LXX ISAIAH 24:1–26:6
AS INTERPRETATION AND TRANSLATION

SBL

Society of Biblical Literature

Septuagint and Cognate Studies

Wolfgang Kraus, Editor

Robert J. V. Hiebert
Karen Jobes
Arie van der Kooij
Siegfried Kreuzer
Philippe Le Moigne

Number 62

LXX ISAIAH 24:1–26:6
AS INTERPRETATION AND TRANSLATION

A METHODOLOGICAL DISCUSSION

By

Wilson de Angelo Cunha

SBL Press
Atlanta

Copyright © 2014 by SBL Press

To Katie

Contents

Preface

The present monograph is a revised version of my PhD dissertation submitted to Universiteit Leiden in September 2011. The present work tackles the difficult issue of explaining divergences found in LXX Isaiah vis-à-vis the MT, arguing that differences found in the Greek must be weighed against the literary context in which they are found. Do they cohere with the so-called "literal translations" taken from the translator's or scribe's *Vorlage*? If so, what is the ideological message of LXX Isa 24:1–26:6 and how does it compare to modern interpretations of MT Isa 24:1–26:6? In general, this work attempts to demonstrate that LXX Isa 24:1–26:6 can be seen as a coherent ideological composition which differs greatly from the way scholars have interpreted MT Isa 24:1–26:6. This coherence comes across through the use of certain lexemes and conjunctions throughout the corpus under discussion. The main conclusion this work draws from the level of coherence found in LXX Isa 24:1–26:6 is that its scribe or translator already had an interpretation—on a higher level—before he started the process of translation. That is, the interpretation of his Hebrew *Vorlage* preceded and, to a large extent, shaped his translation into Greek.

Some will object to attempts at uncovering the translator's ideology: how can the translator's ideology be discovered when he is simply conveying what is in his *Vorlage*? However, while it is true that the translator was trying to relay what he found in his *Vorlage*, it is also true that he tried to communicate what was there *according to his interpretation of it*. In the case of Isa 24:1–26:6, the translator's interpretation differs significantly from modern scholars' interpretation of the same corpus. Indeed, it would be a grave mistake to expect the translator to interpret his *Vorlage* the same way we do today.

Briefly, two interrelated themes come to the fore in LXX Isa 24:1–26:6. The first focuses on "cities" (see Isa 24:10, 12; 25:2–4; 26:1, 5). The use of πόλις and πόλις ὀχυρά lends coherence to LXX Isa 24:1–26:6. It emphasizes the destruction of the city(ies) of the ungodly and salvation for the oppressed. The second theme centers on judgment and salvation. While there is judgment for the "ungodly" and their cities, there is salvation for the oppressed and their cities. In connection with the themes of "cities" and "judgment and

salvation" is an emphasis on a few different groups: the "ungodly," the "poor," the "remnant," a "righteous people," and the "we group" of Isa 25:5. More research on these groups in the historical and social context of the translation will need to be conducted at a future opportunity. For now, it suffices to say that the translator interpreted his *Vorlage* as announcing judgment on the "ungodly," and salvation or liberation for all the other groups, with salvation having different nuances depending on the group in question (see §8 in the present study).

The book starts with an introductory chapter that briefly sketches the main lines of development of research on LXX Isa 24:1–26:6 in order to clearly track shifts in perspective without being exhaustive. The introduction also discusses issues of methodology, contribution, and scope. The work is then divided into two main parts. Part 1 deals with Isa 24:1–23; 25:1–12; 26:1–6 respectively in three main chapters. The focus is on comparing MT with LXX in order to highlight differences in the Greek. Part 2 then analyzes Isa 24:1–23; 25:1–12; 26:1–6 respectively in three main chapters. The focus in these chapters is on analyzing the Greek in its own right in an attempt to ascertain whether the Greek text has a coherence of its own. A concluding chapter summarizes the main themes of LXX Isa 24:1–26:6, discusses the proper methodological approach to LXX Isaiah, and points to future lines of research.

Many thanks are due to numerous people who directly or indirectly contributed to the production of this book. I would like to mention here first my supervisor, Prof. dr. Arie van der Kooij. I would not have been able to complete this project without his superb guidance, dedication, patience, and encouragement. I will never forget meeting him almost every two weeks to discuss the progress of the present research during my four years in Leiden. In those meetings, I not only benefited from Prof. Arie's vast expertise in LXX and Hebrew Bible studies, but also from his patience with my progress and encouragement when it was needed. I will probably never forget the multifaceted learning experience I received in those meetings.

I would also like to thank the members of my dissertation committee who read the present work carefully and made valuable suggestions. Prof. dr. Florian Wilk (Georg-August-Universität Göttingen) must be thanked for his key methodological suggestions, among other things. Prof. dr. Muraoka (Universiteit Leiden) noted many details both in my reading of the Greek and the Hebrew. Michaël N. van der Meer (Rijksuniversiteit Groningen) also called my attention to several details and to other methodological issues. Prof. dr. R. B. ter Haar Romeny (Universiteit Leiden) must also be thanked for insightful questions during the defense. Members of the opposition committee must also be remembered for their helpful suggestions. Worth noting here is Prof.

dr. Wido van Peursen, now at the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, who sent me his valuable notes. I would like to mention my colleague Mirjam van der Vorm-Croughs, who asked helpful questions during the defense. Needless to say, the manuscript as it now stands is my sole responsibility.

Prof. Philippe Le Moigne at Université Paul-Valéry kindly made available to me the manuscript of his French translation of LXX Isaiah for the project La Bible d'Alexandrie. It was very helpful to compare his translation with other translations available during my research.

Others indirectly made this project possible. I am greatly indebted to Carl J. Bosma, Old Testament professor at Calvin Theological Seminary, who secured the necessary funding for my initial PhD studies in the Netherlands. I would later find out that Prof. John Stek, then emeritus Old Testament professor at the same institution, had generously provided that funding. Unfortunately, Prof. Stek passed away before I could thank him for his support. Mention needs to be made of friends of the International Reformed Evangelical Fellowship in Delft and of St. James Anglican Church in Voorschoten, who offered their friendship and support during my family's time in Holland. I should also thank Mrs. Karen Harris from the Evangelical Presbyterian Church of Longview, Texas, for proofreading this manuscript and improving its English. Whatever problems that may remain are my full responsibility.

I would also like to thank Prof. Dr. Wolfgang Kraus for accepting my manuscript for publication in this prestigious series. Thanks are also due to Leigh C. Andersen at SBL Press and her editorial group for their careful work of typesetting, including their suggestions at critical points. In this case also, I am responsible for the final form of this document.

Finally, I dedicate this book to my wife Katie, who followed and faithfully walked by my side in a distant and strange land to both of us, but to a land that has had a tremendous positive impact in our lives. My studies could not have been completed without her friendship, support, motivation, and love.

Wilson de Angelo Cunha
December 2013
Longview, Texas

Abbreviations

Primary Sources

26	Rome, tenth century CE
α’	Aquila
εβρ’	ὁ Ἑβραῖος, τὸ Ἑβραϊκόν
θ’	Theodotion
σ’	Symmachus
A	Alexandrinus
A’	Alexandrinus Group
Agr.	Philo, *De agricultura*
Ant.	Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities*
B	Codex Vaticanus
BHK	*Biblia Hebraica,* ed. R. Kittel
BHS	*Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*
Heb.	Hebrew
L	Lucianic Recension
LXX	Septuagint
Migr.	Philo, *De migrationi Abrahami*
MT	Masoretic Text
P. Tebt.	Tebtunis papyri
Pesh.	Peshitta
Q[mg]	Marchalianus[margin]
Q[txt]	Marchalianus[text]
S	Sinaiticus
Somn.	Philo, *De somniis*
Spec.	Philo, *De specialibus legibus*
Targ.	Targum
Vulg.	Vulgate

Secondary Sources

AB	Anchor Bible
ALR	Ancient Languages Resources
ArBib	The Aramaic Bible
ATA	Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen
BDB	Francis Brown, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1907.
BETL	Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium
Bib	*Biblica*
BIOSCS	*Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*
BKAT	Biblischer Kommentar, Altes Testament. Edited by Martin Noth and H. W. Wolff
Brenton	Lancelot Charles Lee Brenton, *The Septuagint Version of the Old Testament: with an English Translation and with Various Readings and Critical Notes.* London: Bagster & Sons, 1870.
BTL	Benjamins Translation Library
BWANT	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament
BZ	*Biblische Zeitschrift*
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
CBET	Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology
CTAT	Dominque Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament.* 4 vols. OBO 50. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982–2005.
Did	*Didaskalia*
DSSR	Donald W. Parry and Emanuel Tov, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader.* 6 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2004–2005.
EstFr	*Estudios Franciscanos*
FAT	Forschungen zum Alten Testament
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
GELS	*A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint.* Takamitsu Muraoka. Leuven: Peeters, 2009.
GKC	*Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar.* Edited by E. Kautzsch. Translated by A. E. Cowley. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1910.
HALOT	Ludwig Koehler, Walter Baumgartner, and Johann Jakob Stamm, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament.* Translated and edited under the supervision of M. E. J. Richardson. 5 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1994–2000.

HRCS	Edwin Hatch and Henry A. Redpath, *Concordance to the Septuagint and Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament*. 2 vols. Oxford, 1897. Suppl., 1906. Repr., 3 vols. in 2, Grand Rapids: Baker, 1983.
HUB	Moshe H. Goshen-Gottstein, ed., *The Book of Isaiah*. The Hebrew University Bible. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1995.
IBHS	Bruce K. Waltke and Michael O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
ICC	International Critical Commentary
Itin	*Itinerarium* (Portugal)
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JEOL	*Jaarbericht van het Vooraziatisch-Egyptisch Gezelschap (Genootschap) Ex oriente lux*
Joüon	Paul Joüon, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. 2nd reprint of 2nd ed. Translated and revised by Takamitsu Muraoka. SubBi 27. Rome: Gregorian & Biblical Press, 2009.
JSOT	*Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series
JTS	*Journal of Theological Studies*
LEH	Johan Lust, Eric Eynikel, and K. Hauspie, *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. 2nd rev. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2003.
LSJ	Henry George Liddell, Robert Scott, Henry Stuart Jones, and Roderick McKenzie. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. 9th ed. with revised supplement. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.
LXX.D.	*Septuaginta Deutsch. Das griechische Alte Testament in deutscher Übersetzung*. Edited by Eberhard Bons, Wolfgang Kraus, and Martin Karrer. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2009.
MM	James Hope Moulton and George Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament*. London: Hoddler & Stoughton, 1949.
MSU	Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens
MVEOL	*Mededelingen en verhandelingen van het Vooraziatisch-Egyptisch genootschap "Ex Oriente Lux"*
NASB	New American Standard Bible
NAWG	Nachrichten (von) der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen
NETS	*A New English Translation of the Septuagint and the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under That Title.*

	Edited by Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
NICOT	New International Commentary on the Old Testament
NIV	New International Version
NJPS	*Tanakh: The Holy Scriptures: The New JPS Translation according to the Traditional Hebrew Text*
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
OBO	Orbis biblicus et orientalis
OTL	Old Testament Library
OtSt	Oudtestamentische Studiën
RB	*Revue biblique*
RCT	*Revista catalana de teologia*
SBLSCS	Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies
SBLSymS	Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series
SJSJ	Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods
STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
SubBi	Subsidia biblica
Text	*Textus: Studies of the Hebrew University Bible Project*
TLNT	*Theological Lexicon of the New Testament*. Ceslas Spicq. Translated and edited by James D. Ernest; 3 vols; Peabody, Mass., 1994.
VT	*Vetus Testamentum*
VTSup	Supplements to Vetus Testamentum
VWGTh	Veröffentlichungen der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft für Theologie
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
ZAW	*Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*
ZNW	*Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche*

Other Abbreviations

acc.	accusative
act.	active
ch.	chapter
dat.	dative
emph.	emphatic
fem.	feminine
fut.	future
imper	impersonal

impv.	imperative
inf.	infinitive
masc.	masculine
MS	manuscript
nom.	nominative
pass.	passive
pers.	person
pl.	plural
prep.	preposition
ptc.	participle
sing.	singular
subj.	subject
voc.	vocative

1
Introduction

This chapter introduces the history of research on LXX Isaiah and discusses the research questions, methodology, contribution, and scope of the present work. The review of monographs and works dealing specifically with LXX Isaiah will inform the reader of its main research developments since its inception to the present time. It also offers a good background to the research questions that will occupy the present inquiry.

Early on (ca. 1880), research on LXX Isaiah focused mostly on its *Vorlage* and assumed that a very different Hebrew text from MT once lay behind the Greek. After almost a decade, scholars started to show a more cautious approach to the text-critical use of LXX Isaiah, calling attention to the personality of the translator. Since then this phrase has acquired two main emphases. In its initial stage, the "personality of the translator" referred to translation style, which was seen as rather free. In a later period, the same expression would denote not only translation style but also the translator's theology. What follows below reviews in greater detail the shift from a focus on LXX Isaiah's text-critical value to its author's ideology.

Following the review of the research history, this chapter turns to the research questions and methodology that will be the main focus of the study. Justification as to why LXX Isa 24:1–26:6 was chosen as the corpus to illustrate a methodological discussion of LXX Isaiah will then bring this chapter's discussion to an end.

1.1. The Contours of LXX Isaiah's Research History

1.1.1. LXX Isaiah and Its *Vorlage*

The very first monograph on LXX Isaiah was Anton Scholz's *Die alexandrinische Uebersetzung des Buches Jesaias*.[1] In this work, Scholz strongly

---

1. (Würzburg: Woerl, 1880).

argued that the translator's *Vorlage* was in fact different from the Hebrew text preserved in MT. It was full of errors because of the way it was produced, namely, through dictation. Scholz postulated that while one person read the Hebrew aloud, another wrote it down. An unclear diction led the recorder to insert Hebrew words with similar sounds onto his copied text. For Scholz, this model of production accounted for what he viewed as several errors in LXX Isaiah. Conversely, the translator was not responsible for those errors as he worked with great care and could not have possibly made so many mistakes. Consequently, Scholz viewed an unclear diction, due to similarities between certain Hebrew consonants, as the main cause for the errors found in the Greek translation.[2]

To give a few examples from LXX Isa 24:1–26:6, Scholz claimed that ἠσχύνθησαν "they were ashamed" (Isa 24:9) for MT's בשיר "with the song" reflects a Hebrew *Vorlage* that mistakenly read יבשו "they were ashamed." The similarity of sounds between יבשו/בשיר produced the reading יבשו in the translator's *Vorlage*, who then rendered it with ἠσχύνθησαν. Scholz also claimed that certain Hebrew consonants of similar shapes, such as *rêš* and *dālet*, *wāw* and *yôd*, caused some mistakes. For instance, πτωχός "poor" in Isa 25:3 is in place of MT's עז "strong." For Scholz, the translator's *Vorlage* read עני "poor," which was an error that resulted from the similarities of the consonants *zayin* and *nûn*.[3] In no way did Scholz consider that the translator himself may have been responsible for those differences. Instead, they were already in the translator's *Vorlage*, which for him varied from MT.

Scholz's different *Vorlage* hypothesis did not receive wide acceptance and was rejected in the early stages of LXX Isaiah's research.[4] Beginning with Ernst Liebmann, the focus shifted from the text behind the Greek to the translator in front of his *Vorlage*. The following questions became important: First, what was the style of the translation? Second, what was the level of the translator's knowledge of the Hebrew language? And, third, did the translator leave traces of his ideology in his translation?

---

2. Ibid., 15–16.

3. Ibid., 29, 30.

4. In a few cases, however, a few scholars continued to use the hypothesis of a different *Vorlage* to account for some of LXX Isaiah's departure from the Hebrew. See e.g., H. W. Sheppard, "ΤΟΥ ΣΙΛΩΑΜ - הַשִּׁלֹחַ Isa. viii 6," *JTS* 16 (1915): 414–16; Alberto Vaccari, "ΠΟΛΙΣ ΑΣΕΔΕΚ IS. 19, 18," *Bib* 2 (1921), 353–56; Peter Katz, "Notes on the Septuagint," *JTS* 47 (1946), 30–33; Alberto Vaccari, "Parole Rovesciate e Critiche Errate nella Bibbia Ebraica" in *Studi Orientalistici in Onore di Giorgio Levi Della Vida* (Pubblicazioni Dell'Istituto Per L'Oriente 54; Roma: Istituto Per L'Oriente, 1956), 2:553–66; the critical apparatus of *BHS*.

1.1.2. LXX Isaiah and the Personality of the Translator: Translation Style

In 1902, Liebmann began a series of articles devoted to a text-critical discussion of MT Isa 24–27 by comparing it with its ancient witnesses. His main contribution was his plea that the "personality of the translator(s)" should be taken into account before using their translation(s) for text-critical purposes. By this, he meant that a careful study of each translation's style must precede any proposals for a different Hebrew *Vorlage* behind them.[5]

Focusing mainly on LXX Isaiah, Liebmann was interested in the following three questions: First, how well did the translator know the Hebrew language? Second, what was the style of his translation? Third, does the translator betray an influence from his worldview?[6] As for the translator's familiarity with Hebrew, Liebmann concluded that the translator's lexical and grammatical knowledge was good. Although the translator had some difficulties with the tenses of some Hebrew verbs, his familiarity with the Hebrew language was still commendable.[7]

As for the translation style, Liebmann paid attention to "additions" and "omissions," sentence composition, differences in the number of verbal forms, the conjunction καί, the definite article, pronominal suffixes, and the use of prepositions. He concluded that LXX Isaiah does not carry any weight for textual criticism concerning sentence composition, the differences in the number of verbal forms, and additions. Contrarily, LXX Isaiah may have some text-critical value in its use of certain Greek words, certain uses of καί, the definite article, pronominal suffixes, and prepositions.[8]

Finally, Liebmann pointed to a few cases where the translator's "dogmatic views" were responsible for some of LXX Isaiah's divergences from the Hebrew. The translator's usage of διά "on account of" for תחת "under" in Isa 24:5 and ὅτι ἡμάρτοσαν "they sinned" for ויאשמו "they became guilty" in Isa 24:6 all point to the translator's ideology. The more so as, in Liebmann's view, ἀφανίζω "to destroy" could have been used to translate ויאשמו.[9]

---

5. Ernst Liebmann, "Der Text zu Jesaia 24–27," *ZAW* 22 (1902): 6, 7.

6. Ibid., 26.

7. Ibid., 28, 39. For a detailed discussion, see 27–39. In the same year, H. B. Swete (*An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* [2nd ed.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1902; repr., Eugene, Ore.: Wipf & Stock, 2003], 315–16), expressed a completely different view of the Isaiah translator, when he stated that "the Psalms and more especially the Book of Isaiah shew obvious signs of incompetence."

8. Liebmann, "Der Text," 45.

9. Ibid., 49.

The year 1902 saw another important publication. Alfred Zillessen, in his "Bemerkungen zur alexandrinischen Übersetzung des Jesaja (c. 40–66),"[10] tried to show that related phraseology in MT Isa 40–66 is the reason behind many of LXX Isaiah's departures. He argued that the translator borrowed phrases from elsewhere in the book for his translation of certain verses. In these cases, LXX Isaiah would have no bearing in MT's readings.[11] Zillessen proposed that LXX Isaiah carried out two types of corrections in light of related phrases in Isa 40–66. The first type was some sort of improvement of the Hebrew, for example Isa 40:5 (cf. 52:10); 41:6 (cf. 41:5); 42:1 (cf. 45:4); 46:11 (cf. 48:15); 48:16 (cf. 45:19). The second were cases where the Greek reworked, altered, and even replaced the Hebrew due to related phraseology. Some examples of this type are 41:28 (cf. 63:5); 42:4 (cf. 11:2; 51:5); 44:23 (cf. 52:9); 45:8 (cf. 44:23; 49:13). Moreover, Zillessen also identified seven cases outside Isa 40–66 that influenced translations in LXX Isa 40–66. Of these seven, three come from outside the book of Isaiah (Exod 17:6 [cf. Isa 48:21]; Amos 9:14 [cf. Isa 45:13]; Ps 37:6 [cf. Isa 51:5]); the others come from the book of Isaiah itself (42:4 [cf. 11:2]; 45:9 [cf. 28:24; 29:16]; 61: 7 [cf. 35:10]).[12]

Zillessen also discussed whether the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the translator or the translator himself was the source of the divergences found in LXX Isa 40–66. He claimed that, in a few cases, the Hebrew seemed to be the source that motivated the changes; in most cases, however, the source of the change was found in the translation itself. Still prone to viewing LXX Isaiah's value for textual criticism, Zillessen conjectured whether a precursor form of the *Vorlage*, supplied, for instance, with interlinear parallel sentences, was behind the translator's changes.[13] Later on, Joseph Ziegler would pick up on Zillessen's inference of "interlinear parallel sentences" to develop his theory of glosses in the margin of the translator's *Vorlage*.[14]

In 1904, Richard R. Ottley also addressed the differences between the MT and LXX. Contrary to Scholz's previous research, Ottley discarded the idea that a different *Vorlage* once lay behind the Greek. Instead, he argued that LXX Isaiah's deviations originated with the translator's faulty knowledge of the Hebrew language.[15] Although he conjectured that the translator may

10. Alfred Zillessen, "Bemerkungen zur alexandrinischen Übersetzung des Jesaja (c. 40–66)" *ZAW* 22 (1902): 238–63.

11. Ibid., 240.

12. Ibid., 261.

13. Ibid.

14. See Jean Koenig, *L'herméneutique analogique du judaïsme antique d'après les témoins textuels d'Isaïe* (VTSup 33; Leiden: Brill, 1982), 24.

15. Richard R. Ottley, *The Book of Isaiah according to the Septuagint (Codex Alexandri-*

have used an illegible manuscript, he saw the translator's imperfect knowledge of the Hebrew as the main cause for LXX Isaiah's departures.[16] For instance, Ottley claimed that "often we can see the translator losing his clue, and going gradually astray," citing LXX Isa 24:23 as one example. He suggested τακήσεται "it will melt, dissolve" (Isa 24:23a) resulted from the translator's faulty rendering of ובושה "it will be ashamed" with πεσεῖται "it will fall" in the parallel clause of Isa 24:23b.[17] Differences explained as mistakes, misreading or guessing abound in Ottley's work.[18]

Four years before Ziegler's monumental work, Johann Fischer devoted attention to the *Vorlage* behind LXX Isaiah. Against F. Wutz, whose work argued the LXX translators worked from a Hebrew text that had been transcribed into Greek, Fischer proposed that the *Vorlage* behind LXX Isaiah was a consonantal Hebrew text.[19] Noticing that the characteristic feature of LXX Isaiah is its shorter text when compared to MT,[20] Fischer discussed the question of how to account for this phenomenon. He then paid great attention to the style of the translation. Basically, he offered four explanations: minuses in the Greek text itself; translator's intentional minuses; translator's contraction of words or phrases; gaps in the translator's *Vorlage*. Although Fischer argued that a gap in the translator's *Vorlage* should not be denied, he strongly emphasized that, in general, the differences between LXX Isaiah's *Vorlage* and MT were not that significant and that their nature was clear. By this, he meant that a different *Vorlage* is not the reason for most of LXX Isaiah's divergences from the Hebrew. Instead, the translator should be taken as responsible for

---

nus) (London: Clay & Sons, 1904–1906), 1:49: "[I]n Isaiah I find it hard to see that the LXX gives any proof at all (unless in a few isolated exceptions) of an older or superior Hebrew text; because the translators seem to have been so constantly mistaken in reading their Hebrew, or unable to translate it, as to deprive their witness of all authority."

16. Ibid., 1:50: "The failures of the translator (or translators) in reading his original may have been largely justified by illegibility of MSS., and very likely by abbreviations also; the actual script may have been very difficult. But over and above all this, it seems as if his knowledge of Hebrew was imperfect; and if this was so, he may have thought that he saw before him not merely something different from reality, but something such as no skilled Hebrew writer would have written."

17. Ibid.*,* 1:50; 2:224.

18. Ibid., 2:222, 225. In 1:51, Ottley characterized the "mistakes and misreadings" in LXX Isaiah as "so numerous."

19. Johann Fischer, *In welcher Schrift lag das Buch Isaias den LXX vor?* (BZAW 56; Giessen: Töpelmann, 1930), iii.

20. Ibid., 6.

the differences between LXX Isaiah and MT.[21] To prove his point, Fischer proceeded to a discussion of translation style.

Fischer argued that the method of translation was not a word-for-word rendition but, rather, a free translation. The aim of the translator was to bring the meaning of his text into Greek. Fischer also argued that in places where his *Vorlage* was easy to translate, the translation was more literal. Contrarily, the translation was freer in places where the *Vorlage* was difficult to render. In those places, the translator struggled to make the meaning of his text clear, using the context to clarify it. As an example, Fischer pointed to Isa 33:18, where the translator read אֶת־הַמִּגְדָּלִים "the towers" as אֶת־הַמְגֻדָּלִים "the ones being caused to be great" and, in the light of the context, rendered it with τοὺς τρεφομένους "the ones being caused to grow up."[22]

Furthermore, Fischer stressed that a free translation style characterizes LXX Isaiah.[23] In Isa 10:26, for example, ἐν τόπῳ θλίψεως "in the place of affliction" renders בצור עורב. For him, the translator interpreted the image of "raven" (עורב) as a cipher for unhappiness. A free translation style included also free exegesis as in the rendition of שרשך "your root" with τὸ σπέρμα σου "your seed" (Isa 14:30). The elimination of anthropomorphism is also found in LXX Isaiah. Fischer explained the rendition of פלא יועץ אל גבור with μεγάλης βουλῆς ἄγγελος (Isa 9:5) as due, perhaps, to the translator's ignoring גבור to avoid anthropomorphism. Finally, he argued the translation is full of many additions to clarify the Hebrew.[24]

Moreover, Fischer argued the translator deliberately exchanged, added or disregarded certain consonants in his *Vorlage*. For instance, the rendition of נואלו "they acted foolishly" with ἐξέλιπον "they failed" (Isa 19:13) reflects the verbal form נלאו "they grew weary." In this case, the translator overlooked the consonant *waw* to produce the meaning "they failed." There are also other places where the translator added (e.g., 24:14; 25:2–3; 26:17–18; 27:1), omitted (e.g., 25:11; 26:9) or changed the order of consonants, especially when they had the same shape as ד or ר.[25]

Fischer also argued that the translator frequently used knowledge of Aramaic for his translation. He gave several examples highlighting this feature.[26]

---

21. Ibid., 8.

22. Ibid., 9, 10.

23. With Fischer, the view of the translation style as free had considerably changed from Swete's 1902 claim that LXX Isaiah's translation was so literal as to render "entire sentences" as "unintelligible" (*An Introduction*, 324).

24. Ibid., 11.

25. Ibid., 10–11.

26. Ibid., 9. Later, Arie van der Kooij (*Die alten Textzeugen des Jesajabuches: ein Beitrag*

He claimed that because Aramaic was a living language for the translator, he was an expert in the Aramaic language and had better control of it than of Hebrew.[27]

After Fischer, Ziegler published his groundbreaking monograph on LXX Isaiah.[28] In this study, he addressed the fundamental question of the relation between MT and LXX Isaiah. For him, it essentially entailed two alternatives: either the translator had an identical *Vorlage* to MT or the translator's source text markedly diverged from MT.[29] Together with Liebmann and Fischer, Ziegler proposed that an evaluation of LXX Isaiah's relation to MT must pay attention to the translation style. In this respect, he discussed at length matters such as minuses and pluses, the translator's handling of comparisons, his use of related phraseology throughout the translation, and the translator's lexical choices vis-à-vis his Alexandrian background. He categorically argued that a free translation style characterizes LXX Isaiah and that this translation has much in common with LXX Job/Proverbs and some types of *targumimic* literature.[30] Rather than a word-for-word translation, Ziegler viewed the translator as someone who paid attention to the context during the production of his translation.

A case in point is the translator's handling of difficult Hebrew words, for which he reached to the context for help. For instance, the noun נשף "dawn, crepuscule" was rendered as τὸ ὀψέ "late in the day, in the evening" because of τὸ πρωί "in the morning" at the beginning of the verse (Isa 5:11). Similarly, ἡ ψυχή was used for the difficult נשף to create a parallel with ἡ καρδία at the beginning of the verse (Isa 21:4).[31] Thus, the translator did not produce his work mechanically. Rather, he paid careful attention to both the immediate and broader contexts of a given passage.

In his discussion of LXX Isaiah's minuses, Ziegler argued that, for the most part, they originated with the translator himself, who intentionally and unintentionally left words out of his translation. Most importantly, Ziegler claimed that the translator did not feel strictly bound to his *Vorlage* in the

---

zur Textgeschichte des Alten Testaments [OBO 35; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981], 69) would doubt Fischer's claim that the translator utilized his Aramaic knowledge "very often."

27. Fischer, *In welcher Schrift*, 10.

28. Joseph Ziegler, *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias* (ATA 12/3: Münster: 1934).

29. Ibid., 1.

30. Ibid., 7.

31. Ibid., 9. For more examples, see 9–12.

sense that he was not producing a literal word-for-word translation.[32] In fact, Ziegler assumed that the translator's *Vorlage*, with few exceptions, was identical to MT.[33]

In his discussion of "Gegenseitige Beeinflussung sinnverwandter Stellen in der Js-LXX," Ziegler advanced his main thesis that the translator had a sufficiently good general knowledge of the book of Isaiah as a whole and that the exegesis of several related phrases may clarify many divergences. He argued that many of the Greek's differences from MT originated with the translator's technique of rendering one passage in the light of another in the book. In Ziegler's own words:

> Der Js. Übers. scheint überhaupt sein Buch sehr gut dem Inhalte nach im Gedächtnis gehabt zu haben; denn es begegnen viele Wiedergaben, die sich nur auf Grund der Exegese nach sinnverwandten Stellen erklären lassen. Gerade bei der Js-LXX darf irgendein Wort oder eine Wendung, die vom MT abweicht, nicht aus dem Zusammenhang genommen werden und für sich allein betrachtet worden, sondern muß nach dem ganzen Kontext der Stelle und ihren Parallelen gewertet werden; erst so läßt sich manche Differenz der LXX gegenüber dem MT erklären.[34]

Ziegler devoted about forty pages to a discussion of LXX Isa 1–66, pointing to cases where the translation of one passage was influenced by another. With the programmatic statement above, he advanced LXX Isaiah's research significantly by highlighting that the translator made use of his knowledge of the content of the whole book for his rendition of particular passages.

In the last chapter, "Der alexandrinisch-ägyptische Hintergrund der Js-LXX," Ziegler argued that LXX Isaiah must also be studied in the context

---

32. Ibid., 46–47: "Hier erhebt sich die Frage: Hat die LXX bereits in ihrer Vorlage die betreffenden Versteile und Worte nicht gelesen? Wie oben bemerkt worden ist, hat Fischer richtig erkannt, daß LXX-Vorlage und MT sich nicht weit voneinander entfernen; doch besteht kein Zweifel, daß in unserem MT manche Versteile und glossenartige Bemerkungen stehen, die LXX noch nicht gelesen hat. Jedoch geht bei dem größten Teil des Minus die Ursache auf den Übers. selbst zurück; er hat oftmals Satzteile und Worte absichtlich und unabsichtlich ausgelassen. … Der Js-Übers. fühlte sich nicht strenge an seine Vorlage gebunden und hatte auch keineswegs die Absicht, wörtlich und genau, Wort für Wort zu übersetzen; deshalb hat er einfach schwierige, seltene Wörter ausgelassen, manche Sätze verkürzt und zusammengezogen." For a recent, systematic study of LXX Isaiah's minuses and pluses, confirming Ziegler's conclusions above, see Mirjam van der Vorm Croughs, *The Old Greek of Isaiah: An Analysis of Its Pluses and Minuses* (SCS 61; Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014).

33. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 22.

34. Ibid., 135.

of the Alexandrian world. For him, the translator attempted to produce a translation that would be comprehensible to Alexandrian Jews and, in doing so, resorted to the lexicon of his homeland. LXX Isaiah, thus, acquired a new meaning in Greek clothes. This implied, so argued Ziegler, that a proper understanding of LXX Isaiah requires an acquaintance with the cultural world of the translator.[35] For instance, in the light of papyri documents, Ziegler argued that ἀνίημι in LXX Isa 27:10 means "to abandon" as the same verb appears in P. Tebt. I 72, 36, dating from the second century BCE, with this meaning: γῆν ἀνιέναι εἰς νομάς "to abandon the land as pasturage."[36] This example and others point to the importance of comparing LXX Isaiah with contemporary papyri texts.[37]

1.1.3. LXX Isaiah and the Personality of the Translator: The Translator's Theology

The year 1934 also witnessed an influential shift of focus in LXX Isaiah research with Karl F. Euler's study of LXX Isa 53. The value of Euler's work lies in its methodology. Rather than being interested in LXX Isa 53 as a translational text, Euler focused on it as a text in its own right. He took LXX Isa 53 not as a text that reflects faithfully the ideology of its *Vorlage* but as a text that communicates its own ideas. He thus made a distinction between LXX Isaiah as a translational text and as a text in its own right. In the latter capacity, Euler viewed LXX Isaiah as reflecting its translator's particular beliefs. As he put it:

> Wenn im ersten Teil der Arbeit eine Übersetzung und Erklärung des LXX-Textes von Jes 53 gegeben wird, so ist der eben bezeichnete Gesichtspunkt

---

35. Ibid., 175–77.

36. Ibid., 180.

37. For recent research on the cultural context of LXX Isaiah in the light of contemporary papyri literature, cf. Michaël N. van der Meer, "Trendy Translations in the Septuagint of Isaiah: A Study of the Vocabulary of the Greek Isaiah 3,18–23 in the Light of Contemporary Sources," in *Die Septuaginta—Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 20.–23. Juli 2006* (WUNT 1/219; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 581–96; idem, "Papyrological Perspectives on the Septuagint of Isaiah," in *The Old Greek of Isaiah: Issues and Perspectives. Papers Read at the Conference on the Septuagint of Isaiah, Held in Leiden 10–11 April 2008* (ed. Arie van der Kooij and Michaël N. van der Meer; CBET 55; Leuven: Peeters, 2010), 107–33; idem, "Visions from Memphis and Leontopolis: The Phenomenon of the Vision Reports in the Greek Isaiah in the Light of Contemporary Accounts from Hellenistic Egypt," in *Isaiah in Context: Studies in Honour of Arie van der Kooij on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (ed. Michaël N. van der Meer et al., VTSup 138; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 281–316.

bestimmend gewesen, den LXX-Text als selbständigen Text zu betrachten und nicht als einen Übersetzungstext, der die Gedanken des hebräischen Textes nur wortgetreu wiedergäbe. Der Text als übersetzter Text bleibt unberücksichtigt; hier ist er selbständiger Text, der bestimmte und verständliche Aussagen macht.[38]

Euler claimed further that LXX Isa 53 as a text in its own right carries an ideology of its own, independent from its Hebrew *Vorlage*:

Es war ja verschiedentlich schon betont worden, daß der LXX-Text, obwohl er ein übersetzter Text ist, durchaus selbständig ist in seinem Gedankeninhalt.… Denn die Übersetzung kann beeinflußt sein von einem schon vorherrschenden Glauben hinsichtlich des Ebed, der in den Kreisen, aus denen die LXX stammt, beheimatet ist. Ebenso wie Targum und rabbinische Literatur in dieser Hinsicht eine bestimmte Meinung vertreten, könnten ja auch die LXX-Übersetzer eine solche haben, die sie durch ihre Übersetzung zum Ausdruck bringen.[39]

Euler's work represented a major shift in emphasis in LXX Isaiah studies. Rather than studying LXX Isaiah as a translation, focusing on translation style as had so often been done before 1934, Euler argued it should be studied as a text in its own right that carried its own independent ideology. After Euler's publication, one notices in retrospect that scholars began to be more and more interested not only in translation style, but also in LXX Isaiah's ideology.

In 1948, Isac L. Seeligmann published his *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah: A Discussion of Its Problems*. This work, which would become his *opus magnum*, has rightly been deemed "the most significant attempt to use the Septuagint as evidence of Jewish theology."[40] Seeligmann deemed LXX Isaiah as a work that reflected the translator's personal views and his surrounding context:

The translation of Isaiah is characterized in numerous places not only by a fairly considerable independence of the Hebrew text, but also by the fact that it evinces an equally marked influence from the surrounding cultural atmosphere, as well as expressing the author's personal views. This translation, in

---

38. Karl F. Euler, *Die Verkündigung vom leidenden Gottesknecht aus Jes 53 in der Griechischen Bibel* (BWANT 66; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1934), 2.

39. Ibid., 10.

40. Karen H. Jobes and Moisés Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2000), 102.

fact, is almost the only one among the various parts of the Septuagint which repeatedly reflects contemporaneous history.[41]

Seeligmann would see reflected in LXX Isaiah events from the Maccabean period, other "contemporaneous and parallel political developments in the territories bordering on Palestine," the history of Ptolemaic Egypt, as well as events of the broader Hellenistic history.[42] As pertaining to the Maccabean period, he discovered allusions to Antiochus IV Epiphanes (Isa 14:18–20), Onias III (Isa 8:8), Jewish emigration to Egypt (Isa 10:24), a Philistine fleet of ships that Jews used for trading voyages (Isa 11:14), anti-Jewish movements in Phoenician cities during the Maccabean wars and reference to a second century BCE expansion of the Nabatean state (Isa 15:7–9).[43] On the history of Ptolemaic Egypt, he uncovered allusions to the situation of Ptolemaic Egypt after Antiochus Epiphanes's campaigns (Isa 22:5) and to Ethiopian support for Egyptian rebels against the Ptolemeans (Isa 20:5).[44] As for the broader Hellenistic history, Seeligmann saw in the phrase "ships of Carthage" in LXX Isa 23 a reference to Carthage's attempt to become an agrarian state after the destruction of its shipping and trade.[45] For him, therefore, LXX Isaiah was full of references to its historical period. This was a phenomenon that could only be explained from the perspective of contemporization.[46]

It is important to point out that Seeligmann believed that one can only find the translator's references to historical allusions or expressions of his beliefs in places where his translation was free. Talking about LXX Isaiah's departures from its Hebrew source, Seeligmann claimed that

they [inconsistencies] also entitle us to try, on our part, to discover, in isolated, free renderings, certain historical allusions or expressions of the

---

41. Isac L. Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah. A Discussion of Its Problems* (MVEOL 9; Leiden: Brill, 1948; repr. Isac L. Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah and Cognates Studies* [ed. Robert Hanhart and Hermann Spieckermann; FAT 40; Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2004]), 4. See also pp. 79, 82 and idem, "Problemen en perspectieven in het moderne Septuaginta-onderzoek," *JEOL* 7 (1940), 390b–390e. For an English translation of this article, see "Problems and Perspectives in Modern Septuagint Research," *Text* 15 (1990): 169–232.

42. Ibid., 89, 90.

43. Ibid., 83–89. See also idem, "Problemen," 390d–390e.

44. Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, 89–90.

45. Ibid., 91.

46. Ibid., 79.

translator's own views and ideas; also in those places where these insertions appear to constitute an element alien to the main context.[47]

Seeligmann argued that the translator had an atomistic approach to his *Vorlage*. Much like a "feature in the most ancient Jewish exegesis," he introduced interpretations of words or phrases into his translation without paying attention to the immediate context. For that reason, Seeligmann found it unlikely "to discover logical connexions in any chapter or part of a chapter in our Septuagint-text."[48] This last statement, as it will be seen below, is at odds with his claim that both literal and free translations reflect the translator's ideology.

In "The Translation as a Document of Jewish-Alexandrian Theology," which is the last chapter of his *opus magnum*, Seeligmann further elaborated on the "personal views" of LXX Isaiah's author. He discussed the methodology that must be used in writing a history of "Jewish-Alexandrian theology." For him, the sources of the translator's religious notions can be found both in the Bible itself and in Jewish traditions of the time as well as in the Hellenistic worldview.[49] Therefore, both literal and free renderings are important sources of the translator's theology as "both represent fragments of the religious notions of the translator concerned."[50] However, Seeligmann decided to focus only on those places where the translation differed ideologically from its source text. He did not intend to write a history of the religious notions of the translator, which included a study of both literal and free renderings, but "to indicate the differences between those embodied in the translation and in the original."[51] Different from his predecessors, he used the term "personality of the translator" to designate a study not only of translation technique, as it had been done until his day, but also of the translator's theological concepts.[52]

---

47. Ibid., 41. However, Seeligmann viewed literal translations as just as important as free ones for the reconstruction of the translator's "religious notions." As he put it, "passages that were translated literally in a given book of the Septuagint, are of equal importance as free paraphrases: both represent fragments of the religious notions of the translator concerned" (95).

48. Ibid., 41.

49. Ibid., 95: "The sources of information at our disposal are insufficient for the writing of a history of Jewish-Alexandrian theology. We may say, however, that although its content is for the most part derived from the Bible, it also contains later elements which have their origin partly in popular Jewish traditions that grew outside, and simultaneously with, the Bible and gradually became authoritative, and partly in conscious or unconscious borrowing from the Hellenistic thought-world."

50. Ibid., 95.

51. Ibid., 95.

52. Ibid., 96: "the personality of the translator and his spiritual background." In light

In his discussion of the translator's theological notions, Seeligmann focused on the translator's ideas about God, Torah, and Israel, which form "the nuclear idea of every Jewish-theological conception."[53] He found nuances of the translator's views on God in the epithets he used, such as the more usual κύριος for אדני/אלהים instead of the less frequent δεσπότης; the use of δίκαιος, δικαιοσύνη, and ἔλεος; and the nontranslation of צור as an epithet for God to avoid any hint at approval of stone worshiping.[54] Terms such as εὐσεβής, εὐσέβεια, δικαιοσύνη, ἔνδοξος, νόμος, ἀνομέω, and cognates all function as windows into the translator's religious ideas about virtuousness and Torah.[55] Seeligmann also found ample evidence for the translator's view of prophecy as "the revelation of an age-old plan" that is "bound to be fulfilled."[56]

Further, Seeligmann argued the translator had a particular view of exile and diaspora that differed from the Hebrew. Whereas the latter views the exile as a consequence of God's just punishment, the translator views it as the result of "an injustice visited on Israel because of the superior might of other peoples."[57] Exile as an injustice and oppression coupled with a "yearning for national deliverance"[58] shaped the translator's work. LXX Isaiah consistently uses the term ἀδικέω for several Hebrew terms "in regard to the oppressors to whom the Jewish people are subjected."[59] The diaspora feeling can also be seen in the "veneration of national symbols" like Zion and Jerusalem and in the "constant yearning for liberation."[60] The use of σωτηρία, σώζω, σωτήριον for different Hebrew lexemes indicated that the translator viewed their meaning as primarily "liberation from a powerful political enemy," "escape from a great

---

of Seeligmann's discussion on 95–96, "spiritual background" stands for the religious concepts of the translator. At the conclusion of chapter 4, Seeligmann refers to the "translator's personality or … mental images" (120).

53. Ibid. See also idem, "Problemen," 389: "De beschrijving van de theologie der vertalers zal—zooals die van iedere Joodsche theologie—gegroepeerd moeten worden, om de begrippen: God, Israël—hierbij ook Messiaansche idee als nationale verlossingskracht—en Thorah."

54. Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, 97–103. See also idem, "Problemen," 390a: "Dat de vaak voorkomende metaphoor van God als Rots of Steen op geen enkele plaats letterlijk wordt vertaald wortelt misschien ten deele in het apologetische streven ook den schijn van instemming met steenvereering te ontgaan."

55. Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, 103–9.

56. Ibid., 109–10.

57. Ibid., 111.

58. Ibid., 116.

59. Ibid., 111, 112.

60. Ibid., 113.

political disaster," and "deliverance from exile."[61] Seeligmann further noted that the concepts of σῴζω and cognates occur "in close connexion with one of the most notable thoughts in Isaiah's preaching, *i.e.,* the proclamation of the return of the Remnant of Israel"[62] (cf. the parallel occurrence of σῴζω and cognates and κατάλειμμα/καταλείπω in Isa 10:20, 22; 37:32). The translator further identified the "Remnant of the people of Israel with the Jewish diaspora in Hellenistic Egypt" and also in Mesopotamia (Isa 11:16; 19:24–25).[63] Because the translation of Isaiah betrays unique ideas that differ from MT, Seeligmann argued that a study of the "personality of the translator" involved not only translation style but also the translator's theology. And the ideology of the translator would indeed become the general focus of later works.

In 1951, Leonard H. Brockington published an important article that dealt with the translator's interest in the theme of δόξα, which appears sixty-eight times in LXX Isaiah but translates כבוד only twenty-eight times. The high frequency of δόξα in Isaiah is striking in comparison with other LXX books that translate the *Tanach* where δόξα occurs 270 times and translates כבוד 180 times. The difference in frequency is 2:3 for other LXX books versus 7:17 for LXX Isaiah. Brockington argued that δόξα had a theological significance for the translator and that it "was associated, directly or indirectly, with God's redemptive work among men."[64] Substantiation for Brockington's claim of the soteriological meaning of δόξα can be found in places where the translator introduced it when his *Vorlage* referred to "salvation" (e.g., Isa 12:2; 44:23). The opposite also proves Brockington's point. In Isa 40:5; 60:1–7, for instance, the translator introduced σωτηρία where his *Vorlage* referred to "glory."[65] Brockington saw the "individuality of the translator" in his increased use of δόξα as a concept denoting salvation.[66]

Subsequently, Jean Coste published an article on LXX Isa 25:1–5, in which he made important methodological points. He approached LXX Isa 25:1–5 as a "translational" text, as a literary unit, as a text expressing certain beliefs, and as a text that functions as a channel for revelation.[67] As a translation, he concluded that LXX Isa 25:1–5 showed itself "comme un échec presque complet."[68]

---

61. Ibid., 114.

62. Ibid., 115.

63. Ibid., 116, 117.

64. Leonard H. Brockington, "The Greek Translator of Isaiah and His Interest in ΔΟΞΑ," *VT* 1 (1951): 26.

65. Ibid., 30–32.

66. Ibid., 31.

67. Jean Coste, "Le texte grec d'Isaïe XXV, 1–5," *RB* 61 (1954), 37.

68. Ibid., 50.

Contrarily, when studied in its own right,[69] LXX Isa 25:1–5 presented itself as an ordered and coherent text. He further concluded that LXX Isa 25:1–5, as a literary and conceptual text, shows that an active interpretive plan was already at work even before its translation had started, reflecting the translator's personal piety and faith.[70]

As a text that expresses the translator's "personal piety and faith," Coste characterized LXX Isa 25:1–5 as a messianic thanksgiving song that celebrates the destruction of the wicked and the deliverance of the Israelites, who will recognize the Lord in Zion.[71] In his lexical analysis, he claimed the themes of poverty and deliverance, on one hand, and expectation and messianic gift, on the other, are the themes of LXX Isa 25:1–5. As such, he viewed it as the "song of the poor," which reflects a spiritual movement in Judaism that brought the concepts of poverty and humility to the fore of its religious faith.[72] For Coste, therefore, LXX Isa 25:1–5, as a text of its own, betrays the translator's ideology.

After Coste, the Portuguese scholar J. C. M. das Neves sought to recover the theology of the translator in his study of LXX Isa 24.[73] He approached this text in three levels. The first discussed the exegesis and theology of MT; the second paid attention to the LXX's "philological differences" in comparison with MT; and the third discussed the exegesis and theology of the Greek text.[74]

Das Neves understood that the translator's religious conceptions determined his translation and the text as a literary unit. On the level of translation, das Neves noted that the translator sometimes read the Hebrew in slightly different ways from MT/1QIsaᵃ. Note, for instance, ὁ λαός ὁ πτωχός "the poor people" for עַז עָם "the strong people," reflecting a reading of MT as עָם עָנִי. Based on several examples, das Neves concluded that the Isaiah translator was well acquainted with the Hebrew language but that he manipulated it to express his religious beliefs.[75]

For das Neves, the translator's reading method consisted essentially of "re-readings" and "actualizations." The former takes the Hebrew differently from its intended simple meaning while actualizations find the fulfillment of

---

69. A similar approach had already been advanced for LXX Isa 52:13–53:12. See the above discussion of Euler's *Die Verkündigung*.

70. Coste, "Le texte grec," 51.

71. Ibid., 51.

72. Ibid., 59–60.

73. J. C. M. das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega dos Setenta no Livro de Isaías (Cap. 24 de Isaías)* (Lisbon: Universidade Católica Portuguesa, 1973).

74. Ibid., 265.

75. Ibid., 266. For more examples, see 265–66.

former prophecies in the events of the translator's time.[76] These two methods combined are used to express the translator's religious views about two contemporary Jewish groups: the pro- and contrahellenization.[77] The existence of these two groups forms the core of LXX Isa 24's theology:

> Em todo o texto, como se vê, perpassa sempre a mesma mentalidade de *actualização*, tendo por base as duas facções de judeus: os ímpios que se aliam aos inimigos na sua política e os fiéis ao jahvismo, prontos a sofrer com amor e com alegria e até mesmo a morrer *com morte de fogo* (Is. 9, 3–5; p. 232 s), o que nos indica tratar-se de espírito originado numa facção religiosa.[78]

Das Neves identified several themes related to the group faithful to Yahweh. This group is found in dispersion in Egypt (cf. LXX Isa 18: 2, 7; 25:5; 27:12; 33:17; 41:9a, 2, 5: 45:22; 49:6; 52:10; 62:11) and is expecting its redemption (cf. LXX Isa 33:13; 41:1; 45:16, 22; 48:20; 49:1, 6; 51:5; 52:10; 60:9; 62:11). He further pointed out that this group in dispersion is sometimes referred to as the ones "left, spared" (cf. LXX Isa 4:2; 10:17, 11:10; 21; 19; 13:12; 20:6; 28:5, 6–28), the "poor" (cf. LXX Isa 25:1–5) and the "humiliated" (cf. LXX Isa 26:3). Related to the "poor" are concepts such as "joy" (εὐφροσύνη), glory (δόξα), and righteousness (δικαιοσύνη). The "spared-poor-humiliated" group shares an eschatological hope for the messianic Jerusalem.[79]

Contrarily, the party of unfaithful Jews is denominated by terms like πλούσιος/πλοῦτος (with the exception of LXX Isa 32:18; 33:20); ἁμαρτωλός, a

---

76. Ibid., 268. For das Neves's more detailed discussion of actualization in comparison with Daniel and the *pesharim*, see idem, "A Teologia dos Setenta no Livro de Isaías," *Itin* (Portugal) 43 (1964), 26–28.

77. Das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 268, 269.

78. Ibid., 269. See also his "A Teologia dos Setenta," 19, 21.

79. Das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 269–74. For a more detailed discussion of das Neves's view of the "remnant" in LXX Isaiah, see idem, "Isaías 7,14 no Texto Massorético e no Texto Grego: A obra de Joachim Becker," *Did* 2 (1972), 106. Das Neves summarizes the theology of the "remnant" in LXX Isaiah as follows: (1) While MT speaks of the rest of "trees" or of the people in general terms, LXX refer to the "remnant" as a religious concept, as the faithful and pious class among the people. It also applies daily metaphors such as agriculture, for instance, in a personal way and with reference to the "remnant" of Israel; (2) the "remnant" in LXX Isaiah is characterized as "poor" and "small" (LXX Isa 24:6); (3) whenever MT refers to the "remnant" as a specific class and in religious terms, the Greek tends to emphasize those references; (4) the "remnant" relates to the people in diaspora in Egypt who will return with gladness to Zion after their redemption; (5) this "remnant" suffers injustice from the wicked class of the people—but those injustices are considered to be from God, who uses them to purify and sanctify, preparing them for future messianic happiness.

concept that is stressed more in the LXX than in MT; ἄρχοντες,[80] who are in fact referred to with the term ἁμαρτωλός above; βουλή/μάταια as the expression of political aspects devised by the ἄρχοντες; ἔθνη, although this term can also refer to the faithful people of God and the present Jerusalem in its situation of impiety.[81] It is necessary to note that das Neves is not saying that the terms above in all their occurrences in LXX Isaiah always refer to either the faithful or the unfaithful group. Instead, he noted that these terms seem to be associated with one or the other group at several places in LXX Isaiah.

In his analysis of LXX Isa 24, das Neves arrived at the following important conclusions: First, he noted that there are substantial differences between MT and LXX. He argued that it is not possible to explain these differences as errors of a mechanical nature only, such as confusion of consonants, omissions, dittography, and so on. Rather, such differences betray the "personality of the translator." Das Neves also noted that the Greek text, when studied by itself, presents its own well-defined thought. This "well-defined thought" can only be extracted by paying careful attention to the smallest particularities of the text. The differences between MT and LXX originate in the translator's religious views rather than in a faulty understanding of the Hebrew text.[82] LXX Isaiah is, thus, a theological interpretation of the Hebrew, made necessary by the historical and religious actualizations of its historical background.[83]

Another important article that highlighted aspects of the social and political environment of LXX Isaiah was Frederic Raurell's "'Archontes' en la interpretació midráshica d'Is-LXX."[84] He called attention to the social background of Palestinian Jews in the second century BCE who lived under the oppressive control of Antiochus IV Epiphanes. He interpreted ἄρχοντες (Isa 3:4, 14; 14:5) as designating leaders of the Jewish community in Jerusalem favoring Antiochus IV's policy of hellenization. Specifically, the ἄρχοντες were economic oppressors of the poor (πτωχός) by means of harsh taxation (cf. ἀπαιτῶν in Isa 3:12; 14:4).[85] Behind this harsh tax policy were Antiochus IV's war indem-

---

80. For a more in-depth discussion of ἄρχοντες in LXX Isaiah, see Frederic Raurell, "'Archontes' en la Interpretació Midràshica d'Is-LXX" *RCT* 1 (1976), 315–74.

81. Das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 274–75.

82. Ibid., 265. On p. 43, das Neves claims that the differences between the Hebrew and the Greek can be found in the "mentalidade teológica do nosso tradutor." The reason is that LXX Isaiah is more an interpretation than a translation.

83. Ibid., 278. For a critical review of das Neves, see Frederic Raurell, "La teologia de Js-LXX en un studio reciente," *EstFr* 76 (1975): 409–21.

84. Raurell, "Archontes," 315–74.

85. For the theme of economic exploitation in LXX Isaiah, see Ronald L. Troxel, "Economic Plunder as a Leitmotif in LXX-Isaiah," *Bib* 83 (2002): 375–91; idem, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation: The Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah*

nities due to the Romans.[86] Thus, the translator's employment of the term
ἄρχοντες reflected his oppressive socio-political condition under Antiochus
IV's control of Jerusalem.

In 1979, John W. Olley made an important contribution to LXX Isaiah
studies. The purpose of his monograph was to study how the translator under-
stood passages in which the root צדק occurs as well as the "intended meaning
of δικαιοσύνη and related words."[87] With such a study, Olley tried to discuss
the question of the extent to which the translator's use of δικαιοσύνη and its
cognates can be characterized as Jewish Greek.[88] Specifically, he sought to
investigate why the translator "used certain words and what meaning he saw
in those words in their context."[89] He assumed that "[T]he translators believed
that the words and structures they used were at least reasonably capable of
conveying the meaning they saw in the original, allowing for individual theo-
logical views and linguistic abilities. This does not mean that they necessarily
agreed with the meaning they saw."[90]

Olley called for a contextual study of δικαιοσύνη and cognates in their
LXX literary contexts. He warned "one cannot assume that, because a particu-
lar Hebrew word is 'usually' rendered by a particular Greek word, therefore
there is considerable semantic overlap." Further, he claimed that "unusual"
renderings must be analyzed in their literary context, under the assumption
"that the translator intended his reading to make sense."[91]

(SJSJ 124; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 201–9. In his article "Economic Plunder," Troxel identified
the harsh taxation under the Seleucids as the background of the motif of "economic plun-
der" in LXX Isaiah: "This leitmotif accords with the broad consensus that LXX-Isa was
translated in the second quarter of the second century BCE, when Seleucid domination
of Jerusalem and Judea was being thrown off. The level of taxes under the Hellenists had
become repressive, making relief from Seleucid taxation a significant consequence of the
revolt. That seems a likely explanation for the translator's preoccupation with economic
plunder as the supreme crime of the people's rulers, with removal of such oppression con-
stituting a signal feature of divine deliverance" (390).

86. Raurell, "Archontes," 365: "Les elevades indemnitzacions de guerra que els selèu-
cides havien de pagar als romans les hagueren de pagar els pobres súbdits jueus. Per
aquestes mateixes raons econòmiques els selèucides intentaren apoderar-se dels tresors
del temple. Aquest intent sembla que fracassà al principi; tanmateix, el 175, Antíoc IV
Epifanés va deposar el sumo sacerdote legítim i vengué dues vegades el càrrec als dos
millor licitadors."

87. John W. Olley, 'Righteousness' in the Septuagint of Isaiah: A Contextual Study
(SBLSCS 8; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1979), 1.

88. Ibid.

89. Ibid., 11.

90. Ibid., 5.

91. Ibid., 125.

Olley concluded that "while the fact that he [the translator] uses δικαιο-words is due to צדק in MT, this is not simply a case of 'automatic response translation' since no instance has been found where this leads to a meaning unrecognizable on the basis of secular Greek usage."[92] Even though Olley conceded that some "meanings do however undergo slight semantic expansion due to their usage within a Jewish theological framework,"[93] they do not constitute "'Jewish Greek' but rather Greek words with some new associations added due to the Jewish context."[94]

Finally, Olley uncovered a "consistent picture of some aspects of the translator's theology and technique" in the latter's "linguistic preferences."[95] He pointed out that the translator, while following the precedent in the Pentateuch in his use of ἀσεβής for רשע, also employs "ἀσεβής for other roots when reference is to Israel's enemies" and as a description of its oppressors.[96] On the other hand, the translator usually reserves ἀνομ- words as a reference to Israel and "more generally to wrongdoing and wrongdoers."[97] Lastly, ἀδικ- words are employed to describe actions of oppression either by "Israel's leaders" or by others "who have attacked and oppressed Israel (cf. Isa 10:20; 21:3; 23:12; 25:3f; 51:23; 65:25)."[98]

Olley summarized the translator's theology as follows: first, because "acts of oppression by rulers and judges and attacks on other nations are, as in secular Greek understanding, 'unjust,'" the translator employs ἀδικ- words; ἀσεβ- words would not be appropriate in those contexts. Second, given the oppressors' nature as "wrongdoers" and "their failure to serve the Lord," the translator employs ἀσεβ- words, as they are most appropriate for those contexts. And, third, the translator reserves ἀνομ- words to refer to "Israel's disobedience of the law of God."[99] Detecting the translator's theology in his careful contextual study of the translator's linguistic preferences, Olley proposed the translator's theology as the reason for some of his lexical choices.

In 1981, Arie van der Kooij engaged in an important discussion of the proper methodological use of the ancient versions (LXX, θ', α', σ', Targ., Pesh., and Vulg.) and of 1QIsa[a] and 1QIsa[b] for the textual criticism of MT Isaiah. He argued that a study of the textual witnesses in their own milieu must precede

---

92. Ibid.
93. Ibid., 125–26.
94. Ibid., 126.
95. Ibid., 122.
96. Ibid.
97. Ibid.
98. Ibid.
99. Ibid., 123.

any text-critical work.[100] In his analysis of LXX Isaiah, van der Kooij focused on passages where fulfillment-interpretation played an important role, intending to provide a better understanding of the character of LXX Isaiah, its translator, and his background.[101] Much like his predecessors, he paid attention to the translator's theology and his historical background while speaking of the "character of LXX Isaiah."

Van der Kooij identified several cases of fulfillment-interpretation. He argued that the translator often interpreted references to the "king" of Assyria or Babylon as a cipher for the Seleucid kings Antiochus III/IV (e.g., Isa 8:7; 10:9, 10; 14:19–20, 22–27).[102] He further identified two steps in the translator's reworking of Isa 22:5–11. For him, the differences between MT and LXX Isa 22:5–11 reflect events occurring in Jerusalem around 167 BCE. At the same time, some of the divergences in that same passage were due to the translator's allusions to reparations that had been previously carried out under the high priest Simon (ca. 200 BCE).[103] Likewise, LXX Isa 8:8's departures find their cause in the translator, who interpreted it as a reference to Antiochus IV's deposition of Onias III as the high priest in Jerusalem.[104] The phrase πόλις ασεδεκ for עיר ההרס (Isa 19:18) was used to legitimize the temple in Leontopolis, making useless any assertions that עיר הצדק or קיר הסרח were in the translator's *Vorlage*.[105] Finally, van der Kooij also identified a negative

---

100. Van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 1: "Dabei kann es aber schon aus Raumgründen nicht die Absicht sein, die Textzeugen des Jesajabusches umfassend zu behandeln. Es soll vielmehr versucht werden diejenige Aspekte zu beleuchten, die für die textkritische Auswertung der Textzeugen wichtig sein, wie: Gründe und Ursachen textlicher Unterschiede zwischen den Textzeugen und dem masoretischen Text (MT), den Ort der Textzeugen innerhalb der Textgeschichte und das Milieu, in dem sie entstanden sein."

101. Ibid., 34.

102. Ibid., 34–43.

103. Ibid., 49: "die Unterschiede zwischen MT (= meistens Qᵃ) und LXX Jes 22,5–11 finden ihre beste Erklärung durch die Annahme, dass der Übersetzer in diesen Versen auf Ereignisse in Jerusalem im Jahr 167 v.Chr. und auf Wiederherstellungsarbeiten zur Zeit des Hohenpriesters Simon anspielt."

104. Ibid., 52. Van der Kooij has changed his view that LXX Isa 8:8 referred to the time of the translator, asserting that it instead refers to the time of Isaiah, cf. Arie van der Kooij, "LXX-Isaiah 8:9 and the Issue of Fulfillment-Interpretation," *Adamantius* 13 (2007), 23; idem, "The Septuagint of Isaiah and the Mode of Reading Prophecies in Early Judaism" in *Septuaginta—Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten: Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 20.–23. Julie 2006* (ed. Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus; WUNT 1/219; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 602.

105. Van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 55. See also idem, "The Old Greek of Isaiah 19:16–25: Translation and Interpretation" in *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognates Studies: Jerusalem 1986* (ed. Claude E. Cox; SBLSCS 23; Atlanta: Scholars

reference to Menelaus and a positive one to Alcimus in LXX Isa 22:16–18, 20–25 respectively.[106]

Van der Kooij's work contributed greatly to a discussion of the translator's identity. For him, the translator must be seen as a member of the Oniad priesthood circle in Jerusalem, as a scribe, and as a priest. He argued that the translator advocated for the legitimacy of the Leontopolis temple with his rendering πόλις ἀσεδεκ in LXX Isa 19:18. The translator's divergent rendering τοῦ ἰδεῖν ὁδὸν Αἰγύπτου/בדרך מצרים in Isa 10:24 indicates he approved of Onias IV's escape to Egypt by occasion of Antiochus IV's oppression of Jerusalem in 167 BCE. This piece of evidence led van der Kooij to view Onias IV as the author of LXX Isaiah.[107] Whereas LXX Isaiah's provenance is in Leontopolis, the translator's is Jerusalem. The Jerusalem origin of the translator implied he was acquainted with traditions and events from there.[108]

Van der Kooij also viewed the translator as a scribe based on his translation method ("*Art und Weise*").[109] The translator's borrowing from the Torah and the Prophets shows that he was very familiar with those books. Likewise, intraharmonization of passages from Hebrew Isaiah points to the translator's solid knowledge of that book.[110] Van der Kooij also found evidence that the translator viewed himself as a scribe in his unique use of γραμματικός for ספר in LXX Isa 33:18. He argued that the translator compared himself to the

---

Press, 1987), 136–37. Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, 68, had advanced that the translator's *Vorlage* attested to עיר הצדק. Vaccari ("ΠΟΛΙΣ ΑΣΕΔΕΚ," 356; "Parole Rovesciate," 560, 562–64) had argued that הסרח was in the translator's *Vorlage*. The translator then read הסרח as הסדח by changing the ר into a ד. He then transcribed הסדח as ἀσεδεκ. Vaccari supported his proposal with several examples of א for ח. Recently Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 170–71 resorted to Vaccari's explanation to argue against van der Kooij's proposal that the translator used πόλις ἀσεδεκ to legitimize the Leontopolis temple. Against Vaccari, however, it must be noted that there is no textual evidence that the translator's *Vorlage* read הסרח, cf. 1QIsa^a/4QIsa^b: עיר החרס; α' θ' αρες.

106. van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 59, 60.

107. Ibid., 331.

108. Ibid., 60–61.

109. Ibid., 62: "Die Art und Weise, mit der der Übersetzer mit dem Text des Jesajabuches umgeht, macht deutlich, dass er ein *Schriftgelehrter* war" (emphasis original). For van der Kooij's more detailed discussion of the translator as a scribe, cf. his *The Oracle of Tyre: The Septuagint of Isaiah 23 as Version and Vision* (VTSup 71; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 112–23; idem, "Perspectives on the Study of the Septuagint: Who are the Translators?" in *Perspectives in the Study of the Old Testament and Early Judaism: A Symposium in Honour of Adam S. van der Woude on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday* (ed. Edward Noort, Florentino García Martínez, and Adam Simon van der Woude; VTSup 73; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 219–24.

110. See van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 62–63.

Alexandrian γραμματικοί, who were occupied with philological and etymological matters, as well as with the reading and interpretation of literary texts. Like them, the translator was equally engaged in the reading and interpretation of Hebrew Isaiah.[111]

Finally, van der Kooij also considered the translator to be a priest. He found evidence for his view in the advocacy for the Oniad Leontopolis temple in LXX Isa 19:18 and the addition of ἱερεῖς in Isa 40:2.[112] As a priest, the translator read Isaiah from the perspective of fulfillment-interpretation and found in the second century BCE the fulfillment of Isaianic announcements.[113] The translator's reading mode was based on his belief that the last days (τὰ ἐπερχόμενα/τὰ ἔσχατα in LXX Isa 41:22; 44:7; 45:11; 46:10) of Isaiah had started. In this sense, the translator of Isaiah may be compared to the authors of Daniel and certain Qumran documents. Although LXX Isaiah was produced in Egypt, the link between Leontopolis and Qumran is found in the Jerusalemite background of the translator.[114] The translator's bent to fulfillment-interpretation was also based on his assessment of Isaiah as a vision (cf. חזון/ὅρασις in Isa 1:1 and משא/ὅραμα in Isa 22:1).[115]

Picking up on the research developed by Zillessen and Ziegler, which showed that the translator borrowed phraseology from elsewhere in Isaiah or outside it, Jean Koenig devoted a full-fledged discussion of borrowings in LXX Isaiah. He rejected Ottley's claim that the translator introduced the wording of a particular passage into another unconsciously, accidentally, and uninten-

---

111. Ibid., 63. It is interesting to note that van der Kooij does not make much of γραμματικός in LXX Isa 33:18 in his later publications, cf. his passing notes in *Oracle*, 115; "Perspectives on the Study of the Septuagint," 221. Accepting van der Kooij's view of the translator as a γραμματικός, Troxel (*LXX-Isaiah*, *passim*) advanced that LXX Isaiah should be studied in light of the work of the γραμματικοί in Alexandria. In short, he proposed the translator, like the γραμματικοί, was only concerned with linguistic and contextual interpretation. Only very rarely was the translator involved in fulfillment-interpretation. Although Troxel denied van der Kooij's opinion that the translator's use of γραμματικός is self-referential, he proceeded to construct a view of the translator that by and large resembles van der Kooij's scribal model, cf. David A. Baer, review of Ronald L. Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation: The Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah*, *VT* 60 (2010): 302.

112. Van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 64–65.

113. Ibid., 95–96, 330–31.

114. Ibid., 64. In his *LXX-Isaiah*, 20, Troxel criticized van der Kooij for comparing LXX Isaiah with the *pesharim* on the basis that the former was produced in Egypt and the latter in Palestine. However, Troxel did not discuss van der Kooij's view of the translator's Palestinian origin, which would allow for a fruitful comparison of LXX Isaiah with documents from Qumran.

115. Van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 64.

tionally.[116] Rather, for him, the translator consciously borrowed phraseology from elsewhere due to an ideological or historical reason.[117]

For instance, Koenig argued that the plus καὶ οἰκοδομήσωμεν ἑαυτοῖς πύργον in Isa 9:9 reflects the historical milieu of the Samaritan schism in the translator's time. He argued the plus originated with a borrowing from Gen 11:3–4. This borrowing reflects the translator's systematic analogical reading of his Scriptures, prompted by the occurrence of נבנה and לבנים in Gen 11:3, 4 and Isa 9:9.[118] Koenig further argued that the original circumstances of the Isaianic prophecy in Isa 9:11 were lost to the eyes of the translator. He pointed out that "depuis le VIIIe siècle, les oracles d'Is, comme ceux des autres prophètes, avaient acquis une omnivalence temporelle qui permettait d'en tirer des enseignements applicables à des époques autres que celle de leur origine."[119] Consequently, the mention of Samaria in the Hebrew Isaiah evoked in the translator's mind, as a Jew, the Samaritan schism.[120]

Koenig also discussed what he termed the "religious conditions" that favored the use of "analogical hermeneutics." Although Hellenistic influence on the production of the LXX is undeniable,[121] Koenig pointed out that the weight of the religious tradition of Judaism and its mode of thinking is also paramount. He noted that the sacralization of the prophetic writings consisted in their use of earlier prophetic oracles that would be applicable to contemporary and even future events. For him, the same process took place in the sacralization of the LXX, a sacralization that would have profited greatly from an "analogical hermeneutic" method of reading the Scripture.[122]

Like the prophetic writings' application of earlier prophecies to a later period, Koenig observed that LXX Isaiah applied the Hebrew to its contemporary history. The translator used "Carthage" for "Tarsis" in Isa 23:1, 10; saw the "Assyrians" in the Hebrew as a cipher for the "Syrians" in the Seleucid period; interpreted the Philistines as a reference to Palestinian coastal Greek cities in the translator's time, and so on. He noted that all these typological changes attest to an actualizing. He even compared LXX Isaiah's reading-

---

116. Koenig, *L'herméneutique*, 6–8.

117. Ibid., 102: "L'herméneutique ouvre la voie de la solution historique. Elle avertit que la transformation méthodique du texte, étant donné les teneurs, doit nécessairement être en rapport avec un motif idéologique d'envergure."

118. Ibid., 90.

119. Ibid., 101.

120. Ibid.: "Du temps de G ce que la mention de Samarie évoquait nécessairement dans l'esprit d'un juif, qu'il fût palestinien ou membre de la diaspora, c'était *le schisme samaritain*" (emphasis original).

121. Ibid., 33, 49.

122. Ibid., 33–35.

mode with the *pesharim*, claiming that "l'adaptation grecque d'Is est l'une des manifestations qui illustrent un grand courant de spéculation oraculaire sur les Écrits traditionnels d'Israël. Le livre de Daniel et divers écrits de Qumrân, en premier lieu le Habaquq, en sont d'autres témoins."[123] Thus, for Koenig, the translator's theology or historical milieu can be detected in his recourse to Scriptural borrowings.

In 1998, van der Kooij produced a monograph on LXX Isa 23 discussing its coherence as a text in its own right. He approached LXX Isa 23 as a text in two levels: first, in comparison with MT and then in its own right. As a text in its own right, van der Kooij probed whether LXX Isa 23 presents a coherent message or whether "significant renderings and passages in the LXX text make sense in relation to each other."[124] Furthermore, he also focused on whether LXX Isa 23 "not only constitutes, as a translation, a transformation from the linguistic point of view, but also a transformation in the sense of reinterpretation of the temporal application of an ancient prophecy." The question for him was the translator's hermeneutics: "did the translator aim at producing a version of an ancient prophecy which would make sense as an oracle at his time?"[125] His conclusion was:

> The Greek text in its own right turns out to be a coherent text to a large extent, syntactically, stylistically and semantically. Significant renderings and passages appear to be related to each other. It points to a translator who aimed at producing a meaningful text. The main difference between MT and LXX, on the level of contents, has to do with the presence and contextual function of "Carthage" in the Greek text. In contrast to MT which is about a destruction of Tyre, LXX refers to a destruction of Carthage with its serious consequences for Tyre.[126]

Following his investigation of LXX Isa 23 as a text in its own right, van der Kooij addressed the question as to why this text differs from its Hebrew counterpart as far as its content is concerned. For him, the answer is in the translator's reading mode. In short, the translator read Isa 23 from the perspective of fulfillment-interpretation, interpreting "the 'signs' of his time on the basis of ancestral, prophetical books, in our case the book of Isaiah, in order to help

---

123. Ibid., 45.

124. Van der Kooij, *Oracle,* 75. Van der Kooij had already raised the issue of coherence in his earlier publications; cf. idem, "Die Septuaginta Jesajas als Dokument Jüdischer Exegese—Einige Notizen zu LXX–Jes. 7," in *Übersetzung und Deutung* (Nijkerk: Callenbach: 1977), 93, 99; idem, *Textzeugen*, 33–34.

125. Van der Kooij, *Oracle*, 18.

126. Ibid, 87.

his people survive in hard times and to give them, at least the pious ones, hope for the future."[127] Van der Kooij further pointed to the historical-political events that form the background for LXX Isa 23:

- the destruction of Carthage, which the Romans brought about in 146 BCE;
- the Parthian invasion of Babylonia, which was "presumably understood as a sign of the nearby breakdown of the Seleucid empire;"
- Tyre's involvement, "in some way or another, in the Hellenization of the city and temple of Jerusalem."[128]

Finally, van der Kooij further located LXX Isaiah's reading mode in the context of other Jewish and non-Jewish writings of the second century BCE. In general lines, he highlighted two main aspects involved in the reading of prophecies in that period. First, prophecy was seen as a prediction that had not yet been fulfilled; and, second, the interpretation of prophecies was restricted "to persons of the highest scholarly level of the time." As he put it:

In short, in the Hellenistic period the mode of reading prophecies as predictions about the recent past, the present and the near future of the reader/interpreter was the prevailing one. The corresponding interpretation of prophecies was a matter of wisdom and scholarship of a specific nature, an ability which was thought to be the privilege of wise men of the highest level within the society of the time.[129]

Another important study appeared in 1999, which focused on an exegetical and theological study of Isaiah's so-called "servant songs." Central for our purposes was Eugene R. Ekblad Jr.'s evaluations of the causes of the divergences between MT and LXX of Isa 42:1–8; 49:1–9a; 50:4–11; 52:13–53:12.

---

127. Ibid., 109. See also idem, "Zur Theologie des Jesajabuches in der Septuaginta," in *Theologische Probleme der Septuaginta und der hellenistischen Hermeneutik* (ed. Henning Graf Reventlow; VWGTh 11; Gütersloh: Kaiser/Gütersloher, 1997), 16.

128. Van der Kooij, *Oracle*, 109.

129. Ibid., 93. See also his "Theologie," 15: "Es liegen mehrere Texte vor, die darauf hinweisen, daß schriftgelehrte Juden zur Entstehungszeit der LXX die Prophezeiungen Jesajas als Vorhersagen lasen und deuteten, genauso wie es später der Fall ist im Neue Testament, Targum Jonatan zu den Propheten und in der frühchristlichen Exegese. … Ferner spiegeln Stellen wie Sirach 36,14f. und Tobit 14,5 nicht nur ein lebendiges Interesse an den prophetischen Weissagungen und Erwartungen wider, sonder machen zugleich klar, daß man die Prophezeiungen auf die (nahe) Zukunft bezogen verstand."

He claimed that most of the divergences signal "a coherent theology and consistent exegetical method."[130] He urged caution in using LXX Isaiah's variant readings to reconstruct the translator's *Vorlage*. Rather, he called for an evaluation of those divergences in the light of the whole book of Isaiah "because the LXX's word choice is determined by contextual and intertextual exegesis." More importantly, Ekblad concluded that

> the selection of a given word in the LXX is often determined by its semantic rapport … with other words in other texts which the translator saw as linked for the purpose of clarifying meaning. Scripture is used to interpret and clarify Scripture.[131]

As recently as 2008, Ronald L. Troxel published his *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation: the Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah*, a monograph that in his opinion "lays the foundation for a new view of the translator's work."[132] The purpose was to challenge what the author describes as a consensus that has lasted for the past fifty years:

> The sketch of the translator of Isaiah promoted by many scholars over the past fifty years (that he deliberately infused his translation with the beliefs and issues of his day) is … based on undisciplined associations between unique phraseology in the book and significant events known from the second century BCE.[133]

To reevaluate this *status quo*, Troxel argued that it is necessary to take other aspects into consideration:

> In order to reevaluate this portrayal, however, we must consider how translation was conceived in the Hellenistic era, how ancient scholars (especially those in the Alexandrian Museum) studied and used revered texts, and how to determine if a distinctive Greek locution is based on a reading in the translator's *Vorlage* at variance with the one in MT, or even whether we have sufficient evidence to draw a conclusion in every case.[134]

---

130. Eugene R. Ekblad Jr., *Isaiah's Servant Poems according to the Septuagint: An Exegetical and Theological Study* (CBET 23; Leuven: Peeters, 1999), 268.

131. Ibid.

132. Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, ix.

133. Ibid.

134. Ibid.

The first chapter, "The Translator of Isaiah," discussed the translator's identity. This question relates to how the translator approached his work.[135] Troxel justified this quest with Ziegler's observation that LXX Isaiah, in contrast to other LXX books, brings with it the particular imprint of the translator. In other words, the personality of the translator has to be taken into account in evaluations of the relation between LXX Isaiah and MT Isaiah. Because the translator often infuses "Isaiah's oracles with meaning that cannot always be justified linguistically from his source text," the question of his identity becomes important. It implies that "it is not enough to call him a translator, because he seems to have gone beyond simply offering a translation."[136]

Troxel advanced that the translator must be seen against the model of the γραμματικοί in Alexandria. He rejected van der Kooij's comparison of LXX Isaiah's translator with scribes "that produced the *pesharim,*" claiming that "this association with a type of literature found only in *eretz Israel* raises the question in what the [sic] sense the translator was an Alexandrian."[137] He proposed instead to view the translator as an "Alexandrian." He found support for this view in the translator's use of γραμματικοί for ספר in LXX Isa 33:18, the only place where γραμματικός renders ספר in the LXX. After a brief description of the history of the term γραμματικοί in the Hellenistic period and how the latter were expelled from Egypt under Euergetes II after 145 BCE, Troxel argued LXX Isa 33:18 echoes the translator's contemporaneous history:

> In this light, while the translation of ספר by γραμματικοί in Isa 33:18 may simply be a register of the translator's esteem for the grammarians, it seems more likely that his rendering of those verses expressed his dismay at the absence of γραμματικοί as pillars of Alexandrian society after 145 BCE. It is difficult to identify a more likely explanation for why, in this passage alone, he elected the use of γραμματικοί. In fact, the translation of שקל by οἱ συμβουλεύοντες might be equally explicable as reflecting the wholesale dispatching of many who had remained loyal to Philometer's widow.[138]

Troxel viewed two aspects of the Isaiah translator that likened him to the γραμματικοί in Alexandria. The first is the translator's linguistic interpretation (chapter 4), especially his use of etymological exegesis.[139] The second is the translator's recourse to "contextual interpretation" (chapter 5). "Contextual

---

135. Ibid., 1.
136. Ibid., 2.
137. Ibid., 20. See also p. 162.
138. Ibid., 24.
139. Ibid., 107, 132.

interpretation" involves an intertextual interpretation of Isaiah based not only on the immediate or larger context of a given passage but also on the context of the translator's social-political milieu.[140]

Despite the recognition that the translator interpreted Isaiah in light of his "socio-political milieu," Troxel turned to a criticism of "contemporization." The basis for his criticism of "contemporization" was his view of the translator as an Alexandrian as opposed to considering him "*ein Schriftgelehrter*" as van der Kooij had previously advanced. Although Troxel did not make the dichotomy above clear, it becomes apparent in his discussions of "fulfillment-interpretation" in chapters 6–7. According to Troxel, the main difference between his point of view and van der Kooij's is that, for van der Kooij, the translator "considered himself inspired to interpret the ancient oracles as presaging events in his own day."[141] For Troxel, however, the translator should be taken as someone engaged only in linguistic and contextual interpretation.

The basic problem in how to detect aspects of "contemporization" in LXX Isaiah is that "the issue is defining what sorts of textual markers are sufficient to conclude that the translator deliberately alluded to events in his world as the 'true' referent of the prophet's oracle."[142] A comparison with the *pesharim* proves inadequate:

> The problem of comparing the supposed *Erfüllungsinterpretation* of the translator with the *pesharim* is that the latter are explicit in their alignment of the text with contemporaneous events, whereas we have to extrapolate from oblique statements in a translation to what the translator might have had in view, which raises the thorny issue of intention. When we are dealing with a work whose substance is derived from its Hebrew exemplar, how can we ascertain what mental process created what we perceive as a historical allusion?[143]

Troxel characterized his approach as "minimalist." Historical references in the translation can only be postulated if a divergence was not based in the immediate or broader literary contexts. As he put it:

> Embracing this principle requires a minimalist approach: only if the translator can be shown to refer deliberately to people, countries, ethnic groups, circumstances, or events by deviating from his *Vorlage* is it legitimate to entertain the possibility that he sought to identify such entities as the "true"

---

140. Ibid., 134.
141. Ibid., 19. See also p. 3.
142. Ibid., 162.
143. Ibid.

referents of his Hebrew exemplar. More stringently, it must be shown that the translator did not arrive at a rendering by reasoning from the immediate or broader literary contexts, but that he fashioned it with an eye to circumstances or events in his day.[144]

It is important to register here scholars' responses to Troxel's claims. The most detailed replies came from Albert Pietersma and van der Kooij. In his "A Panel Presentation on Ronald Troxel's *LXX-Isaiah*," Pietersma addressed, among other things, Troxel's interpretation of his crucial LXX Isa 33:18. Pietersma considered Troxel's reading of that passage "a good example of what I deem to be undisciplined interpretation of a translated text."[145] His main criticisms were threefold. First, he argued that Troxel completely ignored the context of Isa 33:18. He did not address the relation between verses 18–19 with 17 and 20: "how does the negativity of vv. 18–19 relate to the positive attitude expressed in vv. 17 and 20?"[146] Pietersma further argued, quoting Troxel's own words, that

it is difficult to see 'how the translator went about forming it [the passage] into a literary unity—unless one take Isa 33:18 in complete isolation from its immediate context. And, for some reason, that is precisely what Troxel does, while at the same time making the entire book of LXX-Isaiah its new context.[147]

Second, he further pointed out that Troxel based his interpretation of LXX Isa 33:18 on "*circumstantial* evidence."[148] By "*circumstantial* evidence," he meant Troxel's reading his view of οἱ γραμματικοί as the literati at the Alexandrian museum into the text. For Pietersma, the evidence of the γραμματικοί in the Alexandrian museum is irrelevant because translation was not among the "various genres of Greek literature" studied at the Museum. As Troxel accepted that LXX Isaiah is a translation, his use of the evidence from the Alexandrian museum is unsuitable for LXX Isaiah's study.[149]

And, third, Pietersma accused Troxel's treatment of LXX Isa 33:18 of being "contradictory" and, echoing Troxel's words, "undisciplined." In arguing that οἱ γραμματικοί reflects events around 145 BCE when the literati of the Museum were expelled from Alexandria, Troxel used contemporization, an

---

144. Ibid., 164. See also pp. 166–67.
145. Albert Pietersma, "A Panel Presentation on Ronald Troxel's *LXX-Isaiah*," 2; online: http://homes.chass.utoronto.ca/~pietersm/Troxel'sLXX-Isaiah(2008).pdf.
146. Ibid., 17.
147. Ibid., 17–18.
148. Ibid., 13 (emphasis original).
149. Ibid., 8.

aspect he had heavily criticized in his book. Consequently, Pietersma opined, "What seems contradictory is that, on the one hand, Troxel questions 'contemporization' in LXX-Isaiah, while, on the other hand, he introduces it in grand style. To me this is not disciplined or principled interpretation of a translated text."[150]

Van der Kooij's reception of Troxel's book was cordially mixed as it accepted some aspects while rejecting others. He saw Troxel's call for seeing the translator as a γραμματικός as positive insofar as it takes "the wider cultural context" of LXX Isaiah into account.[151] He additionally pointed out that LXX Isaiah and the γραμματικοί practiced what is termed "etymological exegesis," a similarity that Troxel missed. In a footnote, van der Kooij rejected Troxel's interpretation of Isa 33:18 "as reflecting the dismay of the translator" in view of the absence of the γραμματικοί after 145 BCE as "unlikely in view of the immediate context of LXX Isa 33."[152] Van der Kooij further noted that "contextual interpretation," which is one of the aspects Troxel advanced as new in LXX Isaiah studies, is actually "not that new;" other scholars, such as Ziegler, had already discussed it.[153]

In general terms, van der Kooij criticized Troxel's approach as not detailed enough. In Troxel's discussion of the phrases "the country above Babylon" and "where the tower was built" (LXX Isa 10:9), van der Kooij felt the need for a more detailed explanation. He deemed inadequate Troxel's view that the "country above Babylon" was a sufficient translation of "as Karchemish" in MT. Although Troxel rightly detected a link with Gen 11 in the phrase "where the tower was built," van der Kooij similarly wanted a discussion of the reason for the translator's use of that phrase in LXX Isa 10:9 in relation to Chalanne, and not Babel as in Gen 11. Troxel's insufficient treatment of LXX Isa 10:9 led van der Kooij to conclude that "the text as it stands should be analyzed in more detail" and that "since the motif of 'tower building' is found in a number of texts of the time … it would be more interesting to study the text in a wider perspective."[154] Van der Kooij applied the same criticism to

---

150. Ibid., 18. See also Joachim L. W. Schaper, review of Ronald L. Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation: the Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah*, *JSOT* 33 (2009), 58. Like Pietersma, Schaper also deemed Troxel's "associations" as no more "disciplined" "than, say, those of Isac L. Seeligmann."

151. Arie van der Kooij, review of Ronald L. Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation: The Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah*, *BIOSCS* 42 (2009), 148, 152.

152. Ibid., 148n1.

153. Ibid., 148. In addition to Ziegler, the present historical review shows that Zillessen, Fischer, and Koenig had already gone over the issue of "contextual interpretation."

154. Ibid., 149.

Troxel's treatment of LXX Isa 10:8.[155] Troxel's test case study of LXX Isa 28 on the level of its literary structure was equally lacking in detail. For van der Kooij, it was "rather global."[156]

Van der Kooij also addressed Troxel's criticism of "fulfillment-interpretation." First, he pointed out that "fulfillment-interpretation" "is not a matter of particular vocabulary and toponyms,"[157] as Troxel insinuated in his full treatment of the phrase ἐν (ταῖς) ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις and toponyms in chapter 6 of his book.

Second, van der Kooij highlighted that the "crucial question" in dealing with "fulfillment-interpretation" is hermeneutical in nature, namely, how the "oracles" of Isaiah "were read and understood by the translator."[158] He deemed as "extremely unlikely" that Isaiah was read as referring to the time of the Assyrians and Babylonians, as our historical-critical method postulates. Instead, the "cultural context of LXX Isaiah" indicates that "ancient prophecies were envisaged as trustworthy predictions … and that scholars who were authorized to do so applied ancient prophecies, or visions, to their own time."[159] He faulted Troxel for not paying attention to this cultural context and noted that Troxel referred only to the *pesharim*.[160]

Finally, van der Kooij reminded Troxel that a simple discussion of "words or phrases, whether arrived on the basis of a given context or not, are too small a basis for the issue of actualization."[161] Instead, it is important to discuss, first, how the translator produced particular renderings; second, a given chapter must be analyzed from the point of view of its contents, paying attention to every aspect of transformation as well as thematic links with other passages

---

155. Ibid., 149–50.

156. Ibid., 150. Troxel seemed to be aware that his treatment of LXX Isa 28 was not as detailed as it should have been. Note his concluding statement (*LXX-Isaiah*, 286): "even *if a full treatment* of each verse in this unit might identify *additional* nuances" (emphasis added).

157. Van der Kooij, review of Ronald L. Troxel, 150.

158. Ibid.

159. Ibid., 151.

160. Ibid. As our review thus far has shown, Troxel failed to note that van der Kooij compared LXX Isaiah not only with the *pesharim*, as Troxel suggested in his book, but with Jewish and non-Jewish sources from inside and outside Palestine. See van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 60–65; idem, *Oracle*, 88–94, and, most recently, idem, "The Old Greek of Isaiah and Other Prophecies Published in Ptolemaic Egypt," in *Die Septuaginta—Texte, Theologien, Einflüsse. 2. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 23.–27.7.2008* (ed. Wolfgang Kraus and Martin Karrer; WUNT 1/252; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 72–84.

161. Ibid.

in LXX Isaiah. Third, the question of actualization can only be addressed after the first two aspects are taken into account.[162]

As it can be seen from the review thus far, a shift from the translator's *Vorlage* to the translator himself has occurred in the study of LXX Isaiah. Scholars disagree, however, on the most fitting way to approach it and how to explain its divergences from MT. This disagreement forms a good background for the discussion that follows.

1.2. Preliminary Questions

That the expression "every translation is an interpretation" is commonplace cannot be denied. James Barr, however, has pointed out "that in the context of ancient biblical translation, this remark is a highly misleading truism." He argued that the "process of translation" "may involve" two different types of interpretation, "so different as hardly to deserve to be called by the same name." Whereas the first type of interpretation is a "basic/semantic comprehension of the meaning of the text," the other "lies on a higher level" as "it begins only after these basic linguistic elements have been identified."[163] The present work uses the word "interpretation" in its "higher level" denotation.

In contradistinction to previous works,[164] the term "interpretation" deliberately precedes "translation" in the title of the present monograph; the present work's hypothesis is that interpretation on a "higher level" precedes the process of translation. The theory is that the translator of Isaiah was not only familiar with the contents of Isaiah but also had an understanding—on a higher level—of the book he was about to translate before he started his translation. Although it is true that interpretation on a higher level logically presupposes lower-level reading, it is not clear that the translator started the process of translation based only on his understanding on a basic level. The clue for my hypothesis comes from previous research on LXX Isaiah that has demonstrated a certain coherence of thought and themes found throughout the translation. For instance, in his influential work, Ziegler claimed that the translator of Isaiah "scheint überhaupt sein Buch sehr gut dem Inhalte nach

---

162. Ibid., 152.

163. James Barr, *The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations* (MSU 15; NAWG 11; Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht, 1979), 290–91.

164. See, for example, David A. Baer, *When We All Go Home: Translation and Theology in LXX Isaiah 56–66* (JSOTSup 318; The Hebrew Bible and Its Versions 1; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2001); Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*.

im Gedächtnis gehabt zu haben."[165] Interestingly, the basis for Ziegler's claim is his observation that many renditions in the translation are clarified in the light of similar concepts found in the translator's *Vorlage*.[166] Similarly, in his study of LXX Isa 25:1–5 in its own right, Coste argued that the translator had an interpretative strategy in mind before he started his translation.[167]

As such, the present work hypothesizes that the translator, after interpreting on a basic level, acquired an understanding of the passage(s) and book on a higher level before the translation process started. Consequently, interpretation on a higher level not only anteceded but also governed and shaped the process of translation. In order to try to verify the hypothesis above, this study will analyze LXX Isa 24:1–26:6 as a text in its own right or as a product. If it can be shown that the translation as a product has its own ideological coherence, it will become clear that its scribe-translator already had a higher-level interpretation that shaped the process of translation.

The view that the product of a translation shaped its process is not new to the fields of translation and LXX Isaiah studies. Gideon Toury argued for the interrelatedness of function, process, and product-oriented approaches. Whereas function concerns the position a translation occupies in the culture in which it is or will be embedded, process has to do with "the process through which a translated text is derived from its original." The text-linguistic makeup of the translation, the relationships which tie it to its source text, and its shifts from that source, constitute the concern of a product-oriented approach. Toury argued that all these three aspects "are not just 'related' … but … form one complex whole whose constitutive parts are hardly separable from one another for purposes other than methodical."[168]

Toury explained the relationship between function, product, and process-oriented approaches as follows: "the (prospective) systemic position & function of a translation determines its appropriate surface realization (= textual linguistic make-up)," which in turn "governs the strategies whereby a target text (or parts thereof) is derived from its original, and hence the relationships which hold them together."[169] For him, to understand "the intricacies of

---

165. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 135. See the discussion of this work on the history of research sketched above.

166. Ibid.: "denn es begegnen viele Wiedergaben, die sich nur auf Grund der Exegese nach sinnverwandten Stellen erklären lassen."

167. Coste, "Le texte grec," 51.

168. Gideon Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies—and Beyond* (BTL 4; Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1995), 11.

169. Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies*, 13. The quotation reproduces the concepts he presents in the format of a chart.

translational phenomena," it is of paramount importance to study the "inter-dependencies" between a function, process, and product-oriented approach.[170]

The function of a translation, prospective or not, in a given culture is a "governing factor in the very make-up of the product, in terms of underlying models, linguistic representations, or both." Even the retaining of certain features of the source text in the target text signals not to their inherent importance but the importance the producer of the target text assigned to them.[171] In turn, the prospective function of the translation together with its linguistic make-up (product) "inevitably also govern the strategies which are resorted to during the production of the text in question, and hence the translation process as such."[172] Toury's remarks are highly important for the field of LXX Isaiah studies. The claim that the function and the product of a translation "govern the strategies" which the translator employs in the process of his translation is a good reminder that a proper explanation for the process of LXX Isaiah translation presupposes a firm understanding of it as a product. Because the translation as a product is the only window to the translator's interpretation (on a higher level) of his *Vorlage*, it seems reasonable to ground explanations for how particular readings arose on the results of the analysis of the translation as a product.

Another aspect needing emphasis here is Toury's claim that the retaining of certain features from the source text in the target text does not signal their inherent importance but the importance the translator assigned to them. This claim has a paramount implication for the study of what is normally termed "literal" translations in LXX Isaiah. As was seen in the review of the history of research above, some scholars have argued that the translator's ideology can only be found in his "free renderings." This minimalist approach seems to presuppose that the translator decided to keep aspects of his source text because

---

170. Ibid., 11. See also Cameron Boyd-Taylor, review of Anneli Aejmelaeus, *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays*, BIOSCS 42 (2009): 126, who called for a more target-oriented approach to LXX studies, denying that its translators were "determined principally by linguistic facts."

171. Ibid., 12: "Consequently, translators may be said to operate first and foremost in the interest of the culture into which they are translating, however they conceive of that interest. In fact, the extent to which features of a source text are retained in its translation (or even regarded as even requiring retention, in the first place), which, at first sight, seems to suggest an operation in the interest of the source culture, or even of the source text as such, is also determined on the target side, and according to its own concerns: features are retained, and reconstructed in target-language material, not because they are 'important' in any *inherent* sense, but because they are *assigned* importance, from the recipient vantage point" (emphasis original).

172. Ibid., 13.

of their inherent importance. However, it is vital to note that the translator may have retained certain features of his *Vorlage* intact in his translation because of their importance to him, to his intentions, and to his interpretation, on a higher level, of his source text. As such, the claim that the translator's ideology or intentions can only be found in his deviations is highly problematic. As will be argued in the course of this work, both "literal" and "free" renderings taken together should be seen as expressive to the translator's higher-level interpretation of his *Vorlage*.

Some scholars in the field of LXX Isaiah studies have long applied similar concepts in their research. A prime example is Arie van der Kooij's study of LXX Isa 23. He first approached it as a text, which entailed two interrelated aspects: in comparison with MT (source text) and in its own right (target text). This approach is similar to Toury's product-oriented approach. After analyzing LXX Isa 23 in its own right, van der Kooij went on to discuss why LXX Isa 23 was produced the way it was (function), finishing with remarks on how the translator produced his translation (process).[173] Van der Kooij's logic was similar to Toury's: it is only possible to understand the process of a translation after a study of the translation as a product.

The present work stands firmly on that tradition. It will pursue two main questions. First, where should the translator's "higher level" interpretations be found? Should they be found only in his "free" renderings? Or should they be found in a combination of both "free" and "literal" translations?[174] Second, do the "literal" and "free" renderings of the sections that compose LXX Isa 24:1–26:6 cohere with each other?[175] In other words, is the final product of LXX Isa 24:1–26:6 to be seen as a meaningful coherent literary unit? Another ancillary question would be whether LXX Isa 24:1–26:6, possibly as a coherent text, could shed light on the translation process of those chapters. Although this question falls outside the scope of the present work, occasionally the issue of the translation process will be addressed.

---

173. Van der Kooij, *Oracle*, 48, 88, 110. For details on this work, see the discussion above.

174. For a discussion of the difficulty implied in the terms "literal" and "free" in relation to LXX studies, see Barr, *Typology*, 279–325 and the more recent contribution by Theo A. W. van der Louw, *Transformations in the Septuagint: Towards an Interaction of Septuagint Studies and Translation Studies* (CBET 47; Leuven: Peeters, 2007), passim. For a helpful definition of "free" and "literal" translations, see Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (2nd ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001), 125: "The more a translation unit uses fixed equivalents, the more it is considered literal, and the less that such equivalents are found in it, the freer it is considered."

175. For a discussion of the scope of LXX Isa 24:1–26:6, see discussion below.

What follows is a critique of approaches that limit themselves to the process of the translation without paying attention to the translation as a product. A common characteristic of approaches that start with the process of translation is their atomistic nature. As it will be seen below, with a few exceptions, they usually pay attention to words or phrases and hardly discuss the translation on broader levels, such as verses, paragraphs, chapters, and book. Their working assumption seems to be that translation immediately followed interpretation on its basic level.

1.3. Problematic Assumptions

1.3.1. Low-Level Interpretation to Translation Equals Emergency Solution

Interpretation as an emergency solution assumes the translator did not understand the meaning of his Hebrew *Vorlage*.[176] It is claimed that when faced with a difficult text, the translator panicked and "looked for an emergency exit."[177] It is equally claimed that most cases judged to be theological exegesis are actually examples of "emergency solutions" the translator employed due to his misunderstandings and guessing.[178]

A text cited as an illustration of the translator's perplexity in face of a difficult Hebrew text is Isa 9:5(Eng. 6)d: ויקרא שמו פלא יועץ אל גבור אביעד שׂר שלום/καὶ καλεῖται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ μεγάλης βουλῆς ἄγγελος ἐγὼ γὰρ ἄξω εἰρήνην ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄρχοντας εἰρήνην καὶ ὑγίειαν αὐτῷ. It has been claimed that the translator's interpretation of this passage "is built around a few items that have been analyzed in an incorrect way."[179] First, the Greek genitival construction μεγάλης βουλῆς "is impossible on the basis of the Hebrew" because "Hebrew cannot express a genitive preceding its main word;" second, ἄξω "is based on

---

176. In the field of LXX Isaiah studies, it is sometimes assumed that the translator's knowledge of Hebrew was weak under the impression that such an assumption is "generally agreed" among specialists on LXX Isaiah See, e.g., Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 83n57, 84n67. Troxel dismissed van der Kooij's argument that the translator was trained in reading the Hebrew aloud. With Seeligmann, he argued that the translator's knowledge of Hebrew was more "a product of theoretical study rather than of living experience" (Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, 49). Even if it were true that the translator's knowledge of Hebrew was more a product of theoretical study, it is hard to see how that would prevent him from learning how to read the Hebrew aloud.

177. Anneli Aejmelaeus, "Levels of Interpretation: Tracing the Trail of the Septuagint Translators," in *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays* (rev. and expanded ed.; CBET 50; Leuven: Peeters, 2007), 310.

178. Ibid., 309.

179. Ibid.

a false analysis of the Hebrew 'Father';" that is, the translator analyzed אבי as אביא "I will cause to come." Third, עד was read as a preposition and was translated with ἐπί; fourth, singular שר was "turned to plural 'rulers'" (ἄρχοντας). Fifth, ἄγγελος corresponds to אל גבור; and, finally, there is the threefold translation of שלום.[180] This brief analysis led Aejmelaeus to conclude that "the syntactic structure of the Greek text is based on mere guessing. The translator simply panicked and looked for an 'emergency exit.'"[181]

However, it is maintained that "the difficulty of the source and the ignorance of the translator give way to contemporary theological or ideological convictions." In this case, the ideology is the wish that the rulers of all nations will receive peace. The case of Isa 9:5 is not to be considered an interpretation but as a rewriting of the source text, a rewriting that still gives rise to the translator's ideology.[182]

The principle underlying the approach exemplified is that *if it looks like a mistake, then it must have been a mistake*. The belief is that explanations as mistakes are simpler and, therefore, should receive the priority. On the contrary, ideological reasons should not be seen as key. Note the following circular reasoning: "It is here as important as ever to adhere to the old rule that the simplest adequate explanation should be given precedence over more complicated ones. A deliberate change of the meaning out of an ideological motivation seems to me in many cases to be the more complicated explanation."[183]

The question is, of course, whether explanations from the point of view of "translation style" are in fact the simplest, given Aejmelaeus's recognition that all LXX translators "had a theological or religious motivation for their work."[184]

Aejmelaeus's explanations of Isa 9:5 as the result of guessing give an important opportunity to discuss approaches that focus solely on "translation style." Such an approach is highly limited. First, it is usually atomistic in that it pays attention to single words or phrases at the expense of the broader literary context. For instance, Aejmelaeus offers no comments on the translator's use of the conjunction γάρ and on the transition to divine speech that ἐγώ

---

180. Ibid.

181. Ibid., 309–10.

182. Ibid., 310. Similarly, Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, 96, also maintained that the translator betrayed his theology in mistaken interpretations due to his lack of understanding of the Hebrew.

183. Aejmelaeus, "Levels of Interpretation," 312.

184. Anneli Aejmelaeus, "What We Talk about when We Talk about Translation Technique," in *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators,* 218. See also Boyd-Taylor's critical remarks in a review of Anneli Aejmelaeus, 125.

signals.[185] No attention is devoted to the role words and phrases play in their own literary context.

Second, the approach paradoxically lacks in detailed analysis and it can be characterized as methodologically one-sided. By not discussing the function of ἐγὼ γὰρ ἄξω, Aejmelaeus's approach missed an important clue to understanding the translator's interpretation.[186] Aejmelaeus's approach, besides focusing solely on the translation process without paying attention to the translation as a product, takes for granted that the translation should be "literal." The definition of "literal" is highly problematic. Does "literal" equate to the modern exegete's interpretation of the Hebrew? Is it possible that the translator's divergent interpretations could also be seen as "literal"— at least from his perspective?

And, third, the approach can also be characterized as anachronistic. The question is how to determine whether the translator's reading of Isa 9:5 was the result of a mistake or not. Most importantly, if one wants to call it a mistake, then the question would be: mistake in whose eyes? Perhaps, it would be in the eyes of the modern exegete, who reads Isa 9:5 differently from the translator. But could one still say that the translator made a mistake? And how should one determine whether a particular reading is a mistake? The proposal of this work is that a reading can only be deemed a "mistake" if it can be determined that it does not fit in its own literary context in the Greek. If it can, then the likelihood is that it was not a mistake.

1.3.2. Higher-Level Interpretation Found Only in Free Translations

A common assumption among some specialists is that the translator's ideology is only found in his "free" renderings. Although Seeligmann had argued that the translator's religious notions can be found in literal and free renderings as "both represent fragments of the religious notions of the translator

---

185. For a recent and helpful discussion of these issues, see Ronald L. Troxel, "ΒΟΥΛΗ and ΒΟΥΛΕΥΕΙΝ in LXX Isaiah," in *The Old Greek of Isaiah*, 160; Abi T. Ngunga, *Messianism in the Old Greek of Isaiah: An Intertextual Analysis* (FRLANT 245; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013), 89–93.

186. For a more fruitful discussion of Isa 9:6, see Arie van der Kooij, "'Wie heißt der Messias?' Zu Jes 9,5 in den alten griechischen Versionen," in *Vergegenwärtigung des Alten Testaments: Beiträge zur biblischen Hermeneutik; Festschrift für Rudolf Smend zum 70. Geburtstag* (ed. Christoph Bultmann, Walter Dietrich, and Christoph Levin; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2002), 157–63; Robert Hanhart, *Studien zur Septuaginta und zum hellenistischen Judentum* (ed. Reinhard G. Kratz; FAT 24; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 95–133.

concerned,"[187] he decided to focus only on those places where the translation differed ideologically from its source text. He did not intend to write a history of the religious notions of the translator, which included a study of both literal and free renderings, but "to indicate the differences between those embodied in the translation and in the original."[188]

Recently, Troxel offered a different position from Seeligmann in claiming that the translator's ideology can only be found in "free" renderings. For him, because "what a *translator* offers is bound … to what his source text says," "as long as a translator renders his source text 'literally,' we have no way of perceiving his exegesis."[189] Differently, "exegetical" interpretations can only be found where the translator departed from his presumed *Vorlage* "to the degree it suggests the translator substituted a phrase or a clause for what lay in his *Vorlage*."[190] And, as it is reasonable to assume that the translator's insertions were dictated by his understanding of the context, his exegesis is found in his "contextual interpretations."[191]

In Troxel's monograph, one gets the impression that "literal" equals "linguistic interpretation," whereas "free" stands for "exegetical, contextual interpretation." However, a sharp distinction between "linguistic" and "exegetical" interpretations is unsustainable. For instance, Troxel discussed the translator's interpretation of passages "in the light of theologoumena" elsewhere in the book under the heading "linguistic interpretation in LXX-Isaiah."[192] This is, however, hardly a matter of "linguistic interpretation." For example, Troxel pointed to the translator's equalization of δόξα with salvation—as is clear from LXX Isa 40:5: ונגלה כבוד יהוה וראו כל־בשר יחדו/καὶ ὀφθήσεται ἡ δόξα κυρίου καὶ ὄψεται πᾶσα σὰρξ τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ.[193] The difficulty of

---

187. Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, 95: "This implies that, for such a cross-section, passages that were translated literally in a given book of the Septuagint, are of equal importance as free paraphrases: both represent fragments of the religious notions of the translator concerned." For a seemingly contradictory view, cf. p. 41: "If we look at the mentality behind these inconsistencies in this light, we shall, on the one hand, feel sceptical towards the probability of their being particularly ingenious and particularly purposeful efforts to discover logical connexions in any chapter or part of a chapter in our Septuagint-text, but, on the other hand, they also entitle us to try, on our part, *to discover, in isolated, free renderings, certain historical allusions or expressions of the translator's own views and ideas*" (emphasis added).

188. Ibid.

189. Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 133 (emphasis added).

190. Ibid., 134.

191. Ibid.

192. Ibid., 128–32.

193. Ibid., 130.

terming the translator's use of δόξα and salvation as part of "linguistic" inter-
pretation is clearly seen in Troxel's conclusion that "the translator's exploita-
tion of the themes of δόξα and salvation are good examples of 'theological
exegesis.' "[194] Even if it is true that those themes are "essential elements of
the book of the translator,"[195] the translator's decision to employ them in his
rendition of certain passages cannot be a matter of linguistics only. Rather,
the translator had to make a deliberate and intentional decision to introduce
those themes in a particular passage, in a move that goes far beyond simply
"linguistic" interpretation.

Another problem with the claim that the translator's exegesis can only
be found in his "free" translations is that it tends to dissect the very text the
translator produced as a unit. As seen above, Troxel offered a valuable discus-
sion of the translator's use of prepositions "to clarify relationships between
clauses."[196] The translator's linking of clauses through conjunctions implies
that he aimed at producing a well-knit text, which was composed of "free"
and "literal" translations. If the translator considered that his "free" renderings
went along with his more "literal" ones, it is a mistake to assume that his exe-
gesis is only found in "free" renderings. Moreover, as discussed above, Toury
has pointed out that the retaining of certain features of the source text in the
target text points not to their intrinsic importance but to the significance the
translator assigned to them. As I will argue, the translator's exegesis is found
in the final form of the text he produced, which happens to include both "free"
and "literal" translations.

Troxel's claim that the translator's ideology can only be found in "free"
renderings to the exclusion of "literal" ones raises an important question: Is
the translator's ideology to be found only in "free" renderings or can they also
be found in "literal" translations? More specifically, could the translator's jux-
taposition of "free" and "literal" translations reflect his ideology?

1.3.3. Higher-Level Interpretations and Low-Level Ones Do Not Cohere

As was mentioned above, although Seeligmann viewed "free translations"
as important as "literal renditions" for the reconstruction of the translator's
theology,[197] he also claimed that the translator's own views or historical allu-
sions can be found in free renderings. And not only in "free renderings" in

---

194. Ibid., 131–32.

195. Ibid., 132.

196. Ibid., 91.

197. Seeligmann, *The The Septuagint Version*, 95: "This implies that, for such a cross-
section, passages that were translated literally in a given book of the Septuagint, are of equal

general but "especially in those places where these insertions appear to constitute an element alien to the main context."[198] He did not believe "free renderings" cohered with the translator's more "literal translations:" "If we look at the mentality behind the inconsistencies in this light, we shall … feel skeptical towards the probability of their being particularly ingenious and particularly purposeful efforts to discover logical connexions in any chapter or part of a chapter in our Septuagint-text."[199]

Different from Seeligmann, Coste showed that the "free renderings" of LXX Isa 25:1–5 cohered well with its "literal translations." After discussing the LXX of Isa 25:1–5 in comparison with MT,[200] Coste concluded that it showed itself, as a translational text, "comme un échec presque complet." Contrarily, when analyzed as a literary unit in its own right, LXX Isa 25:1–5 is "une composition ordonnée et cohérent."[201] Coste further concluded that LXX Isa 25:1–5, as a literary and conceptual text, shows that an active interpretive plan was already at work even before its translation had started. Finally, Coste argued that this interpretive plan reflected the translator's personal piety and faith.[202] Das Neves and van der Kooij reached similar conclusions in their studies of LXX Isa 24; 23 respectively.[203]

The divergence of opinions as to whether LXX Isaiah's "free" translations cohere with its "literal" renditions offers an excellent opportunity to ask the question: do the "free" translations in LXX Isa 24:1–26:6 cohere with its "literal" ones? In other words, does LXX Isa 24:1–26:6 make any sense without recourse to its Hebrew *Vorlage*? One specialist remarked: "Nevertheless, that translator [LXX Isaiah] seems to have viewed his task differently than those of the Torah. While he often follows their more literal tendencies, he frequently also stands closer to the style of translation we find in Proverbs and Job. The question is how to account for this peculiar mix."[204] In my view, the question is not so much to account for how "literal" and "free" renderings

<hr />

importance as free paraphrases: both represent fragments of the religious notions of the translator concerned."

198. Ibid., 41.

199. Ibid. See also Barr, *Typology*, 281: "the tendency of many early translators was … to combine the two approaches [literal and free] in a quite inconsequential way."

200. Coste, "Le texte grec," 37–45.

201. Ibid., 50.

202. Ibid., 51.

203. Das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 265; van der Kooij, *Oracle*, 87. On p. 43, das Neves claimed that the differences between the Hebrew and the Greek find their origin in the "mentalidade teológica do nosso tradutor." I.e., LXX Isaiah is more an interpretation than a translation.

204. Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 75.

came to be but whether those two types of translations make sense in their own literary contexts.

1.3.4. Contextual Interpretation versus Interpretation on a Higher Level

In his criticisms of "fulfillment-interpretation," Troxel postulated a principle to detect whether a particular divergence in the Greek reflects the translator's contemporaneous history or not. For him, historical references in LXX Isaiah can only be found if a divergence was not based in the immediate or broader literary contexts. As he put it:

> Embracing this principle requires a minimalist approach: only if the transla-tor can be shown to refer deliberately to people, countries, ethnic groups, circumstances, or events by deviating from his *Vorlage* is it legitimate to entertain the possibility that he sought to identify such entities as the "true" referents of his Hebrew exemplar. More stringently, it must be shown that the translator did not arrive at a rendering by reasoning from the immediate or broader literary contexts, but that he fashioned it with an eye to circum-stances or events in his day.[205]

The principle seems to be based on the assumption that the translator, when faced with a difficult Hebrew text, resorts to phraseology from elsewhere:

> Additionally, the fact that deviations from the MT recur in several passages may mean nothing more than that the translator followed similar paths in trying to rescue verses he found inscrutable, as evidenced by "stop-gap" words like ἡττᾶσθαι.[206]

The problem with this approach is its assumption that the translator resorted to words or phraseology from elsewhere in his *Vorlage* due to their inherent importance. However, Toury has remarked that a translator retains aspects of his source text because of the importance he assigned to them.[207] In this light, it is important to ask the question as to why the translator of Isaiah decided to use words or phraseology from elsewhere for his translation of certain pas-sages. Was it because of their inherent importance or because of the impor-tance he assigned to them? If the second option is correct, then it will become clear that even the use of words or phraseology from elsewhere in the *Vorlage*

---

205. Ibid., 164. See also pp. 166–67.

206. Ibid., 166.

207. See the discussion above and Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies*, 12–13.

may betray the translator's ideology simply because he found them important for his higher level interpretation of his source text.

Furthermore, the fact that a reading may be based on the immediate or broader context does not exclude the issue of intention. In this sense, van der Kooij's critique of Troxel is relevant. He reminded Troxel that a simple discussion of "words or phrases, whether arrived on the basis of a given context or not, are too small a basis for the issue of actualization."[208] I would add they are equally too narrow for detecting interpretation on a higher level.

1.4. Methodology

In the attempt to detect higher-level interpretation in the translation of LXX Isa 24:1–26:6, the present study will approach it from two interrelated perspectives. First, part 1 will compare LXX Isa 24:1–26:6 with MT. The focus lies in describing, not evaluating, the translator's *Übersetzungsweise*.[209] One important aspect is the discovery of unusual lexical choices. Unusual is defined here in the light of the Isaiah translator's profile. The question is: why did the translator choose a particular Greek term for his rendition of a certain Hebrew word?[210] Put differently, when faced with a choice between two or more Greek lexemes for a single Hebrew term, what led the translator to select one lexeme over the other? While part 1 concerns the translator's lexical choices, part 2 attempts to ascertain whether those lexical choices make sense in their own literary contexts.

Part 1 will not attempt to judge whether the translator's *Vorlage* was identical to unvocalized MT or not. It rather takes MT tentatively as the likely *Vorlage* behind the Greek. Dries de Crom pointed out the similarity between LXX and Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS) in relation to the provisional status of the source-text in translation studies: "both DTS and translation technique work with *assumed* source texts, meaning that the nature and extent of ST [source text]-TT [target text] relations are not given but have to be discovered during textual study." Whereas the provisional status of the source text is an axiomatic formulation in DTS, de Crom indicated that in LXX studies that provisional status is "a practical consequence of the textual uncertainty of both ST and TT."[211] As such, unpointed MT will be tentatively taken as the likely

---

208. Van der Kooij, review of Ronald L. Troxel, 151.

209. For the study of "translation style" as descriptive, see van der Kooij, *Oracle*, 16. For a similar position in relation to LXX studies outside LXX Isaiah, see Aejmelaeus, *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators*, 205–6.

210. Olley, *"Righteousness,"* 11.

211. Dries de Crom, "The LXX Text of Canticles: a Descriptive Study in Hebrew-

source text of LXX Isaiah. When there is a divergence between the Qumran Isaiah scrolls and MT, part 1 will discuss that divergence. The assumption is that one cannot make decisions concerning LXX Isaiah's *Vorlage* without understanding its profile. One can only make textual decisions based on a translation after becoming acquainted with its style. For that reason, part 2 will, when necessary, discuss the issue of the translator's *Vorlage*.

Second, part 2 will analyze LXX Isa 24:1–26:6 as a text in its own right. Two aspects will be the focus here: First, to what extent do "free" renderings found in the composing sections of LXX Isa 24:1–26:6 cohere with its "literal" translations? Can LXX Isa 24:1–26:6 be seen as a coherent text? In other words, "To what extent can one make sense of the Greek text without recourse to the Hebrew?"[212] The second aspect concerns the Greek as a text in its own right: how does LXX Isa 24:1–26:6 compare ideologically with MT? As discussed above, some scholars claim the translator's ideology can only be found in "free" renderings. While it is true that one must start with "free" translations, it will be argued in the course of this work that the translator's ideology, in the sense of how he interpreted the Hebrew on a higher level, is to be found in the final product of his translation. This final product is composed of "free" and "literal" renderings.

This two-step, interrelated approach, consisting of a comparison between the Greek text with MT and the Greek text in its own right is steeped in the methodology that van der Kooij has developed in his approach to LXX Isaiah.[213] One of the advantages of his approach is to highlight differences between the Greek and MT (step 1) in order to pursue the question as to whether those differences cohere in the context of the Greek text in its own right (step 2). It should also be noted that step 1 is not an explanation for the process of the translation; such an explanation follows step 2. While some will object that this separation produces a fragmentary examination of the Greek and contradicts Toury's approach discussed above, it should be noted that even Toury recognizes the need for such an approach when he says that the function, process, and product-oriented approach "are not just 'related' … but … form one complex whole whose constitutive parts are hardly separable from one another *for purposes other than methodical.*"[214]

In order to answer the main questions of the present research, the analysis of LXX Isa 24:1–26:6 in part 2 will focus on the following aspects: (1) the

---

Greek Translation" (PhD diss., Katholieke Universiteit Leuven OE Literatuurwetenschap: Tekst en Interpretatie, 2009), xxxix.

212. Ibid., xxxvii.

213. For a discussion of van der Kooij's approach to LXX Isaiah, see above.

214. Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies*, 13 (emphasis added).

translator's lexical choices; (2) issues of delimitation of units and subunits in Isa 24:1–26:6; (3) matters of syntax and style such as the use of particles and conjunctions and (4) the identification of similar themes found in Isa 24:1–26:6. On occasion, the relation of such themes to the rest of LXX Isaiah will also be addressed.

1.5. Contribution

LXX Isaiah's research history is a basic attempt to provide an explanation for the divergences between the Hebrew and the Greek. As the historical overview above shows, scholars have proposed many varied reasons for LXX Isaiah's departures from the Hebrew. A different Hebrew *Vorlage*, translator's deficient knowledge of Hebrew, poor orthographic quality of the translator's Hebrew manuscript, translator's reading errors of similar Hebrew consonants, changes in the transmission of LXX Isaiah, the translator's theology and bent for fulfillment-interpretation, linguistic necessity of the target language, and so on, were all advanced as possible candidates to account for the differences between the translation and its source text. Given the number of divergent opinions, there is clearly a need for a firmer and more helpful methodological meter from which to judge a particular divergence in LXX Isaiah.

One important parameter will be whether the literary sections composing LXX Isa 24:1–26:6 can be seen as a coherent text. Coherence will provide a firmer framework to evaluate the nature of LXX Isaiah's divergences from the Hebrew. The presence of coherence in a given passage in the Greek will suggest that the translator intentionally read his *Vorlage* in a different way from, say, Aquila and our modern interpretation of the Hebrew. The presence of coherence would also indicate the translator had an interpretation on a higher level in mind before he even started his translation. Coherence would also open the doors to a more fruitful search for the discovery of the translator's milieu in his translation. Similarly, the lack of coherence would suggest that LXX Isaiah's divergences from the Hebrew have an accidental nature. As such, explanations like translator's errors, different *Vorlage*, and the like would seem more convincing.

The search for LXX Isaiah's coherence presupposes a methodological approach that focuses not only on describing the process of the translation, but also on the translation as a product. In fact, the methodological contribution of the present work is to call for a study of the Greek in its own right before delving into discussions of how the translator went about producing his translation. It will be argued that the process of the translator can be properly assessed only after the acquisition of a solid understanding of the translation as a product.

As is clear from the historical overview above, scholars have made considerable progress in studying LXX Isaiah as a text in its own right in opposition to studying it in relation to its Hebrew *Vorlage* (textual criticism) or simply as a translation. However, there still remains much to be done in the study of LXX Isaiah as a document in and of itself. Not too long ago, scholars complained about the lack of work on LXX Isaiah in its own right: "there have, of course, been many large strides forward in the study of the LXX, but the LXX remains valuable to most scholars primarily as a witness to its *Vorlage*, and not as a document in and of itself."[215] This statement remains true today. In taking LXX Isa 24:1–26:6 as a text in its own right and commenting on it in detail, the present work hopes to be a step forward in filling this gap.

1.6. Scope

One commentator has correctly remarked on MT Isa 24–27 that "few sections within the book of Isaiah have called forth such a wide measure of scholarly disagreement on their analysis and interpretation as have these four chapters." One of the major problems of this literary section is the issue of whether it has any structural coherence. Basically, scholars have debated the issue of how to relate what appears to be "eschatological prophecy" (Isa 24:1–23; 26:6–27:13) with "liturgical songs" (Isa 25:1–5; 26:1–6).[216] The lack of agreement on the coherence of MT Isa 24–27 offers an interesting opportunity to see what became of those chapters in LXX Isa 24–27.

As will be seen in the course of this work, LXX Isa 24:1–26:6 forms a literary unit that revolves around the theme of "cities" and the "ungodly" (24:10, 12; 25:2–3; 26:1, 5–6). There is a contrast between the "fortified cities" (πόλεις ὀχυράς in 25:2; 26:5) and the "fortified city" (πόλις ὀχυρά in 26:1). In addition, there is a reference to the "city of the ungodly" (τῶν ἀσεβῶν πόλις in 25:2b), the "cities of the wronged men" (πόλεις ἀνθρώπων ἀδικουμένων in 25:3), and to "every city/cities" (πᾶσα πόλις/πόλεις in 24:10, 12).[217] Even though Isa 27:3

215. Stanley E. Porter and Brook W. R. Pearson, "Isaiah through Greek Eyes: The Septuagint of Isaiah," in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition* (ed. Craig C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans; VTSup 70/2; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 531.

216. Brevard S. Childs, *Isaiah* (OTL; Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001), 171–72.

217. For a discussion of the identity of these cities, cf. Arie van der Kooij, "The Cities of Isaiah 24–27 According to the Vulgate, Targum and the Septuagint," in *Studies in Isaiah 24–27: The Isaiah Workshop–De Jesaja Werkplaats* (ed. Hendrik Jan Bosman, et al.; OtSt 43; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 191–96; idem, "Interpretation of the Book of Isaiah in the Septuagint and in Other Ancient Versions," in *"As Those Who Are Taught": The Interpretation of Isaiah*

mentions a "strong, besieged city" (πόλις ἰσχυρά πόλις πολιορκουμένη), Isa 27 has been left out of consideration for practical reasons; the problems Isa 27 presents both in the Hebrew and in the Greek would deserve a monograph dedicated solely to it. The use of πόλεις ὀχυράς in LXX Isa 26:5–6 form a nice *inclusio* around the theme of "cities" that had started in LXX Isa 24:10, 12. As such, the present work will focus on LXX Isa 24:1–26:6.

Another reason for choosing LXX Isa 24:1–26:6 as the object of the present inquiry is the lack of attention which previous works on these chapters have devoted to the theme of cities and their relation to the (un)godly. As seen in the history of research above, neither Liebmann's text-critical interest in LXX Isa 24–27 nor Coste's or das Neves's theological approach have dealt with the cities and (un)godly motif in LXX Isa 24:1–26:6. Apart from a couple of brief articles on the cities,[218] there are no other systematic studies of these important themes in LXX Isa 24:1–26:6. The present study hopes to fill that gap.

Finally, a deeper understanding of how the Isaiah translator read Hebrew Isa 24:1–26:6 is important for modern interpreters of MT. As is well-known, MT Isa 24–27 has received considerable attention in the past hundred years.[219] In contrast, little attention has been devoted to LXX Isa 24–27. With the exception of Liebmann's study of its translation technique, Coste's treatment of LXX Isa 25:1–5 and das Neves's discussion of Isa 24, LXX Isa 24–27 remains unstudied in a detailed way. It is important for those working on Hebrew Isa 24–27 to know how one of its first interpreters, the Greek translator of Isaiah, read it. It is possible that modern students may gain some light from LXX Isaiah in solving difficult problems in the interpretation of the Hebrew.[220] The present study of LXX Isa 24:1–26:6 hopes to give the student of the Hebrew a thorough understanding of how that text was first interpreted in the second century BCE.

---

from the LXX to the SBL (ed. Claire Matthews McGinnis and Patricia K. Tull; SBLSymS 27; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), 62–66.

218. Van der Kooij, "The Cities of Isaiah 24–27," 191–96; idem, "Interpretation of the Book of Isaiah," 62–66.

219. For recent studies on Isa 24–27, see e.g., Reinhard Scholl, *Die Elenden in Gottes Thronrat: Stilistisch-kompositorische Untersuchungen zu Jesaja* 24–27 (BZAW 274; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2000); Brian Doyle, *The Apocalypse of Isaiah Metaphorically Speaking: A Study of the Use, Function and Significance of Metaphors in Isaiah 24–27* (BETL 151; Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters, 2000); J. Todd Hibbard, *Intertextuality in Isaiah 24–27: The Reuse and Evocation of Earlier Texts and Traditions* (FAT 2/16; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006).

220. For an example of an attempt to gain some light from the LXX for the interpretation of MT Isa 24:14–16, cf. Wilson de Angelo Cunha, "A Brief Discussion of MT Isaiah 24,14–16," *Bib* 90 (2009): 530–44.