

# THE SBL COMMENTARY ON THE SEPTUAGINT

## An Introduction

# Septuagint and Cognate Studies

Wolfgang Kraus, General Editor

*Editorial Board:*

Robert Hiebert

Karen H. Jobes

Arie van der Kooij

Siegfried Kreuzer

Philippe Le Moigne

Number 67



# THE SBL COMMENTARY ON THE SEPTUAGINT

## An Introduction

*Edited by*

Dirk Büchner



**SBL PRESS**

**Atlanta**

Copyright © 2017 by SBL Press

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 Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Büchner, Dirk, editor.

Title: The SBL commentary on the Septuagint : an introduction / edited by Dirk Büchner.

Description: Atlanta : SBL Press, [2017] | Series: Septuagint and cognate studies ; number 67 | Includes bibliographical references. | Description based on print version record and CIP data provided by publisher; resource not viewed.

Identifiers: LCCN 2017021413 (print) | LCCN 2017022025 (ebook) | ISBN 9780884142430 (ebook) | ISBN 9781628371871 (pbk. : alk. paper) | ISBN 9780884142447 (hardcover : alk. paper)

Subjects: LCSH: Bible. Old Testament. Greek—Versions—Septuagint—Criticism, Textual. | Bible. Old Testament—Translating.

Classification: LCC BS744 (ebook) | LCC BS744 .S25 2017 (print) | DDC 221.4/86—dc23

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2017021413>

Printed on acid-free paper.





## Contents

Preface.....	vii
Acknowledgments .....	ix
Abbreviations.....	xi
 The Society of Biblical Literature Commentary on the Septuagint: Basic Principles Albert Pietersma.....	   1
 In the Beginning: A Commentary on the Old Greek Text of Genesis 1.1–2.3 Robert J. V. Hiebert.....	   17
 “Drawn from the Water”: A Commentary on the Old Greek Text of Exodus 2.1–10 Larry Perkins .....	   69
 Leuitikon 3.1–17: The Sacrifice of Deliverance Dirk Büchner .....	   95
 Balaam, Pagan Prophet of God: A Commentary on Greek Numbers 22.1–21 Spencer A. Jones.....	   123
 A Tale of Two Eunuchs: A Commentary on Greek Esther 2.19–23 and A.12–17 Cameron Boyd-Taylor .....	   169
 It’s a Question of Intelligence: Iob 34 Claude E. Cox .....	   207

God, Judges, Snakes, and Sinners: A Commentary on the  
Old Greek Text of Psalm 57 (MT 58)  
Jannes Smith .....241

Appendix: Preamble to the Guidelines for the Contributors to  
the SBL Commentary on the Septuagint.....257

Contributors.....261

## Preface

This volume is the fruit of a process begun with a special session of the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies Annual Meeting in May, 2013 in Victoria, British Columbia, as part of the greater Congress of the Humanities and Social Sciences. Victoria is a stone's throw away from Langley, the location of Trinity Western University and the John William Wevers Institute for Septuagint Studies. The location of the Congress that year enabled the Institute to hold one of its regular colloquia in a larger scholarly environment. The session was dedicated to the theoretical approach of the Society of Biblical Literature Commentary on the Septuagint and its application to a representative spread of translational approaches found in the LXX corpus. Seven contributors to the SBLCS presented a perspective or a chapter of commentary from their assigned books and in the months that followed, scrutinized one another's papers and engaged in further conversations. The chapters as they now appear are the culmination of this valuable process.

A commentary series needs to be clear about its presuppositions and approach, as well as how these are to be put into effect, which is why the volume begins with Albert Pietersma's chapter on what the LXX is and what should be found in the commentator's toolkit. The rest of the contributions present the reader with commentary samples that range from legal material and narrative to wisdom and poetry, as follows: Genesis 1 by Robert Hiebert, Exodus 2 by Larry Perkins, Leuitikon (Leviticus) 3 by Dirk Büchner, Numbers 22 by Spencer Jones, Esther 2 in the Old Greek and the Alpha Text, by Cameron Boyd-Taylor, Iob (Job) 34 by Claude Cox, and Psalm 57 by Jannes Smith.

In each case a careful effort is made to describe and explain the *process* of translation that was followed by each translator as they rendered their *Vorlage* into Greek for the benefit of, and according to the cultural norms of their immediate audiences. In an appendix is found the Preamble to the Guidelines for the Contributors to the Society of Biblical Literature

Commentary on the Septuagint. It is hoped that the volume will serve as a handbook for commentators in the series, and open up a new perspective on the delightful quest to discover how the translators went about their work and what they intended by it.

## Acknowledgments

Financial assistance toward the expenses of the conference attendees came from an Aid to Small Universities grant of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, as well as from the Wevers Institute endowment fund. Thanks are due to Elsie Froment and Sue Funk in the Trinity Western University research office, and to Robert Hiebert as director of the Institute.

It is to Al Pietersma that we owe the conception of the commentary series, with its solid theoretical foundation. Over the past two years he put in a tremendous amount of time to minutely scrutinize each contribution and write copious comments. For his expertise, rigor, and watchful eye we are most grateful, as we are for every other member of the team and their congenial way of sharpening each other's work. Spencer Jones, who was responsible for the final formatting and uniformity of each paper, spent countless hours in conversation with contributors and has been an invaluable helper to us all.

Langley, February 2016



## Abbreviations

### Technical Abbreviations

*	Greek form is hypothetical
√	root form
1°, 2°, etc.	first occurrence, second occurrence, etc.
1x, 2x, etc.	once, twice, etc.
ca.	circa
esp.	especially
fem.	feminine
Heb.	Hebrew (language)
IO	indirect object
G	Old Greek translator
gen.	genitive
Gk.	Greek (language)
impv.	imperative
καὶ τὰ λοιπά	καὶ τὰ λοιπά (“and the remaining”)
masc.	masculine
MS(S)	manuscript(s)
pers.	person
pers. comm.	personal communication
pl.	plural
PN	proper name
S	subject
sg.	singular
s.v.	<i>sub verba</i> (“under the word”)
V	verb
V <sup>pass</sup>	passive verb

### Primary Texts

α'	recension attributed to Aquila
θ'	recension attributed to Theodotion

σ'	recension attributed to Symmachus
Ag.	Aeschylus, <i>Agamemnon</i>
A.J.	Josephus, <i>Antiquitates judaicae</i>
Anab.	Xenophon, <i>Anabasis</i>
Ant.	Sophocles, <i>Antigone</i>
Argon.	Apollonius Rhodius, <i>Argonautica</i>
Art.	Plutarch, <i>Artaxerxes</i>
Autol.	Theophilus of Antioch, <i>Ad Autolyicum</i>
BdA	Harl, Marguerite, ed. <i>La Bible d'Alexandrie</i> . Paris: Cerf, 1986–.
BGU	<i>Aegyptische Urkunden aus den Königlichen (later Staatlichen) Museen zu Berlin, Griechische Urkunden</i>
BHK	<i>Biblia Hebraica</i> , ed. R. Kittel
BHS	<i>Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia</i> . Edited by Karl Elliger and Wilhelm Rudolph. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1983.
BHS <sup>sapp</sup>	<i>Apparatus criticus</i> to BHS
Brenton	Brenton, Lancelot Charles Lee. <i>The Septuagint Version of the Old Testament: According to the Vatican Text, Translated into English</i> . London: Bagster, 1844.
Caes.	Plutarch, <i>Caesar</i>
Cat.	Aristotle, <i>Categoriae</i>
Conf.	Philo, <i>De confusione linguarum</i>
Cor.	Plutarch, <i>Marcus Coriolanus</i>
Crat.	Plato, <i>Cratylus</i>
Cyn.	Xenophon, <i>Cynegeticus</i>
Cyr.	Xenophon, <i>Cyropaedia</i>
Deipn.	Athenaeus, <i>Deipnosophistae</i>
Descr.	Pausanias, <i>Graeciae descriptio</i>
El.	Sophocles, <i>Elektra</i>
Eq.	Xenophon, <i>De equitande ratione</i>
Eth. nic.	Aristotle, <i>Ethica nicomachea</i>
Euthyd.	Plato, <i>Euthydemus</i>
FGH	<i>Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker</i> . Edited by Felix Jacoby. Leiden: Brill, 1954–1964.
Frag.	<i>Fragmenta</i>
Gen. litt.	Augustine, <i>De Genesi ad litteram</i>
Geogr.	Strabo, <i>Geographica</i>
Haer.	Irenaeus, <i>Adversus haereses (Elenchos)</i>



<i>Hell.</i>	Xenophon, <i>Hellenica</i>
<i>Herm.</i>	Tertullian, <i>Adversus Hermogenem</i>
<i>Hist.</i>	<i>Historiae</i>
<i>Hom. Phlm.</i>	Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in epistulam ad Philemonem</i>
<i>IG</i>	<i>Inscriptiones Graecae: Editio Minor</i> . Berlin: de Gruyter, 1924–.
<i>Il.</i>	Homer, <i>Iliad</i>
<i>Leg.</i>	Plato, <i>Leges</i>
<i>LXX</i>	Septuagint
<i>LXX.D</i>	Kraus, Wolfgang, and Martin Karrer, eds. <i>Septuaginta Deutsch: Das griechische Alte Testament in deutscher Übersetzung</i> . Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2009.
<i>Mem.</i>	Xenophon, <i>Memorabilia</i>
<i>m. Menah.</i>	Mishna Menahot
<i>Mos.</i>	Philo, <i>De vita Mosis</i>
<i>MT</i>	Masoretic text
<i>NETS</i>	New English Translation of the Septuagint
<i>NJB</i>	New Jerusalem Bible
<i>NRSV</i>	New Revised Standard Version
<i>Oed. tyr.</i>	Sophocles, <i>Oedipus tyrannus</i>
<i>Opif.</i>	Philo, <i>De opificio mundi</i>
<i>Or. Graec.</i>	Tatian, <i>Oratio ad Graecos</i>
<i>Pesh</i>	Peshitta
<i>Phaed.</i>	Plato, <i>Phaedo</i>
<i>Phileb.</i>	Plato, <i>Philebus</i>
<i>Phoc.</i>	Plutarch, <i>Phocion</i>
<i>Praep. ev.</i>	Eusebius, <i>Praeparatio evangelica</i>
<i>P.Rev Laws</i>	Papyrus Revenue Laws
<i>Prom.</i>	Aeschylus, <i>Prometheus vincus</i>
<i>Ra</i>	Rahlfs, Alfred. <i>Septuaginta: Id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes</i> . Revised by Robert Hanhart. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006.
<i>Rahlfs</i>	Rahlfs, Alfred. <i>Psalmi cum Odis</i> . SVTG 10. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967.
<i>Rhet. Alex.</i>	Pseudo-Aristotle, <i>Rhetorica ad Alexandrum</i>
<i>Sam.</i>	Menander, <i>Samia</i>
<i>SamPent</i>	Samaritan Pentateuch
<i>Septim.</i>	Hippocrates, <i>De septimestri partu</i>
<i>Sib. Or.</i>	Sibylline Oracles

<i>Sik.</i>	Menander, <i>Sicyonii fragmenta aliunde nota</i>
<i>Sp. Laws</i>	Philo, <i>Special Laws</i>
<i>Superst.</i>	Plutarch, <i>De superstitione</i>
Syh	Syro-hexapla, the Syriac version of Origen's Hexapla
Teb.	Tebtunis Papyrus
Tg. Job	Targum for Job
Tg. Neof.	Targum Neofiti
Tg. Onq.	Targum Onqelos
Tg. Ps.-J.	Targum Pseudo-Jonathan
<i>Them.</i>	Plutarch, <i>Themistocles</i>
<i>Tim.</i>	Plato, <i>Timaeus</i> ; Aeschines, <i>In Timarchum</i>
T. Iss.	Testament of Issachar
T. Reu.	Testament of Reuben
<i>Vesp.</i>	Aristophanes, <i>Vespae</i>
We <sup>ed</sup>	Wevers's Göttingen edition at the pertinent location
Zi	Joseph Ziegler's Göttingen edition at the pertinent location

### Secondary Sources

ACCS	Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture
ACW	Ancient Christian Writers
AASF	Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae
AAU	Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis
AB	Anchor Bible
AnBib	Analecta Biblica
BCOTWP	Baker Commentary on the Old Testament Wisdom and Psalms
BDAG	Danker, Frederick W., Walter Bauer, William F. Arndt, and F. Wilbur Gingrich. <i>Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> . 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
BDB	Brown, Francis, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs. <i>A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> . Oxford: Clarendon, 1907.
BDR	Blass, Friedrich, Albert Debrunner, and Friedrich Rehkopf. <i>Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch</i> . Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976.
BETL	Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovanien-sium

<i>Bib</i>	<i>Biblica</i>
BIOSCS	<i>Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies</i>
BKAT	Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament
BSac	<i>Bibliotheca Sacra</i>
BTL	Benjamins Translation Library
BTS	Biblical Tools and Studies
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
CBSC	Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges
CGLC	Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics
COut	Commentaar op het Oude Testament
C-S	F. C. Conybeare and St. George Stock. <i>Grammar of Septuagint Greek</i> . Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2010.
CTSRR	College Theology Society Resources in Religion
DCH	Clines, David J. A., ed. <i>Dictionary of Classical Hebrew</i> . 9 vols. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 1993–2016.
DJD	Discoveries in the Judean Desert
DK	Diels, Hermann, and Walther Kranz, eds. <i>Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker, griechisch und deutsch</i> . Zurich: Weidmann, 2004.
ECC	Eerdmans Critical Commentary
EeC	Études et commentaires
<i>Elr</i>	<i>Encyclopaedia Iranica</i> . Edited by Ehsan Yarshater. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1982–.
EnAC	Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique
GELS	Muraoka, Takamitsu. <i>A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint</i> . Leuven: Peeters, 2009.
GKC	Gesenius, Wilhelm. <i>Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar</i> . Edited by Emil Kautzsch. Translated by Arthur E. Cowley. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1910.
GRBS	<i>Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies</i>
HALOT	Koehler, Ludwig, Walter Baumgartner, and Johann J. Stamm. <i>The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> . Translated and edited under the supervision of Mervyn E. J. Richardson. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
HBS	Herders biblische Studien
HCOT	Historical Commentary on the Old Testament
HCS	Hellenistic Culture and Society

HKAT	Handkommentar zum Alten Testament
HRCS	Hatch, Edwin, and Henry A. Redpath. <i>Concordance to the Septuagint and Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament</i> . 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1897. Repr., Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998.
HUCA	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
IBHS	Waltke, Bruce K., and Michael O'Connor. <i>An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax</i> . Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
ICC	International Critical Commentary
JBL	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
JHS	<i>Journal of Hellenic Studies</i>
JJS	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>
Joüon	Joüon, Paul. <i>A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew</i> . Translated and revised by T. Muraoka. 2 vols. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1991.
JRitSt	<i>Journal of Ritual Studies</i>
JSCS	<i>Journal of Septuagint and Cognate Studies</i>
JSJSup	Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism
JSOT	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series
JSS	<i>Journal of Semitic Studies</i>
JTS	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
KAT	Kommentar zum Alten Testament
L&N	Louw, Johannes P., and Eugene A. Nida, eds. <i>Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Based on Semantic Domains</i> . 2nd ed. New York: United Bible Societies, 1989.
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
LEH	Lust, Johan, Erik Eynikel, and Katrin Hauspie, eds. <i>Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint</i> . Rev. ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2003.
LHBOTS	Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies
LSJ	Liddell, Henry George, Robert Scott, and Henry Stuart Jones. <i>A Greek-English Lexicon</i> . 9th ed. with revised supplement. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.
Mayser	Mayser, Edwin. <i>Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit</i> . 2 vols. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1906–1933.
MM	Moulton, James H., and George Milligan. <i>The Vocabulary</i>

	<i>of the Greek Testament</i> . London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1929. Repr., Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1997.
MSU	Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens
NIDOTTE	VanGemen, Willem A., ed. <i>New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis</i> . 5 vols. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1997.
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
OBO	Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis
OLA	Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta
OTL	Old Testament Library
RHR	<i>Revue de l'histoire des religions</i>
RVV	Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten
SBLCS	Society of Biblical Literature Commentary on the Septuagint
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLPS	Society of Biblical Literature Pseudepigrapha Series
SBLTT	Society of Biblical Literature Texts and Translations
SCS	Septuagint and Cognate Studies
Smyth	Smyth, Herbert W. <i>Greek Grammar for Colleges</i> . Revised by Gordon M. Messing. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956.
<i>Suppl.</i>	Aeschylus <i>Supplices</i>
SVTG	Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum
SVTP	Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigraphica
TAPA	<i>Transactions of the American Philological Association</i>
TDOT	<i>Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament</i> . Edited by G. Johannes Botterweck and Helmer Ringgren. Translated by John T. Willis et al. 16 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974–2006.
THB	Text of the Hebrew Bible
Thackeray	Thackeray, Henry St. J. <i>A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint</i> . Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909.
TLG	<i>Thesaurus Linguae Graecae</i>
TLZ	<i>Theologische Literaturzeitung</i>
VT	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
VTSup	Supplements to Vetus Testamentum
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary

WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
ZAW	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>

# The Society of Biblical Literature Commentary on the Septuagint: Basic Principles

*Albert Pietersma*

## Introduction

After a long gestation period, the Guidelines for producing the Society of Biblical Literature Commentary on the Septuagint were finalized in 2013. Later that year a Septuagint section was organized within the congress of the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies (CSBS) for the purpose of discussing and demonstrating the application of the Guidelines to the writing of the commentary.

In this introductory paper I will limit myself to the Preamble of the Guidelines, which delineates a series of four principles, each with its own explanatory subsections (for the text of the Preamble, see the appendix at the end of this volume). But even here I will be selective.

## A Backward Glance

The commentary series now labeled “SBLCS” was effectively conceived in 1995/1996 when a committee of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies (IOSCS) was struck to create a prospectus for a commentary series on the anthology commonly known as the Septuagint (LXX) or the Old Greek (OG). The prospectus was published in 1998 (Pietersma 1998), and the commentary was formally sponsored by the IOSCS in 1999.<sup>1</sup> Like the SBLCS Guidelines, the preamble of the earlier prospectus delineates a series of principles, five in number (see

---

\* My thanks to Cameron Boyd-Taylor for critiquing this paper. Any mistakes or infelicities that remain are mine alone.

1. The members of the planning Committee were Albert Pietersma (convener),

<http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/ioscs/commentary/>). Although these principles were honed and reformulated for the current Guidelines, there is an obvious conceptual connection between the two sets of principles. Furthermore, an equally obvious link has, from the beginning, existed between NETS and the commentary series under whatever title. One might here speak of a continuum from NETS to SBLCS, or as two stages of a single interpretive effort (e.g., Pietersma 2004, 1008).

### The Text-as-Produced and the Text-as-Received

I can think of no more important distinction in the NETS approach than the axiomatic distinction between, on the one hand, the text-as-produced and, on the other, the text-as-received (Pietersma 2005, 2008, 2010), and it is for this reason that the Preamble of the Guidelines begins with this distinction. I quote:

The objective of the Society of Biblical Literature Commentary on the Septuagint (SBLCS) is to elucidate the meaning of the text-as-produced in distinction from the text-as-received. “Meaning,” however, is neither to be presupposed nor to be superimposed from either the source text or the text-as-received.

The distinction may be called “axiomatic” because it is part and parcel of the historical study of literature and a starting point for diachronic inquiry, whether the literature be (original) composition or (derived) translation. As it applies to translation literature, it references, in a nutshell, the translated text as an entity *dependent* on its source text (Guidelines 1.1.1) in distinction from the translated text, cut loose from its historical moorings, and therefore a *free standing* text, or “the text in its own right,” as it is sometimes called.

In the NETS approach the text-as-received or the text in its own right or the text as a freestanding entity alongside its source text is *never* in view—except as a text to be ignored or, perhaps, to be noted as a *curiosum* of what happened to the text-as-produced in reception history.<sup>2</sup> In fact, we

---

Claude Cox, Moises Silva, Benjamin Wright, David Aiken, and John W. Wevers (consultant); the publication of *BIOSCS* was a year behind schedule.

2. Broadly speaking the reception history of the Greek text may be divided into Jewish reception history in distinction from Christian reception history. Although the



can go one step farther and say that the text in its own right has no role to play in the study of the Old Greek *qua translation*, even though it is its logical and historical extension. Instead, as an independent text, standing alongside its erstwhile source, it belongs to the reception history of the Hebrew Bible as a literary document. While genealogically the Greek text remains perforce a translation forever, genetically it ceases to be one when it becomes a text in its own right.

This distinction needs to be stressed the more since, if my experience is any indication, 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.<sup>3</sup>

Some of the reasons for this confusion are not far to seek. The first is probably the common interpreter's pitfall of trying to make a text say more than what is justified by its linguistic make-up, especially when one is dealing with a translation of formal correspondence. Another may well be inherent in the general act of writing a commentary, when the common assumption must surely be that the text on which one is about to write a commentary is a fully fledged text, a discourse in written form, which, *qua* discourse, may be expected to cohere as a unit. While it can scarcely be denied that such units exist in the translated corpus and can in fact be said to exist aplenty, even though many of these may be small or even *very* small in scope, in the light of the constitutive character or the verbal make-up of all the translated books and the *interlinear assumption* of the NETS approach, textual coherence cannot be *presupposed* to exist but must be *shown* to exist. It is clear, therefore, where the burden of proof must lie.<sup>4</sup>

---

*Letter of Aristeas* (ca. 130 BCE) looms large on the Jewish side, the oldest extant evidence hails from Demetrius the Chronographer in the late third century BCE. Christian reception history commences effectively with the earliest Christian writings. For the possible use of reception history see further Prospectus, Principle (2).

3. Needless to say, the distinction applies to *all* translations, whether that be an English translation of a novel by Dostoevsky or a Dutch translation of one of Shakespeare's plays. One can either study them *qua* translation, in which case the translation is mapped onto its original and is studied for interference by the source text, or one can study them as freestanding texts in their own right, apart from or alongside of the text from which they were derived.

4. Cameron Boyd-Taylor (2015, 138) felicitously speaks of interlinearity as a theory of interference. If Toury is correct in arguing that the law of interference is the norm in translations, the question is not *whether* interference occurred but *how*

According to the NETS approach, the amount and kind of interference from the source text in the translated text warrants the interlinear paradigm. This does *not* mean that, de facto, all translated books or individual books in their entirety are characterized by interlinearity from beginning to end. Nor does it mean that it can be dismissed as an interpretive straitjacket or a theory of LXX origins. But what it *does* mean is that, since the text displays characteristics of interlinearity, in descriptive terms interlinearity forms its baseline, and that it is a powerful heuristic tool for the modern interpreter.

Now, if the assumption of textual cohesion and coherence is part and parcel of the writing of commentaries, it should occasion no surprise that a commentator on the text-as-produced is always in mortal danger of getting derailed or of “falling off the wagon” (so to speak), either on the side of the source text—with the result that the commentary turns out to be more about the Hebrew text than about the Greek text-as-produced, or on the side of the Greek text-as-received, that is to say, the text as an independent, free-standing entity, where, for example, items from a source at variance with MT are no longer so perceived; where the translator’s mistakes and instances of ignorance of the source language no longer exist; where the unintelligible tends to become intelligible; where coincidental instances of alliteration and other potentially literary flourishes are happily ascribed to the translator’s intent; where examples of reputed intertextuality tend to be pointed out in great number, even though they are nothing more than inadvertent by-products of Greek-Hebrew defaults and thus instances of interference from the source text.<sup>5</sup> In short, interference from the source text does not exist in the text-as-received.<sup>6</sup>

---

*much and of what kind.* His formulation is: “in translation, phenomena pertaining to the make-up of the source text tend to be transferred to the target text.” Toury further argues that between translational and nontranslational modes of text production and language use, there exists a basic functional opposition (Toury 1995, 275 and 216, respectively).

5. It bears underscoring that, in the text-as-produced, intertextuality can only occur (1) at the level of the translated (Greek) texts (2) and can only be demonstrated to exist when translated texts agree despite their respective source texts. Needless to say, thematic similarity or identity can seldom be considered intertextual, since it typically belongs to the source text.

6. To be distinguished from “linguistic strangeness,” often thought of as a mark of Holy Writ or even the language of the Holy Spirit.

As it happens, I have recently had occasion to read Eric Zenger's Hermeneia commentary on the so-called Psalms of Ascent (Hossfeld and Zenger 2011).<sup>7</sup> At the end of each of the Psalms, Zenger has a few pages on the corresponding Greek psalm. His comments on the psalm in Greek are often of interest, despite being selective. The problem is that, although his vantage point is patently that of the text-as-received, he typically assigns what he finds to the text-as-produced. Thus, he repeatedly gets derailed or falls off the wagon, on the side of the Greek text "in its own right." Alternatively, one could say that he makes the mistake of superimposing the text-as-received on the text-as-produced or, to put it yet another way, he ascribes far more to the text-as-produced than it can linguistically bear.<sup>8</sup>

A commentary like Zenger's offers a good transition to my next point, namely, that, within the modern history of our discipline with its pronounced New Testament dimension, the LXX is regularly construed as the Old Testament of the New Testament, witness, for example, the titles of both Swete's (1909–1922) and Rahlfs's (2006) popular editions. From this perspective, it is scarcely surprising that the reigning paradigm in LXX studies tends to be that of a translation which has replaced its source text, rather than a text dependent upon it (Guidelines 1.1.1); hence a text *in its own right*, a text to be placed alongside of other texts *in their own right* qua documents, like the Hebrew Bible, the New Testament, the Peshitta or whatever text *in its own right* one might care to add. The reason for this paradigm is, no doubt, as Cameron Boyd-Taylor has aptly put it, that what is wanted from this perspective is a translator one can talk to, one with whom the modern reader can carry on a conversation (pers. comm., February 23, 2013).

Not without interest is the fact that this perspective is epitomized by the title of the Göttingen Septuagint, namely, *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum*, perpetuated from Alfred Rahlfs's 1931 edition of the Psalms and the Odes (Rahlfs 1931). Even more noteworthy is that it bears this title

---

7. In the Greek these psalms are called the Psalms of the Steps.

8. For a random example see Ps 125(126).1bc, which speak of return from exile and of being comforted (*παράκαλέω*). According to Zenger (2011, 378), G is here drawing on Esa 40.1–2; 51.12; 53.9 (*sic*) because these passages also speak of return and use of *παράκαλέω*. Strangely he makes no mention of the fact that *παράκαλέω* in Ps 125.1c renders *לָחַץ*, as it does in Esa 38.16.

despite the fact that it offers a reconstructed original of a text that predated the early Church by several centuries.<sup>9</sup>

All of the above is *not* to say that, in principle, one cannot write a commentary on the Greek as a text in its own right (even though methodological problems loom large), but it *is* to say that doing so is an undertaking quite distinct from writing a commentary on the LXX *qua* translation, that is, *qua* text-as-produced. Similarly, the above does not deny that the Greek became the Old Testament of the New Testament, nor does it deny that it played a mediating role between the Hebrew Bible and the New Testament, but it *is* to question the *nature* of such mediation.

What has become patently obvious is that, for our commentator on the text-as-produced, it is far easier to fall off the wagon than to stay on it, to get derailed rather than to remain on track. Or, to use a different metaphor, to write a commentary on the text-as-produced is like sailing between Scylla and Charybdis. Whether one shipwrecks on the one or on the other is immaterial. A shipwreck is a shipwreck by any name.

### The Text-as-Produced

But if, as the Guidelines state, it is the text-as-produced that is the object of the commentary, how then does one access it for commentary and what label might one attach to it? As I have already intimated, the text-as-produced can only be accessed by mapping the Greek text onto its Hebrew (or Aramaic) source text. As for a label—part of the answer is to point out what the text-as-produced is *not*. First, as noted, it is *not* the text-as-received, that is, it is not conceptualized as a text in its own right, but rather as a text that is *compositionally* dependent on its source text, as the Guidelines rightly insist (Guidelines §1.1.1). What that means essentially is that the translator does not undertake to compose his own discourse but renders, in some fashion or other, the discourse of his source text into his own linguistic medium. And this applies to *all* translations within the corpus, regardless of textual-linguistic make-up, that is to say, from Ecclesiastes to Greek Job (see n. 3, above).

Second, as noted, it is *not* *Vetus Testamentum Graecum*. In whatever form the pre-Christian LXX became the Holy Writ of the Christian

---

9. See as well *Septuaginta Deutsch: Das griechische Alte Testament*; *La Bible d'Alexandrie*; and *La Biblia Griega: Septuaginta*; *La Bibbia dei Settanta*.

Church, in terms of both text-form and text-semantics, it was *no doubt* distinct from its ancient forebear. Nor, for that matter, did the translation, upon inception, automatically become Jewish Scripture (see Guidelines §4.14). As Gideon Toury writes, “There is no way a translation could share the same systemic space with its original; not even when the two are physically side by side.” (Toury 1995, 26; see also Honigman 2003, 95).

Third, it is *not*—until proven otherwise—a fully fledged, full-scale text, a discourse in written form. Rather, it is typically a fragmentary text, a text with all kinds of holes in it, despite interpretive nuggets among them. Time and again, for example, when the translator uses nothing but default equivalents and conveys nothing of local or general interest, the commentator is left with nothing to say—except perhaps just how many times Greek X translates Hebrew Y.<sup>10</sup> What this means is that a commentary on the text-as-produced cannot be expected to look like a commentary on the text in its own right. For that reason one might best think of the text-as-produced as *a text between texts*, the Semitic source text, on the one side, and the freestanding Greek text on the other.

The text-as-produced—the text *between* texts—may usefully be described as a two-dimensional text. On the horizontal plane morphemes are knit together into syntactic units to convey information; on the vertical plane the *parent* text forms the de facto context for meaning. As a result of excessive one-for-one dependence on the source text, the target text may be rendered disjointed or worse. À propos here is Northrop Frye’s distinction between the literary genres of the modern novel and sentimental romance. Whereas in the novel as a realistic narrative the writer attempts to keep the action horizontal, using the technique of causality to keep the narrative moving from within, romance “moves from one discontinuous episode to another, describing things that happen to characters, for the most part, externally” (Frye 1976, 47; see also Pietersma 2013b, 158–60). The implication of the text’s two-dimensionality for lexicography and grammaticography should be obvious.

Crucial for determining the linguistic make-up of the text-as-produced, or rather its *constitutive character*, is, on the one hand, to map the translated text onto its source text, in order to establish what sort of translation one is dealing with, and, on the other, to consult Greek composition

---

10. This is not to say, however, that such information is of no importance, since it falls, after all, into the category of interference from the source text and it is the study of such interference that is the primary focus of the study of the Greek text qua translation.

literature of the period in order to determine what sort of Greek document it is (Guidelines §1.3.2). With Boyd-Taylor we might here speak of the *text qua translation* in distinction from the *translation qua text* (Boyd-Taylor 2011, 432).<sup>11</sup> Put the results of these two analyses together and one has the foundation for formulating one's interpretive procedures (Guidelines §1.1.2).<sup>12</sup>

As the Preamble indicates in several places, compositional dependence is balanced by semantic autonomy (Guidelines Introduction; §§1.1.1; 1.2.1). It begins by noting that meaning cannot be presupposed. What does this statement mean? James Barr has shown long ago that, distributed throughout most of the translated LXX, are instances in which translators may be said to decode the source text but effectively do not recode it in the target language, as a result of which they can be said to *represent* the source text rather to *translate* it. Therefore—so Barr—the mantra that translation is always interpretation is a “highly misleading truism” (Barr 1979, 16).<sup>13</sup> Similarly, according to the NETS approach, the text-as-produced includes fragments that are unintelligible (Guidelines §1.3.3). Although certain elements of the source text are clearly *represented* and a given piece may even be grammatical, it cannot be said to communicate information. Although these pieces constitute a minority, they cannot for that reason be swept under the rug, any more than instances of negative transfer in grammaticography and lexicography. In a similar vein, Martin Flashar, a century ago, spoke of *Verlegenheitsübersetzungen*, translations of last resort (Flashar 1912, 113). Since all such items are in the text, they belong to the text and are part of its *constitutive character* and as such refuse to be ignored. In point of fact, any explanatory paradigm of the text that cannot accommodate them must be considered to have been found wanting.

At first blush, the statement that meaning cannot be *presupposed* and that it cannot be *superimposed* on the text-as-produced (from the source text or from the text-as-received) may seem at cross-purposes. In fact they point to the same principle the NETS approach insists upon, namely, that the Greek of the text-as-produced *must* be taken seriously *as Greek*, whether it be standard or stilted usage, literary nuggets or linguistic warts, instances of intelligibility or unintelligibility, it is all Greek!

---

11. He speaks of the two dialectically related concepts as axioms for exegesis.

12. For “levels of interpretation,” see Pietersma 2013e, 212–27.

13. For an excellent exposition of Barr's typology in relation to interlinearity see Boyd-Taylor 2008b and 2015; see also Pietersma 2013a, 362–65.

There is no tolerant reader who can be counted upon to transform translationese Greek into living language. Accordingly, semantic autonomy indicates that the text means what it means “in terms of *conventional* linguistic usage (i.e., the grammar and lexicon of the target language) rather than in terms of what may be encountered in translation Greek” (Guidelines §§1.2; 1.2.1). Here we have what I see as the second most important implication of the NETS approach for the writing of the commentary.

### Grammaticography and Lexicography

The key phrase in Guidelines §1.2 is “*conventional* linguistic usage,” and it is *conventional* usage that is the domain of the disciplines of grammaticography and lexicography. In fact, the two stand or fall together. I begin with the former since, if there is ever going to be a Grammar of the LXX worthy of the title, it has not as yet been written, and that for a very good reason. No doubt as commentators on the LXX, we are all familiar with peculiar grammatical constructions that arise not from straightforward, creative, use of language but rather from a mimicking of the Semitic source text. Since these, like instances of lexical unintelligibility, are an integral part of the text-as-produced, they belong to its constitutive character. Toury refers to them as instances of negative transfer, that is, usage that violates Greek linguistic code (Toury 1995, 274–79).<sup>14</sup> By definition, negative transfer does not constitute conventional usage but rather the opposite. To the extent that such instances of negative transfer can be reflected in English translation, NETS has attempted to do so. In any case, they are grist for the commentary mill, since use of language is a clear component of writing a commentary. When one adds to the phenomenon of negative transfer in grammar the factors of positive transfer, that is, overuse of viable Greek constructions because they mimic the source language, as well as the less than straightforward use of language we typically find in the target text, it is scarcely a surprise that a grammar of the LXX has been so long in coming. To put it another way, a *separate* grammar for an anthology of texts presupposes creative use of language, but it is precisely creative use of language that is in rather short supply in our anthology of

---

14. To be noted further is that whereas in composition literature unintelligibility is routinely attributed to the vicissitudes of transmission history, in translation literature, especially in the LXX, it may well be original, as suggested by the text-critical principle, *lectio difficilior preferenda est*.



translated texts. Thus the question is whether a distinctive grammar for such an anthology makes sense or is even viable.

As intimated above, from LXX grammaticography it is a very small step to LXX lexicography. In this area, however, the discipline now not only has LEH (before LEH we of course had Schleusner 1820–1821), but also and more importantly, *GELS*. Ostensibly, therefore, our discipline is well served. While the two lexica espouse different methods in lexicography, from the perspective of the NETS approach they fall nevertheless in the same category.<sup>15</sup> I will therefore focus only on *GELS*. As in grammaticography so in lexicography, *separate* treatment of the subject presupposes straightforward and creative use of language.

John Lee in his recent review of Muraoka's lexicon rightly notes that *GELS* is not a lexicon of the LXX *as-produced* (Lee 2010). But if that is correct—and I hold that it is—one may well ask, What *is* it a lexicon of, if not of the LXX as produced, that is to say, the LXX *as a translation*? Unfortunately, Lee, despite his seminal article in *Glotta* over forty years ago (1969), does not ask this question and thus fails to apply his earlier insight to the lexicography of the LXX.<sup>16</sup> Instead, he simply cites Muraoka to the effect that the lexicon caters to the reader of circa “250 B.C.–100 A.D. who was ignorant of Hebrew or Aramaic” (Lee 2010, 118). Consequently, instead of being a lexicon of the LXX *qua translation*, it is patently a lexicon of the LXX *qua text*, namely, the translation cut loose from its historical moorings and, therefore, the text in its own right. But if, as I noted earlier, the LXX as a freestanding text, standing alongside the Hebrew Bible and the New Testament, is irrelevant to the study of the LXX *qua translation*, must not the same be concluded about a *lexicon* of that very same text?

Consider the following. If it be true that both grammaticography and lexicography record *conventional* usage—and if that is controversial, I am not aware of it—it can only mean that in the process of writing a lexicon (or a grammar) on the *text-as-received*, namely, the text *in its own right*, the latter is summarily declared to constitute *conventional* usage. But how can such a declaration be justified, any more than it can be justified in the case of LSJ's typical entries on the LXX? While *GELS* is not LSJ and *GELS* has taken important steps to distance itself from LSJ, the distance is, from the NETS perspective, one of degree rather than of kind, since the

---

15. For an interesting discussion involving both, see Büchner 2009.

16. For an exposé of this article with Lee's public endorsement, see Pietersma 2012.



same lexicographical principle remains in full force, namely, that context (*any* context) determines meaning. Furthermore, *GELS* blurs the distinction between the text-as-produced and the text-as-received by inventing the tolerant reader who magically transforms nonconventional usage to conventional usage.<sup>17</sup> I use *magically* advisedly because to assume that an individual reader can bring about such a transformation and can thus institutionalize language use on the fly is nothing short of magical (see Boyd-Taylor 2001, 53, 55, 73–74).<sup>18</sup>

Thus our commentator in the areas of both grammar and lexicon is apparently faced with a dilemma: either, by personal fiat, one declares *non-conventional* usage to be *conventional* usage and thus blatantly transgresses the law of conventionality, or one contests the rule of the law of conventionality as it applies to translation literature of the kind we have in the Old Greek. There is, however, a perfectly principled solution to the problem.

In his *Glotta* article of 1969, referenced above, Lee argues that certain semantic components in the 1968 *Supplement* to the Liddell-Scott-Jones Lexicon fail to stand up to methodological scrutiny (Liddell, Scott, and Jones 1968). To show the seminal nature of Lee's article I can do no better than to cite the example with which he begins his argumentation, namely, ψυχή in Gen 12.5, which on the strength of that verse (and a reputed example from 1 Makk 10.33) is assigned the added semantic component of "slave."<sup>19</sup> While it happens to be true that the reference of ψυχή in this verse is to a bought individual, rather than being determined by contextual considerations, it is triggered instead by the occurrence of שפח in the source text.<sup>20</sup> The problem here is that, as Lee points out, the *Supplement*

---

17. For the same concept, see Troxel 2008, 57, 61. For an assessment of this book see, Pietersma 2013c. To introduce the tolerant reader into the LXX qua translation is like introducing, by the back door, Henry S. Gehman's notion of the LXX having been written in Jewish Alexandrian Greek. At least Charles Thomson, when translating the LXX (1808), was up front about his working assumption that the LXX was a composition in Greek rather than a translation from Semitic (see Muses 1954, xi–xii).

18. Boyd-Taylor questions the viability of *any* lexicon of the LXX. On the one hand, the text-as-produced lacks a creatively conventional dimension that might warrant separate treatment and, on the other hand, the usage of the text-as-received that might warrant separate treatment turns out to be patently nonconventional.

19. The *Supplement* includes 1 Makk 10.33, but there we lack a source text.

20. As a result, the de facto context is the Hebrew. Differently put, the *Supplement* superimposes the sense of the Hebrew onto the Greek. While ψυχή, in time, might have developed the sense of "slave," we have no evidence that it ever did.

violates a standard principle in lexicography, namely, the distinction between sense (a word's conventional meaning, to be recorded in a dictionary) and reference (the referent it has in a specific context). More importantly, in terms of the NETS approach,  $\psi\chi\chi$  in Gen 12.5 belongs to the Greek text's *vertical* dimension, not to its *horizontal* dimension.<sup>21</sup> Thus what we are dealing with here is not simply a failure to distinguish between "sense" and "reference" but, more importantly, a failure to reckon with the fact that, throughout the LXX, Greek  $\psi\chi\chi$  is a stereotypical rendering of Hebrew  $\psi\chi$ . That is to say, the lexical choice is not based on contextual appropriateness but on vertical demand.

I spoke of a perfectly principled solution to our commentator's problem. Given that the translated text has a vertical dimension, which, at times, overrides its horizontal dimension, it makes no sense to insist at all costs on the principle that, in lexicography (and grammaticography), context determines meaning and rules supreme. Given that interference from the source text is the rule rather than the exception and that the interlinear assumption can accommodate all aspects of the translated text (whereas the compositional assumption cannot), there is every reason to avail oneself of interlinearity as a heuristic tool to explain the text, the more when doing so accords with Occam's law of parsimony. That is to say, when a word is used not because it suits the context of the target text but because the source is seen as demanding it, no explanation is more parsimonious than the assumption of interlinearity, an essential tool in our commentator's toolbox (see Boyd-Taylor 2006, 2008, 2011 for more on interlinearity).

Concretely, one will do well never to rely on a single lexicon, or on two of the same kind, such as *GELS* and *LEH*. Moreover, every word definition that does not fall within the semantic range of compositional usage should be deemed *sub iudice*. As a rule of thumb, no lexical sense in the translated LXX should be considered conventional usage unless it is attested in composition literature.

---

21. While *GELS* rightly ignores the semantic component of "slave" in Gen 12.5, presumably because  $\psi\chi\chi$  is not a contextual misfit, it records  $\psi\chi\chi$  with the sense of "corpse" in Leu 22.4 et al. While subentry 4 is duly marked with an asterisk (\*), indicating that this sense does not predate the LXX and thus has limited distribution, it is included all the same as a bona fide semantic component, even though it occurs exclusively in translation literature.

Flashar long ago suggested that a translator's semantic intent can typically be found where paired Hebrew and Greek lexemes intersect (Flashar 1912, 92). In an effort to formalize and restrict undisciplined recourse to the source text, NETS raised Flashar's suggestion to the level of principle, namely, the principle of the source text as arbiter of meaning. That is to say, the source text can be used to arbitrate between established meanings in the target language but *cannot* be used to create new meanings. Thus, far from superimposing the meaning of the Hebrew text onto the Greek, it in fact safeguards the Greek qua Greek.<sup>22</sup>

### Conclusion

While the SBLCS Guidelines are about more than the text-as-produced in distinction from the text-as-received and conventional use of language versus nonconventional use, these two issues nonetheless play a central role. To the extent that that is correct, commentators will neglect them at their peril.

### Bibliography

- Barr, James. 1979. *The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations*. MSU 15. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Boyd-Taylor, Cameron. 2001. "The Evidentiary Value of Septuagintal Usage for Greek Lexicography: Alice's Reply to Humpty Dumpty." *BIOSCS* 34:47–80.
- . 2006. "In a Mirror, Dimly: Reading the Septuagint as a Document of Its Times." Pages 15–32 in *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures*. Edited by Wolfgang Kraus and R. Glenn Wooden. SCS 53. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- . 2008a. "An Ear for an Eye—Lay Literacy and the Septuagint." Pages 127–46 in *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo*. Edited by Anssi Voitila and Jutta Jokiranta. JSJSup 126. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2008b. "Who Is Afraid of *Verlegenheitsübersetzungen*?" Pages 197–210 in *Translating a Translation: The LXX and Its Modern Translations*

---

22. For a specious misconstrual of this principle, see Muraoka 2008, 224. For a response to Muraoka's paper, see Pietersma 2013d.

- in the Context of Early Judaism*. Edited by Hans Ausloos, J. Cook, F. García Martínez, B. Lemmelijn, and M. Vervenne. BETL 213. Leuven: Peeters.
- . 2011. *Reading between the Lines: The Interlinear Paradigm for Septuagint Studies*. BTS 8. Leuven: Peeters.
- . 2015. "The Classification of Literalism in Ancient Hebrew-Greek Translation." Pages 121–42 in *Die Sprache der Septuaginta/The Language of the Septuagint*. Edited by Martin Karrer, Wolfgang Kraus, and Siegfried Kreuzer. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus.
- Büchner, Dirk. 2009. "A Cultic Term (ἁμαρτία) in the Septuagint: Its Meaning and Use from the Third Century B.C.E until the New Testament." *BIOSCS* 42:1–17.
- Flashar, Martin. 1912. "Exegetische Studien zum Septuagintapsalter," *ZAW* 32:81–116, 161–89, 241–68.
- Frye, Northrop. 1976. *The Secular Scripture: A Study of the Structure of Romance*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Honigman, Sylvie. 2003. *Septuagint and Homeric Scholarship in Alexandria: A Study in the Narrative of the Letter of Aristeas*. New York: Routledge.
- Hossfeld, Frank Lothar, and Eric Zenger. 2011. *Psalms 3: A Commentary on Psalms 101–150*. Translated by Linda M. Maloney. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Lee, John A. L. 1969. "A Note on Septuagint Material in the Supplement to Liddell and Scott." *Glotta* 47:234–42.
- . 2010. Review of *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*, by T. Muraoka. *BIOSCS* 43:115–25.
- Liddell, H. G., Robert Scott, and H. Stuart Jones. 1968. *A Greek-English Lexicon: A Supplement*. Edited by E. A. Barber. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Muraoka, Takamitsu. 2008. "Recent Discussions on the Septuagint Lexicography with Special Reference to the So-called Interlinear Model." Pages 221–35 in *Die Septuaginta: Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten*. Edited by Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus. WUNT 219. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Muses, Charles A., ed. 1954. *The Septuagint Bible: The Oldest Version of the Old Testament in the Translation of Charles Thomson*. Indian Hill, CO: Falcon's Wing Press.
- Pietersma, Albert. 1998. "A Prospectus for a Commentary on the Septuagint." *BIOSCS* 31:43–48.

- . 2004. "A New English Translation of the Septuagint and a Commentary to Follow." *TLZ* 129:1008–16.
- . 2005. "The Seven Voices of the Lord: A Commentary on Septuagint Psalm 28." Pages 311–29 in *Interpreting Translation: Studies on the LXX and Ezekiel in Honour of Johan Lust*. Edited by F. García Martínez and M. Vervenne. BETL 192. Leuven: Peeters.
- . 2008. "Text-Production and Text-Reception: Psalm 8 in Greek." Pages 487–501 in *Die Septuaginta: Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten*. Edited by Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus. WUNT 219. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- . 2010. "A Commentary on Psalm 15 in Greek: Text-Production and Text Reception." Pages 523–42 in *Die Septuaginta: Texte Theologien, Einflüsse*. Edited by Wolfgang Kraus and Martin Karrer. WUNT 252. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- . 2012. "Context Is King in Septuagint Lexicography—Or is It?" [http://homes.chass.utoronto.ca/~pietersm/ContextisKing\(2012\).pdf](http://homes.chass.utoronto.ca/~pietersm/ContextisKing(2012).pdf).
- . 2013a. "Beyond Literalism: Interlinearity Revisited." Pages 359–78 in *A Question of Methodology: Albert Pietersma Collected Essays on the Septuagint*. Edited by Cameron Boyd-Taylor. BTS 14. Leuven: Peeters.
- . 2013b. "A New Paradigm for Addressing Old Questions: The Relevance of the Interlinear Model for the Study of the Septuagint." Pages 143–70 in *A Question of Methodology: Albert Pietersma Collected Essays on the Septuagint*. Edited by Cameron Boyd-Taylor. BTS 14. Leuven: Peeters.
- . 2013c. "A Panel Presentation on Ronald Troxel's *LXX-Isaiah*." Pages 339–58 in *A Question of Methodology: Albert Pietersma Collected Essays on the Septuagint*. Edited by Cameron Boyd-Taylor. BTS 14. Leuven: Peeters.
- . 2013d. "A Response to Muraoka's Critique of Interlinearity." Pages 315–37 in *A Question of Methodology: Albert Pietersma Collected Essays on the Septuagint*. Edited by Cameron Boyd-Taylor. BTS 14. Leuven: Peeters.
- . 2013e. "Septuagintal Exegesis and the Superscriptions of the Greek Psalter." Pages 203–27 in *A Question of Methodology: Albert Pietersma Collected Essays on the Septuagint*. Edited by Cameron Boyd-Taylor. BTS 14. Leuven: Peeters.

Pietersma, Albert, and Benjamin G. Wright, eds. 2007. *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and the Other Greek Translations Tradi-*

- tionally Included under That Title*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.  
For updates, see the online version at <http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/nets/>.
- Rahlfs, Alfred. 1931. *Psalmi cum Odis*. SVTG 10. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- . 2006. *Septuaginta: Id est Vetus Testamentum graecum iuxta LXX interpretes*. Revised by Robert Hanhart. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- Schleusner, J. F. 1820–1821. *Novus Thesaurus philologico-criticus, sive lexicon in LXX. et reliquos interpretes Græcos ac Scriptores Apocryphos Veteris Testamenti*. Leipzig.
- Swete, Henry Barclay. 1909–1922. *The Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint*. 3 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Toury, Gideon. 1995. *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. BTL 100. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Troxel, Ronald L. 2008. *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation: The Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah*. JSJSup 124. Leiden: Brill.

## In the Beginning: A Commentary on the Old Greek Text of Genesis 1.1–2.3

Robert J. V. Hiebert

### Literature

**Augustine.** 1982. *The Literal Meaning of Genesis*. Vol. 1. ACW 41. Translated and annotated by John Hammond Taylor. New York: Paulist Press. ♦ **Brayford**, Susan. 2007. *Genesis*. Septuagint Commentary Series 5. Leiden: Brill. ♦ **Brown**, William P. 1993. *Structure, Role, and Ideology in the Hebrew and Greek Texts of Genesis 1:1–2:3*. SBLDS 132. Atlanta: Scholars Press. ♦ **Cassuto**, Umberto. 1961. *A Commentary on the Book of Genesis: From Adam to Noah*. Translated by I. Abrahams. Jerusalem: Magnes. ♦ **Davila**, James R. 1990. “New Qumran Readings for Genesis One.” Pages 3–11 in *Of Scribes and Scrolls: Studies on the Hebrew Bible, Intertestamental Judaism, and Christian Origins Presented to John Strugnell on the Occasion of His Sixtieth Birthday*. Edited by Harold W. Attridge, John J. Collins, and T. H. Tobin. CTSRR 5. Lanham, MD: University Press of America. ♦ **Davila**. 1994. “4QGen<sup>h</sup>,” “4QGen<sup>k</sup>.” Pages 61–64, 74–78 in *Qumran Cave 4.VII: Genesis to Numbers*. DJD 12. Edited by Eugene Ulrich and Frank Moore Cross. Oxford: Clarendon. ♦ **Fenton**, Terry L. 1984. “‘One Place,’ *māqôm ’ehād*, in Genesis 1:9: Read *miqwîm*, ‘Gatherings.’” VT 34:438–45. ♦ **Friedman**, Richard Elliott. 2003. *Commentary on the Torah: With a New English Translation and the Hebrew Text*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco. ♦ **Grabe**, Johann E. 1707. *Septuaginta interpretum, Vol. 1: Octateuchum*. Oxford: Sheldonian Theatre, Smith. ♦ **Gunkel**, Hermann. 1910. *Genesis*. 3rd ed. HKAT 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. ♦ **Harl**, Marguerite. 1994. *La Bible d’Alexandrie 1: La Genèse*. 2nd ed. Paris: Cerf. ♦ **Hendel**, Ronald S. 1998. *The Text of Genesis 1–11: Textual Studies and Critical Edition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. ♦ **Hiebert**, Robert J. V. 2000.



"Translation Technique in the Septuagint of Genesis and Its Implications for the NETS Version." *BIOSCS* 33:76–93. ♦ **Hiebert**. 2001. "Translating a Translation: The Septuagint of Genesis and the New English Translation of the Septuagint Project." Pages 263–84 in *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Oslo, 1998*. Edited by Bernard A. Taylor. SCS 51. Atlanta: Scholars Press. ♦ **Hiebert**. 2006. "The Hermeneutics of Translation in the Septuagint of Genesis." Pages 85–103 in *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures*. Edited by Wolfgang Kraus and Glenn Wooden. SCS 53; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature. ♦ **Hiebert**. 2007. "Genesis: To the Reader." Pages 1–6 in *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*. Edited by Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007. ♦ **Hiebert**. 2013. "A 'Genetic' Commentary on the Septuagint of Genesis." *JSCS* 46:19–36; ♦ **Hiebert**, Robert J. V., and Nathaniel N. **Dykstra**. 2013. "Designing a New Septuagint Commentary: SBLCS and WATER." Pages 515–23 in *XIV Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Helsinki, 2010*. Edited by Melvin K. H. Peters. SCS 59. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature. ♦ **McEvenue**, Sean E. 1971. *The Narrative Style of the Priestly Writer*. AnBib 50. Rome: Biblical Institute Press. ♦ **Orlinsky**, Harry M. 1965. "The Textual Criticism of the Old Testament." Pages 140–69 in *The Bible and the Ancient Near East: Essays in Honor of William Foxwell Albright*. Edited by G. Ernest Wright. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books. ♦ **Plato**. 1871. *The Dialogues of Plato*. Translated by Benjamin Jowett. 4 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. ♦ **Polybius**. 1889. *The Histories of Polybius*. Translated by Evelyn S. Shuckburgh. London: Macmillan. ♦ **Rad**, Gerhard von. 1972. *Genesis: A Commentary*. Translated by John H. Marks. Rev. ed. OTL. Philadelphia: Westminster. ♦ **Runge**, Steven E. 2010. *Discourse Grammar of the Greek New Testament*. Lexham Bible Reference Series. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson. ♦ **Schmidt**, Werner H. 1973. *Die Schöpfungsgeschichte der Priesterschrift*. 3rd ed. WMANT 17. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag. ♦ **Skinner**, John. 1930. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis*. 2nd ed. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark. ♦ **Speiser**, E. A. 1964. *Genesis*. AB 1. Garden City, NY: Doubleday. ♦ **Tertullian**. 1885. *Adversus Hermogenem*. In vol. 3 of *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*. Edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. Translated by Peter Holmes. Repr., Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994. ♦ **Toury**, Gideon. 1995. *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. BTL 4. Amsterdam: Benjamins. ♦ **Tov**, Emanuel. 1985. "The Nature and Background of Harmonizations in Biblical Manuscripts." *JSOT* 31:3–29. ♦



**Wellhausen**, Julius. 1899. *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments*. 3rd ed. Berlin: Reimer. ♦ **Wenham**, Gordon J. 1987. *Genesis 1–15*. WBC 1. Waco, TX: Word. ♦ **Wevers**, John William. 1993. *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis*. SCS 35. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

## Outline

As in the Hebrew source text, the initial creation account in Greek Genesis is framed by the structure of a week. Eight creative utterances by ὁ θεός with their corresponding enactments are distributed over the first six days, while the seventh day, which he blesses and hallows, is marked by the cessation of creative activity.

## Commentary

It should be noted that this commentary takes as the English text for LXX Genesis the most recent version of *A New English Translation of the Septuagint* (NETS) that is posted online (<http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/nets/>).

### 1.1

בראשית ברא אלהים את השמים ואת הארץ

Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν.

In the beginning God made the sky and the earth.

G constructs this verse as an independent clause. This has commonly been the way that the Hebrew text has been understood, though as various interpreters from Rashi (eleventh century) and Abraham Ibn Ezra (twelfth century) onward have pointed out, it is possible to construe this verse as a dependent clause that is antecedent to either verse 3 or verse 2 (see *HALOT*, s.v. “ראשית;” Wenham 1987, 11–12). In any case, the phrase Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός and the concluding words of 2.3, ἡρξάτο ὁ θεός ποιῆσαι, form an *inclusio* that delimits this first section of the book (Wevers 1993, 21; Brown 1993, 26). The *inclusio* has been fashioned by G through rendering the sequence לעשות ... ברא in 2.3 as ἡρξάτο ... ποιῆσαι, which provides a neat parallel to (Ἐν) ἀρχῇ ἐποίησεν in 1.1 with the matching word roots, whereas in the source text that does not hold true in the same way with its opening phrase ברא(שית) ברא.

Ἐν ἀρχῇ. G's counterpart for ראשית is ἀρχή on all three occasions that it occurs in Genesis (1.1; 10.10; 49.3). As Wevers points out, "Gen did not understand בראשית as bound to the following clause, but simply as a prepositional phrase modifying ברא" (Wevers 1993, 1).

ἐποίησεν. ποιέω appears 165 times in Genesis, the counterpart to ברא in nine of eleven of its occurrences, including this one (1.1, 21, 27 [3x]; 5.1 [1°], 2 [2x]; 6.7 [1°]). The exception to this equivalence in the first creation account is in 2.3, where ἤρξατο (ῥαρχω) is the counterpart to ברא. As might be expected, ποιέω is most commonly employed by G to translate עשה, an equivalence that is attested 138 times, eight of which occur in the section under consideration (1.7, 16, 25, 26, 31; 2.2 [2°], 3). The use of ποιέω to render both of these Hebrew terms constitutes semantic leveling, a strategy from which later Greek versions at times depart (ברא: α' ἔκτισεν [1.1]; α' σ' θ' ἔκτισεν [1.27]; עשה: α' θ' ἐποίησεν [1.16]).

ὁ θεός. The term θεός occurs 280 times in Genesis. The counterpart in the MT involves some form of אלהים or אל in all but fifty cases, nine of which have no Hebrew equivalent at all. In 153 contexts in Genesis, including the present one, ὁ θεός appears as the counterpart to MT's anarthrous אלהים (not including equivalences such as κύριος ὁ θεός – אלהים). It is clear that G has not replicated in Greek the Hebrew author's decision to employ an anarthrous plural form to represent Israel's God. Instead the translator has opted for a singular arthrous form of the Greek generic term for deity. The effect of this strategy is to indicate that the reference is to THE god, that is, God.

τὸν οὐρανόν. οὐρανός occurs forty-four times in Genesis, always in the singular (which reflects classical usage) and always as the counterpart to the plural term שמים, except for three occasions when there is no corresponding Greek equivalent to the Hebrew. Of the thirty-six cases in which the Hebrew term is arthrous, in all but one (2.4 [1°]) that is also true in Greek Genesis.

## 1.2

והארץ היתה תהו ובהו וחשך על פני תהום ורוח אלהים מרחפת על פני המים

ἡ δὲ γῆ ἦν ἀόρατος καὶ ἀκατασκεύαστος, καὶ σκότος ἐπάνω τῆς ἀβύσσου, καὶ πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἐπεφέρετο ἐπάνω τοῦ ὕδατος.

Yet the earth was invisible and unformed, and darkness was over the abyss, and a divine wind was being carried along over the water.

ὣ δέ γῆ. G's choice of the postpositive conjunction δέ as the counterpart to the Hebrew conjunction ו constitutes a departure from his default rendering καί. The Greek lexicon includes a significantly greater selection of conjunctions and particles than are attested in Biblical Hebrew, and Greek authors in antiquity make creative use of that repertoire. More often than not, however, G replicates the pattern of paratactic clause construction that would have been found in his source text. Consequently, when that does not occur, it must be regarded to be of expositional significance. In this case, the use of δέ accords with Smyth's category of the copulative δέ, which "marks transition, and is the ordinary particle used in connecting successive clauses or sentences which add something new or different, but not opposed, to what precedes" (§2836; Runge 2010 §2.3). This raises some interesting possibilities with respect to understanding the relationship between this verse and the preceding one, not unlike the ones that arise for the interpreter of the source text. On the one hand, it could be that G views verse 1 as an introductory summary statement for the entire section (1.1–2.3), with the various stages in that process being detailed in verses 2–31. On the other hand, it is possible that G regards verse 1 to be a depiction of the first phase of God's creative work, which results in an earth that exists in the state that is described in verse 2, and that the subsequent phases of God's work are spelled out in the verses that follow. Either option is plausible, though in neither case does there appear to be sufficient evidence in the wording of the Greek text to support an argument for the concept of *creatio ex nihilo*, which came to be articulated in subsequent centuries by authors like Theophilus of Antioch (*Autol.* 2.4) [second century CE], Tatian (*Or. Graec.* 5) [second century CE], Irenaeus (*Haer.* 2.10.3–4) [second century CE], and Tertullian (*Herm.* 33–34) [second–third centuries CE] (see the discussion in Brown 1993, 31–35).

Greek γῆ is the usual equivalent for Hebrew אֶרֶץ, and when the latter is arthrous, γῆ is almost always accompanied by the article (163 out of a total of 172 occurrences).

ἦν. Various forms of the verb εἶμι occur seven times in Gen 1, five times as the equivalent of הָיָה (1.2, 6, 14, 15, 29 [2°]) and twice in relative clauses that correspond to the Hebrew relative pronoun אֲשֶׁר (ὃ ἦν [1.7]; ὃ ἐστίν [1.29 (1°)]). γίνεσθαι is the counterpart to הָיָה twenty-one times in Gen 1

(1.3 [2x], 5 [2x], 6, 8 [2x], 9, 11, 13 [2x], 14, 15, 19 [2x], 23 [2x], 24, 30, 31 [2x]). Throughout the book as a whole, εἰμί renders יהיה a total of 147 times and γίνομαι 151 times. G's choice of these two Greek equivalents for one Hebrew term is evidence of semantic differentiation, a phenomenon that is usually reflected in NETS by means of the verb *be* in the case of εἰμί and of expressions like *become* or *come to be* in the case of γίνομαι. In the present context, εἰμί is part of the description of the existential reality with respect to the state of ἡ γῆ.

**ἀόρατος καὶ ἀκατασκεύαστος.** G's rendering of the phrase תהו ובהו replicates the Hebrew sequence of two terms linked by a conjunction, but it also constitutes an exposition of this Hebrew "rhythmic pair" (Wevers 1993, 1) whose meaning is debated by scholars: "waste, void" (Wevers 1993, 1); "hodge-podge" (Brown 1993, 60, 74); "vide, désert, néant" (Harl 1994, 87); "formless" (Rad 1972, 49); "total chaos" (Wenham 1987, 2, 15–16).

The word ἀόρατος occurs in the translated corpus of the LXX only here as the counterpart to תהו and in Esa 45.3 as the counterpart to מסתר ("secret place" *HALOT*), as well as in 2 Makk 9.5. The characterization of the earth as ἀόρατος can be regarded as a logical inference from the fact that there is as yet no light (Josephus, *A.J.* 1.27; Wevers 1993, 1–2; Brown 1993, 48 n. 33). Another possible explanation for the use of this term here in Gen 1 is that it constitutes evidence of G having been influenced by the thinking of Plato, who employs ἀόρατος to describe the invisible, preexistent world of ideas (Hendel 1998, 19; Brown 1993, 48 n. 33). One work in which his conceptual framework in this regard is articulated is *Timaeus*:

For the present we have only to conceive of three natures [γένη]: first, that which is in process of generation [τὸ μὲν γιγνόμενον]; secondly, that in which the generation takes place [τὸ δ' ἐν ᾧ γίγνεται]; and thirdly, that of which the thing generated is a resemblance [τὸ δ' ὅθεν ἀφομοιούμενον φύεται τὸ γιγνόμενον]. And we may liken the receiving principle to a mother, and the source or spring to a father, and the intermediate nature to a child; and may remark further, that if the model is to take every variety of form [ἐκτυπώματος ἔσεσθαι μέλλοντος ἰδεῖν ποικίλου πάσας ποικιλίας], then the matter in which the model is fashioned [τοῦτ' αὐτὸ ἐν ᾧ ἐκτυπούμενον ἐνίσταται] will not be duly prepared [παρεσκευασμένον εὔ], unless it is formless [ἄμορφον], and free from the impress of any of these shapes [τῶν ἰδεῶν] which it is hereafter to receive from without.... Wherefore, the mother and receptacle of all created and visible and in any way sensible things [τοῦ γεγονότος ὁρατοῦ καὶ πάντως αἰσθητοῦ], is

not to be termed earth, or air, or fire, or water, or any of their compounds or any of the elements from which these are derived, but is an invisible and formless being [ἀνόρατον εἶδος τι καὶ ἄμορφον] which receives all things and in some mysterious way partakes of the intelligible. (Plato, *Tim.* 50c–d, 51a–b, trans. Jowett)

Philo was certainly influenced by Platonic ideas in his comments on the creation narratives in Genesis, with his assertions that the creator first fashioned an incorporeal (ἀσώματος) and invisible (ἀόρατος) cosmos that served as the model (παράδειγμα) on the basis of which the corporeal (σωματικός) and perceptible (αἰσθητός) cosmos was made (*Opif.* 29–36). Hendel suggests that G’s choice of the term ἀόρατος in Gen 1.2 “expresses something of Platonic cosmology in biblical guise, perhaps joining the cosmologies of Plato and Moses, as was a commonplace in Hellenistic Jewish thought, particularly in Alexandria” (Hendel 1998, 19). This is plausible, though it is of course impossible to know for certain what may have motivated the translator to employ this term.

As for ἀκατασκεύαστος, the counterpart to בְּהוּ in this passage, it is a *hapax legomenon* in the LXX and is, in fact, seldom attested in Greek literature as a whole apart from texts that cite or refer to this passage in Genesis. It may be noted that, in the passage cited above, Plato uses the term παρεσκευασμένον (“prepared”), which is derived from the same basic root as ἀκατασκεύαστος, when describing the ἐκτύπωμα (“model”). The ἐκτύπωμα he portrays elsewhere as ἀνόρατον, and he asserts that it must be ἄμορφον (“formless”) in order for it to be ready to receive the perceptible forms that constitute the visible creation. If κατασκευάζω (equip, furnish, construct, prepare, establish), the verbal antonym of ἀκατασκεύαστος, can be taken as an inverse indicator of what the adjective means, it can be understood to connote lack of structure, form, or definition.

**ἐπάνω.** G employs ἐπάνω to render seven different Hebrew constructions in Genesis. One of these, פָּנֵי עַל, occurs here as well as in 1.29 and 7.18. It is clear, however, that the translator does not replicate the Hebrew idiom (“upon the face of”), but with ἐπάνω opts for an interpretative Greek rendering that conveys the idea of being over something.

**τῆς ἀβύσσου.** G chooses ἡ ἄβυσσος as the equivalent for anarthrous תְּהוֹם all three times that the latter occurs in Genesis (1.2; 7.11; 8.2). The adjective ἄβυσσος denotes “bottomless, unfathomed” (LSJ), but it is substan-

tivized in the LXX. The Hebrew term signifies the “primaeval ocean” (*HALOT*), but this appears to be the first context in which ἄβυσσος comes to be associated with the primordial waters of ancient myth (Harl 1994, 87), though this does not mean that it takes on that specific component of meaning.

**πνεῦμα θεοῦ.** πνεῦμα is the equivalent for רוּחַ in all seven places that the latter is found in Genesis (1.2; 6.3, 17; 7.15; 8.1; 41.38; 45.27). Both terms can mean “wind” or “spirit.” In contrast to verse 1, however, in the present context anarthrous, singular θεός is the counterpart to anarthrous, plural אֱלֹהִים. This equivalence occurs only eighteen times in Genesis (1.2, 27; 3.5; 5.1; 9.6; 17.7, 8; 23.6; 28.17, 21, 22; 30.2; 32.3, 29, 30[31]; 33.10; 35.5; 41.38) in comparison to the 153 cases mentioned above in which arthrous ὁ θεός is the counterpart to anarthrous אֱלֹהִים. Since G here departs from his usual way of signifying the creator deity, it must be regarded as a deliberate move with semantic implications, namely that “the divine in an indefinite sense” is being signified by anarthrous θεός “rather than specifically *the god* = God” (Hiebert and Dykstra 2013, 523). If that is the case, and in view of the verb for which this noun pair serves as the subject, it would seem more likely that πνεῦμα is intended in the sense of “wind” rather than that of “spirit,” a wind that is not itself divine in nature but that originates with the deity.

**ἐπεφέρετο.** The verb ἐπιφέρω appears three times in Genesis, on each occasion the counterpart to a different Hebrew verb: ἐπεφέρετο (“be carried along”) – מרחפת (“sweep”) (1.2); ἐπεφέρετο (“be carried along”) – תלך (“float”) (7.18); ἐπενέγκατε (“lay [a hand on]”) – תשלחו (“lay [a hand on]”) (37.22). In none of these cases is there semantic overlap between the Greek and Hebrew terms, so one is warranted in concluding that G has made expositional moves in his choice of equivalent.

**τοῦ ὕδατος.** Greek ὕδωρ is the equivalent for Hebrew מים in all fifty-four contexts in which the latter appears in Genesis. In all but four of those instances, ὕδωρ is singular in number in comparison to the plural form מים, as is the case here.

### 1.3

וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים יְהִי אוֹר וַיְהִי אוֹר

καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεός Γενηθήτω φῶς. καὶ ἐγένετο φῶς.

And God said, “Let light come into being.” And light came into being.

In both the source text and in the LXX, this verse contains the first *Wortbericht*, or report of a divine creative word, and the first *Tatbericht*, or report of a divine creative act, in the initial creation account in Genesis (Schmidt 1973, 171).

**Γενηθήτω ... ἐγένετο.** On G’s use of γίνομαι to render הָיָה, see the comment on verse 2 above. It would appear that in this context and others like it in the first section of the book where God speaks a creative word, implicit in the choice of γίνομαι is the idea of γένεσις, that is to say the origin and creation of the named entities, rather than the concept of simple existentiality that is associated with εἶμι (LSJ).

#### 1.4

וירא אלהים את האור כי טוב ויבדל אלהים בין האור ובין החשך  
καὶ εἶδεν ὁ θεὸς τὸ φῶς ὅτι καλόν. καὶ διεχώρισεν ὁ θεὸς ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ  
φωτὸς καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ σκότους.

And God saw the light, that it was good. And God separated between the light and between the darkness.

καὶ εἶδεν ὁ θεὸς τὸ φῶς ὅτι καλόν. G reproduces the Hebrew word order in the first sentence of this verse, which features two objects for the verb and involves “placing the subject of the ὅτι-clause [τὸ φῶς] outside the clause” in agreement with the Hebrew (Wevers 1993, 2; GKC §117h). There are a number of Greek counterparts to טוב in its forty-four occurrences in LXX Genesis, including ἀγαθός (4x) and its comparative form βελτίων (1x), and καλός (31x) and its adverbial cognate καλῶς (1x). In all seven cases in which טוב occurs in the *Hexaemeron* in the present section (1.4, 10, 12, 18, 21, 25, 31), καλός is the equivalent. Harl comments that the choice of καλός rather than ἀγαθός to render טוב connotes “non pas seulement ce qui fonctionne bien, mais ce qui a une valeur esthétique, morale, ordonnée” (1994, 88). Likewise, Wevers remarks that “[t]he divine recognition was more than functional; it was also an assessment of worth in and for itself” (Wevers 1993, 2). In view of the fact that καλός is G’s usual rendering not only here but also throughout the book of Genesis, one must acknowledge, however, that it is not specifically marked here.

**διεχώρισεν ... ἀνὰ μέσον ... καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον.** While διαχωρίζω and **לָבַד** *hiphil* are more or less semantically equivalent, and ἀνὰ μέσον is an acceptable counterpart to **בֵּין** (e.g., Οἱ δ' Ἀπασιάκαι κατοικοῦσι μὲν ἀνὰ μέσον Ὀξου καὶ Τανάιδος [“The Apasiacae live between the rivers Oxus and Tanais” Polybius, *Hist.* 10.48; trans. Shuckburgh]), διαχωρίζω ... ἀνὰ μέσον does not represent standard usage in Greek literature unrelated to the Genesis creation texts. Furthermore, the repetition of ἀνὰ μέσον with the second noun of a pair in this kind of construction—first attested in the LXX—is, as Gideon Toury would put it, due the negative transfer of the idiom of the source text, **בֵּין ... בֵּין** (Toury 1995, 252–53, 274–76). In Genesis, ἀνὰ μέσον is repeated in nineteen contexts due to Hebrew influence (1.4, 7, 14, 18; 3.15; 9.12 [**בֵּין** 3°], 15 [**בֵּין** 3°], 16, 17; 10.12; 13.3, 7; 16.14; 17.2, 7, 10 [**בֵּין** 3°]; 20.1; 26.28; 30.36), whereas in eleven contexts that is not the case (9.13; 13.8; 16.5; 17.11; 23.15; 31.44, 44[50b], 46c[48a], 48[51], 49; 32.16[17]). NETS replicates G’s redundancy in those preceding nineteen instances. The Greek translator’s decisions in rendering this construction do not, however, appear to be entirely arbitrary. In the majority of cases in which repetition does occur, the object of the second **בֵּין** is a noun (1.4, 7, 14, 18; 3.15; 9.16, 17; 10.12; 13.3, 7; 16.14; 20.1; 30.36), whereas when repetition does not occur, that second object is usually a pronoun (9.12, 15; 13.8; 16.5; 17.10, 11; 23.15; 31.44, 44[50b], 46c[48a], 48[51], 49).

## 1.5

**וַיִּקְרָא אֱלֹהִים לְאֹר יוֹם וּלְחֹשֶׁךְ קֶרָא לַיְלָה וַיְהִי עֶרֶב וַיְהִי בֹקֶר יוֹם**  
**דקא**

καὶ ἐκάλεσεν ὁ θεὸς τὸ φῶς ἡμέραν καὶ τὸ σκότος ἐκάλεσεν νύκτα. καὶ ἐγένετο ἑσπέρα καὶ ἐγένετο πρωί, ἡμέρα μία.

And God called the light Day and the darkness he called Night.

And it came to be evening, and it came to be morning, day one.

**καὶ ἐκάλεσεν ... τὸ φῶς ... καὶ τὸ σκότος ἐκάλεσεν.** G does not attempt to reproduce the Hebrew idiom that involves the introduction of the object of **קרא** with **ל**, but quite appropriately uses the accusative case to mark the objects of ἐκάλεσεν.

**καὶ ἐγένετο.** See comments on **ἦν** in verse 2 and **Γεννηθήτω ... ἐγένετο** in verse 3.



**הַיּוֹם יוֹם**. G follows the lead of the source text in employing a cardinal number.

## 1.6

וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים יְהִי רָקִיעַ בְּתוֹךְ הַמַּיִם וַיְהִי מַבְדִּיל בֵּין מַיִם לַמַּיִם

Καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεός Γενηθήτω στερέωμα ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ ὕδατος καὶ ἔστω διαχωρίζον ἀνὰ μέσον ὕδατος καὶ ὕδατος. καὶ ἐγένετο οὕτως.

And God said, “Let a firmament come into being in the midst of the water, and let it be a separator between water and water.” And it became so.

**στερέωμα**. All nine occurrences of **στερέωμα** in Genesis are found in the first chapter of the book (1.6, 7 [3x], 8, 14, 15, 17, 20), and in each case it is the counterpart to **רָקִיעַ**. In Greek literature that antedates the LXX, **στερέωμα** denotes “solid body,” “foundation,” or “framework,” and it is in LXX Genesis where it first comes to be associated with the idea of separation of the primeval waters. The Hebrew term **רָקִיעַ** is commonly understood to denote the vault or dome that the ancients imagined brought structure to the previously undefined watery mass depicted in verse 2, resulting in a habitable and functional space—beneath, around, and above which the waters were kept in check (Job 37.18; Pss 24.1–2; 136.5–6). This vault was apparently regarded to possess some form of solidity and substance that was also translucent or transparent (Ex 24.10; Ezek 1.22, 26; von Rad 1972, 53–54; Friedman 2003, 7–9). A **στερέωμα** is not, however, an entity with a predetermined shape or function, and if a domed structure had been what G envisaged, other terminology, such as that which appears in Esa 40.22, could have been employed (Harl 1994, 89): ὁ κατέχων τὸν γῶρον τῆς γῆς, καὶ οἱ ἐνοικοῦντες ἐν αὐτῇ ὡς ἀκρίδες, ὁ στήσας ὡς καμάραν τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ διατείνας ὡς σκηνὴν κατοικεῖν (“It is he who holds the circle of the earth, and those who dwell in it are like grasshoppers, who has set up heaven like a vault and stretched it out like a tent to live in”). Thus G’s choice of **στερέωμα** in Gen 1.6 represents a departure from what is envisaged in the source text.

**καὶ ἔστω διαχωρίζον**. G replicates the word order and structure of the source text, including employing a participial form of the finite verb that appears in verse 4.

**ἀνὰ μέσον ὕδατος καὶ ὕδατος.** G's strategy in representing בין מים למים results in an adequate, if less than elegant, explication of the thrust of the source text (Tourey 1995, 56–57). At least it is not as ponderous as what “The Three” produced: *α' μεταξὺ ὑδάτων εἰς ὕδατα, σ' ἐν μέσῳ ὕδατος καὶ εἰς ὕδωρ, θ' ἀνὰ μέσον ὕδατος εἰς ὕδατα.*

**καὶ ἐγένετο οὕτως.** G's placement of this “transition formula” (Tov 1985, 10) at the end of the current verse, between the *Wortbericht* and the *Tatbericht*, accords with the pattern that is exhibited in verses 9, 11, 15, and 24. The OG and its source text agree on that sequence in those four contexts. In the present case, however, the MT's transition formula **וַיְהִי כֵן** appears at the end of verse 7. In the MT's version of the fifth day, it does not occur at all, whereas in the OG, *καὶ ἐγένετο οὕτως* once again comes after the *Wortbericht* in verse 20. As for the sixth day, in both the LXX and its source text the transition formula follows God's declaration that he has granted plant life for food (v. 30). Summing up the situation, then, this formula occurs in Gen 1 a total of seven times in the OG and six times in the MT, with disagreement between the two in regard to either its location (second day) or presence (fifth day). The question arises as to whether the presence of *καὶ ἐγένετο οὕτως* in verses 6 and 20 of the OG reflects a different source text than the MT or is the result of harmonization with the pattern of verses 9, 11, 15, and 24. Emanuel Tov notes that harmonizations originating in a source text are hard to distinguish from those introduced by a translator, but then suggests a criterion for isolating the latter in parallel passages:

If the translator took care to use the same Greek equivalents in both passages, and if at least a few equivalents are unique to the two parallel passages, harmonization in other details, too, is at least a possibility. If the translator varied the translation vocabulary of the two sections, harmonization is still possible, but unlikely (Tov 1985, 20).

The Greek wording of the transition formula is the same in all of its occurrences in Gen 1, though admittedly the translation equivalences are not unique to the parallel passages in question. Hendel's position is that the appearance of the formula in verses 6 and 20 is due to harmonization, though he attributes that activity to the creator of what he calls proto-G, namely G's source text, basing his argument on G's normally conservative approach to rendering his *Vorlage* (Hendel 1998, 12, 16–18, 20–23; see also Orlinsky 1965, 151 and Davila 1990, 11). The problem is, however,

that textual evidence for an alternative *Vorlage* in these two cases is lacking in the Qumran materials and SamPent. Occasional divergences from the pattern that recurs throughout the original Hebrew text of Gen 1.1–2.3 have been noted by various scholars over the years (Wellhausen 1899, 184; Cassuto 1961, 16; McEvenue 1971, 185). Yet it should not automatically be assumed that, where the extant Hebrew textual tradition is unanimous in departing from established patterns while the OG follows them, the Greek text provides evidence of an alternative source text. Although it is true that G's approach to the task of translation can often be described as quantitatively equivalent and isomorphic, it is equally true that the Greek translator does not always exhibit rigid conformity to his source text or consistently opt for stereotypical renderings (Hiebert 2007, 1; 2000, 76–93; 2001, 263–84; 2006, 85–103). In the light of the preceding considerations, it would seem preferable to attribute the transition formula's appearance after the OG's *Wortbericht* in verses 6 and 20 to G's harmonizing activity, carried out in order to “remedy” its anomalous placement in the source text after the *Tatbericht* in verse 7 and its absence following the *Wortbericht* in verse 20, than to conclude that *καὶ ἐγένετο οὕτως* in verses 6 and 20 of the OG and the MT's divergences in these two cases are due to scribal error or intentional alteration (Wevers 1993, 4; Hiebert 2013, 30–33).

## 1.7

ויעש אלהים את הרקיע ויבדל בין המים אשר מתחת לרקיע ובין  
 המים אשר מעל לרקיע ויהי כן  
 καὶ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸ στερέωμα, καὶ διεχώρισεν ὁ θεὸς ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ  
 ὕδατος, ὃ ἦν ὑποκάτω τοῦ στερεώματος, καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ ὕδατος  
 τοῦ ἐπάνω τοῦ στερεώματος.

And God made the firmament, and God separated between the water that was under the firmament and between the water that was above the firmament.

**ἐποίησεν.** G's usual equivalent for עשה in Genesis is ποιέω (see v. 1).

**ὃ ἦν ... τοῦ** 4°. G employs two different means of representing the Hebrew relative pronoun אשר in the present verse. The first features a relative pronoun plus the imperfect form of εἰμί, and the second involves simply an article that is functioning as a relative pronoun. There is no apparent reason for the different approach other than the translator's desire to vary the mode of expression.

**ἀνὰ μέσον ... καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον.** On the repetition of *ἀνὰ μέσον* in imitation of repeated בֵּין, see verse 4.

**ὑποκάτω τοῦ στερεώματος ... ἐπάνω τοῦ στερεώματος.** The *ὑποκάτω* – מתחת equivalence occurs three times in Genesis (1.7, 9; 6.17), whereas *ἐπάνω* – מעל occurs twice (1.7; 40.17). The phrases that these prepositions initiate are not exact matches of the Hebrew in terms of replication of the specific constructions, but the translator has nonetheless chosen sensible equivalents. The Greek phrases are consistent with Greek idiom (*ὑποκάτω* + gen., *ἐπάνω* + gen.) and they represent the Hebrew expressions מתחת לרקיע and מעל לרקיע well.

As noted in the commentary on verse 6, the Greek equivalent of ויהי בן in the present verse follows the *Wortbericht* at the end of verse 6.

#### 1.8

**וַיִּקְרָא אֱלֹהִים לְרָקִיעַ שָׁמַיִם וַיְהִי עֶרֶב וַיְהִי בֹקֶר יוֹם שֵׁנִי**  
*καὶ ἐκάλεσεν ὁ θεὸς τὸ στερέωμα οὐρανόν. καὶ εἶδεν ὁ θεὸς ὅτι καλόν.*  
*καὶ ἐγένετο ἑσπέρα καὶ ἐγένετο πρωί, ἡμέρα δευτέρα.*  
 And God called the firmament Sky. And God saw that it was good.  
 And it came to be evening, and it came to be morning, a second day.

**καὶ ἐκάλεσεν ὁ θεὸς τὸ στερέωμα οὐρανόν.** Regarding the Greek rendering of the Hebrew construction ל ... וַיִּקְרָא, see verse 5. This is the first context attested in Greek literature in which *στερέωμα* is associated with *οὐρανός*.

**καὶ εἶδεν ὁ θεὸς ὅτι καλόν.** This is the only place in Gen 1 where there is no counterpart in the MT to the “formula of divine approbation” (Wevers 1993, 4; cf. vv. 4, 10, 12, 18, 21, 25, 31). In view of the lack of evidence for an alternate Hebrew *Vorlage*, this would appear to be another example of the Greek translator’s harmonizing activity (see v. 6; Hendel 1998, 23–24).

**ἡμέρα δευτέρα.** As in the case of “day one” (v. 5), G replicates his source text here and throughout the rest of the *Hexaemeron*. From this point onward, however, the numbers assigned to the days are ordinals.

1.9

וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים יִקְוּ הַמַּיִם מִתַּחַת הַשָּׁמַיִם אֶל מְקוֹם אֶחָד וְתָרָא  
הַיַּבֶּשֶׁה וַיְהִי כֵן

Καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεός Συναχθήτω τὸ ὕδωρ τὸ ὑποκάτω τοῦ οὐρανοῦ εἰς  
συναγωγὴν μίαν, καὶ ὀφθήτω ἡ ξηρά. καὶ ἐγένετο οὕτως. καὶ συνηχθη  
τὸ ὕδωρ τὸ ὑποκάτω τοῦ οὐρανοῦ εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς αὐτῶν, καὶ ὤφθη  
ἡ ξηρά.

And God said, “Let the water that is under the sky be gathered  
into one gathering, and let the dry land appear.” And it became  
so. And the water that was under the sky was gathered into their  
gatherings, and the dry land appeared.

**Συναχθήτω τὸ ὕδωρ.** The difference between the Greek and the source text at this point is one of number, reflecting the states of the subject nouns that govern the respective verbs. The verb *συνάγω* is employed by G to render four different Hebrew roots in Genesis, all of which fall within the semantic range of “gather” or “collect”: אסף, לקט, קבץ, קוה. This is the only place in Genesis, however, in which *συνάγω* is the counterpart to קוה. The Greek verb here simply relays the meaning of the Hebrew one, apart from the difference in number.

**τὸ ὑποκάτω.** The article ensures that *ὑποκάτω* is read as an adjectival modifier of τὸ ὕδωρ, thus making explicit what is implicit in the source text. Without the article, the adverb/preposition could be construed as specifying where the water is to be gathered, namely *ὑποκάτω τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*.

**εἰς συναγωγὴν μίαν.** Of the five times that *συναγωγὴ* occurs in Genesis, only here is its MT counterpart מקום. It is therefore an anomalous rendering, something that is reinforced by the fact that in all forty-six other appearances of מקום in this book the Greek equivalent is τόπος. The question then arises as to whether *συναγωγὴ* here is evidence of an interpretative move by G or of his translation of an alternate source text. The readings of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion clearly reflect מקום inasmuch as they substitute εἰς τόπον ἓνα for εἰς συναγωγὴν μίαν. Scholars have, however, long pointed out that *συναγωγὴ* accords semantically with מקוה rather than with מקום (e.g., Gunkel 1910, 107; Skinner 1930, 22; Speiser 1964, 6; Harl 1994, 90; Wenham 1987, 4; Hendel 1998, 24; BHS). The discovery and publication of Dead Sea Scrolls manuscript 4Q8 (4QGen<sup>b</sup>) (Davila 1994, 61–62) has provided tangible support for the suggestion that מקוה

was the reading in G's *Vorlage*. The Greek συναγωγή is, of course, the substantival cognate of the preceding verb συναχθήτω, in the same way that the Hebrew מקוה and יקוו are etymologically related. This observation could be construed as evidence, either of harmonization that occurred in the Hebrew or the Greek textual history, or of an original symmetry that is now attested only in the LXX and 4Q8. On balance, the latter option seems more compelling. Graphic confusion involving the final letters of those two words, ה and ם, could account for the shift to מקום, a word that occurs in the MT canon far more frequently (401x) than מקוה root 2 does (4x: Gen 1.10; Exod 7.19; Leu 11.36; Esa 22.11). In the light of these statistics, a shift from an original מקום to מקוה seems less probable than the reverse option. Wevers's argument that מקוה is unlikely to have been the reading in G's parent text is based to a large extent on the fact that the Greek counterpart to מקוה in verse 10 is not συναγωγή but τὰ συστήματα, as it is in "The Three" (Wevers 1993, 5). This is a valid objection, but, in the broader context of verses 9–10, not ultimately fatal to the proposal that מקוה is the *Vorlage* for G in verse 9, as will be argued below. Terry Fenton's suggestion with respect to the interwoven textual histories of the LXX and the MT at this point—namely that, before the introduction of medial *matres lectionis*, מקום was the original consonantal form in verse 9a but that it was vocalized as *miqwîm*; that G's *Vorlage* did indeed read מקוים, but that the current MT reading came about as a result of the accidental loss of *yôd* resulting in the vocalization of מקום as *māqôm*; and that subsequently אחד was added to the clause יקוו המים מתחת השמים אל מקום אחד in order to make for a more sensible reading (1984, 441–442)—while very ingenious, would appear to be a candidate for Occam's razor because of the complexity of the scenario that he sketches with its multiple stages and assumptions. No doubt the reading εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς αὐτῶν that is found in manuscripts 72 of the *O* group and 129 of the *f* group, and the anomalous reading ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς μίαν that is attested by the corrector of manuscript 56 of the *f* group, are the result of harmonization with the latter half of the longer Greek text of the present verse (see below).

καὶ ἐγένετο οὕτως. Regarding the transition formula, see verse 6.

καὶ συνήχθη τὸ ὕδωρ τὸ ὑποκάτω τοῦ οὐρανοῦ εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς αὐτῶν, καὶ ὠφθη ἡ ξηρά. This portion of the verse in the LXX constitutes the *Tatbericht* that is lacking in the MT. It is obelized in various Greek manuscripts (57–73–413 [ind mend] 343–344'). In the apparatus of *BHS*, it is retroverted

into Hebrew: ויקוו המים מתחת השמים אל מקויהם ותרֹא היבשה. This is, in fact, the only instance in the present account in which a *Wortbericht* is not followed by a *Tatbericht* in the MT (see vv. 3–4, 6–7, 11–12, 14–18, 20–21, 24–25, 26–27). Wevers concludes that G “has intentionally restructured the creation account of ch. 1 in the interests of consistency” (Wevers 1993, 5). But there is evidence to suggest that the longer Greek reading may be based on a Hebrew text that differs from the MT. First, the Hebrew equivalent to the clause *καὶ ὠφθῆ ἡ ξηρά* appears to be partly preserved in 4Q10 (4QGen<sup>k</sup>) (Davila 1994, 75–76): [וּתְרֹא הַיָּבֶשֶׁת]. Hendel argues that this phrase is not to be construed as belonging to verse 9a because the verb in this fragment is the short form preterite, which lacks the concluding ה of the jussive וּתְרֹא that does appear in verse 9a. He asserts that it “is very unlikely that a postexilic scribe would miswrite the long prefix form in verse 9a as a short prefix form, as the short form is virtually moribund in Late Biblical Hebrew” (1998, 25–26). Second, the possessive pronoun αὐτῶν that follows the phrase εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς does not agree in number with its antecedent τὸ ὕδωρ, but the plural pronoun can be accounted for as part of a Hebraistic rendering of אֵל מְקוּיָהֶם for which the plural noun הַמִּים is the antecedent of the Hebrew pronominal suffix. This would seem to be a more likely scenario than Wevers’s proposal mentioned above that G has introduced the *Tatbericht* “in the interests of consistency” with the other parts of the *Hexaemeron* that feature the *Wortbericht-Tatbericht* pattern, since harmonizing pluses mirror the wording of the texts with which they are paralleled (see the discussion regarding *καὶ ἐγένετο οὕτως* in v. 6 and *καὶ εἶδεν ὁ θεὸς ὅτι καλόν* in v. 8). The wording of the *Tatbericht* in verse 9b (εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς αὐτῶν) does not, however, mirror the wording of the *Wortbericht* in verse 9a (εἰς συναγωγῇν μίαν), and so it is more likely to be based on a non-MT source text. The absence of the *Tatbericht* in the MT could be the result of homoiarcton involving ויקוו verse 9b and ויקרא verse 10, or of homoioteleuton involving ותרֹא היבשה verse 9a and ותרֹא היבשה verse 9b (BHS; Wellhausen 1899, 184; Skinner 1930, 22; Fenton 1984, 443; Tov 1985, 21–22; Davila 1990, 11; Hendel 1998, 25–27).

#### 1.10

ויקרא אלהים ליבשה ארץ ולמקוה המים קרא ימים וירא אלהים כי  
טוב

καὶ ἐκάλεσεν ὁ θεὸς τὴν ξηρὰν γῆν καὶ τὰ συστήματα τῶν ὑδάτων  
ἐκάλεσεν θαλάσσας. καὶ εἶδεν ὁ θεὸς ὅτι καλόν.



And God called the dry land Earth, and the systems of the waters he called Seas. And God saw that it was good.

καὶ ἐκάλεσεν ὁ θεὸς τὴν ξηράν ... καὶ τὰ συστήματα. Regarding the Greek rendering of the Hebrew construction לָ ... וַיִּקְרָא, see verse 5.

τὰ συστήματα τῶν ὑδάτων. There are a number of interesting matters to consider with respect to how this phrase corresponds to the underlying Hebrew and to verse 9. MT's counterpart in the present verse is מְקוֹה הַמִּים, and one notices at the outset the difference in number between τὰ συστήματα and מְקוֹה. On the basis of this LXX reading, Fenton maintains that the original Hebrew text must have been the plural construct form מְקוֹי, but that it "has obviously been accommodated to" מְקוֹם אחד in verse 9a (1984, 442). His reconstruction of both the original LXX and its source text in verses 9 and 10 therefore involves συναγωγὰς and plural forms of מְקוֹה in all three relevant parts of these verses before they came to be altered to their present form (1984, 442–45). Again the complexity and speculative nature of this scenario is its Achilles's heel. Thus one must begin with the acknowledgement that the Greek plural form in the present verse agrees in number with τὰς συναγωγὰς in verse 9b but not with συναγωγὴν in verse 9a, whose presumed Hebrew counterparts are plural and singular forms of מְקוֹה, respectively. What is somewhat surprising, then, is the choice of a different lexeme, σύστημα, as the equivalent for מְקוֹה here in verse 10. If G's *Vorlage* was, indeed, a form of מְקוֹה in all three places, then the employment of two different Greek lexemes for one Hebrew term represents another case of semantic differentiation. It is clear as well that when G talks about συναγωγὴ μία in verse 9a, on the one hand, and about συναγωγαί in verse 9b and συστήματα in verse 10, on the other hand, those are understood to be different entities. Presumably verse 9a has to do with the general boundary that is drawn between a habitable land mass and the primordial ocean, whereas verse 9b and verse 10 have to do with the different bodies of water that are located on the earth, hence the transition to plural terms. The switch in Greek lexemes may be due to G's desire for variation. Noteworthy as well is the fact that the Greek term for water is plural here, whereas in verses 6, 7, and 9 it is always singular. This reinforces the idea that G is now referring to multiple bodies of water rather than to the single undifferentiated watery expanse that is described as existing prior to the emergence of the ξηρά.



καὶ εἶδεν ὁ θεὸς ὅτι καλόν. Regarding the divine approbation formula, see verse 8.

## 1.11

וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים תְּדַשׂ אֶת הָאָרֶץ דָּשָׁא עֲשֵׂב מִזֵּרִיעַ זֶרַע פָּרִי עֵשָׂה פֶּרִי  
לְמִינוֹ אֲשֶׁר זָרְעוּ בּוֹ עַל הָאָרֶץ וַיְהִי כֵן

καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεός Βλαστησάτω ἡ γῆ βοτάνην χόρτου, σπείρον σπέρμα κατὰ γένος καὶ καθ' ὁμοιότητα, καὶ ξύλον κάρπιμον ποιοῦν καρπόν, οὗ τὸ σπέρμα αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ κατὰ γένος ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. καὶ ἐγένετο οὕτως.

And God said, "Let the earth put forth herbaceous vegetation, seeding seed according to kind and according to likeness, and a fruit-bearing tree producing fruit of which its seed is in it according to kind, on the earth." And it became so.

**Βλαστησάτω ἡ γῆ βοτάνην χόρτου.** The Greek text does not replicate the cognate wordplay in the source text between the verb and direct object in this clause (Βλαστησάτω ... βοτάνην – דַּשׂא ... דָּשָׁא). In the LXX, only here and in Joel 2.22 do both these Greek and Hebrew verbs occur, whereas of the fourteen occurrences of the noun דָּשָׁא, it is rendered by βοτάνη in five contexts including the present one (Gen 1.11, 12; 4 Rgns 19.26; Esa 66.14; Jer 14.5). The verbs are semantically equivalent, as are the nouns βοτάνη and דָּשָׁא. While there is some degree of semantic overlap between χόρτος and עֲשֵׂב in that both can denote either animal or human food that comes from plants (see 1.29, 30), the former is also used of the place where animals feed, whether an enclosure or open pastureland (LSJ). The NRSV interprets עֲשֵׂב as a collective noun, but in rendering it as χόρτου in the singular, G reflects the number of his source text without signaling that it is to be understood as a collective (on Greek collective nouns, see Smyth §996; C-S §48). The fact that the Greek noun is an attributive genitive modifier of βοτάνην makes it clear that G construes the relationship between them to be different than what the Masoretes understand to be the case between דָּשָׁא and עֲשֵׂב. In the present context, it appears that βοτάνην signifies the genus or general category of vegetation and χόρτου the species (Louw-Nida, s.v. "βοτάνη"; BDAG, s.v. "βοτάνη"), namely, of the herbaceous type (on the adjectival force of the adnominal gen., see Smyth §1291). In the MT, the disjunctive accent (*zaqef qatan*) over דָּשָׁא signals an appositional relationship with what follows (Wevers 1993, 6; Harl 1994, 91; Brown 1993, 51 n. 48).

**σπεῖρον σπέρμα.** The verbal root σπείρω appears six times in Genesis; in five cases, including the current one, the Hebrew verb זרע is the counterpart (1.11, 12, 29; 26.12; 47.23), while in the remaining instance (47.19) there is no Hebrew equivalent. The cognate noun σπέρμα occurs sixty times in Genesis, in fifty-nine of which, including the present context, the Hebrew equivalent is זרע, whereas in the remaining case (21.23) the Hebrew counterpart is נין (“offspring” BDB). G’s verb and noun choices here are thus default renderings. The Hebraism σπεῖρον σπέρμα, both here and in the following verse, represents a formally equivalent rendering of זרע מזרע in the source text. Wevers construes σπέρμα as the subject of the preceding predicative participle σπεῖρον, based on the assumption that this neuter verbal form could not be modifying either of the preceding nouns χόρτου (masc.) or βοτάνην (fem.) (Wevers 1993, 6). It seems likely, however, that σπεῖρον modifies or qualifies βοτάνην, despite the fact that they are not congruent in terms of gender, and that σπέρμα is its direct object. βοτάνην is to be understood as describing a class of object rather than an individual thing, and in such a circumstance, the use of the neuter gender for a generalizing modifier is not uncommon (Smyth §1048). G’s rendering, then, communicates the idea that what the earth is to put forth is pastureland vegetation (βοτάνην χόρτου) that disseminates seed (σπεῖρον σπέρμα). Although in the initial portion of this *Wortbericht* there is formal equivalence between the OG and its source text—Βλαστησάτω ἡ γῆ βοτάνην χόρτου σπεῖρον σπέρμα – עשב מזרע זרע – תדשא הארץ דשא – the syntax is different. Thus in contrast to the web of relationships in the OG described above, עשב מזרע זרע, to which χόρτου σπεῖρον σπέρμα corresponds formally, stands in apposition to דשא (βοτάνην).

**κατὰ γένος καὶ καθ’ ὁμοιότητα.** These words are without counterpart in the MT, whereas in the *Tatbericht* of verse 12 they constitute a double translation of the first occurrence of לְמִינֵהוּ. Given the fact that Hebrew evidence is lacking for them here and the fact that they mirror exactly the same Greek phrase in verse 12, this would appear to be a case of harmonization by G.

**καὶ ξύλον κάρπιμον ποιοῦν καρπόν.** The Greek conjunction does not have a counterpart in the MT in the present verse, though there is widespread versional support for it here (BHS), and in the *Tatbericht* in verse 12 where the Hebrew conjunction precedes וְ in agreement with the LXX. Once again G seems to have harmonized the present verse with verse 12.

The choice of ξύλον as the equivalent for רע is consistent with the translator's usual practice, occurring twenty-five of the thirty times that רע appears in Genesis. Harl points out that ξύλον is commonly employed in Classical Greek to signify “bois coupé,” though she acknowledges that in the papyri it is attested with the same meaning as δένδρον (“arbre”; 1994, 91; cf. LSJ)—G's choice of equivalent on only three occasions in Genesis. ξύλον is therefore an unmarked rendering in Genesis. As in the case of χόρτου above, G does not indicate that ξύλον is to be read as a collective in the way that the NRSV interprets רע. Thus OG should be understood to be referring to a tree that presumably serves as an exemplar of all such fruit-bearing trees.

The adjective κάρπιμος occurs in the LXX only here and in the following verse. The phrase ξύλον κάρπιμον constitutes a sensible rendering of the Hebrew noun pair פרי רע in construct relationship.

καρπόν. Apart from the two instances of κάρπιμος mentioned above, G's equivalent for פרי throughout Genesis is, as might be expected, καρπός (1.11, 12, 29; 3.2, 3, 6; 4.3; 30.2).

οὗ τὸ σπέρμα αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ κατὰ γένος. G reflects the various components of his source text, but not in the same sequence. κατὰ γένος corresponds to למינו, apart from the absence of a Greek pronominal modifier. That is how G usually translates this prepositional phrase in its various forms: of the seventeen cases of למין plus pronominal suffix in Genesis, all except three (1.21 [1°], 25 [3°]; 6:20 [3°]) involve κατὰ γένος without an accompanying pronoun. G consistently employs κατὰ γένος in conjunction with σπέρμα (Wevers 1993, 7), whereas in the present verse of the source text the linkage is between either פרי רע or למינו.

ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. In a significant majority of cases in Genesis (24x), this phrase is G's equivalent for על הארץ, as opposed to six instances of ἐπὶ τῇ γῇ. The latter option does contrast with other equivalences that occur in proximity to it: בארץ – ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς (2.5; 6.17) or מעל הארץ – ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς (8.3) or בין הארץ – (ἀνὰ μέσον) τῆς γῆς (9.13). One also observes that in the contexts in which ἐπὶ τῇ γῇ appears as the equivalent to על הארץ, the passage has to do with natural phenomena that affect the earth from above: rain (2.5; 7.4), flood (6.17), wind (8.1), clouds (9.14), or sun (19.23). These are the kinds of factors that could have affected G's choice of case.

**καὶ ἐγένετο οὕτως.** Regarding the transition formula, see verse 6.

### 1.12

ותוצא הארץ דשא עשב מזריע זרע למינהו ועץ עשה פרי אשר זרעו  
בו למינהו וירא אלהים כי טוב

καὶ ἐξήνεγκεν ἡ γῆ βοτάνην χόρτου, σπείρον σπέρμα κατὰ γένος καὶ καθ' ὁμοιότητα, καὶ ξύλον κάρπιμον ποιοῦν καρπὸν, οὗ τὸ σπέρμα αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ κατὰ γένος ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. καὶ εἶδεν ὁ θεὸς ὅτι καλόν.

And the earth brought forth herbaceous vegetation, seeding seed according to kind and according to likeness, and a fruit-bearing tree producing fruit of which its seed is in it according to kind, on the earth. And God saw that it was good.

**καὶ ἐξήνεγκεν.** In the *Tatbericht*, G follows his source text in choosing a different verb from the one employed in the *Wortbericht* in verse 11 to depict the earth's role in generating plant life. The word ἐκφέρω occurs a total of three times in Genesis (1.12; 14.18; 24.53), and all three times its semantically equivalent counterpart is **יצא** *hiphil*.

**σπείρον σπέρμα.** Regarding the translation of this phrase, see verse 11.

**κατὰ γένος καὶ καθ' ὁμοιότητα.** G produces a double translation of למינהו in his source text, the same wording that is employed in verse 11 for the description of the σπέρμα produced by the βοτάνη χόρτου (“herbaceous vegetation”), but there without a counterpart in the source text.

**ξύλον κάρπιμον.** In another move to harmonize the wording of the *Wortbericht* and the *Tatbericht*, G here supplies the adjective that modifies ξύλον in verse 11, though his source text would have read simply עץ.

**κατὰ γένος ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.** G's rendering of the second occurrence of למינהו in this verse is now simply κατὰ γένος rather than the double translation noted above. Thus the pattern observed in verse 11—with κατὰ γένος καὶ καθ' ὁμοιότητα used to characterize the σπέρμα generated by the βοτάνη χόρτου, and only κατὰ γένος employed in connection with the σπέρμα contained in the fruit of the ξύλον κάρπιμον—is replicated in the present verse.

G here further harmonizes the *Tatbericht* with the *Wortbericht* by adding the phrase ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς after κατὰ γένος in order to mirror the wording of verse 11 where, however, the source text reads על הארץ.

Presumably the phrase ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς modifies the description of the propagation of both the βοτάνη χόρτου and the ξύλον ἀρπιμον. G's addition of the phrase here in verse 12 creates something of an *inclusio* for the *Tatbericht*, like the one that exists in the *Wortbericht* of verse 11 in the LXX and its source text.

καὶ εἶδεν ὁ θεὸς ὅτι καλόν. Regarding the divine approbation formula, see verse 8.

1.13

ויהי ערב ויהי בקר יום שלישי

καὶ ἐγένετο ἑσπέρα καὶ ἐγένετο πρωί, ἡμέρα τρίτη.

And it came to be evening, and it came to be morning, a third day.

G replicates his source text as he does with the concluding formula for each of the days of the *Hexaemeron*.

1.14

וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים יְהִי מֵאֵרָת בִּרְקִיעַ הַשָּׁמַיִם לְהַבְדִּיל בֵּין הַיּוֹם וּבֵין הַלַּיְלָה  
וְהָיוּ לְאֹתֹת וּלְמוֹעֲדִים וּלְיָמִים וּשְׁנִים

Καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεός Γενηθήτωσαν φωστῆρες ἐν τῷ στερεώματι τοῦ οὐρανοῦ εἰς φαῦσιν τῆς γῆς τοῦ διαχωρίζειν ἀνὰ μέσον τῆς ἡμέρας καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον τῆς νυκτὸς καὶ ἔστωσαν εἰς σημεῖα καὶ εἰς καιροὺς καὶ εἰς ἡμέρας καὶ εἰς ἑνιαυτούς,

And God said, "Let luminaries come into being in the firmament of the sky for illumination of the earth, to separate between the day and between the night, and let them be for signs and for seasons and for days and for years,

**Γενηθήτωσαν φωστῆρες.** The agreement in number between verb and subject in the Greek text is not matched in the source text, a situation that can occur in Hebrew when the predicate precedes the subject (GKC §145o). The word φωστήρ, which first appears here in extant Greek literature, is the equivalent for מֵאֹר in four of its five occurrences in Genesis, once in this verse and three times in verse 16. In verse 15, the LXX counterpart is φαῦσις. Both φωστήρ and מֵאֹר are cognates of the nouns that are used in verse 3 to designate light (פֶּאֱז, אֹר) and both denote a source of light or luminary.

**εἰς φαῦσον τῆς γῆς.** This phrase constitutes a plus in comparison to the MT. The Greek version here may reflect a source text similar to the SamPent in which **עַל הָאָרֶץ לְהַאִיר** follows **בְּרַקִּיעַ הַשָּׁמַיִם**, as is the case in verses 15 and 17 in both the MT and the SamPent (Wevers 1993, 8; Tov 1985, 6, 23 n. 10; Hendel 1998, 28–29). It would appear, therefore, that the SamPent reading in verse 14 constitutes evidence of harmonizing activity in the Hebrew textual history, which is subsequently reflected in the LXX (Hendel 1998, 29). It should be noted, however, that the Greek equivalent for **עַל הָאָרֶץ לְהַאִיר** in verses 15 and 17 is **ὥστε φαίνειν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς**, which is a more isomorphic rendering than **εἰς φαῦσον τῆς γῆς**. The **ὥστε** + infinitive construction typically expresses result (Smyth §§2011, 2260–2263; LSJ s.v. “ὥστε” B.I), whereas **εἰς** with the accusative is often used in purpose clauses (Smyth §1686d; LSJ s.v. “εἰς” V.2). In verse 14, then, in comparison to the MT, G further emphasizes the purpose for the calling forth of the luminaries, whose “primary role in dividing day from night is the giving of light” on the earth (Wevers 1993, 8). Like **φωστήρ**, **φαῦσις** is noteworthy as a term whose first appearance in extant Greek literature is in the LXX (Gen 1.14, 15; Ps 74[73].16; Idt 13.13).

**τοῦ διαχωρίζειν.** G’s equivalent for the Hebrew preposition + infinitive construct (**לְהַבְדִּיל**) is an articular infinitive, which is another standard Greek construction for signifying purpose (Smyth §1408).

**ἀνὰ μέσον ... καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον.** On the repetition of **ἀνὰ μέσον** in imitation of repeated **בֵּין**, see verse 4.

**καὶ ἔστωσαν εἰς σημεῖα καὶ εἰς καιροὺς καὶ εἰς ἡμέρας καὶ εἰς ἐνιαυτούς.** The specification of the luminaries’ purpose continues. G has replicated his source text quantitatively, except for inserting the preposition **εἰς** prior to **ἐνιαυτούς**—without a corresponding **לְ**—in order to continue the pattern established in the preceding list. This has the effect of specifying four distinct categories with respect to the functioning of the **φωστῆρες** rather than three (Wevers 1993, 8).

The significance of the choice of **σημεῖον** to designate one of these functions is as debatable as that of its counterpart **אוֹת** in the source text. Presumably these terms refer in the present context to phenomena involving the celestial luminaries that may be interpreted as omens of one sort or another (e.g., 4 Rgns 20.8–11; Esa 38.7–8; Ier 10.2; Philo, *Opif.* 58–59). Elsewhere in Genesis, the **σημεῖον** – **אוֹת** equivalence is associated with the

mark placed on Kain (4.15), the covenant sign of the rainbow following the flood (9.12, 13, 17), and the covenant sign of circumcision (17.11).

G employs *καιρός* as the equivalent for *מועד* here, and for its other occurrences in Genesis, all three of which have to do with the appointed time of Isaak's birth (17.21; 18.14; 21.2). The Greek term typically pertains to times of special significance or import rather than to time in the generic, abstract, or durative sense that is more often associated with *χρόνος* (Gen 26.1, 15; see LSJ). In the present verse, *καιρός* is an appropriate translation choice to convey the idea of *מועדים*, which likely refers to the cultic events on the Israelite liturgical calendar rather than to the seasons of nature (Wevers 1993, 8; Wenham 1987, 23).

G's choice of *ἐνιαυτός* to translate *שנה* is noteworthy inasmuch as it is not the usual equivalent. Of the total number of occurrences of *שנה* in Genesis, 110 are rendered by *ἔτος* whereas only five are rendered by *ἐνιαυτός*. In addition to the present context, which deals with the function of the celestial luminaries in demarcating annual cycles, in 17.21 the latter term is used in connection with the promised birth of Isaak in the coming year; in 26.12 the time reference pertains to the year in which Isaak experiences a hundredfold yield of barley; in 47.17 it has to do with the year of the famine in Egypt when Ioseph takes the Egyptians' livestock in exchange for bread; and in 47.28 it applies to the tally of "Iakob's days of the years of his life" (*αἱ ἡμέραι Ἰακώβ ἐνιαυτῶν τῆς ζωῆς αὐτοῦ*). So whether the focus is on nature's calendar, a year that is associated with a singular event, or the reckoning of someone's age, there appears to be no evident rationale for the choice of *ἐνιαυτός* other than stylistic variation.

### 1.15

והיו למאורת ברקיע השמים להאיר על הארץ ויהי כן

*καὶ ἔστωσαν εἰς φαῦσον ἐν τῷ στερεώματι τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὥστε φαίνειν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. καὶ ἐγένετο οὕτως.*

and let them be for illumination in the firmament of the sky so as to give light upon the earth." And it became so.

Because of the presence of the phrase *εἰς φαῦσον τῆς γῆς* in verse 14 (presumably a reflection of G's source text), the repetition of the creator's declaration here in the concluding section of the *Wortbericht* that the *φωστῆρες* are to illuminate the earth makes for even more redundancy in the LXX than in the MT.



**εἰς φαῦσιν.** This phrase, which reiterates the first purpose statement regarding the luminaries in the previous verse, is the counterpart to the MT's **למאורות**. Apart from the fact that **φαῦσιν** is singular and **מאורות** is plural, what further distinguishes these two terms is that **φαῦσις** describes function whereas **מאור** incorporates the element of identity, as is the case with **φωστήρ**, the equivalent for **מאור** in verses 14 and 16.

**ὥστε φαίνειν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.** This result clause corresponds isomorphically to the Hebrew source text **לְהַאִיר עַל הָאָרֶץ**. See the discussion concerning the phrase **εἰς φαῦσιν τῆς γῆς** in verse 14, and the one that deals with **ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς** in verse 11.

**καὶ ἐγένετο οὕτως.** Regarding the transition formula, see verse 6.

#### 1.16

**וַיַּעַשׂ אֱלֹהִים אֶת שְׁנֵי הַמַּאֲרֹת הַגְּדֹלִים אֶת הַמַּאֲוֹר הַגָּדֹל לְמַמְשֶׁלֶת הַיּוֹם וְאֶת הַמַּאֲוֹר הַקָּטָן לְמַמְשֶׁלֶת הַלַּיְלָה וְאֶת הַכּוֹכָבִים**  
**καὶ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς τοὺς δύο φωστῆρας τοὺς μεγάλους, τὸν φωστῆρα τὸν μέγαν εἰς ἀρχὰς τῆς ἡμέρας καὶ τὸν φωστῆρα τὸν ἐλάσσων εἰς ἀρχὰς τῆς νυκτός, καὶ τοὺς ἀστέρας.**

And God made the two great luminaries, the great luminary for rulership of the day and the lesser luminary for rulership of the night, and the stars.

**τὸν μέγαν ... τὸν ἐλάσσων.** In the *Tatbericht* for the fourth day of creation, G distinguishes between “the two great luminaries” by employing an adjective in the positive degree for the first (**τὸν μέγαν**) and one in the comparative degree for the second (**τὸν ἐλάσσων**). In Hebrew there are, of course, no distinctive forms for comparatives or superlatives. In situations like this that involve correlative comparatives, the simple adjective with the article is used (GKC §133a,f): **הַגָּדֹל ... הַקָּטָן**. Due to negative interference from the source text (Tourey 1995, 274–6), G replicates this kind of construction in the case of the first adjective, but then conforms to Greek idiom in the case of the second (C-S §64; Thackeray §12, 13).

**εἰς ἀρχάς ... εἰς ἀρχάς.** G employs the plural form of the noun **ἀρχή** to render the singular Hebrew noun **מַמְשֶׁלָה**, which in Genesis occurs only in this verse. This Greek construction may be understood in terms of an abstract plural that “refers to the single ... cases ... [or] manifestations



of the idea expressed by the abstract substantive” (Smyth §1000.3; Brown 1993, 52 n. 58).

## 1.17

ויתן אתם אלהים ברקיע השמים להאיר על הארץ  
καὶ ἔθετο αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς ἐν τῷ στερεώματι τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὥστε φαίνειν  
ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς,  
And God set them in the firmament of the sky so as to give light  
upon the earth

**ἔθετο.** Of the twenty-seven times that *τίθημι* occurs in Genesis, it serves as the equivalent to *נתן* on twelve occasions (1.17; 9.13; 15.10; 17.2, 5, 6; 30.40; 40.3; 41.10, 48 [2x]; 42.30). There is indeed semantic overlap between these two lexemes, though in both cases their semantic range is quite broad. In Genesis, *τίθημι* is G’s choice of counterpart to four other Hebrew verbs (*אסף*, *נוח* *hiphil*, *שם*, *שית*), while *נתן*, which occurs 150 times in the book, is rendered by twelve other Greek verbs (*ἀποδίδωμι*, *ἀφίημι*, *δίδωμι*, *ἐμβάλλω*, *ἐπιδίδωμι*, *ἵστημι*, *καθίστημι*, *παρατίθημι*, *περιτίθημι*, *ποιέω*, *προεαφέρω*, *προσδίδωμι*).

**ὥστε φαίνειν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.** This result clause corresponds isomorphically to the Hebrew source text *על הארץ להאיר* (cf. v. 15). See the discussion concerning the phrase *εἰς φαῦσιν τῆς γῆς* in verse 14, and the one that deals with *ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς* in verse 11.

## 1.18

ולמשל ביום ובלילה ולהבדיל בין האור ובין החשך וירא אלהים כי  
טוב  
καὶ ἄρχειν τῆς ἡμέρας καὶ τῆς νυκτὸς καὶ διαχωρίζειν ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ  
φωτὸς καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ σκοτὸς. καὶ εἶδεν ὁ θεὸς ὅτι καλόν.  
and to rule the day and the night and to separate between the light  
and between the darkness. And God saw that it was good.

**καὶ ἄρχειν τῆς ἡμέρας καὶ τῆς νυκτὸς.** In his choice of *ἄρχω* + genitive direct object, G fashions an acceptable translation that conforms to the norms of the target language rather than attempting to replicate the Hebrew idiom *משל ב* (Toury 1995, 56–57). This equivalence occurs two other times in Genesis (4.7; 45.26). It seems unlikely in the present context that *ἄρχειν* is governed by *ὥστε* in the preceding verse, in the sense

that ruling day and night is to be regarded as the result of the luminaries being set in the firmament. Instead, like לַמִּשְׁלָּה, this infinitive should be understood as purposive.

**διαχωρίζειν.** Unlike διαχωρίζειν in the *Wortbericht* in verse 14, the infinitive here is not preceded by the genitive article. As in that earlier verse, however, this is an infinitive of purpose like לְהַבְדִּיל.

**ἀνὰ μέσον ... καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον.** On the repetition of ἀνὰ μέσον in imitation of repeated בֵּין, see verse 4.

**καὶ εἶδεν ὁ θεὸς ὅτι καλόν.** Regarding the divine approbation formula, see verse 8.

#### 1.19

וַיְהִי עֶרֶב וַיְהִי בֹקֶר יוֹם רְבִיעִי

καὶ ἐγένετο ἑσπέρα καὶ ἐγένετο πρωί, ἡμέρα τετάρτη.

And it came to be evening, and it came to be morning, a fourth day.

G replicates his source text as he does with the concluding formula for each of the days of the *Hexaemeron*.

#### 1.20

וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים יִשְׂרְצוּ הַמִּים שֶׁרָץ נֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה וְעוֹף יַעֲוֹף עַל הָאָרֶץ עַל פְּנֵי רִקְיעַ הַשָּׁמַיִם

Καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεός Ἐξαγαγέτω τὰ ὕδατα ἐρπετὰ ψυχῶν ζωῶν καὶ πετεινὰ πετόμενα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς κατὰ τὸ στερέωμα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. καὶ ἐγένετο οὕτως.

And God said, “Let the waters bring forth creeping things among living creatures and birds flying on the earth against the firmament of the sky.” And it became so.

**Ἐξαγαγέτω τὰ ὕδατα.** As is often the case in Greek, here the neuter plural subject, which is historically regarded to be a collective, takes a singular verb (Smyth §§958–59; Thackeray §3). In the source text, however, both the verb, יִשְׂרְצוּ, and its subject, הַמִּים, are plural. Of the total of seventeen occurrences of ἐξάγω in Genesis, it is the equivalent for the verb שָׂרַץ only in this verse and in the next one. This is not surprising, since their

semantic ranges do not coincide. With the choice of ἐξάγω in the present context, G in fact assigns to the waters the same productive capacity that will be ascribed to the earth in verse 24 (Brown 1993, 53 n. 60). There the source text has יצא *hiphil*, with which ἐξάγω does correspond semantically. This latter equivalence occurs a total of twelve times in Genesis (1.24; 8.17; 15.5, 7; 19.5, 8, 12, 17; 38.24; 40.14; 43.23; 48.12), while ἐξάγω is the counterpart to יצא *qal* in one additional case (11.31), to רון *hiphil* once (41.14), and to תעה *hiphil* once (20.13).

ἐρπετὰ ψυχῶν ζωῶν. G uses plural forms to render the constituent components of the collective construction of the source text שרץ נפש חיה. The Greek genitive noun with its attributive participial modifier (ψυχῶν ζωῶν) denotes the whole, of which the noun it limits (ἐρπετὰ) constitutes a part (see Smyth §§1306–7, 1310). This corresponds functionally with the *nomen rectum* in the absolute state that is followed by its attributive adjective modifier, and the Hebrew *nomen regens* in the construct state (GKC §89a). There is no cognate connection between the verb Ἐξαγαγέτω and the object ἐρπετὰ, as there is in the Hebrew version שרצו ... ישרצו.

The counterpart to the segholate noun שרץ is ἐρπετόν both here and in the only other place that it occurs in Genesis (7.21). These terms are not really semantically equivalent, and ἐρπετόν is in fact also G's choice for translating the segholate noun רמש in all ten of the contexts in which it appears in Genesis (1.24, 25, 26; 6.7, 20; 7.14, 23; 8.17, 19; 9.3). G's equivalences here in 1.20 in the *Wortbericht* for the fifth day—Ἐξαγαγέτω [ישרצו] τὰ ὕδατα ἐρπετὰ [שרץ] ψυχῶν ζωῶν—are understandable in the light of his rendering of the *Tatbericht* in verse 21: πᾶσαν ψυχὴν ζῶων ἐρπετῶν [הרמשות], ἃ ἐξήγαγεν [שרצו] τὰ ὕδατα. The translation strategy is clearly to forge an explicit linkage between the *Wortbericht* and the *Tatbericht* by employing the same Greek verb (ἐξάγω) and noun (ἐρπετόν) in both, despite the fact that the corresponding noun (שרץ) and attributive participle (√רמש) in the source text are different. It should be noted that the participle is the verbal cognate of the noun רמש, which G consistently renders as ἐρπετόν.

With regard to ψυχή and נפש, they both have broad semantic ranges that overlap to a significant degree, as is the case here. The fact that ψυχή is G's translation choice in forty-one of the forty-three contexts in which נפש occurs in Genesis means that this equivalence is a nearly closed equation for him.

The attributive participial form of ζάω is an acceptable counterpart to the adjective ὤν. G employs this Greek root to render the Hebrew adjective twenty times in the book of Genesis (1.20, 24; 2.7, 19; 3.20; 8.21; 9.3, 10, 12, 15, 16; 25.6; 26.19; 43.7, 27, 28; 45.3, 26, 28; 46.30).

**πετεινὰ πετόμενα.** G again uses a plural noun (πετεινά) to translate a collective form (עוֹף) in his source text, which in and of itself is an appropriate strategy. The syntax of this part of the verse is, however, quite different in the two versions. In the LXX, the noun functions as the second part of the direct object of Ἐξαγαγέτω, and the participle that follows the noun of which it is a cognate form is an attributive modifier. This results in a rather odd scenario, given that the waters are called upon to bring forth birds in addition to sea creatures, a tradition that is perpetuated by “The Three”: α’ ἐξερψάτω τὰ ὕδατα ... πετηγὸν ἰπτάμενον, σ’ ἐξερψάτω τὰ ὕδατα ... πετηγὸν πετόμενον, θ’ ἐξερψάτωσαν τὰ ὕδατα ... πετηγὸν πετόμενον. Early commentators attempt to account for this peculiarity in different ways (Brown 1993, 53 n. 63). Philo explains that both types of creatures are “swimmers”: ἑκάτερα γὰρ νηκτά (*Opif.* 63). Tertullian argues that material objects or beings have material origins of one sort or another:

Whatever was made out of something, has its origin in something made [*Etiam si quid ex aliquo factum est, ex facto habet censum*]: for instance, out of the ground was made the grass, and the fruit, and the cattle, and the form of man himself; so from the waters were produced the animals which swim and fly [*ut ex aquis natatiles et volatiles animae*] (*Herm.* 33; trans. Holmes).

Augustine propounds the idea that the environments that both sea creatures and winged creatures inhabit, and thus from which they would have emerged, are in fact aqueous:

These two kinds of living creatures are described as produced from the waters [*ex aquis productum esse*]. Some water, therefore, is in a liquid and flowing state [*undosum et fluidum est*]; other water is in the rarified form of a vapor distributed in the air [*vaporaliter tenuatum atque suspensum*]. Both forms are classed under the moist element [*utrumque tamen humidae naturae deputatur*], the one being assigned to living creatures that creep [*reptilibus*] on the earth and the other to creatures that fly [*volatilibus*] (*Gen. litt.* 3.3.5; trans. Taylor).

As for G's source text, there is no indication in the textual history that the verb of which עוף is the subject would have been anything other than יעופף, namely the *polet* jussive form of the verbal cognate of the noun עוף. Thus in the Hebrew, the origin of birds is not ascribed to the waters, as is the case with the שרץ נפש חיה; instead the author's focus is on their flying about (BDB, s.v. "עוף I").

ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. Regarding G's choice of this phrase to render על הארץ, see the discussion in verse 11.

κατὰ τὸ στερέωμα. As the description of the designated context for the flight of birds continues, G's choice for the counterpart to the prepositional construction על פני is κατὰ—the only place in Genesis where this particular equivalence is found. A quantitative rendering of the same Hebrew construction is κατὰ πρόσωπον, which occurs four times in the book (16.12; 25.18 [2x]; 32.21[22]). The focus of κατὰ + accusative in the present context, following the rather ambiguous phrase ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, is on specifying further the location of birds in flight. Possible denotations for the Greek preposition in relation to τὸ στερέωμα include "throughout" and "in the region of" (LSJ). If, however, as seems likely, G is interested in describing things from the perspective of an observer looking upward, "against" would likely be the intended sense.

καὶ ἐγένετο οὕτως. G's transition formula has no counterpart in extant Hebrew texts, and so its presence here at the conclusion of the *Wortbericht*, as is usually the case in the *Hexaemeron*, is to be attributed to the harmonizing activity of the translator. See the relevant discussion in verse 6.

### 1.21

ויברא אלהים את התנינים הגדלים ואת כל נפש החיה הרמשת אשר שרצו המים למיניהם ואת כל עוף כנף למינהו וירא אלהים כי טוב  
καὶ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς τὰ κήτη τὰ μεγάλα καὶ πᾶσαν ψυχὴν ζῶων ἐρπετῶν, ἃ ἐξήγαγεν τὰ ὕδατα κατὰ γένη αὐτῶν, καὶ πᾶν πετεινὸν πτερωτὸν κατὰ γένος. καὶ εἶδεν ὁ θεὸς ὅτι καλὰ.

And God made the great sea monsters and every creature among creeping animals, which the waters brought forth according to their kinds, and every winged bird according to kind. And God saw that they were good.

**καὶ ἐποίησεν.** Regarding ποιέω as the translation of ברא, see verse 1.

**τὰ κήτη τὰ μεγάλα καὶ πᾶσαν ψυχὴν ζώων ἐρπετῶν.** In the *Tatbericht* of the fifth day, G follows his source text in dividing ἐρπετὰ ψυχῶν ζωῶν (“creeping things among living creatures”) // שרץ נפש חיה (“swarms of living creatures”) mentioned in the *Wortbericht* in verse 20 into two subgroups (Wevers 1993, 11).

**τὰ κήτη τὰ μεγάλα.** This is the only context in Genesis in which the term κῆτος appears, and it serves as the equivalent for the single occurrence of תנין in the book. Elsewhere in the LXX, κῆτος is associated with לויתן (“Leviathan,” Job 3.8), רהב (“Rahab,” Job 26.12; cf. 9.13), and דג/דגה (“fish,” Ion 2.1 [2x], 2, 11). Wevers remarks that לויתן and רהב are “both mythological creatures,” although in the present context the mention of τὰ κήτη “in itself has no mythological overtones and simply refers to large sea monsters or fish” (Wevers 1993, 11). The reference to התנינים in G’s source text does not appear to have mythological connotations either, though elsewhere תנין is linked with לויתן (Isa 27.1) and רהב (Isa 51.9).

**πᾶσαν ψυχὴν ζώων ἐρπετῶν.** As in the description of the sea creatures in verse 20, G here employs a genitive noun with its attributive modifier (ζώων ἐρπετῶν) to signify the whole, of which the noun it delimits (ψυχὴν) constitutes a part. There is something of a reversal with respect to the categories of whole and part, however, in that, whereas in verse 20 the former consists of ψυχῶν ζωῶν (“living creatures”) and the latter of ἐρπετὰ (“creeping things”), the former now consists of ζώων ἐρπετῶν (“creeping animals”) and the latter of πᾶσαν ψυχὴν (“every creature”). G therefore makes use of the same lexical roots in both verses (ψυχ-, ζω-, ἐρπετ-), though in his source text there would be variation with respect to the counterparts for the third one of these (שרץ [v. 20], רמש [v. 21]; see the discussion of ἐρπετόν in v. 20). The grammar of the source text in verse 21 also differs from that of the Greek translation. G’s combination of singular part (πᾶσαν ψυχὴν) + plural whole (ζώων ἐρπετῶν) is the counterpart to a Hebrew singular construction throughout, consisting of a construct phrase (כל נפש) + adjectival and participial attributive modifiers (הרחיה הרמשות).

**ἃ ἐξήγαγεν τὰ ὕδατα.** The specific antecedent for the neuter relative pronoun ἃ is τὰ κήτη, though undoubtedly the second component of the

direct object of ἐποίησεν—namely, πᾶσαν ψυχὴν ζώων ἐρπετῶν—is in view as well. Regarding the neuter plural subject τὰ ὕδατα with the singular verb ἐξήγαγεν, in contrast to the plurality of both subject and verb in the source text, see verse 20.

**κατὰ γένη αὐτῶν ... κατὰ γένος.** Because two genera of sea creatures are specified in the *Tatbericht*, G employs the plural γένη as the counterpart to the singular גִּי in his source text, the only time this occurs in Genesis. The genitive pronoun αὐτῶν corresponds to the plural pronominal suffix in the source text. All occurrences of גִּי in Genesis include pronominal suffixes. Elsewhere in OG Genesis, however, a suffix follows γένος only when ἐρπετά/ἐρπετόν precedes without an intervening reference to another kind of creature (1.25 [3°]; 6.20 [3°]; 8.19; but not 7.14 [3°]). True to form, in the present verse, γένος without an accompanying pronoun follows the mention of the genus of winged creature.

**πᾶν πετεινὸν πτερωτόν.** G produces an acceptable rendering of בְּכָל עוֹף כְּנָף, the construct phrase of his source text. The attributive adjective πτερωτόν appropriately expresses the function of the *nomen rectum*, כְּנָף.

**καὶ εἶδεν ὁ θεὸς ὅτι καλὰ.** This is the first place in the opening section of Genesis where the divine approbation formula concludes with a plural adjective (καλὰ) rather than a singular one (καλόν). G thereby highlights the plurality of the genera that God makes on the fifth day, a feature that טוֹב in his source text does not explicitly communicate. Regarding the divine approbation formula, see verse 8.

#### 1.22

ויברך אתם אלהים לאמר פרו ורבו ומלאו את המים בימים והעוֹף ירב בארץ

καὶ εὐλόγησεν αὐτὰ ὁ θεὸς λέγων Αὐξάνεσθε καὶ πληθύνεσθε καὶ πληρώσατε τὰ ὕδατα ἐν ταῖς θαλάσσαις, καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ πληθυνέσθω ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.

And God blessed them, saying, “Increase, and multiply, and fill the waters in the seas, and let birds multiply on the earth.”

**καὶ εὐλόγησεν.** G employs εὐλογέω as the equivalent for בָּרַךְ *piel* all fifty-nine times that the latter occurs in Genesis. This translation choice appears to represent an innovation with respect to the incorporation of a new com-

ponent of meaning into the semantic range of εὐλογέω. In pre-LXX and other nontranslation Greek literature, this verb typically denotes “speak well of, praise” (LSJ). In the present context and variously throughout the LXX, the intended sense seems to be that of the above-mentioned Hebrew verb, which, when God is the subject, has to do with bestowing power or benefits upon someone or something (HALOT, s.v. “ברך II”; BDAG, xxii; s.v. “εὐλογέω”; Hiebert 2001, 266–67).

**λέγων.** In the narrative to this point, God’s direct speech has been introduced by the verb εἶπεν. This is the first of seventy-two instances in Genesis that a participial form of λέγω is used to render the Hebrew “uninflected direct speech marker” לֵאמֹר (Wevers 1993, 12), forty-four of which as in this context take the form of the masculine nominative singular present active participle.

**Αὐξάνεσθε.** The semantic ranges of αὐξάνω (“increase”) and its counterpart in the source text, פָּרָה *qal* (“be fruitful”), do not overlap. Nevertheless, for all fifteen occurrences of the verb פָּרָה in Genesis—ten in the *qal* (1.22, 28; 8.17; 9.1, 7; 26.22; 35.11; 47.27; 49.22[2x]) and five in the *hiphil* (17.6, 20; 28.3; 41.52; 48.4)—G’s equivalent is αὐξάνω. One might have expected a Greek equivalent such as καρπόω in the light of the fact that the καρπ- root is used throughout the book for the cognate noun פֶּרִי. G’s strategy in this case, however, seems to have been to interpret the concept of fruitfulness in terms of its practical implications, namely growth in numbers.

**πληθύνεσθε.** G employs πληθύνω in twenty-five of the twenty-six contexts in which the רָבָה I verb occurs in his source text. These terms are semantically equivalent.

**πληρώσατε.** The verb πληρόω is G’s equivalent for מָלָא *qal* in six of the eight contexts in which the latter appears in Genesis, including all three cases of the imperative volitional form which is employed here (1.22, 28; 9.1). These are likewise semantically equivalent terms.

**καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ πληθυνέσθω.** G replicates the word order of his source text in positioning the subject before the verb, which in both Greek and Hebrew involves the same root as the one used earlier in the present verse in the directive to sea creatures to multiply (πληθύνω, רָבָה). The Greek neuter plural subject τὰ πετεινὰ is the counterpart to the Hebrew collective הָעוֹף.



In both cases, the article marks generic usage (hence no article appears in either NETS or the NRSV), and both nouns take singular verbs. The neuter plural noun and singular verb combination in the Greek accords with what is found in verses 20 and 21, where the subject is τὰ ὕδατα and the verb is an aorist indicative singular form of ἐξάγω, though the Hebrew subject and verb in those cases are of course both plural. In the present context, a Greek third-person imperative (πληθυνέσθω) constitutes an acceptable equivalent to the Hebrew jussive (יִרְבֵּ).

ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. G opts for this prepositional phrase nineteen times in Genesis to render the source text construction consisting of the ב preposition + articulated noun אֶרֶץ, typically when no attendant modifiers are involved. It is normally when modifiers are present (e.g., relative clauses, demonstrative pronouns) that the preposition employed is ἐν and its object is in the dative: ἐν τῇ γῇ, ἣ ἂν σοι εἴπω (26.2); ἐν τῇ γῇ ταύτῃ (26.3); ἐν τῇ γῇ ἐκείνῃ (26.12; 35.21[22]). Perhaps the exception that proves the rule is found in the clause Παραοικεῖν ἐν τῇ γῇ ἡκαμεν (47.4), where no such modifier is present. The ἐν + dative object phrase is almost always G's choice of equivalent when the corresponding prepositional phrase with אֶרֶץ is in a construct relationship with a following *nomen rectum* or it includes a pronominal suffix, either with the article (10x) or without one (43x). It is clear, therefore, that G has established certain patterns in rendering these constructions in his source text.

## 1.23

ויהי ערב ויהי בקר יום חמישי

καὶ ἐγένετο ἑσπέρα καὶ ἐγένετο πρωί, ἡμέρα πέμπτη.

And it came to be evening, and it came to be morning, a fifth day.

G replicates his source text as he does with the concluding formula for each of the days of the *Hexaemeron*.

## 1.24

וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים תּוֹצֵא הָאָרֶץ נֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה לְמִינָהּ בַּהֲמָה וּרְמֵשׂ וְחַיִּתּוֹ אֶרֶץ  
לְמִינָהּ וַיְהִי כֵן

Καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεός· Ἐξαγαγέτω ἡ γῇ ψυχὴν ζῶσαν κατὰ γένος, τετράποδα καὶ ἑρπετὰ καὶ θηρία τῆς γῆς κατὰ γένος. καὶ ἐγένετο οὕτως.

And God said, “Let the earth bring forth the living creature according to kind: quadrupeds and creeping things and wild animals of the earth according to kind.” And it became so.

**Ἐξαγαγέτω.** Regarding G’s use of ἐξάγω to render **אצ׳י** *hiphil*, see verse 20.

**ψυχὴν ζῶσαν.** G employs the same equivalents for **נפש חיה** as in verse 20, except that in the present verse singular, rather than plural, forms are counterparts to the collective construction in the source text.

**κατὰ γένος ... κατὰ γένος.** Regarding the translation pattern followed by G in rendering these **מין** constructions, see verse 21.

**τετράποδα ... ἐρπετά ... θηρία.** G employs plural forms for the collective nouns in his source text.

**τετράποδα.** G’s choice of **τετράπους** as the counterpart to **בהמה**, only here and in 34.23, is a striking one, inasmuch as his usual equivalent in Genesis is **κτῆνος** (19x), including the case in the *Tatbericht* in the following verse. With no discernible pattern with respect to the choice of one equivalent or another, it appears as though G is motivated by the desire for stylistic variation when he departs from his default equivalence. Elsewhere in the Pentateuch, the respective ratios of **τετράπους** versus **κτῆνος** as equivalents for **בהמה** are: Exodus: 4–14; Leuitikon: 6–24; Numbers: 1–15; Deuteronomion: 0–14.

**ἐρπετά.** Regarding G’s use of **ἐρπετόν** as the equivalent for both **רמש** and **שרץ**, see verse 20.

**θηρία.** G employs **θηρίον** as an acceptable equivalent for the noun **חיה** in seventeen of its eighteen occurrences in his source text. No attempt is made to reflect the different forms of the *nomen regens* in the present context and the following verse, **חיתו** and **חית** (GKC §90o).

**καὶ ἐγένετο οὕτως.** Regarding the transition formula, see verse 6.

1.25

ויעש אלהים את חית הארץ למינה ואת הבהמה למינה ואת כל רמש  
האדמה למינהו וירא אלהים כי טוב

καὶ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς τὰ θηρία τῆς γῆς κατὰ γένος καὶ τὰ κτήνη κατὰ γένος καὶ πάντα τὰ ἑρπετὰ τῆς γῆς κατὰ γένος αὐτῶν. καὶ εἶδεν ὁ θεὸς ὅτι καλὰ.

And God made the wild animals of the earth according to kind and the cattle according to kind and all the creeping things of the earth according to their kind. And God saw that they were good.

**τὰ θηρία ... τὰ κτήνη ... πάντα τὰ ἑρπετά.** Once again, G employs plural forms to render the collectives in his source text. The sequence of genera differs from that of the list in the preceding *Wortbericht*, though in both verses there are three. As mentioned in the discussion regarding *τετράποδα* in verse 24, in the present context the equivalent for *בהמה* is G's default, *κτῆνος*.

**κατὰ γένος ... κατὰ γένος ... κατὰ γένος αὐτῶν.** Regarding the translation pattern followed by G in rendering these *מִין* constructions, see verse 21.

**καὶ εἶδεν ὁ θεὸς ὅτι καλὰ.** Regarding this version of the divine approbation formula, see verse 21.

#### 1.26

וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים נַעֲשֶׂה אָדָם בְּצַלְמֵנוּ כְּדֹמוֹתֵינוּ וְיִרְדּוּ בִדְגַת הַיָּם וּבְעוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם וּבַבְּהֵמָה וּבְכָל הָאָרֶץ וּבְכָל הָרֶמֶשׂ הָרֹמֵשׂ עַל הָאָרֶץ  
καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεός Ποιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον κατ' εἰκόνα ἡμετέραν καὶ καθ' ὁμοίωσιν, καὶ ἀρχέτωσαν τῶν ἰχθύων τῆς θαλάσσης καὶ τῶν πετεινῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῶν κτηνῶν καὶ πάσης τῆς γῆς καὶ πάντων τῶν ἑρπετῶν τῶν ἐρπόντων ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.

Then God said, "Let us make humankind according to our image and according to likeness, and let them rule the fish of the sea and the birds of the sky and the cattle and all the earth and all the creeping things that creep upon the earth."

**ἄνθρωπον.** G employs *ἄνθρωπος* as the counterpart to *אָדָם* twenty-seven times in Genesis, including the present context, and in all but one of the remaining twenty-six occurrences of the latter (where there is no Greek counterpart), the equivalent is the proper noun *Ἀδάμ*. Here in 1.26, anathrous *ἄνθρωπον*, like *אָדָם*, "denotes generic humanity" (Wevers 1993, 14; LSJ).

**κατ' εἰκόνα ἡμετέραν.** G always employs εἰκών as an equivalent for צֶלֶם in Genesis (1.26, 27; 5.3; 9.6). Furthermore, both here and in the following verse, G's counterpart to בְּצֶלֶם is κατ' εἰκόνα. This translation differs from the more formally equivalent rendering ἐν εἰκόνι in 9.6, specifically in regard to the choice of prepositions. In 5.3, the phrase κατὰ τὴν εἰκόνα αὐτοῦ corresponds to בְּצֶלֶמוֹ and features the prepositional equivalence κατὰ – כִּי that one would expect. This is the only place in the LXX Pentateuch where the possessive adjective ἡμέτερος is found. It thus provides a striking contrast to the fifty-seven occurrences in Genesis alone of the genitive plural personal pronoun ἡμῶν, which is the possessive form that typically modifies a substantive in the LXX.

**καὶ καθ' ὁμολώσιν.** G departs from his source text by supplying the coordinating conjunction καί and not providing an equivalent for the first person plural pronominal suffix. The preposition κατὰ, however, corresponds to כִּי. G's coordination of this phrase with the previous one gives rise to a syntactical, if not a semantic, distinction between them. In the source text, however, the second phrase without the conjunction may be interpreted as explicating the first one. The absence of a possessive form in the OG presumably reflects G's decision not to supply a counterpart to an element of the parent text that may be regarded as redundant (Wevers 1993, 14–15).

**ἀρχέτωσαν.** The verb ἀρχω is G's equivalent for רָדָה both here and in its only other occurrence in Genesis (1.28).

**τῶν ἰχθύων ... τῶν πετεινῶν ... τῶν αἰτηνῶν ... πάσης τῆς γῆς ... πάντων τῶν ἐρπετῶν τῶν ἐρπόντων.** The use of the genitive case for the items that comprise the direct object of ἀρχω conforms to standard Greek usage. G has therefore chosen a normal Greek construction to replace the Hebrew idiom that involves the preposition כִּי as a prefix for the constituent components of the object of the verb רָדָה. As has been noted in several previous contexts, G often renders Hebrew collective nouns as plurals: τῶν ἰχθύων – בְּדָגַת, τῶν πετεινῶν – בְּעוֹף, τῶν αἰτηνῶν – בְּבַהֲמָה, πάντων τῶν ἐρπετῶν τῶν ἐρπόντων – בְּכָל הָרֶמֶשׂ הָרֶמֶשׂ. The other item in this sequence, בְּכָל הָאָרֶץ, is not, of course, a collective, and G shows his awareness of that fact by rendering the phrase πάσης τῆς γῆς.

**ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.** See the discussion regarding this phrase as the rendering for **על הארץ** in verse 11.

## 1.27

ויברא אלהים את האדם בצלמו בצלם אלהים ברא אתו זכר ונקבה  
ברא אתם

καὶ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον, κατ' εἰκόνα θεοῦ ἐποίησεν αὐτόν,  
ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς.

And God made humankind;  
according to divine image he made it;  
male and female he made them.

**ἐποίησεν.** Regarding the **ποιέω** – **ברא** equivalence, see verse 1.

**τὸν ἄνθρωπον.** In contrast to what occurs in verse 26, G has represented generic humanity by means of an arthrous form of **ἄνθρωπος**, undoubtedly in order to distinguish the corresponding differences in his source text: **ἄνθρωπον** – **אדם** in verse 26; **τὸν ἄνθρωπον** – **את האדם** in the present verse (Wevers 1993, 14–15).

**κατ' εἰκόνα θεοῦ.** G apparently decided to simplify things in comparison to what could be regarded as a redundant sequence in his source text—**בצלמו בצלם אלהים**—by representing only the last two words in his translation. See verse 26 regarding the **κατ' εἰκόνα** – **בצלם** equivalence.

**ἄρσεν.** In Genesis, **ἄρσην** is the counterpart to **זכר**, the noun denoting male, nine times, while the cognate adjective **ἄρσενικός** (functioning as a substantive) is the equivalent in the other five contexts in which this Hebrew noun occurs. G's translation choices in these contexts thus reflect his source text.

**θῆλυ.** G employs this Greek term for all six occurrences of **נקבה** in his Genesis source text.

## 1.28

ויברך אתם אלהים ויאמר להם אלהים פרו ורבו ומלאו את הארץ  
וכבשה ורדו בדגת הים ובעוף השמים ובכל חיה הרמשת על הארץ  
καὶ εὐλόγησεν αὐτούς ὁ θεὸς λέγων Αὐξάνεσθε καὶ πληθύνεσθε καὶ  
πληρώσατε τὴν γῆν καὶ κατακυριεύσατε αὐτῆς καὶ ἄρχετε τῶν  
ἰχθύων τῆς θαλάσσης καὶ τῶν πετεινῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ πάντων τῶν

κτηνῶν καὶ πάσης τῆς γῆς καὶ πάντων τῶν ἑρπετῶν τῶν ἑρπόντων ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.

And God blessed them, saying, “Increase, and multiply, and fill the earth, and subdue it, and rule the fish of the sea and the birds of the sky and all the cattle and all the earth and all the creeping things that creep upon the earth.”

**εὐλόγησεν.** Regarding the εὐλογέω – בָּרַךְ *piel* equivalence, see verse 22.

**λέγων.** Regarding the occurrence of λέγων in Genesis, see verse 22. In the present case, however, the counterpart in the MT to this participial form is not the uninflected direct speech marker לֵאמֹר that appears in verse 22 and is the usual equivalent, but the clause וַיֹּאמֶר לָהֶם אֱלֹהִים. It will be noted that the present verse and verse 22 begin the same way in both the OG and the MT: καὶ εὐλόγησεν αὐτοὺς (αὐτὰ [v. 22]) ὁ θεός – וַיְבָרֶךְ אֱתֵם אֱלֹהִים. But then, as indicated, whereas the speech introduction formula that follows is the same in both verses in the OG, namely, λέγων, in the MT it differs. Hendel argues that the appearance of λέγων in the present verse is likely due to harmonizing activity that has occurred in the *Vorlage* of LXX Genesis, which he calls proto-G (Hendel 1998, 30). Wevers maintains that this is a case of harmonization by G (Wevers 1993, 16). In the absence of Hebrew evidence to support Hendel’s contention, I am inclined to agree with Wevers.

**Αὐξάνεσθε ... πληθύνεσθε ... πληρώσατε.** Regarding the αὐξάνω – פָּרָה, πληθύνω – רָבָה I, and πληρώ – מָלָא equivalences, see verse 22.

**κατακυριεύσατε αὐτῆς.** Greek κατακυριεύω is semantically equivalent to Hebrew כָּבַשׁ. Like its simplex cognate, κυριεύω, it takes a genitive direct object. The only other appearance of κατακυριεύω in Genesis occurs in a context where the MT has no counterpart (9.1).

**ἄρχετε.** Regarding the ἄρχω – הָרָה equivalence, see verse 26.

**τῶν ἰχθύων ... τῶν πετεινῶν ... πάντων τῶν κτηνῶν ... πάσης τῆς γῆς ... πάντων τῶν ἑρπετῶν τῶν ἑρπόντων.** Regarding the use of the genitive case for the direct object of ἄρχω, the use of this construction as a replacement for the Hebrew idiom בָּרַדָּה, and the rendering of Hebrew collec-

tive nouns as plurals (τῶν ἰχθύων – בדגת, τῶν πετεινῶν – בעוף) see verse 26.

**καὶ πάντων τῶν κτηνῶν καὶ πάσης τῆς γῆς.** This section of the OG text has no counterpart in the MT. Except for πάντων, however, it mirrors the wording of verse 26—where the source text reads **וּבְבֵהֶמָּה וּבְכָל הָאָרֶץ**—following τῶν ἰχθύων τῆς θαλάσσης καὶ τῶν πετεινῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. Once again in the present verse, Hendel posits harmonizing activity in proto-G (Hendel 1998, 30–31), while Wevers assumes it is the work of the LXX translator (Wevers 1993, 16). The absence of other textual evidence would appear to tip the scales in favor of G.

**καὶ πάντων τῶν ἐρπετῶν τῶν ἐρπόντων.** G has employed plural forms to render singulars in his source text. Furthermore, this is the only place in Genesis where ἐρπετόν is the counterpart to the noun **חַיָּה**, in comparison to seventeen other contexts where the equivalent is **θηρίον**. This anomaly is once again undoubtedly due to harmonization with verse 26 by G.

### 1.29

**וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים הִנֵּה נָתַתִּי לָכֶם אֶת כָּל עֵשֶׂב זֶרַע זֶרַע אֲשֶׁר עַל פְּנֵי כָל הָאָרֶץ וְאֵת כָּל הָעֵץ אֲשֶׁר בּו פְּרִי עֵץ זֶרַע זֶרַע לָכֶם יִהְיֶה לְאִכְלָה**  
**καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεός Ἰδοὺ δέδωκα ὑμῖν πᾶν χόρτον σπόριμον σπεῖρον σπέρμα, ὃ ἐστὶν ἐπάνω πάσης τῆς γῆς· καὶ πᾶν ξύλον, ὃ ἔχει ἐν ἑαυτῷ καρπὸν σπέρματος σπορίμου—ὕμῖν ἔσται εἰς βρῶσιν—**

And God said, “See, I have given to you any herbage, sowable, seeding seed, which is over all the earth, and any tree that has in itself fruit of sowable seed—to you it shall be for food—

**δέδωκα.** In OG Genesis, there are ninety-nine perfect indicative verbs, compared to some 891 Hebrew perfects (excluding *weqatal* forms) in the MT of the book. The default tense employed by G to render Hebrew perfects is the aorist, a verb form that occurs 2,585 times in Genesis. In the first ten chapters of the book, for example, the Greek equivalents for 110 of the 133 Hebrew perfects are aorist indicative verbs. The lone Greek perfect indicative in chapter 1 is δέδωκα in the present verse, the counterpart to the perfect verb **נָתַתִּי** in the source text. In the same chapter, there are nine Hebrew perfects, seven of which are translated by aorist indicatives, and the other one besides **נָתַתִּי** is **הִתְּה** in verse 2, which is rendered by

the imperfect indicative of εἰμί (ἦν), for which, of course, there is no aorist verb form. It is clear, therefore, that δέδωκα here constitutes a deliberate departure from the default for G, a move that has semantic implications in terms of signifying the perfective aspect of the verb.

ὕμῖν ... ὕμῖν. G appropriately employs the pronoun in the dative case for the prepositional phrase כִּלְכֵּל in the source text.

πᾶν χόρτον. Thackeray (§12, 4) points out that the neuter pronominal adjective πᾶν in combination with the masculine noun χόρτον in the present context is the first of a number of such constructions in the LXX (e.g., πᾶν οἰκέτην [Ex 12.44]; πᾶν λόγον [Routh 4.7; 1 Suppl 27.1(2x); 2 Suppl 19.11]; πᾶν ἄνδρα [1 Rgns 11.8; PsSal 3.8]; πᾶν πόνον [3 Rgns 8.37; 2 Suppl 6.28]; πᾶν βουνόν [3 Rgns 15.22; Ier 2.20; Iezek 20.28; 34.6]; πᾶν υἷόν [3 Rgns 21.15]; πᾶν τεκτόνα [4 Rgns 24.14]; πᾶν οἶκον [4 Rgns 25.9; Iezek 36.10; Idt 4.15; Ier 13.11]; πᾶν δὲ ὑβριστήν [Iob 40.11]; πᾶν λίθον [Iezek 28.13]; πᾶν φόβον [Iezek 38.21]). Outside the LXX corpus, other examples may be found: πᾶν ἄρτον (T. Reu. 1.10); πᾶν λόγον (P.Mil. 1.2 27, Milan, Università Cattolica P.Med. 1 Ro [b–c], 158 BCE [http://tinyurl.com/SBL0466e]; UPZ 1.99, Leiden, National Museum of Antiquities 410, 158 BCE [http://tinyurl.com/SBL0466f]; O.Petr. 334, London, UC Inv. Nr. 62038, third century CE [http://tinyurl.com/SBL0466g]); παν τὸν τόπον (UPZ 1.5, Paris, Louvre N 2359, 163 BCE [http://www.trismegistos.org/text/5967]). Thackeray suggests the possibility that πᾶν χόρτον in Gen 1.29 could be “a *syntactical* colloquialism rather than a vulgarism of *accidence*” (Thackeray §12, 4; italics original). Wevers understands this construction to be the result of G’s construal of the masculine accusative noun χόρτον as a neuter (Wevers 1993, 17). It seems more likely, however, that this is a case of a neuter adjectival form πᾶν being used for a generalizing purpose (see the discussion regarding βοτάνην and σπεῖρον in v. 11). This has semantic and therefore interpretative implications with regard to G’s choice of equivalent for כֵּל. Given the generalizing sense of the neuter form, it seems best to translate πᾶν as *any* (LSJ, s.v. “πᾶς” D.III.2).

Greek χόρτος is the equivalent for Hebrew שֶׁבַע all seven times that it occurs in Genesis. It has been noted in the discussion regarding this equivalence in verse 11 that both terms can denote food for animals or humans that is derived from plants (as is the case both here and in the next verse).



**σπόριμον σπείρον σπέρμα.** The words σπόριμον σπείρον are a doublet translation of the participle זרע. Although the adjective σπόριμον (which in Genesis occurs only in this verse) could be read here as a masculine singular attributive modifier of χόρτον, it seems more likely that it is parallel to σπείρον and therefore neuter. These apposite adjectival forms, in turn, modify the gender-incongruent pair πᾶν χόρτον, while σπέρμα, of course, is the direct object of the participle σπείρον. One may observe that G not only produces the Hebraism σπείρον σπέρμα to represent the cognate phrase זרע זרע (cf. σπείρον σπέρμα – מזריע זרע in vv. 11 and 12), but also, without warrant from his source text, heightens the tautology by introducing the additional Greek cognate form σπόριμον to create the doublet rendering. This addition does, however, have the effect of forging a connection with the phrase καρπὸν σπέρματος σπορίμου as the interpretative translation of זרע זרע פרי עץ later in this verse.

**ὃ ἐστὶν ἐπάνω πάσης τῆς γῆς.** In the OG, a copulative verb follows the relative pronoun, though in the source text, of course, the pronoun אשר without any accompanying verbal form constitutes normal Hebrew idiom. The Greek clause is likely to be understood as a nonrestrictive relative, introduced in English by *which* and serving to provide incidental information about the antecedent—in this case πᾶν χόρτον rather than σπέρμα—rather than a restrictive one, introduced in English by *that* and serving to define or articulate the identity of the antecedent. Of the twelve occurrences of the phrase על פני כל הארץ in the MT, only here in the OG is it rendered as ἐπάνω πάσης τῆς γῆς. The other place in the OG where there is not an explicit equivalent for פני in the above-mentioned Hebrew phrase is Gen 7.3: ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν. Elsewhere πρόσωπον is utilized as the equivalent for פני: ἐπὶ παντὶ προσώπῳ πάσης τῆς γῆς (Gen 8.9); ἐπὶ προσώπου πάσης τῆς γῆς (Gen 11.4); ἐπὶ πρόσωπον πάσης τῆς γῆς (Gen 11.8, 9; Deut 11.25; 1 Rgns 30.16; 2 Rgns 18.8; Zach 5.3; Dan 8.5 θ'); ἐπὶ προσώπου τῆς γῆς (Dan 8.5 OG). The same is true in contexts where the middle elements of the Hebrew phrase are reversed (at least in the MT if not in the relevant source texts): על כל פני ארץ – ἐπὶ πρόσωπον τῆς γῆς (Gen 19.28); על כל פני הארץ – ἐπὶ προσώπου πάσης τῆς γῆς (Gen 41.56; Iezek 34.6). Phrases in Genesis other than the one under consideration here in 1.29 where ἐπάνω is the counterpart to על פני include ἐπάνω τῆς ἀβύσσου for על פני תהום in 1.2 and ἐπάνω τοῦ ὕδατος for על פני המים in 1.2 and 7.18. In these cases, it seems that the focus in the OG is less on the topmost parts of the entities mentioned (abyss, water, ground), as על פני might suggest, than on their

surfaces in general. Thus with respect to the herbage described here in verse 29, it would appear that ἐπάνω πάσης τῆς γῆς refers not specifically to the soil in which it grows but more generally to the earth's surface that it covers.

**πᾶν ξύλον.** This phrase parallels πᾶν χόρτον, which occurs earlier in the same verse, though in the present context but unlike the previous one, there is gender congruence inasmuch as both adjective and noun are neuter. The parallel nature of these phrases in the OG is evident as well by virtue of the fact that the respective nouns in both cases are anarthrous whereas in the source text the earlier one is anarthrous (את כל עשב) while the later one is not (את כל העץ). It seems likely that the generalizing sense of πᾶν denoting *any* obtains in the present case as well.

**ὃ ἔχει ἐν ἑαυτῷ.** G employs a different copula verb than the one used in the relative clause earlier in this verse, and in combination with the prepositional phrase that includes the reflexive pronoun it constitutes a sensible rendering of אשר בו in the source text.

**καρπὸν σπέρματος σπορίμου.** G's translation offers an intelligible interpretation of the source text (פרי עץ זרע זרע, literally "fruit of a tree seed-ing seed"), which exhibits a redundancy in the form of the repetition of the noun עץ in the relative clause of which the present phrase is a part, despite that noun's earlier appearance in the antecedent phrase ואת כל העץ. In both the OG and the source text, however, the focus is on the fruit that contains the seed that is to be disseminated. Accordingly, σπέρματος σπορίμου is to be understood as a genitive of material or contents (Smyth §1323).

**ἔσται.** This verb, like the corresponding Hebrew verb in the source text, is singular. Presumably the antecedent to the "dummy subject" signified by "it" in NETS is the herbage and fruit tree combination construed as a single entity.

**βρώσιν.** The word βρώσις is G's choice to render אכלה here as well as in two additional contexts in Genesis (1.30; 9.3). In the only other occurrence of אכלה in the book (6.21), G opts for the aorist infinitive of ἐσθίω in an interpretative translation of the clause ולהם לאכלה – והיה לך ויהי – καὶ ἔσται σοὶ καὶ ἐκείνοις φαγεῖν. The βρώσις – אכלה equivalence may be contrasted

with G's employment of the plural of βρῶμα as the counterpart to the noun **אכל** in fifteen of its sixteen occurrences, the one exception being βρῶσις in 47.24.

## 1.30

ולכל חית הארץ ולכל עוף השמים ולכל רומש על הארץ אשר בו נפש  
חיה את כל ירק עשב לאכלה ויהי כן

καὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς θηρίοις τῆς γῆς καὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς πετεινοῖς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ  
καὶ παντὶ ἑρπετῷ ἑρποντι ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ὃ ἔχει ἐν ἑαυτῷ ψυχὴν ζωῆς,  
καὶ πάντα χόρτον ἁλωρὸν εἰς βρῶσιν. καὶ ἐγένετο οὕτως.

and to all the wild animals of the earth and to all the birds of the sky and to every creeping thing that creeps on the earth that has in itself the animating force of life, and all green herbage for food.”

And it became so.

**πᾶσιν τοῖς θηρίοις ... πᾶσιν τοῖς πετεινοῖς.** Following his source text, G continues to detail the components of the indirect object of δέδωκα in verse 29—namely, all the living creatures for which the herbage and trees provide food—and he again employs the dative case to represent prepositional phrases with **ל**. G's equivalents for the collective nouns **חיה** and **עוף** in the construct state are arthrous plurals. Combined with the plural of **πᾶς**, this communicates that all members of each named species are included. The combination of **כל** with a collective suggests the distributive idea of *each, every* (GKC §127b; cf. NRSV).

**παντὶ ἑρπετῷ ἑρποντι.** In this case, G renders the singular phrase **לכל רומש** in the singular, which represents a departure from the translator's approach in earlier contexts where this type of creature is mentioned: all other references are to **ἑρπετά** in the plural (vv. 20, 21, 24, 25, 26, 28). Preceded by the adjective **πᾶς** in the singular, this then constitutes a shift from the type of expression that is inclusive of all members of a species to one that communicates the distributive sense in terms of every member of a species. The phrase **ἑρπετῷ ἑρποντι** is G's counterpart to the participle **רומש** in the source text. The choice of noun plus attributive participle is presumably due to harmonization by G with respect to that previously-occurring combination: **πάντων τῶν ἑρπετῶν τῶν ἐρπόντων** – **בכל הרמש** (v. 26); **πάντων τῶν ἑρπετῶν τῶν ἐρπόντων** – **בכל חיה הרמשת** (v. 28).

ὃ ἔχει ἐν ἑαυτῷ. Regarding this clause as the rendering for **בו שר**, see verse 29.

ψυχὴν ζῶσιν. Although in the present context, as in verse 24, the source text reads **הַיָּחַיִּים**, G has correctly distinguished one meaning of that phrase from the other. Here G employs the genitive noun ζῶσιν (“life”) to specify what it is that constitutes the animating force (ψυχὴν) of a living creature. In verse 24, the attributive participle ζῶσαν (“living”) serves to characterize the essence of the creature (ψυχὴν) itself.

καὶ πάντα χόρτον γλωρὸν. This phrase, like that of its counterpart in the source text, constitutes the third and final component of the direct object of the main verb (δέδωκα – **יָתַן**) in the divine declaration that begins in verse 29. In Wevers’s edition (We<sup>ed</sup>) cited here, it begins with καί, which is presented as uncontested in the textual history of the LXX, though not adopted in the editions of Johann Grabe and Alfred Rahlfs, who relegate this καί to the status of a variant to the OG. In the Brooke-McLean edition of the so-called Cambridge LXX, the Christian apologist Theophilus of Antioch is cited as the lone witness to a text without καί (*Autol.* 2.11.63). As for the translations of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, they too lack καί. This agrees with the textual tradition of the majority of Hebrew manuscripts in which the corresponding phrase does not begin with the **ו** conjunction. Fifteen Hebrew manuscripts do, however, attest the conjunction (*BHK*), something that Wevers surprisingly fails to mention, given the fact that this evidence could be marshalled in support of his conclusion regarding the originality of καί. Admittedly, the presence of this καί further complicates the already complex syntax of the sentence that spans verses 29–30, and its absence would mitigate the situation somewhat. Without καί, the text would exhibit a more symmetrical structure in which sowable herbage and fruit trees are allocated for food to humans and “green herbage” to the animals. If one were to accept the text cited by Theophilus and adopted by Grabe and Rahlfs as OG, the argument for the secondary introduction of καί would presumably run along the following lines: Very early in the textual history of the LXX, a copyist, confused by the anacoluthon that concludes verse 29 (ὅμιν ἐστὶν εἰς βρώσιν), inserted καί before the clause πάντα χόρτον γλωρὸν εἰς βρώσιν, thus isolating it from what precedes. All subsequent Greek copyists replicated the longer reading, and any Greek manuscripts that would have attested the shorter one

ultimately disappeared. As for the presence of ו in the fifteen above-mentioned Hebrew manuscripts, they would presumably attest to a parallel phenomenon that occurred in the Hebrew textual history, but independently of what happened in the Greek textual tradition.

The preceding scenario, however, is problematic. In the first place, the evidence of virtually the entire textual tradition of the LXX and of a substantial number of Hebrew manuscripts raises the very real possibility that G's source text was different than that of the majority of extant Hebrew manuscripts. Secondly, the presence of καί constitutes the *lectio difficilior*, which it seems easier to account for as the original reading (*pace* Grabe and Rahlfs) than as a complicating addition to an originally symmetrical and more easily understood text. Although καί does muddle the syntax somewhat, the result is not unintelligible. Translators of, and commentators on, this longer text have commonly understood καί to be adverbial, glossing it in various ways: "even" (Brenton 1844; Wevers 1993, 18; Brown 1993, 26), "also" (Thomson 1808), "aussi" (*BdA*), "auch" (LXX.D). Brayford (2007), however, translates this καί conjunctively as "and." Indeed, the fact that καί is G's default rendering for the ו conjunction makes it highly likely that this καί is conjunctive rather than adverbial. In Brayford's translation of the *Wortbericht* in verses 29–30, which includes the phrase being discussed here, one gets the impression that the same kinds of food are allotted to both humans and animals.

Look, I have given you every sowable herbage reproducing seed, which is over all the earth; and every tree, which has in itself fruit of sowable seed; to you it will be for food, and for all the wild animals of the earth and all the birds of the heaven and every reptile that crawls on the earth, which has in itself animate being; and every green herbage for food. (Brayford 2007, 35).

Harl maintains that the phrase with καί, which she however renders adverbially ("aussi"), results in a declaration that humans and animals are accorded the same kinds of food (Harl 1994, 97). In Brayford's commentary on this passage, she asserts, contrary to what appears to be implied in her translation, that different types of food are designated for humans and animals.

Best characterized as a vegetarian diet, what the human is to eat includes herbage and fruit from trees.... God provides a similar, but not identical,

diet for the other animate beings; they are to have *χόρτον χλωρόν*, literally “herbage of green” [*sic*] for food, presumably referring to grass (Brayford 2007, 224).

This interpretation of the text may best be assigned to its reception history, whereas her translation of the dangling clause introduced by a conjunctive *καί* comes nearer the mark of representing the meaning of the text as produced. That is to say, the dangling clause, understood the way it is translated in NETS, signifies that the animal genera mentioned in verse 30 are allocated, not an alternative, but an additional food source (green herbage) besides the types mentioned in verse 29 that they are to share with humans (sowable herbage, fruit trees). The fact that this appears to be an odd combination should not tempt the interpreter to allow the meaning of the text-as-produced to be overtaken by the meaning of the text-as-received.

In contrast to the gender-incongruent collocation *πάν χορτον* in verse 29, here the pronominal adjective *πάντα* that precedes the masculine singular accusative noun *χόρτον* agrees with it in gender. This means that the idea of the whole (“all”) is intended rather than the generalizing (“any”) or distributive (“every”) senses of the term. The noun plus attributive adjective sequence *χόρτον χλωρόν* represents a transposition of terms in the source text *ירק עשב*.

*βρώσιν*. Regarding the *βρώσις* – *אכלה* equivalence, see verse 29.

*καὶ ἐγένετο οὕτως*. Regarding the transition formula, see verse 6.

### 1.31

וירא אלהים את כל אשר עשה והנה טוב מאד ויהי ערב ויהי בקר  
יום הששי

καὶ εἶδεν ὁ θεὸς τὰ πάντα, ὅσα ἐποίησεν, καὶ ἰδοὺ καλὰ λίαν. καὶ ἐγένετο ἑσπέρα καὶ ἐγένετο πρωί, ἡμέρα ἕκτη.

And God saw all the things that he had made, and see, they were exceedingly good. And it came to be evening, and it came to be morning, a sixth day.

*τὰ πάντα, ὅσα*. G employs plural forms to render the elements *את כל אשר* of the object clause in his source text. This highlights the fact that creation

is comprised of many parts rather than the fact implied in the source text that all these parts taken together comprise an integrated whole.

**καλὰ λίαν.** The plural adjective *καλὰ* is congruent in number with the antecedent construction *τὰ πάντα, ὅσα*, but not with its singular counterpart *בּוֹט* in the source text. As for the adverb *λίαν*, here, as in its only other occurrence in the Pentateuch (4.5), it is the equivalent for *דַּמּ* in the source text. This represents a departure from G's default, however, since thirty-one other times in Genesis alone the Greek equivalent is *σφόδρα*, and once it is *σφοδρώς*.

**καὶ ἐγένετο ἑσπέρα καὶ ἐγένετο πρωί, ἡμέρα ἕκτη.** G replicates his source text as he does with the concluding formula for each of the days of the *Hexaemeron*.

## 2.1

ויכלו השמים והארץ וכל צבאם

Καὶ συνετελέσθησαν ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ καὶ πᾶς ὁ κόσμος αὐτῶν.

And the sky and the earth were finished, and all their arrangement.

**συνετελέσθησαν.** The aorist passive indicative of *συντελέω* is an appropriate equivalent for the *pual* perfect of *כלל*, a verb form whose counterpart in its only other occurrence in the LXX is, however, the aorist active indicative of *ἐκλείπω* (Ps 71[72].20).

**ὁ κόσμος αὐτῶν.** G fashions an interpretative translation of *צבא* in his source text, a term that often has to do with military forces and service, less frequently with service in the cult or compulsory labor of some sort, but also with heavenly bodies—especially the stars—and the divine entourage (*HALOT*). Understandably G does not opt here to employ the equivalent that he uses in the other three contexts where *צבא* appears in Genesis, where mention is made in each instance of Phichol who is the commander-in-chief of Abimelech's *δύναμις* ("army"; 21.22, 32; 26.26). In the present case, the choice of *κόσμος*—signifying "order" rather than "ornament," "adornment," or "universe" (LSJ, BDAG)—reflects the translator's focus on the creator's arrangement of the various components of his creation. "La belle ordonnance du monde" is a recurring theme in pagan Hellenistic literature as well as in Jewish and Christian texts (Harl 1994, 98; LSJ).

## 2.2

ויכל אלהים ביום השביעי מלאכתו אשר עשה וישבת ביום השביעי  
מכל מלאכתו אשר עשה

καὶ συνετέλεσεν ὁ θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἕκτῃ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ, ἃ ἐποίησεν,  
καὶ κατέπαυσεν ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἐβδόμῃ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ  
ὧν ἐποίησεν.

And on the sixth day God finished his works that he had made,  
and he left off on the seventh day from all his works that he had  
made.

**συνετέλεσεν.** G employs *συντελέω* to render the *piel* of כָּלָה—an acceptable semantic equivalence both here and in the other five contexts in which this Hebrew verb form occurs in Genesis (6.16; 17.22; 24.15, 45; 43.2).

**τῇ ἕκτῃ ... τῇ ἐβδόμῃ.** In the OG, as in SamPent and Pesh, the potential tension of the source text, which indicates that creator's work was finished on both the sixth day (v. 1) and the seventh day (v. 2), is resolved. In verse 2, G and these other versions intentionally diverge from the source text and take pains to make it clear that the sixth day is the last one on which God is active in creation, and that the seventh day is marked by the absence of such activity.

**τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ ... τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ.** In this verse, as in the next one and 39.11, G renders מְלָאכְתּוֹ—namely, the singular noun plus a third masculine singular pronominal suffix—with an arthrous plural form of ἔργον plus the possessive pronoun.

**κατέπαυσεν.** Here, as well as in the other two contexts in Genesis where his source text had שָׁבַת, G's equivalent is *καταπαύω* (2.3; 8.22). The essential meaning of *καταπαύω* in its intransitive sense, as it is of שָׁבַת in the *qal* stem, is to “cease” or “leave off” doing something.

## 2.3

ויברך אלהים את יום השביעי ויקדש אתו כי בו שבת מכל מלאכתו  
אשר ברא אלהים לעשות

καὶ εὐλόγησεν ὁ θεὸς τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ἐβδόμην καὶ ἡγίασεν αὐτήν, ὅτι  
ἐν αὐτῇ κατέπαυσεν ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ, ὧν ἤρξατο ὁ θεὸς  
ποιῆσαι.



And God blessed the seventh day and hallowed it, because on it he left off from all his works that God had begun to make.

**εὐλόγησεν.** Regarding the εὐλογέω – בָּרַךְ *piel* equivalence, see 1.22.

**καὶ ἡγάσεν.** This is the only place where the semantically equivalent verbs ἀγιάζω and שָׁדַךְ *piel* appear in Genesis.

**ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ.** G employs plural forms to render the singular substantival components of the prepositional phrase מִכָּל מְלָאכְתּוֹ (see 2.2).

**ὣν ἤρξατο ὁ θεὸς ποιῆσαι.** G seems intentionally to have departed from his source text in fashioning the end component of an *inclusio* that is inaugurated with the words ἐν ἀρχῇ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός in 1.1. While ποιέω is far and away his preferred equivalent for עָשָׂה (with 136 equivalences out of a total of 153 occurrences of עָשָׂה in Genesis), this is the only context among eleven occurrences of the verb בָּרָא that the counterpart is ἄρχω.

### Summary

An *inclusio* demarcates the limits of this segment of OG Genesis. Subsections are defined, as in the source text, by the days of the creation week, and structured according to a pattern of *Wortbericht*, transition formula, *Tatbericht*, and formula of divine approbation. Where the source text diverges from that pattern, G resorts to harmonization.



## “Drawn from the Water”: A Commentary on the Old Greek Text of Exodus 2.1–10

Larry Perkins

### Literature

**Aejmelaeus**, Anneli. 1982a. *Parataxis in the Septuagint: A Study of the Renderings of the Hebrew Coordinate Clauses in the Greek Pentateuch*. AASF 31. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedekatemia. ♦ **Aejmelaeus**. 1982b. “*Participium coniunctum* as a Criterion of Translation Technique.” VT 32:385–93. ♦ **Aejmelaeus**. 1993. *On the Trail of Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays*. Kampen: Kok Pharos. ♦ **Boulluec**, Alain Le, and P. **Sandevoir**. 1989. *La Bible d’Alexandrie 2: L’Exode*. Paris: Cerf. ♦ **Chamberlain**, Gary A. 2011. *The Greek of the Septuagint: A Supplemental Lexicon*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson. ♦ **Dozeman**, Thomas B. 2009. *Exodus*. ECC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans. ♦ **Evans**, Trevor V. 2001. *Verbal Syntax in the Greek Pentateuch: Natural Greek Usage and Hebrew Interference*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. ♦ **Harl**, Marguerite. 1986. *La Bible d’Alexandrie 1: La Genèse*. Paris: Cerf. ♦ **Houtman**, C. 1993. *Exodus: Volume 1*. HCOT. Kampen: Kok. ♦ **Johannessohn**, M. 1928. *Der Gebrauch der Präpositionen in der Septuaginta*. MSU 4.1. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung. ♦ **Lee**, John A. L. 1983. *A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch*. SCS 14. Chico, CA: Scholars Press. ♦ **Louw**, Theo A. W. van der. 2007. *Transformations in the Septuagint: Towards an Interaction of Septuagint Studies and Translation Studies*. CBET 47. Leuven: Peeters. ♦ **Soisalon-Soininen**, Ilmari. 1965. *Die Infinitive in der Septuaginta*. AASF B 132. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedekatemia. ♦ **Soisalon-Soininen**. 1987. “Der Gebrauch des Genetivus Absolutus in der Septuaginta.” Pages 175–80 in *Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen: Studien zur Septuaginta-Syntax. Zu seinem 70. Geburtstag am 4. Juni 1987*. Edited by Anneli Aejmelaeus

and Raija Sollamo. AASF B 237. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia. ♦ **Tenhunen**, K. 2008. "The Renderings of the Hebrew Preposition ל in Predicate Expressions Denoting Transition and Becoming Something in LXX Genesis and Exodus." Pages 1–16 in *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo*. Edited by Anssi Voitila and Jutta Jokiranta. JSJSup 126. Leiden: Brill. ♦ **Thackeray**, H. St. John. 1907. "The Greek Translators of the Four Books of Kings." *JTS* 8:262–78. ♦ **Tov**, Emanuel. 1999. "Compound Words in the Septuagint Representing Two or More Hebrew Words." Pages 129–52 in *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint*. VTSup 72. Leiden: Brill. ♦ **Walser**, G. 2001. *The Greek of the Ancient Synagogue: An Investigation on the Greek of the Septuagint, Pseudepigrapha and the New Testament*. Studia Graeca et Latina Lundensia 8. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell. ♦ **Walters**, Peter. 1973. *The Text of the Septuagint: Its Corruptions and Their Emendations*. Edited by D. W. Gooding. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. ♦ **Wevers**, John W. 1990. *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus*. SCS 30. Atlanta: Scholars Press. ♦ **Wevers**. 1992. *Text History of the Greek Exodus*. MSU 21. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

## Outline

With various departures from and adaptations of his source text, G relates Moyses's birth, his three-month concealment, his rescue from exposure in the Nile marsh, and his adoption by Pharaoh's daughter, even as he is nursed by his own mother.

## Commentary

### 2.1

וילך איש מבית לוי ויקח את בת לוי

ἦν δέ τις ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς Λευί, ὃς ἔλαβεν τῶν θυγατέρων Λευὶ καὶ ἔσχεν αὐτήν.

Now there was a certain man from the tribe of Leui who took one of the daughters of Leui and married her.

ἦν δέ τις ... ὃς. G emphasizes a break with the preceding discourse segment by using δέ, a nominal clause, and the indefinite pronoun τις for איש to mark the beginning of the story of Moyses. The indefinite τις in turn is defined by the following prepositional phrase and relative clause. The

phrase ἦν δέ τις marks a shift in discourse and sometimes the introduction of a new episode or a new character in Greek literature. Examples occur in Homer, *Il.* 5.9, ἦν δέ τις ἐν Τρώεσσι Δάρης ἀφνειὸς ἀμύμων (“Now there was amid the Trojans one Dares, a rich man and blameless” [LCL]); Xenophon, *Hell.* 4.1.29, ἦν δέ τις Ἀπολλοφανὴς Κυζικηνός, ὃς καὶ Φαρναβάζῳ ἐτύγχανεν ἐκ παλαιοῦ ξένος (“Now there was a certain Apollophanes of Cyzicus who chanced to be an old friend of Pharnabazus” [LCL]); and Plutarch, *Cor.* 22.1.1 ἦν δέ τις ἀνὴρ ἐξ Ἀντίου πόλεως διὰ τε πλοῦτον καὶ ἀνδρείαν καὶ γένους ἐπιφάνειαν ἀξίωμα βασιλικόν (“Now there was a certain man from the city of Antium both because of wealth and bravery and conspicuous lineage had the standing of a king” [LCL]).

This Greek idiom replaces וַיִּלֶךְ אִשִּׁי and creates a nominal sentence, with the subject modified by a relative clause, whereas the Hebrew has two standard *waw*-consecutive imperfect clauses. G used various strategies of subordination to represent Hebrew parataxis in this section: including the adverbial participle (ἰδοῦσα ... ἀποστείλασα ... ἀνείλατο [v. 5], ἀνοίξασα δὲ ὀρύξ [v. 6], ἐλθοῦσα δὲ ... ἐκάλεσεν [v. 8b]), an adverbial temporal ἐπεὶ clause [v. 3]), and a genitive absolute (ἀδρυθέντος δὲ τοῦ παιδίου εἰσήγαγεν [v. 10]). The translator’s use of such diverse subordination indicates his tendency to pay attention to the target language requirements.

Other cases in Exodus where G renders Hebrew finite verbs other than היה with forms of εἶναι occur at 13.7, οὐκ ἔσται σοι ζύμη = וְלֹא יִרְאֶה לְךָ בַשֶּׁמֶן; 22.15, ἔσται αὐτῷ ἀντὶ τοῦ μισθοῦ αὐτοῦ = וְכִשְׁכַּר בְּאֵזְבֶּכֶת; 34.9, καὶ ἐσόμεθα σοί = וְנִהְיֶה לְךָ. However, none of these are similar to this case in 2.1.

**δέ.** G employs this particle frequently (vv. 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8 [2x], 9 [3x], 10) to render various uses of ו. Its ubiquity in Exodus reflects normal Greek usage and is one of the indicators that G seeks to accommodate the target language. It often signals change of subject, but not in every case (e.g., vv. 3, 6, 10a).

**τις ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς Λευί.** G provides an *ad sensum* rendering for בֵּית לֵוִי. The use of φυλὴ Λευί as the equivalent, while unique in Exodus, is certainly understandable, given that Λευί is one of the twelve tribes. The household of Levi, introduced in Exod 1.1–2 and defined more specifically in 6.19–27, over the intervening centuries has grown significantly, as had all the households connected with Jacob’s offspring. Therefore φυλὴ is a more sensible reflection of this reality within the story, but anticipates later definitions of the Israelite organization.

**Λευί.** The personal name לוֹי is one of two in Exodus that possess a consonantal *waw*. The other is the gentilic כּוּי. In both cases the consonantal *waw* is transliterated with the diphthong –ευ: Λευί, Εὐαῖος (a declinable formation; see also 3.8).

**ἔλαβεν.** The verb λαμβάνω in Exodus and generally in the LXX is the default rendering of לקח (“take”; ca. 70x). The phrase λαμβάνω τῶν θυγατέρων occurs also at 6.25 and 34.16, but reflects a slightly different Hebrew construction (לקח מבנות). In Classical Greek the verb in some contexts can mean to “receive in marriage.” LSJ references this usage in Herodotus, *Hist.* 1.199, 9.108, and Xenophon, *Hell.* 4.1.14. In 6.23 we find the expression ἔλαβεν ... θυγάτερα ... αὐτῷ γυναῖκα, reflecting the Hebrew *Vorlage*, meaning that a man married a daughter of someone (see v. 20 for a similar example).

**τῶν θυγατέρων Λευί.** The partitive plural genitive phrase τῶν θυγατέρων Λευί renders the singular לוֹי בת אֵת, the object of the final verb. G had two options. He could translate it as “the daughter of Levi,” but this chronologically is impossible, or he could construe it as a partitive genitive, that is, “one of the female clan members of Levi,” which he did and thus avoided the chronological issue. Houtman (1993, 270) argues that “grammatically (unless one should think there is merit in appealing to Ges-K [GKC] §126q; Joüon §137n) it is unlikely that לוֹי בת אֵת can mean something else than ‘the daughter of Levi.’”

**καὶ ἔσχεν αὐτήν.** The last clause is in effect a literary addition filling out the sequence of events in four stages and enhancing the parallelism formed by these clauses. The common Greek verb ἔχειν only occurs seven times (2.1; 21.22; 28.28, 39; 33.12; 36.2, 31) in Exodus and usually is part of an idiomatic Greek translation. The sense of the clause in this verse is to cohabit with a wife and in this sense to be married. For example, we find in Aristotle, *Cat.* 15b.28, λεγόμεθα δὲ καὶ γυναῖκα ἔχειν καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἄνδρα· ... οὐδὲν γὰρ ἄλλο τῷ ἔχειν γυναῖκα σημαίνομεν ἢ ὅτι συνοικεῖ (“We say also that a man ‘has’ a wife and a wife has a husband ... For we mean by this ‘have’ nothing more than that he cohabits” [LCL]). Later LXX translators use it in the sense to cohabit with a woman or man. Sometimes this occurs through normal marriage arrangements and sometimes through other events such as war (Deut 28.30; 1 Esd 9.18; Esa 13.16; 54.1 [τὸν ἄνδρα]). The verbal phrase may also imply sexual activity. It would seem that to a

Greek-speaking person the translation expresses that this person married one of the daughters of Levi and he cohabited with her. Aejmelaeus (1993, 101) notes, “the translator seems to be responsible for the divergence here, which, however, adds nothing to the content of the passage.”

## 2.2

ותהר האשה ותלד בן ותרא אתו כי טוב הוא ותצפנהו שלשה ירחים  
καὶ ἐν γαστρὶ ἔλαβεν καὶ ἔτεκεν ἄρσεν. ἰδόντες δὲ αὐτὸ ἀστεῖον  
ἐσκέπασαν αὐτὸ μῆνας τρεῖς.

And she conceived and bore a male child. Now when they saw that it was handsome, they sheltered it for three months.

While the translator resumes his more usual mode of serial fidelity, he incorporates numerous alterations. The use of ἄρσεν to render בן creates continuity with the preceding instruction by Pharaoh to kill all male infants.

καὶ ἐν γαστρὶ ἔλαβεν. The Greek text does not reflect האשה, its omission presumably an example of “implication” (van der Louw 2007, 81–82). The verb הרה, “conceive, become pregnant,” only occurs at 2.2 in Exodus. The cognate adjective הרה, which means “pregnant,” occurs at 21.22 and is rendered by the verbal phrase ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσιν. The LSJ in the entry “γαστήρ” remarks that ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχειν indicates pregnancy, whereas ἐν γαστρὶ λαμβάνειν refers to conception. Muraoka, *GELS*, follows this distinction in his entries related to ἔχειν and λαμβάνειν, as do LEH in their entry on γαστήρ. This distinction seems to be operative in 2.22 and 21.22, the only occurrences of this idiom in Greek Exodus, suggesting that the translator in choosing these different Greek idioms distinguishes between the Hebrew verb and the cognate adjective.

ἔτεκεν. τίκτω is the usual rendering for the verb ילד (7x) with one exception (γεννάω, 6.20).

ἄρσεν. Throughout this section (1.17, 18, 22; 2.2) the translator used ἄρσεν (a neuter form; the masculine form of the adjective is ἄρσεν) to render בן and the plural הילדים. The word θῆλυ (also a neuter form) occurs in 1.16, 22, similarly rendering בת. The translator chose neuter gender terms to render בן and בת rather than the usual “υἱός ... θυγάτηρ.”

**ιδόντες.** Translating the third principle clause as an adverbial participle with the connecting particle **δέ** reflects normal Greek syntax. The adverbial participle occurs eight times in 2.1–10 to render coordinate Hebrew clauses. The participle **ιδών** occurs frequently in this usage (Aejmelaeus 1993, 12–15). Temporal or causal connections often are expressed; the nuance of this participle is probably temporal. Whereas predicative participles in the nominative case almost always precede the principal verb in Exodus (and the rest of the Greek Pentateuch), in other contemporary non-LXX literature they tend to follow. This divergence reflects the translator’s general commitment to serial fidelity in representing his source text (Walser 2001, 20–39). The translator used plural forms, even though the Hebrew text used the third person singular feminine form for each of the verbs. This creates ambiguity in the story because we do not know who the subject referent is specifically; logically it would be the parents, but this is left undefined. G continues with the plural formation in the next clause (v. 3a).

**ἀστεῖον.** G streamlines the **כִּי** clause in the source text as a predicate adjective. The translator’s use of **ἀστεῖον** only occurs here in Exodus and is unique in the LXX as a representation of **נָכוֹן**. Given that it is applied to a newborn infant, its sense probably tends in the direction of handsome or well-proportioned, rather than charming or graceful. Perhaps the translator chose a term that had reference both to the child’s beauty as well as charm.

The use of **ἀστεῖοι** by Aristotle (οἱ μικροὶ δ’ ἀστεῖοι καὶ σύμμετροι, καλοὶ δ’ οὐ in *Eth. nic.* 1123b7) suggests the idea of well-formed or well-proportioned, even though small. LXX.D renders it as “wohlgestaltet.” However, material in Plato and Xenophon focus more on the sense of witty, charming, graceful. Xenophon *Cyr.* 8.4.23.6 writes ὥστε σοὶ ταῦτ’ εἰρήσθαι, καὶ ἀπαγγελθῆναι παρ’ ἧ εὐδοκιμεῖν βούλει ὅτι ἀστεῖος εἶ; (“would you not give a great deal to have made these jokes and to have them reported to the lady with whom you wish to have the reputation of being a witty fellow?” [LCL]). In Plato’s *Phaed.*, 116.d, 5 Ὡς ἀστεῖος, ἔφη, ὁ ἄνθρωπος (“[Socrates] said, ‘How charming the man is!’” [LCL]). In Judg 3.17 Eglon, king of Moab is said to be ἀνὴρ ἀστεῖος [**בְּרִיא**] σφόδρα. Holofernes acknowledges that Judith is ἀστεία ... ἐν τῷ εἶδει (Idt 11.23). Susanna, the wife of Joachim is described as γυνεῖκα ἀστεῖαν τῷ εἶδει (Sus 7). The explicit reference to physical form in two of these contexts (as well as the usage in Aristotle) led me to use “handsome” as the appropriate rendering for **ἀστεῖον** in Exod 2.2, rather than “charming” or “graceful,” which Muraoka, *GELS*, and Le Boulluec and Sandevor (“gracieux”) suggest. In its other two LXX occurrences the adjec-



tive defines *δόξ* (Num 22.32, *יֵרֵט*) and *λογισμός* (2 Makk 6.23). I have not found a case apart from Exod 2.2 where this adjective is applied to an infant.

*ἐσκέπασαν*. The translation of *צָפַן* (“hide”) by *σκεπάζω* (“shelter, protect”) represents a slight shift in meaning. G has the plural (for the third-person plural, see above), as does the initial participle, in contrast to MT. Greek *σκεπάζω* occurs six times in Exodus for four different Hebrew verbs: including *פָּסַח* (*qal* and *hiphil* are considered synonymous; “pass, spring over”) (12.13, 27); *שָׁכַח* (“cover”) (33.22); and *סָכַךְ*, *hiphil* (“screen, cover”) (40.3, 19[21]). By using this verb in 12.13, 27 in relationship to the avenging angel the translator may be suggesting a parallel with the protection afforded to Moyses in 2.2. (I am indebted to Dirk Büchner for this last suggestion.)

*μῆνας τρεῖς*. The concealment lasted for *μῆνας τρεῖς*, the accusative case marking duration. The Greek word order diverges from the Hebrew order that in this case places the absolute form of the numeral first, followed by the object defined in apposition (GKC §134b). This is the only context in Exodus where *μῆν* renders *יָרַח* (“moon,” “month,” the latter occurring only here). In all other contexts (15x) *μῆν* represents *חֹדֶשׁ* (“new moon”). G follows the Hebrew word order in these references to months except 2.2 where he reverses the word order, placing the numeral after the noun.

## 2.3

ולא יכלה עוד הצפינו ותקח לו תבת גמא ותחמרה בחמר ובזפת  
ותשם בה את הילד ותשם בסוף על שפת היאר

ἐπεὶ δὲ οὐκ ἡδύναντο αὐτὸ ἔτι κρύπτειν, ἔλαβεν ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ θίβιν  
καὶ κατέχρισεν αὐτὴν ἀσφαλτοπίσση καὶ ἐνέβαλεν τὸ παιδίον εἰς  
αὐτήν, καὶ ἔθηκεν αὐτήν εἰς τὸ ἔλος παρὰ τὸν ποταμόν.

But when they could hide it no longer, its mother took a basket  
and plastered it with a mixture of pitch and tar, and she put the  
child in it and placed it in the marsh beside the river.

*ἐπεὶ*. G renders the first clause as a temporal subordinate clause, introduced by *ἐπεὶ*, but he still marks the advancing action by *δέ*. By simple juxtaposition of *waw*-consecutive clauses the Hebrew text may intend the initial clause to be read as a temporal clause. G may then have recognized this convention and translated accordingly (GKC §164a). This allows G to eliminate any equivalent for the *ו* that introduces the second clause.

οὐκ ἡδύναντο. ἡδύναντο represents הָלַח (third-person feminine singular *qal*). Given G's use of plural formations in verse 2, he has to continue the plural rendering in verse 3. G normally renders הָלַח by forms of δύναιμι (with the exception of 4.13 and 7.18).

αὐτὸ ἔτι κρύπτειν. The word order αὐτὸ ἔτι κρύπτειν fronts the pronoun in the Greek text in contrast with the Hebrew placement. This reordering does occur elsewhere in Exodus (see 2.10) and suggests that G was marking it, perhaps giving some attention to Greek style. G used κρύπτω to render קָפַץ in contrast to the rendering in verse 2, explainable as an example of μεταβολή ("variety") and indicative of G's literary interest. Lee (1983, 76–77) notes that σκεπάζω develops in usage the sense "to protect" or "to shelter" and documents this from third-century BCE papyri. However, he muses that "conceal" is the meaning for Exod 2.2–3, but acknowledges there is no attestation for this meaning. Le Boulluec and Sandevor (1989, 80) render the Greek as "*ils le mirent à l'abri*" [emphasis original]. The use of the present infinitive allows for a continuative sense, that is, "to keep on hiding." Greek ἔτι occurs as the equivalent of עַד nine times in Exodus (2.3; 4.18; 9.2, 17, 29; 11.1; 14.13; 17.4; 36.3; for other uses of ἔτι in Exodus see 8.29; 9.33; 10.17, 28; 15.18; 36.6.), but πάλιν occurs twice (3.15; 4.6) and οὐκέτι once (10.29).

ἔλαβεν. According to We<sup>cd</sup>, G offered no equivalent for לָקַח. This contrasts with Ra, which does read αὐτῷ. Wevers regards it as a hexaplaric addition because it is marked by an asterisk and metobelus in Syh (which precedes the equivalent of ἔλαβεν) and witnessed by B F O<sup>426</sup>-15' b d 56'-129 370 x y<sup>121</sup> 68'-120' 55 59 130 799<sup>Lat</sup>cod 100 Ach Sa = Ra MT. As Wevers (1992, 169) notes, this textual variation is complicated by the question of the position of αὐτό relative to the preceding κρύπτειν. For example, F reads κρύπτειν αὐτό, ἔλαβεν αὐτῷ. This word order reflects MT.

ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ. G clarifies by adding ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ, as the subject shifts from plural in the first clause to feminine singular in the second. Personal endings of Greek verbs do not distinguish gender in contrast to Hebrew verb formations. SamPent reads וְהָאִמָּה (even though the preceding verb was third-person feminine singular) and it is possible that this was in G's *Vorlage*. However, without additional Hebrew sources and noting the many amplifications in SamPent, it is more likely that both SamPent and G are independent in their activity.

**θῖβιν.** Thackeray (1907, 34) long ago noted θῖβις as one of the “Hellenized Semitic words in the LXX.” Since θῖβις is attested in papyri from the third century BCE, it probably is a Greek loanword coined from Egyptian. Lee (1983, 115) notes: “The meaning of this loan-word is apparently ‘basket.’” He gives examples from P. Cairo.Zen. 69.5 (257 BCE) ἐν θίβει νάρδου μαρσίππια ἐσφρα(γισμένα), as well as UPZ 149.21 (third century BCE) θῖβις τῶν ἄρτων, P. Petr. 3.51.4,13 (third century BCE), and P. Grenf.1.14.10 (second century BCE). The Hebrew term תבה (“ark, chest”) would then be a Hebrew loanword from Egyptian. It only occurs in Exodus in 2.3, 5, but G used it a third time in 2.6 as well. Hebrew נמג describes reeds or papyrus materials and various hexaplaric witnesses add παπυρου in the text or a cognate formation in the margins. However, G did not provide an equivalent.

**κατέχρισεν αὐτὴν ἀσφαλτοπίσση.** In order to waterproof the basket Moses’s mother plasters it with bituminous resin. The verb is modified by two prepositional phrases, the first of which contains a cognate noun (ותחמרה בחמר ובזפת), describing how she “plastered it with bitumen and pitch.” G translates this idiomatically with a verb meaning to smear, plaster (κατέχρισεν) modified by the rare substantive ἀσφαλτόπισσα, which seems to be an alternative form of πισσάσφαλτος/πιττάσφαλτος which only occurs otherwise in a writing by Dioscorides Medicus, first century CE (*De materia medica* 1.73.1.9); ἀσφαλτόπισσα may be an alternative form of this compound noun formed by G to represent the order of two phrases בחמר ובזפת. This form’s only other occurrence in extant Greek literature is in Philo, *Conf.* 106.4, referencing Exod 2.3; for the use of Greek compound words in LXX generally see Tov 1999. The noun זפת occurs twice in Isa 34.9 and in both cases the translator rendered it as πίσσα. G normally uses χρίω to render משיח (“anoint”) and the choice of the compound καταχρίω may suggest a sense of thoroughness. Diodorus Siculus, *Bibliotheca Historica* 2.9.2, 5, describes building processes using baked bricks plastered (κατέχρισεν) with bitumen.

The κατα- compound verb forms that occur in 2.1–10 include κατέχρισεν (v. 2), κατεσχόπευεν (v. 3), and κατέβη (v. 4). Note a similar sequence of such compounds in 1.10, 11, 13, 14.

**ἐνέβαλεν ... ἔθηκεν.** The final two clauses have the same verb form (ותשם). The first is marked by the object את הילד, but there is no expressed object in the second instance. G’s varied rendering of these two instances

semantically works well. In addition G alters the word order of the verbal modifiers in the first of these clauses (τὸ παιδίον εἰς αὐτήν) and may have added the accusative pronoun αὐτήν in the second clause to make clear what his mother placed εἰς τὸ ἔλος. However, it should be noted that 4Q13 (4QExod<sup>b</sup>) apparently reads אֹתוֹ and this may indicate that G had a textual warrant for αὐτήν. G used παιδίον to render יֶלֶד (nine times out of twelve), which becomes its default rendering, but at 4.20; 21.5; 22.24, it translates בֶּן (υἱός is G's default rendering for בֶּן [ca. 190x]). At 4.25, 26 the phrase τοῦ παιδίου μου is added by G. The cognate noun παῖς renders עֶבֶד eight times in Exodus.

**ἔλος.** G renders the collective noun סוּף (“rushes, reeds”) with ἔλος (“marsh”), which is defined by the following prepositional phrase παρὰ τὸν ποταμόν. In Exodus ἔλος twice renders סוּף (“reeds, rushes”) (2.3, 5), as well as the only two occurrences of אֲגֻמָּה (“pool, pond”) (7.19; 8.5 [MT 8.1]). When סוּף occurs in the descriptor סוּף יָם G rendered it with the stock phrase ἐρυθρὰ θάλασσα.

**παρὰ τὸν ποταμόν.** G used ποταμός (“river”) as a default rendering for הַיָּאֵר (twenty-three of twenty-five occurrences). The word translated “the Nile” (הַיָּאֵר) in NRSV is a common noun in Hebrew (note the presence of the article) meaning stream, river, or watercourses of some nature. In the case of Egypt “the river” is the Nile. The translator had at his disposal the proper name Νεῖλος, which occurs as early as Hesiod, but opts consistently to render the Hebrew noun as ὁ ποταμός. The article consistently occurs with ποταμός when referencing the Nile, probably because the Hebrew noun always is marked by an article in Exodus. There are two exceptions in Exodus where the combination עַל נְהַרְתָּם עַל יַאֲרֵיהֶם is rendered as ἐπὶ τοὺς ποταμοὺς αὐτῶν καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς διώρυγας αὐτῶν (7.19; see also 8.5 [MT 1]). Having chosen ποταμός as the rendering for נְהַר the translator must select a different equivalent for הַיָּאֵר in these two contexts. At 23.31 the Hebrew expression עַד הַנְּהַר is rendered in an expanded form as ἕως τοῦ ποταμοῦ τοῦ μεγάλου Εὐφράτου. In 1.22 יָאֵר is marked uniquely in Exodus by the ה-locale, which the translator expresses using the preposition εἰς, a normal equivalent. G does not represent שֶׁפֶת (“lip”) in this verse, but does so in 7.15.

The preposition παρὰ is distributed in Exodus with the following cases: accusative (2.3, 5; 11.5; 12.22 [2x]; 13.20; 14.9, 30; 15.27; 29.12; 33.12, 17; 35.22; 36.5; 40.6); genitive (3.22; 4.20; 11.2 [2x]; 12.35; 14.13; 18.11, 15;

22.12, 14; 25.2, 3; 27.21; 29.28 [2x]; 30.16; 33.16; 35.5; 36.3) and dative (22.25; 31.13; 33.12, 16, 21; 35.24; 36.3).

#### 2.4

ותתצב אחתו מרחק לדעה מה יעשה לו

καὶ κατεσκόπευεν ἡ ἀδελφὴ αὐτοῦ μακρόθεν μαθεῖν τί τὸ ἀποβησόμενον αὐτῷ.

And his sister was watching from a distance to learn what would happen to him.

**κατεσκόπευεν.** Two matters are of interest here: (1) that G chooses *κατασκοπεύω* to render יצב (“set or station oneself, take one’s stand”), and (2) that he uses the durative aspect representing Moyses’s sister not merely standing (at a distance) but keeping a continuous watch. This is the only LXX context in which this verb functions as the equivalent for יצב. By these choices G clarifies that the child’s sister will discover what happens to it because she is watching, not just standing. This is an example of “explicitation” (van der Louw, 2007, 81). This choice also emphasizes the source text’s notion that Moyses’s mother is not abandoning the child to the elements. In Greek Joshua this verb occurs seven times, usually with the sense of spying on territory that is about to be attacked. It renders the Hebrew verbs רגל (*piel*) (Ies 2.1; 6.21[22], 22[23], 24b[25b]; 14.7) and חפר (Ies 2.2, 3) and the noun מלאך (Ies 6.24a[25a]).

**μακρόθεν.** This adverb is the standard rendering for מרחק in Exodus (2.4; 20.18, 21; 24.1). In none of these cases does G represent the prefix (מן) with a separate lexeme. The *-θεν* affix is sufficient to reflect the ablative sense (Smyth §342). In contrast, the translator of Psalms twice rendered מרחק as ἀπὸ μακρόθεν (Ps 137[138].6 and 138[139].2; see also 2 Esd 3.13).

**μαθεῖν.** Although *μανθάνω* rarely renders ידע in LXX and only here in Exodus, it is very apt. The other occurrence of this equivalence in LXX is Est 4.5 in a similar context. G does not reflect specifically ל, the marker of the infinitive (e.g., לדעתה) in this chapter (Soisalon-Soininen 1965, 49–61).

τί τὸ ἀποβησόμενον αὐτῷ. G retains the indirect interrogative structure, but transforms the interrogative clause into a nominal clause with the future middle neuter substantival participle functioning as the subject. Again G’s

choice is idiomatic, but unique in Exodus to describe future events and as an equivalent for **הָשַׁע**; **ἀποβαίνειν** occurs with this sense in Job 15.31, 35; 34.20; and 2 Makk 9.25. This particular usage occurs also in Polybius *Hist.* 5.33.4, 7: Πάντες δ' ἠναγκάσθημεν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀποβλέπειν διὰ τὸ μέγεθος, δεδιότες τὴν συντέλειαν τῶν ἀποβησομένων (“All were compelled to watch it because of its magnitude, fearing the outcome of what would follow” [LCL]).

## 2.5

ותרד בת פרעה לרחץ על היאר ונערתיא הלכת על יד היאר ותרא  
את התבה בתוך הסוף ותשלח את אמתה ותקח

κατέβη δὲ ἡ θυγάτηρ Φαραὼ λούσασθαι ἐπὶ τὸν ποταμόν, καὶ αἱ ἄβραι αὐτῆς παρεπορεύοντο παρὰ τὸν ποταμόν· καὶ ἰδοῦσα τὴν θῆβιν ἐν τῷ ἔλει, ἀποστείλασα τὴν ἄβραν ἀνείλατο αὐτήν.

Now Pharaoh's daughter came down to the river to bathe, and her attendants were walking beside the river. And when she saw the basket in the marsh, she sent her attendant, and she picked it up.

**κατέβη**. Greek **καταβαίνω** is the usual equivalent for Hebrew **יָרַד** in Exodus (17x; exceptions are 9.19 [πέση]; 15.5 [κατέδυσαν εἰς βυθόν]; 33.5 [ἀφέλεσθε]; at 24.16 **καταβαίνω** renders **שָׁכַן** [“settle down, dwell”]). The singular usage of the related verb **ἀποβαίνω** at the end of verse 4 with the following default rendering of **καταβαίνω** for **יָרַד** may reflect stylistic interest on the part of G.

**λούσασθαι**. The initial verb is completed by an infinitive of purpose (λούσασθαι = **רחץ**). See comments regarding the infinitive **μαθεῖν** at 2.4. The medio-passive form of **λούω** defines “washing oneself, bathing.” Active forms of **λούω** (29.4; 40.10) refer to the washing of Aaron and his sons at initial consecration for ministry. Other renderings in Exodus for **רחץ** include **πλυνέω** (washing sacrificial entrails, 29.17) and **νίπτω** (washing hands and feet in preparation for religious service 30.18, 19, 20, 21; 38.27 [2x = 40.30], 31, 32).

**ἐπὶ τὸν ποταμόν**. The Hebrew expression **עַל הַיָּאָר** means “to bathe at or in the river.” It is unclear whether G intends this adverbial phrase to modify the primary verb of motion **κατέβη** or to accompany the infinitive **λούσασθαι** specifying something about the act of washing. If it modifies **λούσασθαι**, then **ἐπὶ** + accusative would have to have the sense of “near, by” which **ἐπὶ** + genitive normally would express (LSJ, s.v. “ἐπὶ” A. with genitive,

I.1. “at” or “near”). There is no textual evidence that G read ἐπὶ τοῦ ποταμοῦ. Neither is there evidence that ἐπὶ + accusative has the sense “at, by” (*GELS*, 265–67 offers no examples and neither does *LEH*). Given the case used with ἐπὶ in this context, I can only conclude that G meant this adverbial phrase to modify κατέβη (Johannesson 1928, 317–24). Occasionally G used ἐπὶ + accusative after a verb of motion to describe movement in a certain direction (e.g., 7.15; 8.20; 22.13; 29.4, 10), representing a variety of Hebrew constructions. Alternatively it could be argued that G is merely following his default rendering of עַל as ἐπὶ + accusative, without regard for the difficulty this creates with the verbal form λούσασθαι. If this is the case, then the Hebrew text will act as the arbiter of meaning. According to We<sup>ed</sup> ἐπὶ + accusative occurs 172 times in Greek Exodus and for the most part it represents the preposition עַל. Eight times it renders ה-locale formations (אַרְצָה) 4.3 [2x]; 9.33; 34.8; הַמִּימָה 7.15a; 8.20; הַמִּזְבֵּחַ 29.13, 25); in twenty contexts the preposition ב (4.14; 7.4; 8.4 [MT 7:29] [3x], 21 [MT 17] [4x]; 9.22; 10.1, 13, 14, 22; 17.16 [case uncertain]; 27.18 [2x]; 33.5 [בְּקֶרֶב]); 37.7 [MT 38.9], 9 [MT 38.10]); and eleven times אַל (14.5, 24; 18.22, 26; 19.20 [2x]; 21.6; 28.24, 26; 29.4; 36.27). It represents a variety of other source text formations, as well as plusses.

καὶ αἱ ἄβραι αὐτῆς. Twice in this verse the translator chose ἄβρα to represent two different Hebrew nouns: נַעֲרָתִיהַ and אֲמָתָה. This is the only context in LXX where אֲמָה = ἄβρα. The more usual rendering in G is παιδίσκη (20.10, 17; 21.20, 32; 23.12). Both Hebrew nouns refer to female attendants, but אֲמָה describes the personal attendant. In the second instance G used the singular articular form τὴν ἄβραν to identify one of the attendants as the chief personal attendant among all the others.

Wevers (1990, 14) indicates ἄβρα is borrowed from the Semitic (חַבְרָה). However, it occurs somewhat frequently in Menander (e.g., *Sik.*, 1.1: ἄβραν γὰρ ἀντωνούμενος ἐρωμένην), an Athenian playwright roughly contemporary with the translator of Exodus. Harl (1986, 204) notes its use in the Hellenistic era (e.g., Aristophanes Byzantinus, *Nomina aetatum* (*fragmenta*), 279,22, ἐλέγοντο δὲ καὶ ἄβραι, ἄβροτέρως κοσμουμένων) and indicates an etymology related to the adjective ἀβρός, meaning “grâcieux.” It does not then seem to be a neologism created by the LXX translators. Nor is its choice here an attempt to reflect a specific nominal form in the Hebrew text. Ezekiel the Tragedian used this word in *Exagoge* as he writes κάπειτα θυγάτηρ βασιλέως ἄβραις ὁμοῦ κατήλθε λουτροῖς (“and then a daughter of the king came down together with servants to bathe”



[my trans.]), reflecting G's rendering here. The pronoun αὐτῆς reflects the Hebrew pronominal suffix.

**παρεπορεύοντο.** G maintains the parataxis, but represents the sense of the Hebrew participle by using the durative aspect. The Hebrew structure (noun + participle) marks this clause as introducing background information and offline information. G used this verb three more times in reference to the census taken in 30.13, 14; 39.3. The tense form is present subjunctive, present participle, or imperfect. Lee (1983, 92) noted that this compound came into usage in the fourth century BCE as illustrated in Aristotle and the early third century Petrie papyri. He regards this compound verb as an example of “new formations” in Koine Greek emerging in the late fourth and early third centuries BCE. He also notes (1983, 85–86) that its usage in Exodus (and the rest of the Greek Pentateuch) reflects the use of πορεύομαι compounds “in the present and imperfect,” whereas παρέρχομαι formations occur in contexts where future (12.23 [2x]; 23.5; 33.19) and aorist (3.3; 15.16 [2x]; 33.22 [2x]; 34.6) tense forms are chosen.

**παρὰ τὸν ποταμόν.** G uses the same phrase he employed in verse 3, but the preposition renders a different Hebrew construction **דַּי לְ**, which means “beside.”

**καὶ ἰδοῦσα ... ἀποστείλασα ... ἀνείλατο.** G renders three paratactic, independent clauses by means of two adverbial participles and one finite verb. Pharaoh's daughter probably is the intended subject of each action, but there is ambiguity, namely, did the attendant or Pharaoh's daughter pick up the basket? Greek ἀποστέλλω is the default rendering for **קָלַץ** (*qal* forms [3.10, 12, 13, 14, 15; 4.13, 28; 5.22; 7.16; 9.15, 27; 23.20, 28] and *piel* forms [10.10; 15.7; 23.27]; ἀποστέλλω renders **נִשְׁלַח** [only occurrence in Exodus] at 15.10.). The main verb in this clause ἀνείλατο (ἀναιρέω) in the middle voice means “take up, take away, carry off,” which certainly expresses the sense of the Hebrew verb **הִקְחָהּ**. However, it is a marked equivalent in that G only used this equivalent for **קָחָהּ** in this context. This verb is used again in the etymology of Moses's name in verse 10. Menander (*Sam.* 410: ἤκουσα καὐτὸς τῶν γυναικῶν ὅτι τρέφεις ἀνελομένη παιδάριον [“I myself heard from the women that you are nursing having taken up an infant”] [my trans.]) used this verb to describe the rescue of a child from exposure.



ἐν τῷ ἔλει. Greek ἐν usually renders the Hebrew preposition ב. The prepositional compound בתוך is rendered by ἐν five times in Exod (2.5; 9.24; 12.49; 25.7; 29.45). In three contexts it is translated in full by ἐν μέσῳ with τῆς θαλάσσης (14.29; 15.8, 19), that is, with a concrete noun, suggesting that G could have chosen ἐν μέσῳ here as well.

## 2.6

ותפתח ותראהו את הילד והנה נער בכה ותחמל עליו ותאמר מילדי  
העברים זה

ἀνοίξασα δὲ ὁρᾷ παιδίον κλαῖον ἐν τῇ θίβει, καὶ ἐφείσατο αὐτοῦ ἡ  
θυγάτηρ Φαραὼ καὶ ἔφη Ἀπὸ τῶν παιδίων τῶν Ἑβραίων τοῦτο.

Now when she opened it, she saw a child crying in the basket, and  
Pharao's daughter spared it and said, “This is one of the Hebrews’  
children.”

ἀνοίξασα. G replaces the parataxis, using an adverbial participle; ἀνοίγω (“to open”) renders both occurrences of פתח I (“open”) in Exodus (2.6; 21.32), the standard equivalent in other sections of the LXX. It is also used in 4.12, 15 to describe Yahweh's promise to open Moyses's mouth (אהיה עם פִּי). Here again G recognizes the temporal aspect inherent in the source text's juxtaposition and renders it as an adverbial participle that may have temporal force in this context.

ὁρᾷ. The pronominal suffix attached to the second verb (ותפתח ותראהו) is omitted, probably because of its presumed redundancy (GKC §131.4b); ὁρᾷ is a present tense and functions as an historic present. “Of the 26 examples ... of the historic present in Exodus, 24 correspond to Consecutive Imperfect,” (Evans 2001, 120; see Thackeray 1907, 273–74) as in this case. Lee's discussion (1983, 131–40) of the use of ὁράω, “perceive by sight,” in contrast with βλέπω indicates that Exodus reflects Greek usage in the third century BCE.

παιδίον. In this chapter MT uses two designations for the child, namely ילד and נער, whereas G only has παιδίον. Because παιδίον is G's default rendering for ילד (see v. 3), and G uses νεανίσκος to translate נער (10.9; 24.5; in 33.11 Joshua is described as יהושע בן נון נער and this is translated as Ἰησοῦς υἱὸς Ναυῆ νέος), presumably G chose not to represent נער in this context. For a different translation pattern consider Greek Genesis's use

of παιδίον. As well, παιδίον here is anarthrous, whereas הִילָד is arthrous. G seems to reflect the perspective of Pharaoh's daughter, rather than that of the reader with prior knowledge. G also does not represent the interjection וַהֲנֵה. Possibly the entire phrase was omitted by parablepsis (from *daleth* to *resh*). Whatever the reason for this omission, G's text has less drama than that expressed in the Hebrew text.

**κλαῖον.** The verb κλαίω occurs only once in Exodus rendering the single usage of בכה ("weep, wail"). This is a regular equivalence throughout LXX. The participle can be read as either predicative or attributive.

**ἐν τῇ θίβει.** Whereas immediately prior G seems to streamline the text by omission, now he makes explicit what is implicit in the source text.

**ἐφείσατο.** External to the LXX a primary sense of φείδομαι is "to spare." LXX.D renders the Greek verb as "schonte" which suggests she "spared, saved, treated with consideration" the infant. Philoctetes, in Sophocles's play of the same name (l. 749), urges Neoptolemos to cut off his diseased foot. "Do not spare my life [μὴ φείσῃ βίου]," he pleads. Thucydides, *Hist.* 7.29.4.2 reports the outcome of battle in which τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἐφόνεον φειδόμενοι οὔτε πρεσβυτέρα οὔτε νεωτέρας ἡλικίας ("they were killing the people, sparing neither old nor young in age" [my trans.]). The word φείδομαι only occurs this once in Exodus, reflecting the single occurrence of לָמַח ("spare, have compassion for"), which it often renders in other sections of LXX whenever the Hebrew verb also carries that meaning. We find similar usage in Greek Gen 19.16, ἐν τῷ φείσασθαι κύριον αὐτοῦ, describing Lot's escape from Sodom. Again in Gen 20.6 Kyrios promises to Abimelek in a dream καὶ ἐφεισάμην ἐγὼ σου τοῦ μὴ ἁμαρτεῖν σε εἰς ἐμέ. Then in the testing of Abraham (Gen 22.12, 16) Kyrios acknowledges καὶ οὐκ ἐφείσω τοῦ υἱοῦ σου τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ δι' ἐμέ. G seems to use φείδομαι here at Exod 2:6 with a similar sense "spare" because in his view Pharaoh's daughter is well aware of the king's decree to destroy every Hebrew male baby and yet she spares one from this destruction.

Le Boulluec and Sandevour (1983, 82), however, emphasize the sense of "pity," translating this verb as "eut pitié de lui." They argue that this significance was known at the time of the translation. This may be. Perhaps the example that comes the closest to supporting their rendering might be Thucydides 7.29: "The Thracians, entering into Mycalessus, spoiled

both houses and temples, slew the people without mercy on old or young” (Hobbes). “Not sparing old or young” works equally well as a translation. Philo, *Mos.* 1.15, interprets this text as *καὶ δεδακρυμένον ὁρῶσαν ἐλεεῖν* (“and seeing him weeping took pity on him”). But here Philo substitutes another term (*ἐλεεῖν*) for that used in the Old Greek translation, one that in his view better conveys the sense of the Hebrew text. This may be a subtle suggestion by Philo that the OG translation did not express the right nuance in its rendering. *GELS* and *LEH* also indicate that “pity” is the meaning for *φείδομαι* in this context.

**ἡ θυγάτηρ Φαραώ.** Although Pharaoh’s daughter appears in verses 5, 7, 8, 9, 10 in both texts, here it is absent from MT. SamPent reads *בת פרעה*, as does 4Q13. Given the additional support of 4Q13 for this plus, it is possible that G read this in his source text. Conversely, G may be responsible for its addition. The same reason for this addition may have motivated scribes within the Hebrew tradition and G, namely the need to clarify who actually made the decision to spare the child, given the possible involvement of the attendants in the action of retrieving the basket.

**καὶ ἔφη.** G’s default translation of *אמר* (“utter, say”) in Exodus (as also throughout LXX) is *λέγω/εἶπα*. Surprisingly, here G uses *φήμι*, its only occurrence in Exodus. Since it often has the sense “assert, affirm,” perhaps G portrays Pharaoh’s daughter as affirming the common reaction of the group.

**ἀπὸ τῶν παιδίων τῶν Ἑβραίων.** G indicates the child’s origin and the group to which it belongs, with a partitive sense. Consider the instances of prepositional phrases such as *ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς* (v. 1) and *ἐκ τῶν Ἑβραίων* (v. 7) in contrast to *τῶν θυγατέρων* (v. 1).

## 2.7

ותאמר אחתו אל בת פרעה האלך וקראתי לך אשה מינקת מן  
העברית ותינק לך את הילד

καὶ εἶπεν ἡ ἀδελφὴ αὐτοῦ τῇ θυγατρὶ Φαραώ Θέλεις καλέσω σοι  
γυναῖκα τροφεύουσιν ἐκ τῶν Ἑβραίων, καὶ θηλάσει σοι τὸ παιδίον;  
And his sister said to Pharaoh’s daughter, “Do you wish that I  
summon for you a nursing woman from the Hebrews, and she  
shall suckle the child for you?”

**ἡ ἀδελφή αὐτοῦ.** The proximity of Moyses's sister relates to prior instructions given in 2.4. In Exodus when referring to a person, ἀδελφή describes Miriam, Moyses's sister (2.7; 15.20), or Aaron's wife (6.23, ἀδελφήν Ναασσών). The Hebrew noun is used to refer to parts of the tabernacle (26.3, 5, 6, 17), but is rendered by forms of ἕτερος or ἕκαστος.

**Θέλεις καλέσω σοι.** In most cases in Exodus the use of θέλω represents an idiomatic rendering of Hebrew finite verbs that do not mean specifically “wish/want” (2.7, 14; 8.32; 11.10), but as Evans (2001, 229) notes, the Greek verb still retains the sense of wish or desire. Exceptions might be 2.14, as well as 10.4, where Πῶς . . . ἴσθι is rendered as μὴ θέλῃς ἐξαποστεῖλαι. Usually the Greek verb is complemented by an infinitive, with the exception of this context.

According to HRCS this is the only context in the LXX where a deliberative construction with θέλω occurs. Smyth (§1806) says that “βούλει, βούλεσθε (poet. θέλεις, θέλετε) *do you wish* often precedes the subjunctive,” in this case a deliberative subjunctive (καλέσω). Examples would include Sophocles, *El.* 80: θέλεις μείνωμεν αὐτοῦ ἀπακούσωμεν γόων; (“Do you wish that we should remain here and listen to her cries?” [my trans.]) and *Oed. tyr.*, 651, τί σοι θέλεις δῆτ’ εἰκάθω; (“What then do you wish that I should grant you?” [my trans.]). If this idiom was still regarded as poetic in the early third century BCE, then this may suggest something about the linguistic register the translator chose for his work in the narrative sections.

The rendering of the ἦ interrogative by G is always contextually determined and usually no specific lexeme reflects it (2.7, 14; 4.11, 14, 18; 10.7; 14.11, 12; 16.4; 17.7; 33.16). This is the only context in Exodus where the deliberative subjunctive is used as an equivalent.

**γυναῖκα τροφεύουσαν.** G reflects the Hebrew by using an adjectival participle. The present aspect of the participle indicates a current activity. The verb τροφεύω is not attested in texts prior to Exodus. Chamberlain (2011, 192–94) lists it among those words “whose first known use is in the LXX, though they are also found in later secular Greek.” Verbs ending in -εω and formed from nouns “usually denote a *condition*, sometimes an *activity*. βασιλεύ-ω *am king, rule* (βασιλεύ-ς)” (Smyth §866.4). In the case of τροφεύω the activity is nursing, that is, feeding.

**θηλάσει.** G's use of this verb to render the Hebrew *hiphil* verb הָיָה, in the light of his use of τροφεύω immediately before to render the same verb,

seems to express a semantic difference. Whereas *τροφεύω* suggests a general activity of nursing/feeding, *θηλάζω* specifically means “suckle.” תניק is *hiphil* jussive and according to Evans (2001, 100) G renders a Hebrew jussive form by a future eleven times.

## 2.8

ותאמר לה בת פרעה לכי ותלך העלמה ותקרא את אם הילד  
 ή δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῇ ή θυγάτηρ Φαραώ Πορεύου. ἐλθοῦσα δὲ ή νεᾶνις  
 ἐκάλεσεν τὴν μητέρα τοῦ παιδίου.

Then she, Pharaoh's daughter, said to her, “Go!” But the girl went and summoned the child's mother.

ή δὲ ... ή θυγάτηρ Φαραώ. This formation is unusual. ή θυγάτηρ Φαραώ is in apposition to a pronominal ή. Probably the translator wanted to signal a change in subject, but then had to repeat that subject after the verb because of the Hebrew structure. It was not necessary to do this in order to communicate the sense of the Hebrew as we can see from the initial segment of verse 7. The Greek construction ή δὲ ... αὐτῇ expresses normal idiom, but the translator, because of commitment to serial fidelity, feels obliged to represent בת פרעה.

**Πορεύου.** The main verbs in these paratactic clauses are all *waw*-consecutive forms. Within the direct speech we have the present imperative *πορεύου* rendering the Hebrew imperative. Note that G selects two different lexemes, *πορεύου* and *ἐλθοῦσα*, even though the source text reads לכי ותלך. Given the repetitive לכי ותלך, G may simply not want to repeat a form of the immediately preceding *πορεύομαι*. Lee (1983, 85–86), however, observed that in compounds formed from these two verbs, the present and future are supplied by *πορεύομαι* compounds and the future and aorist are supplied by “compounds of *ἐλεύσομαι* (Attic *-εἰμι*), and *-ῆλθον*.” Perhaps this lexical pattern is influencing G's selection of renderings in this instance also, even though they are not compound forms. If this is the case this variation is probably not stylistic, but may be idiomatic.

**ἐλθοῦσα δέ.** As we have seen, G often represents one clause in source text paratactical structures with an adverbial participle, perhaps marking emphasis with the finite verb form. Whether we should interpret the participle as attendant circumstance or temporal can be argued. *ἔρχομαι* normally renders בא (“come, go”) in Exodus, but in three contexts G used it as the

equivalent for הלך (2.8 ἐλθοῦσα; 3.16 ἐλθών; 8.25 ἐλθόντες). In Greek Exodus ἔρχομαι occurs primarily as an aorist form (19x), twice as a future form (3.13; 22.9) and once as a present (5.20). The particle δὲ seems to convey a mild adversative sense here as the young girl summons her mother, rather than just any available nursing mother, as the reader might expect.

הַ נַעֲמָנִים. Both עַלְמָה (“young woman”) and נַעֲמָנִים occur only here in Exodus; נַעֲמָנִים represents נַעֲרָה more than twenty times in LXX and עַלְמָה four times. Both נַעֲמָנִים and עַלְמָה are girls of marriageable age. See verse 5 above.

## 2.9

וְתֹאמַר לָהּ בַת פַּרְעֹה הַלִּיכִי אֶת הַיֶּלֶד הַזֶּה וְהִנְקִהוּ לִי וְאֲנִי אֶתֵּן אֹתָהּ  
שֶׁכֶרְךָ וְתִקַּח הָאִשָּׁה הַיֶּלֶד וְתִנְיָקָהּ

εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτήν ἡ θυγάτηρ Φαραώ Διατήρησόν μοι τὸ παιδίον τοῦτο, καὶ θηλασόν μοι αὐτό, ἐγὼ δὲ δώσω σοι τὸν μισθόν. ἔλαβεν δὲ ἡ γυνὴ τὸ παιδίον καὶ ἐθήλαζεν αὐτό.

And Pharaoh's daughter said to her, “Take care of this child for me, and suckle it for me, and I will give you your pay.” Then the woman took the child and kept suckling it.

εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτήν. After twice using εἶπεν + dative of indirect object (vv. 7–8) to render this Hebrew structure, G now switches to the prepositional phrase marking the person addressed (for the first time in his translation). Within Exodus לֵאמֹר is rendered by λέγω/εἶπα + dative sixteen times and λέγω/εἶπα + πρὸς + accusative three times. In comparison אֵלֵאמֹר is rendered by λέγω/εἶπα + dative circa thirty-eight times (see 2.7) and λέγω/εἶπα + πρὸς + accusative ca. eighty-two times. There is no apparent correlation between the different Hebrew prepositions and the Greek rendering.

Διατήρησόν ... τοῦτο. The translator creates parallelism through three connected clauses using the same structure: (conjunction) + verb + indirect object + direct object. This parallelism is enhanced by the translator's addition of μοι in the first clause and using the dative pronoun σοι in the third clause, rather than the possessive σου (read by 376' z Arm Co) as MT reads. The verb διατήρησον renders הַלִּיכִי, which has the sense “carry away.” Wevers (1990, 15) indicates that this Hebrew form “is unique and is usually emended to הוֹלִיכִי” and regarded as *hiphil* imperative feminine

singular (e.g., GKC §69x regards this form as a second feminine imperative to be read as **יְהִי**). G used **διατηρέω** (“take care of, preserve”) to render four different Hebrew constructions (2.9; 9.16; 12.6; 34.7); the cognate noun **διατήρησις** twice translates **משמרת** (16.33, 34). The Greek verb indicates care for and preservation, with a nuance of protection and does not represent the sense of the Hebrew verb that means to “lead away” (Le Boulluec and Sandevor 1989, 82). Perhaps the translator references the continued threat from Pharaoh’s forces toward a Hebrew infant.

**μοι τὸ παιδίον τοῦτο**. G adds **μοι**. The placement of the dative pronoun before the direct object occurs several times in Exodus in distinction from his apparent source text (2.9; 6.8; 13.11; 16.32). It probably reflects G’s accommodation to Greek style. This word order occurs in each of these parallel clauses, but in 2.7 **σοι τὸ παιδίον** reflects the Hebrew word order.

**θηλασόν**. For this verb see verse 7 above. The aorist imperative, the second in the series, renders a *hiphil* feminine singular imperative (**וְהִנְקֶהּ**) introduced by a *waw*-conjunctive and completed by a third person masculine singular pronominal suffix.

**ἐγὼ δὲ δώσω σοι τὸν μισθόν**. G reflects the pronominal suffix on the noun, which usually would be rendered as **σου** (**אֶת שְׂכָרְךָ**), with the dative **σοι**. The change probably enhances the parallelism with the first two clauses. The initial **ἐγὼ** reflects the presence of **אֲנִי**. In representing **אֶת שְׂכָרְךָ** (“your wage”) as **τὸν μισθόν** (“the wage”), G may express the idea of “the appropriate wage.” Nursing contracts dated to late first century BCE (BGU 4, 1107) specify the wages to be paid for this service (**μισθ[ὸν τοῦ τε γάλακτος καὶ τῆς τροφείας κατὰ] μῆνα ἕκαστον ἀργυρίου δραχμὰς δέκα καὶ ἐλαίου κοτύλας δ[ύ]ο**), “the wage for milk and wet-nursing monthly is ten silver drachmas and two half-pints of oil” [my trans.]). Presumably such contracts, informal or formal, were being created in the early third century BCE, when the translation was occurring. For other Exodus occurrences of **μισθός** rendering **שֶׂכֶר**, see 22.15. G also used the adjective **μισθωτός** to render **שָׂכִיר** at 12.45 and 22.15.

**ἔλαβεν δὲ ... καὶ ἐθήλαζεν αὐτό**. The Hebrew narrative continues on with two *waw*-consecutive verbs (**וַתִּנְקֶהּ ... וַתִּשָּׁקֶהּ**) rendered by a Greek aorist and past imperfect, marking the durative aspect. Given that the woman



is Moyses's mother and presumably had been nursing the infant before its exposure, the durative aspect probably conveys that she kept doing so (although it could also be inceptive, i.e., she began nursing the infant).

## 2.10

ויגדל הילד ותבאהו לבת פרעה ויהי לה לבן ותקרא שמו משה ותאמר  
כי מן המים משיתהו

ἄδρυνθέντος δὲ τοῦ παιδίου εἰσήγαγεν αὐτὸ πρὸς τὴν θυγατέρα  
Φαραώ, καὶ ἐγενήθη αὐτῇ εἰς υἱόν· ἐπωνόμασεν δὲ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ  
Μωυσήν λέγουσα Ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος αὐτὸν ἀνελόμην.

Now when the child grew up, she brought it to Pharaoh's daughter,  
and it became to her for a son. And she named his name Moyses,  
saying "I drew him out of the water."

**ἄδρυνθέντος δὲ τοῦ παιδίου.** G continues to vary the subordinate constructions used to represent coordinate structures in his source text. The genitive absolute is a standard Greek construction, used circa fourteen times by G. Aejmelaeus (1982a, 110–12; see also Soisalon-Soininen 1987, 175) indicates that "The cases of the *gen.abs.* in Ex and Deut are used to render verbal clauses." The genitive absolute in Greek Exodus frequently renders a bound infinitive with pronominal suffix (4.21; 5.20; 14.18; 16.1; 19.16; 34.29 [καταβαίνοντος δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ ὄρους/הר' מן הברדו]; 38.27 [MT 40.32]). In other cases it represents expressions denoting time (12.18, 29; 34.22) or an interrogative (33.16) or a bound construction (16.13, probably construed as an infinitive). It also occurs in 40.15[17] in a plus. The genitive participle in 19.9 is most probably a supplementary participle. However, only in 2.10 does G use a genitive absolute construction to render an independent verbal clause. Here again G may recognize a circumstantial/temporal sense expressed in the Hebrew text by simple juxtaposition of the two clauses, so that with the genitive absolute he in fact communicates the sense of the Hebrew text in fine Greek form. In Classical Greek the "subject of the genitive absolute may be identical with the object of the leading verb" (Smyth §2073b), as is the case here (note the presence of αὐτό which is object of εἰσήγαγεν).

G rendered the two occurrences of גדל ("grow up, become great") differently reflecting its two meanings (2.10, 11). Here G correctly reflects the Hebrew verb's sense of maturation; ἄδρυνω in the passive within the LXX means to mature, grow (cf. Judg 11.2; 13.24; Routh 1.13; 2 Rgns 12.3 [Iamb]; 4 Rgns 4.18; Ps 143[144].12 [growing plant]). External to LXX the verb



describes maturation generally, applied, for example, to plants, embryos, and human beings (see Walters 1973, 86). Examples of these usages occur in Herodotus, *Hist.* 1.193.1: ἀδρύνεται τε τὸ λήιον (“that ripens the crop”); Hippocrates, *Septim.* 1.9: ἀδρυνόμενου τοῦ ἐμβρύου (“as the embryo matures”); T. Iss. 3.1: ὅτε οὖν ἡδρύνθην, τέκνα μου, ἐπορευόμην ἐν ἐνθύτητι καρδίας (“when then I was grown up, my children, I began walking in uprightness of heart” [my trans.]). Chamberlain (2011, 3) proposed “weaned” as the meaning for Exod 2.10 and 4 Rgns 4.18, but this seems too specific for this context.

The particle δέ indicates additional information is being provided, which moves the story forward.

**εἰσήγαγεν ... πρὸς.** The verb εἰσάγω occurs thirteen times in Exodus, usually rendering a *hiphil* form of בּוֹא. Only here and 23.23 is it modified by πρὸς + accusative.

**καὶ ἐγενήθη αὐτῇ εἰς υἱόν.** Mayser (§ 2.2.269) provides examples from the early papyri (e.g., Teb. 40, 23 γενηθήτω τῷ ὑποτελεῖ τὸ δίκαιον [117<sup>a</sup>] [“let that which is due belong to the ‘official’”]) for this use of the dative of possession or personal interest with forms of γίνομαι. However, the complete construction γίνομαι + dative of person + εἰς (relationship) does not, as far as I can determine, occur prior to usage in LXX. It reflects the Hebrew construction הָיָה + לְ (pred.) + לְ (pers.) “to be/become for someone for (a wife, son, refuge, etc.)” (BDB, 226). The same Hebrew structure occurs at 15.2 (וַיְהִי לִי לִישׁוּעָה) and the translator rendered it as ἐγένετό μοι εἰς σωτηρίαν (see also Gen 20.12; Harl 1986, 75; Tenhunen 2008, 4–5: “γίνεσθαι εἰς and εἶναι εἰς, as they come to mean ‘to be/become/belong for someone as something’ [such as ... , Exod 2:10], are Hebraisms. The last two examples, Gen 20:12 and Exod 2:10 are the most clearly Hebraistic renderings in my material.”). Here we see interference in the Greek syntax because of the influence of the Hebrew structure. G follows the Hebrew word order and sense exactly.

The aorist passive form of γίνομαι occurs eight times (2.10; 4.6; 10.13; 11.3; 12.29, 30; 14.24; 39.4) in Exodus. Wevers (1990, 16) notes that the aorist middle form was used twenty-five times and “the two forms seem to be almost indistinguishable lexically.” In 2.11 the translator used ἐγένετο ... μέγας γενόμενος.

**ἐπωνόμασεν δὲ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ.** G consistently renders the idiom קרא שם as ἐπονομάζω τὸ ὄνομα (2.10, 22; 15.23; 16.31; 17.7, 15). Occasionally, particu-

larly in Plato's writings, we find ἐπωνομάζω accompanied by τὸ ὄνομα with the sense "give a name to:" Plato, *Leg.* (816, b, 6): καὶ κατὰ λόγον (5) αὐταῖς θέμενος ὄνομα συμπάσαις ἐμμελείας ἐπωνόμασε ("and how rationally, giving a name to them all, he called them 'stately dances'" [LCL]); *Crat.* (406, a, 5) τὰς δὲ Μούσας ... ἀπὸ τοῦ μῶσθαι, ... καὶ ζητήσεώς τε καὶ φιλοσοφίας τὸ ὄνομα τοῦτο ἐπωνόμασεν ("and bestowed the name 'the Muses' ... from μῶσθαι, ... both searching and philosophy" [LCL]); *Tim.* (83, c, 1) καὶ τὸ μὲν κοινὸν ὄνομα πᾶσιν τούτοις ἢ τινες (c.) ἱατρῶν που χολὴν ἐπωνόμασαν ("and either certain of the physicians give the common name 'bile' to all these things" [LCL]). So G is using a known Greek idiom. Other uses of אָקָר usually are translated by forms of καλέω. The Greek expression occurs once (20.24) as the rendering for אֲזַכִּיר אֶת שְׁמִי. Herodotus also used this Greek verbal phrase but in the sense of "calling upon the name" (which is not the sense found in Exod 2.10); for example, *Hist.* 4.35.3, καὶ γὰρ ἀγείρειν σφί τὰς γυναικάς ἐπωνομαζούσας τὰ οὐνόματα ἐν τῷ ὕμνῳ τὸν σφί Ὀλλὴν ἀνὴρ Λύκιος ἐποίησε ("For the women collected gifts for them, calling upon their names in the hymn made for them by Olen of Lycia" [LCL]). Usually this expression occurs when he or one of his characters is speculating about why something or someone has a specific name.

**Μωυσῆν.** Dozeman (2009, 81) indicates that the Hebrew text incorporates two etymologies: "The first underscores the adoption of Moses by Pharaoh's daughter through the wordplay between 'son' in Hebrew (*ben*) and in Egyptian (*mose*)." The Egyptian word for "son" occurs in such names as Thutmose ("son of Thut"). The Greek translator shows no awareness of this etymology. The other etymology references the child's rescue from the river, but is based upon Hebrew language, not Egyptian. The verb מִשָּׁה seems to mean "draw." Greek cannot capture this etymology and so translates the verb as ἀνελόμην.

The vowel cluster ων reflects Egyptian name formations contemporary with the translation according to Mayser (§1.138). He gives the following formations as examples: Ἀρθώουθου, Θαῶντος, Πεκῶντος, Πετῶνε, Πετῶντος. However, the insertion of the υ in Μωυσῆς does not have warrant in the Hebrew form of the name. This proper noun also is inflected, one of the few in Exodus. These details suggest that G did not form this name, but rather it belonged to the lexical stock used by Egyptian Jews prior to the translation of the Pentateuch.

**λέγουσα.** See comments at verse 22 (λέγων Ὅτι κτλ.).

*ἀνειλόμην*. G used an aorist middle form of this verb previously in verse 5 with the sense “draw, take up” to represent *הָקַל*. In verse 10, G uses *ἀναιρουμαι* to render the only use of *הָשָׁה* (“draw”) in Exodus. Le Boulluec and Sandevour (1989, 83) observe that “elle renforce la cohérence narrative.” Note the pre-posed *αὐτόν* at variance with the Hebrew word order (see also *αὐτό* at 2.3).

### Summary

G’s text demonstrates general serial fidelity to its source text but also shows considerable accommodation to the target language. Pluses (1–2, 3, 6) and minuses (3, 6) clarify or reduce redundancy, generating a more acceptable text. Shifts in person and number of verbs (e.g., 2–3a) reduce potential ambiguity. Alterations in source text word order also accommodate Greek word order preferences (e.g., 3, 9). G uses Greek subordinating structures in place of source text coordinating structures, assimilating in the direction of the target text (e.g., adverbial clauses [3], genitive absolute [10], frequent use of adverbial participles). Isomorphism does not seem to be a priority. Lexical variation occurs in the Greek text where the source text uses repeatedly the same lexical term (vv. 2–3, *σκεπάζω* ... *κρύπτω*; v. 3, *ἐμβάλλω* ... *τίθημι*; v. 7, *τροφεύω* ... *θηλάζω*; vv. 6, 9, *φῆμι* ... *λέγω*; v. 10, 11, *ἄδρυνω* ... *μέγας γενόμενος*). Some of these may be examples of *μεταβολή*. Conversely, the Greek text reduces lexical variation (e.g., *ἀναίρω*, vv. 5, 10), perhaps again in the service of literary coherence.



## Leuitikon 3.1–17: The Sacrifice of Deliverance

Dirk Büchner

### Literature

**Athenaeus.** 1927. *The Deipnosophists in 9 Volumes*. Translated by Charles Burton Gulick. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. ♦ **Bergquist**, Brigitte. 1993. “Bronze Age Sacrificial Koine in the Eastern Mediterranean? A Study of Animal Sacrifice in the Ancient Near East.” Pages 11–43 in *Ritual and Sacrifice in the Ancient Near East*. Edited by Jan Quaegebeur. OLA 55. Leuven: Peeters. ♦ **Boulluec**, Alain Le, and P. **Sandevioir**. 1989. *La Bible d’Alexandrie 2: L’Exode*. Paris: Cerf. ♦ **Bowie**, Angus M. 1995. “Greek Sacrifice: Forms and Functions.” Pages 463–82 in *The Greek World*. Edited by Anton Powell. New York: Routledge. ♦ **Boyd-Taylor**, Cameron. 2004. “Linguistic Register and Septuagintal Lexicography.” Pages 149–66 in *Biblical Greek Language and Lexicography: Essays in Honor of Frederick W. Danker*. Edited by Bernard A. Taylor, John A. L. Lee, Peter R. Burton, and Richard E. Whitaker. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans. ♦ **Büchner**, Dirk. 1997. “Jewish Commentaries and the Septuagint.” *JJS* 48:250–61. ♦ **Büchner**. 2014. “Brief Remarks on the Occurrence and Value of Blood in Greek Sources from Epic Literature to Early Christianity.” Pages 255–71 in *Die Septuaginta—Text, Wirkung, Rezeption: 4. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 19.–22. Juli 2012*. Edited by Wolfgang Kraus and Siegfried Kreuzer. WUNT 325. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck. ♦ **Burkert**, Walter. 1966. “Greek Tragedy

---

I am grateful to Al Pietersma for spending a great deal of time and effort critiquing this piece of commentary. Though we did not agree on all points, many of his suggestions and corrections have been incorporated into the final draft. Cameron Boyd-Taylor, Spencer Jones, and the other contributors to this volume also offered helpful advice.

and Sacrificial Ritual.” *GRBS* 7:87–121. ♦ **Burkert**, 1997. *Homo Necans: Interpretationen altgriechischer Opferriten und Mythen*. 2nd ed. RVV 32. Berlin: de Gruyter. ♦ **Crawley**, Richard. 1934. *The Complete Writings of Thucydides: The Peloponnesian War*. New York: Modern Library. ♦ **Daniel**, Suzanne. 1966. *Recherches sur le Vocabulaire du Culte dans la Septante*. EeC 61. Paris: Klincksieck. ♦ **Détienne**, Marcel. 1989. “Culinary Practices and the Spirit of Sacrifice.” Pages 1–20 in *The Cuisine of Sacrifice among the Greeks*. Edited by Marcel Détienne and Jean-Pierre Vernant. Translated by Paula Wissing. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. ♦ **Durand**, Jean-Louis. 1989. “Greek Animals: Toward a Topology of Edible Bodies.” Pages 87–118 in *The Cuisine of Sacrifice among the Greeks*. Edited by Marcel Détienne and Jean-Pierre Vernant. Translated by Paula Wissing. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. ♦ **Fraser**, Peter M. 1972. *Ptolemaic Alexandria, Volume 1: Text*. Oxford: Clarendon. ♦ **Gill**, David. 1966. “Thysia and Selāmīm: Questions to R. Schmid’s Das Bundesopfer in Israel.” *Bib* 47:255–62. ♦ **Goodwin**, William W. 1930. *Greek Grammar*. Revised by Charles Burton Gulick. Boston: Ginn. ♦ **Gould**, John. 1985. “On Making Sense of Greek Religion.” Pages 1–33 in *Greek Religion and Society*. Edited by Pat E. Easterling and John V. Muir. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. ♦ **Graf**, Fritz. 2002. “What Is New about Greek Sacrifice?” Pages 113–25 in *Kykeon: Studies in honor of H. S. Versnel*. Edited by Herman F. J. Horstmanshoff, H. W. Singor, F. T. van Straten, and Johan H. M. Strubbe. RGRW 142. Leiden: Brill. ♦ **Harlé**, Paul, and Didier **Pralon**. 1988. *La Bible d’Alexandrie 3: Le Lévitique*. Paris: Cerf. ♦ **Honea**, Sion M. 1993. “Homer’s Daitos Eises: The Greek Sacrificial Meal.” *JRitSt* 7:53–68. ♦ **Herodotus**. 1920. *The Persian Wars, Volume I: Books 1–2*. Translated by A. D. Godley. LCL 117. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. ♦ **Huber**, Karl. 1916. *Untersuchungen über den Sprachcharakter des griechischen Leviticus*. Giessen: Töpelmann. ♦ **Huffman**, Carl A. 1993. *Philolaus of Croton: Pythagorean and Presocratic; A Commentary on the Fragments and Testimonia with Interpretive Essays*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. ♦ **Jameson**, Michael H. 1988. “Sacrifice and Ritual.” Pages 2:959–79 in *Civilization of the Ancient Mediterranean*. Edited by Michael Grant and Rachel Kitzinger. New York: Scribner. ♦ **Jones**, Spencer. 2015. “Syntax in the Septuagint: With Special Reference to Relative Clauses in Greek Numbers.” MA thesis, Trinity Western University. ♦ **Kirk**, Geoffrey S. 1981. “Some Methodological Pitfalls in the Study of Ancient Greek Sacrifice (in Particular).” Pages 41–90 in *Le Sacrifice Dans l’Antiquité: Entretiens sur l’Antiquité Classique, Vandœuvres-Genève, 25–30 août 1980*. Edited by Jean Rudhart

and Olivier Reverdin. EnAC 27. Geneva: Vandoeuvres. ♦ **Levinsohn**, Stephen H. 1992. *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek*. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics. ♦ **Meuli**, Karl. 1946. “Griechische Opferbräuche.” Pages 185–288 in *Phyllobolia für Paul von der Mühll zum 60. Geburtstag am 1. August 1945*. Edited by Olof Gigon and Karl Meuli. Basel: Schwabe. ♦ **Milgrom**, Jacob. 1991. *Leviticus 1–16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 3. New York: Doubleday. ♦ **Soisalon-Soininen**, Ilmari. 1987. *Studien zur Septuaginta-Syntax: Zu seinem 70. Geburtstag am 4. Juni 1987*. Edited by Anneli Aejmelaesus and Raija Sollamo. AASF B 237. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia. ♦ **Spicq**, Ceslas. 1994. *Theological Lexicon of the New Testament*. Translated by James D. Ernest. 3 vols. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson. ♦ **Stengel**, Paul. 1972. *Opferbräuche der Griechen*. Stuttgart: Teubner. ♦ **Straten**, Folkert van. 1987. “Greek Sacrificial Representations: Livestock Prices and Religious Mentality.” Pages 159–70 in *Gifts to the Gods: Proceedings of the Uppsala Symposium, 1985*. Edited by Tullia Linders and Gullög Nordquist. AAU 15. Uppsala: ACTA Universitatis Upsaliensis. ♦ **Straten**. 1988. “The God’s Portion in Greek Sacrificial Representation: Is the Tail Doing Nicely?” Pages 51–68 in *Early Greek Cult Practice: Proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium at the Swedish Institute at Athens, 26–29, June, 1986*. Edited by Robin Hägg, Nannó Marinatos, and Gullög C. Nordquist. Skrifter Utgivna Av Svenska Institutet i Athen 38. Stockholm: Svenska Institutet i Athen. ♦ **Tarn**, William W. 1933. “Two Notes on Ptolemaic History.” *JHS* 53:57–68. ♦ **Ulrich**, Eugene. 1994. “4QLev<sup>b</sup>.” Pages 177–87 in *Qumran Cave 4.VII: Genesis to Numbers*. Edited by Eugene Ulrich, Frank Moore Cross, James R. Davila, Jastram Nathan, Judith E. Sanderson, Emanuel Tov, and John Strugnell. DJD 12. Oxford: Clarendon. ♦ **Vahrenhorst**, Martin. 2009. “Leuitikon.” in LXX.D. ♦ **Vernant**, Jean-Pierre. 1989. “At Man’s Table: Hesiod’s Foundation Myth of Sacrifice.” Pages 21–86 in *The Cuisine of Sacrifice among the Greeks*. Edited by Marcel Détienne and Jean-Pierre Vernant. Translated by Paula Wissing. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. ♦ **Wevers**, John W. 1986. *Text History of the Greek Leviticus*. MSU 19. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. ♦ **Wevers**. 1997. *Notes on the Greek Text of Leviticus*. SCS 44. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

## Outline

This chapter concerns gifts from the animal groups cattle, sheep, and goats that may be brought as victims for the sacrifice of deliverance (θυσία

σωτηρίου) and in each case, an additional offering (*κάρπωμα*) is made of some of the animals' internal parts, as a kind of ritual within the ritual. The role of the respective agents, whether suppliant or priests, is not always clear. The anatomical terminology is also rather imprecise and together these two matters will provide some indication of the translator's purpose in creating a Greek version of a Hebrew ritual.

### Commentary

#### 3.1

ואם זבח שלמים קרבנו אם מן הבקר הוא מקריב אם זכר אם נקבה  
תמים יקריבנו לפני יהוה

Ἐὰν δὲ θυσία σωτηρίου τὸ δῶρον αὐτοῦ τῷ κυρίῳ, ἐὰν μὲν ἐκ τῶν  
βοῶν αὐτὸ προσαγάγῃ, ἐὰν τε ἄρσεν ἐὰν τε θῆλυ, ἄμωμον προσάξει  
αὐτὸ ἔναντι κυρίου.

Now if his gift to the Lord is a sacrifice of deliverance, if he brings it from the cattle, whether male or female, he shall bring it without blemish before the Lord.

**ἐάν.** When viewed as a whole, the verse consists of a conditional sentence with multiple protases and a single apodosis. The structure of the Hebrew is carefully modeled in Greek; one notices for instance four occurrences of *ἐάν* for the four of **אם**. The first protasis is verbless. Normally, the verb in the protasis is suppressed when it is understood to be the same as the one in the apodosis; for example, in 2.5, *ἐὰν δὲ θυσία ἀπὸ τηγάνου τὸ δῶρόν σου σεμίδαλις πεφυραμένη ἐν ἐλαίῳ ἄζυμα ἔσται* but that is not the case here (cf. Smyth §2345).

**δέ.** NETS renders “now” to indicate that this particle is standing in for Hebrew *waw* in a statement that is not adversative but rather introducing information that builds on what precedes it, in this case the statement of 1.3 (cf. Levinsohn 1992, 112). An example is found in P.Rev. Laws, col. 43.3–4 (259 BCE): “Ὅσαι δ’ ἐν δωρεῖα κῶμαι εἰσιν, ἐν ταύταις δὲ ἐλαιουργῖον μῆθὲν καθιστάτωσαν” (“Now whichever villages are held in gift, in these they shall set up no oil factory”; see Jones 2015, 157).

**θυσία.** The pairing of *θυσία* with **זבח** occurs twice in Genesis and three times in Exodus. The Exodus translator employed along with it three other nominal cognates of *θύω*, but it was the Leviticus translator who cemented



this particular match and subsequently it appears to have become the standard. There may be little else to say about the word's employment in this chapter besides the fact that it is the most self-evident translational equivalent due to its semantic closeness to the Hebrew noun.

However, there is a sense in which cultic words belong to a special category, and having some understanding of this word's cultural value as well as its performance aspects will be essential if we are to form a judgment of the translator's depiction of the procedure in the verses that follow. One could imagine that as he worked, searching for vocabulary of sacrifice from sources familiar to him, he would no doubt have become aware that the ritual described here in his Hebrew text and the Greek *θυσία* are virtually identical in practice. Both belong to what is known as the alimentary communion sacrifice, in which meat for human consumption is slaughtered in a sacral setting. Hebrews as well as Greeks ate meat only under such conditions. In both cultures, depictions of the sacrifice paid more attention to the post-kill ceremony than to the act of slaughter. Of special interest for this chapter is that both required their deities to be given a special due consisting of some of the internal parts. Lastly, in both cultures the victim's flesh was afterward eaten by the wider community in a festal setting. There are of course divergences too. The god's special portion offered by Greeks was not quite identical to that given by Jews, and its giving was motivated by a different understanding of the deity's participation (Gill 1966, 255 and n. 1 for bibliography). Hebrew participants did not partake of the internal organs as their Greek counterparts were accustomed to, and neither was the Hebrew ritual accompanied by a procession, music, or gifts of barley and wine. A Greek *θυσία* had women and sometimes a *μάγειρος* officiating whereas Jewish sacrifice permitted only priests. Nevertheless the fact of the rituals' broadly identical procedures is significant and will constantly be in the background as we ask whether the translator (G) fully understood the terminology found in his *Vorlage* and whether he was concerned about the suitability of the Greek cultic terminology he chose for his translation. Behind these questions lies a statement made by the notable historian Peter Fraser, that in Alexandria, Greek-speaking foreigners writing about their religious practices gave them an *interpretatio graeca* to which Jews would have been no exception (1972, 190). Whether or not this may be true for Leu 3 will be demonstrated below. In preparing the commentary for this chapter it became clear that some background knowledge of the Greek sacrificial vocabulary was necessary in order to come to an understanding of what G tried to pass on to his reader.

Of the alimentary ritual's performance aspects we know a great deal, since it is the cultic procedure most often recounted in Greek literature. Textual as well as epigraphic evidence show that from as far back as Hesiod and Homer through to Appollonius in the third century, the *θυσία* remained essentially the same. Of all retellings, the epic material is most well known and receives the bulk of attention in scholarship. Among later texts that describe it are Sophocles, *Ant.* 1020 and Apollonius Rhodius, *Argon.* 698. On Hesiod, see Burkert 1966, 104 and especially n. 37 for bibliography; on the Homeric material, Kirk 1981, 63–80. On the epigraphic evidence, Jameson 1988, 971; Durand 1989, 87–118; and van Straten 1987, 160; see also Bowie 1995, 464–65; and Honea 1993, 56–57.

As a starting point it must be asserted that the Leviticus translator was familiar with the terminology associated with *θυσία*, and drew from it the vocabulary items he needed in order to create a Greek version of the Hebrew meal sacrifice. But this selection appears to have been made arbitrarily and without care. We notice for example, that technical terms that would have stood him in good stead, such as *γέρας*, or *σπλάγχνα* are absent. Other Greek words like *μηρία* and *ὄσφϋς* were simply slotted into his telling like pieces of a puzzle where they neither fitted well nor brought across the semantic value of their Hebrew counterparts. This can only be explained by the fact that G was primarily concerned with representing the linguistic features present in the source text piece by piece; in other words, he was faithfully translating a sacred text as it was demanded of him by convention. He therefore tended to rely on established equivalents, rather than employ words that more adequately communicated the meaning of the Hebrew. This is why the bound formation *זבח שלמים* is represented by a Greek genitival compound: *θυσία σωτηρίου*. If such care to faithfully render item by item had not been his guiding principle, he might have recognized that *זבח שלמים* and *θυσία* are so similar that the latter term by itself could serve as the most fitting descriptor, fully adequate for Greek speakers to grasp the content and cultural value of the Hebrew ritual. But instead, he gave his version of the alimentary sacrifice a compound title, a hybrid no Greek speaker would have recognized, and this out of concern that the vocabulary of the source text be represented in a quantitatively equivalent fashion.

*σωτηρίου*. NETS's chosen rendering "sacrifice of *deliverance*" is supported by LXX.D's "Rettungsopfer" and BdA "offrande de *salut*." The precise meaning of *שלמים* has always been unclear. The targumim, for instance, offer no

help with their rendering נכסת קודשיא. Hebrew שלמים carries the sense of well-being, health, completeness or finality, but there is little consensus on how exactly such meanings are to be understood in relation to a ritual associated with the rare activity of eating meat. The explanation found in rabbinic tradition is that the שלמים are so called because they give peace, or provide release from vows (Daniel 1966, 274; cf. Milgrom 1991, 220). It is doubtful whether G was himself certain of the Hebrew or aware of any contemporary attempts at making sense of it. It is safer to say that here, as in similar cases, he follows the lead of the Exodus translator (25.5 and 32.6) who selected for it a neuter adjective in the genitive, denoting “safety” or “deliverance” (LSJ, s.v. “σωτήριον” I.b). Why this should have been G Exodus’s rendition is uncertain since there is no discernible semantic overlap between the Hebrew and Greek terms (Le Boulluec and Sandevor 1989, 244). Anyone living in third century Ptolemaic Alexandria hearing the word σωτήριον used in a ritual context would have associated it not with an alimentary sacrifice but rather with a civic offering for deliverance called τό σωτήριον ἱερόν or frequently τά σωτήρια ἱερά, (LSJ, s.v. “σωτήριον” II.2). The *Soteria* in third-century Alexandria included music, sacrifices, and libations by Dionysiac artists to the θεοί σωτῆρες Philadelphus and Arsinoë I (Tarn, 1933, 60). Athenaeus *Deipn.* 11.97 cites the third century lyric poet Theocles as follows: ἐθύσαμεν γὰρ σήμερον Σωτήρια πάντες οἱ τεχνῖται· μεθ’ ὧν πιὼν τὸ δίκερας ὡς τὸν φίλτατον βασιλέα πάρεμι (“All we artists have to-day celebrated with sacrifice the festival of Salvation; in their company I have drunk the double horn and am come into the presence of our dearest king,” trans. Gulick). The presence of τεχνῖται and δίκερας helps to situate this ritual in the Ptolemaic cult. Beyond Egypt, the σωτήριον was a regular sacrifice according to a set calendar that required neighboring dignitaries to attend (Polybius, *Hist.* 4.49), and a sacrifice offered out of gratitude for, or even to achieve deliverance, perhaps in the realm of personal safety or health (Xenophon, *Anab.* 3.2.9). Daniel (1966, 278 and esp. 279) mentions a number of similar occurrences of this term that postdate the Greek Pentateuch.

It is therefore difficult for the modern commentator to account for G’s use of this word. Obviously, he did not intend his readership to take it to connote what it did for pagan Alexandrians. Philo, perhaps anxious to rule out such a possibility, points out that the σωτήρ in this sacrifice is the God of the Jews (*Spec. Laws* 1.252). If all we can say is that G simply went along with the Exodus translator, it is likely that he was uncertain about

the meaning of the Hebrew. Neither was he concerned about any discord caused by including in his nomenclature an adjectival element known to refer to a pagan rite. Later translators in an effort to resolve this tried other alternatives. Reigns and Proverbs, for example, made use of the etymological rendering εἰρηνικός, while Josephus (*A.J.* 3.228) reformulated it as a χαριστήρια θυσία.

**τῷ κυρίῳ.** This may be a *Vorlage*-based harmonization as it is found also in 4Q24 (4QLev<sup>b</sup>) (Ulrich 1994, 180).

**ἐάν μέν ... ἐάν τε ... ἐάν τε.** G is careful to represent each element of the **ואם** clauses with corresponding morphemes. The μέν can either be viewed as solitary, “if in fact” (Wevers 1997, 23) or as resolved by δέ in verses 6 and 12. The double ἐάν τε ... ἐάν τε accompanying the subjunctive προσαγάγη renders the two Hebrew disjunctive clauses (Joüon §175e) and the result finds analogy in, for example, Thucydides 4.98.2: τὸν δὲ νόμον τοῖς Ἑλλήσιν εἶναι, ὣν ἂν ᾗ τὸ κράτος τῆς γῆς ἐκάστης ἦν τε πλεονος ἦν τε βραχυτέρας, τούτων καὶ τὰ ἱερὰ αἰεὶ γίνεσθαι (“The law of the Hellenes was that conquest of a country, whether more or less extensive, carried with it possession of the temples in that country,” trans. Crawley; cf. Smyth §2852a).

**αὐτὸ προσαγάγη.** Here and in verse 7 (cf. 21.8) **הוא מקריב** must be understood as a fientive verb expressing “a single and comparatively transitory act” (GKC §116f; cf. IBHS §37.3b) and G renders appropriately with an aorist subjunctive. Although the meaning is not identical with the Hebrew, G by adding the objective pronoun manages to maintain the Hebrew word order, but also provide his reader with additional information. A chiasm results with προσάξει αὐτό later in the verse.

**ἄμωμον.** The adjective can be applied to concretes (the male victim) as well as to abstracts (the gift). Herodotus speaks of ἀμώμῳ νόμῳ ([by] “a perfect law” *Hist.* 2.177, trans. Godley).

**ἄμωμον προσάξει αὐτό.** The Hebrew formula **תמים יקריבנו** is one in which an indefinite adjective expressing a state is placed before or after a verb (GKC §118n.a) here referring to the verb's object and the feature it possesses at the time of the verbal action (IBHS §10.2.2.d, esp. n. 19). There is therefore more than simple juxtaposition at play, or else an attributive might have been employed with the noun itself. The question for the analyst

of the Greek to settle is this: If the translator was aware of such a sense, and tried to express it by means of Greek that nevertheless strictly maintains the word order of the Hebrew, did he succeed in producing a comparable effect? This is not impossible to imagine, if one regards the adjective as a nominal accusative of specification in apposition to the pronoun, in other words, “he shall bring it (as something) without blemish.” What is the referent of the adjective ἄμωμον and the pronoun αὐτό? In Hebrew, most of the nouns are masculine, so that the masculine verbal suffix could refer to any one of the offering, the sacrifice, or the male and female animal (1.3, 10; 3.1, 6) but most likely it is the animal itself that is intended. The Greek neuter pronoun can refer only to δῶρον or ἄρσεν to be brought as something without defect. The same considerations will obtain in verse 6, but similar wording in verse 9 causes some complications.

### 3.2

סמך ידו על ראש קרבנו ושחטו פתח אהל מועד וזרקו בני אהרן  
הכהנים את הדם על המזבח סביב

καὶ ἐπιθήσει τὰς χεῖρας ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν τοῦ δώρου καὶ σφάξει αὐτὸ  
παρὰ τὰς θύρας τῆς σκηνῆς τοῦ μαρτυρίου· καὶ προσχεοῦσιν οἱ υἱοὶ  
Ἀαρὼν οἱ ἱερεῖς τὸ αἷμα ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον τῶν ὀλοκαυτωμάτων  
κύκλῳ.

And he shall lay his hands on the head of the gift, and he shall slaughter it at the entrance to the tent of witness, and the sons of Aaron the priests shall pour out the blood against all sides of the altar of whole burnt offerings.

**τὰς χεῖρας.** Three times in this chapter, in contrast to chapter 1, hands are plural. Paul Harlé and Didier Pralon (1988, 91) contend that this is following an oral tradition, which one sees reflected in m. Menah. 9:8. There is no doubt that some known traditions of correct cultic procedure will color our interpretation of what is found in the LXX's version of biblical prescriptions (see Büchner 1997). But the question of whether or not G took care to be legally precise for the benefit of a living community will raise itself a number of times in this chapter, and the answer appears most often to be in the negative. Instances in which there are analogies between the OG's wording and later Jewish writings seem to be balanced out by the times when the Greek is so vague that any concern for legal clarity must be out of the question.

**δώρου.** If G were composing a text in which he wanted to convey the details of a ritual, he might have preferred to employ a more suitable Greek word that specifies the victim (gifts tend not to have heads), such as σφάγιον or ἱερεῖον. But as a translator he was determined not to vary the pairing of קרבן and δῶρον he established in 1.2.

**σφάζει αὐτό.** In chapter 1 G changed the singular of the Hebrew (which is consistently so) to a plural but here, as Harlé and Pralon (1988, 91) suggest, the primitive tradition appears unchanged: the suppliant slaughters and the priests participate only by manipulating the parts. Not so in verse 13! One notices that here G represents the Hebrew verbal suffix, a practice he does not follow throughout. That he does not render the suffix on “hands” is simply because it is good Greek to omit a suffix when the possessor is obvious.

**προσχεοῦσιν ... αἷμα.** Again, G appears not to take great pains to reproduce the Hebrew ritual in a pedantic way (pouring on is not sprinkling), but rather to represent a Hebrew action with a loosely corresponding Greek one, already familiar from Exodus. In extrabiblical Greek literature blood as the object of χέω and cognates is found mostly in reference to human bloodshed, not animal sacrifice. Artistic and literary depictions of animal sacrifice do show animal blood being splashed onto altars, and the regular terms for this action are αἰμάσσω and αἵματόω. But unlike the Hebrews, Greeks did not assign any special operative value to blood in animal sacrifice and so it is hardly ever mentioned in recollections of the θυσία. It was merely abandoned as something that belongs to the gods (Durand 1989, 95 and for a fuller discussion of blood in the Greek and Hebrew worlds see Büchner 2014, 256–71). Our translator may have preferred to employ a word like αἰμάσσω, but once again he prefers to retain an established Hebrew-Greek relation, for the sake of his audience.

**τάς θύρας.** Though θύρα can mean “entrance” as well as “door,” in NETS “door” is used for the singular, and “entrance” for the plural. The translator alternates randomly between the two for the Hebrew singular (Wevers 1986, 73).

**τῶν δλοκαυτωμάτων.** The Hebrew העלה מזבח likely underlying this addition occurs several times in Exodus, but there עלה is only rendered

by *όλοκαύτωμα* once. In the case of Leviticus the match of *עלה* with *όλοκαύτωμα* occurs repeatedly in chapter 4, and if Wevers is correct (1997, 25), the translator is harmonizing from a knowledge of the Hebrew text of that chapter. Milgrom (1991, 205) feels that if the addition is for clarification it is unnecessary since there is no doubt that the outer altar is meant.

### 3.3

והקריב מזבח השלמים אשה ליהוה את החלב המכסה את הקרב  
ואת כל החלב אשר על הקרב

καὶ προσάξουσιν ἀπὸ τῆς θυσίας τοῦ σωτηρίου *κάρπωμα* κυρίῳ, τὸ  
στέαρ τὸ κατακαλύπτει τὴν κοιλίαν καὶ πᾶν τὸ στέαρ τὸ ἐπὶ τῆς  
κοιλίας,

And they shall bring from the sacrifice of deliverance an offering  
to the Lord: the fat that covers the entrails and all the fat that is on  
the entrails

*προσάξουσιν*. The verb can take a double accusative like other verbs of bringing and offering. In Hebrew constructions that contain two objects, the predicate accusative is usually marked by indefiniteness (GKC §118; Joüon §129a). In this case indefinite “offering” is followed by definite “fat.” For the most part, G is careful to follow the Hebrew word order and to supply the article in Greek when present in the Hebrew, and vice versa. As in Hebrew, the Greek predicate accusative is usually distinguishable from the direct object by the former’s lacking the article (BDR §273, Smyth §1150, 1614). The same formula is found in verses 7, 9, and 14. The sense conveyed in all three instances is that the fat and the other ingredients are separated off to make up a suboffering, a *κάρπωμα*.

G pluralizes, since in his understanding the priests are manipulating the separated parts (recall chs. 1–2). It brings this verse into conflict with 7.20 [MT 30]. That he fails to pluralize the future verb at the end of 3.4 presents numerous difficulties discussed by Wevers (1997, 24). In NETS we have made no effort at a resolution. From the perspective of modern sensibilities, the translation ends up trapped between an alteration in verse 3 that is not carried over into verse 4. But this kind of logical inconsistency is to be attributed to what Soisalon-Soininen identified as the translators’ mode of work (1987, 88): they proceeded phrase by phrase in a forward direction and often ignored the wider context, in this case the sentences preceding and following.



**θυσίας ... κάρπωμα.** In chapter 1 and in 23.37, these two terms are used appositionally, referring to the gift itself. But in this verse and elsewhere *κάρπωμα* comprises of internal organs removed from the victim. G chose to render the Hebrew sacrificial terms only very generally, a matter that has caused generations of interpreters varying degrees of surprise. Greek to Hebrew equivalence is not always helpful as an indicator of G's intentionality since he uses Greek words interchangeably for more than one Hebrew word: **תשא** – *θυσία* nine times; **זבחו** – *θυσία* thirty-two times; **תשא** – *κάρπωμα* nineteen times; and **שחט** – *όλοκαύτωμα* seven times. While consistent matching was not carried out in all cases, quantitative representation appears to have been a commensurate goal.

**κάρπωμα.** This term succeeds as a stand-in for **תשא** because, as Paul Stengel (1972, 166) pointed out, it is a burnt offering—the cognate verb *καρπύω* does not mean “bring a fruit offering” but “make a burnt offering” (cf. LXX.D “Feueropfer”; this pairing has already been employed in Exodus). Stengel cites there an inscription that describes the sacrifice of a cock to Osiris and Nephthys who receive their share before the suppliants consume the rest. Viewed from a religio-cultural perspective, *κάρπωμα* is not at home in the semantic domain of *θυσία*. It is never used to refer to the firstfruits offering within the alimentary sacrifice, that is, the deity's special portion—the usual terms are *γέρας*, *ἄργματα* or *θυελαί*. G again chooses not to select a field-specific term, but prefers to make use of an established pairing.

To aid us in evaluating G's choice of vocabulary for the ingredients of his *κάρπωμα*, a knowledge of the Greek firstfruits offering will be of some value. Apart from the *σπλάγχνα* the most significant of its ingredients were the *ὀσφῦς* (haunches with tail), *νώτος* or *ράχις* (tender meat from the back and the loin), and the *μηροί* or *μηρία* (thighs or thighbones) onto which a double layer of fat was laid (any of *πιμελή*, *πῖαρ*, *πίων*, *δημός*, *κνίση*).

**στέαρ.** Though *στέαρ* is not found among the other words for fat in standard recollections of the Greek ritual, it is found here as we have come to expect, by reason of being the standard equivalent for **לֶחֶל** found already in Genesis and Exodus (and will remain so in the rest of the LXX). G is unique in rendering also **פֶּתֶל** by *στέαρ*. The word *στέαρ* is more commonly encountered in anatomical descriptions, and if this was a concern of G's it is used correctly here. The fact that he is not employing any of the other five terms mentioned above, shows again that he is not overly concerned



to contextualize, but rather to abide by established pairings, so that when Greek equivalents appear, they will be recognized by the audience as the representative of Hebrew words perhaps known to them.

**κοιλίαν.** In Genesis and Exodus the word levels **בטן**, **גחן**, and **קרב** (“intestines”), and it is likely that Exod 29.13 and 22 served as basis for G’s selection in this case. Though **κοιλία** can also mean the intestines in addition to the cavity (LSJ), the more usual word in Greek parlance is **έντερα**, contrasting with **σπλάγχνα** (the noble viscera), neither of which occurs in the LXX’s cultic contexts. G’s equivalent makes no effort to clarify the Hebrew although the word by its dual sense may communicate that there are two kinds of fat—the first kind enclosing the innards and the second kind found on the organs or on the body cavity.

### 3.4

ואת שתי הכלית ואת החלב אשר עלהן אשר על הכסלים ואת היתרת  
על הכבד על הכליות יסירנה

καὶ τοὺς δύο νεφροὺς καὶ τὸ στέαρ τὸ ἐπ’ αὐτῶν, τὸ ἐπὶ τῶν μηρίων,  
καὶ τὸν λοβὸν τὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ ἥπατος, σὺν τοῖς νεφροῖς περιελεῖ,  
and the two kidneys and the fat that is on them at the thighs, and  
he shall remove the appendage that is on the liver with the kidneys.

**νεφρούς.** To the Greeks, kidneys and liver were regarded as congealed blood and belonged to the category of **σπλάγχνα**, whose spitting and roasting comprised one of the most sacred moments of the sacrifice, the moment of communing with the gods (see below). Semites, on the other hand, regarded the kidneys as suet (Milgrom 1991, 207) and did not eat them. In any case, the kidneys are found in the deity’s portion here just as they are in the Greek ritual.

**μηρίων.** The word **μηρία** (used five times in Leuitikon and in the LXX only ever again in Iob 15.27), meaning “thighs” or “thighbones” (LSJ; cf. *BdA* “cuisse,” *pace* LXX.D “Lendenstücke”) is by far the most weighty technical term of the Greek **θυσία**. The thighbones were part of the **γέρας** or firstfruits, overlaid with fat and burned as the deity’s portion. G chose this part of the anatomy as a match for **בסל**, which Milgrom (1991, 207) translates as “sinews,” noting its Akkadian cognate “the transverse process of the vertebra,” and not “loins” as *HALOT* and *NRSV*. There is therefore neither lexical

nor anatomical connection between כסל (the inner spine) and μηρία (the upper legs), whose pairing is without prior precedent. It is likely that G was uncertain of a Hebrew term and provided for it a word suitable only by virtue of its prominence in the linguistic environment of θυσία (see next entry). It is almost as if his depiction would have been incomplete without inclusion of the μηρία, and the best opportunity for him to do so was here.

τὸ στέαρ τὸ ἐπ’ αὐτῶν, τὸ ἐπὶ τῶν μηρίων. The structure of G’s clauses here, in verse 10 and in verse 15 follows the Hebrew exactly, so that the presence of the Hebrew relative is carefully indicated each time. Whenever רשא occurs with a prepositional phrase as it does here, G renders almost without exception by the adjectival use of the article, producing a restrictive sense that provides essential information about otherwise referentially nonspecific substantives (Jones 2015, §3.6.2.). This makes the current clause all the more jarring, since kidneys are nowhere near thighs, and what little fat is on the flesh of the thighs is not easily separable. NETS tries to convey this somewhat nonsensical aspect of the OG, in contrast to Brenton’s “he shall take away that which is on the thighs” which is not entirely faithful to the Greek since the article in the adjectival phrase refers back to στεάρ (cf. *BdA*, 92). G’s choice of μηρία and especially as something supposedly covered in the fat found in the region of the kidneys, shows that he is quite unconcerned with giving precise instructions by which members of a living community are to observe a rite.

τὸν (ἐπὶ τοῦ ἥπατος). An רשא is presumed to occur here in the same fashion as it does before על twice in the rest of this verse.

καὶ τὸν λοβόν ... περιελεί. NRSV’s “the appendage of the liver, which he shall remove with the kidneys” reads the final clause of verse 3 as an asyndetic relative clause subordinate to הקריב at the beginning of the previous verse. The NJB regards the objective suffix of יסירנה to resume an object other than the lobe of the liver, thus “the mass of fat which he will remove from the liver and kidneys.” There is some value in that, since Milgrom intimates that the Hebrew is concerned with three kinds of fat (1991, 205). But G regards the predicate of καὶ προσάξουσιν beginning the previous verse to end at μηρίων after which a new sentence begins, emphasizing that the lobe on the liver is to be removed together with the kidneys. G reads the relative clause as beginning with a *casus pendens* of the object (Joüon §156c) with that object resumed in the suffix.

**σύν.** Though occurring also in Pesh and followed by Ibn Ezra and 11Q19 (11QTemple) 23.15 (Milgrom, 1991, 208) σύν may be regarded here as an explanatory rendering that represents the correct value of the Hebrew preposition as “in addition to.”

**περιελεί.** In contrast with σφάζει αὐτό above, the objective suffix is not rendered here nor in verse 10. In Hebrew the appendage of the liver is intended by the suffix but the Greek may be viewed as referring to everything that must be removed with the kidneys (cf. Wevers 1997, 25), although NETS reflects the equally possible view that only the lobe is the verb’s intended object.

### 3.5

והקטירו אתו בני אהרן המזבחה על העלה אשר על העצים אשר על  
האש אשה ריח ניחח ליהוה

καὶ ἀνοίσουσιν αὐτὰ οἱ υἱοὶ Ἀαρὼν οἱ ἱερεῖς ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον, ἐπὶ  
τὰ ὀλοκαυτώματα ἐπὶ τὰ ξύλα τὰ ἐπὶ τοῦ πυρός· κάρπωμα, ὁσμὴ  
εὐωδίας κυρίῳ·

And the sons of Aaron the priests shall offer them up on the altar,  
on the whole burnt offerings on the wood that is on the fire; it is  
an offering, an odor of fragrance to the Lord.

**ἀνοίσουσιν.** This verb is not normally employed in cultic descriptions. It is found here most probably as a result of its initial etymological pairing with **עלה** in Genesis. By the time of Exodus this is extended also to קטר (3x) although Exodus was also fond of using θυμιάω (4x). The primary sense of ἀναφέρω here is the act of lifting up onto the altar, and perhaps “offer up” of NETS goes a little too far in the direction of the Hebrew meaning.

**αὐτά.** G pluralizes the objective suffix in this instance, probably to specify the ingredients themselves. The reason may be that in similar contexts (4.10, 35; 7.5) the object of the Hebrew verb is plural, and he levels for the sake of consistency. That he does not pluralize in all occurrences of multiple ingredients is due to his disinterest in standardizing, and neither will he rework any rendering on the basis of another, as we shall see shortly.

**ἐπί.** In reflecting every **על** in this way G lumps everything together on the altar as in 1.7–9. Wevers suggests a meaning like “alongside” for ἐπί (1997, 26) but NETS by repeating “on” conveys that the Hebrew preposition is

rendered consistently, at least here, and that he chose not to make use of σύν as in the previous verse.

**δλοκαυτώματα.** Harlé and Pralon (1988, 91) regard this pluralizing as perhaps referring to the daily sacrifices. In other words, the *κάρπωμα* will be burned alongside the regular whole burnt offerings performed by the Aaronides.

### 3.6

ואם מן הצאן קרבנו לזבח שלמים ליהוה זכר או נקבה תמים יקריבנו  
Ἐὰν δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν προβάτων τὸ δῶρον αὐτοῦ, θυσίαν σωτηρίου τῷ  
κυρίῳ, ἄρσεν ἢ θήλυ, ἄμωμον προσοίσει αὐτό.

But if his gift, a sacrifice of deliverance to the Lord, is from the sheep, male or female, he shall present it without blemish.

**Ἐὰν δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν προβάτων.** The case begun by ἐὰν μὲν ἐκ τῶν βοῶν in verse 1 is now expanded.

**θυσίαν.** It is hard to account for this accusative found in a nominal sentence. If we ask what lies behind it in the source text, the answer must be the *lamed* of the datival goal referring to a change in status, almost without exception rendered in Leuitikon by a preposition (εἰς and more seldom περί) with the accusative (compare εἰς δλοκαύτωμα for לַעֲלֹה in 1.10, also in a nominal sentence). Here, however, the *lamed* is not rendered at all, but the accusative remains. It may have been intended to function as a kind of accusative of respect, although such a construction does better with a verb or an adjective (see Smyth §1601c.). Wevers suggests that the accusative θυσίαν may be viewed as direct object of a proleptic προσφέρω: “(when presenting) a sacrifice of deliverance to the Lord, ... he shall present it” (1997, 27 and cf. *BdA* “si son présent est fait de petit bétail en offrande,” 92). Perhaps a rendering such as “if his gift, *for* a sacrifice of deliverance to the Lord,” would suggest that grammatically speaking the gift is related in some *respect* to the sacrifice.

**προσοίσει.** This verb can mean both “present” or “offer” and is a preferable choice to ἀναφέρω to indicate the act of bringing a sacrifice (Spicq 1994, 3:118).

**ἄμωμον προσοίσει αὐτό.** See comment at verse 1.

3.7

אם כשב הוא מקריב את קרבנו והקריב אתו לפני יהוה

ἐὰν ἄρνα προσαγάγῃ τὸ δῶρον αὐτοῦ, προσάξει αὐτὸ ἔναντι κυρίου

If he brings a lamb as his gift, he shall bring it before the Lord

ἐὰν ἄρνα ... τὸ δῶρον αὐτοῦ. As in verse 3, it would be natural to regard the indefinite noun (in this case the animal kind) as predicate accusative. Although NETS takes indefinite ἄρνα as the direct object, it would be preferable to say “his gift by way of a lamb,” as does LXX.D with “seine Gabe in Gestalt eines Lammes” (101).

προσαγάγῃ. See above at verse 1.

3.8

וסמך את ידו על ראש קרבנו ושחט אתו לפני אהל מועד וזרקו בני אהרן את דמו על המזבח סביב

καὶ ἐπιθήσει τὰς χεῖρας ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν τοῦ δώρου αὐτοῦ καὶ σφάξει αὐτὸ παρὰ τὰς θύρας τῆς σκηνῆς τοῦ μαρτυρίου· καὶ προσχεοῦσιν οἱ υἱοὶ Ἀαρὼν οἱ ἱερεῖς τὸ αἶμα ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον κύκλῳ.

and he shall lay his hands on the head of his gift and he shall slaughter it at the entrance of the tent of witness. And the sons of Aaron the priests shall pour out the blood against all sides of the altar.

Comparing 3.8 with 3.2, one notices that the Greek is quite similar, but for the addition of αὐτοῦ here and the omission of τῶν ὀλοκαυμάτων which was added there. Besides that, G appears to be rendering a text very similar to the MT of verse 2, having פתח instead of לפני and the addition of הכהנים after the sons of Aaron (cf. Milgrom 1991, 210). It is hard to know whether a translator has a previous Greek sentence in memory and harmonizes the present one toward it, or harmonizes the present sentence to a Hebrew verse in memory from elsewhere in the book, although both are possible. This phenomenon is further discussed in Spencer Jones's commentary on Num 22 (p. 147).

3.9

והקריב מזבח השלמים אשה ליהוה חלבו האליה תמימה לעמת העצה יסירנה ואת החלב המכסה את הקרב ואת כל החלב אשר על הקרב

καὶ προσοίσει ἀπὸ τῆς θυσίας τοῦ σωτηρίου κάρπωμα τῷ θεῷ, τὸ στέαρ καὶ τὴν ὀσφύν ἄμωμον· σὺν ταῖς ψόαις περιελεῖ αὐτό· καὶ τὸ στέαρ τὸ κατακαλύπτει τὴν κοιλίαν, καὶ τὸ στέαρ τὸ ἐπὶ τῆς κοιλίας, And he shall present some of the sacrifice of deliverance as an offering to God: the fat and the lower back without blemish (he shall remove it with the loin muscles), and the fat that covers the entrails and the fat that is on the entrails,

**ἀπό.** NETS, with its “some of” rather than repeating “from” at verse 3 (whose Greek text is identical, apart from the initial verb) indicates to the English reader that the **מִן** of the parent text is represented carefully, and that the Greek word, like its Hebrew counterpart, may be understood in these two ways.

**τῷ θεῷ.** The variation of **ὁ θεός** and **κύριος** for the Tetragrammaton is hap-hazard and cannot be regarded as having any significance.

**ὀσφύν.** The anatomical term **ὀσφῦς** refers to the “lower back” (LSJ, cf. LEH, 449), “waist, loins” (LSJ, cf. GELS, 510) of a sacrificial animal. The pairing of **הֵילֵל** (“fat tail”) and **ὀσφῦς** is an innovation of G, and it is uncertain why he made this choice, since there is no semantic affinity between the two words. This fact motivated the Three to render **הֵילֵל** by **κέρκιον** and Josephus in *A.J.* 3.228 to speak of **οὐρά** (Wevers 1997, 28; Harlé and Pralon 1988, 92), which is what Herodotus calls the fat tail of the Arabian sheep (*Hist.* 3.113). In contrast, **ὀσφῦς** refers to the lumbar region and the flesh-covered bones of the haunches as in Xenophon’s description of the horse (*Eq.* 1:12:3) and the hunting hound (*Cyn.* 4.1.9, whose long tail, incidentally, is also **οὐρά**). In Aristophanes, *Pax* 1053–1055 and in the scholiast on that passage, **ὀσφῦς** and **κέρκος** appear together in a way that shows there is this distinction between them.

As a cultic term **ὀσφῦς** is noteworthy because like **μηρία** it is a prominent ingredient in post-Homeric descriptions of the firstfruits ritual, in which it is burned on the altar (for instance Aeschylus, *Prom.* 495). Furthermore, an **ὀσφῦς** on the altar is one of two most frequent motifs found on Attic vase paintings depicting the **θυσία**, the other being the roasting of the **σπλάγχνα** on skewers. Spitting the noble viscera is the moment of communion with the gods and the action of the **ὀσφῦς** in the fire is the means by which the gods communicate their favor (or otherwise) toward the sacrifice (Jameson 1988, 971; Durand 1989, 102). Brigitte Bergquist

(1993, 16, 18) and Folkert van Straten (1988, 57–60) provide detailed sets of illustrations depicting the sacrum with tail. In Herodotus's account of the Egyptian alimentary sacrifice (*Hist.* 2:40) the ὀσφῦς is removed with the edible portion, while what remains is burned with honey and frankincense.

In our passage, the Hebrew understanding is that the fat tail is classed as suet to be removed with the rest of the inedible parts and burned up, since YHWH, in contrast to Greek and Canaanite deities, does not partake of the meal (Milgrom 1991, 221). As with his rather reckless inclusion of the word *μηρία* above, G most likely chose ὀσφῦς above the purely anatomical terms for tail (*χέρκος* or *οὐρά*) purely by reason of the special place it holds within the lexical domain of *θυσία*. The result is that another important ingredient of the Greek *γέρας* or firstfruits now becomes also an ingredient of the LXX's *κάρπωμα*, as will the flesh of the *ψόα* (see next entry), all of which may have come as some surprise to Jews. This unease is noticeable in the alternative suggestions made by revisers of the text. Again it is not likely that by choosing this word G wanted to express anything of a cultural nature. He merely adopted a vocabulary item from the field of *θυσία* as a match for a Hebrew anatomical term of which he was perhaps unsure.

*σὺν ταῖς ψόαις*. The clause *הצעה למטה* means “close to the lower back.” G by his choice of *σὺν* now marks for inclusion in the *κάρπωμα* also the *ψόαι*, the muscles on the inside of the spine. Clearchus (Pollux II 185 [FGH 2:324]) clarifies: *οἱ δὲ ἐνδοθεν κατὰ τὴν ὀσφύν μύες καλοῦνται ψόαι* (“the inner muscles against the lower back are called *ψόαι*”). In the older recollections of *θυσία*, part of the firstfruits ritual would include the placing of fine meat on top of the deity's portion, an action known as *ῥιμοθετεῖν* (Bowie 1995, 469; Burkert 1966, 108). Together with the lower back and the thighbones, the addition now also of choice, edible bits of flesh without pretext in the Hebrew, means that G obviously relied on the Greek conceptual world to mold his portrayal of the subritual. It is hard to draw any conclusions about his intention for doing so, beyond observing that he felt no need to suppress anything that alluded to pagan notions, a fact that must be borne in mind when we evaluate his rendering of *ספח* in verse 11.

*προσώσει ... κάρπωμα ... τὸ στέαρ καὶ τὴν ὀσφύν ἄμωμον· σὺν ταῖς ψόαις περιελεί αὐτό*. An explanation of the difficult Greek syntax may now be attempted. Distinguishing direct object from object complement is the

first task and for this we must invoke the usual rule of the article. Accordingly, the definite direct objects of the verb appear to be *στέαρ* and *ὀσφύν*, with indefinite *κάρπωμα* as the predicate accusative, as NETS has it. The next question to settle is to which words *ἄμωμον* and *αὐτό* hearken back, since they are singular appearing among a list of multiple items, and perhaps at least the pronoun might have been pluralized as it was in verse 5. What is certain is that the Hebrew word order and syntax is being scrupulously represented, apart from the *waw* of the suffix on *στέαρ* being read as a copulative with *ὀσφῦς*. What is unclear is whether G chose to maintain grammatical concord at the expense of sense, or sense at the expense of concord. If we take the first option, *ἄμωμον* modifies *κάρπωμα* attributively and *αὐτό* is the latter's anaphor. In other words, an unblemished offering is removed with the loin-muscles and nothing further needs to be said. The *grammatical* make-up of the text is all we have to work with and the only measurable result is that Hebrew items are represented at the expense of logical sense. But if we take the second option and suppose that the translator wanted to produce some kind of coherent sense, it would have to mean that he allowed some laxity of syntax. In fact, there is enough evidence for G's loose syntax to suggest that this was indeed the case. We begin with *αὐτό*. What single item in the neuter is being removed together with the *ψόα*? Though there is grammatical agreement between *αὐτό* and *κάρπωμα*, it makes no sense that the *κάρπωμα* is to be removed, when as predicate accusative it represents the sum of the ingredients listed for separating off and presenting to God. Once the list is complete, the final action of *ἀναφέρειν* in verse 11 applies to the *κάρπωμα*. Alternatively, the pronoun *αὐτό* refers to *στέαρ*—the other neuter singular noun—but again it hardly makes sense that “the fat” in general is singled out for removal with the *ὀσφῦς* after which two more specific kinds of fat are mentioned. Wevers observes a number of times that G is prone to employ neuter pronouns to refer to the foregoing in a general way with no particular identifiable antecedent (e.g., 1997, 357). Karl Huber also (1916, 34–35) drew attention to this verse as another of many cases in which G employs the neuter singular pronoun in lockstep with a corresponding Hebrew item in the singular, without concern for agreement with antecedents. The neuter pronoun refers to a masculine antecedent in 1.16, *καὶ ἀφελεί τὸν πρόλοβον σὺν τοῖς πτεροῖς καὶ ἐκβαλεῖ αὐτό* (הַשְׁלִיךְ אֹתוֹ) and to a feminine in 2.11, *πᾶσαν γὰρ ζύμην καὶ πᾶν μέλι οὐ προσοίσετε ἀπ' αὐτοῦ* (מִמֶּנּוּ). What is then being removed here with the loin-muscles appears to be an unspecified, general item.



For *ἄμωμον* there are two possible grammatical explanations. It can be a neuter attributive adjective agreeing with *κάρπωμα* some words distant, but this may be no more than fortuitous. It is more probable that *ἄμωμον* is simply employed as the expected stand-in for *תמימה*, again without too much concern shown for agreement with an antecedent, as we saw in the case of *αὐτό*. Again a precedent exists for disagreement in gender when neuter adjectives are employed. In Exod 12.9 we notice οὐκ ἔδεσθε ἀπ' αὐτῶν ὠμὸν οὐδὲ ἠψημένον ἐν ὕδατι ἀλλ' ἢ ὀπτὰ πυρί (“You shall not eat from it raw or boiled with water but rather roasted in fire” NETS). Comparable cases in Leuitikon are *ζυμωτόν* in 2.11 (for *ζυμωτήν*), *ἄθυτόν* in 19.5-7 (for *ἄθυτός*), *ἄμωμον* and *δεκτόν* in 22.21 (for *ἄμωμός* and *δεκτήν*). There is, however, another way of viewing *ἄμωμον*. If it is a predicate adjective then some of the difficulty is removed. It may function as a predicate to the verbal action, that is, as a quality of the *subject*, where in English we would use an adverb (Goodwin 1930, §926, Smyth §1042). The phrase *παῖσαν θυσίαν ἣν ἂν προσφέρητε κυρίῳ οὐ ποιήσετε ζυμωτόν* of 2.11 also fits this category. A meaning like “present ... the fat and the lower back, in a perfect way” would not sit uncomfortably here. Then *pace* Wevers (1997, 29), G was not unaware of the adverbial sense of the Hebrew “the broad tail completely removed close to the sacrum” (so Milgrom 1991, 210).

### 3.10

ואת שתי הכלית ואת החלב אשר עלהן אשר על הכסלים ואת היתרת  
על הכבד על הכלית יסירנה

καὶ ἀμφοτέρους τοὺς νεφροὺς καὶ τὸ στέαρ τὸ ἐπ' αὐτῶν, τὸ ἐπὶ τῶν  
μηρίων, καὶ τὸν λοβὸν τὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ ἥπατος, σὺν τοῖς νεφροῖς περιελών  
and both the kidneys and the fat that is on them at the thighs,  
having also removed the appendage which is on the liver with the  
kidneys,

**ἀμφοτέρους.** Here is an example of the translator's tendency to use variation within a goal of quantitative equivalence. Such variation happens in Genesis and Exodus too but the ratio of *δύο* to *ἀμφοτέρος* is 130:22 in the entire LXX and 31:7 in Leuitikon.

**περιελών.** The same applies to this circumstantial participle that appears as alternative to *περιελεί* of verse 4. It is a regular practice of G to indicate to his readership that a Hebrew clause can be rendered by alternative ways in Greek.

## 3.11

והקטירו הכהן המזבחה לחם אשה ליהוה

ἀνολοίσει ὁ ἱερεὺς ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας· κάρπωμα κυρίου.  
the priest shall make an offering on the altar, an odor of fragrance,  
an offering to the Lord.

**ἀνολοίσει.** This verb signals the culmination of the activity begun in verse 9 with the removal of the ancillary offering's various ingredients. Together, they are now manipulated on the altar as the *κάρπωμα*.

**ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας.** MT has **לחם**, which means that the offering by fire is YHWH's food. Milgrom (1991, 213) puts the notion of YHWH feeding on sacrifices down to an archaism—a linguistic fossil—since it is rejected by later parts of the Hebrew Bible. G replaces the mention of food with the formula found in verse 5. The result is that the *κάρπωμα* appears to be no more than an odor of fragrance. This reading, against all the versions, is surprising and calls for some attention. It may be a simple case of antianthropomorphism (Vahrenhorst 2009, 352) and we will return to this suggestion below. But it also hints at something noticed by historians of religion: ancient writers are uncomfortable about the idea that a deity should be given, and even request, an offering that from a human perspective consists of inedible parts. In the Prometheus myth, for example, the gods feel tricked by being given the thighbones disguised by fat and retaliate by creating womankind. The reason why there should be this unease has been a topic of debate for some time. If the gods are given the worst portion of the alimentary sacrifice, what do they do with it? And so we are back to the matter of eating. Gould (1985, 17–19) spells out the range of possibilities offered by the texts on their own, but suspends judgment on whether or not the gods are actually understood to eat their portion, noting the seminal work of Meuli (1946, 215–23) and Burkert (1966, 105–6). Burkert, in following Meuli's view that the word *μηρία* refers to bones and only bones, argues that humans as primeval hunters feel guilty about taking animal life. Thus, *θυσία* is in fact nothing more than ritualized slaughter in which the Olympian deities are given the bones to symbolize a returning of the animal's marrow to the divine to ensure its continued existence (1997, 1–25). In contrast to this view, the so-called Lausanne School, represented by scholars such as Détienne and Vernant, prefer to think of sacrifice as being more about eating than killing. And so the gods are seen to eat at a distance through the savor of

smoke (Détienne 1989, 7; Vernant, 1989, 24). The difference in diet effects the distance as well as signifies bridge-building between the different realms that they who once shared the same table currently occupy—gods feed on the incorruptible bones but humans on the dead flesh. Humans eat meat and suffer hunger and death, while the immortal gods feed on the superior food of perfumed smoke. Further support may be found in Gill 1966, 261, Jameson 1988, 966, and Kirk 1981, 78–79. This may be of help in deciding why in this verse the **אֵשֶׁה** that is called **לֶחֶם** for YHWH is rendered by *ὁσμὴ εὐωδίας* rather than *ἄρτος*, the default rendering of **לֶחֶם** throughout the Greek Pentateuch. We know already that G is not trying to avoid anything reminiscent of the pagan firstfruits offering and rather deliberately includes the kinds of ingredients in the Lord's portion favored by Greek deities. So it is not convincing to suggest that the Lord cannot be regarded as partaking in the meal (Harlé and Pralon 1988, 93), or that G made the change out of reaction to Egyptian-Greek deities who partake in sacred meals (Wevers 1997, 29). It has been suggested that G is simply harmonizing since the Hebrew formula occurring in verses 5 and 16 is missing here (Daniel 1966, 139). However, adding a missing formula for the sake of consistency is not the same as failing to render an important word like **לֶחֶם**. It is significant that also in chapter 21 **לֶחֶם** is replaced by *δῶρον* six times, although there it is perhaps for a different reason. The answer may lie in the fact that here the Hebrew word for food edible by humans is replaced with one that connotes the food of the gods. The way deities partake in the sacrificial meal is by way of the savory smoke (see Graf 2002, 120 and below at v. 16). So perhaps it is a true antianthropomorphism.

## 3.12

וְאִם עֹז קָרְבָּנוֹ וְהִקְרִיבוּ לִפְנֵי יְהוָה

Ἐὰν δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν αἰγῶν τὸ δῶρον αὐτοῦ, καὶ προσάξει ἐναντὶ κυρίου,  
But if his gift is from the goats, he shall both do the presenting  
before the Lord,

Ἐὰν — δῶρον αὐτοῦ. The verbless protasis of the G follows the syntax of the Hebrew.

ἀπὸ τῶν αἰγῶν. G appears to maintain his regular introduction of the animal kind even though MT varies it at this point.

**καί.** In NETS we have attempted to show that the apodotic *καί* is faithfully rendered, and though it is not the best Greek usage, it can make sense if it is understood to lead to the next sentence in adverbial fashion. A new sentence is produced where G pluralizes again for the priests. Compare verses 1 and 6 where the Hebrew has no apodotic copulative word and G is able to provide standard apodoses.

**προσάξει.** The verbal suffix is not rendered here, in contrast to the object of *σφάξουσιν* of the next verse, and hence NETS reflects this, even though to a Greek reader the referent of the missing pronoun would have been obvious.

### 3.13

וסמך את ידו על ראשו ושחט אתו לפני אהל מועד וזרקו בני אהרן את דמו על המזבח סביב

καὶ ἐπιθήσει τὰς χεῖρας ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ· καὶ σφάξουσιν αὐτὸ ἔναντι κυρίου παρὰ τὰς θύρας τῆς σκηνῆς τοῦ μαρτυρίου καὶ προσχεοῦσιν οἱ υἱοὶ Ἀαρὼν οἱ ἱερεῖς τὸ αἷμα ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον κύκλῳ.

and he shall lay his hands on its head, and they shall slaughter it before the Lord at the entrance of the tent of witness, and the sons of Aaron the priests shall pour out the blood against all sides of the altar.

**σφάξουσιν.** Here, in contrast to verses 2 and 8, in which the suppliant slaughters but the priests manipulate the blood, G pluralizes the act of slaughter, which is singular in Hebrew.

**ἔναντι κυρίου.** It is noteworthy that in MT as well as the OG this formula is absent from the prescriptions for cattle or sheep. But here, only the goat's slaughter is given this designation by G against the Hebrew, which until now has occurred in Exod 29.11 (Greek = Hebrew) and Leu 1 (2x; Greek = Hebrew) and will occur again in chapter 4 (3x; Greek = Hebrew). Notably in 16.15 this formula is again added by G against the Hebrew for the goat of the sin offering. Wevers comments that of the ancient witnesses it is only G who singles out the goat for priestly slaughter since the layman cannot sacrifice at the altar, only at the doors (1997, 30). It is known that the goat is slaughtered in the onomastic cult of the Ptolemies, but whether this has anything to do with the addition is uncertain.

3.14

והקריב ממנו קרבנו אשה ליהוה את החלב המכסה את הקרב ואת  
כל החלב אשר על הקרב

καὶ ἀνοίσει ἀπ' αὐτοῦ κάρπωμα κυρίῳ, τὸ στέαρ τὸ κατακαλύπτει  
τὴν κοιλίαν καὶ πᾶν τὸ στέαρ τὸ ἐπὶ τῆς κοιλίας,

And he shall offer up of it as an offering to the Lord: the fat that  
covers the entrails and all the fat that is on the entrails,

**ἀνοίσει.** As Wevers notes, G probably mistakenly read והקטיר here unless for variation he chose this as a singular pairing, which is not unusual, but unlikely. One has to agree with his view that a better translation of this verb is “take up” (1997, 31).

**κάρπωμα.** G omitted rendering קרבנו and the result is a much smoother reading. He also omits to translate the suffix, presumably because he wants his sentence to be equivalent to the other times the formula appears in the chapter, for example, verse 9.

**τὸ ἐπὶ τῆς κοιλίας.** Once again the Hebrew relative with prepositional phrase is rendered by the adjectival use of the article.

3.15

ואת שתי הכלית ואת החלב אשר עלהן אשר על הכסלים ואת היתרת  
על הכבד על הכלית יסירנה

καὶ ἀμφοτέρους τοὺς νεφροὺς καὶ πᾶν τὸ στέαρ τὸ ἐπ' αὐτῶν, τὸ ἐπὶ  
τῶν μηρίων καὶ τὸν λοβὸν τοῦ ἥπατος, σὺν τοῖς νεφροῖς περιελεί·

and both the kidneys and all the fat that is on them at the thighs,  
and he shall remove the appendage of the liver with the kidneys.

**πᾶν.** An addition not reflected in the versions.

**τοῦ ἥπατος.** Here G varies from his renderings in verses 4 and 10 in representing the Hebrew quite idiomatically. Again it appears as if he first provides a more literal rendition of a Hebrew syntagm, and then an alternative. The benefit to the Greek reader lies on the level of understanding something about the way Hebrew works.

3.16

והקטירם הכהן המזבחה לחם אשה לריח ניחח כל חלב ליהוה

καὶ ἀνοίσει ὁ ἱερεὺς ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον κάρπωμα, ὁσμὴν εὐωδίας τῷ κυρίῳ. πᾶν τὸ στέαρ τῷ κυρίῳ.

And the priest shall offer on the altar an offering, an odor of fragrance to the Lord. All the fat is the Lord's.

**ἀνοίσει.** The verbal suffix is not rendered, and neither is לַחֵם so that the emphasis is no longer on the constituent parts of the **שֶׁה** as the Deity's food, but rather on the fact that the **κάρπωμα** as a whole is pleasing to the Deity.

This chapter shows the interface between variability in the source as well as target texts and one notices the following:

3:5: κάρπωμα ὁσμὴ εὐωδίας

3:11: ὁσμὴν εὐωδίας κάρπωμα

3:16: κάρπωμα ὁσμὴν εὐωδίας

In so doing, G represents three times in full the Hebrew terms first occurring in verse 5, that is **שֶׁה רִיחַ נִחַח**, with a variation in word order. Twice he avoids rendering **לַחֵם**. Here too the *lamed* of the datival goal is not rendered by εἰς but by a simple accusative.

### 3.17

חקת עולם לדרתִיכם בכל מושבתיכם כל חלב וכל דם לא תאכלו  
νόμιμον εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα εἰς τὰς γενεὰς ὑμῶν ἐν πάσῃ κατοικίᾳ ὑμῶν·  
πᾶν στέαρ καὶ πᾶν αἷμα οὐκ ἔδεσθε.

It shall be a precept forever throughout your generations, in all your settlement; you shall not eat any fat and any blood."

**εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.** G renders the Hebrew attributive genitive correctly and provides an idiomatic adverbial rendering. Something needs to be said for the meaning of αἰών in relation to Hebrew **עולם**, both of which carry the sense of enduring time and both of which carry the gloss "eternity" in the lexica. The idea of eternity is philosophically complex and must have meant different things to different cultures. The idea of the eternity of the world was a theme first developed by Aristotle (Huffman 1993, 343), but it is hard to tell in what way the Greek philosophical notion of eternity overlaps with the Hebrew notion of duration. When referring to enduring time the prepositional phrase δι' αἰῶνος is found in apposition to a word like ἄπαυστος; for example, in Aeschylus, *Suppl.* 574 referring both to the unending rule of Zeus and the lasting blessedness of his offspring. When used for the future, the phrase occurs with something like μόρσιμος to refer

to an appointed time (*Suppl.*, 46). The expression εἰς αἰῶνα is well attested before the LXX. The Pythagorean Philolaus of the fifth century BCE uses the expression ἐξ αἰῶνος ἐς αἰῶνα of the universe remaining constant and unchanging in the past and the future (DK B. 21). Similarly, Isocrates (10.62) can use the expression εἰς ἅπαντα τὸν αἰῶνα to speak of the permanence of immortal Menelaus's sharing of Helen's throne. More concretely, Lycurgus speaks in real time of Troy being forever deserted (1.62) or about Tyrtaeus the Athenian whose influence benefited Sparta forever (1.106). The latter two instances suggest an understanding that does justice to the Hebrew phrase in this verse, of a perpetual ordinance, remaining in place as long as the living are able to conceive of it or recognize its validity. It is worth noting that some receptors of this Septuagintal expression found it in need of rephrasing. The Epistle to the Hebrews, in addition to frequently employing εἰς αἰῶνα, also makes use of εἰς τὸ παντελές (7.25) and εἰς τὸ διηνεκές (10.1) "forever" and "in perpetuity," and one wonders if these would have been more clearly understood by a Jewish Greek audience, than the former.

**καὶ πᾶν αἷμα.** The conjunction καί is used in affirmative, not adversative sentences, so that we have reflected this in NETS. We could also have translated, "you must not eat any fat, even any blood."

**κατοικία.** Why a singular? Exodus 35.3, in which the Greek is also singular for the Hebrew plural, is perhaps the example he follows. The Hebrew word is always plural in Leviticus and G will singularize another five times, except for the very last time he encounters the word (23.31), where a plural appears for no discernible reason.

### Summary

The translator's intention can now be stated as one that was not to create a culturally or technically accurate portrayal of a ritual, or a set of instructions that could function in a liturgical setting. Moments of specifying appropriate procedure, such as attributing the slaughter to the priests rather than to the suppliant, must be balanced by the lack of consistency in such matters and the relative freedom with which the closer prescriptions are handled. What is clear, however, is that he intended to provide a conduit to the language units of the original through etymologizing or through existing translational precedent. Here we may call upon Cameron

Boyd-Taylor's distinction between field-specific vocabulary and translation-specific vocabulary (2004, 154).



# Balaam, Pagan Prophet of God: A Commentary on Greek Numbers 22.1–21

Spencer A. Jones

## Literature

**Aejmelaeus**, Anneli. 1982. “*Participium coniunctum* as a Criterion of Translation Technique.” VT 32:385–93. ♦ **Aejmelaeus**. 1993. *On the Trail of Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays*. Kampen: Kok Pharos. ♦ **Boyd-Taylor**, Cameron. 2006. “Toward the Analysis of Translational Norms: A Sighting Shot.” BIOSCS 39:27–47. ♦ **Dorival**, Gilles. 1994. *La Bible d’Alexandrie 4: Les Nombres*. Paris: Cerf. ♦ **Evans**, Trevor V. 2001. *Verbal Syntax in the Greek Pentateuch: Natural Greek Usage and Hebrew Interference*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. ♦ **Holmstedt**, Robert, and Andrew **Jones**. 2014. “The Pronoun in Tripartite Verbless Clauses in Biblical Hebrew: Resumption for Left-Dislocation or Pronominal Copula?” JSS 59:53–89. ♦ **Hunt**, A. S., and C. C. **Edgar**, trans. 1932. *Select Papyri: Volume 1; Non-literary Papyri, Private Affairs, Private Documents*. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. ♦ **Jastram**, Nathan R. 1994. “4QNum<sup>b</sup>.” Pages 205–68 in *Qumran Cave 4. VII: Genesis to Numbers*. Edited by Eugene Ulrich, Frank Moore Cross, James R. Davila, Jastram Nathan, Judith E. Sanderson, Emanuel Tov, and John Strugnell. DJD 12. Oxford: Clarendon. ♦ **Louw**, Theo A. W. van der. 2007. *Transformations in the Septuagint: Towards an Interaction of Septuagint Studies and Translation Studies*. CBET 47. Leuven: Peeters. ♦ **Meer**, Michaël van der. 2012. “The Natural and Geographical Context of the Septuagint.” Pages 387–421 in *Die Septuaginta—Entstehung*,

---

Thanks are due to Dirk Büchner who offered many helpful suggestions and saved me from many errors.

*Sprache, Geschichte: 3. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 22.–25. Juli 2010.* Edited by Siegfried Kreuzer, Martin Meiser, and Marcus Sigismund. WUNT 286. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck. ♦ **Rösel**, Martin, and Christine **Schlund**. 2011. “Arithmoi/ Numeri/Das vierte Buch Mose.” Pages 431–522 in *Septuaginta Deutsch: Erläuterungen und Kommentare zur griechischen Alten Testament; Band I. Genesis bis Makkabäer*. Edited by Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft. ♦ **Tjen**, Anwar. 2010. *On Conditionals in the Greek Pentateuch: A Study of Translation Syntax*. LHBOTS 515. New York: T&T Clark. ♦ **Tov**, Emanuel. 1985. “The Nature and Background of Harmonizations in Biblical Manuscripts.” *JSOT* 31:3–29. ♦ **Tov**. 1999. “Renderings of Combinations of the Infinitive Absolute and Finite Verbs in the Septuagint—Their Nature and Distribution.” Pages 247–56 in *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint*. VTSup 72. Leiden: Brill. ♦ **Wevers**, John W. 1982. *Text History of the Greek Numbers*. MSU 16. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. ♦ **Wevers**. 1998. *Notes on the Greek Text of Numbers*. SCS 46. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

## Outline

When the Israelites encamp on the western edge of Moab (ἐπὶ δυσμῶν Μωάβ), the Moabites become afraid. Balak, the king of Moab, had observed Israel’s destruction of the Amalekites (Num 21) and so he calls together various regional elders of Madiam (ἡ γερουσία Μαδιάμ) to summon the renowned prophet Balaam (22.1–7). Although Balaam turns Balak’s envoy away for the first time when θεός denies him permission (vv. 8–14), Balak repeats his request—this time sending more honorable emissaries and promising rich rewards (vv. 15–19). Balaam is granted permission by θεός on the one condition that Balaam will only do whatever the deity speaks (22.20). Thus, Balaam departs on his she-donkey with Balak’s elders (22.21).

## Commentary

### 22.1

וַיֵּסְעוּ בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיַּחֲנוּ בְּעֶרְבוֹת מוֹאָב מֵעֵבֶר לִירְדֵן יַרְחֹ  
 Καὶ ἀπάραντες οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ παρενέβαλον ἐπὶ δυσμῶν Μωάβ παρὰ  
 τὸν Ἰορδάνην κατὰ Ἱεριχὼ.

And after<sup>a</sup> the sons of Israel set out, they<sup>a</sup> encamped on the west of Moab by the Jordan opposite Jericho.

<sup>a-a</sup> The MT as well as Greek MS 314 have a conjunction (ἡ – καί) before *παρενέβαλον* (NETS, “the sons of Israel set out and encamped”; *BdA*, “les fils d’Israël décampèrent et campèrent”). The translation represented here agrees with We<sup>ed</sup> and the majority of OG manuscripts; see also LXX.D: “Und nachdem die Israeliten aufgebrochen waren, lagerten sie.” The major difference is the omission of καί before *παρενέβαλον*, which indicates that ἀπάραντες is an adverbial participle and should thus be rendered as a dependent temporal clause.

**Καὶ ἀπάραντες.** G at times renders the first *wayyiqtol* form in a coordinate sequence with an adverbial participle—as he does here. This change in grammatical category makes for more idiomatic Greek and betrays G’s concern to produce an *acceptable* translation and avoidance of awkward polysyndeton (see 21.13, 33; 22.14; but not with high consistency). However, he leaves the introductory καί – ἡ which is not idiomatic with *participia coniuncta*. Acceptability is understood to denote an attempt to employ language that suits the linguistic and textual norms of the target language (Boyd-Taylor 2006, 29–30). Having used the *participium coniunctum*, a conjunction between Ἰσραὴλ and *παρενέβαλον* is unnecessary and so omitted (see also vv. 13, 14, 21 in this chapter). Nevertheless, the introductory καί is unusual and not idiomatic in the *participium coniunctum* construction. Likely, the nuance of the participle is temporal, “after setting out.” For a taxonomy of *participia coniuncta* in the LXX, see Aejmelaeus 1982, especially 389–93.

**οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ.** G always renders בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל—when in the nominative—with the definite article (e.g., Num 9.19, *passim*; see Wevers 1982, 105). There is no clear pattern in other cases.

**παρενέβαλον ἐπὶ δυσμῶν Μωάβ.** Whereas *παρεμβάλλω* is common for חָנָה, this is the first occurrence of the match between עֲרֵבָה (“desert”) and *δυσμή* (“setting of the sun,” and by extension, “west”; see 33.48, 49, 50; 35.1; 36.13; also Deut 34.8). G later equivocates and transliterates it as a proper noun, Ἀραβώθ (26.3, 63; 31.12). NETS here takes the phrase as a direction, “in the western parts” (also, LXX.D, “westlich von Moab”).

How G derived *δυσμή* from עֲרֵבָה is subject to some speculation. Wevers states that it was a different vocalization of the consonantal text, but he does not indicate to which Hebrew word it could plausibly be vocalized (1998, 360). Possibly, the Hebrew word is עֲרֵב, as Gilles Dorival explains:

“Au lieu du [MT] ‘*arebôt*, qui est le pluriel de ‘*arābā*, ‘désert, steppe, plaine aride,’ la LXX lisait probablement ‘*arābôt*, qui est un des pluriels de ‘*erēb*, ‘soir, couchant” (1994, 413). There is, however, no indication that עֶרֶב can denote the cardinal direction in Hebrew (see *HALOT*, s.v. “עֶרֶב”). Hebrew עֶרֶב (“desert”) is also confused with עֶרֶב (“evening”) in 1 Rgns 23.24, although *δυσμή* is not selected nor is the cardinal direction indicated: וילכו זיפה לפני שאול ודוד ואנשיו במדבר מעון בערבה – ἐπορεύθησαν [οἱ Ζιφαῖοι] ἔμπροσθεν Σαουλ, καὶ Δαυιδ καὶ οἱ ἄνδρες αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τῇ Μααν καθ’ ἑσπέραν (“the Ziphites set out and went ahead of Saoul, and David and his men were in the Maan wilderness *in the evening*,” NETS). Elsewhere in Numbers, G renders עֶרֶב with ἑσπέρα (“evening”) consistently, thirteen times in total (e.g., 9.11, 15, 21; 19.7, 8, 10). Whereas both *δυσμή* and ἑσπέρα can indicate “west” (see LSJ, s.v. “ἑσπέρα,” II and “δυσμή,” II), *δυσμή* usually indicates the setting of the sun and ἑσπέρα is a temporal term for evening. In light of this, it is curious that G selects *δυσμή* over against ἑσπέρα to indicate “west” here.

παρὰ τὸν Ἰορδάνην. G’s rendering of the idiomatic מעבר לירדן with the preposition *παρά* quite succinctly captures the gist of the Hebrew. In other instances, the phrase is rendered literally with ἐν τῷ πέραν or something similar (21.13; 32.19, 32; 34.15; 35.14; cf. διάβασις of Gen 32.23).

κατὰ Ἱεριχώ. Whereas the relationship between ירחו and לירדן in the MT is that of a simple genitive, G adds *κατά* to add further specificity to the relationship. NETS renders this as “opposite Jericho” (LXX.D, “gegenüber”; *BdA*, “face à Jéricho”). Although in every following instance the Hebrew text has no more than the simple genitive as it does here, G uses this rendering consistently henceforth (26.3, 63; 31.12; 33.48, 50; 34.15; 35.1; 36.13).

## 22.2

וירא בלק בן צפור את כל אשר עשה ישראל לאמרי

Καὶ ἰδὼν Βαλάκ υἱὸς Σεπφὼρ πάντα, ὅσα ἐποίησεν Ἰσραὴλ τῷ Ἀμορραίῳ,

And when Balak son of Sepphor saw all that Israel had done to the Amorrite,

Καὶ ἰδὼν Βαλάκ. The adverbial participle is again used for the *wayyiqtol* (see also v. 1). However, the syntax breaks down in verse 3 where a conjunction, *καὶ*, is used, thus making this clause pendent. Balak is intro-

duced, described, and the conflict that gives rise to the following sequence of events given in this pendent clause (with an embedded relative clause). Likely, in G's unit-by-unit translation style, he began with a *participium coniunctum* and then noticed the change in subject to Moab in the next clause and so abandoned the construction. If, as Dorival suggests, this is a nominative absolute in which the nominative (Βαλάκ) is resumed in the main clause (v. 3) (see Dorival 1994, 419), then Μωάβ of verse 3 is taken to refer to Βαλάκ. However, in standard Greek nominative absolute constructions, a *pronoun* resumes the pendent element *in a different case* (see BDF §466 and the examples cited there). Since this construction looks very little like a nominative absolute, it is better to see it as Hebrew interference.

υἱὸς Σεπφώρ. The epithet בן צפור is applied to Balak in three places in this narrative (22.2, 4, 16). In this occurrence and in verse 4, υἱὸς Σεπφώρ translates the phrase; however, ὁ τοῦ Σεπφώρ appears inexplicably at 22.16 (also Ies 24.9). The transliteration of צפור with Σεπφώρ is relatively stable (outside of Numbers, see Ies 24.9; Judg 11.25). Balak is only later introduced as king (v. 4).

τῷ Ἀμορραίῳ. The collective gentilic אֲמֹרִי is rendered with the singular τῷ Ἀμορραίῳ, which is unusual for G. The account of the destruction of the Amorites has just been told in 21.21–32, where G translates the singular form with a plural (21.13, 21, 25, 26, 29, 31, 34; compare the singular in 21.32). Here the singular would most likely refer to the king of the Amorites, Seon. Although Seon had formerly fought against Moab (21.26), the defeat of Moab's former enemy is clearly taken as a bad omen rather than as a stroke of luck: Balak understands the defeat of Seon to forebode the destruction of Moab.

### 22.3

וַיַּגַּר מוֹאָב מִפְּנֵי הָעָם מְאֹד כִּי רַב הוּא וַיִּקֶּץ מוֹאָב מִפְּנֵי בְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל  
καὶ ἐφοβήθη Μωάβ τὸν λαὸν σφόδρα, ὅτι πολλοὶ ἦσαν, καὶ  
προσώχθισεν Μωάβ ἀπὸ προσώπου υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ.  
also Moab feared the people very much, because they were many,  
and Moab was vexed because of the presence of Israel's sons.

καὶ ἐφοβήθη Μωάβ τὸν λαὸν σφόδρα. The Hebrew form וַיַּגַּר is rendered with ἐφοβήθη. Hebrew גַּר normally takes מן + pronominal suffix (see Deut 18.28; Ps 38[37].18) as a complement in order to indicate the cause

of fear (here מפני). However, given G's choice of φοβέομαι for גור, a literal rendering of מפני—ἀπὸ προσώπου—would create nonsensical Greek and thus the grammatically requisite accusative, τὸν λαόν, is used and מפני not rendered (see also Num 14.9, 21.34; on the accusative with φοβέω, see LSJ, s.v. “φοβέω,” B.II.6). Later in this verse, G reverts to isomorphism and gives προσώχθισεν Μωὰβ ἀπὸ προσώπου for מפני מואב ויקץ. Greek σφόδρα consistently renders Hebrew מאד, except in 22.17, where it is omitted.

Whereas Balak was introduced in the preceding sentence, the Moabite people are the subject here. The incongruity leads Tg. Onq. to render both occurrences of מואב with מואבאה. G, faithful as he is to his parent text, retains Moab as the subject despite the incongruity (cf. Tg. Onq., which reads מואבאה [“Moabite”] here). Greek does also allow for the name of a nation to represent an individual member, such as the king, but this use usually takes the definite article (see Smyth §996b) and so it is unlikely to be the case here.

πολλοὶ ἦσαν. The Hebrew bipartite nominal (or verbless) clause, רב הוא, is singular in both elements. However, G transforms these into plural and produces a *constructio ad sensum*, having its antecedent in τὸν λαόν/העם.

ἦσαν. The Hebrew pronoun in the bipartite nominal clause is certainly pronominal in force, unlike in certain tripartite nominal clauses where it can take on a copular function (see Holmstedt and Jones 2014). G, however, consistently renders the pronoun in bipartite nominal clauses with a form of εἶμι, and selects the best tense for the context, in this case, the imperfect (also in Num 5.28; present tense is used in 12.7; 13.8; 15.25).

καὶ προσώχθισεν. Greek προσοχθίζω renders Hebrew קיץ both times it appears in Numbers; קיץ is variable in its meaning depending on the preposition that appears with it. With מפני, it carries the sense of “dread” as it does here (cf. Exod 1.12, also using βδελύσσομαι). But with the ב preposition, it carries the sense of “abhor,” as in Num 21.5. G does not distinguish and translates with the same lexeme in both locations. Here, unlike in 21.5, the selected lexeme, προσοχθίζω, fits well. Outside of the LXX, προσοχθίζω is rare. The earliest attestation is in P.Oxy. 9.1176 (third century BCE), a fragment of Satyrus's *Vita Euripidis*; it reads, προσώ[χθ]ισεν δὲ τῷ [γ]ένει τούτων χάριν (“he was angry with the generation on account of these things”). Also, see in Sib. Or. 3.272: πᾶς δὲ προσοχθίζων ἔσται τοῖς σοῖς ἐθίμοισιν (“each one will be angered with your customs”). Dorival, who does not mention

the use in P.Oxy 9.1176, seems to think that this appeared first in the LXX (1994, 400); this is unlikely in my opinion. From its cognate simplex, *ὀχθέω* and the later developed *ὀχθίζω*, its meaning is clear: “to be angry, vexed in spirit” (see LSJ, s.v. “ὀχθέω”).

**ἀπὸ προσώπου υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ.** This is a clear instance of a literal rendering resulting in a grammatically possible but thoroughly unidiomatic construction. The phrase *ἀπὸ προσώπου* appears six times in Numbers, rendering **מִלְפָּנֵי** (17.11, 24) and **מִפְּנֵי** (20.6; 22.3; 32.21; 33.55). The former Hebrew expression appears only three times and is rendered with *ἀπέναντι* (20.9). The latter occurs ten times and is rendered in variable fashion: with *πρὸ προσώπου* (33.52), freely with *διὰ* (32.17), and omitted (10.35; 22.3 [1°]) or misrendered (22.33). In his literal rendering here, G allows interference from the Hebrew form, since in Greek idiom *προσοχθίζω* would prefer a bare dative (see P.Oxy. 9.1176; Sib. Or. 3.272; Leu 18.25, 28; 26.44; Ps 21.25). Compare Gen 27.46, where the idiomatic *διὰ* + accusative replaces **מִפְּנֵי** in order to denote the cause of provocation. Curiously, this instance of interference appears directly after G used an idiomatic rendering of **מִפְּנֵי**, disallowing such interference in the phrase *ἐφοβήθη Μωάβ τὸν λαόν*.

Whereas the nominative *υἱοὶ Ἰσραήλ* always appears with the definite article (42x in Numbers), the oblique cases are less consistent. Anarthrous forms are less common than the articular form with oblique cases, with ca. thirty-eight occurrences in Numbers.

#### 22.4

וַיֹּאמֶר מוֹאָב אֶל זִקְנֵי מִדְיָן עֵתָּה יִלְחֲכוּ הַקְּהָל אֶת כָּל סְבִיבְתֵינוּ כָּל־הַיּוֹם  
 הַשּׁוֹר אֶת יָרֵק הַשָּׂדֶה וּבִלְקֹ בֶן צִפּוֹר מֶלֶךְ לְמוֹאָב בַּעַת הַהוּא  
 καὶ εἶπεν Μωάβ τῇ γερουσίᾳ Μαδιάμ νῦν ἐκλείξει ἡ συναγωγὴ αὕτη  
 πάντα τοὺς κύκλῳ ἡμῶν, ὡς ἐκλείξαι ὁ μόσχος τὰ χλωρὰ ἐκ τοῦ  
 πεδίου. καὶ Βαλακ υἱὸς Σεπφωρ βασιλεὺς Μωαβ ἦν κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν  
 ἐκεῖνον.

And Moab said to the council of elders of Madiam, “Now this gathering will lick up all those who are around us, as the bull calf might lick up the greenery of the plain.” And Balak son of Sepphor was king of Moab at that time.

This verse is marked by subtle changes—changes in number, minor pluses—that interpret but do not depart far from the MT. The style employs good Greek idiom.



καὶ εἶπεν Μωᾶβ τῇ γερουσίᾳ Μαδιάμ. G preserves the somewhat awkward בּוֹאֵב, although the identity of the speaker is unclear (cf. again Tg. Onq. which reads מוֹאֲבִיטָה ["the Moabite"]). For the plural מִדִּין זָקֵן, a collective singular γερουσία is used, which in Numbers appears only here and 22.7. Elsewhere, it translates the plural זָקֵן in a genitive construction (see Exod 3.16, 18; 4.29; 12.21; 24.9; Leu 9.1 [cf. 9.3: בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל]; Deut 5.23; 21.2; 25.7) or absolute (Deut 25.9). Outside of the Pentateuch, it appears only rarely (e.g., Ies 23.2; 2 Makk 11.27). According to LSJ, γερουσία refers to a council of elders or a senate. Thus, G's rendering makes explicit what is implicit here: the elders form a governing body. Theo van der Louw calls this type of translation strategy "explicitation" (2007, 81). However, the match πρεσβύτεροι – זָקֵן appears slightly more often (Num 11.16, 24, 25, 30; 16.25; cf. Exod 10.9; 17.5; 18.2). It seems that consistency is not of particular concern for G.

ἐκλείξει ἡ συναγωγή αὕτη. The Hebrew verb לָחַץ *piel* ("lick up") is rare, appearing only here in the Pentateuch. In the rest of the LXX, G's translation of לָחַץ (or a cognate thereof) becomes standard (see 3 Rgns 18.38; Ps 71[72].9; Esa 49.23; Mich 7.17). The Hebrew verb is plural with the collective קָהָל serving as the subject (see Joüon §150.e). G retains the singular subject but brings the number of the verb into alignment. There is some question whether this simply reflects his *Vorlage* since SamPent reads a singular here as well (יִלְחֹץ). However, throughout Numbers, G's renders plural Hebrew verbs with singulars when the subject is a collective, but grammatically singular subject (see 10.3; 11.8; 14.1 [2x], 10, 39; 15.14, 24, 36 [1°]; 20.29; 22.4; 34.14; 35.24, 25). Only twice does he reflect the plural Hebrew verb with a collective, singular subject (15.36 [2°]; 34.25 [2°]). Therefore, if G did render the MT's plural יִלְחֹכוּ with the singular ἐκλείξει, it would at least square with his translation technique elsewhere.

Greek συναγωγή translates Hebrew קָהָל, but also often translates עֵדָה (e.g., 16.21; 17.10). The near demonstrative αὕτη is lacking in the MT but present in OG, SamPent, Tg. Neof., and Pesh. G has a near demonstrative pronoun in only a few places where they are not present in the MT; it is noted that they are always definite nouns (5.18 [probably harmonizing with 5.19]; 14.22; 22.19, 20; 27.16 [with συναγωγή]; 29.12; 32.11). It is possible that one could ascribe this addition to translation technique; however, given that other ancient versions and SamPent attest it as well, it is likely that it was present in the *Vorlage*.



**πάντας τοὺς κύκλῳ ἡμῶν.** G's rendering of **אֵת כָּל סְבִיבֵינוּ** is quite near the Hebrew but departs in one significant way. The Hebrew speaks about surrounding *areas*, while G speaks about surrounding *people* (so Wevers 1998, 361). This indicates a nuanced understanding of the dialogue. Implicit in the statement of Israel's military threat is Moab's request for an alliance to fight back the Israelites. G interprets this to mean that Midian will be destroyed as well as Moab.

**ὡς ἐκλείξαι ὁ μόσχος.** The optative verb captures the sense of Hebrew simile, that is, "as a bull *might* lick up" (so Wevers 1998, 361). The MT merely has an infinitive construct with a prefixed **כ** preposition. Again, G displays a nuanced understanding of the force of the Hebrew and chooses an idiomatic expression for rendering a simile into Greek. Trevor Evans argues that this is a reflection of Homeric similes—which could have influenced G's selection of the otherwise rare optative (2001, 190–7).

**τὰ χλωρὰ ἐκ τοῦ πεδίου.** Although **יֶרֶק** is found rarely, a precedent has been set in Gen 1.30 and Exod 10.15 to translate it with **χλωρόν** (cf. **λάχανον** in Gen 9.3). The substantival adjective captures the sense of "greenery," without tying itself slavishly to the singular form. The Hebrew direct object phrase, **אֵת יֶרֶק הַשָּׂדֶה**, employs a simple genitive to denote the relationship between the two substantives. However, G adds the preposition **ἐκ**, deriving this particular preposition from the verb **ἐκλείχω**. The clear reference to the Israelites annihilating the surrounding nations *from* an area is thereby strengthened. In other words, instead of describing the greenery with the phrase "of the field," the greenery is annihilated "*from the field*"; **πεδίον** is not an altogether unusual choice for **שָׂדֶה**, appearing previously in 19.16 and 21.20 (but **ἀγρός** in 16.4; 20.17; 21.22; 23.14). It may look back to 21.20 where the region around Moab is called a **πεδίον**.

**καὶ Βαλάκ υἱὸς Σεπφὼρ βασιλεὺς Μωάβ ἦν.** This is most likely to be taken as "Balak, son of Sepphor *was* king of Moab." The string of Hebrew nouns is not entirely clear without an explicit copula, to which G accordingly adds one in order to mitigate ambiguity (cf. Pesh's placement of a copula between Balak and son of Beor).

**κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν ἐκείνον.** Greek **καιρός** stands in the place of Hebrew **תָּע**, both of which denote a delimited period of time. The phrase **κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν** has

been used only once before by G at 9.13, where it translates במועדו (see also Exod 23.15). The translator of Genesis, when rendering the prepositional phrase בעת, alternates between the adverb ἡνίκα (31.10; 38.27) and ἐν τῷ καιρῷ (21.22; 38.1; also 15x in Deut). Although G's rendering of בעת with κατὰ is unique, it is an adequate translation. κατὰ probably indicates duration; in other words, through the course of the following events, Balak was king (LSJ, s.v. "κατὰ," B.VII).

## 22.5

וישלח מלאכים אל בלעם בן בעור פתורה אשר על הנהר ארץ בני  
עמו לקרא לו לאמר הנה עם יצא ממצרים הנה כסה את עין הארץ  
והוא ישב ממלי

καὶ ἀπέστειλεν πρέσβεις πρὸς Βαλαάμ υἱὸν Βεὼρ Φαθούρα, ὃ ἐστὶν  
ἐπὶ τοῦ ποταμοῦ γῆς υἰῶν λαοῦ αὐτοῦ, καλέσαι αὐτὸν λέγων Ἰδοὺ  
λαὸς ἐξελήλυθεν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου, καὶ ἰδοὺ κατεκάλυψεν τὴν ὄψιν τῆς  
γῆς, καὶ οὗτος ἐγκάθηται ἐχόμενός μου.

And he sent ambassadors to Balaam son of Beor of Pathoura,  
which is on the river of the land of his people's sons, to call him,  
saying, "Behold, a people has come out of Egypt, and behold, it  
has covered the sight of the earth, and it is lying in wait next to me.

In 22.5b–6, Balak gives a message to his messengers for Balaam. Balaam repeats these words to God in 22.11. In these parallel passages, there are only a few differences in the MT, but still less in G's translation. G prefers to be consistent and to follow patterns for larger units such as this.

**καὶ ἀπέστειλεν πρέσβεις.** Balak is clearly the subject, having been identified in the last clause of 22.4. This is the second occurrence of πρέσβυς in Numbers and carries the sense of "ambassador" (see LSJ, s.v. "πρέσβυς," A.II). It was also just used to render מלאכים in Num 21.21, where Moses sent *ambassadors* to Seon, king of the Amorites. Elsewhere in the Pentateuch, Greek Genesis and Exodus use ἄγγελος for מלאך (15x in Gen, first at 16.7; 5x in Ex, first at 3.2). At times, G also employs ἄγγελος, as in 20.14. Wevers postulates that G uses πρέσβεις "probably to harmonize with v[erse] 7, where they are called זקני מואב וזקני מדין" (1998, 360). This is of course possible; however, G renders the זקני phrases with the collective γεροσύα in both instances and so the harmonization would not be felt on the level of target language.

Alternatively, it may be that G wants to distinguish between heavenly messengers and earthly messengers in this account. Although in two previous instances (20.14, 16) he follows the conventional match of מַלְאָכִים – ἄγγελος, he uses πρέσβεις or γερουσία here to refer to the human messengers. A divine messenger (מַלְאָכִים), rendered with ἄγγελος, will appear shortly (22.22). However, G reverts to ἄγγελος to refer to human messengers in 24.12 once the divine messenger is off the scene.

πρὸς Βαλαὰμ υἱὸν Βεὼρ Φαθούρα. G transliterates the place name פתור as well as the directive ה. If the large number of variants for Φαθούρα is any indicator, it is likely that the location was not known to the translator and subsequent copyists. That the directive ה is transliterated as well further confirms this.

λαὸς ἐξελήλυθεν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου. The Hebrew *qatal*, נִצַּח, is rendered with a perfect by G rather than an aorist. The Greek perfect tense coheres better with the context by focusing on the people's present location, staging on the borders of Moab (see Smyth §434). The perfect is again used in the parallel text in 22.11, although there is some variance in the MT. On this, see at 22.11.

ὁ ἐστὶν ἐπὶ τοῦ ποταμοῦ γῆς υἱὸν λαοῦ αὐτοῦ. G does not depart from an isomorphic rendering to clarify the location. In fact, the string of genitives leaves the location—assuming that Φαθούρα was unknown—quite ambiguous. Whereas the MT and G have λαοῦ αὐτοῦ/וְנַחֲמָנִי (“his people”), SamPent, Pesh, and the Vulgate all have the proper name מְנַחֵם (*Ammon*) or its equivalent (see also ESV, RSV). For G, this phrase adds little more than to say Balaam's homeland was near a river. The Hebrew phrase “the river” is an idiom denoting the Euphrates (as Tg. Onq. makes explicit here; see also NRSV; Exod 23.31 OG) and the idiom is not meaningfully conveyed in this literal rendering (see also Gen 31.21; 36.37). Moreover, the Nile (יַרְדֵּן) is consistently translated with ὁ ποταμός throughout the LXX (e.g., Gen 41.1, Exod 1.22; see van der Meer 2012, 388). On the level of text-as-received, a later reader could easily take this as a reference to the Nile. On the level of text-as-produced, G was simply giving the convenient match for הַנְּחִמָּנִי and was not concerned with referential clarity.

γῆς υἱῶν λαοῦ αὐτοῦ. In what appears to be an effort to imitate the formal shape of the Hebrew, G does not add a definite article on these three nouns, all of which are perforce definite in the original.

καλέσαι αὐτόν. The Greek καλέω here renders Hebrew קרא. The polyvalence of קרא is handled well by G, who employs a different construction or lexeme depending on whether קרא indicates summoning (קרא – [ἐπὶ] καλέω: 11.3, 35; 12.5; 16.12; 22.20; 21.3; 22.37; 24.10; 25.2), meeting in person (קרא – εἰς συνάντησιν: 20.18, 20; 21.33; 22.34, 36; 23.3; 24.1; 31.13), meeting in battle (קרא – παρατάσσω: 21.23), or naming something (קרא – ἐπονομάζομαι: 13.16, 24; 32.38; 32.41, 42). Here, of course, Balak is summoning Balaam and so καλέω is appropriately used. This suggests that G is sensitive to his context and does not simply render קרא with a stereotyped equivalent every time it appears.

καὶ ἰδοὺ κατεκάλυψεν τὴν ὄψιν τῆς γῆς. The obscure Hebrew phrase כסה פני הארץ is found in Exodus twice (10.5, 15) and Numbers twice (22.5, 11). In the LXX, ὀφθαλμός renders פני 510 times whereas ὄψις appears for פני only 7 times (Exod 10.5, 15; Leu 13.55; Num 22.5, 11; Iezek 1.27; 10.9). G, who does not take the easy road of using ὀφθαλμός as the standard equivalent of פני, went the way of his colleague in Exod 10.5 and 15, perhaps allowing the reader to recall the passage and also making a sly comparison between Israel and the plague of locusts in Egypt. Irrespective of whether G is relying on the translator of Exodus, ὄψις represents a deliberate choice to avoid the “easy” equivalent for a more contextually sensitive reading. In the plural, ὄψεις can refer to the organs of sight (LSJ, s.v. “ὄψις,” II.c.) but is more commonly used of things that are seen, that is, “aspect, appearance.” Thus, as the NETS rendering “sight” suggests, Balak’s own ability to see the land is clouded by the host of the Israelites.

οὗτος ἐγκαθῆται. The near demonstrative οὗτος for הוּא in verbal clauses is a usual equivalent throughout the Pentateuch. Whereas the Hebrew has the neutral “to dwell” (שב), G employs a more contextually sensitive lemma, ἐγκαθῆμαι, implying not only Israel’s presence near Moab but also their intent to invade. LSJ defines ἐγκαθῆμαι as it relates to garrisons as “lie in place”; such a use appears in Polybius *Hist.* 18.11: οὔτε γὰρ Πελοποννησίους ἀναπνεῦσαι δυνατόν ἐν Κορίνθῳ βασιλικῆς φρουρᾶς ἐγκαθημένης (“For neither were the Peloponnese able to breathe while the royal garrison was stationed in Corinth”). When used with τρίβος (“ambush”), it means “to lie

in ambush,” as in Gen 49.17: *καὶ γεννηθήτω Δὴν ὄφις ἐφ’ ὁδοῦ ἐγκαθήμενος ἐπὶ τρίβου* (“And let Dan become a snake on the road lying in ambush on the path,” NETS).

However, this also betrays a knowledge of the coming events—from MT’s perspective, Israel in Balak’s mouth is simply present and their motive insinuated from their actions towards the Amorites (22.2). From the translator’s perspective, Israel is present in order to invade and conquer.

**ἐχόμενός μου.** The phrase *ἐχόμενός μου* stands in place of the prepositional phrase *ממלי*, employing a rare use of *ἔχω*, meaning “being close to, bordering” (LSJ, s.v. “ἔχω,” C.IV.3; see also Gen 41.23; Exod 26.3; Leu 6.3; Deut 11.30). Although the construction is not attested often, it is an established meaning and denotes close proximity. In other words, G portrays Balak’s description of Israel as pressed up against their border and staging for war. The Hebrew simply denotes that they are opposite (see *HALOT*, s.v. “מול”).

## 22.6

ועתה לכה נא ארה לי את העם הזה כי עצום הוא ממני אולי אוכל  
נכה בו ואגרשנו מן הארץ כי ידעתי את אשר תברך מברך ואשר  
תאר יואר

*καὶ νῦν δεῦρο ἄρασαί μοι τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον, ὅτι ἰσχύει οὗτος ἢ ἡμεῖς· ἐὰν δυνώμεθα πατάξαι ἐξ αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐκβαλῶ αὐτοὺς ἐκ τῆς γῆς· ὅτι οἶδα οὖς ἂν εὐλογῆσθης σύ, εὐλόγηγνται καὶ οὖς ἂν καταράσῃ σύ, κεκατήρηνται*

And now come, curse for me this people, since it is stronger than we are, if we may be able to strike some of them, and I will cast them out from the land. For I know that whomever you bless are blessed, and whomever you curse are cursed.”

**καὶ νῦν δεῦρο.** The Hebrew has a double imperative construction without a conjunction, *ועתה לכה נא ארה לי*. As this would make for quite awkward Greek if represented in the same manner; G represents the first imperative as the adverbial interjection *δεῦρο* (disregarding *נא*; cf. 22.16). This accurately captures the semantic force of *לכה* if not its grammatical category, following the precedent set in Genesis and Exodus, in each of which *לכה* is matched by *δεῦρο* (Gen 19.32; 31.44; 37.13; Exod 3.10; also Num 10.29; 22.11; 23.7, 13, 27; 24.14).

**ἄρασαί μοι.** In the Pentateuch, ἀράομαι appears only in the Balaam account (22.6, 11; 23.7, 8). Incidentally, this match is one of the few instances in which the Greek root ἀράομαι appears to match phonetically the Hebrew אָרָא, which may have influenced the selection of ἀράομαι. However, as καταράομαι also renders אָרָא later in this verse, this line of argument should not be pushed too far. The Balaam account employs καταράομαι as well (22.6, 12; 23.8; 13, 25, 27, 24.10) and ἐπικαταράομαι (22.17; 23.7), translating alternatively אָרָא, קָבַב, and זָעַם (once, in 23.7). There does not appear to be a discernible pattern here except that G employs καταράομαι and ἀράομαι as synonyms (see, e.g., 22.6; 23.8).

**ὅτι.** The conjunction ὅτι is usually used to represent direct causality in Greek; here, however, G has used ὅτι to represent indirect causality due to the stereotyped match between כִּי and ὅτι (see Aejmelaeus 1993, 11–30). Here, of course, the ὅτι clause is providing a motivation for the imperative clause and under normal Greek constraints, γάρ would have been preferred.

**ισχύει οὗτος ἢ ἡμεῖς.** The Hebrew employs a nominal comparative clause, indicated by כִּי + pronoun. G transforms this into a comparative verbal clause; οὗτος, standing for הַזֶּה, is clearly referring to ὁ λαός. Rather than an adjectival form—positive (πολὺν in Num 14.12) or comparative (ισχυρότερος in Deut 9.1; 11.23)—G employs the verbal form ισχύω + ἢ; ισχύω implies not simply immensity of size, but strength or ability of Israel’s military capacity. Consistent with G’s rendering of the previous verse with οὗτος ἐγκάθεται ἐχόμενός μου (“this [people] is lying in wait next to me”), G continues to insinuate the militaristic intentions of Israel. For an example of a similar use of ισχύω with militaristic connotations, see Thucydides, *Hist.* 3.46.3: ισχύομεν δὲ πρὸς τοὺς πολεμίους τῷδε (“But we are strong against our enemies in this”).

G’s use of ἢ is not uncommon throughout the rest of the Pentateuch for the כִּי comparative forms (Gen 29.19, 30; 38.26; 49.12; Exod 14.12 [cf. Exod 18.18]; Deut 7.17; Deut 11.23). The plural ἡμεῖς renders the suffixed first person common singular pronoun (אֲנִי) of the MT. Logically, it must be plural as Balak is speaking through messengers concerning the ability of his people vis-à-vis that of Israel.

From these data a few remarks can be made. First, G as one of the Pentateuch translators resists characterization as either *literal* or *free*. G’s rendering of ὅτι is literalistic, but ἐγκάθηναι, ἐχόμενος + genitive, and the comparative ἢ are all somewhat “free” and idiomatic. Second, he was quite

capable, and fond of translating idiomatically but appears to value equally highly the practice of letting the Hebrew word order determine the shape of the Greek product.

**ἐὰν δυνώμεθα πατάξαι ἐξ αὐτῶν.** The status of the Hebrew particle **אולי** is debated among Hebrew grammarians (see Tjen 2010, 15, for a synopsis). According to Waltke and O'Connor, it is not a conditional but a *sentence adverb* or *disjunct*, a subclass of adverbs that relate the speaker's attitude toward the proposition (IBHS §39.3.4b); **אולי** ("perhaps") then connotes that Balak is uncertain regarding his ability to strike the Israelites. Accordingly, the striking and the driving out are then two potential or hoped for outcomes of Balaam's acquiescence to come and curse the Israelites. In other words, these serve as *effects* of Balaam's actions related in the first clause.

G transforms this, effectively introducing his own syntactic division. Tjen notes that of the eighteen occurrences of **אולי** in the Pentateuch, eleven are translated with conditionals (2010, 94). In Numbers, **אולי** appears only in the Balaam episode (5x) and is translated variously: **ἐὰν** (22.6), **εἰ ἄρα** (22.11), **εἰ μή** (22.33), **εἰ** (23.3, 27). By rendering **אולי** with **ἐάν**, G introduces the protasis to a conditional statement rather than a clause grammatically connected to the preceding clause, as in MT.

**πατάξαι.** This infinitive renders **נכה**; **נכה** is difficult to identify: although it appears to be a *hiphil yiqtol* first-person plural, an infinitive is expected here; HALOT states that this could be a *piel* infinitive (s.v. "נכה," *hiphil*, 1.b.). That **נכה** does not occur in the *piel* makes this unlikely. Thus, I will tentatively take it as a finite *hiphil* form. G renders this consecution well by transforming **אוכל** into a first-person common plural and rendering **נכה** with an infinitive.

**ἐξ αὐτῶν.** The prepositional phrase **ἐξ αὐτῶν** is likely intended to represent **בו** and is best understood as a substantival prepositional phrase that serves as the direct object, that is, "some of them" (NETS). A **ב** preposition that indicates *not instrument* but *object* is not attested frequently with **נכה** (see Exod 12.13; 17.6). In Exod 12.13, the **ב** preposition is rendered with **ἐν**; in Exod 17.6 the preposition is ignored and a simple accusative is used. Here, G avoids giving a stereotyped rendering of **ב** but still retains quantitative equivalence. The resultant text indicates that Balak is not hoping to destroy them but simply kill enough that they will retreat from his borders. In



this way, G in fact hints at the immensity of Israel vis-à-vis Moab—Balak cannot hope for more than a partial defeat.

*καὶ ἐκβαλῶ αὐτοὺς ἐκ τῆς γῆς.* G opts for quantitative equivalence and renders the apodotic *waw* with *καί*, despite the fact that it is not idiomatic. If Greek marks the apodosis with a conjunction, it prefers *δέ* or *ἀλλά* (see Smyth §2837; Tjen 2010, 36–37). According to Tjen, G renders the apodotic *waw* with a *καί* 65.8 percent of the time (2010, 215). NETS passes this unidiomatic construction on to the reader by rendering the *καί* with an equally awkward “and” before the apodosis.

*οὓς ἂν εὐλογήσῃς σύ ... οὓς ἂν καταράσῃ σύ.* The objects of blessing or cursing are the contingent elements, thus “whomever” in NETS. G adds the independent pronoun *σύ*, which is not necessary from a grammatical standpoint in either Hebrew or Greek. Rhetorically, however, this enhances Balak’s plea to Balaam by emphasizing the subject: “whomever *you* should bless.”

Although *וְשֵׁא*, as a relative complementizer, is unmarked with respect to number, the singular participle *מְבָרַךְ* that follows would dictate that the headless relative envisions a singular entity. However, G renders these participles with a plural (*εὐλόγηγνται, κεκατήρηνται*) and so also the relative pronouns (*οὓς*). This further strengthens Balak’s plea: instead of “the one whom you bless,” G has “whomever [pl.] you should bless.” However, this increase of emphasis comes at the cost of a few departures from his *Vorlage*. These subtle changes from the Hebrew merely make explicit the implicit sense of the Hebrew: Balak is flattering Balaam in order to coax him to come and curse Israel.

*εὐλόγηγνται ... κεκατήρηνται.* With the participle *מְבָרַךְ*, G has a choice: render the participle with a participle and thus be required to add *ἔστιν* and so be inconsistent vis-à-vis the following finite form of *κεκατήρηνται*, or render with a finite form. G chose the latter which allows him to retain isomorphism and consistency. Beyond a transformation of grammatical category, G renders both with plural forms, as his choice of the plural relative pronoun demands (see above on “*οὓς ἂν εὐλογήσῃς σύ ... οὓς ἂν καταράσῃ σύ*”).

## 22.7

וילכו זקני מואב וזקני מדין וקסמים בידם ויבאו אל בלעם וידברו אליו  
דברי בלק



καὶ ἐπορεύθη ἡ γερουσία Μωάβ καὶ ἡ γερουσία Μαδιάμ, καὶ τὰ μαντεῖα ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν αὐτῶν, καὶ ἦλθον πρὸς Βαλαάμ καὶ εἶπαν αὐτῷ τὰ ῥήματα Βαλάκ.

And the council of elders of Moab went, and the council of elders of Madiam, and the instruments of divination were in their hands, and they came to Balaam and said to him the words of Balak.

**ἐπορεύθη ἡ γερουσία Μωάβ καὶ ἡ γερουσία Μαδιάμ.** On *γερουσία*, see 22.4. Curiously, MT has a plural verb, **וָלָכוּ**, whereas G employs a singular form of *πορεύομαι*, despite also having two subjects. Wevers notes that this is G's pattern: "When a compound subject immediately follows a verb the verb is singular if the first element is singular, but in the following narration the verb is in the plural" (1982, 122; cf. 1.17, 12.1, 14.45; 20.6; 22.7 [he also cites 20.10 as an exception]). Although that is G's pattern, this is the only place where he translates a *plural Hebrew verb* as a singular. In the other instances just mentioned, the Hebrew *Vorlage* employs a singular verb with a compound subject following and G merely represents this. Compare this to 20.10: the plural Hebrew verb *is* translated by a plural, despite the fact that a compound subject follows it. Here, then, G is emphasizing the first subject, *ἡ γερουσία Μωάβ*, as the primary actors, which can safely be assumed from the preceding narrative of Balak's initiation (see Smyth §966: "The verb may agree with the nearest or most important of two or more subjects").

**καὶ ἐπορεύθη ... καὶ ἦλθον ... καὶ εἶπαν.** The MT has the normal *wayyiqtol* structure for a sequence of actions in a narrative. G, instead of departing from this as he does in 22.1, retains the clumsier polysyndeton. Here, the tendency towards faithful representation of G's *Vorlage* comes through.

**τὰ μαντεῖα.** The word *μαντεῖον* appears for the first time in the LXX here. It renders **מִסֵּךְ**, usually "divination" or "oracular response" (see Num 23.23; 1 Rgns 15.23; Prov 16.10; Jer 14.14). Since Balaam is the one who is to offer the divination, it is unlikely that they are bringing him divinations and so the Hebrew word is usually understood as *payment* for divination. Outside the LXX, *μαντεῖον* is used in the meanings of "oracular response, method or process of divination, seat of divination" (LSJ). It therefore carries a similar semantic range to **מִסֵּךְ** and although LSJ notes "payment for divination" as a possible gloss, it only finds support here in the LXX (see Dorival 1994, 421 for the tradition related to this interpretation). The two LXX

lexica gloss *μαντεῖα* in this context variously: LEH have “things attached to divination”; *GELS*, glosses “fees for divination” (so *BdA*, “l’argent de la divination”). LEH’s conservative gloss is probably best. In Num 23.23, *סִסְקִי* denotes a divination and is rendered with the cognate noun *μαντεῖα*. It seems most likely, then, that G knew the meaning of *סִסְקִי* or that of a similar root and supplied an etymological translation that is not quite suited to the context. NETS translates this as “the instruments of divination.” Dorival notes that Origen, Rabbah Numbers, and some targumim also understand the Greek word in this way (1994, 421).

*ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν αὐτῶν*. The MT employs the singular form of *יד* with *ב*, a common, idiomatic collocation that can denote agency or control without respect to number of agents (or number of hands, for that matter). What explains G’s plural *ἐν ταῖς χερσίν* then? The translator of Genesis does not render *בִּיד* + suffix with consistency, but equivocates between singular and plural forms of *χεῖρ*. That is, he does not appear to distinguish whether singular (Gen 30.35; 32.17) or plural forms of *χεῖρ* (Gen 16.6; 35.4) are more appropriate, neither does he correlate singular and plural forms with singular and plural agents (see Gen 16.6, 9; 27.17; 30.35). In rare cases, the Hebrew idiom is not represented literally but with an idiomatic Greek phrase that captures the semantic force of the Hebrew; for example, see *μετὰ ἑαυτῶν* (Gen 43.22) or *παρ’ ᾧ* (Gen 44.17).

The translators of Exodus and Leviticus develop this and are moderately consistent in their distinction between singular and plural agents: *ἐν/εἰς* + singular *χεῖρ* is generally used with singular agents (Exod 4.2; 6.1; 7.15, 17; 13.9; 14.8; 15.20; 17.5, 9; 22.3; Leu 26.46; exceptions 4.21; 32.15; 34.29) while *ἐν/εἰς* + plural *χεῖρ* is used with plural agents (12.11; 23.31; Leu 26.25). A brief glance at Numbers demonstrates that G reflects this distinction as well: a singular form of *χεῖρ* with singular agent (about 18x, first in Num 4.28; exception: 21.34) and plural with plural agents (22.7; 31.6 [although a misrendering of a singular pronominal suffix for plural]). Thus in this instance, G likely chooses to use *ἐν ταῖς χερσίν* to reflect the plural agents, though the singular *בִּיד* appears in his *Vorlage*.

*καὶ εἶπαν αὐτῷ τὰ ῥήματα Βαλάκ*. G prefers *λαλέω* for *דבר* (110x). The only exceptions are found in Num 14.17, 26; 15.1; 17.1 [MT 16.36]; 22.7, 35 (1°); 23.2; 24.13; 32.27, 31. The aorist of *λέγω* (i.e., *εἶπον*) and related forms appear about 120x, rendering forms of *אמר* in all but a few instances (15.35; 18.20; 26.1; 27.6, 18). Wevers notes: “The equation is so carefully

maintained that in each of these cases another parent text [i.e., ויאמר] is probably to be presupposed” (1982, 128).

## 22.8

ויאמר אליהם לינו פה הלילה והשבתי אתכם דבר כאשר ידבר יהוה  
אלי וישבו שרי מואב עם בלעם

καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς Καταλύσατε αὐτοῦ τὴν νύκτα, καὶ ἀποκριθήσομαι  
ὑμῖν ῥήματα<sup>a</sup> ἃ ἂν λαλήσῃ κύριος πρὸς με· καὶ κατέμειναν οἱ ἄρχοντες  
Μωᾶβ παρὰ Βαλαάμ.

And he said to them, “Lodge here tonight, and I will answer you matters the Lord may speak to me.” And the rulers of Moab stayed with Balaam.

<sup>a</sup> We<sup>ed</sup> has ῥήματα; however I will argue below that πράγματα is the better reading, which I will treat as the OG. This is a difficult text critical issue; ῥήματα is attested in primarily later manuscripts: Codex M, 416, 458, 767, a few other minuscules, and in Latin codex 100. This is against the better-attested πρᾶγμα (A, 426, Cyrillus Alexandrinus I, 440) and πραγματα (B, F, V, and the rest). Wevers prefers ῥήματα, arguing “[w]henever ἀποκρίνειν is used to represent הַשִּׁיב and has an object modifier either ῥήμα or λόγος is used in the LXX for דָּבַר but never πρᾶγμα” (1982, 129). I have examined the following examples confirming Wevers’s line of argument: Num 13.27 [MT 26], Ies 14.7; 22.32; 2 Rgns 3.11; 3 Rgns 12.24p, 12.24q; 18.21; 21.12; 4 Rgns 18.36; 1 Suppl 21.12; 2 Suppl 10.6, 9; 2 Esd 5.11; Idt 6.17 (plural ῥήμα); Prov 18.3; 22.21; 24.26; Zech 1.13; Esa 36.21; Ier 51.20 (MT 44.20); see also βουλή in Dan θ 2.14. Wevers also asserts that the lesser-attested plural ῥήματα is preferable to the singular ῥήμα as it could lead to the singular reading (1982, 129). The root of the problem is the polyvalence of דָּבַר, which can mean both “word” and “matter,” represented by ῥήμα/λόγος and πρᾶγμα respectively. However, the key text critical judgment is to explain *how* the grammatically smoother ῥήματα could lead to the more awkward (and earlier attested) πράγματα. In my judgment, it seems more likely that a later copyist would correct a translator’s infelicitous selection of πράγματα for דָּבַר in this context *than* a copyist substituting the incorrect πρᾶγματα for ῥήματα. In other words, it is likely that a translator working from the (potentially ambiguous) Hebrew *Vorlage* would make the mistake rather than a later copyist. Undoubtedly, ῥήματα is the *grammatically better* reading (as Wevers makes clear) and for this reason is the easier reading; however, πράγματα is, in my view, *preferable* as the earliest attainable.

Καταλύσατε αὐτοῦ τὴν νύκτα. This phrase is evidence of G’s grasp not only of his *Vorlage*, but also concern for his target language. On the one hand, his style can be characterized as isomorphic, but it also employs

Greek conventions well. When καταλύω is used intransitively, it takes on the meaning “to lodge.” Although first occurring in Gen (19.2; 24.23, 25), κοιμάομαι (“to sleep”) is used through the rest of the occurrences of לָיַן (10x). G’s rendering here, departing from this tendency, captures the sense of the Hebrew. Although לָיַן appears only here in Numbers, καταλύω is used for יָשַׁב in 25.1. Greek αὐτοῦ stands for the Hebrew adverb פֹּה. Although αὐτοῦ derives from the genitive form of αὐτός, it is used as a separate lemma meaning “just here” or “right here” (see LSJ, s.v. “αὐτοῦ”). Elsewhere in Numbers, פֹּה is rendered with αὐτοῦ in 32.6 (also Gen 22.5), but ὧδε in 32.16 (see Gen 19.12). The accusative τὴν νύκτα is an adverbial accusative denoting extent of time (Smyth §1582–83: “the accusative of time implies that the action of the verb covers the *entire* period” [emphasis original]). Thus, Balaam asks the messengers to stay through that night and he would presumably answer them the following morning.

**ἀποκριθήσονται ὑμῖν πράγματα.** The future deponent form of ἀποκρίνομαι is used for the *hiphil weqatal* of שׁוּב. It is not unusual that the object to whom the report is brought is marked as an accusative with אֶת, and rendered with a dative (see 3 Rgns 12.6; cf. Gen 37.14, suffixed pronoun instead of אֶת: (ה)שָׁבִנִי). The lemma ἀποκρίνομαι without ῥῆμα or λόγος is *semantically* sufficient to carry the collocation הַשִּׁיב + דַּבֵּר. (see Gen 37.14; 3 Rgns 12.9, 16; Esa 41.28). Nevertheless, G renders דַּבֵּר with the plural of πράγμα. Two issues must be noted here: first, ῥῆμα or λόγος is not used, although expected (see Wevers 1998, 365; see text critical comment <sup>a</sup> above); second, πράγματα is plural whereas דַּבֵּר is singular. The plural can be explained by attraction to the following phrase ἃ ἂν λαλήσῃ. Attraction to the relative pronoun—in contradistinction to attraction of the relative to the antecedent—places emphasis upon the relative clause (Smyth §2533). However, the choice of πράγμα can only be attributed to a translational misfire, namely, rendering a *possible* gloss of דַּבֵּר but one that is unsuitable to its context. Thus, Wevers’s comment that “only ῥήματα is appropriate” is accurate (1998, 365) and in my opinion, it is for this reason that later copyists “corrected” to the appropriate reading.

**ἃ ἂν λαλήσῃ κύριος.** On the use of ἂν, see comment at 22.6. The collocation ἃ ἂν represents כַּאֲשֶׁר. The sense of the Hebrew is that of comparison, “just as,” or, “in the manner which” rather than “the things which.” In fact, G renders כַּאֲשֶׁר with a variety of phrases to express this idea: καθά (15x), ὃν τρόπον (12x), καθάπερ (3x), καθὼς (2x), ὡς καὶ (2.17), καθὼς ὥσει

(11.12), *διότι* (27.14), and *καθότι* (33.56). This, however, is the only time that G renders it in this manner. Further, **כִּאֲשֶׁר** appears circa two hundred times in the Pentateuch and is never rendered with a simple relative pronoun except here; in a few places *ἄν* is added to denote contingency (e.g., Leu 24.20, 27.14). G's reading makes good contextual sense and conveys Balaam's willingness to present whatever God might say to him; it is, however, somewhat removed from an adequate rendering.

**καὶ κατέμειναν οἱ ἄρχοντες Μωάβ.** The verb *καταμένω* is a rare word in the LXX, appearing only three times: Gen 6.3; Num 20.1; and here. In Num 20.1, it also renders **יָשַׁב** and denotes Israel's sojourn in Kadesh Barnea before entering Edom. G's usual gloss, *κατοικέω* (ca. 20x), is obviously inappropriate to the context since it implies permanent residence rather than delay of a single evening. Later in this account, G selects the cognate *ὑπομένω* when Balaam requests the elders stay a night on their second journey to him (22.19).

## 22.9

**ויבא אלהים אל בלעם ויאמר מי האנשים האלה עמך**  
*καὶ ἦλθεν ὁ θεὸς πρὸς Βαλααμ καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Τί οἱ ἄνθρωποι οὗτοι  
 παρὰ σοί;*  
 And God came to Balaam and said to him, "Why are these people  
 with you?"

**καὶ ἦλθεν ὁ θεὸς πρὸς Βαλααμ.** The MT has the Tetragrammaton to refer to the divine in 22.8 but **אלהים** in verse 9. G seems to distinguish these, rendering them with *κύριος* and *θεός*, respectively. In the following narrative, the MT alternates between **יהוה** (22.8, 12, 13, 18, 22–27 [angel of YHWH], 28, 31, 32, 34, 35) and **אלהים** (2.9, 10, 11, 12, 18, 20, 22, 38). However, G only uses *κύριος* at 22.8, 18, 19, 31, 34, preferring *θεός* in most instances. The following table summarizes the uses of *θεός* and *κύριος* in Num 22; bolded verses mark where the OG and MT agree.

---

Verse **אלהים** **יהוה**

---

<b>8</b>	<i>κύριος</i>	"just as the Lord speaks to me"
<b>9</b>	<i>θεός</i>	"God came to Balaam"
<b>10</b>	<i>θεός</i>	"Balaam said to God"

12	θεός	MT: “YHWH said to Balaam”; G: “God said to Balaam”
13	θεός	MT: “YHWH does not permit”; G: “God does not permit”
18	κύριος	MT: “Lord, my God”; G: “Lord, God”
18	θεός	MT: “Lord, my God”; G: “Lord, God”
19	κύριος	“the Lord will speak”
20	θεός	“God came to Balaam”
22	θεός	MT: “angel of YHWH”; G: “angel of God”
22	θεός	MT: “angel of YHWH”; G: “angel of God”
23	θεός	MT: “angel of YHWH”; G: “angel of God”
24	θεός	MT: “angel of YHWH”; G: “angel of God”
25	θεός	MT: “angel of YHWH”; G: “angel of God”
26	θεός	MT: “angel of YHWH”; G: “angel of God”
27	θεός	MT: “angel of YHWH”; G: “angel of God”
28	θεός	MT: “YHWH opened the mouth”; G: “God opened the mouth”
31	θεός	MT: “angel of YHWH”; G: “angel of God”
32	θεός	MT: “angel of YHWH”; G: “angel of God”
34	κύριος	“angel of the Lord”
35	θεός	MT: “angel of YHWH”; G: “angel of God”
38	θεός	“The word that God puts”

In summation, the OG agrees with the MT in nine of twenty-two instances. In the twelve instances of disagreement, the phrase יהוה מלאך rendered with ὁ ἄγγελος τοῦ θεοῦ accounts for ten of these; indeed the MT and OG only agree on this phrase at 22.34. The other three instances of disagreement are found at 22.12, 13, 28. In this case, although Balaam went to consult with κύριος, θεός comes to him and eventually Balaam states that θεός (for יהוה) refuses to grant the request of the men (v. 13).

καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ. The MT does not have an equivalent for αὐτῷ. When the MT has מִן and indicates an interlocutor, it uses ל + pronoun or substantive, which G usually renders with πρὸς + accusative (ca. 65x) or a bare dative (16x). Less frequently, ל is used and rendered most often with the bare dative (14x), but also rendered with πρὸς + accusative (4x). In the Balaam episode (chaps. 22–24), the numbers are somewhat different: ל + pronoun = πρὸς + accusative (15x); ל + pronoun = dative (7x); ל

= dative (6x); לְ = πρὸς + accusative (2x). Thus, the appearance of αὐτῶ here could indicate a *Vorlage* of either אֱלֹהִי or לוֹ, with a slightly higher probability of אֱלֹהִי. 4Q27 confirms this reading: וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִי מִי הָאֲנָשִׁים הָאֵלֶּה. Moreover, it is present in the Pesh but not Tg. Onq. By the time of Origen, it must have been omitted from the Hebrew text and so was placed under the obelus to indicate that it was not present in the proto-MT (as witnessed in the Syro-Hexapla; see We<sup>ed</sup> ad loc.). Thus, with reasonable certainty, it can be asserted that אֱלֹהִי was present in G's *Vorlage* (see Wevers 1998, 365 n. 15). Note also that G and Pesh agree against MT and Tg. Onq. at 12.6 in the presence of πρὸς αὐτούς; there are no extant Qumran fragments for this phrase, however.

Τί οἱ ἄνθρωποι οὗτοι παρὰ σοί; Although this rendering nearly retains the structure of the corresponding Hebrew phrase, מִי הָאֲנָשִׁים הָאֵלֶּה עִמָּךְ, G departs from the MT in one important way: Τί in this construction can only mean “what” or “why” and not “who,” which would be represented by τίνες. This is a unique rendering in Numbers; in every other instance, מִי is rendered with τίς (6x). G perhaps read מִה in his *Vorlage*, which is found in SamPent rather than מִי of the MT. In support of this reconstruction, G renders מִה with τί in 9.8; 11.11 (2x), 20; 14.3, 41; 15.34; 20.4, 5; 22.19, 28, 32, 37; 23.8 (2x), 17, 23; 32.7.

Wevers notes that τί “can mean either ‘what’ or ‘why’” (1998, 365). NETS follows the former, rendering the phrase with “What are these men with you?” (cf. LXX.D: “Was machen diese Menschen bei dir?”; BdA: “Qu’est-ce, ces hommes”). According to this interpretation, τί would carry the sense of “what is the nature of these men with you?” (see Smyth §310). Accordingly, a plausible answer to such a question might be “ἡ γερουσία Μωάβ.” While it is not beyond the realm of possibility, it does not cohere with the context. The better sense is “why are these men with you?” Not only is it grammatically possible, but the answer Balaam gives in the following verses corresponds with this interpretation of the question—that is, they are here because Balak sent them (v. 10).

## 22.10

וַיֹּאמֶר בִּלְעָם אֶל הָאֱלֹהִים בֵּלַק בֶּן צֶפֶר מֶלֶךְ מוֹאָב שְׁלַח אֵלַי  
καὶ εἶπεν Βαλαὰμ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν Βαλὰκ υἱὸς Σεπφὼρ βασιλεὺς Μωάβ  
ἀπέστειλεν αὐτοὺς πρὸς με λέγων



And Balaam said to God, “Balak son of Sepphor, king of Moab, sent them to me, saying,

*ἀπέστειλεν αὐτοὺς πρὸς με*. The MT has the shorter *אֵלַי וְשָׁלַח*, and assumes that the men are the objects of Balak’s sending. Although the ellipsis is not ambiguous in the MT, it is certainly not a smooth reading. Insofar as Tg. Onq, Tg. Neof., and Pesh do not feel the need to make any similar additions here, it is clear that a literal rendering will do an adequate job.

*λέγων*. This is most likely a case of an alternative *Vorlage*. The collocation *ויאמר/וידבר* (or other verbs of speaking) + *לאמר* appears about seventy-five times in Numbers alone and is usually rendered with a corresponding verb + *λέγων* or *λέγοντες* (depending upon the number of speakers). To suppose that G picked up on this pattern and so included *λέγων* here—although plausible—is belied by two factors. First, it is not used with a verb of speaking but with *שָׁלַח/ἀποστέλλω*. Thus, this instance does not fit the pattern. Second, *לאמור* is attested in 4Q27. In this instance and 20.14, *λέγων* is added after verbs of *sending* and not *speaking*. However, at some point in the MT after Origen’s Hexapla (since only these are not marked with the obelus), it was omitted from the MT, perhaps because it fell out of vogue to use *לאמר* with verbs other than *אמר* and the like and so was omitted in the Masoretic tradition.

## 22.11

הנה העם היצא ממצרים ויכס את עין הארץ עתה לכה קבה לי אתו  
אולי אוכל להלחם בו וגרשתיו

Ἰδοὺ λαὸς ἐξελήλυθεν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου, καὶ ἰδοὺ κεκάλυφεν<sup>a</sup> τὴν ὄψιν  
τῆς γῆς, καὶ οὗτος ἐγκάθηται ἐχόμενός μου· καὶ νῦν δεῦρο ἄρασαί μοι  
αὐτόν, εἰ ἄρα δυνήσομαι πατάξαι αὐτόν καὶ ἐκβαλῶ αὐτόν ἀπὸ τῆς  
γῆς.

‘Behold, a people has come out of Egypt, and behold, it <sup>a</sup>covered the sight of the earth, and it is lying in wait next to me. And now come, curse it for me, if indeed I shall be able to strike it, and I will cast it out from the land.’”

<sup>a</sup> *κεκάλυφεν*. Wevers’s critical text reads the perfect form witnessed in Vaticanus and 71 (also in 509 with variant orthography = Ra). Unsurprisingly, circa twenty minuscules attest the form *κατεκάλυψεν*, harmonizing with verse 5. The rest of the manuscripts, however, read *ἐκαλύψεν* (aorist). Wevers notes that he would now



regard the aorist form as the original and proposed the emendation to the critical text (1998, 366). The perfect tense was probably an early but secondary harmonization with the perfect form of ἐξελέγηθεν preceding. The lemma text commented on here follows his later opinion and emends the text and translation after it.

Apart from a few minor changes, this verse repeats the message Balak sent with the elders to Balaam in verses 5–6. A comparison of the two reveals that the MT has more changes than G; in other words, G's version of verse 11 is harmonized with verses 5–6. In my opinion, however, it is unlikely that G actually did most (or any?) of the harmonization.

22.5b–6a		22.11	
MT	OG	MT	OG
הנה העם היצא ממצרים	ἰδοὺ λαὸς ἐξελέγηθεν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου	הנה העם היצא ממצרים	ἰδοὺ λαὸς ἐξελέγηθεν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου
הנה כסה את עין הארץ	καὶ ἰδοὺ κατεκάλυψεν τὴν ὄψιν τῆς γῆς	ויכס את עין הארץ	ἰδοὺ ἐκάλυψεν τὴν ὄψιν τῆς γῆς
והוא ישב ממלי	καὶ οὗτος ἐγκαθίσταται ἐχόμενός μου	(omitted)	καὶ οὗτος ἐγκαθίσταται ἐχόμενός μου
עתה לכה <u>נא</u> ארה לי את העם הזה	καὶ νῦν δεῦρο <u>ἄρρασαι</u> μοι τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον	עתה לכה <u>קבה</u> לי אתו	καὶ νῦν δεῦρο <u>ἄρρασαι</u> μοι αὐτόν
כי עצום הוא ממני	ὅτι ἰσχύει οὗτος ἢ ἡμεῖς	(omitted)	(omitted)
אולי אוכל <u>נבה</u> בו	ἐὰν δυνάμεθα πατάξαι ἐξ αὐτῶν	<u>אולי להלחם</u> בו	εἰ ἄρα δυνήσομαι πατάξαι αὐτόν
ואגרשנו <u>מן</u> הארץ	καὶ ἐκβαλῶ αὐτούς ἐκ τῆς γῆς	וגרשתיו (omitted)	καὶ ἐκβαλῶ αὐτόν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς

Most of the substantial differences are due to a variance in *Vorlage*. On λαὸς ἐξελέγηθεν and העם היצא, see below in the commentary proper. Whereas MT has three “omissions” in verse 11 when compared to verses 5–6, G and 4Q27 adds in two of them. Although the MT has no counterpart to καὶ οὗτος ἐγκαθίσταται ἐχόμενός μου, 4Q27 has [ממולי] ישב והואה. Furthermore, there is a good possibility that the final letter of this verse in 4Q27 is a **צ**, thus probably reading מן הארץ. Here, at least, there is good reason for

thinking that G was reading a (harmonized) text akin to 4Q27. All three, however, do omit the phrase *ὅτι ἰσχύει οὗτος ἢ ἡμεῖς* מִמֶּנִּי הוּא כִּי עֲצוּם הוּא.

Beyond these differences in *Vorlage*, G uses the same phrase, *δεῦρο ἄρασαι μοι*, to render both *לִי אָרָה נָא לָכָה* (v. 6) and *לִי לָכָה קָבָה* (v. 11). Conversely, *אִלּוּי* is rendered with *ἐάν* in verse 6 and *εἰ ἄρα* in verse 11; 4Q27 clearly attests *אִלּוּי* as well, for which see below.

*λαὸς ἐξεληλύθεν*. The MT reads “the people *who* came out”; that is, a definite substantive modified by an articular attributive participle. This substantival phrase becomes the subject of the verb *בָּסָה*, which naturally follows without an intervening conjunction. The presence of *καί* before *ἰδοὺ ἐκάλυψεν* alerts us to a change. G’s first clause is a full verbal clause, not a subject phrase. Insofar as 4Q27 reads *הִנֵּה עִם יִצָּחַ* (cf. the MT’s *הִנֵּה הָעַם יִצְחָק*) it is with reasonable certainty that we can propose that G was in fact reading a verbal clause followed by *וַיִּכַּס*, another verbal clause. Wevers offers some speculation regarding the origin of these variant Hebrew readings (1998, 366). If it was *יִצָּחַ* that he had before him, he rendered it with a perfect, rather than an aorist. See commentary on 22.5 for the significance of the perfect.

*καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐκάλυψεν τὴν ὄψιν τῆς γῆς*. Given the above explication, *ἰδοὺ* must have arisen through harmonization with verse 5, either by G himself or his *Vorlage*. G does not sustain the stative aspect of the perfect verb with which he began, but makes use of an aorist (*ἐκάλυψεν*). If the translator is making an oblique reference to Israel’s functional defeat of the land Egypt (see above on v. 5), then the aorist in fact fits the situation better—that is, *they covered*. If, on the other hand, it refers to the covering of the earth as a metaphor of Israel’s capability, the perfect would indeed fit the context better—that is, *they are* (or *have been*) *covering*.

*καὶ οὗτος ἐγκάθηται ἐχόμενός μοι*. This phrase is not present in the MT, but as argued above, likely in G’s parent text. It also appears in 22.5; see commentary there.

*καὶ νῦν δεῦρο ἄρασαι μοι αὐτόν*. This phrase appears exactly as it does in 22.6 (see commentary there). However, the MT, which we are taking as G’s *Vorlage* for lack of any other witnesses, varies in three ways primarily. First, the often-untranslated particle of entreaty, *נָא*, although present in 22.6, does not appear in the MT here. Second, the verb represented

by ἄρασαι is אָרָא in 22.6 but קָבַב here. This is the first occurrence of the latter in Numbers, but it appears ten times in Num 22–24; ἀράομαι renders it only here and 23.8, but καταράομαι or a cognate is preferred (8x). G's phrasing here is likely influenced by the parallel text in 22.6. Third, the third-person pronoun is present in both MT and LXX, whereas the phrase τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον/הַזֶּה הָעַם אֵת appears in 22.6; αὐτόν neatly refers to λαός, as well as corresponding to the MT's אֵת in gender and number.

εἰ ἄρα δυνήσομαι πατάξαι αὐτόν. Curiously, instead of representing οὐλί with ἐάν, as he does in verse 6, G uses the collocation εἰ ἄρα, which can carry the sense “perhaps” (see BDAG, s.v. “ἄρα,” 3). Smyth states, εἰ ἄρα is “commonly used of that which is improbable or undesirable” (§2790). It appears only four times in the entire LXX tradition: Gen 18.3; Num 22.11; Ps 57[58].12; OG Dan 6.21. An example from Thucydides, *Hist.* 1.27, is instructive: ἐδεήθησαν δὲ καὶ τῶν Μεγαρέων ναυσὶ σφᾶς συμπροπέμψαι [συμπροπέμψαι], εἰ ἄρα κωλύοιντο ὑπὸ Κερκυραίων πλεῖν (“But they beseeched also the Megareans to join in escorting them with boats, if perchance [εἰ ἄρα] they might be forbidden to sail by the Corcyraeans”). In Thucydides, the εἰ ἄρα clause states some *undesirable* event; in Num 22.11, it states two improbable outcomes. Thus, the rendering here implies that Balak's desired outcome is quite unlikely, which is working against the narrative context in which Balak is attempting to flatter Balaam. Although G uses four different glosses for the five occurrences of οὐλί in the Balaam episode (see at 22.6), εἰ ἄρα carries the sense better than the others. *BdA* does not recognize the difference between εἰ ἄρα and ἐάν and renders both “dans l'espoir.” NETS is similarly problematic, reading “if” at 22.6 and “if indeed” at 22.11. A better rendering for 22.11 might be, “*perhaps* I shall be able to strike it.” LXX.D captures it well: εἰ ἄρα is rendered with *vielleicht* (22.11) and ἐάν with *wenn* (22.6).

The MT here is smoother than the parallel 22.6, using a first person common singular with an infinitive phrase, לְהַלָּחֵם, as opposed to the obscure בּוֹ נִכָּח. In 22.6, G offered the rendering δυνώμεθα πατάξαι ἐξ αὐτῶν (“we might be able to strike some of them”) for this difficult phrase. In 22.11, G uses the same lemmata to render both, δύναμαι and πατάσσω, but does not render the כּ with a preposition (see ἐκ in v. 6). He also switches the tense and mood from present subjunctive to future indicative and the number from plural to singular. The future tense coheres well with his use of εἰ ἄρα and with the following future, ἐκβαλῶ—that is, a future possibility.

The four occurrences of **לחם** *niphal* + **ב**, a standard Hebrew idiom for “fight against,” in OG Numbers are all rendered differently: *πολομέω* + *πρός* (21.1), *πολομέω* + accusative (21.26; see also Exod 1.10; 14.25; Deut 1.30), *πατάσσω* + dative (21.23; see also Exod 17.9, 10), and *πατάσσω* + accusative (here). Nowhere else in the Pentateuch, however, does *πατάσσω* translate **לחם**. In the twenty-one other occurrences of *πατάσσω* in OG Numbers, it always renders a form of **נכה**. Thus, it is a safe assumption that G rendered it to match 22.6, preferring consistency over what may have been his usual lexical choice in other contexts. A simple accusative is the preferred object of *πατάσσω*; curiously, this is the case in every instance but 22.6. A combination of preference for rendering two parallel texts similarly and a tendency towards acceptability explains how the present reading might have arisen.

*καὶ ἐκβαλῶ αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς*. As mentioned above, whereas MT has only **וַיגרשתי**, it is likely that G’s parent had **מִן הָאָרֶץ** as well, probably witnessed in 4Q27. The MT in 22.6 has a *yiqtol* form with a suffixed third person masculine singular pronoun, but a suffixed *weqatal* in 22.11. G uses the future *ἐκβαλῶ* in both instances, which suits the context well. However, in 22.6 he renders the pronoun *ad sensum* with a plural and in 22.11, he renders it according to its grammatical number with a singular.

## 22.12

וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים אֶל בָּלַעַם לֹא תֵלֵךְ עִמָּהֶם לֹא תֵאָר אֶת הָעָם כִּי בָרוּךְ הוּא

καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς πρὸς Βαλαάμ Οὐ πορεύσει μετ’ αὐτῶν οὐδὲ καταράσῃ τὸν λαόν· ἔστιν γὰρ εὐλογημένος.

And God said to Balaam, “You shall not go with them, nor shall you curse the people, for it is blessed.”

*Οὐ πορεύσει μετ’ αὐτῶν*. The MT represents God’s prohibition to Balaam with the normal negative and a *yiqtol*. G follows this closely; *οὐ μή* can be used to express a dramatic or strong prohibition (Smyth §1919, 2756), but G chooses the simple *οὐ*—which is attested everywhere in the manuscripts—to express denial of permission (Smyth §1917). Contextually, G’s choice is the better of the two. The verb *πορεύομαι* is G’s preferred rendering of **הלך**, using it about twenty times throughout the thirty-seven occurrences of **הלך** in Numbers. In the Balaam episode, it appears thirteen times to designate the simple act of moving between locations. However,

if the context warrants a further nuance, G is not hesitant to use ἀποτρέχω (“hurry away”; e.g., 22.13; 24.14), ἀπέρχομαι (“depart”; e.g., 24.25 [2x]), ἀκολουθέω (“follow”; e.g., 22.20) or δεῦρο (“come!”; e.g., 22.6, 11, 16).

**οὐδὲ καταράσῃ τὸν λαόν.** Instead of breaking the syntax into two parallel clauses as the MT does (“you will not ... you will not”), G uses the coordinating compound negative particle, οὐδέ. This may have been influenced by 4Q27’s לֹא ... לֹא structure, which read לֹא rather than the MT’s לֹא and a conjunction (לֹא) rather than an asyndetic construction. There is a conjunction in SamPent, Pesh, Vulgate, Tg. Neof. and twelve Kennicott manuscripts (see Wevers 1998, 367 n. 20). In all likelihood, G has before him a text with a conjunction. Since there is a negative clause preceding this clause in Greek, οὐδέ is properly rendered with “nor,” as NETS has it. Of the twenty-three occurrences of οὐδέ in Numbers, ten of them render לֹא. G chooses his preferred rendering of אַרְרָא, καταράομαι. Some stylistic coherency is added by using cognates in 22.12 and 13 (ἀράομαι and καταράομαι), whereas the MT has קַבַּב and אַרְרָא, respectively.

**ἔστιν γὰρ εὐλογημένος.** A strictly isomorphic rendering would have lead to something like ὅτι εὐλογημένος οὗτος. G’s reading, however, is much less clumsy. The reorganization of the syntax probably developed from the choice to use the postpositive γὰρ rather than ὅτι (see also at 21.26). Then, for stylistic reasons, G moves the copula to the front and makes the participle εὐλογημένος the final element.

## 22.13

ויקם בלעם בבקר ויאמר אל שרי בלק לכו אל ארצכם כי מאן יהוה  
לתתי להלך עמכם

καὶ ἀναστὰς Βαλαάμ τὸ πρωὶ εἶπεν τοῖς ἄρχουσιν Βαλάκ Ἀποτρέχετε  
πρὸς τὸν κύριον ὑμῶν· οὐκ ἀφίησίν με ὁ θεὸς πορεύεσθαι μεθ’ ὑμῶν.

And after Balaam rose in the morning, he said<sup>a</sup> to the rulers of Balak, “Run off to your master; God does not permit me to go with you.”

<sup>a</sup> NETS reads “And Balaam rose up in the morning and he said,” giving the impression that G employed simple parataxis—which is not the case here. My rendering above understands the participle as temporal. See again at 22.14.

**καὶ ἀναστὰς Βαλαὰμ τὸ πρωί.** G's concern to produce an acceptable text is clear here, although he leaves the unidiomatic *καί*, isomorphically rendering the Hebrew *ו*, which is not needed in the Greek construction. First, he employs the *participium coniunctum* construction, thus making *εἶπεν* the main verb (see also Gen 24.25 [*καὶ ἀναστὰς πρωί εἶπεν*]; 26.31). This is the first use of *ἀνίστημι* in the Balaam episode; however, it is used ten times in chapters 22–24 and only six times in the rest of the book. In all but 22.22, it renders a form of *קום*. The adverb *πρωί* with or without an article is used frequently in the Pentateuch to render *בבקר* (“in the morning”), beginning at Gen 19.27 (ca. 35x). In Numbers, every occurrence of *בבקר* is rendered with *τὸ πρωί*, the only exception is 22.41. Throughout the OG Pentateuch, this phrase is nearly formulaic in its consistency (see Wevers 1998, 367).

**Ἀποτρέχετε.** G renders the second-person imperative form of *הלך* with a more semantically specific lemma (see also Num 24.14); *ἀποτρέχω* appears only rarely in the rest of the LXX, thirty times in total. In the Pentateuch, it translates *הלך* (Gen 12.19; 24.51; Exod 3.21; 10.24), *שוב* (Gen 32.10; Leu 25.41), and *יצא* (Exod 21.5, 7). Whereas *שוב* and *יצא* are semantically closer to *ἀποτρέχω* than *הלך*, there is a clear precedent for rendering *הלך* with *ἀποτρέχω*, particularly in contexts where *הלך* indicates departure. Indeed, LSJ notes “depart” and “run home” as its definitions. NETS could just as well have had “run home” or “depart” (cf. *BdA*, “Repartez;” LXX.D, “Kehrt ... zurück).

**πρὸς τὸν κύριον ὑμῶν.** The MT reads “to your land” here, as does Pesh, Tg. Onq., and Tg. Neof. However, G reads *πρὸς τὸν κύριον* (“to your master”). According to Nathan Jastram, 4Q27 *may* have read *עדוניכמה* (“to your master”), rightly marking every letter except the two final letters with a hollow dot, *מה* (Jastram 1994, 232). Thus, it may be that G was reading “to your lord” in his parent text. I disagree, then, with Wevers’s assertion that “This is a somewhat free paraphrase of MT, which had *אֶרְצְכֶם*” (1998, 367). On the reading in 4Q27, Wevers notes, “the first letters of *אֶרְצִיכֶמה* seem to be an equally possible transcription based on the Plate” (1998, 367 n. 22). In the absence of high-resolution photographs to examine the “scant” ink, Jastram’s analysis must stand. In my opinion, G’s careful and quite literal translation militates against Wevers’s assertion that this is “a somewhat free paraphrase” and it is better to see this as present in G’s Hebrew text—albeit difficult to discern from 4Q27. G’s rendering “to your

master” better suits the context than the MT, “to your land” (אל ארצכם), since the messengers have been sent from Balak, designated as “the messengers of Balak,” and delivered the words of Balak (so also Wevers 1998, 367; cf. Rösel and Schlund 2011, 482).

οὐκ ἀφίησίν με ὁ θεός. G neglects to render the כִּי, and simply adds this clause to the previous one asyndetically; We<sup>ed</sup> accordingly adds a raised dot to mark the break in G’s syntax. The MT employs the construction מֵאֵין+ infinitive of נָתַן to convey God’s denial of permission (Exod 22.16; Num 20.21; 22.13). G’s construction is not isomorphic, but a rather idiomatic paraphrase, since he uses the phrase οὐ + ἀφίημι to render this whole construction. Compare with Exod 22.16 (μὴ βούληται ὁ πατήρ αὐτῆς δοῦναι) and Num 20.21 (καὶ οὐκ ἠθέλησεν Ἐδῶμ δοῦναι); see also Gen 37.35; 39.8; 48.19; Deut 25.7. Curiously, in Num 22.14, מֵאֵין appears again with an infinitive and G renders it with οὐ θέλει.

Indeed, οὐκ ἀφίημι appears only here in the OG Pentateuch to render מֵאֵין + infinitive of נָתַן. Yet the other two instances of a negated ἀφίημι in the Pentateuch render נָתַן לֹא, conveying denial of permission (Gen 20.6; Exod 12.23), which may explain the choice of ἀφίημι by G here to express the same.

θεός. Finally, G uses θεός for יהוה, as he did in 22.12 and passim following (22.22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 31, 32, 35). For an overview of this phenomenon, consult the table at verse 9.

#### 22.14

ויקומו שרי מואב ויבאו אל בלק ויאמרו מאן בלעם הלך עמנו  
καὶ ἀναστάντες οἱ ἄρχοντες Μωᾶβ ἦλθον πρὸς Βαλὰκ καὶ εἶπαν Οὐ  
θέλει Βαλαὰμ πορεύθῃναι μεθ’ ἡμῶν

And when the rulers of Moab arose, they went<sup>a</sup> to Balak and said,  
“Balaam does not want to go with us.”

<sup>a</sup> NETS again gives the impression that G has retained the parataxis of his source, rendering “And the rulers of Moab arose and went.” My translation here reflects the adverbial participle followed asyndetically by the finite clause. See also at 22.13.

καὶ ἀναστάντες οἱ ἄρχοντες Μωᾶβ ἦλθον. G renders the *wayyiqtol* form of קוּם just as he did in 22.13 with a *participium coniunctum*. On the καί, see



at 22.14. Similarly, as in 22.13, G again follows the convention of his target language and does not supply *καί* for the *waw* on וַיִּבְאֵן.

Οὐ θέλει Βαλαὰμ πορεύθῃναι μεθ' ἡμῶν. As in 22.13, the construction וַיִּבְאֵן + infinitive appears here. G's rendering in both instances produces readable Greek expressed in two different ways. Compared to the previous instance, G now uses the periphrasis οὐ + θέλω for the single word וַיִּבְאֵן. His rendering coheres with Genesis's precedent to use a similar construction (Gen 37.35; 39.8; 48.19; see also Exod 10.4; Num 20.21; Deut 25.7), but differs from the translator of Exodus's preferred construction of οὐ/μή + βούλομαι (Exod 4.23; 7.27; 9.2; 10.3; 16.28; 22.17 [MT 16]).

The astute reader of G's text would notice that a slight transformation has taken place. Balaam's response to the rulers of Balak was "God does not permit me to go with you" (22.13). However, the rulers report that, "Balaam *does not want* to go with us" (22.14). This, however, is clearly not the case. The MT does not suffer from a similar problem. The rulers repeat to Balak in 22.14 MT Balaam's words in 22.13 MT: "Balaam refused." On the one hand, G's rendering follows translational equivalents established in the rest of the Pentateuch. On the other, it leads G to a slight, but significant, retelling of the narrative appearing in his *Vorlage*. In light of G's transformation, Balak's response in the following verse makes good sense: he offers rich rewards to entice Balaam. There is a warrant for suggesting that G's transformation is intentional. It is in the fact that he has carefully selected his translational equivalents for וַיִּבְאֵן in 22.13 and 14, and not allowed one stereotyped rendering to flatten the narrative.

## 22.15

וַיִּשַׁף עוֹד בַּלַּק שָׁלַח רָבִים וְנַכְבָּדִים מֵאֵלָּה  
καὶ προσέθετο ἔτι Βαλὰκ ἀποστεῖλαι ἄρχοντας πλείους καὶ  
ἐντιμότερους τούτων  
And Balak added again to send rulers, more numerous and more  
distinguished than these.

καὶ προσέθετο ἔτι Βαλὰκ ἀποστεῖλαι. The combination προστιθῆμι + infinitive is well known as an equivalent for וַיִּשַׁף + infinitive (ca. 55x in the Pentateuch alone; see Thackeray 52–53). NETS's rendering, "and Balak added again," conveys the stilted nature of the Greek rendering under influence of the Semitic parent (*pace* LXX.D, "Und so sandte Balak noch einmal" and *BdA*, "Et de nouveau encore Balak envoya," but see Dorival 1994, 424,



“Balak ajouta encore d’envoyer”). Only in Gen 8.10 is **רָסַח** rendered with *πάλιν*, followed by a finite verb that represents the Hebrew infinitive; **רָסַח וַיִּוַּע** is a common collocation in the MT (e.g., Gen 18.29; 38.5, 26), which is consistently rendered by *προστίθῃμι ἔτι* in the OG.

The infinitive *ἀποστεῖλαι* is the Hebraistic complement to *προσέθετο*, since *προστίθῃμι* prefers to take nouns for objects (see LSJ, s.v. “*προστίθῃμι*”). In Numbers, G renders **וַיִּשְׁלַח** with *ἐξαποστέλλω* only in 5.2, 3, 4; 13.2. Subsequently, the simpler form *ἀποστέλλω* is used. Furthermore, G prefers the aorist infinitive (123x) to the present in a ratio slightly over 2:1.

**ἄρχοντας πλείους καὶ ἐντιμωτέρους τούτων.** Balak responds to Balaam’s refusal by sending *more numerous* (*πλείους*) and *more honorable* (*ἐντιμωτέρους*) emissaries. Elsewhere, G has used the comparative *πλείων* to render forms of **רַב** (Num 9.19; 20.15; 26.54; 33.54)—but they are merely intensive and not true comparatives (see Smyth §1067). The near demonstrative *τούτων* must refer to those who had just returned. Although G does not render **מִן** with a separate word, his rendering is grammatically sufficient on levels of adequacy and acceptability. Since *τούτων* and the “greater rulers” both refer to emissaries sent from Balak, the bare genitive indicates that the comparison is between the two groups, not two different people who sent emissaries (Smyth §1069a–b: “The genitive is usual if ... two objects have the same verb in common”).

The MT uses a participle **נִכְבְּדִים** where G uses a comparative adjective, *ἐντιμωτέρους*; *ἐντιμωτέρους* appears only here in Numbers and a positive form appears in Deut 25.28, rendering a participial form of **כָּבֵד** (also Ies 3.5). This simple change in grammatical category makes the two comparative adjectives coordinate, and so was probably made for stylistic reasons.

## 22.16

וַיָּבֹאוּ אֵל בָּלַעַם וַיֹּאמְרוּ לוֹ כֹּה אָמַר בֶּלַק בֶּן צְפּוֹר אֵל נָא תִּמְנַע מֵהָלָךְ  
אֵלַי

καὶ ἦλθον πρὸς Βαλαάμ καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ· Τάδε λέγει Βαλάκ ὁ τοῦ Σεπφὼρ Ἀξιῷ σε, μὴ ὀκνήσῃς ἐλθεῖν πρὸς με·

And they came to Balaam and said to him, “This is what Balak son of Sepphor says, ‘I beg you, do not hesitate to come to me.’

This verse represents a departure from G's normal style, including a present tense for *wayyiqtol* form, ὁ τοῦ Σεπφώρ for בן צפור, and translation of the particle ו. Nevertheless, the translation is quite smooth in Greek.

καὶ ἦλθον πρὸς Βαλαάμ καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ. Coming and speaking is a common consecution in Numbers. However, G rarely renders the first *wayyiqtol* with an aorist and the second with a present; his usual convention is to render both *wayyiqtol* forms with aorists linked with καὶ (in the immediate context, see Num 22.7, 9, 14, 20; cf. 32.16 where an aorist is followed by an imperfect). Likely, as Wevers points out, the present is a historical present (1998, 368; see also 20.19; 22.28, 30). Smyth notes, “in lively or dramatic narration the present may be used to represent a past action as going on at the moment of speaking or writing” (§1883). G's choice, in other words, is for stylistic and narratological reasons.

Τάδε λέγει. The phrase τάδε λέγει is a stereotypical rendering for כה אמר (see Wevers 1998, 368). Apart from the first occurrence of כה אמר in Gen 32.5, which is rendered by οὕτως λέγει, τάδε λέγει is found circa 360 times in the OG.

ὁ τοῦ Σεπφώρ. This phrase renders בן צפור and is an idiomatic construction, in contradistinction to more-literal υἱὸς Σεπφώρ in 22.2, 4. In Numbers, this idiomatic construction appears thirteen times to render the phrase בן + proper noun. Its more literal counterpart, υἱός, is used with much greater frequency. Since G is not bound by (admittedly contrived) categories of *literal* and *free*, he spontaneously chooses to use ὁ τοῦ Σεπφώρ although it does comport with his idiomatic rendering in the rest of the verse.

Ἄξιὼ σε. G now translates the particle ו with a verbal clause. Although rarely choosing to render it, he does so in Num 12.13 with δέομαι σου (cf. 12.11; see also Gen 19.18). The verb ἀξιόω itself means “request, ask” (see LSJ, s.v. “ἀξιόω,” II.2). Relatively speaking, the lemma itself appears infrequently in the LXX outside of Tobit and 1–4 Makkabees and only rarely with the meaning “to ask” (see, e.g., Esth 4.8; 7.8; Dan OG/θ 1.8; 2.16). According to Wevers, “the translator wants to record the pleading character of this second invitation” (1998, 368; see also Dorival 1994, 424).

The phrase ἀξιὼ σε is, however, quite commonly found in the papyri; for example, P.Enteux. AppB (246–222 BCE, Ghoran), ἀξιὼ οὖν σε,

ἐπειδὴ διὰ τὸ ἰσχύειν αὐτὸν ταῦτα συντ[ετέλεσται, μεταπεμψάμενον αὐτὸν ἐπαναγκάσαι ἀποδοῦναι μοι τὴν ... εὐτύχει] (“I ask you, therefore, since he is stronger, complete these things”). It is frequently followed by an infinitive (see, e.g., BGU 3.1006 [third century BCE, unknown provenance]; BGU 6.1244 [225 BCE, Herakleopolite Nome]). Thus, it is likely that G picked up this formula from the conventional language of his Ptolemaic environs.

**μὴ ὀκνήσης ἐλθεῖν.** The word *ὀκνέω* is used only here in the Pentateuch and elsewhere only six times (Judg A/S 18.9; Idt 12.13; Tob 12.6, 13; 4 Makk 14.4; Sir 7.35). It renders **מָנַע**, which can be used with a direct object to mean “hold back something, deprive.” Here, the infinitive construct form is attached to a **מָנַע**, indicating the action from which he should not hold back (see 1 Sam 25.26; Jer 2.25). The phrase *ὀκνέω* + infinitive carries the sense of “to hesitate,” capturing the sense of the Hebrew well here.

22.17

כִּי כְבֹד אֶכְבֹּדךָ מֵאֵד וְכֹל אֲשֶׁר תֹּאמַר אֵלַי אֶעֱשֶׂה וְלֹכָה נָא קִבְּהָ לִּי  
אֵת הָעָם הַזֶּה

ἐντίμως γὰρ τιμήσω σε, καὶ ὅσα ἂν εἴπῃς, ποιήσω σοι· καὶ δεῦρο ἐπικατάρασαί μοι τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον.

For I will honor you honorably, and whatever things you say I will do for you. And come, curse for me this people.”

**ἐντίμως γὰρ τιμήσω σε.** Elsewhere, G renders the intensifying infinitive absolute with a cognate participle (12.14; 13.30 [1°]; 22.30; 24.10; 30.7, 13, 15, 16), cognate noun in the nominative (13.30 [2°]), dative (14.18; 15.31, 35; 18.15; 23.25; 26.65; 35.16, 17, 18, 21, 26, 31), or accusative (23.11; 27.7; 30.3), or quite freely (22.38). This distribution more or less matches that of the entire LXX’s renderings of infinitive absolutes (see Tov 1999, esp. 253). In 24.11, the same Hebrew construction (**כְּבֹד אֶכְבֹּדךָ**) is not rendered with any representation of the infinitive absolute. Thus, the use of the adverb is unusual for G; in the LXX, Tov counts only eleven (Tov 1999, 253). However, its presence might help explain why G did not render **מֵאֵד**: perhaps a concern for acceptability prohibits overloading a verb with adverbial modifiers. Not only is this construction rare but *ἐντίμως* itself appears only here and in Tobit in the LXX.

The conjunction *γάρ* conveys the reason for the preceding command, rather than the direct cause. G often renders **כִּי** with *ὅτι*, leading to some grammatical infelicities, such as the one noted at 22.6 and elsewhere in

the LXX (see again Aejmelaeus 1993, 11–30). G’s choice of γάρ here suits the context.

καὶ ὅσα ἄν. G neglects כּוֹל, which he also does elsewhere and simply leaves ὅσα as a headless relative (see also 4.26 [2°], 6.3; 16.33). Headless ὅσος clauses are also found at 23.12; 24.13; 32.31, making a total of six in Numbers. In compositional Greek, ὅσος can take on the meaning of πᾶς (see Mayser §§2.3.95; 2.1.345, and the examples cited there). Consider, for example, the following occurrence of ὅσος in P. Grenf 1.21 (126 BCE): ἐκαταλείπω καὶ [δίδωμι τὰ ὑπάρχοντά μοι ἔγγαι]ά τε καὶ ἔπιπλα καὶ κτήνη καὶ ὅσα ἂν προσεπικτήσωμαι (“I bequeath and give my property in land and movable objects and cattle and whatever else [= everything] I may have acquired”; trans. Hunt and Edgar, LCL) Accordingly, G’s rendering captures the quantitative sense of כּוֹל אֲשֶׁר (see HALOT, s.v. “כּוֹל,” 10) neatly in his idiomatic phrasing.

In addition, G uses a subjunctive verb with ἄν, marking conditionality. Thus, G’s “whatever things you [might] say I will do for you” (NETS, emphasis added) makes the contingency of what Balaam is permitted to say explicit—there are no limits!—while at the same time making implicit whom Balaam is to speak to by omitting the MT’s “to me.” For a point of comparison, Balak’s promise to Balaam in the MT is, “all that you should say to me, I will do.”

εἴπης, ποιήσω σοι. G does not render אֵלִי in the MT (תֹּאמַר אֵלִי). The effect of this is to leave Balak’s statement as open-ended as possible. However, G has σοι in agreement with 4Q27—which reads אֵלִי לְכָה [אֲנִי]—against MT. Unfortunately, 4Q27 is lost at אֵלִי. Reading “I will do for you” (OG, 4Q27, Pesh MS 7a1), makes good sense in the present context; otherwise, it is only implied that Balak’s words denote his eagerness to reward Balaam in whichever way he pleased.

καὶ δεῦρο ἐπικατάρασαί μοι τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον. As G has done previously (e.g., 22.6, 11), he renders לְכָה with δεῦρο and does not represent נָא. The verb ἐπικατάρασμαι is used only rarely in the LXX and primarily in Numbers (elsewhere, Ps 151.6; Mal 2.2). It renders forms of אָרַר in Num 5 (7x) and is not used again until this occurrence. On other cursing language, see at verse 6; ἐπικατάρασμαι translates קָבַב; however, in 23.7 it translates אָרַר. G does not seem to make a distinction between the Greek lexemes he chooses or the Hebrew words he renders; *pace* Wevers, who notes that the

change to ἐπικαταράομαι “was intended to reflect the change from ארה in v[erse] 6 to קבה here” (1998, 369; note that קבב also appears in verse 11 and is rendered with ἀράομαι). However, the compound form does seem to match the heightened emphasis of Balak’s second request to Balaam.

## 22.18

ויען בלעם ויאמר אל עבדי בלק אם יתן לי בלק מלא ביתו כסף וזהב  
לא אוכל לעבר את פי יהוה אלהי לעשות קטנה או גדולה  
καὶ ἀπεκρίθη Βαλαάμ καὶ εἶπεν τοῖς ἄρχουσιν Βαλάκ Ἐὰν δῶ μοι  
Βαλάκ πλήρη τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ ἀργυρίου καὶ χρυσίου, οὐ δυνήσομαι  
παραβῆναι τὸ ῥῆμα κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ ποιῆσαι αὐτὸ μικρὸν ἢ μέγα ἐν  
τῇ διανοίᾳ μου.

And Balaam answered and said to the rulers of Balak, “If Balak gives me his house full of silver and gold, I shall not be able to transgress the word of the Lord God to do it, whether small or great in my mind.

τοῖς ἄρχουσιν Βαλάκ. In every other instance of either “rulers of Balak” or “rulers of Moab” in the Balaam episode, the MT uses a plural construct form of שר. Here, however, the MT has עבדי בלק. G does not depart from his normal strategy and renders with the formulaic τοῖς ἄρχουσιν Βαλάκ (e.g., 22.8, 13, 14, 35). Unfortunately, neither 4Q23 nor 4Q27 are extant at this phrase. Moreover, Tg. Neof., Tg. Onq., and Pesh all witness to “his servants.” We<sup>d</sup> does not note any telling differences in the manuscript tradition. Thus, it is probably best to conclude that G rendered עבדי בלק with ἄρχουσιν Βαλάκ according to his established pattern (also Dorival 1994, 424; Rösel and Schlund 2011, 483). Therefore, this could count as inner-Greek harmonization (see Tov 1985, 20).

Ἐὰν δῶ μοι Βαλάκ. This phrase serves as the protasis of a conditional sentence. G selects ἐάν + aorist subjunctive (δῶ) to render אם + *yiqtol* rather than εἰ + future indicative. Interpretations of what the commonly used ἐάν + subjunctive means are many (see Tjen 2010, 56–67), but I follow Tjen in affirming that it “expresses various ranges of possibility” (Tjen 2010, 67) but not a “vivid future condition” (contra Smyth §2323). The future in the apodosis (δυνήσομαι) is usual in these constructions (see Smyth §2326). Therefore, the Greek protasis suggests that *whatever* Balak chooses to do will not change Balaam’s response.

πλήρη τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ ἀργυρίου καὶ χρυσίου. The expression מְלֵא בֵיתוֹ and its rendering, πλήρη τὸν οἶκον ἀργυρίου καὶ χρυσίου, are difficult (see also Num 24.13); מְלֵא is the head noun (“fullness,” “full amount”; see HALOT), followed by a genitive phrase בֵּיתוֹ, which could be analyzed as a attributive genitive (see Joüon §129.c.1) or partitive (Joüon §129.c.8). I prefer the latter. In this interpretation of the MT, he is giving the fullness of the gold and silver in his house (i.e., not his house itself). However, G uses an idiomatic expression that uses the adjective πλήρης with a noun in the same case (as opposed to with a genitive noun, see LSJ, s.v. “πλήρης,” I). When πλήρης is used with a noun of the same case, the fullness or completeness of the noun itself is expressed (see LSJ, s.v. “πλήρης,” III.2). For example, see Xenophon, *Anab.* 7.5.5: εἰ γὰρ ἐκήδου, ἦκες ἂν φέρων πλήρη τὸν μισθόν (“For if you cared, you would have come bringing the full wage”); also, P. Rev. Laws 17.2–3 (258 BCE): καὶ ἀπέ[χ]ηι ὁ [ο]ικονό[μος] πλῆρες τὸ ἀδιέγγυσον μέρος[ς τῆς] ὥνης (“and the steward received the full portion of the price not covered by security”). In this way, it comes close to meaning “entire” or “totality of.” Here then, G has Balaam saying that *if Balak will give his entire house*, and so on. Of importance is the genitive following the head noun; it functions as a standard genitive of content (see Smyth §1323). Putting it all together, G’s Greek construction, according to the rules of idiomatic Greek, could be paraphrased as “the entire house containing silver and gold,” *not* “the house full of silver and gold.”

οὐ δυνήσομαι παραβῆναι τὸ ῥῆμα κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ. Tjén notes that a protasis of ἐάν + subjunctive—as is found here—is frequently followed by a future indicative (2010, 39, 43). The effect here is to say that no bribe or reward that Balak can give will alter Balaam’s inability to transgress the word of God. Wevers notes that παραβαίνω, although rendering עָבַר only eleven times, is a contextually sensitive rendering conveying the moral connotation (1998, 370–71).

The MT employs an idiom to convey what Balaam was not willing to transgress, namely, “the mouth of the Lord my God.” There are two possible explanations for why G might have used τὸ ῥῆμα κυρίου rather than τὸ στόμα κυρίου or the like. First, G was motivated by an antianthropomorphizing exegetical tradition. Second, G is rendering a Hebrew idiom with an idiom in Greek while retaining quantitative equivalence. If the former were the case, we would expect to find a *consistent* tendency away from anthropomorphisms, which we do not. For comparison, it is instructive to look at Pesh here. Pesh seems to take the second alternative, but using a

different strategy: “the word of the mouth of the Lord.” In other words, the Hebrew idiom, “to transgress the mouth” was not an acceptable idiom in Syriac and so he inserted “the word” to increase acceptability in his target language. However, G sticks close to a goal of quantitative equivalence while disallowing the interference of a Hebrew idiom. The second is the better interpretation of G’s action here. Elsewhere, G renders **עַל פִּי יְהוָה** with **διὰ φωνῆς κυρίου** (4.37, 41, 45, 49).

**κύριου τοῦ θεοῦ**. Here the question is why the translator might have neglected to render the suffixed first-person common singular pronoun in the phrase **יהוה אלהי** (“YHWH, my God”). Again, this is potentially theologically loaded—did G not want to concede that Balaam was actually a worshiper of YHWH? Textual tradition suggests the omission of the pronoun is original until Origen added it. SamPent and Pesh both contain it, and unfortunately, the suffix falls in a lacuna in 4Q27. In Numbers, the consecution of **יהוה** followed by **אלהים** + suffix appears six times, and only once with a first person common singular suffix. At 10.9, 10, and 15.41 (2x), the MT reads **יהוה אלהיכם**, where the second person masculine plural suffix refers to the Israelites. For this phrase, G only has **κύριου** at 10.9, but **κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν** at 10.10 and 15.41 (2x). At 23.21, Balaam states **עמו יהוה אלהיו** and G renders **κύριος ὁ θεὸς αὐτοῦ μετ’ αὐτοῦ**. The suffix on **אלהים** alone (i.e., without **יהוה**)—which in all but 25.2 refers to the Israelites and their God—is also consistently rendered by G (see 6.7; 15.40, 41 [2x]; 25.13; 33.4). At 25.2, G is careful to render **אלהיהן**, referencing to the Moabites’ gods, by **εἰδῶλων αὐτῶν** (“their idols”). In the rest of the Pentateuch, the possessive suffix is avoided infrequently. The second person masculine singular suffix is omitted at Gen 27.20; Deut 17.15; 18.5; 19.2; 21.5; 30.1, 3 (2x), 6; a first person common plural is omitted in Exod 8.10 [MT 8.6] and a first person common singular in Deut 4.5. Added to this is the absence of evidence to suggest an alternative *Vorlage*. I tentatively conclude that the omission is best explained from a theological perspective. Rösel and Schlund find that G achieved a distancing of the deity from Balaam: “Die LXX gibt das Suffix des hebr. **יהוה אלהי** nicht wieder und erreicht damit eine Distanzierung: Balaam wird nicht als JHWH-Verehrer gekennzeichnet” (2011, 483). The solution proposed by Rösel and Schlund makes the best sense: G is distancing the deity from Balaam.

On this rendering’s effect on the narrative, Wevers states, “the omission neutralizes the reason for Balak’s invitation. After all, as a diviner or prophet who worshipped Yahweh as his God, Balaam’s blessing or curse



would be more powerful or effective against Israel, the people of Yahweh” (1998, 370). Wevers assumes, according to the MT’s account, that Balak was summoning Balaam because he was a prophet of Yahweh himself. *Neutralizes* is perhaps too strong a term here; the omission may weaken the impetus to summon Balaam but does not entirely negate his status as prophet (see 22.6).

**ποιῆσαι αὐτό μικρόν ἢ μέγα.** How this infinitive phrase relates to the preceding is difficult to decide; that is, is it exegetical to *παραβῆναι τὸ ῥῆμα κτλ.*? Or, a second, asyndetic, infinitive complement to *δυνήσομαι*? G is not concerned with this, however, since he renders his Hebrew *Vorlage* without making any changes. The word *αὐτό*, however, is a plus. It could refer to *ῥῆμα*—the nearest neuter substantive (so Dorival 1994, 425)—but this would make little contextual sense. It seems, rather, that the neuter refers to the entire idea of “transgressing the word of the Lord,” or perhaps the act that would have amounted to a transgression (see Wevers 1998, 371). In 24.13, where Balaam repeats his words here, the same addition appears (but with *πονηρόν ἢ καλόν*, instead of *μικρόν ἢ μέγα*). Perhaps G feels that “to do a small or great thing” is not actually a transgression, and so he adds “to do it [i.e., a transgression], either small or large.” In effect then, Balaam is stating that he cannot transgress God’s word in any way for any amount of money that Balak might be able to provide. NETS reads here “to do it, whether small or great.” “Whether” has no basis in the OG text, but does accurately capture the sense. It could be translated literally as “to do a small or great thing [i.e., transgressing the word of the Lord God].”

**ἐν τῇ διανοίᾳ μου.** This, also, is a plus in the OG vis-à-vis MT. The often-harmonizing SamPent, similarly, does not witness this phrase. *Prima facie*, this addition appears to be harmonized in line with מַלְבִּי of 24.13 as Rösel and Schlund suggest: “möglichlicherweise orientierte sich die LXX auch an מַלְבִּי in 24.13” (2011, 483). The Hebrew idiom used at 24.13 is מַלְבִּי, meaning “from my own volition” and not “in my thoughts.” G apparently understands this and translates it with a nonidiomatic, nonliteral rendering *παρ’ ἐμαντοῦ*. However, since G uses *παρ’ ἐμαντοῦ* at 24.13, it is unlikely that G did the harmonizing (see Tov 1985, 20: “Harmonizations which presuppose different Hebrew readings should not be made the center [of an investigation of harmonizations]”). Furthermore, 4Q27 has been reconstructed by Jastram to read בַּלְבִּי, although the only extant letter is the



*lamed*, which is marked as uncertain. Curiously, Wevers does not note this and attributes the change to translation technique (1998, 370–71). On the basis of 4Q27, I submit that there is a good chance that G was indeed reading בלבי in his *Vorlage*.

Since I am arguing that בלבי was in his *Vorlage*, little comment is required beyond noting that G rendered his text well. בלבו, or similar phrases, are rendered with ἐν τῇ διανοίᾳ αὐτοῦ (Gen 17.17; 27.41; 35.34; see also Gen 24.45; cf. Exod 4.14; but ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ at Exod 36.2). Although this precise phrase does not appear anywhere else in Numbers, לב is rendered with διανοία at 32.7, but καρδία at 32.9. In the Pentateuch, both of these serve as equivalents, with καρδία the more common (ca. 30x) followed by διανοία (ca. 15x; cf. διανοέομαι at Gen 6.6; 8.21 [1°]), but also νοῦς (1x, Exod 7.23) and στήθος (1x, Exod 28.30).

## 22.19

ועתה שבו נא בזה גם אתם הלילה ואדעה מה יסף יהוה דבר עמי  
καὶ νῦν ὑπομείνατε αὐτοῦ καὶ ὑμεῖς τὴν νύκτα ταύτην, καὶ γνώσομαι,  
τί προσθήσει κύριος λαλῆσαι πρὸς με.

And now remain here, you too, this night, and I will know what the Lord will add to speak to me.”

**καὶ νῦν ὑπομείνατε αὐτοῦ.** On equivalents for ישב, see at 22.8. The verb ὑπομένω appears only here in the Pentateuch; previously, a cognate, καταμένω, was used of the rulers of Moab staying the night (22.8); ὑπομένω can mean “wait for,” and is often used with an accusative, denoting the object of the waiting. Here, what they are to wait for is implied in the following clause. On αὐτοῦ, see at 22.8. Unlike at 22.8, αὐτοῦ renders the idiomatic prepositional phrase, בזה, similarly meaning “here” (also at Exod 24.14).

**τὴν νύκτα ταύτην.** On the temporal accusative, see at 22.8. G adds the near demonstrative pronoun here, slightly clarifying the definite nature of the Hebrew.

**καὶ γνώσομαι, τί προσθήσει κύριος λαλῆσαι πρὸς με.** G’s rendering is isomorphic. The indefinite pronoun τίς often stands in place of the indeclinable מה (e.g., Num 13.19 [MT 13.18]; 15.34; 23.17). For προστίθηναι see comments at verse 15. The preposition עַל appears twenty times in Numbers and is rendered variously by G, depending on contextual constraints: for example, μετά (10.32; 22.12, 13, 14), ἐν (14.24, 43), παρά (22.8, 9), and πρὸς

(20.3; 22.19). The verb *λαλέω* normally appears with *πρός* (ca. 100x), which has influenced the translation of עַם with *πρός* in these instances. According to G, Balaam expects the Lord (κύριος) to speak *to him*, whereas in the MT he speaks *with* YHWH.

Curiously, G apparently has no problem rendering both דְּבַר עַם (22.19) and דְּבַר אֵל (22.20) with *λαλέω* *πρός*. For G, contextual sensitivity and Greek idiom frequently overrides what might be called “consistency.”

## 22.20

ויבא אלהים אל בלעם לילה ויאמר לו אם לקרא לך באו האנשים קום  
לך אתם ואך את הדבר אשר אדבר אליך אתו תעשה

καὶ ἦλθεν ὁ θεὸς πρὸς Βαλαάμ νυκτὸς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Εἰ καλέσαι σε  
πάρεσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι οὗτοι, ἀναστὰς ἀκολούθησον αὐτοῖς· ἀλλὰ τὸ  
ῥῆμα, ὃ ἂν λαλήσω πρὸς σέ, τοῦτο ποιήσεις.

And God came to Balaam by night and said to him, “If these people are here to call you, rise up, and follow them, but the word that I speak to you—this you shall do.”

καὶ ἦλθεν ὁ θεὸς πρὸς Βαλαάμ νυκτὸς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ. Despite the fact that Balaam states that יהוה/κύριος will speak to him (22.19), אֵל/θεός comes to him. Here, at least, G does not feel the need to make any changes to the divine name. The temporal adverbial accusative לַיְלָה is rendered well with a genitive of time (νυκτός), indicating the period of time in which something takes place rather than a point in time or duration of time (see Smyth §1444).

Εἰ καλέσαι σε πάρεσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι οὗτοι. This is the fourth conditional in the chapter. The following table summarizes the structural elements of the conditionals in Num 22.1–20:

Verse	OG/MT	Protasis	Apodosis
22.6	OG	ἐάν + present subjunctive	καὶ + future indicative
	MT	יְהִי + <i>yiqtol</i>	<i>wayyiqtol</i>
22.11	OG	εἰ (+ᾗρα) + future indicative	καὶ + future indicative
	MT	יְהִי + <i>yiqtol</i>	<i>weqatal</i>
22.18	OG	ἐάν + aorist subjunctive	future indicative
	MT	אם + <i>yiqtol</i>	<i>yiqtol</i>

22.20	OG	εἰ + present indicative	aorist imperative
	MT	בֹּא + <i>qatal</i>	imperative

Tjen identifies aorist subjunctives as the most common renderings of the *qatal* form in Numbers, followed by aorist indicatives and then perfect indicatives. He counts six instances where בֹּא + *qatal* is rendered with εἰ + present indicative (2010, 139–48). The condition here is not whether or not the men are present (παρῆσιν), but rather whether they intend to call Balaam or not. In contradistinction to the conditionals in 22.6 and 18, G's use of the simple condition here does not suggest that its fulfillment is unlikely or improbable.

Whereas the MT has the men *coming* (בֹּא) to summon Balaam, G using παρῆμι focuses on the *presence* of the men rather than their action of coming. As Wevers notes, “of course, if someone has come, he is then present” (1998, 371). Logically, the tense must be present for such a change in focus to make sense in the narrative context. This translation effectively reverses the cause (their coming) and effect (their arrival). For reversal as a translational strategy, see van der Louw 2007, 66. A second possible motivation may have been to avoid repeating an aorist of ἔρχομαι (= ἦλθεν) for בֹּא a second time in the sentence.

On καλέω and cognates, see at 22.5. G follows his *Vorlage* in fronting the complementary infinitive. The periphrastic direct object phrase using the preposition ἕλ, is well rendered by a simple accusative.

**ἀναστὰς ἀκολουθήσον αὐτοῖς.** Hebrew often places the imperative form of בָּרַח (as well as הָלַךְ) next to another imperative, indicating an action subordinate to the following imperative. G represents this with the *participium coniunctum* instead of stacking two imperatives next to each other (see also on δεῦρο in 22.6), but as Aejmelaeus remarks, such pleonastic employment of two verbs of motion is unidiomatic (1993, 6). The use of ἀκολουθεῖω is both idiomatic and semantically more specific than the MT's “go with them” (בָּרַח וְהָלַךְ). It represents a slight transformation: the rulers of Balak are not simply Balaam's traveling companions, but they will lead him back to Balak.

**ἀλλά.** The phrase וְכֵן is rendered with ἀλλά, apparently neglecting to translate the conjunction ו and (correctly) interpreting וְכֵן as adversative; וְכֵן is relatively rare in the Pentateuch, appearing only here and Gen 9.5, where

it is rendered by καὶ γάρ. In Num 14.19, ἤ (without the ἰ) is rendered with ἀλλά; in 18.15 and 31.23, it is rendered with ἀλλ' ἤ. Elsewhere, it is appropriately rendered with πλὴν (18.3, 17; 31.22; 36.6). In all likelihood, G regarded the disjunctive sense of ἤ to be adequately rendered by ἀλλά and ignored the ἰ conjunction since καὶ ἀλλά is quite awkward in Greek.

τὸ ῥῆμα, δ' ἂν λαλήσω πρὸς σέ, τοῦτο ποιήσεις. This clause represents a good example where G has followed the word order of his *Vorlage*, but it nonetheless produces idiomatic Greek. Syntactically, τὸ ῥῆμα, δ' ἂν λαλήσω πρὸς σέ is a fronted direct object phrase of the verb ποιήσεις. Thus, the appearance of τοῦτο is resumptive. However, resumption in the main clause after a fronted relative clause is idiomatic in Greek, as is found in Xenophon's *Mem.* 2.1.25, οἷς ἂν οἱ ἄλλοι ἐργάζωνται, τούτοις σὺ χρήσῃ (“whatever others acquire by labour, that you shall enjoy”; example and trans. from Smyth §2565). Additionally, Smyth finds that “conditional relative clauses that vividly anticipate the realization of a future event take the subjunctive with ἂν” (§2565). Thus, G's addition of ἂν adds some emphasis or vividness in the Greek that is not present in his *Vorlage*.

## 22.21

וַיָּקָם בַּלְעָם בַּבֹּקֶר וַיַּחבֵּשׁ אֶת אֲתָנּוּ וַיִּלְךָ עִם שְׂרֵי מוֹאָב  
καὶ ἀναστὰς Βαλαὰμ τὸ πρωὶ ἐπέσαξεν τὴν ὄνον αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐπορεύθη  
μετὰ τῶν ἀρχόντων Μωάβ.

And after Balaam rose up in the morning, he saddled<sup>a</sup> his donkey and went with the rulers of Moab.

<sup>a</sup> NETS's translation again suggests that G has retained the parataxis present in the Hebrew: “And Balaam rose up in the morning and saddled his donkey.” My translation here reflects the *participium coniunctum* attached asyndetically to the main verb, ἐπέσαξεν (also 22.13, 14).

καὶ ἀναστὰς Βαλαὰμ τὸ πρωί. On this phrase, see at 22.13.

ἐπέσαξεν τὴν ὄνον αὐτοῦ. The Hebrew verb שָׂבַע only occurs in one other instance in the Pentateuch meaning “to saddle” (Gen 22.3), elsewhere it means “bind” or “tie up” (Exod 29.9; Leu 8.13). The phrasing in Gen 22.3 OG is very similar to G's phrasing here, despite the fact that their *Vorlagen* differ:

## Gen 22.3

וַיִּשְׁכֶּם אַבְרָהָם בְּבָקָר וַיַּחֲבֹשׁ אֶת חֲמֹרֹו

ἀναστὰς δὲ Ἀβραάμ τὸ πρῶτὶ ἐπέσαξεν  
τὴν ὄνον αὐτοῦ

## Num 22.21

וַיָּקָם בַּלְעָם בְּבָקָר וַיַּחֲבֹשׁ אֶת אֲתֹנֹו

καὶ ἀναστὰς Βαλαάμ τὸ πρῶτὶ ἐπέσαξεν  
τὴν ὄνον αὐτοῦ

The curious similarity between the Greek of Gen 22.3 and Num 22.21 suggests that perhaps G relied on it to produce his translation here or wanted the reader to recollect Abraham's action, but this lies outside the realm of certainty. Employing the noun ὄνος with the feminine article is a creative way to render the feminine gendered Hebrew word אֲתֹנֹו ("she-donkey"), a rendering he uses fourteen times in Num 22.

**καὶ ἐπορεύθη μετὰ τῶν ἀρχόντων Μωάβ.** In the Greek of verse 20, Balaam was commanded to *follow* (ἀκολουθέω) the men, but now he simply *goes with them* (v. 21). G does not seem concerned with pressing the idea of following here; πορεύομαι + μετὰ is the expected rendering for עָם + הָלַךְ (see e.g., 10.32; 22.12). This illustrates well the tendency of G: he alternates between serial fidelity to his *Vorlage*, relying upon established equivalences, and minor modifications that enhance or downplay contextual elements. In other words, consistency is not a characteristic of G's translation technique.

## Summary

In this pericope, Balaam is summoned twice by delegates from Balak, the king of Moab, to curse the Israelites. After the second, God allows Balaam to go on the condition that Balaam speaks only what κύριος puts in his mouth. G's translation technique generally adheres closely to his *Vorlage*, but makes minor departures to improve the Greek style or subtly interpret the narrative.



## A Tale of Two Eunuchs: A Commentary on Greek Esther 2.19–23 and A.12–17

*Cameron Boyd-Taylor*

The Septuagint version of Esther (OG) poses significant challenges to the SBLCS commentator. Not only is the Greek narrative substantially longer than that of the Masoretic text (MT), but where it does parallel the Hebrew the relationship between the two is not always transparent. There is moreover some likelihood that OG underwent redaction subsequent to its translation from the Hebrew. Complicating matters further is the existence of the so-called L text (Alpha text = AT), preserved in only four manuscripts, which was once thought to be Lucianic. While the textual history underlying OG and AT is far from obvious, the current consensus denies that one is a straightforward recension of the other. If one's aim is to comment on the text-as-produced, Esther proves resistant. One way of proceeding is to distinguish between the text that comes down to us, the received text, a heterogeneous entity with a complex history, and the material shared by OG and MT, where there is sufficient transparency to delineate the methods of a translator (G) working with a source text. The focus of the commentary would be the latter. While the overall design of the text-as-received would not be lost sight of, it would not be the primary object of analysis. Rather one would begin with the parallel material and proceed inductively, speaking to the question put by the Guidelines: what has the translator done, and why. Issues in the history of the text would thus be bracketed. In the following commentary I employ this methodology. The pericope I have chosen—the discovery by Mardochoaios of a plot against the Persian king by two eunuchs—exemplifies the problems raised by a composite text. In OG the pericope is mirrored in two episodes, Esth 2.19–23 (plot<sup>1</sup>) and A.12–17 (plot<sup>2</sup>), a doublet unique to the LXX version, as the former lacks a parallel in AT

and the latter a parallel in MT, Josephus, and the Old Latin (OL). While almost identical structurally, each text arguably functions as a distinct scene within the narrative in its final form. Yet only the translation of plot<sup>1</sup> may be securely attributed to G. For the purposes of the present commentary plot<sup>2</sup> is therefore treated as part of the text-as-received. It will be the subject of §2. I shall begin with plot<sup>1</sup>.

### Literature

- ♦ **Aeschines**. 1919. *Speeches*. Translated by C. D. Adams. LCL 106. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- ♦ **Aristophanes**. 1998. *Clouds; Wasps; Peace*. Translated by Jeffrey Henderson. LCL 488. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- ♦ **Aristotle**. 1926. *Nicomachean Ethics*. Translated by H. Rackham. LCL 73. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- ♦ **Bingen**, Jean. 2007. *Hellenistic Egypt: Monarchy, Society, Economy, Culture*. HCS 49. Berkeley: University of California.
- ♦ **Brosius**, Mara. 2007. "New Out of Old? Court and Court Ceremonies in Achaemenid Persia." Pages 17–57 in *The Court and Court Society in Ancient Monarchies*. Edited by A. J. S. Spawforth. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- ♦ **Bush**, Frederic. 1996. *Ruth/Esther*. WBC 9. Dallas: Word.
- ♦ **Cavalier**, Claudine. 2012. *La Bible d'Alexandrie 12: Esther*. Paris: Cerf.
- ♦ **Clines**, David J. A. 1984. *The Esther Scroll: The Story of the Story*. JSOTSup 30. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic.
- ♦ **Dandamayev**, Muhammad A. 1993. "Courts and Courtiers in the Median and Achaemenid Periods." *Elr* 6:356–59.
- ♦ **Diogenes Laertius**. 1925. *Lives of Eminent Philosophers, Volume I: Books 1–5*. Translated by R. D. Hicks. LCL 184. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- ♦ **Dorothy**, Charles V. 1997. *The Books of Esther: Structure, Genre and Textual Integrity*. JSOTSup 187. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic.
- ♦ **Dover**, Kenneth. 1980. *Plato: Symposium*. CGLC. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- ♦ **Ehrenberg**, Victor. 2010. *The Greek State*. Routledge Library Editions: Political Science 23. London: Routledge.
- ♦ **Fox**, Michael V. 1991. *Character and Ideology in the Book of Esther*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.
- ♦ **Frye**, Northrop. 1976. *The Secular Scripture: A Study of the Structure of Romance*. Harvard: Harvard University Press.
- ♦ **Glickman**, Elaine Rose. 1999. *Haman and the Jews: A Portrait from Rabbinic Literature*. Northvale, NJ: Aronson.
- ♦ **Hacham**, Noah. 2007. "3 Maccabees and Esther: Parallels, Intertextuality and Diaspora Identity." *JBL* 126:765–85.
- ♦ **Harvey**, Charles D. 2003. *Finding Morality in the Diaspora: Moral Ambiguity and Transformed Morality in the Book of Esther*. BZAW 128. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- ♦ **Herodotus**. 1920–1925. *The Persian Wars*. Translated by A. D. Godley. 4



vols. LCL 117–20. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. ♦ **Hengel**, Martin. 2004. *The Septuagint as Christian Scripture: Its Prehistory and the Problem of its Canon*. Translated by M. E. Biddle. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

♦ **Isocrates**. 1928. *To Demonicus; To Nicocles; Nicocles or the Cyprians; Panegyricus; To Philip; Archidamus*. Translated by George Norlin. LCL 209. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

♦ **Josephus**. 1937. *Jewish Antiquities, Volume IV: Books 9–11*. Translated by Ralph Marcus. LCL 326. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

♦ **Josephus**. 1943. *Jewish Antiquities, Volume V: Books 12–13*. Translated by Ralph Marcus. LCL 365. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

♦ **Lenfant**, Dominique. 2012. “Ctesias and his Eunuchs: A Challenge for Modern Historians.” *Histos* 6:257–97.

♦ **Levinsohn**, Stephen H. 1992. *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek*. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics.

♦ **Llewellyn-Jones**, Lloyd, and James **Robson**. 2010. *Ctesias’ History of Persia: Tales of the Orient*. Routledge Classical Translations. London: Routledge.

♦ **Lysias**. 1930. *Lysias*. Translated by W. R. M. Lamb. LCL 244. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

♦ **Moore**, Carey A. 1971. *Esther: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 7b. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

♦ **Moore**. 1977. *Daniel, Esther and Jeremiah: The Additions; A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 44. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

♦ **Paton**, Lewis Bayles. 1908. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Esther*. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

♦ **Plato**. 1925. *Statesman; Philebus; Ion*. Translated by Harold North Fowler and W. R. M. Lamb. LCL 164. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

♦ **Pausanias**. 1935. *Description of Greece, Volume IV: Books 8.22–10 (Arcadia, Boeotia, Phocis and Ozolian Locri)*. Translated by W. H. S. Jones. LCL 297. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

♦ **Plutarch**. 1914. *Lives, Volume II: Themistocles and Camillus; Aristides and Cato Major; Cimon and Lucullus*. Translated by Bernadotte Perrin. LCL 47. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

♦ **Plutarch**. 1919. *Lives, Volume VII: Demosthenes and Cicero; Alexander and Caesar*. Translated by Bernadotte Perrin. LCL 99. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

♦ **Plutarch**. 1926. *Lives, Volume XI: Aratus; Artaxerxes; Galba; Otho; General Index*. Translated by Bernadotte Perrin. LCL 103. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

♦ **Plutarch**. 1928. *Moralia, Volume II: How to Profit by One’s Enemies; On Having Many Friends; Chance; Virtue and Vice; Letter of Condolence to Apollonius; Advice About Keeping Well; Advice to Bride and Groom; The Dinner of the Seven Wise Men; Superstition*. Translated by Frank Cole Babbitt. LCL 222. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

♦ **Polybius**. 2010. *The Histories, Volume II: Books 3–4*. Translated by W. R. Paton. Revised by F. W. Walbank and Christian

Habicht. LCL 137. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. ♦ **Polybius**. 2011. *The Histories, Volume IV: Books 9–15*. Translated by W. R. Paton. Revised by F. W. Walbank and Christian Habicht. LCL 159. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. ♦ **Polybius**. 2012. *The Histories, Volume V: Books 16–27*. Translated by W. R. Paton. Revised by F. W. Walbank and Christian Habicht. LCL 160. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. ♦ **Pseudo-Aristotle**. 1837. *De Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*. Edited by Immanuel Bekker. Aristotelis Opera Volume 11. Oxford: Oxford University Press. ♦ **Spicq**, Ceslas. 1994. *Theological Lexicon of the New Testament*. Translated by James Ernest. 3 vols. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson. ♦ **Strabo**. 1917. *Geography, Volume I: Books 1–2*. Translated by Horace Leonard Jones. LCL 49. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. ♦ **Stronk**, Jan P. 2010. *Ctesias' Persian History. Part I: Introduction, Text and Translation*. Reihe Geschichte 2. Dusseldorf: Wellem. ♦ **Tov**, Emanuel. 2008. "Three Strange Books of the LXX: 1 Kings, Esther and Daniel Compared with Similar Rewritten Compositions from Qumran and Elsewhere." Pages 369–93 in *Die Septuaginta: Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten*. Edited by Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus. WUNT 219. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck. ♦ **Xenophon**. 1998. *Anabasis*. Translated by Carleton L. Brownson. Revised by John Dillery. LCL 90. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. ♦ **Xenophon**. 1914. *Cyropaedia, Volume II: Books 5–8*. Translated by Walter Miller. LCL 52. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

### §1. Greek Esther 2.19–23

#### Outline

This pericope is made up of three parts: (1) it presents Mardocheaios serving at court (v. 19), where, as a result of his advancement, two eunuchs plot to assassinate the king (v. 21); (2) the matter becomes known to Mardocheaios, who alerts Esther, who in turn informs the king (v. 22); the king acts on the information (v. 23a); and (3) orders that Mardocheaios's loyalty be recorded (v. 23b). Verse 20 is an aside noting Esther's adherence to Mardocheaios's instructions.

#### Commentary

#### 2.19

ובהקבץ בתולות שנית ומרדכי ישב בשער המלך

ὁ δὲ Μαρδοχαῖος ἐθεράπευεν ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ.

And Mardocheaios was serving in the court.

This verse marks a new section with the introduction of Mardochoaios and the setting of the court. The pericope is generically a report, defined here as a third-person presentation of actions involving two or more parties without the development of dramatic tension (Dorothy 1997, 51). There is no direct counterpart to the scene in AT, leading Michael Fox (1991, 40) to suggest that it was absent in proto-AT (an early stratum within the Hebrew tradition), and added by the redactor of MT. It was, however, almost certainly present in the Hebrew source of OG, which renders a text similar to MT and reflects its structure. The intrigue has nevertheless undergone various thematic modifications that have an impact on the structure of the Greek narrative (Cavalier 2012, 104).

MT begins with a temporal reference, ובהקבץ בתולות שנית (“When the virgins were being gathered together,” NRSV) (strictly speaking, *a second time*: note שנית, a crux for the Hebrew). This reference serves to establish the time frame of the ensuing events, and is thus parallel to בימים ההם in verse 21, which resumes the narrative following a parenthetical remark in verse 20 (Paton 1908, 188). G has recast the opening of the pericope, dropping the temporal reference, moving ahead the introduction of Mardochoaios, and setting the scene at court.

ὁ δὲ Μαρδοχαῖος ἐθεράπευεν. The textual linguistic features of this clause combine to establish the beginning of a distinct incident. The order of the Greek subject and verb (S-V), which follows the Hebrew order ומרדכי ישב, marks the clause as a point of departure for what follows (see Levinsohn 1992, 31). At the same time G uses the marked equivalent δέ rather than the default equivalent καί to render the Hebrew conjunction ו. Stephen Levinsohn (1992, 31) classifies δέ as a developmental particle. In this context it signals a progression in the narrative. In accordance with Greek linguistic convention G renders the Hebrew participle by a past indicative form, ἐθεράπευεν, the imperfect aspect of which indicates an ongoing activity.

Μαρδοχαῖος. The proper name of the protagonist has been assimilated to Greek morphology. AT and Josephus use the same form. The consonantal form of the name in MT is מרדכי, pointed מְרִדְכִּי.

ἐθεράπευεν ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ. The reference to Mardochoaios serving as an attendant of some sort is distinctive to OG. It locates Mardochoaios both with respect to occupation and to setting. Compare MT, ישב בשער המלך.

(“[he] was sitting at the King’s Gate,” NRSV). See also 6.10 (MT), where the king refers to Mordecai as **מֹרְדֵכַי הַיְּהוּדִי הַיּוֹשֵׁב בַּשַּׁעַר הַמֶּלֶךְ** (“the Jew Mordecai who sits at the king’s gate,” NRSV), which G renders **τῷ Ἰουδαίῳ τῷ θεραπέοντι ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ** (“the Judean who serves in the court,” NETS). The phrase **ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ** might simply refer to a physical location, “in the courtyard,” but given that G replaces **יֹשֵׁב** by **ἐθεράπευεν** (LSJ, s.v. “θεραπεύω,” I. “to be an attendant, do service”), it likely carries the sense “at court” (LSJ, s.v. “αὐλή,” IV. “the Court”), indicating that Mardochoaios is a courtier. Compare Polybius, *Hist.* 26.1 (from Athenaeus 5.193d), in reference to Antiochus Epiphanes, **ὡς ἀποδιδράσκων ἐκ τῆς αὐλῆς ἐνίοτε τοὺς θεραπέοντας** (“escaping from his attendants at court” [Paton, LCL]). It is conceivable that G inferred that Mardochoaios was a courtier from the Hebrew reference to his presence at the gates (see below, **ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ**).

Reference to Mardochoaios’s service at court carries special thematic resonance in the text-as-received. In A.1 Mardochoaios is described as **ἄνθρωπος μέγας θεραπέων ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ τοῦ βασιλέως** (“a great man serving in the court of the king,” NETS), and is thus unambiguously identified as a courtier at the outset of the narrative. As such, he is a direct rival to both the eunuchs and to his antagonist Haman. While present in the extant Hebrew text, the theme of court rivalry has heightened significance in OG. Since it is unlikely that G was responsible for the composition of Addition A, this transformation cannot be located within the production of the translation. Yet whatever its origin it impacts significantly on the received text.

**ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ.** Compare MT **בַּשַּׁעַר הַמֶּלֶךְ**, “at the king’s gate.” In a more isomorphic translation we might expect **ἐν τῇ πύλῃ τοῦ βασιλέως** (see, e.g., 1 Suppl 9.18). The expression **שַׁעַר הַמֶּלֶךְ** occurs eleven times in MT (Esth 2.19, 21; 3.2, 3; 4.2 [2x]; 4.6; 5.9, 13; 6.10, 12) and is consistently matched by the single word **αὐλή** in OG (at 2.21 there is no match). Carey Moore (1977, 175) suggests that the rendering arose from a copying error in the transmission of the Greek text. On his view a copyist read **αὐλή** instead of **πύλη** (the uncials Α and Π being easily confused). This hypothesis has little to commend it, as it does not explain why the word **מֶלֶךְ** is not represented in OG.

In every instance in MT the phrase **שַׁעַר הַמֶּלֶךְ** is used to locate a scene in which Mardochoaios figures. Recent scholarship has tended to interpret the Hebrew expression in reference to the royal court. Fox (1991, 38–39) argues that it refers to the court in its entirety, thus implying that Morde-

cai holds a government office in the palace compound. This, however, is speculative. Lewis Paton (1908, 188) notes that at this point in the Hebrew narrative Mordecai is not obviously an official. The king's gate was a place of congregation, and Mordecai could simply be there to pick up news about Esther. While servants of the king are found at the gate (3.2, 3), Mordecai is not explicitly identified as one of them in MT. How G understood the Hebrew, however, is uncertain. He may have read the phrase **שער המלך** in reference to the royal court and rendered it idiomatically. On the other hand, his work may represent a transformation, such that Mardochoaios has been deliberately relocated from his position at the gates, the threshold of the palace establishment, to a position within the court.

## 2.20

אין אסתר מגדת מולדתה ואת עמה כאשר צוה עליה מרדכי ואת  
מאמר מרדכי אסתר עשה כאשר היתה באמנה אתו

ἡ δὲ Εσθηρ οὐχ ὑπέδειξεν τὴν πατρίδα αὐτῆς· οὕτως γὰρ ἐνετείλατο αὐτῇ Μαρδοχαῖος φοβεῖσθαι τὸν θεὸν καὶ ποιεῖν τὰ προστάγματα αὐτοῦ, καθὼς ἦν μετ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ Εσθηρ οὐ μετήλλαξεν τὴν ἀγωγὴν αὐτῆς.

But Esther did not reveal her ancestry. For so Mardochoaios had commanded her: to fear God and to do his ordinances, just as when she was with him. So Esther did not change her way of life.

**ἡ δὲ Εσθηρ ... Μαρδοχαῖος.** The first two clauses of the Greek text have counterparts in MT and adhere to the form of the Hebrew fairly closely. The particle δέ, which has been introduced without warrant by the translator, here marks a parenthetical remark (see Levinsohn 1992, 31). The parenthesis expresses the secrecy motif and characterizes Esther's relationship to Mordechai as one of filial obedience. It reiterates a similarly phrased remark at 2.10, which was rendered by G without elaboration.

**Εσθηρ.** The proper name of the female protagonist is rendered by an uninflected transliteration. AT and Josephus use the same form. The corresponding Hebrew form **אסתר** is pointed **אַסְתֵּר** in MT.

**τὴν πατρίδα αὐτῆς.** G uses the single phrase *πατρίδα αὐτῆς* to replace two Hebrew phrases, **מולדתה** (HALOT, s.v. "מִוִּלְדָּתָהּ" 2. "relations, the relatives"), and **עמה** (HALOT, s.v. "עַם," C. 1. "people," with an emphasis on connections of kinship and religious ceremonial: the race to which one

belongs). G may simply have regarded the two Hebrew terms as redundant. Yet at Esth 2.10 both members of the pair are rendered: עַם by the word γένος (LSJ, s.v. “γένος,” I. “race, stock, kin”), and מולדת by πατρίς; and again at 8.6, where G renders עַם by the word λαός (LSJ, s.v. “λαός,” II. “a people”), and מולדת by πατρίς. The translator twice matches the words מולדת and πατρίς, and it is therefore not unlikely that the former cued the latter in the present context as well. In Greek compositional literature the substantive πατρίς generally refers to a place, not a kinship group, and it is probable that G intended it thus (LSJ, s.v. “πατρίς,” II. Subst., = “πάτρα,” I. “fatherland, native land”). See 2 and 4 Makkabees where the word consistently means “[one’s] country,” often in reference to Judea. Of the four further occurrences of πατρίς in the translation literature of the LXX, the word is used as a match for מולדת three times (all within the phrase ארץ מולדת): at Ier 22.10 and Iezek 23.15 it is used adjectivally to modify γῆ in the phrase “native land” (NETS), while at Ier 26.16 (=MT 46.16) it occurs as a substantive and may be glossed “fatherland” (NETS). That the use of πατρίς in these contexts is a marked translation equivalent (rather than a mere default) becomes evident when one surveys the rendering of מולדת in the LXX. The Greek matches fall into roughly three distinct semantic categories: (1) *people related by ties of descent, kin*: Gen 12.1 συγγένεια; Gen 31.3; 43.7; and Num 10.30 γενεά; (2) *offspring*: Gen 48.6 ἔκγονα; and (3) *birth*, for which two subcategories may be distinguished, (3a) *nativity, birth*: Iezek 16.3, 4 γένεσις; compare Leu 18.9 (מולדת בית) ἐνδογενοῦς; and (3b) (place of) *origin or birth*, where the source text reads some form of ארץ מולדת, Gen 11.28 ἧ ἐγενήθη; Gen 24.4 οὗ ἐγενόμην; Gen 24:7 ἧς ἐγενήθη; Gen 31.13 and Routh 2.11 γενέσεως; Ier 22.10 and Iezek 23.15 πατρίδος; Ier 26:16 [=MT 46:16] τῇ πατρίδα. As it is reasonable to assume that G distinguished these three senses of מולדת, we would expect (*ceteris paribus*) to find in the present verse a rendering such as συγγένεια (LSJ, s.v., II. “one’s kin, kinsfolk”; cf. Gen 12.1) or γενεά (LSJ, s.v., I. of the persons in a family, 1. “race, family”; cf. Gen 31.3; 43.7; Num 10.30), that is, a rendering within the first category above. That G replaces מולדת by πατρίς is suggestive of a subtle but deliberate transformation from the first to the third category. Compare Leu 25.10 where πατρίς renders משפחה (HALOT, s.v. “מִשְׁפָּחָה,” 1. “extended family, clan,” group in which the sense of blood relationship is still felt). There the context is the return to one’s family during the Jubilee Year. For both Esther and Leviticus the Greek translator appears to have assumed the perspective of the Hellenistic diaspora. Since the time of Ptolemy II subjects of Ptolemaic Egypt were obliged by



law to identify themselves by their *πατρίς*; failure to do so was punishable by death (Bingen 2007, 61). An individual's legal and fiscal identities were thus defined as Macedonian, Thracian, Persian, or Judean, as the case may be (an Egyptian would indicate the nome from which they came).

**φοβεῖσθαι ... αὐτοῦ.** In these two clauses, which are not paralleled in MT, G elaborates upon Mardochaios's instructions to Esther. In the Hebrew version the clause **כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה עָלֶיהָ מֵרְדֵּכַי** ("as Mordecai had charged her," NRSV), refers back to Mordecai's orders that Esther conceal her ethnic identity. The Greek rendering of this clause, *οὕτως γὰρ ἐνετείλατο αὐτῇ Μαρδοχαῖος*, instead points forward to the further injunction that she continue "to fear God and to do his ordinances" (NETS). G's elaboration, ideologically freighted as it is, threatens the coherence of the narrative, since it would presumably be impossible for Esther to both conceal her ethnic identity at court and observe the practices enjoined upon her by Mardochaios. The translator could evidently rely on the suspension of disbelief by his target audience.

The theme of piety is a salient feature of OG in its received form. It is greatly developed in the prayers of Addition C, which, as David Clines (1984, 171) observes, serve to refashion the story as a form of exemplary tale, in which Mardochaios and Esther become models of Jewish piety. Such piety, it is implied, is pivotal in delivering the people of Israel from crisis (Fox 1991, 271).

**φοβεῖσθαι τὸν θεόν.** The phrase "to fear God" would have been intelligible to any Greek speaker; the sentiment it expresses was traditional. See for instance Isocrates, 1.16, *τοὺς μὲν θεοὺς φοβοῦ, τοὺς δὲ γονεῖς τίμα, τοὺς δὲ φίλους αἰσχύνου, τοῖς δὲ νόμοις πείθου* ("Fear the gods, honour your parents, respect your friends, obey the laws" [Norlin, LCL]). (Yet compare Plutarch, *Superst.*, 2, who articulates the philosophical response of a later time, associating fear of the gods with ignorance.) Notwithstanding its universality, the expression had a Jewish literary background that is undoubtedly in play here. In the LXX *θεός* frequently renders **אל** ("god"), but can also stand for **יהוה**, that is, the God of Israel, who in Hellenistic Judaism is identified inter alia as the creator and ruler of all things. In the present context, where *θεός* is introduced without qualification and in reference to a Jewish point of view, it arguably refers to YHWH thus conceived. The Hebrew expression **יראת יהוה** ("the fear of YHWH") and the variant **יראת אלהים** ("the fear of God"), is a conventional motif in the Hebrew Bible.

In certain instances (Gen 20.11; Job 28.28; Esa 11.2; 33.6) the expression is rendered by the word *θεοσέβεια* (LSJ, s.v. “*θεοσέβεια*,” “service or fear of God”), but elsewhere it is translated more literally as *ὁ φόβος κυρίου* (e.g., Pss 19[18].10; 34[33].12; 111[110].10; Esa 11.3). The motif figures significantly in the book of Proverbs, where it is associated with the pursuit of enlightenment, as for example in Prov 1.7: *יראת יהוה ראשית דעת חכמה* (“The fear of the Lord is the beginning of knowledge; fools despise wisdom and instruction,” NRSV). The Hellenistic translator of Proverbs renders the first stich by *Ἀρχὴ σοφίας φόβος θεοῦ* (“Beginning of wisdom is fear of God”), which is elaborated upon in the third line with, *εὐσέβεια δὲ εἰς θεὸν ἀρχὴ αἰσθήσεως* (“and piety unto God is the beginning of perception,” NETS). It is telling that *φόβος θεοῦ* is paralleled with *εὐσέβεια* (LSJ, s.v. 1. “reverence towards the gods or parents, piety or filial respect”). As Ceslas Spicq (1994, 196) notes (citing J. Rudhardt with approval), the word *εὐσέβεια* enunciates the Greek concept closest to the modern idea of religion.

In contrast to MT, OG in its received form is marked by explicit sacral themes. That this transformation may at least in part be attributable to G is evident in the references to the God of Israel. Whereas the Hebrew version is singular in the Bible for the fact that it makes no such references, OG contains four in verses parallel to MT (2.20 *θεός*; 4.8 *κύριος*; 6.1 *κύριος*; 6.13 *θεός*). This is no small difference, and various explanations have been offered. On the theory of Clines (1984, 109) MT represents a late recension in which there has been a deliberate excision of all such language. This is an intriguing hypothesis, yet speculative, and it has not won much favor amongst specialists. On balance these passages in OG look like the elaboration of a shorter text by G, for in most instances we find together with the reference to God motifs peculiar to the Greek translation. The first two references (2.20 and 4.8) occur within injunctions to piety by Mardochoaios to Esther; the third is a statement by the narrator attributing Artaxerxes’s sleeplessness to the Lord’s intervention (6.1); and the fourth is placed on the lips of Haman’s wife, who acknowledges that God is with Mardochoaios (6.13). These elaborations, significant as they are, may simply represent ad hoc interventions on the part of G, rather than moves within a larger redactive strategy. Yet together they actualize the theme of divine providence latent in MT, and carry an ideological force. In a useful discussion, Fox (1991, 270) emphasizes their impact upon the understanding of history conveyed by the text-as-received: they foreground the sacral dimension of events, in which the true meaning of crisis and deliverance is found.



ποιεῖν τὰ προστάγματα αὐτοῦ. This refers to Pentateuchal legislation, the observance of which had become central to the piety of certain circles within Hellenistic Judaism. Reference to this legislation (absent in MT) is also introduced by G at 8.11, where the king's decree permits the Judeans of every city to assemble and defend themselves. In the Greek they are ordered χρῆσθαι τοῖς νόμοις αὐτῶν ἐν πάσῃ πόλει ("to live in accordance with their laws in every city," NETS). This theme is further amplified in the text-as-received. See Addition C, which, as Clines (1984, 169) has noted, assimilates the narrative to the "scriptural norm" defined by the Pentateuchal law.

The word *πρόσταγμα* is associated with Ptolemaic institutions, and is well attested in the papyri in reference to royal ordinances (Cavalier 2012, 69). The chief implement of Hellenistic government was the royal edict, published either as law or directed as instructions to specific recipients; in Egypt the most common form was the *πρόσταγμα*, which was also used in administrative measures and judicial decisions (one should not, however, seek too much precision here, as there was no single nomenclature) (Ehrenberg, 2010). In the Greek Pentateuch the word *πρόσταγμα* (typically the plural form) matches various Hebrew terms that (in context) refer to divinely authorized ordinances. Examples include: Exod 18.16 חֲקֵי הָאֱלֹהִים (BDB, s.v. "חֶק," 7. pl. *enactments, statutes* of a law; see also Exod 18.20; Deut 11.32; 12.1); Lev 4.2 מִצְוֹת יְהוָה (BDB, s.v. "מִצְוָה," 2. b. pl. *commands* of D and later codes; see also Exod 20.6; Lev 26.3, 14); Lev 18.5 חֲקֵי (BDB, s.v. "חֶקָה," 2. pl. *statutes*: d. of the prescriptions of the codes of D, H, P; see also Lev 20.22; 26.43); Lev 19.37 מִשְׁפָּטִי (DCH, s.v. "מִשְׁפָּט," 3. *ordinance*; see also Lev 20.22); Lev 24.12 פִּי יְהוָה (DCH, s.v. "פֶּה," 3. mouth as equivalent of *speech, a. command, declaration*; see also Num 9.18 [2x]; 9.20; 9.23 [2x]; 33.38; 36.5); Lev 18.30 מִשְׁמֶרֶתִי (BDB, s.v. "מִשְׁמֶרֶת," 3. *charge, injunction* of יהוה; see also Gen 26.5). Given this background, it is not surprising that during the Hellenistic period certain Greek-speaking Jewish authors came to use τὰ προστάγματα as a shorthand for the pentateuchal laws, especially as they pertained to individual piety (see, e.g., 3 Makk 7.11; and 1 Esd 8.7). It is likely that in using this term G has in mind interdictions surrounding marriage and diet, as well as prescriptions regarding cultic practices such as libations, but also practices not prohibited de jure, such as commensality.

G's reference to Pentateuchal law raises the question of intertextuality. Certainly the expression ποιεῖν τὰ προστάγματα is reminiscent of the language of the Greek Pentateuch (e.g., Leu 26.14; Deut 11.32). Yet it does

not obviously reference a particular text or group of texts. In this regard it should be noted that *πρόσταγμα* collocates more strongly with the verb *φυλάσσω* (rendering שמר) than with *ποιέω* in the Pentateuch. Both verbs are frequently used in the same context (see also Leu 18.4, 5, 26, 30; 19.37; 20.8, 22), and in certain instances both are construed with *πρόσταγμα* (see, e.g., Leu 20.8, καὶ φυλάξεσθε τὰ προστάγματα μου καὶ ποιήσετε αὐτά). But if the phrasing of Mardocheios's injunction was not modeled on specific Pentateuchal passages, it undoubtedly echoes its language, and one could make the case that this was deliberately so. Verbal echoing suggests that the translator assumed some degree of familiarity with the Greek Pentateuch on the part of his implied reader.

Apart from the present context and 8.11, G uses *πρόσταγμα* in a strictly secular sense (cf. Gen 47.26). Thus at 8.14 it renders the Hebrew word דִּת (BDB, s.v. "דִּת," 1. *decree, edict, commission* of Persian king) in reference to the second royal edict concerning the Judeans; at 8.17 it refers to the same edict, but here the Greek word evidently renders דְּבַר הַמֶּלֶךְ (BDB, s.v. "דְּבַר," I.1.b, *word of command*), though דִּת occurs in the same context and may have primed the match; at 9.4 it is introduced by G without a Hebrew warrant, again in reference to the second edict. In Hellenistic Egypt the form of a letter (ἐπιστολή) could serve any purpose, including relations between the monarch and local governors (Ehrenberg, 2010). Hence the use of the word *πρόσταγμα* for the royal edict (8.14, 17), a letter addressed by the king to his rulers, is altogether conventional. In the received text *πρόσταγμα* occurs a further time at D.10 in reference to a decree concerning the protocol of the throne room.

καθὼς ἦν μετ' αὐτοῦ. Here OG rejoins MT, rendering באמנה היתה (כאשר היתה) ("just as when she was brought up by him," NRSV). Yet the function of the clause differs in each version. In the Hebrew text it modifies the third clause, which is not represented in the Greek, ואת מאמר מרדכי אסתר עשה ("for Esther obeyed Mordecai," NRSV). In OG, on the other hand, it modifies the reference to Esther's piety: she is expected to continue as she did when she was with living with Mardocheios. G does not provide a match for the phrase באמנה, consisting of the preposition ב and the noun אמנה, a *hapax legomenon* (DCH, s.v. "אִמְנָה," II. *fosterage*; or אִמְנָה, *her fostering*), which in this context refers back to Mordecai's guardianship of Esther. It is possible that G was not familiar with the Hebrew word; conversely he may have sought a more economical phrasing. Just possibly the rendering involves a subtle shift away from an explicit reference to

fosterage. Compare 2.7, where such a reference is recast by G: יהי אמן את הדסה ("Mordecai had brought up Hadassah," NRSV), is replaced by καὶ ἦν τούτῳ παῖς θρεπτή ("And this man had a foster child," NETS); and later in the verse the clause, לקחה מרדכי לו לבת ("Mordecai adopted her as his own daughter," NRSV), is rendered ἐπαίδευσεν αὐτήν ἑαυτῷ εἰς γυναῖκα ("he trained her for himself as a wife," NETS).

**οὐ μετήλλαξεν ... αὐτῆς.** This clause, which represents a further elaboration of the piety theme, has no counterpart in MT. The translator stresses that Esther continued to adhere to the ritual practices of her people when she entered the royal palace. The tension with the secrecy motif of the opening of this verse is evident. Taking up the theme of filial obedience from the Hebrew source, G confirms that Esther adhered to Mardochoaios's instructions. This theme is further developed in the text-as-received. In Esther's prayer (Addition C) she asserts that she neither dined at Haman's table, nor drank the wine of libation.

**μετήλλαξεν.** The word occurs in three books of the LXX: Esth 2.7, 20; 1 Esd 1.29; and 2 Makk 4.7, 37; 5.5; 6.31; 7.7, 13, 14, 40; 14.46 (an original Greek composition), yet this is the only example of its unmarked sense (LSJ, s.v. "μεταλλάσσω," I. *change, alter*); elsewhere it bears the idiomatic sense "to die" (LSJ, s.v. II. 2. *quit* [τὸν βίον]).

**ἀγωγήν.** In compositional literature outside the LXX the word may denote either a system of education or the form of life shaped by such a system (LSJ, s.v. "ἀγωγή," II. 2. *direction, training*. 4. *way of life, conduct*). See for example Aristotle, *Eth. nic.*, 1179b: ἐκ νέου δ' ἀγωγῆς ὀρθῆς τυχεῖν πρὸς ἀρετὴν χαλεπὸν μὴ ὑπὸ τοιούτοις τραφέντα νόμοις ("And it is difficult to obtain a right education in virtue from youth up without being brought up under right laws" [Rackham, LCL]). The word occurs in three books of the LXX, of which only Esther is a translation: Esth 2.20; 10.3; 2 Makk 4.16; 6.8; 11.24; and 3 Makk 4.10. At 2 Makk 11.24, it is used in reference to Jewish νόμιμα ("customs"), as opposed to Ἑλληνικά (i.e., "Greek [customs]"). The νόμιμα are in turn referred to as τὰ ἐπὶ τῶν προγόνων αὐτῶν ἔθνη (2 Makk 11.25) ("the customs of their ancestors," NETS). In the present context the term likely refers to the repertoire of traditional practices and observances which would be part of the acculturation of a Jewish girl in the Greek-speaking diaspora and would mark her social identity (such customs would be coextensive with τὰ προστάγματα above).

## 2.21

בימים ההם ומרדכי ישב בשער המלך קצף בגתן ותרש שני סריסי  
 המלך משמרי הסף ויבקשו לשלח יד במלך אחשורוש  
 καὶ ἐλυπήθησαν οἱ δύο εὐνοῦχοι τοῦ βασιλέως οἱ ἀρχισωματοφύλακες  
 ὅτι προήχθη Μαρδοχαῖος, καὶ ἐζήτουν ἀποκτεῖναι Ἀρταξέρξην τὸν  
 βασιλέα.

The two eunuchs who were the king's chief bodyguards were irritated because Mardochaios was promoted, and they sought to kill Artaxerxes the king.

Compare MT which begins with a circumstantial clause, comprising a temporal reference, **ההם בימים** ("in those days"), and a notice regarding Mordecai, **ומרדכי ישב בשער המלך** ("he was sitting at the king's gate," NRSV), that repeats an identical notice made at verse 19. The Hebrew verse is a resumption of verse 19, which was interrupted by the parenthesis of verse 20; thus **ההם בימים** likely corresponds in time to when the virgins were gathered (Paton 1908, 189). The temporal reference at verse 19 was not rendered by G, hence there is no match for the phrase **ההם בימים** in verse 21 (since it now lacks an antecedent). Although the present verse might conceivably derive from a Semitic *Vorlage* different from MT, a *prima facie* case can be made for Greek elaboration of a source text similar to MT.

**ἐλυπήθησαν**. For the aorist indicative passive form of the verb (LSJ, s.v. "λυπέω," II. passive, *to be grieved, distressed*) see, for example Plato, *Phileb.*, 52b, ὅταν τις στεηθείς λυπηθῇ διὰ τὴν χρεῖαν ("when a man who has lost [knowledge] is pained by the lack of it" [Fowler and Lamb, LCL]). In the present context it renders the Hebrew verb **קצף** (HALOT, s.v. *qal* "קָצַף," *to be angry, to be furious*. 1. A. a person's anger towards one or more other people). For the Hebrew-Greek match, see also 1 Rgns 29.4 and 4 Rgns 13.19. The equivalency also occurs at Esth 1.12 in reference to king Artaxerxes. In the present context the passive form of the Greek verb connotes deep disquietude. Compare Lysias, 9.20, where the form is used contrastively with ἀγανακτέω (LSJ, s.v. II. metaphorical, *to be displeased, vexed*): τούτων μὲν οὖν ἀδικούντων μετρίως [ἄν] ἡγανάκτουν, ἡγούμενος τετάχθαι τοὺς μὲν ἐχθροὺς κακῶς ποιεῖν, τοὺς δὲ φίλους εὖ· παρ' ὑμῶν δὲ τοῦ δικαίου στερηθεὶς πολὺ ἄν μᾶλλον λυπηθείην ("The injustice of these men only caused me a moderate annoyance, as I considered it ordained that one should harm one's enemies and serve one's friends; but to be deprived of justice at your hands would cause me a far deeper distress" [Lamb, LCL]).

**εὐνοῦχοι.** The denotation of the Hebrew word סָרִיס (*HALOT*, s.v. “סָרִיס,” [> Akkadian *ša rēši* “the one at the head.”] 1. *high official*, political or military. 2. *eunuch*) remains somewhat uncertain, with some philologists maintaining that it refers exclusively to castrated men, and others arguing that it may designate a noncastrated dignitary or official. Hebrew סָרִיס occurs without qualification thirty-five times in the Hebrew Bible (excluding the book of Esther), and is typically rendered by εὐνοῦχος in the LXX (Gen 39.1; 40.2, 7; 1 Rgns 8.15; 3 Rgns 22.9; 4 Rgns 8.6; 9.32; 20.18; 24.12, 15; 25.19; 2 Suppl 18.8; Esa 56.3, 4; Ier 29[36].2; 41[48].16; 52.25), but also by σπάδων (LSJ, s.v., “eunuch”) (Gen 37.36; Esa 39.7) and δυνάστης (BDAG, s.v., 2. “court official”) (1 Suppl 28.1; Ier 34[41].19); at Ier 38[45].7 the word is not rendered. The expression סָרִיס רַב, which occurs four times, is rendered by ἀρχιευννοῦχος (LSJ, s.v., “chief of the eunuchs”) once (Dan 1.3 in both Greek versions), and by personal names twice (4 Rgns 18.17; and Ier 39[46].3); Ier 39.13 is a LXX minus. The expression שַׁר סָרִיס, occurring six times in the first chapter of the book of Daniel, is consistently rendered by ἀρχιευννοῦχος in both Greek versions (1.7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 18). Hebrew Esther has a dozen occurrences of סָרִיס (1.10, 12, 15; 2.3, 14, 15, 21; 4.4, 5; 6.2, 14; 7.9) all rendered by εὐνοῦχος (at 2.23 εὐνοῦχος is evidently introduced by G). Etymologically the Greek word εὐνοῦχος denotes a functionary: “one who keeps (-ουχος) the bed (εὐνή).” Early attestation of the word is found especially among Asiatic Greeks in contact with Lydia and Persia, including Hipponax in the late sixth century BCE, and Herodotus and Hellanicus in the fifth century BCE (Lenfant 2012, 268). Dominique Lenfant (2012, 285) concludes that in the Greek sources that come down to us the word unequivocally designates a castrated male.

G does not name the eunuchs here. Compare MT, which identifies them as בִּגְתָן וְתֶרֶשׁ (2.21) (בִּגְתָן וְתֶרֶשׁ; “Bigthan and Teresh,” NRSV). In plot<sup>2</sup> G refers to the two eunuchs as Γαβαθα καὶ Θαρρα, forms that may ultimately derive from transliterations of the Hebrew. Josephus’s version, which parallels plot<sup>1</sup>, refers to them as Βαγαθῶς and Θεοδέστης.

**ἀρχισωματοφύλακες.** Compare MT which describes the eunuchs as שַׁמְרֵי הַסֵּף, the ones “who guarded the threshold” (NRSV), possibly referring to the men who guarded the king’s private apartment (Moore 1971, 31). The use of ἀρχισωματοφύλαξ (LSJ, s.v., “chief of the body guard”) by G arguably marks a transformation. Claudine Cavalier (2012, 157) notes that the title is associated with the Ptolemaic court and designates a high functionary. Josephus, *A.J.*, 12.2.5, uses it in reference to the official of

Ptolemy Philadelphus entrusted to serve as an emissary to Eleazar the high priest of Jerusalem, ἀπέσταλκα δέ σοι περὶ τούτων διαλεξομένους Ἀνδρέαν τὸν ἀρχισωματοφύλακα καὶ Ἀρισταῖον ἐμοὶ τιμιωτάτους (“And I have sent Andreas, the commander of the bodyguard, and Aristaeus—men whom I hold in the greatest honour” [Marcus, LCL]). Within the LXX the word occurs at 1 Rgns 28.2 where Anchous, son of Ammach, king of Geth, offers to make Daid chief of the bodyguard, rendering Hebrew, שֹׁמֵר לְרֹאשִׁי (“bodyguard,” NRSV). In the present context it was likely intended by G to underscore the high status of these eunuchs. There are numerous references to eunuchs serving as royal guards in Greek literature. Herodotus, *Hist.* 1.113, refers to bodyguards (δορυφόροι), who are subsequently identified as eunuchs, serving Harpagos under Median rule (1.117). According to Xenophon, *Cyr.*, 7.5.59–65, Cyrus the Great chose to employ eunuchs on account of their reputed loyalty to their masters, ταῦτα δὴ γινώσκων ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τῶν θυρωρῶν πάντας τοὺς περὶ τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σῶμα θεραπευτῆρας ἐποιήσατο εὐνούχους (“Recognizing these facts, he selected eunuchs for every post of personal service to him, from the door-keepers up” [Miller, LCL]).

The two unnamed eunuchs of plot<sup>1</sup> may be distinguished from those of plot<sup>2</sup> (Gabatha and Tharra) by their status. While the latter merely guard the courtyard (A.12), the former are significant functionaries of the court. In the received text the term ἀρχισωματοφύλακες thus marks plot<sup>1</sup> as a distinct episode (Cavalier 2012, 157).

**ὅτι προήχθη Μαρδοχαῖος.** The narrator indicates that the motive of the two conspirators was anger over Mardochoaios’s advancement at court. Compare MT which does not provide a motive for the eunuchs’ plot. This elaboration by G operates at a literary level: it both contributes psychological complexity to the narrative and underscores the related themes of court rivalry and palace intrigue present in the Hebrew text. Within the Greek text-as-received the reference to Mardochoaios’s advancement takes on further significance, inviting a reading of plot<sup>1</sup> in light of the events of plot<sup>2</sup>, where Mardochoaios’s service to the king is acknowledged by his promotion.

**καὶ ἐξήτουν.** From this point onward G adheres to a source very similar in form to MT.

**ἀποκτεῖναι.** A single verb replaces the idiom בַּיָּד שְׁלֹחַ (“lay hands on”) and specifies the intended action as one of killing. The Hebrew idiom occurs

four times in Esther. At 3.6 it is not represented in OG. A more isomorphic rendering occurs at 6.2, ἐπιβαλεῖν τὰς χεῖρας. At 9.2, however, G again uses a single verb (ἀπόλλυμι) to replace the idiom, recasting the clause in the passive voice. Point-to-point rendering of the source language is not a constraint for the translator. In the present instance G has evidently aimed at clarity and succinctness.

## 2.22

וידע הדבר למרדכי ויגד לאסתר המלכה ותאמר אסתר למלך בשם מרדכי

καὶ ἐδηλώθη Μαρδοχαίῳ ὁ λόγος, καὶ ἐσήμανεν Εσθηρ, καὶ αὐτὴ ἐνεφάνισεν τῷ βασιλεῖ τὰ τῆς ἐπιβουλῆς.

But the matter became known to Mardochaios, and he alerted Esther, and she explained to the king the details of the plot.

**ἐδηλώθη Μαρδοχαίῳ ὁ λόγος.** The structure of this clause adheres to that of the Hebrew closely (V<sup>pass</sup>-S-IO). G has, however, switched the order of the two substantives so that S (λόγος) is last, likely due to the fact that the thematic participant of the narrative will switch from the eunuchs to Mardochaios. The match of דבר and λόγος is common, yet works well in this context. Compare the parallel in plot<sup>2</sup> (A.13) where Mardochaios personally overhears the plot. In the present context, as in MT, he learns of it from an unnamed informant. Josephus, *A.J.*, 11.207, identifies this individual as a Judean named Barnabazos: Βαρνάβαζος τῶν εὐνούχων οἰκέτης τοῦ ἐτέρου, τὸ γένος ὦν Ἰουδαῖος, συνεῖς τὴν ἐπιβουλὴν τῷ θεῷ κατεμήνυσε τῆς γυναικὸς τοῦ βασιλέως Μαρδοχαίῳ (“Barnabazos, the servant of one of these eunuchs, who was a Jew by race, discovered their plot and revealed it to Mordecai, the uncle of the king’s wife” [Marcus, LCL]).

**Εσθηρ.** Compare MT where Esther is identified as the queen (אסתר המלכה).

**καὶ αὐτὴ ἐνεφάνισεν.** G avoids repeating the name Esther, using instead a pronoun, which he moves into the first position (S-V), since Esther is now the thematic participant. Compare MT, ותאמר אסתר. G does not render ותאמר, “and she told,” by a common match (for example καὶ εἶπεν), perhaps because there is no reported speech. The Greek phrase ἐνεφάνισεν τινὶ τινά here carries the nontechnical sense, “she informed somebody of something” (BDAG, s.v. “ἐμφανίζω,” 2. “make known, explain, inform”). Compare Acts



23.22, μηδενὶ ἐκλαλῆσαι ὅτι ταῦτα ἐνεφάνισας πρὸς με (“Tell no one that you have informed me of this,” NRSV). The Hebrew phrase בשם מרדכי, “in the name of Mordechai,” is not rendered, which is surprising given that it is a crucial detail. This may reflect a tendency toward the abbreviation of Hebrew phrasing. In verse 23 the Greek text clearly indicates that the king was made aware of Mardochoaios’s role in reporting the plot.

τὰ τῆς ἐπιβουλῆς. This phrase represents an elaboration by G. In the Hebrew clause, וְתֹאמַר אֶל־מֶלֶךְ (“and Esther told the king,” NRSV), the verb has no direct object (though one is implied). The Greek phrasing, which uses the neuter plural article with an arthrous noun in the genitive to convey the sense “that pertaining to something,” is idiomatic. The noun is widely attested in the sense required here (LSJ, s.v. “ἐπιβουλῆ,” *plan formed against another, plot, scheme*). Compare 3 Makk 1.2, 6, where a plot (ἐπιβουλῇ) to murder Ptolemy Philopator is foiled by a Judean named Dositheus.

## 2.23

וַיִּבְקֶשׁ הַדָּבָר וַיִּמְצָא וַיִּתְּלוּ שְׁנֵיהֶם עַל עֵץ וַיִּכְתֹּב בַּסֵּפֶר דְּבָרֵי הַיָּמִים  
לְפָנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ

ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς ᾔστασεν τοὺς δύο εὐνούχους καὶ ἐκρέμασεν αὐτούς· καὶ προσέταξεν ὁ βασιλεὺς καταχωρίσαι εἰς μνημόσυνον ἐν τῇ βασιλικῇ βιβλιοθήκῃ ὑπὲρ τῆς εὐνοίας Μαρδοχαίου ἐν ἐγκωμίῳ.

So the king interrogated the two eunuchs and hanged them. Then the king ordered to make an entry as a memorial in the royal archive in commendation of Mardochoaios’s loyalty.

ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς. Over against the Hebrew, the subject of the clause is made explicit by G, and brought forward, as the king is now the thematic participant. The use of the particle δέ rather than καί may be intended to mark a thematic development (see Levinsohn 1992, 31).

ᾔστασεν τοὺς δύο εὐνούχους. The eunuchs are reintroduced at this point by G, which neatly anticipates the next clause. Compare MT, וַיִּבְקֶשׁ הַדָּבָר וַיִּמְצָא (“When the affair was investigated and found to be so,” NRSV). G has avoided mimicking the Hebrew idiom, replacing the passive construction with an active one, and elaborating the reference to an investigation.

καὶ ἐκρέμασεν αὐτούς. The Greek verb likely refers to crucifixion in this context (LSJ, s.v. “κρεμάννυμι,” I. 2. *to hang, τινα; crucify*). See Plutarch,



*Caes.* 2.2, καὶ σὺν γέλῳτι πολλάκις ἠπείλῃσε κρεμᾶν αὐτούς (“and often laughingly threatened to hang them all” [Perrin, LCL]), where κρεμᾶν is picked up at 2.4 by ἅπαντας ἀνεσταύρωσεν (“crucified them all”). Compare MT, גַּם עַל שְׁנֵיהֶם וַיִּלְוּ (“both the men were hanged on the gallows,” NRSV). G avoids a formal rendering of the Hebrew prepositional phrase in favor of a more idiomatic and economical expression. There is some uncertainty as to what manner of execution is intended in the Hebrew text (BDB, s.v. “לָו,” 2. b. of *pole* on which bodies of slain were exposed; late [in Persia] used for executing criminals [? by hanging = *gallows*]). According to Herodotus, *Hist.* 3.159, Darius I impaled (ἀνεσκολόπισε) the leading men of Babylon on stakes after capturing the city. Yet, as Moore (1971, 31) notes, the height of Haman’s pole argues against impaling. The reference may thus be to the practice of exposing bodies following execution (Bush 1996, 373). See for example Herodotus, *Hist.* 3.125, where Polycrates is murdered by Oroetes in some undisclosed manner and then later crucified (ἀνεσταύρωσε): hanged aloft (ἀνακρεμάμενος), “he was washed by Zeus when it rained” (Godley, LCL). Whether G’s rendering represents the current understanding of the Hebrew idiom or an historical actualization is impossible to say. Bush (1996, 373) observes that the translation reflects the prevalence of crucifixion in the Roman era.

καὶ προσέταξεν ... ἐγκωμίῳ. G recasts this clause somewhat. Cavalier (2012, 157) suggests that the translator accords political importance to the episode by purposely echoing vocabulary designating the official status of a benefactor of the king in the Persian court.

καὶ προσέταξεν ὁ βασιλεὺς. In OG the king takes the initiative. Note that the thematic subject is explicitly identified by G, which underscores his agency. Compare the impersonal use of the passive form in MT, ויכתב (“it was written”), which does not specify the agent (though reference is made to the presence of the king: לפני המלך).

καταχωρίσαι. The Greek verb carries the precise sense required for this context (LSJ, s.v. “καταχωρίζω,” III. “set down in a book, place on record”). See, for example, Strabo, *Geogr.*, 1.2.3, Ὅμηρον γοῦν ὑπὲρ τε τῶν Αἰθιοπῶν ὅσα ἐπύθετο καταχωρίσαι εἰς τὴν ποίησιν καὶ περὶ τῶν κατ’ Αἴγυπτον καὶ Λιβύην (“Homer, for instance, made a place in his poems for everything that he had learned about the Ethiopians and the inhabitants of Egypt and Libya” [Jones, LCL]). The verb occurs only twice elsewhere in the LXX (1 Suppl

27.24 and 3 Makk 2.29). It is introduced into a context similar to the present one at 1 Suppl 27.24 (where it renders עֲלֵה), καὶ οὐ κατεχωρίσθη ὁ ἀριθμὸς ἐν βιβλίῳ λόγων τῶν ἡμερῶν τοῦ βασιλέως Δαυιδ (“and the number was not entered in the Book of Histories of the Days of King David,” NETS).

**εἰς μνημόσυνον.** G introduces this phrase without warrant from the Hebrew not only here but at 9.32 and 10.2 as well. (In the received text it also occurs in Addition A.) Literally it means “as a memorial” (Moore 1977, 178). The phrase occurs elsewhere in the LXX (Exod 17.14; Ps 112[111].6; Sir 45.9, 11, 16; 45.16; 50.16; Esa 66.3), and was taken up by certain early Christian authors (Mark 14.9 = Matt 26.13 and Acts 10.4). At Exod 17.14 it renders זָכְרוֹן (BDB, s.v. “זָכָרֹן,” 1. d. *memorial-record*; in a book), and at Ps 112(111).6 it matches לִזְכֹּר (BDB, s.v. “זָכָר,” 1. *remembrance, memory*: a. of persons). While it is conceivable that the phrase was warranted by G’s source, it seems rather that it had special resonance for the translator and was introduced independently. Its use in the present scene is echoed at 9.32, where, following the demise of Mardocheios’s antagonist Haman and the deliverance of the Judeans, Esther records the establishment of Purim εἰς μνημόσυνον, and then again at 10.2 where, the kingdom being secured, the king records its wealth and glory εἰς μνημόσυνον. Within the received text the occurrence of the phrase εἰς μνημόσυνον here in plot<sup>1</sup> echoes the outcome of plot<sup>2</sup> (A.15), καὶ ἔγραψεν ὁ βασιλεὺς τοὺς λόγους τούτους εἰς μνημόσυνον (“And the king wrote these things in the record,” NETS).

In the phrase εἰς μνημόσυνον it is possible to read an intertextual reference to the figure of Amalek. At Exod 17.14 the Lord declares his intention to blot out זָכַר עֲמָלֵק (“the remembrance of Amalek,” NRSV), which the Greek translator renders τὸ μνημόσυνον Ἀμαλήκ (“the memorial of Amalek,” NETS). Moreover Moses is commanded by the Lord to record this divine resolution: כָּתֹב זֶאת זָכְרוֹן בַּסֵּפֶר (“write this as a reminder in a book,” NRSV), rendered κατὰγραψον τοῦτο εἰς μνημόσυνον ἐν βιβλίῳ in OG. Compare Deut 25.19 where a second such reference is made to the erasure of Amalek’s memory: תִּמְחָה אֶת זָכַר עֲמָלֵק (“you will blot out the remembrance of Amalek,” NRSV). (Here the Greek version renders זָכַר by ὄνομα.) In rabbinic tradition the figure of Amalek is identified both genealogically and typologically with Haman as a paradigm of evil, such that in Haman the sages saw “the remembrance of Amalek” whom God had sworn to blot out (Glickman 1999, 24). That in introducing the phrase εἰς μνημόσυνον G intended to echo the narrative of Amalek is, however, speculative.

**μνημόσυνον**. Outside of Hebrew-Greek translation, the word **μνημόσυνον** typically carries the sense “memorial,” that is, “that which evokes a memory” (Spicq 1994, 500). In Herodotus’s *Historiae* it refers to edifices that perpetuate the memory of a person: at 1.185 and 186 to building works; at 2.100 to the gateway of a temple; and at 2.148 to a labyrinth. Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of Eminent Philosophers* 3.1.40, uses it by extension in reference to the preservation of Plato’s memory in both his writings and his friends: ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡξίου μνημόσυνον αὐτοῦ λείπεσθαι ἢ ἐν φίλοις ἢ ἐν βιβλίοις (“His wish always was to leave a memorial of himself behind, either in the hearts of his friends or in his books” [Hicks, LCL]); and Pausanias, *Descr.* 10.5.3, in reference to places and geographical features associated with the memory of Oedipus, ἔδει δὲ ἄρα παθημάτων τῶν Οἰδίποδος ἀνὰ πᾶσαν τὴν Ἑλλάδα ὑπολειφθῆναι μνημόσυνα (“Fate would have it that memorials of the sufferings of Oedipus should be left throughout the length and breadth of Greece” [Jones, LCL]). It is used similarly by the author of Wis 10.7, in reference to the signs of physical devastation that serve as lasting reminders of the wickedness of the Pentapolis, the five cities of the plain (see Gen 14.1–12). Less frequently **μνημόσυνον** is used in reference to written reminders, for example by Aristophanes, *Vesp.* 538, καὶ μὴν ὅς’ ἂν λέξῃ γ’ ἀπλῶς μνημόσυνα γράψομαι ’γώ (“That I shall, and I’m going to jot down every single point he makes” [Henderson, LCL]).

In the Greek Pentateuch **μνημόσυνον** is used to render זכרון (Exod 12.14; 13.9; 17.14; 28.12 [2x]; 28.23[29]; 30.16; 39.7 [36.14]; Leu 23.24; Num 5.15, 18; 17.5; 31.54), and זכר (Exod 3.15; 17.14; Deut 32.26), both in the sense “memorial or remembrance,” but also אזכרה (BDB, s.v. “אִזְכְּרָה,” “memorial offering”) (Leu 2.2, 9, 16; 5.12; 6.8; Num 5.26). The equivalencies are not, in themselves, lexicographically remarkable. For Greek-speaking Jews, however, it is not implausible to suppose that the word **μνημόσυνον** acquired a certain resonance over time due its use as a translation equivalent, especially in light of its liturgical associations, which are unparalleled outside of the LXX. Spicq (1994, 501) observes that **μνημόσυνον** is variously used in reference to the Passover in the Feast of Unleavened Bread (Exod 12.14; 13.9), the stones in the ephod (Exod 28.12; 39.7), and the breastplate (Exod 28.29; 30.6): all are calls to remembrance for Israel (especially for their offenses); at the same time, the use of **μνημόσυνον** in reference to burnt offerings (Leu 2.2, 9, 16; 5.12; 6.8; Num 5.26) identified it with the Jerusalem temple cult. In view of this background, it is quite possible, as Spicq suggests, that the author of 2 Makk 6.31, in using **μνημόσυνον** in reference to the death of Eleazar, as “a memorial of courage,” intended it

to carry liturgical connotations. Whether such connotations underlay the use of the word by G cannot be ascertained with any confidence, but it is not unlikely.

The singular form of the word *μνημόσυνον* is introduced by G a total of five times (2.23; 9.27, 28; 9.32; 10.2) and represents an important motif within the translation. In the present context it refers to the memorialization of Mardocheaios through chronicling. It is used in a very similar context at Mark 14.9. At Esth 9.27–28 it occurs twice in reference to Israel's remembrance of the days of Purim; there it is perhaps cued by the parallel Hebrew context in which the word *זכר* occurs once. Remembrance is of course central to the Esther scroll: the plot turns on acts of recording and remembering, which in turn are memorialized in the Feast of Purim. G appears to have deliberately emphasized this theme. It is in turn echoed in the received text, where the word *μνημόσυνον* occurs a further two times (A.15; and E.22). At E.22, the second decree of the king (an original Greek composition), the Feast of Purim is identified as a *μνημόσυνον τῆς ἀπωλείας* (“a memorial of destruction,” NETS).

The plural form of *μνημόσυνον* occurs at Esth 6.1 in the phrase *γράμματα μνημόσυνα τῶν ἡμερῶν* (“written daily annals,” NETS), which renders *ספר הזכרונות דברי הימים* (“the book of records, the annals,” NRSV), in reference to the record of Mardocheaios's service at 2.23. Here *μνημόσυνον* was perhaps cued by the Hebrew word *זכרון*. Whether the resulting Greek phrase was a conventional way of denoting such records is uncertain.

*ἐν τῇ βασιλικῇ βιβλιοθήκῃ*. Compare MT, which refers to a record entered *בספר דברי הימים* (“in the book of the annals,” NRSV; literally, “the book of the words of days”). For a formal rendering of the Hebrew expression, see 1 Suppl 27.24, *ἐν βιβλίῳ λόγων τῶν ἡμερῶν*. G replaces the phrase with a reference to a library (LSJ, s.v. “βιβλιοθήκη,” 2. “library, collection of books”). For this sense of the word, see Polybius, *Hist.* 12.27.4, *ὅτι τὰ μὲν ἐκ τῶν βυβλίων δύναται πολυπραγμονεῖσθαι χωρὶς κινδύνου καὶ κακοπαθείας, ἐάν τις αὐτὸ τοῦτο προνοηθῇ μόνον ὥστε λαβεῖν ἢ πόλιν ἔχουσαν ὑπομνημάτων πλῆθος ἢ βιβλιοθήκην που γειτνιώσαν* (“Inquiries from books may be made without any danger or hardship, provided only that one takes care to have access to a town rich in documents or to have a library near at hand” [Paton, LCL]). Ezra 6.1 refers to *בית ספריא*, or “archives” (NRSV) (literally, “the house of books”) at the time of Darius I (522–486 BCE), and the Aramaic phrase is rendered *ταῖς βιβλιοθήκαις* by the Hellenistic translator of 2 Esdras. The author of 2 Makkabees makes reference to an archive

(βιβλιοθήκη) created by Nehemiah (2.13). There, as in the present context, the existence of a royal library provides a guarantee for the knowledge of Jewish traditions independent of the Pentateuch, in particular those regarding the festivals. The Greek historian Ctesias likewise claimed to have used Persian royal archives as a source, though some scholars have denied their existence (Llewellyn-Jones and Robson 2010, 58).

**ἐν ἐγκωμίῳ.** The matter is recorded in the form of an encomium. This detail has no counterpart in MT and represents an elaboration by G. The Greek word *ἐγκώμιον* denotes a specific literary genre. Originally it seems to have denoted a song of welcome addressed by a festive crowd (*κῶμος*), but by the fourth century BCE it was applied to speeches composed in praise of any kind of person or thing (Dover 1980, 11–12). Thus it is used interchangeably with *ἔπαινος* (LSJ, s.v. 2. “complimentary address, panegyric”). Rules for the genre are articulated in Pseudo-Aristotle, *Rhet. Alex.* 35, a late fourth-century BCE work mistakenly attributed to Aristotle in late antiquity. Included in an *ἐγκώμιον* are: (1) the blessings enjoyed by the addressee, that is, *τὰ ἔξω τῆς ἀρετῆς ἀγαθὰ* (“the goods which fall outside of virtue”); (2) a description of his virtues, specifically, *εἰς σοφίαν καὶ δικαιοσύνην καὶ ἀνδρείαν καὶ ἐπιτηδεύματα ἔνδοξα* (“wisdom, justice, courage and notable habits of life”); (3) reference to his forebears; and (4) notable achievements (see Dover 1980, 12).

The word *ἐγκώμιον* is used only once elsewhere in the LXX, at Prov 10.7, where it marks a transformation, *μετ’ ἐγκωμίων* replacing the Hebrew phrase *לְבִרְכָּה* (BDB, s.v. “בִּרְכָּה,” 2. “source of blessing”). The sentiment expressed by the Greek proverb is apposite to the present context: *μνήμη δικαίων μετ’ ἐγκωμίων, ὄνομα δὲ ἀσεβοῦς σβέννυται* (“The memory of the righteous comes with eulogies, but the name of the impious is extinguished,” NETS). In using the term *ἐγκώμιον* in this key passage G is perhaps inviting a reading of the book of Esther as a eulogy in memory of the righteous. Martin Hengel (2004, 80–81) suggests that translations directed at Greek-speaking Jews became an important instrument of religious propaganda particularly after the attainment of Judean independence (see the spurious letter of the Jerusalemmites to Jews in Egypt, 2 Makk 1.10b–2.18).

**ὕπερ τῆς εὐνοίας Μαρδοχαίου.** A further elaboration of the source by G, describing the theme of the *ἐγκώμιον*. The virtues are of primary importance in encomia (Dover 1980, 12). Pseudo-Aristotle, *Rhet. Alex.* 35, writes, *τὰ μὲν τῆς ἀρετῆς δικαίως ἐγκωμιάζεται, τὰ δ’ ἔξω κλέπται* (“The

qualities which pertain to virtue are the proper subjects of eulogy; those which fall outside are smuggled in"). In Hellenistic royal propaganda of this period *εὐνοία* represents the signal virtue of a loyal subject. Within the LXX the word is found primarily in nontranslational literature, but the exception is telling. At 1 Makk 11.33 it is used in a putative copy of a letter of Demetrius II Nicator (king of Syria 145–139 and 129–125 BCE) in reference to the loyalty of the Judean nation, which he intends to repay (cf. 1 Makk 11.53 where the narrator notes the failure of Demetrius to return the favors he received). The word is used in the same sense in 3 Makkabees, an original Hellenistic Greek composition which deals inter alia with a theme central to the book of Esther: the pious Jew as loyal subject of the king. At 3 Makk 3.3, as the Judean population of Egypt faces persecution on the false charge of sedition, the narrator assures the reader that they maintained their *εὐνοίαν καὶ πίστιν ἀδιάστροφον* ("good will and unswerving loyalty," NETS), towards the royal house. At 3 Makk 6.26 when, as a result of divine intervention, the king (Ptolemy Philopator) comes to his senses and accuses his advisors of treason, he describes his Judean subjects as, "those who from the beginning have exceeded all nations in their good will [*εὐνοία*] towards us" (NETS). At 3 Makk 7.7 it occurs in the context of a royal letter, again in reference to the loyalty of the Jews (also 2 Makk 9.21, 26 in a letter of King Antiochus to his Judean citizens, and 2 Makk 11.19 in a letter of Lysias to the Judeans).

The word *εὐνοία* is twice introduced by G without warrant from the Hebrew: in the present context, where the king orders that Mardochoaios's loyalty be recorded, and at 6.4 where the king is reminded of that loyalty. Charles Harvey (2003, 226) concludes that the conscientious loyalty of Mardochoaios to the king is deliberately underscored. The motif finds further expression in the received text, specifically through Additions B and E (the letters of the king). Noah Hacham (2007, 784) has suggested that the author of these additions, perhaps taking his cue from 3 Makkabees, speaks to the anxieties of diaspora Jews living in uncertain times, encouraging them to place their hope in royal recognition of Judean loyalty and service. The Greek version of Prov 24.1 counsels, *φοβοῦ τὸν θεόν, υἱέ, καὶ βασιλέα καὶ μηθετέρῳ αὐτῶν ἀπειθήσης* ("My son, fear God and the king, and disobey neither of them," NETS). This ethos is vividly realized in the Greek text-as-received, which characterizes Mardochoaios and Esther as both loyal subjects and devout Jews. Compare B.3, where the word *εὐνοία* is used ironically of the traitor Haman.

### Summary

The plot against the king (plot<sup>1</sup>) occurs as a result of Mardochoaios's advancement at court and concludes with the king ordering that an encomium be written in his honor. In an aside, G introduces a distinct motif: Esther's piety. In the text-as-received the action refers back to Mardochoaios's discovery of an earlier intrigue (plot<sup>2</sup>) at A.12–17.

### §2. Greek Esther A.12–17

#### Outline

The pericope is made up of two reports. The first (vv. 12–16) falls into three parts: (1) it presents Mardochoaios resting in a courtyard (v. 12), where (2) he uncovers a plot of regicide (vv. 13–14); and as a result (3) is rewarded by the king (vv. 15–16). In the second two-part report (v. 17), (1) Haman is introduced as an antagonist, (2) plotting revenge against Mardochoaios.

#### Commentary

##### A.12

καὶ ἡσύχασεν Μαρδοχαῖος ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ μετὰ Γαβαθα καὶ Θαρρα τῶν  
 δύο εὐνούχων τοῦ βασιλέως τῶν φυλασσόντων τὴν αὐλήν,  
 And Mardochoaios took his rest in the courtyard with Gabatha and  
 Tharra, the two eunuchs of the king who guarded the courtyard.

This verse constitutes the introduction to a report that extends over A.12–16 (Dorothy 1997, 51). In the incident reported, Mardochoaios foils a plot against the king, and is honored accordingly. While the present episode (plot<sup>2</sup>) has no direct counterpart in MT, it parallels an incident in the Hebrew narrative (MT 2.19–23, see above) translated by G (plot<sup>1</sup>), the threefold structure of which it mirrors. Plot<sup>2</sup> has a direct counterpart in AT (A.10–18), but is not represented in either OL or Josephus. AT lacks a parallel to plot<sup>1</sup>. The tradition history of the doublet thus remains uncertain, and it is difficult to determine whether it arises from two stories reporting distinct plots or from a single underlying prototype (Cavalier 2012, 104). The balance of probability favors the latter. It is altogether likely that plot<sup>2</sup> was not an original part of the Esther scroll (see Moore 1977, 179–180), but adapted from plot<sup>1</sup>. Moore (1977, 180) regards the absence of plot<sup>2</sup> in OL as external evidence that it was not originally part



of Addition A, and, as such, introduced as late as the second century CE. This remains speculative.

For the purposes of a historical-critical commentary, a key issue is whether plot<sup>2</sup> had a Semitic *Vorlage* (and thus a source external to the Greek tradition). At present there is a lack of consensus on this matter, though a growing number of scholars are inclined to view the pericope as a translation. OG and AT appear to have a common source for plot<sup>2</sup>, from which they diverge in their choice of vocabulary and syntax (Cavalier 2012, 140). On the hypothesis that plot<sup>2</sup> is a translation one may speculate regarding its textual relationship to the material translated by G. It is possible, for instance, that the pericope was present in G's source (along with so-called Additions A, C, D and F), as Emanuel Tov (2008, 382) has argued. In the absence of decisive evidence, however, it seems prudent to treat the introduction of plot<sup>2</sup> as part of the received text, that is, as a secondary elaboration of the translation produced by G. The want of an extant source obviously precludes an analysis of translation technique.

Within a literary analysis of the text-as-received the question arises as to whether the doublet represents two reports of the same incident or two distinct episodes. Moore (1977, 179), who assumes the former, enumerates various contradictions and inconsistencies between the two accounts that he attributes to later editors, since the original translator (he assumes) would have reconciled any differences. But there are indications that plot<sup>2</sup> and plot<sup>1</sup> function as distinct incidents within the temporal progression of the narrative, each with an important place in its economy (Cavalier 2012, 139). On this view the thematic mirroring of the two episodes is intentional and not a mere by-product of translation and redaction. Whatever its tradition history, plot<sup>2</sup> represents an integral part of OG as it comes down to us.

**καὶ ἡσύχασεν Μαρδοχαῖος.** There is no transition from A.11, where Mar-dochaios ponders the meaning of his dream, rather the two scenes are simply juxtaposed. Such juxtaposition is characteristic of popular narrative (see Frye 1976). Nevertheless a day-night sequence is implied in the text-as-received, suggesting that the following episode is at some level a fulfillment of the dream (Dorothy 1997, 51). The pericope is at the same time metaphorically linked to the motif of the two dragons (Cavalier 2012, 105).

Compare AT, which provides an explicit thematic connection with what has preceded, the narrator stating that the meaning of the dream was



made clear to Mardochoaios on the day he slept in the courtyard: ἐπίκρισις αὐτοῦ [i.e., τὸ ἐνύπνιον] διασαφηθήσεται αὐτῷ ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ἧς ὑπνωσε Μαρδοχαῖος ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ (“Its interpretation would become clear to him on the day on which Mardochoaios napped in the court,” NETS). It is possible that AT represents an elaboration of the narrative sequence of OG.

Assuming that there is less than twenty-four hours separating the dream from the business in the courtyard, the uncovering of the conspiracy occurs in the second year of Artaxerxes. Moore (1977, 177) sees a contradiction here with plot<sup>1</sup> in which the incident occurs in the seventh year of the king, subsequent to the coronation of Esther (2.21). Yet if one reads the doublet as two distinct episodes there is no contradiction.

**ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ.** One may ask what location is signified by this phrase, and what the presence of Mardochoaios there implies about his status. The Greek word αὐλή can refer to either a courtyard or a royal court (see commentary above on 2.19). Where the setting is a royal palace, the two meanings are obviously not exclusive, which seems to be the case here. Mardochoaios is located within a palace courtyard—that is where the action takes place—at the same time, he is a functionary at court in the company of royal officials. In the received text he is described in A.2 as ἄνθρωπος μέγας θεραπεύων ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ τοῦ βασιλέως (“a great man serving in the court of the king,” NRSV). Compare plot<sup>1</sup> from which the setting of the present scene may have taken its cue. In that context G makes reference to Mardochoaios serving in the court (2.19), replacing a reference in the Hebrew to his presence at the king’s gate.

Within the narrative world of the text-as-received Mardochoaios apparently resides in the royal court at the outset of the action, and is thus an active participant in palace intrigues, and a peer of the courtier Haman. Muhammad Dandamayev (1993) notes that Greek literary sources refer to various foreign dignitaries, ambassadors, and rulers dependent on the Achaemenids who were to be found in residence at the imperial court. According to Herodotus, *Hist.* 3.129–33, Democedes of Croton, personal physician to Darius I, was included among the royal table companions. Plutarch, *Them.* 29, relates that the eponymous Athenian of his narrative became influential at the Persian court and participated in the king’s domestic entertainments. Other examples could be enumerated.

Mardochoaios is placed in Susa on the first of Nisa (A.1). The present episode thus occurs in the springtime. This is consistent with Greek sources, according to which the imperial court was located in Susa during

the spring, and relocated seasonally, spending the summer in Ecbatana, and autumn and winter in Babylon (Xenophon, *Cyr.* 8.6.22; *Anab.* 3.5.15). The coronation palace was at Pasargadae (Plutarch, *Art.*, 3).

**Γαβαθα καὶ Θαρρα.** These appear to be transliterations of Semitic names. Whether the Greek forms underwent corruption in the course of transmission is uncertain. In the Hebrew counterpart to plot<sup>1</sup> (2.21, see above), the two eunuchs are referred to as בגתן and תרש (בגתן ותִרְשָׁן). Compare the reference in AT's version of plot<sup>2</sup>, μετὰ Ασάου καὶ Θεδεύτου, which uses Greek forms (Ἀστα[γ]ής and Θεδευτός) (Dorothy 1997, 54). Josephus's Θεοδέστης is perhaps based on Θεδευτός of AT, which as Ralph Marcus (Josephus 1937, 414) observes, may in turn be a corruption of Hebrew תרש, since ר and ט are easily confused in Hebrew script. H. Willrich reportedly connected Θεδευτός with Theodotos, an Egyptian deserter who according to 3 Makk 1.2 attempted to kill King Ptolemy IV, but the similarity is likely coincidental (Josephus 1937, 414).

**τῶν δύο εὐνούχων τοῦ βασιλέως.** Compare the reference in plot<sup>1</sup> to οἱ δύο εὐνοῦχοι τοῦ βασιλέως (2.21), which is a rendering of שְׁנֵי סְרִיסֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ (MT). The match of εὐνοῦχος with סְרִיס is conventional in the LXX (see commentary on 2.21). While the motif of the two eunuchs is present in the Hebrew, the doubling of the motif in the Greek text-as-received gives it further literary significance. The figure of the εὐνοῦχος had become a stock character in Greek stories about the Persian court. In classical Greek literature the εὐνοῦχος serves both as a literary cliché and as a component of ethnic prejudice against the Persian Empire (Lenfant 2012, 297).

In Herodotus eunuchs appear as personal attendants serving the Persian king or his dignitaries (Lenfant 2012, 271). They do not, however, figure prominently in his depiction of the court. It is in the *Persica* of Ctesias of Cnidus, a Greek physician in the Persian court at the end of the fifth century BCE, that they take on a more significant role. (The *Persica*, an extensive history of the Persian Empire, is extant only in fragments; for text and translation, see Stronk 2010.) In Ctesias's narrative, eunuchs serve as prominent attendants of the royal family, and are especially notable for their involvement in palace intrigues (Lenfant 2012, 269). The difference between Herodotus and Ctesias in their depiction of eunuchs can be interpreted in two ways: it may reflect an actual historical development, suggesting that eunuchs did in fact become more influential during the reign of Xerxes; on the other hand, it may be part of the larger trend in

Greek historiography toward using clichés to emphasize the decadence of the Persian Empire (Lenfant 2012, 272–3). The prominent role given to eunuchs in the received text of Greek Esther possibly reflects this trend, though it should be emphasized that in this respect it is picking up and extending a feature of the Hebrew narrative. The motif of plotting eunuchs may well have had wide circulation in the Hellenistic Near East, independent of its use by Greek authors.

**τῶν φυλασσόντων τὴν αὐλήν.** The eunuchs serve as palace guards. Compare the Hebrew version of plot<sup>1</sup> (2.21), where the eunuchs (תְּלָמִידֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ) are referred to as הַשְּׂמֵרָה (“[those] who guarded the threshold,” NRSV). OG is more detailed in describing the conspirators than AT, which simply calls them eunuchs. In the text-as-received the two eunuchs involved in plot<sup>2</sup> evidently have a lower status within the court hierarchy than those involved in plot<sup>1</sup>, who are described as ἀρχισωματοφύλακες (“chief bodyguards”; see the commentary above on 2.21).

#### A.13

ἤκουσέν τε αὐτῶν τοὺς λογισμοὺς καὶ τὰς μερίμνας αὐτῶν ἐξηράννησεν καὶ ἔμαθεν ὅτι ἐτοιμάζουσιν τὰς χεῖρας ἐπιβαλεῖν Ἀρταξέρξει τῷ βασιλεῖ, καὶ ὑπέδειξεν τῷ βασιλεῖ περὶ αὐτῶν.

He both overheard their deliberations and inquired into their ambitions, and learned that they were preparing to lay hands on Artaxerxes the king, and told the king about them.

This verse marks the beginning of the body of the report (vv. 13–14), which is comprised of (1) a description of Mardocheaios’s actions (v. 13), and (2) those of the king (v. 14). Compare the body of the report in plot<sup>1</sup> (2.22–23), which the present episode mirrors structurally.

**ἤκουσέν ... λογισμοὺς ... μερίμνας ... ἐξηράννησεν.** The first two clauses have a pleasing chiasmic structure. This stylistic feature is consistent with the hypothesis of a relatively free adaptation of the source. Moore (1977, 180) suggests that A.11–17 is composed in better Greek than that of the previous pericope A.4–10, but this may simply reflect the generic differences between a dream sequence and a narrative.

**αὐτῶν τοὺς λογισμούς.** In this reference to the eunuchs’ machinations, one notes that the genitival (αὐτῶν) precedes the noun it modifies, which is the

preferred order in Greek prose composition; compare AT A.12 τοὺς λόγους αὐτῶν (“their words,” NETS). The Greek word λογισμός denotes a process of careful thought and planning, with connotations of moral duplicity (LSJ, s.v. “λογισμός,” II. without reference to number, *calculation, reasoning*). See for example Aeschines, *Tim.* 1.84, ἀλλ’ οὕτως ἰσχυρόν ἐστιν ἡ ἀλήθεια, ὥστε πάντων ἐπικρατεῖν τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων λογισμῶν (“but so strong is the truth that it prevails—over all the calculations of men” [Adams, LCL]). If there was a Semitic source for plot<sup>2</sup>, the underlying form would likely have been מַחְשָׁבָה (BDB, s.v. “מַחְשָׁבָה,” 1. “thought.” 2. “device, plan, purpose”); see, for example, Ps 33(32).10, 11; Prov 6.18; 12.5; 15.22, 26; 19.21; Jer 27:45.

**τὰς μερίμνας.** Although the plural form typically carries the sense “cares or anxieties” (cf. Prov 17.12), in the present context the word likely refers to the eunuchs’ “ambitions” (LSJ, s.v. “μέριμνα,” 3. *pursuit, ambition*, esp. in plural). Compare AT A.12 τὰς διαβολὰς αὐτῶν (“their schemes,” NETS). The word μέριμνα occurs infrequently in the LXX (1 Makk 6:10; Ps 55[54].23; Prov 17.12; Job 11.18; Sir 30.24; 31.1; 38.29; 42.9; Dan 11.26). Where a Hebrew source text is extant (Ps 55[54].23; Prov 17.12; Job 11.18) there is no straightforward equivalency upon which to base a retroversion.

**ἐξερευνήσεν.** In OG Mardocheaios not only overhears the conspiracy but investigates it (LSJ, s.v. “ἐξερευνάω,” “search out, examine”), and thus has a more active role than in AT where he simply hears of it (Dorothy 1997, 54). Compare plot<sup>1</sup> where the matter is brought to his attention (2.22), καὶ ἐδηλώθη Μαρδοχαίῳ (“But the matter became known to Mardocheaios,” NETS).

Here Mardocheaios’s role is similar to that of the court functionary referred to by Herodotus, *Hist.* 1.114 (in a story about Cyrus’s childhood), as ὀφθαλμὸς βασιλέως, “the king’s eye.” The young Cyrus, playing the king’s part in a make-believe court, appoints the other children to their respective roles: ὁ δὲ αὐτῶν διέταξε τοὺς μὲν οἰκίας οἰκοδομεῖν, τοὺς δὲ δορυφόρους εἶναι, τὸν δὲ κου τινὰ αὐτῶν ὀφθαλμὸν βασιλέως εἶναι, τῷ δὲ τινὶ τὰς ἀγγελίας φέρειν ἐδίδου γέρας, ὡς ἐκάστω ἔργον προστάσσω (“Then he set them severally to their tasks, some to the building of houses, some to be his bodyguard, one [as I suppose] to be the King’s Eye; to another he gave the right of bringing him messages; to each he gave his proper work” [Godley, LCL]). Dandamayev (1993) notes that according to Greek sources the entire court was under the constant surveillance of the so-called “ears and eyes” of the king, agents who were independent of other authorities and

reported any suspicion of sedition directly to the king. See Xenophon, *Cyr.*, 8.2.10, τοὺς γὰρ ἀπαγγείλαντας ὅσα καιρὸς αὐτῷ εἶη πεπύσθαι μεγάλως εὐεργετῶν πολλοὺς ἐποίησεν ἀνθρώπους καὶ ὠτακουστῆν καὶ διοπτρεῦν τί ἂν ἀγγείλαντες ὠφελήσειαν βασιλέα (“for by rewarding liberally those who reported to him whatever it was to his interest to hear, he prompted many men to make it their business to use their eyes and ears to spy out what they could report to the king to his advantage” [Miller, LCL]).

**τὰς χεῖρας ἐπιβαλεῖν Ἀρταξέρξη.** The construction resembles the Hebrew idiom כַּ יְ הַיָּד (“to lay hands on”). Thus at 6.2 G renders טִי הַיָּד לְמַכּוֹת by ἐπιβαλεῖν τὰς χεῖρας Ἀρταξέρξη. Compare AT A.12 τοῦ ἐπιθέσθαι Ἀσσυήρῳ τῷ βασιλεῖ (“to assault Assyeros the king,” NETS) (LSJ, s.v. “ἐπιτίθημι,” B. med. III. 2. “make an attempt upon, attack”). A common Hebrew source is thus possible. Yet the phrasing of OG is not unidiomatic and thus cannot be enlisted in support of the hypothesis of interference from a Hebrew parent. See, for example, Polybius, *Hist.* 3.2.8, καὶ τὰς χεῖρας ἐπιβάλλειν Φίλιππος μὲν τοῖς κατ’ Αἴγυπτον καὶ Καρίαν καὶ Σάμον, Ἀντίοχος δὲ τοῖς κατὰ Κοίλην Συρίαν καὶ Φοινίκην (“Philip laying hands on Egypt and on Caria and Samos, while Antiochus seized on Coele-Syria and Phoenicia” [Paton, LCL]).

In Ctesias’s depiction of the Persian court there are many references to eunuchs taking part in plots or assassination attempts against the king (see Lenfant 2012, 270). These occur under Semiramis, Cyrus, the Magus, Xerxes II, and Darius II. In later *Persica* (the sources of the final chapters of Plutarch’s *Artaxerxes*) and the historians of Alexander the Great, eunuchs are notable for their involvement in court plots (Lenfant 2012, 274). The motif became quite popular in Hellenistic historiography, which might in turn have influenced the adaptation of plot<sup>2</sup> within the received text.

**καὶ ὑπέδειξεν τῷ βασιλεῖ.** The Greek verb may simply mean “warn” (compare Matt 3.7), but more likely refers to the passing on of information (LSJ, s.v. “ὑποδείκνυμι,” I. 3. “report”). Moore (1977, 178) renders it “he informed the king.” At Tob 1.19 (both texts) the verb carries this sense in a similar context: πορευθεὶς δὲ εἰς τῶν ἐν Νινευῇ καὶ ὑπέδειξεν τῷ βασιλεῖ περὶ ἐμοῦ (“But one of the people of Nineue went and informed the king about me,” NETS). There is no reference to an intermediary, and whether Mardochoaios reported directly to the king is uncertain. Compare plot<sup>1</sup> (2.22) where in both OG and MT Esther acts as an intermediary. The absence of any reference to Esther in plot<sup>2</sup> differentiates it from plot<sup>1</sup> in the received

text. Dorothy (1997, 49) observes that in this section the reader is asked to focus on Mordecai and the king as main characters.

#### A.14

Καὶ ἐξήτασεν ὁ βασιλεὺς τοὺς δύο εὐνούχους, καὶ ὁμολογήσαντες ἀπήχθησαν.

Then the king interrogated the two eunuchs, and when they confessed, they were led away.

**ἐξήτασεν ὁ βασιλεὺς.** This parallels the Greek version of plot<sup>1</sup>, ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς ἤτασεν τοὺς δύο εὐνούχους (2.23), where emphasis is likewise placed on the king's agency. Compare the Hebrew version of plot<sup>1</sup>, which uses an impersonal construction, ויברר הדבר וימצא ("When the affair was investigated and found to be so," NRSV). (The Hebrew verbs are pointed as passive forms in the MT.) At A.14 AT elaborates upon the king's actions (καὶ ἤτασεν ὁ βασιλεὺς τοὺς δύο εὐνούχους) with a further reference to Mardochoaios, καὶ εὔρε τοὺς λόγους Μαρδοχαίου ("and found Mardochoaios's words true," NETS), thus underscoring his role in the affair (Dorothy 1997, 54).

**καὶ ὁμολογήσαντες.** Compare plot<sup>1</sup> (2.23) where in both OG and MT there is no reference to the eunuchs' confession. AT, however, agrees with OG plot<sup>2</sup> (καὶ ὁμολογήσαντες οἱ εὐνούχοι ἀπήχθησαν).

**ἀπήχθησαν.** Moore (1977, 178) suggests that execution is here implied. The Greek verb (also used by AT in this context) is well attested in reference to arrest and imprisonment (LSJ, s.v. "ἀπάγω," IV. 3. "carry off to prison"). See Lysias, 25.15, ὑπ' ἐμοῦ γὰρ ἐν τῇ ὀλιγαρχίᾳ οὔτε ἀπαχθεῖς οὔδεις φανήσεται, οὔτε τῶν ἐχθρῶν οὔδεις τετιμωρημένος, οὔτε τῶν φίλων εὖ πεπονθώς ("I had no hand during the oligarchy, you will find, either in the arrest of anybody, or in taking vengeance upon any of my enemies, or in conferring a favour on any of my friends" [Lamb, LCL]).

#### A.15

Καὶ ἔγραψεν ὁ βασιλεὺς τοὺς λόγους τούτους εἰς μνημόσυνον, καὶ Μαρδοχαῖος ἔγραψεν περὶ τῶν λόγων τούτων·

And the king wrote these things in the record, and Mardochoaios wrote concerning these things.

ἔγραψεν ὁ βασιλεύς. The matter is officially recorded. This detail is likely derived from plot<sup>1</sup> where it represents an important plot device. It is interesting that here the king is the subject of the verb “to write,” emphasizing his agency (though it is possible that this is not meant literally). AT agrees with OG in this regard. Compare plot<sup>1</sup> (2.23) where the Hebrew version uses an impersonal construction (implying the king’s oversight), ויכתב המלך בספר דברי הימים לפני המלך (“It was recorded in the book of the annals in the presence of the king,” NRSV). In that passage G evidently recast the Hebrew so as to make explicit the king’s initiative in recording Mardochaios’s service.

According to Herodotus, *Hist.* 8.85.3, a person who had rendered important service to the Persian king was styled a εὐεργέτης βασιλέος (“benefactor of the king”): Φύλακος δὲ εὐεργέτης βασιλέος ἀνεγράφη καὶ χώρα ἐδωρήθη πολλή. οἱ δ’ εὐεργέται βασιλέος ὀροσάγγαι καλέονται περσιστί (“and Phylacus was recorded among the king’s benefactors and given much land. These benefactors of the king are called in the Persian language, orosangae” [Godley, LCL]). The official recording of the benefactor’s name was evidently conventional. See, for instance, Herodotus, *Hist.* 8.90.4, ὅπως γάρ τινα ἴδοι Ξέρξης τῶν ἑωυτοῦ ἔργον τι ἀποδεικνύμενον ἐν τῇ ναυμαχίῃ, κατήμενος ὑπὸ τῷ ὄρει τῷ ἀντίον Σαλαμῖνος τὸ καλέεται Αἰγάλεως, ἀνεπυνθάνετο τὸν ποιήσαντα, καὶ οἱ γραμματισταὶ ἀνέγραφον πατρώθεν τὸν τριήραρχον καὶ τὴν πόλιν (“For whenever Xerxes, from his seat under the hill over against Salamis called Aegaleos, saw any feat achieved by his own men in the battle, he inquired who was the doer of it, and his scribes wrote down the names of the ship’s captain and his father and his city” [Godley, LCL]). Herodotus, *Hist.* 3.140, knows of official lists of the king’s benefactors in royal archives, and it is not unlikely that there was a body of tales in circulation concerning these individuals (for Histiaeus of Miletus and Coes the Mytilenaeon see 5.11; for Xenagoras see 9.107). A feature of such stories was evidently the granting of a request. See for instance Herodotus, *Hist.* 3.139–141, which tells the story of a Greek benefactor (εὐεργέτης) of Darius. While campaigning in Egypt with Cambyses, Darius approached Syloson, an exile from Samos, to purchase a cloak he much admired. Syloson refused to sell the cloak, but rather gave it to him. Later when Darius assumed the throne, Syloson appeared at court claiming to be a benefactor of the king, and, upon relating the story of the cloak, was granted his request that his native Samos be restored. The story, the basis of a proverb, was undoubtedly a popular tale. (For the granting of requests, see also Herodotus, *Hist.* 5.11.)



*εἰς μνημόσυνον*. The phrase means literally “for a memorial.” In the present context it refers to the memorialization of a person through chronicling. (Presumably Mardochoaios’s Judean ethnicity was recorded in the present instance.) See plot<sup>1</sup> (2.23), where the same phrase is introduced by G without warrant from the Hebrew. Memorialization functions as a key motif in the Greek text-as-received. The phrase *εἰς μνημόσυνον* does not occur in AT.

*καὶ Μαρδοχαῖος ἔγραψεν*. This detail is absent in plot<sup>1</sup> and does not figure in the larger narrative. In the text-as-received it has the effect of further underscoring Mardochoaios’s agency. Moreover it relates to the theme of memory and memorialization, as it establishes the existence of a specifically Jewish record of the events reported in plot<sup>2</sup>. Compare the parallel in AT (A.15) where the verb is passive. There Mardochoaios does not write “concerning these things” but is written about, thus anticipating the events of chapter 6 in the received text (Cavalier 2012, 139): *καὶ ἐγράφη Μαρδοχαῖος ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ βασιλέως περὶ τοῦ μνημονεύειν τῶν λόγων τούτων* (“and Mardochoaios was written about in the book of the king so that these things would be remembered,” NETS). AT’s reference to “the book of the king” is reminiscent of the Hebrew version of plot<sup>1</sup> (בספר דברי הימים).

#### A.16

*Καὶ ἐπέταξεν ὁ βασιλεὺς Μαρδοχαίῳ θεραπεύειν ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ δόματα περὶ τούτων.*

And the king ordered Mardochoaios to serve in the court and gave to him gifts for these things.

Mardochoaios is rewarded by the king immediately. This is an important element, further differentiating plot<sup>2</sup> from plot<sup>1</sup> (Cavalier 2012, 139). In plot<sup>1</sup> such recognition is inexplicably delayed until a later point in the narrative, when the king is reminded of the omission (6.2). Here a relationship is established between Mardochoaios and the king at the outset, one with important implications for the theme of court rivalry in the text-as-received. In this respect it is in sharp contrast to MT.

*θεραπεύειν ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ*. In the text-as-received, this development is in tension with A.2, where Mardochoaios is already identified as serving in the court; A.2 may be read as a proleptic reference, anticipating the present scene.



On the other hand, Mardochaios's role in plot<sup>2</sup> does seem to imply that he holds a position at court from the outset. Thus, the present verse may be understood in reference to a new appointment or promotion. (Compare AT where he is specifically appointed to serve the king: he will guard the doors.) In the received text of OG the king's public acknowledgement of Mardochaios as a benefactor in the opening scene bears on the interpretation of plot<sup>1</sup>, where, over-against the Hebrew, G attributes the conspiracy of the eunuchs to their dissatisfaction with Mardochaios's advancement (2.21). On one reading, which is admittedly quite persuasive, the outcome of plot<sup>2</sup> provides the dramatic motivation for plot<sup>1</sup>, transforming the place of the latter in the overall design of the narrative. That this was perhaps due to fortuity in the transmission of the text, rather than a conscious literary strategy on the part of a redactor, does not lessen its significance for the text-as-received.

Mara Brosius (2007, 55) observes that the key to the working of the Achaemenid court was personal recognition by the king and his bestowal of gifts to reward service. This is emphasized by Xenophon, *Cyr.*, 8.1.39, who credits Cyrus II with initiating the practice of inspiring loyalty through rewarding his subjects with gifts, preferment, and positions of authority: Πρὸς δὲ τούτῳ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων οὕστινας μάλιστα ὀρώη τὰ καλὰ διώκοντας, τούτους καὶ δώροις καὶ ἀρχαῖς καὶ ἔδραις καὶ πάσαις τιμαῖς ἐγέραιρεν· ὥστε πολλὴν πᾶσι φιλοτιμίαν ἐνέβαλλεν ὅπως ἕκαστος ὅτι ἄριστος φανήσοιτο Κύρῳ ("And besides this, he used to reward with gifts and positions of authority and seats of honour and all sorts of preferment others whom he saw devoting themselves most eagerly to the attainment of excellence; and thus he inspired in all an earnest ambition, each striving to appear as deserving as he could in the eyes of Cyrus" [Miller, LCL]). A system of royal favor and patronage—a service aristocracy—developed in which royal acknowledgement of individual courtiers provided them with the opportunity to increase their wealth and to enhance their status (Brosius 2007, 55). The system thus encouraged intense rivalries. This facet of Persian court culture was well known to Hellenistic authors, and became an established literary motif. While present in the Hebrew narrative, it is further developed in the Greek text-as-received, where rivalry and intrigue within the court is established early on as a central theme.

**καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ δόματα.** Mardochaios is rewarded not only with a promotion within the hierarchy of the court, but with gifts as well. According to Xenophon, *Anab.* 1.2.27, a Persian king showed favor through bestowing

specific gifts, that is, δῶρα ἃ νοίζεται παρὰ βασιλεῖ τίμια, ἵππον χρυσοχάλινον καὶ στρεπτὸν χρυσοῦν καὶ ψέλια καὶ ἀκινάκην χρυσοῦν καὶ στολὴν Περσικὴν (“gifts which are regarded at court as tokens of honour—a horse with a gold-mounted bridle, a gold necklace and bracelets, a gold dagger and a Persian robe” [Brownson, LCL]).

#### A.17

Καὶ ἦν Ἀμαν Ἀμαδαθου Βουγαῖος ἐνδοξος ἐνώπιον τοῦ βασιλέως· καὶ ἐξήγησεν κακοποιῆσαι τὸν Μαρδοχαῖον καὶ τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ὑπὲρ τῶν δύο εὐνούχων τοῦ βασιλέως.

But Haman son of Hamadathos, a Bougean, was highly esteemed by the king, and he sought to harm Mardochaios and his people because of the two eunuchs of the king.

The introduction of Haman marks the beginning of the second report (A.17), which has no counterpart in MT (compare the introduction of Haman at 3.1). Here he is identified from the outset as the antagonist of Mardochaios, and his motivation is established. His appearance is thematically linked to the palace intrigue, a transformation that has important implications for the text-as-received.

**Ἀμαν Ἀμαδαθου Βουγαῖος.** The proper-name designation (PN) of Haman favored by G (3.1; 9.10). In the Hebrew text the PN **המנ בן המדתא האגיט** (“Haman son of Hammedatha the Agagite,” NRSV), occurs four times (3.1, 10; 8.5; 9.24); and there are two variants, **המנ האגיט** (8.3) and **המנ בן המדתא** (9.10). Elsewhere the character is simply referred to as **המנ**. At 3.1 G renders the Hebrew PN **Ἀμαν Ἀμαδαθου Βουγαῖος**. **Ἀμαν** is an uninflected transliteration of Hebrew **המנ**, and **Ἀμαδαθου**, represents a partial assimilation of **המדתא בן** to Greek convention: **בן** (“son of”) is picked up by the genitive case of the transliteration. With the third item, however, OG diverges markedly from the Hebrew. While Haman is identified in MT as an Agagite (perhaps Amalekite, so later Jewish tradition), OG identifies him as a Bougean. The origin and meaning of the Greek term remains unknown (Moore 1977, 178). The designation appears again at 9.10, where **המנ בן המדתא** is rendered **Ἀμαν Ἀμαδαθου Βουγαῖος**. G simply uses **Ἀμαν** at 3.10, 8.3, and 8.5. At 9.24, however, where MT reads **המנ האגיט בן המדתא**, OG reads **Ἀμαν Ἀμαδαθου ὁ Μακεδών**. Dorothy (1997, 55) sees contemporizing exegesis in the change of PN designation. The substitution suggests to Moore (1977, 178) that Bougean (like Macedo-

nian) was an updated term of reproach: just as the Hebrew narrative uses Agagite to represent the implacable enemy of the Israelites, so G supplies contemporary terms for Hellenistic readers, the once opprobrious term “Bougean” giving way to “Macedonian.” (Compare the parallel to plot<sup>2</sup> in AT where Haman is likewise identified as Μακεδών.) This might suggest that the Greek form of the PN used at 9.24 is later (tradition historically) than that of A.17.

*ἐνώπιον τοῦ βασιλέως.* Moore (1977, 178) considers this a Hebraism, with *ἐνώπιον* matching Hebrew עֲנִי. Compare AT *κατὰ πρόσωπον τοῦ βασιλέως*, also a Hebraism, and thus suggestive of a common source.

*ἐξήγησεν κακοποιῆσαι τὸν Μαρδοχαῖον.* Given the thematic link between the introduction of the character Haman and plot<sup>2</sup>, and the juxtaposition of this section with the dream sequence, it is implied that Haman’s determination to harm Mardocheaios is in fulfillment of the dream. As Dorothy (1997, 51) observes, this has major implications for the rest of the book’s structure: the main plot is in effect a second complete fulfillment of the present episode.

*ὕπὲρ τῶν δύο εὐνούχων.* In the received text of OG Haman’s hostility is a direct result of the fact that Mardocheaios has informed on the conspirators with whom Haman was presumably in league (Moore 1977, 178). Cavalier (2012, 140) observes that this alters the sense of the book entirely. Compare MT in which Haman’s hatred arises from Mordecai’s refusal to prostrate himself. Moore (1977, 178) sees this as another inconsistency between OG and the Hebrew narrative, but it apparently represents a deliberate transformation. The implication that Haman was complicit in plot<sup>2</sup> is echoed in the text-as-received at Addition E.14, where Artaxerxes reveals Haman’s scheme to transfer the Persian Empire to the Macedonians. His intention in persecuting Mardocheaios, we learn at E.13, was to isolate the king by destroying his *σωτήρα* (“savior”) and *διὰ παντὸς ἐνεργέτην* (“constant benefactor,” NETS). Plot<sup>2</sup> may thus be read as part of a larger conspiracy against the empire (Cavalier 2012, 106). This suggests further that, for the narrative world of the text-as-received, Haman is also complicit in plot<sup>1</sup>. In this respect the abrupt juxtaposition of Haman’s promotion with the conclusion of plot<sup>1</sup> at 3.1 takes on added significance for the Greek reader.

Compare AT A.17 where, as part of his reward from the king, Mardocheaios receives Haman as his servant, which in turn motivates Haman’s

hatred. That the two texts are here genetically related is, however, relatively certain. The two read almost identically, with the exception of three minuses in AT relative to OG.

OG καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ δόματα περὶ τούτων καὶ ἦν Ἀμαν Ἀμαδάθου  
Βουγαῖος ἐνδοξος ἐνώπιον τοῦ βασιλέως·

AT καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ \_\_\_\_\_ περὶ τούτων \_\_\_\_\_ Ἀμαν Ἀμαδάθου  
Μακεδόνα \_\_\_\_\_ κατὰ πρόσωπον τοῦ βασιλέως

### Summary

This pericope presents an initial fulfilment of Mardocheaios's dream (with specific reference to the motif of the two dragons at A.5). Mardocheaios is established as a benefactor of the king (A.16), with Haman as his implacable enemy (A.17). Whereas in MT Haman's antagonism stems from Mordecai's refusal to prostrate himself (3.5–6), in the received text of OG it results from his role in thwarting a plot against the king (plot<sup>2</sup>) in which Haman is evidently implicated. In this way the story of Esther and Mardocheaios unfolds against the background of an intrigue at court in which Mardocheaios figures as a key player.

## It's a Question of Intelligence: Iob 34

Claude E. Cox

### Literature

- Beer**, Georg. 1897. *Der Text des Buches Hiob*. Marburg: Elwertsche.
- ♦ **Bratsiotis**, N. P. 1975. בִּשְׁרָ. TDOT 2:317–32. ♦ **Cadell**, Hélène. 1995. “Vocabulaire de la Législation ptolémaïque: Problème du sens de *dikaiôma* dans le Pentateuque.” Pages 207–21 in *Κατὰ τοὺς ὁ: Selon les Septante; Trent études sur la Bible grecque des Septante; en hommage à Marguerite Harl*. Edited by Gilles Dorival and Olivier Munnich. Paris: Cerf. ♦ **Clines**, David J. A. 2006. *Job 21–37*. WBC 18A. Nashville: Nelson.
- ♦ **Davidson**, A. B. 1918. *The Book of Job*. CBSC. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. ♦ **Dhorme**, Édouard. 1967 [French 1926]. *A Commentary on the Book of Job*. Translated by H. Knight. Nashville: Nelson.
- ♦ **Fabry**, H.-J. 1978. דָּל. TDOT 3:208–30. ♦ **Fohrer**, Georg. 1963. *Das Buch Job*. KAT 16. Gütersloh: Mohn. ♦ **Fox**, Michael V. 2005. “LXX-Proverbs as a Text-Critical Resource.” *Textus* 22:95–128. ♦ **Gordis**, Robert. 1978. *The Book of God and Man: A Study of Job*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. ♦ **Gorea**, Maria. 2007. *Job Repensé ou Trahi? Omissions et raccourcis de la Septante*. Études Bibliques NS 56. Paris: Gabalda. ♦ **Heater**, Homer. 1982. *A Septuagint Translation Technique in the Book of Job*. CBQMS 11. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America. ♦ **Homer**. 1924. *The Iliad with an English Translation*. Translated by A. T. Murray. LCL 170–71. London: Heinemann. ♦ **Homer**. 1950. *The Iliad*. Translated by E. V. Rieu. Penguin Classics. Harmondsworth: Penguin. ♦ **Orlinsky**, Harry M. 1959. “Studies in the Septuagint of the Book of Job.” *HUCA* 29:229–71; 30:153–67. ♦ **Pietersma**, Albert. 1985. Review of *Iob*, edited by Joseph Ziegler. *JBL* 104:305–11. ♦ **Plutarch**. 1868. *Phocion*. In vol. 4 of *Plutarch's Lives: The Translation called Dryden's corrected from the Greek and Revised*. Edited by A. H. Clough. Boston: Little, Brown. ♦ **Pope**, Marvin

H. 1965. *Job*. AB 15. Garden City, NY: Doubleday. ♦ **Pseudo-Justin**. 1996. *Cohortatio ad Graecos*. In vol. 4 of *Orphica: Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors*. Edited by Carl R. Holladay. SBLTT 40; SBLPS 14. Chico, CA: Scholars Press. ♦ **Tjen**, Anwar. 2010. *On Conditionals in the Greek Pentateuch: A Study of Translation Syntax*. LHBOTS 515. New York: T&T Clark. ♦ **Xenophon**. 1914. *Cyropaedia*. Translated by Walter Miller. 2 vols. LCL 51–52. London: Heinemann.

## Outline

The speech in chapter 34 is part of the Elious speeches (chs. 32–37). G retains the basic structure of the source text in chapter 34, while subjecting it to substantial changes. The asterisk tradition indicates that G omitted verses 3–4, 6b–7, 11b, 18b, 23a, 25b and one extended passage, 28–33. Like the source text, the OG has five sections: the narrator introduces the speaker (1); Elious invites “the wise” to listen and cites several of Iob’s claims (2–9). Third and fourth, Elious defends the Lord against these claims in two parts (10–20 and 21–27). Finally, Elious addresses Iob directly and tells him that he should quit his foolish talk (34–37). Notably G preserves the conclusion intact.

## Commentary

### 34.1: Introducing the speaker

ויען אליהוא ויאמר

Ὑπολαβὼν δὲ Ἐλιοῦς λέγει

Now Elious says in reply:

G renders the formulaic introduction in the typical way: a participle + finite verb represents the two, coordinated finite verbs of the source text. The participle ὑπολαβὼν + λέγω means “answer and say” or simply “reply” (LSJ, s.v. “ὑπολαμβάνω” 3.a; BDAG, s.v., 1.d). It appears with this meaning several times in Plato’s dialogues (e.g., *Phaed.* 69.e.6; *Leg.* 705.d.6) and in numerous other classical writers (e.g., Thucydides, Plutarch, Herodotus, Xenophon).

## 34.2–9: Elious cites Iob's claims

## 34.2, 4b (source text 2–4)

וידעים האזינו לי    מלי שמעו חכמים	2
וחד יטעם לאכל    [כי אזן מלין תבחן]	3
משפט נבחרה לנו    נדעה בינינו מה טוב	4

2a Ἀκούσατέ μου, σοφοί·

2b, 4b ἐπιστάμενοι ἐνωτίξεσθε τὸ καλόν·

“Hear me, you wise men;

Know and give ear to what is good—

Ziegler does not include τὸ καλόν (“what is good”) as part of his text. On this issue see Pietersma 1985, 308. Ziegler’s citation of the evidence is: (2b) fin B’-S\* O 534] + το (> 523 Syn) καλον rel: cf. 4b fin. The choice of the shorter text reflects an overreliance on MSS B-S, in reality one witness. Ziegler points us to the end of θ’ 4b as the source of τὸ καλόν (= מה טוב [“what is good,” NRSV]). Note that Theodotion uses ὃ τι καλόν to translate מה טוב, not τὸ καλόν. For his part, Édouard Dhorme (1967) thinks the shorter text is the result of homoioteleuton, (2b) האזינו to (4b) בינינו (“among ourselves”) but Dhorme too often clarifies omissions in the OG with this explanation. Rather, G is responsible for skipping from (almost) the end of verse 2 to the end of verse 4.

**Ἀκούσατέ μου.** G represents מלי (“my words”) with μου (“me”) in the genitive after ἀκούω. Hexaplaric witnesses (O II) replace μου with τα ρήματα μου (“my words”) (= MT); see also 33.31. The verb ἀκούω is G’s default rendering of שמע (“hear”), as is the case throughout the LXX.

**ἐπιστάμενοι.** The participle ידעים is usually read as a vocative (e.g., “You learned” NJPS), parallel to חכמים = σοφοί (so Zi, note the comma following ἐπιστάμενοι in his text; Brenton; NJPS). However, at 7.20b ἐπιστάμενοι is arthrous when used as a vocative and the same is true at 6.19b, where οἱ διορῶντες is vocative. Therefore ἐπιστάμενοι should be regarded as a circumstantial participle, so that both lines of the OG begin with a second-person plural imperative (see NETS). On the articulated participle used as a vocative, see BDF §§147; 412(5).

**ἐνωτίξεσθε.** G uses ἐνωτιζόμεναι to render **יָזַן** *hiphil* (“give ear”) in five of the six occurrences of **יָזַן** in Job (32.11; 33.1; 34.2, 16; 37.14; the exception is at 9.16) and this corresponds to the choice of OG translators generally (27x out of 41x). The first extant use of ἐνωτιζόμεναι is in Gen 4.23, so it appears to be a LXX neologism derived from ὠτίον, diminutive of οὖς “(ear)”. All instances of its use in Iob involve the imperative and an accusative direct object, as in verse 2.

**τὸ καλόν.** G’s omission means that ἐνωτίξεσθε has τὸ καλόν as a direct object. The expression τὸ καλόν does not occur elsewhere in Iob, but it occurs elsewhere in the LXX, including five times in Deuteronomy, where in each case it appears with τὸ ἀρεστόν (“what is pleasing”) (6.18; 12.25, 28; 13.18; 21.9). Following as it does σοφοί, it is possible that τὸ καλόν is to be understood in the light of Greek philosophy, where it is a concept that appears from the fifth century BCE onward. There its opposite is τὸ αἰσχρόν (“the shameful, base; vice”; LSJ, s.v. “καλός” [III.2]; “αἰσχροσύνη”). But, since G is less likely to borrow from Greek philosophy than from the law, there may well be an allusion to OG Deuteronomy. The fact that τὸ καλόν resonates with Greek philosophy is a plus for intellectuals among the intended audience.

In the OG, Elious alone is going to tell the other four “what is good,” whereas in the source text they are to determine this together (4: נדעה [“Let us”]). What he is going to say is “the good,” as the wise will recognize.

34.5, 6a, bβ (source text 5–7)

ואל הסיר משפטי		כי אמר איוב צדקתי	5
אנוש חצי בלי פשע		על משפטי אכזב	6
ישתה לעג כמים		מי גבר כאיוב	7

5 ὅτι εἴρηκεν Ἰὼβ Δίκαιός εἰμι,  
ὁ κύριος ἀπήλλαξέν μου τὸ κρίμα,  
6a ἐψεύσατο δὲ τῷ κρίματί μου,

because Iob has said, ‘I am righteous;  
the Lord dismissed my case,  
but he lied with respect to my case,

In verses 5–9 Elious quotes Job’s complaints against the Lord. G omits 6b (actually 6bα: see 8a), 7, apparently because their subject matter is a



digression, what with their talk of Iob's wound (6b) and his drinking up scoffing like water (7); note that verse 3 with its simile about food is also omitted.

**ὅτι εἴρηκεν.** Usually G employs γὰρ ("for") to represent causative כִּי, so NETS marks the choice of ὅτι with its translation "because." The perfect εἴρηκεν renders קָלַל *qal* perfect. Greek has more choices to represent "tenses" than does Hebrew and the perfect carries the nuance that Iob's claim has endured to the present moment. Compare G's use of the imperfect (1.5), aorist (3.3), and present tense (7.4) to render קָלַל perfect in other contexts.

**Δίκαιός εἰμι.** G uses the predicate adjective and verb "to be" to render קָדַק *qal* (stative), as generally (ca. 10x; e.g., 9.2, 15, 20; 10.15; 11.2).

**ὁ κύριος ἀπήλλαξέν.** G omits *waw* and uses (ὁ) κύριος to render אֱלֹהִים ("God") as elsewhere in Job (5.8). ἀπαλλάσσω ("remove") translates הִפְחִיל *hiphil* ("remove, take away") as at 9.34; 27.5. The use of ἀπαλλάσσω with κρίμα does not occur elsewhere and appears to be G's innovation.

**μου τὸ κρίμα.** "My case," or "my suit, lawsuit." The Lord has dismissed Iob's right to a trial. Here κρίμα ("judgment") is used in the sense of "dispute, lawsuit" (see *GELS*), as in the NT at 1 Cor 6.7 (cited in BDAG).

**ἐψεύσατο δὲ τῷ κρίματί μου.** G adds δέ ("but") to indicate that verse 6a involves a slight shift from 5b: not only will there be no trial but the Lord has acted deceitfully. Brenton translates 6a, "And he has erred (mg: *Gr.* lied) in my judgment"; Harry Orlinsky (1959, 29:268): "He has lied in my justice"; Homer Heater (1982, 108): "He acted falsely in condemning me." All three translations appear to presume that Iob's case has made it to trial.

The MT vocalizes כִּזְבִּי as a *piel* ("lie"), but often it is vocalized as a *niphal* ("prove oneself a liar," *HALOT*) as, apparently, in the NRSV; similarly, Tg. Job: "In spite of my right I am counted as a liar." Sometimes the verb is emended, for example, to כִּזְבָּה, the third-person singular ("he lies") on the basis of the LXX (so Pope 1965, 256), almost certainly a mistaken approach. It seems more likely to me that G has changed "I am counted a liar" to "he lied" in order to continue with the third-person singular. This is a change that G often makes for the sake of coherence and readability.

There is no manuscript evidence for **יִכְזֹב**, though it could have emerged from the dittography of the final *yod* of **מִשְׁפָּטִי**.

G renders **עַל מִשְׁפָּטִי** with **τῷ κρίματί μου**, a dative of respect (see BDF §197, including Hellenistic examples). Iob has been unable to get the Lord to address his suit. The Lord's "lie, deceit" consists in his refusal to accept that Iob is in the right.

34.8

וללכת עם אנשי רשע || וארח לחברה עם פעלי און

οὐχ ἁμαρτῶν οὐδὲ ἀσεβήσας  
ἢ ὁδοῦ κοινωνήσας μετὰ ποιούντων τὰ ἄνομα  
τοῦ πορευθῆναι μετὰ ἀσεβῶν.

seeing that I have not sinned or acted impiously  
or shared a way with doers of lawless acts,  
to walk with the impious.’

G omits verse 7. This and the change from third-person to first-person in verse 8 means that in the OG all of verses 5–6a, 8 becomes a citation by Elious of what Iob said. The OG 8a is marked with an obelus in MSS 706 740 Syh, indicating that Origen found it in his LXX text and that it was without an equivalent in the Hebrew. In fact, as Beer (1897, 215) recognizes—followed by Dhorme (1967, 511) and Heater (1982, 108)—OG 8a renders **בלי פשע** (“without transgression”) (6bβ). Zi puts a question mark after **ἀσεβῶν** because he has punctuated the ecclesiastical text as one text, where verse 7 initiates a question. NETS places a period at the end of verse 8.

**οὐχ ἁμαρτῶν οὐδὲ ἀσεβήσας**. G uses first the negated participle **οὐχ ἁμαρτῶν** to render **בלי פשע** (6bβ). See 33.9 where G employs the same unusual equivalence; there too Elious is quoting Iob. Note that **ἁμαρτάνω** does not elsewhere render **פשע** (“transgression”) in the LXX apart from Iob 33.9; Prov 28.24; 29.6. Indeed **ἁμαρτία**, the noun, rarely renders **פשע** (7x in Psalms; 3x LXX Daniel). The circumstantial participle expresses concession, “though I have not sinned,” perhaps even cause, “because ...” (see “since I have done no wrong” [33.9a]; Smyth §§2060, 2064, 2066).

Dhorme (1967, 511) followed by Heater (1982, 108) suggests that **οὐδὲ ἀσεβήσας** (“and did not act impiously”) represents a second translation of **בלי פשע** but read as **בלי רשע** (“without wickedness”). In favor of

this suggestion is the fact that ἀσεβέω and its cognates usually render רשע and its cognates in Job (e.g., 10.7). Perhaps G saw a certain wordplay in רשע – פשע. At any rate, G has represented בלי פשע with two participial constructions that together serve to emphasize Job's denial of wrongdoing by including the general sense of פשע (ἁμαρτάνω) and a narrower sense, that is, with respect to religion (ἀσεβέω). G's use of ἀσεβέω in verse 8a anticipates verse 8c. The repetition can only be intentional: Job definitely avoided acts of impiety.

ἢ ὁδοῦ κοινωνήσας. G chooses the disjunctive ἢ (“or”) rather than translate *waw* literally with “and” (δέ or καί). The OG continues with the first-person, whereas the source text shifts to the third-person. As a result G sets up a contrast between Job's activities as an individual and those undertaken with others.

G paraphrases ארח לחברה (“journey for company”) (see *DCH*, s.v. “ארח,” “way”) with κοινωνέω (“have *or* do in common with, share, take part in a thing with another” LSJ) + genitive ὁδοῦ so “share a way, road.” HRCS connect ὁδός with ארח (?)—their question mark is not really needed—and κοινωνέω with חברה. The verb κοινωνέω and its cognates occur seldom in the LXX where there is a clear source text—about a dozen times—but in most of these the κοινωνέω – חבר equation obtains. Therefore G is using an equivalence employed elsewhere in the LXX. That being said, while G captures the meaning of the source text in verse 8b, the idiom is changed, from share company to share a road or way. With verse 8bc compare Ps 1.1.

τοῦ πορευθῆναι μετὰ ἀσεβῶν. G passes over *waw* (“and [walks]”). In the source text the preposition ל expresses purpose, both with the noun חברה and with the infinitive לכת (הלך), so literally, “(a path) *for* company ... and *to* walk, and so on.” G subordinates the infinitive to the first member of the parallel, so the *waw* (וללכת) must be passed over. In the OG verse 8b and 8c are not parallel, as in the source text, but one statement. Job says that he did not share a way or street with the lawless in order to have dealings with the impious. G reduces אנשי רשע (lit. “people of wickedness”) to (οἱ) ἀσεβεῖς (“the impious,” those who act irreligiously). Not only did Job do no wrong himself (8a), but he did not associate with those who did (8bc).

μὴ γὰρ εἶπης ὅτι Οὐκ ἔσται ἐπισκοπὴ ἀνδρός·  
καὶ ἐπισκοπὴ αὐτῷ παρὰ κυρίου.

For do not say, ‘There will be no visitation of a man’—  
and there is visitation to him from the Lord!

**μὴ γὰρ εἶπης ὅτι.** G changes the verb from third-person singular to second-person singular, and changes the introduction to the quotation into an admonition by adding the particle *μὴ* (“[do] not [say]”). In the OG Elious chides Iob directly. The change in person leaves verse 9 with its causative *γάρ* (“for”) slightly awkward: it opens an address to Iob alone (“you” [sg.]) as one of “you wise men” (2a). The particle *ὅτι* marks the opening of direct speech, as at 7.13; 11.4; 32.7. Its use is a mark of familiar style (Smyth §2590a).

**Οὐκ ἔσται ἐπισκοπὴ ἀνδρός.** HRCS cite as the equivalents of (9a) *εἶναι ἐπισκοπή* and (9b) *ἐπισκοπή* the verbs *יבס* (“benefit, profit” BDB) and *יצר* (“be pleased with, favorable to” BDB), respectively. *DCH* glosses 9aβ as “it does not profit a man.” Certainly the meaning of *יבס* is the subject of some speculation; see Clines 2006, 747–48. Nonetheless, at a glance one can see that G at best paraphrases verse 9a and constructs 9b in relation to 9a.

Since verse 9a cites Iob’s own words, G must use the Greek of the passage cited, likely 6.14: *ἀπείτατό με ἔλεος, ἐπισκοπὴ δὲ κυρίου ὑπερείδεν με* (“Mercy has renounced me, and the visitation of the Lord has disregarded me”). There was a time when this was not true (29.4), but now the Lord has abandoned Iob. “Man” (*ἀνδρός*) is generic; it includes Iob.

**καὶ ἐπισκοπὴ αὐτῷ.** G adds *καί*. It is not simply a conjunction: Brenton renders it “whereas”; NETS with “when” (see Smyth §2871). Somehow *ἐπισκοπὴ αὐτῷ* represents *יִצְרָהּ*—an infinitive construct of *יצר* with third singular masculine possessive suffix and prefixed preposition *ב*, so “that he should delight himself with God” (ASV). The preposition is replaced by *καί* and the suffixed *waw* (“his”) becomes *αὐτῷ* (“to him”), likely a reference to Iob. G then replaces the infinitive construct with a noun that has a different meaning. It can be no accident that G repeats *ἐπισκοπή*.

In verse 9a *ἐπισκοπή* has a positive meaning, if the Lord’s attention is a positive thing. With its repetition in 9b Elious fully, precisely, and exactly refutes Iob’s claim that the Lord does not “visit.” The Lord does “visit,” but not in the way Iob expected. If we ask *how* the Lord has “visited” Iob, the answer may lie in 33.19–22.

**παρὰ κυρίου.** G changes עִם (“with”) to “from” (παρὰ + genitive) to suit the interpretation placed upon verse 9b.

34.10–20: Elious’s theodicy, first part

34.10

לִבְּכֵן אֲנָשִׁי לִבָּב שְׁמַעוּ לִי  
חֲלִלָה לֹאֵל מִרְשָׁע || וּשְׂדֵי מַעוֹל

διό, συνετοὶ καρδίας, ἀκούσατέ μου  
Μή μοι εἴη ἔναντι κυρίου ἀσεβῆσαι  
καὶ ἔναντι παντοκράτορος ταραῖσαι τὸ δίκαιον.

Therefore, you intelligent of heart, hear me:  
far be it from me to act impiously before the Lord  
and before the Almighty, to pervert what is right.

**συνετοὶ καρδίας.** That is, “intelligent (in matters) of the heart,” an interpretation of לִבְּכֵן אֲנָשִׁי, literally “people of heart,” “you who have sense” (NRSV); Tg. Job: “you men who are wise of heart.” The phrase σύνετος + genitive means “*intelligent in a thing*” (LSJ). In Greek συνετοί is a sufficient rendering of the source text, for in Greek the heart is not the locus of intelligence. Nevertheless G adds καρδίας, following the Hebrew, where the heart is the center of thinking processes. The adjective συνετός is plural, like the underlying Hebrew, and presumably includes Iob if Iob comes around to Elious’s point of view.

**Μή μοι εἴη ἔναντι κυρίου.** G renders the negative interjection, חֲלִילָה לִי (“far be it from,” HALOT) with μή μοι εἴη (lit. “may it not be to me”), the optative with negative particle μή + dative μοι. That is, G adds לִי (“to me”) to the source text; the same construction appears at 27.5. The addition permits G to render לִיָּאֵל (“with respect to God”) as ἔναντι κυρίου. In OG Iob κύριος is the default translation of אֱלֹהִים. So it is that OG 10bc refers to Elious rather than to the Lord (see NRSV). His self-promotion is at the Lord’s expense! Elious asserts his piety to gain a hearing (10a) and to lend credence to his opinion, which follows (11).

**ἀσεβῆσαι ... ταραῖσαι.** G appears to vocalize מִרְשָׁע as מְרִשָּׁע, *qal* infinitive with preposition בְּ prefixed rather than as a noun with the preposition,

as in the MT; see *HALOT*, s.vv. “לָלִי” and “רָשַׁע” *qal*. The same is true of מַעוֹל: G has vocalized it as מַעְוֹל (“to act unjustly”), the *piel* infinitive of עוֹל I; see Fohrer (1963, 464, citing Hölscher et al.) and *HALOT*.

καὶ ἔναντι παντοκράτορος. G repeats the preposition, because שַׁדַּי (“Shad-dai”) is parallel to (10b) אֱלֹ (“God”). The word παντοκράτωρ (“almighty”) represents שַׁדַּי as generally in Iob; however, it is an equivalence unique to Iob in the LXX corpus.

ταράξαι τὸ δίκαιον. G interprets מַעוֹל (“[far be it from ...] to do iniquity”) with ταρασσῶ (“trouble; throw into disorder”) and τὸ δίκαιον (“what is right”), which is a good choice for the immediate and larger context; in the opening lines of the book, G has used the adjective δίκαιος of Iob (1.1). In the OG ἀσεβῆσαι and ταράξαι τὸ δίκαιον are parallel: religious life (θεοσέβεια [“piety”]) embraces ethics. The source text is about the Lord, but G turns it into a pledge by Elious about himself. Finally, G’s translation anticipates ταραξεί κρίσιν (“pervert justice”) (v. 12). The Lord will not pervert justice and Elious shares that virtue.

34.11

כִּי פֶעַל אָדָם יִשְׁלַם לוֹ || [וכֹּאֲרַח אִישׁ יִמְצָאֵנוּ]

ἀλλὰ ἀποδοῖ ἀνθρώπῳ καθὰ ποιεῖ ἕκαστος αὐτῶν.

Rather, he repays a person according to what each of them does.

G uses the strong adversative ἀλλά (“rather, but”) to represent כִּי (“for,” NRSV). Because G changed the subject in verse 10 to Elious (“far be it from *me*”), the connection with verse 10 in the source text (“far be it from *God*”) is severed. In verse 11 G preserves the content of the source text with its assertion of retributive justice, but collapses verses 11a and 11b together to avoid repetition.

ἀποδοῖ ... αὐτῶν. So also OG 24.20c. Origen, working in a mechanical fashion, placed verse 11b under the asterisk, but it seems clear that G has incorporated parts of both 11a and 11b in one line, albeit one long line. G uses ἀποδοῖ ἀνθρώπῳ (“he repays a person”) to render אָדָם יִשְׁלַם לוֹ (lit. “of a person he will repay *him*”); ποιεῖ = פֶּעַל (11a); καθὰ = כֹּאֲרַח (11b, so Beer 1897, 216); ἕκαστος = אִישׁ (11b) as at 2.11, 12; 42.11. G does not represent

the words אַרַח (“path”) (v. 11b) or the impersonal ימצאנו (“he will make it befall him”) (v. 11b), which is now redundant. Gerleman’s suggestion (*BHS<sup>app</sup>*) that perhaps we should read כפַעַל (rather than פַעַל כִּי) in verse 11a—surely based on the OG—can be set aside if καθά renders כָּ (11b).

34.12

אף אמנם אל לא ירשיע || ושודי לא יעות משפט

οἷη δὲ τὸν κύριον ἄτοπα ποιήσιν;  
ἢ ὁ παντοκράτωρ ταραῖξει κρίσιν;

Now, do you think the Lord will do what is amiss?  
Or will the Almighty pervert justice?

οἷη ... ἄτοπα ποιήσιν. G changes verse 12 from an assertion of two parallel lines into two rhetorical questions addressed to Iob. G replaces אף אמנם (“really and truly” *HALOT* s.v. “א”; “of a truth,” *NRSV*), with δέ to indicate a slight shift in Elious’s remarks (*Smyth* §2834, 2836). G has Elious direct his questions to Iob, as is clear from the addition of the second singular οἷη (“[do] you think”). Its use is a rhetorical device to summon the hearer’s attention. The verb οἶμαι occurs six times in Iob, not once with an equivalent in the source text (11.2; 34.12; 37.23; 38.2; 40.8; 42.3); it is a verb G likes.

G uses the compound verb (noun + verb) ἄτοπα ποίεω (“do things that are amiss”) to render רשע *hiphil* (“make oneself guilty” *HALOT*). This rendering is unique in Iob, where ἀσεβέω (“act impiously”) usually translates רשע, as in verse 10b. It is likely that G does not use ἀσεβέω a second time because of an interest in variety of expression. The subject of the future infinitive ποιήσιν is in the accusative case, so τὸν κύριον ποιήσιν (*Smyth* §936). The use of the future infinitive signifies that Elious’s claim on behalf of the Lord specifically includes the future (*Smyth* §1866).

The adjective ἄτοπος means “out of place” and, depending on the context, “absurd; strange; monstrous,” as well as “bad, harmful,” thus “wrong” at Iob 11.11; 35.13; 36.21a. Elious says that the Lord acts according to what we expect of the divine. The Lord does not act inappropriately; the Lord does not get it wrong.

ἢ ὁ παντοκράτωρ ταραῖξει κρίσιν. G connects verse 12b to 12a with the disjunctive particle ἢ (“or”) as at verses 8b and 8a rather than καί or δέ. The

result is that 12a and 12b no longer present two parallel thoughts but two alternatives that say much the same thing. On παντοκράτωρ see 10c. G uses *ταράξει κρῖσιν* to represent *עוֹת מִשְׁפָּט* (lit. “make justice crooked,” i.e., pervert justice; *DCH*, s.v. “מִשְׁפָּט” 2.) and thus repeats the source text at 10c. The repetition lends emphasis to Elious’s question.

34.13

ומי שם תבל כלה || מי פקד עליו ארצה

ὃς ἐποίησεν τὴν γῆν·

τίς δέ ἐστί· ὁ ποιοῦν τὴν ὑπ’ οὐρανὸν καὶ τὰ ἐνόντα πάντα;

He it is who made the earth.

And who is it that sustains what is under heaven and all it contains?

*ὃς ἐποίησεν τὴν γῆν*. G represents both lines of verse 13 in a way that has each refer to creation, in the past (*ἐποίησεν* [aorist] 13a) and as a continuing event (13b). The Greek *ὃς* is used as a demonstrative, rather than as a relative pronoun, so NETS “He it is who.” Other instances of this usage occur at 22.18; 24.12; 34.19. For 13a, compare Tg. Job “Who entrusted to him to make the earth?” which likewise introduces creation.

G read *מי ... ארצה* (“who ... the earth”) and filled it in with “made” on the basis of Gen 1.1 and similar texts (Ps 113.23; 120.2; 123.8; 133.3; 145.6; Jer 10.12—all “who ...”; Esa 37.16; Jer 39.17). Most of these use “sky and earth,” but not all: Esa 45.12; Jer 34.5 have only “earth.” The source text in verse 13a has only “earth” and 13b concerns the earth alone. At any rate, G introduces an explicit reference to creation. We need not enter into the problematic issue of the ה- on *אָרֶץ* (“earth”): is MT *אֶרֶץ* (“to the earth”) a misvocalization for *אֶרְצוֹ* = *אֶרְצוֹ* (“his earth”) (see *BHS<sup>app</sup>*; Clines 2006, 749)? The OG provides no help with that question.

*ὁ ποιοῦν τὴν ὑπ’ οὐρανόν*. Dhorme (1967, 514) thinks that G was inspired by Ps 23[24].1. This is unlikely since there is only the most general contact. Rather, G draws on verse 13a for *ἐστί· ὁ ποιοῦν*, and *τὴν ὑπ’ οὐρανόν*, and *τὰ ἐνόντα πάντα* are translations of *תבל* (“world” BDB) and *כלה* (“its whole, all of it”), respectively. G introduces creation as a continuing activity with the use of the present participle *ὁ ποιοῦν*, so NETS “that sustains.” In verse 13b it is parallel to *τὴν γῆν* “the earth.”



καὶ τὰ ἐνόντα πάντα. G separates תבל כלה, whereas they stand in apposition, “the world, all of it” (*HALOT*, s.v. “כל” 3.) in the source text; compare the NRSV’s, “the whole world.” Indeed, this is reminiscent of Ps 23[24].1, where ἡ γῆ καὶ τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτῆς renders הארץ ומלואה (“the earth and its fullness”). Human beings are included in OG “all it contains.” Implicitly the point seems to be that the Lord who made and sustains all things does not act contrary to this interest by perverting the rules.

34.14–15

רוחו ונשמתו אליו יאסף || אם ישים אליו לבו 14  
יגוע כל בשר יחד || ואדם על עפר ישוב 15

14 εἰ γὰρ βούλοιο συνέχειν  
καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα παρ’ αὐτῷ κατασχεῖν,  
15 τελευτήσει πᾶσα σὰρξ ὁμοθυμαδόν,  
πᾶς δὲ βροτὸς εἰς γῆν ἀπελεύσεται, ὅθεν καὶ ἐπλάσθη.

14 For if he should wish to confine  
and to keep his spirit with himself,  
15 all flesh will die together,  
and every mortal return to dust, whence too he was formed.

εἰ ... συνέχειν. G paraphrases verse 14 as a whole. Notably G attaches verses 14–15 to the rhetorical questions of verses 12–13 with γάρ, so that they become an example of the Lord’s sustaining interest in the world. The particle εἰ (“if”) (14a) marks the opening of the protasis of the conditional sentence.

G seems to attest ישיב (“should return, take back”) instead of ישים (“set [his mind to himself]”) in agreement with two Hebrew manuscripts, the *ketiv* of five oriental manuscripts and the Peshitta (Beer 1897, 216; see Clines 2006, 749). The former reading is widely preferred (so NRSV; Dhorme 1967, 515; Gordis 1978, 388; but not NJPS; Davidson 1918, 272–73; Fohrer 1963, 464; Clines 2006, 749); Tg. Job supports the MT text tradition. The expression שים לב אל means “regard, pay attention to” (*HALOT*, s.v. “שים” 14; see vv. 1.8; 2.3).

G adds βούλοιο, optative third-person singular. The verb βούλομαι appears nine times in Job: four times HRCS mark it with a dagger † (30.14; 35.13; 36.12; 37.10); two or three times it renders חפץ (“desire; delight in”

HALOT) (9.3; 13.3[?]; 21.14); once G uses it for אבה (“want”) (39.9); once they mark the suggested equivalence with a question mark (34.14 [שים לב?]). That is, apart from three instances where there is a clear equivalent, G’s use of βούλομαι in Iob is problematic. At 34.14 it appears G has added it rather than that it represents the use of שים לב. With βούλοιτο G introduces the nuance of choice and desire. The use of the optative in the protasis indicates a low level of possibility, while the use of the future indicative in the apodosis indicates a high level of certainty: it is unlikely that the Lord would so act (14) but if he did, the result stated would be highly likely (15).

So εἰ βούλοιτο συνέχειν represents אם ישיב (“if he should take back”). Note that G uses a synonym of συνέχειν in 14b and that semantically both infinitives are tied to βούλοιτο. G passes over לבו (“his heart”) as do the NRSV and other translations and commentators on MT.

καὶ ... κατασχεῖν. G adds the conjunction καί to join verse 14b to 14a and passes over ונשמתו (“and his breath”). The Greek τὸ πνεῦμα (“[his] spirit”) renders רוחו. G uses παρ’ αὐτῷ κατασχεῖν (“[if he should wish] with him to keep”) to render אליו יאסף (“to himself [should] gather”). The choice of κατέχω (“hold back, withhold”) to render אסף is unique, but stands out as a fine, contextual translation. LSJ cite a variety of related meanings for κατέχω that are suggestive: “place under arrest; sequester; confine” (of the grave).

G has rendered verse 14 at the sentence level, passing over לבו in 14a and נשמתו in 14b, and adding βούλοιτο to govern the two synonymous infinitives that represent the two finite verbs in the parent text. With G’s reduction of “heart,” “spirit,” and “breath” to “spirit” alone the focus is placed on the Lord’s spirit, necessary for all life (so Gen 6.17).

G renders the apodosis of the conditional sentence (15) more or less literally, but adds the adverbial clause at the end of 15b.

τελευτήσει. G uses τελευτάω (“come to an end, die”; see τέλος [“end”]) to render גוּל (“perish”). Elsewhere in Iob, except at 27.15 (HRCS †), τελευτάω translates מוּת (“die”) (9x), as throughout the LXX corpus. G’s choice of τελευτάω emphasizes the blunt finality of the Lord’s decision to withhold his spirit. Tjen (2010, 55) thinks the use of the future indicative in the apodosis after the optative in the protasis betrays interference from the *yiqtol* יִגּוּל.

**πᾶσα σάρξ.** This is a Hebraism that refers to all living things (Gen 7.21) or all human beings (e.g., Ps 64.3; Esa 40.5). It occurs only here in Job but would be immediately familiar to readers of the LXX.

**πᾶς δὲ βροτὸς εἰς γῆν ἀπελεύσεται.** βροτός (“mortal”) is a word of the Greek poets that G uses—uniquely in the LXX—seventeen times. G adds πᾶς (“every”) to emphasize the inescapability of the will of the deity. The NRSV adds “all,” but compare “mankind” (NJPS) and “humanity” (Clines 2006, 744). The verb ἀπέρχομαι εἰς (“go away to”) renders עַל שׁוּב (“return to”). The same equivalence occurs at 1.21, but without prepositions. In the context, “go away to” means “return to” (NETS). Job’s fear is that he will “go away to” the earth (7.21), that is, die.

**ὄθεν καὶ ἐπλάσθη.** That is, implicitly, formed *by the Lord*. This is an addition to the text by G and Origen placed it under an obelus (÷) to indicate it had no equivalent in the Hebrew text. As Dhorme (1967; followed by Heater 1982) recognizes, it is an allusion to Gen 3.19, (εἰς τὴν γῆν) ἐξ ἧς ἐλήμφθης (“[to the earth] from which you were taken”). Genesis 2.7, 8, 15, use πλάσσω so that the allusion seems to include 2.7 (Bratsiotis 1977, 325). In that case, the allusion is conflated.

34.16

הַזִּינָה לְקוֹל מִלִּי || וְאִם בִּינָה שְׁמַעָה זֹאת

εἰ δὲ μὴ νουθετῇ, ἄκουε ταῦτα,  
ἐνωτίζου φωνὴν ῥημάτων.

But lest he rebuke you, hear these things;  
give ear to a sound of words.

**εἰ δὲ μὴ νουθετῇ.** NRSV, NJPS, TNIV, and others disregard the *waw* that begins verse 16. G renders it with the adversative conjunction δέ (“but”) to indicate a slight shift. It seems that the contrast is with verse 13: the Lord sustains all things but he can also be a source of rebuke.

G changes the protasis of the conditional clause (“If ...”) into a caution (“[But] lest ...”) by adding the negative particle μή. Gerleman, among others, suggests emending בִּינָה (“understanding”) to בִּינְתָה (“you understand”) (*BHS<sup>app</sup>*), but the OG, Tg. Job, and other versions may well be loosely rendering “And if (there is) understanding (on your part)” (see

Dhorme 1967, 515; Clines 2006, 749–50). G uses *νουθετέω* for the cognate verb בִּין in the *hithpael* at 37.14; 38.18.

**ταῦτα.** G regularly uses the plural for the singular demonstrative pronouns **זֶה** and **זֶה** (“this”), depending on the context (e.g., 1.22; 2.10; 5.27; 19.26; 37.14).

**φωνῇν ῥημάτων.** In Greek the possessive pronoun “my” may be implicit, “(the sound of) of *my* words” (so NETS 2006)—see “hear *me*” (10); this is explicit in the source text.

34.17

ואם צדיק כביר תרשיע || האף משפט שונא יחבוש

ἴδε σὺ τὸν μισοῦντα ἄνομα  
καὶ τὸν ὀλλύντα τοὺς πονηροὺς ὄντα αἰώνιον δίκαιον.

Look then at him that hates lawless acts  
and destroys the wicked, since he is forever just.

Zi sets out the OG in three lines, so that “since he is forever just” becomes 17c. NETS treats verse 17 as two lines. This simplifies discussion of the relationship of the OG to its parent text. G rewrites verse 17; see Beer 1897, 217: *phantasiert* (“fancies”). The OG has only two points of contact with the parent text: τὸν μισοῦντα and שֹׂנֵא; δίκαιον and צַדִּיק. G takes יַחְבֹּשׁ (“Shall one ... govern”) (17a) with 17b; and the last word of 17b, תַּרְשִׁיעַ (“will you condemn”), with verse 18.

**ἴδε σύ.** The translation is “Look then at (him)” or “Look for yourself at (the one).” Elious has just said, “Give ear,” that is, use one’s ears, and now G has Iob *look at*, use his eyes, in this addition that introduces OG verse 17. G changes 17 from two rhetorical questions that expect a negative answer (see HALOT, s.v. “אָ” 5.) to an admonition.

**τὸν μισοῦντα ἄνομα.** G uses *ἄνομα* to replace משפט. A change of some kind was required after the introduction of ἴδε σύ: now “the one who hates” is the object, not subject as in the source text, of יַחְבֹּשׁ (“govern,” NRSV). G could not have the Lord hating justice; an opposite was required, such as *ἄνομα*. That G was motivated by theological reasons in this change (so

Dhorme 1967, 516) is debatable, given the freedom with which the entire verse is treated. It is notable that G chooses *ἄνομα*—it derives from the translator's own ideas—because the choice reveals the translator's preferred vocabulary for wrongdoing.

**καὶ τὸν ὀλλύντα τοὺς πονηροὺς.** G interprets חבש (“fetter, imprison”; see 40.13 and *HALOT*, s.v. “חבש” *qal* 5.) with ὀλλυμι (“destroy”), and nicely coordinates it with τὸν μισοῦντα by adding καί and by turning the finite verb of the parent text into a participle. G adds the direct object τοὺς πονηροὺς (“the wicked”), thus constructing with verse 17b a parallel for 17a. It is the wicked, such as Job (v. 8), who perform lawless acts.

**ὄντα αἰώνιον δίκαιον.** G passes over וא, that is, the connector *waw* and the וא that marks the beginning of a disjunctive question, and uses a participial construction to represent the adjective) צדיק “righteous”). The adjective αἰώνιον (“eternal”) is an interpretation of כביר (“mighty”). G preserves the asyndeton of the parent text: αἰώνιον δίκαιον = צדיק כביר. NETS understands the circumstantial participle as expressing cause, so “since he is forever just” (Smyth §§2054, 2056, 2064). The Lord’s treatment of the wicked stems from a just character. “Forever” means “always,” including Job’s time and place.

34.18a–19

[רשע אל נדיבים] || האמר למלך בליעל 18  
 19 אשר לא נשא פני שרים || ולא נבר שוע לפני דל  
 כי מעשה ידיו כלם

18a ἀσεβῆς ὁ λέγων βασιλεῖ Παρανομεῖς,  
 19 ὃς οὐκ ἐπησχύνθη πρόσωπον ἐντίμου  
 οὐδὲ οἶδεν τιμὴν θέσθαι ἀδροῖς  
 θαυμασθῆναι πρόσωπα αὐτῶν.

18a Impious is he who says to a king, ‘You are acting lawlessly;’—  
 19 he who felt no reticence before a person of worth  
 nor knows how to accord honor to the prominent  
 so that their persons be respected.

**ἀσεβῆς ὁ λέγων.** G vocalizes האמר as האמר, the masculine participle with an article, “the one who says,” rather than MT’s infinitive construct אמר

(“to say”) with the interrogative ה prefixed, so “Is it fit to say?” (ASV<sup>mg</sup>) The OG reading of the Hebrew, shared with the Peshitta and Vulgate, is widely accepted (*BHS*<sup>app</sup>; NRSV). G takes תרשיע (“you are guilty [who says]”) (v. 17b) with verse 18a. Gerleman (*BHS*<sup>app</sup>) notes two manuscripts read the third singular ירשיע so it is possible, if remotely, that G is following a text that read ירשיע האמר (“the one is guilty who says”). Elious has in mind Iob as that unspecified person.

**βασιλεῖ Παρανομεῖς.** “To a king” repeats the parent text. I see no “sympathy for the monarchy” in G’s treatment of 18 (contra Gorea 2007, 176). G uses παρανομέω (“transgress”)—it occurs only here in Iob—to interpret בליעל, a word whose meaning is disputed: *HALOT* offers “good for nothing” for the adjective and for 34.18 the more colloquial “ne’er do well.” G’s rendering is contextual: in verse 17, the Lord hates lawless acts and now this is the precise accusation made against the deity (by Iob implicitly, according to Elious). Iob the accuser is surely impious.

In the source text it is clear that verse 19 concerns the Lord, the king (18a), who shows no partiality. In the OG, however, it is the impious (18a), in ad hominem language, who have no respect for those deserving of it, including the Lord. G replaces 19c in its entirety because it has no place after the changes made to 19ab. Those changes were made to keep Iob the focus of attention. G is smoothing out the source text for Greek readers. At the same time G appears to have some interest in retaining the length of the verse.

**ὅς οὐκ ἐπῆσχύνθη πρόσωπον ἐντίμου.** Literally, “who was not ashamed at the face of an honored person.” On ὅς see verse 13. G uses ἐπαισχύνομαι to represent the Hebrew idiom נשא פנים (“lift the face of,” i.e., show respect to; *DCH*, s.v. “נשא” *qal* 1b). G employs the same approach, but with the simplex αἰσχύνω, at 32.21. This lexical choice is unique in the LXX, where αἰσχύνω generally renders בוש, as at Iob 19.3. Apart from *Il.* 18.24—where αἰσχύνω (active mood) πρόσωπον means “soil the face” and “face” is understood literally—and patristic commentators (Basil, Chrysostom), this collocation does not occur in Classical Greek, so it should be regarded as a LXX neologism, indeed, one for which G may be responsible. In that case, “face” might be retained in the translation (so Brenton; LXX.D). Note that G is going to use a synonymous LXX neologism in verse 19c.

G uses *ἐντιμος* in the singular to render *שׂר*, a plural. The word *שׂר* has a variety of meanings, including “royal official, commander” or, more generally, a person of note (see *HALOT*; NRSV: “noble”). The translation *ἐντιμος* understands *שׂר* in a most general way. Plato uses *ἐντιμος* of people held in honor (*Euthyd.* 281c) and Xenophon of people of high rank (*Cyr.* 8.1.8: *ἐφοίτων ... ἐπὶ τὰς θύρας Κύρου οἱ ἐντιμοὶ σὺν τοῖς ἵπποις*, [“the nobles came to Cyrus’s court with their horses” (Miller, LCL)]). The change from plural to singular is significant; the single “person of worth” is almost certainly Elious, so Elious intends, “a person of worth, *like me*.” The impious’s impudent mistreatment of a king (18) is repeated in Job’s behavior.

*οὐδὲ οἶδεν τιμὴν θέσθαι ἀδροῖς*. G adds the verb *οἶδεν* (“[nor] knows”). With it G introduces the idea of ignorance: the impious person (Job) does not know any better!

G treats *נכר* as a *hiphil*, “recognize,” and renders it with the compound verb *τίθημι τιμὴν* (“accord honor”), a few examples of which are extant in classical authors such as Homer, Plato, Libanius, and Plutarch. In the *Iliad* the goddess Hera addresses Apollo on behalf of Achilles, *εἰ δὲ ὁμῆν Ἀχιλλεῖ Ἑκτορι θήσετε τιμὴν* (“if indeed ye gods will vouchsafe like honour to Achilles and to Hector” [24.57; Murray, LCL]). Rieu renders the expression with “had it in mind to value” (Homer 1950, 438). J. Dryden uses “show respect” in his translation of Plutarch’s *Phoc.* (17.9.2), a good English equivalent, if less literary than NETS.

The word *ἀδρός*, literally meaning “stout, thick,” is used metaphorically with the meaning “fine, well-grown” (LSJ). NETS uniformly renders it as “prominent,” “the prominent (ones)” in the plural (2 Rgns 15.18; 3 Rgns 1.9; 4 Rgns 10.6, 11; Job 29.9; 34.19; Esa 34.7; Jer 5.5). HRCS cite *ל* (“[the] poor”) as the equivalent of *ἀδρός* in the parent text; Dhorme (1967, 517) and H.-J. Fabry (1978, 216) think G has read *גדול* (“great”) instead of *ל*. Rather, it is more likely that G uses *ἀδρός* to render *שׁוֹע* (“[the] noble, eminent”; *HALOT*, s.v. “שׁוֹע” I B.) and changes the number from singular to plural; see *σ’ πλουσίοις* (“to the rich”). If the “person of worth” is Elious, “the prominent (ones)” are likely Elious and the three friends; OG 19b forms a nice parallel for 19a. G passes over *לפני דל* (“than the poor,” NRSV).

*θαυμασθῆναι πρόσωπα αὐτῶν*. G replaces verse 19c of the source text with this retake on 19a, altered to suit its relationship with 19b. G apparently

wants to emphasize that certain people—let alone the Lord!—should be respected. For this restatement G uses θαυμάζω πρόσωπον (lit. “admire the face”), presumably to be understood metaphorically, a collocation that first appears in Greek literature at Gen 19.21 as a translation of נִשָּׂא פָנִים. A TLG search locates only one occurrence of θαυμάζω πρόσωπον outside the LXX and related materials, and in that case it is used literally of admiring someone’s face (Chariton, *Callihroe*, 2.2 [second century CE]). It should therefore be regarded as a LXX neologism. G has used it already at 13.10; 22.8; 32.22.

G’s use of familiar Semitic expressions ἐπαισχύνομαι πρόσωπον and θαυμάζω πρόσωπον preserves something of the source text for Jewish readers in a translation that usually aspires to meet the literary expectations of a Greek environment. That the two expressions occur in such close proximity is striking.

34.20

יגעשו עם ויעברו || רגע ימתו וחצות לילה  
ויסירו אביר לא ביד

κενὰ δὲ αὐτοῖς ἀποβήσεται τὸ κεκραγέαι καὶ δεῖσθαι ἀνδρός·  
ἐχρήσαντο γὰρ παρανόμως  
ἐκκληνομένων ἀδυνάτων.

But the crying out and begging of a man will prove to be  
of no use to them;  
for they treated them contrary to the law  
when the powerless were being turned aside.

NETS sets up its translation in three lines and the Greek above follows that arrangement. This is appropriate because elements of OG verse 20b and 20c reflect the Hebrew of 20b and 20c, respectively. Zi joins 20c (above) to 20b so that the OG in his edition has two long lines.

**κενὰ ... ἀνδρός.** G again rewrites the source text. G seems to be offering an expansive interpretation of verse 20a and possibly (20ba) יגעשו עם (“the people are shaken,” NRSV), read as a reversal of fortune for the impious (v. 18; the disrespectful of v. 19) as a group and for Iob in particular: “in a moment they die, in the middle of the night,” that is, God takes the impious suddenly in the night and there is no one to help them. G adds the



adversative δέ so that verse 20 marks a slight shift. Most notably ἀνδρός (“of a man”), masculine singular, represents עַם and without doubt refers to Iob! A person like Iob will cry out and beg the Lord but it will be of no use.

The parallel infinitival constructions τὸ κεκραγέῖναι καὶ [τὸ] δεῖσθαι ἀνδρός stand in apposition to κενά (lit. “empty”), a predicate nominative and subject of ἀποβήσεται (Smyth §1987). The indirect object αὐτοῖς (“to them”) appears to refer to the impious. The verb ἀποβαίνω, used impersonally in the sense of “turn out to be” is a favorite for G. Once humbled, the impious should expect no mercy from those they have held in disrespect, including the Lord (see v. 21).

**ἐχρήσαντο γὰρ παρανόμῳς.** Or, “for they acted lawlessly.” G connects verse 20b to 20a with γάρ so that 20bc provides the reason for the merciless treatment that will come upon the impious. Verse 20b represents G’s interpretation of עֲבָרוּ: G understands עָבַר not as “pass away” (NRSV) but as “overstep, contravene” (HALOT, “עָבַר” I *qal* 7), hence “transgress (the law).” The verb χράσμαι (“use [someone or somehow], treat”) is another verb G likes to employ (also 16.9). NETS adds “them”—it refers to the powerless of 20c, which is required for the rendering of χράσμαι into English.

**παρανόμῳς.** “Lawlessly, contrary to the law” (of Moses) is an echo of 18a, where the impious make the accusation against the king that he is breaking the law.

**ἐκκλινομένων ἀδυνάτων.** There is an echo here of OG 24.4. G paraphrases verse 20c with this circumstantial participle construction in the genitive absolute that explains *how* the impious acted lawlessly (Smyth §2058, 2060). The passive participle ἐκκλινομένων (“turned aside”) represents יָסִירוּ (“they remove”), סֹר *hiphil*, which, indeed, can be understood to have an indefinite subject and be rendered with a passive verb (GKC §144g; so NRSV).

G seems to read אָבִיר (“the mighty,” NRSV) as the participle אוֹבֵד (“one perishing”; so Dhorme 1967, 519) and uses ἀδύνατος (“powerless”) to render it. Further, G may have read לֹא בִיד as “nothing in (his) hand”; Beer says ἀδυνατούς represents לֹא בִיד (1897, 218). In Iob the powerless are the poor, but not just the poor, and they are the opposite of the ἀσεβείς (“the impious”) (20.19; 24.4, 22). Iob claims he was a “father of the powerless” (29.16), a claim Elious implicitly refutes.

34.21–27: Elious’s theodicy, second part

34.21–22

וכל צעדיו יראה || כי עיניו על דרכי איש 21  
להסתר שם פעלי און || אין חשך ואין צלמות 22

21 αὐτὸς γὰρ ὁρατὴς ἐστὶν ἔργων ἀνθρώπων,  
λέληθεν δὲ αὐτὸν οὐδὲν ὧν πράσσουσιν·

22 οὐδὲ ἔσται τόπος  
τοῦ κρυβῆναι τοὺς ποιοῦντας τὰ ἄνομα·

21 For he is an eyewitness of human deeds,  
and nothing of what they do has escaped him,

22 nor will there be a place  
to hide for those that do lawless acts.

**αὐτὸς ... ἀνθρώπων.** G follows the source text with its causative particle: γάρ (“for”) renders כִּי, so that verses 21–22 serve to explain why the impious should not expect mercy (20a).

The expression “his eyes (are) upon” is rendered using the following elements: the pronoun αὐτός (“he”), the verb “to be” (ἐστίν), a predicate noun, ὁρατὴς (“viewer, eyewitness”), and the genitive case. Only G Iob uses ὁρατὴς among LXX translators, here and at 35.13. Its cognate verb is used in an Alexandrian poem that predates OG Iob. Pseudo-Justin (third–fourth century CE) cites Pseudo-Orpheus, οὐδέ τις αὐτὸν εἰσοράα θνητῶν, αὐτὸς δέ γε πάντες ὁρᾶται (“and no one among mortals sees Him, though He indeed sees everyone” [trans. Holladay; Pseudo-Justin 1996, 104–5; see also 66–68]). In Eusebius the poem is attributed to Aristobulus (second century BCE; see Eusebius, *Praep. ev.*, 13.12, and Pseudo-Justin 1996, 66; 129 n. 37).

According to Dhorme (1967, 519), G avoids the anthropomorphism of “his eyes,” but note that G uses the same elevated language with respect to wisdom at 28.21 (Orlinsky, 1959, 30:165; 29:237–38). G interprets דרכים (“ways”) with ἔργοι (“works, actions, deeds”), a contextual rendering that has in mind verse 20bc.

**λέληθεν δὲ αὐτὸν οὐδὲν ὧν πράσσουσιν.** This, too, is a paraphrase, wherein the positive assertion of the source text, parallel to 21a, is restated as a contrastive parallel. This translation technique, whereby a positive state-

ment is turned into a negative that means the same thing, is called “converse translation”; it is also known from the targumim; see Orlinsky 1959, 29:231–38, cited in Fox 2005, 116 n. 35; Fox refers to articles on this technique by M. Klein and R. P. Gordon.

G's treatment of verse 21b represents an interest in stylistic variation. G paraphrases כל צעדיו (“all his steps”) with οὐδέν ὧν πράσσουσιν (“nothing of what they do”), a fitting parallel for ἔργοι (“deeds”) (v. 21a). If anything, the OG is more comprehensive than the source text: “he sees everything,” a truism, becomes “nothing, not a thing” escapes the Lord. The verb πράσσω carries the nuance of not simply “doing” but of practicing (see LSJ, s.v. “πράσσω,” II.4 and 5; IV.).

οὐδὲ ἔσται τόπος. Zi prints verse 22 as one long line and NETS 2006 follows suit. However, the Greek divides nicely into two lines, like BHS; OG 22a is a paraphrase, as is clear from a comparison of the OG and MT and their respective translations. G connects verse 22 to 21 with δέ and supplies the verb “to be,” notably in the future tense (ἔσται). G makes 22a more inclusive than the source text, since “no place” is a larger domain than “gloom and darkness.”

τοὺς ποιοῦντας τὰ ἄνομα. This is a Hebraism; see verse 8. The plural participle is in the accusative case as the subject of the (purposive) infinitive τοῦ κρυβῆναι (see Smyth §§936 and 2008). G used ἄνομα (“lawless acts”) at verse 17. Elious and the friends believe Iob is such a person in spite of the disclaimer Elious cites (v. 8). This is true also of the source text.

34.23b–24, 25a (source text 23–25)

להלך אל אל במשפט || [איש ישים עוד כי לא על] 23  
 ירע כבירים לא חקר || ויעמד אחרים תחתם 24  
 לבן יכיר מעבדיהם || [והפך לילה וידכאו] 25

23b ὁ γὰρ κύριος πάντας ἐφορᾷ,  
 24 ὁ καταλαμβάνων ἀνεξιχνίαστα,  
 ἔνδοξά τε καὶ ἐξάίσια, ὧν οὐκ ἔστιν ἀριθμὸς.  
 25a ὁ γνωρίζων αὐτῶν τὰ ἔργα

23b For the Lord observes all people—  
 24 he who comprehends inscrutable things,  
 things both glorious and extraordinary, without number,

25a he who discloses their workings.

Origen worked mechanically in preparing the Hexapla. The OG of verse 23 is a line shorter in the OG than the Hebrew, so he marked 23a as lacking a translation in the OG, but he might as well have so marked 23b instead, for the OG is a translation of neither line. Yet we may note that γάρ represents כִּי (23a); πάντας likely represents שׂאִי (“anyone”) (23a); the prefix ἐπί- (“upon”) of ἐφοράω represents the preposition עַל (23a); and κύριος renders אֱל (“God”) (23b). G uses these elements, perhaps triggered by כִּי—which also begins verse 21—to construct a line parallel to verse 21 so that OG 23b now serves not simply as a restatement of verse 21 but also as an introduction to the liturgical “he who ...,” with its articulated participles, in verses 24–25.

G’s treatment of verse 23 makes emphatic Elious’s claim that the Lord sees all humans and their deeds. G uses ἐφοράω at 21.16; 22.12; 28.24, each of which is similar to verse 23b.

G read ידע (“knows”) instead of ירע (“shatters”; see Beer 1897, 218). *Resh* and *daleth* are easily confused. Since they look alike, G had the option of reading one or the other. Dhorme (1967, 521) is right that לֹא חָקַר (“no inquiry, investigation”) (v. 24a)—combined with reading ידע—leads G to 9.10a, where ἀνεξιχνίαστα (“inscrutable things”) renders אֵין חָקַר (“beyond understanding,” NRSV). Indeed, G replaces a translation of (Hebrew) verse 24b with OG 9.10b (so Beer 1897, 218; Dhorme 1967 [“an exact quotation”]; Heater 1982, 115). Further, G models OG 24–25 on 9.5–10 with its articular participles. In turn, at 9.10 G replicated 5.9! G likes this characterization of the deity that incorporates a doxological formula.

Elious in OG 24 repeats what had earlier been said by Eliphaz and Iob, respectively. That is, he confirms what Eliphaz had said and throws back at Iob what Iob had earlier affirmed. The repetition serves to recall the glorious wisdom of the Lord, surely beyond human understanding. G omitted 24b because its content in the source text made no sense after OG 24a. The same is true of 25b in the source text, now completely out of place.

ὁ γνωρίζων. G passes over לִכֵּן (“thus,” NRSV) and represents the finite verb יָכִיר (“he knows”) with the articulated participle, “the one who reveals,” to form a parallel with verse 24 ὁ καταλαμβάνων. The use of γνωρίζω (“make known”) to translate נָכַר, here as commonly in the *hiphil*, “know,” is unique in the LXX. G omits 25ba and reads 25bβ (οὐδὲνα) with verse 26a.

**αὐτῶν τὰ ἔργα.** G used ἔργα for “deeds” in verse 21 and one might be tempted to see αὐτῶν τὰ ἔργα as referring to human actions, specifically those of the impious, as in NETS 2006. Certainly that is the referent in the source text. However, G replaced verse 24 with a quotation of OG 5.9; 9.10. Both those passages involve cosmological phenomena. “Their” now refers to the glorious (cosmological) activities of OG verse 24. The same Lord who comprehends the workings of the universe surely brings that same level of scrutiny and understanding to the observation of human life. If we ask where the “workings” of the universe are revealed, perhaps G has in mind the creation stories and creation text in Isaiah.

34.26

במקום ראים || תחת רשעים ספקם [25bβ וידכאו]

ἔσβεσεν δὲ ἀσεβεῖς, ὁρατοὶ δὲ ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ,

Now, he extinguished the impious—  
but they are visible before him,

The translation of 26b is that of the 2014 NETS revision, with the addition of the copula verb “are” and its subject “they.”

**ἔσβεσεν δὲ ἀσεβεῖς.** OG verse 26a represents **רשעים וידכאו**. The Syriac also takes **וידכאו** with verse 26. In Job **ἀσεβής** and cognates in 90 percent of their occurrences represent the root **רשע**; see also 34.8. G shares this understanding of wickedness as impiety with other LXX translators, especially in Psalms and elsewhere in the wisdom literature. Note the coincidental homophony in **ἔσβεσεν** (δὲ) **ἀσεβεῖς**.

The use of **δέ** for *waw* marks a shift in the narrative. G continues with the third-person singular, that is, with the Lord as subject, representing **ידכאו** (“they are crushed”), third plural passive, with the third singular active, **ἔσβεσεν** (“he [the Lord] extinguished”). Beer 1897, 218, followed by Dhorme 1967, 521, thinks that **σβέννυμι** renders **דעך** (“be extinguished”), since the former translates the latter at 18.5, 6; 21.17.

This need not be the case. HRCS mark four of the eight occurrences of **σβέννυμι** with † (4.10; 16.15; 34.26; 40.12), which indicates that G uses this verb freely with respect to the source text. At 4.10; 30.8; and 40.12, G uses it metaphorically, as in verse 26. It seems most likely to me that G has used **σβέννυμι** to render **דכא** (“crush”), a verb that is used in Job

in parallel with **piel** בָּצַע (*piel* “cut off,” “destroy” [6.9]) and **hiphil** יָגַה (*hiphil* “torment”) (19.2).

G passes over both **תָּחַת** (“for,” NRSV, but meaning uncertain) and **סָפַק** (“he strikes them,” NRSV). **סָפַק** means “slap, chastise” (BDB) and **סָפַק**, in spite of being third-person singular, is not likely a candidate for the source of *ἔσβεσεν*. Finally, it should be noted that *ἔσβεσεν* means much the same as “he handed them over to darkness” at OG 24.14.

**ὄρατοι δὲ ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ**. This is G’s paraphrase of **ראים ובמקום**, literally, “in a place of seeing ones,” glossed as “while others look on” (NRSV). In the Hebrew God punishes the wicked while others look on. However, **ὄρατοι** (“visible”) represents **ראים** (“seeing”), but understood in a passive sense, “seen”; its antecedent is **ἀσεβεῖς** (“[the] impious”). The word **ὄρατοι** recalls its obverse, **ὄρατής** (“one that views”) (21a): the Lord “views, witnesses” while humans are “the viewed, the visible.” Their misdeeds do not escape his observation. The phrase **ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ** seems to represent **במקום** (“in a place”) but as seen strictly from the deity’s point of view, “before *him*.” In Job everything takes place before the Lord. Nothing is hidden from his sight.

How **ὄρατοι δὲ ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ** is to be understood depends in part on how **δέ** is taken. Does it retain an adversative nuance? If so, then we can render this verbless clause as “but (they are) visible before him,” that is, “but they remain visible,” which may be taken to mean that the Lord “extinguished” the impious but, nevertheless, they remain visible before him in the realm of the dead—he is the Lord, after all, and even sees what lies in death, beyond our view. This understanding of the OG may be shared by LXX.D, which translates, “und sichtbar sind sie vor ihm” adding the copulative verb, present tense, “(they) are.” Rather than “und” (LXX.D), **δέ** usually indicates some kind of slight shift, in this case between 26b and 26a. There is some type of contrast between the two lines: the impious are extinguished *but even then* do not escape from the Lord’s examining eye; see Ps 138.8.

NETS 2006 rendered 26b with, “yes, they were in plain view before him.” This understands 26b to have a connection with 21b–22. This connection need not require the past tense (“were”) rather than the present (“are”), if 26b states a general truth, but the former intimates that their punishment followed the Lord’s clear observation of the wrongdoings of the impious. This interpretation of 26b seems to be what we have in Brenton’s “for they are seen before him,” which carries both the notion of

general truth and the Lord's observation of the behavior of the impious as the explicit reason ("for") why the Lord extinguished them.

The difficulty of making sense of verse 26b is apparent in the various textual corruptions that later took place. The *O* and *L* groups add "enemies" to the line and Lucianic witnesses *L III* Arm add a verb, *εγενοντο*. The result is "but visible before enemies"; "and they became visible before their enemies"; and "but enemies visible before him." See Ziegler's apparatus. These corruptions represent early attempts at clarification.

34.27

וכל דרכיו לא השבילו || אשר על כן סרו מאחריו

ὅτι ἐξέκλιναν ἐκ νόμου θεοῦ,  
δικαιώματα δὲ αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἐπέγνωσαν

because they turned aside from God's law  
and his requirements they did not recognize.

**ὅτι.** G renders the phrase **אשר על כן** ("because") simply, with the causative **ὅτι**, a saving of two words.

**ἐκ νόμου θεοῦ.** This is a notable interpretation of **מאחריו** ("from after him"). For G to "turn aside from following him" means to turn aside "from God's law," that is, from the law of Moses, the benchmark of all wrongdoing in Hellenistic Judaism, G's audience. See the references to law in OG 8b, 17b, 18a, 20b, 22, 37. G makes clear the reason God "extinguished" the impious in the past (26a).

**δικαιώματα ... οὐκ ἐπέγνωσαν.** G uses **δικαιώματα** ("requirements," "ordinances," Brenton; "règles du droit" Cadell 1995, 220) to interpret **כל דרכיו** ("all his [the Lord's] ways"). The word **δικαίωμα** occurs only here in Job, and only here in the LXX does it represent **דרך** ("way"). The lines are synonymously parallel as in the source text, so "his requirements" = "the requirements of God's law." G narrows the focus from the general in the source text ("from following him"; "his ways") to the specific in both lines of the translation. G uses **ἐπιγινώσκω** ("recognize" LSJ) to render **שכל** *hiphil* ("understand, comprehend" HALOT). This equivalence too is unique in the LXX. With it G clarifies the source text for readers. It was not that the impious failed to understand the law; rather, they refused to take it to heart.

[34.28–33]

28 [וצעקת עניים ישמע || להביא עליו צעקת דל  
 29 ויסתר פנים ומי ישורנו || והוא ישקט ומי ירשע  
 ועל גוי ועל אדם יחד  
 30 ממלך אדם חנף ממקשי עם  
 31 נשאתי לא אחבל || כי אל אל האמר  
 32 אם עול פעלתי לא אסיף || בלעדי אחזה אתה הרני  
 33 כי אתה תבחר ולא אני || המעמד ישלמנה כי מאסת  
 ומה ידעת דבר]

34.34–37: Conclusion

34.34

שמע ליוגבר חכם || אנשי לבב יאמרו לי

διὸ συνετοὶ καρδίας ἐροῦσιν ταῦτα,  
 ἀνὴρ δὲ σοφὸς ἀγκάσοεν μου τὸ ῥῆμα.

So, the intelligent of heart will say these things,  
 and a wise man will have grasped what I said.

Pope characterizes the Hebrew text of verses 28–33 as “replete with difficulties” (1965, 259). G omits these verses—in the source text they continue Elious’s defense of God—and skips to the conclusion of Elious’s speech, neatly joining verse 34 to verse 27 with the addition of διό (“so”), thus recalling the opening of Elious’s address at verse 10, where διό (συνετοὶ καρδίας) renders לכן (“therefore”). In verse 34 the OG looks back, whereas the source text looks ahead, to verse 35.

συνετοὶ καρδίας ... ταῦτα. G repeats the translation made at verse 10: see the discussion there. Though not explicitly stated either here or in verse 10, Elious is one of the “intelligent of heart.” G replaces לי (“to me”) with “these things,” that is, the things that Elious has said, thus changing entirely the focus of the text.

ἀνὴρ ... μου τὸ ῥῆμα. G reads שמע as *qal* third-person masculine singular—MT vocalizes it as a participle (שֹׁמֵעַ)—and represents it with the perfect ἀγκάσοεν, so NETS “will have grasped” (see Smyth §1950). This translation takes the reader back to what Elious has said to this point. Again לי



is replaced, with τὸ ῥῆμα μου (“what I said”), a parallel for ταῦτα (“these things”). Like “these things,” τὸ ῥῆμα μου refers to what Elious has said about the Lord’s justness and the impiety of a person who accuses the Lord of acting lawlessly (18). “A wise man” will have grasped the truth of Elious’s remarks. If Job is such a person, he will acquiesce.

34.35

ודבריו לא בהשכיל || איוב לא בדעת ידבר

Ἰὼβ δὲ οὐκ ἐν συνέσει ἐλάλησεν,  
τὰ δὲ ῥήματα αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἐν ἐπιστήμῃ.

But Job did not speak with intelligence,  
and his words were without knowledge.

Ἰὼβ δὲ οὐκ ... ἐλάλησεν. G adds δέ (“but”). This little word sets up a contrast between what the “intelligent of heart” and “a wise man” would say (34)—represented by Elious—and what Job has said. In the OG verse 35 is no longer a direct quotation of Job’s remarks, as in the source text (see NRSV). Rather, it is Elious’s negative assessment of what Job has said.

G uses σύνεσις (“intelligence”) to render דעת (“knowledge”), as at 15.2; 21.22; 33.3. Note the cognate adjective συνετοί at verse 34: Job is doubly unintelligent for he neither belongs to the group of the intelligent nor does he speak with intelligence! G either reads ידבר as a preterit or deliberately chooses the aorist for the imperfective aspect, so that ἐλάλησεν (“did [not] speak”) looks back to Job’s speeches.

ἐν ἐπιστήμῃ. G follows the source text in rendering 35b as a verbless clause. NETS supplies “were”; the NRSV supplies “are.” G represents השכיל, the *hiphil* infinitive construct of שכל, so “insight, cleverness” (*HALOT*), with the noun ἐπιστήμη (“knowledge”) a synonym of σύνεσις (35a). It is the Lord who teaches σύνεσιν καὶ ἐπιστήμην (“understanding and knowledge”) (21.22). According to Elious, Job does not possess such knowledge.

34.36–37

36 על תשבת באנשי און || אבי יבחן איוב עד נצח  
37 || יספוק בינינו || עשפ כי יסיף על חטאתו  
וירב אמריו לאל

36 οὐ μὴν δὲ ἀλλὰ μάθε, Ἰώβ,  
 μὴ δῶς ἔτι ἀνταπόκρισιν ὥσπερ οἱ ἄφρονες,  
 37 ἵνα μὴ προσθῶμεν ἐφ' ἁμαρτίαις ἡμῶν,  
 ἀνομία δὲ ἐφ' ἧμῖν λογισθήσεται  
 πολλὰ λαλούντων ῥήματα ἐναντίον κυρίου.

36 Nonetheless, learn O Iob!  
 No longer give a response as fools do,  
 37 lest we add to our sins  
 and lawlessness be reckoned against us,  
 while speaking many words before the Lord.”

G makes major changes to the content of the source text. Rather than speaking of Job in the third-person, Elious admonishes Iob directly, maintaining the focus on the interaction between the two of them. At the same time, G has Elious include the other friends as possible objects of divine displeasure, given Iob's determination to speak as a fool.

οὐ ... Ἰώβ. G replaces the wish אֲבִי יִבְחֶנּוּ אִיּוֹב (“would that Job were tried [or tested]”) in the parent text with μάθε Ἰώβ (“learn, O Iob”), an imperative and a vocative of address. Has G interpreted the source text to mean that Job should learn from his testing? No, presumably the point is that Iob is to learn from Elious.

Dhorme conjectures that οὐ μὴν δὲ ἀλλὰ (“nonetheless”) indicates the parent text had אַבֵּל (1967, 527), which means “but, however” in later books like Daniel; it does not, however, occur in Job. G likes the heavy collocation of particles οὐ μὴν δὲ ἀλλὰ and adds it to the text of Iob several times (12.6a; 21.17a; 27.7a; see 2.5). Dhorme weakens an already weak case by supposing that G read בִּין (“understand”) instead of יִבְחֶנּוּ (1967, 527). What about the omission of עַד נִצָּח (“to the limit”) and G's treatment of verse 36b in the source text? Contra Dhorme, G is recasting the text, as is often the case.

μὴ δῶς ἔτι ἀνταπόκρισιν. G changes the subordinate clause of the source text, עַל תִּשָּׁבֶה, into a prohibition addressed to Iob, a parallel for 36a but in the negative. This is another example of G's use of the stylistic device called “converse translation”; see verse 21. With the addition of ἔτι, G has Elious accuse Iob of speaking like a fool up until now. Dhorme (1967, 527) suggests that G read אַל תִּשָּׁבֶה (“do not answer” see HALOT, s.v. “שוב,” *hiphil* 5.) rather

than על תשובת (literally “against the answers,” i.e., “because he responds,” HALOT s.v. “תשובה”); and this makes sense: the two look and sound similar. The suggestion does not require that the source text had such a reading.

G uses the compound verb δίδωμι ἀνταπόκρισιν (“give an answer”; see LSJ, s.v. “δίδωμι” I.5) to represent the elliptical (דָּבַר תַּשִּׁיב, as at 13.22. What was Iob responding to? Elious likely has in mind the traditional teaching about suffering as espoused by the friends.

ὥσπερ οἱ ἄφρονες. Gerleman notes that a few Hebrew manuscripts have the particle -־ instead of the preposition (אֲנָשִׁי אֹן) (“among [people of iniquity]”; BHS<sup>app</sup>). G may be following such a witness, but one cannot be certain. The phrase οἱ ἄφρονες (“the fools”) is an interpretation of אֲנָשִׁי אֹן suitable for the context: “the fools” is the opposite of the σοφοί (“wise”) (v. 2) and συνετοὶ καρδίας (“wise of heart”) (vv. 10, 34). G used τὰ ἄνομα (“lawless acts”) for אֹן (“evil”) at verses 8, 22 (cf. NRSV), but in 36b the translation must relate to G’s μάθε (“learn”) in the previous line.

ἵνα μὴ προσθῶμεν ἐφ’ ἁμαρτίαις ἡμῶν. In verse 37 G continues with Elious’s direct speech to Iob, changing the meaning completely, as Dhorme notes (1967, 528). G disregards כִּי (“for”), which, in the source text, subordinates verse 37 to 36b. Since in 36 Elious addresses Iob in the second-person, we might expect G to change the third-person of the parent text to second again but, no, in 37 Elious speaks in the first-person plural, “we ... our ... us.” G may have made this adjustment on the basis of בֵּינֵינוּ (“among us”). G uses προστίθημι to render יִסֵּף *hiphil* as generally in Iob (e.g., 20.9; 27.1) and elsewhere in the LXX.

The OG is ambiguous: By “we,” does G mean Elious and Iob, or does G intend to include all five of the disputants? It seems likely that “we ... our” includes all of them, but surely Elious is speaking diplomatically or, more accurately, tongue-in-cheek because it is not the understanding of Elious and the three friends that is on trial. In their view, it is only Iob who is a sinner; only Iob is guilty of lawlessness.

ἀνομία δὲ ἐφ’ ἡμῶν λογισθήσεται. G (and Pesh) reads פֶּשַׁע (“rebellion,” NRSV) with verse 37b. This sets in motion dramatic changes to the reading of the source text. The word ἀνομία renders פֶּשַׁע, as at 7.21; 8.4; 13.23 (probably); 14.17. In Iob transgression is lawlessness; in fact, all wrongdoing qualifies as lawlessness.

G seems to read ספוקי as ספק V (“abound, be abundant; multiply,” DCH; see the by-form קפץ II in HALOT). It may be that G intends an echo of 31.28 with the choice of λογίζομαι. There Iob says, if he has been guilty of narcissism, ἀνομία ἢ μεγίστη λογισθείη (“may (this too) be reckoned to me as the greatest lawlessness”). These are the only two occurrences of λογίζομαι in Iob. This verb and its cognates belong to the world of financial services, accounting and such like. Elious warns Iob about continuing along the course he has taken so far, a foolish choice (36).

G represents בינינו (“among us”) with ἐφ’ ἡμῖν (“against us”). This understanding of the preposition –ב in the source text is almost required following the use of λογίζομαι. “Against us” may be facetious but, at the same time, Elious is pressuring Iob with a caution that Iob’s “position” may adversely affect all of them. If this suggestion is correct, the OG is a free translation of ספוקי that recalls an earlier passage.

πολλά λαλούντων ῥήματα. G paraphrases verse 37ca with this circumstantial participle and its direct object πολλά ῥήματα (“many words”). Notably the OG includes “us” among the too talkative; compare the source text ירב אמריו (“he [Job] multiplies *his* words”). The offense takes place *in the course of* or *while* speaking too many words (Smyth §2070): see, for example, verse 18. Elious’s point seems to be that too much talk can result in careless talk (see 6.4). In wisdom literature proper speech occupies an important place.

ἐναντίον τοῦ κυρίου. G uses this phrase to represent לִפְנֵי (“toward God”), usually understood in a hostile sense, “against God” (BDB s.v. “לִפְנֵי” 1.d; so NRSV and NJPS; JB: “heaping abuse on God”). The same translation of the preposition לִ is used at 8.4. κύριος renders לַ, as throughout Iob. The OG can be rendered the same as the source text, so “against the Lord” (9.4; 15.25, 26), but this seems the less likely because the friends have not, in Elious’s view, been speaking in opposition to the Lord.

### Summary

G’s treatment of chapter 34 is remarkable for the extent of the editing of the parent text by abbreviation, intratextual replacements, interpretation, and basic changes of meaning. These characteristics of its treatment by G mean that the summary for 34 is far more extensive than is usually true in the commentary. As translation, OG Iob reflects a flexible approach (see

Fox 2005, 95–96) to the source text in verse after verse. The result of G's work is a seamless whole that reflects an over-all approach to the speech, intended to keep the focus on Elious and Iob.

The source text is abbreviated by omitting verses 3–4, 6b–7—both pieces because their subject matter differs from the context; 18b, 23a, 25b and, in their entirety, verses 28–33. In fact, the situation is more complicated than the asterisk tradition indicates: G joins 6bβ to 8, so not all of 6b is omitted; the two lines of 11 are collapsed into one (Origen marked 11b with an asterisk); G replaces verse 23 with a one-line restatement of 21. G's abbreviation represents 32 percent of the source text, more than that of chapter 33 (19 percent), but less than that of chapters 36–37 (49 percent).

On the other hand, there are many small additions, often only a word, that consistently change the meaning and direction of the source text. Here is a list: + ἕκαστος (v. 11a) makes explicit the application to Iob; + οἷη (v. 12a) is a rhetorical device that directs the question to Iob; + γάρ makes verses 14–15 examples of the Lord's sustaining; + πᾶς (v. 15a) emphasizes inclusivity; + ὅθεν καὶ ἐπλάσθη (v. 15b) provides an allusion to the creation story in Genesis (3.19); + μή (v. 16a) changes the clause from a protasis to a caution; + ἰδὲ σύ (v. 17a), another rhetorical device, solicits Iob's attention; + τοὺς πονηροὺς (v. 17b) provides a parallel for "lawless acts" (v. 17a); + οἶδεν ("[nor] knows") (19b) introduces the idea of ignorance; + γάρ (v. 20b) makes verse 20b the cause of the assertion in 20a; + διό turns verse 34 into a conclusion whereas the source text looks ahead; + ὅτι (v. 36b) limits the chiding of Iob to what he has said so far; Iob can change. Perhaps here is the place to mention the use of ἢ ("or") in place of "and" or "but" at verses 8b and 12b so that each verse in the OG sets forth alternatives.

G replaces a translation of the parent text at verses 23 and 24: G omits all of 23 and, as just noted, puts in its place a summary of 21 to introduce what follows; G replaces a translation of verse 24b with the OG of 9.10b and models verses 24–25 on the participial constructions in 9.5–10. G rewrites the content of verse 17 almost entirely.

Elious's speech is interpreted by G. Nowhere is this clearer than in verse 27a, where the impious like Iob are said to be guilty of turning aside from "God's law," the law of Moses. But there are numerous other examples of G's placing an interpretation upon the source text. In verse 6a it is not now a question of Iob being "counted a liar" (NRSV) but of the Lord who has lied to Iob; OG 10bc refers to Elious, not the Lord; verse 11a now contains Elious's contradiction of Iob's claim; verse 13 refers to creation, past *and* present; G brings divine displeasure to bear on Iob in verse 16a;

verse 19a and 19bc now appear to refer to Elious and the three friends, respectively; verse 20a is a clever interpretation that understands Iob as one of the impious.

G smoothens the text for the target readers by continuing rather than changing persons of verbs or by making such changes to suit an understanding placed upon the text as a whole: third-person to first (v. 8); third singular to second (v. 9a); third plural to third singular (v. 25bβ); third singular to first plural (v. 37a). G divides the source text differently than BHS: see 17 || 18; 37a || 37b.

G's treatment of verses 34–37 is especially notable. The addition of διό turns verse 34 into a retrospective conclusion and nicely attaches verse 37 to 27. G then makes verse 35 into Elious's own assessment of what Iob has said so far rather than that of "the wise" in the source text (34). Next, verse 36 is changed into a direct address to Iob; in the same verse "people of iniquity" is interpreted as "fools." Finally, G has verse 37 continue Elious's direct address to Iob. All this strikes the reader as the work of a skillful editor, who comes to the text with an understanding of what the text *should* say for its audience.

There are several examples of Hebraisms and neologisms in chapter 34; for example, μετὰ ποιούντων τὰ ἄνομα (v. 8b = MT 8a; 22); πᾶσα σὰρξ (v. 15a); οὐκ ἐπαισχύνθη (v. 19a); θαυμασθῆναι πρόσωπα (v. 19c). While introducing a strangeness of expression for readers of good Greek, this same strangeness preserves a certain familiarity for Semitic readers who knew the LXX generally and the phraseology of its underlying source language.

God, Judges, Snakes, and Sinners:  
A Commentary on the Old Greek Text  
of Psalm 57 (MT 58)

Jannes Smith

Literature

- ♦ **Ausloos**, Hans. 2006. “לַמְנַצֵּחַ in the Psalm Headings and Its Equivalent in LXX.” Pages 131–39 in *XII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Leiden 2004*. Edited by Melvin K. H. Peters. SCS 54. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature. ♦ **Austermann**, Frank. 2003. *Von der Tora zum Nomos: Untersuchungen zur Übersetzungswiese und Interpretation im Septuaginta-Psalter*. MSU 27. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. ♦ **Barthélemy**, Dominique. 2005. *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament*. OBO 50/4. Fribourg: Presses Universitaires; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. ♦ **Cox**, Claude. 1981. “Εἰσακούω and Ἐπακούω in the Greek Psalter.” *Bib* 62:251–58. ♦ **Dahood**, Mitchell. 1955. “The Etymology of *Malta’ôt* (Ps 58,7).” *CBQ* 17:300–303. ♦ **Dahood**. 1968. *Psalms II*. AB 17. Garden City, NY: Doubleday. ♦ **Day**, John N. 2002. “The Imprecatory Psalms and Christian Ethics.” *BSac* 159:166–86; ♦ **Field**, Frederick. 1964. *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt*. Hildesheim: Olms. ♦ **Flashar**, Martin. 1912. “Exegetische Studien zum Septuagintapsalter.” *ZAW* 32:81–116, 161–89, 241–68. ♦ **Goldingay**, John. 2007. *Psalms, Volume 2: Psalms 42–89*. BCOTWP. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic. ♦ **Hartley**, Vivian. 2001. *The Psalter According to the Seventy*. Westport, ON: WORDSmith. ♦ **Hossfeld**, Frank Lothar, and Erich **Zenger**. 2005. *Psalms 2: A Commentary on Psalms 51–100*. Translated by Linda M. Maloney. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress. ♦ **Kasser**, Rodolphe, and Michel **Testuz**, eds. 1967. *Papyrus Bodmer XXIV: Psaumes*

- XVII–CXVIII. Geneva: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana. ♦ **Kraus**, Hans-Joachim. 1972. *Psalmen*. BKAT 15. Neukirchener-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.
- ♦ **Mozley**, F. 1905. *The Psalter of the Church: The Septuagint Psalms Compared with the Hebrew, with Various Notes*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- ♦ **Munnich**, Olivier. 1983. “La Septante des Psaumes et le Groupe Kaige.” *VT* 33:75–89.
- ♦ **Olofsson**, Staffan. 1997. “The Kaige Group and the Septuagint Book of Psalms.” Pages 189–230 in *IX Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Cambridge, 1995*. Edited by Bernard A. Taylor. SCS 45. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- ♦ **Olofsson**. 2001. “Law and Lawbreaking in the LXX Psalms: A Case of Theological Exegesis.” Pages 291–330 in *Der Septuaginta-Psalter: Sprachliche und theologische Aspekte*. Edited by Erich Zenger. HBS 32. Freiburg: Herder.
- ♦ **Pietersma**, Albert. 1980. “David in the Greek Psalms.” *VT* 30:213–26.
- ♦ **Pietersma**. 1990. “Ra 2110 (P. Bodmer XXIV) and the Text of the Greek Psalter.” Pages 262–86 in *Studien zur Septuaginta Robert Hanhart zu Ehren*. Edited by Detlef Fränkel, Udo Quast, and John W. Wevers. MSU 20. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- ♦ **Pietersma**. 2001. “Exegesis and Liturgy in the Superscripts of the Greek Psalter.” Pages 99–138 in *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Oslo 1998*. Edited by Bernard A. Taylor. SCS 51. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- ♦ **Pietersma**. 2008. “Translating a Translation, with Examples from the Greek Psalter.” Pages 169–82 in *Translating a Translation: The LXX and Its Modern Translations in the Context of Early Judaism*. Edited by Hans Ausloos, J. Cook, F. García Martínez, B. Lemmelijn, and M. Vervenne. BETL 213. Leuven: Peeters.
- ♦ **Pietersma**. 2010. “A Commentary on Psalm 15 in Greek: Text-Production and Text-Reception.” Pages 523–42 in *Die Septuaginta: Texte Theologien, Einflüsse*. Edited by Wolfgang Kraus and Martin Karrer. WUNT 252. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- ♦ **Ridderbos**, Jan. 1958. *De Psalmen: 2, Psalm 42–106*. COut. Kampen: Kok.
- ♦ **Rösel**, Martin. 2001. “Die Psalmüberschriften des Septuaginta-Psalter.” Pages 125–48 in *Der Septuaginta-Psalter: Sprachliche und theologische Aspekte*. Edited by Erich Zenger. HBS 32. Freiburg: Herder.
- ♦ **Tate**, Marvin E. 1990. *Psalms 51–100*. WBC 20. Waco, TX: Word.
- ♦ **Venetz**, Hermann-J. 1974. *Die Quinta des Psalteriums: Ein Beitrag zur Septuaginta- und Hexaplaforschung*. Collection Massorah. Hildesheim: Gerstenberg.
- ♦ **Wesselschmidt**, Quentin F. 2007. *Psalms 51–150*. ACCS 8. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.



## Outline

Humans are asked whether they speak uprightly, in light of evidence to the contrary (2–3). Sinners are aliens and liars (4), unable and unwilling to listen (5–6). But divine vengeance has disarmed them (7, 9b) so that, weakened before God’s bow, they disappear like ebbing water (8) and melting wax (9a). The righteous will prosper (11). Therefore God exists (12).

## Commentary

57.1

לְמַנְצָא אֵל תַּשְׁחַת לְדָוִד מִכְתָּם

Εἰς τὸ τέλος· μὴ διαφθείρης· τῷ Δαυὶδ εἰς στηλογραφίαν.

Regarding completion. Do Not Destroy. Pertaining to Daudid. For a stele inscription.

**Εἰς τὸ τέλος.** The placement of לְמַנְצָא at the start of a superscription, as well as its association with supervision of temple activities in Ezra and Chronicles, suggest the translation “to the leader.” G, however, associated consonantal לְמַנְצָא with לְנָצַח (“forever”). If τέλος means “end, outcome, completion,” and εἰς τέλος “in the end, in the long run” (LSJ), then one might be led to suppose that εἰς τὸ τέλος refers to a specified end, but of what is not clear, nor will it have been of concern to the translator. G consistently wrote εἰς τέλος for לְנָצַח (14x), and εἰς τὸ τέλος for לְמַנְצָא (55x, all in superscriptions). Hence the מ morpheme appears to have triggered the Greek article. One might wonder whether G read לְמַנְצָא as לְמוֹ נָצַח, a fuller form of the inseparable preposition לְ, does not occur in Psalms, so one cannot check how G handled this item elsewhere (unlike לְמוֹ which G readily recognized as alternative for לָהֶם [“for them”]). By analogy, בְּמוֹ (11[10].2) and בְּמוֹ (29[28].6; 58[57].5, 8, 9, 10; 61[60].7, etc.) do occur in the Psalter, and G recognized them as alternatives for בְּ and בְּ respectively, but did not mark them as such by articulating the objects of their Greek equivalents. One suspects, then, that G read לְמַנְצָא and produced what Flashar called a *Verlegenheitsübersetzung* (1912, 94), writing τέλος for נָצַח, εἰς for לְ, and τό to account quantitatively for the מ morpheme. If so, G’s equivalent reflects an item-for-item *modus operandi* rather than, for example, an eschatological interpretation of the psalm (contra Rösel 2001, 138; for a full treatment see Ausloos 2006).

**τῷ Δαυιδ.** NRSV's vague "Of David" does not specify whether the Hebrew preposition indicates authorship ("by": e.g., Hab 3.1; Ezek 27.3; 30.3) or topic ("regarding": e.g., MT Jer 23.9; 46.2, 13; 48.1; 49.17, 23, 28). Had G wanted to express the former, he could have written τοῦ Δαυιδ, as did Aquila (Field 1964, 184). The genitive also appears in the transmission history of the Greek Psalter, but G consistently used the dative (so Pietersma, who argues that the six occurrences of τοῦ Δαυιδ in Rahlfs's text are secondary [1980, 213–26; 2001, 103–4]). Given that the dative is his default rendering, its occurrence here need not imply that G had a specific episode from David's life in mind.

**εἰς στηλογραφίαν.** Like its Hebrew counterpart, *στηλογραφία* occurs only in the titles of six psalms (15, 55–59). The *Supplement* to LSJ cites what otherwise appears to be the oldest attestation of the word, in a Greek inscription (IG 9[2].13.4, 14a3) from the first century AD. One need not conclude, however, that G was the first to use the word, since the noun *στηλογραφός* ("inscriber") is known from an inscription dated to the fourth century BCE and the verb *στηλογραφέω* ("inscribe") from inscriptions of the third and second centuries BCE, and *στηλογραφία* is easily formed from these. More difficult to answer is the question why G so interpreted מכתם, the meaning of which was already unknown to Aquila and Symmachus and remains obscure to this day. Pietersma (2010, 524–25) has suggested that G's determination to translate a word he did not understand led him to construe כתם as כתב ("write"), hence γραφία ("writing"), to which he added στηλο- to account quantitatively for the preformative מ, on the analogy of εἰς τὸ τέλος for נצח. Evidence for such "etymologizing" is not hard to find elsewhere in Psalms (e.g., ἐν τοῖς περιλοιποῖς σου for במיתריך in 20.13). One wonders, however, why G would opt for στηλο- to fill the slot. Since διαφθείρω is found in a Greek inscription (dated 175–171 BCE) with reference to "the 'breaking' of a stone—ἐάν τινα ὑγιῇ λίθον διαφθείρηι κατὰ τὴν ἐργασίαν ὃ τῆς θέσεως ἐργώνης" (MM, 157), one might speculate that G's interpretation of מכתם was informed by the adjacent "Do not destroy," which he may then have construed as a warning not to corrupt the text, or possibly not to break the stele on which he supposed it was once written. Such speculation yields little fruit, however, because it cannot be demonstrated that G *intended* μὴ διαφθείρης to be interpreted in such a manner, since διαφθείρω is his standard equivalent for תהש. Nor can such an interpretation explain the first occurrence of *στηλογραφία*, in the superscription of Ps 15, which lacks μὴ διαφθείρης.

57.2

האמנם אלם צדק תדברון || מִי־שֵׁרִים תִּשְׁפֹּטוּ בְּנֵי אָדָם

Εἰ ἀληθῶς ἄρα δικαιοσύνην λαλεῖτε;  
εὐθεῖα κρίνετε, οἱ υἱοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων;

Do you then truly speak righteousness?  
Do you judge fairly, O sons of men?

**Εἰ ἀληθῶς.** G frequently handled the ἦ-interrogative contextually; where a question expects the answer “No,” he wrote μή, whether or not the Hebrew had a corresponding negative particle (29.10; 49.13; 76.8; 77.19, 20; 84.6; 87.11, 12, 13; 93.20). The resulting nuance would have suited the current context rather well: “Surely you do not speak righteousness, (do you)?” Instead G opted for εἰ, leading all the daughter versions to translate the first clause as a protasis to the second. Hartley (2001, 99) has done the same (“If you truly speak righteousness, judge rightly, O you sons of Men”), and Hossfeld and Zenger (2005, 83), too, construe the Greek as a condition. It is not surprising that the Greek text should so be read in its reception history, but it is a mistake to suppose that G would have intended such a reading: Rahlfs supplied a note to clarify, first, that εἰ translates not the conditional particle אִם, but the interrogative particle ἦ, and second, that κρίνετε is not imperative but indicative, since it translates a Hebrew *yiqtol*. Rahlfs ends the line with a question mark, thus assuming that εἰ can mark a direct question in Greek. A similar instance of εἰ to introduce a direct question is found in 72.11, there not for ἦ but for שׁ: “Is there knowledge in the Most High?” (NETS). It is perhaps an extension of the use of εἰ to introduce indirect questions (“Tell me whether ...”; see Smyth §2671). Third Reigns 8.27 and its parallel, 2 Suppl 6.18, likewise have εἰ ἀληθῶς for האמנם. Like its Hebrew counterpart, ἀληθῶς occurs only here in the Psalter. G’s default use of ἀλήθεια for אמונה (21x out of 22) likely triggered his choice of ἀληθῶς for האמנם here.

**ἄρα ... οἱ υἱοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων.** MT’s אִלִּים is generally associated with אִלם I (“to be dumb,” HALOT; hence Aquila’s ἀλαλία), but how does one speak (תדברון) mutely? Commentators typically emend to אֱלִים (“gods”) construed as a vocative and referring either to human judges (Ridderbos 1958, 2:126; Day 2002, 169–71) or to heavenly beings responsible for justice on earth (Goldingay 2007, 2:202–4). G’s choice of inferential ἄρα (not to be

confused with interrogative *ἄρα*) suggests that he read **לְאֵל** (“on the other hand”). Both **לְאֵל** and *ἄρα* are grammatical particles which one would not expect to appear in an opening verse since they presuppose preceding discourse. If **לְאֵל** is not a vocative, then to whom is the verse addressed? As a consequence of G’s choice, **בְּנֵי אָדָם** is the only candidate. The effect is to alter the profile of the psalm from a complaint against judicial authorities to a litany against humanity.

57.3

אָף בִּלְבַב עוֹלָת תַּפְעֵלוֹן || בֶּאֱרֶץ חֲמֵס יְדִיכֶם תַּפְלִסוֹן

καὶ γὰρ ἐν καρδίᾳ ἀνομίας ἐργάζεσθε ἐν τῇ γῇ,  
ἀδικίαν αἱ χεῖρες ὑμῶν συμπλέκουσιν.

Indeed, in the heart you devise acts of lawlessness on the earth;  
injustice your hands braid.

**καὶ γάρ**. In the Hebrew psalm **וְאֵל** (“in fact”) marks what follows as the answer to the question of verse 2; **καὶ γάρ** (“indeed”) translates eight of twenty-three occurrences of **וְאֵל** and fourteen of thirty-five instances of **וְגַם** (“also”) in Psalms. Following a suggestion made by his teacher Barthélemy, Venetz (1974, 80–84) has touted the latter equation as evidence for recensional activity analogous to *kaige*, but unconvincingly (see Munnich 1983, 77–78; Olofsson 1997, 204). The phrase **καὶ γάρ** had become a formula well before the LXX was produced, attested, for example, in Xenophon (Smyth, §2813–15).

**ἀνομίας**. G’s use of *ἀνομία* (“lawlessness”) to translate a variety of words for sinful activity (**עוֹלָה**, **עוֹן**, **בְּלִיעַל**, **זִמָּה**, **רָשָׁע**, and **שָׂקָר**) levels the diversity of the Hebrew and more generally reflects the prevalence of *νομ*- (law-related) words in the Greek Psalter (for which see especially Olofsson 2001; Austermann 2003). A number of manuscripts have the singular *ἀνομίαν*, doubtless a secondary adjustment (since one would not expect a plural abstract “lawlessnesses”). The plural matches the Hebrew and may be read as distributive (so NETS). According to Hossfeld and Zenger the Greek “emphasizes not so much the voluntary acts of the heart as the active doing of lawlessness” (2005, 83). But since G uses his standard equivalent, such an argument cannot be made for the text-as-produced.

**ἀδικίαν αἱ χεῖρες ὑμῶν συμπλέκουσιν.** MT points **סחמ** as construct and **וּפְלִסָּה** as second-person masculine plural: “you clear a way for the violence of your hands.” But G read **סחמ** as absolute and construed the verb as third-person feminine plural (i.e., **פְּלִסָּה**, according to Mozley 1905, 95), with **ידיכם** as subject. That G understood the meaning of the Hebrew verb is clear from his choice of *ὁδοποιέω* in 77.50: “He made a path for his wrath.” But here, needing an activity of the hands, he opted for *συμπλέκω* (“twist together, braid”), which occurs only here in the Psalter (cf. *περιπλέκω* in 49.19; 118.61). Its metaphorical sense is also attested in nontranslation Greek literature (LSJ). By construing **ידיכם** as subject rather than object, and the verb as third-person rather than second-person plural, G stopped short of producing a Greek idiom for intimacy (*συμπλέκω τινὶ τὰς χεῖρας* [“join hands with someone”]), and instead conceived injustice as a handicraft.

57.4

וְזִרְיָנִים מִרְחָם || תַּעֲזוּ מִבֶּטֶן דְּבָרֵי כֹזֶב

ἀπηλλοτριώθησαν οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἀπὸ μήτρας,  
ἐπλανήθησαν ἀπὸ γαστροῦ, ἐλάλησαν ψεύδη.

Sinners were estranged from the womb;  
they erred from the belly; they spoke lies.

**ἀπηλλοτριώθησαν ... ἀπὸ μήτρας.** The passive voice may indicate that G read the *niphal* (נִפְּלָה, by dittography of preceding פ) rather than the *qal* (MT) of וְזִרְיָנִים. To the Greek reader the passive verbal phrase *ἀπηλλοτριώθησαν ἀπὸ* might suggest (surgical) removal from the womb (if *ἀπὸ* were construed spatially; see LSJ), or abandonment since birth (if *ἀπὸ* were understood temporally). It is unlikely that G intended either interpretation, however, since the semantic component which *ἀπαλλοτριόω* shares with *וְזִרְיָנִים* is that of estrangement or alienation, with a nuance of hostility.

**ἐλάλησαν ψεύδη.** MT has two parallel clauses, but, reading *דברו* rather than MT's *דברי*, G produced a third indicative clause. As Rahlfs notes, *ψεύδη* (“lies”) could be accented as the neuter plural form of either the adjective *ψευδής* (*ψευδῆς*) or the noun *ψεύδος* (*ψεύδη*). Both the adjective and the noun occur in Psalms as equivalents for *כֹּזֶב* (“falsehood, lies”).

57.5–6

חמת למו כדמות חמת נחש || כמו פתן חרש יאטם אזנו  
אשר לא ישמע לקול מלחשים || חובר חברים מחכם

θυμὸς αὐτοῖς κατὰ τὴν ὁμοίωσιν τοῦ ὄφεως,  
ὥσει ἀσπίδος κωφῆς καὶ βυσούσης τὰ ὦτα αὐτῆς,  
ἥτις οὐκ εἰσακούσεται φωνῇ ἐπαδόντων  
φαρμάκου τε φαρμακευομένου παρὰ σοφοῦ.

They have wrath in the likeness of the snake,  
like an adder, deaf and plugging its ears,  
which will not listen to a voice of enchanters,  
nor of a charm being administered by a wise man.

**θυμὸς.** Hebrew חמה can mean either “heat,” or “poison, venom” of animals, or “wrath.” In 139.4 G opted for “venom” in the phrase ἰὸς ἀσπίδων (“venom of vipers”), aided no doubt by the accompanying phrase “under their lips.” Here one might have expected him to do the same, but he opted for the meaning “wrath” and chose θυμὸς, perhaps because it refers in the first instance to the sinners (αὐτοῖς). G was not the first to make such a choice. A similar passage in Deut 32.33 has θυμὸς twice, once for חמה (“venom”) and once for שרא (“poison”): “their wine is the wrath of dragons, and the wrath of asps beyond cure” (NETS). MT’s חמת 2° is not represented in LXX, due perhaps to haplography of חמ-.

**κωφῆς καὶ βυσούσης.** In the Hebrew the wicked are compared to “the deaf adder that stops its ear.” If one presumes that his *Vorlage* was consonantly identical to MT, G may have inserted καὶ to clarify that a comparison is being made to a snake that is not only unable (κωφῆς) but also unwilling (βυσούσης τὰ ὦτα αὐτῆς) to hear. Certainly verse 6 suggests unwillingness, since G opted for εἰσακούω, which has the nuance of heeding and responding to what is heard (L&N §24.60; Cox 1981, 251–58). A simpler explanation, however, is that G was operating from a parent text slightly different from MT: reading עטם in place of עטם and construing it as a participle functioning as an additional attributive adjective, he wrote καὶ βυσούσης.

**τὰ ὦτα αὐτῆς.** G opted for the plural despite the singular of the Hebrew. In fact only here out of twenty-two occurrences of אזן did he deviate from the

number of the source text, possibly because of the indirect plural referent with which the verse begins.

φαρμάκου τε φαρμακευομένου παρὰ σοφοῦ. G understood the Hebrew phrase to function as an additional genitive of קוֹל and thus cast it as a genitive, inserting τε to mark it as coordinate to ἐπαδόντων. However, where MT has a *pual* participle (“skilled, expert”), G read מַחֲכֵם as a מן prepositional phrase, מִחֲכָם, and wrote παρὰ σοφοῦ (“by a wise man”). Reading חֶבֶר (“charm”) for MT’s חֹבֵר (“enchanter”), he opted for φαρμάκου. Then, at pains to preserve the repetition of the Hebrew, and needing a passive verbal form for its agent παρὰ σοφοῦ, he turned חֲבֵרִים into φαρμακευομένου.

57.7

אלהים הרס שנימו בפיו מלתעות כפירים נתץ יהוה

ὁ θεὸς συνέτριψεν τοὺς ὀδόντας αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτῶν,  
τὰς μύλας τῶν λεόντων συνέθλασεν κύριος.

God crushed their teeth in their mouth;  
the molars of lions the Lord shattered!

ὁ θεὸς συνέτριψεν ... συνέθλασεν κύριος. In MT verse 7 begins a modal sequence that extends at least to the end of verse 9 and possibly to the end of the psalm. The vocatives אלהים and יהוה are, however, unmarked, and the imperatives are consonantly indistinguishable from perfects. G therefore stayed in the indicative, invariably using aorists for what he read as perfects, and futures for what he read as imperfects. The effect is to recast the divine response from a plea for action to reported action. Aquila, however, has the imperative: ἐκρίζωσον, κύριε (“Root out, Lord”; Field 1964, 185). G handled הרס (“break down, destroy”) contextually, using καθαιρέω (“take down”) in 10.3 and 27.5, but συντρίβω (“crush”—more appropriate for removing teeth) here. The verb συντρίβω is his default equivalent for the Hebrew שבר (“break”) and translates הרס only here in Psalms. The result is a Greek text identical to 3.8: ὀδόντας ἁμαρτωλῶν συνέτριψας (“the teeth of sinners you shattered”). G uses συνθλάω (“shatter”) to translate נתץ (“tear down, smash”) only here in Psalms; he used καθαιρέω in 51.7 and again for its by-form נחש in 9.7.



τοὺς ὀδόντας αὐτῶν ... τὰς μύλας τῶν λεόντων. Hebrew כפיר refers specifically to the young lion able to hunt food for himself and distinguishable by his mane (*HALOT*). In 16.12 (of young lions in hiding) and 103.21 (of dependent young lions) G translated it with σκύμνος (“whelp”), but here, as in 34.17 and 90.13, he opted for the general label λέων. Hebrew מלתוע refers properly to the jawbone (*HALOT*), though Dahood suggested “fangs” (1955, 300–303). Here, perhaps guessing its meaning from the parallel ὀδόντας (“teeth”), G chose μύλας (“molars”), which also shares the first two consonants of its Hebrew counterpart. The semantic distinction between the two Greek nouns is clear from Pss. Sol. 13.3: “Evil wild animals rushed upon them; with their teeth [ὀδοῦσιν] they tore their flesh, and with their molars [μύλαις] they crushed their bones” (NETS). While breaking their “fangs” (NRSV) would render lions unable to capture their prey, crushing their molars would leave them unable to eat it; either way they would soon perish of starvation.

57.8

ימאסו כמו מים יתהלכו למו || ידרך חצו כמו יתמללו

ἐξουδενωθήσονται ὡς ὕδωρ διαπορευόμενον·  
ἐντενεῖ τὸ τόξον αὐτοῦ, ἕως οὔ ἀσθενήσουσιν.

They shall vanish like water that flows through;  
he will bend his bow until they become weak.

ὡς ὕδωρ διαπορευόμενον. Evidently reading יתהלכו as a relative clause (with gapped relative particle), G rendered it, aptly enough, with an attributive participle. For similar examples in which gapped relative + *yiqtol* is translated with a present participle functioning attributively, see ἀθετῶν in 14.4; ἰστῶν in 17.34; ἐρχομένη in 21.31; συσσειόντος in 28.8; καταρτιζομένου in 28.9; περιεχούσης in 31.7; διανέοντες in 34.19; ἀνοίγων in 37.14, *passim*. In 57.9 (below), however, G opted for an aorist participle (τακείς).

ἐντενεῖ τὸ τόξον αὐτοῦ. The verb טך can mean “to bend the bow by firmly planting the foot in the middle of it” (*HALOT*), but in MT the arrow is said to be trodden rather than the bow. Barthélemy (2005, 4:366) calls the use of “arrow” for “bow” an example of catachresis (applying a term to an object which it does not properly denote). G for his part solved the prob-



lem by supplying a bow: τόξον is his standard equivalent for קשת (“bow”), but here and in 63.3, it translates חץ (“arrow”). It is of some interest that LSJ’s entry includes the meaning “bow and arrows” for the plural τόξα. G at any rate wrote the singular, presumably to mimic the singular of חצו (so MT’s *ketiv*, but *qere* חציו). Both here and in 63.3 G opted for a Greek idiom: ἐντεῖνω τόξον (“bend the bow”) is attested in Aeschylus, *Ag.* 364, and an Aeschylus fragment (*Frag.* 83; LSJ).

ἕως οὗ ἀσθενήσουσιν. Though it sometimes translates עד אשר (see 111.8), ἕως οὗ is not a Hebraism (it occurs, e.g., in Herodotus *Hist.* 2.143), and need not be taken to attest to a different *Vorlage* here. Still in interpretive mode, G chose ἕως (“until”) for כמו (“as”) as better suited to the imminent demise of the victims of God’s bow (Mozley 1905, 98). The verb ἀσθενέω is G’s default equivalent for כשל *qal* (“stumble”) (9.4; 26.2; 30.11; 104.37; 106.12; 108.24; cf. ἐξασθενέω for כשל *hiphil* in 63.9). It similarly translates מעד (“slip”) in 17.37 and 25.1, but more accurately stands for לאה (“be weary”) in 67.10 and דאב (“become faint”) in 87.10. Here it stands in for מלל (“wither”), which occurs twice elsewhere, in 36.2 and 89.6, both times of grass, and is appropriately translated as ἀποξηραίνω (“dry up”) and σκληρύνω (“harden”) respectively. Here the reference is to humans, so G opted for ἀσθενέω (“become weak, sick”), perhaps associating it with the adjective ἀμλ (“feeble”), which he translated as ἀσθενής in 6.3 (cf. Mozley 1905, 95). The sense of the Greek may be that the sinners grow faint at the sight of God’s bow aimed at them.

57.9

כמו שבלול תמס יהלך || נפל אשת בל חזו שמש

ὥσει κηρὸς ὁ ταχεὶς ἀνταναιρεθήσονται.  
ἐπέπεσε πῦρ, καὶ οὐκ εἶδον τὸν ἥλιον.

Like wax that melts they will be removed;  
fire fell, and they did not see the sun.

ὥσει κηρὸς ὁ ταχεὶς. Hebrew שבלול means “snail,” which makes its way in תמס (“slime”), used adverbially, hence “slimily,” that is, with a slimy trail (GKC §118q). G, however, having read תמס as the *niphal* imperfect third-person feminine singular of מסס (“melt”), which he translated with τήκω (“melt”), guessed the meaning of שבלול from the subject of the other three

occurrences of **מסס** in Psalms, namely, **דונג** (“wax”) = **κηρός** (21.15; 67.3; 96.5). For **ταχείς** see verse 8 above.

**ἀνταναιρεθήσονται**. If the Hebrew metaphor is about a snail that dissolves as it goes (**יהלך**) (so Kraus 1972, 533; Tate 1990, 82), it is equally clear that the changes forced upon G demanded a new role for **יהלך**. Thus, since the figurative language in the preceding verses is about the “sinners,” it makes sense that the verb in 9a be made to refer to them as well, the more so since 9b already has a plural verb in the source text. Twice in the LXX is **ἀνταναιρέω** paired with **הלך**, here and in 108.23.

**ἐπέπεσε πῦρ**. The Hebrew next compares the destiny of the wicked to that of **נפל אשת** (“a woman’s stillborn child,” i.e., they do not see the sun). But G read **נפל** as the homographic verb **נפל** (“fall”), and interpreted **אשת** as **שֶׁשׁ** (“fire”), guided perhaps by the melting wax of the first stich. The resulting Greek describes the fate of sinners as death by fire from above.

57.10

בטרם יבינו סירתכם אטד || כמו חי כמו חרון ישערנו

πρὸ τοῦ συνεῖναι τὰς ἀκάνθας ὑμῶν τῇν ῥάμνον,  
ὥσει ζῶντας ὥσει ἐν ὀργῇ καταγιγίται<sup>b</sup> ὑμᾶς.

<sup>a</sup>Before your thistles take note of the thorn-shrub, as if in anger it will bestorm<sup>b</sup> you, as if alive<sup>a</sup>.

<sup>a</sup> Greek uncertain; <sup>b</sup> **καταπίεται** (“devour”) = Rahlfs

**τὰς ἀκάνθας ὑμῶν**. The Hebrew **סירות** can be the plural for either **סיר** (“cooking pot”) or **סירה** (“thorn”); NRSV opted for the former, and G the latter. That G knew the meaning of **סיר** is clear from 59.10 = 107.10, where he translated it as **λέβης** (“cauldron”). Here the context gives little direction, unlike in Eccl 7.6: “the crackling of thorns [**סירים**] under the pot [**סיר**]” (NIV). The verb **בין** (“understand, sense”) will not have helped to tip the balance either, since one would not readily attribute perception to either pots or thorns. The nearby occurrence of **אטד** (“bramble”), which G glossed as **ῥάμνος** (“thorn-shrub”), may well have triggered his choice for a similar plant, **ἀκάνθα** (“thorn”), which he otherwise reserved for **קין** (“thorn”) (31.4 [cf. MT **קין** (“summer”)]; 117.12). The Greek term

is general (BDAG, MM), whereas Hebrew סירה refers specifically to the thorny burnet (*Poterium spinosum*; see NIDOTTE 3:246 and the literature cited there).

ὥσεί ζῶντας ὥσεί ἐν ὀργῇ. The meaning of the Hebrew is obscure, and G makes no effort to enlighten the reader but simply translates item for item. The preposition כ (here כמו) is often prefixed to both members of a comparison, which here would mean something like “alive and burning alike.” Thus NRSV has “whether green or ablaze,” referring evidently to the thorns heating the pots. G opted for ὥσεί (“as if”), which can also be used of comparisons to mean “like, just as” (LSJ). Unlike the Hebrew preposition, comparisons in nontranslational Greek do not repeat ὥσεί. Hence G’s isomorphic approach has produced two comparisons. The Greek follows the word order of the Hebrew; ὥσεί ζῶντας precedes ὥσεί ἐν ὀργῇ, but NETS has reversed the order to reflect the fact that ζῶντας is cast as an accusative plural modifying ὑμᾶς.

καταιγιέται ὑμᾶς. Rahlfs has καταπίεται ὑμᾶς uncontested, which would be an odd translation choice given that it is G’s default for בלע (“to swallow”) and does not overlap with the semantic range of its Hebrew counterpart שער (also spelled סער) (“to storm”). Papyrus Bodmer XXIV (2110) has since provided the variant καταιγιέται (from καταιγίζω [“rush down like a storm”]; Kasser and Testuz 1967, 114, l. 22), which correlates with G’s choice of the noun καταιγίς (“squall, hurricane”) for the same Hebrew root in 49.3; 54.9; 82.16; 106.25, 29; and 148.8. Indeed, καταιγίς appears to have been something of a favorite for G: ten of its twenty-nine occurrences in LXX are found in Psalms, for a variety of Hebrew nouns. Pietersma has adopted this reading in NETS (see also Pietersma 1990, 266–67). Its subject is either πῦρ (“fire”) from verse 9 (so NETS’s “it,” though one wonders whether G even thought that far), or God (i.e., “he”). NETS’s barely intelligible translation deliberately reflects the fact that G was more interested in formal correspondence to the Hebrew than coherence in Greek. The sole antecedent for ὑμᾶς in the Greek psalm is the “sons of men” of verse 2. Since the Hebrew verb has a third-person singular suffix with energetic *nun*, Mozley deems ὑμᾶς a Greek corruption for ἡμᾶς or αὐτούς (1905, 95), but the former lacks manuscript support and the latter has hexaplaric support, suggesting that it was a secondary correction toward the Hebrew. Hence either the *Vorlage* had a second-person plural suffix, or, if it was the same as MT, G adjusted the pronoun to clarify the antecedent (see Pietersma 2008, 174).

57.11–12

ישמח צדיק כי חזה נקם || פעמיו ירחץ בדם הרשע  
ויאמר אדם אך פרי לצדיק || אך יש אלהים שפטים בארץ

εὐφρανθήσεται δίκαιος, ὅταν ἴδῃ ἐκδίκησιν.<sup>c</sup>  
τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ νίψεται ἐν τῷ αἵματι τοῦ ἁμαρτωλοῦ.  
καὶ ἐρεῖ ἄνθρωπος Εἰ ἄρα ἔστιν καρπὸς τῷ δικαίῳ,  
ἄρα ἔστιν ὁ θεὸς κρίνων αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ γῇ.

A righteous one will be glad when he sees vengeance done<sup>c</sup>;  
he will wash his hands in the blood of the sinner.  
And a person will say, “If then there is a return for the righteous,  
then God exists, judging them on the earth.”

<sup>c</sup> + ἀσεβῶν (“to impious ones”) = Rahlfs

**ὅταν ἴδῃ ἐκδίκησιν.** The Greek has a temporal clause referring indefinitely to the future (“whenever that might be”), as it typically does when G understood כִּי to introduce a temporal clause (2.12; 36.24; 48.10, 16, 19; 70.23, 24, 74.3; 101.1; 118.32, 171; 119.7; 126.5). Rahlfs has ἐκδίκησιν ἀσεβῶν (“vengeance of [i.e., “for,” an objective genitive] impious ones”), judging the omission of ἀσεβῶν to be a hexaplaric adjustment toward the Hebrew. But 2110 (not available to Rahlfs), an important witness to the prehexaplaric text of the Psalter, also leaves it out, suggesting that its omission in agreement with the Hebrew is not hexaplaric but original.

**τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ νίψεται.** G followed normal Greek usage of λούω for washing the body, νίπτω (earlier νίζω) for washing hands and feet, and πλύνω for washing clothing. G predictably rendered פֶּעַם (“footstep, instance”) with διάβημα (“step”) in 16.5; 84.14; 118.133; 139.5, and with ποὺς (“foot”) in 56.7. Here (and in 73.3) he opted for χεῖρ (“hand”), however, producing Greek resembling that of 25.6 and 72.13 (νίπτομαι ἐν ἀθώοις τὰς χεῖράς μου [“I wash my hands in innocence”]), though there the Hebrew noun is כַּף, which unlike פֶּעַם can refer to either the sole or the palm. One wonders, then, what might have prompted the shift from “feet” to “hands.” To associate the shift with G’s choice of ἐντείνω (“stretch”) for דָּרַךְ (“tread”; i.e., bending a bow with the hand rather than the foot) in verse 8 is scarcely credible. It is possible that the *Vorlage* had כַּפָּיו (“his hands”), as at 25.6 and 72.13 (so *BHS*), though no Hebrew evidence for such a variant sur-

vives. The fact that 73.3 likewise has *χείρ* for *פֶּעַם* diminishes the likelihood that the difference is due to the parent text. At 73.3 the choice may be contextual, that is, a more suitable object for the Hebrew imperative *הֲרִימָה* (“lift up”). Here context may likewise have played a role: the Hebrew image of wading in the blood of sinners suggests participating in (or at least enjoying) the vengeance carried out on them. G may have written “hands” in order to avoid such a distasteful notion (since vengeance belongs to the Lord), suggesting that in the Greek the righteous disavows participation. On the basis of a Ugaritic parallel, Dahood (1968, 63) translates the Hebrew clause as “wash his hands *of* blood,” but had G so interpreted it, he could have written ἀπὸ τῶν χειρῶν αὐτοῦ νίψεται τὸ αἶμα (“he will wash the blood from his hands”; see LSJ, s.v. “νίζω” II. “wash off”). Rather G may have understood the clause to mean washing one’s hands (in the blood of the sinner) for the purpose of making them clean. That is to say, the bloody end of the sinner serves to cleanse the hands of the righteous one, perhaps by impelling him to avoid a similar fate. One in fact finds such an interpretation in the psalm’s reception history: “For hear the prophet saying, ‘The righteous shall rejoice when he sees the vengeance on the ungodly; he shall wash his hands in the blood of the sinner.’ Not rejoicing on account of it, God forbid, but fearing that he might suffer the same things, he will render his own life more pure” (Chrysostom, *Hom. Phlm.* 3, quoted in Wesselschmidt 2007, 36). At any rate, the resulting translation contrasts the hands of the righteous with the hands of sinners in verse 3.

**Εἰ ἄρα ... ἄρα ἐστὶν ὁ θεός.** The repetition of *εἰ* and *ἄρα* from verse 2 creates the illusion that G has produced an *inclusio* not present in the Hebrew psalm. But here the choice of inferential *ἄρα* (“then”) for emphatic *ךָא* (“surely” [2x]) indicates that *εἰ* does not introduce a question. In fact, the occurrence of *εἰ* without formal warrant from the Hebrew suggests an interpretive move on the part of the translator. Perhaps he construed the second inference as deduced from the first (“then ... so then”) and thus cast it as an apodosis to the first (“if ... then”). Of some interest is the inclusion of the article, making *ὁ θεός* the subject rather than the predicate of *ἐστίν*. That is to say, G did not write, “then there is a God” (cf. 13.1: οὐκ ἐστὶν θεός “there is no God”), but “then God exists.” The article with *θεός* is standard, doubtless to distinguish between Israel’s God and any god, and thus its omission is noteworthy. The effect of the whole is that the return for the righteous proves God’s existence. G cast the condition as real, in keeping

with the gladness of the righteous one in verse 11: if then there is a return for the righteous (and there is), then God exists.

κρίνων αὐτούς. MT has a plural participle (שפטים [“judging”]) attributed to אלהים, an honorific with plural agreement. But G evidently read שפט, that is, singular participle with third masculine plural suffix, writing κρίνων αὐτούς (“judging them”). But who is “them”? The omission of ἄσεβων (“impious ones”) (above) leaves the pronoun without an explicit antecedent, and the reader of NETS might be forgiven for thinking that it refers to “the righteous,” though mistakenly, since the latter is singular. G simply rendered the pronominal suffix with its Greek equivalent, evidently more concerned with formal equivalence than clarity of reference.

### Summary

Whereas the Hebrew psalm is usually read as addressed to “gods,” the Greek addresses “sons of men.” Further, G’s translation of Hebrew imperatives with Greek indicatives in verse 7 makes the psalm slightly less “imprecatory” than its *Vorlage*. Finally, standard equivalents at times have different meanings than their Hebrew counterparts.

## Appendix

### Preamble to the Guidelines for the Contributors to the SBL Commentary on the Septuagint

The objective of the Society of Biblical Literature Commentary on the Septuagint (SBLCS) is to elucidate the meaning of *the text-as-produced* in distinction from *the text-as-received*. Meaning, however, is neither to be presupposed nor to be superimposed from either the source text or the text-as-received (cf. Prospectus [2]). Inherent in this goal statement are four fundamental principles.

**1.1. The commentary is *genetic*, in the sense that it seeks to trace the translation *process* that results in the *product*, i.e., the so-called original text of the Old Greek (cf. Prospectus [1]).**

1.1.1. The text-as-produced is conceptualized as a *dependent* entity, derived from its source text. That is to say, it is perceived to be *compositionally* dependent on its source, though not *semantically* dependent (see Prospectus [3]).

1.1.2. The aim is to uncover the strategies and norms by means of which the text came into being. Therefore, the commentator will analyze the relationship between the target text and the source text, attempting to account for the *process* underlying the derivation of the Greek version from its Semitic parent. It is from this analysis that the commentator will formulate his or her principles of interpretation and procedural methodology.

**1.2. The primary focus of the commentary is the *verbal make-up* of the translation, understood in terms of *conventional* linguistic usage (i.e., the grammar and lexicon of the target language) rather than in terms of what may be encountered in translation Greek (see Prospectus [5]).**

1.2.1. The text-as-produced can be said to have semantic autonomy because it means what it means in terms of the grammar and lexicon of the Greek language at the time of the Septuagint's production.

1.2.2. The "reader" of the text-as-produced is conceptualized as the *prospective* or *implied* reader, a construct based on the text itself, in distinction from any reader, actual or hypothetical, exterior to the text. The prospective reader is to be inferred from those features of the text's make-up that are indicative of a specific linguistic, literary, or cultural aim (e.g., transcriptions and Hebraisms).

**1.3. The text-as-produced represents *a historical event* and should be described with reference to the relevant features of its historical context.**

1.3.1. The translation is to be viewed as a fact of the culture that produced it inasmuch as it is a specimen of discourse within that culture.

1.3.2. The verbal make-up of the translation should be understood in relation to the cultural system in which it was produced, that is to say, the sort of text it is as a Greek document.

1.3.3. Since unintelligibility is one of the inherent characteristics of the text-as-produced, it should not always be assumed to make sense (see §1.2.1 above).

**1.4. The text-as-produced is *the act of a historical agent*—the translator—and should be described with reference to the translator's intentions, to the extent that these are evident (see Prospectus [4]).**

1.4.1. The meaning of the text is best understood as encompassing both *what* the translator did and *why*.

1.4.2. The commentator's task thus includes the following: (a) to search out the intention of the translator insofar as this may be



inferred from the transformation of the source text and the verbal make-up of the target text; (b) to describe the possibilities *deliberately* marked out by the language of the text (see §3.2.3.1 and 3.2.5.1 below).

1.4.3. It should not be presupposed in any given instance that the translator's primary intention was to produce an intelligible text.



## Contributors

Cameron Boyd-Taylor  
*Trinity Western University*

Dirk Büchner  
*Trinity Western University*

Claude E. Cox  
*McMaster Divinity College*

Robert J. V. Hiebert  
*Trinity Western Seminary/ACTS*

Spencer A. Jones  
*Trinity Western University*

Larry Perkins  
*Northwestern Baptist Seminary/ACTS*

Albert Pietersma  
*University of Toronto, emeritus*

Jannes Smith  
*Canadian Reformed Theological Seminary*

