

Postclassical Greek and Septuagint Lexicography

SBL Press

Septuagint and Cognate Studies

Martin Rösel, General Editor

Editorial Board:

Arie van der Kooij

Gideon R Kotze

Siegfried Kreuzer

Daniela Scialabba

Benjamin G. Wright III

Number 75

SBL Press



Postclassical Greek and Septuagint Lexicography

William A. Ross

SBL Press



SBL PRESS

Atlanta

Copyright © 2022 by William A. Ross

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

Library of Congress Control Number: 2022934536

SBL Press

For Amos, Lucas, Samuel, and Phoebe
θαρσεῖτε

SBL Press

SBL Press

Contents

Acknowledgments.....	ix
Abbreviations.....	xi
Sigla.....	xxiv
Tables and Figures.....	xxv
1. Introduction.....	1
2. Septuagint Lexicography: Tracing the Hebrew-Priority Approach.....	17
3. “Who Shall Go Up First?” ΠΑΡΑΤΑΞΙΣ and ΠΑΡΑΤΑΣΣΩ.....	63
4. “For So the Young Men Used to Do”: ΠΑΙΔΑΡΙΟΝ, ΠΑΙΔΙΟΝ, ΝΕΑΝΙΣΚΟΣ, and ΝΕΑΝΙΑΣ.....	113
5. “They Went up to Meet Them”: ΑΠΑΝΤΑΩ, ΑΠΑΝΤΗΣΙΣ and ΣΥΝΑΝΤΑΩ, ΣΥΝΑΝΤΗΣΙΣ.....	163
6. General Conclusions.....	209
Appendix: Sample Lexical Entries.....	219
Bibliography.....	223
Ancient Sources Index.....	265
Modern Authors Index.....	271

SBL Press

Acknowledgments

This volume presents a slightly revised version of my doctoral thesis, completed between 2014 and 2018 at the University of Cambridge. As expected for such a task, I have benefited immensely from many forms of support and encouragement during that time, as well as in the intervening years.

I am immeasurably indebted to my supervisor, Dr. James (Jim) K. Aitken. Rarely have I known someone with such a level of mastery in his field who interacts with students with such charity and humor. Despite the serious personal challenges we each faced during the course of my studies, Jim nevertheless patiently shaped, challenged, and encouraged my thinking while always demonstrating rigorous scholarship to emulate. I am also deeply grateful to Dr. Peter (Pete) J. Williams for taking me on as temporary supervisor with such willingness and competence. Thank you both.

I also wish to express my gratitude to the Cambridge Trust for funding my doctoral research and, more importantly, for so willingly suspending (and then reinstating) it while I intermitted my studies to care for my family in late 2015. The Faculty of Divinity and Fitzwilliam College too have often granted funding to support my research in crucial ways, for which I am very appreciative. I would also like to thank Westminster Theological Seminary for the graduate fellowships granted consistently over six years, which have gone far in supporting my involvement in professional societies through travel and conferences. I am also appreciative to Reformed Theological Seminary for granting funding for the indexing of this volume, and to Ken McMullen for so capably completing the task.

Many colleagues also gave of their time and talent to help me along the way. John A. L. Lee, Trevor V. Evans, Patrick James, and Marieke Dhont rank among the most influential and generous. A similar note of thanks is due to the community at Tyndale House, not least of all to librarian Simon Sykes for his expertise and friendship. Even before my time at

Cambridge, James Mulroney, Fred Putnam, and Greg Beale did so much to enable and inspire me in academic work, for which I am immensely grateful. I also received much practical and theoretical assistance from both Srecko Koralija and Peter Montoro, to whom I am indebted. Thanks also go to my *viva* examiners as well as the anonymous reviewers for SBL Press's Septuagint and Cognate Studies series for their constructive comments.

This study, like so much else in life, has benefited from a wide array of friends and family members, too many to name. Of all these, none compare with my wife, Kelli. Your selflessness, joy, patience, and bravery underwrite everything I do as a husband, father, and scholar. If God is the rudder steering our life, then you must be the boat and I the blustering and sporadic wind. Onward, always together.

William A. Ross
αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας
Advent 2020

SBL Press

Abbreviations

AASF	Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae
AII group	Subgroups KZgln(o)w and (d)ptv ² (representative of Judg ^{OG})
AB	Anchor Bible
AbrNSup	Abr-Nahrain Supplements
<i>Ach.</i>	Aristophanes, <i>Acharnenses</i>
<i>Adul. amic.</i>	Plutarch, <i>Quomodo adulator ab amico internoscatur</i>
<i>Aeginet.</i>	Isocrates, <i>Aegineticus</i> (Or. 7)
<i>Aem.</i>	Plutarch, <i>Aemilius Paullus</i>
<i>Ag. Ap.</i>	Josephus, <i>Against Apion</i>
<i>Ag. Cleom.</i>	Plutarch, <i>Agis et Cleomenes</i>
<i>Ages.</i>	Plutarch, <i>Agesilaus</i> ; Xenophon, <i>Agesilaus</i>
AJSL	<i>American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures</i>
<i>Alex.</i>	Plutarch, <i>Alexander</i>
<i>Alex. fort.</i>	Plutarch, <i>De Alexandri magni fortuna aut virtute</i>
<i>An seni</i>	Plutarch, <i>An seni respublica gerenda sit</i>
<i>Anab.</i>	Xenophon, <i>Anabasis</i>
AnBib	Analecta Biblica
<i>Ann.</i>	Tacitus, <i>Annales</i>
ANRW	Temporini, Hildegard, and Wolfgang Haase, eds. <i>Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung. Part 2, Principat.</i> Berlin: De Gruyter, 1972–.
<i>Ant.</i>	Josephus, <i>Jewish Antiquities</i> ; Plutarch, <i>Antonius</i>
<i>Ant. rom.</i>	Dionysius of Halicarnassus, <i>Antiquitates romanae</i>
APF.B	Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete Beiheft
<i>Arat.</i>	Plutarch, <i>Aratus</i>
<i>Archid.</i>	Isocrates, <i>Archidamus</i> (Or. 6)
<i>Arist.</i>	Plutarch, <i>Aristedes</i>
<i>Art.</i>	Plutarch, <i>Artaxerxes</i>

<i>Ath. pol.</i>	Aristotle, <i>Athēnain politeia</i>
<i>Att.</i>	Cicero, <i>Epistulae ad Atticum</i>
BA	La Bible d'Alexandrie
BASP	<i>Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists</i>
BASPSup	Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists Supplements
BBR	<i>Bulletin for Biblical Research</i>
BCAW	Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World
BCH	<i>Bulletin de correspondance hellénique</i>
BECNT	Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament
BETL	Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium
B group	Subgroups B(d)efm(o)qsz and imrua ₂ (representative of Judg ^{Rv})
BGU	<i>Aegyptische Urkunden aus den Königlichen [later Staatlichen] Museen zu Berlin, Griechische Urkunden</i> . 15 vols. Berlin: Weidmann, 1895–1937.
BH	Biblical Hebrew
BHQ	Schenker, Adrian, et al., eds. <i>Biblia Hebraica Quinta</i> . Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2004–.
<i>Bib</i>	<i>Biblica</i>
BibInt	Biblical Interpretation Series
BIOSCS	<i>Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies</i>
BJGS	<i>Bulletin of Judeo-Greek Studies</i>
BNPSup	Brill's New Pauly Supplements
BSAH	Blackwell Sourcebooks in Ancient History
<i>BT</i>	<i>The Bible Translator</i>
BTS	Biblical Tools and Studies
<i>Bus.</i>	Isocrates, <i>Busiris</i> (Or. 11)
BZA	Beiträge zur Altertumskunde
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
BZNW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
<i>Caes.</i>	Plutarch, <i>Caesar</i>
<i>Cam.</i>	Plutarch, <i>Camillus</i>
<i>Cat. Min.</i>	Plutarch, <i>Cato Minor</i>
CATSS	Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint Studies
<i>Caus. plant.</i>	Theophrastus, <i>De causiis plantarum</i>

CBET	Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology
CCS	Cambridge Classical Studies
CDCH	Clines, David J. A., ed. <i>The Concise Dictionary of Classical Hebrew</i> . Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2009.
Chrest.Wilck.	Wilcken, Ulrich, ed. <i>Grundzüge und Chrestomathie der Papyruskunde</i> . 2 vols. in 4 parts. Leipzig: Teubner, 1912.
Cic.	Plutarch, <i>Cicero</i>
Cim.	Plutarch, <i>Cimon</i>
ClAnt	<i>Classical Antiquity</i>
CLR	<i>Classical Review</i>
CLR	Cognitive Linguistics Research
col.	column
Comp. Ages.	Plutarch, <i>Comparatio Agesilai et Pompeii</i>
Comp. Lys.	Plutarch, <i>Comparatio Lysius et Sullae</i>
Comp. Per.	Plutarch, <i>Comparatio Periclis et Fabii Maximi</i>
Cor.	Demosthenes, <i>De corona</i>
CPJ	Tcherikover, Victor A., and Alexander Fuks, eds. <i>Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum</i> . 3 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press 1957–1964.
Crass.	Plutarch, <i>Crassus</i>
CrStHB	Critical Studies in the Hebrew Bible
CSL	Cambridge Studies in Linguistics
Ctes.	Aeschines, <i>In Ctesiphonem</i>
CTL	Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics
CurBR	<i>Currents in Biblical Research</i>
Cyr.	Xenophon, <i>Cyropaedia</i>
DCH	Clines, David J. A., ed. <i>The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew</i> . 9 vols. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 1993–2014.
Deipn.	Athenaeus, <i>Deipnosophistae</i>
Dem.	Plutarch, <i>Demosthenes</i>
Demetr.	Plutarch, <i>Demetrius</i>
Demosth.	Dinarchus, <i>In Demosthenem</i>
Deo	Philo, <i>De Deo</i>
Det.	Philo, <i>Quod deterius potiori insidari soleat</i>
DGF	Chantraine, Pierre, and Louis Séchan, eds. <i>Dictionnaire Grec Français</i> . Rev. ed. Paris: Hachette, 1950.
Dion	Plutarch, <i>Dion</i>
DJD	Discoveries in the Judean Desert
DSI	De Septuaginta Investigationes

- EAGLL Giannakis, Georgios K., ed. *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics*. 3 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2014.
- Ep. Her. Epicurus, *Epistula ad Herodotum*
- ETL *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses*
- Eum. Plutarch, *Eumenes*
- ExpTim *Expository Times*
- Fab. Plutarch, *Fabius Maximus*
- FAT Forschungen zum Alten Testament
- Fayoum Bernand, Étienne. *Recueil des inscriptions grecques du Fayoum*. 3 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1975–1981.
- FF Foundations and Facets
- Flam. Plutarch, *Titus Flamininus*
- FNT *Filología Neotestamentaria*
- frag(s). fragment(s)
- Garr. Plutarch, *De garrulitate*
- GDI Collitz, Hermann, and Friedrich Bechtel, eds. *Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften*. 4 vols. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1884–1915.
- GELS Muraoka, Takamitsu. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. Leuven: Peeters, 2009.
- Glor. Ath. Plutarch, *De gloria Atheniensium*
- GTS Gettysburg Theological Studies
- HALOT Koehler, Ludwig, Walter Baumgartner, and Johann J. Stamm. *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Translated and edited under the supervision of Mervyn E. J. Richardson. 4 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1994–1999.
- HB Hebrew Bible
- HCS Hellenistic Culture and Society
- Hel. enc. Isocrates, *Helenae encomium (Or. 10)*
- Hell. Xenophon, *Hellenica*
- Hesperia *Hesperia: The Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens*
- Hist. *Historiae*
- HRCS Hatch, Edwin, and Henry A. Redpath. *Concordance to the Septuagint and Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1897. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998.
- HSK Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft

- HSM Harvard Semitic Monographs
- HTLS Bons, Eberhard, ed. *Historical and Theological Lexicon of the Septuagint*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020–.
- IaphMcCabe McCabe, Donald F., ed. *Aphrodisias Inscriptions: Texts and Lists*. The Princeton Project on the Inscriptions of Anatolia, The Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton. Packard Humanities Institute CD 7, 1996.
- Iasos McCabe, Donald F., ed. *Iasos Inscriptions: Texts and List*. The Princeton Project on the Inscriptions of Anatolia, The Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton. Packard Humanities Institute CD 6, 1991.
- IBubon Schindler, Friedel, ed. *Die Inschriften von Bubon (Nordlykien)*. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Klasse. Sitzungsberichte 278.3. Vienna: Bohlaus, 1972.
- ICC International Critical Commentary
- IDelos 6 Roussel, Pierre, and Marcel Launey, eds. *Inscriptions de Délos*. Vol. 6. Paris: Champion, 1937.
- IEED Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary
- IG 2 Kirchner, Johannes, ed. *Inscriptiones Atticae Euclidis anno posteriores*. 2nd ed. 4 vols. IG 2–3. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1913–1940.
- IG 4.1 Gaertringen, Friedrich Hiller von, ed. *Inscriptiones Epidauri*. Fascicle 1 of *Inscriptiones Argolidis*. IG 4. 2nd ed. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1929.
- IG 5.1 Kolbe, Walther, ed. *Inscriptiones Laconiae et Messeniae*. Fascicle 1 of *Inscriptiones Laconiae, Messeniae, Arcadiae*. IG 5. Berlin: Reimer, 1913.
- IG 5.2 Gaertringen, Friedrich Hiller von, ed. *Inscriptiones Arcadiae*. Fascicle 2 of *Inscriptiones Laconiae, Messeniae, Arcadiae*. IG 5. Berlin: Reimer, 1913.
- IG 7 Dittenberger, Wilhelm, ed. *Inscriptiones Megaridis, Oropiae, Boeotiae*. IG 7. Berlin: Reimer, 1892.
- IG 9.1.1 Klaffenbach, Günther, ed. *Inscriptiones Aetoliae*. Fascicle 1 of *Inscriptiones Phocidis, Locridis, Aetoliae, Acarnaniae insularum Maris Ionii*. 2nd ed. Part 1 of *Inscriptiones Graeciae septentrionalis voluminibus VII et VIII non comprehensae*. IG 9. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1932.

- IG 12.6 Hallof, Klaus, and Angelus P. Matthaiou, eds. *Inscriptiones Chii et Sami cum Corassiis Icariaque*. 2 parts. Fascicle 6 of *Inscriptiones insularum maris Aegaei praeter Delum*. IG 12. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2000–2003.
- IG 12Sup Gaertringen, Friedrich Hiller von, ed. *Supplementum*. Supplement to *Inscriptiones insularum maris Aegaei praeter Delum*. IG 12. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1939.
- Ilion Frisch, Peter, ed. *Die Inschriften von Ilion*. Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien 3. Bonn: Habelt, 1975.
- IMT Skam/
NebTäler Barth, Matthias, and Josef Stauber, eds. *Inchriften Mysia und Troas*. Leopold Wenger Institut. Universität München. Version of 25.8.1993 (Ibycus). Packard Humanities Institute CD 7, 1996.
- inf. cons. infinitive construct
- Inst. Lac.* Plutarch, *Instituta Laconica*
- IOSCS International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies
- IosPE 1 Latyshev, Basilius, ed. *Inscriptiones Tyriae, Olbiae, Chersonesi Tauricae*. Vol. 1 of *Inscriptiones antiquae orae septentrionalis Ponti Euxini graecae et latinae*. 2nd ed. St. Petersburg: Societatis Archaeologicae Imperii Russici, 1916.
- IPergamon 1 Fränkel, Max, ed. *Bis zum Ende der Königszeit*. Vol. 1 of *Die Inschriften von Pergamon*. *Altertümer von Pergamon* 8.1. Berlin: Ulan, 1890.
- IPriene Gaertringen, Friedrich Hiller von, ed. *Inschriften von Priene*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1906.
- IPros.Pierre Bernard, André, ed. *La Prose sur pierre dans l'Égypte hellénistique et romaine*. 2 vols. Paris: CNRS, 1992.
- IScM 1 Pippidi, Dionisie M., ed. *Histria et vicinia*. Vol. 1 of *Inscriptiones Scythiae Minoris graecae et latinae*. Bucharest: Academiae Reipublicae Socialistae Romaniae, 1983.
- IScM 2 Stoian, Iorgu, ed. *Tomis et territorium*. Vol. 2 of *Inscriptiones Scythiae Minoris graecae et latinae*. Bucharest: Academiae Reipublicae Socialistae Romaniae, 1987.
- JBL *Journal of Biblical Literature*
- JHebS *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures*
- JJS *Journal of Jewish Studies*
- JNSL *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages*

JNSLSup	Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages Supplement Series
JRS	<i>Journal of Roman Studies</i>
JSCS	<i>Journal for Septuagint and Cognate Studies</i> (formerly BIOSCS)
JSJ	<i>Journal for the Study of Judaism</i>
JSJSup	Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism
JSOT	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
JSPSup	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series
JTS	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
Judg	Hebrew text of Judges according to BHQ
Judg ^A	Rahlfs-Hanhart A text of Greek Judges
Judg ^B	Rahlfs-Hanhart B text of Greek Judges
Judg ^{LXX}	Greek version of Judges in general or “Greek Judges”
Judg ^{OG}	Reconstructed Old Greek translation of Judges (see AII group)
Judg ^{Rv}	Revised text of Judg ^{LXX} (See “B group”)
J.W.	Josephus, <i>Jewish Wars</i>
LBW	Le Bas, Philippe, and William Henry Waddington, eds. <i>Inscriptions grecques et latines de la Syrie</i> . Paris: Didot, 1870. Repr. Hildesheim: Olms, 1972.
Leg.	Plato, <i>Leges</i>
LEH	Lust, Johann, Erik Eynikel, and Katrin Hauspie, eds. <i>Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint</i> . 3rd ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2015.
Leoch.	Demosthenes, <i>Contra Leocharem</i>
Lex.	Photius, <i>Patriarchae Lexicon</i>
Lex. hom.	Apollonius, <i>Lexicon Homericum</i>
LHBOTS	Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies
Life	Josephus, <i>The Life</i>
Lindos 2	Blinkenberg, Christian, ed. <i>Inscriptions</i> . Vol. 2 of <i>Lindos: Fouilles et recherches, 1902–1914</i> . 2 vols. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1941.
LLL	Longman Linguistics Library
LSJ	Liddell, Henry George, Robert Scott, and Henry Stuart Jones. <i>A Greek-English Lexicon</i> . 9th ed. with revised supplement. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.
Luc.	Plutarch, <i>Lucullus</i>
Lyc.	Plutarch, <i>Lycurgus</i>

MAMA	Calder, W. M., et al., eds. <i>Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua</i> . London: Manchester University Press; Longmans, Green, 1928–.
Mar.	Plutarch, <i>Marius</i>
Marc.	Plutarch, <i>Marcellus</i>
Meg.	Demosthenes, <i>Pro Megalopolitanis</i>
Metaph.	Aristotle, <i>Metaphysica</i>
MGS	Montanari, Franco. <i>The Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek</i> . Edited by Madeleine Goh and Chad Schroeder. Leiden: Brill, 2015.
Mid.	Demosthenes, <i>In Midiam</i>
Migr.	Philo, <i>De migratione Abrahami</i>
MM	Moulton, James H., and George Milligan. <i>The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-literary Sources</i> . London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1929.
Mor.	Plutarch, <i>Moralia</i>
MS(S)	manuscript(s)
MSU	Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens
MT	Masoretic Text
MtAthos	Duchesne, Louis, and Charles Bayet, eds. <i>Mémoire sur une mission au Mont Athos</i> . Paris: Thorin, 1876.
Mulier. virt.	Plutarch, <i>Mulierum virtutes</i>
NAC	New American Commentary
NETS	Pietersma, Albert, and Benjamin G. Wright, eds. <i>A New English Translation of the Septuagint</i> . 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.
NewDocs	Horsley, G. H. R., et al., eds. <i>New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity</i> . North Ryde, NSW: The Ancient History Documentary Research Centre Macquarie University, 1981–.
NS	new series
NTOA	Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus
NTS	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
Num.	Plutarch, <i>Numa</i>
OCT	Oxford Classical Texts
O.Did.	Cuvigny, Hélène, and Adam Bülow-Jacobsen, eds. <i>Les textes</i> . Vol. 2 of <i>Didymoi: Une garnison romaine dans le désert oriental d'Égypte</i> . Fouilles de l'IFAO 67. Cairo: Institut français d'archéologie orientale, 2012.

- O.Krok. 1 Cuvigny, Hélène, ed. *La correspondance militaire et sa circulation: O. Krok 1–151*. Vol. 1 of *Ostraca de Krokodilò*. Cairo: Institut français d'archéologie orientale, 2005.
- Od.* Homer, *Odyssey*
- OG Old Greek
- OGIS Dittenberger, Wilhelm, ed. *Orientis graeci inscriptio- nes selectae*. 2 vols. Leipzig: Hirzel, 1903–1905. Repr., Hildesheim: Olms, 1970.
- Ol.* Pindar, *Olympionikai*
- OL Old Latin
- Opif.* Philo, *De opificio mundi*
- OTE *Old Testament Essays*
- Oth.* Plutarch, *Otho*
- PAAJR *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research*
- P.Cair.Zen. Edgar, Campbell Cowan, ed. *Zenon Papyri: Catalogue général des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire Nos. 5* vols. Cairo: Institut français d'archéologie orientale, 1925–1940.
- P.Col. 3 Westermann, William Linn, and Elisabeth Sayre Hasenoehrl, eds. *Zenon Papyri: Business Papers of the Third Century B.C. Dealing with Palestine and Egypt*. Vol. 1. Columbia Papyri Greek Series 3. New York: Columbia University Press, 1934.
- P.Col. 4 Westermann, William Linn, C. W. Keyes, and H. Liebesny, eds. *Business Papers of the Third Century B.C. Dealing with Palestine and Egypt*. Vol. 1. Columbia Papyri Greek Series 4. New York: Columbia University Press, 1940.
- P.Corn. Westermann, William Linn, and Casper John Kraemer Jr., eds. *Greek Papyri in the Library of Cornell University Nos. 1–55*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1926.
- P.Enteux. Guéraud, Octave, ed. *Εντευξεις: Requêtes et plaintes adressées au Roi d'Égypte au IIIe siècle avant J.-C.* Cairo: Institut français d'archéologie orientale, 1931.
- P.Giss. Eger, Otto, Ernst Kornemann, and Paul M. Meyer, eds. *Griechische Papyri im Museum des oberhessischen Geschichtsvereins zu Giessen*. 3 parts. Leipzig: Teubner, 1910–1912.
- P.Grenf. 1 Grenfell, Bernard P., ed. *An Alexandrian Erotic Fragment and Other Greek Papyri Chiefly Ptolemaic*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1896.

- P.Hamb. Meyer, Paul M., et al., eds. *Griechische Papyrusurkunden der Hamburger Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek*. 4 vols. Leipzig: Teubner, 1911–1998.
- P.Heid. 6 Duttonhöffer, Ruth, ed. *Ptolemäische Urkunden aus der Heidelberger Papyrussammlung*. Vol. 6 of *Veröffentlichungen aus der Heidelberger Papyrussammlung*. Heidelberg: Winter, 1994.
- P.Hib. Grenfell, Bernard P., et al., eds. *The Hibeh Papyri*. 2 vols. London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1906–1955.
- P.Iand. Kalbfleisch, Karl, et al., eds. *Papyri Iandanae*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1912–1938.
- P.Laur. Pintaudi, Rosario, ed. *Dai Papiri della Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana*. 4 vols. Firenze: Gonnelli, 1976–1983.
- P.Leid.Inst. Hoogendijk, Francisca A. J., and Peter van Minnen, eds. *Papyri, Ostraca, Parchments and Waxed Tablets in the Leiden Papyrological Institute*. Leiden, 1991.
- P.Lille Jouguet, Pierre, Paul Collart, Jean Lesquier, and Maurice Xoual, eds. *Papyrus grecs*. 2 vols. Lille: Institut Papyrologique de l'Université de Lille, 1907–1928.
- P.Lond. Kenyon, Frederic. G., et al., eds. *Greek Papyri in the British Museum*. 7 vols. London: British Museum, 1893–1974.
- P.Mich. 1 Edgar, Campbell Cowan, ed. *Michigan Papyri: Zenon Papyri*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1931.
- P.Mich. 18 Römer, Cornelia, and Traianos Gagos, eds. *Michigan Papyri: P.Michigan Koenen; Michigan Texts Published in Honor of Ludwig Koenen*. Amsterdam: Gieben, 1996.
- P.Oxy. Grenfell, Bernard P., et al., eds. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1898–.
- P.Petr. Mahaffy, John P., and Josiah Gilbert Smyly, eds. *The Flinders Petrie Papyri*. 3 vols. Dublin: Academy House, 1891–1895.
- P.Petr.Kleon Beek, Bart van, ed. *The Archive of the Architektones Kleon and Theodoros (P. Petrie Kleon)*. *Collectanea Hellenistica* 7. Leuven: Peeters, 2017.
- P.Polit.Iud. Cowley, James M. S., and Klaus Maresch, eds. *Urkunden des Politeuma der Juden von Herakleopolis (144/3–133/2 v. Chr.) (P.Polit.Iud.)*. *Papyrologica Coloniensia* 29. Wiesbaden: Westdeutscher, 2001.
- P.Princ. 3 Johnson, Allan Chester, and Sidney Pullman Goodrich, eds. *Papyri in the Princeton University Collections*. Princeton

- University Studies in Papyrology 4. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1942.
- P.Ryl. Hunt, Arthur S., et al., eds. *Catalogue of the Greek and Latin Papyri in the John Rylands Library, Manchester*. 4 vols. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1911–1952.
- P.Sorb. 3 Clarysse, Willy, Hélène Cadell, and Kennokka Robic, eds. *Papyrus de la Sorbonne, nos. 70–144*. Papyrologica Parisina 1. Paris: Presses de l'Université Paris-Sorbonne, 2011.
- P.Tarich Armoni, Charikleia, ed. *Das Archiv der Taricheuten Ameneus und Onnophris aus Tanis*. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- P.Tebt. Grenfell, Bernard P., et al., eds. *The Tebtunis Papyri*. London: Oxford University Press, 1902–.
- P.Tor.Choach. Pestman, Pieter W., ed. *Il Processo di Hermias e altri documenti dell'archivio dei choachiti, papiri greci e demotici conservati a Torino e in altre collezioni d'Italia*. Catalogo del Museo Egizio di Torino 1.6. Turin: Ministero per i Beni Culturali e Ambientali, Soprintendenza al Museo delle Antichità Egizie, 1992.
- P.Yale Oates, John F., et al., eds. *Yale Papyri in the Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library*. 3 vols. New Haven: American Society of Papyrologists, 1967–2001.
- P.Zen.Pestm. Pestman, Pieter W., ed. *Greek and Demotic Texts from the Zenon Archive*. Leiden: Brill, 1980.
- Panath.* Isocrates, *Panathenaicus* (Or. 12)
- Paneg.* Isocrates, *Panegyicus* (Or. 4)
- Pel.* Plutarch, *Pelopidas*
- PFES Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society
- PGL Lampe, Geoffrey W. H., ed. *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1968.
- Phil.* Plutarch, *Philipoemen*
- Philip.* Demosthenes, *Philippica* (1–4)
- Phoc.* Plutarch, *Phocion*
- Phis.* Aristotle, *Physica*
- Plat.* Isocrates, *Plataicus* (Or. 14)
- Pol.* Aeneas Tacticus, *Polioretica*; Aristotle, *Politica*
- Pomp.* Plutarch, *Pompeius*
- Post.* Philo, *De posteritate Caini*
- Praec. ger.* Plutarch, *Praecepta gerendae rei publicae*
- Praep. soph.* Phrynichus, *Praeparatio sophistica*

prep.	preposition
PSI	Vitelli, Girolamo, et al., eds. <i>Papiri greci e latini</i> . Florence: Ariani, 1912–.
Pub.	Plutarch, <i>Publicola</i>
Pyrrh.	Plutarch, <i>Pyrrhus</i>
Quaest. conv.	Plutarch, <i>Questionum convivialum libri IX</i>
Quaest. rom.	Plutarch, <i>Quaestiones romanae et graecae (Aetia romana et graeca)</i>
REA	<i>Revue des études anciennes</i>
REG	<i>Revue des Études Grecques</i>
RelDis	Religions and Discourse
RevQ	<i>Revue de Qumran</i>
RFIC	<i>Rivista di Filologia e Istruzione Classica</i>
Rom.	Plutarch, <i>Romulus</i>
RSR	<i>Recherches de science religieuse</i>
SB	Preisigke, Friedrich, et al., eds. <i>Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden aus Aegypten</i> . Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1915–.
SBG	Studies in Biblical Greek
SCS	Septuagint and Cognate Studies
Se ipsum	Plutarch, <i>De se ipsum citra invidiam laudando</i>
Sef	<i>Sefarad</i>
SEG	Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum
SIG	Dittengerger, Wilhelm, ed. <i>Sylloge inscriptionum graecarum</i> . 3rd ed. 4 vols. Leipzig: Hirzel, 1915–1924.
SNTS	Society for the Study of the New Testament
SNTSMS	Society for the Study of the New Testament Monograph Series
SNTW	Studies of the New Testament and Its World
Soll. an.	Plutarch, <i>De sollertia animalium</i>
Somn.	Philo, <i>De somniis</i>
Soph. elench.	Aristotle, <i>Sophistici elenchi</i> (Top. 9)
StHell	Studia Hellenistica
Sull.	Plutarch, <i>Sulla</i>
Superst.	Plutarch, <i>De superstitione</i>
SVTG	Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum
TAM 2.1	Kalinka, Ernst, ed. <i>Pars Lyciae occidentalis cum Xantho oppido</i> . Fascicle 1 of <i>Tituli Lyciae linguis Graeca et Latina conscripti</i> . TAM 2. Vienna: Hoelder, 1920.

TAPA	<i>Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association</i>
TBN	Themes in Biblical Narrative
TDNT	Kittel, Gerhard, and Gerhard Friedrich, eds. <i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i> . Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–1976.
Text	<i>Textus</i>
Thes.	Plutarch, <i>Theseus</i>
Ti. C. Gracch.	Plutarch, <i>Tiberius et Caius Gracchus</i>
Tim.	Plutarch, <i>Timoleon</i>
TLG	<i>Thesaurus Linguae Graecae: A Digital Library of Greek Culture</i> . http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/ .
TM	Trismegistos text number
Trag. frag.	Hunt, Arthur S. <i>Tragicorum graecorum fragmenta papyracea nuper reperta</i> . OCT. Oxford: Clarendon, 1912.
Tu. san.	Plutarch, <i>De tuenda sanitate praecepta</i>
UPZ	Wilcken, Ulrich, ed. <i>Urkunden der Ptolemäerzeit (ältere Funde)</i> . 2 vols. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1927–1957.
VT	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
VTSup	Supplements to <i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
WGRWSup	Writings of the Greco-Roman World Supplement Series
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
YCS	Yale Classical Studies
ZAW	<i>Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
ZPE	<i>Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik</i>
ZST	<i>Zeitschrift für systematische Theologie</i>

Sigla

—	epigraphical lacuna of uncertain length, may be enclosed with square brackets to combine with a partial word restoration
- ca.? -	traces illegible/vestiges of text
()	modern editorial expansion of ancient abbreviation
(?)	indicates an uncertain translation
/\	text written below the line in ancient text
:	separates variant readings in an ancient source
[]	modern editorial restoration of lacuna
[...]	uncertain reading
[[]]	characters deleted in antiquity
\ /	text written above the line in ancient text
	line break in ancient text
< >	modern editorial emendation to ancient mistaken omission
vac.	space left empty in ancient source
αβγ	underdotted by modern editor to indicate characters ambiguous outside of context, damaged, illegible, or otherwise uncertain

Tables and Figures

Tables

1.1 Textual groups of Greek Judges	8
3.1. Judg ^{LXX} <i>battle</i> vocabulary in Rahlfs-Hanhart	65
3.2. The underlying Hebrew <i>battle</i> vocabulary	65
3.3. The <i>battle</i> verbs in Judg ^{LXX}	66
3.4. The <i>battle</i> nominals in Judg ^{LXX}	70
3.5. Semantic distinction of פָּרַע	72
3.6. ΠΑΡΑΤΑΣΣΩ and ΠΑΡΑΤΑΞΙΣ in current lexicons	74
3.7. Postclassical attestations of ΠΑΡΑΤΑΞΙΣ	84
4.1. Judg ^{LXX} <i>young male</i> vocabulary in Rahlfs-Hanhart	115
4.2. The <i>young male</i> vocabulary in Judg ^{LXX}	116
4.3. Select lexicon entries for <i>young male</i> vocabulary	123
4.4. Categories of <i>young male</i> vocabulary glosses	124
4.5. ΠΑΙΔΑΡΙΟΝ in Greek sources	127
4.6. ΝΕΑΝΙΣΚΟΣ in Greek sources	142
5.1. Judg ^{LXX} <i>meeting</i> vocabulary in Rahlfs-Hanhart	165
5.2. The underlying Hebrew <i>meeting</i> vocabulary	166
5.3. The <i>meeting</i> vocabulary in Judg ^{LXX}	167
5.4. Hebrew <i>meeting</i> vocabulary in Judges	175
5.5. Postclassical frequency of ΣΥΝΑΝΤΗΣΙΣ and ΣΥΝΑΝΤΑΩ	180
5.6. Postclassical frequency of ΑΠΑΝΤΗΣΙΣ and ΑΠΑΝΤΑΩ	187
5.7. <i>Meeting</i> vocabulary frequency	199

Figures

2.1. Entry for פָּרַע in Kircher's concordance	20
2.2. Entry for ζύμη in Aungier's concordance	27
2.3. Detail of entry for προφήτης from Tromm's concordance	29
2.4. Entry for ζεύγος from Biel	31

2.5. Entry for ζεύγος from Schleusner

SBL Press

Introduction

It is well known to any one that ever perused the Septuagint, that they often translate word for word; though the phrase that results from it be against the genius of the Greek tongue.

—Bentley, *A Dissertation upon the Epistles of Phalaris*

To approach Koine Greek as a sort of debased Classical Greek is a serious mistake.

—Lee, “The Vocabulary of the Septuagint and Documentary Evidence”

The language of the Septuagint has a mixed reputation. There are many reasons for this state of affairs. But in large measure it has arisen from the simple fact that the Septuagint is a diverse corpus of mostly translated texts, produced by many people in many places throughout the ancient Mediterranean world over an uncertain period of time. Differing scholarly assessments of the Greek found in the Septuagint understandably arise from perspectives that emphasize different aspects of the data and assess it against different standards.

As a result of this general state of affairs, the questions of first importance for evaluating the language of the Septuagint are: Which data and what standards? There is a long-standing tradition within biblical scholarship that views the degree of word-for-word correspondence to the source text as the data fundamental to evaluating the language of the Septuagint. This approach sets the Greek text constantly in relationship with its supposed Hebrew or Aramaic *Vorlage*—typically using MT—and examines the two together in terms of their grammatical alignment as a standard. Other scholars, however, frame the discussion in different terms, preferring instead to address the Septuagint first of all in light of its contemporary Greek linguistic milieu and only then to attempt to describe its language and style as a text.

The present study follows the second path. In so doing, I continue on in the routes trodden by many others, such as Adolf Deissmann, Henry St. John Thackeray, John A. L. Lee, Trevor V. Evans, and James K. Aitken. These scholars have repeatedly shown the importance of situating the language of the Septuagint within the broader history of Greek. From this perspective, the standard against which the language of the Septuagint is examined is found in the Greek linguistic milieu in which it was produced. Moreover, our knowledge of that milieu depends entirely upon the data offered by the surviving written sources from that era.

Yet as others have recognized and as is a central concern in this study, there are serious shortcomings in how the primary evidence for Greek has been handled in the reference works most commonly used among Septuagint scholars. Though the literary sources are themselves very relevant, of particular importance—and in regular neglect—is the nonliterary evidence for Greek found especially in the papyri and inscriptions. As difficult as they can be to navigate and decipher, these nonliterary sources preserve the variety of Greek closest to that most common throughout the Septuagint corpus. Because papyrology is such a vivacious discipline unto itself, more nonliterary sources are published each year. Yet, despite the widespread acknowledgement of its importance for Greek and Septuagint scholarship, the incorporation of this evidence into reference works has barely begun. It is true that the last decade has seen comparatively greater interest in Septuagint vocabulary, as is evident in new projects such as the ongoing *HTLS* and the publication of several related volumes.¹ But Septuagint lexicography as a whole remains remarkably underdeveloped, unsettled in method, and practically isolated from its broader postclassical Greek linguistic milieu.

The language of the Septuagint is the heart of this volume, specifically the interconnected challenges of lexical semantics and lexicography. This study sets out not only to draw attention to intramural debates and disciplinary shortcomings, but to contextualize them, to provide a constructive proposal for moving forward, and to demonstrate the validity and value of that proposal through textually based studies. To accomplish these tasks, I will focus on two key issues that bear certain conspicuous theoretical similarities. One key issue is the ongoing scholarly tendency to evaluate

1. Most significant here would be the volumes by Joosten and Bons (2011); Bons, Brucker, and Joosten (2014); and Bons, Joosten, and Hunziker-Rodewald (2015).

the language of the Septuagint from a lexical semantic perspective using the Hebrew Bible as a point of departure, a problematic approach that is deeply entangled with the history of biblical philology. Although in centuries past this approach was in some ways logistically justifiable, the burden of lexicographical research must now shift decisively in a Greek-oriented direction (as shown in ch. 2). Another key issue is to illustrate the benefits of analyzing stages in the textual development of the Septuagint in relation to broader language change in postclassical Greek. Similar to the tendency in lexical semantics just noted, Septuagint scholarship has typically evaluated Greek textual revisions primarily in terms of their relationship to the text of the Hebrew Bible. Although doing so is certainly appropriate, there is much to learn about the motivations for such revision and those who undertook it when the changes are also viewed as Greek linguistic phenomena (as shown in chs. 3–5). What connects these two issues—lexical semantics and textual revision—is the importance of handling the language of the Septuagint as part of the history of Greek at both practical and theoretical levels of lexicography.

The Textual History of Judges

The textual forum I have chosen for several case studies in Septuagint lexicography and postclassical Greek language change is the book of Judges. As explained in more detail below, because the book of Judges is a so-called double text in the textual history of the Septuagint, it offers a window into two distinct stages of the book. These two stages contain numerous instances of divergent vocabulary choices that reflect deliberateness in both original selection and subsequent change within the textual development of the book. The case studies in Greek Judges illustrate the practicalities and payoff of a Greek-oriented lexicographical method that situates the language of the Septuagint squarely within its contemporary historical and linguistic context.²

Though this study focuses almost exclusively upon Greek, it is important to highlight that that focus is possible in large measure thanks to the textual stability of the Hebrew tradition of Judges, to which we now turn our attention.

2. Evans (2010) provides an exemplar for this approach in the book of Tobit, one that first sparked my thinking for the present study.

Hebrew

The most up-to-date critical text of Judges in Hebrew is that of Natalio Fernández Marcos (2011) in the *BHQ* series, which will serve as the point of departure for all discussion in this study.³ In terms of the textual history of the book in Hebrew, at a general level the MT of Judges appears on the basis of the available evidence to be very well-preserved, and therefore it “should be preferred over the variant readings of the versions or a good number of conjectures” (Fernández Marcos 2011, 5*). There is little variation between extant Hebrew textual witnesses, as is reflected in the *BHQ* apparatus, and the MT usually preserves “an acceptable/good/preferable text” (Tov 2012, 486). The Vulgate, Peshitta, and targum of Judges each appear to have had source texts very close to the MT, sometimes perhaps more so than that of the Greek version (Ausloos 2016, 277). The latter is a much more complicated case and is discussed below, but even so, many Greek variants appear to have arisen from haplography, parablepsis, assimilation, alternative vocalization, or explication (Fernández Marcos 2011, 8*).⁴

More significant than the versions for Hebrew textual history are the few but important witnesses discovered near the Dead Sea (see Lange 2016; Treballe Barrera 2016a, 2016b). There are three fragments known from the Qumran site: 1QJudg (1Q6), 4QJudg^a (4Q49), and 4QJudg^b (4Q50).⁵ There is broad agreement that 4Q50 and 1Q6 are very close to MT with only minor variants due mostly to haplography, orthography, and contextual assimilations (Fernández Marcos 2011, 6*; see also 2003). Scholars diverge more meaningfully in their evaluation of 4Q49 since it preserves the text of 6:2–13 with a minus at verses 7–10. As early as Julius Wellhausen, verses 7–10 had been viewed by some as a later editorial (Elohistic or Deuteronomistic) insertion purely on literary-critical grounds.

3. For a fairly recent survey of literature on the book of Judges in general, see Murphy (2017).

4. Satterthwaite (1991) also discusses theologically motivated variants.

5. A fourth manuscript known as XJudges also exists in seven privately owned fragments but is of unknown origin (see Fernández Marcos 2011, 5*–6*). It preserves just seventy-six complete or partial words, with no textual variants from MT (Lange 2016, 282–83). Later evidence for the Hebrew text of Judges from the Cairo Genizah was not collated in *BHQ* owing to its variants having been shown to postdate MT (Goshen-Gottstein 1976; Sanders 1999; Fernández Marcos 2006, 34).

So when 4Q49 was discovered in 1952 with precisely those verses missing, Julio Treballe Barrera—who edited the fragment in the DJD series (1995)—argued that it preserves a shorter, earlier form of Judges (cf. 1989, esp. 239).⁶ Since then others have followed suit (e.g., Tov 2002, 156; Ulrich 2008, 494; Rezetko 2013, 10–31; Ausloos 2014). Among those who have deemed 6:7–10 a plus, some have argued for a pre-Deuteronomistic monarchical setting for the insertion, while others favor a setting in the late Second Temple period.⁷ On the contrary, many scholars argue instead that the variant in 4Q49 at 6:7–10 represents a minus, perhaps an instance of parablepsis (i.e., homoioarcton from -וּ in 6:7 to -וּ in 6:11) or abbreviation (see, e.g., Amit 1999; Block 1999; O’Connell 1996; Rofé 2011). Fernández Marcos (2003) has also argued that 4Q49 is too short a fragment to draw such a far-reaching conclusion about the literary development of the book of Judges (see also Hess 1997).

Whatever else might be said about the significance of 4Q49 for the textual history of Judges in Hebrew, it need not detain our attention here, as it does not in fact bear upon the present study in any major way. Even granting that Judg 6:7–10 represents an editorial insertion, it must have occurred early enough to have been present in the *Vorlage* of the Greek translator, who rendered it in his text just as one would expect on the basis of the reading in MT. In fact, Fernández Marcos (2011, 9*) finds that the original Greek translation (OG) was “a quite literal version of a text very similar, although not identical to MT.”⁸ Similarly, even granting that 4Q49 does represent a distinct literary version of Judges, that version was apparently either unknown to or of little concern among those who later revised the existing Greek version of Judges against a proto-MT text. In short,

6. Treballe Barrera (2000, 455) also notes that six out of ten variant readings in 4Q49 do not align with either MT or LXX.

7. See Hendel and Joosten (2018, 57–58) for the former and Rezetko (2013) for the latter, both mounting arguments upon (theoretically opposed) historical linguistic grounds.

8. With this statement in view, Ausloos (2016, 278) suggests that more OG variants should therefore be “considered as witnesses to a different Hebrew *Vorlage*.” However, Fernández Marcos (2011, 9*) immediately follows his statement by saying that the OG “was not as literal as it has been supposed by previous studies based on G^B [i.e., Judg^B], which has been corrected towards MT.” On that note, it is important to recognize that, because a critical text of OG has not yet been produced, and thus no full studies of it undertaken, generalizing statements about the translation approach must be made (and/or read) with caution.

both the original translation of Judges into Greek and its later revision clearly worked with *Vorlagen* that were aligned with the otherwise stable and well-preserved tradition represented in MT (see Soggin 1981, 67–69; Fernández Marcos 2003, 15; Satterthwaite 2015, 102).⁹

Greek

The textual history of Greek Judges is far more complex. This complexity is itself striking in view of the apparent stability of the Hebrew textual tradition. But that stability is important insofar as it encourages the assumption of a (more or less) consistent source text behind the significant amount of divergence within the textual history of the Greek version.

Over the past two centuries, scholars have evaluated the divergence within the textual evidence for Greek Judges in various ways. Up through the end of the nineteenth century, most scholars presumed there was a single OG translation that was later revised (see Montalvo 1977, 7–10). This view seems to have influenced early scholarly editions of the Septuagint that appeared around the turn of the twentieth century, which printed either the text of the Alexandrinus (A) or Vaticanus (B) codices.¹⁰ However, around that same period Paul de Lagarde (1891) postulated that these two texts actually derived from independent OG translations (see esp. 71–72; see also Moore 1895, 1912). Alfred Rahlfs also found the extensive difference between these codices in the text of Greek Judges difficult to reconcile, especially in chapter 5. Perhaps as a nod to his mentor Lagarde, when Rahlfs compiled his 1935 manual edition of the Septuagint he printed an eclectic text based on A in the upper part of the page (Judg^A) and one based on B in the lower part (Judg^B). Rahlfs's decision would prove influential for later scholarship, as A. V. Billen (1942), Paul Kahle (1959), and others continued to advance Lagarde's two-translation theory (see Ottley 1920, 22–23; Jellicoe 1968, 280–83; Fernández Marcos 2000, 94; Harlé 1995, 26).

9. Although opinion has fluctuated as to how the Greek tradition developed, as discussed below, no scholars have convincingly posited an alternative Hebrew version on that basis (Fernández Marcos 2003, 2). The exception to this rule may be Judg 5 (see Fernández Marcos 2011, 8*; Tov 2012, 487–88; Ausloos 2016, 278), which does not come under examination in this study, but see LaMontagne (2019).

10. Swete (1887) printed B, while Brooke and McLean (1897, 1917) printed A and, later, an eclectic text based on B.

A Single Old Greek Translation

While the issue was vigorously debated in the mid-twentieth century, scholars have now entirely abandoned Lagarde's view. Over the years, numerous studies have shown that the textual evidence for Greek Judges does not represent distinct translations, but rather a complex admixture of different stages and kinds of revision of a single OG text.¹¹ The first substantial defense of this view against the Lagardian double-translation thesis was Otto Pretzl (1926), who argued that it was impossible for the two text-types to represent independent translations in view of the high frequency with which they agree with one another against the Hebrew. Pretzl classified manuscript families into A and B types, the former of which having three groups (AI, AII, and AIII). Important refinements to these groups were then made by Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen (1951), who presented further evidence from syntax and vocabulary for a single OG translation. In addition to showing that there is Hexaplaric influence in all text groups, especially the A groups, Soisalon-Soininen demonstrated how the later revision to the (older) text(s) of Greek Judges tended to bring the text closer to a Hebrew exemplar very close or identical to MT (cf. Aejmelaeus 2020). A decade later, Dominique Barthélemy's landmark study of the Naḥal Ḥever scroll confirmed that the B text of Greek Judges reflects a Hebraizing revision and also took the critical step of connecting that revisional work to the *kaige* phenomenon (1963, esp. 34–5, 47).¹²

The work of Walter Bodine (1980) carried forward the conclusions of Soisalon-Soininen and Barthélemy and led to important developments. First of all, Bodine identified, on the one hand, how the B group does indeed clearly stand within the *kaige* revision. Yet Bodine—aware that *kaige* was a tradition or movement, rather than a singular phenomenon—also showed the “peculiarities” of the B group with respect to other *kaige* texts that made it distinct (67).¹³ Second, and more central to the present

11. See the surveys in Harlé and Roqueplo (1999, 25–27); Satterthwaite (2015, 102–5); Dogniez (2016); and LaMontagne (2019, 15–20).

12. By this time, Schreiner (1957, 1961a, 1961b) considered Soisalon-Soininen's conclusions concerning the single OG translation theory to be fully established.

13. More recently, Karrer (2012, 605) has also classified the extant text of Greek Judges from Sinaiticus (S) as “a second main witness for the ‘*kaige*’-text.”

purposes, Bodine further refined the witnesses in the textual groups (and subgroups), which are given in table 1.1.¹⁴

Table 1.1. Textual groups of Greek Judges

AI	AGabckx
AII	KZgln(o)w + (d)ptv ²
AIII	MNhyb ₂
B	B(d)efjm(o)qsz + imrua ₂

The last few decades of scholarship has identified the AII group in particular (the so-called Antiochene/Lucianic text) as the best witness to the OG text of Judges, particularly when supported by the pre-Hexaplaric Old Latin version (Bodine 1980, 134–36; Lindars 1987; Dorival, Harl, and Munnich 1988, 175; Treballe Barrera 1989, 1991, 2005; Fernández Marcos 2011, 7*). Still greater clarity concerning the textual history of Greek Judges has come from the studies published by José Manuel Cañas Reillo as he has labored since 2013 to compile the Göttingen edition for the book. Having collated the evidence, including some new manuscripts, Cañas Reillo (2020a, 546–47) has found enough “new data to corroborate the idea of a single original text” and to “dismantle” the notion of a double-translation. The most up-to-date refinements of the textual groups have now been published by Cañas Reillo (2020b).

Before saying more about the revision to the OG text of Judges, it is worth addressing several doctoral dissertations that have advanced the two-translation theory of Greek Judges in some way.¹⁵ Although their work remains unpublished, both John Ludlum (1957) and David Montalvo (1977) advance their arguments based on the divergent vocabulary of Greek Judges, which of course comes under close consideration in this study. Their basic argument is that, if lexical differences between the two

14. These manuscript sigla conform to those employed in the Cambridge larger Septuagint (see Brooke and Mclean 1906, v–vii) rather than the numerical sigla employed in Rahlfs and the Göttingen edition. On the latter, see Rahlfs (1914, 2004). For comparative tables, now slightly out of date, see Jellicoe (1968, 360–69). For the full list of manuscripts and editions currently being collated for the Göttingen edition of Judges, see Cañas Reillo (2020b, 177).

15. Notably, Tov (2012, 484) also considers the evidence for the two-translation view “very strong,” although he does not expand on this statement.

texts of Greek Judges exist without any discernable distinction in meaning between the readings, then they likely did not arise from revision—which necessarily implies improvement—but point toward distinct translations (see LaMontagne 2016, 50–51). But there are flaws in this approach. First, while improvement of some kind is of course inherent in the very notion of revision, it is problematic to assume that our notions of improvement match those of the revisers themselves or that their work was unidimensional in this respect. Second, the means by which Ludlum and Montalvo adjudicate distinction in meaning between words (and thus discern the possibility of “improvement”) is far from satisfactory. Montalvo, for one, relies heavily upon *TDNT* and an earlier doctoral thesis by Charles Cooper (1941), who in his own lexical analysis relied entirely upon the ninth edition of *LSJ* (1940) and an edition of Hesychius’s fifth-century CE lexicon by Mauricius Schmidt (1858–1868; see Montalvo 1977, 68–127). Taken together, these reference works omit any meaningful incorporation of the lexical evidence from the postclassical period of Greek that is most relevant to understanding Septuagint vocabulary, as discussed further in chapter 2. Moreover, as shown repeatedly throughout this study, it is evaluating the language of the Septuagint against precisely such evidence that facilitates discerning much finer linguistic subtleties, such as semantic change or distinctions in register, which in part motivated revisional efforts in Greek Judges, as we will see. Indeed, Septuagint lexicography that gives pride of place to contemporary literary and nonliterary sources—and is attentive to the social context—is able to provide enough detail about lexical use and meaning to explain the divergent vocabulary in Greek Judges as sensible and skilled revision of an earlier Greek text, rather than as representing separate translation efforts.¹⁶

16. Much more recently, LaMontagne (2016) advanced the argument that OG and the B group represent independent translations, evidently building upon his 2013 doctoral dissertation. However, the 2019 published version of LaMontagne’s dissertation backs away significantly from this two-translation thesis, evidently owing to awareness at some level of Cañas Reillo’s work on the Göttingen edition. Compare, for example, the dissertation (2013, 30), where the study of Judg 5 is framed as diagnostic for the entire book, with the published version (2019, 21), where LaMontagne states that his aim is instead “to clarify the relationship between the texts [of Greek Judges] in light of the emerging agreement that the Song of Deborah demonstrates evidence of two translations, *even if it is believed that only one translation was made of the rest of Judges*” (emphasis added). Unfortunately, LaMontagne does not interact with the work of Cañas Reillo at all, who in his own work has concluded that even Judg 5, with

An Intentional (Egyptian?) Revision to OG

Scholarship is now in a position to conclude that, despite its complexity, the manuscript evidence for Greek Judges attests two distinct stages in its textual history that may be realistically reconstructed and therefore studied. One stage is, of course, the OG text (Judg^{OG}) already discussed, as represented by the AII group of witnesses in table 1.1. The other stage is the revised version of Judg^{OG} as represented in the B group of witnesses (Judg^{Rv}). In this connection, Fernández Marcos (2012, 161) speaks in general terms of a double process in the textual transmission of the Historical Books in Greek: the initial production of the OG translation followed by a revision that shares tendencies with the kaige movement (cf. Fernández Marcos and Spottorno Díaz-Caro 2011, 13–15). This process is most visible, in Fernández Marcos's (2012, 163) estimation, in the textual history of Greek Judges, within which the B group “has been submitted to a conscious revision of the Old Greek in closer conformity with the Hebrew.”

The basic characteristics of the B group include not only its relationship to the kaige movement but also peculiarities in vocabulary choice, a Hebrew source text closer to MT than that of non-B group witnesses, and the presence of doublets due to Hexaplaric influence (see Sáenz-Badillos 1973; Targarona Borrás 1983a). The most recent textual collation by Cañas Reillo (2020b, 177–80) has subdivided the B group into two parts, one of which more clearly reflects a “compact group” that is very consistent in its distinctive vocabulary choice (B¹), while the other has some interference from other groups (B²). As such, the B group as a whole should be understood as manifesting a “set of revisional processes” that likely began as an intentional effort that is perhaps better visible in the B¹ subgroup (Cañas Reillo 2020a, 548; 2020b, 179).

Since no Göttingen edition of Greek Judges yet exists, the manuscript support for any given reading in either the OG or revised stage must be compiled on a case-by-case basis using the edition of Brooke and McLean (1917). In the chapters that follow, the texts of OG Judges that I provide are the product of my own text-critical reconstruction and, to avoid any ambiguity, are labeled accordingly. Two comments are necessary at this point. First, while in most cases the textual support is clear, some of my reconstructions

its additional complexity, does not stem from two independent translations (Cañas Reillo 2020b, 177).

could be disputed and will most likely be clarified by further evidence once the Göttingen edition is complete. Second, while this study builds upon the text-critical scholarship described above, I make no systematic attempt here to refine text-critical scholarship in Greek Judges. As a final note, of very great importance to the present lexical study is the fact that *all* the textual data for the revised text of Greek Judges point to an Egyptian provenance. Those data include the Coptic and Old Latin versions, as well as the oldest direct witness to Greek Judges, a third-century CE papyrus (PSI 2.127 [TM 62071]) found at Oxyrhynchus (Cañas Reillo 2016).¹⁷

Other Aspects of Greek Judges

Much else could be said about Greek Judges, but only a few comments are necessary here. First, scholarly discussion of translation technique in the book is often clouded by ambiguity over which text-historical stage is in view or the process by which it came about. Often the A or B codices—or Rahlfs’s eclectic A or B texts—are discussed as if they represent a unified translation effort, one that is typically characterized as highly “literalistic” (e.g., Dogniez 2016, 296).¹⁸ But any study of translation technique must be based on a critical reconstruction of an OG text (Satterthwaite 2015, 102; see, e.g., Treballe Barrera 2008). Given the difficulty of this task for Greek Judges, scholarship has made only modest progress in this regard. In several studies conducted with these text-critical concerns in mind, Fernández Marcos (2003, 14–15) has characterized Judg^{OG} as an

expansive text full of small additions (subjects, complements, pronouns) in order to clarify the meaning, with frequent doublets and some freedom in the word order and rearrangement of the verse, along with some light stylistic corrections.... In sum, the most ancient text attainable for the Greek translation of Judges is a relatively free translation compared with the text of *Vaticanus*.¹⁹

17. Also designated Rahlfs 968.

18. Sipilä (1999) purports to present a study of translation technique based on Judg^A. In his conclusion he states that his analysis “fits” the classification of Greek Judges by Thackeray (1909, 13) as a “literal or unintelligent” translation, when in fact Thackeray was referring to the B text (Sipilä 1999, 200). Similarly, Sollamo (1979, 286–87) categorizes Greek Judges as one of the “most slavish” translations but bases this evaluation upon analysis of Judg^A and Judg^B. See also Soisalon-Soininen (1951, 48).

19. Cf. Fernández Marcos (2006, 2010, 2012, 2014).

Others have described the characteristics of the OG translation as: “beaucoup moins littéraliste que A et B, une tendance à l’amplification par doublets allant parfois jusqu’à des développements d’allure targumique, et parfois une compréhension plus fine de la syntaxe hébraïque” (Harlé and Roqueplo 1999, 28). In this connection, it is necessary to recognize that the style and language of Judg^{OG} as a translation has not been studied in depth and thus is still not at all well understood.

Another important aspect of Greek Judges that scholars have noted takes pride of place in this study: its vocabulary. Numerous scholars have noticed the lexical differences between Judg^A and Judg^B, many of which are fairly consistent. For example, Judg^B tends to preserve *ἐγώ εἰμι* corresponding to אֲנִי (MT), *ῥομφαία* rather than *μάχαιρα* (Judg^A), *Φυλιστιίμ* rather than *ἀλλόφυλλοι* (Judg^A), *βλέπω* rather than *ὄράω* (Judg^A), *θέλω* rather than *βούλομαι* (Judg^A), *ὄνος* rather than *ὑποζύγιον* (Judg^A), and *ἀυλίζω* corresponding to אָלַח (MT) rather than *καταλύω*, *ὑπνόω*, or *καταπαύω* (Judg^A).²⁰ As mentioned, scholarship has recognized the similarity of many of these choices to the preferences apparent in other kaige-related texts. Yet many of the differences in vocabulary in the B group (Judg^{Rv}) compared to Judg^{OG} cannot be explained on the basis of a Hebraizing tendency. That is, the motivation for these changes seems to be stylistic in nature and thus intertwined with the development of the Greek language and the social context of those who produced and read the revised text (Fernández Marcos 2012, 169). In this sense, the complicated textual situation in Greek Judges is not a drawback, but an opportunity. Deissmann (1901, 73 n. 3) pointed out that “knowledge of the lexical conditions is itself a preliminary condition of textual criticism.” To understand the phenomena of language change in Greek Judges that was not motivated by the underlying Hebrew exemplar, then, its vocabulary must be situated within the history of Greek as a language and its cultural environment.

Method, Tools, and Terms

The basic method of this study was established almost forty years ago by Lee (1983). By means of thorough examination of Hellenistic papyri, Lee demonstrated that the language of the Greek Pentateuch is essentially that

20. These, among others, are noted in Fernández Marcos (2012). See also Harlé and Roqueplo (1999, 53–69) and Cañas Reillo (2020a, 2020b).

of its own time.²¹ While his conclusions have been widely accepted, very little has occurred over the intervening years to carry forward his method (see Lee 2003b).²² That is not to say, however, that the importance of non-literary Greek sources for understanding the Septuagint has not been repeatedly confirmed. Nor has the near total absence of these sources from current lexicons been denied.²³ Both points are duly acknowledged and are addressed in more detail in the next chapter.²⁴ This study thus joins the more recent investigations of Septuagint vocabulary that reinforce Lee's conclusions, but with emphasis upon the theory and practice necessary to carry it forward for Septuagint lexicography.

The variety of Greek that appears in the Septuagint corpus is post-classical and largely nonliterary. Note, however, that nonliterary does not necessarily mean uneducated per se, but rather that the variety of language generally attested in the Septuagint differs functionally from that of Greek literature in register.²⁵ So while Greek literature from the Hellenistic and early Roman periods is often useful as a point of contrast, the nonliterary evidence found in papyri and inscriptions is of indispensable relevance to the Septuagint. In this study I refer to the language in and around the Septuagint corpus as postclassical Greek, by which I mean the historical phase of the Greek language that arose in the Hellenistic era and was used in a number of varieties beginning in the early third century and that endured and developed through the early Byzantine period (see Bubenik 2014). While more typical terms for this phase of the language are “Koine” or “Hellenistic” Greek, both have problems that are better avoided, as is the ambiguous phrase “Septuagint Greek” for related reasons.²⁶ In reality, the

21. See esp. 145. This was an important project since, in the 1960s, the notion of “Jewish Greek” was gaining in popularity, as discussed in ch. 2 below.

22. Evans (2010) has pointed to the promise of this line of research and developed Lee's approach for dating Septuagint texts based on external linguistic evidence. Elsewhere I (Ross 2016) have expanded on Lee's study of *ὀράω* and *βλέπω* and found his conclusions remain sound in light of new evidence. See also Lee (2018).

23. Lee (2016, 104) states that “a lexicon or extended treatment of the Koine Greek vocabulary is non-existent.” See also Lee (2004b, 67).

24. Also see Horsley (1984, 1989), Lee (2003b, 2004b, 2016), Dines (2004, 114), Evans (2005), and Aitken (1999, 2014a, 2014b, 2014c, 2016).

25. “Register” defines a variety of language as a set of characteristics germane to the situational framework in which it is used. See Willi (2010) and Biber and Conrad (2009, 6–15).

26. “Hellenistic” Greek is inaccurate, since postclassical Greek was used all the

sources for postclassical Greek attest a wide variety of genres, registers, and styles that are best encapsulated by a broad and neutral term (Horrocks 2014, 88–123; Hanson 2015).

The fundamental assumption for Septuagint lexicography must therefore be the necessity of evaluating these diverse Greek sources afresh to understand word meaning (Aitken 2014b, 14). Only in so doing is it possible to obtain an accurate picture of how vocabulary was used according to the linguistic conventions contemporary to the production and revision of the Septuagint.²⁷ In this connection, owing to the general timeline within which scholars agree the Septuagint was likely produced, my lexical analysis is limited to sources dated to the third century BCE through the second century CE. A wealth of tools is available in both print and digital formats that, while not making lexical semantic analysis less challenging in itself, certainly facilitate access to and collection of the relevant data.²⁸ I have made constant use of these tools in my analyses and focused in my presentation of the data on the most reliable and illustrative sources.²⁹ The problems in citing nonliterary sources are well known, so I have used Trismegistos reference numbers wherever possible, which are enclosed in square brackets.³⁰

way through the late Roman era. “Koine” Greek is sometimes considered uniformly vernacular or otherwise unsophisticated, which confuses the historical phase of a language with issues of register and language standards (cf. Dines 2004, 112–13). For example, Gibson and Campbell (2017, 2) incorrectly define what they call “Koine (‘common’) Greek” as “the language of the street.” On the questionable value of the phrase “Biblical Greek,” see Janse (2007, 647); on the related problem of “Septuagint Greek,” see Ross (forthcoming).

27. By “linguistic conventions” or “conventional” use, I am referring to the norms of linguistic behavior in a particular linguistic community, including lexical forms, grammatical patterns, and discourse strategies (Evans 2007, 49–50; cf. Langacker 2013, 227). The term *conventional* provides a more linguistically informed and value-neutral way of talking about what others often call “normal” or “natural” or “standard” Greek.

28. The pertinent reference works and online databases are described by Van der Meer (2011, 65–69), Aitken (2014b, 7–11, 34–38), Pantelia (2014a), Ross (2016, 345 n. 13), Lee (2016, 103–5), and Reggiani (2017).

29. Frequency statistics from one research tool are not always reliable, so I have cross-referenced figures gleaned using different tools and often tallied occurrences myself, but my totals may differ slightly from those of others. I have excluded from my statistics and analyses most fragmentary literature, scholia, and Aesop. For nonliterary evidence I include only sources that are dated and in which the attestation of a word is unambiguous (i.e., not fragmentary).

30. On which see Aitken (2014b, 38) and Depauw and Gheldof (2014). I have

In dealing with this variety of sources, my approach to lexicography is rigorously evidence-based and thus focused on language in use, but with contemporary influences upon semantic analysis. My theoretical approach is informed by cognitive functional linguistics (see Taylor 2003; Cruse 2011; Geeraerts 2015; and Kroeger 2018). From this perspective, content words do not refer immediately to objects in the external world. Rather, words are associated with conceptual categories formed by embodied interaction with the external world. Words are of course *used* to refer to the external world, but the reason they are so used is because a given entity is being identified at the moment of the utterance as a member of a certain conceptual category. Throughout my lexical analysis I will identify these conceptual categories simply as “concepts” and use italic font to denote them. Where a word has more than one conceptual association, it is considered polysemous and for lexicographical purposes is attributed the corresponding number of senses in its entry. Those concepts/senses of the word each receive a definition as a description of their meaning, and that definition is also designated with italic font.³¹ Finally, my approach to the practical aspects of lexicography—the details of actually collecting and reporting data—is fairly traditional with one significant exception. As already indicated, I use definitions to describe the senses of a given lexical item, in the tradition of the *Oxford English Dictionary*, rather than the gloss method that is described in chapter 2. To demonstrate the results of this approach I have created sample lexical entries for several of the words examined in this study, which are presented in the appendix.

The Plan of This Study

To address the ongoing problems and challenges in Septuagint lexicography as a discipline, it is necessary first to understand its place within the history of scholarship. Therefore, chapter 2 surveys the discipline and its surrounding discussion from the early seventeenth century to the present. This survey highlights how study of the language of the Septuagint has from its inception been almost totally severed from the study of Greek in general and points to the urgent need for change. The following

otherwise referred to papyri following Oates et al. (2001) and cite inscriptions as far as possible using Horsley and Lee (1994), supplemented with McLean (2002).

31. In general, I have used less technical language in speaking about linguistic meaning and have kept most theoretical discussion confined to footnotes.

three chapters then offer case studies from Greek Judges to illustrate a Greek-oriented method of lexical semantic analysis and its benefits. Each presents an examination of words used consistently in Judg^{OG} that are in turn consistently replaced in Judg^{Rv} with alternatives. The vocabulary in these case studies are content words that were selected for analysis on the basis of their relatively higher frequency in the book and the consistency with which they were at first used and later revised. Each chapter first explains the nature of the difference in vocabulary selection between the Judg^{OG} and Judg^{Rv} before moving on to lexical analysis of the relevant vocabulary in postclassical Greek sources. Each chapter also concludes by pointing to implications for Septuagint lexicography, the multifaceted motivations underlying the revision of Judg^{OG}, and the value of Septuagint vocabulary as evidence for Greek lexicography in general. Chapter 6 offers general conclusions.

This approach to studying the language of the Septuagint is innovative within the discipline as it currently exists, as stages in the transmission of a single book are evaluated here primarily as linguistically motivated and not merely text-critical. That is, this study gives virtually exclusive attention to evaluating the transmission of a Septuagint text as embedded within the broader context of postclassical Greek and its development, rather than to scrutinizing the correspondence of the constituents of that Greek text to a purported Hebrew source text. While there is certainly profit in the latter, the time has come—as the next chapter demonstrates—for far greater energy to be directed to the former. It is precisely because textual evidence encourages the assumption of a stable *Vorlage* for Judges that vocabulary change in the stages of the Septuagint version can be understood as part of the history of Greek, an attitude that must constitute the point of departure in all further lexicography for the corpus.