COMMENTARY ON THE OLD GREEK
AND PESHITTA OF ISAIAH 1–25

TEXT-CRITICAL STUDIES

Juan Hernández Jr., General Editor

Editorial Board:

Todd R. Hanneken
Roderic L. Mullen
W. Andrew Smith

Number 13

SBL PRESS

COMMENTARY ON THE OLD GREEK AND PESHITTA OF ISAIAH 1–25

Ronald L. Troxel

SBL PRESS

Atlanta

Copyright © 2022 by Ronald L. Troxel

For Ben and Bryan,
Angie and Tyler

Contents

Preface

Five years ago I undertook this commentary on the Old Greek (OG) and the Peshitta (S) of Isaiah as a first step toward writing a commentary on the Hebrew text of Isaiah 1–39 for the SBL series Hebrew Bible: A Critical Edition. I had argued previously that textual criticism must take the form of commentary on the life of the text rather than merely listing differences between the translations and extant Hebrew manuscripts. Even a brief commentary correlated with an apparatus, as in the HBCE, is more useful than a bare apparatus. In particular, the evidence of OG and S needs a discussion of the likely origins of an apparent difference to establish whether it attests a Hebrew variant prior to admitting it to discussion of its role in the life of the Hebrew text.

This commentary was, then, a first step to constructing a commentary on the life of the Hebrew text of Isa 1–39. Life itself, however, is unpredictable. Who could have foreseen a pandemic that confined many of us to home and even disrupted research? In fact, editing the manuscript for chapters 1–20 of this volume was stalled considerably by the pandemic's effects on SBL Press. Only in the fall of 2021 did progress resume, thanks to the efforts of Bob Buller, Director of the Press, who personally undertook much of the editing. Without his diligent work, this volume would yet be languishing.

But the pandemic also had an impact on my plans. Although I have not fallen prey to the virus itself, the isolation it imposed and a health crisis in my family altered my expectations for completing the project with the HBCE and this commentary on OG and S. I had, however, already written commentary on chapters 21–25, and Bob Buller kindly agreed to publish those with chapters 1–20. Bob has been an indispensable aid in bringing this commentary to press, raising good questions about the intent of words and making certain the formatting comports with the standards of SBL Press.

I am also grateful for those who have nourished and expanded my thinking about the versions and textual criticism, beginning with Michael V. Fox, who introduced me to the field. My colleague at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, Jeremy Hutton, engaged in helpful conversations arising from his work in translation studies, while colleagues in the field throughout academe have provided useful comments on the various projects I have undertaken to date. Special mention is due Arie van der Kooij, who has repeatedly proven himself ready to offer comments and collegiality. Despite reaching different conclusions about the approach taken by the translator of OG-Isaiah, we share a passion for studying the version.

I also wish to thank for his contributions Dr. Preston Atwood, who successfully defended a dissertation on the first twenty chapters of the Peshitta of Isaiah at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Dr. Atwood was my project assistant for a semester just prior to my retirement, compiling and reviewing prior publications on S-Isaiah and engaging me in discussions of its character.

My greatest gratitude, as always, goes to my wife, Jacki, whose pursuit of her own passions has enabled "parallel play" throughout our marriage. Retirement has given us opportunities for travel and experiences that our careers in education precluded. I am grateful to enjoy these years with my best friend.

This work is dedicated to the two sons that Jacki and I raised, whom we have always regarded as our most important life's work. Each son was fortunate to find a partner well matched to his personality and needs (Ben and Angie, Bryan and Tyler), and together they have given us three wonderful grandchildren: Noah, Aubrey, and Blake. Watching our sons' partnerships with their wives, especially in parenting the world's cutest grandchildren, has brought us great satisfaction. To the four of them (and their children) I dedicate my labors in writing this book.

Minneapolis
December 2021

General Abbreviations

AB	Anchor Bible
ArBib	Aramaic Bible
ATA	Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen
AThR	*Anglican Theological Review*
AUSS	*Andrews University Seminary Studies*
b.	Babylonian talmudic tractate
Bib	*Biblica*
BIOSCS	*Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*
BO	*Bibliotheca Orientalis*
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
CBET	Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology
CC	Continental Commentaries
CurBR	*Currents in Biblical Research*
DSS	Dead Sea Scrolls
DTS	Descriptive Translation Studies
ETL	*Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses*
FAT	Forschungen zum Alten Testament
frag(s).	fragment(s)
GRBS	*Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies*
HBCE	Hebrew Bible: A Critical Edition
HKAT	Handkommentar zum Alten Testament
HThKAT	Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament
HUB	Hebrew University Bible
HUCA	*Hebrew Union College Annual*
ICC	International Critical Commentary
JJS	*Journal of Jewish Studies*
JSJSup	Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series
JTS	*Journal of Theological Studies*

LBH	Late Biblical Hebrew
LHBOTS	Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies
Mek.	Mekilta
MPIL	Monographs of the Peshitta Institute Leiden
MSU	Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens
NCB	New Century Bible Commentary
OBO	Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis
OTL	Old Testament Library
OTS	Old Testament Studies
RB	*Revue Biblique*
Roš Haš.	Roš Haššanah
SANER	Studies in Ancient Near Eastern Records
SBLCS	Society of Biblical Literature Commentary on the Septuagint
SBLSP	*Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers*
SCS	Septuagint and Cognate Studies
SHSHJ	South Florida Studies in the History of Judaism
SP	Samaritan Pentateuch
STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
TJ	Targum Jonathan
VT	*Vetus Testamentum*
VTSup	Supplements to Vetus Testamentum
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
ZAW	*Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*

Symbols, Abbreviations, and Bibliography

Symbols and Technical Abbreviations

>	indicates a minus in a textual witness.
+	directly attached to a word or phrase marks a plus attributable to the translator
+/-	plus or minus; shorthand for the presence or absence of a form that avoids prejudicial descriptors like "addition" and "omission."
___	(surrounding a word/phrase) marks an adopted emendation
ad loc.	in the place specified
e.g.	for example (*exempli gratia*)
κτλ	καὶ τὰ λοιπά ("and the rest")
q.v.	which see (*quid vide*); refers the reader to the passage cited.
s.v.	under the word (*sub verbum*); refers to a discussion of a word in a lexical resource, found under the heading for the word.
vid.	it appears (*videtur*); designates a manuscript reading that is only partially visible or certain, but considered likely.
(1)/[1]	Following a verse reference, a superscript number in brackets identifies which instance (out of multiple occurrences of a word in a verse) is under discussion. The brackets distinguish the superscript number from a footnote.

Bible Texts and Translations

MT	Masoretic Text. MS Leningrad B19a.
OG	Old Greek. Joseph Ziegler. *Isaias*. Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983.

OL   Old Latin. Cited from Roger Gryson and Paul-Augustin Deproost, eds. *Commentaires de Jerome sur le prophete Isaie: Livres I–IV*. Aus der Geschichte der lateinischen Bibel 23. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1993.

S   Peshitta. Sebastian Brock. *Isaiah*. 2nd ed. Old Testament in Syriac according to the Peshitta Version 3.1. Leiden: Brill, 1993.

T   Targum. "Aramaic Targums." Accordance Bible v. 12.2.8. Oak-Tree Software, 2014.

V   Vulgate. Robert Weber and Roger Gryson, eds. *Biblia Sacra Iuxta Vulgatam*. 5th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007.

Frequently Cited Works

Citations of these works stand within the text, typically with page numbers in parentheses following the author's name.

BDAG — Danker, Frederick W., Walter Bauer, William F. Arndt, and F. Wilbur Gingrich. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

BDF — Blass, Friedrich, Albert Debrunner, and Robert W. Funk. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1961.

Byun — Byun, Seulgi L. *The Influence of Post-Biblical Hebrew and Aramaic on the Translator of Septuagint Isaiah*. LHBOTS 635. Hebrew Bible and Its Versions 9. New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2017.

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

Fischer — Fischer, Johann. *In Welcher Schrift lag das Buch Isaias den LXX vor?* BZAW 56. Giessen: Töpelmann, 1930.

GELS — Muraoka, Takamitsu. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. Leuven: Peeters, 2009.

Goshen-Gottstein — Goshen-Gottstein, Moshe H. ed. *The Book of Isaiah*. HUB 1. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1975. HUB 2. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1981. Hebrew page numbers cited.

Greenberg and Walter — Bali, Joseph, Gillian Greenberg, George A. Kiraz, and Donald M. Walter. *The Syriac Peshiṭta Bible with English Translation: Isaiah*. Antioch Bible. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2012.

HALOT — Koehler, Ludwig, Walter Baumgartner, and Johann Jakob Stamm. *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. 4 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1994–1999.

JM — Joüon, Paul, and Takamitsu Muraoka. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. 2nd ed. Subsidia Biblica 27. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 2006.

La Bible d'Alexandrie — Le Boulleuec, Alain, and Philippe Le Mogne. *Vision Que Vit Isaïe: Traduction du texte du prophète Isaïe selon la Septante*. La Bible d'Alexandrie. Paris: Cerf, 2014.

LSJ — Liddell, Henry, Robert Scott, and Henry Stuart Jones. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. 9th ed. with revised supplement Oxford: Clarendon, 1968.

NETS — Pietersma, Albert, and Benjamin G. Wright III eds. *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*. Oxford: Oxford, 2007.

Nöldeke — Nöldeke, Theodor. *Compendious Syriac Grammar, with an Appendix: The Handwritten Additions in Theodor Nöldeke's Personal Copy*. Translated by James A. Crichton and Peter T. Daniels. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2001.

Ottley — Ottley, Richard R. *The Book of Isaiah According to the Septuagint*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1904–1906.

Payne-Smith — Smith, Jessie Payne. *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1903.

Scholz — Scholz, Anton. *Die alexandrinische Übersetzung des Buches Jesaias*. Würzburg: Woerl, 1880.

Seeligmann — Seeligmann, I. L. *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah*. Leuven: Brill, 1948.

Septuaginta Deutsch — Kraus, Wolfgang, and Martin Karrer, eds. *Septuaginta Deutsch: Das griechische Alte Testament in deutscher Übersetzung*. 2nd ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2010.

Smyth — Smyth, Herbert W. *Greek Grammar*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956.

SyrLex — Sokolof, Michael. *A Syriac Lexicon: A Translation from the Latin, Correction, Expansion, and Update of C. Brockelmann's Lexicon Syriacum*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns; Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2009.

Troxel — Troxel, Ronald L. *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation*. JSJSup 124. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Van der Kooij — Kooij, Arie van der. *Die alten Textzeugen des Jesajabuches: Ein Beitrag zur Textgeschichte des Alten Testaments*. OBO 35. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981.

Van der Vorm-Croughs — Vorm-Croughs, Mirjam van der. *The Old Greek of Isaiah: An Analysis of Its Pluses and Minuses*. SCS 61. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014.

Wagner — Wagner, J. Ross. *Reading the Sealed Book: Old Greek Isaiah and the Problem of Septuagint Hermeneutics*. FAT 88. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.

Warszawski — Warszawski, Ludwig. *Die Peschitta zu Jesaja (Kap. 1–39): Ihr Verhältnis zum massoretischen Texte, zur Septuaginta und zum Targum*. Berlin: Itzkowski, 1897.

Weisz — Weisz, Heinrich. "Die Peschitta zu Deuterojesaia und ihr Verhältniss zu MT., LXX. u. Trg." Halle, 1893.

Ziegler — Ziegler, Joseph. *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias*. ATA 12.3. Münster: Aschendorffschen, 1934.

Bibliography

Alexandre, Marguerite, and Monique Harl. *La Genèse*. La Bible d'Alexandrie 1. Paris: Cerf, 1986.

Atwood, Preston L. "The Peshiṭta of Isaiah in Past and Present Scholarship." *CurBR* 18 (2020): 211–45.

Auld, Graeme. *Joshua: Jesus, son of Nauē, in Codex Vaticanus*. Septuagint Commentary Series. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

Baer, David A. "It's All about Us! Nationalistic Exegesis in the Greek Isaiah (Chapters 1–12)." *SBLSP* 40 (2001): 197–219.

Barr, James. "'Guessing' in the Septuagint." Pages 19–34 in *Studien zur Septuaginta*. Edited by Detlef Fraenkel, Udo Quast, and John W. Wevers. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990.

Barthélemy, Dominique. "Le grand rouleau d'Isaïe trouvé près de la Mer Morte." *RB* 57 (1950): 530–49.

Beuken, Willem A. M. *Jesaja 13–27*. HThKAT. Freiburg: Herder, 2007.

Bodor, Attila. "The Reception of the Septuagint in the Peshitta of Isaiah." *VT* 69 (2019): 19–32.

Brock, Sebastian. "Aspects of Translation Technique in Antiquity." *GRBS* 20 (1979): 69–87.

———. "Text History and Text Division in Peshiṭta Isaiah." Pages 49–80 in *The Peshiṭta: Its Early Text and History*. Edited by Peter B. Dirksen. MPIL 4. Leiden: Brill, 1988.

Brockington, L. H. "The Greek Translator of Isaiah and His Interest in DOXA." *VT* 1 (1951): 23–32.

Budde, Karl. "Über die Schranken, die Jesajas prophetischer Botschaft zu setzen sind." *ZAW* 41 (1923): 154–203.

Cheyne, T. K. *The Prophecies of Isaiah*. London, 1887.

Chilton, Bruce D. *The Isaiah Targum: Introduction, Translation, Apparatus and Notes*. ArBib 11. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987.

Clements, Ronald E. *Isaiah 1–39*. NCB. London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1980.

Clines, David J. A. *Job 1–20*. WBC 17. Dallas: Word, 1989.

Coste, J. "Le texte Grec d'Isaie xxv:1–5." *RB* 61 (1954): 36–66.

Cunha, Wilson de Angelo. *LXX Isaiah 24:1–26:6 as Interpretation and Translation: A Methodological Discussion*. SCS 62. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014.

De Vries, Simon J. *From Old Revelation to New: A Tradition-Historical and Redaction-Critical Study of Temporal Transitions in Prophetic Prediction*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.

Delekat, Lienhard. "Die Peschitta zu Jesaja zwischen Targum und Septuaginta." *Bib* 38 (1957): 185–99.

Dirksen, Peter B. "The Peshiṭta and Textual Criticism of the Old Testament." *VT* 42 (1992): 376–90.

Dogniez, Cécile. "Le traducteur d'Isaïe connaissait-il le texte grec du Dodekapropheten?" *Adamantius* 13 (2007): 29–34.

Driver, Samuel R. *Notes on the Hebrew Text of Samuel*. 2nd ed. London: Oxford University Press, 1912.

Duhm, Bernard. *Das Buch Jesaia*. Edited by D. Wilhelm Nowack. HKAT 3. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1892.

Forster, A. Haire. "The Meaning of Δόξα in the Greek Bible." *AThR* 12 (1929/1930): 311–16.

Fox, Michael V. *Proverbs: An Eclectic Edition with Introduction and Textual Commentary*. Hebrew Bible: A Critical Edition. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015.

———. *Proverbs 10–31*. AB. New Haven: Yale, 2009.

Fraser, Peter M. *Ptolemaic Alexandria*. 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1972.

Gadamer, Hans-George. *Truth and Method*. London: Sheed & Ward, 1975.

Gesenius, Wilhelm. *Philologisch-kritischer und historischer Commentar über den Jesaia*. Vol. 1. Leipzig: Vogel, 1821.

Gils, David. "Universal Quantification in Hebrew and Arabic." Pages 105–22 in *Studies in Afroasiatic Grammar: Papers from the Second Conference on Afroasiatic Languages Sophia Antipolis, 1994*. Edited

by Jacqueline Lecarme, Jean Lowenstamm, and Ur Shlonsky. Hague: Holland Academic Graphics, 1996.

Goshen-Gottstein, Moshe H. "Biblical Philology and the Concordance." *JJS* 8 (1957): 5–12.

———. *The Book of Isaiah, Sample Edition with Introduction*. HUB. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1965.

———. "Theory and Practice of Textual Criticism." *Textus* 3 (1963): 130–58.

Govett, Robert. Isaiah Unfulfilled. London: Nisbet, 1841.

Gray, George Buchanan. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Isaiah I–XXVII*. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1912.

Greenberg, Gillian. *Translation Technique in the Peshitta to Jeremiah*. MPIL 13. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

Harl, Monique. "La Bible d'Alexandrie dans les debats actuels sur la Septante." Pages 7–24 in *La Double transmission du texte biblique:* Études *d'histoire du texte offertes en hommage* à Adrian Schenker. Edited by Yohanan Goldman and Christoph Uehlinger. OBO 179. Fribourg: Editions Universitaires; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001.

Hendel, Ronald. "What Is a Biblical Book?" Pages 283–302 in *From Author to Copyist: Composition, Redaction, and Transmission of the Hebrew Bible in Honor of Zipi Talshir*. Edited by Cana Werman. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2015.

Hiebert, R J. V. "In the Beginning: A Commentary on the Old Greek Text of Genesis 1.1–2.3." Pages 17–67 in *The SBL Commentary on the Septuagint: An Introduction*. Edited by Dirk Büchner. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2017.

Jauss, Hans R. *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*. Translated by Timothy Bahti. Theory and History of Literature 2. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1982.

Jerome. *Commentaires de Jerome sur le prophete Isaie, Livres I–IV*. Edited by Roger Gryson and Paul-Augustin Deproost. Aus der Geschichte der Lateinischen Bibel 23. Freiburg am Breisgau: Herder, 1993.

Kaiser, Otto. *Isaiah 13–39, A Commentary*. Translated by John Bowden. OTL. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1974.

Katz, Peter. "Notes on the Septuagint: I. Isaiah VIII 1[a]." *JTS* 47(1946): 30–33.

Koenig, Jean. *L' Herméneutique analogique du Judaïsme antique*. VTSup 33. Leiden: Brill, 1982.

Kooij, Arie van der. "Accident or Method? On 'Analogical' Interpretation in the Old Greek of Isa and in 1QIsᵃ." *BO* 43 (1986): 366–76.

———. "The Cities of Isaiah 24–27 according to the Vulgate, Targum and Septuagint." Pages 183–98 in *Studies in Isaiah 24–27*. Edited by Arie van der Kooij. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

———. "Isaiah 24–27: Text-Critical Notes." Pages 13–15 in *Studies in Isaiah 24–27*. Edited by Arie van der Kooij. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

———. "Isaiah in the Septuagint." Pages 513–29 in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah*. Edited by Craig C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans. VTSup 70. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

———. *The Oracle of Tyre: The Septuagint of Isaiah 23 as Version and Vision*. VTSup 71. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

———. "The Septuagint of Isaiah and the Hebrew Text of Isa 2:22 and 36:7." Pages 377–86 in *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, and the Septuagint Presented to Eugene Ulrich*. Edited by Peter W. Flint, Emanuel Tov, and James VanderKam. VTSupp 101. Leiden: Brill, 2006.

———. "The Text of Isaiah and Its Early Witnesses in Hebrew." Pages 143–52 in *Sôfer Mahîr: Essays in Honour of Adrian Schenker*. Edited by Yohanan Goldman and Richard D. Weis. Leiden: Brill, 2006.

———. "Wie heißt der Messias?" Pages 156–69 in *Vergegenwärtigung des alten Testaments: Beiträge zur biblischen Hermeneutik; Festschrift für Rudolf Smend zum 70. Geburtstag*. Edited by Christoph Bultmann, Walter Dietrich, and Christoph Levin. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2002.

Koster, Marinus D. "The Copernican Revolution in the Study of the Origins of the Peshitta." Pages 15–54 in *Targum Studies, Volume 2: Targum and Peshitta*. Edited by Paul V. M. Flesher. SFSHJ 165. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998.

———. "Peshiṭta Revisited: A Reassessment of Its Value as a Version." *JSS* 38 (1993): 235–68.

———. "'Translation or Transmission? That is the Question': The Use of the Leiden O. T. Peshitta Edition." Pages 297–312 in *Basel und Bibel: Collected Communications to the XVIIth Congress of the International Organizations for the Study of the Old Testament, Basel 2001*. Edited by Matthias Augustin and Hermann M. Niemann. Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 2004.

Kutscher, E. Y. *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (IQIsaa)*. STDJ 6. Leiden: Brill, 1974.

LaCocque, André, and Paul Ricoeur. *Thinking Biblically: Exegetical and Hermeneutical Studies*. Translated by David Pellauer. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998.

Liebmann, Ernst. "Der Text zu Jesaia 24–27." *ZAW* 22 (1902): 1–56, 285–304; 23 (1903): 209–86; 24 (1904): 51–104; 25 (1905): 145–71.

Loiseau, Anne-Françoise. *L'influence de l'araméen sur les traducteurs de la LXX principalement, sur les traducteurs grecs postérieurs, ainsi que sur les scribes de la Vorlage de la LXX*. SCS 65. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2016.

Louw, Theo A. W. van der. *Transformations in the Septuagint: Towards an Interaction of Septuagint Studies and Translation Studies*. CBET 47. Leuven: Peeters, 2007.

Lust, Johan. "Messianism in the Septuagint: Isaiah 8:23b–9:6 (9:1–7)." Pages 147–63 in *The Interpretation of the Bible: The International Symposium in Slovenia*. Edited by Joze Krašovec. JSOTSup 289. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1998.

Meek, Theophile James. "Some Emendations in the Old Testament." *JBL* 48 (1929): 162–68.

Monsengwo-Pasinya, L. "Isaïe xix 16–25 et universalisme dans la LXX." Pages 192–207 in *Congress Volume: Salamanca, 1983*. Edited by J. A. Emerton. VTSup 36. Leiden: Brill, 1985.

Moran, William L. "The Putative Root of ʿTM in Isaiah 9:18." *CBQ* 12 (1950): 153–54.

Moulton, James Hope. *A Grammar of New Testament Greek: Prolegomena*. 2nd ed. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1906.

Moulton, James H., and George Milligan. *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-literary Sources*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1930.

Orlinsky, Harry M. "Studies in the Septuagint of the Book of Job, Chapter II." *HUCA* 29 (1958): 229–71.

Penner, Ken M. "Introduction to the Series on Greek Isaiah." *B-Greek: The Biblical Greek Forum*, 11 July 2011. http://www.ibiblio.org/bgreek/forum/viewtopic.php?f=51&t=426.

Pietersma, Albert. "Beyond Literalism: Interlinearity Revisited." Pages 3–21 in *Translation is Required: The Septuagint in Retrospect and Prospect*. Edited by Robert J. V. Hiebert. SCS 56. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010.

———. "A New Paradigm for Addressing Old Questions: The Relevance of the Interlinear Model for the Study of the Septuagint." Pages 337–64

in *Bible and Computer: The Stellenbosch AIBI-6 Conference*. Edited by Johann Cook. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

———. "A Panel Presentation on Ronald Troxel's *LXX-Isaiah*." Panel discussion at the Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature. Boston, MA, 23 November 2008. http://homes.chass.utoronto.ca/~pietersm/.

———. "Response to: T. Muraoka, 'Recent Discussions on the Septuagint Lexicography with Special Reference to the So-called Interlinear Model.'" https://tinyurl.com/SBL7013a.

———. "The Society of Biblical Literature Commentary on the Septuagint: Basic Principles." Pages 1–16 in *The SBL Commentary on the Septuagint: An Introduction*. Edited by Dirk Büchner. SCS 67. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2017.

Pietersma, Albert, Claude E. Cox, Moises Silva, Benjamin G. Wright III, and David Aiken. "Preamble to the Guidelines for the Contributors to the SBL Commentary on the Septuagint." Pages 257–59 in *The SBL Commentary on the Septuagint: An Introduction*. Edited by Dirk Büchner. SCS 67. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2017.

———. "A Prospectus for a Commentary on the Septuagint." *BIOSCS* 31 (1998): 43–48.

Procksch, Otto, and Paul Volz. *Jesaja 1*. KAT 9.1. Leipzig: Deichert, 1930

Roberts, J. J. M. *First Isaiah: A Commentary*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2015.

Rowlands, E. R. "The Targum and the Peshiṭta Version of the Book of Isaiah." *VT* 9 (1959): 178–91.

Running, Leona. "An Investigation of the Syriac Version of Isaiah: I." *AUSS* 3 (1965): 138–57.

———. "An Investigation of the Syriac Version of Isaiah: II." *AUSS* 4 (1966): 37–64.

———. "An Investigation of the Syriac Version of Isaiah: III." *AUSS* 4 (1966): 135–48.

Skehan, Patrick W., and Alexander A. Di Lella. *The Wisdom of Ben Sira:A New Translation with Notes*. AB 39. New York: Doubleday, 1987.

Sollamo, Raija. "The Pleonastic Use of the Pronoun in Connection with the Relative Pronoun in the Greek Pentateuch." Pages 75–85 in *VII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Leuven, 1989*. Edited by Claude E. Cox. SCS 31. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991.

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

Sousa, Rodrigo. F. de. *Eschatology and Messianism in LXX Isaiah 1–12*. LHBOTS 516. London: T&T Clark, 2010.

Stenning, John F. *The Targum of Isaiah*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1949.

Stipp, Hermann-Josef. *Das masoretische und alexandrinische Sondergut des Jeremiabuches: Textgeschichtlicher Rang, Eigenarten, Triebkrafte*. OBO 136. Fribourg: Academic Press; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994.

Szpek, Heidi M. "On the Influence of the Septuagint on the Peshitta." *CBQ* 60 (1998): 251–66.

Talmon, Shemaryahu. "Aspects of the Textual Transmission of the Bible in the Light of Qumran Manuscripts." *Textus* 4 (1964): 95–132.

———. "The Old Testament Text." Pages 159–99 in *The Cambridge History of the Bible: Volume 1, From the Beginning to Jerome*. Edited by Peter R. Ackroyd and Craig A. Evans. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.

Ter Haar Romeny, R. Bas. "The Peshiṭta of Isaiah: Evidence from the Syriac Fathers." Pages 149–64 in *Text, Translation, and Tradition: Studies on the Peshitta and Its Use in the Syriac Tradition Presented to Konrad D. Jenner on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*. Edited by Wido Theodor Van Peursen and R. Bas Ter Haar Romeny. MPIL 14. Leiden: Brill, 2006.

Thackeray, H. S. J. "The Greek Translators of the Prophetical Book." *JTS* 4 (1903): 578–85.

Toury, Gideon. *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Benjamins Translation Library 4. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1995.

———. "A Handful of Methodological Issues in DTS: Are They Applicable to the Study of the Septuagint as an Assumed Translation?" *BIOSCS* 39 (2006): 13–25.

Tov, Emanuel. "Biliteral Exegesis of Hebrew Roots in the Septuagint." Pages 459–82 in *Reflection and Refraction: Studies in Biblical Historiography in Honour of A. Graeme Auld*. Edited by Robert Rezetko, Timothy H. Lim, and W. Brian Aucker. VTSup 113. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

———. "Compound Words in the LXX Representing Two or More Hebrew Words." *Bib* 58 (1977): 189–212.

———. *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*. 3rd ed. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2015.

———. *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible.* 3rd ed. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012.

Troxel, Ronald L. "ΒΟΥΛΗ and ΒΟΥΛΕΥΕΙΝ in LXX Isaiah." Pages 153–71 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*. Edited by Arie van der Kooij and Michael N. van der Meer. CBET 55. Leuven: Peeters, 2010.

———. "Economic Plunder as a Leitmotif in LXX-Isaiah." *Bib* 83 (2002): 375–91.

———. "Isaiah 7,14–16 through the Eyes of the Septuagint." *ETL* 79(2003): 1–22.

———. "What Is the 'Text' in Textual Criticism?" *VT* 66 (2016): 603–26.

———. "What's in a Name? Contemporization and Toponyms in LXX-Isaiah." Pages 327–44 in *Seeking Out the Wisdom of the Ancients: Essays Offered to Honor Michael V. Fox on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*. Edited by Ronald L Troxel, Kelvin Friebel, and Dennis Magary. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2005.

———. "Writing Commentary on the Life of a Text." *VT* 67 (2017): 105–28.

Uchelen, Nico A. van "Isaiah 1:9: Text and Context." Pages 155–63 in *Remembering All the Way: A Collection of Old Testament Studies Published on the Occasion of the Fortieth Anniversary of the Oudtestamentisch Werkgezelschap in Nederland*. Edited by Bertil Albrektson. OTS 21. Leiden: Brill, 1981.

Ulrich, Eugene, ed. *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls: Transcriptions and Textual Variants, Vol. 2; Isaiah–Twelve Minor Prophets*. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

———. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Developmental Composition of the Bible*. VTSupp 169. Leiden: Brill, 2015.

Ulrich, Eugene, et al., eds. *Qumran Cave 4.X: The Prophets*. DJD 15. Oxford: Clarendon, 1997.

Ulrich, Eugene and Peter W. Flint. *Qumran Cave 1, 2: The Isaiah Scrolls, Part 2: Introductions, Commentary, and Textual Variants*. DJD 32. Oxford: Clarendon, 2010.

Wevers, John W. *Notes on the Greek Text of Leviticus*. SCS 44. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997.

———. *Notes on the Greek Text of Numbers*. SCS 46. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998.

Weitzman, Michael P. *The Syriac Version of the Old Testament*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Wildberger, Hans. *Isaiah 1–12*. Translated by Thomas H. Trapp. CC. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.

———. *Isaiah 13–27*. Translated by Thomas H. Trapp. CC. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997.

———. *Isaiah 28–39*. Translated by Thomas H. Trapp. CC. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002.

Wilk, Florian. "'Vision wider Judäa und wider Jerusalem' (Jes 1 LXX): Zur Eigenart der Septuaginta-Version des Jesajabuches." Pages 15–35 in Frühjudentum und Neues Testament im Horizont Biblischer Theologie: Mit einem Anhang zum Corpus Judaeo-Hellenisticum Novi Testamenti. Edited by Wolfgang Kraus, Karl-Wilhelm Niebuhr, Traugott Holtz, and Nikolaus Walter. WUNT 162. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.

Williamson, H. G. M. *Isaiah 1–5*. ICC. London: T&T Clark, 2006.

Worthington, Martin. *Principles of Akkadian Textual Criticism*. SANER 1. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2012.

Wutz, Franz. *Die Transkriptionen von der Septuaginta bis zu Hieronymus*. Edited by Paul Kahle. Texte und Untersuchungen zur vormasoretischen Grammatik des Hebräischen. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1927.

Zahn, Molly M. *Rethinking Rewritten Scripture: Composition and Exegesis in the 4Q Reworked Pentateuch Manuscripts*. STDJ 95. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

Introduction

This commentary on the Old Greek (OG) and the Peshitta (S) is intended as a resource for textual criticism of the Hebrew text of Isaiah, to be assessed alongside evidence from the Vulgate (V), Targum (T), and the scrolls from the Judean Desert. Because the goal of textual criticism is to describe the life of the text (rather than merely sorting errors and deliberate changes to arrive at a "pristine text"), the only adequate vehicle for such work is a commentary.[1]

The compositions we call texts (however much writing, rewriting, and expansion they entail) exist in multiple instantiations whose relationship is that of "type" to "token."[2] *Type* names the document after composition is complete, with each stage of editing constituting a type. The type comes to exist in tokens, copies that can differ from their type. Thus, "the type encompasses a family of tokens, the internal relationships of which may be complicated or irrecoverable."[3]

Translations, on the other hand, are not a token, because they constitute typologically different forms of the text, since the composition has been modified according to the norms of a target language. Thus, we can speak of the *Greek* text of Isaiah, the *Syriac* text, or the *Latin* text, over against the *Hebrew* text of Isaiah.[4] Each represents Isaiah, insofar as they represent its distinguishing content—but they constitute Hebrew, Greek, Syriac, and Latin *types* of the book. At whatever points retroversion can

---

1. See Ronald L. Troxel, "Writing Commentary on the Life of a Text," *VT* 67 (2017): 105–28.

2. Ronald Hendel, "What Is a Biblical Book?" in *From Author to Copyist: Composition, Redaction, and Transmission of the Hebrew Bible*, ed. Cana Werman (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2015), 288.

3. Hendel, "What Is a Biblical Book," 292.

4. Ronald L. Troxel, "What Is the 'Text' in Textual Criticism?" *VT* 66 (2016): 624.

claim to have ascertained the translator's source text, it is possible to speak of that as part of a token of the Hebrew text of Isaiah.

Mere citation of divergences between OG, S, and extant Hebrew manuscripts in an apparatus is insufficient. When a translation diverges from any extant Hebrew text, the critic needs access to detailed analysis of how the divergence might have arisen before addressing whether it represents a Hebrew variant for evaluation. This commentary will provide a basis for shorter notations in a commentary on the Hebrew text of Isaiah.

As long as a translation is transparent to a *Vorlage* like MT, explanations of differences are straightforward. However, OG-Isaiah and S-Isaiah have oblique renderings that require extended discussion. Equally, the question of whether S's rendering is dependent on OG is frequently raised, with a decision about whether an apparent difference in S is derivative from OG or offers an independent witness at stake. These issues cannot be resolved in an apparatus. Thus, analysis of the character and readings of these translations must precede judgment on whatever evidence of variants to Hebrew Isaiah they might hold.

1. Previous Commentaries on Syriac Isaiah

There has been no detailed, sequential commentary on S-Isaiah. The earliest study was Heinrich Weisz's inaugural dissertation on the Peshitta of Isa 40–66 in 1893, which was soon followed by Warszawski's study of Isa 1–39 in 1897.[5] Although each presents comments on selected readings in each chapter, Weisz treats nearly every verse in chapters 40–66 and discusses possible variant readings in S's source text, while Warszawski's comments are sporadic (only two readings are addressed in chapters 4, 12, 31, 36, and 39; only one in 20). They note possible misreadings of a source text similar to MT, as well as agreements and disagreements with OG, T, and MT. Both acknowledge the problems with establishing the text of the book (Weisz, 12; Warszawski, 5–6), but note its frequent patterns of +conjunctive *waw*, simple *dālat* representing לאמור and ויאמר, transformations of voice, changes in word order, *ad sensum* translations,

---

5. For Gesenius's evaluation of S in his commentary on Isaiah (Wilhelm Gesenius, *Philologisch-kritischer und historischer Commentar über den Jesaia*, vol. 1 [Leipzig: Vogel, 1821]), as well as a more detailed history of research on S-Isaiah, see Preston L. Atwood, "The Peshiṭta of Isaiah in Past and Present Scholarship," *CurBR* 18 (2020): 211–45.

paraphrases, confusions of similar looking consonants, and words or phrases in MT lacking equivalents in S (Weisz, 5–6; Warszawski, 6–8). Although they note that S shows independence from OG and T in many readings and that its source text frequently diverges from MT (Weisz, 11; Warszawski, 8), they also record many readings similar to OG, leading each to conclude that S's translator frequently consulted OG, a translation they assume was broadly known (Warszawski, 8; Weisz, 11). However, whereas Weisz (12) considered S's agreements with Targum Jonathan (TJ) to betray reliance on it also, Warszawski (10) concluded that those agreements simply reflect that "die im Munde des jüdischen Volkes lebende Textauffassung über die Grenze Palästinas hinaus bis nach Syrien vorgedrungen war."

The issues identified by Weisz and Warszawski have been central to scholarship on all books in the Peshitta. The most heavily discussed issue, however, has been the relationship between S, OG, and T, the latter of which dominated discussion in the first half of the twentieth century.

Anton Baumstark and Paul Kahle, followed by Curt Peters and Schaje Wohl, argued that the Peshitta of the Pentateuch was a translation of an old Jewish Targum.[6] That claim was advanced for Isaiah by Lienhard Delekat, who concluded that OG "von einem aramäischen Targum kräftig beeinflusst worden ist" and that "S die Rezension eines alteren (syrischen oder aramäischen) Textes nach M ist," which equally constituted the foundation for TJ.[7] Leonna Running, following Arthur Vööbus's hypothesis that the variants in S's pentateuchal manuscripts betray revisions of an early form of S that tracked closely with an early Targum, sought to recover a putative old Syriac version of Isaiah that, beneath subsequent revisions of S toward MT, attested that an early Targum was its base.[8]

---

6. See Michael P. Weitzman, *The Syriac Version of the Old Testament* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 87.

7. Lienhard Delekat, "Die Peschitta zu Jesaja zwischen Targum und Septuaginta," *Bib* 38 (1957): 193–195. He considered that although S and TJ were based "auf einem alten Targum," OG was the version most strongly dependent on it (195). Cf. E. R. Rowlands, "The Targum and the Peshiṭta Version of the Book of Isaiah," *VT* 9 (1959): 182.

8. Arthur Vööbus, *Peschitta und Targumim des Pentateuchs: Neues Licht zur Frage der Herkunft der Peschitta aus dem altpalästinischen Targum* (Stockholm: Estonian Theological Society in Exile, 1958). Leona Running, "An Investigation of the Syriac Version of Isaiah: I," *AUSS* 3 (1965): 138–57; "An Investigation of the Syriac Version

Studies undertaken as a basis for the Leiden edition have put to rest the notion of a Targumic tradition at the base of the Peshitta, as well as the hypothesis of a *Vetus Syra* underlying revisions of S toward MT.[9] Marinus Koster's "Copernican Revolution" in understanding the textual history of the Peshitta as encompassing three stages of transmission applies equally to Isaiah. As in other books, the Textus Receptus is represented in Nestorian and Jacobite manuscripts from the ninth century on. The preceding stage comprises manuscripts of the seventh and eight centuries, especially the base text of the Leiden edition, 7a1, plus 8a1 and 6h3.5.[10] The earliest form of the text is often witnessed in the fragmentary palimpsest 5ph1 and "to a certain extent, in 9a1," although "both MSS are … full of idiosyncrasies which often represent secondary developments."[11] Even though the arc of the evidence points to the earliest stratum of S tracking closely with MT, Sebastian Brock judged it "foolhardy to propose a blanket rule that the original reading will always be the one closest to the Hebrew, for there are many other considerations which we need to take into account," such as whether agreement with the Hebrew is attributable to an inner-Syriac error common within the manuscript, whether the apparent agreement "conformed to the norm of translation technique elsewhere in P-Isaiah," or even whether it might be attributable to "sporadic later correction on the basis of the Hebrew."[12] Eight of the early readings agreeing with the Hebrew that Brock isolates fall within chapters 1–39, of which he judges

---

of Isaiah: II," *AUSS* 4 (1966): 37–64; "An Investigation of the Syriac Version of Isaiah: III," *AUSS* 4 (1966): 135–48.

9. Marinus D. Koster, "The Copernican Revolution in the Study of the Origins of the Peshitta," in *Targum Studies 2, Volume 2: Targum and Peshitta*, ed. Paul V. F. Flesher, SFSHJ 165 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998), 19–20.

10. Although in many books 9a1 is a trustworthy carrier of early readings, in Isaiah "it has absorbed more new readings (as well as some even later readings that had become popular in the west) than in other books" (Weitzman, *Syriac Version*, 284).

11. Sebastian Brock, "Text History and Text Division in Peshiṭta Isaiah," in *The Peshitta: Its Early Text and History*, ed. Peter B. Dirksen, MPIL 4 (Leiden: Brill, 1988), 50. Cf. Koster's observation that every manuscript, at whatever stage, shows "the same process took place that characterizes the development of P as a whole: the gradual change and expansion of the text further away from MT" (Marinus D. Koster, "Peshiṭta Revisited: A Reassessment of Its Value as a Version," *JSS* 38 [1993]: 242).

12. For the evidence pointing toward the MT, see Peter B. Dirksen, "The Peshiṭta and Textual Criticism of the Old Testament," *VT* 42 (1992): 376. Quotations from Brock, "Text History and Text Division," 59, 60, 62.

only the transposed order of verses in 5ph1 and 9a1 at 38:21–22 convincing enough to emend 7a1 in his edition.[13]

The notion of an early literal stage does not necessarily imply the stereotypical and quantitative equivalents or the adherence to word order that are standard characteristics of more literal translations. Koster concedes that "the originally fairly literal translation … could have included already a fair number of Jewish translation traditions."[14] He also admits cases in which "the translator deliberately solved the problem of translating a difficult or even corrupt Hebrew text by adapting it to the context" and allows that "he may intentionally have sought a variety of expression."[15] Even if the description of the original translation as "fairly literal" is defensible, Koster's qualifications create space for evaluating cases where OG and S agree against MT as attributable to polygenesis.

Absent the theory of a common Targumic touchstone, perceived similarities between S and OG are often phrased as S "consulting OG." Arie van der Kooij confesses himself convinced by the examples proffered by Warszawski and Weisz that "der Verfasser der Peš Jes mit LXX Jes vertraut war," citing sixteen agreements of S and OG against MT.[16] He highlights "vor allem die Qualität bestimmter Übereinstimmungen" to conclude that S's translator "den griechischen Bibeltext des Jasajabuches gut kannte" (287).

Other scholarship has questioned too facilely resorting to the conclusion that S relied on OG. Moshe Goshen-Gottstein concluded that "about ninety-five percent of the content variants in Isaiah common to Septua-

---

13. Brock, "Text History and Text Division," 54–57. The apparatus of Brock's Leiden edition reports variants that accord with the Hebrew in 5ph1 (13:16; 20:2; 27:13; 33:20; 37:12, 21; 38:2, 20–22) and 9a1/9a1*fam* (10:6).

14. Koster, "Copernican Revolution," 30.

15. Marinus Koster, " 'Translation or Transmission? That is the Question': The Use of the Leiden O. T. Peshitta Edition," in *Basel und Bibel: Collected Communications to the XVIIth Congress of the International Organizations for the Study of the Old Testament, Basel 2001*, ed. Matthias Augustin and Hermann M. Niemann (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 2004), 303. Koster argues that "the chance of *inadvertently* assimilating the text to nearby (or even more distanced) verses, without any explainable conscious motive, is many times greater with scribes," and thus a product of transmission (303, emphasis original), but the use of "*inadvertently*" makes this formulation problematic, since we have no criteria by which to judge what reflects a deliberate change.

16. Arie van der Kooij, *Die alten Textzeugen des Jesajabuches*, OBO 35 (Fribourg: Presses Universitaires; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981), 287.

gint and Peshitta" reflect "their common exegetical background," while he disputed "the claim of any large-scale dependence of the Peshitta on the Septuagint."[17] Gillian Greenberg concluded that an "extremely small" number of agreements between S and OG in Jeremiah are explicable solely in terms of S relying upon OG, while frequently polygenesis is either possible or likely.[18] Most discussions of the question for Isaiah have drawn on isolated phrases rather than considering the translator's habits generally, much less evaluating tendencies within sections of text. The focus on similar vocabulary in the context of a single book sometimes overlooks comparisons with usage elsewhere (e.g., Isa 2:20; 5:7; 10:33; 11:15; 13:9).

Peter Dirksen cites approvingly Jerome Lund's principle that "when translation technique adequately accounts for the difference between MT and S, the extra masoretic agreement between S and G must be considered coincidental," but he rejects Lund's argument that apparent variants shared by S and OG otherwise must be taken at face value, because the question of translation technique must be correlated with whether "the type of deviation in which the P and the LXX agree also occurs in the P without a corresponding translation in the LXX."[19]

Heidi Szpek has elaborated these criteria, stipulating that to qualify as dependence, an agreement must be substantive rather than trivial (e.g., agreements in grammatical number, which are most likely coincidental choices).[20] Equally important is the question of how extensive the congruence between S and OG is.[21] If it does not surpass phrase level, its value as evidence of reliance is weak.[22] In particular, a congruence within a clause or set of clauses that contain features that distinguish the versions (e.g., via an added complementary infinitive or a prepositional phrase) reduces the likelihood of dependence.[23] That likelihood is equally reduced if the reading shared by S and OG is found in another version, since this might

---

17. Moshe H. Goshen-Gottstein, "Theory and Practice of Textual Criticism," *Textus* 3 (1963): 139–40.

18. For S relying on OG, see Gillian Greenberg, *Translation Technique in the Peshitta to Jeremiah*, MPIL 13 (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 22; for polygenesis, see pp. 149–68.

19. Greenberg, *Translation Technique*, 381.

20. Heidi M. Szpek, "On the Influence of the Septuagint on the Peshitta," *CBQ* 60 (1998): 257.

21. Szpek, "On the Influence," 257.

22. This applies to several of the oft-cited agreements between S and OG in Isaiah: 2:6; 3:23; 5:13; 7:9; 14:21.

23. Szpek, "On the Influence," 261.

point to a common variant, a shared translation tradition, or a similar impulse.[24] Finally, since a common supposition is that S appealed to OG when uncertain about how to render its *Vorlage*, the lack of apparent "Septuagintal influence on very difficult passages might be used as an argument *in absentia* that elsewhere the Peshitta's translator did not consult the LXX."[25] A challenge for this argument is how to determine which texts a translator might have found difficult, since passages we find cruxes might not have been for him.

One viable measure for this criterion comes from S's habit of providing the same equivalent for repeated, unusual phrases, whereas OG varies its renderings. Thus in 18:2, 7, S renders עם\גוי ממשך ומורט with ܥܡܐ ܡܫܚܝ ܘܡܚܙ in each verse, while OG gives ἔθνος μετέωρον καὶ ξένον in 18:2; and λαοῦ τεθλιμμένου καὶ τετιμμένου in 18:7. The subsequent גוי קו קו ומבוסה is rendered by OG with ἔθνος ἀνέλπιστον καὶ καταπεπατημένον in 18:2, but with ἔθνος ἐλπίζον καὶ καταπεπατημένον in 18:7, while S gives ܥܡܐ ܡܣܒܪ ܘܕܘܫ in both verses. The variation in OG's renderings in 18:2, 7 stand over against S's use of the same equivalents in both verses, none of which align with OG in either verse.

The difference between the translators' renderings of קו קו is particularly useful for assaying their renderings of repeated קו later, in 28:10, 13. Their equivalents are identical in each verse, except for OG's +προσδέχου in 28:13:

כי צו לצו צו לצו
ܣܟܠܐ ܠܐܝܕܐ ܟܠ ܐܝܕܐ ܘܐܝܕܐ ܟܠ ܐܝܕܐ
θλῖψιν ἐπὶ θλῖψιν (προσδέχου)

קו לקו קו לקו
ܘܣܘܟܐ ܟܠ ܐܝܘܣܟܐ ܘܐܝܘܣܟܐ ܟܠ ܐܝܘܣܟܐ
ἐλπίδα ἐπ' ἐλπίδι

Old Greek's collapse of these phrases is characteristic of its tendency to omit similar or identical words in adjoining phrases (Van der Vorm-Croughs, 188–96), whereas S reflects the repetitions.[26] Whereas ἐλπίς ‖קו accords

---

24. Szpek, "On the Influence," 259.
25. Szpek, "On the Influence," 259.
26. By contrast, S's compression of גוי קו קו into ܥܡܐ ܡܣܒܪ in 18:2, 7 has the same limited scope as its translation of צחה צמא with ܨܗܝ in 5:13, its collapse of את

with OG's equivalents in 18:2, 7, S's ܠܘܚܠ diverges from its equivalent ܡܗܡ;
קו || there. Referring back to 28:8 (ܡܠܚܠܐ ܠܘܚܠ ܠܐܡܚܟܗ ܦܐܗܙܐ ܘܚܕܡܗ, ܘܡܗܠܠ ||
(כי כל שלחנות מלאו קיא צאה) reveals the basis of the translator's choice of
ܠܘܚܠ || קו by association with קיא (cf. ܚܐܚܟܗ || בקיאו in 19:14), as well
as of ܠܚܠ || צו by association with צאה. Old Greek's θλῖψιν ἐπὶ θλῖψιν || צו
לצו, by contrast, is likely by association with צר, which it elsewhere renders
with θλῖψις (8:22; 26:16; 30:6, 20; 63:9; 65:16). Both translators clearly have
difficulty with these phrases, but each follows its own path to resolve it.

This test case for the question of whether S consulted OG when faced
with perplexing words and phrases justifies skepticism about using the
hypothesis that S resorted to OG when confronting a difficulty. Further
evidence against the hypothesis is noted in the commentary on 3:9; 8:1;
10:18; 11:3; 20:2.

As previously noted, Warszawski's commentary on Isa 1–39 is spo-
radic and laconic. Providing a base for understanding S in order to use it
in textual criticism of Hebrew Isaiah requires a comprehensive assessment
of S's differences from MT, both when they agree with OG and when they
go their own way. This commentary aims to fill that role.

2. Previous Commentaries on Old Greek Isaiah

Despite numerous studies of the translator's approach to his task, the only
commentary is Richard Ottley's two volume *The Book of Isaiah according
to the Septuagint*.[27] Using Codex Alexandrinus as base text, he devoted
the first thirty-five pages of the introduction to assessing the textual wit-
nesses, and he frequently included text-critical discussions in the body of
his commentary. Although discussions of features are fuller than those of
Warszawski and Weisz on S, he did not comment on each verse, and it is

אלילי כסף ואת אלילי זהבו into ܘܦܐܢܐܘܐ ܘܘܚܠ ܦܐܟܙܐ in 2:20 (cf. 31:7), and its occasional
condensation of divine names (e.g., ܡܗܠܠ ܘܦܦܗܡ ܘܡܕܢܠ || כי יום ליהוה צבאות 2:12; ܐܗܙ
כה אמר אדני יהוה || ܘܦܚܠ ܐܗܙ ܡܕܢܠ ܣܚܐܠܠ 3:15; נאם אדני יהוה צבאות ܡܕܢܠ ܣܚܐܠܠ ||
צבאות 10:24).

27. For the history of research, see Troxel, 4–19; Van der Vorm-Croughs, 2–12.
Among recent studies to be added are Rodrigo F. de Sousa, *Eschatology and Messian-
ism in LXX Isaiah 1–12*, LHBOTS 516 (London: T&T Clark, 2010); J. Ross Wagner,
Reading the Sealed Book: Old Greek Isaiah and the Problem of Septuagint Hermeneutics,
FAT 88 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013); Wilson de Angelo Cunha, *LXX Isaiah 24:1–
26:6 as Interpretation and Translation: A Methodological Discussion*, SCS 62 (Atlanta:
SBL Press, 2014).

not always clear why he selects certain features for discussion while omitting comment on other vexing issues.

Three projects have been undertaken to address the lack of running commentary on OG: La Bible d'Alexandrie, Brill's Septuagint Commentary Series, and the Society of Biblical Literature Commentary on the Septuagint. The first volume of La Bible d'Alexandrie was published in 1986, setting out to fulfill Dominique Barthélemy's goal of comparing OG and MT as equal representatives of the biblical text.[28] Its "phrase par phrase" translation of each book "met en relief des détails du texte qui passeraient inaperçu, exige la mise en relation d'une partie du texte avec ses autres parties, révèle l'expressivatè propre à la langue traduite, découvre des aspects originaux de la pensée qui la sous-tend."[29] The translation of OG-Isaiah into French, based on Joseph Ziegler's edition, appeared in 2014.[30] The translators confess their aim to be "fidèles à l'esprit du texte plutôt qu'à sa lettre," which they consider to accord with how the Greek translator rendered his source text.[31] Appended to the translation is a brief survey of characteristics of the translation, along with discussion of its date and the presupposed Alexandrian milieu, as well as an index of proper names to highlight networks of meanings through wordplays.[32] The translation will be followed by a volume comparing the Greek translation with the Hebrew text, commentary on Greek syntax and lexicography, and notes on its reception among early Christian readers.[33]

Brill's Septuagint Commentary Series, whose first volume appeared in 2005, offers "a literary commentary on the Greek text of the Septuagint," based on a single codex chosen by each commentator, accompanied

---

28. Marguerite Alexandre and Monique Harl, *La Genèse*, La Bible d'Alexandrie 1 (Paris: Cerf, 1986). Monique Harl, "La Bible d'Alexandrie dans les debats actuels sur la Septante," in *La Double transmission du texte biblique: Études d'histoire du texte offertes en hommage à Adrian Schenker*, ed. Yohanan Goldman and Christoph Uehlinger, OBO 179 (Fribourg: Editions Universitaires; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001), 7.

29. Harl "Bible d'Alexandrie," 8.

30. Departures from Ziegler's text are reported in Alain Le Boulluec and Philippe Le Moigne, *Vision que vit Isaïe: Traduction du texte du prophète Isaïe selon la Septante*, La Bible d'Alexandrie (Paris: Cerf, 2014), 168–70.

31. Boulluec and Moigne, *Vision que vit Isaïe*, 163.

32. For the survey and discussion, see Boulluec and Moigne, *Vision que vit Isaïe*, 149–62. For the index, see pp. 177–312.

33. Boulluec and Moigne, *Vision que vit Isaïe*, 171.

by a translation.[34] The section-by-section commentary focuses on the translation in its own right, "without extended reference to the Hebrew text."[35] The Isaiah volume is under preparation by Ken Penner, who has chosen Sinaiticus as base text. He projects a verse-by-verse commentary that will address "special vocabulary, peculiar translations, textual differences among the main editions and manuscripts, differences between the Greek and its Hebrew source, interpretations of the passage (quotations, allusions) in the NT and Church Fathers."[36]

The Society of Biblical Literature Commentary on the Septuagint (SBLCS), whose Isaiah volume is being edited by Van der Kooij, has an extended published discussion of its principles that allows a more penetrating assessment. Its earliest specified goal, as stated in the initial prospectus of 1998, was to explicate "what is perceived to be the original meaning of the text" (equated with the translator's intent) by reading it "as much as possible … like an original composition in Greek."[37] Since "the translated text is the only accessible expression of 'the translator's mind,'" linguistic information derived from comparison of the source text constitutes the "arbiter of meaning," inasmuch as it can "*arbitrate* between *established meanings* in the target language."[38] Subsequent discussion of the aims and principles of the translation have modified the original prospectus, especially regarding the translator's intent and the goal of studying it "like an original composition in Greek."

---

34. Graeme Auld, *Joshua: Jesus, son of Nauē, in Codex Vaticanus*, Septuagint Commentary Series (Leiden: Brill, 2005). Quotation from the Septuagint Commentary Series (Brill), http://www.brill.com/publications/septuagint-commentary-series. Deserving of mention, although not allied with this series, is *Septuaginta Deutsch: Das griechische Alte Testament in deutscher Übersetzung*, ed. Wolfgang Kraus and Martin Karrer, 2nd ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2010), which is based on the Göttingen edition (if none has been published for a book, Rahlf's edition is used), with divergences from the MT marked and important Greek variants noted.

35. Septuagint Commentary Series (Brill).

36. Ken M. Penner, "Introduction to the Series on Greek Isaiah," *B-Greek: The Biblical Greek Forum*, 11 July 2011; http://www.ibiblio.org/bgreek/forum/viewtopic.php?f=51&t=426.

37. Albert Pietersma et al., "A Prospectus for a Commentary on the Septuagint," *BIOSCS* 31 (1998): 44.

38. First quotation from Pietersma et al., "A Prospectus for a Commentary on the Septuagint," 44. Second quotation from Albert Pietersma, "Response to: T. Muraoka, 'Recent Discussions on the Septuagint Lexicography with Special Reference to the So-called Interlinear Model,'" https://tinyurl.com/SBL7013a, 7, emphasis original.

Paradigmatic for reconstituting the source text is Albert Pietersma's hypothesis of "interlinearity," meant to explicate why "the Greek text *qua* text has a dimension of unintelligibility."[39] Promising to account for "the birth of the Septuagint, i.e. its original *Sitz im Leben*," Pietersma initially adduced evidence that pupils in Hellenistic schools studied Homer by producing line-by-line translations in colloquial Greek.[40] While dismissing the need to assume that there was ever a manuscript with a Greek translation alternating with lines of Hebrew, he posited that the model clarifies the "linguistic relationship … of subservience and dependence of the Greek translation *vis-à-vis* the Hebrew parent text."[41] The interlinear character of most books of the Septuagint betrays its origins within the school, with its register indicating that the translation constituted "a study aid to a text in another language," "a crib for study of the Hebrew."[42]

Pietersma has since recoiled from the reception of his proposal "as a theory about the historical *circumstances* of the Septuagint," claiming that he intended it to serve as "a metaphor or a heuristic tool" and attributing misperceptions to "the failure to recognize that interlinearity as a theory of origins and interlinearity as a heuristic tool are mutually exclusive."[43] This defense is, however, difficult to square with Pietersma's confidence that his identification of the school as OG's "original *Sitz im Leben*" positions the translation to shed light on "what was happening in the Jewish schools of the Greek speaking diaspora."[44]

Additionally, it is difficult to see how labeling interlinearity "a heuristic tool" elevates it beyond what Pietersma acknowledges that "Septuagint scholars in fact routinely do, namely, have recourse to the parent text in order to account for the translated text."[45] His charge that all previous approaches "derive from one and the same paradigm, namely, the paradigm of the Septuagint as an independent, free-standing text"

---

39. Albert Pietersma, "A New Paradigm for Addressing Old Questions: The Relevance of the Interlinear Model for the Study of the Septuagint," in *Bible and Computer: The Stellenbosch AIBI-6 Conference.*, ed. Johann Cook (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 350.

40. Pietersma, "New Paradigm," 346–49; quotation from 340.

41. Pietersma, "New Paradigm," 350.

42. Pietersma, "New Paradigm," 358, 360.

43. Albert Pietersma, "Beyond Literalism: Interlinearity Revisited," in *Translation is Required: The Septuagint in Retrospect and Prospect*, ed. Robert J. V. Hiebert, SCS 56 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2010), 11, emphasis original.

44. Pietersma, "New Paradigm," 340, 361.

45. Pietersma, "New Paradigm," 355.

is overstated.[46] Never has there been doubt among septuagintal scholars of the need to consult the source text "for some *essential* linguistic information."[47] In fact, his ranking of the SBLCS as "akin in principle" to Ottley's commentary on Isaiah "and especially J. W. Wever's *Notes* on the Pentateuch" presumes that interlinearity already has a pedigree within the field.[48] It is at the core of the longstanding principle of aligning the Greek translation with MT.[49]

Pietersma's insistence that interlinearity is the only secure model by which to discover the text-as-produced rests upon his "axiomatic distinction between text production and text reception."[50] He finds that "a failure to distinguish between these quite different Greek texts or a failure to delineate them as clearly as possible typically leads to a schizophrenic approach to the LXX—treating it *now* as a translation and *then* as a text in its own right, both within a single study."[51] I am among those Pietersma has in mind, as is clear from his criticism that my monograph on LXX-Isaiah "ends up being more about the text as (possibly) received than about the text as produced."[52] He especially faults my analysis of Isa 28, which begins with an attempt "to comprehend the literary structure of the passage in the LXX without reference to its *Vorlage*" (Troxel, 250). From this he infers that my "*de facto* object appears to be LXX-Isaiah as a linguistically independent document of Hellenistic Judaism, hence tantamount to an original composition."[53]

---

46. Pietersma, "New Paradigm," 340.

47. Pietersma, "New Paradigm," 350, emphasis original.

48. Pietersma et al., "Prospectus for a Commentary," 43.

49. See, e.g., Emanuel Tov, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research.* 3rd ed. (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2015), 44.

50. Pietersma, "Beyond Literalism," 11.

51. Albert Pietersma, "The Society of Biblical Literature Commentary on the Septuagint: Basic Principles," in *The SBL Commentary on the Septuagint: An Introduction*, ed. Dirk Büchner, SCS 67 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2017), 3 (emphasis original).

52. Albert Pietersma, "A Panel Presentation on Ronald Troxel's *LXX-Isaiah*," (panel discussion at the Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, Boston, MA, 23 November 2008), http://homes.chass.utoronto.ca/~pietersm/.

53. Pietersma, "Panel Presentation." His subsequent statement that "even mistaken readings of the source text are forced into exegetical and expositional moves by the translator" misses the point of the book that the Isaiah translator—quite differently than most others—frequently does not content himself with merely reflecting his Hebrew *Vorlage*, but provides an interpretation of it that takes advantage of oblique morphology and the vagaries of orthography.

In defense of his divide between the text-as-produced and the text-as-received, he cites the assertion by André LaCocque and Paul Ricoeur that

> we hold that the meaning of a text is in each instance an event that is born at the intersection between, on the one hand, those constraints that the text bears within itself and that have to do in large part with its *Sitz im Leben* [i.e., the text as produced] and, on the other hand, the different expectations of a series of communities of reading and interpretation that the presumed authors [or translators] of the text under consideration could not have anticipated [i.e., the text as received].[54]

Pietersma seems unaware that their definition of meaning as "an event that is born *at the intersection between* [emphasis added]" (to use Pietersma's phrases) "the text as produced" and "the text as received" follows Gadamer's insight that our only access to any ancient work is by "the placing of oneself within a process … of tradition in which past and present are constantly fused."[55] Thus Hans Jauss, citing approvingly Walther Bulst's observation that "no text was ever written to be read and interpreted philologically by philologists," adds that neither was any text written to be studied "historically by historians."[56] He rightly objects that "both methods lack the reader in his genuine role, a role as unalterable for aesthetic as for historical knowledge: as the addressee for whom the literary work is primarily destined."[57] This applies as much to a translation whose prospective audience is forever obscured as it does to a composition whose anticipated audience is unknown. Analyzing the structure of the text, including its morphological and syntactic structure compared to the source text, is essential to considering how the text was produced. Pietersma's proposed text as produced is beyond recovery because we have no direct access to the translator's mind. Our only access to its production is by tracing the structures created, understood by the constraints of grammar and discourse. In the end, this is not really reception history,

---

54. André LaCocque and Paul Ricoeur, *Thinking Biblically: Exegetical and Hermeneutical Studies*, trans. David Pellauer (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998), xi, cited by Pietersma, "Panel Presentation." The parenthetical insertions are his.

55. Hans-Georg Gadamer, *Truth and Method* (London: Sheed & Ward, 1975), 258.

56. Hans Robert Jauss, *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*, trans. Timothy Bahti, Theory and History of Literature 2 (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1982), 19.

57. Jauss, *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*, 19.

of course, but part of an inquiry into what effects the translator left as clues to his process.

As the "Preamble to the Guidelines" for the commentary cautions, a translation "should not always be assumed to make sense."[58] There are, in fact, series of verses in Isaiah where both OG and S seem to have lost their bearings (e.g., 16:1–12), forcing the conclusion that not only were they unclear about the meaning of their Hebrew source texts, but also failed to give a coherent rendering for their prospective audiences. On the other hand, chapter 18 in OG-Isaiah shows such a considered choice of equivalents and sufficient coherence to suggest that the translator had a clear conception of the meaning he was producing, whether or not he understood all of the source text. Equally, vocabulary choices in 13:21–14:4 with 32:16–18; and 34:14–17 (see the comments at 14:1) reveal a translator aware of the connections between them, forcing us to recognize that the translator did not work within the confines of the putative inter-linear method.

For this reason, I regard the premise of the "Prologue" that "unintelligibility is one of the inherent characteristics of the text-as-produced" as a false starting point for study of OG-Isaiah.[59] Even if unintelligibility is part of the text-linguistic makeup of other translations in the LXX, the Isaiah translator is more frequently concerned with the acceptability of the product than its adequacy, as has been acknowledged in every study of the book since Ziegler's *Untersuchungen*.

The methodological problems with assuming that we can bypass the effects of translation in favor of a clear view to the text-as-produced also raises problems for adopting the project's goal of explicating "both *what* the translator did say and *why*."[60] As Gideon Toury has noted, in forming hypotheses about why a translator rendered as he did "it is very easy, very tempting, and indeed rather common to suggest explanations that are psychologically dubious."[61] Even when a translation shift is typical enough to find a place in an inventory of transformations, it cannot readily reveal the

58. Albert Pietersma et al., "Preamble to the Guidelines for the Contributors to the SBL Commentary on the Septuagint," in Büchner, *SBL Commentary*, 258.

59. Pietersma et al., "Preamble to the Guidelines," 258.

60. Pietersma et al., "Preamble to the Guidelines," 258.

61. Gideon Toury, "A Handful of Methodological Issues in DTS: Are They Applicable to the Study of the Septuagint as an Assumed Translation?," *BIOSCS* 39 (2006): 22.

translator's motivation.[62] Granted, a pattern of shifts in the grammatical number or person of pronouns within a series of adjacent verses can evince an attempt to present a coherent discourse; but not even that can reveal *why* the translator did so. Was it for the sake of the reader's ease in tracking a narrative or speech? Was it because the translator was constructing a particular understanding of the details of the discourse? Was it because he saw the discourse as paralleling a topic of his day and shaping the passage to correlate with it? It is precisely "why" that eludes certainty. As Toury observes, all "'translation relationships' are unidirectional," and "one and the same product may result from the activation of different strategies."[63]

Accordingly, this commentary will eschew confident assertions about why a translator effected a particular shift. We can mount hypotheses and sift them for probability. But even when we think we can perceive a clue to the translator's trajectory, those observations remain necessarily hypothetical. Qualifiers like "perhaps," "likely," and "might be" will pervade this commentary.

This means that the evidence for the translator's *Vorlage* can never be as certain as a reading in Hebrew, even when one considers a particular conclusion likely. This correlates with the recognition that textual criticism itself is a rhetorical discipline. Even when faced with evidence from Hebrew texts, one can never prove that a particular reading preceded others; one can only argue why a particular assessment seems more likely than alternative explanations. When a pattern of behavior (such as shifts in grammatical number) is evident, it can provide support for an argued assessment of how a translator proceeded in a particular case. A series of similar shifts within a set of verses might increase the tenability of the hypothesis. But the exposition of the translator's work is always a hypothetical construal of effects embedded in the product.

The "Preamble to the Guidelines" also endorses descriptive translation studies as a primary methodology. Descriptive translation studies assesses a translation's balance between acceptability and adequacy in reflecting linguistic features of the source text. That balance constitutes

---

62. Because "knowledge of transformations is necessary in order to reach conclusions about the source text of the Greek translators," Theo van der Louw compiles a useful inventory of shifts common in translations (*Transformations in the Septuagint: Towards an Interaction of Septuagint Studies and Translation Studies*, CBET 47 [Leuven: Peeters, 2007], 57–92; quotation from p. 92).

63. Toury, "Handful of Methodological Issues," 21.

the initial norm for the translation, while operational norms govern the process of rendering specific words and phrases into the target language.[64] Understanding a translation qua translation requires analyzing the process within a matrix comprising the product and the anticipated function.[65] The Society of Biblical Literature Commentary on the Septuagint seeks "to elucidate the meaning of the *text-as-produced*" by identifying "the strategies and norms by means of which the text came into being."[66]

Toury developed descriptive translation studies for analysis of translations whose source text and prospective function are known, so as to permit comparison of the position "a translation (or group of translations) has actually assumed in the host culture with the position it was intended to have, and offer explanations for the perceived differences."[67] Although this analytic "presupposes an extensive knowledge of the target culture" that is inaccessible for the Greek Bible translations, Theo van der Louw claims that descriptive translation studies permits "a bottom-up analysis that less presupposes such prior knowledge."[68]

Regarding that claim, Toury remarks that "the relations between sociocultural context and translation process are not very different from the relations … between product and process," since a translation's prospective function is calibrated to culturally determined norms that shape the product.[69] Allowing that ignorance of one or more data sets is analogous to a mathematical equation with unknown variables, Toury suggests that "sometimes the best heuristics would be to tentatively assume knowledge of one or another of the variables and see where this assumption would lead us."[70] Nevertheless, he adds the caveat that "the greater the number of unknown factors, the more complex the study will turn out to be and the more controversies there will be about the validity of the results."[71]

The challenge here is that, whereas a mathematical equation with variables can be plotted on a line due to numerical stability, the variables

---

64. For initial norm, see Gideon Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*, Benjamins Translation Library 4 (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1995), 79; for operational norms, see p. 82.

65. Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*, 5.

66. Pietersma et al., "Preamble to the Guidelines," 257 (emphasis original).

67. Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*, 8.

68. Van der Louw, *Transformations in the Septuagint*, 20, 21.

69. Toury, "Handful of Methodological Issues," 23.

70. Toury, "Handful of Methodological Issues," 23.

71. Toury, "Handful of Methodological Issues," 24.

in a translation are intrinsically unstable, owing to the choices made by a translator whose rationale remains undisclosed.[72] As Toury stipulates, "once over, the act of translation will have completely vanished," so that "translation strategies and entire processes … cannot be tackled in any direct way," but must be "*reconstructed* from the observables," bestowing on them "only *feasibility* in their role as viable explanations."[73] This calls into question confidence in the explanatory power of descriptive translation studies for study of the OG. Although inventories of commonly used shifts are helpful, simply describing what can be ascertained about the mechanics does not lead us to any certain knowledge of why the translator produced the text as he did.

3. The Aims of This Commentary

This commentary is written to be of service in textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible by attempting to identify readings that likely stood in the *Vorlagen* of OG and S, which are prime witnesses to both early forms of the Hebrew text and to the earliest attempts to render that text into other languages. Although this is not a commentary on either OG or S qua translation, observations about each translation will offer material for such descriptions.

The reason for treating S and OG together is to afford detailed analysis of their relationship, with particular attention to whether S consulted OG directly or, perhaps, was indirectly influenced by OG. A side benefit of that aim is the light comparison sheds on both the shared and distinct tacks the translators took in rendering lexemes, phrases, verses, and even passages. In the course of doing so, observations about the consequent literary structure will be offered, not out of unswerving confidence that the translator deliberately constructed them, but as an attempt to understand how the effects of a translator's process constitutes a coherent (or incoherent) discourse in the target language.

Finding coherence within a set of verses is no more part of reception than attempts to identify the intent of a translator in the text-as-produced. Any analysis is subject to the perceptions and analyses of the

---

72. I owe this observation to Jeremy M. Hutton, pers. comm.

73. Toury, "Handful of Methodological Issues," 22 (emphasis original).

reader. However, arguments about coherence, defended as effects of choices likely due to the translator, have prima facie cogency.[74]

This commentary seeks to be comprehensive while being selective on some levels. I will address the translational features in each verse that are not transparent to a text like that of Leningrad B19ᴬ, whose consonantal text I provide, alongside which I will cite the critically edited texts of the Göttingen and Leiden editions, omitting their punctuation, adducing that only when relevant to discussion of phrasing. Any deviations from the texts of the Göttingen and Leiden editions will be noted and explained.

Although I will not regularly assess evidence for features like +/-conjunctive *waw* or +/-article, I intend to render judgment on every feature that I consider to obscure a clear view of the *Vorlage* or that seems to me important to the flow and logic of the discourse in the version. I will engage in asides on, for example, the translators' habits of representing or omitting הנה, and I devote a lengthy appendix to +/-כל in G and S, measured against variations of כל in 1QIsaᵃ and the SP of Exodus. Equivalents for individual lexemes and syntagms will be compared to their appearances elsewhere in Isaiah and the remainder of the Greek and Syriac Bible translations, because these can confirm the likely underlying *Vorlage* or provide a basis for measuring the translator's approach to his task alongside that of other translators.

I will adduce parallel translations in V and T and evidence from the Dead Sea Scrolls when they shed light on an issue at hand. I cannot guarantee that every reader will find what I merit worthy of comment salient, any more than I can assume she or he will agree with my descriptions. It might equally be that a reader will decide that I have overlooked a crucial feature in a verse. Given that this is the first comprehensive attempt to compare and account for how these translators rendered the book of Isaiah, I hope for both expansions to and disagreements with my work.

Much more scholarship has been devoted to OG than S. The many monographs I have utilized are listed in the bibliographies of the front

---

74. Cf. Hiebert's observation that ἤρξατο ὁ θεὸς ποιῆσαι ‖ ברא אלהים לעשות in Gen 2:3 forms an *inclusio* with ἐν ἀρχῇ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός ‖ בראשית ברא אלהים in Gen 1:1 (Robert J. V. Hiebert, "In the Beginning: A Commentary on the Old Greek Text of Genesis 1.1–2.3," in Büchner, *SBL Commentary*, 19). Although I concur that "G seems intentionally to have departed from his source text" in 2:3, his inference that he did so "in fashioning the end component of an *inclusio*" that "demarcates the limits of this segment of OG Genesis" (67) is vulnerable to Pietersma's opprobrium of reception.

matter ("Symbols, Abbreviations, and Bibliography"), and I refer the reader again to the reviews noted above, note 27. One recent publication that proved particularly useful is Mirjam van der Vorm-Croughs's analysis of the pluses and minuses in OG-Isaiah, which receives as many citations in the course of this commentary as Ottley, Ziegler, and Seeligmann.[75] I am grateful for her catalogues of recurring phenomena and the accompanying observations she makes. Without those, this work would be much the poorer.

---

75. Mirjam van der Vorm-Croughs, *The Old Greek of Isaiah: An Analysis of Its Pluses and Minuses*, SCS 61 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014).