. Genesis 30:2

And Jacob's anger was kindled [ויחר־אף יעקב] against Rachel
ἐθυμώθη δὲ Ιακωβ τῇ Ραχηλ
And Iakob **became angry** with Rachel

C. Genesis 39:19

his wrath was kindled [ויחר אפו]
καὶ **ἐθυμώθη ὀργῇ**[19]
he was **incensed with anger**

To the free rendering, the word ὀργῇ, "in anger," has been added in order to have a formal equivalent of אפו.

2.4 מלא ידו, literally "fill his hands" = "ordain him (to a priestly office)"

A. Exodus 28:41

and thou shalt anoint them, and consecrate them [ומלאת את־ידם], and sanctify them, that they may minister unto me in the priest's office.
καὶ χρίσεις αὐτοὺς καὶ **ἐμπλήσεις αὐτῶν τὰς χεῖρας** καὶ ἁγιάσεις αὐτούς, ἵνα ἱερατεύωσίν μοι.
And you shall anoint them and **fill their hands** and consecrate them so that they may serve me as priests.

---

18. The Hebrew word is never translated as "nose" in this connection.
19. Similarly Isa 5:25.

B. Leviticus 21:10

the high priest among his brethren . . . and that is consecrated [ומלא את־ידו]
ὁ ἱερεὺς ὁ μέγας ἀπὸ τῶν ἀδελφῶν αὐτοῦ . . . καὶ **τετελειωμένου**[20]
the priest who is great among his brothers . . . and when **he has been validated**

C. Exodus 29:35

seven days shalt thou consecrate them [תמלא ידם]
ἑπτὰ ἡμέρας τελειώσεις αὐτῶν τὰς χεῖρας
For seven days **you shall validate *their hands***[21]

Several other idioms could be quoted for which the three basic approaches are attested. For many other expressions, only two or even one of the possibilities—literal, free, or a combination of the two—is found.

3. Observations regarding Idiomatic Renderings

A few comments may be formulated in regard to each type of rendering.

Literal renderings (type A) almost always result in unusual turns of phrase in the target text. To different degrees they may have been hard to understand for Greek readers. This does not mean that such renderings presuppose readers who had access to the Hebrew source text. While literal renderings may lack clarity, they make up for this by making the target text more “Hebraic.” Literal renderings of Hebrew idioms are an index of foreignness. A large part of the intended readership may not have been averse to this.[22] At the same time, Hebraisms of the type created in this way would have been at least partly comprehensible from the context, even to those who did not know Hebrew.

Free renderings (type B) show that most Septuagint translators are prepared occasionally to diverge from word-for-word rendering for the sake of clarity. Usually, free renderings lead to a simplification of the grammar and to a more prosaic target text. “Idiom substitution” is extremely rare.[23] Type B renderings of idiomatic expressions demonstrate that, on the whole, the Greek translators’ grasp of the source language was excellent. Of course, the meaning of one or another Hebrew expression may indeed have been forgotten by the Hellenistic

---

20. The function of the genitive is problematic in this verse, but the meaning is nevertheless clear.

21. Similarly Exod 29:33; Lev 8:33; 16:32; Num 3:3.

22. See Jan Joosten, “Language as Symptom: Linguistic Clues to the Social Background of the Seventy,” *Textus* 23 (2007): 69–80.

23. Examples cited by John Lee illustrate formulaic language more than idiomatic expressions of the type discussed in the present paper: e.g., Gen 43:27 וישאל להם לשלום—ἠρώτησεν δὲ αὐτούς πῶς ἔχετε. See John Lee, *A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch* (SBLSCS 14; Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1983), 25.

period.[24] But on the whole, the translators understood the idiomatic expressions well enough: literal renderings are not to be attributed to a lack of understanding.

Type A and type B renderings correspond to a basic option in favor of either the form or the meaning of the source text. In rendering idiomatic expressions, the translator faced a dilemma: he could either translate the individual words and thereby mystify at least part of his audience, or he could translate the global meaning, sacrificing an adherence to the precise wording of the source text. This brings us to renderings of type C. Very often, the Septuagint translators reject the basic choice between form and meaning.

In renderings of type C, elements of the form are combined with elements reflecting the meaning. To a twenty-first-century specialist of translation, the negative aspects of these renderings leap to the eye: they can be qualified neither as faithful calques of the Hebrew wording nor as intelligent transpositions of the semantics. Nor can they be called doublets,[25] for in the target language they constitute a single grammatical unit. They are true hybrids, monstrosities, that would be allowed in no modern Bible translation.[26]

In the Septuagint, however, such renderings are far from rare. They clearly do not result from occasional blunders. They reflect a conscious policy, shared by a large group of Greek translators who otherwise show much diversity in their approach. Type C renderings are found not only in the Pentateuch but all through the Greek Bible:

1 Sam 4:20:
ולא־שתה לבה, "she did not set her heart" = "she did not understand"
καὶ οὐκ ἐνόησεν ἡ καρδία αὐτῆς, "*her heart* did not understand"[27]

Jer 7:31:
ולא עלתה על־לבי, "it did not go up to my heart" = "I did not intend it"
καὶ οὐ διενοήθην ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ μου "I did not intend it *in my heart*"

24. A good example is the expression דבר על לב ., "to speak on the heart," the meaning of which seems to have been no longer known to late biblical authors. See Babut, *Les expressions idiomatiques*, 87-89.

25. Perhaps renderings of type C functioned virtually as doublets to knowledgeable readers.

26. Lübbe ("Idioms") draws attention to the NIV translation of Ezek 20:5, where the idiomatic expression is rendered: "I swore with uplifted hand," combining, somewhat in the manner of type C renderings in the LXX, the global meaning ("I swore") with a nod to the wording ("with uplifted hand"). Lübbe attributes such renderings to "uncertainty as to the idiomatic quality of the Hebrew." Even in the NIV, such translations are exceptional, while in the LXX they are frequent.

27. NETS has: "her heart did not give heed."

Zech 8:22:

ולחלות את־פני יהוה, "to soften the LORD's face" = "to propitiate the LORD"
καὶ τοῦ ἐξιλάσκεσθαι τὸ πρόσωπον κυρίου, "to propitiate *the face* of the LORD"[28]

Renderings of this type are created by translators whose technique is very literal, as in Judges B:

Judg 3:24

מסיך הוא את־רגליו, "he is covering his feet" = "he is relieving himself"
LXX B ἀποκενοῖ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ[29] "he is emptying *his feet*"[30]

and by translators whose approach is very free, as in Isaiah or Proverbs:

Prov 28:21

הכר־פָּנים לא־טוב
ὃς οὐκ αἰσχύνεται πρόσωπα δικαίων οὐκ ἀγαθός
He who does not feel shame for the *person* (the face) of the righteous is not good.[31]

To the translators, the positive aspect of these hybrid renderings may have been that they allowed them to overcome, to a certain extent, the impossibility of translating idiomatic expressions. When they create a type C reading, the translators are eating their cookie and having it too, so to speak.

3. Conclusions

Idiomatic expressions make up only a small part of the Septuagint's source text. Moreover, only part of the evidence could be presented in this paper. Nevertheless, our tiny sample would appear to be significant in several ways.

To begin with, the fact that different techniques were applied to idiomatic expressions is suggestive. Faced with expressions that proved particularly recalcitrant to translation, the Seventy did not follow a single approach but tried out different possibilities. Within one and the same translation unit, indeed within one and the same short passage, a Hebrew expression may be translated now literally, now freely, and now in a special mode combining the free rendering with

---

28. NETS has: "to appease the face of the Lord."

29. The expression is translated freely in the A text and, in a different way, in 1 Sam 24:4.

30. NETS has: "he is draining his feet," with a note explaining that "feet" may refer here to the "lowest part." In light of the general approach of the Greek translators to idioms, this explanation would seem to be far-fetched and unnecessary.

31. NETS has "before the person." See also Isa 3:9.

the literal one. To my mind, this versatility flows mainly from inexperience. The translators of the Pentateuch did not come to their task with ready-made recipes. Although they were rather proficient in Hebrew, and had at least some knowledge of traditional exegesis, they had not been trained as translators—let alone as translators of Scripture. They learned their trade "on the job," dealing with particular problems as they arose in their successive rendering of the Hebrew text. Recurrent problems were solved not by following one consistent course but by applying a mix of strategies, now privileging the form, now the perceived content of the source text.

The way the translators dealt with idiomatic expressions also reveals something of their deeper motives. The translators brought great creativity to their project. Their objective, however, was not to create something new and unprecedented, but to preserve the old. To all appearances, the ultimate goal of the translators was to give to their readers as much as possible of what they found in the source text. Although the translational process sometimes demands that one should abandon either the wording of the source text or its global meaning, the Seventy were not at ease with this alternative. More often than not, they refused this basic dilemma and tried to compose in Greek an expression that paid tribute to both the wording and the sense. Although some of their renderings are open to criticism, because they follow neither the form nor the meaning of the source, they reflect much intelligence and a general preparedness to try out new formulas.

The facts brought to light in our analysis indicate that the Septuagint was meant by its creators to *represent* the Hebrew source text. The version was designed in such a way as to suggest to its audience that this is not simply a Greek text, nor even simply a Greek translation, but a sort of replica of the Hebrew Scriptures in a different language. In the passage from the *Life of Moses* already referred to above, Philo writes:

> in every case, exactly corresponding Greek words were employed to translate literally the appropriate Chaldaic words, being adapted with exceeding propriety to the matters which were to be explained; for just as I suppose the things which are proved in geometry and logic do not admit any variety of explanation, but the proposition which was set forth from the beginning remains unaltered, in like manner I conceive did these men find words precisely and literally corresponding to the things, which words were alone, or in the greatest possible degree, destined to explain with clearness and force the matters which it was desired to reveal. And there is a very evident proof of this; for if Chaldaeans were to learn the Greek language, and if Greeks were to learn Chaldaean, and if each were to meet with those scriptures in both languages, namely, the Chaldaic and the translated version, they would admire and reverence them both as sisters, or rather as one and the same both in their facts and in their language.[32]

32. See n. 3 above. This English translation is that of C. D. Yonge, *The Works of Philo Judaeus* (4 vols.; London: Bohn, 1854–55).

Although he was no translation specialist and may have known no Hebrew (or Chaldaic, as he calls it), it appears that Philo has here captured something of the essence of the translation approach encapsulated in the Septuagint. The translators made every effort to transmit not only the content but also the form of the source text to their Greek readers. With more than two thousand years of hindsight, and with much better tools, modern-day scholars may estimate that the Seventy failed occasionally to attain their ideal. The target text is not always perfectly true to the meaning of the source, nor—though this is more excusable—to its form. One should recognize, however, that even if the execution of their project may leave something to be desired, the project itself was admirable.

Ruminations on Translating the Septuagint of Genesis in the Light of the NETS Project

Robert J. V. Hiebert

1. Introduction

The New English Translation of the Septuagint project has afforded me the opportunity to work with an international team of scholars in the production of a distinctive version of the Jewish Scriptures. It has been a privilege to interact with this group of individuals and to collaborate with them in preparing an important resource for the Bible-reading public. This project has also been a springboard for contacts and communication with other biblical and Septuagint scholars from around the world. Whether we have met in person at conferences in North America and Europe, or corresponded by e-mail, or read and critiqued each other's research and publications, such interaction has enriched us in many ways. The work of translation itself has proven to be very beneficial as well. We have learned much about the texts over which we have labored, the linguistic realities involved in such an undertaking, the literature of the ancient world, and the ways in which writers and translators in those times used words and went about the tasks of composition or translation. In my own case, I worked methodically through the book of Genesis twice, word for word, even morpheme for morpheme, and then many more times carefully checked and rechecked my translation equivalents, all in order to produce an English version of a Greek translator's rendering of a Hebrew version of this book—an English version that sounds to current readers something like that first Greek version would have sounded to its initial readers. My colleagues attempted to do the same with the books or sections of the Old Greek version of the Jewish Scriptures that they were assigned for this project. If truth be told, and as we all found out, the task that we set before ourselves turned out to be rather more involved and challenging than many of us had originally envisioned, and it took longer than we had supposed or hoped it would. In my case, I labored over the book of Genesis—sometimes to the exclusion of other work, more often at the same time that I was involved in teaching or administrating or researching and writing on other topics—over a period of about seven years. When I sent off the corrections and modifications to the editors, Albert Pietersma and Benjamin

Wright III, it was not with the sense that this was the final word on what the Septuagint of Genesis in English dress must look like, but that it was now time to let it go. I continued to be quite aware that there would be room for adjustments in the future, when, for example, I would prepare the commentary volume on this same book for the Society of Biblical Literature Commentary on the Septuagint (SBLCS) series, for which I serve, along with Ben, as a Joint-Editor-in-Chief.

Concurrent with, and now subsequent to, this work of translation over the past number of years, I have presented a series of papers and written articles on a range of topics associated with my work of translating the Septuagint of Genesis for *A New English Translation of the Septuagint* (NETS)—topics having to do with translation theory and methodology, lexicography, hermeneutics, and transmission and interpretation history.[1] My focus in the present paper is not, however, on rehearsing what I have talked about in the past, but I wish to reflect on convictions that I have come to hold about the process of creating a translation of the Septuagint such as NETS, and on the implications of those convictions.

NETS, the product of an international team of more than thirty scholars, is the first English translation of the Old Greek version of the Jewish Scriptures in 164 years.[2] The work of these translators was carried out under the careful scrutiny of the volume's editors and in accordance with a set of guidelines clearly articulated in the *Translation Manual for "A New English Translation of the Septuagint" (NETS)*. To set the stage for my remarks in this paper, I would like to quote from articles 6 and 7 of the manual's Statement of Principles:

6. NETS translators will seek to reflect the meaning of the Greek text in accordance with the ancient translator's perceived intent, and as occasioned by the ancient translator's linguistic approach, even when this policy may

1. Articles include the following: "Translation Technique in the Septuagint of Genesis and Its Implications for the NETS Version," *BIOSCS* 33 (2000): 76–93; "Translating a Translation: The Septuagint of Genesis and the New English Translation of the Septuagint Project," 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), 263–84; "Lexicography and the Translation of a Translation: The NETS Version and the Septuagint of Genesis," *BIOSCS* 37 (2004): 73–86; "The Hermeneutics of Translation in the Septuagint of Genesis," in *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures* (ed. Wolfgang Kraus and R. Glenn Wooden; SBLSCS 53; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), 85–103; "The Greek Pentateuch and 4 Maccabees," in *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo* (ed. Anssi Voitila and Jutta Jokiranta; JSJSup 126; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2008), 239–54.

2. Prior to NETS, there were the versions of L. C. L. Brenton (*The Septuagint Version of the Old Testament, according to the Vatican Text, Translated into English; with the Principal Various Readings of the Alexandrine Copy* [2 vols.; London: Samuel Bagster & Sons, 1844]) and C. Thomson (*The Holy Bible, containing the Old and the New Covenant, commonly called the Old and the New Testament* [4 vols.; Philadelphia: Jane Aitken, 1808]).

result in an unidiomatic (though grammatical) English rendering. Appropriate footnotes will inform the reader.

7. Since much of the Septuagint derives from the Hebrew Scriptures, it is important to reflect that dependence as consistently and comprehensively as possible for the English reader. For this reason, NETS consciously attempts to employ the wording and approach of a standard modern English translation of the Hebrew Bible in situations in which the Greek understands the Hebrew text in the same way as the English. The New Revised Standard Version (NRSV) has been chosen to provide this English base. Where the Greek does not correspond to the Hebrew as understood by the NRSV, translators will make every reasonable effort to represent the differences fully and accurately.[3]

These principles, to one degree or another, set the NETS project apart from other Septuagint translation projects represented at this conference: *La Bible d'Alexandrie* and *Septuaginta Deutsch*. For example, whereas NETS represents the attempt to reflect in English the meaning that the Greek text would have had for the Septuagint translators and at least some of their contemporaries at the constitutive phase of its history when the connection between the Greek translation and its underlying Semitic *Vorlage* would have been most readily appreciated, the above-mentioned French translation aims to produce "a primary translation of the text, as literary as possible, on the basis of syntactical and lexical usages of the Greek language current in the translators' epoch." Marguerite Harl, the director of the French project, characterizes the theoretical framework of that undertaking:

> We are convinced that every act of translating results in a text which receives a new life within the domain of the translation language. We acknowledge the fundamental axiom of linguistics: a text written in any language should be read and analyzed only in the context of this language.[4]

The inevitable consequence of applying this axiom to the interpretation of the Septuagint is that this translated corpus will, in effect, be treated as an essentially Greek composition, and it will be read in the manner in which it was received by those during the course of its reception history who had little if any access to the Semitic *Vorlage* rather than by those who, in the period of its production, are more likely to have had such recourse.

Septuaginta Deutsch, on the other hand, seems to strive to take a *via media* between the two preceding approaches. On that project's Web site, the goals of that

---

3. Albert Pietersma, *Translation Manual for "A New English Translation of the Septuagint" (NETS)* (Ada, Mich.: Uncial Books, 1996), 49–50.

4. Marguerite Harl, "Translating the LXX: Experience of 'La Bible d'Alexandrie,'" *BIOSCS* 31 (1998): 33.

undertaking, which aims to produce "eine philologisch zuverlässige und zugleich gut lesbare sowie fachlich nachprüfbare Wiedergabe der Septuaginta," are stated. Two volumes are being prepared:[5] the translation volume, which includes some footnotes regarding textual variants and alternative translations, and an accompanying volume containing introductions to the books of the Septuagint and annotations regarding selected issues with respect to the Greek and German translations and the recension and reception history of the Septuagint.[6] Some of the goals of the project involve gaining an understanding of the Septuagint as an independent document of Hellenistic Judaism, an appreciation of the key role of the Septuagint as a translation of Hebrew texts, and access to the oldest available Greek text of the Septuagint that underlies the Jewish recensions and the Christian reception of the Septuagint.[7] These goals pertain to the Septuagint both as originally produced and as subsequently received.

2. Principled Translation

I turn now to the main point of this presentation, which is to emphasize the importance of establishing a carefully thought-out conceptual framework and a set of principles to provide guidance for a modern translation of the Septuagint, and of the need to adopt a consistent methodology when doing the actual work of translation. This does not mean that one establishes rigid translation equivalences from which one never deviates, nor that one can achieve perfection in creating an unassailable translation product (*pace* Philo or Epiphanius or even Aristeas), but it does mean that one makes translation decisions that are in accord with, and defensible in the light of, a conceptual framework and a set of principles. A key factor in developing a sound approach to producing a modern translation of the Septuagint is deciding which aspect of the textual history of the Greek version one wishes to reflect. To be more specific, one must determine whether one wishes to focus on understanding the text as it was produced, with the linguistic horizons of the Greek product and the Semitic *Vorlage* upon which it was based clearly in view, or as it came to be received or understood by subsequent readers, most of whom would have regarded the Septuagint as an independent text that did not need to be linked with, or validated by, its underlying Semitic original.

I have decided to use as my primary points of reference for illustrating these ideas my translation of Genesis for NETS, and a recently published translation of, and commentary on, the Septuagint of Genesis by Susan Brayford in the Septua-

---

5. The *Septuaginta Deutsch* translation volume was published after this paper was presented. I have not yet, as of this writing, had the opportunity to assess its contents.

6. http://www.septuagintaforschung.de/files/Richtlinien3.pdf (accessed September 13, 2008).

7. http://www.septuagintaforschung.de/files/richtlinien1-2.pdf (accessed September 12, 2008).

gint Commentary Series published by Brill.[8] I recently wrote a review of Brayford's book that was published in the *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* (*BIOSCS*).[9] What should make a comparison of Brayford's and my translations of the Septuagint of Genesis a worthwhile one is the fact that they set out to reflect different aspects of its textual history. As I have indicated above, my translation for NETS seeks to represent the Septuagint of Genesis in its original constitutive stage, and for that reason the Greek text that I have used is that of the critical edition of John William Wevers in the Göttingen Septuaginta series.[10] Brayford, in accordance with the prospectus of the series to which her volume belongs, chooses "one of the three main uncial codices" of the Septuagint—the fifth-century Codex Alexandrinus—as her Greek base, so as to focus on "a text that actually existed in a particular reading community."[11] This would presumably mean a fifth-century c.e. Christian reading community rather than the third-century b.c.e. Jewish community in which the Septuagint translator lived. She goes on to say that in her English translation she "attempts to be faithful to the meaning" of her source text, that is, Alexandrinus, and that "some renderings are based on context and the requirements for understandable English" but that "the translation as a whole is fairly literal in most places. This often results in awkward and often [*sic*] inelegant English. Nevertheless, its awkwardness to contemporary readers in a sense mimics the manner in which native readers of Greek might have regarded the style of LXX-G,"[12] that is, the Greek translation of Genesis.

At this point, one seems to encounter a conceptual and methodological inconsistency in Brayford's approach. If the initial reading community of Alexandrinus dates to the fifth century c.e., based on the evidence that is available from both Jewish and Christian interpreters over the approximately seven centuries that elapsed from the time that Genesis and the other pentateuchal books were translated, this corpus will have taken on a life of its own and become autonomous vis-à-vis the Hebrew text that was its *Vorlage*. Thus, the kind of semantic and grammatical stiltedness that often characterizes this quite literal and quantitative rendering of the Hebrew into Greek, and that we as NETS translators have attempted to reflect in our English translations, will have been accommodated and even exploited exegetically in the interpretations of subsequent readers and reading communities.

---

8. Susan Brayford, *Genesis* (Septuagint Commentary Series; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2007).

9. Robert J. V. Hiebert, review of *Genesis,* by Susan Brayford, *BIOSCS* 41 (2008): 122–25.

10. John William Wevers, ed., *Genesis* (Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum 1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974).

11. Brayford, *Genesis*, 24. The other two great uncials are Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus, both of which date to the fourth century and in which only fragments of the book of Genesis have survived.

12. Brayford, *Genesis*, 28.

My analysis of the following passages in Genesis will illustrate how the approach of NETS in consistently attempting to render the Greek in accordance with an understanding of the text as produced compares with Brayford's approach, which seems to fluctuate between an emphasis on the text as received and the text as produced.

2.1. χεῖλος

Gen 11:1 Καὶ ἦν πᾶσα ἡ γῆ χεῖλος ἕν, καὶ φωνὴ μία πᾶσιν.
NETS: And the whole earth was one lip, and there was one speech for all.
Brayford: And there was in all the earth one lip, and one language for all.[13]
MT: ויהי כל־הארץ שׂפה אחת ודברים אחדים
NRSV: Now the whole earth had one language and the same words.

One notices a difference in syntax in Brayford's translation of the first clause in comparison to what NETS has, so that her rendering corresponds to καὶ ἦν (ἐν?) πάσῃ τῇ γῇ χεῖλος ἕν. This wording is not attested by any textual witness, including Alexandrinus, and consequently her translation is not an accurate reflection of any existing Greek text. Her version does, however, mitigate somewhat the stiltedness of the Greek, which mirrors the syntax and idiom of the Hebrew, and the phrase "there was in all the earth" might possibly reflect how this awkwardly worded text would have been interpreted in communities of readers such as the one associated with Alexandrinus.

The question might then be raised whether those readers would not also have contextualized the use of χεῖλος in the present verse and read it as a metonym for speech or language. That seems to be the case in the writings of Philo and Josephus, for example, when they make reference to this event. Philo talks about "the confusion of tongues [τῆς τῶν διαλέκτων συγχύσεως] and the lessons of wisdom taught by Moses thereon. For he says as follows. 'And all the earth was one lip [χεῖλος] and there was one voice [φωνή] to all'" (*Conf.* 1).[14] It should be noted that, although Philo quotes the text of Gen 11:1 exactly as the Septuagint has it[15] with χεῖλος and φωνή in parallel clauses, he uses the term διάλεκτος when referring to the confusion of the languages in his introduction to that citation. This last term along with φωνή and γλῶσσα[16] are commonly used as designations for speech or language. That is not, however, the case with χεῖλος, which denotes "lip," "edge," "rim," "shore," or "bank."[17] In another passage in which Philo quotes from Exod 7:15, with allegorical flourish he links χεῖλος, denoting "(river)bank," with the function of speech:

13. Ibid., 61.
14. Trans. Colson and Whitaker, LCL.
15. Except that Philo has πᾶσι without νῦ ἐφελκυστικόν.
16. γλῶσσαν occurs in Gen 11:7.
17. LSJ, 353, s.v. γλῶσσα; 401, s.v. διάλεκτος; 1967–68, s.v. φωνή; 1982, s.v., χεῖλος; BDAG, 1081, s.v. χεῖλος.

> "Behold," he says, "the King of Egypt comes to the water, but thou shalt stand meeting him at the edge [τὸ χεῖλος] of the river." . . . It is well indeed that the opponents should meet on the lip or edge [τὸ χεῖλος] of the river. The lips [χείλη] are the boundaries of the mouth [στόματος . . . πέρατα] and a kind of hedge to the tongue and through them the stream of speech [τὸ τοῦ λόγου ῥεῦμα] passes, when it begins its downward flow. (*Conf.* 29, 33)

This does not, however, constitute evidence that χεῖλος was used to signify "language" in the same way that שׂפה was. Indeed, as already indicated, there is no evidence in Greek literature for that kind of usage.

Josephus's description in *Antiquities* of the episode in Gen 11 regarding the confusion of languages highlights even more clearly the fact that terms other than χεῖλος were used in ancient Greek literature to denote speech activity.

> He created discord among them by making them speak different languages [ἀλλογλώσσους ἀπεργασάμενος], through the variety of which [πολυφωνίας] they could not understand one another. The place where they built the tower is now called Babylon from the confusion of that primitive speech [διάλεκτον] once intelligible to all, for the Hebrews call confusion "Babel." This tower and the confusion of the tongues [ἀλλοφωνίας] of men are mentioned also by the Sibyl in the following terms: "When all men spoke a common language [ὁμοφώνων ὄντων], certain of them built an exceeding high tower, thinking thereby to mount to heaven. But the gods sent winds against it and overturned the tower and gave to every man a peculiar language [ἰδίαν . . . φωνήν]; whence it comes that the city was called Babylon." (*A.J.* 1.117–18)[18]

All things considered, then, it is possible that, for fifth-century readers of Alexandrinus, the choice of χεῖλος as a metonym for speech or language may have seemed as odd as "lip" does in English. Brayford's rendering of it in this fashion might, therefore, be a legitimate reflection of that readership's mode of reception of the text, though the employment of φωνή in the adjacent clause would have served as an explicit indicator that oral communication was being signified.

2.2. Cognate Dative[19]

Gen 2:17 θανάτῳ ἀποθανεῖσθε
NETS: you shall die by death
Brayford: you will die in death[20]
MT: מות תמות
NRSV: you shall die

18. Trans. Thackeray, LCL.
19. See Hiebert, "Translating a Translation," 271–73.
20. Brayford, *Genesis*, 37.

Gen 3:4 Οὐ θανάτῳ ἀποθανεῖσθε
NETS: You will not die by death
Brayford: You will not die a death[21]
MT: לא־מות תמתון
NRSV: You will not die

Gen 17:13 περιτομῇ περιτμηθήσεται
NETS: shall be circumcised with circumcision
Brayford: they will surely be circumcised[22]
MT: המול ימול
NRSV: must be circumcised

Gen 40:15 ὅτι κλοπῇ ἐκλάπην ἐκ γῆς Ἑβραίων
NETS: For by stealth I was stolen out of the land of the Hebrews
Brayford: for by stealth I was stolen from the land of the Hebrews[23]
MT: כי־גנב גנבתי מארץ העברים
NRSV: For in fact I was stolen out of the land of the Hebrews

Gen 44:5 αὐτὸς δὲ οἰωνισμῷ οἰωνίζεται ἐν αὐτῷ
NETS: And by ornithomancy he practices ornithomancy with it
Brayford: But also by divination he divines with it[24]
MT: והוא נחש ינחש בו
NRSV: Does he not indeed use it for divination?

Gen 44:15 οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι οἰωνισμῷ οἰωνιεῖται ἄνθρωπος οἷος ἐγώ;
NETS: Do you not know that a person such as I will practice ornithomancy by ornithomancy?
Brayford: Did you not know that a man like me would divine by divination?[25]
MT: הלוא ידעתם כי־נחש ינחש איש אשר כמני
NRSV: Do you not know that one such as I can practice divination?

The Hebrew infinitive absolute (free infinitive) plus cognate finite verb combination is a syntactical construction that signifies emphasis of a verbal idea.[26] In the preceding six examples from the Septuagint of Genesis it is rendered by a dative noun plus cognate finite verb. This construction is to be found occasionally in Classical Greek and in the New Testament, but in the Septuagint as a whole it

21. Ibid., 39.
22. Ibid., 77.
23. Ibid., 161.
24. Ibid., 175.
25. Ibid., 177.
26. GKC §113 *l–n*.

occurs frequently[27] as a result of interference from the Semitic source text in the translation process.[28] For NETS, with its focus on representing the Greek text as it would have been understood at the constitutive stage of its history, the appropriate translation strategy is to render the text quantitatively at the expense of good English style, though not ungrammatically. When one surveys Brayford's translations above, it is clear that she vacillates between that approach (2:17; 3:4; 40:15; 44:5, 15) and one that with its idiomatic English seems to imply that the source text contains standard Greek (17:13). Perhaps by the fifth century, readers of Alexandrinus would not have recoiled at the frequent occurrence of the cognate dative. If that was the case, however, Brayford should have rendered all such constructions idiomatically. Whichever conclusion one comes to regarding the significance of this syntactical phenomenon, there should in this case be consistency in translation approach.

2.3. κατὰ πρόσωπον

Gen 16:12 καὶ κατὰ πρόσωπον πάντων τῶν ἀδελφῶν αὐτοῦ κατοικήσει
NETS: and he shall live facing all his kinfolk
Brayford: and opposite the face of all his brothers he will settle[29]
MT: ועל־פני כל־אחיו ישכן
NRSV: and he shall live at odds with all his kin

Gen 23:17 ὁ ἀγρὸς Ἐφρών, ὃς ἦν ἐν τῷ διπλῷ σπηλαίῳ, ὅς ἐστιν κατὰ πρόσωπον Μαμβρή
NETS: the field of Ephron, which was at the double cave, which [i.e., the field] is facing Mambre
Brayford: the field of Ephrōn—in which was the double cave—which is along the face of Mambrē[30]
MT: שׂדה עפרון אשׁר במכפלה אשׁר לפני ממרא
NRSV: the field of Ephron in Machpelah, which was to the east of Mamre

27. F. C. Conybeare and St. George Stock, *A Grammar of Septuagint Greek* (1905; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1980), §61.

28. Gideon Toury speaks of "phenomena pertaining to the make-up of the source text [that] tend to be transferred to the target text, whether they manifest themselves in the form of *negative transfer* (i.e., deviations from normal, codified practices of the target system), or in the form of *positive transfer* (i.e., greater likelihood of selecting features which do exist and are used in any case)" (*Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond* [Benjamins Translation Library 4; Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 1995], 275). The cognate dative construction would be an example of negative transfer.

29. Brayford, *Genesis*, 75.

30. Ibid., 97.

Gen 25:18 Σούρ (σουηλ A), ἥ ἐστιν κατὰ πρόσωπον Αἰγύπτου
NETS: Sour, which is facing Egypt
Brayford: Souēl, which is down facing Egypt[31]
MT: שׁוּר אשר על־פני מצרים
NRSV: Shur, which is opposite Egypt

Gen 25:18 κατὰ πρόσωπον πάντων τῶν ἀδελφῶν αὐτοῦ
NETS: facing all his kinfolk
Brayford: down from the face of all his brothers[32]
MT: על־פני כל־אחיו
NRSV: alongside of all his people

Gen 32:21(22) καὶ παρεπορεύετο (προεπορευοντο A et al.) τὰ δῶρα κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ
NETS: And the presents passed by in front of him[33]
Brayford: And the gifts were going in advance from his face[34]
MT: ותעבר המנחה על־פניו
NRSV: So the present passed on ahead of him

Gen 33:18 καὶ παρενέβαλεν κατὰ πρόσωπον τῆς πόλεως
NETS: and he encamped facing the city
Brayford: and he encamped down from the face of the city[35]
MT: ויחן את־פני העיר
NRSV: and he encamped before the city

The issue in the passages cited above is the translation of the prepositional phrase κατὰ πρόσωπον. This construction is attested by authors as early as Thucydides (fifth century B.C.E.) and Xenophon (fifth/fourth century B.C.E.) in the sense of "in front, facing"[36] and so would have been regarded as standard Greek already prior to the time of the translation of the Septuagint. Accordingly, I have rendered it idiomatically for NETS. The readers of Alexandrinus would certainly not have considered the phrase to be unusual, and so Brayford's stilted translations of it are unwarranted.

31. Ibid., 105.

32. Ibid.

33. For NETS, I translated κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ as "opposite his face," though now I prefer to render it this way for the reason given in the paragraph following this set of examples.

34. Brayford, *Genesis*, 135.

35. Ibid., 139.

36. LSJ, 1533, s.v. πρόσωπον.

2.4. Names

The rendering of names provides a distinctive set of challenges for a translator. There are essentially two broad categories of names in the Septuagint: (1) replacements of Hebrew names by the Greek ones (e.g., מצרים ⇒ Αἴγυπτος), and (2) transliterations or transcriptions of Hebrew names in Greek characters, with or without inflectional or derivational suffixes. For NETS, translators followed a carefully articulated set of guidelines so as to distinguish the kinds of phenomena that occur in the Septuagint with respect to names. As will be seen below, that does not seem to have been the case with Brayford. The following passage is illustrative.

Gen 10:15-19
MT:

[15] וכנען ילד את־צידן בכרו ואת־חת:
[16] ואת־היבוסי ואת־האמרי ואת הגרגשי:
[17] ואת־החוי ואת־הערקי ואת־הסיני:
[18] ואת־הארודי ואת־הצמרי ואת־החמתי ואחר נפצו משפחות הכנעני:
[19] ויהי גבול הכנעני מצידן באכה גררה עד־עזה באכה סדמה ועמרה ואדמה וצבים עד־לשע:

NRSV: [15] Canaan became the father of Sidon his firstborn, and Heth, [16] and the Jebusites, the Amorites, the Girgashites, [17] the Hivites, the Arkites, the Sinites, [18] the Arvadites, the Zemarites, and the Hamathites. Afterward the families of the Canaanites spread abroad. [19] And the territory of the Canaanites extended from Sidon, in the direction of Gerar, as far as Gaza, and in the direction of Sodom, Gomorrah, Admah, and Zeboiim, as far as Lasha.

LXX: [15] Χανααν δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Σιδῶνα πρωτότοκον καὶ τὸν Χετταῖον [16] καὶ τὸν Ἰεβουσαῖον καὶ τὸν Ἀμορραῖον καὶ τὸν Γεργεσαῖον [17] καὶ τὸν Εὐαῖον καὶ τὸν Ἀρουκαῖον καὶ τὸν Ἁσενναῖον [18] καὶ τὸν Ἀράδιον καὶ τὸν Σαμαραῖον καὶ τὸν Ἁμαθί. Καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο διεσπάρησαν αἱ φυλαὶ τῶν Χαναναίων. [19] καὶ ἐγένοντο τὰ ὅρια τῶν [> A et al.] Χαναναίων ἀπὸ Σιδῶνος ἕως ἐλθεῖν εἰς Γέραρα καὶ Γάζαν, ἕως ἐλθεῖν Σοδόμων καὶ Γομόρρας, Ἀδαμὰ καὶ Σεβωίμ, ἕως Λασά [δασα A et al.].

NETS: [15] Now Chanaan became the father of Sidon as his firstborn and the Chettite [16] and the Iebousite and the Amorrite and the Gergesite [17] and the Heuite and the Aroukite and the Hasennite [18] and the Aradian and the Samarite and Hamathi. And afterward the tribes of the Chananites were scattered abroad. [19] And the boundaries of the Chananites extended from Sidon until one came to Gerara and Gaza, until one came as far as Sodoma and Gomorra, Adama and Seboim, as far as Lasa.

Brayford: [15] Then Chanaan fathered Sidōn the firstborn, and the Chettites [16] and the Iebousites and the Amorrites and the Gergesites [17] and the Huites and

the Aroukites and the Asennites [18] and the Aradians and the Samarites and the Hamathi. And after this the tribes of the Chananites were dispersed. [19] And the boundaries of the Chananite came to be from Sidōn until reaching Gerara and Gaza, until reaching Sodoma and Gomorra, Adama and Sebōim and as far as Dasa.[37]

When one compares the rendering of Greek names in NETS and in Brayford's translation, one notices a number of inconsistencies and errors.

1. Brayford does not distinguish singular from plural gentilic forms: e.g., v. 15 τὸν Χετταῖον, "the Chettite" (NETS), "the Chettites" (Brayford); vv. 18, 19 τῶν Χαναναίων "the Chananites" (NETS), "the Chananites" (v. 18 Brayford), "the Chananite" (v. 19 Brayford).[38]
2. Though she states that the diphthong ευ should be rendered "eu,"[39] Brayford's equivalent for τὸν Εὑαῖον is "the Huites" (v. 17).[40]
3. Rough breathing, which should be signified by "h" in transcription,[41] is not represented in her equivalent for τὸν Ἁσενναῖον in v. 17, "the Asennites."
4. Brayford fails to distinguish between names that the Greek translator has construed as proper names and gentilics with derivational suffixes. Thus she renders τὸν Ἁμαθί in v. 18 as "the Hamathi" (cf. "Hamathi" in NETS), when it should be treated like τὸν Σιδῶνα (= Sidon/Sidōn) in v. 15 (cf. also v. 19) because it has neither of the derviational (+ inflectional) suffixes exhibited in this excerpt (i.e., -αῖος and -ιος).[42]

Brayford states that when the Septuagint has replaced the Hebrew name, the usual English counterpart will be used.[43] In some cases like the following, however, that rule is not consistently applied.

1. In 25:18 she translates πρὸς Ἀσσυρίους (אשׁורה) as "at the Assyrians,"[44] but in 2:14 κατέναντι Ἀσσυρίων (קדמת אשׁור) is rendered "opposite the Assuriōs."[45]

---

37. Brayford, *Genesis*, 59, 61.

38. Ibid., 59.

39. Ibid., 27.

40. Another inconsistency occurs with respect to her stated rule for the transliteration of υ as "y" when it is not part of a diphthong (Brayford, *Genesis*, 27). Her rendering of Συμεών, however, is "Sumeōn," rather than "Symeon," which appears in NETS: 29:33; 34:14, 25, 30; 35:23; 42:24, 36; 43:23(22); 46:10; 48:5; 49:5 (ibid., 122–23, 138–41, 144–45, 168–73, 182–83, 190–93).

41. Brayford, *Genesis*, 27.

42. Note that, whereas Ἁμαθί is simply an otherwise unattested transcription of החמתי, Σιδών is a bona fide replacement for צידן inasmuch as it is attested in Greek literature as early as the writings of Homer (LSJ, 1597, s.v. Σιδών).

43. Brayford, *Genesis*, 27.

44. Ibid., 36–37.

45. Ibid., 104–5. Ἀσσύριος is attested already in the writings of fifth-century B.C.E. authors Herodotus and Thucydides (LSJ, 260, s.v. Ἀσσύριος, and Supplement, 56).

2. In 13:10, 11; 32:10(11) her equivalent for Ἰορδάνης is, appropriately, "Jordan," but in 50:10, 11 it is "Iordan."[46]

When the Septuagint transcribes a Hebrew name, says Brayford, she will do likewise in her English version; when the Greek letter ι is involved it will come across in English as "i"; and inflected Greek names will be rendered only in their nominative forms.[47] Yet in regard to the English equivalent for the inflected transcription of יהודה, Ἰούδας, she breaks her own rules on all three counts with her choice of "Jouda."[48] The correct English transcription of the inflected nominative form is "Ioudas," which is the form of the name that appears in NETS Genesis.

As the preceding examples show, the muddling of forms for names is, unfortunately, not unusual in Brayford's translation.[49] Indeed, in the absence of carefully delineated and/or rigorously applied protocols for rendering them (such as were established for NETS), the result is a great deal of methodological inconsistency.

2.5. λίψ and θάλασσα

An interesting translation problem in the Septuagint of Genesis involves certain directional terms. While some of them are consistent with Greek idiom, others are not. The items of interest in the example below are the Greek counterparts of the Hebrew terms for "south" and "west."[50]

Genesis 13:14

MT: ויהוה אמר אל־אברם אחרי הפרד־לוט מעמו שׂא נא עיניך וראה מן־המקום אשר־אתה שׁם צפנה ונגבה וקדמה וימה:

NRSV: The Lord said to Abram, after Lot had separated from him, "Raise your eyes now, and look from the place where you are, northward and southward [נגבה] and eastward and westward [ימה] . . ."

LXX: Ὁ δὲ θεὸς εἶπεν τῷ Ἀβρὰμ μετὰ τὸ διαχωρισθῆναι τὸν Λὼτ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ Ἀναβλέψας τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς σου ἴδε ἀπὸ τοῦ τόπου, οὗ νῦν σὺ εἶ, πρὸς βορρᾶν καὶ λίβα καὶ ἀνατολὰς καὶ θάλασσαν·

---

46. Brayford, *Genesis*, 68–69, 134–35, 198–99. The so-called *Letter of Aristeas* (second century B.C.E.) and Strabo (first century B.C.E.–first century C.E.) are among the earliest to attest this geographical name (BDAG, 477, s.v. Ἰορδάνης).

47. Brayford, *Genesis*, 26–27.

48. Genesis 29:35; 35:23; 37:26; 38:1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12 (2x), 15, 20, 22, 23, 24 (2x), 26; 43:3, 8(7); 44:14, 16, 18; 46:12, 28; 49:8, 9, 10 (Brayford, *Genesis*, 122–23, 144–45, 150–57, 170–73, 176–77, 182–85, 192–95).

49. In my review of Brayford's book, I have documented other examples of this sort of thing in her translation (*BIOSCS* 41 [2008]: 124).

50. See the insightful analysis of directional terminology in the Pentateuch by Cameron Boyd-Taylor, "Lexicography and Interlanguage: Gaining our Bearings," *BIOSCS* 37 (2004): 55–72.

NETS: And God said to Abram after Lot had separated from him, "Look up with your eyes; look from the place where you are now, toward the north and southwest [λίβα] and east and sea [θάλασσαν]…"

Brayford: Then God said to Abram after Lōt separated himself from him, "Looking up with the eyes, look from the place where now you are toward the north and south [λίβα] and east and west [θάλασσαν]…"[51]

The Greek translator's choice of λίψ to render נגב is unexpected inasmuch as this Greek term denotes either "the southwest wind" or, when used in connection with the specification of the four points of the compass, "west."[52] There is no evidence in non-translation Greek literature that λίψ was employed to designate due south, for which the term νότος was standard. Thus, in Gen 13:14—where the northern (βορρᾶν), eastern (ἀνατολάς), and western (θάλασσαν) quadrants are otherwise represented—the only plausible rendering in a translation like NETS that reflects the constitutive phase of its interpretative history is one that accords with its regular usage—in this context, "southwest"—despite the asymmetricality that results. The use of θάλασσα as a counterpart to ים, while explicable in terms of their partial semantic overlap, is an example of interference or negative transfer from the Hebrew source text[53] because of the fact that there is no attested case in ancient compositional Greek literature in which θάλασσα conveys the directional sense that is inherent in Hebrew term in the present context.[54] Consequently, the rendering in NETS is "sea" rather than "west."

The question now is whether the fifth-century community of readers of Alexandrinus would have interpreted λίψ and θάλασσα in Gen 13:14 the way that Brayford translates them—that is, "south" and "west," or in accordance with standard usage in Greek compositional literature—"southwest" and "sea." Once again it is important to make a distinction between translation and interpretation. On the basis of the preceding discussion, it is clear that "southwest" and "sea" are the appropriate translations of λίψ and θάλασσα, respectively. In the Septuagint's reception history, however, there is evidence for their substitution by other directional terms that alleviate the semantic tension created by the Greek translator's choice to employ them as counterparts of נגב and ים. Philo's treatment of another Genesis text that features the same Hebrew directional terms that are found in 13:14 is illustrative.

51. Brayford, *Genesis*, 68–69.

52. Authors such as Herodotus (fifth century B.C.E.), Aristotle (fourth century B.C.E.), Theocritus (third century B.C.E.), and Polybius (second century B.C.E.) use λίψ in reference to "the southwest wind." In third- to second-century B.C.E. Egyptian papyri and Josephus's *Antiquities*, λίψ denotes "west" (LSJ, 1055, s.v. λίψ (A); Josephus, *A.J.* 3.293–94 [Thackeray, LCL]; Boyd-Taylor, "Lexicography and Interlanguage," 61–66).

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

54. LSJ, 781–82, s.v. θάλασσα; BDAG, 442, s.v. θάλασσα.

Genesis 28:14
MT: והיה זרעך כעפר הארץ ופרצת ימה וקדמה וצפנה ונגבה ונברכו בך כל־משפחת האדמה ובזרעך:
NRSV: …and your offspring shall be like the dust of the earth, and you shall spread abroad to the west [ימה] and to the east and to the north and to the south [נגבה]; and all the families of the earth shall be blessed in you and in your offspring.
LXX: καὶ ἔσται τὸ σπέρμα σου ὡς ἡ ἄμμος τῆς γῆς [θαλασσης A et al.], καὶ πλατυνθήσεται ἐπὶ θάλασσαν καὶ ἐπὶ λίβα [λιβαν A et al.] καὶ ἐπὶ βορρᾶν καὶ ἐπ᾽ ἀνατολάς, καὶ ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν σοὶ πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ ἐν τῷ σπέρματί σου.
NETS: And your offspring shall be like the sand of the earth, and it shall widen out to the sea [ἐπὶ θάλασσαν] and to the southwest [ἐπὶ λίβα] and to the north and to the east, and all the tribes of the earth shall be blessed in you and in your offspring.
Brayford: And your offspring will be as the sand of the sea, and they will spread out westward [ἐπὶ θάλασσαν] and southward [ἐπὶ λιβαν] and northward and eastward; and all the tribes of the earth will be blessed in you and in your offspring.[55]

In the following citation, Philo maps his choice of directional terms over those found in the preceding passage in Genesis:

> Wisdom's race is likened to the sand of the earth . . . both because its number is without limit and because the sand-bank forces back the inroads of the sea, as those of sinful and unjust deeds are kept back by trained reason. And this, in accordance with the Divine promises, is broadening out to the very bounds of the universe, and renders its possessor inheritor of the four quarters of the world, reaching to them all, to East [τὰ ἑῷα], and West [τὰ ἑσπέρια], and South [κατὰ μεσημβρίαν] and North [τὰ προσάρκτια]: for it is said, "It shall spread abroad, to the West [ἐπὶ θάλασσαν] and to the South [λίβα] and to the North [βορρᾶν] and to the East [ἀνατολάς]." (*Somn.* 1.175)[56]

Thus, his counterpart of θάλασσα is ἑσπέριος[57] and his replacement for λίψ is μεσημβρία,[58] in both cases solidly attested in early Greek compositional literature as directional signifiers for "west" and "south," respectively.

It is quite conceivable, then, that the readers of Alexandrinus upon whom Brayford wants to focus would have made the kinds of interpretative moves that

55. Brayford, *Genesis*, 118–19.

56. Trans. Colson and Whitaker, LCL. Of course the translations of θάλασσα and λίψ by Colson and Whitaker are not consistent with normal Greek usage.

57. LSJ, 697, s.v. ἑσπέριος.

58. LSJ, 1105–6, s.v. μεσημβρία.

Philo made. What Brayford does not acknowledge, however, in her translations of the terms in question and in her failure to deal with the relevant hermeneutical issues in her commentary is that these moves do not involve a semantic shift at the lexicographical level but that they are part of the reception history of these texts.[59] Takamitsu Muraoka blurs the same category distinctions in his critique of the translation of λίψ in Gen 13:14 of NETS. Referring to a hypothetical scenario involving "a diaspora synagogue or . . . a chapel holding mostly 'proselytes,'" he muses that it is reasonable to assume that "the average member of the congregation adjusted his bearings a little bit with regard to λίψ and did not wonder why God was being very particular and meticulous only in respect of one of the four quarters."[60] That may well have been true when the Septuagint took on a life of its own independent of its Hebrew source text, but this does not mean that lexicographers among the congregants envisioned by Muraoka proceeded to add "= νότος" to the entry λίψ in their Greek dictionaries.

3. Conclusion

In this paper I have attempted to demonstrate the importance of developing and consistently implementing sound methodology for the enterprise of translation. A crucial component of that methodology for the translation of the Septuagint involves making the distinction between the text as produced and the text as received by subsequent communities of readers and interpreters. The failure to take that distinction into account results in the sort of inconsistency of approach that I have documented above.

59. With respect to Gen 13:14, Brayford's commentary mentions simply "four directions," and in regard to 28:14, the reference is to "all directions" (Brayford, *Genesis*, 293, 355).

60. Takamitsu Muraoka, "Recent Discussions on the Septuagint Lexicography with Special Reference to the So-called Interlinear Model," in *Die Septuaginta—Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten: Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 20.–23. Juli 2006* (ed. Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus; WUNT 219; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 235.

"Glory" in Greek Exodus: Lexical Choice in Translation and Its Reflection in Secondary Translations

Larry Perkins

1. Introduction

The various modern-language translations of the Septuagint represent a significant resurgence of interest in Septuagint studies worldwide. Undoubtedly some variation among the end products occurs because the individual translation projects followed diverse translation principles.

As a participant in the project that produced *A New English Translation of the Septuagint* (NETS),[1] I agreed to follow the NETS translation procedures. Two principles were particularly noteworthy. First, NETS seeks to represent the "translator's intent," not the manner in which "a Greek audience might understand that text."[2] Second, NETS seeks to show the dependency of the Greek translation on the Hebrew text "as consistently and comprehensively as possible for the English reader." The method chosen to do this was to follow the New Revised Standard Version's wordings as an English base as much as possible. "NETS strives to maximize synoptic use of the Greek and Hebrew Scriptures."[3]

These two principles influenced the way I rendered the Greek term δόξα and its various cognates (δοξάζω, ἐνδοξάζομαι, ἔνδοξος, ἐνδόξως, παραδοξάζω) for NETS. I attempted to represent these Greek terms with some consistency because the Greek translator seems to have made some effort to emphasize the concept of δόξα in his work. In other words, some interest, perhaps theologically based, seems to have influenced the lexical choices the Greek translator made. If this is the case, then to what degree should the modern translator of the Septuagint seek

1. Larry Perkins, "Exodus," in *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under That Title* (ed. Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright; Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 43–81.

2. Albert Pietersma, *Translation Manual for "A New English Translation of the Septuagint" (NETS)* (Ada, Mich.: Uncial Books, 1996), 9–10, article 6.

3. Ibid., 10, article 7. "Retain what you can, but change what you must."

to represent this emphasis and thus enable the modern reader to appreciate the original translator's intent?

In this paper I will first demonstrate that Greek Exodus does in fact emphasize the motif represented by δόξα and show how the translator achieved that goal. As I work through this material, I will also reflect how NETS of Exodus seeks to replicate this focus. Finally, I will compare how the recent French translation of Greek Exodus by Alain le Boulluec and Pierre Sandevoir and the translators of *Septuaginta Deutsch* have rendered δόξα and its cognates to see what strategies they have selected to reflect this theological focus.[4] I will conclude with a few comments about the challenges that modern translators face in seeking to identify and represent adequately specific theological emphases in the Greek Old Testament.

2. The Motif of δόξα in Greek Exodus

Δόξα and the cognate verb δοξάζω begin to be used in Greek Exodus only in Moses' Song (Exod 15). Once introduced, however, they occur somewhat frequently, specifically with reference to Yahweh's powerful splendor, either directly or as shared through human mediation (i.e., the shining of Moses' face). Apart from Exod 15, the translator employed the verb δοξάζω only in ch. 34 where Yahweh reveals himself to Moses (34:29–35). All uses of this verb (apart from Exod 15:2) are in the perfect tense.

The choice of this terminology by the Exodus translator represents fifteen of thirty-two uses of δόξα in the Pentateuch and eight of ten uses of δοξάζω. Such statistics indicate the degree to which Greek Exodus dominates the use of this terminology in the Pentateuch.[5] Additionally, the cognate terms ἔνδοξος, ἐνδόξως, ἐνδοξάζομαι, and παραδοξάζω expand this statistical impression.

4. Alain le Boulluec and Pierre Sandevoir, *La Bible d'Alexandrie,* vol. 2, *L'Exode* (Paris: Cerf, 1989); Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus, eds., *Septuaginta Deutsch: Das griechische Alte Testament in Übersetzung* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2009).

5. Use in Gen (δόξα [כבד] 31:1, 16; 45:13); Lev (δόξα [כבד] 9:6, 23; δοξάζω [כבד] 10:3); Num (δόξα [כבד] 14:10, 21, 22; 16:19, 42 [17:7]; 20:6; 24:11; [תמונה] 12:8; [תועפות] 23:22; 24:8; [הוד] 27:10); Deut (δόξα [כבד] 5:24[21]; δοξάζω [נזיר] 33:16).

Hebrew equivalents for δόξα in Greek Exodus	**Contexts in which it occurs**	**NETS rendering**
גאון[6]	15:7	glory
תהלה	15:11	glorious deeds
כבד (noun rendered as δόξα everywhere in Greek Exodus except as τιμή in 28:2, 40)	16:7, 10; 24:16, 17; 29:43; 33:18, 22; 40:34, 35	glory
תפארת[7]	28:2, 36(40)	glory
טוב	33:19	glory
עדי (Exod 33:4 – Greek Exodus omits; Exod 33:6 τὸν κόσμον αυτῶν καὶ τὴν περιστολήν)[8]	33:5 (rendered by τὰς στολὰς τῶν δοξῶν καὶ τὸν κόσμον)	glory

Hebrew equivalents for δοξάζω in Greek Exodus	**Contexts in which it occurs**	**NETS rendering**
גאה[9]	15:1, 21	he has glorified himself
נוה (perhaps only occurrence in OT)	15:2	I will glorify
אדר (only other occurrence in Exod in 15:10 = σφοδρῷ)	15:6, 11	has been glorified, glorified
קרן	34:29, 30, 35	charged with glory

6. Single occurrence in Exodus.

7. This noun occurs only in Exod 28:2, 40. The cognate verbal form פאר occurs in Exod 8:5(9) (*hitpaʿel*—assume the honor over me when, or as NRSV renders it, "kindly tell me when"). The translator rendered as τάξει πρός με, "arrange for me." A polite formation in the Hebrew carries a blunt message in the Greek translation. The noun פארי, construct form, occurs in Exod 39:28 and is translated as μίτραν (cf. Isa 6:10).

8. Occurs only in Exod 33:4–6.

9. Occurs only in Exodus in 15:1, 21.

Hebrew equivalents for ἐνδοξάζομαι in Greek Exodus[10]	**Contexts in which it occurs**	**NETS rendering**
כבד (*nipʿal*: only *nipʿal* occurrences in Exodus)	14:4, 17, 18	be glorified in
פלה (*nipʿal*)[11]	33:16	be glorified

Hebrew equivalent for ἔνδοξος in Greek Exodus	**Contexts in which it occurs**	**NETS rendering**
פלא (*nipʿal*)[12]	34:10	glorious things

Hebrew equivalent for ἐνδόξως in Greek Exodus	**Contexts in which it occurs**	**NETS rendering**
גאה (free infinitive)	15:1, 21[13]	gloriously

Hebrew equivalent for παραδοξάζω in Greek Exodus[14]	**Contexts in which it occurs**	**NETS rendering**
פלה (*hipʿil*)	8:22(18); 9:4; 11:7	distinguish gloriously

The Greek translator of Exodus is responsible for 64 percent of this word group’s occurrences (i.e., δόξα and all its cognates) in the Pentateuch. This is a significant concentration. Most of the usages are clustered in Exod 14–16; 24; 33–34, with a few in chs. 28–29 and 40. They are related primarily to accounts of theophanies or demonstrations of divine power. Given the diversity of Hebrew terms that this word group renders, it is reasonable to hypothesize that the translator, through this lexical “leveling” has intentionally emphasized this concept in his

10. The verb occurs only in Greek Exodus in the Pentateuch.

11. The *hipʿil* form of this verb is rendered by παραδοξάζω in 8:18; 9:4; 11:7.

12. This Hebrew verb occurs in Exod 3:20 (*nipʿal* participle) and is rendered as ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς θαυμασίοις μου. The Greek adjective also occurs in Gen 34:19 (*nipʿal* כבד); Num 23:21 (תרועה); Deut 10:21 (*nipʿal* ירא). The Greek translator of Isaiah used this adjective extensively for a wide variety of Hebrew terms.

13. These are the only occurrences of this Greek adverb in the Pentateuch.

14. The Greek verb occurs in one other place in the Pentateuch—Deut 28:59—where it renders a *hipʿil* form of פלא. I have not located an occurrence of this verb that predates its usage in Greek Exodus.

work for some reason. Of course, such a hypothesis requires us to assume that the translator gave attention to motifs within discourse units and even over several discourse units.[15]

I begin with a consideration of ἐνδοξάζομαι. In the Hebrew text of Exodus, the hardness of Pharaoh's heart is expressed by the *qal* and *hip'il* forms of כבד (*qal* 5:9; 9:7; *hip'il* 8:11, 28; 9:34; 10:1) or the adjective כבד (7:14). Pharaoh's heaviness of heart describes his unwillingness to respond to God's command to release Israel. The translator used βαρύνω as the lexical equivalent, conveying the idea of being heavy and thus unresponsive. Conversely, the *nip'al* form of this same verb (נכבד) and its cognate nominal form (for the most part) define the reputation that God possesses because of his mighty deeds against Pharaoh to liberate Israel. The *nip'al* forms all occur in Exodus 14 as God prepares to rescue Israel through the miracle of the Red Sea and at the same time destroy Pharaoh and his army. In each case the translator used the verb ἐνδοξάζομαι to render this *nip'al* form. It is possible that the Hebrew narrator was using a play on words in applying כבד in these different ways to the primary antagonists in the first half of Exodus. The greater Pharaoh's obstinacy, the more glory accrues to God. Such a lexical relationship cannot be duplicated in Greek.

Since this is the first occurrence of ἐνδοξάζομαι in Greek literature, le Boulluec and Sandevoir propose that this verb is "une creation de la Bible grecque."[16] The extent to which the following prepositional phrase (ἐν plus the dative) has influenced this verbal formation (found in each case in 14:4, 17, 18 and reflecting the Hebrew prepositional construction ואכבדה ב or בהכבדי ב is worth considering. The Greek verb formulation would follow the analogy of παράδοξος – παραδοξάζω.[17] If le Boulluec and Sandevoir are correct, then it would seem to

15. Since the corresponding Hebrew terminology does not occur in the section of narrative that relates the construction of the tabernacle, but does appear in Exod 40, the distribution of this Greek terminology does not help us to determine the question of one or multiple translators for Greek Exodus. What does emerge is that ch. 40 seems to be translated in a manner consistent with earlier segments of the narrative (40:28–29[34–35]). However, this is a very small sample and the phrase "the glory of Yahweh" (δόξα κυρίου) is a rather standardized expression in Greek Exodus (16:7, 10; 24:16 [ἡ δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ], 17; 29:43 [ἐν δόξῃ μου]; 33:18 [τὴν σεαυτοῦ δόξαν], 22 [τῇ δόξῃ μου]).

16. Le Boulluec and Sandevoir, *L'Exode*, 163.

17. Herbert Weir Smyth (*Greek Grammar* [rev. by Gordon M. Messing; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973], 245 §866.6) says that "such verbs denote action." He cites examples such as γυμνάς ("stripped naked") and γυμνάζω ("exercise"). F. Blass and A. Debrunner (*A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* [trans. and rev. Robert W. Funk; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961], 58 §108[4]) note "στυγνάζειν ['be in a state of intense dismay, be shocked'] from στυγνός ['gloomy, sad']" as an "intransitive" form. Of course in this formation we are probably seeing the influence of δόξα–δοξάζω primarily. Cf. James H. Moulton and Wilbert F. Howard, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek,*vol. 2, *Accidence and Word-Formation* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1968), 305 §118(a).

support the hypothesis that the concept of "glory" was important to the translator. Whether the verb form is passive or middle has generated some discussion. The French and German translations render the forms as:

14:4	je serai glorifié	ich werde verherrlicht werden
14:17	je serai glorifié	ich will . . . verherrlicht werden
14:18	je suis glorifié	ich verherrlicht werde

These are passive forms. G. B. Caird wonders whether ἐνδοξάζομαι is "a true passive (the action is done to the subject by another agent) or intransitive (the action is done by the subject). . . . LSJ treats ἐνδοξάζομαι as a true passive. But it could instead be an intransitive, derived from the adjective ἔνδοξος, and meaning 'to be or show oneself glorious.'"[18]

Whatever one concludes about the verbal form, in each case God's splendid fame (glory) becomes evident through his actions against Pharaoh, and God is the one who does this all on his own. Israel remains observer and beneficiary through it all.

The translator also used this verb to render נפלינו (NRSV: "we shall be distinct") in 33:16 (ἐνδοξασθησόμεθα;[19] NETS: "we shall be glorified").[20] The Hebrew form is the *nipʿal* first person plural perfect of the root פלה meaning "be separated, distinct." John W. Wevers proposes, however, that "Exod has taken MT's נפלינו as נפלאנו as his ἐνδοξασθησόμεθα shows, an interpretation which is also found in Vulg: glorificemur; cf also Tar^{O}: פלאין."[21] His hypothesis may be supported by the fact that the only occurrence of the cognate adjective ἔνδοξος[22] in Exodus (34:10) translates the *nipʿal* participle נפלאת.[23] Conversely, the *hipʿil* form of פלה is used in Exod 8:18; 9:4; and 11:7 and in each case is rendered by a form of

18. G. B. Caird, "Towards a Lexicon of the Septuagint. I," *JTS* n.s. 19 (1963): 128–29. BDB, 457, s.v. dbk, lists the *nipʿal* verb forms as "medial, *get oneself glory* (*or honour*), of God . . . with בְּ *in* or *by* any one Ex 14 $^{4.17.18}$ (P)."

19. Rahlfs chose the first person singular reading witnessed by B$^{(mg)}$ M^{txt} 73′-550′-551 108* *f*$^{-129}$ 68′ 18 55 (sed hab Compl) = Sixt Ra.

20. The context of 33:16 reflects Moses' insistence that Yahweh must lead Israel through the wilderness. Only Yahweh's presence will distinguish Israel from the surrounding nations.

21. John William Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus* (SBLSCS 30; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990), 550.

22. It is probable that ἔνδοξος functions as the adjectival form for the noun δόξα. This seems to be case for the uses of this adjective in Greek Isaiah.

23. See n. 7 above. The noun פלא occurs in 15:11, and the Greek translator renders it as τέρατα. Usually this Greek noun renders a form of מופת in Greek Exodus. In Exod 3:20 נפלאתי is rendered as τοῖς θαυμασίοις μου. The translator used θαυμαστά in 34:10 to render נורא the *nipʿal* participle of ראה just as it is rendered by θαυμαστός in 15:11. Perhaps in using θαυμαστός for this equivalence in 34:10 he chose a different gloss for נפלאת for the sake of stylistic variation.

παραδοξάζω. The distinction between the meaning of παραδοξάζω ("distinguish in a marvelous manner") and ἐνδοξάζομαι ("show oneself glorious; be glorified") is rather slight. So in the end, Wevers's hypothesis about the translator either misreading his *Vorlage* or having a different *Vorlage* may not be necessary.[24]

The adverb ἐνδόξως occurs only twice in the Pentateuch, and in both instances (Exod 15:1, 21) it renders the free infinitive גָּאֹה[25] in the expression כִּי־גָאֹה גָּאָה, translated consistently as ἐνδόξως γὰρ δεδόξασται. H. St. John Thackeray cites a few other examples in the Septuagint where translators used an adverb to render a free infinitive, but it is uncommon.[26] NETS renders this expression "for gloriously he has glorified himself." Both the French and German translations also seek to reflect this cognate structure in their renderings.

This adjective ἔνδοξος occurs in Exod 14–15 and 33–34, where Yahweh reveals himself in remarkable, visible action for Israel's rescue, which in turn marks Israel as distinctive in some sense.

The verb[27] παραδοξάζω (8:22(18); 9:4; 11:7) renders פלה (*hip'il*). This Greek verb occurs in one other place in the Pentateuch (Deut 28:59), where it renders a *hip'il* form of פלא. Cognate forms occur also in later sections of the Greek Old Testament. However, it is quite probable, I think, that this verb form also may be a new construction attributable to the Exodus translator, as is the verb form ἐνδοξάζομαι. If this is an accurate conclusion from the evidence, then it lends weight to the hypothesis that this translator is seeking to emphasize the theme of divine glory. All of the initial references in Exodus to this concept (chs. 1–14) are expressed through verb forms apparently newly coined by this translator.

At its first occurrence Wevers comments that "the verb παραδοξάζω 'I will deal gloriously, render gloriously' apparently reflects the root פלא (do something

24. The verb is followed by παρὰ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, probably to be construed as a comparative, that is, in comparison with.

25. This Hebrew verb occurs in the Pentateuch only in Exod 15. The cognate noun גאון occurs in the Pentateuch once in Exod 15:7, where it is rendered by δόξα, and once in Lev 26:19, where it rendered by τὴν ὕβριν, with the sense of pride or arrogance.

26. H. St. John Thackeray, *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909), 47. Cf. Wevers, *Notes*, 227; R. Sollamo, "The LXX Renderings of the Infinitive Absolute Used with a Paronymous Finite Verb in the Pentateuch," in *La septuaginta en la investigación contemporánea: V Congreso de la IOSCS* (ed. Natalio Fernández Marcos; Textos y estudios "Cardenal Cisneros" 34; Madrid: Instituto "Arias Montano," 1985), 101–14. Sollamo notes that "only seven instances" of the finite verb "plus an adverb, adverbial phrase or other form of free translation" occur in the Pentateuch. She notes Exod 8:24 (οὐ μακρὰν ἀποτενεῖτε) and 15:1, 21.

27. LSJ only cite references in the LXX. The adjective is used quite commonly. For example, *The Philo Index: A Complete Greek Word Index to the Writings of Philo of Alexandria* (ed. Peder Borgen, Kåre Fuglseth, and Roald Skarsten; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Leiden: Brill, 2000) notes many occurrences of the adjective in Philo's work, but not one instance of the cognate verb. Neither Wevers nor le Boulluec and Sandevoir offer any comment on this issue.

wonderful) rather than MT's הפליתי 'I will set apart, treat differently.'"[28] In 9:4 the Samaritan text reads והפלא[29] rather than the MT's והפלה, and Wevers remarks that "obviously MT's 'make a distinction' fits better than Exod's παραδοξάζω 'I will set up something wonderful (between the cattle, etc.).'"[30] The Samaritan similarly reads יפלא in 11:7 rather than the MT's יפלה. Obviously in the Hebrew traditions related to these texts there is uncertainty as to whether a form of פלה or פלא should be considered original. Thus, exactly what the Greek translator had in his *Vorlage* is also then uncertain. There is no doubt, however, that the Greek translator used παραδοξάζω in these texts as his rendering.

But what is the sense of this verb in these contexts? As already noted, Wevers links it with ideas of glorious and wonderful acts. Since God is always the subject, this reality means that the actions described by this verb are imbued with divine essence. T. Muraoka suggests "to act in discriminating fashion" (for all three contexts in Exodus). He also lists "to render extraordinary" but does not apply this to any usage in Exodus.[31] Our inability to determine which Hebrew verb was in the translator's *Vorlage* means that we cannot rely on the Hebrew tradition to give us the primary direction, whether to emphasize the idea of making a distinction or to focus on the sense of doing something incredible, that is, contrary to expectation.

The contexts in which this verb occurs in Exodus do provide some direction. For example, in 8:22(18) the verb is transitive with a direct object, and so Yahweh as subject is acting with respect to "the land of Gesem." From this act Israel will know that Yahweh "is the Lord, the Lord of all the land." He defines this act as follows: "the dog-fly shall not be" on the land of God's people. So the verb seems to define an act of Yahweh by which he treats Israel differently by exercising his power to accomplish something incredible, that is, something that only Yahweh could do. In 9:4 and 11:7 the verb is followed by prepositional phrases introduced by ἀνὰ μέσον, which would indicate that the concept of distinction is dominant in these texts. However, this distinguishing act is something Yahweh does, and its occurrence is totally unexpected. The result of Yahweh's actions in 11:8 is that the Egyptians will bend the knee before him and expel Israel from their land. So something extraordinary must happen in order to achieve this result. Le Boulluec

---

28. Wevers, *Notes,* 117.

29. That is, work a wonder. The degree to which these two Hebrew roots expressed a significant lexical distinction needs consideration. To act distinctively with marvelous power and to make a distinction between two elements can be closely related ideas, particularly if the actual distinction is viewed itself as a wonder.

30. Wevers, *Notes,* 125.

31. T. Muraoka, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint: Chiefly of the Pentateuch and the Twelve Prophets* (Leuven: Peeters, 2002), 434. He lists no nominal or adjectival forms. As noted in LSJ, the sense of the adjective is to define something as contrary to expectation or incredible. Gerhard Kittel ("δόξα, δοξάζω," *TDNT* 2:255) defines the verb to mean "I do something unusual" linking it with the adjective's sense in Classical Greek to denote an "unusual event contrary to belief and expectation."

and Sandevoir render this verb in 8:18(22) as “marquer d’un prodige,”[32] that is, marked by means of marvel, and *Septuaginta Deutsch* translates it as “wunderbar werde ich . . . dastehen lassen.”

8:18 (22) et je marquerai *d’un prodige* en ce jour-là le pays
und wunderbar werde ich an jenem Tage das Land Gesem dastehen lassen

9:4 *je* ferai *un prodige* entre les troupeaux des Égyptiens et les troupeaux des fils d’Israël
Und *ich werde einem staunenswerten Unterschied*[33] *machen* zwischen den Tieren *der Ägypter* und zwischen den Tieren *der Israeliten*

11:7 afin que tu saches les prodiges que le Seigneur fera entre les Égyptiens et Israël[34]
Wie sehr der Herr einen Unterschied machen wird[35] zwischen *Ägyptern* und Israel.

The French translation acknowledges the Greek’s focus on something extraordinary in all three instances and distinguishes between the transitive and intransitive uses of the verb. However, the reader of this French translation would make no immediate connection between the use of this verb and other cognate forms of δοξάζω, if in fact the Greek translator intended this connection to be noted. In the case of the German translation, the sense of an extraordinary action is expressed in the renderings of 8:22 and 9:4, but not in 11:7 (apart from the footnote). Neither translation enables the reader to discern any potential connection between these texts and those in which forms of ἐνδοξάζομαι or δοξάζω and their cognates occur.

In defence of the rendering by le Boulluec and Sandevoir and the German translators, the Hebrew *Vorlage* does not link these texts specifically with the concept of glory, because it does not use the verb כבד in these contexts. So if the translator, by choosing παραδοξάζω to render forms of פלא/פלה in Exodus, was seeking to link Yahweh’s actions in these cases with the expressions of divine glory, then this is something done at the initiative of the translator, not something that is based in the Hebrew text per se. The French and German renderings would suggest that the translators of those versions did not conclude that the Greek translator chose παραδοξάζω in these contexts because of a desire to make a verbal connection with the larger theme of divine glory.

32. Le Boulluec and Sandevoir, *L’Exode*, 34.

33. Possible English translation: “an astonishing distinction.”

34. In their notes for 11:7, le Boulluec and Sandevoir give “faire des prodiges” as the rendering for this occurrence. A possible English equivalent for 11:7 would be “so that you may know the marvels that the Lord did between the Egyptians and Israel.”

35. *Septuaginta Deutsch* offers in footnote “wörtlich *etwas Wunderbares tun wird;* vgl. 8,22.”

The verb παραδοξάζω occurs only in the plague narrative, which culminates with Israel’s release from Egypt, the confrontation at the Red Sea, and the miraculous crossing. So we have this progression in the Greek translation in which the verb παραδοξάζω occurs in Exod 8, 9, 11, and then ἐνδοξάζομαι and the cognate adverb ἐνδόξως occur in Exod 14 and 15.

This leads us to consider the translator’s use of δοξάζω/δόξα in Exodus. These lexemes only begin to be used in Exod 15 and are clustered in chs. 15–16; 24; 33–34; and 40. The majority of the uses of the verb in the Pentateuch occur in Exodus (eight of ten), rendering four different Hebrew verbs (גאה, נוה, אדר, קרן), and in the case of the noun about half of the occurrences are found in Exodus (fifteen of thirty-two), rendering six different Hebrew nouns (גאון, תהלה, כבד, תפארת, טוב, עדי).Thus some lexical leveling is occurring in the translation.

The data indicate that the Exodus translator is the first translator in the Greek Old Testament to use these lexemes in application to Yahweh.[36] Although the noun δόξα occurs in Greek Genesis, it refers to human wealth (Gen 31:1,16) or position (Gen 45:13).[37] The verb δοξάζω first occurs in the Greek Old Testament in Exod 15 and singularly describes Yahweh’s activity. It appears that Greek Exodus marks the first text in which δόξα occurs as a gloss to describe Yahweh’s כבד.[38] I will comment on the verb δοξάζω first.

In every context, except Exod 15:2, δοξάζω, occurs in a perfect passive or pluperfect form (15:1, 6, 11, 21; 34:29, 30, 35). In ch. 15, Yahweh or a part of Yahweh used in metonymy (i.e., his right hand, but with a vocative κύριε included) is the subject of this verb. Twice the verb is modified by an adverbial phrase describing manner (ἐν ἰσχύι) or the group among which his glory is displayed (ἐν ἁγίοις). In v. 6 le Boulluec and Sandevoir render this as “s’est glorifiée” and in v. 11 “glorifié.” *Septuaginta Deutsch* renders the Greek text as “ist verherrlicht” and “verherrlicht.” Twice (15:1, 21) the verb is modified by the cognate adverb ἐνδόξως, replicating the free infinitive plus finite verb structure in Hebrew:

ἐνδόξως . . . δεδόξασται   גָּאֹה גָּאָה

La Bible d’Alexandrie employs “il s’est glorieusement couvert de gloire,” and the German translation has “herrlich ist er verherrlicht.”

As T. V. Evans demonstrates, there is no correlation between the Greek perfect forms and any specific Hebrew verbal form. “The perfect system in the Pentateuch

36. Kittel, “δόξα, δοξάζω,” *TDNT* 2:232–55. Kittel defines the significant transition in sense that δόξα displays in LXX usage in comparison to its general usage in Classical and Hellenistic Greek.

37. NETS Genesis used “glory” to render each of these occurrences.

38. There are no contexts in Genesis where the term כבד is used to define Yahweh directly. It is applied to serious famine (12:10; 41:31; 43:1; 47:4, 13), grief at death (50:9, 10, 11) or wealth (13:2).

is free of formal interference from the underlying Hebrew."[39] The perfect tense form, then, reflects a deliberate choice on the part of the translator, presumably to communicate a specific nuance of meaning. Evans indicates that "the perfect participle conveys the criterial value of stativity without any external temporal reference."[40] He notes also that eighty-seven out of ninety-seven occurrences of perfect forms in Greek Exodus "are in direct speech."[41] The examples in Exod 15 fit this criterion because they occur in the song that Moses creates and expresses.

As for 15:2, the singer confesses personally his commitment to "glorify" (δοξάσω in the future; French: "je le glorifierai"; German: "ich will ihn verherrlichen") Yahweh. This eagerness to praise Yahweh for his aid, protective care, and rescue is repeated in the parallel stich with the verb ὑψώσω, with the sense of "exalt." Both verbs are in the future, expressing intentionality and perhaps determination. The content of this song is the immediate means by which Moses declares Yahweh's glory.

In Exod 34:29, 30, 35, the verb describes the radiance shining from Moses' face because of his intimate dialogues with Yahweh.

34:29 καταβαίνοντος δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ ὄρους Μωυσῆς οὐκ ᾔδει ὅτι δεδόξασται ἡ ὄψις τοῦ χρωτὸς τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ λαλεῖν αὐτὸν αὐτῷ.

34:30 καὶ ἦν δεδοξασμένη ἡ ὄψις τοῦ χρωτὸς τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν ἐγγίσαι αὐτῷ.

34:35 καὶ εἶδον οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ τὸ πρόσωπον Μωυσῆ ὅτι δεδόξασται, καὶ περιέθηκεν Μωυσῆς κάλυμμα ἐπὶ τὸ πρόσωπον ἑαυτοῦ . . .

In each instance it is Moses' face or countenance that is effusively radiant to the point that other human beings are unable to gaze upon him. In NETS I have used the rendering "charged with glory" to try to capture the sense of a transferred, shining radiance. It might be argued that the periphrastic form in v. 30 should be given more of a pluperfect sense (had been charged with glory) and this rendering is, of course, possible. However, in my opinion, the emphasis of the translator was on the actual state of Moses' countenance, arising from his encounters with Yahweh, and the impact this was having on the Israelites. From the standpoint of the Hebrew narrative, this phenomenon emphasizes Moses' authority and perhaps is a way by which Yahweh demonstrates to Moses his response to his demand in 33:15: "If your presence will not go, do not carry us up from here." Yahweh's radiant glory shining in Moses' countenance is a visible demonstration of Yahweh's presence.

39. T. V. Evans, *Verbal Syntax in the Greek Pentateuch: Natural Greek Usage and Hebrew Interference* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 173.

40. Ibid., 166.

41. Ibid., 159. He adds that "the Classical Greek perfect indicative, because of the combined effects of its essential stative value and non-past reference, has a special affinity with direct speech" (158).

In all three cases, δοξάζω renders a perfect form of the denominative verb קרן, which has the idea of sending out rays (i.e., hornlike extensions). These are the only occurrences of this form of קרן in the Old Testament[42] and so the translator has to consider contextually how best to render this verb. He has no precedents to work from. Le Boulluec and Sandevoir consider that this rendering represents a long-standing Jewish interpretation, reflected as well in the Targums.[43] They render it "était devenu resplendissant" (had become dazzling).[44] *Septuaginta Deutsch* uses "hatte einem glänzenden Ausdruck angenommen" in 34:29–30,[45] but "einem Glanz angenommen hatte" in 34:35.

In chs. 15 and 34, the translator has used the verb δοξάζω to render four different Hebrew verbs and through this means communicates a consistent emphasis in the narrative on the special impact that Yahweh's actions and presence have on humanity. His majesty, power, and awesome essence become radiantly visible. Just as Joseph's δόξα—that is, the way he is respected and honored in Egypt—impresses his brothers and is communicated to his father, so Yahweh's δόξα plainly appears through the destruction of Pharaoh's army, Israel's deliverance through the Red Sea, and his revelation of the Law to Moses. Exodus 15 particularly celebrates the first two divine actions, but they are merely the opening act to even greater demonstrations of divine glory, namely, the giving of the Law and the guidance of Israel through the wilderness.

The noun δόξα has wider use in Exodus[45] and also in the Pentateuch as a whole. The most frequent construction in Exodus with this noun is the phrase ἡ δόξα κυρίου[47] (16:7, 10; 24:17; 40:28[34], 29[35]; with appropriate personal pronouns referring to Yahweh in 29:43; 33:18, 19, 22) or ἡ δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ (24:16).[48] In every context except 33:19, δόξα renders a form of כבוד. In fact, these are the only places in Exodus where δόξα does render כבוד. In 33:19, how-

42. One *hip'il* form occurs in Ps 69:32, and there the Greek translator seems to render it as κέρατα (ἐκφέροντα) (cf. LXX Ps 68:32).

43. Le Boulluec and Sandevoir, *L'Exode*, 345.

44. In 34:30, 35, le Boulluec and Sandevoir use "était resplendissant." In a note attached to 34:29 they note that "et l'on peut préférer 'était devenu resplendissant' à 'était devenu glorieux.'"

45. In 34:29 *Septuaginta Deutsch* has this footnote: "oder *der Anblick seiner Gesichtsfarbe verherrlicht worden war.*"

46. Δόξα renders every occurrence of כבוד in Exodus, apart from 28:2, 40, where the translator used τιμή. The verb כבד is rendered by ἐνδοξάζομαι (14:4, 17, 18), τιμάω (20:12), and βαρύνω (5:9; 8:11, 28; 9:7, 34; 10:1). The noun כבודה ("difficulty") occurs once in Exod 14:25 and is rendered as μετὰ βίας. The adjective כבד has many equivalents: βαρύνω (7:14); βάρυς (17:12; 18:18); πλῆθος (8:24[20]); μέγας (9:3); πολύς (9:18, 24; 10:14; 12:38); βραδύγλωσσος (4:10); ἰσχνόφωνος (4:10); νεφέλη γνοφώδης (19:16). The homonym כבד ("liver") is recognized and translated in Exod 29:13, 22 as τὸν λοβὸν τοῦ ἡπάτου.

47. If we date this translation to the first quarter of the third century B.C.E., then these may be the earliest occurrences of this phrase in Greek Jewish literature that we possess.

48. Strangely, for the same Hebrew expression כבוד יהוה in 24:16, 17 the Greek translator

ever, the translator renders טובי as τῇ δόξῃ μου. It seems that Moses' request that Yahweh reveal his glory to him in 33:18 caused the translator to interpret "all the good attributes of Yahweh" as his glory.

In 16:10; 24:17; and 40:28, 29 the appearance of Yahweh's glory is linked with the cloud or accompanying fire (or both) that descends on Mount Sinai or the tent of meeting. In 16:7, it is the presence of manna that enables Israel to "see the glory of Yahweh." In 29:42–43 God promises to make himself known to Israel at the tent of meeting, and he will be "regarded as holy in his glory," according to the Greek text. The three occurrences in ch. 33 (vv. 18, 19, 22) all relate to God's revelation of himself to Moses. So in each case the "glory of Yahweh" is tied specifically to theophany. Δόξα defines, then, the visible manifestation of Yahweh, his splendor as he reveals himself to human beings.

An anomaly occurs in the account of the preparation of the garments for the high priest and other priests. The vestments serve to provide a "glorious adornment" (NRSV 28:2, 40). The Hebrew expression and its rendering are:

לכבוד ולתפארת εἰς τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν

Wevers notes that this hendiadys occurs elsewhere in the Septuagint, but in each instance the order is transposed and δόξα renders כבוד. Only in Exodus and only in the two places where this phrase occurs does the translator use τιμή ("honor") to render the noun כבוד.[49] The translator was faced with a dilemma. The Hebrew noun תפארת ("splendor, beauty, glory") would not fit within the normal semantic range of τιμή, but δόξα is a very suitable equivalent. Conversely, כבוד does signify both honor and glory, and so the translator could choose either τιμή or δόξα as the rendering. So it is the Hebrew text that is determining this anomalous rendering, and it results in a suitable translation.

The other exceptional occurrence, apart from those in Exod 15, comes in 33:5. Yahweh is rendering his verdict against the Israelite's actions with the golden calf. Yahweh commanded them הורד עדיך מעליך ("take off your ornaments"), which they had donned for the religious celebrations related to the golden calf. The equivalent of the Hebrew term עדיך ("your ornaments") in Greek Exodus is τὰς στολὰς τῶν δοξῶν ὑμῶν καὶ τὸν κόσμον ("the vestments of your glory and the ornamentation" NETS).[50] Wevers suggests that the translator, in a

---

rendered the first as ἡ δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ and the second as τῆς δόξης κυρίου. Wevers discusses this variation (*Notes*, 388–89) but offers no suggestion as to why he thinks the translator did this.

49. In the command regarding parents, the translator chose the verb τιμάω to render the Hebrew imperative כבד. Wevers makes no comment on the translator's choice. This is the only context in Exodus where this equivalence occurs. Probably it is related to the fact that this is a *pi'el* form and this form occurs only in Exod in 20:12. Elsewhere in the LXX the *pi'el* forms of this verb are frequently rendered by τιμᾶν.

50. *Septuaginta Deutsch* reads: "*eure prachtvollen Gewänder*" ["your splendid garments"] but then in a footnote suggests "wörtlich *die Kleider eures Glanzes*."

manner unique among ancient witnesses for this passage, has “rendered doubly” the Hebrew noun. Remarkably the same Hebrew noun in 33:6 is also “rendered doubly” as τὸν κόσμον αὐτῶν καὶ τὴν περιστολήν (“their ornamentation and finery” NETS).[51] Le Boulluec and Sandevoir, however, propose that the Greek translator read a different morpheme מעיליך (“your robes”) instead of מעליך (“from upon you”) in 33:5. The noun מעיל occurs several times in Exod 28 and 36, but the rendering in each case is ὑποδύτης (“undergarment”: 28:27, 30; 36:30, 31, 32, 33, 34) and refers to the high priest’s robes. The absence of a prepositional phrase in the Greek text of 33:5 that would be the equivalent of מעליך would give some credence to this explanation that the translator read the consonantal text differently. However, it does not explain the issue of word order in 33:5, nor does it explain the double rendering in 33:6.[52]

Regardless of the explanation that may account for this unexpected translation in 33:5, 6, the occurrence of δόξα in this context has nothing to do with divine glory. Rather, the translator used the genitive construction to define the quality of the garments that the Israelites wore in their worship of the golden calf. Δόξα signifies their splendor, whether of the garments per se or the effect that these garments had on those who saw them. The relationship between δόξα and garments reflects its usage to describe the garments of the high priest and of other priests in 28:2, 40.

Let us turn now to the Song of Moses, where the first two occurrences of δόξα in Greek Exodus (15:7, 11) render two different words. The first instance renders the noun גאון (its only occurrence in Exodus), which is cognate to the verb גאה that δοξάζω glosses in 15:1, 21. This Hebrew noun signifies splendor or majesty, or negatively, pride (cf. Lev 26:19, where the Septuagint glosses it with ὕβρις) and the translator’s use of δόξα as a rendering fits this semantic range. The entire phrase is rendered in Greek Exodus as καὶ τῷ πλήθει τῆς δόξης σου (rendered by le Boulluec and Sandevoir as “et par l’abondance de ta gloire” and in *Septuaginta Deutsch* as “und mit der Fülle deiner Herrlichkeit”). It builds on the imagery of v. 6, which speaks of Yahweh’s right hand being “glorified in power” and its ability to “crush enemies.” The first stich of v. 7 continues this parallelism, as the Hebrew poet continues to laud Yahweh for “the greatness of [his] majesty” demonstrated in the shattering of his opponents, who include Pharaoh. These lines summarize Yahweh’s victory over Pharaoh described in vv. 4 and 5 and anticipate further description in the verses that follow.

The other occurrence in the Song of Moses comes in v. 11. Again the translator deals with a *hapax legomenon* in Exodus, namely, the noun תהלה in plural form, signifying praise and adoration, as well as qualities or deeds that demand

51. *Septuaginta Deutsch* at this point renders the Hebrew text “ihren Schmuck *und ihre Bekleidung*.”

52. There is more going on in this translation in this context, because in 33:4 the Greek does not mention the removal of personal ornaments that is described in the Hebrew text, thereby removing a contradiction.

praise.[53] According to Hatch and Redpath[54] this is the only context in the Septuagint where this noun is rendered by δόξα.

> τίς ὅμοιός σοι ἐν θεοῖς, κύριε;
> τίς ὅμοιός σοι, δεδοξασμένος ἐν ἁγίοις,
> θαυμαστὸς ἐν δόξαις, ποιῶν τέρατα;

The verse is a series of responses to the initial query τίς ὅμοιός σοι ἐν θεοῖς, seeking to demonstrate the incomparability and thus the uniqueness of Yahweh. The phrase θαυμαστὸς ἐν δόξαις is the middle term in the three responses to this repeated question. The question seems to be whether it parallels the first response or the third response. Le Boulluec and Sandevoir see it linked with "doing wonders," when they comment: "La symétrie est interne au stique, avec *poiȯn térata*, «auteur de prodiges»."[55] They render ἐν δόξαις as "[admirable] par les (œuvres de) gloire."[56] However, they also note that some consider ἐν δόξαις to refer to angelic beings, that is, "glorious ones," apparently paralleling the previous ἐν ἁγίοις, "among holy ones"[57] (cf. 2 Pet 2:10; Jude 8). The Hebrew text gives no support to such a rendering, even though later interpreters of the Greek tradition may have understood it this way. The semantic domain for the Hebrew noun includes the sense of renown and glory because of deeds or attributes that lead human beings to praise the subject. The use of δόξα as the rendering does reflect this sense, even though it is a unique rendering for this Hebrew noun in the Septuagint. Further the use of the plural reflects the Hebrew text and does parallel the plural form τέρατα that follows. So while the plural form of δόξα is unusual, from the standpoint of the translator, it is faithful to the Hebrew *Vorlage*. The plural form also occurs in 33:5 (τὰς στολὰς τῶν δόξων ὑμῶν).[58] Just as in 15:6–7, so in 15:11 we have the conjunction in Greek of the perfect δεδόξασται and δόξα.[59]

---

53. BDB, 239–40, s.v. תהלה.

54. E. Hatch and H. Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint and Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament* (2 vols.; Graz: Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt, 1954), 1:343–44.

55. Le Boulluec and Sandevoir, *L'Exode*, 174.

56. *Septuaginta Deutsch* renders these phrases as "verherrlicht unter *den Heiligen*, *wunderbar in Herrlichkeitserweisen*, Wunder tuend?"

57. It is of course possible to render δεδοξασμένος ἐν ἁγίοις as "glorified by holy (deeds)," because the adjective could be neuter or masculine in gender. The presumed parallel with the preceding ἐν θεοῖς suggests the masculine rather than the neuter. However, the Hebrew is singular ("awesome in holiness"). Perhaps the Greek translator intended the last three phrases in v. 11 to be parallel: "glorious in holy deeds, awesome in glorious works, one doing wonders."

58. Plural forms of this Greek noun occur elsewhere in the LXX only in Hos 9:11 αἱ δόξαι αὐτῶν ἐκ τόκων ("their glories are from childbirth" NETS) and 1 Macc 14:9 καὶ οἱ νεανίσκοι ἐνεδύσαντο δόξας καὶ στολὰς πολέμου ("and the youths were dressing in splendor and uniforms of war" NETS).

59. In both contexts as well, the noun δεξιά ("right hand") occurs, sometimes more than once.

3. Concluding Observations

In conclusion, four pieces of data suggest that the Greek translator of Exodus was emphasizing the concept of Yahweh's δόξα in his translation:

1. The frequency of usage of δόξα and cognates in comparison to the number of occurrences in other translated materials in the Pentateuch is significant. The translator's choice of this noun and its cognates to render a wide variety of Hebrew terms indicates his interest in this term and its connotations. The Exodus translator is the first, at least in the Old Greek translation, to apply this term to Yahweh.
2. The primary application of this terminology is to Yahweh himself and his actions or, by extension, to those who have come into direct contact with him by means of theophany (i.e., Moses). No human potentate or nation apart from Israel is defined by this term in Exodus. Exceptions to this occur in the description of the priestly vestments or the garments the Israelites wear at the feast celebrating the golden calf.
3. The use by the translator (perhaps coined by him) of two, previously unknown (as far as we can tell) verb forms (ἐνδοξάζομαι, παραδοξάζω), compound forms generated perhaps from δοξάζω or the corresponding adjectives ἔνδοξος and παράδοξος, to render specific Hebrew verb forms, suggests intentionality in his rendering. The Exodus translator is the first to apply this terminology to Yahweh.
4. Because the Hebrew verb כבד and noun כבוד do not occur in the Songs of Moses and Miriam, the frequent and clustered use of δόξα terminology to describe Yahweh and his actions seems very deliberate.

Whether the sequential introduction of παραδοξάζω (Exod 8–11), followed by ἐνδοξάζομαι (Exod 14) and then δοξάζω/δόξα (Exod 15 and following contexts) is also significant is perhaps a matter of interpretation. It would be necessary to investigate whether there is any other evidence that this translator was concerned to emphasize specific concepts throughout the discourse and did not attend only to the immediate sentence or clause in the translation process. If various similar translation phenomena can be demonstrated, then it would indicate that the translator of Greek Exodus did his work with a view to the larger discourse and not just in a sentence-by-sentence mode. The rendering of δόξα and its cognates may be one piece of evidence that would support the hypothesis that this translator worked with a view to the interpretation of larger portions of text.

Of course, if we have in fact singled out a special interest of the translator in Yahweh's glory and its demonstration, we have yet to consider why this may have been a significant issue for the translator in his time and context. Space does not allow us to pursue this question.

As for the primary sense of this terminology in application to Yahweh, its usage to describe various garments is perhaps a significant clue. Greek Exodus describes various priestly and other garments that were designed to impress spectators by their rich colors, expensive cloth, and fine craftsmanship, whose splendor marks the wearer as special. They are designed to create a sense of awesome dignity and evoke a suitable response. In Greek Exodus Yahweh's remarkable actions to liberate Israel and constitute it as his special people form the "robes" that display his unique and unparalleled splendor. His actions in Exod 14 that thoroughly defeat Pharaoh and his army show his splendor to surpass that of the Egyptian monarch. Israel "sees" (ὄψεσθε) the "glory of Yahweh" (16:7) when he provides quail and manna. The pillar of cloud and fire similarly create visible expressions of Yahweh's splendor (16:10). The δόξα κυρίου expresses Yahweh's unique, awe-inspiring splendor, that is, his glory. As Greek Exod 15:1 says, Yahweh has shown his splendor in a splendid way, or "gloriously he has glorified himself."

If the Greek translator was indeed seeking to emphasize the concept of Yahweh's glory in his translation, then does the modern translator, if s/he desires to communicate the intended meaning of the Greek translator's text, need to reflect this *Tendenz* in the modern translation? If this is appropriate, then how should this *Tendenz* be expressed? In my translation of NETS Exodus I opted to render this word-group consistently with some form of the English word "glory" and by this means to allow readers to consider for themselves whether the Greek translator was embedding this motif in his translation. Le Boulluec and Sandevoir, in contrast, for the renderings of παραδοξάζω (8:22[18]; 9:4; 11:7) and δοξάζω (34:29, 30, 35) when the verb describes the transformation in Moses' visage, employ terms other than the noun "gloire," the adverb "glorieusement," and the verb "glorifier." *Septuaginta Deutsch* tends to follow a similar pattern with respect παραδοξάζω and the references to the transformation of Moses' face. It also employs a different rendering for the description of Israel's garments used at the celebration in the golden calf episode (33:5). The forms of "preisen" in 29:43 and 33:16 diverge from the usual "verherrlicht werden" or "Herrlichkeit." The result is that in both the French and German translations the reader may not realize the degree to which the Greek translator has employed δόξα and cognate terminology in Exodus. While absolute consistency in modern translations of the Septuagint is not a desideratum, where the Greek translator probably has chosen his renderings with some sense of purpose, it would be helpful for the modern reader to be able to identify and explore this possibility. Perhaps variable means are available to modern translators to display such patterns that the Greek translator has embedded in his translation. However, using consistent verbal patterns, as NETS Exodus does in the case of δόξα and its cognates, demonstrates one viable means.

Complete List of Occurrences of δόξα Terminology in Greek Exodus

Greek Exodus	**NETS**	***La Bible d’Alexandrie***	***Septuaginta Deutsch***
8:22(18) καὶ παραδοξάσω ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ τὴν γῆν	And I will distinguish gloriously on that day the land	Et je marquerai *d’un prodige* en ce jour-là le pays	Und wunderbar werde ich an jenem Tage das Land
9:4 καὶ παραδοξάσω ἐγὼ ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν κτηνῶν	And I will distinguish gloriously between the animals	*Je* ferai *un prodige* entre les troupeaux	Und *ich werde einen staunenswerten Unterschied machen* zwischen den Tieren
11:7 ὅσα παραδοξάσει κύριος ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν Αἰγυπτίων	By what means the Lord shall distinguish gloriously between the Egyptians	Les prodiges que le Seigneur fera entre les Égyptiens	Wie sehr der Herr einen Unterschied machen wird zwischen Ägyptern
14:4 καὶ ἐνδοξασθήσομαι ἐν Φαραώ	And I will be glorified in Pharao	Et je serai glorifié au moyen de Pharaon	Und ich werde verherrlicht werden an Pharao
14:17 καὶ ἐνδοξασθήσομαι ἐν Φαραώ	And I will be glorified in Pharao	Et je serai glorifié au moyen de Pharaon	Und ich will an Pharao . . . verherrlicht werden
14:18 ἐνδοξαζομένου μου ἐν Φαραώ	As I am being glorified in Pharao	Du fait que je suis glorifié au moyen de Pharaon	Wenn ich verherrlicht werde an Pharao
15:1 ἐνδόξως γὰρ δεδόξασται	For gloriously he has glorified himself	Car il s’est glorieusement couvert de gloire	Denn herrlich ist er verherrlicht
15:2 οὗτός μου θεός, καὶ δοξάσω αὐτόν	This is my God, and I will glorify him	Voici mon Dieu et je le glorifierai	Dieser ist mein Gott und ich will ihn verherrlichen
15:6 ἡ δεξιά σου, κύριε, δεδόξασται ἐν ἰσχύι	Your right hand, O Lord, has been glorified in power	Ta droite, Seigneur, s’est glorifiée par sa vigueur	Deine Rechte, Herr, ist verherrlicht in Kraft

15:7 καὶ τῷ πλήθει τῆς δόξης σου	And in the abundance of your glory	Et par l'abondance de ta gloire	Und mit der Fülle deiner Herrlichkeit
15:11 δεδοξασμένος ἐν ἁγίοις	Glorified among holy ones	Glorifié *parmi les saints*	Verherrlicht unter *den Heiligen*
15:11 θαυμαστὸς ἐν δόξαις	Awesome in glorious deeds	Admirable par les (œuvres de) gloire	*Wunderbar in Herrlichkeitserweisen*
15:21 ἐνδόξως γὰρ δεδόξασται	For gloriously he has glorified himself	Car il s'est glorieusement couvert de gloire	Denn herrlich ist er verherrlicht
16:7 ὄψεσθε τὴν δόξαν κύριου	You shall see the glory of the Lord	Vous verrez la gloire du Seigneur	Werdet ihr die Herrlichkeit des Herrn sehen
16:10 καὶ ἡ δόξα κυρίου ὤφθη	And the glory of the Lord appeared	Et la gloire du Seigneur se fit voir	Und die Herrlichkeit des Herrn erschien
24:16 καὶ κατέβη ἡ δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ	And God's glory descended	Et la gloire de *Dieu descendit*	Und die Herrlichkeit Gottes stieg herab
24:17 τὸ δὲ εἶδος τῆς δόξης κυρίου	Now the appearance of Lord's glory	Or l'aspect de la gloire du Seigneur	Das Aussehen der Herrlichkeit des Herrn
28:2 εἰς τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν	For honor and glory	Pour l'honneur et la gloire	Zu Ehre und Herrlichkeit
28:36(40) εἰς τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν	For honor and glory	Pour l'honneur et la gloire	Zu Ehre und Herrlichkeit
29:43 καὶ ἁγιασθήσομαι ἐν δόξῃ μου	And I will be regarded as holy [in] my glory	Et *je* serai sanctifié dans ma gloire	Und *ich* will geheiligt werden, indem (ihr) mich preist
33:5 τὰς στολὰς τῶν δοξῶν ὑμῶν	The vestments of your glory	*Vos vêtements de gloire*	*Eure prachtvollen Gewänder*
33:16 καὶ ἐνδοξασθησόμεθα ἐγώ τε καὶ ὁ λαός σου	And we shall be glorified, both I and your people	Et *je* serai *glorifié*,[60] moi et ton peuple	Und wir werden *gepriesen* werden

60. Le Boulluec and Sandevoir (*L'Exode*) follow Rahlfs's first person singular verb form, rather than Wevers's first person plural form.

33:18 δεῖξόν μοι τὴν σεαυτοῦ δόξαν	Show me your own glory	Montre-moi ta gloire	Zeige mir deine Herrlichkeit
33:19 ἐγὼ παρελεύσομαι πρότερός σου τῇ δόξῃ μου	I will pass by before you in my glory	Je *passerai* devant toi *avec ma gloire*	Ich werde *vor dir in* meiner *Herrlichkeit vorüberziehen*
33:22 ἡνίκα δ' ἂν παρέλθῃ μου ἡ δόξα	Now, whenever my glory passes by	Et quand passera ma gloire	Wenn meine Herrlichkeit vorüberzieht
34:10 ἐνώπιον παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ σου ποιήσω ἔνδοξα	Before all your people I shall do glorious things	Devant tout ton peuple je ferai des actions glorieuses	Vor deinem ganzen Volk werde ich *Herrliches* tun
34:29 ὅτι δεδόξασται ἡ ὄψις	That the appearance . . . was charged with glory	Que *l'aspect* . . . était devenu resplendissant	Dass die Hautfarbe . . . einen glänzenden Ausdruck angenommen hatte
34:30 καὶ ἦν δεδοξασμένη ἡ ὄψις	And the appearance . . . was charged with glory	Et *l'aspect* . . . était resplendissant	Und die Hautfarbe . . . hatte einen glänzenden Ausdruck angenommen
34:35 τὸ πρόσωπον Μωυσῆ ὅτι δεδόξασται	The face of Moyses that it was charged with glory	Que le visage de Moïse était resplendissant	Dass das Gesicht Moses einen Glanz angenommen hatte
40:28(34) καὶ δόξης κυρίου	And . . . with the glory of the Lord	De la gloire du Seigneur	Und . . . *von der* Herrlichkeit des Herrn
40:29(35) καὶ δόξης κυρίου	And . . . with the glory of the Lord	De la gloire du Seigneur	Und . . . *von* der Herrlichkeit des Herrn

Some Reflections on Writing a Commentary on the Septuagint of Leviticus

Dirk Büchner

1. Introduction

A question that came to me before I started my commentary on the Septuagint of Leviticus, that is, Leuitikon (abbreviated Leu), was this: How does one go beyond the careful and skilled work of someone as eminent as John William Wevers, who had already published his sizable collection of notes to the Greek text of Leviticus?[1] This question continues to linger. By now I can say that it has become less a case of "going beyond" than one of "building on" this detailed scholarship. I have found it most useful and a springboard from which to conduct deeper probes. For now these are the following four issues: first, the way in which the Greek translator provides grammatical and syntactical equivalence for Hebrew grammar and syntax; second, the lexicology of the specialist vocabulary and how the reception history of such terms has, for better or worse, made its mark on Septuagint lexicography (one could think of things such as "sin" or "propitiation"); and the third and fourth, the respective areas of Alexandrian religion and culture, as sources for the vocabulary of Leuitikon and possibly the vehicles through which an Alexandrian translator might have wanted to convey the meaning of Jewish piety.

There are a number of tasks that I have decided to abandon in favor of making progress. I have been asked whether, as in my earlier work, I would pay attention again to the Jewish theological ideas in the Septuagint and their coincidence with rabbinic thought.[2] Since as an aid to understanding the Hebrew of each verse I follow along in Jacob Milgrom's commentary,[3] and since he does alert us to the

1. John William Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus* (SBLSCS 30; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990).

2. Dirk Büchner, "פסח: Pass Over or Protect?" *BN* 86 (1997): 14–17; idem, "Jewish Commentaries and the Septuagint," *JJS* 48 (1997): 250–61; idem, "Inside and Outside the Camp: The Halakhic Background to Changes in the Septuagint Leviticus, with reference to Two Qumran Manuscripts," *JNSL* 23 (1997): 151–62.

3. Jacob Milgrom, *Leviticus: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (3 vols.; AB 3, 3A, 3B; New York: Doubleday, 1991–2001).

rabbinic information, I have made occasional reference to possible halakic aspects in the Septuagint text, but for now I have decided not to focus too closely on that side of things, as it probably belongs to a separate project. I imagine that it would require an in-depth study of the midrashic literature, requiring months of intense research. On the level of textual criticism I am of two minds. I have left myself in the capable hands of Wevers as regards the state of the Old Greek, and mention manuscript deviations only when they represent trends. I do try to keep a constant eye on the versions as a source of information on approaches to translation, especially pertaining to the area of literalism. At some point I intend to give detailed attention to the deviations found in the Greek Leviticus material from Qumran from the perspective of Sebastian Brock's seminal article on ancient attitudes to translation.[4]

2. Some Remarks on Greek Grammar and Syntax

Within the space of their detailed studies, Wevers, and Paul Harlé and Didier Pralon in the *La Bible d'Alexandrie* series,[5] do pay attention to grammar and syntax. I have begun to explore the work of those who had been a constant source of guidance for Wevers, notably Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen and Karl Huber.[6] In particular, Huber's large section devoted to syntax has been of considerable help in gathering together and categorizing those features of the language of Leuitikon that are shaped by Hebrew syntax and those features that belong to regular idiom.[7] Huber was far ahead of his time in that he treated Septuagintal syntax as syntax of a translated text. In contrast, a grammar such as BDF looks to Septuagintal syntax for analogies to New Testament usage. There is, of course, some danger in drawing too much attention to the dependence of Septuagintal language constructions on those of the Septuagint's parent text. It has been implied, unfairly, that the view taken by NETS to the Septuagint as translated text par excellence signifies a negative view of the Septuagint's language. For instance, Takamitsu Muraoka, referring to Albert Pietersma's and Cameron Boyd-Taylor's work, recently made the following statement:

4. See Sebastian P. Brock, "To Revise or Not to Revise: Attitudes to Jewish Biblical Translation," 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* (ed. George J. Brooke and Barnabas Lindars; SBLSCS 33; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992; repr., 2006), 312, on two opposing attitudes to translation.

5. Paul Harlé and Didier Pralon, *La Bible d'Alexandrie,* vol. 3, *Le Lévitique* (Paris: Cerf, 1988).

6. I. Soisalon-Soininen, *Studien zur Septuaginta-Syntax* (AASF 237; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1987); Karl Huber, *Untersuchungen über den Sprachcharakter des griechischen Leviticus* (Giessen: Töpelmann, 1916).

7. See further Huber's lists of various kinds of incongruence (*Untersuchungen,* 35–39). Under Hebrew influence intransive verbs take objects (48) or verbs that take objects now take prepositional phrases.

> We have then in the Septuagint a real treasure trove which could extend and enrich our knowledge of Hellenistic Greek, and we should be grateful for its availability, welcoming it with open arms, instead of treating it like Cinderella, looking at it askance with suspicious eyes. I rather feel sorry for those who have a rather low view of the Septuagint and nonetheless make it an object of their intellectual endeavour.[8]

Pietersma has responded to this article and its deficient grasp of NETS principles.[9] Nevertheless, in the light of what it insinuates, I have tried to be very careful to account for the Leviticus translator's innovative use of standard grammar and syntax so as not to short-change him in any way.

The best example of such innovation in my mind is the way that he responds to the Hebrew word חטאת , which means both "sin" and "sin offering".[10] He, along with the other Pentateuch translators, seems to have decided on a manner of work in which quantitative equivalence is the highest goal, and communicating the precise meaning of the Hebrew a necessary ideal, though possibly subservient to that goal. What he came up with was not a slavish nominative ἁμαρτία (although such occurrences in the manuscript record may betray later literalistic hands) but rather a genitive ἁμαρτίας and most frequently an articular prepositional phrase τὸ περὶ ἁμαρτίας—in other words, "the matter concerning sin." Precedents for the latter abound in standard Greek, and one that immediately comes to mind occurs in a sentence from Polybius's *Histories* that reads: ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τὰ περὶ τῆς ἐρημίας, ἔτι δ' ἐρυμνότητος καὶ δυσχωρίας τῶν τόπων ἔκδηλον ποιεῖ τὸ ψεῦδος αὐτῶν ("Similarly, their falsehood is manifest in the things they say about the loneliness, and the extreme steepness and rough ground of those parts") (3.48.5; my translation). What Leuitikon achieves by using a prepositional phrase is to allude to the victim or ritual for sin implied by the Hebrew context, without adding to his text an item that does not occur also in the parent text.

Some further examples from Leuitikon that I have included so far in the commentary may be featured. In 1:2 we read ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ὑμῶν ἐὰν προσαγάγῃ (NETS: "When a person of you brings"). The *casus pendens* of the Hebrew אדם כי־יקריב is represented by the Greek nominative absolute. This form of anacolouthon is considered incorrect or inelegant but is not entirely absent from Greek usage.[11] F. C. Conybeare and St. George Stock are less enthusiastic and comment

---

8. I refer in particular to T. Muraoka, "Recent Discussions on the Septuagint Lexicography with Special Reference to the So-called Interlinear Model," in *Die Septuaginta—Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten: Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 20.–23. Juli 2006* (ed. Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus; WUNT 219; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 221–35.

9. See http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/nets/discussion/pietersma-re-muraoka.pdf.

10. See Dirk Büchner, "A Cultic Term (*hamartia*) in the Septuagint: Its Meaning and Use from the 3rd Century BCE until the New Testament," *BIOSCS* 42 (forthcoming).

11. BDF §§239b, 244a; H. W. Smyth, *Greek Grammar* (2nd ed.; rev. Gordon M. Messing; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1956) §3008e.

that what appears in the Septuagint "can only be described by this name. . . . As this construction arises out of a literal following of the Hebrew, it would be superfluous to adduce Greek parallels. Like effects might be found, but the cause would be different."[12]

In 1:11 one reads καὶ σφάξουσιν αὐτὸ ἐκ πλαγίων τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου πρὸς βορρᾶν. The phrase ἐκ πλαγίων attested in Polybius and Thucydides renders על ירך. Leuitikon here in idiomatic fashion gives account of the entire Hebrew prepositional phrase instead of attending to its individual parts. The Exodus translator, however, tries other possibilities such as εἰς and ἐπὶ τὸ κλίτος (40:22, 24 NETS: "on the side," "toward the side") while the translator of Numbers takes an approach similar to that of the Leuitikon translator (see Num 3:29, 35). These Pentateuch translators were, as Brock suggests, constantly experimenting in translation technique since they had no precedent to follow.[13] In contrast, by the time of the *kaige* recension, literalism had become precedent, and so in 4 Rgns 16:14 we find for the above Hebrew expression ἐπὶ μηρὸν τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου (NETS: "near the thigh of the altar").

In Leu 2:1 we find δῶρον θυσίαν. The translator does not read the two Hebrew words קרבן מנחה as part of a bound formation but rather as appositional. There is a sense in which his resultant Greek expression could qualify as a case of a predicate accusative in apposition to the direct object (although this construction is normally limited to certain verbs).[14] If, for argument's sake, the direct object of προσφέρῃ is θυσίαν, then this is similar to the example given by H. W. Smyth: ἔδωκα δωρειὰν τὰ λύτρα, "I gave them the price of their ransom as a free gift."[15] Our translation might have read: "Now if a soul presents as a gift a sacrifice." Harlé and Pralon and Wevers regard δῶρον as the object with θυσίαν in apposition to it when they translate "un présent en offrande" and "a gift as a sacrifice," respectively. [16] But Wevers at v. 4 renders the same phrase correctly, to my mind, by "as a gift a sacrifice."[17] This is preferable, since it follows on from ch. 1, where the gifts are more closely defined as offerings of cattle, sheep, and birds. Here it is the sacrifice of fine flour. One could compare to this 3:6: ἐὰν δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν προβάτων τὸ δῶρον αὐτοῦ, θυσίαν σωτηρίου τῷ κυριῷ (NETS: "But if his gift, a sacrifice of deliverance to the Lord, is from the sheep"). Here the accusative θυσίαν either proleptically presupposes προσοίσει,[18] or perhaps together τὸ δῶρον and

12. F. C. Conybeare and St. George Stock, *A Grammar of Septuagint Greek* (1905; repr., Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1980) §51.

13. Brock, "To Revise," 311.

14. William Watson Goodwin, *A Greek Grammar* (London: Macmillan & St Martin's Press, 1977), 228.

15. Smyth, *Greek Grammar* §1616.

16. Harlé and Pralon, *Le Lévitique*, 88; Wevers, *Notes,* 13.

17. Ibid., 15.

18. Ibid., 26.

θυσίαν may be seen as the verb's direct object with a predicate accusative; and, as is typical in standard Greek, this predicate noun lacks the article.[19] A revised translation might read: "If he brings as his gift a sacrifice of deliverance to the Lord. . . ."

In 3:1 we find ἐάν τε ἄρσεν ἐάν τε θῆλυ for אם־זכר אם־נקבה. In a Greek disjunctive statement without a verb, one normally expects to find εἴτε . . . εἴτε,[20] but in this verse the pull toward isomorphism becomes too strong so that אם must be represented by ἐάν. Where ἐάν τε occurs in standard Greek, it is usually with the subjunctive.[21]

Leviticus 3:3–4 in the NRSV reads: "You shall offer from the sacrifice of well-being, as an offering by fire to the Lord, the fat that covers the entrails and all the fat that is around the entrails; the two kidneys with the fat that is on them at the loins, and the appendage of the liver, which he shall remove with the kidneys." At the end of this long sentence the translator comes across two asyndetic relative clauses[22] governed by the word היתרת ("the appendage"), as follows: ואת־היתרת על־הכבד על־הכליות יסירנה. This he renders by καὶ τὸν λοβὸν τὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ ἥπατος, σὺν τοῖς νεφροῖς περιελεῖ (NETS: "and he shall remove the appendage that is on the liver with the kidneys"). In other words, he regards the first as a relative clause but not the second and consequently καὶ τὸν λοβὸν . . . περιελεῖ now constitutes a new sentence. His item-for-item representation subtly produces a different emphasis.

From these few cases it can be seen that it was important for the Leuitikon translator that his produced text reflect Hebrew syntax as far as standard usage allowed for it, rather than stylish Greek. The latter would in his mind somehow have detracted from the worth of the resultant text. If we disregard this and view the Septuagintal context by itself as a source of linguistic information, we make of it what it is not. Huber showed nearly a hundred years ago that there is no such thing as Septuagintal syntax in isolation from Hebrew syntax.[23] What applies to Septuagintal syntax must surely apply to Septuagintal lexicology too, as the next section will illustrate.

3. The Lexicology of Pentateuchal Technical Vocabulary

It can be shown, at least for Leuitikon, that the provision of lexical items as corresponding matches for Hebrew items was often more crucial than the production of perfect sense. All too often, lexicography of the Septuagint is carried out from the Greek context without taking this matter into consideration.

19. Smyth, *Greek Grammar* §1614.

20. Ibid. §2163C.

21. Ibid. §2852a; cf. Rom 14:8.

22. See Joüon §158d.

23. See n. 6 above.

Leuitikon is a storehouse, as expected, of cultic terms. Because much of this terminology is so important for later communities that used the Septuagint—for example, the New Testament and early church—it has traditionally received considerable attention from the side of New Testament scholars, whose intention it usually is to account for the New Testament's use of Septuagint terminology. Frequently one comes across the following syllogism:

1. Word X, e.g., διαθήκη, in the New Testament means Y, i.e., covenant;
2. X occurs as the counterpart of Hebrew Y1 (ברית) in the Septuagint;
3. therefore it can be assumed that in the Septuagint it had become the technical expression for the Hebrew meaning Y.

When the lexicographer checks the philological information as James Barr would have us do, it soon becomes clear that often Greek word X is not attested in such a meaning at the time of the Septuagint and that only by reason of its pairing with Hebrew word Y1 was it seen by later audiences to convey that meaning. It is necessary that a commentary on Septuagint Leuitikon should attempt to give a good account of why these words appear in the Septuagint, with what linguistic purpose and with what semantic content, since such information provided by the secondary literature is often bewildering and colored by the idea that Septuagint words are bearers of theological information rather than semantic markers.

In trying to achieve this for the rich vocabulary of the first three chapters of Leuitikon, I have had to conduct some thorough lexical studies and have tried to publish them separately for review and comment. This has been a rewarding learning process, and I am indebted to the reviewers of the journals for their insights and criticisms. So far the words to which I have given particular attention are ἁμαρτία, mentioned above; ἐξιλάσκομαι and cognates (see below);[24] and ἀναφέρω,[25] the act of bringing an offering. The "advanced lemma search" option of *TLG* has enabled me to check Septuagintal lexical and syntactical items against standard Greek usage up to the time of the translation of the Pentateuch. This has brought with it the rewarding but challenging task of reading the classical sources. Scouring the papyrological and inscriptional material on the Packard Humanities Institute (PHI) Web site (http://epigraphy.packhum.org/inscriptions) has proven to be a steep learning curve for someone having no experience in that field, but fortunately there are a number of works that offer translations so that one can get a feel for the vocabulary and style.[26]

---

24. Dirk Büchner, "ἐξιλάσασθαι: Appeasing God in the Septuagint Pentateuch," *JBL* 129 (2010): 237–60.

25. Dirk Büchner, "Contrasting Attitudes to Septuagintalisms in the Reception History" (paper presented in the Biblical Greek Section at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature in Boston in 2008).

26. An example is P. M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (3 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1972).

In the case of ἐξιλάσκομαι, found early on in Leuitikon (1:4), the difficulty that the interpreter of the Septuagint must introduce and then work out to the satisfaction of his readership can be summarized thus:

1. In Greek literature outside of the Bible the verb ἐξιλάσκομαι in the middle voice means "appease" or "propitiate" a human or divine object who is displeased. In a number of Septuagint passages this sense does indeed occur (Prov 16:14; Zech 7:2; 8:22; Mal 1:9).
2. But the verb most commonly appears in the cultic portions of the Septuagint in ways that fly in the face of standard usage. In these passages the deity or a person is no longer the object, the sense of "propitiate" no longer fits the context, and instead the sense imparted by כפר (*pi'el*), that is, "purge" or "cleanse," seems to be invited also by the Greek context.

The means typically employed to resolve this difficulty are, in my opinion, mostly deficient. The pervading argument that has driven solutions is that "propitiate" is alien to the meaning suggested by the Septuagint context and alien to Israelite religion. The translators understood כפר (*pi'el*) to mean "purge" and they accordingly selected a Greek word which imparted that meaning.[27] Solutions vary from arguing that the meaning "purge" is attested in standard usage, to arguing that a semantic development had taken place so that the Hebraic meaning had become part of the word's normal semantic range. Strong appeal is made to the internal context of the Septuagint so that a special sacred meaning may be easily assumed (see below).

In attending to lexical items such as this, I ask a number of typical questions. The question appear in boldface, and the responses in the case of ἐξιλάσκομαι appear in ordinary type:

What impression is gained from the Septuagint lexica and secondary literature about the meaning of the word for the Pentateuch translators?

The semantic range includes "appease," as well as "expiate" or "purge."[28]

---

27. See C. H. Dodd, "Ἱλάσκεσθαι, Its Cognates, Derivatives and Synonyms in the Septuagint," *JTS* 32 (1931): 359: "Thus Hellenistic Judaism, as represented by the LXX, does not regard the cultus as a means of pacifying the displeasure of the Deity, but as a means of delivering man from sin, and it looks in the last resort to God himself to perform that deliverance, thus evolving a meaning of ἱλάσκεσθαι strange to non-biblical Greek." We must allow that Dodd was a child of his own time, and Barr has done enough Dodd-bashing to count for all of us.

28. T. Muraoka, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint: Chiefly of the Pentateuch and the Twelve Prophets* (Leuven: Peeters, 2002), 197–98; D. Kidner, "Sacrifice—Metaphors and Meaning," *TynBul* 33 (1982): 120–24; F. A. Gosling, "Where Is the God of Justice?" *ZAW* 113 (2001): 404–14; K. Grayston, "Ἱλάσκεσθαι and Related Words in LXX," *NTS* 27 (1981): 641–51; C. Breytenbach, *Versöhnung: Eine Studie zur paulinischen Soteriologie* (WMANT 60;

What was the standard meaning of Greek X?

This verb only ever meant "appease" and not "expiate." Interesting passages from Apollonius Rhodius and Posidippus are cited in the Supplement to LSJ, passages in which temples are the object of the verb ἱλάσκομαι, as if one "propitiates" a temple.[29] These cases must be understood in the light of deities resident at shrines and cast light on certain occurrences of the verb, for example, in Leu 16:33. There the meaning could be understood as "reverence."[30] I came to the conclusion that the passages in extrabiblical Greek usually adduced as precedent for the meaning "purge" cannot be regarded as providing definitive evidence. In the process I had to give careful consideration to a passage employing ἐξιλάσκομαι from Plato (*Leg.* 862c) as well as take a fascinating detour into the world of Attic and Lydian inscriptions from the Roman period. In the so-called Men Tyrannos or Sounion inscriptions, ἐξιλάσκομαι appears to take ἁμαρτία as its object, thus suggesting "purge" in parallel with Septuagint and New Testament usage.[31] But evidence from the religious context suggests that this is not possible.[32]

What bearing, if any, has post-Septuagint usage on the lexicography of the word?

It appears that later authors besides the New Testament writers retained the normal understanding of the verb, that is, that its direct object is a deity and only as such does it take an indirect object in the form of a suppliant or sin.

Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1989), 86; S. Lyonnet and L. Sabourin, *Sin, Redemption and Sacrifice: A Biblical and Patristic Study* (AnBib 48; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute 1970; repr., 1998), 124.

29. Apollonius Rhodius, *Argonautica* 2.808; Posidippus apud Athenaeus 7.318d.

30. *Pace* Breytenbach, *Versöhnung*, 85.

31. So argued in BDAG, s.v. ἱλάσκομαι; LSJ, s.v. ἐξιλάσκομαι; BDF §148. In all three cases the lexicographers follow G. Adolf Deissmann, *Bible Studies: Contributions Chiefly from the Papyri and Inscriptions to the History of the Language, the Literature, and the Religion of Hellenistic Judaism and Primitive Christianity* (trans. A. Grieve; 1901; repr., Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1988), 225. Compare G. H. R. Horsley, *NewDocs* 3 (1978): 21–24.

32. See MM, 303, s.v. ἱλάσκομαι; Eugene N. Lane, *Corpus Monumentorum Religionis Dei Menis (CMRDM),* vol. 1, *The Monuments and Inscriptions* (EPRO 19; Leiden: Brill, 1971), and for comment on the inscriptions, vol. 3, *Interpretations and Testimonia*. See also Franciszek Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées des cités grecques* (École française d'Athènes, Travaux et Mémoires 18; Paris: E. de Boccard, 1969), 106–8; Ken Dowden, *European Paganism: The Realities of Cult from Antiquity to the Middle Ages* (London and New York: Routledge, 2000), 33; Fred S. Naiden, "Sanctions in Sacred Laws," in *Symposion 2007: Vorträge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte (Durham, 2.–6. September 2007)* (ed. E. Harris and G. Thür; Akten der Gesellschaft für griechische und hellenistische Rechtsgeschichte 20; Vienna: Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2008), 111; Franz. Steinleitner, *Die Beicht im Zusammenhange mit der sakralen Rechtspflege in der Antike* (Leipzig: Kommissionsverlag der Dieterich'schen Verlagsbuchhandlung, Theodor Weicher, 1913), 83.

Why, in all probability, was Greek item X chosen for Hebrew item X1?

This choice was made because it provided a consistent match with the Hebrew item, but also because Greek audiences would have understood “propitiate” to be the regular means through which the desired outcome of a sacrifical act could be attained. I have tried to suggest that if one adds a divine object to the occurrences of the verb in the Pentateuch, it aligns with the standard usage of the verb. For example, Leu 5:10 reads: ἐξιλάσεται ὁ ἱερεὺς περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας αὐτοῦ. If one matches it up with Hermas *Pastor* 2.1 πῶς ἐξιλάσομαι τὸν θεὸν περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν μου, it raises our suspicions that what a Greek reader saw in the occurrences of the verb in the Pentateuch was not a different, Hebraized meaning but rather that the deity was understood as the object of the verb.

What conclusions may be drawn for the lexicography of this word?

There does not seem to be a case for a lexical entry containing the range of “purify,” or “purge,” or “expiate.” If “make atonement” is acceptable, it is because the deity with whom one is reconciled has been propitiated.

4. The Septuagint Pentateuch and Greek Religion

By the fourth word of the third chapter of Leuitikon I came to the realization that I needed an in-depth knowledge of the Greek sacrificial cult and its vocabulary to be in a position to judge how the terminology from that world related to the sacrifices described in Leu 1–5. The result was a study of the term θυσία.[33] Leviticus 3:1 introduces the Hebrew term זבח שׁלמים in a description in which an animal is slaughtered and the deity is given a special portion. In ch. 7 we are told that the meat is eaten by the community. Because of the translator’s convention of matching Hebrew words with Greek ones, he provides an equivalent for each of זבח and שׁלמים, namely, two familiar items from the Greek cult, θυσία and σωτήριον. The resulting combination must have presented to Greeks something of a cultural oddity. This is because θυσία fits well into the ritual context of the narrative that follows, but σωτήριον does not. If a reader of the Septuagint with some knowledge of the Greek world expected to find in that chapter the prescriptions for a σωτήριον, that is, a civic sacrifice of release, s/he found instead the workings of a θυσία or κάρπωμα, that is, a private alimentary sacrifice in which the deity receives a burnt offering. Why did the chapter not leave it at the description of a θυσία? We can only conclude that the translator wanted not to create a culturally

33. See Dirk Büchner, “The Thysia Soteriou of the Septuagint and the Greek Cult: Representation and Accommodation,” in *Florilegium Lovaniense: Studies in Septuagint and Textual Criticism in Honour of Florentino García Martínez* (ed. H. Ausloos, B. Lemmelijn, and M. Vervenne; BETL 224; Leuven: Peeters, 2008), 85–100.

and technically accurate portrayal of a ritual as much as to provide a conduit to the language units of the source text.

At the same time the translator must have seen the opportunity to provide a culturally relevant product, since he recognized in the Alexandrian θυσία—that is, a community-wide meat-eating sacred feast—a significant overlap with the Jewish feast (שׁלמים) that achieved the same end. Both cultures assumed that a special portion of the sacrifice belonged to the deity. The trouble was that Greek culture conceived of the deity as participating in the meal, whereas Jewish culture probably did not. It is in relation to the special portion from the sheep in Leu 3:9–11 that most of this cross-cultural engineering takes place. What is to be offered in that situation to κύριος is quite different from what is described in the Hebrew version; it consists of typical (and edible) parts of the anatomy found in the Greek γέρας, or firstfruits offering.[34] It appears that here, if only for the benefit of Greek readers, κύριος is portrayed in the manner of a Greek god who is given the gift of a sheep's sacrum and some flesh from its back as if he partakes in the meal together with humans, who may communicate through the curling of the sacrum, and who may even be expected to respond with a reciprocal gift. Such notions were of course quite alien to Jewish thought. This is most definitely an adaptation to suit members of an Alexandrian audience who would never have seen a Jewish sacrifice. Nevertheless, it is worth pointing out that the structure of the Greek is still a virtually one-to-one quantitative equivalence of the Hebrew.

5. Ptolemaic Alexandria

The first pilot study that I conducted before beginning work on the commentary itself was a test case involving one of the few instances in which a major difference occurs between the MT and the OG, namely, Leu 18:21, where ἄρχων is the equivalent for מלך.[35] For this study I had to immerse myself in the culture and history of the Jews in Ptolemaic Alexandria in the third century B.C.E. In 18:21 it is probable that the Greek translator makes a significant theological shift against all the ancient versions. He recasts the Hebrew prohibition ומזרעך לא־תתן להעביר למלך, "You shall not give any of your offspring to sacrifice them to Molech" (NRSV) as καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ σπέρματός σου οὐ δώσεις λατρεύειν ἄρχοντι, "And you shall not give any of your offspring to serve a ruler" (NETS). The refashioning of the prohibition emphasizes the act of giving seed or offspring as an act of service

34. Though the ὀσφῦς, or sacrum, is normally not regarded as edible, it must be noted that in Herodotus's account of the Egyptian alimentary sacrifice the ὀσφῦς is removed with the edible portions belonging to humans (*Hist.* 2.40).

35. Dirk Büchner, "'You shall not give of your seed to serve an Archon': Leviticus 18:21 in the Septuagint," in *Translating a Translation: The Septuagint and Its Modern Translations in the Context of Early Judaism* (ed. H. Ausloos, J. Cook, F. García Martínez, B. Lemmelijn, and M. Vervenne; BETL 213; Leuven: Peeters, 2008), 183–96.

to be rendered to an ἄρχων. As such, it could be argued that the emphasis on improper placement of semen is in accord with similar discussions in Judaism. At the same time it could be a contemporization so that members of the Alexandrian Jewish community would recognize an ἄρχων as perhaps the Ptolemy in veiled language, or perhaps a cult figure within Dionysian religion, wildly popular with the Ptolemies. At the same time the translator maintains a one-to-one equivalence to his Hebrew parent text.

6. Final Remarks

Over and above these details, two aspects of the Leuitikon translator's modus operandi stand out: his need to provide equivalence and his need to contextualize. One perceives in the translator what may be called a tension of intent: as much variation as is permissible but within an overall plan of one-to-one representation. He reflects with a deliberate or accidental variation what Hebrew phrases contain. He will not always mechanically provide equivalents, but at times does do so. He sacrifices good Greek to this end but nonetheless employs it when possible.

It is too early to say definitely that he works fully within Greek thought rather than within Jewish thought, but it certainly seems that he has an inclination to provide through Greek cultural ways an avenue in which to make sense of the Hebrew text.

Translating a Translation: Some Final Reflections on the Production of the New English Translation of Greek Deuteronomy

Melvin K. H. Peters

1. Introduction

As its title indicates, this paper consists of some final personal reflections after many years of work on Deuteronomy. Its goals are limited and targeted. It does not resolve a specific textual problem, nor does it aim to be "stunningly original," "remarkably insightful," or "dazzlingly brilliant." Rather, it has three modest, overlapping purposes: first, to review and amplify some observations about the Greek translation of Deuteronomy made in my introduction to NETS[1] *Deuteronomion*; second, to focus more sharply on (a few) instances where the Greek text of Deuteronomy is clearly at variance with the Hebrew of the St. Petersburg Codex[2]—the so called MT; and finally, to use those divergences as a springboard to revisit and challenge once again the long-standing and continuing practice, in both scholarly

1. Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright, eds., *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under That Title* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 141–46.

2. This manuscript, also known as the Leningrad Codex, has long been the basis for scholarly editions of the Hebrew Bible. See R. Kittel, ed., *Biblia Hebraica* (3rd ed.; Stuttgart: Priviligierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1937), and K. Elliger and W. Rudolph, eds., *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1987). A fifth edition, *Biblia Hebraica Quinta*, is in preparation with the Deuteronomy fascicle having already appeared (Carmel McCarthy, ed., *Biblia Hebraica Quinta: Deuteronomy* [Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007]). The manuscript has also been photographed and is now available for the first time in facsimile edited by David Noel Freedman et al., as *The Leningrad Codex: A Facsimile Edition* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Leiden and New York: Brill, 1998). Aron Dotan has also edited the manuscript as *Torah Nevi'im u-Ketuvim = Biblia Hebraica Leningradensia: Prepared according to the Vocalization, Accents, and Masora of Aaron ben Moses ben Asher in the Leningrad Codex* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2001). It is also available for viewing electronically as the Westminster Leningrad Codex at BibleGateway.com.

and confessional circles, of elevating the St. Petersburg Codex to a normative status unwarranted by the evidence of its text and, in my view, by sound judgment. I fully appreciate the pragmatic need of believing communities to define and preserve a single authoritative text as sacred Scripture, but the decision of so many Hebrew Bible and Septuagint scholars to follow their lead suggests that something more significant and subtle is at work, something that requires identification, clarification, and critique.

2. NETS Deuteronomy

It is a tribute to our generation that, after more than a century and a half, and thanks to Oxford University Press, we have produced a new English translation of the Septuagint, now available both in electronic form and in a reasonably priced hard copy. NETS has already been incorporated into software packages and search engines, which will facilitate its wide dissemination and use. I do not presume by virtue of those facts, however, that anyone, apart from the two main editors of NETS, has read and digested all of the data in the introductory sections of each book. For that reason, I reprise here, to begin, a few of the main points made in the introduction to Greek Deuteronomy.

In general, it is fair to conclude that the translator of Greek Deuteronomy utilized a Hebrew source text similar to, but not identical with, that of the St. Petersburg/Leningrad Codex (hereafter "L"). It is also fair to say that the translator was competent and faithful in the execution of his task, generally maintaining a close relationship to his source but occasionally engaging in some interpretation of it. In addition to the presence of the usual markers indicating that a Greek translator was paying close attention to his Hebrew source and was being controlled by it—calques, stereotypes, and the like—there is also evidence in Deuteronomy of strict adherence to Hebrew word order at the expense of standard Greek style along with a tendency toward quantitative representation—one Greek word for one Hebrew word—as much as possible. Hebraisms such as infinitives before or after cognate finite verbs, or the pleonastic expressions so common in Deuteronomy, were not interpreted by the translator but were represented fully, lexeme for lexeme, in the Greek translation.

Several new words, neologisms, appear in Deuteronomy.[3] Some were occasioned by practical situations. For instance, a root in Hebrew that has both nominal and verbal representation may have only a noun form in Greek. When encountering the Hebrew verbal form of the root, the translator would create a new verb

3. For discussion of some these, see NETS, 142–43. A complete list of neologisms, both those unique to Deut and those shared with other books in the Pentateuch, appears in Cécile Dogniez and Marguerite Harl, *La Bible d'Alexandrie,* vol. 5, *Le Deutéronome* (Paris: Cerf, 1992), 64–65.

from the noun or the adjective already known in Greek. The verbs μακροχρονίζω, μακροημερέω, and πολυχρονίζω as translations of the Hebrew idiom אריך ימים are examples of this kind of neologism. Alternately, he would create new words by combining existing words in new ways—the Greek title of the book, Δευτερονόμιον, is an example of this kind of neologism.

As is the case with many translations, even those classified as literal, Deuteronomy engages in both semantic leveling—the use of a single word to translate several Hebrew words—and semantic differentiation—the use of more than one Greek word to render the same Hebrew word. One example of the former is the verb ἐξολεθρεύω ("to destroy"), which translates no fewer than six different Hebrew verbs; as to the latter, the popular Hebrew noun גר, ("stranger") is translated both as προσήλυτος (NETS "guest") and πάροικος (NETS "sojourner") in Deuteronomy.

Two quick examples of interpretation by the Greek translator must suffice. When his source Hebrew suggests, ambiguously, that הרע, "the evil," should be removed from among the people of Israel, the translator, because he is able to do so in Greek, makes it explicit that it is the evil person, τὸν πονηρόν, not evil as an abstraction, τὸ πονηρόν, that should be removed. One final example of interpretation concerns the translation of מלך. Normally, the standard gloss for this Hebrew noun is βασιλεύς. However, in those instances where מלך could point to a king of Israel, the translator routinely chooses ἄρχων. Some theological motives seem to be at work here; Israel in the translator's view had only one βασιλεύς and that was κύριος, their god, and he wished to make that clear.

3. Deuteronomy Vorlage

I turn now to some significant passages where the Hebrew text underlying the Greek of Deuteronomy,[4] its *Vorlage* (hereafter GV), is at variance with that found in L. To some of these only passing reference was made in the introduction; I discuss them now in greater detail.

4. This has been a matter of some debate. It often has been suggested that, because the LXX is written in Greek and is represented by divergent manuscripts from the early centuries C.E., it should not be considered a credible witness to the Hebrew Bible. This might of course be true for certain sections, especially those books demonstrably written in "composition Greek." With "translation Greek," and especially the pentateuchal books, the case is different. These are widely recognized to have been translated first, and that this occurred in the third century B.C.E. is not in dispute. Retroversion of Greek into Hebrew is a science and an art that has been refined in recent times so that, even in the absence of a complete extant text of the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Pentateuch, one can confidently postulate its existence. Such a text, when carefully retroverted, predates L by at least twelve hundred years. The alternative—that Septuagint translators were translating the text of the Leningrad Codex and deviating from it regularly and whimsically—is illogical, disrespectful, and absurd on its face.

The parade example that comes to mind is in Deut 30:15–16.

[15] ראה נתתי לפניך היום את־החיים ואת־הטוב ואת־המות ואת־הרע:
[16] אשר אנכי מצוך היום לאהבה את־יהוה אלהיך ללכת בדרכיו
ולשמר מצותיו וחקתיו ומשפטיו וחיית ורבית וברכך יהוה אלהיך
בארץ אשר־אתה בא־שמה לרשתה:

There is no credible way to argue for the primacy of the text of L in this instance, yet it is still translated, printed, and defended rather creatively by distinguished scholars and translators for no other reason than the presumption of "originality" of the text of L—the so called Masoretic Text. The L reading is not just more difficult; it is clearly incomplete.

There are several points of variance. Whereas in v. 15, GV reflects that the options being set before the Israelites are "life and death, good and evil," a formula recapitulated with modification in v. 19—life and death, blessing and curse—L reads the equivalent of "life and prosperity, death and adversity." The contrast is not between adjacent antonyms, but between paired synonyms. On the surface, it is not reasonable or worthwhile to argue for the one reading or the other on textual grounds alone. Both can be defended plausibly and may have been variant forms of texts in circulation. Were those the only points of variation, that would be unremarkable. However, L begins v. 16 with אשר, which, in normal Hebrew syntax, usually connects/relates an element that precedes it with whatever follows it. The antecedent of אשר here is הרע ("the evil"), and that would be logically unacceptable; to love Yahweh is not an evil thing. It is rather rare for אשר to begin a clause with the intent to serve a disjunctive rather than a relative function.

Reverence for L has led, however, to a widespread specialized reading of אשר in this case; it is translated as if it were כי ("for"), which has a wider range of functions than אשר. That reverence also led to other elements in v. 16 being interpreted/translated in unusual ways. The NJPS (*Tanakh*) translation,[5] which is as consistent and faithful a representation of L in English as there is, exemplifies the situation perfectly.

> [15] See, I set before you this day life and prosperity, death and adversity.[16] For* I command you this day, to love the Lord your God, to walk in His ways, and to keep His commandments, His laws, and His rules, that you may thrive and increase, and that the Lord your God may bless you in the land that you are about to enter and possess. [17] But if your heart turns away and you give no heed, and are lured into the worship and service of other gods, [18] I declare to you this day . . .[6]
> **Septuagint reads "If you obey the commandments of the Lord your God, which."*

5. Adele Berlin and Marc Zvi Brettler, eds., *The Jewish Study Bible: Jewish Publication Society Tanakh Translation* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2004). For the NJPS, see *Tanakh: The Holy Scriptures. The New JPS Translation according to the Traditional Hebrew Text* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1985). See also the translation of the NIV.

6. Ibid., 236.

The phrase אשר אנכי מצוך היום becomes "For I command you this day." The relationship between that opening line of v. 16 and what precedes it in v. 15 is rather strained. The setting forth of life and prosperity, death and adversity, even granting the specialized reading of אשׁר, seems to have little connection to the command to love the Lord your God. The duplication of the phrase "you this day" in adjacent verses suggests that something is amiss. Even if one finds other odd instances in the Hebrew Bible where אשׁר functions in this rare way, it does not obviate the overwhelming pattern of use for this most common particle. The natural expectation following such a divine summons in Deuteronomy is an "If . . . then" clause. The preceding chapters, especially 28, are replete with examples of that formula (see 28:1–2, 13–14, 15, 58–59; 30:1–4).

Having chosen that translational path, the JPS translators are forced to make further adjustments in the rendering of perfectly simple Hebrew. The resumptive *vav* of וחיית is at worst ignored, or at best translated as a causative/consecutive pronoun, "that" or "so that," and the even simpler conversive *vav* of וברכך, "and he (the Lord your God) will bless you" is translated both as a conjunction and, as before, as a causative pronoun "that."

The result is that the new JPS translation produces a single divine command (along with expected results), followed by a "but if" clause with results. The "but if" clause almost screams for a prior "if" clause. This latter is present in GV. NETS Deuteronomy reads:

> [15] See, I have given before you today life and death, good and evil. [16] Now if you listen to the commandments of the Lord your God that [L = אשׁר] I command you today, to love the Lord your God, to walk in his ways, to keep his statutes and his commandments and his judgments, then [L = ו] you shall live and become many, and the Lord your God will bless you in all the land into which you are entering there to inherit it. [17] And if your heart turns away and you do not listen but having been led astray you do obeisance to other gods and serve them, [18] I declare to you today . . .[7]

The Hebrew behind this translation of the Greek is balanced and logical. Life and death, blessing and curse are restated in v. 19 in exactly the order of v. 15 in the Septuagint. The paired elements are opposites—antonyms, not synonyms. Two protases and two apodoses are represented, as would be expected. If you listen, you will live; if you do not listen, you will be destroyed. The odd אשׁר in L is easily explained, and no contortions or strained interpretations of *vav* are necessary to make sense of the Hebrew as it stands. Why, then, would translators of the Hebrew Bible—the RSV, NRSV, NIV etc.,—accept a portion of the Greek reading (the clarifying phrase that makes sense of the L reading) without taking into account the reading of the verse that immediately precedes it? (The NJPS is at least consistent

7. NETS, 169.

in rendering what is found in one manuscript.) The answer is clear: they, we, hold the text of L in a place of honor despite its late date and irrespective of its content or context.

This piecemeal adoption of readings in the Septuagint by translators of the so-called MT is well known and broadly accepted. As widespread as that practice has become, it always has implied, and still indicates, disrespect for the efforts of Septuagint translators to render faithfully the Hebrew that was before them. The Septuagint has been deemed good enough to serve as a private consort solicited mainly to relieve tension but not respectable enough to be introduced and defended in broad daylight as an equal partner. It seems to me that, as leading scholars, our concern and passion should be not only to render faithfully and comment on the text of the Septuagint among ourselves, but also to advocate in powerful influential circles for the integrity of the Hebrew it represents, not only as a corrective of L in tough passages, but as a witness in its own right to a Hebrew text that is different from L.

Another example of significant variance between L and the GV is the introduction to the Shema in 6:4. Because of its widespread popularity, especially in Jewish religious tradition, the text reflected in L has been accepted "as is" and has not been scrutinized sufficiently. That famous Shema in v. 4 fits poorly into its context and is rather abrupt. Verse 3 also begins with the Hebrew term ושמעת (though not as an imperative), and ends with חלב ודבש ("milk and honey"). This state of affairs apparently so concerned the JPS translators that they transposed the final clauses of L to provide a smoother transition to the Shema. They render vv. 3-4 in the following way:

> [3]Obey, O Israel, willingly and faithfully, that it may go well with you and that you may increase greatly [in] a land flowing with milk and honey, as the Lord, the God of your fathers, spoke to you. [4]Hear, O Israel! The LORD is our God, the LORD alone.[8]

Note the following: ושמעת, "and you will listen/hear," becomes a simple imperative, "Obey!" with the *vav* evidently having been ignored. The following command ושמרת לעשות, "and you shall be careful to do," becomes "willingly and faithfully," if one can assume that the translators are still rendering L. The rest of the rather free rendering is easy to follow. It seems curious that translators who engaged in such contortions to preserve the L text in a later context (cf. 30:16 above) would be so free with it in this setting.

Again, the Greek text reflects a different and, I would suggest, clearer, more logical textual tradition. (I have long avoided terms like "better" or "original" in discussions of this sort, since I am fully persuaded that multiple textual traditions were in circulation simultaneously in the ancient world.) As in the previous

8. *Jewish Study Bible*, 379.

example, GV removes/explains the abrupt transition and provides an appropriate context for the Shema. Here are the same verses in NETS:

> [3]Now hear, O Israel, and be watchful to perform so that it may be well with you and that you may multiply greatly, just as the Lord, the God of your fathers, has spoken, to give you a land flowing with milk and honey.
> [4]And these are the statutes and the judgments, which the Lord commanded to the sons of Israel in the wilderness as they were coming out from the land of Egypt. Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God is one Lord.[9]

It is clear that, at the beginning of the chapter, in 6:1, Moses is the speaker; the introduction is in his voice. The JPS translators recognized this by adding "me" in square brackets after "commanded" and before "to impart to you" in their translation. The introduction in GV in v. 4 is in the third person—in the voice of the narrator—and is specifically addressed to the sons of Israel as they are coming out from the land of Egypt.

One is tempted in situations like these to seek an explanation that would resolve the apparent conflict. Commentators often postulate haplography or dittography, eye skips due to homoioteleuton or homoioarchton, harmonizations, and so forth, or they recommend acceptance of the *lectio difficilior/brevior* and so on, in the pursuit of a "resolution." None of these applies here. The Greek is reflecting what seems to be a perfectly reasonable and defensible text that supplements or clarifies our understanding of the textual history and is undoubtedly based on a Hebrew parent text. The logic behind *lectio difficilior* as a text-critical rule, by the way, has long puzzled me. Why would any reasonable person prefer and adopt a difficult text in the face of a simpler one, or by extension a shorter and more difficult text, simply because it is shorter and more difficult? I am well schooled in the conventional explanations, but they still fail to persuade in many instances.

These first two examples are straightforward and do not challenge accepted traditions too aggressively; one could very well adopt the Greek reading as Scripture in either case. But what does one do with cases that are not simply a matter of textual variation but also reflective of theological differences? We turn now to one of these—Deut 32:43. Here in parallel are the readings reflected in L and GV. For the sake of convenience, I quote the texts of NJPS and of NETS.

---

9. NETS, 151-52.

NJPS *Deut 32:43*	NETS *Deut 32:43*
	Be glad, O skies, with him, and let all the divine sons do obeisance to him.
O nations, acclaim his people! For He'll avenge the blood of his servants, Wreak vengeance on His foes, And cleanse the land of His people.	Be glad, O nations, with his people, and let all the angels of God prevail for him. For he will avenge the blood of his sons and take revenge and repay the enemies with a sentence, and he will repay those who hate, and the Lord shall cleanse the land of his people.

The situation here is complex; conventional descriptors such as "original" and "secondary" are unhelpful and remain elusive in this case. Even Bernard Levinson, who contributed the introduction and notes to the *Jewish Study Bible* published in 2004, a scholar normally quite respectful of L, begins his note on this verse in this way:

> As it stands, the Hebrew presents numerous difficulties. The opening vocative, *O nations* is illogical in this context. The verse demands that the very nations judged guilty of spilling Israel's blood suddenly join in the chorus of those praising Israel—in the moment before their destruction! The expected poetic parallelism (AA 'BB', as in v. 2) is absent. Here the second line presents a completely different idea than the first line, rather than repeating it with a variation. The absence of parallelism is not simply a formal stylistic issue: It renders the climax of the poem unintelligible. The incoherence of v. 43 in its present form suggests that the **original** text has been **disrupted. Alternative** reflections of the text, **as preserved by** the LXX and by the Dead Sea Scrolls, restore the poem's lost coherence.[10]

Although noting the "numerous difficulties" of "the Hebrew" and, despite recognizing the coherence reflected in the Septuagint reading, Levinson is unwilling to grant it primacy. His choice of the word "restore" rather than say "preserve" or "reflect" in relation to the poem's lost coherence, speaks directly to the larger problem to which I am calling attention. Even the support from the Dead Sea Scrolls is not enough to dignify the reading found in the Septuagint.

Let us focus for a minute on the Septuagint *Vorlage* for its beauty, simplicity, and perhaps originality. "Be glad, O Skies" (heavens) is paralleled by "Be glad,

10. *Jewish Study Bible*, 444 (emphasis added in boldface).

O nations," and "divine sons do[ing] obeisance" is paralleled by "angels of God prevail[ing] for." A full, well-formed, and balanced set of poetic lines is reflected throughout the rest of the poem.

Contra Levinson, I would assert that it is just as, or even more, reasonable to suggest that the shorter difficult text preserved in L is a later crude attempt to purge GV of polytheistic elements with which a more religiously orthodox and sensitive community had become uncomfortable. But it need not be only a theoretical postulate; there is ample and convincing evidence in ch. 32, both before and after the verses in question, that L readings are subsequent to those reflected by GV.

As early as v. 4, the first of many instances[11] of a metaphor for the divine name appears in L, while the GV attests the divine name itself. GV reads אלהים in these verses; L routinely reads צור ("Rock") with or without a suffix. The most compelling evidence that the replacement of אלהים with צור was a later mechanical process appears in vv. 30–31. In v. 30, GV reads the logical אלהים in parallel to יהוה, while L reads the illogical צורם"("their Rock"). The critical question is this: to whom does "them" refer, the one or two initiating the rout or the many who were sold/delivered? GV makes it clear that it is אלהים, the god of Israel who sells and delivers. L, seeking to avoid the divine name, ambiguates the situation by suffixing צור (צורם, "their rock"), leaving open the possible meaning that it is the god of the pursued who had sold them to the one or two pursuers.

NJPS *Deut 32:30–31*	NETS *Deut 32:30–31*
[30] "How could one have routed a thousand, Or two put ten thousand to flight, Unless their Rock had sold them, The LORD had given them up?" [31]For their rock in not like our Rock, In our enemies' own estimation.	[30] How shall one pursue thousands and two remove myriads unless God sold them and the Lord delivered them up? [31]For not like our God are their gods, but our enemies are without understanding.

Again, in v. 31, where אלהים is clearly intended as a plural, referring to the "no-gods" of the nations, GV properly reflects that, and the Greek reads οἱ θεοὶ ἀυτῶν, "their gods." L again reads however the illogical צורם, "their rock," completely negating the force of the entire poem. Indeed, it could be argued that what

11. See, for instance, 32:15, 18, 30, 31, 37. This phenomenon is present in other OG/LXX books and has been frequently discussed. See notably Staffan Olofsson, *God Is My Rock: A Study of Translation Technique and Theological Exegesis in the Septuagint* (ConBOT 31; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1990).

occurred in v. 30 is a case of backwards parablepsis on צורם in L. An Israelite would not wish to grant similar status to the nations' gods; there is only one god.

NJPS *Deut 32:37–38*	NETS *Deut 32:37–38*
[37] He will say: Where are their gods, The rock in whom they sought refuge, [38]Who ate the fat of their offerings And drank their libation wine? Let them rise up to your help, And let them be a shield unto you![12]	[37] And the Lord said: where are their gods, they in whom they trusted, [38]the fat of whose sacrifices you were eating and were drinking the wine of their libations? Let them rise up and help you, and let them be protectors for you![13]

A similar situation obtains also in vv. 37 and 38. The singular "rock" at the beginning of v. 37b in L stands in contrast with the plural "gods" in 37a and also with the plural "let them rise up" in the next verse. In the haste to substitute צור for אלהים , contextual matters were overlooked in the tradition reflected in L.

I think it fair to assert that it is more likely that the practice of avoiding the use of the divine name developed later, than to argue the reverse, that is, that the divine name was introduced to make explicit the enigmatic reference to "Rock." Surely, if the situations were switched—L reading אלהים and the GV, צור —few would defend the GV reading as prior.

Verse 8b provides further evidence to support the antiquity and priority of the GV reading where the text states clearly that when the Most High apportioned the nations, he fixed the boundaries of nations according to the number of the divine sons[14] = Hebrew בני אלים.

---

12. *Jewish Study Bible*, 443.

13. NETS, 171.

14. The literature on this verse, and indeed on this chapter, is extensive. No effort to be exhaustive is intended here. Some of the more recent treatments are I. Himbaza ("Dt 32,8, une correction tardive des scribes: Essai d'interpétation et de datation," *Bib* 83 [2002]: 527–48), who cites most of the early literature on this verse; Jan Joosten ("A Note on the Text of Deuteronomy xxxii 8," *VT* 57 [2007]: 548–55), who argues quite convincingly that the original might have been neither the MT's nor the LXX's *Vorlage* but rather an unattested reading "according to the number of the sons of Bull El (אל בני שר)" from which both may have derived; W. R. Garr, *In His Own Image and Likeness: Humanity, Divinity, and Monotheism* (Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 15; Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2003); A Rofé, *Deuteronomy: Issues and Interpretation* (London and New York: T&T Clark, 2002). Commentaries include Jeffrey H. Tigay, *Deuteronomy* דברים*: The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation*(JPS Torah Commentary; Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1996); John William Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Deuteronomy* (SBLSCS 30; Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1990); Duane L. Christensen,

NJPS *Deut 32:8*	NETS *Deut 32:8*
[8]When the Most High gave nations their homes And set the divisions of man, He fixed the boundaries of peoples In relation to Israel's numbers.	[8]When the Most High was apportioning nations, as he scattered Adam's sons, he fixed boundaries of nations according to the number of divine sons . . .

This clear polytheistic reference would also be disturbing to a later monotheistic sensibility, and so L reads למספר בני ישׂראיל, "according to the number of the sons of Israel." Again, arguing for the primacy of בני ישׂראיל contradicts all the standard assumptions of textual study. If we utilize the old principle of *lectio difficilior*, the results are equally obvious. It is easy to see why the much more common בני ישׂראיל would supplant the more uncommon בני אלים than the other way around. Furthermore, the בני ישׂראיל should not yet have been in existence at this early period, but the בני אלים would have been. So on both text-critical and theological grounds the priority of the GV reading seems clear. Here again, Levinson's note in the *Jewish Study Bible* in relation to L's reading of למספר בני ישׂראיל, "according to the number of the sons of Israel," is highly instructive:

> *In relation to Israel's numbers* is **unintelligible** as it stands. The **variant** attested by the Septuagint and at Qumran, "according to the sons of El" (cf. NRSV), which preserves the mythological reference to *Most High* ("Elyon") earlier in the verse, makes much more sense. . . . Almost certainly, the **unintelligible** reading of the MT represents a "**correction**" of the original text (whereby God presides over other gods) to **make it conform** to the later standard of pure monotheism: There are no other gods! The polytheistic imagery of the divine council is also **deleted** at 32.43; 33.2-3, 7.[15]

Several things can be noted in response. The L reading is not unintelligible; its meaning is clearly understandable. It just is demonstrably unacceptable. But Levinson cannot admit the clearly secondary nature of his "MT"; the best he can do is characterize its reading as a "correction" of the original text. Nor can he state explicitly that the Septuagint reading is "original," only that it is a "variant" that "makes much more sense."

Lest anyone be confused, let me state categorically that this is not an ad hominem attack. I profoundly respect and admire Levinson's scholarship; it is for this reason that he features so prominently in this paper. I am using him vicariously, as

---

Deuteronomy 21:10–34:12 (WBC 6B; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2002); and Dogniez and Harl, *Le Deutéronome*.

15. *Jewish Study Bible*, 441 (emphasis added in boldface).

a surrogate for numerous other scholars and commentators who tacitly or explicitly share his views. He has written exhaustively and magisterially about passages in the Greek Deuteronomy,[16] seeking to make the case for the primacy of MT [his term] readings, even in places where the broad consensus of scholarship goes in another direction and even when, as in the verse under discussion, one finds textual support from the Dead Sea Scrolls.

Permit me to discuss briefly a representative few of these. One passage on which Levinson has spent a lot of intellectual energy is 13:7–12(6–11). He is particularly exercised by vv. 7(6), 9(8), and 10(9), but, in spite of his erudition, he betrays a prejudice toward L that is widely shared. In 2001 he wrote:

> Nothing could be clearer than the burden of evidence calling for the **emendation** of the Masoretic text (MT) of Deut 13:7. That evidence includes not simply the Septuagint, Peshitta, and Samaritan Pentateuch but the attestation of the Septuagint (LXX) reading in Hebrew among the biblical manuscripts of the Dead Sea Scrolls. The latter, in particular, seem decisive. They strongly suggest that the LXX **translator,** working in mid-third-century B.C.E. Alexandria, **must have based his Greek rendering directly on a Hebrew *Vorlage*.**[17]

Before summarizing the argument he makes in defense of the readings preserved in L, let me highlight what is implicit, stunning, and widely assumed about the/our Septuagint in this quotation. Put simply, certain scholars hold the view that Septuagint "translators" were sometimes not translating at all, at least not from Hebrew, but were "authors" either making things up "on the fly" or, worse, copying Greek from other witnesses, composing from memory, or freely "harmonizing with / borrowing from" other parts of the Hebrew Bible itself. How else could one interpret the words "must have based his Greek rendering *directly* on a Hebrew *Vorlage*" in the quotation above? Is it not in the very nature of translating that there be a parent and a target language? And in the case of the Septuagint, can there be any doubt that the parent text was Hebrew?

The main burden of Levinson's article is to show that the reading reflected in 13:7(6)a of L is "original" and that of the LXX et al. is secondary. What is involved here is the phrase ὁ ἀδελφός σου ἐκ πατρός σου ἢ ἐκ μητρός σου, "your brother, from your father or from your mother." The article argues for the exclu-

16. See, for instance, Bernard M. Levinson, "Textual Criticism, Assyriology and the History of Interpretation: Deuteronomy 13:7a as a Test Case in Method," *JBL* 120 (2001): 211–43; idem, "Recovering the Lost Original Meaning of ולא־תכסה עליו (Deuteronomy 13:9)," *JBL* 115 (1996): 601–20; idem, "'But You Shall Surely Kill Him!' The Text-Critical and Neo-Assyrian Evidence for MT Deuteronomy 13:10," in *Bundesdokument und Gesetz: Studien zum Deuteronomium* (ed. Georg Braulik; Herders Biblische Studien 4; Freiburg and New York: Herder, 1995), 37–63; idem, "You Must Not Add Anything to What I Command You: Paradoxes of Canon and Authorship in Ancient Israel," *Numen* 50 (2003): 1–51.

17. Levinson, "Textual Criticism," 211 (emphasis added in boldface).

sion of the equivalent of the Hebrew phrase "the son of your father," utilizing impressive and extensive data from Assyriology, comparative Semitics, historical linguistics, and rabbinic exegesis; in places it is quite convincing. But the agenda of the author, and I suspect that it might be a theological agenda, is revealed in a number of instances. For example, his choice of the word *variant* or *plus* to describe a reading reflected in the Septuagint, his use of the rubric "emendations of the MT" to describe selections of the Septuagint reading by English translators, and his comfort with terms such as "original" and "better" readings betray a sense of condescension toward GV. Evidence to confirm my assessment of the author's working assumptions stated above is clearly apparent in these quotations:

> The Septuagint translator of Deuteronomy frequently follows the model of translations of previous books. That stands to reason, given the extent to which Deuteronomy provides an expansive reprise of prior narrative and legal material of the Tetrateuch. On occasion, much like the **redactor** of the Samaritan Pentateuch, the translator **will fill in perceived gaps**. Something like that seems to have taken place here.
>
> In rendering the incest law of Lev 18:9, the Septuagint translator had **normalized** the formulaic Hebrew double construct into two genitive phrases, while also **eliminating** the redundant second reference to the daughter:
>
> . . . The perceived genealogical gap of the one text is completed by the symmetry of the other text. The precise conformity of the Septuagint rendering of Deut 13:7(6) to the syntax of LXX Lev 18:9 urges the latter as **the direct *Vorlage*** of the plus.[18]

This paints a rather dismal picture of the translator of Deuteronomy. He is a cavalier, irresponsible figure, prone to normalize, eliminate, and borrow from other parts of the Pentateuch on a whim. That is not the translator I have come to know. The disputed issue in this text is explained rather easily by standard text-critical processes such as parablepsis occasioned by homoioteleuton in the tradition reflected in L. But since such common errors are not committed by the scribes who wrote in Hebrew, only those in Greek, elaborate reasoning and scholarly creativity have to be utilized to maintain the originality of L.

But v. 7(6) is just the beginning. Levinson has argued in other articles,[19] and with equal erudition, for the originality of the MT reading in just about every instance. He argues *against* the consensus translation of ולא־תכסי עליו, "do not 'shield/protect' him," in v. 9(8)b and *for* the meaning "do not condone him" as the accurate translation of that clause. He defends L's "you will kill" (הרג) him against the GV's reading of "you will report" (הגד) him (that is, the Israelite who secretly sponsors the worship of other gods) in v. 10(9) despite the unique reading of הרג

18. Ibid., 229–30 (emphasis added in boldface).

19. Levinson, "But You Shall Surely Kill Him!"; "Recovering the Lost Original Meaning."

in Deuteronomy, and despite the tautology that results from the L reading he defends. The command "You will take his life" contradicts and weakens the force of the next command, "Let your hand be first to put him to death and the hand of the rest of the people thereafter." Furthermore, accepting L's reading suggests that killing can be progressive—that murdered individuals do not die completely, they die in stages. If the single individual who first discovers his disloyal Israelite brother is expected summarily to murder him, there is no further need for the community to participate. But these larger matters of logic dissipate so long as the text of the MT is protected.

But Levinson is obviously not alone in his commitment to the sanctity of L. Virtually every article and monograph in the field uses the term the Masoretic Text not just as a descriptor for L but as a cipher for *the* original Hebrew text. No less distinguished a scholar than my esteemed mentor, John William Wevers, has repeatedly advocated for respect of readings found in L. Throughout his *Notes on the Greek Text of the Pentateuch* and in his voluminous other publications, he has repeatedly made the case that we should adopt the text of L unless and until there is overwhelming evidence to do otherwise. Numerous readings reflected by the Greek manuscripts have been judged "secondary" by Wevers, and even more have been explained by borrowing/echoing/harmonizing with adjacent or similar texts in the Pentateuch. I do not recall ever hearing him articulate the logic behind his position, but I am aware that it is increasingly being challenged by contemporary scholars, especially those engaged in Qumran studies. Anyone reading the critical apparatuses of the *Biblia Hebraica* editions cannot escape the sense that the Greek, while important, is considered secondary. The very notion of *the* traditional MT gives weight and validity to that practice because, intentionally or not, we often ignore the fact that L is but one manuscript with masoretic vocalization, not the only one, and the equally relevant fact that GV, the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Septuagint, antedates it by more than a millennium.

4. On the Hegemony of the St. Petersburg Codex

At the beginning of this paper, I promised to revisit and challenge the practice of elevating the St. Petersburg Codex to a normative status. Thus far, I have been hinting in rather subtle ways why I think this convention is both textually irresponsible and disrespectful to the Septuagint translators and their work. In the rest of this paper I intend to remove any pretense of diplomacy and reveal what I think is too often concealed about Septuagint studies in the name of propriety.

Septuagint studies could theoretically be located within any number of fields in the academy: theology, Hebrew Bible, Hellenistic Greek, cultural anthropology, ancient history, or linguistics, to name just a few. As I have observed it in practice, Septuagint studies, wherever else it might be located in universities, functions in fact only within the first field—theology. A presumption of the existence and real-

ity of the god of Israel seems to be at the heart of much of Septuagint research, as it is of course in much of Old Testament studies. The god of Israel is not considered to be just another ancient conception of divinity, but the god of the universe whose word is enshrined and preserved in a specific language, a defined text, and a particular manuscript containing that text. Only such a postulate, whether explicitly admitted and articulated or not, explains the ongoing preoccupation in Septuagint studies with maintaining and preserving the readings in a particular flawed manuscript. Only such a postulate justifies the practice of capitalization of the English noun "god" in NETS and many other English translations. Only such an argument would "cherry pick" bits from an older textual witness to fill voids in a younger one. Heated arguments about primary and secondary, original and variant, pluses and minuses in manuscripts, however cleverly disguised, make sense only against such a template.

My final reflections on the completion of the NETS Deuteronomy center squarely on this area. The careful work that I and others have done to produce NETS seems at times pointless in the face of traditional religious customs and habits. Where will NETS be used and who will accept its readings? Nowhere that really matters. The biblical canon is closed. It seems to me that the identification and deployment of powerful advocates for NETS as witness in its own right to the Hebrew Bible is an urgent desideratum and should be one of the outcomes and goals of this conference.

There are theistic and secular Septuagintalists. In the first category are mostly Jewish and Christian scholars. (I am unaware of any Muslims doing significant Septuagint research.) The former are concerned with preserving and maintaining a traditional "received text," hence the reverence for and defense of the text of L. The latter, including a number of colleagues in Europe these days, are in many instances increasingly preoccupied with finding theological echoes, motivations, messianic and eschatological allusions in the Septuagint translation to support a distinctly Christian agenda. Both types of Septuagint theists jointly support monotheism and Israelite exceptionalism.

But where does that leave secular Septuagintalists, whose primary interests may lie only in comparative linguistics, Classics, Greek literary history, ancient cultural studies, translation studies, and so forth, and for whom Septuagint studies is more like anthropology, the study of humans, or like science—the solving of puzzles? Is there room for such scholars, and what is an appropriate role for them? It seems to me that there ought to be room, and that theirs is a valuable and critical role. Indeed, Septuagint scholars without an expressed theological agenda are in the best position to advocate for the appreciation of the Septuagint as it stands, both among fellow theistic colleagues and also within influential theological circles. But that will require broad commitment to and acceptance by the majority of Septuagint scholars of the idea of multiple forms of Hebrew Scripture and multiple textual traditions. Concomitantly, it will require rethinking (or abandonment of) the notion of a single original text. Such ideas may not be compatible with the

presuppositions, objectives, and expectations of established believing communities, but if Septuagint studies as a field is to have sustained viability or relevance, it will have to move in this direction sooner or later.

5. Conclusion

Let me summarize. I have attempted, using the text of Greek Deuteronomy, to make and emphasize a few simple points, none of which should be surprising to anyone engaged seriously in the study of the Septuagint. Basic as they are, they often get drowned in the noise of textual studies and methodological disputes and occasionally need to be highlighted. The few examples I have cited could be multiplied by a factor of thousands. The "takeaway" from this paper that I hope to have made clear is this: the time has long past when selective use of the Septuagint by Bible translators and commentators is considered acceptable; Septuagint scholars are best situated to advocate against this practice. Hybridized translations like the NRSV with which NETS is aligned, do more harm than good in representing the state of ancient textual traditions, not just because they selectively include or exclude readings from the so-called versions at the translators' pleasure, but they are often targeted at religious and confessional expectations and communities. The NRSV's preoccupation with inclusive language, which thankfully NETS has sought to avoid, is a case in point. The main criticism I have heard of NETS thus far from graduate students, by the way, is that the editorial committee chose to base it on the NRSV. What seems to be needed as we move forward are not discrete scholarly translations and commentaries on various witnesses to the text of the Hebrew Scriptures in isolation from other texts, but a comprehensive evaluation and publication of all the available evidence in one place without privileging any single witness in deference to the concerns of religious communities. This will require massive collaborative efforts by international and interfaith communities, as well as scholars without stated faith commitments, and will certainly disrupt established norms and practices. I hope we will summon the courage to begin this effort. The Septuagint Institute at Trinity Western University and this conference might be the appropriate locus for this conversation to start.

The Elihu Speeches in the Greek Translation of Job

August H. Konkel

1. Introduction

Elihu has often been viewed negatively in the book of Job. In the seventh century, Gregory the Great, in his *Moralia in Iob*, characterized Elihu as a haughty presider under the pretense of being a faithful teacher.[1] Martin Luther made no reference to Elihu in his sermons or lectures, but in his *Table Talk* described him as an "empty gasbag."[2] In recent times, Edwin Good has referred to Elihu as a pompous, intensive bore and an opaque thinker who employs pretentious language that is often quite unintelligible.[3]

The book of Job has challenged all readers with its grandeur and mystery. As with great literature of this type, there is no adequate genre classification; usual conventions are transformed and transcended to meet artistic goals. This presents a great challenge to a translator, whose task is to represent the thoughts and creativity of the author. That challenge appears to have been addressed in some rather distinctive ways in the Old Greek (OG) translation of Job, which is significantly shorter than the Masoretic Text (MT)—especially in the Elihu section, where the Greek version is less than two-thirds the length of the Hebrew. As will be discussed below, these differences in the OG seem to be the result of the translator's approach to dealing with a Hebrew *Vorlage* that was substantially the same as the MT, rather than that he was working with a dissimilar Hebrew text. Such a significant reconfiguration understandably altered the effect of the original. Why did the translator treat the Elihu section in particular so radically? What were his methods

1. *S. Gregorii Magni Moralia in Iob* 3: *Libri XXIII–XXXV* (ed. Marci Adriaen; 3 vols.; CCSL 143B; Turnholt: Brepols, 1979–85), 23.4.

2. Martin Luther, *D. Martin Luthers Werke, Kritische Gesamtausgabe: Tischreden* (6 vols.; Weimar: H. Böhlau, 1912–21) 1:68.

3. Edwin M. Good, *In Turns of Tempest: A Reading of Job, with a Translation* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990), 321.

and what was their effect? These questions deserve scrutiny if the Greek version of Job is to be understood.

2. Elihu in the Book of Job

Elihu has not fared well in literary analysis. Critics have generally concluded that the section of the book that contains the Elihu speeches must be an addition. Elihu makes no appearance in the epilogue, his speeches interrupt the continuity between the dialogue involving Job and his friends and the response of God, and he contributes almost nothing to the content or movement of the book. Many believe that these speeches were composed by the same author who was responsible for the other poetic discourses that constitute the bulk of the book, and if it was not the same author it must have been someone who was not only acquainted with the content of those discourses but was also steeped in their thought patterns and modes of expression. David Noel Freedman has compiled dozens of parallels, allusions, and correlations between Elihu's speeches and the other discourses.[4] His explanation regarding the origin of the Elihu speeches is that they were originally separate compositions that the author intended to insert within the dialogue involving Job and his friends in order to refute or counterbalance Job's assertions. The author apparently did not realize the enormity of the task of adding this fourth character to the dialogue, or he abandoned it as unsatisfactory, but other copyists preserved his work by inserting the whole after the dialogue. Such literary observations about the close relationship between the dialogue and Elihu's speeches are very helpful, but explanations as to how the current layout of discourses came about remain completely speculative. Harald-Martin Wahl provides a review of studies in the "historical-critical" epoch,[5] but it cannot be said that any of these have led to a better understanding of the book of Job. It has been impossible to achieve a consensus regarding a more satisfactory arrangement of the book's contents, let alone provide an explanation for how it came into its present form.

Appreciating great literature is somewhat like appreciating great music. The progression of a piece is determined by certain patterns logical to the author and to the audience. An understanding of music history is an important aspect of enjoying music, because without it a great masterpiece may seem redundant, pretentious, and tedious. In the times of Gregory the Great and Martin Luther, there was little recognition of the original literary milieu of ancient authors, so to them Elihu seemed to be blustering words. The author of Job has shaped his profound and compelling poetry within the structure of a dialogue that includes

4. David Noel Freedman, "The Elihu Speeches in the Book of Job," *HTR* 61 (1968): 55–57.

5. Harald-Martin Wahl, *Der gerechte Schöpfer: Eine redaktions- und theologiegeschichtliche Untersuchung der Elihureden, Hiob 32–37* (BZAW 207; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1993), 8–23.

elements of a dispute or legal case. Job has demanded a hearing (9:3); he longs for an arbiter (9:32–34); and he wants a chance to defend himself directly before God (13:13–15). The dispute could not be complete without an arbiter, one who presides over the case and recommends a resolution to the problem. At the beginning of his speech, Elihu points out that there has been no arbiter who can mediate in the dispute that Job has with God (32:12). This seems to be the role that Elihu is intended to fill. His task is unlike that of the other disputants in this case, who have condemned Job (32:3). Though resolution might be impossible, there must be a viewpoint outside that of the litigants themselves.

The author of Job has creatively used traditional wisdom texts in shaping his book. The view in ancient Mesopotamia was that suffering was the legal sentence by the gods for a sin committed, whether that sin was known to the sufferer or not.[6] The sufferer was typically tried *in absentia,* and the conviction was often summary. The sufferer could petition the court for a post-penalty accounting of the crime, offer proof of innocence or confession, and request pardon if confession was appropriate. It was believed that such a procedure would bring both legal and physical relief to the sufferer. Disease, disability, and disaster were important aspects of divine law. The author of Job incorporated the worldview found in Mesopotamian ritual incantations, hymns, prayers, and wisdom texts. As a result the book of Job is rich with litigation metaphors. The Satan acts as a third party prosecutor, a role common in the ancient Near East, charging Job with having a proclivity to blasphemy. Job, for his part, believes he has a legitimate countersuit against God for abuse of judicial authority (Job 10:2–3).[7] Job, the friends, Elihu, and God all come to participate in the negotiations.

Job rejects the charge that God has convicted him of sin. He goes on the offensive, describing himself as a man of integrity who has not violated the regulations of the covenant, listing in various ways the stipulations named in the Decalogue (Job 31:1–40). Job does not directly address the possibility of the sin of blasphemy. F. Rachel Magdalene suggests that this is the role of Elihu.[8] Elihu accuses Job of blasphemy in his legal assault on God, as the Satan had first predicted. Job has accused God of taking away his rights (34:5), and so Elihu's assessment is that Job drinks sacrilege like water (v. 7). Elihu expands on God's justice, which treats all according to their deeds (vv. 11, 12). He asserts that Job deserves to be tested to the limit, as he continues to increase transgression (vv. 36–37). His wealth does not have power to save (36:17–21). The arbiter does have a case against Job not previously considered.

The author of Job has made extensive use of traditional legal materials in the accusations that Job suffers because he has been convicted of sin. Elihu as an

6. F. Rachel Magdalene, "The ANE Legal Origins of Impairment as Theological Disability and the Book of Job," *PRSt* 34 (2007): 37.

7. Ibid., 45.

8. Ibid., 53–54.

arbiter has the power of decision. He rejects the charges of the friends, while not absolving Job of his guilt. There are two disputes in the dialogue: one between Job and his friends and the other between Job and God. Both of these are set against the dispute in the councils of heaven between God and the Satan. In all of this, Job has been denied a fair hearing. False charges have been laid against him, most specifically by Eliphaz (Job 22:5–9), and he has been condemned. It is up to Elihu to be sure that Job receives an impartial trial in the light of the charges that he has lived as a tyrant in a position of power. Such arbitration is a natural part of the code of honor that Job maintains has been the rule of his life (ch. 31). As an arbiter in Job's case, Elihu must also deal with his charges against God, which is what the friends have failed to do.

It would seem presumptuous that anyone should speak for God against the wise, who also represent God. As observed by Norman C. Habel, the poet subtly portrays this arbiter as a brilliant young fool.[9] Eliphaz has protested that a wise man does not answer with wind (15:2), yet that is exactly what Elihu intends to do (32:17–20); he will uncork himself and let his words gust forth. In creating this pretentious modesty for Elihu, the author of Job again enforces the point that there is no intellectual solution to the problem of Job, which began in the councils of heaven. Human suffering in this world is always as mysterious as it was for Job.

3. Job in Greek Translation

Printed editions of the Greek translation of Job are distinguished by the marking of certain lines with an asterisk at the beginning and an obelus at the end. These markings retain for the reader an important aspect of the manuscript tradition of Job. The asterisked lines are rarely found in the Coptic (primarily the Sahidic) tradition and Vetus Latina (which is only fragmentarily attested); these sources have only the lines without asterisks. A small number of witnesses have the additional lines marked diacritically using the Aristarchian signs in a recognizable fashion.[10] These include a thirteenth-century minuscule from Rome (248) and a tenth-century minuscule from Florence (252), the Vulgate of Jerome, the Syro-Hexapla, and the Armenian version.[11] The majority of witnesses have the same text as those

9. Norman C. Habel, "The Role of Elihu in the Design of the Book of Job," in *In the Shelter of Elyon: Essays on Ancient Palestinian Life and Literature, In Honor of G.W. Ahlström* (ed. W. Boyd Barrick and John R. Spencer; JSOTSup 31; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984), 88–92.

10. On the appearance of the signs, see Claude E. Cox, *Hexaplaric Materials Preserved in the Armenian Version* (SBLSCS 21; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), 2; Henry Barclay Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (2nd ed.; rev. Richard Rusden Ottley; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1914), 69–72.

11. These manuscripts are described by Joseph Ziegler, *Iob* (Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum 11.4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982), 133–49.

with the marked lines but retain no formal distinction of the asterisked lines. This may be referred to as the Ecclesiastical Text,[12] since it is the version of Job used and transmitted by the Christian church. According to historical tradition, Origen inserted the asterisked lines into the OG text of Job to which he had access. Origen gives a brief description of his work in his commentary on Matthew, and specifically discusses the situation of Job in his letter to Africanus.[13] Origen apparently supplemented the missing lines from later Greek revisers or translators. Later patristic writers such as Jerome, as well as those who supplied notes in some of the Catena manuscripts and Syro-Hexapla, identified the added lines as derived in whole or in part from Theodotion.

The translation ascribed to Theodotion in antiquity has ancient roots that go back to the middle of the first century B.C.E., in manuscripts that contain a text type referred to as *kaige*.[14] The lines subsequently inserted into the book of Job appear to come from an independent translation rather than from a revision of the OG translation.[15] This translation is like that of the Greek Psalms and has similarities to the *kaige* text type. It can be characterized as a literal and straightforward translation of a parent text that was, for the most part, identical with the MT. As analyzed by Peter Gentry, the translation reflects the parent text with regard to both its content and the sequence in which the elements of that text are arranged.[16] There is a tendency to render particular terms in the Hebrew consistently by the same term in translation. The translator is concerned to align the Greek closely with the Hebrew but not with the formal and semantic consistency of Aquila's translation.

The approach to translation in OG Job is quite different from the literal, quantitative methodology exhibited in the asterisked lines. As is well known, Origen's recensional activity was largely quantitative in nature. His goal was to identify absent or additional materials in comparison to his text of the Hebrew. He was faced with difficulties in correlating the OG with the Hebrew in Job, especially when one characteristic of the OG was to summarize a couplet in the Hebrew with one stich in Greek. In attempting to supply what he considered to be missing from the OG, Origen frequently produced a text that is both redundant and unintelligible. In total, Gentry counts roughly sixty-six instances in which a stich from the OG and that of the revised text represent the same line in the MT.[17] This provides a considerable basis for comparison of the two translations.

---

12. This is the designation of Peter J. Gentry (*The Asterisked Materials in the Greek Job* [SBLSCS 38; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995], 2).

13. Gentry (*Greek Job,* 2–6) provides a discussion of these references.

14. Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 145.

15. Gentry, *Greek Job*, 418.

16. Ibid., 498.

17. Ibid., 385.

An anomalous situation exists in the Greek Job, one that Claude Cox describes as "disastrous," and "a veritable hodgepodge of two very different translations."[18] OG Job is a literary creation in its own right. The Ecclesiastical Text of Job is a mixture of translations that creates at times an incoherent composition. The lines restored from other translations disrupt the development and structure of the original translation, as amply illustrated by Cox in his study on the Elihu speeches.

The abbreviated sections in OG Job are not evenly distributed throughout the book. Only seven stichoi that are found in the MT are absent from the first eleven chapters of the OG. Chapters 12–14 of the OG are about 4 percent shorter; chs. 15–21 about 16 percent shorter; chs. 22–31 about 25 percent shorter; the speeches of Elihu 35 percent shorter; and the remainder of the book about 16 percent shorter.[19] Specifically, there are 123 lines of the MT's Elihu section lacking in the OG, out of a total of 389.5 missing lines in the entire book.[20] The original Greek translation must be studied as a coherent whole, apart from the Hexaplaric text as preserved in most of the manuscript tradition.

Harry Orlinsky has provided us with an erudite examination of OG Job in comparison with the MT.[21] His objective is to carry out a systematic analysis of the style of translation so that the results can be used to determine the differences between the Hebrew text of the translator and the MT. He offers many astute observations in individual instances, while acknowledging that there are "numerous occasions in the Book when it is difficult to decide whether the Septuagint represents a version or a commentary."[22] Homer Heater shows that the practices of the Greek translator go well beyond the matter of style. Often the translator interpolates material from some other part of the Septuagint, although usually from

---

18. Claude E. Cox, "Origen's Use of Theodotion in the Elihu Speeches," *SecCent* 3 (1983): 97.

19. These statistics are provided by Édouard Dhorme, *A Commentary on the Book of Job* (trans. Harold Knight; 1967; repr., Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1984), ccii–cciii. They are described as "roughly estimated" in S. R. Driver and G. B. Gray, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Job* (2 vols.; ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1921), lxxv.

20. The numbers follow the enumeration of Gentry. Ziegler actually has a discrepancy between the number of asterisked lines given in his *Einleitung* and the reproduction of the text.

21. In a series of articles in the *Hebrew Union College Annual* entitled "Studies in the Septuagint of the Book of Job," Harry M. Orlinsky examined the entire text of Job for translation technique, use of anthropomorphisms and euphemisms, and variations of text and script: 28 (1957): 53–74; 29 (1958): 229–71; 30 (1959): 153–67; 32 (1961): 239–68; 33 (1962): 119–51; 35 (1964): 57–78; 36 (1965): 37–47.

22. See *HUCA* 29 (1958): 229–30. Orlinsky maintains that the translator did not delete phrases or sections of Job: "A translator who reproduced anthropomorphisms, anthropopathisms, charges against God, absence of belief in afterlife, and the like, and who made every effort to understand and translate difficult words and phrases instead of passing over them in silence, should have been treated with greater respect than that – unless and until the charges had been proved" ("The Septuagint as Holy Writ and the Philosophy of the Translators," *HUCA* 46 [1975]: 112–13).

within Job itself, into a passage with which he is working.[23] Heater refers to this technique as "anaphoric translation." Not only is the translator willing to abridge the Hebrew, but he is also willing to modify his translation by bringing in other passages of Scripture that are more in keeping with his concept of the direction of the passage.[24] His paraphrastic approach and generous manipulation of the text have led to considerable reinterpretation. This is notably true in the case of Elihu, with the result that the function of speeches in the Greek version is substantially modified in comparison to their role in the Hebrew, as will be shown below.

Édouard Dhorme believes that the author of this version of Job was an Alexandrian Hellenist writing for a wide circle of readers, and not for the synagogue.[25] He observes that there is no case for the hypothesis that "the Septuagint version was produced on the basis of an original Hebrew text, of which the present text is only an amplification."[26] There are not only paraphrases and explanations but also theological speculations, substitutions of various sorts (e.g., common nouns for proper nouns, singular and plural interchanges, etc.), errors, wrong clause divisions, redundancies, and omissions. The Greek translator created his own version of the speech of Elihu through his translation methods. A comparison of the Greek with the MT will reveal the effect this has had on the book and will provide occasion to review again the possible reasons for the procedures of the translator.

4. Elihu the Arbiter (32:1–33:13)

Elihu the intruder is introduced with an elaborate Hebrew family pedigree: "Elihu son of Barachel the Buzite, of the family of Ram" (32:2). Unlike the names of the three friends, which are Edomite in their connections, most of the names in Elihu's lineage seem to be Hebrew in origin. Ram is one of the ancestors of David (Ruth 4:19; 1 Chr 2:9, 25). Buz is the brother of Uz, a nephew of Abraham (Gen 22:21). In business documents of the Persian period, several people from the Murashu family in the reign of Artaxerxes I are named Barachel.[27] The semantic content of these names in their Hebrew form may be of some significance. Barachel means either "bless God" or "God has blessed"; Ram means "exalted"; and Buz means "scorn" or "contempt." This may provide a context within which to introduce Elihu the intruder, scornful of his elders and conscious of his noble role as the defender of God. The etymological significance of the names is obviously not preserved in the Greek translation, but the geographical and genealogi-

---

23. Homer Heater, *A Septuagint Translation Technique in the Book of Job* (CBQMS 11; Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1982), 6.

24. Ibid., 131.

25. Dhorme, *Book of Job*, cxcvi.

26. Ibid., cciii.

27. See *The Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania* (series A, vol. 9; ed. H. V. Hilprecht; Philadelphia: Department of Archaeology, University of Pennsylvania, 1898), 52.

cal identification is developed. Ram is said to come from the region of Αὐσίτις, the OG manner of rendering Uz (עוץ) found in Job 1:1. In the appendix to Greek Job (Iob 42:17a-e), Αὐσίτις is said to be "on the borders of Idumea and Arabia" (42:17bα). With the transition from Persian to Hellenistic domination in the fourth century B.C.E., Edomite territory was transformed into the politically cohesive entity called Idumea. The southern border of Idumea seems to have been guarded by a series of fortified towns. Among them was Ḥorvat ʿUza (עוזה) located south of Arad on the border of Idumea and Nabatea between Malatha and Zoar.[28] It appears that the Greek translator, working about 150 B.C.E., identified the land of Αὐσίτις with the Idumean fortress known to him by that name. The Greek translator supplied a geographical location for Elihu in accordance with his own geographical knowledge. The appendix identifies Job with Jobab, one of the kings of Edom (Gen 36:33; cf. Iob 42:17d).[29] The translator was interested in genealogical and geographical information concerning Elihu, which is consistent with that provided for Job.

The first place in the Greek version of the Elihu section where an abbreviation vis-à-vis the Hebrew occurs is in 32:4b–5. One of the tendencies of the shorter Greek translation is to condense two stichs into one while preserving information from each of the original Hebrew components.[30] In this case the translation of v. 4a is a paraphrase of a difficult line:

ואליהו חכה את איוב בדברים
Ἐλιοῦς δὲ ὑπέμεινεν δοῦναι ἀπόκρισιν Ἰώβ

Emending בדברים to בדברם would yield the translation, "First Elihu waited with Job for them to speak."[31] The Greek can be translated, "Yet Elious waited to give an answer to Job" (NETS). The Greek does not have the line that explains that the other dialogue partners were older than Elihu (v. 4b), though that point is made later when Elihu speaks (v. 6b). The Greek also lacks v. 5, which states that the three could not answer and restates that Elihu was angry. The translator may have considered this introductory material in vv. 4b–5 to be redundant, as Elihu explains his reticence to enter into the conversation when he begins to speak.

In the Hebrew poem that follows, Elihu introduces himself in a reluctant manner (32:6–22), saying almost nothing at all and finding it necessary to repeat himself several times. In spite of the caricature created in this "seemingly windy

28. Annette Yoshiko Reed, "Job as Jobab: The Interpretation of Job in LXX Job 42:17b-e," *JBL* 120 (2001): 44–48.

29. The date of the appendix cannot be determined, but it is thoroughly consistent with the translation of the book (Reed, "Job as Jobab," 33–40). It may have been a later addition to the translation, like the speech of Job's wife (2:9a–e).

30. Heater, *Septuagint Translation Technique*, 2–3.

31. Robert Gordis, *The Book of Job: Commentary, New Translation, and Special Studies* (Moreshet Series 2; New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1978), 367.

chapter about windy words,"[32] a formal structure is evident. Elihu speaks of sharing his knowledge three times: מחות דעי (v. 6); אחוה דעי (vv. 10, 17). The poem accordingly is divisible into three stanzas based on the repetition of Elihu's assertion that he will speak (vv. 6–10, 11–16, 17–22). The Greek renders this repetition as ἀναγγεῖλαι τὴν ἐμαυτοῦ ἐπιστήμην in v. 6, and as ἀναγγελῶ ὑμῖν ἃ οἶδα in v. 10. In v. 17, however, the Greek counterpart to אחוה דעי אף־אני is λέγει Πάλιν λαλήσω, which serves as an introduction to v. 18. It will be noticed that the stanza divisions of the Hebrew for these three units of text are not followed in the Greek, and that a substantial portion of the middle stanza (vv. 12, 15–16) is lacking in that version. It is in the middle stanza of the Hebrew version in particular that the need for an arbiter like Elihu is established, because the friends have been unable to provide a satisfactory response to Job's complaint against God.

In the full poem, Elihu first affirms that those older and more experienced than he should speak, but he goes on to say that all have understanding and the older are not always wiser (vv. 6–9). Elihu therefore must speak (vv. 10–16); he will act as an arbiter (מוכיח) in the dispute that Job has with God (v. 12) because the older friends have nothing more to say. Elihu has waited (v. 11) for them to give an answer and then waited some more (v. 16) after they have fallen silent. Elihu decides that he must answer (v. 17) and now does answer by giving vent to his thoughts (v. 20). The three stanzas are introduced with the announcement that Elihu will speak his mind (v. 6), and conclude by saying that he will not flatter anyone (vv. 21–22). The poem is a formal rhetorical exercise introducing an ostensibly reticent individual who has something he must say in spite of his youth and inadequacy. Elihu dares to speak because of the utter failure of the friends to answer Job, though they have condemned him. There is no arbiter for Job; none of the friends has answered his arguments (32:3, 12); and there is no one who has responded to him fairly. The friends have given up speaking to Job, saying that God must rebuff him (32:13). Elihu appears to be responding to Job's earlier wish for one who could act as an arbiter (מוכיח) between him and God (9:33). Elihu uses the same term, recognizing that no one has responded to his case. The Greek translator does not, however, portray Elihu as an arbiter who will intervene in this dispute. The material in vv. 11b–12 of the MT is lacking, and v. 13 is significantly different. In the OG, Elihu exhorts the friends to listen to his words lest they say, "We discovered wisdom, and contributed it (προστιθέναι) to the Lord" (v. 13).[33] The translation of v. 13 appears to have been influenced by the rendering of an earlier passage. In the Hebrew text of 13:9, Job warns his friends by asking, "Would it be good if God should examine you? Will you trifle with him as one trifles with a man?" In the Greek of 13:9–10a, Job tells his friends, "It would indeed be good, if [God] traced your footsteps; for if, in doing everything you can, you will join

32. Patrick W. Skehan, "'I Will Speak Up!' (Job 32)," *CBQ* 31 (1969): 380.

33. Heater, *Septuagint Translation Technique*, 97. Translations of the Greek in this article are taken from NETS.

yourselves [προστιθέναι] to him, he will convict you nonetheless." This free rendering appears to have influenced 32:13; the friends are cautioned against thinking that they have seen Job from God's viewpoint.[34] The Hebrew of v. 13 warns the friends against thinking they have wisdom, since none of them can answer Job (v. 12). Elihu will answer as an arbiter (מוכיח).

Elihu speaks as one who has received true knowledge of God (32:8); his words are pure and his knowledge genuine (33:3). The Hebrew in 33:4 emphasizes that Elihu should not be a threat to Job, since both have been created equal by God. In the OG, Elihu claims to have been taught by the Almighty (33:4). This may be a case of reading a different text, as argued by Orlinsky,[35] especially since the verb חיה ("give life") might readily be confused with the verb to חוה ("teach"). Though Elihu is young, he has the right to speak since he also possesses the intelligence that God has given mortals, and he has true knowledge. While the shorter Greek version lacks the reference to an arbiter who could speak fairly on Job's behalf, it does present Elihu as one qualified by God to address Job's complaint.

The OG also lacks the material in the MT of 32:15–16 and has a truncated version of v. 17, providing a different transition to v. 18 as noted above. This somewhat alters the construction of the poetic rhetoric, since the reference to Elihu's knowledge is missing from v. 17 (cf. vv. 6c, 10), but that does not otherwise change the effect of the introduction.

The Greek follows the Hebrew as Elihu goes on to address three claims that Job has made in his hearing (33:9–13): he has insisted that he is pure (v. 9), that God has found fault and treated him like an enemy (vv. 10–11), and that God does not answer human questions (vv. 12–13). Elihu takes these issues up in reverse order. He first shows that God does speak in various ways (33:14–33), then explains that God does bring about justice (34:1–37), and finally declares that it is pride that keeps people from God (35:1–16). The Greek retains intact the critical introduction of the chapters to follow. It lacks the first line in the strophe introducing the words of Job (33:8), but it is made clear nonetheless that these are Job's words.

5. Words of Correction (33:14–33)

In the MT, Elihu states that God communicates in three ways to people in order to rescue their lives from death. The first two are ordinary: God speaks through dreams (vv. 14–18) and through illness (vv. 19–22). The third means is supernatural: the agent is a divine messenger who intervenes and saves guilty persons from the punishment of the grave (vv. 23–24) so that their health is restored and they are saved from death (vv. 25–28). These three things (v. 29) God does continually

---

34. For the Hebrew translation and the suggested association by the translator, see Heater, *Septuagint Translation Technique*, 97–98.

35. Orlinsky, "Studies in the Septuagint," *HUCA* 36 (1965): 46–47.

to spare people from "the pit" (v. 30). There are five references to the grave or the pit in this section, as Elihu explains the ways in which God responds to suffering. These references occur after the mention of dreams (v. 18), illness (v. 22), and the warning messenger (v. 24), as well as following the description of the healing of the supplicant (v. 28) and in the concluding statement regarding God's redemptive activity (v. 30). In vv. 31–33 Elihu challenges Job to answer him if he can, returning to the theme with which he began (vv. 1–7).

The OG of this section lacks the MT's vv. 19b, 20b, 28–29, and 31b–33. The MT's parallelism in vv. 19–20 on the subject of illness is not reflected, as the second stich in each case has no counterpart in the Greek. The description of God's redemption of the supplicant in the MT's vv. 28–29 is not found in the OG, but that theme is picked up in v. 30. The absence from the Greek version of the injunctions to Job to respond if he can but otherwise to keep silent (MT vv. 31b–33) means that a sentiment expressed earlier in 33:5 is not repeated here.

Perhaps the most significant difference between the OG and the MT in this section has to do not with the shorter text of the former but with the identity of the מלאך/ἄγγελοι referred to in v. 23. The ἄγγελοι θανατηφόροι ("death-bearing angels") seem to be linked with ממתים ("those who bring death" NRSV) who are mentioned in v. 22, though it should be noted that the Greek counterpart to לממתים is ἐν ᾅδῃ ("in Hades"). The Greek translator understands the angels to be agents of death who will not be permitted to harm the one who turns to God. The translator has taken considerable liberties with the text in vv. 22–27 and has imported material from a number of other locations in Job.[36] The Hebrew portrays the work of the mediator positively, that is, to declare that a person is upright (v. 23c). The Greek translator, however, speaks not of a mediator but of emissaries of death, and it is the individual with whom God is dealing who purposes "to turn to the Lord and declare to a person his own fault and reveal his folly."[37] The Lord supports such an individual so that he will not perish (v. 24). Though there is considerable reworking of the passage in the OG, the primary difference in comparison with the Hebrew has to do with angelic participation in all of this. In both versions, however, the sufferer is delivered from death.

6. The Work of Justice (34:1–37)

The second charge that Job makes (cf. 33:10–11) is that God has unjustly faulted him and made him an enemy. Job has earlier declared that God regards him as an enemy, has laid grievous charges against him, has indicted him for the sins of his

36. Heater (*Septuagint Translation Technique*, 101–7) provides a detailed analysis of the translation procedure in these verses.

37. The first Hebrew verb of 33:24a (חנן *qal*: "show favor") is translated as though it is from חוה in the *pi'el* ("announce").

youth, and has imprisoned him in stocks (13:24–27). Before taking up that charge, Elihu affirms that he has wisdom to impart (34:2–4) and asserts that Job has gone the way of the sinner (34:5–9) in making his charges against God.

In the Hebrew version, Elihu begins with a wisdom proverb in v. 3: "the ear tests words as the palate tastes food" (NRSV). Job has quoted this proverb earlier (12:11); it appears to have been a common saying. Wisdom is gained through analogies with observable phenomena. Just as good food is judged through the sense of taste, so truth is discerned through the sense of hearing. The senses are channels through which we come to know the order of the world. Job has quoted this proverb as part of a series of wisdom sayings in order to challenge the usual assertions of wisdom. Conventional wisdom asserted that wisdom belongs to the aged (12:12) who have heard its truths from the previous generations. Job has argued that there is a disorder in society (12:14–25) that such traditional wisdom does not acknowledge or understand. Elihu returns to an appeal to this conventional wisdom (34:3–4). In his challenge to traditional wisdom, Job has presented a view of the world that envisages a form of anarchy: the wise, the rulers, and the priests (12:17–19) are all robbed of their ability to fulfill their respective roles. Job considers himself to be a casualty of the anarchy that comes with the violation of good order. Elihu will take up this charge of anarchy and Job's assertion that the governance of God can be considered perverse.

Job has portrayed himself as a victim of a breakdown in social order because he knows that he is innocent (34:5) and that God has robbed him of justice (מִשְׁפָּט). God has taken away his rightful place in society. The words "Job has said" (v. 5) introduce a quotation from his concluding complaint that the Almighty has removed justice from him (cf. 27:2) and has made his life bitter. Job has said that his protest of innocence (מִשְׁפָּט) has led only to his being branded a liar (34:6). His version of things is that God has assailed him with arrows of pain that have shot through his body (cf. 6:4; 16:13–14) for which there is no reason and no relief. Elihu wonders what kind of man could make such assertions (v. 7). When Eliphaz describes Job's vision of the relationship between humans and God (15:14–16), he says that humans "drink iniquity like water" (15:16). Elihu apparently does not think much of the vision or of Job's ideas. He says that Job drinks sacrilege like water (34:7) and implies that Job has no respect for the justice and dignity of God. Job is traveling the way of the sinner (34:8), the very path that the wise warn against (Ps 1:1, 6). The wise have said that those who follow God's ways will be blessed (Ps 1:2–3), but Job has said that there is no particular benefit to piety (34:9). Job has made this point at various times (cf. 9:22; 10:3), but most specifically in talking about the way the wicked escape punishment (cf. 21:7, 15). Eliphaz has responded by saying that humans cannot benefit God (22:2) but that they can most certainly benefit themselves if they will follow God's ways (22:21–22). Elihu intends to make his own case against assertions that disorder and chaos characterize the way that God governs his world.

The Greek version lacks vv. 3–4 and 7 of this introduction (34:1–9) with their vital connections to what has been said earlier. Verses 3 and 7 contain proverbial and metaphorical sayings, which may have led to their omission. If so, then the omission of v. 4 was deliberate, with the result that the call to hear (v. 2) was joined to Job's claims (v. 5).[38] Without the proverb on receiving wisdom (v. 3) there is no connection to Job's protest against injustice in ch. 12.[39] The absence of the saying regarding drinking iniquity like water (v. 7) loses the link to the key question of the dialogue (15:14–16), through which Job challenges the traditional views of justice. The Greek translation of vv. 6 and 8 is quite different from the Hebrew version. The MT of v. 6a may be a *tiqqun sopherim* to protect the name of God.[40] Rather than saying something like "I am made a liar," the Greek says, "the Lord dismissed my case and played false in my judgment" (vv. 5b–6). The last half of v. 6 is incorporated into v. 8, which continues the thought of v. 6: God has falsely condemned Job though he has not sinned or acted wickedly.[41] The translator has further paraphrased v. 9. Apparently he has not understood the verb סכן ("benefit") that is used by Eliphaz and repeated by Elihu.[42] Instead the translator's equivalent is ἔσται ἐπισκοπή, so as to say that a man will have a visitation (provision) from the Lord.

The Greek provides a significant reinterpretation of vv. 6–9. The lines added in the Ecclesiastical Text (vv. 6b–7) create confusion. The OG begins with the complaint that God has falsely accused Job (v. 6a). Part of v. 6 is carried over to v. 8, where Job says that he has not acted wickedly, nor has he kept company with ungodly people. The form of v. 8 is the converse of the MT, in which Elihu claims that Job shares the way of sinners. The argument is not actually changed; Job declares that he is innocent, whereas Elihu says that he should not be presumptuous in assuming that piety does not matter. More significantly, the introductory section (vv. 2–9) loses the connection to the earlier argument with Eliphaz,[43] where Job rejects traditional wisdom (ch. 15) and defies God instead of receiving benefit (ch. 22).

---

38. Claude E. Cox, "Elihu's Second Speech according to the Septuagint," in *Studies in the Book of Job* (ed. Walter E. Aufrecht; Studies in Religion Supplement 16; Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1985), 40–41.

39. The translator does retain a protest of innocence in joining v. 6 with v. 8.

40. Carmel McCarthy, *The Tiqqune Sopherim and Other Theological Corrections in the Masoretic Text of the Old Testament* (OBO 36; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981), 209–11.

41. Heater (*Septuagint Translation Technique*, 108) cites this as another example of an "anaphoric translation," incorporating the translation of Job's protest of innocence from 33:9a and drawing on Job's protest of innocence in 10:7a.

42. Ibid., 109.

43. It should be observed that the translator very faithfully retained references to earlier words of Job in the introduction to Elihu's response (cf. 33:9–12). Perhaps, as Cox suggests, the omission of proverbial sayings led to the loss of connection.

In the Hebrew of 34:10–33, Elihu provides a defense of divine justice. Job has said that the way God governs the world is unfair, because the wicked prosper without suffering (21:7–13). He has found the arguments of wisdom against this state of affairs to be hollow and without substance (21:17–33). He has further said that God has mistreated him personally, removing justice (27:2) and twisting (עות) what is right for him (19:6). Bildad has asserted that God cannot be accused of twisting (עות) justice (8:3), and Elihu begins with that same affirmation (34:12). The mysteries of life must be based on certain unshakable premises. One of the unquestioned attributes of God must be that he is good and just. Job has challenged how this can be seen to be true, so Elihu begins by establishing the foundation of that truth (vv. 10–15). God is the creator of the world who upholds it constantly in his care (vv. 13). If God should withdraw his constant provision for his world, everything would die (vv. 14–15). God is certainly not going to do wrong in the world that he has created and continuously sustains. People whom God has created do wrong (v. 11), and those who violate the order that God has established in his creation will find that punishment comes to them, for they impede the work that God is constantly performing to sustain life in creation. To this point the wisdom argument has advanced little. This is the very mystery to which Job has referred (10:3–7). How could God take pleasure in afflicting the work of his own hands? Elihu has only laid down the first premise of his argument about the justice of God in his rule of the world.

The Greek translation goes its own way in establishing the point that the creator of the world will not pervert justice (vv. 10–15). Elihu first declares that he will not act impiously or pervert what is right (v. 10). The phrase ταράξαι τὸ δίκαιον (v. 10c) is not dealing with מעול but is supplied by passages where ταράσσειν is used for עות (cf. v. 12b).[44] With this rendering, the translator makes Elihu the subject of the verse. The declaration that God does not do wrong (v. 10) is turned into a personal defense of Elihu in the spirit of his earlier claim (32:21–22). Elihu speaks truly about God (v. 12); the intelligent of heart cannot suppose that the Lord will do what is amiss or that the Almighty will pervert justice.

In the Hebrew, Elihu goes on to appeal again for the attention of the wise in his defense of God's justice (v. 16). There is a further premise that cannot be questioned: God does not show favoritism to anyone (v. 19), for all are the work of his hands. It is inconceivable that one who hates justice could rule (v. 17a). Would Job condemn the one who is both just and strong? God calls the most powerful king a scoundrel and he calls the nobleman a villain (v. 18), no matter what their influence and prestige. If God governs this world with impartiality and without compromise, it is evident that we must be careful what we say about the leaders of this world. God could not govern if he were unjust, for then he would violate the prin-

---

44. Heater, *Septuagint Translation Technique*, 110. This is an "inner Job" translation. Nowhere else is עות translated by ταράσσειν as it is three times in Job (8:3; 19:6; 34:12).

ciple of impartiality, which is the very essence of how he deals with rich and poor (v. 19). It is blasphemous and irrational to accuse the creator of being an unjust judge. Since equity is God's design for mortals, it is obvious that he will demand the same standard of all other rulers. If rulers violate the law of the created order, then they will be swept away in judgment themselves (v. 20). The people (עם) referred to in v. 20b are those who exercise power, much like those to whom Job has said "you are the people" (12:2) when addressing those who consider themselves exceptionally wise. Nothing these people do will escape God's notice. Since God is constantly at work sustaining the world, he sees every step that everyone takes (v. 21). There is no hiding place from divine scrutiny (v. 22), not even death. The thick darkness described as the "shadow of death" is a reference to the place of the dead.

The Greek of vv. 16–22 is shorter only with respect to v. 18b, but the passage involves a reinterpretation of the Hebrew. The Hebrew emphasizes the impartiality of God in dealing with humans, while the Greek warns that those who dishonor and wrong others will not escape God's notice. Elihu first exhorts Job to consider the eternally righteous one who hates the lawless and destroys evil people (v. 17). The ungodly call kings lawless (v. 18a) and lack humility before prominent people; they do not know how to show respect (v. 19). Crying and pleading will not avail those who lawlessly take advantage of the powerless (v. 20). The Greek implies that Job is guilty of the same sins that these leaders have committed.[45] Both the Greek and the Hebrew conclude by observing that everything is under God's scrutiny (vv. 21–22), though the Greek makes no reference to the darkness of death.

In the Hebrew text, Elihu now moves to closure in his argument about justice (34:23–28). Job has complained that the day of reckoning does not come (24:1). In the end the wicked get away with everything they do (21:19, 30–33), living luxurious lives and having grand funerals. If one accepts the proposal that in 34:23 עוד is an error for מעוד (i.e., resulting from haplography of מ in the phrase ישׂים מעוד),[46] one could conclude that Elihu is accusing Job of asking for too much in thinking that he should be the one to set the times of judgment. In demanding to see such a day of judgment, Job is setting a limit on how God rules his world. God cares about the poor and the needy; their cry is a harsh grinding in his ears (34:28). Those who have caused the poor to cry out in this way have placed themselves under judgment. There is no limit to God's might; he will crush the most powerful rulers who have acted in such a harsh manner (vv. 24–26). Powerful leaders especially need to be careful to act with justice because this is the way of God (v. 27). This is true for God, and it is true for all who represent his rule in his world. Job

45. Heater (*Septuagint Translation Technique,* 112) points out that the added phrases are drawn from Eliphaz's second discourse, where he comments on the woes of the wicked (15:31, 35), and from Job's lament that God does not deter the wicked (24:4a).

46. See the apparatus of *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (5th ed.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1997).

has challenged this because he thinks he should be able to determine when this judgment takes place.

The OG of v. 23 is: ὁ γὰρ κύριος πάντας ἐφορᾷ. It is difficult to account for this rendering, though the translator may have drawn on Job 28:24–25 since these verses speak of God seeing everything under the whole heaven.[47] The line in the Ecclesiastical Text of 34:23 that precedes the one cited above (ὅτι οὐκ ἐπ' ἄνδρα θήσει ἔτι) was likely inserted to remedy a perceived deficiency in the OG occasioned by the translator's condensing two stichs into one. The Greek in v. 24 makes no reference to the ruin of the mighty, but instead speaks of God's grasp of the unsearchable, following the thought of 9:10 (which in itself is Job's response to Eliphaz in 5:9). No reference is made either to the time of judgment, the pivotal argument in Elihu's conclusion in understanding the justice of God. Elihu goes on to describe God's public destruction of the wicked (i.e., the rich) who do not understand God ways (vv. 26–27), but the OG lacks v. 28 with its reference to judgment of the mighty being God's answer to the cry of the poor who have been wronged.

Returning to the Hebrew, one observers that Elihu concludes his argument about God's governance of the world with a very strong statement about humans not having the authority to determine when and how this judgment of earthly powers will take place (vv. 29–33). When God grants peace (v. 29), there will be no trouble, but there are also those times when God hides his face, when his light does not shine. At such times the wicked may rule over a nation and over all its people (v. 30).[48] He may allow the godless to rule because of the evil of the people in a nation. When that happens, these wicked rulers should repent (v. 31). This is at least one interpretation of Elihu's argument.[49] Elihu is saying that in God's system of justice we get the kind of government we deserve. Elihu may be insinuating that Job has been an evil ruler, that he has been deposed from such a position of authority, but that he should know there is still hope for him (v. 32). God will show the wicked what they do not know if they will let him, and their wickedness will cease. The one thing no one can ever do is decide the standard and the time when God metes out his justice (v. 33). A mortal who rejects the manner of God's judgment does not stand in a position to determine what that judgment

47. Heater, *Septuagint Translation Technique*, 113.

48. Gordis, *The Book of Job*, 392–93. ממלך should be vocalized as a *hip'il* to say that God allows a godless person to rule because of the sins of the people. This explains the result of God hiding his face (v. 29b).

49. Wahl (*Der gerechte Schöpfer*, 89–90) follows Georg Fohrer and others in making God the subject. Should God say to you, "I have erred, but I will do wrong no longer"? Job has charged God with wrong. Is it reasonable to think that the creator should be judged by the creature? This interpretation is a speculative emendation of the text, but it has the advantage of clarifying the subject of the next verses as a development of Elihu's argument against Job. According to Job, humans teach God what he does not see and stop the wrong he is doing (v. 32), and they decide on proper retribution (v. 33), either accepting or rejecting it.

should be. The time and manner of judgment remain solely within God's purview. Elihu comes to the inescapable conclusion of his argument with the words "if you refuse" (כי־מאסת; v. 33). These words are somewhat enigmatic, but in this context it should be expected that they apply to Job. Job has used this verb on two previous occasions (7:16; 9:21) to say that he will not accept his life as it is in the present. Unlike the friends, Elihu never condemns Job for particular transgressions. He does say that Job is wrong in thinking that he can pass judgment on what is right for his life. No one can determine when and how the judgment of God should come, and that is also true for Job and for his own situation. Job has no right to reject his life as he did in his opening speech (ch. 3) and in his later statements. How could mortals begin to have such a presumption about judgment? How could one person reject or choose the time of judgment over another? If mortals are in no position to decide such ordinary matters as when, where, and by what amount the rain should fall, how much less are they in a position to declare the weighty matters of life and death. If Job knows something about this, then now is the time to speak up (v. 33). Elihu does not think for a minute that Job can have anything to say about this argument.

Verses 29–33 are very difficult in the Hebrew. G. B. Gray justly says that these verses are "as a whole unintelligible, the details being . . . very ambiguous, and the ambiguities, in the face of the extreme uncertainty of the remainder, insoluble."[50] They are omitted completely in the Greek, possibly for that very reason.[51] The climax of the argument in Greek is that God will extinguish the wicked (v. 26), with no reference to the right of mortals to decide the times of judgment, and in particular to the demand of Job that he have the right of refusal if his life is unjust.

Elihu concludes (34:34–37) with the assertion that the truth of his words will be recognized by the wise and that Job should be fully tested for adding to his transgressions with his words. The OG is not shorter in these verses, but vv. 36–37 become an appeal to Job to learn in order that he may not be the instigator of sin. It is likely that the translator read בין ("understand, learn") for בחן ("try or test").[52] The perspective in the Hebrew is that Job deserves his discipline, while the Greek implores Job to change lest he cause others to sin.

7. The Watcher of Humankind (35:1–16)

Elihu turns to Job's final claim that he is righteous before God. He is convinced that he has something to say to both Job and the friends (v. 4) concerning the relationship of God with mortals. He does not like the stance that Job has taken concerning his own righteousness (v. 2), but he is not happy with the assertion of

50. Driver and Gray, *Book of Job*, 1:300.

51. Cox, "Elihu's Second Speech," 46.

52. Dhorme, *Book of Job*, 527.

Eliphaz that the benefit (סכן) to being righteous is that it will bring prosperity and blessing (22:2, 21). For Elihu, the retribution principle does not explain the divine relationship with mortals. Job has taken this to an extreme in his assertion that there is no difference in outcome for being righteous or evil because God treats people all the same in the end (9:22–24). What does it benefit him (סכן) if he does not sin (35:3)? Elihu responds by saying that our acts do not affect God, but they do affect others like ourselves (vv. 7–8). Humans cry out because of their pain (v. 9), but it never leads them to turn to God. It is wrong to think that God does not listen to them or see their plight (v. 13). The problem is their pride (v. 12). People need to wait for the justice of God (v. 14). God is very concerned about sin (v. 15).[53] Mortals are taught to know more than the animals (v. 11), but this does not mean that they can displace their creator in determining justice for themselves. Job has spoken in vain (v. 16) in making his claims that God is unjust when he does not immediately intervene when the innocent suffer (e.g., 24:2–11). God is watching over mortals all the time, but their pride prevents them from turning to him and recognizing his ways.

The OG lacks entirely the argument of Elihu in the Hebrew, which declares that justice need not involve immediate retribution. In the MT, Elihu rejects the argument of Eliphaz that righteousness will benefit the individual, and also the argument of Job that there is no benefit to righteousness. The translator has trouble with the word סכן ("benefit");[54] he reinterprets v. 3 to ask, "What am I to do, if I sinned?"[55] He then goes on to point out that Job can do nothing about his sin (v. 6) and can contribute nothing to God by his righteousness (v. 7a[6c]). There is no reference to the cry of the oppressed, as vv. 7b–10a and 12a are not represented in the OG. What follows beginning in v. 10b is a doxology to the one who grants watches in the night and sets one apart from the animals and from the insolence of those who are evil. Verses 13–14 are reinterpreted to say that God does not wish to see wrongs; the Almighty is the one who sees all those who perform lawless acts, and he will save. Job is exhorted to consider this before God and to praise God as he is if he is able.[56] The Hebrew does emphasize the majesty of God, which is unaffected by human conduct, and exhorts mortals to turn to their creator, but it does not have anything like a doxology. The omissions of the OG remove the argument that justice may be delayed, but God remains well aware of transgression (v. 15). The chapter ends with the exhortation for Job to "submit to judgment before [God]" (v. 14), if Job "can approve of him as he is."

---

53. Reading the asseverative לו rather than the negative לא.

54. Heater (*Septuagint Translation Technique*, 109) notes that there are six occurrences of סכן in Job, but it is never translated correctly.

55. Heater (*Septuagint Translation Technique*, 115) suggests that the translator drew on 34:8a; 35:6; and 7:20a for assistance in this verse.

56. It appears that the translator read הלל ("praise" = αἰνεῖν) in v. 14 rather than חיל ("wait").

8. Lessons of Justice (36:1–37:24)

Elihu concludes his teaching on justice by developing his thoughts on the corrective power of suffering (36:5–15) and applying it to Job in particular (vv. 16–21). He begins by asserting again that his teaching is correct and his knowledge extensive (vv. 2–4). He affirms without qualification God's care for the poor (vv. 5–7), who will be eternally exalted, and emphasizes that if they come into bondage it is not to be construed as punishment but should be understood in terms of God getting their attention for correction (vv. 8–10). There are only two responses to divine discipline (vv. 11–12). If the response is obedience, the result will be prosperity, but refusal to obey will result in the punishment of death (vv. 13–14). Adversity is good for the poor because it draws them to God and to his deliverance (v. 15). In the past God has been gracious to Job, giving him a life of prosperity and opportunity (v. 16). Job has not used this opportunity to seek justice for the poor (v. 17).[57] Job must beware (v. 18)[58] lest he be seduced by his wealth and think that it has the power to save him. Wealth (שׁוע) will not avail in time of trouble (v. 19),[59] nor will grasping for power. Job is in danger of great error (v. 21). Rather than embracing the correction of suffering, he has turned to the way of wrong and is in danger of suffering the punishment of death. Elihu leaves Job with a word of correction and with a warning as he concludes this section of discourse.

The Hebrew poetry of 36:16–21 is particularly difficult. Among modern translations, the New American Bible omits vv. 16–19 entirely. Consistent with the previous chapter, the OG goes its own way with a description of justice as the dispensing of reward and punishment (vv. 17–18), omitting entirely the presentation of a case for suffering as a means of correction as described in vv. 8–9 of the MT. Heater treats vv. 5–17 as a unit "because they represent a collocation of selected Hebrew phrases not observed to this extent in the Book of Job."[60] Verse 5 has an ellipsis inasmuch as there is no object for the verb מאס ("refuse"), something that occurs regularly in Job (cf. 7:16; 34:33; 42:6; cf. 9:21) and thereby creates a certain emphasis and ambiguity in each case. In this instance the topic is God's care of the poor (36:6); they must receive justice. The Greek translator, however, has gone to 8:20 for help. There the object of the verb מאס is תם ("upright"), and

57. As Gordis notes (*Book of Job*, 416), the Masoretic word division in this verse is incorrect. The Hebrew ודין־רשׁע מלאת דין ומשׁפט יתמכו should be emended to ודין רשׁי עם לא תדין ומשׁפט יתמים. The text should be construed to mean, "You did not judge the case of the poor or the suit of the orphans." This provides an appropriate context for משׁפט ("justice"), which is always the basis for action on behalf of someone rather than against him/her.

58. The Hebrew noun חמה ("wrath") is syntactically impossible here; a verb needs to precede the particle פן. Thus, an Aramaic verb חמי / חמה meaning "beware" could be intended.

59. The word שׁוע must be understood as denoting wealth, as in 34:19, rather than a cry for help.

60. Heater, *Septuagint Translation Technique*, 116.

the Greek wording of 8:20a is nearly identical to that of 36:5: ὁ [γὰρ 8:20] κύριος οὐ μὴ ἀποποιήσηται τὸν ἄκακον. The OG lacks vv. 5b–9 and supplies v. 10a as a parallel line for v. 5a, affirming that God will hear the just. The translator directly refutes Job's statement that God will not hear the cry of the just (9:15). In 36:12 his assertion is that God will not save those who are disobedient when they are warned. The phrase παρὰ τὸ μὴ βούλεσθαι εἰδέναι αὐτοὺς τὸν κύριον exhibits certain parallels with 21:14b: ὁδούς σου εἰδέναι οὐ βούλομαι. In 21:7–14 Job says that the ungodly get along quite well, even when they tell God they want nothing to do with him. But the equivalent phrase in 36:12 is followed in v. 14 by the expressed wish that such godless ones die in their youth. The translator's statement that the righteous will receive justice (v. 17) comes close in thought and vocabulary to the lines in 36:6b–7a, which are not, however, in the OG. The translator takes חמה in v. 18 to pertain to wrath rather than a warning and seems to have fused vv. 17a and 18a to say that wrath will be upon the ungodly because they take bribes. Then in v. 19 he extends the warning of v. 18 to Job. He must not deliberately allow his mind to be turned away from the powerless when they are in distress. The translator concludes with a warning to Job not to do wrong (ἀλλὰ φύλαξαι μὴ πράξῃς ἄτοπα [v. 21a]), choosing words that are close to those used in the translation of Job's avowal that he is not conscious of having done anything wrong (οὐ γὰρ σύνοιδα ἐμαυτῷ ἄτοπα πράξας [27:6b]). Here there is no argument regarding suffering as correction, but Elihu ends up affirming the idea of suffering as retribution and punishment, just as Eliphaz and the others do.

In the Hebrew text, Elihu concludes with a description of the majesty of God as seen in the tempest (36:22–37:13) and the hot sun (37:14–24), a reminder that the just will emerge from the storm of adversity into the light of divine favor. Instead of a narrow personal concern about present suffering, Elihu seeks to call attention to the wonder of the works of God. It is the duty of mortals to exalt his glory (36:22–26) and not to focus on themselves. God is the exalted teacher, and no one ever tells him he is wrong (36:23). No one can presume to hold God accountable for what he does. Instead it is the responsibility of mortals to sing the praises of the great things God has done (36:24), things that all may see (36:25), though admittedly humans see them from a distance and they are not always cognizant of what God is doing. God is on high (36:26) and they are limited to an earthly perspective. There is no limit to God's years, while the years of mortals are very few. The greatness of God is conceivable, but it is not comprehensible.[61] Failure to understand this greatness must not lead people to challenge it or deny it.

The whole section of 36:22–37:24 is abbreviated substantially in the OG. The introduction of God as the exalted sovereign (36:22–25) is limited to vv. 22b–24a, 25b. Job is exhorted to "remember that [God's] works are great . . . how-

61. F. I. Andersen, *Job: An Introduction and Commentary* (TOTC; Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1976), 263.

ever many mortals are being wounded" (vv. 24a, 25b). The MT of v. 24 reads, זכר כי־תשׂגיא פעלו אשר שׁררו אנשׁים "Remember to extol his work, of which mortals have sung" (NRSV). It would seem that v. 24b (אשר שׁררו אנשׁים) is the intended parallel for the OG of v. 25: ὅσοι τιτρωσκόμενοί εἰσιν βροτοί, "however many mortals are being wounded." The lexical choice of τιτρωσκόμενοι for שׁררו was possibly influenced by the OG of 36:14b (ἡ δὲ ζωὴ αὐτῶν τιτρωσκομένη ὑπὸ ἀγγέλων), where, however, there is no equivalent for that term in the MT.[62] The situation of mortals is addressed further in v. 28: ἐσκίασεν δὲ νέφη ἐπὶ ἀμυθήτων βροτῶν, "and clouds cast a shadow on untold mortals."

The translator concludes in 36:28 with a theme that is picked up in the next chapter. The mystery of animal behavior (37:8) is an indicator of God's providential oversight of nature, and reflecting on the reality of divine sovereignty in creation should amaze the mind and make the heart pound (cf. 37:1). The ordering of the snow upon the earth (v. 6a) has the purpose of showing mortals their weakness (v. 7b; vv. 6b–7a are lacking in the OG). The storm wind, cold, and rain are ordered by God as he wishes (vv. 9, 10b), while the animals go to their shelters (v. 8). The description of the majesty of God in the storm concludes with 37:7b–9, 10b, a reflection on the instincts of the animals and the mystery of the weather. Verses 11–13 in the Hebrew are mostly without a counterpart in the OG, though the clause ταῦτα συντέτακται παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, "these things have been instructed by him on earth" (v. 12), is partially coextensive with על־פני תבל ארצה. This picks up on where v. 10b leaves off (οἰακίζει δὲ τὸ ὕδωρ ὡς ἐὰν βούληται, "And he steers the water as he wishes") and completes the thought that God ordains all these things upon the earth.

Beginning at 36:26, the Hebrew text takes up the theme of the magnificence of God as seen in the storm. Elihu provides a splendid description of the storm (36:27–37:13), which may be either a blessing or a judgment for those on earth (37:13) depending on whether those affected are obedient.[63] Elihu turns from the lessons of the storm to those of the clearing of the sky and the bright sun (37:14–24). The OG is relatively complete in this section but has its own interpretations. God understands the dispersion of the clouds (v. 16) and the extraordinary calamities of the wicked. The heat of the sun returns when the clouds disperse, and the land becomes quiet (v. 17). In the Hebrew text, Elihu speaks of the heat of the sun after the arrival of the south wind (v. 17) and asks whether Job can assist in the clearing of the clouds to provide a bright clear sky (v. 18). Verse 19 is difficult, but says something to the effect that Job should teach his companions how to speak to God so that their arguments might not be uninformed. In v. 20, Elihu asks whether his words will confound the God of the storm. The OG lacks the MT's

---

62. Heater, *Septuagint Translation Technique*, 119–20.

63. The difficult first line of 37:13 refers to those who are punished if they do not find favor with God. The word division of v. 13aβ should be "if they are not in favor (with God)" (לא רצו) rather than "for his land" (לארצו) as in the MT.

v. 18 and in v. 19 says, "Teach me what we shall say to him, and let us cease talking so much." A series of transformations has led to a different version of vv. 20–21 in Greek in comparison to the Hebrew.[64] Elihu says, μὴ βίβλος ἢ γραμματεύς μοι παρέστηκεν, ἵνα ἄνθρωπον ἑστηκὼς κατασιωπήσω; πᾶσιν δ' οὐχ ὁρατὸν τὸ φῶς . . . , "Is book or scribe in attendance on me, that I stand and put a person to silence? But the light is not visible to all."

Elihu concludes by saying that the splendor of God is beyond what we can attain, so all should reverence him (vv. 22–24). The Greek provides a reasonable paraphrase of these last lines.

9. Elihu in Old Greek

There are a number of possible ways to account for the shorter version of the OG: scribal error, theological perspective, failure to understand the Hebrew poetry.[65] The idea that the Hebrew parent text was shorter than the MT, either because an original text was expanded or because there were two "original" versions, has no evidence for support. This is not a case like Jeremiah or the story of David and Goliath. The Greek translator has created his own version of Job.

The Greek translator has undertaken significant creative work of his own. An example is his complete rewriting of the section on illness (33:19–22), where God speaks through his messenger. In the Hebrew of ch. 33, Elihu maintains that God corrects a person through consuming illness (vv. 19–21), when the soul approaches "the pit" and the emissaries of death (v. 22). There may be an advocate, a heavenly messenger, to declare that the person is upright (v. 23). God will show compassion, announce redemption for him, so that his health is restored like that of a youth (vv. 24–25). The restored person will pray to God and receive his favor; he will declare to others his error and God's righteousness (vv. 26–27). The translator, however, rewrites the entire section, with a great deal of imported material.[66] The heavenly advocate (v. 23), one of a thousand, becomes "a thousand death-bearing angels." These emissaries of death do not wound (τιτρώσκειν) the sick person (v. 23). The translator has drawn this verb from other passages. It is found seven times in Job; only twice is there a Hebrew equivalent. If the person, thus spared, purposes to turn to the Lord and declare his guilt to others, he will escape death (vv. 23c–24a). Here the translator renders the declaration of righteousness in the Hebrew text of v. 23c by its opposite (μέμψις), and makes the man rather than the messenger (now a thousand agents of death) the subject. The translator goes on to speak in terms of the health of the restored body (v. 25), the converse of the sick man.

64. Dhorme, *Book of Job*, 570–71.

65. Cox, "Elihu's Second Speech," 36–38.

66. Heater, *Septuagint Translation Technique*, 105–6.

The poetic creativity of the translator can be seen in the way he develops parallel images in reconstructing the Hebrew text concerning the healed individual. The one who could not even eat (v. 20a) will be restored in full maturity (v. 25b). The rotting flesh (v. 21a) will be transformed with soft texture like that of an infant (v. 25a). The exposed bones (v. 21b) will become a renewed body, like a wall restored with plaster (v. 24b), and the bones themselves will be filled with marrow (v. 24c). The images are laid out in chiastic structure, with the description of the escape from death (vv. 23a, b; 24a) and the turning in confession to the Lord (v. 23c, d) forming the center section.

There are some notable differences in the shorter version of the Elihu speeches. He is not said to be an arbiter authorized to settle the dispute between Job and God because of the inadequate arguments of the friends (32:12). Elihu does address the three assertions that Job has made (33:9–13), but does not make the same case for understanding the justice of God in response to Job's claim that he is an innocent sufferer. The justice of God in the Hebrew version is a matter of God's sovereign timing (34:23), a matter concerning which Job has been presumptive in demanding that he be vindicated immediately. This critical point is not reflected in the OG, in that both the observation that humans do not set the times of judgment (34:23) and the explanation that humans do not know how the judgment of the powers in this world will take place (vv. 29–33) are absent. Furthermore, the experience of justice for an individual described in the Hebrew text is conditioned by the fact that suffering has a disciplinary value that should lead mortals to see their pride (35:1–16). The translator reduces this passage to a statement about justice through retribution. There is no reference to the need to repent of pride, but there is a doxology celebrating the one who sets humans apart from the animals and the insolence of those who are evil. Elihu finally develops the concept of suffering as a discipline (36:1–21). In the OG this simply becomes a warning against unrighteousness. Though Elihu relentlessly condemns Job for self-righteousness in the Hebrew text, he does also mitigate the argument of the friends with his observation that God exercises judgment in his own time and that suffering is a discipline. As an arbiter, he does not settle in favor of Job; he has a lot of blustery words, but he does contest the concept of simple immediate retribution. This is lost completely in the OG.

In the OG version of Job, therefore, Elihu does come across as "an empty gasbag," much as Luther understood him to be. The translator has not paid attention to Hebrew verbal connections, but has devoted a great deal of attention to verbal connections within his own translation. The OG version is an alternate literary creation, not to be regarded as equivalent to the Hebrew version. The Ecclesiastical Text, for its part, can be characterized as an unliterary creation that creates confusion for the reader who seeks to understand the argument of Elihu.

At the Beginning: The Septuagint as a Jewish Bible Translation

Leonard Greenspoon

1. Introduction

It was in the fall of 1931 that Harry M. Orlinsky, an aspiring graduate student, met Max L. Margolis, the Dropsie professor whom he had sought out to lead him in advanced study on the Hebrew Bible. Margolis's illness and death (in April 1932) cut short the amount of time these two individuals could spend with each other. Nonetheless, Margolis's influence on Orlinsky was pivotal in many respects, and their combined influence on Septuagint studies and, more broadly, on Jewish translations of the Bible was unique. In this article, I use the work of these two giants as a way to explore what it means to view the Septuagint as the first Jewish translation of the Bible. It is my contention not only that the Septuagint (or, more properly, the Septuagint as perceived by a given scholar or group of scholars) has had a marked effect on all subsequent Jewish versions of the Bible, but also that study of these later versions (in a variety of languages) can broaden the basis by which we evaluate and illuminate the Septuagint itself.[1]

2. Highlights in the Scholarly Careers of Max Margolis and Harry Orlinsky

By late 1931, Max Margolis had a considerable number of achievements to his academic credit: he had co-authored (with Alexander Marx) his generation's history of the Jews;[2] he was editor-in-chief of the Jewish Publication Society's first Bible translation, which was to serve English-speaking Jews for a half century;[3] he served as president of the Society of Biblical Literature, as well as other scholarly

1. For a full exposition of Margolis's influence on Orlinsky, see Leonard Greenspoon, "When Harry Met Max," *Journal of the American Jewish Archives* (forthcoming).

2. Max L. Margolis and Alexander Marx, *A History of the Jewish People* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1934).

3. *The Holy Scriptures* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1917).

organizations;[4] he wrote a book on how the Bible came into being, as well as a history of Bible translations;[5] he had a distinguished academic career, primarily at Jewish institutions; and last, but for our purposes far from least, he was a leading Septuagint scholar of his day.[6]

With respect to his work on the Septuagint, Margolis is most highly regarded, and properly so, for his pioneering efforts to establish the oldest recoverable form of the Greek version of the book of Joshua. Or, to use his own words, his goal was to prepare a text that was "the nearest approach to the Greek original as it left the hands of the translator(s)."[7] This text, as Margolis constructed it, was on the whole shorter than our Received Text or MT. As we know, there are, broadly speaking, two explanations for the often pronounced differences between the Old Greek (OG) and the MT of Joshua or any other book or extended block of material: either the OG translator accurately reflected his Hebrew text, which was itself shorter than the MT, or the OG translator regularly curtailed a Hebrew *Vorlage* that was essentially the same as our MT. In Margolis's opinion, the second view correctly characterizes the OG translator's handling of his Hebrew *Vorlage*:

> On the whole [this translator] handled his Hebrew freely, repeatedly curtailing the text. . . . While here and there the translator read a slightly different Hebrew text compared with the received Hebrew, substantially the Hebrew and Greek . . . do tally.[8]

By late 1991, when his career was coming to a close, Harry Orlinsky also had a considerable number of achievements to his academic credit: He had written one of his generation's most popular efforts to combine archaeology and the biblical text;[9] he was editor-in-chief of much of the Jewish Publication Society's second Bible translation, which is destined to serve English-speaking Jews for at least half a century;[10] he served as president of the Society of Biblical Literature, as well as

---

4. Margolis was elected president of the Society of Biblical Literature in 1923.

5. Max L. Margolis, *The Hebrew Scriptures in the Making* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1922); idem, *The Story of Bible Translations* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1917).

6. It is fitting that Orlinsky wrote the chapter on Margolis in *Max Leopold Margolis: Scholar and Teacher* (ed. Robert Gordis; Philadelphia: Alumni Association, Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning, 1952). See also Leonard Greenspoon, *Max Leopold Margolis: A Scholar's Scholar* (Biblical Scholarship in North America 15; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987).

7. Max L. Margolis, in his preface to *The Book of Joshua in Greek* (Philadelphia: Annenberg Research Institute, 1992).

8. Max L. Margolis, "Specimen of a New Edition of the Greek Joshua," in *Jewish Studies in Memory of Israel Abrahams* (New York: Jewish Institute of Religion, 1927).

9. Harry M. Orlinsky, *Ancient Israel* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1954).

10. The entire translation was first published in 1985 as *TANAKH: A New Translation of THE HOLY SCRIPTURES According to the Traditional Hebrew Text.*

other scholarly organizations;[11] he co-authored (with Robert Bratcher) a history of Bible translations;[12] he had a distinguished academic career, primarily at Jewish institutions; and last, but for our purposes far from least, he was a leading Septuagint scholar of his day.[13] It may appear artificial to line up in so parallel a manner the achievements of these two individuals. But I would assert that, while such a listing does not include all of the achievements of either, it does highlight the many areas in which their respective careers overlapped. And, in my view, it highlights the stark differences in how they evaluated the way in which the Septuagint translators went about their task.

3. Different Perspectives on the Relationship between the Septuagint and the Masoretic Text

While, as we have seen, for Margolis, differences between the Septuagint and the MT are for the most part to be ascribed to scribal activity (in the case of Joshua, primarily in the direction of curtailment), for Orlinsky, looking at the same material engendered a view that is diametrically opposed to that of his teacher. So, Orlinsky wrote: "In the notes that are found at the bottom of the page in this edition of the Greek Joshua, Margolis observed time and again the 'G om(its) . . . ,' that is to say, whenever the LXX lacks a correspondent for the Hebrew, it is because the translator omitted the Hebrew word or phrase in question."[14] And he continued:

> As I first saw the problem, I kept asking myself: On what basis does one assert "G omits" instead of, say "H lacks." In conjunction with Rabbis Chesman and Soffer, I studied minutely a dozen or so words and phrases throughout the book of Joshua. . . . .It soon became apparent that in every instance that a clear-cut decision could be reached—and this constituted all but a couple of instances—it was not the LXX translator who was guilty of omissions but his Hebrew *Vorlage* that was lacking the word or phrase in question.[15]

In other scholarly work and (as we shall see) in popular discussion, Orlinsky tended to expand this insight to include much, if not most, of the rest of the Septuagint as well.

---

11. Orlinsky was elected president of the Society of Biblical Literature in 1970.

12. Harry M. Orlinsky and Robert G. Bratcher, *A History of Bible Translation and the North American Contribution* (Biblical Scholarship in North America; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991).

13. It is also worth recalling that Orlinsky was among the founders of the IOSCS.

14. Harry M. Orlinsky, "The Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Septuagint of the Book of Joshua," in *Congress Volume: Rome, 1968* (VTSup 17; Leiden: Brill, 1969), 191.

15. Ibid., 192–93.

In arriving at such diverse positions, Margolis and Orlinsky were for the most part looking at the same Greek texts. But they were looking at them from different perspectives, anchored as each was in the multiple contexts of his day. Margolis, although not uncritical or anticritical in his biblical scholarship, was conservative in his overall orientation. Facing mounting "assaults" on the MT that cast doubt on its antiquity and reliability, Margolis was its staunch defender. In this connection, the Septuagint, as valuable and revealing as it was in many respects, cast little, if any, light on non- or pre-Masoretic textual developments. Or, as Margolis succinctly put it on at least one occasion, one tiny fragment of Biblical Hebrew would have been worth more than all of the Greek manuscripts.[16]

Like Margolis, Orlinsky was a man of his times—but the times had changed. For one thing, Qumran manuscripts had been discovered and published that contained in Hebrew many of the distinctive Septuagint readings that up until that time had been preserved only in Greek. Although Orlinsky did not make the mistake of saying that the Scrolls constituted the actual Hebrew *Vorlage* of any of the Septuagint, he did strongly argue that the burden of proof had in effect been changed: from then on, it was up to the modern scholar to demonstrate that the ancient scribe had changed his *Vorlage*.

Now one might think that Orlinsky, having essentially argued in favor of the Greek translators as literal renderers of their Hebrew *Vorlage,* would have adopted such an approach in the version of the Torah he was preparing for JPS. As it turns out, nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, so Orlinsky stated on many occasions and in many forums, the literal approach—if it ever had its rightful place in the sun—should now be buried deeply in the bushel of history. In its place was something that, in Orlinsky's view, was ideally suited for the modern world and its readers:

> The Fourth Great Age, on the other hand, is the unprecedented attempt on the part of the Jewish, Catholic, and Protestant communities in the United States and Great Britain to get away from purely sectarian eisegesis and from the mechanical, word for (God's) word reproduction of the Hebrew and Greek text—a procedure that had characterized Bible translation from the very beginning—and, instead, to make accessible to their readers the plain meaning intended in the original. Granted that much, all too frequently too much, remains to be achieved in this direction; but that should not be permitted to diminish the importance of the fact that a significant change in the overall philosophy of Bible translation has been introduced and is currently flourishing. . . .
>
> These two Jewish translations, the Septuagint and the Targums, are not only the oldest translations of the Bible but also the most influential, each in its own way, both in Jewish and in Christian circles. The philosophy of translation in the case of the Septuagint was essentially word for word. In Hellenistic culture and society, in the vast area of Asia and southeastern Europe into which Greek culture

16. Greenspoon, *Margolis*, 108–10, 122–25.

> had penetrated, when they made translations involving two languages like Greek and Latin, they tended to make these translations word for word; and so it was natural to follow that philosophy to translation even when translating a Semitic language such as Hebrew or Aramaic into an Indo-European language like Greek or Latin—where the vocabulary, the syntax, case endings, verbal moods, and the like, are worlds apart. . . .
>
> The Septuagint, the Bible of the Jewish community of Alexandria, became in time, as Christianity emerged, the Bible of the Christian community; and its essentially word for word rendering of the Bible has remained the norm in Christian Bible translation generally to this day.[17]

Here again, Orlinsky showed himself to be a man of his times: the model he was advocating is functional equivalence (initially termed dynamic equivalence). The intellectual powerhouse behind this idea was the Bible Society's Eugene Nida.[18] Thus, Orlinsky and his New Jewish Version stood side by side with Nida and the Good News Bible.

Although Orlinsky's championing of functional equivalence marks an important moment in the history of Jewish Bible translating, for the purposes of this article greater emphasis is placed on Orlinsky's emphatic characterization of the Septuagint (and not only the Septuagint) as the "word for (God's) word reproduction of the Hebrew . . . text." In similar fashion, although with very different results, Margolis's championing of the MT, combined with his affection for the classical English rendering presented by the King James Version, led to his editing of a version that is only a light revision of texts in the KJV tradition. But again, for present purposes, emphasis falls on Margolis's repeated insistence that "substantially the Hebrew [= MT] and the [Hebrew *Vorlage* of the] Greek . . . do tally."

4. Jewish Bible Translations and the Problem of Septuagint Origins

A full history of Jewish Bible translations would present the views of Margolis and Orlinsky, as well as those of other scholars.[19] But it is not entirely a one-way street; that is, not only does the Septuagint provide the necessary starting point for any discussion of Jewish Bible translations (or, for that matter, all Bible translations), but later Jewish versions may in fact also shed light on thorny issues relating the study of the Septuagint. In this connection, it is worth taking a close look

17. Orlinsky and Bratcher, *History of Bible Translation*, xiii, 3, 4. See also Harry M. Orlinsky, *Essays in Biblical Culture and Bible Translation* (New York: Ktav, 1974), 349–62, 396–417.

18. Jeremy Munday, *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications* (2nd ed.; London: Routledge, 2008), 38–44.

19. I have begun work on just such a history in a volume for the American Bible Society.

at the topic of Septuagint origins. In broad strokes, I think we can identify four approaches that have some support among contemporary scholars.[20]

Albert Pietersma's interlinear paradigm is well known, in and of itself and as one of the major underpinnings of NETS.[21] Pietersma locates institutional support for such an undertaking—which aims (among other things) to bring the reader to the text by privileging Hebrew as the source language—within the context of the Ptolemaic school. Earlier, Sebastian Brock had discerned the impetus for Septuagint Pentateuch as "not just liturgical, but also, and perhaps primarily, educational."[22] Pietersma's paradigm has undergone a series of changes since it was first promulgated. Widely accepted as a heuristic starting point, it is likely to remain an influential thesis for some time to come, whether or not it ultimately wins the day.

Another view has been expressed by the scholar Meleze Modrzejewski. [23] Building on the work of Elias Bickermann and others, as well as on the publication of papyri that present the laws of indigenous inhabitants of Egypt, he discerns the origins of the Pentateuch in the needs of the royal administration of Ptolemy II to have a Greek version of the Jewish Law that could be included, among others, in his judicial system. There is, to my knowledge, no "incontrovertible proof" (to use Natalio Fernández Marcos's term) that the Torah/Pentateuch was indeed included within the extensive system established by the Ptolemies;[24] it must also be acknowledged that large sections of the Pentateuch are not legal at all. Nonetheless, this is an option that, perhaps in a modified form, should continue to be taken seriously.

More recently, Sylvie Honigman has found cultural prestige more than piety to be the key motivating factor in the production of Septuagint Pentateuch.[25] The

---

20. For one summary and evaluation, see Ronald L. Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation: The Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah* (JSJSup 124; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 54–72.

21. See, among many statements, 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: Brill, 2002), 337–64.

22. Sebastian Brock, "The Phenomenon of the Septuagint," in *The Witness of Tradition: Papers Read at the Joint British-Dutch Old Testament Conference Held at Woudschoten, Netherlands, 1970* (ed. Martinus A. Beek; OtSt 17; Leiden: Brill, 1972), 16.

23. Joseph Mélèze Modrezejewski, "A Law for the Jews of Egypt," in *The Jews of Egypt: From Rameses II to Emperor Hadrian* (1st English ed.; Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1995), 99–119.

24. Natalio Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Version of the Bible* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 63.

25. Sylvie Honigman, *The Septuagint and Homeric Scholarship in Alexandria: A Study in the Narrative of the Letter of Aristeas* (London: Routledge, 2003).

Dutch scholar Michael van der Meer has extended this insight to cover the origin of Greek Joshua, which he dates to the 220s B.C.E.[26] As he states, promoting one's cultural heritage, especially at a difficult time (as would have been the case around 215 B.C.E. or so in Ptolemaic Egypt), is not without parallels—as with Josephus, for example, whose apologetic edge was not in the least dulled by his serving under Vespasian and Titus (as the author[s] of Septuagint Joshua would have been doing under the not-always-well-disposed Ptolemies). Van der Meer concludes, "The Greek translation of Joshua was probably meant both to strengthen the cultural position of Jews in the early Ptolemaic Period and to provide the royal court with a faithful rendering of a book concerning the history of [Palestine, over which the Ptolemies and Seleucids were then fighting]."[27] Drawing on Honigman, van der Meer, and others, one can make a reasonable case for this position also, although we should assiduously avoid terms such as "secular" that have sometimes been applied to these activities (can we really speak of anything as "secular" in Ptolemaic Egypt?).

Moving from the most recent to the oldest interpretation in our purview, we turn to H. St. John Thackeray's arguments in favor of a liturgical setting for the OG of the Pentateuch.[28] Interestingly enough, Emanuel Tov, in one of his early articles on the influence of the Greek Pentateuch on other books of the Septuagint, states, essentially as a given, that just such a liturgical setting did exist. He writes:

> From the outset it was only natural that the Greek Pentateuch would influence the translation of the subsequent books. The reading of the Hebrew Pentateuch in the synagogue started at an early date, and although there is no sound evidence for the liturgical use of the Greek Pentateuch (nor of the later Greek Books), the Pentateuch must also have been widely known in Greek. Accordingly, it must have influenced the translation of the later books.[29]

Fernández Marcos speaks of Thackeray's work as "the most ambitious hypothesis to try to incorporate in a coherent way the whole process of decanting the Bible from Hebrew to Greek in its different stages"; at the same time, he points to the numerous weaknesses in Thackeray's reconstruction (not the least of which is

26. Michael van der Meer, "Provenance, Profile, and Purpose of the Greek Joshua," 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), 55–80.

27. Ibid., 79.

28. H. St. John Thackeray, *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship: A Study in Origins* (2nd ed.; London: H. Milford, 1923).

29. Emanuel Tov, "The Impact of the LXX Translation of the Pentateuch on the Translation of the Other Books," in *Mélanges Dominique Barthélemy: Études bibliques offertes à l'occasion de son 60e anniversaire* (ed. Pierre Casetti, Othmar Keel, and Adrian Schenker; OBO 38: Fribourg: Éditions universitaires; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981), 577.

that he failed to account for the translation of Joshua and Judges).[30] Nonetheless, in my view at least, van der Meer overstates the case when he dismisses, as completely abandoned, Thackeray's "option of a liturgical setting for the Greek translation of Joshua"—and by extension the remainder of the Septuagint.[31] Surely—given how little we know of what went on in a synagogue in third-century B.C.E. Alexandria—we cannot altogether rule out a liturgical connection of some sort.

Within the contours of this paper, we are not so much interested in adjudicating between or among these positions as in demonstrating the relevance of later Jewish versions for the study of the very earliest translation. As pointed out briefly above, in Pietersma's reconstruction, the translators consciously sought to bring the readers to the text. This procedure, which is part of the goal for formal equivalence translators, would not have been as arduous for a third-century B.C.E. Alexandrian as it would be for us today, but we still need to acknowledge the fact that the Old Greek of the Pentateuch was in many respects "foreign" to its initial hearers and readers. And this very "foreignness" is, I would suggest, part and parcel of what it means to be a Jewish translation of the Bible.[32] Of course, it is just this position that Orlinsky wished to counter, but all in all the force of evidence is not on his side. We need not look at "extreme" examples like Buber-Rosenzweig or Everett Fox,[33] to demonstrate that, throughout history, Jewish translators have taken pains to highlight the fact that their text is not the original, that it should point to—but never seek to replace—the Hebrew text, and that this approach stands in contrast to Christianity.[34]

Moreover, Jewish versions of the Bible have long been associated with the school and home, both venues in which women (who traditionally were seen as "needing" a modern-language versions when men did not) hold sway. In fact, the Chief Rabbi of the British Empire sanctioned (that is, promoted) several English-language versions of the Bible for Jewish homes and schools.[35] Of course, observations of this type do not take the place of rigorous philological or historical

---

30. Fernández Marcos, *Septuagint in Context,* 60.

31. Van der Meer, "Provenance," 77–78.

32. Leonard Greenspoon, "Jewish Translations of the Bible" in *The Jewish Study Bible: Jewish Publication Society Tanakh Translation* (ed. Adele Berlin and Marc Zvi Brettler; Oxford and New York: Oxford, 2003), 2005–20.

33. Martin Buber and Franz Rosenzweig, *Die Schrift* (14 vols.; Berlin: Schocken, 1934; repr., Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1992); Everett Fox, *The Schocken Bible,* vol. 1, *The Five Books of Moses: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy. A New Translation with Introductions, Commentary, and Notes* (New York: Schocken, 1995).

34. Greenspoon, "Jewish Translations."

35. For further details and context, see Leonard Greenspoon, "The King James Bible and Jewish Bible Translations," in *Translation That Openeth the Window: Reflections on the History and Legacy of the King James Bible* (ed. David G. Burke; Biblical Scholarship in North America 23; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature/American Bible Society, 2009), 123–38.

research; nonetheless, they do function validly as a device to enhance and deepen discussion.

The same holds true when we speak of the Septuagint as a purveyor of cultural prestige in the ancient Alexandrian context. In a sense, it would be serving as one of perhaps several methods by which the Jewish community could assert that it "had arrived"—or at least was making substantive strides in that direction. A number of later Jewish translations served a similar function. Most recently, the JPS translation of 1917, with Max Margolis as editor-in-chief, was so constructed—in terms of format as well as text—that it would occupy the same place in the libraries of Jewish middle-class families that the King James Version did for Christians, especially Protestants. [36] And Moses Mendelssohn's Biur, of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, was devised as a way of establishing a Jewish presence in a German culture that was just opening up to them.[37] Again, these and other examples are no substitute for the methods regularly practiced by Septuagint researchers; rather, they can extend and broaden the context for further discussion.

There is less to be said for the view that the Septuagint of the Pentateuch was created to provide the statutes for self-governance of Jews in the Ptolemaic Empire. But there is much of relevance with reference to the connection posited between Septuagint origins and liturgy. With respect to Anglo-Jewish versions of the Bible, it is notable that the first steps away from the King James Version can be detected in prayer services of the late eighteenth century.[38] Many Jewish translators of Scripture have served, or at least functioned, as rabbis. At the same time, these examples would also serve to delineate the boundaries of the use of such translations. So it is that in every synagogue, whether traditional or not, the Torah scroll in Hebrew continues to be at the center of the liturgy. Translations definitely have a place in the synagogue, but that place remains subsidiary to the Hebrew text itself.

This observation from modern times may help to fill in the enormous gaps in our knowledge of what transpired in an Alexandrian synagogue during the reign of the early Ptolemies. It is worth reflecting on how little we really know about what went on in such a synagogue or, as it would have then been known, προσευχή. (Parenthetically, I would not place too much weight on this term, "house of prayer," with respect to the activity or activities that went on therein. If we did so today, what would we think about a "synagogue"? And what would future historians think of a synagogue/temple/schul?)

We simply do not know whether there was an established "service" and what role scriptural reading would have played. Was there some early practice of

36. See Jonathan D. Sarna, *JPS: The Americanization of Jewish Culture 1888–1988* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1989), 104–16.

37. Greenspoon, "Jewish Translations," 2009–10.

38. Greenspoon, "King James Bible," 125–26.

"lectionary" reading—the Greek in tandem with the Hebrew—that would have made the translation of the entire Pentateuch superfluous for liturgical purposes? It need not be the case (as Jennifer Dines, among others, argues) that liturgical use of the Greek Pentateuch would have necessitated some system of markers (weekly portions, etc.) or revision to make it more "suitable" for synagogue use.[39] This would especially be the case when we look at the ways other translations, from the Targumim on, were used in Jewish worship.

It would not be inaccurate to detect in my remarks a certain preference for a liturgical context for Septuagint origins or at the least a more serious scholarly hearing for this view. But what is perhaps of greater importance for this paper is how clearly the history of Jewish Bible translations comes down on the side of both-and explanations rather than those that hypothesize either-or. It may well be that the Greek Bible originated in several contexts (school/court of law/royal court/court of popular opinion/synagogue), answering to different needs of the community.

Moreover, these needs in all likelihood defy neat categorization as either internal or external. (This sort of argument tends to dominate when the discussion turns to whether the Septuagint originated because of internal needs of the Alexandrian community or through the impetus of the Ptolemaic bureaucracy—as if it could not in fact have been a confluence of both sorts of pressures.) So it is that the early Anglo-Jewish translations were intended to meet both internal needs (for example, British Jews were not only unable to read Hebrew, but increasingly German or Spanish as well) and external needs (the Bible societies were beginning to mass-produce English Bibles that missionary groups were circulating among Jews, especially immigrant Jews, at little or no cost, etc.). Moreover, the earliest translators were themselves not part of the establishment, which only haltingly saw the value of versions produced for Jews in English.[40]

5. Conclusion

To conclude: Real life is messy, and its study should reflect that reality. It is very easy for us, at many lengths removed from the realities of early Alexandria, to construct highly polished accounts of what happened, in which this or that motivated the translators, who consistently followed a given policy for an audience that was clearly identifiable. Upon even a bit more reflection, we must admit that such reconstructions are simplistic.

Whether they are intended to provide a carefully delineated point for all subsequent Jewish versions of the Bible or, more broadly, to define what any version of the Bible should be, such "reconstructions" fail to take into full account what

39. Jennifer M. Dines, *The Septuagint* (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 48–50.

40. Greenspoon, "King James Bible," 126–31.

(admittedly little) we know about conditions in the third century B.C.E. or what lessons we can glean from later Jewish versions, about which we know a good deal more. Indeed, the Septuagint was "at the beginning" of a long and still evolving tradition of Jewish translations of the Bible. In turn, with the help of these later exemplars, we can better understand the complexity, and the ingenuity, of those individuals and groups who created the text that is as worthy of study today as it was "at the beginning."

The Role of the Septuagint in the New Testament: Amos 9:11–12 as a Test Case

Wolfgang Kraus

1. Introduction

The wider context of my topic is the question of how the Jewish Scriptures had an impact on the development of early Christian thought and belief. According to Rom 3:21, the Scriptures bear witness to the gospel of the righteousness of God: "But now, apart from law, the righteousness of God has been disclosed, being attested by the law and the prophets."[1] According to Romans, the gospel of God (1:1) "concerning his son" (1:2), Jesus Christ, was "announced beforehand by his prophets in holy scriptures" (1:2). Paul finds prophetic words not only in the scribal prophets, but also in the Psalter and the Pentateuch.

In his book *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums*, Dietrich-Alex Koch shows that the Scriptures serve as witnesses in Paul's view.[2] On the one hand, they are understood as words "directed to the present."[3] On the other hand, they can be understood correctly only if looked at from the gospel because the gospel itself is the "prerequisite for the understanding of scripture."[4] Finally, the Scriptures are witnesses to the gospel.[5] The term "scripture," used by Koch in its singular form, does not mean that we have to speak of a finalized or approved "canon" of Old Testament books in the first century. The limits of the "canon" are still open. "Scripture" includes more than the later so-called biblical books. This becomes immediately evident if we look at the various quotations of "scriptural" proofs in the New Testament, such as 1 Cor 2:9; Jas 1:19; Jude 14–15; Mark 10:17–21.[6]

---

1. "Law and prophets" is to be understood here as a recapitulatory term for the biblical tradition (cf. Matt 5:17; 7:12; 11:13; 2 Macc 15:9; 4 Macc 18:10).

2. Dietrich-Alex Koch, *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums: Untersuchungen zur Verwendung und zum Verständnis der Schrift bei Paulus* (BHT 69; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1986). In principle, the textual basis for Paul is the Septuagint. In most cases this is true also for the other New Testament writers.

3. Ibid., 322–31.

4. Ibid., 331–43.

5. Ibid., 343–51.

6. On this issue, see Wolfgang Kraus, "Umfang und Aufbau der Septuaginta," in *Die Septuaginta—Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten: Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septua-*

Proofs from the Jewish Scriptures were of crucial importance for the early Christian formation of tradition and helped the church to build up an identity of its own. Neither in their self-understanding nor in the view of others were Christianity and Judaism separate and distinct groups in the time of Paul. In the midst of the second century, however, in the writings of Justin Martyr, Christianity and Judaism can be identified as two sociologically and theologically distinct groups, connected only by their origin. Christians claim to be the true people of God (Justin, *Dial.* 119), whereas Jews—from a Christian point of view—can no longer claim this identity for themselves. In the eyes of early Christians, this view is verified in the Scriptures. Furthermore, the text of Scripture itself has now become the subject of the argument between the two groups. (e.g., Justin, *Dial.* 43; 66–67; 71–76; 84; 120.5). The dispute between emerging Christianity and formative Judaism, which had to redefine itself after 70 C.E., is, in its crucial points, an argument about Scripture and about how to understand it.[7] Amos 9:11–12 is an interesting test case for this issue.

The end of the book of Amos has an important reception history both in ancient and rabbinic Judaism and in early Christianity. Sabine Nägele dedicated a whole study to this topic in her monograph entitled *Laubhütte Davids und Wolkensohn*.[8]

As for the reception of Amos in antiquity, Amos 9:11(–12) does play a role, and it is explicitly quoted in the writings of Qumran: namely, in the *Damascus Document* (CD VII, 16) and in the collection of eschatological midrashim called 4Q Florilegium (4QFlor = 4Q174) III, 12. It is also cited in the speech of James during the convention of the apostles in the book of Acts (15:16–18). The *Damascus Document* and 4QFlorilegium quote a text that to a large extent corresponds to the MT.[9] The background of the text cited in Acts is mainly the Septuagint version

ginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 20.–23. Juli 2006 (ed. Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus; WUNT 219; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 9–39, esp. 10, 12–25.

7. It is of crucial importance for Christian theology to discern which particular texts were employed in early Christian times and how these texts were used or misused. And as it was mainly the LXX that was used, the conference on the LXX at Trinity Western University provided a good opportunity to ask questions like this. Thanks to Rob Hiebert and his team for a very stimulating and well-organized conference! For his help with the translation of this paper into English, I thank Christof Aschoff, Saarbrücken.

8. Sabine Nägele, *Laubhütte Davids und Wolkensohn: Eine auslegungsgeschichtliche Studie zu Am 9,11 in der jüdischen und christlichen Exegese* (AGJU 24; Leiden: Brill, 1995).

9. The Hebrew text of Am 9:11–12 is also attested in the Minor Prophets scroll from Wadi Murabaʿat. Although the text is very fragmentary, the legible consonants are in accordance with the MT. I shall come back to this later in this paper. In the Minor Prophets Scroll from Naḥal Ḥever (8ḤevXIIgr) the Amos section is missing. On this, see Emanuel Tov, *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Naḥal Ḥever (8ḤevXIIgr)* (DJD 8; Oxford: Clarendon, 1990), 99–101. For the textual attestation of Amos in other Qumran manuscripts, see Jostein Ådna, "James' Position at the Summit Meeting of the Apostles and the Elders in Jerusalem (Acts 15)," in *The Mission of the*

of Amos. What causes the basic problem of interpretation of Amos 9:11-12 is the use of the singular expression סכת דויד ("booth of David") or σκηνὴ Δαυίδ, and the question is how this has to be understood.

2. Amos 9:11–12 MT

Amos 9:11-12 is part of the ending of the prophetic book (9:11-15). The introductory phrases ביום ההוא in v. 11 and הנה ימים באים in v. 13 as well as the concluding formulae נאם־יהוה at the end of v. 12 and אמר יהוה אלהיך in v. 15 clearly indicate two separate prophetic words: vv. 11–12 and vv. 13–15.[10] But this does not necessarily mean that vv. 11-12 and 13-15 were originally two entities. Verse 12 follows v. 11 with למען. However, v. 12 is written in prose, whereas v. 11 is poetic. The main verb of v. 12 (יירשׁו) is plural and has no real reference in v. 11. Who is the subject of this action? The "booth of David"? Then the use of the plural would be surprising. As far as its content is concerned, v. 12 is not necessarily dependent on v. 11. Nevertheless, Hans Walter Wolff in his famous commentary argues that the two verses belong together because the introductory formula and the continuation with למען form a frame around vv. 11–12 as a word of salvation.[11]

Verses 13–15 are also mostly regarded as a unit. Both prophetic words are usually ascribed to the same author. In this case the discussion has to do with whether the text goes back to Amos himself or comes from a later redactor.

The assumption of a single author for the concluding verses of Amos, which can often be found in the literature,[12] has convincingly been called into question by James Nogalski, whose argument has been taken up by Jörg Jeremias in his commentary on Amos.[13] Nogalski writes: "However, multiple tensions within these five verses argue that the structure created by the יום formula does not indicate a single author. Rather the material within these four [*sic!*] verses must reckon with more than one layer of redaction."[14] According to Nogalski and Jeremias, Amos 9:11–15 dates not from the eighth century but from the exilic/postexilic period. Verses 12a and 13 constitute a later interpretation, which was not part of the original oracle

---

Early Church to Jews and Gentiles (ed. Jostein Ådna and Hans Kvalbein; WUNT 127; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 125–61, esp. 140–41.

10. Hans Walter Wolff, *Joel und Amos* (BKAT 14.2; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969), 404.

11. Ibid.

12. From time to time this opinion was questioned; see, e.g., Ulrich Kellermann, "Der Amosschluß als Stimme deuteronomistischer Heilshoffnung," *EvT* 29 (1969): 169–83, esp. 173. Referring to V. Maag and E. Rohland, he sees Amos 9:13–15 as a secondary comment.

13. James Nogalski, *Literary Precursors to the Book of the Twelve* (BZAW 217; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1993); Jörg Jeremias, *Der Prophet Amos* (ATD 24.2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995), 128–37.

14. Ibid., 104.

contained in vv. 11, 12b, and 14–15. For our purpose it is not necessary to reproduce Nogalski’s analysis in detail. But the decisive arguments are as follows:

1. In vv. 11–12 “two distinct ideas of kingdom restoration may be detected. The first perspective is the restoration of what is fallen (9:11), while the second communicates a restoration of domination (9:12a).”[15]
2. “Amos 9:12b (‘declares YHWH who is doing this’) is very difficult to harmonize with 9:12a, since the 3mp יירשׁו in 9:12a presupposes the people as subject, not YHWH. On the other hand, this concluding formula conforms remarkably well with 9:11, where YHWH is the subject of several active verbs (I will raise, I will wall up, I will rebuild). In addition the concluding feminine singular suffix in 9:11 (I will rebuild ‘it’) has its counterpart in 9:12b with the feminine singular pronoun זאת.”[16] In sum: grammatically and syntactically Amos 9:12a has no close connection with 9:11 and 12b.
3. As for v. 13, Nogalski argues that it presupposes vv. 14–15 and “overshoots the promise of restoration.”[17] Verses 14–15 continue the promise of restoration found in v. 11, now with an emphasis on the people.[18] Verse 13 instead “portrays an eschatological utopia where the harvest and the planting run together,” which stands in contradistinction to what vv. 14–15 have in view.[19]

Thus, it is justified to see in v. 12a and 13 a different speaker than in vv. 11, 12b, and 14–15. Amos 9:12a and 13 therefore postdate the rest of the text.

This literary analysis makes it possible to interpret the “fallen booth of David” in v. 11.[20] On one level it has to be understood in the context of 9:11, 12b, and 14–15. Here the restoration of the Davidic kingdom, which is fallen, is in view: the rebuilding of David’s cities and the return of the people. “The ruined cities in 9:14 and the fallen booth (David’s ruins) of 9:11 intend one and the same entity.”[21] On another level v. 12a then “takes up the promise of Davidic restoration, but redefines restoration as political domination. . . . V. 12a seeks political domination over

15. Ibid., 105.

16. Ibid.

17. Ibid., 109.

18. Ibid., 106.

19. Ibid., 109.

20. For the “fallen booth of David” different interpretations are discussed: Wolff, *Joel und Amos*, 406–7; see also Nägele, *Laubhütte*, 150–58; Jostein Ådna, “Die Heilige Schrift als Zeuge der Heidenmission: Die Rezeption von Amos 9,11–12 in Apg 15,16–18,” in *Evangelium, Schriftauslegung, Kirche: Festschrift für Peter Stuhlmacher zum 65. Geburtstag* (ed. Jostein Ådna, Scott J. Hafemann, and Otfried Hofius; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997), 1–23, esp. 14–15; cf. also Ådna, “James’ Position,” 152–54.

21. Nogalski, *Precursors*, 106.

the former Davidic kingdom, especially Edom."[22] "Amos 9:13 emphasizes abundance, not merely a return to pre-destruction normalcy as portrayed in 9:14f."[23] Taken together, these aspects indicate a later perspective. Maybe the "remnant of Edom" refers to the situation "in which the Nabatean incursion into Edom had already begun."[24]

This analysis of the literary layers of Amos 9:11–15 also enables us to solve the often disputed problem of the suffix forms in v. 11. Most exegetes correct the different suffixes to one form—the third feminine singular—and assume a misspelling.[25] But Nogalski argues: "Three successive, but distinct, suffixes refer back to the phrase 'booth of David.' 'Their breaches' (3fp) refers to holes in the booth, and treats the phrase 'booth of David' collectively. 'His ruins' concentrates upon David, while the 3fs suffix in the phrase 'I will rebuild it' refers specifically back to the feminine noun 'booth.'"[26]

In this way it is possible to interpret correctly the content and reason of the use of the singular expression סכת דויד ("booth of David"), whose reconstruction is expected: "The significance of the metaphor 'booth' clarifies itself considerably when compared with its surrounding context as relating to David's kingdom."[27] The expression "booth of David" (maybe as an antithesis to Amos 5:2) is employed to avoid the usual usage of "house of David" as the term signifying the dynasty.[28] This may be because only a few members of the Davidic dynasty were still alive when this word was composed in the exilic/postexilic period.[29]

After this analysis, Sabine Nägele's and Jostein Ådna's contention that the סכת דויד ("booth of David") in Amos 9:11 MT denotes not the Davidic dynasty but the temple in Jerusalem, and that the term could be expanded to refer to the whole city, is very improbable.[30]

22. Ibid., 108.

23. Ibid., 113.

24. Ibid., 108.

25. Wilhelm Rudolph, *Joel, Amos, Obadja, Jona* (KAT 13.2; Gütersloh: Mohn, 1971), 279; cf. Nägele, *Laubhütte*, 169.

26. Nogalski, *Precursors*, 106. This salvation of the suffix problem is more convincing than the proposal of Nägele, *Laubhütte*, 213; cf. 169.

27. Nogalski, *Precursors*, 106.

28. Jeremias, *Der Prophet Amos*, 134. Jeremias speaks of "gebräuchliche Rede."

29. Ibid.

30. Ådna, "James' Position," 153. In my opinion, his position is possible only because he combines different texts and refrains from a literary-critical analysis of the Amos text. Ådna cites the commentary of Jeremias (*Der Prophet Amos*, 152 n. 86) but does not make use of Jeremias's literary analysis. In my opinion, there is no real alternative to the convincing arguments of Nogalski and the reception by Jeremias.

3. Amos 9:11–12 LXX

As a working hypothesis, I assume that the *Vorlage* of the Septuagint translator had the same consonantal text that we find in the MT. For our purpose it is sufficient to concentrate on Amos 9:11–12 alone. What strikes the eye in v. 11 is that the three different pronouns of the Hebrew text (third feminine plural, third masculine singular, and third feminine singular) are all translated as third feminine singular pronouns. All of them refer back to the feminine singular noun σκηνή. This does not mean—as, for example, Wilhelm Rudolph suggests—that the Hebrew text had been messed up[31] or—as, for example, Ådna argues—that the Septuagint represents a different text type, one earlier than that of the MT.[32] It would seem, instead, that the Septuagint translator made some grammatical adaptations. One strong argument for a text similar to that of the MT is also the fact that, as far as we can detect, the later MT is also attested in the Minor Prophets Scroll from Wadi Muraba'at (Mur XII/Mur 88).[33] As far as the very fragmentary text is preserved for Amos 9:11–12, it is in total agreement with the consonants of MT.

Since we have no textual witnesses that could testify to another text type for Amos, the best thing we can do is to assume that a consonantal text that was essentially the same as the MT was the *Vorlage* for the Septuagint. Appealing to the idea of "textual pluriformity and variety," the existence of which in ancient Judaism can basically not be denied, is too vague and does not help us here. [34] The two main differences between the Hebrew and the Greek versions will be treated below.

The Hebrew term אקים occurs twice in Amos 9:11 and is rendered both times in the Septuagint as ἀναστήσω. Ἀνοικοδομήσω translates גדר *qal* and בנה *qal*. Thus, the restoration is translated in a parallel way and is therefore especially emphasized. The "breaches" mentioned in the Hebrew text (את־פרציהן) are translated as τὰ πεπτωκότα αὐτῆς, that is, as "what is fallen of her" or "her fallen parts." The ruins (הרסת) are rendered correspondingly as τὰ κατεσκαμμένα, with the third masuline singular Hebrew suffix, as I have already pointed out, being replaced by a feminine singular pronoun. What is meant in v. 11 by σκηνὴ Δαυίδ? Is it also the "booth of David" in the sense of the Davidic kingdom and dominion as in the MT? NETS translates it as "tent of David."[35]

---

31. Rudolph, *Joel, Amos, Obadja, Jona*, 279. Rudolph speaks of "in Unordnung gekommen."

32. Against Ådna, "Die Heilige Schrift," 4.

33. The scroll has been published by Jozef T. Milik, *Les Grottes de Muraba'at: Texte* (ed. P. Benoit, J. T. Milik, and R. de Vaux; DJD2; Oxford: Clarendon, 1961), 181–205. For minor disagreements with the MT, see 183–84, 205.

34. Against the authors cited by Ådna, "Die Heilige Schrift," 5, 11.

35. *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under That Title* (ed. Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright; Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2007). The Twelve Prophets were translated by George E. Howard.

There are 435 occurrences of the term σκηνή in the Septuagint. Sixty-five of them have no Hebrew equivalent. Of the remaining 370 occurrences, 245 times σκηνή renders אהל, 93 times it renders משכן, 25 times it renders סכה (or סֹךְ), and seven times some other expressions.[36] It is noteworthy, on the one hand, that סכה is translated only as σκηνή (and derivatives). On the other hand, it is interesting to observe that in more than two-thirds of the occurrences σκηνή is related to the tabernacle.

Wilhelm Michaelis argues that this fact—namely, the translation of משכן and אהל by σκηνή—is the starting point of the change of meaning of the Greek word σκηνή, which originally meant only "tent." The validity of this proposed semantic change has to be evaluated.[37] Martin Rösel argued in his paper at the Wuppertal conference in 2008 that, since the translation of the book of Exodus, σκηνή at least slightly *implies* a relation to the sanctuary.

Thus, does σκηνή in Amos 9:11 also refer to the sanctuary, the temple? This is the position of Nägele and Adna, but they want to extend the term to the whole city of Jerusalem. They see the reason for this understanding already in the use of the Hebrew term סכה (or סֹךְ) in Amos 9:11 MT, which—according to our analysis above—is rather improbable.[38]

On the basis of Amos 9:11 alone, the meaning of σκηνὴ Δαυίδ cannot be proven definitely. We will have to examine how σκηνή is used in other passages in the Minor Prophets and in other Septuagintal books. And, additionally, we must not look only at the term σκηνή, but at σκηνὴ Δαυίδ. This investigation will show that σκηνή covers a variety of ideas and cannot be limited to the tabernacle or Jerusalem. There is, of course, no doubt that σκηνή can denote Jerusalem or the sanctuary, but the question is whether this aspect is always implied and therefore has to be taken into account in Amos 9:11.

a. Σκηνή occurs eight times in the Dodekapropheton: Hos 12:9; Jonah 4:5; Hab 3:7; Zech 14:16, 18, 19; Amos 5:26; 9:11. In Hos 12:9 the term is related to the situation in the wilderness and has no connection to Jerusalem or the tabernacle. In Jonah 4:5 it has to do with the tent (σκηνή) that Jonah puts up so as to sit there in the shade. Habakkuk 3:7 talks about the tents of the Ethiopians and Midianites, which will be shattered.[39] In Zech 14 the term refers to the eschatological Feast of Tabernacles. The nations

36. Wilhelm Michaelis, "σκηνή, κτλ," *TWNT* 7:369–96, esp. 370.

37. Ibid., 370, 372–73; cf. Wilhelm Michaelis, "Zelt und Hütte im biblischen Denken," *EvT* 14 (1954): 29–49.

38. Nägele, *Laubhütte*, 192–214, 217–20; Ådna, "Die Heilige Schrift," 14–16; eadem, "James' Position," 152–54.

39. The meaning of σκηνή is the same in the text of the versio Barberini. The versio Barberini of Hab 3 is included in LXX.D, and is translated by Heinz-Josef Fabry: *Septuaginta Deutsch: Das griechische Alte Testament in deutscher Übersetzung* (ed. Wolfgang Kraus and Martin Karrer; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2009; 2d ed., 2010).

will come to Jerusalem to celebrate this feast. Σκηνή itself does not signify Jerusalem or the sanctuary there. In Amos 5:26 we read about a σκηνὴ τοῦ Μολοχ, which was carried by the Israelites. Here σκηνή seems to signify a portable sanctuary of a foreign deity, which is paralleled by the "star" of a deity named Ραιφαν. All in all these references do not allow one to speak of an explicit or implicit relation of σκηνή to the sanctuary in Jerusalem or to Jerusalem itself.

b. We get the same result if we look at other occurrences in the prophetic literature, such as Isa 1:8; 22:16; 33:20; 38:12; 40:22; 54:2 (Isa 16:5 will be treated below); Jer 4:20; 6:3; 10:20; 30:7 [MT 49:29]; 42:7, 10 [MT 35:7, 10]; Lam 2:4. In Isa 1:8 σκηνή is used in a comparison: Jerusalem was left over after the siege like a hut in the vineyard after the harvest. In Isa 22:16 the Hebrew term משכן is translated as σκηνή, signifying the tent of Somnas. In Isa 33:20 σκηνή is used in a figurative sense. Jerusalem is in view, but neither Jerusalem nor the sanctuary is specifically designated a σκηνή. In Isa 38:12 σκηνή stands for life, that is, a lifetime: when life ends, it can be compared to the pulling down of a tent. In Isa 40:22 σκηνή is related to creation: the heavens are like a vault and stretched out like a tent. In Isa 54:2 the audience members are told to enlarge the site of their tent, that is, to enlarge their dominion. Israel will inherit the nations and will inhabit cities that have become desolate (v. 3). Σκηνή here stands for the territory.

In Jer 4:20 tent is used in a figurative sense for Jerusalem. Jeremiah 6:3 speaks of the tents of the besiegers, who will build a circle. In Jer 10:20 the double use of σκηνή is comparable to that in Jer 4:20 to signify a place to live. Jeremiah 30:7 is about the tents of Kedar, which will be taken away. In Jer 42:7, 10 the Rechabites' habit of living in tents is contrasted to all other people's habit of living in solid buildings. In Lam 2:4 σκηνή is used to denote the place where the daughter of Sion lived.

These instances do not allow us to state such a close relation between σκηνή and Jersualem or the sanctuary as Ådna, Nägele, and Rösel suggest. Instead we have to realize a wide range of use of the term.

c. For the combination σκηνὴ Δαυίδ we have only one other occurrence in the Septuagint: Isa 16:5. Before we come to this passage, another text should be mentioned. In 4 Macc 3:8 we read of a βασιλεῖος σκηνή, which is David's royal tent on the field of battle. Although the text does not provide explicit evidence for σκηνὴ Δαυίδ, it points in a certain direction, that is, to a military or political meaning of σκηνή. But we have to take into consideration that 4 Maccabees must be dated to the end of the first century C.E. and that the book is not the translation of an originally Hebrew text. So its significance for our analysis is very limited.[40]

40. According to David A. deSilva, *4 Maccabees: Introduction and Commentary on the*

For our purpose Isa 16:5 is of greater importance. Here σκηνὴ Δαυίδ is the translation of the Hebrew אהל דויד. It is not only one of the two occurrences of σκηνὴ Δαυίδ in the Septuagint but also is comparable to Amos 9:11 with regard to content. If we compare Isa 16:1–5 LXX and MT, we have to realize that the Septuagint and the MT differ considerably. We find additions and modifications. In v. 1b it is asked ironically whether Mount Zion is a desolate rock. This could indeed include a relation to the temple. But, on the other hand, v. 5a explicitly speaks of a throne that will be restored. A (new) ruler "shall sit on it with truth in the tent of Dauid" (NETS). His duty will be to judge with righteousness. Isa 16:4–5 reads (NETS):

> The fugitives of Moab will sojourn with you;
> they will be a shelter to you from before a pursuer,
> because your alliance has been taken away
> and the ruler who trampled on the land has perished.
> Then a throne shall be restored with mercy,
> and he shall sit on it with truth in the tent of David,
> judging and seeking judgment
> and quickly procuring (or: striving after) righteousness.

Here σκηνὴ Δαυίδ is the place where "he," a successor to the throne of David, reigns. This is, of course, Jerusalem. But σκηνὴ Δαυίδ is not an equivalent for the city of Jerusalem but a symbolic expression for the Davidic reign. David's throne will be restored after the ruler who trampled on the land has perished. One person—someone like a successor of David, but not specifically identified—will sit on the throne in David's tent to execute righteousness. The Moabites will sojourn with the Israelites.

Isaiah 16:4–5 calls a passage like *Pss. Sol.* 17:21–32 to mind. This second text is, of course, later than the preceding one. But from the aspect of content we have striking parallels. A ruler will be installed on the throne of David. He will rule with justice and righteousness. But the differences also must be noticed. According to *Pss. Sol.* 17:21–23, the son of David will rule over the tribes of Israel, purify Jersualem from the nations, and "drive out sinners from the inheritance." In Isa 16:4, contrary to this, one reads that Moab will sojourn among the Israelites. This latter aspect reminds one of texts like Zech 2:11 [MT 2:15 and Rahlfs], where it is said: "And many nations shall flee to the Lord for refuge on that day and shall become a people to him, and they will tent in your midst" (NETS). In Isa 16:5 a kind of a "messianic" figure seems to be in view, not explicitly called Messiah but imagined as sitting on the throne in David's tent. So in comparison with the other

---

Greek Text in Codex Sinaiticus (Septuagint Commentary Series; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2006), 106. 4 Macc 3:8 refers to David's usual army camp.

occurrences discussed above, the most probable solution seems to be that σκηνὴ Δαυίδ in Isa 16:5 (as a translation of Hebrew אהל דויד) and σκηνὴ Δαυίδ in Amos 9:11 (as a translation of סכת דויד) have the same meaning and denote the Davidic reign. But before we can finally decide what is meant by σκηνὴ Δαυίδ in Amos 9:11, we should include v. 12 in our considerations.

In Amos 9:12 the differences between the MT and the Septuagint are considerable, but they can be explained by two little variations in the consonants. Two major differences can be observed:

1. In the Septuagint, the counterpart of the Hebrew verb יירשׁו is ἐκζητήσωσιν. This presupposes that ידרשׁו as the consonantal Hebrew text. The second *yod* was read as a *dalet*. This can be explained in three ways: (a) it was simply misread; (b) it is a deliberate interpretation; (c) the *Vorlage* of the Septuagint differed from the MT. The Greek verb ἐκζητεῖν is usually used transitively, but there are (rare) examples of an intransitive use (e.g., Herm. *Mand.* 11.5). Various textual witnesses of the Septuagint understand ἐκζητεῖν to be transitive and give με as an accusative object after ἐκζητήσωσιν. Codex Alexandrinus and other witnesses explicitly add τὸν κύριον after ἀνθρώπων. Furthermore, Alexandrinus et al. insert ἄν between ὅπως and the subjunctive ἐκζητήσωσιν, which is typical of Attic Greek.[41] This corresponds to the text that Acts 15 offers. From a text-critical perspective, these variants can all be judged by the rule *lectio difficilior potior* as secondary readings, which is what Joseph Ziegler has decided in his Göttingen edition.[42] These variants will become interesting later on when we are dealing with the quotation in Acts. If ἐκζητήσωσιν is used without an accusative object, then it means "to start looking for," "to inquire," or "to investigate." In that case what one is looking for remains at first indistinct. We could think that one is inquiring about what was going on with respect to the restoration of the fallen σκηνὴ Δαυίδ.
2. The second major difference between the MT and the Septuagint in v. 12 has to do with the term ἄνθρωποι. The people inquiring are called οἱ κατάλοιποι τῶν ἀνθρώπων. Edom (אדום) is not mentioned here. This reading can be explained if we imagine the defective Hebrew spelling of Edom, that is, אדם, without the *o*-vowel. Then we have the same radicals as for Adam. Instead of Edom, it is Adam, and instead of "the rest of Edom," it is "the rest of the people." There are again three—actually even four—possible ways of explaining this translation: (a) (i) and (ii) in the case of plene spelling: (i) the word was misread, or (ii) this was a deliberate inter-

41. BDF §369.5.

42. *Duodecim Prophetae* (3rd ed.; Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum 13; ed. Joseph Ziegler; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984).

pretation; (b) in the case of defective spelling and therefore the same consonants: different vocalization resulted in a different reading; (c) the *Vorlage* of the Septuagint differed from the MT. The second alternative is very improbable because, as was mentioned above, the consonants are attested to also in Mur 88. The third alternative cannot be ruled out, but seems to me justifiable only as *ultima ratio*.

But before we can try to come to a decision, we have to deal with another problem of the Septuagint version: the accusative object of the MT ("the rest of Edom") occurs in the nominative in the Septuagint ("the rest of the people"). So the *nota accusativi* את becomes a problem too. But that את can be understood to refer to the nominative "people" is also possible in Hebrew. According to Rudolf Meyer, there are some literary examples of את emphasizing the subject: "[Es gibt] im MT einige literarisch sichere Belege, in denen את einwandfrei nicht den Objekts-Akk[usativ] regiert, sondern den Nom[inativ] nach sich hat und damit das Subjekt hervorhebt."[43]

With regard to the possibilities of a misreading, a deliberate interpretation, or a different vocalization, the translator of the Septuagint would have understood the Hebrew text that has to do with domination over the rest of Edom to be a statement about the behavior of the rest of the people. The phrase that follows, καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, would then correctly translate the Hebrew וכל־הגוים, and the end of the verse could also be regarded as a proper translation.

With respect to the first alternative mentioned above, the first half of v. 12 in the Septuagint is considerably different from our extant Hebrew texts. Whether this is simply due to a double misreading or whether it represents a purposely modified interpretation remains the question; both would be possible.

At this point, Isa 16:5, the only other evidence for σκηνὴ Δαυίδ again comes into play. In my opinion, both Isa 16:5 and Amos 9:11–12 are best understood in relation to the horizon of the eschatological expectation that, at the end of time, other nations will follow the God of Israel too.[44] Within the Dodekapropheton this can be found in the MT as well as in the Septuagint. In Mic 4 the nations come to Jerusalem to receive Torah. The Septuagint explicitly talks about λαοί who will come to the mountain of the Lord (4:1b). The term λαός is usually used to denote exclusively Israel. According to Mic 4:3 LXX, the God of Israel will κρινεῖ ἀνὰ μέσον λαῶν πολλῶν. These λαοί will receive νόμος καὶ λόγος κυρίου from Zion (v. 2) resulting in a cessation of all warfare (v. 3b).

43. Rudolf Meyer, *Hebräische Grammatik,* vol. 3, *Satzlehre* (3rd ed.; 4 vols.; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1966–72), 71–72 (§105.1b); cf. Ådna, "Die Heilige Schrift," 4 n. 12.

44. For a detailed treatment of this expectation in the Bible and in ancient Jewish literature, see Wolfgang Kraus, *Das Volk Gottes: Zur Grundlegung der Ekklesiologie bei Paulus* (WUNT 85; Tübingen: Mohr, 1996).

Zechariah 2:11 [= MT 2:15 and Rahlfs] has already been mentioned above. The Hebrew text is already extraordinary since the covenant formula is used with regard to non-Israelite peoples. In the Septuagint, to καὶ ἔσονται αὐτῷ εἰς λαόν is added the phrase καὶ κατασκηνώσουσιν ἐν μέσῳ σου. So according to Zech 2:11 LXX, the nations will be living in the midst of God's people—what an astonishing expectation![45] Based on this, we could find an answer to the question of how σκηνὴ Δαυίδ in Amos 9:11 LXX has to be understood and why the text has been altered in comparison to the Hebrew. If in Amos 9:12 LXX the expectation that the other nations will follow the God of Israel is in view, then it seems probable that a political ("messianic") restoration of the Davidic rulership is meant, and the relation of v. 12 to v. 11, which is indicated by the use of ὅπως at the beginning of v. 12, supports that idea too. The political restoration will motivate the nations to seek the God of Israel, who does such things for his people. In addition, v. 11 could have Zion/Jerusalem in view as the center for both Israel and the Gentiles to come together and to meet God there. This idea would fit with the way the verb ἐκζητεῖν is used in the Psalter, that is, as a word denoting the search for God in the temple. And there God can be found, eschatologically, also by the nations. So it is not only Edom that will be ruled by a Davidic ruler, as in Amos 9:11–15 MT, but also all the nations that seek the God of Israel. The inclusion of the Gentiles will happen. This action will be initiated by the restoration of the σκηνὴ Δαυίδ, which coincides with the installation of a "messianic" figure by God. The final goal will be God, respected as παντοκράτωρ (Amos 9:15 LXX).[46]

45. The interpretation by Arie van der Kooij ("'De tent van David': Amos 9:11–12 in de griekse Bijbel," in *Door het oog van de Profeten: Exegetische studies angeboden aan Prof. Dr. C. van Leeuwen* [ed. B. Becking, J. van Dorp, and A. van der Kooij; Utrechtse Theologische Reeks 8; Utrecht: Rijksuniversiteit, 1989], 49–56) goes in the same direction. He mentions Hos 3:5 LXX; Zech 8:22 and 14:16 LXX as the conceptual context of Amos 9:11–12 LXX.

46. An interpretation of Amos 9:11–12 related to the end of time can be found also in two writings from Qumran: CD VII, 16; 4QFlor (= 4Q174) III, 12–13. Aside from the first word (והקימותי *hip'il* perfect instead of אקים *hip'il* imperfect) both texts are in accordance with Amos 9:11 MT (את־סכת דויד הנפלת). A minor difference between the two texts pertains to the spelling of "David" and "fallen"—written with or without *mater lectionis*. In the *Damascus Document* we find a combination of Amos 5:26–27; 9:11; and Num 24:13. The Sikkut of the king in Amos 5:26 is interpreted as Sukkat of the king in Amos 9:11 and identified with the Torah. The king himself is identified with the congregation. In Num 24:13 the scepter is understood as the Prince of the Congregation. In 4QFlor we are concerned with a messianic interpretation of 2 Sam 7, one of the main texts regarding the messianic expectation, and its combination with Jer 23:5; 33:13; and Amos 9:11. Amos 9:11 is regarded as a reference to the appearance of the Messiah in the "end of the days."

4. Amos 9:11–12 in the Acts of the Apostles

The situation that Luke, the author of Acts, is talking about in ch. 15 is the so-called Jerusalem "council."[47] The question is whether Gentile believers have to be circumcised—which means they have to convert to Judaism—to become full members of the eschatological community, the ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ. Τινές from Judea (Act 15:1), later identified as τινὲς τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς αἱρέσεως τῶν Φαρισαίων (v. 5), say yes, they have to convert and they have to keep the commandments of Moses. Peter and James say no, they need not, and they argue for their position. After Peter's statement that everyone will be saved through grace, Barnabas and Paul are allowed to tell about what God did among the Gentiles. Finally, James, Jesus' brother and the leading figure in the Jerusalem congregation, rises to speak. In his statement, he first refers to God's deeds through Peter's missionary activities. And this is important: he refers to Symeon (Luke uses this archaic name deliberately, because for his audience it would reflect the historical situation) who made clear καθὼς πρῶτον ὁ θεὸς ἐπεσκέψατο λαβεῖν ἐξ ἐθνῶν λαὸν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ.

With this statement the stage is set to address the question of how uncircumcised people can be part of the λαὸς τοῦ θεοῦ. God has decided to choose for his name a λαὸς ἐξ ἐθνῶν. Then James quotes prophetic words that confirm this intention of God in order to support Peter's view. So the following statement, which includes quotations from the Scriptures, is made as a confirmation. In this way the fact that non-Jews are included in the eschatological people of God is proven to be in line with the Scriptures: καθὼς γέγραπται. Amos 9:11 functions as a scriptural proof for what was already been going on in the early church, that is, the inclusion of the Gentiles.

Let us have a look at the citation itself. At the outset it is important to note that James does not speak of a specific prophetic word, but of οἱ λόγοι τῶν προφητῶν, which accord with the situation. So it becomes clear from the beginning that we are concerned with the words of several prophets, with a mixed quotation.[48] Martin Stowasser rightly argues for the position that the most important catchword in Amos 9:11–12 is to be found in ἔθνος. It is the word that "Apg 15 wie ein roter Faden durchzieht" (vv. 3, 7, 12, 14, 19, 23).[49]

---

47. One has to bear in mind that the term "Jerusalem council," traditionally used for the event reported in Acts 15, does not appropriately describe the situation of the early church.

48. For a mixed quotation, see Martin Stowasser, "Am 5,25–27; 9,11f. in der Qumranüberlieferung und in der Apostelgeschichte: Text- und traditionsgeschichtliche Überlegungen zu 4Q174 (Florilegium) III 12 / CD VII 16 / Apg 7,42b–43; 15,16–18," *ZNW* 92 (2001): 47–63, esp. 58 n. 62.

49. Ibid., 58–59.

In Acts 15:16, the intial words of Amos 9:11—ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ—are not cited, but the clause μετὰ ταῦτα ἀναστρέψω appears instead. Exegetes have made a number of suggestions as to what could have inspired this introductory formula. In Nestle-Aland[27] the suggestion is Jer 12:15. Traugott Holtz posits Zech 1:16 because there the connection to ἀνοικοδομέω would be smoother. But both proposals are not fully appropriate.[50] Holtz is correct in stating that the idea of God turning back to his people is to be found in the prophets repeatedly (cf. Zech 8:3; Mic 7:19; Jer 12:15).[51] Therefore it is not possible to identify one particular passage as the basis of the citation.[52] We instead have to assume that the statement was freely made following such ideas from the prophets.[53]

The lines that follow in Acts 15:16 certainly go back to Amos 9. However, they differ considerably from the Septuagint text of Amos. That is the reason why Holtz wonders if the Septuagint was even the source.[54] Jostein Ådna and Sabine Nägele are convinced that Luke had another *Vorlage*.[55] Ådna assumes that the background of Acts 15:16–18 is another *Hebrew* tradition that differed from both the MT and the LXX. According to Ådna, the historical James used *another Hebrew version,* which was then translated. Ådna therefore concludes that Acts 15:16–18 is a "historisch glaubwürdiges Referat der ausschlaggebenden Stellungnahme des Herrenbruders."[56] I consider these hypotheses to be unjustified and unnecessary. In my opinion the variations have to be explained in a different way.

In Acts 15:16, we find Amos 9:11 in a form that is shortened and changed in order. But all these phenomena can be explained as redactional changes (or at least by the use of another *Greek* form of the text). To presuppose a different *Hebrew* text, used by James and translated by Luke, cannot be proven. Surprisingly, the use of Amos 9:11–12 is in accordance with Luke's ecclesiological ideas.

In v. 16a, Luke replaces the first verb ἀναστήσω with ἀνοικοδομήσω. He does the same when ἀναστήσω occurs a second time in v. 16b.[57] So he moves one word, which occurs in the quotation, to an earlier position in v. 16a.[58] If we examine Luke's language use in the rest of Acts, we find that he uses the transitive form of ἀνίστημι twice in the sense of "to raise up" or "to awaken" a prophet like Moses

---

50. Traugott Holtz, *Untersuchungen über die alttestamentlichen Zitate bei Lukas* (TU 104; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1968), 24.

51. Ibid., 24.

52. Ibid.

53. Ibid.

54. Ibid., 24–25.

55. Ådna, "Die Heilige Schrift," 5–11, esp. 11; Nägele, *Laubhütte*, 83–89.

56. Ådna, "Die Heilige Schrift," 11, 23; cf. eadem, "James' Position," 142–44.

57. Luke does not replace ἀναστήσω in v. 16b with ἀνορθώσω, as Stowasser ("Am 5,25–27; 9,11f.," 59) claims, but moves ἀνοικοδομήσω from v. 16b to v. 16a, and therefore writes ἀνορθώσω in v. 16b.

58. With ἀνορθοῦν Luke refers to 2 Rgns (2 Sam) 7:13, 16 (cf. also 2 Rgns 7:26 in Codex A) and the parallels in 1 Suppl (1 Chr) 17:12, 14, 24; 22:10.

(Acts 3:22; 7:37; based on Deut 18:15, 18). But in all the other instances, ἀνίστημι (transitive) is exclusively used for "to resurrect," "to wake up" (Acts 2:24, 30, 32; 3:26; 9:40–41; 13:33–34; 17:31).[59] As Nägele and others have already noted, at this point the choice of words is due to Luke's language use.[60] He replaces ἀναστήσω because the term is used to denote another concept.

With regard to Acts 15:16, Stowasser has tried to argue for the use of a *testimonium*. He has two major arguments:

1. The first has to do with the choice of words, especially the replacement of ἀνίστημι. For him it seems "unwahrscheinlich, daß der dritte Evangelist Amos 9,11 zwar durch die Auferweckung Jesu als erfüllt ansah, jedoch den deutlichen Bezug, den die Version der LXX mit ἀναστήσω geboten hätte, tilgte, um das Gemeinte durch eine wesentlich schwieriger zu entschlüsselnde Anspielung auf die Natansverheißung auszudrücken."[61] But this presupposition is questionable. In my opinion, Luke did not identify the restoration of the tent of David with the resurrection of Jesus.[62] This seems to be the main reason for the choice of other words.
2. The second argument of Stowasser has to do with the structure of the citation in v. 16. The verbs of v. 16a form a concentric structure: ἀναστρέψω – ἀνοικοδομήσω – ἀνοικοδομήσω – ἀνορθώσω. Simultaneously, the objects taken by ἀνοικοδομήσω are chiastically ordered.[63] Verses 17–18 have a much less "ausgefeilte Struktur."[64] Thus, Stowasser refutes Paul Hoffmann's thesis that v. 16 refers back to v. 14 with convincing arguments.[65]

Jacques Dupont, by contrast, supposes intensive redactional work in v. 16 on Luke's part, which can be identified mainly from the Lukan phrase μετὰ ταῦτα and the verb (ἀνα)στρέφω, which is among the words preferred by Luke.[66] Stowasser rejects Dupont's view, asserting that the allusion in v. 16a to Acts 7:42a, postulated by Dupont, does not exist.[67] Even if Stowasser's assertion is correct, the possibility of redactional changes in v. 16 by Luke would not be refuted.[68] Rather,

59. Ἀνίστημι (transitive) is found in the New Testament only in John 6:39–40, 44, 54 and Matt 22:24 (Mark 14:58 Codex D as *varia lectio*).

60. Evidence is provided by Ådna ("Die Heilige Schrift," 6 n. 21) and Nägele (*Laubhütte*, 89) with reference to Dupont and others.

61. Stowasser, "Am 5,25–27; 9,11f.," 59.

62. Against Stowasser, "Am 5,25–27; 9,11f.," 59.

63. Ibid., 59–60.

64. Ibid., 60.

65. Ibid.

66. Jacques Dupont, "'Je rebâtirai la cabane de David qui est tombeé' (Ac 15,16 = Am 9,11)," in *Glaube und Eschatologie: Festschrift für Werner Georg Kümmel zum 80. Geburtstag* (ed. Erich Gräßer and Otto Merk; Tübingen: Mohr, 1985), 19–32.

67. Stowasser, "Am 5,25–27; 9,11f.," 61.

68. The suggestion of Nägele (*Laubhütte*, 81–82) that the phrase μετὰ ταῦτα has to be

the phrase μετὰ ταῦτα at the level of Lukan redaction makes sense if we, as Stowasser suggests,[69] accept the validity of the allusion in v. 16 to Act 7:42b–43 and consider the Babylonian exile, mentioned in Acts 7:43, to be the point of reference. This is Luke's intention, and it did not happen at a pre-Lukan stage of the tradition.

If the changes in Acts 15:16 go back to Luke's redactional activity, it becomes understandable why Luke omits the phrase καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω τὰ πεπτωκότα αὐτῆς. He has moved up the verb ἀνοικοδομήσω and, as he has already expressed the idea of the rebuilding of the fallen in the first sentence, he can now leave it out.

The clause καὶ τὰ κατεσκαμμένα αὐτῆς ἀναστήσω from Amos 9:11 is completely reproduced by Luke with the exception of the verb, which he has again replaced with ἀνοικοδομήσω. The end of v. 11, καθὼς αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ αἰῶνος, is not reproduced by Luke. We shall see why presently.

In Acts 15:17, Amos 9:12 is reproduced quite literally. However, there are three differences in comparison to the text of Amos: (a) In v. 17a, Luke has inserted ἄν between ὅπως and the subjunctive ἐκζητήσωσιν.[70] (b) After the word ἀνθρώπων he has added the accusative object τὸν κύριον. (c) He omits the article ὁ in front of ποιῶν. Two of these variants are attested in a number of Septuagint manuscripts, including Codex Alexandrinus. Only the omission of the article ὁ in front of ποιῶν is not attested to by the Septuagint manuscript tradition.[71] So it seems possible that Luke used a text that was close to the text tradition of Alexandrinus.

At the end of James's quotation, Luke adds γνωστὰ ἀπ' αἰῶνος. This is no longer part of the quotation from Amos 9. Various exegetes have proposed that it comes from Isa 45:21–23. That is possible.[72] Others see the influence of Hos 3:5.[73] However, we must not call it an exact quotation. As was true for the introductory formula of the citation in v. 16, we may only speak of an "echo," since none of the suggested texts fully accords with Acts 15:17b–18. Thus, that a collection of testimonies was available to Luke must be considered to be a possibility, but, in my opinion, it cannot be proven.[74] It must rather be assumed that, in using the phrase

understood in an eschatological sense, as is the case with ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις, is correctly rejected by Stowasser ("Am 5,25–27; 9,11f.," 62).

69. Stowasser, "Am 5,25–27; 9,11f.," 63.

70. See, as above, BDF §369.5.

71. See Holtz, *Untersuchungen*, 23. However, Holtz's assumption that Luke's *Vorlage*, which was close to the text of Alexandrinus, did not include the article, is very speculative.

72. According to Rudolf Pesch (*Die Apostelgeschichte*, vol. 2, *Apg 13–28* [EKKNT 5.2; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1986], 80), it is exactly the combination with Isa 45:21–22 that made possible a reinterpretation of Amos 9:11–12, "wonach der Wiederaufbau der Hütte Davids in der Gemeinde des Messias Jesus . . . die Voraussetzung dafür ist, daß auch die 'Heiden den Herrn suchen.'"

73. James D. G. Dunn, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Epworth Commentaries; Peterborough: Epworth, 1996), 203.

74. Gerhard Lohfink, *Die Sammlung Israels: Eine Untersuchung zur lukanischen Ekklesiologie* (SANT 39; Munich: Kösel, 1975), 59 n. 142; Pesch, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 81; Ådna, "Die

γνωστὰ ἀπ᾽ αἰῶνος at the end of the quotation, Luke has modified the wording of Amos 9:11, καθὼς αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ αἰῶνος, which was left out earlier.[75]

Let us sum up. For theological reasons Luke has replaced ἀναστήσω twice; therefore, he has twice moved ἀνοικοδομήσω to an earlier position in the sentence and has once newly inserted ἀνορθώσω instead of ἀνοικοδομήσω, which he had already used. Something similar is true for αἰῶνος. He offers an adaptation of the phrase καθὼς αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ αἰῶνος (Amos 9:11b fin) in Acts 15:18. Thus he creates a smooth connection for the introduction of his quotation and emphasizes that what is happening now is in accordance with God's eternal plan. That is why we need not assume any *Vorlage* apart from our text from the Septuagint. The differences can be explained by the redactional activity of the author of Acts.

However, the possibility that the *Vorlage* that Luke used was closely related to Codex Alexandrinus et al. should be considered.[76] But if, as Helmut Utzschneider argues, Luke had a written *Vorlage* that agreed with Alexandrinus, then we would have to state that (1) ὁ θεός was left out after κύριος and (2) the definite article ὁ in front of ποιῶν was also left out.[77] Yet the changes can also be explained in the absence of such a *Vorlage* if Luke quoted from memory or "echoed" scriptural contexts. In that case, too, one of the names of God could have dropped out, and the article, which is not absolutely necessary anyway, could have been omitted.

5. The Quotation from Amos and the Ecclesiology of Luke-Acts

To round out our analysis of the texts of Amos 9 and Acts 15, I would like to examine briefly the theological question of how Luke understood the quotation that he presents to us via James. To answer this question, we have to look at Luke's narrative of the Jesus story and of the early church.

Heilige Schrift," 10. According to Jürgen Wehnert (*Die Reinheit des "christlichen Gottesvolkes" aus Juden und Heiden: Studien zum historischen und theologischen Hintergrund des sogenannten Aposteldekrets* [FRLANT 173; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997], 43), the quotation from Amos in Acts 15 differs a good deal from the other long citation of Amos in Acts 7:42–43. Therefore he assumes that Luke took it from a collection of testimonies. Jacob Jervell (*Die Apostelgeschichte* [KEK 3; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998], 395) says, "könnte."

75. Joachim Jeremias, *Die Sprache des Lukasevangeliums: Redaktion und Tradition im Nicht-Markusstoff des dritten Evangeliums* (KEK: Sonderband; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980), 74. Against this is Wehnert (*Die Reinheit*, 43), but without giving any reasons.

76. See Helmut Utzschneider, "Flourishing Bones: The Minor Prophets in the New Testament," in *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures* (ed. Wolfgang Kraus and R. Glenn Wooden; SBLSCS 53; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature; Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2006), 273–92, esp. 288.

77. In Alexandrinus there is a different ending for Acts 15:17–18: ο ποιων ταυτα γνωστον απ αιωνος τω κ̅ω̅ το εργον αυτου.

Three special texts from the Gospel of Luke describing events shortly before and after Jesus' birth make it clear that the fulfillment of salvation begins in Israel. This is particularly the case in the announcement of the birth (Luke 1:32–33), in Mary's Magnificat (1:46–56, esp. vv. 54–55), and in the prophecy of Zechariah (1:68–79). But at the same time all peoples are included in this salvation, which is pointed out in particular in Simeon's Nunc Dimittis (2:29–32):

> Master, now you are dismissing your servant in peace,
> according to your word;
> for my eyes have seen your salvation,
> which you have prepared in the presence of all peoples,
> a light for the revelation to the Gentiles
> and for glory to your people Israel.

Through his appearance, Jesus provides the prerequisite for the eschatological gathering of Israel and simultaneously the expansion of God's people by those from among the Gentiles. This is the topic of Acts. There are two stages, both to be characterized as fulfillment: first the gathering of Israel, then the gathering of the Gentiles.[78] The beginning of the Gospel of Luke corresponds to the beginning of Acts in a special way: the gathering of Israel begins here. In Acts 2–5, all those who belong to the eschatological people of God are gathered from Israel. Thus, the gathering and reestablishment of Israel by God is taking place.[79] The gathering of Israel corresponds to the special relevance of Jerusalem throughout Luke-Acts.[80]

The first stage of the gathering of Israel is followed by a second stage—the reception of the Gentiles—which is dealt with in most parts of Acts.[81] It is a step-by-step process: first the circle around Stephen goes to the Samaritans; then the minister from Ethiopia joins the believers. Luke supposedly understands him to be a proselyte or sympathizer, though this remains unclear. Through the baptism of Cornelius by Peter, a God-fearer explicitly joins the church. After that, the border to the Gentiles is finally crossed as a result of Paul's missions.[82]

Exactly at this point we find Acts 15 with its discussion about the status of the non-Jews in the eschatological people of God. The speech of James recapitulates and, by quotations from the Scriptures, justifies what has been happening in terms of conformity with the divine plan. In v. 14, James points to the divine plan of sal-

78. Jürgen Roloff, *Die Kirche im Neuen Testament* (GNT 10; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993), 200.

79. Lohfink, *Die Sammlung*, 59.

80. Roloff, *Die Kirche*, 201.

81. Ibid.

82. Wolfgang Kraus, *Zwischen Jerusalem und Antiochia: Die 'Hellenisten,' Paulus und die Aufnahme der Heiden in das endzeitliche Gottesvolk* (SBS 179; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1999), 26-81.

vation, according to which it has always been God's intention "to take from among the Gentiles a λαός for his name." Subsequently James describes this process by his quotation from the prophetic Scriptures.

On the basis of this understanding of the connection between v. 16 and v. 17 involving the purpose clause ὅπως ἂν ἐκζητήσωσιν οἱ κατάλοιποι τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὸν κύριον, it becomes clear that, according to Luke, the raising up of the booth of David is, on the one hand, the indispensable condition for the Gentiles to embark on their quest to seek the Lord.[83] On the other hand, a final purpose is also included. The goal of the raising up of Israel is to gather the Gentiles.[84]

According to Luke, the raising of the fallen booth of David does not mean the restoration of the Davidic dynasty in a political sense, and it does not mean the restoration of the temple, which was destroyed in the year 70. What it means is the specific restoration of the Davidic throne through Jesus, who is the χριστός, the Lord in the city of David. What Luke wants to point out is that in the coming of Jesus the fallen booth of David has finally been restored: "To you is born this day in the city of David a Savior, who is the Messiah, the Lord" (Luke 2:11).

6. Conclusion

Luke has the leader of the early church in Jerusalem quote from Amos 9:11–12 and thus proclaim the biblical justification for the integration of the Gentiles into the eschatological people of God. So Luke uses scriptural proofs to justify current practice. Scripture testifies to the present time and provides the possibility of understanding the identity of the church, even if the text's original focus was different.

But what is meant by "original focus"? Is it found in Amos 9:11, 12b, 14–15 MT, where the restoration of the Davidic kingship is announced? Is it found in the postexilic interpretation of the MT, whereby v. 12a and v. 13 are inserted and domination over Edom and other nations is in view? Is it found in the Septuagint, where the restoration of σκηνὴ Δαυίδ is understood "messianically," and this understanding is coupled with a universal expectation for the rest of the peoples? What is the original focus?

The study of the different stages of these biblical texts provides a different and somehow more complicated set of textual foci. So when I hear the phrase "The Bible says," I ask, "Which Bible? The Masoretic Text, the Septuagint, or the texts quoted in the New Testament?"

The study of the Septuagint adds an aspect to our reading of the Bible that would otherwise be missing. The text becomes fluid or, perhaps more accurately,

83. Jervell, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 395; Roloff, *Die Kirche*, 203; Lohfink, *Die Sammlung*, 60.

84. Lohfink, *Die Sammlung*, 60.

vivid. The study of the LXX sometimes makes theological argumentation more complicated but, at the same time, more interesting, because it demonstrates one important thing. The objective of faith is not the text itself but the one to whom the texts point, that is, the living God.

A Well-Watered Garden (Isaiah 58:11): Investigating the Influence of the Septuagint

Alison Salvesen

1. Introduction

Over twenty years ago Marguerite Harl spoke of two possible ways of studying the Septuagint as a translation: "upstream" (*amont*) or "downstream" (*aval*). In other words, one can look either at the relationship of the Old Greek and its revisions to a posited Hebrew exemplar, or at the reception of the Septuagint in its own right by later generations who had no contact with the Hebrew text.[1] Recent translations of the Septuagint into modern languages have utilized and publicized both of these approaches.[2]

It may now be time to consolidate research and translation activities in areas "irrigated" by the tradition of the Septuagint, namely, the daughter versions and their exegetical traditions in the non-Western churches, many of whose adherents now live in Europe, North America, and Australia. This paper will attempt to summarize what has already been achieved in these areas and will suggest directions for future researchers and translators.

2. Text and Exegesis "Downstream" of the Septuagint? The "Daughter" Versions

Septuagint scholars are hardly unaware of the importance of the versions derived directly from or influenced by the Septuagint. Some have worked on Syriac,

1. Marguerite Harl, "Traduire la Septante en français: pourquoi et comment?" *Lalies* 3 (1984): 83–93; reprinted in eadem, *La langue de Japhet: Quinze études sur la Septante et le grec des Chrétiens* (Paris: Cerf, 2004), 33–42; and, more recently, eadem, "La Bible d'Alexandrie dans les débats actuels sur la Septante," in *La double transmission du texte biblique: Études d'histoire du texte offertes en hommage à Adrian Schenker* (ed. Yohanan Goldman and Christoph Uehliger; OBO 179; Fribourg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001), 7–21.

2. For a recent overview of the different approaches, see Wolfgang Kraus, "Contemporary Translations of the Septuagint: Problems and Perspectives," in *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures* (ed. Wolfgang Kraus and R. Glenn Wooden; SBLSCS 53; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), 63–83.

Armenian, Latin, or Coptic versions in the course of their own research, especially in their role as witnesses to a particular Septuagint recension. To continue with Marguerite Harl's helpful metaphor, they employ the versions in the quest to discover the source of the Nile. Although I will refer to their value for this purpose, today I want to discuss what is going on much further down, in the "Delta."

Therefore this paper will focus on current research on the reception history of the daughter versions, not so much for the light they shed on the OG or its later revisions and recensions as for the influence they had within their societies. What is the legacy of the Septuagint for the later period, and what do the various believing communities owe to the Greek translators and revisers of antiquity?

Greek Versions in Byzantine Jewish Communities

The old notion that the Septuagint was abandoned by Jews in the rabbinic period should be at least nuanced, if not abandoned. Greek versions strongly influenced by the methods and lexicography of the Septuagint continued to be used for centuries by Greek-speaking Jewish communities. The recent Cambridge project entitled The Greek Bible in Byzantine Judaism undertaken by Nicholas de Lange, Cameron Boyd-Taylor, and Julia Krivoruchko highlights the evidence through the Byzantine and Ottoman periods, as far as the Constantinople Pentateuch of the mid-sixteenth century. The project has studied and digitized materials from manuscripts, the Cairo Geniza, and the printed editions and demonstrates the legacy of the Septuagint and other versions in the Jewish world. It also helps us to understand the extent to which changes to the Greek text are due to necessary updating of what had become an archaic language, and the degree to which they were driven by theological considerations within Judaism.

As for Christian versions based on Septuagint, there are still many useful facts in H. B. Swete's *Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*; some additional information in the *Anchor Bible Dictionary* and in Cécile Dogniez's Septuagint bibliography which covers publications between 1970 and 1993. A very full bibliography on the "oriental biblical versions" was provided in 1996 by the late Michel van Esbroeck.[3] He included manuscripts, older editions, and the New Testament as well.

In the last decade, however, significant progress has been made in certain fields. In others it has been slower, whether because of the complexity of the evidence, or because of different priorities, or simply for lack of funding.

---

3. Henry Barclay Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (2nd ed.; rev. Richard Rusden Ottley; Cambridge: University Press, 1914; repr., Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1989), 87–121. In *ABD,* see the various articles under "Versions (Ancient)," 6:787–813; see also Cécile Dogniez, *Bibliographie de la Septante (1970–1993)* (VTSup 60; Leiden: Brill, 1995); and Michel van Esbroeck, "Les versions orientales de la Bible: une orientation bibliographique," in *The Interpretation of the Bible: The International Symposium in Slovenia* (ed. J. Krašovec; JSOTSup 289; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 399–509.

The Role of the Septuagint in Syriac Christianity

The Syriac church is an interesting case because it had its own version of the Jewish canon of the Old Testament, translated directly from the Hebrew by the end of the second century C.E., which therefore did not depend on the Septuagint. However, Septuagintal influence may be seen occasionally in individual renderings, and of course most of the deuterocanonical books were rendered from Greek *Vorlagen*.[4]

Nonetheless, Greek influence on the biblical text and on theology in general increased rapidly from the beginning of the fifth century. There emerged a scholastic "industry" in rendering Greek works into Syriac. Moreover, the resulting translations were continually revised to reflect the Greek originals even more closely, particularly for theological reasons.[5] In the case of the biblical text, this culminated in the Philoxenian and Harklean versions of the New Testament, and the Syrohexapla rendering of Origen's Greek Hexaplaric text of the Septuagint. The Philoxenian version dates from 507/8 C.E., and it may have extended to include some Old Testament books.[6] The Syrohexapla Old Testament and Harklean New Testament shared a similar, very literal translation style, and were both carried out in Egypt in the early seventh century (616 and 615–617 C.E. respectively). As Bas Romeny has noted, part of the motivation behind this kind of activity arose from the unfamiliarity of the biblical citations in Greek patristic works rendered into Syriac. Should the Syriac translator render the quotation according to the Peshitta or the Septuagint text of the original author?[7]

---

4. Michael P. Weitzman, *The Syriac Version of the Old Testament: An Introduction* (University of Cambridge Oriental Publications 56; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 270.

5. Sebastian P. Brock, "Towards a History of Syriac Translation Technique," in *III Symposium Syriacum, 1980: Les contacts du monde syriaque avec les autres cultures. Goslar 7–11 septembre 1980* (ed. René Lavenant; OrChrAn 221; Rome: Pontificium Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1983), 4–5; idem, "From Antagonism to Assimilation: Syriac Attitudes to Greek Learning," in *East of Byzantium: Syria and Armenia in the Formative Period. Dumbarton Oaks Symposium 1980* (ed. Nina G. Garsoïan, Thomas F. Mathews, and Robert W. Thomson; Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Center for Byzantine Studies, Trustees for Harvard University, 1982), 17–34.

6. On the possible existence of a Philoxenian version of the Old Testament, see also R. G. (Geoff) Jenkins, *The Old Testament Quotations of Philoxenus of Mabbug* (CSCO 514, Subsidia 84; Leuven: Peeters, 1989); and Harry F. van Rooy, "The Peshitta and Biblical Quotations in the Longer Syriac Version of the Commentary of Athanasius on the Psalms (BL Add. 14568) with Special Attention to Psalm 23 (24) and 102 (103)," in *The Peshiṭta: Its Uses in Literature and Liturgy. Papers Read at the Third Peshiṭta Symposium* (ed. Bas ter Haar Romeny; Monographs of the Peshiṭta Institute Leiden 15; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 311–25.

7. Bas ter Haar Romeny, "A Philoxenian-Harclean Tradition? Biblical Quotations in Syriac Translations from Greek," in *Syriac Polemics: Studies in Honour of Gerrit Jan Reinink* (ed. Wout J. van Bekkum, Jan Willem Drijvers, and Alex C. Klugkist; Leuven: Peeters, 2007), 59–76. Romeny focuses mainly on New Testament citations, but his conclusions are likely to hold true for the Old Testament as well.

Several manuscripts of the Syrohexapla version have come down to us. The Syrohexapla provided a mirror translation of the "best" Greek Old Testament text—though there seem to be some Lucianic readings in some books, and maybe even some influence from the Peshitta in the course of transmission of the text.[8]

A different course was taken by Jacob of Edessa, in the face of stiff resistance from some of his Syrian Orthodox coreligionists who associated Greek with their theological opponents. Jacob produced a version of the Old Testament of which only certain books survive. In general he seems to have used the Peshitta as a base and replaced individual readings or supplemented them with words or phrases taken directly from Greek manuscripts. There are some signs that he used the Syrohexapla, but being a more than competent Greek scholar, he was able to translate directly from Greek texts in his possession. In the case of Samuel, these had some affinities with Lucianic and Hexaplaric readings.[9]

However, citations in Jacob's other works[10] do not necessarily match his own version of the Old Testament, even in his work on the Six Days of Creation, which was written after he composed his biblical text. This makes it less likely that he was trying to create a kind of standard text primarily for citation purposes. Perhaps it was intended more for exegetical work on the text.[11] Jacob's unique practice of combining the Peshitta with the Septuagint does not appear to have caught on, since what survives of Jacob's version is found only in individual manuscripts written within a decade of his death.

In contrast, the Syrohexapla, with its highly unnatural Syriac style, is much better attested for several centuries. It even became known in the inaccurately titled "Nestorian" church of the East, which was more isolated from contact with Greek. According to a fascinating letter by Timothy I, Catholicos in Baghdad (780–823 C.E.), in around 800 Gabriel of Bukhtishu lent Timothy a copy of the Syrohexapla for six months, in order for him to make three copies of the manu-

---

8. Robert Hiebert, "The 'Syrohexaplaric' Psalter: Its Text and Textual History," in *Der Septuaginta-Psalter und seine Tochterübersetzungen: Symposium in Göttingen 1997* (ed. Anneli Aejmelaeus and Udo Quast; MSU 24; Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), 122–46. There are a number of other studies in this volume on the text and reception history of the Psalter in the daughter versions, which will be mentioned in turn below. See also T. Michael Law, "The Syrohexapla of 3 Kingdoms" (D.Phil. thesis, University of Oxford, 2008).

9. Richard J. Saley, *The Samuel Manuscript of Jacob of Edessa: A Study in Its Underlying Textual Traditions* (Monographs of the Peshiṭta Institute Leiden 9; Leiden: Brill, 1998); Alison G. Salvesen, *The Books of Samuel in the Syriac Version of Jacob of Edessa* (Monographs of the Peshiṭta Institute Leiden 10; Leiden: Brill, 1999).

10. Principally Jacob's biblical scholia, his letters, the *Commentary in Short*, the revision of Severus of Antioch's *Homiliae Cathedrales*, the *Hexaemeron*.

11. See Bas ter Haar Romeny, "Jacob of Edessa on Genesis: His Quotations of the Peshitta and His Revision of the Text," in *Jacob of Edessa and the Syriac Culture of His Day* (ed. Bas ter Haar Romeny; Monographs of the Peshiṭta Institute Leiden 18; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 145–58.

scripts.[12] Timothy speaks of the difficulties of the process, including the transcription of the many marginal notes of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion. Clemens Leonhard notes that, from the evidence of this letter, the provenance of the Syrohexapla was no longer an issue in the church of the East (perhaps because the Arabs were now in charge in Mesopotamia). The Syrohexapla began to be used in the liturgy, as we know from lectionary manuscripts, and West Syrian exegetes like Dionysius bar Salibi (d. 1171) expounded the Peshitta and the Syrohexapla separately in their commentaries. In the ninth century Ishoʿdad of Merv includes readings from the Syrohexapla and also from Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion.[13] Leonhard compares this procedure with what the Antiochene Greek writers were doing at a much earlier date but also with the contemporary practice of comparing the different translations of Greek scientific works to establish the reliability of the textual base.[14]

What is the role that such knowledge played in the Syriac churches, especially in the church of the East? Were readings derived from Greek sources used as aids to understanding the Peshitta, to increase the exegetical possibilities of the biblical text,[15] or merely to demonstrate the learning of the commentator who included them?

The Septuagint and the Old Latin Versions

This is a vast topic, and current research is being carried out chiefly by scholars and monks associated with the Archabbey of Beuron, Germany. The Vetus Latina

---

12. O. Braun, "Ein Brief des Katholikos Timotheos I über biblische Studien des 9 Jahrhunderts," *OrChr* 1 (1901): 312–13; P. Petitmengin and B. Flusin, "Le livre antique et la dictée: Nouvelles recherches," in *Mémorial André-Jean Festugière: Antiquité païenne et chrétienne* (ed. E. Lucchesi and H. D. Saffrey; Cahiers d'orientalisme 10; Geneva: P. Cramer, 1984), 247–62; English translation by Sebastian P. Brock, *A Brief Outline of Syriac Literature* (Kottayam, Kerala: SEERI, 1997), 245–50. See also Bas ter Haar Romeny, "Biblical Studies in the Church of the East," in *Studia Patristica: Papers Presented at the Thirteenth International Conference on Patristic Studies Held in Oxford, 1999* (ed. M. F. Wiles, E. J. Yarnold, and P. M. Parvis; 5 vols.; SP 34–38; Leuven: Peeters, 2001), 34.503–10; Clemens Leonhard, *Ishodad of Merw's Exegesis of the Psalms 119 and 139–147: A Study of His Interpretation in the Light of the Syriac Translation of Theodore of Mopsuestia's Commentary* (CSCO 585, Subsidia 107; Leuven: Peeters, 2001), 34–39.

13. Alison G. Salvesen, "Hexaplaric Sources in Ishoʿdad of Merv," in *The Book of Genesis in Jewish and Oriental Christian Interpretation: A Collection of Essays* (ed. Judith Frishman and Lucas Van Rompay; Traditio Exegetica Graeca 5; Leuven: Peeters, 1997), 229–53.

14. Leonhard, *Ishodad of Merw's Exegesis,* 38. See also the comments of Romeny, "Biblical Studies," 504, comparing the process to the practice of the great "Interpreter" of the church of the East, the revered Theodore of Mopsuestia, in his commentaries.

15. Compare Origen's desire for "exegetical maximalism," as argued by Adam Kamesar (*Jerome, Greek Scholarship, and the Hebrew Bible: A Study of the* Quaestiones Hebraicae in Genesim [Oxford: Clarendon, 1993], esp. 19 and 29), and now also T. Michael Law, "Origen's Parallel Bible: Textual Criticism, Apologetics, or Exegesis?," *JTS* 59 (2008): 1–21.

Institute there was founded by the Benedictine Dom Bonifatius Fischer and is now overseen by Dom Roger Gryson of Louvain-la-Neuve. They are apparently about halfway through, after sixty years of work.

The reason for the size and complexity of the task is that the Old Latin was never a single text or version. The Latin versions (in the plural) that preceded the work of Jerome on the Hebrew text probably started to emerge in the second century C.E. They may have arisen as ad hoc translations of whatever Septuagint texts were available. Subsequent revisional activity sometimes even reflected the influence of the Hebrew as well as the various Greek text types in circulation.[16] This diversity was certainly recognized in antiquity: Jerome tells us that in his day there were as many types of text as there were manuscripts of the Latin Bible.[17] Of course, it was in Jerome's own interest to stress the unsatisfactory nature of the Old Latin, which he had begun to revise before being convinced of the necessity of returning to the "Hebraica veritas." Yet even Augustine, a strong proponent of the Old Latin because of its derivation from the inspired Septuagint, commented on the infinite diversity, unknown number, and poor competence of the Latin translators of the Septuagint, compared with the Seventy who had rendered the Hebrew into Greek.[18]

The modern scholarly task is to gather up fragments, palimpsests, and early patristic citations of Old Latin biblical texts. Natalio Fernández Marcos has emphasized that the very complex nature of the Old Latin means that it must first be critically examined according to the proper criteria of inner-textual criticism before it can be used for the restoration of the [Hebrew] biblical text.[19] In the meantime, a number of studies of individual books and their text history have appeared, such as that of Pierre-Maurice Bogaert on the Old Latin Psalter.[20]

As is well known, Jerome characterized the Old Latin as having been "poured from the third jar," as if each translation process formed a step further away from

---

16. See Julio Trebolle-Barrera, "Mestizaje textual de la Biblia en el Mediterranéo," in *La Biblia i el Mediterrani: Actes del Congrés de Barcelona 18–22 de setembre de 1995* (ed. A. Borrell, A. de la Fuente, and A. Puig; Barcelona: Associació Bíblica de Catalunya, 1997), 15–40.

17. Jerome, *Preface to Joshua:* Maxime cum apud Latinos tot exemplaria quot codices, et unusquisque pro arbitrio suo vel addiderit vel subtraxerit quod ei visum est, et utique non possit verum esse quod dissonet.

18. Augustine, *Doctr. chr.* 2.11.16: . . . latinorum interpretum infinita uarietas . . . qui enim scripturas ex hebraea in graecam uerterunt, numerari possunt, latini autem interpretes nullo modo. Ut enim cuique primis fidei temporibus in manus uenit codex graecus et aliquantum facultatis sibi utriusque linguae habere uidebatur, ausus est interpretari. See also *Letter* 82 to Jerome: ideo autem desidero interpretationem tuam de septuaginta, ut et tanta latinorum interpretum, qui qualescumque hoc ausi sunt, quantum possumus, inperitia careamus.

19. Natalio Fernández Marcos, *Scribes and Translators: Septuagint and Old Latin in the Books of Kings* (VTSup 54; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 87.

20. Pierre-Maurice Bogaert, "Le psautier latin des origines au XIIe siècle, Essai d'histoire," in Aejmelaeus and Quast, *Der Septuaginta-Psalter*, 51–81.

the Hebrew truth. Jerome felt that his "inside track" of the rabbis and the Three (Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion) enabled him to reach the meaning of that Hebrew Truth, but an examination of his translation reveals that he did not necessarily abandon distinctive readings of the Septuagint (such as Isa 7:14) but merely tried to justify them on Hebrew grounds.[21]

Other daughter versions have been studied to a greater or lesser extent for their textual witness to the Septuagint, but there appears to have been little work as yet carried out on the reception of their biblical texts within their communities.

The Septuagint and the Armenian Version of the Old Testament

Armenia converted to Christianity in the early fourth century. The Armenian alphabet was invented around 400 C.E., and biblical translations followed soon after. According to Koriwn's *Life of Mashtoc'*,[22] the originator of the Armenian alphabet, the first Old Testament book translated from Greek was Proverbs, a rather unlikely starting point.[23] According to early Armenian sources, there were two stages of translation, separated only by a single generation. The first took place just after the invention of the alphabet, and the second just after the Council of Ephesus (431), in which the original renderings, characterized by one early writer as "hasty," were revised on the basis of manuscripts brought from Constantinople. Some scholars have identified Syriacisms in the early stratum (Arm 1) of certain books (such as Daniel[24] but not Job and probably not Deuteronomy either; see below), which would not be surprising in the light of historical allusions to the role of Syriac early on in the translation process. However, the actual textual evidence

21. See Benjamin Kedar, "The Latin Translations," in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading, and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (ed. Martin J. Mulder and Harry Sysling; CRINT, section 2, Literature of the Jewish People in the Period of the Second Temple and the Talmud 1; Assen: Van Gorcum; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1988), 299–338, esp. 323.

22. The account was written ca. 442, and Mashtoc' lived ca. 361/2–440 C.E. See Claude E. Cox, *The Armenian Translation of Deuteronomy* (University of Pennsylvania Armenian Texts and Studies 2; Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1981), 6–13.

23. However, see Robert W. Thomson, *Hamam: Commentary on the Book of Proverbs: Edition of the Armenian Text, English Translation, Notes and Introduction* (Hebrew University Armenian Studies 5; Leuven: Peeters, 2005), 11–12, for some explanations. Vrej Nersessian (*The Bible in the Armenian Tradition* [London: British Library, 2001], 13–17, 38–45) provides a critique of the three earliest historical accounts of the background to the translation, and of the commentary tradition.

24. S. Peter Cowe, *The Armenian Version of Daniel* (University of Pennsylvania Armenian Texts and Studies 9; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 11, 350, 419–32. Cowe also makes extensive use of patristic and liturgical citations of the book (389–414), though as witnesses to the earliest possible biblical text rather than for reception history of the book.

is not clear-cut.[25] As for the text revised toward the apparently officially sanctioned Greek manuscripts (Arm 2), J.-P. Mahé suggests that it must have rather undercut the exegesis based on the Syriac Antiochene biblical translation models, and that the new drive to translate or revise the works of the Greek Fathers (rather than the Syriac or Antiochene ones, as previously) derived from a desire to follow the orthodox theological line.[26]

As with other versions such as Coptic and Ethiopic, one of the main problems of investigating the textual base of the Armenian Old Testament is that the earliest manuscripts are very late: the phenomenon of early exemplars being preserved in caves in the Judean desert or in arid monasteries in Egypt does not occur for the Armenian biblical tradition. The oldest manuscript is a Psalter of the tenth or eleventh century. So evidence of the earlier translational layer (Arm 1) has to come from fifth-century citations. As with all citations, there is an element of uncertainty concerning whether they derive directly from a biblical text or are the result of paraphrase or faulty recollection on the part of the writer.[27]

Though the nearest thing we have to a critical text of the whole Old Testament is Zohrab/Zohrapian's diplomatic edition of 1805, which for modern scholars leaves much to be desired, in recent years there have been some notable studies on individual Armenian Old Testament books.[28] The Armenian patriarch of

25. Cowe comments that "the Syriac component which seems embedded in the texture of Arm1 is still extremely nebulous" ("Problematics of Editions of Armenian Biblical Texts," in *Armenian Texts and Tools* [ed. H. Lehmann and J. J. S. Weitenberg; Acta Jutlandica 69.1, Humanities Series 68; Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 1993], 32). Others find more positive evidence, e.g., Levon Ter Petrosyan, "La plus ancienne version arménienne des chroniques. Étude préliminaire," *Revue des Études Arméniennes* 18 (1984): 215–25, but this is disputed by Cowe ("The Two Armenian Versions of Chronicles: Their Origin and Translation Technique," *Revue des Études Arméniennes* 22 [1990–91]: 53–96).

26. J.-P. Mahé, "Traduction et exégèse: Réflexions sur l'example arménien," in *Mélanges Antoine Guillaumont: Contributions à l'étude des christianismes orientaux* (Cahiers d'orientalisme 20; Geneva: Patrick Cramer, 1988), 243–55. On the position of the Armenian church in contrast to the Greek churches, see 244: "Les communautés chrétiennes de la langue grecque n'ont jamais eu à traduire l'Écriture, aussi bien le NT que l'AT; elles n'ont donc jamais eu le choix entre plusieurs transpositions possibles du discours inspiré, impliquant déjà virtuellement différentes exégèses. Pour elles, il y eut d'abord le texte et ensuite l'exégèse. Au contraire, pour les Arméniens, ni l'un ni l'autre ne furent d'abord donnés, mais l'un et l'autre furent à conquérir, et, pour ainsi dire, simultanément."

27. See Nersessian, *Bible in the Armenian Tradition,* 17–21.

28. L. Ter Petrosyan's introduction to A. Zeyt'unyan's *The Book of Genesis* (in Armenian; Monuments of Ancient Armenian Translations 1; Erevan: Academy of Sciences, 1985) provides a bibliography of research on the different translation influences in the biblical books and commentaries, but both introduction and edition are in Armenian. However, Zeyt'unyan's article "Les divergences des manuscrits grecs et arméniens du livre de la Genèse," in *Armenia and the Bible: Papers Presented to the International Symposium Held at Heidelberg, July 16–19, 1990* (ed. Christoph Burchard; University of Pennsylvania Armenian Texts and Studies 12; Atlanta: Schol-

Jerusalem, Shahe Ajamian, encouraged research on the Armenian Bible.[29] Claude Cox, who is well known as a Septuagintist as well as an Armenian scholar, wrote and subsequently published his doctoral thesis on Armenian Deuteronomy.[30] He recently produced a critical edition of Armenian Job compared with the Old Greek. This study proves that Armenian Job was influenced both by Origen's Hexaplaric text and by the Lucianic recension, with little or no influence from the Peshitta.[31] Peter Cowe has published an edition of Armenian Daniel, in the introduction to which he notes the centrality of the book of Daniel for early Armenian Christianity (perhaps even before a written version based on Greek existed in the language). He recounts the book's influence on the community's self-perception in a period of political unrest and martyrdom.[32] Making extensive use of patristic and liturgical citations of the book as witnesses to the earliest possible biblical text, he argues that, in contrast to the situation in Deuteronomy and Job, there are signs of influence from the Peshitta on the original translation.[33] Cox has produced a significant study of the Armenian witnesses to the Psalter and has also worked on the preservation of Hexaplaric material in Armenian biblical manuscripts, including readings from the Three—Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion.[34] J. J. S. Weitenberg has produced a parallel text and concordance of Armenian and Greek Jonah, and an index to Armenian Deuteronomy.[35]

---

ars Press, 1993), 233–43, concludes that the Greek *Vorlage* for Armenian Genesis was Hexaplaric. Zeyt'unyan's approach has been criticized by Claude E. Cox ("A Review of Zeyt'unyan's Edition of Genesis from the Standpoint of Septuagint Criticism," *Revue des Études Arméniennes* 21 [1988–89]: 87–125). Cowe surveys the difficulties of producing editions of biblical texts in "Problematics of Editions," 26–37.

29. See the volume of papers edited by Michael E. Stone, *Armenian and Biblical Studies* (Sion Supplement 1; Jerusalem: St. James Press, 1976). There have also been some studies on the Armenian Apocrypha: see Valentina Calzolari Bouvier, Jean-Daniel Kaestli, and Bernard Outtier, eds., *Apocryphes arméniens: transmission, traduction, création, iconographie. Actes du colloque international sur la littérature apocryphe en langue arménienne, Genève, 18–20 septembre, 1997* (Publications de l'Institut romand des sciences bibliques 1; Lausanne: Zèbre, 1999).

30. Cox, *Armenian Translation of Deuteronomy*. On the scant influence of the Peshitta, see 326–27.

31. Claude E. Cox, *Armenian Job*: *Reconstructed Greek Text, Critical Edition of the Armenian with English Translation* (Hebrew University Armenian Studies 8; Leuven and Dudley, Mass.: Peeters, 2006), 1, 407–9.

32. Cowe, *Armenian Version of Daniel*, 1–4.

33. Ibid., 11, 389–414, 419–32.

34. Claude E. Cox, "The Armenian Version and the Old Greek Psalter," in Aejmelaeus and Quast, *Der Septuaginta-Psalter*, 174–47; idem, *Hexaplaric Materials Preserved in the Armenian Version* (SBLSCS 21; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986).

35. J. J. S. Weitenberg, *Parallel Aligned Text and Bilingual Concordance of the Armenian and Greek Versions of the Book of Jonah* (Dutch Studies in Armenian Language and Literature 1; Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1992). This is Zohrab's diplomatic edition of the Armenian Bible aligned with the CATSS (Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint Studies) text. See also J. J. S.

It was noted above that the work of translating Greek patristic commentaries into Armenian started very early.[36] Some attributions appear to have been changed, and this is how some more theologically controversial authors survived in the Armenian tradition: thus Theodoret's *Commentary on Ezekiel* went under the name of his opponent Cyril of Alexandria, Theodoret's Psalm commentary was attributed to Epiphanius, and a *Commentary on the Octateuch* that was actually composed by Eusebius of Emesa was also passed off as the work of Cyril.[37] The comparatively late timing of Armenian literary development, just before the major theological schisms of the fifth century, meant that both biblical and exegetical translations were inevitably affected by the desire for what was seen as orthodoxy, and both of them became more literal over time. Perhaps the power and authority of Greek ecclesiastical writers exerted a stranglehold on native commentary writing until the later period.

As for medieval exegesis of the Old Testament by native Armenians, Robert Thomson has provided an overview of the trends in reception history, such as the way in which historical writers used the book of Genesis to provide a setting for their own national origins.[38] He has also written on the reception of Psalms by early Armenian writers and by the twelfth-century writer Nerses of Lambron and the thirteenth-century commentator Vardan Arewelc'i.[39] Thomson has himself recently published an edition of a late-ninth-century commentary on Proverbs by Hamam.[40] He observes that, most unusually, the lemmata in the commentary do not correspond to the biblical text of the commentary itself. The commentator explains the received Armenian biblical text, which follows the Septuagint, but as Thomson observes, sometimes the lemma at the start of each section of commentary does not agree with any known version of Proverbs.[41] Thomson has ruled out

---

Weitenberg and A. de Leeuw van Weenen, *Lemmatized Index of the Armenian Version of Deuteronomy* (SBLSCS 32; Leiden Armenological Publications 1; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990).

36. In this context it is relevant to note that Philo of Alexandria's work *Questions on Genesis and Exodus* survives only in an Armenian translation, probably dating from the fifth century. See Charles Mercier, *Quaestiones et solutiones in Genesim e versione armeniaca* (2 vols.; Les œuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie 34A, 34B; Paris: Cerf, 1979, 1984).

37. Mahé, "Traduction et exégèse," 248.

38. Robert W. Thomson, "Aspects of Medieval Armenian Exegesis," in *New Approaches to Medieval Armenian Language and Literature* (ed. J. J. S. Weitenberg; Dutch Studies in Armenian Language and Literature 3; Amsterdam and Atlanta: Rodopi, 1995), 47–62.

39. See preceding note, and idem, "Uses of the Psalms in Some Early Armenian Authors," in *From Byzantium to Iran: Armenian Studies in Honour of Nina G. Garsoïan* (ed. Jean-Pierre Mahé and Robert W. Thomson; Columbia University Program in Armenian Studies 8; Suren D. Fesjian Academic Publications 5; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), 281–300.

40. See Thomson, *Hamam,* 15-18, on the biblical lemmata. Thomson notes that some early Old Testament commentaries (such as those attributed to Ełishe) have been published, but only in Armenian.

41. See Thomson, "Traditions of Armenian Biblical Exegesis" (forthcoming).

interference from the Vulgate on the part of the late-seventeenth-century scribe, and the source of the aberrant citations seems to be unknown.[42]

Theo van Lint is working on the reception of the throne vision of Ezekiel in Armenian literature and art, in particular through Vardan Anecʿi's poem on the divine chariot (tenth–eleventh centuries), and Esayi Nchʿecʿi's commentary on the book of Ezekiel, written in 1303.[43]

Robert Thomson generously sent me a copy of his bibliography of texts and studies on the subject of Armenian biblical commentaries known to him. From this it is clear that there is a good deal of work relevant to Septuagint studies currently being carried out by Armenologists. Some of this has appeared in English, French, German, or Italian, and so is accessible to nonspecialists. Many other studies have been published, however, only in Armenian. According to Thomson, "There is an important undertaking at Ejmiacin to publish Armenian commentaries, so many of which have remained unpublished. But the study of sources and the Armenian interpretation of scripture remain little explored."[44]

Coptic Versions

Studies on the Old Testament in Coptic appear to be sparse.[45] However, two articles on the textual witnesses to the Sahidic Psalter appeared in the volume edited by Aejmelaeus and Quast on the Septuagint Psalms and the daughter versions.[46] Van Esbroeck's bibliography gives details of some recent papyrological publications relevant to the Old Testament in various Coptic dialects.[47]

---

42. Thomson provides a helpful overview of Armenian commentaries in "Homilies and Biblical Commentary in Classical Armenian Writers," in *Worship Traditions in Armenia and the Neighboring Christian East: An International Symposium in Honor of the 40th Anniversary of St. Nersess Armenian Seminary* (ed. Roberta A. Ervine; AVANT: Treasures of the Armenian Christian Tradition 3; Crestwood, N.Y.: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press; New Rochelle, N.Y.: St. Nersess Armenian Seminary, 2006), 175–86. He notes that there are more complete surveys, but only in modern Armenian.

43. Esayi Nchʿecʿi (1255?–1338) was abbot, from 1284 until his death, of the monastery of Gladzor, which was one of the leading schools in Armenia. His commentary apparently includes many references to readings of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion. I am grateful to Prof. Van Lint for this information on his current research.

44. See also Cox, *Armenian Job*, 1–4, for a brief survey of Job citations and the commentary tradition on Job.

45. P. Nagel, "Old Testament, Coptic translations of," in *The Coptic Encyclopedia* (ed. Aziz S. Atiya; 8 vols.; New York: Macmillan, 1991) 6:1836–40.

46. P. Nagel, "Der sahidische Psalter: Seine Erschließung und Erforschung neunzig Jahre nach Alfred Rahlfs' Studien zum Text des Septuagint-Psalters," in Aejmelaeus and Quast, *Der Septuaginta-Psalter*, 82–96; and, in the same volume, J. Horn, "Die koptische (sahidische) Überlieferung des alttestamentlichen Psalmenbuches: Versuch einer Gruppierung der Textzeugen für die Herstellung des Textes," 97–106.

47. Van Esbroeck, "Les versions orientales de la Bible," 422–51.

Robert Simpson reports that

> most Coptic biblical research is concentrated on the New Testament at the moment; another [problem] is that many Bible MSS are in a dismembered state with the leaves scattered over different Western collections, so the next thing we Copticists need to do (it is being started) is to sort out which leaves go (or originally went) together and thus create "virtual codices" which can then be studied in something like the normal way. As you might imagine this means that Coptic biblical studies are millions of miles behind Greek.[48]

Thus it seems that the reception history of the Coptic Old Testament may be at an early stage. However, Arietta Papaconstantinou has published studies of eighth-century Coptic documents recording the donation of children by their parents to a monastery. These deeds refer to, or even employ, the text of the Song of Hannah from 1 Samuel 2. The texts reflect not the OG but the Origenic recension, as we would expect. They demonstrate the scribes' familiarity with the biblical episode.[49]

Ethiopic

The general consensus is that there are three stages in the history of the Geez Old Testament text. First it was translated from the Septuagint in the fourth to sixth centuries; next a vulgar recension emerged, incorporating revisions to the Arabic and perhaps also to the Syriac text; and in the third stage it was revised toward the Hebrew MT. However, there is a long gap between the first translation and the first manuscript evidence for it, since the earliest Old Testament manuscripts date from the fourteenth or fifteenth centuries. This means that other sources such as liturgy and inscriptions are important witnesses to earlier forms of the text.

Some critical editions of individual books (Chronicles, Daniel, and the Minor Prophets) appeared in the 1920s and 1930s.[50] Both Edward Ullendorff and Michael

48. E-mail communication, September 2008. I am very grateful to Dr. Simpson for his help.

49. Arietta Papaconstantinou, "Θεία οἰκονομία: Les actes thébains de donation d'enfants ou la gestion monastique de la pénurie," in *Mélanges Gilbert Dagron* (Travaux et Mémoires 14; Paris: Association des amis du Centre d'histore et civilisation de Byzance, 2002), 511–26; eadem, "Notes sur les actes de donation d'enfant au monastère thébain de Saint-Phoibammon," *Journal of Juristic Papyrology* 32 (2002): 83–105; eadem, "La prière d'Anne dans la version sahidique du *Premier livre des Règnes*: quelques témoins méconnus," in *Adamantius: Journal of the Italian Research Group on "Origen and the Alexandrian Tradition,"* 11 (2005): 227–31. I am grateful to Dr. Papaconstantinou for these references.

50. E.g., Sylvain Grébaut, *Les Paralipomènes, livres I et II: Version éthiopienne éditée et traduite d'après les manuscrits 94 de la Bibliothèque nationale et 35 de la collection d'Abbadie* (PO 23.4; Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1932); Oscar Löfgren, *Die äthiopische Übersetzung des Propheten Daniel: Nach Handschriften in Berlin, Cambridge, Frankfurt am Main, London, Oxford, Paris und Wien* (Paris: Geuthner, 1927); idem, *Jona, Nahum, Habakuk, Zephania, Haggai, Sacharja und*

Knibb gave their British Academy Schweich Lectures on Ethiopia and the Bible, in 1967 and 1995 respectively.[51] So Knibb was able to report on what progress had been made in the study of the Old Testament text in Geez. He cited the work of microfilming thousands of manuscripts as a significant step.[52] He himself is currently preparing an edition of the Ethiopic translation of Ezekiel.[53] He has also written on the textual history of the Psalms,[54] and Monica Devens has produced a concordance to the text of the Psalter.[55] According to Knibb, "research into the broad area of the Ethiopic Bible and traditional Ethiopian exegesis is flourishing, but perhaps not so much is being done directly on the Old Testament";[56] that is, there is more work being done on the New Testament and what we might term pseudepigraphal books. He also reports that the Asien-Afrika-Institut in Hamburg is a major research center, actively publishing studies in the area.

As for the commentary tradition, in 1988 Roger Cowley produced a study of the *andemta* interpretations of the Geez text of Gen 1:1–2:4 and the complex relations of the Greek, Syriac, Arabic, and Amharic commentary materials.[57] He

---

Maleachi äthiopisch: Unter Zugrundelegung des Oxforder MS. Huntington 625 nach mehreren Handschriften herausgegeben (Arbeiten utgivna med understöd av Vilhelm Ekmans universitetsfond Uppsala 38; Paris: Champion; Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1930); Hans Ferdinand Fuhs, *Die äthiopische Übersetzung des Propheten Micha: Edition und textkritischer Kommentar nach den Handschriften in Oxford, London, Paris, Cambridge, Wien und Frankfurt am Main* (BBB 28; Bonn: Hanstein, 1968); idem, *Die äthiopische Übersetzung des Propheten Hosea: Edition und textkritischer Kommentar nach den Handsciriften in Berlin, Cambridge, Frankfurt am Main, London, München, Oxford, Paris und Wien* (BBB 38; Bonn: Hanstein, 1971); Samuel A. B. Mercer, *The Ethiopic Text of the Book of Ecclesiastes* (Oriental Research Series 6; London: Luzac, 1931); Hugh Craswall Gleave, *The Ethiopic Version of the Song of Songs* (London: Taylor's Foreign Press, 1951).

51. See Edward Ullendorff, *Ethiopia and the Bible* (Schweich Lectures 1967; London: Oxford University Press, 1968), 31–62, on the origins of the Ethiopic Bible; followed and largely superseded by Michael A. Knibb, *Translating the Bible: The Ethiopic Version of the Old Testament* (Schweich Lectures 1995; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999). See also Ullendorff, "Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek: The Versions Underlying Ethiopic Translations of the Bible and Intertestamental Literature," in *The Bible World: Essays in Honor of Cyrus H. Gordon* (ed. Gary Rendsburg et al.; New York: Ktav, 1980), 249–57.

52. This is the work of the Hill Monastic Microfilm Library: see http://www.hmml.org/centers/ethiopia/emml_intro.html.

53. Michael A. Knibb, "Hebrew and Syriac Elements in the Ethiopic Version of Ezekiel?" *JSS* 33 (1988): 11–35; idem, "The Ethiopic Text of Ezekiel and the Excerpts in *Gebra Hemamat*," *JSS* 34 (1989): 443–58.

54. Michael A. Knibb, "The Ethiopic Translation of the Psalms," in Aejmelaeus and Quast, *Der Septuaginta-Psalter*, 107–22.

55. Monica S. Devens, *A Concordance to Psalms in the Ethiopic Version* (Aethiopische Forschungen 59; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2001).

56. Michael A. Knibb, e-mail communication. He also draws attention to the periodical *Aethiopica*, and the three published volumes of the *Encyclopaedia Aethiopica*, which has a series of articles on the Bible. I am very grateful to him for his assistance.

57. Roger W. Cowley, *Ethiopian Biblical Interpretation: A Study in Exegetical Tradition and*

concluded that there is continuity with Antiochene exegetical traditions of commentary, and that the commentary tradition contains some haggadic elements. His work has encouraged the study of the *andemta* tradition, and there has been at least one conference session on the topic, as well as monographs on the exegesis of the Psalms, Hosea, and Micah.[58]

Jon Abbink of Leiden University has produced an extensive bibliography of Ethiopian Christianity in 2003, available on the Web, but the number of studies specifically on the Old Testament and its reception in Ethiopia still appears to be relatively limited.

Christian Palestinian Aramaic

The Christian Palestinian Aramaic Old Testament was translated from the Septuagint, but according to Christa Müller-Kessler and Michael Sokoloff, only 10 percent of the original corpus has survived, and in a very uneven way. The 1973 edition of Goshen-Gottstein incorporated previously published lectionary texts, some of which were relatively late manuscripts of the ninth to thirteenth centuries, and Old Testament citations in the New Testament.[59] The 1997 edition of Müller-Kessler and Sokoloff covers some new material as well as improved readings of previously known texts. It includes only texts from the earlier stage of the written language, the fifth to eighth centuries, and thus does not cover lectionary texts from a later period.[60] Most of the texts in the edition are palimpsests and therefore hard to decipher. They include fragments, often very small ones, from Genesis, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, 1 and 2 Samuel, 1 and 2 Kings, Job, Proverbs, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Lamentations, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, and Epistle of Jeremiah. There is a glossary, but the editors admit that they have left the evaluation of the biblical text to experts. Thus, there is no sustained comparison with the Septuagint text tradition within the edition itself, and, presumably, not all the

---

Hermeneutics (University of Cambridge Oriental Publications 38; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).

58. Kirsten Stoffregen Pedersen, *Traditional Ethiopian Exegesis of the Book of Psalms* (Aethiopische Forschungen 36; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1995); Weldetensae Andeberhan, *Commentari Etiopici sul Libro del Profeta Osea: Ecizione critica da mss inediti, principi ermeneutici, temi teologici* (Aethiopische Forschungen 40; Wiesbaden; Harrassowitz, 1994); Miguel Angel García, *Ethiopian Biblical Commentaries on the Prophet Micah* (Aethiopische Forschungen 52; Wiesbaden; Harrassowitz, 1999).

59. Moshe Goshen-Gottstein, *The Bible in the Syropalestinian Version,* part 1, *Pentateuch and Prophets* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1973).

60. Christa Müller-Kessler and Michael Sokoloff, *The Christian Palestinian Aramaic Old Testament and Apocrypha Version from the Early Period* (Corpus of Christian Palestinian Aramaic 1; Groningen: STYX, 1997). David G. K. Taylor plans to edit some of the Christian Palestinian Aramaic Psalms texts.

readings will have been incorporated into the Göttingen editions that were published prior to 1997.

Christian Arabic

Regarding modern editions of the Old Testament in Christian Arabic, there seems to be very little beyond what one can find in the entries in the *Anchor Bible Dictionary*,[61] and *The Coptic Encyclopedia*,[62] along with van Esbroeck's bibliography. Samir Khalil Samir has published some articles in French on the reception history of the Old Testament in Christian Arabic, especially on the twelfth-century commentator Marqus Ibn al-Qunbar.[63] Most current work on the Arabic Bible seems to be focused on the text of and commentaries on the New Testament.

Georgian

The Georgian people converted to Christianity probably toward the end of the fourth century.[64] Their language is unrelated to any other, apart from ones very local to the Caucasus, and it certainly has no connection to Armenian, which is Indo-European. The earliest complete text of the Old Testament is the Bible of Oshki, written in 978 C.E. In recent years many Georgian manuscripts and palimpsests with relevance to biblical studies have been discovered on Mount Sinai, but it will be some time before these are fully edited. Moreover, fighting in Georgia itself in 2008 has undoubtedly resulted in the loss of many manuscripts, but in the absence of full catalogues in many monasteries and churches, we may never know how many have perished.

Anna Kharanauli has written a detailed introduction on the Georgian Psalter for the Göttingen Symposium volume mentioned earlier. She concludes that the question of the Georgian Psalms' dependence on the Armenian needs further discussion, since certain similarities could arise from common translation techniques

61. See n. 3 above.

62. Samir Khalil Samir, "Old Testament, Arabic versions of," in *The Coptic Encyclopedia* (ed. Aziz S. Atiya; 8 vols.; New York: Macmillan, 1991) 6:1827–36.

63. Samir Khalil Samir, "L'Esprit dans le Commentaire de la Genèse d'Ibn al-Qunbar (12e s.)," in *L'Esprit-Saint dans la vie de l'Église: Actes du Deuxième Colloque (27, 28 Février et 1er Mars 1998)* (ed. Samir Khalil Samir; Jounieh: Editions St-Paul, 2000), 99–128; idem, "La symbolique de l'Arche de Noé dans le commentaire allégorique de Marqus Ibn al-Qunbar (12e siècle)," in *Bible et patrimoine de l'Orient: Mélanges offerts au Rvd. Père Paul Féghali* (ed. Ayoub Chehwan and Antoine Kassis; Beirut: Fédération Biblique, 2002), 265–317; idem, "L'Esprit dans le Commentaire de la *Genèse*, d'Ibn al-Qunbar, XII siècle," in *Cedrus Libani* no. 66 (4° trimestre 2002): 139-42.

64. A very brief overview is given by J. Neville Birdsall, "Georgian Translations of the Bible," in Krašovec, *Interpretation of the Bible*, 387–91.

or exegesis. Other "Armenianisms" could have entered later.[65] Other articles have appeared since the 1970s on biblical subjects, but mainly in Georgian.[66]

---

65. Anna Kharanauli, "Einführung in die georgische Psalterübersetzung," in Aejmelaeus and Quast, *Der Septuaginta-Psalter*, 248–308.

66. See Van Esbroeck, "Les versions orientales de la Bible," 479. The following information was kindly supplied by Prof. Bernard Outtier of the Centre national de la recherche scientifique (CNRS). He notes that the first complete edition of the Bible in Georgian dates from 1743 and was published in Moscow. I have preserved the French titles of some of the following works for accessibility, since many are wholly or principally in Georgian. The names of authors and editors are transliterated according to French convention, and I have not attempted to change them. Vol. 1: *Genesis, Exodus* (ed. B. Gigineichvili and C. Kikvidze; Tbilisi: Institute of Manuscripts, 1989); Vol. 2: *Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy* (ed. I. Abuladze, B. Gigineichvili, N. Goguadze, and T. Kurtsikidze; Tbilisi: Institute of Manuscripts, 1990); Vol. 3: *Joshua, Judges, Ruth* (ed. C. Kurcikidze and U. Cindeliani; Tbilisi: Institute of Manuscripts, 1991); Vol 4: *Esdras, Tobie, Sagesse, Baruch, Lettre de Jérémie, 3 Esdras* (ed. Ciala Kurcikidze; Tbilisi: Institute of Manuscripts, 1970); Vol. 5: *Psalms* (ed. Mzekala Chanidze; Tbilisi: Institute of Manuscripts, 1960). See also R. P. Blake and M. Brière, *Petits prophètes* (PO 29.2 [1961]); Blake and Brière, *Isaie* (PO 29.3 [1962]); Blake and Brière, *Jérémie* (PO 29.4 [1962]); Blake and Brière, *Esdras et Daniel* (PO 29.5 [1962]); Blake and Brière, apparatus (PO 30.3 (1962)]; K. Danelia, *Jérémie* (Tbilisi University edition, 1992); Tinatin Ckitichvili, *Ezechiel* (Georgian Academy of Sciences, 1976); Sulxan Saba Orbeliani. Mcxeta manuscript edition (eighteenth century, eclectic edition); *Octateuch* (Georgian Academy of Sciences, 1981); Elene Dotchanachvili, *1–4 Kingdoms, 1–2 Chronicles, 1–3 Esdras* (1982); *Tobit, Judith, Esther, Job, Psalms, Proverbs* (1983); *Ecclesiastes, Wisdom, Canticum, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Baruch, Ezekiel* (1985); *Daniel, Minor Prophets* (1986). A. Chanidze, *Books of the Old Testament (according to a manuscript dated 978)* fasc. 1 *Genesis, Exodus* (Tbilisi: Georgian Academy of Sciences, 1947); fasc. 2 *Leviticus, Judges, Ruth, Job* and the beginning of *Isaiah* (1948).

Prof. Outtier writes: "In 1910, M. Djanachvili wrote about a Georgian biblical version with hexaplaric notes in the margin (Nachromi, Tbilisi) from 1 Kings to Nehemiah. The text is still unpublished, but U. Cindeliani gave two articles on the subject: 'Variants of Aquila and Symmachus in a Georgian translation of the Old Testament (marginal readings),' in the periodical *Macne* of the Academy of sciences, language and literature series (1973), I, 54-65, and 'About a peculiar redaction of the Book of Kings (a short redaction),' *Mravaltavi* (periodical of the Institute of Manuscripts), X, (1983), 50–74."

The text of the Paris lectionary (Bibliothèque Nationale ms géorgien 3) with supplements taken from other lectionaries, was edited at the University of Tbilisi by K. Danelia, S. Tchkhenkeli and B. Chavichvili: vol. 1 (1987); vol. 2 (1997).

Regarding Georgian translations of Greek exegetical writers, Bernard Outtier provides the following indications: Gérard Garitte, *Traités d'Hippolyte sur David et Goliath, sur le Cantique des Cantiques et sur l'Antéchrist* (CSCO 263–264, Scriptores Iberici 15–16; Louvain: Peeters, 1965); M. Brière, L. Mariès, and B. Ch. Mercier, *Hippolyte de Rome sur les Benedictions d'Isaac, de Jacob et de Moise* (PO 27.1-2; Paris: Firmin-Didot 1957); B. Gigineichvili and E. Giunachvili, *Translation of Epiphanius on the Psalms* [in Georgian] (Tbilisi: Institute of Manuscripts, 1979) (note: Prof. Outtier has demonstrated that this was translated from the Armenian version and that the author of the commentary was in fact Theodoret); Mzekala Chanidze, *Athanasius, Letter to Marcellinus* (?): appendix to the author's edition of Psalms, 446-452.; I. Abuladze, *The Oldest Recensions of the* Hexaemeron *of Basil of Caesarea and of* De hominis opificio *of Gregory of Nyssa* [in Georgian] (Tbilisi: Institute of Manuscripts, 1964); A. Chanidze, *Commentaire (compilation)*

Church Slavonic

Francis Thomson's monograph-length contribution to the 1996 Ljubljana Symposium volume edited by Krašovec was the first presentation in a non-Slavic language of the state of scholarship on the Old Testament text in Slavic.[67] It is a mine of information on the very complicated history of the Slavonic Bible and its revisions, and it provides a critique of scholarship so far. Thomson examines the ambiguities in the early account of the brothers Cyril and Methodius's embassy to the Khazars in 860 C.E. This records that they found written in *rus'sky pismeny* the Gospels and Psalms, yet in the same account Cyril is said to have invented the Slavic script himself. There was resistance from some Moravians who thought that one could worship God only in Hebrew, Greek, or Latin, but Cyril and Methodius produced translations of the biblical passages required for the liturgy. The rest of the Old Testament books (with the exception of Maccabees, 1–2 Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther) were rendered from Greek into Slavonic after 881 C.E. However, Thomson points out that the variations in rendering of these early Slavonic biblical texts rule out their translation by one person. He also believes that even the earliest surviving texts represent revisions to such a degree that it is impossible to recover the original renderings of Cyril and Methodius.[68] The earliest stage of translation is represented by texts used as readings in the liturgy, whereas complete texts of entire biblical books represent a later stage.

3. Conclusion

This necessarily very brief overview of the "daughter versions" of the Septuagint has, I hope, highlighted what is going on and how much there is still to be done, in terms of critical editions and study of reception history.

---

sur le Cantique des cantiques (1924); K. Kekelidze, *Commentaire de l'Ecclésiaste de Metrophane de Smyrne et Olympiodore d'Alexandrie* (Tbilisi, 1920); G. and Z. Arochvili, *Commentary on Psalms* [in Georgian]; 2 vols. (Pss 1–69) (Tbilisi).

"Some years ago," Prof. Outtier says, "Viktoria Djugheli wrote a remarkable thesis on Theodoret of Cyrus, but it may not have been published." I am deeply grateful to Prof. Outtier for his very detailed responses to my inquiries. Any errors in these bibliographical entries are due to my lack of knowledge of Georgian.

67. Francis J. Thomson, "The Slavonic translation of the Old Testament," in Krašovec, *Interpretation of the Bible*, 605–920.

68. Mary MacRobert has worked on the medieval textual tradition of the Slavonic Psalter and arrives at similarly pessimistic conclusions: C. M. MacRobert, "What Is a Faithful Translation? Changing Norms in the Church Slavonic Version of the Psalter," *Slavonic and East European Review* 69 (1991): 401–17; eadem, "Translation Is Interpretation: Lexical Variation in the Translation of the Psalter from Greek into Church Slavonic up to the Fifteenth Century," *Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie* 53 (1993): 254–84; eadem, "The Textual Tradition of the Church Slavonic Psalter up to the Fifteenth Century," in Krašovec, *Interpretation of the Bible,* 921–42.

By drawing attention to the phenomenon of the Greek Bible and making the Septuagint more generally accessible, NETS and other translations into modern languages will certainly stimulate further the study of the text and reception of the Greek Bible. I believe that their effect will not be confined to the more traditional constituency of Greek and Hebrew biblical scholars, but will extend also to researchers in adjacent fields such as the ones I have mentioned above.

Historically, scholarly attitudes to the daughter versions of the Septuagint may have been ultimately influenced by Jerome's dismissal of versions that had been "poured into the third jar,"[69] being translations of a translation, whereas only Hebrew (often taken to mean the MT) is the "Truth." Yet the daughter versions have profoundly influenced religion and culture in the Mediterranean, the Caucasus, Egypt, Ethiopia, and the Slavic regions. They were often the starting point for literature in regions when scripts were invented expressly to give Scripture a written form in that land. Should they be any less important because they were on the periphery of the Greco-Roman world? From a theological perspective, the existence and survival of their communities must be testimony to at least some degree of inspiration, however we wish to define that. In many respects, it is possible to make a strong case for the Septuagint's having an importance equivalent to the Hebrew text, in terms of its "irrigation" of so many believing communities, both Jewish and Christian.

Philo's view of the Septuagint (Pentateuch) translation as a divine gift to the entire world has been more than realized:

> . . . taking the sacred books, [the translators] stretched them out towards heaven with the hands that held them, asking of God that they might not fail in their purpose. And He assented to their prayers, to the end that the greater part, or even the whole, of the human race might be profited and led to a better life by continuing to observe such wise and truly admirable ordinances.[70]

The daughter versions and their reception history should be seen not as "the third jar" but as the children of Pharos and the grandchildren of Sinai.

69. *in tertium uas transfusa*: from the end of Jerome's *Prologue to the Books of Solomon Translated from the Hebrew*, in which he invites the reader to compare his own, fresh, rendering taken straight from the Hebrew with the sour wine of the Old Latin (et tamen, cum diligentissime legerit, sciat magis nostra intellegi, quae non in tertium uas transfusa coacuerint, sed statim de praelo purissimae commendata testae suum saporem seruauerint).

70. Philo, *Mos.* 2.36 (Colson, LCL): τὰς ἱερὰς βίβλους λαβόντες ἀνατείνουσιν ἅμ' αὐταῖς καὶ τὰς χεῖρας εἰς οὐρανόν, αἰτούμενοι τὸν θεὸν μὴ διαμαρτεῖν τῆς προθέσεως· ὁ δ' ἐπινεύει ταῖς εὐχαῖς, ἵνα τὸ πλεῖστον ἢ καὶ τὸ σύμπαν γένος ἀνθρώπων ὠφεληθῇ χρησόμενον εἰς ἐπανόρθωσιν βίου φιλοσόφοις καὶ παγκάλοις διατάγμασι.

A New English Translation of the Septuagint *and the* Orthodox Study Bible: *A Case Study in Prospective Reception*

Brian Anastasi Butcher

1. Introduction

What are the prospects for the potential reception of *A New English Translation of the Septuagint* (NETS) by Christians of the Eastern Orthodox and Byzantine-Rite Catholic Churches? Inasmuch as the Septuagint is taken to be the canonical form of the Old Testament by these Churches, the publication of NETS would at first glance appear to be a banner event for their English-speaking members. Indeed, the Septuagint is regarded in Orthodox precincts as not merely an authoritative translation, but one inspired. As Timothy (Kallistos) Ware, arguably the foremost exponent of Orthodox Christianity in the English-speaking world, observes, "[we] believe that the changes in the Septuagint were made under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, and are to be accepted as part of God's continuing revelation."[1]

Ostensibly, therefore, the interest in NETS on the part of English-speaking Orthodox should prove to be significant, greater indeed than that of those Jewish or Christian communities for whom the Septuagint is considered rather an ancillary form of Sacred Writ. Nevertheless, I will suggest that despite the intrinsic appeal that NETS would seem to possess, certain theological and social factors particular to the Orthodox tradition may well conspire to mitigate against a widespread reception of the text being duly celebrated in this volume.

2. The Orthodox and Byzantine-Rite Catholics as a Potential Audience for NETS

It may be helpful at the outset to clarify, for the benefit of those unfamiliar with the contours of Eastern Christianity, the identity of the communities in question. The

1. Timothy (Kallistos) Ware, *The Orthodox Church* (London: Penguin Books, 1964), 208.

Eastern Orthodox Churches, also commonly termed Greek Orthodox or simply Orthodox, are those Churches claiming apostolic origin in the eastern Mediterranean basin (and their daughter Churches—most notably among the East Slavic nations), which accept the first seven ecumenical councils, follow the Byzantine liturgical tradition (as this crystallized during the course of the first millennium in the worship of the Church of Holy Wisdom, *Hagia Sophia*, in Constantinople) and are in sacramental communion with one another. They are organized as a federation of some twenty autocephalous or autonomous national churches, with a symbolic primacy given to the four ancient patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, and especially Constantinople, known today as the Ecumenical Patriarchate. Orthodox Christians usually refer to themselves as a singularity, that is, the Orthodox *Church*; from a sociological perspective, however, each Church of the Orthodox communion operates independently. Their number worldwide is more than three hundred million, the largest being the Church of Russia, the smallest, the Church of Sinai. For all intents and purposes, their English-speaking members number some four million, belonging to communities in Britain, North America, and Oceania. I take these to represent the potential Orthodox readership of NETS.[2]

The second community to which the subtitle of this paper refers may also warrant elucidation. Byzantine-Rite Catholics, also known as Greek Catholics or Eastern (-Rite) Catholics, are comprised of communities of Orthodox Christians who either maintained or reestablished communion with the See of Rome dur-

2. The Eastern Orthodox are not to be confused with the Oriental Orthodox Churches, which claim a similar apostolic origin and subsist in a communion of faith and sacramental life with one another. These acknowledge, however, only the first three ecumenical councils, that is, up to and including the Council of Ephesus (431), most remembered for its validation of the ascription to Mary of the title *Theotokos* ("God-bearer" or, more commonly, "Mother of God"). They have no primacy among themselves comparable to that of the Ecumenical Patriarchate in the Orthodox Church, much less to that of the pope in the Catholic Church. The Oriental Orthodox (in the past referred to pejoratively as Monophysite, but today in the wake of the ecumenical movement rather as Miaphysite, non-Chalcedonian, or Pre-Chalcedonian —in reference to their nonreception of the Fourth Ecumenical Council, held at Chalcedon in 451, which declared Christ to be "one person in two natures") comprise the Coptic, Ethiopian, Eritrean, Syrian, Armenian, and Malankara (Indian) Orthodox Churches. They number some forty million worldwide and also have a presence in the English-speaking world. I shall not be treating them specifically in this presentation.

Neither the Eastern Orthodox nor the Oriental Orthodox are to be confused, furthermore, with the Assyrian Church of the East, whose members are also wont to call themselves Orthodox. This ancient church, today very small although historically exercising considerable influence throughout Asia, is presently in full communion with no other church. It will also not figure in the present investigation, although it today has a notable presence in the English-speaking world, its patriarch in fact living in exile in Chicago, Illinois.

For a comprehensive and up-to-date introduction to all the Eastern Churches, see Ronald G. Roberson, *The Eastern Christian Churches: A Brief Survey* (7th ed.; Rome: Edizioni "Orientalia Christiana," 2007). On-line: http://www.cnewacanada.ca/generalpg-verca.aspx?pageID=181.

ing the centuries following the so-called Great Schism of 1054. Worldwide they number some seven-and-a-half million. The complex history of these churches does not bear rehearsing in the present connection. Suffice it note that, alongside English-speaking Orthodox, there are some four hundred and thirty thousand Byzantine-Rite Catholics. They follow the same Byzantine liturgy as the Eastern Orthodox and adhere similarly to its theological and spiritual tradition; thus, the Septuagint is also for them the privileged form of the Old Testament. In consequence, unless otherwise noted, my use of the term "Orthodox" will refer to both the Eastern Orthodox and the Byzantine-Rite Catholics; indeed, the latter are sometimes designated "Orthodox in communion with Rome."

In respect of their communion with the Roman See, and given the paucity of Septuagint translations available hitherto, most Byzantine Catholics have had recourse to various Roman Catholic editions of the Bible for personal reading, although the Old Testament lections for the liturgy, including the Psalms, have not infrequently been translated into English directly, on a diocesan or synodal level, usually from the Greek or Slavonic liturgical books (in the latter case resulting in a translation of a translation of a translation!).

This process gained significant momentum after the Second Vatican Council (1962–65), with its clarion call to the Eastern Catholic Churches to repristinate their heritage, and its summons to the Catholic Church as a whole to make greater use of the vernacular in liturgical celebrations. The translation initiatives carried out in this connection are multiple and diverse because the different churches have in practice adopted English independently of one another. Hence, one will encounter a spectrum of partial Septuagint translations within and among the various Byzantine Catholic jurisdictions: Ukrainian, Ruthenian, Melkite, and Romanian, *inter alia*. This same pattern of localized, piecemeal translation of scriptural pericopes for liturgical usage has also been characteristic of English-speaking Orthodox.

Taken together, then, the English-speaking Eastern Orthodox and Byzantine-Rite Catholic communities constitute a potential readership for NETS of around four and a half million. The extent to which this readership will in fact respond favorably to NETS, however, is dependent on several factors, to whose social and theological contours we now turn.

3. The Criteriology of Orthodox Biblical Translation

That the Orthodox have a distinct approach to the Scriptures, which conditions the manner in which they approach Bible translation, is startlingly evident in the recent response of Simon Crisp, Director of Translation Services for the United Bible Societies, to the rhetorical question of which English translation of the Bible is best suited for Orthodox Christians: "My experience of the English-speaking

Orthodox world tells me the answer is, 'None of the existing translations,' and this has made me wonder what an English translation acceptable to the Orthodox Church would look like."[3] Crisp comes to this conclusion because he considers that no current text is sufficiently in possession of the "essential" characteristics of "sacrality, authority and communality."

It would be tempting to dismiss such a bleak assessment, especially since the plethora of English translations offers the anglophone reader a seemingly unlimited range of choice on the matter. Furthermore, Crisp rendered this verdict before the 2008 publication of both NETS and the *Orthodox Study Bible* (*OSB*).[4] Aside from the latter, moreover, at least two other projects are currently under way, under Orthodox auspices, to translate the Bible into English.[5]

Nevertheless, it is worth attending to the concerns presented by Crisp; as will become evident, they are in fact indicative of a tension within contemporary Orthodox biblical hermeneutics. In adducing the criterion of *sacrality,* he explains that the biblical text should not, in the Orthodox estimation, be couched in too familiar or colloquial an idiom. It must possess a certain quality of otherness, "a kind of radical foreignisation," which will indicate, on the one hand, that the Bible originates in a time and place not our own and, on the other, that it treats of matters of grave consequence. One may assume, in this connection, that the register of Eugene Petersen's *The Message*, for example, would not be considered appropriate.[6]

Crisp acknowledges, however, that this "foreignisation" obtains not simply through the idiom of the text itself, but preeminently through the context in which the text is encountered. For the Orthodox, this context is that of the liturgical worship of the Church, wherein Scripture presents itself not as a text to be perused silently by an individual but rather as an oral/aural phenomenon, a communal dialogue to be performed in song. This enacted engagement with the biblical word, moreover, typically occurs within the aesthetically rich environment of a traditionally appointed Byzantine church, replete with colorful icons, brocade vestments, candles, incense, bells, etc. Here, where the criterion of beauty is paramount, the scriptural idiom is ideally marked by a commensurate beauty, in keeping with the dignity of the text as *revelation*. Crisp draws the analogy, to wit, between the form and role of the Byzantine icon, and the Bible:

---

3. Simon Crisp, "Sacrality, Authority and Communality as Essential Criteria for an Orthodox Bible Translation," *The Messenger: Journal of the Episcopal Vicariate of Great Britain and Ireland* 6 (2008): 3.

4. St. Athanasius Academy of Orthodox Theology, *The Orthodox Study Bible* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2008).

5. Namely, the *Eastern Orthodox Bible* (on-line: http://www.orthodox-church.info/eob/index.asp) and the *Holy Orthodox Bible* (on-line: http://www.peterpapoutsis.com/).

6. Eugene H. Peterson, *The Message: The Bible in Contemporary Language* (Colorado Springs: NavPress, 2007).

> [T]he language of Scripture functions in a way analogous to the icon: not primarily as an aural or visual reminder of the event described or depicted, but as an embodied means of penetrating to the spiritual essence of the event. In this way, the icon and the Bible function in very similar ways: both are means of access to another level of reality, the mystery of faith. A clear—if unsurprising—practical implication for Orthodox Bible translation is that the language or register must be stylized enough to permit this effect to be achieved.[7]

One should note that the author is not idiosyncratic in equating Scripture with iconography. Ware confirms: "Orthodoxy regards the Bible as a verbal icon of Christ, the Seventh Ecumenical Council laying down that the Holy Icons and the Book of the Gospels should be venerated in the same way."[8] What Crisp neglects to countenance, however, is that the "foreignisation" of a text, in terms of its idiom, may in fact conflict with the vocation of the text to serve as a verbal "window" onto the transcendent. The very awkwardness that, for example, literalistic translations achieve, in attempting to preserve the truth of a given text's original language and context, would seem to be at odds, not to say incompatible, with the stylization implied by liturgical worship, in which beauty of form is the regnant concern.[9]

It is important in this connection to perceive the assumption sustaining Crisp's argument, namely, that an Orthodox translation ought to be *singular*, combining in one "nature" (to invoke a trinitarian metaphor) the three "persons" or faces of the text which the introduction to NETS, quoting *The Theory and Practice of Translation*,[10] identifies as "liturgical," "literary," and "popular."[11] Where Eugene A. Nida and Charles R. Taber posit the need for three registers of translation, intended for different audiences/purposes, Crisp implies, representatively if perhaps unwittingly, that an Orthodox translation of the Bible could and should be comprehensive.

The criterion of *authority*, the second in Crisp's taxonomy, also devolves from the Orthodox view that "worship is Scripture's natural habitat."[12] He observes that "the principal way . . . in which Orthodox worshippers engage with the text of

7. Crisp, "Sacrality, Authority and Communality," 12.

8. Ware, *Orthodox Church*, 209.

9. The former attribute is markedly in view in NETS, in which, for example, the very names of the biblical books and characters are unfamiliar to the English reader. It is not readily apparent that this kind of "foreignisation" would serve the biblical text well in its liturgical expression. NETS, in any event, does not present itself as intended or even suitable for liturgical usage.

10. Eugene A. Nida and Charles R. Taber, *The Theory and Practice of Translation* (1969; repr., Leiden: Brill, 1982).

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

12. Cited in Crisp, "Sacrality, Authority and Communality," 6.

Scripture is through the creative imagination of liturgical hymnographers."[13] This imagination is in turn funded by the stock of patristic exegesis, with the result that the encounter with the Scriptures occurs within a matrix of intertextuality constructed from the allegorical/typological interpretation of biblical passages. (It should be noted that such interpretation, as found in the homilies and other writings of the Church Fathers, is set forth not only obliquely in hymnography, but also directly, inasmuch as excerpts from patristic literature feature daily in the service of Matins, or morning prayer, *inter alia*). Hence, Crisp calls for a translation of the Bible that will reflect a *patristic* hermeneutic.

In response, one might legitimately ask whether this would not effectively result in the seemingly paradoxical situation of the translated form of a text being based on its *a posteriori* interpretation, rather than vice versa. Perhaps anticipating this objection, the author astutely acknowledges that it is simpler to espouse the *principle* that a biblical translation ought to evince its interpretation history than to specify how in *practice* such a translation could be carried out.[14] While it is obvious that the Septuagint would have to be the *point de départ* for an Orthodox translation of the Old Testament, it is less than clear how one might reconcile, on the one hand, the variant readings of a given passage as attested in the works of the Fathers and, on the other, the findings of historical-critical scholarship, which not infrequently appear to challenge the hegemony of received tradition. In consequence, Crisp recommends that an Orthodox translation of the Bible seek at least to be "consistent" with interpretation of the Fathers, especially by including notes that present patristic commentary.[15]

Finally, Crisp calls for *communality*, although he does not develop this criterion at length. Rather, we are given the straightforward assertion that "both lan-

13. Ibid., 7.

14. One of the obvious challenges in this connection is the historiographical, and theological, task of delimiting the very bounds of interpretation history. When, for example, does the period of "the Fathers" end—or does it even? And how, and by whom, is the roster of Orthodox patristic personages determined? As Ware muses: "[I]t is dangerous to look on 'the Fathers' as a closed cycle of writings belonging wholly to the past, for might not our own age produce a new Basil or Athanasius? To say that there can be no more Fathers is to suggest that the Holy Spirit has deserted the Church" (*Orthodox Church*, 212).

15. Arbitrating between the variant interpretations of the Fathers is a corollary challenge to those of situating the latter historically and identifying their membership—a challenge that, in the Orthodox understanding, is to be met not by a theoretical circumvention of the hermeneutical circle, but rather by a practical entry into it. To quote Ware again (*Orthodox Church*, 212): "[A]s with the Local Councils, so with the Fathers, the judgement of the Church is selective: individual writers have at times fallen into error and at times contradict one another. Patristic wheat needs to be separated from Patristic chaff. An Orthodox must not simply know and quote the Fathers, he must enter into the spirit of the Fathers and acquire a 'Patristic mind.' He must treat the Fathers not merely as relics from the past, but as living witnesses and contemporaries."

guage and text must be perceived as the special property of the community."[16] In a sense the entire article at hand reflects this proprietary concern, namely, that the Orthodox come to have their *own* translation of Scripture. Having access to the Scriptures per se is of course not a problem, since English speakers have, as mentioned above, a greater range of translations from which to choose than speakers of any other language. It is rather the confessional aspiration to have one's own church represented in the constellation of Bibles, as it were, by an eponymous star.

4. The *OSB* and the Challenges of Confessionalism

Anecdotal evidence suggests that, on a popular level, Crisp's assertion is well founded. In a recent issue of *Again: The Ancient Christian Faith Today*, the quarterly magazine of the flagship Orthodox publishing house Conciliar Press, a special article explores the reception on the ground of the *OSB*. Tellingly, one respondent comments, "For so long, one of the ironies of the Church has been that we are the one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church, yet no one knows about us and we don't even have a translation of our own Bible. The *OSB* is a big step forward, especially since we know that it is the Septuagint. . . ."[17] He continues, illustrating well the Orthodox *Weltanschauung*:

> St. Athanasius Academy (the group responsible for the translation) are Orthodox Christians. They are people of the Church, so this is a translation of the Church. It was not done by outsiders. Because members of the body of Christ have the inspiration of the Holy Spirit through the sacrament of Holy Chrismation, this manifests itself in a translation that reflects to a large degree the mind of the Church.[18]

In fact, however, both the Greek source for the *OSB* and the English controls on the translation actually *are* attributable to "outsiders." The Old Testament of the *OSB* is based on the Greek text of Rahlfs, using the NKJV as a base English text,

---

16. Crisp, "Sacrality, Authority and Communality," 12.

17. "Three Perspectives on the New Orthodox Study Bible," *Again: The Ancient Christian Faith Today* (Summer 2008): 18. One may well wonder, in light of this comment, how the Orthodox *define* the LXX. In other words, which specific textual corpus does common usage denote? The short answer would be, I venture, that *no* particular recension is customarily brought to mind by the term "the Septuagint," any more than standard English usage implies reference to a given codex when mention is made of "the Bible." The long answer would countenance, on the one hand, a philosophical reflection on the contemporary pertinence of the classical controversy concerning universals (exemplified in the Scholastic debate between nominalism and realism) and, on the other, a historical exploration of the actual manuscript traditions important within/across the different Orthodox Churches; moreover, this latter inquiry would, in the case of the Slavic Churches and their "daughters," involve the complex question of their giving normative status to the Slavonic translation(s) of the LXX.

18. Ibid., 19.

in a manner analogous to that employed by NETS with respect to the NRSV. The other major reference for the project was Brenton's text of 1851.

The introduction to the *OSB* explains that the Orthodox Church in North America, despite its two-century history, has never produced an English translation of the Septuagint. But while aiming to fill this niche, "the Old Testament text presented in this volume does not claim to be a new or superior translation. The goal was to produce a text to meet the Bible-reading needs of English-speaking Orthodox Christians."[19] Curiously, then, while it was deemed important that the Orthodox Church produce its *own* translation, it was not thought necessary to base this on the existing ecclesiastical text, that is, the Church's *own* Septuagint tradition,[20] nor again on the critical text such as it has been established by the Göttingen editions. By contrast, both of the other Septuagint translation projects currently being completed under Orthodox auspices *do* take the ecclesiastical text as their Greek basis.[21] The rationale for this latter decision is, I think, well articulated by Ephrem Lash, the renowned translator of Orthodox liturgical texts. Although in context the following comments treat the decision of the *OSB* to adopt the NKJV as the English control on its New Testament translation, their gravamen is to establish the first principles of an Orthodox philosophy of biblical translation:

> [T]he translation used . . . is not an Orthodox one at all. The editors defend this [i.e., the NKJV] on the grounds that the underlying Greek text of the New Testament in the King James version is closer to the traditional Byzantine text than that of modern critical editions. This is for the most part true and all they needed to say was that the Byzantine text is the text accepted by the Orthodox Church. Instead they defend their decision on supposedly scholarly grounds. This is irrelevant, except for conservative Evangelicals who wish to justify their conservatism by making it "scientifically" respectable. *It also obscures the central point that for the Orthodox the Bible comes from the Church, exists in the Church, lives in the Church. . . . [The editors] should have taken their stand on the Orthodox ground that the Church's text is the Orthodox text, full stop.*[22]

Essentially, the question that emerges both in this connection and in the remarks of the *Again* interviewee is that of *fideism*: namely, what is the role of confessional faith vis-à-vis critical scholarship in regard to the determination of the

19. St. Athanasius Academy of Orthodox Theology, *OSB*, xi.

20. On-line, http://www.apostoliki-diakonia.gr/bible/bible.asp. Unfortunately, I am not *au courant* in regard to the sources and editing of this currently "official" Orthodox version of the LXX, nor to what extent one may legitimately view it as a complement to the Byzantine text of the New Testament.

21. See n. 5 above.

22. Ephrem Lash, "The Orthodox Study Bible: New Testament and Psalms (Review)," *Eastern Churches Journal* 1, no. 3 (1994): 128 (emphasis added).

biblical source text, the legitimation of the translators themselves and the approbation of the resulting translation?

At stake here, of course, is the perennial problem of the relationship of faith and reason as it pertains to biblical studies generally. Ware, in "The Unity of Scripture and Tradition: An Orthodox Approach," presents the Orthodox as *not* espousing the model of inspiration found in Philo, namely, that of a "divine dictation" received in ecstasy, but rather that of Origen, who affirmed the presence of an irreducibly human element in the composition process. This in turn, according to Ware, grounds the historical-critical study of the Bible as a worthwhile investigation of said element and process. Nonetheless, he admits that one may reasonably suspect, *prima facie*, that Orthodox are "basically 'fundamentalists'":

> Yet, even though in principle Orthodox ascribe crucial importance to Scripture, in practice during the past two centuries they have made only a marginal contribution to the critical study of the Bible. . . . Orthodox writers have for the most part confined themselves to Patristics, church history and liturgical theology.[23]

This apparent neglect is arguably due to some extent to the Platonizing idealism characteristic of Orthodoxy, its commitment to the "unchanging identity of Scripture and Tradition."[24] Ultimately, according to Ware, the Bible is to be regarded as "a unique book, sacred in character; and, if it is to be rightly comprehended, faith is required on the part of the reader."[25] In light of the present study, one wonders if this conviction is tantamount to holding that faith is required on the part of the *translator*, inasmuch as the art of translation presumes an exemplary reading comprehension. If so, how and by whom is such to be validated?

It would be myopic to consider this query as implicating only the Orthodox. All churches must face the challenge of arbitrating between the proprietary claims of theology and the intractable fact of the Scriptures being "public domain." Is confessionalism in regard to biblical translation thus to be regarded as a normal symptom of ecclesial health and vitality? Matthew Francis argues that it is a sign of the maturity of the Orthodox Church in North America, of its successful inculturation in the New World, that it has proven able to issue a tome like the *OSB*—a text without precedent in the Orthodox tradition. Commenting on the 1993 version of the *OSB*, he remarks: "[It] demonstrates the capability of the faith to graft into its midst people and concepts from the Evangelical Protestant community. . . .

---

23. Timothy (Kallistos) Ware, "The Unity of Scripture and Tradition: An Orthodox Approach," in *What Is It the Scripture Says? Essays in Biblical Interpretation, Translation and Reception in Honour of Henry Wansbrough* (ed. Philip McCosker; Library of New Testament Studies 316; London and New York: T&T Clark, 2006), 233. This appraisal may help explain the conspicuous fact of the NETS team having had no Orthodox members whatsoever.

24. Ware, "Scripture and Tradition," 238.

25. Ibid., 237.

it is a profoundly new thing for the Orthodox to have actually produced a 'study Bible' for popular use."[26]

As indicated in the critique of Ephrem Lash quoted above, this very novelty has been the cause of critique in certain quarters, precisely because the relationship between the traditional Orthodox approach to Holy Scripture and that implied by the genre of study Bible is ambiguous. Lash's scathing review treats the first edition of the *OSB*, which contained only the New Testament and Psalms; many of his criticisms have in fact been attended to, whether consciously or not, in the new version. Nevertheless, one article, "Introducing the Orthodox Church," which he excoriates as "a tendentious and wholly unnecessary chapter . . . [having] absolutely no place in a biblical study guide for the Orthodox," abides as a preface to the actual biblical text. Lash declares it to be "simply a piece of not very effective propaganda aimed at those outside the Church,"[27] and indeed, it reads as a polemical screed laced with historical inaccuracies, not to say caricatures. But this very fact provides an index of the "effective historical consciousness," to use a Gadamerian phrase, of the editors/audience of the *OSB*, elucidating the horizons of interpretation according to which the text that follows ought to be read.[28]

By contrast, Lash's principal concern with respect to the Psalter of the original *OSB*, concerning the absence in that version of a Septuagint-based translation, has now been alleviated (inasmuch as the new Bible alters the NKJV translation of the Old Testament on the basis of Rahlfs, through the prism of Brenton). His secondary concern is with numerous errors in the liturgical references of the Psalter's study notes, which have also for the most part been rectified in the new version. Such notes, a characteristic feature of the *OSB*, make apparent that while the volume is expressly intended to facilitate the *reading* of the Bible by English-speaking Orthodox, such reading is to be conducted according to the *lex orandi* of the Byzantine Rite. If the introductory article mentioned above situates the biblical text within the continuum of Orthodox confessional history and doctrine, the notes circumscribe its proper interpretation by means of what Oriental liturgist Robert Taft calls its *Sitz im Gottesdienst*. It is worth recalling in this connection that the word "orthodox" has traditionally been taken to denote both "right teaching" and "right worship"—and to connote thereby that these two are in actuality concomitant.[29]

26. Matthew Francis, "*The Orthodox Study Bible* and Orthodox Identity in North America," *Canadian Journal of Orthodox Christianity* 2, no. 2 (Summer 2007): 55.

27. Lash, "Orthodox Study Bible . . . (Review)," 133.

28. See Hans-Georg Gadamer, *Truth and Method* (New York: Seabury, 1975).

29. Jaroslav Pelikan (*Credo: Historical and Theological Guide to Creeds and Confessions of Faith in the Christian Tradition* [New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2003], 407–8) explains that the Greek term has long been ambivalent, its suggestive polysemy being only intensified in the Slavic calque *pravoslavie* created by Sts. Cyril and Methodios in the ninth century: "The noun *doxa* means 'opinion,' and the noun *orthotēs* means 'correctness.' Therefore Aristotle

5. The Interstices of a Liturgical Hermeneutics

As will have become apparent by now, Orthodox scholars are prone to claim that Orthodoxy entails a *sui generis* approach toward the Bible, and hence toward biblical translation, distinguished from that of the Western Churches not simply in terms of its methodology, treated above in the discussion of Crisp's article, but more importantly, in terms of its existential presuppositions. These latter posit that authentic engagement with Scripture (reading, translating, interpreting) results from a mode of existence marked by prayer, fasting, sacramental and liturgical praxis, and religious assent of will to ecclesial tradition—what Orthodox theologian Vladimir Lossky termed the "life of the Holy Spirit in the Church."[30]

This ontological framework is further clarified by John Breck, one of the preeminent contemporary Orthodox biblical scholars, in his *Scripture in Tradition*: "For the Word to be truly *heard* it must be celebrated; read and proclaimed, yes; but also reactualized, internalized and consumed. This emphasis on the fulfillment of the Word of God through liturgical celebration marks the uniqueness of an Orthodox hermeneutic."[31] Resisting, as it were, the Western convention whose Muse is the voice that beckoned Augustine, *Tolle, lege!* ("Take and read!"), Breck continues, "My contention is that the only way we can avoid the futility of so much contemporary study of the Bible is by situating the Word of God once again in its proper ecclesial and liturgical context."[32]

Breck takes for granted, however, in this instance at least, that the meaning of "proper ecclesial and liturgical context" is self-evident. In point of fact, a caveat is in order here, since the context usually presumed by Orthodox writers, namely, the fully developed Byzantine Rite, can only tendentiously be regarded as a privileged locus of encounter with the Scriptures, at least as far as the Old Testament is concerned. As Robert Taft has shown, one of the curious features of Byzantine liturgical history is the incremental suppression of Old Testament lections in favor of liturgical hymnography—despite the original purpose of the latter as a gloss on the former.[33] Not only at the Eucharist—which no longer has any reading

in his *Nicomachean Ethics*, without actually using the relatively rare term *orthodoxia*, can propound the definition: 'Correctness of opinion is truth [*doxēs orthotēs alētheia*].' But when the opinion of others about someone is favourable, *doxa* already in classical Greek has the meaning of 'good reputation' or 'honor,' and therefore of 'glory'. . . . In Church Slavonic, and then in the other Slavic languages, *doxa* . . . is translated with *slava*, and *Orthodoxia* becomes *Pravoslavie*. It means simultaneously the right way of believing or teaching and the right way of rendering glory to God, for ultimately the two are seen as identical."

30. Vladimir Lossky, *In the Image and Likeness of God* (ed. John H. Erickson and Thomas E. Bird; Crestwood, N.Y.: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1974), 152.

31. John Breck, *Scripture in Tradition: The Bible and Its Interpretation in the Orthodox Church* (Crestwood, N.Y.: Saint Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2001), 13.

32. Ibid., 14.

33. See Robert F. Taft, *Beyond East and West: Problems in Liturgical Understanding* (2nd

whatsoever from the Old Testament, save for the select use of psalmody (itself greatly pared back in respect of former practice)—but in the other offices as well, the liturgical reading of Scripture has suffered attrition, and this not only in practice but also in the prescriptions of the *Typicon*, the manual that prescribes the order for Orthodox worship.

Thus, while the Orthodox are surely accurate in regarding the subapostolic and early patristic liturgical assembly as the vantage point from which the canon of Scripture was compassed, in terms of the biblical books recognized to be worthy of inclusion in the lectionaries for public worship, the further step of equating the modern Byzantine Rite—and not, for example, the Roman or Anglican Rites with their currently more ample and diverse lectionary, especially as concerns the Old Testament—with such an assembly seems unwarranted. Breck avers that one is being faithful to the Greek Fathers only by insisting on the following:

> Above all, it is clear that they held every proper (i.e., "orthodox-catholic") reading of Scripture to be an ecclesial act. The Liturgy is the first and most basic context within which the Word of God comes to expression. While personal meditation on the Biblical texts is essential, there is no such thing as a "private" reading. This is because every reading must be governed by Church Tradition, with its particular dogmatic and liturgical stance.[34]

The virtue of this claim notwithstanding, it is equally apparent that the liturgy, as celebrated today, offers an ecclesial reading of the Scripture greatly reduced in scope from that of former times. In consequence, it is now possible to understand many of the sophisticated allusions in Byzantine hymnography only on the basis of individual study of the Scriptures. Ironically, one must "leave" the normative context "within which the Word of God comes to expression" in order for a great portion of that Word to come to expression at all.

Moreover, *pace* Breck's claim that "personal meditation on the Biblical texts is essential," it is arguably the case that the Orthodox have *not* traditionally regarded such meditation as an integral element of Christian spirituality. Otherwise it would be difficult to understand why the *OSB* has been seen as a veritable innovation, albeit in most circles a positive one. Matthew Francis candidly concedes that the Orthodox have not habitually practiced Bible study; he contends that this was not perceived to be a lacuna, however, given the pervasive if tacit consensus concerning the sufficiency of a liturgical exposure to the Scriptures.[35] Incidentally, the same consensus historically characterized the Latin Catholic tradition—with the marked exception of monastic/clerical spirituality, in which the practice of *lectio divina* has always retained a cherished place.

---

rev. and enl. ed.; Rome: Pontifical Oriental Institute, 1997), 175–76.

34. Breck, *Scripture in Tradition*, 76.

35. Francis, "*Orthodox Study Bible* and Orthodox Identity," 41.

6. Excursus: Liturgical Translation of the Septuagint in the Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Church

By way of comparison to the aforementioned Orthodox approach to Septuagint translation, one may consider the recent experience of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church (UGCC). As the largest of the Eastern Catholic Churches, both in terms of total population and in terms of its number of English-speaking members, its encounter with NETS can perhaps be seen as a harbinger of the reception of the text by other Byzantine-Rite Catholics.

The most significant Septuagint-related translation project in the UGCC was completed in 2004,[36] namely, a unified musical setting for the standard UGCC translation of the Divine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom, to which was joined the translation of several shorter services and proper parts for the Divine Liturgy, hitherto without an official translation. The editor of the volume, in an explanatory article on the translation theory undergirding the work, notes the discrepancy of many Byzantine-Rite Churches in the West giving preference to the Masoretic Text in their liturgical translations, despite paying lip-service to the preeminence of the Septuagint. He attributes this counterintuitive phenomenon to a "lack of appreciation for the Septuagint, and lack of 'liturgically friendly' English translations thereof."[37]

It should be acknowledged, however, that one of the most long-standing and well-known Catholic translations of the Byzantine Rite services—which has enjoyed favor among Orthodox as well—is based on the Septuagint.[38] Galadza observes that Septuagint-based translations of the Psalter (the Old Testament book employed most fully and frequently in the liturgy) have been published as early as 1966 and as late as 1993.[39] Recourse to the Masoretic tradition has been resisted, moreover, especially in the past two decades, by a strong pastoral movement in favor of restoring the Septuagint to pride of place, a trend much indebted to the contemporary renewal of interest in the Septuagint on the part of Jewish and Western Christian scholars.[40]

---

36. Peter Galadza, ed., *The Divine Liturgy: An Anthology for Worship* (Ottawa: Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky Institute of Eastern Christian Studies, 2004).

37. Peter Galadza, "Principles Applied in the Compilation and Translation of *The Divine Liturgy: An Anthology for Worship*," *Studia Liturgica* 35 (2005): 83.

38. Most Reverend Joseph Raya and Baron José de Vinck, eds., *Byzantine Daily Worship* (Allendale, N.J.: Alleluia Press, 1969).

39. Galadza, "Translation of *The Divine Liturgy*," 84.

40. This trend was manifest, for example, in "The International Symposium on English Translations of Byzantine Liturgical Texts" held in Stamford, Connecticut, in 1998. The proceedings have been published in two installments in *Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies*: 39, nos. 2–4 (1998) and 41–42 (2000–2001).

With regard to the dearth of "liturgically friendly" translations of the Septuagint, one returns to the concern adumbrated above in regard to the typical Orthodox approach to Scripture, inasmuch as Byzantine-Rite Catholics tend to be similarly preoccupied with the *aesthetic* criterion of the suitability of a given translation for public worship, its potential as an "ecclesiastical translation," to reiterate the term referred to in the introduction to NETS. As Galadza explains, the committee charged with translating the relevant portions of the Septuagint (predominantly sections of the Psalter, but also the canticles of Exod 14 and Dan 3), *began* with NETS as a base text for interpreting the meaning of the Greek underlying the Slavonic *editio typica*—the canonical liturgical corpus for the Byzantine Churches of Slavic origin:

> [T]he hard work began when it was necessary to convey this meaning in an idiom appropriate for liturgical use. . . . The Anthology's translators were caught between the desire to remain as accurate as possible on the one hand, while on the other hand investing the translation with the cadences, alliteration, assonance, inversions, etc., appropriate to a text intended for public proclamation.[41]

"Public proclamation" in this connection has a connotation that, while not absent from the Western context, has a more pronounced significance in that of the Christian East; Byzantine liturgy is, as a rule, *sung* in its entirety, the myriad Byzantine musical traditions engendering in turn a variety of translational challenges specific to the production of musically suitable English texts. As Galadza acknowledges in regard to the translation of hymnography, it was therefore deemed appropriate in the *Anthology* to take the particular musical heritage of the UGCC into consideration in the translation process, that is, the manner in which a given text would fit a received melody. This decision similarly affected the translation of those selected scriptural verses, drawn from the Psalms and elsewhere in the Old Testament, appointed to be sung melodically rather than *recto tono*.

It is beyond the scope of this paper to conduct a detailed comparison of the Septuagint translations in the *Anthology* with those of NETS. This introduction to the former text has served, it is hoped, to anticipate the conclusion below, apropos of the "translationese" quality of NETS, a quality that would seem to have proven a disadvantage in terms of the reception of the text within the UGCC. One can only speculate that if the register of NETS had been determined with the first, rather than the second—or, to beg the question, *in addition* to the second—of Nida and Taber's three registers in mind, then perhaps the translation would have enjoyed incorporation into a volume like the *Anthology*, and from there a peregrination into the minds and hearts of those Christians who, justifiably or not, do consider liturgical suitability a barometer of the merits of a given edition of Holy Writ.[42] As

41. Galadza, "Translation of *The Divine Liturgy*," 85.

42. Given the combination of factors in the translation "equation," it is worth ponder-

we shall see below, however, the question of what precisely *is* suitable for liturgical use is, in the case of Orthodox appropriation of the Septuagint, inherently ambiguous, susceptible of being answered neither readily nor conclusively.

7. Select Passages from NETS and the *OSB*

The following table offers a brief comparison of key Septuagint texts (in terms of the frequency with which they are employed liturgically or referenced theologically in the Orthodox tradition), as translated in the *OSB* and NETS:

LXX (Rahlfs)	*OSB*	NETS
Genesis 1:2 ἡ δὲ γῆ ἦν ἀόρατος καὶ ἀκατασκεύαστος, καὶ σκότος ἐπάνω τῆς ἀβύσσου, καὶ πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἐπεφέρετο ἐπάνω τοῦ ὕδατος.	The earth was invisible and unfinished: and darkness was over the deep. *The Spirit of God was hovering* over the face of the water.	Yet the earth was invisible and unformed, and darkness was over the abyss, and *a divine wind was being carried along* over the water.
Genesis 1:26-27 καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεός Ποιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον κατ' εἰκόνα ἡμετέραν καὶ καθ' ὁμοίωσιν, καὶ ἀρχέτωσαν τῶν ἰχθύων τῆς θαλάσσης. . . . καὶ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον, κατ' εἰκόνα θεοῦ ἐποίησεν αὐτόν, ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς.	Then God said, "Let Us make man *in Our image, according to Our likeness*. Let them have dominion over the fish of the sea. . . ." So God made man; *in the image of God He made him*; male and female He made them."	Then God said, "Let us make humankind *according to our image and according to likeness*, and let them rule the fish of the sea. . . ." And God made humankind; *according to divine image he made it*; male and female he made them."
Genesis 28:17 οὐκ ἔστιν τοῦτο ἀλλ' ἢ οἶκος θεοῦ, καὶ αὕτη ἡ πύλη τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.	This is none other than *the house of God*, and this is the gate of heaven.	This is nothing other than *a divine house*, and this is the gate of heaven.

ing whether the UGCC example may well illustrate the proverbial "best that can be hoped for": namely, the exploitation of NETS as a critical resource in the context-specific development of appropriate liturgical translations.

3 Reigns 19:11-12 καὶ εἶπεν Ἐξελεύσῃ αὔριον καὶ στήσῃ ἐνώπιον κυρίου ἐν τῷ ὄρει· ἰδοὺ παρελεύσεται κύριος. καὶ πνεῦμα μέγα κραταιὸν διαλῦον ὄρη . . . καὶ μετὰ τὸ πῦρ φωνὴ αὔρας λεπτῆς, κἀκεῖ κύριος.	Then He replied, “Go out tomorrow and stand on the mountain before the Lord; and behold, the Lord will pass by, and before the Lord, a great and powerful wind *will be rending* the mountains. . . . After the fire, there will be a sound of a gentle breeze, and *the Lord will be there.*”	And he said, “You shall go out tomorrow and shall stand before the Lord on the mountain; behold, the Lord will pass by.” *And there was* a great, strong wind splitting mountains . . . and after the fire the sound of a light breeze, and *the Lord was there.*
Psalm 1:1 Μακάριος ἀνήρ, ὃς οὐκ ἐπορεύθη ἐν βουλῇ ἀσεβῶν καὶ ἐν ὁδῷ ἁμαρτωλῶν οὐκ ἔστη	Blessed is the man who *walks not* in the counsel of the ungodly, nor stands in the way of sinners . . .	Happy the man who *did not walk* by the counsel of the impious, and in the way of sinners did not stand . . .
Psalm 39:7-10 (40:6-9) θυσίαν καὶ προσφορὰν οὐκ ἠθέλησας, ὠτία δὲ κατηρτίσω μοι. . . . τότε εἶπον Ἰδοὺ ἥκω, ἐν κεφαλίδι βιβλίου γέγραπται περὶ ἐμοῦ· τοῦ ποιῆσαι τὸ θέλημά σου, ὁ θεός μου, ἐβουλήθην καὶ τὸν νόμον σου ἐν μέσῳ τῆς κοιλίας μου. εὐηγγελισάμην δικαιοσύνην ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ μεγάλῃ	Sacrifice and offering You did not will, *but a body You prepared for me. . . .* Then I said, “Behold, I come (it is written of me in the volume of the book); I willed to do Your will, O my God. And Your law in the midst of my heart.” I proclaimed righteousness in the great *church. . . .*	Sacrifice and offering you did not want, *but ears you fashioned for me. . . .* Then I said, “Look I have come; in a scroll of a book it is written of me. To do your will, O my God, I desired—and your law, within my belly.” I told the glad news of righteousness in a great *assembly. . . .*
Psalm 50:7 (51:5) ἰδοὺ γὰρ ἐν ἀνομίαις συνελήμφθην, καὶ ἐν ἁμαρτίαις ἐκίσσησέν με ἡ μήτηρ μου.	For behold, I was conceived in transgressions, and in sins my mother *bore* me.	For, look, I was conceived in lawlessness, and in sin did my mother *crave* for me.

Daniel 3:92 (Old Greek) Ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ὁρῶ ἄνδρας τέσσαρας λελυμένους περιπατοῦντας ἐν τῷ πυρί, καὶ φθορὰ οὐδεμία ἐγενήθη ἐν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἡ ὅρασις τοῦ τετάρτου ὁμοίωμα ἀγγέλου θεοῦ.	Behold, I see four men untied and walking in the midst of the fire, yet they are not destroyed, and the vision of the fourth is *like the Son of God.*	Lo, I see four men unbound and walking in the fire, and no ruin has come to them, and the appearance of the fourth is *the likeness of a divine angel.*
(Theodotion) Ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ὁρῶ ἄνδρας τέσσαρας λελυμένους καὶ περιπατοῦντας ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ πυρός, καὶ διαφθορὰ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἡ ὅρασις τοῦ τετάρτου ὁμοία υἱῷ θεοῦ.		Here I see four men unbound and walking in the middle of the fire, and there is no destruction on them, and the appearance of the fourth is *like a divine son.*

These few examples illustrate the fault lines in the translational philosophy counseled by Simon Crisp (in the article treated above) and examined in the course of our analysis. As he elsewhere elaborates, an Orthodox translation of the Bible ought, on the one hand, "to maintain in some way the status of the text as a window onto another world by preserving a sense of the distance between the (modern) reader and the (ancient) text, and by marking in some way the inherent strangeness or otherness of that text."[43] On the other hand, it should demonstrate a "faithfulness to patristic tradition . . . [which] represents an overtly community driven exegesis rather than a search for 'objectivity,'" the latter being, according to the author, characteristic of a post-Reformation, post-Enlightenment West that views the Bible as simply one more text.[44]

With regard to the first criterion, it is evident that NETS better conveys the otherness of the Septuagint, in terms of the awkwardness of some of the expressions (e.g., "according to divine image," "walk by the counsel of the impious," or "there is no destruction on them"). While it is beyond the competence of this writer to comment on whether the NETS translators, in the specific instances above, pursued

43. Simon Crisp, "Icon of the Ineffable? An Orthodox View of Language and Its Implications for Bible Translation," in *Bible Translation on the Threshold of the Twenty-First Century: Authority, Reception, Culture and Religion* (ed. Athalya Brenner and Jan Willem van Henten; JSOTSup 353; London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 44.

44. Ibid., 42.

formal equivalence too far—with the result that the English text is *unnecessarily* awkward in its literalness—it suffices to note that *as a translation,* NETS succeeds well in conveying a sense of distance between the reader and the text.[45]

To press the matter further, it is important to remember, as the introduction to NETS specifies, that for the most part the Septuagint would have already sounded strange to its initial audience, given the overall "translationese" quality of its Greek.[46] If Ware's assertion regarding the inspiration of the Septuagint is taken into account, must one not ineluctably conclude that the Orthodox are bound accordingly to consider this very quality *itself* to be on some level inspired and commanding of respect in any translation entreprise? Is it not inconsistent, in other words, to credit divine inspiration with such notable variants in the *content* of the text as the "virgin" of Isa 7:14, but not with the linguistic *form* of the text?

If so, then *pace* Crisp's speculation that there is no intrinsic reason why the "marking of distance between the reader and the text should have to be done in opposition to a commitment to make the translation understandable to the reader, by a return to literal renderings or artificially archaic language,"[47] it would seem that any translation that in fact belies the very opacity of the Greek text by, as it were, *clarifying* it into a more elegant English than is textually warranted, cannot be said to be fully congruent with an Orthodox approach. NETS would appear then, in this connection, to merit an appreciative reception within the Orthodox community, inasmuch as, to paraphrase the introduction to NETS, it brings the English reader to the (inspired) Greek original rather than vice versa.

Crisp's second criterion of continuity with patristic tradition, however, is obviously better reflected in the *OSB* than in NETS. Clearly, "a divine wind" does not do justice to the Fathers' interpretation of Gen 1:1 as referring to the action of the Holy Spirit at creation and demonstrating thereby that the Old Testament contained intuitions of the trinitarian theology of the New. As St. Basil (330–379), for example, explains in the second homily of his *Hexaemeron*:

> *And the Spirit of God was borne upon the face of the waters.* Does this spirit mean the diffusion of air? The sacred writer wishes to enumerate to you the elements of the world, to tell you that God created the heavens, the earth, water, and air

45. In personal correspondence with the author, NETS translator Larry Perkins elucidates that "the quality of literalness is an attempt to assist English readers to discern differences between the Greek translation and the Masoretic Text (or other Hebrew *Vorlage* as may be the case). This was not motivated by a desire in the first instance to convery 'otherness.' The perceived sense of 'otherness' is an intended consequence (if this is not putting it too strongly) of the desire to enable NETS to provide non-Greek- and non-Hebrew-competent readers the opportunity to make some limited comparisons." I would like to express appreciation to Dr. Perkins for his insightful comments on my paper, which have proved to be of great benefit in the revision process.

46. Pietersma and Wright, *New English Translation of the Septuagint*, xiv.

47. Crisp, "Icon of the Ineffable," 44.

> and that the last was now diffused and in motion; or rather, that which is truer and confirmed by the authority of the ancients, by the Spirit of God, he means the Holy Spirit. It is, as has been remarked, the special name, the name above all others that Scripture delights to give to the Holy Spirit, and always by the spirit of God the Holy Spirit is meant, the Spirit which completes the divine and blessed Trinity. You will find it better therefore to take it in this sense . . . the Spirit was borne: let us understand, that is, prepared the nature of water to produce living beings: a sufficient proof for those who ask if the Holy Spirit took an active part in the creation of the world. (2.6)[48]

Similarly, the patristic reading of the ordeal of the three youths in the furnace, as related in Daniel, is categorically one that acclaims the presence of the pre-incarnate Logos—another example, it is said, of an anticipation of the revelation of the Trinity. As Hippolytus (170–236) comments:

> *And the form of the fourth is like the Son of God.* Tell me, Nebuchadnezzar, when did you see the Son of God, that you should confess that this is the Son of God? And who pricked your heart, that you should utter such a word? . . . But, as it is written, The heart of a king is in the hand of God: the hand of God is here, whereby the Word pricked his heart, so that he might recognise Him in the furnace, and glorify Him. And this idea of ours is not without good ground. For as the children of Israel were destined to see God in the world, and yet not to believe in Him, the Scripture showed beforehand that the Gentiles would recognise Him incarnate, whom, while not incarnate, Nebuchadnezzar saw and recognised of old in the furnace, and acknowledged to be the Son of God. And he said, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego. The three youths he thus called by name. But he found no name by which to call the fourth. For He was not yet that Jesus born of the Virgin. (*Scholia on Daniel* 3:92–93 [25–26])[49]

As a final example of the patristic character of the *OSB*, one may observe that the "body" referred to in its rendering of Ps 39:7 is taken by the Fathers to foretell the incarnation. In his treatise *On the Psalms,* St. Augustine argues that the "body" prepared in lieu of sacrifices and offerings prophesies the sacramental and mystical Body of Christ:

> *But a Body have You perfected for me.* It was for this reason that You did not desire the others [i.e., sacrifices and offerings]; that You might perfect this; before You perfected this, You desired the others. The fulfillment of the promise has done away with the words that express the promise. For if they still hold out a promise, that which was promised is not yet fulfilled. This was promised by certain signs; the signs that convey the promise are done away; because the Substance that was promised is come. We are in this Body. We are partakers of this Body. . . . A Body

48. NPNF2-08:62–63, ed. Philip Schaff and Henry Wace; on-line: www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf208.html.

49. *ANF* (ed. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson; 10 vols.; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1994), 5:188.

> has been perfected for us; let us be made perfect in the Body. (*Expositions on the Book of Psalms* 40.12)[50]

Such examples could be multiplied, but these should suffice to demonstrate the discrepancy obtaining at times between the critical editions of the Septuagint texts (in the case of Psalms, the edition of Rahlfs) and the *mens patrum* according to which Orthodox customarily read the Old Testament.

The liturgy, which Crisp argues to be the privileged *Sitz im Leben* of the Bible, is also, because of its aesthetic exigencies, better served by the elegance of the *OSB*, based as this is on the NKJV. Admittedly NETS, for its part, is specifically intended as a literary translation for a *reading* public, a "biblically well-educated audience," rather than as an "'ecclesiastical translation'" reflecting traditional usage and suited for the aural/oral demands of liturgy.[51] The discrepancy illustrated above between the Septuagint readings given in NETS and the corresponding patristic commentary, however, suggests that even if the *register* of NETS had been that of an "ecclesiastical translation"—even if it had avoided the faithful rendering of the Septuagint's "translationese," that is—it would have potentially still run aground, in terms of its content, on the shoals of theological sedimentation. How then, in Ricoeurian terms, does one navigate between the Charybdis of exegetical "critique" and the Scylla of ecclesial "conviction"?[52] Is one destined to founder on the one, if not the other?

8. Conclusion

It would appear to be a formidable challenge indeed to produce a translation that can, to borrow the christological terminology of the Council of Chalcedon (451), hold together "two natures in one person."[53] Here Paul Ricoeur is again germane, warning against the hubris that would pretend to a total, exhaustive translation:

---

50. NPNF1-08:124, ed. Philip Schaff; on-line: www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf108.html.

51. Pietersma and Wright, *New English Translation of the Septuagint*, xiv.

52. See Paul Ricoeur, *Critique and Conviction: Conversations with François Azouvi and Marc de Launay* (trans. Kathleen Blamey; New York: Columbia University Press, 1998), 143–45, for a discussion of these two different "attitude[s] of reading."

53. Ware invokes this very analogy in describing the ideal interpretive strategy: "In the Biblical field it is legitimate to speak in terms of a 'Chalcedonian exegesis.' This strives to do justice equally to the divine and human elements in Scripture. It rejects the Monophysite approach to the Bible, which overstresses the divinely inspired aspect and allows no place for historical criticism, failing to discriminate between the different levels of truth within the scriptural narrative. But 'Chalcedonian' exegesis rejects also a unilaterally Nestorian perspective, such as regards the Bible simply as a book like any other, as a purely human record. The Chalcedonian exegete keeps in this way to a middle course between Monophysite fundamentalism and Nestorian reductionism" (Ware, "Scripture and Tradition," 239). As cogent as such a model may be, its implementation seems bound to prove rather more complicated, as indeed church history shows that of the Chalcedonian definition itself to have been.

> [T]here is no absolute criterion for a good translation; for such a criterion to be available, we would have to be able to compare the source and target texts with a third text which would bear the identical meaning that is supposed to be passed from the first to the second. . . . Hence the paradox, before the dilemma: a good translation can aim only at a supposed equivalence that is not founded on a demonstrable identity of meaning. An equivalence without identity. This equivalence can only be sought, worked at, supposed.[54]

The dilemma to which he refers is that discerned by Franz Rosenzweig, namely, that every translator must hearken to the summons "to serve two masters: the foreigner with his work, the reader with his desire for appropriation." According to Ricoeur, "this paradox falls within the domain of an unparalleled problematic, doubly sanctioned by a vow of faithfulness and a suspicion of betrayal."[55] In the context of the Septuagint, when the "foreigner" in question is unavailable for interrogation, the dilemma becomes more acute: to whom or what is one to be faithful in his stead? Is his face reflected in the speculum of the critical text, or rather the house of mirrors constituted by the Septuagint's reception history? And who, ultimately, has the authority to dispel suspicion of betrayal, to assuage the apprehension in the Italian maxim, *traduttore traditore*?

After all, NETS offers English-speaking Orthodox Christians—in what one blogger has called an act of supreme "translational generosity"—the rare opportunity of encountering what is considered to be the inspired Old Testament in all its complexity and plenitude, without reduction of its variegated textual traditions or loss of its linguistic enigmas. The reader of the text, addressed so courteously in the introductions to each book, cannot but be convinced of the sincerity and skill of the translators: that each has duly fulfilled his or her "desire for appropriation." Nevertheless, inasmuch as Orthodoxy posits church tradition as a *tertium quid*, a kind of embodied "third text" in which the meaning of the Scriptures subsists (itself articulated in the liturgical context with its corollary patristic frame of reference), and given the sociocultural impetus for a community to name and claim a Bible translation as its o*wn*, it would seem prudent to predict that the *OSB*, as a Bible directed toward the galvanizing of said tradition, will receive a more widespread reception than NETS in Orthodox precincts.[56]

---

54. Paul Ricoeur, *On Translation* (trans. Eileen Brennan; London and New York: Routledge, 2004), 22.

55. Ibid., 4.

56. One hopes, however, that there will be many who purchase and consult *both* Bibles, in an effort to respect the venerable Orthodox principle of antinomy, that is, that truth often emerges, paradoxically, between two logical alternatives: for example, the Holy Trinity being seen as three yet one; Christ, God yet man; Mary, virgin yet mother; the Holy Eucharist, bread yet the body of Christ. Can the Word of God be said analogously to inhere in both patristic exhortation and scholarly critique? Does this apparent impasse perhaps conceal a Ricoeurian "surplus of meaning"?

Part Two
Panelists' Introductory Statements

NETS and the "Upstream–Downstream" Metaphor

Albert Pietersma

By way of summarizing what I wrote in my conference paper, I would like to comment briefly on a metaphor attributed to Marguerite Harl, but noted by Alison Salvesen, Jan Joosten, and Wolfgang Kraus.[1] According to the metaphor, there are two possible ways of studying the Septuagint as a translation: "upstream" or "downstream," that is to say, either in relationship to its Hebrew parent text or as a text in its own right at some point in its reception history.

Though the stream metaphor is apt in one respect, it is decidedly inapt in another. It is apt in the sense that it pictures a current that flows in a single direction. It is inapt since it suggests that one can travel in either direction on this stream, either "upstream" or "downstream," either with the current or against it. That is to say, as students of the Septuagint we supposedly can go backwards, from the Septuagint to the Hebrew, or go forward to the Greek text in reception history; one can choose to be either translator-oriented or reader-oriented. Alternatively, it has been suggested that one can do a bit of both—one can go *both* backwards and *also* forward (at the same time, perhaps?).

Presumably, this is what Helmut Utzschneider (as cited by Jan Joosten) had in mind when he applied the "upstream–downstream" metaphor to three modern translation projects of the Septuagint. NETS is characterized as "upstream," because it is thought to approach the Septuagint from the point of view of the Hebrew; *La Bible d'Alexandrie* is characterized as "downstream," because it is thought to approach the Septuagint from the point of view of later readers; and *Septuaginta-Deutsch* is characterized as "on level," presumably because it is thought to maintain the right balance between "upstream" and "downstream."

Jan Joosten calls this three-way characterization somewhat facile and,

1. Alison Salvesen, "A Well-Watered Garden (Isaiah 58:11): Investigating the Influence of the Septuagint," pp. 191–208 in the present volume; Jan Joosten, "*La Bible d'Alexandrie* and How to Translate the Septuagint," pp. 239–42 below; Wolfgang Kraus, "*Septuaginta Deutsch* (LXX.D): The Value of a German Translation of the Septuagint," pp. 243–48 below. See also Wolfgang Kraus, "Contemporary Translations of the Septuagint: Problems and Perspectives," in *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures* (ed. Wolfgang Kraus and R. Glenn Wooden; SBLSCS 53; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), 63–83.

moreover, deems it incorrect as applied to *La Bible d'Alexandrie*. I would go one step further and suggest that the metaphor becomes inappropriate at this point, since it distorts the approaches of all three projects. None of them, as far as I can tell, is trying to travel "upstream" against the current to reach the *Ur*-source, namely, the Hebrew text. Nor would it make any sense to do so, unless for some perverse reason one is intent on superimposing the Hebrew original on the Greek translation, thus making a mockery of the very act of translating.

The current of our stream begins with the Septuagint and runs in one direction only, from text production to text reception. As I see it, all three projects are appropriately going with the flow, that is, downstream. The difference among them, I would suggest, centers on the kind of reader that is being presupposed. I can think of only two readers: (a) the reader *implied* in the translated text or (b) the readers in reception history who refigure the text based on their life situation. Though I have also heard tell of a so-called tolerant reader, I do not know where to find such a reader. Hence, the "tolerant reader" would seem to be a fiction, invented, perhaps, to blunt the implications of the textual-linguistic make-up of the Septuagint.

NETS decided not to go beyond the production of the translated text. This means that it focuses on the Greek translator and the reader implied by the text he produced, both of whom are therefore embedded in the translated text. Consequently, it means that NETS focuses on the textual linguistic makeup of the translation, which in turn means that the Hebrew source comes into view but only to the extent that that source text is embodied in the target text. Of course NETS consults the Hebrew source text, but only to discern as accurately as possible the extent to which the Hebrew original is embodied in the Greek translation, decidedly not, as some critics have intimated, to superimpose the Hebrew on the Greek. Interlinearity, then, is a conceptualization of the Hebrew source text *as embodied* in the Greek target.

To use the stream metaphor one last time: NETS identifies and studies the deposit left by the stream that flowed from the Septuagint's *ultimate* source, namely, the Hebrew text.

As I stated in my paper, *qua* paradigm, the "interlinear assumption" aims to challenge what might be called "the 'compositional assumption,' under which the Septuagint is treated as if it were a straightforward product of Hellenistic Judaism."[2]

2. Albert Pietersma, "Beyond Literalism: Interlinearity Revisited," p. 11 above.

The Textual-Linguistic Character and Sociocultural Context of the Septuagint

Benjamin G. Wright III

In these brief comments I want to follow up on several issues that I raised in my paper for this conference, particularly with respect to the historical and sociocultural issues connected with translation and the idea of interlinearity and the abilities of the translators. Rather than an extended argument, however, I will make a series of brief observations.

Since translation is a linguistic enterprise and every translation is situated in specific social and cultural circumstances, it stands to reason that the two will be intimately related. In a sense this is one of Gideon Toury's most basic and important observations. What a translation looks like, its textual-linguistic makeup, is closely related to its intended position in the target culture. As almost all Septuagint scholars will agree, we do not know exactly what sociocultural niche the translators of the Septuagint (here meaning the translation of the Pentateuch) intended for their product. We have what they produced, and that product has a textual-linguistic makeup that we can describe, especially in comparison with its Hebrew *Vorlage*. One of the descriptors that NETS has used to characterize that relationship is "linguistic dependence," which has led to the use of the metaphor of interlinearity. Indeed, as a characterization of a *linguistic* relationship between target and source texts, the generally isomorphic approach of the Septuagint translators and its consequences for the resulting translation suggest that the translation brings the reader to the original and not the other way around. To make this claim, however, is not to deny that in many cases the Septuagint translators displayed tremendous sensitivity to their Hebrew source. What the metaphor of interlinearity tries to take account of is *both* the intelligible and the unintelligible; places, on the one hand, where the translator "gets" his source text and produces a felicitous Greek rendering, some examples of which Jan Joosten pointed to in his paper, *and,* on the other hand, places where precisely the opposite is the case, where the translation does not make intelligible Greek sense and one must resort to the Hebrew source in order to see what the translator was up to.

I still do think that much of our conversation about these issues is colored by the unspoken, and I think sometimes unrecognized, hegemony of the *Letter*

of Aristeas. What I mean is that *Aristeas* portrays the Septuagint at its stage of production as a linguistically independent replacement for the Hebrew source text even though what we actually observe in the textual-linguistic makeup of the Septuagint belies *Aristeas*'s assessment of the translation, and this presumed independence underlies a lot of scholarly discussion of the Septuagint. Yet, as I noted in my paper, even though *Aristeas* would have us believe that the Septuagint is a great work of Greek philosophy and literature, for example, the translation itself is neither literary nor philosophical. I have argued in other venues that the *Letter of Aristeas* testifies to the position of the Septuagint at some point in its reception history and not at the point of its production.

I want to return, then, to historical and sociocultural concerns. I think it bears repeating that the textual-linguistic character of the Septuagint, which can be described as a largely isomorphic translation that suggests dependence on the source text rather than independence from it, points us away from certain kinds of sociocultural slots and locales. Thus, for example, I am extremely dubious that the Septuagint would have been intended for the king's library—not simply because of the numerous historical difficulties that we find in *Aristeas* connected with this claim, such as the problems connected with Demetrius of Phalerum's presumed relationship to Ptolemy II. I am dubious because presumably such a function would require an independent, literary text that a Greek reader would be able to decode readily without recourse to the source text—exactly what the Septuagint does not allow in numerous cases. So, if the historical and sociocultural are linked to the textual-linguistic, we must ask ourselves what the possible contexts are in which a text such as the Septuagint might have been produced. One such context would be the school, and indeed Al Pietersma has suggested an educational context for the Septuagint. But I want to reemphasize a point that I made in my paper. The way that NETS has understood the Septuagint—as linguistically subservient to or dependent on its source text, using the so-called interlinear paradigm—is *not* a theory of Septuagint origins. That is another creature altogether. The interlinear paradigm is part of a theoretical framework for understanding the LXX/OG corpus as those of us who worked in NETS tried to understand how best to translate a translation.

I want to highlight one other historical note in this short presentation. The *Letter of Aristeas* presents the Septuagint translators as sophisticated scholars and philosophers who produce a literary and philosophical text. Simply because we can argue that the picture presented in *Aristeas* does not reflect the Septuagint at its point of production, that is not to say that the translators were not up to their task. We do not know who these translators were, what models, if any, they drew on for their work, their levels of education and competence, etc. But if the interlinear paradigm within the framework of descriptive translation studies has any explanatory power, we come to the conclusion that the approach that the translators took to their work was intentional. That is, as Al and I write in "To the Reader of NETS," "the Greek's subservience to the Hebrew may be seen as indicative of its

aim."[1] Consequently, we should not be surprised when we find literary nuggets in the translation. They, together with the linguistic infelicities, require explanation, but they do not necessarily surprise. Of course, like all translators we can identify places where a translator apparently misunderstood the Hebrew, but this does not indicate that the translators were hacks not up to the task before them. Indeed, some modern scholars have interpreted the interlinear paradigm as presenting the translators in a pejorative light, but I think that this is the farthest thing from the truth. The textual-linguistic information we can glean from the Septuagint indicates to me an intentional approach, and within the framework of Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS), where the intended function of a translation determines its textual-linguistic makeup, intentionality becomes a historical/sociocultural "fact" and is part and parcel of the analysis.

I would like, then, for just a moment to turn to some issues in Jan's paper. Before I begin, though, I would like to say in this forum that in scholarly discussions such as the ones we are engaging in here, we often emphasize our differences at the expense of our agreements. I know that in other places Jan has argued that the interlinear paradigm does not succeed as an explanatory hypothesis. But if I were to take the second to last paragraph of his paper for this conference, I would suggest that we are not all that far apart. He writes, "The facts brought to light in our analysis indicate that the Septuagint was meant by its creators to *represent* the Hebrew source text. The version was designed in such a way as to suggest to its audience that this is not simply a Greek text, nor even simply a Greek translation, but a sort of replica of the Hebrew Scriptures in a different language." I agree, although I would add that the use of "replica" ought not to imply that the Septuagint was considered Scripture at its point of production—although clearly at a later point in its reception history that is what it became. Within this formulation, there is much room for common ground on a whole host of issues related to the Septuagint.

I confess that I do not have as much clarity as Jan expresses in his paper about the reasons for the phenomenon that he describes. How experienced the translators were, I am not certain. I imagine that, like all translators, they learned their trade on the job to a degree, as Jan notes. I do think, however, that one of the advantages of the interlinear paradigm is that it enables us to take account of the range of translational approaches that Jan cites, particularly inasmuch as the text as it was produced remains the final arbiter of how we answer such questions. Interlinearity does not, as some have suggested, *require* unintelligibility, but rather it "recognizes that unintelligibility of the Greek text *qua text* is one of its inherent characteristics."[2] In his article for the Raija Sollamo festschrift,[3] Jan also appeals to

1. *A New English Translation of the Septuagint* (ed. Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright; Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), xiv.

2. Ibid., xv.

3. Jan Joosten, "Reflections on the 'Interlinear Paradigm' in Septuagintal Studies," *Scrip-*

linguistic register as part of a critique of the interlinear paradigm. And while it is true, as Jan notes, that "[m]any words, forms and constructions of the Septuagint are poorly attested in contemporary literary texts, but well-known from non-literary papyri and ostraca,"[4] I think that we would be hard-pressed to use linguistic register as a sufficient *overarching* explanation of the phenomena that we find in the Septuagint. And that leads me back to the main point that I want to make in this short presentation. Within the framework of the interlinear paradigm as we have worked it out in the course of the NETS project, one can account for a whole range of possible phenomena—linguistic register, phrases that the translator did not understand, literary felicity, intelligible and unintelligible Greek, and so on.

I am delighted that we have the opportunity to debate these issues in contexts like the one we have here at Trinity Western. Certainly the study of the Septuagint has seen great progress as a result of the current translation projects and the concurrent scholarly discussion that has taken place around them. I look forward to continuing our discussion of these issues.

---

ture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Seas Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo (ed. Anssi Voitila and Jutta Jokiranta; JSJSup 126; Leiden: Brill, 2008) 163–78.

4. Ibid., 172.

La Bible d'Alexandrie *and*
How to Translate the Septuagint

Jan Joosten

The French project called La Bible d'Alexandrie ("The Alexandrian Bible") was launched in the early 1980s by Marguerite Harl and some of her students in the Classics Department of the University of Paris. Harl's interest in the Septuagint had grown out of her research on Origen and Philo. From a study of their theology she went on to investigate their Bible text, which was, of course, nothing other than the Septuagint. She and her students—Gilles Dorival, Olivier Munnich, Cécile Dogniez, and many others—were all classics scholars, and from the start they approached the Septuagint as a Greek text. Only on second thought, so to speak, did they become aware of the usefulness, for understanding the Septuagint, of looking at the Hebrew source text. At this stage, they studied Biblical Hebrew and sought the help of biblical scholars such as Pierre Sandevoir and Hebraists such as Jean Margain.

This quick sketch of the origins of the project explains some of its main characteristics. The Bible d'Alexandrie provides a translation of the Septuagint along with copious notes, addressing mainly three fields of inquiry: (1) questions of vocabulary and grammar, oriented toward the correct understanding of the Greek text; (2) the relation between the Septuagint and the available Hebrew texts: pluses, minuses, divergences of all stripes; and(3) the reception of the Greek text in Philo, the New Testament, and early Christian literature.

Because of the background of the core group of scholars working on La Bible d'Alexandrie and because of the makeup of the volumes, the project has sometimes been misunderstood as intending to offer a translation of the Septuagint "according to the Church Fathers." In the earliest stages of the Septuaginta Deutsch project, Helmut Utzschneider somewhat facilely opposed NETS, Septuaginta Deutsch, and La Bible d'Alexandrie as being situated "upstream," "on level," and "downstream," respectively, in regard to the Greek Bible—that is, approaching the Septuagint from the point of view of the Hebrew Vorlage (in the case of NETS), from the point of view of later readers (in the case of La Bible d'Alexandrie), and

just plainly as a Greek text (in the case of Septuaginta Deutsch).[1] Insofar as La Bible d'Alexandrie is concerned, this characterization is not correct.

It is true that in some cases the interpretation of Philo or the Fathers is included in the notes simply for its own sake. But La Bible d'Alexandrie does not attempt to write a full history of interpretation of the Septuagint.[2] Instead, the main reason for consulting the earliest readings of the Septuagint is the desire to understand the Greek text correctly. It is true that some of the early interpretations seem arbitrary. Ancient readers of the Septuagint had their own agendas and blind spots. But very often the early use of the Greek Bible text throws real light on its meaning and implications. No wonder: most of the ancient readers were native speakers of Greek, and they came from a culture that was not far removed, in time and in space, from that of the translators. Some of them also had a very intimate knowledge of the Greek Bible and cognate literature.

I would like to illustrate this principle with an example encountered in our work on Hosea, published in 2002 as volume 23.1 in La Bible d'Alexandrie.[3] In Hos 12:11(12)b, the MT says:

גם מזבחותם כגלים על תלמי שׂדי

So their altars shall be like stone heaps on the furrows of the fields.

The Hebrew is highly poetic and, as such, not particularly easy to understand, but it poses no textual or philological problems. Notably, the word Mylg ("stone heaps") is well known (think of Gal-Ed/Gilead, the "stone heap" attesting the border between Jacob and Laban in Gen 31:48). In Greek the verse is as follows:

καὶ τὰ θυσιαστήρια αὐτῶν ὡς χελῶναι ἐπὶ χέρσον ἀγροῦ
Their altars are like chelonai in a dry field.

When one looks up χελώνη in Lust-Eynikel-Hauspie's Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint,[4] one learns that the word occurs only once in the Septuagint and that it means "hillock, mound" (similar information is found in T. Muraoka's lexi-

1. Helmut Utzschneider, "Auf Augenhöhe mit dem Text," in Im Brennpunkt: Die Septuaginta. Studien zur Entstehung und Bedeutung der Griechischen Bibel (ed. Heinz-Josef Fabry and Ulrich Offerhaus; BWANT 153; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2001), 11–50.

2. Marguerite Harl, "L'usage des commentaires patristiques pour l'étude de la Septante," in *Aspects de la Bible grecque: Actes du colloque du Groupe de Recherches sur la Septante, 23 octobre 1997* (ed. J. Joosten, Ph. Le Moigne) Revue des Sciences Religieuses 280 [1999]: 184–201.

3. E. Bons, J. Joosten, S. Kessler et al., *La Bible d'Alexandrie,* vol. 23.1, *Les douze prophètes* (Paris: Cerf, 2002).

4. J. Lust, E. Eynikel, and K. Hauspie, *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (2nd ed.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2003).

con to the Twelve Minor Prophets).[5] In the great dictionary of Liddell and Scott,[6] the meaning "hillocks" figures—although only with a reference to Hos 12:11(12)—among several other glosses going from "tortoise" to "footstool" and "tomb with an arched roof." One might conclude, then, that the Greek translator rendered the Hebrew word competently. Sure enough, Brenton translates, "Their altars were like heaps on the ground of the field,"[7] and George Howard renders it in NETS: "Their altars like stone heaps on a parched patch of a field."

A glance at the Church Fathers, however, shows that something more may be going on. Indeed, several patristic commentators take the word χελώνη in its primary meaning of "tortoise (or turtle)." They interpret it as a daring image qualifying the altars, and what will happen to them. Theodore of Mopsuestia explains that water is the turtle's usual habitat and that it will perish on dry land: in the same way, Israel's altars will perish according to Hosea's prophecy. Theodoret of Cyr shows better knowledge of biology, noting that the tortoise is amphibious. However, whereas in the water it is quick and versatile so that it can escape its attackers, on dry land it is slow and easy to catch: Israel's altars "are like tortoises in a dry field"—they will fall easily into the hands of its enemies.

One might attribute these patristic readings to an overly fertile imagination. In fact, Cyril of Alexandria argues against the Antiochians that χελῶναι refers to small mounds that farmers build in the fields for purposes of irrigation—not to animals. There are good reasons, however, to hold that the Greek translator of Hosea really was thinking of tortoises when he chose this word. As was pointed out by Marcus Jastrow long ago,[8] one of the meanings of the word lg in Aramaic and postbiblical Hebrew is indeed "tortoise." It is a well-known fact that the Septuagint translators sometimes mistake later Hebrew or Aramaic meanings for biblical ones. One should note, too, that the meaning "tortoises" fits the context reasonably well: after all, the adverb ὡς defines the expression as a simile. On balance, the rendering that most probably captures the translator's intention should be: "Their altars are like tortoises in a dry field."

The point of this illustration is not that La Bible d'Alexandrie has rendered this verse better than NETS: there may be other passages where the NETS translation is preferable to ours. The point is one of method. Translating the Septuagint is very hard. In trying to understand the Greek text one should exploit all possible

---

5. T. Muraoka, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint: Twelve Prophets* (Leuven: Peeters, 1993).

6. H. G. Liddell, R. Scott, and H. S. Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon; New York: Oxford University Press, 1996).

7. L. C. L. Brenton, *The Septuagint Version of the Old Testament, according to the Vatican Text, Translated into English; with the Principal Various Readings of the Alexandrine Copy* (2 vols.; London: Samuel Bagster & Sons, 1844).

8. Marcus Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature* (London: Luzac; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1903).

sources of illumination. The input of the Greek Fathers (and on occasion of other early readers of the Septuagint) should not be spurned. Drawing on their native competence in Greek, the Fathers are able to point out nuances in the Septuagint text that mere consultation of dictionaries and concordances cannot reveal. The help they give is well worth the effort—of course, the effort is considerable. To my mind, the systematic consultation of ancient readings of the Septuagint is a decisive strength of the French project.

Fourteen volumes have appeared to date in La Bible d'Alexandrie series. Several more are in the pipeline. The group of productive workers is rather small, consisting mostly of French researchers with some help from abroad. The project will take many more years to finish.

Septuaginta Deutsch *(LXX.D): The Value of a German Translation of the Septuagint*

Wolfgang Kraus

What is a translation of the Septuagint into German good for? Let me try to answer this question with three biographical reminiscences. And I have to add immediately, these are reminiscences that come from a German context.[1]

When I was studying theology about thirty years ago, I sometimes came across the Septuagint in Old Testament seminars or classes.[2] My professors of the Old Testament (Hans Walter Wolff, Claus Westermann, Horst Dietrich Preuß, Lothar Perlitt, Hans Jürgen Hermisson, Rolf Rendtorff, Walther Zimmerli, Georg Fohrer) used the Septuagint mainly to verify uncertain Hebrew readings.[3] The Septuagint on its own did not have any significance for me at the time. According

1. The genre of a statement for a panel discussion is not the same as an article in a book. For a more detailed evaluation of some major problems pertaining to Septuagint translation, see Wolfgang Kraus, "Hebräische Wahrheit und Griechische Übersetzung: Überlegungen zum Übersetzungsprojekt Septuaginta-deutsch (LXX.D)," *TLZ* 129 (2004): 989–1007; idem, "Contemporary Translations of the Septuagint: Problems and Perspectives," in *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures* (ed. Wolfgang Kraus and R. Glenn Wooden; SBLSCS 53; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2006), 63–84.

2. When I speak of the Septuagint, I refer to a collection of books traditionally included under that title.

3. This seems to be an experience already mentioned by Isac Leo Seeligmann, "Problems and Perspectives in Modern Septuagint Research," in idem, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah and Cognate Studies* (ed. Robert Hanhart and Hermann Spieckermann; FAT 40; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 21–80, esp. 23. It was also one of the reasons that Rudolf Smend Sr. in his "Denkschrift" (1910) argued for establishing the "Göttinger Septuaginta Unternehmen": "Die Septuaginta . . . ist von weltgeschichtlicher Bedeutung, weil in ihr das Judentum schon in vorchristlicher Zeit die sprachliche Schranke durchbrochen hat, durch die es vom Abendlande geschieden war. . . . Dazu kommt, daß die Septuaginta einen höchst wertvollen Schlüssel für die Erklärung des hebräischen Urtextes bietet und daß sie zugleich das wichtigste Korrektiv für seine zahllosen Fehler abgibt" (cited by Rudolf Smend Jr., "Der geistige Vater des Septuaginta-Unternehmens," in *Studien zur Septuaginta – Robert Hanhart zu Ehren: Aus Anlaß seines 65. Geburtstages* [ed. Detlef Fraenkel, Udo Quast, and John William Wevers; MSU 20; Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-historische Klasse, Folge 3, 190; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990], 332–44, here 338).

to a definition introduced by Marguerite Harl,[4] my professors used the Septuagint predominantly "amont," that is, "upstream."

In the seminars and lectures I attended I also acquired some knowledge about Old Testament Apocrypha. But the Bible I grew up with did not contain any Apocrypha.[5] Therefore they were less important for me right from the start.

We also dealt with the question of the biblical canon, of course. But instinctively we were primarily concerned with the "*hebraica veritas*." The Hebrew Bible, with its set of books and structure, was always the decisive factor. This attitude was deeply rooted in us. It resulted not from intentionally devaluing the Septuagint but from intentionally enhancing the status of the Hebrew Bible and valuing it more highly. Maybe it is a long-term consequence of the decision of the theologians of the Reformation, embracing the humanist motto "*ad fontes*," to rely mainly on the Hebrew text of the Old Testament. Without exaggerating, one can say that it is not only I who had this attitude, but also most of my fellow students. And for the most part it was an unconscious and unreflective attitude.

Writing my dissertation and postdoctoral thesis, I became aware of the meaning of the following two facts: we have the Greek version of the Old Testament besides the Hebrew text, and, when dealing with the Old Testament, the authors of the New Testament usually refer to the Septuagint and not to the Hebrew text. I would like to give you two examples.

1. In my dissertation I examined Rom 3:21–26, especially 3:25–26a, from a tradition-historical perspective.[6] Here Paul probably uses an early Christian tradition (a formula) and integrates it into his argumentation. This tradition says about Christ: προέθετο ἱλαστήριον.

In most instances ἱλαστήριον is used as a translation of the Hebrew כפרת, but not exclusively. Therefore, the attempt to identify Jesus only with the כפרת, as is often done in the literature, has to fail.[7] There is no exclusive link from the concept of the Hebrew Bible concerning the כפרת to the statement of Jesus as ἱλαστήριον. Rather, the semantic context of ἱλαστήριον in the Septuagint and other Greek

4. Marguerite Harl, "Traduire la Septante en français: pourquoi et comment?," in eadem, *La langue de Japhet: quinze études sur la Septante et le grec des chrétiens* (Paris: Cerf, 1992), 33–42.

5. Unfortunately many Protestant Bible editions, especially since 1945, did not and still do not include the Apocrypha.

6. Wolfgang Kraus, *Der Tod Jesu als Heiligtumsweihe: Eine Untersuchung zum Umfeld der Sühnevorstellung in Römer 3,25-26a* (WMANT 66: Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1991).

7. E.g., Peter Stuhlmacher, "Zur neueren Exegese von Röm 3,24–26," in idem, *Versöhnung, Gesetz und Gerechtigkeit: Aufsätze zur biblischen Theologie* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981), 117–35; Bernd Janowski, *Sühne als Heilsgeschehen: Studien zur Sühnetheologie der Priesterschrift und zur Wurzel KPR im Alten Orient und in Altes Testament* (2nd ed.; WMANT 55; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2000), 350–54, 449–50.

literature has to be taken into consideration and constitutes the decisive framework for the correct interpretation, which the Hebrew כפרת alone cannot provide.[8]

2. In my postdoctoral thesis I dealt with the tradition-historical background of Pauline ecclesiology, especially the motif "people of God." I was interested in the question of the basis on which Paul could argue that the nations were to be included in the eschatological people of God and thus in eschatological salvation.[9] The promise to Abraham in Gen 12:3 has literary parallels in Gen 18:18; 22:18; 26:4; 28:14. The Hebrew text uses the verb ברך in various forms, *nipʿal* and *hitpaʿel* (cf. also Sir 44:21). The Septuagint uses the same form, ἐνευλογέομαι (passive), in each instance. The word itself is a neologism and is to be found only in the Septuagint and in literature depending on it.[10] Paul also uses this form of the verb in Rom 4 and Gal 3. So the nuances of the Hebrew text are not expressed and are irrelevant. Therefore the decisive framework for the interpretation of Gal 3 and Rom 4 is not the Hebrew text, but the Septuagint.

In the winter term of 1991–92 I was giving a seminar entitled "The Relevance of the Septuagint for the Understanding of the New Testament." I started with ten students. In the end there were only two left. The Greek of the Septuagint was too difficult for the rest, and so eight of them gave up—particularly as the seminar was not mandatory for the curriculum.

I draw three conclusions from these three reminiscences:

1. The Septuagint is more than a "quarry" to be used just for the verification of uncertain Hebrew readings. It is a "transfer"—a transfer of religious tradition from a cultural context shaped by the Hebrew language into the context of Greek-speaking people living in a Ptolemaic world.[11] How this transfer is achieved varies from book to book. The varying translation techniques of the books show that there is no consistent approach and that every book has to be examined separately. A translation makes it easier to read entire books of the Septuagint in their context and not just some selected passages. It enables us to see the Septuagint as a work of literature.

---

8. Cf. besides Ex 25 and Lev 16 also Ezek 43:14,17,20 LXX; Am 9:1 LXX; Gen 16:16 Sym; 4 Macc 17:21-22, etc. (Kraus, "Der Tod Jesu," 21-32).

9. Wolfgang Kraus, *Das Volk Gottes: Zur Grundlegung der Ekklesiologie bei Paulus* (WUNT 85; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996; repr., 2004).

10. There are no instances in the Pseudepigrapha either. In the Old Testament the verb occurs in Gen 12:3; 18:18; 22:18; 26:4; 28:14; Pss 9:24 (10:3); 71(72):17 (*varia lectio* by corrector "a" in Codex Sinaiticus); Sir 44:21. 1 Reigns (Sam) 2:29 could be a medial use. The instances in Philo, *Migr.* 1.118, 122; *Her.* 8; *Somn.* 1.3, 176 are Septuagint quotations of Gen 12:3; 26:4; 28:14. This means that, except for Ps 9:24 (10:3), all passive instances are connected with Gen 12:3.

11. "Transfer" is used by Robert Hanhart to describe Isac Leo Seeligmann's attempt to describe what the Septuagint is (Robert Hanhart, "Introduction," in Seeligmann, *Septuagint Version*, 3-15, esp. 4).

2. The transfer into a different language makes it necessary for the New Testament scholar not only to study the tradition-historical background of the Hebrew Bible but also to examine the semantic field of a Greek term.
3. The Septuagint has to be translated for academic teaching. Only in this way can it be made accessible to a larger readership. There is no use in complaining about the vanishing knowledge of the classical languages. We have to offer a concrete solution to this problem. In this context a translation will not suppress or replace the Greek or Hebrew original but will lead to the original text.

Permit me to relate another personal experience. From 1986 to 1990 I worked full time in the field of the Christian–Jewish dialogue. The Septuagint did not play any role in this context. It was overlooked, or worse, regarded as a hinderance in the Christian–Jewish relations. The Septuagint was considered to be the Old Testament to which the Christians laid claim. As a result of this Christian "seizure," the Septuagint was then suppressed and finally and rightfully rejected by many Jewish scholars. Apart from the fact that this opinion is only partly correct, because the Septuagint was used by Jewish scholars up to the Middle Ages, many people failed to see the Septuagint as an originally Jewish translation of the Bible. What was also not realized in the context of the Jewish–Christian dialogue is the fact that the Septuagint originated in Judaism and that it therefore provides insight into the varieties of Judaism in antiquity.

These personal experiences—comparable to those of my colleague and coeditor, Martin Karrer—had an impact on the concept of *Septuaginta Deutsch* (LXX.D):[12]

---

12. The translation volume for the *Septuaginta Deutsch* project has already appeared: *Septuaginta Deutsch: Das griechische Alte Testament in deutscher Übersetzung* (ed. Wolfgang Kraus and Martin Karrer; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2009; 2d ed., 2010). A second volume with philogical, historical, and other annotations is in preparation. The following volumes with papers from conferences organized by *Septuaginta Deutsch* have appeared or will appear in the near future: Heinz-Josef Fabry and Ulrich Offerhaus, eds., *Im Brennpunkt: Die Septuaginta. Studien zur Entstehung und Bedeutung der Griechischen Bibel* (BWANT 153; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2001); Siegfried Kreuzer and Jürgen Peter Lesch, eds., *Im Brennpunkt: Die Septuaginta. Studien zur Entstehung und Bedeutung der Griechischen Bibel*, vol. 2 (BWANT 161; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2004); Wolfgang Kraus and R. Glenn Wooden, eds., *Septuagint Research. Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures* (SBLSCS 53; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2006); Heinz-Josef Fabry and Dieter Böhler, eds., *Im Brennpunkt: Die Septuaginta*, vol. 3, *Studien zur Theologie, Anthropologie, Ekklesiologie, Eschatologie und Liturgie der Griechischen Bibel* (BWANT 174; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2007); Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus, eds., *Die Septuaginta—Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten: Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 20.–23. Juli 2006* (WUNT 219; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008); Wolfgang Kraus and Olivier Munnich, eds., *La Septante en Allemagne et en France: Textes de la Septante à traduction double ou à traduction très littérale. Septuaginta Deutsch und Bible d'Alexandrie* (OBO 238; Fribourg: Academic Press; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck

1. The starting point of a translation has to be the Greek text. The Greek text is the "original" text for the translator into a modern language.
2. The second step is to examine the relation to the Hebrew/Aramaic *Vorlage*. On the one hand, the Septuagint became an independent work of literature. On the other hand, it cannot be seen in isolation from its Hebrew *Vorlage*. These aspects are not mutually exclusive; they complement each other. Those involved with LXX.D, therefore, would not subscribe to the idea that the Septuagint is an independent piece of literature from its point of production,[13] but they would likewise not be prepared to regard the Septuagint as "a Greek translation which aimed at bringing the Greek reader to the Hebrew original rather than bringing the Hebrew original to the Greek reader. Consequently, the Greek's subservience to the Hebrew may be seen as indicative of its aim."[14] The Septuagint mediates between Hebrew tradition and a Greek-speaking audience in a Hellenistic environment. So both sides are complementary: a product of translation in its own right, but in most books not to be understood without relation to its *Vorlage*.
3. The Septuagint contains evidence of various translation techniques. There is no consistent methodology applicable to the whole of the Septuagint; each book has to be examined separately. Statements about the freedom/restrictedness of a translator in relation to his Hebrew/Aramaic *Vorlage* cannot be made in a general way. The various aspects have to be studied in each book separately. These facts led LXX.D editors to the decision not to use a guideline translation in the way that NETS uses the NRSV. Using a guideline translation would have given a false impression; the uniformity might have become too strong. Thus, the long time span during which the Septuagint was composed and the implied development of the language would have been factored out.
4. LXX.D is not intended to replace the study of the original Greek text but to encourage readers to deal with the Greek original and its Hebrew *Vorlage*. In its print layout LXX.D indicates obvious differences between the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint by means of italic type. However, these can only take the form of a limited range of notes and hints that encourage the reader to have a look at the Greek text and the Hebrew *Vorlage*. Furthermore, LXX.D provides footnotes to indicate alternative translations or

& Ruprecht, 2009); Wolfgang Kraus, Martin Karrer, and Martin Meiser, eds., *Die Septuaginta—Texte, Theologien, Einflüsse* (WUNT 252; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010).

13. The statement of Marguerite Harl that the LXX became "un oeuvre autonome, détachée de son modèle" is definitely right for the process of reception, but cannot be applied to the production process (Harl, "Traduire la Septante en français," 36).

14. Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright, "To the Reader of NETS," in *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under That Title* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), xiv.

give short thematic annotations. A superscript plus sign indicates passages where the Hebrew *Vorlage* offers a longer text than that of the Septuagint.[15]

5. We anticipate that LXX.D will stimulate various forms of Septuagint study and research:
   a. In order to facilitate Septuagint research in general, the LXX.D volume containing the translation will be followed by another volume with more extensive annotations and discussions of issues pertaining to translation and the reception history.
   b. LXX.D constitutes a tool for theologians, historians whose research focus is ancient history, specialists in Judaism, and other persons interested in the Septuagint.
   c. LXX.D will have great significance for Orthodox Christians in German-speaking countries since now a translation is available in the language they use today. LXX.D indicates in footnotes when the text of the critical editions (Septuaginta Gottingensis[16] and the edition of Rahlfs/Hanhart[17]) differs from the one used by the Orthodox Churches.
   d. As for the promotion of Christian–Jewish dialogue, we hope that LXX.D will prove to be the impetus for dealing with this Jewish translation more intensively and thus for promoting knowledge of the various manifestations of Jewish thought in antiquity.
   e. We expect that LXX.D will create new interest in biblical hermeneutical research. What is important for me as a New Testament scholar and Protestant theologian is the following question: What is the significance of the fact that we have (at least) two different versions of the Old Testament and that the authors of the New Testament usually take their Old Testament quotations from the Septuagint and not the Masoretic Text?

---

15. The second volume with annotations will contain a more detailed treatment of these issues.

16. *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1931–).

17. *Septuaginta: Id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes edidit Alfred Rahlfs* (rev. ed.; ed. Robert Hanhart; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006).