

1.3.1 Greek Translations

1.3.1.1 Septuagint

1.3.1.1.1 Nature

The Septuagint (LXX) is a Jewish translation that was prepared in Alexandria, Palestine, and possibly elsewhere. The Jewish character of the Torah translation is well established, while that of the post-Pentateuchal books is not, although this assumption is almost certainly correct. There probably were no Gentiles in Egypt or elsewhere who would have had the skills to make such a transcultural translation, or would have had an incentive to do so. The Hebrew source of LXX differed much from the other textual witnesses (MT+ and many of the Qumran texts), and this fact accounts for its great significance in biblical studies. LXX is the main ancient witness that occasionally reflects different compositional stages of the Scripture books than those included in MT+ (→ 1.3.1.1.11); the term MT+ is used to indicate the combined evidence of MT (→ 1.2.2) and the versions that are close to it, the Targumim (→ 1.3.3), ~~Peshitta (→ 1.3.4)~~, and Vulgate (→ 1.3.5). Moreover, LXX is important as a reflection of early biblical exegesis, Jewish-Greek culture, and the Greek language. Finally, this translation is also of major importance for understanding early Christianity since much of the vocabulary and some religious ideas of the New Testament are based on it (Tov, “Septuagint and Christian Origins”). The analysis below focuses on the text-critical importance of LXX.

1.3.1.1.2 Name

The name LXX reflects the tradition that seventy-two elders translated the Torah into Greek (thus *Sop.* 1.7 and parallels and the *Epistle of Aristeas*, an early Jewish composition describing the origin of LXX). In the first centuries C.E., this tradition was expanded

to include all the translated biblical books (the first to do so was Justin Martyr, *Apology*, and *Dialogue with Trypho*, 68:7) and finally it encompassed all of Jewish-Greek Scriptures translated into Greek as well as several compositions originally written in Greek. The translation of the Torah (→ 2.4.1) may reflect an official translation, as narrated in the *Epistle of Aristeas* and Hebrew sources.¹ However, it was not created by seventy-two individuals, as narrated in these sources, but rather by five different translators.² Most of the post-Pentateuchal books were translated by different individuals, while some translators rendered more than one book (→ 1.3.1.1.5).

The collective name Septuagint(a) now denotes both the original *translation* of Hebrew–Aramaic Scripture into Greek and the *collection* of sacred Greek writings in their present, canonical, form. Neither use is precise, since the name Septuaginta is not suitable for a collection that contains, in addition to the original translation of some books, late revisions of original translations (→ 1.3.1.2), as well as compositions written in Greek. Accordingly, scholars usually distinguish between the collection of sacred Greek writings named the “Septuagint” and the reconstructed original translation, called the Old Greek (OG) translation. When it is necessary to stress the diverse nature of the collection of books included in LXX, its name is often placed in quotation marks (“LXX”).

1.3.1.1.3 Scope of the Corpus

The “LXX” contains two types of books:

- a) The Greek translation of the twenty-four canonical Hebrew–Aramaic books. These translations contribute significantly to biblical studies, in particular to the understanding of the textual transmission

¹ See Veltri, *Eine Tora*.

² See Kim, *Multiple Authorship*.

and exegesis of the Scripture books.

b) Books not included in the Hebrew Scripture collection and subsequently named *Apocrypha* (the “hidden” books) in Greek and *sefarim hišoniyyim* (the “outside books”) in Hebrew. These books, named deuterocanonical in the Catholic Church, consist of two groups:

- 1) A Greek translation of books, whose Hebrew or Aramaic source has been lost or preserved only in part such as Ben Sira and Baruch;
- 2) A few works composed in Greek, such as the Wisdom of Solomon.

1.3.1.1.4 Sequence of the Books

The twenty-four books of the Hebrew canon included in LXX together with the so-called Apocrypha are arranged in a sequence different from that of Hebrew Scripture in several aspects. Whereas the books of the Hebrew canon are arranged in three divisions (Torah, Prophets, Writings), probably reflecting their acceptance as authoritative books at different stages (→ 1.1.2.1), the Greek arrangement reflects their literary genre, which may be phrased in different ways. The Torah, with its legal and narrative segments, and the historical books represent different genres, but together they may be conceived of as one large historical block including legal sections. The poetical and sapiential books likewise represent different genres, but they are bound together by common poetical features. The Greek canon may thus be conceived of as consisting of three, four, or five divisions:

- 1) Legal and historical books (Genesis–until Ezra–Nehemiah together with several apocryphal books);
- 2) Poetical and sapiential books (Psalms until Job together with several apocryphal books);
- 3) Prophetic books (the Minor Prophets and

the three Major Prophets).

The Greek tradition that places the Prophets at the end of the Greek canon is represented by codex LXX^B and many additional sources. According to Swete, this tradition reflects “the great majority of authorities both Eastern and Western.”³ On the other hand, the three-section division of codices LXX^A, LXX^S, and other sources reflects the division of Hebrew Scripture. The sequence of the majority Greek tradition (codex LXX^B, etc.) is usually presented as reflecting a Christian tradition (→ 1.1.2.2). In this sequence, the Prophets, who according to Christian belief foretell the coming of Jesus, are placed immediately before the New Testament books. The minority tradition of codices LXX^A, LXX^S, and other sources possibly reflects either a late approximation to the Hebrew tradition or the original Greek arrangement, since LXX^S is the earliest manuscript containing the complete Greek Scripture.

Within each section, the Greek books are arranged in a sequence different from that of the twenty-four books of Hebrew Scripture. Lust, reviewing earlier views, shows that there is no evidence for the assumption that LXX reflects an Alexandrian as opposed to a Palestinian canon.⁴ The differences between the Hebrew and Greek canons pertain to the following areas:

- *Major/Minor Prophets*. Since the Minor Prophets were combined into one unit, there was no option to place some of them before the Major Prophets and others after them. The Hebrew tradition places the Major Prophets first because of their prominence, in defiance of chronological considerations that would have given preference to Amos as the earliest of the writing prophets (Amos prophesied shortly after 760 B.C.E.). This tradition is also reflected in codex LXX^S and some,

3 Swete, *Introduction*, 219.

4 J. Lust, “Septuagint and Canon,” in *The Biblical*

Canons (eds. J.M. Auwers and H.J. de Jonge; BETL 163; Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 39–55.

chiefly Western, church fathers. However, in codices LXX^{A, B, V} and the majority of the patristic lists, the Minor Prophets precede the Major Prophets. The reason for this internal sequence probably coincides with the placing of the Major Prophets at the end of Greek Scripture, representing the wish to place them just before the New Testament.

- Internal sequence of the *Minor Prophets* (→ 9.1).
- *Judges–Ruth*. In the arrangement of LXX, Ruth follows Judges. This sequence is secondary since the Hebrew and Greek canons contain the same Deuteronomistic block of historical books from Deuteronomy until the end of 2Kings, in which the different literary genre of Ruth is out of place.

Additionally, the individual apocryphal books are integrated into the various sections of LXX in accordance with their literary genre and content.

1.3.1.1.5 *Original Form, Date, and Milieu*

In the wake of de Lagarde,⁵ most scholars are now of the opinion that all LXX manuscripts derive from a single translation (for its reconstruction, → 1.3.1.1.1) that was repeatedly revised to the changing Hebrew text. An alternative model, suggested by Kahle,⁶ assumes multiple translations without specifying the relation between these translations.

Origin. Although LXX is often described as the “Alexandrian version of the Bible,” an Alexandrian origin of LXX is likely only for the Torah and some additional books. There is now a growing understanding that several books were produced in Palestine. These are, in sequence of probability: Esther (→ 13–17.1.1.5), Qohelet (→ 13–17.1.1.3; both Aquila or *kaige*-Th, or another translator, → 1.3.1.2.2, → 1.3.1.2.3.4), sections of the “LXX” of Samuel–Kings (→ 5.1; → 5.2), Canticles

(→ 13–17.1.1.2), Lamentations (→ 13–17.1.1.4), Ruth (→ 13–17.1.1.1; all: *kaige*-Th; Tov, “Post-Pentateuchal”). Each book was rendered by a different individual, while a few clusters of books were prepared by a single translator or group of translators. One individual probably rendered the Old Greek of Jeremiah–Baruch, Ezekiel, and the Minor Prophets (→ 8.3.5), and another one produced the Old Greek of 1–4 Kingdoms (Samuel–Kings). Job (→ 11.3.1) and Proverbs (→ 12.3.1) were probably also produced by a single translator.

Date. According to the generally accepted explanation of the testimony of the *Epistle of Aristeas*, the Torah translation was carried out in Egypt in the beginning of the third century B.C.E. (→ 2.4.1). This assumption is compatible with the early date of several Greek papyrus and leather fragments of the Torah from Qumran and Egypt, some of which date from the middle of the second century (→ 1.3.1.1.6). The remaining Scripture books were translated at different times. Some evidence for their dates is external, e.g., quotations from LXX in ancient sources, and some is internal, e.g., reflections of historical situations or events found in the translation.

The post-Pentateuchal books were translated after the translation of the Torah, for most of these translations use its vocabulary, and several translations also quote from the Greek Torah. Since the Prophets and several of the Hagiographa were known in their Greek version to the grandson of Ben Sira (→ 11.4.3) at the end of the second century B.C.E., we may infer that most of them were translated in the beginning of that century or somewhat earlier. There is only limited explicit evidence concerning the dates of individual books: Chronicles (→ 20.3.1) is quoted by Eupolemos in the middle of the second century B.C.E., and Job (→ 11.3.1) by Pseudo-Aristeas in the beginning of the first century B.C.E.⁷ The translation of Isaiah con-

5 Lagarde, *Anmerkungen*, 2–4.

6 Kahle, *Untersuchungen*.

7 See Swete, *Introduction*, 25–26.

tains allusions to historical situations and events that point to the years 170–150 B.C.E. (→ 6.3.2). See, further, the colophon in LXX-Esth (→ 13–17.1.1.5.A.2).

The corpus of the “LXX” also contains revisions of original translations (→ 1.3.1.2). These revisions were made from the second or first century B.C.E. onwards (parts of Samuel–Kings, → 5.4.1.2) until the beginning of the second century C.E. (Qohelet [→ 13–17.1.1.3], if indeed translated by Aquila, as assumed by Barthélemy⁸). Therefore, some four hundred years separate the translation of the Torah from the youngest translation contained in the “LXX.”

1.3.1.1.6 Evidence

LXX is evidenced in many witnesses, some direct, such as early papyrus fragments, and others indirect, such as the secondary translations made from LXX (→ 1.4), and quotations by early authors (→ 1.7).

a) Direct Witnesses⁹

Numerous sources contain LXX, either completely or in part, varying in date from the second century B.C.E. until the late Middle Ages:

1) Early papyrus and leather texts, including both scrolls and codices dating from the second century B.C.E. onwards, were discovered in the Judean Desert and Egypt. The early date of these fragments, mainly of the Torah, helps us in gaining insights into ear-

lier periods, since the Hexapla either replaced older text traditions or contaminated manuscripts from the third century C.E. onward (→ 1.3.1.2).

4QLXXLev^a and 4QpapLXXLev^b (both first century B.C.E.) are probably closer to the Old Greek than to the later uncials, which had been slightly revised towards MT. 4QLXXLev^a contains a slightly freer translation than that found in the uncial manuscripts. This scroll presumably reflects the Old Greek, revised toward MT in the uncials. In 4QpapLXXLev^b Lev 3:12, 4:27, Ιαω “IAW” for MT יהוה “Lord” probably reflects the original, pre-Christian rendering of the Tetragrammaton, preceding κύριος “Lord” of LXX.¹⁰ The translation vocabulary of both Qumran scrolls was not yet standardized as it was in the later uncials.

The Chester Beatty/Scheide Collection contains large sections of most biblical books; especially significant are the papyri containing Ezekiel (→ 8.3.4) and Daniel (numbered LXX^{967–68}). For Daniel, they serve as the sole witness of LXX in this book (except for the late Hexaplaric manuscripts). All other manuscripts of Daniel contain the revision of *kaige*-Theodotion that had replaced the original translation in the corpus of the “LXX” (→ 18.3.1). The Schøyen papyri of Exodus, Leviticus, and Joshua likewise attest to valuable early text forms.¹¹

8 Barthélemy, **Devanciers*, 21.

9 For an updated description of all the direct witnesses known until 2004, see A. Rahlfs and D. Fraenkel, *Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften des Alten Testaments*, Vol. 1.1: *Die Überlieferung bis zum VIII. Jahrhundert* (Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum Supplementum; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004).

10 Thus Ulrich, **DSSDCB*, 152–67; Tov, **HB, GB, and Qumran*, 349–60; F. Shaw, *The Earliest Non-Mystical Jewish Use of Ιαω* (CBET 70; Leuven: Peeters, 2014). On the other hand, A. Pietersma, “Kyrios or Tetragram: A Renewed Quest for the Original LXX,” in *De Septuaginta: Studies in Honour of J.W. Wevers on His Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (eds. A. Pietersma and C. Cox; Mississauga: Ben-

Ben Publications, 1984), 85–101 (98); J.W. Wevers, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Septuagint,” *BIOCS* 38 (2005): 1–24; M. Rösel, “The Reading and Translation of the Divine Name in the Masoretic Tradition and the Greek Pentateuch,” *JSTOT* 31 (2007): 411–28 and N. Petersen, “An Analysis of Two Early LXX Manuscripts from Qumran: 4QLXXNum and 4QLXXLev^a in the Light of Previous Studies,” *BBR* 19 (2009): 481–510 consider κύριος “Lord” the original rendering. As a result, in his Göttingen editions (→ 1.3.1.1.7), Wevers incorporates the Qumran fragments in the apparatus as (revisional) variants revising the main (OG) text.

11 K. De Troyer, “The Textual Character of the Ex-

2) Uncial (*uncialis*) or majuscule (*majusculus*) manuscripts from the fourth to the tenth centuries C.E., written with “capital” letters, are the main source for our knowledge of LXX. The three most important manuscripts containing all or almost all books of LXX are LXX^{B, A, S}, all of which also include the New Testament:

Codex LXX^B (Cod. Vat. Gr. 1209, or “Vaticanus”), dating to the fourth century, is the best complete LXX manuscript, serving as the base text for several editions. LXX^B is relatively free of corruptions and influences from the revisions of LXX. However, in Isaiah it is Hexaplaric and in Judges it contains another type of revision.

Codex LXX^A (B.M. Royal ms 1 D v–viii, or “Alexandrinus”), dating to the fifth century, often adapted the text to similar verses and is also prone to harmonizing. LXX^A is greatly influenced by the Hexaplaric tradition and in several books it represents that tradition faithfully.

Codex LXX^S also named Ⲛ (B.M. Add. 43725, or “Sinaiticus”), dating to the middle of the fourth century, is the oldest manuscript that combined LXX and the New Testament. Codex LXX^S usually agrees with LXX^B, when the two reflect the Old Greek translation, but is also influenced by the later revisions of LXX. C. von Tischendorf brought this manuscript to Russia in the middle of the nineteenth century from St. Catherine’s Monastery in Sinai, from which it derives its name.

3) Minuscule (*minusculus*) manuscripts, written with lowercase letters, from the ninth to the sixteenth centuries are recorded in the Göttingen and Cambridge editions,

while others are known from the edition of Holmes-Parsons (→ 1.3.1.1.7). Even though minuscules are relatively late, they often preserve ancient traditions, as, for example, in the Lucianic tradition (LXX^{Luc}) known mainly from the four minuscules denoted as b, o, c₂, e₂ in the Cambridge editions (→ 1.3.1.1.7) and 19, 82, 93, and 108 in Rahlfs, **Septuaginta*.

b) *Indirect Witnesses: Secondary Translations of LXX*

In the first centuries C.E., LXX served as the official source of the Bible for the Christian church and therefore many translations were made from it in accordance with the needs of the churches in the East and West (→ 1.4). Several of these translations are important for our knowledge of LXX and its revisions in early centuries. The testimony of the secondary versions is adduced in the editions of Cambridge and Göttingen (→ 1.3.1.1.7).

Vetus Latina (→ 1.4.1). Particularly important among these is the *Vetus Latina*, “the Old Latin <translation>.” This translation preserved many important Greek readings, sometimes as their only witness, in 1–4 Kingdoms often in conjunction with LXX^{Luc} and 4QSam^a.¹² The *Vetus Latina*, the first Christian translation of LXX, was translated from the Greek, but some of its “Hebraizing” elements may have entered the Latin translation directly from a Hebrew source, possibly during the oral citation of the text in the synagogue service in North Africa, as surmised by Quispel.¹³ The textual evidence for the VL is very complex, and its various manuscripts may evidence several Greek sources of dif-

odus Codex of the Schøyen Collection (MS 187; RA 866),” *Analecta Papyrologica* 23–34 (2011–2012): 57–79; for Leviticus: K. De Troyer, *Papyri Graecae Schøyen (PSchøyen 11)* (eds. D. Minutoli and R. Pintaudi; Papyrologica Florentina 40; Florence: Gonnelli, 2010), 1–68 + plates i–xvi; for Joshua: *Papyri Graecae Schøyen (PSchøyen 1)* (ed. R. Pintaudi; Papyrologica Florentina 35;

Florence: Gonnelli, 2005), 79–145 + plates xvi–xxvii.

12 Ulrich, *DSS, 233–74.

13 G. Quispel, “African Christianity before Minucius Felix and Tertullian,” in *Actus: Studies in Honour of H.L.W. Nelson* (eds. J. den Boeft and A.H.M. Kessels; Utrecht: Instituut voor Klassieke Talen, 1982), 257–335 (260–65).

ferent nature. If all these complications are taken into consideration, one may extract valuable data from the VL not only for the reconstruction of the Old Greek, but also for its Hebrew *Vorlage*, especially in Samuel and Kings.¹⁴

1.3.1.1.7 Editions

Almost all the uncial manuscripts of LXX have been published in diplomatic editions with or without an accompanying critical apparatus. The two major diplomatic editions are:

- R. Holmes and J. Parsons, *Vetus Testamentum graecum cum variis lectionibus* (5 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1798–1827). This edition records variants from 164 manuscripts, the daughter translations of LXX, and early printed editions and is valuable for the few books not covered by the Göttingen and Cambridge editions.
- A.E. Brooke, N. McLean, and H.St.J. Thackeray, *The Old Testament in Greek according to the Text of Codex Vaticanus: Supplemented from Other Uncial Manuscripts: With a Critical Apparatus Containing the Variants of the Chief Authorities for the Text of the Septuagint* (4 vols.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1906–1940), generally known as “the Cambridge Septuagint.” This series contains the books Genesis–Nehemiah, as well as Esther, Judith, and Tobit in four volumes, according to codex LXX^B, and where that manuscript is lacking, it has been supplemented by either codex LXX^A or LXX^S. Together with the editions of the Göttingen series (see below), this edition is used by scholars for precise research.

Critical or eclectic editions present the reconstructed “original” text together with a critical apparatus.

- The Göttingen Septuagint series, named *Septuaginta, Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Societatis Litterarum Göttingensis editum* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1926–), offers the most thorough critical editions of LXX. Each volume contains a detailed critical apparatus in which the witnesses are divided into groups and subgroups, so that readers can find their way through the maze of manifold variants.
- Rahlfs, **Septuaginta* (1935) and Rahlfs–Hanhart, **Septuaginta* (2006) contain an abridged critical edition according to the Göttingen system.

1.3.1.1.8 Auxiliary Tools

Concordances: Hatch–Redpath, **Concordance* (the most important printed tool for LXX scholarship in addition to the text editions) lists the “formal” Hebrew and Aramaic equivalents for most of the LXX words in the canonical books and Ben Sira; for the other Apocrypha, the Greek words are listed without equivalents. T. Muraoka, *A Greek–Hebrew/Aramaic Two-Way Index to the Septuagint* (Louvain: Peeters, 2010) provides a convenient reverse index to Hatch–Redpath in addition to the one included in Hatch–Redpath itself.

Lexicons: T. Muraoka, *A Greek–English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (Louvain: Peeters, 2009) provides an updated lexicon. A short lexicon is *Greek–English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (eds. J. Lust et al.; rev. ed.; Stuttgart:

14 See N. Fernández Marcos, *Scribes and Translators: Septuagint and Old Latin in the Book of Kings* (VTSup 54; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 71–87; P.-M. Bogaert, “La *Vetus Latina* de Jérémie: texte très court, témoin de la plus ancienne Septante et d’une forme plus anciennes de l’hébreu (Jer 39 et 52),” in Schenker, **Earliest Text*, 51–82;

P. Hugo, “Le Grec ancien des Livres des Règles: Une histoire et un bilan de la recherche,” in *Sôfer Mahûr: Essays in Honour of Adrian Schenker Offered by Editors of Biblia Hebraica Quinta* (eds. Y.A.P. Goldman, A. van der Kooij, and R.D. Weis; VTSup 110; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 113–41. See further → 1.3.1.1.10–12.

Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2003). Very helpful is also B. Taylor, *The Analytical Lexicon to the Septuagint: A Complete Parsing Guide* (Grand Rapids: Hendrickson, 1994; expanded edition 2009, including *Word Definitions* by J. Lust, E. Eynikel, and K. Hauspie).

Scholarly translations: *NETS and <http://cat.sas.upenn.edu/nets/>; *Septuaginta Deutsch: Das griechische Alte Testament in deutscher Übersetzung* (eds. W. Kraus and M. Karrer; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2009); <http://www.septuagintaforschung.de/>; **Bible d'Alexandrie*.

Grammar: Thackeray, **Grammar*.

Introductions: Swete, **Introduction*; Jellioe, **SMS*; Tov, **TCU*; K.H. Jobs and M. Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2000); J.M. Dines, *The Septuagint* (London: T & T Clark, 2004); J.K. Aitken (ed.), *The T & T Clark Companion to the Septuagint* (London: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2015).

Commentaries: *Septuagint Commentary Series* (Leiden: Brill); the various commentaries of J.W. Wevers on the LXX-Pentateuch (1990–1998); *Septuaginta Deutsch: Erläuterungen und Kommentare zum griechischen Alten Testament* (eds. M. Karrer and W. Kraus; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2011); **Bible d'Alexandrie*.

Electronic editions and tools: **CATSS*; see further Tov, **TCHB*, 377–82 and Tov, **Greek-Hebrew Bible*, 31–51.

Bibliographies: S.P. Brock et al., *A Classified Bibliography of the Septuagint* (Arbeiten zur Geschichte und Literatur des hellenistischen Judentums 6; Leiden: Brill, 1973); C. Dogniez, *Bibliography of the Septuagint/Bibliographie de la Septante 1970–1993* (VTSup 60; Leiden: Brill, 1995).

1.3.1.1.9 Exegesis

Exegesis is a necessary part of the translation enterprise. It has many forms, and in the case of LXX many aspects have been researched extensively (see the bibliographies in → 1.3.1.1.8). Within the present framework,

there is only room for the most essential information regarding the translators' exegesis.

a) *Linguistic Exegesis*

Every translation reflects linguistic exegesis that is essential to this undertaking. This exegesis consists of three levels.

- *Linguistic identifications* that identify all forms in the source language and the connection between the words. Without this identification, the words of the source text cannot be translated. Among other things, an analysis of most (but not all) morphological constituents of the nouns and verbs is essential for the translation procedure. For example, the translator needed to analyze the morphological nature of the word being translated in order to determine, for example, whether it was a noun or a verb.
- *Semantic exegesis* of all the words in the source language. Before turning to the determination of equivalents, the translator has to determine the meaning of each Hebrew word.
- *Determining the equivalents* of words of the source language in the target language on the basis of the translator's knowledge and sensitivity in that language.

All translations reflect at least these three levels of linguistic exegesis, and a few translation units (such as Aquila) are confined to such exegesis. As a rule, translations also reflect the first two types of exegesis that are described below. This feature may then be used to characterize the translations: the greater the number of exegetical elements found in a translation unit, the freer it is considered. Conversely, the greater the number of fixed equivalents in a translation unit, the more it is considered literal, and the smaller the number of such equivalents, the freer it is considered.

Among the exegetical elements contained in the translations, it is possible to distinguish between linguistic exegesis that fol-

lows the text closely, and other forms of exegesis that move the translation away from a literal understanding. Some exegetical elements form a necessary part of the translation process, while others infuse the text with elements of the taste, understanding, and personality of the translator, sometimes to such an extent that the plain meaning of the text is completely obscured. For example, some translators allowed themselves the freedom to include allusions to other Bible verses or to insert their own reflections into the translation. However, even if according to our understanding the translators seem to have strayed far from the simple meaning of the verses, they were, nevertheless, reflecting what they considered to be their message. The three types of non-linguistic exegesis that are found in most of the translations are mentioned below.

b) *Contextual Exegesis*

A translator sometimes explains a detail based on another detail in the context or he may add or omit a detail.

c) *Theological Exegesis*

Almost any translation option in an ancient or modern translation of the Hebrew Bible is potentially a carrier of theologically motivated exegesis, because of the central place of the Bible in the religions based on it. It is, in fact, difficult to imagine a biblical translation without theological exegesis. Among the ancient translations, the Palestinian Targumim (→ 1.3.3) probably provide the most data on embedded theological exegesis. An analysis of this exegesis provides many helpful insights for the text-critical examination of the ancient translations.

Theological exegesis relates to the description of God and His acts, the Messiah, Zion, the exile, as well as various ideas, such as that of repentance, reflected especially in LXX of Isaiah (→ 6.3), Job (→ 11.3.1), Proverbs (→ 12.3.1), and Daniel (→ 18.3.1). Such exegesis may be expressed through theologically motivated choices of translation equivalents, in changes in words and verses (either large or

small) or in expansions or omissions of ideas considered offensive.

Hebrew scribes and translators inserted similar changes in their manuscripts, and it is often hard to distinguish between these two options. Knowledge of translation technique is our main guide in order to decide whether a translational deviation from MT derived from the translator or his Hebrew *Vorlage*.

The theological world of the free translator of LXX-Isa is clearly recognizable in his exegesis. Thus, the idea that God brings σωτήριον “salvation,” referring particularly to salvation from the exile, has often been introduced in LXX in places where it is not found in MT (→ 6.3.4).

d) *Midrashic Tendencies*

The ancient translations of several biblical books include midrashic elements similar or identical to midrashic exegesis known from rabbinic literature. By definition, midrashic elements add a dimension to the plain meaning of Scripture. Such exegesis is particularly frequent in the Targumim, but it is also found in LXX, e.g., in Joshua, 1 Kings, and Proverbs (→ 3.3, → 6.3, → 12.3.1).

e) *Translation Styles*

On the basis of information gathered on exponents of exegesis such as mentioned above, and of translation technique such as mentioned below (→ 1.3.1.10), one may form a general opinion on the translation character of the individual units in LXX, usually books, but sometimes segments of books (Samuel–Kings). This analysis is interesting in its own right, but it is also used when elements in the *Vorlage* of LXX are reconstructed (→ 1.3.1.11).

In the analysis of differences between LXX and the other sources, much attention is paid to its translation character, that is, whether the LXX unit should be considered (very) literal, (very) free or somewhere in between. We therefore ought to clarify the categories “literal” (“wooden,” “stereotyped,” “faithful,” “careful”) and “free” (“contextual”). These two adjectives are admittedly very

general and are therefore often considered inadequate. However, other characterizations of translation techniques do not cover the full range of the translators' attitudes to their task.¹⁵ The characterizations "free"/"literal" refer to renderings of individual words, syntagmata, and clauses, and on the basis of such characterizations, a complete unit (book) may be dubbed a "literal" or "free" translation. The translator of such a unit is then described as someone who tried to be "faithful" to the underlying Hebrew text or who let his imagination run freely while transferring the details of the source text into the target language. Between these two opposite approaches, many gradations and variations may be discerned, from extremely paraphrastic (to the extent that the wording of the parent text is hardly recognizable) to slavishly faithful. The translation units in LXX analyzed below use such characterizations in their descriptions.

When analyzing these approaches from the point of view of the translators' attitudes toward the Hebrew text, we are grasping in the dark because no external information is available.

Tov¹⁶ analyzed possible explanations for these different approaches. In that study, I discarded the possibilities that the translators followed a specific translation model, were influenced by the different content of the biblical books, chronological considerations (that is, a free approach followed by a literal one or *vice versa*), different Egyptian backgrounds, and different views about the

sacred character of the books translated. Instead, I suggested that these differences reflect the personal approaches of the translators. After all, each of the original Greek translations was the product of an individual who created a personal translation, as opposed to an official one. Although the translators of the five books of the Torah were influenced by their milieu, they produced personal translations that were later accepted as official documents. The two basic approaches toward the nature of the translation, the free and the literal, probably existed from the very beginning of the translation enterprise even if the translators did not have specific models in mind.

1.3.1.1.10 Translation Technique

The transposition of the internal system of the Hebrew language to the translation is especially intriguing in the case of the non-Semitic language of LXX. Each language has its own internal logic, which complicates the translation activity when categories of the source language do not exist in the target language. In such cases, the translators exhibited their inventiveness within the framework of what is usually named translation technique. Thus, the translators had to locate ways of representing the intricacies of the Hebrew verbal system, the Hebrew construct formation, conjunctions, and particles as well as constructions unique to Hebrew, such as *בו ... אשר* (literally: "which/that ... upon which"). In these instances, the translators sometimes deviated from the exact

15 See especially J. Barr, *The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations* (MSU 15; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979) and Tov, **TCU*, 17–29. See also Bickerman, "Septuagint"; C. Rabin, "The Translation Process and the Character of the Septuagint," *Text* 6 (1968): 1–26; Brock, "The Phenomenon of the Septuagint"; S.P. Brock, "Aspects of Translation Technique in Antiquity," *Greek Roman and Byzantine Studies* 20 (1979): 67–87; H.M. Orlinsky, "The Septuagint as Holy Writ and the Philosophy of the Translators," *HUCA* 46 (1975): 89–114; E. Tov

and B.G. Wright, "Computer-Assisted Study for Assessing the Literalness of Translations Units in the Septuagint," in Tov, **Greek-Hebrew Bible*, 219–37; Olofsson, *The LXX Version*; S. Olofsson (ed.), *Translation Technique and Theological Exegesis: Collected Essays on the Septuagint Version* (ConBOT 57; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2009); E. Tov, "The Nature and Study of the Translation Technique of the LXX in the Past and Present," in Tov, **Greek-Hebrew Bible*, 239–46; Aejmelaeus, **Trail*.

16 **HB, GB, and Qumran*, 330–38.

wording of their source in accordance with the needs of the target language, while in other cases they slavishly reproduced the Hebrew, thus creating unnatural elements (“Hebraisms”) in the target language.

Translation techniques have been studied especially in detailed studies by the Finnish school, starting with Soisalon-Soininen, and continuing with Aejmelaeus, Sollamo, Voiti-la, and others (see the bibliographies in → 1.3.1.1.8).

1.3.1.1.11 Reconstruction of the Parent Text(s)

Almost all translations reflect a certain amount of content exegesis and inner-translational corruption, which is taken into consideration when the differences between MT and the Hebrew source of the ancient translation are being analyzed. If the deviation of a translation from MT did not result from such exegesis or inner-translational corruption, often the translation is based on a different (“variant”) Hebrew reading.

Complete practical rules for the reconstruction of such readings cannot be formulated, but important aspects have been analyzed in methodological discussions by Margolis, Ziegler, Goshen-Gottstein, Barr, Tov, *TCU, and Aejmelaeus, mainly in relation to LXX.¹⁷ Reconstruction is based on the assumption that elements of the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the translation can be determined with greater ease the more consistently the translator used fixed equivalents for individual words and grammatical categories. If a certain translation unit is rendered freely, it is much more difficult and often impossible to reconstruct the elements of its Hebrew source.

Details in the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the translations can be reconstructed primarily

on the basis of intuition in conjunction with the use of research tools, especially bilingual concordances to the translations that record all the equivalents of the translation and MT.

When a rendering in one of the ancient translations is problematic when compared with its equivalent in MT, various factors are taken into consideration:

- *Translation equivalents*: an examination of equivalents elsewhere in the translation, after a prior analysis of possible exegetical elements in that version.
- *Intuition*: reliance on intuition when a reconstruction is suggested.
- *Textual probability*: the choice of retroverted readings that appear reasonable with regard to what is known about the textual transmission of MT, involving, e.g., known interchanges of letters, such as *resh/dalet* and *waw/yod*.
- *Linguistic plausibility*: the degree of conformity of the reconstructed reading to the grammar, vocabulary, and style of biblical Hebrew, especially in the book in which the reconstructed reading is found.
- *Possible support from other Hebrew texts*: As a rule, the criteria for the reconstruction of Hebrew readings are considered subjective. However, some types of retroversions are relatively objective.
- If the reading reconstructed from an ancient version was developed by way of corruption from the reading of MT or vice versa—especially in the case of interchanges of letters—and if the Hebrew words are remote from one another with regard to content, the reconstruction is plausible.
- The degree of certainty in the reconstruction of proper nouns is greater than in the reconstruction of common nouns, since

Isaias (ATA 12.3; Münster: Aschendorff, 1934); Barr, **Literalism*; Tov, *TCU; A. Aejmelaeus, “What Can We Know about the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Septuagint,” *ZAW* 99 (1987): 58–89 (repr. in Aejmelaeus, **Trail*, 77–115).

17 M.L. Margolis, “Complete Induction for the Identification of the Vocabulary in the Greek Versions of the Old Testament with Its Semitic Equivalents: Its Necessity and the Means of Obtaining It,” *JAOs* 30 (1910): 301–12; J. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches*

no exegetical factors are involved in the transliteration of proper nouns; e.g., the *Rodanim/Dodanim* interchange in Gen 10:4.

- Some reconstructions are *supported* by other (usually: extra-Masoretic) Hebrew evidence. The discovery of the Qumran scrolls provided much support for the procedure of retroverting. Before these discoveries, many readings had been retroverted from the versions, but only when such readings turned up in Qumran Hebrew manuscripts could there be greater certainty regarding the correctness of the procedure, although doubts remain in matters of detail.

In the reconstruction of translational deviations into Hebrew, there remains constant uncertainty whether they derived from a different Hebrew reading or from some other factor, such as content exegesis. Moreover, even if the assumption of a different Hebrew reading seems well founded, it is possible that the reading itself actually never existed, since the translator may have misread the source or may have interpreted it etymologically.¹⁸

The reconstruction of readings in the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the ancient translations pertains to all the elements of the text found before the translator, that is, additions, omissions, differences in letters or words, and differences in sequence. However, it also includes elements that are not expressed in the manuscripts, but which form an integral part of the exegetical tradition accompanying the biblical text, that is, the reading of the words (vocalization in MT) and the syntactical relationship between words (expressed as the combination or separation of words, sometimes resulting in a different verse division).

The reconstruction process is necessarily limited to words that can be reconstructed

with some degree of probability. Besides these, there are more than a few differences between MT and the translations in which one cannot easily decide whether they reflect a different Hebrew *Vorlage* or translational changes. In many cases, the analysis of the translation technique and the translator's exegesis provides insufficient information in order to determine whether deviations in certain grammatical categories derived from the translator or from his Hebrew *Vorlage*. Thus, one often gropes in the dark when encountering differences in number (singular/plural), the tenses of the verb, pronominal suffixes, prepositions, the article, etc.¹⁹

Since there is disagreement among scholars concerning the reconstruction of the elements of the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the ancient translations, many of the deviations from MT in the translations that have been reconstructed by some scholars as variant Hebrew readings have been described by others as inner-translational differences. Moreover, in certain cases where a deviation is recognized as reflecting a variant reading, the possible reconstructions appear to be endless. Many such disagreements are recorded in the critical editions of Hebrew Scripture.

Beyond these disagreements, the final result of the analysis of the translation technique of the several translations and the reconstruction procedure is the recognition of a variant or series of variants. These variants are analyzed as part of the text-critical and exegetical study of the Scripture books.

1.3.1.1.12 *Text-Critical Value*

The study of the exegesis and translation technique of LXX described in paragraphs → 1.3.1.1.9–10 was developed in the twentieth century with the aim of better assessing the text-critical value of that version. This research is incomplete but, in the meantime, scholars allow themselves judgments

18 Cf. Tov, *TCU, 162–80.

19 See Tov, *TCU, 154–62.

on individual readings and translation units based on studies of these units, supplemented by external support from SP and the Qumran scrolls.

Reconstructions of elements of LXX are recorded in monographs, commentaries, critical editions of Hebrew Scripture, Polak and Marquis,²⁰ as well as *CATSS.

Among the ancient translations, LXX holds pride of place for textual critics since it reflects a greater number of variants than all the other translations put together. If reconstructed reliably, these LXX variants are as important for text-critical analysis as the readings found in Hebrew sources. Some scholars even claim that they are more important than these sources since LXX readings are often superior to elements in MT. However, LXX also reflects many secondary readings (especially harmonizing variants in the Torah, see below).

Valuable variants reconstructed from LXX are recognized in all the Scripture books, and in a great concentration in 1–2 Samuel because its MT version is often faulty (→ 5.1, → 5.4).

*Survey of Books and Chapters in LXX Differing Significantly from MT+*²¹

Torah: Only rarely does the reconstructed *Vorlage* of a LXX book reflect *textual* features that characterize a book as a whole. However, the *Vorlage* of LXX-Torah is characterized by a large number of harmonizing pluses. These pluses are similar to those of the SP group (→ 1.2.3), but are less well known since it is often said that this feature is typical of the SP group only. However, LXX reflects more harmonizations than SP, often two or three times as many (→ 2.1). In Genesis and Deuteronomy, textual harmonization characterizes LXX more than any other feature, while a smaller amount of harmonization is also visible in SP and MT+. Many

harmonizations are shared by LXX and SP, and although they cover merely a portion of each text, the two reflect a common background (→ 2.1.5). Harmonizing changes (usually additions) were inserted by scribes at a late stage in the development of the Torah text while, in other cases, LXX contains early elements. The text of LXX-Torah thus reflects opposing tendencies.

Genesis: Some editorial differences. SP (→ 2.2.4.1) and LXX (→ 2.4.1.1) differ systematically from MT+ in their presentation of the chronological data in the genealogies in Genesis 5 and 11. SP and LXX reflect similar tendencies, but are not interdependent. Likewise, the text of MT+ in Gen 31:46–52 appears in a different sequence in LXX, which may well be earlier (→ 2.4.1.1).

Exodus: Editorial differences. LXX and MT+ differ considerably in chapters 35–40 with regard to the internal order and content (→ 2.4.1.2).

Numbers: Some editorial differences. The pluses, minuses, and sequence differences in LXX compared with MT indicate an active textual/editorial involvement in small details (→ 2.4.1.4.6).

Joshua: Transpositions, pluses, minuses, and theological differences. These features reflect an editorial stage in the development of the book differing from that in MT+ and are sometimes earlier than it (→ 3.3.6).

1–2 Samuel: Textual and editorial differences between MT+, LXX, and 4QSam^a, among them editorial stages in LXX and 4QSam^a that differ from MT+ and that are sometimes earlier than it. This pertains to the Song of Hannah and 1 Samuel 16–18, where LXX is significantly shorter than MT+ (→ 5.4). Initially, the *Vorlage* of LXX reflected a text close to 4QSam^a (→ 5.3.2.1; → 5.3.3); subsequently, both texts were developed in different directions (→ 2.1.5; → 5.1).

20 F.H. Polak and G. Marquis, *A Classified Index of the Minuses of the Septuagint*, Part I: Introduction; Part II: *The Pentateuch* (CATSS Basic Tools 4 and 5; Stellenbosch: Print24.com, 2002).

21 Details in this table, though cross-referenced to analyses elsewhere in the *THB*, may differ in outlook from those discussions.

1–2 Kings: Editorial differences. The differences between MT+ and LXX-1Kings (3 Kingdoms) are among the most numerous in LXX. Its editorial pluses, minuses, transpositions, and different chronology are usually later than MT+. Systematic differences between MT+ and LXX in 1–2Kings concern their chronology (→ 5.2).

Isaiah: While LXX (→ 6.3) often deviates greatly from MT+ because of its extensive exegesis, its underlying Hebrew text did not differ much from MT+ or 1QIsa^a.²²

Jeremiah: Editorial differences. Sequence differences and a much shorter text in LXX reflect an editorial stage in the development of the book often earlier than MT+. These editorial differences are among the most prominent in LXX (→ 7.2.2; → 7.3.3; → 7.3.6).

Ezekiel: Editorial differences. A slightly shorter version than MT+, including a thin layer of editorial differences. LXX-Ezek is 4–5 percent shorter than MT+ and in Ezek 7:3–9 the two texts reflect different editions. According to Lust and several other exegetes, the Old Greek was even shorter and reflected another edition in Ezekiel 36–40 (→ 8.3.4).

Minor Prophets: The reconstructed *Vorlage* of Hosea remains a topic of much contention (→ 9.3.7).

Psalms: A few editorial differences. LXX-Ps differs from MT+ in a few editorial details, namely the inclusion of Psalm 151 and the combining or separating of some psalms of MT+ (→ 10.3.1.5).²³

Job: Large-scale differences between LXX (→ 11.3.1) and MT+ in this book were most likely created by the free translator,²⁴ and do not pertain to its literary development (→ 1.3.1.1.12).

Proverbs: Editorial differences. Beyond the freedom of translation in LXX-Prov, one discerns editorial features visible in its major differences in order (especially in Proverbs 24–31) and its lacking and added verses (→ 12.3.1 and → 12.3.1.3).

Esther and Esther^{A-Text}: *Editorial differences.* Both translations represent rewritten compositions including large narrative expansions reworking a text like MT+. According to some scholars, the *Vorlage* of LXX-Esth preceded MT (→ 17.1.1).

Daniel: Editorial differences. LXX-Dan translated a book that reworked a text like MT+, especially in Daniel 4–6, with the inclusion of at least some segments that are now considered “apocryphal,” while occasionally reflecting an earlier text. However, according to some scholars, the *Vorlage* of LXX-Dan preceded MT in most cases (→ 18.1).

22 The minor agreements between LXX and 1QIsa^a do not substantially alter this picture. See J. Ziegler, “Die Vorlage der Isaias-Septuaginta (LXX) und die erste Isaias-Rolle von Qumran (1QIsa),” *JBL* 78 (1959): 34–59. See, further, **DJD* XXXII, 92–95.

23 MT-Ps 9, 10 = LXX-Ps 9; MT-Ps 114, 115 = LXX-Ps 113; MT-Ps 116 = LXX-Ps 114 + 115; MT-Ps 147 = LXX-Ps 146 + 147. The additional psalm headings in LXX are usually not based on a Hebrew source, e.g. Psalms 33 (LXX: 32); 43 (LXX: 42); 71 (LXX: 70). Other psalms remained without headings in LXX (e.g. Psalms 1; 2; 10). See S. Gillmayr-Bucher, “The Psalm Headings: A Canonical Relecture of the Psalms” in *The Biblical Canons* (eds. J.M. Auwers and H.J. de Jonge; *BETL* 163; Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 249–54; A. Pietersma, “David in

the Greek Psalms,” *VT* 30 (1980): 213–26 (214). On the other hand, A. van der Kooij, “On the Place of Origin of the Old Greek of Psalms,” *VT* 33 (1983): 67–74, considers these headings original, reflecting a Palestinian tradition.

24 This translation is one-sixth shorter than its counterpart in MT+. The free character of LXX was analyzed in detail by J. Ziegler, “Der **text**-kritische Wert der Septuaginta des Buches Job,” in *Sylogoe: Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Septuaginta* (MSU 10; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971), 9–28. For a judicious contextual analysis of the translator’s major changes, see C.E. Cox, “Elihu’s Second Speech according to the Septuagint,” in *Studies in the Book of Job* (ed. W.E. Aufrecht; *SR* 16; Waterloo: Wilfred Laurier University Press, 1985), 36–53.

Summarizing Table: Textual and Literary Character of LXX Books²⁵

Book in LXX	1. Comp. elements earlier than MT+	2. Textual elements earlier than MT+	3. Comp. elements later than MT+	4. Text elements later than MT+
Genesis	<u>Genesis 31</u>		<u>chronology</u>	harm
Exodus	<u>Exodus 35–40</u>			harm
Leviticus				harm
Numbers				harm
Deuteronomy				harm
Joshua	ed. elements			
Judges				
1–2 Samuel	ed. elements	mistakes, changed theophoric names in MT+		
1 Kings			rewr. comp.	
2 Kings			<u>chronology</u>	
Isaiah				
Jeremiah	ed. elements			
Ezekiel	ed. elements			
MP				
Psalms	<u>few ed. elements</u>			
Proverbs	<u>ed. elements</u>			
Ruth				
Song				
Lamentations				
Qoheleth				
Esther			rewr. comp.	
Esther ^{A-Text}			rewr. comp.	
Daniel			rewr. comp.	
Ezra–Nehemiah	ed. elem. in 1 Esdras, LXX-Neh 11			
1–2 Chronicles	<u>few ed. elements</u>			

Ezra–Nehemiah: Some editorial differences. According to some scholars, the literary shape of several chapters in 1 Esdras and LXX-Neh 11 is earlier than the parallel chapters in Ezra–Nehemiah and Chronicles in MT (→ 19.1).

Chronicles: Some editorial differences. LXX-1–2 Chr (→ 20.3.1) differs significantly from MT+ in several details (→ 20.1).

The table summarizes this section while tentatively distinguishing between presumably early and late elements in LXX.

The nature of the evidence of LXX, and

subsequently its value for research, differs from book to book. We attach an extreme importance to LXX in some books that reflect groups of variants shedding light on the literary growth of the Hebrew Bible (→ 1.3.1.1.13), while we consider the characteristic readings of LXX in the Torah, visible in harmonizing changes, mainly pluses, to be secondary to MT (→ 2.1). However, the Greek Torah also contains many original readings and the books analyzed in → 1.3.1.1.13 likewise contain many secondary readings. Such is the nature of the textual transmission.

25 The following abbreviations are used: harm(onization), ed(itorial), rewr(itten) comp(osition),

tion), elem(ents), text(ual). Underlining: relation unclear.

1.3.1.1.13 *Relevance for Literary Analysis*

The relevance of LXX for literary analysis is one of its prominent features as summarized in → 1.3.1.1.12. These data give rise to some general thoughts on the relation between textual and literary analysis, especially in the case of LXX, where readings of this type are more frequently found than in the other sources. Textual criticism is involved with the study of textual witnesses and their transmission. However, an examination of these texts also leads to other disciplines, which principally include exegesis and literary criticism. At the outset, it would appear that literary criticism is far removed from the topics usually treated by textual critics, but researchers pay an increasing amount of attention to this discipline because the textual witnesses preserve many relevant data.

Modern researchers pay attention to a new category of evidence when claiming that not all differences between textual witnesses could have derived from the later copyists–scribes, but that some must have derived from the earlier authors/editors–scribes. The later copyists–scribes created small variants, while the earlier authors/editors–scribes created the sizable differences described in section → 1.3.1.1.12. above. The distinction between these two types of evidence is based on the assumption that copyists were not involved in large-scale content changes. This subjective reasoning leads to another hypothesis, namely that the details described in that section were created at the final literary growth stage of the biblical books. In the past, these changes have often been described as scribal changes, glosses, and interpolations, but they are now pushed back one stage in the presumed history of the biblical books and manuscripts. They

are described here as literary (editorial) variants, with the understanding that they attest to the existence of different stages in the literary development of the books. In some cases, these stages may be named editions, while in other cases the editorial intervention is more limited.

While the Hebrew copies used for LXX do not share any textual features except for the mentioned harmonizations in the Torah, they share a frequent divergence from MT+, greater than the Qumran scrolls. MT and LXX thus preserve the greatest amount of information on the development stages of Hebrew Scripture.²⁶

When turning to the background of this situation, the assumption is unavoidable that the Hebrew scrolls used for the Greek translation were valuable, authoritative, and sometimes more ancient than MT. Otherwise they would not have contained so much material that scholars consider relevant to the literary development of the biblical books.

The special character of the *Vorlage* of LXX seems to be related either to one of two factors or to a combination thereof: 1) the idiosyncratic Hebrew scrolls used for the Greek translation were *not* embraced by the circles that fostered MT; and 2) the relatively early date of the translation enterprise (from the beginning of the third century B.C.E. until 150 B.C.E.), involving still earlier Hebrew scrolls, explains the existence of vestiges of earlier editorial stages of the biblical books in LXX (col. 1 of the table in → 1.3.1.1.12).²⁷ Only a combination of the two factors explains that ancient texts, such as probably used for the Greek translation, still circulated in the third and second centuries B.C.E., when some of the proto-Masoretic texts already existed, such as 4QJer^a, which

26 See the table in → 1.3.1.1.12 and Tov, “Large-Scale Differences.”

27 There is no evidence for one of several alternative assumptions that LXX was based on Hebrew texts of a local Egyptian vintage. If the Jewish

population of Egypt hardly knew Hebrew, they would not have developed their own Hebrew version of the biblical text (*pace* the assumption of local texts as developed by Albright and Cross, → 1.1.1.2.4; → 1.2.1.3.4).

is dated around 200 B.C.E. (→ 7.2.1). In the reality of the third and second centuries B.C.E., it was probably not unusual that scrolls other than the Masoretic tradition were chosen as the base for the translation. This approach does not explain the cases in which LXX presumably reflects editorial stages subsequent to MT+ (col. 3 of the table in → 1.3.1.1.12). In these cases, we have to appeal to the independence of LXX from the circles that embraced MT (factor 1).

When ascribing the idiosyncratic character of the Hebrew scrolls underlying LXX to their early date (factor 2), we find some support for this approach in the Qumran documents. A few early Qumran texts, similarly deriving from the third and second centuries B.C.E., reflect redactional differences from MT+.²⁸ Thus, according to a tentative working hypothesis, the early date of the Hebrew scrolls used for LXX translations in some books *and* of some of the Qumran scrolls may explain their attesting to early literary traditions.

A Septuagintal Text Type?

The description of the character of LXX in the various Scripture books in → 1.3.1.1.12 shows that they share only a limited number of features; therefore, it would not be appropriate to speak of a Septuagintal text type, Septuagintal features, or the like. However, Septuagintal features are often mentioned in the literature, not on the basis of the evidence of LXX, but following general perceptions about the transmission of the biblical text.

The translations included in LXX reflect different backgrounds. The Hebrew

Scripture books were translated into Greek at different times and in different places (Alexandria, Palestine, and possibly elsewhere, → 1.3.1.1.5). Further, no common textual features of the *Vorlagen* of the Greek books are recognized except for harmonizations in the *Vorlage* of the Greek Torah (→ 1.3.1.1.12).

1.3.1.1.14 Relation with Other Sources

When the Hebrew Bible was translated into Greek it was a *creatio ex nihilo* in which no other sources were involved, but in today's research its text is often compared with other sources, in Hebrew and in translation, that agree occasionally, and in some cases more frequently, with LXX. In the former case, the agreements may aid us in retroverting the Hebrew parent text of LXX (→ 1.3.1.1.11), and in the latter, other translations may be influenced by LXX or may share exegetical traditions.

LXX and SP. From the earliest days of the critical study of SP (→ 1.2.1; → III.1.1.3), it was known that this text often agrees with LXX against MT (→ 1.2.3; → 2.1.5), and this situation was exploited much in theological discussions of the comparative value of all three versions. Traditionally, the Catholics upheld the value of LXX against MT, and in this struggle they found much support in LXX's agreement with SP. Besides, that version was written in the ancient Hebrew script that was considered more trustworthy than MT. This was the situation in the seventeenth century,²⁹ not long after SP became known in the West. The main facts regarding this tension have been provided

²⁸ Two Qumran scrolls contain the same early redactional stage as LXX, namely 4QJer^b and 4QJer^d (both: 200–150 B.C.E.), while 4QJosh^a is relatively early (150–50 B.C.E.; → 3.2.1). However, another scroll that possibly reflects an early literary stage derives from a later period: 4QSam^a (50–25 B.C.E.; → 5.3.1). The evidence for Qumran is thus not clear-cut, but neither is it unequivocal for LXX, for only some of the LXX books

reflect editorial differences.

²⁹ See especially J.C.H. Lebram, "Ein Streit um die hebräische Bibel und die Septuaginta" in *Leiden University in the Seventeenth Century: An Exchange of Learning* (eds. T.H. Luningh Scheurleer and G.H.M. Posthumus Meyjes; Leiden: Brill, 1975), 21–63; L. Diestel, *Geschichte des Alten Testaments in der christlichen Kirche* (Jena: Mauke, 1869), 343–440.

by Anderson and Giles.³⁰ Much earlier, the main facts had been discussed by Wilhelm Gesenius, himself a major participant in the scholarly discussion of SP.³¹

The discussion was started by Morin (Morinus), a Catholic, who opined that the combined evidence of LXX and SP weighed more heavily than that of MT alone.³² He also based himself much on the ancient origin of the Samaritan script compared with the square (Aramaic) script of MT. A few years later he published another philological work that discredited MT.³³

Several Protestant scholars polemicized against Morinus,³⁴ but the first to write a systematic treatise against him was de Muis (Musius).³⁵ This discussion of the extra-Masoretic agreements between SP and LXX suffered not only from its being part of the theological discussions between Catholics and Protestants, but also from scholarly prejudices. At that time and actually until recent times, scholars were used to expressing themselves in terms of a three-fold division of the textual witnesses, and within that framework it was only natural that scholars could only think of SP as linked to either MT or LXX. They were quite inventive in describing the relation between the three, but since the textual horizon never included more texts than three, not too many options were open. Scholars simply

counted the number of differences between the sources, and these numbers were impressive. From the seventeenth century onwards, it was declared that 1,900 or 1,600 of the assumed 6,000 differences between SP and MT involved readings common to SP and LXX. Reacting to these numbers, an endless number of theories appeared concerning the special relation between SP and LXX. A logical assumption was that LXX was translated from SP. This view was expressed by L. de Dieu, J. Selden(us), J.H. Hottinger(us), J. Hassencamp(ius),³⁶ and Kohn.³⁷ Another view was that SP was revised according to LXX, or, conversely, that LXX was revised according to SP.³⁸

These and other theories show the limitations of an approach that was bound by the assumption of a tripartite or bipartite division of the textual witnesses of the Bible. The truth of the matter is that possibly in the presumed pedigree of the biblical text of the Pentateuch, these two texts were closer to each other than to MT. We need not speak about other books, since there was no Samaritan version of these books.³⁹

The number of harmonizations in LXX is very large, more than in SP. In this triad, MT has few harmonizations, LXX has many, and SP has fewer, but still many. Previous research on the harmonizations in LXX focused on great parts of the Torah.⁴⁰

30 R.T. Anderson and T. Giles, *The Samaritan Pentateuch: An Introduction to Its Origin, History, and Significance for Biblical Studies* (SBLRBS 72; Atlanta: SBL, 2012), 150–68.

31 Gesenius, **Pent. Sam.*, 10–14.

32 J. Morinus, *Exercitationes Ecclesiasticae utrumque Samaritanorum Pentateuchum* (Paris: Antonius Vitray, 1631).

33 Morinus, **Exerc.*

34 The views of William Eyres, James Usscher, John Selden, and later Johannes Buxtorf and Arnold Boates were summarized by Anderson and Giles, *The Samaritan Pentateuch*, 160–62.

35 S. de Muis, *Assertio veritatis hebraicae adversus exercitationes ecclesiasticas in utrumque Samaritanorum pentateuchum Johannis Morini* (Paris: Libert, 1631).

36 For a detailed description of the view of L. de Dieu, J. Selden(us), J.H. Hottinger(us), J. Hassencamp(ius) and bibliographical references, see Gesenius, **Pent. Sam.*, 11.

37 S. Kohn, *De Pentateucho Samaritano ejusque cum versionibus antiquis nexu* (Leipzig: Kreyssing, 1865).

38 See Gesenius, **Pent. Sam.*, 13.

39 I do not know whether the number of disagreements between SP and LXX is significant; more important is the nature of their agreements. Against the traditional number of 1,900 agreements between the two (→ 1.3.1.1.14), Kim, *Multiple Authorship* counts merely 964 (of which 493 are meaningful and of these 493, 328 are common harmonizations).

Most of these harmonizations appear in the narrative sections, while some pertain to the phraseology of the laws. In a very few cases, the content of a law is harmonized with a parallel one, as in LXX-Deut 16:7 adapted to Exod 12:8.

Conclusions

- 1) MT stands apart from the combined witness of SP, the pre-Samaritan texts, and LXX.
- 2) SP and the pre-Samaritan texts form a firm sub-group probably going back to a single hyparchetype, changed in each individual source.
- 3) LXX is clearly related to the SP group, but not by way of revision of SP to LXX, as was once thought.⁴¹ Rather, in the phenomenon of the harmonizations they reflect the same secondary/inferior text,

while it is hard to determine whether LXX or the SP group reflects a better version of the earlier text. In my view, LXX in the Torah does not reflect the same quality text as in most other books of LXX, but this issue needs to be studied further.

LXX and the other translations. The relation of each translation to LXX should be analyzed on its own merits. In some books, the wording of the Peshitta (→ 1.3.4) is close to LXX in exclusively common elements, but the background of these agreements is not clear. In Isaiah, the two translations may reflect common exegetical traditions,⁴² while the Peshitta in Psalms and Proverbs may have been based on LXX.⁴³ Some scholars believe that the Peshitta often relied on LXX as a source of lexical information and exegesis.⁴⁴

40 For the data, see Hendel, *Genesis 1–11 (Genesis 1–11)*; E. Tov, “The Harmonizing Character of the Septuagint of Genesis 1–11,” in Kraus-Kreuzer, *Septuaginta 2014*, 315–32; E. Tov, “Textual Harmonizations in the Stories of the Patriarchs,” in *Rewriting and Interpreting the Hebrew Bible: The Biblical Patriarchs in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. D. Dimant and R.G. Kratz; BZAW 439; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2013), 19–50 (Genesis 12–50); E. Tov, “Textual Harmonizations in the Ancient Texts of Deuteronomy,” in Tov, *HB, GB, and Qumran*, 271–82; H. Kim, *Multiple Authorship*, 311 (the complete Torah). See further M. Rösel, “Die Septuaginta und der Kult: Interpretationen und Aktualisierungen im Buche Numeri,” in *La double transmission du texte biblique: Hommage à A. Schenker* (eds. Y. Goldman and C. Uehlinger; OBO 179; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001), 25–40 (29–39), and G. Dorival, *La Bible d’Alexandrie*, Vol. 4: *Les Nombres* (Paris: Cerf, 1994), 42–43; G. Dorival, “Les phénomènes d’intertextualité dans le livre grec des Nombres,” in *Katà τοὺς Ο’: Selon les Septante: Trente études sur la Bible grecque des Septante en hommage à Marguerite Harl* (eds. G. Dorival and O. Munnich; Paris: Cerf, 1995), 261–85. Both Rösel and Dorival discuss several examples of harmonization in LXX-Num, without statistics, and with the clear implication that this was an inner-Septuagintal

phenomenon.

41 See Gesenius, *Pent. Sam.* 13.

42 Cf. especially L. Delekat, “Die Peschitta zu Jesaja zwischen Targum und Septuaginta,” *Bib* 38 (1957): 185–99, 321–35; L. Delekat, “Ein Septuagintatargum,” *VT* 8 (1958): 225–52; J.A. Lund, “The Influence of the Septuagint on the Peshitta: A Re-evaluation of Criteria in Light of Comparative Study of the Versions in Genesis and Psalms” (PhD diss., Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1988).

43 See especially A.J. Baumgartner, *Etude critique sur l’état du texte du livre des Proverbes d’après les principales traductions anciennes* (Leipzig: Drugulin, 1890); I. Carbajosa, *The Character of the Syriac Version of Psalms: A Study of Psalms 90–150 in the Peshitta* (Monographs of the Peshitta Institute Leiden 17; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 3–19, 187–272 for an updated survey of the views expressed and a detailed description of his own views. Similar dependence of the Peshitta on Th-Dan was noticed by R.A. Taylor, *The Peshitta of Daniel* (Monographs of the Peshitta Institute Leiden 7; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 311–13.

44 For example, P.F. Frankl, “Studien über die Septuaginta und Peschito zu Jeremia,” *MGWJ* 21 (1872): 444–56, 497–509, 545–57; G. Greenberg, *Translation Technique in the Peshitta to Jeremiah* (Monographs of the Peshitta Institute Leiden

Jerome's commentaries, as well as his translation, the Vulgate (→ 1.3.5), show that this church father did not base himself exclusively on MT, but often was guided by LXX, Symmachus, Aquila, and *kaige*-Th (in this order).⁴⁵ Therefore, when the Vulgate differs from MT, the translation does not necessarily provide independent text-critical evidence (at such a late period, variation from MT would not be expected anyway). However, when the Vulgate deviates from these sources and from MT, we may suspect variant readings, but such instances are extremely rare.⁴⁶

*LXX and the Qumran scrolls.*⁴⁷ The discovery in the Qumran Hebrew scrolls of single readings and fragments that are close to LXX was an unexpected phenomenon that is of major importance for several aspects of the text-critical analysis of the Hebrew and Greek Bibles. The idea that we would ever get close to the Hebrew texts from which the Greek translation was rendered had never entered anyone's mind. Had scholars been asked where to look for such scrolls, they would have been divided between ancient

Israel and Egypt.

An immediate benefit from the find of ancient Hebrew readings identical to the content of LXX was felt in the area of reconstructing the Hebrew source of that translation. The masters in the area of reconstruction, from Cappellus, **Critica Sacra* (1650) and Houbigant (1777),⁴⁸ on to Wellhausen, **Samuel* (1871) and more recent scholars, operated with such tools as grammars, lexica, and concordances, but actually their intuition remained their major source of inspiration. Guided by this intuition, the above-mentioned scholars, as well as many others, suggested many a retroversion for readings in LXX that deviated from MT.

However, it was not until the discovery of the Qumran scrolls that it was recognized that the system of retroverting had been correct all along. For example, readings that had been retroverted from LXX-Sam without real support were now found in 4QSam^{a,b} (→ 5.3.1.2; → 5.3.1.3; → 5.3.3) thus vindicating the procedure.

At the same time, a number of scrolls were found that agree closely with LXX.

13; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 22, 143–68. R.J. Clifford, "Observations on the Text and Versions of Proverbs," in *Wisdom, You Are My Sister: Studies in Honor of Roland E. Murphy, O. Carm., on the Occasion of His Eightieth Birthday* (ed. M.L. Barré; CBQMS 29; Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1997): "Apart from OG, each version translated MT with the help of another version. S used LXX and T used s" (61). He further notes that Jerome used LXX, Symmachus, the Old Latin, and the Peshitta.

45 Thus F. Stummer, *Einführung in die lateinische Bibel* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1928), 123; J.H. Marks, *Der textkritische Wert des Psalterium Hieronymi Juxta Hebraeos* (Winterthur: P.G. Keller, 1956), 24–27 provides detailed proof of Jerome's reliance on the various Greek versions in Psalms. J.A. Montgomery, *The Book of Daniel* (ICC; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1927), 56: "It is fatuous to lay any stress upon \mathfrak{B} as evidence, where it agrees with one or other of the preceding vss"; W. McKane, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Jeremiah* (2 vols.;

ICC; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1986–1996), 1:xxxix–xxxiii. See further R.J. Clifford, "Observations on the Text and Versions of Proverbs," in *Wisdom, You Are My Sister: Studies in Honor of Roland E. Murphy, O. Carm., on the Occasion of His Eightieth Birthday* (ed. M.L. Barré; CBQMS 29; Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1997), 47–61.

46 See B. Kedar-Kopfstein, "The Vulgate as a Translation" (PhD diss., Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1968); B. Kedar-Kopfstein, "The Latin Translations," in Mulder, **Mikra*, 299–338. W. Nowack, *Die Bedeutung des Hieronymus für die alttestamentliche Textkritik* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1875), 25–50 gives a list of deviations of the Vulgate from MT.

47 E. Tov, "The Qumran Hebrew Texts and the Septuagint: An Overview," in Kreuzer–Meiser–Sigismund, **Septuaginta 2012*, 3–17.

48 A.F. Houbigant, *Notae criticae in universos Veteris Testamenti libros* (Frankfurt: Varrentrapp Filium and Wenner, 1777).

Although no identical or almost identical text to the presumed Hebrew source of LXX has been found at Qumran, a few texts are very close to that translation: 4QJer^{b,d} (→ 7.2.1.3; → 7.2.1.5; → 7.2.3) bear a strong resemblance to LXX in characteristic details. Similarly close to LXX, though not to the same degree, are 4QNum^b (→ 2.2.1.3.2), 4QDeut^q (→ 2.2.1.6.3), 4QSam^a (close to LXX and LXX^{Luc} [slightly], but also non-aligned), 4QSam^b, and 11QPs^a Psalm 151 (→ 10.2.1.2; → 10.2.3.2). For all these texts, see → 1.3.1.1.12.

There is insufficient evidence for speculating on a special relationship between the texts that are close to LXX. This issue can best be analyzed by contrasting these texts with the MT group and the SP group among the Qumran texts. Both groups are internally coherent, while texts that resemble LXX do not form a close-knit textual family. They represent individual scrolls that in the putative stemma of the biblical texts happened to be close to the Hebrew text from which LXX was translated. Since the *Vorlage* of each biblical book in LXX was a single biblical scroll and not a family or recension, the recognition of Hebrew scrolls that were close to the *Vorlage* of LXX does not contribute to our understanding of the development of the Hebrew text. The seven Hebrew Qumran texts that are close to LXX comprise 5.75 percent of the 121 Qumran biblical texts that are large enough to enable analysis of their textual features.

1.3.1.1.15 *History of Research*

The approach towards LXX is determined on the basis of scholarly criteria, although

in earlier times religious feelings were influential. LXX originally was a Jewish translation, but in the first centuries C.E. it was abandoned by the Jewish community (see the post-Talmudic tractate *Soferim* 1.7) and disregarded in the rabbinic literature. The translation that started off as a Jewish enterprise was subsequently accepted by the early Christians when they were still a group within Judaism. From that time onwards, when the Jews had already abandoned LXX, Christianity held on to LXX as Scripture until the time of the Vulgate when that version became determinative for the Western church some time after its creation. At a later point, in the seventeenth to the nineteenth centuries, the evaluation of LXX was tied up with theological discussions valuing either LXX (often, the Catholics) or MT (often, the Protestants). We are now in a position to evaluate this source better.

The differences between LXX and MT derive either from Hebrew variants in the translators' *Vorlage*, from the translators' exegesis and techniques, or from inner-translation developments. Cappellus (1650)⁴⁹ was the first scholar to indicate that details in the versions, especially LXX, sometimes reflected the "autograph" of a biblical book better than MT. In subsequent centuries, the value of LXX for biblical research⁵⁰ was viewed in different ways, with excessive stress placed either on the translators' exegesis, techniques, and theology or on the differences between their Hebrew text and MT.⁵¹

There certainly was (and still is) a tendency, even among critical scholars, to de-

49 Capellus, **Critica Sacra*, 384–85.

50 This issue should be separated from the theological discussion about the authority of either LXX or MT in the church, which preoccupied the church fathers as well as the researchers of the last five centuries. See n. 29. Our discussion refers merely to scholars who analyzed the Hebrew Bible philologically.

51 The evaluation of LXX in scholarship has been summarized by the following scholars:

E.F.C. Rosenmüller, *Handbuch für die Literatur der biblischen Kritik und Exegese*, Vol. 1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1797), *passim*; D.F. Keil, *Manual of Historico-Critical Introduction to the Canonical Scriptures of the Old Testament*, Vol. 2 (trans. from the 2nd ed. by G.C.M. Douglas; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1870; repr. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1952), 306–09; E. König, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (Bonn: Weber, 1893), 116; Cross, **ALQ*³, 130–31.

preciate the value of LXX by ascribing most of its deviations to the translators' exegesis and techniques. This was partly influenced by religious⁵² and other prejudices, which rejected the possibility that the underlying text of LXX sometimes differed from MT. More often such a possibility was simply not entertained. Thus in ancient times, Origen and Jerome, who analyzed many differences between LXX and the Hebrew text of their times, were not aware of the possibility that LXX reflected readings different from their Hebrew text.⁵³ The views of those who rejected LXX in modern times have been summarized by König (see n. 51).

On the other hand, there have been periods when a tendency towards extreme reliance upon LXX coincided with a negative judgment of the value of MT. In the seventeenth century this approach was represented, *inter alia*, by Cappellus (**Critica Sacra*) and Vossius.⁵⁴ For the nineteenth century, we refer to the oft-quoted instruction with which Hitzig was accustomed to open his lectures on the exegesis of the Bible:

"Gentlemen, do you have a copy of the Septuagint? If not, please sell all you have, and buy yourself a Septuagint!"⁵⁵ Hitzig's approach is also reflected in his commentaries on the books of the Bible.

Ever since the nineteenth century there have been scholars who, in their evaluation of LXX, took the middle road between recognizing Hebrew variants and the translators' exegesis. See especially the remarks of Wellhausen, **Samuel* (both in the introduction and in the commentary), and Driver, **Samuel*, which are still the soundest approaches to this issue.

The understanding of and use of LXX as a tool in biblical criticism were significantly advanced in the middle of the twentieth century by the finds of Hebrew scrolls at Qumran. It was then recognized that many of the Hebrew readings (variants) tentatively reconstructed from LXX did indeed exist as readings in Hebrew scrolls from Qumran.⁵⁶

The agreements between the Hebrew scrolls from Qumran and the Jewish-Greek

52 Cf., e.g., the *Formula consensus ecclesiae helveticae* (1676), which declared the absolute authority and inspiration even of the vowel points of MT and condemned the acceptance of readings from LXX. See A.F. Kilpatrick, "The Septuagint Version: Its Bearing on the Text and Interpretation of the Old Testament," *The Expositor* v.3 (1896): 263–87 (269). The *Formula* was printed only in the year 1714 as an appendix to the Second Helvetic Confession (J.H. Heidegger [ed.], *Confessio et expositio simplex orthodoxae fidei, et dogmatum catholicorum sinceræ religionis christianae etc: Cui accedit Formula consensus ecclesiarum Helvetiarum reformatarum circa doctrinam de gratia universali* [Zurich: Apud Davidem Gessnerum, 1714]).

53 Philo, *De Vita Mosis*, II, VII.38, inclined towards an even more extreme view when claiming that "the Greek words used corresponded literally with the Chaldean (that is, the Hebrew), exactly suited to the things they indicated" (translation according to F.H. Colson, *Philo: In Ten Volumes*, Vol. 6: *On Abraham (De Abrahamo)*, *On Joseph (De Iosepho)*, *Moses I. and II. (De vita Mosis)*

[*The Loeb Classical Library*; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1935]).

54 I. Vossius, *De LXX interpretibus et eroundem translatione* (The Hague: Hagae-Comitis, 1661). For a thorough discussion of the evaluation of LXX in this period, see the literature mentioned in n. 29.

55 See J.J. Kneucker (ed.), *Ferdinand Hitzig's Vorlesungen über biblische Theologie und messianische Weissagungen des Alten Testaments* (Karlruhe: Reuther, 1880), 19, n. 1 (quoted by Seeligmann, **Isaiah*, 60).

56 See especially G.R. Driver, "Hebrew Scrolls," *JTS* 2 (1951): 17–30; F.M. Cross, "A New Qumran Biblical Fragment Related to the Original Hebrew Underlying the Septuagint," *BASOR* 132 (1953): 15–26 (25); F.M. Cross, *ALQ*³, 130–31; E. Tov, "The Contribution of the Qumran Scrolls to the Understanding of the LXX," in Tov, **Greek-Hebrew Bible*, 285–300; Tov, **TCHB*, 108–09, 329; P. Hugo, *Les deux visages d'Élie: Texte massorétique et Septante dans l'histoire la plus ancienne du texte de 1 Rois 17–18* (OBO 217; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2005), 5–29.

translation of LXX from Palestine and Alexandria (→ 1.3.1.1.11) enhanced the credibility of LXX, although inevitably there continued to be a great deal of argument over matters of detail. LXX has definitely been recognized by most biblical scholars as a tool that provides important information for the textual criticism of the Bible. Additionally, it has also been recognized as containing data that contributes significantly to the literary criticism (→ 1.3.1.1.13) and exegesis of the Bible, as well as to the study of biblical Hebrew.⁵⁷

Emanuel Tov

- Barthélemy, *Devanciers.
- Barthélemy, *Studies.
- Brock, S.P., "The Phenomenon of the Septuagint: The Witness of Tradition," *OTS* 17 (1972): 11–36.
- Dorival–Harl–Munnich, *Septante.
- Driver, *Samuel.
- Fernández Marcos, N., *Septuaginta: La Biblia griega de judíos y cristianos* (Biblioteca de Estudios Bíblicos Minor 12; Salamanca: Sígueme, 2008).
- Hengel, M., *The Septuagint as Christian Scripture: Its Prehistory and the Problem of Its Canon* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2002).
- Jellicoe, *SMS.
- Karrer–Kraus, *Septuaginta 2008.
- Karrer–Kraus, *Septuaginta 2010.
- Kim, H., "Multiple Authorship of the Septuagint Pentateuch" (PhD diss., Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 2007; Summary: *Bulletin of Judaeo-Greek Studies* 40 [2007]: 2–3).
- Olofsson, S., *The LXX Version: A Guide to the Translation Technique of the Septuagint* (ConBOT 30; Lund: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1990).
- Seeligmann, I.L., "Problems and Perspectives in Modern Septuagint Research," *Text* 15 (1990): 169–232 (Engl. trans. of "Problemen en perspectieven in het moderne Septuaginta onderzoek" *JEOL* 7 [1939–1942]: 359–90e, 763–66 [Dutch]).
- Swete, *Introduction.
- Tov, *Greek-Hebrew Bible.
- Tov, *HB, GB, and Qumran.
- Tov, E., "The Nature of the Large-Scale Differences between the LXX and MT S T V: Compared with Similar Evidence in Other Sources," in *HB, GB, and Qumran, 1–55–57.
- Tov, E., "Reflections on the Septuagint with Special Attention Paid to the Post-Pentateuchal Translations," in Karrer–Kraus, *Septuaginta 2010, 3–22.
- Tov, E., "The Septuagint between Judaism and Christianity," in *Die Septuaginta und das frühe Christentum/The Septuagint and Christian Origins* (eds. T.S. Cauley and H. Lichtenberger; WUNT 277; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 3–25.
- Veltri, G., *Eine Tora für den König Talmi: Untersuchungen zum Übersetzungsverständnis in der jüdisch-hellenistischen und rabbinischen Literatur* (TSAJ 41; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994).
- Wellhausen, *Samuel.

57 See some of the studies mentioned in Brock, *Bibliography, §§ 15–16; Dogniez, *Bibliography, §§ 12–13; and, more systematically, T. Muraoka, "Hebrew Hapax Legomena and Septuagint Lexicography," in *VII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Stud-*

ies (ed. C.E. Cox; SBLSCS 31; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991), 205–22; T. Muraoka, "The Semantics of the LXX and Its Role in Clarifying Ancient Hebrew Semantics," in *Studies in Ancient Hebrew Semantics* (ed. T. Muraoka; AbrNSup 4; Leuven: Peeters, 1995), 19–32.