

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

TEXT-CRITICAL STUDIES

Juan Hernández Jr., General Editor

Editorial Board:

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

Number 13



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

Ronald L. Troxel



SBL PRESS

Atlanta

Copyright © 2022 by Ronald L. Troxel

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: Troxel, Ronald L., 1951– author.

Title: Commentary on the old Greek and Peshitta of Isaiah 1–25 / Ronald L. Troxel.

Other titles: Text-critical studies ; 13.

Description: Atlanta : SBL Press, 2022. | Series: Text-critical studies; 13 | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2019059619 | ISBN 9781628372755 (paperback) | ISBN 9780884144397 (hardback) | ISBN 9780884144403 (ebook)

Subjects: LCSH: Bible. Isaiah—Commentaries.

Classification: LCC BS1515.53 .T769 2020 | DDC 224/.1042—dc23

LC record available at <https://lccn.loc.gov/2019059619>

For Ben and Bryan,
Angie and Tyler

Contents

Preface.....	ix
General Abbreviations.....	xi
Symbols, Abbreviations, and Bibliography	xiii
Symbols and Technical Abbreviations.....	xiii
Bible Texts and Translations.....	xiii
Frequently Cited Works.....	xiv
Bibliography.....	xvi
 Introduction.....	 1
 Isaiah 1.....	 21
Isaiah 2.....	47
Isaiah 3.....	67
Isaiah 4.....	101
Isaiah 5.....	109
Isaiah 6.....	143
Isaiah 7.....	155
Isaiah 8.....	171
Isaiah 9.....	193
Isaiah 10.....	215
Isaiah 11.....	251
Isaiah 12.....	269
Isaiah 13.....	275
Isaiah 14.....	293
Isaiah 15.....	321
Isaiah 16.....	331
Isaiah 17.....	345
Isaiah 18.....	361
Isaiah 19.....	369
Isaiah 20.....	387

Isaiah 21393

Isaiah 22409

Isaiah 23431

Isaiah 24447

Isaiah 25473

Appendix A: +/- בל in Old Greek and Syriac Isaiah507

Appendix B: Translation of אד in Old Greek and Syriac Isaiah543

Appendix C: Translation of כי in Old Greek and Syriac Isaiah547

Preface

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Minneapolis
December 2021

General Abbreviations

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

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

Symbols, Abbreviations, and Bibliography

Symbols and Technical Abbreviations

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

Bible Texts and Translations

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

- OL Old Latin. Cited from Roger Gryson and Paul-Augustin Deproost, eds. *Commentaires de Jerome sur le prophete Isaie: Livres I–IV*. Aus der Geschichte der lateinischen Bibel 23. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1993.
- S Peshitta. Sebastian Brock. *Isaiah*. 2nd ed. Old Testament in Syriac according to the Peshitta Version 3.1. Leiden: Brill, 1993.
- T Targum. “Aramaic Targums.” Accordance Bible v. 12.2.8. Oak-Tree Software, 2014.
- V Vulgate. Robert Weber and Roger Gryson, eds. *Biblia Sacra Iuxta Vulgatam*. 5th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007.

Frequently Cited Works

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

- BDAG — Danker, Frederick W., Walter Bauer, William F. Arndt, and F. Wilbur Gingrich. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
- BDF — Blass, Friedrich, Albert Debrunner, and Robert W. Funk. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1961.
- Byun — Byun, Seulgi L. *The Influence of Post-Biblical Hebrew and Aramaic on the Translator of Septuagint Isaiah*. LHBOTS 635. Hebrew Bible and Its Versions 9. New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2017.
- das Neves—Neves, J. C. M. das. *A Teologia da Tradução Grega dos Setenta no Livro de Isaías*. Lisbon: Universidade Católica Portuguesa, 1973.
- Fischer — Fischer, Johann. *In Welcher Schrift lag das Buch Isaias den LXX vor?* BZAW 56. Giessen: Töpelmann, 1930.
- GELS — Muraoka, Takamitsu. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. Leuven: Peeters, 2009.
- Goshen-Gottstein — Goshen-Gottstein, Moshe H. ed. *The Book of Isaiah*. HUB 1. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1975. HUB 2. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1981. Hebrew page numbers cited.
- Greenberg and Walter — Bali, Joseph, Gillian Greenberg, George A. Kiraz, and Donald M. Walter. *The Syriac Peshitta Bible with English Translation: Isaiah*. Antioch Bible. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2012.

- HALOT — Koehler, Ludwig, Walter Baumgartner, and Johann Jakob Stamm. *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. 4 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1994–1999.
- JM — Joüon, Paul, and Takamitsu Muraoka. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. 2nd ed. Subsidia Biblica 27. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 2006.
- La Bible d'Alexandrie — Le Boulleuec, Alain, and Philippe Le Mogne. *Vision Que Vit Isaïe: Traduction du texte du prophète Isaïe selon la Septante*. La Bible d'Alexandrie. Paris: Cerf, 2014.
- LSJ — Liddell, Henry, Robert Scott, and Henry Stuart Jones. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. 9th ed. with revised supplement Oxford: Clarendon, 1968.
- NETS — Pietersma, Albert, and Benjamin G. Wright III eds. *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*. Oxford: Oxford, 2007.
- Nöldeke — Nöldeke, Theodor. *Compendious Syriac Grammar, with an Appendix: The Handwritten Additions in Theodor Nöldeke's Personal Copy*. Translated by James A. Crichton and Peter T. Daniels. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2001.
- Ottley — Ottley, Richard R. *The Book of Isaiah According to the Septuagint*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1904–1906.
- Payne-Smith — Smith, Jessie Payne. *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1903.
- Scholz — Scholz, Anton. *Die alexandrinische Übersetzung des Buches Jesaias*. Würzburg: Woerl, 1880.
- Seeligmann — Seeligmann, I. L. *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah*. Leuven: Brill, 1948.
- Septuaginta Deutsch — Kraus, Wolfgang, and Martin Karrer, eds. *Septuaginta Deutsch: Das griechische Alte Testament in deutscher Übersetzung*. 2nd ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2010.
- Smyth — Smyth, Herbert W. *Greek Grammar*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956.
- SyrLex — Sokolof, Michael. *A Syriac Lexicon: A Translation from the Latin, Correction, Expansion, and Update of C. Brockelmann's Lexicon Syriacum*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns; Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2009.
- Troxel — Troxel, Ronald L. *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation*. JSJSup 124. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Van der Kooij — Kooij, Arie van der. *Die alten Textzeugen des Jesajabuches: Ein Beitrag zur Textgeschichte des Alten Testaments*. OBO 35. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981.

- Van der Vorm-Croughs — Vorm-Croughs, Mirjam van der. *The Old Greek of Isaiah: An Analysis of Its Pluses and Minuses*. SCS 61. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014.
- Wagner — Wagner, J. Ross. *Reading the Sealed Book: Old Greek Isaiah and the Problem of Septuagint Hermeneutics*. FAT 88. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.
- Warszawski — Warszawski, Ludwig. *Die Peschitta zu Jesaja (Kap. 1–39): Ihr Verhältnis zum massoretischen Texte, zur Septuaginta und zum Targum*. Berlin: Itzkowski, 1897.
- Weisz — Weisz, Heinrich. “Die Peschitta zu Deuteriojesaja und ihr Verhältniss zu MT., LXX. u. Trg.” Halle, 1893.
- Ziegler — Ziegler, Joseph. *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaías*. ATA 12.3. Münster: Aschendorffschen, 1934.

Bibliography

- Alexandre, Marguerite, and Monique Harl. *La Genèse*. La Bible d’Alexandrie 1. Paris: Cerf, 1986.
- Atwood, Preston L. “The Peshiṭta of Isaiah in Past and Present Scholarship.” *CurBR* 18 (2020): 211–45.
- Auld, Graeme. *Joshua: Jesus, son of Nauē, in Codex Vaticanus*. Septuagint Commentary Series. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Baer, David A. “It’s All about Us! Nationalistic Exegesis in the Greek Isaiah (Chapters 1–12).” *SBLSP* 40 (2001): 197–219.
- Barr, James. “‘Guessing’ in the Septuagint.” Pages 19–34 in *Studien zur Septuaginta*. Edited by Detlef Fraenkel, Udo Quast, and John W. Wevers. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990.
- Barthélemy, Dominique. “Le grand rouleau d’Isaïe trouvé près de la Mer Morte.” *RB* 57 (1950): 530–49.
- Beuken, Willem A. M. *Jesaja 13–27*. HThKAT. Freiburg: Herder, 2007.
- Bodor, Attila. “The Reception of the Septuagint in the Peshitta of Isaiah.” *VT* 69 (2019): 19–32.
- Brock, Sebastian. “Aspects of Translation Technique in Antiquity.” *GRBS* 20 (1979): 69–87.
- . “Text History and Text Division in Peshiṭta Isaiah.” Pages 49–80 in *The Peshiṭta: Its Early Text and History*. Edited by Peter B. Dirksen. MPIL 4. Leiden: Brill, 1988.
- Brockington, L. H. “The Greek Translator of Isaiah and His Interest in DOXA.” *VT* 1 (1951): 23–32.

- Budde, Karl. "Über die Schranken, die Jesajas prophetischer Botschaft zu setzen sind." *ZAW* 41 (1923): 154–203.
- Cheyne, T. K. *The Prophecies of Isaiah*. London, 1887.
- Chilton, Bruce D. *The Isaiah Targum: Introduction, Translation, Apparatus and Notes*. ArBib 11. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987.
- Clements, Ronald E. *Isaiah 1–39*. NCB. London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1980.
- Clines, David J. A. *Job 1–20*. WBC 17. Dallas: Word, 1989.
- Coste, J. "Le texte Grec d'Isaie xxv:1–5." *RB* 61 (1954): 36–66.
- Cunha, Wilson de Angelo. *LXX Isaiah 24:1–26:6 as Interpretation and Translation: A Methodological Discussion*. SCS 62. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014.
- De Vries, Simon J. *From Old Revelation to New: A Tradition-Historical and Redaction-Critical Study of Temporal Transitions in Prophetic Prediction*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
- Delekat, Lienhard. "Die Peschitta zu Jesaja zwischen Targum und Septuaginta." *Bib* 38 (1957): 185–99.
- Dirksen, Peter B. "The Peshiṭta and Textual Criticism of the Old Testament." *VT* 42 (1992): 376–90.
- Dogniez, Cécile. "Le traducteur d'Isaïe connaissait-il le texte grec du Dodekapropheten?" *Adamantius* 13 (2007): 29–34.
- Driver, Samuel R. *Notes on the Hebrew Text of Samuel*. 2nd ed. London: Oxford University Press, 1912.
- Duhm, Bernard. *Das Buch Jesaja*. Edited by D. Wilhelm Nowack. HKAT 3. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1892.
- Forster, A. Haire. "The Meaning of Δόξα in the Greek Bible." *ATHR* 12 (1929/1930): 311–16.
- Fox, Michael V. *Proverbs: An Eclectic Edition with Introduction and Textual Commentary*. Hebrew Bible: A Critical Edition. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015.
- . *Proverbs 10–31*. AB. New Haven: Yale, 2009.
- Fraser, Peter M. *Ptolemaic Alexandria*. 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1972.
- Gadamer, Hans-George. *Truth and Method*. London: Sheed & Ward, 1975.
- Gesenius, Wilhelm. *Philologisch-kritischer und historischer Commentar über den Jesaja*. Vol. 1. Leipzig: Vogel, 1821.
- Gils, David. "Universal Quantification in Hebrew and Arabic." Pages 105–22 in *Studies in Afroasiatic Grammar: Papers from the Second Conference on Afroasiatic Languages Sophia Antipolis, 1994*. Edited

- by Jacqueline Lecarme, Jean Lowenstamm, and Ur Shlonsky. Hague: Holland Academic Graphics, 1996.
- Goshen-Gottstein, Moshe H. "Biblical Philology and the Concordance." *JJS* 8 (1957): 5–12.
- . *The Book of Isaiah, Sample Edition with Introduction*. HUB. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1965.
- . "Theory and Practice of Textual Criticism." *Textus* 3 (1963): 130–58.
- Govett, Robert. *Isaiah Unfulfilled*. London: Nisbet, 1841.
- Gray, George Buchanan. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Isaiah I–XXVII*. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1912.
- Greenberg, Gillian. *Translation Technique in the Peshitta to Jeremiah*. MPIL 13. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Harl, Monique. "La Bible d'Alexandrie dans les débats actuels sur la Septante." Pages 7–24 in *La Double transmission du texte biblique: Études d'histoire du texte offertes en hommage à Adrian Schenker*. Edited by Yohanan Goldman and Christoph Uehlinger. OBO 179. Fribourg: Editions Universitaires; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001.
- Hendel, Ronald. "What Is a Biblical Book?" Pages 283–302 in *From Author to Copyist: Composition, Redaction, and Transmission of the Hebrew Bible in Honor of Zipi Talshir*. Edited by Cana Werman. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2015.
- Hiebert, R J. V. "In the Beginning: A Commentary on the Old Greek Text of Genesis 1.1–2.3." Pages 17–67 in *The SBL Commentary on the Septuagint: An Introduction*. Edited by Dirk Büchner. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2017.
- Jauss, Hans R. *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*. Translated by Timothy Bahti. Theory and History of Literature 2. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1982.
- Jerome. *Commentaires de Jerome sur le prophete Isaie, Livres I–IV*. Edited by Roger Gryson and Paul-Augustin Deproost. Aus der Geschichte der Lateinischen Bibel 23. Freiburg am Breisgau: Herder, 1993.
- Kaiser, Otto. *Isaiah 13–39, A Commentary*. Translated by John Bowden. OTL. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1974.
- Katz, Peter. "Notes on the Septuagint: I. Isaiah VIII 1^a." *JTS* 47(1946): 30–33.
- Koenig, Jean. *L' Herméneutique analogique du Judaïsme antique*. VTSup 33. Leiden: Brill, 1982.

- Kooij, Arie van der. "Accident or Method? On 'Analogical' Interpretation in the Old Greek of Isa and in 1QIs^a." *BO* 43 (1986): 366–76.
- . "The Cities of Isaiah 24–27 according to the Vulgate, Targum and Septuagint." Pages 183–98 in *Studies in Isaiah 24–27*. Edited by Arie van der Kooij. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- . "Isaiah 24–27: Text-Critical Notes." Pages 13–15 in *Studies in Isaiah 24–27*. Edited by Arie van der Kooij. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- . "Isaiah in the Septuagint." Pages 513–29 in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah*. Edited by Craig C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans. VTSup 70. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- . *The Oracle of Tyre: The Septuagint of Isaiah 23 as Version and Vision*. VTSup 71. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- . "The Septuagint of Isaiah and the Hebrew Text of Isa 2:22 and 36:7." Pages 377–86 in *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, and the Septuagint Presented to Eugene Ulrich*. Edited by Peter W. Flint, Emanuel Tov, and James VanderKam. VTSupp 101. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- . "The Text of Isaiah and Its Early Witnesses in Hebrew." Pages 143–52 in *Sôfer Mahîr: Essays in Honour of Adrian Schenker*. Edited by Yohanan Goldman and Richard D. Weis. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- . "Wie heißt der Messias?" Pages 156–69 in *Vergegenwärtigung des alten Testaments: Beiträge zur biblischen Hermeneutik; Festschrift für Rudolf Smend zum 70. Geburtstag*. Edited by Christoph Bultmann, Walter Dietrich, and Christoph Levin. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2002.
- Koster, Marinus D. "The Copernican Revolution in the Study of the Origins of the Peshitta." Pages 15–54 in *Targum Studies, Volume 2: Targum and Peshitta*. Edited by Paul V. M. Fleisher. SFSHJ 165. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998.
- . "Peshiṭta Revisited: A Reassessment of Its Value as a Version." *JSS* 38 (1993): 235–68.
- . "'Translation or Transmission? That is the Question': The Use of the Leiden O. T. Peshitta Edition." Pages 297–312 in *Basel und Bibel: Collected Communications to the XVIIth Congress of the International Organizations for the Study of the Old Testament, Basel 2001*. Edited by Matthias Augustin and Hermann M. Niemann. Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 2004.
- Kutscher, E. Y. *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (IQIsaa)*. STDJ 6. Leiden: Brill, 1974.

- LaCocque, André, and Paul Ricoeur. *Thinking Biblically: Exegetical and Hermeneutical Studies*. Translated by David Pellauer. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998.
- Liebmann, Ernst. "Der Text zu Jesaja 24–27." *ZAW* 22 (1902): 1–56, 285–304; 23 (1903): 209–86; 24 (1904): 51–104; 25 (1905): 145–71.
- Loiseau, Anne-Françoise. *L'influence de l'araméen sur les traducteurs de la LXX principalement, sur les traducteurs grecs postérieurs, ainsi que sur les scribes de la Vorlage de la LXX*. SCS 65. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2016.
- Louw, Theo A. W. van der. *Transformations in the Septuagint: Towards an Interaction of Septuagint Studies and Translation Studies*. CBET 47. Leuven: Peeters, 2007.
- Lust, Johan. "Messianism in the Septuagint: Isaiah 8:23b–9:6 (9:1–7)." Pages 147–63 in *The Interpretation of the Bible: The International Symposium in Slovenia*. Edited by Joze Krašovec. JSOTSup 289. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1998.
- Meek, Theophile James. "Some Emendations in the Old Testament." *JBL* 48 (1929): 162–68.
- Monsengwo-Pasinya, L. "Isaïe xix 16–25 et universalisme dans la LXX." Pages 192–207 in *Congress Volume: Salamanca, 1983*. Edited by J. A. Emerton. VTSup 36. Leiden: Brill, 1985.
- Moran, William L. "The Putative Root of 'TM in Isaiah 9:18.'" *CBQ* 12 (1950): 153–54.
- Moulton, James Hope. *A Grammar of New Testament Greek: Prolegomena*. 2nd ed. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1906.
- Moulton, James H., and George Milligan. *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-literary Sources*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1930.
- Orlinsky, Harry M. "Studies in the Septuagint of the Book of Job, Chapter II." *HUCA* 29 (1958): 229–71.
- Penner, Ken M. "Introduction to the Series on Greek Isaiah." *B-Greek: The Biblical Greek Forum*, 11 July 2011. <http://www.ibiblio.org/bgreek/forum/viewtopic.php?f=51&t=426>.
- Pietersma, Albert. "Beyond Literalism: Interlinearity Revisited." Pages 3–21 in *Translation is Required: The Septuagint in Retrospect and Prospect*. Edited by Robert J. V. Hiebert. SCS 56. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010.
- . "A New Paradigm for Addressing Old Questions: The Relevance of the Interlinear Model for the Study of the Septuagint." Pages 337–64

- in *Bible and Computer: The Stellenbosch AIBI-6 Conference*. Edited by Johann Cook. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- . “A Panel Presentation on Ronald Troxel’s *LXX-Isaiah*.” Panel discussion at the Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature. Boston, MA, 23 November 2008. <http://homes.chass.utoronto.ca/~pietersm/>.
- . “Response to: T. Muraoka, ‘Recent Discussions on the Septuagint Lexicography with Special Reference to the So-called Interlinear Model.’” <https://tinyurl.com/SBL7013a>.
- . “The Society of Biblical Literature Commentary on the Septuagint: Basic Principles.” Pages 1–16 in *The SBL Commentary on the Septuagint: An Introduction*. Edited by Dirk Büchner. SCS 67. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2017.
- Pietersma, Albert, Claude E. Cox, Moises Silva, Benjamin G. Wright III, and David Aiken. “Preamble to the Guidelines for the Contributors to the SBL Commentary on the Septuagint.” Pages 257–59 in *The SBL Commentary on the Septuagint: An Introduction*. Edited by Dirk Büchner. SCS 67. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2017.
- . “A Prospectus for a Commentary on the Septuagint.” *BIOSCS* 31 (1998): 43–48.
- Procksch, Otto, and Paul Volz. *Jesaja 1*. KAT 9.1. Leipzig: Deichert, 1930.
- Roberts, J. J. M. *First Isaiah: A Commentary*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2015.
- Rowlands, E. R. “The Targum and the Peshitta Version of the Book of Isaiah.” *VT* 9 (1959): 178–91.
- Running, Leona. “An Investigation of the Syriac Version of Isaiah: I.” *AUSS* 3 (1965): 138–57.
- . “An Investigation of the Syriac Version of Isaiah: II.” *AUSS* 4 (1966): 37–64.
- . “An Investigation of the Syriac Version of Isaiah: III.” *AUSS* 4 (1966): 135–48.
- Skehan, Patrick W., and Alexander A. Di Lella. *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: A New Translation with Notes*. AB 39. New York: Doubleday, 1987.
- Sollamo, Raija. “The Pleonastic Use of the Pronoun in Connection with the Relative Pronoun in the Greek Pentateuch.” Pages 75–85 in *VII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Leuven, 1989*. Edited by Claude E. Cox. SCS 31. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991.

- . “The Pleonastic Use of the Pronoun in Connection with the Relative Pronoun in the LXX of Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy.” Pages 43–62 in *VIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Paris, 1992*. Edited by Leonard J. Greenspoon and Olivier Munnich. SCS 41. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.
- Sousa, Rodrigo. F. de. *Eschatology and Messianism in LXX Isaiah 1–12*. LHBOTS 516. London: T&T Clark, 2010.
- Stenning, John F. *The Targum of Isaiah*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1949.
- Stipp, Hermann-Josef. *Das masoretische und alexandrinische Sondergut des Jeremiabuches: Textgeschichtlicher Rang, Eigenarten, Triebkräfte*. OBO 136. Fribourg: Academic Press; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994.
- Szpek, Heidi M. “On the Influence of the Septuagint on the Peshitta.” *CBQ* 60 (1998): 251–66.
- Talmon, Shemaryahu. “Aspects of the Textual Transmission of the Bible in the Light of Qumran Manuscripts.” *Textus* 4 (1964): 95–132.
- . “The Old Testament Text.” Pages 159–99 in *The Cambridge History of the Bible: Volume 1, From the Beginning to Jerome*. Edited by Peter R. Ackroyd and Craig A. Evans. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.
- Ter Haar Romeny, R. Bas. “The Peshitta of Isaiah: Evidence from the Syriac Fathers.” Pages 149–64 in *Text, Translation, and Tradition: Studies on the Peshitta and Its Use in the Syriac Tradition Presented to Konrad D. Jenner on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*. Edited by Wido Theodor Van Peursen and R. Bas Ter Haar Romeny. MPIL 14. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Thackeray, H. S. J. “The Greek Translators of the Prophetic Book.” *JTS* 4 (1903): 578–85.
- Toury, Gideon. *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Benjamins Translation Library 4. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1995.
- . “A Handful of Methodological Issues in DTS: Are They Applicable to the Study of the Septuagint as an Assumed Translation?” *BIOSCS* 39 (2006): 13–25.
- Tov, Emanuel. “Biliteral Exegesis of Hebrew Roots in the Septuagint.” Pages 459–82 in *Reflection and Refraction: Studies in Biblical Historiography in Honour of A. Graeme Auld*. Edited by Robert Rezetko, Timothy H. Lim, and W. Brian Aucker. VTSup 113. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

- . “Compound Words in the LXX Representing Two or More Hebrew Words.” *Bib* 58 (1977): 189–212.
- . *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*. 3rd ed. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2015.
- . *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. 3rd ed. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012.
- Troxel, Ronald L. “BOYAH and BOYAEYEIN in LXX Isaiah.” Pages 153–71 in *The Old Greek of Isaiah: Issues and Perspectives; Papers Read at the Conference on the Septuagint of Isaiah, Held in Leiden 10–11 April 2008*. Edited by Arie van der Kooij and Michael N. van der Meer. CBET 55. Leuven: Peeters, 2010.
- . “Economic Plunder as a Leitmotif in LXX-Isaiah.” *Bib* 83 (2002): 375–91.
- . “Isaiah 7,14–16 through the Eyes of the Septuagint.” *ETL* 79(2003): 1–22.
- . “What Is the ‘Text’ in Textual Criticism?” *VT* 66 (2016): 603–26.
- . “What’s in a Name? Contemporization and Toponyms in LXX-Isaiah.” Pages 327–44 in *Seeking Out the Wisdom of the Ancients: Essays Offered to Honor Michael V. Fox on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*. Edited by Ronald L Troxel, Kelvin Friebel, and Dennis Magary. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2005.
- . “Writing Commentary on the Life of a Text.” *VT* 67 (2017): 105–28.
- Uchelen, Nico A. van “Isaiah 1:9: Text and Context.” Pages 155–63 in *Remembering All the Way: A Collection of Old Testament Studies Published on the Occasion of the Fortieth Anniversary of the Oudtestamentisch Werkgezelschap in Nederland*. Edited by Bertil Albrektson. OTS 21. Leiden: Brill, 1981.
- Ulrich, Eugene, ed. *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls: Transcriptions and Textual Variants*, Vol. 2; *Isaiah–Twelve Minor Prophets*. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- . *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Developmental Composition of the Bible*. VTSupp 169. Leiden: Brill, 2015.
- Ulrich, Eugene, et al., eds. *Qumran Cave 4.X: The Prophets*. DJD 15. Oxford: Clarendon, 1997.
- Ulrich, Eugene and Peter W. Flint. *Qumran Cave 1, 2: The Isaiah Scrolls, Part 2: Introductions, Commentary, and Textual Variants*. DJD 32. Oxford: Clarendon, 2010.

- Wevers, John W. *Notes on the Greek Text of Leviticus*. SCS 44. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997.
- . *Notes on the Greek Text of Numbers*. SCS 46. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998.
- Weitzman, Michael P. *The Syriac Version of the Old Testament*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Wildberger, Hans. *Isaiah 1–12*. Translated by Thomas H. Trapp. CC. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.
- . *Isaiah 13–27*. Translated by Thomas H. Trapp. CC. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997.
- . *Isaiah 28–39*. Translated by Thomas H. Trapp. CC. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002.
- Wilk, Florian. “‘Vision wider Judäa und wider Jerusalem’ (Jes 1 LXX): Zur Eigenart der Septuaginta-Version des Jesajabuches.” Pages 15–35 in *Frühjudentum und Neues Testament im Horizont Biblischer Theologie: Mit einem Anhang zum Corpus Judaeo-Hellenisticum Novi Testamenti*. Edited by Wolfgang Kraus, Karl-Wilhelm Niebuhr, Traugott Holtz, and Nikolaus Walter. WUNT 162. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.
- Williamson, H. G. M. *Isaiah 1–5*. ICC. London: T&T Clark, 2006.
- Worthington, Martin. *Principles of Akkadian Textual Criticism*. SANER 1. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2012.
- Wutz, Franz. *Die Transkriptionen von der Septuaginta bis zu Hieronymus*. Edited by Paul Kahle. Texte und Untersuchungen zur vormasoretischen Grammatik des Hebräischen. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1927.
- Zahn, Molly M. *Rethinking Rewritten Scripture: Composition and Exegesis in the 4Q Reworked Pentateuch Manuscripts*. STDJ 95. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

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

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

3. Hendel, “What Is a Biblical Book,” 292.

4. Ronald L. Troxel, “What Is the ‘Text’ in Textual Criticism?” *VT* 66 (2016): 624.

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

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

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

1. Previous Commentaries on Syriac Isaiah

There has been no detailed, sequential commentary on S-Isaiah. The earliest study was Heinrich Weisz's inaugural dissertation on the Peshitta of Isa 40–66 in 1893, which was soon followed by Warszawski's study of Isa 1–39 in 1897.⁵ Although each presents comments on selected readings in each chapter, Weisz treats nearly every verse in chapters 40–66 and discusses possible variant readings in S's source text, while Warszawski's comments are sporadic (only two readings are addressed in chapters 4, 12, 31, 36, and 39; only one in 20). They note possible misreadings of a source text similar to MT, as well as agreements and disagreements with OG, T, and MT. Both acknowledge the problems with establishing the text of the book (Weisz, 12; Warszawski, 5–6), but note its frequent patterns of +conjunctive *waw*, simple *dālat* representing *לֵאמֹר* and *וַיֹּאמֶר*, transformations of voice, changes in word order, *ad sensum* translations,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Studies undertaken as a basis for the Leiden edition have put to rest the notion of a Targumic tradition at the base of the Peshitta, as well as the hypothesis of a *Vetus Syra* underlying revisions of S toward MT.⁹ Marinus Koster's "Copernican Revolution" in understanding the textual history of the Peshitta as encompassing three stages of transmission applies equally to Isaiah. As in other books, the Textus Receptus is represented in Nestorian and Jacobite manuscripts from the ninth century on. The preceding stage comprises manuscripts of the seventh and eighth centuries, especially the base text of the Leiden edition, 7a1, plus 8a1 and 6h3.5.¹⁰ The earliest form of the text is often witnessed in the fragmentary palimpsest 5ph1 and "to a certain extent, in 9a1," although "both MSS are ... full of idiosyncrasies which often represent secondary developments."¹¹ Even though the arc of the evidence points to the earliest stratum of S tracking closely with MT, Sebastian Brock judged it "foolhardy to propose a blanket rule that the original reading will always be the one closest to the Hebrew, for there are many other considerations which we need to take into account," such as whether agreement with the Hebrew is attributable to an inner-Syriac error common within the manuscript, whether the apparent agreement "conformed to the norm of translation technique elsewhere in P-Isaiah," or even whether it might be attributable to "sporadic later correction on the basis of the Hebrew."¹² Eight of the early readings agreeing with the Hebrew that Brock isolates fall within chapters 1–39, of which he judges

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

14. Koster, “Copernican Revolution,” 30.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

19. Greenberg, *Translation Technique*, 381.

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

21. Szpek, “On the Influence,” 257.

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

23. Szpek, “On the Influence,” 261.

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

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

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

כי צו צו לצו
ܡܠܝܬܐ ܡܠܝܬܐ ܡܠܝܬܐ ܡܠܝܬܐ
 θλιψιν ἐπὶ θλιψιν (προσδέχου)

קו לקו לקו
ܡܠܝܬܐ ܡܠܝܬܐ ܡܠܝܬܐ ܡܠܝܬܐ
 ἐλπίδα ἐπ’ ἐλπίδι

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

24. Szpek, “On the Influence,” 259.

25. Szpek, “On the Influence,” 259.

26. By contrast, S’s compression of גוי קו into ܡܚܕܝܬܐ in 18:2, 7 has the same limited scope as its translation of צחה צמא with ܡܝܬܐ in 5:13, its collapse of נת

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

Three projects have been undertaken to address the lack of running commentary on OG: La Bible d'Alexandrie, Brill's Septuagint Commentary Series, and the Society of Biblical Literature Commentary on the Septuagint. The first volume of La Bible d'Alexandrie was published in 1986, setting out to fulfill Dominique Barthélemy's goal of comparing OG and MT as equal representatives of the biblical text.²⁸ Its "phrase par phrase" translation of each book "met en relief des détails du texte qui passeraient inaperçu, exige la mise en relation d'une partie du texte avec ses autres parties, révèle l'expressivité propre à la langue traduite, découvre des aspects originaux de la pensée qui la sous-tend."²⁹ The translation of OG-Isaiah into French, based on Joseph Ziegler's edition, appeared in 2014.³⁰ The translators confess their aim to be "fidèles à l'esprit du texte plutôt qu'à sa lettre," which they consider to accord with how the Greek translator rendered his source text.³¹ Appended to the translation is a brief survey of characteristics of the translation, along with discussion of its date and the presupposed Alexandrian milieu, as well as an index of proper names to highlight networks of meanings through wordplays.³² The translation will be followed by a volume comparing the Greek translation with the Hebrew text, commentary on Greek syntax and lexicography, and notes on its reception among early Christian readers.³³

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

35. Septuagint Commentary Series (Brill).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

41. Pietersma, "New Paradigm," 350.

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

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

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

45. Pietersma, "New Paradigm," 355.

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

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

46. Pietersma, “New Paradigm,” 340.

47. Pietersma, “New Paradigm,” 350, emphasis original.

48. Pietersma et al., “Prospectus for a Commentary,” 43.

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

50. Pietersma, “Beyond Literalism,” 11.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

59. Pietersma et al., “Preamble to the Guidelines,” 258.

60. Pietersma et al., “Preamble to the Guidelines,” 258.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

69. Toury, “Handful of Methodological Issues,” 23.

70. Toury, “Handful of Methodological Issues,” 23.

71. Toury, “Handful of Methodological Issues,” 24.

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

3. The Aims of This Commentary

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

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

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

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

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

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

This commentary seeks to be comprehensive while being selective on some levels. I will address the translational features in each verse that are not transparent to a text like that of Leningrad B19^A, whose consonantal text I provide, alongside which I will cite the critically edited texts of the Göttingen and Leiden editions, omitting their punctuation, adducing that only when relevant to discussion of phrasing. Any deviations from the texts of the Göttingen and Leiden editions will be noted and explained.

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

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

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

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

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

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

ISAIAH 1

1:1

Goshen-Gottstein (N) reasonably doubts that ὄρασις ἦν εἶδεν Ησαίας υἱὸς Ἀμώς ἦν εἶδε attests two occurrences of אשר חזה. The front-shifted ἦν εἶδεν complies with target language norms, and the use of the resumptive pronoun is prominent in Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, but found otherwise in Isaiah only in 8:20 (περὶ οὗ οὐκ ἔστι δῶρα δοῦναι περὶ αὐτοῦ || (אשר אין לו שחר); 37:10 (ἐφ' ᾧ πεποιθὼς εἶ ἐπ' αὐτῷ || (אשר אתה בוטח בו)).¹ This pleonasm appears twice elsewhere in Isaiah without a corresponding אשר in any witness: ἐν ᾗ δικαιοσύνη ἐκοιμήθη ἐν αὐτῇ || צדק ילין בה, 1:21; τοῦ εὐρεῖν σε τὴν ὁδὸν ἐν ᾗ πορεύσῃ ἐν αὐτῇ || מדריךך בדרך תלך, 48:17. More frequently the translator avoids the construction, as in 13:1, which is structurally similar to this verse: "Ὁρασις, ἦν εἶδεν Ησαίας υἱὸς Ἀμώς κατὰ Βαβυλῶνος || משא בבל אשר חזה ישעיהו בן אמוץ".² Accordingly, the initial ἦν εἶδεν is less likely a "Glosse aus dem folgenden ἦν εἶδεν [sic]" (Zeigler, 60; cf. Van der Vorm-Croughs, 167) than a rare appearance of a construction common elsewhere in the Greek Bible but typically eschewed by this translator.

The +preposition in καὶ κατὰ Ἱερουσαλὴμ and וירושלם || ירושלים occurs again in 2:1. Although these might be the translator's harmonizations to על יהודה, it is equally possible that ירושלים ועל stood in the *Vorlage*

1. Raija Sollamo, "The Pleonastic Use of the Pronoun in Connection with the Relative Pronoun in the LXX of Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy," in *VIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Paris, 1992*, ed. Leonard J. Greenspoon and Olivier Munnich, SCS 41 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 43–62; Sollamo, "The Pleonastic Use of the Pronoun in Connection with the Relative Pronoun in the Greek Pentateuch," in *VII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Leuven, 1989*, ed. Claude E. Cox, SCS 31 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991), 75–85.

2. On the variety of tacks this translator takes see Van der Vorm-Croughs, 105–7.

by attraction to the frequent use of על in parallel phrases (e.g., על ישראל ועל יהודה, 1 Kgs 1:35; על יהודה ועל כל הגוים, Jer 36:2; על יהודה ועל כל יושבי ירושלם, Zeph 1:4), in accord with Goshen-Gottstein's "law of the scribes" as shorthand for scribal tendencies to conform to common patterns subconsciously (cf. the comments at 9:6).³

ἐν βασιλείᾳ Οὐζίου || בימי עזיהו is striking by comparison to ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Αχαζ || בימי אחז (7:1), the only other incidence of בימי in Isaiah.⁴ Goshen-Gottstein (א) compares Gen 14:1's 'Εγένετο δὲ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῇ Ἀμαρφαλ βασιλέως Σενναάρ (|| ויהי בימי אמרפל מלך שנער), where the use of בימי + ruler's name is comparable.

Eugene Ulrich attributes οἱ ἐβασίλευσαν τῆς Ιουδαίας || מלכי יהודה to either the translator's technique or a *Vorlage* reading מלכו.⁵ This is a strong possibility, although there is insufficient basis for a sure choice. In either case, the translator would have supplied the relative pronoun.

1:2

ἄκουε || שמעו accommodates the grammatical number of οὐρανέ.

ἐγέννησα || גדלתי is anomalous. Nowhere else in Isaiah does γεννάω translate גדל but renders יד exclusively (9:6[5]; 39:7; 45:10; 49:21; 66:9), as is typical throughout the Greek Bible.⁶ However, given that this translator's most frequent equivalent for גדל is ὑψόω (10:15; 28:29; 51:18; cf. ὑψηλῇ || גדל in 9:9[8]) and he uses μεγαλύνω for גדל in 42:21 (cf. μέγαν || גדל in 10:12), he likely chose ἐγέννησα for differentiation from καὶ ὑψωσα || ורוממתי, just as he uses τρέφω for that purpose in 23:4: οὐδὲ ἐξέθρεψα νεανίσκους οὐδὲ ὑψωσα παρθένους || ובחורים רוממתי בתולות ולא גדלתי.⁷

3. Moshe H. Goshen-Gottstein, "Biblical Philology and the Concordance," *JJS* 8 (1957): 6.

4. Cf. also OG-Isaiah's translation of ביום + a noun in the construct state: e.g., τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἣ ἂν ἐπέλθῃ ὁ θυμὸς αὐτοῦ || וביום חרון אפו (13:13); τῇ δὲ ἡμέρᾳ ἣ ἂν φυτεύσῃς || ביום נטעך (17:11).

5. Eugene Ulrich, ed., *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls: Transcripts and Textual Variants*, Vol. 2: *Isaiah–Twelve Minor Prophets* (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 330.

6. Its only other correspondences are היה (Jer 16:2; Job 42:13; 1 Chr 7:15), ברא (Ezek 21:35), קנה (Zech 13:5), חלל (Prov 8:25), הרה (1 Chr 4:17), with a Hebrew equivalent lacking in three other places (Gen 46:21; Job 42:17; Prov 11:19). καὶ γεννήσω || והולכתי in Ezek 36:12 suggests that the *Vorlage* read הולכתי.

7. He renders גדל with τρέφω again in 49:21, where the subject is the rearing of children: τοῦτους δὲ τίς ἐξέθρεψέ || ואלה מי גדל.

Moreover, as Goshen-Gottstein (8) observes, “beget” and “raise” are allied concepts, as evidenced in 23:4; 49:21; 51:8 (T renders ילד with רבי in 49:21; 65:23). Positing that the translator calibrated his word choice to the context seems more likely than suggesting that OG’s *Vorlage* read a form of ילד (pace Ziegler, 136; Ottley 2:8).⁸

Although Wagner (77) rightly notes that ἀθετέω generally renders בגד, its use for פשע is exemplified again in 27:4 and elsewhere (e.g., 3 Kgdms 8:50; 12:19; 4 Kgdms 1:1; 3:5).⁹ For لَحْصَ || פשעו, compare حَل || פשע in Isa 43:27; 59:13; 66:24; 1 Kgs 8:47.

1:3

Although it is possible that OG’s lack of representation of the 3ms pronominal suffix of קנהו may attest haplography in its *Vorlage* or that the final *waw* is a dittograph (from the following וחמור), likely the definite article (τὸν κτησάμενον) sufficed to represent the 3ms suffix, given the obvious relationship between the βούς and its owner. Such shifts are common (e.g., ὅταν τὰς χεῖρας ἐκτείνητε πρὸς με || ובפרשכם כפיכם, 1:15; οὐ παύσεται γὰρ μου ὁ θυμὸς ἐν τοῖς ὑπεναντίοις || אנחם מצרי, 1:24) and accord with target language norms (see Smyth §1121).

The two occurrences of enclitic με as direct object (unparalleled in other witnesses, including 1QIsa^a; 4Q55 [4QIsa^a]) owe to explicitation by the translator (see Van der Vorm-Croughs, 49). While καὶ ὁ λαός με οὐ συηῆκεν || עמי לא התבונן is doubtless based on the 1cs suffix of עמי, the latter’s juxtaposition to the foregoing ידע likely triggered supply of με for it, as well.

Neither OG’s +δέ (Ισραηλ δέ) and καί (καὶ ὁ λαός) nor S’s لَمَّا and حَتَّى provide sufficient foundation to infer that their *Vorlagen* contained + *waw* (despite וישאל in 4Q63 [4QIsaⁱ]; and ועמי in 1QIsa^a). Because uncertainty of whether +/- conjunction betrays +/- *waw* in the *Vorlage* or has been supplied for the target language, +/- *waw* will typically not be

8. Cf. the contextually nuanced καὶ ὑετὸς ἐμήκυνεν || וגשם יגדל in 44:14.

9. Wagner’s larger hypothesis about literary connections between ch. 1 and chs. 65–66 (such as his claim that the translator’s rendering of עזבו with ἐγκατελίπετε in 1:4 “replicates one of the verbal links connecting the opening of the vision to its final movement” [81]), while well established for the Hebrew text, is implausible for this translator, whose associations between one passage and others was too sporadic to fit this schema.

addressed in this commentary, although it will take note when a translator appears to have utilized +*waw*/καί or a lexical substitution for *waw* to structure syntax in the target language.

1:4

For λαὸς πλήρης ἁμαρτιῶν || עַם כְּבֹד עוֹן compare μετὰ δυνάμεως πολλῆς || בְּחִיל כְּבֹד in 36:2. The translation of עוֹן in the grammatical plural (ἁμαρτιῶν) occurs again in 5:18's οἱ ἐπισπώμενοι τὰς ἁμαρτίας || מַשְׁכִּי הָעוֹן (and note τὰς ἀνομίας || חַטָּא at the end of that verse).

σπέρμα πονηρόν || זֶרַע מְרַעִים places the equivalent for מְרַעִים in agreement of grammatical number with σπέρμα || זֶרַע (cf. S's سهم), in contrast to the construct state of זֶרַע in MT.¹⁰ As Ottley (2:8) notes, σπέρμα πονηρόν || זֶרַע מְרַעִים occurs again in 14:20.

Old Greek translates both עֲזָבוּ and נָאַצוּ with grammatically second-person plural forms (ἐγκατελίπετε, παρωργίσατε), as does S (هملوا), apparently construing הוּא גִי חַטָּא as vocative.¹¹ The conforming of the person (ἐγκατελίπετε, παρωργίσατε) to the second-person plural address in 1:5 is typical of this translator's shifting of grammatical features to accord with an overall understanding of the context (see Seeligmann, 56; Scholz, 34–35).

For the equivalent παρωργίσατε || נָאַצוּ (S هملوا) compare τὸ λόγιον τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰσραὴλ παρώξυναν || קְדוּשַׁת יִשְׂרָאֵל נָאַצוּ in 5:24 (S هملوا).

נָזְרוּ אַחֲרָי (MT, 1QIsa^a, S, V, T) > OG.¹² Given αὐτοὶ δὲ ἀπεστράφησαν || נָזְרוּ אַחֲרָי in 42:17, it is unlikely that the translator passed over נָזְרוּ אַחֲרָי in silence. Although he does not give as precise an equivalent for the similar phrase in 50:5 (ἐγὼ δὲ οὐκ ἀπειθῶ οὐδὲ ἀντιλέγω || לֹא מְרִיתִי אַחֲרָי), he does not leave the slot empty. Because there is no discernable trigger for parablepsis, נָזְרוּ אַחֲרָי was likely absent from OG's *Vorlage*.¹³

10. Cf. the influence of the grammatical number of the verb on that of the noun in 1:16's παύσασθε ἀπὸ τῶν πονηριῶν ὑμῶν || חֲדְלוּ הָרַע.

11. Although that might seem to conflict with λαός, distinct vocative forms are not as common in Hellenistic Greek: BDF §147.

12. 4Q56 (4QIsa^b) attests the final ׀ and perhaps ׀ before it. S's هملوا accords with its هملوا || נָזְרוּ אַחֲרָי in 42:17; and هملوا || לֹא מְרִיתִי אַחֲרָי in 50:5, while T's هملوا comports with המלתי in 42:17; and המלתי in 50:5 (cf. V).

13. In agreement with Ziegler, 53; *pace* Van der Vorm-Croughs, 479; and H. G. M. Williamson, *Isaiah 1–5*, ICC (London: T&T Clark, 2006), 39.

1:5

Both OG (τί) and S (ܠܡܐ) construe על מה as “because of what?” = “why?”

For ἀνομίαν || סרה compare ἄνομον || סרה in 31:6.

Syriac’s ܠܡܐ is likely an inner-Syriac corruption of ܠܡܢ, in light of שׁוּבוּ לְאִשְׁרֵי הָעַמִּיקוּ סְרָה || ܠܡܢ ܠܡܐ, ܠܡܢ ܠܡܐ || סְרָה || ܠܡܢ in 14:6; ܠܡܢ ܠܡܐ || ܠܡܢ ܠܡܐ in 31:6; and ܠܡܢ ܠܡܐ || סְרָה in 59:13 (Greenberg and Walter, xxiv).

Although חלי occurs but three other times in Isaiah: μαλακία in 38:9; 53:3 (cf. Deut 7:15; 28:61; 2 Chr 21:5, 18); and τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν || חלינו in 53:4, πόνος renders חלי in Jer 6:7 (cf. τὸ τραῦμα in Jer 10:19).¹⁴ This gives adequate support to recognize εἰς πόνον || לחלי here.

Adjectival דוי and its indistinguishable nominal counterpart occur five times. לָטֶהַן || דוי here is comparable to ὀδύνη || דוי in Ps 40[41]:4; and λυπεῖται || דוי in Lam 1:22.

1:6

Van der Vorm-Croughs (69–70) cites ἀπὸ ποδῶν || מכר רגל among passages where the translator omits a term for a body part in construct with another noun (e.g., καὶ ἐρημώσει κύριος τὴν θάλασσαν Αἰγύπτου || והחרים יהוה את הים מצרים, 11:15; οἱ ἔφερον ἐπ’ ὄνων || בתף עירים ישאו על, 30:6; ἐπ’ ὄρους || על ראש ההר, 30:17). Such omissions are hardly ideologically motivated, since words for body parts are often translated.¹⁵ Van der Vorm-Croughs (69–70) places these omissions under the broader umbrella of “omission of the governing noun in a genitival relationship,” one of several strategies for condensing a phrase or clause (cf. Ziegler, 46–47).

ܡܡܠ (|| ראש) elsewhere translates קדקד (Deut 28:35; 2 Sam 14:25; Job 2:7) and always in the same merism as here, except in Job 20:11; 21:24, where it renders עצמותיו, in the sense of “marrow.”

οὔτε τραῦμα οὔτε μῶλωψ οὔτε πληγή φλεγμαίνουσα gives equivalents for three of four units, including a quantitative match for ומכה טריה. Most equivalences are exemplified elsewhere: τραῦμα || פצע (e.g., Gen 4:23; Exod

14. The rendering of 53:4 echoes 53:3, whose καὶ εἰδὼς φέρειν μαλακίαν expands חלי by using the same verb used for נשא in 1:4, where חלינו is its object. The resulting impression is that οὗτος τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν φέρει in 53:4 decodes חלי as a metaphor for sin.

15. E.g., the translator typically renders כף with χεῖρα (1:15; 28:4; 33:15; 36:6; 38:6; 49:16; 59:3; 62:3).

21:25; Prov 27:6); μάλωψ || חבורה (e.g., Gen 4:23; Exod 21:25 [2x]; Isa 53:5); πληγῇ || מכה (e.g., Isa 10:26; 14:6 [2x]; 30:26). φλεγμαίνω appears again only in Neh 3:19, where it is also paired with πληγῇ (οὐκ ἔστιν ἰασις τῇ συντριβῇ σου ἐφλέγμανεν ἡ πληγῇ σου || לשברך נחלה מכתך (אין כהה לשברך נחלה מכתך)). Given that ἐρριμμένην || טריה in Judg 15:15 (the only other instance of טריה) seems based on speculation about where a donkey's jowl might be found (καὶ εὗρεν σιαγόνα ὄνου ἐρριμμένην ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ || וימצא לחי חמור טריה), there is no reason to consider φλεγμαίνουσα here more than a guess. More importantly, the omission of an equivalent for מתם (which Judg 20:48 renders with ἐξῆς; and Ps 37[38]:4, 8 with ἰασις—its only other appearances) is part of a reformulation that lists the afflictions for which no treatment is available (note the accent ἔστι, “it is possible”). Although καταδέσμους aligns semantically with חבשו (cf. Ezek 30:21; 34:4, 16) and ἔλαιον with שמן, neither זרו (a *hapax legomenon*) nor רכבה (ἀσθενείτω || ירך in 7:4) are represented.¹⁶ Although Goshen-Gottstein's (ב) observation that οὔτε ἔλαιον οὔτε καταδέσμους places the treatments in the expected order is apt, the translator's reformulation seems primarily interested in deriving a coherent sense from the verse.

As Wagner (86) notes, by rendering בו אין with οὔτε, supplying οὔτε before πληγῇ, giving οὐκ ἔστι for לא and οὔτε for each occurrence of ולא, “he maintains the syntactical cohesion.”

Syriac's ܡܬܡ ܥܡ ܚܝܬܐ || מתם substitutes the concrete for the abstract, a tendency similarly evident in the grammatically plural nouns ܡܬܡ ܥܡ ܚܝܬܐ || ܡܬܡ ܥܡ ܚܝܬܐ, which transition from generic injuries to particular ones.

Syriac translates טריה with the adjectival phrase, ܡܬܡ ܥܡ ܚܝܬܐ, “which are swollen.” The only other occurrences of ܡܬܡ ܥܡ ܚܝܬܐ translate עביו (1 Kgs 7:26; Jer 52:21). Given the construction ܡܬܡ ܥܡ ܚܝܬܐ || ܡܬܡ ܥܡ ܚܝܬܐ, seems likely an equivalent chosen based on the context. (S translates the only other occurrence of טריה [Judg 15:15] with ܡܬܡ ܥܡ ܚܝܬܐ “fresh.”)

ܡܬܡ ܥܡ ܚܝܬܐ uses a verb that appears in only one other place: 2 Sam 20:28, where ܡܬܡ ܥܡ ܚܝܬܐ || ܡܬܡ ܥܡ ܚܝܬܐ “and the sword was bound on” translates חרב מצמדת. Syriac's ܡܬܡ ܥܡ ܚܝܬܐ “to bandage” shares similar semantics with ܡܬܡ ܥܡ ܚܝܬܐ, since ܡܬܡ ܥܡ ܚܝܬܐ serves elsewhere as an equivalent for חבש (Isa 30:26; 61:1; Ezek 30:21; Ps 147:3) and even רפא (Ps 60:4; Zech 11:16). The semantic overlap

16. Given Ezek 30:21; 34:4, 16, the alignment καταδέσμους || חבשו seems more likely than Goshen-Gottstein's (ב) speculation that the translator read צרי for זרו.

raises the question of which verb each translates: חבשו or זרו. The relationship to זרו is vague, especially when we compare S's equivalents with kindred verbs elsewhere: ויזר || סחזס חסל "and he pressed out the fleece" || ויזר || ויהזורה || סחזס in Judg 6:38; and ויזר || ויהזורה || סחזס in Isa 59:5. The semantic kinship of חבש and חב suggests that, although the translator offered a quantitative rendering, his choices were keyed to the semantics of חבשו. His translation with ויזר || סחזס likely has an illocutionary force that highlights רכבה as the least that should have been done: "There is no binding, no treating, *not even* softening with oil."

1:7

Syriac translates both occurrences of שממה as adjectival: سبط, سبط. OG follows a similar path, although it renders the second with a stative verb: ἔρημος, ἡρήμωται.

Old Greek's κατεστραμμένη || כמהפכת examples the translator's frequent use of participles to create subordinate clauses (e.g., τί ἔτι πληγῇ τε προστιθέντες ἀνομίαν || על מה תבו עוד תוסיפו סרה, 1:5; cf. 2:18b–19; 3:16).

Van der Vorm-Croughs (59–60) lists ὑπὸ λαῶν ἀλλοτρίων || זרים among cases of OG supplying "a pleonastic noun." Particularly notable are nouns added for explication, such as ὡς γυναιδὸς τιτατούσης || ביולדה (13:8) and καὶ μάρτυράς μοι ποιήσον πιστοὺς ἀνθρώπους || ואעידה לי (8:2).

1:8

Both OG and S have simple conjunctions before the second clause, but S also has one before the final clause, which in OG and MT is appositional to the preceding clause.

ὁπωροφυλάκιον || מלונה occurs again in 24:20.

As Warszawski (11) observes, סחזס סחזס || כעיר נצורה is likely based on association of נצורה with צור (cf. T's דצירין עלה), for which he compares חסב חסב || לצור אל דוד in 1 Sam 23:8 (cf. מסחזס || חסב in 42:6), whereas סחזס in 49:8 renders ואצרך. In 27:3 (2x) and 48:6 S translates נצר with חסב; and reads חסב || תצר in 26:3.

To OG's ὡς πόλις πολιορκουμένη || בעיר נצורה, compare πόλις πολιορκουμένη || נצרה in 27:3, the only other place in the book where πολιορκέω translates נצר (otherwise לחם: 7:1; 37:8, 9), although πόλις πολιορκουμένη there is the second of two renderings, the first being πόλις ἰσχυρά. Ziegler (88) argues that πόλις πολιορκουμένη is an original render-

כמעט untranslated.”¹⁹ He adduces instances where the translator converts a negative image of Israel into a positive one (49:6; 54:6), finding in them reason to posit the translator’s omission of כמעט here. However, it is one thing to reformulate verses and another to pass over components in silence.

Williamson, although conceding that כמעט is not attested in S, argues that its presence in the OG’s *Vorlage* is betrayed by the double occurrence of ὥς ... ἂν that contributes “a measure of emphasis (‘we would *nearly* have become...’).”²⁰ However, ἂν in conjunction with the preterite (ὥς Σοδομα ἂν ἐγενήθημεν καὶ ὥς Γομορρα ἂν ὠμοιώθημεν) constitutes a contrary-to-fact apodosis, following καὶ εἰ μὴ κύριος σαβαωθ ἐγκατέλιπεν ἡμῖν σπέρμα: “Unless the Lord Sabaoth had left seed to us, we would have become like Sodom and would have been like Gomorrah.”

Uchlen, recognizing the *irrealis* construction, argues that כמעט was omitted because it merely “intensifies the *irrealis* character of the clause as a whole.”²¹ But this amounts to an argument *ex silentio* that, furthermore, does not take account of the fact that S and V also lack an equivalent. Its absence from the *Vorlagen* of all three versions seems likely.

1:10

Although ἐνωτίζομαι is the most frequent equivalent for האזין in the Greek Bible (thirty-one times; cf. 1:2), translators use προσέχω again in Deut 1:45; 32:1; Ps 76[77]:2. προσέχοντες || יבוא אליהם in 1:23 (καὶ κρίσιν χηρῶν οὐ προσέχοντες || וריב אלמנה לא יבוא אליהם) illustrates its semantic aptness for “pay attention to.”

Old Greek’s silence regarding the pronominal suffix of אלהינו (νόμον θεοῦ) might be for harmony with the preceding דבר יהוה || λόγον κυρίου. However, a misreading or miswriting of אלהינו as אלהים is at least as

19. David A. Baer, “It’s All about Us! Nationalistic Exegesis in the Greek Isaiah (Chapters 1–12),” *SBLSP* 40 (2001): 199.

20. Williamson, *Isaiah* 1–5, 53.

21. Nico A. van Uchelen, “Isaiah 1:9: Text and Context,” in *Remembering All the Way: A Collection of Old Testament Studies Published on the Occasion of the Fortieth Anniversary of the Oudtestamentisch Werkgezelschap in Nederland*, ed. Bertil Albrektson, OTS 21 (Leiden: Brill, 1981), 158. For the same reason, V’s pluperfect (*fuisse*) provides no attestation of כמעט, since it marks nothing more than the *irrealis* construction (*pace* Goshen-Gottstein, ב).

possible, given the frequent appearance of errant ligatures between *nun* and *waw* in textual witnesses.²²

1:11

ܠܡܗ ܠܝ || ܠܡܗ ܠܝ (ܠܡܗ ܠܝ) is likely supplied as an explicit copula, in accord with Syriac syntactic norms.

Old Greek's equivalent πλήρης εἰμί || שבעתי is unremarkable, given that שבע is often translated with forms of (ἐμ)πίμπλημι (cf. 9:19; 44:16; 53:11; 58:10, 11; 66:11).

The accusative case of (καὶ) στέαρ breaks phrasing after ὁλοκαυτωμάτων κριῶν, initiating a new clause (contra MT).

Old Greek lacks an equivalent for וכבשים. It translates עם כבש with μετὰ ἄρνός in 11:7, while οἱ διηρησμένοι || כבשים in 5:17 is best explained by Ottley's (2:128) hypothesis that the translator analyzed כבשים as the *qal* passive participle כְּבֻשִׁים (see the discussion at 5:17). Although Van der Vorm-Croughs (188–90) provides a substantial list of passages where, she posits, the translator omitted “synonymous words or phrases in coordination,” particularly “when the translator regarded more than two words or phrases with a similar content in the same verse as too much of the same thing” (190), she attributes the absence of וכבשים in 1:11 to the influence of the phrase ταύρων καὶ τράγων from Deut 32:1–43, one of five verses (including 26:15; 34:6; 44:2; 65:3) that betray its interference (367–68). Although there is a solid argument for her claim with regard to Isa 34:6, here the translator retains an equivalent for דם and follows the Hebrew word order (in contrast to 34:6, q.v.), leaving the influence of Deut 32:14 unclear. Because this translator's propensity to omit synonyms cannot be discounted, Van der Louw rightly suggests that the translator passed over כבשים in 1:11 as “semantically superfluous.”²³

1:12

οὐδ' ἄν || כִּי concludes the clause begun with καὶ στέαρ ἄρνων καὶ αἶμα ταύρων καὶ τράγων οὐ βούλομαι at the end of 1:11. The use of ἄν is similar to 58:5, where, after specifying ἡμέραν ταπεινοῦν ἄνθρωπον τὴν ψυχὴν

22. See Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 3rd ed. (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012), 232.

23. Van der Louw, *Transformations in the Septuagint*, 189.

αὐτοῦ as a type of fasting the Lord does not choose, οὐδ' ἂν κάμψῃς ὡς κρίκον τὸν τράχηλόν σου ("you should not bow your neck like a hook") is another rejected type of fasting. Similarly, οὐ βούλομαι οὐδ' ἂν ἔρχῃσθε ὀφθῆναι μοι in 1:12 caps the rejection of sacrifices with a rejection of the people's approach to offer such sacrifices: "nor should you come to appear before me" (cf. Wagner, 109).

By contrast, S's **לֹא אֶבְחַר** accords with the syntax of MT, serving as a pro-tasis answered by **מִי בָקֵשׁ מִי אֶבְחַר**. Equally notable is its translation of **תֹּאזַת** with an active infinitive (**חַסְסוּ**), rather than the passive infinitive of OG (**ὀφθῆναι**).

Old Greek supplies **γάρ** (τίς γὰρ ἐξεζήτησε || **מִי בָקֵשׁ**), as often (Troxel, 92), to connect with the preceding clause, after linking the clause headed by **כִּי** (οὐδ' ἂν ἔρχῃσθε || **כִּי תִבְאוּ**) with 1:11. In that light, **ταῦτα** || **זֹאת** refers back to the various types of sacrifices just listed (cf. S's **וְכֵן**).

Whereas MT's **רַמַּס חֲצָרִי** is likely in apposition to **זֹאת** (**מִי בָקֵשׁ זֹאת**), OG construes it as the object of **οὐ προσθήσεσθε** || **לֹא תוסיפו** in 1:13. OG's **τὴν αὐλήν μου** signals that the translator construed **חֲצָרִי** as a grammatically singular noun + 1cs pronominal suffix (contrast S, **وَيْتِي**). Despite segmenting the phrases differently than MT, OG retains its word order.

1:13

Old Greek construes **πατεῖν τὴν αὐλήν μου** || **רַמַּס חֲצָרִי** in 1:12 as the complement to **οὐ προσθήσεσθε** || **לֹא תוסיפו** at the start of this verse.

Much as with **γάρ** in 1:12, the translator supplies **ἐάν** in service of his segmentation of the verse, in which **ἐάν φέρετε** begins a new clause.

Although there is no semantic difference in the nouns **σεμίδαλιν μάταιον** || **מִנְחַת שׁוּא**, OG's implicit segmentation shifts the idea. Rather than a prohibition against an "empty offering," any flour offering is described as "vain." Although OG correctly reproduces the syntax of **קִטְרֹת תועבה היא** **לִי**, given **ἐάν** at the outset of the preceding phrase, **θυμίαμα** is parallel to **σεμίδαλιν**, so that a direct prohibition of bringing offerings (MT) becomes a declaration of their detestable character.

Syriac translates **מִנְחַת שׁוּא** with a plural noun and adjective (**ܡܢܚܬܐ ܫܘܐ**), apparently construing it as a characterization of the rejected sacrifices of the preceding verse.

The +**ὅμων** of **τὰς νομηνίας ὅμων** || **חֲדָשׁ** more likely reinforces the mode of address than reflects **חֲדָשִׁים** in the *Vorlage* (cf. **ἐγενήθητέ μοι** || **הָיוּ** **עָלַי** in 1:14). The pronoun might have been supplied based on **חֲדָשִׁים** in

1:14, which OG renders τὰς νομηνίας ὑμῶν. Although it is possible that this change had already been effected in the *Vorlage*, OG frequently adds pronouns, particularly in the genitive case (see Van der Vorm-Croughs, 33–36).

As Seeligmann (102–3) infers, ἡμέραν μεγάλην || קרא מקרא likely reflects language used for the Day of Atonement in the translator's community, as is supported by evidence from the Talmud (b Roš Haš. 21a) and from later Christian sources that attest רבא יומא as an epithet.

Ziegler (106) rejects Johann Fischer's and Bernard Duhm's perceptions that νηστείαν arose through the translator misreading און as צום, positing instead that his *Vorlage* read צום and that it was the original reading, since it better fits the concern with cultic matters in these verses and accords with their juxtaposition in Joel 1:14; 2:15 (קדשו צום קראו עצרה). Although Ziegler's opinion about the original reading is irrelevant to divining what stood in the translator's *Vorlage*, his conclusion can appeal to the fact that twenty-five of the remaining twenty-six appearances of νηστεία align with צום in the MT (including Isa 58:3, 5 [2x], 6), while no other Greek noun translates צום.²⁴ Nevertheless, that nearly invariable equivalence is insufficient to prove that the *Vorlage* read צום, since recognition that ἡμέραν μεγάλην || קרא מקרא reflects an epithet for the Day of Atonement introduces uncertainty at how he arrived at the attending νηστείαν || און and ἀργίαν || ועצרה (see further below).

Notably, just as πατεῖν τὴν αὐλήν μου οὐ προσθήσεσθε form a clause that crosses the boundary between 1:12, 13 in MT (cf. οὐδ' ἂν ἔρχησθε at the head of 1:12, continuing οὐ βούλομαι), so νηστείαν καὶ ἀργίαν καὶ τὰς νομηνίας ὑμῶν καὶ τὰς ἐορτὰς ὑμῶν μισεῖ ἡ ψυχὴ μου straddle 1:13, 14. Between them are three other clauses, the first of which is headed by ἐάν, marking the translator's segmentation of the verse. The two clauses governed by ἐάν demean specific offerings: σεμίδαλιν as inefficacious and θυμίαμα as contemptible. The third clause brands three observances intolerable by connecting οὐκ ἀνέχομαι (|| לא אוכל) with them: τὰς νομηνίας ὑμῶν καὶ τὰ σάββατα καὶ ἡμέραν μεγάλην.

The clause that overlaps 1:13–14 pairs two ritual acts (νηστείαν καὶ ἀργίαν) and two ritual festivals (καὶ τὰς νομηνίας ὑμῶν καὶ τὰς ἐορτὰς

24. So also Ulrich, *Biblical Qumran Scrolls*, 331. Although nineteen of the twenty-one occurrences of the verb צום are translated by νηστεύω or νηστεία, its equivalent in Esth 4:16 is the synonym ἀσπεύω. (No equivalent to הצמות can be identified in Esth 9:31.)

ὑμῶν), the first of which was mentioned in the preceding triad. The upshot of these segmentations—along with paired *νηστείαν καὶ ἀργίαν*—is that OG does not simply inveigh against *inappropriate* cultic practices, but *all* cultic practices. Given the careful structure created by the translator, we must consider the possibility that *νηστείαν καὶ ἀργίαν* are not precisely based in the translator's *Vorlage*, but are, like *ἡμέραν μεγάλην* || קרא מקרא, chosen as representing prominent features in cultic life that are declared useless.

Ziegler (106–7) considered *καὶ ἀργίαν* || ועצרה “absichtlich von der LXX gewählt sein,” since τὰ σάββατα signifies an absence of work, although he also suggested that the translator might have connected *עצרה* with *עצל*. The other two appearances of *ἀργία* in the Greek Bible afford no help (πλήν τῆς ἀργίας αὐτοῦ ἀποτείσει || רק שבתו יתן, Exod 21:19; καὶ ἐν ἀργία χειρῶν || ובשפלות ידים, Eccl 10:18), and speculation about the translator associating *עצרה* with *עצל* lacks a demonstrable basis, leaving us with no sure path to reconstruct what underlay the choice of *νηστείαν καὶ ἀργίαν*. Above all, there are no grounds to infer what his *Vorlage* read.

Syriac paraphrases קרא מקרא with ܩܪܐ ܕܡܩܪܐ to characterize the people's behavior on two occasions, each marked by *bēth* prefixed to each noun: ܩܪܐ ܕܡܩܪܐ || חדש ושבת. As a result, S “construes the remainder of [the verse] as a separate sentence” (Wagner, 106), whose ܐܘܬܐܪ is an intelligible but surprising construal of ܐܘܬܐܪ. Its ܐܘܬܐܪ arises from construal of the root as *עצר*, as evident from its rendering of *מעצר* by ܡܥܥܪ in 53:8 (so also Warszawski, 11). More difficult is trying to penetrate to what sense the translator made of this, unless, having given the perplexing ܐܘܬܐܪ, he left it to readers to make of it what they could.²⁵

1:14

Syriac tracks closely with MT, while OG offers intriguing transformations. ἐγενήθητέ μοι || היו עלי likely owes to modifying the phrase to fit the address.

In the case of εἰς πλησμονήν || לטרח, the translator was likely unfamiliar with טרח. The noun occurs elsewhere only in Deut 1:12, where OG translates טרחכם by τὸν κόπον ὑμῶν, likely in the sense of “labor on your behalf,” as suggested by the following καὶ γὰρ ὑπόστασιν ὑμῶν || ומשאכם

25. By contrast, in Ps 101:5 S integrates the same errant analysis sensibly: ܕܡܕܢ ܕܡܕܢ ܕܡܕܢ ܕܡܕܢ || גבה עינים ורחב לבב אתו לא אוכל.

“support of you.” The translator seems to have arrived at εἰς πλησμονήν || לִטְרַח by reasoning from the context. Elsewhere in Isaiah πλησμονή renders שבעה (55:2; 56:11) and שבועה (65:15), suggesting that he uses it here in the sense of “satiety,” but with a negative connotation.²⁶

Notable is the plus in οὐκέτι ἀνήσω τὰς ἁμαρτίας ὑμῶν || נִלְאִיתִי נָשָׂא. The translator likely supplied τὰς ἁμαρτίας as a contextually suitable complement of ἀνήσω (cf. Van der Vorm-Croughs, 54) and added to it the 2 pl. pronoun based on the context, as in the case of ἐγενήθητε. The translator’s familiarity with לֹא־הָאֵל is attested by 16:12 (ὅτι ἐκοπίασε Μωαβ || כִּי נִלְאָה); and 47:13 (κεκοπίακας || נִלְאִית).²⁷ οὐκέτι ἀνήσω might reflect reticence to speak of the Kyrios being *weary* of forgiveness.²⁸ Wagner (129) astutely compares the rendering of similar theological affronts in 43:24, where OG again finds the Kyrios rejecting sacrifices:

לֹא קִנִּיתִי לִי בִכְסֵף קֶנָה	οὐδὲ ἐκτήσω μοι ἀργυρίου θυμίαμα
וְחֹלֶב זֶבַחִיד לֹא הָרִוּיִתִּי	οὐδὲ τὸ στέαρ τῶν θυσιῶν σου ἐπεθύμησα
אֲךָ הָעֲבַדְתִּנִּי בַחֲטָאוֹתַי	ἀλλὰ ἐν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις σου
הוּגַעְתִּנִּי בְעוֹנוֹתַי	καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἀδικίαις σου προέστην σου

1:15

Consistent with OG’s pattern of inserting pronouns (see above, 1:13), it supplies πρὸς με to complement τὰς χεῖρας ἐκτείνητε, and the genitive pronoun ὑμῶν to complement εἰσακούσομαι, as it does again in 1:19.

ἀποστρέψω τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς μου || אֶעֱיֵן אֵלַיִם עֵינִי finds a parallel in Prov 28:27 (ὅς δὲ ἀποστρέφει τὸν ὀφθαλμὸν αὐτοῦ || וּמַעֲלִים עֵינָיו), although the phrase also appears with different Hebrew verbs in Ps 117[118]:37 (ἀπόστρεψον τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς μου || הָעֵבֶר עֵינִי); and Song 6:5 (ἀπόστρεψον ὀφθαλμούς σου ἀπεναντίον μου || הִסְבִּי עֵינַיִךְ מִנִּגְדִּי). Similarly, S’s حَتَّ عَنْكَ

26. The only other occurrence of πλησμονή is in 30:23, where πλησμονή καὶ λιπαρός || דֶּשֶׁן וְשֶׁמֶן seems to have the positive connotation of “satisfaction.”

27. Note, however, μὴ μικρὸν ὑμῖν ἀγῶνα παρέχειν ἀνθρώποις; καὶ πῶς κυρίῳ παρέχετε ἀγῶνα; || הֲמַעֲט מִכֶּם הַלְאוֹת אֲנָשִׁים כִּי תִלְאוּ גַם אֶת אֱלֹהֵי in 7:13.

28. Notably, the equivalent for each instance of לֹא־הָאֵל in the Torah has been chosen for its context: καὶ παρελύθησαν ζητοῦντες τὴν θύραν || וְיִלְאוּ לְמִצָּא הַפֶּתַח (Gen 19:11); καὶ οὐ δυνήσονται οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι πιεῖν ὕδωρ ἀπὸ τοῦ ποταμοῦ || מִן מַיִם מִן מִן || וְנִלְאוּ מִצָּרִים לְשִׁתּוֹת מַיִם מִן (Exod 7:18).

(“I will avert my eyes”) || אֶעֱלִים עֵינַי || has parallels in Job 7:7 (|| סִלִּיפְסִי חֶבֶב || (הסבי עיניך); and Song 6:5 (|| אֶפְפֶּה חֶסֶב || (תשוב עיני).

As with +γάρ in 1:12, the translator supplies an explanatory γάρ in the final clause: αἱ γὰρ χεῖρες ὑμῶν || ידיכם.

1:16

Syriac’s plural حَقْلًا⁽¹⁾ || רַע is apparently intended to be coordinate with حَقْبِص, or teases out the idea that deeds result in a multitude of evils. The latter seems confirmed by حَقْلًا⁽²⁾ || הרע at the end of the sentence. Similarly, τὰς πονηρίας || רַע and τῶν πονηριῶν || הרע accord with the translator’s typical shifts, as does +ὑμῶν with τῶν πονηριῶν, while the supply of ἀπό was necessitated after rendering הרע with a noun.

Seeligmann (54) diagnosed ἀπὸ τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν as likely attesting a *Vorlage* that read מַעַל לְבַבְכֶּם rather than מַעַלְלֵיכֶם, based on the fact that מַעַל is translated by simple ἀπό in 6:6; 7:17; 10:27 (2x); 14:25 (2x); 20:2 (2x); 25:8 (2x); 56:3, and לֵב with ψυχῇ in 24:7; 33:18; 42:25.²⁹ This seems more likely than Goshen-Gottstein’s (ג) speculation that OG relies on the “common picture of ‘cleaning soul.’”

1:17

As Warszawski (11) observed, S’s +waw (|| و ||) suggests the translator linked this clause with حَقْلًا in 1:16.

Old Greek translates all other occurrences of אֲשֶׁר with μακαρίζω (3:12; 9:15) or εὐλογέω (36:16). As Wagner (141) concludes, although the translator might have derived ῥύσασθε by reasoning “from אֲשֶׁר via יִשְׁרָאֵל to יִשְׁע,” his choice “may have simply derived from his sense of what the immediate context required.”

Old Greek and S analyze חֲמוּץ as a passive voice verbal noun: ἀδικούμενον/حَقْلًا.

As Ottley (2:107) notes, the dative complement to κρίνω (κρίνατε ὀρφανῶν) “is hardly classical or usual Greek; it seems to suggest the interest of the orphans in receiving justice.”

29. Ottley (2:107) attributes the initial suggestion of this to Robert Govett, *Isaiah Unfulfilled* (London: Nisbet, 1841).

1:18

Old Greek and S have a +conjunction with the initial imperative (οὐ καὶ δεῦτε), but S lacks any with the following verb (וְנוֹכַח || **سَلِّحْ** **حَم** **تَنْبِإِ**), which accords with S's tendency to simply juxtapose coordinate verbs (OG καὶ διελεγχθῶμεν). Since S translates every other occurrence of יָכַח with **سَلِّحْ** (2:4; 11:3, 4; 29:21; 37:4), Warszawski's suggestion (11) that **سَلِّحْ** || **וְנוֹכַח** is a deliberate attenuation owing to scruples over the notion of humans reproaching God is compelling.

Both OG and S seem to supply the simple conjunction in καὶ ἐὰν ὥσιν/ **וְ** || **אִם** יִהְיוּ, as well as in ἐὰν δὲ ὥσιν ὡς κόκκινον/ **וְ** || **אִם** יֵאָדִימוּ, although their grammatical renderings of the verbal form differ.

Whereas S's **يَسْلِحْ** and **يَسْلِحْ** conform to the grammatical person and number of their Hebrew counterparts (יָכַח and יֵאָדִימוּ), OG renders the first with λευκανῶ and rephrases **אִם** יֵאָדִימוּ כְתוּלַע as ἐὰν δὲ ὥσιν ὡς κόκκινον, to which it conforms the final **יֵהְיוּ** כְצִמְרֵי: ὡς ἔριον λευκανῶ. There is no reason to think that this reflects anything more than his stylistic proclivities.

1:19

لَا يَسْمَعُ is one of S's common equivalents for **אָבַה**, just as θέλητε is in OG.

Old Greek's τὰ ἀγαθὰ || **טוֹב** comports with the translator's frequent use of plural forms to translate grammatically singular nouns (cf. S's **טוֹבִים**).

Although OG's εἰσακούσῃτέ μου || **וְשָׁמַעְתֶּם** again provides a pronoun in the genitive case with εἰσακούω (cf. εἰσακούσομαι ὑμῶν, 1:15; εἰσακούσῃτέ μου, 1:20), S's lack of such a tendency (cf. **لَا يَسْمَعُ** in 1:15; **لَا يَسْمَعُ** in 1:20) suggests that the suffix on **يَسْمَعُ** || **וְשָׁמַעְתֶּם** likely reflects corruption of the final *mem*. The resultant **שָׁמַעְתִּי** might then have been analyzed as defectively written (cf. **צִמְתִּי** in Zech 7:5).

1:20

Old Greek's ἐὰν δὲ μὴ θέλητε μὴδὲ εἰσακούσῃτέ μου || **וְאִם** תִּמְאֲנוּ וּמְרִיתֶם is a good example of the translator's occasional reformulation by negating an antonym, particularly with verbs of will or desire: for example, οὐ γὰρ ἤθέλησαν τὸν νόμον κυρίου σαβαωθ || **כִּי** מֵאֲסוּ אֶת תּוֹרַת יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת (5:24); διὰ τὸ μὴ βούλεσθαι τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον || **יֵעָן** כִּי מֵאֵס הָעָם הַזֶּה (8:6). A similar use of a negative occurs in S's equivalent, **لَا يَسْمَعُ** || **لَا يَسْمَعُ** with a verb of

volition is standard for מאן throughout S (e.g., לָא, לָא in Gen 37:35; 39:8; 48:19). Even if פֿעס + לָא typically translates אֵלֶּה, its choice was likely also with awareness of אֵלֶּה פֿעס || אִם תֵּאבֹדוּ in 1:19.

Old Greek's μηδὲ εἰσακούσητέ || ומריתם specifies the sort of rebellion in view by coordination with καὶ εἰσακούσητε || ושמעתם in 1:19. Compare 30:15, where the translator supplies ἀκούειν to specify the type of resistance: καὶ οὐκ ἐβούλεσθε ἀκούειν || ולא אביתם. For OG's +μου as complement to εἰσακούσητε see the comments at 1:15, 19; and compare ἐλάλησε ταῦτα || דבר below.

For אִם תֵּאבֹדוּ || ומריתם, see אִם תֵּאבֹדוּ || וימררהו in Gen 49:23.

In light of OG's supply of μου as complement to εἰσακούσητε, μάχαιρα ὑμᾶς κατέδετα || הרב תאכלו is an evident reformulation.

Syriac has no equivalent to כִּי, which might have been lost by haplography with פִּי or added secondarily. Old Greek has γάρ, although its tendency to add this particle makes its evidence equivocal.

For OG's ταῦτα (ἐλάλησε ταῦτα || דבר) compare τὸ γὰρ στόμα κυρίου ἐλάλησε ταῦτα || כִּי פִי יְהוָה דבר in 58:14; and its ταῦτα || הדבר הזה in 24:3 (τὸ γὰρ στόμα κυρίου ἐλάλησε ταῦτα || כִּי יְהוָה דבר את הדבר הזה). Most likely the translator supplied ταῦτα.

1:21

Although Σιων (πόλις πιστὴ Σιων || קריה נאמנה) might reflect צִיּוֹן in OG's *Vorlage*, it is more likely the translator's insertion, making it parallel to μητρόπολις πιστὴ Σιων || קריה נאמנה in 1:26, where Σιων is drawn from צִיּוֹן in 1:27 to create the phrase πιστὴ Σιων (contra Troxel, 192).

Syriac's reformulation of מִלֵּאֲתֵי מִשְׁפָּט with ܡܠܬܐ ܡܝܬܝܢ ܡܫܦܬܐ yields a more prosaic structure.

Old Greek's double representation of בה in its relative clause and again at the end (ἐν ᾗ δικαιοσύνη ἐκοιμήθη ἐν αὐτῇ || בה (צדק ילין) is a structure found throughout the Greek Bible, but not frequently in OG-Isaiah (see the comments on 1:1).

1:22

As Ziegler (81) observes, ἀδόκιμον || לְסִיגִים likely owes to the translator's unfamiliarity with the Hebrew word, for which he substituted a contextually apt guess (cf. τοὺς δὲ ἀπειθοῦντας || סִיגִיד in 1:25)—an equivalent that appears again in Prov 25:4 τύπτε ἀδόκιμον ἀργύριον || הִגוּ סִיגִים מִכֶּסֶף.

Syriac's ܣܚܕܐ ܕܠܥܝܢܐ || ܠܫܝܢܝܢ agrees with OG's τὸ ἀργύριον ὑμῶν ἀδόκιμον, whereas T's לפסולא and V's *in scoriam* (both “dross”) are allied. Despite the striking semantic similarity between οἱ κάπηλοί σου and ܣܚܕܐ (see below), both equivalents fit the topic of smelting, diminishing any claim that S relied on OG.

Old Greek's οἱ κάπηλοί σου “might mean generally ‘traders,’ ‘hucksters,’ or more particularly ‘wine-merchants,’ ‘tavern keepers’” (Ottley 2:108), and is the likely equivalent for סבאך, as Ziegler (60) perceived.³⁰ That judgment is supported by the pronoun σου, whereas τὸν οἶνον lacks a pronoun.³¹ As Van der Vorm-Croughs (271) points out, the parallel between the pronouns in οἱ κάπηλοί σου μίσγουσι (|| סבאך) and οἱ ἄρχοντες σου ἀπειθοῦσι (|| שריך סוררים) in 1:23 is striking. In that light, τὸν οἶνον was likely supplied by the translator.

Syriac's ܣܚܕܐ ܕܠܥܝܢܐ || ܠܫܝܢܝܢܐ aligns with the OG's οἱ κάπηλοί σου μίσγουσι τὸν οἶνον ὕδατι, without any complement for τὸν οἶνον. Warszawski, who judged that S “sich auch oft an die damals sehr verbreitete Uebersetzung der LXX angelehnt und dieselbe direct benutzt habe” (8), concludes that S “scheint die dem Sinne entsprechende Umschreibung der LXX als wirkliche Uebersetzung des Textes aufgefasst zu haben” (11–12), while omitting a complement like ܡܝܡܝܢ.³² His contention that S adopted OG's paraphrase while omitting a key component in it for the sake of being literal amounts to special pleading, especially since S does not tend to be literal in its rendering, as is evident, for example, in ܡܩܪܐ ܘܫܒܬ ܩܪܐ || ܡܩܪܐ ܘܫܒܬ ܩܪܐ (1:13). This places the similarity of ܣܚܕܐ and οἱ κάπηλοί σου into the unsatisfying territory of a shared tradition, although the poorly attested transmission of S until the sixth

30. סבאך appears elsewhere only in Hos 4:18 and Nah 1:10, in neither of which does the Greek translator seem familiar with the noun, suggesting that the Isaiah translator was also uncertain about its meaning, just as he was likely unfamiliar with the *hapax legomenon* מלה.

31. Van der Vorm-Croughs (33–36) notes Wilk's suggestion that οἱ κάπηλοί σου depends on interpreting סבאך as שבא and thus, “your merchants”, comparing ἔμποροι Σαβα καὶ Παγμα || רכלי שבא ורעמה in Ezek 27:22 (Florian Wilk, “‘Vision wider Judäa und wider Jerusalem’ [Jes 1 LXX]: Zur Eigenart der Septuaginta-Version des Jesajabuches,” in *Frühjudentum und Neues Testament im Horizont Biblischer Theologie*, ed. Wolfgang Kraus et al., WUNT 162 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003]). The connection seems strained, however.

32. Gesenius also finds S reliant on OG, without commenting on the lack of an equivalent for τὸν οἶνον (Gesenius, *Commentar über den Jesaja* 1:82).

century also leaves open the possibility of secondary influence from OG. Nevertheless, the absence of a counterpart to τὸν οἶνον makes supposing the translator's reliance on OG problematic.

By comparison, Jerome's commentary attests the OL's reading as *caupones tui miscent vinum aqua*, in agreement with OG, while attributing *vinum tuum mixtum est aqua* (the reading in V) to Symmachus.³³ V's *vinum* aligns with סבאך as the drink, as does T's במיא מערב, although T distinguishes itself from OL by analyzing the final *kaph* as a pronoun.

1:23

כלו (1QIsa^a בולם) > OG. Although +πᾶς/- כל are frequent in OG-Isaiah (see Van der Vorm-Croughs, 41–42, 72–73), +πᾶς occurs in environments sufficiently similar to this (Ziegler, 58) as to support the suspicion that many pluses were supplied by the translator (see appendix A). On the other hand, the frequent lack of an equivalent for כל is often due to the translator's tendency to omit words whose contribution to the semantics is negligible (Van der Vorm-Croughs, 72), as seems the case here. Even if בלו stresses the pilfering of each and every שר (or 1QIsa^a's בולם, of the implied group), OG's reformulation of the sentence as asyndetic clauses and its rendering of grammatically singular אהב and ורדף as grammatically plural (ἀγαπῶντες ... ὠδῶντες) make an equivalent for בלו superfluous in this sweeping characterization of Jerusalem's rulers.

Old Greek's ἀπειθοῦσι || סוררים is one of a variety of Hebrew words signifying obstinance or disobedience for which ἀπειθέω is used. Compare especially ἀπειθοῦσι || ויסרני in 8:11.

Both OG and S render יתום and אלמנה as grammatically plural nouns (ὀρφανοίς/אֵלְמָנָה and χήρῶν/יְתֻמִּים), elaborating constituent members of the class. Old Greek's οὐ προσέχοντες || לא יבוא אליהם || simultaneously concretizes the action and highlights agency (cf. προσέχετε || האזינו in 1:10).

1:24

נאם || אַמַּל is somewhat unusual, since the typical equivalent for נאם אַמַּל is יהוה. Only in 56:8 does אַמַּל represent a formula that incor-

33. Jerome, *Commentaires de Jerome sur le prophete Isaie, Livres I–IV*, ed. Roger Gryson and Paul-Augustin Deproost, *Aus der Geschichte der Lateinischen Bibel* 23 (Freiburg am Breisgau: Herder, 1993), 174.

porates אִמְלָא מִן כְּהָ = נָאם אֲדִנִי יְהוָה || אִמְלָא מִן כְּהָ = נָאם (except 49:5, where it aligns with simple אָמַר). Although it is likely that S's *Vorlage* read כְּה in 49:5, +אִמְלָא here and in 56:8 probably owes to a mechanical insertion (Goshen-Gottstein's "law of the scribes") by either the translator or a scribe.³⁴

Οὐαί, which is "not a classical Greek interjection, but common in the LXX" (Ottley 2:109) as an equivalent for both הוּי and אוּי, is transferred forward owing to the construal of אֲבִיר יִשְׂרָאֵל as an epithet for Israel's rulers, οἱ ἰσχύοντες Ἰσραηλ, which parallels οἱ ἄρχοντες in 1:23, a recurrent theme in the book (see Troxel, 230–34). Compare καὶ ὁ υἱός σου ὁ ἀάλιστος δὲν ἀγαπᾷς μαχαίρα πεσεῖται καὶ οἱ ἰσχύοντες ὑμῶν μαχαίρα πεσοῦνται καὶ ταπεινωθήσονται || מתוך בחרב יפלו וגבורתך במלחמה in 3:25 (q.v.).³⁵ Quite likely the role of the "mighty" as Israel's rulers determined the translator's path here, especially since the context makes clear that the opponents (ὑπεναντίους) are the rulers.

Given the translator's address of οἱ ἰσχύοντες Ἰσραηλ as under "woe" (οὐαί), the supply of γάρ in the next clause, so as to explain their plight, is intelligible.

οὐ παύσεται γάρ μου ὁ θυμὸς ἐν τοῖς ὑπεναντίοις || אָנַחַם מִצָּרִי is a reformation. Most often in Isaiah נָחַם appears in the *piel* and is translated with παρακαλεῖν (22:4; 40:1 [2x]; 51:3 [2x]; 51:12, 19; 54:11; 61:2; 66:13). As Tov argues, in this instance the translator likely employed biliteral association with נֹחַ, which is frequently rendered by παύομαι.³⁶ The translator's insertion of ὁ θυμὸς as subject is likely inferred from the context.³⁷ His supply of the negative particle is among Seeligmann's (57) examples of the translator "wrenching" meaning from a passage "either by adding a negation not occurring in the Hebrew text, or by neglecting a negation

34. Goshen-Gottstein, "Biblical Philology and the Concordance," 6.

35. Cf. οὐαὶ οἱ ἰσχύοντες ὑμῶν οἱ τὸν οἶνον πίνοντες καὶ οἱ δυνάσται οἱ κεραννύντες τὸ σικερα || וְהוּי גְבוּרִים לְשָׁחוֹת יֵין וְאֲנִשִּׁי חֵיל לְמִסַּךְ שָׁכַר in 5:22.

36. Emanuel Tov, "Biliteral Exegesis of Hebrew Roots in the Septuagint," in *Reflection and Refraction: Studies in Biblical Historiography in Honour of A. Graeme Auld*, ed. Robert Rezetko, Timothy H. Lim, and W. Brian Aucker, VTSup 113 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 472. He reports that נָחַם is rendered by παύομαι also in Jer 26(33):3, 13, 19; 31(38):15; 42(49):10.

37. Similarly, in 57:6, OG again teases out the semantics of "wrath" from אָנַחַם: ἐπὶ τοῦτοις οὐκ οὐκ ὀργισθήσομαι || וְעַל אֱלֹהֵי אָנַחַם. οὐκ ὀργισθήσομαι amounts to a compressed form of οὐ παύσεται (γάρ) μου ὁ θυμός.

which does figure in the Hebrew original,” a tack found also in OG-Job (cf. Troxel, 93–99).³⁸

Although this is the only occurrence of the verb נקם in Isaiah, its nominal form occurs six times and is twice rendered by κρίσις (34:8; 35:4). The combination κρίσις + ποιήσω follows a common tack for creating verbal action (e.g., ἔμεινα τοῦ ποιῆσαι κρίσιν ποιῆσαι κρίσιν || ויקו למשפט in 5:7; Τοῦ ὀξέως προνομῆν ποιῆσαι σκύλων || למהר שלל חש בז in 8:1).

1:25

ἐπάξω || אשיבה is relatively unremarkable, once the translator’s use of ἐπάγω for diverse verbs is noted: ἀλλὰ ἐπάξει ὁ θεὸς ἐπὶ σέ || יביא יהוה עליך (7:17); ἐπάξει ἐπὶ τὸν νοῦν τὸν μέγαν || אפקד על פרי גדל לבב (10:12); πλεγήν γὰρ ἐγὼ ἐπάγω ἐπὶ σέ τοῦ ἰδεῖν ὁδὸν Αἰγύπτου || ומטהו ישא עליך בדרך מצרים (10:24); ἐπάξω γὰρ ἐπὶ Πεμμων || כי אשית על דימון (15:9).

Ziegler (81) cites πυρώσω σε εἰς καθάρων || ואצרף כבר among several passages exemplifying the translator’s tendency “Bilder aus der Natur und unpersönliche Ausdrücke persönlich umzugestalten.” The translator’s supply of σε as the direct object of πυρώσω aligns the phrase with ἐπὶ σέ || עליך. Ziegler (81) also astutely identifies καθάρων as arising from the translator’s association of ברר with בר. Ottley (2:111–12) notes that, as “in classical Greek, especially Plato and Thucydides,” the neuter adjective “is equivalent to an abstract substantive.”

Goshen-Gottstein (ה) suggests that the translator arrived at τοὺς δὲ ἀπειθοῦντας || סיגיד by relating סיג to סוג, comparing παραβαίνοντας || סגים in Ps 118[119]:119. More relevant might be the association of ἀντιλέγω || נסוגתי with ἀπειθῶ || מריתי in Isa 50:5 (ἐγὼ δὲ οὐκ ἀπειθῶ οὐδὲ ἀντιλέγω || נסוגתי לא נסוגתי ואנכי לא מריתי אחור לא נסוגתי; cf. Ziegler, 81). The translator’s construal of סיגיד as the direct object and his association of ואסירה with the next clause might have prompted his supply ἀπολέσω as an action coordinate with καὶ ἀφελῶ || ואסירה.

Syriac, on the other hand, seems to have translated סיגיד with ܡܬܝܨܝܬ, corresponding to ܡܬܝܨܝܬ || סוררים in 1:23. (S-Isaiah consistently translates סוג with ܡܬܝܨܝܬ [42:17; 50:5; 59:13, 14]). Syriac parallels OG in associating בר with ברר — ܡܬܝܨܝܬ ܡܬܝܨܝܬ || ואצרף כבר — although Warszawski (12)

38. Harry M. Orlinsky, “Studies in the Septuagint of the Book of Job, Chapter II,” *HUCA* 29 (1958): 231.

notes that S's **כבר** || **حَبْر** is similar to **כבר** || **سَابِي حَبْر** in Ps 18:21, 25. Neither of these maneuvers can be convincingly attributed to reliance on OG.³⁹

Old Greek renders **אסירה**(ו) twice—once with the equivalent for **סיגיד** (τοὺς δὲ ἀπειθοῦντας ἀπολέσω) and the second with its equivalent for **בדיליד** (καὶ ἀφελῶ πάντας ἀνόμους ἀπὸ σοῦ). **ἀνόμους** || **בדיל**—which is elsewhere translated by **μόλιβος** (Num 31:22; Ezek 22:20), **κασσίτερος** (Ezek 27:12; Zech 4:10), or **σίδηρος** (Ezek 22:18), but appearing only here in Isaiah—is among the many cases of this translator resorting to words in the group **ἄνομος/ἀνομία/ἀνομέω** for a wide range of words (e.g., **און**, **זד**, **זמה**, **חטא**, **חנף**, **חנף**, **מעלל**, **משפח**, **סרה**, **עריץ**, **פשע**, **רשע**, **שודד**, **שחת**, **שקר**) to express the idea of impiety (see Seeligmann, 105).⁴⁰ **ἀπὸ σοῦ** seems inferred from the suffix of **סיגיד** and **בדיליד**.

Syriac similarly renders **בדיליד** **כל** with **ܕܟܠܗ ܡܚܝܬܐ** “all your evildoers,” choosing a general word for offenders, based on the context. It uses the same word for **פשעים** in 1:28, parallel to OG’s **ἄνομοι**.

καὶ πάντας ὑπερηφάνους ταπεινώσω lacks a corresponding phrase in MT. Jean Koenig reasonably posits that this clause has been borrowed and adapted from 13:11b: **καὶ ὕβριν ὑπερηφάνων ταπεινώσω** || **וגאות עריצים** **אשפיל**.⁴¹ The theme of humiliation turns up unexpectedly elsewhere, such as **διότι νῦν ἐταπεινώθη ἡ δόξα αὐτῶν** || **אל יהוה למרות עני כבודו** in 3:8. Even if one can account for **ἐταπεινώθη** there via **עני**, that rephrasing suggests the important place the theme of abasement held for the translator. Compare also **καὶ ταπεινώσει ὁ θεὸς ἀρχούσας θυγατέρας Σιων** || **ושפח אדני קדקד בנות** || **ציון** in 3:17.

1:26

καὶ ἐπιστήσω || **ואשיבה** is notable for shifting the semantics from “return” to “appoint,” but equally by contrast with **ἐπάξω** || **אשיבה** in 1:25. The translator employs **ἐπίστανμι** for varied words (**שוב** here; **נתן**, 3:4; **שם**, 21:4 and 41:22; **ידע**, 29:11; **סמך**, 63:5). Syriac’s semantic shift—**ܐܫܝܒܐ** || **ܐܫܡܝܐ**—is

39. Pace Gesenius, *Commentar über den Jesaia* 1:82.

40. A prime example is **καὶ κατακαυθήσονται οἱ ἄνομοι καὶ οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἅμα** || **ובערו שניהם יחדו** in 1:31 (q.v.).

41. Jean Koenig, *L’Herméneutique analogique du Judaïsme antique*, VTSup 33 (Leiden: Brill, 1982), 84. Cf. Ziegler, 61.

similar to its $\text{סלסמ} || \text{ונתתי}$ in 3:4, where OG reads $\kappa\alpha\iota \epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\tau\eta\sigma\omega$. Elsewhere OG uses a form of $\epsilon\phi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\eta\mu\iota$, however, S's equivalents hew closer to MT: $\text{ססס} || \text{שם}$, 21:4; $\text{ססס} || \text{נשימה}$, 41:22; and $\text{ססס} || \text{סמך}$, 63:5. Given these comparisons, it is unlikely that the similarity of סלסמ to $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\tau\eta\sigma\omega$ arose from S consulting OG. Notably S's $\text{סלסמ} || \text{קריה נאמנה}$ aligns with the MT while diverging from OG's $\mu\eta\tau\rho\acute{o}\pi\omicron\lambda\iota\varsigma \pi\iota\sigma\tau\eta \Sigma\iota\omega\nu$.

$\text{סלסמ} || \text{קריה נאמנה}$ varies slightly from the rendering of the same phrase with $\text{סלסמ} || \text{סלסמ}$ in 1:21, but this is less likely due to a variant than attraction to the syntactic pattern of $\text{סלסמ} || \text{עיר הצדק}$.

As Seeligmann (113–14) posits, OG's translation of קריה with $\mu\eta\tau\rho\acute{o}\pi\omicron\lambda\iota\varsigma$ registers affection for Jerusalem with a term that was likely current in Alexandrian Jewish circles. Old Greek's drawing $\Sigma\iota\omega\nu$ from ציון at the outset of 1:27 supports the surmise that it supplied $\Sigma\iota\omega\nu$ in 1:21 ($\pi\iota\sigma\tau\eta \Sigma\iota\omega\nu$) parallel to $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\eta \Sigma\iota\omega\nu$ here.

Old Greek's $\kappa\lambda\eta\theta\eta\sigma\eta || \text{יקרא לך}$ (1QIsa^a יקראו לך) is typical of reformulations this translator effects.

1:27

Even though $\text{סלסמ} || \text{ושביה}$ parallels OG's $\eta \alpha\iota\chi\mu\alpha\lambda\omega\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha \alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\varsigma$, their agreement is likely attributable to polygenesis, since the etymological association is hardly obscure.

As irregular as $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\eta\mu\omicron\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\eta\varsigma || \text{צדקה}$ might seem at first blush, the same equivalence appears elsewhere in the book (28:17; 59:16) and outside it (Deut 6:25; 24:13; Pss 23[24]:5; 32[33]:5; 102[103]:6).

1:28

In contrast to OG's $\kappa\alpha\iota \sigma\upsilon\nu\tau\rho\iota\beta\eta\sigma\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\iota || \text{ושבר}$, S uses a noun ($\text{סלס} || \text{פשעים וחטאים}$) and adjusts the two following equivalents: $\text{סלס} || \text{פשעים וחטאים}$ (versus $\text{οἱ ἄνομοι καὶ οἱ ἁμαρτωλοί}$).

1:29

$\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\iota\sigma\chi\upsilon\nu\theta\eta\sigma\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\iota/\epsilon\pi\eta\sigma\chi\acute{\upsilon}\nu\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu + \epsilon\pi\acute{\iota} + \text{dative}$ is an atypical equivalent. More typical equivalents use $\alpha\pi\acute{o}/\epsilon\kappa + \text{ablative function}$ (cf. Ezek 36:32; Hos 4:19; Mic 7:16; Zeph 3:11; Zech 13:4) or $\epsilon\nu\epsilon\tau\rho\acute{\alpha}\pi\eta\sigma\alpha\nu + \alpha\pi\acute{o} + \text{ablative}$

function (Judg 11:33; 4 Kgdms 22:19; 2 Chr 12:12; 30:11; 34:27; 36:12).⁴² καταισχυνθήσονται + ἐπί + dative appears also in Jer 10:14, where the Hebrew phrase is similar to this verse: κατασχύνθη πᾶς χρυσοχόος ἐπὶ τοῖς γλυπτοῖς αὐτοῦ || הָבִישׁ כָּל צוּרָה מִפָּסֶל || Compare also μὴ ἐντραπίεισαν ἐπ' ἐμοὶ οἱ ζητοῦντές σε ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ || אֵל יִכְלְמוּ בִּי מִבְּקֶשֶׁךָ אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל || Ps 68(69):7. ἐπί + dative in these constructions designates the *cause* of shame.

The noun αἶλις (*איל) meaning “mighty trees” appears only here, in 57:5; 61:3; and Ezek 31:14. In 57:5 OG translates it with τὰ εἰδῶλα, as here.⁴³ This is the first occurrence of εἰδῶλον in Isaiah, which serves as equivalent for פֶּסֶל in 30:22; for עֶצֶב in 10:11 (where καὶ τοῖς εἰδῶλοις αὐτῆς || וְלַעֲצָבִיהָ is parallel to καὶ τοῖς χειροποιήτοις αὐτῆς || וְלֵאלֹהִיָּהּ) and 48:5; for אֱלֹהִים in 37:19; and for אֱלֹהֵי in 41:28. In this case, τοῖς εἰδῶλοις αὐτῶν is probably based on associating αἶλις with αἶλῖ or אֱלֹהִים, as seems to have happened in 41:28. There is no reason to assume that the *Vorlage* contained a different word.

For the modification of the person of ἡβούλοντο καὶ ἐπησχύνθησαν || ותחפרו ותמדתם and ἐπεθύμησαν || בחרתם to accord with καταισχυνθήσονται || יבשו, see above, 1:4. The addition of αὐτῶν⁽²⁾ equally accords with this translator's recognized tendencies (cf. 1:13, 16).

Although S's 3mp verbal forms יִבְשׁוּ and יִחְפְּרוּ || ותחפרו ותמדתם, it || בחרתם accord with OG's ἡβούλοντο καὶ ἐπησχύνθησαν ... ἐπεθύμησαν, it is hardly necessary to infer dependence, since S and OG coordinate these verbs with the person of יבשו, for which they read the equivalents יבשו and καταισχυνθήσονται. Of course, it is not impossible that these modifications had been introduced into one or both of their *Vorlagen*.

1:30

Old Greek and S continue the difference of the person noted in 1:29: ἔσονται/ἔσονται || תהיו, although the question of whether this is attributable to the translators or their *Vorlagen* remains open. Both also analyze עַל as a collective noun (τὰ φύλλα/עַל). There is no reason to suppose influence of OG upon S in either case, especially since they differ in whether

42. The specification of the source of shame in these constructions contrasts with the frequent use of Hebrew verbs for shame without a complement.

43. Isa 61:3 γενεαὶ δικαιοσύνης || אֵילֵי הַצֶּדֶק; Ezek 31:14 καὶ οὐκ ἔστησαν ἐν τῷ ὕψει αὐτῶν πρὸς αὐτὰ πάντες οἱ πίνοντες ὕδωρ || וְלֹא יַעֲמִדוּ אֵלֵיהֶם בְּגִבֵּהֶם כָּל שְׁתֵּי מַיִם ||

likely arose by comparison with פשעים וחטאים יחדו in 1:28. It is unnecessary to posit any trigger for this by an insertion from outside Isaiah (*pace* Ziegler, 92–93). The frequency with which the OG translator expands for the sake of explication makes him suspect of this addition.

καὶ ἅμα τὰ παῖδια αὐτῶν ἔσσονται || ילדיהן. On the other hand, συναχθήτωσαν πάντες καὶ στήτωσαν ἅμα || יעמדו יפחדו in 44:11 likely reflects יחדו (for יפחדו) in the *Vorlage*.

ISAIAH 2

2:1

Goshen-Gottstein (ו) describes ὁ γενόμενος παρὰ κυρίου || אֲשֶׁר חֲזָה as a “formulaic change,” comparing ὁ λόγος ὁ γενόμενος παρὰ κυρίου πρὸς Ἱερουσόαν || יְרֵמְיָהוּ מֵאֵת יְהוָה || אֲשֶׁר חֲזָה in Jer 11:1; 35:1. Given the translator’s ἡ εἰδέν || אֲשֶׁר חֲזָה in 1:1; 13:1, however, it seems more likely that this instance reflects a *Vorlage* that read היה rather than חֲזָה (or problems of legibility prompted the translator to read it thus), which in turn prompted his supply of παρὰ κυρίου.

Old Greek reads καὶ περὶ Ἱερουσαλὴμ, and S וִירוּשָׁלַם || וְיֵהוּדָה. The additional preposition is coordinate with περὶ τῆς Ἰουδαίας/יְהוּדָה || עַל יְהוּדָה. Although this plus might have been coincidentally supplied by each translator, it might also have stood in their *Vorlagen*, added by a scribe influenced by the pattern of עַל in juxtaposed clauses (e.g., עַל יִשְׂרָאֵל וְעַל יְהוּדָה, 1 Kgs 1:35). See the comments at 1:1.

2:2

Old Greek reads ὅτι ἔσται || וְהָיָה, while S has asyndetic ἵνα. Although OG’s *Vorlage* might have read בִּי, it renders initial *waw* with ὅτι elsewhere (e.g., 9:19; 15:4; 24:6), and ὅτι also frequently lacks a Hebrew counterpart (e.g., 9:20; 10:24; 20:4).

Neither OG nor S appears, on first blush, to have an equivalent for יהיה, which is also absent from 4Q59 (4QIsa^e) וְהָיָה בְּאַחֲרִית הַיָּמִים נִבּוֹן הָרַ (בֵּית יְהוָה), although 1QIsa^a reads יהיה, and 4Q60 (4QIsa^f) reads היה before הָרַ, with initial *yod* perhaps concealed by a lacuna. Accordingly, while either OG or S may have omitted an equivalent for יהיה for the sake of concision, it is possible that it was absent from the *Vorlage* of one or both. To arrive at a conclusion, we must compare the position of ἐμφανές and נִבּוֹן in Isa 2:2 and Mic 4:1.

Whereas S's equivalent for נכון (מלמ) stands after מְכִילָה, as a predicate adjective to τὸ ὄρος and complementing ἔσται, stands in the same slot as נכון. Although this might signal that OG regarded יהיה as redundant, comparison with Mic 4:1 spurs a different analysis:

והיה באחרית הימים

וְהָיָה כְּתִיבָהּ אֵלֶּיךָ

καὶ ἔσται ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν

יהיה הר בית יהוה

וְהָיָה מְכִילָה

ἐμφανὲς τὸ ὄρος τοῦ κυρίου,

נכון בראש ההרים

מְכִילָה כְּתִיבָהּ

ἔτοιμον ἐπὶ τὰς κορυφὰς τῶν ὄρέων.

Notably S reads וְהָיָה || (versus asyndetic וְהָיָה in Isa 2:2) and מְכִילָה fills the same place in the word order as נכון, which occupies a different slot than it does in Isa 2:2 (נכון יהיה versus נכון בראש). Rather than suggesting that S conformed its translation of Isa 2:2 to its rendering of Mic 4:1 (which would make the variation between וְהָיָה and וְהָיָה hard to explain), it seems likely that S's *Vorlage* in Isa 2:1 had been conformed to Mic 4:1 (note that 4Q59 reads [וְהָיָה] הוֹנֵשׂ here, in agreement with Mic 4:1; and cf. S's + וְהָיָה in 2:4). On the other hand, because ἐμφανὲς stands in the same position in both Isaiah and Micah, and because ἔτοιμον aligns with נכון in Mic 4, ἐμφανὲς in both passages likely serves as the equivalent for יהיה.

ἐμφανής and ἐμφανίζω appear rarely elsewhere in the Greek Bible: ἐμφανὲς γέγονεν || נודע (Exod 2:14); ἐμφάνισόν μοι || הודעני (Exod 33:13); and ἐνεφάνισεν || ותאמר (Esth 2:22, likely to accord with the preceding καὶ ἐδלגלגתה || וידע and καὶ ἐσήμανεν || ויגד). Within Isaiah, ἀνήγγειλαν καὶ ἐνεφάνισαν translates כהדו לא הגידו in 3:9; and ἐμφανὲς ἐγενόμην τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ζήτοῦσιν renders נדרשתי ללואי שאלו in 65:1. Most likely, in both Isa 1:2 and Mic 4:1, ἐμφανὲς is the equivalent for יהיה, read as יחזה, much like חזה is read as היה in Isa 2:1.¹ Meanwhile, OG's lack of equivalent for נכון in Isa 2:2 might attest its absence from the *Vorlage*.

1. Observed by Meek, who preferred the reading to יהיה (Theophile James Meek,

τὸ ὅρος τοῦ κυρίου καὶ ὁ οἶκος τοῦ θεοῦ || הַר בֵּית יְהוָה in Isa 2:2 might signal that בֵּית was absent from the *Vorlage*, while καὶ ὁ οἶκος τοῦ θεοῦ might be borrowed from 2:3 (εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ Ιααωβ || אֶל בֵּית אֱלֹהֵי יַעֲקֹב), just as the translator inserted Σιων in 1:21 based on the parallel in 2:26 (Van der Vorm-Croughs, 321). However, both OG-Isaiah and OG-Micah lack an equivalent for בֵּית in הַר בֵּית יְהוָה, even though it is attested in all other witnesses. Although it is possible that OG-Isaiah omitted an equivalent for בֵּית to create balance with καὶ ὁ οἶκος τοῦ θεοῦ, borrowed from 2:3, we would have to posit that he concomitantly omitted an equivalent for both יַעֲקֹב and אֶל, rendering בֵּית in the nominative case to provide a precise match to τὸ ὅρος τοῦ κυρίου. We would also need to explain the lack of an equivalent for בֵּית in Mic 4:1, which lacks καὶ ὁ οἶκος τοῦ θεοῦ. In short, there is more afoot with the absence of an equivalent for בֵּית than simple harmonization.

It is possible that אֱלֹהִים וּבֵית (or יְהוָה וּבֵית) stood in the OG's *Vorlage* as an alternative reading (perhaps from the margin) for הַר בֵּית יְהוָה that, in another stream of transmission, became הַר בֵּית יְהוָה through variants conflation. This would parallel the way נֶבֶן, absent from OG's *Vorlage*, migrated into Isa 2:2 in the train of manuscripts leading to the MT (= 1QIsa^a; 4Q59) and the *Vorlage* of S, while taking different places in the word order. In the end, however, none of these scenarios for +καὶ ὁ οἶκος τοῦ θεοῦ is provable, leaving us with the bare conclusion that the OG-Isaiah's *Vorlage* lacked בֵּית and נֶבֶן, but that אֱלֹהִים וּבֵית preceded הַר בֵּית יְהוָה. On the other hand, S likely omitted יהיה in service of target language norms.

Both OG's καὶ ὑψωθήσεται and S's يَمُ; coordinate with their translations of נִשָּׂא elsewhere (e.g., ὑψόω || נִשָּׂא, 19:13; 33:10; 52:8, 13; 63:9; يَمُ || נִשָּׂא, 2:13, 14; 6:1).

καὶ ἥξουσιν and مَسْكُونٌ || וְנָהְרוּ are likely guesses keyed to the context, owing to unfamiliarity with the verb נָהַר, as seems the case again in Mic 4:1's καὶ σπεύσουσιν/سَمْعُوعٌ || וְנָהְרוּ. The verb recurs only in Jer 51:44, where συναχθῶσιν and يَنْهَرُ render יְנַהֵר.

2:3

ἀναγγέλλω as the equivalent for יָרָה (here καὶ ἀναγγελεῖ ἡμῖν || וִירָנוּ) appears again in 28:9's τῖνι ἀνγγείλαμεν κακά || אֶת מִי יוֹרָה דְּעָה.

"Some Emendations in the Old Testament," *JBL* 48 [1929]: 162–63). Wildberger dismisses Meek's emendation, without commenting on OG's *Vorlage* (Hans Wildberger, *Isaiah* 1–12, trans. Thomas H. Trapp, CC [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991], 82).

OG's rendering of *מדרכיו* with the simple accusative *τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ* (S *المحلى*) is comparable to its reformulation of *אנחם מצרי* with *οὐ παύσεται γάρ μου ὁ θυμὸς ἐν τοῖς ὑπεναντίοις* (1:24) and *τοιγαροῦν ἀρεῖ σύσσημον ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν τοῖς μακράν ||* *ונשא נס לגוים מרחוק* (5:26): in each case the translator conforms the equivalent to target-language norms.

There is also a question about the difference in grammatical number between *τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ* and *מדרכיו*. In most cases OG's equivalent for *דרך* agrees in grammatical number with MT, including in 42:24's thematically parallel *καὶ οὐκ ἐβούλοντο ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτοῦ πορεύεσθαι ||* *ולא אבו בדרכיו* *הלוך*. By this measure, we might conclude that his rendering of the subsequent *בארחתיו* (and *ונלכה*) with *(καὶ πορευσόμεθα) ἐν αὐτῇ ||* *בארחתיו* conforms the noun's grammatical number to earlier *מדרכיו*. On the other hand, although in 55:8 OG preserves the grammatical number in *οὐδὲ ὥσπερ αἱ ὁδοὶ ὑμῶν αἱ ὁδοί μου ||* *ולא דרכיכם דרכי*, it diverges from it in the next verse: *οὕτως ἀπέχει ἡ ὁδός μου ἀπὸ τῶν ὁδῶν ὑμῶν καὶ τὰ διανοήματα ὑμῶν ἀπὸ τῆς διανοίας μου ||* *מחשבתי ומחשבתיכם דרכי מדרכיכם* (55:9). The translator's shift of grammatical number in rendering *דרכי* and *מחשבתי* in 2:9, despite his translation of *דרכי* (and *מחשבתי*) with grammatically plural nouns in 2:8, raises questions about whether he would have been scrupulous about preserving grammatical agreement in 2:3.

Old Greek's substitution of a pronoun for a parallel synonym (*καὶ πορευσόμεθα ἐν αὐτῇ ||* *ונלכה בארחתיו* [حفظه]) accords with its tendency to mute parallel, semantically similar words (see Van der Vorm-Croughs, 188–90).

2:4

Old Greek's grammatically singular *λαὸν πολύν ||* *לעמים רבים* is remarkable, given the surrounding plural forms (*τῶν ἐθνῶν ||* *בין הגוים*; *καὶ συγκαύσουσι ||* *וכתתו*). Even if OG's *Vorlage* had read *רב לעם*, it would have been unsurprising for this translator to render it as grammatically plural in agreement with the adjacent plural forms. Accordingly, it seems likely that he meant to distinguish *λαὸν πολύν* from *τῶν ἐθνῶν*. A reasonable inference is that he associated this *λαὸν πολύν* with the *λαός* of 1:3, 4, 10, where it denotes Israel, and perhaps even more so, *ἀνῆκε γὰρ τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν οἶκον τοῦ Ισραηλ ||* *כי נטשתה עמך בית יעקב* in 2:6.²

2. Although OG's *τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ||* *עמים* in 3:13 might seem susceptible of a simi-

Syriac's +ܝܚܘܩ, agrees with +עד רחוק in Mic 4:3, which S translates with ܝܚܘܩ. ܝܚܘܩ had likely insinuated itself into S's *Vorlage* in 2:4, given that S's ܝܚܘܩܗܗ || ܠܓܘܝܡ ܥܥܡܝܢ ܥܕ ܪܚܘܩ || (versus ܝܚܘܩܗܗ || ܠܥܡܝܢ ܪܒܝܢ || here) makes it unlikely that the translator compared the parallel in Micah.

Old Greek's πολεμεῖν || מלחמה accords with its use of an infinitive for a noun elsewhere (e.g., τοῦ ὑψῶσαι καὶ δοξάσαι || ולגאון ולתפארת, 4:2).

2:5

Old Greek's clause-initial καὶ νῦν might reflect ועתה in its *Vorlage* (unattested in any other witness), but more likely it is one among the several instances in which the translator supplied νῦν, including clause-initial καὶ νῦν in 2:10.³

Although Van der Kooij accurately notes that +καὶ νῦν in 2:10 stresses that “the LORD is going to act, right now, against every one that is high and arrogant” (cf. +ἀλλὰ νῦν in 3:13), his claim that καὶ νῦν generically “evokes the idea that a crucial moment of time has arrived” gains no validation from καὶ νῦν elsewhere, and 2:5 contains nothing to signal that nuance.⁴ Rather, καὶ νῦν transitions from the description of the future interactions

lar explanation, there are good reasons to think that OG's *Vorlage* read עמי, not least of which is S's similar ܥܡܝܐ, despite its divergence from the rest of OG's translation in that verse.

3. καὶ νῦν (5:3; 16:14; 36:10; 43:1; 48:16; 49:5; 52:5; 64:7) and εἰ (1:21; 5:5; 37:26; 44:1; 47:8) typically represent ועתה. καὶ νῦν aligns with עתה in 36:5; εἰ with עתה in 37:26; bare νῦν with ועתה in 36:8 and עתה in 29:22; 33:10 (3x); 36:8; 48:7; 49:19. Cf. +καὶ νῦν in 40:28, as well as +διότι νῦν in 3:8; +ἀλλὰ νῦν in 3:13; and +οὕτως νῦν in 48:19. In addition, καὶ νῦν/νῦν δέ correspond to conjunctive waw in 33:4; 37:28; 47:9; and 51:13, while they correspond to אַך in 14:15; אִם in 26:11; כִּי in 51:3; and הֵן in 64:8. סὺ δέ || ועתה in 37:20 reflects ואתה in its *Vorlage* and καὶ ὑμεῖς || ועתה in 28:22 reflects ואתה, which the translator rendered grammatically plural as subject of μὴ εὐφρανθείητε (cf. οὐ νῦν ἐκάλεσά σε || ולא אתי קראת in 43:22). Isaiah 21:2; 43:22; and 58:2 contain + νῦν, while νῦν is sometimes an understandable equivalent: for אפוא in 19:12; 22:1 (cf. Judg 9:38); for נא in 47:12 (cf. Gen 18:27). It is inserted three times to conform a phrase to type: ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν καὶ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα χρόνον || מן הוא והלאה, 18:7; ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν καὶ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα χρόνον || מעתה ועד עולם, 9:7(6); and 59:21. Similar is OG's use of νῦν in 33:11 (νῦν ὁψεσθε νῦν αἰσθηθήσεσθε || קש (תהרו חשש תלדו קש) to extend the pattern of νῦν δοξασθήσονται νῦν ὑψωθήσονται || עתה ארומם עתה אנשא in 2:10.

4. Arie van der Kooij, “The Septuagint of Isaiah and the Hebrew Text of Isa 2:22 and 36:7,” in *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, and the Septuagint Presented to*

between the nations and the Kyrios in 2:1–4 to the summons of the house of Jacob in 2:5.

2:6

Old Greek's τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ || יַעֲקֹב is unattested in other witnesses. Van der Kooij argues that the translator replaced “Jacob” with “Israel” in connection with his translation of נַטְשָׁתָה by ἀνῆκε, chosen to signal a link between this verse and καὶ ἀνήσω τὸν ἀμπελῶνά μου || וַאֲשִׁיתָהּ בְּתָה in 5:6, after which 5:7 identifies the vineyard as οἶκος τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ.⁵ However, ἀνίημι hardly constitutes a clear signal to associate this verse with 5:6, since it occurs eleven other times in the book, and there is no other mark that either verse affected the rendering of the other.⁶ Lacking a perceptible motivation for the translator substituting Ἰσραὴλ for יַעֲקֹב, I conclude that his *Vorlage* read בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל. In fact, one could reasonably contend that בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל was the original reading, for which יַעֲקֹב בֵּית was substituted reflexively, under the influence of יַעֲקֹב in the preceding verses, especially 2:3, 5.

Old Greek's ἀνῆκε γὰρ τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ || כִּי נַטְשָׁתָה עִמָּךְ is alone in using the third-person singular form of the verb and the third-person singular pronoun (1QIsa^a, 4Q56, S, and V read a verb conjugated in the second-person singular).⁷ Alongside these differences we must also note the third-person form ἐνεπλήσθη || מָלְאוּ (= 1QIsa^a and 4Q56; S and V use grammatically plural verbs), whose subject is ἡ χώρα αὐτῶν, which lacks a corresponding word in 1QIsa^a, 4Q56, S, and V.⁸

Seeligmann's (56) observation that the translator “often sacrifices grammatical accuracy to his own stylistic text-formulation,” coupled with Ziegler's (7–8) comment that the translator frequently appears “von

Eugene Ulrich, ed. Peter W. Flint, Emanuel Tov, and James VanderKam, VTSupp 101 (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 382, 381.

5. Van der Kooij, “Septuagint of Isaiah,” 381.

6. Van der Kooij contends that ἀνῆκε signals a connection to 5:6 because ἀνίημι bears the technical agrarian sense attested in the papyri (381, referring to Ziegler, 180.). However, ἀνίημι bears diverse meanings in Isaiah, as evidenced by its uses in οὐκέτι ἀνήσω τὰς ἀμαρτίας ὑμῶν (1:14); and καὶ ἀνήσει τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ (25:11). It is difficult to see why the translator might expect a reader to perceive a link to 5:6 via this verb.

7. T's paraphrastic rendering has the 2mp: פִּרְיָךְ לִכְוֹן דְּהוּהָ דְּחִלָּתָא דְּתִקְיָא.

8. Although T reads אֶרְעֹכֶנּוּ, it stands within its expansive paraphrase, and T likely drew it from 2:7, like OG.

irgendeinem Gedanken beherrscht zu sein und übersetzt dann unter dem Einfluß dieses Gedankens die betreffenden Stellen” seems apropos to this passage. The translator might have perceived 2:6 as explanatory of the summons δεῦτε πορευθῶμεν τῷ φωτὶ κυρίου in 2:5, motivated by the Kyrios’s abandonment of the people for what they have allowed to fill their country, a motif built around ὅτι ἐνεπλήσθη (|| מלאו (כ) here and ἐνεπλήσθη γάρ in 2:7 (|| ותמלא). Although each verse has ἡ χώρα αὐτῶν as its subject, only in 2:7 does ἡ χώρα αὐτῶν align with a Hebrew word: ארצו. The leveling of מלאו and תמלא via ἐνεπλήσθη in 2:6–8 suggests that the translator supplied ἡ χώρα αὐτῶν as subject in 2:6, correlative to ἡ χώρα αὐτῶν || ארצו in 2:7a and ἡ γῆ || ארצו in 2:7b, 8.⁹ The resultant shift from ἡ χώρα αὐτῶν with ἐνεπλήσθη in the first two clauses to ἡ γῆ (|| ארצו) with ἐνεπλήσθη in the last two suggests a conscious shaping of 2:6–8 in Greek that additional features in 2:6 support.

In particular, although ἀλλόφυλοι is a common OG equivalent for פלשתים (e.g., 1 Kgdms 4:1, 2, 3), as here and in 11:14, the translator uses it also for נכרים. By supplying the definite article with ὡς ἡ τῶν ἀλλοφύλων || בפלשתים, the translator creates a closer parallel to ἡ χώρα αὐτῶν, asserting that the assimilation of their land to the ἀλλόφυλοι, via the abundance of κληδονισμοί, has led to their own offspring being ἀλλόφυλοι. Because αὐτοῖς is likely anaphoric to αὐτῶν, ἀλλόφυλα is used to denigrate the character of Israel’s children rather than as an ethnic label.

ἐγενήθη αὐτοῖς || ישפיקו is likely a guess to provide a contextually appropriate predicate. שפק appears again only in Job 27:23, where κροτήσῃ ἐπ’ αὐτοῦ χεῖρας αὐτοῦ || שפק עלימו כפימו stands subasterisk and agrees with the equivalent ascribed to σ’ in this passage (εκροτησαν; θ’ ηρκεσαντο).¹⁰ Syriac’s equivalent, ܫܦܟ (like its ܫܦܟ in Job 27:23) and V’s *et pueris alienis adheserunt* (*stringet super eum manus suas* in Job 27:23) suggest similar unfamiliarity with the Hebrew verb (T offers no clear equivalent).

9. Ziegler (107), noting that מעון is translated by κληδών in Deut 18:14 and by κληδονίζω in Deut 18:10 (cf. 4 Kgdms 21:6; 2 Chr 33:6), posits that the translator’s insertion of ἡ χώρα αὐτῶν was motivated by his recollection of Deut 18. However, while Deut 18:10, 14 prohibit imitating the nations’ practice of divination, those verses do not specifically mention the land. Thus, even if the translator thought of Deut 18:10, 14, it is more likely that his insertion of ἡ χώρα αὐτῶν was prompted by 2:7.

10. 4Q56 reads ܫܦܟ, the more frequently occurring by-form of שפק (e.g., Num 24:10; Jer 31:19; Ezek 21:17; Lam 2:15; Job 27:23).

Not only does **ܝܫܦܝܩܘ** betray the translator's unfamiliarity with **ܝܫܦܝܩܘ**, but his **ܝܫܦܝܩܘ ܕܒܝܠܕܝ ܢܚܪܝܡ** || **ܝܫܦܝܩܘ ܕܒܝܠܕܝ ܢܚܪܝܡ** doubles down on that choice.¹¹ Given that **ܝܫܦܝܩܘ** is a *paal* perfect 3mp (for the *paal* perfect 3mp see **ܝܫܦܝܩܘ ܕܒܝܠܕܝ ܢܚܪܝܡ** || **ܝܫܦܝܩܘ ܕܒܝܠܕܝ ܢܚܪܝܡ** in Judg 11:2), with **ܝܫܦܝܩܘ** accenting the multitude of foreign children the people bear.

Syriac's **ܝܫܦܝܩܘ ܕܒܝܠܕܝ ܢܚܪܝܡ** || **ܝܫܦܝܩܘ ܕܒܝܠܕܝ ܢܚܪܝܡ** is comparable to OG's **ὡς** in **ὅτι ἐνεπλήσθη ὡς τὸ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς**. **ܡܩܕܡ** can designate either geography or time, as both translators recognize (cf. **ἀφ' ἡλίου ἀνατολῶν/ܡܩܕܡ** || **ܡܩܕܡ ܐܚܪܝܬ** || **ܡܩܕܡ ܐܚܪܝܬ**, 9:11; **πρὶν αὐτὰ γενέσθαι/ܡܩܕܡ** || **ܡܩܕܡ ܐܚܪܝܬ**, 46:10). Only in 45:21 do we find equivalents similar to 2:6 (**ἀπ' ἀρχῆς/ܡܩܕܡ**). Under the perception that **ܡܩܕܡ** is temporal, and given that the topic is what has caused the Kyrios to abandon the people in the present, a *comparison* to past behavior might have seemed more apt than speaking of sins in the past. Accordingly, the comparative clauses in both OG and S of 2:6 likely reflect similar analyses of **ܡܩܕܡ** as temporal.

In fact, S's **ܡܩܕܡ ܐܚܪܝܬ** || **ܡܩܕܡ ܐܚܪܝܬ** differs significantly from OG's rendering. Whereas OG's genitive case in **καθηδονισμῶν** designates what fills the house of Jacob (cf. 2:7, where S designates the material of filling by simple **ܡܩܕܡ**), S's participle **ܡܩܕܡ**, in the absolute state, serves as predicate for a new clause that assumes the same subject as the clause headed by **ܡܩܕܡ**: "because they are filled, as in the past, and are practicing divination like the Philistines." S seems content to leave the material with which they are filled ambiguous.

2:7

Both S and OG translate the pronominal suffixes of **ܐܪܥܘ**⁽¹⁾, **ܐܪܥܘ**, and **ܐܪܥܘ** with grammatically plural pronouns, in agreement with the grammatical person and number of their verbs in 2:6. On the other hand, whereas S translates **ܐܪܥܘ**⁽²⁾ with **ܐܪܥܘ**, OG has **ἡ**, the article carrying the force of a possessive pronoun.

Syriac translates both instances of **ܐܪܥܘ** with **ܐܪܥܘ**, used elsewhere for **ܐܪܥܘ** in the sense of "limit/extent" (e.g., **ܐܪܥܘ ܐܪܥܘ**, Num 22:41), but found only here in Isaiah. By contrast, OG renders both occurrences of **ܐܪܥܘ** with **ἀριθμός**, found outside Isaiah only in the phrase **καὶ**

11. Bodor's argument that S "was inspired by LXX's ἐγγενήθη" lacks any observable basis (Attila Bodor, "The Reception of the Septuagint in the Peshitta of Isaiah," VT 69 [2019]: 29–30).

οὐκ ἔν ἀριθμός || אין מספר (Ps 146[147]:5; 2 Chr 12:3).¹² Both instances of καὶ οὐκ ἔν ἀριθμός || ואין קצה here elaborate the result of ἐνεπλήσθη.

2:8

Old Greek and S render ארצו as they did ארצו⁽²⁾ in 2:7 (ἡ γῆ/ἡ ἀρχὴ [cf. T ארעהו]) and translate the 3ms pronominal suffix of ידיו and אצבעתיו with plural pronouns (τῶν χειρῶν αὐτῶν/οἱ [T ידיהו], οἱ δάκτυλοι αὐτῶν/οἱ [T אצבעתהו]), just as they did the suffixes in 2:7.

βδελύγματα || אלילים occurs again in 2:20. Although it is possible that τῶν ἔργων || למעשה reflects a *Vorlage* lacking initial ἰ (OG regularly translates מעשה with τὰ ἔργα in the phrase יד מעשה [e.g., 5:12]), the translator might have felt pressed to choose between ידי למעשה and לאשר עשו as the recipient of the action in ישתחוו and analyzed the ἰ of למעשה as equivalent to a genitival relationship, which allowed αὐτῶν (τῶν χειρῶν αὐτῶν || ידיו) to attribute responsibility for the βδελύγματα directly to the people.

2:9

The alternation between ἄνθρωπος and ἀνὴρ in καὶ ἔκυψεν ἄνθρωπος καὶ ἐταπεινώθη ἀνὴρ || איש וישפל אדם וישח follows typical usage patterns for these lexemes in Isaiah. ἄνθρωπος is more frequent than ἀνὴρ (eighty-six times versus fifteen times), rendering both איש (thirty-four times) and אדם (twenty-six times), while ἀνὴρ translates only איש (ten times).¹³ Although the translator is not averse to using ἄνθρωπος multiple times in a sentence (cf. 2:17; 3:5; 13:14; 19:2; 25:4, 5; 51:12; 52:14; 53:3), here and two other times (5:15; 31:8) he alternates ἄνθρωπος and ἀνὴρ. Because each of those

12. Elsewhere in Isaiah, ἀριθμός is the equivalent for מספר (10:19; 40:26); ספר (33:18; 34:16); and צבא (34:2).

13. ἄνθρωπος also serves as the equivalent for אנוש (24:6); גוים (25:3); עם (36:11; 44:7) and provides explication in phrases like πιστοὺς ἀνθρώπους || נאמנים (8:2) and καὶ ἀλώσονται ἄνθρωποι || ונלכדו (8:15; cf. 19:20; 22:25; 23:15; 25:4, 5; 29:11; 31:2; 40:6). In other cases, tracing it back to a Hebrew *Vorlage* is difficult: ἄνθρωπον δς δυνήσεται κεφαλὴν ἄραι ἢ δυνατὸν συντελέσασθαι τι || שטף ועבר עד צואר יגיע (8:8); πεποιθότες ἐπ' ἀνθρώποις || תשעינה עיני ראים (32:3). ἀνὴρ also translates גבר in 22:17 and serves as explicator three times: πτωχοὶ δὲ ἄνδρες || ואביונים (14:30); ἀνὴρ τέκτων || חרש (41:7); τῆς ἐχούσης τὸν ἄνδρα || בעולה (54:1).

entails parallelism with a neighboring clause, as here, this variation is likely stylistic.

Although καὶ οὐ μὴ ἀνήσω αὐτούς || וְאֵל תִּשָּׂא לָהֶם comports with this translator's shift of the grammatical person in verbal forms elsewhere, his motivation here is perceptible by noting that ἀνίημι is the same verb he used in 2:6, where the subject of ἀνῆκε is the Kyrios.¹⁴ Goshen-Gottstein's (†) suggestion that ἀνήσω is "theol exeg" prompts the question of when an equivalent occurring elsewhere (1:14; 42:2; 46:4) constitutes a theological choice. Even if the translator adds τὰς ἁμαρτίας ὑμῶν as object of ἀνήσω || נִשְׁכַּח in 1:14 (οὐκέτι ἀνήσω τὰς ἁμαρτίας ὑμῶν || נִשְׁכַּח וְנִלְאִיתִי), the addition simply makes explicit a nuance legitimately associated with the verb (cf. Gen 18:24; Josh 24:19).

Although in Attic οὐ μὴ with the aorist subjunctive or the future tense expressed emphatic denial (Smyth §§1804, 2755), a weakened sense is "far more common in the LXX and the NT."¹⁵ In the latter it occurs primarily in "quotations from the LXX and sayings of Jesus," where it is "for the most part less emphatic than in the classical language" (BDF §365).¹⁶ That description befits OG-Isaiah, where οὐ μὴ + aorist subjunctive in the third-person commonly represents לֹא + verb (2:4; 5:6 [2x]; 7:7, 25; 8:10; 11:9 [2x]; 13:18, 20 [2x]; 16:12; 17:8; 24:20; 25:2; 27:9, 11 [2x]; 28:15, 16, 18^[2]; 31:2; 35:8 [2x], 9^[2]; 37:10, 33 [3x]; 39:6; 41:28; 43:2; 44:12; 46:7 [3x]; 47:14; 51:6; 54:10; 55:10, 11; 55:9; 59:21; 63:8; 65:17, 20, 22); or בִּלְ + verb (26:10, 14 [2x]; 33:20 [2x], 24; 35:9^[1]).¹⁷ Similarly, when οὐ μὴ +

14. S, V, and T have second-person verb forms; 4Q55 preserves only שָׂא-, and the entire verb stands in a lacuna in 4Q56, although both read וְלֹא for וְאֵל (on the absence of 2:9b–10 in 1QIsa^a see Ziegler, 107). Comparison of DSS witnesses to Isaiah shows no general pattern of replacing לֹא with לֹא־. 1QIsa^a reads עַל for both occurrences of לֹא in MT of 6:9 (OG, S, V, T have negative particles), doubtless owing to the "weakening of laryngeals and pharyngeals" (E. Y. Kutscher, *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll [1QIsa^a]*, STDJ 6 [Leiden: Brill, 1974], 505).

15. James H. Moulton, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek: Prolegomena* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1906) 1:188.

16. Moulton speculates that, because quotations from the LXX and the logia constituted sacred texts "in the first age of Christianity, one is tempted to put [this construction] down to the same cause in both—a feeling that inspired language was fitly rendered by words of a decisive tone not needed generally elsewhere" (Moulton, *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, 1:192.).

17. Simple μὴ + the imperative (7:4 [2x]; 10:24; 35:4; 36:11, 16; 36:14, 15; 37:10; 40:9; 41:10 [2x], 13; 43:1, 5, 6, 18 [2x]; 44:2, 8; 51:7; 52:11; 54:4¹; 56:3 [2x]; 64:8^[1]); the

a second-person verb in the subjunctive mood expresses prohibition, it regularly aligns with **לֹא** (6:9; 8:12 [2x]; 9:19; 14:20; 33:8; 36:15; 41:12; 47:11).¹⁸

Yet, as Moulton observes, **οὐ μή** with the aorist subjunctive or the future tense remained “capable of being used by a cultured writer like Paul with its full classical emphasis.”¹⁹ Thus, despite the general attenuation of **οὐ μή** + aorist subjunctive, there may be instances it retained its locutionary force, as seems the case in 48:19, where a pleonastic negation + subjunctive is followed by **οὐδε** + future tense, in both cases translating **לֹא**: **οὐδὲ νῦν οὐ μή ἐξολεθρευθῆς οὐδὲ ἀπολείται τὸ ὄνομά σου ἐνώπιόν μου || לֹא יכרת ולא ישמד שמו מלפני ||**²⁰ **οὐ μή** with the future tense occurs with the second-person in 54:4 and with the third-person in 16:10; 65:8, but seems to carry no more emphasis than the future tenses preceding it in those verses.

Nevertheless, **οὐ μή** + a future tense 1cs verb in two other passages (besides 2:9) is noteworthy. First is Ahaz’s exclamation in 7:12, where emphasis seems likely in **οὐ μή αἰτήσω οὐδ’ οὐ μή πειράσω κύριον || לֹא יהוה אשאל ולא אנסה את יהוה**. The formal rhetorical style of 43:25 also suggests emphasis: **ἐγὼ εἰμι ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ἐξαλείφων τὰς ἀνομίας σου καὶ οὐ μή μνησθήσομαι || אנכי אנכי הוא מחה פשעך למעני וחטאתיך לא אזכר**. It is in comparison with that set of examples that **καὶ οὐ μή ἀνήσω αὐτούς || ואל תשא להם** in 2:9 seems at home. The disavowal of forgiveness gives to **οὐ μή** + the future tense the tenor of an asseveration.²¹

subjunctive (6:9 [2x]; 16:3; 22:4; 37:6; 54:2, 4^[2]; 58:1; 64:8^[2]; 65:5, 8); or the optative (14:29; 28:22) mood translates **לֹא**, with the exception of 62:6, where we find **οὐκ ἔστι γὰρ ὅμῳ ὅμοιος || אל דמי לכם** (but also **וְאֵל תִּתֶּנּוּ דָּמִי לוֹ** at the start of 2:7), likely due to the preceding **οἱ διὰ τέλους οὐ σιωπήσονται μιμνησκόμενοι κυρίου || לא יחשו המזכרים** **את יהוה**.

18. Although we find **οὐ μή συνάψετε, πλανήθητε τὴν ἔρημον** in 16:8, it has no Hebrew analogue in MT and 1Q8 (**יִם ... בַּעֲלִי**) (cf. 28:17, 18).

19. Moulton, *Grammar of New Testament Greek* 1:190.

20. Similarly, **οὐ μή** (**|| לֹא**) appears in 50:7 with an aorist subjunctive, 1cs verb, in an indirect rhetorical statement where emphatic negation seems likely: **ἀλλὰ ἔθηκα τὸ πρόσωπόν μου ὡς στερεὰν πέτραν καὶ ἔγνω ὅτι οὐ μή αἰσχυθῶ || שְׁמִי פָנִי כְחִלְמִישׁ וְאָדַע כִּי לֹא אֲבוֹשׁ**.

21. Although **וְאֵל** and **לֹא** in 4Q55; 4Q56 opens the possibility that the same reading stood in OG’s *Vorlage*, smoothing the way to the choice of **οὐ μή** + the future tense, this translator unlikely required such a foundation for his choice.

2:10

Although OG's initial +καὶ νῦν might reflect ועתה in its *Vorlage* (without attestation in any other witness), more likely the translator supplied it as a transition from 2:9 (cf. +καὶ νῦν in 2:5).

Both OG and S render the grammatical person of the imperatives בוא and והטמן as plural: εἰσέλθατε/ܠܝܝܬܝ and καὶ κρύπτεσθε/ܠܝܝܬܝ. Each seems to have adjusted the grammatical number to the context, particularly להם (אֲבוֹתָם/ܠܝܝܬܝ) at the end of 2:9.

The equivalent ܠܝܝܬܝ || גאון is attested elsewhere (Lev 26:19; Jer 12:5; 49:19; 50:44; Ezek 32:12; cf. ܠܝܝܬܝ in Exod 15:7; and ܠܝܝܬܝ in Ezek 30:6), even if ܠܝܝܬܝ, ܠܝܝܬܝ, and ܠܝܝܬܝ are more frequent equivalents in Isaiah.

On the other hand, OG's τῆς ἰσχύος (αὐτοῦ) || גאון occurs again only for גאון in 2:19, 21. The more frequent equivalents for גאון are ὕβρις (e.g., Lev 26:19; Isa 13:11; 16:6); and ὑπερηφανία (e.g., Ezek 7:20; 16:49, 56; Amos 8:7; Prov 8:13). Given that the 3ms suffix in גאון in these verses refers to the LORD, the use of either ὕβρις or ὑπερηφανία might have been objectionable. δόξα (|| גאון in Exod 15:7; Isa 14:11; 24:14; Mic 5:3) was already used for הדר, perhaps compelling a different equivalent here. Why ἰσχύς was chosen is not evident, although “strength” is a frequently mentioned attribute of the deity.²² The fact that S also frequently uses words for “strength” to translate גאון suggests that the association was a shared tradition.

Ziegler (61) attributes ὅταν ἀναστῇ θραῦσαι τὴν γῆν to borrowing from 2:19, 20, where בקומו לערץ הארץ (ὅταν ἀναστῇ θραῦσαι τὴν γῆν) follows מפני פחד יהוה ומהדר גאון. Although this translator's renderings often seem influenced by passages elsewhere (Ziegler, 103–34), the abundant attestation of borrowings in proto-SP manuscripts at Qumran and expansions by borrowing in the MT of Jeremiah make it possible that some borrowings already stood in the translator's *Vorlage*.²³

22. Greek lexemes for strength align with a variety of Hebrew words: (1) ἰσχύς: חסן (1:31), גאון (2:10, 19, 21), כח (10:13; 37:3), גבורה (11:2; 28:6; 30:15; 33:13), מעוז (23:4), מעוז (23:11), תאניה (29:2), קש (33:11); (2) ἰσχυρός: עצום (8:7), אזור (8:9^[1]), חזק (8:11; 27:1; 28:2), גבור (21:17), ? (27:3), משגב (33:16); (3) participial forms of ἰσχύω: אביר (1:24; 3:2), גבורה (3:25), גבור (5:22; 10:21), מערצה (10:33), נמצא (22:3), נצח (25:8), חזק (28:22; 35:3, 4); (4) verbal forms of ἰσχύω: אזור (8:9^[2]), אשר (23:8), נטה (23:11).

23. For Qumran, see Molly M. Zahn, *Rethinking Rewritten Scripture: Composition and Exegesis in the 4Q Reworked Pentateuch Manuscripts*, STDJ 95 (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 143–56. For Jeremiah, see Hermann-Josef Stipp, *Das masoretische und alexandrinische Sondergut des Jeremiabuches: Textgeschichtlicher Rang, Eigenarten, Trieb-*

2:11

Old Greek's +γάρ in οἱ γὰρ ὀφθαλμοὶ κυρίου ὑψηλοί || עיני גבהות fits the pattern of an insertion for the sake of the target language (Troxel, 92). Its οἱ ... ὀφθαλμοὶ κυρίου || עיני (unparalleled in other textual witnesses) might have been forced upon it by its decision to analyze גבהות as a feminine plural adjective modifying עיני (cf. τὰ ὄρη τὰ ὑψηλά || ההרים הגבהים in Gen 7:19). Compare S's حَتْلَا ۛ حَتْلَا. Seeligmann (66) suggests that the translator may either have inferred that the final *yod* was an abbreviation of the Tetragrammaton or may have found י עיני in his *Vorlage*. More convincing, however, given the translator's apparent familiarity with both the nearer and farther contexts of this book (see Troxel, 134), is Ziegler's (61) suggestion that the translator inferred a contrast between the elevation of the Kyrios and the abasement of humans from 2:17. In fact, the correlation of ὑψηλοί with τὸ ὕψος τῶν ἀνθρώπων || רום אנשים and καὶ ὑψωθήσεται κύριος || ונשגב ונשגב is noteworthy, since ὕψος ἀνθρώπων || רום אנשים and καὶ ὑψωθήσεται κύριος || יהוה ונשגב occur again in 2:17.

The equivalent ὑψωθήσεται || נשגב here, in 2:17, and in 12:4 (ὑψώθη τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ || נשגב שמו) is paralleled in Ps 148:13 (ὅτι ὑψώθη τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ μόνου || כי נשגב שמו לבדו); Prov 18:10.²⁴ The choice complements the contraposition between forms related to ταπεινός and ὑψηλοί throughout 2:11–17.

Syriac's equivalent ܡܨܗܝܐ || נשגב occurs again in 2:17; 9:10.

Syriac's ܡܨܗܝܐ is a *paal*, in contrast to ܡܨܗܝܐ, while the *ethpaal* ܡܨܗܝܐ accords with ושא but retains an implied divine agent, parallel to the implied agent of ܡܨܗܝܐ. Although S's *Vorlage* might have read ܡܨܗܝܐ, compare 3:17, where S translates ושא with ܡܨܗܝܐ.

2:12

As Zielger (61) notes, +καὶ μετέωρον has been borrowed from 2:13, creating a two member adjectival unit parallel to ἐπὶ πάντα ὑβριστὴν καὶ ὑπερήφανον. The interpretive scheme that surfaces in 2:13–16 (see 2:13) favors seeing this as part of the translator's shaping of the passage.

krafte, OBO 136 (Fribourg: Academic Press; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994), 106–8, 133–36.

24. On the translator's difficulties rendering נשגב, see the comments at 9:19.

Old Greek's grammatical plural *καὶ ταπεινωθήσονται* || *ושפל* treats the juxtaposed prepositional phrases *ἐπὶ πάντα ὑβριστὴν καὶ ὑπερήφανον καὶ ἐπὶ πάντα ὑψηλὸν καὶ μετέωρον* as an implicit compound subject. His choice of the masculine singular form for the adjectives marks these as persons, while *ταπεινωθήσονται* suggests that *πάντα* in each instance is distributive: "each and every" (see appendix A).

Syriac's ܡܠܬܐ, || *גאה*, using *dālat* + participle as modifier, is one of its frequent strategies. ܡܠܬܐܐ, renders *ושפל* as a final clause and uses the *ethpaal*, as in 2:11.

2:13

καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσαν κέδρον τοῦ Λιβάνου || *כל ארזי הלבנון* and *δένδρον βαλάνου* *Βασαν* || *אלוני הבשן* are the first examples of this translator's tendency to render morphologically plural nouns preceded by *כל* in the grammatical singular (cf. *ὅρος* || *ההרים* and *βουνὸν ὑψηλόν* || *הגבעות הנשאות* in 2:14, as well as 7:25; 8:7, 9; 15:2; 21:8).²⁵ Not only does it align them with the grammatically singular nouns *πύργον* || *מגדל* and *τείχος* || *חומה* in 2:15, but it creates a distinctive role for *τῶν ὑψηλῶν καὶ μετεώρων* by making each of these the property of the haughty humans who will be humbled (2:12). Their abasement is reprised in 2:17, where *πᾶς ἄνθρωπος* (|| *גבהות האדם*) bears the same distributive sense as *πάντα* in 2:12.

2:14

For OG's grammatically singular nouns *ὅρος* (|| *ההרים*) and *βουνόν* (|| *הגבעות*) see 2:13. Although its lack of an equivalent for *הרמים* might owe to parablepsis following *ההרים*, it is equally possible that the translator omitted an equivalent for *הרמים* for concision, with a view to the following *καὶ ἐπὶ πάντα βουνὸν ὑψηλόν* (*הגבעות הנשאות*) (ועל כל הגבעות הנשאות).²⁶

The relative clause *וְהָרָמִים* for *הרמים* and *הנשאות* is one of S's common ways of rendering an articular modifier.

25. For *δένδρον βαλάνου* || *אלוני* specifying the type of tree, cf. *καὶ ὡς βάλανος* || *וכאלון* in 6:13.

26. Cf. *καὶ ἐπὶ πάντα ὑψηλὸν καὶ μετέωρον* || *ועל כל נשא*; and *τῶν ὑψηλῶν καὶ μετεώρων* || *הרמים והנשאים* in 2:12, 13, respectively.

2:15

ועל כל חומה || סחלא סחלא סחלא || ועל כל מגדל גבה || סחלא סחלא סחלא ||²⁷ S's extrapolate individual cases from a collective noun (cf. 1:30).

ועל כל חומה || סחלא סחלא סחלא || occurs again in 25:2; 27:10; 36:1. By contrast, the most common equivalent for בצורה throughout translations in the Greek Bible is ὀχυραί (e.g., Deut 3:5; 28:52; 2 Kgdms 20:6), as occurs in 25:2; 36:1; 37:26, while ὑψηλόν is its equivalent only here, likely chosen for this context in the same way that καὶ ὑψηθήσεται || ונשגב was in 2:11 and 17.²⁷

2:16

For OG's grammatically singular πάντες πλοῖον || כל אניות, see the comment on πᾶσαν κέδρον || כל ארזי in 2:13. Goshen-Gottstein (ח) notes that πλοῖον θαλάσσης || אניות תרשיש parallels an exegetical tack “esp. frequent in Ξ Β.”

Ziegler (61) offers the most likely explanation of θέαν πλοίων || שכיות, positing a double rendering, the first based on the similarity to Aramaic סכא “to see,” the second based on the parallel πλοῖον || אניות. In the same vein, Warszawski (13) suggests that S's ܡܬܠܝܢ || ܡܬܠܝܢ, “observations of delight” rests on a similar perceived relationship to ܡܬܠܝܢ.²⁸ Use of Aramaic is attested for both OG and S, allowing this case to be attributable to polygenesis.

For κάλλους || ונחמדה compare κάλλος || ונחמדה in 53:2.

2:17

Old Greek's translation of the first half of this verse bears comparison to 2:11, where the Hebrew lexemes are identical (except עיני there), as are the equivalents άνθρωπος || אדם; καὶ ταπεινωθήσεται || ונש; ὑψος || רום; and ἀνθρώπων || אנשים. A notable difference is καὶ πεσεῖται || ונשפל here and ταπεινός || שפל in 2:11, since nowhere else does πίπτω translate שפל, whose most frequent equivalent is ταπεινώ. However, in 25:12's ταπεινώσει καὶ καταβήσεται ἕως τοῦ ἐδάφους (|| השפיל הגיע לארץ || השחך החומה || לבצר החומה in 22:10; πόλεις ὀχυράς || קריה בצורה in 25:2. (עד עפר), καὶ καταβήσεται was likely chosen to avoid repeating ταπεινώ.

27. In Num 13:28 ὀχυραί is modified by τετειχισμένα, while in Deut 1:28; Hos 8:14 another inflected form of the perfect passive participle is the sole equivalent, and in Deut 9:1; 2 Chr 32:1; 33:14 a form of the adjective τειχίρης suffices. Cf. εἰς ὀχύρωμα τοῦ τείχους τῇ πόλει || לבצר החומה in 22:10; πόλεις ὀχυράς || קריה בצורה in 25:2.

28. Cf. α' οψεις <της> επιθυμιας; σ' θ' θεας επιθυμητας.

That impulse might account for πεσεῖται || וּשְׁפַל here, in the wake of καὶ ταπεινωθήσεται || וּשַׁח.

More striking is πᾶς ἄνθρωπος || גְּבוּהוֹת הָאָדָם, in contrast to ὑψηλοί ὁ δὲ ἄνθρωπος || גְּבוּהוֹת אָדָם in 2:11, whose ὑψηλοί serves as predicate adjective for οἱ γὰρ ὀφθαλμοὶ κυρίου || עֵינִי. Although that rendering is intelligible, he might have had pause at גְּבוּהוֹת הָאָדָם here, especially since the slot occupied by עֵינִי in 2:11 is occupied by וּשַׁח here. Also, because the semantics of גְּבוּהוֹת are reflected in ὕψος ἀνθρώπων || רֹם אַנְשִׁים, πᾶς might be a type of compensation along the lines of πάντες οἱ ἀντίδικοί σου || אַנְשֵׁי רִיבְךָ in 41:11. In any event, this verse is among many cases of πᾶς lacking a semantic counterpart in Hebrew (see Van der Vorm-Croughs, 41–42), many of which involve πᾶς || עַל or expansions like ὁ ἀποστέλλων πρὸς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη || חוֹלֵשׁ עַל גּוֹיִם in 14:12 (cf. ἰδοὺ πάντες ὡς φρύγανα ἐπὶ πυρὶ κατακαήσονται || אֵשׁ שְׂרַפְתָּם, הִנֵּה הָיוּ כְּקֶשׁ אֵשׁ שְׂרַפְתָּם, 47:14). For a detailed discussion, see appendix A.

On OG's καὶ ὑψωθήσεται and S's وَنُشِجِبُ || וְנִשְׁגֵּב, see 2:11.

2:18

Both καὶ τὰ χειροποίητα πάντα κατακρύψουσιν and وَكُلُّ مَخْرُوجِ الْيَدِ الْفَعْلِ وَهُوَ الْإِلَاحُ, although وَكُلُّ يَدِ الْفَعْلِ better fits the semantics and voice of יַחֲלֶי. Old Greek shifts the subject from הָאֱלִילִים to the abased people of 2:17 and links κατακρύψουσιν to the subordinate participle εἰσενέγκαντες || וּבָאוּ at the outset of 2:19, whereas S's وَكُلُّ يَدِ الْفَعْلِ begins a new clause. The grammatically plural verb forms in both translations accord with יַחֲלוּ in 1QIsa^a (cf. V, T).

2:19

As Goshen-Gottstein (ח) suggests, OG's εἰσενέγκαντες likely reads וּבָאוּ and analyzes it as a *hiphil*. By rendering it as a participle the translator subordinates it to κατακρύψουσιν in 2:18.

Although Ziegler (61) posits that OG's εἰς τὰ σπήλαια καὶ εἰς τὰς σχισμὰς τῶν πετρῶν reflects a double translation of בְּמַעְרוֹת, while “wahrsch. ist σπήλαια spätere Korrektur nach dem MT,” more likely καὶ εἰς τὰς σχισμὰς τῶν πετρῶν || צְרִים reflects the translator's harmonization with καὶ εἰς τὰς σχισμὰς τῶν πετρῶν || בְּנִקְרוֹת הַצְרִים in 2:21, where that phrase is followed, as here, by καὶ εἰς τὰς τρώγλας τῆς γῆς (cf. Van der Vorm-Croughs, 146). In fact, καὶ εἰς τὰς τρώγλας τῆς γῆς in 2:21 aligns with וּבְסַעְפֵּי הַסְלָעִים, whereas

here it aligns with **ובמחלות עפר**, suggesting that these harmonizations took place in the translation process and for the sake of the product rather than reflecting a variant Hebrew *Vorlage*.

Regarding **καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς δόξης τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ** || **ומהדר גאווו**, see the notes on **τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ** || **גאווו** in 2:10.

2:20

Old Greek's lack of an equivalent for the 3ms suffix of **זהבו**, following **τὰ βδελύγματα αὐτοῦ τὰ ἀργυρᾶ** || **את אלילי כספו** befits its typical practices, as evinced again in 31:7's **τὰ χειροποίητα αὐτῶν τὰ ἀργυρᾶ καὶ τὰ χρυσᾶ** || **אלילי כספו ואלילי זהבו**.

Syriac's **ܐܬ ܐܠܝܠܝ ܕܟܣܦܐ ܐܬ ܐܠܝܠܝ ܕܙܗܒܐ** collapses **ܐܬ ܐܠܝܠܝ ܕܙܗܒܐ**, but differs from OG's condensation (**τὰ βδελύγματα αὐτοῦ τὰ ἀργυρᾶ καὶ τὰ χρυσᾶ**) by lacking an equivalent for either of the 3ms pronominal suffixes. Nevertheless, this rendering comports with **ܐܬ ܐܠܝܠܝ ܕܟܣܦܐ ܐܬ ܐܠܝܠܝ ܕܙܗܒܐ** || **ܐܬ ܐܠܝܠܝ ܕܙܗܒܐ** in 31:7.

Syriac again shows its tendency to extrapolate from singular to plural with the verbal form of **ܐܬ ܐܠܝܠܝ ܕܙܗܒܐ** and the pronominal suffix in **ܐܬ ܐܠܝܠܝ ܕܙܗܒܐ**. In both cases OG takes a different path, reproducing the singular number in **ἐκβαλεῖ ἄνθρωπος** || **ישליך האדם** and reformulating **עשו לו להשתחות** as a relative clause: **ἃ ἐποίησαν προσκυνεῖν**.

The semantic similarity of **ܐܬ ܐܠܝܠܝ ܕܙܗܒܐ** || **ܐܬ ܐܠܝܠܝ ܕܙܗܒܐ** to **τοῖς ματαίοις (ἀ' ορυκταῖς, σ' ἀκαρποῖς)** appears to be one reason that Warszawski (9) lists this among passages where agreement between S and OG "nicht aus dem Text allein zu erklären sind, sondern [sic] deutlich auf eine Abhängigkeit der Pesch. von LXX hinweisen." In support of that claim he notes (13) that both render **פרות לחפר** with one word.²⁹ However, given **לחפרפרים** in 1QIsa^a, we cannot assume that either translator conjoined separate words; and even though the term's status as a *hapax legomenon* makes the semantic similarity of the equivalents notable, S renders it with an abstract noun rather than a nominalized adjective. This difference must be viewed alongside the other differences in grammatical features already noted that distinguish their renderings in this verse.

The parallel between **καὶ ταῖς νυκτερίσιν** and **ܐܬ ܐܠܝܠܝ ܕܙܗܒܐ** || **ܐܬ ܐܠܝܠܝ ܕܙܗܒܐ** seems more salient, since **νυκτερίς** is the equivalent for the noun in its only

29. See Gesenius, *Commentar über den Jesaia* 1:82.

other appearances (Lev 11:19; Deut 14:18), whereas S uses **לְהַמָּה** “peacock,” while **חַפְצֵי־סִי** appears only here. A useful base from which to evaluate whether **חַפְצֵי־סִי** is based on the OG, as Warszawski (13) contends, is to compare their equivalents for another entomological species in 33:4.

אסף החסיל	ὁν τρόπον ἐάν τις συναγάγη	אִם חֲסִיל וְלִמָּה
כמשק גבים	ἀκρίδας	הִאִם חֲסִיל וְמַחֲלִי
שוקק בו	οὕτως ἐμπαίξουσιν ὑμῖν	וְחֲסִיל

ἀκρίδας is a frequent Greek equivalent for “locusts” and appears again in 40:22, for **חגבים**. The translator may have arrived at *ἀκρίδας* || **גבים** here through its graphic similarity to **חגבים**, just as S uses **מַחֲלִי** for **גבים** here and **חגבים** in 40:22. Old Greek lacks a clear equivalent for **משק** and **חסיל**, perhaps owing to its tendency to reduce synonyms (cf. Van der Vorm-Croughs, 188–90), while S (despite rendering **כמשק** by replicating **אִם** || **חֲסִיל** (אסף) renders **חסיל** with **לִמָּה**, a term it uses for locusts elsewhere.³⁰ Notably, however, while **לִמָּה** || **חסיל** in 33:4 is attested again in 1 Kgs 8:37, it is not S’s most frequent equivalent: **חֲסִיל** || **חֲסִיל** in Joel 1:4; 2:25, and **מַחֲלִי** || **חסיל** in Ps 78:46. Given this variation, **חַפְצֵי־סִי** || **עטלפים** in contrast to **לְהַמָּה** || **עטלפים** in Lev 11:19; Deut 14:18 affords no reason to suppose that it relied on OG.

2:21

εἰς τὰς τρώγλας (τῆς στερεᾶς πέτρας) || **בנקרות (הצרים)** conforms to *εἰς τὰς τρώγλας (τῆς γῆς)* || **ובמחלות (עפר)** in 2:19 (q.v.). *πέτρα* is a common equivalent for **צור** (e.g., Exod 17:6 [2x]; 33:21, 22); and (as later in this verse) **סלע** (e.g., Num 20:8, 10; 1 Kgdms 13:6; Isa 7:19; 16:1; 22:16; 31:9). The Isaiah translator uniquely uses *στερεά πέτρα* for **צור** here; in 5:28; and in 51:1; as well as for **חלמיש** in 50:7 (the only parallel is *ἐκ στερεᾶς πέτρας* || **מחלמיש** in Deut 32:13).

30. Pace Van der Vorm-Croughs’s claim (345 n. 106) that *ὁν τρόπον ἐάν τις συναγάγη* owes to associating **כמשק** with **קשש**, *συναγάγη* || **אסף** is more likely. **חסיל** appears only here in Isaiah, but OG elsewhere translates it with *ἐρυσίβη* (Joel 1:4; 2:25; 3 Kgdms 8:37; Ps 77[78]:46); or *βροῦχος* (2 Chr 6:28). **סלע** || **מַחֲלִי** (1 Kgs 8:37); **חֲסִיל** || **מַחֲלִי** (Joel 1:4, 25); **חֲסִיל** || **חֲסִיל** (Ps 78:46); **חֲסִיל** || **חֲסִיל** (2 Chr 6:28).

Syriac's ܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ || ܒܢܩܪܘܬ ܗܥܪܝܡ (T במערת טנריא) recalls ܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ || ܒܢܩܪܘܬ ܗܥܪܝܡ in 2:19, save for the use of ܡܠܟܐ (rather than ܡܠܟܐ) || ܒܢܩܪܘܬ ܗܥܪܝܡ and ܡܠܟܐ || ܒܢܩܪܘܬ ܗܥܪܝܡ. However, in Exod 33:22 (the sole analogue to ܒܢܩܪܘܬ ܗܥܪܝܡ) S reads, similarly to here, ܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ || ܒܢܩܪܘܬ ܗܥܪܝܡ (T במערת טנריא), whereas OG reads εἰς ὁπήν τῆς πέτρας.

In contrast to OG's repetition of καὶ εἰς τὰς σχισμὰς τῶν πετρῶν from 2:19 (|| (ובמחלות עפר (q.v.), S translates ובסעפי (T ובשקיפי), whereas it rendered מחלות with ܡܠܟܐ in 2:19.

Regarding OG's τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ and S's ܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ || ܒܢܩܪܘܬ ܗܥܪܝܡ, see 2:10.

2:22

The verse is lacking in the OG. As Ulrich observes, “there is no trigger for parablepsis, whereas the change to second person in the imperative contrasts with the previous two verses and suggests that it too is a latter expansion.”³¹

Van der Kooij argues that, although the verse was present in the translator's *Vorlage*, he omitted it as superfluous following his interpretation of 2:5–21.³² He bases this on the observation that ἀνῆκε γὰρ τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν οἶκον τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ in 2:6 differs from the MT (and 1QIsa^a, 4Q56) in the grammatical number of ἀνῆκε (נטשתה)—which he ascribes to “assimilation to the ending of 2:5”—and in the name Ἰσραὴλ (יעקב), which he judges linked to the choice of ἀνέμει for נטש (see the comments above, 2:6). Arguing that the two occurrences of καὶ νῦν divide 2:5–21 into two units (2:5–10 and 11–21), he finds that the first “contains a passage (2:6b–9), which explains why God had abandoned his people” (see the notes at 2:5) “whereas the second section (2:10–21) announces the day of the LORD on which every one that is high and lofty will be humbled.”³³ The

31. Eugene Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Developmental Composition of the Bible*, VTSup 169 (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 291–92.

32. Van der Kooij, “Septuagint of Isaiah,” 382.

33. Van der Kooij, “Septuagint of Isaiah,” 380. Although he concedes that 2:10's call on the people to hide themselves from the Kyrios's wrath “may seem different from that of 2:5,” his only response to the problem is to compare the exhortation to the people in 26:20 to hide themselves from the wrath of the Kyrios that will last but a little while. Evidently he means that the significance of καὶ νῦν as “the crucial moment” in 2:5 relates to the short time the abasement of the people (cf. 2:9) will last. However that might be, his isolation of 2:6b–9 as the core, even though + καὶ νῦν introduces the summons to the house of Jacob, goes unaddressed.

translator's emphasis of that turning point made him consider superfluous 2:22's admonition not to rely on "man," understood as "the strong and arrogant man in verses 9, 11, 17 (see also 2:20)."³⁴

The fundamental problem is that, after acknowledging that "the interpretation of [2:22] is disputed," Van der Kooij posits his interpretation of it and *assumes* that this was the translator's understanding of 2:22, without offering any support for that assumption.³⁵ Of course, no support is available, precisely because OG offers no translation of the verse.

Syriac's query **ܡܠܟܐ ܕܝܫܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ** || **ܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ** is distinctive, not only because **ܡܠܟܐ** is S's equivalent for **במה** in twenty-six of its twenty-eight occurrences, but also because **ܡܠܐ** occurs only here in the Peshitta.³⁶ Although one might conjecture that **ܡܠܐ** reflects **במה** in its *Vorlage*, that compound is fittingly translated with **ܡܠܐ** in ten of its twelve occurrences.³⁷ **ܡܠܐ** is likely an ad hoc rendering tailored to the question about the value of mortals, using semantics akin to **ܡܠܐ ܕܡܠܐ ܕܡܠܐ** in 5:28; and **ܡܠܐ ܕܡܠܐ ܕܡܠܐ** in 29:16.

34. Van der Kooij, "Septuagint of Isaiah," 378–79.

35. Van der Kooij, "Septuagint of Isaiah," 378.

36. The two exceptions are **ܡܠܐ ܕܡܠܐ ܕܡܠܐ ܕܡܠܐ** || **ܡܠܐ ܕܡܠܐ ܕܡܠܐ ܕܡܠܐ** in Qoh 3:22; and in a widely divergent rendering of 2 Chr 7:21 that includes **ܡܠܐ ܕܡܠܐ ܕܡܠܐ ܕܡܠܐ** || **ܡܠܐ ܕܡܠܐ ܕܡܠܐ ܕܡܠܐ**. **ܡܠܐ** occurs only as part of a relative clause: **ܡܠܐ ܕܡܠܐ ܕܡܠܐ ܕܡܠܐ** || **ܡܠܐ ܕܡܠܐ ܕܡܠܐ ܕܡܠܐ** in 1 Sam 15:22; **ܡܠܐ ܕܡܠܐ ܕܡܠܐ ܕܡܠܐ** || **ܡܠܐ ܕܡܠܐ ܕܡܠܐ ܕܡܠܐ** in 1 Kgs 20:11.

37. But note **ܡܠܐ ܕܡܠܐ ܕܡܠܐ ܕܡܠܐ** || **ܡܠܐ ܕܡܠܐ ܕܡܠܐ ܕܡܠܐ** in Ps 35:17; **ܡܠܐ ܕܡܠܐ ܕܡܠܐ ܕܡܠܐ** || **ܡܠܐ ܕܡܠܐ ܕܡܠܐ ܕܡܠܐ** in Ps 78:40.

ISAIAH 3

3:1

יְהוָה הֵנָּה (|| כי הנה) translates הנה alone in 22:17; 33:7, suggesting that here it might render only הנה. However, הֵנָּה translates כי in 39:8, while it is the equivalent for נָא in 5:1; 7:13. In that light, OG might simply have compressed הנה כי.

The epithet הַאֲדֹנָי יְהוֹה צְבָאוֹת (occurring only here) aligns with מְלִיכָא in S (OG ὁ δεσπότης κύριος σαβαωθ). This is the only instance of מְלִיכָא unaccompanied by another epithet in Isaiah, and there is no attestation of הַאֲדֹנָי יְהוֹה unaccompanied by צְבָאוֹת in the Hebrew witnesses of Isaiah. Syriac renders הַאֲדֹנָי יְהוֹה צְבָאוֹת with מְלִיכָא in 1:24 (OG ὁ δεσπότης κύριος σαβαωθ); מְלִיכָא in 10:16 (κύριος σαβαωθ) and 10:33 (ὁ δεσπότης κύριος σαβαωθ); and מְלִיכָא in 19:14 (κύριος σαβαωθ). These equivalents throughout both S and OG suggest that the variation is attributable to the translators.

Old Greek's transposition ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ || וּמִיְהוּדָה וּמִירוּשָׁלַם agrees with the Hebrew word order in 1:1; 2:1, but OG alone attests the order here. It has a similar transposition in 5:3 (ἄνθρωπος τοῦ Ἰουδα καὶ οἱ ἐνοικοῦντες ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ || יוֹשֵׁב יְרוּשָׁלַם וְאִישׁ יְהוּדָה), where S agrees (ܝܫܒܝܝܪܫܠܝܡ ܘܐܝܫ ܝܗܘܕܐ). On the other hand, OG agrees with MT's order in 3:8 (Ἱερουσαλὴμ καὶ ἡ Ἰουδαία || וִירוּשָׁלַם וִיהוּדָה); 22:21 (τοῖς ἐνοικοῦσιν ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ καὶ τοῖς ἐνοικοῦσιν ἐν Ἰουδα || לְיוֹשְׁבֵי יְרוּשָׁלַם וּלְבֵית (יהודה)). It is impossible to know whether these differences are due to the translator or to an earlier scribe in each case.

Syriac renders מִשְׁעָן וּמִשְׁעֵנָה with ܡܫܥܢܐ and translates the two instances of מִשְׁעָן in the second half of the verse with ܡܫܥܢܐ (cf. T's (סמך ... סמך ... סמך וסעיד), comparable to ܡܫܥܢܐ || מִשְׁעֵנָה in 36:6.¹ On

1. Outside Isaiah, S translates מִשְׁעָן with ܡܫܥܢܐ (2 Kgs 18:21); ܡܫܥܢܐ (Exod 21:19; Num 21:18; Judg 6:21; 2 Kgs 4:29; 18:21; Ezek 29:6; Zech 8:4; Ps 23:4); ܡܫܥܢܐ "helper"

the other hand, ἰσχύοντα καὶ ἰσχύουσιν || משען ומשענה and ἰσχύν || משען (2x) have no parallel, and none of the typical Hebrew counterparts to these words are likely candidates for retroversion.² Throughout Isaiah, Greek words for “strength/strong” align with atypical Hebrew counterparts.³ In 2:10, 19, and 21 ἰσχύς translated גִּאֲוֹן, an equivalence that appears nowhere else in the OG but agrees with S’s חֲמַל (see the comments on 2:10). Given that elsewhere ἰσχύς, ἰσχυρός, and ἰσχύω appear without a typical counterpart in any extant Hebrew text (see above, p. 58 n. 22), and since γίγαντα καὶ ἰσχύοντα at the outset of 3:2 is a double translation of גִּבּוֹר, OG’s choice of grammatically gendered ἰσχύοντα καὶ ἰσχύουσιν is likely keyed to the larger context’s theme of undermining the aristocracy, whether men or women.⁴

Although OG’s lack of an equivalent for כָּל in 1:23 is likely due to the translator’s reformulation of the phrase, the absence of an equivalent for either instance of כָּל here is more vexing.⁵ The fact that OG tracks closely with MT otherwise seems to favor concluding that כָּל was absent from the *Vorlage* and added secondarily (the omission of both instances suggests that this does not owe simply to haplography). Although one can imagine

(2 Sam 22:19); מִשְׁעָן (Ps 18:19). S’s use of מִשְׁעָן || משען in Ps 18:19 correlates with מִשְׁעָן || משען in Isa 50:10. Otherwise, S-Isaiah translates verb forms of שַׁעַן with the *ethpeel* of מִשְׁעָן (10:20 [2x]; 30:12; 31:1).

2. Equivalents elsewhere are ῥάβδος (Exod 21:19; Judg 6:21; 4 Kgdms 18:21; Isa 36:6; Ezek 29:6; Zech 8:4; Ps 22[23]:4); βακτηρία “staff” (4 Kgdms 4:29 [2x], 31); ἐπιστήριγμα “support” (2 Kgdms 22:19); and ἀντιστήριγμα (Ps 17[18]:19), while it renders verbal forms of שַׁעַן with the passive voice of πείθω (10:20 [2x]; 30:12; 31:1) and ἀντιστήριζω (50:10; cf. ἐπιστήριγμα || משען in 2 Kgdms 22:19; ἀντιστήριγμα || משען in Ps 17[18]:19).

3. συνταράσσει τοὺς ἐνδόξους μετὰ ἰσχύος || מסעה פארה במערצה (10:33); καὶ οἱ ἰσχύοντες ἐν σοὶ πόρρω πεφεύγασιν || כל נמצאיד אסרו יחדו מרחוק ברחו (22:3); μὴ ἦσσαν ἐστὶν ἢ οὐκ ἰσχύει || המעטירה אשר (23:8); ἐνετείλατο περὶ Χανααν ἀπολέσαι αὐτῆς τὴν ἰσχύν || בלע המות לנצח (23:11); κατέπιεν ὁ θάνατος ἰσχύσας || אני יהוה נצרה (27:3); καὶ ἔσται αὐτῆς ἡ ἰσχύς || והיתה תאניה (29:2); ματαία ἔσται ἡ ἰσχύς τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν || תלדו קש רוחכם (33:11).

4. ἰσχύοντες elsewhere designates Israel’s rulers (e.g., 1:24; 3:25).

5. The presence of כָּל before both instances of משען problematizes Van der Vorm-Croughs’s (73–74) citation of this as a passage where “an extra motivation for the omission of כָּל may have been the amelioration of parallelism, given that in a parallel phrase or clause a word corresponding to כָּל is absent.”

מִשְׁעָן מִשְׁעָן לֶחֶם וּמִשְׁעָן מִים serving as a gloss (original or secondary) on מִשְׁעָן, it is difficult to see what would have spurred the insertion of כָּל before each phrase, except perhaps to highlight the comprehensive span of מִשְׁעָן וּמִשְׁעָנָה, but this becomes as speculative as positing reasons the translator might have omitted equivalents for each כָּל.

3:2

γίγαντα καὶ ἰσχύοντα is a double translation of גִּבּוֹר, just as in 3:18 τὴν δόξαν τοῦ ἱματισμοῦ αὐτῶν καὶ τοὺς κόσμους αὐτῶν is a double translation of תְּפָאֶרֶת. γίγας (13:3; 49:24, 25), ἰσχύων (5:22; 10:21), and ἰσχυρός (21:17) render גִּבּוֹר elsewhere in the book. Seeligmann (33), noting that ἰσχύοντα is obelized in Q-oI (and omitted in 8), posits that γίγαντα is original and that καὶ ἰσχύοντα was added to override mythological connotations.⁶ However, this involves unwarranted speculation about the translator's psyche.

Ziegler's (61) diagnosis that +καὶ ἰσχύοντα is "infolge des vorausgehenden ἰσχύοντα 3:1" fails to address why ἰσχύων and ἰσχύς were used for מִשְׁעָן in 3:1 to begin with, since the effect might have worked in reverse: that is, from 3:2 to 3:1. Van der Vorm-Crouchs (146) speculates that the translator may have provided the double rendering "with the aim of further increasing the number of forms related to ἰσχύω in this passage (counting five in the LXX)," although this raises the question of why ἰσχύοντα alone would not have sufficed. In short, there is no adequate explanation of what might have triggered the double rendering.

3:3

אֶל וְנִשְׁוּא פָּנִים is a good (partial) resolution of the metaphor פָּנִים וְנִשְׁוּא for the target language. The equivalent occurs again in 9:14.

As Goshen-Gottstein (†) suggested, καὶ θαυμαστὸν σύμβουλον is a condensation of וְנִשְׁוּא פָּנִים וְיוֹעֵץ. Compare καὶ τοὺς τὰ πρόσωπα θαυμάζοντας || וְנִשְׁוּא פָּנִים in 9:14.

ⲛⲓⲥⲁⲓ || חֲרָשִׁים need not reflect influence from OG's ἀρχιτέκτονα (*pace* Warszawski, 13), since ⲛⲓⲥⲁⲓ is a common equivalent for חֲרָשִׁים in S (e.g., Exod 35:35; 38:23). The grammatical singular ἀρχιτέκτονα || חֲרָשִׁים conforms to the surrounding grammatically singular nouns.

6. α' δυνατον σ' ανδρειον Q 710 Eus.; θ' δυναστην Q Syh 710 Eus.j.

ἀκροατήν || לחש is analogous to καὶ τὰ ἐνώτια || והלחשים in 3:20, while its ἐν θλίψει μικρᾷ || לחש צקון in 26:16 is likely a guess.⁷ Similarly, S's translation of לחש with محلل (T בעיצא) seems based on the preceding מוחל || ויועץ.⁸

3:4

Both OG and S translate ותעלולים with a term for “mockers” (καὶ ἐμπαῖκται/مخسلس), just as they arrive at similar equivalents for בתעלליהם in 66:4 (τὰ ἐμπαίγματα αὐτῶν/حسوس). Although these are the only two occurrences of תעלולים, S translates התעללת בי with حلس in Num 22:9 (OG ἐμπέπαιχάς μοι); התעלל בהם with حسه in 1 Sam 6:6 (OG ἐνέπαιξεν αὐτοῖς); and והתעללו בי with محلسه in 1 Sam 31:4 (OG καὶ ἐμπαίξωσίν μοι). Thus, the equivalents are native to each translation.

3:5

καὶ συμπεσεῖται || ונגש differs from equivalences attested elsewhere in Isaiah. Old Greek renders נגש with πράκτωρ “tax collector” in 3:12; and with ἀπαιτέω “demand payment” in 9:3; 14:4, while it translates ורדו בנגשיהם with καὶ κυριευθήσονται οἱ κυριεύσαντες αὐτῶν in 14:2; and ונגשיך with καὶ τοὺς ἐπισκόπους σου in 60:17.⁹ Notably different is καὶ πάντας τοὺς ὑποχειρίους ὑμῶν ὑπονύσσετε || וכל עצביכם תנגשו in 58:3, the only occurrence of ὑπονύσσω “afflict” in the Greek Bible, likely influenced by association with עצב.¹⁰ Similarly, συμπεσεῖται || ונגש is also likely chosen based on context, with the translator taking account of the parallel ירהבו (Goshen-

7. In Jer 8:17; Eccl 10:11 (the only other occurrences) OG translates לחש with ἐπαείδω “sing an incantation.”

8. S's equivalent to והלחשים in 3:20 is سوارحهم “their armlets,” which is also likely a guess based on context. In Isa 26:16 S uses the verb حسم “murmur,” while in Jer 8:17; Eccl 10:11 the translator uses حسمه “charm.”

9. The translator recognized the phonically distinct ונגש, most often rendering it with ἐγγίζω (29:13; 41:21, 22; 45:21; 50:8; 65:5). Isaiah 45:20's συνάχθητε καὶ ἤκετε βουλευσασθε ἅμα || והתנגשו יחדו הקבצו ובאו may stand under the influence of ἡγγισαν αἱ βουλαὶ ὑμῶν || הגישו עצמותיכם in 41:21 (cf. Ziegler, 158).

10. Besides the translation of nominal עצב with εἰδῶλοι (10:11; 48:5) and γλυπτὰ (46:1), עצב is translated with ὀδύνη (14:3) and καὶ ὀλιγόψυχον (|| ועצובת רוח, 54:6), while ונעצבו is translated καὶ παρώξυναν in 63:10.

Gottstein, י). As Ottley (2:116) noted, “συμπίπτειν seems to admit some suggestion of a hostile intent.”

The hostile tenor of προσκόψει || ירהבו accords with ὁ ἐπισπουδαστής in 14:4, reflecting מרהבה in its *Vorlage* (MT מדהבה), the reading in 1QIsa^a (see the comments at 14:4). Syriac’s סܡܠܝܬ || ירהבו accords with its rendering of ירהב רעיד “stir up, then, your friend” in Prov 6:3 (OG παρόξυνε δὲ αὐτὸν φίλον σου).¹¹ Compare T’s ויתגרון “and they will provoke each other.”

Similar to καὶ συμπεσεῖται is S’s ספלא || ונגש, which differs from its other equivalents for נגש. The participle of נגש is rendered with ספלא (e.g., 3:12; 14:4; 60:17), but also ספלא (9:3) and ספלא (14:2), while finite verbal forms are rendered with ספלא (53:7; 58:3). The present case is complicated by S’s use of ספלא as a slot verb elsewhere: ספלא || לארץ תשב, 3:26; ספלא || וכאלון אשר בשלכת מצבת || ספלא, 6:13; ספלא || נגדעת לארץ || ספלא, 14:12; and ספלא || ברע, 46:1, 2. The translator might have resorted to ספלא as a contextually apt equivalent, particularly in light of ספלא || ונהקלה and ירהבו || ספלא.¹² Notably, ספלא || ונהקלה diverges semantically from OG’s ὁ ἄτμος, making it unlikely that ספלא || ונגש owes to consultation of OG.

Syriac’s grammatically plural ספלא || חתמל חל likely owes to the preceding plural verb, ירהבו || ספלא.

3:6

Old Greek and S understand כי יתפש איש באחיו בית אביו differently, even though each seems to have read a *Vorlage* like MT. Although neither translation accords with the typically perceived meaning of “seizing one’s brother,” OG’s ἀνθρωπος τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ accurately represents the syntactic relationship in איש באחיו. Syriac, on the other hand, gives a double rendering of איש, the first time as subject (ספלא || יתפש; ספלא), the second qualifying the subject by the reciprocal phrase לספלא, similar to ספלא || יתפש in 3:5. Just as ספלא || יתפש modifies the subject (ספלא || יתפש) in 3:5, the double rendering of איש in 3:6 makes of ספלא a corporate figure whose action is distributed among its constituents via לספלא.

11. S’s translation in the two other cases of רהב are ספלא || יתפש (Ps 138:3); and ספלא || “stirred me up” (Song 6:5).

12. N.B. its underscoring of the motif of internecine strife in 3:6’s ספלא || יתפש איש באחיו.

It seems more likely that the translator replicated the structure of 3:5 than that his *Vorlage* read **כִּי יִתְפַּשׂ אִישׁ אִישׁ**. Although dittography is possible in the transmission of either Hebrew or S, the distinctive character of this idiom would likely secure the attention of any sober scribe, making an accidental dittograph unlikely.

Old Greek's *ἡ* before τοῦ οἰκείου τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ differentiates candidates to draft and shifts the meaning of **בֵּית אָבִיו**, with τοῦ οἰκείου τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ approximating "his father's relative," as in Lev 18:12: ἀσχημοσύνην ἀδελφῆς πατρός σου οὐκ ἀποκαλύψεις οἰκεία γὰρ πατρός σου ἐστίν || **עֲרוֹת אחות אביך לא תגלה שאר אביך הוא**.¹³ Syriac, on the other hand, translates **בֵּית אָבִיו** as modifying **ܐܡܝܐ** by prefixing *mem* to specify a genetically related brother (**ܡܡܐ ܐܡܝܐ**), with its pronominal suffix anaphoric to **ܡܡܐ ܕܝܗܝܐ**.

Although OG's *λέγων* and S's **ܠܡܥܢ** (cf. T **למימר**) might reflect **לֵאמֹר** in their *Vorlagen*, it is also possible that each simply found it necessary to mark off the quotation, parallel to **לֵאמֹר** in 3:7.

Both OG and S sensibly render **תְּהִיָּה** with an imperative (*γενοῦ*/ **ܡܡܐ**) (see the comments at 8:13 regarding their tendencies to shift verbal forms), since **קָצִין תְּהִיָּה לָנוּ** implies a command. Parallel to this, OG supplies *ἔστω* in the predicate of the final clause, whereas both MT and S have nominal clauses that gap the verb.

ܐܡܝܐ ܡܡܐ ܕܝܗܝܐ || **ܐܡܝܐ ܡܡܐ ܕܝܗܝܐ** accords with S's regular use of **ܡܡܐ** for **כֶּשֶׁל** (e.g., 3:8; 5:27; 8:15). Old Greek's equivalents for **כֶּשֶׁל** are more varied: *ἀνίημι*, 3:8; *κοπιάω*, 5:27; 31:3; 63:13; *ἀδυνατέω*, 8:15; *πίπτω*, 28:13; 59:10; *καταλίσκω*, 59:14; *παρालύω*, 35:3; *ἀνίσχυες ἔσσονται* || **ܐܡܝܐ ܡܡܐ ܕܝܗܝܐ**, 40:30. However, nowhere else does it associate **כֶּשֶׁל** with food. *βρῶμα* appears again only in 62:8, where it translates **מֵאֲכָל**. As Zeigler (136) concludes, even though it is impossible to know what stood in the translator's *Vorlage*, most likely he chose *βρῶμα* with a view to the respondent's objection that he lacked **לֶחֶם** (3:7), parallel to his lack of a **שִׁמְלָה**.

Old Greek probably chose *τὸ ἐμόν* || **ܐܡܝܐ ܡܡܐ ܕܝܗܝܐ** as a counterpart to *ὕπὸ σέ*, which condenses **יָדָךְ תַּחַת**, similar to *τότε ἐλάλησε κύριος πρὸς Ησαΐαν* || **ܐܡܝܐ ܡܡܐ ܕܝܗܝܐ** in 20:2; *διὰ τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν* || **ܐܡܝܐ ܡܡܐ ܕܝܗܝܐ** in

13. Although **בֵּית אָבִיו** functions adverbially, often understood as "in his father's house," it seems less to identify location than to explicitize "brother" as a literal kinship rather than fictive. *οἰκεῖος* appears twice more in Isaiah: in 31:9's *μακάριος ὃς ἔχει ἐν Σιών σπέρμα καὶ οἰκεῖους ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ* || **ܐܡܝܐ ܡܡܐ ܕܝܗܝܐ**; and then in 58:7, where *σπέρμα* and *οἰκεῖους* are still more closely joined: *καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν οἰκείων τοῦ σπέρματός σου οὐχ ὑπερόψῃ* || **ܐܡܝܐ ܡܡܐ ܕܝܗܝܐ**.

64:6(7); and *καὶ ἔλαβεν Ἐξεκίας τὸ βιβλίον παρὰ τῶν ἀγγέλων* || יקה חזקיהו || את הספרים מיד המלאכים in 37:14 (see Van der Vorm-Croughs, 124–27).

3:7

Although *ἀποκρίνομαι* typically renders ענה (14:10, 32; 21:9; 36:21[2x]; but *ἀποκριθῶσιν μοι* || ישיבו דבר in 41:28), *καὶ ἀποκριθείς* || ישא here is comparable to *εὐφρανθήσεται ἔρημος* || ישאו מדבר in 42:11, correlating with *εὐφρανθήσονται* || ירנו later in the verse, and likely arose by regarding נשא as shorthand for *נשא קול* (cf. *ἀναβοήσαν δὲ τὸ παιδίον ἔκλαυσεν* || ותשא את קלה, Gen 21:16). Reasoning similarly here, the translator rendered *לאמר* with *ἐρεῖ*, to which he subordinated *ἀποκριθείς* || ישא (سلا occupies the same slot as *לאמר* in MT).

سلا (cf. T's יתיב) likely also reflects an assumption that קול is implicit with ישא, just as S renders ונעתר להם ורפאם in 19:22 with *سلا*, under the assumption that דבר is implicit.

Syriac's *ܐܢܐ ܠܐ ܐܗܝܐ* is a peculiar rendering of חבש, especially when compared with its translation of אהיה in Isa 44:7, its only other appearance in the book: *ܐܢܐ ܠܐ ܐܗܝܐ* || *ܐܢܐ ܠܐ ܐܗܝܐ*. Whereas *ܐܢܐ ܠܐ ܐܗܝܐ* sets the discourse in the future, the predication *ܐܢܐ ܠܐ ܐܗܝܐ* (participle + pronoun) is likely of modal force (“I would not be”) rather than a straightforward rejection of the role (cf. *οὐκ ἔσομαι σου ἀρχηγός*).¹⁴ Its *ܐܢܐ ܠܐ ܐܗܝܐ* (cf. T ריש) resembles *ἀρχηγός* insofar as it designates a leader, but it does so metaphorically (cf. *ܐܢܐ ܠܐ ܐܗܝܐ* || חמשים, 3:3) rather than via a word like *ܐܢܐ ܠܐ ܐܗܝܐ*, which is its equivalent for קצין later in the verse (for which OG uses *ἀρχηγός* once more).

As Van der Vorm-Croughs (321) perceives, the translator likely supplied the pronoun in σου ἀρχηγός in response to *ἀρχηγός ἡμῶν γενοῦ* in 3:6. Equally, *οὐκ ἔσομαι* || לא תשימני is conformed to *οὐκ ἔσομαι* || לא אהיה earlier in this verse.

Syriac's *ܐܢܐ ܠܐ ܐܗܝܐ* entails reformulation for the target language. For *ܐܢܐ ܠܐ ܐܗܝܐ* versus *ܐܢܐ ܠܐ ܐܗܝܐ* in 3:6, compare *ܐܢܐ ܠܐ ܐܗܝܐ* || *ܐܢܐ ܠܐ ܐܗܝܐ* in 4:1; and note *ܐܢܐ ܠܐ ܐܗܝܐ* || *ܐܢܐ ܠܐ ܐܗܝܐ* in Exod 22:6 (cf. Deut 10:18; 22:3).

Old Greek's +demonstrative in *τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου* || עם occurs again in 65:3 (*ὁ λαὸς οὗτος ὁ παροξύνων με* || (העם המבעיסים). *העם הזה* is so frequent

14. Although the participle can be employed to speak of the future (Nöldeke §§270, 272), the volitional force of אהיה is not conveyed by the Syriac participle.

association of the *hapax legomenon* שפח with שפל and שח.¹⁸ The domination of the translator's mind by the theme of abasement is equally revealed in his καὶ ἡ αἰσχύνῃ τοῦ προσώπου αὐτῶν || הכרת פניהם in 3:9 (q.v.). Accordingly, +διδότι νῦν is inferential, linking ἐταπεινώθη ἡ δόξα αὐτῶν || עני בבודו to what precedes to summarize the preceding verses. This surmise seems stronger than Van der Vorm-Crough's suggestion of dependence on Hos 5:3–5, since, as she admits (440), “the points of contact between these two texts are only subtle.”¹⁹

τὰ πρὸς κύριον ἀπειθοῦντες || אל יהוה למרות (1QIsa^a על) is based on מרה, for which ἀπείθω serves as equivalent frequently in the Greek Bible (e.g., Num 20:10; Deut 1:26; Isa 50:5; 63:10). Van der Vorm-Croughs (373) reasonably posits that this reformulation betrays recollection of ἀπειθοῦντες διετελείτε τὰ πρὸς κύριον || ממרים הייתם עם יהוה in Deut 9:7. The expansion of אל יהוה into τὰ πρὸς κύριον elaborates their crime as opposition to anything related to the κύριος.

Like OG, S translates למרות with a finite verb: מנחם. However, rather than rendering אל יהוה as the direct recipient of the action, its מנחם adopts the circumlocution especially familiar from the targumim, helping to explain why the quadraliteral verb מנחם, which is always transitive, lacks a direct object. Equally in contrast to OG, S joins its מנחם !חסם || סחב אבסם to this clause as subject.

If חס is the correct reading, then S's *Vorlage* likely read ענן בבודו rather than עני בבודו (1QIsa^a עני). However, סחס could be an inner-Syriac error for חס.

The shift to the third-person plural pronoun in (ἡ δόξα) αὐτῶν || בבודו, conforms the grammatical number to αἱ γλῶσσαι αὐτῶν || לשונם.

3:9

Ziegler's (107) suggestion that ἡ αἰσχύνῃ reflects חפרת instead of הכרת in the *Vorlage* is possible, but it is equally possible that the translator divined the association in conjunction with the immediately preceding ἐταπεινώθη ἡ δόξα αὐτῶν || עני בבודו. In fact, given the insertion of διότι νῦν just before that phrase, Ziegler reasonably places a comma after ἡ δόξα αὐτῶν, recognizing καὶ ἡ αἰσχύνῃ τοῦ προσώπου αὐτῶν ἀντέστη αὐτοῖς as a clause parallel to it.

18. The use of biliteral etymology (on which see Tov, “Biliteral Exegesis”) was encountered already in 1:24.

19. Regarding the translator's use of conjunctions, see Troxel, 91–93.

The grammatically plural nouns τὰ γενήματα and פרי || פֶּרִי are likely by attraction to מעלליהם. Compare OG's πονηρὰ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν αὐτοῦ || רע בי גמול ידיו in 3:11.

אשתמודעות || פֶּרִי פֶּרִי “their partiality” agrees with הכרת פניהם || אשתמודעות in T. The idiom חַפְּזָה occurs again in 2 Chr 19:7 || (ומשא פנים) and is S’s equivalent for ὑπόκρισις in 2 Macc 6:25; Matt 23:28. Old Greek’s likely path to καὶ ἡ αἰσχύνη suggests a struggle to make sense of the text, as does V’s *agnitio vultus eorum*, which differs from its idiom *personarum acceptio* (e.g., 2 Chr 19:7; Rom 2:11; Eph 6:9; Col 3:25). The fact that S’s equivalent for הכרת agrees with T points to a shared exegetical tradition rather than simply a similar exegetical reasoning. Syriac’s grammatical plural חֲפִזָּה || וחטאתם (OG τὴν δὲ ἁμαρτίαν αὐτῶν) and its expansion of רעה into חֲפִזָּה underscores the people’s crimes as the verse’s topic.

For ἀντέστυ αὐτοῖς || עֲנִתָהּ בָּם compare ἀντέστυσαν ἡμῖν || עֲנִתָהּ בָּנוּ in 59:12, in whose light Ottley (2:117) remarks that ἀντέστυ in 3:9 “doubtless implies coming forward in witness against” (emphasis original).

ἐνεφάνισαν || כִּחְדוֹ לֹא exemplifies the translator’s penchant for reformulating phrases and clauses by manipulating negative particles.²⁰

The subject of חֲפִזָּה || כִּחְדוֹ is uncertain, calling into question equally what serves as subject of חֲפִזָּה. Although no conclusion can be drawn from the absence of a *lāmād* to mark a direct object, it is difficult to construe חֲפִזָּה as the subject of חֲפִזָּה, since that would leave no object. Accordingly, its subject must be identical with the suffixes of חֲפִזָּה and חֲפִזָּה. However, it is strained to think that the referent of those pronouns is also the subject of חֲפִזָּה (for חֲפִזָּה || כִּחְדוֹ, cf. 1 Sam 3:18; Jer 38:14), compelling the inference that חֲפִזָּה is its subject: “and (their sins) were not hidden.”

Syriac’s rendering of גמול is unusual: חֲפִזָּה || חֲפִזָּה. In 63:7 S twice translates גמול with its most common equivalent, חֲפִזָּה (cf. 1 Sam 24:18; 2 Sam 19:37; 22:21; Joel 4:4; Pss 7:5; 18:21; 103:10; 116:7; 137:8; 142:8; 2 Chr 20:11).²² Nevertheless, חֲפִזָּה || חֲפִזָּה finds a parallel in Prov 11:17’s חֲפִזָּה || חֲפִזָּה. (נפשׁו אישׁ חסד).²³

20. See the comments at 1:20 and the broader discussion in Troxel, 93–99.

21. גמול להם is attested in MT; 1QIsa^a and implied by V’s *reddita sunt*.

22. Presuming the text is correct, we find חֲפִזָּה || חֲפִזָּה in Ps 13:6, but cf. חֲפִזָּה || חֲפִזָּה in Ps 116:7; חֲפִזָּה || חֲפִזָּה in 142:8.

23. Although חֲפִזָּה + pronoun is often reflexive, the parallel between חֲפִזָּה and חֲפִזָּה in the next clause makes that unlikely. Conversely, חֲפִזָּה in the next clause

The woe begun in the last half of 3:9 of OG—οὐαὶ τῇ ψυχῇ αὐτῶν διότι βεβούλευνται βουλὴν πονηρὰν καθ' ἑαυτῶν || רעה להם כי גמלו להם—continues with εἰπόντες (3:10) that introduces a call to attack τὸν δίκαιον. The particle τοῖνυν signals that the final clause of 3:10 is an exposition of the woe pronounced on the speakers: τοῖνυν τὰ γενήματα τῶν ἔργων αὐτῶν φάγονται. Central to this motif of retribution is διότι βεβούλευνται βουλὴν πονηρὰν καθ' ἑαυτῶν || רעה להם כי גמלו להם, which contains no recognizable equivalent for גמלו (cf. κατὰ τὰ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν αὐτοῦ || כי גמול ידיו in 3:11), while the only evident Hebrew counterpart to βεβούλευνται βουλὴν πονηρὰν καθ' ἑαυτῶν is רעה להם.

The collocation of βουλεύω and βουλή, without corresponding Hebrew terms, occurs throughout the book. Isaiah 31:6 is a key example: ἐπιστράφητε οἱ τὴν βαθεῖαν βουλὴν βουλευόμενοι καὶ ἄνομον || ושוב לאשר לעמיקו סרה בני ישראל. Although ἐπιστράφητε and βαθεῖαν are transparent to the Hebrew, οἱ aligns with לאשר, and ἄνομον || סרה recalls ἀνομίαν || סרה in 1:5, βουλὴν βουλευόμενοι lacks any apparent footing. Ziegler (148) rightly detects mutual influence between 31:6 and 29:15, where the basis for βουλή is clear:

הוי המעמיקים מיהו οὐαὶ οἱ βαθέως βουλὴν ποιοῦντες καὶ οὐ διὰ κυρίου
לסתר עצה οὐαὶ οἱ ἐν κρυφῇ βουλὴν ποιοῦντες

The translator gives double renderings of both הוי and עצה, and twice makes use of ποιοῦντες to create verbal phrases.²⁴

But 29:15 is also striking for its reminiscence of ἐβουλεύσαντο βουλὴν πονηρὰν in 7:5:

יען כי יעץ עליך ארם רעה καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Αραμ καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Ρομελίου
אפרים ובן רמליהו ὅτι ἐβουλεύσαντο βουλὴν πονηρὰν περὶ σοῦ

The rooting of ἐβουλεύσαντο in יעץ is transparent, while the translator supplied βουλὴν as an explication for πονηρὰν || רעה (see comments ad loc.).

is likely reflexive (“Woe to the souls of those who cast evil rewards for themselves”) a role that *lāmad* + pronoun can fill. Cf. Nöldeke, §223, who implies that reflexive **فعل** is more frequent in prose.

24. His use of ποιέω to fashion verbal phrases is exemplified also in καὶ κρίσιν ἐκ τῶν ἐχθρῶν μου ποιήσω || ואנקמה מאויבי, 1:24; ἔμεινα τοῦ ποιῆσαι κρίσιν, ἐποίησε δὲ ἀνομίαν || למשה ולחנה משפט, 5:7; Τοῦ ὁξέως προνομήν ποιῆσαι σκύλων || למחר שלל חש בז, 8:1 (cf. 10:6).

βουλὴ appears unexpectedly in 25:7's ἡ γὰρ βουλὴ αὕτη || המסכה הנסוכה (cf. αὕτη ἡ βουλὴ || זאת העצה, 14:26), while the phrases ἡ βουλὴ αὕτη οὐδὲ ἔσται || ולא תהיה in 7:7; ἐπὶ τὴν βουλὴν αὐτῶν || על תבליתם in 10:25; and ἀρὰ ἔδεται ταύτην τὴν βουλὴν αὕτη γὰρ ἡ βουλὴ ἔνεκεν πλεονεξίας || כי בלי מקום צאה קיא מלאו כל שלחנות מלאו in 28:8 all attest the translator's proclivity to supply the notion of "counsel."²⁵ Isaiah 3:9's βεβούλουνται βουλὴν πονηράν, untethered to any extant Hebrew text, seems to evince the same fascination with the theme, particularly as a plot by the wicked.

βεβούλουνται βουλὴν πονηράν in 3:9 was triggered by רעה (cf. 7:5), in view of the conspiracy against τὸν δίκαιον divined in 3:10. Given the translator's frequent pairing of βουλεύω with βουλὴ, his rendering of ונמלג by βεβούλουνται rather than a verb like ἀνταποδίδωμι (as in 35:4; 63:7; cf. Deut 32:6; 1 Kgdms 24:18; 2 Kgdms 19:37) is intelligible, while he renders הלה with καθ' ἑαυτῶν.

3:10

Syriac's +ܐܠܗ (ܐܠܗܐ || אמרו צדיק כי טוב), which likely marks the indirect object (T לצדיקא), matches the supralinear ܐ before צדיק in 1QIsa^a. Syriac apparently analyzes כי as nominalizer but provides no equivalent, as again in 31:1; 39:8 (see appendix C).²⁶ The question is the function of ܐܠܗ.

Greenberg and Walter (15) render ܐܠܗܐ as an imperative, ܐܠܗܐ as indirect object, and ܐܠܗ as an implied predicate: "Say to the righteous—Good [it is]: because of this they will eat the fruits of their works." They appear to have arrived at this as parallel to 3:11's ܐܠܗܐ ܐܠܗܐ ܐܠܗܐ ܐܠܗܐ ܐܠܗܐ, which they render, "Alas! For the wicked—Evil: for the work of his hands is repaid." But this seems strained, owing to two dissimilarities between the clauses. First, ܐܠܗܐ and ܐܠܗ have different syntactic functions: while ܐܠܗܐ is an imperative, ܐܠܗ is an interjection bound to ܐܠܗܐ: "Alas for the wicked!" Second, while ܐܠܗ is a masculine singular absolute form, if ܐܠܗܐ is analyzed as the absolute state, it is in the feminine gender, raising the question of how it parallels ܐܠܗ. More likely, its agreement with ܐܠܗܐ, in the masculine singular determined state, identifies it as an attributive

25. See Ronald L. Troxel, "BOYAH and BOYAEYEIN in LXX Isaiah," in *The Old Greek of Isaiah: Issues and Perspectives; Papers Read at the Conference on the Septuagint of Isaiah, Held in Leiden 10–11 April 2008*, ed. Arie van der Kooij and Michael N. van der Meer, CBET 55 (Leuven: Peeters, 2010), 164–68.

26. Nominalizing ܐ || כי is infrequent (e.g. 12:4; 16:12).

adjective (“the dastardly wicked”). If the translator intended these clauses to be read in parallel, it is perplexing that he avoided rendering **כִּי פָרִי** in 3:10 with **פִּרְיָם חַבְתִּים**, which would have secured parallelism with **גְּמוּל יָדָיו** in 3:11.

Although the role of **לָמַד** remains oblique, a more tenable analysis is that **לָמַד** is a 3mp perfect, whose subject is the same as **לָמַד** in 3:9, and concludes the accusation of the wicked, while the *lāmad* in **לָמַד** is the reference point for **לָמַד**: “They said of the righteous man, ‘he is good,’” implicitly recognizing that they, having piled up **חַטָּא** (3:9), are *not* good. The standard meaning of **לָמַד** as “therefore” draws an inference from what has preceded:²⁷ “Therefore, they will eat the fruits of their deeds.” While the translator’s rendering leaves obscurities, his exegetical maneuvers are evident and show no sign of him consulting OG to extricate himself from the aporia.

Old Greek’s **εἰπόντες δῆσωμεν** || **אָמַר** is either a double rendering—first as **אָמַר** (MT, 1QIsa^a; cf. S, V, T), then as **אָסַר**—or it reflects a *Vorlage* that read **אָסַר**, before which the translator supplied **εἰπόντες** to introduce the words of the wicked.²⁸ Although the evidence is insufficient to determine which was the case, Tov correctly observes that **δῆσωμεν** “changed the meaning of the text,” compelling the translator “to render **טוֹב** antithetically with **δύσχερηστος**.”²⁹ The translator’s tendency to manipulate negative particles was noted in 3:9 (**ἐνεφάνισαν** || **לֹא כָחוּדוּ**), and already in chapter one (1:20, 24).³⁰ **τοίνυν** || **כִּי** accords with his frequently novel renderings of conjunctions (cf. **ὁδὸς ἥ** || **כִּי הִנֵּה** in 3:1).³¹

27. **לָמַד** is S’s most common equivalent for **כִּי** (see appendix C), while **לָמַד** || **כִּי** is distinctive. Elsewhere **לָמַד** translates either **לִכְן** (e.g., 1:24; 5:13, 14, 24); or **עַל כֵּן** (5:25; 9:16; 13:7, 13), except 44:9 (**לְמַעַן יִבְשׁוּ** || **לָמַד בְּחֹלֶס**), where his *Vorlage* may have read **עַל כֵּן**, since **לְמַעַן** marking purpose is regularly translated with **לְ** + imperfect. **לָמַד** has no equivalent in 43:10; 66:11.

28. Ottley (2:117) and Ziegler (61) waver between these options, while Seeligmann (57) implies that **אָסַר** stood alone in the source text. Van der Vorm-Croughs (24) calls it a double translation, with **δῆσωμεν** an “associative rendering.” Tov (*Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint*, 150–51) concludes that **אָמַר אָסַר** stood in the *Vorlage*.

29. Tov, *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint*, 151.

30. Cf. Seeligmann’s comments (57) on the translator’s use of this tack and Orlinsky’s notice of the same phenomenon in Job (Orlinsky, “Studies in the Septuagint of the Book of Job,” 231).

31. **τοίνυν** renders **לִכְן** in 5:13 but lacks a Hebrew counterpart in 27:4; 33:23. It occurs outside Isaiah only in Job 8:13; 36:14; 1 Chr 28:10; 2 Chr 28:23.

singular to plural: οἱ μακαρίζοντες ὑμᾶς || מאשריך || τῶν ποδῶν ὑμῶν || ארחתיך. The rendering of מתעים with πλανῶσιν ὑμᾶς finds parallels in S (لحمي), V (*ipsi te decipiunt*), and T (טעיען). The fact that none agree with OG's prior shifts of third-person pronouns to second-person raises the possibility of מתע as a variant owing to graphic confusion, whether in Aramaic script or paleo-Hebrew (1QIsa^a מתעים). In my estimation, it remains more likely that they supplied the pronoun under the influence of מאשריך.

Ziegler (200) notes that the papyri use πράκτωρ of a civil office, while James Moulton and George Milligan specify that “the πράκτωρ in the Ptolemaic era was concerned with the exaction of fines or payments.”³⁵ The translator's choice of πράκτωρ is illuminated by καὶ οἱ ἀπαιτοῦντες || ונשים, derived by analyzing נשים as a participle from נשה, so that οἱ ἀπαιτοῦντες denotes “those who demand payment,” in accord with the use of ἀπαιτέω in the papyri for collecting taxes.³⁶ Thus, πράκτορες ὑμῶν || נגשיו reflects the Hellenistic system of tax collection, with the translator casting the abusive rulers as “tax farmers.”

καλαμῶνται || מעולל is based on association with עלל, as in 24:13, where οὕτως καλαμῶνται αὐτούς || בעולל follows ὃν τρόπον ἐάν τις καλαμῶσεται ἐλαίαν || בנקף זית.³⁷ The choice of this equivalent was likely stimulated by הכרם in 3:14, yielding a striking metaphor in which, as Ottley (2:118) observed, καλαμῶνται approaches “the sense of English ‘fleece.’” Taken together with καὶ ἐμπαῖχται || ותעלולים in 3:4; μετὰ ἀνομίας || ומעלליהם in 3:8; and τῶν ἔργων αὐτῶν || מעלליהם in 3:10, it evinces the translator's studied attention to rendering עלל in this chapter.

καὶ τὴν τρίβον τῶν ποδῶν ὑμῶν || ודרך ארחתיך is noteworthy on two counts. First, even though καὶ τὴν τρίβον aligns with ודרך, this equivalent appears again only in Prov 2:20; 30:19, while ὁδός is the most frequent equivalent.³⁸ τρίβος typically renders words like מסלה (e.g., 40:3); נתיב (e.g.,

35. James H. Moulton and George Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-literary Sources* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1930), 533.

36. The calculation behind the choice to analyze נשים as a participle becomes evident from γυναῖκες || נשים in the remaining instances of נשים in Isaiah (4:1; 19:16; 27:1; 32:9). For ἀπαιτέω in the papyri, see Moulton and Milligan, *Vocabulary*, 52. Ziegler (200) reports that ἀπαιτής in the papyri designates a tax collector. Cf. Ottley's translation (1:73) of οἱ ἀπαιτοῦντες κυριεύουσιν ὑμῶν: “the tax gatherers shall lord it over you.”

37. Cf. T's במעללי כרמא; S's مبححج.

38. τρίβος renders both דרך and ארח in Prov 2:20. In Prov 30:19 we find ἵχνη ... καὶ ὁδοὺς ... καὶ τρίβους ... καὶ ὁδοὺς || דרך ... דרך ... דרך ... דרך.

42:16); and ארח (e.g., 30:11). In passages where דרך and a synonym stand parallel, it is always rendered with ὁδός, while τρίβος is regularly used for the synonym.³⁹ By this measure, γῆν τρίβον is an irregular equivalent for דרך.

Second, although πύς is not a common equivalent for either noun, comparison with 58:13 might shed light on the translator's word choice: οὐκ ἀρεῖς τὸν πόδα σου ἐπ' ἔργῳ || וכבדתו מעשות דרכיך. This clause continues the protasis begun in the first clause of the verse: ἐὰν ἀποστρέψῃς τὸν πόδα σου ἀπὸ τῶν σαββάτων τοῦ μὴ ποιεῖν τὰ θελήματά σου (|| אם תשיב (משבת רגלך עשות חפצך), and that clause seems to have influenced how the translator rendered וכבדתו מעשות דרכיך. Not only does οὐκ ἀρεῖς displace וכבדתו (and מכבד preceding it), but the position of ἐπ' ἔργῳ || מעשות at the end of the clause makes it semantically similar to τὰ θελήματά σου, while τὸν πόδα σου || דרכיך seems chosen to parallel the prior τὸν πόδα σου || רגלך, which in both cases serves as a metonymy for behavior. This illumines the choice of τῶν ποδῶν ὑμῶν || ארחתיך in 3:12 in a similar metonymic role, in which light καὶ τῇ πορείᾳ τῶν ποδῶν || הלוך in 3:16 can hardly be accidental.⁴⁰ Thus, καὶ γῆν τρίβον τῶν ποδῶν ὑμῶν likely reflects a *Vorlage* identical to the MT.⁴¹

As for ταρασσουσιν || בלעו, the translator usually renders בלע with καταπίνω (9:16; 16:8; 25:8; 28:4; 49:19), while he employs ταρασσω erratically, using it twelve times, but never more than once for a Hebrew word and sometimes with an opaque relationship to the MT (e.g. || צהלו, 24:14; התרעה, 24:19; להנפה, 30:28). He might have chosen ταρασσουσιν here to resolve what he saw as a peculiar metaphor in בלעו (cf. S حسم, “trouble,” T קלקילו “ruin”). Goshen-Gottstein (יב) compares κύριος ἐν ὁργῇ αὐτοῦ συνταράξει αὐτούς || יהוה באפו יבלעם in Ps 20(21):10.

39. τῆς ὁδοῦ ... τὸν τρίβον || דרך ... ארח, 30:11; γῆν ὁδόν ... τὰς τρίβους τοῦ θεοῦ ὑμῶν || דרך ... מסלה, 40:3; ἐν ὁδῷ ... καὶ τρίβους, || בדרך ... בנתיבות, 42:16; ὁδὸν ... τρίβον || דרך ... נתיבה, 43:16 (cf. 43:16; 49:9, 11; 59:8).

40. Cf. καὶ διώξεται αὐτούς καὶ διελεύσεται ἐν εἰρήνῃ ἡ ὁδὸς τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ || יבוא ירדפם יעבור שלום ארח ברגליו לא יבוא suggested itself to the translator, although τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ there actually renders a form of רגל. Goshen-Gottstein (יב) rightly dismisses any supposition that ποδῶν is an inner-Greek error for ὁδῶν.

41. 1QIsa^a reads ודרךי אורחותיך, with the first *yod* added supralinearly following a final kaph.

3:13

ἀλλὰ νῦν lacks a counterpart in MT, 1QIsa^a, or any other witness. As noted already at 2:5, 10; 3:8, the translator often inserts νῦν to highlight a link between sentences and clauses. ἀλλὰ νῦν here marks a shift from describing the plunder of the people to the scene of the Kyrios defending them.

Although OG's equivalents follow the Hebrew word order and are quantitatively similar, their semantics shift. This is particularly clear when viewed against S's leveling of semantics by translating both נצב and עמד with מלך, as well as both לריב and לדין with חכמי. Although OG also uses the same equivalent for לריב and לדין—εἰς κρίσιν—its equivalents for נצב and עמד distinguish the role of εἰς κρίσιν from that of חכמי.⁴² Although καταστήσεται and στήσει can be either transitive or intransitive, the accusative case of τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ marks στήσει as transitive and, given the role of εἰς κρίσιν as verbal complement with both verbs, the same seems true of καταστήσεται: “But now the Kyrios will appoint for judgment and station for judgment his people.” While S speaks of the Lord standing to conduct judgment, OG speaks of the Kyrios stationing his people for judgment.

Old Greek's τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ and S's حکمه || עמים (MT, 1QIsa^a; cf. T) might attest עמו. Syriac's divergence from OG's interpretation of the surrounding verses in other respects strengthens this conclusion, suggesting that S offers independent attestation of עמו.

3:14

αὐτὸς κύριος || יהוה is unparalleled in any other textual witness. Although αὐτός might reflect a corrupt dittograph of יהוה as הוא, more likely the translator supplied the pronoun to distinguish a new phase of divine action labeled as εἰς κρίσιν from 3:13. Whereas there the Kyrios was to station “his people for judgment,” here he will “come for judgment” with those he has charged with crimes against his people.

εἰς κρίσιν ἥξει is an unusual translation of the idiom במשפט יבוא. ἔρχομαι is the typical equivalent for בוא elsewhere:

ואל תבוא במשפט	καὶ μὴ εἰσέλθῃς εἰς κρίσιν
את עבדך	μετὰ τοῦ δούλου σου (Ps 142[143]:2)

42. Goshen-Gottstein's (יב) suggestion that καὶ στήσει might suppose יעמד (וי), read as a *hiphil*, would not account for καταστήσεται || נצב.

תביא במשפט עמך	εἰσελθεῖν ἐν κρίματι ἐνώπιόν σου (Job 14:3)
יבוא עמך במשפט	συνεισελεύσεται σοι εἰς κρίσιν (Job 22:4)

On the two occasions that בוא is construed as transitive, ἄγω is used:

ודע כי על כל אלה	γνώθι ὅτι ἐπὶ πᾶσι τούτοις
יביאך האלהים במשפט	ἄξει σε ὁ θεὸς ἐν κρίσει (Qoh 11:9)
כי את כל מעשה	ὅτι σὺν πᾶν τὸ ποίημα
האלהים יבא במשפט	ὁ θεὸς ἄξει ἐν κρίσει (Qoh 12:14).

By contrast, αὐτὸς κύριος εἰς κρίσιν ἤξει stresses the *arrival* of the Kyrios for an act of judgment. The scene is similar to 4:5, where καὶ ἤξει || ויבא (perhaps reflecting ויבוא: see the comments ad loc.) describes a theophany.

+μετά in the second phrase of μετὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ μετὰ τῶν ἀρχόντων αὐτοῦ (|| עם זקני עמו ושריו) examples the translator's tendency to repeat a preposition, as observed with κατὰ Ἱερουσαλημ || וירושלם in 1:1 (cf. εἰς λύπην || דוי, 1:5; καὶ εἰς τὰς σχισμάς || צרים, 2:19). These phrases headed by μετὰ less likely speak of those who accompany the Kyrios than of the opponents in judgment, against whom the next words level an accusation.

τί before ἐνεπυρίστατε might reflect למה after ואתם, but the translator likely supplied it corresponding to τί in 3:15 (no interrogative pronoun or particle appears in 1QIsa^a, S, or T; V translates ואתם with *vos enim*).

Similarly, although τὸν ἀμπελῶνά μου might reflect כרמי in place of הכרם in the *Vorlage*, the accent on the indictment of the wicked rulers could just as easily have inspired it as an explication of the definite article, opposite ὑμεῖς at the start of the accusation. As Van der Vorm-Croughs (34 n. 8) observes, this role for τὸν ἀμπελῶνά μου resonates with 5:1, 3, 4, 5, 6, where διαρπαγὴν || לבער (3:5) suggests a conceptual association with these verses.

Although ἡ ἀρπαγὴ || גזל is a semantically apt match, every other occurrence of גזל in the Bible is rendered by ἄρπαγμα (Lev 5:23; Ezek 18:7, 12, 16; 33:15), a word used for plundered goods in 61:8 (καὶ μισῶν ἀρπάγματα ἐξ ἀδικίας || שנא גזל בעולה); 42:22 (καὶ οὐκ ἦν ὁ ἐξαιρούμενος ἄρπαγμα || ואין מציל משסה), in accord with classical morphosemantics of nouns ending in -μα designating the result of an action (Smyth §841). ἀρπαγή, on the other hand, occurs again only in 10:2, where εἰς ἀρπαγὴν || יבזו stands parallel to εἰς προνομῆν. This signals that ἀρπαγὴ in 3:14 designates the *act* of plundering.

Ziegler (81) suggests that ἀδικεῖτε || דכאו and καταισχύνετε || תטחנו are the translator's way of dealing with a metaphor that he found "zu real und derb," much as Ottley (2:119) posits that "LXX softens the Heb. verbs 'crush' ... 'grind.'" More to the point, however, the translator seems to have been uncertain about rendering דכא elsewhere. In 53:10, καθάρσαι αὐτόν || דכאו reflects the semantics of Aramaic דכא (cf. T למצרף ולדכאה). In 57:15, καὶ διδοὺς ζωὴν τοῖς συντετριμμένοις τὴν καρδίαν || ולהחיות לב ושפל רוח להחיות רוח || διδοὺς μακροθυμίαν || ושבפליים, obscuring whether he was familiar with the meaning "crush" for דכא.⁴³ However, Seeligmann (42) observes that ἀδικέω (along with ἀδικῶς) is used throughout the book as a "wellnigh [*sic*] technical term, to express, without any direct sanction from the Hebrew text, the violence from which Israel was made to suffer by other peoples (10:20; 23:13; 25:3–4; 43:24; 51:23)." Whether or not it constituted a technical term, the use of it in such contexts suggests that it was not likely intended to "soften" the verbs here.

ἀλεσον || יחט in 47:2 suggests that the translator likely would have recognized יחטת here. Perhaps, however, having translated יאכזב with ἀδικεῖτε, ἀλέω seemed “zu real und derb” (Ziegler, 81), and κατασιχύνετε

44. In two of the four other uses of **לַח** outside Isaiah, the relationship to the Hebrew is transparent: **לַח חֶמֶס** || **לַח** in Prov 8:36; and **לַח נֹגַע** in Dan 8:5. The relationship is more oblique in Zech 3:1 (**וְהָיָה לְךָ לְלֶחֶם לֶחֶם לֶחֶם** || **לַח**), where **לַח** aligns with the second occurrence of **לֶחֶם**. In Prov 10:26 (**כְּחֶמֶץ לֶשׁוֹן** || **לַח**), a participial form of **לַח** is supplied in a simile about the affect of sour grapes on teeth.

3:16

On S's lack of equivalents for יהוה ויאמר see above, 3:15.

ܡܠܝܬܐ reformulates גרן גרן, similar to OG's ὑψηλῶ τραχήλῳ, although each transformation fits the norms of its target language.⁴⁷

Syriac's translation of עינים ומשקרות with ܡܬܠܝܬܐ ܡܬܠܝܬܐ resembles OG's καὶ νεύμασιν ὀφθαλμῶν, to the extent that it uses a nominal form in an adverbial phrase. The fact that the previous clause spoke of the disposition of their necks sets the expectation that this reference to eyes is about behavior and appearance, making the semantic similarity between S and OG unsurprising.

Syriac diverges from OG in construing הליוך with what precedes it (contrast MT's *athnach*), so that ܡܬܠܝܬܐ ܡܬܠܝܬܐ parallels ܡܬܠܝܬܐ earlier in the verse. It also diverges from OG in its rendition of וברגליהם וטפף תלכנה in its rendition of ܡܬܠܝܬܐ ܡܬܠܝܬܐ “and knocking with their feet and provoking.” Targum's comparable מרגזן points to an exegetical association of תעכסנה with בעס. This difference is noteworthy because its rendering of ܡܬܠܝܬܐ ܡܬܠܝܬܐ in 3:18—ܡܬܠܝܬܐ ܡܬܠܝܬܐ “the glory of their garments”—accords with OG's τὴν δόξαν τοῦ ἱματισμοῦ αὐτῶν.

Old Greek renders וטפף תלכנה וברגליהם expansively: καὶ τῇ πορείᾳ τῶν ποδῶν ἅμα σύρουσαι τοὺς χιτῶνας καὶ τοῖς ποσὶν ἅμα παίζουσai. καὶ τῇ πορείᾳ τῶν ποδῶν is reminiscent of καὶ τὴν τρίβον τῶν ποδῶν ὑμῶν in 3:12 and is likely a substitution for הליוך rather than a translation. Old Greek uses σύρω again in 28:2; 30:28, in both cases for שטף, to speak of water sweeping through a locale, although it is unclear whether the translator was familiar with the Hebrew verb.⁴⁸ τοὺς χιτῶνας, the object of σύρουσαι, lacks any isolable equivalent. As Goshen-Gottstein (יב) perceived, σύρουσαι τοὺς χιτῶνας is an image that the translator deemed fitting for the context.

Finally, καὶ τοῖς ποσὶν renders וברגליהם, whereas παίζουσai aligns with תעכסנה, the only time the equivalence appears in the Greek Bible (elsewhere παίζω translates צחק [three times] or שחק [twelve times]). Anne-Françoise Loiseau suggests that παίζουσai derives from the same exegetical play between עכס and בעס attested in S (ܡܬܠܝܬܐ) and T (מרגזן), noting that

47. As Seeligmann (48) notes, χεῖρ ὑψηλή is a regular equivalent for ידו גבוהה (9:11, 16, 20; 10:4), which S translates with ܡܠܝܬܐ ܡܠܝܬܐ.

48. שטף lacks a clear equivalent in 8:8, is rendered by a semantically inapt equivalent in three cases (συντρέμων, 10:22; συγκαλύσουσι, 43:2; εἰρήνης, 66:12), and stands in three phrases for which καταγίγ is substituted (28:15, 17, 18).

“παίζω a pris un sens sexuel dans les passages où c’était le cas en hébreu pour שחק/שחק,” so that παίζουσαι here implies enticing foot motions.⁴⁹ Although this is possible, it entails a bit of mind reading of the translator.

More readily evident is that ἄμα in both this participial phrase and the preceding one describes simultaneous effects for τῇ πορείᾳ τῶν ποδῶν, making the women’s carriage coordinate with their outstretched necks and eye movements.

3:17

Ziegler (137) posits that the translator was likely unfamiliar with the *hapax legomenon* שפח and chose ταπεινώσει in view of the following description of the abasement of daughter Zion’s haughtiness. It might also reflect biliteral etymological analysis of שפח via שפל (cf. above, 3:8).

וישעביד || וישפח accords with both OG’s καὶ ταπεινώσει and T’s וישעביד “and shall subdue” (1QIsa^a and V [*decalvabit*] = MT). Syriac often employs שפח for שחח (2:9, 11; 5:15; 25:12; 26:5; 60:14) and שפל (2:11, 12, 17; 5:15^[2]; 13:11; 25:11, 12; 26:5; 29:4; 32:19; 40:4; 57:9, 15 [2x]) and even uses it for both verbs in 2:11 (שפל וישפח || וישעביד). Thus S, like OG probably associated שפח with שפח/שחח.

וישפח || וישפח accords with OG’s ἀρχούσας θυγατέρας Σιών, which finds a parallel in ἄρχοντα || קדקד in Deut 33:20 (S וישפח); and וישפח || וקדקד בני שאון in Jer 48:45 (> G), evincing that OG and S could each extrapolate from קדקד to the notion of a ruler.

ἀποκαλύψει || יערה has precedent in ἀπεκάλυψεν || הערה in Lev 20:18, 19 (in both verses immediately after ἀποκαλύπτω || גלה), but lacks a parallel in the book.⁵⁰ Syriac’s וישפח, on the other hand, accords with the equivalents for ערותה (פישפח) and ערה (פישפח and פישפח) in Lev 20:18, 19; and פישפח in Zeph 2:4, leaving no reason to suspect its reliance on OG.

וישפח || וישפח parallels OG’s τὸ σχῆμα αὐτῶν, the only appearance of σχῆμα in the Greek Bible, while וישפח occurs again in Num 18:7 (וישפח || וישפח); לכל דבר המזבח [κατὰ πάντα τρόπον τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου];

49. Anne-Françoise Loiseau, *L'influence de l'araméen sur les traducteurs de la LXX principalement, sur les traducteurs grecs postérieurs, ainsi que sur les scribes de la Vorlage de la LXX*, SCS 65 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2016), 169.

50. The remainder of OG-Isaiah gives semantically inapt equivalents: καὶ συναγωγῇ παρατάξεως || וקיר ערה מן, 22:6; ἕως ἂν ἐπέλθῃ || עד יערה, 32:15; ἄνθ' ὧν παρεδόθη || תחת אשר הערה, 53:12.

and Prov 7:10 (וְהָיָה אִשָּׁה לִקְרָאתָהּ שֵׁת זֹנָה || لاَ يَحْسَبُ الْغُلَامُ لَهَا حِلًّا وَنَسِيًّا) [ή δὲ γυνή συναντᾷ αὐτῶν εἶδος ἔχουσα πορνικόν]).⁵¹ Those other appearances of אִשָּׁה permit the conclusion that the translator chose אִשָּׁה independently of OG, in accord with the topic of depriving the women of their pretenses.⁵²

3:18

Ziegler's (203) preface to the OG of 3:18–24 provides an entrée equally applicable to S:

Hier ist es naheliegend, daß der Übers. die Fachausdrücke seiner Zeit wählte, die von seinen Landsleuten und besonders auch von den Leserinnen verstanden werden konnten. Dazu kommt, daß viele Wörter der hebr. Vorlage schwierig und unbekannt waren, die der Übers. einfach durch griech. Ausdrücke ersetzte, ohne sich sonderlich Mühe zu geben, die richtigen Äquivalente zu suchen und ohne auch in der Lage zu sein, bei allen Wörtern philologisch richtig zu übersetzen. Deshalb ist es teilweise schwierig, immer die zusammengehörenden Äquivalente zu finden.

A useful starting point is to note the alignments between MT, OG, and S, based not on word order but semantics, beginning with 3:18:

את תפארת	אִשָּׁה	τὴν δόξαν τοῦ ἱματισμοῦ αὐτῶν καὶ τοὺς κόσμους αὐτῶν
העכסים	בְּשָׂמִים	καὶ τὰ ἐμπλόκια
והשבִּיסים	בְּשָׂמִים	καὶ τοὺς κοσσύμβους
והשהרנים	בְּשָׂמִים	καὶ τοὺς μηχανίσκους

Examining word choices here and in 3:19 quickly confounds any perception that S has leaned on OG for assistance. Although both identify תפארת with terms for clothing, OG connects only τοῦ ἱματισμοῦ αὐτῶν with τὴν

51. פת appears again only in 1 Sam 7:50, where OG renders לדלתות with και τὰ θυρώματα τῶν θυρῶν, and S with פת, פת.

52. Pace Warszawski (14) and Gesenius, *Commentar über den Jesaia*, 82.

δόξαν, while its *καὶ τοὺς κόσμους αὐτῶν* is a second object of ἀφελεῖ, followed by three more objects. Syriac, by contrast, binds the series ܡܬܠܝܬܐܝܬܐ, ܡܬܠܝܬܐܝܬܐ, ܡܬܠܝܬܐܝܬܐ, providing a quantitative match to *העכסים והשבִּיסים והשהרנים*.

Noting the semantic similarity between ܡܬܠܝܬܐܝܬܐ and τοῦ ἱματισμοῦ αὐτῶν, as well as *καὶ τὰ ἐμπλόκια* and ܡܬܠܝܬܐܝܬܐ (ܝܐ), one might posit that S consulted OG to translate *העכסים והשבִּיסים והשהרנים*, using its first three equivalents but ignoring the last two. *GELS* (s.v. “ἐμπλόκιον”) glosses ἐμπλόκιον (which occurs again in 3:20, without a clear Hebrew corollary) as an “accessory woven into hair,” which agrees with Ziegler’s (205) report of its use in the papyri to designate a hair ornament.⁵³ Syriac’s ܡܬܠܝܬܐܝܬܐ “their curls,” from ܡܬܠܝܬܐܝܬܐ “twist, braid,” is comparable to ἐμπλόκιον, insofar as it has to do with styling of the hair.

That might suggest that ܡܬܠܝܬܐܝܬܐ is based on τοῦ ἱματισμοῦ αὐτῶν and ܡܬܠܝܬܐܝܬܐ on *καὶ τοὺς κόσμους αὐτῶν*, in which case ܡܬܠܝܬܐܝܬܐ, ܡܬܠܝܬܐܝܬܐ (3:19) follows *καὶ τοὺς κοσύμβους καὶ τοὺς μηνίσκους* to render *השבִּיסים והשהרנים*. Ziegler (204) reports uncertainty about the meaning of *κοσύμβους* but speculates that it might designate hairnets, if it is related to the preceding ἐμπλόκια. That, however, prompts the question of whether perhaps it should be related to *καὶ τοὺς μηνίσκους*, which Ziegler (204) notes appears in the papyri for a crescent-shaped jewelry item. This muddies speculation about ܡܬܠܝܬܐܝܬܐ, ܡܬܠܝܬܐܝܬܐ being chosen with reference to *τοὺς κοσύμβους*. Moreover, *καὶ τοὺς κοσύμβους* aligns physically with *השבִּיסים*, whereas ܡܬܠܝܬܐܝܬܐ, ܡܬܠܝܬܐܝܬܐ aligns with *הנטיפות* (3:19). It seems likely that S’s choices of ܡܬܠܝܬܐܝܬܐ, ܡܬܠܝܬܐܝܬܐ and ܡܬܠܝܬܐܝܬܐ, ܡܬܠܝܬܐܝܬܐ owe to its translator, independent of OG.

Again, although S’s next phrase, ܡܬܠܝܬܐܝܬܐ, ܡܬܠܝܬܐܝܬܐ (3:20), is semantically parallel to OG’s *καὶ τὸν κόσμον τοῦ προσώπου αὐτῶν* of 3:19, to suppose that S followed OG here would mean that it offers nothing corresponding to the preceding *καὶ τὸ κάθεμα*. Given that S has elaborated the theme of coiffure in 3:19, without any connection to OG, makes it unlikely that ܡܬܠܝܬܐܝܬܐ, ܡܬܠܝܬܐܝܬܐ derives from OG.

This discussion suffices to show the problems of trying to find S indebted to OG in these verses. Throughout the rest of OG there are sporadic links to MT, such as *τῆς δόξης* || *הפארים* and *τοὺς δακτυλίους καὶ τὰ ἐνώτια* || *הטבעות ונזמי* but no clear correlations between OG and S.

53. Cf. *καὶ τὰ ἐμπλόκια* || *העכסים* differs from *τῶν σιρώνων* “ornaments” || *השהרנים* in Judg 8:26.

Given that the strongest apparent link between OG and S is τὴν δόξαν τοῦ ἱματισμοῦ αὐτῶν καὶ τοὺς κόσμους αὐτῶν || ܐܠܡܢܐ ܐܠܡܢܐ ܠܠܗܐ, their common themes may be attributable to a shared tradition or similar exegetical perceptions. As Goshen-Gottstein (2) posited, OG's (τὴν δόξαν) τοῦ ἱματισμοῦ αὐτῶν καὶ τοὺς κόσμους αὐτῶν amounts to an "introductory summary" attributable to the translator.

Thus Ziegler (204) inferred that, for OG, "Die Veranlassung bildeten die V. 21–23, die Kleidungsstücke nennen," concluding that the translator "wußte bloß aus den bekannteren Begriffen (so נזם, תבעת 3:21), daß es sich um Schmuckgegenstände und um Kleidungsstücke handelte, und so zählte er die bekanntesten Stücke mit den griech. Namen seiner Zeit auf" (208). That S should have worked similarly should not be surprising, given that it rightly understands these verses enumerating beauty regimens and garments of aristocratic women.

Syriac and OG share the distinction (from all other witnesses) of reading third-person plural pronouns with τοῦ ἱματισμοῦ αὐτῶν καὶ τοὺς κόσμους αὐτῶν and ܐܠܡܢܐ ܐܠܡܢܐ. However ܐܠܡܢܐ ܐܠܡܢܐ again has a 3fp pronominal suffix, which will remain the regular inflection through 3:24. Old Greek, on the other hand, lacks a pronoun with any of its final three nouns in 3:18. It has a third-person plural pronoun in 3:19 (τοῦ προσώπου αὐτῶν), but not another until its second-person singular pronouns in 3:24. These differences, along with the different semantics in word choices already noted, undermine Warszawski's (14) conclusion that "Die Pesch. folgt meistens der Uebersetzung der LXX."

3:19

As Ziegler (205) observes, "3:19 nennt der hebr. Text drei Glieder, während die LXX nur einen bestimmten Gegenstand und einen allgemeinen Begriff hat." GELS (s.v. "κάθεμα") compares to κάθεμα here its use in Ezek 16:11 (καὶ κάθεμα περὶ τὸν τράχηλόν σου || ורביד על גרונוך), glossing it as "necklace, collar," as does LSJ (s.v. "κάθεμα"), citing this passage and Antiphanes Comicus 319, where the orthography is κάθημα.

καὶ τὸν κόσμον τοῦ προσώπου αὐτῶν is impossible to align semantically with the lexemes in MT (= 1QIsa^a). The plural form of κόσμος already appeared in 3:19 but here it is defined by the genitive phrase as adornments for the face.

Syriac, meanwhile, continues its focus on hair begun with ܐܠܡܢܐ ܐܠܡܢܐ at the end of 3:18. Its ܐܠܡܢܐ ܐܠܡܢܐ ܐܠܡܢܐ "and their circlets of hair,

and their plaits” diverges not only from OG but also T, whose list of jewelry is closer to OG.

3:20

As Ziegler (205) observes, *καὶ τὴν σύνθεσιν τοῦ κόσμου τῆς δόξης* is a general expression and “veranlaßt durch *הפארים* ... der hier doppelt durch *κόσμος* und *δόξα* wiedergeben ist.” *σύνθεσις*, on the other hand, accords with its usage in the papyri to refer to “die ‘ganze Kleidergarnitur’” (205).

The six jewelry items that follow in OG—*καὶ τοὺς χλιδῶνας καὶ τὰ ψέλια καὶ τὸ ἐμπλόκιον καὶ τὰ περιδέξια καὶ τοὺς δακτυλίους καὶ τὰ ἐνώτια*—have few identifiable correlative Hebrew terms: “Außer den beiden Wörtern *δακτυλῖος*, *ἐνώτιον* = טבעת, נזם können im Hebr. die Äquivalente nicht festgestellt werden” (Ziegler, 206).⁵⁴

Because the relationships between S’s equivalents and their Hebrew counterparts are as tenuous as those in OG, and because only the old belief in the *Urtext* as determinant could justify sorting them out as text-critical evidence, I will simply cite Greenberg and Walter’s (17) translation of *לְפָנֵיהֶם חֲסִימֵי וְאֵפִסֵּי וְאֵזֵרֵי וְאֵזֵרֵי* (shifting their equivalent for *לְפָנֵיהֶם* to the beginning of 3:20 to accord with the Leiden edition): “their temples, the decorations of their faces, their earrings, their necklaces.” The semantic divergence from OG is clear, as is the difference from T’s *כליליא ושירי רגליא וקולמומסיא וקדשיא וחליטתא* “the headdresses, and the anklets and the combs and the earrings and the necklaces.”⁵⁵

3:21

In contrast to OG’s *καὶ τοὺς δακτυλίους καὶ τὰ ἐνώτια* || *הטבעות ונזמי האף* (incorporated into 3:20), S’s equivalents are less semantically matched

54. Based on comparison of the Greek terms in this list and other passages in the Greek Bible that mention them, Ziegler (208) observes that, rather than being guided by whimsy, “scheint der Übers. die Listen von Schmucksachen und Kleidungsstoffen, wie sie an anderen Stellen des AT aufgeführt werden, gekannt und ausgeschrieben zu haben.”

55. Translation by Bruce D. Chilton, *The Isaiah Targum: Introduction, Translation, Apparatus and Notes*, ArBib 11 (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987), who observes, “The number of Greek loan words in the last passage [in this verse, *קולמומסיא* “combs”] ... may suggest that specifically Hellenistic practices are in mind” (9).

to the Hebrew: סַמְלֵי חֲסִימָה “their bracelets and their bangles.” Although סַמְלֵי חֲסִימָה formally aligns with הַטְּבָעוֹת, in its only other occurrence (2 Sam 1:10) it translates אַצְעָדָה “bracelet.” סַמְלֵי חֲסִימָה appears again in Gen 24:22, where it renders צַמִּידִים (so also in Num 31:50), but נֹזָם in Gen 24:30, 47; Exod 35:22, which accounts for its use for נֹזָם here.

Meanwhile, OG reads καὶ τὰ περιπόρφυρα καὶ τὰ μεσσοπόρφυρα “purple-edged and purple striped garments” (see GELS, s.v. “περιπόρφυρα”; Ziegler, 206). The words appear only here in the Bible and only rarely in the papyri, and none matches a Hebrew lexeme.

3:22

Old Greek again lacks transparent links to Hebrew lexemes: καὶ τὰ ἐπιβλήματα τὰ κατὰ τὴν οἰκίαν καὶ τὰ διαφανῆ Λακωνικά || הַמַּחְלָצוֹת וְהַמַּעֲטוֹת וְהַמְּטַפְחוֹת וְהַחֲרִיטִים. In Zech 3:4 מַחְלָצוֹת is translated with ποδήρη, a much simpler equivalent than καὶ τὰ ἐπιβλήματα τὰ κατὰ τὴν οἰκίαν here. Ziegler (207) considers doubtful Otto Procksch’s claim that the reference to τὰ διαφανῆ Λακωνικά is derived from וְהַגְלִינִים (via גִּלָּה) in 3:23,⁵⁶ since “Die lakonischen Gewebe scheinen in damaliger Zeit einen besonderen Namen gehabt zu haben.”

Syriac also enumerates items of clothing, but of different types: סַמְלֵי חֲסִימָה סַמְלֵי חֲסִימָה סַמְלֵי חֲסִימָה סַמְלֵי חֲסִימָה “their coats, their long robes, their fine white linens, their purple garments” (Greenberg and Walter, 17). Although the similarity between סַמְלֵי חֲסִימָה and הַמַּחְלָצוֹת is notable, it is difficult to know how significant this is, since S’s equivalent for מַחְלָצוֹת in its only other occurrence is מָלָא לְחָל (Zech 3:4).

Although בּוּץ and Aramaic בּוּצָא are related to biblical Hebrew בּוּץ, which appears first in Ezek 27:16 (HALOT, s.v. “בּוּץ”), and their roots are related to βύσσος (3:23), there is no confirmable link between סַמְלֵי חֲסִימָה and any of the four Hebrew words here (but cf. τὰ βύσσινα || וְהַגְלִינִים in 3:23).

Most telling for the relationship between S and T here is that the latter does not use בּוּצָא, while its first and third equivalents are Greek loan-words: כִּיתוֹנִיָּא וְשׁוּשִׁפִּיָּא וְלְבוֹרְנָקִיָּא וּמַחְכִּיָּא “the tunics and the mantles and the shawls and the breast ornaments.”⁵⁷

56. Otto Procksch and Paul Volz, *Jesaja 1*, KAT 9,1 (Leipzig: Deichert, 1930), 80.

57. Chilton, *Isaiah Targum*. “And the breast ornaments” is based on reading וּמַחְכִּיָּא rather than וּמַחְכִּיָּא, for which Chilton cites J. F. Stenning, *The Targum of Isaiah* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1949), 15.

Old Greek's lack of an equivalent for יהיה accords with this tendency and is paralleled in 7:23 (καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ πᾶς τόπος || והיה ביום (ההוא) יהיה כל מקום); 29:2 (ἐκθλίψω γὰρ Ἀριηλ καὶ ἔσται αὐτῆς ἡ ἰσχὺς καὶ τὸ πλοῦτος ἐμοί || והתה תאניה ואניה והתה לי באריאל (והציקותי לאריאל והתה)). The pattern fits the translator's tendency toward concision.

Syriac's shift of ܡܠ to follow ܝܫܘܥ accords with other modifications in this verse, especially the expansive translation of ܒܫܡ with ܡܠܚܡܐ ܕܡܝܠܗ, whose 3fp suffix distinguishes it from OG's ὁσμῆς ἡδείας, a suffix found with all S's nouns in the verse, but unparalleled in OG.

To accompany *ζώνης* || חגורה, OG supplies the verb *ζώσῃ*, coordinate with *περιζώσῃ* || מחגרת later in the verse, whereas S uses *بَلَّغْنِي*, in accord with its use of verbs like *حَمَّ* for חגר when the topic is donning a garment (e.g., *وَدِدَ חָגוֹר אֶפּוֹד בֶּד* || *وَدِدْتُ حَمَّ فِئَالٍ وَحَمَّ*, 2 Sam 6:14). While 3fp pronouns continue to dominate S, OG conjugates both its verbs in

62. Although S uses the homonym $\text{סַלְסַל} \parallel \text{סַלְסַל}$ in 5:24; 29:5 and aligns with OG's $\chi\omicron\nu\nu\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\rho}\varsigma$, "dust" is hardly a fitting contrast to former sweet odors. סַלְסַל elsewhere translates סַלְסַל in 5:24; 29:5, as it does in Ezek 26:10; Nah 1:3; Song 3:6. All appearances of the homonym סַלְסַל "vinegar" align with חֶמֶץ (Num 6:3 [2x]; Ruth 2:14; Ps 69:22; Prov 25:20).

63. κοινωστικός renders אבק in 5:24; 29:5, and חמר in 10:6 (q.v.), while it is inserted in a phrase by association in 17:13 (q.v.).

the second-person singular and it supplies σου with τὰ ἔργα (διὰ τὰ ἔργα σου || מעשה [see below]). The previous pronouns in 3:18–23 were third-person plural (3:18, 19, building on those in 3:16–17), and only OG has the second-person singular pronoun in this verse. This creates a transition to the second-person singular pronoun at the outset of 3:25 (ὁ υἱός σου || מתיך), continued in the relative clause, ὃν ἀγαπᾷς, which is made even more curious by OG's switch to the second-person plural pronoun with καὶ οἱ ἰσχύοντες ὑμῶν || וגבורתך.

Hebrew counterparts for καὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ κόσμου τῆς κεφαλῆς τοῦ χρυσοῦ φαλάκρωμα are isolable only for καὶ ἀντί (ותחת) and φαλάκρωμα (קרחה). κόσμος, which appears without a Hebrew counterpart three other times in 3:18–20, might align with מעשה, while τῆς κεφαλῆς could have been inferred from the predicted change to קרחה (|| φαλάκρωμα). Elsewhere Greek translators analyze the homonym מקשה “wrought metal work” as an adjective and render it with either τορευτός “worked in relief” (Exod 25:18, 31, 36; Jer 10:5); στερεός “firm” (Num 8:4 [2x]); or ἐλατός “hammered” (Num 10:2).⁶⁴ In most cases מקשה is associated with זהב, which might account for τοῦ χρυσοῦ modifying τοῦ κόσμου here. The problem at each step of this reconstruction is having nothing concrete to signal the precise path the translator took to his rendering.

In the same vein, διὰ τὰ ἔργα σου at the end of the clause might be a second rendering of מעשה ותחת.⁶⁵ Compare κατὰ τὰ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν αὐτοῦ συμβήσεται αὐτῷ || כי גמול ידיו יעשה לו in 3:11, particularly because that phrase has to do with retribution. The translator likely supplied ἔξεις as a generic verb fit for expressing the replacement of מקשה with קרחה, conjugated it in the 2ms, in concert with ζώσῃ || חגורה and περιζώσῃ || מחגרת, and supplied the 2ms pronoun in διὰ τὰ ἔργα σου.

Old Greek's τοῦ χιτῶνος || פתגיל is an appropriate equivalent, but likely arrived at intuitively, since פתגיל is a *hapax legomenon* rendered variously by the versions, including S's لِبَاسٌ , which reprises لِبَاسٌ from 3:23 (T מהלכן בגיוה). Old Greek likely inferred its meaning from its contrast to σάκκον || שק. Modification of τοῦ χιτῶνος with τοῦ μεσπορφύρου reminds of 3:21's καὶ τὰ περιπόρφυρα καὶ τὰ μεσπορφύρα as colors of fabric composing garments.

64. מקשה > OG-Exod 37:7, 17, 22.

65. This explanation seems more compelling than Seeligmann's (36) speculation that διὰ τὰ ἔργα σου is a fragment of an earlier translation that was later displaced (but not fully replaced) by τοῦ κόσμου τῆς κεφαλῆς τοῦ χρυσοῦ.

שחת כי תחת יפי || מלכל, בלסכל מהפסח perhaps associates תחת with שחת in 1:4; 11:9; 14:20; 38:17; 51:13, 14; 65:8 [2x], 25).⁶⁶ The 3fp suffix in מלכל || מהפסח יפי conforms to S's supply of pronouns in יפסח, יפסח, יפסח, and יפסח, in accord with the 3fp pronouns it uses in describing the daughters of Jerusalem throughout 3:18–24, despite their absence from MT, 1QIsa^a, 4Q56 (in 3:18, 20, 22 [frags.]), and V. For OG's equivalent for כי תחת יפי, see 3:25.

3:25

Although OG has no equivalent to כי תחת יפי at the end of 3:24, *άλλος* is the most frequent equivalent for יפי, providing the most likely explanation for *ὁ ἀλλιστος* modifying *ὁ υἱός*.⁶⁷ The translator's omission of an equivalent for תחת כי accords with his frequent omission of repeated words.

The pronoun σου following *ὁ υἱός* hints that this is the translator's rendering of מתיד, even though the equivalent is attested nowhere else.⁶⁸ Given that distinction and because *ὁ ἀγαπᾷς* lacks a Hebrew counterpart, Ottley's (2:120) perception that this entails "a reminiscence of Gen. xxii. 2" is the likely explanation, given Ziegler's documentation of the translator's habit of borrowing phrases from elsewhere (see Ziegler, 134–75).

Syriac's محنتف || גיברך מתיד accords with T's גיברך. Its other equivalents for מתיד (محنتف || מחל מספר, Gen 34:30; Deut 4:17; cf. محنتف || מחל מספר, Deut 28:62; and محنتف || מחל מספר in Deut 33:6, which helps account for محنتف || מחל מספר in Isa 41:14) would have been ill-fitting. Syriac likely chose محنتف parallel to محنتف || محنتف in the next clause.

Old Greek and S translate גיבורתך as if it were גיבוריך (*καὶ οἱ ἰσχύοντες ὑμῶν*, محنتف), which is the original reading in 1QIsa^a, to which ות is added supralinearly, apparently by the original hand. Although OG and

66. Warszawski's (15) intuition that בלסכל betrays an association with חתת falters on the fact that בלסכל never translates חתת in the book, which it renders with לח (7x); בל (7:8); בל (31:4); חכ (51:6); and בל (51:7).

67. *άλλος* || יפי, Ezek 16:14, 15, 25; 27:3, 4, 11; 28:7, 12, 17; 31:8; Ps 44(45):12; Prov 6:25; 31:30; Esth 1:11; *καλός*, Zech 9:17; *εὐπρέπεια*, Ps 49(50):2.

68. Its rendering of מחל מספר by *Ιακωβ ὀλιγοστός Ἰσραηλ* in 41:14 accords with the translation of מתיד by *ὀλίγος* (Deut 4:27; Jer 51[44]:28) or *ὀλιγοστός* (Gen 34:30; 1 Chr 16:19) elsewhere, while *νεκρῶν διὰ λιμόν* || מחל מספר in 5:13 owes to construing מחל מספר as from מות.

S might have found גבוריך in their *Vorlagen*, both translators show themselves capable of effecting this shift on their own.

Old Greek's shift of the suffixed pronoun of וגבורתך to the grammatical plural is striking, given the earlier agreement of pronouns in ὁ υἱός σου || מתיך. Although the same shift occurs with αἱ θῆκαι τοῦ κόσμου ὑμῶν || פתחיה in 3:26, καὶ καταλειφθήσῃ || ונקתה there suggests that the translator likely understood the second-person singular pronouns as collectives. For a suggestion of what referents the translator imagined for these pronouns in their discourse context, see the excursus following 3:26.

Old Greek's μαχαίρα πεσοῦνται draws its verb from the preceding πεσεῖται and repeats μαχαίρα for במלחמה. Van der Vorm-Croughs (181) cites other passages where “the verb phrase is repeated in a (nearly) identical way,” among which 14:29 is especially pertinent:

כי משרש נחש יצא צפע ἐκ γὰρ σπέρματος ὄφεων ἐξελεύσεται ἔκγονα ἀσπίδων
וּפְרִיו שְׂרָף מְעוּפָה καὶ τὰ ἔκγονα αὐτῶν ἐξελεύσονται ὄφεις πετόμενοι

Not only does this illustrate the repetition of a verbal phrase to fill out parallel lines, but the insertion of ἔκγονα in the first line exemplifies the same influence of nominal complements in parallel clauses as μαχαίρα here.

As Ottley (2:120) correctly perceived, ταπεινωθήσονται is likely intended as the equivalent for 3:26's ואנו, read as if it were וענו. Goshen-Gottstein (ד') compares ταπεινουμένην καὶ τεταπεινωμένην || תאניה ואניה in Lam 2:5.

3:26

כחץ will be S's equivalent for ואבלי in 19:8, while כחץ will translate אבל אמללה in 24:4; and אבלי אמללה ארץ in 33:9.

After καὶ πενθήσουσιν || ואבלי, OG diverges from MT, with only εἰς τὴν γῆν || לארץ being transparent. The noun θήκη (αἱ θῆκαι τοῦ κόσμου ὑμῶν || פתחיה) appears again in Isa 6:13, where it designates the “husk” containing the seed of the oak tree. Outside Isaiah it is found only in Exod 25:26(27), where it designates the container for the rings of the temple curtains (εἰς θήκας || לבתים). Ottley's (120) speculation that the translator may have arrived at αἱ θῆκαι by associating פתח with צפחת “jar” in 2 Kgs 17:12, 14, 16, (rendered with καψάκης) seems unnecessary. More likely, just as he supplied τοῦ κόσμου in reference to the list of accouterments in 3:18–24,

ἀντέστη αὐτοῖς ... τὴν δὲ ἁμαρτίαν αὐτῶν ... τῇ ψυχῇ αὐτῶν, 3:8–9)—and embodies them in a single exemplar (τῷ ἀνόμῳ)—intermingled with plural pronouns describing their actions (βεβούλευνται βουλὴν πονηρὰν καθ’ ἑαυτῶν ... εἰπόντες ... τὰ γενήματα τῶν ἔργων αὐτῶν φάγονται ... κατὰ τὰ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν αὐτοῦ, 3:9–11).

The same interchange of singular and plural continues in the address of those they have wronged, with a second-person plural pronoun first appearing in 3:12: λαός μου οἱ πράκτορες ὑμῶν καλαμῶνται ὑμᾶς. When the second-person pronoun appears next, in 3:14–15, it is addressed to the “elders” and “rulers” charged with wronging and shaming the people. Isaiah 3:16–17 launch into the assault on the haughty “daughters of Zion,” “the ruling daughters of Zion.” When 3:24–26 resume the second-person pronouns, one assumes that the addressees encompass the same group charged in 3:14–15. Not only does this fit well the designation of the women called “the ruling daughters of Zion” who are lambasted in 3:16–24, but the link is secured with αἱ θῆκαι τοῦ κόσμου ὑμῶν, which recalls the articles of clothing and jewelry enumerated in 3:18–24. Thus, ὁ υἱός σου ὁ κάλλιστος and οἱ ἰσχύοντες ὑμῶν who fall by the sword are the men related to these women, who will be left desolate. This analysis suggests a coherence wrought by the translator’s choices. While we can describe the effects of those choices, explaining why he made them often leads onto uncertain terrain.

ISAIAH 4

4:1

Old Greek's lack of an equivalent for **ביום ההוא** is unique among the textual witnesses. Of the forty-five appearances of this phrase in Isaiah (MT), an equivalent is lacking in OG here and again in 20:6; 24:21 but is attested by all other witnesses. H. G. M. Williamson dismisses OG's minus here on the grounds of "the translator's free approach to translation," including elimination of redundant phrases, since **ביום ההוא** appears at the beginning of 4:2.¹ However, those tendencies must be weighed against the minuses of this phrase in 20:6; 24:21, where redundancy is not a factor, and against the fact that OG translates both instances of **ביום ההוא** in successive verses in 19:19–20, 23–24. Thus, **ביום ההוא** was likely absent from OG's *Vorlage* and inserted later in the Hebrew text's transmission.²

4:2

Ziegler's (107) endorsement of Fischer's (20) judgment that ἐπιλάμψει derives from reading **צמח** in light of the Aramaic verb meaning "be bright, shine" has been put on a sound footing by Seulgi Byun (174–77), who notes that this meaning also developed for **צמח** in postbiblical Hebrew.³ The translator's collapse of **צמח יהיה** into a single verb is intelligible in light

1. Williamson, *Isaiah 1–5*, 294.

2. For scribal insertions of **ביום ההוא**, see Simon J. De Vries, *From Old Revelation to New: A Tradition-Historical and Redaction-Critical Study of Temporal Transitions in Prophetic Prediction* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 40–41, who includes 4:1 among his examples.

3. This undermines Bodor's attempt to show that S's **יָסַס וַיַּחְזֵק** reflects theological influence from OG (Bodor, "Reception of the Septuagint," 30–31).

of his omission of pleonastic יהיה elsewhere (see the comments at 3:24 and cf. S's *יְהִי וְיִשְׁמַח*).

Although the judgment that ἐν βουλῇ || לְצַבִּי is based on Aramaic צבא (translated by βούλεσθαι in Dan 5:19) has also been frequently advanced (Ziegler, 107; Troxel, 77), Byun's (179) evaluation of the evidence finds "conjectural hurdles that make such a claim questionable." Those include the lack of a precise semantic match between צבא and βουλή and OG-Isaiah's translation of the six other occurrences of צַבִּי by ἐλπίς (24:16; 28:4, 5), as well as δόξα and ἔνδοξος (13:19; 23:9; 28:1). Most likely the translator's affinity for βουλή and βουλεύειν played a role in his rendering, but it does not account for his use of the phrase ἐν βουλῇ.⁴ While μετὰ δόξης naturally complements ἐπιλάμψει, the contribution of ἐν βουλῇ to the verb's meaning is uncertain. Given the semantics of βουλή as a plan, the phrase's role must be understood with a view to τοῦ ὑψῶσαι καὶ δοξάσαι τὸ καταλειφθὲν τοῦ Ἰσραηλ.⁵

The choice of δόξα for כבוד might have left the translator in a bit of a quandary as to how to render צַבִּי, since δόξα is one of its regular equivalents. Also noteworthy is Ziegler's (137) observation that, while μετὰ δόξης || (ו)לכבוד is intelligible, μετὰ δόξης appears again in 33:27 (|| וכבוד) and 33:17 (|| בִּפְיוֹ), where "sieht er eine Theophanie geschildert," supporting his inference, "Der Übers. sah in 4,2ff. eine Theophanie ... geschildert" (107; cf. 3:16). Perhaps a perception of the theophany as purposeful triggered his use of ἐν βουλῇ, with the plan explicated by τοῦ ὑψῶσαι καὶ δοξάσαι τὸ καταλειφθὲν τοῦ Ἰσραηλ, although this engages in speculation about the translator's mental processes. Although τοῦ ὑψῶσαι καὶ δοξάσαι || ולתפארת לגאון is transparent, the choice to use infinitival forms is likely significant (contrast S's *لِجَمْعِ سَائِلَةٍ*).

Although κύριος is most frequent for יהוה, ὁ θεός is also used (e.g., 6:12; 7:17; 8:17, 18; 9:10; 10:20, 23 [ὁ θεός || אֲדֹנֵי יְהוּה], 26; 11:2, 3; 14:2, 3, 5, 7).

Goshen-Gottstein (יד) rightly dismisses OG's ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς (|| וּפְרִי הָאָרֶץ) as attesting וּפְנִי, positing instead that ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς is exegetically related to the translator's choice of ἐπιλάμψει (so also Ziegler, 108). Old Greek's ten-

4. These lexemes appear 51x in Isaiah, or 18.8x per 100 words, the highest frequency in the Greek Bible (Troxel, "BOYAH and BOYΛEYEIN," 153), and often without a suitable Hebrew counterpart (3:9; 7:5, 7; 10:25; 25:7; 28:8 [2x]; 29:15; 31:6; 32:7, 8; 36:5; 41:21; 44:25; 55:7, 8). Even if many of these are explicable on the basis of context (see Troxel, "BOYAH and BOYΛEYEIN," 157–71), they attest the translator's "besondere Neigung für die Idee der βουλή" (Ziegler, 148).

5. See Troxel, "BOYAH and BOYΛEYEIN," 154–57.

dency to render a text according to its predilections was apparent in: the varied equivalents for עלל in 3:4, 8, 12; *καὶ οἱ ἀπαιτοῦντες* || וְנָשִׁים in 3:12; his association of עני with ענה in 3:8 and ואנו with וענו in 3:26; his possible exploitation of graphic similarities with ἐμφανές || יהיה in 2:2; and his rendering of שפח by biliteral association with שפל in 3:17.

τὸ καταλειφθέν || לפליטת shares with S's *حَصْرٌ*, *بَاقٍ* an impersonal description of the "remnant" (contrast V's *his qui salvati fuerint*), although this does not inevitably imply S's dependence on OG.

4:3

Although τὸ ὑπολειφθέν ... *καὶ τὸ καταλειφθέν* || הנשאר ... והנותר continues OG's impersonal description of the remnant, S shifts to personal constructions: *صَحْبٌ*, *بَاقٍ* (cf. V's *omnis qui relictus fuerit in Sion et residuus in Hierusalem*). On the other hand, whereas OG reformulates קדוש יאמר לו using the grammatical plural (*ἄγιοι κληθήσονται*) and renders כל הכתוב in the grammatical plural (*πάντες οἱ γραφέντες*), S uses collectives: *כָּל*, *בָּלַד* and *מִבְּלַל*.

Syriac's transposition of לחיים בירושלם into *ܚܝܬܐ ܕܝܪܘܫܠܡ* stresses where the inscription is written. This shift likely reflects ideology less than simply the influence of word order in the preceding phrases: הנשאר בציון והנותר בירושלם.

4:4

Even if OG's renderings of Hebrew conjunctions are frequently atypical, they are also often paralleled elsewhere in the book. For *ὅτι ἐκπλυνεῖ κύριος* || אִם רַחֵץ אֲדִנִּי || *ὅτι οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται ὑμῖν αὕτη ἡ ἁμαρτία* || אִם יִכְפֹּר הָעוֹן הַזֶּה לָכֵן in 22:14.⁶

Syriac's simple *waw* in *ܐܡܝܢ* || אִם רַחֵץ is noteworthy, since *ܐܡܝܢ* is its typical equivalent for אִם. Although it is possible that S's *Vorlage* read *ורחץ*, the translator may have had difficulty finding a suitable semantic function for אִם. His simplification of this verse is evident in his reformulation of ואת דמי ירושלם ידיח מקרבה with *ܐܡܝܢ ܕܡܝ ܝܪܘܫܠܡ ܕܝܪܘܫܠܡ*.

6. The translator's use of *ὅτι* for unusual equivalents is evident again in *ὅτι ἐν σοὶ ὁ θεός ἐστιν* || אֵל בְּךָ אֱלֹהִים (45:14). He also inserts *ὅτι* to establish a relationship between clauses: *ὅτι ἡμάρτοσαν οἱ κατοικοῦντες αὐτήν* || וַיֵּשְׁבוּ בָּהּ, 24:6; *ὅτι οἱ ὀφθαλμοί σου ὄψονταί τοὺς πλανῶντάς σε* || וְהָיוּ עֵינֶיךָ רְאוּת אֶת מוֹרֵךְ, 30:20.

Ziegler (62) attributes +τῶν υἱῶν καὶ to the translator supplying a companion to τῶν θυγατέρων. Similar expansions occur in 45:11 (Ἐρωτήσατέ με περὶ τῶν υἱῶν μου καὶ περὶ τῶν θυγατέρων μου || שאלוני על בני (שאלוני על בנותי); 56:6 (τοῦ εἶναι αὐτῶ εἰς δούλους καὶ δούλας || להיות לו לעבדים). It is, however, possible that these additions already stood in the OG's *Vorlage*, since complementary masculine and feminine phrases are prominent in Deuteronomy (e.g., אתה ובנך ובתך ועבדך ואמתך, 12:12; ובנותיכם ועבדיכם ואמהתיכם אתם ובניכם, 12:18) and could have been supplied for Isaiah by any scribe. Compare יהודה+ at the end of 4:2 in 1QIsa^a, creating the pair ישראל ויהודה, the only instance of this expansion in 1QIsa^a.

τὸ αἶμα ἐκαθαριεῖ ἐκ μέσου αὐτῶν || ערושלים ידיח מקרבה || lacks an equivalent for ערושלים, while translating ערושלים as if it read ערם or ערמים (αἶμα translates either). Ziegler (51) cites numerous passages where the translator condensed words by omitting “ein synonymes Wort im parallelen Satzglied,” such as καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶν ὄρος καὶ ἐπὶ πάντα βουνὸν ὑψηλόν || ועל כל ההרים הרמים ועל כל הגבעות הנשאות (2:14; cf. 2:17). Old Greek's lack of an equivalent for ערושלים here (following ציון בנות) likely reflects a similar maneuver, while the translator simplifies ערושלים with αἶμα. As Goshen-Gottstein (ט) observes, the omission occasioned the translation of ערושלים with the third-person plural pronoun, ἐκ μέσου αὐτῶν. Syriac, on the other hand, reformulates ערושלים ידיח מקרבה with ܡܕܢܗܝܬܐ ܕܡܕܢܗܝܬܐ.

4:5

Old Greek's καὶ ἤξει || וברא differs from its equivalents for ברא elsewhere: εἰμί (65:17); γίνομαι (48:7); καταδείκνυμι (40:26; 41:20; 43:15); κατασκευάζω (40:28; 43:7); κτίζω (45:7^[2]; 45:8; 54:16 [2x]); ποιέω (42:5; 43:1; 45:7^[1], 18 [2x]; 65:18^[2]), each of which (except εἰμί and κατασκευάζω) translate ברא in the Pentateuch.⁷ Within Isaiah, ἤξει most frequently renders בוא, suggesting either that the *Vorlage* read (an irregular) ובוא (Goshen-Gottstein [ט] reports that one de Rossi manuscript reads יבוא) or (more likely) that the translator exploited a graphic similarity. That latter possibility is but-

7. An equivalent for ברא is lacking in 45:12 (likely omitted as redundant after ἐγὼ ἐποίησα || עשיתי אנכי), 57:19 (part of a larger minus), and 65:18⁽¹⁾ (likely omitted as redundant preceding ὅτι ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ποιῶ || כי הנני בורא). Outside the Pentateuch and Isaiah, κτίζω is the dominant equivalent (twelve times), with γενέσθαι || נבראת in Ezek 21:35 the only divergence.

tressed by the following $\kappa\alpha\iota \xi\sigma\tau\alpha\iota \parallel \text{יהוה}$, which might attest והיה or reflects exploitation of graphic similarity (cf. $\kappa\alpha\iota \xi\sigma\tau\alpha\iota \parallel \text{יהוה}$ in 8:18; 28:21).⁸ As Ziegler (108) notes, “hängt die Wiedergabe enge mit V. 2 zusammen,” continuing the theophany introduced there.

Given the previous modifications, $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma \tau\acute{o}\pi\omicron\varsigma \tau\omicron\tilde{\upsilon} \delta\rho\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \Sigma\iota\omega\nu \parallel \text{על כל}$ מכון הר ציון might owe to passing over על , as may be the case also with $\kappa\alpha\iota \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha \tau\grave{\alpha} \pi\epsilon\rho\iota\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\lambda\omega \alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\varsigma \parallel \text{ועל מקראה}$. On the other hand, Seeligmann (62–63) reports R. Akiba’s citation of this passage in Mek. Bô (§14) as $\text{ענן יומם ענן מקראה ועל ציון הר מכון על ה' וברא}$ and, noting the absence of both instances of כל there, he concludes that MT attests variants conflation, with על the original reading in each phrase. Whether the translator passed over על in both cases or his *Vorlage* read only כל in each phrase is difficult to determine, given the lack of transparency of OG to MT in the surrounding context.

Goshen-Gottstein rejects proposed retroversions of $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha \tau\grave{\alpha} \pi\epsilon\rho\iota\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\lambda\omega \alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\varsigma$ ($\parallel \text{מקראה}$), arguing that the translator was influenced by Ps 97:2, where “ ענן ” stands in parallelism to מכון in connection with סביביו ,” although he allows that “the appearance of an equivalent of סביב may have been influenced also by some additional verses,” such as Ps 1:3; Lam 2:3.⁹ This proposal, however, seems to hang by a thread, since the only thing to commend it is the partial similarity of $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\lambda\omega \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\tilde{\upsilon} \parallel \text{סביביו}$ there to $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\lambda\omega \alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\varsigma$ here. Nor does the fact that $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\lambda\omega$ renders סביב in 42:25; 49:18; and 60:4 establish any relationship between them.

It seems preferable to entertain evidence from within Isaiah. Especially pertinent is $\tau\grave{\alpha} \kappa\acute{\upsilon}\lambda\omega \tau\tilde{\omega}\nu \beta\omicron\upsilon\nu\tilde{\omega}\nu \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha \parallel \text{עשן גאות}$ in 9:18(17), which bears the marks of a substitution rather than translation (see the commentary at 9:18). Likewise, in translating $\text{עלות על יאור על פי יאור}$ in 19:7, OG renders עלות with $\kappa\alpha\iota \tau\grave{o} \acute{\alpha}\chi\iota \tau\grave{o} \chi\lambda\omega\rho\acute{o}\nu$ (on its addition of the adjective, see the notes at 19:7), while it condenses the remainder into $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\nu \tau\grave{o} \kappa\acute{\upsilon}\lambda\omega \tau\omicron\tilde{\upsilon} \pi\omicron\tau\alpha\mu\omicron\tilde{\upsilon}$. In both verses $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma$ is integral to the construction, just as it figures in $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha \tau\grave{\alpha} \pi\epsilon\rho\iota\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\lambda\omega \alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\varsigma$ here. The most likely assessment of the phrase here, then, is that it is a substitution for מקראה .

$+\sigma\iota\alpha\iota\sigma\epsilon\iota$ is a fitting action supplied for ענן hovering over Zion and might, as Ziegler (62) suspected, reflect reminiscence of Exod 40:35’s $\text{ὅτι ἐπεσκίαζεν ἐπ’ αὐτὴν ἡ νεφέλη} \parallel \text{בי שכן עליו הענן}$.

8. S, V, T, and 1QIsa^a attest ברא , although 1QIsa^a reads ויברא .

9. Goshen-Gottstein, “Theory and Practice of Textual Criticism,” 143.

ܣܒܝܒ || מקראה resembles OG's τὰ περιούκιον αὐτῆς. Most often in the Peshitta ܣܒܝܒ translates סביב (including Isa 42:25; 49:18; 60:4), although in several cases it renders קץ or קצה (Num 11:1; Jer 50:26; 51:13; Ezek 25:9). More significantly, whereas OG uses περιούκιον invariably for סביב, S uses ܣܒܝܒ for other Hebrew words in Deut 1:7 (ܣܒܝܒ ܚܝܬܐ ܫܡܝܐ || סביב חצי הכדור); Ezek 27:28 (ܣܒܝܒܐ || מן העיר); and 1 Chr 6:41 (ܣܒܝܒܐ || מן העיר ואת חצירה). Syriac's ܣܒܝܒܐ || מקראה seems cut from the same cloth as OG's τὰ περιούκιον αὐτῆς. However, if OG's rendering reflects an exegetical ploy, S's ܣܒܝܒܐ might reflect common knowledge of that ploy, particularly when we note their different approaches to the rest of the verse.

The *lāmad* of ܠܗܒܐ likely marks the action as taken “on behalf of Mount Zion.” The absence of *waw* before ܠܗܒܐ suggests that the suffix refers to ܠܗܒܐ, since the 3fs suffix cannot be anaphoric to ܠܗܒܐ (for ܠܗܒܐ, marked as feminine, see ܠܗܒܐ in 14:32). Recognizing that syntactic feature, ܠܗܒܐ likely functions as a conceptual appositive to ܠܗܒܐ: “The Lord will create over all the place, for Mount Zion—over all its surroundings—a cloud by day and smoke and brightness of [produced by] a flame of fire by night.” Notable is the transposition ܠܗܒܐ || ܠܗܒܐ for the sake of sense (cf. OG's πυρὸς καιομένου that retains the word order by the use of a participle).

Although ܠܗܒܐ || חפה might be explained by the following סכה (since ܠܗܒܐ frequently translates סכה) or ܠܗܒܐ (cf. ܠܗܒܐ, ܠܗܒܐ in 14:32). Recognizing that syntactic feature, ܠܗܒܐ likely functions as a conceptual appositive to ܠܗܒܐ: “The Lord will create over all the place, for Mount Zion—over all its surroundings—a cloud by day and smoke and brightness of [produced by] a flame of fire by night.” Notable is the transposition ܠܗܒܐ || ܠܗܒܐ for the sake of sense (cf. OG's πυρὸς καιομένου that retains the word order by the use of a participle).

Although ܠܗܒܐ || חפה might be explained by the following סכה (since ܠܗܒܐ frequently translates סכה) or ܠܗܒܐ (cf. ܠܗܒܐ, ܠܗܒܐ in 14:32). Recognizing that syntactic feature, ܠܗܒܐ likely functions as a conceptual appositive to ܠܗܒܐ: “The Lord will create over all the place, for Mount Zion—over all its surroundings—a cloud by day and smoke and brightness of [produced by] a flame of fire by night.” Notable is the transposition ܠܗܒܐ || ܠܗܒܐ for the sake of sense (cf. OG's πυρὸς καιομένου that retains the word order by the use of a participle).

Given the number of shifts attributable to OG's translator, the ὡς prefixed to καπνοῦ and φωτός likely subordinates to νεφέλη these characterizations of its nocturnal appearance, making the cloud the central feature of the theophany.

Old Greek's omission of ܠܗܒܐ with πάση τῇ δόξῃ (|| על כל כבוד) parallels its lack of an equivalent for ܠܗܒܐ earlier. Even if ܠܗܒܐ was absent from its *Vorlage* in those instances (see above), the omission of ܠܗܒܐ here is consonant with the translator's willingness to alter or dispense with prepositions (cf. τῇ ἰσχυρᾷ χειρὶ || חזקת היד in 8:11). Similarly, the translator is not so scrupulous in his rendering of conjunctions that the absence of an equivalent

for כִּי should prompt speculation of whether it stood in his *Vorlage* (cf. his translation of כִּי by δὴ [3:1]; καί [3:8; 6:5; 8:23; 9:17]; τοίνυν [3:10]; ἀλλά [7:8; 10:7]; > 7:22; 8:11; 15:1).

Was OG's σκεπασθήσεται based on חפה at the end of 4:5 or וסכה at the outset of 4:6? Elsewhere in Isaiah σκεπάζω translates סתר (28:15; 49:2); כסה (51:6); and ולחסות בצל (30:2). חפה occurs again only in Joel 2:16; Ps 19:6, where OG translates it with παστός “bridal chamber,” and S with בית חדר “house of the chamber,” in both verses. Although σκεπασθήσεται may have been based on the idea of protection implicit in the context, the relationship between σκεπασθήσεται and וסכה (which otherwise lacks an equivalent) is noteworthy, inasmuch as σκεπάζω translates סכך in Exod 40:3, 21, the same chapter that may have influenced the translator to supply σκιάσει earlier in the verse. In that case σκεπασθήσεται is likely a condensation of וסכה חפה.

4:6

Unlike OG, S offers a distinct equivalent for וסכה || וסל. Elsewhere in Isaiah וסל translates סתר (16:4; 28:17; 32:2; cf. Ps 31:21; Job 22:14); כסה (30:3); מחסה (25:4; cf. Ps 62:9; Job 24:8); חסן (33:6). However, there are two similar employments of וסל in Psalms: וסל וסל וסל וסל וסל || כי יצפנני בסכה ביום רעה || כי אעבר || וסל וסל וסל וסל וסל || בסך אדם (42:5).

Old Greek probably prefixes the coordinating conjunction καί (καὶ ἔσται || וסכה) in the wake of σκεπασθήσεται || חפה וסכה.

There is no apparent reason that OG should have omitted יומם, had it been in its *Vorlage*. Old Greek likely attests a form of the text before יומם was added.¹⁰ Thus Ziegler (53) lists it among words that “einen glossenartigen Charakter tragen” and were likely absent from the *Vorlage*.

ἀπὸ αὐτοῦ ὁ ἀσκηρὸς || מזרם likely reflects the translator’s uncertainty about זרם, as is evident elsewhere, such as in 28:2:

לֹאדְנִי כֹזֶרֶם בְּרֹדֶם... ὁ θυμὸς κυρίου ὡς χάλαζα...
כֹּזֶרֶם מִיָּם כְּבִירִים שְׁטִפִּים ὡς ὕδατος πολλὴ πλῆθος σῦρον χώρων

10. See Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12*, 163; Williamson, *Isaiah 1–5*, 304.

The translator gives no equivalent for זרם in either clause, collapsing it (together with its prefixed *kaph*) into the following noun. Similar maneuvers omitting or obscuring זרם are found in 25:4; 30:30; and 32:2. Accordingly, ἀπὸ σκληρότητος is likely an attempt to represent מזרם by inferring its meaning from the context.¹¹

11. σκληρότης appears in Isaiah again only in 28:27 (μετὰ σκληρότητος || בחרוץ), while σκληρός is the typical equivalent for קשה.

ISAIAH 5

5:1

Syriac lacks an equivalent for נָא, as often (e.g., 1:18; 5:3, 5), but it is also absent from 1QIsa^a here, further complicating the question of whether S's *Vorlage* read נָא. Old Greek has δὴ || נָא here and in 7:13 but lacks an equivalent in 5:3, 5, and for eleven other occurrences of נָא in MT.¹

The lack of a personal pronoun with τῷ ἡγαπημένῳ || לִידִידִי (in both instances) or with τοῦ ἡγαπητοῦ || דּוּדִי raises the question of whether the translator reckoned the final *yod* part of the noun. Pronominal suffixes on יִידִי are often rendered (οἱ ἡγαπητοί σου || יִידִידִךָ, Pss 59[60]:7; 107[108]:7; τοῖς ἡγαπητοῖς αὐτοῦ || לִידִידוֹ, Ps 126[127]:2), while the 1cs pronoun of לִידִידִי in Jer 11:15 was likely represented by the prefixed article in τί ἡ ἡγαπημένη ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ μου ἐποίησε βδέλυγμα || מֵה לִידִידִי בְּבֵיתִי עֲשׂוּתָהּ הַמְזֻמָּתָה || particularly since ἡ ἡγαπημένη refers to Judah/Jerusalem, addressed in 5:11. The present case might be similarly explained if the translator considered the Kyrios speaker, as suggested by τῷ ἀμπελῶνί μου || לְכִרְמִי.

The shifts to the grammatical first-person of all the verbs in 5:2 (καὶ φραγμὸν περιέθηκα καὶ ἐχαράκωσα καὶ ἐφύτευσα ἄμπελον σωρηχ καὶ ὠκοδόμησα || וַיִּעֲזְקוּהוּ וַיִּסְקְלוּהוּ וַיִּטְעוּהוּ שָׂרָק וַיִּבְנוּ || and with ἔμεινα || וַיִּקֹּו in 5:7 (as well as τί ποιήσω || מֵה לַעֲשׂוֹת in 5:4, ἀφελῶ || הִסֵּר and καὶ καθελῶ || פָּרַץ in 5:5) are noteworthy. These pervasive shifts make it likely that the translator rendered לְכִרְמִי in light of τῷ ἀμπελῶνί μου || לְכִרְמִי in 5:4, 5 (cf. καὶ ἀνήσω τὸν ἀμπελῶνά μου || וְאַשִׁיתָהּ בְּתָהּ in 5:6).²

Syriac correctly understood שָׁמֶן בֶּן שָׁמֶן to characterize the land and so supplied ܠܝܠܝ to explicitize ܡܥܬܝܠܝܢ. Old Greek similarly supplies ἐν τόπῳ to concretize πίονι, although its ἐν τόπῳ πίονι stands in apposition to ἐν κέρατι

1. OG reads καὶ δεῦτε for נָא לְכוּ in 1:18, and νῦν || נָא in 47:12.

2. Cf. the absence of a pronoun in καὶ ἀνθρώπος τοῦ Ἰουδα νεόφυτον ἡγαπημένον || וְאִישׁ יְהוּדָה נָטַע שְׁעָשׂוּעִי.

rather bound with it in the manner of *חֲמִיל, וְלֵיל, מְחִיל*. In fact, OG's repetition of *ἐν* || *בן* hints that it may have considered this equivalent to *ב*, as suggested further by *ἐν ἐμοί* || *בִּי* in 5:3. Given that both OG and S perceive this as a question of the soil in which the vineyard is planted, polygenesis is a reasonable explanation of their similar addition of a noun designating a place (contrast their equivalents in 5:2).

5:2

OG renders the *hapax legomenon* *ויעזקהו* with *φραγμὸν περιέθηκα*, similar to its use of *φραγμός* for another *hapax legomenon* in 5:5: *τὸν φραγμὸν αὐτοῦ* || *משוכתו* (S *ܡܫܘܚܬܐ*). Syriac renders *ויעזקהו* with *ܡܫܚܐ*, a verb frequently used for tilling soil (e.g., Gen 2:5, 15), as it will be in 5:6 (*ܡܫܚܐ* || *וְלֹא יַעְדֵּר*).

These must be considered together with their renderings of *וּסְקֵלְהוּ*, for which neither OG nor S gives a semantically apt equivalent. *סֵקֶל* occurs twenty times outside Isaiah, for which OG most often employs *λιθοβολέω* (thirteen times), while S uses *ܡܫܚܐ* exclusively.³ Both instances of *סֵקֶל* in Isaiah have privative force, which both translators reflect in 62:10:

סֵקֶל מֵאֲבָן

ܡܫܚܐ ܡܢ ܥܬܝܬܐ

καὶ τοὺς λίθους τοὺς ἐκ τῆς ὁδοῦ διαρρίψατε

However, *ܡܫܚܐ* and *διαρρίψατε* might owe less to familiarity with the privative use of *סֵקֶל* than to the association of prefixed *min* of *מֵאֲבָן* with the preceding call to prepare a way for the people.

The similarity of S's *ܡܫܚܐ* to OG's *καὶ φραγμὸν περιέθηκα* might spur an inference that S relied on OG and simply transposed the phrases (cf. the comments on 5:3). However, that does not explain why S chose *ܡܫܚܐ* rather than a word symantically closer to *καὶ ἐχαράκωσα*. Likely the two translators independently lighted on the idea of surrounding the plot with a wall, if for no other reason than they divined the destruction of *τὸν φραγμὸν/ܡܫܚܐ* in 5:5, albeit in different phrases: *ἀφελῶ τὸν φραγμὸν αὐτοῦ* || *הסר משוכתו* (S *ܡܫܚܐ ܠܐ ܡܫܚܐ*) versus *ܡܫܚܐ ܠܐ ܡܫܚܐ* || *פרץ גדרו* (OG *καὶ*

3. *καταλιθοβολέω* is used in Exod 17:4 and *λιθάζω* in 2 Sam 16:6, 13. The absence of an equivalent in 3 Kgdms 21:15 is within a large minus: G < *בִּי סֵקֶל נְבוּת וִימָת*. S lacks an equivalent for *בְּאֲבָנִים אֹתָם וְיִסְקְלוּ* in Josh 7:25 and for *סֵקֶל* (alone) in 1 Kg 21:15.

καθελῶ τὸν τοῖχον αὐτοῦ). Moreover, whereas καὶ φραγμὸν περιέθηκα καὶ ἐχαράκωσα pairs verbs about erecting a barrier, ܡܫܬܥܝܐ speaks of tilling the vineyard.⁴ This raises doubt about Goshen-Gottstein's (זט) otherwise attractive suggestion that φραγμὸν περιέθηκα is based on association with Aramaic עזקתה "ring." Syriac, at least, failed to perceive that association, and OG might have arrived at its solution from its perception of the scene.

The choice of ἐχαράκωσα might seem odd, since it is used in Jer 39(32):2 to describe the investiture of Jerusalem and given that χάραξ is a feature of a siege in Isa 29:3; 31:9; 37:33. Nevertheless, the verb's concrete meaning "to set stakes" accounts for why both it and φραγμός were used in the papyri for an enclosure around a vineyard (Ziegler, 179).

Both OG and S translate ויטעהו accurately but differ in the semantic equivalents they choose for שרק: ἄμπελον and ܡܫܡܠܐ, the same equivalents each uses for שרק in Jer 2:21. Notably, ἄμπελον accompanies σωρηχ, likely to gloss what it considered a technical name (cf. T's בחריא גפן). In 16:8 OG translates שרוקיה with τὰς ἀμπέλους αὐτῆς, immediately following ἄμπελος Σεβαμα || גפן שבמה.

Old Greek's καὶ προλήνιον ὠρυξα ἐν αὐτῷ || יקב חצב בו, besides continuing to recast verbs in the first-person, uses προλήνιον for יקב, which is more commonly translated by ληνός throughout the Greek Bible. Although it is reasonable to suppose that this draws on a technical term of viticultural, no evidence of such usage survives in the papyri (Zielger, 179). Equally curious is S's bland ܡܫܡܠܐ || חצב, whereas it uses ܡܫܡܠܐ || ܡܫܡܠܐ || חצב in 10:15 and ܡܫܡܠܐ || ܡܫܡܠܐ || חצב in 22:16.

Both here and 5:4 OG translates באשים with ἀκάνθας, likely a guess. Syriac renders it with ܡܫܡܠܐ, which *SyrLex* and Payne-Smith (s.v. "ܡܫܡܠܐ") report can designate the carob tree. However, while Payne-Smith adds merely that it can designate "its husks or pods which are used for fodder," *SyrLex* reports that it can designate "wild grapes," for which he cites probative examples.

5:3

יושב ירושלם ואיש יהודה (1QIsa^a יושבי) are transposed in OG and S: ἄνθρωπος τοῦ Ιουδα καὶ οἱ ἐνοικοῦντες ἐν Ιερουσαλημ/ܡܫܡܠܐ ܡܫܡܠܐ ܡܫܡܠܐ ܡܫܡܠܐ.⁵

4. For OG's inflection of all the verbs as 1cs, see 5:1.

5. A similar transposition appeared in 3:1 in OG alone: ἀφελεί ἀπὸ τῆς Ιουδαίας καὶ ἀπὸ Ιερουσαλημ || מסיר מירושלם ומיהודה (the same order as in 1:1; 2:1).

Both OG and S agree with MT's order **ירושלם ויהודה** in 3:8; 22:21. There is insufficient evidence to know the basis or reason for the transposition in either OG or S.

Old Greek and S lack equivalents for **נא**, as often (see comments at 5:1).⁶ Although OG rendered **נא** with **δή** in 5:1, **κρίνατε δή** would likely have been infelicitous Greek after **καὶ νῦν** in the first clause.

With **κρίνατε ἐν ἐμοὶ καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ ἀμπελῶνός μου** || **שפטו נא ביני** || **ובין כרמי**, compare **τὰ ἀμαρτήματα ὑμῶν διυστῶσιν ἀνὰ μέσον ὑμῶν καὶ τοῦ θεοῦ** || **לבין אלהיכם** || **ביןכם** in 59:2, the only other occurrence of **בין ... בין** in Isaiah.⁷ The characteristic equivalent for **בין ... בין** is **ἀνὰ μέσον** + genitive + **καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον** + genitive (e.g., Gen 1:4), although the condensed form of 59:2 (above) occurs occasionally (e.g., 1 Kgdms 24:13; 3 Kgdms 15:19). **ἐν ἐμοί** || **ביני**, however, is unique.⁸ Although **κρίνω ἐν** occurs in 2 Chr 20:12 (**οὐ κρίνεῖς ἐν αὐτοῖς** || **הלא תשפט בם**); Ps 109(110):6 (**κρίνεῖ ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν** || **ידין בגוים**), the accompanying pronoun or noun specifies the realm in which judgment is made. Although Ottley (2:124) suggests that **בי** stood in the source text, comparison with **ἐν τόπῳ πίνον** || **בן שמן** in 5:1 hints that the translator may have regarded **ביני** as an extended form of **בי**, considering the entire clause to mean, “execute judgment in my case, specifically in relation to my vineyard.”

5:4

ל is a *peal* active participle, masculine singular absolute of a *pe-waw* verb meaning “be fitting” (cf. Num 12:14) that explicitizes the meaning of **מה לעשות**, serving as predicate adjective with **ל**. It contrasts with the malicious intent of **ל** in 5:5. As Goshen-Gottstein (טז) suggests, **אֲתָּו/ח** || **בו** is likely by harmonization with the preceding **אֲתָּו/ח** || **לכרמי**.

Old Greek and S render **מדוע** with causal conjunctions (**διότι** **ἐμεινα/** || **מדוע** קויתי || **המט**), different from their equivalents for **מדוע** in 50:2 (**τί/** || **המט**); 63:2 (**διὰ τί/** || **המט**), as well as from **τί** **ὅτι** and **διὰ** **τί**, the most frequent equivalents for **מדוע** in the Bible, and from **המט** as its most frequent

6. 1QIsa^a's שפוטנה entails א/ה confusion, as appears again in its שמעו נה || שמעו נה || 7:13; cf. also its ויגדו נה || ויגדו נה || 19:12.

7. S reads **המט** || **המט** here and **המט** || **המט** in 59:2.

8. **ὡς κρίνον ἐν μέσῳ ἀκανθῶν οὕτως ἡ πλησίον μου ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν θυγατέρων** || **כשוננה בין החוחים כן רעיתי בין הבנות** in Song 2:2 is not a genuine parallel.

5:5

διαρπαγὴν || לָבַעַר is unusual. The most frequent equivalents for לָבַעַר are *kaiō* and its permutations (ἐκκαίω, κατακαίω, καῦσις) (twelve times), but also ἐμπυρίζω (3:14) and μωραίνω (19:11), all of which are attested elsewhere in the Greek Bible. In 6:13 לָבַעַר is rendered with *eis pronomēn* (س ح م ل). As expounded elsewhere, the OG translator betrays a heightened interest in the theme of plunder.¹⁰ Already in 3:14 he equates burning “my vineyard” (τί ἐνεπυρίσατε τὸν ἀμπελῶνά μου || בערתם הכרם) with ἡ ἀρπαγὴ τοῦ πτωχοῦ (|| גזלת העני). That charge is leveled at οἱ πράκτορες and οἱ ἀπαιτοῦντες who “glean” the people (καλαμώνται ὑμᾶς) (5:12). In that light, it is reasonable to infer that the choice of διαρπαγὴν || לָבַעַר here reflects attraction to the theme of the people’s plunder under the image of a vineyard in 3:14, which he will allude to again via οἱ διηρπασμένοι in 5:17 (see below).

10. Troxel, "Economic Plunder," 375–91.

חבל || לבער parallels OG's διαρπαγήν, especially since חבל diverges from S's typical equivalents for בער. Elsewhere in Isaiah חבל translates a word that means plunder (שלל/בז) or that S regularly associates with that idea (שד, 13:6; 51:19; 59:7; 60:16, 18). Conversely, its standard equivalents for בער in Isaiah are verbal מע and nominal מעב, and it renders ובזיקות בערתם with מעב and מעב in 50:11 (סח in 42:25 and סח in 9:17 are unusual equivalents but remote from חבל here). Meanwhile, S's חבל aligns with T's למיבז, while neither S nor T accords with OG's οἱ διαρπασμένοι || כבשים in 5:17 (צדיקיא/אמנ) or εἰς προνομήν || לבער in 6:13 (לצרבא/חמב), nor does S inject the theme of plundering elsewhere. Thus there is little reason to suspect that S took its cue from διαρπαγήν and more reason to conclude that it rendered לבער in accord with a tradition shared with T, or even one that all three versions shared but OG exploited further elsewhere.

Syriac renders פרץ with a participle (ל, ל), while OG uses a finite verb (καὶ καθελεῖ), which each inflects in the first-person singular, in concord with their preceding verbs. The Greek Bible's wide range of equivalents for פרץ includes καὶ καθαίρω in 4 Kgdms 14:13; Pss 79(80):13; 88(89):41. Syriac's range of verbs for פרץ is equally broad (e.g., חל, Gen 28:14; חל, 30:43; חל, Exod 19:22), and ל, || פרץ is attested again in Gen 38:29; 2 Sam 5:20; 6:8; 2 Kgs 14:13.

5:6

καὶ ἀνήσω τὸν ἀμπελῶνά μου || ואשיתו בתה is notable, first, for τὸν ἀμπελῶνά μου explicitizing the object pronoun of ואשיתו, based on the context. בתה is a *hapax legomenon*, likely unfamiliar to the translator, who then used καὶ ἀνήσω as a guess that the vineyard's abandonment was the topic (cf. T's ואשיונן רטישין; V's *et ponam eam desertam*). סחבסחב יסחב || ואשיתו בתה must also be ranked a guess.

סחבסחב || יעדדר recalls its סחבסחב in 5:2, where סחב connoted tilling the ground. Syriac renders במעדד יעדדרון in 7:25 with the more precise סחבסחב סחבסחב סחבסחב סחבסחב. Old Greek's σαφῆ || יעדדר accords with its καὶ πᾶν ὄρος ἀροτριώμενον ἀροτριάθῃσεται || וכל ההרים אשר במעדד יעדדרון in 7:25.

Old Greek supplies εἰς αὐτόν after καὶ ἀναβήσεται, parallel to εἰς αὐτόν || עליו later in the verse. Syriac similarly supplies ح, although this hardly requires stimulus from OG.

ὥς εἰς χέρσον ἄκανθα || שמיר ושית recurs in 7:23, 24, 25.

מִלְּפָנֶיךָ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ מִתְּחִלָּה || סִפְּפֵנוּ חֲתָנָה בְּלֹא סֵלַי חֲבֹסֹת מִלְּפָנֶיךָ is structurally similar to מִלְּפָנֶיךָ יְהוָה (ואשיתיהו בתה ||) at the outset of the verse. The translator supplies חֲתָנָה as the complement to סִפְּפֵנוּ. The circumlocution מִלְּפָנֶיךָ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ מִתְּחִלָּה recalls חָלַל מִלְּפָנֶיךָ יְהוָה in Gen 2:5; 7:4.

5:7

νεόφυτον is a neuter nominative singular adjective used substantivally (see GELS, s.v. “νεόφυτον”) for נטע, which is translated with φύτευμα in 17:10, while φυτεύσῃς renders נטעך in 17:11.

שעשעים appears again in Jer 31:20, where παιδίον ἐντροφῶν “child of revelers” renders ילד שעשעים, and it stands within the phrase ואהיה שעשעים in Prov 8:30, where it is rendered ἐγὼ ἣν ἡ προσέχαιρεν “I was the one in whom he delighted.” שעשעי is rendered with μελέτη μου “my meditation” in Ps 118(119):24, 77, 92, 143, and 174. καὶ ἐνευφραίνετο is the equivalent for ושעשעי in Prov 8:31, although immediately after ὅτε εὐφραίνετο || משחקת, which might have influenced the word choice. Given this diversity of equivalents, there is reason to suspect that ἡγαπημένον || שעשועיו was chosen under the influence of ἡγαπημένῳ in 5:1 and in light of the detailed actions by which the Kyrios nurtured the plant. Additionally, as Ottley (2:123) noted, ἡγαπημένος appears as an epithet for Israel in 44:2 (παῖς μου Ἰακώβ καὶ ὁ ἡγαπημένος Ἰσραὴλ || עבדי יעקב וישרון ||), echoing the translation of ישרון by ὁ ἡγαπημένος already in Deut 32:15, as well as Deut 33:5, 26.

נטע שעשועיו || יִבְחַל בְּלֹא מִסְחָל might entail a double rendering of שעשועיו. שֵׁחַ agrees with T (נצבא דחדותיה) and is attested again in Prov 8:30: חֵם בְּלֹא מִסְחָל || חֵם וְאֵהִיָּה (cf. 8:31). Meanwhile, מִסְחָל accords with מִסְחָל || אִם יִלְד שֵׁחַ in Jer 31:20, in contrast to OG’s ἐντροφῶν. Accordingly, even if מִסְחָל is similar to OG’s ἡγαπημένον, there is reason to suspect polygenesis.

Syriac’s expansionistic בְּיַד אֱמִינִי ... בְּיַד אֱמִינִי || בית ישראל accords with its use of בְּיַד אֱמִינִי for “those belonging to the house of Israel” (e.g., בְּיַד אֱמִינִי || בית ישראל והתנחלים || סִלְזִלְסִי אֱמִינִי || 46:3; 63:7).¹¹ בְּיַד אֱמִינִי || יהודה ואיש (contrast בְּיַד אֱמִינִי || איש יהודה || 5:3) reinforces the perception that בְּיַד אֱמִינִי designates Israel’s constituent members.

11. Contrast S’s בְּיַד אֱמִינִי || בְּיַד אֱמִינִי || לשני בתי ישראל in 8:14.

Accordingly, וְכִי־יִשְׂרָאֵלִים וְכִי־אֲנָשִׁים מִיְּהוּדָה can be translated “because the vineyard of the Lord Almighty is the house composed of Israelites and the men who are from Judah.”

The translation of וַיִּקְוּ with a 1cs verb in OG (ἐξμεῖνα) and S (مَعَمَل) is paralleled in V (*et expectavi*) and T (אִמְרִית), and is more likely attributable to harmonizing of the grammatical person with 5:6 rather than to וַאֲקוּ in their *Vorlagen* (pace Goshen-Gottstein, 7).

τοῦ ποιῆσαι κρίσιν || לְמַשְׁפַּח uses ποιέω to create a verbal phrase, as the translator does occasionally elsewhere in the book (e.g., 1:24; 8:1), and was likely the impetus for the succeeding ἐπολύσε δὲ ἀνομίαν || וְהִנֵּה מַשְׁפַּח. Notably, the translator replaces וְהִנֵּה in the next clause with a conjunction: ἀλλὰ κραυγὴ || וְהִנֵּה צַעֲקָה. Although S's سَفَحَل || וְהִנֵּה מַשְׁפַּח might reflect וְהִי in its *Vorlage* (cf. its subsequent سَفَحَل || וְהִנֵּה צַעֲקָה, 5:30 has the same equivalent سَفَحَل || וְהִנֵּה חֶשֶׁד), while the absence of an equivalent for וְהִנֵּה in the middle of 5:26 (cf. وَالْأَرْضُ يَبِيتُ وَهِيَ خَرَّة || וְהָאָרֶץ יָבִיט וְהִנֵּה צָרָה || סַחֲחָה סֶפֶד; 8:7; 8:22) suggests that the translator may have dealt with midsentence הִנֵּה more freely than sentence-initial הִנֵּה, which he typically translates.

Neither OG nor S seem familiar with the *hapax legomenon* מַשְׁפַּח, and each offers a word befitting the context: ἀνομίαν, سَفَحَل. As mentioned with ἀνόμους || בְּדִיל in 1:25, OG resorts to lexemes from the *ἀνομος*-group for a wide range of Hebrew lexemes to express the idea of impiety (see Seeligmann, 105). Syriac used سَفَحَل for גִּזְלוֹת in 3:14 and will use it for גִּזְלֵי in 61:8, while more frequently سَفَحَل translates חֲמָס (e.g., Jer 6:7; 51:46; Ezek 45:9; Joel 4:19; Amos 3:10; 6:3). Thus here it might have been chosen from intuition that מַשְׁפַּח designates wrongdoing in general.

καὶ οὐ δίκαιοσύνην || לְצַדִּיקָה presents another case of the translator mentally injecting a negative particle (irrespective of whether he took *lamed* as pretext), as first noted in commenting on 1:20, 24 and most strikingly exemplified in δύσχερηστος || טוֹב in 3:10.

5:8

Old Greek and S appear to follow the word order of their *Vorlagen* in the first half of the verse but render יִקְרִיבוּ as a participle (ἐγγίζοντες/سَحَلِي), coordinating it with οἱ συνάπτοντες/حَمَصَحِي || מִגִּיעִי. Although it is not impossible to imagine a scribe changing יִקְרִיבוּ into מִקְרִיבִים to comport with מִגִּיעִי, both of these translators often effect such shifts.

Whereas **עַד אַפְסֵי מְקוֹם** marks the result of the actions in the verse's first half, OG renders it as a verbal clause expressing intent: *ἵνα τοῦ πλῆσιον ἀφέλωνται τι. ἵνα* || **עַד** is unparalleled and is likely a substitution, chosen to express the perceived syntactic role of the clause, much as he can insert *ἵνα* or substitute it for a particle to mark a syntactic relationship (e.g., *ἵνα εἴπωσιν οὐχ ὥς τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο* || **אִם לֹא יֹאמְרוּ כְּדָבָר הַזֶּה**, 8:20; *ἵνα μὴ ἀναστῶσι* || **בְּלִי יִקְמוּ**, 14:21).¹² *ἀφέλωνται* || **אַפְסֵי** is similar to the renderings of **אַפְסֵי** with *αἴρω* in 16:4 and *ἐκλείπω* in 29:20.

In its three other appearances, *πλῆσιον* renders **רַע** (3:5; 19:2; 41:6). Although **מְקוֹם** is most frequently translated by *τόπος* in Isaiah (twelve times), notable substitutions are *καὶ ἡ γῆ σεισθήσεται ἐκ τῶν θεμελίων αὐτῆς* || **וּתְרַעַשׂ הָאָרֶץ מִמְּקוֹמָהּ** in 13:13 and *ἰδοὺ γὰρ κύριος ἀπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου ἐπάγει τὴν ὀργὴν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐνοικοῦντας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς* || **כִּי הִנֵּה יְהוָה יֵצֵא מִמְּקוֹמוֹ** **יְהוָה יֵשֵׁב הָאָרֶץ עָלָיו** in 26:21. Just as in both of those cases the translator explicitizes the “place,” so he does here via a metonymic association of **מְקוֹם** with the property (τι, already given specificity by *οἰκίαν* and *ἀγρόν*) that they take from τοῦ πλῆσιον.

Although *لَا يَلْبَسُ*, likewise reformulates **עַד אַפְסֵי מְקוֹם** as a purpose clause, *لَا* is one of its regular equivalents for **מְקוֹם** (e.g., 7:23; 18:7). *لَا* appears extrapolated from the context, much as seems the case in 52:4's *لَا تَقُولُ* || **וְאַשׁוּר בְּאַפְסֵי עֶשְׂקוֹ**. The inflection of *لَا*, as second-person masculine plural differs from OG's third-person plural inflection of *ἀφέλωνται*. Equally distinct is that S continues the purpose clause with *وَهُوَ شَبْتُمْ* || **וְהוֹשַׁבְתֶּם**, whereas OG renders it as an asyndetic rhetorical question that, by insinuating a negative particle, anticipates a negative response: *μὴ οἰκίσσετε* || **וְהוֹשַׁבְתֶּם**. Use of the active voice likely owes to difficulty expressing the *hophal*, as Goshen-Gottstein (ר) suggests.

As Van der Vorm-Crouchs documents (127), *ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς* || **בְּקֶרֶב הָאָרֶץ** is common in Isaiah (see 6:12; 7:22; 10:23; 19:24; 24:13).

12. This translator elsewhere renders **עַד** as temporal, especially via *ἕως* (e.g., 1:6; 6:11 [2x]; 9:12; but always *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα* [χρόνον] || **עַד עוֹלָם**, 9:6; 34:17; 59:21) and uses *πρός* for action that extends to a person (e.g., *πρὸς κύριον* || **עַד יְהוָה**, 19:22; *πρὸς αὐτόν* || **עַד יְדֵי**, 45:24). Not only is this the only case of **עַד אַפְסֵי** in Isaiah, but this collocation appears elsewhere only in the phrase **עַד אַפְסֵי אֶרֶץ** (Mic 5:3; Zech 9:10; Ps 72:8).

5:9

Both OG and S analyze the relationship בַּאזְנֵי יְהוָה as genitival: εἰς τὰ ὦτα κυρίου/ܡܢ ܠܗ.¹³ Goshen-Gottstein (יז) aptly compares καὶ ἀνακεκαλυμμένα ταῦτά ἐστιν ἐν τοῖς ὤσι κυρίου σαβαωθ || וְגַלְהָ בַּאֲזְנֵי יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת || in 22:14.

Each also inserts a contextually fitting verb (ἡκούσθη/ܡܠܝܬܐ), differing only in its placement within the sentence. Old Greek supplies ταῦτα as subject, while S seems to regard the words that follow as the proclamation.¹⁴ This decision likely accounts for the fact that S lacks an equivalent for אִם לֹא, while OG offers ἐὰν γάρ. Both translators deal with אִם לֹא variously elsewhere.

Excursus: Translation of אִם לֹא in Old Greek and Syriac

In 10:9 S twice elides אִם לֹא:¹⁵

הלא ככרכמיש כלנו אם לא כארפד חמת

ܡܢ ܠܗ ܕܡܡܡܝܫ ܕܠܢ ܐܡ ܠܐ ܕܐܪܦܕ ܚܡܬ

אם לא כדמשק שמרון

ܐܡ ܠܐ ܕܡܫܟ ܫܡܪܝܢ

Equally pertinent is 14:24, where S and OG omit אִם לֹא in an oath:

נשבע יהוה צבאות לאמר

ܐܡܢ ܕܝܗܘܐ ܥܒܕܐܘܬ ܕܐܡܪ

τάδε λέγει κύριος σαβαωθ

אם לא כאשר דמיתי בן היתה

ܐܡ ܠܐ ܕܐܫܪ ܕܡܝܬܝ ܒܢ ܗܝܬܐ

ὅν τρόπον εἴρηκα, οὕτως ἔσται

13. As Warszawski (17) observes, this analysis appears more likely than regarding ܡܢ ܠܗ as plural + 1cs personal suffix and ܡܢ ܠܗ as subject of ܡܠܝܬܐ.

14. Van der Vorm-Croughs (44–48) catalogs OG's many instances of explicitizing the subject.

15. On OG's paraphrastic rendering of 10:9, see the comments there.

This leaves uncertainty as to whether S and OG understood the function of **אם לא** in oaths. They may simply have found no semantic significance in the phrase, as seems the case for S in 40:28

הלוא ידעת אם לא שמעת
 𐤁𐤏 𐤏𐤍 𐤏𐤍 𐤏𐤍
 και νυν ουκ ἔγνωσ εἰ μή ἤκουσας

By contrast, in 7:9 each is able to render the sequence **אם לא ... כי לא** to good effect in the target language:

אם לא תאמינו
 𐤁𐤏 𐤏𐤍 𐤏𐤍
 και ἐὰν μὴ πιστεύσητε

כי לא תאמנו
 𐤁𐤏 𐤏𐤍 𐤏𐤍
 οὐδὲ μὴ συνῆτε

Comparison of these cases suggests that each translator treated **אם לא** ad hoc, giving a semantically apt equivalent when it agreed with target language needs, but modifying it when the target language compelled it. In 5:9, S likely passed over **אם לא** because it perceived what followed as what was heard, whether regarded as an oath or not.

גדלים וטובים lacks an equivalent in S, whereas OG accommodates *μεγάλοι και καλοί* in the sentence by supplying *γένωνται*.¹⁶ There is no apparent trigger for omission by S, whose tendency to represent substantives, particularly in the interior of a sentence (and certainly ones as common as these), argues that this phrase was absent from the *Vorlage*. Their absence from S but attestation by OG illustrates Goshen-Gottstein's observation that, despite the growing dominance of proto-MT, otherwise unattested variants are found in the "rivulets flowing side by side with it."¹⁷

16. Although this could be considered a double rendering of **יהיו**, first with *γένωνται*, then *ἔσονται*, Van der Vorm-Crough (56–57) documents that the translator often supplies either *εἰμί* or *γίνομαι* to complete clauses (cf. *τοῖσιν αἰχμάλωτος ὁ λαός μου ἐγενήθη* || **לכן גלה עמי** in 5:13).

17. Moshe H. Goshen-Gottstein, *The Book of Isaiah, Sample Edition with Introduction* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1965), 17. Talmon similarly observed that the absence of

Whereas **כֹּחַ יָשָׁב** matches **οἱ ἐνοικοῦντες** particularizes the phrase, with the article bearing the force of a possessive pronoun: “and their inhabitants will not exist.”

5:10

ζεῦγος is OG’s most frequent equivalent for **צמד**, although **δύο** appears in Isa 21:7’s **ἰππεῖς δύο** || **צמד פרשים** (cf. 1 Kgdms 11:7). Ziegler’s (108) speculation that the translator saw “in der ersten [Vershälfte] ganz allgemein das Ackerland (nicht speziell den Weinberg) geschildert” seems less persuasive than Fischer’s (21) proposal that the translator read **כרם** as **פרם**.

ἐργῶνται lacks a clear counterpart. The word choice presumes the same agrarian setting as **ἐργάζου** **τῆς γῆς σου** || **עבדי ארצך** (read as **עבדי**) in 23:10 and **οἱ ταῦροι ὑμῶν καὶ οἱ βόες οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι τῆς γῆς** || **והאלפים והעירים עבדי האדמה** in 30:24. In that light, it is less likely that **ἐργῶνται** is a first rendering of **יעשו** than that it was supplied (along with **οὗ**) to form a protasis. **יעשו** is more clearly rendered with the grammatically singular **ποιήσει**, whose subject is less likely the neuter plural **δέξα ζεύγη** (given the plural inflexion of **ἐργῶνται**) than an impersonal subject related to **οὗ**: “it [that place] will produce.”

Although S gives a clear equivalent for **כרם**, **אֶמְכָּר** is not a standard equivalent for **צמדי**.¹⁸ **אֶמְכָּר** occurs again only in 2 Sam 23:11’s **אֶמְכָּר לַחַיִּים** **חֶלֶק הַשָּׂדֶה מִלֵּאָה עֶדְשִׁים וְתֵהִי שָׂם** || **בְּחֶזֶק הַחֶסֶד**. Here, as there, it stands for a quantity of land, a meaning **צמד** itself bears in 1 Sam 14:14’s **כבחי מענה צמד שדה**.

Ziegler (193) asserts that, by using **κεράμιον ἔν** and **ἀρτάβας**, OG has “an Stelle der israelitischen Maßbezeichnungen die griech.-ägyptischen Maße gesetzt.” He reports that **κεράμιον** (a *hapax legomenon* in the Greek Bible) appears frequently in the papyri, although it does not designate “einen einheitlichen Rauminhalt,” while **ἀρτάβη** (found again only in Bel 3) is “ein gebräuchliches Hohlmaß, namentlich für Getreide, dessen

a concerted effort to establish a uniform text allowed the survival of vestiges of earlier traditions (Shemaryahu Talmon, “The Old Testament Text,” in *The Cambridge History of the Bible: Volume 1, From the Beginning to Jerome*, ed. Peter R. Ackroyd and Craig A. Evans [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970], 198).

18. Elsewhere: **אֶמְכָּר** (Judg 19:3, 10; 2 Sam 16:1; 2 Kgs 5:17; Isa 21:7; 1 Sam 11:7; 1 Kgs 19:21; Job 1:3); **אֶמְכָּר** (1 Sam 14:14; 1 Kgs 19:19). Cf. **אֶמְכָּר** **יְהוֹנָדָה** **לַחַיִּים** **חֶלֶק הַשָּׂדֶה מִלֵּאָה עֶדְשִׁים וְתֵהִי שָׂם** in Isa 7:25.

Rauminhalt ebenfalls sehr verschieden ist” (193). ἔξ and τρία are likely specifications supplied by the translator (cf. T’s בית כור זרע יעבד תלת || וזרע || וזרע || סאין). *καὶ ὁ σπείρω* || *וזרע* reasonably constitutes the subject.

|| *בַּת* || *בַּת* (|| *בַּת* ||) appears only here in the Peshitta (|| *בַּת* ||, 1 Kgs 7:26, 38; || *בַּת* ||, Exod 45:10, 11), while || *בַּת* || renders חמר in Exod 8:10; Lev 27:16; Num 11:32, and || *בַּת* || renders אִיפָה in Exod 16:36; Lev 5:11; et passim.

5:11

οἱ ἐγειρόμενοι || משכימי is a semantically apt choice but a unique equivalent.¹⁹ Elsewhere in the Bible שכם is rendered with ὀρθρίζω (thirty-eight times); ὀρθρος (six times); ὀρθρινός (twice); and ἀνίστημι (eight times), the latter of which appears in the compound form *καὶ ἐξαναστάντες* || *וישכימו* in Isa 37:36.²⁰

Both OG and S reformulate ירדפו as a substantival participle (διδάσκοντες/ *διδάσκοντες*) in describing the recipients of woe. Notably, however, *καὶ τὸ σισαερα* *διδάσκοντες* accords with the Hebrew word order, whereas || *διδάσκοντες* || fits with the word order of the preceding and following phrases of the target text. Similarly, whereas S renders the finite verb in the final clause with a participle (|| *διδάσκοντες* ||), OG elects a finite verb (*αὐτοὺς συγκαύσει*) and supplies a conjunction (*ὁ γὰρ οἶνος*) that makes the final clause explanatory of the preceding actions.

5:12

The translations produced by OG and S are structurally parallel. Each lacks an equivalent for והיה and renders משתיהם with a verbal form: the finite verb *πίνουσιν* in OG and the participle *πίνοντες* in S. Both analyze the four initial nouns as modifying the verb: OG inflects the four nouns in the genitive

19. Elsewhere in Isaiah ἐγείρω translates *hiphil* forms קום (14:9); קיץ (26:19); and עיר (41:25; 45:13). In 26:19 it appears in the passive voice (*ἐγερεθήσονται*), alongside *ἀναστήσονται* (26:19).

20. Verbal שכם > OG in Josh 8:14; 1 Kgdms 7:16, 20 (a lengthy minus); Jer 7:13; 11:7 (a lengthy minus); 36(29):19 (a lengthy minus); 42(35):15. The prime exception is *καὶ ἐκσυμῆθη* || *וישכימו* in 1 Kgdms 9:26, where Driver recognized the superiority of the OG’s *Vorlage* (Samuel R. Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of Samuel* [London: Oxford University Press, 1912], 77).

cally plural *καὶ τὰ ἔργα*, while S uses grammatically singular *سحبح* (cf. *τῶν ἔργων τῶν χειρῶν αὐτῶν* vs. *سحبح آسوس* || *למעשה ידיו* || *חב* in 2:8).

5:13

OG's *αἰχμάλωτος ... ἐγενήθη* || *גלה* uses a predicate of existence to forge a verbal equivalent, similar to *πλήρης εἰμί* || *שבועתי* in 1:11; and *οὐκ ἔσομαι ἀρχηγός* || *לא תשימני קצין* in 3:7.

+τὸν κύριον as the object of knowing (*εἰδέναι* || *דעת*) is attested by no other witness (although T reads *ידעו אורייתא* (מידלא ידעו אורייתא), but the plus recalls +*με* (2x) in 1:3. Although τὸν κύριον might be the equivalent for *ובבודו* and *καὶ πλῆθος* for *והמונו*, nowhere else does κύριος render *בבוד*, while this translator's penchant to supply a direct object for verbs (see Van der Vorm-Croughs, 49–55) makes him more likely the source of +τὸν κύριον.²⁴ In fact, given the word order agreement in *καὶ πλῆθος ἐγενήθη νεκρῶν διὰ λιμόν* || *ובבודו מתי רעב* || *והמונו* (cf. *πλῆθος* || *המון* in 17:12; 63:5), which is then omitted in the next clause (cf. *ἐγγισάτω* || *יחיתה* in 5:19, where it is based on the following *ותקרב* that otherwise lacks an equivalent).²⁵ Additionally, his analysis of *מתי* as a form of *מות* (*νεκρῶν*) might have inclined him to translate *ובבודו* with *καὶ πλῆθος* (cf. S, below). He then supplied *ἐγενήθη* to complete the clause, as he did by inserting *γένωνται* in 5:9.

The choices of *سحبح* for *ובבודו* and of *سحبح* for *והמונו* seem coordinate. *سحبح* is otherwise the equivalent for *רב* or *רבה*, save in 45:8 (*سحبح* || *ויפרו ישע* || *פסמל*); and 54:3 (*سحبح* || *ושמאול תפרצי*). Syriac most frequently renders *בבוד* with *سحبح*, although nominal and verbal forms of *سحبح* render it four times.²⁶ *سحبح* || *ובבודו* here is likely tied to the translator's analysis of *מתי* as a form of *מות* (*سحبح* || *מות*).

Given that choice, *سحبح* || *והמונו* is equally intelligible. Syriac's rendering of *המון* with *سحبح* (Judg 4:7; 1 Sam 14:16; 1 Kgs 20:13; Isa 17:12); and *سحبح* (Isa 16:14; 29:5, 7, 8; 31:4) suggest that the translator's understand-

24. The equivalents are an alignment suggested (under "?") in the CATSS database.

25. Cf. Van der Vorm-Croughs's (208) parallel examples, including *οἱ ἔμποροι αὐτῆς ἔνδοξοι, ἄρχοντες τῆς γῆς* || *אשר סחריה שרים כנעניה נכבדי ארץ*, 23:8; and *ὁ πλοῦτος τῶν ἀσεβῶν καὶ ὡς χνοὺς φερόμενος* || *המון זריך וכמץ עבר המון עריצים*, 29:5.

26. The only other variation is in 17:3, where *سحبح* || *והמונו* diverges from MT and all other witnesses (OG effects its own modification, on which see the comments at 17:3).

The semantics of **המונה** and **המונה** are closer to **הדרה**, while **המונה** || **המונה** in 5:13 indicates that **המונה** here is keyed to **המונה**, leaving no explicit equivalent for **המונה**, but also no equivalent for **המונה**.²⁸ In 23:12 S renders **המונה** with **המונה**, the same verb that translates **המונה** in Jer 11:15; Pss 68:5; 96:12, although the equivalent **המונה** appears in Jer 15:17; **המונה** in Jer 50:11 (cf. 2 Sam 1:20; Hab 3:18; Zeph 3:14); and **המונה** in Jer 51:39. This translator's use of **המונה** as an equivalent for **המונה** in 23:12; 32:13 may illuminate the translator's conundrum, since **המונה** likely renders **המונה**. Although it is possible that **המונה** was absent from S's *Vorlage* (through homoioteleuton with **המונה**), it might equally be that he considered **המונה** to suffice for both **המונה** and **המונה**.

In 5:9, S's tendency to preserve substantives embedded within a sentence was cited as a reason to conclude that גדלים וטובים was absent from S's Vorlage. Here, however, ועלז בה, without an equivalent in S, stands at the end of this sentence, much as with ישאו in the final line of 17:12:

|| מלא .וּשְׂאוֹן לְאָמִים כְּשֶׁאוֹן מֵיַם בְּבִירִים יִשְׂאוּ || :וְהִמְעַל וְהִנְחָל אֶפְרַיִם מֵלָא וְכֻלָּא

might avoid repeating שְׂאוֹן, could be derived from the association of שְׂאוֹן and קול elsewhere (e.g., וְהִמְעַל || מלא ,קול שְׂאוֹן 13:14), and

ἀσεβῶν || שֹׂאֵן עֲלִיִּים, πλοῦτος is not singularly aligned with שֹׂאֵן and might be a later gloss, given that ἀυθάδεια appears only here in the Greek Bible (cf. Ziegler, 66). Nowhere else in the Bible does a word for wealth translate שֹׂאֵן. On the other hand, הֶמֶן is translated by πλοῦτος in 16:14; 29:5, 7, 8; 32:14; 60:5, so that οἱ πλούσιοι might be influenced by הַמֹּנֵה.

28. S's וְשֹׁמֵם in 17:12; וְשֹׁמֵם in 13:4; קוּל שָׂאוֹן || מַלָּא וְיִסְחָר in 66:6 reveal the translator's familiarity with שָׂאוֹן as "turmoil," while other equivalents stray from that field: וְיִסְחָר || לְאַחֲכֵי (parallel to וְיִסְחָר || חֶסְדִּים); וְיִסְחָר || חֶסְדִּים (parallel to וְיִסְחָר || חֶסְדִּים); וְיִסְחָר || חֶסְדִּים (parallel to וְיִסְחָר || חֶסְדִּים); וְיִסְחָר || חֶסְדִּים (parallel to וְיִסְחָר || חֶסְדִּים). Clearly the translator was not averse to selecting an equivalent befitting the context.

finds a parallel with $\text{שׂאון עליזים} || \text{מלך ייִ} ||$ in 24:8. His omission of an equivalent for ישׂאו is likely for concision, to which the omission of a distinct equivalent for בה ועלז here might be comparable. Although it is necessary to retain that argument as a plausible, alternative explanation, the absence of בה ועלז from S's *Vorlage* remains quite possible.

5:15

Old Greek's $\text{καὶ ἀτιμασθήσεται} || \text{ישׂפל}$ resolves the metaphor, although it might also have been used to avoid three occurrences of ταπεινώω in the sentence.²⁹ Although S renders ישׂח and תשׂפלנה with ἡττήθη , it renders the intervening ישׂפל with ἡττήθη .

Although S and OG translate ועיני גבהים with a noun + attributive adjective— $\text{ἡττήθη ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ οἱ μετέωροι}$ —it is unnecessary to suppose that their *Vorlagen* read ועינים גבהות . Goshen-Gottstein (יט) draws attention to $\text{οἱ γὰρ ὀφθαλμοὶ κυρίου ὑψηλοὶ/ἡττήθη ἡττήθη} || \text{עיני גבהות}$ in 2:11.

5:16

Old Greek's $\text{δοξασθήσεται} || \text{נקדש}$ (S ἁγιασθήσεται) is the sole case of קדש translated by a word for “glory.” The equivalents for the verbal and nominal forms of קדש elsewhere are ἀγιάζω (four times); ἅγιος (twenty-three times); ἀγίασμα (63:18^[21]); καθαρός (65:5); and ἀγνίζομαι (66:17). On the other hand, A. Haire Forster noted that, of the twenty-five Hebrew words translated by δόξα in the Greek Bible, sixteen of them occur in Isaiah, of which fully half are translated by δόξα *only* in Isaiah (e.g., $\text{καὶ πλήρης ὁ οἶκος τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ} || \text{ושׂוליו מלאים את ההיכל}$, 6:1).³⁰ The translator's interest in δόξα is expressed equally in his use of δοξάζω to render not only forms of כבד (43:4, 23; 44:23; 49:5; 66:5) and פאר (4:2; 10:15; 44:23; 49:3; 60:7, 13) but also תהלה (42:10), רום (25:1; 33:10), and גבה/ונשא (52:13, $\text{καὶ ὑψωθήσεται καὶ δοξασθήσεται σφόδρα} || \text{ירום ונשא וגבה מאד}$).

Here the phrase $\text{δοξασθήσεται ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ} || \text{(נקדש בצדקה)}$ is suggestive, since δόξα and δικαιοσύνη are paired elsewhere, even when כבוד is not present, as in 45:24: $\text{λέγων δικαιοσύνη καὶ δόξα πρὸς αὐτὸν ἤξουσιν}$

29. ἀτιμάζω translates קלל in 16:14; 23:9; and בוה in 53:3.

30. A. Haire Forster, “The Meaning of Δόξα in the Greek Bible,” *ATR* 12 (1929/1930): 312–13.

(אמר צדקות ועז עדיו יבוא) (cf. 26:10; 58:8).³¹ Their juxtaposition is especially noteworthy in 61:3

לשום לאבלי ציון	δοθῆναι τοῖς πενθοῦσι Σιων
לתת להם פאר תחת אפר	δόξαν ἀντὶ σποδοῦ
שמן ששון תחת אבל	ἄλειμμα εὐφροσύνης ἀντὶ πένθους
מעטה תהלה תחת רוח כהה	καταστολὴν δόξης ἀντὶ πνεύματος ἀκηδίας
וקרא להם אילי הצדק	καὶ κληθήσονται Γενεαὶ δικαιοσύνης
מטע יהוה להתפאר	Φύτευμα κυρίου εἰς δόξαν

Although δόξα translates פאר in 3:20, and δόξα/δοξάζω regularly translate תפארה or תפארת (e.g., 3:18; 4:2; 10:12; 20:5), δόξα || תהלה occurs only in 61:3; Exod 15:11. Although καταστολὴν || מעטה is intelligible (cf. καὶ ἀφελεῖ τὴν στολὴν σου || ועטך עטה, 22:17), καταστολὴν δόξης is reminiscent of καὶ ἡ δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ περιστελεῖ σε || כבוד יהוה יאספך in 58:8, whose next clause associates this wearing of δόξα with δικαιοσύνη: καὶ προπορεύσεται ἔμπροσθέν σου ἡ δικαιοσύνη σου || והלך לפניך צדקך. Such correlations provide reason to attribute to the translator the collocation δοξασθήσεται ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ || נקדש בצדקה here.

5:17

Syriac more clearly follows MT than does OG: ܡܠܝܬܐ reflects בבשים, over against OG's οἱ διηρηπασμένοι, while in contrast to ὡς ταῦτοι || בדברים, ܡܠܝܬܐ recognizes the 3mp suffix and perhaps reflects analysis of דבר as a (legal) decree.

Although מחים is the sole instance of nominal מח in Isaiah, the translator renders the graphically similar ממחים in 25:6 by association with מחים שמרים מזקקים שמנים || ܡܡܚܝܡ ܫܡܪܝܢ ܡܙܩܩܝܢ ܫܡܢܝܢ ܚܝܬܐ. A different association might account for ܡܚܝܢ || מחים here. Warszawski (17) notes S's equivalents in 51:3, where the topic of ruins appears again: ܡܚܝܢ ܡܚܝܢ ܡܚܝܢ ܡܚܝܢ || ܡܚܝܢ ܡܚܝܢ ܡܚܝܢ ܡܚܝܢ. If the transla-

31. Cf. δόξα || עז in 12:2, where OG's διότι ἡ δόξα μου καὶ ἡ αἰνεσίς μου κύριος || כי עזי וזמרת יה יהוה associates δόξα with the theme of salvation (see the comments on 12:2), as δικαιοσύνη often does (Seeligmann, 98).

32. The only other occurrence of מח in the Bible is in Ps 66:15, where S correctly divines its semantics: ܡܚܝܢ ܡܚܝܢ ܡܚܝܢ ܡܚܝܢ || ܡܚܝܢ ܡܚܝܢ ܡܚܝܢ ܡܚܝܢ. He appears to have read שמנים in place of the second שמרים.

tor associated “rebuilding” with “comfort” in speaking of a destroyed city, he may have reasoned similarly here by associating מַחִים with נַחַם.

Syriac explicitizes the object of ܠܡܚܝ by supplying (anaphoric) ܐܢܝ.

Each of OG’s divergences from MT in the following underlined words has generated explanations based on aural or graphic errors:

ורעו כבשים כדברם	καὶ βοσκηθήσονται οἱ διηρπασμένοι ὡς ταῦροι
וחרבות מחים	καὶ τὰς ἐρήμους τῶν ἀπηλειμμένων
גרים יאכלו	<u>ἄρνες</u> φάγονται

Seeligmann (11 n. 8), citing J. F. Schleusner and Richard Ottley and asserting that “Ziegler erroneously omitted to mention this correction” (his edition reads ἀπειληγμένων), argues persuasively that τῶν ἀπηλειμμένων reflects analysis of מַחִים as a form of מַחָה, noting that ἀπαλείφω || מַחָה is attested in 44:22, as well as Gen 6:7; 4 Kdms 21:13, while ἐξαλείφω || מַחָה occurs frequently.

Ottley (2:128) proposes that ταῦροι arose from the translator reading כאבירים. However, the equivalents for אביר in this book (οἱ ἰσχύοντες, 1:24; πόλεις, 10:13; οἱ κριοί, 34:7; οἱ ἀπολωλεκότες, 46:12; ἰσχύος, 49:26; θεός, 60:16) do not support this reconstruction. Noting Anton Scholz’s (38) hypothesis that ταῦροι reflects an aural error of כפרים for כדברם, Ziegler (101) nevertheless attributes it to a “wohl absichtlich” misreading of כדברם as כפרים. Although ὡς indicates the translator interpreted word-initial *kaph* as a preposition, attributing ταῦροι to an intentional misreading seems less likely than Goshen-Gottstein’s (יט) proposal that the translator simply required “a new suitable subject,” alongside ἄρνες.

There are two viable proposals for explaining ἄρνες || גרים. T. K. Cheyne posited that גרים is an aural error for כרים, which is translated by ἄρνός in Deut 32:14; Isa 34:6, as well as 4 Kdms 3:4; Jer 51[28]:40.³³ One need not presume an oral setting for this, however, since phonetic confusion can arise from the “interior dictation” that accompanies copying.³⁴ Ottley (2:128) proposed that גרים is a graphic error for גדים (ἄρνός translates גדי in Exod 23:19; 34:26). Either גדים or כרים is a plausible retroversion of

33. Ottley (128) reports this stood in the fourth edition of T. K. Cheyne’s *The Prophecies of Isaiah* (London, 1887).

34. Regarding “interior dictation” see Martin Worthington, *Principles of Akkadian Textual Criticism*, SANER 1 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2012), 98–100.

ἄρνες and preferable to גרים, since one expects the subject of יאכלו to be an animal, given the preceding כבשים ורעו.

Scholz's (38) hypothesis that διηρπασμένοι reflects aural confusion of כבשים with a form of בזז seems implausible on phonetic grounds. Moreover, although בזז is elsewhere frequently translated by διαρπάζω (e.g., Gen 34:27, 29; 1 Kgdms 14:36; 4 Kgdms 7:16; Ezek 7:21), in Isaiah it is translated by προνομή/προνομεύω (10:2, 6; 11:14; 24:3 [2x]; 33:23; 44:22 [2x], 24) and κληρονομέω (17:14), while διαρπάζω serves as the equivalent for השם (42:22); ἄρπάζω renders גזל (10:2); and ἄρπαγή renders גזלת (3:14) and שלל (10:2).

Ottley (2:128) speculated that the translator settled on διηρπασμένοι by analyzing כבשים as a *qal* passive participle of כבש "subdue." However, nowhere else in the Greek Bible does a term for "plunder" translate כבש, while equivalents for כבש better accord with its recognized semantics: κατακυριεύω (Gen 1:28; Num 32:22, 29); κρατέω (Josh 18:1); καταδυναστεύω (2 Kgdms 8:11; Neh 5:5 [2x]); ὠθέω (Jer 41[34]:11); καταδύω (Mic 7:19); καταχώννυμι (Zech 9:15); βιάζομαι (Esther 7:8); ὑποτάσσω (1 Chr 22:18); and κατακτάομαι (2 Chr 28:10).³⁵ On the other hand, the frequency of כבש in the Bible (even if it appears nowhere else in Isaiah) suggests that the translator would likely have been familiar with it.

As already noted at 3:14; 5:5, the motif of plunder is prominent in OG-Isaiah, not simply by virtue of its equivalents for בזז/בז (προνομεύω, 8:3; 24:3; 42:22, 24; προνομή, 10:2, 6; 24:3; 33:23; 42:22); for גזל/גזלת (ἄρπαγή, 3:14; ἄρπαγμα, 61:8; ἄρπάζω, 10:2); for משסה/שסה (ἄρπαγμα; 42:22; προνομεύω, 10:13; 17:14); and for שלל (ἄρπαγή, 10:2; προνομή, 8:1; 33:23), but also their association with themes of taxation, as in 3:12–15; 5:5. The fact that the association will be reprised by εἰς προνομήν || לבער in 6:13 suggests that it was prominent in the translator's mind.

In that light, and given the overtones of salvation in 5:16's καὶ ὁ θεὸς ὁ ἅγιος δοξασθήσεται ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ that leads to the dispossessed thriving, Ottley's proposal that the translator analyzed כבשים as a passive participle is the most tenable explanation of οἱ διηρπασμένοι.

35. OG offers no equivalent in Jer 41[34]:16; 2 Chr 9:18's ἐνδεδεμένοι χρυσίῳ || כבש בזהב leaves unanswered the question of whether ἐνδεδεμένοι is intended as a translation of וכבש or was simply supplied to accompany χρυσίῳ.

5:18

Old Greek and Syriac reflect the metaphor of **משכי העון**, with slight differences. The similarity of **ὡς σχοινίῳ μακρῷ** and **ܐܒ ܣܠܐ ܐܝܬܐ** (for **בחבלי** **השוא**) is noteworthy, as is the observation that **μακρῷ** and **ܐܝܬܐ** (for **השוא**) are semantically equivalent, while differing from equivalents for **שוא** elsewhere (**μάταιος** in 1:13; 30:28; **κενός** in 59:4; **ܗܝܬܡܐ** in 1:13; 30:28; **ܡܥܬܐ** in 59:4). Additionally, both OG and S render **העון** and **חטאה** with grammatically plural nouns: **τὰς ἀμαρτίας** and **τὰς ἀνομίας**/**ܡܬܥܬܐܝܬܐ** and **ܡܬܥܬܐܝܬܐ**.³⁶ Syriac, however, attaches a pronoun to each noun, explicitizing the relationship between the subjects of the verbs and the direct objects.

The similarity of **ὡς σχοινίῳ** and **ܐܒ ܣܠܐ ||** **בחבלי** spurred Goshen-Gottstein (יט) to speculate that both *Vorlagen* read **בחבלי**. Although a *kaph/bet* interchange is possible, it is just as likely that each translator assimilated the preposition to **וכעבות** for the sake of parallelism. More precisely, while **ܐܒ ܣܠܐ** can be retroverted to **בחבלי**, the instrumental (dative) case in **ὡς σχοινίῳ** can equally be analyzed as reflecting **בבחי**, with **ὡς** either a double rendering or supplied by the translator. The case is complicated by the likelihood that the translator conformed the phrases **ὡς σχοινίῳ μακρῷ καὶ ὡς ζυγοῦ ἱμάντι δαμάλεως** to one another. In the latter phrase, **ὡς ζυγοῦ ἱμάντι δαμάλεως ||** **וכעבות העגלה** explicitizes the role of the rope in relation to the heifer.

Even though **ἐπισπάομαι** translates **משך** only here, **οὐαὶ οἱ ἐπισπώμενοι τὰς ἀμαρτίας** is semantically transparent to **הוי משכי העון**.³⁷ Although **ܐܒ ܣܠܐ ||** **ܐܒ ܣܠܐ** is unparalleled elsewhere, its semantics are not clearly aligned with **משכי**. And whereas S renders **משכי קשת** with **ܡܫܟܝܐ ܩܫܬܐ** in 66:19—the typical equivalent for this phrase elsewhere (Gen 37:28, Deut 21:3, Jer 31:3; 38:13)—it gives **ܡܫܟܝܐ ܩܫܬܐ** for the oblique **ܐܠ ܩܝܡܐ** in 18:2 (OG **πρὸς ἔθνος μετέωρον καὶ ξένον**), 7 (**ἐκ λαοῦ τεθλιμμένου καὶ τετιλμένου**), and it renders **ימיה לא ימשכו** with **ܡܫܟܝܐ ܕܝܡܝܐ** in 13:22 (OG **καὶ οὐ χρονεῖ**).³⁸

36. OG frequently renders grammatically singular **עון** and **חטאה** with plural noun forms (e.g., **οἱ**, 1:4; 6:7; 13:11; 14:21; **αἱ**, 30:1; 38:17; 53:12; 58:1), as does S (**ܐܝܬܐ**, 64:5, 6, 8; **ܡܬܥܬܐܝܬܐ**, 3:9; 6:7; 30:1).

37. **ἐπισπάομαι** translates **משך** in Gen 39:12, its only other appearance. **ἐκσπάω** occurs seventeen times (e.g., Judg 3:22; 16:14; 20:32; 1 Sam 17:35).

38. The idiom is rendered with **ܡܫܟܝܐ ܩܫܬܐ** in 1 Kgs 22:34; 2 Chr 18:33. **ܡܫܟܝܐ** otherwise renders **משך** only in Hos 7:5; 11:4; Ps 10:9; Job 21:33; Song 1:4.

Syriac uses a broad range of equivalents for מִשַׁךְ elsewhere, such as *ܡܡܫܚܬܝ* || *ܡܡܠܬܐ ܚܚܝܬ ܒܗܪ* || *ܡܠܬܐ ܚܚܝܬ* in Judg 4:6, followed by *ܚܚܝܬ* || *ܡܠܬܐ ܚܚܝܬ* in Judg 5:7; *ܡܡܫܚܬܝ* || *ܡܠܬܐ ܚܚܝܬ* appears in Judg 5:14; *ܡܠܬܐ ܚܚܝܬ* || *ܡܠܬܐ ܚܚܝܬ* in Ezek 12:25; and *ܡܠܬܐ ܚܚܝܬ* || *ܡܠܬܐ ܚܚܝܬ* in Ps 28:3.³⁹ Therefore, it is intelligible that *ܡܡܫܚܬܝ* should be S's rendering of Isa 13:22, even if this equivalent occurs nowhere else, while this translator uses *ܡܠܬܐ* for נֹטָה (34:11; 40:22^[1]; 42:5; 44:24; 45:12; 51:13, 16 [MT נֹטָה]; 54:2); and *ܡܠܬܐ ܚܚܝܬ* (40:22^[2]). Similarly, the choice of *ܡܠܬܐ ܚܚܝܬ* || *ܡܠܬܐ ܚܚܝܬ* here seems calibrated to the understanding of *ܡܠܬܐ ܚܚܝܬ* as a simile and the choice of *ܡܠܬܐ ܚܚܝܬ* || *ܡܠܬܐ ܚܚܝܬ*.⁴⁰

Even if OG's *μακρόν* and S's *ܡܠܬܐ ܚܚܝܬ* || *ܡܠܬܐ ܚܚܝܬ* are similar, OG's *ὡς σχοινίον μακρόν* describes how those addressed draw their sins ("as if with a long rope"), whereas S compares the lengthening of their *sins* to "a long cord." The similarity between OG's *μακρόν* and S's *ܡܠܬܐ ܚܚܝܬ* || *ܡܠܬܐ ܚܚܝܬ* thus proves to be superficial.

This singular appearance of *μακρόν* in the book has prompted numerous suggestions, such as Robert Lowth's proposal (reported by Ottley, 2:128) that the *Vorlage* read שְׂרֹעַ "extended," as in Lev 21:18; 22:23, and Ottley's proposal that an original ΜΑΤΑΙΩ was corrupted into ΜΑΚΡΩ. Lowth's proposal posits retroversion to a word otherwise not found in Isaiah, while Goshen-Gottstein rightly rejects Ottley's proposal as entailing "considerable palaeographical or phonetic difficulties."⁴¹ However, Goshen-Gottstein's tracing of *μακρόν* to midrashic roots is as tenuous as the proposals he rejects.⁴² Ultimately, there is no satisfying explanation for how the translator lighted upon *ܡܠܬܐ ܚܚܝܬ* || *ܡܠܬܐ ܚܚܝܬ* (or S upon *ܡܠܬܐ ܚܚܝܬ*).

39. Even if the translator guessed right with *ܡܠܬܐ ܚܚܝܬ* || *ܡܠܬܐ ܚܚܝܬ* in Josh 6:5 (*ܡܠܬܐ ܚܚܝܬ* || *ܡܠܬܐ ܚܚܝܬ* appears in the previous verse), *ܡܠܬܐ ܚܚܝܬ* in Exod 19:3 reflects difficulty reconciling permission to ascend the mountain with the earlier proscription of it.

40. Elsewhere in Isaiah *ܡܠܬܐ ܚܚܝܬ* translates only אֶרֶץ (48:9; 54:2; 57:4). Outside of Isaiah *ܡܠܬܐ ܚܚܝܬ* occurs only in Ezek 31:5 (*ܡܠܬܐ ܚܚܝܬ* || *ܡܠܬܐ ܚܚܝܬ*) and 35:13 (*ܡܠܬܐ ܚܚܝܬ* || *ܡܠܬܐ ܚܚܝܬ*). Although *ܡܠܬܐ ܚܚܝܬ* || *ܡܠܬܐ ܚܚܝܬ* renders *וַיֹּאדָם* in 1 Kgs 8:8; 2 Chr 5:9, the primary equivalents for אֶרֶץ are *ܐܪܥܐ* (e.g., Gen 26:8; Num 9:19) and *ܡܠܬܐ ܚܚܝܬ*, especially with *ܡܠܬܐ ܚܚܝܬ* as object (Exod 20:12; Deut 4:26, 40).

41. Goshen-Gottstein, "Theory and Practice," 139.

42. Goshen-Gottstein, "Theory and Practice," 140–41.

5:19

Although both S and OG represent יחִישֶׁה with an adverb preceding a finite verb (חַיִּי/τὸ τάχος ἐγγίστατω), only חַיִּי preserves the semantics of יחִישֶׁה (cf. חַיִּי || מְהֵרָה חוֹשֶׁה || 1 Sam 20:38).⁴³ Since ἐγγίζομαι often translates קָרַב (e.g., ἐγγίζοντες || יִקְרִיבוּ in 5:8), whereas לָמַעַן later in this verse lacks an equivalent (ἐἵνα ἰδῶμεν καὶ ἐλθῇτω || וְתִקְרַב וְתִבֹּאֶה), and given the translator's seeming unfamiliarity with חוֹשׁ elsewhere, ἐγγίστατω might be a substitute for יחִישֶׁה, based on וְתִקְרַב.⁴⁴

Old Greek renders מַעֲשֵׂהוּ with αὐτοῦ ποιήσει, which serves as subject of ἐγγίστατω. Syriac, on the other hand, analyzes מַעֲשֵׂהוּ as the direct object of יחִישֶׁה and adds מְחַל to explicitize the subject: חַיִּי מְחַל || חַיִּי. Similarly, S adds the pronoun לוֹ as direct object of יָסַר, corresponding to its grammatically plural חַיִּי || מַעֲשֵׂהוּ, a shift it makes also with וּפָעֵלוּ || 1:31; וְאֵת פֶּעַל יְהוָה || 5:12; and אֵת כָּל מַעֲשֵׂהוּ || 10:12. Although it might also have supplied the objective pronominal suffix of וְנִדְעָה || סִבְחָה, more likely that represents the final *he*, with חַיִּי assumed as its antecedent.

5:20

Old Greek creates a balanced structure, lacking an equivalent for any of the four *lamed* prepositions and leveling morphemes by rendering each participle as articular and prefixing τὸ to the first nominal form in each clause.

The only notable distinctive in S is its lexical choice חַיִּי || הָאֲמָרִים, a verb that explicitates the notion of naming or designating.

43. S accords a similar meaning to חוֹשׁ in 8:1 (חַיִּי || חַיִּי), but its equivalents in the verb's two other instances are oblique: חַיִּי || חַיִּי, 28:16; חַיִּי || חַיִּי, 60:22.

44. Although πάρεστι γάρ || חַיִּי in 8:1 is reminiscent of Deut 32:35 (καὶ πάρεστιν ἔτοιμα ὑμῖν || וְחַיִּי עֵתִידָהּ לָמוּ), πάρεστιν is an oblique equivalent for חַיִּי, at best. Equally, καὶ ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ' αὐτῷ οὗ μὴ κατασχυσθῇ || חַיִּי in 28:16; and ἐγὼ κύριος κατὰ καιρὸν σπύλας αὐτοῦ || חַיִּי in 60:22 suggest that the translator had difficulty with the verb. Cf. 5:13, where καὶ πλεῖστος || וְכַבִּיד is likely rooted in the following וְהָמוֹנוּ, which lacks an equivalent in its slot.

5:21

Old Greek's +οί harmonizes the structure of this woe with that used in 5:19, 20. The same modification will appear again in 5:22.

ἐν αὐτοῖς || בעיניהם accords with this translator's regular condensation of בעיני with a suffixed pronoun: ἐνώπιόν σου || בעיניך, 38:3; ἐναντίον μου || בעיני in 43:4; 65:12; 66:4; and καὶ οὐκ ἤρρεσεν αὐτῶ || וירע בעיניו in 59:15. Similarly, the rendering of פניהם וגד with καὶ ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν (the reflexive pronoun is paralleled in حجت בפניהם) is comparable to ἐνώπιόν σου || לפניך, 9:2; ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν || לעיניהם, 13:16; cf. 30:11; 41:2; 43:10).

5:22

As in 5:21, by prefixing the article to συνετοί OG harmonizes the structure of this woe with those that precede. Also, just as OG forged stylistic uniformity in 5:20, so it does here via two appellations (οἱ ἰσχύοντες ὑμῶν, οἱ δυνάσται), each modified by an attributive clause that overrides the Hebrew syntagmeme *lamed* + infinitive, creating a link to the attributive clauses of 5:23.

Although +ὕμῶν might attest גבוריכם in place of גבורים, οἱ ἰσχύοντες ὑμῶν must be evaluated in light of thematic links in the larger context. The most recent second-person pronoun was in 5:5 (νῦν δὲ ἀναγγελῶ ὑμῖν τί ποιήσω τῷ ἀμπελῶνί μου || עשה לכרמי אשר אני עשה אתכם נא אודיעה נא אתכם את אשר אני עשה לכרמי), in accord with which the addressees are ἄνθρωπος τοῦ Ἰουδα καὶ οἱ ἐνοικοῦντες ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ (5:3). The vineyard becomes identified as οἶκος τοῦ Ἰσραήλ and ἄνθρωπος τοῦ Ἰουδα, which is equated with the νεόφυτον ἡγαπημένον (5:7), implying that the addressees and the vineyard are coreferential. Furthermore, εἰς προνομίην || לבער in 5:5 reprises the motif of the people as a plundered vineyard that was developed in 3:12–15 and is highlighted again by οἱ διηρπασμένοι in 5:17.

In this light, οἱ ἰσχύοντες ὑμῶν in 5:22 is likely considered similar to οἱ ἄρχοντες who are charged with harming τὸν ἀμπελῶνά μου in 3:14 and are implicit agents in the people's plundering in 5:17. οἱ ἰσχύοντες ὑμῶν || גבורים and the unique equivalent οἱ δυνάσται || אנשי חיל are classes similar to οἱ ἰσχύοντες in 3:25 (q.v.).⁴⁵ Thus, +ὕμῶν with οἱ ἰσχύοντες less likely reflects גבוריכם than clarifies their relationship to the people.

45. The equivalents for אנשי חיל elsewhere are ἄνδρες δυνατοί (Exod 18:21, 25;

Syriac, on the other hand, uses no personal pronoun and follows both the syntax and semantics of MT in the first half of the verse, while rendering למסך in the second half as a relative clause (ܡܨܚܝܬܐ), after translating וְאִנְשֵׁי חֵיל with ܡܨܚܝܬܐ ܡܨܚܝܬܐ, an equivalent found also in Judg 20:46; 2 Sam 11:16; Jer 48:14; and Ps 76:6.

5:23

οἱ δίκαιοὶντες || מְצַדִּיקִי conforms to and extends the attributive clauses modifying οἱ ἰσχύοντες ὑμῶν and οἱ δυνάσται in 5:22. The grammatically singular τοῦ δικαίου || צַדִּיקִים likely means to project a generic class parallel to τὸν ἀσεβῆ || רָשָׁע (similarly, S ܡܨܚܝܬܐ), just as its rendering of יסירו with αἴροντες conforms it grammatically to δίκαιοὶντες (cf. ܡܨܚܝܬܐ). Old Greek's lack of an equivalent for מִמֶּנּוּ might owe to implicitation with τοῦ δικαίου (cf. καὶ οἰκοδομηθήσονται σοι αἱ ἔρημοι αἰῶνοι || ובנו מִמֶּד in 58:12).⁴⁶

Although the +pronominal suffix of ܡܨܚܝܬܐ might attest שְׁחָדוֹ (owing to dittography of the following conjunctive *waw*), it was more likely added for explication (cf. ܡܨܚܝܬܐ || וִירֵד in 5:14).

5:24

Old Greek resolves the metaphors for fire in the first two clauses, beginning with καυθήσεται || כֹּאכַל (cf. αἰεταί || אוֹכְלֵה, 33:14), corresponding to which he likely chose καὶ συγκαυθήσεται out of uncertainty over חֶשֶׁשׁ, which appears again only in Isa 33:11: νῦν ὁψέσθῃ νῦν αἰσθηθήσεσθε ματαία ἔσται ἡ ἰσχὺς τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν || קֶשׁ רֹחַבְכֶּם (cf. discussion of יְחִישָׁה in 5:19, above).

ܡܨܚܝܬܐ || וְחֶשֶׁשׁ is likely also a guess, employing a verb that elsewhere renders phrases for kindling fire (e.g., ܡܨܚܝܬܐ || لَا تَبْعُرُوا אֵשׁ || לא תבערו אש, Exod 35:3; ܡܨܚܝܬܐ || וִיבַעַר אֵשׁ, Judg 15:5). ܡܨܚܝܬܐ is again fientive, with ܡܨܚܝܬܐ as subject, in Ps 39:4 (ܡܨܚܝܬܐ || תִּבְעַר אֵשׁ); Ps 78:21 (ܡܨܚܝܬܐ || וְאֵשׁ נִשְׁקָה).

ὕπὸ ἄνθρακος || לֶשֶׁן occurs only here, where it resolves the metaphor. The only other juxtaposition of לֶשֶׁן and אֵשׁ in the Bible is in 30:27, where

Judg 20:24, 26; Nah 2:4); ἄνδρες δυνάμεως (2 Sam 11:16); and ἄνδρες τοῦ πλούτου (Ps 75[76]:6; Neh 11:6).

46. Regarding the translation strategy of implicitation, see Van der Vorm-Croughs, 63–81.

καὶ ἡ ὄργη τοῦ θυμοῦ ὥς πῦρ ἔδεται || ולשׁונו כאשׁ אכלת || entails omission of ולשׁונו, explicable under the translator's penchant to elide body parts in construct phrases (see Van der Vorm-Croughs, 69–70). The same phrase as here, ἀνθρακας πυρός, appears in 47:14, where it renders לחמם גחלת אור (cf. ἐπ' ἀνθρώπων πυρός || על הגחלים, Prov 6:28; and ἀνθρακας πυρός || גחלים, Prov 25:22).⁴⁷ Although both Isa 5:24; 47:14 show a nearly quantitative match between ἀνθρακας πυρός and the Hebrew, the phrase is a substitution rather than a translation.⁴⁸

Although the lexical equivalents of ὑπὸ φλογὸς ἀνειμένης || להבה ירפה are unremarkable and the phrase bears a sensible meaning—"by a flame run wild" (see GELS, s.v. "ἀνίημι")—the formulation avoids a set phrase such as ὑπὸ γλώσσης πυρός (29:6; 66:15), despite having just used another one, ἀνθρακας πυρός.⁴⁹ In both phrases the translator had to supply ὑπό to complement the passive verb.

ἐκ λυθῆσεται || להבה ירפה is similar to OG insofar as it prefixes a preposition to its equivalent for להבה. ἐκ λυθῆσεται befits the semantics of ירפה but also parallels OG's ἀνειμένης. Its choice of equivalent for ירפה here is different than in its use of λυθῆσεται in the metaphor כל ידים תרפינה in 13:7, in the same way that OG's ἀνειμένης || ירפה differs from ἐκ λυθῆσεται || תרפינה in 13:7.

λυσῆσεται seems a plus by the translator, who has already rendered וחשש with יסב.

On ὥς χνοῦς || כמק see the discussion of κοινορτός || מק in 3:24.

οὐ ... ἠθέλησαν || מאסו is another example of the translator's penchant to translate מאס by a negated verb of "willing" (see the comments at 1:20).

Old Greek's underscoring of the contrast via ἀλλὰ τὸ λόγιον || ואת אמרת parallels ἀλλὰ κραυγή || והנה צעקה in 5:7 and recalls its supply of ἀλλὰ νῦν at the outset of 3:13.

47. ἀνθραξ renders גחל in 44:19; 47:14, as elsewhere in the Bible (e.g., Lev 16:12; 2 Kgdms 14:7; 22:9, 13).

48. Cf. 6:6, where ἀνθρακα || רצפה is a guess befitting the context, as is likely the case also for ἀνθρακα τὸν λίθον σου || בפוך אבניך in 54:11.

49. φλόξ is a common equivalent for להבה (cf. 13:8; 29:6; 30:30; 43:2; 47:14), and ἀνίημι || רפה occurs elsewhere (e.g., Deut 31:6, 8; Judg 8:3; 1 Sam 11:3), including χεῖρες ἀνειμέναι || ידים רפות in Isa 35:3.

5:25

Old Greek's use of a broad range of conjunctions (see Troxel, 91–93) is epitomized in its choices from the end of 5:24 to the beginning of 5:26: ἀλλὰ τὸ λόγιον || ואת אמרת ... καὶ ἐθυμώθη || על בן חרה ... ἀλλ' ἔτι || ועוד ... τοιγαροῦν ἀρεῖ || ונשא. For OG's καὶ || על בן (4Q56), see the comments on καὶ || לכן in 5:14.

Old Greek's +σαβαωθ parallels the apparent reading of 4Q56, where a supralinear צ is visible just after יהוה, on the edge of a lacuna. No other witness attests this plus, but OG's tendency to omit an equivalent for צבאות (see the comments at 8:13) makes it more likely that צבאות stood in its *Vorlage* than that it inserted σαβαωθ.

Although ἐθυμώθη ὀργῇ κύριος accords with MT's חרה אף יהוה, the use of κύριος in the nominative case and ὀργῇ in the dative contrasts with the translator's typical inflection of ὀργῇ in the nominative or accusative (cf. 7:4; 9:18[19]; 13:13; 26:20; 42:25; 59:19). On the other hand, it agrees with the regular structure of equivalents for חרה אף יהוה from the Pentateuch through 4 Kingdoms (e.g., Exod 4:14; Num 32:10).⁵⁰

Although OG and S provide an equivalent for נטויה here and most subsequent instances of ידו נטויה (ἡ χεὶρ ὑψηλή/כַּיָּד 16, 20; 10:4), only S invokes “height” in rendering ויט ידו with יָסַם (OG καὶ ἐπέβαλε τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ).⁵¹ Although they use similar semantics for וזאת הגוים in 14:26 (καὶ αὕτη ἡ χεὶρ ἡ ὑψηλή/כַּיָּד 16, 20; 10:4) and וידו הנטויה in 14:27 (καὶ τὴν χεῖρα τὴν ὑψηλήν/כַּיָּד 16, 20; 10:4), their renderings in 23:11 differ: ἡ δὲ χεὶρ σου οὐκέτι ἰσχύει κατὰ θάλασσαν/כַּיָּד 16, 20; 10:4. Only S uses a stereotypical equivalent for נטה when associated with יד. Given how frequently נטה occurs in Isaiah (twenty-seven times) and the varied equivalents for it when not associated with יד (e.g., καὶ ἐπιβληθήσεται/כַּיָּד 16, 20; 10:4, 34:11; εἰσάκουσον κύριε/כַּיָּד 16, 20; 10:4, 37:17; ὁ στήσας ὡς καμάραν τὸν οὐρανόν/כַּיָּד 16, 20; 10:4, 40:22), their occasional shared use of “height” in metaphors about the LORD's hand is likely coincidental rather than a sign of S consulting OG.

50. Even when different phrasing is used, it is never ἐθυμώθη/ὠργίσθη + ὀργῇ κύριος (e.g., καὶ κύριος ἐθυμώθη εἰς τὸν λαόν || וזאת חרה יהוה בעם, Num 11:33; καὶ ὀργῇ θυμοῦ κυρίου ἐπ' αὐτοῖς || ויחר אף יהוה בם, 12:9).

51. Cf. καὶ ἐπὶ κοίτην ἐκαγώνων ἀσπίδων τὴν χεῖρα ἐπιβαλεῖ || ועל מאורת צפעוני גמול || ויחר אף יהוה בם, 12:9. ידו versus כַּיָּד 16, 20; 10:4 in 11:8.

Old Greek and S both explicitize the collective semantics of בעמו in rendering עליו ויכהו: ἐπ' αὐτοὺς καὶ ἐπάταξεν αὐτούς/ܥܠܝܘܐܝܗܘܝܚܝܚܝܐ.

For καὶ παρωξύνθη || וירגזו, compare 14:16; 23:11.

Old Greek's grammatically singular ὁδοῦ || חוצות accords with its ἐπ' ἄκρου πάσης ἐξόδου || בראש כל חוצות in 51:20, the only other place where חוצות is translated with a semantically apt noun (cf. τὰς πόλεις || חוצות, 10:6; πανταχῇ || בחוצות, 24:11).

Old Greek and S translate בכל זאת as grammatically plural here (ἐπὶ τούτοις πᾶσιν/ܥܠ ܡܢ ܕܝܗܘܐ) and in the other appearances of this phrase (9:11, 16, 20; 10:4). In this case the plural accords with the multiple acts of judgment in the preceding clauses.

5:26

τοιγαροῦν appears again in Greek translations of books in the Hebrew Bible only in Prov 1:26 (τοιγαροῦν ἀγῶ || גם אני) and 31 (τοιγαροῦν ἔδονται || ויאכלו); Job 22:10 (τοιγαροῦν || על כן); and 24:22 (τοιγαροῦν οὐ μὴ πιστεύσῃ || ולא יאמין). Here it strongly links the pronouncement that the Kyrios's hand remains high to the summons of a group outside Israel's borders.

The prepositional phrase in ἀρεῖ σύσσημον ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν τοῖς μακράν || ונשא נס לגוים מרחוק, contrasted with καὶ συριεῖ αὐτοῖς ἀπ' ἄκρου τῆς γῆς || ושרק לו מקצה הארץ, is distinctive, particularly by comparison with the similar phrases of 11:12 (καὶ ἀρεῖ σημεῖον εἰς τὰ ἔθνη || ונשא נס לגוים), 49:22 (αἶρω εἰς τὰ ἔθνη ἡνὶ χεῖρά μου καὶ εἰς τὰς νήσους ἀρῶ σύσσημόν μου || אשא אשא ארים נסי), and 62:10 (ἐξάρατε σύσσημον εἰς τὰ ἔθνη || (הרימו נס על העמים). Given the lack of a clear motivation for the translator to render לגוים with ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι, OG's *Vorlage* might have read בגוים.

τοῖς μακράν || מרחוק (modifying ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι) is an ad hoc rendering, much like the renderings of מרחוק in βουλῇν ἀρχαίαν ἀληθινήν || עצות מרחוק (25:1) and διὰ χρόνου πολλοῦ στήσεται || מרחוק יהוה (49:1).

Old Greek's and S's grammatical plurals αὐτοῖς/ܗܘܢ || לו are more likely assimilations to לגוים (ל) than attestations of להם, especially in light of ἔρχονται/ܠܝܒܘ || יבוא at the end of the sentence and the shifts to grammatically plural forms in 5:27.

ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ || יבוא קל מהרה lacks an equivalent for הנה, which is attested by OG (καὶ ἰδού). Although S regularly translates clause-initial הנה, it frequently has no equivalent for it midsentence (see above, 5:7).

5:27

Old Greek and S adopt parallel strategies. They render אִין + participle and לֹא + finite verb with a negative particle + a finite verb, each in the future tense.⁵² They also translate נִפְתַּח with an active verb (λύσουςι/نفسه) — more likely conforming the grammatical number to the preceding verbs than reading פָּתַחוּ — while retaining the passive voice of נִתְק (ῥαγῶσιν/نفسه) (soldiers breaking their own sandal thongs would be inconceivable). And both render the suffix of חֲלָצִיו with a plural pronoun (τῆς ὀσφύος αὐτῶν/نفسه). The lack of an equivalent for בּוּ in either version is likely because it would disrupt symmetry. Each of these renderings is a reasonable adaptation of the source text, given the choices each made in 5:26.

Old Greek and S differ only in their rendering of אֲזוּר חֲלָצִיו. Syriac gives نفسه, while OG's equivalent is expansive: τὰς ζώνας αὐτῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ὀσφύος αὐτῶν. Not only does retroversion to מַחֲלָצִיו create an unlikely Hebrew phrase, but the same type of difference appears in 11:5, where S renders אֲזוּר מִתְּנִי צֶדֶק אֲזוּר וְהָיָה צֶדֶק with نفسه, whereas OG reads καὶ ἔσται δικαιοσύνη ἐξωσμένος τὴν ὀσφὺν αὐτοῦ (cf. 3:24). Syriac's use of نفسه versus circumlocutions in OG appears also in Ezek 9:2, 3; Ps 109:19; Prov 31:24. Old Greek never uses an equivalent of the sort ἡ ζώνη τῆς ὀσφύος.

5:28

Old Greek and S conform the 3ms pronominal suffixes to the plural pronouns, extending choices each made already in 5:26, 27.

Whereas OG renders אֲשֶׁר with ὃν (τὰ βέλη ὃξεῖά ἐστι), S elides it (نفسه), creating an asyndetic independent clause (contrast نفسه || שאגה לו, 5:29). This seems part of S's decision about how to structure 5:27–29, on which see 5:29. The absence of the relative pronoun marks more clearly the shift from the soldiers' behavior and dress to descriptions of appurtenances. On the other hand, +waw in نفسه || שאגה לו at the outset of 5:29 links the similes describing their weapons at the end of 5:28 with the comparison to lions.

52. κοπιάσουσιν and نفسه are regular equivalents for כָּשַׁל in the respective translations (κοπιάω, 31:3; 63:13; نفسه, 3:8; 8:15). S's نفسه || עִיף matches its equivalents in 8:23; 28:12.

מַחֲכֵה || מַחֲכֵה is echoed in מַחֲכֵה || מַחֲכֵה in 21:15, while OG's ἐντεταμένα is similar to its choice of τῶν διατεταμένων for דְּרוּכָה in 21:15. στερεὰ πέτρα (|| כְּצֵר, read as כְּצֵר) is the equivalent for צֵר in 2:21, צֹר in 51:1, and חֲלָמִישׁ in 50:7. Similarly, מַחֲכֵה renders צֵר in 2:21 and צֹר in 2:10; 8:14; 48:21.

Both OG and S lack an equivalent for כָּל (before קִשְׁתֵּי), which is attested by 1QIsa^a, V, and T. Although S might have passed over כָּל to enhance symmetry, as he seems to have done with בּוֹ and אֲשֶׁר, rendering כָּל would not have created awkwardness in the target language that an equivalent for בּוֹ would have after מַחֲכֵה. Nevertheless, we lack sufficient information to judge whether S elided כָּל or if its *Vorlage* lacked it.

Like S, OG enforces regularity on verbal forms and pronominal suffixes in 5:27 and lacks an equivalent for בּוֹ, which would likely have been as awkward with its verb (οὐδε κοπιᾶσουσιν || וְאִין כּוֹשֵׁל בּוֹ) as with S's מַחֲכֵה.⁵³ On the other hand, OG represents the initial אֲשֶׁר (ὡς τὰ βέλγη || אֲשֶׁר חֲצִיו), while it explicitizes גִּלְגָּלִי by adding τῶν ἁρμάτων (cf. the association of the deity's chariots with סוּפָה in 66:15's καὶ ὡς καταγίγξ τὰ ἅρματα αὐτοῦ || וְכִסּוּפָה מְרַכְבֵּתִי). It is not clear, however, that its lack of an equivalent for כָּל embodies a desire to rectify an imbalance between חֲצִיו and שְׁנוֹנִים and קִשְׁתֵּי דְּרוּכָה (pace Van der Vorm-Croughs, 73–74), since elsewhere OG allows such an imbalance to stand (see appendix A). As in the case of S, we have too little information to render judgment.

5:29

שֶׁאֵג and שֶׁאֵג appear only here in Isaiah. ὁρμῶσιν utilizes the most frequent equivalent for שֶׁאֵג in the Greek Bible (Judg 14:5; Jer 2:15; Ezek 22:25; Hos 11:10; Zeph 3:3; 11:3; Pss 21[22]:14; 37[38]:9; 103[104]:21).⁵⁴ Although καὶ παρέστηκαν || וְשֶׁאֵג is remarkable, ἅμα ὡς λέοντες ἐξηγέρθησαν καὶ ὡς σκύμνοι λεόντων || כְּגִוִּי אֲרִיֹת in Jer 28(51):38 likewise intuitively compares lions' movements (even though ὠρύντο renders שֶׁאֵג in Jer 2:15). Following οἱ τροχοὶ τῶν ἁρμάτων αὐτῶν, the Isaiah

53. κοπιᾶω renders כֹּשֵׁל again in 31:3; 63:13.

54. Its nominal cognate appears in Ezek 19:7: ὠρμάτος αὐτοῦ || שֶׁאֵגוֹ. Among the less frequent equivalents, ἐρεῦγομαι “I declare” renders שֶׁאֵג in Hos 11:10; Amos 3:4, 8; χρηματίζω renders it twice in Jer 32[25]:30, while other verbs for speaking occur singly: ἀνακεκράξω (Joel 4:16); κρᾶζω (Ps 31[32]:3); φθέγγομαι (Amos 1:2); ἐγκαυχάομαι (Ps 73[74]:4); and βόᾶω (Job 37:4, subasterisk).

translator appears to have perceived the swift arrival of lions as an essential point of comparison.

καὶ βοήσεται || וינהם is identical to the rendering at the outset of 5:30, although here the translator (most likely) transposes καὶ βοήσεται with καὶ ἐπιλήμψεται (|| ויאחז) to reflect the typical order of behavior.

Regardless of whether מַסַּם reflects יִשְׁאֵג (MT's *qere*) or harmonizes it with וינהם, it places the latter verb in a relative clause: || סַּםִּי מַסַּםִּי וְיִנְהֵם || ככפירים וינהם. In fact, its +*waw* (סַּםִּי)—in contrast to its apparent elision of אֲשֶׁר in 5:28—together with its reformulation of וינהם as סַּםִּי מַסַּםִּי as סַּםִּי מַסַּםִּי, make it a closer parallel to אֲשֶׁר מַסַּםִּי, not least through use of grammatically singular מַסַּםִּי in each clause.

The distinctive features of S noted since 5:27 create a clear structure. Following the report of the nations' response to the divine summons (5:26), 5:27 begins a characterization of the approaching horde to which S gives tighter unity by its regularized use of 3mp imperfect verbs, its consistent rendering of 3ms singular pronominal suffixes as grammatically plural, and its elision of בּוּ (5:27) and אֲשֶׁר (5:28) that would otherwise disrupt the symmetry. The list culminates in the parallel clauses אֲשֶׁר מַסַּםִּי מַסַּםִּי, including the translation of ככפירים as grammatically singular (מַסַּםִּי) to coordinate with אֲשֶׁר (מַסַּםִּי) and the rendering of the *waw* of וינהם with the relative pronoun (מַסַּםִּי).

5:30

סַּםִּי is likely a substitution for ונהם (cf. סַּםִּי סַּםִּי in 5:7 and the apparent replacement of הנה with the explanatory particle in 5:26: סַּםִּי סַּםִּי סַּםִּי). (והנה מהרה קל יבוא || ,סַּםִּי סַּםִּי סַּםִּי) is a *hapax legomenon*, unfamiliarity with which might have prompted the choice of סַּםִּי סַּםִּי as a parallel to סַּםִּי.

Syriac renders the 3fs suffix of סַּםִּי in the 3mp, agreeing with סַּםִּי and עליו || סַּםִּי, conforming the referents to the plural סַּםִּי in 5:26, as it has every pronoun after that. Old Greek does the same with δι' αὐτούς || עליו; καὶ ἐμβλέψονται || ונבט; and ἐν τῇ ἀπορίᾳ αὐτῶν || בערפיה.

Although ὡς φωνή || כנהמת is consistent with καὶ βοήσεται || וינהם, the conjoined θαλάσσης κυμαίνουσης || ים closely resembles ὡς θάλασσα κυμαίνουσα || כהמות ימים in 17:12.⁵⁵ ἡ πόλις βοώντων || עיר הומיה in 22:2

55. The only other instance of נהמה in the book is translated with στενάζω (ὡς

is reminiscent of καὶ βοήσεται || יינהם, suggesting that ὡς φωνὴ θαλάσσης κυμαίνουσας || כנהמת ים might entail a double rendering of כנהמת, perhaps due to the frequent association of noise with waves (κύματα), as in 51:15 (cf. Ps 65[64]:8).⁵⁶

ἐν τῇ ἀπορίᾳ αὐτῶν || בערפיה, while doubtless a guess for the *hapax legomenon*, is just as surely coordinated with 8:22

והנה צרה וחשכה	καὶ ἰδοὺ θλίψεις καὶ στενοχωρία καὶ σκότος
מעוף צוקה ואפלה	ἀπορία στενὴ καὶ σκότος

Ziegler (138) considered the lack of an equivalent for ואור חשך evidence that it was absent from OG's *Vorlage*, since "es wäre ja auffallend, wenn sie diese bekannten Wörter gelesen, aber nicht übersetzt hätte." He infers that they are probably "eine Glosse, die dasselbe wie 8,23a besagen will: 'aber Licht wird die Finsternis' (also das Gegenteil von MT)."⁵⁷ However, Ziegler's conviction that the translator would have translated ואור חשך if present in his *Vorlage* overlooks the translator's tendency to omit repeated words or synonyms (חשך) and omit words difficult to integrate (אור). Thus, the lack of an equivalent seems weak grounds on which to judge the words absent from the *Vorlage*. ואור חשך is attested by 1QIsa^a, S, and V (T is too paraphrastic to permit perception of its *Vorlage*).

ἀποθνήσκοντες στενάζουσιν || כמתים [end of 59:10 and start of 5:11]), while equivalents for המתה are ἡχέω (16:11; 51:15); and βοάω (22:2).

56. Although φωνὴ αὐτοῦ ὡς θάλασσα κυμαίνουσα || יהמה כים קולם in Jer 6:23 is reminiscent of Isa 5:30, κυμαίνω is used frequently in descriptions of the sea throughout Greek literature, from Homer on (see LSJ and GELS, s.v. "κυμαίνω"), vacating suspicion of dependence of OG-Jeremiah on OG-Isaiah. Certainly ὡς ποταμοὶ κυμαίνουσιν ὕδωρ || כנהרות יתגעשו מימיו in Jer 26[46]:7 is explicable without that hypothesis.

57. If it is a secondary insertion, MT's vocalization (ואור חשך) might rightly see it as correlative to 8:22–9:1, where the reverse process occurs.

ISAIAH 6

6:1

καὶ ἐγένετο (> MT) most frequently renders ויהי (7:1; 12:2; 36:1; 37:1; 38:4; 48:19; 63:8).¹ We might suspect that the translator himself supplied καὶ ἐγένετο to introduce the genitive τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ, if it were not for 14:28 (τοῦ ἔτους οὗ ἀπέθανεν Ἀχαζ ὁ βασιλεύς || בשנת מות המלך אחז) and 20:1 (τοῦ ἔτους οὗ εἰσῆλθε Ταναθαν εἰς Ἀζωτον || בשנת בא תרתן אשדודה), where a genitive noun serves as a clause-initial temporal phrase. In that light, and given OG's regular use of καὶ ἐγένετο for ויהי, as well as the rarity of +καὶ ἐγένετο, OG's *Vorlage* likely read ויהי בשנת מות המלך עזיהו, a scribe having supplied ויהי to conform the phrase to the typical construction for a temporal clause (cf. 7:1).

For the translator's reformulation of a construct phrase with a relative clause here (τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ οὗ ἀπέθανεν Οὔζιας || בשנת מות המלך עזיהו) in 14:28; and in 20:1, see the examples Van der Vorm-Croughs (105) cites from elsewhere in OG-Isaiah. For the order Οὔζιας ὁ βασιλεύς || המלך עזיהו, compare Ἀχαζ ὁ βασιλεύς || אחז המלך in 14:28, both of which reflect the more common order (e.g., 7:1; 8:6), although this might already have been effected in the OG's *Vorlage* in each place.

As an equivalent for מות, S employs a relative pronoun + *peal* 3ms perfect, והוא. Its והוא || והוא omits the *waw* apodosis in accord with target language norms.

1. Conversely, ויהי is rendered with καὶ ἔσται in 9:18; καὶ ἔσονται in 22:7; ἐγένετο ἄν in 48:18 (irreal apodosis); and ויהי הוא משתחוה in 37:38 is reformulated as καὶ ἐν τῷ αὐτὸν προσκυνεῖν. In 42:22 καὶ ἐγένετο aligns with והוא: (καὶ εἶδον) καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ λαὸς πεπρονομευμένος καὶ διηρασμένος || והוא עם בזוז ושסוי. OG's nearly uniform rendering of ויהי with καὶ ἔσται undercuts positing that its *Vorlage* read והיה for והוא. Notably, καὶ ἐγένετο there joins with καὶ εἶδον, continuing the clause, and is thus probably a substitute for והוא.

|| ܨܫܐ suggests that the translator understood ܨܫܐ as nominal, “a lifting.”² || ܨܫܐ is the equivalent for ܨܫܐ elsewhere in S (e.g., 1:14; 2:4, 12). The translation of the initial *waw* of ܨܫܐ with *dālat* (ܐܢܝܐ) is comparable to || ܨܫܐ || ܨܫܐ in 5:29. Although *dālat* there functions as a relative pronoun, both instances reformulate syntactic relationships.

It seems less likely that || ܨܫܐ attests ܨܫܐ than that the pronominal suffix conveys the force of articular ܨܫܐ as anaphorically referring to ܨܫܐ.

ܨܫܐ || ܨܫܐ harmonizes with ܨܫܐ || ܨܫܐ in 6:3 (cf. T’s ܨܫܐ || ܨܫܐ, parallel to ܨܫܐ || ܨܫܐ in 6:3). ܨܫܐ might well have been unfamiliar to the translator, as suggested by comparison with ܨܫܐ || ܨܫܐ in Jer 13:22, 26; Nah 3:5; and ܨܫܐ || ܨܫܐ in Lam 1:9. Regarding the translator’s interest in the theme of ܨܫܐ, see Troxel, 128–31.

6:2

Although S’s || ܨܫܐ fittingly renders the spatial relationship in ܨܫܐ, OG renders this with || ܨܫܐ, even though OG’s || ܨܫܐ in 14:13; and || ܨܫܐ in 45:8 show that the translator comprehended the construction. Wildberger is likely justified in speculating that “it would not set well with the translator that the seraphim should be standing *over* their divine Lord.”³ Although it is possible that a scribe had already replaced ܨܫܐ with ܨܫܐ from a similar motivation, no such reading survives in any witness.

Both S and OG modify the repeated ܨܫܐ: S by repeating only the numeral (ܨܫܐ), as is typical of distributive expressions in Syriac (Nöldeke §240); OG does so by adding ܨܫܐ to each phrase (ܨܫܐ || ܨܫܐ).

Syriac’s || ܨܫܐ explicitizes the implied partitive in ܨܫܐ, at the same time that it modifies the grammatical number of the participles to plural:

2. This translator’s renderings are not sufficiently stereotypical to assume that his *Vorlage* read ܨܫܐ, as Warszawski (18) proposes.

3. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12*, 249.

ܩܬܝܒ, ܡܚܝܬܐ, ܡܚܝܬܐ. Old Greek also explicitizes the plurality of seraphim via grammatically plural verbs: κατεκάλυπτον, κατεκάλυπτον, ἐπέταντο.

6:3

Old Greek and S render וקרא with grammatically plural forms (καὶ ἐκέκραγον/ܩܬܝܒ), consistent with their modification of verbs in 6:2. 1QIsa^a's וקראים likely attests a similar harmonization with the plural implicit in זה אל זה.⁴ On the other hand, although OG also modifies ואמר to a grammatically plural form (καὶ ἔλεγον), S renders it with grammatically singular ܐܡܪ, implicitly assigning the words to one seraph at a time.

The punctuation of MS 7a1 carries a distinctive phrasing of קדוש קדוש קדוש, placing a break after the second קדוש: ܩܕܝܫ ܩܕܝܫ ܩܕܝܫ.

6:4

καὶ ἐπήρθη (|| וינעו) might attest a form of נשא, an equivalent found in 6:1 (καὶ ἐπηρμένους || ונשא), since ἐπαίρω appears only in these verses within the book. Old Greek renders נע elsewhere with ἐξίστημι (7:2^[1]); σαλεύω (7:2^[2]; 19:1); κλίνω (24:20^[1]); σείω (24:20^[2]); and κινέω (37:22) (it gives no equivalent for נעו in 29:9). Although Goshen-Gottstein (כב) deflects the conclusion that OG reads נשא by suggesting that καὶ ἐπήρθη is exegetically related to Ps 23(24):7 (ἄρατε πύλας || שאו שערים), it is not clear what would trigger such an association. Neither does καὶ ἐπήρθη seem a likely semantic substitute for וינעו, since σαλεύω, κλίνω, σείω, or κινέω would fit the sense well. Old Greek's *Vorlage* likely read either וישאו or ונשא.

ܐܡܘܬ ܕܠܝܬܐ, “the lintels of the gates” is an intelligible rendering of אמות הספים, although its quantitatively matched equivalent differs from OG's single term, τὸ ὑπέρθυρον, one of nine times when OG uses a compound Greek word to translate two or more Hebrew words.⁵ Syriac uses ܐܡܘܬ ܕܠܝܬܐ in Judg 19:27; 1 Kgs 14:17; 2 Kgs 12:10; 22:4; 23:4; 25:18 et passim.

Old Greek's ἤς ἐκέκραγον || הקורא extends its shift of verbal forms into the grammatical plural that began in 6:2–3, whereas S reads ܩܪܐ, in concert with its shift from plural verb forms to singular that began with וינעו || earlier in the verse.

4. 1QIsa^a also lacks ואמר, as well as one instance of קדוש.

5. Emanuel Tov, “Compound Words in the LXX Representing Two or More Hebrew Words,” *Bib* 58 (1977): 206–12.

6:5

Although *τάλας* frequently occurs in laments in works composed in Greek (see 4 Macc 8:17; 12:4; Wisd 15:14), it appears only here in translations from Hebrew, reflecting the translator's concern for acceptability in the target language.

אֱלֹהִים || נְדָמִיתִי has a parallel in 15:1, where אֱלֹהִים renders the second instance of נְדָמָה in the verse (אֱלֹהִים translates the first). *κατανένυγμαי* || נְדָמִיתִי is unparalleled among equivalents for נְדָמָה elsewhere in the Bible, which are either *ὁμοιόω* (Hos 4:5, 6; Zeph 1:1; Ps 48[49]:13, 21) or *ἀπορίπτω* (Hos 10:7, 15; Obad 1:5). On the other hand, *κατανενυγμένη* || דּוֹמָם in 47:5 and instances of *κατανύσσομαι* || דָּמָם elsewhere (Lev 10:3; Pss 4:5; 29[30]:13; 35[36]:15) parallel the translator's use of *κατανένυγμαי* || נְדָמִיתִי here.⁶

Although S translates the first occurrence of שִׁפְתַּי טָמֵא precisely with *ἡλικὸς ὤλεθ*, its translation of the second occurrence with *ἡλικὸς ὤλεθ* correlates with the distinction between *ἡλικὸς* as modifier of *ἡλικὸς* and the relative clause *ὅτι ὤλεθ*, whose 3ms pronominal suffix is anaphoric to *ἡλικὸς*. They differ in whether “unclean” modifies the person (*ἡλικὸς*) or the lips (*ὤλεθ*), ultimately a rather subtle difference.

Old Greek, on the other hand, pairs its equivalent for each instance of טָמֵא closely with *χείλη*. In the first case it creates two independent participial phrases: *ἄνθρωπος ὢν καὶ ἀκάθαρτα χεῖλη ἔχων*. In the second, it gives a single clause in which *ἀκάθαρτα χεῖλη ἔχοντος* modifies *λαοῦ*.

The insertion of *ὢν*, *ἔχων*, and *ἔχοντος* in each case surpasses adequacy. The *ὅτι* preceding *ἄνθρωπος* (|| *כִּי אִישׁ*) introduces the reason for his peril. The insertion of *ὢν καί* and the substitution of *ἔχων* for a pronominal equivalent to *אֲנִי*⁽²⁾ create two circumstantial clauses. Even though the central predication (*ἐγὼ οἰκῶ*) is about where he lives, defined in terms of people who also “have unclean lips” (*ἔχοντος* modifying *λαοῦ*), the speaker's description of himself is the focus. The circumstantial participles highlight his predicament as his humanity: “since I am a man and have unclean lips.”

Similarly, his rendering of *עֵינִי* with the instrumental case shifts it from subject to a utility of the speaker: *εἶδον τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς μου. καί* (|| *כִּי*) at the outset of that clause, followed by *εἶδον*, places this assertion on the same plane as the first, allowing the inference that the problem with seeing

6. Regarding the absence of a rendering of נְדָמָה in 15:1; 23:1, 14, see appendix C.

the Kyrios is inherent in being a corrupt human. Whatever the translator's conception of "unclean lips," his sentence structure conveys a notion that innate corruption separates humanity from the deity, over against the assumption of the Hebrew that Isaiah's lips must be purified to speak in the divine council.

Syriac likewise translates the third כִּי with a simple conjunction but renders *ḥt* as the subject of the clause.⁷ For S, having unclean lips and living amid people in the same state is a predicament, but seeing the Lord in S is not as clearly infused with the dire anthropology implied by OG.

6:6

Even if *καὶ ἀπεστάλη* would typically betoken a form such as *וּשְׁלַח* (cf. 6:8; 9:7) in place of *וַיַּעַר*, it seems likely that the translator inferred from the seraphims' role as divine attendants that the Kyrios's dispatch of the seraph was implied.

Old Greek supplies *εἰχεν* as part of its reformulation of the relationship of *רַצְפָּה* and *וּבִידוֹ* for the target language, including its rendering of *בְּמַלְאָכָיו* as a relative clause modifying *רַצְפָּה*.⁸ Although S's equivalents are transparent to the Hebrew, it reorders them, placing *ܡܠܟܝܐ* after *ܕܪܥܦܐ* and postponing *ܕܒܝܕܐ* to the end. This proved necessary when he considered *וּבִידוֹ* the beginning of a new clause rather than a circumstantial clause modifying what precedes it.

6:7

Syriac supplies *ܕܥܡܐ* as indirect object to *ܕܥܡܐ*, as he will again in 6:9. He has a penchant for explicitizing the indirect object with verbs of speaking (cf. 3:6; 4:1).

Syriac translates both instances of *נָגַע* as transitive, employing the *pacl* of *ܡܢܝܐ*, as in 5:8. The translator's rendering of *וְהָיָה נֹגַע זֶה עַל שְׁפָתֶיךָ* with *ܡܢܝܐ ܕܥܡܐ ܕܥܡܐ ܕܥܡܐ* makes clear that the seraph is the subject of *ܡܢܝܐ*,

7. The relationship between the clauses expressed by *כִּי* was likely as obscure to OG and S as it often has been to subsequent interpreters, so that their common simple conjunction unlikely reflects a variant.

8. The translator elsewhere reformulates asyndetic relationships via a relative clause that creates hypotaxis (e.g., 1:21; 7:20). For a catalog of cases, see Van der Vorm-Croughs, 102–3.

since the 1cs form identifies the speaker with the subject of ܡܢܝܢ. This is doubtless attributable to the translator, since retroversion of ܡܢܝܢ would produce ܡܢܝܢ, which is graphically distant from ܡܢܝܢ.

Conversely, although one might assume that the subject of ܡܢܝܢ is the seraph, with ܡܢܝܢ the implied object, the following ܡܢܝܢ ܡܢܝܢ ܡܢܝܢ suggests that ܡܢܝܢ is subject. That inference is supported by ܡܢܝܢ and ܡܢܝܢ later in the seraph's utterance.

For ܡܢܝܢ || ܡܢܝܢ compare ܡܢܝܢ ܡܢܝܢ ܡܢܝܢ ܡܢܝܢ || ܡܢܝܢ in 47:11. Its prior ܡܢܝܢ ܡܢܝܢ || ܡܢܝܢ employs a lexeme it uses for ܡܢܝܢ in 27:9; 28:18, while manipulating transitivity (cf. ܡܢܝܢ || ܡܢܝܢ, 7:17), as happens frequently in the book (Seeligmann, 56).

The contrast in grammatical number between OG's ܡܢܝܢ ܡܢܝܢ ܡܢܝܢ and S's ܡܢܝܢ ܡܢܝܢ ܡܢܝܢ (|| ܡܢܝܢ ܡܢܝܢ) suggests that S renders ܡܢܝܢ precisely, whereas ܡܢܝܢ ܡܢܝܢ ܡܢܝܢ is a shift by the translator to match the grammatical number of ܡܢܝܢ ܡܢܝܢ ܡܢܝܢ (cf. ܡܢܝܢ ܡܢܝܢ in 1QIsa^a, whereas its ܡܢܝܢ agrees in grammatical number with MT). As noted at 5:18, OG and S frequently render grammatically singular forms of ܡܢܝܢ and ܡܢܝܢ with grammatically plural nouns. Their renderings of ܡܢܝܢ, whether as an independent noun (e.g., ܡܢܝܢ ܡܢܝܢ || ܡܢܝܢ ܡܢܝܢ, 30:1) or with pronominal suffixes (e.g., ܡܢܝܢ ܡܢܝܢ ܡܢܝܢ || ܡܢܝܢ ܡܢܝܢ, 27:9), typically agree in grammatical number, while their occasional differences (e.g., ܡܢܝܢ ܡܢܝܢ || ܡܢܝܢ ܡܢܝܢ in 3:9) have to do with whether ܡܢܝܢ is read as grammatically singular or plural.

On the other hand, every instance of ܡܢܝܢ is inflected in the grammatical singular, as it is here, despite being conjoined with ܡܢܝܢ ܡܢܝܢ.⁹ When the translator renders ܡܢܝܢ with a plural noun, he always uses ܡܢܝܢ (ܡܢܝܢ || ܡܢܝܢ, 53:6; ܡܢܝܢ || ܡܢܝܢ, 64:5; ܡܢܝܢ, 64:6; ܡܢܝܢ, 64:8).¹⁰

Syriac's ܡܢܝܢ || ܡܢܝܢ transmutes ܡܢܝܢ into the idea of forgiveness, as it does with ܡܢܝܢ || ܡܢܝܢ in 27:9, whose subject is ܡܢܝܢ (|| ܡܢܝܢ ܡܢܝܢ). This word choice will become especially significant with ܡܢܝܢ || ܡܢܝܢ in 6:10 (q.v.).

9. Although ܡܢܝܢ ܡܢܝܢ ܡܢܝܢ || ܡܢܝܢ ܡܢܝܢ ܡܢܝܢ occurs in 1:25, the parallel phrase ܡܢܝܢ ܡܢܝܢ ܡܢܝܢ || ܡܢܝܢ ܡܢܝܢ ܡܢܝܢ reveals ܡܢܝܢ to be the homonymic adjective, which appears again in 46:8; 53:12.

10. Notably, in 43:24 ܡܢܝܢ || ܡܢܝܢ (OG ܡܢܝܢ ܡܢܝܢ ܡܢܝܢ ܡܢܝܢ) agrees with 1QIsa^a's ܡܢܝܢ (T and V use grammatically plural nouns).

6:8

6:9

6:10

11. Jerome, *Commentaires de Jerome*, 321, my translation.

Like S, OG translates השמן with past tense verbs in the passive voice. لحي draws on a standard equivalent for the idiom of “hardening the heart” in the Pentateuch (Exod 7:22; 9:35; 14:17; 8:11). Old Greek-Pentateuch uses σκληρύνω (Exod 7:22; 9:35; 14:7) or βαρύνω (Exod 8:11) for that idiom, whereas OG-Isaiah’s ἐπαχύνθη seems to rest on semantic analysis of השמן, as confirmed by παχύς || שמנים in 28:1; and supported by ἐπαχύνθη ἀπὸ στέατος || הדשנה מחלב in 34:6.

The conjunction و marks this sentence as explaining 6:9.

Although لحي and حصى could be imperatives or 3ms perfects, more likely, in the wake of لحي, they are zero-termination 3fs perfects. *SyrLex* (s.v. “حصى”) documents instances of the *aphel* of حصى as intransitive, including a case with لحي. *SyrLex* also reports that حصى can be either transitive or intransitive in the *peal*.

Whereas S translates הכבד with a single verb (لحي), OG elaborates the semantics with βαρέως ἤκουσαν.

Old Greek understands העם הזה as the subject of the remaining verbs, whose grammatical number it modifies to explicitate the collective force: ἤκουσαν || הכבד; ἐκάμυσαν || השע; ἰδωσι || יראה; ἀκούσωσι || ישמע¹²; στυγῶσι || יבין; καὶ ἐπιστρέψωσι || ושב. Correlatively, it shifts the grammatical number of the 3ms pronominal suffixes to plural: καὶ τοῖς ὤσιν αὐτῶν || ובאזניו; καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν || ועיניו. Syriac, on the other hand, inflects all forms as grammatically singular.

The equivalents to MT’s ולבבו in OG (καὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ) and S (لحي) accord with בלבבו in 1QIsa^a and ובלבבו in 4Q60. Although this raises the possibility that they found *bet* in their *Vorlagen*, it is equally possible that one or both translators effected the shift to accord with their renderings of ובאזניו and בעיניו.

Despite OG and S’s similar renderings of השמן in the past tense and the passive voice and their similar supply of explanatory γάρ/و, their renderings of verbs in 6:9 suggest that those similarities are coincidental. Old Greek’s future-tense verbs in 6:9 *predict* the people’s difficulty hearing and seeing, owing to the impairment of their hearts, ears, and eyes recounted in 6:10. By contrast, S renders the verbs of 6:9 as imperatives whose accompanying prohibition of gaining “insight” or “knowledge” are explained by 6:10’s description of impaired senses.

12. 1QIsa^a reads ישמעו but has the grammatically singular suffix in בלבבו, while its remaining verbs are conjugated in the singular number.

Equally differentiating OG and S are their equivalents for **ורפא**. Syriac's **ܠܐܫܬܪܦܐ** || **ܠܐܬܚܦܐ** echoes its **ܠܐܬܚܦܐ** || **ܬܚܦܐ** in 6:7 (q.v.), while correlating well with **ܠܐܬܚܦܐ**, and makes a natural complement for **ܠܐ** || **ܠܐ**. Old Greek, on the other hand, renders **ורפא** **לὸ** with **καὶ ἰάσονται αὐτούς**, providing a counterpoint to the people's willful obduracy by stating what the Kyrios would have done for them (with **αὐτούς** || **לὸ** cf. **ἄγιοι κληθήσονται** || **קדוּשׁ** **לὸ** in 4:3).

6:11

Noteworthy for its stylistic awareness is **πόλεις παρὰ τὸ μὴ κατοικεῖσθαι καὶ οἴκοι παρὰ τὸ μὴ εἶναι ἀνθρώπους** || **ערים מאין יושב ובתים מאין אדם**. While using semantically apt equivalents, it conveys elegantly the effects of the parallel clauses in Hebrew, accommodated to Greek grammatical structures.

Although Goshen-Gottstein (כג) explores the possibility that **καταλειφθήσεται** betrays **תשאר** (which he reports stands in one Kennicott manuscript), he astutely compares 24:12, whose **καὶ καταλειφθήσονται πόλεις ἔρημοι καὶ οἴκοι ἐγκαταλειμμένοι ἀπολοῦνται** || **נשאר בעיר שממה** **ושאיה יכת שער** is dependent on this passage (cf. Ziegler, 144–45).

Syriac's **ܠܐܬܪܦܐ** assumes analysis of **שממה** as a verb, to which the translator prefixed a conjunction. Less likely, a *waw* might already have stood in his *Vorlage*, which would have precluded analysis of **שממה** as a predicate adjunct. Old Greek's *Vorlage* apparently read simply **שממה**, which it construed as adjectival: **ἔρημος** (cf. 1:7).

6:12

καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα μακρυνεῖ || **ורחק** is comparable to **+καὶ νῦν** in 2:5, 10; **+διότι νῦν** in 3:8; and **+ἀλλὰ νῦν** in 3:13, as well as cases where **νῦν** + conjunction replaces particles (e.g., **νῦν δὲ εἰς ἄδου** || **אך אל שאול**, 14:15; **καὶ νῦν πῦρ τοὺς ὑπεναντίους ἔδεται** || **אף אש צריך תאכלם**, 26:11). **μετὰ ταῦτα** is the equivalent for **כֵּן אַחֲרֵי** in 1:26 and for **אַחֲרֵי** in 44:6 but inserted by the translator here to explicitize a sequence of actions.

Analyzing **ורבה** as *waw* + verb (cf. **ܠܐܬܪܦܐ**), OG conjugated it in the grammatical plural (**πληθυνθήσονται**), coordinate with **οἱ καταλειφθέντες** || **העוזבה**. Given **τὸ καταλειφθὲν τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ** || **לפליטת ישראל** in 4:2, **τὸ καταλειφθὲν ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ** || **והנותר בירושלם** in 4:3, and **πᾶς ὁ καταλειφθεὶς ἐπὶ τῇς γῆς** || **כל הנותר בקרב הארץ** in 7:22, his choice of the grammati-

cal plural οἱ καταλειφθέντες πλεθυσθήσονται || רבה העזובה must be seen as significant. As Seeligman (116) observed, καὶ οἱ καταλειφθέντες πλεθυσθήσονται renders העזובה not “in its abstract but in its concrete meaning (i.e., the community which was left behind and spared).”

Although Seeligmann (116) detected in this the translator’s “amalgamation of prophetic with contemporaneous expectations regarding the future” having to do with the Egyptian diaspora, and Ziegler (139) observes, “Die Idee des Restes spielt beim Js-Übers. eine große Rolle,” the decision to render both רבה and העזובה with grammatically plural forms was likely simply of a piece with his rendering of אדם with ἀνθρώπους in both 6:11, 12. In fact, articular τοὺς ἀνθρώπους here is most readily understood as anaphoric to ἀνθρώπους in 6:11, whose removal would result in the prolific growth of those remaining. Whatever motivated the rendering of phrases about a remnant elsewhere, the translator’s decisions here seem to derive from this context.

ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς || בקרב הארץ is common in Isaiah (e.g., 5:8; 7:22; 19:24).

6:13

Syriac renders בה ועוד as a noun phrase (ܒܗ ܘܥܘܕ) whose predicate is ܡܚܕܝܬܗ: “Those who remain in it are one-tenth.”¹³ Old Greek, by contrast, retains the adverbial force of ועוד via καὶ ἔτι: “and yet upon it is a tenth.”

εἰς προνομίην || לבער recalls εἰς διαρπαγὴν || לבער in 5:5 and, as there, is part of this translator’s heightened motif of plunder as a form of divine punishment (see the comments at 5:5).

Although ὅταν ἐκπέσῃ is the formal equivalent for בשלכת, its choice is less likely based on perceived semantics than on the translator’s assessment of the source domain of the metaphor as an agrarian image entailing ejection of a seed from its “husk.”¹⁴ βάλανος (|| אלון) likely denotes the acorn rather than the oak tree, since in its only other appearance βάλανος is conjoined with δένδρον to designate the tree (δένδρον βαλάνου Βασαν || אלוני הבשן, 2:13). Accordingly, τῆς θήκης αὐτῆς (likely a guess for מצבת), probably designates the acorn’s outer shell, whose loss makes

13. Although ܡܚܕܝܬܗ appears forty other times in the Bible (never elsewhere in Isaiah), the closest parallel is ܡܚܕܝܬܗ || ועודנו in Jer 40:5.

14. On 1QIsa^a’s משלכת and במה, see Troxel, “Writing a Commentary,” 121, 124–25. For the agrarian image, see Troxel, “Economic Plunder,” 386 n. 53.

it vulnerable, thereby serving as a metaphor for the land's exposure to repeated plundering.¹⁵

Karl Budde's argument that the feminine pronoun in τῆς θήκης αὐτῆς shows that a scribe's eye skipped from מצבתה to מצבת would be compelling if this were a translator who hewed strictly to his *Vorlage*.¹⁶ Not only does this one show a willingness to reformulate clauses and sentences, but he also has a penchant for condensing repeated or synonymous words. Elsewhere he inserts a personal pronoun in the genitive to explicitize the referent or modifies one to suit the context (see Troxel, 138). He might, then, have modified the pronominal suffix in מצבת בם to clarify its antecedent as the feminine noun βάλανος. Thus, his *Vorlage* must remain uncertain.

Although I once judged that **עץ מן הגourd** “which fell from its gourd” betrays reliance on the OG, further consideration reveals that the only significant tie between S and OG is ἐκπέση/**עץ**.¹⁷ Whereas OG employs it in a temporal phrase to modify βάλανος, S prefixes a relative pronoun to **עץ** so that it modifies **הגourd**, to which the “seed” is compared. The preposition “from” (both OG and S) is derivable from **מ(צבת)**. The translators interpret the morphology and semantics distinctly, with each offering a guess for **מ(צבת)**. There is no evidence of collusion.

15. For other interpretations of OG's intent, see Troxel, “Writing a Commentary,” 122.

16. Karl Budde, “Über die Schranken, die Jesajas prophetischer Botschaft zu setzen sind,” ZAW 41 (1923): 167.

17. Troxel, “Writing a Commentary,” 121 n. 91.

ISAIAH 7

7:1

Αχαζ τοῦ Ἰωαθαμ || אַחַז בֶּן יוֹתָם is distinctive, inasmuch as the translator gives an equivalent for בֶּן in τοῦ υἱοῦ Οἷου || בֶּן עֲזִיָּהוּ and καὶ Φακεε υἱὸς Πομελίου || בֶּן רַמְלִיָּהוּ, and does so again in 7:4, 6, and 9, as well as often elsewhere (e.g., 1:1; 2:1; 8:2, 6; 13:1; 20:2). On the other hand, Van der Vorm-Croughs (136) notes that “בֶּן- used in patronyms is now and then not represented in LXX Isaiah,” as in 36:3, 22 (Ελιακιμ ὁ τοῦ Χελκίου || וְיִזְכְּרִיָּה בֶּן חֶלְקִיָּהוּ ... καὶ Ἰωαχ ὁ τοῦ Ἀσαφ || וְיִזְכְּרִיָּה בֶּן אֶסָּף), even though it is rendered again in 37:2, 21; 38:1; and 39:1. Because the use of the genitive case to denote parent-child relationships is common in Greek (Smyth §1301), nothing can be inferred from the lack of an equivalent for בֶּן.

Both OG and S translate לַמְּלַחְמָה with an infinitive (πολεμῆσαι/حَمَلُوكُم). Meanwhile, their 3mp forms ἤδυνήθησαν/لَمَّحُوا || יָכָלוּ parallel יָכָלוּ in 1QIsa^a, although this is a change any tradent might make to force agreement with the plural subject (there is no evident trigger for omission of final *waw*). Compare 7:5, where both OG and S render יַעַן as grammatically plural to coordinate with the subject, whereas 1QIsa^a reads יַעַן, in concord with MT.

All of these changes plausibly evince polygenesis. Indeed, whereas OG uses distinct verbs for לַמְּלַחְמָה and לַהֲלָחֵם (πολεμῆσαι αὐτήν ... πολιορκῆσαι αὐτήν), S uses the same verb, varying equivalents only for the two occurrences of עָלֶיהָ: حَمَلُوكُم ... حَمَلُوكُم.¹

1. The same equivalent occurs in 37:8 (πολιορκοῦντα || נָלַחַם); 37:9 (πολιορκῆσαι || לַהֲלָחֵם). Cf. καὶ ἐπολιόρκει || וַיִּלָּחֶם in Josh 1:29; 10:31, 34.

7:2

וַיִּשָּׁבֶן || and recitative *dālat* (וַיִּשָּׁבֶן) tolerate omission of an explicit equivalent for לאמר.

Syriac's וַיִּשָּׁבֶן || need not evince dependence on OG's συνεφώνησεν, since both are reasonable guesses as to what "rest on" might mean (cf. וַיִּשָּׁבֶן || סִכַּן in Job 22:2, 21).² Compare T's אתחבר.

Whereas S renders both instances of נוע with semantically equivalent נֹעַ, καὶ ἐξέστη ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ || וינע לבבו resolves the metaphor. Old Greek matches equivalents for לבב to the context, often using καρδία when referring metaphorically to the center of one's being (e.g., 1:5; 9:8; 19:1; 32:4; 47:8), ψυχὴ when emotional turmoil is implied (cf. 7:4; 13:7), and διανοία (14:13) or νοῦς (10:7, 12) when it is a matter of mental activity. Although there are cases of καρδία or ψυχὴ that diverge from these uses (e.g., 6:10; 10:7; 49:21; 60:5), the translator seems often to have considered the semantics in choosing an equivalent.

Syriac's ورحب انحل reformulates כנוע עצי יער to meet target language norms, as does OG's ἐν τρόπῳ ὅταν ἐν δρυμῶ ξύλον (ὕπὸ πνεύματος) σαλευθῇ, although the latter speaks of a single tree, perhaps to match the grammatical number of the subject of the simile to ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ, conceived as if a single ψυχὴ.

7:3

Old Greek's and S's translations of אל קצה תעלת הברכה construe קצה differently. πρὸς τὴν κολυμβήθραν emphasizes the end point of their travel, while וַיִּשָּׁבֶן || מקצהו, 56:11). (cf. וַיִּשָּׁבֶן || מקצהו, 56:11).

Whereas וַיִּשָּׁבֶן analyzes העליונה as modifying הברכה, so that וַיִּשָּׁבֶן is the identifying mark of the pool, τῇς ἁγῆς ὁδοῦ associates העליונה with אל מסלת, making it the distinguishing characteristic of this road. Meanwhile, S's rendering of אל with a relative pronoun and preposition bēth (בְּ) || (אל מסלת שדה כובס || בְּהֵת מַסְלַת שְׂדֵה כּוּבֶס) specifies the location of the pool.

2. Cf. πάντες οὗτοι συνεφώνησαν || כל אלה חברו in Gen 14:3, for which S reads וַיִּשָּׁבֶן || וַיִּשָּׁבֶן.

7:4

Although *καὶ ἐρεῖς* accurately reflects the morphology of *ואמר*, S captures its function via an imperative (*ⲉⲣⲉⲓ*), following the imperative *ⲡⲉⲙ ⲉⲣⲉⲓ* in 7:3.

Old Greek's resolution of the syndetic imperatives *השמר והשקט* into *φύλαξαι τοῦ ἡσυχάσαι* creates subordination, in accord with target language norms.

Although S's translation of *רכבה* with the cognate *ⲕⲁⲃⲁ* in 1:6 suggests familiarity with the semantics of *יך*, the rendering of *אל יך לבב* with *ⲁⲗ ⲓⲕ ⲙⲁⲃⲁ* in Deut 20:3; Jer 51:46; and 2 Chr 34:27 (cf. 2 Kgs 22:19) suggests a less precise grasp of the verb's meaning, so that *ⲁⲗ ⲓⲕ* likely reflects the translator's estimate of its semantics in this context.³ Following the prohibition of fear, he finds a command against being dumbfounded.

Old Greek's *ἀπὸ τῶν δύο ξύλων τῶν δαλῶν τῶν καπνιζομένων τούτων* follows the word order of *משני זנבות האודים העשנים האלה* but substitutes *ξύλων* for *זנבות* (a choice likely based on context), perhaps out of perplexity over what "tails" might mean (cf. *οὐράν* || *זנב* in 19:14, 15). Syriac, on the other hand, translates *זנבות* with an appropriate semantic equivalent but alters the word order: *ⲙⲉ ⲉⲥⲁⲣⲉ ⲙⲉⲧⲁⲗⲁ ⲁⲩⲉⲓ ⲙⲉⲥⲧⲁ*. The shift of *ⲉⲥⲁⲣⲉ* || *האלה* to the front of the clause makes clear that *ⲁⲩⲉⲓ ⲙⲉⲥⲧⲁ* is appositional to *ⲙⲉⲧⲁⲗⲁ*. There is no reason to attribute this word order to anyone but the translator, who appears to have had difficulty understanding the sentence.

Syriac renders every occurrence of nominal *עשן* with *ⲙⲁ* (4:5; 6:4; 9:17; 14:31; 34:10; 51:6; 65:5). Syriac's only recognition of verbal forms are in Gen 15:17; Exod 20:18, where it uses a participial form (masculine singular absolute) of *ⲉⲃⲉ*. The use of *ⲙⲉⲥⲧⲁ* "burning" here was likely extrapolated from "smoke."

Although OG's *ὅταν γὰρ ὁργῇ τοῦ θυμοῦ μου γένηται* || *בחרִי אף* seems self-explanatory, its choice to translate this as a verbal clause differs from equivalents for the phrase elsewhere: *μετὰ θυμοῦ* (Exod 11:8); and *ἐν ὀργῇ θυμοῦ* (1 Sam 20:34; Lam 2:3; 2 Chr 25:10).⁴ These alternative renderings of

3. Cf. *ⲁⲗ ⲓⲕ* || *ואל הרך לבי* in Job 23:16. S uses *ⲉⲣⲉⲓ* as the equivalent for *הלומי* in 28:1 (*ⲙⲉⲧⲁⲗⲁ ⲙⲉⲥⲧⲁ*) and for *נדמיתי* in 6:5's *ⲙⲉⲧⲁⲗⲁ* || *כי נדמיתי* (cf. 15:1).

4. Although *γὰρ* aligns with *בִּי* in 1QIsa^a, the OG translator too frequently supplies *γὰρ* to consider either witness corroboration of the other.

the phrase render unnecessary Ottley's (2:140) surmise that θυμοῦ "seems to be רצון, 'violence,' for רצין" (cf. Seeligmann, 56).⁵

On the other hand, OG's path to *πάλιν* *ιάσσομαι* is obscure. Although it is possible that *ὅταν γὰρ κτλ* renders only *בַּחֲרִי*, while *πάλιν* is based on *אֵף*, understood as a conjunction, the derivation of *ιάσσομαι* from *רצין* is difficult to explain. It seems preferable to retain the conclusion that *ὅταν γὰρ κτλ* renders *אֵף בַּחֲרִי* and infer that *רצין* was absent from OG's *Vorlage*. Conversely, S's *وَأَرَمَ* lacks an equivalent for *וָאֵף*, while clearly OG read it.

It is less likely that OG's *καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Αραμ* || *וָאֵרֶם* reflects *בֶּן אֶרֶם* in its *Vorlage* (cf. *רצין מלך אֶרֶם*, 7:1) than that the translator supplied *ὁ υἱὸς* to match *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Πομελίου* within the extraposed *καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Αραμ καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Πομελίου* at the outset of 7:5. At the same time, OG and S might represent variant forms of the text—*וָאֵרֶם וּבֶן רַמְלִיָּהוּ* (OG) and *רצין וּבֶן רַמְלִיָּהוּ* (S)—that became conflated in MT's *וָאֵרֶם וּבֶן רַמְלִיָּהוּ* (so already in 1QIsa^a).

Old Greek's *καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Αραμ* renders improbable Ottley's (2:140) (already fanciful) speculation that *πάλιν* *ιάσσομαι* derives from confusion of *אֶרֶם* with *אֶפְרַיִם* in 7:5, read as if it were *אֶרְפָּא*. Given that *πάλιν* *ιάσσομαι* appears untethered to any Hebrew words, Ziegler's (62) surmise that the translator tailored this clause to accord with 6:10 is tenable, if unprovable. Under this explanation, the translator correlated the forecast of healing following the Kyrios's expenditure of wrath with the forecast of survivors multiplying after cities and the populace have been decimated due to the people's obduracy that blocked their healing (6:10–11).

7:5

καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Αραμ καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Πομελίου derives from 7:4 (see the comments there), in the wake of which the translator might well have considered *אֶרֶם* and *וּבֶן רַמְלִיָּהוּ* superfluous, consistent with his tendency to suppress synonyms and repetitions, including toponyms (cf. 4:4; 29:2).

Both OG and S translate *עָרָה* as grammatically plural (*ἐβουλεύσαντο βουλῆν/أُمَحَّصَ*), while all other witnesses have grammatically singular verbs. Old Greek's cognate accusative *βουλῆν* (> MT) accords with the

5. This reverses the judgment in Ronald L. Troxel, "Isaiah 7,14–16 through the Eyes of the Septuagint," *ETL* 79 (2003): 13 n. 63.

translator's tendency to supply βουλῇ, especially in cases of mutual influence (3:9; 7:5; 25:7; and 31:6).⁶ Syriac translates לְאָמַר with a finite verb conjugated in the 3mp (ܐܡܪܝܢ), comparable to which is OG's plural participle λέγοντες.

7:6

Syriac likely chose ܐܡܪܝܢ out of perplexity at וְנִקְצְנָה and with a view to ܐܡܪܝܢ (|| וְנִבְקַעְנָה אֵלֵינוּ), a verb used for בָּקַע elsewhere (e.g., Gen 7:11; Ps 78:3). The closest morphological comparison to וְנִקְצְנָה in the book is קִיץ in 26:19; 29:8, which S rendered with the *ethpaal* of ܡܕܢܝܢ, its typical equivalent elsewhere (e.g., 1 Sam 26:12; 2 Kgs 4:31; Jer 31:26). Old Greek's καὶ συλλαλήσαντες αὐτοῖς is equally a guess at וְנִקְצְנָה, envisioning a more diplomatic interaction, similar to its συνεφώνησεν Ἀραμ πρὸς τὸν Ἐφραιμ || נַחַה אֲרָם עַל אֲפֵרַיִם in 7:2.

Whereas ܡܡܠܝܚܐ ܡܠܚܐ represents each component of מַלְיָךְ מַלְיָךְ, OG's καὶ βασιλεύσομεν αὐτῆς fits its habit of condensing phrases, particularly its omission of repeated words or synonyms.

Although S's ܡܡܠܝܚܐ ܡܠܚܐ is less common than a syntagm like ܡܡܠܝܚܐ ܡܡܠܝܚܐ || ܡܡܠܝܚܐ ܡܡܠܝܚܐ (5:2), comparison of ܡܡܠܝܚܐ ܡܡܠܝܚܐ || ܡܡܠܝܚܐ ܡܡܠܝܚܐ in 61:9; ܡܡܠܝܚܐ ܡܡܠܝܚܐ || ܡܡܠܝܚܐ ܡܡܠܝܚܐ in Jer 37:12, and ܡܡܠܝܚܐ ܡܡܠܝܚܐ || ܡܡܠܝܚܐ ܡܡܠܝܚܐ in Jer 41:8 (cf. Ezek 3:24) permits affirmation that ܡܡܠܝܚܐ is the equivalent for ܡܡܠܝܚܐ. Old Greek's (καὶ βασιλεύσομεν) αὐτῆς || ܡܡܠܝܚܐ ܡܡܠܝܚܐ entails a similar elision of an equivalent for ܡܡܠܝܚܐ (cf. ἐν [μεσημβρινῇ] || [צהרים] בתוך, 16:3; ἐν [χώρᾳ Αἰγυπτίων] || [ארץ מצרים] בתוך, 19:19) to conform to the target language norm of using the genitive case for the object of βασιλεύω: οἱ ἐβασίλευσαν τῆς Ἰουδαίας || מַלְכֵי יְהוּדָה, 1:1 (q.v.); βασιλεύσει σου ὁ θεός || מַלְכֵךְ אֱלֹהֶיךָ, 52:7.

7:7

Nowhere else in Isaiah does σαβαωθ translate יהוה (or אֲדֹנִי), and OG regularly gives a single equivalent for אֲדֹנִי יהוה, typically κύριος. In 5:25 κύριος σαβαωθ (|| יהוה) agrees with what seems the (revised) reading of 4Q56, which reads יהוה followed by a supralinear צ (vid.) just before a lacuna.

6. See Troxel, "BOYAH and BOYAEYEIN," 162–65.

Given the prevailing patterns for divine names in OG-Isaiah, צבאות יהוה was likely the reading of its *Vorlage*.

Old Greek explicitizes the subject of ἐμμείνῃ and ἔσται by supplying ἡ βουλὴ αὐτῆς, based on ἐβουλεύσαντο βουλὴν πονηράν in 7:5 (q.v.).

7:8

For *صَحْمَ مَحَلٍّ* || *ובעוד ששים וחמש שנה* || *סחל; סחל; ססעע* قنح in 21:16. *בעוד שנה כשני שכיר* || *قنح; قنح; قنح* ||

סחל || *יחת* is unparalleled in Isaiah, where S typically renders *חתת* with *סחל*, the most common equivalent throughout the Bible (eighteen times).⁷ On the other hand, compare *סחל; סחל; סחל* || *וצדקתי לא תחת* || *סחל; סחל; סחל* in 51:6 (where OG renders *תחת* with *ἐκλίπη*, the same verb it uses for *יחת* here).⁸ Even if it is possible that *סחל* is used along the same lines as *סחל* in 51:6, that does not fit how *סחל* is otherwise used in the book: to speak of leaves falling (1:30; 64:5), stars falling from heaven like a leaf from a vine (34:4), and dust that has fallen (41:2). Perhaps by using *סחל* the translator meant to depict Ephraim's disappearance from "the people" as the falling away of a dead member, although this inference is quite speculative.

Old Greek's *ἡ βασιλεία Εφραιμ* || *אפרים* is more likely a case of explicitation than attestation of *ממלכת אפרים* (all other witnesses agree with MT). Compare *εἰς τὴν πόλιν Αγγαί* || *על עית* in 10:28 and *τὸ ὄρος τὸ Χερμελ* || *כרמל* in 29:17 (2x) (cf. Van der Vorm-Croughs, 41).

7:9

Noteworthy are OG's and S's similar equivalents for *כי לא תאמנו*: *οὐδὲ μὴ συνῆτε/سحله* || *אם לא*. It is unlikely, however, that S followed OG, since *תאמנו* would hardly pose a difficulty and there is no evidence of reliance on OG in the adjacent verses. The *Vorlage* of each may have read *ת(א)בינו*, either by confusion of *mem* as *bet* + *yod* (perhaps due to a scribe's recall of

7. Otherwise: *סחל* (13x); *סחל* (5x); *סחל* (2x); *סחל* (Jer 50:2^[1]); *סחל* (Job 32:15).

8. *ἐκλείπω* aligns with various Hebrew words in the book, including *תחת* again in 51:6 but also *כלה* (15:6 and 21:16); *יחרב* (19:5); *דללו* (19:6); *נואלו* (19:13); *אפס* (29:20); *ת(א)בינו* (38:14); *חדל* (53:3); *מוש* (54:10; 59:21); *ברת* (55:13; 56:5); *יכזבו* (58:11); and *יאסף* (60:20).

ינבתי in 6:9) or (conversely) as the original reading that suffered ligature of *bet* + *yod* into *mem*, with a consequent “correction” by prefixing א.⁹

7:10

Syriac’s ܐܠܡ is likely an addition by the translator or a prior scribe, harmonizing with ܡܠܚܡܐ ܐܠܡ ܡܢܠܚܡܐ ܚܝܬܐ ܚܝܬܐ in 8:5. In both verses ܐܠܡ occupies its normal slot in Syriac word order (cf. ܐܠܡ ܝܠܡܕܐ ܥܘܕ || ܐܠܡ ܠܐ ܠܚܝܬܐ ܡܢܠܚܡܐ, 1:5; ܥܠ ܡܐ ܬܒܝ ܥܘܕ || ܚܝܬܐ ܐܠܡ ܠܚܝܬܐ, 2:4). The translator omits an equivalent for ܠܐܡܪ, having rendered ܕܒܪ with ܚܝܬܐ (cf. 8:5).

7:11

Syriac’s ܐܠܡ⁽²⁾ analyzes שאלה as a *qal* imperative and stands in asyndetic coordination with ܚܝܬܐ, as commonly in Syriac (Nöldeke §337; cf. 1:18; 2:3, 5).¹⁰ By contrast, OG’s symmetrical εἰς βάθος ἢ εἰς ὕψος || העמק שאלה או הגבה למעלה is a condensation.

7:12

Syriac’s final ܐܠܡ is unparalleled in other witnesses and likely attests אלהי in the *Vorlage*, a reflexive scribal addition under influence of אלהי in 7:13 (cf. אלהיך in 7:11). Syriac shows no tendency to expand divine names.

7:13

Syriac’s lack of an equivalent for נא in ܡܠܚܡܐ ܚܝܬܐ ܚܝܬܐ || שמעו נא בית דוד accords with its tendency to pass over נא (cf. 1:18; 5:1, 3, 5).

Syriac reformulates הלאות as ܐܠܡܐ, supplying the 2mp pronoun based on its ܚܝܬܐ || ܡܢܠܚܡܐ. By contrast, OG explicitizes the *qal wahomer* force implied in כי תלאו by translating it with καὶ πῶς, which often renders

9. 1QIsa^a reads תאמינו, with a scribe conforming the form to the orthography of the verb earlier in the verse. As Wildberger observes, תאמינו is more likely a corruption, since תאמנו makes for a strong play on words, and “perceive” hardly fits the context (*Isaiah* 1–12, 285).

10. Parsing ܐܠܡ⁽²⁾ as a noun in the absolute state, serving as direct object of ܚܝܬܐ, is contraindicated by ܠܐ, which (as direct object of ܐܠܡ⁽¹⁾) is in the determined state.

tive (προελέσθαι), while rendering the second with a finite verb (ἐκλέξεται τὸ ἀγαθὸν || ובחור בטוב), which serves as the main clause to which πρὶν ἢ κατλ is subordinate.

Although προαιρέω does not appear again in Isaiah, Prov 21:25 pairs it with οὐ as an equivalent for מאן:

תאות עצל תמיתנו כי מאנו ידיו לעשות
ἐπιθυμῖαι ὀκνηρὸν ἀποκτείνουσιν οὐ γὰρ προαιροῦνται αἱ χεῖρες
αὐτοῦ ποιεῖν τι

As noted in discussing μὴ θέλητε || תמאנו in 1:20, the Isaiah translator shares the strategy of rendering verbs of refusal by negating a verb of willingness or choosing (cf. 5:24; 8:6). However, Seeligmann (57) has noted also the translator's penchant to neglect "a negation which does figure in the Hebrew original," as in 30:19:

בירושלם בכו לא תבכה חנון יחנך לקול זעקך
καὶ Ἱερουσαλημ κλαυθμῶ ἔκλαυσεν ἐλέησόν με ἐλεήσει σε τὴν
φωνήν τῆς κραυγῆς σου

The translator renders חנון יחנך as a recollection of Jerusalem's tearful petitions that will receive an answer, accomplished by means of modifications that include suppressing לא, shifting the person and tense of תבכה, separating חנון from יחנך, while analyzing the former as an imperative and supplying a pronoun object.

The translator's manipulations in 7:15 are as deliberate as in 30:19, beginning with his choice of πρὶν ἢ for דעתו (ל) (by association with בטרם ידע in 7:16) and supplying the correlative ἢ ("before he knows or prefers"). His suppression of לא to permit a choice (προελέσθαι) correlates with his interpolation of ἀγαθὸν ἢ κακόν in 7:16 under the ideology of youth as a period of innocence. Here he transmutes rejecting evil into a possible choice eclipsed by the child opting for "the good" before he knows or is tempted to prefer "evil things" (πονηρά, in contrast to πονηρία as a category in 7:16).

7:16

Whereas OG's διότι πρὶν ἢ γινῶναι τὸ παιδίον is transparent to כי בטרם ידע הנער, its ἀγαθὸν ἢ κακόν matches nothing in any extant witness (MT, 1QIsa^a, S, V, T). Although Goshen-Gottstein (בז) correctly observes that

this amounts to a double rendering of ברע and בטוב is accurate, their extraction from the larger phrase differs in character from most double renderings, in which the second rendering is merely juxtaposed to the first. The subordination of ἀγαθὸν ἢ κακόν to γινῶναι and its association with a child hints at speculation about the time one comes to “know good and evil” similar to what is implied by the pluses of Num 14:23; 32:11 that identify adolescence as a threshold leading from innocence to moral accountability.¹³ What sets the child aside, then, making him a σήμεῖον, is his precocious rejection of evil in favor of “the good.”¹⁴

Just as OG recast the syntactic relationship between מאוס ברע ובחור in 7:15 by its choice of moods and tenses, so here it subordinates τοῦ ἐκλέξασθαι τὸ ἀγαθόν || בטוב ובחור to ἀπειθεῖ πονηρίᾳ || מאוס ברע.

As in 7:15, S prefixes a *lāmad* to each infinitive (למאס || למאס and לובחור || לובחור) as complements to יב.

Both OG and S infer that the direct antecedent of אשר is the land (ἡ γῆ σὺν φοβῇ/ח, וימח, למ), rather than properly recognizing the anaphoric suffix in מלכיה.¹⁵ Old Greek omits any equivalent for the suffix, while S supplies ח as the object of וימח, with למח specifying why they loathe “the land.”

7:17

Although most occurrences of ἀλλά align with conjunctive *waw* or בי, the choice of ἀλλά always registers the translator’s appraisal of the semantic connection between clauses and phrases, as becomes especially clear from his insertion of it to clarify discourse relationships (cf. 3:13; and the notes on +διότι νῦν in 3:8).¹⁶ Consequently, although his *Vorlage* might have read *waw* in place of *yod* at the outset of the verse, more likely he supplied ἀλλά to underscore the shift in fortunes from 7:16. Correlatively, οὕτω (αἶ

13. For a discussion of these passages, see Troxel, “Isaiah 7,14–16 through the Eyes of the Septuagint,” 3–7.

14. Although the translator provides no indication of what constitutes “the good,” the fact that τὸ ἀγαθόν is set over against πονηρίᾳ in 7:14, maintains it as an abstract entity akin to its role in Greek philosophy.

15. For למח וימח || אשר אתה קץ, cf. חבב למח || ויקץ בישראל in 1 Kgs 11:25.

16. 1QIsa^a’s ויבא can hardly be taken as substantiation that the translator’s *Vorlage* contained a *waw*.

οὕτω ἤκασιν || (אשר לא באו), which appears only here in Isaiah, seems to have been supplied to underscore the temporal semantics in the relative clause (cf. οὐκέτι in 1:14; 17:3; 23:11).

ἄφειλεν || suggests that the translator perceived the subject as the same agent who brings “new” days on the people: ὁ θεός. τὸν βασιλέα τῶν Ἀσσυρίων (in the accusative case) reflects analysis of את מלך אשור as appositional to ימים.

We might infer that “God” is the subject of S’s لَحَد, but that would leave مَحَل دَانِ dangling. As Warazawski (20) perceives, the translator likely considered مَحَل دَانِ the subject of مَحَل دَانِ, لا فَنَم مَحَل دَانِ. Taking مَحَل دَانِ as subject hearkens back to 7:2’s report of Aram negotiating a treaty with Ephraim, alienating it from Judah.

Although ἄφειλεν and لَحَد might attest הַסִּיר in their *Vorlagen*, the syntax of the Hebrew is ambiguous enough that the choice of transitive verbs is a minor shift.

7:18

Syriac translates the collective nouns זבוב and דבורה with grammatically plural nouns: دَبَابَة and دَبَابَة. Although OG renders זבוב with a grammatically plural noun (μύαις), it renders דבורה with τῇ μελίσση, the article perhaps marking the class (see Smyth §§1122–23). This correlates with a notable difference in the relative clause that modifies each noun. ὁ κυριεύει μέρους ποταμοῦ Αἰγύπτου construes μύαις as a collective by means of the neuter singular pronoun ὃ, serving as the subject of the grammatically singular κυριεύει. By contrast, the relative pronoun anaphoric to τῇ μελίσση agrees with it in gender and number: ἣ ἔστιν ἐν χώρᾳ Ἀσσυρίων.

Correlative to this is a distinction between the verbs in these clauses. The second clause uses simple ἐστίν to establish the location of the “bee”: ἣ ἔστιν ἐν χώρᾳ Ἀσσυρίων || אשר בארץ אשור. The first clause, on the other hand, has the more specific κυριεύει. Although μέρος is a frequent equivalent for קצה (e.g., ἐν μέρει || בקצה, Gen 23:9; εἰς μέρος || אל קצה, Exod 16:35), the translator likely extrapolated from prefixed *bet* the notion of ruling over the region. This less likely owes to association of שרר with אשר (pace Ziegler, 62) than to viewing μύαις as a metaphor for rulers, as in 5:26, where the LORD whistles to summon the nations against Judah—the only other place in Isaiah where שרק and συρίζω occur.

ποταμοῦ Αἰγύπτου || יארי מצרים accords with the use of the grammatical singular of ποταμός whenever the Nile is referent (see the notes at 19:6).

larity of שחל to נהללים likely signals what evoked it.²¹ Although one might suspect haplography (homoioarchton, via ובכל), S does not always pursue quantitative agreement.

7:20

Old Greek's μεμεθυσμένω and S's 𐤌𐤍 owe to reading the sibilant in השכירה as *shin*. Although תִּפְּ מֵגָלֹף might attest +הגדולה, there is little indication of what might have triggered a scribe to add it. The translator, on the other hand, employs μέγας readily in phrases such as μεγάλης βουλῆς || פלא יועץ (9:6[5]), καὶ ἀπὸ λαοῦ μεγάλου || ומעם נורא (18:7), and ὁ θεὸς ὁ μέγας ὁ αἰώνιος || יהוה צור עולמים (26:4), and he uses it to aggrandize images: πληγῇ μεγάλῃ || נגף (19:22); εἰς χώραν μεγάλην καὶ ἀμέτρητον || אל ארץ (22:18). Thus, תִּפְּ מֵגָלֹף was likely supplied by the translator.

Old Greek's ὁ ἐστὶ πέραν τοῦ ποταμοῦ βασιλέως Ἀσσυρίων || בעברי נהר בעברי אשור reflects either a *Vorlage* that read מלך אשור or the translator's failure to perceive that במלך אשור glosses the metaphor describing the river. The latter is more likely, since there is no obvious graphic trigger for omission of *bet*.

Syriac reformulates the list of areas from which hair is removed as a merismus (ܡܥܝܢܐ ܟܝܬܝܢܐ ܡܥܝܢܐ ܟܝܬܝܢܐ), whereas OG connects the direct objects with simple καί. Both translators appear to assume that the subject of תספה is implicit אדני, while their semantically similar equivalents for תספה (ἀφελῆ/ܐܦܠܐ) recalls their similar choice of transitive verbs for סור in 7:17 (ἀφελῆν/ܐܦܠܐ).²² That common reflex cannot be cited as evidence of S's reliance on OG in isolation from S's independent choice to render the rest of the clause as a merismus.²³

7:21

Although τρέφω occurs only here in Isaiah, the rendering of יחיה with θρέψει finds a corollary in the translation of גדל by ἐκτρέφω in 23:4's οὐδὲ ἐξέθρεψα νεανίσκους οὐδὲ ὑψωσα παρθένους || ולא גדלתי בחורים רוממתי

21. In 55:13 S translates הנעוצים with ܐܬܝܢ “thorn.”

22. The choice of ἀφελῆ || תספה is comparable to the use of ἀπόλλυμι and συναπόλλυμι to render ספה in Gen 18:23, 24; 19:15, where S used ܐܦܠܐ, conjugated in the *aphel* (18:23, 24), and ܠܐܦܠܐ (19:15).

23. Pace Gesenius, *Commentar über den Jesaia* 1:82.

בתולות; and 49:21's *τούτους δὲ τίς ἐξέθρεψέ μοι* || *ואלה מי גדל*. In both cases, *ἐκτρέφω* is used of nourishing a living creature, as is *θρέψει* here. *τρέφω* is also the equivalent for *להחיות* in Gen 6:19, 20.

δάμαλιν βοῶν || *עגלת בקר* occurs again in 1 Kgdms 16:2, where we also find *חול*, *חול* again in S.

7:22

OG is the only witness to lack equivalents for *כי יאכל חמאה כי*. Although this could be explained as some type of haplography, word order does not lend itself to this.²⁴ Assuming that the translator's eye skipped from the first *חמאה* to the second should have caught him up short, since he would already have rendered the *יאכל* just before *חמאה*, thereby raising a problem when he reached the *יאכל* following *ודבש*. More likely, this is another instance of the translator collapsing identical or similar adjacent phrases (see Van der Vorm-Croughs, 201).

כי חמאה ודבש || *כי חמאה ודבש* suggests absence of *כל* from its *Vorlage*, since it otherwise renders *כל* + participle or adjective with *כי* (2:12 [2x]; 3:1 [2x]; 4:3; 13:15 [2x]; 19:7, 10; 29:20; 30:18; 36:6; 43:7; 45:24; 55:1; 56:6; 59:8; 66:10), as it does also *כל אשר* (19:17 39:2, 4, 6; 63:7).²⁵ On the other hand, it uses *כי* for *he* + participle (4:3 [2x]; 10:15 [3x]; 24:18 [2x]; 28:4; 40:22) and even an anarthrous participle (41:15). This is also its regular equivalent for a participle with prefixed preposition (28:6; 29:11) or a pronominal suffix (10:20), and can render a relative clause (29:12; 43:4) or (in the case of 44:7) a preposition + infinitive construct + suffix (*כי ימשיך*).²⁶ The inference that S's *Vorlage* lacked *כל* finds a notable parallel in 1QIsa^a, where a corrector struck a line through *כול* (see appendix A).

24. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12*, 320 views it as haplography.

25. We also find *כי ימשיך* || *כי ימשיך* (18:3; cf. 23:9; 29:7; 60:14; 61:9; 66:10).

26. Other deviations are *כי ימשיך* || *כי ימשיך* (18:3; cf. 23:9; 29:7; 60:14; 61:9; 66:10). The inference that S's *Vorlage* lacked *כל* finds a notable parallel in 1QIsa^a, where a corrector struck a line through *כול* (see appendix A).

7:23

Syriac's lack of an equivalent for יהיה is likely due to the translator, who typically leaves יהיה untranslated after clause-initial ויהיה (e.g., 2:2; 3:24).

This singular occurrence of σίκλος in Isaiah is explicable from the frequent association of σίκλος with ἄργυρος, both in rendering the phrase כסף שקלים (e.g., 2 Kgdms 24:24) and when σίκλος accompanies ἄργυρος in rendering כסף (e.g., χιλίους σίκλους ἀργυρίου || אֶלֶף כֶּסֶף, 2 Kgdms 18:12; cf. 4 Kgdms 6:25). Here σίκλων alone renders כסף.

7:24

Although τόξωμα means “arrow” and is elsewhere the equivalent for קֶחַץ (Gen 49:23; Jer 50[27]:14; 51[28]:11; 39:3, 9; Prov 7:23; 25:18), it is used for קשת in its every occurrence in Isaiah (cf. 13:18; 21:15, 17).

All the versions represent יבוא as grammatically plural (εἰσελεύσονται, יבֹּאוּ, ingredientur), whereas both 1QIsa^a and 1Q8 agree with MT's יבוא. The grammatically plural forms of the versions are likely explicitations of the group implied by כל הנותר in 7:22.

Syriac's ܡܠܝܬܐ || תהיה is calibrated to target-language semantics and contrasts with OG's ἔσται. To S's grammatically plural ܡܠܝܬܐ || ובקשת, compare 1QIsa^a's ובקשתות.

7:25

As Warszawski (21) observes, both OG and S analyze אשר במעדר as modifying ההרים, which both take as the subject of יעדרון, but they proceed quite differently. Old Greek reduces אשר במעדר to the passive participle ἀροτριώμενον and makes ἀροτριαθήσεται (|| יעדרון) the predicate of the clause, while creating a new clause with καὶ οὐ μὴ ἐπέλθῃ || לא תבוא. By contrast, S translates the relative clause with ܐܝܬܐ ܠܡܥܕܪܐ ܦܬܝܬܐ, shifting the verb into the active voice and adding ܡܝܬܐ, whose antecedent is ܐܝܬܐ.

Old Greek's καὶ πᾶν ὄρος || וכל ההרים accords with the observable tendency to render morphologically plural nouns preceded by כל in the grammatical singular, with πᾶς (e.g., 2:13[2x], 14 [2x], 16[2x]; 8:7[2x], 9; 15:2; 21:8).

The syntactic relations in this verse proved problematic for OG and S, largely owing to uncertainty about the role of יראת, which is likely reflected also by the superlinear ברזל after it in 1QIsa^a, apparently clarifying the

object of fear.²⁷ Both OG and S analyze יראת as the subject of תבוא, although they negotiate the relationship between יראת and שמיר ושית differently, with φόβος || יראת concluding a clause in OG, whereas S renders שמיר ושית as modifying יראת.

Owing to its declaration of the absence of fear in the plowed land, OG construes the final clause as an explanation (γάρ) and provides ἀπό to integrate שמיר ושית into its syntax.

חל חל is a paraphrase of למשלח שור, with חל a marker of location (cf. 10:29; 23:18; 25:12), correlative to חל by ולמרמס שה. Although S elsewhere renders משלח יד with variations on the phrase חלח. Although S elsewhere renders משלח יד with variations on the phrase חלח (Deut 12:17, 18; 15:10; 23:21; 28:20), this is the only occurrence of משלח outside Deuteronomy and the only time it is combined with a noun other than יד. Although one might posit S's reliance on OG's εἰς βόσκημα, equating a place where oxen are dispatched with pasture is insufficiently arcane to attribute to a single mind (cf. חלח חלח || חלח חלח in 32:20).

27. Whether this addition played a role in the scribe blotting out *taw* of תהיה (conceivably with יראת as subject) in favor of a supralinear *yod* is not knowable.

ISAIAH 8

8:1

Old Greek's *τόμον καινοῦ μεγάλου* || לְדוֹן גִּלְיָן is an enduring crux, to which the textual evidence bears witness. *καινοῦ* stands subasterisk in Q and Ziegler's oI (88-Syh), attesting Origen's inability to detect a corresponding Hebrew equivalent. The reading *καινον μεγαν* is widely attested (especially in Zielger's L and C groupings), while +*χαρτου* "papyrus sheet" is also sporadically attested. Likely both *καινον μεγαν* and *χαρτου* are secondary readings meant to make sense of the text. The relationship *μεγάλου* || לְדוֹן is transparent, and although *τόμος* occurs only here in Greek translations of biblical books, in 1 Esd 6:22 it refers to a document of court records, which befits *τόμον* || לְדוֹן here.

Peter Katz rested his suggestion that *καινοῦ* is a corruption of original *κλήρου* on Kurt Galling's proposal that לְדוֹן is a corruption of לְדוֹר, thereby relating this document's inscription to the child whose birth is reported in 8:3: the *לְדוֹן גִּלְיָן* would have allocated land to the prophet's anticipated son.¹ An emendation proposed for the Hebrew text, based on speculation about the relationship between 8:1 and 8:3, is hardly solid footing for positing that *καινοῦ* is a corruption of *κλήρου*. It seems more likely that we should consider *καινοῦ* an explication by the translator that this "sheet of a large (scroll)" has not been used previously.

Comparison of τοῦ ὀξέως προνομήν ποιῆσαι σκύλων with ταχέως σκύλευσον ὀξέως προνόμευσον in 8:3 (where מָהַר and חָפַז have distinct equivalents) suggests that, although it first appears that the translator condensed מָהַר and חָפַז in 8:1 into a single equivalent (τοῦ ὀξέως), more likely *πάρεστι γάρ* represents חָפַז.

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

וַיַּצַּר אֹתוֹ בַּחֲרֹט appears again only in Exod 32:4, where S renders בַּחֲרֹט with ܠܗܝܬܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ “and he shaped it (in accord) with the copy,” whereas OG renders בַּחֲרֹט with $\epsilon\nu\ \tau\eta\ \gamma\rho\alpha\phi\acute{\iota}\delta\iota$, as here. Most likely ܠܗܝܬܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ here, which does not accord with OG’s $\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\acute{\iota}\delta\iota$, was selected as equivalent by inference from the context.

The prefixed *lāmad* in ܠܡܕܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ || ܠܡܕܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ was likely supplied in coordination with ܠܡܕܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ || ܠܡܕܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ .

8:2–3

While MT and 1Q8 read וְאַעֲדֶהּ, the imperative forms ποιήσον and ποιήσον concur with וְהָעֵד in 1QIsa^a.

Old Greek lacks an equivalent for הִכְהֵן, while S renders it with ܠܡܕܐ . Because there is no obvious trigger for haplography, and because all other witnesses attest הִכְהֵן, we must suspect that it was absent from OG’s *Vorlage*. If a scribe added it secondarily, it might have been for differentiation with אֲרִיה in 21:8.

Although OG’s $\text{ταχέως σκύλευσον ὁξέως προνόμεισον}$ || ܠܡܕܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ differs from its rendering of the same phrases in 8:1 (including σκύλευσον vs. προνομήν ποιῆσαι and its readily evident, parallel equivalents for מָהָר and ܠܡܕܐ), S’s ܠܡܕܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ differs little from its equivalent there.

8:4

The pronominal suffixes of אָבִי וְאִמִּי (MT, 4Q59, and 4Q60 [vid.]) have no counterpart in OG’s πατέρα ἢ μητέρα and S’s ܐܒܐ ܐܡܐ (T אָבִי וְאִמִּי), similar to their renderings in Gen 22:7, which again entail a vocative use of אָבִי:²

וַיֹּאמֶר יִצְחָק אֶל אַבְרָהָם אָבִיו וַיֹּאמֶר אָבִי
 $\text{ܐܒܐ ܐܡܐ ܐܡܐ ܐܡܐ ܐܡܐ ܐܡܐ ܐܡܐ ܐܡܐ ܐܡܐ}$
 εἶπεν δὲ Ἰσαακ πρὸς Ἀβραάμ τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ εἴπας πάτερ

Syriac does not consistently follow this pattern, however. For example, although OG renders אָבִי with πατέρα in Gen 27:18, 34, 38; 48:18, S uses ܐܒܐ .

2. Contrast 1QIsa^a (אָבִי וְאִמִּי) and V (*patrem suum et matrem suam*), owing to *yod/waw* confusion.

8:5

Although both OG and S frequently render לאמר with a finite verb (e.g., 3:7), a participle (e.g., 9:8), or a recitative particle (e.g., OG uses ὅτι in 44:19; S uses , in 7:2), each can also simply pass over it in silence, especially when it follows a finite verb of speaking, as here (cf. τάδε λέγει κύριος σαβαωθ || כי אומר || 23:4). ים מעוז הים לאמר, 14:24; גשבע יהוה צבאות לאמר || 23:4).

8:6

Syriac inflects both finite verbs as grammatically plural, in accord with the collective noun حمله. Old Greek's τὸ πορευόμενον, by contrast, renders the grammatical number of ההלכים in the singular to accord with the Greek collective noun ὄδωρ.

Syriac and T represent ומשׁושׁ as a grammatically plural verb: ܡܫܘܫܐ/ܡܫܘܫܐܐ. Whereas T's ܡܫܘܫܐܐ ܡܫܘܫܐܐ ܡܫܘܫܐܐ expresses merely the people delighting in these rulers, OG's equivalent accents acquiescence: ἀλλὰ βούλεσθαι, opposite τὸ μὴ βούλεσθαι || מאס. Meanwhile, its supply of the complements εἶναι and βασιλέα ἐφ' ὑμῶν explicitizes what preference for τὸν Παῖσσαν καὶ τὸν υἱὸν Πομελίου entails. Since ἐφ' ὑμῶν was likely supplied by the translator, this embodies his perception that the oracle of 8:5–8 is directed to the people.

8:7

Old Greek lacks the quantifier in καὶ τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ || ואת כל כבודו. Although OG can omit quantifiers (see appendix A), in this case the emphatic function of כל makes it suspect of being a scribal addition not yet present in OG's *Vorlage*, especially since the translator represents כל in ἐπὶ πᾶσαν φάραγγα ὑμῶν || על כל אפיקיו and ἐπὶ πᾶν τεῖχος ὑμῶν || כל גדותיו.

The differences in grammatical person and number in ἐφ' ὑμᾶς || ܡܫܘܫܐܐ ܡܫܘܫܐܐ ܡܫܘܫܐܐ, φάραγγα ὑμῶν || ܡܫܘܫܐܐ ܡܫܘܫܐܐ ܡܫܘܫܐܐ, and τεῖχος ὑμῶν || ܡܫܘܫܐܐ ܡܫܘܫܐܐ ܡܫܘܫܐܐ are attributable to the translator, whose penchant for modifying the grammatical person and number of pronouns is well recognized (Seeligmann, 56; Troxel, 89–90, 138, 219–22). Similarly, S conforms the grammatical number of the pronominal suffixes in ܡܫܘܫܐܐ ܡܫܘܫܐܐ ܡܫܘܫܐܐ || ܡܫܘܫܐܐ ܡܫܘܫܐܐ ܡܫܘܫܐܐ earlier in the sentence.

Syriac's **ܩܥܝܠܐ ܡܚܡܝܬܐ ܕܗܪܒܝܡ** || **הרבים והעצומים** may reflect a transposition in its *Vorlage* like that attested in 4Q60: **הרבים והעצומים**.

περιπατέω translates **הלך** only here in Isaiah, for which the translator typically uses **πορεύομαι** (thirty-nine times) (but cf. **τοῖς πατοῦσιν** || **להלכים**, 42:5). More strikingly, **τείχος** (**יְמִינִי**) || **גְּדוּתִי** (a *hapax legomenon* in Isaiah) differs from **κρηπὶς** || **גִּדִּי** in Josh 3:15; 4:18; and 1 Chr 12:16. The image of the Assyrian ruler “walking about on your walls” is likely the translator’s concretization of the picture as the conquest of a city.

8:8

Although only here does **ἀφαιρέω** translate **חָלַה**, it is comparable to **καὶ ἀπελεύσει ἐκεῖθεν** || **מִשָּׁם וְחָלַפְתָּ** in 1 Kgdms 10:3, which speaks of a physical departure, while **τὸ πρῶτ' ὥσ' ἐλθὼν παρ' ἐλθὼν** || **בְּבֹקֶר כַּחצִּיר יִחְלֶה** and **τὸ πρῶτ' ἀνθ' ἑαυτοῦ καὶ παρ' ἐλθὼν** || **בְּבֹקֶר יִצִּיץ וְחָלַה** in Ps 89(90):5–6 treat **חָלַה** as a euphemism for death. **καὶ ἀφελεῖ** here renders **חָלַה** as causative, comparable to **ἀφεῖλεν** **Εφραιμ** || **סֹר אֶפְרַיִם** in 7:17. **ἀπό** || **ב** was more likely chosen under the influence of **ἀφελεῖ** than attests *mem/bet* confusion in the *Vorlage*.

Especially remarkable is the similarity to 3:1's **ἀφελεῖ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ** || **מִיְרוּשָׁלַם וּמִיְהוּדָה**, first because its (transposed) order for **ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας** agrees with **καὶ ἀφελεῖ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας** here, but even more so because of the thematic similarity of the object of **ἀφελεῖ** here—**ἄνθρωπον ὃς δυνήσεται κεφαλὴν ἄραι ἢ δυνατὸν συντελέσασθαι τι** || **שֶׁטָף וְעָבַר עַד צוּר יִיגַע**—to its object there: **ἰσχύοντα καὶ ἰσχύουσιν** || **מִשְׁעָנָה וּמִשְׁעָנָה**.

A possible trace of MT within **ἄνθρωπον ὃς δυνήσεται κεφαλὴν ἄραι ἢ δυνατὸν συντελέσασθαι τι** is detectable in **κεφαλὴν** || **צוּר**. Although the equivalent for **צוּר** is **τράχηλος** in 30:28; 52:2, the rendering of **ועליו מעל צוּר** with **καὶ ὁ ζυγὸς αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὤμου σου** in 10:27 suggests that the translator could find that it implicates adjacent areas of the body as well. Nevertheless, labeling this as a “possible trace” is apt, since we cannot know how much anatomy the translator supposed this term to encompass.

Old Greek insinuates **δύναμαι** as a verbal modifier elsewhere (e.g., **εἰς βοήθειαν οἱ οὐκ ἠδύναντο σωθῆναι** || **לְעֹזְרָה לְהַנְצִל**, 20:6; **καὶ οὐ μὴ δύνῃται ἀναστῆναι** || **וְלֹא תִסִּיף קוֹם**, 24:20; **στενοχωρούμενοι οὐ δυνάμεθα μάχεσθαι** || **בִּי קֶצֶר הַמַּצָּע מִהַשְׁתַּרֵּעַ**, 28:20). In this verse, **ὃς δυνήσεται** is paired with

δυνατόν as a predicate of ἄνθρωπον.³ Even if we allow that he has insinuated this predicate and propose that ἄνθρωπον reflects the use of ἄνθρωπος for explicitation (cf. καὶ ἀποστελεῖ αὐτοῖς κύριος ἄνθρωπον ὃς σώσει αὐτούς || וישלח להם מושיע in 19:20), we are left with inscrutable links to any putative Hebrew text until we reach καὶ ἔσται || והיה. Although one might intuit a relationship between συντελέσασθαι τι and יגיע, there is no evidence from elsewhere to confirm that connection.

Given Ziegler's (134) catalog of "sinnverwandten Stellen des Js-Buches" that raise "die Möglichkeit einer gegenseitigen Beeinflussung," influence of 3:1 on the rendering of 8:8 seems a more likely explanation than Seeligmann's (84) confident assertion that "the Hebrew text is here given greater concreteness in the translation by being made to allude to a definite contemporaneous historical event" (see Troxel, 226). As Ottley (2:148) observed, 8:8 "almost summarises iii.1." Given the shaping of the end of 8:7 to speak of the Assyrian ruler traipsing the walls, the assertion of his removal of anyone with power is readily intelligible.

καὶ ἔσται ἡ παρεμβολὴ αὐτοῦ || והיה מטות כנפיו supports this surmise. This is the lone occurrence of מטות in the Bible, helping to explain S's מוט; as a guess (cf. its recurrent use of מוט for נטויה 5:25; 9:11, 16, 20) and the fact that OG's ἡ παρεμβολὴ αὐτοῦ aligns morphologically with כנפיו. Old Greek's regular equivalent for כנף is πτέρυξ (cf. 6:2; 11:12; 18:1; 24:16), while παρεμβολὴ renders מחנה in 37:6 (its most frequent equivalent in the Bible); and משמרת in 21:8, where καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς παρεμβολῆς ἔστην is on the lips of a watchman. Given that the translator has found in 8:7–8 the image of an Assyrian king victorious in battle, ἡ παρεμβολὴ αὐτοῦ || כנפיו likely registers his inference of that scenario here.

For OG's creation of a syntactic link of מלא רחב ארצך to כנפיו והיה מטות כנפיו via ὥστε + infinitive, compare καὶ οὐκ ἔσται ὁ συνάγων ὥστε ἄνθρωπον εἰς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ἀποστραφῆναι || ואין מקבץ איש אל עמו יפנו in 13:14.

8:9

As often suggested (e.g., Goshen-Gottstein, ל), γῶν reflects דעו rather than רעו in OG's *Vorlage*, while רע is based on analyzing רעו as רעע,

3. The peculiar grammatical relationship of δυνατόν to ὃς δυνήσεται owes to the syntactic requirements of the relative clause. The accusative case of δυνατόν is by attraction to ἄνθρωπον in extending the semantic function of the relative clause.

cognate to Aramaic רצץ, as it appears to do again in 24:19's מנא לנסא ו;חא || רעה התרעעה הארץ ||

Old Greek supplies ἕως to conform its rendering of מרחקי ארץ to the idiom ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς, which elsewhere renders קצה הארץ אל/עד (48:20; 49:6; 62:11).

لحمه comports with S's equivalents for אזור elsewhere (e.g., 1 Sam 2:4; 2 Sam 22:40), while ل is S's most frequent equivalent for חתת (see the comments on ἐκλείψει in 7:8). لحمه ل represents only one instance of התאזור וחתי, and no manuscript of S evinces a variant. It was likely missing in S's *Vorlage*, especially since the same minus is attested by 1QIsa^a and appears to have been the case also in 4Q59 and likely 4Q60.⁴

Meanwhile, OG, despite often omitting repeated phrases, accommodates this one by creating an explanatory conditional sentence out of the second (ἐὰν γάρ), adding πάλιν to each of its verbs, and varying the inflection of its equivalents for התאזור between the substantival participle ἰσχυρότες and the finite verb ἰσχύσητε. This reformulation appears closely linked to the continuity the translator forges with this verse in 8:10.

8:10

Old Greek's divergences come not from lexical choices but grammatical ones, accompanied by pluses. βουλεύσησθε βουλὴν || עצה עשו is hardly surprising, given ἐβουλεύσαντο βουλὴν πονηρὰν περὶ σοῦ || יעץ עליך ארם רעה in 7:5 and the translator's special interest in βουλή throughout Isaiah (see the comments at 7:5). More significant is the shift of conjugation from עשו to βουλεύσησθε, with the plus ἦν ἄν, alongside the shift in λαλήσητε || דברו, connected with the plus ὅν ἐάν. These appear to be an extension of the reformulation of the final clause of 8:9 as conditional (ἐὰν γάρ). In this light, both κύριος and ὑμῖν are best considered explicitizing additions. The κύριος in μεθ' ἡμῶν κύριος ὁ θεός || עמנו אל is likely the translator's addition, both given the Hebrew formula (without a variant in any other witness) and an observable tendency to expand a single divine epithet into κύριος ὁ θεός elsewhere (e.g., 26:12; 28:13; 41:21).

لحمه is a frequent equivalent for עצה in S, even as لحمه is for פרה.

4. See Eugene Ulrich et al., eds., *Qumran Cave 4.X: The Prophets*, DJD 15 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1997), 93, 105.

8:11

Neither S nor OG represents initial כִּי. The bottom line of 4Q60 (frag. 12) begins with כִּי אָמַר יְהוָה. The preceding line began with עָצָה וְתָפַר, the initial words of 8:10, but the remainder is lost. Although this leaves the possibility that כִּי stood at the end of that line, Patrick Skehan and Eugene Ulrich opined that “There was probably a short interval at the end of this line (לִי ס), and it is unlikely that this scribe wrote כִּי ... after the interval, at its left margin.”⁵ Although the lack of representation of כִּי in S likely betrays its absence in its *Vorlage*, כִּי is one of the particles most frequently without an equivalent in OG (Van der Vorm-Croughs, 95), leaving the reason for its absence here ambiguous.

Old Greek’s lack of an equivalent for אֲלִי might reflect implicitation, with the indirect object omitted as self-evident (so Van der Vorm-Croughs, 77; cf. 1:23’s ὁρῶντες οὐ κλίνοντες ἀλλὰ κλίνουσιν ἡρώων οὐ προσέχοντες || יתום (לֹא יִשְׁפֹּטוּ וְרִיב אֲלֵמָנָה לֹא יִבֹּא אֵלֵיהֶם). However, as recently as 8:1 OG rendered וְיֹאמַר יְהוָה אֲלִי with ἀλλὰ εἰπὲν κύριος πρὸς με. Therefore, this case must be evaluated in conjunction with other divergences from MT in this verse.

Although ἀπειθοῦσι might suggest that the translator analyzed וִיסְרִנִּי as the *hiphil* imperfect of סוּר, similar to S’s سَعَى—perhaps even lacking the prefixed *waw*, similar to 1QIsa^a’s יִסְרִינוּ—Fischer (23), comparing οἱ ἄρχοντές σου ἀπειθοῦσιν || שְׂרִיד סוֹרְרִים in 1:23, reasonably posited that the translator related the verb to סָרַר. Although OG’s failure to reflect the pronominal suffix—whether וִיסְרִנִּי with MT (cf. S, V, T) or יִסְרִינוּ with 1QIsa^a—might indicate that it read וִיסַר, a decision on that question must be linked with evaluation of τῇ πορείᾳ τῆς ὁδοῦ || מַלְכָּת בְּדֶרֶךְ (S, مَلِكَةُ سَبِيلِ). (חַסְדֵּי וְחַסְדֵּי אֱלֹהִים).

While the lexical choice of τῇ πορείᾳ || (מ)לְכָת echoes τῇ πορείᾳ || הִלֹךְ in 3:16, the lack of an equivalent for prefixed מִן is unique to this verse.⁶ The translator typically renders מִן + infinitive construct via an infinitival phrase with privative semantics (e.g., τοῦ μὴ βρέξαι εἰς αὐτὸν ὑετός || מִהַמְטִיר עָלָיו מָטָר, 5:6).⁷ Even when he chooses a different syntactic construction (e.g., ἵνα μὴ ἡσυχάσῃ || מִשְׁמַע or ἵνα μὴ ἡδῶ || מִרְאוֹת

5. Ulrich, *Qumran Cave 4.X*, 105. Ulrich presumes this evaluation again in his more recent edited volume, *Biblical Qumran Scrolls*, 346.

6. This equivalence appears again only in Jonah 3:3; Prov 2:7.

7. As an action complementary to a verb (5:6; 24:10), object (21:3), negative pur-

in 33:15), the relationship to the morphology of the Hebrew remains discernable.⁸ In the present case, the lack of an equivalent for prefixed מן likely owes to the choice of ἀπειθοῦσι, a verb whose complement is regularly in the dative case (cf. ἀπειθεῖ πονηρίᾳ || מאס ברע, 7:16). While Goshen-Gottstein (לא) reasonably infers that the lack of an equivalent for the *bet* of בדרך is a “condens[ation],” the associated neglect of the prefixed preposition in מלכת, along with omission of an equivalent for the *kaph* in חזקת היד (ἡσχρηξί χειρί), makes it more likely that the translator also disregarded the suffixed pronoun of (ו/)יִסְרֵנִי than that he found a reading like ויסר in his *Vorlage*.

In the light of these modifications, the translator’s silence on אלי is attributable to his construal of the verse in its context rather than lack of אלי from his *Vorlage*.⁹ The omission of an equivalent for אלי might be in service of the translator’s shaping of the pronouns of 8:12–14 to address a group. The implication of אלי that the oracle was delivered to an individual might have seemed to him a diversion from perceiving the addressees as a group.

8:12

A conundrum arises immediately with μήποτε εἴπητε σκληρόν, which NETS translates with, “Never say ‘hard.’” Although LSJ notes that μήποτε is used with the aorist subjunctive as a prohibition in Classical Greek,

pose (59:2), or result (49:15; 56:2, 9), or expressing incapacity to undertake an action (28:20; 33:19; 44:18; 59:1).

8. Cf. ἀφ’ οὗ ἐποίησα ἄνθρωπον εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα || משומי עם עולם, 44:7; μέγα σοί ἐστιν τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ σε παῖδά μου || נקל מהיותך לי עבד, 49:6. In 54:9 (καθότι ὥμοσα αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ ἐκείνῳ ἧ γῆ μὴ θυμωθήσεται ἐπὶ σοὶ ἔτι || וְעַל הָאָרֶץ || אשר נשבעתי מעבר מי נח עוד על הארץ || כן נשבעתי מקצף עליך) the translator appears to have been perplexed by מעבר מי נח and perhaps construed מעבר מי נח as מי נח, setting aside מעבר entirely. In 58:13, οὐκ ἀρεῖς τὸν πόδα σου ἐπ’ ἔργῳ || מעשות דרכיך || accords with the translator’s avoidance of repeated phrases, since he had rendered משבת רגלך תשיב אם תפצץ with ἐὰν ἀποστρέψῃς τὸν πόδα σου ἀπὸ τῶν σαββάτων τοῦ μὴ ποιεῖν τὰ θελήματά σου earlier in the verse. He likely chose ἀρεῖς in order to describe moving the foot ἐπ’ ἔργῳ, which might be his equivalent for the second occurrence of תפצץ that appears two words later. γινώσκω ἐγὼ ὅτι σκληρὸς εἶ || כי קשה אתה || מידעתי in 48:4 renders מידעתי as if it were ידעתי.

9. Attempts to link the translator’s rendering of these verses to political events in Jerusalem of the early second century BCE are untenable (see Troxel, 237–43), leaving us with shifts but no verifiable explanation of their motivation.

GELS, *BDAG*, and *BDF* list no examples of μήποτε with a volitive, and there is no clear example elsewhere in the Greek Bible.¹⁰ The only other instance of μήποτε translating אֲלֵ is a report of words addressed to Joseph by his brothers: καὶ εἶπαν αὐτῷ μήποτε ἐκτριβῶμεν ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν || וַיֹּאמְרוּ לוֹ לֹא נִכְחַד מֵאֲדֹנָי (Gen 47:18). Although this might be an indirect volitive, a similar use of μήποτε in the brothers' plot following Isaac's death (50:15) is not so easily explained: εἶπαν μήποτε μνησικακήσῃ ἡμῖν Ἰωσήφ (|| וַיֹּסֶפוּ לֵאמֹר יוֹסֵף יִשְׁטַמְנוּ לוֹ) καὶ ἀνταπόδομα ἀνταποδῶ ἡμῖν πάντα τὰ κακά ἃ ἐνεδειξάμεθα αὐτῷ. Because this rumination is followed by the brothers approaching Joseph with a false report of Isaac having required that he pardon them, μήποτε μνησικακήσῃ ἡμῖν Ἰωσήφ seems a compressed expression of apprehension along the lines, "There is reason to fear that Joseph will bear ill-will against us." This accords with *GELS*'s (s.v. "μήποτε") observation that the nuance of apprehension with μήποτε can be tacit.¹¹ In that light, (καὶ εἶπαν αὐτῷ) μήποτε ἐκτριβῶμεν ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν in Gen 47:18 likely approximates, "We fear that we might perish from before our lord," which is explained by the following clause, εἰ γὰρ ἐκλέλοιπεν τὸ ἀργύριον καὶ τὰ ὑπάρχοντα καὶ τὰ κτήνη πρὸς σέ τὸν κύριον, καὶ οὐχ ὑπολείπεται ἡμῖν ἐναντίον τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν ἀλλ' ἢ τὸ ἴδιον σῶμα καὶ ἡ γῆ ἡμῶν: "because given that our money, goods, and possessions have devolved to you, our lord, the only things remaining to us are our bodies and our land."

Accordingly, against the *NETS* assumption that λέγοντες in Isa 8:11 introduces a statement of strong resistance to "the journey of the way of this people" in the form of prohibiting use of the word σκληρόν (8:12), μήποτε likely expresses the *reason* for that opposition: "lest you say something harsh." The insertion of γάρ in πᾶν γάρ ὃ ἐὰν εἴπῃ ὁ λαὸς οὗτος σκληρόν ἐστὶ (|| וְכָל אֲשֶׁר יֹאמַר הָעָם הַזֶּה קֶשֶׁר) would, then, explain that fear as rooted in the people's habits of speech.

10. Although μήποτε θῆς διαθήκην τοῖς ἐγκαθημένοις ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς in Exod 34:15 initially seems to qualify, it reprises πρόσεχε σεαυτῷ μήποτε θῆς διαθήκην τοῖς ἐγκαθημένοις ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς in 8:12 (μήποτε renders פ in both verses).

11. Similarly, μήποτε ἐκτριβῶμεν ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν in Gen 47:18 should be translated, "We fear being annihilated from our lord," following which the brothers explain the reason for their fear (εἰ γὰρ ἐκλέλοιπεν τὸ ἀργύριον καὶ τὰ ὑπάρχοντα καὶ τὰ κτήνη πρὸς σέ τὸν κύριον) and propose a remedy (8:19): ἵνα οὖν μὴ ἀποθάνωμεν ἐναντίον σου (|| לִמָּוֶת נָמוּת לֹעֵינִךְ) ... κτῆσαι ἡμᾶς καὶ τὴν γῆν ἡμῶν ἀντὶ ἄρτων.

σαληρόν || קשר is readily diagnosed as involving קשה versus קשר, whether owing to a variant in the *Vorlage*, taking advantage of unclear orthography, or lexical association based on the first two consonants. There is no clear basis to decide between these options.

Much remains oblique in these verses (not least of which is the subject of ἀπειθοῦσι), and we need not assume that the translator had a clear picture of the actors and actions he divined in his source text. Nevertheless, the modifications he introduced in 8:11, his choice of μήποτε || לא, and his insertion of γάρ in this verse suggest that he was intent on producing a sensible Greek translation.

Syriac's ܐܡܝܢ || ܐܡܝܢ, while perhaps reflecting minus ܬܠ in its *Vorlage*, should be compared to its use of ܐܡܝܢ for *lamed* in 11:3 (ܐܡܝܢ (ܠܡܫܡܥ ܐܝܢܝ || ܐܡܝܢ ܐܝܢܝܢ and ܠܡܪܐܗ ܥܝܢܝ || ܐܡܝܢ ܥܝܢܝܢ) or insertion within an expanded phrase in 60:9 (ܐܡܝܢ ܐܝܢܝܢ) and 62:5 (ܐܡܝܢ ܐܝܢܝܢ). In any case, ܐܡܝܢ here makes the presence or absence of ܬܠ in S's *Vorlage* hard to determine.

The 3mp pronominal suffix on ܐܡܝܢܝܢ || (ܐܡܝܢܝܢ) is *constructio ad sensum* following ܐܡܝܢ. ܐܡܝܢ is Syriac's typical preposition prefixed to a complement to ܐܡܝܢ.

Although παρασσω is nowhere else the equivalent for ערץ, compare use of καὶ παραχθήσονται || ונבהלו in 13:8 and the wide range of Hebrew verbs παρασσω translates in the book, as discussed at 3:12. φόβος is the single equivalent for מוראכם and מערצכם in 8:13, and φοβηθήσονται renders יעריצו in 29:23. παραχθήτε might have been used after οὐ μὴ φοβηθήτε || לא תיראו to avoid repeating that verb in the next clause.

8:13

Old Greek lacks an equivalent for צבאות again in 9:18; 10:23, 26; 14:24; 19:17, 18, 20; 24:23; 31:5; 39:5. On OG's minuses with divine names, see the commentary at 3:15. Van der Vorm-Crougths (68 n. 13) speculates that an equivalent for צבאות may have been omitted for the sake of "assimilation to the phrase κύριος αὐτός/αὐτὸς κύριος, which occurs in LXX Isa 3:14; 7:14; and 63:9, and elsewhere in the LXX e.g., in Deut 10:9; 18:2; and Ps 104:7, 21; 151:3."

Syriac is the only witness to lack an equivalent for אתו, which could owe to parablepsis following צבאות but just as likely reflects the translator's judgment that ܐܬܐ would be superfluous following ܐܬܐ (cf. discussion of S's lack of an equivalent for הוא in אות in לכם 7:14).

Old Greek and S both render תקדישו with an imperative (ἀγιάσατε/ܡܒܥܫܐ) raising the question of whether their *Vorlagen* read הקדישו. Both translators rendered תהיה with an imperative in 3:6 (γενεῖ/ܡܢܝܐ), where קצין תהיה לנו implies a command. Old Greek shifts second-person future forms to imperatives in 27:12 (συναγάγετε || תלקטו); 30:16 (ἀλλ' εἶπατε || ותאמרו), while S does so in 20:2, where ܡܢܝܐ suffices for both לפתחת and תחלץ. Notable are the different tenses each chooses for Hebrew imperfect forms in the rhetorical questions of 3:15: τί ὑμεῖς ἀδικεῖτε/ܚܡܠܐ || מלכם תדכאו; and κατασχύνετε/ܠܚܡܠܐ || תטחנו. Of similar interest is a comparison of αἰ ἀπέστρεψας τὸν θυμόν σου καὶ ἡλέησάς με with ܡܠܟܐ ܝܫܒ || ܝܫܒ ܝܫܒ ܝܫܒ in 12:1, where both translators recognize that the words forecast for the future look back on the replacement of anger with comfort and, thus, they chose the past tense. The variety with which each translator rendered imperfect forms and the discourse logic that makes them sensible in each case accounts for their imperative equivalents for תקדישו rather than *Vorlagen* that read הקדישו.

For מערצכם S reads ܡܥܪܥܬܟܡ “your helper,” in contrast to its rendering of תעריצו by ܠܡܥܪܥ in 8:12 (cf. ܠܡܥܪܥ || ואל תערצו, Deut 31:6); and לערץ in 2:19, 21 (cf. ܠܡܥܪܥ || לערץ in Ps 10:18).¹² Syriac renders the remaining occurrences of ערץ in Isaiah with forms of ܠܡܥܪܥ || ܠܡܥܪܥ, 29:3; ܠܡܥܪܥ || ܠܡܥܪܥ, 10:33; ܠܡܥܪܥ || ܠܡܥܪܥ, 47:12), an equivalent found nowhere outside Isaiah. The association of ערץ with “strength” might, however, help explain ܡܥܪܥܬܟܡ here (as Warszawski [21] posited), since S renders מעוז מעוז כי היית מעוז לדל מעוז לאביון ܡܥܘܙ ܡܥܘܙ ܡܥܘܙ ܡܥܘܙ || ܡܥܘܙ ܡܥܘܙ ܡܥܘܙ ܡܥܘܙ in 25:4 with ܡܥܘܙ ܡܥܘܙ ܡܥܘܙ ܡܥܘܙ, reflecting analysis that the metaphor of God as a stronghold means that he is a help.¹³

Although we cannot rule out that καὶ αὐτὸς ἔσται σου φόβος || והוא מערצכם might attest the absence of one of the two phrases from the *Vorlage*, this translator frequently collapses synonymous phrases.¹⁴ His rendering of the 2mp pronominal suffix with the grammatically singular σου correlates with πεποιθὼς ἦς ἔσται σοι in 8:14.

12. ܡܥܪܥ is the more frequent equivalent for ערץ (Deut 1:29; 7:21; Josh 1:9), although we also find ܠܡܥܪܥ || ܠܡܥܪܥ in Deut 20:3.

13. There is evidence of this inference also in Psalms: e.g., ܡܥܪܥ ܡܥܪܥ || יהוה עזי, 31:5; ܡܥܪܥ ܡܥܪܥ || כי אתה מעוזי, 28:8; ܡܥܪܥ ܡܥܪܥ || ומעוזי, 28:7.

14. Thus Goshen-Gottstein (לא) marks this with “condens.”

8:14

Two pluses in OG are remarkable. Ziegler's explanation of +καὶ ἐὰν ἐπ' αὐτῷ πεποιθὼς ᾖς as evincing the translator's struggle to connect והיה למקדש with what precedes finds a parallel (as he notes) in T's prefix of a conditional protasis: ואם לא תקבלון ויהי מימריה בכון לפורען. Targum's focus on the consequences of refusing to receive the (prophetic) mandate differentiates its strategy for linking 8:14 to 8:13 from OG's focus on what accrues to the one relying on the Kyrios. Despite the similar creation of a conditional sentence, this difference weakens Zielger's (96) claim that the parallel proves that OG's maneuver "wohl nicht eine Privatmeinung eines Übers. vorliegt, sondern bereits eine Schultradition." Similarly, his claim (95) that the translator "zweifelloos von 28,16 abhängig gewesen, wo derselbe Gedanke (allerdings etwas variierend) ausgesprochen ist" rests on the similar theme of reliance on the Kyrios that protects against disaster, with which the phrases ἐπ' αὐτῷ πεποιθὼς ᾖς and καὶ ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ' αὐτῷ share only vocabulary, while the expansion of 8:14 with συναντήσεσθε αὐτῷ has no obvious connection to οὐ μὴ καταισχυθῇ there. On the other hand, phrases involving a perfect active participle of πείθω are frequent, even when not semantically apt, suggesting that ἐπ' αὐτῷ πεποιθὼς ᾖς was diction ready-to-hand for the translator.¹⁵ Correspondingly, he hardly needed special warrant to insert συναντήσεσθε αὐτῷ as the harmful event that a pious person would avoid.

The variation of grammatical number between πεποιθὼς ᾖς ἔσται σοι and συναντήσεσθε matches the shift from ἀγιάσατε to σου φόβος in 8:13. While the grammatical number in 8:13 differs from מוראכם והוא מערצכם, the pronouns in 8:14, having no Hebrew counterparts, strengthen the argument that the translator generated the shifts.

Van der Vorm-Croughs (49) reasonably places +σοι (ἔσται σοι εἰς ἀγίασμα || והיה למקדש) among cases of a pronoun added for explicitation. Seeligmann (57) ranks καὶ οὐχ ὡς λίθου || ולאבן among instances when the translator supplied a negative particle (see the commentary on 1:19,

15. πείθω most often renders בטח (sixteen times, as well as מבטם and מבטנו in 20:5, 6, based on biliteral association); but also קוה (8:17; 33:2); מחסה (28:17; cf. 30:3, based on biliteral association), שען (20:10 [2x]; 30:12; 32:3; so also for שעה in 17:7, 8, based on biliteral association), and words even farther afield semantically, such as תלה (22:24); תתענג (58:14); תברעו (65:12), or even without a corresponding Hebrew word, as in 32:19.

24), which occurs so frequently (see Troxel, 93–99) so as to make positing a dittograph **וּלֹא לֵאבֹן** in the *Vorlage* unnecessary (*pace* Ziegler, 95). The translator's supplements make his modification of the prepositions in **וּלֵצִוֹר** and **וּלֵאבֹן** a minor feature of his rendering, but it is notable that his shifts explicitize these as metaphors.

Old Greek's **ὁ δὲ οἶκος Ἰακωβ** is not a translation of **בְּתֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל** (MT, 1QIsa^a; cf. S, V, T). Although the lack of an equivalent for **בְּ** fits this translator's tendencies (cf. **ἐγκαθήμενοι** || **לְיוֹשֵׁב**), nowhere else does OG read a name in place of **יִשְׂרָאֵל**, and every other occurrence of **οἶκος Ἰακωβ** in Isaiah corresponds to **בֵּית יַעֲקֹב** (2:3, 5; 8:17; 14:1; 29:22; 46:3; 48:1; 58:1).¹⁶ Because OG does not seem to have effected this type of change elsewhere, **בֵּית יַעֲקֹב** probably stood in its *Vorlage*. Although Goshen-Gottstein's (**לֵב**) attribution of this change to the translator is unlikely, his suggestion that it reflects exegesis by association with 8:17 could be correct. There is, however, no reason to deny that to an earlier scribal tradent.

(**ὁ δὲ οἶκος Ἰακωβ**) **ἐν παγίδι καὶ ἐν κοιλάσματι ἐγκαθήμενοι ἐν Ἱερουσαλημ** || **יְרוּשָׁלַם לְיוֹשֵׁב וּלְמוֹקֵשׁ לִפְנֵי** (לְבֵית יַעֲקֹב) entails modifications of prepositions, similar to **ὡς λίθου προσκόμματι ... ὡς πέτρας πτώματι** || **וּלְאֵבֹן נֶגֶד** and **ἐν παγίδι** || **לִפְנֵי** uses an equivalent that occurs elsewhere (24:17, 18; 42:22), **καὶ ἐν κοιλάσματι** || **וּלְמוֹקֵשׁ** not only uses an equivalent unattested elsewhere (cf. **πρόσκομμα** [Exod 23:33; 34:12]; **σκάλλον** [Exod 10:7; Deut 7:16]; and especially **σκάνδαλον** [e.g., Josh 23:13; 1 Sam 18:21; Pss 68(69):23; 105(106):36;]), but a word found nowhere else in the Greek Bible. The cognate nouns **κοιλὰς** (“a valley/hollow”) and **κοιλία** (a body cavity, often “belly/womb”) occur in the Greek Bible with the same senses as in Classical Greek (cf. LSJ and GELS, s.v. “κοιλὰς,” “κοιλία”), which leads Muraoka, noting the parallel **ἐν παγίδι**, to venture that **ἐν κοιλάσματι ἐγκαθήμενοι** means “lying in ambush” (GELS, s.v. “κοίλασμα”). However, as suggested by **καὶ οἱ ἐγκαθήμενοι ἐν Σαμαρείᾳ** (|| **וְיוֹשֵׁב שְׁמֶרֶן**) in 9:9(8) (the only other use of **ἐγκαθήμενοι** in Isaiah), **ἐγκαθήμενοι** should be linked to **ἐν Ἱερουσαλημ** as the subject of its nonverbal clause, parallel to **ὁ δὲ οἶκος Ἰακωβ**.

A clue to what the translator imagines here is the translation of **הַיְעֲלֶה** **יְלֹכֹד** in Amos 3:5 with **εἰ σχασθήσεται παγὶς ἐπὶ τῆς**

16. **οἶκος τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ** renders **בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל** in 5:7 and 63:7, but no equivalent appears for it in 14:2, likely because it was a later gloss (see the comments ad loc). Similarly, in 46:3 OG's **καὶ πᾶν τὸ κατάλοιπον τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ** || **בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל** agrees with S's **וְכָל שְׁאֵרֵי בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל**, suggesting that **בֵּית** is secondary.

γῆς ἄνευ τοῦ συλλαβεῖν τι. The verb σχάζω appears only here in the Greek Bible, but is attested in Classical Greek as an action of traps (see LSJ, s.v. “σχαζω”) when their tension is relaxed and they snap shut. In that light, the translator’s selection of ἐν κοιλάσματι, parallel to ἐν παγίδι, envisions the concave center of a trap, with the idea that peril impends for the inhabitants of Jerusalem, coming when the trap snaps shut.

Syriac’s plural nouns ܚܦܬܐ ܕܠܡܘܩܫ || ܚܦܬܐ ܕܠܡܘܩܫ are intelligible in light of its construal of ליושב as a collective: ܚܦܬܐ ܕܠܡܘܩܫ. For ܡܠܟܐ || מלכות compare Lev 19:14; 1 Sam 25:31; Isa 57:14.

8:15

While S tracks with MT and 1QIsa^a (as do V and T), OG contains pluses and unusual equivalents. In thirty-seven of its forty-one occurrences, διὰ τοῦτο is OG’s equivalent for לכן (e.g., 1:24; 5:24) or על כן (e.g., 9:17[16]; 13:7), while it aligns with אכן in 49:4. It appears without a Hebrew counterpart in 27:4 (τοῖνυν διὰ τοῦτο ἐποίησεν κύριος ὁ θεὸς πάντα ὅσα συνέταξεν || אפשעה בה אציתנה יחד); 64:5 (διὰ τοῦτο ἐπλανήθημεν || בהם עולם ונושע), both of which entail extensive differences from extant Hebrew witnesses, betraying scant dependence on the *Vorlage*.¹⁷

Although it is possible that διὰ τοῦτο is the translator’s rendering of conjunctive *waw* in וכשלו, he typically uses νῦν to explicitize connections in such cases (νῦν δέ, 33:4; 37:28; καὶ νῦν, 26:11; 51:13). While his use of διὰ τοῦτο in phrases he created (27:4; 64:4) leaves open the possibility that he supplied it here, it is also possible that a scribe had already inserted לכן or על כן to link 8:15 to 8:14.¹⁸

Even if, as Van der Kooij notes, ἀδυνατέω occurs only here in the Greek Bible (ἀδυνατήσουσιν || כשלו[ו]), that is inadequate for his identification of those opposed to “the way of this people” as those in “a posi-

17. Zielger (87) describes 27:2–5 as “ein schönes Beispiel dafür, daß der Übers. sich von einem Gedanken ... leiten ließ und im Bannkreis dieser Vorstellung die einzelnen Ausdrücke übersetzte.” Although he detects points of contact between words in OG and MT (ἐποίησεν || אפשעה, via עשה; συνέταξεν || אציתנה), he (90) accounts for the final two lines above as language taken from Isa 37:26; Lam 2:17.

18. Uncertainty over the origins of διὰ τοῦτο places a question mark over Seeligmann’s (105–6) citation of it as a mark of the translator shaping this passage as a polemic against antinomians in his day. His hypothesis does not stand or fall on this claim, but the question of what stood in the *Vorlage* affects judgments of whether the translator (re)shaped the passage.

tion of power and might” in the translator’s sociopolitical environment.¹⁹ Since OG elsewhere renders כשל with terms for loss of power (ἀνεῖται, 3:8; ἀνίσχυες ἔσονται, 40:30; καταναλώθη, 59:14), ἀδυνατήσουσιν affords no basis for speculating about the translator’s motivation.

A greater divergence from the putative *Vorlage* arises with καὶ ἐγγιούσι || וְנוֹקְשׁוּ, followed by +ἄνθρωποι ἐν ἀσφαλείᾳ ὄντες. Ziegler (34) notes the different rendering of the similar verb sequence in 28:13: καὶ πέσωσιν εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω καὶ κινδυνεύσουσιν καὶ συντριβήσονται καὶ ἀλώσονται || וְכָשְׁלוּ אַחֲרָיו וְנִלְכְּדוּ וְנוֹשְׁבְּרוּ וְנוֹקְשׁוּ. Given how frequently συντρίβω renders שבר (1:28; 14:5, 29; 21:9; 42:3; 45:2; 61:1), καὶ κινδυνεύσουσιν appears the equivalent for וְנוֹקְשׁוּ. Because κινδυνεύω is but one of the diverse equivalents for יקש in the Greek Bible, there seems to have been uncertainty about the latter’s meaning.²⁰ Accordingly, καὶ ἐγγιούσι || וְנוֹקְשׁוּ (the only other occurrence of יקש in Isaiah) was likely a guess, perhaps through phonetic association with נוש, as Ziegler (34) suggested (so also Goshen-Gottstein, לב). One consequence of this choice is that καὶ ἐγγιούσι καὶ ἀλώσονται depicts action distinct from καὶ πεσοῦνται καὶ συντριβήσονται (as Ziegler’s comma after συντριβήσονται implies). Although Ziegler (62) posits that this distinction prompted the translator to supply ἄνθρωποι ἐν ἀσφαλείᾳ ὄντες as subject, Van der Kooij’s speculation that the phrase “is probably based on the Hebrew צור taken in the sense of ‘rock,’ ‘refuge’” is attractive.²¹ It would explain the absence, otherwise, of an equivalent for צור and could reflect reasoning from 2:10, where entering בְּצֹר has to do with hiding oneself from divine wrath. Even if this yields no firm conclusion about the *Vorlage*, it provides an attractive hypothesis about how the translator might have derived the phrase from a text resembling MT.

8:16

This is one of four passages in OG Isaiah without a clear equivalent for τότε (30:15; 44:8; 65:25), which otherwise translates או (35:5, 6; 41:1; 45:21; 58:8, 9; 60:5); waw prefixed to a verb (28:25; 30:23; 58:10); and בעת

19. Arie van der Kooij, “Isaiah in the Septuagint,” in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah*, ed. Craig C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans, VTSup 70 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 528.

20. πταίω, Deut 7:25; ἐπιτίθῃμι, Jer 27(50):24; θηρεύω, Ps 123(124):7; συνίστημι, Ps 140(141):9; παγίς, Prov 6:2; παγιδεύω, Qoh 9:12.

21. Van der Kooij, “Isaiah in the Septuagint,” 526.

8:18

In καὶ ἔσται εἰς σημεῖα || לאתות the translator appears to have supplied καὶ ἔσται to set this clause apart from the previous one.

All manuscripts of S read 𐤒𐤒 and 𐤒𐤒𐤕𐤕𐤕—grammatically singular—against לאתות and ולמופתים in MT (OG εἰς σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα, T אתין [ומופתין] but in agreement with 1QIsa^a (לאות ולמופת) and V (*in signum et in portentum*). The grammatically plural forms are suspect of having been conformed to the compound subject אנכי והילדים, while there is no evident motivation to shift the plural forms to the singular number.

8:19

Old Greek's τοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς φωνοῦντας || האבות is the equivalence used also in 19:3; 29:4. The more common equivalent elsewhere is ἐγγαστρίμυθος (Lev 19:31; 20:6, 27; Deut 18:11; 1 Kgdms 28:3, 7; 1 Sam 28:8, 9; 1 Chr 19:13; 2 Chr 33:6), which here renders הידענים, as it does in 19:3.²³

The verb צפף appears only in Isaiah and always in the *polel*. Old Greek's equivalent for its other appearances is obscure: ἡ ἀντίπη μοι || ומוצפפה (10:14); καὶ πρὸς τὸ ἔδαφος ἡ φωνή σου ἀσθενήσει || ומעפר (29:24); and οὕτως φωνήσω || כן אצפפה אהגה (38:14). Old Greek's τοὺς κενολογοῦντας, a verb that occurs only here in the Greek Bible, must be considered within the larger phrase, המצפפים והמהגים, whose οἱ ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας φωνοῦσιν || והמהגים is also unique. Old Greek's most frequent equivalent for הגה is μελετάω (16:7; 27:8; 33:18; 59:3, 13), although ὃν τρόπον ἐὰν βοήσῃ ὁ λέων ἢ ὁ ἀσύννος || כאשר יהגה האריה והכפיר appears in 31:4. ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας elsewhere in Isaiah renders מבטן (44:2, 24; 46:3; 48:8; 49:1), as typically throughout the Greek Bible. The whole of τοὺς κενολογοῦντας οἱ ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας φωνοῦσιν || המצפפים והמהגים seems, then, to be the translator's own paraphrase.

Syriac's equivalents, ܡܥܦܦܐ ... ܡܥܦܦܐ, are commonplace (e.g., Lev 19:31; Deut 18:11; 1 Sam 28:3), while ܡܥܦܦܐ ܡܥܦܦܐ are the same equivalents used in 38:14 (ܡܥܦܦܐ ܡܥܦܦܐ || כן אצפפה אהגה).

23. 4 Kgdms 21:6; 23:24 use θελητής for אוב. Equivalents for ידענים elsewhere are ἐπασιδός (Lev 19:31; 20:6, 27; 2 Chr 33:6); γνώστης (1 Kgdms 28:3, 9; 4 Kgdms 21:6; 23:24 [γγνωριστής]); and τερατοσκόπος (Deut 18:1).

Although S largely follows Hebrew word order, it reformulates the final half of the verse as the response to those advocating various types of divination. In place of the *he*-interrogative, it supplies the past predicate ܡܡܝܢ and integrates its equivalent for יִדְרֹשׁ into the relative construction $\text{ܐܢܝܢ ܕܝܕܪܫܝܢ ܒܥܕ ܗܚܝܝܡ ܐܠ}$. Although it rearranges the word order of ܐܠ with ܡܡܝܢ with ܬܠ ܕܠܚܝܝܡ , it retains its semantics (for ܐܠ as “on behalf of” cf. $\text{ܐܠܝܐܬܝܢ ܕܡܡܝܢ ܕܡܡܝܢ ܕܡܡܝܢ}$ in 37:4).

8:20

The ambiguous syntactic role of ܠܬܘܪܗ ܘܠܬܥܘܕܗ has its effects on S. Manuscript 7a1 has a minor stop at the end of 8:19, and another stands after ܠܬܘܪܗ ܘܠܬܥܘܕܗ , with a full stop at the end of the next clause. This phrasing construes ܠܬܘܪܗ ܘܠܬܥܘܕܗ as continuing the assertion at the end of 8:19. Setting aside this punctuation, an alternative is to connect ܠܬܘܪܗ ܘܠܬܥܘܕܗ with what follows, as do Greenberg and Walter (*ad loc*): “On account of the law and on account of the testimony, they should not speak thus.” However, the translation of ܠܬܘܪܗ ܘܠܬܥܘܕܗ as “they should not speak” is problematic, since ܠܬܘܪܗ ܘܠܬܥܘܕܗ + imperfect expresses negative purpose/apprehension.

Syriac’s $\text{ܠܬܘܪܗ ܘܠܬܥܘܕܗ ܐܡ ܠܐ}$ recalls the observation at Isa 5:19 about S’s varied equivalents for ܐܡ ܠܐ , which it often omits. In this case it represents the negative particle, but creates a negative purpose clause: “lest they speak according to this word, for which there is no bribe to give.” The most likely construal of this phrase is to identify the subject of ܠܬܘܪܗ ܘܠܬܥܘܕܗ with ܕܡܡܝܢ in 8:19: “The people of God are not those who seek the dead on behalf of the living about torah and testimony so as to avoid saying this sort of thing for which there is no ransom.”

Old Greek’s $\text{ἵνα εἰπωσιν οὐχ ὡς τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο || ἅμλα ἡμῶν ܐܡ ܠܐ}$ employs an atypical equivalent for ܐܡ ܠܐ , although OG renders ܐܡ ܠܐ distinctly elsewhere (e.g., $\text{ὅτι ἐκπλυνεῖ κύριος || ἅμλα ἡμῶν ܐܡ ܠܐ}$, 4:4; $\text{ὅτι οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται ὑμῖν αὐτὴ ἡ ἁμαρτία || ἅμλα ἡμῶν ܐܡ ܠܐ}$, 24:14). Although this negative purpose clause is reminiscent of S, it functions differently in relationship to the clause that precedes it.

$\text{νόμον γὰρ εἰς βοήθειαν ἔδωκεν || ἅμλα ἡμῶν ܐܡ ܠܐ}$ must be ranked as a reformulation. As Ottley (2:150) perceived, OG’s εἰς βοήθειαν is based on reading ܠܬܘܪܗ ܘܠܬܥܘܕܗ as a form of ܐܡ ܠܐ , while adding “ ἔδωκεν to complete the sense; γὰρ for connection.” It is the help of torah that keeps its adherents from speaking ὡς τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο .

Old Greek's δῶρα and S's ܕܘܪܐ suggest that either their *Vorlagen* read שדח or they misconstrued the *resh* of שחר as a *dalet*.²⁴ Likewise, both translators supplied an infinitive (δοῦναι/ܕܡܝܢܐ). However, because ܕܡܝܢܐ ܕܡܝܢܐ ܕܡܝܢܐ does not accord with νόμον γὰρ εἰς βοήθειαν ἔδωκεν, it is difficult to regard ܕܡܝܢܐ ܕܡܝܢܐ ܕܡܝܢܐ as reflecting dependence on OG.

8:21

σακληρά λιμός || נקשה ורעב confirms that καὶ ἤξει ἐφ' ὑμᾶς || ועבר בה is chosen for this reformulation. ἐφ' ὑμᾶς indicates that the translator looked back to πρὸς ὑμᾶς || אליכם in 8:19 for its referent. Although ἤγω most frequently translates בוא, there are cases lacking a Hebrew equivalent (e.g., 10:29; 30:28; 32:19), or that align with a nontypical equivalent (e.g., תחרף, 18:6; ישרתונך, 60:7; ויעמדו, 61:5). A ready association of ἤγω with ἐπί + pronoun is apparent in ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἤξει || עליו תחרף in 18:6 and ἡ δὲ χάλαζα ἐὰν καταβῇ οὐκ ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἤξει || וברד ברדת in 32:19.

ܕܡܝܢܐ shows that the translator recognized נקשה as derived from קשה but analyzed its *he* termination as a 3fs objective pronoun.

Syriac treats והיה as otiose (ܡܠܐ ܕܝܗܝܐ || ܡܠܐ ܕܝܗܝܐ), as in 5:12.²⁵

8:22

Whereas OG renders ונבט לארץ in 5:30 with καὶ ἐμβλέψονται εἰς τὴν γῆν, its use of the same equivalents for ואל ארץ יביט here incorporates ἀάτω. ἀάτω translates למטה in 37:31 and מתחת in 51:6, the latter case being the more significant: καὶ ἐμβλέψατε εἰς τὴν γῆν ἀάτω || והביטו אל הארץ מתחת. Given that ἀάτω does not appear in the similarly phrased 5:30, it appears less likely that the translator added it by attraction to 51:6 (since we would then expect it also in 5:30) than that a scribe had inserted it in 8:22, so that OG's *Vorlage* read ונבט אל הארץ מתחת. θλιψις renders צרה again in 30:6; 33:2; 37:3; 46:7; 63:9; 65:16.

Given the semantic alignment καὶ σαότος || וחשכה, καὶ στενοχωρία seems to be the equivalent to מעוף. However, we must consider this together with the rendering of the first half of 8:23 (in Hebrew):

24. So also Ottley (2:150); Bodor, "Reception of the Septuagint," 26.

25. By contrast, his rendering of temporal expressions involving ב + היה tends to be more isomorphic (e.g., 7:1, 18, 22, 23; 10:12, 20, 27; 11:10, 11).

כי לא מועף לאשר מוצק לה כעת

καὶ οὐκ ἀπορηθήσεται ὁ ἐν στενοχωρίᾳ ὡς ἔως καιροῦ

The physical alignment of ἀπορηθήσεται with מועף and στενοχωρία with מוצק differs from στενοχωρία || מעוף and ἀπορία || צוקה in 8:22. Meanwhile, καὶ τῇ στενοχωρίᾳ renders וצוקה in 30:6. Also worth noting in 8:22 is the word order καὶ στενοχωρία καὶ σκότος ἀπορία στενή || צוקה מעוף וחשכה. These variations call into question how much we can determine from word order here.

The translator's supply of στενή to modify ἀπορία might have been motivated by the preceding στενοχωρία, while ὥστε μὴ βλέπειν is a reasonably conceived consequence of the "distress and darkness," whether or not the translator related מנדח to מן + Aramaic דנח, as Fisher (23–24) proposed (cf. Ziegler, 139).

The preposition *bēth* בֵּית || ואל ארץ is the target language complement to ܒܝܬܝܢ. Syriac lacks an equivalent for והנה in midsentence, as it did in 8:7, likely a tendency of this translator (see the notes at 5:26).

ܡܥܘܬܝܐ appears to be S's equivalent for the phrase צוקה מעוף, judging by ܡܥܘܬܝܐ || צוקה in 8:23 (cf. ܡܥܘܬܝܐ || מעוף). The rendering of מנדח as a 3mp imperfect with a 3ms objective pronominal suffix (ܡܢܪܚܝܐ) betrays construal of ܡܢܪܚܝܐ ܡܢܪܚܝܐ ܡܢܪܚܝܐ as a compound subject.

8:23

Parallel to ܡܥܘܬܝܐ || מעוף here is ܡܢܪܚܝܐ || עיף in 5:27. In 8:22 the translator employed ܡܢܪܚܝܐ for צוקה and here renders מוצק with the *aphel* passive participle ܡܢܪܚܝܐ. This participle, in the masculine gender, may have left no clear role for לה, accounting for the lack of an equivalent.

Whereas כעת הראשון is likely meant to be construed with the following הקל, S connects ܡܢܪܚܝܐ ܡܢܪܚܝܐ ܡܢܪܚܝܐ with what precedes it: "for he will not exhaust the one who is weary just as in the former time." The implication is that the expulsion of the one who curses his god and king will bring relief to the one who has been distressed.

Although S's translation of הקל with ܡܢܪܚܝܐ seems to make the territories of Zebulun and Naphtali force haste on something, the verb can be used fientively: "they hasten."

Given that OG's previous verse ended with ἔως καιροῦ || בעת, πρῶτον aligns with הראשון, while ποίει has been supplied to fashion it into an imperative, similar to ταχὺ ποίει || הקל. (On the use of ποιέω + noun or

adverb to create a verbal phrase, see 1:24.) The compelling inference is that the translator also supplied *τοῦτο* to create a clause out of *הראשון*.

Although one might suppose that *והאחרון* derives from reading *והאחדון* and rendering it via Aramic (*והאחרון* renders *אחוז* in Num 27:7; 32:32; 35:2; Ps 2:8), it is equally possible that the translator read *והאחרון* as (Hebrew) *והאחזון*. *והאחרון* occurs just one more time in Isaiah, in 11:15, where its selection seems calibrated to the context: *והניח ידו על הנהר בעים רוחו* || *והניח ידו על הנהר בעים רוחו*. What seems clear is that it did not read *והאחרון*.

The translator uses *כבד* for *כבד* again in 24:20, where *כבד* corresponds to *הכבדת* *עלך* *מאד* in 47:6, where *כבד* represents *מאד*.

Seeligmann (80) argued convincingly that *καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ οἱ τὴν παραλίαν κατοικοῦντες* “was literally taken over from Ezek 25:16” (*καὶ ἀπολῶ τοὺς καταλείπους τοὺς κατοικοῦντας τὴν παραλίαν* || *והאבדתי את שארית חוף* (הים)). Van der Vorm-Croughs (432) raises the question of whether OG Ezekiel might rely on OG Isaiah instead, since *τοὺς κατοικοῦντας* is a plus in Ezekiel, while it leaves *הים* untranslated. However, as she (432 n. 340) notes, “*παραλία* already implies ‘the sea,’ so the separate mention of that noun is not necessary.” As for *τοὺς ... κατοικοῦντας*, translation of *שארית חוף* virtually requires a modifier to specify the relationship of *שארית חוף* to *הים*.²⁶ *τοὺς ... κατοικοῦντας* was likely added by the translator for that purpose.

1QIsa^a reads *ארצה זבולון וארצה נפתלי* for MT’s *ארץ זבולון והארץ נפתלי*, but OG hardly needs such morphology to justify its *χώρα Ζαβουλων ἡ γῆ Νεφθαλιμ*.

In association with observations about the translator’s interest in geography, Seeligmann (80) draws attention to *τὰ μέρη τῆς Ἰουδαίας* as amounting to a “technical formulation ... [for] the districts of Judea—or Palestine.” He (81 n. 21) notes that “the use of *μέρος*, in the technical signification of ‘district’ is particularly known from the papyri.” Even if Johan Lust reads too much into this phrase in asserting that it is meant to “apply the oracle originally addressed to the northern kingdom of Israel, to the southern of kingdom of Judah,” *μέρος* befits the kind of updating of geography found in OG-Isaiah.²⁷

26. On the relationship between OG-Isaiah and OG-Ezekiel, see Seeligmann, 74–75.

27. Johan Lust, “Messianism in the Septuagint: Isaiah 8:23b–9:6 (9:1–7),” in *The Interpretation of the Bible*, ed. Jozse Krašovec, JSOTSup 289 (Sheffield: Sheffield Aca-

Although S might have expanded הִירְדָן into מִסְוֵן מִסְוֵן, this phrase appears in none of the other 192 renderings of הִירְדָן in the Peshitta. On the other hand, never does הִנְהַר הִירְדָן occur in the Hebrew Bible, making a scribal addition of הִנְהַר here hard to imagine. מִסְוֵן מִסְוֵן occurs in the Syriac translation of 1 Macc 9:42, where the Greek lacks an equivalent for מִסְוֵן. Thus, it seems more likely that the translator supplied מִסְוֵן here than that he found הִנְהַר הִירְדָן in his *Vorlage*.

demic, 1998), 155. For the updating of geography, see Ronald L Troxel, “What’s in a Name? Contemporization and Toponyms in LXX-Isaiah,” in *Seeking Out the Wisdom of the Ancients: Essays Offered to Honor Michael V. Fox on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. Ronald L Troxel, Kelvin Friebe, and Dennis Magary (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2005), 327–44.

ISAIAH 9

9:1

The difference in grammatical number between δ πορευόμενος and ההלכים (cf. S حمل, مصحح) doubtless owes to its use as an attributive adjective directly joined with δ λαός (cf. λαὸς πλήρης || עם כבד 1:4). The translator is able to resume his habit of rendering subsequent references to collective עם with grammatically plural pronouns via analysis of ראו as an imperative (ἴδετε).¹ It and the subsequent shift in the pronoun of עליהם to ἐφ' ὑμᾶς (which could have forced reanalysis of ראו as a 3ms perfect form) confirm that δ λαὸς δ πορευόμενος is a vocative.²

|| ٩:١ || ٩:١ is S's regular equivalent (e.g., Jer 2:6; 13:16; Amos 5:8), even as σκιᾷ θανάτου is standard in OG (e.g., Jer 13:16; Amos 5:8; Ps 22[23]:4).

Only here does ٩:١ translate נגה, whose typical equivalent is ٩:١ (cf. 13:10; 2 Sam 22:29; Ps 18:29). Not surprisingly, ٩:١ most often translates זרח in Isaiah, as in 58:10; 60:1, 2, in each of which there is an association between light rising and deliverance. Isaiah 11:3's || ٩:١ || סגל סגל סגל || וְהָיָה אֵשׁ בְּרִיחַת יְהוָה examples the use of ٩:١ for an atypical equivalent, as does ٩:١ || ٩:١ || וְהָיָה אֵשׁ בְּרִיחַת יְהוָה in 58:8, where ٩:١ || ٩:١ || וְהָיָה אֵשׁ בְּרִיחַת יְהוָה seems to have been chosen in view of ٩:١ || ٩:١ || וְהָיָה אֵשׁ בְּרִיחַת יְהוָה in the next hemistich, while the choice of ٩:١ || ٩:١ || וְהָיָה אֵשׁ בְּרִיחַת יְהוָה likely owes to ٩:١ || ٩:١ || וְהָיָה אֵשׁ בְּרִיחַת יְהוָה in the preceding clause.

1. For an example of this habit, see τοίνυν αἰχμάλωτος ὁ λαὸς μου ἐγενήθη διὰ τὸ μὴ εἰδέναι αὐτοὺς τὸν κύριον || לכן גלה עמי מבלי דעת in 5:13.

2. The nominative often usurps the vocative form, especially with participial modifiers, “which hardly ever form the vocative” (BDF §147 [2]).

9:2

πλείστον occurs again in Isaiah only in 7:22's ἀπὸ τοῦ πλείστον || מרב, confirming that τὸ πλείστον is related to MT's הרבית הגוי but leaving open the question of what form stood in OG's *Vorlage*. All other textual witnesses reflect הרבית (1QIsa^a, הרביתה; S, 𐤇𐤓𐤁𐤓; T, אסגיתא; V, *multiplacasti*). However, τὸ πλείστον τοῦ λαοῦ || הרבית הגוי must be considered together with δ κατήγαγες || הגדלת and in light of what has already been noted about the translator's rendering of 9:1–5.

Scholz (36) posited that κατήγαγες reflects הרגלת in the *Vorlage*, owing to graphic confusion and consequent transposition of consonants. However, as Goshen-Gottstein noted, κατάγω || רגל is unattested elsewhere.³ The most frequent equivalents for רגל are κατάσκοποι (|| מרגלים), κατασκοπεύω, and κατασκέπτομαι, while twice it is rendered with a verb denoting “deception” (μεθώδευω, 4 Kgdms 19:28; δολόω, Ps 14[15]:3) and once with a verb for “binding feet” (συμπαδίζω, Hos 11:3).

Goshen-Gottstein rejected Franz Wutz's proposal that the *Vorlage* read הרגלת, on the grounds that it has nothing to do with κατάγω, despite the graphic similarity.⁴ Although Wutz's alternative proposal, that κατήγαγες reflects הרגית, seems to find support in ἀνάγει || יגר in Lev 11:7, examination of the full clause, καὶ τοῦτο οὐκ ἀνάγει μηρυκισμόν (|| והוא גרה לא יגר), shows that the translator merely followed his rendering of 9:3: καὶ ἀνάγον μηρυκισμόν || מעלת גרה.⁵ Ulrich's retroversion to הפלתה is semantically compatible with κατήγαγες, but it is difficult to explain the graphic changes this would entail.⁶ Goshen-Gottstein suggests that κατήγαγες ἐν εὐφροσύνῃ reflects an “exegetical association,” since it is “a perfect expression for leading back the people from exile,” comparing ἐν γὰρ εὐφροσύνῃ ἐξελεύσεσθε καὶ ἐν χαρᾷ διαχθήσεσθε || כי בשמחה תצאו ובשלוֹם תובלון in 55:12.⁷ Taken

3. Goshen-Gottstein, “Theory and Practice,” 150.

4. Goshen-Gottstein, “Theory and Practice,” 150.

5. Franz Wutz, *Die Transkriptionen von der Septuaginta bis zu Hieronymus*, ed. Paul Kahle, Texte und Untersuchungen zur vormasoretischen Grammatik des Hebräischen (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1927), 237. For the examination of the full clause, see John W. Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Leviticus*, SCS 44 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), 145.

6. Ulrich, *Biblical Qumran Scrolls*, 348.

7. Goshen-Gottstein, “Theory and Practice,” 150. Nevertheless, he disputes Ziegler's adoption of διαχθήσεσθε in 55:12 (attested by 22^c, 93, *cl*, 198, Co, Hi., and supported by V's *deducemini*), preferring the more widely attested διδαχθήσεσθε, judg-

together with τὸ πλεῖστον || הרבית, there is good reason to suppose that the translator's rendering was not strictly determined by his Hebrew text, which hobbles our ability to speculate about his *Vorlage*.

Whatever the explanation for κατήγαγες, it seems clear he replaced לו/לָא (cf. S's ܐܕܐ, in agreement with the *qere*) with a relative pronoun (ὅ), a maneuver in evidence elsewhere in the book (see Van der Vorm-Croughs, 102–3). Equally, his supply of σου accords with his willingness to modify or add pronouns elsewhere, while his ὡς οἱ εὐφραινόμενοι || כשמחת || (δ), a maneuver in evidence elsewhere in the book (see Van der Vorm-Croughs, 102–3). Equally, his supply of σου accords with his willingness to modify or add pronouns elsewhere, while his ὡς οἱ εὐφραινόμενοι || כשמחת || accords with his frequent substitution of a participle for a nominal form or phrase (e.g., πυρὸς καιομένου || אש להבה, 4:5; οἱ τὸν οἶνον πίνοντες || לשתות יין, 5:22), as exemplified again in καὶ ὃν τρόπον οἱ διαιρούμενοι || כאשר יגילו || בחלקם שלל, which also entails omission of a rendering for יגילו, doubtless to avoid yet another instance of εὐφραίνω.

Syriac's parallel structures ܐܬܐ ܕܥܡܐ ܕܥܡܐ || ܐܬܐ ܕܥܡܐ ܕܥܡܐ and ܐܬܐ ܕܥܡܐ ܕܥܡܐ || ܐܬܐ ܕܥܡܐ ܕܥܡܐ suggest the translator's aim to create a balanced construction in Syriac.

9:3

διότι ἀφαιρεθήσεται ὁ ζυγὸς ὁ ἐπ' αὐτῶν κείμενος καὶ ἡ ῥάβδος ἡ ἐπὶ τοῦ τραχήλου αὐτῶν || ואת מטתו ואת סבלו ואת כנפיו || should be compared with the two other passages containing this vocabulary:

10:27

יסור סבלו מעל שכמו	ἀφαιρεθήσεται ὁ φόβος αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ σοῦ
ועלו מעל צוארך	καὶ ὁ ζυγὸς αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὤμου σου

14:25

וסר מעליהם עלו	καὶ ἀφαιρεθήσεται ἀπ' αὐτῶν ὁ ζυγὸς αὐτῶν
וסבלו מעל שכמו יסור	καὶ τὸ κῦδος αὐτῶν ἀπὸ τῶν ὤμων ἀφαιρεθήσεται

This comparison suggests that the translator added ἀφαιρεθήσεται in 9:3, under influence of the other two verses, overriding the object marker את and making על the subject. The varied equivalents for סבלו in these verses (ὁ φόβος αὐτοῦ and καὶ τὸ κῦδος αὐτῶν) suggest that he was unfamiliar

ing διαχθήσεσθε “a rather well-taken correction” toward MT (151). I consider Ziegler's evaluation of the evidence defensible, but that argument is not germane to the current verse.

with סבל, forcing him to choose an equivalent suitable to the context: ὁ ἐπ' αὐτῶν κείμενος. That modifying phrase, in turn, likely influenced his rendering of שכמו with ἡ ἐπὶ τοῦ τραχήλου αὐτῶν. Although τράχηλος renders צואר in 30:28 and ערך in 48:4, ἀπὸ τοῦ ὥμου σου renders מעל צואר in 10:27, semantically similar to τραχήλου αὐτῶν || שכמו here (cf. τὸν τράχηλόν σου || ראשו in 58:5).

Although τῶν ἀπαιτούντων is an unusual equivalent for הנגש, comparison of καὶ οἱ ἀπαιτοῦντες || ונשים parallel to οἱ πράκτορες ὑμῶν || נגשיו in 3:12 shows that the translator analyzed ונשים as from נשה and construed נגשיו as economic oppressors (see the comments at 3:12).

In accord with the Kyrios's role in deliverance implied by κατήγαγες ἐν εὐφροσύνῃ σου and ἐνώπιόν σου in 9:2, the OG shifts the person in διεσκέδασε || החתת (1QIsa^a, והחתת, 4Q57 [4QIsa^c], תותי[הח]) and explicitizes its subject with κύριος.

Syriac's translation of סבלו with ܫܒܠܐ is echoed in its equivalents for the only other occurrences of nominal סבל in Isaiah, 10:27 (ܫܒܠܐ || סבלו); 14:25 (ܫܒܠܐ || וסבלו).⁸

Syriac's pronominal suffixes in ܫܒܠܐ, ܫܒܠܐ, and ܫܒܠܐ accord with the collective ܫܒܠ in 9:2.

Old Greek explicitizes מדין כיום by expanding it into ὥς τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἐπὶ Μαδιαμ.

9:4

The *hapax legomena* סאון סאון proved problematic for both OG and S (cf. V, *omnis violenta praedatio*; T, כל מיסבהון ומיתנהון). Warszawski's (22) perception that ܫܐܢ ܫܐܢ is based on reading סאון as שאון is substantiated by ܫܐܢ ܫܐܢ || ܫܐܢ ܫܐܢ in 17:12, ܫܐܢ ܫܐܢ || ܫܐܢ ܫܐܢ in 25:5, and ܫܐܢ ܫܐܢ || ܫܐܢ ܫܐܢ in 66:6.

Old Greek's rendering of סאון סאון with στολήν ἐπισυνηγμένην δόλω is notably distinct from S. Ziegler's (195) observation that the translator likely chose στολήν || סאון based on the parallel שמלה accords with the translator's frequent appeal to parallelism (Ziegler, 9–10), obviating speculation that he read סאון as (Aramaic) מאן (Fischer, 24). As Byun (218) observes, “ἱμάτιον and στολή are synonymous terms in the LXX.”

8. Verbal forms of סבל are translated with ܫܒܠ in 46:4 [2x]; 53:4, 11, reinforcing the perception that ܫܒܠ in 9:3; 10:27; and 14:25 register the translator's perception that סבלו connotes hard service.

|| מַפְחָלָא חַסָּא חֲפָצָא בְּדַמִּים || מַפְחָלָא חֲפָצָא || finds a parallel in מַפְחָלָא חֲפָצָא בְּדַמִּים || מַפְחָלָא חֲפָצָא || in 2 Sam 20:11, perhaps so rendered by association with a passage such as Gen 37:31 (חֲפָצָא חֲפָצָא בְּדַמִּים || מַפְחָלָא חֲפָצָא ||). (ויטבלו את הכתנת בדם || מַפְחָלָא חֲפָצָא || חֲפָצָא חֲפָצָא בְּדַמִּים ||). פ becomes common in descriptions of contamination with blood (e.g., פ מתבוססת || פ פלש, Jer 6:26; 25:34; 27:30; Ezek 27:30; Hos 6:8; Mic 1:10; גֵּאל, Lam 4:14).

Although the relationship of ἐπισυνηγμένην to נאם is too opaque to account for satisfactorily, Fischer's diagnosis of δόλω as resting on transposition of consonants in שרע is more plausible than Byun allows. While ἀσεβής is the most frequent equivalent for nominal רשע in Isaiah (five times), we also find ἄνομος (3:11), ἀνομία (|| רשעה, 9:17), ἄδικος (57:20), ἀδικία (58:6), ἁμαρτωλός (14:5), πονηρός (53:9), and ταπεινός

(58:4, based on $\sqrt{\text{רשע}}$).⁹ The verbal form ירשיעני is rendered with $\kappa\alpha\kappa\acute{\omega}\sigma\epsilon\iota$ με in 50:9, while in 54:17 $\eta\tau\tau\eta\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ renders תרשיעי , although the following οἱ δὲ ἔνοχοί σου there appears based on it as well. This range of equivalents permits supposition that the translator might have associated רע with רשע , while choosing $\delta\acute{o}\lambda\omega$ in light of the commercial tenor of $\text{μετὰ καταλλαγῆς ἀποτείσουσι}$.

The translator's path to $\kappa\alpha\iota \theta\epsilon\lambda\eta\sigma\upsilon\sigma\iota\nu \epsilon\iota \epsilon\gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu \pi\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\kappa\alpha\upsilon\sigma\tau\omicron\iota || \text{אש והיתה לשרפה מאכלת אש}$ hinges on his insertion of $\epsilon\iota$ that, with his substitution of $\theta\epsilon\lambda\eta\sigma\upsilon\sigma\iota\nu$ for והיתה , created a contrary-to-fact wish. Taking as a starting point the GELS gloss of $\alpha\pi\omicron\tau\acute{\iota}\nu\omega$ as "make compensation for" (s.v. " $\alpha\pi\omicron\tau\acute{\iota}\nu\omega$ "), I translate the sentence, "they will pay for every garment and cloak that was deceitfully gathered, and they will wish that they had been burned."¹⁰ I construe the subject of $\alpha\pi\omicron\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\sigma\upsilon\sigma\iota$ and $\theta\epsilon\lambda\eta\sigma\upsilon\sigma\iota\nu \epsilon\iota \epsilon\gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$ as those referred to as $\tau\acute{\omega}\nu \alpha\pi\alpha\iota\tau\acute{o}\upsilon\sigma\iota\tau\omega\nu$ in 9:4.¹¹ This verse explicates what the breaking of their "rod" entails.

9:5

Both οὗ ἡ ἀρχή and אֶת־הָאֶרֶץ represent the definite article of הַמֶּשֶׁרֶת through a possessive pronoun (cf. 9:6). There is no reason to suspect מֶשֶׁרֶת in their *Vorlagen* or dependence of S on OG, since both use this strategy elsewhere (e.g., $\text{ἐπὶ τοῖς κήποις αὐτῶν || מִהַגְנוֹת, 1:29; אֶת־הָאֶרֶץ ||$

9. Although ταπεινόν might attest רשע in the *Vorlage*, more likely it reflects the translator's use of etymology to identify a direct object for the verb: $\kappa\alpha\iota \tau\acute{\upsilon}\pi\tau\epsilon\tau\epsilon \pi\upsilon\gamma\mu\alpha\acute{\iota}\varsigma \tau\alpha\pi\epsilon\iota\nu\acute{o}\nu || \text{רשע באגרף רשע}$. Although רשע appears nowhere in MT-Isaiah, the translator similarly detects a Hebrew word that does not otherwise occur in the book in $\text{θάνατος || דבר 9:7}$.

10. This construal accords with both *Septuaginta Deutsch* and *La Bible d'Alexandrie* and is preferable to NETS's perplexing "and they will be willing to do so even if they have been burned by fire."

11. In agreement with *Septuaginta Deutsch* (1239 n. 9.5a) but demurring from its construal of μετὰ καταλλαγῆς as modifying ἱμάτιον via an implied predication: "Denn jedes Gewand, das mit List zusammengebracht wurde, and (jedes) Kleid (, das) mit Aufgeld (erworben wurde,) werden sie bezahlen." So also *La Bible d'Alexandrie*: "Car ils paieront toute robe gagnée par ruse et tout vêtement gagné avec profit." The juxtaposition of the economic terms καταλλαγή and $\alpha\pi\omicron\tau\acute{\iota}\nu\omega$ favors analyzing μετὰ καταλλαγῆς as modifying $\alpha\pi\omicron\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\sigma\upsilon\sigma\iota$, although not with the meaning "reconciliation" adopted by NETS.

החסו, 1:31). Similarly, S's rendering of ויקרא in the passive voice (يُكَلِّمُ) parallels OG (καὶ καλεῖται), but neither is remarkable.¹²

Whether סֹמֵךְ attests פלא ויועץ or (more likely) the translator supplied the conjunction for the sake of a sensible equivalent, its relationship to the Hebrew is significantly clearer than OG's μεγάλης βουλῆς ἄγγελος. Although θαυμαστά πράγματα || פלא in 25:1 uses the more frequent equivalent for פלא (especially in Psalms, but see also Exod 3:20; Josh 3:5; Jer 21:2; Joel 2:26), while τέρας appears in 28:29 (cf. Exod 15:11), μεγάλης || פלא finds precedent in ὃς ἂν μεγάλως εὐξήται εὐχὴν || כי יפלא || לנדר נדר (Num 6:2) and μεγαλῦναι εὐχὴν || לפלא נדר (Num 15:3, 8).

Given this translator's use of βουλή or βουλευώ six times for semantically dissimilar equivalents (3:9; 10:25; 32:7; 32:8; 44:25; 45:20) and six times without a Hebrew counterpart (7:5, 7; 28:8 [2x]; 29:15; 31:6), his use of βουλῆς for יועץ is not surprising, while he likely supplied ἄγγελος to explicitize the agent.¹³

As Scholz (25) divined, the translator likely arrived at ἐγὼ γὰρ ἄξω εἰρήνην ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄρχοντας for אביעד שר שלום by analyzing אבי as equivalent to אביא and reading עד שר together, although ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄρχοντας is probably equally the equivalent for אל גבור, the two phrases combined into a single equivalent (cf. τοῦ μὴ ἐμπεσεῖν εἰς ἐπαγωγὴν || בלתי כרע || ולו תחת אסיר ותחת הרונים יפלו, 10:4; ὡσαύτως ἐάν τις ἄρῃ ῥάβδον ἢ ξύλον || כהניף שבט ואת מרימיו כהרים מטה לא עץ, 10:15).¹⁴ Although this translator elsewhere renders גבור with γίγας (3:2; 13:3; 49:24, 25), ἰσχύων (3:2; 5:22; 10:21), ἰσχυρός (21:17), and δύναμις (42:13), his use of ἄρχων translates more nouns than שר (קצין, 1:10; נדיב, 13:2; יתד, 22:23; מחקקו [ἄρχων ἡμῶν], 33:22; לאמים, 34:1; 41:1; 43:4, 9; רזונים, 40:23; סגנים, 41:25; מליציד [καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες αὐτῶν], 43:27; פקדתך [τοὺς ἄρχοντάς σου], 60:17), making the hypothesis that he conjoined אל גבור and עד שר in ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄρχοντας tenable.

Seeligmann (119) reasonably judged εἰρήνην καὶ ὑγίειαν αὐτῶ “to be a second translation of עד שר שלום,” although Van der Kooij better described it as “eine Doppelübersetzung von שלום ... und zwar in zweierlei Hinsicht, (1) als zweite Wiedergabe von שלום, und (2) als Doppelwiedergabe dieses

12. 1QIsa^a's וקרא is noteworthy, although neither OG nor S was scrupulous enough about following Hebrew verb forms to posit that their *Vorlagen* read this.

13. See Troxel, “BOYAH and BOYAEYIN in LXX Isaiah,” 153–71.

14. The phrase's two other occurrences are rendered: ἐπὶ θεὸν ἰσχύοντα || אל אל גבור (Isa 10:21); and ἐπὶ τοὺς μαχητάς αὐτῆς || אל גבוריה (Jer 27[50]:36).

As in 9:5, OG and S have a third-person possessive pronoun with their renderings of articular *הַמְשָׁרָה* (ή ἀρχή αὐτοῦ, 𐤀𐤌𐤔𐤓𐤁𐤀), and both supply one with their equivalents for *וְלִשְׁלוֹם* (καὶ τῆς εἰρήνης αὐτοῦ, 𐤅𐤋𐤍𐤔𐤓𐤁𐤀). In neither case is there need to posit a different *Vorlage*. Given both translators' use elsewhere of a possessive pronoun for an articular noun (see above, on 9:5), the supply of a possessive pronoun amounts to a reflex.

Old Greek typically renders each instance of *עַל* prefixed to nouns in series (cf. 9:7; 2:12–16; 7:17; 8:7) and has an equivalent for *עַל* before a second noun where MT and 1QIsa^a (cf. V and T) lack it in 1:1; 2:1.²⁰ Although the close association between *כְּסֵא דוֹד* and *מַמְלַכְתּוֹ* might have prompted the translator to omit the second *עַל*, in view of how regularly OG renders repeated *עַל*, it seems more likely that *עַל* was absent from its *Vorlage*, while MT and 1QIsa^a (cf. S, V, T) reflect its later addition by the same scribal reflex that introduced it in 1:1; 2:1 (q.v.).²¹

The word order of *ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ ἐν κρίματι* is the inverse of *בְּמִשְׁפָּט וּבִצְדָקָה* (the regular order for this word pair; cf. 5:16; 16:5; 32:16). As with transpositions elsewhere (3:1; 5:3; 6:1; 8:7 [in S]), it is impossible to know whether this was a change effected by the translator or already stood in his *Vorlage*.

καὶ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα χρόνον || *וְעַד עוֹלָם* appears again at 34:7 (see the note at 13:20).

9:7

Although *θάνατος* typically translates *מוֹת* in Isaiah, elsewhere it also renders *דָּבָר* (e.g., Exod 5:3; 9:3, 15), a Hebrew word that never occurs in Isaiah but that the translator seems to have divined here.²²

καὶ ἤλθεν ἐπὶ Ἰσραὴλ || *וַנִּפְל בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל* is one of only three times in Isaiah that a verb other than *πίπτω* renders *נָפַל*.²³ Instructive is the

20. S's 𐤀𐤌𐤔𐤓𐤁𐤀 || 𐤅𐤋𐤍𐤔𐤓𐤁𐤀 agrees with OG in 1:1; 2:1.

21. Cf. OG's *καὶ* || *וְעַל* in 30:6, where its *Vorlage* may well attest a stage prior to a reflexive scribal addition of *עַל* attested by MT and 1QIsa^a (cf. S, V, T).

22. The exceptions are *ἤκουσεν γὰρ ὅτι ἐμαλακίσθη ἕως θανάτου καὶ ἀνέστη* || *וַיִּחַר וַיִּשְׁמַע כִּי חָלָה וַיַּחַר* in 39:1 and *ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνομιῶν τοῦ λαοῦ μου ἤχθη εἰς θάνατον* || *מִפְּשַׁע נַגַּע עָמִי נָגַע לָמוֹ* in 53:8.

23. *πίπτω* || *נָפַל* appears fifteen times, and its compound forms render it another five times: *συμπίπτω* (3:8); *ἐκπίπτω* (14:12); and *ἐμπίπτω* (10:4; 24:18; 47:11). The lack of an equivalent for *נָפַל* in 31:3 is explicable as a condensation of adjacent, semanti-

He (63) similarly attributed +ἀλλὰ δεῦτε to the translator's reliance on Gen 11:3–4, whose influence he perceived again in “die Glosse 10,9: ‘wo der Turm gebaut wurde.’”

Koenig faults Ziegler's perception that *καὶ οἰκοδομήσωμεν ἑαυτοῖς πύργον* was borrowed from Gen 11:4 as being misled "par la modification de l'ordre des mots et la correspondance formelle avec Gen 11,4."²⁵ Whereas *ἐκκόψωμεν* renders *עֲדַג*, the translator created an allusion to Gen 11:4 by transposing the equivalents for the second (*נבנה*) and fourth (*נחליל*) verbs, with the equivalent for the fourth, *λαξεύσωμεν*, reached "par un recours à une rac. araméenne homonyme de la rac. courante en hébreu ancien qui figure dans H," meaning "cut."²⁶ This has, he claims, the advantage of uncovering the translator's methodological approach.

Two difficulties confront Koenig's argument. First, this translator uses ἀλλάσσω (the most frequent equivalent for חָתַךְ in the LXX) in 24:5, 40:31, and 41:1 and uses κατακρύπτω in 2:18, ἀφαιρέω in 8:8, and διέρχομαι in 21:1, leaving no hint of familiarity with a meaning "cut off" for חָתַךְ. Nor do we find a trace of that elsewhere in the LXX. Second, λαξεύω does not mean simply "cut off" but "cut stone," in accord with the following λίθους, which has no counterpart in Hebrew. Thus, Ziegler's hypothesis that the translator borrowed from Gen 11:4 provides a more straightforward explanation than Koenig's notion that the translator worked by "l'analyse des relations analogiques."²⁷

With regard to S, Warszawski (23) rightly concluded, “Durch diese dem Texte nicht ganz entsprechende Wiedergabe werden die Gegensätze zwischen den einzelnen Gliedern des Satzes verwischt.” Syriac renders the declaration **נפלו לבנים** as an exhortation: **הבה || לו חסד חסל** (cf. **חסל חסל** **וגזית נבנה || סוסי וסגל**, Gen 11:3), alongside **נלבנה לבנים**

There is no substantive indication that OG influenced S, despite the word order of *ⲙⲉⲙⲉⲛ ⲉⲃⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁⲛⲉⲛ ⲉⲃⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁⲛⲉⲛ* and *ⲉⲃⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁⲛⲉⲛ ⲉⲃⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁⲛⲉⲛ*. Syriac's join of *ⲉⲃⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁⲛⲉⲛ* with *ⲉⲃⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁⲛⲉⲛ* (OG *ⲉⲃⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁⲛⲉⲛ ⲉⲃⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁⲛⲉⲛ*) is also found in the Syriac version of the *Book of the Acts* (e.g. *ⲉⲃⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁⲛⲉⲛ ⲉⲃⲁⲕⲁⲛⲁⲛⲉⲛ*).

25. Koenig, *Herméneutique analogique*, 92.

26. Koenig, *Herméneutique analogique*, 94–95.

27. Koenig, *Hermeneutique analogique*, 89. See the critique by Arie van der Kooij, "Accident or Method? On 'Analogical' Interpretation in the Old Greek of Isa and in 1QIsa^a," *BO* 43 (1986): 366–76.

28. S uses מנב in the *aphel* for the *hiphil* נפל in 34:17 (והוא || סיסם ;ומנב חסם פל) in 34:17 (והפלתיו בחרב בארצו || ס;וממסוט חסגח לאזוס) and 37:7 (הפיל לחן גורל occurs in the Peshitta (e.g., Gen 2:21).

נחליף) suggests that **ספחם** **מקמל** || **גדעו** || **שקמים** follows target language norms for word order.

9:10

Syriac translated **שגב** with **حج** in 2:11, 17 and will do so again in 12:4; 26:5 (cf. Deut 2:36; Ps 107:4; Prov 18:10). The imperfect (**سحج**) places the action in the future, similar to OG's **καὶ ῥάξει** (on which see below).

τοὺς ἐπανιστάνομένους ἐπ' ὅρος Σιών || **את צרי רצין** is arresting, since the equivalent for **רצין** is typically **Παασσων**, both within Isaiah (7:1; 8:6) and outside it (e.g., 4 Kgdms 15:37; 16:5, 6, 9).²⁹ Although Seeligmann (81) posited that the translator took advantage of the orthography of **רצין** to find a reference to Zion, comparison of **τῆς φάραγγος Σιών** || **גיא חזיון** in 22:1 and **ἐν φάραγγι Σιών** || **בגיא חזיון** in 22:5 (for which a *Vorlage* reading **הציון** is likely) favors Duhm's conclusion that OG's *Vorlage* in fact read **את צרי הר ציון**.³⁰

καὶ ῥάξει || **וישגב** at the outset of the verse is distinctive. The translator's most frequent equivalent for **שגב** is **ὑψόω** (2:11, 17; 12:4), and even **πόλεις ὀχυράς καταβαλεῖς** || **ישפילנה** **קריה נשגבה** in 26:5 follows **κατήγαγες τοὺς ἐνοικοῦντας ἐν ὑψηλοῖς** || **השח ישבי מרום**, while the choice of **πόλεις ὀχυράς** seems influenced by **πόλεις ὀχυρά** || **עיר עז** in 26:1.³¹ In 33:5 we find **ἅγιος ὁ θεὸς ὁ κατοικῶν ἐν ὑψηλοῖς** || **נשגב יהוה כי שכן מרום**, comparable to OG's **ἐκραταιώθη** || **נשגבה** in Ps 138(139):6, where S reads **سكنا**.³²

Similar perplexity over **שגב** is evident elsewhere, not least in Deut 2:36 (its only instance in the Pentateuch), where Moses asserts, **οὐκ ἐγενήθη πόλις ἣτις διέφυγεν ἡμᾶς** || **לא היתה קריה אשר שגבה ממנו**. Equivalents for **שגב** vary greatly throughout the Bible: **ὑπερασπίσαι σου τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ** **Ιακωβ** || **ישגבך שם אלהי יעקב** (Ps 19[20]:2); **ἐπ' ἐμὲ λύτρωσαί με** || **תשגבני**

29. Regarding **רצין** in 7:4, see the commentary there. The masculine plural pronoun in **ἐπ' αὐτούς** || **עליו** is coordinate with **τοὺς ἐπανιστάνομένους**.

30. Duhm, *Buch Jesaia*, 70.

31. The fact that 30:13 renders **נשגבה** with **πόλεως ὀχυρᾶς**, inferred from 26:5, suggests that the association of **נשגב** with a stronghold was intuitive (**ὀχυρά** || **מבצר** in 17:3; **בצורה** in 25:2; and **בצרות** in 36:1; 37:26).

32. Although one might posit that the Isaiah translator avoided using **ὑψόω** for **נשגב** because of the following **ὁ κατοικῶν ἐν ὑψηλοῖς** || **שכן מרום**, the translator does not consistently avoid repetition, as is clear from **ὁ δὲ ἄνθρωπος ταπεινός καὶ ταπεινωθήσεται τὸ ὕψος τῶν ἀνθρώπων** || **אנשים רום ושפל אדם** in 2:11.

(Ps 58[59]:2); ἀντελάβετό μου || תשגבני (Ps 68[69]:30); σκεπάσω αὐτόν || אשגבהו (Ps 90[91]:14); καὶ ἐβοήθησεν || וישגב (Ps 106[107]:41); ἐξεγείροντα || שגבו ישע (Job 5:11); εὐφρανθήσεται (Prov 29:25).

Meanwhile, ῥήγνυμι || בקע (35:6; 58:8; 59:5) is common (e.g., Gen 7:11; Exod 14:16), likely explaining its use for פצחו in Isa 49:13; 52:9; 54:1. On the other hand, ἐρράγησαν (τὰ σχοινία σου) || נטשו (חבליך) in 33:23 is unparalleled, and (οὐδὲ μὴ) ῥαγῶσιν οἱ ἰμάντες (τῶν ὑποδημάτων αὐτῶν) || (שרוך נעליו) נתק (ולא) in 5:27 finds a parallel only in the peculiar ἐρράγη δὲ τὰ ἄρθρα τῆς καρδίας μου || נתקו מורשי לבבי of Job 17:11.³³ Thus there is reason to suspect that the translator employed καὶ ῥάξει for וישגב here based on his comprehension of the context rather than the verb.

That conclusion is reinforced by διασκεδάσει || יסכסך at the end of the verse.³⁴ Although this translator uses διασκεδάννυμι for פרר (8:10; 14:27; 44:25), as do others (e.g., Gen 17:14; Lev 26:15, 44), he employs it distinctively for חתת in 9:4(3) and בלע in 19:3, while he inserts it parallel to καταφθεῖραι in 32:7. Given the semantic compatibility of διασκεδάσει and ῥάξει, his choices of verbs for וישגב and יסכסך seem guided by his perception that the verse speaks of an assault on Zion's foes (particularly founded on צירי הר ציון in his *Vorlage*).

9:11

Syriac reads ארם as אדם and construes both it and ופלשתים as appositional to איביו (ܡܚܕܝܬܝܗܘܢ) in 9:10.³⁵

Whereas ܡܠܚܕܝܬܝܗܘܢ accords with ויאכלו in MT, OG employs a participle, describing what these enemies have done to Israel: τοὺς κατεσθίοντας.

Only here is Συρία OG's equivalent for ארם, although Σύρος renders it in 17:3. The only other occurrences of ארם in Isaiah are in chapter 7, where Αραμ is the consistent equivalent (see the commentary on 7:4, 5).³⁶

33. OG's path to τὰ ἄρθρα from מורשי is uncertain. Clines judges Dhorme's association of it with Aramaic מרשא "rope" "questionable" (David J. A. Clines, *Job 1–20*, WBC 17 [Dallas: Word, 1989], 374).

34. The verb סך appears elsewhere only in Isa 19:2's καὶ ἐπεγερθήσονται Αἰγύπτιοι ἐπ' Αἰγυπτίους || וסכסכתי מצרים במצרים.

35. Translation of ארם as אדם is frequent throughout S. See Weitzman, *Syriac Version*, 62–67.

36. See Troxel, "What's in a Name?," 332.

καὶ τοὺς Ἑλληνας || פלשתים occurs only here, with ἀφ' ἡλίου ἀνατολῶν (|| מאחור) identifying the Hellenistic coastal cities as the contemporary equivalent for פלשתים.³⁷

For ἀφ' ἡλίου ἀνατολῶν || מקדם, cf. 11:14. Although (ἀφ') ἡλίου δυσμῶν || (מ)אחור is unexampled elsewhere, καὶ ἕως τῆς θαλάσσης τῆς ἐπὶ δυσμῶν renders ועד הים האחרון in Deut 11:24, in which book δυσμή also renders ערבה (Deut 1:1; 11:30), as it does in Isa 43:5, 6; 59:19 (cf. S's מח).³⁸

explicitizes the agent by adding a suffix to פה בכל, anaphoric to the subject assumed by מלכיהם (cf. 10:24). Both OG and S translate זאת בכל with a grammatical plural (ἐπὶ τούτοις πᾶσιν/محکمہ), as both do in all other occurrences of the phrase (5:25; 9:16, 20; 10:4).

ἐπὶ τούτοις πᾶσιν οὐκ ἀπεστράφη ὁ θυμός ἀλλ' ἔτι ἡ χεὶρ ὑψηλή is the rendering of ונטיה ידו ועוד אפו ושב לא שב again in 9:21(20); 10:4, while the only variations elsewhere affect זאת בכל: ἐν πᾶσι τούτοις in 5:25; and ἐπὶ πᾶσιν τούτοις in 9:16. Syriac's equivalents are the same in each case.

9:12

Syriac's use of the grammatical plural لافسہ || שב betrays recognition that וידעו העם || جمع حقتل is a collective noun (contrast its جمع حقتل || ויהם in 9:8) and conforms it to the grammatically plural حده || דרשו at the end of the verse.³⁸ This seems more likely than S's *Vorlage* having ושב, given S's tendency to explicitize עם as collective.

Syriac renders the *hiphil* of נכה with حده again in 1:5; 30:31 (cf. 2 Sam 11:15), although its more frequent equivalent is مصل (e.g., 5:25; 10:24; 11:4, 15; 14:6; 27:7). حده is used intransitively in both 1:5; 30:31, as it is here, which made possible the translator's shift from the morpho-syntax of המכה to حده. Old Greek's ἐπλήγη also shifts the Hebrew verb, but into the passive voice.³⁹

37. Troxel, "What's in a Name?," 332.

38. S uses حده to render דרש again in 31:1; 34:16; 55:6; 58:2; 65:1, 10. OG uses ἐκζητέω for דרש also in 1:17; 8:19; 16:5; 31:1.

39. This and the fact that S uses حده intransitively elsewhere undermines Gesenius's perception that S is dependent on OG here (Gesenius, *Commentar über den Jesaia*, 82).

9:13

Syriac translates כרת with the *aphel* of ܟܪܬ again in 14:22; 22:5.

Old Greek and S appear flumoxed by כפה ואגמון. Old Greek substitutes the merismus μέγαν καὶ μικρόν, as elsewhere when perplexed (22:5, 24; 33:4, 19), although it renders כפה ואגמון in 19:15 with ἀρχὴν καὶ τέλος, likely as an exposition of the preceding κεφαλὴν καὶ οὐράν. By contrast, ܟܦܐ ܐܓܡܝܢ are the same equivalents used in 19:15.

Old Greek's ἐν μιᾷ ἡμέρᾳ and S's ܒܝܝܡ ܐܚܕ correlate with 1QIsa^a's ביום אחד, against MT's יום אחד. However, because יום אחד can function adverbially in the same sense (cf. Gen 27:45; 33:13), the translators might have prefixed the preposition, which might also account for the reading of 1QIsa^a.

9:14

Old Greek construes זקן וגשוא פנים as continuing the pairs of terms from the previous verse, placing its equivalents (πρεσβύτην καὶ τοὺς τὰ πρόσωπα θαυμάζοντας, both attested throughout the Greek Bible) in the accusative case, while using the nominative case with αὕτη ἡ ἀρχή || הוּא הַרְאָשׁ. The translation of הַרְאָשׁ by ἡ ἀρχή—rather than κεφαλὴ (9:13)—suggests a carefully considered identification of הַרְאָשׁ (cf. ἀρχὴν καὶ τέλος || כפה ואגמון in 19:15). πρεσβύτην καὶ τοὺς τὰ πρόσωπα θαυμάζοντας appear to be the civic leaders. In contrast to these are the prophets he identifies with ἡ οὐρά || הַזֶּנֶב, which he terms προφήτην διδάσκοντα ἄνομα || מוֹרֵה שָׁקֶר. Although this translator uses ψευδός as an equivalent for שָׁקֶר in 28:15; 44:20, he uses moralistic equivalents when שָׁקֶר typifies speech: ἐν λόγοις ἀδίκους || בְּאִמְרֵי שָׁקֶר (32:7); τὰ δὲ χεῖλη ὑμῶν ἐλάλησεν ἀνομίαν || שְׁפִתוֹתֵיכֶם דִּבְרוּ שָׁקֶר (59:3); λόγους ἀδίκους || דְּבָרֵי שָׁקֶר (59:13).

ܐܦܠ ܡܝܬܐ ܦܢܝܢ || זקן וגשוא פנים (found already in 3:3) partially decodes the metaphor of זקן וגשוא, much as V reduces the phrase to *et honorabilis*.

9:15

Old Greek and S construe ויהיו as *waw* + imperfect: καὶ ἔσονται/ῶσονται. Whereas MT's מַאֲשֵׁרִי and מַאֲשֵׁרֵי are best understood as designating those who “direct” the people and those who have “been directed,” OG and S identify מַאֲשֵׁרִי with the noun אֲשֵׁרִי and render it as a verb, using

ἐπλήγη). The rendering of *ומרע* by a simple adjective in both OG and S (καὶ πονηροί/سحق) is unremarkable, given the preceding *ὅτι πάντες ἄνομοι/سحق*. The grammatically plural *ἄδικα* designates the numerous unjust utterances of every mouth, just as the prophet in 9:14 taught *ἄνομα* (cf. *ὁ γὰρ μωρὸς μωρὰ λαλήσει* || *כי נבל נבלה ידבר* in 32:6).

Although one might suspect that *נסע* (|| *ירחם*) is a corruption of *נסע*, Isa 30:18 attests the same equivalent (*||* *חנן*), and *נסע* renders *חנן* and *חוס* elsewhere (e.g., Isa 27:11; Jer 13:14).

For OG's and S's renderings of the refrain *בכל זאת*, see 9:11.

9:17

Although OG renders *רשעה* as subject of *בערה*, its *καὶ ὡς ἄγρωστις ξηρά* || *שמיר ושית* creates an analogy coordinate with *ὡς πῦρ* || *כאש*, shifting *ῥή* *ἀνομία* (*רשעה*) from agent of the action to its victim, as clarified by the translation of *תאכל* in the passive voice, *βρωθήσεται*, with the addition of *ὑπὸ πυρός* as agent.

Its *ἄγρωστις ξηρά* || *שמיר ושית* is distinct from every prior occurrence of the phrase, where *χέρσος καὶ ἄκανθα* was the equivalent (5:6; 7:23, 24, 25).⁴¹ The unique *καὶ ὡς ἄγρωστις ξηρά* || *שמיר ושית* reinforces the judgment that the translator considered this verse focused on the destruction of *ῥή* *ἀνομία*.⁴²

Syriac's rendering, on the other hand, reflects the most likely reading of the Hebrew. Notably, it translates both *בערה* and *ותצת* with *هف*, which appears only here in Isaiah, where the typical equivalent for *בער* is *مح* (e.g., 1:31; 6:13; 10:17), which is used also for the only other appearance of *יצת* (33:12).⁴³ On the other hand, *هف* renders *בער* in Num 11:1, 3; Judg 15:14; Job 1:16 and *יצת* in 2 Kgs 22:17. *مح* is S's standard equivalent for *שמיר* (cf. 5:6; 7:24, 15).

41. In 10:17 we find *καὶ φάγεται ὡς εἰς χόρτον τὴν ὕλην* || *והאכלה שיתו ושמירו* and in 27:4 *τίς με θήσεται φυλάσσειν καλὰμην ἐν ἀγρῷ* || *מי יתנני שמיר שית* (in 32:13 *שמיר* is paired with *קוץ*: *ἀκανθα καὶ χόρτος* || *קוץ שמיר*).

42. *ἄγρωστις* appears again in Isa 37:27 (*καὶ ἐγένοντο ὡς χόρτος ξηρὸς ἐπὶ δωματίων καὶ ὡς ἄγρωστις* || *והיו עשב שדה וירק דשא חציר וגו' ושדמה לפני קמה* || *עלי* || *ἄγρωστιν*), where it seems the equivalent for either *עשב* or *דשא*, judged by comparison with *ἐπὶ ἄγρωστιν* || *עלי* in Deut 32:2 and *ἐπὶ ἄγρωστιν* || *עלי* in Mic 5:6. Its only other occurrence is *ἀνατελεῖ ὡς ἄγρωστις κρίμα ἐπὶ χέρσον ἀγροῦ* || *ופרח כראש משפט על תלמי שדי* in Hos 10:4.

43. S renders *בער* with *سح* in 42:25; and with *مح* in 62:1.

from **לחל** || **עברה** in Isaiah are 16:6, where S translates **ועברתו** with **لحمه** “and his ill-will”; and 13:13, where the phrase is identical to here (**חלל** || **בעברת יהוה צבאות** || **محلل**). In this light, most likely **חלל** here and in 13:13 are copyists’ errors for **חלל**.

Old Greek’s **διὰ θυμὸν ὀργῆς κυρίου** || **בעברת יהוה צבאות** finds a parallel in **διὰ θυμὸν ὀργῆς κυρίου σαβαωθ** || **בעברת יהוה צבאות** in 13:13. Van der Vorm-Croughs (153) posits that “**θυμὸν ὀργῆς** is most likely formed in assimilation to the common Hebrew formulations **אף חרון** and **אף חרי**” that “figure in 7:4 and 13:9, 13.”⁴⁷ The combination of **θυμός** and **ὀργή** are also used for **אף חמה**, often in the order **ὀργή θυμοῦ** (e.g., Isa 42:25; Exod 32:12; Num 25:4), although there is no evidence of attempts to match a specific Greek lexeme to a Hebrew term (e.g., **ὀργή θυμοῦ κυρίου** || **חרון אף יהוה**, Num 25:4 versus **τὸν θυμὸν τῆς ὀργῆς κυρίου** || **יהוה אף חרון**, Num 32:14). The variation in word order was a natural part of the equivalent for collocations of **אף**, **חרון**, **חרי**, and **חמה**.

Although the Isaiah translator employs this phrase in 7:4 (**ὅταν γὰρ ὀργῇ τοῦ θυμοῦ μου γένηται** || **בחרי אף**) and 42:25 (**ὀργῇ θυμοῦ αὐτοῦ** || **חמה אפו**), equally remarkable are the places he does not: **ἰδοὺ γὰρ ἡμέρα κυρίου ἀνίατος ἔρχεται θυμοῦ καὶ ὀργῆς** || **אף** **וחרון** **ועברה** **אכזרי** **יהוה בא** **אכזרי** **יהוה יום יהוה**, 13:9; **τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἣ ἂν ἐπέλθῃ ὁ θυμὸς αὐτοῦ** || **אפו** **וביום חרון**, 13:13; **ἀποδοῦναι ἐν θυμῷ ἐκδίκησιν** || **להשיב בחמה אפו**, 66:15.⁴⁸ In 30:27 he repeats **τὸ λόγιον** from the preceding phrase (**τὸ λόγιον τῶν χειλέων αὐτοῦ** || **משאה שפתי**) as subject of **ὀργῆς πληῖρες** || **זעם** **מלאו** and then utilizes the compound phrase: **καὶ ἡ ὀργῇ τοῦ θυμοῦ ὡς πῦρ ἔδεται** || **ולשונו באש אכלת**.⁴⁹ In 30:30 he renders **אף** **בזעף** **יראה** **זורעו** **ונחת** with **καὶ τὸν θυμὸν τοῦ βραχίονος αὐτοῦ δείξει μετὰ θυμοῦ καὶ ὀργῆς** and translates **בו** **נסה** **יהוה צר** **רוח** **כנהר** **כי** **יבוא** **כנהר** **צר** **רוח** **יהוה נסה** **בו** with **ἥξει γὰρ ὡς ποταμὸς βίαιος ἡ ὀργῇ παρὰ κυρίου ἥξει μετὰ θυμοῦ** in 59:19. In this light, the motivation for **διὰ θυμὸν ὀργῆς κυρίου** || **יהוה בעברת** here and in 13:13 is as impossible to recover as the reason he does *not* use the phrase for **אף** **וחרון** (13:9); **אפו** **חרון** (13:13); **אפו** **בחמה** (66:15).

47. This phrase also translates **אף חמה** (e.g., Isa 42:25; Ezek 23:25).

48. It is unlikely that the translator intended **ἐκδίκησιν** in 66:15 as his equivalent for **אפו** (which would be unparalleled) and more likely that he supplied it as a direct object paired with **καὶ ἀποσκοραχισμὸν** || **וגערותו** (cf. **καὶ ἀποσκοραχιεῖ αὐτόν** || **וגער בו**, 17:13). **ἐκδίκησιν** occurs again in Isaiah only in 59:17, where it renders **נקם**, as elsewhere (e.g., Num 31:2; Deut 32:35; 2 Kgdms 4:8).

49. Van der Vorm-Croughs (69–70) notes the translator’s tendency to omit nouns denoting body parts when they serve as *nomen regens*, as in 5:24 (q.v.).

αὐτοῦ || בי נגזר מארץ חיים. Uncertainty over ויגזר in 9:19 and the presence of על ימין and על שמאול likely account for the translator's use of the idiom ἐκαλῶναι δεξιὰν οὐδὲ ἀριστεράν, which translates וימין ושמאול in Num 22:26 (cf. Num 20:17) and אסור ימין ושמאול in Deut 2:27 (cf. 2 Chr 34:2).

Old Greek's translation of the initial *waw* of ויגזר with ἀλλά (cf. 5:7, 24, 25; 8:6; 9:11) was likely to explicitize the contrast in action with ἐλεήσει. Similarly, by rendering the initial *waw* of ורעב with ὅτι, OG makes it the reason for inclining to the right.

The suffixes in וימין || שמאול and וימין || שמאול are likely to explicitize the location of the action relative to the subject.

Old Greek inserts ἔσθων in its reformulation of ולא שבעו איש בשר ולא שבעו זרעו with μὴ ἐμπλησθῇ ἄνθρωπος ἔσθων τὰς σάρκας τοῦ βραχίονος αὐτοῦ, likely based on ויאכל earlier. Both OG and S connect ולא שבעו with the rest of the verse, resulting in reading יאכלו with 9:20. However, whereas OG conforms the grammatical number of ἐμπλησθῇ and ἔσθων to ἄνθρωπος (|| איש), Syriac's ܫܒܥܘܐ reflects the grammatical plural שבעו.⁵²

9:20

The agreement of OG and S in construing יאכלו as the predicate of the first clause in 9:20 extends to their adjustment of its grammatical number to מנשה, unless the *Vorlage* of one or both of them read ויאכל like 1QIsa^a. Old Greek's γάρ explicitizes this as an explanation of the eating reported in 9:19.

Despite S's lack of an equivalent for המה, its translation of the phrase is an adequate rendering. Although πολιορκήσουσι aligns with המה, OG doubtless supplied it as a verb fitting the context. Ziegler (63) compares καὶ οὐκ ἡδυνήθησαν πολιορκῆσαι αὐτήν || ולא יכל להלחם עליה in 7:1, where καὶ οὐκ ἡδυνήθησαν πολιορκῆσαι αὐτήν expresses a failure of the preceding ἀνέβη Ραασσων ... ἐπὶ Ἱερουσαλὴμ πολεμῆσαι αὐτήν, a nuance accomplished despite the fact that πολεμῆσαι renders למלחמה while πολιορκῆσαι translates להלחם. Here it seems less likely that the OG's *Vorlage* contained something other than המה than that πολιορκῆσαι decodes the metaphor of "eating," which ὅτι signals this verse will do.

52. As Goshen-Gottstein (ל) observes, OG's καὶ οὐ μὴ ἐμπλησθῇ ἄνθρωπος has different phrasing than MT, which has *athnach* under שבעו.

ISAIAH 10

10:1

הוּי הַחֲקָקִים חֲקִי אֲזַן appears to attest חֲבִיחַ חֲבִל, and the central question is the meaning of חֲבִל, which occurs only here in Isaiah. Syriac-Isaiah uses חֲבִיחַ for חֲקִי when it esteems it to mean “cut, engrave” (22:16; 49:16). On the other hand, חֲבִיחַ חֲבִל, חֲבִיחַ חֲבִל || סֵפֶר חֲקָה || Isa 30:8 attests the translator’s perception that חֲקִי can refer to a promulgated document. Given that סֵפֶר חֲבִיחַ חֲבִל || סֵפֶר חֲבִיחַ חֲבִל || seems to collapse חֲבִיחַ חֲבִל into סֵפֶר חֲבִיחַ as a parallel to חֲבִיחַ חֲבִל, and in light of the use of חֲבִיחַ for חֲקִי in 33:22 (which Greenberg and Walter translate as “lawgiver”), they render, “Woe to those who promulgate unfair precepts.”¹ However, in none of its other appearances does חֲבִיחַ mean “lawgiver,” nor does חֲבִיחַ mean “promulgate” or חֲבִיחַ “precept” (see *SyrLex*, s.vv. “חֲבִיחַ,” “חֲבִיחַ,” and “חֲבִיחַ”).

However, חָקַם frequently renders חָקַר in the sense of “search” (e.g., Num 21:18; 1 Sam 20:12; see the comments at 16:6) and is used with that meaning for חָקַק elsewhere (e.g., Judg 5:15, 16). Accordingly, סוֹבְחֵי חַלְמָה, חֲקֹמִים proclaims woe on “those making inquiries into villainy.”

Old Greek imposes a different relationship between the two clauses by supplying γάρ, overriding the parallelism and designating γράφοντες ... πόνον γράφουσιν as the reason for pronouncing woe. As Goshen-Gottstein (חב) observed, τοῖς γράφουσι πονηρίαν condenses וְהַחֲקִיקִים חֲקִי וְהַחֲקִיקִים.

1. Isa 33:22 כִּי יְהוָה שֹׁפְטֵנוּ יְהוָה מַחֲקֵנוּ || מַחֲלֵנוּ וְיִשְׁלַח אֶת הַמֶּלֶךְ וְיִשְׁלַח אֶת הַמֶּלֶךְ וְיִשְׁלַח אֶת הַמֶּלֶךְ
 accords with use of מַחֲלֵנוּ “ruler, leader” as an equivalent for מַחֲקֵנוּ in Gen 49:10; Deut 33:21; Judg 5:14 (for חֹקֵקֵינוּ in Judg 5:9). However, none of these can be considered equivalent to “lawgiver,” nor does *SyrLex* attest that meaning.

of the pronoun *ὁ αὐτῶν* (cf. *αὐτοῖς* in 10:2) agrees in person and number with *καταφεύξεσθε* || תנוסו and *καταλείπετε* || תעזבו. As in 10:1, +*γάρ* explicitizes the relationship between the second clause and the first, for which ולשואה has been rendered with *ἡ θλίψις* as the subject of *ἔξει*. Although *θλίψις* is typically the equivalent for צר (e.g., 8:22; 10:26; 26:16) and nowhere else in the Bible renders שואה, diverse equivalents for שואה elsewhere (e.g., *ὑετός*, Ezek 38:9; *ἀωρία*, Zeph 1:15) suggest some uncertainty about the word. Similarly in Isa 22:2, *μάταια* || תשאות is by association with שוא. A similar guess is likely even in Isa 47:11, where *καὶ ἔξει ἐπὶ σὲ ἐξαπίνης ἀπώλεια καὶ οὐ μὴ γνῶς* || ותבא עליך פתאם שואה לא תדעי seems chosen in the light of *καὶ ἔξει ἐπὶ σὲ ἀπώλεια καὶ οὐ μὴ γνῶς* || ותבא עליך רעה לא תדעי earlier in the verse. *θλίψις* || ולשואה here likely reflects a similar uncertainty over semantics.

סחכסל || ולשואה not only matches וסחכסל in 47:11 but also the rendering of תשאות in 22:2 and שאון in 66:6. Syriac's translation of ממרחק as a modifier of סחכסל (ܣܚܚܩܐ) accords with its frequent construction of relative clauses (e.g., ܣܚܚܩܐ ܕܡܡܪܚܩ, ואיש יהודה || בכפירים וינהם || 5:29).

Syriac reformulates לעזרה as verbal, ܠܠܥܙܪܗ, comparable to its translation of לעזרה with ܠܠܥܙܪܗ in 20:6; 31:1.

Although סחכסל || ונאנה תעזבו כבודכם || סחכסל || על מי תנוסו, there is no comparable rendering of אנה elsewhere.² Even though this is the sole occurrence of אנה in Isaiah, there is no reason to suppose that this translator was unaware of its meaning, nor is it clear what the translator would gain by avoiding ܠܠܥܙܪܗ.³ Even in his reformulation of להיות אלמנות שללם || ܠܠܥܙܪܗ (10:2), coordinate with ܠܠܥܙܪܗ || ואת יתומים יבזו || סחכסל, he used ܠܠܥܙܪܗ to render שלל as elsewhere (e.g., 8:1, 3). Thus, סחכסל || ונאנה likely attests a *Vorlage* in which ונאנה had been replaced by על מי under influence of the preceding clause.

10:4

ܠܠܥܙܪܗ || ܠܠܥܙܪܗ and ܠܠܥܙܪܗ || ܠܠܥܙܪܗ confirm that S shifted the grammatical person to the 2mp verbal forms in the preceding verse, much like its shift ܠܠܥܙܪܗ || ܠܠܥܙܪܗ in 10:2 (cf. 10:5).

2. Its typical equivalent is ܠܠܥܙܪܗ (e.g., Gen 16:8; 32:18; 37:30), while ܠܠܥܙܪܗ regularly translates עד אנה (e.g., Exod 16:28; Num 14:11; Josh 18:3).

3. There is no evidence in the context that סחכסל || ונאנה is an exegetical ploy to suggest hope of some sort of divine refuge.

Although one might posit that OG's lack of an equivalent for תחת יפלו attests a transmission error (see the discussion in Ziegler, 46–48), this translator's penchant for omitting semantically parallel clauses makes it likely that he collapsed תחת יפלו and תחת אסיר into בלתי ברע תחת אסיר. Although ἐμπεσεῖν is semantically closer to יפלו than to ברע, compare ἔπεσε Βηλ || ברע בל in 46:1.

The translator uses ἐπαγωγὴ for אסיר again in 14:17, outside of which it appears only in καὶ ἐκλελοιπότας ἐν ἐπαγωγῇ || ונאפס עצור in Deut 32:36. Correlatively, this translator uses ἐπάγω to speak of judgment, often in accord with equivalents attested in the Pentateuch, while also using it for unusual counterparts: ὁ δὲ κύριος ἐπάξει τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἐπ' αὐτούς || ויהוה וישפך עליו (31:3); καὶ ἐπήγαγεν ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ὄργην θυμοῦ αὐτοῦ || ויטה ידו (42:25); καὶ τὰ ἐνδοξά μου ἐπάξω ἐπὶ σοί || ותהלתי אחטם לך (48:9); ἐπάγει ἡμῖν κατὰ τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ καὶ κατὰ τὸ πλεῖθος τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ || אשר גמלם כרחמיו וכרב חסדיו (63:7).⁴ These distinctive renderings accord with the use of ἐπαγωγὴ here to connote straits into which one might fall.

10:5

Whereas OG almost invariably renders אשור with the grammatically plural Ἀσσύριοι, S translates it with a grammatically singular noun, whether ܐܫܘܪ or the gentilic ܐܫܘܪܝܐ, as here.

Syriac construes שבט אפי (ܡܨܬܒܬܐ ܐܦܝ) as a predication (ܡܨܬܒܬܐ ܐܦܝ ܡܨܬܒܬܐ), in accord with ܡܨܬܒܬܐ ܐܦܝ ܡܨܬܒܬܐ || ומטה הוא בידם. Syriac can separate a genitival relationship marked by *dālat* from the governing noun (Nöldeke §208), as it does with ܡܨܬܒܬܐ, whose *nomen regens* is ܡܨܬܒܬܐ.

Warszawski's (24) "Vielleicht ist für ܡܨܬܒܬܐ, zu lesen, was dem זעמי besser entspräche" is persuasive. ܡܨܬܒܬܐ is the preferred reading.

Although omitting an equivalent for מטה, considered redundant after שבט, would be typical of this translator, καὶ ὀργῆς ἐστὶν || ומטה הוא introduces a synonym for τοῦ θυμοῦ. He is not averse to conjoining θυμός and ὀργή, as evident in διὰ θυμὸν ὀργῆς κυρίου || בעברת יהוה צבאות of 9:18 (cf.

4. ἐπάγω || פקד (10:12; 15:7; 24:21; 26:14; 27:21) has precedent in Exod 32:34; 34:7; ἐπάγω || ישא (10:24) in Exod 28:43; Lev 22:16; and Deut 28:49, while καὶ ἐπάξω || ואשיבה (1:25) in Exod 15:19; and ἐπάξω || אשית (15:9) in ἐπάγω || שים in Exod 15:26 (2x). Curiously, ἐπάξει || יביא in 7:17 is the lone instance in Isaiah of the most frequent Hebrew counterpart for ἐπάγω (12/25 in the Pentateuch; 6/9 in 1–4 Kingdoms; 22/23 in Jeremiah).

13:13). His inclusion of τὴν ὀργὴν μου (isomorphic with זעמי) with the first clause of 10:6 overrides the parallelism of שבט אפי and the association of ומטה with זעמי, perhaps out of perplexity over the syntax of הוא ומטה בידם זעמי. More significant is the translator's equation of מטה with "wrath" again in 10:26's καὶ ὁ θυμὸς αὐτοῦ τῇ ὀδῷ τῇ κατὰ θάλασσαν || עורב ומטהו על ||. Although θυμός there is likely based on association of עורב with עברה (cf. 9:18), καὶ ὁ θυμὸς αὐτοῦ reflects the grammatical features of ומטהו, suggesting that the translator did not simply omit ומטהו but considered it integral to his equivalent. This gives good reason to think that καὶ ὀργῆς ἐστίν, isomorphic with הוא ומטה, reflects the translator's word choice.

10:6

τὴν ὀργὴν μου renders זעמי at the end of 10:5, making עברתי seem dispensable, as this translator often esteems parallel synonyms.

τῷ ἐμῷ λαῷ is most naturally construed as the indirect object of συντάξω, which would distinguish the referent from the preceding εἰς ἔθνος ἄνομον. In that case, 10:6 spells out at least part of the form the "woe" against the Assyrians will take: divine wrath executed against them via "my people."

Although one might perceive ἐμῷ as borrowed from the suffix of עברתי, the entirety of עברתי is rendered with τὴν ὀργὴν μου. More likely, then, the translator supplied ἐμῷ to clarify which people are intended, much as in 3:6 he renders ידך תחת ידך והמכשלה הזאת תחת ידך with καὶ τὸ βρῶμα τὸ ἐμὸν ὑπὸ σὲ ἔστω for the sake of explicitation alongside ὑπὸ σέ. The form of the pronoun, ἐμός, occurs nine times in Isaiah (as in Job and comparable with Genesis [11x] and 3 Kgdms [5x]).⁵ Those nine instances contrast strongly with the more than 250 occurrences of μου, befitting GELS's perception that ἐμός typically carries "a stressed notion of ownership, affiliation, or claim" (s.v. "ἐμός"; cf. τοῦ ἀπολέσαι τοὺς Ἀσσυρίους ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς τῆς ἐμῆς || לשבר אשור בארצי in 14:25). Although the *Vorlage* might have read עמי, the choice of ἐμῷ supports the suspicion that the translator supplied it to explicitize the identity of this nation.

سحاح حصلا لمل || עברתי ועל עם עברתי places the equivalent for עברתי in the same slot as in the Hebrew word order but carries no trace of the 1cs pronominal suffix. The noun لمل renders עברה in 14:6 (سحاح حصلا لمل).

5. The outlier is Proverbs, where ἐμός occurs thirty-eight times.

|| מכה עמים בעברה מכת || מסל), as well as in Amos 1:11; Zeph 1:15, while the adjectival form || (עברה) || in 13:9 is noteworthy, inasmuch as || (עברה) || prepares the way for || (עברה) ||. The phrase || (עברה) || here describes a people not just as profane (|| (עברה) ||) but as vicious. This word choice might have made it problematic to represent the pronominal suffix of || (עברה) ||, if it stood in S's *Vorlage*. Whereas OG's +ἐμῶν explicitizes this people as Israel, S seems to think of this target of wrath as another nation.

Old Greek collapses || (עברה) || into || (עברה) || (cf. 8:1). For || (עברה) || see the comments at 10:2.

Old Greek compresses || (עברה) || (1QIsa^a) into || (עברה) ||, the verb used for || (עברה) || in 16:4; 28:3; 41:25. However, || (עברה) || appears to offer a second rendering of || (עברה) ||, joined with || (עברה) ||, that gains significance from comparison with an alternative (hypothetical) || (עברה) ||. The effect of || (עברה) || is to highlight the action's consequences.

Ziegler (63) described || (עברה) || as "vom Übers. als sinnngemäße Obj. ergänzt" but does not explain why || (עברה) || would have been an intuitive choice. Although we might suspect that || (עברה) || is the translator's metonymic equivalent for || (עברה) || at the end of the clause by comparing || (עברה) || || (עברה) || in 15:3, equivalents for || (עברה) || elsewhere raise doubts that he associated || (עברה) || with || (עברה) || streets. In 42:2; 51:23 he renders || (עברה) || with || (עברה) ||, its nearly unvarying equivalent in the Penateuch (50/53 times), just as || (עברה) || || (עברה) || in 51:20 employs a common equivalent (e.g., 2 Kgdms 1:20; cf. Jer 11:13; Prov 1:20; 24:27) not associated with cities (cf. || (עברה) || || (עברה) || in 24:11). There is reason, then, to think that || (עברה) || is a substitution (rather than a translation) for || (עברה) ||.

Although || (עברה) || in 10:28's || (עברה) || || (עברה) || (|| (עברה) || renders || (עברה) || in Gen 12:8; 13:3) and || (עברה) || || (עברה) || in 10:29 merely serve to classify each of these names, || (עברה) || is a Hellenistic label for a central social structure.⁶ The reformulation || (עברה) || || (עברה) || || (עברה) || || (עברה) || in 10:14 provides eloquent witness to its importance. As argued below, 10:14 gives a fuller expression of the translator's perception that this ruler's central aim is to attack

6. Cf. || (עברה) || || (עברה) || || (עברה) || in 18:4.

cities. Correspondingly, τὰς πόλεις here are the cities of the Ἀσσυρίοις of 10:5, with the article anaphoric to αὐτῶν at the end of that verse.

10:7

The referent of αὐτὸς δέ (והוא) cannot be Ἀσσυρίοις, given the difference in grammatical number. Needless to say, this translator could have easily modified the grammatical number to ensure that connection. Instead, he likely associated והוא with τὸν ἄρχοντα τῶν Ἀσσυρίων || מלך אשור in 10:12, where the epithet τὸν νοῦν τὸν μέγαν (|| פרי גדל לבב) resonates with the diction in this verse.⁷

This translator's typical equivalent for דמה is ὁμοιόω (1:9; 40:18, 25; 46:5), while ὁμοιος is its equivalent in 14:14 and renders דמות in 13:4, דמו in 23:2, and דמי in 62:7.⁸ ἐνθυμέομαι, on the other hand, which appears only here in Isaiah and nowhere else in the Greek Bible, renders דמה. ἐνεθυμήθη || ידמה appears a choice associated with ὁ νοῦς αὐτοῦ || בלבבו.⁹

ψυχὴ || לבב appears again in 7:2 (2x), 4; 13:7, although καρδιά || לבב is more frequent (1:5; 6:10; 9:8; 19:1; 21:4; 32:4; 47:8; 49:21; 60:5). ὁ νοῦς αὐτοῦ || בלבבו and τὸν νοῦν || לבב in 10:12 are two of four appearances of νοῦς in Isaiah, and only in 42:21 does νοῦς again render לבב.¹⁰ The choice of νοῦς here resonates with 14:13, where σὺ δὲ εἶπας ἐν τῇ διανοίᾳ σου εἰς

7. According to a hypothesis advanced by Seeligmann (88) and developed by Van der Kooij (34–38), the translator shaped the actions ascribed to the Assyrian ruler in 10:5–14 to reflect those of Antiochus Epiphanes IV, seen as the contemporary fulfillment of these verses. For problems with this model, see Troxel, 226–34.

8. He translated נדמיתי with κατανένυγμαi in 6:5 and rendered דומם with κατανενυγμένη in 47:5 (κατανενυγμένη || דומם). Isaiah 15:1 lacks a discernable equivalent for נדמה. εἴρηκα || דמיתי in 14:24 likely either attests a variant or is a misreading of it as דברתי.

9. Cf. Josh 6:18, where μήποτε ἐνθυμηθέντες ὑμεῖς αὐτοὶ λάβητε ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀναθέματος (|| פן תחרימו ולקחתם מן החרם) uses ἐνθυμηθέντες rather than a form of ἀναθεματίζω (as in 6:21) to make sense of the preceding warning to guard themselves ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀναθέματος (|| מן החרם).

10. ἵνα ἴδωσιν καὶ γνῶσιν καὶ ἐννοηθῶσιν καὶ ἐπιστῶνται ἅμα || למען יראו וידעו in 41:20 suggests that it influenced the diction of καὶ ἐπιστήσομεν τὸν νοῦν || ונשימה לבנו in 10:21. The other appearance of νοῦς is in 40:13's τίς ἔγνω νοῦν κυρίου || מי תכן את רוח יהוה. On the other hand, ὀλιγόψυχοι τῇ διανοίᾳ || לבב לנמהרי לב in 35:4 and καὶ ἡ καρδιά τῶν ἀσθενούντων || נמהרים in 32:4 suggest a focus on the meaning of the phrases rather than an equivalent for לבב on its own.

τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀναβήσομαι || ואתה אמרת בלבבך השמים אעלה describes the ruler's arrogance.

Although the choice of ἀλλά to render כִּי is hardly surprising (cf. S's ו), ἀπαλλάξει || להשמיד presents a puzzle. Although ἀπαλλάσσω can be used intransitively ("depart"), the lack of a complementary prepositional phrase (e.g., ἀπό) negates that possibility. Ottley (2:160) observes that the transitive meaning, "remove," "would agree with the Heb." but concludes that "LXX are hardly likely to have used it so."¹¹ Thus he translates ἀπαλλάξει ὁ νοῦς αὐτοῦ with "his mind shall change" (1:103) and suggests (2:160) that the translator "may have read some form of שִׁנָּה." Not only is that graphically unlikely, but we should begin with the semantic agreement between ἀπαλλάξει and להשמיד and note that the following καὶ τοῦ ἐξολεθρεῦσαι conforms to the semantics and morphology of ולהכרית. Although ἀπαλλάξει is the reading of most of the codices, Ziegler's conjecture, ἀπαλλάξαι (reported in his first apparatus), is more likely, while ἀπαλλάξει is easily explicable as a modification to accommodate analysis of ὁ νοῦς αὐτοῦ as subject. The resulting ἀλλὰ ἀπαλλάξαι ὁ νοῦς αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἐξολεθρεῦσαι ἔθνη is hardly elegant Greek but can be analyzed as a nonverbal sentence whose predicate is ἀπαλλάξαι κτλ, as does La Bible d'Alexandrie: "mais détruire est son idée, et exterminer un bon nombre de nations" (cf. *Septuaginta Deutsch*).

Although 𐤒𐤍 might spur analysis of 𐤌𐤍 (ידמה ||) as a *paal* passive participle serving as predicate adjective ("and he was not of the same sort" ≈ "he was not so minded"), 𐤒𐤍 𐤌𐤍 𐤒𐤍 || כִּן יחשב favors analyzing 𐤒𐤍 in both clauses as pleonastic (Nöldke §263) and 𐤌𐤍 as a 3ms *paal* perfect: "and he did not think that way." S's insertion of *bēth* in 𐤌𐤍 𐤒𐤍 (making it parallel to the following 𐤌𐤍 𐤒𐤍) and its rendering of כִּי with ו conveys a contrast: "but rather (the intent) that he should destroy was in his mind."

Syriac resolves the litotes of 𐤌𐤍 𐤒𐤍 with ܩܬܝܠܐ, whereas OG renders it forthrightly: ἔθνη οὐκ ὀλίγα.

10:8

Old Greek's pattern of frequently supplying pronouns likely explains its +αὐτῷ, perhaps compelled by the person and number of εἰπωσιν || יאמר.

11. ἀπαλλάσσω bears this meaning in Job 27:5; 34:5; Jer 39:31, in each case rendering a *hiphil* form of סור.

סוּ ... εἴ equally lack counterparts in Hebrew and are most plausibly attributable to the translator.

Also remarkable is OG's selection of *μόνος* to represent יְחִידוּ, given that *ἄμα* is typical (nineteen out of twenty-nine times), while *μόνος* is used almost exclusively for לְבַד (seven times).¹² The translator's collapse of שְׂרִי and מַלְכִּים into *ἄρχων* accords with his tendency to eliminate synonyms. His rendering of them in the grammatical singular, coordinate with σὺ *μόνος* εἶ, suggests that his rendering of this verse had the larger context in view. These words by an unidentified group could be construed either as a declaration of uncontested sovereignty ("You alone are") or a question of that ("Are you alone?"), options that must be weighed.¹³

The apodosis to καὶ ἐὰν εἴπωσιν (καὶ ἐρεῖ, 10:9) is marked by the indicative mood and a change of speaker, which is followed by the ruler's boast of his successes (10:9–11).¹⁴ If σὺ *μόνος* εἶ *ἄρχων* is a declaration, his rhetorical questions would affirm the acclamation (10:9–11). However, construing it as a question accenting *μόνος* provides a stronger rhetorical set up for his detailed résumé as a refutation of all doubts. Given the seemingly sovereign hand of the translator in shaping these verses, that stronger rhetorical ploy is possible.

ܫܪܝܐ as the equivalent for שְׂרִי (always grammatically plural in Syriac) is established as early as 1:23; 3:4, 14. The absence of the pronominal suffix of שְׂרִי, however, is anomalous among S's renderings of שְׂרִי + pronominal suffix. Although ܫܪܝܐ might attest שְׂרִים in the *Vorlage*, there is no obvious trigger for omitting the pronoun. More likely is Warszawski's (24) diagnosis that ܫܪܝܐ is an inner-S error for ܫܪܝܐܐ that "wohl durch das ܝ des folgenden ܫܪܝܐ entstanden [ist]."

12. Other formal equivalents for יְחִידוּ are ἀλλά (43:17); οἱ ἀντικείμενοι αὐτῷ (45:16); and ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό (66:17). A Greek equivalent is lacking in 22:3; 40:5; 41:19; and 65:7. The only other deviation from the *μόνος* || לְבַד pattern is 3:26, where *μόνη* serves as a subject complement, without a Hebrew counterpart.

13. Direct questions can use the same phrasing as a statement (Smyth §§2637, 2640). Note that the translator does not give an equivalent for הֲלֵא, although he will render the same syntagm with οὐκ at the outset of 10:9.

14. καὶ ἔσται ὅταν συντελέσῃ in 10:12 marks a new stage in the discourse, forecasting the Kyrios's punishment of the ruler.

10:9

+καὶ ἐρεῖ at the outset is attributable to the translator creating the apodosis to καὶ ἐὰν εἴπωσιν αὐτῷ in 10:8. The rendering of לֹא with οὐκ at the start of the question sets the expectation of an affirmative response.

Syriac renders the initial לֹא with ܠܐ (cf. 10:8) and lets it suffice for the two succeeding instances of לֹא אִם (see the excursus at 5:9).

ἔλαβον appears twice without a corresponding Hebrew lexeme, both times likely inserted to explicitate the action perceived in the similes. The translator seems to have shaped his rendering according to his perception of the verse's role in the context, so that the ruler's assertions about captured lands would explicitize the claim implied by μόνος ἄρχων.

The comments on 9:9 reported scholars' perception that Genesis's scene of building a tower influenced the translator, based on phrases resonate with Gen 11:4. Seeligmann's (78) suggestion that τὴν χώραν τὴν ἐπάνω Βαβυλῶνος || כּכּרכּמִישׁ here betrays the translator's unfamiliarity with the toponym does not address *why* he chose a description rather than transliteration, which was his most frequent expedient for unfamiliar toponyms (cf. Χαρχαμῖς in Jer 26[46]:2).¹⁵ The solution likely has to do with his identification of כלנו with the city כלנה mentioned in Gen 10:10 (καὶ Χαλαννη ἐν τῇ γῇ Σεννααρ || בארץ שׁנער (וּכְלָנָה), which this translator associates with the story of the tower, as attested by his insertion of οὗ ὁ πύργος ὠκοδομήθη. שׁנער appears in Isa 11:11 at the end of a series of place names, where καὶ ἀπὸ ἡλίου ἀνατολῶν renders ומשׁנער, even though its equivalent in Gen 11:10, following Χαλαννη (|| כלנה) is Σεννααρ. However, that story begins (Gen 11:2) with the report καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ κινήσαι αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν εὗρον πεδίον ἐν γῇ Σεννααρ καὶ κατῴκησαν ἐκεῖ. Thus in the list of lands in Isa 11:11, the translator represents שׁנער simply as situated in the east, while in 10:9 he locates כּכּרכּמִישׁ as τὴν χώραν τὴν ἐπάνω Βαβυλῶνος καὶ Χαλαννη, whose claim to fame was the tower. Notably, OG-Zech 5:11 renders בארץ שׁנער with ἐν γῇ Βαβυλῶνος.

Although Δαμασκὸν καὶ Σαμάρειαν aligns with כּדמִשׁק שׁמרון, the basis for Ἀραβίαν || כּארפּד חמת is inscrutable, although it is likely a guess. It recurs in 11:11, where καὶ ἐξ Ἀραβίας renders ומחמת, although elsewhere חמת is transliterated as Αἰμαθ (Isa 36:19; 37:13; 4 Kgdms 14:25,

15. See Troxel, "What's in a Name?" 329.

28, et passim); Εφααθ (Num 13:21); Εμαθ (Num 34:8; Josh 13:5); Ημαθ (2 Kgdms 8:9; 3 Kgdms 8:65; Jer 30[49]:23).

10:10

A series of divergences from MT in this verse bear the marks of shifts effected by the translator. The omission of an explicit equivalent for ידי is explained by the inflection of ἔλαβον in the first-person (cf. τῇ ἰσχύϊ || בכח ידי in 10:13). λαμβάνω || מצא is paralleled by καταλήμψομαι τῇ χειρὶ ὡς νοσσιάν || ידי ותמצא כקן ידי in 10:14, although ידי there is not collapsed into the verb, even if the 1cs pronominal suffix is omitted in consideration of the subject. ἔλαβον here is coordinate with ἔλαβον in 10:9, explicitizing the claim of conquest.¹⁶

Similarly, the translator inserted λήμψομαι in the second line, conjugated in the future tense for the boast that his past seizures are the template for future victories. To it he prefixed ταύτας as anaphoric to the list of territories the speaker claims to have captured previously (10:9).¹⁷ His rendering of לממלכת with καὶ πάσας τὰς χώρας (correlative to τὴν χώραν τὴν ἐπάνω Βαβυλῶνος, 10:9)—including the addition of πάσας—buttresses that correlation and echoes the ruler's resolve τοῦ ἔθνη ἐξολεθρεῦσαι οὐκ ὀλίγα || מעט לא גוים ולהכרית גוים in 10:7.¹⁸

Given OG's modifications here and the preceding verse, it is more likely that ὁλολύξατε || האליל takes advantage of the graphic similarity to הילי than that the latter actually stood in its *Vorlage*. The equivalents for אליל elsewhere (always morphologically plural) are τὰ βδελύγματα (2:8, 20), τὰ χειροποίητα (2:18; 10:11; 19:1; 31:7), and τοὺς θεοὺς (19:3). This grammatically singular form of אליל in Isaiah, prefixed with the article, enabled association with הילי, which this translator always renders with ὁλολύζω.¹⁹ His masculine plural imperative ὁλολύξατε might reflect read-

16. This finds further support from καὶ σείσω || ותמצא in 10:14 (where ידי again lacks an equivalent), a choice that seems again calibrated to the context.

17. In a passage where the translator exercises broad freedom in rendering phrases and clauses, I see no need to attribute his insertion of ταύτας to an association of האליל with אלה (*pace* Van der Vorm-Croughs, 166).

18. To τὰς χώρας || לממלכת, cf. ἐν ταῖς φάραγξι τῆς χώρας || בנחלי הבתות, 7:19; and πάντες ὡς χώρα κατοικουμένη· κατοικηθήσεται ἡ χώρα αὐτῶν || כל ישובי תבל ושכני ארץ, 18:3. On frequent +πᾶς in OG-Isaiah, see appendix A.

19. 1Q8 reads לממלכת האליל (cf. V, *regna idoli*), while 1QIsa^a reads לממלכות האליל, similar to which S reads 𐤁𐤏𐤏𐤏𐤏𐤏; and T פלחא די מלכוון.

ing the initial *waw* of **וּפְסִילֵיהֶם** with **הָאֱלִיל** or might simply be an accommodation to the address to τὰ γλυπτά.

Although τὰ γλυπτά might have arisen by suppressing the pronominal suffix of **וּפְסִילֵיהֶם** following **ῥολογῶντες**, S's **ܐܠܝܠܐ** attests a similar reading, following its **ܐܠܝܠ || ܐܠܝܠ**. The *Vorlagen* of OG and S may have read **וּפְסִילִים** rather than **וּפְסִילֵיהֶם**, the latter of which might have arisen under the influence of **וּלְאֱלִילָהּ** in 10:11.

The remainder of the verse in S and OG is transparent to a *Vorlage* like MT. The use of *ἐν* for the prefixed **מִן** in **מִדְּרוֹשֶׁם וּמִשְׁמֵרוֹן** falls within the range of freedom rendering particles that the Greek translator evinces.

10:11

Syriac and OG provide no clear equivalent for **הֵלֵא**, translating the statement as a simple assertion. **γάρ** is one of OG's most frequent additions, in this case serving to make this clause an explanation of 10:10's summons of the idols to wail. The **+καί** following **οὕτως ποιήσω** parallels **+καί** introducing the clause of comparison after **ἐλάβον** in 10:10.

10:12

Although nominal **בָּצַע** occurs in Gen 37:26; Exod 18:21; Judg 5:19; and 1 Sam 8:3, its verbal forms appear only in the prophets (ten times), Psalms (once), Job (twice), Proverbs (twice), and Lamentations (once). **συντελέω** (**συντελέσῃ || יִבְצַע**) is its most frequent equivalent (Jer 6:13; Ezek 22:12; Joel 2:8; Prov 1:19; Lam 2:17; cf. **ἐπιτελέω** in Zech 4:9). Similarly, **ܡܒܥܥ || ܡܒܥܥܐ** agrees with **ܡܒܥܥܐ || ܡܒܥܥܐ** in Job 6:9 and **ܡܒܥܥܐ || ܡܒܥܥܐ** in Lam 2:17.²⁰

Old Greek's reformulation of **אֵת כָּל מַעֲשָׂהוּ** as **πάντα ποιῶν** is both transparent (cf. **ἂ ποιήσει || מַעֲשָׂהוּ** in 5:19) and a fitting complement to

1QIsa^a likely entails harmonization with the predominantly plural forms of **אֱלִילִים** in Isaiah and morphological attraction to **לְמַמְלָכוֹת**. The habit of referring to idols as a collective likely lies behind the plural forms in S and T. All twenty-one instances of **ܐܠܝܠܐ** in Isaiah are grammatically plural.

20. The other appearance of **בָּצַע** in Isaiah (38:12) is rendered **ܐܠܝܠܐ || ܐܠܝܠܐ** in 38:12, under influence of the preceding **ܐܠܝܠܐ || ܐܠܝܠܐ**.
קפדתי בארג חיי

συντελέσει. Syriac's grammatically plural ܡܥܫܗܘ || מעשהו is typical in Isaiah (5:19; 19:14; 28:21 [2x]).²¹

Although ἐπάξει could reflect יפקד in place of אפקד (MT, 1QIsa^a, S, V, T), a modification of the grammatical person to accord with συντελέσει befits this translator's practice.

All the versions construe גד as an adjective, with V and T retaining its position before לבב (*magnifici cordis*; רם ליבא), while OG and S reverse the order (τὸν νοῦν τὸν μέγαν/; ܠܒܝܬܐ), in accord with word-order norms in their target languages. Their equivalents for מלך אשור (τὸν ἄρχοντα τῶν Ἀσσυρίων/; ܡܠܟܐ ܐܫܘܪ) stand in apposition to τὸν νοῦν τὸν μέγαν/; ܠܒܝܬܐ.

The topic of τὸν νοῦν τὸν μέγαν recalls ἀλλὰ ἀπαλλάξει ὁ νοῦς αὐτοῦ || כי בלבו and ἐνεθυμήθη || ידמה in 10:7. In light of the ruler's hubristic reasoning in 10:8–11, that epithet is likely sarcastic. The omission of an equivalent for פרי is one of the translator's many omissions of a *nomen regens* catalogued by Van der Vorm-Croughs (71). Perhaps the translator's focus on the characterization of the ruler as τὸν νοῦν τὸν μέγαν rendered פרי superfluous in his mind.

ἄρχων is the equivalent for מלך only here and in 8:21, where τὸν ἄρχοντα || במלכו appears to have no greater significance than the choice of καὶ τὰ παταχρα || ובאלהיו in the neighboring phrase. The choice of ἄρχων here is likely determined by the use of ἄρχων to render מלכים (יחדו) שרי in 10:8.²²

Equally distinctive is the transposition of תפארת and רום in ἐπὶ τὸ ὕψος τῆς δόξης τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτοῦ || ועל תפארת רום עיניו. This could be a reformulation to correlate with the description of the ruler's haughtiness in 10:7–11 (it might be regarded as slightly stronger than [a hypothetical] ἐπὶ τὴν δόξαν τοῦ ὕψους τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτοῦ), or the transposition might have already stood in the *Vorlage*.

10:13–14

Old Greek lacks an equivalent for both instances of ידי in these verses: תָּהִי יִשְׁחָדֵךְ || בכה ידי עשיתי in 10:13; and (καὶ τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην) καταλήμφομαι || ותמצא כקן ידי in 10:14. The implication of ידי in 10:13 is comparable to τὰ ἔργα μου || מעשה ידי in 29:23

21. The lone exception is ܡܠܟܐ ܐܫܘܪ || ܡܥܫܗܘ, 54:16.

22. Attempts to identify this ἄρχων as alluding to a specific Hellenistic ruler are unsupportable, in my view (see Troxel, 228–34).

(see Van der Vorm-Crouchs, 109–10). The omission of the 1cs suffix of ידי in each instance is explicable from the first-person subject of each verb, allowing the definite article of τῇ ἰσχύϊ and τῇ χειρὶ to bear its force.

Given the translator's frequent resort to reformulation in the surrounding verses, τῇ σοφίᾳ τῆς συνέσεως || בננותי כי ובחכמתי suggests that he compressed the clauses, representing the 1cs suffix by the force of the article, since the person is identified in ποιήσω. לו. || معلمي, معلمي renders בננותי sensibly within an explanatory clause (cf. T, ארי סוכלתן אנא).

The relationship between τῇ ἰσχύϊ αὐτῶν and ועתידתיהם (ועתודותיהם) is obscure. In 1:11; 34:6, עתודים is rendered with τράγυν, while 14:9's πάντες οἱ γίγαντες οἱ ἄρξαντες τῆς γῆς || עתודי ארץ likely reflects an exegetical tradition (see the discussion there). Although the equivalent ἰσχύς || עתוד\ עתיד is without parallel elsewhere, this would not be the first substitution of a word meaning “strength” for a word rendered more suitably elsewhere (see esp. ἰσχύς || גאון in 2:10, 19, 21), nor will it be the last (μετὰ ἰσχύος || במערצה, 10:33; αὐτῆς ἡ ἰσχύς || תאניה, 29:2; ἰσχύς || קש, 33:11; πέτρας ἰσχυρᾶς || סלעים משגבו, 33:16). Thus, τῇ ἰσχύϊ αὐτῶν might be a substitution for ועתי/ודתיהם, although this does not mean that it arose out of thin air. Conspicuous in 10:14 is the lack of an equivalent for לחיל העמים, as is the shift forward of καὶ τῇ οἰκουμένῃ ἐλγῇ || כל הארץ to serve as direct object of καταλήψομαι. Given the semantic match between ἰσχύς and חיל, and given the similarity of לחיל העמים to 10:13's גבולת עמים, the translator might have perceived חיל as a guide to the perplexing ועתי/ודתיהם.

A similar association might account for S's || معصية, ועתי/ודתיהם, even if one might infer that the translator found it a suitable object for לו || שושתי (cf. || معصية, معصية || ואת כל חילם בזו || Num 31:9).²³ The only other occurrence of معصية in Isaiah is || معصية, || معصية in 61:6 (where OG frequently renders חיל elsewhere: e.g., Gen 34:29; Num 31:9; Deut 8:17), where OG reads τῇ ἰσχύϊ ἐβῶν.²⁴ Although S renders לחיל העמים with || معصية, || معصية in 10:14 (where OG is silent), its rendering of ועתי/ודתיהם with a term that frequently renders חיל makes for a notable parallel to τῇ ἰσχύϊ αὐτῶν, even if there is no reason to suspect collusion otherwise.

23. S renders עתודים with || معصية in 1:11; 34:6 and analyzes עתודי ארץ in 14:9 as a metaphor for rulers: || معصية, || معصية.

24. Although T reads תושבתהון וקרי || ועתי/ודתיהם here, in 14:9 it renders כל עתודי ארץ with נכסיה.

The similarity of S's **מְבִלִּים** to *πόλεις κατοικουμένας* is frequently cited as evidence of S's reliance on OG (Warszawski, 24–25; Van der Kooij, 288), a claim based on the assumption that OG carries distinctive exegesis. However, the discovery of “cities” in this verse is paralleled in T, which finds the ruler boasting that he will plunder “esteemed cities” and forcefully debase the “inhabitants of strong cities”: **וקרי תושבחתהון ועתי/ודתיהם שושתי ואוריד כאביר || בזית ואחיתית בתקוף ית יתבי כרכין תקיפין** (Targum's perception that the ruler boasts of attacks on peoples is evident already in the preceding clause: **ואגליתי עממיא ממדינא ואסיר גבולת עמים || למדינא יושבים**).²⁶ Targum's **מְבִלִּים** seems its equivalent for **כאביר**, while **כרכין** explicates the referent. Targum's perception that the ruler boasts of attacks on peoples is evident already in the preceding clause: **ואגליתי עממיא ממדינא ואסיר גבולת עמים || למדינא יושבים**. In this light, *πόλεις* and **מְבִלִּים** appear intelligible as explications of **יושבים** along the same lines as T, whatever each made

26. T's rendering of the immediately preceding clause reinforces the perception that the translator divined in these phrases attacks on politically organized populations: ואסיר גבולת עמים || ואגלית עממיא ממדינא למדינא

Equally noteworthy is OG's καὶ σείσω, which nowhere else renders ירר. The only other passage in the Greek Bible to associate σείω and πόλις is Isa 33:20's praise of Jerusalem as τὸ σωτήριον ἡμῶν:

נוה שאנן אהל בל יצען	πόλις πλουσία σκηναὶ αἱ οὐ μὴ σεισθῶσιν
בל יסע יתדתיו	οὐδὲ μὴ κινήθῶσιν οἱ πάσσαλοι τῆς σκηνῆς αὐτῆς
לנצח	εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα χρόνον

Because צען is a *hapax legomenon*, σεισθῶσιν is likely a guess, chosen for use in a metaphor denying vulnerability for πόλις πλουσία. The equivalent for יסע, κινήθῶσιν, renders נסע elsewhere only in Gen 11:2, 20.³⁰ Both σεισθῶσιν and κινήθῶσιν appear to have been chosen to mark (but deny) the vulnerability of tents and, by transfer, that of the πόλις πλουσία.

The similarity between the vulnerability of a tent in 33:20 and inhabited cities seems instructive for the choice of καὶ σείσω in 10:14 to connote a military assault, with πόλεις κατοικουμένας καὶ τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην expressing the extent the Assyrian ruler's overreach. To achieve this image, the translator moved forward his equivalent for כל הארץ, τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην. Even though οἰκουμένη occurs often in the book (fifteen times), its pairing with cognate κατοικουμένας stands out.³¹

Syriac renders הורד with ܠܫ in 14:11 and ܘܐܘܪܝܕ with ܠܠܫ in 63:6, while in 43:14 it renders ܘܗܘܪܕܬܝ with ܠܠܫ, likely because that verb is more compatible with its translation of בריחים as an adjective from ברח: ܠܠܫܝܬ. Its translation of ܘܐܘܪܝܕ with ܠܠܫ here may reasonably be perceived as extrapolating what “bring down” implies in this context (cf. ܡܥ ܡܢܝܦܘ || ܡܢܝܦܘ in 10:15).

30. Within Isaiah, יונעו renders מוש in 22:25; 46:7 and מוט in 41:7.

31. Seeligmann (81) considers the translator's use of οἰκουμένη to betray his Hellenistic environment, particularly joined with πόλεις κατοικουμένας, which transposes us “from the atmosphere surrounding the Assyrian claims to world sovereignty into the Hellenistic period” (cf. Van der Kooij, 38). As in the rest of the Bible, οἰκουμένη frequently renders תבל in Isaiah (13:11; 14:17; 24:4; 27:6; 34:1)—as does γῆ (14:21; 26:9, 18)—and renders ארץ often (10:14, 23; 13:5, 9; 14:26; 23:17; 24:1; 37:16), although γῆ (100+) and χώρα (17x) are more frequent. However, if the use of οἰκουμένη is as revealing as Seeligmann claims, it is odd that γῆ renders both ארץ and תבל in 14:21, a passage Seeligmann ranked an allusion to Antiochus IV's death (84).

עץ and שבט by linking כהניף שבט and עץ directly (see Van der Vorm-Croughs, 201).

Although S uses the Syriac cognate verb ܠܦ in rendering ܝܕ הניף in 10:32; 13:2, it translates the same phrase with ܢܦܡ in 11:15; 19:16, similar to ܡܠܝܡ here. On the other hand, ܡܢܦܝܢ || ܡܢ || ܡܢܦܝܢ explicitizes the action (ܡܢܦܝܢ || ܡܢܦܝܢ). The translator might have chosen ܡܢܦܝܢ || ܡܢܦܝܢ coordinate with ܡܢܦܝܢ || ܡܢܦܝܢ.

As Ottley (2:161–62) perceived, ܡܢܦܝܢ || ܡܢܦܝܢ reflects the translator reading ܡܢܦܝܢ (10:16) as though it were ܡܢܦܝܢ perhaps under influence of ܡܢܦܝܢ (prefixed to ܡܢܦܝܢ) that he otherwise passes over. A similar case appears in 16:7, where ܡܢܦܝܢ || ܡܢܦܝܢ was likely influenced by ܡܢܦܝܢ || ܡܢܦܝܢ in 10:6. Such manipulations of negative adverbs are common in OG-Isaiah (see Troxel, 93–98).

10:16

Although ἀλλά most often corresponds to ܡܢܦܝܢ (thirteen times) or ܡܢܦܝܢ (twenty times), another thirteen times it lacks a formal equivalent (cf. 7:17; 9:9[10]). Here it creates a natural transition to the action of the Kyrios after ܡܢܦܝܢ || ܡܢܦܝܢ.

ܡܢܦܝܢ || ܡܢܦܝܢ accords with Van der Vorm-Croughs's (503) observation that OG-Isaiah, "in nearly all instances where the Hebrew presents the combinations ܡܢܦܝܢ, ܡܢܦܝܢ, or ܡܢܦܝܢ, translates this with only one divine name."

ܡܢܦܝܢ likely reflects unfamiliarity with ܡܢܦܝܢ, as is apparent in Mic 6:10 (ܡܢܦܝܢ || ܡܢܦܝܢ [OG ܡܢܦܝܢ || ܡܢܦܝܢ]), and explains Ps 106:15, where ܡܢܦܝܢ || ܡܢܦܝܢ seems an outcome inferred from the preceding ܡܢܦܝܢ || ܡܢܦܝܢ.³⁴ The choice of ܡܢܦܝܢ here comports with other examples of this translator using ܡܢܦܝܢ for destruction: e.g., ܡܢܦܝܢ || ܡܢܦܝܢ (34:12); ܡܢܦܝܢ || ܡܢܦܝܢ (40:17).

Old Greek's capacity to recognize ܡܢܦܝܢ is suggested by ܡܢܦܝܢ || ܡܢܦܝܢ in 17:4, where it is part of its rendering ܡܢܦܝܢ || ܡܢܦܝܢ ܡܢܦܝܢ || ܡܢܦܝܢ, a clause that can illuminate ܡܢܦܝܢ || ܡܢܦܝܢ here. Just as its ܡܢܦܝܢ || ܡܢܦܝܢ was likely

34. S chooses a cognate Syriac lexeme for ܡܢܦܝܢ in Isa 17:4 (ܡܢܦܝܢ || ܡܢܦܝܢ). (ܡܢܦܝܢ || ܡܢܦܝܢ).

ὡς ἄγρωστις ξηρά || (שמיר ושית). There, as here, the insertion enables the collapse of שמיר ושית into a single phrase. The lack of equivalents for the pronominal suffixes likely owes to the same standardization of the phrase that transformed it into a simile, although the definite article (τῇ ὕλην) might represent the pronominal suffix.

ὕλη appears only here in Isaiah and is found elsewhere only in Job 29:29; 38:40. The choice of ὕλη might be influenced by יערו in 10:18.

Old Greek reads τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ || ביום אחד at the head of 10:18, in contrast to ἐν μιᾷ ἡμέρᾳ || ביום אחד in 47:9; 66:8. Although OG might attest ביום ההוא (1QIsa^a, S, V, and T attest אחד ביום), more likely the translator's decision to read the phrase with 10:18 spurred adjustment to the more common phrase, particularly given the similar modifications in 14:3 (καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἀναπαύσει σε ὁ θεός || והיה ביום הניח יהוה לך); 30:25 (ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ὅταν ἀπόλωνται πολλοί || ביום הרג רב).

10:18

Given τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ || ביום אחד and καὶ καταφάγεται ἀπὸ ψυχῆς ἕως σαρκῶν || מנפש ועד בשר יכלה, we might expect that ἀποσβεσθήσεται τὰ ὄρη καὶ οἱ βουνοὶ καὶ οἱ δρυμοί renders וכבוד יערו וכרמלו (MT, 1QIsa^a; 1Q8 preserves יערו וכרמלו [the fragment of the preceding letter leaves it unclear]; cf. S and V). Although Ottley's (2:162) proposal that ἀποσβεσθήσεται τὰ ὄρη reflects a *Vorlage* that read יכבו ההרים posits a graphically intelligible corruption of וכבוד, the gap between ההרים and יערו is too great to explain on graphic or phonological grounds.³⁷ He offers no explanation of καὶ οἱ βουνοὶ καὶ οἱ δρυμοί || וכרמלו.

δρυμός regularly translates יער (e.g., 7:2; 9:18; 21:13; 32:19; 37:24), making καὶ οἱ δρυμοί || יערו transparent.³⁸ τὰ ὄρη collocates with οἱ βουνοί so frequently in Isaiah, particularly as a word pair (2:14; cf. 2:2; 10:32; 30:17, 25; 40:4; 41:15; 44:23; 54:10; 55:12; 65:7), that we should consider them jointly. In fact, βοήσατε ὄρη εὐφροσύνην οἱ βουνοὶ καὶ πάντα τὰ ξύλα τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς || וכל עץ בו פצחו הרים רנה יער in 44:23 likely reflects the influence of the word pair ὄρη + βουνοί on the translator's word choice. Something similar seems afoot with τὰ ὄρη καὶ οἱ βουνοί || וכרמלו here.

37. ἀποσβέννυμι appears only here in Isaiah, but σβέννυμι regularly renders כבה (1:31; 34:10; 42:3; 43:17^[2]; 66:24).

38. יער is linked with כרמל again in 29:17(2x); 32:15; 37:24, where it is always rendered by δρυμός.

Although כרמל is transliterated Χερμελ in 29:17; 32:15 and Κάρμηλος in 32:16; 33:9; 35:2, it seems collapsed into יער in 37:24's τοῦ δρυμοῦ || יער כרמלו. Moreover, in 16:10 כרמל is rendered metonymically: καὶ ἀρθήσεται εὐφροσύνη καὶ ἀγαλλίαμα ἐκ τῶν ἀμπελώνων σου || מן וּגִיל שְׂמֵחָה שְׂמֵחָה וּגִיל מִן הַכְּרָמִל (ἀμπελώνων is likely chosen in light of καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀμπελῶσίν σου οὐ μὴ εὐφρανθήσονται || ירנן לא יכרמים ובכרמים that follows). Similarly here, τὰ ὄρη καὶ οἱ βουνοὶ καὶ οἱ δρυμοί (|| יערו וכרמלו) detail the scope of the devastation by the fire that now turns to destroy humans (καὶ καταφάγεται ἀπὸ ψυχῆς ἕως σαρκῶν).³⁹

In the wake of two verses whose vocabulary the translator manipulated to speak of a πῦρ καιόμενον devouring the ruler's δόξαν, the perception that he derived ἀποσβεσθήσεται from reading וכבוד as from כבה seems likely, although speculating about the particular form he read requires more information than this translator reveals. There is no clearer evidence of his tack than καὶ ἔσται ὁ φεύγων ὡς ὁ φεύγων ἀπὸ φλογὸς καιομένης || וְהָיָה כַּמָּס נָס at the end of the verse, where he utilizes an association with נוס but also supplies ἀπὸ φλογὸς καιομένης, in accord with his double use of πῦρ καιόμενον in 10:16, 17.

Although S's אֵשׁ מְסִיחָה aligns with כ(מסס) והיה, the relationship of מְסִיחָה to the remainder of the clause is oblique. The only similar phrases are מְסִיחָה הָיָה || וְהָיָה כְּלוֹא הָיָה in Obad 16 and מְסִיחָה אֵשׁ || כְּאֵשׁ בְּאֵשׁ in Job 10:19. The Isaiah translator renders verb forms of מסס elsewhere with מִשַּׁח, conjugated in the *ethpeel* (13:7; 19:1; 34:3). The most plausible inference is that he found כַּמָּס נָס inscrutable and substituted for it a sensible parallel to יִכְלֶה.⁴⁰ Notably, although he seems to have found himself at a loss, he did not draw on OG.

10:19

Although καὶ οἱ καταλειφθέντες is transparent to ושאר (cf. τὸ καταλειφθὲν Ἰσραὴל || שאר ישראל in 10:20), the rendering of ושאר elsewhere by καὶ κατάλειμμα (14:22), τὸ λοιπόν (17:3), and τὸ κατάλοιπον (21:17) accentuates his exercise of choice here. καὶ οἱ καταλειφθέντες shifts attention

39. καταφάγεται || יכלה aligns with the semantics of כלה but also fits the image of destruction by fire (cf. καὶ φλῶξ πυρὸς κατεσθίουσα || אש אוכלת, 29:6; καὶ φλογὸς κατεσθίουσας || אש אוכלת ולהב, 30:30).

40. Warszawski's (25) diagnosis that the translator construed "מסס im Sinne von 'zerfließen, verschwinden'" is possible but beyond confirmation.

from the impious ruler to the fate of a group that the translator might have inferred from generic *ὁ φεύγων* in 10:18, as suggested by his *+ἀπ' αὐτῶν*.

His exercise of choice seems also to entail the omission of *עַרְוָה* (perhaps considered redundant after *עַרְוָה* in 10:18) and the supply of *ἀπ' αὐτῶν*. Ziegler's (82) explication, "Der Übers. verläßt das Bild des Waldes, das V. 18 vorliegt, und deutet die Worte auf die Einwohner," provides the most likely account of the translator's path.

10:20

After *καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ*, the translator shifts attention from the survivors (*οἱ καταλειφθέντες*) among the Assyrians to the collective *τὸ καταλειφθὲν Ἰσραὴλ* || *שְׂאֵר יִשְׂרָאֵל* (S *سائر اسرائيل*, versus *وحده*, *وَمَتَعِل*, *وَمَتَعِل* || *עַרְוָה* in 10:19). Both OG and S explicitize the collective *וּפְלִיטָה* by using forms in the grammatical plural (*καὶ οἱ σωθέντες*/*سالمون*), after which they inflect all nouns and pronouns referring to that group in the grammatical plural.

Ottley (2:163) suggests that *οὐκέτι προστεθήσεται τὸ καταλειφθὲν Ἰσραὴλ καὶ οἱ σωθέντες τοῦ Ἰακωβ οὐκέτι μὴ πεποιθότες* reveals that the "the translator may not have grasped the construction here," since *προστίθημι* typically takes an infinitive complement. However, we do find alternative constructions involving *προστίθημι*, such as *προσθέμενος δὲ Ἀβραὰμ ἔλαβεν γυναῖκα* in Gen 25:1 (cf. Gen 38:5) and *καὶ προσέθετο ὁ ἄγγελος τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἀπελθὼν ὑπέστη ἐν τόπῳ στενῷ* in Num 22:26. In Isa 10:20 the considerable gap between *לֹא יוֹסִיף* and *וְהָשַׁעַן* and the fact that *πεποιθώς* + *εἰμί* is the standard formation for *πίθω* (thirty of thirty-six times, with finite forms appearing only six times) likely shaped the translator's use of verbal coordination, with *οὐκέτι* (+ *μή*) repeated before *πεποιθότες ὧσιν*.⁴¹

Old Greek's lack of an equivalent for *בֵּית* in *καὶ οἱ σωθέντες τοῦ Ἰακωβ* || *וּפְלִיטָה בֵּית יַעֲקֹב* is among the many cases of the translator omitting a *nomen regens* (cf. *ἐπὶ τὸν νοῦν τὸν μέγαν* || *עַל פְּרִי גְדֹל לָבָב* in 10:12; see Van der Vorm-Croughs, 71).

Despite *τοὺς ἀδικήσαντας αὐτοὺς* || *מַכְהוּ* (S, *مكحول*), the grammatical number of the participle less likely reflects *מַכְהוּ* (a form unattested in the Bible) than teases out the implication that the attackers would be a group.

41. Under this analysis, Ziegler's comma after *Ἰσραὴλ* obscures that *οἱ σωθέντες* is part of a compound subject.

10:21

τὸ καταλειφθὲν τοῦ Ιακωβ || שאר יעקב, spurring +καὶ ἔσται as predicate, might attest the loss of שאר ישוב by haplography (homoioarchton) in its *Vorlage* (but attested in all other witnesses). However, this translator's penchant to reduce coordinated synonymous words and phrases offers a fitting explanation, especially given τὸ κατάλειμμα σωθήσεται || שאר ישוב in 10:22.⁴² By supplying καὶ ἔσται and using the same preposition with ἐπὶ θεὸν ἰσχύοντα || אל גבור as for ἐπὶ τὸν θεὸν τὸν ἅγιον τοῦ Ισραηλ || על יהוה in 10:20, the translator implicitly extends the force of predicative πεποιθότες (10:20) through this verse.

10:22–23

καὶ ἔάν fits within OG's range of equivalents for כי אם (ὅτι, 33:21; ἀλλά, 37:19; 59:2; 65:11; ἀλλ' ἢ, 42:19; ἕως ἄν, 55:10, 11; 65:6). Similarly, לו corresponds with S's range of equivalents (ﻻ, 33:21; לו, 37:19; 42:19; 55:10; 59:2; 65:18; ﻻ לו, 55:11; ﻻ, 65:6).

ὁ λαὸς Ισραηλ || עמך ישראל less likely attests עם ישראל than it reflects the translator conforming the phrase to τὸ καταλειφθὲν Ισραηλ and (looking back to 10:20) οἱ σωθέντες τοῦ Ιακωβ in anticipation of τὸ κατάλειμμα σωθήσεται || שאר ישוב בו. σωθήσεται || ישוב בו contrasts with καὶ ἔσται τὸ καταλειφθὲν τοῦ Ιακωβ || שאר ישוב שאר יעקב in 10:21. Although σωθήσεται might reflect a form of ישע, more likely it interprets ישוב בו in the light of τὸ καταλειφθὲν Ισραηλ καὶ οἱ σωθέντες τοῦ Ιακωβ || שאר ישראל ופליטת בית יעקב in 10:20.

Syriac's ܣܘܡܡܐ interprets בו as partitive and explicitizes the collectivity of ישראל.

ܥܡܪ || כליז is the sole appearance of ܥܡܪ “prune” in S. It likely reflects reasoning that hinges on the semantics of ܥܡܪ, which it translates with ܥܡܡܐ, an equivalent employed also in 1 Kgs 20:40; Job 14:5. Syriac appears to tease out the theme of remnant under a viticultural metaphor, much like the ܥܡܪ of 5:1–7, albeit without any signal that he has that passage in mind. ܥܡܡܐ || שטף appeared earlier in 8:8 and will again in 28:2, 17; 30:28; 43:2; 66:12.

42. OG rendered שאר ישוב with καὶ ὁ καταλειφθεὶς Ιασουβ in 7:3.

Whereas *λόγον γὰρ συντελῶν καὶ συντέμνων* || כליון חרוץ שוטה is interwined with vocabulary at the outset of 10:23 (*ὅτι λόγον συντετμημένον* || כי בלה ונחרצה), S's rendering of 10:23 is separable from 10:22.

Although *לֹגוֹן מְטֵמֵן וְחָרָצָה* || כלו ונחרצה is identical with S's rendering of this clause in 28:22, *διότι συντετελεσμένα καὶ συντετμημένα πράγματα* in 28:22 differs from 10:22 by rendering בלה with *συντετελεσμένα* rather than *λόγον*.⁴³ Scholz (38), followed by Fischer (26–27), attributed *λόγον* in 10:22, 23 to misreading כליון as מליון and בלה as מלה. As Ziegler (140) recognized, “Eine sichere Lösung ist nicht zu geben,” particularly since “gehören beide Stellen zusammen und haben aufeinander engewirkt.” There are indications, however, that OG reflects interpretation rather than a different *Vorlage*.

συντελεσθήσονται renders יכלו in 1:28, an equivalence found sixty-five times in the Greek Bible and likely the basis for *συντετελεσμένα* || בלה in 28:22, so that *συντελῶν* might be OG's rendering of כליון. *συντετμημένον* is the equivalent for נחרצה in 10:22, while *καὶ συντετμημένα* aligns with נחרצה in 28:22, suggesting that *συντέμνων* is the equivalent to חרוץ here. On the other hand, based on the formal alignment of equivalents in Greek and Hebrew, *καὶ συντέμνων* pairs with שוטה, a word rendered by *σύρω* in 28:2; 30:28, *ἐπικλύζω* in 66:12, *συγκλύω* in 43:2, and incorporated into *καταιγίς φερομένη* || שוטה שוטה in 28:15, 18, suggesting that the translator may have finessed his rendering of שטה for its contexts. Accepting Scholz's and Fischer's proposals that *λόγον* misreads כליון as מליון implies that *συντελῶν* renders חרוץ and *καὶ συντέμνων* renders שוטה, contrary to the comparisons just noted. Acknowledging that *συντελῶν* is the intended equivalent for כליון and *συντέμνων* for חרוץ compels acceptance of Ziegler's (140) inference that the translator omitted an equivalent for שוטה. Under either scenario, the crux is *λόγον*.

Already Ottley (2:163) suggested that *λόγον* “may be a mere paraphrase,” comparing the addition of “*πράγματα* to complete the paraphrase” in 28:22 (*διότι συντετελεσμένα καὶ συντετμημένα πράγματα ἤκουσα* || כי בלה ונחרצה שמעתה). Although Ziegler (140) posited that *λόγον συντελῶν* might be a “Doppelübers. von כליון,” he also allowed that *λόγον* might be an addition similar to *πράγματα* in 28:22, where it is clarified by another plus: *ἃ ποιήσει ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν* || על כל הארץ. As he also noted, +*πράγματα*

43. *לֹגוֹן מְטֵמֵן* is the equivalent for נחרצה/נחרצת in Dan 9:26, 27; 11:36, and *מְטֵמֵן* renders בלה in Dan 9:27.

there finds a parallel in 25:1's *ὅτι ἐποίησας θαυμαστὰ πράγματα βουλὴν ἀρχαίαν ἀληθινὴν* || *בי עשית פלא עצות מרחוק אמונה*. Correspondingly, the *πράγματα* heard in 28:22 are plans decreed that the Kyrios will execute in the future, just as in 10:22 *λόγον γὰρ συντελῶν καὶ συντέμνων* explains (as marked by +γάρ) the forecast that *τὸ κατὰλειμμα σωθήσεται*, and 10:23 expounds it with the assertion *λόγον συντετμημένον ποιήσει ὁ θεός*. Most likely, then, *λόγον* was supplied by the translator, who also compressed *ἡσυχίαν ἡσυχίαν* into *συντελῶν καὶ συντέμνων* and abbreviated *כלה ונחרצה* as *συντετμημένον*, in accord with his bent toward concision.

ὁ θεός || *אדני יהוה צבאות* accords with OG's tendency to condense or omit a divine epithet conjoined with another (cf. 3:15). The reduction of the epithet to *ὁ θεός* (cf. *ὁ θεός* || *יהוה* in 10:26) provides the subject for *ποιήσεται*, while a fuller epithet stands at the outset of 10:24.

Syriac's *ܡܠܟܐ ܕܢܗܝܬܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ* || *אדני יהוה צבאות* appeared already in 3:15 and will occur again in 10:23, as well as in 22:15, 22.

This lone occurrence of *בקרר כל הארץ* in the Bible is attested by 1QIsa^a and V, while OG reads *ἐν τῇ οἰκουμένῃ ὅλη* and S *ܡܠܟܐ ܕܢܗܝܬܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ* (T, *עם כל, רשיעי ארעא*). Although OG often condenses *בקרר הארץ* into *ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς* (e.g., 5:8; 6:12; 7:22) or *ἐν τῇ γῇ* (e.g., 24:13), S otherwise represents each component: *ܡܠܟܐ ܕܢܗܝܬܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ* (5:8; 6:12; 7:22; 24:13). *בקרר* precedes *כל* again only in Deut 11:6, where S reads *ܡܠܟܐ ܕܢܗܝܬܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ*.⁴⁴ The regularity of *ܡܠܟܐ ܕܢܗܝܬܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ* || *בקרר הארץ* in Isaiah suggests that S's *Vorlage* read *בכל הארץ*.

10:24

Syriac lacks an equivalent for *לכן*, contrasting with its typical *ܡܠܟܐ ܕܢܗܝܬܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ* || *כה לכן* (28:16; 29:22; 30:12; 37:33; 65:13). *לכן* was likely absent from its *Vorlage*.

κύριος σαβαωθ || *אדני יהוה צבאות* appears again in 22:5, 12; 28:22. Syriac's equivalent, *ܡܠܟܐ ܕܢܗܝܬܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ*, is the same as in 10:23.

οἱ κατοικοῦντες || *ישב* explicitizes the collective noun *ὁ λαός* (contrast S's *ܡܠܟܐ ܕܢܗܝܬܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ*, V's *habitor Sion*, and T's *ציון*).

44. *ܡܠܟܐ* renders *בקרר* throughout the Pentateuch, especially when *בקרר* has a pronominal suffix (e.g., Gen 24:3; Exod 3:20; 10:1; Num 11:4, 21; Deut 1:42; 13:2, 12), but also before nouns in Deut 17:20; 18:2; 29:15. *ܡܠܟܐ ܕܢܗܝܬܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ* renders *בקרר הארץ* in Gen 45:6; 48:16; Exod 8:18.

Syriac reformulates **יכבה בשבת** with **ܡܨܠ ܚܝ ܥܡܕܐ** and **ܡܨܬܗܝܝܫܐ** with **ܡܨܡܝܢ ܡܨܡܝܢ ܡܨܡܝܢ**, while OG's insertion of **ὅτι** (cf. **γάρ** in 10:22; and **+ὅτι** in 9:19[20], 20[21]) makes the clause explanatory: **ὅτι ἐν ῥάβδῳ πατάξει σε**. For S's explicitation by adding the pronominal suffix (**ܡܨܡܝܢܝܝܐ**) compare **ܡܨܡܝܢ ܡܨܡܝܢ || ܡܨܡܝܢ || ܡܨܡܝܢ** in 9:11; **ܡܨܡܝܢ || ܡܨܡܝܢ** and **ܡܨܡܝܢ || ܡܨܡܝܢ** in 9:19.

Although Seeligmann (83) perceived in **πληγὴν γὰρ ἐγὼ ἐπάγω ἐπὶ τοῦ ἰδεῖν ὁδὸν Αἰγύπτου || ܡܨܬܗܝܫܐ ܡܨܬܗܝܫܐ ܡܨܬܗܝܫܐ** an “echo of the idea of a Jewish emigration from Palestine to Egypt to escape the religious persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes,” Van der Kooij (39) considered it more likely that **πληγή** refers to events involving Onias's deposition prior to 167 and “scheint eine Flucht nach Ägypten ausgelöst zu haben.” Both of these explanations rest on perceptions that the translator insinuated references to events of the early second century in Jerusalem, which I have disputed elsewhere (Troxel, 209–34). It seems sounder to analyze this passage by critical evaluation of the Hebrew text and through what we know of the translator's strategies.

ܡܨܬܗܝܫܐ γὰρ || ܡܨܬܗܝܫܐ readily retroverts to **ܡܨܬܗܝܫܐ**, which finds support from **ܡܨܬܗܝܫܐ || ܡܨܬܗܝܫܐ** in 1:6; 10:26; 14:6; 30:26; 53:4. On the other hand, **ܡܨܬܗܝܫܐ || ܡܨܬܗܝܫܐ** (ܡܨܬܗܝܫܐ || ܡܨܬܗܝܫܐ) in 30:31 is not as likely due to a confusion with or corruption into **ܡܨܬܗܝܫܐ**, and **ܡܨܬܗܝܫܐ** renders **ܡܨܬܗܝܫܐ** again in Prov 22:8; 29:15. It remains possible, nevertheless, that OG's *Vorlage* read **ܡܨܬܗܝܫܐ** as an error for **ܡܨܬܗܝܫܐ**, under the influence of the preceding **ܡܨܬܗܝܫܐ**.

Old Greek's **+ἐγὼ** (**ἐγὼ ἐπάγω || ܡܨܬܗܝܫܐ**) accords with target language norms by marking the change of subject. Scholz (38) argues that **ἐπάγω** attests **ܡܨܬܗܝܫܐ**, as in 15:9, where OG reads **ἐπάξω**. Ottley (2:164) rejects this, suggesting **ܡܨܬܗܝܫܐ**, for which **ἐπάξει || ܡܨܬܗܝܫܐ** in 7:17 is a precedent. However, the range of verbs translated by **ἐπάγω** is broad enough (cf. **ܡܨܬܗܝܫܐ**, 1:25; **ܡܨܬܗܝܫܐ**, 10:12; **ܡܨܬܗܝܫܐ**, 31:3; **ܡܨܬܗܝܫܐ**, 48:9; **ܡܨܬܗܝܫܐ**, 63:7) to make speculating about a variant reading tenuous.

Ottley (2:164) analyzed the surplus infinitive in **τοῦ ἰδεῖν ὁδὸν Αἰγύπτου || ܡܨܬܗܝܫܐ ܡܨܬܗܝܫܐ** as the translator's allusion “to such passages as Exod. xiv.13, Deut. xvii.16, xxii.68” (*sic*; read xxviii.68). Among these possible allusions Ziegler (64) highlighted Deut 28:68, where OG's **καὶ ἀποστρέψει σε κύριος εἰς Αἴγυπτον ἐν πλοίοις ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ἣν εἶπα οὐ προσθήσεσθε ἔτι ἰδεῖν αὐτήν**, transparent to a Hebrew text like MT, revealing in its **ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ἣν** analysis of the relative clause **ܡܨܬܗܝܫܐ ܡܨܬܗܝܫܐ** as anaphoric to **ܡܨܬܗܝܫܐ** (ܡܨܬܗܝܫܐ). Noting that **εἰς τὴν ὁδὸν τὴν κατ' Αἴγυπτον** in 10:26 renders **ܡܨܬܗܝܫܐ**

מצרים, Ziegler (64) questions whether τοῦ ἰδεῖν might be a corruption of διὰ (ὁδὸν Αἰγύπτου), which would align it with Symmachus. But εἰς τὴν ὁδὸν τὴν κατ' Αἰγύπτου || בדרך מצרים in 10:26 is more complicated, since it is preceded by τῇ ὁδῷ τῇ κατὰ θάλασσαν || ומטהו על הים, which has likely been influenced by ὁδὸν θαλάσσης || דרך הים in 8:23.

The insertion of τοῦ ἰδεῖν (ὁδὸν Αἰγύπτου) clarifies the prohibition μὴ φοβοῦ by ascribing a potentially salutary effect of the Assyrian blows. Even if the precise significance of *seeing* ὁδὸν Αἰγύπτου is uncertain, it, coupled with ἐγὼ ἐπάγω, suggests that the Assyrian assault is a divine aid for the people. καὶ ὁ θυμὸς αὐτοῦ τῇ ὁδῷ τῇ κατὰ θάλασσαν εἰς τὴν ὁδὸν τὴν κατ' Αἰγύπτου in 10:26, where divine wrath is transferred to the people's foes, suggests that the route to Egypt is envisioned as the place of the Assyrians' defeat.

10:25

The condensation (ἔτι γὰρ) μικρόν || מעט מזער (כי עוד) finds parallels in 16:14 (ὀλιγοστός); 29:17 (μικρόν).

Syriac's +1cs suffix in ܐܝܢܐ || זעם might reflect זעמי in its *Vorlage*, although it would be the lone witnesses to that. More likely, S supplied the 1cs suffix to match ܐܝܢܐ || ואפי (cf. ܐܝܢܐ ܫܚܝܬܐ ܫܠܡܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ || 1:31).

Old Greek's τὴν βουλὴν αὐτῶν is the equivalent for the *hapax legomenon* תבליתם, which also seems to have perplexed S, ܬܒܠܝܬܐ (cf. T, ܠܫܝ- "to destroy them"; V, *scelus eorum* "their crime"). 1QIsa^a's תבליתם has spurred conjecture that OG may have read (or associated תבליתם with) תחבולותם (cf. Goshen-Gottstein, מב). However, תחבולות occurs only in Job 37:12, where it is transliterated as θεεβουλαθω; and Prov 1:5; 11:4; 12:5; 24:6, in all of which it is rendered with κυβερνάω or κυβερνήσις.⁴⁵ There is no reason to suppose that this translator would have been more familiar with תחבולותם than with תבליתם.

On the other hand, βουλὴ and βουλεύω are often atypical equivalents for a Hebrew word in this translation (e.g., גמלו, 3:9; צבי, 4:2; ἡ γὰρ βουλὴ αὐτῇ || והמסכה הנסוכה, 25:7) or are inserted without any warrant from the Hebrew (e.g., 3:9; 7:5, 7; 28:8).⁴⁶ Here the translator likely chose τὴν βουλὴν

45. תחבולות appears in Prov 20:18, but the verse is absent from OG.

46. See Troxel, "BOYAH and BOYAEYEIN," 164–68.

αὐτῶν (|| תבליתם) in regard to the Assyrian attacks of 10:25, much as in 3:9 he rendered רעה להם כי גמלו להם with διότι βεβούλευνται βουλὴν πονηρὰν καθ' ἑαυτῶν.

10:26

For OG's ὁ θεός || יהוה, compare 10:24. On its frequent omission of עבדות, see 3:15.

שׁוּט, which appears only here in Isaiah, is translated with μάστιξ in all other appearances (3 Kgdms 12:11, 14; Nah 3:2; Job 5:21; Prov 26:3; 2 Chr 10:11, 14). Although Van der Vorm-Crouchs (195) places this among “examples of the reduction of synonymous elements,” the rendering of (the homonym) שׁוּט with καταιγίς in 28:15, 18 leaves the translator's recognition of שׁוּט here uncertain. Goshen-Gottstein's (מב) verdict that this is a condensation seems inadequate, inasmuch as active voice ἐπεγεῖρω typically takes a direct object (13:17; 42:13; 43:14; cf. 1 Kgdms 3:12; 22:8), which could be filled by any equivalent for שׁוּט.

The anomalous absence of a direct object for ἐπεγερεῖ echoes in the verbless clause καὶ ὁ θυμὸς αὐτοῦ || עורב ומטהו. The nominative case is remarkable, since ומטהו is a second object of ועורר, parallel to שׁוּט. This reinforces the likelihood that the translator was unfamiliar with שׁוּט, but equally underscores the peculiarity that he chose not to substitute a word as direct object for ἐπεγερεῖ, allowing it to be implied by κατὰ τὴν πλῆγην τὴν Μαδιαμ.

ἐν τόπῳ θλίψεως || בצור accords with OG's θλίψις || צר (8:22; 26:16; 30:6, 20; 33:20; 37:3; 63:9; 65:16). The explicitizing use of ἐν τόπῳ with θλίψεως is comparable to ἐν κέρατι ἐν τόπῳ πίονι || בקרן בן שמן in 5:1; and τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ τόπον πίονα καὶ εὐρύχωρον || ביום ההוא כר נרחב in 30:23.

Although S's ܡܕܝ || (ב)צור is close to ܡܕܝ, its most frequent equivalent for צור (2:10, 21; 5:28; 8:14; 48:21^[1]), ܡܕܝ || צורי מדי (21:2) and ܡܕܝ || צור הביטו אל צור חצבתם (51:1) attest ܡܕܝ || צור (cf. Num 23:9; 1 Sam 24:3; Jer 18:14).⁴⁷

ܡܕܝ is S's typical equivalent for the place-name חורב. This could reflect חורב in the *Vorlage*, as Goshen-Gottstein (מב) suggests, through association of חורב בצור with phrases such as הצור בחורב (Exod 17:6), מהר

47. ܡܕܝ renders צור in 2:19; 48:21⁽²⁾, while ܡܕܝ is its equivalent in 17:10, 26:4; 30:29; and ܡܕܝ renders it in 44:8.

חורב (Exod 33:6), and הר האלהים חרבה (Exod 3:1; cf. 𐤇𐤓𐤁 𐤇𐤓𐤁𐤇𐤓, 𐤇𐤓𐤁𐤇𐤓 || בהר האלהים, Exod 4:27). Although such an association might be in the mind of the translator, it also easily arises in copying a text.⁴⁸

ὁ θυμὸς αὐτοῦ renders עורב (only here in Isaiah) by association with עברה, for which θυμός is used in 13:9, 13; 14:6 (cf. ὁ δὲ θυμὸς αὐτοῦ || עבדתו, 28:21). However, καὶ ὁ θυμὸς αὐτοῦ also reflects the grammatical features of ומטהו (conjunction and suffixed pronoun), highlighting its similarity to καὶ ὁργῆς ἐστὶν || ומטה הוא in 10:5 (q.v.).

Old Greek's τῇ ὁδῷ τῇ κατὰ θάλασσαν εἰς τὴν ὁδὸν τὴν κατ' Αἴγυπτον || על הים ונשאו בדרך מצרים renders בדרך twice, the first time in τῇ ὁδῷ τῇ κατὰ θάλασσαν. Although this might be based on recollection of ὁδὸν θαλάσσης || דרך הים in 8:23, the translator might also have inserted τῇ ὁδῷ τῇ to create a parallel to εἰς τὴν ὁδὸν τὴν κατ' Αἴγυπτον, as Ziegler (64) proposed. The translator apparently overrode ונשאו in this reformulation.

10:27

The translations of סבלו by OG (ὁ φόβος αὐτοῦ) and S (𐤇𐤓𐤁𐤇𐤓) are guesses, as suggested by their translations of על סבלו with δίδωμι ... ὁ ζυγὸς ὁ ἐπ' αὐτῶν κείμενος and 𐤇𐤓𐤁𐤇𐤓 𐤇𐤓𐤁𐤇𐤓 in 9:3 and of על וסבלו מעל שכמו by καὶ ὁ ζυγὸς⁴⁹ αὐτῶν ἀπὸ τῶν ὥμων ἀφαιρεθήσεται and 𐤇𐤓𐤁𐤇𐤓 𐤇𐤓𐤁𐤇𐤓 in 14:25.⁵⁰ Notably, S's equivalent is the same in all passages (𐤇𐤓𐤁𐤇𐤓), whereas OG's equivalents in 9:3; 14:25 differ from here.

Old Greek's ἀπὸ σοῦ || על שכמך finds a parallel in (καὶ δώσω τὴν δόξαν Δαυὶδ) αὐτῷ || על שכמו (ונתתי מפתח בית דוד) in 22:22 and is allied with the translator's habit of collapsing construct phrases (e.g., ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς || בקרר הארץ, 5:8). Here, however, he did not simply elide שכמ but allowed it to determine his rendering of both על צוארך (ἀπὸ τοῦ ὥμου σου) and מפני שמן (ἀπὸ τῶν ὥμων ὑμῶν).⁵¹ The switch in grammatical

48. See Goshen-Gottstein's discussion of the "law of the scribes" in "Biblical Philology and the Concordance," 6.

49. Reading ὁ ζυγὸς in place of τὸ κῦδος, adopting Ziegler's (16) argument that τὸ κῦδος is an inner-Greek error rising from paelographic confusion. See the commentary on 14:25.

50. Cf. αἴρουσιν αὐτὸ ἐπὶ τῶν ὥμων καὶ πορεύονται / 𐤇𐤓𐤁𐤇𐤓 𐤇𐤓𐤁𐤇𐤓 || ישאוו על כתף יסבלו in 46:7.

51. His familiarity with צואר is evinced by his rendering of it with τράχηλος in 30:28; 52:2.

number from ἀπὸ τοῦ ὧμου σου to ἀπὸ τῶν ὧμων ὑμῶν is similar to the shifts of grammatical number in μὴ φοβοῦ ὁ λαός μου οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐν Σιων ... πατάξει σε in 10:24.

Whereas the Leiden edition accepts ܡܚܡܠܐ “calves” in place of ܡܚܡܠܐ “annointers” found in 7a1, R. Bar ter Haar Romney cites credible evidence from Severus’s commentary that the original reading was ܡܚܡܠܐ “oil.”⁵²

10:28

ܠܚܬ (|| עֵיט) is S’s equivalent for עֵיט in 1 Chr 7:28; as well as עֵנַר in 1 Chr 6:55; עֵנַת in Judg 1:33; 3:31; 5:6; עֵנוֹת in Josh 15:59; and מַפְעֵת in Josh 13:18. Old Greek’s +πόλιν explicitizes the identity of Ἀγγαί (|| עֵיט) (cf. πόλιν Σαοὺλ || גִּבְעַת שְׁאוּל in 10:29). Ἀγγαί is the equivalent for הָעִי in Gen 12:8; 13:3.

For מַגְרוֹן OG reads Μαγεδω; and S reads ܡܚܡܠܐ, while the remaining witnesses accord with מַגְרוֹן. *Dalet/resh* interchange is evident. Syriac’s standard equivalent for מַגְדוֹ is ܡܚܡܠܐ (ܡܚܡܠܐ in Josh 12:21), and OG elsewhere renders it with Μαγεδων (e.g., Josh 12:21; 2 Chr 35:22) or Μαγεδω/Μαγεδδω (e.g., Josh 17:11; 2 Kgs 23:9). It is unlikely that S arrived at ܡܚܡܠܐ by consulting OG for assistance with an isolated place-name. Neither is it necessary to suppose that it needed to compare OG’s θήσει || יִפְקִיד to arrive at ܡܚܡܠܐ as semantically compatible with ܡܚܡܠܐ || בְּלִיּוֹ.

10:29

Although φάραγξ || מַעְבְּרָה occurs only here in the Greek Bible, ἔπειτα δέ Ἀρῶν || מַעְבְּרַת לְאַרְנוֹן in 16:2; and καὶ ἔσται αὐτῷ κυκλόθεν || וְהָיָה כָּל מַעְבֵּר in 30:32 (the only other appearances of מַעְבְּרָה in Isaiah) tempers suspicion of a different *Vorlage*, especially since φάραγγα constitutes a sensible equivalent for מַעְבְּרָה in this overland journey, as Goshen-Gottstein (מג) observed.

καὶ ἔξει εἰς Ἀγγαί is the same rendering OG gives for עֵיט in 10:28 (discounting γάρ), but it has no perceptible relationship to גִּבְעַת שְׁאוּל. The only reasonably tenable speculation is that the translator substituted the clause from 10:28 for words that were unintelligible or illegible to him.

52. R. Bas Ter Haar Romeny, “The Peshitta of Isaiah: Evidence from the Syriac Fathers,” in *Text, Translation, and Tradition: Studies on the Peshitta and Its Use in the Syriac Tradition*, ed. Wido Theodor Van Peursen and R. Bas Ter Haar Romeny, MPIL 14 (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 158.

Syriac renders גבע as a place-name, bound with מעברה ܡܥܒܪܗ; ܡܥܒܪܗ ܡܥܒܪܗ. The relationship between ܡܥܒܪܗ and ܡܥܒܪܗ ܡܥܒܪܗ is discernable, understanding the phrase as “to the place of our lodging.”

Both OG’s nominal φόβος and S’s verbal ܡܥܪܕܐ, render חרדה. For OG’s periphrastic φόβος λήμψεται, compare καὶ αἰσχύνῃ λήμψεται || ובשו in 19:9 and λήμψεται αὐτοὺς ὁδύνῃ || יחילו in 23:5.

Old Greek transforms שׂאול גבעת into πόλιν Σαουλ, like εἰς τὴν πόλιν Ἀγγαί || על עית in 10:28, while S gives ܡܥܪܕܐ ܡܥܪܕܐ. See 10:6 on the apparent significance of πόλις for OG.

10:30

Old Greek’s lack of an equivalent for צהלי קולך is conspicuous, although it is attested by all other witnesses and lacks any evident trigger for omission. Goshen-Gottstein’s (מג) suggestion that the translator might have considered צהלי קולך adequately expressed in his rendering is possible, but OG’s equivalents for צהל elsewhere might betray uncertainty over its meaning.⁵³ If so, it might be for that reason that he regarded his rendering sufficient, despite silence about the first clause. Meanwhile, his use of ἐπακούσεται for הקשיבי and עניה attest his interest in fashioning the verse into parallel clauses.

Like OG, S treats עניה as a verb, using cognate ܡܥܪܕܐ. Its prefixed *bēth* in ܡܥܪܕܐ follows target language norms for complements to ܡܥܪܕܐ.

10:31

ἐξέστη || נדדה is an equivalent found again in 16:3; 32:11; 33:3 but elsewhere only in Jer 9:9. (For παρακαλεῖτε || העיזו, see the comments on 10:32.)

ܡܥܪܕܐ || נדדה is comparable to the translator’s choice of ܡܥܪܕܐ for ידיח in 4:4 (ואת דמי ירושלם ידיח מקרבה || ܡܥܪܕܐ ܡܥܪܕܐ) and befits his

53. παραχθήσεται τὸ ὕδωρ τῆς θαλάσσης || צהלו מים in 24:14 must be considered in light of the translator’s use of παράσσω for a wide range of Hebrew words (e.g., בלע, 3:2; ערץ, 8:12; רעע, 24:19; נוג, 30:28), but never twice for the same word. His ἀγαλλιᾶσθε || צהלי in 12:6 might be guided by the conjoined καὶ εὐφραίνεσθε || ורני, a frequent equivalent (e.g., 16:10; 24:14; 26:19; 28:26). On the other hand, his omission of an equivalent for וצהלי in 54:1 (εὐφράνῃ στείρα ἢ οὐ τίκτους ῥῆξον καὶ βόησον, ἢ οὐκ ὠδίνουσα || חלה לא וצהלי רנה פצחי ילדה עקרה לא רני) fits his tendency toward concision.

substitution of a contextually fitting verb in 10:14: **ולא || סלא וסל ומנמ** (cf. **היה נדד כנף** in 16:2). Its rendering of **העיוז** with **חמס** is intelligible.

Μαδεβηνα || מדמנה attests a *bet/mem* interchange, while **מנמ** seems to reflect a *resh/dalet* interchange, in agreement with **מרמנה** in 1QIsa^a, just as **Γιββιρ || הגבים** might signal a difference of the final consonant. On the other hand, the peculiarities of the equivalents for proper nouns in 10:28 (q.v.) caution against too easily embracing that conclusion.

10:32

Old Greek renders **העיוז** with this verse. Ottley's (2:165) notice that *παρακαλέω* (and *παράκλησις*) are among the translator's "favourite words" (cf. 21:2; 28:29; 30:7; 33:7) is useful in considering its double appearance here. Given the translator's use of *ἐπακούσεται* in parallel clauses in 10:30, **παρακαλεῖτε || העיוז** is likely calibrated to the parallel **תְּחִי חֵירִי פָּרָאכְלֵיטֵה || ינפף יד**, which matches **παρακαλεῖτε τῇ χειρί || הניפו יד** in 13:2, likely the consequence of imagining the type of communication **יד הניפו** designates.⁵⁴

The relationship of **σήμερον ἐν ὁδῷ τοῦ μεῖναι** to **לעמד בנב** is largely recognizable, with **עוד** likely implicitized in **τοῦ μεῖναι || לעמד**. As Goshen-Gottstein (מג) implies, **ἐν ὁδῷ** is likely a substitution for **בנב**, under the same impulse as **τῇ ὁδῷ τῇ κατὰ θάλασσαν || על הים** in 10:26 and **παρακαλέσω εἰς ὁδόν || מבשר אתן** in 41:27. It is unlikely that **ἐν ὁδῷ || בנב** is attributable to paleographic confusion, as Ottley (2:165) supposes, or deliberate modification of a transcribed **ἐν νοβ** or **ἐν νοδ**, as Seeligmann (30) posits.

Syriac's **+ܠܚܝܬ (2x)** following **ܠܦܠܝܬ** accords with target language norms.

Given other features of OG's translation in this verse, **καὶ οἱ βουνοὶ οἱ ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ || גבעת ירושלם** is more likely an expansion by the translator than attesting a *Vorlage* that read **הגבעת אשר בירושלם**.

θυγατέρα, ܠܚܝܬ, and filiae (V) all reflect the *qere*, **בת**, which is also the reading in 1QIsa^a and 4Q57 (T reads **בית**).

54. The absence of a pronoun corresponding to the suffix of **יד** accords with the locutionary force of the Greek article.

10:33

Old Greek's insinuation of γάρ designates this verse as the motivation for the call to proclaim encouragement in 10:32. Old Greek used δεσπότης || האדון already in 1:24; 3:1. Otherwise, האדון appears only in the phrase יהוה צבאות, which OG renders with κύριος σαβαωθ (10:16; 19:4).

Both OG's and S's equivalents for פארה (τοὺς ἐνδόξους/محسلا accord with their frequent use of δόξα and محسلا to translate פאר and תפארת (e.g., 4:2; 10:12, 15). However, even though חסמל || מערצה accords with נחמל || ערץ in 29:23 and חסמל || תערוצי in 47:12, OG's equivalents for ערץ in those passages differ from S's (φοβηθήσονται || יעריצו, 29:23; ὠφελθήναι || תערוצי 47:12), and only with μετὰ ἰσχύος || מערצה here does it use a word for strength to render ערץ.

The compound verb συνταράσσω appears only here in the book, but its simple form, ταραάσσω, is one of OG's slot verbs (see above, n. 53), which likely accounts for συνταράσσει || מסעי, a verb appearing only here in the Bible. Syriac's equivalent, مھسھ "cast down/destroy," is elsewhere used for verbs that express destruction or collapse: הרס (14:17; 22:19; 49:17); גדע (22:5); נפל (26:19); כשל (28:13; 31:3); קרס (46:1, 2).

Equally noteworthy is the difference in their equivalents for רמי הקומה גדועים. While תִּיבֵּרֵי || רמי defines οἱ ὑψηλοὶ (|| רמי [ו]) by their attitude, חסמל || מھسھ employs a noun used primarily for either physical height or age (see *SyrLex*, s.v. "مھسھ").⁵⁵

Although OG most often uses συντρίβω for שבר, συντρίβήσονται || גדועים is comparable to συνετρίβη || נגדעת in 14:12.

נחמל || גדועים, attested nowhere else in S, was likely influenced by the parallel מھسھ || מھסھ, since مھسھ and مھسھ are often paired (2:9, 17; 5:15; 25:12). Similarly, although S translates גדע with words for cutting in 9:9 (فھم) and 45:2 (قھم) (each an equivalent occurring also outside Isaiah), نھدھ || نھدھ لاأرھ in 14:12 is explicable from the preceding نھدھ || نھدھ משמים.⁵⁶

55. The only other occurrence of קומה in Isaiah is τὸ ὕψος τῆς κέδρου αὐτοῦ || קומת ארזיו in 37:24. ὕψις typically translates forms of גאה (9:8; 13:3, 11; 16:6; 25:11; 28:1, 3).

56. قھم is the primary equivalent for גדע in S, while فھم renders גדע outside Isaiah only in 2 Chr 14:2. The only other instance of גדע in Isaiah is in 22:25, where it is translated with مھسھ.

10:34

The translator's likely uncertainty over ונקף (cf. his equivalents for נקף in 15:8; 17:6; 24:13) probably played a role in his choice of καὶ πεσοῦνται || ונקף parallel to πεσεῖται || יפול at the end of the verse.

οἱ ὑψηλοὶ || סבכי היער (compared to ἐν τοῖς δάσεσι τοῦ δρυμοῦ || בסבכי היער in 9:17), together with σὺν τοῖς ὑψηλοῖς || באדיר (a word he seems unsure of in 33:21's ὅτι τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου μέγα ὑμῖν || שם אדיר יהוה (לנו), suggests that the translator's rendering of this verse was shaped by the description of the Kyrios troubling and abasing τοὺς ἐνδόξους and οἱ ὑψηλοὶ τῇ ὕβρει in 10:33. The first evident link to the Hebrew is μαχαίρα || בברזל, although this equivalent never occurs elsewhere in the Greek Bible. ברזל is typically rendered by σίδηρος or its adjectival form, σιδηροῦς, which are the equivalents elsewhere in Isaiah (44:12; 45:2; 48:4; 60:17[2x]). The translator likely chose μαχαίρα as an appropriate weapon for the felling of opponents in battle.

Syriac is responsible for the explicitizing pronoun in ܡܚܬܝܬ || באדיר, similar to its ܡܚܬܝܬ || יקד in 10:16. It renders אדיר with ܡܚܬܝܬ again in 33:21.

ISAIAH 11

11:1

Syriac reformulates the second half of the verse, making ܡܫܪܫܐ clause-initial, parallel to ܡܫܪܫܐ. Whether ܡܫܪܫܐ attests מִשְׁרָשׁוֹ (rather than מִשְׁרָשָׁיו) in its *Vorlage* or simply portrays the “root” as simplex, parallel to מִגְזַע, is uncertain. It is also possible that the suffix of ܡܫܪܫܐ, anaphoric ܐܝܬܐ, prompted modification of the grammatical number to match ܡܫܪܫܐ.¹ The same is possible (perhaps even more likely) for OG, which renders מִגְזַע and (again) מִשְׁרָשׁוֹ with ἐκ τῆς ῥίζης, whose definite article stands in lieu of a possessive personal pronoun (see Van der Vorm-Croughs, 111). The grammatical plural of מִשְׁרָשׁ does not appear again in Isaiah and does so only twelve times elsewhere, most of which OG and S render with grammatically plural nouns.²

$\rho\acute{\iota}\zeta\alpha$ is the translator's most common equivalent for both שרש and גזע, and in 40:24 he collocates forms of the word again: οὐδὲ μὲν $\rho\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega\theta\eta\acute{\iota}$ εἰς τῆν γῆν ἣ $\rho\acute{\iota}\zeta\alpha$ αὐτῶν || אף בל שרש בארץ גזעם || Although this translator frequently eliminates synonyms in parallel clauses and avoids repetition, clearly this was not a thoroughgoing principle for him, even if we cannot assign a reason for repetition in a short space (he translates שרש with σπέρμα in 14:29, 30 and ישרש יעקב with τέκνα Ιακωβ in 27:6).

Syriac never uses ܦܪܗ for פרה again in Isaiah (cf. ܦܪܗ, ܦܪܗ || ܓܢ || ܦܪܗ, 32:12; ܦܪܗ || ܐܬܪܗ, 45:8), whereas its other occurrences in Isaiah

1. Cf. the relationship of **חַסִּיד** || **רָשָׁע** to **אֱדוּן** || **חַסִּיד** in 11:4.

2. The highest concentration of the plural form is in Ezekiel's allegory of the eagle (Ezek 17:3–9), where it appears four times, all of which OG and S translate with grammatically plural forms, save for S's **חַמְּסֵי מִן חַמְּסֵי מִשְׁרֵיָּהּ** || **למשאות אותה משריה** in 11:9 (OG *ἐκσπάσαι αὐτὴν ἐκ ῥίζων αὐτῆς*), similar to which is its **חַמְּסֵי מִן חַמְּסֵי מִשְׁרֵיָּהּ** || **וּתְשֵׁרֵשׁ** in Ps 80:10 (OG *κατεφύτευσας τὰς ῥίζας αὐτῆς*), despite both rendering **שְׁרָשִׁי** with grammatically plural forms in Jer 17:8; Hos 14:6; Amos 2:9; Job 18:16.

render פרח (17:11; 27:6; and 35:1), as commonly in the Bible (Gen 40:10; Num 17:23; plus twelve other times). There is good reason to infer that its *Vorlage* read יפרח.

The situation with ἀναβήσεται || יפרה is less clear. The regular equivalent for פרה throughout the Greek Bible is αὐξάνω, which appears in Isaiah only in 61:11's καὶ ὡς γῆν αὕξουσιν || בי כארץ תוציא.³ Of the three other appearances of פרה in Isaiah, the only equivalent for it found also outside the book is ἀνατειλάτω || ויפרו in 45:8, although it never again renders פרה, while occasionally rendering פרח (Lev 14:43; Hos 10:4; Pss 71[72]:7; 91[92]:8; Prov 11:28).⁴ ἀναβαίνω renders עלה twenty-five times in Isaiah, but on three other occasions its choice seems calibrated to the context: καὶ ἀνέβη εἰς τὸν οἶκον κυρίου || ויבא בית יהוה (37:1); καὶ ἀνέβη ὁ ἥλιος τοὺς δέκα ἀναβαθμούς || ותשב השמש עשר מעלות (38:8); and καὶ οὐκ ἀναβήσεται αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν || וכי נסתרו מעיני, parallel to ἐπιλήσονται γάρ || כי נשכחו (65:16). The same might be true here, although ἀναβήσεται, then, affords no clear view into what OG's *Vorlage* read.

נצר appears only two other times in Isaiah. The translator renders נצר in 60:21 with φυλάσσω (S נצר, נצר > 1Q8) but כנצר נתעב with ὡς νεκρὸς ἐβδελυγμένος in 14:19 (S נצר, נצר), where νεκρὸς is more likely part of the interpretation of the verse than due to a corrupted transliteration of נצר with νσρ (see the comments on 14:19). The choice of καὶ ἄνθος || ונצר here is likely also a guess, perhaps based on (biliteral) association with נצה, which is rendered with ἄνθος in 18:5 (cf. Job 15:33).

11:2

נחמה appears to be a double rendering of נוחה. Targum's תשרי is cognate to S's נחמה, although T regularly translates נוח with שרי (7:19; 14:1), as well as נוח (14:3, 7; 23:12; 30:32). It is not clear what motivated S's double rendering.

εὐσεβείας || ויראת יהוה is echoed by εὐσέβεια πρὸς τὸν κύριον || יראת יהוה in 33:6, similar to εὐσέβεια δὲ εἰς θεόν || יראת יהוה in Prov 1:7. εὐσέβεια appears only in Isaiah and Proverbs in translations of Hebrew Bible books but is a common noun for “piety” in 3 and 4 Maccabees, including τὴν εἰς

3. αὐξάνω renders פרה in twenty-two of its thirty appearances, with the only other divergences being φύω (Deut 29:17), καρπός (Ezek 19:10), and εὐθιγνέω (Ps 128[127]:3).

4. (καὶ ἀμπέλου) γενήματος || פריה (גפן) in 32:12 seems chosen for juxtaposition with גפן, while καταλειφθῇ || פריה in 17:6 parallels καὶ καταλειφθῇ || ונשאר.

τὸν θεὸν εὐσέβειαν in 4 Mac 12:14. Here εὐσεβείας probably represents the whole phrase **ויראת יהוה**. Although parablepsis involving **יהוה** is possible, there is no apparent trigger for it. On the other hand, it would comport with this translator's tendencies that he settled on εὐσεβείας || **ויראת יהוה** with an eye to 11:3, where he renders **ביראת יהוה** with φόβου θεοῦ, thereby avoiding repetition of a divine name.

11:3

ἐμπλήσει αὐτὸν πνεῦμα || **והריחו** is an etymological rendering, probably encouraged by the four occurrences of **רוח** in 11:2.⁵ Jerome adopts this solution (likely via the OL) with *et replebit eum spiritus*, while T's **ויקרביניה** (לדחלתיה וי) seems a guess.

והריחו || **סבס** is peculiar. Warszawski's (26) suggestion "זורח = **סבס**" retroverts to the most frequent equivalent (cf. 58:10; 60:1, 2), but graphic confusion of *he* and *zayin* is improbable, and the absence of the 3ms pronominal suffix is unexplained. More likely is Goshen-Gottstein's (מד) verdict that **סבס** is an inner-S error for **סבס**.⁶

Old Greek's **κατὰ τὴν δόξαν** || **למראה עיניו** and **κατὰ τὴν λαλίαν** || **למשמע אזניו** are associative with the action that the Hebrew phrases imply. **δόξα** is used in its sense of "appearance," while **λαλία** (appearing only here in Isaiah) seems used in the neutral sense of "speech," as in Ps 19(18):4; Song 4:3; 6:7; Job 29:23; 33:1.

למשמע אזניו || **אפ** **יפתח** **אפס** and **למראה עיניו** || **אפ** **יפתח** **חתס** reformulate the verbal nouns as participial phrases nominalized by *dālat*.

11:4

This is one of several times OG renders *waw* with the adversative ἀλλά (e.g., 5:24, 25; 7:8) or simply imposes it (e.g., 3:13; 7:17). See the comments at 3:13.

5. Goshen-Gottstein (מד) notes the similarity to Exod 31:3's **καὶ ἐνέπλησα αὐτὸν πνεῦμα θεῖον** || **ואמלא אתו רוח אלהים**.

6. Use of **אפ** offers no detectable path to an exegetical ploy. **אפ** renders **נגה** in 9:1 and for **צמח** in 58:8 (cf. Ps 132:17; Ezek 29:21; Zech 6:12), while the verb is pressed into play in phrases about light (e.g., **אפ** **יפתח** **אפס** || **אפ** **יפתח** **אפס**, Num 24:17; **אפ** **יפתח** **אפס** || **אפ** **יפתח** **אפס**, Job 25:3).

חַמְסֵא || בצדק diverges remarkably from S's equivalents elsewhere in Isaiah, where חַמְסֵא renders באמת (10:20; 16:5; 38:3; 48:1; 54:14; 61:8), simple אמת (38:18; 39:8; 43:9; 59:14, 15). On the other hand, it renders בצדק/הבצדק exclusively with חַמְסֵא (1:27; 5:16; 9:6; 42:6; 45:13; 48:1; 59:4; 63:1). Given this distribution, and given that no special motivation to render בצדק with חַמְסֵא is evident, S's *Vorlage* likely read באמת.⁷

Old Greek's (ἀλλὰ) κρινεῖ ταπεινῶ κρίσιν || שפט בצדק דלים asserts that the Kyrios will act *on behalf of* the poor, reformulating adverbial בצדק much as he does in 59:4's οὐδεὶς λαλεῖ δίκαια οὐδὲ ἔστιν κρίσις ἀληθινή || אין אִין קרא בצדק ואין נשפט באמונה. On the other hand, καὶ ἐλέγξει τοὺς ταπεινοὺς τῆς γῆς || לענוי ארץ lacks an equivalent for במישור (cf. εἰς εὐθείαν || למישור, 40:4; 42:16), perhaps in affinity with his modification of adverbial בצדק in the preceding clause. ἀλλὰ (for initial *waw*) may signal that these are formulated as examples of the (negated) behaviors in 11:3: κρινεῖ ταπεινῶ κρίσιν implies οὐ κατὰ τὴν δόξαν κρινεῖ, while καὶ ἐλέγξει τοὺς ταπεινοὺς τῆς γῆς is an instance of οὐδὲ κατὰ τὴν λαλιὰν ἐλέγξει.

תִּפְּ לֹגֶזֶן תּוֹ שְׁטֵמָה || בשבט פיו resolves the metaphor the same way as T's פומיה (contrast S's حَمْلٌ, حَمْلٌ). Although their renderings might imply a common interpretative tack, it is an obvious enough resolution as not to have required a tradition. It would be a strain to suppose that a scribe of the Hebrew text would have substituted בדבר for בשבט.

The preposition διὰ in the phrase ἐν πνεύματι διὰ χειλέων || וברוח שפתי explicitizes the semantic relationship between the nouns. In contrast to the resolution of the metaphor via תִּפְּ לֹגֶזֶן, this phrase presupposes a literal meaning for רוח. Old Greek likely omitted a pronominal equivalent to the suffix of שפתי because the definite article implies a link with τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ.

Syriac's grammatical plural ܡܠܚܝܬܐ || רשע is likely a modification to coordinate with the grammatical plural ܡܠܚܝܬܐ || לענוי ארץ.

11:5

Old Greek and S seem to have had a common impulse to vary their equivalents for אזור. Old Greek renders them with participles from different

7. Although T reads בקושטא, its distribution of this equivalent differs from S. It regularly uses בקושטא for באמת (10:20; 16:5; 38:3; 48:1; 61:8) but also for בצדק again in 42:6; 45:13; and 59:4, consistent with its frequent translation of צדק with קושטא (e.g., 1:21, 26; 32:1).

verbs (ἐζωσμένος and εἰλημένος), while S employs the nouns סמל and אֶחָד. Old Greek's omission of pronouns for the suffixes of חלציו and מתניו (S renders them) is attributable to his use of articular nouns, τὴν ὁσφύν and τὰς πλευράς.

Whereas S renders וְהָאֱמוּנָה and צִדֵּק as the subjects of the clauses, OG declines its equivalents in the dative case to designate with what the subject clothes himself.

11:6

Old Greek's καὶ συμβοσκηθήσεται || וְגַר differs from all other versions, which recognize a verb signifying “to dwell” (S, سَجَدَ; V, *habitabit*; T, וַיֵּדֹר). This lone instance of συμβόσκειν in the Greek Bible coordinates with the later ἅμα βοσκηθήσονται, while the prefix in συναναπαύσεται || יִרְבֵּץ (making it also a *hapax legomenon*) equally marks joint action (cf. ἀναπαύω || רִבֵּץ in 13:20, 21; 14:30; 27:10). Given יִרְבֵּץ, it would seem sensible for him to have translated וְגַר with a verb such as παροικέω (cf. παροικήσουσί σοι || יִגְוּרִי בְךָ in 16:4). His use of verbs with prefixed συν- and the presence of ἅμα || יַחַד reflects his perception of joint action. A similar perplexity arises in 11:7, where יַחַד יִרְבְּצוּ, for which συναναπαύσεται here would seem suitable, is rendered with ἅμα ... ἔσονται. In neither case do we have a hint of what motivated the translator's word choices.

The possibility that OG's βοσκηθήσονται and S's سَجَدَ attest a verb in their *Vorlagen* might find support from יִמְרוּ (|| וּמְרִיא) in 1QIsa^a, which is most likely a form of מָרָא “become fat,” with loss of *aleph* through quiescence. Barthélemy inferred that perhaps an earlier form of the Hebrew read יִמְרָאוּ, which in MT suffered parablepsis of the verb and in 1QIsa^a parablepsis of the noun.⁸ Although this proposal is enticing, the likelihood of graphic confusion involving *yod/waw* with (an original) יִמְרָאוּ would be sufficient to account for the text. The caution Wildberger gives is that “the verb is not found elsewhere in the OT, but it is found in rabbinic Hebrew and examples have also been found in Ugarit.”⁹ Before rendering judgment, we must consider what OG and S might have read for וּמְרִיא.

An alignment of καὶ μοσχάριον καὶ ταῦρος καὶ λέων ἅμα βοσκηθήσονται with יַחַד יִמְרִיא וּכְפִיר וְעֵגֶל is difficult, since it is not clear for which word

8. Dominique Barthélemy, “Le grand rouleau d’Isaïe trouvé près de la Mer Morte,” *RB* 57 (1950): 542.

9. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12*, 462.

ταῦρος is the equivalent. ταῦροι renders פרים in 1:11; 34:7, while οἱ ταῦροι ὑμῶν translates האלפים in 30:24. By contrast, מריאים in 1:11 is rendered with ἀρνῶν, its most common equivalent in the Greek Bible, while ταῦρος never elsewhere renders it. Thus, while καὶ λέων renders וכפיר, ταῦρος is difficult to align with a particular word. Its parallel in S, ܐܠܝܐ, more clearly aligns מריא in word order. Syriac used ܐܠܝܐ for פרים in 1:11 (cf. 34:7), where it rendered מריאים with ܡܪܝܐܝܐ, its most frequent equivalent in the Bible.¹⁰ Meanwhile, ܐܠܝܐ renders כפיר again in Ps 17:12; Isa 31:4; Hos 5:14; Mic 5:7; Job 4:10. Neither version allows a clear view of its path in word selection. The subject in each is trifold (as in MT), even if their equivalents for וכפיר stand in different word order slots. Nevertheless, their use of three nominal components makes it difficult to infer that they read a verb form in place of מריא.

Old Greek's ἅμα βοσκαθήσονται and S's ܐܡܪ ܝܚܕܐ || ܐܡܪ ܝܚܕܐ are identical to their equivalents for יחדו in 11:7 and stand in the same order as there. Although it is possible that a scribe had inserted תרעינה after יחדו in either or both of their *Vorlagen* (based on 11:7), it is also possible that one or both translators mentally supplied תרעינה to fill out the clause.

11:7

Old Greek and S have multiple renderings of the יחדו that appears once in MT, 1QIsa^a, 4Q57 (cf. V, T). ܐܡܪ precedes the verb in each of the first two clauses: ܐܡܪ ܝܚܕܐ || ܐܡܪ ܝܚܕܐ (ܐܡܪ ܝܚܕܐ). The repetition likely owes to the position of יחדו between תרעינה and ירבצו, spurring a rendering of it with each verb.

Old Greek has ἅμα both before the verb of the first clause (ἅμα βοσκαθήσονται || יחדו (תרעינה) and as a complement to ἔσονται in the second clause (καὶ ἅμα τὰ παιδία αὐτῶν ἔσονται || ירבצו ילדיהן), where ἔσονται curiously differs from typical equivalents for רבץ (cf. συναναπαύσεται in 11:6; ἀναπαύω in 13:20, 21; 14:30; 27:10). There is nothing in the environment to suggest that ירבצו would have suffered haplography. As with OG's καὶ συμβοσκαθήσεται || וגר in 11:6, nothing affords us a view into the translator's choice.

Finally, OG uniquely reads ἅμα φάγονται || יאכל in the final clause, likely part of its insinuation of συν- or ἅμα throughout 11:6–7. The rendering of וואריה בבקר with καὶ λέων καὶ βοῦς (cf. καὶ Δαμασκὸν καὶ Σαμάρειαν

10. S uses ܐܠܝܐ || ܐܠܝܐ in 11:7; 22:13; 65:25 but more frequently || ܐܠܝܐ.

|| כדמשק שמרון in 10:9) creates a tidier match to καὶ βοῦς καὶ ἄρκος in the first clause (contrast S's ܟܕܡܫܩ ܫܡܪܢܐ).

11:8

The compound καὶ παιδίον νήπιον || ושעשע יונק likely involves a guess. עשע II occurs again only in 66:12, where OG renders תשעשעו with παρακληθήσονται, one of the translator's favorite slot words (cf. 10:31). עשע I appears in 6:10 (ἐκάμυσαν || השע); 29:9 (ἐκλύθητε καὶ ἔκστητε || נטע שעשעו) (התמהמהו ותמהו השתעשעו ושעו). νεόφυτον ἡγαπημένον || נטע שעשעו in 5:7 is an inference from 11:1 (see the comments there), similar to the παιδίον ἐντρύφῳ || ילד שעשעים in Jer 38(31):20.¹¹ There is no evidence that any of the Greek translators knew its precise meaning.

Although παιδίον translates יונק in 53:2 and τὰ παιδία αὐτῶν renders וינקתם in 66:12, νήπιος appears only here in Isaiah, while outside the book it most often renders עולל or נער. It is possible that νήπιον reflects his inference of the age of the child. The numerical equivalence to ושעשע יונק may have been spurred by παιδίον μικρόν in 11:6, but he offers no equivalent for גמול in the next clause, unless it figures in ἐχγόνων ἀσπίδων, as Goshen-Gottstein (מו) suggested (but see below).

Although OG's ἐπὶ τρώγλην ἀσπίδων represents על חר פתן accurately, S lacks an equivalent for חר. Even if S had been unfamiliar with this word (it appears in Isaiah again only in 42:22, in the form בחורים, which S renders with ܝܬܝܡܐ, “young men”), the parallel ועל מאורת, which S renders with ܝܬܝܡܐ, shows that על חר would hardly have stumped it. In that light, S's rendering of ושעשע יונק על חר פתן with ܫܥܫܥܝܢ ܝܘܢܩܐ ܥܠ ܚܪ ܦܬܢ “and a child shall play among snakes” might have led to an inner-Syriac haplography of an original ܫܥܫܥܝܢ ܝܘܢܩܐ ܥܠ ܚܪ, as Warszawski (26) posited.

צפעוני occurs again in 59:5, where OG translates it with ἀσπίς. However, the full phrase ἐχγόνων ἀσπίδων occurs again in 14:29 as the equivalent for צפע (followed by καὶ τὰ ἔχγωνα αὐτῶν || ופריו) and in 30:6, where καὶ ἀσπίδες καὶ ἔχγωνα ἀσπίδων πετομένων renders אפעה ושרף מעופף. There is good reason, then, to regard ἐχγόνων ἀσπίδων as OG's equivalent for צפעוני.¹²

11. ושעשע appears five times in Ps 118(119), each rendered with μελέτη, and twice in Proverbs, rendered with προσχαίρω (8:30); εὐφραίνομαι (8:31).

12. 1QIsa^a and 4Q57 read צפעונים, but ἀσπίδων || פתן earlier in the verse and OG's tendency to render grammatical singulars in the plural number becloud the translator's Vorlage.

הדה is a *hapax legomenon*. Old Greek's rendering of it with ἐπιβαλεῖ is explicable from the translator's frequent insertion of ἐπιβάλλω into phrases with יד: *καὶ ἐπέβαλε τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἐπ' αὐτούς* || וַיִּט יְדוֹ עָלָיו 5:25; *καὶ ἐπὶ Μωαβ πρῶτον τὰς χεῖρας ἐπιβαλοῦσιν* || וּמוֹאֵב מִשְׁלֹחַ יָדָם 11:14 (cf. 11:15; 19:16; 25:11). The article likely suffices for the pronominal suffix of יד, given the clear referent.

Syriac's ܐܬܝܬܝܢ ܝܕܐ ܕܗܕܐ || employs the same verb it will use in 11:14 (ܡܫܠܚܐ ܝܕܐ || (ܡܫܠܚܐ ܝܕܐ || ܐܬܝܬܝܢ ܝܕܐ + ܝܕ outside Isaiah (e.g., Gen 3:22; 8:9; 19:10; Exod 3:20).

11:9

Old Greek's rendering of *ישחיתו ולא* entails two pluses. +οὐδένα accords with the translator's penchant to supply a pronoun as direct object of a verb (Van der Vorm-Croughs, 49–52). +δύνωνται typifies his occasional use of δύναιμι to explicitize a perceived verbal modality, as in 20:6, where *להנצל מפני מלך אשור* is reformulated as a relative clause: οἱ οὐκ ἠδύναντο σωθῆναι ἀπὸ βασιλέως Ἀσσυρίων.¹³

Old Greek's lack of an equivalent for כל in ἐπὶ τὸ ὄρος τὸ ἅγιόν μου parallels 1QIsa^a's *בהר קדשי* (V and T reflect MT's *בכל הר*). כל is atypical in phrases that include *בהר* in Isaiah (*בהר ציון* [8:18; 10:12; 24:23], *בהר* [25:6, 7, 10], and *בהר הקדש* [27:13]), while the phrase *בהר קדשי* occurs only here and 65:25 in the Bible.¹⁴ In the latter verse, OG's ἐπὶ τῷ ὄρει τῷ ἁγίῳ μου again lacks an equivalent for כל, while all other witnesses (MT, 1QIsa^a, and 1Q8; cf. S, V, and T) attest *בכל הר קדשי*. Van der Vorm-Croughs (131) posits that OG omits an equivalent for כל under influence of τὸ ὄρος τὸ ἅγιόν μου || *בהר קדשי* in 65:11, just as that phrase seems to have influenced *καὶ κληρονομήσει τὸ ὄρος τὸ ἅγιόν μου* || *יורש הרי* in 11:9. However, expanding *הרי* into τὸ ὄρος τὸ ἅγιόν μου is quite different from omitting an equivalent for כל that profiles the scope of the sacred space

13. Cf. *καὶ πῶς δύνασθε ἀποστρέψαι* || *וְאִיךָ תִּשִׁיב* (36:9); *μὴ ἐδύναντο ῥύσασθαι* || *וְכִי הִצִּילֹ* (36:19); and *καὶ οὐδεὶς δύναται ἐξελεῖσθαι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ* || *וְנָפְשׁוֹ* (44:20). +δύναιμι in 24:20 replaces *תִּסְיָי*: *καὶ πεσεῖται καὶ οὐ μὴ δύνῃται ἀναστῆναι* || *וְנָפְלָה וְלֹא תִסְיָי קוֹם*.

14. Nowhere else is כל part of (*בהר קדשי*) (Isa 27:13; Ezek 20:40; 28:14; Joel 2:1; Zeph 3:11; Pss 14[15]:1; 88[87]:1) nor is כל prefixed to (*הר קדשי*) (Isa 56:7; 57:13; 65:11; 66:20; Joel 4:17; Obad 16; Pss 2:6; 3:5; 43:3; 48:2; 99:9; Dan 9:16, 20).

under protection.¹⁵ Given OG's apparent addition of $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma$ to enhance the locutionary force elsewhere (e.g., 23:18; 24:13; 27:4), it is difficult to perceive what would have motivated its omission here. Old Greek and 1QIsa^a likely attest a text preceding the insertion of כל.

σύμπασα appears only here in Isaiah. However, it renders תבל in Ezek 27:13; Nah 1:5, while τῇν σύμπασαν is likely the equivalent for בארץ in Job 2:2, making σύμπασα an intelligible equivalent for הארץ here.

It is not possible to judge whether S's 𐤓𐤌𐤕𐤔(?) reflects a *Vorlage* reading תמלאה, as attested by 1QIsa^a (מלאה in MT, 4Q56, and 4Q57), or simply shifted the tense to agree with 𐤕𐤓𐤕𐤔 and 𐤕𐤓𐤕𐤔.

As Goshen-Gottstein (מו) judged, 𐤕𐤓𐤕𐤔 || 𐤕𐤓𐤕𐤔 is more likely a reformulation than evidence of דעת יהוה.

Old Greek uniquely reads ὥς ὕδρ πολὺ || כמים, which can be retroverted as כמים רבים מים. כמים רבים appears elsewhere in Isaiah in 17:13; 23:3, where it is translated with ὕδρ πολὺ, as here. There are no grounds to decide whether the adjective originated with the translator or a prior scribe.

Syriac's reformulation of לים ממים with ܡܡܝܢ ܡܡܝܢ is an example of its penchant to elaborate a participial phrase with a relative clause.

11:10

Old Greek's reformulation of the relative clause אשר עמד לנס עמים as an independent clause (καὶ ὁ ἀνιστάμενος ἄρχειν ἐνθῶν) has parallels in 49:9 (λέγοντα τοῖς ἐν δεσμοῖς ἐξέλθατε καὶ τοῖς ἐν τῷ σκοτει ἀνακαλυφθῆναι || (לאמר לאסורים צאו לאשר בחשך הגלו and 49:23 (καὶ γνώσῃ ὅτι ἐγὼ κύριος καὶ οὐκ αἰσχυνθήσῃ || וידעת כי אני יהוה אשר לא יבשו קוי).

Old Greek's ἄρχειν || נס varies from its renderings of נס with σύσσημον (5:26; 49:22; 62:10), σημαίαν (30:17), and σημεῖον (11:12; 13:2; 18:3; 33:23).¹⁶ Ziegler (82) suggested, "Viell. ist er auf die Deutung ἄρχειν verfallen infolge des lautlichen Anklanges an נסִיך (Jos 13,21 = ἄρχων) oder an das aram. נסיא 'Fürst.'" However, the words translated by ἄρχειν range broadly enough as to make identifying a semantic basis for ἄρχειν here futile. Besides the frequent uses of ἄρχων for שר, מלך, and other

15. Additionally, while 65:9's τὸ ὅρος τὸ ἄγιόν μου matches 11:11, it also matches τὸ ὅρος τὸ ἄγιόν μου in 11:9, suggesting that the impetus for expanding יורש הרי in 65:9 may have run deeper than just 11:11.

16. In 31:9 it treats מנס as if from נוס: φεύγων.

terms for rulers, the translator renders ותקעתיו יתד with καὶ στήσω αὐτὸν ἄρχοντα in 22:23; יהוה מחקקנו with ἄρχων ἡμῶν κύριος (preceding βασιλεὺς ἡμῶν κύριος || יהוה מלכנו) in 33:22; ומליציד with καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες αὐτῶν in 43:27; and פקדתך with τοὺς ἄρχοντάς σου in 60:17.¹⁷ Suggestive that he found his own way to ἄρχειν here is his rendering of אשר עמד with καὶ ὁ ἀνιστάμενος.¹⁸ ἀνίστημι typically renders קום (fifteen times) and was likely chosen to coordinate with ἄρχειν || לָנֶס (i.e., the choice was more at phrase level than a selection of individual words).

Although חַחֲמַל || לָנֶס עִמִּים uses the same equivalents as in 11:12 (נָס לְגוֹיִם || לָנֶס חַחֲמַל), its syntactic role in the clause is oblique. The prefixed *waw* in סַחֲחַמַל || אֱלִיו forces the first half of the verse to be read as a distinct clause (in contrast to MT, OG, and T).¹⁹ Although סַחֲחַמַל often serves as a temporal phrase + predicate for a following verbal clause (as in 11:11), that is not the case here. Syriac construes שרש ישי (rather than the clause גוים ידרשו) as the subject of והיה. Analyzing חַחֲמַל || מָמַל as an ascriptive relative clause (“who stands [as] a sign for the nations”) leaves סַחֲחַמַל without a predicate complement. The more viable syntactic analysis is to construe חַחֲמַל || לָנֶס alone in that role: “In that day the root of Jesse who arises will be a sign to the nations.”²⁰ Syriac’s misperception of the syntactic role of גוים ידרשו led to its rendering of לָנֶס עִמִּים like נָס לְגוֹיִם in 11:12.

ἐλπιούσι (|| ידרשו) is a unique equivalent for דרש, which is predominately translated by ζητέω (three times) or its compounds (ἐκζητέω [five times]; ἐπιζητέω, 62:12). As Ziegler (141) observes, ἐπ’ αὐτῷ ἔθνη ἐλπιούσι || ידרשו || אֱלִיו is one of several passages where the translator “scheint eine besondere Vorliebe für den Gedanken zu haben, daß die Völker und Inseln auf Jahwh ‘hoffen’” (e.g., cf. καὶ εἰς τὸν βραχίονά μου ἔθνη ἐλπιούσιν || ידרשו || עִמִּים שפֶּטוּ, 51:5). More broadly, this translator highlights the theme of hope by using ἐλπίζω not only for בטח (26:4; 39:12); שבר (38:18);

17. ἄρχων also serves as the equivalent for קצין (1:10; 22:3); אדון (22:18); חר (34:12); נדיב (13:2; 32:5); מַשֵּׁל (14:5; 28:14; 49:7; 63:19); רחנים (40:23); ראש (29:10); נגיד (55:4); עתוד (14:9); סגנים (41:25); שפט (40:23); and קדקד (3:17).

18. ἀνίστημι renders עמד again only in 50:8, where ἀντιστήτω μοι (|| נעמדה) is used with a legal sense of opposition. ἵστημι is the most common equivalent for עמד (eleven times); μένω in 10:32; 46:7; and 66:22; ἀφίστημι in 59:14; ἤκω in 61:5.

19. V creates a separate clause by (apparently) implicitizing אל in the verb, while leaving its suffixed pronoun fronted: *ipsum gentes deprecabuntur*.

20. Cf. 7:23, where S’s ellipsis of יהיה (see the comments there) compels אֱלִיו to serve as subject of סַחֲחַמַל (סַחֲחַמַל || סַחֲחַמַל) (cf. 2:2; 3:24).

and יחל (42:4), but also for קוה (25:9; 26:8; גוי קו קו in 18:7), whose more frequent equivalent is μένω (5:2, 4, 7; 40:31; 51:5; 59:9, 11; 60:9).²¹ Equally distinctive is ἡ δὲ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ εἰς κενὸν ἤλπισεν || ונפשו שוקקה בן in 29:8.

11:11

Old Greek's tendency to eliminate redundancy obscures whether its *Vorlage* lacked שנית (cf. τῷ δὲ ἐνιαυτῷ τῷ δευτέρῳ || ובשנה השנית in 37:30) or the translator passed over it following προσθήσει (cf. S's ١٤١, ١٤٢). Ottley's (2:168) speculation that "LXX. supplies τοῦ δεῖξαι" is likely right, although "*substitutes* τοῦ δεῖξαι for שנית" would be more accurate. There is no evident semantic relationship between τοῦ δεῖξαι and שנית, prompting the (unanswerable) question of why the translator did not employ a verb such as αἶρω, which he uses with σημεῖον in 11:12. Elsewhere he uses δείκνυμι for the *hiphil* of ראה (30:30; 39:2 [2x]; 53:11), the *piel* of למד (40:14; 48:17; elsewhere only in Deut 4:5), and the *hiphil* of ידע (40:14), in each case in the sense of "disclose."²² It might be, as Goshen-Gottstein (מו) hints, that the translator perceived "revelation" as befitting the appearance of the hand of the Kyrios.

Although τοῦ ζηλῶσαι might reflect תואנל in OG's *Vorlage*, more likely it interprets תנול by association with תנל, in accord with his frequent recourse to biliteral etymological analysis.²³

τὸ καταλειφθὲν ὑπόλοιπον || **ῥαψ** (ὑπόλοιπον appears only here in Isaiah) is among the translator's occasional double renderings of verbs, comparable to ταπεινώσας κατήγαγες || **πη** in 26:5 and εὐλαβηθεῖσα ἐφοβήθης || **ἄρητη** in 51:12 (cf. Van der Vorm-Croughs, 155).

Two other variations are standard in OG and S. The articular τοῦ λαοῦ (|| עמו) suffices to imply the relationship denoted by the suffixed pronoun in Hebrew. Syriac's ܐܡܪܝܢܐ || אשר ישאר explicitizes the collective force of עם (cf. 1:3; 5:13, 25; 8:6, 12).

21. Cf. *πείθω* || *קוה* in 8:17; 33:2.

22. The only anomaly is ἐνεαεν τοῦ ἐμοῦ ὀνόματος δέξω σοι τὸν θυμόν μου || למען אפי אפריך שמי in 48:9, where it is possible that the *Vorlage* read אפריך, although the resonance of this with αἱ τὸν θυμόν τοῦ βραχίονος αὐτοῦ δέξει μετὰ θυμοῦ αἱ ὀργαίς || בועף אף in 30:30 raises the possibility that the translator rendered 48:9 with 30:30 in mind.

23. See Tov, "Bilateral Exegesis," 475, citing Isa 11:11 as an example.

Although every other occurrence of פתרוס is transliterated as Παθουρης (Jer 51[44]:1, 15; Ezek 29:15; 30:14), και Βαβυλωνίας || ומפתרוס is intelligible alongside και ἀπὸ ἡλίου ἀνατολῶν || ומשנער. τὴν χώραν τὴν ἐπάνω Βαβυλῶνος || בכרכמיש in 10:9 was explicable in light of the following και Χαλαννη οὗ ὁ πύργος ὠκοδομήθη || בלנו, a reference to και Χαλαννη ἐν τῇ γῇ Σεννααρ || בארץ שנער in Gen 10:10, cross-referenced with και ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ κινῆσαι αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν εὗρον πεδίον ἐν γῇ Σεννααρ in Gen 11:2. The location of שנער in the east accounts for και ἀπὸ ἡλίου ἀνατολῶν || ומשנער here, while the equation of בכרכמיש with τὴν χώραν τὴν ἐπάνω Βαβυλῶνος in association with Χαλαννη in 10:9 explicates και Βαβυλωνίας || ומפתרוס here (cf. T's ומבבל || ומשנער).²⁴ Confirming this is Ἀραβίας || חמת, which also occurred in 10:9 (see Troxel, 146–47).

سحح attests either a corruption of ומשנער into ומשעיר in S's *Vorlage*, as Warszawski (26) perceived, or an inner-S corruption of سحح, as Goshen-Gottstein (מו) proposed.

Ziegler (55) lists ומאיי הים among omissions from the OG that he considers to have “einen glossenartigen Charakter.” He suggests that ומאיי הים may have been borrowed “viell. aus 24,15” (56). However, given the translator’s tendency to condense enumerated lists through omissions (Van der Vorm-Croughs, 190–91) and the attestation of ומאיי הים in MT and 1QIsa^a (cf. S, V, and T), there is greater reason to suspect that the translator simply left this generic phrase untranslated in the wake of the more specific toponyms.

11:12

Old Greek’s τοὺς ἀπολομένους (Ισραηλ) || (ישראל) נדחי is paralleled by οἱ ἀπολόμενοι || והנדחים in 27:13, while נדחי ישראל is rendered with τοὺς διεσπαρμένους Ισραηλ in 56:8, comparable to και τοὺς διεσπαρμένους Ιουδα || ונפצות יהודה here.

24. Given the parallel with 10:9, it is less likely that και ἀπὸ ἡλίου ἀνατολῶν renders מוחמת, understood as “from the sun” (so Goshen-Gottstein, מו). As Van der Vorm-Croughs (207) notes, OG-Isaiah often follows Hellenistic Greek style of not repeating a preposition that governs successive phrases.

11:13

Although only here in Isaiah does ἐχθρός render צרר (otherwise אויב); ἐχθρός translates צרר elsewhere (e.g. Gen 14:20; Num 24:8; Deut 32:41, 43; 33:7).

Old Greek and S each render יכרתו with a generic word for perishing that they employ for כרת elsewhere: ἀπολοῦνται (cf. 14:22), נאבִּי (cf. 22:25).

11:14

Syriac's ܡܢܚܝܬ || ܘܥܦܝ is remarkable not only in contrast to OG's more appropriate καὶ πετασθήσονται but more so because S typically renders עוף with ܦܢܝ (6:2, 6; 14:29; 30:6; 31:5; 60:8). Syriac uses ܦܢܝ three times for עבד (19:23; 30:24; 60:12), while in 5:2, 6 it uses it as a (contextually apt) slot word for עזק and עדר, respectively. Although it is possible that S's *Vorlage* read עבו, which a scribe attempted to fix by adding a *dalet* (with S reading the resultant form according to its meaning in Aramaic), more likely ܡܢܚܝܬ is an inner-Syriac error for ܡܢܦܝܬ, as Warszawski (26) suggested.

The peculiarity of πετασθήσονται ἐν πλοίοις lies in the fact that elsewhere the translator renders כתר with ὄμος (46:7; 49:22), a frequent equivalent in the Bible (e.g., Exod 28:12; Num 7:9; Josh 6:3).²⁵ Ottley (2:169) regards ἐν πλοίοις || בכתף as likely "a paraphrase or guess," noting that "'ships' intrudes also in LXX. ii.16, xviii.1." The word "intrudes" is, however, an exaggeration for 2:16, where אניות (πλοῖον) is already present, while πλοίων in 28:1 likely renders the *hapax legomenon* שכיות in light of אניות (see the comments ad loc.). The rendering of the rare word צלצל by πλοίων in 18:1 (cf. ἡ ἐρυσίβη || הצלצל in Deut 28:42) is likely a logical inference from 11:2's reference to travel by sea (see the comments ad loc.).²⁶ It is similarly possible to understand that the translator here reasoned from the return of the survivors foreseen in 11:11–12 to a means of transporting them. His rendering of ימה as the direct object of יבזו (θάλασσαν ἄμα προνομεύσουσι) coheres with an interpretation of the people's return as a

25. The only other variation involving כתר occurs in 30:6, where it lacks an equivalent in the condensed rendering דבשת גמלים אוצרתם ועל חילהם ועל עירים חילהם by ἔφερον ἐπ' ὄνων καὶ καμήλων τὸν πλοῦτον αὐτῶν.

26. καὶ ἐν πλοίοις ἀλιέων κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ || ובצלצל דגים ראשו in Job 40:31 can hardly be adduced as evidence, since it stands subasterisk.

sea voyage on which they begin the plunder that will envelope the Idumeans, Moabites, and Ammonites. Compare 23:10, where ἐργάζου τὴν γῆν σου καὶ γὰρ πλοῖα οὐκέτι ἔρχεται ἐκ Καρχηδόνος (|| עברי ארצך כּיאר בת || (תרשיש אין מוזח עוד extrapolates the topic of ships from the call, ὁλολύζετε πλοῖα Καρχηδόνος ὅτι ἀπώλετο || משה צר הילילו אניות תרשיש כּי שדד || in 11:1.

τοὺς ἀφ' ἡλίου ἀνατολῶν || קדם את בני קדם finds parallels in other phrases containing בן in a sense “other than ‘son’” (Van der Vorm-Croughs, 136), such as ὁ πρῶτὸ ἀνατέλλων || בן שחר in 14:12, ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων || מבני אדם in 52:14 (cf. 56:2), and ὁ ἀλλογενὴς || בן הנכר in 56:3 (cf. 61:5). By contrast, note the noun phrase οἱ δὲ υἱοὶ Ἀμμων || ובני עמון later in the verse. For S's حبس مجس || (מקדם ארם) || לו, سمح مجس || (קדם את בני קדם), compare حبس مجس || (מקדם ארם) in 9:11.

The contemporizing equivalent Ἰδουμαία || אדום appears again in 34:5, 6 (as well as for דומה in 21:11, likely by connection with the final *aleph* of the preceding משה). Edōm appears only in 63:1.

Old Greek's τὰς χεῖρας ἐπιβαλοῦσιν || משלוח ידם accords with this translator's use of ἐπιβάλλω when “hands” is the object of a verb (as discussed in the comments on τὴν χεῖρα ἐπιβαλεῖ || ידו הדה in 11:8), while its omission of an equivalent for the possessive pronoun (ידו) is common with an articular equivalent.

سملح يدم || משלוח ידם at first blush seems peculiar, since S's regular equivalent for שלח is سملح (in 37:17, 21), while سملح occurs only here and in 11:8.²⁷ However, سملح + يدم is the equivalent for שלח + יד elsewhere (see 11:8), correlative to which *bēt* is prefixed to the proper nouns in سملح (for *bēt* as adversative, see 1 Sam 24:7, 11; 26:11, 23).

Old Greek and S render משמעתם with verbs connoting obedience, inflected in the third-person plural in accord with the 3mp personal pronoun (ὑπακούσονται/سملح), while S adds سملح to explicitize that this obedience is rendered to the (returning) people of Israel and Judah.

No warrant for OG's πρῶτον or πρῶτοι survives in any Hebrew witness and is unparalleled in any other translation. Ottley (2:17) opines that perhaps the translator sought to recall “the early conquests of David” so as to anticipate that the “glories of the Kingdom of the Twelve Tribes are to be renewed.” Although noting Ottley's suggestion, Ziegler (64) sug-

27. S renders למשלח שור in 7:25 with سملح, while translating משלח כּי עיר בצורה בּדד in 16:2 with سملح, and משלח כּי עיר בצורה בּדד in 27:10 with سملح. (for שלח see 50:1 [2x]); and משלח רגל השור והחמור in 32:20 with سملح. (for שור and חמור see 50:1 [2x]).

gests, “Viell. stand am Rand die Glosse ראשון, die ein Leser beifügte, der über Moab zuerst das Gericht vollzogen wissen wollte.” As is the nature of speculation, each of these explanations is possible, but neither can be confirmed. Ziegler (64) pertinently notes +πρῶτος in 43:26, a verse OG apparently understood as the logical sequel to the Kyrios’s promise to wipe out the people’s sins and remember them no more (11:25). The Kyrios calls on them to recall their sins and enter into litigation (σὺ δὲ μνήσθητι καὶ κριθῶμεν || הזכירני נשפטה יחד), in which their role will be *first* to speak their sins (λέγε σὺ τὰς ἀνομίας σου πρῶτος || ספר אתה) ἵνα δικαιωθῇς (|| למען תצדק). In that case, however, +πρῶτος is little more than a stage direction, whereas in its occurrences here it seems to emphasize the penalties that Moab and Ammon will pay with Israel’s restoration. Whatever the explanation for πρῶτον and πρῶτοι here, there is no reason to think that they reflect a form of the text earlier than attested by M, 1QIsa^a, V, and T.

11:15

καὶ ἐρημώσει/سجد || והחרב might reflect והחרב. Old Greek and S translate every verbal form of חרב with ἐρημώω/سجد (34:10; 37:18; 44:27; 49:17; 51:10; 60:12) and every nominal form with ἐρημος/سجد (5:17; 44:26; 48:21; 49:19; 51:3; 52:9; 58:12; 61:4). On the other hand, S also translates להחרים with سجد (OG τοῦ ἀπολέσαι αὐτούς) in 34:2 and להחרים with سجد (OG ἀπώλεσαν) in 37:11. Although S’s use of سجد for חרם as well as חרב makes its *Vorlage* here uncertain, OG’s use of ἐρημώω for חרב in 37:18; 60:12 could attest והחרב, although two cases provide slim grounds for that conclusion. Although a *bet/mem* interchange is conceivable, there is insufficient evidence to conclude that here. However, see the comments on ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ || מאשור in 11:16.

The omission of an equivalent for לשון falls within the set of examples Van der Vorm-Croughs (69) cites of a body part serving as *nomen regens* that the translator omits as superfluous (e.g., ἀπὸ ποδῶν || מכף רגל, 1:6; ἐπ’ ὄνων || על כתף עירים, 30:6).

To עמי מצרים || حبب מצרים compare ים מצרים || بحر מצרים in 19:25, but also את כל כבודי במצרים || محبة اسمي במצרים in Gen 45:13 and צען מצרים || حبب מצרים in Num 13:22. These typify S’s penchant to render modifiers via relative clauses (cf. 1:6, 21).

עִים is a *hapax legomenon* that lacks a well-attested Semitic cognate.²⁸ Old Greek translates the phrase רוחו בעים with πνεύματι βιαίω and S with בלסב, prompting BHS to commend reading בעצם.²⁹ However, βιαίος is difficult to align semantically with the Hebrew in its two other appearances in Isaiah (διάλυε στραγγαλιὰς βιαιῶν συναλλαγμάτων || התר אגדות כי יבוא בנהר || מוטה, 58:6; ἥξει γὰρ ὡς ποταμὸς βιαίος ἡ ὄργη παρὰ κυρίου || צר רוח יהוה, 59:19) and the nominal form features in the phrase βίᾳ καταφερομέν(ου/η) to describe the violent force of water (17:13) or hail (28:2; 30:30), without clear roots in the Hebrew (cf. καὶ εἰς Ἀσσυρίους βίᾳ ἤχθησαν || ואשור באפס עשקו || in 52:4). Meanwhile, equivalents for עצם (verbal or nominal) throughout the Greek Bible denote strength (ἰσχύρω, κραταίω, κράτος, δυνατός, στερεόω) or plenitude (πληθός, πληθύνω). Neither the use of βιαίος by this translator or typical Greek translation equivalents for עצם supports positing an original עצם, making it more likely that βιαίω is a guess for בעים.

Syriac's equivalents for עצם similarly denote strength (ܠܡܥ, ܡܥܬܐ, ܡܥܬܐ) or plenitude (ܡܥܬܐ, ܡܥܬܐ), while ܠܡܥ most often renders אַחֲזָה (e.g., Num 27:7; 32:32; Ps 2:8), but also חֲסֵן (Prov 27:24; Dan 4:27).³⁰ Thus there is little reason to suspect עצם behind ܠܡܥ here. Most likely, OG and S each offers its own guess at the meaning of בעים (there is no reason to think S's ܠܡܥ is based on βιαίω). Neither grants insight into what stood in its *Vorlage*, if not בעים.

Old Greek's lack of a possessive pronoun with πνεύματι || רוחו coincides with רוח in 1QIsa^a. The following word begins with a *waw* (והכה), raising the possibility of haplography or dittography in transmission (see Van der Vorm-Croughs, 500).

Another possible case of +/-*waw* suffix concerns καὶ πατάξει || והכהו, perhaps attesting והכה. More likely, the absence of an independent pronoun owes to the verb continuing the action of καὶ ἐπιβαλεῖ τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ, the recipient of whose action is τὸν ποταμόν, which can be assumed as object also of καὶ πατάξει.

ὥστε διαπορεύεσθαι (αὐτόν) || והדריך matches ܡܥܬܐ, αὐτόν might find a parallel in 1QIsa^a, which preserves the top of a letter following *kaph*, with

28. See Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12*, 488.

29. See J. J. M. Roberts, *First Isaiah: A Commentary*, Heremeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2015), 185.

30. In Isa 8:23 ܡܥܬܐ || והאחרון הכבד likely reflects והאחרון rather than a misreading as והאחרון (see the commentary ad loc.).

a form closer to *waw* than *yod*: וְהָדְרִיכּוּ.³¹ Given the ambiguous referent of αὐτόν, it was less likely introduced by the translator than reflects a *Vorlage* similar to 1QIsa^a.

11:16

τῷ καταλειφθέντι μου λαῷ || אשר עמו אשר ישאר is notable for the lack of an equivalent to אשר ישאר, which is the touchstone for the subsequent היתה באשר, which OG renders with καὶ ἔσται. The closest parallel to the lack of an equivalent for the relative clause is τότε ἔσται ὁ ὑετὸς τῷ σπέρματι τῆς γῆς σου || ונתן מטר זרעך אשר תזרע את האדמה in 30:23, which condenses אשר + a verbal cognate to the earlier noun. The translator eliminates a relative clause also in 28:1's τὸ ἄνθος τὸ ἐκπεσὸν ἐκ τῆς δόξης ἐπὶ τῆς κορυφῆς τοῦ ὄρους τοῦ παχέος || וציץ נבל צבי תפארתו אשר על ראש גיא || אשר שמונים (cf. 28:4, 12). Similarly here the translator might have omitted אשר ישאר in the interest of concision.

More significant is μου λαῷ || עמו. A *Vorlage* reading עמי more likely underlies this than a deliberate misreading, which likely would have prompted rendering עלתו with ἐξήγαγον rather than ἐξήλθεν.

Seeligmann (117) considered OG's ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ || מאשור “a striking contemporization” that refers to “the Jewish diaspora in Egypt.” He found confirmation in the rendering of 19:25 (εὐλογημένος ὁ λαός μου ὁ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ ὁ ἐν Ἀσσυρίοις καὶ ἡ κληρονομία μου Ἰσραὴλ || ברוך עמי מצרים || ומעשה ידי אשור ונחלתי ישראל), inferring that the replacement of “Egypt and Assyria, as the recipients of God’s blessing ... by the diaspora groups in Egypt and Mesopotamia” (117) evinces what he earlier (111) called “the Galuth psychology of Alexandrian Jewry.” Seeligmann’s exposition of this alleged facet of the translation set the agenda for much scholarship on OG-Isaiah, despite the fact that his accounts take the product as *prima facie* evidence of contemporization by correlating divergences from MT with circumstances in the Hellenistic world, *without* applying text-critical questions about scribal errors or considering other possible motivations.

ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ might be an effect of a *Vorlage* that read וְהָחַרִּיב in 11:15. חרב appears in describing the evaporation of water (19:5; 44:27), including the sea (50:2) and especially in the exodus (51:10). וְהָחַרִּיב is a likely spur

31. V's *ita ut transeant per eum* likely derives from the OL, even as *in fortitudine spiritus sui* is almost certainly Jerome's modification *iuxta Hebraica[m]*.

ISAIAH 12

12:1

Old Greek's and S's equivalents for ישב (καὶ ἀπέστρεψας/Ἀποστρέψας) and ותנחמני (καὶ ἡλέησάς με/Ἠλέησας) are inflected as second-person singular preterite verbs, in conformity with ὠργίσθης/ὠργίσθης || אנפת. Polygenesis readily accounts for this.

Goshen-Gottstein (מח) considers whether καὶ ἡλέησάς με might reflect ותרחמני rather than ותנחמני, for which one could cite 9:17 (ἐλεήσει || ירחם); 13:18 (ἐλεήσουσιν || ירחמו) (cf. 30:18; 49:10, 15). However, he also notes passages where ἐλεέω again renders נחם: ἡλέησεν ὁ θεός || נחם יהוה (49:13); ἡλέησε κύριος || נחם יהוה (52:9).¹ There is no reason to posit a variant.

12:2

Old Greek and S render ישועתי with a *nomen agentis*, σωτήρ μου/Σωτήρ μου. Compare τὸν θεὸν τὸν σωτῆρά σου/Ἰσχυὸς ὁ ἰσχυρὸς || אלהי ישעך in 17:10 and ἰδοὺ σοι ὁ σωτὴρ παραγίνεται/Ἰδοὺ ὁ ἰσχυρὸς || אלהי ישעך בא in 62:11.² Here the confessional tenor of the context likely prompted explicit titling of the deity as savior.

Old Greek's personal pronoun with ὁ θεός μου (|| אל) could owe to ditto-graphy of *yod* in the following ישועתי or might attest a 1cs pronominal suffix אֱלִי lost by haplography. It is notable, however, that μου accompanies each of these proper nouns, despite the translator's tendency to omit

1. ἐλεέω also renders חמל (9:18) and חנן (27:11; 30:19; 33:2) and is used on apparently exegetical grounds for עשה (44:23), שוב (52:8), קבץ (54:7), and שמוע (59:2).

2. S uses Σωτήρ for a broader range of Hebrew words than OG does σωτήρ, including ישועתנו in 33:2 (OG ἡ δὲ σωτηρία ἡμῶν), as well as for שוע in 32:5 (σίγα), וישענו in 33:22 (ἡμᾶς σώσει), לאג in 41:14 (ὁ λυτρούμενός σε), and גמול in 35:4 (ἀνταποδώσει).

pronouns with articular nouns. The liturgical tenor likely accounts for the use of the pronoun. Supporting this analysis is +κύριος, for which a Hebrew counterpart is unattested in any other witness, but might have been inserted to effect a confessional tenor. As Van der Vorm-Croughs (392) notes, θεός μου σωτήρ μου appears in Ps 61(62):3, 7, where OG uses the same confessional formula in each verse:

הוא צורי וישועתי משגבי αὐτὸς θεός μου καὶ σωτήρ μου ἀντιλήμπτωρ μου

Although she initially suggests that the Isaiah translator “may have taken Ps 62(61):3, 7 as an example,” she later observes that “ὁ θεός μου is a quite common biblical phrase that may just as easily have been produced without interference of LXX Psalms.” She compares the similar epithets in Isa 17:10 (392 n. 255):

כי שכחת אלהי ישעך διότι κατέλιπες τὸν θεὸν τὸν σωτήρᾱ σου
וצור מעוז לא זכרת καὶ κυρίου τοῦ βοηθοῦ σου οὐκ ἐμνήσθης

Both τὸν σωτήρᾱ σου || ישעך and καὶ κυρίου || וצור appear to be reformulations suggestive of “the influence of the liturgy in the Jewish-Alexandrian milieu” that Seeligmann (101) noted. For additional evidence of this influence, he pointed to equivalents such as γένοιτο κύριε || אמן that concludes the prayer of 25:1 and ἄγιος ὁ θεὸς ὁ κατοικῶν ἐν ὑψηλοῖς || כי נשגב יהוה in 33:5. Accordingly, the similarity between the confession of Isa 12:2; Ps 61(62):3, 7 likely owes to common liturgical forms.

This perception is strengthened by +ἐπ’ αὐτῷ in the next clause, which the translator supplied to complement πεποιθὼς ἔσομαι || אבטח (cf. ἐφ’ οἷς ἤσαν πεποιθότες οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι || מן מצרים, 20:5; καὶ τοῖς πεποιθόσιν ἐπ’ Αἰγύπτου || והחסות בצל מצרים, 30:3).

Syriac also reformulates the first half of the verse, incorporating the verbless clause אל ישועתי (ܐܠ ܝܫܘܥܬܝ) with a prefixed ܠ, the characteristic prepositional complement to the passive participle ܠܡܝܢ (cf. ܠܡܝܢ ܠܚܝܬܝ, Isa 42:17).³ Although +ܐܠ in 1QIsa^a (הנה אל אל ישועתי אבטח) might reflect S’s *Vorlage*, it is equally possible that the translator supplied ܠ to accent the profession of trust.

3. S translates פחד with ܡܝܢ elsewhere in 19:16 and uses ܡܝܢ for בעת in 21:4 and חתח (parallel to ܠܝܫܥܬܝ || תיראו) in 51:7.

Old Greek's διότι ἡ δόξα μου καὶ ἡ αἰνεσίς μου κύριος || כי עזי וזמרת יה יהוה evinces one of the many odd uses of δόξα in this book (S ܡܕܝܬܐ ܕܝܫܐܝܐ).⁴ As L. H. Brockington notes, δόξα is often central to OG's "marked soteriological emphasis," as in 40:5, where the translator effects a parallel of salvation to glory (καὶ ὀφθήσεται ἡ δόξα κυρίου, καὶ ὥσεται πᾶσα σὰρξ τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ || כל בשר יחדו וראו יהוה כבוד יהוה (ונגלה כבוד יהוה וראו כל בשר יחדו || and, of particular interest here, 44:23, where God's redemption of Jacob is spoken of equally as Israel's "glorification": ὅτι ἐλυτρώσατο ὁ θεὸς τὸν Ιακωβ καὶ Ἰσραὴλ δοξασθήσεται || יעקב ובישראל יתפאר || כי גאל יהוה יעקב ובישראל יתפאר || Psalm 67[68]:35 substitutes δόξα for εὐ, as here: δότε δόξαν τῷ θεῷ || תנו עז לאלהים (contrast καὶ ἡ δύναμις αὐτοῦ ἐν ταῖς νεφέλαις || ועזו בשחקים later in that verse).

Old Greek and S have a 1cs pronoun with their rendering of זמרת: καὶ ἡ αἰνεσίς μου/ܡܕܝܬܐ ܕܝܫܐܝܐ, while having a single divine name for יהוה.⁶ Notably, 1QIsa^a reads זמרתיה || זמרת יה, with supralinear *he* supplied by the original scribe. Whatever the impetus for the correction, the earlier reading allows the possibility that the *Vorlagen* of OG and S might have read זמרת, although it is also possible that each translator supplied the pronoun coordinate to עזי.

12:3

ܡܕ is a frequent equivalent for שאב (e.g., Gen 24:11; Deut 29:10; Josh 9:21).

Syriac's use of the grammatical singular, ܡܕܡܥܝܢ || ממעני, has too many variables (from loss of *seyame* to loss of *yod* in Hebrew) to proffer an explanation.

12:4

καὶ ἐρεῖς || ואמרתם is remarkable, given the regularity of grammatical number in the subsequent verses (καὶ ἀντλήσετε, 12:3; ὑμνεῖτε ... βοᾶτε ... ἀναγγεῖλατε ... μιμνήσκεισθε, 12:4; ὑμνήσατε and ἀναγγεῖλατε, 12:5; and ἀγαλλιᾶσθε καὶ εὐφραίνεσθε, 12:6). Given such consistent use of the

4. See Forster, "Meaning of Δόξα," 312–13.

5. L. H. Brockington, "The Greek Translator of Isaiah and His Interest in DOXA," VT 1 (1951): 30.

6. T's דחילא יי || דחילא יהוה is similar to במימר דחילא יי in 26:4 and קדם (דחילא יי || דחילא יהוה in 38:11.

second-person plural, it seems unlikely that the translator would have modified his equivalent for ואמרתם in this verse to accord with καὶ ἐρεῖς || ואמרת in 12:1. More likely, his *Vorlage* read the second-person singular, as attested by ואמרתה in 1QIsa^a.

Old Greek will use ὑμνήσατε for זמרו in 12:5 but ὑμνήσω for אודה in 25:1 (like its ὑμνεῖτε || הודו here), where the verb again takes a direct object in the accusative, as frequently in Greek literature (see BDAG, s.v. “ὑμνέω”). The accusative case in βοᾶτε τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ || קראו בשמו accords with the accusative in ὑμνεῖτε κύριον. Compare S’s קראו בשמו || קראו בשמו, in accord with קראו בשמו || קראו בשמו, in 65:11, although more often S renders קראו + בשם with קראו בשם (41:25; 43:7; 44:5; 64:6). Both OG and S seem to understand the phrase as mandating proclamation of the name.

Old Greek’s τὰ ἔνδοξα αὐτοῦ || עלילותיו is singular; ἐπιτηδεύματα is the most frequent equivalent for עלילה in the Bible. Although עלילה appears only here in Isaiah, τῶν ἔργων αὐτῶν || מעלליהם in 3:10 (cf. Pss 77[76]:12; 78[77]:7), τοῖς ἔργοις || העליליה in Jer 39(32):19 and ἀπαγγεῖλατε ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ || עלילותיו בעמים הודיעו in Ps 104(105):1 likely elucidate the translator’s path. His word choice is similar to καὶ τὰ ἔνδοξά μου ἐπάξω ἐπὶ σοί || ותלהתי אחסם לך in 48:9 and ὅταν ποιῇς τὰ ἔνδοξα || בעשותך in 64:2.

עלילותיו renders עלילות elsewhere (e.g., 1 Sam 2:3; Ezek 14:22, 23; 20:43). Similarly, קראו בשמו is exemplified elsewhere (e.g., Deut 2:36; Isa 2:11, 17; 9:10).

12:5

ὑμνήσατε τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου || זמרו יהוה can be accounted for in one of two ways: either the translator added τὸ ὄνομα in the light of 12:4, or שם was already supplied by a copyist who was similarly motivated (cf. ὑμνήσω τὸ ὄνομά σου || אודה שמך, 25:1). There are no grounds to decide between these options.

Although ὑμνήσατε might reflect the translator’s predilection, 1QIsa^a reads זמרו ליהוה, in accord with the structure S implies.

Although OG’s ἀναγγεῖλατε might attest הודיעו (cf. ἀναγγεῖλω || אודיעה in 5:5), it is more likely due to the translator conforming מידעת (or מודעת ק’; cf. 1QIsa^a מודעות) to the preceding imperative(s), given his penchant for harmonization.

12:6

In 10:30 S translated צהלי with ܨܠܝܝܬܐ, which it uses again in 24:14 (ܨܠܝܝܬܐ || צהלו). In 54:1, however, it uses the same equivalent for וצהלי as here: ܨܠܝܝܬܐ.⁷

Despite allowing the possibility of *waw/yod* confusion, ἀγαλλιᾷσθε καὶ εὐφραίνεσθε || וצהלי ורני accords with the translator's penchant to harmonize the number of the person (cf. οἱ κατοικοῦντες || יושבת, which he might have analyzed as a plural, but, if so, shifted it to the masculine gender).

Syriac distinguishes itself from OG (and all other witnesses) with its rendering of גדול בקרבך with ܓܕܘܠܐ ܒܩܪܒܝܬܐ, so that בקרבך, rather than limiting גדול, becomes a nominal clause to which ܡܒܥܠܐ ܕܡܥܬܐ is in apposition. Given S's penchant to create relative clauses, there is no reason to suspect a different *Vorlage*.

7. S uses this lexeme for יגילו in 9:2 (ܨܠܝܝܬܐ, cf. 25:9; 29:19; 35:1; 35:2; 41:6; 49:13; 61:10; 65:18; 66:10), פצחו in 14:7 (ܨܠܝܝܬܐ || פצחו רנה; cf. 52:9), and (וששתי בעמי || ܨܠܝܝܬܐ) in 65:19.

ISAIAH 13

13:1

ὄρασις ἦν εἶδεν Ησαίας υἱὸς Αμώς κατὰ Βαβυλῶνος reformulates מִשָּׁא בָּבֶל מִשָּׁא בָּבֶל in accord with 1:1 in OG (minus its ἦν εἶδε). Whereas ὄρασις there translates חֲזוֹן, here it renders מִשָּׁא, an equivalent found again in 19:1; 30:6. Although κατὰ Βαβυλῶνος || בָּבֶל parallels κατὰ τῆς Ἰουδαίας in 1:1, both lexically and by its position in the sentence, there κατὰ renders עַל. Nevertheless, τὸ ῥῆμα τὸ κατὰ τῆς Μωαβίτιδος || מִשָּׁא מִשָּׁא in 15:1 and τὸ ῥῆμα τὸ κατὰ Δαμασκοῦ || מִשָּׁא דְּמַשֶּׁק in 17:1 suggest that this way of representing מִשָּׁא בָּבֶל proved useful again (contrast ὄρασις Αἰγύπτου || מִשָּׁא מִצְרַיִם in 19:1; ἡ ὄρασις τῶν τετραπόδων || מִשָּׁא בַּהֲמוֹת in 30:6).

13:2

Old Greek's πεδινού for נִשְׁפָּה, a verb that occurs only here and Job 33:21 (where it has no Greek equivalent), might be based on association with וּבִשְׁפִלָּה תִּשְׁפֹּל || ὡς οἱ ἐν τῇ πεδινῇ || וּבִשְׁפִלָּה תִּשְׁפֹּל in 32:19 and πεδινός || שְׁפִלָּה elsewhere (e.g., Josh 9:1; 10:40; 3 Kgdms 10:27; Jer 17:26).¹ שְׁפִי, on the other hand, associates נִשְׁפָּה with שְׁפִי.

More notable is that הִר נִשְׁפָּה || הִר נִשְׁפָּה entails a change of grammatical number (OG reads the grammatical singular, ὄρος). Every occurrence of הִר to this point in the book has agreed in number with MT. However, comparison with הִר וְשׁוּעַ אֶל הָהָר || הִר וְשׁוּעַ אֶל הָהָר in 22:5 and הִר עַל הָהָר גְּבוּהָ עַל לֵךְ || חֲבֵצֵי הָהָר in 40:9 suggests that the plural form might reflect an assumption (born of realism?) that such a proclamation to the nations requires multiple mountains.

1. This seems more likely than Seeligmann's (50) suggestion that the translator derived this "from the spirit of the Aramaic language with which he was familiar."

(449 613, Tht). A and B read simply *και εγω αυτους*, although B also lacks *ηγιασμενοι εισι και εγω αγω αυτους* (found in B^{mg}), as does the rest of Ziegler's Origenic group, most of the Catenen group, and several of the mixed codices, an omission likely caused by homoioteleuton, as noted by Rahlfs and Ziegler. On the other hand, 88 reads *εγω παρακαλω*, and 301 has *εγω καλω*. Based on this evidence, Ziegler reads ("scripsi") *καὶ ἀγιάζω αὐτούς*, places *ηγιασμενοι εισι* within brackets, and proposes ("scripsi") *καλω* in place of the second *αγω*, noting *voco* in Tyconius, while reporting *αγιω* in 26 and the absence of the entire clause from 106. For *ηγιασμενοι*, α' reads *τοις ηγιασμενοις μου*, corresponding to which V reads *sanctificatis meis*. Although *ηγιασμενοι* clearly corresponds to *למקדשי* (α' and V even more so), OG's text appears corrupt and thus too uncertain to say anything useful about its *Vorlage* after *ἐγὼ συντάσσω* || *אני צויתי* until *γίγαντες* || *גבורי*.

גבורי || *גבורי* is likely attributable to the translator construing the final *yod* as the masculine plural construct, as he does with *סמלחם* || *סמלחם* || *עליזי גאותי*. For *עליזי* as S's equivalent for *עליזי*, compare *קריה* || *קריה* || *עליזי* (22:2); *עליזה* || *עליזה* (23:7); *עליו* || *עליו* (23:12); and *עליו* || *עליו* (32:13).

Ziegler (64) posits that the translator "frei ergänzt [ἐρχονται πληρῶσαι] um einen besseren Sinn zu bekommen," speculating, "viell. war sein Text verderbt." Whether the translator "frei ergänzt" ἐρχονται or did so by evoking *ויבאו* from 13:2 (where it has no equivalent), it is more likely that *πληρῶσαι* was supplied to fill out the sense of *לאפי* than that it reflects a divergent *Vorlage*. The fact that the translator supplied the infinitive as a verbal complement rather than as *πληροῦσιν* seems telling. In the wake of 13:2's summons, as well as 13:3's issuance of a command, ἐρχονται is contextually fitting (cf. *ἐρχεσθαι* || *באים*, 13:5).

Although +*ἄμα* in *χαίροντες ἄμα καὶ ὑβρίζοντες* || *עליזי גאותי* might signal simultaneous action (cf. *ὁ μεθύων καὶ ὁ ἐμὼν ἄμα* || *שכור בקיאו* in 19:14), its slot in the clause more likely accents shared exultation among the approaching *γίγαντες*, an effect of inserted *ἄμα* elsewhere (e.g., 24:14; 41:5; 44:11; 46:10).

13:4

ἐθνῶν πολλῶν || *המונ* is as much unparalleled as *καὶ οἱ μεγάλοι* || *והמונה* in 5:14 and (*διὰ φωνήν*) *τοῦ φόβου σου* || *(המונ) (מקול)* in 33:3. Only three times does this translator use an equivalent for *המונ* attested outside the book:

πλῆθος (5:13; 17:12; 63:5). Its most frequent equivalent is πλοῦτος (16:14; 29:5, 7, 8; 32:14; 60:5), which is unique in the Greek Bible.³ Although πολλῶν || המון finds precedent in πολλῶν (ἐθνῶν) || המון (גוים) in Gen 17:5, the translator likely supplied ἐθνῶν here to accord with ἐθνῶν πολλῶν || עם רב that follows.⁴ In turn, φωνῇ βασιλέων || קול שאון ממלכות rests on its parallel to φωνῇ ἐθνῶν πολλῶν, prompting analysis of ממלכות as metonymic for the rulers themselves. φωνῇ κραυγῆς || קול שאון in 66:6 suggests that the translator may have considered שאון a virtual synonym to קול and omitted it (cf. Van der Vorm-Croughs, 194).

Syriac's grammatically singular ܢܗܪܝܢ || בהרים is likely tied to its rendering of למקדשי with ܡܠܟܬܐ in 13:3, which led the translator to think of the Temple Mount.

Like ἐθνῶν πολλῶν || עם רב, S's ܡܠܟܬܐ || ܡܠܟܬܐ treats עם as a collective rather than a mass noun.

Although קול שאון || ܡܠܟܬܐ is apt, it is the same equivalent used for קול המון earlier (cf. ܡܠܟܬܐ || ܡܠܟܬܐ in 17:12).

The prefixed *dālat* on the participle ܡܠܟܬܐ || ܡܠܟܬܐ, creating a relative clause, is one of this translator's common strategies for attributive adjectives.

ܡܠܟܬܐ || ܡܠܟܬܐ occurs again in Ruth 1:6; Ps 17:3; Hos 4:14.

ἐθνει || צבא is unparalleled in the Bible. When צבא occurs in the grammatical singular, it is sometimes rendered with grammatically singular equivalents (e.g., τὸν κόσμον in 24:21; 40:26) whose use is attested elsewhere (κόσμος in Gen 2:1; Deut 4:19). ἐθνει amounts to a substitution for צבא, chosen for association with ὁπλομάχῳ (מלחמה), in a reverse of the process that generated οἱ στρατευσάμενοι || הגוים הצבאים in 29:7, where הגוים is suppressed (cf. ἀρχιστράτηγος || צבא in Gen 21:22, 32; 26:26). The adjective ὁπλομάχῳ || מלחמה is an equivalent that appears only here, although καὶ οἱ ὁπλομάχοι αὐτοῦ || וכלי זעמו (again unique) occurs in 13:5. This pairing of ἐθνει ὁπλομάχῳ and οἱ ὁπλομάχοι αὐτοῦ suggests that the translator had a clear conception of the role of those summoned.

3. In 33:3 the translator renders נפצו גוים מרוממתך נדדו עמים מקול המון with διὰ φωνῆς τοῦ φόβου σου ἐξέστησαν λαοὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ φόβου σου καὶ διεσπάρησαν τὰ ἔθνη, where the notion of the people's astonishment (ἐξέστησαν || נדדו, as in 10:31; 16:3), in speaking of ἡ δὲ σωτηρία ἡμῶν ἐν καιρῷ θλίψεως (13:2), seems to have guided the choice of τοῦ φόβου σου in both cases.

4. For the reverse, cf. ἐθνῶν πολλῶν || רבים, following ἐθνῶν πολλῶν || רבים in 17:12.

سلا construes צבא as a military force, using the grammatical plural in agreement with מַלְחָמָה || מִלְחָמָה, whose role as *nomen agentis* and grammatical number are determined by its connection with באים מארץ מרחק at the beginning of 13:5, where it likely condenses מארץ מרחק into ;סמל ,מח, implicitizing ארץ for conformity to ;סמל ,מח || מרחוק (e.g., 5:26; 22:11; 25:1). Compare ;סמל ,מח || ;סמל ,מח in 10:3.

13:5

Like S (see above), OG connects the end of 13:4 with 13:5 but by subordinating באים to מפקד :ἐντέταλται ... ἔρχεσθαι.

Although ἀπ' ἄκρου is a common equivalent for מקצה (5:26; 41:9; 42:10; 43:6) and τοῦ οὐρανοῦ renders השמים, θεμελίου lacks an evident equivalent. Ziegler (64) posits that it is "Doppelübers. von מקצה," although no other Greek equivalent for קצה approaches this sense, leaving this proposal tenuous.

Alternatively, Ziegler (64) opines, "θεμελίου ist viell. Zusatz des Übers., der das Mißverständnis ausschließen wollte, als ob 'vom höchsten Himmel' die Rede sei." Although that might offer a motivation for the addition, it is not clear why this translator would fear that inference when the translators of Neh 1:9 (ἀπ' ἄκρου τοῦ οὐρανοῦ || בקצה השמים) and Ps 18(19):7 (ἀπ' ἄκρου τοῦ οὐρανοῦ || (מקצה) השמים) apparently did not.

Although Van der Vorm-Croughs (37 n. 24) posits that possibly "the translator has borrowed θεμελίου from 13:13," where καὶ ἡ γῆ σεισθήσεται ἐκ τῶν θεμελίων αὐτῆς renders ותערע הארץ ממקומה, she does not offer a hypothesis about what might have motivated the borrowing. And although, as she notes, "τὰ θεμέλια τοῦ οὐρανοῦ also occurs in 2 Kgdms 22:8," there it aligns clearly with השמים מוסדות. There is no obvious reason that this translator should have associated 13:5 with that passage. In the end, there is no good explanation for why θεμελίου is here.

13:6

שדי appears only here in Isaiah. Syriac regularly translates the epithet elsewhere with ܫܕܝ (e.g., Num 24:4, 16; Ezek 1:24; Joel 1:15), much as OG here reads παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ || משידי.⁵ The same phrase as here, וכשד

5. For OG's συντριβή || בשד, cf. τὸ σύντριμμα || שד in 22:4; 59:7; 60:18.

משדי יבוא, appears in Joel 1:15, where S's rendering with ܡܫܕܝ ܝܒܘܐ spurs Warszawski (28) to label S's ܡܫܕܝ ܝܒܘܐ here "ein Schreibfehler," positing that "es muss dafür ܡܫܕܝ ܝܒܘܐ gelesen werden," a tenable resolution to the problem.⁶

13:7

πάσα χείρ || כל ידיים comports with OG's translation elsewhere of a grammatically plural noun following כל in the grammatical singular, yielding a distributive nuance, as in καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσαν κέδρον τοῦ Λιβάνου || ועל כל ארזי and καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶν δένδρον βαλάνου Βασαν || ועל כל אלוני הבשן, 2:13; πᾶν ὄρος || כל ההרים, 2:14; 7:25.

Old Greek's δειλιάσει || ימס (the only occurrence of δειλιάω in Isaiah) finds precedent in δειλιάνη || ימס in Deut 20:8 and καὶ διελύθησαν || וימסו in Judg 15:14. This translator uses ψυχή for לבב as frequently as καρδία.

13:8

The punctuation in 7a1 marks ܡܠܟܐ ܝܫܪܐܝܝܡ || ܡܠܟܐ ܝܫܪܐܝܝܡ as coordinate with ܡܠܟܐ ܝܫܪܐܝܝܡ || ܡܠܟܐ ܝܫܪܐܝܝܡ at the end of 13:7, making ܡܠܟܐ ܝܫܪܐܝܝܡ || ܡܠܟܐ ܝܫܪܐܝܝܡ a separate clause. Both OG and S read a 3mp object pronoun in their equivalents for ܡܠܟܐ ܝܫܪܐܝܝܡ: αὐτούς / ἐξουσίαν.⁷ A pronominal object is commonly specified with this phraseology elsewhere (cf. הלוא חבלים יאחזון, Jer 13:21; צרה וחבלים אחזתה, Jer 49:24; cf. Jer 22:23; Hos 13:13). Although it is possible that S's *Vorlage* read ܡܠܟܐ ܝܫܪܐܝܝܡ, the degree of the translator's manipulation of the word order raises the likelihood that he supplied the pronoun. Old Greek's tendency to add object pronouns makes that explanation likely for αὐτούς also.

οἱ πρέσβεις || צירים is the equivalent for forms containing צר again in 21:2 (צור); 57:9 (צריך); and 63:9 (צר). Syriac's ܡܠܟܐ ܝܫܪܐܝܝܡ (ܡ) accords with its use of ܡܠܟܐ ܝܫܪܐܝܝܡ for words containing צר (25:4; 26:16; 29:3; 49:19, 20; 59:19; 63:9).

6. Contrast S's ܡܠܟܐ ܝܫܪܐܝܝܡ || ܡܠܟܐ ܝܫܪܐܝܝܡ in Jer 6:26, where ܡܠܟܐ ܝܫܪܐܝܝܡ renders פתאם and ܡܠܟܐ ܝܫܪܐܝܝܡ is translated by ܡܠܟܐ ܝܫܪܐܝܝܡ.

7. OG places the pronoun before the verb, while S places the simile before the verb: ܡܠܟܐ ܝܫܪܐܝܝܡ || ܡܠܟܐ ܝܫܪܐܝܝܡ.

To ὡς γυναικὸς τικτούσης || בְּיִלְדָּה, compare ὡς ἡ τίκτουσα || בְּיִלְדָּה in 42:14. γυναικὸς is an explicitation similar to πιστοὺς ἀνθρώπους || נַאֲמָנִים in 8:2 (cf. 19:20, 25; 25:4).

For the lack of an equivalent for the suffix of רָעָה (τὸν ἕτερον), compare καὶ βοήσονται ἕτερος πρὸς τὸν ἕτερον || וְשַׁעֲרֵי עַל רָעָה יִקְרָא in 34:14.

καὶ τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτῶν ὡς φλόξ μεταβαλοῦσιν || פְּנֵי לִהְבִּים פְּנִיהֶם, following καὶ ἐκστήσονται || יִתְמָהוּ, is similar to 29:22, where οὐδὲ νῦν τὸ πρόσωπον μεταβαλεῖ Ἰσραήλ || פְּנֵי יַחֲוֹרֵי וְלֹא עֵתָה follows οὐ νῦν αἰσχυνθήσεται Ἰακώβ || לֹא עֵתָה יָבוֹשׁ יַעֲקֹב. In each case, the face mirrors the emotion of the preceding verb. In this case the change of face, compared to (the flicker of) a flame, registers astonishment.

13:9

ἀνίατος is a frequent equivalent for אֲכֹזֵר and אֲכֹזֵרִי throughout the Greek Bible. Syriac's equivalents are more diverse: ܠܡܥܬܐ (Deut 32:33; Jer 6:23; 50:24); ܠܡܥܬܐ (Jer 30:14); ܠܡܥܬܐ (Job 30:21); ܠܡܥܬܐ (Job 31:2); ܠܡܥܬܐ (Prov 5:9; 11:17; cf. 12:10; 17:11). Clauses containing ܠܡܥܬܐ elsewhere render locutions with אֵין + מְרַפָּא (Jer 14:19; Prov 6:15; 16:24; 29:1; 2 Chr 21:18; 36:16), although it is used as an equivalent for אֲכֹזֵר in Lam 4:3. These diverse equivalents undermine confidence that ܠܡܥܬܐ evinces dependence on OG (*pace* Warszawski, 9).

For καὶ ὀργῆς || וְחֵרוֹן אָף, compare ἡ ἄν ἐπέλθῃ ὁ θυμὸς αὐτοῦ || וְבִיּוֹם וְחֵרוֹן אָפו in 13:13, and see the discussion at 9:18. Syriac translates all three nouns, rendering the first two as predicate adjectives modifying ܐܝܢܐ || ܐܝܢܐ, which bears a +3ms pronominal suffix anaphoric to ܐܝܢܐ.

ὅλος is the only universal quantifier with οἰκουμένη in OG-Isaiah. οἰκουμένη ὅλη || כָּל הָאָרֶץ occurs eight times (10:14, 23; 13:5, 9, 11; 14:17, 26; 37:18), while (οἰκουμένη) + ὅλη stands without a parallel in other witnesses here; 13:11; and 14:17. In each case it was likely supplied by the translator. See appendix A.

The definite article of τοὺς ἁμαρτωλούς || וְחַטְאִיָּה suffices for the pronominal suffix. The shift ἀπολέσαι || יִשְׁמִיד coordinates with the preceding θεῖναι || לִשּׁוֹם.

13:10

The only analogue to καὶ ὁ Ὠρίων || וְכִסְלִיָּהֶם is καὶ φραγμὸν Ὠρίωνος ἤνοιξας || אִו מְשׁוֹכֹת כְּסִיל תִּפְתַּח in Job 38:31 (following συνήκας δὲ δεσμὸν

καὶ ἀπολῶ || והשבתי comports with the wide range of words for which this translator uses ἀπόλλυμι, such as ואסירה (1:25), ישחיתו (11:9), נדחי (11:12), יכרתו (11:13), and לשבר (14:25).

καὶ ὕβριν ὑπερηφάνων || וגאות עריצים accords with OG's rendering of ערי elsewhere as denoting evil action (ἀδικουμένων in 25:3, 4; ἄνομος [parallel to ὑπερήφανος || לץ] in 29:20).

חמלא || עריצים occurs again in 25:3, 4, 5; 29:5.

13:12

Although καὶ ἔσονται οἱ καταλελειμμένοι lacks a semantic counterpart, it likely explicitizes אנוש as survivors of the day of the Lord in the foregoing verses (cf. his insertion of καὶ ἔσονται οἱ καταλελειμμένοι at the outset of 13:14).

Although the relationship of ἔντιμος to אוקיר is evident (cf. ἔντιμον || יקרת, 28:16; ἔντιμος ἐγένου || יקרת, 43:4) and μᾶλλον ἢ τὸ χρυσίον renders מפז (cf. χρυσᾶς, Song 5:15; χρυσᾶ, Job 28:17), this is the only occurrence of ἄπυρος in the Greek Bible. Perhaps the translator supplied τὸ ἄπυρον to specify what sort of gold proves inferior to οἱ καταλελειμμένοι. Although this is speculative, it seems more likely than positing an otherwise unattested Hebrew equivalent here.

Although אופיר frequently denotes a type of gold (1 Kgs 9:28; 10:11; 22:49; 1 Chr 29:4; 2 Chr 8:18; 9:19) and כתם אופיר is translated with ἐν ἱματισμῷ διαχρύσω in Ps 44[45]:10 and χρυσίω Ωφיר in Job 28:16, (μᾶλλον ἔντιμος ἔσται ἢ) ὁ λίθος ὁ ἐν σουφίρ || כתם אופיר (מ) here is similar to λίθω πολυτελεῖ || לכתם אמרתי in Job 31:24 and σάρδιον πολυτελές || וחלי כתם in Prov 25:12. For σουφίρ || אופיר, compare 3 Kgdms 9:28; 10:11.

13:13

ἐκ τῶν θεμελίων αὐτῆς || ממקומה is comparable to καὶ εἰς τὰ θεμέλια τῆς γῆς || אל ירכתי בור in 14:15 and θεμέλια τῆς γῆς || תחתיות ארץ in 44:23.

As in 9:18 (q.v.), חבלא is to be preferred over חבלא.

ὁ γὰρ οὐρανὸς θυμωθήσεται translates שמים ארגז in the passive voice, in harmony with the following καὶ ἡ γῆ σεισθήσεται || ותרעש הארץ.

Regarding διὰ θυμὸν ὀργῆς κυρίου || בעברת יהוה, see the comments on 9:18(19), where the same equivalent occurs.

To τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἣ ἂν ἐπέλθῃ ὁ θυμὸς αὐτοῦ || וביום חרון אפו, compare τῇ δὲ ἡμέρᾳ ἣ ἂν φυτεύσῃς || ביום נטע in 17:11.

13:14

Although $\text{חֲמֵץ} \parallel \text{מִדַּח}$ accords with S's equivalents for נדח elsewhere (e.g., $\text{חֲמֵץ} \parallel \text{נִדְחִים}$ 16:3; $\text{חֲמֵץ} \parallel \text{נִדְחִי}$ 11:12; $\text{חֲמֵץ} \parallel \text{מִנְדַּח}$ 8:22; $\text{חֲמֵץ} \parallel \text{בְּמִנְדַּח}$), its use also correlates with $\text{חֲמֵץ} \parallel \text{יָנוּסוּ}$ at the end of the verse.

$\text{καὶ ἔσονται οἱ καταλελειμμένοι} \parallel \text{וְהָיָה}$ transfers here 13:12's (καὶ ἔσονται) $\text{οἱ καταλελειμμένοι}$, as an explication of אֲנוּשׁ as those who survive the day of the Lord. Parallel to $\text{ὡς δορκάδιον φεύγον} \parallel \text{כַּצְבִּי מִדַּח}$, the translator appears to have supplied πλανώμενον to modify $\text{καὶ ὡς πρόβατον} \parallel \text{וְכִצְאָן}$, while the insertion of ὥστε to create hypotaxis for $\text{ἀποστραφῆναι} \parallel \text{יָפְנוּ}$ and $\text{διῶξαι} \parallel \text{יָנוּסוּ}$ gives to $\text{καὶ οὐκ ἔσται ὁ συνάγων} \parallel \text{וְאֵין מִקְבֵּץ}$ a different role in the sentence than is marked by *athnach* in MT.¹¹ Although the collocation of πλανάω and πρόβατον may have suggested itself naturally, in 21:15 the translator pairs them either by a double rendering of נדדו or by associating נטושה with נטה: $\text{διὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν φευγόντων καὶ διὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν πλανωμένων καὶ διὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῆς μαχαίρας} \parallel \text{כִּי מִפְּנֵי חֲרָבוֹת נִדְדוּ מִפְּנֵי חֶרֶב}$ (Van der Vorm-Croughs, 175).¹² There is no necessity to suppose that $\text{καὶ ὡς πρόβατον πλανώμενον}$ in 13:14 attests a *Vorlage* reading נטושה .

וְהָיָה indicates that, rather than construing וְהָיָה as predicate for the compound clause begun by אִישׁ אֶל עָמוֹ (which S sets off from with a conjunctive *waw*: וְ), it assumes an unidentified group as subject. Given the absence of a plural noun in 13:12–13, the likely suspects are the “wicked,” “boastful,” and “mighty” of 13:11. The result is four distinct clauses, the first two affording comparisons that signal distress and the last two describing the group's flight.

Old Greek creates a connection between the clauses whose topic is flight by inserting ὥστε and reformulating יָפְנוּ and יָנוּסוּ as infinitives. Although διῶκω is otherwise transitive in Isaiah (most often rendering רָדַף but also שׁוּדַד [16:4] and מַחֲרִיד [17:2]), GELS (s.v. “ διῶκω ”) cites examples of διῶκω as fientive, “to move with speed”: Jer 28:31 ($3\text{x} \parallel \text{רוץ}$); Hag 1:9 ($\parallel \text{רוץ}$); Amos 6:12 ($\parallel \text{רוץ}$); Nah 3:2 ($\parallel \text{דָּהַר}$).

13:15

ἀλῶ is intelligible as OG's semantic finessing of הִנְמָצָא in describing the aftermath of the day of the Lord. דָּקַר appears only here in Isaiah, but is fre-

11. Cf. $\text{φεύγουσιν} \parallel \text{נִדְחִים}$ in 16:3; $\text{οἱ φυγάδες} \parallel \text{נִדְחִי}$ in 16:4.

12. נטושה and חרב are collapsed into a single equivalent: τῆς μαχαίρας .

quently translated by *κεντέω* (Num 25:8; 1 Kgdms 31:4[2x]; Jer 44[37]:10; 28[51]:4; Lam 4:9), raising doubts about how likely it would have been that the translator did not recognize it.¹³ Although this translator often employs *ἡττάω* to render *חתת* (8:9; 20:5; 30:31; 31:9; 51:7), he also uses it for other verbs implying harm (*ימס*, 19:1; *יבגדו*, 33:1; *תרשיעי*, 54:17), which might be why he resorted to it here. Syriac, on the other hand, is transparent to a text like MT.

ܠܡܥܢ ספܘܬ || *ܝܡܫܥ* construes *הנספה* as a form of *יסק* (cf. *ܝܡܫܥ* || *למען ספוח*, Deut 29:18). *ספה* occurs elsewhere in Isaiah only in 7:20, where S translates *תספה* with *ܝܡܫܥ*.¹⁴ Although it is possible that S's *Vorlage* read *הנוספה*, as Warszawski (28) posited, it is at least as likely that *ܝܡܫܥ* reflects a text like MT, with *ܝܡܫܥ* inflected to agree with the preceding *ܡܠܚܡܐ*.

στυγγωμένοι associates *הנספה* with *אסף* via biliteral etymology, despite its translation of *תספה* with *ἀφελῆ* in 7:20.¹⁵

13:16

Whereas suitable Greek equivalents are given for the four instances of *רטש* elsewhere (*ἐνσείσεις* in 4 Kgdms 8:12; *ἐδαφίζω* in Hos 10:14; 14:1; Nah 3:10), *ῥάξουσι* || *ירטשו* is odd, as is *στυτρίψουσιν* || *תרטשנה* in 13:18. Both Greek verbs are employed for unusual counterparts elsewhere in the book (*ῥήγνυμι* || *שגב* in 9:11[10]; *ντשו* in 33:23; *פצח* in 49:13; 52:9; 54:1; *στυτρίβω* || *גדע* in 10:33; 14:12; *קרס* in 46:1). *ῥάξουσι* likely substitutes for a verb the translator did not recognize.

ܝܡܫܥ || *ירטשו* piques interest by its semantic similarity to *ῥάξουσι* and by the fact that its *ܬܪܬܫܢܐ* || *תרטשנה* in 13:18 similarly accords with OG's *στυτρίψουσιν*. However, *ܡܫܥ* is S's equivalent for *רטש* in 2 Kgs 8:12; Hos 10:14; 14:1; Nah 3:10.

For *ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν* || *לעיניהם*, compare *καὶ ἐνώπιον ἑαυτῶν* || *ונגד פניהם* in 5:21 and the examples cited there.

The equivalent *ܬܫܓܠܐ* || *תשגלה* is found again in Zech 14:2, one of only three other occurrences of *שגל* in the Bible, the others being Deut 28:30

13. On the other hand, the equivalent for *דקר* in Zech 12:10 is *κατορχέομαι*, while *στυμμιζω* renders it in Zech 13:3, perhaps reflecting that translator's lack of familiarity with it.

14. Cf. S's equivalents for *ספה* in Gen 18:23, 24 (*ܡܫܥܐ* || *תספה*); 19:15 (*ܠܫܬܐ* || *תספה*); 19:17 (*ܠܫܬܐ* || *תספה*; cf. Num 16:26); Deut 32:33 (*ܠܫܬܐ* || *תספה*).

15. See Tov, "Biliteral Exegesis," 473.

(ישגלנה || נסחֶסֶה); Jer 3:2 (שגלת || שגלת). ἔξουσιν || תשגלנה finds a parallel in Deut 28:30's καὶ ἄνθρωπος ἕτερος ἔξει αὐτήν || נישגלנה (contrast ἔξεφύρθη || שגלת in Jer 3:2; μολυνθήσονται || תשגלנה in Zech 14:2).¹⁶

13:17

For ἰδοὺ ἐπεγείρω || הנני מעיר, compare καὶ ἐπεγερεῖ || ועורר in 10:26.

The second-person pronouns in ὑμῖν and حَاصְف || עליהם (unattested in any other witness) are difficult to comprehend as intentional modifications, since there have been no second-person plural forms since the imperative ὁλολύετε/لَا || הילילי in 13:6, and both OG and S represent the four 3mp pronominal suffixes in 13:16. Old Greek's second-person plural pronoun τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν || ופרי בטן (פֶּלֶא; בְּחֵא) in 13:18 might be due to the translator (but see below). The next second-person pronoun appears in 14:3. Thus the *Vorlagen* of both OG and S likely read עליכם in place of עליהם.

χρεῖαν ἔχω || חפץ occurs also in Jer 22:28; 31(48):38; Prov 18:2; Job 31:16.

The construction לא יחשבו || לא יספד חסֶה finds a parallel twice in 40:16 (אין די עולה || לא יספד חסֶה חסֶה) and twice in 40:17 (נחשבו לוֹ || יספד חסֶה; באין נגדו || אֵב לא יספד חסֶה).

13:18

For τοξεύματα || וקשתות, see the comments on 7:24.

συντρίψουσιν (|| תרטשנה) renders diverse verbs in Isaiah (see the comment on ῥάξουσιν || ירטשו in 13:16). However, it is regularly used in phrases about breaking bows (Pss 36[37]:15; 45[46]:10; 75[76]:4; Hos 1:5; 2:29; Jer 25[49]:35), which likely influenced its choice here.

Although S otherwise translates רטש with عصف (as in 13:16) and typically uses لَحْ for שבר or חתת, it translates טרפו with لَحْ, لَحْ in 31:4 (see also לَحْ || טרף, 5:29) and והזורר with لَحْ, لَحْ in 59:5. Syriac likely chose مقطع ... תרטשנה || קשתות שבר/חתת (e.g., 1 Sam 2:4; Ps 37:15; Jer 51:56; Zech 9:10). Its similarity to συντρίψουσιν owes to polygenesis.

16. In each passage the *masorah qetannah* commends a form of כבש as *qere*, with which OG shows no familiarity.

The OG translator could be responsible for (καὶ τὰ τέκνα) ὑμῶν || ופרי בטן (itself a harmonization with τοῖς τέκνοις || בנים), along with the addition of the pronoun, with a view to ὑμῖν in 13:17. However, S's בנים || خبوسه provokes a question. Although S might have supplied the pronoun to add specificity, such an addition would be atypical for it, compelling consideration that its *Vorlage* might have read בניהם. It is, accordingly, possible that OG's ἐπὶ τοῖς τέκνοις reflects that reading, with the article referring anaphorically to τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν. If so, the pronoun ὑμῶν would have been added in anticipation of בניהם, while modifying its third-person plural pronoun to accord with the second-person pronoun in 13:17. Although this degree of speculation problematizes this hypothesis, OG's pattern of using the article with the force of a pronoun makes it conceivable, if unprovable.

The plural forms οὐ φείσονται οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτῶν and لا يسهو حتموه || לא תחוס עינם are so frequently adjustments by the translators as to make any determination of whether either of them read something different than MT impossible.

13:19

Syriac translates צבי with سلا again in 23:9; 24:16; 28:1, 4.

The alignments between ἡ καλεῖται ἔνδοξος ὑπὸ βασιλέως Χαλδαίων and צבי ממלכות תפארת גאון כשדים are: (1) ἔνδοξος as the equivalent for צבי (cf. τῶν ἐνδόξων || צבי, 23:9), תפארת (cf. τοὺς ἐνδόξους || פארה, 10:33), and גאון (cf. ἡ δόξα σου || גאוןך, 14:11); (2) βασιλέως as the equivalent for ממלכות; and (3) Χαλδαίων for כשדים. The introduction of ἡ καλεῖται and the association of ממלכות with כשדים to create ὑπὸ βασιλέως Χαλδαίων yield a concise statement about Babylon's downfall.

13:20

εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα χρόνον || לנצח appears again in 33:20 (cf. 9:7[6]; 34:17).

εἰσέλθωσιν || שכן is anomalous, since שכן elsewhere in Isaiah is rendered by κατοικέω (οἰκέω in 33:16) or ἀναπαύω (as in 13:21), while εἰσερχομαι is otherwise the equivalent for בוא. εἰσέλθωσιν || שכן was perhaps chosen as a companion to διέλθωσιν || יהל', itself explicable via biliteral association of יהל' with יהלך (cf. Warzawski, 28; Seeligmann, 65).¹⁷

17. The natural pairing of these verbs is evident in Ezek 44:2's equivalents for בא: καὶ οὐδεὶς μὴ διέλθῃ δι' αὐτῆς ὅτι κύριος ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ εἰσελεύσεται δι' αὐτῆς || ואיש יבא בו לא יבא בו כי יהוה אלהי יושב בו (cf. Josh 19:27).

Old Greek's supply of εἰς αὐτήν to complement εἰσέλθωσιν parallels its frequent insertion of a pronominal object with a verb (see Van der Vorm-Croughs, 49). Similar are his renderings of שם⁽¹⁾ with αὐτήν and שם⁽²⁾ with ἐν αὐτῇ as complements to the immediately preceding verbs (cf. ἐκεῖ || שם [3x] in 13:21).

13:21

θηρία || ציים is unusual. θηρίον elsewhere in Isaiah renders בהמה (2x) or חיה (5x), while ציים appears again only in 23:13; 34:14. While in 23:13 OG's divergences from all other witnesses obscure identifying an equivalent to לציים, in 34:14 καὶ συναντήσουσι δαιμόνια ὀνοκένταυροι || ושער ציים את אים creates uncertainty by dint of its quantitative differences. Although δαιμόνια || ושער seems similar to καὶ δαιμόνια || ושעירים in 13:21, the word order of 34:14 seems to align δαιμόνια with ציים or אים.¹⁸ Meanwhile, ὀνοκένταυροι || אים in 13:22 might leave ושער in 34:14 unaligned. The only other instance of ὀνοκένταυροι is in 34:11, where καὶ ὀνοκένταυροι οἰκήσουσιν ἐν αὐτῇ || ואבני בהו חריה is likely a phrase substituted in accord with καὶ κατοικήσουσιν ἐν αὐτῇ ὄρνεα καὶ ἐχῖνοι καὶ ἴβεις καὶ κόρακες earlier in the verse (cf. Van der Vorm-Croughs, 346 n. 108).

Likewise, σειρήνες || בנות יענה appears only here (13:21) in Isaiah, while σειρήνες || בנות תנים stands alongside (θυγατέρες) στρούθων || בנות יענה in 34:14; 43:20 (cf. Jer 27[50]:39; Mic 1:8). Meanwhile, ותנים is rendered by ἐχῖνοι in 13:22 (which renders קפד in 14:23; 34:11 and קפוז in 34:15), while התנין is rendered by τὸν δράκοντα in 27:1.

The upshot of these comparisons is that the translator likely had no fixed equivalents for these terms. Accordingly, he might have chosen θηρία as a generic term under which to categorize the creatures in 13:21–22. Most likely, as Ziegler (142) observes, “Der Übers. nennt jeweils die gleichen Fabeltiere, weil ihm die Tiere der Vorlage nicht genau bekannt waren; als Prädikat faßt er an den verschiedenen Stellen die gleiche Tätigkeit.” This is reminiscent of 3:18–23, where OG offered not a translation per se, but, given a listing of apparel, “zählte er die bekanntesten Stücke mit den griech. Namen seiner Zeit auf” (Ziegler, 208).

18. In its only other appearances in Isaiah, τῷ δαιμονίῳ aligns with לגד in 65:11, while it is a plus in 65:3.

Syriac's ܣܝܝܡ || ציים need not be attributed to taking its cue from OG's *θηρία*, given T's use of תמוז || ציים here and again in 34:14. Each translator has rendered ציים with a generic name for creatures said to inhabit abandoned Babylon. Neither is ܣܝܝܡ || ܫܥܝܪܝܡ chosen by comparison with OG's *καὶ δαιμόνια*, since ܣܝܡ is again the equivalent for ܫܥܝܪ in 34:14 and stands as the equivalent for ܫܥܝܪ already in Lev 17:7 (ܠܫܥܝܪ || ܡܥܝܪ).

Old Greek's lack of a personal pronoun with αἱ οἰκίαι (|| בתיהם) implies that the article is anaphoric to Babylon, via ἐκεῖ, although likely with a view to the city's denizens, as suggested by ἐν τοῖς οἴκοις αὐτῶν || בהיכלי in 13:22 (q.v.).

Seeligmann's (30) suggestion that ἡχου is "a consciously applied alteration" of a transcription of אַחִים stands among his proposals that ἐν ὁδῶ || בְּנֵי in 10:32 belies an earlier transcription ἐν νοβ or ἐν νοδ, that lying behind ὡς νεαρός || כְּנָצֵר in 14:19 is νεσρ, and that σίγα in 32:5 arose from a transliteration of שׁוּעַ. Although each of these Greek lexemes is problematic as an equivalent for its Hebrew counterpart and each has a phonological connection to the Hebrew, one must tolerate considerable speculation to accept Seeligmann's diagnosis. With a translation that treats its source text as supplely as this one, other explanations are more likely. In this case, the inference of noise filling the abandoned houses befits θηρία and σερήνες. Syriac's ܠܬܝܬܐܢܐ || אַחִים designates animals that make noise, parallel to ܠܬܝܬܐܢܐ || בְּנוֹת יַעֲנָה. The similarity of this to ἡχου might point to a shared understanding of אַחִים, although it is hardly inconceivable that S and OG should reach similar inferences about with what these animals would fill the abandoned houses, especially since S renders יַעֲנָה in 13:22 with ܡܚܬܝܬܐ (contrast κατοικήσουσι) and understands its subject as ܡܚܬܝܬܐ.

Old Greek's καὶ ἀναπαύσονται || ושכנו is found again in 32:16; 34:17; 57:15. To ἐκεῖ || שם, compare ἐκεῖ || באלמנותיו in 13:22.

13:22

Syriac's and OG's renderings differ markedly. Old Greek's substitution of *ἐκαῖ* for *באלמנותיו*, followed by a verb that accords better with 13:21's portrayal of animals who *ἀναπαύσονται ἐκαῖ* than with *וענה*, suggest that the translator's word choices were influenced by context.¹⁹ His insertion of

19. Seeligmann's (51) suggestion that OG preserves memory of ענה as "to reside," based more "on a traditional or living verbal custom than on any linguistic-comparative method," is nothing more than speculation.

|| לא תזכרי עוד || לו לא לו, in accord with 54:4.²² These additions are equally possible for a scribe or the translator.

As for || לו לא לו || here, *עוד + משך* occurs again only in Ezek 12:25, where לו לא renders *עוד תמשך לו*, and three verses later (12:28), where לו לא renders the same phrase. The possibility that S's לו attests *עוד* in its *Vorlage* in Isa 13:22 is enhanced by *עוד* in 1QIsa^a.

Seeligmann (72) characterized ταχὺ ἔρχεται καὶ οὐ χρονεῖ || *וקרוב לבוא* as a “very free rendering” that carries “a distinct echo of Hab. 2.3,” where οὐδὲ ἔρχόμενος ἤξει καὶ οὐ μὴ χρονίσῃ renders *כי בא יבא*. Ziegler (112) more explicitly attributed χρονεῖ to “eine direkte Wiedergabe von Hab 2,3,” which he hypothesized “bereits an den Rand von Js 14,1 geschrieben war.” This presupposes his perception that Hab 2:3 “trägt in der LXX sicherlich messianischen Charakter” and that “χρονίζειν besagt das Verschieben, das Verzögern des Heiles” that was central to the “Messias Hoffnungen” of the era when OG-Isaiah was produced. Although eschatological delay is a frequent motif in literature of the Second Temple period, it is linguistically problematic to use a perceived role of οὐ μὴ χρονίσῃ in the discourse setting of Hab 2:3 to explain οὐ χρονεῖ here.

As Cécile Dogniez observes, “il n’est pas absolument certain que le lien avec Habacuc soit délibéré et l’on peut penser à une traduction tributaire d’une exégèse de l’époque du traducteur ou à une traduction libre.”²³ In favor of “une traduction libre” she points to the equally opaque ἐν γὰρ τῷ σῶζεσθαι σε οὐ στήσεται οὐδὲ χρονεῖ || *מהר צעה להפתח ולא ימות* in 51:14. However one explains that rendering’s relationship to MT, whose text is largely confirmed by other witnesses, οὐ στήσεται οὐδὲ χρονεῖ qualifies ἐν γὰρ τῷ σῶζεσθαι σε, suggesting the swift arrival of salvation (cf. 51:5), in contrast to καὶ ἰδοὺ ταχὺ κούφως ἔρχονται || *והנה מהרה קל יבוא* in 5:26, which stresses the swift arrival of the warriors whom the Kyrios has summoned.²⁴ Consequently, “rien

22. This diction is found more frequently outside Isaiah (e.g., Jer 11:19; 23:36; 31:34; Ezek 23:27; Hos 2:19; Zech 13:2).

23. Cécile Dogniez, “Le traducteur d’Isaïe connaissait-il le texte grec du Dodekapropheten?” *Adamantius* 13 (2007): 31.

24. Rejecting Fischer’s (62) proposal that ἐν γὰρ τῷ σῶζεσθαι σε derives from *להפתח*, Ziegler (113) posited that “hat LXX hier den Stamm יָשַׁע vermutet und die zwei ersten Worte in בְּחֹשֶׁיךָ verlesen” and ignored *להפתח*. He identified οὐ στήσεται as equivalent to *ולא ימות* “das in יַעֲמֹד לא erlesen oder besser verhört wurde,” while οὐδὲ

ne nous indique qu'il y a un emprunt volontaire de la part du traducteur d'Isaïe à ce passage précis des XII."²⁵ A description of the relationship of OG to MT must focus on this verse.

ταχὺ ἔρχεται has a perceptible semantic relationship to וקרוב לבוא, to which we can compare ἐγγίξει ταχὺ ἡ δαίμωνισσὺν μου || קרוב צדקי, 51:5. The lack of a discrete equivalent for עתה is intelligible in light of πρὸς ἐσπέραν || לעת ערב (17:14), τότε || בעת ההיא (20:2), and ἡνίκα ἐγένετο || מעת היותה (48:16). Similarly, the implicit role of (ו)ימיה within καὶ οὐ χρονεῖ || ימיה לא ימשכו is comparable to σπέρμα μακρόβιον || זרע יאריך (to (ו)ימיה (לא) ימשכו) in 53:10. χρονεῖ suggests a semantic analysis of ימשכו (to “draw out days” = to “delay”) parallel to the semantics it inferred from וקרוב לבוא עתה.

Ziegler (112) was likely right, however, in judging that ταχὺ ἔρχεται καὶ οὐ χρονεῖ is closely linked to καὶ ἐλεήσει κύριος τὸν Ιακωβ in 14:1 (q.v.).

χρονεῖ derives from ולא יחסר, for which the translator chose χρονίζειν over ὑστερεῖν. Despite my agreement with Ziegler against Fischer's (62) conclusion that “LXX kein Äquivalent hatte oder der Text verlorengegangen sei ... ist unwahrscheinlich,” most of Ziegler's speculations strain credulity, even if οὐδὲ χρονεῖ may have been the translator's choice for ולא יחסר. 1QIsa^a reads צרה for צעה, while S reads حَسْبُ, V *gradiens*, and T פורענא. S's equivalent for להפתח is حَسْبُ, while it shares with T a difference in the grammatical number of ימות (ימותון/ימות), which V renders in the third-person singular but as causative (*interficiet*).

25. Dogniez, “Traducteur d'Isaïe,” 31.

ISAIAH 14

14:1

Ziegler (112) regarded *ταχὺ ἔρχεται καὶ οὐ χρονιεῖ* as the beginning of a new literary unit (14:1–2), “wo von der Wiederherstellung Israels gesprochen wird.”¹ The signal that 14:1 continues 13:22 is the translator’s choice of *καί* for *כִּי*, rather than, say, *ὅτι* or *γάρ* (cf. S *כִּי* *וְכִי* *וְכִי*). Whether this means that *ταχὺ ἔρχεται κατλ* introduces a discrete unit is another question. Whereas Ziegler inferred that based on a shift to the theme of Israel’s restoration, other word choices question how distinct the translator considered these verses from what preceded them.

Although *καὶ ἀναπαύσονται* || *והניחם* is a lexical equivalence found elsewhere (7:19; 11:2; 14:3), we might have expected a transitive verb form, as with *ἀναπαύσει σε* || *והניח* in 14:3. Retroversion of *καὶ ἀναπαύσονται* should yield *ונוחו* (cf. 7:19). However, comparing this rendering with *ἐκεῖ ἀναπαύσονται ὀνοκένταυροι* || *שם הרגיעה לילית* in 34:14 gives reason to suspect that the translator effected the semantic shift. Surveying the use of this verb elsewhere brings further light to bear.

Although *ἀναπαύω* (18x) and *ἀνάπαυσις* (9x) are dispersed throughout the book, six occurrences cluster in 13:21–14:4, another three in 32:16–18, and three others in 34:14–17. We have already noted that the translator drew *καὶ νοσσοποιήσουσιν* in 13:22 from 34:15. His attraction to 34:14–17 in rendering this passage is understandable, given its similar theme of *δαιμόνια*, *ὀνοκένταυροι*, and *ἐχθὺς* inhabiting vacated properties.

Isaiah 32:16–18 equally bears an affinity with these verses, inasmuch as, following a call to lament the abandonment of the land and dwellings of “my people” to animals (32:9–15), 14:16–17 forecast the resting (*ἀναπαύσεται*) of *κρίμα καὶ δικαιοσύνη* in the wilderness, with *δικαιοσύνη*

1. That matches V’s versification: *prope est ut veniat tempus eius et dies eius non elongabuntur miserebitur enim Dominus Iacob.*

“laying hold of rest” (καὶ κρατήσει ἡ δικαιοσύνη ἀνάπαυσιν). Isaiah 14:18 then claims that ὁ λαὸς αὐτοῦ will dwell securely καὶ ἀναπαύσονται μετὰ πλούτου, similar to the scene of restoration announced in 14:1–2.

It is not the mere clusters of these lexemes that prove salient but how the translator effected them. ἀναπαύω, ἀνάπαυσις, and ἀνάπαυμα (14:1, 3; 32:18; 34:14) are regular equivalents for נוח, מנוח, and מנוחה (thirteen of eighteen times), just as ἀναπαύω is the common equivalent for רבץ (six of eight times), as in 13:20, 21. However, even though ἀναπαύω renders שכן (found in these passages in 13:21; 32:16; 34:17) again in 57:15 and translates שקט (found in 32:17) again in 57:20, it renders שבת only in 14:4 (2x) and רגע only in 34:14.² The translator’s use of ἀναπαύω, ἀνάπαυσις, and ἀνάπαυμα for varied lexemes in a narrow range of verses that are thematically related comports with Ziegler’s (135) observation, “Der Js.-Übers. scheint überhaupt sein Buch sehr gut dem Inhalte nach im Gedächtnis gehabt zu haben; denn es begegnen viele Wiedergaben, die sich nur auf Grund der Exegese nach sinnerwandten Stellen erklären lassen.”

ἀναπαύσονται || והניחם in 14:1 activates a contrast with the animals who abide (καὶ ἀναπαύσονται || ורבצו, 13:21) in Babylon’s abandoned spaces, similar to the way that 32:16–18 counters the abandonment of Israel’s land with a new habitation. For that reason, it seems likely that the translator regarded 14:1 as continuing 13:21–22, anticipating the promise to the people that God would give them rest (ἀναπαύσει σε || הניח יהוה לך) from their previous afflictions, putting them in a position to mock the rest (ἀναπέπαιται || שבת [2x]) of Babylon’s king (14:3–4).

Syriac’s rendering of the verb in ܡܪܚܡ ܡܢܠ || ܡܪܚܡ ܡܢܠ might raise suspicion that its *Vorlage* read ܡܪܚܡ. Its subsequent rendering of ܡܪܚܡ with a participle, ܡܪܚܡܐ, assumes no morphologically different reading but could suggest that a scribe had modified ܡܪܚܡ to ܡܪܚܡܐ. However, because S’s rendering of these clauses smacks of a confessional formulation (ܡܪܚܡܐ ܡܢܠ ܡܪܚܡܐ ܡܢܠ), it is likely that liturgical traditions have shaped the rendering. All other witnesses (OG, V, T, 1QIsa^a, and 4Q57) agree with MT.

2. The most frequent equivalents for שכן are permutations of οἰκέω (seven of thirteen times), while שקט is otherwise rendered with ἡσυχάζει (7:4), πεποιθώς (14:7), ἀσφάλεια (18:4), and ἀνῆσω (62:1). שבת is translated with πέπαιται in 16:10, 24:8 (2x); 33:8; ἀφαιρέω in 30:11; ἀπόλλυμι in 13:11; and καὶ οὐκέτι ἔσται in 17:3 (2x). Elsewhere רגע is translated with ταχύ (51:4) and ὁ παράσσω (51:15).

Syriac explicitizes the collective sense of הָגַר by translating it with a grammatical plural (ܚܚܪܝܢ), coordinate with the grammatical number of its verb: ܚܚܪܝܢ ܘܢܠܐܐ (cf. T's גִּיּוּרִין וְנִלְוָה).

ܐܒܚܪ ܥܘܕ ܣܡܚܠܬܐ ܠܥܡ ܚܝܣܪܐܝܠ seems to bear a different nuance than ܐܒܚܪ ܥܘܕ. Whereas MT speaks of a new selection of Israel, S diverges from its use of ܚܚܪ for the three previous occurrences of ܐܒܚܪ (1:29; 7:15, 16) and for thirteen out of its fifteen remaining occurrences.³ The two exceptions are relevant for ܐܒܚܪ || ܣܡܚܠܬܐ here. Isaiah 66:3 concludes with:

ܓܡ ܗܡܐ ܒܚܪܝܢ ܒܕܪܟܝܗܡ ܐܢܝ ܐܠܐܝܡ ܠܐܝܚܝܬܐ ܚܐܣܬܐܠܡܐܝܬܐ
ܐܒܫܩܘܥܝܗܡ ܢܦܫܐ ܚܦܥܐ ܣܚܠܐ ܢܦܫܐ ܚܦܥܐ

The deliberation over their ways (ܐܠܐܝܚܝܬܐ || ܒܚܪܝܢ) that results in their delight in idols receives a studied contrast in 66:4: ܓܡ ܐܢܝ || ܐܢܐ ܠܚܐ ܚܝܠܐ ܚܝܠܐ ܚܝܠܐ ܚܝܠܐ ܚܝܠܐ. Similarly, ܐܒܚܪ || ܣܡܚܠܬܐ in 14:1 expresses God's delight in Israel.

Syriac's ܐܢܝ ܐܠܐܝܡ || ܐܢܝ ܐܠܐܝܡ finds a parallel in 65:15 (ܐܠܐܝܡܝܢ) and accords with the rendering of the *hiphil* of ܢוּחַ with ܡܚܡ elsewhere (e.g., Gen 2:5; 49:23; Exod 16:24; 36:10).

Old Greek translates both ܐܠܐܝܡ and ܐܒܚܪ with *προστέθῃσεται*. Although this translator otherwise uses *προστίθημι* for יָסַף, *προστίθημι* renders לִוֶּה outside Isaiah (e.g., Num 18:2, 4).⁴ The translator was likely unfamiliar with סָפַח, as seems the case with all other Greek translators who confront the verb (1 Kgdms 2:36; 26:19; Hab 2:15; Job 30:7). Syriac's ܐܠܐܝܡܝܢ likely also reflects unfamiliarity with סָפַח, although it is hardly sustainable to posit dependence on OG for its word choice, given its ܐܠܐܝܡ || ܐܠܐܝܡ (versus *προστέθῃσεται*) in the preceding clause.

14:2

ܐܢܝ ܐܠܐܝܡ || ܐܢܝ ܐܠܐܝܡ is an equivalent attested elsewhere (e.g., ܐܢܝ ܐܠܐܝܡ || ܐܢܝ ܐܠܐܝܡ, 28:19; ܐܢܝ ܐܠܐܝܡ || ܐܢܝ ܐܠܐܝܡ, 36:17) and is more contextually apt than, say, ܐܢܝ ܐܠܐܝܡ (8:1; 23:16; 44:15; 47:2).

3. ܐܢܝ ܐܠܐܝܡ || ܐܢܝ ܐܠܐܝܡ in 48:10 creates a better parallel to ܐܢܝ ܐܠܐܝܡ and likely reflects ܐܢܝ ܐܠܐܝܡ in its *Vorlage*, just as 1QIsa^a reads ܐܢܝ ܐܠܐܝܡ.

4. The lone exception is in 50:4, where *ἐθέλω μοι κερῶι προσέθῃ μοι ὡς τὸν ἀκούειν* || ܐܢܝ ܐܠܐܝܡ || ܐܢܝ ܐܠܐܝܡ was perhaps spurred by uncertainty about how to render יָעִיר in context.

Although **אל מקומם** || **לִיְהוָה** might have been chosen coordinate to **יהוה על אדמת** || **לִיְהוָה**, this is the only time in Isaiah that S does not translate **מקום** with **מָקוֹם** or **מָוֶן**, while it otherwise uses **לִיְהוָה** for **ארץ** or **אדמה** exclusively.⁵ This makes inescapable the conclusion that S's *Vorlage* read **ארצם** or **אדמתם**.

καὶ κατακληρονομήσουσι καὶ πληθυνθήσονται ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς τοῦ θεοῦ shows points of contact with **והתנחלום** and **על אדמת יהוה**.⁶ The lack of an equivalent for the 3mp suffix of **והתנחלום** is insignificant, since this translator often passes over objective pronominal suffixes: when the object is otherwise clear, as with **καὶ εἰσάξουσιν** || **והביאום** earlier in this verse; when a shift of voice renders it superfluous (e.g., **οὐκ ἔσομαι** || **תשימני**, 3:7; **καὶ οὐκ ἐλογίσθη** || **חשבנהו**, 53:3); in syntactic reformulations (e.g., **διὰ τὸ προστάξει τὸν βασιλέα μηδένα ἀποκριθῆναι** || **כי מצות המלך** **היא לאמר לא כי מצות המלך**, 36:21); and when overriding it creates a more sensible Greek sentence (e.g., **ἐπάξω γὰρ ἐπὶ τὴν φάραγγα Ἀραβας καὶ λήμψονται αὐτήν** || **קיונך** **על נחל הערבים ישאום**, 15:7; **ἡλπίσαμεν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί σου** || **לשמך**, 26:8). An equivalent for the suffix of **והתנחלום** would be redundant, in any event, after **καὶ λήμψονται αὐτούς** (cf. **καὶ εἰσάξουσιν** || **והביאום**).

More provocative are **καὶ πληθυνθήσονται**, which lacks a Hebrew counterpart, and the absence of an equivalent for **בית ישראל**. Ziegler (139), noting the similarity of **καὶ πληθυνθήσονται** to 6:12's **καὶ οἱ καταλειφθέντες πληθυνθήσονται ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς** || **ורבה העזובה בקרב הארץ**, concluded that 14:2 distinctively introduces the "Idee des Restes" that plays "eine große Rolle" in the translation, for which he cites 13:12, 14; 24:14. Noting the absence of an equivalent for **בית ישראל**, he concludes (139), "der Übers. scheint mit diesem Ausdruck nicht zurecht gekommen zu sein und hat deshalb nach 6,12 übersetzt," but also asks, "Hat der Übers. vermutet יהוה ... רבות (ר aus מ des vorhergehenden Verbums verlesen)?" However, **בית ישראל** is hardly an obscure or insignificant phrase, nor would it seem outside this translator's skill to incorporate it. Even if, for sake of argument, we grant that the *Vorlage*

5. In 27:13 **לִיְהוָה** || **לִיְהוָה** attests a scribal addition of **יהוה בארץ** as a balance to the preceding **והנדחים בארץ** **מזרים**.

6. The third edition of Ziegler's Göttingen text (1983) accepts **τοῦ θεοῦ**, against the conclusion advanced in his *Untersuchungen* (139): "Die Lesart von S **τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτῶν** und AQΓ **τοῦ θεοῦ** scheint spätere Verbesserung nach dem MT zu sein." The evidence in his apparatus better supports his later acceptance of **τοῦ θεοῦ** as original, which Seeligmann (117) also adopted.

might have lent itself to reading רבבות ישראל, a text that read רבבות seems unlikely to result in πληθυνθήσονται, without Ισραηλ serving as its subject.

Van der Vorm-Croughs (338) posits that בית ישראל was a gloss added subsequent to the translator's *Vorlage* in order to specify the subject of והתנחלום. The OG translator, on the other hand, resolves that ambiguity by “omit[ing] the object suffix in והתנחלום, and add[ing] the phrase καὶ πληθυνθήσονται, so that the text, rather than invoke the offensive idea that the people would inherit Israel as slaves, would instead insinuate that the foreign people *themselves* would become slaves of Israel” (Van der Vorm-Croughs, 338, emphasis original).

The suggestion that בית ישראל is a gloss inserted later than OG's *Vorlage* is tenable *prima facie*, insofar as any sentence without a subject invites a gloss. On the other hand, her surmise (338) that καὶ πληθυνθήσονται was supplied to obviate “the offensive idea that the people would inherit Israel as slaves, would instead insinuate that the foreign people *themselves* would become slaves of Israel” is unpersuasive. Although she rightly concludes that the translator “continued with the subject עמים and considered this also to govern והתנחלום,” her inference that he omitted rendering the pronominal suffix to obviate the people taking Israel as slaves misconstrues the likely semantics of κατακληρονομήσουσι, which is frequently causative, and in this case could presume a double object of the people and τὸν τόπον αὐτῶν.⁷

Seeligmann's understanding of 14:2 is rooted in his claim (116) that οἱ καταλειφθέντες || העזובה in 6:12 identifies “the community which was left behind and spared” and now invested with “the promises of future salvation.” The translator imported πληθυνθήσονται here from 6:12 (where οἱ καταλειφθέντες is its subject) in order to elaborate the topic of “the promised numerical increase of the Remnant” by speaking of the increase of ὁ γιώρας (14:1)—“a technical term for ‘proselyte’”—through “propagating the Jewish religion among the Gentiles” (Seeligmann, 117). The translator's vision of the restored community “could not imagine Israel being blessed in the future without a constant flow of proselytes” (117).

Seeligmann's assertion that the translator supplied καὶ πληθυνθήσονται to link 14:1–2 with prospects for οἱ καταλειφθέντες in 6:12 must be con-

7. κατακληρονομέω is used elsewhere for granting possession to someone (e.g., Deut 3:28; 12:10; 31:7) and κληρονομέω seems used in this sense in 53:12's διὰ τοῦτο αὐτὸς κληρονομήσει πολλούς || לכן אחלק לו ברבים, given the following καὶ τῶν ἰσχυρῶν μεριεῖ σκυλα || ואת עצומים יחלק שלל (cf. GELS, s.v. “κληρονομέω”).

sidered from two vantage points. First is his claim that πληθυνθήσονται is borrowed from 6:12, a proposal that seeks to explain why it stands here without any clear Hebrew counterpart. Support for this proposal can be found especially from ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς τοῦ θεοῦ and its similarity to an expansion in 24:14

המה ישאו קולם	οὗτοι φωνῇ βοήσονται
	οἱ δὲ καταλειφθέντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς
ירנו בגאון יהוה	εὐφρανθήσονται ἅμα τῇ δόξῃ κυρίου

There is little doubt that the translator insinuated the contrast between the fates of two groups, importing οἱ δὲ καταλειφθέντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς from 6:12. Although ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς τοῦ θεοῦ || יהוה אדמת עץ in 14:2 is as unremarkable as ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς || בקרב הארץ in 6:12 (cf. 5:8 and 7:22), the juxtaposition of καὶ πληθυνθήσονται with ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς makes deliberate imitation of πληθυνθήσονται ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς in 6:12 as likely here as the insertion of οἱ δὲ καταλειφθέντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς in 24:14.⁸ To that degree, Seeligmann's perception that the translator considered 14:2 related to 6:12 in its vision of the people's future is convincing.⁹

On the other hand, his assumption that πληθυνθήσονται envisions propagation of "the Jewish religion among the Gentiles" that will ensure "a constant flow of proselytes" (117, emphasis added) is unsupportable. Even if 14:1 speaks of ὁ γιώρας as added to the people, εἰς δούλους καὶ δούλας seems unrelated to proselytes. κατακληρονομήσουσι asserts that the ἔθνη cause the people they lead back to inherit τὸν τόπον αὐτῶν, equivalent to τῆς γῆς τοῦ θεοῦ. Their consequent multiplication εἰς δούλους καὶ δούλας is less likely a matter of ὁ γιώρας than a description of them as αἰχμάλωτοι who κυριευθήσονται. Notably, the translator created that description of the new role for the ἔθνη by reformulating the final words of the verse:

8. πληθύνω otherwise renders a word the translator perceived as a form of רבה (1:15; 6:12; 51:2; 57:9). καὶ ἐπλήθυνας τὴν πορνείαν σου || ותשרי למלך בשמן in 57:9 is accounted for by Ziegler's (129) perception of borrowing from Ezek 16:25 (ותרבי את) (תונתן) "um den schweren Text von Js 57,9 zu verdeutlichen." Notably, ותרבי appears in the next clause of 57:9 (ותרבי רקחך, rendered with καὶ πολλοὺς ἐποίησας τοὺς μακρὰν ἀπὸ σοῦ) and likely triggered the association with Ezek 16:25. Thus, ἐπλήθυνας in 57:9 also arises from a form of רבה.

9. This explanation also strengthens Van der Vorm-Crough's (338) hypothesis that בית ישראל was a gloss to clarify the subject of והתנחלום but supplied later than OG's Vorlage.

καὶ ἔσονται αἰχμάλωτοι οἱ αἰχμαλωτεύσαντες αὐτούς καὶ κυριευθήσονται οἱ κυριεύσαντες αὐτῶν || ויהיו שבים לשביהם ורדו בנגשיהם || πληθυνθήσονται does not forecast numerous proselytes but the subjugation of numerous nations who formerly ruled over Israel.

Syriac's rendering of בנגשיהם with ܡܢܝܢܝܬܐ echoes ܡܢܝܢܝܬܐ || ܡܢܝܢܝܬܐ || ܡܢܝܢܝܬܐ in 9:3 and finds a parallel in 14:29's ܡܢܝܢܝܬܐ || ܡܢܝܢܝܬܐ || ܡܢܝܢܝܬܐ.

14:3

ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ || ביום might reflect ביום ההוא in the *Vorlage*, resulting from a scribe analyzing הניח as a finite verb (cf. OG's ἀναπαύσει) and supplying the demonstrative. Comparison of ὅταν ἀπόλωνται πολλοὶ καὶ ὅταν πέσωσι πύργοι || ביום הרג רב בנפל מגדלים in 30:25 suggests it is unlikely that the translator would have been stumped by ביום heading a temporal clause, although that does not preclude that the translator supplied ἐκείνῃ. Nevertheless, this case differs from 10:18, whose initial τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ aligns with ביום אחד at the end of 10:17 and is most likely a modification occasioned by connecting the phrase to 10:18. Neither is it comparable to 14:4, where OG has +ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ after καὶ ἐρεῖς || ואמרת (q.v.). Most likely, OG's *Vorlage* here read ביום ההוא.

ἧς ἐδούλευσας αὐτοῖς and ܠܡܠܝܚܝܐ, reformulate אשר עבד בך for their target languages. Old Greek's +αὐτοῖς is likely a reflex from the reversal of captors and captives in 14:2, assuming as referent their former captors.

14:4

For λαμβάνω || ܠܡܠܝܚܝܐ, compare 2:4; 8:4; 15:7.

The appearance of ἐρεῖς ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ || ואמרת ביום ההוא prior to this (3:7; 12:1, 4) makes equally possible the insertion of ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ by the translator or of ביום ההוא by a scribe.

ܥܡܪܐ “exhort” appears nowhere else in extant translations of Hebrew texts. It is found only in superscriptions to Pss 127:1; 147:1, which differ notably from MT. In Prov 13:24 the adverb ܡܠܝܚܝܐ renders שחרו; it renders Aramaic ܠܡܠܝܚܝܐ in Dan 2:25 and Aramaic ܠܡܠܝܚܝܐ in Ezra 7:21. Accordingly, ܡܠܝܚܝܐ || מדהבה in Isa 14:4 likely reflects מרהבה, as read by 1QIsa^a and implied by ἐπισπουδαστής.

The hostile tenor of ὁ ἐπισπουδαστής is evident from its pairing with ὁ ἀπαιτῶν in reference to τὸν βασιλέα Βαβυλῶνος, epithets that collocate in 9:4(3) as technical terms for tax farmers.

14:5

The shift in grammatical number with משלים || מַחֲלֵה and רשעים || רַשָּׁעִים is likely attributable to the translator conforming them to מַחֲלֵה and מַחֲלֵה in 14:4.

14:6

Whereas S renders both עמים and גוים with grammatically plural *ḥqṣṣ*, OG renders both with grammatically singular *ἕθνος*. Because +αὐτοῖς in 14:3 suggests the translator saw these verses continuing the theme of the reversed relationship between captors and captives (14:2), and given its word pair *ὁ ἀπαιτῶν καὶ ... ὁ ἐπισπουδαστής* in 14:4 that signals the translator picking up the theme of a foe “gleaning” the people through taxation (developed in 3:12–15), there is reason to think that the translator chose the grammatical singular for a people personified in its king as *ἀπαιτῶν καὶ ... ὁ ἐπισπουδαστής*.

Although both OG and S render מכה with a participle, their analysis of its syntactic role differs. Old Greek's *πατάξας* assumes that *ὁ θεός* (14:5) continues to be the subject, and the clause parallels the participial clause headed by *παίω*, with *ἀνεπαύσατο πεποιθώς* as predicate. Syriac prefixes a relative pronoun in *ܡܚܟܐ* || *ܡܚܟܐ*, parallel to which is *ܪܕܐ* || *ܪܕܐ*, by virtue of which the subject of the parallel clauses is the *ܡܚܟܐ* in 14:5. *ܡܪܕܝܐ ܒܠܝ ܡܚܟܐ*, whose lack of *ܡܚܟܐ* marks *ܡܪܕܝܐ* as a finite verb, is an independent clause.

Old Greek's *ἀνιάτω* and S's *ܡܚܟܐ* are both intelligible renderings of *ܒܠܬܝ סרה*, with OG understanding *סרה* modifying *מכת* in the sense of “relenting,” whereas S understands it in terms of *מכת* as intended to make the people “turn back.” Although S offers a recognizable rendering of *רדה* גוים, its translation of *רדה* with *ܡܚܟܐ* “and was chastising” (cf. Lev 26:18; Deut 21:18) differs from its *ܡܚܟܐ* in 14:2, the verb's only other occurrence in the book.

With *παίω* *ἕθνος* *πληγῇ* *θυμοῦ*, OG likely interpreted *רדה* parallel to *מכה*, for which *παίω* is the equivalent in 14:29 (*τοῦ παίοντος ὑμᾶς* || *ܡܚܟܐ*). Although OG rendered *ורדו* in 14:2 with *κατατρεῖσονται*, *בפרך* is rendered with *κατατενεῖ αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς μόχοις* in Lev 25:43, 46, 53 and *διώξονται ὑμᾶς* in Lev 26:17, raising the possibility that OG might have chosen *παίω* || *רדה* based on the same meaning S detects. However, whereas S rendered *נחה שקטה* with 14:6, construing *כל*

הארץ as subject (ܐܪܥܐ ܕܡܕܢܚܐ), OG makes ἀνεπαύσατο πεποιθώς the predicate of the clause, conforming the gender of πεποιθώς || שקטה to πατάξας and παίων. For OG, having inflicted an incurable wound unsparingly, the Kyrios rests at ease (cf. Goshen-Gottstein, 11).

14:7

Old Greek renders פצה with βοάω again in 44:23, while S translates it with ܦܫܚ, again in 52:9, where ܡܚܒܐ renders the accompanying רגן, similar to ܡܚܒܐ || רנה here. Syriac's shift from the earth at rest and quiet (ܡܚܒܐ ܡܕܢܚܐ) to "rejoicing" entails a shift of the number and gender of פצחו (ܦܫܚܐ), while βοᾷ in the grammatical singular accords with πᾶσα ἡ γῆ. Although it is possible that their *Vorlagen* read פצחה, both translators modify grammatical person or number often.¹⁰

14:8

Syriac joins ברושים and ארזי לבנון in a compound subject (ܐܪܝܐ ܕܡܕܢܚܐ), while OG follows the Hebrew word order. Old Greek's rendering of the other occurrences of ברוש with κυπάρισσος (41:19; 55:13; 60:13) makes τὰ ξύλα τοῦ Λιβάνου novel.¹¹ There is no apparent reason that the translator could not have written αἱ κυπάρισσοι τοῦ Λιβάνου, but there is equally no reason to suspect a *Vorlage* that read עצי לבנון rather than ברושים. Goshen-Gottstein's (11) perception that the translator was guided by parallelism with ἡ κέδρος τοῦ Λιβάνου is probably right. The translator might have chosen τὰ ξύλα τοῦ Λιβάνου as a generic term before ἡ κέδρος τοῦ Λιβάνου. ܡܚܒܐ betrays S's analysis of הכרת as a *hiphil* infinitive.

14:9

Syriac and OG construe the semantics of רגזה similarly: ܪܓܝܐ/ἐπικράνθη. Although πικραίνω occurs only here in Isaiah, the semantically compa-

10. פצחו רנה should more likely be read with ברושים גם at the start of 14:8, to which ארזי לבנון stands parallel.

11. עצי ברושים is rendered ξύλα πεύκωνα in 3 Kgdms 6:34; 9:11, but never is ξύλα used alone for ברושים. Cf. ξύλα κέδρινα || עצי ארזים in 3 Kgdms 5:22, while in 5:24 the same Hebrew phrase is rendered simply by κέδρους.

rable καὶ παρωξύνθη || וירגזו appears in 5:25, and ὁ παρωξύνων will render מרגיז in 14:16 (cf. 23:11). Similarly, S renders מרגיז with مَرَجِز in 14:16.

Although neither S nor OG give an explicit equivalent for לך, S represents each component of לקראת בואך (لِقَاءِ مَحَبِّ), whereas OG condenses them into συναντήσας σοι.

συνηγέρθησαν || עורר is comparable to καὶ ἐπεγερεῖ || ועורר in 10:26 (cf. 13:17) and ἐξήγειρεν || העיר in 41:2. Whereas OG renders עורר with a third-person plural verb form (συνηγέρθησαν), regarding οἱ γίγαντες (|| רפאים) as subject, S's 3fs form (لَحَبِل) assumes that مَحَب continues as subject, as does its اَمَصَل, || הקים, while OG renders הקים with οἱ ἐγείραντες.

οἱ γίγαντες is OG's equivalent for רפאים (cf. Gen 14:5; Josh 12:4; 13:12), before which it places its equivalent for כל and then renders עתודי ארץ with οἱ ἄρξαντες τῆς γῆς, modifying οἱ γίγαντες. The similarity of οἱ ἄρξαντες τῆς γῆς to S's اَمَصَل لَحَبِل reflects either a shared exegetical tradition or a similar impulse (cf. *V omnes principes terrae*). Syriac's distinctive understanding of مَحَب as the subject of اَمَصَل, undercuts suspicion that it consulted OG.

In rendering הקים with the participial phrase οἱ ἐγείραντες (modifying οἱ γίγαντες) and construing πάντας βασιλεῖς ἐθνῶν (|| כל מלכי גוים) as its direct object, OG depicts two groups rising to meet the arriving king: πάντες οἱ γίγαντες οἱ ἄρξαντες τῆς γῆς and πάντας βασιλεῖς ἐθνῶν whom they stir from their thrones. Syriac, on the other hand, employs مَحَب as the subject of مَحَصَل, حَقَصَل as the subject of حَصَل in 14:10.

14:10

Syriac lacks a representation of בלם, which is also absent from 4Q59 (OG, V, T, and 1QIsa^a attest it). Although the connection of حَصَل with مَحَصَل of 14:9 might reflect an absence of בלם from S's *Vorlage*, more likely S's construal of مَحَصَل as subject of لَحَبِل, followed by its analysis of כל מלכי גוים as the subject of יענו, caused it to perceive בלם as already represented in حَقَصَل, مَحَصَل.

ἐάλως || חלית is peculiar. The most frequent equivalent for חלה is μαλακίζομαι (38:1, 9; 39:1), similar to which κοπιῶ || חליתי in 33:24 connotes being "weary" (cf. οὐ πεινάσουσιν οὐδὲ κοπιήσουσιν || אין עייף ואין כושל in 5:27).¹² There are, however, three other passages where ἀλίσκομαι finds no

12. κληρώση in 17:11 analyzes הלח as from לחל; τῆς πληγῆς in 53:10 construes

evident foothold in the Hebrew.¹³ In 30:13 ὡς τεῖχος πίπτον παραχρῆμα πόλεως ὀχυρᾶς ἐαλωκυίας ἥς παραχρῆμα πάρεστι τὸ πτώμα is partially transparent to כפרץ נפל נבעה בחומה נשגבה אשר פתאם לפתע יבוא שברה, with the exception of πόλεως ὀχυρᾶς ἐαλωκυίας. Comparison with πόλεις ὀχυράς || קריה נשגבה in 26:5 accounts for ὀχυρᾶς || נשגבה, suggesting that πόλεως is likely an explicitation.¹⁴ The translator likely supplied the modifier ἐαλωκυίας as part of the phrase defining ὡς τεῖχος πίπτον. Similarly, in 31:9 ὁ δὲ φεύγων ἀλώσεται || מנס שריו recognizes נוס, while ἀλώσεται was likely substituted to underscore the preceding assertion that νεανίσκοι will fall (καὶ ἡττηθήσονται || וחתו) even when shielded by a rock (cf. δς γὰρ ἐὰν ἀλῶ ἡττηθήσεται || ידקר כל הנמצא ידקר in 13:15). In 33:1 ἀλώσονται οἱ ἀθετοῦντες καὶ παραδοθήσονται καὶ ὡς σῆς ἐφ' ἱματίου οὕτως ἡττηθήσονται || כהתמך שודד תושד כנלתך לבגד יבגדו בד (following καὶ ὁ ἀθετῶν ὑμᾶς οὐκ ἀθετεῖ || (ובוגד ולא בגדו בו) shows a similar association of ἀλώσονται and ἡττηθήσονται, without identifiable Hebrew counterparts. Like these examples, καὶ σὺ ἐάλως ὥσπερ καὶ ἡμεῖς || גם אתה חלית כמונו in 14:10 likely owes to the translator providing a contextually appropriate substitute for חלית.

κατελογίσθης is a contextually sensible choice for נמשלת, as seems true also for S's ܠܡܠܚܬܐ (cf. ܠܡܠܬܐ || ונמשלתי, Ps 28:1; ܠܡܠܬܐ || ונמשלתי, Ps 49:13, 21; ܠܡܠܬܐ || נמשל, Ps 143:7).¹⁵

14:11

Syriac modifies the word order of הורד שאול גאונך (ܠܡܠܬܐ ܣܠܐ ܡܢܚܐ) without a difference in meaning (note the shift ܣܠܐ || הורד; cf. 14:15) and analyzes the מית as from מית (ܡܝܬܐ). Old Greek renders the מית with πολλή, which might be related (via biliteral exegesis) to its καὶ οἱ μεγάλοι || והמונה in 5:14 and φωνῇ ἐθνῶν πολλῶν || קול המון in 13:4. On the other hand, its translation of נבליך with σου εὐφροσύνη (S, ܡܢܝܐ; V, *cadaver tuum*) is a notable divergence from καὶ ψαλτηρίου || ונבל in 5:12, the only other instance of נבל in Isaiah. Although one might posit that the translator extrapolated from

יחלי as nominal; and κατεδεήθης || חלית in 57:10 reasons from usage of חלה in the *piel* (cf. καὶ τοῦ προσώπου τοῦ κυρίου οὐκ ἐδεήθη || חלית יְהוָה לֹא יוֹהוּ, 1 Kgdms 13:12).

13. καὶ οἱ ἀλόντες || יחד in 22:3 is likely by association with Aramaic ܐܚܕ (= אחד).

14. πόλεως is less likely based on (ב)חומה via metonymy, since OG likely arrived at ὡς τεῖχος by associating כפרץ and בחומה.

15. The only other appearance of משל I in Isaiah is נדמה in 46:5, for which S lacks an equivalent.

“harps” to their role in rejoicing, the basis for εὐφροσύνη 25:6’s πίνονται εὐφροσύνην πίνονται οἶνον || משתה שמנים משתה שמרים || is equally opaque (S 𐤌𐤎𐤕; V *convivium pinguium*), leaving us without a suitable explanation.

Whereas στρώσουσιν || יצע uses the active voice (cf. ὑποστρώσῃ || יציע in 58:5; ἔστρωσαν || יצע in Esth 4:3), 𐤌𐤎𐤕 is passive voice, with 𐤌𐤎𐤕 || יצע as subject, in accord with יצע in MT (cf. 𐤌𐤎𐤕 || יצע in 58:5; 𐤌𐤎𐤕 || יצע in Esth 4:3, but also 𐤌𐤎𐤕 || יצע in Ps 139:8 [OG ἐὰν καταβῶ εἰς τὸν ἄδην]).

Old Greek’s καὶ τὸ κατακάλυμμά σου || ומכסיד entails a difference in number but also a shift to a nominal form, making it unavailable for comparison with ומכסד in 1QIsa^a (*pace* Goshen-Gottstein, נד).

14:12

The shift of person in ἐξέπεσεν || נפלת breaks the pattern of second-person pronouns that have dominated the preceding verses and will return in 14:13. However, the shift parallels its συνετρίβῃ || נגדעת and accords with the epithets ὁ ἑωσφόρος ὁ πρῶτ' ἀνατέλλων and ὁ ἀποστέλλων, each of which betray reflective choices by the translator. The shift in the grammatical person of the main verbs might reflect harmonizing with the lament of 14:4: πῶς ἀναπέπαυται ὁ ἀπαιτῶν καὶ ἀναπέπαυται ὁ ἐπισπουδαστής || איד שבת נגש שבתה מ(ר)הבה.

𐤌𐤎𐤕 appears only here in the Bible, as the equivalent for the *hapax legomenon* הילל. It must be regarded as a transliteration, since the verb 𐤌𐤎𐤕 denotes lamenting, which would be out of place here. As for 𐤌𐤎𐤕 || בן שחר, although S often renders independent בן with 𐤌, it can incorporate בן in a phrasal equivalent (𐤌𐤎𐤕 || בן שמן || 5:1; 𐤌𐤎𐤕 || בן חכמים אני || 19:11), which seems to be its tack here.¹⁶ 𐤌𐤎𐤕 is the most frequent equivalent for שחר throughout S (e.g., Gen 19:15; 32:25, 27; Josh 6:15), while 𐤌𐤎𐤕 is used here *and* for the only שחר in Isaiah: 𐤌𐤎𐤕 || בן שחר (58:8).

The only other instance of ἑωσφόρος in the Greek Bible is within a merismus: ἀπὸ ἑωσφόρου ἕως δαίμονος || מהנשף ועד הערב (1 Kgdms 30:17). Here, by contrast, it reflects the religious culture of Ptolemaic Egypt, as Seeligmann (100) noted. The Pompe, composed by Callixenus of Rhodes to report “a lavish sacred procession early in the reign of Philadelphus,” specifies the position of ἑωσφόρος: πρῶτῃ δ' ἐβάδιζεν ἡ ἑωσφόρου· καὶ

16. We also find 𐤌𐤎𐤕 || בן בטנה in 49:15 and 𐤌𐤎𐤕 || בן הנבר in 56:3.

γὰρ ἀρχὴν εἶχεν ἡ πομπὴ καθ' ὃν ὁ προειρημένος ἀστήρ φαίνεται χρόνον ("First came the [image] of Heosphoros, for the procession had a beginning in accord with the time the aforesaid star appears").¹⁷ Thus, ὁ πρῶτος ἀνατέλλων || בן שחר is intelligible as the translator's gloss on ἑωσφόρος.¹⁸

Syriac renders נגדעת with ܢܓܕܬܐ and OG with συνετρίβη. Whereas in 9:9 OG translated גדעו with ἐκκόψωμεν (S ܢܚܬܡܐ), in 10:33 it renders גדועים with συντριβήσονται (S ܢܬܚܬܡܐ), as here. In 22:25 S translates ונגדעה with ܢܬܚܬܡܐ immediately before ܢܬܠܐ || ונפלה (OG offers no clear equivalent), just as ܢܬܠܐ || ܢܬܚܬܡܐ stands parallel to ܢܬܠܐ || ܢܬܚܬܡܐ in 31:3 and ܢܬܠܐ || ܢܬܚܬܡܐ parallels כרע בל || כרע בל in 46:1. Despite that pattern, S seems to have rendered נגדעת with ܢܓܕܬܐ here under the impress of ܢܬܠܐ || ܢܬܚܬܡܐ earlier in the verse.

חלש על גוים || ܡܚܝܠܐ likely owes to unfamiliarity with חלש, whose only other occurrence (ויחלש, Exod 17:13) S translates with ܡܠܐ. As Fischer (28) observed, ὁ ἀποστέλλων reflects association of חלש with שלח, while πρὸς πάντα is its equivalent for על, after which he (likely) prefixed πάντα to τὰ ἔθνη.¹⁹ Regarding OG's frequent insertion of πᾶς, see appendix A.

14:13

ܡܠܐ ܡܠܐ and ἐν ὄρει ὑψηλῷ coincide semantically, although they differ in grammatical number. Together they conflict with בהר מועד in MT, 1QIsa^a, and 4Q57 (*vid.*), the only collocation of these words (let alone this phrase) in the Bible. Warszawski (29) posited that their *Vorlagen* read ועד רם בהר, but neither OG nor S shows a trace of ועד. It is possible that their *Vorlagen* read בהר רם (later corrupted to מועד בהר?), which S rendered in the grammatical plural, as it does similarly elsewhere: ܡܠܐ ܡܠܐ || ܡܠܐ ܡܠܐ

17. Peter M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 3 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1972), 1:191, 2:1001.

18. Cf. V's *qui mane oriebaris* and T's נגהא כוכבי בני אנשא כוכבי נגהא בן כוכבי.

19. Cf. Goshen-Gottstein's (נד) labeling of ὁ ἀποστέλλων as "exeg[etical]," likely as an etymological exigency. Although ὁ ἀδύνατος || החלש in Joel 4:10 might attest familiarity with חלש, the remainder of the clause (λεγέτω ὅτι Ἰσχύω ἐγώ || יאמר גבור || אני) might have guided its word choice. The other two cases of חלש in the Bible undercut confidence that the word was familiar to OG translators: καὶ ἐτρέψατο Ἰησοῦς τὸν Ἀμαλῆα || עמלק את יהושע ויחלש, Exod 17:13; ἀνῆλθον δὲ τελευτήσας ὥχχεται || וגבר ימות, Job 14:10.

in 22:5 (OG, *πλανῶνται ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρη*); ܠܗܐ ܕܗܪ ܓܒܗ || על הר גבה in 40:9; 57:7 (OG, *ἐπ' ὄρος ὑψηλόν*).

We must consider, however, that the phrase *הר מועד* (only here in the Bible) might have caused problems for one or both translators. Although *καὶ τὰς ἑορτὰς ὑμῶν* / ܡܚܬܥܝܚܝܚܝܚܝܚܝܚ || ומועדיכם in 1:14 is intelligible in an address to the people and ܡܠܟܐ ܕܩܪܝܬ ܡܘܥܕܢܐ signals that *הר מועד* in 33:20 was recognizable as an epithet of Jerusalem, already in the latter verse OG gives *ἡ πόλις τὸ σωτήριον ἡμῶν* (see especially the comments on 18:4, below). Although S's ܡܠܟܐ ܕܩܪܝܬ ܡܘܥܕܢܐ || ܡܠܟܐ ܕܩܪܝܬ ܡܘܥܕܢܐ in 14:31 already strains intelligibility (and OG's *καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν τοῦ εἶναι* registers perplexity), we cannot overlook the conceptual difficulty that *הר מועד*, located in the distant north, might have presented for these translators.²⁰

Despite the semantic agreement between ܡܠܟܐ ܕܩܪܝܬ ܡܘܥܕܢܐ and *ἐν ὄρει ὑψηλῷ*, they part company in rendering *צפון בירכתי*. Syriac's ܡܠܟܐ ܕܩܪܝܬ ܡܘܥܕܢܐ || ܡܠܟܐ ܕܩܪܝܬ ܡܘܥܕܢܐ in 37:24, and OG's (*τὰ*) *πρὸς βορρᾶν* accords with the use of *πρὸς βορρᾶν* for *צפון* elsewhere, while *εἰς τὰ θεμέλια τῆς γῆς* || אל ירכתי בור (14:15) and *εἰς τὰ ἔσχατα τοῦ Λιβάνου* || ירכתי לבנון in 37:24 suggest that *ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρη τὰ ὑψηλὰ τὰ πρὸς βορρᾶν* could be the translator's rendering of *צפון בירכתי*, particularly given this translator's insertions of *ὄρος* elsewhere.²¹

A notable effect of the translator's choices is that *ἐν ὄρει ὑψηλῷ ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρη τὰ ὑψηλὰ τὰ πρὸς βορρᾶν* specifies a terrestrial location for the king's placement of his *θρόνον*. Old Greek's rendering of *ארים* with *θήσω*, a verb commonly associated with *θρόνον*, obviates redundancy, since *εἰς*

20. T renders *מועד בהר* with *בטור זמן*, similar to its *קריית מועדנו* || קריית זמנא in 33:20, whose *זמן* is frequently used in the sense of "meeting" (especially *זמנא*, e.g., Exod 27:21; 28:43), comparable to *במועדיו* || במזמנוה in 14:31. Although T also uses *זמן* for *מועד* in the sense of "time" (e.g., Gen 1:14; 17:21), it never does for *מועדים* as holy festivals, for which it uses *מועדיא* (e.g., Isa 1:14). Note the distinction T creates in Lev 23:4 between *אלו מועדי יהוה* || אלו מועדי יהוה and *דתערעון יתהון בזמניהון* || דתערעון יתהון בזמניהון. תקראו אתם במועדים.

21. *πρὸς βορρᾶν* renders *צפנה* (e.g., Gen 13:14; Lev 1:11; Num 2:25; cf. *ἐπὶ βορρᾶν* in Gen 28:14) and even bare *צפון* (e.g., Exod 26:35; Num 34:7; 35:5). *τὸ ὄρος τὸ Χερμελ* explicitizes *כרמל* in 29:17 (cf. discussion of *τὰ ὄρη καὶ οἱ βουνοὶ καὶ οἱ ὄρημοι* || וכבוד יערו וכרמלו at 10:18), while *ὄρος* lacks an equivalent in *σὺ δὲ ῥιφήση ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν* || על ראש גיא שמנים || ἐπὶ τῆς κορυφῆς τοῦ ὄρους τοῦ παχέος || ואתה השלכת מקברך in 28:1, 4; and *ἔως ἂν ἐμπλησθῇ τὰ ὄρη τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ* || מלא רעים מקולם in 31:4 (cf. 41:18).

τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀναβήσομαι already specifies height.²² Although the prefixing of ἐπὶ to τὰ ὄρη might seem unremarkable, the preceding καθὼ ἐν ὄρει || בהר ואשב gives ἐπὶ a distinctive function before τὰ ὄρη τὰ ὑψηλά. Comparisons of ἐπὶ τὸ ὄρος τὸ ἅγιόν μου || בכל הר קדשי in 11:9 and ἐπ' ὄρους πεδινού ἄρατε σημεῖον || על הר נשפה שאו נס in 13:2 (cf. 25:10; 27:13) support the spatial import of ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρη τὰ ὑψηλά.²³ ἐν ὄρει ὑψηλῷ ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρη τὰ ὑψηλά τὰ πρὸς βορρᾶν designates the highest of the northern mountains as the location for the king's throne. In this light, these prepositional phrases were more likely chosen as a unit than as reflexive equivalents for ביהר מועד and בירכתי צפון.

There is no indication that S's *وَالْعَالَمِينَ* was based on OG's ἐν ὄρει ὑψηλῷ, since it did not take over its ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρη τὰ ὑψηλά.²⁴ Faced with any possible *Vorlage* considered here, S would hardly have been at a loss for equivalents.

14:14

Although S translates forms of במה with *وَمَا* in 15:2; 16:12; 36:7; in 58:14 it translates *על במתי ארץ* with *وَالْأَرْضِ*, perhaps because it found במתי unfamiliar. That is likely also what led to *وَالْأَرْضِ* here. ἀναβήσομαι ἐπάνω τῶν νεφελῶν might reflect similar perplexity.

14:15

Old Greek and S give similar equivalents for initial אָךְ (νῦν δέ/*وَالْحَالِ*), marking the contrast between the king's aspirations and what awaits him. Although neither translation consistently gives an equivalent for אָךְ, here both use a temporal expression: νῦν δέ/*وَالْحَالِ*.²⁵ Only in 33:4 does *وَالْحَالِ* again parallel νῦν, where each renders conjunctive *waw* (*וְ*/*وَالْحَالِ*).

22. Collocations of τίθημι and θρόνος render כסא + שים in 3 Kgdms 2:19; 4 Kgdms 10:3; Jer 25:18(49:38); 50(43):10. They also render שית כסא in Ps 132(131):11, נתן כסא in Jer 1:15, and כרסון רמיו in Dan 7:9.

23. ἐπὶ with the accusative seems indistinguishable from ἐπὶ with the genitive: e.g., φωνή ἐθνῶν πολλῶν ἐπὶ τῶν ὀρέων || קול המון בהרים in 13:4; καὶ ἔσται ἐπὶ παντὸς ὄρους ὑψηλοῦ || והיה על כל הר גבה in 30:25.

24. The same question applies to its *وَالْعَالَمِينَ* || אל ירכתי בור in 14:15, which OG renders more intelligibly with καὶ εἰς τὰ θεμέλια τῆς γῆς.

25. For אָךְ, see appendix B. *وَالْحَالِ* is S's regular equivalent for עתה (29:22 [2x]; 30:8; 33:10 [3x]; 44:21 [reading עתה for אתה]; 48:7; 49:19) or מעתה (9:6), just as OG

δὲ συναχθήσεται || (ואסף), with 𐤇𐤍𐤕 and 𐤅𐤨 δε marking the shift from an address of the deity (33:2–3) to addressing the nations, despite OG's and S's different understandings of 33:4. Here as there, the similarity of 𐤇𐤍𐤕 and 𐤅𐤨 δέ reflects polygenesis, since the contrast between what the king anticipated for himself and the fate awaiting him is sufficient to spur 𐤇𐤍𐤕 as much as 𐤅𐤨 δέ.

As noted with τὰ ὄρη τὰ ὑψηλὰ τὰ πρὸς βορρᾶν || בִּירְכֵתִי צִפּוֹן || τὰ θεμέλια τῆς γῆς || בּוֹר יִרְכֵתִי understands יִרְכֵתִי as the farthest extremities. The rendering of בּוֹר in two other passages shows a similar perception of בּוֹר as the nether regions: καταβαινόντων εἰς ἄδου || בּוֹר אֶל אֲבִנֵי || (14:9); and οἱ ἐν ἄδου || יוֹרְדֵי בּוֹר || (38:18).

14:16

𐤇𐤍𐤕 is unattested in any other witness. Although S does not show a penchant to add 𐤇𐤍𐤕 (the only likely case is in 3:23), in this instance, twice in 24:6, and again in 37:11, 2, 𐤇𐤍𐤕 is attributable to either the translator or כל in the *Vorlage*.

Both OG and S have a verb of speech before הִזָּה (καὶ ἐροῦσιν/ سَمْعِس), as does T (יִמְרוּן), while none is present in V. Although it is possible that וַאֲמָרוּ or יִאֲמָרוּ had been inserted in the *Vorlage* of each to clarify that the following words are those of the observers, each translator might just as readily have supplied a verb of speaking for the same reason. Old Greek's καὶ ἐροῦσιν stands in the slot where יִתְבּוֹנְנוּ is attested in all other witnesses. Although it is possible that its *Vorlage* lacked יִתְבּוֹנְנוּ, more likely the translator considered it redundant, having determined that אֵלֶיךָ is the complement to יִשְׁגִּיחוּ (οἱ ἰδόντες σε θαυμάσουσιν ἐπὶ σοί). Old Greek's choice of θαυμάσουσιν for יִשְׁגִּיחוּ (a *hapax legomenon* in Isaiah, appearing again only in Ps 33:14; Song 2:9) comports with the translator's use of it for unfamiliar verbs in 41:23 (καὶ θαυμασόμεθα καὶ ὁψόμεθα ἅμα || יַחְדּוֹ וְנִשְׁתַּעֲה וְנִרְאָה); 52:5 (οὕτως θαυμάσσονται ἔθνη πολλὰ ἐπ' αὐτῷ || כֵּן יִזֶּה גּוֹיִם רַבִּים עָלָיו || בְּכֵן יִזֶּה גּוֹיִם רַבִּים עָלָיו).²⁶

To מִרְגִּיז || مَرَجِز, compare רִגְזָה || لَمَرَجِز in 14:9; וִירְגָז || سَمْعِس in 2 Sam 19:1.

בַּאֲסִלְעִיז || מַמְלְכוֹת is comparable to 13:4, 19, where the translator rendered מַמְלְכוֹת with a grammatically plural form of בַּאֲסִלְעִיז. The recurring

regularly translates עֵתָה with 𐤅𐤨, although it sometimes inserts 𐤅𐤨 (see the comments on 3:1).

26. μή πλανῶ, ἐγὼ γάρ εἰμι ὁ θεός σου || אֵל תִּשְׁתַּע כִּי אֲנִי אֱלֹהֶיךָ in 41:10 betrays OG's association of תִּשְׁתַּע there with עֵתָה.

role of βασιλείς in this chapter (cf. 14:4, 9, 18) likely influenced the translator's choice here.

14:17

Although *למד* || *שם* might reflect analysis of *שם* as from *שמם* (Goshen-Gottstein, נה), S otherwise renders that verb with *ל* (33:8; 54:3), *למד* (52:14), or *למד* (63:5), although the nominal form *למד* renders *שממות* in 49:8, 19. Because the translator frequently renders the consonant combination *שם* with *חכ* (see esp. 14:23's *חכמה* || *חכמה*), the choice of *למד* might be a finessing of the equivalent to explicitize how the world will become like a wilderness. Particularly notable for its use of *למד* for atypical equivalents is *למד* || *למד* in 27:10.

οἰκουμένη is accompanied by the quantifier *ὅλη* in each of its occurrences to this point (10:14, 23; 13:5, 9, 11) and will be again in 14:26⁽¹⁾; 37:18, while a quantifier is lacking (both in Greek and Hebrew) in 23:17; 24:1, 4; 27:6; 34:1; 37:16; 62:4. As in 13:9, 11 (q.v.), where *ὅλη* is unattested in other witnesses, the translator likely supplied the quantifier with *οἰκουμένη*.²⁷

למד and *καὶ τὰς πόλεις* lack an equivalent for the 3ms pronominal suffix of *וערים* (attested in V and T), although that observation must be qualified for OG, since the pronoun might be implicitly anaphoric to *τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην*. Because omission of the pronoun is uncharacteristic for S, its *Vorlage* might have read *וערים*.

For *τοὺς ἐν ἐπαγωγῇ* || *אסיריו*, compare *εἰς ἐπαγωγῇ* || *אסיר* in 10:4.

Both S and OG lack an equivalent for *ביתה*, while V reads *carcerem* and T *תרעא*. *ביתה* itself is improbable, since the *he*-locale is nonsensical with the *piel* of *פתח* (as analyzed by OG and S), for which a complement should specify *from what* one is liberated. Syriac's lack of an equivalent suggests that *ביתה* was absent from its source text and buttresses the likelihood that it was absent from OG's *Vorlage*, as well (*pace* Goshen-Gottstein, נה).²⁸

27. On the related difficulty with trying to ascertain significance in the distribution of *οἰκουμένη* in Isaiah, see the comments on 10:13–14.

28. *ביתה* might be a variant of *בביתו* (pronominal suffix marked with *he* rather than *waw*) at the end of 14:18 that was erroneously inserted at the end of 14:17 from the margin.

14:18

The lack of a clear equivalent for כלם in both S and OG might be elimination of redundancy in the wake of בל מלכי גוים. Notably, however, it is also absent from 1QIsa^a (but attested in both V and T). Although this cannot verify that כלם was absent from the *Vorlagen* of OG and S, it raises the possibility that MT (cf. V and T) reflects secondary assimilation to בל מלכי גוים in 14:9–10.

14:19

μετὰ πολλῶν τεθνηκότων || לבוש הרגים is likely a paraphrase, as Seeligmann (84) suggested, concretizing the image. A similar conclusion applies to ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν || מקברד, which concretizes the place where the warmonger died in accord with the common trope in Hellenistic histories of mountains as the scene of battle (see Troxel, 214–16).²⁹ More plausible than Seeligmann's (30) proposal that νεκρός developed out of transliteration of נצר with νεσρ is Goshen-Gottstein's (נה) suggestion that ὡς νεκρός owes to association of כנצר with (otherwise untranslated) כפגר. The image of a warrior slain in battle is evident again in ἀκακεντλημένων μαχαίραις || מטעני חרב. Suspicion that ἀκακεντέω attests knowledge of the *hapax legomenon* טען is dampened by the use of ἀκακεντέω for הרג in Num 22:29; Judg 9:54, making it likely that ἀκακεντλημένων is a second rendering of הרגים, chosen by association with חרב as the instrument of death. Compatible with this explanation is that S's repetitive قهله قهله || מטעני likely owes to ignorance of טען.

Old Greek's εἰς ἄδου || אל אבני בור is comparable to εἰς ἄδου καταβήσῃ || הורד || אל שאול תורד that follows and resonates with κατέβη δὲ εἰς ἄδου || הורד || אל שאול in 14:11 as the destination of the king. εἰς ἄδου is written supralinearly in 1QIsa^a but in the same hand as the original scribe.)

ὃν τρώσων ἰμάτιον might attest כבגד in place of כפגר, but it more likely picks up the previously untranslated לבוש, as Goshen-Gottstein (נו) suggested. οὐκ ἔσται καθαρὸν is the first of two renderings of לא טחר—instead of לא תחד (14:20)—in OG's *Vorlage*, as Ottley (2:180; cf. Ziegler, 94) suggested. Furthermore, Ziegler (94) noted that πεφυρμένην ἐν τῷ αἵματί σου

29. I have elsewhere (Troxel, 209–23) argued against Seeligmann's (82–83) perception, elaborated by Van der Kooij (39–42), that OG's rendering of 14:18–20 means to portray Antiochus IV as a fulfillment of this as prophecy.

renders מתבוססת בדמיון in Jer 16:6, 22 (cf. ἐμόλυναν || בססו, Jer 12:10), while πεφυρμένος ἐν τῷ αἵματι || מתגלל בדם in 2 Kgdms 20:12 and φύρονται ἐν αἵματι || יעלעו דם in Job 39:30 shows that “das Bild vom ‘Kleid, das mit Blut besudelt ist’, nicht fernliegend [war]” (Ziegler, 95).

Syriac’s grammatically plural ܡܒܫܬ ܕܡܝܐ likely conforms to the preceding plural nouns, especially ܡܢ ܡܢ ܡܢ.

14:20

Syriac’s ܡܠܐ ܠܐ ܬܚܕ || ܡܠܐ ܠܐ ܬܚܕ is based on Aramaic ܚܕܝ (cf. ܡܠܐ ܠܐ ܬܚܕ || ܡܠܐ ܠܐ ܬܚܕ, Ps 86:11).

Old Greek’s οὐδὲ σὺ ἔσῃ αἰσχρολογία || ܠܐ ܬܚܕ suggests that it read ܬܚܕ, as noted in 14:19, while σὺ likely derives from reading אתם as the second-person pronoun rendered in the grammatical singular in coordination with שחת and הרגת, even though the translator also shifted the suffixes on עמד and ארצך to the first-person: τῇ μου, τὸν λαόν μου.

Old Greek’s οὐ μὴ μείνης and S’s ܡܠܐ ܠܐ diverge from יקרא, in both cases likely reading לא יקום in their *Vorlagen* (cf. 14:24; 27:9; 32:8; 40:8), a surmise supported by T’s יתקיים.³⁰ Old Greek’s μείνης shifts the person in harmony with ἀπέκτεινας (|| שחת) and the following ἐτοίμασον (|| הכינו), as well as his rendering of the pronominal suffix of לבניו with τὰ τέκνα σου and אבותם in 14:21 with τοῦ πατρός σου.

Syriac renders the plural מרעים (זרע) in the singular number ܡܪܝܥܐ (ܡܪܝܥܐ) to serve as a collective for the sons whose rise must be prevented. Old Greek also renders מרעים in the grammatical singular (πονηρόν) but as part of an epithet for the addressee as the head of what might have been a dynasty.

14:21

Old Greek translates הכינו with a grammatically singular imperative (ἐτοίμασον) that, together with τὰ τέκνα σου || לבניו and τοῦ πατρός σου || אבותם, continues to harmonize pronouns in an address to the ruler. σφαγήναι || מטבח might simply be a substitution of part of speech, but it could also have been inspired by the form’s affinity to the Aramaic infinitive.

30. Although יקרא is the more distinctive reading, יקום is sensible, and יקרא could have arisen by corruption.

Although **הכינו** || **لهد** could likewise be read as a second-person (masculine) singular imperative, there is no clearly identifiable addressee. Thus, it is more likely a 3ms perfect (*pael*), assigning responsibility for the sons' deaths to their father, who "set them up" for slaughter. Although it is possible that S's *Vorlage* read **הכין**, all witnesses besides OG (1QIsa^a, 4Q59, V, T) attest **הכינו**. Thus, the translator likely effected the shift to the grammatical singular.

As Goshen-Gottstein (נו) observed, **ומלאו פני תבל** || **ἐμπλήσωσι τὴν γῆν** entails a condensation. Van der Vorm-Crouchs (70) notes that condensation of **פני תבל** occurs again in 27:6 (**ὅς οἰκουμένην**). It is also connected with her catalogue of omissions of words for body parts in construct phrases (69–70).

Syriac's rendering of **ערים** with **ܡܚܠܚܡܐ**, which otherwise corresponds to **מלחמה** (eight times), is similar to OG's **πολέμων** (contra Ziegler's adoption of **πολέων**), which (together with **πολεμέω** and **πολεμιστής**) typically renders **מלחמה**.³¹ Warszawski's (30) proposal that "sie haben **ערים** von **עור** 'aufregen' abgeleitet" raises the question of what would motivate such analysis. The reading could have had its roots in a corruption of **πολέων** as **πολέμων**, but the lack of indications that OG influenced S otherwise (see esp. **ܠܒܐ ܚܚܝܬܐ** versus **σὺ ἔσῃ καθαρὸς** || **אתם**; **ܠܚܝܬܐ** versus **τὴν γῆν μου** || **ארצך**; and **ܠܚܝܬܐ** versus **καὶ τὸν λαόν μου** || **עמד**, 14:20; **ܠܚܝܬܐ** versus **τὰ τέκνα σου** || **לבניו**; **ܠܚܝܬܐ** versus **τοῦ πατρὸς σου** || **אבותם**, 14:21) makes it unlikely that S arrived at **ܡܚܠܚܡܐ** by consultation with OG. The similar equivalents might derive from an interpretive tradition (cf. T's **בעלי דבב**), perhaps related to 14:19's assumption of a battle (**לבוש הרגים מטעני חרב**), but venturing even that far exceeds what the text reveals.

14:22

αὐτῶν ὄνομα || **שם** **לבבל** apparently postpones **בבל** to 14:23, where **τὴν Βαβυλωνίαν** lacks a Hebrew counterpart. As an effect of that, this proclamation is more closely annexed to the opposition to the ruler's line as **σπέρμα πονηρόν** at the end of 14:20 and as **τὰ τέκνα σου** in 14:21, to whom **αὐτῶν ὄνομα** here might then equally refer.

31. **πολέμων** is attested by all witnesses but *V-ol* (as well as **σ', α', θ'**), which read **πολέων** (Ziegler's text). Seeligmann's (14) classification of **πολέων** among variants that, while secondary, "borrow authentic material from older sources or must be an older textual form" seems special pleading.

καὶ κατάλειμμα καὶ σπέρμα represents the semantics of ושאַר וגין ונכד, while its use of two nouns in place of three accords with its condensation of lists of similar words (see Van der Vorm-Crouchs, 190–91). On the other hand, סחפסח סחפסח סחפסח agrees quantitatively with ושאַר וגין ונכד, and its last two equivalents are the same ones it uses in Gen 21:23 (סחפסח סחפסח סחפסח || וליני וליני וליני), while סחפסח differs from its regular equivalent for שאַר (סחפסח), perhaps for harmony with the previous nouns. The possessive pronoun it adds to each noun is anaphoric to ושאַר. Although OG uses σπέρμα for וליני וליני וליני, it renders ושאַר with καὶ κατάλειμμα (cf. 10:22).

14:23

Old Greek's rendering of this verse entails remarkable divergences from MT, beginning with τὴν Βαβυλωνίαν, which appears transferred from 14:22 as a substitute for the 3fs suffix of ושמתי, while it supplies ἔρημον as a predicate complement (cf. ὁ θεὸς τὴν οἰκουμένην ὄλην ἔρημον || שם כמדבר, 14:17). ὥστε κατοικεῖν aligns with למורש (treated like an Aramaic infinitive).³²

καὶ ἔσται εἰς οὐδέν can hardly be reckoned a translation of ואגמי מים, which OG translates with ἔλη in 41:18, the same equivalent it uses for אגם alone in 35:7; 42:15. εἰς οὐδέν renders לאין in 40:23 and לריק in 49:4, while its only appearance outside Isaiah is for לאל in Job 24:25. It is less likely that one of these phrases stood in the translator's *Vorlage* here than that καὶ ἔσται εἰς οὐδέν is a substitute for whatever he might have read.

The syntactic parallel of καὶ θήσω αὐτήν to καὶ θήσω τὴν Βαβυλωνίαν reveals it to be a second rendering of ושמתי, with the 3fs suffix explicitly represented. אטטא and its accompanying derivative noun are *hapax legomena*. As Ziegler (190) perceived, πηλοῦ suggests an association of אטטא with טיט (cf. καταπατῶν τὸν πηλόν || ירמס טיט, 41:25). Although the accompanying βάραθρον is a *hapax legomenon* in the Greek Bible, Ziegler (189) cites Strabo's report that βάραθρον was applied to the marshlands of the Nile Delta region, deriving "von dem Lehm und von dem Schlamm," making its association with πηλοῦ a reflection of the translator's likely Egyptian setting.

32. ὥστε κατοικεῖν || למורש is comparable to καὶ κατοικήσουσιν ἐν αὐτῇ || יירשוה in 34:11, the only other use of κατοικέω for ירש in the Greek Bible.

The referent of OG's other third-person plural pronouns is more ambiguous than in the Hebrew, where the grammatically singular pronouns of **עלו וסבלו** distinguish them from the referent of **מעליהם**. Nevertheless, given the shift of subject in **καὶ ἔσονται εἰς καταπάτημα** (**|| אבוסנו**) and because of the ejection of **τοὺς Ἀσσυρίους ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς τῆς ἐμῆς καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ὀρέων μου** (**|| בארצי ועל הרי**), those relieved of the yoke and their shoulders unburdened seem implicitly those living in "my land."

Although numerous examples of *bet/mem* confusion allow that **ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς τῆς ἐμῆς** could attest **מארצי** and that **ἀπὸ τῶν ὀρέων μου** might reflect **הרי מן** for **על הרי**, the change is more likely due to the translator, whose equivalents for prepositions are often fitted to his understanding of a clause or phrase (cf. **καὶ φάγεται ἐκ τῶν ἀριστερῶν || ויאכל על שמאול**, 9:19; **καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν μαστῶν κόπτεσθε ἀπὸ ἀγροῦ ἐπιθυμήματος καὶ ἀμπέλου γενήματος || על שדים ספדים על שדי חמד על גפן פריה**, 32:12).

τὸ κῦδος occurs only here in the Greek Bible, prompting the question of why the translator resorted to it in place of the more common **δόξα** or **τιμή**. Most likely correct is Ziegler's (16) suggestion of an inner-Greek corruption of **ζυγός**, "zumal beide Worte paläographisch sehr leicht zu verwechseln waren."

14:26

The reformulation embodied **ἦν βεβούλευται κύριος || היעוצה** is reminiscent of **καὶ ἔσονται εἰς καταπάτημα || אבוסנו** in 14:25 and was likely triggered by **עץ יהוה צבאות** in 14:27 (cf. Ziegler, 65).

The phrase **ἡ οἰκουμένη ὅλη** often corresponds to **כל הארץ** (10:14, 23; 13:5; 37:18), as it does in its first appearance in this verse. Although **+τῆς οἰκουμένης** might reflect **הארץ** in the *Vorlage*, it could just as readily have been supplied by the translator as a reprisal of **τὴν οἰκουμένην** earlier in the verse (cf. Van der Vorm-Croughs, 36–37). Adding **ἅλης** would have been superfluous, given that **τῆς οἰκουμένης** modifies **ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη**.

14:27

Given OG's modifications in the preceding verses, it is more likely that the translator supplied **ἃ** to synthesize **עץ ומי יפר** **יהוה צבאות** **עץ כי יהוה צבאות** in a single clause than that it reflects **אשר** in his *Vorlage*. He effects a similar synthesis by translating **וידו** in the accusative case (**καὶ τὴν χεῖρα**) as the object of **ἀποστρέψει** (**|| ישיבנה**).

Syriac, on the other hand, lacks an equivalent for כִּי. Since it is difficult to detect a reason the translator might have omitted it deliberately, we must allow that his *Vorlage* might not have contained it. Two possibilities come to mind: (1) it was the victim of the association of its *yod* with that of the Tetragrammaton (perhaps already by a scribe) or (2) כִּי was inserted secondarily to mark this as an explanation of what precedes. In favor of the latter option is that the paired clauses are more poignant rhetorically without the (possibly) pedantic כִּי.

14:28

Syriac's ܡܫܐ ܡܥܪܝܡ attests a heading מִשָּׁא מְעָרִים not found in any other witness but one that builds upon ܡܫܐ ܡܥܪܝܡ || ܗܝܗ ܗܡܫܐ ܗܝܗ and the address of ܦܠܫܬ in 14:29 (cf. ܡܫܐ ܡܥܪܝܡ || ܡܫܐ ܡܥܪܝܡ in 15:1).

Old Greek employs τὸ ῥῆμα for מִשָּׁא again in 15:1; 17:1, as well as for הדבר in 16:13.

14:29

Old Greek's shift of ܦܠܫܬ ܗܝܗ and ܡܥܪܝܡ into grammatically plural forms (εὐφρανθείητε πάντες οἱ ἀλλόφυλοι ... ὑμεῖς), followed by its rendering the second-person singular pronouns in 14:30 (τὸ πῆμα σου καὶ τὸ κατάλειμμά σου || ܫܪܫܝܬܐ ܕܝܟܝ) and a return to second-person plural forms in 14:31 (ἐλογύζετε, πύλαι || ܗܝܠܝܝ ܫܥܪ; οἱ ἀλλόφυλοι πάντες || ܦܠܫܬ ܕܝܟܝ) is a pattern noted in 3:18–24, as discussed in the excursus following 3:26.

The Leiden Peshitta emends the reading of 7a1 (ܡܥܪܝܡ) to ܡܥܪܝܡ (|| ܕܝܟܝ). While lacking manuscript evidence, the emendation is induced by the 2fs form ܡܥܪܝܡ (|| ܕܝܟܝ). 7a1's ܡܥܪܝܡ is likely due to inadvertent influence of ܡܥܪܝܡ ܡܥܪܝܡ in 14:31, which is itself at variance with MT's נִמּוּג פִּלְשֶׁת ܕܝܟܝ (see the comments ad loc.).

Only here in Isaiah does S use ܡܥܪܝܡ to render נֶכֶה, the same noun it used for בִּגְשֵׁייהֶם in 14:2 (its only other appearance in the book), while it translated ܡܥܪܝܡ ܡܥܪܝܡ with ܡܥܪܝܡ ܡܥܪܝܡ in 14:3 (but ܡܥܪܝܡ || ܥܒܕܬܐ [2x] in 28:21 and ܡܥܪܝܡ ܡܥܪܝܡ || ܥܒܕܬܐ ܕܥܕܩܐ in 32:17) and rendered ܡܥܪܝܡ with ܡܥܪܝܡ in 14:25.³⁵ Given the concentration of nominal forms from

35. נֶכֶה is otherwise rendered by ܡܥܪܝܡ (11x); ܡܥܪܝܡ (1:5; 9:12; 30:31); ܡܥܪܝܡ (37:38; 66:3); ܡܥܪܝܡ (10:20); and ܡܥܪܝܡ (37:36). Although ܡܥܪܝܡ renders נֶכֶה in 9:3 (cf. Exod 3:7; Ezek 34:27; Zech 9:8; Job 3:18), the remaining occurrences of נֶכֶה in Isaiah are

ܡܚܒ in this chapter, its ܡܚܒܢܝ || מַכְךְ is comprehensible as attesting the translator's perception of "subservience" as a leitmotif here.

ἐκ ... σπέρματος || מִשְׁרֵשׁ diverges from OG's regular equivalent for מִשְׁרֵשׁ, ῥίζα (6x) but is echoed in 14:30's τὸ σπέρμα σου || מִשְׁרֵשׁךְ. The word choice owes to the theme of offspring (cf. οἱ ἐρχόμενοι τέκνα Ἰακωβ βλαστήσει καὶ ἐξανθήσει Ἰσραὴλ || יִצְיָן וּפְרָחַי יִשְׂרָאֵל || הַבָּאִים יִשְׂרָאֵל יַעֲקֹב יַעֲקֹב יִצְיָן וּפְרָחַי יִשְׂרָאֵל, 27:6).

ἔκγονα ἀσπιδῶν (|| צַפְע here) rendered צַפְעוֹנִי in 11:8 and will render שַׁרְף מַעוֹפֵף (1) in 30:6, although ὄφεις πετόμενοι renders שַׁרְף מַעוֹפֵף at the end of this verse. καὶ τὰ ἔκγονα αὐτῶν || וּפְרִי, echoing ἔκγονα ἀσπιδῶν || צַפְע of the preceding clause and followed by ἐξελεύσονται, borrowed from ἐξελεύσεται || יֵצֵא earlier, recalls the translator's maneuvers in 3:25, where μαχαίρα πεσοῦνται || בַּחֲרֵב יִפְּלוּ is based on μαχαίρα πεσεῖται || בַּחֲרֵב יִפְּלוּ in the previous clause.

14:30

It is less likely that OG failed to recognize the ubiquitous בכורי (for which πρωτότοκος was the equivalent established in the Pentateuch) than that the oddity of the phrase בכורי דלים spurred its omission of an equivalent, with δι' αὐτοῦ constituting a quantitative compensation whose semantics fit the context.

Syriac's rendering of יהרג in the passive voice (ܢܡܠܝܬ) is intelligible after ܐܡܬܝ || והמתי. Although this suggests that its *Vorlage* read the same contrast in grammatical person between the verbs as in the MT, all other witnesses show agreement in person between the verbs. On the one hand, OG reads ἀνελεῖ δέ || והמתי and ἀνελεῖ || יהרג, which accords with T's ימית and יקטיל. One might argue that the third-person singular reflects the original reading, since the divine voice appears nowhere else in this unit, and והמתי might entail an errant transposition of *yod* and *taw*, with והמית the original reading. However, OG's desire to harmonize in this passage is evident in its lexical choice of σπέρμα σου || מִשְׁרֵשׁךְ, linking with σπέρματος || מִשְׁרֵשׁ in 14:29, and in his simple πτωχοί for דלים (on δι' αὐτοῦ, see above) that accords with explicitizing πτωχοὶ ... ἄνδρες || וְאִבְיוֹנִים. Thus, it is feasible that OG harmonized the grammatical person of the verbs, and T is equally susceptible to that explanation.

rendered with ܢܡܠܝܬ (3:5), ܡܢܬ (53:7; 58:3), or a nominal form of ܡܠܝܬ (3:12; 14:4; 60:17).

On the other hand, 1QIsa^a reads **והמת** and **אהרוג**, with which V's *et interire faciam ... interficiam* agrees. Given V's typical fidelity to its *Vorlage*, its *interficiam* likely reflects **אהרוג** in its *Vorlage*, perhaps reflecting a scribal harmonization. The same analysis might explain 1QIsa^a.

14:31

עיר || **שער** is irregular, since **שער** elsewhere in Isaiah corresponds to **עיר** (קיר) || **לח** in 15:1 or **קריה**.³⁶ Conversely, **שער** is otherwise translated by **לח** with **לח** in 38:2 and **לח** in 59:10), except here and in 29:21. Warszawski (30) posits that “**שער** ist als pars pro toto mit **שער** wiedergegeben.” However, it is possible that S's *Vorlage* read **עיר** for **שער**, under influence of the following **עיר**, and the same reading would explain OG.

Indeed, OG might represent variants conflation: **πύλαι πόλεων** || **שער** **עיר**. This is the sole occurrence of this combination in Isaiah, and its only parallel in Hebrew is **בפתחי שערים בעיר** in Prov 1:21. Although it remains possible that OG supplied **πόλεων** under the influence of **עיר** (|| **πόλεις**) later in the verse, it is difficult to explicate S's solitary **שער** under that supposition.

Given OG's willingness to manipulate grammatical features, the plural forms **ὀλολύετε πύλαι** || **שער** **הילילי** are attributable to the translator. The same is true of **κεκραγέτωσαν πόλεις** || **עיר** **זעקי**, including the decision to inflect the verb in the subjunctive mood rather than the imperative, as suggested by its **τεταραγμένοι** || **נמוג** to modify **πόλεις**. Equally, the choice of **παράσσω** marks the translator's shaping of this verse, since this verb (11x) renders a wide range of Hebrew lexemes, with none represented more than once (see the comments on **παράσσωσις** in 3:12).

שפ **יבס** **פכס** **חכס** || **נמוג** finds a parallel in Josh 2:9(24): **שפ** **יבס** **פכס** **חכס** **נמוג**. The translator seems to have taken the liberty afforded by the lack of inflection for person in **נמוג**

36. There is already an anomaly in Hebrew, insofar as **שער** is regularly grammatically masculine, whereas **הילילי** is inflected as feminine. This could be explained as reflecting an assumption that **שער** is metonymic for **עיר**. It is uncertain what would motivate this, however, and S has no clear examples of this elsewhere. S uses **שער** for **קריה** in 1:21, 26 and for **עיר** in 1:8, 26; 19:2 (2x); 36:1. **עיר** lacks an equivalent in 19:18 (**שער** **ההרס** **יאמר** **לאחת** || **שער** **ההרס** **יאמר** **לאחת**), probably because **שער** || **שער** is anaphoric to **שער** at the outset of the verse. The only other notable difference in equivalents is **שער** || **שער** in 14:21 (q.v.).

to render it as a 3fs. Whether his *Vorlage* read בלה, as suggested by ܡܠܚ, is difficult to say, although it is notable that the translator retains both the gender and person of במועדיו, even while rendering it in the grammatical plural: ܡܠܚܝܢ. Notably, OG reads simply οἱ ἀλλόφυλοι πάντες (so also in 14:29), as does V *Philisthea omnis* (also in 14:29), while 1QIsa^a reads בולך, and T reads פלשתאי כולכון (as in 14:29). One might argue that כלך reflects an error under the influence of 14:29. In that case, נמוג פלשת בלה would describe the addressee's state of mind, the infinitive absolute expressing an action accompanying the outcry. This seems strained, however, for which reason כלך is likely original, with S's ܡܠܚ a change already effected in its *Vorlage*.

ܡܠܚ || בודד is the same as in Hos 8:9, where S reads ܡܠܚ || בודד (cf. ܡܠܚ || בודד, Ps 102:8).

Old Greek's καὶ οὐκ ἔστι τοῦ εἶναι || בודד במועדיו might reflect uncertainty about the meaning of the Hebrew, spurring an ad hoc translation. Compare καὶ ἔσται εἰς οὐδέν || ואגמי מים in 14:23.

14:32

Although βασιλεῖς ἐθνῶν || מלכא גוי might reflect מלכי in its *Vorlage* (which is the reading in 1QIsa^a), this translator's attention to connections within this passage affords a foothold for Ziegler's (142) conclusion, "Der Übers. hat das 8 ignoriert (vgl. Fischer 29f.), wohl in Hinsicht auf V. 9 und V. 18 dieses Kap., wo die 'Könige der Völker' genannt sind."³⁷ This decision might have been influenced by the perception that the noun was the subject of יענה (thus ἀποκριθήσονται).

In neither OG nor S should ἐθνῶν or ܡܠܚܝܢ be presumed to reflect a variant גוים.

καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ might well attest ובו in OG's *Vorlage*, which is also the reading of 1QIsa^a. Alternatively, it could be based on analysis of the final *he* as a 3ms suffix. However, this translator's often flexible rendering of the person, gender, and number of pronouns must be kept in mind. The article of τοῦ λαοῦ takes the force of the personal pronoun, as often.

Although σώζω is the equivalent for חסה only here in the Greek Bible, this translator's equivalents for the two other occurrences of חסה allow for

37. Cf. βασιλέων || ממלכות in 13:4, where the translator analyzes ממלכות as metonymic.

a wide range of meaning: καὶ σαεπασθῆναι ὑπὸ Αἰγυπτίῳ || ולחסות בצל
 מצרים, 30:2 (alongside τοῦ βουθῆθῆναι ὑπὸ Φαραῶ || (לעוז במעוז פרעה); οἱ δὲ
 ἀντεχόμενοί μου ατῆσσονται γῆν || בי ינחל ארץ || והחוסה, 57:13. σωθήσονται ||
 יחסו easily fits within this range of meanings.

ISAIAH 15

15:1

As in 14:28, ῥῆμα is OG's equivalent for מִשָּׁה. The modifier τὸ κατὰ (τῆς Μωαβίτιδος) is paralleled by τὸ ῥῆμα τὸ κατὰ Δαμασκοῦ || מִשָּׁה דְּמִשָּׁק in 17:1.

Old Greek and S lack an equivalent for the first כִּי. Although this accords with OG's frequent omission of an equivalent for כִּי, its absence here could owe to the fact that the clause it introduces has no intrinsic dependence on τὸ ῥῆμα τὸ κατὰ τῆς Μωαβίτιδος.¹ Although that might also explain the lack of an equivalent in S, it is also possible that כִּי was absent from the *Vorlagen* of both versions and was supplied by a later Hebrew scribe, under the influence of כִּי בליל.

Syriac's omission of the second כִּי might owe to viewing it as superfluous, especially since it would obscure the parallel phrases headed by ܡܬܬܝܢ. Old Greek renders כִּי⁽²⁾ with γάρ, which rivals ὅτι for the most frequent equivalent for כִּי throughout Isaiah.

Syriac's ܠܠܚܢ || שׁדד parallels 16:4 (ܡܢ ܡܝܡ ܠܠܚܢ) and 21:2 (ܡܦܢܝ ܫܘܕܕ || ܡܢ ܡܝܡ ܠܠܚܢ) (cf. 23:1, 14; 33:1, et passim). The translation of נדמה with ܡܡܝܠ and ܡܡܝܠ accord with ܠܠܚܢ || ܡܡܝܠ in 6:5. Notably, ܡܡܝܠ and ܡܡܝܠ are conjugated in the 3mp, like ܠܠܚܢ || שׁדד. Although ܡܡܝܠ, a masculine plural noun + 3fs suffix, is the subject of ܠܠܚܢ and might be also for ܡܡܝܠ, more likely both ܡܡܝܠ and ܡܡܝܠ assume Moab's citizens as those appalled.

Meanwhile, OG's twice-used equivalent for שׁדד here, ἀπολείται, recurs in 23:1 (ὅτι ἀπώλετο || כִּי שׁדד) and 23:14 (ἀπώλετο || שׁדד). Its lack of an equivalent for the first נדמה—just as an equivalent for נדמה is missing after ὅτι ἀπώλετο || כִּי שׁדד in 23:1, 14—accords with its tendency to condense

1. On OG's and S's renderings of כִּי, see appendix C.

coordinate synonyms (Van der Vorm-Croughs, 188–30). The second נדמה is accounted for by λυπεῖσθε at the start of 15:2.

The lack of an equivalent for ער with OG's nominalized feminine singular adjective ἡ Μωαβίτις || ער מואב (as throughout ch. 15) is comparable to ἐν τῇ Ἰδουμαίᾳ || בארץ אדום in 34:6 and εἰς Ἀρμενίαν || ארץ ארט in 37:38.²

15:2

The only modification in S's rendering of the first clause is עלה || هحمله, for the sake of agreement with هملوا and هملوا in 15:1. As Goshen-Gottstein (נט) perceived, ἐφ' ἑαυτοῖς likely derives from עלה, with the *he* analyzed as a pronoun and adjusted for agreement with λυπεῖσθε.

The semantic field of λυπεῖσθε encompasses verbs implying pain like κατανένυγμαi || נדמיתי in 6:5 (cf. λυπηθήσονται καὶ τὰς ψυχὰς πονέσουσιν in 19:10). Parallel to that, λυπεῖσθε here likely renders נדמה⁽²⁾ in 15:1, which otherwise lacks an equivalent.

ἀπολείται was likely adopted from ἀπολείται in 15:1 to create an explanatory clause (γάρ) for the exhortation to “grieve over yourselves.” Although הבית might have been absent from OG's *Vorlage*, it is just as likely that the translator found no role for “house” in the reformulation. Goshen-Gottstein (נט) recalls καὶ ἀνήσω τὸν ἀμπελῶνά μου || ואשיתוהו בתה in 5:6, where τὸν ἀμπελῶνά μου is a replacement.

Despite uncertainty about Λεβηδων || דיבן, the supply of οὗ and ἐκεῖ marks it as a place-name (there is no reason to suppose that they reflect words in the *Vorlage*).³

τῆς Μωαβίτιδος || מידבא מואב might be due to the translator associating מידבא with Aramaic מדינתא and rendering the phrase parallel to τῆς Μωαβίτιδος || ער מואב in 15:1. In that case, he would also be responsible for the collapsing of מידבא מואב ועל נבו into ἐπὶ Ναβαυ τῆς Μωαβίτιδος.

Although ὁ βωμός renders הבמות (cf. ἐπὶ τοῖς βωμοῖς || על הבמה in 16:12), the adjoining ὑμῶν was more likely supplied by the translator than

2. Cf. the lack of a noun to categorize a toponym with ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ || בארץ מצרים in 19:18; 27:13; cf. ἐκ τῆς Μωαβίτιδος || ומארץ מואב in Jer 31(48):33; followed by καὶ τῇ Μωαβίτιν || ואת מואב in 32(25):21.

3. Ziegler's apparatus attests a wide range of inner-Greek variants, some of them corrections toward MT. Cf. τὸ Πεμμων || דימון in 15:9.

attests *הבמות* || *ܚܡܐ* in his *Vorlage*. Syriac's equivalent *ܚܡܐ* || *ܚܡܐ* appears again in 16:12 (*ܚܡܐ* || *ܚܡܐ*); 36:7 (*ܚܡܐ* || *ܚܡܐ*).

Although *ἐφ' ἑαυτοῖς* is likely based on *עלה*, *ἀναβήσεσθε* might be a second rendering of it as a verbal form. *λαλείειν* clearly renders *לִבְכִי*. The similarity to *κλαίοντες ἀναβήσονται* || *בבכי יעלה* in 15:5 is likely telling for the translator's choice here.

Sporadic links between OG and MT are recognizable in the second half of the verse, particularly in *ἐπὶ πάσης κεφαλῆς φαλάκρωμα* || *בכל ראשיו קרחה* and *πάντες βραχίονες κατατετμημένοι* || *כל זקן גרועה*. Not surprisingly *βραχίων* most often renders *זרוע*, while *הזקן* in 7:20 (its only other instance in the book) is translated with *τὸν πώγωνα*. Accordingly, Ziegler (26) opined that the translator's *Vorlage* here likely differed from MT but rejected the suggestion by Scholz (38) and Fischer (30) that the translator misread *זקן* as *זרוע*, since the only commonality is the initial letter. He concluded that *κατατετμημένοι*, which in 3 Kgdms 18:28; Hos 7:14 renders *התגדר*, reflects a *Vorlage* that incorporated *על כל ידיים גדדה* from Jer 48:37 (where it follows *כל ראש קרחה* *כי כל ראש קרחה*), speculating (26–27), “Vielleicht stand sie ursprünglich am Rand und wurde von einem Redaktor (wohl nach Jer 48) beigefügt, der hier diese Trauerzeremonie vermißte; LXX hat sie dann für ihre Wiedergabe benützt, dafür aber die Stelle vom Bartschneiden unterdrückt.”

As imaginative as this proposal is, its suppositions about how the putative Hebrew came to exist and what caused the translator to omit the final clause are too speculative to embrace. Further, the problem becomes sharper when Ziegler (27) speculates that *καὶ κόπτεσθε* in 15:3 is an insertion “aus seiner Randglosse *מִסִּפֵּד*, die aus der Jer-Parallele [48:37] stammt und von einem Redaktor beigefügt wurde.”

More straightforward is the possibility that *זקן* had been corrupted into *זרוע* (or simply *זרע*) under the influence of adjacent *גרועה*. Syriac's *ܚܡܐ* || *ܚܡܐ* attests an impulse to render *גרועה* in association with something subject to cutting. As Ziegler (26) observes, the cutting of arms as a mourning rite is commonly referenced in the Bible, making the association of cutting with “arms” intelligible.

15:3

The change in grammatical gender of the pronoun in *ἐν ταῖς πλατείαις αὐτῆς* || *בחוצותיו* correlates with its referent, *ἡ Μωαβίτις*.

The lack of an equivalent for the pronominal suffixes in *על גגותיה* *ܡܡܠܐ* || *ܡܡܠܐ* is atypical for S but must be considered in

15:5

ⲡⲱⲥⲱⲥ reflects reading ברוחה as בריחה. The same reading might underlie OG's unusual equivalent, ἐν ἑαυτῇ. Although this is not the only time OG gives an unusual equivalent for a perceived instance of רוח, ἐν ἑαυτῇ could be aligned with Van der Vorm-Croughs's (119–29) category of “free translation” of “semiprepositions” with pronominal suffixes (e.g., καὶ ἡ καρδία αὐτῶν ἡττηθήσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς || ולבב מצרים ימס בקרבו, 19:1; οὐαὶ οἱ συνετοὶ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς || הוי חכמים בעיניהם, 5:21) or the omission of nouns designating “body parts” with attached pronominal suffixes (Van der Vorm-Croughs, 70).⁴ Compare especially ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτοῦ || בדרך לבו, 57:17. ἐν ἑαυτῇ might be a similarly collapsed reading of ברוחה (בריחה)).

Even though δάμαλις is a frequent equivalent for עגלה (e.g., 5:18; 7:21) and τριετής || שלש is transparent, δάμαλις γάρ ἐστι τριετής is difficult to comprehend as an explanation (γάρ) of the preceding clause and seems an uncharacteristically wooden rendering for this translator. ⲙⲁⲗⲓⲥ, by contrast, is a toponym, like ⲙⲁⲗⲓⲥ ⲙⲁⲗⲓⲥ, ⲙⲁⲗⲓⲥ ⲙⲁⲗⲓⲥ || עד חרנים || עגלת שלש in Jer 48:34.

Following its transparent ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς ἀναβάσεως τῆς Λουιθ || כי מעלה || הלוות, OG supplies πρὸς σέ to provide a point of reference for κλαίοντες, which functions as a circumstantial participle modifying ἀναβήσονται. As noted in 15:2, the parallel to ἀναβήσεσθε κλαίειν there is telling and might account for the lack of an equivalent for בו here. The intended referent of σέ and the subject of ἀναβήσονται are oblique, particularly since the following βοᾷ || זעקת returns to the third-person singular.

The only previous plural verb forms appeared in the summons to a group of addressees to lament, in 15:2–3. The reason for lament is subsumed under ὅτι at the outset of 15:4 and concerns the suffering that spurs the “loins” and “heart” τῆς Μωαβίτιδος to cry out. κλαίοντες ἀναβήσονται is redolent of ἐκεῖ ἀναβήσεσθε κλαίειν in 15:2, suggesting that the addressees of 15:2–3 are here spoken of in the third-person as weeping for someone addressed in the second-person singular (σέ). Even though the verb βοᾷ that follows is reminiscent of βοᾷ in 15:4 and earlier in this verse, its

4. For רוח, cf. καὶ μάτην οἱ πλάσσοντες ὑμᾶς || ותהו נסכיהם || רוח in 41:29. Other distinctive equivalents for רוח are καὶ οὐκ ἔστι βοήθεια || ולא רוח in 31:3 and καὶ ἔσται ὁ ἄνθρωπος κρύπτων τοὺς λόγους αὐτοῦ || ויהי איש כמחבא רוח in 32:2. Its most frequent equivalents are πνεῦμα and ἀνεμος.

subject is σύντριμμα καὶ σεισμός. Isaiah 15:6 turns from her expression of suffering to a description of calamities that befall her.⁵

At first blush, S's סחלסל ׀ סעזסמ || כִּי דֶרֶךְ חֹרָנִים resembles OG's τῇ ὁδῷ Ἀρωνιμ. Warszawski (9) cited this as an example of OG and S reliant "auf einer gleichen, vom MT abweichenden Lesart." There are, however, three telling differences between them. First, whereas סחלסל ׀ סעזסמ represents בּו, ἀναβήσονται lacks an equivalent for it. Second, S renders כִּי with a *waw*, which it uses nine other times for כִּי (see appendix C), whereas OG gives no equivalent. Third, not only does S prefix *bēth* in סחלסל(ס), but that correlates with סחלסל(ס) earlier. Via these modifications, S creates nicely balanced clauses, based on a *Vorlage* like MT.

Old Greek, on the other hand, appears uninterested in balance. Although it supplies ἐπὶ with τῆς ἀναβάσεως, analogous to סחלסל(ס), its omission of equivalents for בּו and כִּי, although not atypical for this translator, leave τῇ ὁδῷ imbalanced with ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς ἀναβάσεως. There is no reason to suspect that OG's *Vorlage* diverged from what we find in MT, but it follows a very different tack than S.

יעער, the solitary instance a *pilpel* form of עור in the Bible, may have perplexed S's translator, who rendered it with the generic semantics of סחב. One might contemplate that OG's καὶ σεισμός recognizes עור, although σεισμός occurs again only in 29:6, where it translates רעש (thus, Ottley [2:185] suggested that the *Vorlage* read רעש here). Old Greek most often translates עור with ἐγείρω or one of its compounds (10:26; 13:17; 14:9; 41:2, 25; 42:13; 45:13; 51:9 [3x], 17 [2x]; 52:1 [2x]). Positing a leap from those semantics to an earthquake is highly speculative. The only inference available (short of adopting Ottley's proposal that רעש stood in the *Vorlage*) is that the translator found σεισμός a fitting companion to σύντριμμα. As Warszawski (31) observes, S's סחב ׀ יעער "aus dem Zusammenhange geraten ist."

15:6

Old Greek's lack of an equivalent for כִּי is one of twenty-three times it neglects clause-initial כִּי (see appendix C). It is possible that the translator did not see a connection of 15:6 to 15:5 that warranted a causal or

5. This description is tendered with full acknowledgment that the translator's path and intent are opaque.

explanatory conjunction, just as his rendering of the second כי with καί likely reflects an assessment that the two clauses functioned on the same syntactic plane. By contrast, his addition of γάρ in the final clause explains the failure of χόρτος as an instance of the vanishing of χόρτος χλωρός.

|| מַלְאִי וְיָבֹסֶן יְהוֹ || occurs again in Jer 48:34's || יְהוֹ ||. By contrast, in Ezekiel, the only other book where מַלְאִי appears, S's regular equivalent is מַלְאִי (5:15; 6:14; 33:28, 29; 35:3).

It is less likely that the personal pronoun in ὁ χόρτος αὐτῆς reflects חצירו in the *Vorlage* than that the translator construed חציר as another property of τῆς Νεμριμ || נַמְרִים ||, a relationship that αὐτῆς explicitizes (Van der Vorm-Croughs, 33–34).

ἐλθείψει || בִּלְהָ, an equivalent that appears again in 21:16, suffices also for יבש, as part of a condensation. Syriac's || בִּלְהָ was likely chosen for its compatibility with ح, as it is in 40:7–8, where بَلْ translates גַּבַל, alongside יבש || ح.

15:7

Although || עָשָׂה || invites recognition of graphic similarity to ح and the latter's semantic fit with עָשָׂה, it is not clear how “he made/did that which was left” would fit contextually (*pace* Warszawski's [31] adoption of || ح).⁶ On the other hand, || ح || is sensible in context as a statement that everything will perish. How the translator arrived at this equivalent is unclear, unless it constitutes what he considered a meaning appropriate to the context.

Old Greek rephrases עָשָׂה as a rhetorical question: καὶ οὕτως μέλλει σωθῆναι. Although καὶ might derive from reading עָשָׂה as אָל, this translator readily supplies or removes negative particles according to what he perceives to be the sense of a phrase (see Troxel, 93–99). Ziegler (29) summarizes examples of OG associating forms similar to עָשָׂה with יֵשַׁע with “diese Beispiele ... zeigen deutlich, daß עָשָׂה und הוֹשִׁיעַ, eben infolge ihrer graphischen Ähnlichkeit, leicht vermengt werden konnten,” leading him to conclude that σωθῆναι arose from association of עָשָׂה with יֵשַׁע. μέλλει accompanies σωθῆναι as a circumlocution for the future tense that also reflects the semantics of יֵתֵרָה (cf. ὁ μέλλων τὸ μέγα ἀγῆτος χειρώσασθαι || || לֵיתָן ||, Job 3:8).

6. The only variant reported in Leiden's apparatus is || ح || (12a1).

The lexical equivalent $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\alpha}\xi\omega$ || ופקדתם is attested elsewhere in the book (10:12; 24:21; 26:14, 21; 27:1), while manipulation of inflection is one of this translator's salient marks. $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\alpha}\xi\omega$ is intelligible following $\mu\eta\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \sigma\acute{\upsilon}\tau\omega\varsigma\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\epsilon\iota\ \sigma\omega\theta\eta\gamma\alpha\iota$ || יתרה עשה , as is the supply of $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ to mark the clause as explanatory.

יהוה צבאות || ܡܢܠܐ ܣܚܠܠܐ ܡܠܟܐ accords with מפקד צבא in 13:4, an equivalent found also in Ruth 1:6; Ps 17:3; Hos 4:14.

While OG's $\lambda\eta\mu\psi\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\iota\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\gamma$ || ישאום shifts the pronoun to accord with its perceived antecedent, $\tau\eta\gamma\ \phi\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha\gamma\gamma\alpha$, S's ܡܥܡܕܝ evidently analyzed the suffix as anaphoric to ופקדתם (ܡܥܡܕܝܢܝܟܡ) but considered it redundant.

15:8

Old Greek's $\sigma\upsilon\nu\eta\psi\epsilon$ || הקיפה is likely a guess, as suggested by $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \pi\epsilon\sigma\omicron\upsilon\nu\tau\alpha\iota$ || ונקה in 10:34 and $\phi\acute{\alpha}\gamma\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon\ \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho\ \sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\ \text{Μωαβ}$ || חגים ינקפו in 29:1, the verb's only other appearances in the book.⁷ Syriac's ܠܡܫܝܚ matches its use of ܡܫܝܚ for הקיה elsewhere (e.g., Josh 6:3; 2 Kgs 6:14; 11:8; cf. Josh 6:11; 1 Kgs 7:24).

Old Greek's translation of only one instance of יללתה befits its pattern of omitting synonyms, which is a more convincing explanation than Ziegler's judgment (16) that the second יללתה "ist wohl nicht urspr\u00fcnglich." Equally, the position of $\acute{\epsilon}\omega\varsigma$ (|| עד) in $\tau\eta\varsigma\ \text{Μωαβίτιδος τῆς Αγαλλιμ καὶ ὀλολυγμὸς αὐτῆς ἕως τοῦ φρέατος τοῦ Αἰλιμ}$ || $\text{מואב עד אגלים יללתה ובאר אילים}$ is more likely due to the translator than the *Vorlage*.

15:9

ܡܥܡܕܝ is S's common equivalent for דיבון (e.g., Num 21:30; 32:34), whereas Πεμμων is OG's common equivalent for רמון/רמן (e.g., Num 33:19, 20; Judg 20:47). Thus, whereas ד/ר confusion lies behind Πεμμων , ܡܥܡܕܝ is part of a larger pattern. 1QIsa^a reads דיבון in both instances.

As Ottley (2:186) perceived, $\acute{\alpha}\rho\omega$ is based on נוספות , construed as a form of אסף (cf. 10:4; 16:4 [$\text{[ἄρθη]} || \text{אפס}$], 10), while Ἀραβας lacks a clear equivalent. $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\alpha}\xi\omega$ || אשית is not found elsewhere in the book but is a verb

7. OG lacks an equivalent for תקפו in Lev 19:27 and הקיה in Josh 6:3, 11; while ἀνιστᾶν renders מקפים in 3 Kgdms 7:24, συντετέλεσθησαν is the equivalent for הקיפו in Job 1:5, and ὑψωσεν renders הקיה in Job 19:6. On the other hand, κυκλόω is a suitable equivalent in 4 Kgdms 11:8; Lam 3:5; 2 Chr 4:3; 23:7, as is περικυκλόω in 4 Kgdms 6:14, περιέχω in Pss 16(17):9; 21(22):17, and περιλαμβάνω in Pss 47(48):13; 87(88):18.

the translator often uses to speak of divine retribution, as an equivalent for a wide range of Hebrew verbs (e.g., for ואשיבה, 1:25; וביא, 7:17; אפקד, 10:12). He last used it in the clause ἐπάξω γὰρ ἐπὶ τὴν φάραγγα Ἀραβας || τὸ σπέρμα σου || נחל הערבים || ופקדתם על נחל הערבים (15:7), from which he likely imported Ἀραβας as the force imposed upon Πεμμων, annihilating Moab's offspring.

Everywhere else OG translates פליטה (here || τὸ σπέρμα) with a verbal or nominal form of λείπω, similar to κατάλοιπον || שארית later in the verse. τὸ σπέρμα is comparable to ἀνελεῖ δὲ λιμῶ τὸ σπέρμα σου || והמתי ברעב || שרשך in 14:30, whose σπέρμα σου || שרשך (parallel to καὶ τὸ κατάλειμμα σου || ושאריתך) clarifies what will be eradicated.

Although S elsewhere translates אריה with לו (11:7; 31:4; 35:9; 65:25), there is no recognizable equivalent here. Concomitantly, לו (typically for הנה, as in 27:8; 59:3, 13) lacks a Hebrew counterpart. Warszawski (31) urges reading לו but does not consider the position of לו in the sentence relative to אריה, nor does he address the rendering of לפליטה with חל as the complement to לו.

לו might signal that the translator meant the literally rendered but oblique לו in the sense, “I will plot more things against.” Despite the graphic similarity between לו and לו, it is far-fetched to imagine that he chose לו through linguistic play on אריה. It was more likely the sense ascribed to דימון נוספות that led to a reformulation in which אריה had no suitable role and was replaced by the verb. Something comparable happens in Ps 41:9, where the translator, following עלִי יחשבו רעה לי || לו סעם חכ || סעם חכ at the end of 41:8, renders 41:9's דבר בליעל יצוק בו with לו סעם חכ. There לו is used instead of לו, based on the theme of plotting in the preceding clause.

Accordingly, לו וּלְשֹׂאֲרֵי אָדָמָה || סח חכ לו is more likely to be read with the preceding phrases than with לו חכ, in 16:1 (*pace* Greenberg and Walter, 79). If the phrase were intended to be the complement of לו, translating the prefixed preposition of וּלְשֹׂאֲרֵי with לו would have differentiated the phrase from the preceding לו חכ and לו. Moreover, when this translator uses חל to mark the indirect object of לו, it carries adversative force (10:6, 16), whereas he typically uses לו (6:8; 19:20; 36:2; 37:2; 39:1; 43:14; 57:9; 66:19) when the sending bears a neutral or positive tenor.⁸

8. Once as an adversative for *bet*, in 9:7 (לו סעם חכ || סעם חכ) (דבר שלח אדני ביעקב ונפל בישראל || לו סעם חכ) (36:2; 37:9).

Αρηλ || אריה (usually translated with λέων) is OG's equivalent for אריאל in 29:1, 2, 7. The translator might have inferred that אריה was an abbreviation of אריאל, associated with the city David battled (ἐπολέμησεν || חנה) in 29:1.

ISAIAH 16

16:1

Old Greek alone reads a 1cs form for שלח : $\alpha\pi\sigma\tau\epsilon\lambda\omega$. Given that $\alpha\rho\tilde{\omega}$ || נוספות in 15:9 conforms in grammatical person and number, as well as tense, to the preceding $\epsilon\pi\acute{\alpha}\xi\omega$ || איש , $\alpha\pi\sigma\tau\epsilon\lambda\omega$ more likely reflects a similar modification of שלח than attests a variant אשלח .

The parsing of S's שָׁלַח (|| שְׁלַח) is equivocal: it could be either a 3ms perfect or a *paʿel* masculine singular imperative. Either breaks from the first-person singular speech of 15:9. Isaiah 16:2 (in Syriac) describes an action of the ruler compared to the flight of a bird, after which 16:3–4 have a series of feminine singular imperative forms. The next reference to a ruler arises in 16:5, which characterizes his reign as the pursuit of justice but with no clear connection to this verse. Nevertheless, given that 16:5 speaks of the ruler as a figure in the future, שָׁלַח is better analyzed as an imperative (understood as a petition) than as a perfect tense.

Old Greek's ὡς ἐρπετὰ ἐπὶ γῆνι reflects a different division of words than MT's כַּר מִשָּׁל אֲרֵץ. ἐρπετόν appears only here in Isaiah but frequently renders רמש elsewhere (e.g., Gen 1:21; 26; 28; 7:8; 14; 8:19), suggesting that OG read כְּרַמְשָׁל. This is also the reading of 1QIsa^a, which cautions against assuming that the translator simply innovated this reading.¹ Indeed, even though the word division in S's Vorlage appears to have been the same that MT attests, it reads כַּר as if it were בַּר: חב; מחلل; وَاُحَلِّبْ بَار. In the only other appearance of כַּר in Isaiah (34:6), S reads حَمْلٌ وَمَقْعَعْمَةٌ قَبْلِ مَحْلِبٍ || صَحْبِ لَوْحًا وَمَقْعَعْمَةً سَوِيَّةً. Deut 32:14; وَمُقْتَسِلٌ عَם حُلُب كَرِيمٍ || حمّر لَوْحًا وَمَقْعَعْمَةً (cf. מדם כרים ועתודים מאה אלף || ملاء الكف معتملاً وحملاً, 1 Sam 15:9; והמשנים ועל הכרים || ومقّعلمة کرم, 2 Kgs 3:4).

1. Ziegler's (101) suggestion, "Der Übers. hat den kontinuierlich geschriebenen Konsonantentext von 16,1 anders punktiert und eigenteilt," rests on the assumption that texts were transmitted in *scriptio continua*.

Old Greek's *μή* reads *אל* as the negative particle and shifts the location of *πέτρα ἔρημος*, its equivalent for *מסלע מדברה*, within the clause.

This is the only appearance of *הר בת ציון* in Isaiah, although *הר בת ציון* by itself appears in 1:8; 37:22; 52:2; and 62:11, each time rendered by *θυγάτηρ Σιών*. Although *הר בת* might have been absent from the *Vorlage*, it is equally possible that the translator conformed his rendering to the commonplace *הר ציון*.

16:2

ἔση aligns the grammatical person of *והיה* with the addressee of 16:3 (*βουλεύου ποίει τε || עשה [ק' הביאי] עצה עשו ||*), while *νεοσσός* serves as a subject complement, by association with *קן*, in light of *ὡς πετεινοῦ || בעור*. The modifier *ἀφρηρημένος || משלח* establishes the connection with *πετεινοῦ* as *ἀνιπταμένου*, even as *νεοσσός* functions as a metaphor for the addressee, *θυγάτηρ Μωαβ || בנות מואב*. By inserting *ἔπειτα δέ*, placing the equivalent for *לארנן* before *πλείονα* (see below), and joining the latter with *βουλεύου* at the outset of 16:3, he creates a second address, parallel to that to *θυγάτηρ Μωαβ*. The shift of number in *θυγάτηρ || בנות* conforms to *ἔση* and the second-person singular imperatives in 16:3.

Syriac entails a significant reformulation, placing its equivalent for *משלח*, *ܡܨܠܚܐ*, along with *ܬܗܝܝܢܐ || (תהיינה)*, after *ܒܢܐܬ ܡܡܠܚܐ || (בנות מואב)* and attaching it to *ܒܝܬܐ ܒܝܬܐ || (בית בית)*, to which it prefixes *bēth*.

Every other occurrence of *מעברה* outside Isaiah is translated with *διαβάσις* (Josh 2:7; Judg 3:28; 12:5, 6; 1 Sam 14:4; Jer 51:32). *מעברה* appeared in 10:29, where *καὶ παρελεύσεται φάραγγα καὶ ἔξει εἰς Ἀγγαί* is difficult to align with *עברו מעברה גבע מלון לנו*, while the cognate *מעבר* in 30:32 is equally difficult to align with an equivalent: *καὶ ἔσται αὐτῷ κυκλόθεν || מעבר*. Neither is there any retroversion of *ἔπειτα δέ* that could be linked to *מעברה* here.

ἔπειτα occurs only here in Greek Bible translations of Hebrew. *ἔπειτα δέ* is less likely intended as a substitute for *מעברה* (*pace* Van der Vorm-Croughs, 159) than inserted to clarify the relationship between the preceding address of *θυγάτηρ Μωαβ* and the commands to *Ἀρνω* that follow. Such an insertion accords with behaviors of this translator elsewhere, such as his supply twice of *τοίνυν* (27:4; 33:23), his use of *τοιγαροῦν* for conjunctive *waw* in 5:26, his frequent addition of *νῦν*, and his insertion of *γάρ* without a Hebrew counterpart (see Troxel, 92–93).

It is less likely that *πλείονα* is OG's equivalent for *מעברת* than that it was supplied as direct object for *βουλεύου* in 16:3. In fact, *מעברת* is not the only lexeme lacking an equivalent, since in 16:3 *βουλεύου || עצה* likely

implicitizes הביאי/הביאי, ποίει corresponds to both עשו and שיתי, and פלילה lacks a clear equivalent. It seems pointless, then, to try to identify a textual basis for πλείονα, particularly since this translator often supplies πολύς: for example, καὶ τέκνα πολλὰ ἀλλόφυλα ἐγενήθη αὐτοῖς || ובילדי נכרים ישפיקו (2:6), ὡς ὕδωρ πολὺ κατακαλύψαι θαλάσσας || כמים לים מכסים (11:9), διὰ πολλῶν γενεῶν || עד דור ודור (13:20), ἡ πολλή σου εὐφροσύνη || המית נבליך (14:11), μετὰ πολλῶν τεθνηκότων || לבוש הרגים (14:19).

16:3

سحب reads עשי, whether as a variant in its *Vorlage* or as an exigency to conform עשו to the other 2fs forms in the verse. The fact that both פלילה and سحل are *hapax legomena* is likely not coincidental. سحل, parallel to لحي, likely means “engage in meditation.” Positing that سحل reflects recognition that פלילה might entail the semantics of prayer (פלל) seems overly speculative. It was more likely chosen simply to parallel لحي.

σκέπη πένθους is difficult to align with particular Hebrew counterparts, unless πένθους means to render פלילה by association with prayer (פלל), but that seems tenuous.

σκέπη renders סתר in 16:4, drawing attention to the otherwise untranslated סתרי later in this verse. On the other hand, σκέπη translates צל in 25:4; 49:2 (cf. καὶ σκεπασθῆναι || בצל in 30:2; σκέπη || צל in Gen 19:8; Judg 9:15) and might be the touchstone for σκέπη. However, we also must account for σκοτία in the next clause, the only occurrence of this noun in Isaiah, although σκοτός renders חשך (14x), as well as אפל (2x) and קדר (1x). The question of whether σκοτία was chosen through association with σκία || צל (4:6; 38:8; 51:16)—despite the imperfect semantic overlap—or if σκέπη translates צל or סתרי is unanswerable and perhaps unnecessary, since the translator hardly renders 16:1–4 based on a strict alignment of words.

αὐτῇ was likely supplied by the translator to explicitize Arnon’s service of Moab in creating a “shelter from mourning.” Meanwhile, διὰ παντός is based on כליל, as confirmed by διὰ παντός || כליל in 30:29.

Old Greek’s ἐν || בתוך (i.e., without a distinct representation of תוך) is paralleled by ἐν χώρᾳ Αἰγυπτίων || בתוך ארץ מצרים in 19:19; ἐκ τοῦ βοθύνου || מתוך הפחת in 24:18; ἀπὸ σοῦ || מתוכך in 58:9. For the adverbial function of سحبا, compare سحبا in Ezek 32:25.

For φεύγουσιν ἐξέστησαν || נדחים נדד, compare οἱ φυγάδες Μωαβ || נדחי מואב in 16:4 (φεύγον || מדח in 13:14), as well as ἐξέστη Μαδεβηνα || נדדה מדמנה in 10:31 and ἐξέστησαν || נדדו in 33:3.

Old Greek's translation of תגלי with ἀπαχθῆς compares with τοίνυν αἰχμάλωτος ὁ λαός μου ἐγενήθη || לכן גלה עמי || in 5:13 and ἔκται αἰχμάλωτος || נגלה למו || in 23:1. The use of ἀπάγω for captivity finds a parallel in τοῦ μὴ ἐμπεσεῖν εἰς ἐπαγωγὴν || ברע תחת אסיר || in 10:14 and τοὺς ἐν ἐπαγωγῇ οὐκ ἔλυσεν || פתח ביתה || in 14:7.

16:4

Whereas MT's נדחי serves as subject of יגורו and regards מואב as addressee (so also V and T), OG and S analyze נדחי as a plural construct form: οἱ φυγάδες Μωαβ/ܡܘܥܒ ܢܚܝܝܬܐ. However, whereas ܡܡܡ ܚܝܝܬܐ ܡܘܥܒܐ comports with מופני שווד, ἔσσονται renders ἡοι as if it were יהיו, in concord with the grammatical person and number of יגורו. ὑμῖν modifies למו for the addressee it has presumed since 16:2 (alternating grammatical plural pronouns with second-person singular ones, such as the preceding σοι). Neither case sustains suspicion that the *Vorlage* differed from MT. Notably, OG carries the twist that, while the σκέπη called for in 16:3 was for the benefit of Moab, the σκέπη of this verse is constituted by the refugees of Moab, protecting Arnon from "the pursuer." The result is a less than coherent picture, suggesting that the translator was perhaps confused about the text's meaning.

Although OG typically uses διώκω for רדף (1:23; 5:11; 17:13; 30:16; 41:3; 51:1), we also find διώκων || מחריד in 17:2. Conversely, ἀπόλλυμι renders שדד in 15:1(2x) and 23:1, 14, and ταλαιπωροῦσιν and ποιεῖ ταλαιπώρους render forms of שדד in 33:1. There is sufficient variety in these renderings to account for διώκοντος || שווד here, which is chosen in connection with φυγάδες.

Whereas καὶ ὁ ἄρχων ἀπώλετο likely rests on reading שד as שר and collapsing כלה and תמו (1QIsa^a תמ), the noun συμμαχία appears only here in books of the Greek Bible translated from Hebrew, although συμμαχέω translates עזר in Josh 1:14; 1 Par 1:22.² Vulgate's *pulvis* agrees with S (ܡܣܠ), while T reads ארי סף מעיקא, interpreting המץ as "the oppressor." Most likely, ἡ συμμαχία σου was substituted for המץ to express an understanding of Arnon's new relationship to Moab, facilitated by the end of a compact. As already noted, the translator's grasp of the text's meaning seems tenuous.

ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς || מן הארץ is doubtless another of the translator's modifications of prepositions to fit the Greek sentence.

2. מץ appears again in Isaiah only in 17:13's ὡς χνοῦν || כמץ (ܡܥܣܠܐ S).

16:5

Both OG and S track transparently with MT. For OG's *καὶ διορθωθήσεται* || *והוכן*, compare *διορθώση* || *יבונן* in 62:7.

16:6

גא is a *hapax legomenon*. 1QIsa^a reads *גאה*, which appears in the same phrase in Jer 48:29 (*שמענו גאון מואב גאה מאד*). *גא* is the 3ms perfect (1cs imperfect would be *גא*), and the initial *dālat* of *גא* is either causal or nominalizing: “(We have heard the boast of Moab,) because/that it boasts voluminously.”³

Old Greek translates *גאה* as an appositive to *Μωαβ: ὑβριστῆς σφόδρα*.⁴ Whereas S gives equivalents for each component of *גאותו וגאוןו ועברתו*, OG collapses *גאותו וגאוןו* into *τῆν ὑπερηφανίαν* and renders *ועברתו* with *ἐξῆρας*, likely based on the verb *עבר* (cf. *τῆν κρίσιν ἀφείλεν* || *משפטי יעבור*, 40:27).

Syriac analyzes *בדיו* as “diviners” (*ܡܕܝܐܝܐ*) and, taking *כן* as an adverb, expands the clause by stipulating an appropriate action with *ܚܝܡܐ*, which appears in Isaiah again in 10:1, where it renders *חקק* in the sense of “search” (see the comments ad loc.). *ܠܐ ܟܢ ܗܝܬ ܚܝܡܐ ܡܕܝܐܝܐ ܚܝܡܐ* thus means, “It was not thus that his diviners inquired on his behalf.” OG’s *ἡ μαντεία σου* construes *בדיו* along the same lines as S, but its second *οὐχ οὕτως* is derived from *לכן* in 16:7, read as *כן* *לא*. The role each statement plays in its respective discourse is opaque, suggesting that neither S nor OG had a clear grasp of the passage.

16:7

Although OG’s *ὀλολύξει* *Μωαβ* || *יילי מואב* is transparent, what follows exemplifies its flexible rendering of prepositions: *ἐν γὰρ τῇ Μωαβίτιδι πάντες ὀλολύξουσιν* || *למואב כלה יילי*. The insertion of *γὰρ* makes the clause

3. Although the gender of *ܡܕܝܐܝܐ* is not otherwise evident in this verse (the third-person suffixes on *ܡܕܝܐܝܐ ܚܝܡܐ ܡܕܝܐܝܐ* could be masculine or feminine), comparison of *ܡܕܝܐܝܐ* in 16:7 (cf. *ܡܕܝܐܝܐ*, 15:2) and *ܡܕܝܐܝܐ* in 16:12 confirms the masculine gender.

4. Although *ὑβριστῆς σφόδρα* could be vocative, it is difficult to see how *τῆν ὑπερηφανίαν ἐξῆρας* could be addressed to Moab.

explanatory of $\delta\lambda\omicron\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\xi\epsilon\iota$ $\text{M}\omega\alpha\beta$, assisted by rendering כָּלָה יִלִּיל as grammatically plural, thereby distinguishing it from $\delta\lambda\omicron\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\xi\epsilon\iota$ $\text{M}\omega\alpha\beta$. By contrast, S's $\text{כָּלָה יִלִּיל} \parallel \text{כָּלָה יִלִּיל}$ uses an equivalent for כָּלָה that it employs again in $\text{כָּלָה יִלִּיל} \parallel \text{כָּלָה יִלִּיל}$.

Although כָּלָה יִלִּיל might be a guess for the *hapax legomenon* כָּלָה יִלִּיל , there is merit in Warszawski's perception (33) that "Pesch. hat כָּלָה יִלִּיל von dem aramäischen כָּלָה יִלִּיל ," comparing $\text{כָּלָה יִלִּיל} \parallel \text{כָּלָה יִלִּיל}$ in Ezra 4:12 (cf. Goshen-Gottstein, 58).⁵

τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν is likely its guess for כָּלָה יִלִּיל , which is inferred to be a property of Αδεσεθ .⁶ This translator incorporates κατοικέω into other passages implying habitation: $\text{καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ οἱ τὴν παραλίαν κατοικοῦντες καὶ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου} \parallel \text{עבר הירדן (8:23/[9:1])}$, $\text{καὶ ὄνοκένταυροι ἐκεῖ κατοικήσουσι} \parallel \text{וענה איים באלמנותיו (13:22)}$, $\text{καὶ θήσω τὴν Βαβυλωνίαν ἔρημον ὥστε κατοικεῖν ἐχίνους} \parallel \text{ושמחיה למורש כפד (14:23)}$.

Old Greek's reduction of כִּיר חרשת to Αδεσεθ (*dalet/resh* interchange), in distinction from $\text{ὥσει τεῖχος ὃ ἐνεκαίνισας} \parallel \text{לקיר חרש}$ in 16:11, below (which again presumes *dalet/resh* interchange), is comparable to $\text{ἡ Μωαβίτις} \parallel \text{ער מואב}$ in 15:1 and $\text{τῆς Μωαβίτιδος} \parallel \text{מידבא מואב}$ in 15:2 (see comments above).

Syriac's ܡܪܫܬܐ construes כִּיר חרשת as modifying כִּיר and associates it with ܚܪܫܐ , rendering it with a participle in the passive voice, as it will again in 16:12.⁷

$\text{ܢܚܐ} \parallel \text{ἐντραπήγη}$ appears only here in Isaiah. Ottley (2:189) refers to 16:12, where $\text{καὶ ἔσται εἰς τὸ ἐντραπήγναι σε}$ aligns with והיה כי נראה . There he (2:190) posits that the translator's *Vorlage* read ܢܚܐ , pointing to Dan 11:30, where θ' reads $\text{καὶ ταπεινώσεται} \parallel \text{ܢܚܐ}$. However, even if OG's *Vorlage* read ܢܚܐ , ἐντρέπω elsewhere in Isaiah translates כָּלָם (41:11; 45:16, 17; 50:7) or פחד (44:11). The only similar Hebrew construction is רוח ונבה in 66:2 (ܪܘܚܐܝܢ in 1QIsa^a), which OG renders with καὶ ἡσύχισον .⁸

5. Cf. $\text{ܡܪܫܬܐ} \parallel \text{ܡܪܫܬܐ}$ in 14:15.

6. This seems more likely than Goshen-Gottstein's (58) speculation that τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν reflects ܠܐܝܫܝ or ܠܐܢܝܝ .

7. In 19:18, the only occurrence of ܚܪܫܐ in Isaiah, S transliterates it as a proper noun: $\text{ܚܪܫܐ} \parallel \text{ܚܪܫܐ}$.

8. He may have inferred "silence" as the effect of a "stricken spirit" (cf. $\text{πεπληγὼς τοὺς πόδας} \parallel \text{רגלים נבה}$, 2 Sam 4:4; 9:3; $\text{συνήχθησαν ἐπ' ἐμὲ μάστιγες} \parallel \text{נאספו עלי נכים}$, Ps 34[35]:15).

There is no clear indication of how the translator arrived at *ἐντραπήση* here or *ἐντραπήναι* in 16:12, even if he saw a link between them.

Although the rapidly shifting addressees in 16:7–12 confound detection of a coherent discourse, the second-person singular *μελετήσεις* (|| תהגו) assumes the same addressee as in 16:6, who is said to have removed (*ἐξήρας* || ועברתו) Moab's infamous hubris. If *μελετήσεις καὶ οὐκ ἐντραπήση* in 16:7 carries on this address, then the addressee is said to show concern for the inhabitants of *Ἀδεσεθ* without being put to shame. The identity of the addressee in the verses leading to 16:12 becomes even more clouded by the assertion that the addressee *will* be ashamed (*καὶ ἔσται εἰς τὸ ἐντραπήναί σε* || והיה כי נראה). Accordingly, although the translator apparently sought to produce a grammatically coherent address, whatever identity he conceived for the addressee (if he did so) remains obscure.

16:8

As in 15:1, 5, 6, OG lacks an equivalent for *בי*. There is no reason to suspect its *Vorlage* lacked it here, but also no evidence to decisively call it an omission. See appendix C.

Although all other occurrences of *πεδίον* translate *בקעה* (40:4; 41:18; 63:14), it is difficult to imagine *בקעה* underlying it here, given the graphic dissimilarity to *שדמות*. More likely, OG was uncertain about *שדמות* (it has no clear equivalent for it in 37:27, its only other appearance in the book). Although it is tempting to suggest that the translator related *שדמות* to *שדה* (cf. S's *ساحة*), he typically translates the latter with *ἀγρός*. *τὰ πεδία* is likely a guess that places *τὰ πεδία* *Εσεβων*, a generic topographic term, parallel to *ἄμπελος Σεβαμα*.

Syriac elsewhere renders *אמל* with *ܐܡܠ* or *ܐܡܠܐ* (24:4[2x], 7; 33:9) and once with *ܐܡܠܐ* (19:8). Although S uses *ܥܡܠ* for *חרב* (e.g., 19:5, 6), it also frequently substitutes it for another verb, as seems the case here (see the comments on *ܥܡܠܐ* || *ܥܡܠܐ* in 14:17; cf. *ܥܡܠܐ* || *ܥܡܠܐ* in 5:6; *ܥܡܠܐ* in 6:11[2x]; *ܥܡܠܐ* in 24:6; *ܥܡܠܐ* in 27:10; and *ܥܡܠܐ* in 33:9).

τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοῦ || *בעליו* in 1:3 attests its familiarity with *בעל*, and *καὶ τὸς ὁ κρινόμενός μοι* || *מי בעל משפטי* in 50:8 represents well its function in a phrase. Most likely, then, *καταπίνοντες* here attests *בלעי*, analyzed as a form of the verb *בלע* that OG translates with *καταπίνω* in 9:15, 25:8, 28:4, and 49:19.

Syriac's equivalents for *הלם* in its two other occurrences in the book suggest that the translator was unfamiliar with it: *ܠܗܠܡܐ* || *ܠܗܠܡܐ*

ἀμπελώνων a contextually appropriate metonym for כרמל, just as in 10:18 and 37:24 it omits a toponymic equivalent juxtaposed to יער: *καὶ οἱ ὄρυμοί* || יערו וכרמלו (10:18); *τοῦ ὄρυμοῦ* || יער כרמלו (37:24).¹⁴

Although graphic similarity of *mem* and *kaph* in Paleo-Hebrew could be adduced to explain σου in each phrase, the pronoun likely arose from an attempt to create parallel phrases and link with the second-person singular pronouns of 16:9.

ἐμφρανθήσονται/|| סָבִי agree not only with the grammatical plural in T (ידוצון) but also 1QIsa^a (ירננו), whose 3mp inflection is distinct from the following ירועע (which OG, S, and T translate with grammatically plural verbs).

Whereas V's *neque iubilabit* and T's יחיכון ולא both analyze ירועע (לא) as from רוע, OG and S fill the slot before ביקבים יין with verbs apt for crushing grapes: *καὶ οὐ μὴ πατήσουσιν/|| סָבִי*.¹⁵ For OG this less likely betrays a semantic interpretation of ירועע (לא) via רעע^{II} (*pace* Goshen-Gottstein, סג) than a transfer of its rendering for ידרך לא before ביקבים יין, after which it omits any translation of הדרך הידד (cf. 16:9).

By contrast, S provides an expanded rendering of הידד הדרך, using סָבִי, for הידד, as in 16:9, as well as for הדרך, while using the cognate סָבִי || ידרך. However, the use of those equivalents for דרך suggests that סָבִי is less likely an equivalent for ידרך לא shifted forward than S's studied choice for ירועע (לא). Notably, S regularly uses the verb סָבִי for pressing grapes (e.g., *וְאַקַח אֶת הָעֵנָבִים וְאַשְׁחַט אֹתָם* || סָבִי חֲטַח סָבִי אֶת, Gen 40:11; cf. Amos 9:13) or olives (e.g., *שֶׁמֶן זֵית זָךְ כִּתִּית* || סָבִי חֲטַח סָבִי חֲטַח, Lev 24:2). Having inferred that סָבִי סָבִי was the counterpart to סָבִי סָבִי, based on the shift from הכרמל מן הכרמל to יער, he considered ירנן (לא) the end of the parallel clause and analyzed ירועע (לא) as joined with (סָבִי סָבִי || סָבִי סָבִי).

14. Less likely does OG regard βουός as a semantic equivalent for יער (*pace* Van der Vorm-Croughs, 146 n. 18). The nouns have distinct equivalents in 32:15's *καὶ ἔσται ἔρρημος ὁ Χερμελ καὶ ὁ Χερμελ εἰς ὄρυμόν λογισθήσεται* || יהיה מדבר לכרמל וכרמל || [ה]כרמל ליער יחשב.

15. In 15:4 S translated ירועע with סָבִי and OG with βόξ, equivalents they use for it again in 42:13, while in 44:23 S renders הריעו with סָבִי, and OG uses *σαλπίζατε*. On the other hand, in 24:19 both S and OG translate רעה התרעעה with words meaning “to tremble” (סָבִי סָבִי/ταραχῇ *ταραχθήσεται*), recognizing the verb as רעע^{II} (cf. S's סָבִי || רעו in 8:9, where OG's γῶντε attests דעו).

Although OG and S conjugate their equivalents for השבתי in different voices (πέπαιται/ܡܥܬܝܐ), each provides a similar conjunction to link the clause with what precedes (γάρ/ܐܝܢܐ). The differences in the voice of their verbs (which correlates with whether they give an equivalent for הוֹדוּ) make it likely that their similarities owe to polygenesis rather than borrowing.

16:11

For ܡܠܐ ܠܡܥܬܝܐ || יהמו ||, compare ܡܠܐ ܡܠܐ ܡܥܬܝܐ || אב מלך || in 17:12 and ܡܠܐ ܠܡܥܬܝܐ || יהמו || in 22:2. ܡܠܐ ܡܥܬܝܐ || יהמו || is comparable to καὶ ἐὼς || יהמו || in 57:15.

Syriac and OG construe קיר as a common noun, while S's ܡܥܬܝܐ translates חרש as a participle ("destroyed"), analyzing it as a by-form of הרס, as in 16:7.

16:12

For καὶ ἔσται εἰς τὸ ἐντραπήναί σε || וְהָיָה כִּי נִרְאָה ||, compare 16:7, where καὶ οὐκ ἐντραπήσῃ translates אַךְ נִכְאִים. Although Ottley's (2:190) speculation that the translator's *Vorlage* read נִכְאָה for נִרְאָה is possible, the translator's use of ἐντρέπω for either בָּלַם or בּוּשׁ elsewhere leaves his path to ἐντραπήναι here opaque, as was the case with ἐντραπήσῃ in 16:7 (q.v.).

Ottley (2:190) posits that σε might represent כִּי (נִרְאָה) read as γ, but ὅτι is a clear equivalent for כִּי, and the translator's willingness to supply a pronoun is well established.

Syriac passes over וְהָיָה in translating כִּי נִרְאָה as a temporal clause, although he renders the verb in the active voice: ܡܠܐ ܡܥܬܝܐ.

The relationship between τὰ χειροποίητα αὐτῆς and מִקְדָּשׁוּ is uncertain. χειροποίητα translates אֱלִילִים in 2:18; 10:11; 19:1; and 31:7, τὰ χειροποίητα αὐτῆς translates פְּסִילֵי אֱלֹהִים in 21:9, and ἐποίησαν χειροποίητα renders וַיַּעֲשׂוּ אֵל in 46:6. τὰ χειροποίητα αὐτῆς might be an interpretation of מִקְדָּשׁוּ as Moabite holy objects, but, lacking similar equivalents, this amounts to trying to read the translator's mind. Unlikely is Ottley's (2:190) suggestion that the *Vorlage* "read וְחָרַשׁ for וְקָדַשׁ," which fails to take into account the *mem* prefix of מִקְדָּשׁוּ. Syriac lacks the suffix of מִקְדָּשׁוּ in its equivalent, ܡܥܬܝܐ.

ἐξελεῖσθαι αὐτόν appears supplied by the translator as a complement to δύνηται (|| יוּכַל ||), based on the preceding καὶ εἰσελεύσεται || וּבֹא ||, just

as in 29:11 he supplies an infinitive complement for δύναμαι (οὐ δύναμαι ἀναγνώσθαι || לא אוכל) based on the preceding ἀνάγνωθι || קרא.

16:13

Syriac's frequent creation of relative clauses, particularly after a demonstrative + articular noun (e.g., *ܗܙܐ ܗܐܝܬ ܡܪܓܝܝܐ* || *ܗܙܐ ܗܐܝܬ ܡܪܓܝܝܐ* 14:16; *ܗܙܐ ܗܐܝܬ ܡܪܓܝܝܐ* 23:7), and its use of the relative pronoun in phrases headed by *ܕܠܗ* (2:1; 37:6, 22) make the absence of an equivalent for *ܐܝܬ* in the first clause remarkable. It likely reflects the absence not merely of *ܐܝܬ* but of the phrase *ܐܝܬ ܕܒܪ*, owing to homoioteleuton. The translator supplied *ܐܝܬ* as predicate, with *ܐܝܬ ܕܒܪ* as direct object. Although this account is speculative, the absence of a relative pronoun is so uncharacteristic of S that some hypothesis is in order.

Old Greek represents *ܐܝܬ*, with *καὶ ἐλάλησε* likely supplied as a complement to *ὁπότε* || *ܡܐܝܢ* (for which he uses a variety of equivalents elsewhere: *ὅτ*, 14:8; *ἀπ' ἀρχῆς*, 44:8; 48:8; *τότε*, 45:21; *ἔτι*, 48:3; *πάλαι*, 48:5, 7). With the addition of *καὶ ἐλάλησε*, in anticipation of *ܕܒܪ ܝܗܘܐ* in 16:14, what in the Hebrew text was a modification of a previous oracle became an oracle once spoken in conjunction with another: *ὁπότε καὶ ἐλάλησε*.

16:14

καὶ νῦν λέγω || *ܐܝܬ ܕܒܪ ܝܗܘܐ* is of a piece with *+καὶ ἐλάλησε* at the end of 16:13, making 16:14 the *ῥῆμα* cited from the past.

It appears that the translator chose to accommodate the *kaph* in his rendering *ܐܝܬ ܕܒܪ ܝܗܘܐ* by using the genitive case to define the quality of *ܐܝܬ ܕܒܪ ܝܗܘܐ* (cf. his frequent use of *ὡς* with the genitive: e.g., 4:5; 8:14; 13:8; 16:2).

Syriac translates *ܐܝܬ ܕܒܪ ܝܗܘܐ* with *ܐܝܬ ܕܒܪ ܝܗܘܐ* again in 29:5[2x], 7, 8; 31:4. Similarly, OG renders *ܐܝܬ ܕܒܪ ܝܗܘܐ* with *πλοῦτος* again in 29:5, 7, 8; 32:14; 60:5.

Although *ܐܝܬ ܕܒܪ ܝܗܘܐ* might be a deduction based on the tacit use of *ܕܒܪ ܝܗܘܐ* for "many people" (e.g., 8:15) and the frequent juxtaposition of *ܕܒܪ ܝܗܘܐ* and *ܐܝܬ ܕܒܪ ܝܗܘܐ* (e.g., 2:3, 4; 13:4; 17:12), the fact that *ܐܝܬ ܕܒܪ ܝܗܘܐ* appears alone (rather than in an expansion such as *ܐܝܬ ܕܒܪ ܝܗܘܐ*), while *ܐܝܬ ܕܒܪ ܝܗܘܐ* never occurs elsewhere in S without support from the Hebrew, suggests that his *Vorlage* read *ܐܝܬ ܕܒܪ ܝܗܘܐ* (less likely *ܐܝܬ ܕܒܪ ܝܗܘܐ*) rather than *ܐܝܬ ܕܒܪ ܝܗܘܐ*, despite the lack of graphic similarity.

καὶ οὐκ ἔντιμος seems to read לֹא כְבוֹד as לֹא כְבוֹד (cf. S's لا). The equivalence ἔντιμος || כְבוֹד (cf. τιμή || כְבוֹד, 11:10 ;14:18) matches the phrase correlative to ἀτιμασθήσεται || וְנִקְלָה earlier. ὀλιγοστός || מַעַט מִזֶּעַר is comparable to μικρόν || מַעַט מִזֶּעַר in 10:25.

ISAIAH 17

17:1

Regarding τὸ ῥῆμα τὸ κατὰ || מִשָּׁא, see 15:1.

ἀπὸ πόλεων (|| מַעִיר) less likely attests מערים than attempts to make sense of the assertion that Damascus will be “removed” (ἀρθήσεται || מוֹסָר via סֹר). Given the perception that this has to do with its downfall, the notion of its removal from among cities is an intelligible inference.

S renders the *hapax legomenon* מַעִי with حَمِيح, comparable to حَمِيح || עֵי in Jer 26:18; Mic 3:12; Ps 79:1. Old Greek’s lack of an equivalent for it led Bernard Duhm and George Buchanan Gray to posit that מַעִי is a corrupt dittography of מַעִיר that entered a form of the text after OG’s *Vorlage*.¹ Hans Wildberger rejected their proposal on the grounds that it “does not directly follow מַעִיר” and argued that מַעִי, “a less common form of the better known עֵי,” was selected “because the word sounded so much like מַעִיר.”² Aside from that aesthetic defense of מַעִי, καὶ ἔσται εἰς πτώσιν || מַעִי מַפְלָה is too readily attributable to the translator’s penchant for concision to consider it evidence that מַעִי was absent from the *Vorlage*.

Beyond that, there is little evidence for OG’s familiarity with עֵי. Although the word ὁπωροφυλάκιον that OG uses for מְלוֹנָה in 1:8 (ὡς ὁπωροφυλάκιον ἐν σικυηράτῳ || כְּמְלוֹנָה בַּמִּקְשָׁה; cf. 24:20), translates עֵי in Mic 1:6 (εἰς ὁπωροφυλάκιον ἀγροῦ || לְעֵי הַשְׂדֵּה); Mic 3:12 (καὶ Ἱερουσαλὴμ ὡς ὁπωροφυλάκιον ἔσται || וְיִירוּשָׁלַם עֵיִן תִּהְיֶה); Ps 78(79):1 (εἰς ὁπωροφυλάκιον || לְעֵיִם), these are suspect of having appropriated the phraseology from Isa

1. Duhm, *Buch Jesaja*, 108. George Buchanan Gray, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Isaiah I–XXVII*, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark), 298. HALOT attributes the same judgment to Seeligmann, but the only discussion of 17:1–2 (73) makes no mention of this.

2. Hans Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27*, trans. Thomas H. Trapp, CC (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997), 156.

1:8. Only καὶ Ἱερουσαλημ εἰς ἄβατον ἔσται || וירושלים עיים תהיה in Jer 33:18 provides a semantically apt equivalent. There is diminished reason, then, to think that the translator would have recognized מעי.

17:2

Although it is possible that a scribe had already supplied תהינה at the outset of the verse, corresponding to תהינה later, the lack of attestation in any other witness makes it more likely that S supplied סמס to fill out the clause. This is but the first supplement the translator provides in reshaping the verse. סמס reformulates ורבצו as a relative clause, with its + סמס explicitizing the relationship to סמס, just as סמס is added in סמס || ואין מחריד.

Because OG construed עזבות as referring to Damascus, it inflected it in the grammatical singular, καταλελειμμένη.³ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα implies reading ערער as עד עד, and the translator likely also read the preceding ערי as עדי.⁴

ποιμνίων is the equivalent for לעדרים in a reformulation whose εἰς κοίτην and καὶ ἀνάπαυσιν appear to be double renderings of ורבצו.

καὶ οὐκ ἔσται ὁ διώκων || ואין מחריד recalls ἔσονται σκέπη ὑμῶν ἀπὸ προσώπου διώκοντος || סתר למו מפני שווד in 16:4, where διώκοντος is a generic term for one who afflicts fugitives (οἱ φυγάδες), a topic the translator will introduce again in 17:3 with τοῦ καταφυγεῖν.

17:3

Although καὶ οὐκέτι ἔσται renders שבת nowhere else in the Greek Bible, the use of παύω for שבת in 15:10; 24:8 (2x); 33:8; 58:12 suggests that οὐκέτι ἔσται is the translator's choice for ונשבת here. Correspondingly, the repetition of καὶ οὐκέτι ἔσται before βασιλεία seems more likely his insertion than attestation of a second ונשבת in his *Vorlage* (cf. S's + סמס in 17:2).

ὀχυρά (|| מבצר) could be parsed as a neuter plural adjective, but more likely it is feminine nominative singular, serving as a predicate adjective for implicit Δαμασκός (17:1), just as καταλελειμμένη (|| עזבות) did in 17:2.⁵

3. This observation remains true even if its *Vorlage* read, say, עזבות.

4. ערער is translated with Ἀροη elsewhere (e.g., Num 32:34; Deut 2:36; 3:12).

5. ὀχυρά || מבצר occurs commonly in the phrase πόλεις ὀχυραί throughout the Greek Bible (e.g., Num 13:28; Deut 3:5; Isa 25:2; 36:1; 37:26).

The translator's supply of +τοῦ καταφυγεῖν explicitizes the function that Damascus as ὄχυρά is unable to play for Ephraim.⁶

Syriac's ܡܒܥܨ || ܡܒܥܨ occurs again in 34:13. Its ܡܒܥܨ || (ושאר) || ܡܒܥܨ likely reflects a scribal error in light of the preceding ܡܢܐܦܪܝܡ (מ), although it is possible that the misreading was by the translator.

Old Greek's +ἀπολείται extends the semantics of καὶ οὐκέτι ἔσται || ונשבת, using a verb that renders שבת in 13:11; 33:11 (and often outside Isaiah).

The comparative adjective βελτίων is infrequent in the Greek Bible.⁷ The first of two equivalents for ככבוד, βελτίων casts the comparison of Damascus to Israel and its glory via a question with an insinuated negative particle, as this translator often does. This use of βελτίων is similar to ποῖον βέλτιον || הוי רב in 45:9, insofar as it stands in a contrived rhetorical question. The second rendering of ככבוד leaves the comparison behind and is shifted to the end of the clause, with anaphoric αὐτῶν supplied to specify to whose "glory" Damascus falls short. Not only does this entail reformulation as a question, but one addressed to an unspecified person, although the context leaves Damascus the presumed addressee. Although one would expect οὐ γὰρ σὺ βελτίων εἶ to expect an affirmative response, the discourse context undermines that, unless the translator understood the question to sarcastically taunt an addressee who assumes superiority.

Old Greek joins its rendering of יהוה צבאות נאם (τάδε λέγει κύριος σαβαωθ) with the beginning of 17:4, just as its τάδε λέγει κύριος ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραὴλ (|| נאם יהוה אלהי ישראל) at the end of 17:6 serves as preface to τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκεῖνῃ at the beginning of 17:7.

17:4

ἐκλειψις || ידל' finds a parallel in 38:14's ἐξέλιπον || דל', although both might be based on association of the verb with חדל, which is translated with ἐκλείπον in 53:3 (cf. Gen 18:11; Deut 15:11).

6. Cf. καὶ τὸ ὕψος τῆς καταφυγῆς τοῦ τοίχου σου || ומבצר משגב חומתיך השח in 25:12, where τὸ ὕψος reflects משגב (cf. 2:11, 17; 12:4; but cf. καταφυγή || משגב in Ps 9:10; 94:22), while τῆς καταφυγῆς appears to align with מבצר to specify the function the wall will (not) play for the addressee.

7. It typically renders טוב (Num 14:3; Judg 18:19; Jer 22:15; 38[45]:20; 40[47]:9; 42[49]:6; Prov 8:19). The lone exception outside Isaiah is ὡς συμφέρει καὶ ὡς βέλτιον ὑμῖν || כטוב וכישר בעיניכם in Jer 26[33]:14, although it is used as a virtual synonym alongside ὡς συμφέρει || כטוב.

τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ || בשרו בשרו accords with T's יקריה. Analogous to his inferential rendering in the last clause of 17:3, the translator may have reasoned from the parallel יעקב בבוד, to which the pronominal suffix of בשרו is anaphoric, and from that extended the theme of δόξα with which 17:3 concluded. A similar choice of δόξα based on context is 6:1's καὶ πλῆρης ὁ οἶκος τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ || ושליו מלאים את ההיכל, coordinate with 6:3's πλῆρης παῖσα ἡ γῆ τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ || מלא כל הארץ בבודו (cf. 40:6). Although it is not always clear how the translator arrived at his choice of δόξα, the lexeme becomes a leitmotif in the translation (see Troxel, 128–32).

σεισθήσεται || ירזה seems attributable to associating the verb with רגז (based on biliteral etymology), which it translates with σείω in 13:13; 14:16.⁸ רזה appears only here and Zeph 2:11, where it is translated with ἐξολεθρεύσει.

17:5

אב אב reflects analysis of כאסף as *kaph* + participle (cf. אב אב אב || אב אב אב later in the verse), while אב אב construes קציר קמה as a construct phrase, whereas MT's קציר קמה entails apposition. As Warszawski (84) notes, καὶ ἔσται ὃν τρόπον ἐάν τις συναγάγῃ || והיה כאסף is formally similar to אב אב אב אב. However, S frequently uses *dālat* to nominalize verbal phrases, and other cases of אב אב do not correlate with a clause containing τις in OG (cf. אב אב אב אב, אב אב אב אב || ὡς ὑπὸ πυρὸς κατακαυμένους || כהולך || אב אב אב אב || ὡς εὐφραينوμένους || כמאכלת אש || 9:18; אב אב אב אב || בחליל, 30:29), so that the similarity here is inconsequential to the question of whether S relied on OG.

Although καὶ σπέρμα might attest זורע (rather than זורעו), it is equally likely that the translator ignored the final *waw* once he understood the

8. For biliteral etymology, see Tov's examples in "Biliteral Exegesis," 461–78. As he concludes, "it is hard to know how widespread this procedure was since it comes to light only from the recognition of occasional errors in identification" (478), but these suggest "an unsystematic *ad hoc* exegesis in the identification process" that sometimes entailed disregarding letters of words "because the translator did not recognize them" (479). Ziegler (140) endorsed Wutz's perception that the translator associated ירזה with רעש (Wutz, *Transkriptionen*, 99), but the shared grapheme ר is hardly sufficient to sustain the hypothesis. Regarding the difficulties with Goshen-Gottstein's (סה) opinion that σεισθήσεται is based on the translator associating ירזה with Aramaic רזי "be violent," see Byun, 118–19 n. 22.

lexeme as “seed” and analyzed it as syntactically bound to שבליים, similar to σπέρμα Χαλδαίων || זרעו כשדים in 48:14, as Goshen-Gottstein (סה) noted.

It is unclear what to make of στερεῶς || רפאים, since elsewhere in Isaiah the adjective accompanies πέτρα (2:21; 5:28; 50:7; 51:1), and φάραγξ and στερεός collocate only here in the Greek Bible. רפאים is translated with οἱ γίγαντες in 14:9 (cf. τοὺς γίγαντας || רפאים in Gen 14:5), while the seven occurrences of the toponym עמק רפאים have different equivalents: γῆς Παφαῖν (Josh 15:8); ἐκ μέρους Εμεκραφαῖν (Josh 18:16); τὴν κοιλάδα τῶν τιτάνων (2 Sam 5:18 [= 1 Chr 14:19], 22; 23:13 [= 1 Chr 11:15]).⁹ Although association of στερεός with ἐν φάραγγι (|| בעמק; cf. 22:7; 28:21; 65:10) might owe to perplexity over רפאים, why he supplied any modifier is unclear. Ziegler (114) attributed it to recollection of Deut 21:4, “wo die LXX im Gegensatz zum MT (‘immerfließender Bach’) dem ‘rauhem Tal’ das Präd. zuschreibt: ‘das nicht bebaut noch besät wird,’” but this is highly speculative.

17:6

עוללת || صحح appears elsewhere in Judg 8:2, Jer 49:9, Obad 5, and Mic 7:1. The reformulation כנקף זית || אב אלה || صحח is structurally similar to אב אלה || صحח, and אב אלה || صحח in 17:5, with אלה occupying the slot of אב in those phrases.

The antecedent of ἐν αὐτῇ (|| בו) is φάραγγι (17:5), and καὶ καταλειφθῇ (|| ונשאר) is coordinate with συναγάγη (17:5), while καλάμη is its subject. Comparing καλάμη ἢ ὡς ῥῶγες ἐλαίας || עוללת כנקף זית to 24:13's ὃν τρόπον ἐάν τις καλαμήσῃται ἐλαίαν οὕτως καλαμήσονται αὐτούς || עוללת כנקף זית elucidates the translator's word choice (cf. καλαμῶνται || מעולל in 3:12).¹⁰ As noted at 15:8 (q.v.), the translator's handling of נקף elsewhere suggests it was unfamiliar to him, making ὡς ῥῶγες || כנקף most likely a guess. The lack of a discernable equivalent for גרגרים befits the translator's tendency to dispense with unfamiliar words he found superfluous.

Although אלה aligns formally with גרגרים, it is defined by حنة ط, which incorporates an equivalent for בסעפיה, suggesting that אלה is a guess for what would be found on branches after a gleaning, comparable to “an olive tree that has been beaten.” The shift forward of its

9. In 26:14 ἰατροί translates רפאים.

10. καλάμη appears again in ὡς καλάμη στιππύου || לנער (1:31); καλάμη || קש (5:24); φυλάσσειν καλάμην ἐν ἀγρῷ || שמיר שית (27:4).

equivalent for **בסעפיה** and the lack of an equivalent for **פריה** (typically rendered with פִּי [e.g., 3:10; 4:2; 10:12]) reflect a struggle to make sense of the verse.

As Warszawski (34) observes, OG also lacks a clear equivalent for **פריה**. However, whereas S shifted its equivalent for **בסעפיה** forward, OG's ἐπὶ τῶν κλάδων aligns with its slot in the sentence, while καταλειφθῆν aligns with the slot occupied by **פריה**, although it was doubtless chosen to accord with καὶ καταλειφθῆν || **ונשאר** at the start of the verse. The differences between S and OG prevent a clear perception of what stood in their *Vorlagen* in the slot that **פריה** occupies.

Although **חל** could be seen as proving the translator's familiarity with **אמיר**, the latter appears again in the Bible only in 17:9, where S renders **והאמיר** with **והאמיר**, making **חל** more likely a guess that befits the context. Similarly, OG's μετεώρου || **אמיר** is likely a guess, perhaps based on association with **רום** (cf. 2:12, 13).

17:7

The equivalents πεποιθώς ἔσται and **למלך** for **ישעה** recur in 17:8, just as in 31:1 OG renders **על קדוש ישראל** with καὶ οὐκ ἦσαν πεποιθότες ἐπὶ τὸν ἄγιον τοῦ Ἰσραήλ and S with **חל למלך**. In the latter case, those equivalents follow οἱ ἐφ' ἵπποις πεποιθότες/ **חל למלך** || **על סוסים ישענו**, suggesting that they are based on biliteral association with **שען**. Notably, OG and S part company in rendering **תשעינה** in 32:3, where OG reformulates **עניי ראים** with καὶ οὐκέτι ἔσονται πεποιθότες ἐπ' ἀνθρώποις, while **חל למלך** associates **תשעינה** with Aramaic **חל למלך** (cf. **חל למלך** || **בי טח מראות עיניהם**, 44:18).

17:8

Although OG's and S's equivalents for **ישעה** and **ולא** are semantically alike and each renders **אל** with a preposition suitable before the object of reliance (ἐπὶ/ **חל**), OG inflects its verb in the grammatical plural, explicitizing the collective force of ἄνθρωπος of 17:7.

חל למלך reformulates **ידיו ואשר** with coordinate, verbal relative clauses, while OG removes the apposition of **ידיו** to **מעשה** making them coordinate: ἐπὶ τοῖς βωμοῖς οὐδὲ ἐπὶ τοῖς ἔργοις τῶν χειρῶν αὐτῶν. Old Greek's rendering of

the pronominal suffixes in the grammatical plural (αὐτῶν) comports with πεποιθότες ὥσιν.

Each associates לֹא יֵרָאֶה (καὶ οὐκ ὄψονται/סו) with the next clause, a consequence of not recognizing ישׁעָה as semantically parallel to יֵרָאֶה. Old Greek inflects the verb in the grammatical plural, coordinate with πεποιθότες ὥσιν and αὐτῶν.

The +pronoun (αὐτῶν) following τοῖς ἔργοις τῶν χειρῶν accords with the characteristic diction of this phrase (cf. 2:8; 3:11; 5:12), in the wake of which +αὐτῶν with οἱ δάκτυλοι was a natural addition.

Whereas S translates והאשרים והחמנים (פלא; סבתא), OG renders והאשרים with τὰ δένδρα (αὐτῶν), as it does again in 27:9 (the typical equivalent for אֲשֵׁרִים is ἄλση; e.g., 1 Kgs 14:23; 17:10; 23:14; 2 Chr 14:2; 17:6), and והחמנים with τὰ βδελύγματα (αὐτῶν), a word it elsewhere uses for תועבה (1:13; 41:24; 44:19), אֱלִילִים (2:8, 20 [2x]), and שִׁקָּץ (66:3, 17).¹¹

+αὐτῶν with τὰ δένδρα and τὰ βδελύγματα accords with the translator's additions of a pronoun in the genitive case elsewhere to explicitize relationships (Van der Vorm-Croughs, 33–36).

17:9

Each instance of שָׁמָּה elsewhere in Isaiah translates בּוֹר, except 30:14, where it renders the synonymous גִּבְאָה (מִים מִגִּבְאָה || מִלָּא מִעַ גִּבְאָה). Goshen-Gottstein (סו) rightly dismisses conjecture of an inner-S corruption of שָׁמָּה (as a transliteration of עֲזוּבָה). Although ו/ש interchange (by an aural/quasi-aural error) would account for שָׁמָּה it is improbable that S would have given a transliteration for עֲזוּבָה rather than a translation.

Greenberg and Walter (xxii) argue that the translator, having settled on שָׁמָּה || הֶחָרֵשׁ, “needed a word which would fit his use of ‘silent’; a disused abandoned well would be silent.” This tautology does not explain why the translator should have associated עֲזוּבָה with an abandoned *well*. There is no satisfying explanation of שָׁמָּה.

Old Greek's addition of the second-person singular pronoun in αἱ πόλεις σου || עִירֵי embodies the translator's tendency to add pronouns for

11. Contrast 27:9, where τὰ εἰδωλα αὐτῶν || חַמְנִים (cf. τὰ ξύλινα χειροποίητα ὑμῶν || את חַמְנִיכִם in Lev 26:30).

clarification, as noted in 17:8.¹² σου anticipates κατέλιπες || שכחת and τοῦ βουθου σου || ישעך in 17:10.

ἐγκαταλείμμεναι || מעזו correlates with ὃν τρόπον ἐγκατέλιπον || בעזובת, suggesting that ἐγκαταλείμμεναι reflects biliteral association of מעזו with עזב (Byun, 187 n. 15), based on graphic similarity between מעזו (מ) and עזובת (כ). Old Greek's lack of an equivalent for אשר עזבו fits its penchant for omitting synonymms.

Although οἱ Ἀμορραῖοι || האמרי (read as האמרי) seems transparent (سَامِرِيّ analyzes it as a passive participle), οἱ Ευαῖοι, which represents החוי in the Pentateuch, lacks a clear foothold in the Hebrew, although it aligns formally with החרש, which otherwise has no evident equivalent.¹³ Ottley (2:192) reports suggestions that OG's *Vorlage* read החוי in place of החרש, as well as Paul de Lagarde's observation that וי can be easily confused with רש in some stages of the script. But he also judges that this suggestion founders on word order, since οἱ Ἀμορραῖοι καὶ οἱ Ευαῖοι is the reverse of (putative) והאמרי החוי החרש והאמרי. The translator's starting point might have been identifying האמרי with the Amorites, to which he paired the Hivites, a group frequently associated with them in the Pentateuch (e.g., Exod 3:8, 17; 13:5; 23:23). In the end, however, there can be no certainty about the translator's mental process or his *Vorlage*.

καὶ ἔσονται || והיתה shifts the grammatical number to match αἱ πόλεις σου.

17:10

Syriac translates כִּי with a simple *waw*, as it does in nine other cases (see appendix C), and renders שכחת with ܫܚܚܬ, just as it translates נשכחת with ܢܫܚܚܬ in 23:15 and ܠܫܚܚܬ in 23:16 (cf. 49:14, 15; 51:13; 54:4; 65:16). The fact that κατέλιπες (|| שכחת) accords with the use of ἐγκαταλείπω in 17:9 suggests that OG might have chosen it to explicitize the consequence of “forgetting” as he does again in 23:15 (καταλειφθήσεται || נשכחת).¹⁴

12. Notably, this countervails his tendency to allow a definite article to serve as surrogate for a pronoun. This translator is hardly one to abide by “rules.”

13. Neither gentilic occurs elsewhere in OG-Isaiah. OG translates the other instances of חרש in Isaiah with τέκτων, χαλκεύς, or κωφός.

14. The equivalent for שכח otherwise is ἐπιλανθάνομαι (23:16; 49:14, 15[3x]; 51:13; 54:4; 65:16).

Syriac's rendering of ישׁעך with the *nomen agentis* ܝܫܥܝܐ, in apposition to ܠܠܗܐ, does not presume אלהים (rather than אלהי) in his *Vorlage*, as demonstrated by comparing ܡܢܬܐ ܝܫܥܝܐ ܝܬܐ ܡܢܬܐ ܝܫܥܝܐ in 30:18 and ܡܢܬܐ ܝܫܥܝܐ ܡܢܬܐ ܝܫܥܝܐ in 40:28. Old Greek takes the same path: τὸν θεὸν τὸν σαωτήρᾱ σου. On the translators' distinct uses of σαωτήρ and ܝܫܥܝܐ as equivalents, see the comments on 12:2.

Syriac translates other occurrences of צור with ܠܗܐ (2:10, 21; 8:14; 48:21^[1]), ܠܦܬܐ (2:19; 48:21^[2]), and ܠܗܐ (10:26; 51:1). ܠܡܥܠ appears again in 26:4, where צור is a divine epithet (cf. 30:29), and in 44:8's ܡܠܚܡܐ. ܠܡܥܠ ܥܘܪ ܒܠ ܝܕܥܬܝ ||, ܠܡܥܠ ܥܘܪ ܒܠ ܝܕܥܬܝ ||. In keeping with the epithet ܠܡܥܠ, the deity's action is characterized via ܡܥܘܕ || ܡܥܘܕ (cf. ܡܥܘܕ || ܡܥܘܕ in 17:9).

ܠܡܥܠ ܥܘܪ || is comparable to OG's rendering of צור with θεός in 30:29; 44:8 and with ὁ μέγας in 26:4. For ܡܥܘܕ || ܡܥܘܕ, compare ܡܥܘܕ || ܡܥܘܕ in 25:4 and ܡܥܘܕ || ܡܥܘܕ ܡܥܘܕ || ܡܥܘܕ in 30:2, each of which perhaps reflects biliteral association with ܥܘܪ (cf. ܥܘܪ || ܥܘܪ in 8:20).

Old Greek and S render both components of נטעי נעמנים in the grammatical singular (φύτευμα ἄπιστον/ܢܥܡܢܐ), as do V (*plantationem fidelem*) and T (נצבא בחירה). The unanimity of the versions more likely reflects a shared perception that נטעי נעמנים designates a single plant than that it attests a variant נטע.

Although S's ܢܥܡܢܐ || נטעי נעמנים seems intuitively intelligible, the equivalence never occurs elsewhere. Syriac's most frequent equivalent for נעם is ܡܥܡ (Ezek 32:19; Ps 141:6; Prov 2:10; 9:17; 24:25; Song 7:7), while ܠܥܝܐ renders it in Gen 49:15 and ܡܥܡ in 2 Sam 1:26. The adjective ܢܥܡ renders נאה in 52:7, just as it frequently renders other forms of נאה elsewhere (e.g., Pss 33:1; 93:5; 147:1; Prov 17:7). In that light, ܢܥܡܐ was likely selected for נעמנים here as an attribute suited to the context.

Similarly ܡܥܡܐ || נטעי נעמנים owes to reading the Hebrew as נאמנים and mentally supplying a negation, as this translator often does. Although the *Vorlage* itself might have read נאמנים (through an aural error), the translator's frequent interpretive ploys make an exegetical maneuver equally likely.

In contrast with ܢܥܡܐ || נטעי נעמנים is the grammatical plural ܢܥܡܐ || ܢܥܡܐ (ܢܥܡܐ || ܢܥܡܐ) found also in Num 13:23). Perhaps the translator declined it as grammatically plural and prefixed *bēth* to clarify how planting ܢܥܡܐ || ܢܥܡܐ is a consequence of neglecting the deity, but this is highly speculative. On the other hand, his rendering of ܢܥܡܐ || ܢܥܡܐ

with ܠܢܚܝܣܝܐ, inflected as the 2fs imperfect +3fs suffix, comports with the preceding ܠܢܚܝܥ and with ܠܢܚܝܣܝܐ in 17:11.

Old Greek, on the other hand, renders the final clause as a phrase parallel to the preceding one, the most significant difference being *σπέρμα* || ܬܙܪܥܢܐ, while *ἀπιστος*⁽²⁾ is likely repeated from the preceding line as a substitution for *זמרת*, which occurs only here in Isaiah.¹⁵

17:11

Both S and OG translate *ביום נטעך* with a verbal clause that refers back to 17:10, and both conjugate the verb in the second-person singular. Syriac's added 3fs suffix (ܠܢܚܝܣܝܐ) is anaphoric to ܠܢܚܝܥ in 17:10, while *φυτεύσης* || ܬܙܪܥܢܐ echoes *φυτεύσεις* *φύτευμα* in 17:10, while also illuminating its subsequent *ἐὰν σπείρης* || ܬܙܪܥܢܐ.

πλανήθησῃ reflects analysis of *תשגשי* as *שגה* (cf. *ὁ πλανῶν* || *משגה*, Deut 27:18). Syriac's *ܢܚܝܣܝܐ* || *ܢܚܝܥ* appears elsewhere only in Song 2:13, 15; 7:13, each time for *סמדר*. Warszawski's (34) suggestion that the translator associated *תשגשי* with *שגא* is semantically too far removed from *ܢܚܝܣܝܐ* to confirm. More likely, the translator chose his rendering by association with *ܠܢܚܝܥ* || *ܬܙܪܥܢܐ*. Whereas OG identifies a negative result from the planting, S simply extrapolates the natural consequence.

Although *ܢܚܝܣܝܐ* suggests that S read *נר* in place of *נר*, it is doubtful that *ܢܚܝܣܝܐ* reflects a prefixed *kaph*, just as it is unlikely that *ܢܚܝܣܝܐ* attests *וכנאב*. More likely, the translator inferred that these phrases function as comparisons.

εἰς ἀμνητόν might reflect *עד קציר* in the *Vorlage*, although it is also possible that *εἰς* is simply part of OG's construal of the syntax, while it passed over the unfamiliar *נר*. The translator's frequent manipulation of inflection undercuts suspicion that *ἀνθήσει* attests *תפרח* for *תפריחי*.

ἢ ἡμέρα ἀλγηρώσῃ || *ביום נחלה* follows naturally from *τῇ δὲ ἡμέρᾳ ἣ ἂν φυτεύσῃ* || *ביום נטעך* at the outset of the verse.

ܢܚܝܣܝܐ appears again in 28:20's *ܢܚܝܣܝܐ* || *ܢܚܝܥ*, *ܢܚܝܣܝܐ* || *ܢܚܝܥ* here is a second rendering of *מהשתרע*. Although we might posit that *ܢܚܝܣܝܐ* here is a second rendering of *קציר*, creating a comparison to the light of harvest as that of a "short day," more likely it is an inner-Syriac error for *ܢܚܝܥ* || *ܢܚܝܥ*, S's regular equivalent for *חלה* (14:10; 33:24; 38:1, 9; 39:1).

15. *αλῆμα* renders *זמרת* in Num 13:23, which is its equivalent again in Ezek 14:2, while *τὰ κλήματα αὐτῶν* translates *זמריהם* in Nah 2:3. The OG of Ezek 8:17 reads *ἰδοὺ αὐτοὶ ὡς μυατρὶζόντες* || *והנם שלחים את הזמורה אל אפם*.

Following καὶ ὡς πατήρ ἀνθρώπου || וכאב אנוש, analyzed as ו+כ+אב, it appears probable that the translator introduced ἀλγηρώση⁽²⁾ again and added τοῖς υἱοῖς σου to complete the clause.

17:12

17:12 || סלא ׀ חסלא in 32:14 is paralleled by its חסלא ׀ חסלא (cf. סחעס in 5:13).

Syriac's reformulation סחעס ׀ חסלא ׀ חסלא is comparable to Jer 51:55: חסלא ׀ חסלא. Collocation of סחעס and חסלא occurs also in Ezek 23:42: סחעס ׀ חסלא. In this light, חסלא here is most likely S's substitution for יהמיון, shifted forward to create a relative clause, with סחעס supplied as subject by inference.

למאמין ושאון || סחעס ׀ חסלא, following כשאון מים || סחעס ׀ חסלא in 13:4, the only other place סחעס appears in Isaiah. שאון עליונים || סחעס ׀ חסלא renders שאון again in 24:8: סחעס ׀ חסלא.

πλήθος ἐθνῶν πολλῶν || compares to τοῦ ἐστι τὸ πλήθος τοῦ ἐλέους σου || המון מעיד in 63:15 (cf. καὶ τὸ πλήθος τοῦ θυμοῦ || ומהמונם in 31:4).

ὡς θάλασσα κυμαίνουσα || recalls 5:30's ὡς φωνὴ θαλάσσης κυμαίνουσης || כנהמת ים, the only other occurrence of κυμαίνω in the book. ταρασσω is a slot word favored by this translator (see the comments at 3:12), who likely supplied οὕτως ταραχθήσεσθε correlative to ὡς θάλασσα (cf. ταραχθήσεται τὸ ὕδωρ τῆς θαλάσσης || צהלו מים, 24:14).

The crux in this verse is καὶ νῶτος ἐθνῶν || ושאון למאמין (S, סחעס ׀ חסלא). νῶτος and νῶτον elsewhere render ערף, כתר, גב, גו, and even מתנים (Pss 66[65]:11; 69[68]:24) and מפרקתו (1 Kgdms 4:18). However, none of these clarifies how the translator arrived at νῶτος or what his *Vorlage* might have read, nor is there a compelling explanation. ἐθνῶν πολλῶν, on the other hand, reflects connecting כבירים with למאמין (cf. ὡς ὕδατος πολὺ πλήθος || כזרם מים כבירים, 28:2).

שאון מים כבירים || סחעס ׀ חסלא suggests correlation with מים כבירים || סחעס ׀ חסלא. כהמות ימים יהמיון || סחעס ׀ חסלא is found again in 28:2.

With ἡγήσει || ישאון, compare ὡς κιθάρα ἡγήσει || ככנור יהמו in 16:11 and καὶ ἡγῶν τὰ κύματα αὐτῆς || ויהמו גליו in 51:15, the only other instances of ἡγέω in Isaiah. These comparisons suggest that the transla-

tor's choice of this verb for ישאון was conditioned by the prior יהמין, even though he rendered it with παραχθήσεσθε. The omission of an equivalent to כשאון likely owes to the translator regarding ἡγήσει as sufficing for כשאון and ישאון.

17:13

Syriac lacks equivalents for ישאון מים רבים at the outset. With the exception of רבים (in place of כבירים), the phrase is identical with the end of 17:12, raising the question of whether it might have originated as a marginal notation to preserve רבים that was subsequently copied into the text erroneously. Alternatively, the phrase might have been omitted by parablepsis in S's *Vorlage*.

On the other hand, ὡς ὕδωρ πολὺ ἔθνη πολλά reverses the word order of רבים מים כשאון, and ἔθνη πολλά plays a different syntactic role than (καὶ ὥτος) ἐθνῶν πολλῶν ὡς ὕδωρ in 17:12 by dint of its nominative case. Hypothesizing a *Vorlage* that read לאמים כבירים would suppose an unusual type of scribal modification. Because only OG associates כבירים with לאמים in 17:12, +πολλά in 17:13 is most likely the translator's addition.

Whereas καὶ ὥτος ἐθνῶν aligns with ושאון לאמים in 17:12, only the *kaph* of כשאון seems represented in ὡς ὕδωρ here. Meanwhile, βία καταφερομένου (following ὡς ὕδατος πολλοῦ as a second translation of (כשאון מים רבים) lacks foundation in any attested Hebrew witness and occupies the same slot as ישאון. As Ziegler (143) recognized, the translator had "eine besondere Vorliebe zu dem appositionellen φερόμενος," as evidenced with καταιγὶς φέρουσα || סופה again later in the verse. The combination of καταφέρω and βία, together with ὡς + ὕδωρ + πολὺς, recurs in 28:2 (ὡς χάλαζα καταφερομένη οὐκ ἔχουσα σκέπην βία καταφερομένη ὡς ὕδατος πολὺ πληθὺς || כזרם ברד שער קטב כזרם מים כבירים); 30:30 (κεραυνῶσει βιαίως καὶ ὡς ὕδωρ καὶ χάλαζα συγκαταφερομένη βία || נפץ ברד כזרם ברד). As Ziegler (143) notes, βία "hat keine richtige Entsprechung im MT und scheint infolge der Ähnlichkeit den Stellen beigefügt worden zu sein."

καὶ ἀποσκορακιεῖ || וגער is unique to OG-Isaiah, although the verb appears again in Ps 26(27):9: μὴ ἀποσκορακίσῃς με καὶ μὴ ἐγκαταλίπῃς με || אל תטשני ואל תעזבני. Nominal ἀποσκορακισμός renders גערת in Isa 66:15 (ἀποδοῦναι ἐν θυμῷ ἐκδίκησιν καὶ ἀποσκορακισμὸν ἐν φλογὶ πυρός || להשיב בחמה אפו וגערתו בלהבי אש), in whose light ἀποσκορακιεῖ likely

means “curse” (see GELS, s.v. “ἀποσκορακίζω”). This correlates with the rendering of גער in 54:9, where (καθότι ὤμοσα αὐτῷ) μὴ θυμωθήσεσθαι ἐπὶ σοὶ ἔτι μηδὲ ἐν ἀπειλῇ σου renders בך מקצץ עליך ומגער בך.¹⁶

καὶ πόρρω αὐτὸν διώξεται not only renders מרחק ורדף but might also encompass נס, regarded as semantically allied with רדף, allowing διώξεται to suffice for both.

Syriac’s ܣܢܚܝܦ || ורדף is likely a semantic choice based on the perception that the subject is the same as that of ܣܢܚܝܦ || ונס.

Old Greek uses χνοῦς for מץ in 5:24; 29:5; 41:15 and ἄχυρα for חמץ in 30:24, suggesting that ὡς χνοῦν ἄχυρου might be a double rendering of מץ במץ.

λαϊμῶντων || הרים is distinctive. Out of the fifty-seven occurrences of הר in Isaiah, only in three other cases does it lack an equivalent or is it translated by a word other than ὄρος.¹⁷

(1) In 18:6 τοῖς πετεινοῖς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τοῖς θηρίοις τῆς γῆς || לעיט הארץ likely uses τοῦ οὐρανοῦ in view of the contrast with “earth,” although a variant שמים, arising from the same impulse, might have stood in the *Vorlage*.

(2) The absence of an equivalent for בהר in ὅτι βασιλεύσει κύριος ἐκ Σιών καὶ ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ || ובירושלם בהר ציון ובירושלם in 24:3 is unique to OG. Given the translator’s penchant for concision and in view of the parallel ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ, the minus might be attributable to the translator. On the other hand, an omission of בהר ציון simply for concision would be remarkable, whereas the addition of בהר could have been motivated by recollection of 2:3.

(3) When 66:20 enumerates the vehicles and animals bringing refugees ירושלם על הר קדשי displaces הר with πόλιν. The lack of an equivalent for the suffixed 1cs pronoun on קדשי is striking, although it is conceivable that the translator regarded ירושלם in apposition to a putative קדשי and omitted the pronoun. On the other hand, when πόλις and ἁγία cooccur elsewhere, the Hebrew phrasing is עיר הקדש (מ) (48:2), עיר הקדש (52:1), and עיר קדשך (64:9). The *Vorlage* is inscrutable.

This translator uses λαϊμάω for the verb זרה in each of its other occurrences (30:22; 30:24; 41:16). Notably, it is associated with חמץ

16. ἀπειλή appears in 50:2’s ἰδοὺ τῇ ἀπειλῇ μου ἐξερημώσω τὴν θάλασσαν || הן ים בנערתי אחריב (cf. Nah 1:4).

17. The whole of אחרים וכל עשבם אוביש is unrepresented in OG in 42:15.

in 30:24 and מן in 41:15–16, similar to כמך here. The translator might either have read or mentally substituted זרים for הרים in association with לפני רוח and כמך.¹⁸

Most likely S chose ܐܠܐ because of the preceding ܐܠܐ, ܐܠܐ, even if ܐܠܐ is not a semantic equivalent to ܐܠܐ. Its ܐܠܐ renders לעת ערב from the start of 17:14.

Old Greek correctly renders ܐܠܐ with τροχοῦ but expands it into ὡς κονιορτὸν τροχοῦ, parallel to ὡς χυνοῦν ἀχύρου. The phrase ὡς κονιορτὸς ἀπὸ τροχοῦ translates כמך דק in 29:5, suggesting that the association was to hand in the translator's mind.

17:14

Although OG usually translates הנה with ἰδοὺ, its divergences from that caution against positing that ἔσται attests והיה. Not only do הנה and הן sometimes lack an equivalent (e.g., 29:8 [2x]; 38:8, 17; 40:15^[2]) or are rendered by an atypical equivalent (e.g., δέ and ἀλλά in 5:7 [cf. δέ in 22:13]; καί in 23:13; ἔτι, 29:8^[3]; ἦ, 37:11; ὅτι, 41:24), but ἔσται can lack an explicit warrant (e.g., καὶ ἔσται εἰς σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα || לאתות ולמופתים, 8:18; καὶ ἔσται τὸ καταλειφθὲν τοῦ Ιακωβ || שאר ישוב שאר יעקב, 10:21). Accordingly, ἔσται || והנה here is ambiguous.

בלהה appears only here in Isaiah. Its three occurrences in Ezekiel (26:21; 27:36; 28:19) are translated by ܐܠܐ in S and ἀπώλεια in OG. In Ps 73:19 S translates it with ܐܠܐ, but OG with ἀνομία. In Job, S translates בלהה with ܐܠܐ (18:11, 14), ܐܠܐ (24:17), and ܐܠܐ (27:20; 30:15), while OG uses ὀδύναι (18:11; 27:20; 30:15) and ἀνάγκη (18:14). Accordingly, S's ܐܠܐ (only here in the Bible) and OG's πένθος here are likely guesses. Similarly, their equivalents for אֵינוֹ (ܐܠܐ / καὶ οὐκ ἔσται) were likely selected based on the context.

In 10:13 S translated שושתי with ܐܠܐ, while in 42:22 it translates ושסוי with ܐܠܐ, both of which occur in this verse: ܐܠܐ || ܐܠܐ || ܐܠܐ. Likewise, S translates חלקות with ܐܠܐ again in 30:10.

αληρονομέω typically represents ירש (נחל in 49:8; חלק in 53:2) but is pressed into service for בז here, which itself is otherwise regularly rendered by προνομεύω (11:14; 24:3^[2]; 33:23; 42:22, 24; προνομή in 10:2, 6;

18. This explanation seems more compelling than Ziegler's (93) speculation that the translator considered "daß die Tätigkeit des Dreschens und Worfelns in Palästina möglichst auf Bergen geschieht."

24:3^[1]). Having already used *προνομευσάντων* for שוסינו, he might have chosen *κληρονομήσασιν* for לבזינו to accord with *κληρονομία* || גורל. The most frequent equivalent for גורל outside Isaiah is *κληρος* (cf. Isa 34:17; 57:6), while *κληρονομία* || גורל appears again only in Ps 15(16):5. Aside from this passage, *κληρονομία* in Isaiah translates only נחלה, for which it is the exclusive equivalent (19:25; 47:6; 49:8; 54:17; 58:14; 63:17). Although this fact does not support an assumption that the *Vorlage* read נחלה here (any more than *κληρονομήσασιν* attests לירשינו rather than לבזינו), it does signal the translator's attentive choice of *κληρονομία τοῖς ὑμᾶς κληρονομήσασιν* || גורל לבזינו.

The use of ὑμᾶς as object with each of these participles (rather than the first-person plural pronouns of שוסינו and לבזינו) is likely due to the translator, who established the addressee with *παραχθήσεσθε* || יהמיון in 17:12.

ISAIAH 18

18:1

מִצֵּל(,) || צִלָּץ is transparent, while *πλοίων* likely owes to unfamiliarity with צִלָּץ.¹ *πλοῖα* in Isaiah regularly renders אֲנִיּוֹת (2:16; 23:1, 14; 43:14; 60:9), the exceptions being 11:14; 23:10, of which 11:14 is particularly relevant: καὶ πετασθήσονται ἐν πλοίοις ἀλλοφύλων θάλασσαν || וַעֲפֹ בַכֶּתֶף פְּלִשְׁתִּים יָמָה.² Both there and here language about flight, in connection with the sea, seems to have engendered an association with ships, even if the precise trigger is unclear.

18:2

Old Greek's $\delta\mu\eta\kappa\alpha$ || צירים is the only appearance of $\delta\mu\eta\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ in the Greek translation of books that became part of the Hebrew Bible. Nevertheless, it appears five times in 1 Maccabees (1:10; 8:7; 9:53; 10:6; 11:61), where it is always inflected as grammatically plural, even when referring to an individual hostage (1:10). Notably, S translates each instance of $\delta\mu\eta\kappa\alpha$ in 1 Maccabees with the Greek loanword סמכא , the equivalent used for צירים here. This seems *prima facie* evidence that S consulted OG here.

Although *δμηρα* appears only here, *סִמְחָה* renders *פליטם* in Num 21:29 (*וְסִמְחָה בְּחֵסֶד לַיהוָה בְּנֵי פִלִּיטִים* || *נתן בניו פליטים*), where OG reads *ἀπεδόθησαν οἱ υἱοὶ αὐτῶν διασώζεσθαι*, showing that S can select *סִמְחָה* independently.³ The

1. Cf. ἡ ἐρυσίβη || צלצל in Deut 28:42. Job 40:31's καὶ ἐν πλοίοις ἀλιέων κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ || דגים ראשו וצלצל stands subasterisk and, as Ziegler (114) observed, is “von Js abhängig.”

2. ἐργάξου τὴν γῆν σου καὶ γὰρ πλοῖα οὐκέτι ἔρχεται ἐκ Καρχηδόνος || עבֵר יָרֵךְ בֵּית תְּרַשִׁי in 23:10 was likely fashioned in light of ὁλολύετε πλοῖα Καρχηδόνος ὅτι ἀπώλετο καὶ οὐκέτι ἔρχονται ἐκ γῆς Κιτιέων in 23:1.

3. S more often renders פליט with the cognate **فاح**, as in Gen 14:13's **מֵאֶחָד** || **فاح** (cf. **פליט** in Isa 45:20).

most likely basis for ܡܚܒܝܢ is inference from צור . Although most of S's equivalents for צר mean "oppress" (ܥܠܝܢ , 29:3; 49:19, 20; 63:9; cf. ܠܥܒܕܢܐ in 25:4; 26:16; ܥܠܝܢ in 59:19), it renders צור with ܥܒܕܢܐ "to bind" in 8:16, an equivalent found elsewhere (Deut 14:25; 2 Kgs 5:23; 12:11).⁴

Most telling against S's reliance on OG, however, is ܡܚܒܝܢ , which is closer to ܡܚܒܝܢ than ܥܒܕܢܐ and ܥܒܕܢܐ (ܥܒܕܢܐ explicates ܥܒܕܢܐ), as well as the closer semantic alignment of ܡܚܒܝܢ to ܡܚܒܝܢ than is the case with OG's $\text{ἐθνὸς μετέωρον καὶ ξένον}$.

Syriac's ܡܚܒܝܢ || ܡܚܒܝܢ are apt verbs for an object removed. While ܡܚܒܝܢ (ironically) translates מרט in Ezra 9:3, the Isaiah translator uses diverse equivalents for משהו (ܡܚܒܝܢ , 5:18; ܡܚܒܝܢ , 13:22; ܡܚܒܝܢ , 66:19), each seemingly chosen for its context, which is equally the impression given by ܡܚܒܝܢ here.⁵

Syriac's equivalents in the rest of the verse are nearly identical to those used in 18:7, the sole difference being the relative clause in 18:2 (ܡܚܒܝܢ) versus simple adjectives in 18:7 (ܡܚܒܝܢ). The only observable difference between S and MT in either verse is ܡܚܒܝܢ || ܡܚܒܝܢ in 18:7.⁶

Old Greek's equivalents here do not always correlate with those in 18:7 (differences in the Hebrew text of 18:7 against 18:2 are in parentheses):

18:2	18:7
אל גוי (עם) ממשד ומורט	ἐκ λαοῦ τεθλιμμένου καὶ τετιλμένου
אל עם (ומעם) נורא מן הוא והלאה	καὶ ἀπὸ λαοῦ μεγάλου ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν καὶ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα χρόνον
גוי קו קו ומבוסה	ἔθνους ἐλπίζον καὶ καταπεπατημένον
אשר בזאו נהרים ארצו	ὅ ἐστιν ἐν μέρει ποταμοῦ τῆς χώρας αὐτοῦ

4. S renders צירי with ܥܒܕܢܐ "distresses" in 13:8. OG's most frequent rendering for צר is οἱ πρέσβεις (13:8; 21:2; 57:9; 63:9)—cf. S's ܥܒܕܢܐ in 57:9—while other equivalents appear but once: βάλλω (29:3); βίαιος (59:19); ἐνδεια (25:4); θλίψις (26:16); στενοχωρέω (49:19); στενός (49:20).

5. Cf. the use of ܡܚܒܝܢ + ܡܚܒܝܢ for the other two collocations of משהו + קשת (1 Kgs 22:34; 2 Chr 18:33).

6. Its ܡܚܒܝܢ || ܡܚܒܝܢ in both verses is by association with ܡܚܒܝܢ .

Although *πρός* in 18:2 aligns with the first *לֹא*, OG has no equivalent for the second *לֹא*, joining *καὶ ξένον* directly to *λαόν* and supplying *καί* before *χαλεπόν* || *נורא*. Both *ξένος* and *χαλεπός* appear only here in Isaiah, although *χαλεπόν* renders *נורא* more aptly than does *μεγάλου* (18:7). *μετέωρον* (|| *ממשך*, 18:2) renders *נשא* in 2:12, 13; 30:25 and *גבה* in 5:15; 57:7. *θλίβω* renders various verbs in Isaiah (*צרר*, 11:13; *ץחל*, 19:20; *לצון*, 28:14; *צוק*, 29:7; 51:13 [2x]; *ינה* [*hiphil*], 49:26) but is nowhere else an equivalent for *משך* (*ἐπισπάσμαι*, 5:18; *χρονίζω*, 13:22; *Μοσοχ*, 66:19). Although *τετιλμένον* || *מורט* in 18:7 accords with *καὶ ἔτιλλον* || *ואמרט* in Ezra 9:3 and *ἐτίλη* || *מרטי* in Dan 7:4, *μεγάλου* is not an equivalent for *ירא* elsewhere.

μετέωρον καὶ ξένον ... χαλεπόν seem chosen to comport with *πορεύονται γὰρ ἄγγελοι κοῦφοι πρὸς ἔθνος* || *גוי* in 18:2, with *μετέωρον καὶ ξένον λαόν* apparently chosen to describe this distant people (*τίς αὐτοῦ ἐπέκεινα*;). Similarly, *τεθλιμμένον ... μεγάλου* in 18:7 were chosen to describe those from whom *ἀνενεχθήσεται δῶρα κυρίῳ σαβαωθ* || *יובל שי ליהוה צבאות*. That perception might account for the antonyms *ἀνέλπιστον* and *ἐλπίζον* that translate *קו קו* in each verse (*ἐλπίζω* || *קוה* in 25:9; 26:8; and *קו* in 28:17), contrasting the “fierce” and distant people who have no hope with the “afflicted” but “great” people who do.

Although the path from *הוא והלאה* to *ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν καὶ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα χρόνον* in 18:7 is readily apparent, *τίς αὐτοῦ ἐπέκεινα* for the same phrase in 18:3 likely associates *מן* with the Aramaic interrogative pronoun, while *αὐτοῦ ἐπέκεινα* befits the description of a *ξένον λαόν καὶ χαλεπόν* to whom messages must be sent by sea.⁷

The different translations of *אשר בואו נהרים ארצו* with *νῦν οἱ ποταμοὶ τῆς γῆς* and *ὁ ἐστὶν ἐν μέρει ποταμοῦ τῆς χώρας αὐτοῦ* seem equally calibrated to the clauses that follow: *πάντες ὡς χώρα κατοικουμένη* || *כל ישיבי* *תבל* in 18:3; and *εἰς τὸν τόπον οὗ τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου σαβαωθ ὅρος Σιων* || *אל מקום שם יהוה צבאות הר ציון* in 18:7.

Whether the translator conceived of these as contrasting groups is beyond recovery, but his vocabulary choices (particularly *ἀνέλπιστον* versus *ἐλπίζον*) can be read that way. Equally beyond recovery is whether the translator had any extratextual referents in mind. We cannot, however, simply chalk up these images to chance; as part of the translation-as-produced, the translator’s renderings in these verses were likely motivated, not indifferent.

7. Pace Goshen-Gottstein (סח), whose diagnosis of *מן* as “מנהו(א) and reformulated as a question” sidesteps the question of why the translator formulated the question with *τίς*.

Because of the variety of words for which $\nu\tilde{\nu}$ is used and the many times it is inserted (see the comments at 2:5), nothing can be inferred from its alignment with אשר בזאו .⁸ The rendering of the phrase with $\delta' \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu \acute{\epsilon}\nu \mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon\iota$ (ποταμοῦ) in 18:7 suggests unfamiliarity with the verb, even as it betrays analysis of the initial *bet* as a preposition. In both verses, OG links its equivalent for בזאו אשר to נהרים ארצו .

While קו קו is transparent to ומבוסה , the relationship of קו קו to קו קו is opaque, at best, even if the same equivalent is used for קו קו in both verses. All fifteen verbal forms of קוה in Isaiah are translated by קוה , while nominal קו is most often translated with terms for measurement: קוה (34:11); קוה (28:17; 34:17); and the verb קוה (44:13). Although קו קו occurs in 28:17, the repetition of קו in 28:10, 13, similar to 18:2, 7, is rendered by unique equivalents, identical in both verses: קוה קוה (see the comments there). The only clue about what might have occasioned קו קו here is the juxtaposition to קוה (ומבוסה). The only other occurrence of קוה is in 1 Sam 21:14's קוה ($\text{וושנו את טעמו בעיניהם ויתהלל בידם}$), where it amounts to “and became despised in their eyes,” a meaning that conceivably correlates with the disfigurement (literal or metaphorical) implied in קוה קוה here.

18:3

Following πάντες כל (modifying οἱ ποταμοί in 18:2), OG exhibits a series of studied reformulations. χωρα κατοικουμένη || ישבי תבל , with prefixed $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$, creates a parallel with the equally reformulated $\acute{\omega}\varsigma\epsilon\iota \text{σημείον ἀπὸ ὄρους ἄρθῃ}$ || נשא נס הרים (lacking an equivalent for the following תראו) and the reformulation of ושמעת שופר ותקע as $\acute{\omega}\varsigma \text{σάλπιγγος φωνὴ ἀκουστὸν ἔσται}$, which collapses ושמעת and ותקע into a single predicate (cf. $\text{σαλπισσοῦσιν τῇ σάλπιγγι}$ || יתקע בשופר , 27:13) and explicitizes what is heard by adding φωνή . Each reformulation renders its predicate in the passive voice (including κατοικουμένη as a predication of χωρα). The role of the repeated lexical choices (κατοικέω || ישבי and ושכנ ; χωρα || תבל and ארץ) in unifying the first half of the verse is notable, reinforcing the perception of a considered approach to translating these verses.

8. It is tempting to speculate that the translator analyzed בזאו as בזא or בזאת and extrapolated from it “in this time” = “now.” Although this is possible, the translator’s frequent insertion of $\nu\tilde{\nu}$ undermines treating that proposal seriously.

Syriac, meanwhile, analyzes כל ישבי תבל as the start of a new clause and reformulates כנשא by a temporal clause with an impersonal subject. Its rendering of ארץ ושכני with ܐܪܥܐ ܕܝܫܒܝܐ, exemplifies S's penchant for using *dālat* + participle to create a relative clause as modifier.

18:4

Although ܐܬܬܝܬܐ is S's regular equivalent for שקט in Isaiah (7:4; 14:7; 18:4; 30:15; 32:17; 57:20; 62:1), it is otherwise in the G-stem. Furthermore, the collocation of ܐܬܬܝܬܐ with the 2ms imperative ܬܬܝܬܐ (|| ואביטה ||) creates a quandary over whether to analyze ܐܬܬܝܬܐ as an *aphel* 2ms imperative, "Be silent," or as an *aphel* 1cs imperfect, "I will bring calm" (so Greenberg and Walter).⁹ Because ܬܬܝܬܐ suggests that S considered this oracle a mandate, ܐܬܬܝܬܐ is most likely an imperative. Perhaps the translator understood the call to "be silent and look on what I have founded" as a reassurance to the people when they see the nations rising against them (18:3). As Goshen-Gottstein (סט) observed, it is possible that S's *Vorlage* read והביטה השקיתה.

For S's ܬܬܝܬܐ, compare ܬܬܝܬܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܝܬܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ in 14:21 and ܬܬܝܬܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܝܬܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ in 51:13. Warszawski (35) compares ܬܬܝܬܐ || ותכונתו in Ezek 43:11.

Although ἀσφαλεία || אשקוטה seems intuitive, elsewhere שקט is rendered with τοῦ ἡσυχάσαι (7:4), ἀνάπαυσιν (32:17), ἀναπαύομαι (14:7; 57:20), and σιωπάω (62:1).¹⁰ Neither of the other appearances of ἀσφαλεία in Isaiah has a clear Hebrew counterpart: καὶ ἐγγιούσιν καὶ ἀλώσονται ἄνθρωποι ἐν ἀσφαλείᾳ ὄντες || ונוקשו ונלכדו (8:15); καὶ ἔσωσεν ἡ γῆ τὰ παιδία αὐτῆς μετὰ ἀσφαλείας || ותמלט ובקעה ודגרה בצלה (34:15).¹¹ The translator's choice of ἀσφαλεία here, then, was likely driven by his construal of the verse as reassurance about the security offered by Jerusalem, similar to 33:20's ἡ πόλις τὸ σωτήριον ἡμῶν || קרית מועדנו. Even if,

9. Cf. ܬܬܝܬܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܝܬܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ, Ezek 1:25.

10. The translator's regular use of πειθῶ || בהט explains the collapse of בהשקט into ὅτε ἐπεποιθεῖς in 30:15 (cf. οἱ ... πεποιθότες || ישענו ויבטחו, 31:1).

11. Even if the *bet* of בצלה could be aligned with μετὰ in 34:15, most likely ἐν ἀσφαλείᾳ in 8:15 and μετὰ ἀσφαλείας in 34:15 were supplied. They are similar to καὶ οὐκ ἐν ἀσφαλείᾳ || אל יתמכו בו in Prov 28:17, where ἐν ἀσφαλείᾳ has, at best, an intuitive relationship to יתמכו בו. Elsewhere, ἀσφαλεία renders בטח (Lev 26:5; Deut 12:10; Prov 11:15) and מכון (Ps 103[104]:5), while in Prov 8:14 it is the equivalent to תושיה (לי עצה ותושיה || καὶ ἀσφαλεία).

as seems likely, S's **חֲסִיד** || **במכוני** refers to Jerusalem, OG's **ἐν τῇ ἐμῇ πόλει** is more explicit.

μεσημβρίας || **צח** might be based on association with **צהרים**, for which **μεσημβρία** is the equivalent in 58:10; 59:10.¹² Although one might adduce **μεσημβρίας** || **כחם היום** in Gen 18:1, **καύματος** is the clear equivalent for **חם** here (cf. Gen 8:22; 2 Kgdms 4:5; Jer 17:8), although that might have had a role in spurring recollection of **μεσημβρίας**. **φῶς** is an explicitizing supplement, like **φωνή** in 18:3.

Syriac's **ܚܨܝܪ ܒܝܝܡ** might reflect a *Vorlage* that read **חציר ביום**, a possibility strengthened by OG's **ἡμέρας ἀμῆτου**. Nowhere else does OG render **ב** prefixed to an infinitive with **ἡμέρα** (typically **ἐν τῷ** + infinitive, **ὅταν**, or **ἡνίκα**), nor does S use **ܚܨܝܪ** in such an environment (typically **ܚܦ** or **ܚܦܐ** + finite verb). As Goshen-Gottstein (סט) suggested, OG and S likely attest **ביום** in place of **בחם**.

Syriac's supply of the relative pronoun in **ܚܨܝܪ ܐܘܪ ܥܠ** || **ܐܘܪ** is congruent with its patterns elsewhere (cf. 18:4, above). More interestingly, however, **ܐܘܪ** likely reflects **יֹאֹר** in the *Vorlage* (Goshen-Gottstein, סט), as in 19:7: **ܥܠ ܝܐܘܪ ܥܠ ܦܝ ܝܐܘܪ** || **ܥܠ ܝܐܘܪ ܥܠ ܦܝ ܝܐܘܪ**.

18:5

Old Greek's lack of an equivalent for **כי** is not necessarily evidence of its absence in its *Vorlage*, since it represents **כי** irregularly (see appendix C)

Syriac reformulates the first half of the verse by subsuming three clauses to the temporal phrase **ܡܚܝܢ ܡܚܝܢ**. It passes over the *kaph* of **כתם** and makes the next clause the main clause, renders **ובסר גמל** as an independent clause (**ܘܒܫܪ ܓܡܠ**), and then supplies a conjunction (**ܘܝܗܝܐ**) to create a third clause. Its **ܘܒܫܪ** || **ובסר** is remarkable, however, because all other instances of **בסר** are translated with **ܚܫܝܐ** (Jer 31:29, 30; Ezek 18:2; Job 15:33) and because **ܚܫܝܐ** most often renders **אביב** (Exod 13:4; 23:15; 34:18; Deut 16:1). The Isaiah translator likely chose **ܚܫܝܐ** coordinate to **ܦܪܚ** || **פרח**. Notably, **ܚܫܝܐ** is the equivalent for **הנצנים** in Song 2:12.

Whereas **δμφαξ** || **בסר** is more precise than **ܚܫܝܐ**, its **ἄνθος δμφακίζουσα** || **יהיה נצה** is a reformulation based on the prior **δμφαξ ἀνθήσκη**, in contrast to S's more exact **ܚܫܝܐ ܚܫܝܐ**. The choice of **τὰ βοτρύδια** || **הזלזלים** (a *hapax*

12. Unfamiliarity with **צח** is evinced by **λαλεῖν εἰρήνην** || **לדבר צחות** in 32:4, **πνεῦμα πλανήσεως ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ** || **רוח צח שפיים במדבר** in Jer 4:11, and **ἀδελφιδός μου λευκός καὶ πυρρός** || **דודי צח ואדום** in Song 5:10.

legomenon) is semantically linked to *ῥυπαῖα* || בסר, whereas S has recourse to the cognate *ⲛⲥⲗⲏ*. Old Greek's +τὰ μικρά explicates what makes the clusters defective and why they are removed.

תזז (*hataz*) is a *hapax legomenon*. Syriac uses *ܢܥܪ* elsewhere for נער (33:15; 52:2) and מלט (34:15), and it likely constitutes a guess here. Earlier in the verse OG translated וכתת with *καὶ ἀφελεί*, which it uses again for הסיר, just before *καὶ κατακόψει* || התז. Although *ἀφαιρέω* renders כתת elsewhere (9:13; 22:25), *κόπτω* (and its prefixed analogues) also render כתת (14:8; 37:24; 44:14). For that reason, *καὶ κατακόψει* is more likely indebted to lexical associations endemic to the verse than to recognition of התז.

18:6

Syriac renders יעזבו in the passive voice (*ܡܬܥܝܒܝܢ*), whereas OG inflects it in the active voice, with a change of person: *καὶ καταλείψει*. Old Greek's frequent shifts of inflectional details suggest that the translator coordinated the grammatical person with *ἀφελεί καὶ κατακόψει* in 18:5.

The replacement of “mountains” with “heaven” (*τοῖς πετεινοῖς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τοῖς θηρίοις τῆς γῆς* || לעיט הרים ולבהמת הארץ) likely owed to the contrast with “earth,” resulting in an “idiomatic pair” (Goshen-Gottstein, סט). This change could trace back to either the translator or his *Vorlage* (see the notes on 17:13). No other witness attests this reading.

Neither S nor OG recognizes the denominative verbs for summer (וקץ) and winter (תחרף). Syriac renders the first with *ܠܚܬܝܬ* and OG with *καὶ συναχθήσεται*, each perhaps associating קץ(ו) with קבץ, which they elsewhere translate with *ܡܠܥ* and *συναγω* (e.g., 11:12; 13:14). Alternatively, they might have arrived at their equivalents for קץ(ו) based on the type of action implied by the context (cf. *ῥῥῥῥ*).

They take notably different tacks in rendering תחרף: whereas *ܠܚܬܝܬ* associates it with חרף, OG's *ῥῥῥῥ* is a generic verb of motion, against its regular rendering of חרף with *ὀνειδίζω* (37:4, 17, 23, 24; 65:7).

18:7

The renderings of S and OG are transparent to a *Vorlage* like MT from the outset through צבאות and again from ארצו to the verse's end. Syriac's rendering of the remainder of the verse largely tracks with 18:2, although its *ܡܠܥ ܡܢ ܡܡܫܝܢ* || *ܡܠܥ ܡܢ ܡܡܫܝܢ* lacks representation of *waw* + מן. Neither MT nor S has a preposition before ממשך, distinct

from **אל גוי ממשד** in 18:2. By contrast, OG reads **ἐκ λαοῦ || עם** and **καὶ ἀπὸ λαοῦ || ומעם**. An associated difference is OG's rendering of **יובל** with a passive-voice verb (*ἀνενεχθήσεται*), whereas S uses a causative form in the active voice (**שדס**). The passive-voice verb likely spurred OG to supply **ἐκ**, parallel to **ἀπὸ**. Syriac, on the other hand, required a subject for **שדס**, which it found in **|| עם ממשד ומורט ||** **ܥܡܐ ܡܡܫܕ ܡܡܪܬ**. The remainder of S's equivalents are identical to 18:2. Old Greek's equivalents, on the other hand, vary significantly from 18:2, on which see the comments there.

ISAIAH 19

19:1

For ὄρασις || מִשָּׁא, see 13:1; 30:6.

The shift of grammatical number with חַתָּלָה || עַב קָל is so characteristic of S as to make speculation that its *Vorlage* read קָלִים עַבִּים needless.

Although OG-Isaiah elsewhere translates רַכַּב with ἀναβάτης (30:16; 36:8) and ἀναβιβάζω (58:14), καὶ ἐπεκάθισαν renders וַיִּרְכַּבו in 2 Kgdms 13:29 (cf. καὶ ἐπεκάθισεν ἐπὶ Χερουβιν || עַל כְּרוּב וַיִּרְכַּב, 2 Kgdms 22:11), providing a parallel to ἀκάθεται ἐπὶ νεφέλης κούφης || עַב קָל here.

While مَصْرٌ || מִצְרַיִם makes the referent of the pronoun in ⲉⲙⲥ clear, OG's ἡ καρδία αὐτῶν and ἐν αὐτοῖς leaves uncertainty about whether the referent is Egypt or its idols. καὶ ἡ καρδία αὐτῶν is most likely an impicitation of מִצְרַיִם, since it stands parallel to τὰ χειροποίητα Αἰγύπτου.

In 13:7 OG translated יָמַס with δειλιάσει, an equivalent found in Deut 20:8 (cf. Judg 15:14). The translator uses ἡττάομαι most frequently for חָתַת but also employs it as a generic word for defeat, as in ὅς γάρ ἐάν ἀλῶ ἡττηθήσεται || כָּל הַנִּמְצָא יִדְקָר, 13:15 (q.v.), so that ἡττηθήσεται || יָמַס hardly offers reason to suspect a different reading in OG's *Vorlage*.

Old Greek will render בִּקְרָבו with ἐν αὐτοῖς again in 19:3 (cf. 63:7) and בִּקְרָבָה with simple αὐτοῖς in 19:14 (cf. δι' ἐμέ || בִּקְרָבו in 29:23). The lack of a distinct equivalent for קָרַב appeared as early as ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς || בִּקְרָב הָאָרֶץ in 5:8 (q.v.).

19:2

Syriac's ܡܫܚܝܬܝ is a suitable match for וַסַּכְסַכְתִּי, even though it appears only here and in 9:10 (ܡܫܚܝܬܝ || וַסַּכְסַכְתִּי).¹ On the other hand, OG's καὶ

1. Whether the translator was familiar with סוּךְ or simply happened on an apt equivalent for a verb that appears only twice is difficult to know. This translator uses

Old Greek-Isaiah translates בלע with καταπίνω in 25:8; 28:4; 49:19. Nevertheless, καὶ τὴν βουλὴν αὐτῶν διασκεδάσω || ועצתו אבלע accords with its use of διασκεδάννυμι with βουλή and its verbal cognates again in 8:10 (καὶ ἦν ἂν βουλευέσθη βουλήν διασκεδάσει κύριος || ועצו עצה ותפר); 14:27 (ἀ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ὁ ἅγιος βεβούλευται τίς διασκεδάσει || כי יהוה צבאות יעץ ומי יפר) (cf. 32:7).

Old Greek uses ἐπερωτάω again in 30:2 (ἐμὲ δὲ οὐκ ἐπερώτησαν || ופי לוא שאל) and 65:1 (τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ἐπερωτῶσιν || בקשני ללא), both of which concern consulting the deity, as does καὶ ἐπερωτήσουσι || ודרשו here.

ἄγαλμα (|| האטם) appears again in OG-Isaiah only in 21:9's καὶ πάντα τὰ ἀγάλματα αὐτῆς || ובכל פסילי אלהיה.⁴ Outside of 19:3; 21:9, it occurs only in 2 Macc 2:2 in the Greek Bible. τὰ ἀγάλματα αὐτῶν might betoken unfamiliarity with האטם, with the translator deducing its meaning from the parallel τοὺς θεοὺς αὐτῶν || האלילים.

The +αὐτῶν with each term for foreign deities befits the translator's penchant to add a pronoun in the genitive case to explicitize relationships (Van der Vorm-Croughs, 33–36), including (notably) seven other times with terms for idols (1:29 [2x]; 17:8 [2x]; 27:9 [2x]; 40:20).

καὶ τοὺς ἐκ τῆς γῆς φωνοῦντας καὶ τοὺς ἐγγαστριμύθους || ואל האבות ואל הידענים are the same equivalents found in 8:19's ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς φωνοῦντας καὶ τοὺς ἐγγαστριμύθους || אל האבות ואל הידענים.

19:4

סכר (a *hapax legomenon*) is given fitting equivalents by OG (καὶ παραδώσω) and S (سكّر).⁵ They also agree in rendering both components of אדנים קשה in the grammatical plural (κυρίων σκληρῶν), while T translates them as grammatically singular (ריבון קשי). Although it is possible that the *Vorlagen* of OG and S had been modified to read קשים, more likely the translators analyzed אדנים as semantically plural and adjusted the grammatical number of the adjective to match. Old Greek's ἀνθρώπων explicitizes κυρίων as *human* overlords.⁶

4. OG otherwise translates פסיל with γλυπτός (10:10; 42:8) and εἰδωλόν (30:22).

5. S uses سكّر to render סגר + ביד in 1 Sam 17:46; 24:19; 26:8, for which OG uses ἀποκλείω, its regular equivalent for phonically similar סגר (e.g., Gen 19:10; Judg 3:22), although that does not imply that either read וסכרתי in its *Vorlage* here.

6. Regarding OG's frequent addition of ἄνθρωπος for explicitation, see Van der Vorm-Croughs, 60.

Old Greek-Isaiah gives varied equivalences for עז, such as πτωχός (25:3), ἰσχυρός (43:16), and ἀναιδής (56:11). Its καὶ βασιλεῖς σκληροί || זמלך || עז likely reflects coordination with κυρίων σκληρῶν || אדנים קשה || in its grammatical number.

The concision κύριος/ܡܠܝܟ || יהוה (ה)אדון is frequent in both versions (e.g., 7:7; 10:16, 24; 22:5; 22:12).

19:5

Old Greek (καὶ πίονται) associates ונשתו with שתה, and it likely supplied οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι as subject from 19:4, rather than as a second rendering of מים, as Ziegler (65) posited. Syriac renders ונשתו with ܡܫܝܡ, a verb it uses in the similar contexts of 15:6 (ܡܫܝܡ ܕܡܝܢ ܡܝܢܐ); 58:11 (ܡܫܝܡ ܕܡܝܢ ܡܝܢܐ). ܡܫܝܡ appears again in 41:17 (ܡܫܝܡ), where S translates it with ܡܫܝܡ and OG with ἐξηράνθη, choices doubtless determined by the preceding צמא (ܡܫܝܡ/δῖψης) as part of a description of a failed search for water.

For OG's phrasal modifier (ὕδωρ) τὸ παρὰ θάλασσαν || מהים (מים), compare (ἢ γὰρ ὁρόσος) ἢ παρὰ σοῦ || טלך in 26:19 (cf. 46:13; 52:10; 54:10; 59:21).

ἐκλείψει || יחרב reserves ξηρανθήσεται for יבש (but contrast 19:6).⁷ OG uses ἐκλείπω to render diverse verbs (cf. 7:8), as becomes apparent by comparing the outset of 19:6, where it renders וחרבו with ξηρανθήσεται.

19:6

ܡܫܝܡ || והאזניחו uses the same verb (and conjugation) it used for ונשתו in 19:5 and likely chosen based on context, since ܡܫܝܡ appears only here in Isaiah and, when it appears elsewhere, S's regular equivalent is ܡܫܝܡ (e.g., Hos 8:3, 5; Zech 10:6; Pss 43:2; 44:10). Although ἐκλείψει aligns formally with והאזניחו, it is more likely based on דללו, given ἐκλείψει || ידל in 17:4 and ἐξέλιπον || דלו in 38:14, the only other appearances of דלל in Isaiah.⁸

7. Although this could be seen as countervailing OG's pattern of reducing synonyms, that description falsely assumes that the translator was beholden to a set of invariable principles.

8. The four equivalents for דלל outside Isaiah render it with words for poverty: πτωχεύω in Judg 6:6; Ps 79(78):8 and ταπεινός in Pss 116(115):6; 142(141):7.

Whereas in 19:5 ἐκλείψει || יחרב seems reserved καὶ ξηρανθήσεται for ויבש, here καὶ ξηρανθήσεται renders וחרבו.

As Seeligmann (46) observes, vocabulary similar to οἱ ποταμοὶ ... ἐν παντὶ ἔλει occurs in Exod 7:19

על נהרתם על יאריהם ἐπὶ τοὺς ποταμούς αὐτῶν καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς διώρυγας αὐτῶν
ועל אגמיהם καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ ἔλη αὐτῶν

τὰς διώρυγας αὐτῶν || יאריהם in that verse agrees with αἱ διώρυγες || יארי here.⁹ As for τοῦ ποταμοῦ || מצור, Ziegler (115) compares συναγωγὴ ὕδατος || יארי מצור in 37:25. Although τὰ ἔλη αὐτῶν || אגמיהם in Exod 7:19 occurs also in Isaiah (35:7; 41:18; 42:15), more enlightening is ἔλη ἐγένετο ὁ Σαρων || קמל היה השרון in 33:9, since καὶ ἐν παντὶ ἔλει καλάμου καὶ παπύρου is likely the rendering of קמלו וסוף קנה. Ziegler (65) plausibly suggests that the translator “hat קמל ‘welken’, das nur noch 33,9 vorkommt, nicht verstanden, sondern als ἔλος (= גמא?) genommen (ebenso 33,9) als verwandten Begriff zu κάμαλος.” It seems likely, then, that the translator used a set of lexemes for marshland and waterways that he did not always calibrate to particular Hebrew lexemes, making it difficult to verify his *Vorlage*.

Like OG, S does not render מצור as a toponym, translating יארי מצור with Ἰαρίου, as it does again in 37:25. He employs חמל to render a wide range of Hebrew lexemes (e.g., כבד, 1:4; בצורה, 2:15; מתוך, 3:25; עלו, 5:14; עצום, 8:7; נשגב, 12:4).

Syriac has a surplus of equivalents for קמלו וסוף קנה: סܠܚܢܐ, סܠܚܢܐ, סܠܚܢܐ. Warszawski (36) considered סܠܚܢܐ an addition that “aus LXX nachträglich in den Text der Pesch. interpoliert worden ist,” while Goshen-Gottstein (עא) diagnosed סܠܚܢܐ as a double rendering of סוף. On the other hand, given the alignment of סܠܚܢܐ with קנה and סܠܚܢܐ with וסוף, סܠܚܢܐ (which renders גמא in 18:2) might be the equivalent for קמלו, after which the translator supplied סܠܚܢܐ as predicate, coordinate with the preceding verbs for evaporation (ܣܚܦܐ, ܣܚܦܐ). Syriac’s rendering of קמל with סܠܚܢܐ in Isa 33:9 (the only other occurrence of קמל in

9. Ziegler (191) notes that Herodotus, Strabo, and Diodorus described the canal system and that the papyri frequently referred to the system under the monikers of διώρυξ and ὑδραγωγός. Cf. ἀπὸ τῆς διώρυγος τοῦ ποταμοῦ || משבלת הנחר in Isa 27:12, followed by ἕως Πινοκορούρων (|| עד נחל מצרים), the Hellenistic technical term for the boundary between Egypt and Syria (Seeligmann, 80).

נדרך or, less likely, נדר, as here, while in Hos 8:7 ἀνεμόφθορα aligns with רוח.¹¹ Thus, ἀνεμόφθορον appears to have been chosen to specify the cause of the drying and amounts to a substitute for ואיננו נדרך.

19:8

חלל || סלח || סלח || חלל accords with חלל || סלח || סלח || חלל in 3:26 (cf. 24:4; 33:9), suggesting that חלל || סלח || סלח || חלל here, as well as סלח || חלל || סלח || חלל (an equivalence also found in 3:26), engages stock vocabulary for lament. Accordingly, although everywhere else חלל renders חלה, חלל || סלח || סלח || חלל might owe to avoiding repetition of חלל.

Syriac renders חכה as grammatically plural (ܚܚܝܬܐ), perhaps because more than one agent (ܚܚܝܬܐ || ܚܚܝܬܐ) throws a hook (contrast OG's ἄγκιστρον).

Syriac has no equivalent for כל, which is attested by all other witnesses (1QIsa^a, 4Q56, OG, V, T). Given S's regular translation of כל, its absence is difficult to explain if its *Vorlage* contained it (see appendix A).

Although οἱ ἀμφιβολεῖς (a *hapax legomenon* in the Greek Bible) aligns with על פני מים, it is not transparent to it. Its derivation from βάλλω resonates with the preceding οἱ βάλλοντες (2x), whose use for משליכי and פרשי creates a conspicuous parallelism, another variation from the translator's tendency to avoid synonyms.

Simplex βάλλω appears again in 29:3; 37:33 (2x) but renders שלך or פרש only here.¹² Although שלך is translated by ἐκβάλλω in 2:20 (cf. Lev 1:16; 14:40; Deut 29:27), the more frequent equivalent is ῥίπτω (Isa 14:9; 34:3; ἀπορίπτω in 38:17), as it is in the Pentateuch (fifteen times).

Comparably, פרש is translated with ἐκτείνω in 1:15 (cf. Exod 25:20) but with ἀνίημι in 25:11, χαλάω in 33:23, ἀνοίγω in 37:14 (cf. ἀναπτύσσω in Deut 22:17), and ἐκπετάννυμι in 65:2 (cf. Exod 9:29, 33).¹³ ἐπιβάλλω renders פרש in Num 4:6, 7, 8, 14, but simple βάλλω appears nowhere else.

A useful parallel is Hab 1:15–16, where, following ἐν ταῖς σαγήναις αὐτοῦ || במכמתו (cf. σαγήνας || מכמת here) in 1:15, 1:16 reads ἔνεκεν τούτου θύσει

11. Michael V. Fox, *Proverbs: An Eclectic Edition with Introduction and Textual Commentary*, Hebrew Bible: A Critical Edition (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015), 174–75. נדר appears again in Isa 41:2, where καὶ ὡς φρύγανα ἐξωσμένα τὰ τόξα αὐτῶν renders בקש נדרך.

12. βάλλω renders שלך in 2 Kgdms 20:22; Mic 2:5; Ps 146(147):6; Eccl 3:5.

13. פרש is rendered by ἐπικαλύπτω in Num 4:11, 13; διῴημι in Deut 32:11.

τῇ σαγήνῃ αὐτοῦ καὶ θυμιάσει τῷ ἀμφιβλήστρῳ αὐτοῦ || יזבח לחרמו || ויקטר למכמתו. In that light, οἱ ἀμφιβολεῖς here might be a second rendering of מכמת, with על פני מים considered superfluous after εἰς τὸν ποταμόν. Alternatively, οἱ ἀμφιβολεῖς could be extrapolated from על פני מים (in view of the mention of a hook and nets) to supply a subject for πενθήσουσι || אמללו.

19:9

καὶ αἰσχύνῃ λήμψεται paraphrases ובשו similar to φόβος λήμψεται Παμα || חרדה הרמה in 10:29 and ζῆλος λήμψεται λαόν || קנאת עם in 26:11 (cf. 23:5). Old Greek fashions parallel clauses, giving τοὺς ἐργαζομένους τὸ λίνον for עבדי פשתים and rendering חורי וארגים with καὶ τοὺς ἐργαζομένους τὴν βύσσον. The latter contrasts with the apt equivalents for ארג in 38:12 (ὡς ἰστὸς ἐρίθου || בארג) and 59:5 (ὕφαινονσιν || יארגו), while the forging of parallelism is similar to 19:8.

Although חורי is intelligible as a grammatical shift for harmonization with חורי || חסו, וארגים || חסו is difficult.¹⁴ Because this translator uses the verb חסו to translate לבן in Isa 1:18 (cf. Gen 30:37; Lev 13:3, 4 [2x], 10, 13, 16), it is doubtful that he would have failed to recognize חורי here (cf. חסו || חסו, חסו || חסו, Dan 7:9; חסו || חסו, בלבוש מלכות תכלת וחור || חסו, Esth 8:15).¹⁵

Generally, S offers suitable equivalents to חור/חר as toponyms, persons, and ethnic groups.¹⁶ It renders חרי “wrath” with חסו or verbal חסו (e.g., Exod 11:8; Deut 29:23; Isa 7:4) and translates חר “hole” with חסו (Isa 11:8), חסו (1 Sam 14:11), חסו (2 Kgs 12:10; Ezek 8:7; Song 5:4), חסו (Nah 2:13), and חסו (Job 30:6).¹⁷ Its equivalents for חר “noble” are חסו “free

14. Although S's *Vorlage* might have read חרקות, as Warszawski (36) posits, its tendency to impose grammatical shifts makes that explanation more likely. OG translates חורי with τὴν βύσσον. 1QIsa^a and 4Q56 read חורו, which could be construed as the verb “became white” (see Wildberger, *Isaiah* 13–27, 232).

15. S's חסו || חסו in Isa 29:22 suggests that his *Vorlage* read the *lectio facilior* ויחפרו.

16. Toponymns: חר = חסו (Num 33:32, 33); חסו (Exod 17:10, 12; 24:14; 31:2; 35:30; 38:22; Num 31:8; Josh 13:21; 1 Kgs 4:8; 1 Chr 2:20, 50; 4:4; 2 Chr 1:5; Neh 3:9 [but חסו in Num 13:5; חסו in 1 Chr 2:19; חסו in 1 Chr 4:1]); חורי = חורי (1 Chr 1:39; 5:14); חסו in Gen 36:22; but חסו in 2 Sam 23:30 || 1 Chr 11:32. Ethnic groups: חרי = חסו (Gen 14:6; 36:21, 29, 30; 40:16; Deut 2:12, 22).

17. Intelligibly it renders בחורים with חסו in Isa 42:22. Less readily explicable is

Conversely, שמה elsewhere in Isaiah most often renders שמחה (13x), while six times it renders משוש and once ששון. Another unusual alignment appears in 30:29's ושמחת לבב || וסמחתי וסמחתי וסמחתי, where the front position of שמחת might have played a role in the choice of וסמחתי (contrast וסמחתי in 5:12). Unfortunately, this sheds little light on וסמה in 19:9.

Goshen-Gottstein (עא) suggested that חורי || חֲסוּהָל in 19:9 might be attributable to “interchange ד/ר in Vorlage” and, similarly, that סְחַל || סְחָל in 34:12 might reflect a Vorlage that read חודה for חורי (קמה; cf. Warszawski, 36). Although S translates all forms containing -חוד in MT with שׁב, support for Goshen-Gottstein’s proposal comes from tracing S’s use of the verb שׂב, especially when used for forms containing the consonant cluster חד.¹⁸ Syriac translates the two recognized instances of the Hebrew verb חדה with שׂב (שׂב), Exod 18:9; ותחדו || ויחדו (Exod 18:9; Ps 21:7), but it also renders אתם בקבורה לא תחד (MT ותחד) in Isa 14:20 with سبلا لبلا حمصه, حمبال, an equivalent found again in Ps 86:11 (سبل حبص).¹⁹ Likewise, יחד לבבי ליראה שמך || חכמ כחמכי (MT [ותחד]).²⁰ Similarly, אז תראי ונהרת ופחד ורחב לבבך || אלה אלמים מאלים מסוב מכפ in Isa 60:5 suggests that the translator read ותחד for ופחד.²⁰ Given the translator’s detection of forms of חדה in 14:20; 60:5, there is reason to infer that he derived חסה from חורי, read as חודי, in 19:9 and from חריה, read as חדיה, in 34:12.

20. Elsewhere S translates פחד (verb or noun) with **ܦܚܕ**, **ܦܚܕܐ** (2:10, 19, 21; 24:17, 18; 44:8; 51:13), **ܦܚܕܝܢ** (12:2; 19:16), **ܦܚܕܝܬܐ** (19:17; 33:14), and **ܠܦܚܕܐ** (44:11). Nowhere else does **ܦܚܕ** || **ܦܚܕܐ** occur. For a similar variant reading involving **ܦܚܕ**, see **ܡܥܬܪܐ ܐܢܐ ܐܘܠܐ** || **ܡܥܬܪܐ ܒܐܪܐ ܐܬܐ ܡܬܚܪܐ ܒܐܪܐ** || **ܡܥܬܪܐ ܐܢܐ** in Jer 22:15, which supposes **ܡܬܚܪܐ**.

19:10

|| שבתיה והיו || סמל מספיק accords with S's rendering of דכא in 53:5, 10; 57:15 (cf. || תדכאו || בסמל. 3:15, q.v.). Its rendering is a reformulation of the verse that appears to postpone its equivalent for שבתיה to the end of the verse, where || סמל מספיק seems a substitute for אגמי (cf. OG, below) to fit with || שבר || סמל.

|| והיו שבתיה || οἱ διαζόμενοι αὐτά uses an equivalent better suited semantically for ארגים of 19:9 and was perhaps chosen in its light. The noun שבת occurs again in 20:4's שבת ערות מצרים, which OG translates with ἀνακαλυμμένους τὴν αἰσχύνην Αἰγύπτου and S with || סמל מספיק, suggesting their unfamiliarity with שבת.²¹

The rendering of שבר by τὸν ζῦτον, which occurs only here in the Bible, betrays that “die LXX hat von ihrer ägyptischen Einstellung aus nicht anschaulich übersetzt; denn ζῦθος ist das einheimische Nationalgetränk” (Ziegler, 194).

Old Greek's ἐν ὀδύνῃ || מדכאים differs from its equivalents for דכא elsewhere (e.g., ἀδικέω, 14:3; μαλακίζομαι, 53:5; καθαρίζω [Aramaic דכא], 53:10; τοῖς συντετριμμένοις τὴν καρδίαν || [נדכאים לב, 57:15), while ὀδύνῃ renders various words (עצב, 14:3; בן גרני, 21:10; יחילו, 23:5; מחץ, 30:26; יגון, 51:11).²² The seeming ambiguity in the translator's understanding of דכא raises the possibility that ἐν ὀδύνῃ is linked with his supply of λυπηθήσονται as predicate for πάντες οἱ τὸν ζῦτον ποιοῦντες (|| עשי שבר ||) and his rendering of אגמי נפש with καὶ τὰς ψυχὰς πονέσουσι, less likely owing to knowledge of the *hapax legomenon* אגמי than to a guess.²³

19:11

Syriac's lack of an equivalent for א and OG's καὶ are exemplified elsewhere. See the discussion of their renderings of א in appendix B.

21. Dependence of S on OG is unlikely, since the diction of “uncovering nakedness” appears again in Isa 47:3 with the same equivalents used (ἀνακαλυφθήσεται ἡ αἰσχὺνὴ σου/|| סמל מספיק, ערותך תגל ||) and is frequent elsewhere in the prophets (e.g., Ezek 16:36, 37; 22:10).

22. The first occurrence of דכא in 57:15 is difficult to align with a specific equivalent: καὶ ὀλιγοψύχοις διδοὺς μακροθυμίαν || ואת דכא ושפל רוח להחיות רוח שפלים || aligns with different phrases elsewhere: חרב, 25:5; גמהרי לב, 35:4; עצובת רוח, 54:6. Perhaps καὶ ὀλιγοψύχοις here translates ושפל רוח, while דכא lacks a specific equivalent.

23. The homonym אגם occurs frequently in Isaiah. OG gives no equivalent for it in 14:23 but uses ἔλη in 35:7; 41:18; 42:15. S uses || סמל מספיק || for it each time.

Old Greek renders the nominal function of אֱלֹהִים with *μωροί*, while using the allied verbal form later in the verse: *μωρανθήσεται* || נִבְעֶרָה. Syriac, on the other hand, highlights the counselors' errant behavior with *ܐܠܗܝܡ* || נִבְעֶרָה עֲצָה || *ܡܚܠܐ ܥܬܬܐ* || אֱלֹהִים, uses the same verb for נִבְעֶרָה in 19:13, in a sentence similar to this one: *ܐܠܗܝܡ ܢܘܐܠܝܢ ܫܪܝ ܥܥܢ* || *ܐܠܗܝܢ ܕܥܝܠܐ*.

Old Greek reads *βασιλεύς* for both occurrences of פֶּרַעָה. Although one might posit that this is a substitution, *Φαραω* renders פֶּרַעָה in 30:2, 3, and *Φαραω βασιλεὺς Αἰγύπτου* translates מֶלֶךְ מִצְרַיִם in 36:6 (the only other appearances of פֶּרַעָה in the book). Moreover, nowhere else in the Greek Bible does *βασιλεύς* render פֶּרַעָה, and the only occasions when פֶּרַעָה lacks a noun equivalent in OG entail substitution of a pronoun (*αὐτῷ* || פֶּרַעָה אֵל, Exod 5:1; *ἀπὸ σοῦ* || מִפְּרַעָה Exod 8:25).²⁴ Conversely, all other appearances of *βασιλεύς* in Isaiah align with מֶלֶךְ (70x), מְלוּכָה (34:12), מַמְלָכָה (13:4, 19; 14:16; 23:1; 60:12), or מְלָאכִי (14:32), while *βασίλεα* is a plus in 8:6, and *καὶ οἱ βασιλεῖς* aligns with וְלְאֻמִּי in 51:4.²⁵ Thus it is more likely that OG's *Vorlage* read מֶלֶךְ than that the translator substituted *βασιλεύς* for פֶּרַעָה. Although in an oracle labeled מִשְׁאַ מִצְרַיִם (19:1) the referent of מֶלֶךְ is intelligible, a scribal substitution of פֶּרַעָה for מֶלֶךְ would harmonize with other references to פֶּרַעָה.

Notably, S reads *ܡܚܠܐ ܥܬܬܐ* || פֶּרַעָה⁽¹⁾ but simply *ܐܠܗܝܢ* || פֶּרַעָה in 30:2, 3 and *ܡܚܠܐ ܥܬܬܐ* || פֶּרַעָה in 36:6. Every other occurrence of *ܡܚܠܐ ܥܬܬܐ* is linked with *ܐܠܗܝܢ* (Gen 41:46; Exod 6:11, 13, 27, 29; 14:8; Deut 7:8; 11:3; 1 Kgs 3:1; 9:16; 11:18; 2 Kgs 17:7; 18:21; Isa 36:6; Jer 25:19; Ezek 29:2, 3; 30:21, 22; 31:2; 32:2). Although *ܡܚܠܐ ܥܬܬܐ* could be a dittograph of the following *ܡܚܠܐ ܥܬܬܐ*, as Goshen-Gottstein (עב) suggested, no textual evidence for that reading survives in the manuscript

24. OG translates מֶלֶךְ מִצְרַיִם with *Φαραω βασιλεὺς Αἰγύπτου*, never omitting *Φαραω* (Exod 6:11, 13, 27, 29; 14:5, 8; Deut 7:8; 11:3; 3 Kgdms 9:16; 11:18; 4 Kgdms 17:7; 18:21; 23:29; Jer 25:19; 51[44]:30; 26[46]:2, 17 [+Nεχω, as in 3 Kgdms 23:29; Jer 26(46):2]); Ezek 29:2; 30:21, 22; 31:2; 32:2), while *Φαραω + βασιλεύς* || פֶּרַעָה occurs in Gen 45:21; Exod 3:10, 11. OG reads *Φαραω* || פֶּרַעָה מֶלֶךְ מִצְרַיִם in Ezek 29:3. All of 1 Kgs 3:1, which contains מֶלֶךְ מִצְרַיִם, is lacking in OG, while 1 Kgs 9:16–19 (including פֶּרַעָה מֶלֶךְ מִצְרַיִם in 19:16) is replaced with other text in OG.

25. *οἱ ἐβασιλεύσαντες τῆς Ἰουδαίας* renders מְלָכֵי יְהוּדָה in 1:1; *καὶ βασιλεύσομεν αὐτῆς* || מְלוּכָה in 7:6 (cf. 30:33; 36:1). Only one instance of מֶלֶךְ (out of three, in series) is rendered in 37:13. *καὶ ἐπλήθυνας τὴν πορνείαν σου μετ' αὐτῶν* in 57:9 lacks recognizable correspondences with MT's וְתִשְׂרִי לְמֶלֶךְ בְּשִׁמְךָ. On the unique textual problems in 37:8–9, see the comments there.

evidence. Syriac might attest a conflate reading, with **ܡܚܠܬ** surviving from the reading of OG's *Vorlage* but **ܦܪܥܐ** added.

Syriac's **ܡܚܠܬ ܦܪܥܐ** || **ܡܚܠܬ ܦܪܥܐ** likely owes its existence to the rendering of **ܡܚܠܬ** with the relative clause **ܡܚܠܬ ܦܪܥܐ** earlier, spawning a direct object. There is little reason to suspect that **ܡܚܠܬ ܦܪܥܐ** stood in the *Vorlage*.

ܡܚܠܬ is likely a condensation of **ܡܚܠܬ ܦܪܥܐ**, with the grammatical number harmonized to **ܡܚܠܬ** (cf. OG's **οἱ συνηγμένοι ἡμεῖς**), similar to **ܡܚܠܬ** in 5:1, even though S renders **ܡܚܠܬ** in similar locutions elsewhere (e.g., 11:14; 49:20).

19:12

Syriac renders **ܐܝܡ** with **ܐܝܡ** but lacks an equivalent for **ܐܦܢܐ**, which it translates with **ܐܦܢܐ** in 22:1 by association with **ܦܐ**, which it renders with **ܐܦܢܐ** in 22:16 (3x); 52:5 (cf. Exod 33:16).²⁶ That equivalent would have been redundant alongside **ܐܝܡ**, however, likely accounting for S's silence.

Given how frequently *ἀναγγέλλω* translates both **ܢܓܕ** (e.g., 3:9; 7:2; 21:6) and **ܝܕܥ** (e.g., 5:5; 12:4, 5), it is more likely that the translator selected **ܐܦܢܐ** || *ἀναγγεῖλαι* to follow **ܐܦܢܐ** || *ἀναγγεῖλαι* than that his *Vorlage* read something different. Isaiah 48:6 has another curious interplay of these words, rendering **ܐܦܢܐ** with **ܐܦܢܐ** and **ܐܦܢܐ** with **ܐܦܢܐ**.

19:13

ܐܦܢܐ || **ܐܦܢܐ** not only reprises **ܐܦܢܐ** from the start of 19:11, but the rendering of all of **ܐܦܢܐ** || **ܐܦܢܐ** accords with its **ܐܦܢܐ** || **ܐܦܢܐ** there. Such wholesale borrowing of phrasing from a parallel passage is frequent in OG but rare in S.

ܐܦܢܐ || *ἐξέλπω* is among the varied equivalents for *ἐκλείπω* in this book, as discussed at 7:8 (cf. **ܐܦܢܐ** || **ܐܦܢܐ** in 19:5; **ܐܦܢܐ** || **ܐܦܢܐ** in 19:6). On the other hand, **ܐܦܢܐ** appears only three other times in the Bible. Whereas **ܐܦܢܐ** in Num 12:11 is semantically apt,

26. S renders **ܐܦܢܐ** variously elsewhere: **ܐܦܢܐ** (Gen 27:33); **ܐܦܢܐ** (Gen 27:37; Hos 13:10; Job 19:6); **ܐܦܢܐ** (Prov 6:3); **ܐܦܢܐ** (Gen 43:11; Judg 9:38); **ܐܦܢܐ** (2 Kgs 10:10; Job 17:15).

ἐδυνάσθησαν || נואלו in Jer 5:4 is not, and the absence of an equivalent in Jer 27(50):36 might reflect uncertainty about נואלו.²⁷ The Isaiah translator might have been similarly uncertain about the singular נואלו.

Old Greek's ὑψώθησαν and S's ʕܠܠܝܢܝܝܢ (|| נשא) employ equivalents each uses for נשא elsewhere (cf. 2:2).

Although γωνία is frequently used for פנה (e.g., Exod 7:2; 1 Sam 14:38) and ἀκρογωνιαῖον translates פנת in Isa 28:16, κατὰ φυλάς || פנת שבטיה here likely owes to imitation of this phrase elsewhere (e.g., κατὰ φυλάς || לשבטיו, Num 24:2 [cf. 26:55 and 33:54]; κατὰ φυλάς || לשבטיך, Deut 16:18). Goshen-Gottstein (עב) usefully compares τὸ δὲ εὖρος τῆς αὐλῆς τὸ κατὰ θάλασσαν || ורחב החצר לפאת ים in Exod 27:12 and ἐὰν δὲ κατὰ πρόσωπον μαδῆσῃ ἡ κεφαλὴ αὐτοῦ || ימרט ראשו || ואם מפאת פניו in Lev 13:41.

19:14

The translator's supply of γάρ provides a connection to the preceding clause, so that it explains why the rulers of Tanis and Memphis will wander Egypt. The theme of wandering is underscored by πλάνησις || עועים. πλανάω often translates תעה in the book (e.g., 3:12; 9:15; 16:8; 19:13; 21:4; 28:7^[2]; 29:24), even as καὶ ἐπλάνησαν renders והתעו and ὡς πλανᾶται כהתעות in this verse. Those seem to have spurred the translator to use πλανήσεως for the *hapax legomenon* עועים, as also appears the case with S's ܠܠܠܝܢܝܝܢ (alongside its ܠܠܠܝܢܝܝܢ || והתעו || ܠܠܠܝܢܝܝܢ, both likely inferring that עועים was etymologically related (association of wandering with drink may also have been reflexive, as evidenced in 28:7, q.v.)).

Syriac's ܠܠܠܝܢܝܝܢ likely owes to analysis of the final *waw* in והתעו as a pronoun, which it conformed to the gender of ܠܠܠܝܢܝܝܢ || בקרבה. For αὐτοῖς || בקרבה, see the comments on ἐν αὐτοῖς || בקרבו in 19:1.

καὶ ὁ ἐμῶν ἅμα || בקיאו is, on the one hand, semantically apt, while +ἅμα has parallels in passages where the translator seems to have added ἅμα to clarify the coordination of nouns or actions (cf. 11:7; 13:3; and see the comments at 1:31).

27. Δέομαι κύριε μὴ συνεπιθῇ ἡμῖν ἁμαρτίαν διότι ἡγνοήσαμεν καθότι ἡμάρτομεν || בי אדני אל נא חשת עלינו חטאת אשר נואלנו ואשר חטאנו (Num 12:11). OG-Pentateuch uses ἀγνοέω in several passages invoking ignorance as a mitigating factor in sin: ἔθνος ἀγνοοῦν καὶ δίκαιον ἀπολεῖς; || הגוי גם צדיק תהרג, Gen 20:4; ἐὰν δὲ πάντα συναγωγὴ Ἰσραὴל ἀγνοήσῃ || ואם כל עדת ישראל ישגו, Lev 4:13 (cf. 5:18).

19:15

Although OG frequently supplies explicitizing *ἄνθρωπος* (see Van der Vorm-Croughs, 60), S appears to do something similar only here: ܡܥܫܐ ܐܫܪ ܝܥܫܐ || ܡܥܫܐ. Syriac frequently substantivizes clauses by prefixing a *dālat*, but nowhere else does it utilize ܡܥܫܐ in such a construction.²⁸ That fact is a basis for accepting Herbert Thorndike's proposal (cited by Warszawski, 37) that ܡܥܫܐ is an error for ܡܥܫܐ || ܡܥܫܐ.

Old Greek translates ܡܥܫܐ ܐܫܪ ܝܥܫܐ as an exposition of *ῥαση* *ὡς* *καὶ* *τέλος* (cf. its *μέγαν* *καὶ* *μικρόν* || ܡܥܫܐ ܐܫܪ ܝܥܫܐ in 9:13).²⁹ Syriac translates these words with the same equivalents it uses for *ῥαση* *ὡς* but in reverse order: ܡܥܫܐ ܐܫܪ ܝܥܫܐ. These are the same equivalents it used for ܡܥܫܐ ܐܫܪ ܝܥܫܐ in 9:13.

19:16

The prepositional phrases *ἐν φόβῳ* *καὶ* *ἐν τρόμῳ* || ܡܥܫܐ ܐܫܪ ܝܥܫܐ, part of the predicate for *οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι* (|| ܡܥܫܐ), are complements to *ἔσονται* (|| ܡܥܫܐ), whose grammatical number has been modified to agree with *οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι*. Although *φόβος* *καὶ* *βόθυτος* *καὶ* *παγὶς* *ἐφ'* *ὕμᾱς* *τοὺς* *ἐνοικοῦντας* *ἐπὶ* *τῆς* *γῆς* || ܡܥܫܐ ܐܫܪ ܝܥܫܐ in 24:17 is semantically similar to this adverbial complement, the closest syntactic parallel comes from early Christian literature: *ἀγὼν ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ* *καὶ* *ἐν φόβῳ* *καὶ* *ἐν τρόμῳ* *πολλῶ* *ἐγενόμην* *πρὸς* *ὕμᾱς* (1 Cor 2:3), likely equivalent to *ὡς* *μετὰ* *φόβου* *καὶ* *τρόμου* *ἐδέξασθε* *αὐτόν* in 2 Cor 7:15 (cf. Phil 2:12).

ܡܥܫܐ ܐܫܪ ܝܥܫܐ (with *τὴν χεῖρα* *αὐτοῦ* the antecedent) is comparable to *καὶ* *ἐπιβαλεῖ* *τὴν χεῖρα* *αὐτοῦ* *ἐπὶ* *τὸν ποταμόν* || ܡܥܫܐ ܐܫܪ ܝܥܫܐ in 11:15, while the omission of an equivalent for *תנופת* in the preceding *ἀπὸ* *προσώπου* *τῆς* *χειρὸς* *κυρίου* || ܡܥܫܐ ܐܫܪ ܝܥܫܐ is explicable from the translator's tendency to pass over synonyms in adjacent phrases.³⁰

28. Phraseology similar to ܡܥܫܐ ܐܫܪ ܝܥܫܐ appears only in ܡܥܫܐ ܐܫܪ ܝܥܫܐ (56:2); ܡܥܫܐ ܐܫܪ ܝܥܫܐ (66:24; cf. 36:12; 41:11, 12; 45:14).

29. *ῥαση* occurs again in Job 15:32, where OG translates it appropriately with *ὁ* *ῥάδαμος*, while S uses ܡܥܫܐ ܐܫܪ ܝܥܫܐ. *ῥαση* appears again in Isa 58:5 (*ὡς* *κρίκον* versus ܡܥܫܐ ܐܫܪ ܝܥܫܐ); Job 40:26 (> versus ܡܥܫܐ ܐܫܪ ܝܥܫܐ); and Job 41:21 (*ἀνθράκων* versus ܡܥܫܐ ܐܫܪ ܝܥܫܐ).

30. *ἐπιβάλλω* translates ܡܥܫܐ ܐܫܪ ܝܥܫܐ also in Exod 20:25; Deut 23:26; 27:5; Josh 8:3.

With $\text{סִנְיָם אֶבֶן} || \text{יד תנופת}$ and $\text{יִמְנֵם} || \text{מניף}$, compare $\text{סִנְיָם אֶבֶן} || \text{הניף}$ in 11:15.

19:17

The grammatical number of $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma || \text{אליו}$ has been brought into agreement with $\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma \text{ Αἰγυπτίοις} || \text{למצרים}$. Oddly, the subject of $\phi\omicron\beta\eta\theta\eta\sigma\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\iota$ ($|| \text{יפחד}$) appears to be those who mention $\eta\ \chi\acute{\omega}\rho\alpha\ \tau\acute{\omega}\nu \text{ Ιουδαίων}$ ($\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\gamma$) to the Egyptians ($\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$), despite the fact that the preceding clause declared that land $\phi\acute{o}\beta\eta\tau\rho\nu$ to the Egyptians. One would need to suppose anacoluthon to construe the Egyptians as the subject of $\phi\omicron\beta\eta\theta\eta\sigma\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\iota$. On the other hand, the fear possessing the subject of the verb is the divine plan for Judah, which might be conceivable as knowledge held by some who speak to the Egyptians about Judah. Nevertheless, the meaning is opaque.

Although OG's most frequent equivalent for זכר is $\mu\iota\mu\eta\eta\sigma\kappa\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$, comparable to $\text{ὀνομάσῃ} || \text{יזכיר}$ is $\tau\acute{o}\ \delta\text{'}\nu\omicron\mu\acute{\alpha}\ \sigma\omicron\upsilon\ \delta\text{'}\nu\omicron\mu\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu || \text{נזכיר שמד}$ in 26:13 (cf. Josh 23:7; Jer 3:16; 20:9; 23:36; Amos 6:10).

Old Greek integrates יהוה in its reformulation $\text{διὰ τὴν βουλὴν ἣν βεβούλευται κύριος ἐπ' αὐτήν} || \text{עליו הוא יועץ יהוה}$ but lacks an equivalent for צבאות (cf. 3:15 and comments there).

For $\text{לִיפָחַד} || \text{יפחד}$, compare 33:14; 44:8; 57:11.

19:18

$\text{ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ} || \text{בארץ מצרים}$ differs from $\text{ἐν χώρᾳ Αἰγύπτου} || \text{בארץ מצרים}$ in 19:20 but parallels $\text{ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ} || \text{מצרים}$ in 27:13 (where it is preceded by $\text{ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ τῶν Ἀσσυρίων} || \text{בארץ אשור}$). Likewise, we find $\text{ἐν τῇ Ἰδουμαίᾳ} || \text{בארץ אדום}$ in 34:6.

Although $\chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ is the standard equivalent for שפה , $\gamma\lambda\tilde{\omega}\sigma\sigma\alpha$ renders it also in Gen 11:7⁽¹⁾; Zeph 3:9; Ps 80(81):6. Similarly, although ܣܦܗ is S's common equivalent for שפה , it often uses ܠܗܠܐ (as here) when שפה is metonymic for speech (e.g., Gen 11:1, 6, 7, 9; Exod 6:12, 30; Ps 81:6).

Although $\text{τῷ ὀνόματι κυρίου} || \text{ליהוה}$ could be the translator's expansion, the assimilation of ליהוה to יהוה in an expression of an oath might already have been an expansion in the *Vorlage*. As in 19:17, OG lacks an equivalent for צבאות .

As I argue in detail elsewhere (Troxel, 167–71), Πόλις-ασεδεα is likely a transcribed corruption of ההרס (or החרס , as in 1QIsa^a) into הסדח . $\eta\ \mu\acute{\iota}\alpha\ \pi\acute{o}\lambda\iota\varsigma$ is an explication of אחת . Syriac renders אחת with ܐܚܬܐ ,

The equivalents in *καὶ εὐξονται εὐχάς* || *ונדרו נדר* appear already in, for example, Gen 28:20 (*καὶ ἠὕξατο Ιακωβ εὐχῆν* || *וידר יעקב נדר*); Gen 31:13 (*καὶ ἠὕξω μοι ἐκεῖ εὐχῆν* || *אשר נדרת לי שם נדר*).

19:22

καὶ πατάξει ... πληγῇ μεγάλῃ is OG's equivalent for *ונגף ... נגף*. For the sake of balance, it seems, the translator supplied a nominal complement to the verb in the parallel clause, *καὶ ἰάσεται αὐτοὺς ἰάσει* || *ורפוא*, in addition to providing *αὐτοὺς* as direct object.

19:23

ὁδὸς Αἰγύπτου likely reflects manipulation of *מסלה ממצרים* to accord with the phrase *דרך מצרים*, rendered with *ὁδὸν Αἰγύπτου* in 10:24.

לחן likely attests a scribal addition of *מאשור ממצרים* in S's *Vorlage* as a companion to *אשור*, matching the paired phrases *במצרים ומצרים באשור* that follow. Although it is possible that the translator created this expansion, he does not typically innovate such harmonizations.

Old Greek likely supplied *πορεύσονται* as predicate for *Αἰγύπτου* to fill out the clause, parallel to *καὶ εἰσελεύσονται Ἀσσύριοι εἰς Αἴγυπτον* || *ובא אשור במצרים*.

19:24

Old Greek's translation of this verse is transparent to a Hebrew *Vorlage* much like MT, save that *ἐν τοῖς Ἀσσυρίοις καὶ ἐν τοῖς Αἰγυπτίοις* likely reflects the word order *לאשור ולמצרים*. The translator's rendering of both instances of *ל* with *ἐν* accords with the flexibility in rendering prepositions found throughout this translation, just as *ἐν τῇ ἡγ* || *בקרב הארץ* is a typical condensation in this book (cf. 5:8; 6:12; 7:22; 10:23).

לחן for the ordinal *שלישיה* is the same solution used in 6:13's *עשריה* || *לחן*.

19:25

לחן || *לאמר* is commonplace in S (e.g., 3:7; 4:1; 7:5).

Old Greek presents two issues: the translation of *עמי ממצרים* by *ὁ λαός μου* *ὁ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ* and of *אשור ידי ומעשה ידי* by *καὶ ὁ ἐν Ἀσσυρίοις*, lacking

any equivalent for *מעשה ידי*. *مَعِيشَة يَدِي* translates the first phrase similar to OG, and its second relative clause conjoined with *bēth* (בֵּית) parallels *καὶ ὁ ἐν*, except that the antecedent of the pronoun is *سَحْبِ آبٍ* (*||* *מעשה ידי*). Nevertheless, OG and S both call people from Israel residing in Egypt and Assyria “my people,” likely owing to a shared disbelief that Egypt and Assyria could ever merit that label (cf. Warszawski, 38).³¹ This hardly requires direct influence of OG on S. In fact, according to the manuscript tradition, the pronoun of *سَحْبِ* at the outset of the sentence is masculine gender (contrast *הָעַ*), signaling that S considered its antecedent to be *سَحْبِ آبٍ* in 19:24, so that the blessing spoken is exclusively on “my people,” an understanding that would readily motivate its renderings of *אשור* and *מצרים*.

|| *מעשה ידי אשור* || *سَحْبِ آبٍ* utilizes S’s common maneuver of creating a relative clause as a modifier. Old Greek represents *יד מעשה* + pronominal suffix everywhere else it occurs, and there is no evident trigger for parablepsis to explain accidental omission from the *Vorlage*.³² But neither is it likely that the phrase was added secondarily, given the kinds of problems *אשור* posed for these interpreters. *יד מעשה* constitutes an epithet for *אשור*, just like *עמי* before *מצרים* and like *ונחלתי* before *ישראל*. Passing over *יד מעשה* might have been attractive to OG, owing to the symmetry of *ὁ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ ὁ ἐν Ἀσσυρίοις καὶ ἡ ἀղηρονομία μου* *Ἰσραηλ*, after it construed *עמי* as an epithet for Israel.

31. There is no reason to consider this a special reflection of the Hellenistic era, as Seeligmann (117) claims.

32. Most frequently it renders *יד מעשה* + pronominal suffix with (τὰ) *ἔργα/ἔργον* τῶν *χειρῶν* + pronoun (2:8; 17:8; 37:19; 60:21), but simply τὰ *ἔργα* in 5:12 (*||* *מעשה ידי*) and 29:23 (*||* *מעשה ידי*) and τὰ *ἔργα* τῶν *πόνων αὐτῶν* || *מעשה ידיהם* in 65:22. Especially remarkable is its rendering *יד מעשה* as an epithet for Israel in 64:7’s *ἡμεῖς δὲ πηλὸς ἔργον τῶν χειρῶν σου πάντες* || *כלנו* *ידך* *מעשה* *יצרנו* *ומעשה* *והחמר* *והתה* *אנחנו*.

ISAIAH 20

20:1

Besides *Tαναθαν* || תרתן (Θαρθαν in 4 Kgdms 18:17, S 𐤕𐤓𐤕); *Σαρναν* || סרגון (a *hapax legomenon*, S 𐤑𐤕𐤓𐤏), and the Hellenistic toponym Ἀζωτον (S 𐤀𐤗𐤟𐤕) || אשדודה, the only noteworthy feature is OG's translation of בשלח אתו with a passive construction: ἡνίκα ἀπεστάλη (S 𐤁𐤑𐤕𐤕𐤓𐤕).

20:2

Old Greek's τότε || בעת ההיא is distinctive alongside its other renderings of this phrase with ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ (18:7; 39:1). τότε most often translates אז (35:5, 6; 41:1; 45:21 [מאז]; 58:8, 9; 60:5) but also renders *waw* prefixed to a verb (28:25; 30:23; 58:10), or the translator supplies it to specify a temporal relationship between clauses (8:16; 30:15; 44:8; 65:25). Despite this being the only time that τότε renders בעת ההיא, there is no reasonable suspicion that the *Vorlage* read anything different, since τότε is a temporal adverb, and the translator uses temporal phrases rather freely (cf. ἡ ἄν ἡμέρᾱ κληρώσῃ || ביום נחלה in 17:11 and his frequent insertion of νῦν, as summarized in the note regarding καὶ νῦν at 2:5).

The most frequent equivalents for ביד in OG-Isaiah are ἐν (τῇ) χειρὶ/ταῖς χερσίν (6:6; 10:5; 28:2 [ταῖς χερσὶ]; 36:15; 62:3) and εἰς τὴν χεῖρα/(τὰς) χεῖρας (19:4; 22:21; 37:13; 47:6; 51:23).¹ The closest parallel to πρὸς Ησαίαν || ביד עבדיך חרפת is 37:24's ὅτι δι' ἀγγέλων ὠνείδισας κύριον || ביד ישעיהו אדני (cf. διὰ Μωυσῆ || ביד משה, Josh 20:2; πρὸς Ἰου τὸν προφήτην || ביד

1. OG-Isaiah translates ביד with the genitive τῆς χειρὸς in connection with the verbs κρατέω (42:6) and ἀντιλαμβάνω (51:18). Its translation of ביד עוננו with καὶ παρέδωκας ἡμᾶς διὰ τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν in 64:7(6) reflects a nuancing of phrasing for the setting, and he passes over ביד in καὶ βούλεται κύριος ἀφελεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ πόνου τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ || וחפץ יהוה בידו יצלח מעמל נפשו, 53:10–11.

יהוא הנביא, 1 Kgs 16:12). More importantly, this case fits Van der Vorm-Croughs's (70) observation about the tendency to elide words for body parts when they serve as a *nomen regens*.

Old Greek's lack of an equivalent for בן אמוץ more likely signals its absence from its *Vorlage* than a deliberate omission, since OG gives equivalents for it in 1:1; 2:1; 13:1; 37:2, 21; 38:1. בן אמוץ in MT, 1QIsa^a, and 4Q56 (cf. S, V, T), on the other hand, likely attests a scribal addition to fill out the title found elsewhere. Its absence from OG accords with the likelihood that chapter 20 had its own history before being incorporated into Isaiah.²

Syriac has ܐܡܘܥܐ following ܐܬܬܐ. The full title ܐܡܘܥܐ ܕܢܒܝܐ appears in MT (= 1QIsa^a, OG, V, T) only in 37:2; 38:1, in both of which S has the word order ܐܡܘܥܐ ܕܢܒܝܐ, as here. ܐܡܘܥܐ ܕܢܒܝܐ in 39:3 accords with MT and OG, as does ܐܡܘܥܐ ܕܢܒܝܐ in 1:1; 2:1; 13:1 and its solitary ܐܡܘܥܐ in 7:3; 20:3. Given these data, the full phrase in S might owe to a scribal harmonization already found in its *Vorlage*.

Syriac's lack of an equivalent for תחליץ might evince condensation but could also owe to uncertainty over semantics, not only because S's other equivalents for חליץ denote "strength" (ܡܫܬܥܬܝܬܐ ܕܡܘܥܐ || ܡܫܬܥܬܝܬܐ ܕܡܘܥܐ, 15:4; ܡܫܬܥܬܝܬܐ ܕܡܘܥܐ || ܡܫܬܥܬܝܬܐ ܕܡܘܥܐ, 58:11) but because S rarely recognizes in חליץ the meaning "draw off." Although it renders חליץ with ܡܫܬܥܬܝܬܐ in Deut 25:9, 10, the direct object is "sandal" and ܡܫܬܥܬܝܬܐ ܕܡܘܥܐ in 20:9 already implies removal (ܡܫܬܥܬܝܬܐ ܕܡܘܥܐ || ܡܫܬܥܬܝܬܐ ܕܡܘܥܐ). The same is true of Lev 14:40, 43, where ܡܫܬܥܬܝܬܐ renders חליץ in speaking of extracting stones that have a defiling mark (ܡܫܬܥܬܝܬܐ ܕܡܘܥܐ || ܡܫܬܥܬܝܬܐ ܕܡܘܥܐ).³ Otherwise S translates חליץ with ܡܫܬܥܬܝܬܐ (Num 31:3, 5; 32:17, 20, 21, 27, 29, 30, 32; Deut 3:18; Josh 4:13; 6:7, 9, 13; Ps 60:7), ܡܫܬܥܬܝܬܐ (Pss 50:15; 91:15; Prov 11:9), ܡܫܬܥܬܝܬܐ (2 Sam 22:20; Pss 6:5; 18:20; 34:8; 81:8; 116:8; 119:153; 140:2; Prov 11:8), ܡܫܬܥܬܝܬܐ (Hos 5:6; Ps 108:7), ܡܫܬܥܬܝܬܐ (Job 36:15), and ܡܫܬܥܬܝܬܐ (Lam 4:3).⁴ It is highly unlikely that תחליץ was a later addition, given that חליץ is regularly associated with the phraseology ... מעל רגליך נעלך, while ופתחת would be an unusual verb to associate with it via zeugma. There is no sign

2. See Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27*, 286–88.

3. ܡܫܬܥܬܝܬܐ elsewhere is typically associated with ܡܫܬܥܬܝܬܐ, translating שלף or הריק (e.g., Exod 15:9; Lev 26:33; Num 22:23).

4. Notable circumlocutions are ܡܫܬܥܬܝܬܐ ܕܡܘܥܐ || ܡܫܬܥܬܝܬܐ ܕܡܘܥܐ in 1 Chr 12:25; ܡܫܬܥܬܝܬܐ ܕܡܘܥܐ || ܡܫܬܥܬܝܬܐ ܕܡܘܥܐ in 2 Chr 17:18; and ܡܫܬܥܬܝܬܐ ܕܡܘܥܐ || ܡܫܬܥܬܝܬܐ ܕܡܘܥܐ in 2 Chr 20:21. In Ps 7:5, ܡܫܬܥܬܝܬܐ ܕܡܘܥܐ likely reads ואלחצה for ואלחצה.

of a potential trigger for parablepsis of תחליץ. Syriac's lack of an equivalent is best ascribed to the translator's uncertainty over the verb.

Old Greek's semantically apt ὑπόγλωσσαι || תחליץ is found also in Deut 25:9, 10. The fact that S did not follow OG's path here is tacit evidence that it did not regularly consult OG when stumped.

Syriac's transposed order ܥܪܘܡ ܝܚܝܦ || ܫܥܒ ܫܚܝܦ is paralleled in 20:3 (ܥܪܘܡ ܝܚܝܦ || ܫܥܒ ܫܚܝܦ), while we find ܥܪܘܡ ܝܚܝܦ || ܫܥܒ ܫܚܝܦ in 20:4. Although S shows a freedom to reformulate word order, it does so typically in regard to order of verb, subject, object, and modifiers, not isolated phrases. It is difficult to see what might have motivated the translator to transpose these phrases, making it likely that they were transposed in its *Vorlage*.

20:3–4

Neither OG nor S reflects the correspondence between כאשר in 20:3 and כן in 20:4 in MT, where Isaiah's walking about naked and unshod (הלך חלד) is qualified by the adverbial phrase שלש שנים אות (עבדי ישעיהו ערום ויחף) and 20:4 provides the correlative warning: כן ינהג על מצרים ועל כוש מלך אשור. Old Greek disrupts the comparison by supplying +ἔσται, while S inserts ܐܡܠܬ at the same spot.

Old Greek construes שלש שנים as a temporal frame for Isaiah's activity more directly than MT, whose *athnach* (וַיַּחֲדָךְ) marks the temporal phrase either as the beginning of a separate clause or, more likely, in apposition to the first. OG creates a second clause by supplying ἔσται before σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα (|| אות ומופת) and regards both instances of על as marking the indirect object: τοῖς Αἰγυπτίοις καὶ Αἰθίοψιν. The absence of a conjunction before ἔσται creates uncertainty about the relationship of the clause to what precedes, as well as the subject. These problems are elucidated by comparing the rendering of 8:18, the only other place this phraseology occurs in the book:

הנה אנכי והילדים אשר נתן לי יהוה	ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ καὶ τὰ παιδία ἃ μοι ἔδωκεν ὁ θεός
לאותות ולמופתים	καὶ ἔσται εἰς σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα
בישראל מעם יהוה צבאות	ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ παρὰ κυρίου σαβαωθ

The most striking similarity to 20:3 is the translator's insertion of καὶ ἔσται before εἰς σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα. However, his inclusion of καί in 8:18 underscores the ambiguous relationship of the clause to the preceding clause

in 20:3. Although the subject of *καὶ ἔσται* in 8:18 is oblique, *εἰς* prevents identifying *σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα* in that role. There the preceding clause seems the only available subject, consistent with the translator's rendering of presentative *הנה*, which would be left hanging otherwise.⁵ The lack of a conjunction before *ἔσται* in 20:3 makes it likely that its subject is the preceding clause, as confirmed by the fact that 20:4 identifies the prime corollary (*οὕτως*) to the clause headed by *ὃν τρόπον* (in 20:3) as the Assyrian king leading Egyptian and Ethiopian captives *γυμνοὺς καὶ ἀνυποδέτους ἀνακεκαλυμμένους τὴν αἰσχύνην Αἰγύπτου*. However, *+ὅτι* likely makes 20:4 the explanation of how Isaiah's action constitutes *σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα τοῖς Αἰγυπτίοις καὶ Αἰθίοψιν*.⁶

Additionally, although *οὕτως* || כן marks the corollary to *ὃν τρόπον* in 20:3, the tense difference between *πεπόρευται* (|| הלך) and *ἔσται* must be given its due. The translator's supply of *ἔσται*, rather than translating *אות ומופת* with, say, *εἰς σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα*, differentiates between Isaiah's *past* act and its function as *σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα* for the Egyptians and Ethiopians in the future.

Like OG, S inserts a verb of existence before *אות ומופת* (ܐܡܝܢ) in 20:3, but it also adds the correlative *ܐܡܝܢ*, explicitizing what is implied in OG. On the other hand, whereas OG construes *שלוש שנים* as the duration of Isaiah's behavior, S uses it to describe the period when the "signs and wonders" will appear: ܐܡܝܢ ܬܬܝܬܝܢ ܠܐܝܬܐ ܠܡܝܬܪܐ ܕܡܝܬܪܐ. Syriac's *ܐܡܝܢ* at the outset of 20:4 marks the fulfillment of 20:3's ܐܡܝܢ ܬܬܝܬܝܢ ܠܐܝܬܐ ܠܡܝܬܪܐ ܕܡܝܬܪܐ.

Less significant differences between OG and S are that the latter uses *ܐܡܝܢ* for both *שבי* and *גלות*, whereas OG provides an equivalent for only one—in accord with its tendency to omit synonyms in coordinate phrases—just as S translates both occurrences of *על*, whereas OG collapses both into a single *τοῖς*. Regarding S's transposition *ܥܪܘܡ ܐܝܬܐ || ܥܪܘܡ ܐܝܬܐ*, see the notes on 20:2. The pattern of agreements and differences suggests that, although each translator made some similar decisions, those attest independent attempts to render the text.

For the lack of an equivalent for *שת* (in both OG and S), see the notes on *שתתיה* in 19:10. OG's equivalent, *ἀνακεκαλυμμένους* || *וּחְשׁוּפִי*, appears again in 47:2; 52:10, where S once more uses *ܠܗ* for *חשף*.

5. For the translator's handling of *הנה*, see the comments at 17:14.

6. It seems less likely that *ὅτι* is recitative, detailing the import of *σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα*.

20:5

Old Greek's καὶ αἰσχυνθήσονται ἡττηθέντες || וחזו ובשו employs standard equivalents, while its subordination of one verb to the other by use of a participle is common. Notable is the decision of which verb to subordinate to the other, assuming that the word order of the *Vorlage* was the same as MT (= 1QIsa^a; cf. S, T).

Old Greek appears to have supplied οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι⁽¹⁾ based on its reading of the verse along the following lines. Its ἐπὶ τοῖς Αἰθίοψιν || מכוש and ἐφ' οἷς ἦσαν πεποιθότες || מבטם suggest that it treated the *mem* of each alike. Its ἐφ' οἷς ἦσαν πεποιθότες (as well as ἡμεῖς ἡμεν πεποιθότες || מבטנו in 20:6) likely reflects biliteral etymology that relates מבטם to בטח, just as it based πείθω on a biliteral etymology of ישעה by association with שען in 17:7, 8 (q.v.).⁷ That analysis seems to have been the basis for his construal of οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι || מצרים (ignoring ומן) as the subject of מבטם and his supply of οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι, correlatively, as the subject of καὶ αἰσχυνθήσονται ἡττηθέντες. δόξα || תפארת is commonplace in the book (e.g., 3:18; 10:12; 28:1, 4, 5; 52:1; 60:19, 21; 63:12, 14, 15; 64:10), while ἦσαν γὰρ αὐτοῖς fills out the sense, with the inflection of the verb likely related to the 3mp suffix of תפארתם.

Like OG, S gives an etymological rendering of מבטם (مبسم), just as it translated ישעה with لعل in 17:7–8, based on association with שען. Its overall structure of the verse differs so much from OG that contemplating this as a sign of dependence on OG would infer that the translator cherry-picked this feature. Its لمحبسائم || תפארתם accords with other occasions it renders תפארת with محب (e.g., 3:18; 4:2; 10:12; 13:19).

20:6

Most of OG's adjustments here are consistent with its *Übersetzungsweise*, such as its rendering of ישב in the grammatical plural (cf. 10:24; 26:1), its reformulation of נסנו אשר into τοῦ φυγεῖν, and its rendering of שם as εἰς αὐτούς, based on the perception that שם is anaphoric to τοῖς Αἰθίοψιν in 20:5.⁸

7. πείθω translates בטח in 12:12; 30:15; 32:11, 17, 18; 36:4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10; 42:17; 47:8; 50:10; 59:4. لعل is the equivalent for בטח in 12:2; 30:12; 31:1; 36:4, 5, 6 (2x), 7, 9, 15; 37:10; 42:17; 47:10; 59:4.

8. For τοῦ φυγεῖν, cf. its use of the articular infinitive in the reformulations of 5:7; 10:3; 14:31; 16:12; 17:3. For שם, cf. οὐδὲ μὴ διέλθωσιν αὐτήν || שם יהל ולא ירהל, 13:20; οὐδὲ μὴ βάλῃ ἐπ' αὐτήν βέλος || חץ יורה שם חץ ולא יורה שם חץ, 37:33.

ISAIAH 21

21:1

ὄρασις is the equivalent for **מִשָּׁא** at 13:1; 19:1; 30:6, while *ὄραμα* renders it in 21:11; 22:1; 23:1, and *ῥῆμα* does so in 14:28; 15:1; 17:1. Never outside Isaiah is **מִשָּׁא** as a term for divine communication described as visible. The standard equivalent elsewhere is *λήμμα* (e.g., Jer 23:33, 34; Nah 1:1; Hab 1:1). The precedent for *ὄρασις* to render **מִשָּׁא** is set by Isa 13:1, whose *ὄρασις ἣν εἶδεν Ἡσαιας υἱὸς Ἀμώς κατὰ Βαβυλῶνος* || **מִשָּׁא בָּבֶל אֲשֶׁר חִזָּה** || **חִזֹּן יִשְׁעִיהוּ בֶן אֲמוּץ אֲשֶׁר חִזָּה עַל יְהוּדָה וִירוּשָׁלַם** in 1:1, although there *ὄρασις* renders **חִזֹּן** (see comments on 13:1). Whether the translator weighted the semantics of “vision” in choosing *ὄρασις/ὄραμα* rather than simply viewing them as technical terms for oracles is irretrievable.

Old Greek’s lack of an equivalent for **יָם** is one of the frequently discussed problems with this superscription. Given the difficulty of figuring out a role for **מִדְבָּר**, with or without **יָם**,¹ it seems almost perilous to venture whether **יָם** was present in the translator’s *Vorlage* or he omitted it out of uncertainty over what a **יָם מִדְבָּר** might be. Goshen-Gottstein’s (עו) comment, “cf. context,” although cryptic, at least spurs comparison with *τὸ ὄραμα τῆς Ἰδουμαίας* || **מִשָּׁא דּוּמָה** in 21:11 and *ἐν τῷ δρυμῷ ἐσπέρας* || **מִשָּׁא בְעֶרְבַּ בֵּיעֵר** in 21:13, where the translator fought to make sense of the Hebrew.

καταιγίς for **סוּפָה** is commonplace (cf. 5:28; 17:13), while the rendering of a grammatically plural noun with a grammatically singular form is unremarkable for this translator.

1. For a discussion of the many problems besetting this superscript, see Wildberger, *Isaiah 13-27*, 301–2. As he notes, the problem persists even if we try to work from 1QIsa^a’s **יָם דְּבָר**.

21:3) but appears in the passive voice again only in 33:7 (הָיָה לִי אִסְרָא חֶסֶד || גַּם תִּרְאֶה חֲרַפְתָּךְ || סַלְמָן סַפְּפָה); 47:3 (אֲרָאִים || סַלְמָן סַפְּפָה); 60:2 (וּכְבוֹדוֹ עָלֶיךָ יִרְאֶה). Because S likely read something other than הָגַד and its *Vorlage* read רְחוּקָה rather than נִרְאֶה in 21:1, we must entertain the possibility that it read נִרְאֶה here. Although there is no clear graphic change that would mutate רְחוּקָה into נִרְאֶה, it is possible to imagine confusion by which נִרְאֶה was incorrectly copied into 21:1 and הָגַד provided as the verb in its place, especially given its use in 21:6, where יָגִיד is subjoined to יִרְאֶה. Whether or not this accurately traces the vicissitudes of the text, S likely read נִרְאֶה here.

ἀθετέω renders בָּגַד again in 24:16 (2x); 33:1 (2x); and 48:8 (2x) but renders פָּשַׁע in 1:2 and 27:4, while οὐ μὴ ἀθετηθῇ renders לֹא הִסִּיר in 31:2, and οὐ μὴ ἀθετήσωσι translates לֹא יִשְׁקְרוּ in 63:8.

On the other hand, ὁ ἀνομῶν ἀνομεῖ || וְהַשּׁוֹדֵד שׁוֹדֵד is anomalous. The most frequent equivalent for שׁוֹדֵד in Isaiah is ἀπόλλυμι (15:1; 23:1, 14), found also in Ezek 32:12 (cf. ἀπώλεια || וְשָׂדֶם, Prov 11:3). The equivalents τοῖς τὰ λαιπωροῦσιν || שׁוֹדֵד and ὑμᾶς δὲ οὐδεὶς ποιεῖ τὰ λαιπῶρους || וְאַתָּה לֹא שׁוֹדֵד (both in Isa 33:1) are the most frequent throughout the Bible.⁶ The lexical group ἄνομος/ἀνομία/ἀνομέω is used for such a wide range of words (see the comments at 1:25) that the use of ἀνομέω for שׁוֹדֵד, parallel to ὁ ἀθετῶν ἀθετεῖ, is intelligible.

οἱ πρέσβεις τῶν Περσῶν || צִירִים צוֹרֵי מִדִּי accords with οἱ πρέσβεις || צִירִים in 13:8 (cf. 57:9; 63:9), and 1QIsa^a reads צִירִי. Notably, however, OG will translate צִירִים with ὠδῖνες in 21:3 (q.v.). S's סַלְמָן סַפְּפָה מִדִּי || מִדִּי מִבְּבָב recalls its rendering of בָּצוּר עוֹרֵב with כַּמְכַת מִדִּין בָּצוּר עוֹרֵב with סַלְמָן סַפְּפָה מִדִּין בָּצוּר עוֹרֵב.

Ziegler's (65) verdict regarding + ἐπ' ἐμὲ ἔρχονται is sound: "Als Prädikat zu πρέσβεις ergänzt."

The translator often supplied νῦν, as here (see the data at 2:5), while στενάξω elsewhere renders וְאַנְחָה (cf. στενάξουσιν || וְאַנְחָה, 24:7). Notably, in 30:15 OG renders וְנָחַת בְּשׁוּבָה with ὅταν ἀποστραφῇς στενάξῃς, likely employing biliteral association with אָנַח, a device that here probably accounts for καὶ παρακαλέσω ἑμαυτόν as a second rendering of וְאַנְחָה via association with נָחַם (most often translated with παρακαλέω), a reflex attested elsewhere: καὶ ἐν γαστρὶ ἐχούσας παρακαλέσει || עֲלוֹת יִנְהַל (40:11); ὁ ἐλεῶν αὐτοὺς παρακαλέσει || מִרְחַמִּים יִנְהַגֵּם (49:10); καὶ οὐκ ἔν ὁ

6. For the unique ἀπὸ προσώπου διώκοντος || מִפְּנֵי שׁוֹדֵד in 16:4, see the comments ad loc.

παρακαλῶν σε || אין מנהל לה (51:18). In this case, the association might have been encouraged by השבתי, which implies putting an end to groaning. On OG's omission of an equivalent for כל, see appendix A. S's translation of כל אנחתה in the grammatical plural comports with shifts in grammar it tolerates frequently.

21:3

חלחלה appears elsewhere only in Ezek 30:4, 9; Nah 2:11. OG uses παραχή in both verses in Ezekiel and ὠδῖνες in Nahum, while S uses חסח in Ezek 30:4; חסל in Ezek 30:9; and חל in Nah 2:11. Their equivalents here are likely just as much chosen for contextual fit as in those verses. That seems especially evident with S's חסח, which appears chosen in tandem with חל, || נעויתי, an equivalence found again in Ps 38:7 but differing from חסח || אפס in Isa 24:1 and the frequently appearing equivalent חסח (e.g., 2 Sam 19:20; 1 Kgs 8:47; Ps 106:6). The suspicion that S's word choices are strategic finds support from חסח || בעתתני in 21:4 (q.v.).

Old Greek's lack of an equivalent for (ב)צירי accords with its tendency to omit repeated words, with the (minor) consequence that it compares being attacked with pains to a woman giving birth rather than comparing his pains to birth pains.

21:4

The equivalent חסח || פלצות occurs elsewhere (Ezek 7:18; Job 21:6),⁷ and חסח || בעתתני is found again in Job 9:34; 13:21; 33:7, each time in the clause חסח לא (חסח), the only difference being the pronominal suffix on the noun. In both 2 Sam 22:5 and Ps 18:5 חסח renders יבעתוני,⁸ while חסח translates בעת in Job 3:5; 7:14; 15:24. The choice of חסח here was likely coordinated with חסח and חל in 21:3.

Although OG's με βαπτίζει || בעתתני is similar to καὶ ἔπνιγεν αὐτὸν πνεῦμα πονηρὸν παρὰ κυρίου || ובעתתו רוח רעה מאת יהוה in 1 Kgdms 16:14

7. חסח || פלצות in Ps 55:6 likely attests צלמות (cf. OG σκότος).

8. On the other hand, the translation of ובעתתו with חסח in 1 Sam 16:14 ורוח יהוה סרה || חסח חסח || חסח חסח (מקם שאול ובעתתו רוח רעה מאת יהוה) might reflect uncertainty about the verb's meaning. S's lack of an equivalent for it in v. 15 owes to parablepsis from נא to נא in v. 16, which likely occasioned omission of אדננו, whether by a scribe or the translator.

(cf. πνεῦμα κυρίου πονηρὸν πνίγει σε || רוח אלהים רעה מבעתך in 16:15), equivalents that connote “troubling” (θαμβέω, ταρασσω, καταπλήσσω, στροβείτω) are more frequent. Here it seems likely chosen coordinate to ἡ ἀνομία || פלצות, a noun that appears only here in Isaiah and is translated with θάμβος (Ezek 7:18) and ὀδύνη in Job 21:6,⁹ while its verbal cognate (יתפלצון) is rendered with σαλεύονται in Job 9:6, where it is coordinate with ὁ σείων || המרגיז. The choice of ἀνομία was perhaps influenced by ὁ ἀνομῶν ἀνομεῖ || והשוודד שוודד in 21:2.

Warszawski’s (38) suggestion that 𐤀𐤍𐤓𐤌𐤀 should be read for 𐤀𐤍𐤓𐤌𐤀 is strengthened by 𐤀𐤍𐤓 || נשף in 59:10 (cf. 2 Kgs 7:5, 7; Job 3:9; 7:4).

While the words most frequently rendered by 𐤀𐤍𐤓 in Isaiah are חפץ (8x) and רצון (5x), the rendering of the verbal form חשקת by 𐤀𐤍𐤓 in 38:17 is a common equivalence elsewhere (e.g., Gen 34:8; Deut 10:15; 21:11).

Old Greek-Isaiah elsewhere recognizes the temporal meaning of נשף, translating בנשף with τὸ ὀψέ in 5:11 and כנשף with ὥς ἐν μεσονυκτίῳ in 59:10.

Although the transposition of consonants reflected in ἡ ψυχὴ μου || נשף might have stood in the *Vorlage* (with or without the first-person common singular suffix, which might have been inferred from the parallel לבבי), the equivalence for ἐφέστηκεν is uncertain, since it corresponds formally to חשקי שם לי. Whereas ἐφίστημι is transitive in 1:26 (καὶ ἐπιστήσω τοὺς κριτάς σου || ואשיבה שפטיך) and 3:4 (καὶ ἐπιστήσω νεανίσκους ἄρχοντας αὐτῶν || ונתתי נערים שריהם), its intransitive use here is particularly striking owing to the silence about לי. However, this parallels καὶ ὁ θυμός μου ἐπέστη || וחמתי היא סמכתי in 63:5, where a pronoun is suppressed and the verb is intransitive: “And my wrath stood ready” (following καὶ ἐρρύσατο αὐτοὺς ὁ βραχίων μου). In this verse, standing in the wake of ἡ καρδία μου πλανᾶται καὶ ἡ ἀνομία με βαπτίζει, the clause ἡ ψυχὴ μου ἐφέστηκεν εἰς φόβον seems to connote something like “my soul is paralyzed [stood still] with fear.” Owing to the translator’s apparent reading of this verse (in light of 21:3) as a statement of psychological distress, Ziegler’s diagnosis (9) that “die Konsonanten sind einfach umgestellt” as an instance among “manchen selteneren und schwierigen Wörtern” that “errät der Übers. ihre Bedeutung aus dem Zusammenhang” seems likely, since the phrase נשף חשקי might easily have proved perplexing.

9. For σκότος || פלצות in Ps 54(55):6, see n. 7, above.

ception that *πρός με* makes the address wholly about what the prophet is tasked to do.

This is the only appearance in Isaiah of *σκοπός* (but cf. *εἰς τὴν σκοπῖαν κυρίου* || *עַל מִצְפֵּה אֲדָנִי*, 21:8), which renders forms of *צפה* elsewhere seventeen times. Language about appointing a *σκοπός* occurs also in Jer 6:17 (*κατέστακα ἐφ' ὑμᾶς σκοπούς* || *והקמתי עליכם צפים*) and Ezek 3:17 (*σκοπόν δέδωκά σε τῷ οἴκῳ Ἰσραὴλ* || *צפה נתתיך לבית ישראל*; cf. Ezek 33:2, 7), each time of a human watchman. Although we might construe *στῆσον σκοπόν* as a command to appoint someone else a watchman, that stands awkwardly with the following *καὶ ὁ ἐὰν ἴδῃς ἀνάγγειλον* (a rendering that manipulates the grammatical person of *יגיד יראה*), which suggests that the addressee himself serves as watchman. Yet we cannot regard *στῆσον* as intransitive, since that would require the nominative, *σκοπός*, as subject complement (“stand as a watchman”). Because the accusative case requires *σκοπόν* to be external to the addressee, while the connected *καὶ ὁ ἐὰν ἴδῃς ἀνάγγειλον* suggests an allied action, the translator likely used *σκοπόν* similar to *σκοπιάν* in 21:8: “take up position at a watchpost.”

21:7

One distinction between OG and S already apparent in this passage is that S renders finite verb forms in these verses in the same person, voice, and mood as in its source text (save for *שָׁבַר* || *سَبَر* in 21:9), whereas OG readily shifts such grammatical features. The parsing of *καὶ εἶδον* (|| *וראה*) pushes this distinction fully into the light. Morphologically, *εἶδον* could be analyzed as a second aorist active indicative, first-person singular, effectively fulfilling the command, *καὶ ὁ ἐὰν ἴδῃς ἀνάγγειλον*. However, this leaves dangling the following command, *ἀκρόασαι ἀκρόασιν πολλήν*, which is followed by another in 21:8, *καὶ κάλεσον*. The second-person singular imperatives are abrupt if *καὶ εἶδον* begins a vision report.

Although it is possible that *ἀκρόασαι ἀκρόασιν πολλήν* tacitly resumes the divine address, this would imply that the translator left the shift in speakers unmarked, whereas in 21:8 he supplies *καὶ εἶπεν* to flag a shift in speakers. Why would he leave the shift unmarked with *ἀκρόασαι*?

If we analyze *καὶ εἶδον* as a second aorist active imperative singular (transparent to *וראה*), adopting the first aorist form (like *εἶπον* in 22:15; 38:5; 40:9, over against the more common *εἶπε*), it comports with the preceding *ἀνάγγειλον*, the following *ἀκρόασαι* (|| *והקשיב*), and *καὶ κάλεσον* (|| *ויקרא*) in 21:8. On the other hand, this would initiate a peculiar sequence,

since the commands lead to the summoning Ουρίαν, who then makes his own statement, without a report by the speaker in 21:6 of what he saw.

Although it is possible that the translator lacked a clear sense of the relationships between speakers, it seems clear from $\delta \text{ ἐὰν ἴδῃς ἀνάγγελον} || \text{אשר יראה יגיד}$ in 21:6 (if not already from $\beta\alpha\delta\acute{\iota}\sigma\alpha\varsigma \text{ σεαυτῷ} || \text{לך}$) that he picked his way through these verses with some conception of the speakers and addressees. It seems likely that he chose $\kappa\alpha\iota \text{ εἶδον}$ to report what the speaker saw (as commanded), leaving implicit the reversion to the Kyrios as speaker with $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\rho\acute{o}\alpha\sigma\alpha\iota \acute{\alpha}\kappa\rho\acute{o}\alpha\sigma\iota\upsilon\upsilon \text{ πολλῶν καὶ κάλεσον}$.

Old Greek's condensation of קשב רב קשב into $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\rho\acute{o}\alpha\sigma\iota\upsilon\upsilon \text{ πολλῶν}$ is consistent with this translator's reduction of repeated words (see Van der Vorm-Croughs, 196–97). Syriac's ܡܥܬܪܐܐܝܬܐ might entail a similar reduction, although S typically retains repeated words. It is possible that its *Vorlage* lacked the final קשב , but it should be noted that 1QIsa^a, the only extant Hebrew witness besides MT, reads קשב רב קשב .

21:8

Syriac's most perplexing equivalent is ܠܗܝܬܐ . Warszawski (39) accounted for ܠܗܝܬܐ under the hypothesis that “statt ܠܗܝܬܐ hat sie $\text{ܐܘܢܝ} = \text{אזני}$ gelesen, ܠܗܝܬܐ als ‘der auf der Warte stehende’ aufgefasst und wie LXX die folgende Rede als die Rede Gottes genommen.” Although ܐܘܢܝ might be explained by 1QIsa^a's הראה (for אריה), that would leave both ܠܗܝܬܐ and the absence of an equivalent for על מצפה unexplained. Moreover, ܐܘܢܝ translated מצפה in 21:6 and צפה in 21:5, equivalents common in the Bible (e.g., Gen 31:49; Num 23:14; Josh 11:3). S's ܐܘܢܝ accords with its insertion of a form of ܐܡܪ before direct speech elsewhere (e.g., ܐܡܪ in 3:6; ܐܡܪ in 14:16; ܐܡܪ in 22:14), signaling its direction in handling the difficult אריה . Although its *Vorlage* might have read אזני as a corruption of אריה , the rendering of מצפה as subject, with insertion of ܐܡܪ to introduce speech, suggests that the translator drew on the pattern of $\text{וּנְגִלָה בְּאָזְנֵי יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת}$ in 21:14 to make a sense of the clause, given opaque אריה .

OG's choice to render וּקְרָא by a grammatically singular imperative ($\kappa\alpha\iota \text{ ἀλέσσο}$) is unremarkable, given its unique conjugations of verbs in 21:6–7.

The detection of a personal name in אריה accords with τὸν Ουρίαν || אוריה in 8:2. Because the translator elsewhere renders אריה with λέων (11:7; 31:4; 35:9; 65:25), Ottley's (2:206) surmise that “the translator prob-

ably thought of viii.2” is likely and accords with Ziegler’s (143) observation, “Diese Stelle ist wiederum ein deutlicher Beweis, daß der Js-Übers. sein Buch auch inhaltlich gut beherrschte.” Nevertheless, the insinuation of *Ουρίαν* here, while resolving the question of *אריה*, introduces another agent into an already complex discourse.

The inserted καὶ εἶπεν (cf. 8:17; 10:9; 14:16; 22:15; 45:14) specifies a shift in speaker to Ουρίαν, who has been summoned εἰς τὴν σκοπίαν κυρίου. παρεμβολή || מַשְׁמֶרֶת is unexampled elsewhere, while the lack of an equivalent for the suffixed pronoun (מִשְׁמֶרֶת) likely owes to the discourse force of the article (τῆς παρεμβολῆς). The usual equivalent for מַשְׁמֶרֶת is φυλακή (found in Isa 42:7, for כֶּלֶא), just as φυλάσσω is the most frequent equivalent for שָׁמַר (cf. 21:11, 12; 7:4; 26:2; 42:20; 56:1, 2, 4, 6). παρεμβολή, on the other hand, translates מַחֲנֶה in 37:36 (its equivalent in the Greek Bible 200+ times), while in 8:8 ἡ παρεμβολή αὐτοῦ concretizes מִטּוֹת כְּנָפָיו. The translator might have chosen παρεμβολή here with a view to the ἀναβάτης συνωρίδος of 21:9, understood as a military image.

Old Greek's ὅλην τὴν νύκτα || כל הלילות uses the grammatical singular typical of this phrase in Greek idiom.

21:9

This verse is the report by Ουρίαν of what he has seen, with αὐτός (|| זה) highlighting the shift of subject to the ἀναβάτης συνωρίδος, whose approach had already been noted in 21:7. Although, as Ottley (2:207) observes, “οὗτος would represent Heb. more exactly” and is this translator’s typical equivalent for זה, he occasionally provides a distinctive equivalent, such as καὶ τὸ βρώμα τὸ ἐμόν || והמכשלה הזאת (3:6), καὶ ἐκέκραγον ἕτερος πρὸς τὸν ἕτερον || וקרא זה אל זה (6:3; cf. 44:5), ἀπάγγειλον αὐτοῖς || קראתי לזאת (30:7), καὶ ἐπὶ τίνα ἐπιβλέψω || ואל זה אביי (66:2). Although it is possible that the translator chose αὐτός with an eye to איש, which otherwise lacks an equivalent, his pattern of rendering is hardly so scrupulous as to think he felt compelled to represent איש. Compare S’s هذا مع هذا، وهذا || וזה בא רכב איש צמד || והנה זה בא רכב איש צמד, which leaves זה without an isolable equivalent and renders רכב איש with a partitive phrase.

Since the messenger's words are cast in the past tense (καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπε), ἔρχεται (|| 83) should be understood as a historical present, lending vividness to the report marked by ἰδοῦ.

The use of varied equivalents for lexemes in a recurrent phrase was seen already in 18:2 and 7 and here is manifest in *συνωρίδος* (a *hapax lego-*

menon in the Greek Bible). The phrase for which it is the equivalent here, *צמד פרשים*, was translated with *ἰππεῖς δύο* in 21:7.

As typical for OG, it reduces the repetition in *נפלה נפלה* to a single *πέπτωκεν*.

Instructive for considering OG's *καὶ πάντα τὰ ἀγάλματα αὐτῆς καὶ τὰ χειροποίητα αὐτῆς* || *וְכָל פְּסִילֵי אֱלֹהֶיהָ* is its *καὶ ἐπερωτήσουσι τοὺς θεοὺς αὐτῶν καὶ τὰ ἀγάλματα αὐτῶν* || *וְדָרְשׁוּ אֶל הָאֱלִילִים וְאֶל הָאֲטִים* in 19:3 (the only other occurrence of *ἄγαλμα* in OG-Isaiah), where it supplies the third-person plural possessive pronouns, similar to *τὰ ἀγάλματα αὐτῆς* here, creating parallel conjoined phrases. Its rendering of *הָאֱלִילִים* with *τοὺς θεοὺς* suggests that *τὰ χειροποίητα αὐτῆς* || *אֱלֹהֶיהָ* is not chosen to deny the people's view of them as divine but to emphasize their fabrication. Although *χειροποίητος* elsewhere in Isaiah renders *אֱלִילִים* (2:18; 10:11; 19:1; 31:7), it is unnecessary to suppose that *אֱלִילִיהָ* stood in OG's source text, as shown by *ἐποίησαν χειροποίητα* || *וַיַּעֲשׂוּהָ אֵל* in 46:6.

Syriac contains two deviations from its likely source text. First is its reformulation of *צמד פרשים* with *ܐܝܫ ܕܪܒܐ ܕܥܡܠܐ* with *ܐܝܫ ܕܥܡܠܐ*, which entails the creation of a partitive phrase but also lacks an equivalent for *צמד*, in contrast to its rendering of *צמד פרשים* in 21:7 with *ܐܝܫ ܕܥܡܠܐ*. Although S typically represents all Hebrew lexemes, in this case the choice to construe *אִישׁ* in a partitive phrase might have made something like *ܐܝܫ ܕܥܡܠܐ* seem awkward.

Alongside this, Syriac's reformulation of *וְכָל פְּסִילֵי אֱלֹהֶיהָ* into *ܐܡܠܚܝܡܐܝܢܐ* || *ܐܡܠܚܝܡܐܝܢܐ* seems another concession to acceptability. A useful comparison is its rendering of another clause that happens to contain *פְּסִיל* (without suggesting that the noun itself triggered the modifications): *ܐܡܠܚܝܡܐܝܢܐ ܐܬܐ ܥܦܝܐ ܕܦܫܝܠܐ ܕܥܡܠܐ ܕܥܡܠܐ ܕܥܡܠܐ* || *ܐܬܐ ܥܦܝܐ ܕܦܫܝܠܐ ܕܥܡܠܐ ܕܥܡܠܐ ܕܥܡܠܐ* (30:22). Although the omission of an explicit equivalent for *ܐܬܐ* is unremarkable, the reformulation of the clause again evinces the translator's willingness to rephrase for acceptability. (Notably, S omits a significant lexeme in 21:11's *ܐܡܠܚܝܡܐܝܢܐ ܕܥܡܠܐ ܕܥܡܠܐ* || *ܐܡܠܚܝܡܐܝܢܐ ܕܥܡܠܐ ܕܥܡܠܐ*.)

Both OG and S render *שבר* in the passive voice and the third-person plural form: *συνετρίβησαν/ܥܡܠܐܝܢܐ*. Although the grammatically plural form accords also with 1QIsa^a (*שברו*), V (*contrita sunt*), and T (*ידקקון*), there are no graphic ambiguities that could account for a loss of final *waw* in MT, while creating agreement with the grammatical number of the subject might have proved attractive.

21:10

Warszawski (39) astutely regards *חֵסֶד* as part of the final clause of 21:9. Given that nouns with *חֵסֶד* prefixed are regularly placed in the emphatic state (cf. *חֵסֶד* ... *חֵסֶד* ... *חֵסֶד* 21:1), the use of the absolute state for both these nouns is notable and reminiscent of adverbial expressions such as *חֵסֶד* (always *חֵסֶד* in Isaiah) and *חֵסֶד*. Even *חֵסֶד* distinguishes itself from *חֵסֶד* in 28:8 and *חֵסֶד* in 50:2. The semantic-syntactic function of *חֵסֶד* here amounts to “deprived of any threshing floor and without any barn” and seems to be the translator’s attempt to make sense of *מִדְשָׁתִּי וּבֵן גִּרְנִי*.

Although OG frequently eliminates repetition in adjacent phrases, the two occurrences of *ἀκούσατε* here were likely inserted to create balance, as the translator will do more elaborately in 21:15 (compare 17:3 and see Van der Vorm-Croughs, 226). As Ziegler (65) perceived, *ἀκούσατε*, which is common in the book (e.g., 1:10; 7:13), is calibrated to the relative clause, *ἡ ἤκουσα*. The significant questions, however, are whom the translator considered the addressees and whom the speaker.

Seeligmann (109), observing that the wording “is practically independent of the Hebrew text,” opined that the translator “must have had in mind his exiled compatriots,” citing use of *καταλείπω* also in 6:12, 11:16, and 14:2 as evidence that the translator regarded hope of a “remnant” relevant for his diaspora community (Seeligmann, 116–17). The commentary on each of those passages pointed out the problems with attempting to diagnose them as marking an overarching theme the translator saw connected to his community. Most instances of *καταλείπω* render such Hebrew words as *יָתַר*, *עָזַב*, and *שָׁאַר*, and where *καταλείπω* lacks a Hebrew counterpart it is difficult to ascribe its use to preoccupation with a remnant of Israel. Thus for example, *οἱ καταλελειμμένοι* in 13:12 and 14 (where it lacks a Hebrew counterpart) are those who have survived the Day of the Lord. They are described as rarer than gold and fleeing like animals who lack anyone to gather them. That hardly betokens the translator’s preoccupation with a specially saved remnant. In this verse the choice of *οἱ καταλελειμμένοι καὶ οἱ ὀδυνώμενοι* as the addressees is consonant with the previous scene of calamity for Babylon in 21:9.

גִּרְ occurs only here in Isaiah but is common elsewhere, including the Torah, where it is most often rendered with *ἄλων* (Gen 50:10, 11; Exod 22:5; Deut 16:13) or *ἄλω* (Num 15:20; 18:27, 30), making it likely that the translator knew the word. Equally telling is that the Isaiah translator

uses the verbal cognate ἀλογήσεις as the equivalent for תדוּשׁ in 41:15, while translating דוּשׁ with πατέω in 25:10⁽²⁾ and with καταπατέω in 25:10⁽¹⁾; 28:28, leaving little doubt about his ability to recognize ובן גרני, if that stood in his source text. On the other hand, although שאר, sometimes rendered with καταλείπω, is graphically close to מדשתי and ובן גרני might have been connected with יגון (cf. ὁδύνη || יגון in 35:10; 53:4), the chance maligning of the graphics so as to produce a text that read like נשאר ובן יגון is implausible when compared with the translator's need to derive sense from a text like MT's in this location. His insertion of ἀκούσατε already evinces his attempt to integrate these phrases into the verse, including his perception that שבר לארץ closed the previous clause.

Lacking a signal of a change of speaker, the first-person pronoun of ἡκουσα likely assumes the same speaker who announced the fall of Babylon in 21:9. The concluding ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ ἀνήγγειλεν ἡμῖν, entailing a shift from לָכֵן that is likely due to the translator, identifies the speaker with those addressed.

The introduction of a new oracle in 21:11 signals that 21:10 concludes the oracle that 21:1 introduced as τὸ ὄραμα τῆς ἐρήμου. As noted previously, the Greek translator's grasp of coherence in these verses is uncertain. More evident is his attempt to produce sensible renderings of individual clauses, without giving great attention to how they integrated.

21:11

Ἰδουμαία is more often the equivalent for אדום (11:14; 34:5, 6), although its use for דומה here is comparable to Ἰδουμα || דומה in Gen 25:14 and 1 Chr 1:30.

Given that S typically translates repeated phrases or clauses (e.g., 28:10, 13), either שמר מה מלילה or its twin (with מליל) might have been absent from the source text. Its שמר, and seems more likely a reformulation (to obviate the problem of מה) than witness to a text that read שמר אשר בלילה.

Although φυλάσσετε correlates with שמר, the translator's frequent manipulation of grammatical features (as displayed in 21:1–10) renders doubtful his source text having read שמרו. Equally, his standard omission of repetitions obscures what his source text read beyond שמר⁽¹⁾, an uncertainty that involves ἐπαλξεις, which occurs again in 54:12. There the translator uses it for an obscure architectural term: καὶ θήσω τὰς ἐπαλξεις σου ἱασπιν καὶ τὰς πύλας σου λίθους χρυσάλλου || ושמתי בדכדך שמשתיך || ושעריך, the translator reasoning from שעריך to conclude

that שמשתיך designated another defensive structure. The same inference is likely in the three other appearances of ἑπαλξίς in translations from Hebrew: ἔπρασαν αἱ ἐπάλξεις αὐτῆς καὶ κατεσκάφη τὸ τεῖχος αὐτῆς || נפלו אשיותיה נהרסו חומותיה (Jer 27[50]:15); εἰ τεῖχος ἐστὶν οἰκοδομήσωμεν ἐπὶ αὐτὴν ἐπάλξεις ἀργυρεῖς || אם חומה היא נבנה עליה טירת כסף (Song 8:9); ἐπίγνωθι ὅτι ἐν μέσῳ παγίδων διαβαίνεις καὶ ἐπὶ ἐπάλξεων πόλεως περιπατεῖς || דע כי בין פחים תצעד ועל רשת תתהלך (Sir 9:13 [SirA 3v.13–14]). In Isa 21:10 ἑπαλξίς seems to have been supplied as a complement to φυλάσσετε amidst imagery of the watchman awaiting messengers that includes the phrase καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς παρεμβολῆς ἔστην (21:8) in a claim to having stood watch day and night, as appears again at the outset of 21:12. The meaning he attaches to that verb is likely similar to φυλάσσω in 21:12, where it is intransitive, with τὸ πρῶν καὶ τὴν νύκτα serving as adverbial modifiers rather than direct objects. A similar meaning is likely here: “Keep a lookout at the parapets.”

21:12

The translator appears to have allowed φυλάσσω τὸ πρῶν καὶ τὴν νύκτα to suffice for both מליל מה שמר מלילה in 21:11 and שמר אתה בקר וגם לילה here, while leaving אמר and אתה without equivalents. As dramatic as this condensation is, it would hardly be atypical for this translator, whose rendering of the remainder of the verse points to a similar characterization of his work.

Both ζητῆς and ζήτει differ from the address of a group in MT (תבעיון בעי), and the same is true of οἶμαι (|| שבו). Comparison of (καὶ) παρ’ ἐμοὶ and אתיו suggests analysis of the latter as a preposition, with its pronominal suffix conformed to πρὸς ἐμέ || אלי in 21:11. Although these surmises are reasonable inferences from a comparison of the text produced with our closest approximation to a source text, the most we can affirm about his *Vorlage* is that it contained a form of שמר, a phrase resembling בקר וגם) followed by two forms of בעה, and a form he associated with ישב. Even if we can align these with forms in MT, our inferences of his *Vorlage* and thus how he produced his translation remain inevitably hypothetical.

21:13

Whereas S’s ܡܫܐ ܒܥܪܒ attests משה בערב (albeit reformulated), OG gives no equivalent for it. Ziegler’s (48) suggestion that “viell. von der LXX über-

sehen infolge 2^o בערב is reasonable if it is understood as intentional condensation, given that ἐν τῷ ὄραμα || ביער makes parablepsis unlikely. OG's low tolerance for repetition accounts for its single equivalent for בערב. Its omission of משה might owe to condensation in respect to perception of τὸ ὄραμα τῆς Ἰδουμαίας (21:11) as the title for these verses. Even if these explanations could account for OG's silence on משה בערב, it remains possible that these words were lacking in OG's source text.

Whereas S's لَحْمًا matches the morphology of תלינו, OG's κοιμηθήσῃ differs in using the singular grammatical number.

Both OG and S render ארחות in the grammatical singular and with a prefixed locative preposition: ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ/حجلاً (cf. ἐν χώρᾳ || ארץ, 21:14). Their use of a preposition is likely a result of polygenesis, owing to the need to integrate ארחות into the clause. Although it is possible that each read ארח in its source text, it is equally likely that the shift in number was occasioned by the assumption that this designated the "route to" this people or nation.

21:14

Old Greek's ἄρτοις || בלחמו employs ἄρτος as a count noun ("loaves of bread"), as it does again in 44:15: καὶ καύσαντες ἔπεψαν ἄρτους || אף ישיק ואפה לחם. However, 1QIsa^a reads בלחם, leaving uncertain whether OG's *Vorlage* had a pronominal suffix on the noun. Although the personal pronoun of S's حَمَمٍ compares favorably with T's זמינו, the latter is a paraphrase that has no equivalent for the *beth* prefixed to לחם that is reflected in all other witnesses. S likely adjusted the pronoun to accord with the second masculine plural imperative inflexion of اِهْرَبُوا.

OG's switch in grammatical number from διψῶντι || צמא earlier to the plural number τοῖς φεύγουσι || נדד is likely coordinate with διὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν φευγόντων || כי מפני חרבות נדדו in 21:15, where the notion of a multitude of those in flight logically implies the grammatical plural.

21:15

As Ottley (2:208-09) observed, "the repeated διὰ τὸ πλῆθος is apparently an attempt to explain and enforce the Heb. מפני ... followed twice by חרב, 'sword', which may have been misread as רב, 'multitude.'" Besides needing to include כי in the Hebrew phrase underlying διὰ (since this translator frequently conflates synonyms), it is likely that the "misreading" involved

reading the initial ה as ה, although it is not necessary to suppose that the translator read חרבות “as though it were הרב” (Van der Vorm-Croughs, 175), since the translator often shows himself content with reasoning from affinities in groups of consonants. The repetition of the phrase exemplifies the translator’s occasional creation of anaphora, despite his tendency to condense phrases (see Van der Vorm-Croughs, 225–30).

Ottley (2:209) regarded καὶ διὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν πλανωμένων as “possibly a duplicate” of the first clause, which used τῶν φευγόντων for נדדו (cf. πεφεύγασιν || נדדו, 22:3). Van der Vorm-Croughs (175) opines that this “might mirror two conjugations of נדד,” τῶν φευγόντων reflecting “the Polal meaning of this root” and τῶν πλανωμένων giving “its Qal meaning, ‘to wander around.’” Although the nominal form πλανῆται renders נדדים in Hos 9:17, never is πλανάω elsewhere an equivalent for נדד, and there is no clear example of this translator distinguishing the semantics of נדד based on conjugation.¹²

A useful parallel might be ὡς δορκάδιον φεῦγον καὶ ὡς πρόβατον πλανώμενον || כבצ'י מדה וכצאן in 13:14, whose φεῦγον καὶ ... πλανώμενον likely entails a double rendering of מדה. נדה is rendered by φεύγω in 16:3 (cf. οἱ φυγάδες in 16:4), and, even though πλανάω never translates נדה in Isaiah, it does so in Deut 4:19; 22:1; 30:17; Ezek 34:4, 16. Perhaps נדה stimulated association of the concepts here. We must also consider that נטושה lacks an isolable equivalent, while καὶ πλανῶνται is the equivalent for הוּתָהוּ in 44:20, perhaps based on associating הטהו with נטה. In either case, τῶν πλανωμένων is the product of the translator’s mind.

Goshen-Gottstein (עח) speculates that perhaps S’s גחל || נטושה is rooted in the translator’s perception of “twin roots (נטוש*/לטוש).” Notably, the translator followed his tack of modifying גחל via an adjective with prefixed relative pronoun in the phrase גחל || קשת דרוכה || גחל.

Ottley (209) regards τῶν πεπτωκότων as “a misreading or misunderstanding of כבד, ‘weight’” but offers no suggestion of what would occasion it, while none of the equivalents for כבד in the book hint what might have triggered use of πεπτωκότων. Lacking such clues, one might hypothesize that, in a context that speaks of many swords and bows, the idea of those fallen in battle seemed apt, similar to his rendering of the haughty ruler cast aside ὡς νεκρὸς ἐβδελυγμένος μετὰ πολλῶν τεθνηκότων ἐκκεκεντημένων μαχαίραις || כנצר נתעב לבוש הרגים מטעני חרב in 14:19.

12. HALOT offers no evidence that the semantics of the *qal* and *polal* differ.

21:16

The translator likely chose the grammatical singular form of ὡς ἐνιαυτὸς μισθωτοῦ (|| כשני שכיר ||) coordinate to the preceding ἐνιαυτός || שנה.

S's מִסְחָר is a unique equivalent for בעוד, which is elsewhere rendered by חַי (Isa 7:8; Gen 40:13, 19), חַי (Isa 28:4; Gen 25:26; Deut 31:27), and other temporal particles (מִחָא, Josh 1:11; Jer 28:3; חַי, 2 Sam 12:22; Job 29:5; מִסְחָר, Amos 4:7), but never otherwise with מִסְחָר, a noun found nowhere else in S. There is less reason to suspect a word other than בעוד underlying מִסְחָר than to attribute its selection to a nuance intuited in the source text.

OG's lack of an equivalent for כל in כל כבוד קדר agrees with 1QIsa^a, supporting the hypothesis that כל was added, whether under the graphic influence of וכלה or by inference from the semantics of eliminating an asset, which implies a totality. Nevertheless, haplography following וכלה remains possible (כל is attested in S, V, and T).

As Ziegler (66) posited, either τῶν υἱῶν Κηδαρ || קדר reflects a *Vorlage* harmonized with בני קדר in 21:17 or the translator was responsible for doing so.

21:17

The lack of an equivalent for מספר in καὶ τὸ κατάλοιπον τῶν τοξευμάτων || ושאר מספר קשת || is explicable by comparison with other passages where the translator omitted the *nomen regens*, such as ἐπὶ τὸν νοῦν τὸν μέγαν || על פרי גדל לבב (10:12) and εἰς ἄδου || אל אבני בור (14:19) (for additional examples, see Van der Vorm-Croughs, 71).

ISAIAH 22

22:1

τῆς φάραγγος Σιων || בגיא חזיון || comports with ἐν φάραγγι Σιων || בגיא חזיון in 22:5, as well as καὶ ῥάξει ὁ θεὸς τοὺς ἐπανοστανομένους ἐπ' ὄρος Σιων ἐπ' αὐτούς || וישגב יהוה את צרי רצין עליו || in 9:11 (10), where a *Vorlage* reading הר ציון is likely. Ottley (2:209) offers that OG “may have interpreted or guessed, or may have misread it as ציון; but this last seems unlikely, as the phrase recurs in v. 5.” If misreading seems unlikely, it is equally unclear why חזיון reflects a guess, since he recognizes forms of חזה elsewhere, including ὁψεσθε || תחזינה in 33:17. Goshen-Gottstein (עט) points particularly to ὁδὸς Σιων || חזה ציון in 33:20, where the translator distinguishes the juxtaposed lexemes. Although a hypothesis that the translator interpreted חזיון is possible, the motivation is unclear. Although 22:8–11 describe calamities that are explicitly associated with Judah and Jerusalem, it is uncertain why positing that the translator interpreted חזיון as Zion is preferable to supposing that graphic similarity lent itself to a scribe modifying חזיון to הציון both here and in 22:5. Either hypothesis is possible.

נֹכַח || אפוא appeared already in 19:12, the only other instance of אפוא in the book. S translates אפוא with ⲛⲟⲕⲁⲥ, likely by association with פה, which it renders with ⲛⲟⲕⲁⲥ in 22:16 (3x) and 52:5 (cf. Exod 33:16). Perhaps its *Vorlage* actually read פה, which Goshen-Gottstein (עט) reports is found in one of de Rossi's manuscripts.

Whereas the differences in grammatical number between ἀνέβητε || עלית and ⲙⲁⲧⲁⲗⲁⲧⲁ || לגגות are unremarkable, εἰς δώματα μάταια, on the other hand, was produced by connecting לגגות with תשאות from 22:2, as Ziegler (115) observed. Compare the translator's use of his use of μάταιος for שוא in 1:13 and 30:28 and for תושיה in 28:29. Ziegler's suggestion that μάταια has in view the futility of rooftop worship of foreign gods is too speculative to adopt. The most that can be said is that the translator views flight to the roofs a vain address to the addressees' predicament.

Old Greek's shift from the second-person singular pronoun σοι || לך to second-person plural ἀνέβητε πάντες || עליה כלך is perplexing when viewed solely within this verse. Although a full discussion must await a retrospective look at pronouns in 22:14, it is worth noting that second-person singular pronouns are used in 22:2 (2x), 3 (2x), and 7 (2x), before being replaced by second-person plural pronouns in 22:11 (3x) and 14 (2x). Perhaps the translator anticipated this shift here. Such a strategic distribution of pronouns seems detectable elsewhere, such as 3:18–24, discussed in the excursus following 3:26.

22:2

Syriac's ܡܠܐ || ܡܠܟܐ finds analogues in ܡܠܐ || ܡܠܟܐ in 10:3 and ܡܠܐ || ܡܠܟܐ in 47:11. Syriac repeats ܡܠܐ as predicate for ܡܠܐ || ܡܠܟܐ, for which compare ܡܠܐ || ܡܠܟܐ in 17:12.

Although nowhere else does βρά render המה, the use of ἡμέω for המה in 16:11 and 51:15 (in 17:12 it translates ישאון) helps verify that הומיה underlies βράντω, especially considering that ἡμέω is otherwise used of an inanimate force such as the kithara (16:11) or the sea (17:12; cf. 51:15).

While I agree with Van der Vorm-Croughs (192) that the translator omitted עליה because he perceived it as redundant in light of the foregoing clause, I would not include הומיה in the omission, disputing her diagnosis that תשאון underlies βράντω. S, on the other hand, renders הומיה with ܡܠܐ (cf. ܡܠܐ || ܡܠܟܐ, 16:12; ܡܠܐ || ܡܠܟܐ, 17:12) and insinuates ܡܠܐ from the preceding clause. For ܡܠܐ || ܡܠܟܐ, see 13:3, 23:7, and 32:13, where the same equivalence appears.

To create a full clause parallel to οἱ τραυματῖαι σου οὐ τραυματῖαι μαχαίρας, OG's translator supplies οἱ νεκροὶ σου as subject for νεκροὶ πολέμου, just as he insinuates verbs, nouns, or prepositions to create a parallel phrase elsewhere (see Van der Vorm-Croughs, 178–83).

22:3

σκληρῶς renders מקשה, analyzed as from קשה, whether based on a perception of biliteral affinity (cf. σκληρόν || קשה, 8:12) or construal of קשה as feminine singular (e.g., σκληρὰ ἡμέρα || קשה רוח, 1 Kgdms 1:15). The translator omits a specific equivalent for prefixed *mem*, just as he does with πόρρω || מרחוק later in the verse.

Fischer (37) suggested that OG's *Vorlage* read **וּיְחַד**, which the translator associated with the Aramaic passive participle **אֲחִיד** and connected to it the **מ** prefix of the following **מִקְשֵׁת**. Alternatively, the translator may have read **יְחַד** and associated it with Aramaic **אֲחַד** (cf. Byun, 188), particularly under recollection of his **ὁς γὰρ ἐν ἀλῶ || כל הנמצא** in 13:15 (cf. Deut 24:7; Jer 2:26).

Nowhere else in the Greek Bible does a word meaning “strong” translate **מִצָּא**,¹ while the translation of the suffix of **נִמְצָאִיד** with **ἐν σοί** is unparalleled in Isaiah.² Ottley's (2:211) attempt to find a faulty reading, either because **נִמְצָאִיד** “was misread by transposition, omitting **נ**, **אֲמָצִיד**; or, by sound, **מַעֲזִיד**,” seems less profitable than taking stock of the parallel between **οἱ ἄρχοντες σου πεφεύγασιν** in the first clause and **οἱ ἰσχύοντες ἐν σοὶ πόρρω πεφεύγασιν** in the third.³ Given that this translator often uses **ἰσχύω** and **ἰσχύς** for Hebrew words whose semantics are dissimilar,⁴ **οἱ ἰσχύοντες** may have been chosen as a suitable companion to **οἱ ἄρχοντες σου**.

The lack of an equivalent for **כֹּל**⁽²⁾ in both S and OG likely signals its absence in their source texts (see appendix A).

Unremarkable for OG are the absence of an equivalent for **אֲסֵרו**⁽²⁾ (condensation) and the implication of **יְחַדוּ** (as in 27:4; 40:5; 41:19; 43:26; 45:16) (see Van der Vorm-Croughs, 74).

Although **ἐν σοί** finds a parallel in S's **حده**, suggesting a *Vorlage* reading **בְּךָ נִמְצָאִיד** for both S and OG, S's lexical choice is curious, given

1. The closest is **οὐκ ἡδυνήθησαν ἀποκριθῆναι ἀντίθετα** Iωβ || **לֹא מִצָּאוּ מַעֲנָה** in Job 32:13. This is a reasonable translation but does not draw on the semantics of “strength.” Although **ἰσχύω** translates **אָמַץ** in Deut 31:6, 7, and 23, there is no evidence that this translator strategically rearranged consonants to derive meaning, even if he sometimes relies on a biliteral theory to do so.

2. Other cases where the translator renders an objective pronominal suffix with **ἐν** + pronoun are condensations of phrases (**καὶ πορευσόμεθα ἐν αὐτῇ** || **וְנִלְכָּה בְּאַרְחִתִּי** 2:3; **ἐν αὐτοῖς** || **בְּקִרְבּוֹ** 19:1, 3; 63:11), conformity to the norms of Greek semantics (**τοὺς ἐνοικοῦντας ἐν αὐτῇ** || **יֹשְׁבֶיהָ** 24:1; cf. 27:5; 40:22), or paraphrases/substitutions (**ἐν αὐτῇ** || **שָׁם** 13:20; **οἱ ἐν αὐτῇ ... καὶ ὁ λαὸς ὁ ἐν αὐτῇ** || **צִאצִּיאָה ... וּמִלֵּאָה** in 34:1 [cf. 42:5]; **ἐν ᾗ πορεύσῃ ἐν αὐτῇ** || **בְּדֶרֶךְ תֵּלֶךְ** 48:17). **ὥστε μὴ εὐρεῖν ἐν αὐτοῖς ὄστρακον** || **וְלֹא יִמְצָא בְּמִכְתָּתוֹ חֶרֶשׁ** in 30:14 likely reflects associating **מִכְתָּת** with **בְּתוֹךְ**. Otherwise, **ἐν** + pronoun translates **ל/ב/אֶל** + pronominal suffix.

3. Scholz's (38) suggestion that the translator read the second **אֲסֵרו** as **אֲדִיר** seems (graphically) improbable, as does Seeligman's (50) proposal that the translator thought of Aramaic **מָצִי** “be able.”

4. Compare **ἰσχύοντα καὶ ἰσχύουσιν** || **מִשְׁעָן וּמִשְׁעָנָה** in 3:1 and n. 3 there.

the more common use of **מִצָּד** for **מִצָּד** (13x). Nevertheless, S occasionally renders **מִצָּד** with equivalents chosen for the context (e.g., **וְיָסִיבֵם מִצָּד** || **וְיָסִיבֵם מִצָּד**, 51:3; **וְיָסִיבֵם מִצָּד** || **וְיָסִיבֵם מִצָּד**, 58:3), most notably in its **וְיָסִיבֵם מִצָּד** || **וְיָסִיבֵם מִצָּד** in 37:4. Here the translator renders **מִצָּד** with **מִצָּד** and links it with **אָסְרוּ** to speak of capture without a fight. He construes **נִמְצָאִים** as the subject, expressed with the help of a prefixed relative pronoun and understood as those who remain after the rulers have fled. Because its rendering of the second-person suffix with **חֲבִיב** comports with the semantics of **וְיָסִיבֵם מִצָּד**, it is unnecessary to infer that **נִמְצָאִים בְּךָ** stood in its *Vorlage*.

22:4

Old Greek's *ἄφετέ με* and S's **וְיָסִיבֵם מִצָּד** agree in their understanding of **שָׁעוּ מִנִּי**, without raising suspicions of collusion, particularly in light of T's **שָׁבוּקוּ מִנִּי**.⁵ The translators diverge in their accommodations to the next clause, **אָמַרְרָ בְּבָכִי**, whose first-person singular finite verb is the key to S's **וְיָסִיבֵם מִצָּד**, while OG's *πικρῶς κλαύσομαι* takes the pronominal suffix of **בְּבָכִי** as its starting point. Both correctly perceive the semantics of compulsion in **אֵל תֹּאמְרוּ** (*μὴ κατισχύσητε/לֹא תִּחְצֹק*).

γένος appears only twice elsewhere in Isaiah, both for **עַם** (42:6; 43:20). As much as one is tempted to suggest that this equivalent connotes special affection or loyalty, neither of the other appearances supports that conclusion.

22:5

S's connection of **וּמְבוּכָה** to **בָּכָה** is transparent in its **וְיָסִיבֵם מִצָּד**, as is the semantic basis for its **וּמְבוּסָה** || **וּמְבוּסָה**. Whereas **וְיָסִיבֵם מִצָּד** in 22:1 has analogues in Isa 10:3, 47:11, and 66:11 (cf. Pss 74:23; 89:10; Ezek 38:9) but only here renders **מְבוּסָה**, it is the equivalent for **מְבוּסָה** in Deut 28:20 and Ezek 7:7, 11, **הַמּוֹן** in 1 Sam 4:14, and **הַמּוֹן** in Zech 9:15.

Zielger's (66) observation regarding *ταραχῆς καὶ ἀπωλείας καὶ καταπατήματος καὶ πλάνησις* || **וּמְבוּכָה וּמְבוּסָה**, "Es liegt Doppelübers. vor; jedoch ist es nicht zu entscheiden, welches griech. Wort in

5. The same combination of Hebrew words appears in Job 7:19, where S renders **כִּי לֹא תִשְׁעָה מִמֶּנִּי** with **וְיָסִיבֵם מִצָּד** (OG *ὥς τίνος οὐκ ἔξ με*).

Betracht kommt,” is somewhat overstated. The correspondence between *καὶ καταπατήματος* and *ומבוסה* is clear. Although *ταραχή* appears elsewhere in Isaiah only in 24:19 (*ταραχῇ ταραχθήσεται* || רעה התרעעה || *כי לא בחפזון תצאו*), the translator uses *ταράσσω* twelve times, never more than once for any Hebrew word, to describe a disturbance (e.g., *καὶ τὴν τρίβον τῶν ποδῶν ὑμῶν ταράσσουσιν* || ודרך ארחתיך || בלעו, 3:12; *οὐδὲ μὴ ταραχθήτε* || ולא תעריצו || 8:12; *πόλεις τεταραγμέναι* || עיר כהמות || 14:31), including *ὡς θάλασσα κυμαίνουσα οὕτως ταραχθήσεσθε* || כהמות ימים ימהיון in 17:12. A relationship between *ταραχῆς* and *מהומה* is, therefore, not hard to perceive, but neither, it turns out, is a relationship between *καὶ ἀπωλείας* and *מהומה*, inasmuch as the translator uses *ἀπωλεία* as cavalierly as he does *ταράσσω*. Although *εἰς ἀπώλειαν* || השמד in 14:23 is semantically apt, *ἐγενήθη τὸ σπέρμα τῶν ἀπειθούντων εἰς ἀπώλειαν* in 33:2 is only partly transparent to *היה זרעם לבקרים* and likely fashioned as counterpart to the following *ἡ δὲ σωτηρία ἡμῶν ἐν καιρῷ θλίψεως* || אף ישועתנו בעת צרה, based (as Ziegler, 69–70, suggested) on the trope of the destruction of the wicked.⁶ Although *ἐπὶ τὸν λαὸν τῆς ἀπωλείας μετὰ κρίσεως* || ועל עם וכל חרמי למשפט in 34:5 and *καὶ οἱ μεγιστᾶνες αὐτῆς ἔσονται εἰς ἀπώλειαν* || וכל פס שריה יהיו אפס in 34:12 are intelligible, the latter is unparalleled. Notably, *καὶ ἀπολέσει αὐτοὺς ἀπωλεία μεγάλη* translates *גדלה מהומה והמם* in Deut 7:23, and *τάραχος μέγας σφόδρα* is the equivalent for *מאד גדולה מהומה* in 1 Kgdms 5:9, providing a *prima facie* case that *καὶ ἀπωλείας* is a second rendering of *מהומה* here. Although *καὶ πλάνησις* does not have as evident a connection to *ומבוכה* as S’s *مبوء*, Ottley (2:210) notes the similar word choice in Exod 14:3’s *οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ πλανῶνται οὗτοι ἐν τῇ γῇ* || לבני ישראל בנכים הם בארץ. As recently as 21:15, however, we have seen the translator impose the verb *πλανάω* without clear justification from the Hebrew, just as we observed the insinuation of the verb in 13:14’s *καὶ ὡς πρόβατον πλανώμενον* || וכצאן. Equally, given the following *πλανῶνται ἀπὸ μικροῦ ἔως μεγάλου πλανῶνται ἐπὶ τὰ ὅρη* || מקרקר קר ושוע אל ההר || *ההר*, there is reason to conclude that *καὶ πλάνησις* reflects more the translator’s conception of the verse than his reading of a particular Hebrew word.

As with *τῆς φάραγγος Σιων* || גיא חזיון in 22:1 (q.v.), a *Vorlage* reading *חזיון* in place of *חזיון* is likely, even if it remains possible that the translator simply “interpreted” *חזיון* as *הציון*, as Ottley (2:209) suggested.

6. Van der Vorm-Crougths’s hypothesis (162) that “*לבקרים* received two renderings,” with *τῶν ἀπειθούντων* perhaps echoing *בגדים* and *εἰς ἀπώλειαν* “obtained from *לבקרים* via the noun *שקר*,” is untenably speculative.

while his choice of ἵπποις for פרשים was likely because ἀναβάται is a *nomen agentis*.

Ottley (2:211) suggests that συναγωγή might result from reading “קרי for קיר Kir” and observes that “the Greek word sometimes represents מקוה, but this is not very near.” The only occurrences of קרי are in Leviticus (26:21, 23, 24, 27, 28, 40, 41) and are all translated with πλάγιος. συναγωγή appears elsewhere in Isaiah in the phrase πᾶσα συναγωγὴ ὕδατος || יארי מצור (19:6; 37:25) and in συνάξω ἐπ’ αὐτὸν συναγωγήν || אקבץ עליו לנקבציו (56:8).

Equally, although Ottley’s (2:211) proposal that “LXX. read ערך, ‘order,’ ‘arrangement,’ for ערה” is a sensible retroversion supported by καὶ παρετάξαντο || יוערכו in Gen 14:8 (cf. 1 Kgdms 17:8; 2 Kgdms 10:8, 9, 10, 17), the only other occurrence of the Greek noun in Isaiah renders מלחמה (μὴ ἐν βουλῇ ἣ ῥόγοις χειλέων παράταξις γίνεται || אך דבר שפתים || מלחמה לעצה וגבורה למלחמה, 36:5), effectively a metonym similar to παρατάξεως || מן here. This undermines Ottley’s (2:211) hypothesis that the translator omitted מן, which was “perhaps considered to be implied.” More likely, καὶ συναγωγὴ παρατάξεως amounts to a substitution for מן ערה וקיר, chosen to fit in a series of preparations for battles: archers taking quivers and horsemen mounted on their steeds.

22:7

καὶ ἔσονται and ויהי || (cf. V, *et erunt*) might attest a scribal modification into ויהי (1QIsa^a reads ויהי) but are more likely due to the translators’ adjustments of the grammatical number in their equivalents ἐλεατα/ || מבוחר, a Hebrew word regularly in the grammatical singular (cf. 37:24).

Both OG (ἐμφράξουσιν) and S (יִסְמְכוּ) offer verbal substitutes for שת ושתו, with S’s יִסְמְכוּ closer to T’s ממנן, as Warszawski (40) observed. The renderings of השערה with grammatically plural nouns (so also T) is an intelligible shift. It is unlikely that OG’s +σους represents a reading שערך, especially given the translator’s tendency to supply pronouns for purposes of explication (Van der Vorm-Croughs, 33–36).

22:8

OG and S have opposing perceptions of the actions in this verse. Whereas OG finds the actions of the attackers of 22:6–7 continuing here, S speci-

fies Judah's defensive maneuvers. Thus, whereas OG renders יגל with a grammatically plural verb form (*ἀνακαλύψουσι*) to continue the report of the assault, S renders it in the grammatical singular, identifying יהודה as its subject (לַיְהוּדָה יִגַּל) and construing מִסָּךְ “als die das Land deckende Schutzwehr der Mannschaft” (Warszawski, 40).⁹ OG's τὰς πύλας || מִסָּךְ, meanwhile, seems likely chosen in light of τὰς πύλας σου || הַשְּׁעָרָה at the end of 22:7. Ottley (2:211) suspects that the use of πύλας, ἐκλεκτοῦς, as well as ἀνακαλύψουσι and οἴκων in 22:9, “each unwarranted by the Hebrew” but “rightly used just above at this point,” evinces that “the translator's or a scribe's eye had repeatedly strayed backward at some stage in the history of the text, or the lines been disordered.” These seem more appropriately explained, however, as an attempt to create a coherent picture of the action in these verses (cf. 21:10, 15). Not only is ἐκλεκτοῦς likely a substitute for נִשָּׁךְ under the influence of ἐκλεκταί in 22:7 (note its semantics in λίθον πολυτελῆ ἐκλεκτὸν ἀκρογωνιαῖον ἔντιμον || פֶּנֶת יְקָרָה || אֶבֶן בַּחֵן in 28:16), but τῆς πόλεως less likely owes to הָעִיר in the *Vorlage* than to explicitizing the location of these gates and houses, just as he adds εἰς τὴν πόλιν at the end of 22:9 and τῇ πόλει at the end of 22:10 to make the location explicit.

22:9

τὰ κρυπτὰ is not explicable from other equivalents for בקע in this book (thrice by ῥήγνυμι; once each by ἀποστρέφω, κατισχύω, σχίζω, συντρίβω), nor does any semantically similar equivalent appear elsewhere in the Greek Bible. As Ottley (2:211) inferred, it was likely chosen “to suit ἀνακαλύψουσι.”

As noted in 22:8, τῶν οἴκων is an expansion imported from there. It is unnecessary to suppose (*pace* Ziegler, 116) that τῆς ἄκρας Δαυιδ || עִיר דָּוִד is attributable to the translator's familiarity with 2 Kgdms 5:9 and 3 Kgdms 11:27 (where ἄκρα renders מְלוּא), since ἡ πόλις Δαυιδ || עִיר דָּוִד also appears in those verses and (as Ziegler notes) ἄκρα “sehr oft die Davidsburg bezeichnet,” independently of language about the “city of David.” In the context of an attack on the city, the choice of ἄκρα is unsurprising.

9. For יִגַּל as subject of a third-person masculine singular verb, see לַיְהוּדָה יִגַּל in 11:13. This implies, however, that יִגַּל is second masculine singular, since its subject is likely not יִגַּל. The addressee is not immediately clear, although it is notable that יִגַּל in 22:9 agrees with רִאִיתָם. S's lack of an equivalent for אֵל || אֱלֹהִים (אל) is peculiar, since one expects a prefixed *lamed* in any case.

ἀπέστρεψαν τὸ ὕδωρ || ותקבצו את מי || ἀποστρέψω τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς μου ἀφ' ὑμῶν || אעלים עיני מכם in 1:15 and ἀποστρέψωμεν αὐτοὺς πρὸς ἡμᾶς || ונבקענה אלינו in 7:6.

Despite Ziegler's verdict (66) that τῆς ἀρχαίας is a "plus" "aus V. 11 heraufgenommen," it is not actually a plus, since an equivalent for התחתונה is absent. Given that every other occurrence of תחתון is rendered with a directional adverb functioning as adjective (typically κάτω or ὑποκάτω), τῆς ἀρχαίας might attest הישנה in the source text, the effect of a copyist's accidental assimilation to the phrase in 22:11. Given the considered nature of the translator's rendering, this is unlikely a simple misreading. Taking into account the consideration the translator gives to describing the construction of the κολυμβήθρα as water between its "two inner walls" in 22:11, it is reasonable to attribute to him the substitution of ἀρχαίας here to make the descriptions cohere.

As noted in discussing 22:8, the translator adds εἰς τὴν πόλιν here and τῇ πόλει at the end of 22:10 to make the location explicit.

22:10

As Van der Vorm-Croughs (87–88) observes, the translator's insertion of ὅτι before the last clause in 22:9 and at the outset of this verse "has transformed two independent clauses into subordinate ones, still depending on the verb 'to see' earlier in the text." While καθαιρέω is a frequent equivalent for נתץ in the Greek Bible (13x), the translator shifts καθείλοσαν forward to follow ὅτι and passes over ספרתם, perhaps due to his perplexity about how it coordinates with ותחתו.

Although S's ܣܦܪܬܡ seems to reflect perplexity at ספרתם, Warszawski (40) infers that this is an inner-Syriac misreading for ܣܦܪܬܡ, comparing T's מניתון. Although S's ܣܦܪ אתה || ספר in 43:26 and ܣܦܪ ܠܗܡ || ספר in 52:15 show the translator's familiarity with ספר as a verb for speech, its translation of ספר את המגדלים with איה ספר איה שקל איה ספר in 33:18 shows his familiarity both with ספר as a title and with the semantics of "count,"¹⁰ for which ܣܦܪ is the frequent equivalent elsewhere (e.g., Gen 15:5; 16:10; 32:13).

10. Its rendering of 43:21, containing the only other appearance of ספר in Isaiah, is oblique: ܣܦܪ ܠܝ תהלתי יספרו || ܣܦܪ ܠܝ תהלתי יספרו || עם זו יצרת לי תהלתי יספרו || עם זו יצרת לי תהלתי יספרו. That clause is curiously like its final clause in 43:20: ܣܦܪ ܠܝ תהלתי יספרו || עם זו יצרת לי תהלתי יספרו.

the *κολυμβήθρα* that was created by diverting water in 22:9. Rather than a *κολυμβήθρα* built between the city walls, the walls of the *κολυμβήθρα* hold its water. Given these modifications, it is conceivable that the translator supplied *ἐαυτοῖς* as befitting the contrast between what the people did and what they left undone.

ἀπ' ἀρχῆς renders such a wide range of words (בתחלה, 1:26; מקדם, 2:6; 45:21 [cf. 23:7]; ראשנות, 42:9; מיום, 43:13; מאז, 44:8; 48:8; מראש, 48:16; מעולם, 63:16, 19) that its use for מרחוק here is unremarkable, as is equally true of the translator's shift of its place in the sentence.

22:12

OG's *κύριος σαβαωθ* || יהוה צבאות אדני comports with its reduction of multiple divine names elsewhere. See the comments at 3:15.

22:13

Although OG most often renders הנה with *ἰδοῦ*, substitutions occur, as apparent with *ἀρχὴν Σιών δώσω καὶ Ἱερουσαλὴμ παρακαλέσω εἰς ὁδόν* || ראשון לציון הנה הנם ולירושלם מבשר אתן (41:17). Although *αὐτοὶ δὲ ἐποίησαντο* || והנה ששון here might reflect interpretation of הנה as a feminine plural pronoun, *ἐποίησαντο* accords with the translator's tendency to insinuate forms of *ποιέω* to create a verbal phrase, as in 5:7, where הנה is twice replaced: *ἔμεινα τοῦ ποιῆσαι κρίσιν ἐποίησεν δὲ ἀνομίαν καὶ οὐ δικαιοσύνην ἀλλὰ κραυγὴν* || ויקו למשפט והנה משפח לצדקה והנה צעקה. The closest analogue to *αὐτοὶ δὲ ἐποίησαντο* || והנה ששון is his reformulation of 59:9: *ὑπομεινάντων αὐτῶν φῶς ἐγένετο αὐτοῖς σκότος* || נקוה לאור והנה חשך. In such reformulations it is unnecessary to assume that an independent subject pronoun in Greek attests one in Hebrew (cf. *אשר חמדתם* || αὐτοὶ ἡβούλοντο, 1:29; *αὐτὸς κύριος εἰς κρίσιν ἤξει* || יהוה במשפט יבוא, 3:14). In the present case, *αὐτοὶ δὲ* contrasts the people's behavior to the Kyrios's call for weeping in 22:12.

ὥστε φαγεῖν || אכל is merely a more elaborated example of the translator's renderings of uninflected (infinitive absolute) verbs in this verse, including the following *φάγωμεν καὶ πίωμεν* || אכול ושתו (cf. S's *אכלו ושתי*), although it renders the previous infinitives with nominal forms: *אכלו* [2x], *אכלו*, and *אכלו*.

Old Greek's *+λέγοντες* is an explication of reported discourse, as in 3:6's *ὅτι ἐπιλήμψεται ἄνθρωπος τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ ... λέγων Ἰμάτιον*

ἐστιν || אַךְ בְּךָ אֵל in 45:14 and paralleled by insertions of ὅτι to establish a relationship between clauses in 24:6 (ὅτι ἡμάρτοσαν οἱ κατοικοῦντες αὐτήν || וַיֵּשְׁבוּ בָהּ) and 30:20 (ὅτι οἱ ὀφθαλμοί σου ὄψονται τοὺς πλανῶντάς σε || וְהָיוּ עֵינֶיךָ רְאוּת אֶת מוֹרִיד).

ὅτι likely marks a cause or explanation (consecution is not in its range) of what ταῦτα signifies: the Kyrios's knowledge of the addressees' rebellious revery. But whom does the translator identify as the malfeasants?

Although it is possible that he rendered the Hebrew pronouns without thinking about whom they designated, as recently as 22:5–11 he introduced words to clarify the nature of the assault on Jerusalem and shaped the description of the conduit to form a sensible picture. In 22:13 he introduced αὐτοὶ δὲ ἐποίησαντο to characterize the group's actions as contrary to the Kyrios's mandate, while 22:14 reports the Kyrios's knowledge of these actions, linking them to a resolve not to forgive the people, addressed as the audience (ὁμῶν ... ἀποθάνητε), in agreement with the Hebrew pronouns.

The most recent second-person plural pronouns were in 22:11's report, καὶ ἐποίησατε ἑαυτοῖς ὕδωρ ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν δύο τειχεῶν ἐσώτερον, which is contrasted with what they failed to do: καὶ οὐκ ἐνεβλέψατε εἰς τὸν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ποιήσαντα αὐτήν. Prior to that, in 22:7 the second-person singular pronoun spoke of the fate befalling the addressees' properties at the hand of Elamite (22:6) forces. While φάραγγές σου there accords with מַמְקֶיךָ, τὰς πύλας σου aligns with הַשְּׁעָרָה, the translator adding the explicitizing pronoun. The remainder of 22:9–10 speak of the destruction of the city, before 22:11–13 remind the addressees of their rebellious acts. This, in turn, reaches back to the beginning of the oracle, which addresses the city with a second-person singular pronoun that immediately shifts to second-person plural: τί ἐγένετό σοι νῦν ὅτι ἀνέβητε πάντες εἰς δώματα μάταια (22:1). The translator's choice of pronouns, including interchange between singular and plural number, can reasonably be considered strategic.

For the condensation τάδε λέγει κύριος σαβαωθ || אֲמַר אֲדֹנִי יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת, compare τάδε λέγει κύριος || נֶאֱמַר אֲדֹנִי יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת in 3:15–16 and εἰς ἀπώλειαν τάδε λέγει κύριος σαβαωθ ὃν τρόπον εἶρηκα || אֲמַר אֲדֹנִי יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת לֹא כִּשְׁרָה in 14:23–24.

22:15

Old Greek frequently collapses divine names, as here: κύριος σαβαωθ || אֲדֹנִי יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת (see Van der Vorm-Croughs, 503).

understand the switch from a verb for cutting to the generic ἐποίησας || חצבי and the suppression of the suffixed pronoun of קברו, the translator's addition of σεαυτῷ to coordinate with the preceding clause is remarkable, especially since he might have simply incorporated ἐν ὑψηλῷ into the previous clause and left קברו ... חצבי untranslated. The fact that this contravenes a tendency apparent elsewhere illustrates that tendencies are merely that. In fact, his addition of σεαυτῷ accords with a tendency to supply nouns or pronouns to balance parallel clauses (Van der Vorm-Croughs, 270–80), which is effected again with +σεαυτῷ in the next clause. The adjustment of the pronominal suffixes of both חצבי and חקקי to the morphology of the Greek verbs (ἐποίησας ... ἔγραψας) is equally typical for this translator.

By contrast, S renders חצבי and חקקי with third-person masculine singular perfect forms (ܡܥܡ and ܡܥܡܐ), perhaps based on reading the first-person singular suffixes as *waws*, analyzing them as third masculine singular pronouns, although one cannot rule out the possibility that its *Vorlage* lacked the suffix in each case.

22:17

ἰδοὺ δὴ rendered הנה already in 3:1 and will translate הן in 33:7.

As in 7:7; 23:11; 45:14 σαβαωθ lacks צבאות in any other witness, while in 5:25 its +σαβαωθ parallels the apparent reading of 4QIsa^b, where a supralinear צ is visible just after יהוה, on the edge of a lacuna. In each case, OG's tendency to omit an equivalent for צבאות (see the comments at 8:13) makes it more likely that צבאות stood in its *Vorlage* than that it inserted σαβαωθ.

Whereas Syriac's ܡܥܡܐ ܬܠܬܐ is transparent to מטלטלך טלטלה, OG renders טלטלה with a verb different from the semantically apt ἐκβαλεῖ || מטלטלך: καὶ ἐκτρίψει, which occurs only here in Isaiah, although it appears frequently elsewhere in the Greek Bible (especially for שחח and שמד), and its near synonym συντρίβω is the standard equivalent for שבר in Isaiah. The choice of verb in καὶ ἀφελεῖ τὴν στολὴν σου || עטה ועטך accords with ἐκτρίψει semantically, while τὴν στολὴν σου likely reflects recognition of the verb עטה, which is frequently rendered with περιβάλλω (Lev 13:45; Pss 70[71]:13; 108[109]:19, 29; Song 1:7).¹³

13. Unnecessary is Fischer's (38) surmise, endorsed by Zielger (85), that the translator related עטה to Aramaic עדתה.

As Fischer (38) perceived, the translator derived *στέφανος* from צנוף (22:18), in support of which Ziegler (85) noted the parallelism between *στέφανος* || עטרות and *καὶ διάδημα* || וצנוף in 62:3 (1QIsa^a 62:3). The second-person singular suffix, *σου*, is readily attributable to יצנפך. Given the correspondence of *καὶ τὸν στέφανόν σου τὸν ἔνδοξον* to the phrase צנוף צנפה יצנפך צנפה, one need not strain to detect a scrupulous derivation for τὸν ἔνδοξον (*pace* Fischer, 38; Ziegler, 85), particularly given how frequently the translator found grounds for it elsewhere (τὰ ἔνδοξα αὐτοῦ || עלילותיו, 12:4; τῶν ἐνδόξων || צבי, 23:9; καὶ τὰ ἔνδοξα μου || ותהלותי, 48:9; τὰ ἔνδοξα || נוראות, 64:2) and his partiality to the *δόξα* lexical group (Troxel, 128–31).

S's מַעְבֵּל חֶבְלַי || מעביל עטף follows the structure of מַעְבֵּל חֶבְלַי || מטלטלך טלטלה.

22:18

Although צנוף יצנפך צנפה and צנוף יצנפך צנפה clearly aligns with *לחבץ חסכילא אב אסכילא* and *לחבץ חסכילא אב אסכילא* ... corresponds to כדור, into which the translator inserted אסכילא to coordinate with the preceding clause, how the translator arrived at אסכילא as equivalent for צנוף in the first place is inscrutable.

Even if *καὶ ῥίψει σε* aligns with כדור (Ziegler, 85), it is unclear whether the translator found a semantic foothold for his equivalent or simply chose a verb that he considered befit the context. As Ziegler (85) remarks, because the translator “in Verlegenheit war,” owing to the unfamiliar vocabulary, he “bewußt und absichtlich in V. 17 (18) seinen Test gestaltete.”

נְהַרִים יֵאָרִים רַחֲבֵי יָדִים occurs again in 33:21, where OG renders רַחֲבֵי יָדִים with *ποταμοὶ καὶ διώρυγες πλατεῖς καὶ εὐρύχωροι*, both of which adjectives are equivalents for רַחֲבֵי יָדִים elsewhere (*πλατεῖα*, Gen 34:21; *εὐρύχωρος*, Judg 18:10). *μεγάλην καὶ ἀμέτρητον* here is likely a double rendering.

Given *εἰς ἀτιμίαν* || קלון, the translator likely supplied *εἰς καταπάτημα* to match it (Ziegler, 85). Compare +σεαυτῷ (2x) in 22:16.

22:19

הדף is given various equivalents in both OG and S. Although the apt equivalent *ὠθέω* (“push out”) is used in Num 35:20, 22 (cf. *διωθέω* in Ezek 34:21; *ἀπωθέω* in Job 18:18), more common are general words for destruction (e.g., *ἐκδιώκω*, Deut 6:19; *ἐξαναλίσκω*, Deut 9:4; *ἐξολεθρεύω*, Josh 23:5; *παρλύω*, Jer 46:15). *ἀφαιρέω* is a favorite slot verb for this translator to

express removal or deprivation, as in 22:17's *καὶ ἀφελεῖ τὴν στολὴν σου* || *ונכרת עטה* and in 22:25's *καὶ ἀφαιρεθήσεται ἡ δόξα ἢ ἐπ' αὐτόν* || *ונכרת עליה* (cf. *καὶ τὸν πῶγωνα ἀφελεῖ* || *וגם את הזקן תספה*, 7:20; *νεοσσὸς ἀφηρημένος* || *קן משלח*, 16:2). Notably here, *ἀφαιρεθήσεται* stands as the single equivalent for both *והדפת* and *יהרס*.

ܐܝܠܐ || *והדפת* accords semantically with S's typical equivalents for *הדה* (e.g., *ܡܚܠ*, Num 35:20, 22; *ܠܚ*, Deut 6:19; 9:4; Josh 23:5), most frequent of which is *ܚܫܝܐ* (Jer 46:15; Ezek 34:31; Job 18:18; Prov 10:3), which is used later in this verse for *יהרס* (*ܐܚܫܝܐ*). *ܚܫܝܐ* rendered *חרשת* in 16:7.

The word *οἰκονομία* appears again in this book only in 22:21, as part of a double rendering (*καὶ τὸ κράτος καὶ τὴν οἰκονομίαν σου* || *וממשלתך*) of the intangible benefits accompanying the investiture of a third person with the tunic and crown (*τὴν στολὴν σου καὶ τὸν στέφανόν σου* || *כתנתך* *וואבנטך*) stripped from the addressee (22:17). The bestowal of *οἰκονομία* on *Ελιακίμ τὸν τοῦ Χελκίου* (22:20) correlates with the epithet *ὁ οἰκονόμος* he bears in 36:3, where it renders *על הבית אשר*, the same phrase translated as *ταμία* in 22:15 (q.v.).

The relationship of *ἐκ τῆς οἰκονομίας σου* to *ממצב* is opaque. Although *מצב* appears only here in the book, it seems to have provoked perplexity among other translators also. Joshua 4:3 lacks an equivalent for the phrase *ממצב רגלי הכהנים*: *Ἀνέλεσθε ἐκ μέσου τοῦ Ἰορδάνου ἐτοίμους δῶδεκα λίθους* || *שאו לכם מזה מתוך הירדן ממצב רגלי הכהנים הכין עשרה אבנים*. The omission might be partly illuminated by comparing the rendering of *מצב* in Josh 4:9: *ἔστησεν δὲ Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἄλλους δῶδεκα λίθους ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ ἐν τῷ γενομένῳ τόπῳ ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας τῶν ἱερέων* || *ושתיים עשרה אבנים הקים יהושע בתוך הירדן תחת מצב רגלי הכהנים*. Similarly, *מצב* is simply transcribed in 1 Kgdms 14:1, 11 (*μεσσαβ τῶν ἀλλοφύλων* || *מצב פלשתים*); 14:6 (*εἰς μεσσαβ τῶν ἀπεριτμήτων τούτων* || *אל מצב הערלים האלה*); and 14:15 (*καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς οἱ ἐν μεσσαβ* || *ובכל העם המצב*). In two cases *מצב פלשתים* is translated with *ὑπόστασις τῶν ἀλλοφύλων* (13:23; 14:4) and once with *τὸ ὑπόστημα τῶν ἀλλοφύλων* (2 Kgdms 23:14). There is every reason, then, to infer that *ἐκ τῆς οἰκονομίας σου* is a substitution for an unfamiliar lexeme, chosen to suit the context.

Although Syriac's *ܡܡܥܒܕ* || *ܡܥ* recalls OG's frequent use of *δόξα* for Hebrew words with differing semantics (e.g., *τὴν δόξαν Δαυιδ* || *מפתח* *בית דוד*, 22:22; *ἡ δόξα ἢ ἐπ' αὐτόν* || *המשא אשר עליה*, 22:25), the only divergences from *ܡܡܥܒܕ* || *כבוד* in the book are for *גאון* (14:11; 23:9; 60:15)—a semantic association recognized also in OG (14:11; 24:14)—and *ܡܡܥܒܕ* || *ܡܪܒ* *אונים* in 40:26. This is the only instance of *מצב* in Isaiah, while

the phrase **פלשתים מצב** is translated with **פלשתים** in 1 and 2 Samuel (5x), while **ובכל העם המצב** || **סחכסו חמל וּמלם** occurs in 1 Sam 14:15, in accord with S's regular translation of **נצב** with **ממ** (e.g., Gen 18:2; 21:28; Exod 17:9). There is little reason to suspect that S's *Vorlage* read anything like a graphically dissimilar **מכב(ו)דד**, and it seems equally unlikely that **מכב(ו)דד** || **מכב(ו)דד** in 22:18 (|| **מרכבות כבודד**), where **מכב(ו)דד** functions as modifier, spurred the translator to substitute **מכב(ו)דד** for **מכב(ו)דד** (מ). Given the anomaly of this rendering, the most likely explanation is that **מכב(ו)דד** is an inner-Syriac error for **מכב(ו)דד**, the same equivalent used for **ומעמדד** (unsurprisingly, **מכב(ו)דד** is the regular equivalent for **עמד**).

22:20

Only S marks direct speech: **מכב(ו)דד**. As noted with **מכב(ו)דד** in 22:14 and **מכב(ו)דד** in 22:15, this translator often explicitizes direct speech.

22:21

Although **אבנט** appears only here in Isaiah, it occurs frequently enough in Exodus and Leviticus (17x, always rendered with **ζώνη**) that it was likely familiar to the translator, who seems to have substituted **στέφανος** to coordinate what is bestowed on **Ελιακιμ** with **τὴν στολὴν σου καὶ τὸν στέφανόν σου** that were removed from **Σομναν** in 22:17. As noted in 22:19, **ἐκ τῆς οἰκονομίας σου** || **ממצבב** was chosen as the office for **Ελιακιμ ὁ οἰκονόμος**, of 36:3, and here **οἰκονομία** is one component of a double rendering of **וממשלתך**: **καὶ τὸ κράτος καὶ τὴν οἰκονομίαν σου**. Also part of these echoes is **δώσω αὐτῷ** || **אחזקנו**, which not only pairs with **δώσω εἰς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ** || **אתן בידו**¹⁴ but also is a counter action to **ἀφαιρεθήσῃ** in 22:19. In 22:19–21 as elsewhere, the translator has orchestrated a rendering attentive to relationships within a context rather than simply isolated words and phrases.

τοῖς ἐνοικοῦσιν ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ || **ירושב ליושב** hardly attests a difference in grammatical number, given the frequency with which **יושב** is translated in the grammatical plural (e.g., 5:9; 8:14; 9:1, 8; 10:24; 12:6; 20:6; 24:27). Old Greek's supply of **τοῖς ἐνοικοῦσιν** in the juxtaposed clause is equally

14. To OG's **εἰς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ** || **בידו**, cf. S's **חזקנו**, which is hardly evidence of dependence, nor is it possible to detect whether either actually attests **בידו**. The same applies to a comparison of OG's **τοῖς ἐνοικοῦσιν** and S's **חזקנו**.

unremarkable, given the translator's penchant to insert components to enhance parallelism (see Van der Vorm-Croughs, 270–80).

By contrast, S's **בית יהודה** || **סכך** is noteworthy because its characteristic way of rendering phrases that include a proper name perceived as a group is with prefixed *dalet* (e.g., **בית יעקב** || **בית**, 2:5; cf., e.g., 2:6; 5:7; 8:17; 10:20; 14:1), even when **בית** has a prefixed *lamed*: **בית ישראל** || **בית**, 63:7. Comparison with 5:3 and 5:7 suggests that its *Vorlage* in this verse read **בית יהודה**.¹⁵

22:22

Ziegler (86), after defending his textual decisions (which agree with Ottley [2:213], who notes agreement with Field and Ceriani), denies that any of OG's divergence from MT owes to misreading (*pace* Wutz, *Transkriptionen*, 94; Fischer, 39), concluding that they are “absichtliche Deutungen der Bilder”:

Denn δόξα kann schwerlich aus **מפתח** als Verlesung abgeleitet werden, sondern ist bewußte Deutung in Verbindung mit V. 25 [*sic*; read 21] und V. 23; ebenso ist καὶ ἄρξει gewählt infolge des Zusammenhanges mit dem vorhergehenden V. 21 (οἰκονομία) und V. 25 [*sic*; read 23] (ἄρχων; θρόνος). Die Wiedergabe καὶ οὐκ ἔσται ὁ ἀντιλέγων soll den widerspruchsslosen Gehorsam ausdrücken.

To καὶ οὐκ ἔσται ὁ ἀντιλέγων he compares the “ähnliche Deutung” found in 10:14's καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ὃς διαφεύξεται με ἢ ἀντίπαυ μοι || **לא יהיה נדד כנף** || **ואנכי לא מריתי אחור** || **ואנכי לא מריתי אחור** and ἐγὼ δὲ οὐκ ἀπειθῶ οὐδὲ ἀντιλέγω || **פצה ופצה פה ומצפצף** || **ואנכי לא מריתי אחור** || **ואנכי לא מריתי אחור** in 50:5. It is difficult to gainsay Ziegler's analysis, particularly given evidence of the translator reasoning from the context in 22:19–21.

By contrast, S's **ונתתי** || **סכך** (unparalleled in any other extant witness) is peculiar, since there is no apparent reason for the translator to diverge from the first common singular pronouns that have preceded this. An inner-Syriac corruption of **סכך** seems more likely than **ונתתי** in S's *Vorlage*.

15. The only place the translator supplies **סכך** without an explicit equivalent in Hebrew is **סכך** || **סכך** in reformulating **ראש יעשה אשר מעשה** in 19:5.

22:23

Old Greek's *καὶ στήσω αὐτόν* || ותקעתיו (cf. *Λαβαν δὲ ἔστησεν τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ ὄρει Γαλααδ* || בהר הגלעד in Gen 31:25) contrasts with *ὁ ἐστηριγμένος* || התקועה in 22:25 but accords with the imprecise equivalents *καὶ ἀφαιρεθήσῃ* || והדפתיד (and יהרסד) in 22:19 and *δώσω αὐτῷ* || אחזקנו in 22:21. The choice here is likely coordinate with *ἄρχοντα* || יתד, to which Ziegler (86) compares *ὁ ἄνθρωπος* || יתד in 22:25, even though the translator attests his familiarity with the word in 33:20 and 54:2 by rendering it with *πάσσαλος*. “Das persönliche ἄρχων ist hier gewählt mit Rücksicht auf V. 18 (*καὶ τὸν οἶκον τοῦ ἄρχοντός σου*)” (Ziegler, 86) and with a view to *εἰς θρόνον*. The translator’s hand in shaping this verse is as apparent as in the foregoing verses.

22:24

πείθω appears often (36x) in the book, most frequently for *בטח* (15x) but also for a variety of other Hebrew words, including *שען* (10:20 [2x]). Use of *πείθω* as a metaphorical equivalent likely lies behind *καὶ ἔσται πεποιθὼς ἐπ’ αὐτόν* || ותלו עליו here.

והצפעות והצאצאים seems to have presented a problem for both translators, with nothing corresponding to the phrase in OG and *ܡܥܬܐ ܡܥܬܐ* its equivalent in S. Although OG renders *צאצאִים* with *ἐπὶ τὰ τέκνα σου* and S with *ܚܒܝܢܐ ܚܒܝܢܐ* in 44:3 and both render *מַעֲיָן* *וצאצאִים* similarly in 48:19 (*καὶ τὰ ἔκγονα τῆς κοιλίας σου/ܡܥܝܢܐ ܡܥܝܢܐ*), in each case *צאצאִים* directly follows a form of *זרע*, making inference easy. More distinctly, whereas OG translates *הצאצאִים* in 34:1 with *ἡ οἰκουμένη καὶ ὁ λαὸς ὁ ἐν αὐτῇ*, S gives *ܚܒܝܢܐ ܚܒܝܢܐ*. In 42:5 OG translates *הצאצאִים* with *τῇ γῇ καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ*, while S reads *ܚܒܝܢܐ ܚܒܝܢܐ*. Whereas OG translates *הצאצאִים* in 61:9 with *τὸ σπέρμα αὐτῶν καὶ τὰ ἔκγονα αὐτῶν*, S renders with *ܚܒܝܢܐ ܚܒܝܢܐ*. Although S offers *ܚܒܝܢܐ ܚܒܝܢܐ* || *אתם* in 65:23, the lack of an equivalent in OG suggests that the phrase was absent from its *Vorlage* and might have been a later supplement based on 61:9.

Thus, both translators appear to have been nonplussed by *צאצאִים*. OG seems to have omitted an equivalent for *והצפעות והצאצאים*, perhaps judging it implicit in *בית אביו*. Syriac’s *ܡܥܬܐ ܡܥܬܐ* is likely a phrase chosen to fill the gap for words that perplexed the translator.

Old Greek’s merism *ἀπὸ μικροῦ ἕως μεγάλου* is a substitution for the remainder of the verse, triggered by *הקטן ... ועד* (cf. *ἀπὸ μικροῦ ἕως μεγάλου*

|| מִקְרָקֶר קָר in 22:5),¹⁶ while its concluding καὶ ἔσονται ἐπικρεμάμενοι αὐτῶ seems a second rendering of ותלו עליו (see Ziegler, 87).

22:25

Ziegler's edition rightly places ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκεῖνῃ with the preceding clause (cf. Goshen-Gottstein, פב), leaving τάδε λέγει κύριος σαβαωθ to begin a new divine speech. Verses 15–24 forecast the replacement of the current steward, Σομναν (22:15–19), with Ελιακιμ (22:20–24). Verses 16–21 are addressed to Σομναν via second-person singular pronouns, and verses 22–24 are implicitly part of that address. τάδε λέγει κύριος σαβαωθ in 22:25 introduces speech *about* the person being removed, which clarifies ὁ ἄνθρωπος || הֵיטָד (versus ἄρχοντα || יִתָּד in 22:23, designating an office). This use of ἄνθρωπος is similar to 19:20 (καὶ ἀποστελεῖ αὐτοῖς κύριος ἄνθρωπον ὃς σώσει αὐτούς || וַיִּשְׁלַח לָהֶם מוֹשִׁיעַ; cf. 25:4), where ἄνθρωπος explicitizes the agent of the action. In this case, the action is given in ὁ ἐστηριγμένος || הַתְּקוּעָה, which is delimited by ἐν τόπῳ πιστῶ || בַּמְּקוֹם נֶאֱמָן, as in 22:23. The articular nominal forms seem anaphoric references to Σομναν.

Old Greek's lack of an equivalent for ונגדע accords with the translator's penchant to condense by omitting coordinate synonymous words (Van der Vorm-Croughs, 188–90). S used هسف to render יִהְרָסֶךָ in 22:19 and הָרַס in 14:17, while هسف; هسف; هسف translates רָפְאִים תְּפִיל in 26:19, and هسف; هسف renders וכשלו אחור in 28:13. Conversely, its equivalents for גַּדַע are varied: هسف (9:9), هسف (10:33), هسف (14:12), and هسف (45:2), leaving هسف || ונגדע here unsuspecting.

καὶ ἀφαιρεθήσεται || ונכרת is an equivalent found already in 9:13; 18:5. Similarly, هسف uses the same equivalent for כרת as in 9:13; 11:13; 14:22. The insertion of هسف before هسف is unremarkable.

Ziegler's suggestion (87) that ἡ δόξα || ὁ μῆσα betrays that the translator “an den Stamm נשא ‘erhaben sein’ gedacht hat” finds possible support from only one out of the fifty-eight appearances of נשא (καὶ ὑψωθήσεται καὶ δοξασθήσεται σφόδρα || וְנִשָּׂא וְגִבָּה מְאֹד, 53:13), while nowhere else in the book does δόξα translate מִשָּׂא. More likely, the translator's τῇν δόξαν Δαυιδ || מִפֶּתַח בֵּית דָּוִד in 22:22, under influence of כבוד in 22:23–24, explains this equivalent as part of his understanding of 22:15–25.

16. Ziegler (87) compares μέγαν καὶ μικρόν || כֹּהַּ וְאֶגְמוֹן in 9:13(14), μικροῦ καὶ μεγάλου· ὃν τρόπον ἓάν τις συναγάγῃ ἀκρίδας || אֶסֶף הַחֲסִיל כַּמְשֶׁק גְּבִים in 33:4, and μικρόν καὶ μέγαν λαόν || עַם עִם נֶעֱזָר in 33:9.

ISAIAH 23

23:1

Καρχηδόνος as equivalent for **יִשְׁתִּי** appears only in these verses (6, 10, 14), while **Καρχηδόνιοι** renders **יִשְׁתִּי** in Ezek 27:12, 25 and 38:13. **Θαρσις** is its equivalent in Isa 60:9, 66:19, and elsewhere (Gen 10:4; 3 Kgdms 10:22; 22:49; Jer 10:9; Jonah 1:3 [3x]; 4:2; Pss 47[48]:8; 71[72]:10; 1 Chr 1:7; 2 Chr 9:21 [2x]; 20:36, 37). Unique is **πλοῖον θαλάσσης || יִשְׁתִּי תִינִי** in Isa 2:16, differing not only from **πλοῖα Καρχηδόνος** here and in 23:14 but also **πλοῖα Θαρσις** in 60:9; Ps 47(48):8 and **πλοῖα ἐκ Θαρσις** in 2 Chr 9:2 (cf. Ezek 27:25).

The Hellenistic toponym **Καρχηδών** identifies **יִשְׁתִּי** (whose location is debated) with the Tunisian coastal city of Carthage, a choice Arie van der Kooij suggests alludes to the Roman destruction of Carthage in 146 BCE.¹ Noting the parallel between **ὀλολύζετε πλοῖα Καρχηδόνος ὅτι ἀπώλετο** in 23:1 and **ὀλολύζετε πλοῖα Καρχηδόνος ὅτι ἀπώλετο τὸ ὀχύρωμα ὑμῶν** in 23:14, where the ships are called to bemoan the fate of their fortress, he infers that “this fortress is also the implied subject of the last part of v. 1,” whose grammatically singular **ἦκται αἰχμάλωτος** agrees with the person and number of **ἀπώλετο**.² On the other hand, the subject of **ἔρχονται**, he argues, is established by **καὶ γὰρ πλοῖα οὐκέτι ἔρχεται ἐκ Καρχηδόνος** in 23:10, which has no analogue in MT. Read in the light of 23:10, the subject of **ἔρχονται** in 23:1 is the ships: “ships no longer come ‘from the land of Kittim,’ apparently because ‘their fortress’” (Carthage) “has been destroyed.”³

1. Arie van der Kooij, *The Oracle of Tyre: The Septuagint of Isaiah 23 as Version and Vision*, VTSup 71 (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 96–98. On the use of Hellenistic toponyms in OG Isaiah, see Troxel, “What’s in a Name?”

2. Van der Kooij, *The Oracle of Tyre*, 76.

3. Van der Kooij, *The Oracle of Tyre*, 77.

Van der Kooij's detection of a relationship between ἔρχονται in 23:1 and ἔρχεται in 23:10 is perceptive. His comparison of καὶ οὐκέτι ἔρχονται || מְבוֹא with τοῦ μὴ εἰσελθεῖν || מְבוֹא in 24:10 illuminates the translator's path, while he notes that the translator made it "the beginning of an independent verbal clause, introduced by καί."⁴ The οὐκέτι ἔρχονται of 23:1 is echoed in 23:10, where καὶ γὰρ πλοῖα οὐκέτι ἔρχεται ἐκ Καρχηδόνος differs from בִּיאָר בַּת תְּרִישִׁישׁ אִין מִזַּח עוֹד. Although οὐκέτι reasonably corresponds to עוֹד ... אִין, ἔρχεται has no foothold in the Hebrew, and the same is true of πλοῖα, which last appeared in 23:1 (in combination with Καρχηδόνος) and will appear in 23:14, where similarities with 23:1 are again striking. As Van der Kooij argues, καὶ οὐκέτι ἔρχονται in 23:1 "is best understood as part of a strategy of producing a coherent Greek version of ch. 23."⁵

The question, however, is whether these links allow us to fill in the subjects of ἀπώλετο and ἔρχονται in 23:1 or if they are simply part of a pattern of shared words and images with unspecified subjects. While πλοῖα, for example, is the subject of ἔρχεται (23:10), conjugated in the grammatical singular with the plural neuter noun, it is difficult to explain the grammatical plural ἔρχονται in 23:1 if πλοῖα is its implied subject. Although ἔρχονται could be a *constructio ad sensum* for "ships," καί presents a problem. Given that ὅτι ἀπώλετο is predicate for calling the ships to wail, καὶ οὐκέτι ἔρχονται offers a correlative reason to wail. Given that the πλοῖα Καρχηδόνος are called upon to wail within this ὄραμα Τύρου, most likely the subject of ἀπώλετο is Tyre, also referenced by γῆς Κιτιέων (the lone occurrence of Κιτιεύς in Isaiah), which is the subject of ἦκται αἰχμάλωτος, "[Tyre] has become captive."⁶ The subject of the grammatically plural ἔρχονται is likely impersonal "they," explicitized by μεταβόλοι Φοινίκης in 23:2. πλοῖα Καρχηδόνος are not those belonging to a destroyed Carthage but merchant ships traveling from there to a now-destroyed Tyre, the subject of the lament.

As Warszawski (41) suggested, S's מְבוֹא suggests that it read מְבוֹא in place of מְבוֹא. Although S most often translates לָמוֹ with לָמוֹ (16:4; 30:5; 43:8; 48:21), it also renders it with לָמוֹ (35:8) and לָמוֹ (44:15) or omits an

4. Van der Kooij, *The Oracle of Tyre*, 49.

5. Van der Kooij, *The Oracle of Tyre*, 125.

6. The masculine and feminine markers of the adjective αἰχμάλωτος are shared, as is clear with ἡ αἰχμάλωτος θυγάτηρ in 52:2. For ἦκται αἰχμάλωτος || גְּלָה לָמוֹ, compare αἰχμάλωτος ὁ λαός μου ἐγενήθη || גְּלָה עָמִי, 5:13. לָמוֹ lacks an equivalent again in 30:5's οὐτε εἰς ὠφέλειαν || לָמוֹ וְיִעֲלוּ לָמוֹ.

equivalent (26:16; 44:7). Accordingly, it is tenuous to suppose that 𐤒 here attests לָנוּ, as Warszawski (41) proposed.

23:2

Whereas S's 𐤍𐤌𐤎 recognizes דָּמוּ as a masculine plural imperative from דָּמָה, OG analyzes it as a third-person plural perfect form of דָּמָה. The supply of τίνι (used with ὁμοιόω in 40:18, 25; 46:5) is coordinate with the construal of קָצִיר in 23:3 as a simile: ὡς ἀμητοῦ.

Although OG-Isaiah is the only translation of a biblical book that renders צִידוֹן with Φοινίκης, it is not the only one to use this Hellenistic toponym. Exodus 16:35 renders כָּנַעַן אֶרֶץ קִצְוָה בְּאֵם אֶל קִצְוָה with ἕως παρεγένοντο εἰς μέρος τῆς Φοινίκης, while οἱ βασιλεῖς τῆς Φοινίκης is the equivalent for וְכָל מַלְכֵי הַכְּנַעֲנִי in Josh 5:1, and τὴν χώραν τῶν Φοινίκων renders אֶרֶץ כְּנָעַן in Josh 5:12. Although the Isaiah translator employs Σιδῶν for צִידוֹן in 23:4, 12, that variation is similar to his rendering of מַאֲחֹר מִקְדָּם וּפְלִשְׁתִּים in 9:11 with Συρίαν ἀφ' ἡλίου ἀνατολῶν καὶ τοὺς Ἑλληνας ἀφ' ἡλίου δυσμῶν, in contrast to his otherwise consistent rendering פְּלִשְׁתִּי or פְּלִשְׁתִּי with οἱ ἀλλόφυλοι (2:6; 11:14; 14:29, 31). Just as in 9:11, where τοὺς Ἑλληνας ἀφ' ἡλίου δυσμῶν is joined with Συρία || אֶרֶם to orient readers by the toponyms of their day,⁷ the translator employed Φοινίκης || צִידוֹן to explicitize for his readers the region, parallel to his rendering of תְּרִשִׁישׁ with Καρχηδών.

μεταβόλοι appears in translations of biblical books only here and 23:3 (twice for סָחַר and once for שָׁחַר), while μεταβολή appears only in 30:32 (πολεμήσουσιν αὐτὸν ἐκ μεταβολῆς || בָּהּ וּבְמַלְחָמוֹת תִּנּוּפָה נֶלְחַם בָּהּ) and 47:15 (ἐν τῇ μεταβολῇ σου || סָחַרִיד). The typical equivalent for סָחַר outside Isaiah is ἔμποροι (10x) (or its verb form, ἐμπορεύω, 9x), as found in 23:8 (οἱ ἔμποροι αὐτῆς || סָחַרִיהָ). Van der Kooij finds significance in a distinction between the μεταβόλος as “the retailer, i.e. the small business man who sells in small quantities,” over against the ἔμπορος, “who is the ‘wholesaler,’ the merchant, the big business man,” upon whom the μεταβόλος relies for merchandise.⁸ Accordingly, “‘the inhabitants of the isle’ are called ‘the retailers of Phoenicia’; they are not its ‘merchants’ (ἔμποροι).”⁹ In fact, οἱ

7. Σύρος || אֶרֶם appears in 17:3, while Αραμ || אֶרֶם is the equivalent in 7:1, 2, 8. On both τοὺς Ἑλληνας || פְּלִשְׁתִּים and Συρία || אֶרֶם, see Troxel, 192–93, and the commentary on 9:11.

8. Van der Kooij, *The Oracle of Tyre*, 52.

9. Van der Kooij, *The Oracle of Tyre*, 52.

ἔμποροι αὐτῆς (23:8) reside in Carthage and are spoken of as Tyre's ἔμποροι because "Tyre was the mother-city of Carthage..., [which was] founded by traders from Tyre."¹⁰

Although Van der Kooij presents a plausible reconstruction of the trading relationship, his inference that οἱ ἔμποροι αὐτῆς live in Carthage rests on special pleading, invoking a distinction between the roles of μεταβόλοι and ἔμποροι to allow οἱ ἔμποροι αὐτῆς in Carthage to be called Tyre's ἔμποροι. Trying to confirm this distinction in the translator's word choice is difficult, however, because the terms are not juxtaposed in a way that spurs that inference, and both μεταβόλοι and ἔμποροι render forms of סחר, raising the possibility that the translator used them as synonyms.

Equally, the nominal forms μεταβολή and ἐμπορία occur only in isolation: μεταβολή appears in 30:32 (πολεμήσουσιν αὐτὸν ἐκ μεταβολῆς || (ובמלחמות תנופה נלחם בה) and 47:15 (ἐν τῇ μεταβολῇ σου || (סחרך)), while ἐμπορία twice renders סחרה in 23:18 and סחר in 45:14. Van der Kooij's construal rests on a priori assumptions in identifying the cities and describing their trading relationships.

Old Greek's lack of an equivalent for מלאך is striking, since it elsewhere lacks an equivalent for מלא (30x) only in 28:8, which diverges widely from MT (ἀρὰ ἔδεται ταύτην τὴν βουλὴν αὕτη γὰρ ἡ βουλή ἔνεκεν πλεονεξίας || (כי כל שלחנות מלאו קיא צאה בלי מקום)).¹¹ There are no evident triggers that would spur haplography in 23:2. Although 1QIsa^b reads מלאך, 1QIsa^a reads מלאכך, and 4QIsa^a reads מלאך; none of these explains the lack of an equivalent in OG, while V and T each offer one. Zielger (52) catalogs this minus under the heading, "Seltene und schwierige Wörter hat LXX an folgenden Stellen ausgelassen." מלאך can hardly be called a "rare" word, but one can comprehend why the translator, having concluded that דמו implies a comparison, construed סחר צידון as elaborating אי ישבי, and having found ים עבר to describe their behavior, "kam mit "מ" nicht zurecht" (Ziegler, 52). This supposition is strengthened by his direct link of διαπερῶντες τὴν θάλασσαν with the beginning of 23:3: ἐν ὕδατι πολλῷ || ובמים רבים.

10. Van der Kooij, *The Oracle of Tyre*, 81.

11. Typical equivalents are (ἐμ)πίμπλημι, πλήρης, or πληρόω. The substitutions in 34:1 (ἀκουσάτω ἡ γῆ καὶ οἱ ἐν αὐτῇ, ἡ οἰκουμένη καὶ ὁ λαὸς ὁ ἐν αὐτῇ || תשמע הארץ (ומלאה תבל וכל צאצאיה) and 42:10 (οἱ καταβαίνοντες εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ πλέοντες αὐτὴν || (ירדי הים ומלאו איים וישביהם) are readily intelligible.

23:3

Ziegler's (101) perception that "Der Übers. kannte sich in der Konstruktion der hebr. Vorlage nicht aus, und hat frei *ὡς* zur Verdeutlichung eingeschoben" is valid if "der Konstruktion der hebr. Vorlage" means the flow of 23:2–3, a difficulty already apparent in the lack of an equivalent for מלאוֹךְ and the linking of רבים ובמים with עבר ים in 23:2. Even then, the supply of *ὡς* is not a spontaneous attempt "zur Verdeutlichung" but dependent on his prior rendering of דמו with τίνοι ὅμοιοι γεγόνασιν, to which this simile is the answer. In Van der Kooij's estimation, its meaning "is not difficult to guess: Instead of 'crossing the sea' as 'the retailers of the nations' 'the retailers of Phoenicia' have become 'as when a harvest is gathered in,' that is to say, they have to stay at home."¹² His "guess" is hardly self-evident, however, since the comparison could focus on the merchants' hard labor or the reward they bring in, either of which seems more likely than comparing a circumstance only incidental to the harvest.

Although the relationship of εἰσφερομένου to תבואתה is transparent,¹³ the translator seems also to have found it necessary to pass over ותהי so as to construe סחר גוים as subject of the verbless clause, much as he omitted a rendering of מלאוֹךְ at the end of 23:2. This buttresses Ziegler's (52) evaluation of 23:2 that "LXX hat diesen Vers ganz frei wiedergegeben" and his (101) extension of that by commenting, "Das ganze Kap. 23 ist ziemlich frei wiedergegeben."

23:4

Old Greek and Syriac treat differently כי אמר followed by לאמר and the juxtaposed ים מעוז הים. OG renders them as two distinct clauses, making ים the subject of אמר and passing over כי (εἶπεν ἡ θάλασσα || כי אמר ים), as it did with מלאוֹךְ and ותהי in 23:2–3, while rendering לאמר with a second εἶπεν. S, on the other hand, reflects כי, while reformulating ים מעוז הים with +waw conjunctive, with an appended pronoun (ܝܠܐ ܫܚܝܬܐ ܕܝܡܐ), while leaving לאמר without an equivalent.

12. Van der Kooij, *The Oracle of Tyre*, 54.

13. S uses ܝܠܐ ܫܚܝܬܐ ܕܝܡܐ for סחר again in 23:18 (2x).

translated by ἀναφέρω in 18:7 and ἄγω in 53:7, each in the passive voice,¹⁴ Ottley (1:50) cited this instance as an example of the translator's frequent employment of παραδίδωμι as a "stop-gap" word (cf. Ziegler, 14).

Although S renders יובל with נַחֲלֵי in 18:7, its equivalent for it in 53:7 is נַחֲלֵי, while it renders תובלון in 55:12 with נַחֲלֵי, paralleling נַחֲלֵי here. Its reformulation of לגור with לַחֲדָה is transparent, its subject being חֲסִידָא, understood as an epithet.

Old Greek's lack of an equivalent for רגליה מרחוק לגור is explicable under either option stipulated by Zielger (49): "Entweder war ihre Vorlage hier schlecht, oder sie kam mit ihrer Vorlage nicht zurecht." No trigger for haplography is apparent, and it is difficult to imagine how יבלוה could have concluded the sentence, while Ziegler (49) reminds us that the translator "hat Kap. 23 vielfach abwegig und gekürzt wiedergegeben," for which one might look ahead to the inexplicable lack of equivalents for קומי עברי in 23:12. There are no grounds for a confident account of why the verse ends with παραδοθῆναι αὐτήν.

23:8

Although the relationship between ἡσσων and המעטירה via מעט is transparent, the translator's path to ἡ οὐκ ἰσχύει is oblique. Van der Kooij regards "the clause, ἡ οὐκ ἰσχύει, as an expansion meant to elucidate the first clause," citing "the similar case in LXX Isa. 8:8."¹⁵ Earlier he adduced comparison of 8:8 for its clause added (with ἡ) "as a clarification of the first (Hebraistic) part": ἀνθρωπον ὃς δυνήσεται κεφαλὴν ἄραι ἡ δυνάτὸν συντελέσασθαι τι || שטף ועבר עד צואר יגיע ||¹⁶ As analyzed in the comments on 8:8, the only potential associations with the Hebrew are κεφαλὴν || צואר and συντελέσασθαι || יגיע, but even identifying these is speculative. There is no "Hebraistic" clause on which ἡ δυνάτὸν συντελέσασθαι τι elaborates. That said, it is possible that ἡ οὐκ ἰσχύει is an expansion by the translator.

Ottley (2:217) suggested that "ἡ οὐκ ἰσχύει may be a duplicate," urging comparison of 23:11 (ἡ δὲ χεὶρ σου οὐκέτι ἰσχύει || ידו נטה) and 50:2 (μὴ οὐκ ἰσχύει ἡ χεὶρ μου τοῦ ῥύσασθαι || הקצור קצרה ידי מפדות). Although neither of these provides evidence of a duplicate rendering here, they do

14. As Ziegler (165) suggests, διδαχθήσεσθε || תובלון in 55:12 "ist verderbt aus διαχθήσεσθε, wie die Mn. 22, 93, 198, 308 lesen."

15. Van der Kooij, *The Oracle of Tyre*, 135.

16. Van der Kooij, *The Oracle of Tyre*, 59.

show a similar impulse to press ἰσχύω into service. Ziegler (66) endorses Ottley's reference to 23:11, arguing that "scheint es aus V. 11 zu stammen," but points to the translation of אָזַר with ἰσχύω || in 8:9 (2x) and 50:11 to suggest that "viell. wurde aus dem hebr. Text der Stamm אָזַר (= ἰσχύειν oder καταισχύειν) herausgelesen." Although he sets aside Fischer's (39) perception that ἰσχύει arises from "Aram., אָשַׁר = 'fest, stark sein,'" Byun (152) has noted that "one of the primary meanings of אָשַׁר in PBH is 'confirm' or 'verify,' which often occurs in legal contexts," while "another common meaning is 'make strong' or 'make firm.'" He concludes (154) that, from "an etymological standpoint, it appears that the PBH [Post-Biblical Hebrew] and Aramaic meanings of אָשַׁר 'strengthen' and 'confirm' are related to Aramaic שָׁרַר (*Pael*) 'make strong.'" Reviewing the Isaiah translator's renderings of אָשַׁר and observing that the translator shows no familiarity with the meanings "go straight," "lead" found in BH but unattested in PBH (152), he concludes that ἰσχύει here is based on אָשַׁר in its PBH meaning "be strong" (159). Although the translator's frequent insinuation of a negative particle makes it unnecessary to suppose that his *Vorlage* read וְלֹא in place of יִרְהוּ (הַמַּעֲט) (pace Buyn, 159), this explanation for ἰσχύει seems more likely than the other proposals.

Although ἡσσων is a comparative adjective, it does not necessarily imply comparison to a particular referent,¹⁷ since a comparative adjective can be used absolutely (Smyth §1083; BDF §244). The more significant rhetorical feature here is the shift from μὴ to οὐκ in the question: "Not inferior, surely, is she, (but) strong, right?" The evidence of her strength is her merchants' repute as ἑνδοξοί.

Likely alignments of words in οἱ ἔμποροι αὐτῆς ἑνδοξοὶ ἀρχοντες τῆς γῆς || שָׁרִים כְּנַעֲנִיָּה נִכְבְּדֵי אֶרֶץ || are apparent, despite the altered word order. Equally obvious is the absence of an equivalent for כְּנַעֲנִיָּה (cf. Χανααν || כְּנַעַן, 23:11), most likely owing to a "distributive rendering" between parallel clauses that omits "a specific syntactic unit ... from one clause, the function of which was then taken over by the parallel unit in the preceding or following clause," which here and in 5:13 entails omission of "a noun and a pronoun ... referring to the same entity" (Van der Vorm-Croughs, 207–8).

17. Pace Van der Kooij, *The Oracle of Tyre*, 60.

Βαβυλῶνος).¹⁹ Although one could posit haplography before בת, it is equally possible that בתולת was added later. In either case, it was likely not present in OG's *Vorlage*.

In light of ἀπέλθατε εἰς Καρχηδόνα || עברו תרשישה in 23:6, the reformulation of קומי עברי as καὶ ἐὰν ἀπέλθῃς εἰς Κιτιεῖς is transparent as a condensation of the predicate via omission of an equivalent for קומי. S shifts its equivalent for כתיים to the same position in the sentence, in conformity with Syriac word order norms: ܡܫܬܬܚܝܬܐ ܕܡܪܝܬܐ ܕܕܢܝܢܐ.

23:13

For καὶ || הן, compare ὅτι πόθεν ἐστὲ ὑμεῖς || אתם מאין in 41:24, καὶ πάντες ὅθεν ἐγένοντο ἐξηράνθησαν || כל חבריו יבשו in 44:11, ἐγὼ δέ || הן in 49:21, and καὶ νῦν ἐπίβλεψον || הן הבט נא in 64:8.

As Van der Kooij observes regarding καὶ αὕτη ἡρήμωται ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀσσυρίων, “one gets the impression that this is a paraphrastic rendering” of אשור לא היה אשור.²⁰ Although use of ἡρήμωται recalls 6:11's ἕως ἂν ἐρημωθῶσι πόλεις || עד אשר אם שאו ערים, a textual basis for it in MT is opaque.

Although Van der Kooij regards ὅτι ὁ τοῖχος αὐτῆς πέπτωκεν “as a paraphrastic rendering of the Hebrew from הקימו up to למפלה,”²¹ the only clear point of contact is πέπτωκεν || למפלה, making it hard to describe this as an attempt to represent the Hebrew at all. Ziegler's (144) suggestion that perhaps ὁ τοῖχος αὐτῆς arose because “hat der Übers. in שָׁרָה verlesen” strains plausibility. More credible is his (144) speculation that “am Ende von V. 13 mag ihm Anlaß gegeben haben, diese Wendung hier zu gebrauchen, die auch sonst bei der Js-LXX eine besondere Rolle spielt.” In support of this, he cites 24:23, where καὶ πεσεῖται τὸ τεῖχος finds a toehold in ובושה החמה; 27:3, where πεσεῖται τὸ τεῖχος aligns with אצרנה; and 30:13, where ὡς τεῖχος πῖπτον corresponds to נבעה בחומה. As Van der Kooij concludes, given that in each case “this expression is used as a free rendering of the Hebrew ... it seems that it represents a favourite expres-

19. Pace Goshen-Gottstein (פ), T's לעמא דבצידון does not support condensation by OG. Although its rendering of בת בתולת with מלכות כנשתא in 37:22; 47:1 is a quantitative match, לעמא is semantically distinct from כנשתא, voiding any inference about T's *Vorlage* here.

20. Van der Kooij, *The Oracle of Tyre*, 144.

21. Van der Kooij, *The Oracle of Tyre*, 144.

עדרו, the continuation with grammatically plural סַחֲבֵיהֶם (|| שמה) suggests that the translator considered its subject the same as with חָצֵה , namely, חָצֵה . Also notable is the rendering of $\text{לֹא הָיָה אֲשׁוּר יֹסֵדָה לְצִיִּים}$ as a relative clause modifying הָעָם .

Given these alignments, what sense does S's translation carry? First, given that this verse stands in an oracle about Tyre and otherwise addresses $\text{אֵל אֲדָחַ וְאֲדָחַ}$ (as it will again in 23:14), it is more likely that $\text{אֵל אֲדָחַ וְאֲדָחַ}$ introduces statements about this land than an address of it. The punctuation of MS 7a1 isolates $\text{אֵל אֲדָחַ וְאֲדָחַ}$ as a discrete clause and marks a division after חָצֵה and another after הַמִּצְבֵּה . This demarcation seems a useful starting point, as one construal of the phrasing.

Taken by itself, $\text{אֵל אֲדָחַ וְאֲדָחַ}$ suffices as a predication. If, however, it is read with what follows, there is a double predication: $\text{אֵל אֲדָחַ וְאֲדָחַ}$ and חָצֵה , the antecedent of whose pronominal suffix is $\text{אֲדָחַ וְאֲדָחַ$, while the subject of both verbs is אֲדָחַ וְאֲדָחַ . Although the most common use of $\text{אֵל אֲדָחַ וְאֲדָחַ}$ with another verbal form is with a participle (e.g., $\text{אֲדָחַ וְאֲדָחַ אֲדָחַ וְאֲדָחַ}$, 7:25), its pleonastic use with finite verb (Nöldeke, §263) is occasionally found, as in $\text{אֵל אֲדָחַ וְאֲדָחַ}$ (10:7, on which see the commentary). Thus here, $\text{אֵל אֲדָחַ וְאֲדָחַ חָצֵה}$ is likely best understood as “This is the people that Assyria did not make into wind.”

Although $\text{אֵל אֲדָחַ וְאֲדָחַ}$ is intelligible as another act by the Assyrians, the subject of חָצֵה is חָצֵה , which does not allow $\text{אֵל אֲדָחַ וְאֲדָחַ}$ to be explained as readily as חָצֵה ... $\text{אֵל אֲדָחַ וְאֲדָחַ}$ cannot be connected with what precedes, because it would then be subject to $\text{אֵל אֲדָחַ וְאֲדָחַ}$, which governs the preceding clause. It seems to be part of a contrast to what stands before, except that one would expect a third feminine singular objective suffix in that case. The only option seems to be reading $\text{אֵל אֲדָחַ וְאֲדָחַ}$ as a full clause, followed by the distinct clause חָצֵה , despite standing in a unit demarcated in the 7a1: “[Assyria] established inquirers: they investigated its towers.” The concluding $\text{אֵל אֲדָחַ וְאֲדָחַ}$ parallels $\text{אֵל אֲדָחַ וְאֲדָחַ}$ earlier, but with a different subject: “And they made them into a ruin.”

This reading is not entirely satisfying but seems the only one defensible. In no detail does it attest a *Vorlage* divergent from MT, while providing a good example of S being perplexed by its source text but not turning to OG for help.

23:14

S used nominal and verbal forms of חן as an equivalent for שׁדד already in 15:1 (2x); 16:4; 21:2 (2x).

23:15

The relationship between καταλειφθήσεται and ונשכחת is not only intuitively clear but exemplified in 17:10's διότι κατέλιπες τὸν θεὸν τὸν σωτῆρά σου || בִּי שִׁכַּחַת אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׁעָךְ. As there, καταλειφθήσεται concretizes “forgetting.” Contrast ἐπιλελησμένη || נשכחה in 23:16.

It is not clear on what grounds Zielger (66) considers +ὥς χρόνος ἀνθρώπου “Spätere Glosse, die sich aus ὥς χρόνος βασιλέως bildete” rather than a repetition of ὥς χρόνος in rendering אחד with ἀνθρώπου, comparable to substitutions such as ὁ ἄνθρωπος || יתד in 22:25 and ἀνθρώπων || גוים in 25:3.

Ziegler (66) is doubtless right to judge καὶ ἔσται⁽²⁾ as a “Wiederholung des καὶ ἔσται 1° als bekannte Einleitungsformel,” which explains the absence of an equivalent for the prefixed *lamed* of לָצַר, since Τύρος is the subject of the preceding ἔσται.

Similarly, S's lack of an equivalent for the prefixed *kaph* of כשירת is likely attributable to its choice to reformulate יהיה לָצַר כשירת הזונה with יהיה (grammatical plural) prior to 23:16's call to perform the song. This seems more straightforward than positing that a verb such as שירו stood in place of יהיה and the prefixed *kaph* of כשירת was lost.

23:16

Although OG's πόλις || עיר lacks any text-critical significance, the inflection is significant for its role as a vocative, with πόρνη ἐπιλελησμένη in apposition. The city, personified as a forgotten harlot (ἐπιλελησμένη || נשכחה,²⁴ in contrast to καταλειφθήσεται || ונשכחת in 23:15) is told to take up the lyre and sing a large repertoire of songs: πολλὰ ᾄσον, a grammatical inversion of הרבי שיר.

καὶ ἔσται μετὰ ἐβδομήκοντα ἔτη κ.τ.λ. will be addressed with 23:17.

24. S's rendering of נשכחה in its role as modifier via prefixed relative pronoun (הַנִּשְׁכַּחַת) is unremarkable.

23:17

This translator's use of ποιέω + a noun to render a verb (ἐπισκοπήν ποιήσῃ || יפקד) is a maneuver attested previously: καὶ κρίσιν ἐκ τῶν ἐχθρῶν μου ποιήσω || אֲנַחֵם מִצָּרֵי || 1:24; τοῦ ὀξέως προνομήν ποιῆσαι σκύλων || לְמַהֵר שָׁלַל || 8:1.

καὶ πάλιν likely renders ושבָה (as in 6:13), while Ottley (2:219) posits that εἰς τὸ ἀρχαῖον (|| לְאַתְנָנָה) might owe to the translator connecting “the word with אִיתָן, which Theodotus renders by ἀρχαῖον in Jerem v. 15, parallel to ἀπ’ αἰῶνος.” This explains not only εἰς τὸ ἀρχαῖον || לְאַתְנָנָה but also why the choice of equivalent differs from καὶ ὁ μισθός || וְאַתְנָנָה in 23:18. In that event, ἀποκατασταθήσεται is likely a second rendering of ושבָה (cf. καὶ ἀπεκατέστησεν || וישָׁב, Gen 40:21; καὶ πάλιν ἀπεκατέστη || וְהָנָה שְׁבָה, Exod 4:7) (cf. Van der Vorm-Croughs, 159). Although Ottley (2:219) posits that εἰς τὸ ἀρχαῖον (|| לְאַתְנָנָה) means something like “to her ancient way,” it seems more likely a reference to her former prominence in trade. ἐμπόριον is more likely a second equivalent for לְאַתְנָנָה than a rendering of וזָנְתָה. As in 23:15, +καὶ ἔσται was supplied by the translator.

Van der Vorm-Croughs (195) rightly places τῆς οἰκουμένης || הָאָרֶץ עַל among examples of condensation by the “reduction of synonymous elements,” although S’s ܐܦܝ ܐܪܥܐ ܕܥܡܡܝܐ ܕܥܠ ܐܪܥܐ raises a question about whether perhaps הָאָרֶץ was absent from its *Vorlage* and (by extension) OG’s as well. The superfluity of terms could attest variants conflation in MT (= 1QIsa^a & 4QIsa^c; V; cf. T’s אַפִּי אֶרְעָא (מְלֻכּוֹת עַמְמֵיָא דְעַל אַפִּי אֶרְעָא)).

23:18

For the neuter declension of ἄγιον || קֹדֶשׁ, compare τὸ ἄγιον || הַקֹּדֶשׁ, 26:13.

With συναχθήσεται || יֵאָצֵר, Van der Vorm-Croughs (169) aptly compares καὶ ὅσα συνήγαγον || וְאַשֶׁר אֵצְרוּ in 39:6 and rightly lists (192) the absence of an equivalent for וְלֹא יִחָסַן among examples of condensation by omission of a verb in a parallel clause. There is little reason to doubt that the translator supplied αὐτοῖς to correspond to ἀλλὰ τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν || כִּי יוֹשְׁבִים, correlative to his omission of an equivalent for יִהְיֶה, allowing συναχθήσεται to serve as the controlling verb for both phrases. Similarly, he is likely responsible for +πᾶσα emphasizing the devotion of ἡ ἐμπορία to the second group exclusively (for his free additions and omissions of the universal quantifier, see appendix A). Even if +καὶ πλεῖν based on לְשִׁתּוֹת in the source text is not unthinkable, it is more likely an expansion correlative to φάγειν || לֹאכַל.

Seeligmann (47) saw in εἰς συμβολήν μνημόσυνον ἔναντι κυρίου || עתִּיק ולמכסה “an echo of Num 31.54, where the statement to the effect of a similar destination being given to the booty of the Midianites finishes on the words” יהוה לבני ישראל לפני יהוה. Van der Kooij elaborates on this by suggesting that “συμβολή reflects Hebrew מכסה (MT = 1Q^a, 4Q^c) in the sense of מְכָסָה, ‘portion, contribution,’” comparing מכס in Num 31:28, 37–41.²⁵ Although that is possible, it is at least noteworthy that each of those six cases is rendered by τέλος, whereas συμβολή is otherwise used in the Pentateuch for a “joint” or “coupling” (|| מחברת in Exod 26:4 [2x], 5, 10; 36:27; תחרא in Exod 28:32; קצות in Exod 36:25), while μηδὲ ἐκτείνου συμβολαῖς κρεῶν renders בזללי בשר in Prov 23:20. Muraoka (*GELS*, s.v. “συμβολή”) suggests that it is in the sense of Prov 23:20, “joint meal,” that it is used here with μνημόσυνον ἔναντι κυρίου to designate a “commemorative” meal. Even if μνημόσυνον ἔναντι κυρίου is reminiscent of Num 31:54 (μνημόσυνον τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ ἔναντι κυρίου || זכרון לבני ישראל לפני יהוה), the notion of a meal is more likely evoked by φαγεῖν καὶ πιεῖν than by a meaning derived from מכסה.

Similarly, Van der Kooij’s adoption of Scholz’s suggestion that “the Hebrew עתִּיק, ‘old,’ was taken in the sense of ‘the Old of Days’, i.e. God, of Dan. 7:9 (עתִּיק יומִין)” relies on too many assumptions to embrace.²⁶ Consequently, little can be said about the Hebrew underlying OG’s εἰς συμβολήν μνημόσυνον ἔναντι κυρίου.

S’s حَلَقَمَس seems to make עתִּיק serve sensibly as the object of حَلَقَمَس, perhaps in the sense of using some of the bounty as clothing for its elderly denizens.

25. Van der Kooij, *The Oracle of Tyre*, 148.

26. Van der Kooij, *The Oracle of Tyre*, 148.

As Goshen-Gottstein (פח) suggests, καὶ ἀνακαλύψει likely reflects a reading וערה, a proposal that traces back to Scholz (40), who compared a similar confusion of ו and ר in 37:26's συνέταξα || ויצרתיה. For ἀνακαλύπτω as equivalent for ערה, compare ἀποκαλύψει || יערה in 3:17.

For OG's expansion of ישביה into τοὺς ἐνοικοῦντας ἐν αὐτῇ following τὴν οἰκουμένην, compare καὶ οἱ ἐνοικοῦντες ἐν αὐτῇ || וישביה following תִּשָּׁב in 40:22.

24:2

Old Greek and Syriac adopt similar strategies for rendering the first five pairs of juxtaposed comparative phrases in this verse (e.g., כעם ככהן),² leaving the first *kaph* untranslated (cf. καὶ ἔσται ὁ δίκαιος ὡς ὁ ἀσεβής/ וְהָיָה כַצְדִּיק כְּרָשָׁע || 18:25). However, for the final pair (כנשה כאשר נשא בו) S provides an equivalent for the *kaph* of כנשה but lacks one for כאשר, whereas OG continues its pattern of translating only the second comparative particle in paired phrases. OG distinguishes itself from S further by lacking an equivalent for the personal pronouns of כַּאֲדָנִי and כַּגִּבְרָתָהּ and adding a conjunction between the first and second paired clauses, as well as between the third and fourth, while it has +ἔσται preceding the third pair. Although it is possible that OG's *Vorlage* read יהיה (or ויהיה), the likelihood seems greater that the translator supplied ἔσται in creating a balanced structure (for OG's insertion of the copula elsewhere, see 8:18; 18:4; 20:3). No other witness attests an explicit predicative construction.

24:3

Both Old Greek and Syriac use the same verbal roots for הבוק תבוק (φθορᾷ φθαρήσεται/ܡܠܬܬܐ ܡܠܬܬܐ) that they use in 24:1 (καταφθείρει/ܡܠܬܬܐ ܡܠܬܬܐ || ܒܘܩܬ).

Old Greek's +ὡ γῆ is likely the translator's explicitation of the subject, as he does frequently elsewhere (see Van der Vorm-Croughs, 47–48), creating a balanced clause structure, similar to supply of +ἔσται in 24:2.

As Ziegler (66) posits, τὸ γὰρ στόμα κυρίου might reflect כִּי פִי in the *Vorlage*, as could also be the case in τὸ γὰρ στόμα κυρίου ἐλάλησε || כִּי

2. Contrast V's rendering of each particle: *sicut* ... *sic*.

יהוה דבר in 25:8.³ Less likely is his suggestion that τὸ γὰρ στόμα reflects a double rendering of כִּי, since this translator needs no stimulant to expand a phrase, particularly to harmonize it with a phrase elsewhere. Especially notable is his rendering of את הדבר הזה דבר כִּי פִי יהוה דבר with ἐλάλησε ταῦτα, just as he supplies ταῦτα in rendering דבר כִּי פִי יהוה דבר in 1:20; 58:14. Although τὸ γὰρ στόμα κυρίου ἐλάλησε ταῦτα might betray harmonization with כִּי פִי elsewhere, as Ottley (2:221) suggested, ὅτι κύριος ἐλάλησε || כִּי פִי יהוה דבר in 40:5 is a countervailing example that leaves the question open.

24:4

Old Greek regularly renders the verb נָבַל, when associated with a noun denoting vegetation, as “cast off” (ἀποβάλλω, 1:30) or “fall off” (ἐκπίπτω, 28:1, 4; 40:7; πίπτω, 34:4; ἐκρέω, 64:5). S’s word choice is often similar (נָבַל, 1:30; 34:4; 64:5; cf. וְעָלָהּ לֹא יָבוּל || וְעָלָהּ לֹא יָבוּל, Ps 1:3), although it also uses the verb מָסַח, “with(er)” (40:7, 8), which it also employs for כָּלָה in 15:6 (מָסַח דְּשֵׂא || כָּלָה דְּשֵׂא). Equally, OG recognizes that אָמַל refers to mourning (cf. πένθῃ, 16:8; 19:8), as it does in its second occurrence here. Accordingly, the choice of ἐφθάρη likely owed not to unfamiliarity with נָבַל but to a sentiment that φθορᾷ φθαρήσεται ἡ γῆ in 24:3 established the import of the imagery, justifying the replacement of verbs for vegetative decay with the concrete notion of destruction. In fact, καὶ ἐφθάρη ἡ οἰκουμένη echoes καταφθείρει τὴν οἰκουμένην in 24:1.

For the idiom נָבַל חַלָּה, compare מָסַח חַלָּה || וְאָנוּ וְאָבְלוּ in 3:26. As Warszawski (43) observes, S’s equivalents point to its reading נָבַל as נָאֲבַלָה, which supports the Leiden edition’s adoption of נָאֲבַלָה in place of נָאֲבַלָה in 7a1. Whether S actually found נָאֲבַלָה in its *Vorlage* or simply worked by association with the foregoing אָבַלָה and the following אָמַלָה cannot be determined, although its rendering of אָמַלָה and אָמַלָה (ו) with מָסַח, the same verb used earlier for אָבַלָה, suggests some lexical harmonization in the verse.

Syriac’s grammatically singular verb מָסַח agrees with אָמַלָה in 1QIsa^a and 4QIsa^c, as well as V’s *infirmata est* (*altitudo populi terrae*), over against the plural form אָמַלְלוּ in MT (cf. OG ἐπένθησαν and T סָפּוּ). Conspicuously absent from both S and OG, however, is an equivalent for עָם.

3. S, V, T, 1QIsa^a, 4QIsa^c, & 4QIsa^f (vid) agree with MT in 24:3, while S, V, 1QIsa^a, and 4QIsa^c agree with MT in 25:8 (T reads כִּי גִזִּיר בִּין).

Scholarship on the Hebrew text has focused on the relationship of *מָרוֹם* to *עַם הָאָרֶץ*. Although the noun *עַם*, serving as subject, can agree with either a grammatically singular or plural verb, that reading makes the role of *מָרוֹם* problematic. Although Wildberger (2:471) posits that *מָרוֹם* could function adverbially, he reasonably finds the resultant clause (“In the heights, the people of the earth wilt”) semantically difficult. Accordingly, he resorts to analyzing *מָרוֹם* as subject, reading *עַם* as a preposition, and adopting the grammatically singular *אֶמְלִל*, since it “is what one would expect with the substantive *מָרוֹם*” (2:470). Blenkinsopp (349–50) takes the same tack, translating the clause, “the highest heaven languishes with the earth.” Van der Kooij endorses Barthélemy’s judgment that MT’s “reading may represent the primary one” if one analyzes *עַם מָרוֹם* “in the sense of people that are in a high position,” for which he compares Job 5:11.⁴ It is not clear how those semantics accord with the word order of *מָרוֹם עַם*; one would expect *עַם מָרוֹם*. Nor does Job 5:11’s *לְשׁוֹם שְׁפִלִים לְמָרוֹם* (τὸν ποιοῦντα ταπεινοὺς εἰς ὕψος) use *מָרוֹם* for a group, particularly given that *יֵשַׁע*, in the parallel clause (וְקֹדְרִים שִׁגְבוּ יֵשַׁע), echoes the function of *לְמָרוֹם*. That said, it remains possible that Old Greek translator construed *עַם מָרוֹם* in that sense.

Talmon suggested that OG’s *Vorlage* lacked *עַם*, as appears the case with S. Although OG’s rendering elsewhere of nouns with adjectives declined in the plural to designate classes of people (e.g., καὶ καταβήσονται οἱ ἔνδοξοι καὶ οἱ μεγάλοι καὶ οἱ πλούσιοι || וירד הדרה והמונה ושאוונה 5:14) makes it unnecessary to assume that *עַם* is presupposed by οἱ ὑψηλοί, this translator can also leave implicit words for humans in an adjectival phrase, as in καὶ οἱ δυνάσται || ואנשי חיל (5:22); ἀναβάτης συνωρίδος || רכב איש צמד (21:9). Equally, his paraphrase of *אֶרֶץ כְּשָׁדִים* זה העם לא היה אשור (23:13 with (καὶ ἐὰν ἀπέλθῃς...) εἰς γῆν Χαλδαίων καὶ αὕτη ἡρήμωται ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀσσυρίων suggests that melding *עַם* with *מָרוֹם* would fit within his range of solutions to problems.⁵ In the end, there is insufficient evidence to posit either the presence or absence of *עַם* in OG’s *Vorlage*.

4. Arie van der Kooij, “The Text of Isaiah and Its Early Witnesses in Hebrew,” in *Sôfer Mahîr: Essays in Honour of Adrian Schenker*, ed. Yohanan Goldman and Richard D. Weis (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 148.

5. Beuken summarily dismisses OG’s rendering as “unter Weglassung von *עַם*” (Willem A. M. Beuken, *Jesaja 13–27*, HThKAT [Freiburg: Herder, 2007], 317). Similarly, Goshen-Gottstein (פט) labels it a condensation. His comparison of διαλλάσσω καρδίας ἀρχόντων γῆς || מִסִּיר לֵב רָאשֵׁי עַם הָאָרֶץ in Job 12:24 entails more precise

On the other hand, the syntax of S's וְעַם undermines speculation that עַם figures in this rendering, compelling the inference that it was absent from the source text. What is more, 1QIsa^a attests עַם (with medial *mem*) as a supralinear correction in the hand of the original copyist, leading Wildberger (2:471) to describe it as “inserted as if the copyist missed it the first time.” However, this characterization needs justification, which neither Wildberger nor others have provided; they simply assume that עַם is original to the text of Isaiah. Although Goshen-Gottstein (פט) notes the similarity to one Kennicott manuscript that lacks עַם, he offers no comment on the case. And no one remarks on the distinctive physical placement of the supralinear addition.

Although the writing of עַם slightly to the left of the position for which it seems intended accords with the distinctive habits of this scribe,⁶ it is elevated above the line to a degree unusual for corrections, even when they stand at the top of a column. Typical, rather, is the close association with the next line seen with אֲדוֹנָיו written in the open space between XXIV, 24–25 and with the substitution (*secunda manu*) of נֹרְאָה above an original רְחוּקָה that has been struck through (XVI, 14), despite additional space above the line, following a *petuhah*. Even the supralinear bold and enlarged *kaph* above XII, 31 (to correct the incomplete הַמֶּלֶךְ) is virtually contiguous with the line beneath it. Letters added supralinearly in the top margin elsewhere are likewise contiguous with the line beneath them, as in the insertion of עַ above וְיִשְׁיֵרוּ and וְ above בִּימֵי in I, 1 and of בְּ above טָרֶם in VII, 1. Here, by contrast, עַם is written a full space above XIX, 1, so that, absent inference from MT, V, and T, its placement would be uncertain.

This anomaly cannot speak for itself but comports with Talmon's conjecture that עַם is a vestige of a doublet to מְרוֹם הָאָרֶץ that “was collated between the lines from a not anymore extant text-type,” after which it was “misconstrued as a corrected omission, and was reinstated in the text proper.”⁷ He concurs with Kutscher's (549) inference that grammatically singular אִמְלֵל “indicates that this is not the chance elision of the word עַם.” Although עַם can have a predicate conjugated in the singular number, the word order makes מְרוֹם the more likely subject.

semantics than οἱ ὑψηλοί || מְרוֹם עַם, insofar as the role of ἀρχόντων implies rule over people, whereas ὑψηλοί, a social category, is not explicitly related to political power.

6. Ulrich and Flint, *Qumran Cave 1*, 2, 64

7. Shemaryahu Talmon, “Aspects of the Textual Transmission of the Bible in the Light of Qumran Manuscripts,” *Textus* 4 (1964): 118–19.

While nothing in this discussion provides insight into the *Vorlage* behind OG's οἱ ὑψηλοὶ τῆς γῆς, there is good reason to perceive in S's אֱלֹהֵי אֲדָמָה a form of the text in which מְרוֹם הָאָרֶץ alone was the subject of grammatically singular אֱמֹלָל.

24:5

Whereas OG's ἡγρόμνησε || חֲנָפָה accords with its use of ἄνομος for חֲנָף in 9:16; 10:6; 32:6 (cf. τοὺς ἄσεβεις || חֲנָפִים, 33:14), Syriac's ܐܠܗܝܬܐ differs from its rendering of חֲנָף with ܣܚܐ (“idolatrous”) in 9:16; 10:6; 33:14 and of חֲנָף with ܠܥܫܘܬܐ with ܣܚܐ in 32:6. Its ܡܢ ܡܪܝܬܐ || חֲנָפָה as complement to the verb increases the curiosity, since its typical equivalents for חֲנָף are ܠܡܠܟܐ/ܠܡܠܟܐ/ܠܡܠܟܐ (3:6; 10:4 [2x]; 14:9, 11; 25:10; 51:6; 57:5 [2x]), ܣܚܐ (3:24 [4x]; 10:16; 43:4 [2x]; 53:12; 55:13 [2x]; 60:15, 17 [4x]; 61:3 [3x], 7). Nevertheless, the translator sometimes chooses equivalents for חֲנָף to fit their contexts. For example, after translating חֲנָף with ܣܚܐ in the first of four phrases stipulating replacement of a commodity with an inferior one in 3:24, he shifts his word choice for the final phrase: ܡܠܟܐ, ܡܠܟܐ || חֲנָף. Similarly, after paraphrasing מְרוֹם הָאָרֶץ with ܡܪܝܬܐ, he renders כּוֹשׁ וְסֹבֵא תַּחְתִּיךְ with words that emphasize priority: ܡܠܟܐ, ܡܠܟܐ (43:3). His translation of וַיִּנְחֲלוּ in 46:7 with ܡܠܟܐ, ܡܠܟܐ appears coordinate with ܡܠܟܐ, ܡܠܟܐ in the companion clause. His choice of ܡܠܟܐ for חֲנָף in rendering חֲנָף in 37:38 befits the idea of succession. Similarly, his choice of prefixed ܡܠܟܐ for חֲנָף here is likely intended to accord with the semantics of ܡܠܟܐ, which becomes the key issue.

Elsewhere in Isaiah ܡܠܟܐ renders a form of דָּמָה (1:19; 10:7; 14:14; 40:18, 25; 46:5). Given the improbability that S's *Vorlage* here read anything like דָּמִיתִי, the likeliest explanation is that, when considered in light of his typical equivalent חֲנָף || ܣܚܐ, the idea of the earth “practicing idolatry” was inscrutable. The notion of the earth being like its inhabitants might well have pressed itself by 24:2's accent on an equal sharing of judgment's effects. This inference seems more likely than Warszawski's (24) speculation that “Pesch. hat wohl חֲנָף gelesen und diese Stelle so aufgefasst: und das Land ging an die Stelle seiner Bewohner, d. h. wurde ihnen gleich.”

Even though OG was able to comprehend חֲנָפָה via its usual semantics (ἡγρόμνησε), its rendering of חֲנָף with διὰ τοὺς κατοικοῦντας αὐτῆν entails a shift of the preposition to make the complement accord with the

verb, as in 10:16's *καὶ εἰς τὴν σὴν δόξαν πῦρ καιόμενον καυθήσεται* || תחת כבודו יקד יקד כבודו, coordinate with *ἀποστελεῖ κύριος σαβαωθ εἰς τὴν σὴν τιμὴν ἀτιμίαν* || ישלח האדון יהוה צבאות במשמנו ריון. Equally clear evidence of a struggle to comprehend this clause is V's *et terra interfecta est ab habitatoribus suis*.

Old Greek's alteration of the grammatical number with *τὸν νόμον καὶ ... τὰ προστάγματα* (|| תורת ... חק) likely conforms them to the typical inflection of each among the translators (e.g., Deut 4:8; 17:19; 2 Kgs 17:37; Amos 2:4), even if תורה is attested by 4QIsa^c. S (according to the orthography of 7a1) renders both תורת and חק in the singular.

ܐܠܗ is Syriac's equivalent for פֶּרַר throughout Isaiah (8:10; 14:27; 33:8; 44:25), for which OG-Isaiah elsewhere gives an equivalent (*διασκεδάνυμι* in 8:10, 14:27, and 44:25; *αἴρεται* appears the equivalent for הפֶּר in 33:8). There is no apparent graphic trigger for haplography here, nor is the verb absent from any other textual tradition. Van der Vorm-Croughs (211) is likely right to categorize this among the many examples of "distributive rendering of the verb phrase," in which the translator omits an equivalent for a verb because its semantic function is filled by a verb in an adjacent clause. In this case, *διαθήκην αἰώνιον* might have been considered an epitome for *τὸν νόμον καὶ ... τὰ προστάγματα*, whose violation was already expressed by *παρέβησαν* and *ἤλλαξαν*.

24:6

Although OG frequently renders initial *waw* with *ὅτι* (e.g., 2:2; 9:20[19]), *ὅτι* also often lacks a Hebrew counterpart (e.g., 9:21[20]; 10:24; 20:4). Compare 15:4, where *ὅτι κέκραγεν* *Εσεβων καὶ Ελεαλη* || חשבון ואלעלה || ותזעק חשבון ואלעלה subordinates the clause to the imperatives in the preceding verse, providing their motivation (cf. 6:10). Similarly here, *ὅτι* is explicative, anaphoric to *διὰ τοῦτο*, with *ἡμάρτοσαν οἱ κατοικοῦντες αὐτήν* correlate to *ἡνόμησε διὰ τοὺς κατοικοῦντας αὐτήν* in 24:5.

Given Syriac's consistent equivalent *ܐܠܗ* || על כן elsewhere (5:25; 9:16; 13:7, 13; 15:4, 7; 16:9, 11; 17:10; 21:3; 22:4), including the second occurrence of על כן in this verse and again in 24:15, Warszawski's (43) perception that "Pes. hat אֱלֹהָ אֲבִלָה || על כן" is compelling, including the inference that its source text read אֲבִלָה. On the other hand, S's rendering of initial לכן (for which it typically uses *ܠܟܢ* || *ܠܟܢ*) in 30:18's *ܠܟܢ ܝܚܝܬܝܢ ܝܗܘܐ ܠܚܢܢܟܡ* || *ܠܟܢ ܝܚܝܬܝܢ ܝܗܘܐ ܠܚܢܢܟܡ* leaves open the possibility that *ܠܟܢ* simply condenses *ܐܠܗ* || על כן אלה.

The only other occurrence of אשם in Isaiah is 53:10, where S translates אשם תשים אשם נפשו with أشهم سألهم صفعه , one of S's most common equivalents for אשם. The rendering of ויאשמו with أشهم here is unparalleled, and the Leiden edition corrects it to أشهم , which renders אשם elsewhere (e.g., أشهم || ויאשמו, Lev 4:13). Nevertheless, the graphic similarity is marginal enough to seek an explanation of what triggered the change. Although أشهم recalls أشهم in 24:1 and أشهم || הבוק תבוק הארץ in 24:3, it is unclear why those forms should have triggered graphic confusion here. Noteworthy is the balance between this clause and the next by أشهم in each, unattested in any other witness and not in an environment where the universal quantifier is commonplace and thus likely to spur a scribal addition (see appendix A, pp. 519–20). The likelihood that the translator thus created balanced clauses makes it likely that أشهم || ויאשמו and أشهم || חרו are his choices. Although OG, V, and T also appear to have guessed at the meaning of the *hapax* חרו (πτωχοὶ ἔσσονται , *insanient*, ספו), the semantic agreement between S's verbs in these clauses points to the translator intuiting the verse's meaning from the context.

Despite Old Greek's ἐθιμώθη || חרה in 5:25—a common equivalent in the Greek Bible (e.g., Gen 30:2; 39:19; 44:18)—the translator shows uncertainty about the meaning of חרו here, apparently offering πτωχοὶ ἔσσονται as a guess at what sort of a depleted state would befit those ἄνθρωποι ὀλίγοι who survive.⁸ They stand over against οἱ ὑψηλοὶ τῆς γῆς who lament the plundered land (24:4) and πάντες οἱ εὐφραινόμενοι τὴν ψυχὴν (24:7), the end of whose joy correlates with πέπνυται αὐθάδεια καὶ πλοῦτος ἀσεβῶν (24:8).

Although أشهم might attest ונשארו in S's source text, the translator's path to rendering other components of the verse make it likely that he conformed the grammatical number of the verb to the collective אנוש מוזהר, as did OG (καταλειφθήσονται) and V (*et relinquentur*).

24:7

Warszawski's (43) judgment that חרה "verallgemeinert" תירוש is unsupported. Although חרה regularly translates דגן in the word pair דגן ותירוש

8. Similar perplexity underlies οὐ νῦν αἰσχυνθήσεται Ἰακωβ οὐδὲ νῦν τὸ πρόσωπον μεταβαλεῖ Ἰσραὴλ || פניו יחורו || לא עתה יבוש יעקב ולא עתה פניו יחורו in 29:22; καὶ ἐντραπήσονται πάντες οἱ ἀντικείμενοί σοι || ויכלמו כל הנחרים בך in 41:11; καὶ αἰσχυνθήσονται πάντες οἱ ἀφορίζοντες ἑαυτούς || ויבשו כל הנחרים בך in 45:24.

(e.g., $\text{סְמִימָה} \parallel \text{חֲבֵיבִים}$, 36:17), דָּגָן וְתִירוֹשׁ appears again only in Hos 9:2.⁹ S's standard equivalent for תִּירוֹשׁ otherwise is סִמְכָן (e.g., Gen 27:28, 37; Deut 7:13),¹⁰ as occurs in 62:8. תִּירוֹשׁ appears again in Isaiah in 65:8, where S translates $\text{כֹּאשֶׁר יִמְצָא הַתִּירוֹשׁ בְּאֶשְׁכּוֹל}$ with סְמִימָה , evidently choosing סְמִימָה , "berry" as a concretization of the material in the cluster.¹¹ The only cases that fit the category of "generalization" in rendering תִּירוֹשׁ are $\text{לֹא מִכְמַל אֵל אֲבִימִי}$ in Judg 9:13 and $\text{אֲכַל וְאָבֵל סִיחָה}$ in 1 Kgs 18:32, where the equivalents are generic terms for fruit. Given these usages, חֲבֵיבִים is not a generalization but a substitution of the other member of the word pair, דָּגָן , either by the translator or (more likely) a scribe who wrote it as a reflex from familiarity with the phrase. If that is valid, then S's source text would have read אֲבֵל דָּגָן .

The grammatically plural forms סְמִימָה likely elaborate the collective גֶּפֶן .

24:8

As Ziegler (66) suggests, $\alpha\upsilon\theta\acute{\alpha}\delta\epsilon\iota\alpha \text{ και } \pi\lambda\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ is likely a double rendering of שָׂאוֹן . Notably, the translator renders וְשָׂאוֹנָה with οἱ πλούσιοι in 5:14, while translating שָׂאוֹנוֹת with πλούσιοι in 32:9 (μετὰ πλούτου in 32:18) and שָׂאוֹן with πλουσία in 33:20.

Although $\alpha\upsilon\theta\acute{\alpha}\delta\epsilon\iota\alpha$ occurs only here in the Bible, $\alpha\upsilon\theta\acute{\alpha}\delta\eta\varsigma$ renders עַו in Gen 49:3, 7, while $\text{θρασὺς και } \alpha\upsilon\theta\acute{\alpha}\delta\eta\varsigma \text{ και } \acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\zeta\acute{\omega}\nu \text{ λοιμὸς καλεῖται}$ renders $\text{וְזֶה יִהְיֶה לְךָ שְׁמוֹ}$ in Prov 21:24. Although Fox judges, in the latter case, that "G compounds the offenses of the pest by adding $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\zeta\acute{\omega}\nu$,"¹² it is notable that ἀνῆρ ἄλαζών renders גִּבּוֹר יִהְיֶה in Hab 2:5, the only other appearance of יִהְיֶה in the Bible. In that light, $\text{και } \acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\zeta\acute{\omega}\nu$ might be the equivalent for יִהְיֶה in Prov 21:24, while $\text{θρασὺς και } \alpha\upsilon\theta\acute{\alpha}\delta\eta\varsigma$ is a double rendering of זֶה ,

9. Otherwise סִמְכָן is the standard rendering of דָּגָן וְתִירוֹשׁ (Gen 27:28, 37; Deut 7:13; 11:14; 12:17; 14:23; 18:4; 28:51; 33:28; Jer 31:12; Hos 2:10, 11, 24; 7:14; Joel 1:10; 2:19), although the words are transposed in Num 18:12 ($\text{חֲבֵיבִים וְסִמְכָן}$). (וכל חלב תירוש ודגן || סִמְכָן).

10. סִמְכָן otherwise renders only שָׂמֶן in Isaiah (1:6; 39:2; 41:19; 57:9; 61:3), as it does in other books, where it also translates יֶצֶהָר (e.g., Num 8:12; Deut 7:13; 11:14).

11. Compare סִמְכָן וְסִמְכָן in Hos 4:11, where סִמְכָן elaborates wine's effects.

12. Fox, *Proverbs*, 295.

correlating with translation of זדון by ὑπερηφανία (Deut 17:12; Obad 3), ἀσεβεία (Deut 18:22), and ὕβρις (Jer 27:32 [50:32]; Ezek 7:10), as well as the verb זיד with ἀσεβέω in Deut 17:13; 18:20, with which resonates καὶ ἀπολῶ ὕβριν ἀνόνμων καὶ ὕβριν ὑπερηφάνων ταπεινώσω || והשבתי גאון זדים in Isa 13:11. Although that is the lone instance of זד in Isaiah (זדון does not occur), it underlies the diagnosis of ד/ר confusion in τῶν ἀσεβῶν πόλις εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα οὐ μὴ οἰκοδομηθῇ || זרים מעיר לעולם לא in 25:2; ἀνθρώπων ἀσεβῶν || זרים in 25:5; and ὁ πλοῦτος τῶν ἀσεβῶν || יבנה in 29:5. The most tenable explanation of the translator's choice of αὐθάδεια in his translation of שאן, as Van der Vorm-Croughs (148) posits, is that he associated it with either שאנן, in the sense of being at ease (cf. ὑπνώσει || שאנן in Jer 26[46]:27; ἀνεπαύσατο in Jer 31[48]:11; ἡσυχάσει in Prov 1:33) or with נשא.

Old Greek's choice of ἀσεβῶν || עליזים in this context accords with its equivalents χαίροντες ἅμα καὶ ὑβρίζοντες || עליי גאוחי in 13:3 and οὐχ αὐτῇ ἦν ὑμῶν ἡ ὕβρις ἡ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς || לכה עליזה מימי קדם in 23:7. Equally, ἀσεβῆς renders diverse words in Isaiah, including זרים in 25:2, 5; 29:5, פריצים in 28:21, and חנפים in 33:14.

Old Greek and Syriac show the same impulse to substitute a word meaning "voice" for lexemes in these clauses. Although the Greek translator is willing to use the same Greek equivalent more than once in a verse (see Ziegler, 17–21), he can also omit synonyms in paired phrases or clauses (see Van der Vorm-Croughs, 188–90), and sometimes he varies his word choices (e.g., πολεμῆσαι || למלחמה but also πολιορκῆσαι || להלחם in 7:2). Rendering שבת משוש with πέπαιται φωνῇ κιθάρας is unlikely an attempt to avoid repetition, since πέπαιται is the same form used for שבת earlier in the verse. Rather, his choice of φωνῇ for משוש seems determined by כנור, much as his rendering of כנהמת with ὡς φωνῇ in 5:30 relates to the preceding καὶ βοήσεται || וינהם (cf. καὶ βοήσει || וינהם, 5:29) and the closely bound ים (ὡς φωνῇ θαλάσσης || כנהמת ים), even as the image of a trumpet sounding seems to have led to the substitution of φωνῇ for וכתקע in 18:3's ὡς σάλπιγγος φωνῇ ἀκουστὸν ἔσται || ובתקע שופר תשמעו.

Syriac's choice of "voice" is rooted in its rendering of the preceding phrase, שאן עליזים. This has precedent in the multiple uses of ܡܠܐ in 17:12, first in the creation of the relative clause ܡܠܐ ܡܢ ܡܠܐ, to modify ܡܠܐ ܡܢ ܡܠܐ (|| עמים רבים; see the comments at 17:12). That appears based on perceiving that the people's ܡܠܐ (ܡܠܐ ܡܢ ܡܠܐ, ܡܠܐ ܡܢ ܡܠܐ) is manifest in their uproar, whose force is defined in the verse's final clause: ܡܠܐ ܡܢ ܡܠܐ, where ܡܠܐ is the equivalent for שאן, as here.

יָגֵל appears again in 24:11, where יָגֵל, יָגֵל translates מְשׁוֹשׁ הָאָרֶץ (cf. 65:18), once again to forecast its disappearance, with the phrase חָלַח מִן־הָאָרֶץ used there just as it is in the accompanying clauses here. Elsewhere יָגֵל renders nominal and verbal forms of גִּיל (16:10; 35:2) and שִׁשׂוֹן (51:3). Since S renders every other instance of עֲלִיזָה/עֲלִיזָה in Isaiah with a form of חָלַח (5:14; 13:3; 22:2; 23:7, 12; 32:13), יָגֵל here is most likely a lexical substitute chosen for compatibility with מְשׁוֹשׁ || מְשׁוֹשׁ in the previous and the following clauses.

24:9

ἡσχύνθησαν likely reflects biliteral association of בָּשִׁיר with בּוֹשׁ, a maneuver evident throughout the book (see already the discussion of παύσεται || אָנַח via association with נֹחַ in 1:24). Although Goshen-Gottstein's (צ) proposed retroversion to בָּשׁוּ invokes conceivable graphic errors, no other witness attests a form of בּוֹשׁ. On the other hand, the notion of experiencing shame befits OG's emphasis on the diminishing of the impious in 24:8.

Twice elsewhere OG insinuates the notion of shame as punishment. In rendering ἡσχύνθησαν with ἡ αἰσχύνῃ τοῦ προσώπου αὐτῶν ἀντέσθαι αὐτοῖς in 3:9, the translator's choice of ἡ αἰσχύνῃ more likely owes to the preceding δόξα αὐτῶν ἡ δόξα αὐτῶν (|| עֲנִי כְבוֹדוֹ) than to a *Vorlage* reading חֲפֵרָה in place of הֲכָרָה (*pace* Ziegler, 107). Likewise, in rendering the reproach of the "Daughter of the Chaldeans" (47:5–15), the Greek translator cites as the reason for the addressee's imminent comeuppance her reliance on magic and charmers: αἰσχύνῃ σου ἔσθαι σου αἰσχύνῃ || רָאִנִי חֲכָמָתְךָ וְדַעְתְּךָ הִיא שׁוֹבְבָתְךָ (47:10).¹³ αἰσχύνῃ || שׁוֹבְבָתְךָ has no parallel in books of the Hebrew Bible translated into Greek. Similarly, association of בָּשִׁיר with בּוֹשׁ in 24:9, following the assertion that the impious will be bereft of their autonomy, wealth, and celebration, likely accounts for ἡσχύνθησαν.

The omission of an equivalent for the suffixed pronoun of לְשִׁיתוֹ (τοῖς πίνουσιν) accords with this translator's tendency to leave the object implicit by omitting a pronominal object (Van der Vorm-Croughs, 77–78).

13. Whether OG read כִּי דַעִי or (more likely) construed רָאִנִי in a way similar to his rendering of יַחְזִיק יַחְזִיק בָּל with αὐτὸς ἔδειξεν in 26:11, he evidently read וְדַעְתְּךָ.

Both Old Greek and Syriac may have been swayed by תהו in their renderings of נשברה. OG's ἡρημώθη is anomalous as an equivalent for נשברה but explicable if chosen with a view to תהו. OG's equivalents for תהו elsewhere include κενός (45:19), μάταιος (44:9; 45:19; 49:4; 59:4), and μάτην (41:29). Nowhere else in the Bible does ἡρημώω translate שבר, whose most common equivalent is συντρίβω, as it is in Isaiah. On the other hand, ἡρημώθη resonates with σπαρτίον γεωμετρίας ἐρήμου || קו תהו in 34:11, making conceivable that the translator did not simply omit תהו (*pace* Ottley, 2:221) but relied on its semantics in choosing ἡρημώθη.

Unlike OG's ἡρημώθη, there is no clear semantic evidence that S chose ܠܠܠ' with a view to תהו, even though תהו has no apparent equivalent. On the other hand, S commonly uses ܕܢ for דדש, as in describing the destruction of Tyre in 23:1, 14. At a minimum, the choice of ܠܠܠ' specifies the kind of “breaking” that applies to a city.

Although OG frequently supplies the quantifier $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\zeta$, in this case it seems to have shifted its equivalent for כָּל in the second clause to the first. This transposition seems more likely, on the face of it, than either an intentional or unintentional shift of כָּל in Hebrew. Although there are plusses and minuses of כָּל in Hebrew tradition and כָּל stands in a different word

16. Compare נטה || מלב |חל| מח |סח| in Deut 32:10 (cf. נטה || חסח|ח| in Job 26:7). Other than transliterations of תהו in Gen 1:2 and Jer 4:23, the only other equivalent used is בתהו || חלסח| in Ps 107:40; Job 6:18; 12:24.

order in **לחלל גאון כל צבי** of 1QIsa^a (versus **כל צבי** of MT) at Isa 23:9, transposing **כל** between two clauses would be an unusual move for scribes.

Because *παῖσαν οἰκίαν* would be an apt parallel to *παῖσα πόλις*, positing that the translator omitted **כל** before **בית** is implausible. A more likely scenario is that OG's *Vorlage* lacked **כל** in either slot, and the translator supplied *παῖσα* before *πόλις*, as he does in 25:4's *ἐγένου γὰρ πάση πόλει ταπεινῇ βοηθός* || **בי היית מעון לדל מעון**.

Although *κλείσει* is transparent to **סגר**, the choice of the future tense is inscrutable, and even though S's lexical choice of **س** for **סגר** is not unique (cf. 26:20; 45:1; 60:11), its conjugation of it in the grammatical plural is likely tied to its choice to render the subject (**س**) as plural. Warszawski's (43) inference about the rendering of **בית מבוא** is reasonable: "Pesch. hat wohl übersetzt: 'jedes Haus, in welches hineingebracht wird', oder sie hat vielleicht **תבואה** statt **מבוא** gelesen." Neither explanation seems more probable than the other.

24:11

In each of its eleven other occurrences in the book, *ὀλολύζω* translates **לל** (*ὀλολύξατε* || **האליל** in 10:10 reflects association with **לל**), while *יצוחו* in 42:11 is rendered with *βοήσουσιν*, and *κραυγή* renders every instance of the noun **צוהה** (Jer 14:2; 26[46]:12; Ps 143[144]:14). Syriac's **ܐܠܠܐ**, on the other hand, is the same equivalent used in Jer 46:12; Ps 144:14 (although *יצוחו* in Isa 42:11 is rendered as **ܡܚܝܐ**). Therefore, despite the striking semantic similarity between *ὀλολύζετε* and **ܐܠܠܐ**, only OG's choice is remarkable. Equally distinctive is that, whereas S's nominal form accords with **צוהה**, OG's *ὀλολύζετε* shifts to a second-person plural imperative. Although such grammatical shifts are common in this translator, it seems likely part of the explanation of his lexical choice, insofar as perceiving a summons to hearers led to characterizing the outcry expected regarding the wine, which 24:9 suggested had failed.

πανταχῇ occurs only here in Greek translations of Hebrew Bible books. It is explicable as an extrapolation from the common equivalent for **חן**, *ἐξω*, which the translator uses in 42:2; 51:23 and which is the dominant equivalent for **חן** in the Penateuch (50/53x). The lament is to be undertaken outside, without limits.

Old Greek's *πέπαιται* reprises the verb used in *πέπαιται εὐφροσύνη* || **משוש** in 24:8, even as Syriac's **ܡܫܝܚܐ** takes up again the

phrasing it used twice in 24:8, חֲכָלָא בְּיָמָיו. In each case, the substitution for עָרְבָה likely reflects uncertainty over the verb (cf. νῦν μείχθητε τῷ κυρίῳ μου τῷ βασιλεῖ Ἀσσυρίων/לִישׁוֹל מְחַל חַם מִבְּחַל לִישׁוֹל מְחַל || וְעַתָּה הִתְעַרְבָה נָא || אֶת אֲדָנִי הַמֶּלֶךְ אֲשׁוּר, 36:8; πρὸς τὸν κύριον, ὃς ἐξείλατό με/מִן הַכּוֹחַ הַזֶּה הַיּוֹמָה || אֲדָנִי עֲשֶׂה לִּי עֲרֵבָנִי, 38:14).

Old Greek's tendency to omit synonymous words and phrases makes its lack of specific equivalents for גִּלָּה מְשׁוּשׁ unremarkable.

24:12

Old Greek's reformulation of נִשְׁאָר בְּעִיר שְׁמָה with καὶ καταλειφθήσονται πόλεις ἔρημοι is chaste by comparison with its other reformulations that describe the fate of cities and their inhabitants,¹⁷ including the next clause: καὶ οἴκοι ἐγκαταλελειμμένοι ἀπολοῦνται || וְשִׂאִיה יִכָּת שַׁעַר. After surveying possible corruptions of יִכָּת שַׁעַר וְשִׂאִיה offered to explain the rendering, Ziegler (145) concluded, “Die Wiedergabe der LXX ist vielmehr hier unter dem Einfluß des Parallelismus entstanden,”¹⁸ noting that +οἴκοι might have arisen by inspiration from the collocation of “city” and “house” in 6:11 and 24:10, while also pointing to the similarity to ἔσσονται αἱ πόλεις σου ἐγκαταλελειμμέναι καὶ ἔσονται ἔρημοι || יִהְיוּ עָרֵי מַעֲזוֹ כְּעִזּוֹבָת || כִּי אֲרָמוֹן נִטַּשׁ הַמּוֹן עִיר in 17:9. Particularly comparable, as Ziegler (144) notes, is 32:14's οἴκοι ἐγκαταλελειμμένοι πλοῦτον πόλεως καὶ οἴκους ἐπιθυμητοὺς ἀφήσουσι || כִּי אֲרָמוֹן נִטַּשׁ הַמּוֹן עִיר, where οἴκοι is extrapolated from אֲרָמוֹן, an equivalent unexampled elsewhere (ἐγκαταλείπω translates נִטַּשׁ again in 16:8).¹⁹ As Ziegler (145) acknowledges, certainty is unattainable, but the hypothesis of reformulation, given this translator's habits elsewhere, seems more plausible than Ottley's (2:222) speculation that “ἀπολοῦνται, though brought to the end of the verse, may represent שִׂאִיה, the participle may

17. Compare ὅτι ἔθνης πόλεις εἰς χῶμα || כִּי שְׁמַת מְעִיר לָגַל, 15:2. On occasion the translator insinuates πόλεις, as in καὶ καταπατεῖν τὰς πόλεις καὶ θεῖναι αὐτὰς εἰς κονιορτόν || וְלִישְׁמוֹ מִרְמָס כַּחֲמֵר חוּצוֹת in 10:6 and ὀλοῦντε πύλαι πόλεων κεκραγέτωσαν πόλεις τεταραγμέναι || הַיְלִילִי שַׁעַר זַעֲקִי עִיר נִמוּג in 14:31.

18. In a *Nachtrag* to his book, Ziegler (214) similarly discounted Rudolph's proposal that the *Vorlage* read שַׁעַר בֵּית וְשִׂאִיה: “LXX hat jedoch hier nur frei im Anschluß an den vorausgehenden Satzteil übersetzt.”

19. Although one might initially suspect that τῶν ἀσεβῶν πόλεις in 25:2 (q.v.) renders אֲרָמוֹן זִרִים, further consideration aligns πόλεις with מְעִיר⁽²⁾, while τὰ θεμέλια is the equivalent for אֲרָמוֹן, as it is elsewhere (e.g., Jer 6:5; Amos 1:4, 12, 14).

be שער for שער gate, and οἶμαι suggests בתי for יכת 'is smitten.'" Although each of these posited misreadings is possible in isolation, it is unclear how proposing them in aggregate puts us on firmer ground than Ziegler's surmise that the translator worked under the influence of motifs and themes he shows interest in elsewhere.

Although elsewhere S renders שמה with שחל (5:9; 13:9; cf. Jer 2:15; 4:7; 25:18), its choice of שחל here uniquely in Isaiah (למסל and שחל are the prime equivalents for שמה throughout the Bible, but cf. חסל מסל || ופנימ חסל מסל || אפרים לשמה תהיה in Hos 5:9) is intelligible from the translator's reliance on vocabulary earlier in this passage, in this case מלסכח למסל || הבוק || מלסכח למסל in 24:3 and ויאשמו || מלסכח למסל in 24:6.

The translator's supply of the explicitizing pronoun in לעחם || שער (anaphoric to חסל) is exemplified elsewhere (e.g., יקד || חסל, 10:16; חסל || באדיר, 10:33). Here it was likely compelled by the construal of שאיה as the subject of יכת, analyzed as in the active voice.

24:13

Although it is possible that ταῦτα πάντα ἔσται || בי כה יהיה reflects haplography of בי, OG frequently omits בי at the outset of a clause, including before כה (see appendix C). Whereas the translator's most frequent equivalent for כה is οὕτως (33x), he often uses τᾷδε (17x), a lexeme frequently used in Greek reports of decrees by Persian kings.²⁰ ταῦτα is an allied demonstrative, here modified by the quantifier πάντα, which is frequently supplied by the translator (see appendix A). The effect of these choices is to cap the preceding list of calamities with a summarizing statement, a perception that is reinforced by the translator's rendering of כעוללת with καλαμῆσονται αὐτούς (see below).

S has its own pattern of diminishing the force of בי (see appendix C), whether by rendering it with simple waw (9x) or unusual equivalents such as חסל (29:16; 36:19), ו (7:9), and לו (30:21), each of which seems chosen for the connection between phrases the translator perceived. It lacks an equivalent for בי twelve times, three in agreement with OG, including here (cf. 8:11; 49:19). Although בי might have been lacking in S's source text (as in 8:11, q.v.), its omission has no significant effect on חסל, making it equally possible that the translator omitted an equivalent.

20. See BDAG, s.v. "ὅδε."

As Van der Vorm-Crouchs (127) documents, OG regularly omits an equivalent for *בקרב הארץ* in the phrase *בקרב הארץ*.

Since elsewhere the translator appears to have supplied *οὕτως* as corollary to the preceding comparative clause (cf. 17:12; 27:7 [2x]), his use of it for the comparative *kaph* of *כעוללת* is unremarkable.

Syriac renders *כעוללת* with a comparative particle and a verbal noun (*ܟܥܘܠܠܬܐ*), to which it subordinates its equivalent for *אם בלה* as a temporal clause (*ܟܕ ܕܡܕܐ*). Although Old Greek's rendering of the infinitive construct with a conjugated verb (*καλαμήσονται*) is unsurprising,²¹ the choice of the third-person plural and the supply of *αὐτούς* are notable. To this point the translator has focused on the effects of judgment on people, cities, and produce. Although *αὐτούς* is anaphoric to the group implied by *ἐν μέσῳ τῶν ἐθνῶν*, the choice of a transitive verb in the third-person plural implies otherwise-unidentified agents.²² The likely solution to this conundrum relates to *οὗτοι* at the outset of 24:14, whose referent must be understood as the subject of *καλαμήσονται*. Given that the subjects in 24:14 are beneficiaries of judgment rather than agents and that *ταῦτα πάντα ἔσται κτλ* transitions from the list of afflictions to a summary, the role of the subjects of *καλαμήσονται* is to despoil those now devastated.

24:14

Although *οὗτοι* || *המה* seems unremarkable, this equivalent appears again only in 66:3. Otherwise the pronoun is left implicit in the conjugation of the verb it serves (9:20; 44:11; 63:8), is rendered as subject with *αὐτοί* (63:10) or with the copula (e.g., *ἦσαν* in 37:19; cf. 56:11; 65:23). *οὗτοι* distinctively invokes the subject of *καλαμήσονται* for *βοήσονται*.

In every other reference to “raising” *קוּ*, OG employs the phrasing *ὑψώσατε τὴν φωνήν* (13:2; 37:23; 40:9; 42:8; 58:1). *βοάω* is used for a variety of verbs, most frequently *קרא* but also *פצח* (2x), *רוע* (2x), *זעק* (1x),

21. *καλαμάομαι* occurs in Isaiah only here and in 3:12, where it rendered *לל* (so also in Judg 20:45; Jer 6:9). Use of the verb in the first instance for *נקר* is singular but likely reflects the translator's difficulty translating *נקר* noted already in 10:34. Especially comparable is his rendering of *שנים שלשה זית כנקר* with *καταλειφθῇ ἐν αὐτῇ καλάμη ἢ ὡς ῥῶγες ἐλαίας δύο ἢ τρεῖς* in 17:6.

22. The only agent previously identified was *ἀρὰ ἔδεται τὴν γῆν* (24:6), implying divine action, as stated explicitly in 24:1: *κύριος καταφθεῖρει τὴν οἰκουμένην καὶ ἐρημώσει αὐτήν ... καὶ διασπερεί τοὺς ἐνοικοῦντας ἐν αὐτῇ*.

קעק (1x), צהל (1x), הגה (1x), and for הומיה in 22:2. As anomalous as φωνῇ βοήσονται || יִשְׂאוּ קוֹלָם is in Isaiah, it finds a parallel in καὶ βοήσας τῇ φωνῇ αὐτοῦ || וַיִּשְׂאוּ אֶת קוֹלָם in Gen 29:11 and καὶ βοήσαντες φωνῇ || וַיִּשְׂאוּ קוֹלָם in Job 2:12 (cf. ἀνεβόησεν φωνὴν Ἡσαυ || וַיִּשְׂא עֲשׂו קוֹלָם, Gen 27:38).

As Ziegler (60) noted, +οἱ δὲ καταλειφθέντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς as subject recalls 13:12, where +οἱ καταλειμμένοι elaborates an understanding of אָנוּשׁ as subject of the clause, followed by 13:14, where οἱ καταλειμμένοι is supplied as subject. Seeligmann (116), for his part, noted the similar wording of this plus to καὶ οἱ καταλειφθέντες πληθυνθήσονται ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς || וְרַבָּה הָעֲזוּבָה בְּקֶרֶב הָאָרֶץ in 6:12. Both Ziegler (139) and Seeligmann (117) noted the influence of 6:12 on the rendering καὶ κατακληρονομήσουσι καὶ πληθυνθήσονται ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς τοῦ θεοῦ || וְהַתְנַחֲלוּם בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל עַל אֲדַמַּת יְהוָה in 14:2 (see the comments there). There is little reason to doubt that the translator has drawn from there οἱ δὲ καταλειφθέντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς as the subject for this clause as well.

δόξα previously rendered גָּאוֹן in 14:11 (ἡ δόξα σου || גָּאוֹנְךָ), and τὴν δόξαν κυρίου translates יְהוָה גָּאוֹן in 26:10. ἅμα rendered the preposition *bet* previously in 3:16; 19:14.

As discussed at 3:12, the translator employs τάρασσω twelve times, each time for a different Hebrew word (cf. 24:19, below). Here παραχθήσεται || וְצָהַל contrasts with ἀγαλλιᾶσθε καὶ εὐφραίνεσθε || וְרִנִּי וְצָהַל in 12:6 and εὐφράνθητι στεῖρα ἢ οὐ τίκτουςα ῥῆξον καὶ βόησον || וְרִנִּי וְצָהַל in 54:1, since וְצָהַל collocates with רִנָּה, and the translator recognized וְצָהַל as a verbal act. The choice of παραχθήσεται creates a dramatic context for the appearance of the glory of the Kyrios ἐν ταῖς νήσοις ... τῆς θαλάσσης in 24:15.²³ That motif might also have triggered +τῆς θαλάσσης as a natural qualifier for ὕδωρ, perhaps as a double rendering of מִים. This seems more likely than supposing that מִי יָם stood in his source text, even if that cannot be precluded.

24:15

Old Greek and Syriac treat בארִים differently, with the former lacking a clear equivalent in a slot aligned with its position in Hebrew. Goshen-Gottstein's (צא) perception that حاسه is a guess to coordinate with its كبدو || כבדו is more plausible than Warszawski's (43) proposed variant בשירים.

23. δόξα rendered גָּאוֹן in 14:11, and τὴν δόξαν κυρίου translates יְהוָה גָּאוֹן in 26:10.

The proposal that ἐν ταῖς νήσοις is a substitution for בארים based on ם באי הים (Ottley, 2:222; cf. Goshen-Gottstein, צא) seems a less likely explanation than beginning from OG's rendering of יהוה כבדו as the subject of the clause, to which it supplied the copula, ἔσται.²⁴ Although +ἐνδοξον ἔσται at the end of the verse might be a free supplement to accord with the theme, it is possible that this is its (postponed) equivalent for בארים via association with פאר, for which compare τοὺς ἐνδόξους || פארה, 10:33; ἐνδοξον εἶναι || פארך, 60:9.

24:16

Old Greek's Κύριε ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραὴλ takes up יהוה אלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל from the end of 24:15, rendering יהוה a second time, having first used it in the phrase τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου || שם יהוה in 24:15. Although one might posit that the translator inferred יהוה as an implicit adjunct for שם, that inference is facilitated by juxtaposed יהוה itself. In terms of OG's *Vorlage*, there is no sound reason to posit two occurrences of יהוה.

Unsurprisingly, both Old Greek and Syriac decline their equivalents for the noun כנף (מ) in the grammatical plural, in effect understanding כנף as a collective: ἀπὸ τῶν πτερύγων/ܡܢ ܡܦܝܠܬܝܢ. Syriac's addition of the pronoun is unremarkable.

In 8:18; 20:3 τέρας translates מופת, and in 28:29 τὰ τέρατα renders הפליא. Conversely, OG renders זמרה with αἴνεσις in 12:2; 51:3, while its rendering of זמיר in 25:5 is obscured by difficulty aligning Greek equivalents with Hebrew words. These data support the inference that the translator chose τέρατα to characterize the content of זמרת, with the phrase ἐλπίς τῷ εὐσεβεῖ epitomizing what those τέρατα portend. ἐλπίς renders צבי again in 28:4, 5. Although δίκαιος is the most frequent equivalent for צדיק (9/14x), εὐσεβής renders it in 26:7 as well (2x).

Although OG's rendering of ואמר with the grammatically plural καὶ ἐροῦσιν is unremarkable, it imposes a switch of subjects, apparently teasing out a collective force for τῷ εὐσεβεῖ and attributing the following woe to them. Syriac, on the other hand, ascribes the reported speech to the צדיק by prefixing a relative pronoun (ܐܝܬܝܗ), so that the words that follow are those of the ܐܝܬܝܗ.

24. Although OG's *Vorlage* might have read כבדו, it is at least as likely that the translator collapsed יהוה כבדו into ἡ δόξα κυρίου in accord with תְּהִי דֹדְךָ כְּדֹדְךָ || בגאון יהוה in 24:14.

Whereas Syriac's translation of those words is transparent to their Hebrew source, OG's ἀθετοῦσιν οἱ ἀθετοῦντες correlates with its ὁ ἀθετῶν ἀθετεῖ || בוגד הבוגד in 21:2 and suggests that οὐαὶ τοῖς ἀθετοῦσιν οἱ ἀθετοῦντες condenses בגדו ובגד בוגדים בגדו, while omitting an equivalent for לִי רִזִּי לִי רִזִּי owing to unfamiliarity with רִזִּי, as Ziegler (49) suggested and as confirmed by its apparent perplexity at related forms in 10:16's ἀποστελεῖ κύριος σαβαωθ εἰς τὴν σὴν τιμὴν ἀτιμίαν || שְׁלַח הָאָדוֹן במשמנו רזון יהוה צבאות and 17:4's καὶ τὰ πίονα τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ σεισθήσεται || ומשמן בשרו ירזה.

Old Greek's propensity to add an explicitizing direct object (see Van der Vorm-Croughs, 49–52) likely accounts for +τὸν νόμον. The disobedience of torah as cause for punishment was already divined in 24:5's ἡ δὲ γῆ ἡνόμησε διὰ τοὺς κατοικοῦντας αὐτήν διότι παρέβησαν τὸν νόμον καὶ ἡλλαξαν τὰ προστάγματα, while the paired clauses ὁ ἀθετῶν ἀθετεῖ ὁ ἀνομῶν ἀνομεῖ || והשודד שודד הבוגד in 21:2 correlates “rejection” and “lawlessness,” shedding light on the choice of τὸν νόμον as the object of ἀθετοῦντες here.

24:17

Old Greek's rendering of the second-person singular pronoun of עֲלֶיךָ in the grammatical plural (ἐφ' ὑμᾶς) accords with its translation of יושב conjugated as a grammatically plural participle (τοὺς ἐνοικοῦντας), teasing out its collective force. This shift is frequent for this translator, as is his supply of a preposition in ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς || הארץ, recalling καὶ οἱ ἐγκαθήμενοι ἐν Σαμαρεία || ויושב שמרון (9:8), ὁ λαός μου οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐν Σιών || עמי יושב ציון (10:24), and οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐν τῇ νήσῳ ταύτῃ || יושב האי הזה (20:6).

24:18

Van der Vorm-Croughs (69–70) includes the lack of an equivalent for מקול in her catalog of nouns denoting body parts omitted when they head a genitival phrase. However, it is the sole example cited of קול treated as a “body part,” raising the question of whether that classification is apt. In fact, as she notes (69 n. 22), in 38:5 “one finds a word for ‘voice’ as a plus: תפלתך את שמעתי/ἤκουσα τῆς φωνῆς τῆς προσευχῆς σου.” Although one might suggest that the translator found the notion of fleeing “the sound of fear” peculiar, his rendering of 33:3 suggests that the idea was not unintel-

ligible to him: διὰ φωνήν τοῦ φόβου σου ἐξέστησαν λαοὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ φόβου σου καὶ διεσπάρησαν τὰ ἔθνη || מקול המון נדדו עמים מרוממתך נפצו גוים.²⁵

An alternative explanation of the missing equivalent for מקול could be that the translator sought to replicate the unadorned series φόβος καὶ βόθυνος καὶ παγίς of 24:17, with each prefixed article (τόν) having demonstrative force, anaphoric to the nouns in 24:17 (“that particular fear”). However, such speculation is better set aside in favor of a hypothesis that the translator’s source text lacked מקול, which was perhaps added at a later stage to parallel מתוך.

Regarding ἐκ τοῦ βοθύνου || מתוך הפחת, Van der Vorm-Croughs (129) notes a similar absence of an equivalent for תוך as part of the compound preposition in 58:9’s ἐὰν ἀφέλῃς ἀπὸ σοῦ σύνδεσμον || אם תסיר מתוכך מוטה, despite ἐξέλθατε ἐκ μέσου αὐτῆς || צאו מתוכה in 52:11. (For similar variations in rendering בתוך, see the comments on 7:6.)

Old Greek renders מרום with οὐρανός again in 24:21 and in 38:14.

Syriac’s ܡܪܘܡܐܢܐ analyzes ארבות after the manner of ܡܪܘܡܐܢܐ || ווארבת השמים in Gen 7:11; 8:2 (cf. ܡܪܘܡܐܢܐ || ארבותיהם in Isa 60:8). Old Greek’s θυρίδες is unique among equivalents for ארבת elsewhere, with καταρράκται being the most frequent (Gen 7:11; 8:2; 4 Kgdms 7:2, 19; Mal 3:10). The choice of θυρίδες is comparable to καὶ σκοτάσουσιν αἱ βλέπουσαι ἐν ταῖς ὀπαῖς || וחשכו הראות בארבות in Eccl 12:3, where the choice of ταῖς ὀπαῖς appears calibrated to βλέπουσαι.²⁶ In this context, the notion of the “windows of heaven” allows a broader corollary to “the foundations of the earth” shaking than would the notion of καταρράκται, “waterfalls.”

24:19

Elsewhere the OG translator renders רעע with verbs meaning “to be or do evil” (11x), “to be displeasing” (59:15^[2]), or “to devour” (65:25^[1]). With παραχῇ παραχθήσεται || רעה התרעעה here, he chose the same verb he used as a slot word for צהלי in 24:14 to fit the semantics of the context. Similarly, this translator typically renders פרר with διασκαεδάνυμι (8:10; 14:27; 44:25; cf.

25. The rendering of מקול with διὰ φωνήν is paralleled in 30:31’s διὰ γὰρ φωνήν κυρίου ἡττηθήσονται Ἀσσύριοι || כי מקול יהוה יחת אשור and is similar to 6:4’s καὶ ἐπήρθη τὸ ὑπέρθυρον ἀπὸ τῆς φωνῆς ἧς ἐκέκραγον || וינעו אמות הספים מקול הקורא || τῆς φωνῆς designates the cause of ἐπήρθη.

26. Ottley’s (2:367) suggestion that καὶ ὡς περιστρεφαὶ σὺν νεοσσοῖς || וכיונים אל ארבותיהם in Isa 60:8 might reflect אפרחיהם in its Vorlage is reasonable.

αἴρεται || פור התפוררה || פור in 33:8), making καὶ ἀπορία ἀπορηθήσεται || פור התפוררה noteworthy. The phrases *ταραχῇ ταραχθήσεται* and *ἀπορία ἀπορηθήσεται* appear chosen jointly under a perception of “calamity” as the controlling idea. That inclination seems evident again in his collapse of מוט התמוטטה ארץ with נוע into *ἐκλινε καὶ σεισθήσεται*... ἡ γῆ at the outset of 24:20.

Syriac’s ܡܚܝܬܐ ܕܐܪܥܐ || רעה התרעעה הארץ is intelligible from its use of ܡܚܝܬܐ for רעו in 8:9 and from ܡܚܝܬܐ ܕܐܪܥܐ || ותרעש הארץ, where “earth” is again the subject. פור התפוררה ארץ || ܡܚܝܬܐ ܕܐܪܥܐ, on the other hand, diverges from the regular use of ܡܚܝܬܐ for forms of פור throughout Isaiah (8:10; 14:27; 24:5; 33:8; 44:25), as prevails in other books (e.g., Gen 17:14; Lev 26:15). ܡܚܝܬܐ appears again in 63:19; 64:2, where ܡܚܝܬܐ ܕܐܪܥܐ renders מפניד הרים נזלו (the only occurrences of זלל in the Bible). Otherwise, ܡܚܝܬܐ translates עור in Jeremiah (6x) and חרד in Hos 11:11. There is good reason, therefore, to suspect that the translator chose ܡܚܝܬܐ to accord semantically with ܡܚܝܬܐ in the preceding clause and ܡܚܝܬܐ in the next one.

24:20

In light of OG’s καὶ σεισθήσεται || ונעו in 19:1, it seems likely that καὶ σεισθήσεται is the equivalent for נוע תנוע here, while *ἐκλινε* renders מוט התמוטטה in 24:19, a choice perhaps guided by association with נטה, for which *κλίνω* is a frequent equivalent in the Greek Bible (e.g., Judg 9:3; 19:8; 1 Kgdms 4:2; 14:32; 3 Kgdms 2:28 [2x]; 19:16; 20:10).²⁷ The translator’s distinctive word choices in reducing נוע תנוע ארץ מוט התמוטטה to *ἐκλινε καὶ σεισθήσεται* (including his elision of ארץ) shapes his portrayal of earth’s suffering, joined to his link of suffering to the lawless behavior of its inhabitants (24:5) in repudiating torah (24:16).

The individual components of ὡς ὁπωροφυλάκιον ἡ γῆ ὡς ὁ μεθύων can be readily aligned with כמלונה and ארץ כשכור. καὶ κραιπαλῶν is either a second equivalent for כשכור or substitution of a verb akin to μεθύων for והתנוודדה. The only other appearance of κραιπαλάω in the book (29:9) translates שכר but also suffices for the collocated נעו (καὶ κραιπαλήσατε οὐκ ἀπὸ σικερα οὐδὲ ἀπὸ οἴνου || שכר ולא יין נעו ולא שכר), similar to the associa-

27. *Κλίνω* appears again only in 33:23, where *ἐκλινεν* lacks an isolable Hebrew counterpart. Elsewhere this translator renders מוט in the passive voice of *σαλεύω* (40:20) or *κινέω* (41:7; 54:10^[1]) but translates its second occurrence in 54:10 with *μεθίστημι* (οὐδὲ ἡ διαθήκη τῆς εἰρήνης σου οὐ μὴ μεταστῇ || תמוט לא תמוט), the same verb that rendered ימוש earlier in the verse: τὰ ὅρη μετασθῆσθαι || כי ההרים ימוש.

tion with והתנודדה here. Not only the jumbled distribution of equivalents but also the awkward structure of the Greek sentence suggests an attempt to wrench meaning from the source text.

Although it is possible that OG's *Vorlage* had suffered transposition of כשכור and כמלונה and read פשעה עליה וכבד after קום, the former accords with scribal behavior, while the latter is more likely attributable to the translator, whose penchant for reformulation is evident throughout the book. The insertion of γάρ into the latter clause to make it explanatory (κατίσχυσε γὰρ ἐπ' αὐτῆς ἡ ἀνομία) is a penchant of this translator (e.g., 1:12, 15, 24; 2:7), who uses it alongside grammatical or syntactical shifts to create explanatory clauses (e.g., 6:10; 7:4; 8:9).

δύνηται || תסיף is notable both for its semantic mismatch and its divergence from the translator's typical use of προστίθμι for יסף (15/20x).²⁸ The only other semantically divergent equivalent for יסף is καὶ ἀγαλλιάσονται πτωχοὶ διὰ κύριον ἐν εὐφροσύνῃ || ויספו ענוים ביהוה שמחה || בקדוש ישראל in 29:19, where ἀγαλλιάσονται is coordinate to ἐμπλησθήσονται εὐφροσύνης || יגילו at the end of the verse.²⁹ Aside from the prevalent use of δύνamai for יכל (11x), the verb is occasionally inserted as an explicating verbal adjunct (8:8 [cf. +δυνατός 2x]; 11:9; 20:6; 28:20; 36:9, 19; 44:20). Even though there is no other example of δύνamai substituting for a Hebrew word (on the problems of 8:8 and 28:20, see the comments at 8:8), δύνηται fits the pattern of an added explicating adjunct, and, just as clearly, it occupies the slot of תסיף (καὶ οὐ μὴ δύνηται ἀναστῆναι || ולא תסיף קום). It is likely attributable to the translator, probably as substitution for תסיף (or whatever form stood in this slot in his source text).

24:21

Even if 1QIsa^a, 1QIsa^b, S, V, and T all attest ביום ההוא, its absence from the Old Greek is comparable to its lack of an equivalent for ביום ההוא in

28. In 47:5 he uses the adverb οὐκέτι as its semantic equivalent (οὐκέτι μὴ κληθῆς || לא תוסיפי יקראו לך). Twice he analyzes a form of יסף as from אסף (15:9; 29:1), while in reformulating 37:31 he places the copula in its slot and supplies φυήσουσιν as a semantically apt predicate with ῥίζαν (καὶ ἔσονται οἱ καταλελειμμένοι ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ φυήσουσιν ῥίζαν ἀάτω || ויספה פליטת בית יהודה הנשארה שרש למטה).

29. בקדוש ישראל in 29:19 may have been omitted as synonymous with ביהוה in the preceding clause. ἀγαλλιάω frequently renders גיל, while ἐμπλησθήσονται εὐφροσύνης is conceivably an alternative rendering of שמחה ... ויספו.

4:1; 20:6. Although there is reason to consider the phrase a later addition at 4:1 (q.v.) and the same is possible for 20:6 (q.v.), this case is more doubtful. Although καὶ ἐπάξει might attest ופקד in the source text, one would have to posit the later insertion not only of ביום ההוא but also והיה and the consequent modification of ופקד to יפקד. Such changes are possible, but it is equally possible to posit a motivation the translator might have had for ignoring the phrase. Even if in 19:18–19, 23–24 the translator rendered a series of clause-initial phrases composed of ביום ההוא followed by a form of היה in the imperfect with τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐαίνη ἔσται/ἔσονται, in each case the formula introduces a topic distinct from the clause preceding it. By contrast, this verse continues the description of convulsions that befall the earth because of its inhabitants' misdeeds that might seem disrupted by והיה ביום ההוא, which might have been seen as redundant. In the end, OG's silence is equivocal, since we cannot infer how the translator reasoned or establish what his *Vorlage* read.

Old Greek rendered מרום with οὐρανοῦ previously in 24:18. For τὸν κόσμον || צבא, compare not only τὸν κόσμον αὐτοῦ || צבאם in 40:26 but also (as Ziegler [117] noted) ὁ κόσμος αὐτῶν || צבאם in Gen 2:1, τὸν κόσμον τοῦ οὐρανοῦ || צבא השמים in Deut 4:19, and ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τοῦ οὐρανοῦ || צבא השמים in Deut 17:3.

The idiom καὶ ἐπάξω τὴν χεῖρά ἐπὶ appeared in 1:25 and will again in 31:3. In both those cases, however, τὴν χεῖρα aligns with יד, whereas here there is no evident Hebrew counterpart. ἐπάγω elsewhere has the complement ἐπὶ + a proper name (10:12; 15:9; 27:1), a group (26:21), or a place (φάραγγα, 15:7), although more commonly a personal pronoun (7:17; 10:24; 31:3; 42:25; 48:9). Even though ἐπάγω + ἐπὶ can be used absolutely, with the sense of “bring punishment upon” (10:12), it is more frequently accompanied by an object such as ὀργήν (26:21; 42:25), πληγὴν (10:24), or χεῖρα. It is this pattern that likely spurred insertion of τὴν χεῖρα here, just as in 31:3 +ἐπ’ αὐτούς supplies an expected complement to ἐπάξει τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ || יטה ידו (cf. Goshen-Gottstein, צב), comparable to the translator's tendency to add an explicitizing object (see Van der Vorm-Croughs, 49–55).

Old Greek's lack of equivalents for both במרום and על האדמה fit the translator's pattern of omitting juxtaposed, identical elements (Van der Vorm-Croughs, 198), making that explanation more likely here than positing homoioteleuton.

24:22

καὶ συνάξουσιν || ואספו אספה is as much an omission of identical elements as was the case with במרום and על האדמה in 24:21.

Although the semantics of καὶ ἀποκλείουσιν align with וסגר (cf. κλείσει || סגר, 24:10; ἀπόκλεισον || וסגר, 26:20), the translator might have considered it equally pertinent for אסיר betokening imprisonment (cf. δεδεμένους || אסיר, 42:7). εἰς ὀχύρωμα καὶ εἰς δεσμωτήριον reflects translation of both על בור and על מסגר, the latter of which accords with ἐκ δεσμῶν || ממסגר in 42:7. ὀχύρωμα has no relationship to equivalents for בור elsewhere in the book (otherwise rendered with λάκκος [36:16; 51:1], γῆ [14:15], and ἄδης [14:19; 38:18]) but renders בצר in 22:10 and מבצר in 34:14 (cf. 4 Kgdms 8:12; Jer 31[48]:18; 30:16 [49:22]; Amos 5:9). On the other hand, ויריצהו מן הבור is rendered καὶ ἐξήγαγον αὐτὸν ἐκ τοῦ ὀχυρώματος in Gen 41:14. By comparison, the translation of והוצאתני מן הבית הזה by ἐξάξεις με ἐκ τοῦ ὀχυρώματος τούτου in Gen 40:13 seems to regard בית as an abbreviated form of בית הסהר, which was translated with ὀχύρωμα in Gen 39:20; 41:14 and by δεσμωτήριον in 39:22, 23; 40:3, 5. The pairing of ὀχύρωμα with δεσμωτήριον in Isa 24:22 comports with these cases and clarifies ὀχύρωμα || בור.

In light of the clear equivalents of وَاَسْفَوْا אَسْفَا || وَاَسْفَوْا אَسْفَا, Warszaewski's (44) proposal that وَاَسْفَوْا is a corruption of وَاَسْفَوْا is compelling, particularly given وَاَسْفَوْا, which he attributes to the translator reading מסגר as a *pual* passive participle. Regarding وَاَسْفَوْا, he (43) reasonably posits that “על אסיר בור ist frei umgestellt zu על אסיר בור.”

Old Greek occasionally renders a verb with a noun + εἰμί (e.g., πλήρης εἰμί || שבעתי, 1:11), with ἐπισκοπὴ ἔσται αὐτῶν || יפקדו here comparable to ἐπισκοπὴ γὰρ ἔσται || תפקד in 29:6, except with a pronoun included to express the grammatical person and number of יפקדו.

The phrase διὰ πολλῶν γενεῶν appeared in 13:20, where it rendered עד דור ודור, parallel to εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα χρόνον || לנצח. No phrase similar to διὰ πολλῶν γενεῶν appears elsewhere in the Greek Bible, and nowhere else does γενεά render יום. Notably, even though διὰ πολλῶν γενεῶν in 13:20 is readily aligned with עד דור ודור, phrases such as מדור לדור (34:10) and לדור ודור (34:17) are otherwise rendered with εἰς γενεάς (34:10; 61:4) or εἰς γενεὰς γενεῶν (34:17; 51:8; cf. 58:12; 60:15). The uniqueness of this paraphrase suggests that the translator chose it in 13:20 and here without concern to give precise equivalents to the Hebrew.

Goshen-Gottstein (צב) dismisses the likelihood that לפני reflects יפדו , proposing that it is an “inner- ס ” corruption (i.e., for לפני) or is a suitable rendering, despite appearances. The last option agrees with Warszawski’s (44) suggestion that the translator יפקדו “[hat] in gutem Sinne genommen.” Although that is possible, a surmise that the *Vorlage* read יפדו cannot be summarily dismissed, since פד renders פדה elsewhere in the book (e.g., 1:27; 29:22; 35:10), nor can the possibility of scribal mis-copying be set aside easily. These viable options leave a clear explanation of לפני beyond reach.

24:23

Old Greek’s reading of הלבנה as הלבנה and of החמה as החמה guides its choice of equivalents for the verbs והפרה and ובושה , each of which is typically rendered with $\alpha\lambda\sigma\chi\acute{\upsilon}\nu\omega$ or its compound forms ($\acute{\epsilon}\pi\text{-}/\kappa\alpha\tau\text{-}$). On the other hand, תָּהָא appears again only in its rendering of 63:19–64:1, where the verb appears chosen based on המסים in 64:1, which the translator analyzed as מסס (cf. τηκομένη || המס , 4 Kgdms 17:10; $\acute{\omega}\varsigma \text{τήκεται}$ || בהמס , Ps 67[68]:3). What caused the translator to attribute the act of “melting” to bricks is more difficult to discern than what spurred his choice of πεσεῖται to describe a wall’s motion. Nevertheless, the longstanding suggestion that the translator read והפרה as והפרה and analyzed it as a form of פרר (see Scholz, 39) comes closer to grasping at straws than a solution, since never elsewhere does a form of תָּהָא (or any synonym) align with פרר .

Regarding OG’s frequent lack of an equivalent for צבאות (as here), see the comments at 3:15. $\acute{\epsilon}\alpha \Sigma\iota\omega\upsilon\eta$ || בהר ציון is understandable alongside other instances of the translator omitting the *nomen regens* in a bound construction (e.g., $\kappa\alpha\iota \text{οἱ σωθέντες τοῦ Ιακωβ}$ || ופליטת בית יעקב , 10:20; see Van der Vorm-Croughs, 71). For $\acute{\epsilon}\alpha$ || ב , compare $\kappa\alpha\iota \acute{\alpha}\phi\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota} \acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron \tau\eta\varsigma \text{Ιουδαίας}$ || וביהודה in 8:8 and $\tau\omicron\upsilon \acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\alpha\iota \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \text{Ἀσσυρίους ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς τῆς ἐμῆς}$ || $\text{לשבר אשור בארצי ועל הר}$ in 14:25.

The uniqueness of מִבְּנֵי־סֹב || זקניו raises suspicion that it might be a copyist’s error for מִבְּנֵי־סֹב , an adjective that elsewhere translates זקני ישראל (e.g., Exod 17:5; Josh 7:6; 24:1) and similar phrases (e.g., οἱ ἄνδρες || זקני העם , Exod 16:22; οἱ ἄνδρες || זקני העם , Exod 19:7). The peculiarity of מִבְּנֵי־סֹב || זקניו and its graphic similarity to מִבְּנֵי־סֹב supports this conclusion, as does the rendering of וזקן with מִבְּנֵי־סֹב in 3:2.

ISAIAH 25

Preface to 25:1–5

A thicket of opaque alignments between OG and MT in 25:1–5 have made these verses among the most studied in the book. Reviewing scholarship on them shows the shifts in trajectory in study of Old Greek-Isaiah and contextualizes the options to be considered by situating them within views of the translator and his *Vorlage*.

Scholz (44–45) first recognized the density of issues here, placing 25:4–8a under the heading, “Bis zur Unerkennbarkeit des Ursprünglichen verschiedener Text.” Most other entries in this category are isolated phrases, with 25:4–8a and 44:9b–11 the only sets of contiguous verses. Whereas Scholz categorized ὁ πτωχός || יע in 25:3 as “Verwechslung ähnlich aussehender Buchstaben,” with the translator reading יע as עני, he labeled 25:4–5 examples “Wo kein oder fast kein erträglicher Sinn ausgedrückt ist” (43) and among “Uebersetzte Stellen” (44). They are among verses Scholz (14) alluded to in stating that the translator “folgt im Wesentlichen seinem Originale von Wort zu Wort,” although in some passages “eine solche Verschiedenheit vorliegt, dass sich fast nicht mehr feststellen lässt, was das Ursprüngliche gewesen sein möchte.” Such divergences attest “die grosse Gewissenhaftigkeit des Verfassers” (14), whose goal was “den Leser mit den Gedanken des Originales bekannt zu machen” (16). On the other hand, the translator faced a *Vorlage* corrupted via similar-sounding words and graphic confusion (19–20) that carried “alle Verschiedenheiten, die uns seine Arbeit vorführt, bis auf jene, welche ihrer Natur nach Sache des Uebersetzers sein müssen” (21).

Liebmann shared Scholz’s belief that the translator followed his source text closely while prioritizing good sense in the target language.¹ Simi-

1. Ernst Liebmann, “Der Text zu Jesaia 24–27,” ZAW 22 (1902): 41, 46.

lar to Scholz, “alle Zusätze und Auslassungen, die bei ihm zu verzeichnen sind, auf seiner, Vorlage beruhen, oder wenigstens den Zweck, weshalb sie erfolgt sind, klar erkennen lassen.”² Thus, OG’s lack of an equivalent for אַתָּה (25:1) shows that it was inserted later,³ while τῶν ἀσεβῶν (πόλις) in 25:2 attests זִדִּים for זָרִים,⁴ as does ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπων πονηρῶν in 25:4.⁵ He inferred that πόλις || מעיר (25:2) arose from analysis of אַרְמוֹן as direct object of למפלה, “למען עיר זרִים wird nun für ihn zu עיר זרִים, eine der wenigen Stellen, an denen der Übersetzer künstlich einen Zusammenhang herzustellen sucht!”⁶ On the other hand, πόλει (25:4) “scheint auf לעיר in der Vorlage hinzuweisen, den ein Grund, מען durch πόλις zu übersetzen, könnte kaum gefunden werden.”⁷ Agreeing with Scholz, he perceived that πτωχός (25:3) betrays that the translator “verlas er bloss עַן in עַן und deutete dies auf עב,” after which “musste עריץ in ähnlichem Sinne wiedergegeben werden, und auch גוים und ירא mussten sich dieser Anschauung fügen.”⁸ Concluding that ῥύσῃ αὐτοῦς “oder etwas Ähnliches musste ergänzt werden” once מַחֲסָה was rendered with σκέπη (25:4), he aligned צל with σκέπη⁽²⁾ and attributed διψώντων to a *Vorlage* reading כַּחֲרֵב for כַּחֲרֵב.⁹

Ottley (1:150–51) agreed that the translator carefully followed a text “very closely resembling the M.T.” but disputed the notion of a masterful translator, since one “can see the translator losing his clue, and going gradually astray ... and apparently reduced to guessing or a stop-gap rendering.” Although sometimes this owed to the “illegibility of MSS,” more often it evinces the translator’s “imperfect knowledge of Hebrew” (1:150). Accordingly, Ottley (2:225) diagnosed πάσῃ πόλει ταπεινῇ βοηθός || מען מען לדל מען (25:4) as the translator having “been confused,” misreading the first מען as עיר and the second as עזר, while “πάσῃ might owe to reading דל again as כל before the first מען דל.”

2. Liebmann, “Der Text zu Jesaia 24–27,” 41.

3. Liebmann, “Der Text zu Jesaia 24–27,” 253.

4. To support this claim he cited ἀσεβήσῃ || זִיד in Deut 18:20 (cf. 17:13) and ἐν ἀσεβείᾳ || בְּזִדּוֹן in Deut 18:22 (Liebmann, “Der Text zu Jesaia 24–27,” 252) Similarly, ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπων πονηρῶν and ὡς ἄνθρωποι ὀλιγόψυχοι in vv. 4–5 attest זִדִּים rather than זָרִים (259).

5. Liebmann, “Der Text zu Jesaia 24–27,” 259.

6. Liebmann, “Der Text zu Jesaia 24–27,” 255–56.

7. Liebmann, “Der Text zu Jesaia 24–27,” 258.

8. Liebmann, “Der Text zu Jesaia 24–27,” 257.

9. Liebmann, “Der Text zu Jesaia 24–27,” 259.

He posited that ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπων πονηρῶν in 25:4 reflects מזרים, in accord with 25:2, where τῶν ἀσεβῶν construes “Heb. ‘strangers,’ often in a bad sense” (2:224), adducing (without citation) Delitzsch’s characterization of זר as “a general term for the enemies of God’s people.”

While allowing that ῥύσῃ αὐτοῦς || צל suggests that the translator “read or guessed as some part of נצל” (2:225), he also speculated that the source text might have read the “Hiphil impf. תציל, with מ from the beginning of the next word possibly read as 3 pl. pronoun object-termination” (2:225). On the other hand, σκέπη might be “a duplicate rendering of צל” if it is not simply “repeated from previous clause” (2:225).

Ottley (2:225) intuited that ὡς ἄνθρωποι (25:5) might reflect a misreading of בזרם as באדם and that ὀλιγόψυχοι “suggests קצר, which may have been the LXX’s attempt to read קיר.” He ranked οἷς ἡμᾶς παρέδωκας a special conundrum, observing that of “the about six Heb. words to account for, ... this clause bears no perceptible resemblance to any of them” (2:226). Noting that παραδίδωμι is one of the translator’s slot words, he speculated that the source text “may have been illegible at this point,” although he added that “passages with the same words recurring constantly are apt to reduce them [*sic*] to helplessness” (2:226).

Fischer (5) allowed that the translator shows throughout the book “dieselbe freie Übersetzungsmethode und auch dieselbe Unbeholfenheit gegenüber schwierigen Texten,” while he attributed many divergences to the translator supplying “ein Wort oder mehrere Worte” or finding “durch abgekürzte Wiedergabe der Sinn genügend ausgedrückt” (7). The *Vorlage* “war mit unserem MT so ziemlich identische,” and discrepancies are mainly only apparent (8).

He surmised (40) that τὰ θεμέλια (25:1) arose from reading ארמון as “אמון = das Verlässige = die Grundfesten,” while πόλει || מעון (25:4) reflects a *Vorlage* reading מחון, which the translator associated with Aramaic מחוןא. On the other hand, καὶ πνεῦμα || כי רוח owes to confusion of כ with ב and misreading י as ו, which he connected with the following word: ורוח (40–41).

Fischer (40) attributed τῶν ἀσεβῶν (25:2) to the translator reading זדים instead of זרים, as again with ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπων πονηρῶν || מזדם in 25:4, where he (41) elaborated Ottley’s speculation that בזרם was read as באדם by positing that the perplexed translator “betrachtete er ז als Überrest eines א and nahm ר als ד.” He intuited that ὀλιγόψυχοι (25:4) reflects association of קיר with קר, “cold,” construed as a metaphor for distressed souls (41). In 25:5 διψῶντες reflects reading בחרב in place of בחרב, “in Trockenheit =

in Durst" (41), while οἷς ἡμᾶς παρέδωκας reflects corruption of תכניע into "תכריע" als abgekürzter Relativsatz gefaßt" (8). The remainder of the verse "war in der Vorlage eine Lücke oder der Text war so verstümmelt, daß der Ü.r auf seine Wiedergabe verzichtete" (8).

Despite the shift in perception from a masterful translator to one who struggled to understand his text, the assumptions shared by Scholz, Liebmann, Ottley, and Fischer were that the *Vorlage* was close to MT and that deviations reflect the translator's attempt to make what he could out of it. Joseph Ziegler posited a different notion of how he worked.

While agreeing with his predecessors' sketch of a translator who "macht sich kein Gewissen daraus, schwere, seltene Wörter einfach auszulassen, wenn dadurch der Sinn des Satzes nicht gestört wird, oder auch einen Satz anders einzuteilen and zusammenzuziehen, wenn er nicht mit seiner Vorlage auskommt" (Ziegler, 7), he posited that often "scheint er von irgendeinem Gedanken beherrscht zu sein and übersetzt dann unter dem Einfluß dieses Gedankens die betreffenden Stellen" (7–8). Accordingly, he urged, "muß zunächst die ganze Persönlichkeit des Übers. vor uns erstehen," inasmuch as OG-Isa "ein ganz eigenartiges, individuelles Geprägt trägt" (Ziegler, 7).

His comments on 25:4–5 reflect this orientation, beginning with his judgment (82) that these verses rest on "Undeutung der hebr. Ausdrücke זרם 'Wetter' und חרב 'Hitze.'" Detecting that כי רוח עריצים בורם קיר already entails "die Personifizierung" of the first half of 25:4, he judged OG's ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπων πονηρῶν an extension of that, with the translator having "זדים" (vgl. V. 2. 5) gelsen *oder besser* gedeutet und ἄνθρ. ergänzt," while from "חרב (V. 4. 5) hat er den Begriff 'Hitze', 'Durst' herausgelesen und deshalb διψῶντων übersetzt (vgl. 35,6 ἡ δὲ διψῶσα = ערבה)" (Ziegler, 82, emphasis added). Although he studied words aligned in the Greek and MT to evaluate the translator's path, he allowed a greater role to the translator as interpreter. Thus he reckoned ἄνθρωποι (25:4, 5) as the translator's insertion, rather than derived from a hypothesized אדם, and suggested that ὀλιγόψυχοι might reflect the translator having interpreted ("herausgelesen") קיר זרם by association with צרר or קציר (82).

Ziegler (83) found the translator's willingness to divert from "die einzelnen hebr. Wendungen seiner Vorlage" apparent in his equivalents for words meaning "poor," where his tendency was "etwas plastischer darzustellen und sozusagen psychologisch auszudrücken." This explains καὶ τοῖς ἀθυμῆσασιν || לאביון in 25:4, to which he compared καὶ οἱ ἀπηλπισμένοι τῶν ἀνθρώπων || ואביוני אדם in 29:19 (83).

Ziegler's (49) initial statement on οἷς ἡμᾶς παρέδωκας || חרב בצל עב ענה posited that the translator "hat den ganzen V. 5 verkürzt wiedergegeben," perhaps owing to a corrupt *Vorlage*. Later, however, he (117) opined that the translator "verfiel auf sein beliebtes παραδιδόναι, weil vorher von den 'gottlosen Menschen' gesprochen wurde, denen Gott die Gerechten in die Hand gegeben hat," appending the curious suggestion that the translator perhaps "aus seiner Vorlage das Verbum מנה oder אנה herausgelesen hat."

Ziegler's emphasis on "die ganze Persönlichkeit des Übersetzer" was extended by Seeligmann, who posited that the translation betrays not only the Alexandrian background in its lexical choices but also the influence of "the traditional exegesis of the Synagogue" (49), thus breathing "the atmosphere of the synagogue and religious teaching Alexandria" (47). It equally betrays the translator's "efforts to contemporize the old biblical text," convinced that "the period in which he lived was to be time for the fulfillment of ancient prophecies" (4).

His view of prophecy as announcing deliverance based on "an age-old divine plan" (110) is rooted in ἐποίησας θαυμαστὰ πράγματα βουλὴν ἀρχαίαν ἀληθινήν || עשית פלא עצות מרחוק אמונה in 25:1, while γένοιτο κύριε || אמן at the end of the verse reflects Alexandrian synagogal liturgy (110). While conceding that the translator of 25:1–5 "failed to understand fully the Hebrew text he had before him," he detected in it a conviction that the "Last Judgment, which God has determined upon since time immemorial, is going to destroy the large powerful cities," so that "the humiliated people ... will sing God's praise" (112). These projections reflect "the conditions of his own time and the state of exile," as shown by the clause οἷς ἡμᾶς παρέδωκας (25:5), which identifies the ἄσεβεις as those "'into whose hands Thou hast delivered us' παραδιδόναι, a term by which the translator time and again refers to the Last Judgment on the various peoples" (112).

Jean Coste cited the extensive agreement of 1QIsa^a with MT as reason to suppose that the source text "état substantiellement identique à celui que nous lisons aujourd'hui."¹⁰ Although he noted graphic similarities in assessing peculiar equivalents, he considered having to choose between a copying error and the translator's incomprehension "la fausseté d'un pareil dilemme" because it ignores consideration of "les mots et les tournures qui

10. Jean Coste, "Le texte Grec d'Isaie xxv:1–5," *RB* 61 (1954): 37.

portent la marque personnelle du traducteur,”¹¹ reminiscent of Ziegler’s summons to regard “die ganze Persönlichkeit des Übersetzer.”

Citing $\delta\chi\upsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}$ || $\epsilon\zeta$ in 26:1 to dismiss analysis of $\pi\tau\omega\chi\acute{o}\varsigma$ as betraying misreading of $\epsilon\zeta$ as $\epsilon\upsilon\eta$ in 25:3,¹² he posited that the translator used “un schème dynamique de lecture qui utilise à son profit toutes les ambiguïtés du texte original,” so that “le ‘*am* ‘*az* est devenu le ‘*am* ‘*ani*, les ‘violents’, les ‘violentés’, tout comme les *zarîm* étaient les *zedîm*.”¹³ In his choice of $\pi\tau\omega\chi\acute{o}\varsigma$ the translator was guided by the image of “l’Israël pauvre et opprimé de la diaspora.”¹⁴ Similarly, the translator contrasted the cities of the impious and the oppressed in 25:4 by taking advantage of “une confusion possible entre le premier *ma’ôz* (refuge) et *ma’îr* (πόλει),” while ignoring the *lamed* prefixed to $\delta\lambda$.¹⁵

Seeligmann’s influence on Coste is evident in his perception that $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\iota\tau\omicron$ κύριε || $\alpha\mu\eta\eta$ (25:1) betrays a translator “guidé par l’habitude des lectures liturgiques.”¹⁶ He posited that the translator fashioned these verses to emulate “la lyrique cultuelle des psaumes.”¹⁷ While maintaining “foi au caractère actuel du texte sacré, son souci de donner à la Parole divine toute la résonance et l’ampleur que sa piété lui suggérerait.”¹⁸

Like Ziegler, Coste appealed to strategies evinced throughout the book to explain peculiarities. He concluded that $\alpha\lambda\theta\rho\acute{\omega}\pi\omega\eta$ ἀδικουμένων || $\gamma\iota\mu$ עריצים (25:3) less likely shows that “le traducteur ait voulu faire d’ἀνθρωποι l’équivalent de *gōîm*” than it reflects his tendency to supply $\alpha\lambda\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\varsigma$,¹⁹ as again with $\alpha\lambda\theta\rho\acute{\omega}\pi\omega\eta$ ἀσεβῶν || $\gamma\iota\mu$ זרים in 25:4. Similarly, ἀδικουμένων || $\gamma\iota\mu$ עריצים must be evaluated in light of the translator’s repeated perplexity at $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\rho\eta\phi\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega\varsigma$ || $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\varsigma$, 13:11; the lack of an equivalent in 29:5; $\alpha\lambda\theta\omicron\mu\omicron\varsigma$ || $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\varsigma$, 29:20; and $\iota\sigma\chi\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\omicron\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$ || $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\varsigma$, 49:25), which nevertheless show “que le traducteur attribuait au mot ‘*aris* une nuance pejorative assez floue, susceptible d’être précisée selon le contexte.”²⁰

11. Coste, “Le texte Grec d’Isaie xxv:1–5,” 47, 66.

12. Coste, “Le texte Grec d’Isaie xxv:1–5,” 40–41.

13. Coste, “Le texte Grec d’Isaie xxv:1–5,” 47.

14. Coste, “Le texte Grec d’Isaie xxv:1–5,” 47.

15. Coste, “Le texte Grec d’Isaie xxv:1–5,” 41–42.

16. Coste, “Le texte Grec d’Isaie xxv:1–5,” 38.

17. Coste, “Le texte Grec d’Isaie xxv:1–5,” 49.

18. Coste, “Le texte Grec d’Isaie xxv:1–5,” 51.

19. Coste, “Le texte Grec d’Isaie xxv:1–5,” 41.

20. Coste, “Le texte Grec d’Isaie xxv:1–5,” 41

Coste discerned that the translator, having linked σκέπη with (paraphrastic) καὶ τοῖς ἀθυμήσασι δι' ἔνδειαν, read מִזֶּרֶם as מִרְיָן and rendered it with πονηρῶν and explicitizing ἀνθρώπων. Conceding that “ῥύση et σκέπη ont tous les deux de titres à être l'équivalent de *şel*,” he regarded it impossible to decide whether “σκέπη se trouvant rajouté ici in écho du précédent” or ῥύση αὐτούς was inserted “pour appuyer ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπων πονηρῶν, member de phrase resté sans verbe.”²¹ Rejecting speculation about variant Hebrew words to account for ὀλιγόψυχοι,²² Coste considered it “plus sage de penser ... à une glose délibérément détachée du texte,” particularly because οἷς ἡμᾶς παρέδωκας in 25:5 also elicits that judgment.²³ For Coste, the translator was also a literary craftsman.

J. C. M. das Neves embraced Seeligmann's perception that the translator employed “‘atualização’ de antigos textos bíblicos” (21–22), through which he presented “o original hebraico segund as necessidades religiosas do seu tempo” (43), describing a rift between the diasporic faithful and an impious, Hellenized aristocracy in Jerusalem (44).

That rift is epitomized in 25:1–5. Old Greek's city of the impious over against cities of the poor and afflicted who will find deliverance arises from the translator's interpretation of a text identical with MT, as in his derivation of πόλεις and πόλις from מעיר in 25:2 and of πόλει (25:4) through association of מעו (1) with מעיר (166, 168). Likewise, τῶν ἀσεβῶν (25:2) is a “releitura do original זרים... por יוֹדִים,” while ὁ πτωχός (25:3) shows that the translator “relê o original עַז (‘forte’) em עָנִי (‘pobre’),” based on “reflexão teológica” (167). Similarly, ἀδικουμένων || עֲרִיצִים accords with the book's varied equivalents for עֲרִיץ, through which “o G dirige-se contra o povo eleito,” so that “ἀδικούμενος relaciona-se directamente com πτώχος e tem sentido religioso e positivo” (168). Dismissing variants posited to explain ὡς ἄνθρωποι ὀλιγόψυχοι || בְּזֶרֶם קִיר (25:4), he detected in it a “releitura intencional, tanto mas que ὀλιγόψυχοι não tem um sentido pejorative na tradução G” in 25:5 (169). In these and every other apparent deviation from a Hebrew source text, OG offers an interpretation of a Hebrew *Vorlage* identical to MT.

21. Coste, “Le texte Grec d’Isaie xxv:1–5,” 43. He notes that the difficulty in positing that ῥύση reflects analysis of צַל as a form of נִצַּל is that “ce verbe n’est jamais attesté au qal” (43).

22. Coste, “Le texte Grec d’Isaie xxv:1–5,” 43.

23. Coste, “Le texte Grec d’Isaie xxv:1–5,” 44.

Arie van der Kooij accepted that “25:1–5 represents a free translation, reflecting the ideas of its author more than the contents of the underlying Hebrew text.”²⁴ Although the grammatically plural form πόλεις in 25:2 (2x) is “typical of LXX Isa. 24–26,” τῶν ἀσεβῶν πόλεις appears only here among all the translated books.²⁵ He claimed that τῶν ἀσεβῶν “does not support the reading זִדִּים” but reflects זָרִים, as in 25:5.²⁶ This use of the grammatical singular suggests that this “‘city of the wicked ones’ must be an important city dominating the earth,” which, in the book of Isaiah, must be Babylon.²⁷ The Old Greek engages in “actualizing interpretation” by which Isaiah is “read and interpreted as oracles about events of the time of its translator.”²⁸ Because it comprehends “prophecies about Ashur and Babel ... as referring to the Seleucid empire,” τῶν ἀσεβῶν πόλεις, referring to Babylon, is a cipher for the Seleucids.²⁹

Wilson de Angelo Cunha, eschewing analysis of “single words or phrases at the expense of the broader literary context,”³⁰ sought to evaluate the translation’s coherence “without recourse to the Hebrew.”³¹ Even if atypical lexical equivalents spur the question of what underlay them, the answer lies on the literary plane,³² where the interplay of “‘free’ and ‘literal’ renderings” shows “how [the translator] interpreted the Hebrew on a higher level.”³³ Accordingly, a diagnosis of “misreading” is inaccurate, and the category of “mistake” applies only to an equivalent that “does not fit its own literary context in the Greek.”³⁴

Thus δοξάσω σε || אֲרֹמֶמְךָ in 25:1 (an equivalent occurring again only in 33:10) was chosen to echo δοξασθήσεται in 24:23, signaling that 25:1–5

24. Arie van der Kooij, “The Cities of Isaiah 24–27 according to the Vulgate, Targum and Septuagint,” in *Studies in Isaiah 24–27*, ed. Arie van der Kooij, (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 193.

25. Van der Kooij, “The Cities of Isaiah 24–27,” 192.

26. Arie van der Kooij, “Isaiah 24–27: Text-Critical Notes,” in Van der Kooij, *Studies in Isaiah 24–27*, 13.

27. Van der Kooij, “The Cities of Isaiah 24–27,” 192–93.

28. Van der Kooij, “The Cities of Isaiah 24–27,” 195.

29. Arie van der Kooij, “The Cities of Isaiah 24–27, 196.

30. Cunha, *LXX Isaiah 24:1–26:6*, 37.

31. Cunha, *LXX Isaiah 24:1–26:6*, 44.

32. Cunha, *LXX Isaiah 24:1–26:6*, 43.

33. Cunha, *LXX Isaiah 24:1–26:6*, 44.

34. Cunha, *LXX Isaiah 24:1–26:6*, 38.

is to “be read in light of and in conjunction with LXX Isa 24:21–23.”³⁵ Similarly, by rendering למפלה with τοῦ πεσεῖν, “πίπτω connects Isa 25:2 and 24:23 together.”³⁶

Observing the similarity of the grammatical plural form of πόλεις (|| מעיר) to πόλεις (|| בעיר) in 24:10, 12, Cunha posited that the use of the plural number attests a “‘higher level’ interpretation of his *Vorlage*,”³⁷ just as ἀσεβῶν was chosen for זרים in service of “the theme of judgment of the ἀσεβής” in Isa 24–26 within “a ‘higher level’ interpretation.”³⁸ Similarly, πτωχός (v. 3) does not derive from “misreading” ע but from an interpretive scheme about “the liberation of the ‘poor.’”³⁹ ἀδικουμένων (|| עריצים) was chosen to complement ὁ πτωχός and τοῖς ἀθυμήσασι δι’ ἔνδειαν,⁴⁰ while ἄνθρωποι ὀλιγόψυχοι coordinates with ἀνθρώπων ἀδικουμένων in a “‘high level’ interpretation of the Hebrew that paid considerable attention to the immediate literary context.”⁴¹

Even if οἷς ἡμᾶς παρέδωκας (25:5) might attempt to render תכניע, the controlling question remains “how this phrase fits in its literary context.”⁴² Noting that παρέδωκας “contrasts sharply in meaning with ῥύσῃ,”⁴³ Cunha concluded that “the translator interpreted Isa 25:5 in the light of Isa 64:6 (LXX 7),” where καὶ παρέδωκας ἡμᾶς διὰ τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν stands in a context (63:18–19) depicting “God’s people as living under the oppression of ‘ungodly men,’ ‘nations’ or ‘adversaries.’”⁴⁴ In particular, the translator’s choice of οἷς ἡμᾶς παρέδωκας “betrayed the ‘conditions of his own time.’”⁴⁵

These widely differing assessments of the translator’s path through these verses turn on two issues: the state of the source text and the role of the translator. After early attributions of all significant differences to the source text, the dominant evaluation came to be that it was close to MT, with the translator creating most of the deviations. Ottley’s accent on the

35. Cunha, *LXX Isaiah 24:1–26:6*, 158.

36. Cunha, *LXX Isaiah 24:1–26:6*, 161–62.

37. Cunha, *LXX Isaiah 24:1–26:6*, 161.

38. Cunha, *LXX Isaiah 24:1–26:6*, 160.

39. Cunha, *LXX Isaiah 24:1–26:6*, 162.

40. Cunha, *LXX Isaiah 24:1–26:6*, 163.

41. Cunha, *LXX Isaiah 24:1–26:6*, 168.

42. Cunha, *LXX Isaiah 24:1–26:6*, 96, 169.

43. Cunha, *LXX Isaiah 24:1–26:6*, 96, 169.

44. Cunha, *LXX Isaiah 24:1–26:6*, 170.

45. Cunha, *LXX Isaiah 24:1–26:6*, 170.

translator's deficient knowledge of Hebrew and Fischer's emphasis on the strategies the translator adopted in his rendering of difficult texts yielded to Ziegler's (7) focus on the "die ganze Persönlichkeit des Übersetzer," which included his knowledge of other passages in the book or parallels in other books that came to constitute the Hebrew Bible. Seeligmann's focus on the translator's social setting took account of liturgical phrases and perceived allusions to conditions of the translator's day. Coste's evaluation of the translator as *litterateur* extended Seeligmann's portrayal by isolating evidence that the translator addressed circumstances of his day in shaping his rendering as a liturgical poem. The development of "contemporizing" by Van der Kooij, das Neves, and Cunha accented the religious and ideological struggles encoded in the translation. Although observations about relationships between the Greek and a putative Hebrew source text played a role, the controlling factor came to be the image of translator as mantic interpreter.

The thicket of Isa 25:1–5 has served as a Rorschach test for how one views the translator. Whereas a concordance enables one to establish equivalencies and confirm the translator's path in verses such as 1:2–3 and might even equip one to pick a way through a difficult verse such as 3:8, the lexical, semantic, and grammatical divergences in this passage lend themselves to speculation presented as solutions. In a passage such as this, where we are left only with the text as product, the question is what we can infer from the structures the translator created by scrutinizing his word choices within their context.

25:1

Old Greek's rendering of this verse casts it as hymnic praise, beginning with the verbal pair *δοξάσω σε ὑμνήσω τὸ ὄνομά σου* (|| ארוממד אודה שמך ||). The use of *ὑμνέω* as an equivalent for *ידה* is unique to the OG of Isaiah, appearing also in the words 12:4 forecasts the people uttering: *ὑμνεῖτε κύριον βοᾶτε τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ* || יהודו ליהוה קראו בשמו ||. The translator's choice of *γένοιτο* to render *אמן*, with *+κύριε*, confirms his construal of this as a prayer (cf. S's *الحمد*). This focus might account for the lack of an equivalent for *אתה*, if he analyzed it as anticipatory of the second masculine singular objective suffix of *ארוממד*.

The expansion *θανυμαστὰ πράγματα* || פלא || *διότι συντετελεσμένα καὶ συντετμημένα πράγματα ἤκουσα* || כי כלה ונחרצה || *שמעתי* in 28:22.

Although βουλῆν could reflect עצה instead of MT's עצות,⁴⁶ the translator so often manipulates grammatical markers that βουλῆν more likely reflects his predilection (cf. S's ܠܫܢܐܝܬܐ). Although ἀρχαίαν is nowhere else an equivalent for מרחוק (most often translated with a spatial sense: μακράν, μακρόθεν, πόρρω, πόρρωθεν), temporal ἀρχαίαν accords with the notion of a plan already executed, as presumed in verses 2 and 4, making it likely the translator's choice for מרחוק.

ܠܥܫܝܬ || ܟܝ ܥܫܝܬ is one out of nine times that S reads simple *waw* rather than ܟܝ (see 6:5; 8:21; 17:10; 32:13; 40:2 [2x]; 61:11; 65:16). Given the difficulty in perceiving what would have motivated shifting from the contextually apt explanatory conjunction, the source text might have read ܠܥܫܝܬ.

Syriac seems to have shifted forward its adjectival equivalent for אמונה to modify its nominal equivalent for עצות, inflecting both in the grammatical singular: ܠܫܢܐܝܬܐ ܡܨܡܥܬܐ. The choice of the grammatical singular likely reflects grammatical analysis of אמונה as a feminine singular adjective. The seventeen other instances of עצה in the book are in the grammatical singular and are rendered as such in Syriac.⁴⁷ The translator's rendering of 32:7 conveys a similar description of "counsel" as unitary: ܠܫܢܐܝܬܐ ܡܨܡܥܬܐ ܠܥܫܝܬ || ܟܝ ܥܫܝܬ.

25:2

Although OG reflects the prefixed preposition of מעיר in 17:1 (ἀπὸ πόλεων) and 66:6 (ἐκ πόλεως), the renderings of neither instance of מעיר here reflect prefixed מן. The same is the case in 48:2, where τῆς πόλεως || מעיר is entangled with a pleonastic rendering of נקראו: καὶ ἀντεχόμενοι τῷ ὀνόματι τῆς πόλεως τῆς ἁγίας || ܟܝ ܡܥܝܪ ܗܩܕܝܫ ܢܩܪܐܘ. Notably ἀπὸ πόλεων || מעיר in 17:1 is embroiled in an analysis of מוסר as a form of סור (ἰδοὺ Δαμασκός

46. Cunha found the grammatical singular βουλῆν for עצות remarkable, given the preceding plural form of θαυμαστά πράγματα and the fact that "עצה appears regularly in the singular and it is equally rendered with the singular of βουλῆ" (Cunha, *LXX Isaiah* 24:1–26:6, 86). His claim (159) that this owes to "harmonization with LXX Isa 14:26," where ἡ βουλὴ is directed ἐπὶ τῇ οἰκουμένῃ ὄλῃ, with οἰκουμένη translating ארץ as it does in 24:1, at the head of the passage literarily connected to 25:1–5, rests on multiple unprovable assertions.

47. On the other hand, S generally inflects ܠܫܢܐܝܬܐ in the plural to match grammatical plurals in Hebrew, as in its rendering of עצמותיכם in 41:21 and especially forms of מחשבת inflected in the plural (55:8 [2x], 9 [2x]; 59:7 [2x]; 65:22; 66:18; but cf. ܠܫܢܐܝܬܐ || מחשבתי, 55:7).

ἀρθήσεται ἀπὸ πόλεων || (הנה דמשק מוסר מעיר) and seems to have served as the touchstone for his reasoning. Correspondingly here, recognition of שמת as verbal likely shaped his rendering of πόλεις as direct object, while his focus on לא יבנה as the heart of the final clause directed his choice of πόλεις as subject.

Although S's מַעִיר || resembles OG's πόλεις, so do V's *civitatem* and T's פִּצְחִין קְרוֹי. However, none of the versions is a trustworthy witness to a source text reading עיר, since each had reason to find the direct object for שמת in מעיר to provide an intelligible translation. (Notably, 1QIsa^a reads מעיר.)

ὄχυρά || בצר occurs commonly in the phrase πόλεις ὄχυραί throughout the Greek Bible,⁴⁸ including 36:1; 37:26. S's equivalent בצורה || חֲסִיָּה recurs in 36:1 (חֲסִיָּה || חֲסִיָּה) and 37:26 (חֲסִיָּה || עָרִי יְהוּדָה הַבְּצֻרוֹת || עָרִים בְּצֻרוֹת || חֲסִיָּה).

In contrast to S's forthright חֲסִיָּה || למפלה, OG's τοῦ μὴ πεσεῖν evinces the translator's habit of "forcibly tr[ying] to wrench, from passages which he cannot understand, some signification" by supplying a negative adverb (Seeligmann, 57), a tactic prominent also in OG Job (see the comments at 3:10). In this instance the translator's perception that למפלה complements בצורה seems to have spurred him to supply a negative.

Although the Isaiah translator often uses θεμέλιον for מוֹסֵד (24:18; 28:16; 40:21; 58:12), he also uses it unexpectedly, as with ἐκ τῶν θεμελίων αὐτῆς || ממקומה in 13:13, εἰς τὰ θεμέλια τῆς γῆς || אל ירכתי בור in 14:15, and θεμέλια τῆς γῆς || תחתיות ארץ in 44:23. It also shows up in ἔρχεσθαι ἐκ γῆς πόρρωθεν ἀπ' ἄκρου θεμελίου τοῦ οὐρανοῦ || באים מארץ מרחק מקצה השמים || (13:5), where מוֹסֵד would be an unlikely interloper in the phrase מקצה השמים.⁴⁹ The translator may have supplied θεμελίου to underscore ἐκ γῆς πόρρωθεν by locating it where the earth's horizon meets the sky. Although ὁ τοῖχος αὐτῆς renders ארמנותיה in 23:13 (in close association with למפלה, as here) and οἴκοι translates ארמון in 32:14, θεμέλιον is the equivalent for ארמון again in Jer 6:5; Amos 1:4, 12, 14; 2:2, 5.

Old Greek uses ἀσεβής to render זר again in 25:5 and 29:5. Based on comparison with καὶ ἀπολῶ ὕβριν ἀνόμων || גֵּאוֹן זִידִים in 13:11 (cf. παράνομοι || זִידִים in Pss 85[86]:14; 118[119]:85 and ὑπερήφανοι || זִידִים in

48. E.g., καὶ αἱ πόλεις ὄχυραί || והערים בצרות, Num 13:28; cf. Num 32:36; Deut 3:5; Josh 10:20; 14:12; 2 Kgdms 20:6.

49. The only similar phrase in the Bible is τὰ θεμέλια τοῦ οὐρανοῦ || מוֹסְדוֹת הַשָּׁמַיִם, 2 Kgdms 22:8.

Ps 118[119]:21, 51, 69, 78, 122), it is reasonable to infer that ד/ר confusion (whether already in the source text or so read by the translator) accounts for ἀσεβῶν for forms of ר here and in 25:5 and 29:5.⁵⁰

25:3

εὐλογέω is the equivalent for כבד only here and in 43:20, where the Kyrios foresees wilderness creatures' response to a gift of water: εὐλογήσει με τὰ θηρία τοῦ ἀγροῦ ... ὅτι ἔδωκα ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ὕδωρ || כי ... תכבדני חית השדה תכבדני במדבר מים.⁵¹ The only occurrences of this equivalent in the Greek Bible are here and in 43:20. εὐλογέω befits a hymn of praise, as attested by εὐλογήσω σε κύριε || יהוה אודך in 12:1, which is also the only time εὐλογέω renders ידה in the Bible. These novel selections of εὐλογήσει σε in hymns of praise illuminate the unusual equivalent εὐλογήσουσί σε || ייראוך at the end of the verse.

Scholz (40) posited that graphic confusion lies behind ὁ λαὸς ὁ πτωχός || עַם עַז, with עַז read as עַנִי. Similar confusion or error likely accounts for τὰ δένδρα σου || אריוך in 16:9, for which 1QIsa^a reads ריוך. Whether the source text read עַנִי or the translator was induced to read it thus in light of לִדְ in 25:4 (elaborated into πάσῃ πόλει ταπεινῇ) is unknowable.⁵²

On the other hand, the quest for a *Vorlage* that spurred πτωχός might be beside the point. After all, τοῖς ἀθυμήσασιν || לִאֲבִיּוֹן in 25:4 is similarly unparalleled but likely due to the translator's propensity to choose words with psychological coloring, as Ziegler detected (see below, 25:4). Since the present context already highlights the plight of ὁ λαὸς ὁ πτωχός and πόλεις ἀνθρώπων ἀδικουμένων (25:3) over against τῶν ἀσεβῶν πόλεις (25:2), the more fitting question regarding ὁ λαὸς ὁ πτωχός || עַם עַז might be about the shape of the discourse the translator created, along the lines Coste suggested.

50. For a mirrored confusion, compare the translation of זדים with ἄλλοτριοί in Mal 3:15; Ps 18[19]:14; ἀλλογενεῖς in Mal 3:19.

51. כבד is most often translated with δόξα or δοξάζω. Compare τοῖς χεῖλεσιν αὐτῶν τιμῶσιν με || ובשפתיו כבדוני in 29:13. Other equivalents distinctively chosen for their setting include: καὶ τοῖς ὤσιν αὐτῶν βαρέως ἤκουσαν || ואזני הכבד, 6:10 (cf. 59:1); κατίσχυσεν γὰρ ἐπ' αὐτῆς ἡ ἀνομία || וכבד עליה פשעה, 24:20.

52. Although ταπεινός || דל is evidenced elsewhere (10:2; 11:4; 14:30; 26:6), nowhere else is עַז rendered with πτωχός or ταπεινός.

ἀδικουμένων is the equivalent for עריצים both here and in 25:4, while ἀνθρώπων that precedes it aligns with גוים in this verse but lacks any equivalent in 25:4's phrase, ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπων πονηρῶν || מזרם. As Coste noted, the translator frequently insinuated explicative ἀνθρωπος.⁵³

ἀδικέω renders various verbs throughout the book, but only in these verses does it render ערץ. As reported in discussing ἀδικεῖτε || תדכאו in 3:15, Seeligmann (42) perceived that ἀδικέω (along with its cognate forms) is used throughout the book as a "wellnigh technical term, to express, without any direct sanction from the Hebrew text, the violence from which Israel was made to suffer by other peoples (10:20; 23:13; 25:3–4; 43:24; 51:23)." The claim that it serves akin to a technical term overstates its role, since ἀδικέω || עוה in 21:3, ἀδικία || עון in 43:24, ἀδικέω/ἀδικία/ἄδικος for forms of עשק in 23:12, 33:15, 54:14, and 59:13, רשע in 57:20 and 58:6, עולה in 61:8, and שקר in 32:7 and 59:13 all have precedents in the Pentateuch, while τοὺς ἀδικήσαντας αὐτοῦς || מכהו in 10:20, τῶν ἀδικησάντων σε || מוגיד in 51:23, ἀδικία || רעה/רע in 33:15 and 57:1 (cf. ἀδικέω || רעע in 65:25) are hardly whimsical equivalents.⁵⁴ On the other hand, there seems little doubt that ἀδικεῖτε was chosen strategically to render תדכאו in 3:15, whose preceding verses leveled charges of abuse of the people of the Kyrios (3:12–14). It is unremarkable that in 9:17(16) the translator rendered כל נבלה דבר נבלה with καὶ πᾶν στόμα λαλεῖ ἄδικα, on the heels of πάντες ἄνομοι καὶ πονηροί || בלו חנה ומרע. Although his rendering of לערץ with θραῦσαι in 2:19, 21, of תעריצו with παραχθῆτε in 8:12, and of יעריצו with φοβηθήσονται in 29:23 (cf. τρωθήσῃ || תערץ, Deut 7:21; πτοηθῆς || תערצו, Deut 31:6) seems to belie a perception that ערץ bespeaks a fear-inducing threat, it is not clear that his choice of ἀδικουμένων here and in 25:4 relies on semantic reasoning. More likely, these instances are similar to the contextually calibrated choice of ἀδικεῖτε || תדכאו in 3:15 and ἄδικα || נבלה in 9:17(16). The description of those who will bless the Kyrios as ὁ λαὸς ὁ πτωχός and πόλει ταπεινῇ who find deliverance ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπων πονηρῶν sets the frame of reference for selecting ἀδικουμένων to describe their distress.

53. Coste, "Le texte Grec d'Isaie xxv:1–5," 41; cf. Van der Vorm-Croughs, 60.

54. There are unusual but not necessarily erratic alignments, such as ἀδικούμενον || חמוץ in 1:17, whose comparability to καὶ ἀδικοῦντος || וחומץ in Ps 70(71):4 likely owes to each translator associating חמץ with חמס, for which ἀδικία, ἄδικος, and ἀδικέω are equivalents in the Pentateuch (Gen 6:11, 13; 16:5; 49:5; Exod 23:1; Deut 19:16) and appear again in Isa 60:18 (ἀδικία || חמס) and frequently in Psalms (e.g., 7:17; 10[11]:5; 17[18]:49; + 10x).

25:4

In this light, the translator's association of מעור with מעור seems less likely than positing that he supplied πόλει to create a phrase to match ὁ λαὸς ὁ πτωχός || עַם עָנִי (25:3). Although this proposal is speculative, it is a reasonable inference in light of the discourse the translator fashioned. The plight of ὁ λαὸς ὁ πτωχός (25:3) over against τῶν ἀσεβῶν πόλις (25:2) is intrinsic to the product and likely owes to the translator's reading. Even if 25:5 asserts that the Kyrios assigned the wicked to afflict the people,

55. Coste, "Le texte Grec," 42–43.

equally prominent is proclamation of the reduction of the πόλεις ... πόλεις ὀχυράς (|| קריה בצורה ... מעיר) to rubble. These cities are individuated by consigning τῶν ἀσεβῶν πόλεις (|| זרים מעיר) to enduring desolation, just as πόλεις ἀνθρώπων ἀδικουμένων (25:3) are individuated by πάσῃ πόλει ταπεινῇ (25:4) who find deliverance and respond with praise for the Kyrios. These structures are unique to the product.

Just as the grammatically singular קריה בצורה was translated in the plural with πόλεις ὀχυράς in 25:2, קרית גוים עריצים is rendered πόλεις ἀνθρώπων ἀδικουμένων, with ἀνθρώπων less of an equivalent for גוים than an explicitizing substitution for it (cf. +ἄνθρωποι in 25:5). Although Coste concluded that πόλει ταπεινῇ reflected a *Vorlage* that read לדל מעיר in place of לדל מעון,⁵⁶ the intertwined vocabulary and the strained relationships to any likely Hebrew source text suggest that the translator fashioned the grammatically singular πόλει ταπεινῇ as an echo of the sequence of πόλεις...πόλεις in 25:2. Prefixed πάσῃ, likely supplied by the translator (on +πᾶς, see appendix A), conspicuously contrasts with the prohibition of rebuilding τῶν ἀσεβῶν πόλεις.

S's equivalents for מעון, مَعُون and حِمَى, are remarkable within the book, where מעון is otherwise rendered by حِمَى (17:9; 23:4, 14; 27:5; 30:2, 3) or a participial form of حَمَى (17:10). Nevertheless, the same equivalents as here are attested outside Isaiah: יהוה עזי ומעזי || مِنْ لَ سَح سَحْمَوْن (Jer 16:19; cf. Nah 3:11; Pss 31:3; 37:39); || לָּ וּס מִן חֲסִידָה חֲסִידָה וְאֶחָדָה (Nah 1:7; cf. Pss 28:8; 31:5). This suggests that the same semantic tradition for מעון reflected in the OG was likely known to S's translator as well. (For עריצים || حِمَى, see 25:3.)

Although other equivalents for אביון are attested outside Isaiah (πτωχοί || ואביונים, 14:30; ταπεινῶν || אביון, 32:7; καὶ οἱ ἐνδεεῖς || והאביונים, 41:17), ἀθυμέω || אביון is unparalleled and the only appearance of the verb in Isaiah.⁵⁷ As Ziegler (83) phrased it, τοῖς ἀθυμῆσαι || לאביון likely owes to the translator's preference "sozusagen psychologisch auszudrücken" terms for the poor, as with ὡς ἄνθρωποι ὀλιγόψυχοι || כורם קיר in 25:5, οἱ ὀλιγόψυχοι τῇ διανοίᾳ || לנמהרי לב in 35:4, ὀλιγόψυχον || ועצובת רוח in 54:6, and καὶ ὀλιγόψυχοις διδούς μακροθυμίαν || ואת דכא ושפל רוח in 57:15. That

56. Coste, "Le texte Grec," 42–43.

57. ἀθυμέω renders כעס (along with nominal ἀθυμία) in 1 Kgdms 1:6, 7, is used to translate the idiom ל ויחר in 1 Kgdms 15:11; 2 Kgdms 6:8; 1 Chr 13:11, while καρδία ἀθυμοῦσαν || לֵב רָגַז is found in Deut 28:65. ἀθυμία κατέσχεν με renders אַחֲזַתִּי זַלְעָפָה in Ps 117(118):53.

assessment is reinforced by the complement phrase δι' ἔνδειαν || בצר לו.⁵⁸ Although this is the only appearance of ἔνδεια in the book, καὶ οἱ ἐνδεεῖς renders וְהָאֲבִיּוֹנִים in 41:17.⁵⁹

The OG translator treats כִּי variably (see appendix C). In this case, given the set of modifications throughout the verse, it is possible (if unverifiable) that he chose καὶ to place πνεῦμα on the same plane as σκέπη as benefits granted those suffering, parallel to βοηθός and σκέπη in the first half of the verse.

σκέπη elsewhere renders both מחסה (4:6) and צל (16:3), and likely its two instances here render each noun. At the same time, ῥύσῃ αὐτούς lacks any discernible foundation in the Hebrew and possibly (while speculative) arose by biliteral association of צל with נצל (cf. ὁ ῥυόμενος || מציל, 5:29; ῥύσασθαι || להציל, 36:14; + 7x). In fact, after ῥύσασθε || אשׁרוּ in 1:17, ῥύομαι renders only נצל in its other nine occurrences through 37:12.⁶⁰ The addition of αὐτούς as direct object is a frequent maneuver taken by this translator (see Van der Vorm-Croughs, 49–52).

25:5

As Ziegler (82) summarized, “25,4.5 liegt Umdeutung der hebr. Ausdrücke זרם ‘Wetter’ und חרב ‘Hitze’ vor.” The semantic relationship of διψώντων to מחרב is transparent, even if the equivalence occurs nowhere else in this book or other translated books of the Hebrew Bible (it commonly renders ציה or צמא), while חרב is more frequently rendered in this book by ἐρημόω (7x). This unusual equivalent joins those of τοῖς ἀθυμήσασιν δι' ἔνδειαν || לאביון בצר לו, ἀνθρώπων ἀδικουμένων || עריצים, and ὡς ἄνθρωποι ὀλιγόψυχοι, which Ziegler (82) reasonably aligned with קיר בזרם at the end of 25:4, rightly noting that ἄνθρωποι is the same explicative addition as in 25:3–4.

58. Other equivalents for צר/רצ are σκληρός (5:30), στενοχωρέω (49:19), στενός (49:20), and θλίψις (3x), which includes ἐν θλίψει || בצר (26:16), the most common equivalent for בצר in the Greek Bible (along with ἐν τῷ θλίβεσθαι).

59. Outside Isaiah, ἔνδεια most frequently renders forms of חסר (8/14x; cf. διὰ τὴν ἔνδειαν πάντων || בחסר כל, Deut 28:57). חסר (both times a verb) appears twice in Isaiah. Only in 32:6 does it have a clearly identifiable equivalent: κενὰς ποιῆσαι || יחסיר (51:14 diverges too much to align any Greek and Hebrew words).

60. From 44:6 on it translates גאל in eleven cases, as well as ישע (3x) and פדה (1x).

ὀλιγόψυχος appears twice in the Pentateuch: ἀπὸ τῆς ὀλιγοψυχίας || מקצר רוח (Exod 6:9) and καὶ ὀλιγοψύχησεν ὁ λαὸς || ותקצר נפש העם (Num 21:4). Elsewhere in Isaiah it figures in οἱ ὀλιγόψυχοι τῇ διανοίᾳ || לנמהרי לב (35:4), καὶ ὀλιγόψυχον || ועצובת רוח (54:6), and καὶ ὀλιγοψύχοις || ובא ושפל רוח (57:15). Whereas each of those cases is based on a Hebrew term for the psyche (רוח/נפש/לב), the alignment of ἄνθρωποι ὀλιγόψυχοι with כִּיר קִיר (= 1QIsa^a, 1QIsa^b; cf. S, V, T) has no such basis. Ziegler's (82) speculation that the translator associated קִיר with צר or קצר is, of course, unconfirmable. Given the predilections evident in τοῖς ἀθυμήσασι δι' ἔνδειαν, ἀνθρώπων ἀδικουμένων, and διψώντων in 25:4–5, it is possible that the translator simply chose ὀλιγόψυχοι as a contextually fitting substitute.

Observing the lack of equivalents for ערצים יענה, חרב בצל עב זמיר ערצים יענה, Ziegler (49) posited, "LXX hat den ganzen V. 5 verkürzt wiedergegeben," perhaps because "war er schon in ihrer Vorlage nicht in Ordnung." Similarly, Fischer (8) cited this minus as evidence that OG's source text "an verdorbenen Stellen gegenüber unserer M durchaus nicht immer einen besseren Text hatte." Abbreviation and a corrupt source text are each possible, although neither is more verifiable than the other. Nor does the translator's use of παραδίδωμι, one of his favorite slot words, reveal anything about his source text, any more than forging a relative clause such as οἷς ἡμᾶς παρέδωκας befits this translator's tendencies. Suspecting the translator's hand in this leaves his *Vorlage* unknowable.

S's ܠܚܒ ܒܥܠ is similar to ܠܚܒ ܒܥܠ || ܠܚܒ ܒܥܠ later in this verse and ܠܚܒ ܒܥܠ || ܠܚܒ ܒܥܠ in 25:4, although there it renders ܠܚܒ, translates a form of ܠܚܒ, just as in each of its twelve other appearances (including ܠܚܒ ܒܥܠ || ܠܚܒ ܒܥܠ in 18:1). As Warzawski (44) reported, in 32:2 S renders ܒܥܠ with ܠܚܒ and the immediately following ܠܚܒ with ܠܚܒ. For that reason, he concluded that S's *Vorlage* here read ܠܚܒ in place of ܠܚܒ, although he posited, "scheint im Texte der Pesch. ein Fehler zu sein, und es muss wohl ܠܚܒ ܠܚܒ gelesen werden." His solution shoehorns S's rendering into a two-stage explanation that obscures ambiguities. Although a *Vorlage* reading ܠܚܒ is conceivable, the lack of textual evidence for an inner-Syriac transposition raises the question of whether the translator might have been responsible for both features, conforming the phrasing to ܠܚܒ || ܠܚܒ ܒܥܠ in 25:4. No answer is possible, but Warzawski's proposal fails to address what would have triggered a scribe to transpose the words.

Although ܠܚܒ ܒܥܠ || ܠܚܒ ܒܥܠ could owe to reading ܬ as ܬ, (cf. ܠܚܒ || ܠܚܒ ܒܥܠ, 2:2; ܠܚܒ, 5:26), S renders ܠܚܒ with equivalents con-

noting sound: $\text{סִפְּחָהּ וְאִמְחָהּ אִי מַלְא וְיִסְחָהּ}$ (13:4); $\text{קוֹל שְׂאוֹן || מַלְא וְיִסְחָהּ}$ (17:12); $\text{וְשְׂאוֹן לְאִמִּים כְּשְׂאוֹן מִים כְּבִירִים יִשְׂאוֹן || סִפְּחָהּ מַלְא וְיִסְחָהּ}$ (24:8); $\text{קוֹל שְׂאוֹן מַעִיר || מַלְא וְיִסְחָהּ מִן הַמַּלְא}$ (66:6). However, the variety of equivalents suggests that the choice of each was linked to the translator's understanding of the context, which is equally likely here.

The translator's choice of מַחֲבֵה for the parallel verbs תַּכְנִיעַ and יַעֲנֶה likely reflects a leveling based on עָנָה , given that the typical equivalent for כָּנַע is לָחַץ , (Lev 26:41; Deut 9:3; +14x), while מַחֲבֵה is never its equivalent outside Isaiah but renders עָנָה in 53:4, 7; 58:3; 60:14; 64:11.

As Warzawski (44) perceived, מַחֲבֵה appears based on associating זְמִיר with זִמְרָה (cf. $\text{זִמְרָה וְזִמְרָה || חֲבֵהּ וְחֲבֵהּ}$ in 17:10).

25:6

The key lexical hook for the translator was מִשְׁתָּה , which he twice rendered with πίονται . Although οἶνον is a common object for this verb, it is likely too generous to assume that the translator selected it as a semantic link with שְׁמֵרִים , a word that appears only here in Isaiah and seems to have been unfamiliar to the translators of Jer 31(48):11 ($\text{καὶ πεποιοῦσιν ἡν ἐπὶ τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ || וְשָׁקַט הוּא אֶל שְׁמֵרֵי}$) and Zeph 1:12 ($\text{ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀνδρας τοὺς καταφρονοῦντας ἐπὶ τὰ φυλάγματα αὐτῶν || וְשָׁמְרֵיהֶם}$), while only Ps 74(75):9 uses a semantically apt equivalent, τρυγίαν “dregs.”

If, however, he supplied οἶνον as an object compatible with πίονται , we are harder pressed to explain εὐφροσύνην , which nowhere else is the object of πίνω . Even if $\text{πίονται εὐφροσύνην}$ can be explicated as a figure made concrete by πίονται οἶνον ,⁶¹ it is unclear what might have spurred the translator to forge this novel metaphor. Rather than the translator having merely associated שְׁמֵרִים with שְׁמָחִים (*pace* Van der Vorm-Croughs, 443), his *Vorlage* probably read שְׁמָחִים .

On the other hand, Ottley's (2:226) surmise that with χρίσονται μύρον “the translator had somehow extracted what he took for מִשְׁחָו מֵר from $\text{מִשְׁתָּה שְׁמֵרִים}$ ” seems peculiar alongside his judgment that 25:6 is otherwise the product of “intentional shortening.” More likely is Ziegler's (214) conclusion that “hat LXX nur frei übersetzt: μύρον entspricht שְׁמָחִים .” On

61. The semantics might be similar to the designation of abandoned villages as $\text{εὐφροσύνη ὄντων ἀγρίων}$ ($\text{|| מְשֻׁשׁ פְּרָאִים}$) in 32:14 as places where wild donkeys take delight, or $\text{βοήσατε ὅρη εὐφροσύνην}$ ($\text{|| פָּצְחוּ הָרִים רִנָּה}$) in 44:23 as characterizing what is announced.

the other hand, Ziegler's (117) suggestion that the translator "denkt hier viell. an Am 6, 6: οἱ πίνοντες τὸν διυλισμένον οἶνον, καὶ τὰ πρῶτα μύρα χρίόμενοι" (|| וראשית שמנים ימשחו ||) rests only on the few words common to the passages while ignoring the differences. More likely the translator created the association of drinking wine and anointing with oil in a reformulation that condensed verbiage.

Although the shift to describing the acts of the Kyrios via third-person pronouns tracks with the Hebrew (καὶ ποιήσει κύριος || ועשה יהוה), the choice to translate מִשְׁתָּה as a verb conjugated in the third-person plural (πίονται ... πίνονται ... χρίσονται) shifts the focus to the nations' enjoyment of divine gifts. The effect of this decision is clarified from noting that Genesis—the only book of the Torah where מִשְׁתָּה appears—renders it with nouns: πότος (19:3; 40:20), δοχή (21:8; 26:30), γάμος (29:22). πότος proves the standard equivalent throughout most of the Greek Bible (19x).⁶² The choice to render it here with a verb in the third-person plural shifts focus from what the Kyrios provides to the nations' experience.

Each of the first two occurrences of ܡܫܬܗ is an adjective modifying an instance of ܡܫܬܗ, and each corresponds to an instance of שמנים. Similarly, ܡܫܬܗ modifies ܡܫܬܗ based on analysis of שמרים as a passive participle but declined in the grammatical singular, coordinate with ܡܫܬܗ.

The relationship of Syriac's final three words of the verse to MT is more opaque. Although the alignment of ܡܫܬܗ with מִמְּחִים suggests association with חיה, the prefixed *dalet* and the 1cp object suffix point to a reformulation, as seems likely the case also with the following ܡܫܬܗ that, despite sharing the graphic form of the earlier equivalents for שמנים, is unlikely the same lexeme, given that it modifies ܡܫܬܗ, a *nomen agentis* form (ending in -ān) constructed from a participle (Nöldeke §130).⁶³ By dint of that grammatical form, the 1cp suffix should serve as an object, and the prefixed *dalet* is an independent relative pronoun, marking an epithet: "the one who delivers us." In that light, ܡܫܬܗ is likely an adjectival

62. Esther alone uses δοχή (6x) and γάμος (3x). Although it uses πότος for מִשְׁתָּה six times, it also uses συμπόσιον (7:7) and κώθων (8:17). מִשְׁתָּה is translated with a verb again only in Prov 15:15b, which contraposes to an assertion that evil people always suffer the claim, οἱ δὲ ἀγαθοὶ ἡσυχάζουσιν διὰ παντός (|| וטוב לב מִשְׁתָּה תמיד ||).

63. Although this noun occurs nowhere in translations of other books of the Hebrew Bible, it appears in the Syriac translation of Wis 16:7, which asserts that those who repented during the incident of the bronze serpent (Num 21) were saved not by the image but ܡܫܬܗ ܡܫܬܗ ܡܫܬܗ ܡܫܬܗ ܡܫܬܗ (διὰ σὲ τὸν πάντων σωτήρα).

form from **מַחֲלֵל**, a fitting modifier for the deity, especially alongside **חַמְלָה** || **מִזְקָקִים**.

Warszawski's (45) proposal that S's *Vorlage* read **מִשְׁמִים הַחֹזֵק** can presuppose graphic errors in the first word (initial **מ** as a dittograph; final **ם** as ligation of **נו**) and assume that **מִשְׁמִים** was wrongly copied under influence of the preceding **שְׁמִרִים**. It is more difficult, however, to posit that the *Vorlage* read **הַחֹזֵק** in place of **מִזְקָקִים**,⁶⁴ let alone to understand how this proposed text might have been comprehended in its context. It seems much more likely that the translator created, out of uncertainty about the Hebrew, this epithet to be read as a further definition of **חַמְלָה**, identifying the benefactor of the nations as the deliverer of Israel. In that event, S avoids condensation and omitting repeated or unfamiliar words.

25:7

The use of **παράδος** || **ובלע** contrasts with **κατέπειν** || **בלע** in 25:8, a common equivalent for **בלע** (e.g., Isa 9:15; 28:4; cf. Gen 41:7, 24). **παραδίδωμι** is among the words the translator employs when he “übersetzt so mehr dem Sinne nach, als dem Wortlaut” (Ziegler, 13–14).⁶⁵ Its use here likely reflects uncertainty about the verse more broadly, as highlighted by the lack of an equivalent for **הַלֹּט הַלֹּט**.

Although **בַּשְׁמֵלָה** **הִיא לֹטָה** is rendered by **καὶ αὕτῃ ἐνείλημμένη** **ἐν ἱματίῳ** in 1 Kgdms 21:10 and **בְּאֲדָרְתוֹ** **וַיִּלֵּט** by **καὶ ἐπεκάλυψεν τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ μηλῶτῃ ἑαυτοῦ** in 3 Kgdms 19:13, the lexical adjuncts that constrain semantics there (**בַּשְׁמֵלָה**, **בְּאֲדָרְתוֹ**) have no analogue here. While **ταῦτα πάντα** aligns with **הַזֶּה** and **τοῖς ἔθνεσιν** corresponds to **עַל כָּל הָעַמִּים**, he might have repositioned his equivalent for **כָּל** to associate it with **הַזֶּה** (compare the reordering of syntagms in **ἐν τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ παράδος** || **ובלע** **הַזֶּה** (בהר הזה)).⁶⁶ There is reason to suspect that the translator simply omitted a rendering of **הַלֹּט הַלֹּט**, in accord with Ziegler's (7) observation that

64. S's familiarity with **זָקַק** is uncertain. Although it appears only here in Isaiah, evidence from elsewhere is mixed. While it is rendered by **חָלַל** in Mal 3:3 (cf. **חַמְלָה** **חָלַל** **בְּכַף נִבְחָר** || **חָלַל**, Prov 10:20), **חָלַל** in Ps 12:7, and **חָלַל** in Job 28:1, in each case the semantics of refining is inferable from the context. In Job 36:27 **יִזְקֶה** is rendered by **יִסְתַּיֵּם**, while **חָלַל** is the equivalent for **מִזְקָקִים** in 1 Chr 29:4.

65. He renders **בלע** with favored “slot words” on two other occasions: **παράσσουσιν** || **בלעו** (3:12) and **διασκεδάσω** || **אבלע** (19:3).

66. On the other hand, the translator is not shy about adding forms of **πᾶς**, as in

the translator “macht sich kein Gewissen daraus, schwere, seltene Wörter einfach auszulassen, wenn dadurch der Sinn des Satzes nicht gestört wird.” That condition appears met in this verse via ταῦτα πάντα as anaphoric to the undertakings for the nations promised in 25:6, whose justification is specified by the explanatory clause, ἡ γὰρ βουλή αὕτη ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη.⁶⁷

ἡ γὰρ βουλή αὕτη || והמסכה הנסוכה is the only one among the several passages in the book that expound the divine βουλή (see the comments on 3:9) without a clear footing in the Hebrew. The structure of ἡ γὰρ βουλή αὕτη ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη is reminiscent of αὕτη ἡ βουλή ἣν βεβούλευται κύριος ἐπὶ τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην || כל הארץ על כל היעוצה עז in 14:26, except that it lacks an equivalent for הנסוכה similar to how ἣν βεβούλευται κύριος renders היעוצה there. It is hardly necessary to think of this as borrowing from there, any more than one must posit that διότι βεβούλευνται βουλήν πονηράν καθ’ ἑαυτῶν || כי גמלו להם רעה in 3:9 consciously drew on ὅτι ἐβουλεύσαντο βουλήν πονηράν περὶ σοῦ || כי יעץ עליך ארם רעה in 7:5. Rather, it seems to be phraseology at home in the translator’s mind, called on when deemed appropriate (cf. ἀρὰ ἔδεται ταύτην τὴν βουλήν αὕτη γὰρ ἡ βουλή ἔνεκεν πλεονεξίας || בי כל שלחנות מלאו קיא צאה בלי מקום, 28:8). The phrasing recalls the extolling of the Kyrios’s βουλήν ἀρχαίαν ἀληθινήν in 25:1.

Although S appears similarly uncertain about הלויט הלויט, it takes a different tack: 𐤋𐤁𐤁𐤁 𐤋𐤁𐤁𐤁 𐤋𐤁𐤁𐤁 𐤋𐤁𐤁𐤁 (cf. 1 Sam 21:10; 1 Kgs 19:13, which render לוֹיִט with 𐤋𐤁𐤁𐤁). Elsewhere in this translation 𐤋𐤁𐤁𐤁 renders מִשַׁל (14:5; 16:1; 28:14; 42:19), נָגַשׁ (3:12; 14:4; 60:17), נָדִיב (32:5; 55:4), סָגַן (41:25), קִצְוִין (1:10; 3:6, 7), רָזַן (40:23), and שָׁר (9:5). Even if some of these equivalents would not pass muster with modern lexicography, the translator’s sense of semantic correlations between 𐤋𐤁𐤁𐤁 and Hebrew lexemes is consistent enough to cast doubt on proposing a variant. More likely his approach is comparable to that in 33:21, where, after correctly

ταῦτα πάντα || כה, 24:13; ἐποίησε ταῦτα πάντα || עשה זאת, 41:20. On the use of quantitative modifiers, see appendix A.

67. Ziegler’s (145) surmise that “LXX hat den Abschnitt 25,6–8 im Gegensatz zum MT in einem den Völkern feindlichen Sinne aufgefaßt” is difficult to sustain in light of the rendering of יהוה צבאות לכל העמים ויעשה in 25:6 with καὶ ποιήσει κύριος σαβαωθ πάσι τοῖς ἔθνεσιν. Because it is difficult to construe the subject of πίνονται (2x) and κρίσονται as anyone other than the just-mentioned nations, and each of those acts is beneficial to the participants, καὶ ποιήσει ... πάσι τοῖς ἔθνεσιν seems something done for the nations.

Although the similarity to T's עממיא על דרב רבא might betray a shared exegetical tradition, S sets off in a different direction in the next clause than T's extension of the notion: ואפי מלכא דשליט על כל מלכותא. Although it is simple enough to observe that "Pesch. verwechselt hebr. נסך mit aram. נכס" (Warszawski, 45) or that it reflects etymological association with נכס (Goshen-Gottstein, צד), that judgment requires asking why it is used, since the translator renders both מסכה and נסך adequately elsewhere (e.g., || סנעם נמלא; 29:10, בי נסך עליכם יהוה || מלך ובער חכמים מכל; 30:1, מסכה, 30:22). On the other hand, the translator's familiarity with it did not prevent using an equivalent chosen according to his sense of the context, as in 28:20's מלך כי קצר המצע מהשתרע והמסכה || כחן מלא חכמה וסמיהא מלך סלא מכלל צרה בהתכנס מהשתרע, which he analyzed by association with Aramaic סתר/שתר, "to overthrow/pull down," a verb S uses elsewhere to render נתץ (Jer 18:7; 31:28), פרץ (Qoh 3:3), and Aramaic סתר (Ezra 5:12). Its use here subverts its violent overtones, owing to its subordination to קצר. The image of something too short to be pulled down likely affected the translator's choice of מלך for המצע, the use of which likely shaped his choice of מסכה for מעלה, parallel to מלך. The effect of earlier choices seems equally evident in מלך || צר (the only occurrence of מצר in the Peshitta), in contrast to the rendering of all other occurrences of צר with מצר, including מצר || מצר מלא חכמה וסמיהא מלך סלא מכלל, including מצר || מצר מלא חכמה וסמיהא מלך סלא מכלל. The rendering of בהתכנס with מכלל seems similarly chosen as corollary to מלך. S's translator is no less adaptive than the OG's in facing the lexical challenges of this verse but clearly did not look to the latter for his cues.

25:8

Both OG and S construe המות as subject of בלע, but OG renders the verb in the active voice and as fientive (κατέπιεν), while S chooses the passive voice (ܠܡܝܢ). There is no reason to think this reflects a difference in *Vorlagen* rather than the translators' assessments of the relationship between subject and verb.

Syriac's ܠܡܝܢ ܠܡܝܢ is a double rendering of לנצח, using equivalents it employs elsewhere (e.g., ܠܡܝܢ, 13:20; ܠܡܝܢ, 28:28), here conjoined to explicitize ܠܡܝܢ. A relationship between ܠܡܝܢ and OG's ισχύσας, implied by Warzawski's (45) assessment that S's double rendering "vereignet somit die Uebersetzung der LXX ισχύσας und das Targ. לנצח," finds no support from S's use of ܠܡܝܢ, which otherwise renders נכה (3:26), צדקה (5:23), and נצח (28:8) but never a word for "strength."

Old Greek renders the other occurrences of לנצח with temporal phrases, most often εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα (χρόνον) (4x) but also διὰ παντός (57:16).⁶⁸ ισχύσας finds a parallel only with ἵνα τί οἱ λυποῦντές με κατισχύουσίν μου || למה היה כאבי נצח (Jer 15:18), where the verb is transitive (with an object complement supplied), likely owing to the construal of כאבי as nominal. Participial forms of ισχύω are often used nominally in OG Isaiah (οἱ ισχύοντες, 1:24 plus 3x; ισχύοντα καὶ ισχύουσιν, 3:1; [γίγαντα καὶ] ισχύοντα, 3:2; ισχύοντι, 46:2; ισχύοντος, 49:25), including as modifier in 10:21's ἐπὶ θεὸν ισχύοντα (|| אל גבור). Although ισχύσας agrees in gender and number with ὁ θάνατος, the lack of a definite article suggests that it is more closely related to κατέπιεν, comparable to 8:9's ισχυρότερος ἡττᾷσθε, where it stipulates a circumstance. Likely here it explains under what circumstances death has come to devour: "Death devoured, having prevailed."

As Fischer (41) recognized, ισχύσας || לנצח is comparable to the sporadic εἰς νῆκος for לנצח (e.g., 2 Kgdms 22:6; Jer 3:5), based on the Aramaic verb נצח, "to be strong or victorious."⁶⁹

The rendering of מחה with ἀφαιρέω is unique in the Bible but semantically similar to the use of ἐξαλείφω in 43:25 and ἀπαλείφω in 44:22, frequent equivalents for מחה elsewhere. The choice of ἀφείλεν might owe to coordination with ἀφείλεν || יסיר in the next clause, which is a common equivalent in the book.

68. εἰς νῆκος is its equivalent occasionally elsewhere (e.g., 2 Kgdms 22:6; Jer 3:5).

69. So Loiseau, *L'influence de l'araméen*, 45; cf. Byun, 117.

Although in 43:25 Syriac renders מחה with ܡܚܐ (its most frequent equivalent elsewhere: 12/13x in the Pentateuch), in 44:2 ܡܚܐ renders מחית || יסיר in the parallel clause here is a standard equivalent in S.

The prefixing of καὶ πάλιν (|| ומחה) accords with the translator's use of πάλιν elsewhere, using it to make explicit that an act is subsequent to a similar one (8:9; 28:5).⁷⁰ As in 7:4, where πάλιν ἰάσονται is the apodosis to ὅταν γὰρ ὀργὴ τοῦ θυμοῦ μου γένηται,⁷¹ and 30:18, where καὶ πάλιν introduces a promised reversal of judgment (καὶ πάλιν μενεῖ ὁ θεὸς τοῦ οἰκτιρῆσαι ὑμᾶς || ולכן יחכה יהוה לחנכם), καὶ πάλιν ἀφείλεν ὁ θεός here underscores a reversal of the effects of death's reign.

+πᾶν (πᾶν δάκρυον || דמעה) is unparalleled in any other witness and seems to overload the clause before the phrase ἀπὸ παντὸς προσώπου || מעל כל פנים. The translator's frequent insinuation of πᾶς (see appendix A) might account for it here, although scribal insertion of כל is always possible. In fact, it is difficult to detect a rhetorical motivation for either a scribe or the translator to insert it.

Representation of a pronominal suffix with the article (τοῦ λαοῦ || עמו) is common and accords with Greek idiom (Smyth §1121).

As Ziegler (66) posited for τὸ γὰρ στόμα κυρίου || כִּי יְהוָה דָּבַר in 24:3, τὸ γὰρ στόμα κυρίου might reflect כִּי פִי in the *Vorlage*, although all other witnesses agree with MT.⁷² It is possible, as Ottley (2:221) suggests, that the translator supplied στόμα to harmonize with phrasing elsewhere (1:20; 58:14), but ὅτι κύριος ἐλάλησε || כִּי פִי יְהוָה דָּבַר in 40:5 is countervailing evidence that leaves the question open.

A notable feature of this verse is the translator's choice to conjugate all the verbs in the aorist (κατέπιεν ... ἀφείλεν ... ἀφείλεν), in contrast to the future tense that dominated 25:7–8 and will appear again in 25:10. Although one might attribute κατέπιεν to conforming the tense of בלע, this does not account for ἀφείλεν || יסיר later in this verse. Given that this translator often bases grammatical or syntactic choices on their fit in the

70. Of the six other appearances of πάλιν in the book, only 6:13's καὶ πάλιν ἔσται || ושבָה והיתה and 23:16's καὶ πάλιν || ושבָה have a basis in Hebrew.

71. However one accounts for ἰάσονται (see the comments at 7:4), the prefixed πάλιν does not originate with אַ, for which πάλιν is never used elsewhere in the LXX, while אַ seems likely included in the rendering of אַף בחרי with ὅταν γὰρ ὀργὴ τοῦ θυμοῦ μου γένηται.

72. S, V, 1QIsa^a, and 4QIsa^c agree with MT; T reads ארי במימרא דיני גזיר כן.

context, what can one surmise about how he might have conceived of these shifts of tense in the discourse?

Although the aorist forms used in 25:8 speak retrospectively of death's domination ending, that does not necessarily impose a break with the future tenses of 25:6–7. Not only do the performative future tenses of *δοξάσω ... ὑμνήσω* (25:1) follow the form of a hymn of thanksgiving, but so does the trope of citing past events as motivation: *ὅτι ἐποίησας θαυμαστὰ πράγματα*, with which *βουλὴν ἀρχαίαν ἀληθινὴν* is equated. The subsequent unfolding of this *βουλή* remains retrospective: *ἔθηκας πόλεις εἰς χῶμα* (25:2). The future tense in *εὐλογήσει σε* (25:3) is formulaic (like *δοξάσω ... ὑμνήσω*), and the motive for the proclamation is *ἐγένου γὰρ πάση πόλει ταπεινῇ βοηθός* (25:4). Following *ἐγένου, ῥύση αὐτούς* (25:4) is likely gnomic, (see BDF §349; Smyth §1914). *οἷς ἡμᾶς παρέδωκας* (25:5) points back to what occasioned the distress.

The future tense used to forecast the Kyrios's treatment of the nations and their consequent benefit (25:6) occurs concurrent with a shift of the speaker's attention from the deliverance the Kyrios has brought to the speaker's group to deliverance for the nations. That distinction is underscored by the speaker's exhortation *παράδος ταῦτα πάντα τοῖς ἔθνεσιν*, which he validates with *ἡ γὰρ βουλή αὕτη ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη*. The same *βουλὴν ἀρχαίαν ἀληθινὴν* that gives rise to thanksgiving for deliverance among the Kyrios's people (25:1) will bring benefits to the nations. By choosing the lexeme *παραδίδωμι* and conjugating it as an imperative in the singular number (*παράδος*, 25:7), the translator resumes the address to the deity begun in 25:1–5.

In the flow of that discourse, the shift to past tense in 25:8 rejoins the perspective of the speaker who extolls the Kyrios for the performance of *θαυμαστὰ πράγματα βουλὴν ἀρχαίαν ἀληθινὴν*. The overthrow of cities of the wicked, aiding the afflicted, has brought to an end the prevalence of death with its tears and has removed *τὸ ὄνειδος τοῦ λαοῦ ... ἀπὸ πάσης τῆς γῆς*. This shift to the future tense in 25:9, introduced by *τὸ γὰρ στόμα κυρίου ἐλάλησε*, leads to a new proclamation of the deeds of the Kyrios in 25:9–12. Whether or not this is a precise retracing of the translator's reasoning, it suggests coherence in the product.

25:9

Syriac's ܡܕܢܐ || ܡܕܡܪ agrees with the reading of 1QIsa^a, ܡܕܡܪ. Although *καὶ ἐροῦσι* might attest a variant ܡܕܡܪ for ܡܕܢܐ, we find the same variation

in 23:12's *καὶ ἐροῦσιν οὐκέτι μὴ προσθήτε τοῦ ὑβρίζειν* || ויאמר לא תוסיפי || עוד לעלול. OG frequently effects agreement between the subject and verb, as in his rendering of *וואמר ישב האי הזה* with *καὶ ἐροῦσιν οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐν τῇ νήσῳ ταύτῃ* in 20:6. In this case, the verb may have been adjusted to the grammatical number of those who proclaim hope.

Although OG typically renders *זה* with inflected forms of *οὗτος*, he is not averse to modifications, such as the interrogative pronoun in *καὶ ἐπὶ τίνα ἐπιβλέψω ἀλλ' ἢ ἐπὶ τὸν ταπεινόν* || ואל זה אביט אל עני (66:2) or *ποιῶν τὸ βιβλίον τοῦ ἀποστασίους τῆς μητρὸς ὑμῶν* for *אזי זה ספר כריתות אמכם* in 50:1 (cf. 66:1 [2x]). His enlisting of the relative clause *ἐφ' ᾧ ἡλπίζομεν* for *לו קוינו זה* is comparable to his reformulations *ἐν ᾧ δικαιοσύνη ἐκοιμήθη ἐν αὐτῇ* || צדק ילין בה (1:21), *περὶ οὗ οὐκ ἔστι δῶρα δοῦναι περὶ αὐτοῦ* || אשר אין לו שחר (8:20), and *ἐφ' οἷς ᾗσαν πεποιθότες* || מבטם (20:5).

Syriac's reformulation integrates *ווישיענו* within a single clause: *ܐܡܝܢ ܗܢܐ ܐܠܗܝܢ ܙܗ ܩܘܝܢܐ ܠܐܝܬܝܢ ܠܐܠܗܝܢ ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ*. Rather than just replacing *זה* with a relative clause, it also shifts its equivalent forward, with the demonstrative pronoun + enclitic pronoun, *ܐܡܝܢ*, taking the place of *ܗܢܐ*. The relative clause *ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ*, modifying *ܐܠܗܝܢ*, leaves *ܐܝܬܝܢ* as predicate of the main clause. This explanation seems more likely than positing a difference in the *Vorlage*. + *ܐܠܗܝܢ* in the parallel clause might reflect *ܐܠܗܝܢ* in the *Vorlage* but might equally have been inserted by the translator, who otherwise conforms the clause to the preceding one.

One might infer that OG's *ἐφ' ᾧ ἡλπίζομεν καὶ ἡγαλλιώμεθα ἐπὶ τῇ σωτηρίᾳ ἡμῶν* reflects parablepsis from *לו קוינו זה*. In any accounting one must assume that distillation of the synonyms *נשמה* to a single equivalent, *καὶ ἡγαλλιώμεθα*, and conforming of the pronominal suffix of *בישועתו* to the preceding pronouns. Although it is conceivable that the *Vorlage* might have read *בישועתנו*, the translator's tendency to adjust pronouns to each other in a clause makes it more likely attributable to him. For the same reason, the absence of any equivalent for *ווישיענו זה יהוה קוינו* לו likely owes to the translator's proclivity to reduce two parallel clauses to one (see Van der Vorm-Croughs, 191–94).

25:10

With *ἀνάπαυσιν δώσει ὁ θεός* || תנוח יד יהוה, compare *ἀνάπαυσις ἔσται* || ינוח in 23:12 and *ποιήσῃ ἀνάπαυσιν* || הניח in 28:2. Although the omission of *יד* has sometimes been attributed to avoidance of anthropomorphic descriptions of God, such omissions are insufficiently consistent to support that

inference.⁷³ As Van der Vorm-Croughs (69–70) concludes, the absence of an equivalent for יד here is better cataloged among omitted references to body parts in a construct chain, as already noted for ἀπὸ ποδῶν || מכף רגל in 1:6 and καὶ ἐρημώσει κύριος τὴν θάλασσαν Αἰγύπτου || והחרים יהוה את לשון in 11:15. The translator's tendency to concision likely led him to regard תחתיו as implicit in καταπατηθήσεται (Van der Vorm-Croughs, 77).

Ziegler (185) reports that πατέω || דוש “ist singulär; dagegen findet sich die griech. Wendung καταπατοῦσιν τοὺς ἄλως 1 Rg 23,1,” where ἄλως translates גרן. He (186) notes that πατέω “in den Papyri öfters das Austreten der Körnerfrucht bedeutet” and that ἄλως “zunächst die Tenne bezeichnet und gewöhnlich die Wiedergabe des hebr. גרן ist.” Conjugation of the verb in the present tense and the grammatical plural (πατοῦσιν) befits a report of what typically happens.

Likely owing to the obscure terminology of מדמנה [ק' במו] מתבן במי, “bringt hier die LXX das Bild von der Tenne, die durch Walzen ‘getreten’ wird,” and chooses ἀμάξαις to designate “die Dreschwalzen, weil sie durch ihre Tätigkeit die Tenne ‘treten’” (Ziegler, 97). The same exigency likely led S to render מדמנה במו with مدمنة. There is no need to posit a variant מדמכה, cognate to Arabic *midmak* (pace Wutz,⁷⁴ as reported by Ziegler, 97) or that “sie haben wohl כמורגים gelesen” (Warszawski, 45; cf. Ottley, 2:227).

25:11

ἀνίημι || פרש accords with the translator's employment of a different equivalent for every instance of פרש in the book: ἐκτείνω (1:15), βάλω (19:8), χαλάω (33:23), ἀνοίγω (37:14), ἐκπετάννυμι (65:2). All these equivalents are attested elsewhere in the Greek Bible,⁷⁵ except οὐ χαλάσει τὰ ἱστία || בל פרשו נס in 33:23 and καὶ ἀνήσει || ופרש here. Ziegler's (145) surmise is as cogent as it is unsatisfying: “Die Vorstellung vom ‘Schlaffwerden’ der Hände schien dem Übers. besser in den Zusammenhang zu passen.” It is unclear why the translator might have considered it a better fit than καὶ ἐκτεína or καὶ ἔβαλον.

73. See the survey in Van der Vorm-Croughs, 464–68.

74. Wutz, *Transkriptionen*, 501.

75. Even the semantically awkward match (καὶ ἔλαβεν Εἰσεκίας τὸ βιβλίον) ... καὶ ἤνοιξεν αὐτὸ ἐναντίον κυρίου || ופרשהו חזקיהו לפני יהוה (37:14; cf. καὶ ἀνέπτυξεν αὐτὰ || ופרשהו, 4 Kgdms 19:14) finds a parallel in χεῖρας δὲ αὐτῆς διήνοιξεν πένητι || כפה לעני פרשה in Prov 31:20.

The assumption that he held in mind the image “vom ‘Schlaffwerden’ der Hände” accords with *πᾶσα χεὶρ ἐκλυθήσεται* in 13:7 (|| כל ידים תרפינה) as a metaphor for enervation, similar to *καὶ ἐξελύθησαν αἱ χεῖρες αὐτοῦ* (|| וירפו ידיו) in 2 Kgdms 4:1. When the verb is in the active voice, the phrase speaks of ceasing action, with the agent restraining itself, as in the command to the destroying angel, *ἄνες τὴν χεῖρά σου* || הרף ירך (2 Kgdms 24:16), or the exhortation not to disengage activity, *καὶ γε ἀπὸ τούτου μὴ ἀνῆς τὴν χεῖρά σου* || וגם מזה אל תנח את ירך (Eccl 7:18). Attempting to understand *καὶ ἀνήσει τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ* in this sense is problematic. Although one might regard ἡ Μωαβίτις as the subject, making this statement the consequence of her trampling in 25:10, the gender of Μωαβίτις is consistently feminine, not only when the article is present (15:1, 2, 4, 5, 8; 16:7) but also with anaphoric pronouns (15:4, 8).⁷⁶

A more instructive parallel to *καὶ ἀνήσει τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ* is *ἀνήκα τὰς χεῖρας* in 37:27, which continues the divine speech of 37:26:

מִימִי קִדְּם וַיִּצְרֵתִּי עֵתָהּ הַבָּאֲתִּיָּה ²⁶ἐξ ἀρχαίων ἡμερῶν συνέταξα νῦν δὲ ἐπέδειξα
וַתְּהִי לְהִשָּׁאוֹת גִּלִּים נִצִּים ²⁷ἐξερημῶσαι ἔθνη ἐν ὄχυροῖς
וַיִּשְׁבִּיָּהּ עָרִים בְּצִרוֹת ²⁷καὶ ἐνοικοῦντας ἐν πόλεσιν ὄχυραῖς

The notion that action determined in the past is now revealed recalls *ἐποίησας θαυμαστὰ πρᾶγματα βουλὴν ἀρχαίαν ἀληθινὴν* in 25:1, while the action against *ἔθνη ἐν ὄχυροῖς* ... recalls *ἔθηκας πόλεις εἰς χῶμα πόλεις ὄχυράς τοῦ πεσεῖν αὐτῶν τὰ θεμέλια* in 25:2. The equivalents in 37:27 are equally redolent of chapter 25, including its initial phrase:

קִצְרֵי יָד חָתוּ וּבָשׁוּ ²⁷ἀνήκα τὰς χεῖρας καὶ ἐξηράνθησαν
הָיוּ עֹשֵׁב שָׂדֶה וַיִּרַק דְּשֵׁא חֲצִיר גִּגּוֹת ²⁷καὶ ἐγένοντο ὡς χόρτος ξηρὸς ἐπὶ δωμάτων
וַשְׁדָּמָה לִפְנֵי קָמָה ²⁷καὶ ὡς ἄγρως

ἀνήκα τὰς χεῖρας connotes unleashing one's power to cause destruction. Similarly in 25:11, *καὶ ἀνήσει τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ*, assuming the same subject as *δώσει ὁ θεός*, speaks of action accompanying the trampling of Moab.

76. Although Μωάβ is occasionally treated as a grammatically masculine noun (e.g., *εἰς τὸν Μωαβ καὶ εἰς τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἀμμων* || במואב ובבני עמון, 1 Kgdms 14:47; cf. Jer 31[48]:15–17, 25, 39, 35, 38; Ezek 25:9), including perhaps Isa 16:12's *ὅτι ἐκοπίασε Μωαβ ἐπὶ τοῖς βωμοῖς καὶ εἰσελεύσεται εἰς τὰ χειροποίητα αὐτῆς ὥστε προσεύξασθαι, καὶ οὐ μὴ δύνηται ἐξελεῖσθαι αὐτόν* || ואל מקדשו להתפלל ולא כי נלאה מואב על הבמה ואל מקדשו להתפלל ולא כי נלאה מואב על הבמה, never is Μωαβίτις treated as masculine in this translation.

The choice of *καὶ ἀνήσει τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ* likely made it difficult to integrate an equivalent for *בקרבו*, as seems to have been true also in 26:9's *ἐκ νυκτὸς ὀρθρίζει τὸ πνεῦμά μου πρὸς σέ ὁ θεός || בלילה אף רוחי בקרבי אשחרר*. For the translator's tendency to condense forms with *קרב*, compare *ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς || בקרב הארץ* in 5:8 (cf. 6:12; 7:22; 10:23; 19:24; 24:13).

The lack of an equivalent for *יפרש* is explicable from the translator's frequent omission of identical or similar words in adjacent clauses (see Van der Vorm-Croughs, 197–200), here abetted by his rendering *השחה לשחות* as the heart of the comparison.

ἐταπεινώσε reflects identification of *השחה* with *שחת*, as in 2:11, 17, 5:15, and 25:12. *τοῦ ἀπολέσαι* renders *לשחות* by association with *שחת* (compare *οὐδὲ μὴ δύνωνται ἀπολέσαι οὐδένα || ולא ישחיתו*, 11:9; *ἀπώλεσας || שחת*, 14:20). Correlative to this will be another humbling: *καὶ ταπεινώσει τὴν ὕβριν αὐτοῦ || והשפיל גאותו*. If the referent of *αὐτοῦ* is the Kyrios, as seems to be true with *τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ*, then the Kyrios will abase his own *ὑβρις*, an attribute otherwise not associated with him. This problem has produced different solutions.

NETS's tack is to pair the first two clauses closely—"And he will send forth his hands, as he himself brought him low to destroy him"—allowing the next clause to stand independently: "and he will bring low his pride." Although this leaves the referent undefined, it allows the first two clauses to form a statement unencumbered by *τὴν ὕβριν αὐτοῦ*. The problem, however, is the use of *ἐταπεινώσε* for *השחה* in the clause introduced by *ὁν τρόπον* and *καὶ ταπεινώσει* for *והשפיל* in the next. Although *ταπεινώω* renders *שפל* elsewhere (e.g., 2:9, 11; 10:33; 13:11), the translator avoided repeating it in adjacent clauses in 5:15 (*καὶ ταπεινωθήσεται ἄνθρωπος, καὶ ἀτιμασθήσεται ἀνὴρ, καὶ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ οἱ μετέωροι ταπεινωθήσονται || וישפיל אדם וישפיל איש ועיני גבהים תשפלנה*) and will do so again in 25:12's *ταπεινώσει καὶ καταβήσεται || השח השפיל*. Its repetition in adjacent clauses here highlights the correlation between a humiliation accomplished (*ἐταπεινώσε*) and one yet future (*καὶ ταπεινώσει*).

This correlation seems implied also by *+καὶ αὐτός*. Although *καὶ αὐτός* could reflect *והוא* in the source text (as in 8:13; 34:17; 53:7, 12), the translator elsewhere inserts a pronoun in the nominative case to explicitize (e.g., 1:29; 30:32; 42:17; 53:12) or underscore (e.g., 3:14; 28:20; 63:9; 65:3, 21 [2x]) the subject. Notable are *+αὐτός* in the protasis and *+καὶ αὐτός* in 27:7's *μὴ ὥς αὐτὸς ἐπάταξε καὶ αὐτὸς οὕτως πληγῆσεται; || הכמכת מכהו הכהו*. Their pairing in the rhetorical question underscores correlation between his abuse of others and the retribution he receives. On the other

hand, +αὐτοὶ δέ in 28:8's στενοχωρούμενοι οὐ δυνάμεθα μάχεσθαι αὐτοὶ δὲ ἀσθενοῦμεν τοῦ ἡμᾶς συναχθῆναι || כִּי קָצַר הַמָּצַע מִהַשְׁתַּרֵּעַ וְהַמַּסְכָּה צָרָה || כַּהֲתַכְנֹס marks the change of subject in the contrast. In 25:11 +καὶ αὐτός marks continuity of agent with ἀνήσει, but it is peculiar because the subject is already clear. Its semantic function, then, is likely to distinguish this clause from the preceding one, implicitly marking ὃν τρόπον as the protasis, with καὶ ταπεινώσει as apodosis. This, however, provides no solution to the problem of referent in τὴν ὕβριν αὐτοῦ.

Septuaginta Deutsch resolves the problem by inferring Moab (25:10) as subject for ἐταπεινώσει and as referent for (τὴν ὕβριν) αὐτοῦ: “und er wird seinen Händen freien Lauf lassen, ebenso wie auch er (Moab) (andere) erniedrigt hat bis zur Vernichtung; und er wird seine (Moabs) Überheblichkeit erniedrigen.” Arrogance is prominently associated with Moab in 16:6's τὴν ὕβριν Μωαβ ὑβριστῆς σφόδρα (|| גִּאוֹן מוֹאָב גָּא מְאֹד). The problem is that Μωαβίτις (rather than Μωαβ) is the antecedent to αὐτοῦ, and it is consistently treated as grammatically feminine (see n. 77, above). Meanwhile, the switch in subject from the Kyrios to Moab and back to the Kyrios seems capricious.

Perplexity over the referent in τὴν ὕβριν αὐτοῦ bumps up against another problem: ἐφ' ἃ τὰς χεῖρας ἐπέβαλε || עַם אֲרָבוֹת יָדָיו. NETS separates this phrase from what precedes it by an em dash, treating it as a fragment: “things on which he laid his hands.” This effective shelving of the problem could be explained as an instance of “the translator losing his clue, and going gradually astray” (Ottley 1:50). Even granting that the translator was likely perplexed by אֲרָבוֹת (cf. S's حَمْرٌ مِصْرِيَّةٌ, ܡܫܬܪܬܐ) and chose ἐπιβάλλω, as he did often when the phrase involved יָד, ⁷⁷ ἐφ' ἃ || עַם defies explanation. Although the structure ἐφ' ἃ || עַם recalls ἐφ' ὧ || לו ... זֶה in 25:9, the typical equivalent for עַם is μετὰ (7x; cf. καὶ πάρδαλις συναναπαύσεται ἐρίφω || עַם גְּדִי יִרְבֵּץ, 11:6), while מעם is rendered by παρά four times. The only other atypical equivalent is ἐκ τῆς συγγενείας μου (38:12) || עַם יוֹשְׁבֵי חֲדָל דּוּרִי, an understandable choice given the preceding οὐκέτι μὴ

77. Compare καὶ ἐπέβαλε τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἐπ' αὐτούς || וַיִּט יָדוֹ עֲלֵיהֶם (5:25), καὶ ἐπὶ Μωαβ πρῶτον τὰς χεῖρας ἐπιβαλοῦσιν || וּמוֹאָב מִשְׁלֹחַ יָדָם (11:14), καὶ ἐπιβαλεῖ τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸν ποταμόν || וְהִגִּיף יָדוֹ עַל הַנָּהָר (11:15; cf. 19:16). Although these uses of the verb connote violence, its sense elsewhere is more neutral: καὶ ἐπὶ κοίτην ἐκγόνων ἀσπιδων τὴν χεῖρα ἐπιβαλεῖ || וְעַל מְאוֹרֵת צַפְעוֹנִי גְמוּלָה יִדּוּ הַדָּה (11:8); καὶ ἐπιβλήσεται ἐπ' αὐτήν σπαρτίον γεωμετρίας ἐρήμου || וְנִטָּה עֲלֶיהָ קוֹ תֵּהוּ (34:11); καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπιβαλεῖ αὐτοῖς κλήρους || וְהוּא הִפִּיל לָהֶן גּוּרָל (34:17).

ἴδω ἄνθρωπον (|| אָבִיט אָדָם עוֹד ||). Further, despite the similar ἐφ' ἃ ἂν ἐπιβάλλωσι τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν καὶ λήμψονται || ישימו בידם ולקחו || in 3 Kgdms 21:6, the relative pronoun has an antecedent in the preceding clause: καὶ ἔσται τὰ ἐπιθυμήματα ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν (|| וְהָיָה כָּל מַחְמַד עֵינֶיךָ ||). Although ἐπί is frequently used to mark the indirect object (and especially so with ἐπιβάλλω), the antecedent of (ἐφ') ἃ is as unclear as that of αὐτοῦ.

One might posit that the *Vorlage* read עַל for עִם, but it is unclear what would have triggered the error. Nor did this translator use ἐπί exclusively for עַל (e.g., καὶ αἰσχυνθήσονται ἡττηθέντες οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι ἐπὶ τοῖς Αἰθίοσιν || וְהָיוּ כִּשְׂרָפוֹת וְהָיוּ כִּשְׂרָפוֹת, 20:5), any more than he had a single equivalent for עַל (e.g., ἦν εἶδεν κατὰ τῆς Ἰουδαίας || אָשֶׁר חָזָה עַל יְהוּדָה, 1:1).

Septuaginta Deutsch renders this phrase more expansively through a gloss on καὶ ταπεινώσει τὴν ὕβριν αὐτοῦ that bridges to it: “(, nämlich die Unternehmungen vereiteln), an die es Hand angelegt hat.” As is already clear from the inferences about subjects and referents, the translation reflects an assumption that the translator did not falter but regarded ἐφ' ἃ... integral to the discourse.

The translator injects a comparably oblique prepositional phrase in rendering 46:11, following the proclamation of 46:10b:

אָמַר עֲצָתִי תִּקּוּם	καὶ εἶπα πᾶσά μου ἡ βουλὴ στήσεται
וְכָל חִפְצֵי אַעֲשֶׂה	καὶ πάντα ὅσα βεβούλευμαι ποιήσω
קָרָא מִמְּזִרְחַ עֵיט ¹¹	¹¹ καλῶν ἀπ' ἀνατολῶν πετεινὸν
מֵאַרְץ מִרְחָק אִישׁ עֲצָתִי	καὶ ἀπὸ γῆς πόρρωθεν περὶ ὧν βεβούλευμαι
אֶף אֲבִיאנָה	ἐλάλησα καὶ ἤγαγον
יִצְרֵתִי אֶף אַעֲשֶׂנָה	ἔκτισα καὶ ἐποίησα

Although περὶ ὧν βεβούλευμαι doubtless refers to ὅσα βεβούλευμαι before it, it aligns only with אִישׁ עֲצָתִי, in contrast to the acceptable rendering of עֵיט by πετεινόν. Nevertheless, as ἐλάλησα καὶ ἤγαγον suggests, περὶ ὧν βεβούλευμαι functions as direct object of καλῶν, much like πετεινόν, with ὧν grammatically in the neuter plural, reminiscent of ὅσα.

The relative clause ἐφ' ἃ τὰς χεῖρας ἐπέβαλε here can be similarly understood.⁷⁸ Just as περὶ in 46:11 seems selected for its relationship to βεβούλευμαι, so ἐπί was chosen to match ἐπέβαλε. Likewise, just as περὶ ὧν βεβούλευμαι functions as a nominal phrase, so does ἐφ' ἃ τὰς χεῖρας

78. Although not as tortuous, a somewhat novel use of a relative clause is καὶ ταχὺ οἰκοδομηθήσῃ ὑφ' ὧν καθηρέθης || מִהֶרָו בְּנִיד מִהֶרָו in 49:17.

ἐπέβαλε, the subject of which can be understood more readily as in agreement with αὐτοῦ than ταπεινώσει, although the phrase itself qualifies τὴν ὕβριν: “and he will humble the pride of him who laid hands on items.” This analysis remains speculative, but it is preferable to concluding that this translator simply ignored the meaning he created through these exigencies.

Syriac’s ܠܝܫܬܝܢ, ܠܝܫܬܝܢ has traditionally been glossed as “the spreading of his hands,” but this is the only occurrence of the noun ܠܝܫܬܝܢ, whose lexical roots are uncertain (according to Sokoloff [s.v. “ܠܝܫܬܝܢ”], Bar Hebraeus related it to ܠܝܫܬܝܢ).

25:12

ܠܝܫܬܝܢ appears only here in Hebrew books translated into Syriac, although in 2 Macc 5:5 ܠܝܫܬܝܢ translates τὴν ἀκρόπολιν, just as ܠܝܫܬܝܢ alone does in 2 Macc 4:28, and it renders ἡ ἄκρα in 1 Macc 15:28; 2 Macc 15:31. This differs from the semantics of ܠܝܫܬܝܢ as “conspiracy” throughout the translated biblical books. In all but one case (|| רָאשׁ, Lam 3:5) it is the equivalent for קשר (12x). Syriac renders the other two appearances of מְבַצֵּר with ܡܒܥܥܪ (17:3; 34:13). This complicates identifying equivalents here when we take account of מְשׁוּב, ⁷⁹ which is most frequently translated by ܡܫܥܒܐ (e.g., 2 Sam 22:3; Pss 9:10; 18:3) but is also rendered by ܡܥܥܒܐ (Ps 48:4) and ܡܥܥܒܐ (Ps 94:22), while the verb שׁוּב is most often rendered by ܡܥܥܐ in Isaiah (2:11, 17; 9:10; 12:4; 26:5). Accordingly, although the precise alignment of equivalents in ܡܥܥܐ || ܡܫܥܒܐ is uncertain, there seems no question of a different *Vorlage*.

Comparison with καὶ ὑψωθήσεται κύριος μόνος || וְנִשְׁבַּח יְהוָה in 2:11, 17 and ὑψώθη τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ || נִשְׁבַּח שְׁמוֹ in 12:4 suggests that τὸ ὄνομα renders מְשׁוּב, although καταφυγή renders מְשׁוּב in Pss 9:10; 93(94):22. On the other hand, despite OG otherwise rendering מְבַצֵּר with ὀχυρός (17:3) or ὀχύρωμα (22:10; 34:13), as throughout the LXX (e.g., Num 13:28; 32:36; Deut 3:5; Josh 10:20; 14:12; 2 Kgdms 20:6), in Isa 17:3 + τοῦ καταφυγεῖν explicitizes the function that Damascus can no longer play for Ephraim

79. The only other occurrence of מְשׁוּב in the book stands in the phrase ܡܥܥܒܐ || ܡܥܥܒܐ (33:16), but the identification of equivalents in that series is uncertain, since ܡܥܥܒܐ renders מְשׁוּב there alone and more often aligns with a form of שָׁכַן (e.g., 22:16; 57:15). Although יִשְׁכֵּן, which stands directly before the phrase in 33:16, is translated by ܡܥܥܐ, given the frequent relationship of ܡܥܥܐ to שָׁכַן, there is a significant likelihood that יִשְׁכֵּן influenced the choice of ܡܥܥܐ.

(καὶ οὐκέτι ἔσται ὄχυρά τοῦ καταφυγεῖν Εφραιμ || ונשבת מבצר מאפרים). As with S, we are left uncertain about the alignment of individual equivalences but have no reason to suspect a source divergent from MT.

καὶ καταβήσεται ἕως τοῦ ἐδάφους || עד עפר || השפיל הגיע לארץ is echoed by πόλεις ὄχυράς καταβαλεῖς καὶ κατὰξεις ἕως ἐδάφους || קריה נשגבה ישפִי- || ארץ יגיענה עד עפר in 26:5. Although ישפִיל is absent from 1QIsa^a in 26:5 and is likely a doublet preserved in MT, it is possible that (1QIsa^a reads יגיע) itself harbors a doublet in הגיע לארץ. However, OG is too prone to drop repeated vocabulary for the sake of condensation to support that conclusion. Giving equivalents for both ישפִיל and יגיענה in καταβαλεῖς καὶ κατὰξεις in 26:5 might have been part of omitting the phrase ארץ עד that separates them, allowing ἕως ἐδάφους || עד עפר to suffice.

APPENDIX A: +/-כָּל IN OLD GREEK AND SYRIAC ISAIAH

1. Introduction

Among the challenges to recovering the *Vorlage* of OG-Isaiah are its many cases of +/-כָּל, linguistically categorized as a “universal quantifier.”¹ Even restricting this study to chapters 1–39, the number of cases is large. Of the 145 instances of כָּל in Lenningrad B19^A of those chapters, OG renders 104 with $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma$ and another 8 with $\delta\lambda\omicron\varsigma$, leaving 33 cases without an apparent equivalent.² Conversely, OG reads $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma$ or $\delta\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ 21 times where כָּל is not attested. In a translation so regularly flexible in rendering its source text, discriminating between +/-כָּל as an effect of pursuing an acceptable translation versus a variant in the *Vorlage* often stymies analysis or tempts one to a tenuous reading of the translator’s mind.

Because +/-כָּל functions at a higher semantic level than most cases of +/-*waw*, the instances of +/-כָּל deserve study. The likelihood that כָּל was present or absent in the source text, how the translator might have reckoned with it when an explicit equivalent is lacking, as well as why he might have supplied $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma$ or $\delta\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ must be weighed. However, those observations will be more disciplined if we first examine patterns of +/-כָּל in Hebrew manuscripts.

1. See David Gil, “Universal Quantification in Hebrew and Arabic,” in *Studies in Afroasiatic Grammar: Papers from the Second Conference on Afroasiatic Languages Sophia Antipolis, 1994*, ed. Jacqueline Lecarme, Jean Lowenstamm, and Ur Shlonsky (Hague: Holland Academic Graphics, 1996).

2. Hereafter Lenningrad B19^A will simply be called MT, but with recognition that other Masoretic manuscripts have variants that could affect the statistics and cases cited here.

2. +/- כל in Hebrew Manuscripts

2.1. +/- כל in Dead Sea Scrolls Witnesses to Isaiah

Below is the evidence of +/- כל variants in MT and 1QIsa^a in Isa 1–39. No other Dead Sea Scrolls manuscript agrees with 1QIsa^a in these cases, while manuscripts supporting MT's reading are noted.

	MT	1QIsa ^a
2:12	כי יום ליהוה צבאות על כל גאה ורם ועל כל נשא ושפל = 4QIsa ^b	כיא יום ליהוה צבאות על כל גאה ורם ____ ונשא ושפל
7:22	כי חמאה ודבש יאכל כל הנותר	כיא חמאה ודבש יאכל כול הנותר
11:9	ולא ישחיתו בכל הר קדשי = 4QIsa ^b	ולוא ישחיתו בהר קדשי
14:18	כל מלכי גוים כלם שכבו	כול מלכי גואים ____ שכבו בכבוד
21:16	שכיר וכלה כל כבוד קדר	שכיר יכלה ____ כבוד קדר
23:9	לחלל גאון כל צבי	לחלל כול גאון צבי
23:17	ושבה לאתננה וזנתה את כל ממלכות על פני האדמה הארץ = 4QIsa ^c	ושבה לאתננה וזנתה את ____ ממלכות על פני האדסה הארץ
30:5	כל הבאיש [הביש] על עם	כלה באש על עם
39:2	את ____ בית נכתה [נכתו] את הכסף = 4QIsa ^b	את כול בית נכתיו את הכסף

Isaiah 23:9 entails a variation in word order, and 30:5 is a matter of word division. Isaiah 21:16 attests either haplography or dittography. More significant are +כל in MT at 2:12; 11:9; 14:18; 23:17 and the striking of כול in 7:22. Isaiah 39:2 contains the only +כול in 1QIsa^a.

Examining the pluses individually, +ועל כל in 2:12 (MT, 4Q56) conforms to the preceding על כל גאה. Similarly, 1QIsa^a's +כול in 39:2 assimilates the line to ואת כול בית כליו later in the sentence. The possibility that MT's +כלם in 14:18 assimilates the preceding כל מלכי גוים to the end of

14:9 will be discussed below in evaluating the lack of an equivalent in OG and S.

The deliberate excision of כל at 7:22 in 1QIsa^a is striking, given that MT's כל stands before an articular noun, just as 1QIsa^a has +ה after כל in 7:23. +כל between ב and הר in the MT of 11:9 seems unlikely influenced by diction elsewhere, given the many similar phrases without כל: הר בית: כל יהוה (2:2); בהר ציון (8:18; 10:12; 24:23); בהר הזה (25:6, 7, 10); and even בהר הקדש (27:13). Finally, MT's +כל in 23:17 is likely a reflexive addition in a phrase implying the totality of earth's kingdoms.³

2.2. +/- כל in Samaritan Pentateuch Exodus

A further base for considering +/- כל in Hebrew manuscripts is offered by comparing cases in MT, SP, and DSS of Exodus, a book of similar length to Isa 1–39. Despite the large number of Exodus fragments among the DSS, frequent lacunae impede comparison (all available evidence is cited below). Although there are no cases of כל in MT but unattested in the DSS, the DSS evidence contains two cases of +כל. Nevertheless, most of the evidence comes from comparison of SP with MT.

	MT	SP	DSS
7:5	וידעו __ מצרים כי אני יהוה	וידעו כל מצרים כי אני יהוה	N/A
9:24	לא היה כמהו בכל ארץ מצרים	לא היה כמהו במצרים	4Q14 (4QExod ^c) = MT
9:25	ויד הברד בכל ארץ מצרים	ויד הברד בארץ מצרים	N/A
11:6	והיתה צעקה גדלה בכל ארץ מצרים	והיתה צעקה גדלה במצרים	2Q2 (2QExod ^a), 4Q11 (4Qpaleo-Gen-Exod ^l) = MT

3. "Reflexive" refers to modifications attributable to a scribe's or translator's familiarity with diction and idioms elsewhere. Cf. Goshen-Gottstein's "law of the scribes" ("Biblical Philology," 5–12).

12:50	ויעשו כל בני ישראל כְּאִשֶּׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה אֶת מֹשֶׁה וְאֶת אֹהֶרֶן בֶּן עֲשׂוֹ	SP, 4Q128, 4Q136 = MT	XQ1 ויעשו כל בני ישראל כְּבָל אִשֶּׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה אֶת מֹשֶׁה וְאֶת אֹהֶרֶן בֶּן עֲשׂוֹ
14:18	וידעו __ מצרים כי אני יהוה	וידעו כָּל מִצְרַיִם כִּי אֲנִי יהוה	N/A
20:7	כי לא ינקה יהוה את אֲשֶׁר יֵשֵׁא אֶת שְׁמוֹ לְשׁוֹא	SP = MT	4Q149 (4QMez A) [כי] ל[וא] ינקה יהוה את כ[ל] א[ש]ר [י]שא את שמו לש[וא] [
20:18	וירא __ העם וינעו ויעמדו מרחק	ויראו כָּל הָעָם וינעו ויעמדו מרחק	N/A
20:24	בְּכָל הַמָּקוֹם אֲשֶׁר אֶזְכֹּר אֶת שְׁמִי	בַּמָּקוֹם אֲשֶׁר אֶזְכְּרִי אֶת שְׁמִי שְׁמָה	N/A
40:33	ויכל משה את __ המלאכה	ויכל משה את כָּל הַמְּלָאכָה	N/A

In 9:24, 25; 11:6 MT has the full formula בכל ארץ מצרים found elsewhere in Exodus (e.g., 9:9; 10:22). Although כְּאִשֶּׁר צִוָּה in the MT of 12:50 is the more common form of the phrase (twenty-three times in Exodus), the phylactery text XQ1 has כָּל, the form of the phrase found in MT at 29:35; 31:11; 39:32, 42; 40:16, and thus likely a reflexive scribal expansion. כָּל in the relative clause of 20:7 (4Q149) underscores the generic nature of the case (“anyone who”). Similarly, כָּל in the SP of 14:18; 20:18; 40:33 makes explicit the implied scope (“all the ____”). Each of these pluses can be understood as a reflexive (rather than deliberative) addition.

+/- כָּל in Exod 20:24 (MT), however, has been suspected of a deliberate change. Molly Zahn has argued that SP intentionally omitted כָּל as part of “the specifically Samaritan revision of SP” to support “the sectarian claim that Mt. Gerizim rather than Mt. Zion was chosen by God as his official site of worship.”⁴ Given the vicissitudes of כָּל generally within Hebrew manuscripts, claiming that a scribe omitted it to score an ideological point

4. Zahn, *Rethinking Rewritten Scripture*, 157 n. 50.

requires additional evidence, especially since none of the other instances appears to be a matter of SP omitting כל.

It is possible to read במקום as an earlier form of the text into which כל has been introduced later. Whether read as arthrous or not, במקום simply designates a site where an altar might be built. Within 20:24–26 the location of altars is incidental; the focus is on what sort of construction is permitted. Although +כל makes clear that multiple sites can be divinely sanctioned, that is already implicit in the optional building materials permitted. Thus, כל in MT is likely a later expansion of the reading attested in SP.

2.3. Conclusions Based on +/- כל in Hebrew Manuscripts

This survey of +/- כל in Hebrew manuscripts yields three conclusions that can inform consideration of cases in OG-Isaiah. First, in a manuscript the length of Isa 1–39 and Exod 1–40, the number of cases of +/- כל in the *Vorlage* is unlikely to be as large as OG-Isaiah suggests. Second, we should expect an occasional +כל, most often introduced reflexively rather than deliberately. Third, the dominant trend is the addition of כל rather than its omission, whose only certain case is a corrector striking it in 7:22 of 1QIsa^a.

3. +/- כל in Syriac and Old Greek

A further control for evaluating +/- כל in OG-Isaiah comes from examining passages where both OG and S attest a variant.

3.1. - כל in Syriac and Old Greek

Although cases of - כל are often especially difficult to evaluate, since the prime factor is shared silence, the lack of a rendering in both translations spurs questions from more angles than contemplating - כל in either version alone.

Syriac's regular equivalent for כל is ܐܠܝܐ, which it employs 132 times in Isaiah, thirteen of which are pluses in comparison to MT. There are six minuses S shares with OG: 5:28; 14:18; 22:3; 30:5; 37:17; 38:16. In 30:5 both OG and S lack an equivalent for the first two words, כל הבאיש (1QIsa^a reads בלה באש, a different word division; V and T agree with MT), which is most straightforwardly explained as a minus in the *Vorlage* of each translator.

Isaiah 5:28 is the first instance where both OG and S lack an equivalent for כל:

וכל קשתתיו דרכות
 ܡܩܬܬܝܘܢ ܕܪܚܬܝܐ
 και τὰ τόξα αὐτῶν ἐντεταμένα

Following 5:26's report of a divine mustering of troops, S unifies the description of the horde by its uniform use of ʕ + 3mp imperfect verbs in 5:27, its rendering of 3ms pronominal suffixes as grammatically plural (ܬܢܝܫܝܐ || ܡܚܬܝܬܝܐ; ܡܚܬܝܬܝܐ || ܢܥܠܝܐ), and its apparent elision of ܒܘ (ܒܘ || ܘܐܝܢ ܒܘܫܠ ܒܘ) (cf. ܘܐܝܢ ܒܘܫܠ ܒܘ || ܫܐܝܓܐ ܠܘ || 5:29). Syriac's lack of an equivalent for אשר in 5:28 expedites the shift from the soldiers' behavior and dress to descriptions of their appurtenances, while its translation of ܫܐܝܓܐ ܠܘ with ܡܩܬܬܝܘܢ at the head of 5:29 extends the description and links the similes at the end of 5:28 to the lion similes of 5:29. It is possible that the translator omitted a rendering of כל before קשתתיו in 5:28 to enhance the symmetry in the same way he seems to have done with ܒܘ and אשר. However, rendering כל would not have created awkwardness for the target language in the way that an equivalent for ܒܘ would have after ܡܩܬܬܝܐ or that a wooden rendering of ܫܐܝܓܐ ܠܘ in 5:29 would have for continuing the description from 5:28.⁵ Consequently, 5:28 provides insufficient information to decide whether S elided כל in a sweep of harmonizations.

Like S, OG enforces regularity on verbal forms and pronominal suffixes in 5:27 and lacks an equivalent for ܒܘ, which would have been as awkward with its verb (ܘܐܝܢ ܒܘܫܠ ܒܘ || ܘܐܝܢ ܒܘܫܠ ܒܘ) as it would have with S's ܡܩܬܬܝܐ.⁶ On the other hand, OG represents the initial אשר of 5:28, while it explicates ܓܠܓܝܐ by adding ἄρματων to οἱ τροχοί, perhaps based on the association of the deity's chariots with a סופה in 66:15 (καὶ ὡς καταργίς τὰ ἄρματα αὐτοῦ || ܘܟܫܘܦܐ ܡܪܚܒܬܝܐ). It is not clear, however, that its lack of an equivalent for כל aims to level the phrases חציו שנונים

5. Regardless of whether ܡܩܬܝܐ in 5:29 reflects ישאג (MT *qere*) or is a translational shift of ܫܐܝܓܐ, the translator does not harmonize with it the following וינהם, which he renders with a relative clause: ܡܩܬܝܐ ܕܝܫܐܝܓܐ.

6. Κοπιῶ renders כשל again in 31:3; 63:13, while the verse's other equivalents are also attested elsewhere: σπεραὶ πέτρα translates צר here and in 2:21, צור in 51:1, חלמיש in 50:7; ἐντεταμένα accords with τῶν διατεταμένων || דרוכה in 21:15.

ובל קשתתיו דרכות (*pace* Van der Vorm-Croughs, 73–74), since elsewhere OG allows such an imbalance to stand or even creates it (cf. 29:21, discussed below).

The most we can say about +/-כּל in 5:28, then, is that we lack sufficient evidence to render judgment about its presence or absence in the *Vorlagen* of OG and S. We cannot assume that its absence is more likely due to the translators than their *Vorlagen*.

Old Greek and S each lack an equivalent for כֹּל⁽²⁾ in 22:3, where its absence in OG has been attributed to the translator's pursuit of symmetrical clauses (Van der Vorm-Croughs, 74):

כל קצינך נדדו יחד מקשת אסרו כל נמצאך אסרו יחדו מרחוק ברחו
 כחשך חלחל בזה אסר מן מעלה אללה, חש אסר אללה
 כחשך חלחל בזה אסר מן מעלה אללה, חש אסר אללה
 πάντες οἱ ἄρχοντές σου πεφεύγασι καὶ οἱ ἀλόντες σκληρῶς δεδεμένοι
 εἰσὶ, καὶ οἱ ἰσχύοντες ἐν σοὶ πόρρω πεφεύγασι

Syriac gives equivalents for both יחדו and יחד (in each case اصبر), while OG appears, at first blush, to lack an equivalent for either. Their equivalents for נמצאך similarly distinguish the pronominal suffix from the verb via a preposition + pronoun: اصبرك/και οι ισχυοντες εν σοι (cf. T כל בך דאשתכח ביך).⁷ The separation of εν σοι from και οι ισχυοντες is striking, since although اصبر comports with the semantics of اصبر, εν σοι does not accord with οι ισχυοντες, and no similar semantic construction appears in the book.⁸ Given that consideration, the *Vorlagen* of OG and S likely read נמצא בך.

[illegible]

7. V's *omnes qui inventi* shows no sign of the second-person singular pronoun. 1QIsa^a reads אסורה for the first אסרו but otherwise agrees with MT.

8. The closest comparison is 51:3, where καὶ ἀγαλλίαμα εὐρήσουσιν ἐν αὐτῇ translates ושמחה ימצא בה (S 𐤔𐤌𐤁𐤀 𐤁𐤅; T וחודא ישתבח בה).

Although *σκληρῶς δεδεμένοι εἰσί* is clearly derived from *מקשת אסרו*, the basis for *καὶ οἱ ἀλόντες* is more opaque. Ottley (2:210) suggested that the translator read *חלם* for *יחד*, “taking the *מ* from the following word,” in support of which he pointed to *καὶ σὺ ἐάλως || גם אתה חלית* in 14:10, even though there is no evidence that *חלה* was elsewhere understood to mean “captured,” and the rendering of 14:10 may have been influenced by 14:2.

Perhaps closer to the truth is Fischer’s (37) suggestion that the *Vorlage* read *יחד*, which the translator associated with the Aramaic passive participle *אחיד* and connected to it the *מ* prefix of the following *מקשת*. Although it seems unnecessary to assume that the translator read anything other than *יחד*, which he may have associated with Aramaic *אחד* (see Byun, 188), this association might have been encouraged by the parallel (*בד*) *נמצאי*, given the translation of *כל הנמצא* by *ὅς γὰρ ἐὰν ἀλῶ* in 13:15.

Although OG retains the slot for *נמצאי בד*, its path to *οἱ ἰσχύοντες* (*ἐν σοί*) is oblique. Scholz’s suggestion (38) that the translator read the second *אסרו* as *אדיר* seems (graphically) improbable, as do Ottley’s (2:210) hypotheses that *οἱ ἰσχύοντες ἐν σοί* might reflect graphic confusion of *נמצאי* into *אמציד* or aural confusion with *מעזיד*. Seeligmann’s (50) suggestion that the translator thought of Aramaic *מצי* “be able” is likely unnecessary, given the variety and range of Hebrew words translated by *ἰσχύω*, *ἰσχυρός*, and *ἰσχύς*.⁹ More likely the translator placed *καὶ οἱ ἰσχύοντες ἐν σοί* in the semantic slot occupied by *נמצאי בד*, having already rendered its semantics with *οἱ ἀλόντες* and seeking a match for *οἱ ἄρχοντές σου || קציניך*.¹⁰ Although the translator might have omitted an equivalent for *כל* because he regarded *πάντες* before *οἱ ἄρχοντές σου* as sufficient, the likelihood that *כל* was absent from S’s *Vorlage*, whose *Vorlage* *נמצאי בד* OG seems to have shared, enhances the suspicion that it was also absent from OG’s *Vorlage*.

The lack of an equivalent for *כלם* in OG and S at 14:18 (attested by V and T) likely reflects its absence from their *Vorlagen*:

9. *ἰσχύω* and *ἰσχύς* || *משען* (3:1); *μετὰ ἰσχύος || במעצה* (10:33); *καὶ οἱ ἰσχύοντες ἐν σοί || נמצאיד כל* (22:3); *μη ἥσσω ἐστὶν ἢ οὐκ ἰσχύει || המעטירה אשר* (23:8); *αὐτῆς τῇν ἰσχύν || מעזניה* (23:11); *κατέπιεν ὁ θάνατος ἰσχύσας || בלע המות לנצח* (25:8); *ἐγὼ πόλις ἰσχυρά, πόλις πολιορκουμένη || אני יהוה נצרה* (27:3); *αὐτῆς ἡ ἰσχύς || תאניה* (29:2).

10. Cf. 29:5, where *ὁ πλοῦτος τῶν ἀσεβῶν || המון זריר* is likely based on *המון עריצים* in the next clause, where OG lacks an equivalent: *καὶ ὡς χνοῦς φερόμενος || וכמן עבר* *המון עריצים*.

כל מלכי גוים כלם שכבו בכבוד איש בביתו איש בביתו
 כחסי מלחמ וחקמל עמם חסמ; אמ חסמ
 πάντες οἱ βασιλεῖς τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐκοιμήθησαν ἐν τιμῇ ἄνθρωπος ἐν τῷ
 οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ

As noted earlier, 1QIsa^a lacks כלם, from which E. Y. Kutscher inferred that this passage (along with others) “may indicate that the Scr[oll] was a source for changes,” implying that the scribe omitted כלם.¹¹ But this inference was based on his ranking of 1QIsa^a among “popular texts” that were exposed to “all the various forms of corruption” that differentiate them from MT, in contrast to which “the standard text ... was carefully preserved in the temple, and elsewhere.”¹² As Ulrich observes, that view arose because scholars, faced with the scroll’s unusual orthography, “were simply unprepared to see that it was not a ‘vulgar’ text impaired by the Qumran community.”¹³ Accordingly, Kutscher’s judgment that a plus like כלם in the MT of 14:18 is of a sort that “it is unlikely that the writer of the MT could complete on his own” has yielded to recognition that MT “displays a later stage of textual development,” even if its “linguistic features ... did not undergo as much updating as those of 1QIsa^a.”¹⁴ Accordingly, we must ponder the absence of כלם at 14:18 in 1QIsa^a alongside the lack of an equivalent for it in both S and OG.

By comparison, S seems to treat כלם at the head of 14:10 as pleonastic in its translation of the final words of 14:9, which it joins with the first clause of 14:10:

כל מלכי גוים (10) כלם יענו ויאמרו אליך
 כחסי מלחמ וחקמל עמם חסמ; ח

Old Greek, on the other hand, construes כל מלכי גוים as the direct object of a clause in 14:9 and renders כלם as subject of יענו ויאמרו in 14:10: (οἱ ἐγείραντες ἐκ τῶν θρόνων αὐτῶν) πάντας βασιλεῖς ἐθνῶν. (10) πάντες ἀποκριθήσονται καὶ ἐροῦσί σοι.

11. Kutscher, *Language and Linguistic Background*, 554.

12. Kutscher, *Language and Linguistic Background*, 78–79.

13. Ulrich, *Dead Sea Scrolls and the Developmental Composition*, 128.

14. First quotation from Kutscher, *Language and Linguistic Background*, 554; second and third quotations from Ulrich and Flint, *Qumran Cave 1, II: The Isaiah Scrolls, Part 2*, 90.

Although the lack of an equivalent for כלם in OG and S in 14:18 might reflect the same concision S imposes on כלם in 14:10, that cannot explain the absence of כלם in 1QIsa^a. The redundancy of כלם, so close on the heels of כל, has spurred arguments for (either) excising כל, analyzing כל מלכי גוים as appositional to אסיריו in 14:17, or retaining both כל and כלם as emphatic.¹⁵ The latter seems unduly speculative, however, since no similar concatenation of כל for rhetorical emphasis is available.

Even absent sufficient evidence to render judgment about whether both כל and כלם stood in the *Vorlagen* of OG or S, regarded in themselves, 1QIsa^a suggests that MT's כלם in 14:18 might be an errant assimilation of כלם כל מלכי גוים ot כל מלכי גוים in 14:9–10. George Buchanan Gray rightly cautioned that “it would be unsafe to infer that G had one only of the words כל, כלם,” and the same could be said of S.¹⁶ But the lack of כלם in 1QIsa^a prevents assuming that an impulse to condense makes it more likely that it stood in the *Vorlagen* of OG and S than not.

The lack of an equivalent for כל in both OG and S at 38:16 is likely a matter of how each handled the oblique phrase in which it stands:

אדני עליהם יחיו ולכל בהן חיי רוחי
 منہا حبسہ سے مہلہ اہلہ تنہا
 κύριε, περὶ αὐτῆς γὰρ ἀνηγγέλη σοι καὶ ἐξήγειράς μου τὴν πνοήν

על כן אלה appears again in Isaiah only in 24:6, where it renders מלך אלה (cf. מלך אלה || כי מפני אלה in Jer 23:10 and || על אלה in Neh 13:26). In 38:16 it is likely a substitute for ולכל בהן in order to present an intelligible rendering, playing a role parallel to حبسہ in the speaker's petition. The remainder of S is transparent to a text like MT, in contrast to OG's opaque rendering of the entire verse that also obscures whether its *Vorlage* read ולכל. Although Ottley's (2:294) conjecture that ἀνηγγέλη construes יחיו as יחיו is plausible, his speculation that σοι is derived from ולכל read as לך leaves too much opaque to inspire confidence.

Isaiah 37:17 is one of many cases where OG lacks an equivalent for כל before an articular plural noun, and S is in agreement:

15. For excising, see Otto Kaiser, *Isaiah 13–39, A Commentary*, trans. John Bowden, OTL (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1974), 29, citing Budde. For appositional, see Ronald E. Clements, *Isaiah 1–39*, NCB (London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1980), 144. For emphatic, see Roberts, *First Isaiah*, 206.

16. Gray, *Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, 260.

וראה ושמע את כל דברי סנחריב אשר שלח

ܠܡܢܐ ܣܡܥܬ ܕܠܥܡܪܐܢ ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܐܪܡܐ

καὶ ἴδε τοὺς λόγους οὓς ἀπέστειλε Σενναχωριμ

Old Greek's omission of an equivalent for one verb of perception (καὶ ἴδε || וראה ושמע ||) accords with its tendency to reduce near synonyms for the sake of concision, while its reformulation of the phrase serving as direct object does not seem radical enough to have entailed omission of כל.¹⁷ S's retention of the syntactic relationship of דברי סנחריב makes its lack of an equivalent for כל conspicuous. Thus, the *Vorlagen* of OG and S likely lacked כל, in contrast to MT, 1QIsa^a, V, and T.

3.2. כל in Syriac Alone

In 7:22 S lacks an equivalent for כל, against MT, 1Q8, OG, V, and T:

כי חמאה ודבש יאכל כל הנותר בקרב הארץ

ܟܝ ܚܡܐܗ ܘܕܒܫ ܝܐܬܠ ܕܠܥܡܪܐܢ ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܐܪܡܐ

The grammatical construction כל + arthrous participle appears seven additional times, each of which S translates with ܐܘܪܝܬܐ + participle (4:3; 36:6; 43:7; 45:24) or a finite verb (13:15 [2x]; 66:10).¹⁸ On the other hand, ܐܘܪܝܬܐ translates an arthrous participle (4:3 [2x]; 10:15 [3x]; 24:18 [2x]; 28:4; 40:22), a participle with a prefixed preposition (28:6; 29:11), or a suffixed pronoun (10:20), and even an anarthrous participle (41:15).¹⁹ Thus, S's patterns give reason to think that it lacked כל here. Notably, 1QIsa^a reads כול הנותר in 7:22. Whether כל reflected familiarity with another manuscript whose reading was not confirmed in rechecking the copy or was errantly prefixed to הנותר reflexively (recall MT's הר בכל in 11:9 and כל

17. For concision, see Van der Vorm-Croughs, 188–90. The argument that OG regarded כל with arthrous plural nouns as “logically inherent” and, therefore, dispensable (Van der Vorm-Croughs, 72) is not compelling. See below, pp. 528–31.

18. ܐܘܪܝܬܐ + a participle, finite verb, or adjective also translates כל + participle or adjective (2:12 [2x]; 3:1 [2x]; 4:3; 13:15 [2x]; 19:7, 10; 29:20; 30:18; 36:6; 43:7; 45:24; 55:1; 56:6; 59:8; 66:10), with ܐܘܪܝܬܐ + noun/participle an alternative rendering (18:3; 23:9; 29:7; 60:14; 61:9).

19. It also renders a relative clause in 29:12; 43:4, as well as a preposition + infinitive construct + suffix in 44:7's ܡܫܘܡܝ || ܡܥ ܝܚܝܕܐ.

Vorlage.²⁴ For example, OG's translation of 1:23 is lucid Greek but opaque to its source text:

שריך סוררים וחברי גנבים כלן אהב שחד ורדף שלמנים יתום לא ישפטו
 וריב אלמנה לא יבוא אליהם
 οἱ ἄρχοντές σου ἀπειθοῦσι, κοινωνοὶ λεπτῶν, ἀγαπῶντες δῶρα,
 διώκοντες ἀνταπόδομα, ὀρφανοῖς οὐ κρίνοντες καὶ κρίσιν χηρῶν οὐ
 προσέχοντες

The compact οὐ προσέχοντες || לא יבוא אליהם is a reformulation that sets OG apart from S, V, and T, each of which reflects the Hebrew phraseology and word order. The grammatical and syntactic parallel between οὐ κρίνοντες and οὐ προσέχοντες reflects pursuit of a balanced structure. Although S and T render ישפטו with a participle (V uses a finite verb), only S renders יבוא with a participle, while both T and V use finite verbs. Old Greek's attention to balanced clauses is equally evident in the rendering of יתום and אלמנה with the grammatically plural nouns ὀρφανοῖς and χηρῶν, correlative to ἀγαπῶντες || אהב and διώκοντες || ורדף. Although those grammatically plural participles agree with S, V, T, and 1QIsa^a (אוהבי שוחד), OG distinguishes itself with its ἀπειθοῦσι || סוררים, the sole finite verb in the sentence. By rendering each phrase asyndetically, OG creates modifiers appositional to οἱ ἄρχοντές σου that adumbrate *how* these rulers are disobedient. This evident design in the structure of 1:23 raises the question of whether כלן (1QIsa^a בולם, S כולם, V omnes, T כולהון) was absent from OG's *Vorlage* or if the translator suppressed it for the sake of his structure. Although the latter surmise seems likely, his reformulation complicates assessing +/-כל. Given that every component of the Hebrew has a clear Greek equivalent, it is reasonable to ask why the rhetorical force of πάντες would not have served the translator's purpose, perhaps by shifting it before the first noun, as he appears to do in 14:9:²⁵

24. "Substitution" designates a class of nontranslations that are not based on interchanges of Hebrew letters and are not necessarily required by the translator's choices earlier in a passage. Their primary feature is that they replace words in the text, even if they are obviously triggered by some of its words, as with ἀπὸ μικροῦ ἕως μεγάλου || הקטן ... ועד in 22:24.

25. It is necessary, however, to recall 1QIsa^a's צבי לחלל כול גאון צבי versus MT's לחלל כול גאון in 23:9.

עורר לך רפאים כל עתודי ארץ הקים מכסאותם כל מלכי גוים
 συνηγέρθησάν σοι πάντες οἱ γίγαντες οἱ ἄρξαντες τῆς γῆς οἱ
 ἐγείραντες ἐκ τῶν θρόνων αὐτῶν ἐκ τῶν θρόνων αὐτῶν πάντας
 βασιλεῖς ἐθνῶν

This shift of the word order to utilize כל renders moot the question of whether he omitted כל in 1:23 or his *Vorlage* lacked it.

Old Greek's rendering of 8:9 is even more opaque:

והאזינו כל מרחקי ארץ
 ἐπακούσατε ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς

The phrase ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς renders עד קצה הארץ in 48:20; 49:6 and אל קצה הארץ in 62:11. Although this raises the possibility that the *Vorlage* read something other than כל, we also must consider מרחקי, whose other occurrences in the book are grammatically singular (מרחק) and translated with πόρρωθεν (10:3; 13:5; 33:17; 46:11) or πόρρω (17:13), except in 30:27's διὰ χρόνου ἔρχεται πολλοῦ || בא ממרחק. Given this translator's "viele Wiedergaben, die sich nur auf Grund der Exegese nach sinnverwandten Stellen erklären lassen" (Ziegler, 135), it is likely that ἐπακούσατε ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς in 8:9 reflects mental association of the phrase with ἀναγγείλατε ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς || הוציאוה עד קצה הארץ in 48:20 or ἰδοὺ γὰρ κύριος ἐποίησεν ἀκουστὸν ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς || הנה יהוה השמיע אל קצה הארץ in 62:11. If so, then it is a substitution that renders consideration of +/- כל in the translator's *Vorlage* fruitless.²⁶

The absence of כל⁽²⁾ in 22:24 stands within a substitution:

ותלו עליו כל כבוד בית אביו הצאצאים והצפעות כל כלי הקטן מכלי
 האגנות ועד כל כלי הנבלים
 καὶ ἔσται πεποιθὼς ἐπ' αὐτὸν πᾶς ἔνδοξος ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τοῦ πατρὸς
 αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ μικροῦ ἕως μεγάλου καὶ ἔσονται ἐπικρεμάμενοι αὐτῷ

Although OG renders צאצאִים with ἐπὶ τὰ τέκνα σου in 44:3, וצאצאִים with καὶ τὰ ἔκγονα in 48:19, and וצאצאיהם with καὶ τὰ ἔκγονα αὐτῶν in 61:9, in each case צאצא directly follows a form of זרע, likely influencing the choice of an equivalent. By contrast, OG translates וכל צאצאיה with ἡ

26. Cf. vñ στενάζω || כל אנחתה in 21:2, discussed below, p. 527.

οἰκουμένη καὶ ὁ λαὸς ὁ ἐν αὐτῇ in 34:1 (where כל falls within the reformulation) and הארץ וצאצאיה with תֵּן גִּיּוֹן וְתֵן גִּיּוֹן in 42:5.²⁷ Accordingly, in this verse OG might have regarded הצאצאים והצפעות as references to offspring implicit in בית אביו, spurring it to condense the verbiage, a pattern so prevalent in OG-Isaiah as to justify speaking of condensation as a tendency (see Van der Vorm-Crouchs, 188–90). The merism ἀπὸ μικροῦ ἕως μεγάλου is a substitution for all words after בית אביו (based on הקטן and ועד), similar to the substitution of ἀπὸ μικροῦ ἕως μεγάλου for מִקְרָקֶרֶק in 22:5. The final clause, on the other hand, is recognizable as a second rendering of ותלו עליו, whether as an attempt to fill out the verse or as a secondary translation of the first clause.²⁸ Given OG's substitution of ἀπὸ μικροῦ ἕως μεγάλου for extended phrases, there is no basis for opining on the presence or absence of כל(2) in its *Vorlage*.

Isaiah 34:2 shows that the substitution of a single word can render a determination about +/- כל infeasible:

כִּי קֶצֶף לִיהוּהָ עַל כָּל הַגּוֹיִם וְחִמָּה עַל כָּל צְבָאָם
διότι θυμὸς κυρίου ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη καὶ ὀργὴ ἐπὶ τὸν ἀριθμὸν αὐτῶν

Not only does ἀριθμός typically translate מספר, but only here does it align with צבא, which the translator elsewhere renders (besides σαβαωθ || צבאות) with τὸν κόσμον (24:21; 40:26), τὰ ἄστρα (34:4; 45:12), and ἡ ταπείνωσις (40:2).²⁹ The first two of these occur elsewhere in the Greek Bible, while ἡ ταπείνωσις in 40:2 is most likely a substitution for צבאה, meant as a characterization of the exile (cf. T, גלותהא; Ziegler, 123).³⁰ Although only here ἀριθμός aligns with צבא, ἀριθμός appears as an unusual equivalent again in 2:7, where it twice renders קצה:

וְתַמְלֵא אֶרֶצוֹ כֶּסֶף וְזָהָב וְאֵין קֶצֶף לְאַצְרָתִיו וְתַמְלֵא אֶרֶצוֹ סוּסִים וְאֵין קֶצֶף
לְמַרְכַּבָּתִיו

27. OG lacks an equivalent in 65:23, where וצאצאיהם אתם may be a late expansion based on 61:9.

28. Ziegler (87) asserts that “Dieses Sätchen hat urspr. nicht zur Ur-LXX gehört. Die Idee von πεποιθώς εἶναι gehört zu den Lieblingsgedanken des Js-Übers.”

29. OG reads ὁ ἄγιος || צבאות in 14:27 and lacks an equivalent for צבאות in 3:15; 8:13; 9:18; 10:23, 26; 14:24; 19:17, 18; 24:23; 31:5; 39:5.

30. κόσμος || צבא, Gen 2:1; Deut 4:19; 17:3; τὰ ἄστρα, Jer 8:2; Dan 8:10 (2x).

ἐνεπλήσθη γὰρ ἡ χώρα αὐτῶν ἀργυρίου καὶ χρυσίου καὶ οὐκ ἦν
 ἀριθμὸς τῶν θησαυρῶν αὐτῶν καὶ ἐνεπλήσθη ἡ γῆ ἵππων καὶ οὐκ ἦν
 ἀριθμὸς τῶν ἀρμάτων αὐτῶν

οὐκ ἦν ἀριθμὸς—parallel to the assertion of the land being full of silver, gold, and horses—uses litotes to designate an incalculable number.

By contrast, ἐπὶ τὸν ἀριθμὸν αὐτῶν in 34:2 likely connotes “their full complement,” parallel to ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη.³¹ τὸν ἀριθμὸν αὐτῶν is OG’s equivalent for צבאם, but the semantic shift obscures whether its *Vorlage* read כל, particularly since על צבאם would suffice as a parallel to קצץ ליהוה על כל הגוים.

Problems at least as severe afflict 27:9 (καὶ τοῦτό ἐστιν ἡ εὐλογία αὐτοῦ || וזה כל פרי); 28:8 (ἀρὰ ἔδεται ταύτην τὴν βουλήν αὕτη γὰρ ἡ βουλή ἔνεκεν πλεονεξίας || בלי מקום צאה קיא מלאו כל שלחנות מלאו כי כל שלחנות מלאו); and 30:32 (καὶ ἔσται αὐτῷ κυκλόθεν ὅθεν ἦν αὐτῷ ἡ ἐλπίς τῆς βοηθείας || והיה כל מעבר מוסדה).

4.2. Old Greek’s *Vorlage* Lacked כל

There are, nevertheless, cases where it seems likely that OG’s *Vorlage* lacked כל, as in 11:9, where it is also absent from 1QIsa^a:

לֹא יָרְעוּ וְלֹא יִשְׁחִיתוּ בְּכָל הָרָקְדָשִׁי
 καὶ οὐ μὴ κακοποιήσωσιν οὐδὲ μὴ δύνωνται ἀπολέσαι οὐδένα ἐπὶ τὸ
 ὄρος τὸ ἅγιόν μου

δύνωνται is explicable in light of other passages where δύναμαι modifies the verbal action but lacks a Hebrew counterpart such as יכל (8:8; 20:6; 24:20; 28:20). Since none of the other textual witnesses for these verses attest יכל or a similar basis for δύνωνται, it must be regarded as insinuated by the translator in each.

There is no reason to suppose that οὐδένα reflects a *Vorlage* that read ירדש בהר הכל ישחיתו, and it is less likely that the translator disassociated כל from הר בכל to make it the object of ἀπολέσαι than that he supplied οὐδένα (correlative to οὐδὲ μὴ) as the object of the verb, since

31. Cf. 34:16’s ἀριθμῷ παρήλθον καὶ μία αὐτῶν οὐκ ἀπώλετο, whose adverbial ἀριθμῷ designates a *succession* of the ἔλαφοι (34:15) that inhabit destroyed cities.

the active voice of ἀπόλλυμι typically takes a direct object.³² Similarly, in 51:13 he rendered שחת with αἴρω (another verb that always takes a direct object when in the active voice) and added σε to make the object explicit: באשר בונן להשחית || דנ תרופן γὰρ ἐβουλεύσατο τοῦ ἄραι σε ||

The possibility that OG's *Vorlage* lacked כל finds support in 1QIsa^a, which reads ולא ישחיתו בהר קדשי. Although this does not prove that כל was absent also from OG's *Vorlage*, it evinces that not all manuscripts of Isaiah in the era when OG was produced read כל in 11:9.

In 65:25, whose content is reminiscent of 11:9, OG's οὐκ ἀδικήσουσιν οὐδὲ λυμανοῦνται ἐπὶ τῷ ὄρει τῷ ἁγίῳ μου || לא ירעו ולא ישחיתו בכל הר || suggests כל was absent from its *Vorlage*. Van der Vorm-Croughs (331) proposes that OG's lack of an equivalent for כל results from the influence of τὸ ὄρος τὸ ἅγιόν μου || הר || קדשי in 65:11 just as that phrase seems to have influenced καὶ κληρονομήσει τὸ ὄρος τὸ ἅγιόν μου || יורש הרי in 65:9. However, expanding הרי into τὸ ὄρος τὸ ἅγιόν μου is quite different from omitting an equivalent for כל, which underscores the scope of the sacred space under protection.³³ In fact, כל הר קדשי occurs only in Isa 11:9; 65:25 in the Bible (both הר קדשי in בבלי הר קדשי), while הר קדשי without כל occurs often in Isaiah (56:7; 57:13; 65:11; 66:20) and elsewhere (Exod 20:40; Joel 2:1; 4:17; Obad 16; Zeph 3:11). This pattern strengthens the inference that כל was absent from the *Vorlage*.

Old Greek's lack of an equivalent for כל in 21:16's ἐκλείψει ἡ δόξα τῶν υἱῶν Κηδάρ || כבוד קדר || כלה aligns with its absence in 1QIsa^a, reinforcing the likelihood that OG's *Vorlage* lacked כל, perhaps by haplography, as Van der Vorm-Croughs (72 n. 28) suggests, although it is also possible that a later scribe added כל to כבוד קדר in order to emphasize the depth of Kedar's loss.³⁴

By contrast, in 8:7's τὸν βασιλέα τῶν Ἀσσυρίων καὶ τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ || את מלך אשור ואת כל כבודו (כל is attested by 1QIsa^a, 4Q59, 4Q60, S, V, and T), it is difficult to discern either why כל might have fallen out or why the

32. Exceptional is 25:11's δν τρόπον καὶ αὐτὸς ἐταπείνωσε τοῦ ἀπολέσαι, καὶ ταπεινώσει τὴν ὕβριν αὐτοῦ || באשר יפרש השחה לשחות והשפיל גאותו ||. The object of ἀπόλεσαν is implicit in 37:11.

33. Additionally, while 65:9's τὸ ὄρος τὸ ἅγιόν μου matches 65:11, it also matches τὸ ὄρος τὸ ἅγιόν μου in 11:9, suggesting that the impetus for expanding הרי in 65:9 may have run deeper than just 65:11.

34. S, V, and T reflect כל τῶν υἱῶν Κηδάρ || כבוד קדר || likely reflects a *Vorlage* harmonized with בני קדר in 21:17.

translator might have omitted it. On the other hand, one can understand why a scribe copying **כבודו ואת מלך אשור** might prefix **כל** to **כבודו** to enhance the gravity of **כבודו ואת כבודו**. Whatever the verdict on the origins of **כל**, it was absent from OG's *Vorlage*.

The criterion of probability—whether **כל** is more likely attributable to the translator or a later scribal addition—is a factor elsewhere, such as 3:1:

כי הנה האדון יהוה צבאות מסיר מירושלם ומיהודה **כל** משען לחם וכל
משען מים משען ומשענה
Ἰδοὺ δὲ ὁ δεσπότης κύριος σαβαωθ ἀφελεῖ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ ἀπὸ
Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἰσχύοντα καὶ ἰσχύουσιν, ἰσχὺν ἄρτου καὶ ἰσχὺν ὕδατος

OG's transposition ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ || מירושלם ומיהודה agrees with the word order of 1:1; 2:1 (יהודה וירושלם), even if it is the only witness that does so. Old Greek shows a similar transposition in 5:3 (ἄνθρωπος τοῦ Ἰουδα καὶ οἱ ἐνοικοῦντες ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ || יושב ירושלם ואיש יהודה), while it agrees with the MT's order in 3:8 (Ἱερουσαλὴμ καὶ ἡ Ἰουδαία || (ירושלם ויהודה); 22:21 (τοῖς ἐνοικοῦσιν ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ καὶ τοῖς ἐνοικοῦσιν ἐν Ἰουδα || ליושב ירושלם ולבית יהודה). Given the lack of a discernable pattern, these likely reflect OG's *Vorlage*.

Old Greek's rendering of **משען ומשענה** with ἰσχύοντα καὶ ἰσχύουσιν and both instances of **משען** with ἰσχὺν have no parallel, and none of the Hebrew words rendered with ἰσχὺς is likely to have stood in the *Vorlage*.³⁵ Elsewhere in Isaiah ἰσχὺς, ἰσχυρός, and ἰσχύω have unusual Hebrew counterparts, including nearby 2:10, 19 and 21, where ἰσχὺς translates **גאון**, an equivalence that agrees solely with S's **جمل**.³⁶ Given that **γίγαντα καὶ ἰσχύοντα** at the outset of 2:2 is a double rendering of **גבור**, OG's choice of grammatically gendered ἰσχύοντα καὶ ἰσχύουσιν might be keyed to

35. OG's equivalents elsewhere are **ράβδος** (Exod 21:19; Judg 6:21; 4 Kgdms 18:21; Isa 36:6; Ezek 29:6; Zech 8:4; Ps 22[23]:4), **βακτηρία** (2 Kgs 4:29 [2x], 31), **ἐπιστήριγμα** (4 Kgdms 22:19), and **ἀντιστήριγμα** (Ps 17[18]:19), while it renders **במשענתם** with **ἐν τῷ κυριεῦσαι αὐτῶν** in Num 21:18. OG-Isaiah translates verbal forms of **שען** with the passive voice of **πέιθω** (10:20 [2x]; 30:12; 31:1) and with **ἀντιστηρίζω** (50:10; cf. **ἐπιστήριγμα** || **משען** in 4 Kgdms 22:19; **ἀντιστήριγμα** || **משען** in Ps 17[18]:19). **ισχύς**: **חסן** (1:31); **גאון** (2:10, 19, 21); **כח** (10:13; 37:3); **גבורה** (11:2; 28:6; 30:15; 33:13); **מעוז** (23:4); **מעון** (23:11); **תאניה** (29:2); **תלדו** (33:11). **ισχυρός**: **עצום** (8:7); **אזר** (8:9^[1]); **חזק** (8:11; 27:1; 28:2); **גבור** (21:17); ? (27:3); **משגב** (33:15).

36. See n. 9, above.

the larger context's focus on the aristocracy (cf. 2:4), for which OG uses ἰσχύοντες elsewhere (e.g., 1:24; 3:25).

The fact that OG tracks MT closely otherwise favors concluding that כל was absent from its *Vorlage* (the omission of both instances makes haplography improbable). A text that read simply מִשְׁעַן לֶחֶם וּמִשְׁעַן מִים as a gloss (original or not) on מִשְׁעַן וּמִשְׁעָנָה is conceivable.

4.3. Old Greek Likely Omitted כל

In other cases we can infer that the translator omitted a semantic equivalent for כל. Isaiah 21:2 is a convincing example:

עלי עילם צורי מדי כל אנחתה השבתי
 ἐπ' ἐμοὶ οἱ Αἰλαμίται, καὶ οἱ πρέσβεις τῶν Περσῶν ἐπ' ἐμὲ ἔρχονται.
 νῦν στενάξω καὶ παρακαλέσω ἑμαυτόν

It requires little imagination to perceive that the translator made sense of the first two lines by repeating his equivalent for עלי in the second line (with variation of the grammatical case) and supplying ἔρχονται (Ziegler, 65). Old Greek's lack of a standard equivalent for השבתי spurred Ottley (2:205) to speculate that the translator analyzed it as “from שׁוּב, in sense of ‘refresh,’ ‘restore,’” although he also noted that “παρακαλέω is a favourite word in the LXX in Isaiah, to use in cases of doubt or difficulty: cf. x.32, xxxviii.16.” On the other hand, the Hebrew word that παρακαλέω most frequently translates is נחם (22:4; 40:1 [2x]; 51:3 [2x], 12, 19; 54:11; 57:5; 61:2; 66:13 [3x]), which seems sometimes inferred based on etymological associations, not least significant of which is καὶ ἰασάμην αὐτὸν καὶ παρεκάλεσα αὐτόν || וארפאהו in 57:18 (cf. παρακαλέσει || ינהל, 40:11; καὶ οὐκ ἦν ὁ παρακαλῶν σε || כי מרחמם ינהגם || 51:18; ἀλλὰ ὁ ἐλεῶν αὐτοὺς παρακαλέσει || אין מנהל לה, 49:10). In that light, καὶ παρακαλέσω ἑμαυτόν in 21:2 is most likely a second rendering of אנחתה, substituted for השבתי. Given these maneuvers, it is reasonable to posit that the translator substituted νῦν for כל, just as elsewhere he substitutes it for another particle, as in νῦν δὲ εἰς ἄδου καταβήσῃ || אך אל אף אש צריך תאכלם || שואל תורד, 14:15; καὶ νῦν πῦρ τοὺς ὑπεναντίους ἔδεται || עמדי נא בחבריד, 47:12; στήθῃ νῦν ἐν ταῖς ἐπασιδαῖς σου ||

Isaiah 33:20 invites a similar explanation:

עניך תראינה ירושלם נוה שאנן אהל כל יצען כל יסע יתדתי לנצח וכל
 חבלי כל יתקו

οἱ ὀφθαλμοί σου ὄψονται Ἱερουσαλημ, πόλις πλουσία σκηναὶ αἱ οὐ
μὴ σεισθῶσιν οὐδὲ μὴ κινηθῶσιν οἱ πάσσαλοι τῆς σκηנῆς αὐτῆς εἰς
τὸν αἰῶνα χρόνον οὐδὲ τὰ σχοινία αὐτῆς οὐ μὴ διαρραγῶσιν

One possible explanation of οὐδὲ || וכל is that the *Vorlage* actually read וכל, even though MT, 1QIsa^a, S, V, and T all attest וכל. Although graphic confusion is possible, it would take a very inattentive scribe to overlook the problems in a sentence like וכל חבליו כל ינתקו. The orthography is dissimilar enough to undermine a suggestion that the translator took advantage of graphic similarity, as he seems to have done in the case of τὸ σωτήριον ἡμῶν || מועדנו || above. More likely, the translator suppressed כל in favor of better coordinating the beginning of this clause with οὐδὲ || בל in the preceding clause. Given the translator's tendency to omit synonyms, reduce the number of enumerated items, and collapse parallel clauses (see Van der Vorm-Croughs, 188–96), the possibility that he might omit the universal quantifier to do so is tenable.

Van der Vorm-Croughs (72) concludes that in most cases when כל lacks an equivalent, its meaning is “logically inherent in the text,” of which 38:13 seems a possible example:

מיום עד לילה תשלימי¹³ שויתי עד בקר כארי כן ישבר כל עצמותי מיום
עד לילה תשלימי

¹³ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ παρεδόθην ἕως πρωὶ ὡς λέοντι οὕτως τὰ ὀστέα
μου συνέτριψεν ἀπὸ γὰρ τῆς ἡμέρας ἕως τῆς νυκτὸς παρεδόθην

Following the translator's substitution of ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ for מיום עד לילה (cf. ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ || בימים ההם in 38:1), his path from the Hebrew is evident, including his omission of an equivalent for שויתי following παρεδόθην || תשלימי, correlative to παρεδόθην || תשלימי at the end of the verse. Equivalents for the remainder of the words are apparent, save כל. Under the assumption that his *Vorlage* read כל, Van der Vorm-Croughs's (72) observation that the translator perceived the meaning of כל was “logically inherent” to the context is appealing, with עצמותי understood as a synecdoche: the full complement of bones that constitute a person.

The intuition that the translator omitted the quantifier before a semantically determined, plural noun in 38:13 seems equally plausible in the following examples:

30:18

אשרי כל חובי לו

μακάριοι οἱ ἐμμένοντες ἐν αὐτῷ

34:12

וכל שריה יהיו אפס

καὶ οἱ μεγιστᾶνες αὐτῆς ἔσσονται εἰς ἀπώλειαν

36:1

על כל ערי יהודה הבצרות

ἐπὶ τὰς πόλεις τῆς Ἰουδαίας τὰς ὀχυρὰς

Nevertheless, in all these cases the verdict relies on divining the translator's mental processes in his absence, based on what OG *lacks* in comparison to MT.

Against this we must set the cases of + כל before determined nouns in Hebrew manuscripts, as in the SP of Exod 20:18 (כל העם; cf. earlier in the verse) and 40:33 (כל המלאכה ≈ OG), as well as the כל prefixed to הנותר in MT at Isa 7:22 (> 1QIsa^a, S) and before ממלכות הארץ in Isa 23:17 (> 1QIsa^a).

Evidence from S also problematizes testing the translator's motives. Syriac's lack of כל before arthrous forms in 41:11 (ܐܢܚܝܢ ܐܠܝܗܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ, where MT, 1QIsa^a, 1Q8, 4Q56, OG, V, and T all attest it, contrasts strikingly with passages where S alone has the quantifier: ܐܠܝܗܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ, 14:16; ܐܠܝܗܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ, 24:6; ܐܠܝܗܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ, 37:11; ܐܠܝܗܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ, 37:21. As noted in discussing these cases above, each seems an addition by a scribe or the translator, either of whom was capable of supplying it before arthrous nouns or phrases implying a set. In that case, OG's lack of an equivalent for כל in the MT of Isa 30:18; 34:12; 36:1; and 38:13 might owe to a scribal addition in the transmission process that had not affected OG's *Vorlage*.

A correlative observation Van der Vorm-Croughs (73–74) offers is that in many cases “an extra motivation for the omission of כל may have been the amelioration of parallelism, given that in a parallel phrase or clause a word corresponding to כל is absent.” An apt example is 29:20, where OG lacks an equivalent for כל in a clause parallel to one lacking it, although πάντας in 29:21 complicates matters:

כי אפס עריץ וכלה לך ונכרתו כל שקדי און מחטיאי אדם בדבר ולמוכיח
בשער יקשון יקשון

²⁰ ἐξέλιπεν ἄνομος, καὶ ἀπώλετο ὑπερήφανος καὶ ἐξώλεθρεύθησαν
οἱ ἀνομοῦντες ἐπὶ κακία ²¹ καὶ οἱ ποιοῦντες ἁμαρτεῖν ἄνθρωπους ἐν
λόγῳ πάντας δὲ τοὺς ἐλέγχοντας ἐν πύλαις πρόσκομμα θήσουσι

The parallelism between οἱ ἀνομοῦντες ἐπὶ κακία at the end of 29:20 and καὶ οἱ ποιοῦντες ἁμαρτεῖν ἄνθρωπους ἐν λόγῳ in the first line of 29:21 (as well as the clause preceding it in 29:20) fits the hypothesis that the translator could silence כל to balance parallel lines. However, +πάντας (> MT, 1QIsa^a, S, V, T) modifying τοὺς ἐλέγχοντας is more likely attributable to the translator, inasmuch as he has modified ולמוכיח to serve as the direct object of θήσουσι, with πρόσκομμα serving as object complement for his rendering of יקשון.³⁷ Also noteworthy is that he declined τοὺς ἐλέγχοντας in the masculine plural, likely to accord with οἱ ποιοῦντες ἁμαρτεῖν, despite their different syntactic roles. A *Vorlage* reading מוכיח ולכל is far less likely than positing OG's supply of πάντας.

Thus, whatever his reason for passing over כל in 29:20 in silence (assuming that it stood in his *Vorlage*), his addition of πάντας before an arthrous plural noun of his own construction undercuts the notion that the translator perceived the universal quantifier as “logically inherent” in arthrous plural nouns, and it problematizes the hypothesis that he was inclined to omit כל for harmonization with nearby lines.

In fact, he renders other cases of כל before a grammatically plural noun with πᾶς and a grammatically *singular* noun, giving the quantifier the distributive sense of “each/every”: καὶ πᾶν ὄρος ἀροτριώμενον ἀροτριαθήσεται || אשר במעדר יעדרון וכל ההרים (7:25; cf. 2:13, 14, 16; 8:7).³⁸ Especially instructive is the series of six grammatically *plural* nouns with prefixed כל translated by a grammatically *singular* noun with πᾶς in 2:13–17 (e.g., πᾶσαν κέδρον τοῦ Λιβάνου || כל ארזי הלבנון, 2:13). Each stands as an instance of judgment ἐπὶ πάντα ὑβριστήν καὶ ὑπερήφανον καὶ ἐπὶ πάντα ὑψηλὸν καὶ μετέωρον in 2:12, coordinate with which 2:17 begins with καὶ ταπεινωθήσεται πᾶς ἄνθρωπος (אדם), substituting πᾶς for גבוהות (whose semantics are duly represented by ὕψος || רום). The delib-

37. His use of the circumlocution πρόσκομμα θήσουσι || יקשון parallels οἱ ποιοῦντες ἁμαρτεῖν || מחטיאי.

38. Cf. the target language shift of כל הלילות to כללן תגן נוכתא in 21:8.

erate choice of $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma$ + singular noun, producing a distributive sense, is that of the translator.

Isaiah 15:2 offers an especially interesting example: $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\eta\varsigma\ \kappa\epsilon\phi\alpha\lambda\eta\varsigma\ \phi\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\kappa\rho\omega\mu\alpha$, $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma\ \beta\rho\alpha\chi\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu\epsilon\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\tau\epsilon\tau\mu\eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\iota$ || $\text{בכל ראשיו קרחה וכל זקן גרעה על כל גרועה}$. Ziegler (26–27) rightly points to $\text{כל ראש קרחה וכל זקן גרעה על כל גרועה}$ in Jer 48(31):37 as testimony that כל ידים stood in OG-Isaiah's *Vorlage* in place of כל זקן גרועה . Notably, the translator rendered בכל ראשיו with the grammatically singular $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\eta\varsigma\ \kappa\epsilon\phi\alpha\lambda\eta\varsigma$ but retained the grammatical plural $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma\ \beta\rho\alpha\chi\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu\epsilon\varsigma$ || כל ידים . He shows no single pattern of handling $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma$ prefixed to a plural noun.

4.4. $+\pi\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma/\delta\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ in Old Greek

The preceding discussions have already noted $+\pi\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma$ in 2:17; 29:21, but other cases of $+\pi\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma/\delta\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ remain. Three can be set aside at the outset: $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\ \chi\epsilon\iota\rho\omicron\pi\omicron\iota\eta\tau\alpha\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha$ || והאלילים כליל in 2:18; $\delta\iota\acute{\alpha}\ \pi\alpha\nu\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ || כליל in 16:3; and 30:29 (2x). In each case $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma$ renders כליל .

In agreement with Ziegler (58), Van der Vorm-Croughs (41) observes that “ $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma$ occurs as a plus especially often where in the Hebrew כל is found in a nearby—usually consecutive—phrase or clause.” Isaiah 41:11 offers a useful example:

הן יבשו ויכלמו כל הנחרים בך היו כאין ויאבדו אנשי ריבך
 $\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\upsilon\ \alpha\acute{\iota}\sigma\chi\upsilon\nu\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\rho\alpha\pi\acute{\eta}\sigma\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma\ \omicron\acute{\iota}\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\iota\kappa\epsilon\acute{\iota}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota$
 $\sigma\omicron\iota\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\ \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho\ \acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \omicron\upsilon\kappa\ \acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\lambda\omicron\upsilon\acute{\nu}\nu\tau\alpha\ \underline{\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma}\ \omicron\acute{\iota}\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\acute{\iota}\delta\iota\kappa\omicron\acute{\iota}\ \sigma\omicron\upsilon$

$\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ represents כל before הנחרים (attested in MT, 1QIsa^a, 1Q8, 4Q56, V, and T but absent from S; see above, p. 518), and $+\pi\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma$ appears in the next clause, where no other witness attests a quantifier. Although this fits the scenario Van der Vorm-Croughs describes, it is uncertain whether the translator inserted the second $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ or כל already stood in his *Vorlage*.

Similar is 29:7, where $+\pi\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma$ in the second clause lacks attestation in any other textual witness:

וכל צביה ומצדתה והמציקים לה
 $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma\ \omicron\acute{\iota}\ \sigma\tau\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\ \text{Ιερουσαλημ}\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \underline{\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma}\ \omicron\acute{\iota}$
 $\sigma\upsilon\nu\eta\gamma\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\iota\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\prime\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\eta}\nu\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \omicron\acute{\iota}\ \theta\lambda\acute{\iota}\beta\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\eta}\nu$

The quantifier may have been added before οἱ συνηγμένοι || ומצדתה (οἱ συνηγμένοι was likely chosen based on context) to match καὶ πάντες οἱ στρατευσάμενοι || וכל צביה. However, given the evidence we have seen that both scribes and translators were attracted to adding the universal quantifier in such environments, there is no reason to presume πάντες was supplied by the translator.

In 14:12 +πᾶς again precedes an arthrous plural noun but is not compelled by πᾶς/כל in a parallel clause:

איך נפלת משמים הילל בן שחר נגדעת לארץ חולש על גוים
 πῶς ἐξέπεσεν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὁ ἑωσφόρος ὁ πρῶτῳ ἀνατέλλων συνετρίβη
 εἰς τὴν γῆν ὁ ἀποστέλλων πρὸς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη

Ottley's (2:178) branding of ὁ ἑωσφόρος ὁ πρῶτῳ ἀνατέλλων as a paraphrase and his intuition that ὁ ἀποστέλλων owes to the translator mentally transposing the consonants of חולש remain the best hypotheses for these equivalents. Although πρὸς aligns with על, there is no equivalent to πάντα in the other textual witnesses (MT, 1QIsa^a, S, V, T).³⁹ However, על כל הגוים appears in 14:26, as well as 25:7; 34:2, so that a scribe might have reflexively added כל to גוים על, although the frequency of the phrase πάντα τὰ ἔθνη might equally have prompted the translator to add πάντα.⁴⁰

A peculiar case is 24:10, where 1QIsa^a and 4Q57 agree with MT:⁴¹

נשברה קרית תהו סגר כל בית מבוא
 ἠρημώθη πᾶσα πόλις, κλείσει οἰκίαν τοῦ μὴ εἰσελθεῖν

39. 1QIsa^a's only variant is גוי for גוים. The phrase חולש על גוים stands at the bottom edge of frag. 21 of 4Q59, where the tops of חולש are visible, followed by the top of a single ל. The character preceding that ל is not visible.

40. Cf. 40:15, where the frequent על הגוים seems to have spurred addition of the quantifier, whether by the translator or a scribe. Particularly notable is 36:20, where τίς τῶν θεῶν πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν τούτων (|| מי בכל אלהי הארצות האלה ||) leaves the relationship of πάντων to the nouns on either side ambiguous. Given other adjustments of Hebrew phrasing for the target language (no equivalent for אשר; conforming the grammatical number of the verb to the subject, τίς; and rendering the pronoun in ארצם to the singular number), the translator's adaptation of הארצות האלה to the more familiar τῶν ἐθνῶν τούτων is intelligible, likely accomplished by shifting the quantifier from אלהי בכל to πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν. Still more complicated is 29:7, where not just +πάντων but its position is noteworthy: ὁ πλοῦτος τῶν ἐθνῶν πάντων || המון כל הגוים.

41. 4Q57 reads plene סוגר.

Old Greek seems to have chosen ἡρημώθη || נשברה with an eye to תהו, as suggested by ἐρήμου || תהו in 34:11.⁴² This rendering correlates with καὶ καταλειφθήσονται πόλεις ἔρημοι || נשאר בעיר שמה in 24:12, where καὶ οἴκοι ἐγκαταλειμμένοι ἀπολούνται || ושאיה יכת שער also shows the influence of 24:10. Both πᾶσα πόλις and the bare πόλεις designate a group, without reference to a particular set of cities. The lack of an equivalent for כל before οἰκίαν in 24:10 is striking, since πᾶσαν οἰκίαν would be an apt parallel to πᾶσα πόλις. Although one can imagine the translator inserting πᾶσα with πόλις, it is difficult to imagine omitting the quantifier if it stood before בית in his *Vorlage*. It is conceivable that the *Vorlage* lacked כל and that bare קרית and בית were original here.

Isaiah 24:13 contains a phrase with +πᾶς that effects a generalization: ταῦτα πάντα ἔσται ἐν τῇ γῇ ἐν μέσῳ τῶν ἐθνῶν || כי כה יהיה בקרב הארץ || בתוך העמים. ταῦτα πάντα || כה occurs only here in the Bible and anaphorically references the calamities detailed in 24:1–12 that will befall those who have nullified the commands of the Kyrios. ταῦτα πάντα is not simply a semantic equivalent of כה but places stress on the number of calamities.

Allied with this, in 23:18 + πᾶσα seems supplied for a rhetorical purpose:

והיה סחרה ואתננה קדש ליהוה לא יאצר ולא יחסן כי יושבים לפני יהוה
 יהיה סחרה לאכל לשבעה ולמכסה עתיק
 καὶ ἔσται αὐτῆς ἡ ἐμπορία καὶ ὁ μισθὸς ἄγιος τῷ κυρίῳ· οὐκ αὐτοῖς
 συναχθήσεται, ἀλλὰ τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν ἐναντι κυρίου πᾶσα ἡ ἐμπορία
 αὐτῆς φαγεῖν καὶ πιεῖν καὶ ἐμπλησθῆναι εἰς συμβολὴν μνημόσυνον
 ἐναντι κυρίου

The relationship of this verse to 23:17 differs from the MT. Although in both it is a reversal of Tyre's seventy-year fate, ושבה לאתננה וזנתה (in 23:17) employs vocabulary not found previously in this chapter and describes Tyre's business dealings more derogatively. Thus, although it is accurate to call OG "an interpretation of the metaphorical language in Hebrew," it is a

42. S's ܡܠܟܐ || נשברה קרית תהו diverges from its commonplace rendering of שבר with a verbal or nominal form of ܬܫܒܪ. (Equally notable is its lack of an equivalent for תהו, which it renders elsewhere.) ܡܠܟܐ || נשברה might be comparable to the only other deviation from ܬܫܒܪ, in ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ || ܬܫܒܪ, in ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ || ܬܫܒܪ (66:9), where we must reckon with a guess at meaning befitting the context. Of course, ܡܠܟܐ could be an inner-Syriac corruption of original ܬܫܒܪ.

remarkably benign one.⁴³ As in MT, the restriction imposed in 23:18 is that its trade and profit will belong to the Kyrios. Rather than being collected by the merchants of Tyre (emphasized by the insertion of αὐτοῖς before συναχθήσεται, which suffices for יאצר and יחסן), it will be “[gathered] to those dwelling before the Kyrios” for consumption as a memorial offering. The omission of an equivalent for יהיה in the final line allows συναχθήσεται to serve as the sole verb of the clause. Accordingly, the effect of +παῖσα (and perhaps, therefore, the reason for its insertion) is to stress the devotion of Tyre’s entire income to those near the temple. This is analogous to +כל in 1QIsa^a at 39:2—את כול בית נכתיו (MT [נכתו] את)—emphasizing that Hezekiah exposed the entirety of his treasury to Babylonian eyes.

In other cases, +παῖς stands within a phrase or clause that seems an attempt to make sense of a perplexing text. Thus in 16:9 καὶ πάντα πεσοῦνται || הידד נפל is understandable in light of an attempt to find sense in the preceding ὅτι ἐπὶ τῷ θερισμῷ καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ τρυγήτῳ σου καταπατήσω || כי על קיצד ועל קצירך. Although πεσοῦνται reflects נפל, καὶ πάντα appears to have been provided as a subject for a generalized calamity before the trampling of the harvest, in which καταπατήσω is likely supplied by association with καταπατήσατε τὰς ἀμπέλους αὐτῆς || הלמו הרוקיה in 16:8.

Especially frequent are instances of +παῖς within a reformulation, a substitution, or an expansion, as in 27:4, where a phrase often associated with verbs meaning “to command” seems to have been supplied to complement συντάσσω:

במלחמה אפשעה בה אציתנה יחד
διὰ τὴν πολεμίαν ταύτην ἡθέτηκα αὐτὴν τοίνυν διὰ τοῦτο ἐποίησεν
κύριος ὁ θεὸς πάντα ὅσα συνέταξεν. κατακέκαυμαι

The second half of this verse hangs on two interpretations of אציתנה, the latter of which (κατακέκαυμαι) begins a new clause that continues in 27:5. The first rendering analyzes אציתנה as from צוה, with the remainder of the sentence building on it with formulaic language especially at home in the Pentateuch (e.g., Exod 35:10, 29; 39:22; Num 2:34).

Both instances of +παῖς in 19:6b appear in reformulations:

43. Arie van der Kooij, *The Oracle of Tyre: The Septuagint of Isaiah 23 as Version and Vision*, VTSup 71 (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 72. Cf. T, which has Tyre restored to “her place” (לאתרה) and “supplying trade” (ותהי מספקא סחורא) to all the nations.

וחרבו יארי מצור קנה וסוף קמלו
καὶ ξηρανθήσεται πᾶσα συναγωγὴ ὕδατος καὶ ἐν παντί ἔλει
καλάμου καὶ παπύρου

Viewing these lines in sequence with those preceding them, they appear attempts to corral the meaning of the Hebrew:

ונשתו מים מהים ונהר יחרב ויבש והאזניחו נהרות
καὶ πίνονται οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι ὕδωρ τὸ παρὰ θάλασσαν ὁ δὲ ποταμὸς
ἐκλείψει καὶ ξηρανθήσεται καὶ ἐκλείψουσιν οἱ ποταμοὶ καὶ αἱ
διώρυγες τοῦ ποταμοῦ

The recurrence of ἐκλείπω and ξηραίνω from 19:5b in 19:6 helps bind the verses. Ziegler (143) reasonably divined that the translator chose καὶ ἐκλείψουσιν owing to unfamiliarity with והאזניחו “und so übersetzte er dem Sinn entsprechend in Anlehnung an dieselbe Wendung, die er eben im V. 5 gebraucht hatte.” As he notes (115), πᾶσα συναγωγὴ ὕδατος || יארי מצור is paralleled by καὶ πᾶσαν συναγωγὴν ὕδατος || כל יארי מצור in 37:25, although equally notable for this verse is ποταμοὶ καὶ διώρυγες || נהרים in 33:21, parallel to οἱ ποταμοὶ καὶ αἱ διώρυγες (τοῦ ποταμοῦ) here.⁴⁴

While ἔλη translates קמל in 33:9, they do not align here. ἔλος renders גמא in Isa 35:7, recurs in the phrase ובכלי גמא in 18:2, rendered καὶ ἐπιστολὰς βυβλῖνας (cf. πάπυρος || גמא, Job 8:11). Although κάλαμος aligns with קנה in 35:7; 42:3, καὶ ἐν παντί ἔλει καλάμου does not neatly align with קנה וסוף here, suggesting that the translator rendered קמלו וסוף as a semantic unit and to have fashioned the last two clauses of 19:6 from phrases elsewhere, incorporating πᾶσα and παντί to stress the failure of any source of potable water.

+πᾶς stands in another substitute phrase in 10:10, within verses whose images were likely constructed by the translator based on his observation of Hellenistic rulers' behavior.⁴⁵ In 10:10 the ruler vows, based on past successes he enumerated in 10:9, that he will extend his conquests:

כאשר מצאה ידי לממלכת האליל ופסיליהם מירושלם ומשמרון

44. Even ἀπὸ τῆς διώρυγος τοῦ ποταμοῦ || משבלת הנהר in 27:12, the only other appearance of διώρυξ in Isaiah, attests association of διώρυγες with ποταμοί.

45. See Troxel, 226–34; Seeligmann, 87–88; Van der Kooij, 34–38.

ὁν τρόπον ταύτας ἔλαβον καὶ πάσας τὰς χώρας λήμψομαι ὁλολύξατε,
τὰ γλυπτὰ ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ καὶ ἐν Σαμαρείᾳ

Allowing that the translator read הַלֵּיל as if it were הִילֵּיל (cf. 13:6; 14:31), the relationship between his equivalents and the Hebrew in the last two lines are transparent. In the first line, however, after the correspondence of ὁν τρόπον to בְּאִשׁוֹר, the relationship becomes intuitive, with ἔλαβον paraphrasing יָדָה מִצָּאָה and the translator supplying ταύτας to make the basis of comparison explicit. In this light it is possible to grant that καὶ πάσας τὰς χώρας is his substitution for לְמַמְלַכָּת (attested by all other witnesses), while he supplied λήμψομαι as corollary to ἔλαβον. πάσας might be the translator's extrapolation of the conquest of the nations in 10:9 to any other foe. However, the case is also comparable to MT's אֵת מַמְלַכּוֹת הָאָרֶץ versus 1QIsa^a's אֵת מַמְלַכּוֹת הָאָרֶץ in 23:17, leading to consideration that כָּל may have already stood in his *Vorlage*.

+πᾶς figures in a substitute phrase in 4:5, whose explanation requires comparison to texts elsewhere in the book:

וּבְרָא יְהוָה עַל כָּל מְכוֹן הָרַ צִיּוֹן וְעַל מִקְרָאָה עֵנַן יוֹמָם
καὶ ἥξει, καὶ ἔσται πᾶς τόπος τοῦ ὄρους Σιών καὶ πάντα τὰ περικύκλω
αὐτῆς σκιάσει νεφέλη ἡμέρας

The antecedent of αὐτῆς, representing the 3fs suffix of מִקְרָאָה, is Σιών. πάντα τὰ περικύκλω, however, is not a recognizable semantic equivalent for מִקְרָא, which is elsewhere translated by κλητή (Exod 12:16; 11x in Leviticus; 5x in Numbers), ἐπίκλητος (5x in Numbers), ἀνάγνωσις (Neh 8:8), καλέω (Exod 12:16), and ἀνακαλέω (Num 10:2). Just as OG's substitution καὶ ἡμέραν μεγάλην recognized מִקְרָא in 1:13 as a festival, so its substitution καὶ πάντα τὰ περικύκλω αὐτῆς recognized (ה) מִקְרָא in 4:5 as a place. The claim that it is a substitution rather than a translation is substantiated by two similar phrases in the book, the first of which is τὰ κύκλω τῶν βουνῶν πάντα in 9:18(17):

כִּי בַעֲרָה כֹאֵשׁ רַשְׁעָה שְׁמִיר וְשִׁית תֹּאכֹל וְתַצַּת בְּסִבְכִּי הָעֵר וְיִתְאַבְּכוּ גֵאוֹ
יָשׁ
καὶ καυθήσεται ὡς πυρ ἡ ἀνομία καὶ ὡς ἄγρωστις ξηρὰ βρωθήσεται
ὑπὸ πυρός καὶ καυθήσεται ἐν τοῖς δάσεσι τοῦ δρυμοῦ καὶ
συγκαταφάγεται τὰ κύκλω τῶν βουνῶν πάντα

ἄγρωστις ξηρά || שמיר ושית varies from χέρσος καὶ ἄκανθα || שמיר ושית in 5:6; 7:23, 24, 25. It appears again in 37:27, within an oracle in which the Kyrios, recalling Sennacherib's boasts that his prior victories were unimpeded by any other nation's deities (ἢ οὐκ ἤκουσας ἃ ἐποίησαν βασιλεῖς Ἀσσυρίων || עשו מלכי אשור שמת אתה הנה, 37:11), utters a counterpart to the Assyrian's boasts: οὐ ταῦτα ἤκουσας πάλαι, ἃ ἐγὼ ἐποίησα || עשיתי אותה למרחוק (37:26).⁴⁶ Those deeds include:

קצרי יד חתו ובשו היו עשב שדה וירק דשא חציר גגות ושדמה לפני קמה
²⁷ἀνῆκα τὰς χεῖρας, καὶ ἐξηράνθησαν καὶ ἐγένοντο ὡς χόρτος ξηρὸς
ἐπὶ δωμάτων καὶ ὡς ἄγρωστις

With καὶ ὡς ἄγρωστις in 9:18 the translator conforms the verse to the image of a conflagration, already signaled by his supply of ὑπὸ πυρός (cf. ὡς πῦρ || כאש) to complement βρωθήσεται.⁴⁷ A similar indication of this is καὶ συγκαταφάγεται || ויתאבכו (a *hapax legomenon*), which the translator likely chose based on the preceeding verbs for burning, after which he likely dispensed with עשן as implied by the fire, in accord with his bent toward concision (cf. the lack of an equivalent for חתו).

Although βουνός frequently translates גבעה (2:2, 14; 10:32; 30:17, 25), only in 9:18(17) does it render גאות, rendered elsewhere with ὑψηλός (12:5), ὕβρις (28:1, 3), and δόξα (26:10; cf. ἐνδόξως, δοξάζω || גאה in Exod 15:1, 21).⁴⁸ In light of the previous substitutions in this verse, τὰ κύκλῳ τῶν βουνῶν πάντα is likely another, used to evoke the image of a conflagration that destroys all around it. That scope is underscored in 9:19(18) by συγκέαυται ἢ γῆ ὅλη || נעתם ארץ, with συγκέαυται extending the motif of burning and, via its prefixed preposition, resonating with συγκαταφάγεται in 9:18(17). The use of τὰ κύκλῳ τῶν

46. OG includes its equivalent for וישביהן (at the outset of 37:27) with the final phrase of 37:26: καὶ ἐνοικοῦντας ἐν πόλεσιν ὀχυραῖς || ערים בצרות וישביהן.

47. שדמה is rendered by τὰ πεδία in 16:8 (cf. Hab 3:17), likely through association with שדה, for which πεδίον is frequently employed. OG-Isaiah translates the only other occurrence of קמה with a participle, ἀμνητὸν ἐστῆκα ὅτα || קציר קמה (17:5), although ἄμνητος renders קמה in Deut 16:9; 23:26.

48. The translator renders גאות with ὑψηλός in 12:5, ὕβρις in 28:1, 3 (cf. ὕβρις || גאות in 9:8; 13:11; 25:11), and δόξα in 26:10 (cf. ἐνδόξως, δοξάζω || גאה in Exod 15:1, 21).

βουνῶν πάντα as a substitute phrase in 9:18(17) supports the perception that πάντα τὰ περικύκλω in 4:5 substitutes for ועל מקראה.

Additional support comes from 19:7 (καὶ τὸ ἄχι τὸ χλωρόν πᾶν τὸ κύκλω τοῦ ποταμοῦ || ערות על יאור על פי יאור), where OG's πᾶν τὸ κύκλω τοῦ ποταμοῦ, modifying καὶ τὸ ἄχι τὸ χλωρόν (|| ערות), gives πᾶν τὸ κύκλω as the equivalent to the prepositional phrases of על יאור על פי יאור.⁴⁹ πᾶν is integral to that reformulation, just as it is in τὰ κύκλω τῶν βουνῶν πάντα in 9:18(17) and πάντα τὰ περικύκλω αὐτῆς in 4:5.

ἡ γῆ ὅλη || ארץ in 19:18(19) raises the issue of +πᾶς/ὅλος before geographic terms. Although 1QIsa^a reads הארץ, it is less likely that ἡ γῆ ὅλη attests הארץ כל than that the translator supplied the quantifier to correlate with τὰ κύκλω τῶν βουνῶν πάντα in 19:18.⁵⁰ In 66:16 the entire phrase πᾶσα ἡ γῆ—unattested in MT, 1QIsa^a, 1Q8, S, V, and T—was added, but it is just as likely to reflect +אֶרֶץ כל as a supplement by the translator.

καὶ πᾶς ὁ κόσμος τοῦ οὐρανοῦ in 13:10 lacks a counterpart in M, 1QIsa^a, 4Q56, S, V, and T:

כי כוכבי השמים וכסיליהם לא יהלו אורם
οἱ γὰρ ἀστέρες τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ὁ Ὠρίων καὶ πᾶς ὁ κόσμος τοῦ
οὐρανοῦ τὸ φῶς οὐ δώσουσι

Ziegler (64) diagnoses this as a “Glosse aus 24, 21 ... viell[eicht] schon in der Vorlage um כסיליהם zu erklären.” With the exception of τὴν χεῖρα || במרום, OG's rendering of that verse is transparent to MT:⁵¹

49. τὸ χλωρόν was likely supplied by the translator to provide a base against which ξηρανθήσεται || ייבש is stark, similar to ἐν αὐτῇ πᾶν χλωρόν διὰ τὸ ξηρανθῆναι || ביבש קצירה תשברנה in 27:11.

50. This is the only time ὅλος modifies γῆ in Isaiah (πᾶς modifies γῆ ten times), while it is the only universal quantifier with οἰκουμένη. οἰκουμένη ὅλη || כל הארץ occurs eight times (10:14, 23; 13:5, 9, 11; 14:17, 26; 37:18), while (οἰκουμένη) +ὅλη stands without a parallel in other witnesses in 13:9, 11; 14:17. The inclination to supply a quantitative particle with γῆ and οἰκουμένη parallels the expansion of במצרים (SP) in Exod 9:24; 11:6 and בארץ מצרים (SP) in 9:25 into בכל ארץ מצרים attested in MT. ὅλος otherwise occurs only in ὅλω τῷ στόματι (9:12[11]), ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν (28:24; 62:6; 65:2), and ὅλην τὴν νύκτα (21:8).

51. ἐπάγω || פקד is common in Isaiah (10:12; 15:7; 26:14; 21; 27:1), but τὴν χεῖρα is its direct object elsewhere only in 1:25 (καὶ ἐπάξω τὴν χεῖρά μου ἐπὶ σέ || ואשיבה וידי עליך) and 31:3 (ὁ δὲ κύριος ἐπάξει τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἐπ' αὐτούς || ויהוה יטה ידו). The translator's apparent supply of ἐπ' αὐτούς in 31:3 suggests that the idiom of bringing

יפקד יהוה על צבא המרום במרום

καὶ ἐπάξει ὁ θεὸς ἐπὶ τὸν κόσμον τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τὴν χεῖρα

Although κόσμος renders צבא elsewhere in the Greek Bible (e.g., Isa 40:26; Gen 2:1), οὐρανός || מרום appears again only in Isa 24:18; 38:14 (ὕψος and ὑψηλός, the primary equivalents elsewhere, are otherwise typical). Meanwhile, retroversion of καὶ πᾶς ὁ κόσμος τοῦ οὐρανοῦ to צבא המרום ועל כל in 13:10 is defensible Hebrew. Given the translator's identification of (ו)כסיל(יהם) as ὁ Ὠρίων (found again only in Job 38:31), there is no discernable motive for his insertion of the phrase as a gloss; the parallel to 24:21 establishes only his use of the same equivalents. Although it is possible that he supplied πᾶς, there would be good reason for a glossator to include כל in identifying וכסיליהם as something superseding the השמים כוכבי.

The translator's motivation for adding the quantifier in 25:4's talk of a city is transparent from analysis of it in its context:

כי היית מעוז לדל מעוז לאביון בצר לו מחסה מזרם צל מחרב כי רוח עריצים כזרם קיר

ἐγένου γὰρ πᾶσιν πόλει ταπεινῇ βοηθός καὶ τοῖς ἀθυμήσασιν δι' ἔνδειαν σκέπη ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπων πονηρῶν ῥύσῃ αὐτοῦς σκέπη διψώντων καὶ πνεῦμα ἀνθρώπων ἀδικουμένων

βοηθός || מעוז is comparable to τοῦ βοηθοῦ σου || מעוז in 17:10 and τοῦ βοηθηθῆναι || במעוז in 30:2, with the translator reasoning from biliteral association with עזר, for which βοηθός and βοηθέω are common equivalents (e.g., 10:3; 20:6; 30:5).⁵²

Other equivalents involve vocabulary shared by 25:4 and its neighbors. ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπων πονηρῶν || מזרם (based on reading as if it were מזדם, as Ziegler [82] perceived) corresponds to τῶν ἀσεβῶν || זרים in 25:2 (cf. ὁ πλοῦτος τῶν ἀσεβῶν || המון זר in 29:5) and ἀνθρώπων ἀσεβῶν || עריצים in 25:3. ἀσεβῶν renders זרים again in 25:5, while other equivalents link it to 25:2–4:

the hand upon someone was fixed in his mind, corresponding to which τὴν χεῖρα || במרום in 24:21 may also be a matter of conforming to the idiom.

52. Cf. εἰς βοήθειαν || ולתעודה in 8:20. See Troxel, 112–13.

כחרב בציון שאון זרים תכניע

ὡς ἄνθρωποι ὀλιγόψυχοι διψῶντες ἐν Σιων ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπων ἀσεβῶν,
οἷς ἡμᾶς παρέδωκας

ἄνθρωπος is twice inserted as an explication (cf. πτωχοὶ δὲ ἄνδρες || ואביונים, 14:30), echoing ἀνθρώπων ἀδικουμένων in 25:3, while διψῶντες || כחרב matches διψώντων || מחרב in 25:4.⁵³ ὀλιγόψυχος, which lacks a Hebrew counterpart, was likely supplied by the translator as a parallel to τοῖς ἀθυμήσασι || לאביון in 25:4, the sole instance of ἀθυμέω in the book (neither does ἀθυμία occur) and the only time it renders אביון.⁵⁴ παρέδωκας || תכניע finds explanation in Ziegler's (198) observation that the translator often resorted to παραδίδωμι to speak of punishment. The translator embedding it in a relative clause he fashioned (cf. 8:10; 10:14) is no more surprising than his supply of a pronoun as its object.

This web of relationships provides the frame for explicating πάσῃ πόλει ταπεινῇ || לדל in 25:4, whose relationship to ὁ λαὸς ὁ πτωχός || עם עז in 25:3 is significant. Although ταπεινός || דל is common, only here does πτωχός (or ταπεινός) render עם עז. ὁ λαὸς ὁ πτωχός || עם עז likely owes to a prejudicial reading of עם עז as עני (Ziegler, 198), influenced by the contrast between the righteous and the wicked with which the translator infuses these verses.

J. Coste's surmise that πόλει ταπεινῇ attests מעיר לדל in place of לדל מעיר, although intelligible in terms of graphic changes, is unlikely given the other unusual equivalences and lexical ties in 25:2–5 created by the translator.⁵⁵ Neither does that proposal account for +πάσῃ, which must still be attributed to the translator. Likely the translator prefixed πόλει to his rendering of לדל by ταπεινῇ correlative to πόλεις ἀνθρώπων ἀδικουμένων (|| קרית גוים עריצים) in 25:3, over against 25:2's destroyed πόλεις (|| מעיר) that were built to withstand collapse (πόλεις ὀχυρὰς τοῦ μὴ πεσεῖν αὐτῶν τὰ θεμέλια || בצורה למפלה) and are inhabited by the impious (τῶν ἀσεβῶν πόλεις || זרים מעיר).⁵⁶ πόλει ταπεινῇ takes up πόλεις ἀνθρώπων ἀδικουμένων,

53. OG provides no translation for the remainder of the verse (חרב בצל עב זמיר), most likely because חרב and עריצים invoked his penchant for condensing phrases containing synonyms.

54. Elsewhere, οἱ ὀλιγόψυχοι τῇ διανοίᾳ || לנמהרי לב (35:4); καὶ ὀλιγόψυχον || ונעצות רוח (54:6); καὶ ὀλιγοψύχοις || ונפל רוח (57:15).

55. J. Coste, "Le texte Grec d'Isaie xxv:1–5," *RB* 61 (1954): 42–43. Cf. Ottley, 2:225.

56. For ἀνθρώπων || גוים, cf. ἀνθρώπων || העם (36:11); ἀφ' οὗ ἐποίησα ἄνθρωπον ||

but in the grammatical singular, with the quantifier prefixed to individuate the cities of *ὁ λαὸς ὁ πτωχός* (25:3) who have received divine help.

5. Conclusions

The evidence surveyed yields two observations. First, although some instances of *כל* in OG are attributable to the *Vorlage* (3:1; 5:28; 11:9; 22:3; 24:10), the translator might have omitted an equivalent for *כל* in some cases. The challenge is to establish that its absence can be due only to the translator. Under that requirement, the number of omissions securely attributable to the translator are fewer than might be supposed. There is reason to believe its *Vorlage* lacked *כל* in eight verses (3:1[2x]; 8:7; 11:9; 14:18; 21:16; 22:3; 24:10; 65:25), while there is reason to think the translator omitted an equivalent in 21:2; 33:20. Even if we can reasonably postulate that the translator likely omitted an equivalent in other cases, renderings in the following verses render a judgment untenable: 1:23; 5:28; 8:9; 22:24; 34:2, 4; 38:15, 16; and 39:2. We must allow that an uncertain number reflect the absence of *כל* in OG's *Vorlage*.

Second, we must recognize that *כל* is just as easily added by a scribe as *πᾶς* by a translator, as was in evidence in comparing MT and 1QIsa^a in 2:12; 7:22; 11:9; 14:18; 23:17; and 39:2, as well as MT, SP, and DSS in Exod 7:5; 9:24, 25; 11:6; 12:50; 14:18; 20:7, 18, 24; and 40:33. Thus there is uncertainty about whether a scribe or the translator added the quantifier in 14:12; 29:7; 30:18; 34:12; 36:1; 38:13; and 41:11. Although *+πᾶσα ἡ γῆ* in 66:16 could be ascribed to either a scribe or the translator, *+καὶ πᾶς ὁ κόσμος τοῦ οὐρανοῦ* in 13:10 most likely reflects a gloss standing in OG's *Vorlage*. On the other hand, there are reasonable suspicions that the translator added the quantifier in 9:19(18); 13:9, 11; and 14:17, including for rhetorical effect in 23:18; 24:13; and 29:21. We can also ascribe *+πᾶς* to the translator in 2:17; 5:27; 24:10; and 25:4, and it is just as clearly attributable to him when it stands within a reformulated or a substituted phrase (i.e., nontranslations): 4:5; 9:18[17]; 10:10; 16:9; 19:6; 24:13; and 27:4. Thus the impression that this translator often supplied a quantifier is justified, even if nearly half occur in nontranslations.

משומי (44:7), for which the only parallels outside Isaiah are *εἴτα ὑμεῖς ἐστε ἄνθρωποι* || *אנתם כי אתם עם* in Job 12:2; *στένουσιν ἄνδρες* || *עם יאנח* in Prov 29:2.

The intractability of +/- כל in OG-Isaiah owes to uncertainty over whether it was the work of a scribe or the translator. We must temper tendencies to assume that the translator was consistently responsible for variations, given the evidence of +/- כל in Hebrew manuscripts of the same era, as well as careful analysis of each example in OG-Isaiah.

APPENDIX B:

TRANSLATION OF תא IN OLD GREEK AND SYRIAC ISAIAH

The renderings of תא by OG and S have some similarities in tack and on two occasions are semantically equivalent. More often they differ.

14:15	תא אל שאול תורד	νῦν δὲ εἰς ἄδου καταβήσῃ	ܡܨܠܐ ܕܥܡܠܐ ܕܥܡܠܐ
16:7	לאשישי קיר חרשת תהגו תא נכאים	τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν Δεσεθ μελετήσεις καὶ οὐκ ἐντραπήσῃ	ܠܥܡܠܐ ܕܥܡܠܐ ܕܥܡܠܐ ܕܥܡܠܐ ܕܥܡܠܐ ܕܥܡܠܐ ܕܥܡܠܐ ܕܥܡܠܐ ܕܥܡܠܐ
19:11	תא אולים שרי צען	καὶ μωροὶ ἔσονται οἱ ἄρχοντες Τάνεως	ܥܡܠܐ ܕܥܡܠܐ ܕܥܡܠܐ
34:14	תא שם הרגיעה לילית ומצאה לה מנוח	ἐκεῖ ἀναπαύσονται ὄνοκένταυροι εὗρον γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἀνάπαυσιν	ܥܡܠܐ ܕܥܡܠܐ ܕܥܡܠܐ ܕܥܡܠܐ ܕܥܡܠܐ ܕܥܡܠܐ ܕܥܡܠܐ ܕܥܡܠܐ ܕܥܡܠܐ
34:15	תא שם נקבצו דיות אשה רעותה	ἐκεῖ ἔλαφοι συνήντησαν καὶ εἶδον τὰ πρόσωπα ἀλλήλων	ܥܡܠܐ ܕܥܡܠܐ ܕܥܡܠܐ ܕܥܡܠܐ ܕܥܡܠܐ ܕܥܡܠܐ
36:5	אמרתי תא דבר שפתים עצה וגבורה למלחמה	μὴ ἐν βουλῇ ἢ λόγοις χειλέων παράταξις γίνεται	ܥܡܠܐ ܕܥܡܠܐ ܕܥܡܠܐ ܕܥܡܠܐ ܕܥܡܠܐ ܕܥܡܠܐ ܕܥܡܠܐ ܕܥܡܠܐ ܕܥܡܠܐ
43:24	תא העבדתני בחטאותיך הוגעתני בעונתיך	ἀλλὰ ἐν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις σου καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἀδικίαις σου προέστην σου	ܠܥܡܠܐ ܕܥܡܠܐ ܕܥܡܠܐ ܕܥܡܠܐ ܕܥܡܠܐ ܕܥܡܠܐ ܕܥܡܠܐ ܕܥܡܠܐ ܕܥܡܠܐ

(OG *καλάμου εὐώδους*) and is its equivalent for קנה הטוב in Jer 6:20 (OG *κιννάμωμον*). Equally, S's rendering of הרויתי, the verb preceding אָ, with אֱלֵם is a better semantic equivalent than OG's *ἐπεθύμησα*, which diverges from the standard *μεθύσκαω* || רוה (34:5, 7; 55:10; cf. Jer 38[31]:14, 25; 26[46]:10; Ps 65[64]:11; Lam 3:15), likely because no form of *μεθύσκαω* befits הרויתי in this context.² Finally, S's *محب* is an intelligible equivalent to העבדתני, as is its אֱלֵם || הוגעתני. By contrast, OG's *προέστην σου* is based on reading the *dalet* in העבדתני as *resh* (cf. *ὁ προεστὼς ἀλλοτρίας κρίσεως* || עבר מתעבר על ריב לא לו in Prov 26:17).³ The translators' only agreement comes in envisioning a contrast of actions the speaker has taken to those of the addressees, making the agreement explicable as polygenesis.

Although OG and S occasionally render אָ with the simple conjunction (*καί* [2x]/*ο* [2x]), they never do so for the same occurrence of אָ. Whereas S reads recitative *;* in the slot occupied by אָ in 36:5; 45:14; 63:8, recitative *ὅτι* does not occur (OG's *ὅτι* in 45:14 is causal). Syriac uniquely reads *ܐܝܢ* corresponding to אָ in 16:7, although the semantic difference makes it difficult to describe this as a translation. Old Greek and S each omit an equivalent for אָ in 34:14; 45:24, while OG more often omits it independently (36:5; 45:24; 63:8) than does S (19:11).

Those omissions, along with the translations' diverging equivalents, suggest uncertainty about the meaning or rhetorical force of אָ. If that is the case, one might reasonably question whether any word that fills the same slot as אָ can be appropriately called a *translation* equivalent rather than a substitution.

2. Divergences from this equivalent vary greatly: *τὰ δένδρα σου κατέβαλεν* || אָריוך in Isa 16:9; *ἡ δὲ ἰδία ἡγείσθω σου καὶ συνέστω σοι* || דדיה ירוך in Prov 5:19; *ἐλθὲ καὶ ἀπολαύσωμεν φιλίας ἕως ὄρθρου* || עדיהבקר || לכה נרוה דדים in Prov 7:18; and *ἀνὴρ δὲ θυμῶδης οὐκ εὐσχήμων* || יורא וומרוא גסהוא יורא in Prov 11:25.

3. On OG Prov 26:17 see Fox, *Proverbs: An Eclectic Edition*, 347; Fox, *Proverbs* 10–31, AB 18B (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 1048.

APPENDIX C: TRANSLATION OF כִּי IN OLD GREEK AND SYRIAC ISAIAH

Surveying the pattern of +/-כִּי in chapter 15 offers a useful base for comparing tendencies in OG and S:

	MT	OG	S
15:1 ⁽¹⁾	כִּי בָלִיל	Νυκτός	ܠܝܠܬܐ
15:1 ⁽²⁾	כִּי בָלִיל	νυκτὸς γάρ	ܠܝܠܬܐ
15:5 ⁽¹⁾	כִּי מַעֲלָה	ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς ἀναβάσεως	ܡܠܚܬܐ, ܡܚܡܠܐ
15:5 ⁽²⁾	כִּי דֶרֶךְ	τῇ ὁδῷ	ܡܠܚܬܐ
15:6 ⁽¹⁾	כִּי מִי נִמְרִים	τὸ ὕδωρ τῆς Νεμριμ	ܡܠܚܬܐ, ܡܠܬܐ, ܡܚܡܠܐ
15:6 ⁽²⁾	כִּי יֵבֶשׁ חֲצִיר כֻּלָּה	καὶ ὁ χόρτος αὐτῆς ἐκλείψει	ܡܠܚܬܐ, ܡܠܬܐ, ܡܚܡܠܐ, ܡܠܬܐ
15:8	כִּי הַקִּיפָה	συνῆψε γάρ	ܡܠܬܐ, ܡܚܡܠܐ
15:9 ⁽¹⁾	כִּי מִי דִּימוֹן	τὸ δὲ ὕδωρ τὸ Πεμμων	ܡܠܬܐ, ܡܠܬܐ, ܡܚܡܠܐ
15:9 ⁽²⁾	כִּי אֲשִׁית עַל דִּימוֹן	ἐπάξω γὰρ ἐπὶ Πεμμων	ܡܠܬܐ, ܡܠܬܐ, ܡܚܡܠܐ

Syriac either translates כִּי with ܡܠܬܐ, ܡܚܡܠܐ or lacks an equivalent (three times). Old Greek has no equivalent in three instances, and its word choices in three others are not semantic equivalents (δέ, 15:1, 5 [conjunctive]; καί, 15:6). γάρ appears three times.

Old Greek and S lack equivalents for clause-initial **כִּי** also in 8:11: οὕτως λέγει κύριος/ **כִּי** אָמַר יְהוָה || **כִּי** אָמַר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי. Contrary to OG's omission of **כִּי** before **אָמַר יְהוָה**, S represents **כִּי** before **אָמַר יְהוָה** in all its other appearances, making the lack of an equivalent here noteworthy. Additionally, OG's omission of **כִּי** in this phrase diverges from its rendering of it in every instance of **כִּי** before **אָמַר** 30:15. Accordingly, **כִּי** was likely absent from the *Vorlage* of each translator (see the comments on 8:11 regarding its absence from 4Q60).⁴

Old Greek and S again lack an equivalent for **כִּי** in 24:13: ταῦτα πάντα ἔσται ἐν τῇ γῇ/ **כִּי** אָמַר יְהוָה בְּקֶרֶב הָאָרֶץ || **כִּי** אָמַר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי. Old Greek's frequent omission of **כִּי** at the outset of a clause and its expansion of **כִּי** into **ταῦτα πάντα** makes it likely that it regarded **כִּי** as superfluous. That explanation is equally compelling for S, whose **כִּי** is effective without any other link to what precedes.

In only two passages does S alone lack an equivalent for clause-initial **כִּי**: 14:27; and 66:22. Although 66:22 yields no conclusion about the lack of an equivalent for **כִּי**, in 14:27 it may have been absent from S's *Vorlage* (see the comments ad loc.).

4. As noted at 1:20, S's **כִּי** אָמַר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי || **כִּי** אָמַר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי (OG: τὸ γὰρ στόμα κυρίου) likely reflects a *Vorlage* that lacked **כִּי**, given that it renders the same phrase with **כִּי** אָמַר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי in its two other occurrences (40:5; 58:14) and renders **כִּי** אָמַר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי (OG: **כִּי** אָמַר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי) with **כִּי** אָמַר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי in 21:17; 22:25; 24:3; 25:8.

