

# THE OLD GREEK OF ISAIAH



Society of Biblical Literature



Septuagint and Cognate Studies

**Editor**

Wolfgang Kraus

**Editorial Board**

Robert Hiebert

Karen H. Jobes

Siegfried Kreuzer

Arie van der Kooij

Volume 61

THE OLD GREEK OF ISAIAH

THE OLD GREEK OF ISAIAH  
AN ANALYSIS OF ITS PLUSES AND MINUSES

MIRJAM VAN DER VORM-CROUGHS

SBL Press  
Atlanta

Copyright © 2014 by SBL Press

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

**Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data**

Van der Vorm-Croughs, Mirjam.

The old Greek of Isaiah : an analysis of its pluses and minuses / Mirjam van der Vorm-Croughs.

pages cm. — (Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and cognate studies ; no. 61)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-1-58983-978-6 (paper binding : alk. paper) — ISBN 978-1-58983-980-9 (electronic format) — ISBN 978-1-58983-979-3 (hardcover binding : alk. paper)

1. Bible. Isaiah. Greek—Versions—Septuagint. 2. Bible. Isaiah—Language, style. 3. Greek language, Biblical. 4. Hebrew language. I. Title.

BS1514.G7S486 2014

224'.10486—dc23

2014010033

Printed on acid-free, recycled paper  
conforming to ANSI/NISO Z39.48-1992 (R1997) and ISO 9706:1994



# CONTENTS

Preface	ix
Abbreviations	xi
<b>CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 A brief survey of studies on the Septuagint of Isaiah	2
1.2 A survey of studies on pluses and minuses in the Septuagint	12
1.3 How to establish pluses and minuses in a translation	14
1.4 <i>Vorlage</i> or translator?	27
1.5 An outline of this study and a discussion of the method of analysis	28
<b>CHAPTER 2. EXPLICITATION</b>	<b>31</b>
2.1 Introduction	31
2.2 Explicitation through the addition of an attribute	33
2.3 The addition of $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ , $\delta\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ and $\acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha$	41
2.4 Explicitation of the subject	44
2.5 Explicitation through the addition of an object	49
2.6 Explicitation through the addition of a verb phrase	55
2.7 The addition of a pleonastic noun	59
2.8 Explicitation without the occurrence of a plus	60
2.9 Conclusion	61
<b>CHAPTER 3. IMPLICITATION</b>	<b>63</b>
3.1 Introduction	63
3.2 Implicitation through the omission of an attribute	64
3.3 The omission of the governing noun in a genitival relationship	69
3.4 The omission of $\text{כל}$ , $\text{יחד}$ and $\text{רב}$	71
3.5 Implicitation of the subject	74
3.6 Implicitation by the omission of an object	77
3.7 Implicitation without the occurrence of a minus	80

3.8	Conclusion	80
<b>CHAPTER 4. THE ADDITION AND OMISSION OF PARTICLES</b>		<b>83</b>
4.1	The copulative conjunctions <i>καί</i> and <i>ἠ</i>	83
4.2	Particles forming a plus	84
4.3	Particles forming a minus	95
4.4	Conclusion	97
<b>CHAPTER 5. FREE TRANSLATION OF HEBREW IDIOMATIC AND GRAMMATICAL FEATURES</b>		<b>99</b>
5.1	Introduction	99
5.2	The translation of the asyndetic relative clause	101
5.3	The formation of a relative clause to replace a Hebrew construct state	104
5.4	The omission of the retrospective pronoun or adverb in the relative clause	105
5.5	The omission of the genitive pronoun	108
5.6	The omission of the infinitive absolute	115
5.7	Translation of semi-prepositions	119
5.8	The omission of Hebrew idiomatic expressions and formulae	130
5.9	Conclusion	137
<b>CHAPTER 6. DOUBLE TRANSLATION</b>		<b>141</b>
6.1	Introduction	141
6.2	Doublets and double translations in LXX Isaiah	143
6.3	The two renderings are joined in coordination	145
6.4	The two Greek renderings are in genitival relationship	153
6.5	Two renderings of one Hebrew expression form different grammatical units within the same sentence	155
6.6	One Hebrew expression is used again in a preceding or following clause	164
6.7	With a second rendering of a Hebrew phrase or clause a new clause is formed	171
6.8	Two Greek renderings each reflect a different aspect of one Hebrew expression	177
6.9	Repetitive rendering	177
6.10	Conclusion	184
<b>CHAPTER 7. CONDENSATION</b>		<b>187</b>
7.1	Introduction	187

7.2	The reduction of synonymous elements	188
7.3	The reduction of (nearly) identical elements	196
7.4	Two phrases or clauses are combined into one	200
7.5	The cancelling of paronomasia	203
7.6	Distributive rendering	205
7.7	A single Greek rendering represents two Hebrew expressions, reflecting the location of the one and the syntactical function or content of the other	214
7.8	Conclusion	215

## **CHAPTER 8. PLUSES AND MINUSES CREATING OR IMPROVING RHETORICAL FIGURES 217**

8.1	LXX Isaiah and classical rhetoric	218
8.2	Division of figures	219
8.3	Word figures of addition	221
8.4	Word figures of omission (detractio)	262
8.5	Word figures of transposition (figurae per ordinem)	268
8.6	Repetition of clauses: the refrain	291
8.7	The deletion of rhetorical figures	294
8.8	Conclusion	297

## **CHAPTER 9. ANAPHORIC TRANSLATION 299**

9.1	Introduction	299
9.2	The adoption of elements from the near context: LXX Isaiah's pluses and minuses caused by contextual harmonisation and exegesis	304
9.3	The adoption of elements from passages elsewhere in Isaiah	333
9.4	The adoption of elements from other biblical books	357
9.5	Assimilation to fixed biblical phrases	450
9.6	Conclusion	453

## **CHAPTER 10. SOME OTHER FACTORS THAT MAY HAVE MOTIVATED THE TRANSLATOR TO ADD OR OMIT ELEMENTS 455**

10.1	Additions and omissions related to the translator's supposed deficient understanding of the Hebrew	456
10.2	Additions and omissions related to the translator's "improvement" or deletion of obscure or (seemingly) "incorrect" Hebrew	460
10.3	Additions and omissions related to ideological or theological considerations	463
10.4	Conclusion	470

<b>CHAPTER 11. PLUSES AND MINUSES CAUSED BY TRANSLATION MISTAKES</b>	<b>471</b>
11.1 Haplography	471
11.2 Parablepsis	473
11.3 Other possible cases of translational errors	475
11.4 Conclusion	476
 <b>CHAPTER 12. PLUSES AND MINUSES CAUSED BY A DIFFERENT <i>VORLAGE</i></b>	 <b>477</b>
12.1 Introduction	477
12.2 A plus or minus cannot be explained by one of the translation tendencies LXX Isaiah displays	478
12.3 The plus or minus has a parallel in one of the Qumran manuscripts	485
12.4 Conclusion	512
 <b>CHAPTER 13. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS</b>	 <b>515</b>
 Bibliography	 523
 <b>INDICES</b>	
Scripture Index	535
Index of Authors	565
Index of Subjects	571



## PREFACE

This study is a slightly revised version of a dissertation that was defended in November 2010. It is an offshoot of the research project '*The Septuagint of the Book of Isaiah*,' which was started in 2004 at the Institute of Religion of Leiden University, and in which Prof. A. van der Kooij and Dr. M.N. van der Meer also collaborated.

It is a great pleasure to thank those who played an important role in assisting me in this study. In the first place, I owe many thanks to Prof. A. van der Kooij. Without his continuous help and advice this work could not have been written. I also would like to express my gratitude to Prof. T. Muraoka, who, some fifteen years ago, inspired me to focus my research on the Septuagint of Isaiah. Special thanks are due to Dr W. Th. van Peursen for his advice on section 1.3.2 of this study. I am also much indebted to Helen Richardson-Hewitt for the many hours she spent correcting the English of this book.

Lastly, I thank all those who supported me in any respect during the completion of the project, in particular my husband, Matthijs van der Vorm. This work is dedicated to him, and to our three children, Michiel, Boaz and Marit.



## ABBREVIATIONS

1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	1QIsaiah <sup>a</sup>
LXX	The Septuagint version of the Hebrew Bible
MT	The Masoretic Text
AASF	Annales Academiae scientiarum fennicae
AAWG	Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen
ABD	<i>Anchor Bible Dictionary</i> . Edited by D. N. Freedman. 6 vols. New York, 1992
AGJU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums
ATA	Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen
BDB	Brown, F., S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs. <i>A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament. With an Appendix Containing the Biblical Aramaic</i> . Oxford, 1979
BDR	Blass, F., A. Debrunner, and F. Rehkopf. <i>Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch</i> . 17th ed. Göttingen, 1990
BETL	Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium
BGNTL	Baker's Greek New Testament Library
BHS	<i>Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia</i> . Edited by K. Elliger and W. Rudolph. Stuttgart, 1983
<i>Bib</i>	<i>Biblica</i>
BIOSCS	<i>Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies</i>
BKAT	Biblischer Kommentar, Altes Testament. Edited by M. Noth and H. W. Wolff
BWAT NF	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten Testament, Neue Folge
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
CATSS	Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint Studies

CBET	Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology
CBQMS	Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series
ConBOT	Coniectanea biblica: Old Testament Series
COut	Commentaar op het Oude Testament
DJD	Discoveries in the Judaean Desert
DSD	<i>Dead Sea Discoveries</i>
EncJud	<i>Encyclopaedia Judaica</i> . 16 vols. Jerusalem, 1972
ETL	<i>Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses</i>
FAT	Forschungen zum Alten Testament
FIEC	Fédération internationale des associations d'études classiques
GKC	<i>Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar</i> . Edited by E. Kautzsch. Translated by A. E. Cowley. 2d. ed. Oxford, 1910
GTS	Gettysburg Theological Studies
HALOT	Koehler, L., W. Baumgartner, and J. J. Stamm. <i>The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> . Translated and edited under the supervision of M. E. J. Richardson. 2 vols. Leiden, 2001
HdA	Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft
HKAT	Handkommentar zum Alten Testament
HUB	Hebrew University Bible
HUB Isa	Goshen-Gottstein, M. H. <i>The Book of Isaiah</i> . Jerusalem, 1995
HUCA	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
ICA	Initiations au christianisme ancien
ICC	International Critical Commentary
JBL	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
JBS	Jerusalem Biblical Studies
JBTh	<i>Jahrbuch für Biblische Theologie</i>
Jouön	Jouön, P. <i>A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew</i> . Translated and revised by T. Muraoka. 2 vols. Subsidia biblica 14/1–2. Rome, 1991.
JQR	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i>
JSJSup	Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods: Supplements
JSOT	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series
JTS	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
KHC	Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament
LD	Lectio divina

Lett	Lettinga, J. P. <i>Grammatica van het Bijbels Hebreeuws</i> . Revised by T. Muraoka with the assistance of W. Th. van Peursen. 10th ed. Leiden, 1996.
MPIL	Monographs of the Peshitta Institute Leiden
MSU	Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens
MVEOL	Mededeelingen en verhandelingen van het Vooraziatisch- Egyptisch Gezelschap “Ex Oriente Lux”
NAWG	<i>Nachrichten von der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen</i>
NETS	<i>A New English Translation of the Septuagint</i> . New York, 2007.
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
OBO	Orbis biblicus et orientalis
OCA	Orientalia christiana analecta
OTL	Old Testament Library
PAAJR	<i>Proceedings of the American Academy of Jewish Research</i>
POuT	De Prediking van het Oude Testament
PSL	Perspectives on Syriac Linguistics
RB	<i>Revue bibilique</i>
SANT	Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testaments
SBLSCS	Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies
SS	Studi semitici
SSN	Studia semitica neerlandica
STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
StudOr	Studia orientalia
SubBi	<i>Subsidia biblica</i>
TBL	Tübinger Beiträge zur Linguistik
TCT	Textual Criticism and the Translator
TRu, NF	<i>Theologische Rundschau</i> , Neue Folge
UCOP	University of Cambridge Oriental Publications
VT	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
VTSup	Vetus Testamentum Supplements
VWGT	Veröffentlichungen der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft für Theologie
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
ZAW	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
ZVS	<i>Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete der Indogermanischen Sprachen</i>



# Chapter 1.

## INTRODUCTION

In recent decades the inquiry into the Greek translation of Isaiah has gained in popularity. Whereas in the course of the previous two centuries studies were only sporadically dedicated to this translation, more recently quite a number of publications on the Greek Isaiah have appeared. Apparently, the study of this document has an increasing attraction for scholars. This is not surprising, though, as the LXX of Isaiah provides an exceedingly fascinating and rich source for examination. The multifaceted nature of the translation offers ample opportunity for scholars to choose different aspects of the work to analyse and illuminate.

One of the first to be responsible for the growing interest in the Greek Isaiah was Joseph Ziegler. In addition to composing a critical edition<sup>1</sup>, he also wrote a comprehensive work on the character of the translation, *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias* (1934).<sup>2</sup> In that work Ziegler presents a compilation of the differences between the Masoretic and the Septuagint text of Isaiah. One of the conclusions he draws, is that the Septuagint of Isaiah can be characterised as a rather free translation. Its text bears the personal stamp of the translator, who sometimes omitted words which he did not understand, or added words favoured by him. Moreover, the translator of Isaiah occasionally appears to have imbued his translation with his own ideas and thoughts, shaping the text to his own preferences.<sup>3</sup> This observation of Ziegler concerning the special character of the LXX of Isaiah is one of the main principles on which later Septuagint scholars have based their investigation.

---

<sup>1</sup> Joseph Ziegler, ed., *Isaias* (2nd ed.; Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graece Auctoritate Academiae Litterarum Göttingensis editum 14; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967).

<sup>2</sup> Joseph Ziegler, *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias* (ATA XII,3; Münster: Aschendorff, 1934).

<sup>3</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 7–8.

In his *Untersuchungen*, Ziegler has devoted much attention to the pluses and minuses in the Greek Isaiah. According to Ziegler, the majority of them are innovations of the translator himself. Pluses are often the result of the translator's aspirations towards explication and exegesis, while minuses are mostly meant to reduce redundancy in the Hebrew text; they usually dispense with synonymous words or phrases in Hebrew. While Ziegler's discussion of pluses and minuses is extremely valuable for the study of the Greek Isaiah, his work can be seen as somewhat random and incomplete. Since Ziegler, investigations have been made into a wide variety of other aspects of the translation, but up to now we still lack a more systematic analysis of pluses and minuses in the Septuagint of Isaiah, notwithstanding that such an analysis may well be helpful in establishing general tendencies displayed in the translation and the main techniques used by the translator in rendering his Hebrew text. This *lacuna* has stirred up the motivation to dedicate this study to investigating the pluses and minuses in the Greek translation of Isaiah. Do they indeed betray certain translation tendencies of the translator, or do they indicate that he had a *Vorlage* in front of him which differed from the Masoretic text?

But before I reach that intricate issue, I shall first discuss a number of previous works on the Greek Isaiah that have been of importance for the present study, as well as some publications that have focused on the pluses and minuses in other books of the Septuagint. Moreover, before the examination of LXX Isaiah's pluses and minuses can be undertaken, I shall have to clarify what exactly I mean when speaking of "pluses" and "minuses."

### 1.1 A brief survey of studies on the Septuagint of Isaiah

One of the earliest modern works that has been published on the Septuagint of Isaiah is *Die Alexandrinische Uebersetzung des Buches Jesaias* (1880) by Anton Scholz.<sup>4</sup> In this paper Scholz specifically considers the origins of the Isaiah translation. He believes that its Alexandrian author tried to render the Hebrew into Greek word by word, with an admirably profound knowledge of the Hebrew text. Only in such a way can one clarify why the Greek version of Isaiah achieved such a great authority within the Jewish community. This could, in Scholz's eyes, never have happened if the translation had been freer.<sup>5</sup> Arguing from that principle, Scholz seeks to explain LXX Isaiah's deviations from the Masoretic text in the first place as having a bearing on the translator's Hebrew *Vorlage*. This *Vorlage* would have contained many scribal mistakes, particularly

---

<sup>4</sup> Anton Scholz, *Die Alexandrinische Uebersetzung des Buches Jesaias. Rede zur Feier des 298. Stiftungstages der Kgl. Julius-Maximilians-Universität* (Würzburg: Woerl, 1880).

<sup>5</sup> Scholz, *Alexandrinische Uebersetzung*, 7, 11–14.



due to its transmission by means of dictation, which was accomplished by scribes who interchanged similar sounding letters, who altered words, added and omitted elements, and permitted themselves all kinds of freedoms. Only now and then are differences between the two versions, in Scholz's opinion, to be traced back to the translator himself, especially when the Hebrew text was unclear because of corruption or on account of metaphorical language that was incomprehensible to the Alexandrian readers.<sup>6</sup>

A somewhat remarkable conclusion that Scholz reaches in the course of his work is that, even though both the Hebrew and Greek versions do indeed comprise a significant number of additions, they hardly contain any omissions. That is to say, elements which are present in the MT but absent in the Septuagint, should in Scholz's view by definition be perceived as additions to the MT, while elements which are present in the LXX but not in the MT, have to be taken as additions to the LXX. Scholz explains these additions as "Randglossen," adopted into the text by later scribes. His denial of the existence of omissions in the LXX is based on the assumption that it was unthinkable in antiquity that someone would leave out even one word from Holy Scripture.<sup>7</sup>

A quite different approach was advocated by Richard R. Ottley. In the introduction to his work *The Book of Isaiah according to the Septuagint* (1909)<sup>8</sup> he writes:

In Isaiah I find it hard to see that the LXX. gives any proof at all (unless in a few isolated exceptions) of an older or superior Hebrew text; because the translators seem to have been so constantly mistaken in reading their Hebrew, or unable to translate it, as to deprive their witness of all authority ... Seldom, if ever, is its reading intrinsically preferable to the M.T.<sup>9</sup>

Hence, contrary to Scholz, Ottley is of the opinion that the differences between the MT and the LXX of Isaiah in most cases have to be ascribed to the translator rather than to a deviating Hebrew parent text. Besides, Ottley thinks that the Isaiah translator has had a deficient rather than a profound knowledge of the Hebrew. This the translator betrays by his constant confusion of letters, mistakes in word divisions, and the way in which he disregards the grammatical functions of words, loses the thread of the text, and takes refuge in "stop-gap rendering." As an important explanation for the failures of the translator Ottley

---

<sup>6</sup> Scholz, *Alexandrinische Uebersetzung*, 15–16.

<sup>7</sup> Scholz, *Alexandrinische Uebersetzung*, 17.

<sup>8</sup> Richard R. Ottley, *The Book of Isaiah according to the Septuagint (Codex Alexandrinus)* (2 vols.; Cambridge: University Press, 1904–6).

<sup>9</sup> Ottley, *Book of Isaiah*, 1:49.

offers the illegibility of the Hebrew manuscripts with their frequent use of abbreviations.<sup>10</sup>

Like Ottley, Johann Fischer also maintains that the Isaiah translator was lacking in competence as regards the Hebrew language. In his work *In welcher Schrift lag das Buch Isaias den LXX vor? Eine textkritische Studie* (1930),<sup>11</sup> Fischer notices that in places where the Hebrew is easy to comprehend, the translation accords with the MT, but when it becomes more complicated, the translator has often changed his text and occasionally resorted to conjecture. Still, Fischer also allows for the possibility that deviations from the MT are sometimes caused by the *deliberate* interventions of the translator: The translator has dealt freely with his text; he did not aim at an exact word by word translation, but rather attempted to express the meaning of his text. This free way of rendering, together with the translator's supposed lack of knowledge of the Hebrew, Fischer assumes to account for the majority of LXX Isaiah's variants. Differences in *Vorlage*, by contrast, have caused only a minority of them, the Hebrew *Vorlage* of LXX Isaiah being practically identical to that of the MT.<sup>12</sup>

Fischer mentions several phenomena that he regards to be typical for the Greek Isaiah. These are, among others, *Doppelübersetzungen* (which he takes to be the work of later editors), clarifying additions, the transposition of consonants (לֵא becomes אֵל), the mutual influence of related texts, haplography and dittography at the beginning and end of words, and inner Greek corruptions.<sup>13</sup> But the most striking aspect that he thinks typifies the LXX of Isaiah is the fact that this translation very frequently displays a *Defizit* in comparison to the MT. As a clarification for these (mostly small) minuses he offers several options:

- The translator has accidentally skipped part of the text.
- Intentional omissions by the translator, especially when he did not grasp an expression, or when something in his eyes did not fit well in the context.
- The drawing together of textual elements by the translator, who thus wanted to offer a shortened version of the text.
- Something was already missing in the *Vorlage* of the LXX.

Fischer concludes by positing that in most cases LXX Isaiah's *Defizit* is merely apparent, and not evidence of a more original reading.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> Ottley, *Book of Isaiah*, 1:50.

<sup>11</sup> Johann Fischer, *In welcher Schrift lag das Buch Isaias den LXX vor? Eine textkritische Studie* (BZAW 56; Giessen: Töpelmann, 1930).

<sup>12</sup> Fischer, *In welcher Schrift*, 8–9.

<sup>13</sup> Fischer, *In welcher Schrift*, 10–15.

<sup>14</sup> Fischer, *In welcher Schrift*, 6–8.

The scholar who was next in line, and who left his predecessors somewhat in his shadow, is Joseph Ziegler. I have already lingered on his major work—*Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaías* (1934)—earlier in this introduction, and will do here some more. In the *Untersuchungen* Ziegler criticises the method of isolating a word from its surrounding and then comparing it to its Greek equivalent. He prefers to give consideration to the *context* in which a word occurs—to parallel and related places—and to elucidate the translation from that perspective.<sup>15</sup> Ziegler means that the Septuagint of Isaiah distinguishes itself from other translations in that it bears the personal stamp of the translator. The Isaiah translator often tends to give a free rendering of the Hebrew. When he has trouble in understanding the text, he does not hesitate to omit words, to change the order within a clause, or to add his own explanation of it. Repeatedly, the translator is seized by a particular idea and then renders his text under the impact of it.<sup>16</sup> Many times he is influenced by parallel passages elsewhere in Scripture.<sup>17</sup> He further reveals a preference for certain expressions, which he applies in his translation whenever it suits his purposes.<sup>18</sup> Yet, Ziegler emphasises, not all differences between the LXX and the MT of Isaiah can be ascribed to this liberal attitude of the translator. Some of the interpreting additions and variants may already have been extant in his Hebrew *Vorlage* in the form of glosses—scribal notations in the margin of manuscripts.<sup>19</sup>

In the *Untersuchungen* two chapters are assigned to the occurrence of pluses and minuses in the Greek Isaiah. As it concerns minuses, Ziegler regards some of them as gloss-like remarks that the translator has not yet read in his *Vorlage*, but the preponderance he thinks to be accounted for by intentional or unintentional omissions on the part of the translator himself. *Unintentional* omissions—often embodying larger minuses—have occurred through a mistake, made by either the Hebrew scribe, or the Greek translator, or a later Greek editor. *Intentional* omissions are largely due to nonchalance or to a lack of understanding of the translator, who regularly left out difficult or rare Hebrew words. Furthermore, minuses often appear where one finds two (or more) identical or synonymous elements in the Hebrew text. The translator may have removed either of them because he conceived the text as redundant, or because he could not think of a Greek synonym.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, iv.

<sup>16</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 7–8.

<sup>17</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 103, 134–35.

<sup>18</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 13.

<sup>19</sup> Today scholars question the idea of glosses in Hebrew manuscripts. One of the main reasons for this is that the Dead Sea Scrolls, which at the time when Ziegler was writing his *Untersuchungen* had not yet been discovered, do not provide any evidence of such marginal notes.

<sup>20</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 46–56.

Also regarding LXX Isaiah's pluses Ziegler stresses the uncertainty of their origin: this may have been the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX, the Greek translator, or a later Greek editor. Nevertheless, most pluses betray, according to the scholar, the exegetical and explicating aspirations of the translator himself.

All in all, Ziegler distinguishes the following categories of pluses in LXX Isaiah:

- *Doppelübersetzungen*: These only rarely go back to the "Ur-LXX"; usually they have been added by later readers.
- $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma$  (appears approximately forty times as a plus): This word has generally been inserted by the translator himself, in particular when the same word is attested in the surrounding text, for example in a parallel verse.
- $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega\nu$  or  $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\tilde{\omega}$ : These expressions are most commonly additions by the translator.
- Auxiliary verbs.
- Pleonastic additions or similar explicating renderings: The insertion of a noun in the genitive, or of an adjective or a common noun such as  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\varsigma$ ; these are usually supplied by the translator.
- The translator's insertion of a subject or an object in order to make the text more explicit (sometimes the extra text may already have been present in the Hebrew manuscript as an exegetical marginal gloss).<sup>21</sup>

After Ziegler's *Untersuchungen*, another influential publication that appeared on the Greek Isaiah was Isac L. Seeligmann's *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah. A Discussion of Its Problems* (1948).<sup>22</sup> In this pioneering study, Seeligmann argues that the Septuagint of Isaiah is not only characterised by a considerable measure of independence vis-à-vis the Hebrew text, but that it also stands out by the influence it reveals of the cultural and political-historic context in which it was composed. The text hides a translator who believed that the period in which he lived, was the time for the fulfilment of ancient prophecies. The Alexandrian translator tried to revive the text of Isaiah and to contemporise it by incorporating in it the religious concepts of the Jewish Hellenistic times in which he lived.<sup>23</sup> This intriguing facet of the Greek Isaiah which Seeligmann has

---

<sup>21</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 56–60.

<sup>22</sup> Isac L. Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah. A Discussion of Its Problems* (MVEOL 9; Leiden: Brill, 1948). Recently also published in Isac L. Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah and Cognate Studies* (ed. Robert Hanhart and Hermann Spieckermann; FAT 40; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 119–294.

<sup>23</sup> Seeligmann, *Septuagint Version*, 3–4; 76–120.

brought to the fore was later elaborated on by, among others, Robert Hanhart,<sup>24</sup> Jean Koenig,<sup>25</sup> and Arie van der Kooij.<sup>26</sup>

Yet, even though van der Kooij in his works has paid much attention to the phenomenon of actualisation within the Greek Isaiah, in his opinion this is only one of the various aspects on which an examination of this translation should focus. In several of his studies van der Kooij has emphasised that an atomistic approach to the Septuagint of Isaiah ought to be avoided: the differences between the LXX and the MT should not be investigated merely on word or verse level, but rather in the light of their own context in the Greek, especially their immediate context—the pericope or chapter in which they occur. In view of this, van der Kooij wants to promote a “contextual approach” to the Greek Isaiah.<sup>27</sup> In *The Oracle of Tyre* (1998)<sup>28</sup> he introduces a method that fits such a course, involving an analysis of the LXX in four steps. Firstly, the investigation of the Masoretic text on a grammatical, stylistic, and semantic level. Secondly, the comparison of the Greek with the Hebrew, followed by a study of the LXX on its own, which is directed at contextual questions, such as: Which function and meaning do particular LXX renderings have in their own context? Are they related to each other? Does the Greek in itself form a coherent text? The third step is to analyse the LXX passage according to its genre. In LXX Isaiah this is especially useful as it concerns prophetic texts. These prompt discussion as to whether the translator has tried to reinterpret those texts in order to apply them to his own time. This is where we arrive at the topic of actualisation. The fourth and final step has bearing on the Hebrew source text behind the Greek translation, and on the question of how the translator has read and interpreted

---

<sup>24</sup> See e.g. Robert Hanhart, “Die Septuaginta als Interpretation und Aktualisierung,” in *Isac Leo Seeligmann Volume. Essays on the Bible and the Ancient World* (ed. Alexander Rofé and Yair Zakovitch; 3 vols.; Jerusalem: E. Rubinstein’s Publishing, 1983), 3:331–46.

<sup>25</sup> Jean Koenig, *L’herméneutique analogique du Judaïsme antique d’après les témoins textuels d’Isaïe* (VTSup 33; Leiden: Brill, 1982).

<sup>26</sup> Also das Neves has written on this subject: see J. C. M. das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega dos Setenta no Livro de Isaías* (Lisbon: Universidade Católica Portuguesa, 1973).

<sup>27</sup> See e.g. Arie van der Kooij, *Die alten Textzeugen des Jesajabuches. Ein Beitrag zur Textgeschichte des Alten Testaments* (OBO 35; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981), 33; idem, “The Old Greek of Isaiah 19:16–25. Translation and Interpretation,” in *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies. Jerusalem 1986* (ed. Claude E. Cox; SCS 23; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1987), 127–66; idem, “Isaiah in the Septuagint,” in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah. Studies of an Interpretive Tradition* (ed. Craig C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans; 2 vols.; VTSup 70; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 2:520; idem, *The Oracle of Tyre. The Septuagint of Isaiah XXIII as Version and Vision* (VTSup 71; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 15–19.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*

this text.<sup>29</sup> With respect to this issue, van der Kooij follows the line that the *Vorlage* of LXX Isaiah was probably not very different from the MT.<sup>30</sup>

A somewhat controversial, and—not only for that reason—also very fascinating work, is *L'herméneutique analogique du Judaïsme antique d'après les témoins textuels d'Isaïe*, written by Jean Koenig in 1982.<sup>31</sup> Koenig in this monograph polemicises against the “explication empiriste” of the Greek Isaiah of which he accuses his predecessors, especially Ziegler and Ottley. Those scholars too often, in his view, explained LXX Isaiah’s deviations from the Hebrew as the product of the translator’s ignorance or subjectivity. This especially relates to the way in which they approach the phenomenon of “analogy” in the translation.<sup>32</sup> By the term “analogy” Koenig seeks to indicate the adoption of elements from elsewhere in Scripture (“analogie scripturaire”) on the one hand, and cases in which the translator has intentionally read Hebrew words in a variant way—for example by means of metathesis or homonymy—(“analogie verbale formelle”) on the other. Even if Ziegler and Ottley did recognise some instances of analogy, they failed, in Koenig’s eyes, to identify the method that was hidden behind it. On these grounds, Koenig wants to replace the empirical exegesis of his predecessors by his own “herméneutique analogique et méthodique,” which presupposes an authoritative *norm* to underlie cases of analogy. Analogy was not employed just randomly in the translation, but with precision and subtlety. This implies, as Koenig argues, that the technique was the outcome of scholarly investigation, bound to the religious principles of contemporary Judaism. The purpose of its application was to create a text that would be edifying for the religious community. Within Hellenistic Judaism a particular hermeneutics existed that legitimated and authorised the phenomenon of analogy in religious texts. It did not only impact on the Septuagint of Isaiah, but also, *inter alia*, on the Great Isaiah Scroll from Qumran, in which plenty of examples of analogy can also be found. In later Rabbinical texts this hermeneutical method of analogy has been applied even more extensively, Koenig contends.

While Koenig now and then runs the risk of clarifying LXX Isaiah’s variants in a somewhat speculative way, his approach is directly opposed to the rather careful evaluation of Moshe Goshen-Gottstein. His analysis of LXX Isaiah is included in the text edition of the book of Isaiah that forms part of *The Hebrew University Bible* of which Goshen-Gottstein is one of the editors.<sup>33</sup> In the critical

<sup>29</sup> van der Kooij, *Oracle of Tyre*, 15–19.

<sup>30</sup> van der Kooij, *Oracle of Tyre*, 12.

<sup>31</sup> Jean Koenig, *L'herméneutique analogique du Judaïsme antique d'après les témoins textuels d'Isaïe* (VTSup 33; Leiden: Brill, 1982).

<sup>32</sup> Koenig, *L'herméneutique analogique*, 3–12.

<sup>33</sup> Moshe H. Goshen-Gottstein, ed., *The Book of Isaiah* (HUB; Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1995).

apparatus to this text Goshen-Gottstein pays much consideration to the comparison of the MT with the LXX of Isaiah. He offers comments on many of the pluses, minuses and variants of the latter, which he most often perceives as being the result of a translation technique or a translational mistake. Some examples of categories he offers in order to classify pluses and minuses are “condensed rendering,” the influence of other texts (from inside or outside of Isaiah), double reading or rendering, dittography, haplography, homoeoteleuton, exegesis, expanded rendering, inner Greek changes, a lack of lexicographical knowledge, a tendency to level cases of parallelism, reduction of repetitions, reformulation, and simplification. In his discussion of the differences, Goshen-Gottstein tries hard to avoid conjectural explanations,<sup>34</sup> regularly rejecting creative explanations of not obvious Greek equivalents. In this he may sometimes go slightly too far, in my view, as it seems clear that an associative, midrashic way of rendering the Hebrew was typical of the Isaiah translator.<sup>35</sup>

This midrashic component of the Greek Isaiah is regularly pointed out by David A. Baer. In his monograph *When We All Go Home* (2001)<sup>36</sup> Baer puts forward that LXX Isaiah chapters 56–66 are marked by theological *Tendenz* and homiletical motivation. Several of the tendencies that he recognises in the translation are “personalization,” which refers to the translator’s inclination to “personalise” his text by turning third-person references into first- and second-person statements; “imperativization”—indicating the fact that declarative statements are regularly turned into commands; the translator’s amelioration of theologically or ideologically offensive passages, and his display of a nationalistic bias in favour of the Jews and Jerusalem.<sup>37</sup> However, even when diverging from his source text, the translator still remains close to the details of his Hebrew *Vorlage*: he “seldom strays from his Hebrew text for more than two or three words,”<sup>38</sup> and there is almost always some concrete textual feature that has authorised or facilitated the translator’s manoeuvre.<sup>39</sup> In this, the translator reveals an affinity with the midrashic tradition.<sup>40</sup> To this topic of the freedom

---

<sup>34</sup> This he himself admits in a footnote in *Textus*: “I readily admit that because of the flights of fancy in which many critics indulge, I may be too cautious. But, generally speaking, I am suspicious of any conjecture which does not ‘click’ after the assumption of one intermediate step and which assumes the improbable in the way of script and sound” (Moshe H. Goshen-Gottstein, “Theory and Praxis of Textual Criticism. The Text-critical Use of the Septuagint,” *Textus* 3 [1963]: 142 n.39).

<sup>35</sup> See section 1.3.2d below.

<sup>36</sup> David A. Baer, *When We All Go Home. Translation and Theology in LXX Isaiah 56–66* (JSOTSup 318; The Hebrew Bible and Its Versions 1; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001).

<sup>37</sup> See section 10.3.

<sup>38</sup> Baer, *When We All Go Home*, 278; see section 1.3.2e.

<sup>39</sup> Baer, *When We All Go Home*, 119.

<sup>40</sup> Baer, *When We All Go Home*, e.g. 15–16; 22, 119.

versus conservatism of LXX Isaiah which Baer touches upon, we will return later on in this chapter.

Another study from the same year which I have regularly consulted, is “Le Livre d’Ésaïe dans la Septante. Ecdotique, stylistique, linguistique ou esquisse d’une poétique de la Septante,” which forms the PhD dissertation of the French scholar Philippe Le Moigne.<sup>41</sup> This work has unfortunately not been published yet. It contains much valuable and detailed information on a number of particles in the Greek Isaiah, and on LXX Isaiah’s use of the figure of chiasmus.

The most recent work that has been written on the Isaiah translation is *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation. The Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah* (2008), by Ronald L. Troxel.<sup>42</sup> In it Troxel seeks to present a counterview to the dominant idea of recent decades that the free translation style of LXX Isaiah reveals the translator’s conviction that Isaiah’s oracles were being fulfilled in his own days. According to Troxel, there is no basis to classify the translator’s work under the rubric of *Erfüllungsinterpretation*. His way of translating is rather determined by another interest, namely his concern to convey the sense of the Isaianic text to his Greek readers. For this purpose he used whatever devices were at his disposal, such as the interpretation of words in the light of others occurring later on in the context, his supply of a word or phrase to complete the meaning he finds implied, his insertion of an expression based on a parallel in the nearby context, his choice of contextually appropriate equivalents based on etymological interpretations; his inclination to plug in stop-gap words, selecting a word that best fitted his understanding of the context, and his willingness to interpret words and phrases in the light of the broader context, as well as to borrow formulations from elsewhere in the book or from outside it. Also his reformulations of sentences are intended to give his readers a better insight into the message of the Isaianic text. Still, such manoeuvres should, according to Troxel, merely be understood as “ad hoc attempts to make sense of the text for the reader”;<sup>43</sup> they do not reveal any method of the translator. Some of the devices mentioned, such as etymological reasoning, and the rendering of Scriptural passages in the light of other, related ones—even though they were also applied in contemporary Jewish literature—make Troxel assume that the translator was influenced by the work of Aristarchus and other γραμματικοί in the Alexandrian Museum: “Just as Aristarchus practiced interpretation of Homer by Homer ... so the Isaiah translator found a sure guide to meaning by looking to other passages inside and outside Isaiah that contained similar words, phrases,

---

<sup>41</sup> Philippe Le Moigne, “Le Livre d’Ésaïe dans la Septante. Ecdotique, stylistique, linguistique ou esquisse d’une poétique de la Septante” (PhD diss., l’École Pratique des Hautes Études, Paris, 2001).

<sup>42</sup> Ronald L. Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation. The Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah* (JSJSup 124; Leiden: Brill, 2008).

<sup>43</sup> Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation*, 228.



or themes.”<sup>44</sup> According to Troxel it is very likely that the Isaiah translator was influenced by these scholars, since their work was probably familiar to any intellectual Alexandrian.

Although I think that Troxel is right in underlining the Isaiah translator’s large-scale use of certain interpretative devices with the purpose of bringing the message of Isaiah closer to his readers, I do not believe that his employing such means excludes the possibility that at times this message in the translator’s eyes contained elements that were of a special importance for his own time and community. His application of linguistic and contextual or intertextual exegesis may well have gone hand in hand with a certain interest in contemporisation.

When surveying the various works that have been written over the last two centuries concentrating on the Greek Isaiah (although I have been unable to deal with many of them here),<sup>45</sup> I have found that two things stand out for me. In the first place, in the investigation of LXX Isaiah throughout the years one can observe a shift. While in the earlier period differences between the Hebrew and Greek were quite often ascribed to the translator’s supposed *incompetence* (by, among others, Ottley, Fischer, Ziegler, and Seeligmann),<sup>46</sup> in the course of the decades scholars became more and more aware of the deliberate approach and scrutiny of the translator. As a consequence, the majority of LXX Isaiah’s variants came to be conceived of as the product of the translator’s purposeful interventions. While a scholar such as Koenig went quite far in this direction, others, such as Goshen-Gottstein, Baer, and Troxel took a more moderate position.

A second observation is that in works on LXX Isaiah certain patterns that appear to typify the translation recur again and again, having been noticed by successive authors. These are, for instance, the translator’s penchant for borrowing elements from other passages in Scripture, his inclination towards making his text more explicit, his reduction of synonymous or identical elements, and his homiletical interest and midrashic-like way of interpreting the Hebrew. Also in the present work these translational patterns will be treated, as they provide a significant clarification of many of the translation’s pluses and minuses as well. Yet, other typical habits of the Isaiah translator seem to have been somewhat neglected in previous studies. One of these is the translator’s stylistic or literary inspiration. Although while taking a closer look at the style

---

<sup>44</sup> Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation*, 291.

<sup>45</sup> One of these is Ekblad’s useful study on the Septuagint version of Isaiah’s Servant Poems, in which the author tries to determine the specific exegesis and underlying theology of these chapters. See Eugene R. Ekblad Jr., *Isaiah’s Servant Poems according to the Septuagint. An Exegetical and Theological Study* (CBET 23; Leuven: Peeters, 1999).

<sup>46</sup> Ottley, *Book of Isaiah*, 1:36, 49, 51, etc.; Fischer, *In welcher Schrift*, 5, 7, 9, etc.; Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 7, 13, 46–47, etc.; Seeligmann, *Septuagint Version*, 49, 56–57.

and rhetoric of the Isaiah translation, one can do nothing else but appreciate the way in which the translator has dealt with the rhetorical aspect of his work, it has regularly been denied that the LXX translator was even concerned with this side of his translation. One of the few scholars who has given due credit to the stylistic efforts of the Isaiah translator is the already mentioned Philippe Le Moigne. Because the translator of Isaiah has been underestimated in this respect, the present work will pay special consideration to this topic of stylistics, and attempt to shed more light on how it may have influenced the translation, even if my inquiry regarding this subject has to be restricted to the cases of plus and minus.

### 1.2 A survey of studies on pluses and minuses in the Septuagint

Despite the fact that other works focusing on the pluses and minuses in the Greek Isaiah have not been published yet, there are some studies which discuss pluses and minuses in sections elsewhere in the Septuagint. An early example of such a study is George B. Gray's article "The Additions in the Ancient Greek Version of Job," dating from 1920.<sup>47</sup> In it Gray divides the pluses in the LXX translation of Job into two groups: Firstly, small pluses, composed of a word or two or a clause, of which some according to the author may already have been present in the underlying Hebrew manuscript of the LXX, while others were probably added by the translator himself. In addition to these small pluses, LXX Job contains two larger ones, in 2:9 and at the end of the book. These Gray supposes to have been inserted by a later editor of the translation, since they differ in vocabulary from the surrounding text.

More than a half century later, in 1984, the work *Additions or Omissions in the Books of Samuel. The Significant Pluses and Minuses in the Massoretic, LXX and Qumran Texts* appeared, written by Stephen Pisano.<sup>48</sup> This book deals with the "significant"—that is larger—pluses and minuses in the Greek version of Samuel, which can be encountered in this translation in substantial numbers. Usually they are formed by major parts of verses, but also by one or more entire verses. The main point that Pisano infers after inquiring into these pluses, is that the Masoretic version of Samuel generally reflects a more original text form than the LXX: pluses and minuses in LXX Samuel are quite often the result of later literary activity on the part of the translator or the editor of the Hebrew

---

<sup>47</sup> George B. Gray, "The Additions in the Ancient Greek Version of Job," *The Expositor* VIII, 19 (1920): 422–38.

<sup>48</sup> Stephen Pisano, *Additions or Omissions in the Books of Samuel. The Significant Pluses and Minuses in the Massoretic, LXX and Qumran Texts* (OBO 57; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984).

*Vorlage*. In some cases they are the outcome of translational mistakes, but more often of deliberate modification. The LXX translator or the Hebrew editor from time to time inserted elements for “expansionist” motives, or shortened their text so as to produce a smoother or more unified narrative.<sup>49</sup> Strikingly often LXX Samuel displays pluses that can be explained in a “haplographic” way. Those pluses contain identical or similar words at the beginning and end of the phrases or sentences of which they consist, suggesting that their omission in other manuscripts may be the result of a haplogenic error, although in reality the extra text is an expansion accomplished by a later editor or by the LXX translator, who was thus trying to make his insertions fit more smoothly into the text.<sup>50</sup>

Also the “CATTS-project” under the guidance of Robert A. Kraft and Emanuel Tov has made the pluses and minuses of the Septuagint one of its targets of investigation.<sup>51</sup> This especially pertains to the work that this project has produced under the title *The Minuses of the Septuagint. The Pentateuch*.<sup>52</sup> This extremely scrupulous study, edited by Frank Polak and Galen Marquis, gives a comprehensive listing of all minuses in the Pentateuch. They are classified on the basis of different levels, such as the linguistic unit they form, and their syntactic and stylistic functions. Also minuses that possibly have a translational or scribal background have been grouped together, as well as ones that are paralleled in other Hebrew texts.

In their analysis of minuses the authors are inevitably faced with all kinds of complexities related to the definition of a “minus.” Polak and Marquis regard a minus as

... an element of the biblical text present in the MT that is not represented in the LXX, in a constellation indicating a possible shorter reading of the Hebrew source text. On the other hand, if there is a reasonable justification for deciding that the

---

<sup>49</sup> Pisano, *Additions or Omissions in the Books of Samuel*, 283.

<sup>50</sup> Pisano, *Additions or Omissions in the Books of Samuel*, 242, 283.

<sup>51</sup> See e.g. Robert A. Kraft and Emanuel Tov, “Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint Studies,” *BIOSCS* 14 (1981): 22–40; Emanuel Tov, “The Use of a Computerized Data Base for Septuagint Research. The Greek-Hebrew Parallel Alignment,” *BIOSCS* 17 (1984): 36–47, esp. 45; idem, “Computer Assisted Alignment of the Greek-Hebrew Equivalents of the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint,” in *La Septuaginta en la investigación contemporánea (V Congreso de la IOSCS)* (ed. Natalio Fernández Marcos; Textos y estudios “Cardenal Cisneros” 34; Madrid: Instituto “Arias Montano,” 1985), 221–42, esp. 229–30; idem, *A Computerized Data Base for Septuagint Studies. The Parallel Aligned Text of the Greek and Hebrew Bible* (CATSS 2; Stellenbosch: CATSS, 1986), 51–56.

<sup>52</sup> Frank Polak and Galen Marquis, *A Classified Index of the Minuses of the Septuagint* (2 vols.; CATSS Basic Tools 4; Stellenbosch: CATSS, 2002).

responsibility for the shorter Greek text lies solely with the translator, we are dealing with a reduced rendering, rather than with a minus.<sup>53</sup>

Hence, Polak and Marquis opt to speak of a “minus” only if the absence of a Greek equivalent is probably caused by a deviating Hebrew *Vorlage*, and not when this is most likely the translator’s own achievement. Notwithstanding this, missing elements that according to the authors have their roots in translational practices, still receive a discussion in their work, being assigned to specific categories, and in this way included among “the Minuses of the Septuagint.” This inconsistency illustrates the complex nature of analysing pluses and minuses in ancient translations.

Polak and Marquis have offered a pleasingly systematic and (virtually) complete list of the minuses in the Greek translation of the Pentateuch. Yet, their method of identifying and registering minuses cannot readily be applied to every other book of the Septuagint. This has to do with the different character of the various Greek translations: The Septuagint of the Pentateuch—like for instance the LXX of the Psalms, Chronicles and part of Samuel-Kings—affords a quite literal translation of the Hebrew text, making it relatively easier to catalogue all pluses and minuses of this document. The translation of other biblical writings, such as the book of Isaiah, on the contrary, is characterised by a large number of sections which render the supposed underlying Hebrew in a fairly free way. As a result, it is sometimes rather doubtful what exactly are the “pluses” and “minuses” in a specific unit, or whether it is even useful to employ these terms in some contexts (we will continue on this subject further on in this chapter). On these grounds, as far as the LXX of Isaiah is concerned, it is not a realistic aim to try to offer an entirely complete list of its pluses and minuses.

### 1.3 How to establish pluses and minuses in a translation

#### 1.3.1 Defining “plus” and “minus”; “addition” and “omission”

The terms “plus” and “minus” easily give rise to confusion. This makes it necessary to include in this introduction a short reflection on their meaning.

In the present study a “plus” denotes a textual element (consisting of one or more words) which is present in the LXX but does not have a counterpart in the Masoretic text. A “minus,” on the contrary, is an element attested in the MT which is not represented in the LXX. This terminology is meant to be neutral, not conveying any implication about the origin of the textual element under consideration. Hence, it does not indicate whether the cause of this extra or

---

<sup>53</sup> Polak and Marquis, *Minuses of the Septuagint*, 1:8.

missing part of the text lies either in the translation process or in the underlying Hebrew text of the translation. This accords with the way in which the categories “plus” and “minus” are used, for instance, in Tov’s handbook *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint*.<sup>54</sup> Some other works, though, reckon among “pluses” and “minuses” only those components of the translation that probably have to be attributed to a *Vorlage* that was at variance with the MT.<sup>55</sup>

A similar confusion exists around the terms “addition” and “omission.” Especially in earlier works on the Septuagint these have occasionally been employed to indicate extra or missing text in the translation without the purpose of claiming anything as the cause, so leaving open the possibility that this is due to a different *Vorlage*.<sup>56</sup> However, nowadays “addition” and “omission” are mostly used in their literal sense, that is, designating quantitative deviations from the MT that are most likely accounted for by the translator himself. Also in the present study I will label text as an “addition” or an “omission” solely if assuming that a translational move is at stake.

### 1.3.2 Segmentation of the source text

Before one can try to identify pluses and minuses in a translation, it has first to be clear which choice the translator has made in the *segmentation* of his source text.<sup>57</sup> In other words, one has to establish on which linguistic level he has realised his translation.<sup>58</sup> A translator may choose as segments on which he

---

<sup>54</sup> Emanuel Tov, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (rev. and enl. ed.; JBS 8; Jerusalem: Simor, 1997), 127–33.

<sup>55</sup> E.g. Tov, *Computerized Data Base*, 51: “It should immediately be added that not all plus and minus elements of the LXX are indicated as pluses and minuses. Many of these plus and minus elements are considered as integral part of the rendering and hence are not denoted in a special way. Only those elements which have possible or probable text-critical implications are considered as pluses and minuses. Minus and plus elements which are not indicated in the data base as minus or plus refer to the realm of the translator’s language or exegesis ... or are doublets ... .” See also Polak and Marquis, *Minuses of the Septuagint*, 1:8.

<sup>56</sup> See e.g. Richard R. Ottley, *A Handbook to the Septuagint* (London: Methuen, 1920), e.g. 105–9.

<sup>57</sup> By using the word “choice” I do not want to suggest that this was mainly an *intentional* choice of the translator. Rather, he may often not have been conscious at all of which segmentation he choose, but just acted upon his intuition; see Konrad D. Jenner, Wido Th. van Peursen, and Eep Talstra, “CALAP. An Interdisciplinary Debate between Textual Criticism, Textual History and Computer Assisted Linguistic Analysis,” in *Corpus Linguistics and Textual History. A Computer-Assisted Interdisciplinary Approach to the Peshitta* (ed. P. S. F. van Keulen and W. Th. van Peursen; SSN 48; Assen: Van Gorcum, 2006), 30–32.

<sup>58</sup> James Barr, *The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations* (NAWG 11, MSU 15; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979), 294–303; Sebastian Brock, “Towards a History of Syriac Translation Technique,” in *III<sup>e</sup> Symposium Syriacum 1980. Les contacts du monde syriaque avec les autres cultures (Goslar 7-11 Septembre 1980)* (ed. René Lavenant; OCA 221; Rome: Pontificium Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1983), 5–6.

bases his rendition paragraphs, sentences, clauses, phrases, words, or even morphemes. If, for instance, he works at word level, this entails that every word in the source text is represented by a related word in the translation. Still, in practice it hardly ever happens that a translator remains faithful to one and the same translation level in his work. Often he switches to another level, for example clause instead of word level. This especially happens in the case of a passage that is hard to translate.

In a translation pluses and minuses occur when there is a “quantitative divergence from the original.”<sup>59</sup> This means that one can speak of a “minus” if one segment in the translation is not reflected in the source text, and of a plus if there is one segment extra in the translation as compared to the source text. When the segments in a specific part or place of the translation include *phrases*, this can mean that one word in the source text corresponds to more than one word in the translation, without there being any mention of a plus (such as is the case in the rendering of יולדה by γυναικὸς τικτούσης in Isa 13:8), or, that two or more words in the *Vorlage* are the equivalent of only one word in the translation without the occurrence of a minus (for example, אֲשֶׁר-עַל-הַבַּיִת becomes οἰκονόμον in Isa 37:2), namely if on those occasions the word(s) in the translation constitute(s) one and the same syntactical phrase, which clearly matches one phrase in the source text.

This method of establishing pluses and minuses in a translation conveys a *quantitative* approach to the text, which does not always coincide with a *semantic* approach: If one *content* element in the translation is extra or lacking as compared to the source text, it does not always form a “plus” or a “minus.” This pertains, among others, to cases where the source text has been made more explicit or implicit in the translation, in the light of which the translation contains more, or respectively less, information, yet without displaying an additional or missing syntactical unit. The following instances can illustrate such a situation:

1:31            ובערו שניהם יחדו            καὶ κατακαυθήσονται  
   οἱ ἄνομοι καὶ οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἅμα

“Those two” has been glossed in the translation as “the lawless and the sinners,” which does not form a real plus.

35:2            הָמָה יִרְאוּ כְבוֹד־יְהוָה            καὶ ὁ λαὸς μου ὀψεται τὴν δόξαν κυρίου

הָמָה has received an interpretative translation as ὁ λαὸς μου.

39:5            ויאמר ישעיהו אל־חזקיהו            καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Ἡσαιας

<sup>59</sup> Barr, *Typology of Literalism*, 303.

In the LXX the text has been made more implicit by the rendering of אל-חזקיהו as αὐτῷ.

*a. Translation at word level*

The translator of LXX Isaiah has mainly rendered his text at word level: most commonly one word in the Hebrew is mirrored by one word in the Greek. “Word” should not be taken in the sense of a *graphical* word—a series of letters between two empty spaces—but as a *functional* word, that is the smallest linguistic unit that by itself has a meaning and a grammatical function,<sup>60</sup> or, in technical terms, “a lexeme together with all its inflectional affixes.”<sup>61</sup> Functional words do sometimes not accord with graphical words, for instance, in the case of the so-called “clitics”—words that are immediately connected to other words on which they are dependent for their realisation.<sup>62</sup> Hebrew instances of these are the article ה, the pronominal suffixes, the conjunction ו and the prepositions כ, ב and ל, which formally count as (functional) words.

In parts of the text which are translated at word level pluses and minuses are simply those *words* in the translation that are extra as compared to the source text, respectively those words in the source text of which an equivalent fails in the translation. One example of a passage in LXX Isaiah that has almost entirely been translated at word level, is afforded by Isa 1:3:

MT Isa 1:3	ידע שור קנהו וחמור אבוס בעליו ישראל לא ידע עמי לא התבונן
LXX Isa 1:3	ἔγνω βοῦς τὸν κτησάμενον καὶ ὄνος τὴν φάτνην τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοῦ· Ἰσραὴλ δὲ με οὐκ ἔγνω, καὶ ὁ λαὸς με οὐ συνῆκεν.

In the synopsis below, the n-dash indicates a minus, while pluses have been underlined>.

ידע	ἔγνω
שור	βοῦς
קנהו	τὸν κτησάμενον (–)

<sup>60</sup> For this distinction, see Hendrik Jan Bosman and Constantijn J. Sikkel, “Reading Authors and Reading Documents,” in *Bible and Computer. The Stellenbosch AIBI-6 Conference. Proceedings of the Association Internationale Bible et Informatique “From alpha to byte.”*; University of Stellenbosch 17–21 July, 2000 (ed. Johann Cook; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 115–20; idem, “A Discourse on Method. Basic Parameters of Computer-Assisted Linguistic Analysis on Word Level,” in *Corpus Linguistics and Textual History. A Computer-Assisted Interdisciplinary Approach to the Peshitta* (ed. P. S. F. van Keulen and W. Th. van Peursen; SSN 48; Assen: Van Gorcum, 2006), 103–5.

<sup>61</sup> Bosman and Sikkel, “Reading Authors and Reading Documents,” 115.

<sup>62</sup> Constantijn J. Sikkel, “Lexeme Status of Pronominal Suffixes,” in *Foundations for Syriac Lexicography. Colloquia of the International Syriac Language Project* (ed. Janet Dyk and Wido van Peursen; 3 vols.; PSL 4; Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2008), 3:65.

<sup>63</sup> The article has been left out of consideration.

וחמור	καὶ ὄνος
אבוס	τὴν φάτνην
בעליו	τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοῦ.
ישראל	Ἰσραηλ
(-)	<u>δέ</u>
(-)	<u>με</u>
לֹא	οὐκ
ידע	ἔγνω,
(-)	<u>καὶ</u>
עמי	ὁ λαός (-)
(-)	<u>με</u>
לֹא	οὐ
התבונן	συνῆκεν.

*b. Translation at phrase level*

Very frequently the translator switches from a translation at word level to a translation at phrase level, which means that one phrase in the Hebrew is reflected by one phrase in the Greek. As discussed earlier, this may entail that something that in Hebrew is expressed by means of only one word, in Greek is formulated using two or more words, or *vice versa*. There can be multiple reasons for such a difference in the number of words forming a phrase, both semantic and grammatical. From a semantic perspective, the translator may employ more words for denoting the same entity simply because his language requires more words for conveying this idea. Also when he renders a Hebrew word in a variant way this sometimes causes a deviation in the number of words used (for instance שְׁנֵיהֶם becomes οἱ ἄνομοι καὶ οἱ ἁμαρτωλοί in Isa 1:31). An example of a grammatical reason is that the Hebrew sometimes has a preposition where the Greek uses a declension (for instance לְשִׁמְרוֹן becomes Σαμαρείᾳ in Isa 10:11); another one is that in Greek a verb is regularly followed by a preposition where in Hebrew it is not (παύσασθε ἀπὸ corresponds to חַדְלִי in Isa 1:16).

Besides in the case where equivalent phrases have a different number of words, one can also speak of a rendering at phrase level when the translation utilises a *grammatical category* other than the source language, which changes the internal word structure. An illustration is provided by the Hebrew method of qualifying a thing or a person by means of a genitive construction (such as זֶרַע



מרעים in Isa 1:4), whereas the Greek commonly uses an adjective for that purpose (σπέρμα πονηρόν).<sup>64</sup>

Some additional examples of a translation at phrase level are the following:

3:13	ועמד לדין עמים	καὶ στήσει εἰς κρίσιν τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ
	He stands to judge <i>the peoples</i>	And he will make <i>his people</i> stand to judge them
8:8	והיה מטות כנפיו	καὶ ἔσται ἡ παρεμβολὴ αὐτοῦ ὥστε πληρῶσαι
	And <i>its outspread wings</i> will fill	And <i>his camp</i> will be such as to fill
35:6	ותרן לשון אלם	καὶ τρανὴ ἔσται γλῶσσα μογιλάλων
	the tongue of the speechless <i>shall sing for joy</i>	and the tongue of stammerers <i>shall be clear</i>
35:6	בערבה	ἐν γῇ διψώσῃ
	in the <i>wilderness</i>	in a <i>thirsty land</i>

In some situations it is hard to ascertain whether the translation is either at word or phrase level, which can also make it complicated to determine whether or not there is a plus or minus at stake. This can be exemplified by the rendering of מכף־רגל as ἀπὸ ποδῶν in Isa 1:6. On the one hand, one could perceive this as a translation at phrase level, positing that in this word combination כף (“sole”) does not offer extra information, but only specifies that on this occasion רגל denotes a “foot” rather than a “leg” (which is the alternative meaning of רגל).<sup>65</sup> Yet, in favour of the assumption that ἀπὸ ποδῶν in Isa 1:6 is a translation at *word* level—with כף being a minus—one can argue that it was not really necessary for the translator to omit an equivalent for כף: He could have reproduced מכף־רגל in a more literal way by τὸ ἵχνος τοῦ ποδός, as has also happened in Deut 11:24; 28:35, 56, 65; Josh 1:3; and 2 Sam/2 Kgdms 14:25.

As a consequence of this often vague distinction between translation at word or phrase level, I have to admit that in the present study I have not always been as faithful to this demarcation as I may here have led the reader to expect. At times I discuss “pluses” and “minuses” that may in fact rather form part of a translation at phrase level, sometimes also because they can offer an interesting insight into a certain translation pattern of LXX Isaiah. On such occasions, I have however usually tried to indicate and explain my own aberration.<sup>66</sup>

<sup>64</sup> The phenomenon that a Hebrew *genitivus qualitatis* corresponds to an adjective in the Greek, has parallels in the Peshitta; see Wido Th. van Peursen, *Language and Interpretation in the Syriac Text of Ben Sira. A Comparative Linguistic and Literary Study* (MPIL 16; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 194–95.

<sup>65</sup> Compare Polak and Marquis, *Minuses of the Septuagint*, 1:14.

<sup>66</sup> See especially sections 4.7 and 9.1.

### c. Translation at clause level

Now and then the Isaiah translator has provided a rendering at clause level, conveying the message of a Hebrew clause in his own words, without sticking to the original words or phrases. The next three examples can illustrate this:

1:23	ורִיב אֶלְמָנָה לֹא־יָבוֹא אֵלֶיהֶם and the widow's cause does not come before them	καὶ κρίσιν χηρῶν οὐ προσέχοντες. and not paying attention to the widows' cause
23:13	אֲשׁוּר יִסְדֶּה לְצִיִּים Assur destined her for wild animals	καὶ αὕτη ἡρήμωται ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀσσυρίων This too has been made desolate (left) without the Assyrians <sup>67</sup>
37:34 (etc.)	נֹאמֵי־יְהוָה (This is) the revelation of the Lord	τάδε λέγει κύριος. These things says the Lord

Translation at clause level does not occur so often in the LXX of Isaiah. This may seem odd for a translation that has regularly been characterised as “free.” However, in the next paragraph we will see that our own idea of a “free” translation, namely translation at clause level—or paraphrase—entails something different from the free style of rendering of the Isaiah translator. This observation is in line with what James Barr has remarked in his much-acclaimed treatise, *The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations*, which is that the modern ideal of a free translation—“the idea that one should take a complete sentence or even a longer complex, picture to oneself the meaning of this entirety, and then restate this in a new language in words having no necessary detailed links with the words of the original”—scarcely existed in antiquity.<sup>68</sup>

### d. Rearrangement

The free style of rendering that the Isaiah translator has applied in his translation with regularity, and at which I have hinted in the preceding section, pertains to a particular method, which, even if it is far from a straightforward word-for-word (or phrase-for-phrase) translation, does not involve paraphrase either. In this way of translating most separate Hebrew words or phrases do have a counterpart in the Greek, but these are semantically and/or grammatically often different from their Hebrew source. Also, the way in which they are joined together into one sentence deviates from the *Vorlage*, resulting in a text that not only has a different syntax but also a different content as compared to the original one. In

<sup>67</sup> NETS translates by “this too has been made desolate by the Assyrians.” For the translation with “... left without the Assyrians,” see van der Kooij, *Oracle of Tyre*, 66–67.

<sup>68</sup> Barr, *Typology of Literalism*, 281.

the present study I shall call this method—by lack of a better term—“rearrangement.”<sup>69</sup> Passages in LXX Isaiah that have been rearranged often display the following features:

- The translator has made a selection from the words of his *Vorlage*: some he does render, others not; with the chosen words he composes a new sentence.
- Besides omitting, the translator may also *add* words if this suits the internal structure of the new sentence or its content. Sometimes one word in the source text has received two counterparts in the translation (“double translation”),<sup>70</sup> or two synonymous expressions have been reduced to one (“condensation”).<sup>71</sup>
- In rearranged sentences the translator has frequently rendered words not in a literal or faithful way but in an associative way; that is, with the help of expressions that are related to the original only indirectly, through a semantic or formal link. Those expressions may belong to another grammatical category (e.g. a verb becomes a noun), or have an entirely different connotation from the original words. In LXX Isaiah, especially formal association occurs abundantly (particularly in rearranged texts, but also beyond). This kind of association means that an expression in the translation, even if it does not form a *semantic* equivalent of a word in the source text, when retroverted into the Hebrew, does resemble the original word as regards its *form*, for instance through the replacement of one letter by another, similar, one (for example, in Isa 44:14 אֲרֶז—“cedar” has generated κύριος via אֲרִיז), or through the application of metathesis.<sup>72</sup> In the past, the origin of such alternative readings has often been sought in an error of the translator or in a different *Vorlage*. Yet, in a large number of these cases the translator has probably read words in a different way *on purpose*. Such a deliberate, creative dealing with the form of words has its roots in Jewish hermeneutics. In this the idea prevailed that words in Scripture do not solely have a literal meaning, but also a derivative one, based on formal

<sup>69</sup> Goshen-Gottstein speaks of “reformulation” (*HUB Isa*, passim); I prefer not to use this term, because it may suggest paraphrase. Troxel calls texts that are rendered in a similar way “non-translations” (Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation*, 134).

<sup>70</sup> See chapter 2.

<sup>71</sup> See chapter 3.

<sup>72</sup> Hundreds of examples of this kind can be found in LXX Isaiah. Only a few of them can be given here: See e.g. 2:6 מְקֹדֶם (MT: קֶדֶם—“east”) / ὡς τὸ ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς (= קֶדֶם—“ancient times”); 8:15 צֹר (MT: imperative of צָר —“wrap up”) / ἀνθρῶποι ἐν ἀσφαλείᾳ ὄντες (= צֹר —“rock”); 9:4(5) בְּדָמִים (MT: דָּם—“blood”) / μετὰ καταλλαγῆς (= דָּמִים—“price”); 16:3 כְּלֵיל (MT: לֵיל—“like night”) / διὰ παντός (= כְּלֵיל—“entire”); תְּגִיל (MT: Pi’el of גָּלָה—“uncover,” “reveal”) / ἀπαχθῆς (= Hif’il of גָּלָה—“take into exile”); 17:5 וְרֵעַ (MT: רֵעַ—“arm”) / σπέρμα (= רֵעַ—“seed”); 17:11 וְכָאֵב (MT: כָּאֵב—“pain”) / καὶ ὡς πατὴρ (= כָּ + אָב —“like a father”).

similarities.<sup>73</sup> An outcome of this same way of interpreting biblical texts can be found in the midrashic method of *al tikre*. This method facilitates the reading of a large number of words from Scripture in a different manner, for instance through a change in the vocalisation of the original word, the transposition of its consonants, or the replacement of one consonant by another one that is formally or phonetically related to it. Such manoeuvres were not made by the rabbis because they rejected the accepted or literal reading, but because they held the opinion that a text could contain various meanings. The reading of the *al tikre* often supported their interpretation of the *halaka* or the *aggadah*.<sup>74</sup> The hypothesis that also the translators of the Septuagint made use of similar midrashic procedures has been defended by, among others, Zacharias Frankel, Leo Priejs, van der Kooij, Roger Le Déaut, and Tov.<sup>75</sup>

- In rearranged texts the translator has not always preserved the Hebrew sentence division; he has often made divisions where they are not attested in the MT (though it is not always clear if he has done this intentionally or not), or he has drawn two clauses of his *Vorlage* together into one.
- Neither has he consistently maintained the word order of his parent text (although mostly he has).
- Rearranged passages at times seem to have been created with the purpose of imbuing certain ideas into the text, such as ideological or theological ones. Rearrangement could provide the translator with a means to, on the one hand, stay close to his *Vorlage* (at least, from a formal perspective), and so to respect the Hebrew text, but on the other hand, where it comes to the message, to deviate from the text and to be able to incorporate in it his own thoughts. In such a way, this method could authorise the translator's ideological, theological, or actualising interpretation of the text. Yet, rearrangement has also been applied for other, more "internal" reasons, for

<sup>73</sup> See e.g. the rabbinical principle *מקרא אחד יוצא לבמה טעמים*—"One biblical verse or expression is susceptible of many (different) interpretations" (Sanhedrin 34a) (translation from Max Kadushin, *The Rabbinic Mind* [New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1952], 104).

<sup>74</sup> Harry Torczyner, "Al tikrei," *EncJud* 2:776.

<sup>75</sup> Zacharias Frankel, *Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta. Historisch-kritische Studien zu der Septuaginta. Nebst Beiträgen zu den Targumim* (Leipzig: Vogel, 1841), 185–91; Leo Priejs, *Jüdische Tradition in der Septuaginta* (Leiden, Brill: 1948), 35–61; van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 66–67; Roger Le Déaut, "La Septante. Un Targum?," in *Études sur le judaïsme hellénistique. Congrès de Strasbourg (1983)* (ed. Raymond Kuntzmann et al.; LD 119; Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1984), 187–90; Tov, *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint*, 164. For the LXX Isaiah translator's use of midrashic methods, see in addition to van der Kooij (op.cit.), e.g. Koenig, *L'herméneutique analogique*, e.g. 35–37; Baer, *When We All Go Home*, e.g. 16, 22; Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation*, 107–18.

instance in order to make a connection with biblical passages elsewhere,<sup>76</sup> or for stylistic motives.<sup>77</sup>

The way of translating I have just tried to expose has been described by Barr decades ago. In his aforementioned treatise he notes that in ancient Greek Bible translations one often encounters a translation method in which “the lexical elements are ... taken fairly literally and rendered with common or easily understandable equivalences. But the syntactic structure of the Greek sentence is a quite free composition of the translator.”<sup>78</sup> Barr further remarks that it is not unusual in Greek translations from the Hebrew that the translation is on the one hand “literal”—in the sense that it offers an “one-for-one representation” of the Hebrew elements by Greek ones—but at the same time “free,” because the translator in rendering those separate elements allowed himself great liberties. According to Barr many translators in antiquity were neither consistently literal nor consistently free in their way of translating but combined these two approaches in a rather inconsistent way.<sup>79</sup> This image that Barr depicts of ancient Bible translations fits the Septuagint of Isaiah quite well. Also in this translation literal and free rendition are often closely and intricately intertwined.<sup>80</sup>

To make this rather technical exposition somewhat more concrete, let me now offer a few illustrations of rearranged texts in LXX Isaiah:

### *Isa 3:10*

MT Isa 3:10

אמרו צדיק כִּי־טוב

Tell the innocent how fortunate they are

LXX Isa 3:10

εἰπόντες Δήσωμεν τὸν δίκαιον, ὅτι δύσχρηστος ἡμῖν ἐστι·

saying, “Let us bind the just, for he is a nuisance to us.”

The words or phrases of this verse can be aligned in a synopsis in the following way. At the right a proposal is made for the manner in which the Hebrew and Greek may match:

אמרו	εἰπόντες	different mood of corresponding verbs
אמרו	Δήσωμεν	double translation and formal association (אסרו)
צדיק	τὸν δίκαιον	
כִּי־	ὅτι	

<sup>76</sup> See chapter 8.

<sup>77</sup> See chapter 7.

<sup>78</sup> Barr, *Typology of Literalism*, 323.

<sup>79</sup> Barr, *Typology of Literalism*, 281.

<sup>80</sup> This point is also repeatedly emphasised by Baer. See Baer, *When We All Go Home*, e.g. 15–16, 22, 119, 278.

טוב	δύσχερηστος	semantic association (antonym)?
(-)	ἡμῖν	addition
(-)	ἐστι	addition

אמר seems to have received a double translation in the LXX as both εἰπόντες and Δήσωμεν. The latter is an associative rendering, echoing the Hebrew imperative אסרו (“bind!”). The relation between טוב and δύσχερηστος is somewhat obscure; maybe the translator has opted for a Greek adjective meaning “nuisance” because it forms an antonym to טוב.<sup>81 82</sup>

### Isa 5:13

MT Isa 5:13 וכבודו מתי רעב והמונו צחח צמא  
their nobles are dying of hunger, and their multitude is parched with thirst.

LXX Isa 5:13 καὶ πλῆθος ἐγενήθη νεκρῶν διὰ λιμὸν καὶ δίψαν ὕδατος.  
They have become a multitude of corpses because of famine and thirst for water.

וכבודו	καὶ πλῆθος (-) (?)	semantic association + omission of suffix?
(-)	ἐγενήθη	addition
מתי רעב	νεκρῶν διὰ λιμὸν	different vocalisation of מתי
המונו	καὶ πλῆθος (-) (?)	condensation?
צחח	(-)	omission
צמא	δίψαν	
(-)	ὕδατος	addition (explicitation)

The translator has reused the Hebrew expressions וכבודו, צמא, מתי, and רעב, but equipped them with other syntactical functions. וכבודו he may have reproduced with καὶ πλῆθος through a link of the root כבד, which can mean “numerous”,<sup>83</sup> with the idea of a multitude. מתי he has vocalised as מתי (“dead ones”) rather than as מתי (“men”) such as the MT exhibits. Besides, he has supplied ἐγενήθη and ὕδατος, and omitted צחח and והמונו. The latter noun means “multitude,” parallel to πλῆθος. It is possible that he has interpreted וכבודו and והמונו in the same sense, and collapsed these two expressions together into καὶ πλῆθος.

<sup>81</sup> According to Tov the translator, having rendered אמרו with Δήσωμεν, “felt compelled to render טוב antithetically with δύσχερηστος (Tov, *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint*, 139). Troxel thinks “this seems a maneuver of last resort to wrest meaning from confusion” (Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation*, 93).

<sup>82</sup> For a discussion of the rendering of this verse, see Scholz, *Alexandrinische Uebersetzung*, 31; Fischer, *In Welcher Schrift*, 19; Ottley, *Book of Isaiah*, 2:117; Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 61; Tov, *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint*, 138–39; Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation*, 93.

<sup>83</sup> For כבד with this meaning, see e.g. Gen 50:9; Exod 8:20; 10:14; 12:38; Num 20:20. For the possible rendering of כבד with πλῆθος, see Isa 21:15: כבד מלחמה / καὶ διὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν πεπτωκότων ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ.

## Isa 16:3

MT Isa 16:3 עשו פלילה שיתי כליל צלך בתוך צהרים סתרי נדחים נדד אל-תגלי  
grant justice; make your shade like night at the height of noon; hide  
the outcasts, do not betray the fugitive;

LXX Isa 16:3 πλείονα βουλεύου, ποίει τε σκέπην πένθους αὐτῇ διὰ παντός·  
ἐν μεσημβρινῇ σκοτία φεύγουσιν, ἐξέστησαν, μὴ ἀπαχθῇς.  
... take further counsel, and make for her a shelter for mourning for  
all time. They flee in darkness at noon, they were astonished; do not  
be taken away.

עשו פלילה	πλείονα βουλεύου	
שיתי	ποίει τε	
כליל	διὰ παντός	different vocalisation
צלך	σκέπην	transposition + omission of suffix
	πένθους	addition?
	αὐτῇ	addition?
בתוך צהרים	ἐν μεσημβρινῇ	
סתרי	σκοτία	semantic association
נדחים	φεύγουσιν	different mood
נדד	ἐξέστησαν	formal association
אל-תגלי	μὴ ἀπαχθῇς	different vocalisation

In this quite complex translation, most Greek words still seem to hide a link to the Hebrew. πλείονα βουλεύου (“take further counsel”) might render עשו פלילה (“grant justice”), which is likewise governed by an imperative, even if the meaning of the two clauses is different. ποίει τε σκέπην πένθους αὐτῇ διὰ παντός derives from עלך כליל שיתי, in which ποίει reflects שיתי, and σκέπην translates צלך (with omission of the suffix).<sup>84</sup> διὰ παντός echoes כליל, read as כליל (“entirely”) instead of as כליל (“like night”). The appearance of πένθους (“mourning”) is striking. A word with a similar sense cannot be found in the Hebrew version. Probably it is an addition, just like αὐτῇ (although, alternatively one could connect πένθους αὐτῇ to פלילה, which would have been linked to אמלל or אבל [= “to mourn”], while αὐτῇ would be based on its final two consonants (לה). The source of ἐν μεσημβρινῇ is plain, as this phrase forms a fairly literal rendering of בתוך צהרים. The succeeding noun—σκοτία—is probably related to סתרי; compare for this link Dan 2:22 where “hidden things” (ומסתרתא) are called “dark things” (καὶ σκοτεινά) in the LXX. The verb φεύγουσιν (“they will flee”) in all probability renders נדחים (“the banished ones”), while ἐξέστησαν (“they were astonished”) represents נדד (“fugitive”), interpreted as a

<sup>84</sup> For the translation of צל as σκέπη, see Gen 19:8; Judg 9:15; Ps 17(16):8; 36(35):8; 63(62):8; 91(90):1; 121(120):5; Isa 25:4; 49:2; Ezek 31:12, 17; Hos 4:13; and 14:8.

form of נוד, which in Aramaic can denote “to be confused.” *μὴ ἀπαχθῆς* (“do not be taken away”), at last, comes from אֶל-תִּגְלִי, read as though it were a Hif. form of גלה (“to take into exile”) rather than a Pi. form of the same root meaning “to betray.”

However uncertain one remains about the exact moves the translator has made, his achievement is a Greek text with a different syntax and sentence division, the content of which is almost independent from the Hebrew.

### *1.3.3 The limits of a quantitative approach*

The reason why I have paid so much attention to the subject of rearrangement in LXX Isaiah is so as to expose the problem that in passages, which have been rendered according to this method, the identification of pluses and minuses is usually quite complicated. In rearranged sentences it is often unclear how the source text and translation exactly relate to each other. The connection between segments in the Hebrew and Greek is often merely indirect and hence difficult to ascertain, which makes it hard to find out whether and where the text contains pluses and minuses. What is more, elements have in many cases been added or omitted by the translator just because this suited the syntax and/or logic of his newly created sentence. Such kind of additions and omissions cannot always be detached from their context and clarified on their own. Most do not have a function in themselves, but are purely related to and dependent on the new sentence that has been formed.<sup>85</sup> One could even query whether those elements can still be defined as cases of “plus” and “minus.” For these reasons, doubtful “pluses” and “minuses” forming part of rearranged sentences will mostly be excluded from my discussion of the pluses and minuses in the Greek Isaiah. Nonetheless, there are also pluses and minuses in rearranged texts that can be explained separately. See, for example, ὕδατος in 5:13 above, which explicates “thirst” and of which an equivalent could likewise be imagined to stand in the Hebrew text. Most of such pluses and minuses in rearrangements which can be classified among the “regular” categories of pluses and minuses that LXX Isaiah displays, will receive treatment in the present study.

The complication mentioned above confronts us with the limits of a quantitative approach. The “unsystematic” way of rendering and the elusiveness that feature in certain parts of the Isaiah translation make it often extremely complicated to ascertain which elements can be identified as pluses and minuses; or, they even make it impossible to speak of LXX Isaiah’s pluses and minuses in an unambiguous manner. Here also lies the reason why the present study cannot offer a complete list of “pluses and minuses” in the Septuagint of

<sup>85</sup> For examples, see ἡμῶν ἐσδι in 3:10; ἐγενήθη, צחה, and ו in וכבודו in 5:13; and שיתי in 16:3 above.



Isaiah, let alone that for all those cases an explanation could be provided. This work merely seeks to afford a large collection of examples illustrating certain translation processes, patterns, and tendencies that seem to characterise the Greek Isaiah and that have given rise to the occurrence of pluses and minuses in the translation. Additionally, this research highlights the truth we are faced with when searching for extra or missing elements in the translation, namely that a rather extensive amount of the Greek text of Isaiah does not lend itself to a systematic, quantitative approach, but asks of us a more creative and intuitive way of looking at this intriguing translation.

### 1.4 *Vorlage* or translator?

One question that turns up each time that pluses and minuses in the Septuagint are subjected to an examination is whether they have been caused by an underlying Hebrew manuscript at variance with the MT, or by the translator himself who has added or omitted elements to or from his text. Septuagint scholars have approached this issue in different ways. On the one side, there are those who hold the opinion that prior to establishing the source of a variant to be a different *Vorlage*, one should be able to exclude the possibility that the plus or minus was the translator's own accomplishment. So, first one has to check whether or not the deviation may have come into being by a mistake of the translator (or copyist), a certain translation technique that he has applied, or perhaps a specific interpretation he wanted to incorporate into his text, and only if these options seem implausible, may one postulate that the plus or minus was already present in the translator's Hebrew manuscript. Scholars who take this position, are, *inter alia*, John W. Wevers, Staffan Olofsson and Tov.<sup>86</sup> On the opposite side are the ones who contend that the explanation for a plus or a minus first has to be looked for in a different Hebrew *Vorlage*. One of them is Anneli Aejmelaeus who reasons as follows:

Now, knowing that the translators considered the text they translated to be authoritative Scripture and, on the other hand, that most of them, after all, were fairly literal, it would seem to be a good rule of thumb to start with the assumption

---

<sup>86</sup> John W. Wevers, "The Use of Versions for Text Criticism. The Septuagint," in *La Septuaginta en la investigación contemporánea (V Congreso de la IOSCS)* (ed. Natalio Fernández Marcos; Textos y estudios "Cardenal Cisneros" 34; Madrid: Instituto "Arias Montano," 1985), 20–21; Staffan Olofsson, *The LXX Version. A Guide to the Translation Technique of the Septuagint* (ConBOT 30; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1990), 72; Tov, *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint*, 18, 40.

that larger divergences from the MT mainly come from the *Vorlage*, and only exceptionally and with imperative reasons to attribute them to the translator.<sup>87</sup>

A balanced way of dealing with this question, as most of these scholars (including Aejmelaeus) themselves acknowledge, is to study and evaluate each and every individual case of plus or minus on its own, only after a thorough analysis has been made of the translation character of the work in which it is found. When a translation turns out to be quite literal, this may be an argument to seek the origin of its pluses and minuses in the first place in a different *Vorlage*. When, on the contrary, it appears rather free, one may first try to identify the extra or missing elements as innovations of the translator. Since the Septuagint of Isaiah clearly belongs to the second group—that of “free” translations—this gives rise to the presumption that the preponderance of its pluses and minuses may stem from the translator himself.<sup>88</sup> This is in line with the outcome of the present study, which seems to indicate that most of LXX Isaiah’s pluses and minuses fit within one of the several categories I have found of translation techniques that have been applied frequently in this translation, for which reason it is not necessary to attribute them to a Hebrew text differing from the MT. However, this surely does not imply that I exclude the alternative, namely that any one of them might actually still be the result of a different *Vorlage*. All pluses and minuses which have been labelled under a particular flag in this work should be considered as *possibly*—and not necessarily—explicable in the way suggested.

### 1.5 An outline of this study and a discussion of the method of analysis

A categorisation of the pluses and minuses of the Greek Isaiah can give a more objective and precise insight into the way in which the translator has dealt with his Hebrew text. In view of this fact, I have attempted to classify LXX Isaiah’s

---

<sup>87</sup> Anneli Aejmelaeus, “What Can We Know about the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Septuagint?,” ZAW 99 (1987): 68. Eugene Ulrich also maintains that one should first take into consideration whether the Hebrew parent text of the LXX may have been different from the MT before one decides to deal with an intervention of the Isaiah translator; see e.g. Eugene Ulrich, “Light from 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> on the Translation Technique of the Old Greek Translator of Isaiah,” in *Scripture in Transition. Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Rajia Sollamo* (ed. Anssi Voitila and Jutta Jokiranta; JSJSup 126; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 197–98.

<sup>88</sup> This fits with the scholarly consensus that the *Vorlage* of LXX Isaiah was probably not very different from the MT; see e.g. Fischer, *In Welcher Schrift*, 8; Otteley, *Book of Isaiah*, 1:51; Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 46; van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 29; idem, “‘The Servant of the Lord.’ A Particular Group of Jews in Egypt According to the Old Greek of Isaiah. Some Comments on LXX Isa 49,1–6 and Related Passages,” in *Studies in the Book of Isaiah. Festschrift William A.M. Beuken* (ed. J. van Ruiten and M. Vervenne; BETL 132; Leuven: Peeters, 1997), 384; idem, *Oracle of Tyre*, 12.

extra and missing elements, the results of which are shown in this study. In doing this, I have sought to elaborate on the classification of pluses and minuses Ziegler has made, though also to complement and enhance his work where necessary. In this way, I have arrived at eleven categories to account for the large majority of the pluses and minuses to be found in the Greek Isaiah. Each one of these groups will be discussed in one of the next eleven chapters. The order of these categories will be as follows:

- To begin with, the nine categories of translation *techniques* will be described. Initially techniques will be described which are applied universally in translations, and which cause only a small change in the source text and its meaning. These are: explicitation, implicitation,<sup>89</sup> the addition or omission of particles, and free translation. Next follow some techniques which are less common, yet seem to be quite typical of the translator of Isaiah. These techniques often produce a more considerable change in the text. They concern the categories of double translation, condensation, the amelioration of rhetorical figures and anaphoric translation. The chapter on anaphoric translation will extend its range to other parts of Scripture.
- The section on translation techniques will end with one chapter dealing with some other minor factors that may have motivated the translator to add or omit elements, such as his supposedly deficient understanding of the Hebrew, his tendency to improve obscure Hebrew texts, and his ideological or theological convictions.
- After the section on translation techniques, one chapter will follow on pluses and minuses that may have come about through the *error* of the translator.
- The third and final section of this work will deal with extra and missing elements that might have a *different Vorlage* underlying. In this section a comparison between the cases of plus and minus in LXX Isaiah and the Isaiah Scroll from Qumran will also be included.

Thus, the structure of this study can be expressed in a scheme as follows:

Pluses and minuses possibly caused by the translator	chapters 2–11
translation techniques	chapters 2–10
translation mistakes	chapter 11
Pluses and minuses possibly caused by a different <i>Vorlage</i>	chapter 12

---

<sup>89</sup> The terms “explicitation” and “implication” are not found in the *Oxford English Dictionary*, but have been coined in the field of translation studies. For a further explanation of them, see chapters 2 and 3.

When examining the pluses and minuses of LXX Isaiah, one is confronted with an extensive amount of material. This has forced me to limit my discussion of each separate case. On account of this, the analysis may occasionally run the risk of appearing somewhat superficial, especially as compared to some other publications on LXX Isaiah that in a very detailed and elaborate way have examined one or two passages of the Isaiah translation. However, the concise style of the present study is the consequence of my choice to treat as large as possible a number of instances of plus and minus in the Greek Isaiah rather than only a selective few.

A second restriction of this study is that it will mainly attempt to discover which translational *tendencies* or *patterns* are disclosed by the Greek translation. The processes leading to pluses and minuses which will be described, will include linguistic and stylistic aspects (that is, cases in which elements have been added or omitted for the sake of a proper use of the Greek language), literary aspects (additions and omissions meant to embellish the Greek text), translation technical aspects (such as the avoidance of redundancy), and contextual and intertextual exegesis and harmonisation. However, it will leave aside a thorough content analysis of the translation, and will thus not try to answer the question as to why the translator may have applied such a specific way of translating from the perspective of the message and content of the wider discourse. Similarly, this study will only sparingly continue into the possible deeper theological, ideological, or actualising motives behind the moves of the translator.

Besides translational patterns, this work will—as mentioned—also pay attention to the relation between the Greek Isaiah and its possible Hebrew *Vorlage*, and try to find out which pluses and minuses may have been the result of the translator's use of a different Hebrew text. But also as concerns this topic, restrictions of room have stopped me from elaborating every detail. The *Vorlage* issue is treated globally throughout and at the end of every chapter, and also separately in chapter 12.

#### *Text editions used*

The Greek text of Isaiah I have employed for this study reflects the critical edition of Ziegler, unless indicated otherwise. Also for the other books of the Septuagint I have used the Göttingen editions for as far as these are already available. The English translation of the Greek comes from *NETS*, except for some occasional changes, which I have indicated in the footnotes. Hebrew citations derive from *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*, while the English translation of the Hebrew generally follows the *New Revised Standard Version*.

## Chapter 2.

# EXPLICITATION

### 2.1 Introduction

A phenomenon that can be encountered in translations throughout the centuries, is the making explicit of information that the source text contains only in an implicit way. This technique has in translation studies been labelled as “explicitation.”<sup>1</sup> The Septuagint of Isaiah displays such a tendency too. Many of its pluses can be classified as “explicitating” additions. By way of explicitation, the translator may primarily have attempted to make the now and then somewhat cryptic text of Isaiah more understandable for his public. Yet, the clarification of the text was probably not his only motive for applying this technique. Another reason may have been the possibility that it can influence the *cohesion* of the text. By supplying details referring to something mentioned earlier in the text (for example, demonstrative pronouns), he could extend the internal links within a textual unit, and thus make his discourse more cohesive. However,

---

<sup>1</sup> The term was first introduced in a glossary of translation techniques by Vinay and Darbelnet (J.-P. Vinay and J. Darbelnet, *Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais. Méthode de traduction* [Bibliothèque de stylistique comparée 1; Paris: Didier, 1958], 9). These scholars define “explicitation” as “Procédé qui consiste à introduire dans LA [target language] des précisions qui restent implicites dans LD [source language], mais qui se dégagent du contexte ou de la situation.” The first systematic study that appeared on explicitation was accomplished by Shoshana Blum-Kulka, “Shifts of Cohesion and Coherence in Translation,” in *Interlingual and Intercultural Communication. Discourse and Cognition in Translation and Second Language Acquisition Studies* (ed. Juliane House and Shoshana Blum-Kulka; Tübinger Beiträge zur Linguistik 272; Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 1986), 18–21. See also Kinga Klaudy, “Explicitation,” *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (ed. Mona Baker; New York: Routledge, 1998), 80–84. In Septuagint studies the technique has been described by e.g. van der Louw (see “Transformations,” 70–71). He defines an explicitation as “a transformation whereby elements that are linguistically implicit in the source text are made explicit in the target text; or whereby an SL element, the intended meaning of which is considered unknown or unusual for the target audience, is rendered with a description or paraphrase of its meaning” (“Transformations,” 70).

explicitation can also *diminish* the internal reference within a text, for instance, when a pronominal subject (“*he* went home”) is replaced by a nominal one (“*the man* went home”). Such a subject change can be used as a marker of discontinuity and of the beginning of a new textual unit.<sup>2</sup>

Explicitation of textual elements is as a rule accomplished with the help of information the text itself provides, sometimes because this information has been offered before, but at other times because the text strongly suggests something without using words for it. Especially in the latter case, the line between explicitation and exegesis can be very thin, that is, the translator may have inserted something that in *his* view is inherent in the text, but which in fact was never meant to be insinuated by the actual author. Such interpretative additions may have occurred quite frequently in the translation of Isaiah, ambiguous and open to different explanations as the Hebrew text often is. For this reason explicitation always remains, to some degree, a form of interpretation.<sup>3</sup>

This is why I do not agree with Jan de Waard when he posits that one should not speak about “additions” if information is already implied by the source text and merely made explicit by the translator, but only if the text provides *new* information:

So we should no longer speak of “interpretative additions” in translation when we mean to say that implicit source information has been made explicit. In such a case nothing has been added to the source text. Only when we have to do with the making explicit of information which is *not* implicit in the source ... we can talk of additions.<sup>4</sup>

This principle of de Waard is in my opinion not feasible, because—as already stated—it is not always so evident whether an extra element in the translation is presupposed by the source text, or that it truly offers new information. This quite often depends on the way in which the text was interpreted by the translator, as well as by ourselves. Besides, in those instances in which it *is* clear that something is embodied in the Hebrew and has only been made explicit by the translator, it may be that no *new information* has been added, but there could still have been an addition of words in a *quantitative* sense.<sup>5</sup> On these grounds,

<sup>2</sup> See van Peursen, *Language and Interpretation*, 393–95.

<sup>3</sup> See e.g. Isa 1:3, where the translator twice seems to have added a pronoun *με* for explicitation: *יִשְׂרָאֵל לֹא יָדַע עָמִי לֹא הִתְבּוֹנֵן* / *Ἰσραὴλ δὲ με οὐκ ἔγνω, καὶ ὁ λαὸς με οὐ συνῆκεν*. These additions suggest that he has interpreted *יָדַע* according to its transitive meaning, i.e. “to know someone,” even though *יָדַע* could just as well have been meant in its intransitive sense here: “to have knowledge,” “to have insight.”

<sup>4</sup> Jan de Waard, “Translation Techniques Used by the Greek Translators of Ruth,” *Bib* 54 (1973): 515.

<sup>5</sup> This is not always true, since it may also be that an “implicit” word (e.g. an independent personal pronoun) is *replaced* by a more explicit one (e.g. a noun), in which case one *cannot* speak about an addition or a plus.

one is justified, in my view, in speaking of “explicitating additions” of the author, even if it may be safer to speak of explicitating “pluses.”

In conformance with what has been said above, the continuation of this chapter, which will discuss the pluses of the Greek Isaiah that may have arisen from the translator’s wish to make his text more explicit, will use the term “explicitation” in a wide sense, which means that it sometimes involves an element of exegesis.

The explicitating pluses of LXX Isaiah have been classified under the following headings:

- Explicitation by the addition of an attribute.
- The addition of *πᾶς*, *ὅλος* and *ᾅμα*.
- Explicitation of the subject.
- Explicitation through the addition of an object.
- Explicitation through the addition of a verb phrase.
- The addition of a pleonastic noun.
- Explicitation without the occurrence of a plus.

## 2.2 Explicitation through the addition of an attribute

In LXX Isaiah explicitation most frequently takes place by way of the addition of an *attribute*. This attribute may consist of a substantive noun or pronoun in the genitive, or sometimes of an adjective, demonstrative, or apposition.

### 2.2.1 The addition of a substantive noun or pronoun in the genitive

A major part of LXX Isaiah’s explicitating pluses is formed by substantive nouns or pronouns in the genitive case. This genitive identifies the owner, source, subject or object of the phrase to which it has been added.

#### a. The addition of a pronoun in the genitive

A pronoun in the genitive can be found more than sixty times as a plus in LXX Isaiah:

1:13	חדש ושבת	τὰς νουμηνίας <u>ὑμῶν</u> και τὰ σάββατα
	קרא מקרא לא־אובל	και ἡμέραν μεγάλην οὐκ ἀνέχομαι
1:16	הסירו רע	παύσασθε ἀπὸ <u>τῶν</u> <u>πονηριῶν</u> <u>ὑμῶν</u>
1:29	כי יבשו מאלים	διότι καταίσχυνθήσονται <u>ἐπὶ</u> <u>τοῖς</u> <u>εἰδώλοις</u> <u>αὐτῶν</u> ,
	אשר חמדתם	ἃ αὐτοὶ ἠβούλοντο,
	ותחפרו מהגנות	και ἐπησχύνθησαν <u>ἐπὶ</u> <u>τοῖς</u> <u>κήποις</u> <u>αὐτῶν</u> ,
	אשר בחרתם	ἃ ἐπεθύμησαν.

1:31	והיה החסן לנערת	καὶ ἔσται ἡ ἰσχὺς αὐτῶν ὡς καλάμη στιππού <sup>6</sup>
3:7	לא־אִהיה חבש	Οὐκ ἔσομαι σου ἀρχηγός. <sup>7</sup>
3:14	ואתם בערתם הכרם	Ἵμεῖς δὲ τί ἐνεπυρίσατε τὸν ἀμπελῶνά μου <sup>8</sup>
5:22	היו גבורים	οὐαὶ οἱ ἰσχύοντες ὑμῶν
	לשתות יין	οἱ τὸν οἶνον πίνοντες
5:27	ולא נפתח אזור	οὐδὲ λύσουσι τὰς ζώνας αὐτῶν
	חלציו	ἀπὸ τῆς ὀσφύος αὐτῶν
9:6(7)	לסרבה המשרה	μεγάλη ἡ ἀρχὴ αὐτοῦ,
	ולשלום אִין־קץ	καὶ τῆς εἰρήνης αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔστιν ὄριον
12:2	כִּיעֲזִי וזמרת יה יהוה	διότι ἡ δόξα μου καὶ ἡ ἀἵνεσίς μου κύριος <sup>9</sup>
13:18	ופרי־בטן לא ירחמו	καὶ τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν οὐ μὴ ἐλεήσουσιν
13:22	ותנים בהיכלי ענג	καὶ νοσσοποιήσουσιν ἔχθινοι ἐν τοῖς οἴκοις αὐτῶν.
15:6	כִּי־יִבֶשׁ חציר	καὶ ὁ χόρτος αὐτῆς ἐκλείψει.
17:8	והאשרים	καὶ οὐκ ὀψονται τὰ δένδρα αὐτῶν
	והחמנים	οὐδὲ τὰ βδελύγματα αὐτῶν.
17:9	ביום ההוא יהיו ערי	τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἔσονται αἱ πόλεις σου
	מעוז	ἐγκαταλελειμμένα
19:3	ודרשו אל־האלילים	καὶ ἐπερωτήσουσι τοὺς θεοὺς αὐτῶν
	ואל־האטים	καὶ τὰ ἀγάλματα αὐτῶν
19:11	עצה נבערה	ἡ βουλὴ αὐτῶν μωρανθήσεται.
22:7	והפרשים שת שתו	οἱ δὲ ἵππεῖς ἐμφράξουσιν
	השערה	τὰς πύλας σου.
26:1	ישועה ישית חומות	καὶ σωτήριον ἡμῶν θήσει τεῖχος
	לחי	καὶ περίτειχος
26:8–9	קוֹינוּךְ לשמך	ἡλπίσαμεν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί σου
	ולזכרך תאות־נפש	καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ μνείᾳ, ἣ ἐπιθυμεῖ ἡ ψυχὴ ἡμῶν.
27:6	ומלאו פני־תבל תנובה	καὶ ἐμπλησθήσεται ἡ οἰκουμένη τοῦ καρποῦ αὐτοῦ.
27:9	וזה כל־פרי	καὶ τοῦτο ἔστιν ἡ εὐλογία αὐτοῦ
27:9	לא־יקמו אשרים	καὶ οὐ μὴ μείνη τὰ δένδρα αὐτῶν,
	וחמנים	καὶ τὰ εἰδῶλα αὐτῶν ἐκκεκομμένα
28:16	יקרת מוסד מוסד	ἐντιμον εἰς τὰ θεμέλια αὐτῆς
28:17	וצדקה למשקלת	ἡ δὲ ἐλεημοσύνη μου εἰς σταθμούς
30:23	ולחם תבואת	καὶ ὁ ἄρτος τοῦ γενήματος
	האדמה	τῆς γῆς σου
30:24	והאלפים והעירים	οἱ ταῦροι ὑμῶν καὶ οἱ βόες
33:8	נשמו מסלות	ἐρμωθήσονται γὰρ αἱ τούτων ὁδοί.

<sup>6</sup> 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> has החסנכס.

<sup>7</sup> The translator may have wanted to harmonise this clause to ἀρχηγός ἡμῶν γενοῦ in verse 6, to which Οὐκ ἔσομαι σου ἀρχηγός in verse 7 forms a reaction.

<sup>8</sup> For ὁ ἀμπελῶν μου, see LXX Isa 5:1, 3, 4, 5, 6.

<sup>9</sup> LXX Isaiah may have taken the *yod* in יה as a suffix to זמרת. 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> gives יהוה עזי וזמרת<sup>9</sup> יהוה; see section 12.3.1.1.



34:7	ועפרם מחלב ידשן	καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ στέατος <u>αὐτῶν</u> ἐμπλησθήσεται.
37:23	ועלמי הרימותה קול	ἢ πρὸς τίνα ὑψώσας <u>τὴν φωνήν σου</u> ;
40:20	להכין פסל	πῶς στήσει <u>αὐτοῦ εἰκόνα</u> καὶ ἵνα
	לא ימוט	μὴ σαλεύηται.
43:28	ואחלל שרי קדש	καὶ ἐμίαναν οἱ ἄρχοντες <u>τὰ ἁγία μου</u> . <sup>10</sup>
44:20	רעה אפר לב הותל	γινῶτε ὅτι σποδὸς <u>ἡ καρδία αὐτῶν</u>
44:28	והיכל תוסד	καὶ <u>τὸν οἶκον τὸν ἁγίον μου</u> θεμελιώσω. <sup>11</sup>
45:23	דבר ולא ישוב	<u>οἱ λόγοι μου</u> οὐκ ἀποστραφήσονται
49:16	הן על-כפים	ἰδοὺ ἐπὶ <u>τῶν χειρῶν μου</u> ἐξωγράφησά σου
	חקתך	τὰ τείχη
51:7	עם תורתי בלבם	<u>λαός μου</u> , οὗ ὁ νόμος μου ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμῶν. <sup>12</sup>
51:18	מכל-בנים ילדה ...	ἀπὸ πάντων <u>τῶν τέκνων σου</u> , ὧν ἔτεκες ...
	מכל-בנים גדלה	οὐδὲ ἀπὸ πάντων <u>τῶν υἱῶν σου</u> , ὧν ὑψώσας. <sup>13</sup>
52:7	משמיע ישועה	ὅτι ἀκουστήν ποιήσω <u>τὴν σωτηρίαν σου</u>
53:3	וכמסתר פנים ממנו	ὅτι ἀπέστραπται <u>τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ</u>
53:12	ולפשעים יפגיע	καὶ διὰ <u>τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν</u> παρεδόθη. <sup>14</sup>
54:10	והגבעות תמוטנה	οὐδὲ <u>οἱ βουνοί σου</u> μετακινήθονται
56:6	כל-שומר	καὶ πάντας τοὺς φυλασσομένους
	שבת	<u>τὰ σάββατά μου</u> . <sup>15</sup>
57:4	על-מי תרחיבו פה	καὶ ἐπὶ τίνα ἡνοίξατε <u>τὸ στόμα ὑμῶν</u> ;
	תאריכו לשון	καὶ ἐπὶ τίνα ἐχαλάσατε <u>τὴν γλῶσσαν ὑμῶν</u> ;
57:5	שחטי הילדים בנחלים	σφάζοντες <u>τὰ τέκνα αὐτῶν</u> ἐν ταῖς φάραγξιν
58:3	הן ביום צמכם	ἐν γὰρ ταῖς ἡμέραις τῶν νηστειῶν ὑμῶν
	תמצאו-חפץ	εὐρίσκετε <u>τὰ θελήματα ὑμῶν</u> . <sup>16</sup>
58:12	ובנו ממך חרבות	καὶ οἰκοδομηθῶσονται <u>σου αἱ ἔρημοι</u>
	עולם	αἰῶνιοι
59:2	וחטאותיכם הסתירו	καὶ διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας ὑμῶν ἀπέστρεψε
	פנים מכם	<u>τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ</u> ἀφ' ὑμῶν. <sup>17</sup>
59:13	והגו מלב	καὶ ἐμελετήσαμεν <u>ἀπὸ καρδίας ἡμῶν</u>
	דברי-שקר	λόγους ἀδίκους.
62:2	וקרא לך שם חדש	καὶ καλέσει σε <u>τὸ ὄνομά σου</u> τὸ καινόν

<sup>10</sup> For other occurrences of τὰ ἁγία μου, see section 9.5.

<sup>11</sup> See 43:28 above. 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> has והיכל י תיסדד (it is unclear whether the suspended yod belongs to תיסדד or to והיכל); see section 12.3.1.1.

<sup>12</sup> Possibly in harmonisation with λαός μου in verses 4 and 16.

<sup>13</sup> For τὰ τέκνα σου, see LXX Isa 14:21; 39:7; 54:13; and 60:4, 9; the phrase appears in the immediate context of οἱ υἱοί σου also in 54:13 and 60:4.

<sup>14</sup> The translator has apparently understood ולפשעים as ולפִשְׁעִים—“and for the transgressions”—rather than as ולפִשְׁעִים—“and for the transgressors.”

<sup>15</sup> μου may have been added in harmonisation with verse 4 אשר יסמרו את-שבתותי / ὅσοι ἂν φυλάξωνται τὰ σάββατά μου.

<sup>16</sup> See עשות חפצך / τοῦ μὴ ποιεῖν τὰ θελήματα σου and מוצא חפצך in verse 13.

<sup>17</sup> For ἀποστρέφω τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ, see 8:17; 38:2; 53:3; 54:8; 57:17; and 64:6(7), and see section 9.5.

62:10	עברו עברו בשערים פנו דרך העם	πορεύεσθε διὰ τῶν πυλῶν μου καὶ ὁδοποιήσατε τῷ λαῷ μου <sup>18</sup>
64:8(9)	ואל-לעד תזכר עון	καὶ μὴ ἐν καιρῷ μνησθῆς ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν.
65:14	ואתם תצעקו מכאב לב	ὕμεις δὲ κεκράξεσθε διὰ τὸν πόνον τῆς καρδίας ὑμῶν
65:16	כי נשכחו הצרות הראשונות	ἐπιλήσονται γὰρ τὴν θλίψιν αὐτῶν τὴν πρώτην
65:17	ולא תעלינה על-לב	οὐδ' οὐ μὴ ἐπέλθῃ αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν
65:21	ואכלו פרים	καὶ αὐτοὶ φάγονται τὰ γενήματα αὐτῶν.

Notice that a possessive pronoun is added nine times to a designation of idols, namely in 1:29 (2x); 17:8 (2x); 19:3 (2x); 27:9 (2x); and 40:20. After *καρδία* a pronoun appears as a plus in four places: 44:20; 59:13 and 65:14, 17.

In several of the above instances the insertion of a pronoun may additionally (or primarily) have been motivated by the translator's intention to make a clause more parallel to a preceding or following one, or to harmonise it with an expression in its immediate surrounding: See 1:13; 3:7; 30:24; 37:23; 51:7; 56:6; and 58:3.<sup>19</sup>

Sometimes the "addition" of a genitive pronoun is not a matter of explicitation but a side-effect of a variant translation. For examples, see:

3:13	ועמד לדין עמים	καὶ στήσει εἰς κρίσιν τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ
16:4	כי-אפס המץ	ὅτι ἦρθη ἡ συμμαχία σου
33:3	מקול המון נדדו עמים	διὰ φωνὴν τοῦ φόβου σου ἐξέστησαν λαοὶ

For the repetition of possessive pronouns in coordinate items, see section 6.9.2.

### *b. The addition of a substantive noun in the genitive*

Genitive *nouns* that in LXX Isaiah have been appended to other nouns are often pleonastic: the information they offer is already implied by the words that govern them, or sometimes by the immediate context.<sup>20</sup> Here too the translator's inclination to level parallel clauses or to assimilate a phrase or clause to another one close at hand may account for some of the explicating additions. This could apply to 14:26, 31; 17:13; and 49:13 below.

<sup>18</sup> See 51:7 above.

<sup>19</sup> See sections 8.5.1 and 9.2.

<sup>20</sup> See also Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 58–59. Among the examples of "pleonastische Zusätze" or "sonstige verdeutlichende Wiedergaben" that he offers, Ziegler also includes some nouns, that are—in my opinion—added for other reasons, e.g. for reasons of style; he mentions for instance 14:8 ברושים / τὰ ξύλα τοῦ Λιβάνου, where τοῦ Λιβάνου in my view has rather been added in parallelism to ἡ κέδρος τοῦ Λιβάνου in the following stich.

1:31	לנערת	ὡς καλὰ μὴ <u>στιππύου</u>
1:31	לניצוי	ὡς σπινθήρες <u>πυρός</u>
3:16	הלוי	καὶ τῇ πορείᾳ <u>τῶν ποδῶν</u>
5:18	וכעבות העגלה	καὶ ὡς <u>ζυγοῦ</u> ἱμάντι δαμάλεως <sup>21</sup>
5:28	וגלגליו	οἱ τροχοὶ <u>τῶν ἁρμάτων</u> αὐτῶν <sup>22</sup>
5:29	ככפירים	ὡς σκύμνος <u>λέοντος</u>
9:18(19)	בעברת יהוה צבאות	διὰ θυμὸν <u>ὀργῆς</u> κυρίου <sup>23</sup>
13:5	מקצה השמים	ἀπ' ἄκρου <u>θεμελίου</u> τοῦ οὐρανοῦ <sup>24</sup>
13:13	בעברת יהוה צבאות	διὰ θυμὸν <u>ὀργῆς</u> κυρίου σαβαωθ <sup>25</sup>
14:26	על-כל-הגוים	ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη <u>τῆς οἰκουμένης</u> <sup>26</sup>
14:31	שער	πύλαι <u>πόλεων</u> <sup>27</sup>
17:13	כמץ הרים	ὡς χνοῦν <u>ἀχύρου</u> <sup>28</sup>
22:9	ואת בקיעי עיר-דוד	τὰ κρυπτὰ <u>τῶν οἴκων</u> τῆς ἄκρας Δαυιδ
26:20	זעם	ἢ <u>ὀργῇ</u> <u>κυρίου</u> <sup>29</sup>
30:6	לביא וליש	λέων καὶ σκύμνος <u>λέοντος</u>
33:20	יתדתיו	οἱ πάσσαλοι <u>τῆς σκηνῆς</u> αὐτῆς
38:8	במעלות	τοὺς δέκα ἀναβαθμοὺς <u>τοῦ οἴκου</u>
	זחא	τοῦ πατρός σου <sup>30</sup>
38:14	למרום	εἰς τὸ ὕψος <u>τοῦ οὐρανοῦ</u>
41:25	כמו-חמר	ὡς πηλὸς <u>κεραμέως</u> <sup>31</sup>
49:13	ועניו	τοὺς ταπεινοὺς <u>τοῦ λαοῦ</u> αὐτοῦ <sup>32</sup>

<sup>21</sup> See Job 39:10 ἐν ἱμάσι ζυγόν. The LXX translator has read גִּלְגַּל (which the MT vocalises גִּלְגַּל—“heifer”) as גִּלְגַּל—“cart”—and supplied the noun ζυγός under the influence of the context. See *HUB Isa*, 19.

<sup>22</sup> See 66:15 מרכבתיו / ὡς καταιγὶς τὰ ἅρματα αὐτοῦ.

<sup>23</sup> The insertion of ὀργῆς is probably in assimilation to the Hebrew expressions הָאֵרֶן and הָאֵרֶרֶת, which appear approximately forty times in the MT; in *Isa*, see 7:4; and 13:9, 13 (see section 9.5).

<sup>24</sup> In all likelihood, the translator has borrowed θεμέλιος from verse 13. The construction τὰ θεμέλια τοῦ οὐρανοῦ also occurs in 2 *Kgdms* 22:8. Compare further τὰ θεμέλια τῆς γῆς in LXX *Isa* 14:15; 24:18; and 40:21.

<sup>25</sup> See 9:18(19) above.

<sup>26</sup> τῆς οἰκουμένης may reprise ἐπὶ τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην earlier in the same verse.

<sup>27</sup> πόλεων has most likely been added under the influence of עיר / πόλεις in verse 31b.

<sup>28</sup> הָרִים has been read as זֵרִים and translated λιχμώντων. ἀχύρου may have been supplied in parallelism to ὡς κονιορτὸν τροχοῦ later in the verse. See section 6.4a.

<sup>29</sup> For ὀργῇ κυρίου, see 9:18(19) and 13:13 above, and see also θυμὸς κυρίου in 28:2; 30:33; 34:2; and 51:20.

<sup>30</sup> 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> offers אֶחָד עֶלֶית אֶחָד; see section 12.3.1.1.

<sup>31</sup> For ὡς πηλὸς κεραμέως, see *Isa* 29:16 and 45:9, and *Jer* 18:6.

<sup>32</sup> τοῦ λαοῦ resumes τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ earlier in the same verse. Compare also 14:32 καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ σωθήσονται οἱ ταπεινοὶ τοῦ λαοῦ.

### 2.2.2 The addition of an adjective

Also of the few adjectives that appear as pluses in LXX Isaiah, most are pleonastic in the context in which they are embedded.<sup>33</sup> This makes it sometimes hard to distinguish whether they can be considered as real “pluses,” or whether they are just part of a descriptive translation of a Hebrew lexeme:

3:23	והרדדים	καὶ θέριστρα <u>κατάκλιτα</u> <sup>34</sup>
5:30	כנהמתים	ὡς φωνὴ θαλάσσης <u>κυμαινούσης</u>
7:20	בתער השכירה	τῷ ξυρῷ <u>τῷ μεγάλῳ</u> καὶ μεμεθυσμένῳ
18:5	הזולים	τὰ βοτρυδία <u>τὰ μικρά</u>
19:22	ונגף יהוה את־מצרים	καὶ πατάξει κύριος τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους
	נגף	<u>πληγῇ μεγάλῃ</u> <sup>35</sup>
28:25	והפיץ קצח	τότε σπείρει <u>μικρόν μελάνθιον</u>
30:10	חזו מהתלות	καὶ ἀναγγέλλετε ἡμῖν <u>ἐτέραν πλάνησιν</u>
30:19	כיעם בציון ישב	Διότι <u>λαὸς ἅγιος</u> ἐν Σιων οἰκήσει
30:23	כר נרחב	<u>τόπον πίονα</u> καὶ εὐρύχωρον
34:13	ועלתה ארמנתיה	καὶ ἀναφύσει εἰς τὰς πόλεις αὐτῶν
	סירים	<u>ἀκάνθινα ξύλα</u> <sup>36</sup>
43:10	לפני לא־נוצר אל	ἔμπροσθέν μου οὐκ ἐγένετο <u>ἄλλος θεός</u> <sup>37</sup>

The noun πέτρα (“rock”), when translating צור (“rock”) or שילית (“flint”), is four times provided with the adjective στερεός (“solid”).<sup>38</sup>

2:21	לבוא בנקרות	τοῦ εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὰς τρώγλας
	הצרים	<u>τῆς στερεᾶς πέτρας</u>
5:28	כצר נחשבו	ὡς <u>στερεὰ πέτρα</u> ἐλογίσθησαν
50:7	על־כן שמתי פני	ἀλλὰ ἔθηκα τὸ πρόσωπόν μου
	כחלמיש	<u>ὡς στερεὰν πέτραν</u>
51:1	הביטו אל־צור	ἐμβλέψατε εἰς <u>τὴν στερεὰν πέτραν</u> ,
	חצבתם	ἣν ἐλατομήσατε

<sup>33</sup> See also Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 59.

<sup>34</sup> See section 6.5b.

<sup>35</sup> For πληγῇ μεγάλῃ, see Num 11:33; 1 Kgdms 4:10, 17; 6:19; and 2 Chr 21:14 (compare van der Kooij, “LXX Isaiah 19:16–25,” 145).

<sup>36</sup> ξύλα may have been added in order to compensate for the omission of קמוש וחוה (“nettles and thistles”) in the clause which follows, or might be a rendering of (either of) those two nouns. See section 7.6.2a.

<sup>37</sup> See Isa 26:13; 45:21, 22; and Exod 8:6.

<sup>38</sup> For the possible influence of Deut 32:13 on these pluses, see section 9.4.1.2a; for a stylistic explanation, see section 8.3.2.2a.

### 2.2.3 The addition of a demonstrative

Sporadically a demonstrative adjective is inserted. It indicates the object or part of speech to which the text refers, and thus strengthens the textual coherence:

29:1	ותהי לכם חזות הכל כדברי הספר	καὶ ἔσονται ὑμῖν πάντα τὰ <u>ρήματα ταῦτα</u> ὡς οἱ λόγοι <u>τοῦ βιβλίου</u>
	<b>החתום</b>	<u>τοῦ ἐσφραγισμένου τούτου</u>
29:12	ונתן הספר על אשר לא־ידע ספר	καὶ δοθήσεται τὸ <u>βιβλίον τούτο</u> εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπου μὴ ἐπισταμένου γράμματα
30:11	סורו מני־דרך הטו מני־ארח	καὶ ἀποστρέψατε ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ <u>τῆς ὁδοῦ</u> <u>ταύτης</u> , ἀφέλετε ἀφ' ἡμῶν τὸν <u>τρίβον τούτον</u>
37:4	بعد השארית הנמצאה	περὶ <u>τῶν καταλειμμένων τούτων</u> .

After *ὁ λαός* an additional demonstrative can be encountered twice:

3:7	לא תשימני קצין עם	οὐκ ἔσομαι ἀρχηγὸς <u>τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου</u> .
65:3	העם המכעיסים אותי	<u>ὁ λαὸς οὗτος</u> ὁ παροξύνων με

*ὁ λαὸς οὗτος* / *העם הזה* further appears in 6:8, 9, 10; 8:6, 11, 12; 9:15(16); 28:11, 14; and 29:13, 14. The supply of *οὗτος* provides “the people” with a negative connotation.

### 2.2.4 The addition of an apposition

#### a. The addition of a divine title

The Isaiah translator with regularity seems to have extended the divine name by supplementing *ὁ θεός* to *κύριος* and *vice versa*:

8:10	כי עמנו אל	ὅτι μεθ' ἡμῶν <u>κύριος ὁ θεός</u> .
26:12	יהוה תשפת שלום לנו	<u>κύριε ὁ θεός</u> ἡμῶν, εἰρήνην δὸς ἡμῖν
28:13	והיה להם דברי־יהוה	καὶ ἔσται αὐτοῖς τὸ λόγιον <u>κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ</u>
38:22	כי אעלה בית יהוה	ὅτι ἀναβήσομαι εἰς τὸν οἶκον <u>κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ</u> .
51:20	גערת אלהיך	ἐκλελυμένοι διὰ <u>κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ</u> .
52:12	ומאספכם אלהי ישראל	καὶ ὁ ἐπισυνάγων ὑμᾶς <u>κύριος ὁ θεός</u> Ἰσραηλ.
57:21	אמר אלהי	εἶπε <u>κύριος ὁ θεός</u> .

In chapters 41–45 the translator shows a special preference for denoting God with *κύριος ὁ θεός*.<sup>39</sup> Where in the Hebrew just יהוה appears, the LXX has *ὁ*

<sup>39</sup> The literal retroversion of *κύριος ὁ θεός*—that is יהוה אלהים (without an attribute or suffix following)—does not occur in the book of Isaiah. The closest Hebrew counterpart to *κύριος ὁ θεός* in MT Isa is האל יהוה in 42:5.

θεός added sixteen times.<sup>40</sup> This has particularly often happened in the expressions ἐγὼ κύριος ὁ θεός<sup>41</sup> and (οὕτως) λέγει κύριος ὁ θεός.<sup>42</sup>

41:17	אני יהוה אענם	ἐγὼ <u>κύριος ὁ θεός</u> , ἐγὼ ἐπακούσομαι
41:21	יאמר יהוה	λέγει <u>κύριος ὁ θεός</u> .
42:6	אני יהוה קראתיך בצדק	ἐγὼ <u>κύριος ὁ θεός</u> ἐκάλεσά σε ἐν δικαιοσύνη
42:8	אני יהוה	ἐγὼ <u>κύριος ὁ θεός</u>
42:13	יהוה כגבור יצא	<u>κύριος ὁ θεός</u> τῶν δυνάμεων ἐξελεύσεται
42:21	יהוה חפץ למען צדקו	<u>κύριος ὁ θεός</u> ἐβούλετο ἵνα δικαιωθῇ
43:1	כה־אמר יהוה	οὕτως λέγει <u>κύριος ὁ θεός</u>
43:14	כה־אמר יהוה	Οὕτως λέγει <u>κύριος ὁ θεός</u>
43:15	אני יהוה קדושכם	ἐγὼ <u>κύριος ὁ θεός</u> ὁ ἅγιος ὑμῶν
44:2	כה־אמר יהוה עשך	οὕτως λέγει <u>κύριος ὁ θεός</u> ὁ ποιήσας σε
45:1	כה־אמר יהוה למשיחו	Οὕτως λέγει <u>κύριος ὁ θεός</u> τῷ χριστῷ μου
45:3	כי־אני יהוה	ὅτι ἐγὼ <u>κύριος ὁ θεός</u>
45:5	אני יהוה	ὅτι ἐγὼ <u>κύριος ὁ θεός</u>
45:6	אני יהוה	ἐγὼ <u>κύριος ὁ θεός</u>
45:7	אני יהוה עשה כל־אלה	ἐγὼ <u>κύριος ὁ θεός</u> ὁ ποιῶν ταῦτα πάντα.
45:11	כה־אמר יהוה	ὅτι οὕτως λέγει <u>κύριος ὁ θεός</u>

Also the divine epithet σαβαωθ appears now and then as a plus in the Greek Isaiah. The translation has five instances where this noun follows the name of God while the equivalent צבאות is absent from the MT.<sup>43</sup> This is mostly in verses where the Hebrew provides יהוה צבאות nearby (as regards the cases below, compare 5:24; 22:14, 15; 23:9; and 45:13). Probably the translator has added σαβαωθ on these occasions from the perspective of assimilation:

5:25	על־כן חרה אף־יהוה בעמו	καὶ ἐθυμώθη ὀργῇ <u>κύριος σαβαωθ</u> ἐπὶ τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ
7:7	כה אמר אדני יהוה	τάδε λέγει <u>κύριος σαβαωθ</u>
22:17	יהוה מטלטלך טלטלה גבר	<u>κύριος σαβαωθ</u> ἐκβαλεῖ καὶ ἐκτρίψει ἄνδρα
23:11	יהוה צוה אל־כנען	<u>κύριος σαβαωθ</u> ἐνετείλατο περὶ Χανααν
45:14	כה אמר יהוה	Οὕτως λέγει <u>κύριος σαβαωθ</u>

<sup>40</sup> Besides κύριος ὁ θεός a mere ὁ θεός frequently renders יהוה in these chapters; this happens fourteen times.

<sup>41</sup> A similar Hebrew expression can be found in 41:13 and 43:3: כי אני יהוה אלהיך (even though the suffix is not in line with the Greek).

<sup>42</sup> For the closest Hebrew parallel, see 42:5 יהוה האל יהוה / οὕτως λέγει κύριος ὁ θεός.

<sup>43</sup> On צבאות being an apposition to the divine name (rather than a genitive), see Joüon §131o.

*b. The addition of an apposition to geographical names*

On six occasions a defining apposition is supplied to a geographical name:

7:8	אפרים	ἡ βασιλεία Εφραιμ
10:28	על-עית	εἰς τὴν πόλιν Αγγαι
29:17	לכרמל	ὡς τὸ ὄρος τὸ Χερμελ
29:17	והכרמל	καὶ τὸ ὄρος τὸ Χερμελ
36:19	אלהי ספרוים	ὁ θεὸς τῆς πόλεως Σεπφარიμ
37:12	אשר בתלשר	αἱ εἰσιν ἐν χώρᾳ Θεμαδ

### 2.3 The addition of *πᾶς*, *ὅλος* and *ἅμα*

Approximately forty times the words *πᾶς*, *ὅλος* and *ἅμα* turn up in LXX Isaiah where there is no counterpart in the MT. These words generally do not change the content of the sentence in which they are inserted, but have a purely intensifying function.

#### *πᾶς*

*πᾶς* occurs as a plus especially often where in the Hebrew כל is found in a nearby—usually consecutive—phrase or clause.<sup>44</sup> Among the examples presented below this applies to 2:17 (see כל in verses 12–16); 4:5; 19:7; 25:8; 29:7; 40:4, 15, 16 (see כל-הגוים in verse 17), 26; 41:11; 46:10; 49:9, 11; and 58:6:

2:17	ושח גבהות האדם	καὶ ταπεινωθήσεται <i>πᾶς</i> ἄνθρωπος
4:5	וברא יהוה על כל-מכון הר-ציון ועל-מקראה ענן יומם	καὶ ἥξει, καὶ ἔσται <i>πᾶς</i> τόπος τοῦ ὄρους Σιων καὶ <i>πάντα</i> τὰ περικύκλω αὐτῆς σκιάσει νεφέλη ἡμέρας
10:10	כאשר מצאה ידי לממלכת	καὶ <i>πάσας</i> τὰς χώρας λήμψομαι.
14:12	חולש על-גוים	ὁ ἀποστέλλων πρὸς <i>πάντα</i> τὰ ἔθνη. <sup>45</sup>
19:7	ערות על-יאור על-פי יאור וכל מזרע יאור	καὶ τὸ ἄχι τὸ χλωρόν <i>πάν</i> τὸ κύκλω τοῦ ποταμοῦ καὶ <i>πάν</i> τὸ σπειρόμενον διὰ τοῦ ποταμοῦ
23:18	כי יושבים לפני יהוה יהיה סחרה	ἀλλὰ τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν ἐναντίον κυρίου <i>πᾶσα</i> ἡ ἐμπορία αὐτῆς
25:4	כי-יהי מעוז לדל	ἐγένου γὰρ <i>πάσῃ</i> πόλει ταπεινῇ βοηθὸς
25:8	ומחה אדני יהוה דמעה מעל כל-פנים	καὶ πάλιν ἀφείλεν ὁ θεὸς <i>πάν</i> δάκρυον ἀπὸ παντός προσώπου. <sup>46</sup>

<sup>44</sup> Compare Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 58.

<sup>45</sup> See verse 26 על-כל-הגוים / ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς οἰκουμένης. For πάντα τὰ ἔθνη / τὰ ἔθνη πάντα, see also 2:2; 25:6, 7; 29:7, 8; 34:2; 40:15, 17; 43:9; 52:10; 56:7; 61:11; and 66:18, 20.

<sup>46</sup> Note the fourfold alliteration of the π.

29:7	וכל-צביה	καὶ πάντες οἱ στρατευσάμενοι ἐπὶ Ἱερουσαλημ
	ומצדתה	καὶ <u>πάντες</u> οἱ συνηγμένοι ἐπ' αὐτήν
29:21	ולמוכח בשער	<u>πάντας</u> δὲ τοὺς ἐλέγχοντας ἐν πύλαις
	יקשן	πρόσκομμα θήσουσι
40:4	והיה העקב למישור	καὶ ἔσται <u>πάντα</u> τὰ σκολιὰ εἰς εὐθεΐαν
40:15	גוים כמר מדלי הן	εἰ <u>πάντα</u> τὰ ἔθνη ὡς σταγὼν ἀπὸ κάδου
	וכשחק מאזנים נחשבו	καὶ ὡς ῥοπή ζυγοῦ ἐλογίσθησαν <sup>47</sup>
40:16	וחיתו אין די	καὶ <u>πάντα</u> τὰ τετράποδα οὐχ ἱκανὰ
	עולה	εἰς ὀλοκάρπωσιν
40:26	מי-ברא אלה	τίς κατέδειξε <u>πάντα</u> ταῦτα; <sup>48</sup>
41:11	ויאבדו אנשי ריבך	καὶ ἀπολούνται <u>πάντες</u> οἱ ἀντίδικοί σου. <sup>49</sup>
41:20	כי יד-יהוה עשתה זאת	ὅτι χεὶρ κυρίου ἐποίησε ταῦτα <u>πάντα</u> <sup>50</sup>
46:10	עצתי תקום	<u>Πᾶσά</u> μου ἢ βουλὴ στήσεται,
	וכל-חפצי אעשה	καὶ πάντα, ὅσα βεβούλευμαι, ποιήσω·
47:14	הנה היו כקש אש	ידου <u>πάντες</u> ὡς φρύγανα ἐπὶ πυρὶ
	שרפתם	κατακαήσονται <sup>51</sup>
49:9	על-דרכים	καὶ ἐν <u>πάσαις</u> ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτῶν
	ירעו ובכל-שפיים	βοσκηθήσονται καὶ ἐν <u>πάσαις</u> ταῖς τρίβους
	מרעיתם	ἢ νομὴ αὐτῶν. <sup>52</sup>
49:11	ושמתי כל-הרי לדרך	καὶ θήσω <u>πάν</u> ὄρος εἰς ὁδὸν
	ומסלתי ירמון	καὶ <u>πᾶσαν</u> τρίβον εἰς βόσκημα αὐτοῖς.
58:6	פתח חרצבות רשע	ἀλλὰ λῦε <u>πάντα</u> σύνδεσμον ἀδικίας
60:4	בניך מרחוק יבאו	ἤκασι <u>πάντες</u> οἱ υἱοί σου μακρόθεν <sup>53</sup>
65:4	ופרק פגלים	καὶ ζωμὸν θυσίων, μεμολυμένα <u>πάντα</u>
	כליהם	τὰ σκεύη αὐτῶν·

### ὅλος

Each time that ὅλος is a plus, it is joined to γῆ or οἰκουμένη:

9:18(19)	בעברת יהוה צבאות	διὰ θυμὸν ὀργῆς κυρίου
	נעתם ארץ	συγκέκαυται <u>ἡ γῆ ὅλη</u>
13:9	לשום הארץ לשמה	θεῖναι <u>τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην</u> ἔρημον
13:11	ופקדתי על-תבל רעה	καὶ ἐντελοῦμαι <u>τῇ οἰκουμένη ὅλη</u> κακὰ
14:17	שם תבל כמדבר	ὁ θεὸς <u>τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην</u> ἔρημον

<sup>47</sup> See verse 17 גודו / כל-הגוים כאן נגדו / καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ὡς οὐδὲν εἰσι; see also 14:12 and footnote above.

<sup>48</sup> See 41:20.

<sup>49</sup> 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> has נעתם אנשי ריבכה כול / יובדו אנשי ריבכה; see section 12.3.1.1.

<sup>50</sup> See 45:7 ὡς עשה כל-אלה / אני יהוה עשה כל-אלה / ἐγὼ κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὁ ποιῶν ταῦτα πάντα, and see section 9.5.

<sup>51</sup> For πάντες ὡς, see 18:3; 41:11; 50:9; 53:6; and 64:5(6).

<sup>52</sup> 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> likewise has an extra כל הרים ירעו ובכול שפאים מרעיתם: כל בול הרים ירעו ובכול שפאים מרעיתם; see section 12.3.1.1.

<sup>53</sup> Possibly πάντες is not a plus, but the result of a transposition of כלם from the previous sentence to this one.



Presumably *ὅλος* was added in assimilation to the fixed expression כִּלְהָאֶרֶץ, which recurs repeatedly throughout the book of Isaiah, particularly in passages dealing with God's judgment of the world. The LXX renders this phrase *οἰκουμένη ὅλη* or *πάσα ἡ γῆ*. See 6:3; 10:14, 23; 12:5; 13:5; 14:26; 25:8; 28:22; 37:11 (LXX); and 37:18 (LXX).

### ἅμα

*ἅμα*—meaning “together” or “at the same time”—is usually prompted by יחד or יחדו. Yet, about ten times it has no Hebrew match:

3:16	הלוך וטפך תלכנה וברגליהם תעכסנה	καὶ τῇ πορείᾳ τῶν ποδῶν <u>ἅμα</u> σύρυσαι τοὺς χιτῶνας καὶ τοῖς ποσὶν <u>ἅμα</u> παίζουσαι
11:7	ופרה ודב תרעינה ירבצו ילדיהן יחדו ואריה כבקר יאכל־תבן	καὶ βοῦς καὶ ἄρκος <u>ἅμα</u> βοσκηθήσονται, καὶ ἅμα τὰ παιδία αὐτῶν ἔσονται, καὶ λέων καὶ βοῦς <u>ἅμα</u> φάγονται ἄχυρα.
13:3	עליזי גאותי	χαίροντες <u>ἅμα</u> καὶ ὑβρίζοντες.
19:14	כהתעות שכור בקיאו	ὥς πλανᾶται ὁ μεθύων καὶ ὁ ἐμῶν <u>ἅμα</u> .
24:14	המה ישאו קולם ירנו בגאון יהוה	οἱ δὲ καταλειφθέντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς εὐφρανθήσονται <u>ἅμα</u> τῇ δόξῃ κυρίου. <sup>54</sup>
41:5	קרבו ויאחיון	τὰ ἄκρα τῆς γῆς ἤγγισαν καὶ ἤλθοσαν <u>ἅμα</u>
41:7	מחליק פטיש את־הולם פעם	καὶ χαλκεὺς τύπτων σφύρη <u>ἅμα</u> ἐλαύνων. <sup>55</sup>
42:22	הפח בחורים כלם ובבתי כלאים החבאו	ἡ γὰρ παγὶς ἐν τοῖς ταμείοις πανταχοῦ, καὶ ἐν οἴκοις <u>ἅμα</u> , ὅπου ἔκρυψαν αὐτοὺς
44:11	יתקבצו כלם יעמדו יפחדו יבשו יחד	συναχθήτωσαν πάντες καὶ στήτωσαν <u>ἅμα</u> , ἐντραπήτωσαν καὶ αἰσχυνηθήτωσαν <u>ἅμα</u> .
46:10	מגיד מראשית אחרית ומקדם אשר לא־נעשו	ἀναγγέλλων πρότερον τὰ ἔσχατα πρὶν αὐτὰ γενέσθαι, καὶ <u>ἅμα</u> συνετελέσθη.
59:11	נהמה כדבים כלנו וכיונים הגה נהגה	ὥς ἄρκος καὶ ὥς περιστέρα <u>ἅμα</u> πορεύονται. <sup>56</sup>

In 11:7 and 44:11 *ἅμα* most likely has been added parallel to *ἅμα* in the neighbouring line.

The frequent addition of *πᾶς*, *ὅλος* and *ἅμα* is counterbalanced by an almost equally large number of omissions of כָּל and יחד. For a discussion on the (seeming) discrepancy of these two contrasting tendencies, see section 3.8.

<sup>54</sup> See 52:8 καὶ τῇ φωνῇ *ἅμα* εὐφρανθήσονται; and 52:9 ῥηξάτω εὐφροσύνην *ἅμα* τὰ ἔρημα Ἱερουσαλὴμ.

<sup>55</sup> *ἅμα* may represent פעם אחת, read as פעם—“at once” (see Isa 66:8); see section 6.6.1b.

<sup>56</sup> *ἅμα* may render כלנו.

## 2.4 Explicitation of the subject

By definition every clause has a subject, so that in a strict sense one cannot speak of the “addition of a subject” to a clause. Yet, in so-called “null subject languages,” such as Greek and Hebrew, the subject does not always consist of an independent phrase, but can also be implied in the verb. When in the translation an implied subject is altered into an explicit one embodying a noun phrase, even if in a grammatical sense this is no addition, still in a quantitative sense it is. Such a transformation from an implicit to an explicit subject takes place quite often in the Greek Isaiah. Some examples of it have been offered by Ziegler.<sup>57</sup> These and other cases will be presented in the paragraphs below.

### 2.4.1 The “addition” of a pronominal subject

One way in which implied subjects in the Hebrew have regularly been made explicit in LXX Isaiah is by the addition of an independent pronoun. This occurs especially often in the near presence of another such pronoun, for instance with the purpose of focusing on a certain person by repeating strong reference to him, or, on the other hand, so as to accentuate the contrast between different groups.

#### 14:8–21

In 14:8–21—verses which form part of the song about the king of Assur— independent pronouns in the second person singular have been applied abundantly in the Greek. One can find seven instances of σου, five of σοι and an equal number of σύ. Of the latter, there are two that concern pluses:

14:8	מִאֵז שְׁכַבְתָּ	Ἀφ’ οὗ <u>σύ</u> κεκοίμησαι
14:20	לֹא־תַחַד אַתָּם בַּקְּבוּרָה	οὕτως οὐδὲ <u>σύ</u> ἔσῃ καθαρός

Maybe the repeated use of these pronouns was meant to highlight the pretentious greatness and the arrogance of the king.

#### 37:22–30

Also 37:22–30—the word of God about Sennacherib—displays a considerable number of independent pronouns in the second person singular addressed to the king of Assyria (nine times σου; twice σε; twice σοι and once σύ), and, additionally, twice a first person singular ἐγὼ coming from the mouth of Sennacherib himself. Two of the subject pronouns are pluses:

37:24	וְתֹאמַר	<u>σύ</u> γὰρ εἶπας
37:26	הֲלוֹא־שְׁמַעַת לְמַרְחֹק	οὐ ταῦτα ἤκουσας πάλαι,
	אוֹתָהּ עָשִׂיתִי	ἃ <u>ἐγὼ</u> ἐποίησα;

<sup>57</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 59–60.

Verses 28 and 29 play on the contrast between pronouns in the first person singular—referring to God—and in the second person singular—directed at the king. In this way the text adds force to the impression that these two persons are being played off against each other. The Greek has adopted this special usage of independent pronouns and even added an extra one:

37:28–29	ושבתך וצאתך ובואך ידעתי ואת התרגוז אלי יען התרגוז אלי ושאננד עלה באוני ושמתי חחי באפך ומתגי בשפתך והשיבתך בדרך אשר־באת בה	νῦν δὲ τὴν ἀνάπαυσίν σου καὶ τὴν ἔξοδόν σου καὶ τὴν εἴσοδόν σου <b>ἐγὼ</b> ἐπίσταμαι· ὁ δὲ θυμός σου, ὃν ἐθυμώθης, καὶ ἡ πικρία σου ἀνέβη πρὸς με, καὶ ἐμβάλῳ φιμόν εἰς τὴν ῥῖνά σου καὶ χαλινὸν εἰς τὰ χεῖλή σου καὶ ἀποστρέψω σε τῇ ὁδῷ, ἧ ἦλθες ἐν αὐτῇ
----------	---	--

42:16–17

The addition of αὐτοὶ δέ in 42:17 sharpens the paradox between God favouring “the blind ones” (mentioned in verse 16), and the bad behaviour of the blind themselves:

והולכתי עורים בדרך לא ידעו בנתיבות לא־ידעו אדריכם אשים מחשך לפניהם לאור ומעקשים למישור אלה הדברים עשיתם ולא עזבתם נסגו אחור	καὶ ἄξω τυφλοὺς ἐν ὁδῷ, ἧ οὐκ ἔγνωσαν, καὶ τρίβους, οὓς οὐκ ᾔδεισαν, πατήσαι ποιήσω <b>αὐτούς</b> · ποιήσω <b>αὐτοῖς</b> τὸ σκότος εἰς φῶς καὶ τὰ σκολιά εἰς εὐθεΐαν· ταῦτα τὰ ῥήματα ποιήσω καὶ οὐκ ἐγκαταλείψω <b>αὐτούς</b> . <b>αὐτοὶ δὲ</b> ἀπεστράφησαν εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω
--	---

43:25–26

In 43:26 σύ may have been interpolated in order to intensify the contrast between God (ἐγώ), who will not remember the sins of his people, and the people of Israel themselves (σύ), who *ought* to remember their own sins:

אנכי אנכי הוא מחה פשעיך למעני וחטאתיך לא אזכר הזכירני נשפטה יחד ספר אתה למען תצדק	<b>ἐγὼ</b> εἰμι <b>ἐγὼ</b> εἰμι ὁ ἐξαλείφων τὰς ἀνομίας σου καὶ οὐ μὴ μνησθήσομαι. <b>σύ δὲ</b> μνησθητι καὶ κριθῶμεν· λέγε <b>σύ</b> τὰς ἀνομίας σου πρῶτος, ἵνα δικαιωθῇς.
--	---

## 45:4

God's gracious dealings with his people are once again put in opposition to Israel's own obstinacy in 45:4:

למען עבדי יעקב	ἔνεκεν Ἰακωβ τοῦ παιδὸς μου
וישראל בחירי	καὶ Ἰσραηλ τοῦ ἐκλεκτοῦ μου
ואקרא לך בשמך	<u>ἐγώ</u> καλέσω σε τῷ ὀνόματί σου
אכנך	καὶ προσδέξομαι σε,
ולא ידעתני	<u>σὺ</u> δὲ οὐκ ἔγνως με.

## 65:21–22

αὐτοὶ stands opposite to ἄλλοι:

ובנו בתים	καὶ οἰκοδομήσουσιν οἰκίας
וישבו	καὶ <u>αὐτοὶ</u> ἐνοικήσουσι,
ונטעו כרמים	καὶ καταφυτεύσουσιν ἀμπελῶνας
ואכלו פרים	καὶ <u>αὐτοὶ</u> φάγονται τὰ γενήματα αὐτῶν·
לא יבנו	καὶ οὐ μὴ οἰκοδομήσουσι
ואחר יושב	καὶ <u>ἄλλοι</u> ἐνοικήσουσι,
לא יטעו	καὶ οὐ μὴ φυτεύσουσι
ואחר יאכל	καὶ <u>ἄλλοι</u> φάγονται·

## Chapters 41–66

In chapters 41–66 (in particular 41–49) of the Hebrew text of Isaiah the independent pronouns אנכי and אני appear more than ninety times in divine speech. The Greek translation renders these pronouns generally by ἐγώ and sometimes by εἰμί. Besides, the translator seems to have added ἐγώ repeatedly.<sup>58</sup>

41:17	אני יהוה אענם	<u>ἐγώ</u> κύριος ὁ θεός, <u>ἐγώ</u> ἐπακούσομαι
	אלהי ישראל	ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραηλ
41:25	העירותי מצפון	<u>ἐγώ</u> δὲ ἤγειρα τὸν ἀπὸ βορρᾶ
44:3	כי אצק-מים על-צמא	ὅτι <u>ἐγώ</u> δώσω ὕδωρ ἐν δίψει
45:4	ואקרא לך בשמך	<u>ἐγώ</u> καλέσω σε τῷ ὀνόματί σου <sup>59</sup>
45:7	יוצר אור	<u>ἐγώ</u> ὁ κατασκευάσας φῶς
45:12	וכל-צבאם צויתי	<u>ἐγώ</u> πᾶσι τοῖς ἄστροις ἐνετειλάμην.
45:19	אני יהוה דבר צדק	<u>ἐγώ</u> εἰμι <u>ἐγώ</u> εἰμι κύριος λαλῶν δικαιοσύνην
46:4	ועד-זקנה אני הוא	ἕως γήρους <u>ἐγώ</u> εἰμι,
	ועד-שיבה	καὶ ἕως ἂν καταγηράσῃτε, <u>ἐγώ</u> εἰμι·

<sup>58</sup> For another case where ἐγώ has been used for God in these LXX chapters while אני is missing in the Hebrew, see 47:10 אֲנִי רֹאשׁ / Ἐγώ εἰμι, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐτέρα.

<sup>59</sup> See ἐγώ in 45:2, 3, 5, 6, 7 (2x, one of which is a plus), 8, 12 (3x, one of which is a plus), 13, 18, 19 (2x, one of which is a plus), 21, and 22. In sum, ἐγώ occurs sixteen times in LXX Isa 45, four of which are pluses.

	אני אסבל	ἐγὼ ἀνέχομαι ὑμῶν
47:6	ואתנם בידך	<u>ἐγὼ</u> ἔδωκα εἰς τὴν χεῖρά σου
48:4	מדעתי כי קשה אתה	γινώσκω <u>ἐγὼ</u> ὅτι σκληρὸς εἶ
56:4	ובחרו באשר חפצתי	καὶ ἐκλέξωνται ἃ <u>ἐγὼ</u> θέλω
58:6	הלוא זה צום אבחרהו	οὐχὶ τοιαύτην νηστείαν <u>ἐγὼ</u> ἐξελεξάμην
65:12	ומניתי אתכם לחרב	<u>ἐγὼ</u> παραδώσω ὑμᾶς εἰς μάχαιραν

Also the following verses illustrate the possible addition of independent subject pronouns:

1:29	כי יבשו מאילים אשר חמדת	διότι αἰσχυνθήσονται ἐπὶ τοῖς εἰδώλοις αὐτῶν, ἃ <u>αὐτοὶ</u> ἠβούλοντο
3:14	יהוה במשפט יבוא	<u>αὐτός</u> κύριος εἰς κρίσιν ἥξει <sup>60</sup>
13:3	אני צויתי למקדשי גם קראתי גבורי לאפי	<u>ἐγὼ</u> συντάσσω, καὶ ἁγιαζω αὐτούς· [ <u>ἡγιασμένοι εἰσὶ</u> ] καὶ <u>ἐγὼ</u> καλῶ αὐτούς·
47:10	ותאמרי בלבך אני ואפסי עוד	<u>σὺ</u> γὰρ εἶπας Ἐγὼ εἰμι, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἑτέρα.
54:17	וצדקתם מאתי	καὶ <u>ὁμείς</u> ἔσεσθέ μοι δίκαιοι
65:3	זבחים בגנות	<u>αὐτοὶ</u> θυσιάζουσιν ἐν τοῖς κήποις <sup>61</sup>

#### 2.4.2 The “addition” of a nominal subject

In some other cases where in the Hebrew the subject is only represented in the grammatical person and number of the verb, the translator has made the subject explicit by way of the addition of (a noun phrase governed by) a substantive noun in the nominative. In general, this noun (phrase) derives from the immediate context. Its purpose is usually just to clarify the text, but sometimes it changes the reference to the person implied by the verb (see, for example, 24:14, where the MT suggests the subject of ירנו to be “the people,” whereas LXX Isaiah has turned it into οἱ δὲ καταλειφθέντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς; see also 53:3).

2:6	כי מלאו מקדם	ὅτι ἐνεπλήσθη ὡς τὸ ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς ἡ <u>χώρα αὐτῶν</u> <sup>62</sup>
7:7	לא תקום	Οὐ μὴ ἐμμείνη ἡ <u>βουλὴ αὐτῆς</u> <sup>63</sup>
9:3(4)	שבט הנגש בו החתת	τὴν γὰρ ῥάβδον τῶν ἀπαιτούντων διεσκέδασε <u>κύριος</u> <sup>64</sup>
13:14	והיה כצבי מדח	καὶ ἔσονται οἱ <u>καταλειμμένοι</u> ὡς δορκάδιον φεύγον <sup>65</sup>

<sup>60</sup> For κύριος αὐτός / αὐτός κύριος, see 7:14; 8:13; and 63:9.

<sup>61</sup> The presence of αὐτοὶ could also be the outcome of a different Vorlage: see 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> המה זובחים בגנות (see section 12.3.1.1).

<sup>62</sup> See ἡ χώρα αὐτῶν in verse 7.

<sup>63</sup> See βουλὴν πονηράν in verse 5.

<sup>64</sup> For the addition of κύριος, see 8:10; 14:26; and 19:20. See also 33:22.

<sup>65</sup> See οἱ καταλειμμένοι in verse 12.

19:20	וישלח להם מושיע	καὶ ἀποστελεῖ αὐτοῖς <u>κύριος</u> ἄνθρωπον, ὃς σώσει αὐτούς
20:5	וחתו ובשו	καὶ αἰσχυνηθήσονται ἡττηθέντες <u>οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι</u>
24:14	ירנו	<u>οἱ δὲ καταλειφθέντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς</u> εὐφρανθήσονται ἅμα <sup>66</sup>
30:17	מפני גערת חמשה תנסו	καὶ διὰ φωνὴν πέντε φεύξονται <u>πολλοί</u>
37:8	כי שמע	καὶ ἤκουσεν <u>βασιλεὺς Ἀσσυρίων</u>
38:8	ותשב השמש עשר מעלות במעלות אשר ירדה	καὶ ἀνέβη ὁ ἥλιος τοὺς δέκα ἀναβαθμούς, οὓς κατέβη <u>ἡ σκιά</u> .
39:4	ויאמר מה ראו בביתך	καὶ εἶπεν <u>Ἡσαιας</u> Τί εἶδosan ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ σου;
42:25	ולא ידע	καὶ οὐκ ἔγνωσαν <u>ἔκαστος αὐτῶν</u>
48:11	כי איך יחל	ὅτι <u>τὸ ἐμὸν ὄνομα</u> βεβηλοῦται <sup>67</sup>
49:15	גם־אלה תשכחנה	εἰ δὲ καὶ ἐπιλάβοιτο ταῦτα <u>γυνή</u> <sup>68</sup>
53:3	נבזה	ἀλλὰ <u>τὸ εἶδος αὐτοῦ</u> ἄτιμον

Occasionally, the explicitation of the subject is related to a variant reading, for instance as a consequence of the translator's rendition of (what he conceived to be) a passive verb by an active one (see 1:22; 8:10; 14:26; and 19:5 below):

1:22	סבאך מהול במים	<u>οἱ κάπηλοι σου</u> μίσγουσι τὸν οἶνον ὕδατι. <sup>69</sup>
8:10	עצו עצה ותפר	καὶ ἦν ἂν βουλευθήσθε βουλὴν, διασκεδάσει <u>κύριος</u>
14:26	זאת העצה היעוצה	αὕτη ἡ βουλὴ, ἣν βεβούλευται <u>κύριος</u>
19:5	ונשתו־מים מהים	καὶ πίνονται <u>οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι</u> ὕδωρ τὸ παρὰ θάλασσαν <sup>70</sup>
22:14	ונגלה באזני יהוה צבאות	καὶ ἀνακεκαλυμμένα <u>ταῦτά</u> ἐστιν ἐν τοῖς ὡσὶ κυρίου σαβαωθ <sup>71</sup>

Finally, the LXX often repeats a subject where the Hebrew uses it in a *distributive* way. For instances of this phenomenon, see section 6.9.3.

<sup>66</sup> In all probability the translator has added οἱ δὲ καταλειφθέντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς under the influence of καὶ καταλειφθήσονται ἄνθρωποι ὀλίγοι in verse 6. Elsewhere in LXX Isaiah participle forms of καταλείπω denoting “the remnant” appear in LXX Isa 4:2, 3; 6:12; 7:22; 10:19, 20, 21; 13:12, 14; 21:10; 28:5; 37:4, 31, 32; and 62:4.

<sup>67</sup> τὸ ἐμὸν ὄνομα was probably inserted in assimilation to the fixed phrase βεβηλόω τὸ ὄνομα (see section 9.5). By means of this addition the translator has also ameliorated the parallelism with the succeeding line καὶ τὴν δόξαν μου ἐτέρω οὐ δώσω.

<sup>68</sup> The translator has conceived אלה as an object rather than as a subject, supplying γυνή to serve as a subject instead.

<sup>69</sup> See section 6.5b.

<sup>70</sup> The translator has likely regarded ונשתו as a Nif'al of שתה—“water shall be drunk,” albeit the form is actually a Nif'al of נשת—“to be dried up.”

<sup>71</sup> ונגלה seems to have been interpreted by the LXX translator in a passive sense—“it has been revealed (in the ears of the Lord ...)”—rather than in a reflexive sense—“he has revealed himself (in my ears ...).”

## 2.5 Explicitation through the addition of an object

*Objects* have been added in the Isaiah translation more often than subjects.<sup>72</sup> This includes direct, indirect, and prepositional objects.

### 2.5.1 The addition of a pronominal object

In the majority of cases the extra object takes the form of a pronoun or a pronoun phrase (that is, a phrase the head of which is a pronoun):

1:3	ישראל לא ידע עמי לא התבונן	Ισραηλ δέ <u>με</u> οὐκ ἔγνω, καὶ ὁ λαὸς <u>με</u> οὐ συνῆκεν.
1:15	ובפרשכם כפיים	ὅταν τὰς χεῖρας ἐκτείνητε <u>πρὸς με</u>
1:20	כי פי יהוה דבר	τὸ γὰρ στόμα κυρίου ἐλάλησε <u>ταῦτα</u> . <sup>73</sup>
5:6	ועלה שמיר ושית	καὶ ἀναβήσεται <u>εἰς αὐτὸν</u> ὡς εἰς χέρσον ἄκανθα.
5:9	באזני יהוה צבאות	ἡκούσθη γὰρ εἰς τὰ ᾠτα κυρίου σαβαωθ <u>ταῦτα</u> .
8:10	ולא יקום	οὐ μὴ ἐμμείνη <u>ὑμῖν</u>
8:14	והיה למקדש	ἔσται <u>σοι</u> εἰς ἀγίασμα
10:3	ולשואה ממרחק תבוא	ἢ γὰρ θλίψις <u>ὑμῖν</u> πόρρωθεν ἥξει.
11:15	והדריך בנעלים	ὥστε διαπορεύεσθαι <u>αὐτὸν</u> ἐν ὑποδήμασι. <sup>74</sup>
12:2	הנה אל ישועתי	ἰδοὺ ὁ θεός μου σωτήρ μου κύριος, πεποιθώς ἔσομαι <u>ἐπ' αὐτῷ</u> <sup>75</sup>
13:20	ולא תשכן עד-דור ודור	οὐδὲ μὴ εἰσέλθωσιν <u>εἰς αὐτήν</u> διὰ πολλῶν γενεῶν
22:11	ומקוה עשיתם בין החממים	καὶ ἐποιήσατε <u>ἐαυτοῖς</u> ὕδωρ ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν δύο τειχεῶν
22:16	חצבי מרום קברו	καὶ ἐποίησας <u>σεαυτῷ</u> ἐν ὑψηλῷ μνημεῖον
23:18	לא יאצר	οὐκ <u>αὐτοῖς</u> συναχθήσεται
26:19	כי טל אורת טלך	ἢ γὰρ δρόσος ἢ παρὰ σοῦ ἱάμα <u>αὐτοῖς</u> ἐστιν
29:13	יען כי גש העם הזה	Ἐγγίξει <u>μοι</u> ὁ λαὸς οὗτος
30:11	סורו מני-דרך הטו מני-ארח	καὶ ἀποστρέψατε <u>ἡμᾶς</u> ἀπὸ τῆς ὁδοῦ ταύτης, ἀφέλετε <u>ἀφ' ἡμῶν</u> τὸν τρίβον τοῦτον <sup>76</sup>
30:19	חנן יחנך לקול זעקך	Ἐλέησόν <u>με</u> · ἐλεήσει σε τὴν φωνήν τῆς κραυγῆς σου. <sup>77</sup>
30:20	ולא-יכנה עוד מורִיךְ	καὶ οὐκέτι μὴ ἐγγίσωσί <u>σοι</u> οἱ πλανῶντές σε. <sup>78</sup>
30:31	בשבט יכה	τῇ πληγῇ, ἣ ἂν πατάξῃ <u>αὐτούς</u> .

<sup>72</sup> Compare Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 59.

<sup>73</sup> See 24:3 and 58:14, and see section 9.3.1.

<sup>74</sup> 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> seems to support the LXX: והדריך בנעלים; see section 12.3.1.1.

<sup>75</sup> 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> has הטט אל אל ישועתי אבטט; see section 12.3.1.1.

<sup>76</sup> LXX Isaiah reflects a reading as הסירו instead of as סורו.

<sup>77</sup> The translator appears to have understood the infinitive absolute חנן as an imperative.

<sup>78</sup> יכנה is rendered as though it were יקרב.

30:32	והיה כל מעבר מטה מוסדה	καὶ ἔσται <u>αὐτῷ</u> κυκλόθεν, ὅθεν ἦν <u>αὐτῷ</u> ἢ ἐλπίς τῆς βοήθειας
31:2	ויבא רע	ἦγεν <u>ἐπ'</u> <u>αὐτούς</u> κακά
31:3	ויהוה יטה ידו	ὁ δὲ κύριος ἐπάξει τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ <u>ἐπ'</u> <u>αὐτούς</u>
33:8	הפר ברית	καὶ ἢ <u>πρὸς</u> <u>τούτους</u> διαθήκη αἴρεται
33:8	לא חשב אנוש	καὶ οὐ μὴ λογίσῃσθε <u>αὐτούς</u> ἀνθρώπους.
33:21	מקום-נהרים	τόπος <u>ὑμῖν</u> ἔσται, ποταμοὶ
	יאים רחבי ידים	καὶ διώρυγες πλατεῖς καὶ εὐρύχωροι·
33:24	נשא עון	ἀφέθη γὰρ <u>αὐτοῖς</u> ἡ ἁμαρτία.
34:16	כִּי־פִי הוא צוה	ὅτι κύριος ἐνετείλατο <u>αὐτοῖς</u>
35:9	והלכו גאולים	ἀλλὰ πορεύσονται <u>ἐν</u> <u>αὐτῇ</u> λελυτρωμένοι.
36:12	ויאמר רבישקה	καὶ εἶπε Ραψακῆς <u>πρὸς</u> <u>αὐτούς</u> <sup>79</sup>
38:20	ונגותי נגנן	καὶ οὐ παύσομαι εὐλογῶν <u>σε</u> μετὰ ψαλτηρίου <sup>80</sup>
41:4	מִי־פעל ועשה	τίς ἐνήργησε καὶ ἐποίησε <u>ταῦτα</u> ; <sup>81</sup>
41:28	וישיבו דבר	οὐ μὴ ἀποκριθῶσιν <u>μοι</u> .
42:1	בחירי	Ἰσραὴλ ὁ ἐκλεκτός μου,
	רצתה נפשי	προσεδέξατο <u>αὐτὸν</u> ἢ ψυχὴ μου. <sup>82</sup>
42:22	ובבתי כלאים החבאו	καὶ ἐν οἴκοις ἅμα, ὅπου ἔκρυψαν <u>αὐτούς</u> <sup>83</sup>
42:25	וישפך עליו חמה אפו	καὶ ἐπήγαγεν ἐπ' αὐτούς ὄργην θυμοῦ
	ועוזו מלחמה	αὐτοῦ, καὶ κατίσχυσεν <u>αὐτούς</u> πόλεμος <sup>84</sup>
44:12	ופעל בפחם	σκεπάρνω εἰργάσατο <u>αὐτὸ</u>
44:13	לשבת בית	στῆσαι <u>αὐτὸ</u> ἐν οἴκῳ. <sup>85</sup>
44:15	אף־ישיק ואפה לחם	καὶ καύσαντες ἔπεισαν ἄρτους <u>ἐπ'</u> <u>αὐτῶν</u> .
45:21	מאז הגידה	τότε ἀνηγγέλη <u>ὑμῖν</u>
46:4	ועד־שיבה	καὶ ἕως ἂν καταγηράσῃτε, ἐγὼ εἰμι·
	אני אסבל	ἐγὼ ἀνέχομαι <u>ὑμῶν</u> ,
	אני עשיתי ואני אשא	ἐγὼ ἐποίησα καὶ ἐγὼ ἀνήσω,
	ואני אסבל ואמלט	ἐγὼ ἀναλήμψομαι καὶ σῶσω <u>ὑμᾶς</u> .
47:13	מודיעם לחדשים	ἀναγγειλάτωσάν <u>σοι</u> <sup>86</sup>

<sup>79</sup> Also the parallel text 4 Kgdms 18:27 shows this plus. In the “Hezekiah-chapters”—Isa 36–39—an object is supplied to verbs of speaking in 37:4; 38:20; and 38:21 as well; a subject is added to such a verb in 39:4.

<sup>80</sup> The translator may have considered נגנן ונגותי נגנן—“and we will sing to my stringed instruments” (נגנית = “stringed instrument”)—as a perfect consecutive in the first singular followed by an infinitive absolute: נגנן ונגנתי —“I will surely sing.”

<sup>81</sup> See 9:6(7)=37:32; 41:20; and 45:7, 21, and see section 9.5.

<sup>82</sup> In the MT רצתה נפשי is most likely an asyndetic relative clause modifying בחירי (see section 5.2).

<sup>83</sup> Perhaps the translator has regarded החבאו as an asyndetic relative clause with ובבתי כלאים as its antecedent (see section 5.2) and read the verb as a Hif'il form: “where they have hidden” (the MT has a Hof. הִתְחַבְּאוּ: “they are hidden in prisons”).

<sup>84</sup> LXX Isaiah translates עזו (“force”) as though it were a verb form עזו—“it was strong.”

<sup>85</sup> στήσαι mirrors להושיב—a Hif'il infinitive of ישב, meaning “to put down.” Maybe the translator thought להושיב / στήσαι better to fit into the context than a Qal לשבת—“to stay”.

<sup>86</sup> See 19:12 and 41:22, 23.



48:5	בטרם תבוא השמעתִיךְ	πρὶν ἔλθεῖν <u>ἐπὶ σέ</u> ἀκουστόν σοι ἐποίησα. <sup>87</sup>
48:5	פְּתַאמֶר עֲצִי עֵשׂם ופסלי ונסכי צום	μὴ εἴπῃς ὅτι Τὰ εἰδωλὰ <u>μοι</u> <sup>88</sup> ἐποίησαν, καὶ μὴ εἴπῃς ὅτι Τὰ γλυπτὰ καὶ τὰ χωνευτὰ ἐνετείλατό <u>μοι</u> . <sup>89</sup>
48:11	למעני למעני אעשה	ἔνεκεν ἐμοῦ ποιήσω <u>σοι</u>
49:6	ויאמר נקל מהיותך לי עבד	καὶ εἴπῃ <u>μοι</u> Μέγα <u>σοι</u> ἐστι τοῦ κληθῆναι σε παῖδά μου
49:7	מלכים יראו	βασιλεῖς ὄψονται <u>αὐτόν</u>
49:11	ושמתי כל־הרי לדרך ומסלתי ירמון	καὶ θήσω πᾶν ὄρος εἰς ὁδὸν καὶ πᾶσαν τρίβον εἰς βόσκημα <u>αὐτοῖς</u> .
49:21	ואלה מי גדל	τούτους δὲ τίς ἐξέθρεψέν <u>μοι</u> ; <sup>90</sup>
49:21	אלה איפה הם	οὗτοι δὲ <u>μοι</u> ποῦ ἦσαν;
50:4	יעיר בבקר בבקר	ἔθῃκέ <u>μοι</u> πρωί
50:8	נעמדה יחד	ἀντιστήτω <u>μοι</u> ἄμα. <sup>91</sup>
51:13	כאשר כונן להשחית	ὃν τρόπον γὰρ ἐβουλεύσατο τοῦ ἄραι <u>σε</u>
52:5	ותמיד כל־היום שמי מנאץ	<u>δι' ὑμᾶς</u> διὰ παντὸς τὸ ὄνομά μου βλασφημεῖται ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι.
52:15	כן יזה גוים רבים	οὕτως θαυμάσσονται ἔθνη πολλὰ <u>ἐπ' αὐτόν</u> . <sup>92</sup>
54:9	אשר נשבעתי	καθότι ὥμοσα <u>αὐτῷ</u>
54:11	אנכי מרביץ בך ובניך	ἐγὼ ἐτοιμάζω <u>σοι</u> ἄνθρακα τὸν λίθον σου
55:5	הן גוי לא־תדע תקרא	ἔθνη, ἃ οὐκ ᾔδεισάν <u>σε</u> , ἐπικαλέσονται <u>σε</u> . <sup>93</sup>
55:6	בהיותו קרוב	ἡνίκα δ' ἂν ἐγγίξῃ <u>ὑμῖν</u>
57:10–11	על־כן לא חלית	διὰ τοῦτο οὐ κατεδεήθης <u>μου</u> σύ. <sup>94</sup>
57:11	כי תכזבי ואותי לא זכרת לא־שמת על־לִבְךָ	καὶ ἐψεύσω <u>με</u> καὶ οὐκ ἐμνήσθης μου οὐδὲ ἔλαβές <u>με</u> εἰς τὴν διάνοιαν οὐδὲ εἰς τὴν καρδίαν σου; <sup>95</sup>
57:16	כי לא לעולם אריב ולא לנצח אקצוף	Οὐκ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ἐκδικήσω <u>ὑμᾶς</u> οὐδὲ διὰ παντὸς ὀργισθήσομαι <u>ὑμῖν</u> .
57:17	בעון בצעו קצפתי ואכהו	<u>δι' ἁμαρτίαν</u> βραχύ τι ἐλύπησα <u>αὐτόν</u> καὶ ἐπάταξα αὐτόν

<sup>87</sup> See 47:9, 11, 13.

<sup>88</sup> The Göttingen edition has *μου*.

<sup>89</sup> The object suffixes in עֲשֵׂם and צום are however not represented in the LXX.

<sup>90</sup> Parallel to *מי ידילי את־אלה* / *τίς ἐγέννησέ μοι* τούτους in verse 21b.

<sup>91</sup> The LXX offers a third masculine singular verb, reflecting יעמד—"let him stand up" instead of a first person plural.

<sup>92</sup> יזה should perhaps be read as יבוזה—"they despised him."

<sup>93</sup> תדע and תקרא may have been perceived as third feminine singular (rather than as second masculine singular) verbs, referring to גוי.

<sup>94</sup> LXX Isaiah seems to have read *חלית* as a Pi'el form *חִלִּית*—"you appeased," contrary to the MT, which presents a Qal form *חָלִית*—"you became weak."

<sup>95</sup> See section 6.6.2a.

הסתר	καὶ ἀπέστρεψα τὸ πρόσωπόν μου <u>ἀπ' αὐτοῦ</u>
58:4 לא־תצומו כיום	ἵνα τί <u>μοι</u> νηστεύετε ὡς σήμερον
58:14 כי פי יהוה דבר	τὸ γὰρ στόμα κυρίου ἐλάλησε <u>ταῦτα</u> . <sup>96</sup>
60:17 תחת הנחשת אביא זהב־כסף	καὶ ἀντὶ χαλκοῦ οἶσω <u>σοι</u> χρυσίον,
61:10 ותחת הברזל אביא כסף	ἀντὶ δὲ σιδήρου οἶσω <u>σοι</u> ἀργύριον
כחתן יכהן פאר	ὡς νυμφίῳ περιέθηκε <u>μοι</u> міτραν
וככלה תעדה כליה	καὶ ὡς νύμφην κατεκόσμησέ <u>με</u> κόσμῳ. <sup>97</sup>
63:16 מעולם שמך	ἀπ' ἀρχῆς τὸ ὄνομά σου <u>ἐφ' ἡμᾶς</u> ἐστι.
64:8 אלת־קצף יהוה עד־מאד	μὴ ὀργίζου <u>ἡμῖν</u> σφόδρα
65:1 נדרשתי ללוא שאלו	Ἐμφανῆς ἐγενόμην τοῖς <u>ἐμὲ</u> μὴ ζητοῦσιν
65:5 אש יקדת כלהיום	πῦρ καίεται <u>ἐν αὐτῷ</u> πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας.
66:3 שוחט השור	ὁ δὲ ἄνομος ὁ θύων <u>μοι</u> μόσχον
מכה־איש	ὡς ὁ ἀποκτένων κύνא
66:20 כאשר יביאו בני ישראל את־המנחה	ὡς ἂν ἐνέγκαισαν οἱ υἱοὶ
וגם־מהם אקח לכהנים	Ἰσραηλ <u>ἐμοί</u> τὰς θυσίας αὐτῶν
ללויים	καὶ ἀπ' αὐτῶν λήμψομαι <u>ἐμοί</u> ἱερεῖς
	καὶ Λευίτας. <sup>98</sup>

To certain verbs an object seems to have been added on a more regular basis:

#### ἐπακούω/εἰσακούω

1:15 גם כִּי־תִרְבוּ תִּפְלָה	καὶ ἐὰν πληθύνητε τὴν δέξιν,
איני שמע	οὐκ εἰσακούσομαι <u>ὑμῶν</u> .
1:19 אס־תֵּאָבֹוּ וּשְׁמַעְתֶּם	καὶ ἐὰν θέλητε καὶ εἰσακούσητέ <u>μου</u>
1:20 ואס־תִּמְאָנוּ וּמִרִיתֶם	ἐὰν δὲ μὴ θέλητε μηδὲ εἰσακούσητέ <u>μου</u>
55:3 שמעו ותחי	ἐπακούσατέ <u>μου</u> , καὶ ζήσεται ἐν ἀγαθοῖς
נפשכם	ἡ ψυχὴ ὑμῶν. <sup>99</sup>
58:9 ויהוה יענה	καὶ ὁ θεὸς εἰσακούσεται <u>σου</u> .
65:24 ואני אענה	ἐγὼ ἐπακούσομαι <u>αὐτῶν</u>

#### (ἐπι)καλέω

43:1 קראתי בשמך	ἐκάλεσά <u>σε</u> τὸ ὄνομά σου
55:5 הן גוי לא־תדע תקרא	ἔθνη, ἃ οὐκ ᾔδεισάν σε, ἐπικαλέσονται <u>σε</u>

<sup>96</sup> See 1:20 above.

<sup>97</sup> While the MT interprets פאר כחתן יכהן פאר and וככלה תעדה כליה as complex sentences in which כחתן יכהן פאר and כליה תעדה are asyndetic relative clauses with as their subject the bridegroom, and respectively the bride ("as a bridegroom, who decks himself with a garland, and as a bride, who adorns herself with her jewels"), the LXX considers them as simple sentences with as their subject God ("he has put on me a garland as on a bridegroom, and adorned me with ornaments like a bride"), parallel to the preceding clause ἐνέδυσε γάρ με ἱμάτιον σωτηρίου καὶ χιτῶνα εὐφροσύνης.

<sup>98</sup> 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> equally displays an indirect object: לֹא לְכוֹהֲנִים לְלֹוִיִּם אֶקַּח מִהֶם. See sections 9.4.1.2b and 12.3.1.1.

<sup>99</sup> μου may have been supplied in analogy to ἀκούσατέ μου καὶ φάγεσθε ἀγαθά in verse 2.

65:12	יען קראתי ולא עניתם	ὅτι ἐκάλεσα <u>ὑμᾶς</u> καὶ οὐχ ὑπηκούσατε
66:4	יען קראתי ואין עונה	ὅτι ἐκάλεσα <u>αὐτούς</u> καὶ οὐχ ὑπήκουσάν μου

**προσκυνέω**

44:15	ויתחוו	καὶ προσκυνοῦσιν <u>αὐτούς</u> .
46:6	יסגדו אֶף־יִתְחַוּוּ	καὶ κύψαντες προσκυνοῦσιν <u>αὐτοῖς</u> .
49:7	ויתחוו למען יהוה	καὶ προσκυνήσουσιν <u>αὐτῷ</u> ἕνεκεν κυρίου.

**ὠφελέω**

30:6	על-עם לא יועילו	πρὸς ἔθνος δ' οὐκ ὠφελήσει <u>αὐτούς</u> εἰς βοήθειαν <sup>100</sup>
30:7	ומצרים הבל וריק יעזרו	Αἰγύπτιοι μάταια καὶ κενὰ ὠφελήσουσιν <u>ὑμᾶς</u> . <sup>101</sup>
44:9	וחמודיהם בל-יועילו	οἱ ποιοῦντες τὰ καταθῦμια αὐτῶν, ἃ οὐκ ὠφελήσει <u>αὐτούς</u> .

Regularly, one can find an additional object in places where the Hebrew text has a *participle*:

3:12	עמי נגשיו מעולל	οἱ πράκτορες ὑμῶν <u>καλαμώνται ὑμᾶς</u> <sup>102</sup>
3:12	עמי מאשריך מתעים	οἱ μακαρίζοντες ὑμᾶς <u>πλανῶσιν ὑμᾶς</u>
19:20	כִּי־יִצְעֲקוּ אֶל־יְהוָה מִפְּנֵי חֲצִים	ὅτι κεκραῖχονται πρὸς κύριον διὰ <u>τοὺς θλίβοντας αὐτούς</u>
19:20	וישלח להם מושיע	καὶ ἀποστελεῖ αὐτοῖς κύριος ἄνθρωπον, <u>δς σώσει αὐτούς</u>
28:16	המאמין לא יחיש	καὶ ὁ <u>πιστεύων ἐπ' αὐτῷ</u> οὐ μὴ καταισχυθῇ.
33:1	הוא שודד	Οὐαὶ <u>τοῖς τάλαιπωροῦσιν ὑμᾶς</u>
33:1	ובוגד ולא־בגדו בו	<u>καὶ ὁ ἄθετῶν ὑμᾶς</u> οὐκ ἄθετε·
42:24	וישראל לבוזים	καὶ Ἰσραὴλ <u>τοῖς προνομεύουσιν αὐτόν;</u>
51:13	מפני חמת המציק	τὸ πρόσωπον τοῦ θυμοῦ <u>τοῦ θλίβοντός σε·</u>
51:13	ואיה חמת המציק	καὶ νῦν ποῦ ὁ θυμὸς <u>τοῦ θλίβοντός σε;</u>

In a considerable number of the examples given above the object pronoun is added in parallelism to an adjacent clause, or in assimilation to a similar sentence close at hand. For an example, see 29:13:

29:13	יען כי נגש העם הזה בפיו ובשפתיו כבדוני ולבו רחק ממני	Ἐγγίζει <u>μοι</u> ὁ λαὸς οὗτος τοῖς χεῖλεσιν αὐτῶν τιμῶσί <u>με</u> , ἢ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν πόρρω ἀπέχει <u>ἀπ' ἐμοῦ</u> .
-------	--	---

<sup>100</sup> See verse 5 על-עם לא־יועילו למו / πρὸς λαόν, δς οὐκ ὠφελήσει αὐτούς.

<sup>101</sup> Perhaps ὑμᾶς is not a plus, but a rendering of לכן ("therefore") read as כִּן. In the MT this is the first word of the next sentence.

<sup>102</sup> מעולל is probably a derivation of עלל in its signification of "to act the child" (BDB 760). The LXX translator may have considered it as coming from a homonymous root, denoting "to glean."

Compare also: 1:15; 3:12; 5:6; 13:20; 19:20 (2x); 22:16; 23:18; 30:6, 11, 19; 34:16; 35:9; 43:1; 44:12, 13; 49:21; 50:4, 8; 55:3, 5 (2x); 57:11, 17 (2x); 61:10 (2x); 65:1; and 66:4. For a more detailed discussion, see sections 8.5.1 and 9.2.

### 2.5.2 The addition of a nominal object

A minor part of the extra objects involves a substantive noun or a noun phrase. Most commonly it is formed of words that appear in the surrounding, or that are parallel to expressions in a neighbouring clause (see 6:2; 22:9; 29:15; 37:4; 39:4; and 43:26 below):

1:14	נלאיתי נשא	οὐκέτι ἀνήσω <u>τὰς ἀμαρτίας ὑμῶν</u> .
5:13	מבלידעת	διὰ τὸ μὴ εἰδέναι αὐτοὺς <u>τὸν κύριον</u>
6:2	שש כנפים	ἐξ πτέρυγες <u>τῷ ἐν</u> <sup>103</sup>
	שש כנפים לאחד	καὶ ἐξ πτέρυγες τῷ ἐν <sup>103</sup>
19:22	ונגף יהוה את־מצרים	καὶ πατάξει κύριος τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους
	נגף ורפוא	πληγῇ μεγάλῃ καὶ <u>ιάσεται</u> αὐτοὺς <u>ιάσει</u>
22:9	ותקבצו את־מי הברכה	καὶ ὅτι ἀπέστρεψαν τὸ ὕδωρ τῆς ἀρχαίας
	החתונה	<u>κολυμβήθρας εἰς τὴν πόλιν</u> <sup>104</sup>
28:2	כזרם מים כבירים	ὡς ὕδατος πολλὴ πληθὺς
	שטפים	σῦρον <u>χώραν</u>
29:1	ספו שנה על־שנה	συναγάγετε <u>γενήματα</u> ἐνιαυτὸν ἐπ' ἐνιαυτόν <sup>105</sup>
29:15	הוי המעמיקים	οὐαὶ οἱ βαθέως <u>βουλήν</u> ποιοῦντες καὶ οὐ
	מיהוה	διὰ κυρίου. <sup>106</sup>
30:10	ולחזים	καὶ τοῖς <u>τὰ ὀράματα</u> ὀρώσι
32:11	וחגורה על־חלצים	περιζώσασθε <u>σάκκους</u> τὰς ὀσφύας <sup>107</sup>
37:4	ונשאת תפלה	καὶ δεηθήσῃ <u>πρὸς κύριον τὸν θεόν σου</u> <sup>108</sup>
38:21	ויאמר ישעיהו	Καὶ εἶπεν Ἡσαιας <u>πρὸς Εἰzekian</u>
39:4	לא־היה דבר	καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν <u>ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ μου</u>
	אשר לא־האיתים	ὃ οὐκ εἶδον <sup>109</sup>
40:5	וראו כל־בשר יחדו	καὶ ὄψεται <u>πᾶσα σὰρξ τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ</u> . <sup>110</sup>

<sup>103</sup> 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> has שש כנפים לאחד, displaying שש כנפים only once.

<sup>104</sup> Possibly repeating πόλις from verse 8 and verse 10. See 2 Kgs/4 Kgdms 20:20 (*HUB Isa*, 80).

<sup>105</sup> LXX Isaiah renders ספו as if it were אספו. For the combination of γενήμα with συνάγω, see Exod 23:10; Lev 25:20; and Jer 8:13; for the combination with ἐνιαυτόν ἐπ' ἐνιαυτόν, see Deut 14:22. See also section 9.4.1.2b.

<sup>106</sup> See verse 15b לסתר עצה / οἱ ἐν κρυφῇ βουλήν ποιοῦντες, and see also 30:1.

<sup>107</sup> For other occurrences of the common expression περιζωννύω σάκκους, see section 9.5.

<sup>108</sup> κύριος ὁ θεός appears three times in 37:4. See also Jer 42 (LXX 49):2 (see section 9.4.3.3).

<sup>109</sup> Added in analogy to verse 2b, and repeating ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ σου / ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ μου earlier in verse 4; in LXX Isa 39 these words turn up no fewer than eight times. See section 9.2.2.4.

43:26	ספר אתה	λέγε σὺ <u>τὰς ἀνομίας σου</u> πρῶτος <sup>111</sup>
52:5	ותמיד כל-היום שמי מנאץ	δι' ὑμᾶς διὰ παντὸς τὸ ὄνομά μου βλασφημεῖται <u>ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν</u> . <sup>112</sup>
55:7	כִּי־רבה לסלוח	ὅτι ἐπὶ πολὺ ἀφήσει <u>τὰς ἁμαρτίας ὑμῶν</u> . <sup>113</sup>
57:17	הסתר	καὶ ἀπέστρεψα <u>τὸ πρόσωπόν μου</u> ἀπ' αὐτοῦ <sup>114</sup>
58:13	ממצוא חפצך ודבר דבר	οὐδὲ λαλήσεις λόγον <u>ἐν ὄργῃ</u> ἐκ τοῦ στόματός σου <sup>115</sup>
65:3	ומקטרים על-הלבנים	καὶ θυμιῶσιν ἐπὶ ταῖς πλίνθοις <u>τοῖς δαιμονίοις, ἃ οὐκ ἔστι</u> . <sup>116</sup>
65:4	ובנצורים ילינו	καὶ ἐν τοῖς σπηλαίοις κοιμῶνται δι' <u>ἐνύπνια</u>

For the LXX repetition of objects that the MT uses in a distributive way, see section 6.9.4.

## 2.6 Explicitation through the addition of a verb phrase

### 2.6.1 The Hebrew text supposes a form of “to be”

In classical Greek the third person singular form of εἶναι—ἔστιν—is often left out as a copula. Other forms of εἶναι are usually present, however.<sup>117</sup> In Biblical Hebrew nominal clauses even more often lack a copula, although sometimes, in order to link the subject to the predicate, a form of היה, the expressions וְיִּ or אִין, or an independent pronoun in the third person (such as הוּא) are employed.<sup>118</sup> When the Hebrew implies a form of “to be” without displaying such a linking element, the Isaiah translation occasionally supplies a finite verb form. This sometimes consists of an inflection of εἶναι, but also of other, more informative verbs.

<sup>110</sup> τοῦ θεοῦ may be based on יהוה, read as יהוה. τὸ σωτήριον could have been added parallel to ἡ δόξα κυρίου in the preceding line. For similar expressions, see Isa 38:11 (τὸ σωτήριον is a plus here too) and 52:10, and see section 10.3.2.

<sup>111</sup> See τὰς ἀνομίας σου at the beginning of the same verse.

<sup>112</sup> See section 9.4.4.2.

<sup>113</sup> For ἀφήμι in combination with ἁμαρτία, see Isa 22:14 and 33:24, and beyond Isaiah in Gen 50:17; Exod 32:32; Lev 4:20; 5:6; 19:22; Num 14:19; Job 42:10; and Ps 24:18; 31:5.

<sup>114</sup> In assimilation to the fixed phrase הסתיר פנים; see section 9.5.

<sup>115</sup> Probably ἐκ τοῦ στόματός σου renders ממצוא חפצך, read in a associative way as מהוציא מפִּיךָ.

<sup>116</sup> The addition may be influenced by verse 11 “who set a table for Gad and fill cups of mixed wine for Meni” (Gad and Meni being the names of Babylonian gods). For the possible influence of Deut 32:16–17, see section 9.4.1.2a.

<sup>117</sup> BDR §127–128.

<sup>118</sup> Lett §66g.

## a. The addition of a form of εἶμι or γίνομαι

5:7	כי כרם יהוה צבאות בית ישראל	ὁ γὰρ ἀμπελῶν κυρίου σαβαωθ οἶκος τοῦ Ἰσραηλ <u>ἐστὶ</u>
5:13	וכבודו מתי רעב	καὶ πλῆθος <u>ἐγενήθη</u> νεκρῶν διὰ λιμὸν
5:28	אשר חציו שנונים	ὧν τὰ βέλη ὀξεῖα <u>ἐστί</u>
6:13	ועוד בה עשריה	καὶ ἔτι ἐπ' αὐτῆς <u>ἔστι</u> τὸ ἐπιδέκατον
7:18	ולדבורה אשר בארץ אשור	καὶ τῇ μελίσσῃ, ἥ <u>ἐστὶν</u> ἐν χώρᾳ Ἀσσυρίων
7:20	בעברי נהר במלך אשור	ὃ <u>ἐστὶ</u> πέραν τοῦ ποταμοῦ βασιλέως Ἀσσυρίων
8:12	לכל אשר־יאמר העם הזה קשר	πᾶν γάρ, ὃ ἐὰν εἴπῃ ὁ λαὸς οὗτος, σκληρόν <u>ἐστι</u> .
8:13	והוא מוראכם	καὶ αὐτὸς <u>ἔσται</u> σου φόβος.
8:18	לאותות ולמופתים בישראל	καὶ <u>ἔσται</u> εἰς σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ Ἰσραηλ
10:21	שאר יעקב אל־אל גבור	καὶ <u>ἔσται</u> τὸ καταλειφθὲν τοῦ Ἰακωβ ἐπὶ θεὸν ἰσχύοντα. <sup>119</sup>
18:4	כעב טל בחם קציר	καὶ ὡς νεφέλῃ δρόσου ἡμέρας ἀμῆτου <u>ἔσται</u> . <sup>120</sup>
18:7	אשר בזאו נהרים ארצו	ὃ <u>ἐστὶν</u> ἐν μέρει ποταμοῦ τῆς χώρας αὐτοῦ <sup>121</sup>
19:11	אך־אולים שרי צען	καὶ μωροὶ <u>ἔσονται</u> οἱ ἄρχοντες Τάνεως.
20:3	אות ומופת על־מצרים ועל־כוש	<u>ἔσται</u> σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα τοῖς Αἰγυπτίοις καὶ Αἰθίοψιν.
23:7	הזאת לכם עליזה	οὐχ αὕτη <u>ἦν</u> ὑμῶν ἡ ὕβρις
26:7	ארח לצדיק מישרים	ὁδὸς εὐσεβῶν εὐθεῖα <u>ἐγένετο</u>
26:19	כי טל אורת טלך	ἢ γὰρ δρόσος ἢ παρὰ σοῦ ἱάμα αὐτοῖς <u>ἐστὶν</u>
27:9	וזה כל־פרי	καὶ τοῦτό <u>ἐστὶν</u> ἡ εὐλογία αὐτοῦ
30:14	ושברה כשבר נבל יוצרים	καὶ τὸ πτώμα αὐτῆς <u>ἔσται</u> ὡς σύντριμμα ἀγγείου ὀστρακίνου <sup>122</sup>
30:18	כי־אלהי משפט יהוה	διότι κριτῆς κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν <u>ἐστι</u>
31:1	כי רב	<u>ἔστι</u> γὰρ πολλὰ
33:18	איה ספר איה שקל איה ספר את־המגדלים	ποῦ <u>εἰσὶν</u> οἱ γραμματικοί; ποῦ <u>εἰσὶν</u> οἱ συμβουλευόντες; ποῦ <u>ἐστὶν</u> ὁ ἀριθμῶν τοὺς συστρεφόμενους

<sup>119</sup> The Hebrew sentence reads in its entirety: שאר ישוב שאר יעקב אל־אל גבור; the translator has perhaps omitted ישוב for the sake of condensation. This left him with שאר יעקב אל־אל גבור, which he may have considered a nominal clause.

<sup>120</sup> The translator has likely taken כעב טל בחם קציר כעב טל to be an independent nominal clause ("like clear heat in sunshine, like a cloud of dew in the heat of harvest it is"), and on those grounds added a form of "to be," even though in the MT it comprehends two adverbial phrases modifying ואביסה במכני ("I will quietly look from my dwelling like clear heat in sunshine, like a cloud of dew in the heat of harvest").

<sup>121</sup> The translator may have read בד ("part") instead of בזאו.

<sup>122</sup> Whereas the MT vocalises ושברה as a verb (ושִׁבְרָה—"and it will break"), the LXX has probably read the form as ושִׁבְרָה—"and her breach."

33:21	מקום־נהרים יארים	τόπος ὑμῖν <u>ἔσται</u> , ποταμοὶ καὶ διώρυγες
	רחבי ידים	πλατεῖς καὶ εὐρύχωροι.
36:6	כן פרעה מלך־מצרים	οὕτως <u>ἔστι</u> Φαραω βασιλεὺς Αἰγύπτου
36:19	איה אלהי חמת וארפד	ποῦ <u>ἔστιν</u> ὁ θεὸς Εμαθ καὶ Αρφαδ;
37:13	איה מלך־חמת	ποῦ <u>εἰσιν</u> οἱ βασιλεῖς Εμαθ
	ומלך ארפד	καὶ Αρφαδ
41:26	ונאמר צדיק	καὶ ἐροῦμεν ὅτι ἀληθὴ <u>ἔστιν</u> ;
42:8	הוא שמי	τοῦτό μου <u>ἔστι</u> τὸ ὄνομα.
42:17	אתם אלהינו	‘Ὑμεῖς <u>ἔστε</u> θεοὶ ἡμῶν.
45:14	אך כך אל	ὅτι ἐν σοὶ ὁ θεός <u>ἔστι</u>
56:7	עולתיהם	τὰ ὀλοκαυτώματα αὐτῶν καὶ αἱ θυσίαι αὐτῶν
	ובחיהם לרצון על־מזבחי	<u>ἔσονται</u> δεκταὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου μου. <sup>123</sup>
59:21	רוחי אשר עליך	τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἐμόν, ὃ <u>ἔστιν</u> ἐπὶ σοί
62:6(7)	אל־דמי לכם	οὐκ <u>ἔστι</u> γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅμοιος
63:11	איה השם בקרבו	ποῦ <u>ἔστιν</u> ὁ θεὸς ἐν αὐτοῖς
	את־רוח קדשו	τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον;
63:15	איה קנאתך וגבורתך	ποῦ <u>ἔστιν</u> ὁ ζῆλός σου καὶ ἡ ἰσχὺς σου;
63:16	מעולם שמך	ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς τὸ ὄνομά σου ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς <u>ἔστι</u> .
65:8	כי ברכה בו	ὅτι εὐλογία κυρίου <u>ἔστιν</u> ἐν αὐτῷ
65:22	כי־כימי העץ	κατὰ γὰρ τὰς ἡμέρας τοῦ ξύλου τῆς ζωῆς
	ימי עמי	<u>ἔσονται</u> αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ λαοῦ μου

### b. The addition of a verb replacing “to be”

In a few places a verb other than εἶμι or γίνομαι is utilised where the Hebrew supposes a form of “to be”:

3:24	והיה תחת בשם מק יהיה	καὶ ἔσται ἀντὶ ὁσμῆς ἡδείας κονιορτός,
	ותחת חגורה נקפה	καὶ ἀντὶ ζώνης σχοινίῳ <u>ζώσῃ</u>
	ותחת מעשה מקשה	καὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ κόσμου τῆς κεφαλῆς τοῦ χρυσίου
	קרח	φαλάκρωμα <u>ἔξει</u> διὰ τὰ ἔργα σου
	ותחת פתיגיל מחגרת	καὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ χιτῶνος τοῦ μεσοπορφύρου
	שק	<u>περιζώσῃ</u> σάκκον.
5:9	באזני יהוה צבאות	<u>ἡκούσθη</u> γὰρ εἰς τὰ ᾠτα κυρίου σαβαωθ ταῦτα. <sup>124</sup>
6:5	כי איש	ὅτι ἄνθρωπος ὢν
	טמא־שפתים אנכי	καὶ ἀκάθαρτα χεῖλη <u>ἔχω</u> . <sup>125</sup>

<sup>123</sup> 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> reads: עולותיהם ובחיהמה יעלו לרצון על מזבחי; see section 12.3.1.1.

<sup>124</sup> LXX Isaiah may have interpreted צבאות יהוה באזני as “(it is) in the ears of the Lord of Hosts,” rather than as “to my ears (has spoken) the Lord of Hosts” (see 22:14). According to Wildberger (*Jesaja*, 1:176–77) ἡκούσθη reflects נשמע, which would be a corruption of נשבע—“he has sworn.” The latter would, in his opinion, be the original reading, since what follows is an oath formula (... אִם־לֹא).

	ובתוך עִסְטָמָא שפֿתִים	ἐν μέσῳ λαοῦ ἀκάθαρτα χεῖλη <u>ἔχοντος</u>
	אנכי יושב	ἐγὼ οἰκῶ
6:6	ובידו רצפה	καὶ ἐν τῇ χειρὶ <u>εἶχεν</u> ἄνθρακα
7:18	אשר בקצה יארי מצרים	ὁ <u>κυριεύει</u> μέρους ποταμοῦ Αἰγύπτου
9:20(21)	יחדו המה על־יהודה	ὅτι ἅμα <u>πολιορκήσουσι</u> τὸν Ιουδαν.
28:4	בעודה בכפו	πρὶν ἢ εἰς τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ <u>λαβεῖν</u>
	יבלענה	θελήσει αὐτὸ καταπιεῖν.
28:6	ולרוח משפט ליושב	<u>καταλειφθήσονται</u> ἐπὶ πνεύματι κρίσεως
	על־המשפט	ἐπὶ κρίσιν <sup>126</sup>
53:9	ולא מרמה בפיו	οὐδὲ <u>εὐρέθη</u> δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ.

### 2.6.2 The addition of an infinitive

In the next seven verses an infinitive is supplied in the LXX, giving more information on the content of the finite verb form to which it is appended:

16:12	ובא אל־מקדשו	καὶ εἰσελεύσεται εἰς τὰ χειροποίητα αὐτῆς
	להתפלל ולא יוכל	ὥστε προσεύξασθαι, καὶ οὐ μὴ δύνηται
		<u>ἐξελέσθαι αὐτόν</u> . <sup>127</sup>
29:11	ואמר לא אוכל	καὶ ἐρεῖ Οὐ δύναμαι <u>ἀναγνῶναι</u>
38:14	דלו עיני	ἐξέλιπον γάρ μου οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ <u>τοῦ βλέπειν</u>
	למרום אדני	εἰς τὸ ὕψος τοῦ οὐρανοῦ πρὸς τὸν κύριον <sup>128</sup>
53:3	וידוע חלי	καὶ εἰδὼς <u>φέρειν</u> μαλακίαν
53:4	ואנחנו חשבנוהו נגוע	καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐλογισάμεθα αὐτόν <u>εἶναι</u> ἐν πόνῳ
56:10	לא ידעו	οὐκ ἔγνωσαν <u>φρονῆσαι</u>

### 2.6.3 The addition of a form of λέγω to introduce direct speech

In order to introduce direct speech, the LXX translator has from time to time added a finite or participle form of λέγω.<sup>129</sup> He can be assumed to have done this principally because he thought the transition of indirect to direct speech or the change of speaker too abrupt in the Hebrew (see 3:6; 22:15; 30:16; 39:6; 45:14; and 58:3 below). In other places a finite form of λέγω serves to identify the speaker, who would otherwise have remained ambiguous (see 49:1, 15 and 58:6). Furthermore, the addition of a *verbum dicendi* is sometimes related to a change in the content of the Hebrew text made by the translator (see 8:17; 10:9;

<sup>125</sup> The translator has altered **אנכי יושב עִסְטָמָא שפֿתִים** **כי איש** into two participle clauses, adding **ὦν** and **ἔχων**, thus subtly changing the content of the text.

<sup>126</sup> Contrary to the LXX, in the Hebrew the subject is God.

<sup>127</sup> See section 10.3.3.

<sup>128</sup> The translator may have read **כלו**—"they have stopped."

<sup>129</sup> Compare Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 58.



21:8; and 49:1). In 30:16 and 48:5, finally, a verb phrase has been added for the sake of parallelism:

3:6	שמלה לכה	<u>λέγων</u> ἱμάτιον ἔχεις
8:17	וחכיתי ליהוה	<u>καὶ ἐρεῖ</u> Μενῶ τὸν θεόν
10:9	הלא	<u>καὶ ἐρεῖ</u> Οὐκ ἔλαβον
	ככרכמיש כלנו	τὴν χώραν τὴν ἐπάνω Βαβυλῶνος καὶ Χαλαννη
14:16		<u>καὶ ἐροῦσιν</u>
	הזה האיש מרגיז הארץ	Οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὁ παροξύνων τὴν γῆν
21:8	אנכי עמד תמיד יומם	<u>καὶ εἶπεν</u> Ἔστην διὰ παντὸς ἡμέρας
22:15–16	מה-לך פה	<u>καὶ εἰπὼν</u> αὐτῷ Τί σὺ ᾤδε
30:16	ועל-קל נרכב	<u>καὶ εἶπατε</u> Ἐπὶ κούφοις ἀναβάται ἐσόμεθα.
39:6	הנה ימים באים	Ἴδου ἡμέραι ἔρχονται, <u>λέγει κύριος</u>
45:14	ואין עוד אפס אלהים	<u>καὶ ἐροῦσιν</u> Οὐκ ἔστι θεὸς πλὴν σοῦ.
48:5	ופסלי	<u>καὶ μὴ εἶπης</u> ὅτι Τὰ γλυπτὰ
	ונסכי צום	καὶ τὰ χωνευτὰ ἐνετείλατό μοι.
49:1	יהוה מבטן קראני	διὰ χρόνου πολλοῦ στήσεται, <u>λέγει κύριος</u> . <sup>130</sup>
49:15	ואנכי לא אשכחך	ἀλλ' ἐγὼ οὐκ ἐπιλήσομαί σου, <u>εἶπε κύριος</u> .
58:3	למה צמנו	<u>λέγοντες</u> Τί ὅτι ἐνηστεύσαμεν
58:6	הלוא זה צום אבחרהו	οὐχὶ τοιαύτην νηστείαν ἐγὼ ἐξελεξάμην, <u>λέγει κύριος</u>

## 2.7 The addition of a pleonastic noun

A peculiar detail of the translation style of LXX Isaiah is that Hebrew nouns—usually substantivated adjectives—are regularly represented by a semantically related *adjective* (or as a participle used as an adjective) plus an explicating, pleonastic *noun*.<sup>131</sup> Although, strictly speaking, these nouns cannot be qualified as “pluses”—as they actually form part of a translation at phrase level—these cases are still noteworthy enough to mention here:

1:7	זרים	ὑπὸ <u>λαῶν</u> ἀλλοτριῶν
3:9	רעה	<u>βουλήν</u> πονηράν <sup>132</sup>
7:5	רעה	<u>βουλήν</u> πονηράν
13:8	כיולדה	ὡς <u>γυναικὸς</u> τικτούσης
14:6	הא	<u>πληγὴν</u> θυμοῦ
14:13	בירכתי צפון	ἐπὶ <u>τὰ ὄρη</u> τὰ ὑψηλὰ τὰ πρὸς βορρᾶν
14:20	לעולם	εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα <u>χρόνον</u>

<sup>130</sup> λέγει might reflect קראני, while κύριος may go back to יהוה at the beginning of the Hebrew sentence.

<sup>131</sup> Compare Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 58–59.

<sup>132</sup> For πᾶν / βουλεύομαι βουλήν, see section 9.5.

18:7	מִן־הוּא וְהִלָּאֵה	ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν καὶ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα <u>χρόνον</u>
25:1	פֶּלֶא	θαυμαστὰ <u>πράγματα</u>
28:22	כֻּלָּהּ וְנִחְרָצָהּ	συντετελεσμένα καὶ συντετμημένα <u>πράγματα</u>
32:6	צִמָּא	<u>τὰς ψυχὰς</u> τὰς διψώσας
33:15	מִישְׂרִים	εὐθεΐαν <u>ὁδόν</u> <sup>133</sup>
34:10	לְעוֹלָם	εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα <u>χρόνον</u>
34:17	לְעוֹלָם	εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα <u>χρόνον</u>
43:6	מִרְחוֹק	ἀπὸ <u>γῆς</u> πόρρωθεν
54:5	קְדוֹשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל	ἅγιος <u>θεὸς</u> Ἰσραὴλ

Relatively often the “added” noun consists of *ἄνθρωπος*:

8:2	עֲדִים נֶאֱמָנִים	μάρτυράς ... πιστοὺς <u>ἀνθρώπους</u>
8:16(15)	צוּר	<u>ἄνθρωποι</u> ἐν ἀσφαλείᾳ ὄντες <sup>134</sup>
19:4	אֲדָנִים קִשָּׁה	<u>ἀνθρώπων</u> κυρίων σκληρῶν
19:20	מוֹשִׁיעַ	<u>ἄνθρωπον</u> , ὃς σώσει αὐτοὺς
25:4	מִזֶּרֶם	ἀπὸ <u>ἀνθρώπων</u> πονηρῶν <sup>135</sup>
25:4	עֲרִיצִים	<u>ἀνθρώπων</u> ἀδικουμένων
25:5	כֹּזֵרִים	<u>ἄνθρωποι</u> ὀλιγόψυχοι
25:5	זֵרִים	<u>ἀνθρώπων</u> ἀσεβῶν
29:11	אֶל־יְדוּעַ הַסֶּפֶר	<u>ἀνθρώπων</u> ἐπισταμένων γράμματα
29:12	עַל אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יָדַע סֵפֶר	<u>ἀνθρώπου</u> μὴ ἐπισταμένου γράμματα
31:2	מִרְעִים	<u>ἀνθρώπων</u> πονηρῶν

Twice the pleonastic noun concerns *ἀνὴρ*:

14:30	וְאֲבִיּוֹנִים	πτωχοὶ δὲ <u>ἄνδρες</u>
41:7	חֲרָשׁ	<u>ἄνθρω</u> τέκτων

## 2.8 Explication without the occurrence of a plus

Explication can be achieved not alone by means of an addition, but also by replacing words, especially by substituting a pronoun for a noun. A few of the many examples that can be discovered in the Isaiah translation are presented here:

<sup>133</sup> Perhaps in assimilation to Isa 26:7 and 45:13.

<sup>134</sup> The translator has probably understood צוּר (imp. צָרָה—“to tie up”) as צוּר—“rock,” and saw this as a metaphor for security (compare Fischer, *In welcher Schrift*, 23; van der Kooij, “Isaiah in the Septuagint,” 526–27).

<sup>135</sup> In 25:4, 5 זֶרֶם (“heavy rain”) and זֵרִים (“strangers”) may have been read as or linked to זִדִּים—“arrogant ones,” although it is also possible that the translator arrived at the “evil people” and “faint-hearted people” through an association with “strangers.”

1:31	ובערו	καὶ κατακαυθήσονται
	שניהם יחדו	οἱ ἄνομοι καὶ οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἅμα
5:6	ואשיתו בתה	καὶ ἀνήσω τὸν ἀμπελῶνά μου
14:23	ושמתה למורש קפד	καὶ θήσω τὴν Βαβυλωνίαν ἔρημον <sup>136</sup>
30:12	ותשענו עלי	καὶ πεποισθῶς ἐγένου ἐπὶ τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ
35:2	המה יראו כבוד־יהוה	καὶ ὁ λαός μου ὕψεται τὴν δόξαν κυρίου
40:6	וכל־חסד כציץ השדה	καὶ πᾶσα δόξα ἀνθρώπου ὡς ἄνθος χόρτου·
51:6	וישבד, כמו־כן ימותון	οἱ δὲ κατοικοῦντες τὴν γῆν ὥσπερ ταῦτα ἀποθανοῦνται
60:4	כלם נקבצו	συνηγμένα τὰ τέκνα σου·

## 2.9 Conclusion

LXX Isaiah offers a large number of pluses that function to make the text more explicit. After having catalogued and analysed these, one can distinguish several tendencies:

- Explicitating pluses very frequently seem to have been adopted from or influenced by the surrounding context. They are often similar to or parallel to elements in a neighbouring clause, or they assimilate a clause to a related one nearby. This illustrates the translator's inclination to harmonise his text and to level parallelisms. These tendencies will be investigated further in chapters 8 and 9.
- Especially widespread is the (supposed) addition of pronouns in the genitive, and of the words *πᾶς*, *ὅλος* and *ἅμα*, and besides, the insertion of objects, particularly in the form of pronouns. Also noteworthy is the frequent supply of a verb where the Hebrew supposes a form of "to be," as well as the many cases in which a pleonastic noun has been added.

By reason of their large number and the specific patterns that can be discerned among them, it seems safe to suppose that most of the explicating pluses in LXX Isaiah are additions by the translator himself rather than being caused by a different Hebrew *Vorlage*. By inserting explicating details, the translator may have wished to:

- *Clarify* or *specify* his text, or give more *information* to the reader, for instance through the supply of pronouns in the genitive, making evident to which entity something refers, or by identifying a subject or an object.
- Make his text more *coherent* by extending internal links and references, for example by means of the addition of demonstratives or genitive pronouns. Sometimes the reverse may have been intended: the

<sup>136</sup> IQIsa<sup>a</sup> has ושמתי למורשת קפדו.

replacement of an implied subject by a noun, for instance, weakens the link to the earlier mention of this subject, and hence may mark the beginning of a new section.

- *Intensify* his text, adding force to a certain idea or expression, for example by providing pleonastic nouns or adjectives, or words such as *πᾶς*, *ὅλος* and *ᾧμα*. Furthermore, also the interpolation of independent pronouns where the Hebrew includes the subject in the verb, may have served to intensify the text; it especially seems to have been applied with the purpose of sharpening the contrast.

## Chapter 3.

# IMPLICITATION

### 3.1 Introduction

The analysis of LXX Isaiah would be less complicated if we were able to outline a consistent and uniform translation method which was applied by its translator. But in fact, the opposite appears to be true. The Greek Isaiah is typified by contrasting translation tendencies. While chapter 2 has shown that many pluses in the Greek Isaiah can be explained by the translator's inclination towards making his text more explicit, the present chapter will deal with his penchant for *implication*. "Implication" is a term used in translation studies to indicate that an element which in the source text is stated explicitly, is made implicit in the translation.<sup>1</sup> This technique may have been employed by the translator because he considered some information provided by the Hebrew text as redundant, since it could also have been derived from the context, or was supposed to have been familiar to the readers. Besides, he may have used implication so as to strengthen the textual coherence. If, for instance, a proper name instead of being repeated, is replaced by a pronoun, this makes a stronger link to the clause in which the name itself is mentioned.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Like explicitation, the term "implication" was first introduced by Vinay and Darbelnet (Vinay and Darbelnet, *Stylistique comparée du français*, 10). They define this technique as: "Procédé qui consiste à laisser au contexte ou à la situation le soin de préciser certains détails explicites dans LD [source language]." For the application of the term on the Septuagint, see van der Louw, "Transformations," 71–72. Van der Louw defines implication as follows: "An implication is a transformation whereby elements that are explicit in the source text are made implicit in the target text. This transformation is close to 'omission', the difference being that the information explicit in the source text is not deleted altogether, but recedes into the background while leaving traces in the target text, thus becoming implicit" (*op.cit.* p.71).

<sup>2</sup> See van Peursen, *Language and Interpretation*, 393–95. An example can be found in Isa 63:6 וְאִבּוֹס בְּאֶפֶס וְעַמִּים בְּאֶפֶס καὶ κατεπάτησα αὐτοὺς τῇ ὀργῇ μου; while in the MT verse 6 repeats "the people" mentioned in verse 3, in LXX Isaiah a pronoun replaces the noun, just as in the previous verses, which makes the internal connection between these verses stronger. For two cases in which the

Implication often entails the replacement of one word or phrase by another, but in some cases it accounts for a minus. Such minuses, as found in LXX Isaiah, will be listed below. They will be grouped according to the following division:

- Implication through the omission of an attribute.
- Implication through the omission of the governing noun in a genitival construction.
- Omission of כל and יהוה.
- Implication of the subject.
- Implication through the omission of an object.

Sometimes the omission of details that may have seemed “insignificant” in the eyes of the translator, has led to the *generalisation* of the text (for example, “the palm of his hand” becomes “his hand”). As it is not always easy to draw a line between “implication” and “generalisation,” these two phenomena will not be strictly differentiated, but will be treated alongside each other in the present chapter.

### 3.2 Implication through the omission of an attribute

Attributes, which modify the noun to which they are syntactically subordinate, can often be omitted without significantly changing the content of the text. They may consist of:

- an attributive pronoun, which in Hebrew is formed by a nominal suffix (that is, a suffix joined to a substantive noun);
- the governed noun in a genitival (construct state) construction;
- an apposition.

#### 3.2.1 The omission of a nominal suffix

In Greek it is not necessary to use an attributive (“possessive”) pronoun in order to denote the possessor, object, subject, or the whole of something or someone when this entity or being is made obvious by the immediate context. Particularly when attached to body parts, the attributive pronoun is regularly omitted; see for instance 1:15, where ובפרשכם כפיכם becomes ὅταν τὰς χεῖρας ἐκτείνητε πρὸς με (for more examples, see section 5.5). When in such situations the translation does not represent the Hebrew suffix, this has rather been motivated by the translator’s concern for using stylistically correct Greek than by his deliberation

---

implication of the *subject* strengthens the cohesion of the text, see 33:24 and 49:23 in section 3.5.2 below.

to make information implicit. However, when the translator chose not to render a suffix because he wanted to remove or reduce the emphasis on the idea that something was in a genitive relationship to something else, or because he intended to generalise a notion by leaving out the specifying genitive pronoun, this might be considered as implicitation or generalisation. See the following examples:

13:21	ומלאו בתיהם אחים	καὶ ἐμπλησθήσονται αἱ οἰκίαι ἡχοῦ <sup>3</sup>
14:32	ובה יחסו עניי עמן	καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ σωθήσονται οἱ ταπεινοὶ τοῦ λαοῦ.
24:23	ונגד זקניו כבוד	καὶ ἐνώπιον τῶν πρεσβυτέρων δοξασθήσεται.
26:19	יחיו מתדי	ἀναστήσονται οἱ νεκροί,
	נבלתי יקומון	καὶ ἐγερθήσονται οἱ ἐν τοῖς μνημείοις <sup>4</sup>
40:16	ולבנון אין די בער	ὁ δὲ Λίβανος οὐχ ἱκανὸς εἰς καῦσιν,
	וחיתו אין די	καὶ πάντα τὰ τετράποδα οὐχ ἱκανὰ εἰς
	עולה	ὀλοκάρπωσιν
49:11	ושמתי בל-הרי לדרך	καὶ θήσω πᾶν ὄρος εἰς ὁδὸν
	ומסלתי ירמון	καὶ πᾶσαν τρίβον εἰς βόσκημα αὐτοῖς. <sup>5</sup>

### 3.2.2 The omission of the governed noun in a genitival relationship

In a genitival relationship between words—which in Hebrew is expressed in a construct state conjunction—the second noun (the governed noun) qualifying the first one (the governing noun), has occasionally not been represented in LXX Isaiah. In most of these cases the qualifying noun is pleonastic. Perhaps the translator left it out because he thought it redundant:

10:13	בכח ידי עשיתי	Τῇ ἰσχύϊ ποιήσω
17:6	בסעפיה פריה	ἐπὶ τῶν κλάδων αὐτῶν
23:3	קציר יאור תבואתה	ὥς ἀμητοῦ εἰσφερομένου
29:23	מעשה ידי	τὰ ἔργα μου
30:29	ושמחת לבב	καὶ ὥσει εὐφραينوμένους
30:30	ולהב אש אוכלה	καὶ φλογὸς κατεσθιούσης
34:6	מחלב כליות אילים	καὶ ἀπὸ στέατος τράγων καὶ κριῶν
58:11	וכמוצא מים	καὶ ὡς πηγῇ

<sup>3</sup> In the Hebrew the suffix in בתיהם probably refers to the רעים of verse 20. LXX Isaiah may with αἱ οἰκίαι refer to all houses of the city referred to in the text (i.e. Babylon).

<sup>4</sup> The omission of the genitive pronoun may have been influenced by verse 14 where מתים בלי-יחי / οἱ δὲ νεκροὶ ζῶῃν οὐ μὴ ἴδωσιν.

<sup>5</sup> Perhaps also under the influence of verse 9 ובכל-שפיים מרעהם / καὶ ἐν πάσαις ταῖς τρίβοις ἡ νομὴ αὐτῶν.

For the omission of the governed noun in a genitival relationship when this noun is synonymous to the governing noun, see section 7.2.2a.

### 3.2.3 The omission of an apposition

Also appositions may primarily have been deleted in order to avoid redundancy.

#### a. The omission of a divine name

As we have seen in chapter 2, LXX Isaiah regularly offers *κύριος ὁ θεός* where the MT only has either *אלהים* or *יהוה*. However, the converse situation also occurs, appositionally used designations for God being absent in the Greek translation. Indeed, in nearly all cases where the Hebrew presents the combinations *אדני יהוה*, *יהוה*, *האדון יהוה*, or *יה יהוה*, LXX Isaiah displays merely one divine name. These compound Hebrew titles are mostly represented in the translation by:

- *κύριος*:

7:7	כה אמר <u>אדני יהוה</u>	τάδε λέγει <i>κύριος</i> σαβαωθ
10:16	לכן ישלח <u>האדון יהוה</u> צבאות	ἀλλὰ ἀποστελεῖ <i>κύριος</i> σαβαωθ <sup>6</sup>
10:24	לכן כה-אמר <u>אדני יהוה</u> צבאות	Διὰ τοῦτο τάδε λέγει <i>κύριος</i> σαβαωθ <sup>7</sup>
12:2	כִּי-עֲזִי וּזְמֶרְתָּ <u>יה יהוה</u>	διότι ἡ δόξα μου καὶ ἡ αἰνεσίς μου <i>κύριος</i>
19:4	נאם <u>האדון יהוה</u> צבאות	τάδε λέγει <i>κύριος</i> σαβαωθ.
22:5	<u>לאדני יהוה</u> צבאות	παρὰ <i>κυρίου</i> σαβαωθ
22:12	ויקרא <u>אדני יהוה</u> צבאות	καὶ ἐκάλεσε <i>κύριος</i> σαβαωθ
22:15	כה אמר <u>אדני יהוה</u> צבאות	Τάδε λέγει <i>κύριος</i> σαβαωθ
28:16	לכן כה אמר <u>אדני יהוה</u>	διὰ τοῦτο οὕτως λέγει <i>κύριος</i> <sup>8</sup>
28:22	שמעתי מאת <u>אדני יהוה</u> צבאות	ἤκουσα παρὰ <i>κυρίου</i> σαβαωθ
30:15	כה-אמר <u>אדני יהוה</u> קדוש ישראל	οὕτως λέγει <i>κύριος</i> ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Ἰσραῆλ <sup>9</sup>
40:10	הנה <u>אדני יהוה</u> בחזק יבוא	ἰδοὺ <i>κύριος</i> μετὰ ἰσχύος ἔρχεται
48:16	ועתה <u>אדני יהוה</u> שלחני	καὶ νῦν <i>κύριος</i> ἀπέσταλκέ με
49:22	כה-אמר <u>אדני יהוה</u>	Οὕτως λέγει <i>κύριος</i> <sup>10</sup>
50:4	<u>אדני יהוה</u> נתן לי לשון למודים	<i>Κύριος</i> δίδωσί μοι γλῶσσαν παιδείας
50:5	<u>אדני יהוה</u> פתח-לי אֶזֶן	καὶ ἡ παιδεία <i>κυρίου</i> ἀνοίγει μου τὰ ὦτα
50:7	<u>ואדני יהוה</u> יעזר-לי	καὶ <i>κύριος</i> βοηθός μου ἐγενήθη
50:9	הן <u>אדני יהוה</u> יעזר-לי	ἰδοὺ <i>κύριος</i> βοηθεῖ μοι.

<sup>6</sup> *האדון* equally is missing in some Hebrew manuscripts (but not in the Qumran documents of Isaiah). According to Wildberger (*Jesaja*, 1:405) it was originally absent.

<sup>7</sup> Wildberger (*Jesaja*, 1:417) thinks that the LXX translator has not read *אדני* in his *Vorlage*.

<sup>8</sup> In 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> *יהוה* appears as superscript: *יהוה אדני* (see section 12.3.1.2).

<sup>9</sup> 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> reads *יהוה קדוש ישראל אדני* (see section 12.3.1.2).

<sup>10</sup> In 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> *אדני* likewise is missing: *יהוה* (see section 12.3.1.2).



52:4	כי כה אמר <u>אדני יהוה</u>	οὕτως λέγει κύριος
56:8	נאם <u>אדני יהוה</u>	εἶπε κύριος
61:1	רוח <u>אדני יהוה</u> עלי	Πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐπ' ἐμέ
61:11	כן <u>אדני יהוה</u> יצמיח צדקה	οὕτως ἀνατελεῖ κύριος δικαιοσύνην
65:13	לכן כה-אמר <u>אדני יהוה</u>	Διὰ τοῦτο τάδε λέγει κύριος
65:15	והמיתך <u>אדני יהוה</u>	ὅμως δὲ ἀνελεῖ κύριος.

### - ὁ θεός:

10:23	כי כלה ונחרצה <u>אדני יהוה</u> צבאות עשה בקרב כל-הארץ	ὅτι λόγον συντετμημένον ποιήσει ὁ θεός ἐν τῇ οἰκουμένῃ ὅλη.
25:8	ומחה <u>אדני יהוה</u> דמעה	καὶ πάλιν ἀφεῖλεν ὁ θεός πᾶν δάκρυον
26:4	כי ביה <u>יהוה</u> צור עולמים	ὁ θεός ὁ μέγας ὁ αἰώνιος

The translator probably did not translate אדני because he was unable to think of an apt Greek counterpart. He could have rendered the word by *δεσπότης*, yet only uses that title three times, where the Hebrew in all three places displays *האדון*:<sup>11</sup>

1:24	לכן נאם <u>האדון יהוה</u> צבאות	διὰ τοῦτο τάδε λέγει ὁ <i>δεσπότης</i> κύριος <i>σαβαωθ</i>
3:1	<u>האדון יהוה</u> צבאות מסיר	Ἴδου δὴ ὁ <i>δεσπότης</i> κύριος <i>σαβαωθ</i> ἀφελεῖ
10:33	הנה <u>האדון יהוה</u> צבאות מסערף	Ἴδου γὰρ ὁ <i>δεσπότης</i> κύριος <i>σαβαωθ</i> συνταράσσει

The combination *יהוה אלהים* (+ suffix) has mostly received a literal rendering as *κύριος ὁ θεός*. Still, in the following places *יהוה אלהים* is represented by a mere *ὁ θεός σου*:

41:13	כי אני <u>יהוה אלהים</u>	ὅτι ἐγὼ ὁ θεός σου
48:17	אני <u>יהוה אלהים</u>	Ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ θεός σου
51:15	ואנכי <u>יהוה אלהים</u>	ὅτι ἐγὼ ὁ θεός σου
55:5	למען <u>יהוה</u> אלהים ולקדוש ישראל	ἐνεκεν τοῦ θεοῦ σου τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰσραηλ

Also the noun *צבאות* ("hosts"), which can be joined as an apposition to the divine name,<sup>12</sup> has now and again no equivalent in LXX Isaiah. Often this can be attributed to the translator's aspiration to assimilate clauses to related ones in the surrounding text or to similar formulations elsewhere in Scripture:

<sup>11</sup> In 10:16 and 19:4 the translator has omitted *האדון*, though (see above).

<sup>12</sup> On *צבאות* being an apposition rather than the governed noun in a construct state conjunction, see Jouön §131o.

8:13	את־יהוה <u>צבאות</u> אתו תקדישו	κύριον αὐτὸν ἀγιάσατε <sup>13</sup>
9:12(13)	ואת־יהוה <u>צבאות</u> לא דרשו	καὶ τὸν κύριον οὐκ ἐξεζήτησαν. <sup>14</sup>
9:18(19)	בעברת יהוה <u>צבאות</u>	διὰ θυμὸν ὀργῆς κυρίου
10:23	כי כלה ונחרצה יהוה <u>צבאות</u> עשה	ὅτι λόγον συντετμημένον ποιήσει ὁ θεός <sup>15</sup>
10:26	ועורר עליו יהוה <u>צבאות</u> שוט	καὶ ἐπεγερεῖ ὁ θεός ἐπ' αὐτοὺς <sup>16</sup>
19:17	מפני עצת יהוה <u>צבאות</u> אשר־הוא יועץ עליו	διὰ τὴν βουλήν, ἣν βεβούλευται κύριος ἐπ' αὐτήν. <sup>17</sup>
19:18	ונשבעות ליהוה <u>צבאות</u>	καὶ ὀμνύουσai τῷ ὀνόματι κυρίου. <sup>18</sup>
19:20	והיה לאות ולעד ליהוה <u>צבאות</u>	καὶ ἔσται εἰς σημεῖον εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα κύριω <sup>19</sup>
24:23	כי־מלך יהוה <u>צבאות</u> בהר ציון	ὅτι βασιλεύσει κύριος ἐν Σιών <sup>20</sup>
31:5	כן יגן יהוה <u>צבאות</u> על־ירושלם	οὕτως ὑπερασπιεῖ κύριος ὑπὲρ Ἱερουσαλὴμ

### b. The omission of other appositions

Some other examples of appositions missing a counterpart:

8:2	את אוריה <u>הכהן</u>	τὸν Ουρίαν
20:2	ישעיהו <u>בן־אמוץ</u>	Ἡσαΐαν
24:23	<u>בהר ציון</u>	ἐν Σιών
37:4	מלך־אשור <u>אדניו</u>	βασιλεὺς Ἀσσυρίων

<sup>13</sup> צבאות may have been removed in 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.

<sup>14</sup> Possibly in harmonisation with Jer 10:21 ואת־יהוה לא דרשו / καὶ τὸν κύριον οὐκ ἐξεζήτησαν; see section 9.4.3.3.

<sup>15</sup> The omission of צבאות in 10:23 and 26 is likely connected to the translation of יהוה by ὁ θεός, which on its own is rarely followed by σαβαωθ in the LXX (see only Isa 44:6 and 1 Esd 9:46). The use of θεός instead of κύριος may be due to the appearance of the same title in verse 20 (LXX) and verse 21, or in assimilation to similar statements announcing what God will do in the future, which likewise use a mere ὁ θεός; see e.g. 7:17 ἀλλὰ ἐπάξει ὁ θεός ἐπὶ σέ ... ἡμέρας, αἱ οὕτω ἤκασιν; 24:21 καὶ ἐπάξει ὁ θεός ἐπὶ τὸν κόσμον τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τὴν χεῖρα (see further e.g. 3:17; 4:2; 6:12; 14:3; 23:17; 25:10; and 30:30).

<sup>16</sup> See the previous footnote. According to Wildberger (*Jesaja*, 1:417) צבאות possibly has to be deleted.

<sup>17</sup> Perhaps צבאות was omitted because in the ensuing section—19:17–22—κύριος without σαβαωθ appears no less than twelve times, usually at the end of the clause; see section 8.3.1.1c.

<sup>18</sup> Maybe in harmonisation with Isa 48:1 יהוה הַנִּשְׁבָּעִים בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה / οἱ ὀμνύοντες τῷ ὀνόματι κυρίου θεοῦ Ἰσραὴλ.

Furthermore, parallel to κύριος in the preceding and following verses (see 19:17 and footnote above).

<sup>19</sup> Parallel to κύριος in the preceding and following verses (see 19:17 and footnote above).

<sup>20</sup> Possibly relying on Mic 4:7 יְהוָה יִהְיֶה עֲלֵיהֶם בְּהַר צִיּוֹן / καὶ βασιλεύσει κύριος ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ἐν ὄρει Σιών.

37:5	עבדי המלך חזקיהו	οἱ παῖδες τοῦ βασιλέως
37:37	סנחריב מלך-אשור	βασιλεὺς Ἀσσυρίων

### 3.3 The omission of the governing noun in a genitival relationship

Also when the translator did not render the first (governing) noun in a genitival relationship, this was probably mostly because that noun was not vital to the message of the text and hence could be left out without significantly changing the content.

#### 3.3.1 The omitted governing noun consists of the name for a body part

The omitted governing noun relatively often is the name of a body part, which is used either in a literal sense (see 1:6; 25:11; 30:6; 34:16; 40:5; and 62:2 below) or in a metaphorical sense (see 11:15; 14:21; 24:18; 27:6; and 30:17 below). Concerning metaphorically used body parts, the translator may have opted not to represent them because he wanted to make his text more concrete, or because the use of a comparable metaphor was uncommon in Greek. In the case of literally used ones the omission is probably largely the result of the translator's inclination to shorten or simplify his text. Perhaps he considered it unnecessary to be very specific. Furthermore, he may have avoided rendering parts of the body governing a (pro)noun in order not to produce Hebraistic language (in analogy to his frequent rendition of compound prepositional expressions containing the name of a body part by a simple preposition [for example, מִפְּנֵי becomes ἀπό]).<sup>21</sup> Nevertheless, on the whole the non-translation of body parts occurs only sporadically: Most commonly they did receive a rendering, both the ones used in a literal and those used in a metaphorical way.

Some instances of the omission of body parts in a genitive construction are as follows:

1:6	מִכְּפִּי-רֹגַל וְעַד-רֹאשׁ	ἀπὸ ποδῶν ἕως κεφαλῆς
11:15	וְהַחֲרִים יְהוָה אֶת לִשְׁוֹן יִם-מִצְרַיִם	καὶ ἐρημώσει κύριος τὴν θάλασσαν Αἰγύπτου
24:18	הֵנֶס מִקּוֹל הַפֶּחַד	ὁ φεύγων τὸν φόβον <sup>22</sup>
25:11	עִם אַרְבּוֹת יָדָיו	ἐφ' ἃ τὰς χεῖρας ἐπέβαλε
30:6	יִשְׂאוּ עַל-כַּתֵּף עֵרִים ...	οἱ ἔφερον ἐπ' ὤμων
	וְעַל-דְּבַשֵּׁת גַּמְלִים	καὶ καμῆλων
30:17	עַד אִם-נֹתֶרְתֶּם כְּתָר	ἕως ἂν καταλειφθῇτε ὡς ἱστὸς

<sup>21</sup> See section 5.7.

<sup>22</sup> The contrary has happened in 38:5, where one finds a word for “voice” as a plus: שמעתי את-תִּפְלִתָךְ / “ἤκουσα τῆς φωνῆς τῆς προσευχῆς σου.

	על־ראש ההר	ἐπ' ὄρους
37:14	ויקח חזקיהו את־הספרים	καὶ ἔλαβεν Εἰζεκίας τὸ βιβλίον
	מיד המלאכים	παρὰ τῶν ἀγγέλων

Both times the phrase פני־תבל occurs in Isaiah פני has no equivalent in the LXX, most probably so as to escape a Hebraistic translation:

14:21	ומלאו פני־תבל ערים	καὶ ἐμπλήσωσι τήν γῆν πολέμων
27:6	ומלאו פני־תבל	καὶ ἐμπλησθήσεται ἡ οἰκουμένη
	תנובה	τοῦ καρποῦ αὐτοῦ

A comparable move is the rendering by a mere pronoun where the Hebrew offers a pronoun governed by a body part, see for instance:

10:27	יסור סבלו מעל־שכמך	ἀφαιρεθήσεται ὁ φόβος αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ σοῦ
22:22	ונתתי מפתח בית־דוד על־שכמו	καὶ δώσω τὴν δόξαν Δαυיד αὐτῷ
38:17	כי השלכת אחרי גֻךְ	καὶ ἀπερριψας ὀπίσω μου πάσας
	כל־חטאי	τάς ἀμαρτίας μου.

Also the few examples of the omission of body parts belonging to *God* can be clarified in the light of what has been discussed above. These minuses are sometimes explained as an attempt by the translator to avoid anthropomorphism:<sup>23</sup>

25:10	כי־תנוח יד־יהוה	ὅτι ἀνάπαυσιν δώσει ὁ θεός
	בהר הזה	ἐπὶ τὸ ὄρος τοῦτο
29:23	בראתו ילדיו מעשה	ἀλλ' ὅταν ἴδωσιν τὰ τέκνα αὐτῶν
	ידי בקרבו	τὰ ἔργα μου
30:2	ופי לא שאלו	ἐμὲ δὲ οὐκ ἐπηρώτησαν
34:16	כי־פי הוא צוה	κύριος ἐνετείλατο αὐτοῖς
37:29	ושאננך עלה באוני	καὶ ἡ πικρία σου ἀνέβη πρὸς με
40:5	כי פי יהוה דבר	ὅτι κύριος ἐλάλησε.
62:2	אשר פי יהוה יקבנו	ὁ δὲ κύριος ὀνομάσει αὐτό.

### 3.3.2 The omitted governing noun consists of a word other than a body part

When preceding geographical names, ארץ has in LXX Isaiah generally received a rendering as γῆ or χώρα. However, on several occasions a translation of ארץ is missing:

<sup>23</sup> See section 10.3.2.

19:18	בארץ מצרים	ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ
27:13	בארץ מצרים	ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ
34:6	בארץ אדום	ἐν τῇ Ἰδομαίᾳ <sup>24</sup>
37:38	ארץ אררט	εἰς Ἀρμενίαν

Some additional examples of the omission of a governing noun:

2:17	ושח נבהות האדם	καὶ ταπεινωθήσεται πᾶς ἄνθρωπος
6:4	וינעו אמות הספים	καὶ ἐπήρθη τὸ ὑπέρθυρον
7:3	אל-קצה תעלת הברכה העליונה	πρὸς τὴν κολυμβήθραν τῆς ἄνω ὁδοῦ
10:12	אפקד על-פרי-גדל לבב	ἐπάξει ἐπὶ τὸν νοῦν τὸν μέγαν
10:20	ופליטת בית-יעקב	καὶ οἱ σωθέντες τοῦ Ἰακωβ
14:14	אעלה על-במתי עב	ἀναβήσομαι ἐπάνω τῶν νεφελῶν
14:19	יורדי אל-אבני-בור	καταβαινόντων εἰς ἄδου. <sup>25</sup>
14:30	ורעו בכורי דלים	καὶ βοσκηθήσονται πτωχοὶ δι' αὐτοῦ
17:14	לעת ערב והנה בלהה	πρὸς ἑσπέραν ἔσται πένθος
21:17	ושאר מספר-קשת	καὶ τὸ κατάλοιπον τῶν τοξευμάτων
	גבורי בני-קדר	τῶν ἰσχυρῶν υἱῶν Κηδαρ
22:22	ונתתי מפתח בית-דוד	καὶ δώσω τὴν δόξαν Δαυיד
	על-שכמו	αὐτῷ
24:4	אמללו מרום עס-הארץ	ἐπένθησαν οἱ ὑψηλοὶ τῆς γῆς. <sup>26</sup>
30:2	לעזו במעון פרעה	τοῦ βογηθῆναι ὑπὸ Φαραω
	ולחסות בצל מצרים	καὶ σκεπασθῆναι ὑπὸ Αἰγυπτίων.
30:3	והחסות בצל-מצרים לכלמה	καὶ τοῖς πεποιθόσιν ἐπ' Αἰγυπτὸν ὄνειδος.
30:6	בארץ צרה וצוקה	Ἐν τῇ θλίψει καὶ τῇ στενοχωρίᾳ
30:30	נפץ וזרם ואבן ברד	καὶ ὡς ὕδωρ καὶ χάλαζα
		συγκαταφερομένη βίᾳ.
40:12	וכל בשלש עפר הארץ	καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν δρακί;
40:14	וילמדהו בארח משפט	ἢ τίς ἔδειξεν αὐτῷ κρίσιν;
48:1	וממי יהודה יצאו	καὶ οἱ ἐξ Ἰουδα ἐξελθόντες
52:1	לבשי בגדי תפארתך	καὶ ἔνδυσαι τὴν δόξαν σου

### 3.4 The omission of כל, יחד and רב

The translator gives the impression of having been quite flexible in using or not using expressions in the sense of “all” and “together.” Whereas the previous chapter listed plenty of examples of his *addition* of such words, the next pages

<sup>24</sup> ארץ may have been left out in parallelism to the preceding phrase *ἔτι θυσία κυρίῳ ἐν Βοσορ*.

<sup>25</sup> 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> has אבני written supralinearly: בור אבני [ל] יורדו א (see section 12.3.1.2).

<sup>26</sup> In 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> עמ has been added by a later hand: אמללו מרום עמ הארץ (see section 12.3.1.2).

will demonstrate that he equally often has *omitted* Hebrew lexemes bearing these connotations. Representations of כל and יחד are absent in LXX Isaiah so regularly, that this cannot simply be attributed to a different *Vorlage*. Probably their frequent omission is due to the fact that in most cases the meaning of these words is logically inherent in the text in which they appear. For this reason the translator may have thought their lexical presence not absolutely necessary.

## כל

1:23	שריך סוררים	οἱ ἄρχοντές σου ἀπειθοῦσι,
	וחברי גנבים כלל אהב שחד	κοινωνοὶ κλεπτῶν, ἀγαπῶντες δῶρα
3:1	כי הנה האדון יהוה צבאות	Ἴδου δὴ ὁ δεσπότης κύριος σαβαωθ
	מסיר מירושלם	ἀφελεῖ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ ἀπὸ
	ומיהודה משען ומשענה	Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἰσχύοντα καὶ ἰσχύουσιν,
	כל משען-לחם וכל משען-מים	ἰσχὺν ἄρτου καὶ ἰσχὺν ὕδατος
5:28	אשר חציו שנונים	ὧν τὰ βέλη ὁξεῖά ἐστι
	וכל-קשתתיו דרכות	καὶ τὰ τόξα αὐτῶν ἐντεταμένα
8:7	את-מלך אשור	τὸν βασιλέα τῶν Ἀσσυρίων
	ואת-כל-כבודו	καὶ τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ
8:9	והאזינו כל מרחק-ארץ	ἐπακούσατε ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς
13:15	כל-הנמצא ידקר	ὅς γάρ ἂν ἁλῶ, ἡττηθήσεται,
	וכל-הנספה	καὶ οἵτινες συνηγμένοι εἰσὶ,
	יפול בחרב	μαχαίρα πεσοῦνται.
14:18	כל-מלכי גוים כלם	πάντες οἱ βασιλεῖς τῶν ἐθνῶν
	שכבו בכבוד	ἐκοιμήθησαν ἐν τιμῇ <sup>27</sup>
21:16	וכלה כל-כבוד קדר	ἐκλείψει ἡ δόξα τῶν υἱῶν Κηδαρ <sup>28</sup>
22:3	כל-נמצאִיךְ אסרו יחדו	καὶ οἱ ἀλόντες σκληρῶς δεδεμένοι εἰσὶ
24:10	סגר כל-בית מבוא	κλείσει οἰκίαν τοῦ μὴ εἰσελθεῖν. <sup>29</sup>
27:9	וזה כל-פרי	καὶ τοῦτό ἐστιν ἡ εὐλογία αὐτοῦ
29:20	ונכרתו כל-שקדי און	καὶ ἐξωλεθρεύθησαν οἱ ἀνομοῦντες ἐπὶ κακία
30:18	אשרי כל-חוכי לו	μακάριοι οἱ ἐμμένοντες ἐν αὐτῷ.
33:20	וכל-חבליו בלי-יתקו	οὐδὲ τὰ σχοινία αὐτῆς οὐ μὴ διαρραγῶσιν.
34:1	תבל וכל-צאצאיה	ἡ οἰκουμένη καὶ ὁ λαὸς ὁ ἐν αὐτῇ.
34:2	כי קצץ ליהוה על-כל-הגוים	διότι θυμὸς κυρίου ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη
	וחמה על-כל-צבאם	καὶ ὀργὴ ἐπὶ τὸν ἀριθμὸν αὐτῶν
34:12	וכל-שריה	οἱ γὰρ βασιλεῖς αὐτῆς καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες αὐτῆς
	יהיו אפס	καὶ οἱ μεγιστᾶνες αὐτῆς ἔσονται εἰς ἀπώλειαν.

<sup>27</sup> In 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> כלם is missing correspondingly: כול מלכי גוים שכבו בכבוד. Probably it was left out for the sake of condensation (see section 12.3.1.2).

<sup>28</sup> See 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> כלה כבוד קדר. The lack of representation of כל might be caused by an error of haplography (see sections 11.1 and 12.3.1.2).

<sup>29</sup> כל may have been transposed to the previous clause: ונשבר קריתתהו / ἡρημώθη πᾶσα πόλις.

36:1	עלה סנחריב מלך-אשור על כל-ערי יהודה הבצרות	ἀνέβη Σενναχηριμ βασιλεὺς Ἀσσυρίων ἐπὶ τὰς πόλεις τῆς Ιουδαίας τὰς ὀχυράς <sup>30</sup>
37:17	ושמע את כל-דברי סנחריב	καὶ ἰδὲ τοὺς λόγους, οὓς ἀπέστειλε Σενναχηριμ <sup>31</sup>
38:13	כארי כן ישבר כל-עצמותי	οὕτως τὰ ὅστ'α μου συνέτριψεν
40:2	כי לקחה מיד יהוה כפלים בכל-חטאתיה	ὅτι ἐδέξατο ἐκ χειρὸς κυρίου διπλᾶ τὰ ἁμαρτήματα αὐτῆς.
45:22	פנו-אלי והושעו כל-אפסי-ארץ	ἐπιστράφητε πρὸς με καὶ σωθήσεσθε, οἱ ἅπ' ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς.
53:6	ויהוה הפגיע בו את עון כלנו	καὶ κύριος παρέδωκεν αὐτόν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ἡμῶν. <sup>32</sup>
55:1	הוי כל-צמא לכו למים	Οἱ διψῶντες, πορεύεσθε ἐφ' ὕδωρ
56:2	ושמר ידו מעשות כל-רע	καὶ διατηρῶν τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ μὴ ποιεῖν ἀδίκημα.
57:5	הנחמים באלים רענן תחת כל-עץ	οἱ παρακαλοῦντες ἐπὶ τὰ εἶδωλα ὑπὸ δένδρα δασέα
59:8	נתיבותיהם עקשו להם כל דרך בה לא ידע שלום	αἱ γὰρ τρίβοι αὐτῶν διεστραμμέναι, ἃς διοδεύουσι, καὶ οὐκ οἶδασιν εἰρήνην. <sup>33</sup>
59:11	נהמה כדבים כלנו וכיונים הגה נהגה	ὥς ἄρκος καὶ ὥς περιστέρα ἅμα πορεύσονται. <sup>34</sup>
60:4	כלם נקבצו	συνηγμένα τὰ τέκνα σου. <sup>35</sup>
60:14	והלכו אליך שוחו בני מעריך והשתחוו על-כפות רגליך כל-מנאציר	καὶ πορεύσονται πρὸς σὲ δεδοικότες υἱοὶ ταπεινωσάντων σε καὶ παροξυνάντων σε
62:2	וראו גוים צדקך וכל-מלכים כבודך	καὶ ὄψονται ἔθνη τὴν δικαιοσύνην σου καὶ βασιλεῖς τὴν δόξαν σου

In a large proportion of these cases an extra motivation for the omission of כל may have been the amelioration of parallelism, given that in a parallel phrase

<sup>30</sup> כל might have become lost on account of haplography (על כל). In the parallel text 4 Kgdms 18:13 a Greek equivalent for כל likewise is missing.

<sup>31</sup> Possibly in assimilation to v.4: τοὺς λόγους Παψακου, οὓς ἀπέστειλε βασιλεὺς Ἀσσυρίων (see section 9.2.2.2).

<sup>32</sup> Perhaps in parallelism to the first two lines of verse 5: αὐτὸς δὲ ἐτραυματίσθη διὰ τὰς ἀνομίας ἡμῶν καὶ μεμαλάκισται διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν.

<sup>33</sup> LXX Isaiah has likely perceived הך דרך בה דרך כל as a relative clause modifying כל ("all [roads] on which they walk"), whereas in the MT כל דרך בה דרך כל forms the subject of the next clause: "no one who walks in them knows peace."

<sup>34</sup> כל could be represented by ἅμα.

<sup>35</sup> Maybe כל has been moved to the next sentence: יבאו מרחוק יבאו / ἰδοὺ ἤκασι πάντες οἱ υἱοὶ σου μακρόθεν.

or clause a word corresponding to כל is absent: see 1:23; 3:1; 5:28; 8:7; 21:16; 22:3; 29:20; 33:20; 34:1, 12; 40:2; 53:6; 56:2; 57:5; 59:11; 60:14; and 62:2.

### יחדו / יחד

22:3	כל-קצינך נדדו-יחד	πάντες οἱ ἄρχοντές σου πεφεύγασι,
	מקשת אסרו כל-נמצאך אסרו יחדו	καὶ οἱ ἀλόντες σκληρώς δεδεμένοι εἰσὶ
27:4	אציתנה יחד	πάντα, ὅσα συνέταξε. κατακέκαυμαι <sup>36</sup>
40:5	וראו כל-בשר יחדו	καὶ ὄψεται πᾶσα σὰρξ τὸ σωτήριον
		τοῦ θεοῦ. <sup>37</sup>
41:19	אתן במדבר ארז שטה	θήσω εἰς τὴν ἄνυδρον γῆν κέδρον
	והדס ועץ שמן אשים בערבה ברוש	καὶ πύξον καὶ μυρσίνην
	תדהר ותאשור יחדו	καὶ κυπάρισσον καὶ λεύκην
43:26	הזכירני נשפטה יחד	σὺ δὲ μνησθητι καὶ κριθῶμεν.
45:16	בושו וגם-נכלמו	αἰσχυνθήσονται καὶ ἐντραπήσονται
	כלם יחדו	πάντες οἱ ἀντικείμενοι αὐτῷ <sup>38</sup>

In four of the seven cases in which a rendering of יחד or יחדו (“together”) is missing, in the same clause the synonymous כל appears (see 22:3 [2x]; 40:5; and 45:16). Apparently, the combination of these two expressions was regarded as superfluous by the translator.

### רב

The noun רב (“abundance”) lacks a Greek counterpart in the following two verses:

47:9	שכול ואלמן כתמם באו עליך	χρηεῖα καὶ ἀτεκνία ἤξει ἐξαίφνης ἐπὶ σέ
	ברב כשפיך	ἐν τῇ φαρμακείᾳ σου
47:13	נלאית ברב עצתיך	κεκοπίαχας ἐν ταῖς βουλαῖς σου.

## 3.5 Implication of the subject

### 3.5.1 The omission of a pronominal subject

When in Hebrew an independent personal pronoun functions as a subject in a nominal clause, and is placed at the end of that clause (which means that it is not

<sup>36</sup> Possibly יחד is rendered by πάντα. For an analysis of this translation, see section 6.7a.

<sup>37</sup> According to Ziegler (*Untersuchungen*, 150) the *Vorlage* of the LXX read יתועת יהוה את, the more original form יחדו mistakenly having been copied as יהוה. It is also thinkable, however, that the translator himself has read יהוה for יחדו.

<sup>38</sup> יחדו might have been linked to נחרים and on those grounds translated as οἱ ἀντικείμενοι (see 41:11 כל הנחרים בך / πάντες οἱ ἀντικείμενοί σοι).



intended to give prominence to the subject),<sup>39</sup> LXX Isaiah generally reproduces this pronoun by a form of εἰμί. For examples, see:

41:9	עבד־יְהוָה	Παῖς μου εἶ
41:10	אֶל־תִּירָא כִּי עַמְךָ־אֲנִי	μὴ φοβοῦ, μετὰ σοῦ γάρ εἰμι.
41:23	וְנִדְעָה כִּי אֱלֹהִים אַתָּם	καὶ γνωσόμεθα ὅτι θεοὶ ἐστε.
43:2	אֶתְךָ־אֲנִי	μετὰ σοῦ εἰμι
43:5	אֶל־תִּירָא כִּי אֶתְךָ־אֲנִי	μὴ φοβοῦ, ὅτι μετὰ σοῦ εἰμι.
44:5	לִיהוֹה אֲנִי	Τοῦ θεοῦ εἰμι
48:4	מִדַּעְתִּי כִּי קִשָּׁה אַתָּה	γινώσκω ἐγὼ ὅτι σκληρὸς εἶ

If the independent pronoun in nominal clauses does have an emphatic function, in which case it usually precedes the predicate,<sup>40</sup> LXX Isaiah often renders it in a “double way”: by means of a form of εἰμί in combination with a Greek independent pronoun. Some instances are the following:

8:13	וְהוּא מוֹרֵאכֶם	καὶ αὐτὸς ἔσται σου φόβος.
37:20	כִּי־אַתָּה יְהוָה לְבַדְךָ	ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ θεὸς μόνος.
42:17	אַתָּם אֱלֹהֵינוּ	Ἵμεῖς ἐστε θεοὶ ἡμῶν.
43:1	לִי־אַתָּה	ἐμὸς εἶ σύ.
44:8	וְאַתָּם עַדִּי	μάρτυρες ὑμεῖς ἐστε
45:22	כִּי אֲנִי־אֵל	ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ θεός
46:9	כִּי אֲנִכִּי אֵל	ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ θεός
48:12	אֲנִי רֹאשׁוֹן	ἐγὼ εἰμι πρῶτος
48:17	אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ	Ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ θεός σου
56:3	הֵן אֲנִי עֵץ יֵבֶשׁ	Ἐγὼ εἰμι ξύλον ξηρόν.
57:4	הֲלוֹא־אַתָּם יְלִידֵי־יֶפֶס	οὐχ ὑμεῖς ἐστε τέκνα ἀπωλείας

In expressions in which the Hebrew employs the independent pronoun together with a predicative participle in order to indicate the person who forms the subject of this participle,<sup>41</sup> this construction is mostly reproduced into Greek by means a finite verb form without an independent pronoun:

5:5	אֶת אֲשֶׁר־אֲנִי עֹשֶׂה לְכַרְמִי	τί ποιήσω τῷ ἀμπελῶνί μου.
21:8	אֲנִכִּי עֹמֵד תָּמִיד יוֹמָם	Ἔστην διὰ παντὸς ἡμέρας
29:11	כִּי חֲתוּם הוּא	ἐσφράγισται γάρ.
37:10	אֲשֶׁר אַתָּה בּוֹטָח בּוֹ	ἐφ' ᾧ πεποιθὼς εἶ ἐπ' αὐτῷ
48:13	קֵרָא אֲנִי אֱלֹהִים	καλέσω αὐτούς

<sup>39</sup> See Joüon §154fa.

<sup>40</sup> See Joüon §154fa.

<sup>41</sup> See Joüon §154fd.

Independent pronouns preceding finite verbal forms with the purpose of giving special prominence to the subject of these verbs,<sup>42</sup> are virtually always represented in LXX Isaiah. Only incidentally do they not have a match in the Greek, namely in the following cases:

10:14	וכאסף ביצים עזבות כל-הארץ <u>אני</u> אספתי	καὶ ὡς καταλελειμμένα ὥα <u>ἀρῶ</u>
34:16	ורוחו <u>הוא</u> קבצן	καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ <u>συνήγαγεν αὐτάς.</u>
37:11	הנה <u>אתה</u> שמעת	ἢ οὐκ <u>ἤκουσας</u>
37:25	<u>אני</u> קרתי ושתיתי מים	καὶ <u>ἔθηκα</u> γέφυραν
38:17	<u>ואתה</u> חשקת נפשי	<u>εἴλου</u> γάρ μου τὴν ψυχὴν
38:19	חי חי <u>הוא</u> יודך	οἱ ζῶντας <u>εὐλογήσουσί</u> σε
43:12	<u>אנכי</u> הגדתי והושעתי	<u>ἀνήγγειλα</u> καὶ ἔσωσα

In nearly all of the instances offered (10:14; 34:16; 37:25; 38:17; 43:12) the omission of the independent pronoun could be brought about by the translator's levelling the clause to a parallel one in which (in the Greek) an independent pronoun does not appear either.

### 3.5.2 The omission of a nominal subject

Subjects have repeatedly been omitted in LXX Isaiah because in the translation their function is adopted by an identical or synonymous subject in a neighbouring clause ("distributive rendering," see section 7.6.2b). Under other circumstances, Hebrew nominal subjects are in LXX Isaiah only rarely transformed into subjects that are implied in the verb:

13:22	וקרוב לבוא <u>עתה</u> וימיה לא ימשכו	ταχὺ ἔρχεται καὶ οὐ χρονιεῖ. <sup>43</sup>
16:10	יין ביקבים לא-ידרך <u>הדרך</u>	καὶ οὐ μὴ πατήσουσιν οἶνον εἰς τὰ ὑπολήγνια <sup>44</sup>
16:14	ועתה דבר <u>יהוה</u> לאמר	καὶ νῦν λέγω <sup>45</sup>
28:21	כי כהר-פרצים יקום <u>יהוה</u>	ὥσπερ ὅρος ἀσεβῶν ἀναστήσεται <sup>46</sup>
33:24	ובל-יאמר <u>שכן</u>	καὶ οὐ μὴ εἴπη
49:23	אשר לא-יבשו <u>קני</u>	καὶ οὐκ αἰσχυνθήσῃ.
61:1	רוח אדני יהוה עלי יען משח <u>יהוה</u> אתי	Πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐπ' ἐμέ, οὗ εἶνεκεν ἔχρισέ με. <sup>47</sup>

<sup>42</sup> See Joüon §146a.

<sup>43</sup> See Hab 2:3 (see section 9.4.5.6).

<sup>44</sup> See sections 7.5 and 9.4.3.1.

<sup>45</sup> LXX Isaiah has changed indirect speech into direct speech, probably because an introduction of direct speech has already occurred (Τοῦτο τὸ ῥῆμα, ὃ ἐλάλησε κύριος ἐπὶ Μωαβ, ὁπότε καὶ ἐλάλησε).

<sup>46</sup> יהוה has probably been read as יהיה and rendered by καὶ ἔσται at the beginning of the clause following.

In some of these examples, the omission entails that whereas the Hebrew starts with a new subject, the Greek continues with the subject of the preceding clause. Through this continuation the cohesion of the text is strengthened (see 16:10; 33:24; and 49:23).<sup>48</sup>

### 3.6 Implication by the omission of an object

Just as was the case with other sentence elements, objects<sup>49</sup> were probably also mostly omitted because their information was seen as redundant (see 9:3[4]; 25:10; 26:20, 21; 28:4; 30:14, 33; 31:7; 33:12; 36:21; 40:20; 44:5; and 54:1 below). Furthermore they may have been deleted in order to circumvent a certain suggestion in the text (37:28–29 and 59:13), or to give a broader validity to the words (8:11 and 40:17). Lastly, they may sometimes have been omitted for the sake of parallelism (44:7; 46:11; and 48:15).

#### 3.6.1 The omission of a pronominal object

8:11	כי כה אמר יהוה <u>אלי</u>	Οὕτως λέγει κύριος
9:3(4)	שבט הגנש <u>בו</u> החתת	τὴν γὰρ ῥάβδον τῶν ἀπαιτούντων διεσκέδασε κύριος
25:10	ונדוש מואב <u>תחתיו</u>	καὶ καταπατηθήσεται ἡ Μωαβίτις
26:20	וסגר דלחיד <u>בעדך</u>	ἀπόκλειςον τὴν θύραν σου
26:21	כִּי־הנה יהוה יצא ממקומו לפקד עון ישב־הארץ <u>עליו</u>	ἰδοὺ γὰρ κύριος ἀπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου ἐπάγει τὴν ὀργὴν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐνοικοῦντας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς
30:33	נשמת יהוה כנחל גפרית בערה <u>בה</u>	ὁ θυμὸς κυρίου ὡς φάραγξ ὑπὸ θεοῦ καιομένη.
31:7	אשר עשו <u>לכם</u> ידיכם חטא	ἃ ἐποίησαν αἱ χεῖρες αὐτῶν.
36:7	וכִּי־תאמר <u>אלי</u> אל־יהוה אלהינו בטחנו	εἰ δὲ λέγετε Ἐπὶ κύριον τὸν θεὸν ἡμῶν πεποιθᾶμεν <sup>50</sup>
36:21	לא תענהו <u>ו</u>	μηδὲνα ἀποκριθῆναι.
37:28–29	ואת התרגוך <u>אלי</u> יען התרגוך <u>אלי</u>	ὁ δὲ θυμὸς σου, ὃν ἐθυμώθη <sup>51</sup>
40:17	כל־הגוים כאין <u>נגדו</u> מאפס ותהו נחשבו־לו	καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ὡς οὐδὲν εἰσι καὶ εἰς οὐθὲν ἐλογίσθησαν.
40:20	חרש חכם יבקש־לו להכין	καὶ σοφῶς ζητεῖ πῶς στήσει

<sup>47</sup> Presumably omitted in order to avoid repetition.

<sup>48</sup> See van Peursen, *Language and Interpretation*, 395.

<sup>49</sup> The term “object” includes direct, indirect, and prepositional objects.

<sup>50</sup> According to Goshen-Gottstein (*HUB Isa*, 151) אלי is omitted mistakenly, due to haplography ( אלי אל). Yet, the translator may also have left it out deliberately, because he thought it superfluous.

<sup>51</sup> Perhaps anger directed towards God was offensive in the eyes of the translator; see section 10.3.2.

	פסל לא ימוט	αὐτοῦ εἰκόνα καὶ ἵνα μὴ σαλεύηται.
44:7	יקרא ויגידה ויערכה לי	στήτω καλεσάτω καὶ ἑτοιμασάτω μοι
46:11	אף-אביאנה	ἐλάλησα καὶ ἤγαγον,
	יצרתי אף-אעשנה	ἔκτισα καὶ ἐποίησα
48:15	אני אני דברתי אף-קראתי	ἐγὼ ἐλάλησα, ἐγὼ ἐκάλεσα <sup>52</sup>

Object suffixes are occasionally not represented when a reference to the object also occurs elsewhere in the same sentence (either in a different or in the same syntactical function):

- As object to a another phrase:<sup>53</sup>

27:11	על-כן לא-ירחמנו עשהו	διὰ τοῦτο οὐ μὴ οἰκτιρήσῃ ὁ ποιήσας αὐτούς,
	ויצרו לא יחננו	οὐδὲ ὁ πλάσας αὐτούς οὐ μὴ ἐλεήσῃ.
37:11	אתה שמעת אשר עשו	ἢ οὐκ ἤκουσας ἃ ἐποίησαν
	מלכי אשר	βασιλεῖς Ἀσσυρίων
	לכל-הארצות להחרימם	παῖσαν τὴν γῆν ὡς ἀπώλεσαν;
49:10	כי-מרמחם ינהגם	ἀλλὰ ὁ ἐλεῶν αὐτούς παρακαλέσει
55:6	בהמצאו קראהו	καὶ ἐν τῷ εὗρίσκειν αὐτὸν ἐπικαλέσασθε. <sup>54</sup>
56:2	שמר שבת מחללן	καὶ φυλάσσω τὰ σάββατα μὴ βεβηλοῦν
56:6	כל-שמר	καὶ πάντας τοὺς φυλασσομένους
	שבת מחללן	τὰ σάββατά μου μὴ βεβηλοῦν
58:7	כי-תראה ערם וכסיתו	ἐὰν ἴδῃς γυμνόν, περιβάλε
62:9	כי מאספין יאכלהו	ἀλλ' ἢ οἱ συνάγοντες φάγονται αὐτά
62:9	ומקבצין ישתהו	καὶ οἱ συνάγοντες πίνονται αὐτά

- As an object in *casus pendens*, located at the beginning of the clause and later resumed by way of a retrospective pronoun.<sup>55</sup>

13:17	וזהב לא יחפצו-בו	οὐδὲ χρυσίου χρεῖαν ἔχουσι.
14:27	ידו הנטויה ומי ישיבנה	καὶ τὴν χεῖρα τὴν ὑψηλὴν τίς ἀποστρέψει;
42:3	ופשתה כהה לא יכבנה	καὶ λίνον καπνιζόμενον οὐ σβέσει <sup>56</sup>
59:12	ועונתינו ידענום	καὶ τὰ ἀδικήματα ἡμῶν ἔγνωμεν.

<sup>52</sup> Cf 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>: אני אני דברתי אף קראתי (see section 12.3.1.2).

<sup>53</sup> See also 8:16.

<sup>54</sup> In the MT the sentence division lies in between בהמצאו קראהו and קראהו: “Seek the LORD while he may be found, call upon him while he is near.”

<sup>55</sup> See Joüon §156. For an example in which such a construction has been maintained in LXX Isaiah, see e.g. 1:7 **אתה** זרים אכלים / τὴν χώραν ὑμῶν ἐνώπιον ὑμῶν ἀλλότριοι κατεσθίουσιν **αὐτήν**. For an example in which both MT Isa and LXX Isaiah do *not* resume the object after a *casus pendens*, see e.g. 5:17 **וחרבות יאכלו** / καὶ τὰς ἐρήμους τῶν ἀπειλημένων ἄρνες φάγονται.

<sup>56</sup> 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> displays יכבה לוא יכבה ופשתה (see section 12.3.1.2).

- When the object is made explicit in an apposition at the end of the sentence (a figure called *epergesis*). In the Greek the words of the apposition are integrated within the sentence:

15:7	ופקדתם על נחל הערבים	ἐπάξω γὰρ ἐπὶ τὴν φάραγγα Ἰσραήλ <sup>57</sup>
23:9	יהוה צבאות יעצה לחלל גאון כל-צבי	κύριος σαβαωθ ἐβουλεύσατο παραλῦσαι πᾶσαν τὴν ὕβριν τῶν ἐνδόξων
41:12	תבקשם ולא תמצאם אנשי מצתך	ζητήσεις αὐτούς καὶ οὐ μὴ εὔρης τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, οἱ παροινήσουσιν εἰς σέ·
63:11	איה המעלם מים את רעי צאנו	ὁ ἀναβιβάσας ἐκ τῆς γῆς τὸν ποιμένα τῶν προβάτων. <sup>58</sup>

- In another syntactical function, for instance as a subject or as an object complement:

24:9	ימר שכר לשתיך	πικρὸν ἐγένετο τὸ σικερα τοῖς πίνουσιν.
46:6	ויעשה אל	ἐποίησαν χειροποίητα

### 3.6.2 The omission of a nominal object

30:10	לא תחזו לנו נכחות	Μὴ λαλεῖτε ἡμῖν
30:14	לחתות אש מיקוד ולחשף מים מגבא	ἐν ᾧ πῦρ ἀρεῖς καὶ ἐν ᾧ ἀποσυριεῖς ὕδωρ μικρόν.
31:7	אשר עשו לכם ידיכם חטא	ἃ ἐποίησαν αἱ χεῖρες αὐτῶν.
33:12	והיו עמים משרפות שיד קוצים כסוחים באש יצתו	καὶ ἔσονται ἔθνη κατακεκαυμένα ὡς ἄκανθα ἐν ἀγρῷ ἐρριμμένη καὶ κατακεκαυμένη.
38:21	ישאו דבלת תאנים וימרחו על-השחין	Λαβὲ παλάθην ἐκ σύκων καὶ τριῖψον καὶ κατὰπλάσαι
44:5	וזה יכתב ידו ליהוה	καὶ ἕτερος ἐπιγράψει Τοῦ θεοῦ εἰμι
54:1	פצחי רנה וצהלי	ῥῆξον καὶ βόησον
59:13	פשע וכחש ביהוה ונסוג מאחר אלהינו	ἡσεβήσαμεν καὶ ἐψευσάμεθα καὶ ἀπέστημεν ἀπὸ ὀπισθεν τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν. <sup>59</sup>

<sup>57</sup> LXX Isaiah seems to have read ופקדתם as a first singular perfect consecutive, with a suffix in the third masculine plural pointing to הערבים: “For I will bring them to the valley, namely the Arabs.” In the MT, by contrast, הערבים is a genitive attribute to נחל, while ופקדתם is vocalised as a noun phrase meaning “their possessions” (ופקדתם). The latter is the subject of a clause governed by the verb phrase ישאום: “and their possessions they carry away over the Wadi of the Willows.” The rendering of ישאום forms a separate clause in the LXX: καὶ λήμψονται αὐτήν—“and they will take her.”

<sup>58</sup> 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> gives ונ(ו)ע את רע צאנו (see section 12.3.1.2).

<sup>59</sup> Possibly the translator regarded the idea of lying to God himself as too offensive.

Elsewhere, the omission of objects bears on the application of distributive rendering. For examples, see section 7.6.2a.

### 3.7 Implication without the occurrence of a minus

Implication is only now and then achieved by way of an omission. In other places it is done through the *substitution* of words, in particular of a noun by a pronoun. Three examples to illustrate this are:

14:22	והכרתי לבבל שם ושאר ונין ונכד	καὶ ἀπολώ <b>αὐτῶν</b> ὄνομα καὶ κατὰλειμμα καὶ σπέρμα
52:9	כי־נחם יהוה עמו	ὅτι ἠλέησε κύριος <b>αὐτήν</b>
63:6	ואבוס עמים באפי	καὶ κατεπάτησα <b>αὐτούς</b> τῇ ὀργῇ μου

### 3.8 Conclusion

Even though the Isaiah translator was particularly apt to make his text more explicit and to add interpretative glosses to it, some instances of implication can also be encountered in his translation. He has regularly left out words that are already implied by the context (such as כל and יחד), or information he may have supposed to be familiar to his readers. Now and then he has omitted specifying details that do not really influence the message and content of the text (for instance specifications of body parts). By removing such “superfluous” words, he may have wished to create a text that was more concise in character.<sup>60</sup>

Nevertheless, the avoidance of redundancy on its own does not provide a sufficient explanation for many of the translator’s omissions mentioned in this chapter. It does not answer the question of why in some cases he has made elements implicit, whereas in plenty of other cases he has rather made his text more explicit, sometimes even by adding the same words that in other verses he had discarded (such as words in the sense of “all”). One solution for this paradox is that the translator was quite willing either to add or omit (seemingly) “insignificant” elements if this could serve other purposes, such as the amelioration of parallelism, the assimilation of an expression to a related one nearby, or the strengthening of the coherence of his discourse. The possibility also exists that he occasionally deleted or inserted small words just because this favoured the rhythm of his text. Finally, he may sometimes have employed the implication of textual elements with the aim of extending or generalising a

<sup>60</sup> Despite the translator’s aim for conciseness, implication in LXX Isaiah hardly ever leads to *ellipsis*, i.e. the omission of *syntactically required* elements. See section 8.4a.

notion of the text, or in order to reduce the emphasis on—or sometimes even to remove—certain suggestions (see 37:29 and 59:13). This is where implicitation begins to touch on exegesis. In this twilight zone it could be used as a technique that on the one hand allowed the translator to remain close to the literal wording of Scripture, but which on the other hand gave him some room for a broader or slightly different interpretation of the source text.

Without doubt this chapter has included some minuses that have not actually been caused by the application of implicitation, but by the fact that the translator had a source text in front of him that sometimes differed from the MT. Still, because the omission of redundant words closely accords with the translator's penchant for condensation (see chapter 7), this favours the attribution of implicitating minuses to the translator himself.





## Chapter 4.

### THE ADDITION AND OMISSION OF PARTICLES

In their use of particles the MT and LXX of Isaiah display an abundance of differences. Sometimes these may be the outcome of a different Hebrew manuscript underlying the two documents, but in most cases they were probably inserted or left out by the translator himself. The present chapter will present a short overview of these variations in the employment of particles, with the purpose of giving an impression of when and for what reasons the Isaiah translator has added or omitted these words.

#### 4.1 The copulative conjunctions καί and ו

Especially in the appearance of the copulative conjunctions καί and ו a large diversity exists between the two versions. As the Hebrew ו is a letter that was liable to be skipped over by scribes or translators, or to be confused with the ׀, the reason for the occasional absence of an equivalent conjunction in the Greek may regularly have been a different *Vorlage* or a translational mistake. Similarly, the erroneous reading of a conjunctive ו may explain a considerable number of the pluses in LXX Isaiah consisting of καί, γάρ and δέ. Nonetheless, differences in the occurrence of καί/ו will often be due to the deliberate intervention of the translator as well. Many of the omissions of ו can be explained by the choice made by the translator—for stylistic reasons or for the sake of a correct use of the Greek—not to represent this abundantly used Hebrew conjunction.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> To achieve a correct use of the Greek the translator may for instance have omitted the ו in an apodosis (see e.g. Isa 8:21; 22:20; 23:15; and 65:24); compare Anneli Aejmelaeus, “The Significance of Clause Connectors in the Syntactical and Translation-Technical Study of the Septuagint,” in *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies. Jerusalem 1986* (ed. Claude E. Cox; SCS 23; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1987), 368–69.

To these few remarks my discussion of the copulative conjunction in LXX Isaiah has to be restricted, as however much this subject is worth investigating, an extensive analysis would require even more time and room than are available to me.

## 4.2 Particles forming a plus

### 4.2.1 Conjunctive particles

Conjunctive particles (such as *καί*, *γάρ*, *δέ* and *ἀλλά*) fairly often appear as pluses in LXX Isaiah. This can be clarified by the discrepancy that Hebrew and Greek show in their application of conjunctions. Whereas “Hebrew possesses very few clause connectors and is most sparing in the employment of connectives other than ו ‘and’ ... Greek, on the other hand, has plenty of connectives and an ideal which is the direct opposite to parataxis, the ideal of composing well-organized periods of subordinate clauses and main clauses.”<sup>2</sup> Consequently, in order to produce a stylistically adequate Greek text, the Isaiah translator may have felt obliged to now and then add conjunctive particles to his text.

#### a. *γάρ*

In LXX Isaiah *γάρ* has been employed very frequently,<sup>3</sup> mostly as a representation of ו and occasionally of ו (see 3:7; 10:1, 24; 28:7; 29:2; 30:3; 31:9; 32:7; 34:12; 37:24, etc.). The conjunction appears as a plus approximately eighty times: In 1:12, 15, 24, 27; 2:11, 20; 5:9, 11, 12; 6:10; 7:4<sup>4</sup>, 25; 8:1, 9, 12, 20; 9:3(4), 5(6), 20(21); 10:11, 22, 28, 33; 13:9, 15; 15:2, 5, 6; 16:7, 8, 10; 17:3; 18:2; 19:14; 20:5; 23:10; 24:20; 26:10; 28:8; 29:1, 6; 32:1; 33:2, 7, 8, 24; 34:12; 35:10; 37:18; 38:13, 14, 16, 19; 40:20, 24, 27; 41:11, 12, 17, 26, 29<sup>5</sup>; 42:22; 44:22; 47:10; 49:20; 51:14, 17; 54:1, 10; 55:12; 59:6, 8, 21; 60:20; 62:7, 11; 64:4(5); and 65:16. In some of those verses the translator (whether or not mistakenly) may have read a ו (or ו) in his Hebrew manuscript; in others he may have added *γάρ* on purpose. The latter could be true particularly when the Hebrew offers a cause or an explanation of something stated in the preceding text, while this cause has not been introduced by means of a conjunction. By

<sup>2</sup> Aejmelaeus, “Significance of Clause Connectors,” 364–65. See also J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1934), xliii.

<sup>3</sup> The unusually high frequency of the occurrence of *γάρ* in LXX Isaiah has been pointed out by Troxel (*LXX-Isaiah as Translation*, 92). Only in the Greek Proverbs has the conjunction a relatively higher rate of appearance.

<sup>4</sup> In line with the LXX, 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> offers ו as a plus; see section 12.3.1.1.

<sup>5</sup> Perhaps *γάρ* translates ו; see section 5.8.2b.

supplying γάρ the translator may have intended to make the causal relationship more explicit. See for instance:<sup>6</sup>

1:15

ὅταν τὰς χεῖρας ἐκτείνῃτε πρὸς με,  
ἀποστρέψω τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς μου ἀφ' ὑμῶν,  
καὶ ἐὰν πληθύνῃτε τὴν δέησιν,  
οὐκ εἰσακούσομαι ὑμῶν·  
αἱ γὰρ χεῖρες ὑμῶν αἵματος πλήρεις.

When you stretch out your hands to me  
I will turn away my eyes from you;  
even if you make many petitions,  
I will not listen to you,  
**for** your hands are full of blood.

5:11

οὐαὶ οἱ ἐγειρόμενοι τὸ πρωὶ  
καὶ τὸ σικερα διώκοντες,  
οἱ μένοντες τὸ ὀψέ·  
ὁ γὰρ οἶνος αὐτοὺς συγκαύσει.

Woe to those who rise early  
and pursue the sikera,  
who linger till evening  
**for** wine will inflame them.

Le Moigne notes that in LXX Isaiah γάρ is often used after a volitive mood (such as an imperative) with the aim of justifying the command, especially after verbs denoting “(not) to fear” or “(not) to rejoice.”<sup>7</sup> Among the *extra* occurrences of γάρ, this is the case in 2:11; 7:4; 8:1, 9; 10:11; 15:2; and 26:10, and also in 1:24; 5:11; 18:2; and 29:1 where γάρ comes after οὐαί, and in 33:2 where it follows a prayer.<sup>8</sup> Related to this is the addition of γάρ to the interjection ἰδοὺ in 10:33; 13:9; and 32:1. γάρ further regularly appears in the context of predictions, in order to rationalise or explain them (see the pluses in 7:25; 10:22, 28; 24:20; and 33:7–8).<sup>9</sup>

A large number of the possible insertions of γάρ in LXX Isaiah are connected to variant translations, such as a distinct interpretation of the text, a different sentence division, or a rearrangement of the Hebrew: see 1:12, 24; 5:9, 12; 6:10; 7:4, 25; 8:1, 9, 12, 20; 9:3(4), 5(6); 10:22; 15:5; 16:8, 10; 17:3; 18:2; 20:5; 23:10; 24:20; 26:10; 28:8; 29:1, 6; 33:7, 24; 35:10; 38:14, 16, 19; 41:17; 51:14, 17; 54:1, 10; 62:7; and 65:16.

<sup>6</sup> Apart from a causal or explanatory force, Denniston mentions several other—less common—functions of γάρ, e.g. an anticipatory function (the γάρ clause preceding rather than following the clause which it explains), and γάρ introducing a supporting reply to a statement of another speaker, in the sense of “Yes, for” or “No, for” (see Denniston, *Greek Particles*, 58–95).

<sup>7</sup> Le Moigne, “Livre d’Ésaïe,” 232–68.

<sup>8</sup> See also 10:1, 24 and 30:2, where after a volitive mood ἵ is rendered γάρ.

<sup>9</sup> Other regular usages of γάρ in LXX Isaiah are according to Le Moigne e.g. γάρ following on a rhetorical question as an explanation of the expected answer (see the pluses in 5:9 and 15:7); γάρ introducing repeated words (see the pluses in 1:27; 9:20[21]; 16:8; 19:14; 26:10; and 28:8); and γάρ preceding an idea that is repeated in a different wording (see the pluses in 15:6; 16:7, 10; and 20:5) (Le Moigne, “Livre d’Ésaïe,” 271–72, 289–95, 302–5).

In 1:12, for instance, the apparent addition of γάρ is a consequence of the translator's divergent interpretation of the sentence division. Whereas in the MT זאת in verse 12 anticipates רמס חצרי, the LXX translator has understood the demonstrative (rendered by ταῦτα) to refer back to the offerings that are mentioned earlier in the same verse. The words מידכם זאת מיבקש he has apparently regarded as a complete clause, telling *why* God does not want Israel's offerings (the succeeding phrase רמס חצרי he considered as the object of לא תוסיפו—which in the MT belongs to the next sentence). To expose the relationship that he supposed to exist between these clauses, he supplied the conjunction γάρ:

1:11–13

MT:	שבעתי עלות אילים וחלב מריאים ודם פרים וכבשים ועתודים לא חפצתי כי תבאו לראות פני מיבקש זאת מידכם רמס חצרי לא תוסיפו הביא מנחת־שוא	I have had enough of burnt offerings of rams and the fat of fed beasts; I do not delight in the blood of bulls, lambs or goats. When you come to appear before me, who requires <b>this</b> of you <b>to trample my courts</b> ? Bring no more vain offerings;
-----	---	---

LXX:

πλήρης εἰμι ὀλοκαυτωμάτων κριῶν καὶ στέαρ ἀρνῶν καὶ αἷμα ταύρων καὶ τράγων οὐ βούλομαι, οὐδ' ἐὰν ἐρχῇσθε ὀφθῆναι μοι. τίς γὰρ ἐξεζήτησε ταῦτα ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν ὑμῶν; πατεῖν τὴν αὐλήν μου οὐ προσθήσεσθε·	I am full of burnt offerings of rams; and the fat of lambs, the blood of bulls and goats I do not want, not even if you come to appear before me. <b>For</b> who asked <b>these things</b> from your hands? You shall trample my court no more!
---	--

The sentence division of the LXX is supported by compositional observations. If one reads the Hebrew text of 1:12–14 in the manner of the LXX, it comprises a series of four clauses, all in a similar way composed of a subject in *casus pendens*, followed by an estimation of this very subject:

רמס חצרי	the trampling of my courts—
לא תוסיפו	you will do no more;
הביא מנחת־שוא	the bringing of vain offerings—
קטרת תועבה היא לי	an abominable incense it is to me.
חדש ושבת קרא מקרא	New moon and sabbath, the calling of assemblies—
לא־אוכל	I cannot endure (them);
און ועצרה חדשים ומועדיכם	iniquity and solemn assembly, your new moons and your feasts
שנאה נפשי	my soul hates (them).

b. *ὅτι*

*ὅτι* is most commonly a rendering of כִּי, but now and again it represents ו (see 2:2; 9:19[20]; 15:4; 24:6; and 30:8). Almost forty times the conjunction is a plus in LXX Isaiah: In 9:20(21); 10:24; 20:4; 22:9, 10, 14; 23:13; 28:11; 30:7, 12; 33:14, 23; 37:24; 39:7; 41:24(?)<sup>10</sup>, 26; 44:12, 16, 20 (2x); 45:5, 11, 14; 47:14; 48:5 (2x), 7, 8; 50:8; 52:7; 56:3(?)<sup>11</sup>, 8, 10; 57:10; 59:4; 63:15; and 64:8(9). If it was not because a conjunction was already present in his *Vorlage*, then the translator may have inserted it for several other reasons:

- Like γάρ, *ὅτι* may have been added so as to make clear that something gives an explanation or motivation for what precedes it, and so is used in the sense of “because.”<sup>12</sup> See 9:20(21); 20:4; 23:13; 37:24; 41:24; 44:12; 45:5, 11, 14; 50:8; 59:4; and 64:8(9).
- *ὅτι* can serve to introduce object clauses, following verbs denoting a mental act, such as “to see,” “to know,” “to understand,” or “to say,” or verbs of emotion or fear, initiating the cause of this emotion. In Hebrew the conjunction כִּי is usually applied with such a substantival function. Where כִּי in the sense of “that” is missing, the Greek sometimes fills in *ὅτι*. See 33:14; 39:7; 44:16, 19, 20; 48:8;<sup>13</sup> and 56:10. See also 10:24:

Μὴ φοβοῦ, ὁ λαός μου  
οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐν Σιων, ἀπὸ Ἀσσυρίων,  
**ὅτι** ἐν ῥάβδῳ πατάξει σε·

Do not be afraid, O my people,  
who live in Sion, for the Assyrians,  
**that** he will beat you with a rod;

In 22:9–10 the addition of *ὅτι* has transformed two independent clauses into subordinate ones, still depending on the verb “to see” earlier in the text:

<sup>10</sup> Perhaps *ὅτι* translates כִּי; see section 5.8.2b.

<sup>11</sup> Perhaps *ὅτι* translates כִּי; see section 5.8.2b.

<sup>12</sup> As Aejmelaeus remarks, *ὅτι* and γάρ have different meaning nuances, in that *ὅτι* is a subordinate conjunction for “directly causal clauses expressing cause or reason,” while γάρ is a coordinative conjunction, used for “expressions of motivation or explanation which are somewhat more independent in relation to the main clause” (“indirectly causal”). Aejmelaeus considers it a peculiarity of Septuagintal texts translated from Hebrew that they comprise a high frequency of causal clauses introduced by *ὅτι*, also in places where one finds only an *indirectly* causal relation with the preceding sentence, on which grounds in secular Greek γάρ would have been employed. This LXX inclination towards *ὅτι* probably results from the translator’s preference for that conjunction above γάρ to render the Hebrew כִּי, for the reason that *ὅτι* can represent כִּי in both substantival and causal instances, and does not change the original word order (which γάρ does). See Anneli Aejmelaeus, “Οτι causale in Septuagintal Greek,” in *La Septuaginta en la investigación contemporánea (V Congreso de la IOSCS)* (ed. Natalio Fernández Marcos; Textos y estudios “Cardenal Cisneros” 34; Madrid: Instituto “Arias Montano,” 1985) esp. 122; and idem, “Significance of Clause Connectors,” 371. See also section 4.3.1 below.

<sup>13</sup> 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> likewise gives a conjunction here: בִּי אֵי יְדַעְתִּי בִּיָּא בְּגוֹד תִּבְגֹּד; see section 12.3.1.1.

καὶ εἶδον ὅτι πλείους εἰς  
καὶ **ὅτι** ἀπέστρεψαν τὸ ὕδωρ τῆς  
ἀρχαίας κολυμβήθρας εἰς τὴν πόλιν  
καὶ **ὅτι** καθεῖλον τοὺς οἴκους  
Ιερουσαλημ εἰς ὀχύρωμα τοῦ τείχους  
τῇ πόλει.

And they saw that there were rather many  
and **that** they had turned the water of the  
old pool into the city,  
and **that** they had demolished the houses  
of Ierousalem to fortify the wall  
for the city.

- The Greek particle has been supplemented to signal the beginning of direct speech in 2:2;<sup>14</sup> 30:7; 41:26(?); 44:20; 48:5 (2x), 7; and 56:3, 8. Operating in such a way it is called ὅτι *recitativum*, which is a genuine Greek phenomenon.<sup>15</sup>
- The addition of ὅτι is connected to a variant translation of the Hebrew in 22:9–10; 28:11; 30:12; 33:14, 23; 41:24; 44:16, 20; 47:14; 52:7; 56:10; 57:10; and 63:15.

### c. δέ

Even though δέ usually corresponds to *et*, it occurs as a plus nearly forty times: In LXX Isa 1:3, 18, 25; 2:11; 4:2; 8:14; 14:10, 11; 16:2; 17:11; 19:16; 23:5, 11; 24:14; 26:14; 27:3; 31:9; 35:8; 37:26; 38:1; 39:6; 40:23; 41:25; 42:17; 43:26; 47:6, 15; 49:21;<sup>16</sup> 54:17 (as part of a larger plus); 55:13; 59:3, 7; 64:7(8); 65:23; and 66:3 (2x), 9.

In most cases—if not the result of a different *Vorlage* or a translational mistake—δέ has been added so as to make explicit the relation of one sentence to the previous one. This relation is often adversative, δέ functioning to signal an opposition.<sup>17</sup> Besides, with regularity it is utilised in a continuative way, in order to express the continuation of a thought.<sup>18</sup> A third function of δέ is to connect two synonymous clauses.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>14</sup> הָיָה becomes "Ὅτι ἔσται in the LXX.

<sup>15</sup> See Anneli Aejmelaeus, "Ὅτι recitativum in Septuagintal Greek," in *Studien zur Septuaginta. Robert Hanhart zu Ehren. Aus Anlaß seines 65. Geburtstages*. (ed. Detlef Fraenkel, Udo Quast, and John W. Wevers; AAWG 190, MSU 20; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990), 74–82. According to Aejmelaeus the use of ὅτι *recitativum* is not uncommon (albeit relatively unfrequent) in the LXX. It relatively more often takes place in the freer translations. Its occurrence reaches the highest frequency in the LXX of Genesis (eighteen cases, of which seven concern additions), after which follows LXX Isaiah (eight cases, of which seven were added).

<sup>16</sup> Perhaps δέ translates הָיָה: see section 5.8.2b.

<sup>17</sup> Denniston notes that whereas ἀλλά is a strong adversative, eliminating the opposed idea, δέ balances two opposing ideas (Denniston, *Greek Particles*, 165).

<sup>18</sup> Denniston, *Greek Particles*, 162–68; LSJ 371; Le Moigne, "Livre d'Ésaïe," 307.

<sup>19</sup> Le Moigne, "Livre d'Ésaïe," 368–75.

One example of the probable insertion of *δέ* with the purpose of highlighting a contrast is afforded by 1:3:

1:3

ἔγνω βοῦς τὸν κτησάμενον  
καὶ ὄνος τὴν φάτνην τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοῦ·  
Ἰσραὴλ **δέ** με οὐκ ἔγνω,  
καὶ ὁ λαὸς με οὐ συνῆκεν.

The ox knows its owner  
and the donkey its master's crib  
**but** Israel has not known me  
and the people have not understood me.

An example of an additional *δέ* expressing continuation can be found in 39:6–7:

39:6–7

Ἴδού ἡμέραι ἔρχονται, λέγει κύριος,  
καὶ λήμψονται πάντα τὰ  
ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ σου,  
καὶ ὅσα συνήγαγον οἱ πατέρες σου  
ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης,  
εἰς Βαβυλῶνα ἕξει,  
καὶ οὐδὲν οὐ μὴ καταλίπωσιν·  
εἶπε **δέ** ὁ θεὸς ὅτι  
καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν τέκνων σου,  
ὧν ἐγέννησας, λήμψονται

Look, days are coming, says the Lord,  
when they will take all the things  
in your house;  
and whatever your ancestors have collected—  
up until this day—  
shall go to Babylon,  
and they shall leave nothing behind.  
God has **further** said  
that some of your children,  
whom you have begotten, they shall take too.

Instances illustrating the supposed addition of *δέ* in order to connect two synonymous or parallel clauses can be found in 14:10; 40:23; 54:17; 59:3, 7; and 66:3, as well as in 55:13:

καὶ ἀντὶ τῆς στοιβῆς  
ἀναβήσεται κυπάρισσος,  
ἀντὶ **δέ** τῆς κονύζης  
ἀναβήσεται μυρσίνη·

And instead of a brier  
shall come up a cypress;  
**and** instead of the nettle,  
shall come up a myrtle.

The addition of *δέ* is related to a variant translation in LXX Isa 1:25; 2:11; 8:14; 16:2; 23:11; 24:14; 27:3; 31:9; 35:8; 39:6; 43:26; 54:17; and 65:23.

*d. ἀλλά*

*ἀλλά* in Greek answers to the purpose of indicating a contrast or limitation, mostly in a strong way, eliminating the opposing idea.<sup>20</sup> In LXX Isaiah *ἀλλά* is generally the counterpart to ו or וְ, yet appears as a plus in 7:17; 9:9(10) (*ἀλλὰ*

<sup>20</sup> Denniston, *Greek Particles*, 1.

δεῦτε); 10:16; 30:6 (as part of a larger plus), 10; 37:34; 39:4; 41:18; 42:3; 45:18; 48:6; 53:3; 58:6; and 63:16. These pluses may either go back to a deviating *Vorlage*, or are additions by the translator himself. In the latter case they have been inserted principally after a negation to stress the contrast with what will follow.<sup>21</sup> See, for instance, 45:18:

45:18	οὐκ εἰς κενὸν ἐποίησεν αὐτήν <u>ἀλλὰ</u> κατοικεῖσθαι	he did not make it to be empty <u>but</u> to be inhabited.
-------	--	---

In 10:16; 39:4; and 58:6 the presence of ἀλλά is bound to a variant translation of the LXX.<sup>22</sup>

#### 4.2.2 Particles of comparison

In several situations particles of comparison have been interpolated:

- (a) The Isaiah translator from time to time has turned metaphors into similes by supplying a comparative particle ὥς or ὥσεί. In 44:4 and 50:9 he has done this in assimilation to the subsequent, or respectively earlier (part of the) clause, which contains a particle of comparison as well:<sup>23</sup>

37:27	היו עשב שדה וירק דשא חציר גגות ושדמה לפני קמה	καὶ ἐγένοντο ὥς χόρτος ξηρὸς ἐπὶ δωμάτων καὶ ὥς ἄγρωστις.
44:4	וצמחו בבין חציר בערבים על-יבלי-מים	καὶ ἀνατελοῦσιν ὥσει χόρτος ἀνὰ μέσον ὕδατος καὶ ὥς ἰτέα ἐπὶ παραρρέον ὕδωρ.
50:3	אלביש שמים קדרות ושק אשים כסותם	καὶ ἐνδύσω τὸν οὐρανὸν σκότος καὶ θήσω ὥς σάκκον τὸ περιβόλαιον αὐτοῦ.
50:9	הן כלם כבגד יבלו עש יאכלם	ἰδοὺ πάντες ὑμεῖς ὥς ἱμάτιον παλαιωθήσεσθε, καὶ ὥς σῆς καταφάγεται ὑμᾶς.
52:6–7	מה-נאוו על-ההרים רגלי מבשר משמיע שלום מבשר	πάρειμι ὥς ὥρα ἐπὶ τῶν ὀρέων, ὥς πόδες εὐαγγελιζομένου ἀκοὴν εἰρήνης, ὥς

<sup>21</sup> Le Moigne, “Livre d’Ésaïe,” 393–97. Occasionally, the content of the negative sentence which ἀλλά follows is synonymous to that of the succeeding positive sentence (see Le Moigne, “Livre d’Ésaïe,” 398–420): see the pluses in 30:6 and 53:3. In 9:9(10) ἀλλά accompanies a volitive mood: ἀλλὰ δεῦτε λαξεύσωμεν λίθους. According to Le Moigne this is a very classical employment of the conjunction (Le Moigne, “Livre d’Ésaïe,” 385–86).

<sup>22</sup> Troxel notes that the frequency of ἀλλά in LXX Isaiah is among the highest in the books of the LXX. Of its fifty-five occurrences only thirteen correspond to כִּי in the Hebrew. He infers from this that “the translator was interested in marking strong disjunction for his readers” (Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation*, 92).

<sup>23</sup> For the LXX Isaiah tendency to interpret metaphors, see Arie van der Kooij, “The Interpretation of Metaphorical Language. A Characteristic of LXX-Isaiah,” in: *Jerusalem, Alexandria, Rome. Studies in Ancient Cultural Interaction in Honour of A. Hilhorst* (ed. Florentino García Martínez and Gerard P. Luttikhuisen; JSJSup 82; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 179–85.



	טוב משמיע	εὐαγγελιζόμενος ἀγαθά, ὅτι ἀκουστήν
	ישועה	ποιήσω τὴν σωτηρίαν σου
66:3	שוחט השור מכה־איש	ὁ δὲ ἄνομος ὁ θύων μοι μόσχον
	זובח השׁה ערף כלב	<u>ὥς</u> ὁ ἀποκτείνων κύνא,
	מעלה מנחה דם־חזיר	ὁ δὲ ἀναφέρων σεμίδαλιν <u>ὥς</u> αἷμα ὕειον,
	מזכיר לבנה מברך און	ὁ διδοὺς λίβανον εἰς μνημόσυνον <u>ὥς</u> βλάσφημος.

Also compare 55:8:

לא מחשבותי כי	οὐ γάρ εἰσιν αἱ βουλαί μου
מחשבותיכם	<u>ὥσπερ</u> αἱ βουλαί ὑμῶν
ולא דרכיכם דרכי	οὐδὲ <u>ὥσπερ</u> αἱ ὁδοί ὑμῶν αἱ ὁδοί μου

(b) In various places the translator has created a simile where the Hebrew gives neither a simile nor a metaphor (in 5:29; 16:11; 27:10[9]; and 30:22 he has thus harmonised the clause to the previous one):<sup>24</sup>

4:5	וברא יהוה על כל־מכון	καὶ ἤξει, καὶ ἔσται πᾶς τόπος τοῦ
	הר־ציון ועל־מקראה	ὄρους Σιων καὶ πάντα τὰ περικύκλῳ αὐτῆς
	ענן יומם ועשן	σκιάζει νεφέλῃ ἡμέρας καὶ <u>ὥς</u> καπνοῦ
	ונגה אש להבה לילה	καὶ <u>ὥς</u> φωτὸς πυρὸς καιομένου νυκτός.
5:29	שגגה לו כלביא	ὁρμῶσιν <u>ὥς</u> λέοντες
	ושאג בכפירים	καὶ παρέστηκαν <u>ὥς</u> σκύμνος λέοντος.
	וינהם ויאחו טרף	καὶ ἐπιλήμψεται καὶ βοήσῃ <u>ὥς</u> θηρίου
10:17	ואכלה שיתו ושמירו ביום אחד	καὶ φάγεται <u>ὥσπερ</u> χόρτον τὴν ὕλην
16:1	שלחו־כר משל־ארץ	Ἀποστελῶ <u>ὥς</u> ἐρπετὰ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν. <sup>25</sup>
16:11	על־כן מעי למואב	διὰ τοῦτο ἡ κοιλία μου ἐπὶ Μωαβ
	ככנור יהמו וקרבי	<u>ὥς</u> κιθάρα ἡχῇ, καὶ τὰ ἐντός μου
	לקיר חרש	<u>ὥσπερ</u> τεῖχος, ὃ ἐνεκαίνισας. <sup>26</sup>
17:11	וכאב	καὶ <u>ὥς</u> πατὴρ ἀνθρώπου κληρώσῃ
	אנוש	τοῖς υἱοῖς σου. <sup>27</sup>
23:3	קציר יאור תבואתה	<u>ὥς</u> ἀμητοῦ εἰσφερομένου
	ותהי סחר גוים	οἱ μεταβόλοι τῶν ἐθνῶν.
27:10(9)	כי עיר בצורה בדד	<u>ὥσπερ</u> δρυμὸς μακράν. <sup>28</sup>

<sup>24</sup> Compare Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 100–103.

<sup>25</sup> The translator has read the clause with a different word division: שלחו כרמש לארץ—“Send something like a snake to the country.” Compare Fischer, *In welcher Schrift*, 30; Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 101.

<sup>26</sup> לקיר חרש—“for Kir-heres”—is translated as if it were חדש בקיר—“like a new wall.”

<sup>27</sup> The translator has read וכאב (MT וְכָאֵב—“and pain”) as כְּאָב—“and like a father”; compare Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 95.

<sup>28</sup> כי עיר has been read as if it were כיער; see Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 101.

30:22	תזרם כמו דוה צא תאמר לו	καὶ λιχμήσεις ὥς ὕδωρ ἀποκαθιμένης καὶ ὥς κόπρον ὥσεις αὐτά. <sup>29</sup>
-------	----------------------------	---

However, there are also some instances in which a simile has been removed:

13:6	בשד משדי יבוא	καὶ συντριβὴ παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ἔξει
33:9	היה השרון בערבה	ἔλη ἐγένετο ὁ Σαρων.
57:20	והרשעים בים נגרש כי השקט לא יוכל	οἱ δὲ ἄδικοι οὕτως κλυδωνισθήσονται καὶ ἀναπαύσασθαι οὐ δυνήσονται.

(c) Now and then, when in (what was considered) the apodosis of a comparative clause the Hebrew lacks the particle כִּן, the Greek has complemented it with οὕτως:

17:12	כהמות ימים יהמיון	ὥς θάλασσα κυμαίνουσα οὕτως ταραχθήσεσθε
33:1	כנלתך לבגד יבגדוך	καὶ ὥς σῆς ἐπὶ ἱματίου οὕτως ἡττηθήσονται. <sup>30</sup>
33:4	כמשק גבים שוקק בו	δν τρόπον ἐάν τις συναγάγη ἀκρίδας, οὕτως ἐμπαίξουσιν ὑμῖν.
38:14	כסוס עגור כן אצפצף אהגה כיונה	ὥς χελιδών, οὕτως φωνήσω, καὶ ὥς περιστερὰ, οὕτως μελετήσω.
41:25	ויבא סגנים כמו־חמר וכמו יוצר ירמס־טיט	καὶ ὥς πηλὸς κεραμέως καὶ ὥς κεραμεὺς καταπατῶν τὸν πηλόν, οὕτως καταπατηθήσεσθε. <sup>31</sup>
53:7	כשה לטבח יובל וכרחל לפני גזויה נאלמה ולא יפתח פיו	ὥς πρόβατον ἐπὶ σφαγὴν ἤχθη καὶ ὥς ἄμνός ἐναντίον τοῦ κείροντος αὐτόν ἄφωνος οὕτως οὐκ ἀνοίγει τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ.

(d) In 55:9 the MT lacks a particle introducing the comparative clause (maybe due to haplography). Nevertheless, the LXX does use ὥς here:<sup>32</sup>

55:9	כי־גבהו שמים מארץ כן גבהו דרכי מדרכיכם	ἀλλ' ὥς ἀπέχει ὁ οὐρανὸς ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς, οὕτως ἀπέχει ἡ ὁδὸς μου ἀπὸ τῶν ὁδῶν ὑμῶν
------	---	--

<sup>29</sup> The Greek insinuates a Hebrew text כצואה תסיר; see Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 102.

<sup>30</sup> כנלתך probably ought to be read as ככלתך—“when you have ceased.” The translator seems to have rendered it by ὥς σῆς—“like a moth,” while interpreting the infinitive לבגד (“to destroy”) as a noun phrase על בגד (“on a garment”). In doing this he was probably influenced by 50:9. See Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 102–3.

<sup>31</sup> In the MT ירמס־טיט belongs to the protasis of the comparison (“as the potter treads clay”). In the LXX it is used to form both the protasis (ὥς κεραμεὺς καταπατῶν τὸν πηλόν) and the apodosis (οὕτως καταπατηθήσεσθε) (see section 6.6.2).

<sup>32</sup> 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> supports the LXX: כִּי־אֵל גְּבוּהָ שָׁמַיִם מֵאֶרֶץ כֵּן גְּבוּהוּ דַרְכֵי מִדְרָכֶיכֶם; see section 12.3.1.1.

In 62:5 the particles introducing the apodosis as well as the protasis seem to be missing in the Hebrew. In the LXX both are present, however:

62:5	כִּי־יִבְעַל בַּחֹר בַּתּוֹלָה	καὶ ὥς συνοικῶν νεανίσκος παρθένῳ,
	יִבְעֹלֹךְ בִּנְיָן	οὕτως κατοικήσουσιν οἱ υἱοί σου μετὰ σοῦ.
	וּמִשׁוֹשׁ חֶתֶן	καὶ ἔσται <u>δὲν τρόπον</u> εὐφρανθήσεται νυμφίος
	עַל־כִּלְכֵּל יִשִּׁישׁ עֲלֶיךָ אֱלֹהֶיךָ	ἐπὶ νύμφῃ, <u>οὕτως</u> εὐφρανθήσεται κύριος ἐπὶ σοί.

### 4.2.3 Other particles

#### a. νῦν

In classical and Hellenistic Greek νῦν can, in addition to its primary temporal sense, also be used as a particle of emphasis. In the latter function it frequently appears in combination with a conjunction, serving as a connective (καὶ νῦν; νῦν οὖν; διότι νῦν) or as an antithetic particle (νῦν δέ; ἀλλὰ νῦν; οὐδὲ νῦν).<sup>33</sup> In the Isaiah translation these compound forms usually render ועתה,<sup>34</sup> an expression which in Hebrew has the purpose of introducing a new thought or a new section of the text. At times it happens that while the MT provides a mere conjunction, the translator appears to have attached νῦν to it. Also the whole combination of νῦν plus a conjunction now and then turns up as a plus in the Greek. Most of these instances probably concern intentional additions on the part of the translator in order to articulate a specific relation towards the preceding part of the text (for instance an antithesis, as in 14:15 and 47:9, or a consequence, as in 3:8), to stress a command (see 2:5, 10),<sup>35</sup> or—when preceding questions—to provide these with more force (see 40:25, 28; 51:13). In some cases of νῦν accompanying a conjunction, νῦν may have preserved its temporal meaning, however (see 3:8, 13 and 33:4).<sup>36</sup>

καὶ νῦν	MT = (–) : 2:5, 10; 40:28; MT = 7א: 26:11; MT = 1: 51:13.
νῦν δέ	MT = 7א: 14:15; MT = 1: 33:4; 37:28; 47:9.
ἀλλὰ νῦν	MT = (–) : 3:13.

<sup>33</sup> LSJ 1185; Timothy Friberg, Barbara Friberg, and Neva F. Miller, eds. *Analytical Lexicon of the Greek New Testament*, cited from Bibloi 8.00, 2004.

<sup>34</sup> See 1:21; 5:3, 5; 16:14; 36:10; 43:1; 44:1; 48:16; 47:8; 49:5; 52:5; and 64:7(8).

<sup>35</sup> Van der Kooij notes about the plus καὶ νῦν in LXX Isa 2:5 and 10 that this expression “evokes the idea that a critical moment of time has arrived.” See Arie van der Kooij, “The Septuagint of Isaiah and the Hebrew Text of Isaiah 2:22 and 36:7,” in *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, and the Septuagint Presented to Eugene Ulrich* (ed. Peter W. Flint, Emanuel Tov, and James C. VanderKam; VTSup 101; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 381.

<sup>36</sup> According to Le Moigne νῦν has preserved its independent temporal meaning—marking the transition of past to present—in all of the occurrences of νῦν δέ in LXX Isaiah. Hence, he thinks νῦν δέ in LXX Isaiah not to be a combination, but a *collocation* of words (Le Moigne, “Livre d’Ésaïe,” 315–16; 328).

διότι νῦν	MT = (–) : 3:8.
νῦν οὖν	MT = ι: 40:25. <sup>37</sup>
οὐδὲ νῦν	MT = (–) : 48:19.

Also without a conjunction νῦν can be found in LXX Isaiah where an equivalent is missing in the MT: see 18:2; 21:2; 33:11 (2x); 51:3; and 58:2.<sup>38</sup> In all of these verses the word bears its primary meaning as an adverb of time.

For τοίνυν as a plus, see LXX Isa 33:23.<sup>39</sup>

### b. τότε

When τότε in LXX Isaiah occurs as an adverb of time meaning “then, when that time comes,” it mostly reproduces יא (or—in case of 30:23—י). In 8:16; 41:1;<sup>40</sup> and 65:25 τότε with that same connotation can be found as a plus. Also when the adverb appears in apodosis, introducing a conditional clause (“when/if ..., then...”) it occasionally mirrors יא (although the Hebrew mostly gives י or no conjunction at all in such places); in that function τότε has been added in 30:15, where the Hebrew has a different syntax, however.<sup>41</sup> Referring to a point in the past (German “damals”) τότε is a plus in 44:8.

### c. δῆ

The LXX of Isaiah comprises six occurrences of the intensive particle δῆ, of which two are a plus. Both pluses—in 22:17 and 33:7—form part of the expression ἰδοὺ δῆ (the MT offers הנה and הן, respectively). Elsewhere in the Greek Isaiah ἰδοὺ δῆ is attested only in 3:1, translating בי הנה.<sup>42</sup> The addition of δῆ in 22:17 may have been performed in analogy to that verse, as it has a somewhat similar wording:<sup>43</sup>

- 3:1 **Ἰδοὺ δῆ** ὁ δεσπότης κύριος σαβαωθ ἀφελεῖ ἀπὸ τῆς Ιουδαίας  
καὶ ἀπὸ Ιερουσαλημ ἰσχύοντα καὶ ἰσχύουσιν  
22:17 **ἰδοὺ δῆ** κύριος σαβαωθ ἐκβαλεῖ καὶ ἐκτρίψει ἄνδρα

<sup>37</sup> See 30:8 where the MT offers הנה, while the LXX has νῦν οὖν. For an inquiry into νῦν οὖν in LXX Isaiah, see Le Moigne, “Livre d’Ésaïe,” 221–28. Le Moigne points out that the function of νῦν οὖν is to mark the continuation of an account, which is influenced by what has been said earlier in the text.

<sup>38</sup> See also 43:22 οὐ νῦν ἐκάλεσά σε, Ιακωβ / יעקב יקראתי וְלֹא-אֲנִי (νῦν probably comes from הנה < יא).

<sup>39</sup> For a discussion on this plus, see Le Moigne, “Livre d’Ésaïe,” 203–6.

<sup>40</sup> It may be that in this verse τότε represents יא, which appears in the preceding clause. Yet, there the Hebrew adverb seems already to have been translated as καὶ.

<sup>41</sup> For examples of י in apodosis becoming τότε, see 28:25 and 58:10.

<sup>42</sup> For a more extensive analysis of the use of δῆ in LXX Isaiah, see Le Moigne, “Livre d’Ésaïe,” 207–19.

<sup>43</sup> See Le Moigne, “Livre d’Ésaïe,” 217.

### 4.3 Particles forming a minus

#### 4.3.1 כִּי

Apart from ו, the only Hebrew conjunction for which a counterpart frequently is missing in LXX Isaiah is כִּי. This pertains to approximately forty cases: 7:22; 15:1, 5, 6; 16:8; 18:5; 21:15; 24:13; 28:10, 11, 19, 21; 29:20; 30:15, 16 (לֹא-כִּי); 31:1; 32:10, 14; 33:5, 22; 34:5; 36:16; 47:5; 48:2; 49:19, 25; 52:1, 4; 54:6 (2x), 9, 10; 56:4; 57:15, 16; 60:2, 9 (2x); 62:4;<sup>44</sup> and 65:16.

כִּי has a large range of usage in Hebrew. If used as a conjunction, it can denote “because,” “for,” “that,” and “when,” or—after a negative statement—“but rather.” Besides, the lexeme occurs as a demonstrative or emphatic particle in the sense of “indeed,” “surely,” opening a statement with emphasis. Finally, כִּי sometimes introduces the direct narration, turning into a “כִּי recitativum.”<sup>45</sup> There are also cases in which it is unclear which of these various connotations כִּי conveys. The multi-functionality and resulting ambiguity of כִּי may partly explain its many omissions in the translation of Isaiah. Maybe the translator was not always sure about the specific meaning of כִּי in a certain context, and hence tended to discard it altogether. Especially when כִּי is employed in the sense of “indeed,” he often seems to have left it out, perhaps because that connotation was difficult to reflect in Greek. Also כִּי following a negative statement (“but rather”; see 30:16) may have caused him trouble. In places where the conjunction is applied in such a way many errors appear throughout the entire LXX.<sup>46</sup>

Among the instances of כִּי being a minus eight occur in expressions starting with כִּי כֹה אָמַר (see 8:11; 30:15; 36:16; 45:18; 49:25; 52:4; 56:4; and 57:15).<sup>47</sup> Starting with כִּי this formula is found fourteen times in MT Isaiah, in addition to almost thirty times without כִּי and six times where it begins with לִכֵּן.<sup>48</sup> LXX Isaiah’s frequent lack of representation of כִּי in the translation of this expression might be a matter of assimilation. The translator may have wanted to adjust the formula to its most common appearance, which is without כִּי. But usually the

<sup>44</sup> In 62:4 the entire sentence that starts with כִּי is absent in the Greek.

<sup>45</sup> BDB 471–72; Aejmelaeus, “Οτι recitativum,” 74–78; HALOT 1:470–71. Two possible cases of כִּי recitativum in MT Isaiah which Aejmelaeus mentions can be found in 14:32 and 39:8 (see “Οτι recitativum,” 78).

<sup>46</sup> Aejmelaeus, “Significance of Clause Connectors,” 373.

<sup>47</sup> In 4QIsa<sup>f</sup> 8:11 כִּי is a minus as well. See section 12.3.2.2.

<sup>48</sup> Starting with כִּי: 8:11; 18:4; 21:6, 16; 30:15; 31:4; 36:16; 45:18; 49:25; 52:3, 4; 56:4; 57:15; 66:12. Without כִּי: 7:7; 22:15; 36:4, 14; 37:3, 6, 21; 38:1, 5; 42:5; 43:1, 14, 16; 44:2, 6, 24; 45:1, 11, 14; 48:17; 49:7, 8, 22; 50:1; 51:22; 56:1; 65:8; 66:1. Starting with לִכֵּן: 10:24; 28:16; 29:22; 30:12; 37:33; 65:13.

explanation can also be found in contextual harmonisation, in that the text contains a similar formula close at hand that is not introduced by **כִּי** either.<sup>49</sup>

Despite the many cases in which **כִּי** is not represented, in the majority of its occurrences it does however have a Greek parallel. This generally consists of **ὅτι**—nearly always when **כִּי** introduces a subordinate object clause (“that”), but also often when it has a causal meaning.<sup>50</sup> Twice **כִּי** matches **ὅτι** in the Greek (3:1 and 39:8), where the translator probably intended to reflect the emphatic function of the Hebrew word. Additionally, **כִּי** has been rendered a few times by **ἐάν** (1:15; 8:19; 10:8, 22; 28:15, 18; 43:2; 58:7); **γάρ** (10:25; 37:19; 57:16), **καί** (14:1; 32:13; 54:14), **ἀλλά** (10:7; 49:10), **διότι** (7:16; 30:19), **ἕως** (55:10), and **μή** (36:19).

#### 4.3.2 **אֲנִי**

For the non-translation of **אֲנִי** in LXX Isaiah, see section 5.8.3.

#### 4.3.3 **כִּי**

Like **כִּי**, **אֲנִי** also may have confused the translator on account of the multiple purposes that this particle has: **אֲנִי** can serve as an emphasising “surely,” but it can also be utilised in a restrictive sense as “only,” as well as antithetically in the meaning of “however,” “but.”<sup>51</sup> This complexity may have triggered the omission of the word in three places: Isa 34:14, 15; and 45:24. In its other occurrences, **אֲנִי** is represented by **ὅτι** (14:15); **καί** (19:11); **ἀλλά** (43:24); and **ὅτι** (45:14), and also twice by means of a rhetorical question introduced by **μή** (36:5) or **οὐχ** (63:8), and once by a negation **οὐκ** (16:7).

#### 4.3.4 **אֲנִי**

**אֲנִי** (“also”) in among half of its thirty-one attestations in Isaiah is rendered by **καί** or **οὐδέ/οὔτε** in the LXX. In the nine cases where the Hebrew gives **אֲנִי**, the LXX generally offers a mere **καί** (see 5:2; 7:20; 21:12; 30:5; 31:2; 45:16; and 66:21). Probably this was because the translator could not think of a synonym that he could add to **καί**. In 28:7 **אֲנִי** is rendered by **γάρ**, and in 40:24 an equivalent is entirely absent in the translation. **אֲנִי** is left out in another four instances where it is not preceded by **ו**: see 7:13; 26:12; 47:3; and 49:25.

<sup>49</sup> In 36:16 the omission of **כִּי** has most likely been carried out in assimilation to verse 14; in 49:25 to 49:5, 7, 8, 22; in 52:4 to 52:5; in 56:4 to 56:1, 8; and in 57:15 to 57:19, 21.

<sup>50</sup> On the rendering of **כִּי** by **ὅτι**, see section 4.2.1b above.

<sup>51</sup> *HALOT* 1:45.

#### 4.4 Conclusion

Although the present chapter could not go into great detail in discussing LXX Isaiah's pluses and minuses consisting of particles, still, it has however attempted to shed some light upon the way in which the translator has dealt with these small words. One impression given, is that he has much more often *inserted* particles than omitted them. This has probably to do with the fact that the Hebrew language displays a smaller variety and a lower frequency in its use of particles—especially connective ones—than the Greek does.<sup>52</sup> As a consequence, the translator may, for the sake of a proper and clear use of the Greek language, from time to time have felt himself called upon to add particles, thus clarifying or creating relationships between different parts of the text. In doing so, he has at the same time demonstrated that he was not just concerned to render his text in a mechanical way, but that he also aimed at employing the Greek language in a correct manner. In this respect, as Le Moigne has pointed out, the addition of particles illustrates the *autonomy* of the Greek Isaiah. By ameliorating the discourse through the insertion of particles the translator exhibits “une lecture qui ‘corrige’ le texte grec à partir du texte grec lui-même, qui révèle un souci d’offrir un texte trouvant sa cohérence en soi et non par rapport au modèle hébreu.”<sup>53</sup> This subject of the translator's aspiration to use Greek style and language properly, for which he was occasionally prepared to deviate from his Hebrew source, will be further investigated later in this study.

As for minuses consisting of particles in LXX Isaiah, this concerns in particular the Hebrew conjunction וְ. Perhaps the translator omitted this multi-functional lexeme for the reason that it caused him some trouble.

Except by the addition or omission of these words by the translator, the presence or absence of particles in LXX Isaiah will occasionally have been caused by a Hebrew ancestor text in which these words were extra or lacking as compared to the MT. This can be expected especially as it concerns minuses consisting of the Hebrew *copula* וְ, as well as pluses formed by the conjunctions καί, γάρ and δέ which may render וְ, because the וְ was a letter which was easily skipped over or added by copyists.

---

<sup>52</sup> Except for the conjunction וְ—“and.”

<sup>53</sup> Le Moigne, “Livre d’Ésaïe,” 578–79.





## Chapter 5.

# FREE TRANSLATION OF HEBREW IDIOMATIC AND GRAMMATICAL FEATURES

### 5.1 Introduction

The pluses and minuses that will be discussed in the present chapter are related to the translator's aim to use the Greek language and its grammar correctly. In classical rhetoric this component of writing is called "correctness" and forms a subcategory of style.<sup>1</sup> More precisely it denotes speaking or writing in a manner consistent with the conventions of vocabulary and syntax, grammar and usage that predominate in a given language.<sup>2</sup>

Deviation from stylistic correctness was known as "barbarism"—the use of non-standard or foreign speech.<sup>3</sup> One of the forms in which this could occur was "Hebraism,"<sup>4</sup> which means that a Greek text would reflect unique grammatical and idiomatic features of the Hebrew. A Hebraistic use of language is typical of the Greek Bible, translated as it was from a Hebrew original by Jewish translators. One of the most well-known and extreme illustrations of this can be found in the work of Aquila. In the Septuagint also we often encounter Hebraisms,<sup>5</sup> even though they occur in varying numbers throughout the different

---

<sup>1</sup> For a further discussion on the LXX Isaiah translator's dealing with Greek style, see chapter 8.

<sup>2</sup> Burton, "Silva Rhetoricae" ([rhetoric.byu.edu](http://rhetoric.byu.edu)).

<sup>3</sup> Burton, "Silva Rhetoricae" ([rhetoric.byu.edu](http://rhetoric.byu.edu)).

<sup>4</sup> One could also speak of "semiticism," thus including influence of the Aramaic language too.

<sup>5</sup> As e.g. Moulton and Thackeray emphasise, the "Hebraising" nature of the Septuagint—especially in its earlier works—lies not so much in the *incorrect* Greek rendering of certain Hebrew expressions, but rather in the prominent occurrence of certain correct, though unidiomatic Greek phrases, which nearly correspond to idiomatic expressions in the Hebrew. Even though parallels of most of these Greek expressions can be found in the papyri, in no other document than the Greek Bible they do appear in such a high frequency. An example is the interjection ἰδοὺ as a rendering of הנה (see section 5.8.2 below). In the Hebrew Bible הנה is used abundantly, which has resulted in a large number of instances of its counterpart ἰδοὺ in the LXX, even if in Greek ἰδοὺ in fact belongs to

books. Thackeray took this variable as the basis for classifying the Greek translations into three groups: ones written in “good κοινή Greek,” those displaying “indifferent Greek,” and versions that are “literal or unintelligent” with a style comparable to that of Theodotion. Among the latter group he included for instance Judges (B) and Lamentations, while he counted the Pentateuch in the first group. The LXX of Isaiah he reckoned as belonging to the first category as well.<sup>6</sup>

In the continuation of this chapter we will try to obtain a clearer picture of how the translator of LXX Isaiah dealt with typical Hebrew features. Did he principally translate them in a free way, producing good Koinē Greek, or did he mostly render them literally? We will in particular examine several specific Hebrew constructions which, as a result of the translator’s decision on how to render them, have led to the occurrence of pluses and minuses in the translation.<sup>7</sup> These include the following topics:

- the asyndetic relative clause;
- the construct state;
- the retrospective pronoun or adverb in Hebrew relative clauses;
- the nominal suffix;
- the infinitive absolute construction;
- semi-prepositions;
- several idiomatic expressions in the Hebrew.

---

vernacular speech (see Elias Bickerman, “The Septuagint as a Translation,” in *Studies in Jewish and Christian History* [3 vols.; AGJU 9; Leiden: Brill, 1976], 1:187 n.55; repr. from PAAJR 28 [1959]). Not only the high frequency, but also the specific *usage* of certain—in themselves genuine Greek—expressions can turn them into Hebraisms, i.e. if the way in which they are used in the LXX differs syntactically or semantically from the manner in which they are employed in secular Koinē Greek. It was only in later Greek Bible translations that a considerable number of phrases were introduced for which parallels in Koinē had never existed at all. Those were applied in cases where Greek expressions close enough to the Hebrew were not available. This tendency towards literalism culminated in the work of Aquila. See Moulton, *Grammar*, 1:10–13; Thackeray, *Grammar*, 1:29–31; Raija Sollamo, “Some ‘Improper’ Prepositions, Such as ἐνώπιον, ἐναντίον, ἔναντι, etc., in the Septuagint and Early Koinē Greek,” *VT* 25 (1975): 781. For further discussion of Hebraism in the Septuagint, see e.g. Thackeray, *Grammar*, 1:25–55; Swete, *Introduction*, 299, 306–9; Ottley, *Handbook*, 160–67; Dorival, Harl and Munnich, *La Bible grecque*, 228–30; Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen, “Zurück zur Hebraismenfrage,” in *Studien zur Septuaginta. Robert Hanhart zu Ehren. Aus Anlaß seines 65. Geburtstages* (ed. Detlef Fraenkel, Udo Quast, and John W. Wevers; AAWG 190, MSU 20; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990), 35–51.

<sup>6</sup> Thackeray, *Grammar*, 1:12–13.

<sup>7</sup> Strictly speaking, it is doubtful whether omissions and additions resulting from a free translation of Hebrew grammatical or idiomatic features may properly be called “pluses” and “minuses,” or whether they are better perceived as part of a translation at a different linguistic level (e.g. translation at phrase rather than word level). In the present chapter I will nonetheless discuss such “pluses” and “minuses,” because they can provide a valuable insight into the standard of Greek used by the LXX translator.

The translator's treatment of many other typical aspects of the Hebrew, such as the article and the conjunction **ו**, will be not be considered in this study.<sup>8</sup> Even though these are also relevant to the scope of the present subject, I have to limit myself to the issues mentioned.

## 5.2 The translation of the asyndetic relative clause

In classical Hebrew relative clauses<sup>9</sup> may be either syndetic (introduced by a relative particle **אשר** or **ש**) or asyndetic (without a relative particle). Asyndetic relative clauses are found especially in the poetical parts of Scripture, and in particular when the antecedent is undetermined.<sup>10</sup>

Because in Greek the relative pronoun is an essential part of the relative clause, in places where in the Hebrew a relative particle is missing, the Isaiah translator has usually supplemented it:

30:5	על-עם לא-יועילו למו	πρὸς λαόν, <u>ὃς</u> οὐκ ὠφελήσκει αὐτοὺς
30:6	על-עם לא יועילו	πρὸς ἔθνος <u>ὃ</u> οὐκ ὠφελήσκει αὐτοὺς
30:9	בנים לא-אבו שמוע תורת יהוה	υἱοὶ ψευδεῖς, <u>οἱ</u> οὐκ ἠβούλοντο ἀκούειν τὸν νόμον τοῦ θεοῦ
33:20	אהל בל-יצען	σκηναὶ <u>αἱ</u> οὐ μὴ σεισθῶσιν
42:16	והולכתי עורים בדרך לא ידעו בנתיבות לא-ידעו אדריכם	καὶ ἄξω τυφλοὺς ἐν ὁδῷ, <u>ᾧ</u> οὐκ ἔγνωσαν, καὶ τρίβους, <u>οὓς</u> οὐκ ᾔδεισαν, πατῆσαι ποιήσω αὐτούς·
44:1	וישראל בחרתי בו	καὶ Ἰσραηλ, <u>ὃν</u> ἐξελεξάμην·
44:2	וישרון בחרתי בו	καὶ ὁ ἡγαπημένος Ἰσραηλ, <u>ὃν</u> ἐξελεξάμην·
45:20	ומתפללים אל-אל לא ישיע	καὶ προσευχόμενοι ὡς πρὸς θεούς, <u>οἱ</u> οὐ σῶζουσιν.
48:17	בדרך תלך	τὴν ὁδόν, ἐν <u>ᾧ</u> πορεύσῃ ἐν αὐτῇ. <sup>11</sup>
50:11	ובזיקות בערתם	καὶ τῇ φλογί, <u>ᾧ</u> ἐξεκαύσατε·
51:1	הביטו אל-צור חצבתם ואל-מקבת בור נקרתם	ἐμβλέψατε εἰς τὴν στερεάν πέτραν, <u>ᾗ</u> ἐλατομήσατε, καὶ εἰς τὸν βόθυνον τοῦ λάκκου, <u>ὃν</u> ὠρύξατε.
51:7	עם תורתי בלבם	λαός μου, <u>ὃν</u> ὁ νόμος μου ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμῶν·
51:12	מאנוש ימות ומבן-אדם חציר ניתן	ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπου θνητοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ υἱοῦ ἀνθρώπου, <u>ὃν</u> ὥσει χόρτος ἐξηράνθησαν.
51:18	איך-מנהל לה	καὶ οὐκ ἔγν ὁ παρακαλῶν σε

<sup>8</sup> For a discussion of the rendering of conjunctions in LXX Isaiah, see chapter 4.

<sup>9</sup> Sometimes called an “attributive clause,” since in Hebrew a proper relative pronoun does not exist (see Lett §84).

<sup>10</sup> Joüon §158; Lett §84.

<sup>11</sup> 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> has בדרך אשר תלך בה; see section 12.3.1.1.

	מכל-בנים ילדה	ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν τέκνων σου, ὧν ἔτεκες,
	ואין מחזיק בידה	καὶ οὐκ ἦν ὁ ἀντιλαμβανόμενος τῆς χειρός σου
	מכל-בנים גדלה	οὐδὲ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν υἱῶν σου, ὧν ὕψωσας.
54:17	וכל-לשון תקום-אתך למשפט	καὶ πᾶσα φωνή, ἥ ἀναστήσεται ἐπὶ σέ εἰς κρίσιν.
55:5	הן גוי לא-תדע תקרא וגוי לא-ידעוך אליך ירוצו	ἔθνη, ἃ οὐκ ἤδεισάν σε, ἐπικαλέσσονται σε, καὶ λαοί, οἳ οὐκ ἐπίστανται σε, ἐπὶ σέ καταφεύξονται
64:3(4)	עין לא-ראתה אלהים זולתך יעשה למחכה-לו	οὐδὲ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ἡμῶν εἶδον θεόν πλὴν σοῦ καὶ τὰ ἔργα σου, ἃ ποιήσεις τοῖς ὑπομένουσιν ἔλεον.

Also when in the Hebrew it is doubtful whether—or even improbable that—a clause is an asyndetic relative one, the translator has sometimes supplied a relative pronoun. This has often happened close to a true instance of such a clause, which is exemplified by LXX Isa 30:6, 31 (compare 30:5, 9); 41:10 (compare 41:8); 42:9, 22, 23 (compare 42:16, 24); 43:19 (compare 43:21); and 44:9 (compare 44:1, 2) below. It may be that in these latter cases the translator actually thought he had dealt with asyndesis. In other places, however, he will have created a relative clause on purpose, in view of the greater preference of the Greek language for subordination above parataxis:

1:21	איכה היתה לזונה קריה נאמנה מלאתי משפט צדק ילין בה	Πῶς ἐγένετο πόρνη πόλις πιστὴ Σιών, πλήρης κρίσεως, ἐν ᾗ δικαιοσύνη ἐκοιμήθη ἐν αὐτῇ
6:6	ובידו רצפה במלקחים לקח מעל המזבח	καὶ ἐν τῇ χειρὶ εἶχεν ἄνθρακα, ὃν τῇ λαβίδι ἔλαβεν ἀπὸ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου
7:20	בתער השכירה בעברי נהר במלך אשור	τῷ ξυρῷ τῷ μεγάλῳ καὶ μεμεθυσμένῳ, ὃ ἐστὶ πέραν τοῦ ποταμοῦ βασιλέως Ἀσσυρίων
9:2(3)	הרבית הגוי לא הגדלת השמחה	τὸ πλεῖστον τοῦ λαοῦ, ὃ κατήγαγες ἐν εὐφροσύνῃ σου <sup>12</sup>
23:7	הזאת לכם עליזה מימירקדם קדמתה	οὐχ αὕτη ἦν ὑμῶν ἡ ὕbris ἢ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς
23:11	ידו נטה עליהם הרגז ממלכות	ἢ δὲ χεὶρ σου οὐκέτι ἰσχύει κατὰ θάλασσαν, ἢ παροξύνουσα βασιλεῖς.
25:9	הנה אלהינו זה קוינו לו	Ἴδου ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν, ἐφ' ᾧ ἡλπιζόμεν
30:6	אפעו ושרף מעופף ישאו עלי-כתף עירים חילהם	ἐκεῖθεν καὶ ἀσπίδες καὶ ἔκχονα ἀσπίδων πετομένων, οἳ ἔφερον ἐπ' ὄνων

<sup>12</sup> The translator may have read הגלת for הגלת (see Scholz, *Alexandrinische Uebersetzung*, 27; Fischer, *In welcher Schrift*, 24), reading the clause as though it were הגלת בשמחה (with the omission of לא), and considering these words as an attribute of הגוי.

	ועל־דבשת גמלים אוצרתם	καὶ καμήλων τὸν πλοῦτον αὐτῶν
30:31	כִּי־מְקוֹל יְהוָה יַחַת אשור בשבט יכה	διὰ γὰρ φωνὴν κυρίου ἡττηθήσονται Ἀσσύριοι τῇ πληγῇ, ἧ ἂν πατάξῃ αὐτούς.
40:13	ואיש עצתו יודיענו	καὶ τίς σύμβουλος αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, ὃς συμβιβῶν αὐτόν;
41:10	כִּי־אֲנִי אֱלֹהֶיךָ אֲמַצְחֶיךָ	ἐγὼ γάρ εἰμι ὁ θεός σου ὃ ἐνισχύσας σε
42:9	וחדשות אני מגיד	καὶ καινὰ ὃ ἐγὼ ἀναγγελεῶ
42:22	ובבתי כלאים החבאו	καὶ ἐν οἴκοις ἅμα, ὅπου ἔκρυψαν αὐτούς <sup>13</sup>
42:23	מי בכם יאזין זאת	τίς ἐν ὑμῖν, ὃς ἐνωτιεῖται ταῦτα
43:19	עשה חדשה עתה תצמח	ποιῶ καινὰ ὃ νῦν ἀνατελεῖ
44:9	וחמודיהם בל־יועילו	οἱ ποιοῦντες τὰ καταθύμια αὐτῶν, ὃ οὐκ ὠφελήσει αὐτούς. <sup>14</sup>
46:2	קרסו כרעו יחדו לא יכלו מלט משא	καὶ πεινῶντι καὶ ἐκλελυμένῳ οὐκ ἰσχύοντι ἅμα, οἳ οὐ δυνήσονται σωθῆναι ἀπὸ πολέμου
59:8	נתיבותיהם עקשו להם כל דרך בה	αἱ γὰρ τρίβοι αὐτῶν διεστραμμέναι, ὃς διοδεύουσι
62:6	על־חומת־ךָ ירושלם הפקדתי שמרים כל־היום וכל־הלילה תמיד לא יחשו המזכרים את־יהוה	καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν τειχεῶν σου, Ἱερουσαλημ, κατέστησα φύλακας ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν καὶ ὅλην τὴν νύκτα, οἳ διὰ τέλους οὐ σιωπήσονται μιμνησκόμενοι κυρίου.
66:3	גם־המה בחרו בדרכיהם ובשקוציהם נפשם חפצה	καὶ οὗτοι ἐξελέξαντο τὰς ὁδοὺς αὐτῶν καὶ τὰ βδελύγματα αὐτῶν, ὃ ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτῶν ἠθέλησε <sup>15</sup>

On some occasions the translator has rendered the Hebrew asyndetic relative clause in an alternative way, for instance with the help of a participle (see 51:2 and 54:17 below), or by integrating it into the main clause (see 41:3; 42:16; and 61:10). Now and then the explanation for this may have been that he did not recognise the asyndesis (such as in the case of 42:1 and 61:10), but more often it was probably just a matter of style. In the examples below the Hebrew relative clause is shown in *italics*:

<sup>13</sup> The translator apparently read *והחבאו* as a Hif'il "they have hidden" rather than as a Hof'al "they are hidden" (= MT).

<sup>14</sup> The translator may have perceived *בל־יועילו* as a relative clause under the influence of 30:5 (*πρὸς λαόν, ὃς οὐκ ὠφελήσει αὐτούς*), and 6 (*πρὸς ἔθνος ὃ οὐκ ὠφελήσει αὐτούς*); see also 57:12 *τὴν δικαιοσύνην μου καὶ τὰ κακά σου, ἃ οὐκ ὠφελήσουσί σε*.

<sup>15</sup> The MT gives: "and in their abominations their soul takes delight." The LXX has probably regarded *הפצה* as a relative clause analogous to 65:12 (*וּבְאִשָּׁר לֹא־חִפְצָתִי בַּחֲרָם*) and 66:4 (*וּבְאִשָּׁר לֹא־חִפְצָתִי בַּחֲרָם*). The LXX has probably regarded *הפצה* as a relative clause analogous to 65:12 (*καὶ ἐποίησατε τὸ πονηρὸν ἐναντίον ἐμοῦ καὶ ὃ οὐκ ἐβουλόμην ἐξελέξασθε*) and 66:4 (*καὶ ἐποίησαν τὸ πονηρὸν ἐναντίον μου καὶ ὃ οὐκ ἐβουλόμην ἐξελέξαντο*).

40:20	להכין פסל לא ימוט	πῶς στήσει αὐτοῦ εἰκόνα <u>καὶ ἵνα</u> μὴ σαλευῇται.
41:3	יעבור שלום	καὶ διελεύσεται ἐν εἰρήνῃ
	ארח כרגליו לא יבוא	ἡ ὁδὸς τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ.
42:1	בחירי רצתה נפשי	Ἰσραηλ ὁ ἐκλεκτός μου, προσεδέξατο <u>αὐτὸν</u> ἢ ψυχὴ μου. <sup>16</sup>
42:16	אלה הדברים עשיתם	ταῦτα τὰ ῥήματα ποιήσω
51:2	הביטו אל-אברהם אביכם	ἐμβλέψατε εἰς Ἀβρααμ τὸν πατέρα ὑμῶν
	ואל-שרה תחוללכם	καὶ εἰς Σαρραν <u>τὴν ὧδίνουσαν ὑμᾶς</u> .
54:17	כל-כלי יוצר עליך לא יצלח	πᾶν σκεῦος <u>φθαρτόν</u> . ἐπὶ σὲ οὐκ εὐοδώσω
61:10	כחתן יכהן פאר וככלה תעדה כליה	ὡς νυμφίῳ περιέβηκέ <u>μοι</u> μίτραν καὶ ὡς νύμφην κατεκόσμησέ <u>με</u> κόσμῳ. <sup>17</sup>

### 5.3 The formation of a relative clause to replace a Hebrew construct state

Also when it is obvious that the Hebrew text does not contain a relative clause, the Isaiah translator has sometimes still created one. This he has done, for instance, so as to replace an apposition (see LXX Isa 1:1; 20:5; 26:9; and 48:12), or in order to transform two juxtaposed independent clauses into one complex clause including a subordinate one (see 9:5[6]; 36:14; 37:26; 44:16; and 57:12). Furthermore, the formation of a relative clause gave him a means of substituting Hebrew construct state constructions. He has made regular use of this tactic probably because translating all Hebrew construct states by equivalent Greek genitive constructions would give rise to a literalistic and Hebraistic tone. This is understandable from the perspective that whereas in Hebrew the *status constructus* can be employed to express many different relationships between two nouns, and appears in a high frequency, in Greek the genitive construction occurs much less often.<sup>18</sup> Especially when the second part of the construct state

<sup>16</sup> It is unclear whether רצתה נפשי in the Hebrew is a relative clause with as its antecedent בחירי or an independent clause with an elliptic object. In any case, the translator makes an independent clause of it.

<sup>17</sup> While in the MT כחתן יכהן פאר is a relative clause with as its antecedent the groom (כחתן)—which results in the sentence “as a bridegroom who decks himself with a garland,” the translator has understood כחתן יכהן פאר as one independent clause, with כחתן as an adverbial phrase (“like a groom”) and with as its implicit subject God, implied in יכהן: “He has put on me a garland as on a bridegroom.” In the same way he has interpreted וככלה תעדה כליה as an independent clause, with its subject God implied in the verb תעדה (“he has adorned me with ornaments like a bride”) rather than as a complex sentence including a subordinating clause (“and as a bride who adorns herself with her jewels”).

<sup>18</sup> Other ways in which LXX Isaiah has rendered the Hebrew *status constructus* are, for instance, by means of an adjective (see e.g. 1:4; 2:6, 20; 14:20), a preposition (see e.g. 10:32; 13:12; 22:24), or a

construction involves a verb, the translator has regularly altered it into a relative clause. Besides, he has often deleted the construct state when it embodies a notion of time (the day of...; the year of...; etc.): see 6:1; 7:17; 13:13; 14:28; 17:11 (2x); and 20:1 below:<sup>19</sup>

1:1	חזון ישעיהו בן-אמוץ	“Ορασις, <u>ἦν εἶδεν</u> Ἡσαιας υἱὸς Αμως
6:1	בשנת־מות המלך עזיהו	τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ, <u>οὗ</u> ἀπέθανεν Οζίας ὁ βασιλεὺς
7:17	למיום סור־אפרים	<u>ἀφ’ ἧς</u> ἡμέρας ἀφείλεν Εφραιμ
13:13	וביום חרון אפו	τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, <u>ἥ ἂν ἐπέλθῃ</u> ὁ θυμὸς αὐτοῦ.
14:28	בשנת־מות המלך אחז	Τοῦ ἔτους, <u>οὗ</u> ἀπέθανεν Αχαζ ὁ βασιλεὺς
17:11	ביום נטעך ... ביום נחלה	τῇ δὲ ἡμέρᾳ, <u>ἥ</u> ἂν φυτεύσης ... <u>ἥ</u> ἂν ἡμέρᾳ κληρώσῃ
18:7	אל־מקום שם־יהוה צבאות	εἰς τὸν τόπον, <u>οὗ</u> τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου σαβαωθ <u>ἐπεκλήθη</u>
20:1	בשנת בא תרתן אשדודה	Τοῦ ἔτους <u>οὗ</u> εἰσῆλθε Ταναθαν εἰς Ἄζωτον
29:1	הוי אריאל אריאל	Οὐαὶ πόλιν Αριηλ,
	קרית חנה דוד	<u>ἦν</u> Δαυיד ἐπολέμησεν·
41:12	אנשי מצתך	τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, <u>οἱ</u> παροινήσουσιν εἰς σέ·
49:20	בני שכליך	οἱ υἱοί σου <u>οὓς</u> ἀπολώλεκας

#### 5.4 The omission of the retrospective pronoun or adverb in the relative clause

A typical feature of the Hebrew relative clause is the so-called “retrospective pronoun,” which is a pronominal element in the relative clause that refers back to the antecedent. This pronoun is used in Hebrew because the relative particle **אשר** is not declinable, and thus cannot make reference to the antecedent itself. The retrospective pronoun may appear as a suffix to a verb, noun or pronoun (see Gen 45:4 **אני יוסף אחיכם אשר־מכרתם אתי מצרימה**), but can also be attached to the preposition on which it is dependent (see Exod 3:5 **המקום אשר אתה עומד עליו**). When the antecedent denotes a place, the preposition together with the

---

verb (e.g. a participle) with an object or a subject (see e.g. 1:1, 7, 27; 9:3[4]; 12:6; 13:19; 14:23; 17:5; 19:9; 26:9).

<sup>19</sup> This happens particularly when in the temporal expression the second constituent of the construct state is a verb. When, however, expressions such as “the year of ...” “the day of ...” are followed by a noun and bear an eschatological connotation, they are generally translated in a literal way, see e.g. 10:3 **ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς**; 22:5 **ἡμέρα ταραχῆς καὶ ἀπωλείας καὶ καταπατήματος καὶ πλάνησις**; 34:8 **ἡμέρα γὰρ κρίσεως κυρίου καὶ ἐνιαυτὸς ἀνταποδόσεως**; 37:3 **Ἡμέρα θλίψεως καὶ ὄνειδισμου ...**; 49:8 **ἡμέρα σωτηρίας**; 61:2 **ἡμέραν ἀνταποδόσεως κρίσεως Σιών**; 63:4 **ἡμέρα γὰρ ἀνταποδόσεως ... ἐνιαυτὸς λυτρώσεως**. Occasionally the translator has found yet other solutions to render a construct state expressing the period or time in which something took place, e.g. by means of an adverb or an adjective; see 14:3; 30:26; 49:8; 58:5; and 61:2.

retrospective pronoun is often replaced by the adverbs שם (“there”), שמה (“there”) or משם (“from there”). The retrospective pronoun can also be omitted, which often happens specifically in poetry.<sup>20</sup>

Reference to the antecedent by means of a pronoun or an adverb is uncharacteristic of Indo-European languages. In these languages the relative pronoun itself can be declined and hence incorporates a referral to the antecedent in itself.<sup>21</sup> This explains why in the Greek translation of Isaiah the retrospective pronoun in the relative clause is usually not represented.<sup>22</sup>

5:28	אשר חצין שנונים	ὧν τὰ βέλη ὀξεῖά ἐστι
7:23	יהיה כל־מקום אשר יהיה־שם אלף גפן באלף כסף	πᾶς τόπος, οὗ ἐὰν ὦσι χίλια ἄμπελοι χιλίων σίκλων
19:24–25	ברכה בקרב הארץ אשר ברכו יהוה צבאות	εὐλογημένος ἐν τῇ γῇ, ἣν εὐλόγησε κύριος σαβαωθ
24:2	כנשה כאשר נשא בן	καὶ ὁ ὀφείλων ὡς ὃ ὀφείλει.
30:13	כפרץ נפל נבעה בחומה נשגבה אשר־פתאם לפתע יבוא שברך	ὡς τεῖχος πῖπτον παραχρῆμα πόλεως ὀχυρᾶς ἐαλωκυίας, ἥς παραχρῆμα πάρεστι τὸ πτώμα
30:32	מטה מוסדה אשר יניח יהוה עליו	ἢ ἐλπίς τῆς βοηθείας, ἐφ' ἣ αὐτὸς ἐπεποιθεί. <sup>23</sup>
37:4	את דברי רב־שקה אשר שלחן מלך־אשור אדניו	τοὺς λόγους Ραψακου, οὓς ἀπέστειλε βασιλεὺς Ἀσσυρίων
41:8–9	יעקב אשר בחרתיו זרע אברהם אהבי אשר החזקתיו	παῖς μου Ἰακωβ, ὃν ἐξελεξάμην, σπέρμα Ἀβρααμ, ὃν ἡγάπησα, οὗ ἀντελαβόμεν
58:11	וכמוצא מים אשר לא־יכזבו מימין	καὶ ὡς πηγὴ ἣν μὴ ἐξέλιπεν ὕδωρ
62:8	תירושך אשר יגעת בן	τὸν οἶνόν σου, ἐφ' ᾧ ἐμόχθησας.

In other occurrences of the retrospective pronoun or adverb the translator has avoided the problem by removing the relative clause construction:

1:30	וכגנה אשר־מים אין לה	καὶ ὡς παράδεισος ὕδωρ μὴ ἔχων.
20:6	הנה־יכה מבטנו אשר־נסנו	Ἴδου ἡμεῖς ἡμῶν πεποιθότες τοῦ φυγεῖν

<sup>20</sup> Joüon §158c; Lett §84b.

<sup>21</sup> Joüon §158a\*.

<sup>22</sup> See, however, BDR §297: “Die zusätzliche Hinzufügung von αὐτός zu einem Relativum ist eine durch das Semitische besonders nahegelegte, aber auch dem klass. und späteren Griechisch nicht ganz unbekannte Nachlässigkeit.”

<sup>23</sup> The LXX seems to have understood עליו as a retrospective pronoun, and יניח as “he will trust”: “the hope of help in which he himself (יהוה > הוא) trusted.” In the Hebrew, however, יניח is a plain prepositional object, not referring to the antecedent (= מטה מוסדה), but to Assur: “And every stroke of the staff of punishment that the LORD lays upon him ...”



	שם לעזרה	εἰς αὐτοὺς εἰς βοήθειαν
23:8	אשר סחריה שרים כנעניה נכבדי־ארץ	οἱ ἔμποροι αὐτῆς ἐνδοξοί, ἄρχοντες τῆς γῆς.
28:4	אשר יראה הראה אותה	ὁ ἰδὼν αὐτὸ
49:3	עבדי־אתה ישראל אשר־בך אתפאר	Δοῦλός μου εἶ σύ, Ἰσραηλ, <u>καὶ</u> ἐν σοὶ δοξασθήσομαι
49:23	כי־אני יהוה אשר לא־יבשו קוי	ὅτι ἐγὼ κύριος, <u>καὶ</u> οὐκ αἰσχυνθήσῃ.
50:1	או מי מנושי אשר־מכרתי אתכם לו	ἢ τίνι ὑπόχρεω πέπρακα ὕμᾱς;
66:13	כאיש אשר אמו תנחמנו	ὥς <u>εἰ</u> τινα μήτηρ παρακαλέσει

In only three cases does the retrospective pronoun have an equivalent in LXX Isaiah. Two of these are found in Isa 37:

37:10	אל־ישאך אלהיך אשר אתה בוטח בו	Μή σε ἀπατάτω ὁ θεός σου, ἐφ' ᾧ πεποιθώς εἶ <u>ἐπ' αὐτῷ</u>
37:29	והשיבתיך בדרך אשר־באת בה	καὶ ἀποστρέψω σε τῇ ὁδῷ, ἣ ἦλθες <u>ἐν αὐτῇ</u> .
62:2	וקרא לך שם חדש אשר פי יהוה יקבנו	καὶ καλέσει σε τὸ ὄνομά σου τὸ καινόν, ὃ ὁ κύριος ὀνομάσει <u>αὐτό</u> .

In 1:21 the translator has apparently interpreted צדק ילין בה as an asyndetic relative clause with *בה* as a retrospective pronoun:

1:21	איכה היתה לזונה קריה נאמנה מלאתי משפט צדק ילין בה	Πῶς ἐγένετο πόρνη πόλις πιστῇ Σιών, πλήρης κρίσεως, <u>ἐν ᾗ</u> δικαιοσύνη ἐκοιμήθη <u>ἐν αὐτῇ</u>
------	---	--

Also in 8:20 the translator perceived a retrospective pronoun, although in the Hebrew לו does in fact not refer to the antecedent:

8:20	כדבר הזה אשר אין־לו שחר	ὥς τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο, περὶ οὗ οὐκ ἔστι δῶρα δοῦναι <u>περὶ αὐτοῦ</u> .
------	----------------------------	---

If Ziegler's punctuation is correct, in 37:34 the retrospective pronoun is represented in the Greek not in the relative clause, but in the main clause: "But by the way that he came, *by it* he will return." This would produce accurate Greek.<sup>24</sup>

37:34	בדרך אשר־בא בה ישוב	ἀλλὰ τῇ ὁδῷ, ἣ ἦλθεν, <u>ἐν αὐτῇ</u> ἀποστραφήσεται.
-------	------------------------	--

<sup>24</sup> It is well thinkable, however, that Ziegler's punctuation is wrong in this case. In analogy to 37:29 (see above) one would expect in 37:34 ἀλλὰ τῇ ὁδῷ, ἣ ἦλθεν ἐν αὐτῇ, ἀποστραφήσεται, i.e. with a literal rendering of the retrospective pronoun within the relative clause.

In the case of LXX Isa 48:17 the retrospective pronoun is extra as compared to the MT.<sup>25</sup>

48:17	מלמדך להועיל מדריךך בדרך תלך	δέδειχαί σοι τοῦ εὐρεῖν σε τῇν ὁδόν, ἐν ᾗ πορεύσῃ <u>ἐν αὐτῇ</u> .
-------	---------------------------------	---

In contrast to the Greek Isaiah, some other books of the Septuagint do render the retrospective pronoun in the relative clause on a regular basis, despite the fact that this has generated pleonastic and unidiomatic Greek. This can be observed, for instance, in specific sections of the Pentateuch. Raija Sollamo has pointed out this phenomenon in her two articles on “the pleonastic use of the pronoun in connection with the relative pronoun in the Greek Pentateuch.”<sup>26</sup> She has demonstrated that the retrospective pronoun or adverb<sup>27</sup> in the LXX of Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy is rendered literally in as many as 70 to 80 percent of all of its occurrences. With regard to the LXX of Genesis and Exodus this applies to approximately 50 percent.<sup>28</sup> Sollamo further notes that in Koinē Greek outside of the LXX the retrospective pronoun or adverb does occur, but only in some fourteen cases, which is minimal in comparison to its large number of attestations in the LXX.<sup>29</sup> The high frequency of the retrospective pronoun in the LXX can, in her view, be traced back to the translators’ wish to render the biblical text in an extremely literal way.

### 5.5 The omission of the genitive pronoun

In order to indicate that an unspecified person or thing is the possessor, origin, subject, object, or whole of something or someone, Koinē Greek most

<sup>25</sup> It is possible that the translator had a *Vorlage* in front of him that included a retrospective pronoun, see 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> אִשׁרְךָ בְּדֶרֶךְ אֲשֶׁר תֵּלֵךְ בָּהּ; see section 12.3.1.1.

<sup>26</sup> Raija 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, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1991), 75–85; idem, “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 Greenspoon and Olivier Munnich; SCS 41; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1995), 43–62. See also Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen, “The Rendering of the Hebrew Relative Clause in the Greek Pentateuch,” in *Proceedings of the Sixth World Congress of Jewish Studies* (ed. Avigdor Shinan; 4 vols.; Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1975–1980), 1:405–6.

<sup>27</sup> Sollamo herself uses the term “resumptive pronoun.”

<sup>28</sup> Sollamo, “Pleonastic Use of the Pronoun in the LXX of Leviticus,” 60.

<sup>29</sup> Sollamo, “Pleonastic Use of the Pronoun in the Greek Pentateuch,” 76–77. Some secular Koinē Greek instances which Sollamo mentions can be found in Diod. I 97,2; Ped.Dioscur. III 8,1; P. Oxy I 117, 12–14; Plb. I 20,15; and P. Bad. II 43,6–8.

commonly uses a genitive form of the personal pronoun (μου, σου, αὐτοῦ, ἡμῶν, etc.). However, this genitive can sometimes be omitted, especially when the relationship between two entities—in particular that of possession—is obvious, and when the “owner” forms the subject of the clause. In such cases the pronoun is usually replaced by an article, which in Greek can equally serve to communicate that a thing or a person belongs to something or someone else, or that a necessary relationship exists between the two things or persons. Situations in which the omission of the genitive pronoun often takes place specifically, concern the naming of body parts, family members, and parts or measures of things.<sup>30</sup>

In line with this, the LXX of Isaiah also has plenty of examples of Hebrew attributively functioning suffixes which are not reflected in the translation.<sup>31</sup> This has happened particularly on the following occasions:

*a. Often when the governing noun consists of a body part (used either in a literal or in a metaphorical sense):*

1:15	ובפרשכם כפיכם	ὅταν τὰς χεῖρας ἐκτείνητε πρὸς με
5:25	בכל־זאת לא־שב אפן ועוד ידן נטויה	καὶ ἐν πᾶσι τούτοις οὐκ ἀπεστράφη ὁ θυμός, ἀλλ' ἔτι ἡ χεὶρ ὑψηλή.
6:2	בשתיים יכסה פניו ובשתיים יכסה רגליו	καὶ ταῖς μὲν δυσὶ κατεκάλυπτον τὸ πρόσωπον καὶ ταῖς δυσὶ κατεκάλυπτον τοὺς πόδας
6:6	ובידו רצפה	καὶ ἐν τῇ χειρὶ εἶχεν ἄνθρακα
6:10	פן־יראה בעיניו	μήποτε ἴδωσι τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς
	ובאזניו ישמע ולבבו יבין	καὶ τοῖς ὠσὶν ἀκούσωσι καὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ συνῶσι
9:11(12),20(21); 10:4	בכל־זאת לא־שב אפן ועוד ידן נטויה	ἐπὶ τούτοις πᾶσιν οὐκ ἀπεστράφη ὁ θυμός, ἀλλ' ἔτι ἡ χεὶρ ὑψηλή.
9:16(17)	בכל־זאת לא־שב אפן ועוד ידן נטויה	ἐπὶ πᾶσι τούτοις οὐκ ἀπεστράφη ὁ θυμός, ἀλλ' ἔτι ἡ χεὶρ ὑψηλή.
10:14	ותמצא כקן יד־י לחיל העמים	καὶ τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην καταλήμψομαι τῇ χειρὶ ὡς νοσητὴν
10:32	ינפץ ידו	τῇ χειρὶ παρακαλεῖτε
11:4	וברוח שפתיו ימית רשע	διὰ χειλέων ἀνελεῖ ἀσεβῆ.
11:5	והיה צדק אזור מתניו	καὶ ἔσται δικαιοσύνη ἐξωσμένος τὴν ὀσφύν <sup>32</sup>

<sup>30</sup> Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen, “Die Auslassung des Possessivpronomens im griechischen Pentateuch,” *StudOr* 55 (1984): 279–80; see also Frankel, *Vorstudien*, 140.

<sup>31</sup> At the same time, though, LXX Isaiah contains many genitive pronouns that are *pluses*, probably additions by the translator to make his text more explicit; see chapter 2 Explicitation.

<sup>32</sup> Rahlfs has τὴν ὀσφύν αὐτοῦ, which is supported by most witnesses (including A), and may thus be the more original reading.

	והאמונה אזור <b>חלצין</b>	καὶ ἀληθείᾳ εἰλημένος <b>τὰς πλευράς.</b>
11:8	ושעשע יונק על-חר פתן ועל מאורת צפעוני גמול ידן הדד	καὶ παιδίον νήπιον ἐπὶ τρώγλην ἀσπίδων καὶ ἐπὶ κοίτην ἐκγόνων ἀσπίδων <b>τὴν χεῖρα</b> ἐπιβαλεῖ.
11:14	אדום ומואב משלוח ידם	καὶ ἐπὶ Μωαβ πρῶτον <b>τὰς χεῖρας</b> ἐπιβαλοῦσιν
14:25	וסבלו מעל שכמן יסור	καὶ τὸ κῦδος αὐτῶν ἀπὸ <b>τῶν ὤμων</b> ἀφαιρεθήσεται.
14:27	ידדן הנטויה ומי ישיבנה	καὶ <b>τὴν χεῖρα</b> τὴν ὑψηλὴν τίς ἀποστρέψει;
29:22	ולא עתה פנני יחורו	οὐδὲ νῦν <b>τὸ πρόσωπον</b> μεταβαλεῖ Ἰσραηλ.
33:14–15	נער כפני מתמדך בשחד אטם אזנן משמע דמים ועצם עינין מראות ברע	καὶ <b>τὰς χεῖρας</b> ἀποσειόμενος ἀπὸ δώρων, βαρύνων <b>τὰ ὦτα</b> ἵνα μὴ ἀκούσῃ κρίσιν αἵματος, καμμύων <b>τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς</b> ἵνα μὴ ἴδῃ ἀδικίαν
38:15	והוא עשה אדדה כל-שנותי על-מר נפשי	καὶ ἀφείλατό μου τὴν ὀδύνην <b>τῆς ψυχῆς.</b>
40:10	וזרעו משלה לו	καὶ <b>ὁ βραχίον</b> μετὰ κυριείας
40:12	מי-מדד בשעלן מים	Τίς ἐμέτρησε <b>τῇ χειρὶ</b> τὸ ὕδωρ
41:22	ונשימה לבנן	καὶ ἐπιστήσομεν <b>τὸν νοῦν</b>
45:1	אשר-החזקתי בימיני	οὐ ἐκράτησα <b>τῆς δεξιᾶς</b>
53:7	ולא יפתח-פין	οὐκ ἀνοίγει <b>τὸ στόμα.</b>
59:17	וכובע ישועה בראשן	καὶ περιέθετο περικεφαλαίαν σωτηρίου <b>ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς</b>
60:5	ופחד ורחב לבבך	καὶ ἐκστήσῃ <b>τῇ καρδίᾳ</b>

Nevertheless, one can also find some instances where a genitive pronoun has been *added* to a body part (relatively often to καρδιά):

44:20	רעה אפר לב הותל	γνώτε ὅτι σποδὸς <b>ἡ καρδιά αὐτῶν</b>
49:16	על-כפים חקתיד	ἐπὶ <b>τῶν χειρῶν μου</b> ἐξωγράφησά σου τὰ τείχη
53:3	וכמסתר פנים ממנו	ὅτι ἀπέστραπτai <b>τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ</b>
57:4	על-מי תרחיבו פה תאריכו לשון	καὶ ἐπὶ τίνα ἡνοίξατε <b>τὸ στόμα ὑμῶν;</b> καὶ ἐπὶ τίνα ἐχαλάσατε <b>τὴν γλῶσσαν ὑμῶν;</b>
59:2	וחטאותיכם הסתירו פנים מכם משמוע	καὶ διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας ὑμῶν ἀπέστρεψε <b>τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ</b> ἀφ' ὑμῶν τοῦ μὴ ἐλεῆσαι.
59:13	והגו מלב דבריי-שקר	καὶ ἐμελετήσαμεν <b>ἀπὸ καρδίας ἡμῶν</b> λόγους ἀδίκους.
65:14	ואתם תצעקו מכאב לב	ὑμεῖς δὲ κεκραῖξεσθε διὰ τὸν πόνον <b>τῆς καρδίας ὑμῶν</b>
65:17	ולא תעלינה על-לב	οὐδ' οὐ μὴ ἐπέλθῃ <b>αὐτῶν</b> ἐπὶ <b>τὴν καρδίαν</b>

The supply of a pronoun to a body part may in several of the above cases be the outcome of harmonisation with a parallel or related phrase in the same

verse—for instance as it concerns 37:23 (compare עיניך), and 44:20 (compare נפש)—or of assimilation to a fixed biblical phrase (see 53:3 and 59:2).<sup>33</sup>

*b. Occasionally when the noun expresses an emotion, feature, or character trait of the person referred to by the suffix:*

5:25	בכל־זאת לא־שב אפן	ἐν πᾶσι τούτοις οὐκ ἀπεστράφη ὁ θυμός
9:11(12),20(21); 10:4	בכל־זאת לא־שב אפן	ἐπὶ τούτοις πᾶσιν οὐκ ἀπεστράφη ὁ θυμός
9:16(17)	בכל־זאת לא־שב אפן	ἐπὶ πᾶσι τούτοις οὐκ ἀπεστράφη ὁ θυμός,
16:6	שמענו גאון־מואב גא מאד גאותו וגאוונו ועברתו	Ἐκούσαμεν τὴν ὕβριν Μωαβ, ὕβριστης σφόδρα, τὴν ὑπερηφανίαν ἐξήρας.
30:27	בער אפן	καίόμενος ὁ θυμός
33:17	מלך ביפין תחזינה עיניך	βασιλέα μετὰ δόξης ὤψεσθε
59:16	וצדקתו היא סמכתו	καὶ τῇ ἐλεημοσύνῃ ἐστηρίσατο.
60:10	וברצוני רחמתך	καὶ διὰ ἔλεον ἠγάπησά σε.
63:1	צעה ברב כחן	βία μετὰ ἰσχύος
63:3	ואדרכם באפן	καὶ κατεπάτησα αὐτοὺς ἐν θυμῷ

*c. In other cases where the noun clearly forms a possession, part, object, or product of the person or thing referred to by the suffix:*

11:1	ויצא חטר מגזע ישי ונצר משרשיו יפרה	Καὶ ἐξελεύσεται ῥάβδος ἐκ τῆς ῥίζης Ἰεσσαί, καὶ ἄνθος ἐκ τῆς ῥίζης ἀναβήσεται.
13:10	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
27:1	ביום ההוא יפקד יהוה בחרבן	Τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἐπάξει ὁ θεὸς τὴν μάχαιραν
37:1	ויקרע את־בגדיו	ἔσχισε τὰ ἱμάτια
37:24	ברב רכבי אני עליתי	Τῷ πλήθει τῶν ἁρμάτων ἐγὼ ἀνέβην
38:10	בדמי ימי אלכה בשערי שאול פקדתי יתר שנותי	Ἐν τῷ ὕψει τῶν ἡμερῶν μου ἐν πύλαις ἄδου καταλείψω τὰ ἔτη τὰ ἐπιλοιπα.
44:17	ושארינתן לאל עשה לפסלו	τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν ἐποίησεν εἰς θεὸν γλυπτὸν ἐκοπίασας ἐν τῇ μεταβολῇ σου ἐκ νεότητος
47:15	אשר יגעת סחרך מגעוריי	καὶ ἐκφέρων σκεῦος εἰς ἔργον.
54:16	ומוציא כלי למעשהו	καὶ τὰ ῥήματα, ἃ ἔδωκα εἰς τὸ στόμα σου ἀγαγεῖν τὰ τέκνα σου μακρόθεν καὶ τὸν ἄργυρον καὶ τὸν χρυσὸν μετ' αὐτῶν οὕτως ὡραίος ἐν στολή
59:21	ודברי אשר־שמתי בפוך	καὶ λέων ὡς βοῦς φάγεται ἄχυρα,
60:9	להביא בניך מרחוק כספם וזהבם אתם	
63:1	זה הדור בלבושו	
65:25	ואריה כבקר יאכל־תבן	

<sup>33</sup> See section 9.5.

	ונחש עפר לחמון	ὄφεις δὲ γῆν ὡς ἄρτον·
66:4	ומגורתם אביא להם	καὶ τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἀνταποδώσω αὐτοῖς·

Repeatedly suffixes that point back to “the world,” “the land,” or “the people,” or to a specific name of a people have no equivalent in the Greek, probably because it is evident that the noun governing the suffix forms a component of that geographical or ethnical entity:

7:16	תעזב האדמה אשר אתה קץ מפני שני מלכיה	καὶ καταλειφθήσεται ἡ γῆ, ἣν σὺ φοβῆ ἅπὸ προσώπου τῶν δύο βασιλέων.
13:9	לשום הארץ לשמה וחטאיה ישמיד ממנה	θεῖναι τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην ἔρημον καὶ τοὺς ἁμαρτωλοὺς ἀπολέσαι ἐξ αὐτῆς. <sup>34</sup>
14:17	שם תבל כמדבר וערין הרס אסירין לא־פתח ביתה	ὁ θεὸς τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην ἔρημον καὶ τὰς πόλεις καθεῖλε, τοὺς ἐν ἐπαγωγῇ οὐκ ἔλυσε. <sup>35</sup>
19:13	התעו את־מצרים פנת שבטיה	καὶ πλανήσουσιν Αἴγυπτον κατὰ φυλάς.
24:20	נוע תנוע ארץ כשכור... וכבד עליה פשעה	καὶ σεισθήσεται ὡς ὄπωροφυλάκιον ἡ γῆ ὡς ὁ μεθύων ... κατίσχυσε γὰρ ἐπ' αὐτῆς ἡ ἀνομία.
26:21	וגלתה הארץ את־דמיה ולא־תכסה עוד על־הרוגיה	καὶ ἀνακαλύψει ἡ γῆ τὸ αἷμα αὐτῆς καὶ οὐ κατακαλύψει τοὺς ἀνηρημένους.
29:14	לכן הנני יוסף להפליא את־העם־הזה ... ואבדה חכמת חכמין	ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ προσθήσω τοῦ μεταθεῖναι τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον ... καὶ ἀπολῶ τὴν σοφίαν τῶν σοφῶν
	ובינת נבנין תסתתר	καὶ τὴν σύνεσιν τῶν συνετῶν κρύψω.
31:8	ונפל אשור... ובחורין למס יהיו	καὶ πεσεῖται Ἀσσυρ ... οἱ δὲ νεανίσκοι ἔσονται εἰς ἥττημα
60:11	להביא אליך חיל גוים ומלכיהם נהוגים	εἰσαγαγεῖν πρὸς σὲ δυνάμιν ἐθνῶν καὶ βασιλεῖς ἀγομένους.

Likewise, suffixes making reference to “the heaven” have twice been omitted:

34:4	ונגלו כספר השמים וכל־צבאם יבול כנבל עלה מגפן	καὶ ἐλιγθήσεται ὁ οὐρανός ὡς βιβλίον, καὶ πάντα τὰ ἄστρα πεσεῖται ὡς φύλλα ἐξ ἁμπέλου
45:12	אני ידי נטו שמים וכל־צבאם צויתי	ἐγὼ τῇ χειρί μου ἑστερέωσα τὸν οὐρανόν, ἐγὼ πᾶσι τοῖς ἄστροις ἐνετειλάμην.

<sup>34</sup> 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> has ישמיד חטאיהם. See Ps 104:35 מִן־הָאָרֶץ יִשְׁמַד חַטָּאִים.

<sup>35</sup> The suffixes in עריו and אסיריו might refer to the king of Assur (ὁ θεὸς ...) rather than to the “world.”

In a few cases suffixes attached to ארץ itself are not rendered:

2:7–8	... ותמלא ארצן סוסים	καὶ ἐνεπλήσθη ἡ γῆ ἵππων ...
	ותמלא ארצן אלילים	καὶ ἐνεπλήσθη ἡ γῆ βδελυγμάτων
		τῶν ἔργων τῶν χειρῶν αὐτῶν
34:7	ורוּתָהּ ארצם מדם	καὶ μεθυσθήσεται ἡ γῆ ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος
61:7	לכן בארצם משנה יירשו	οὕτως ἐκ δευτέρας κληρονομήσουσι τὴν γῆν

In the following verses the suffix added to עַם lacks a Greek counterpart. In all these cases עַם stands for Israel, while the suffix alludes to God, which designates Israel as God's possession:

1:3	עַמִּי לֹא הִתְבוֹנֵן	καὶ ὁ λαός με οὐ συνῆκεν.
3:14	יהוה במשפט יבוא עַם־זִקְנֵי עַמִּי	αὐτὸς κύριος εἰς κρίσιν ἤξει μετὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων τοῦ λαοῦ
11:11	לִקְנוֹת אֶת־שָׂאֵר עַמִּי	τοῦ ζηλωσαι τὸ καταλειφθὲν ὑπόλοιπον τοῦ λαοῦ
14:32	וְבָהּ יִחַסּוּ עֲנִיֵּי עַמִּי	καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ σωθήσονται οἱ ταπεινοὶ τοῦ λαοῦ.
25:8	וְחָרַפְתָּ עַמִּי יִסִּיר	τὸ ὄνειδος τοῦ λαοῦ ἀφείλεν

*e. Occasionally when the noun denotes the possessor, producer, or superior of the person or thing referred to by the suffix:*

1:3	יֵדַע שׁוֹר קִנְהוֹ	ἔγνων βοῦς τὸν κτησάμενον
8:4	קִרְא אֲבִי וְאִמִּי	καλεῖν πατέρα ἢ μητέρα
8:21	וְקָלַל בְּמַלְכֵּנוּ וּבֵאלֹהֵינוּ	καὶ κακῶς ἐρεῖτε τὸν ἄρχοντα καὶ τὰ παταχρα
24:2	וְהָיָה כַּעַם כְּהֵן כַּעֲבָד כַּאֲדֹנָיו	καὶ ἔσται ὁ λαός ὡς ὁ ἱερεὺς καὶ ὁ παῖς ὡς ὁ κύριος
	כַּשְׁפָּחָה כְּגִבְרָתָהּ	καὶ ἡ θεράπεινα ὡς ἡ κυρία
29:16	כִּי־יֹאמַר מַעֲשֵׂה לַעֲשֵׂה לֹא עֲשֵׂה וַיֵּצֵר אֱמֶר לַיּוֹצֵר לֹא הָבִין	μὴ ἐρεῖ τὸ πλάσμα τῷ πλάσαντι Οὐ σύ με ἔπλασας; ἢ τὸ ποίημα τῷ ποιήσαντι Οὐ συνετῶς με ἐποίησας;

From this perspective possibly one can also understand the frequent absence of a genitive pronoun in LXX Isaiah where in the MT a suffix is joined to a divine title:<sup>36</sup>

1:10	הַאֲזִינוּ תּוֹרַת אֱלֹהֵינוּ	προσέχετε νόμον θεοῦ, λαὸς Γομορρας.
7:13	כִּי תִלְאוּ גַם אֶת־אֱלֹהֵינוּ	καὶ πῶς κυρίῳ παρέχετε ἀγῶνα;
35:2	הִמָּה יִרְאוּ כְבוֹד־יְהוָה	καὶ ὁ λαός μου ὀψεται τὴν δόξαν κυρίου

<sup>36</sup> In a number of these cases—where in a neighbouring line a divine title also appears, but without a suffix—the omission of the suffix may better be related to the translator's wish to improve the parallelism between the two lines; see 1:10; 35:2; 50:10; 51:20; 52:10; 60:19; 61:6, 10; and 66:9.

	הדר <u>אלהינו</u>	καὶ τὸ ὕψος τοῦ θεοῦ.
40:1	יאמר <u>אלהיכם</u>	λέγει ὁ θεός.
50:10	וישען <u>באלהינו</u>	καὶ ἀντιστηρίσασθε ἐπὶ τῷ θεῷ.
51:20	גערת <u>אלהינו</u>	ἐκλελυμένοι διὰ κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ.
51:22	כה־אמר <u>אדניך</u> יהוה	οὕτως λέγει κύριος ὁ θεός
52:10	את ישועת <u>אלהינו</u>	τὴν σωτηρίαν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ.
57:21	אמר <u>אלהינו</u>	εἶπε κύριος ὁ θεός.
59:2	כי אס־עונתיכם היו מבדלים בינכם לבין <u>אלהיכם</u>	ἀλλὰ τὰ ἁμαρτήματα ὑμῶν διιστῶσιν ἀνὰ μέσον ὑμῶν καὶ τοῦ θεοῦ
60:9	לשם יהוה <u>אלהינו</u>	διὰ τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου τὸ ἅγιον
60:19	והיה־לך יהוה לאור עולם ו <u>אלהינו</u> לתפארתך	ἀλλ' ἔσται σοι κύριος φῶς αἰώνιον καὶ ὁ θεός δόξα σου.
61:6	ואתם כהני יהוה תקראו משרתי <u>אלהינו</u> יאמר לכם	ὕμεις δὲ ἱερεῖς κυρίου κληθήσεσθε, λειτουργοὶ θεοῦ.
61:10	תגל נפשי <u>באלהינו</u>	ἀγαλλιάσθω ἡ ψυχὴ μου ἐπὶ τῷ κυρίῳ.
62:5	ישיש על־יך <u>אלהינו</u>	οὕτως εὐφρανθήσεται κύριος ἐπὶ σοί.
66:9	אמר <u>אלהינו</u>	εἶπεν ὁ θεός.

These sixteen instances are counterbalanced by about thirty other ones, in which the pronoun suffix in divine titles did receive a translation in the Greek Isaiah.<sup>37</sup>

*f. When there is another specific relationship between two persons or two groups of people:*

5:1	אשירה נא <u>לידיך</u> שירת דודי לכרמו כרם היה <u>לידיך</u>	Ἴστω δὴ τῷ ἡγαπημένῳ ἄσμα τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ τῷ ἀμπελῶνί μου. ἀμπελῶν ἐγενήθη τῷ ἡγαπημένῳ
24:23	ונגד זקננו כבוד	καὶ ἐνώπιον τῶν πρεσβυτέρων δοξασθήσεται.
37:24	ביד עבדך חרפת אדני	ὅτι δι' ἀγγέλων ὠνειδίσας κύριον.
41:6	איש את־רעהו יעזרו ולאחיו יאמר חזק ועבדי אשר בחרתי	κρίνων ἕκαστος τῷ πλησίον καὶ τῷ ἀδελφῷ βοηθήσαι καὶ ὁ παῖς, ὃν ἐξελεξάμην
43:10	ועבדי אשר בחרתי	ὡς ἀνταποδώσω ἀνταπόδοσιν
59:18	כעל גמלות כעל ישרם חמה <u>לצריך</u>	ὄνειδος τοῖς ὑπεναντίοις.
66:6	קול יהוה משלם גמול <u>לאיבין</u>	φωνὴ κυρίου ἀνταποδιδόντος ἀνταπόδοσιν τοῖς ἀντικειμένοις.

<sup>37</sup> See LXX Isa 25:9; 26:13; 28:26; 35:4; 36:7; 37:4, 10, 20; 40:3, 8, 9; 41:10, 13; 43:3; 48:17; 49:4, 5; 51:15; 52:7; 54:6; 55:5; 58:2; 59:13; and 62:3. The genitive pronoun is a plus in 26:12; 30:18; 36:18; and 58:11, 13.



I could detect only one example of the omission of a pronoun suffix where the persons referred to by the suffix form the object of an action or a situation expressed by the noun:

63:8–9      ויהי להם למושיע      καὶ ἐγένετο αὐτοῖς εἰς σωτηρίαν  
                  בכל־צרתם לא צר      ἐκ πάσης θλίψεως.

By rendering the genitive pronoun in most instances, while sometimes leaving it out, the Isaiah translator remained close to a natural Greek style, given that in Greek the use or non-use of these pronouns for denoting relationships varies as well.

### 5.6 The omission of the infinitive absolute

The Hebrew infinitive absolute construction (“tautological infinitive”)—in which the infinitive absolute is used in a nominal way, placed before or after a finite verb form of the same root, and thus expressing an emphatic nuance of that verb<sup>38</sup>—is particularly apt for illustrating how differently the various translators of the Septuagint have handled idiomatic aspects of the Hebrew. The construction is translated throughout the Septuagint in many ways variously ranging from very freely to very literally. Its LXX rendering has been examined by, among others, Thackeray, Sollamo and Tov,<sup>39</sup> who have noted the following methods of representing it:

- a. An extremely literal translation with the help of a Greek infinitive form. This can be found in only two places in the LXX, that is, in Josh 17:13 and Jer 44(51):25.
- b. A translation by way of an adverb (see, for instance, Exod 15:1) or an adjective (see Num 13:30). This too is an unusual way of rendering the infinitive absolute, and occurs only sporadically in the LXX.
- c. Much more common is a translation by means of a finite verb form in combination with a Greek noun, mostly in the dative, from the same

<sup>38</sup> Joüon §123d.

<sup>39</sup> Henry St. John Thackeray, “Renderings of the Infinitive Absolute in the Septuagint,” *JTS* 9 (1908): 597–601; idem, *Grammar*, 1:47–50; Raija Sollamo, “The LXX Renderings of the Infinitive Absolute Used with a Paronymous Finite Verb in the Pentateuch,” in *La Septuaginta en la investigación contemporánea (V Congreso de la IOSCS)* (ed. Natalio Fernández Marcos; Textos y estudios “Cardenal Cisneros” 34; Madrid: Instituto “Arias Montano,” 1985), 101–13; Emanuel Tov, “Renderings of Combinations of the Infinitive Absolute and Finite Verbs in the LXX. Their Nature and Distribution,” in *Studien zur Septuaginta. Robert Hanhart zu Ehren. Aus Anlaß seines 65. Geburtstages* (ed. Detlef Fraenkel, Udo Quast, and John W. Wevers; AAWG 190, MSU 20; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990), 64–73. Compare also Frankel, *Vorstudien*, 142–43.

root as the verb (or sometimes from another root with the same meaning). This method can be observed especially often in the Greek Pentateuch. A similar construction is attested in Classical Greek (for example, *γάμω γαμείν* in Herodotus),<sup>40</sup> notwithstanding that parallels of such a construction in Koinē Greek beyond the Septuagint are rare.<sup>41</sup>

- d. Next to a translation with a noun, the most usual LXX rendering of the infinitive absolute construction is by means of a finite verb form combined with a participle. Such a rendition occurs predominantly in the Greek versions of the later historical books of Scripture. According to Sollamo it produces “passable, although unidiomatic, Greek”: “The participial constructions of the LXX under discussion show a formally correct Greek structure, but the semantic content can be correctly understood only on the basis of the underlying Hebrew expressions.”<sup>42</sup>
- e. In about sixty cases the infinitive absolute construction is rendered in the LXX solely by a finite verb form, while a representation of the infinitive is missing.
- f. Sometimes the infinitive absolute construction can no longer be recognised because of a reformulation or rearrangement of the Hebrew text in the LXX.

The LXX of Isaiah contains examples of each of these representations, except for the extremely literal one involving a Greek infinitive. I will offer below a more detailed description of the way in which the Isaiah translator has dealt with the tautological infinitive in his translation.

#### *a. Omission of the infinitive absolute*

In comparison to other books of the Septuagint, LXX Isaiah includes relatively many instances in which the infinitive absolute has not received any rendering. This has happened in eleven cases, as compared to about sixty throughout the entire Septuagint:<sup>43</sup>

22:7	והפרשים <b>שָׁתו</b> השערה	οἱ δὲ ἵππεῖς <b>ἐμφράξουσιν</b> τὰς πύλας σου·
24:19–20	<b>מוֹט</b> התמוטטה ארץ <b>נוֹעַ</b> תנוע ארץ בשכור	<b>ἔκλινε</b> καὶ <b>σεισθήσεται</b> ὡς ὁπωροφυλάκιον ἢ γῆ ὡς ὁ μεθύων
28:28	כִּי לֹא לִנְצַח <b>אֲדוּשׁ</b> יְדוּשְׁנוּ	οὐ γὰρ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ἐγὼ ὑμῖν <b>ὀργισθήσομαι</b>
31:5	כִּן יִגַּן יְהוָה עֲבֹאוֹת על-ירושלם <b>גִּנָּן</b>	οὕτως <b>ὑπερασπιεῖ</b> κύριος ὑπὲρ Ἱερουσαλὴμ

<sup>40</sup> See Thackeray, *Grammar*, 1:50; Tov, “Infinitive Absolute,” 65.

<sup>41</sup> Sollamo, “LXX Renderings,” 106–7.

<sup>42</sup> Sollamo, “LXX Renderings,” 105. Compare also Bickerman, “The Septuagint as a Translation,” 181.

<sup>43</sup> Tov, “Infinitive Absolute,” 68 n.13.

35:2	<b>פָּרַח תִּפְרַח</b>	καὶ ἐξανθήσει
36:15	<b>הַצֵּל יַעֲלֵנוּ יְהוָה</b>	ὅτι ῥύσεται ὑμᾶς ὁ θεός
40:30	ובחרים <b>כְּשׁוֹל יִכְשֹׁל</b>	καὶ ἐκλεκτοὶ ἀνίσχυες ἔσονται·
50:2	<b>הַקְצֹר קְצֶרָה</b> יְדֵי מַפְדּוֹת	μὴ οὐκ ἰσχύει ἡ χεὶρ μου τοῦ ῥύσασθαι;
55:2	<b>שָׁמְעוּ שְׁמוֹעַ</b> אֵלַי	ἀκούσατέ μου
59:11	וכיונים <b>הִנֵּה נִהְגָה</b>	καὶ ὡς περιστέρα ἅμα πορεύσονται·

Compare also 26:3–4 where the translator may have interpreted **בִּטּוֹחַ** as a tautological infinitive (whereas the MT perceives the form as a passive participle, starting a new sentence with **בִּטְחוּ**, vocalised as an imperative):<sup>44</sup>

26:3–4	כִּי בְךָ <b>בִּטּוֹחַ בִּטְחוּ</b> בִּיהוָה	ὅτι ἐπὶ σοὶ ἠλπίσαν, κύριε,
	עַד עַד	ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος

Besides that the lack of representation of the infinitive absolute could be the outcome of a translational choice, it might in some cases originate from the Hebrew parent text of the Greek Isaiah. As regards the LXX of the Pentateuch, Polak and Marquis mention as one explanation for the regular omission of the tautological infinitive the fact that in Post-exilic Hebrew this grammatical construction was largely unknown, and on those grounds may already have been left out from the Hebrew manuscript on which the Greek Pentateuch was based.<sup>45</sup> The same circumstance may have accounted for the instances in which the infinitive absolute is missing in the Greek translation of Isaiah. However, LXX Isaiah equally provides examples in which the tautological infinitive does receive a more or less literal rendering, demonstrating that the grammatical feature was still present in LXX Isaiah's *Vorlage*. If it were true that the scribe of LXX Isaiah's Hebrew manuscript removed the infinitive absolute construction because he was not familiar with it, one would rather expect him to have deleted it more or less consistently. Therefore, instead of indicating a different *Vorlage*, it seems more likely to me that the occasional omission of the tautological infinitive is simply the result of the Isaiah translator varying his way of rendering the construction, just as he did with the other grammatical and idiomatic aspects we have discussed earlier in this chapter. Sometimes he rendered them in a literal way, and at other times more liberally.

#### *b. Translation by means of an adverb*

In LXX Isaiah the infinitive absolute is only once reflected by an adverb:

56:3	<b>הַבְדֵּל יַבְדִּילֵנִי</b> יְהוָה מֵעַל עַמּוֹ	Ἀφοριεῖ με ἄρα κύριος ἀπὸ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ·
------	---	---

<sup>44</sup> 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> offers **בִּי בְכָה בִּטְחוּ** בִּיהוָה; see section 12.3.1.2.

<sup>45</sup> Polak and Marquis, *Minuses of the Septuagint*, 1:46.

*c. Translation by means of a noun in the dative*

Ten times the tautological infinitive is reproduced by a dative noun from a cognate root or from a root with the same meaning as the finite verb form:

6:9	שמעו שמוע	Ἀκοῇ ἀκούσετε
19:22	ונגף יהוה את־מצרים	καὶ πατάξει κύριος τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους
	נגף ורפוא	πληγῇ μεγάλῃ καὶ <b>ιάσεται</b> αὐτοὺς <b>ιάσει</b>
24:3	הבוק תבוק הארץ	φθορᾷ φθαρήσεται ἡ γῆ,
	והבוח תבוח	καὶ <b>προνομή</b> <b>προνομευθήσεται</b> ἡ γῆ.
24:19	רעה התרעעה הארץ	<b>ταραχῇ</b> <b>ταραχθήσεται</b> ἡ γῆ,
	פור התפוררה ארץ	καὶ <b>ἀπορία</b> <b>ἀπορηθήσεται</b> ἡ γῆ.
30:19	בכו לא־תבכה	καὶ Ἰερουσαλημ <b>κλαυθμῷ</b> <b>ἐκλαυσεν</b>
60:12	והגוים חרב יחרבו	καὶ τὰ ἔθνη <b>ἐρημία</b> <b>ἐρημωθήσονται</b> .
61.10	שוש אשיש ביהוה	καὶ <b>εὐφροσύνη</b> <b>εὐφρανθήσονται</b> ἐπὶ κύριον.

*c. Translation by means of a participle*

In two places LXX Isaiah renders the infinitive absolute by a participle:

6:9	וראו ראו	καὶ <b>βλέποντες</b> <b>βλέψετε</b>
48:8	כי ידעתי בגוד תבגוד	ἔγνων γὰρ ὅτι <b>ἀθετῶν</b> <b>ἀθετήσεις</b>

This is much less often than in some other LXX translations such as 1–2 Kingdoms (approximately forty times) and Jeremiah (twenty-six times)

*d. Variant translation*

Regularly the infinitive absolute construction can no longer be recognised in the translation due to a rearrangement or reformulation of the Hebrew text. On some of these occasions either of the two parts of the infinitive absolute construction may have been misunderstood as a noun (22:17–18 and 54:15) or as a second finite form (30:19). Yet, instead of a misunderstanding, this may as well concern an intentional move by the translator so as to avoid a literal translation of the tautological infinitive:

3:16	הלוך וטפף	καὶ τῇ πορείᾳ τῶν ποδῶν
	תלכנה	ἅμα σύρουσαι τοὺς χιτῶνας
22:17–18	ועטך עטה	καὶ ἀφελεῖ τὴν στολὴν σου
	צנוף יצנפך צנפה	καὶ τὸν στέφανόν σου τὸν ἔνδοξον <sup>46</sup>

<sup>46</sup> עטה was probably associated with Aramaic עדה Pa.—“to take away”—and on that basis rendered by a form of ἀφαιρέω. Either יצנפך or צנוף may have been related to צניץ = “headband,” which is close in meaning to στέφανος (see 62:3 στέφανος | διάδημα = עטרת | צנוף) (compare Fischer, *In*

30:19	חנן יחנך	Ἐλέησόν με· ἐλέησει σε ...
54:15	הן גור יגור אפס מאותי	ἰδοὺ προσήλυτοι προσελεύσονται σοι δι' ἐμοῦ <sup>47</sup>

In sum, LXX Isaiah displays a forty-sixty ratio as regards the translation of the infinitive absolute construction. Eleven cases display a literal representation of the construction by means of a noun in the dative or a participle, while seventeen places show a free rendering, with the infinitive absolute lacking an equivalent in the translation, being rendered by an adverb, or having been “dissolved” in a variant translation.

### 5.7 Translation of semi-prepositions

A number of Hebrew prepositions, such as for instance לפני, בקרב, בגלל, and למען, were originally composed of a noun with a prefixed preposition. In the course of time, these expressions came to function in a purely prepositional way, wholly or partially losing the actual meaning of the noun they contain.<sup>48</sup> It is interesting from the perspective of translation technique to examine how such prepositions were rendered in the Septuagint, and whether or not the original noun is still reflected in the translation. This was also the interest of Sollamo, who has studied the rendition of, what she calls, “semiprepositions”<sup>49</sup> throughout the Greek Bible. The way in which semi-prepositions have been reproduced in the LXX she classifies into three categories:<sup>50</sup>

- *Slavish renderings*: The semi-preposition is translated in an extremely literal way, which entails that the original Hebrew noun is reflected by an equivalent noun in the Greek. Often this has led to a Hebraistic use of language, although some of the slavishly translated prepositional expressions do occur in the same form in secular Greek literature too.

---

welcher Schrift, 38; Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 85; *HUB Isa* 82). According to Ziegler (*Untersuchungen*, 85) עֲנֵה־סֵדֶן may derive from צַנִּיף, which the translator linked to הַצִּיבִי.

<sup>47</sup> גור (infinitive absolute of גור—“to sojourn”) was most likely read as though it were גַּר—“sojourner.”

<sup>48</sup> Raija Sollamo, *Renderings of Hebrew Semi-prepositions in the Septuagint* (AASF 19; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedekatemia, 1979), 1; GKC §101.

<sup>49</sup> The term “semi-prepositions” Sollamo has adopted from Brockelmann, who uses the German term “Halbpräpositionen.” Brockelmann wanted to express by employing this name the fact that these expressions consist partly of a preposition and partly of a noun; see Carl Brockelmann, *Grundriß der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen* (2 vols.; Berlin: Reuther & Reichard, 1908–1913), 2:383.

<sup>50</sup> Sollamo, *Semi-prepositions*, e.g. 3, 69.

- *Literal renderings:* Although the translator did not render the semi-preposition in a slavish way, he did still try to approximate quite closely to the Hebrew expression.
- *Free renderings:* The semi-preposition has been replaced by a common Greek preposition in which the meaning of the Hebrew noun cannot be recognised anymore.

Even though, admittedly, the non-translation in the LXX of the original Hebrew noun in semi-prepositional expressions can hardly be said to produce actual “omissions” or “minuses,” in this paragraph I will still offer a brief analysis of the rendering of semi-prepositions in LXX Isaiah, because such an inquiry can give us a good insight into the translation style of its translator.

### 5.7.1 Semi-prepositions with פנים

#### a. לפני

The preposition לפני, which literally means “before the face of,” occurs around thirty times in the book of Isaiah. Only once has the LXX rendered the nominal component פנים by an independent Greek equivalent, namely in 62:11 where לפני has generated πρὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ. In almost all other places לפני matches a plain Greek preposition:<sup>51</sup>

ἔμπροσθεν	43:10; 45:1 (2x), 2; 58:8
ἐναντίον	37:14; 40:10; 41:2; 53:2, 7
ἐνώπιον	9:2(3); 38:3; 65:6; 66:22, 23
ἐναντι	8:4; 23:18
ἀπέναντι	17:13
πρό	18:5
πρότερος	52:12

In the other books of the Septuagint a literalistic translation of לפני does not occur very often either. Of the total number of Scriptural instances of this preposition, not more than about 13 percent are represented by πρὸ προσώπου or κατὰ πρόσωπον.<sup>52</sup>

The rendering of לפני by ἐνώπιον is from an etymological point of view comparatively literal, in that ἐνώπιον is formed from the stem ωπ (from ὁράω—“to see”) plus a prefixed preposition ἐν, which corresponds closely to the structure of לפני.<sup>53</sup> Yet, in itself ἐνώπιον can hardly be considered a Hebraism, as

<sup>51</sup> In 42:16 לפני matches αὐτοῖς. In 17:13; 36:7; 37:27; 48:7; and 55:12 a representation of לפני is absent due to a larger omission, or a reformulation or rearrangement of the Hebrew text.

<sup>52</sup> Sollamo, *Semi-prepositions*, 13, 30–32.

<sup>53</sup> Sollamo, *Semi-prepositions*, 18–19.

it is attested regularly in the Greek papyri. Only when it parallels לפני used in the sense of “in somebody’s opinion” or is applied with a temporal function is it not in accordance with a genuine Greek employment of the preposition, since in Koinē Greek ἐνώπιον does not appear with those connotations.<sup>54</sup> This we do not encounter, however, in the LXX of Isaiah. When ἐνώπιον is a counterpart to לפני in LXX Isaiah, the Hebrew preposition consistently is used with a local force.

### b. מפני

Also מפני (literally “away from the face of”) figures around thirty times in MT Isaiah. Seventeen times the LXX translates the preposition in a free way, without reproducing the meaning of פנים:

7:2	כנוע עצייער	ὄν τρόπον ὅταν ἐν δρυμῶ ξύλον
	מפני־רוח	ὑπὸ πνεύματος σαλευθῇ.
10:27	וחבל על	καὶ καταφθαρήσεται ὁ ζυγὸς
	מפני־שמן	ἀπὸ τῶν ὤμων ὤμων.
19:17	יפחד	φοβηθήσονται
	מפני עצת יהוה צבאות	διὰ τὴν βουλήν
19:20	כִּי־יצעקו אל־יהוה	ὅτι κεκραῖονται πρὸς κύριον
	מפני לחצים	διὰ τοὺς θλίβοντας αὐτοῦς
20:6	להנצל מפני מלך	οἱ οὐκ ἐδύναντο σωθῆναι ἀπὸ βασιλέως
	אשור	Ασσυρίων.
21:15	כִּי־מפני חרבות	διὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν φευγόντων
	נדדו	καὶ διὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν πλανωμένων
	מפני חרב נטושה	καὶ διὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῆς μαχαίρας
	ומפני קשת	καὶ διὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν τοξευμάτων τῶν
	דרוכה ומפני כבד	διατεταμένων καὶ διὰ τὸ πλῆθος
	מלחמה	τῶν πεπτωκότων ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ.
26:17	מפניך יהוה	διὰ τὸν φόβον σου, κύριε.
30:11	השביתו מפנינו	καὶ ἀφέλετε ἀφ’ ἡμῶν
	את־קדוש ישראל	τὸν ἅγιον τοῦ Ἰσραήλ.
30:17	אלף אחד מפני גערת אחד	διὰ φωνὴν ἐνὸς φεύξονται χίλιοι,
	מפני גערת חמשה תנסו	καὶ διὰ φωνὴν πέντε φεύξονται πολλοί
37:6	אל־תִּירא מפני הדברים	Μὴ φοβηθῇς ἀπὸ τῶν λόγων
63:19 (64:1)	מפניך הרים נזלו	τρόμος λήμψεται ἀπὸ σοῦ ὄρη
64:2(3)	מפניך הרים נזלו	τρόμος λήμψεται ἀπὸ σοῦ ὄρη

In thirteen cases, which is somewhat less than 45 percent, the semi-preposition is rendered in a literalistic manner, each time with the expression

<sup>54</sup> Sollamo, “Some ‘Improper’ Prepositions,” 777–79.

ἀπὸ προσώπου (except for 51:13 which offers τὸ πρόσωπον). In half of these instances the object of the preposition embodies a *person*, which allows a literal interpretation of פנים (see 7:16; 16:4; 17:9; 19:1; 63:12; and 64:1[2] below):

2:10,19,21	מפני פחד יהוה	ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ φόβου κυρίου
7:16	אשר אתה קץ מפני שני מלכיה	ἣν σὺ φοβῆ ἄπὸ προσώπου τῶν δύο βασιλέων.
16:4	הוֹי־סֹתֵר לְמוֹ מִפְּנֵי שׁוֹדֵד	ἔσονται σκέπη ὑμῖν ἀπὸ προσώπου διώκοντος
17:9	כַּעֲזוּבַת הַחֶרֶשׁ וְהָאֲמִיר אשר עזבו מפני בני ישראל	δὲν τρόπον ἐγκατέλιπον οἱ Ἀμορραῖοι καὶ οἱ Εὐαῖοι ἀπὸ προσώπου τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ
19:1	וְנָעוּ אֱלִילֵי מִצְרַיִם מפניו	καὶ σεισθήσεται τὰ χειροποίητα Αἰγύπτου ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ
19:16	וְחָרַד וּפָחַד מִפְּנֵי תְנוּפַת יְד־יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת	ἐν φόβῳ καὶ ἐν τρόμῳ ἀπὸ προσώπου τῆς χειρὸς κυρίου σαβαωθ
31:8	וְנָס לוֹ מִפְּנֵי־חֶרֶב	καὶ φεύξεται οὐκ ἀπὸ προσώπου μαχαίρας·
51:13	וּתְפַחַד תְּמִיד כְּל־הַיּוֹם מפני חמת המציק	καὶ ἐφόβου αἰεὶ πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας τὸ πρόσωπον τοῦ θυμοῦ τοῦ θλίβοντός σε·
57:1	כִּי־מִפְּנֵי הָרָעָה נֶאֱסָף הַצַּדִּיק	ἀπὸ γὰρ προσώπου ἀδικίας ἤρται ὁ δίκαιος·
63:12	בּוֹקֵעַ מִים מִפְּנֵיהֶם	κατίσχυσεν ὕδωρ ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ
64:1(2)	מִפְּנֵי גּוֹיִם יִרְגָּזוּ	ἀπὸ προσώπου σου ἔθνη παραχθήσονται.

In terms of percentage, the LXX Isaiah rate of literalistic translation of מפני is lower than that of the Septuagint as a whole, in which as much as 65 percent of the occurrences of this preposition have generated ἀπὸ προσώπου.<sup>55</sup>

In Koinē Greek outside of the Septuagint the phrase ἀπὸ προσώπου has been used very sparingly. Despite this, Sollamo believes that it forms sound Koinē Greek, provided that the expression is used to render the *local* aspect of meaning of מפני (“away from” or “from”), and if the referent is a *person* (in LXX Isaiah, see 16:4[?] and 63:12). When, however, a *causal* מפני (“because of”) is translated by ἀπὸ προσώπου (in LXX Isaiah, see 2:10, 19, 21; 7:16; 19:1, 16; 31:8; and 64:1[2]) this does, in Sollamo’s eyes, not accord with genuine Greek usage. As far as is known such a use is unparalleled in secular Greek literature.<sup>56</sup> In this aspect Sollamo disagrees with Moulton, who maintains that *all* prepositional compounds of προσώπον are forms of Semitism, notwithstanding the appearance of some of them in a few papyri.<sup>57</sup>

<sup>55</sup> That is, 194 of the circa 300 cases of מפני; see Sollamo, *Semi-prepositions*, 81.

<sup>56</sup> Sollamo, *Semi-prepositions*, 84.

<sup>57</sup> Moulton, *Grammar*, 3:279: “Prepositional compounds of προσώπον are undoubtedly a Semitism in spite of their occurrence in the papyri of ii/A.D. and one of iv/A.D.”



### c. מלפני

מלפני (“away from before the face of”) appears three times in Isaiah. The LXX has in all three places rendered it by a regular Greek expression:

41:26	מִי־הַגִּיד מֵרָאשׁ וּנְדַעָה וּמִלִּפְנֵי וְנֹאמַר צָדִיק	τίς γὰρ ἀναγγελεῖ τὰ ἐξ ἀρχῆς, ἵνα γνῶμεν, καὶ τὰ ἔμπροσθεν, καὶ ἐροῦμεν ὅτι ἀληθὴς ἐστίν;
48:19	וְלֹא־יִשְׁמַד שְׁמוֹ מִלִּפְנֵי	οὐδὲ ἀπολείται τὸ ὄνομά σου ἐνώπιόν μου.
57:16	כִּי־רוּחַ מִלִּפְנֵי יַעֲטוּף	πνεῦμα γὰρ παρ’ ἐμοῦ ἐξελεύσεται

### d. על-פני

On על-פני (“above/on the face of”) we find four examples in Isaiah. In the LXX the preposition has twice disappeared on account of a reformulation of the Hebrew (19:8) and a larger omission (23:17), while in the other two cases it is translated freely:

18:2	הִשְׁלַח בִּים צִירִים וּבְכָל־גִּמְאָ עַל־פְּנֵי־מִים	ὁ ἀποστέλλων ἐν θαλάσῃ ὄμηρα καὶ ἐπιστολὰς βυβλίνας ἐπάνω τοῦ ὕδατος.
65:3	הָעַם הַמִּכְעִסִּים אוֹתִי עַל־פְּנֵי תַמִּיד	ὁ λαὸς οὗτος ὁ παροξύνων με ἐναντίον ἐμοῦ διὰ παντός <sup>58</sup>

## 5.7.2 Semi-prepositions with עִינִים

### a. בעיני

בעיני (“in the eyes of”) functions seven times as a semi-preposition in MT Isaiah.<sup>59</sup> In none of these cases is it reproduced in a literalistic way in the Greek. This is the more striking as in the entire Septuagint בעיני in almost 30 percent (namely in 86 of its approximately 300 occurrences) did receive such an extremely literal rendering, namely by means of ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς.<sup>60</sup>

5:21	הוּא חֲכָמִים בְּעִינֵיהֶם	οὐαὶ οἱ συνετοὶ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς
38:3	וְהַטּוֹב בְּעֵינֶיךָ עֲשִׂיתִי	καὶ τὰ ἀρεστὰ ἐνώπιόν σου ἐποίησα.
43:4	מֵאֲשֶׁר יִקְרָת בְּעֵינֵי	ἀφ’ οὗ ἔντιμος ἐγένου ἐναντίον μου
49:5	וְאֶכְבַּד בְּעֵינֵי הָיוּהוּ	καὶ δοξασθήσομαι ἐναντίον κυρίου
59:15	וְיִרַע בְּעֵינָיו	καὶ οὐκ ἤρεσεν αὐτῷ

<sup>58</sup> A further example of a semi-preposition containing פנים in MT Isaiah concerns פני נגד. This form can be found only in 5:21, where it is translated ἐνώπιον in the LXX.

<sup>59</sup> In Isa 6:10 בעיני does not form a semi-preposition but a prepositional phrase in which עין functions in its literal sense of “eye”: “so that they may not look *with their eyes*, and listen with their ears.”

<sup>60</sup> This is mainly the case in the expressions “to do evil/good in the eyes of ...,” “it was evil/good in the eyes of ...,” and “to find mercy in the eyes of ... .” See Sollamo, *Semi-prepositions*, 123, 125.

65:12	ותעשו הרע בעיני	καὶ ἐποιήσατε τὸ πονηρὸν ἐναντίον ἐμοῦ
66:4	יעשו הרע בעיני	καὶ ἐποίησαν τὸ πονηρὸν ἐναντίον μου

### b. לעיני

Twice in Isaiah the preposition לעיני (“before the eyes of”) comes up. Both times it corresponds to ἐνώπιον in the Greek:

13:16	ועלליהם ירטשו לעיניהם	καὶ τὰ τέκνα αὐτῶν ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν ῥάξουσιν
52:10	חשף יהוה את־זרוע קדשו לעיני כל־הגוים	καὶ ἀποκαλύψει κύριος τὸν βραχίονα αὐτοῦ τὸν ἄγιον ἐνώπιον πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν

In the remainder of the LXX לעיני has regularly been translated in a literalistic way with the help of the noun ὀφθαλμός. This has happened in thirty-four out of its 107 attestations.<sup>61</sup>

## 5.7.3 Semi-prepositions with יד

### a. ביד

ביד can serve as a semi-preposition, but also as a regular prepositional phrase in which the noun יד still bears its actual meaning of “hand.” According to Sollamo it can be regarded as a semi-preposition “in all cases where the concrete sense of the noun יד ‘hand’ has weakened, or has adopted metaphorical connotations, or where the meaning ‘hand’ is no longer present at all.”<sup>62</sup> When ביד has the status of a semi-preposition it is mostly used with a metaphorical local force (“in the power of”), or with an instrumental force (“by way of,” “through”).<sup>63</sup>

Of the ten Isaianic instances of ביד as a semi-preposition the word is three times rendered in a free way in the LXX, without the Greek echoing יד.<sup>64</sup> In all three cases ביד may bear its instrumental meaning “by way of,” “through”.<sup>65</sup>

20:2	בעת ההיא דבר יהוה ביד ישעיהו	τότε ἐλάλησε κύριος πρὸς Ἡσαιαν
37:24	ביד עבדיך חרפת אדני	ὅτι δι’ ἀγγέλων ὠνείδισας κύριον
64:6(7)	ותמוגנו ביד־עוננו	καὶ παρέδωκας ἡμᾶς διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν.

<sup>61</sup> Sollamo, *Semi-prepositions*, 148.

<sup>62</sup> Sollamo, *Semi-prepositions*, 156.

<sup>63</sup> Sollamo, *Semi-prepositions*, 157; HALOT 1:388.

<sup>64</sup> In 51:23 it can be disputed whether ביד is a semi-preposition or not. In 53:10 ביד is absent due to a larger omission.

<sup>65</sup> In 64:6(7) it is doubtful whether the Hebrew uses ביד in the sense of “in the hands of” or as “through”; the first option may be more feasible. Yet, the LXX seems to have interpreted the preposition in the sense of “through,” which equals διὰ in the Greek.

On six occasions ביד has prompted a literal translation which includes the noun χεῖρ. Each time the preposition carries a local force: “in the power of”:

19:4	וסכרתי את־מצרים ביד אדנים קשה	καὶ παραδώσω Αἴγυπτον εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπων κυρίων σκληρῶν
22:21	וממשלתך אתן ביד	καὶ τὴν οἰκονομίαν σου δώσω εἰς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ
36:15	לא תנתן העיר הזאת ביד מלך אשור	καὶ οὐ μὴ παραδοθῇ ἡ πόλις αὕτη ἐν χειρὶ βασιλέως Ἀσσυρίων
37:10	לא תנתן ירושלם ביד מלך אשור	Οὐ μὴ παραδοθῇ Ἱερουσαλημ εἰς χεῖρας βασιλέως Ἀσσυρίων.
47:6	ואתנם בידך	ἐγὼ ἔδωκα εἰς τὴν χεῖρά σου
51:23	ושמתיה ביד־מוגד	καὶ ἐμβάλῳ αὐτὸ εἰς τὰς χεῖρας τῶν ἀδικησάντων σε

The number of literal translations of ביד in LXX Isaiah is comparable in percentage to that of the whole of the Septuagint, which in more than 80 percent of its occurrences matches ביד to an expression with χεῖρ.

In Classical and in secular Koinē Greek related prepositional expressions with χεῖρ are employed occasionally in a (metaphorical) *local* sense, yet never in an instrumental sense.<sup>66</sup> Hence, in rendering ביד in a literal way only when it means “in the power of” the Isaiah translator has remained faithful to the prescriptions of a good Greek style. This is in contrast to other parts of the Greek Bible. In the entire Septuagint ביד *instrumenti* has still generated a translation which includes χεῖρ in almost 85 percent of its instances.<sup>67</sup>

## b. מיד

The semi-preposition מיד—literally “from the hand of”—incorporates, roughly speaking, two different aspects of meaning:

- After verbs such as “to deliver,” “to flee,” or “to deprive” it denotes “from the power/possession of.”
- In connection with verbs such as “to demand,” “to receive,” or “to buy” it means “from (the side of).”<sup>68</sup>

In the book of Isaiah מיד serves as a semi-preposition in eleven cases. Eight of these have generated an expression with χεῖρ in the Greek,<sup>69</sup> six of which

<sup>66</sup> Sollamo, *Semi-prepositions*, 157, 160.

<sup>67</sup> Sollamo, *Semi-prepositions*, 182.

<sup>68</sup> Sollamo, *Semi-prepositions*, 191; HALOT 1:387–88.

<sup>69</sup> Also in 51:17 and 22 מיד is translated with an expression containing χεῖρ, but in those verses the noun יד is probably meant in a literal sense, for which reason מיד cannot be considered a semi-preposition there.

concern מִיד in its connotation of “from the power/possession of.” מִיד in the sense of “from (the side of)” is rendered in a literalistic way only in 1:12 and 40:2:

1:12	מִי־בִקֵּשׁ זֹאת מִדְּכֶם	τίς γὰρ ἐξεζήτησε ταῦτα ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν ὑμῶν;
36:18	הֲצִילוּ אֱלֹהֵי הַגּוֹיִם אִישׁ אֶת־אֶרְצוֹ מִיַּד מֶלֶךְ אַשּׁוּר	μη ἐρρύσαντο οἱ θεοὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν ἕκαστος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ χώραν ἐκ χειρὸς βασιλέως Ἀσσυρίων;
36:19	וְכִי־הֲצִילוּ אֶת־שִׁמְרוֹן מִיַּד	μη ἐδύναντο ῥύσασθαι Σαμάρειαν ἐκ χειρὸς μου;
36:20	מִי בְכַל־אֱלֹהֵי הָאֲרָצוֹת הָאֵלֹהִים אֲשֶׁר־הֲצִילוּ אֶת־אֲרָצָם מִיַּד כִּי־צִיל יְהוָה אֶת־יְרוּשָׁלַם מִיַּד	τίς τῶν θεῶν πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν τούτων ἐρρύσατο τὴν γῆν αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῆς χειρὸς μου, ὅτι ῥύσεται ὁ θεὸς Ιερουσαλημ ἐκ χειρὸς μου;
37:20	הוֹשִׁיעֵנו מִיַּד	σῶσον ἡμᾶς ἐκ χειρὸς αὐτῶν
40:2	כִּי לִקְחָה מִיַּד יְהוָה כְּפָלִים בְּכָל־חַטָּאתֶיהָ	ὅτι ἐδέξατο ἐκ χειρὸς κυρίου διπλᾶ τὰ ἁμαρτήματα αὐτῆς.
43:13	וְאֵין מִיַּד מִצִּיל	καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν μου ἐξαιρούμενος.

Three times מִיד is translated freely, without an equivalent for יַד. This includes two cases in which מִיד carries the denotation “from (the side of)” (37:14; 50:11), and one in which it indicates “from the power/possession of” (47:14):

37:14	וַיִּקַּח חֲזִקְיָהוּ אֶת־הַסְּפָרִים מִיַּד הַמְּלָאכִים	καὶ ἔλαβεν Ἐζεκίας τὸ βιβλίον παρὰ τῶν ἀγγέλων
47:14	לֹא־יִצִּילוּ אֶת־נַפְשָׁם מִיַּד לַהֲבָה	καὶ οὐ μὴ ἐξέλωνται τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτῶν ἐκ φλογός.
50:11	מִיַּד הִיתָ־זֹאת לָכֶם	δι' ἐμὲ ἐγένετο ταῦτα ὑμῖν

Also in the rest of the Septuagint מִיד has more often received a free translation when it stands for “from (the side of)” than in its other connotation.<sup>70</sup>

In secular Greek the phrases ἐκ (τῶν) χειρῶν and ἐκ (τῆς) χειρὸς can be encountered as well. According to Sollamo they are suitable for both nuances of meaning of מִיד, without producing unnatural Greek.<sup>71</sup> However, they are only employed when the referent is a living being.<sup>72</sup> The rendition of מִיד in LXX Isaiah is in agreement with this. In all of the above examples of מִיד being

<sup>70</sup> Throughout the entire Septuagint מִיד with the meaning of “from (the side of)” is rendered freely in 22 % of its occurrences, while מִיד in the sense of “from the power/possession of” is translated freely in only 10 percent of its instances (Sollamo, *Semi-prepositions*, 202).

<sup>71</sup> Sollamo, *Semi-prepositions*, 193, 194.

<sup>72</sup> Sollamo, *Semi-prepositions*, 194.

parallel to an expression with  $\chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\rho$  the reference is to a person, whereas in 47:14—where the referent is a “flame”—the semi-preposition is reproduced by  $\acute{\epsilon}\alpha$  only.

### c. תחת יד

The semi-preposition יד תחת appears only once in Isaiah. In the LXX it is represented by  $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\acute{o}$ :

3:6      **יד תחת** והמכשלה הזאת       $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \tau\acute{o}\ \beta\rho\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha\ \tau\acute{o}\ \acute{\epsilon}\mu\acute{o}\nu\ \acute{\upsilon}\pi\acute{o}\ \sigma\acute{\epsilon}\ \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\omega.$

## 5.7.4 Semi-prepositions with קרב

### a. בקרב

Of the fifteen Isaianic occurrences of בקרב (“in the middle of”) eleven are rendered without a Greek noun for “middle”:<sup>73</sup>

- The original noun קרב is not reflected when בקרב is used purely in the sense of “in” (often as “the inward parts” of the body), without the literal meaning of קרב (“middle”) being of significance in the context:

19:1	<b>ולבב מצרים ימס בקרב</b>	$\kappa\alpha\iota\ \eta\ \kappa\alpha\rho\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omega}\nu\ \eta\tau\tau\eta\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}\iota\varsigma.$
19:3	<b>ונבקה רוח־מצרים בקרב</b>	$\kappa\alpha\iota\ \tau\alpha\rho\alpha\chi\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota\ \tau\acute{o}\ \pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\ \tau\acute{\omega}\nu\ \text{Αἰγυπτίων}\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}\iota\varsigma$
19:14	<b>יהוה מסך בקרבה רוח עוועים</b>	$\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho\ \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\sigma\epsilon\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}\iota\varsigma\ \pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\ \pi\lambda\alpha\nu\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\omega\varsigma$
29:23	<b>כי בראתו ילדיו מעשה ידי בקרב</b> יקדישו שמי	$\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\prime\ \delta\tau\alpha\nu\ \acute{\iota}\delta\omega\sigma\iota\nu\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\ \tau\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\nu\alpha\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omega}\nu\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\ \acute{\epsilon}\rho\gamma\alpha\ \mu\omicron\upsilon,\ \delta\iota\prime\ \acute{\epsilon}\mu\acute{\epsilon}\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\iota}\alpha\sigma\sigma\upsilon\sigma\iota\nu\ \tau\acute{o}\ \delta\acute{\nu}\omicron\mu\acute{\alpha}\ \mu\omicron\upsilon^{74}$
63:11	<b>איה השם בקרב</b> את־רוח קדשו	$\pi\omicron\upsilon\ \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu\ \acute{o}\ \theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}\iota\varsigma\ \tau\acute{o}\ \pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\ \tau\acute{o}\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\omicron\nu;$

- As regards the translation of בקרב הארץ, the Greek consistently lacks any trace of the original noun:

5:8	<b>בקר</b> הארץ	$\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \gamma\eta\varsigma$
6:12	<b>בקר</b> הארץ	$\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \gamma\eta\varsigma$
7:22	<b>בקר</b> הארץ	$\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \gamma\eta\varsigma$
10:23	<b>בקר</b> כל־הארץ	$\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\eta\ \omicron\iota\kappa\omicron\upsilon\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta\ \delta\lambda\eta$
19:24	<b>בקר</b> הארץ	$\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\eta\ \gamma\eta$
24:13	<b>בקר</b> הארץ	$\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\eta\ \gamma\eta$

<sup>73</sup> Twice an equivalent for בקרב is entirely absent in LXX Isaiah, that is in 25:11 and 26:9.

<sup>74</sup> The translator may have read בקרבי instead of בקרב.

Twice the translator has rendered בקרב literally by ἐν μέσῳ. In both cases קרב can be understood in its straightforward, local sense of “middle,” “amidst,” for which reason its literal translation has not resulted in an unidiomatic use of the Greek:

5:25	ותהי נבלתם כסוחה בקרב חוצות	καὶ ἐγενήθη τὰ θνησιμαῖα αὐτῶν ὡς κοπρία ἐν μέσῳ ὁδοῦ.
12:6	כִּי־גָדוֹל בַּקֶּרֶב קְדוֹשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל	ὅτι ὑψώθη ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ ἐν μέσῳ σου.

#### b. מקרב

The one representation of מקרב in MT Isaiah has a literal counterpart in the Greek:

4:4	וְאֵת־דָּמִי יְרוּשָׁלַם יִדִּיחַ מִקְרָבָהּ	καὶ τὸ αἷμα ἐκκαθαριεῖ ἐκ μέσου αὐτῶν
-----	--	---------------------------------------

### 5.7.5 Semi-prepositions with תוך

#### a. בתוך

בתוך, the original meaning of which is similar to that of בקרב—“in the middle of,” is used eight times in Isaiah. Its nominal component תוך is reflected in the LXX when the content of that noun (“middle”) is relevant to the context and has a local aspect (“in the middle of,” “amidst of”).<sup>75</sup>

5:2	וַיְבִן מִגְדָּל בְּתוֹכּוֹ	καὶ ὠκοδόμησα πύργον ἐν μέσῳ αὐτοῦ
6:5	וּבְתוֹךְ עַם־טָמֵא	ἐν μέσῳ λαοῦ ἀκάθαρτα
	שִׁפְתֵים אֲנֹכִי יוֹשֵׁב	χείλη ἔχοντος ἐγὼ οἰκῶ
24:13	בְּתוֹךְ הָעַמִּים	ἐν μέσῳ τῶν ἐθνῶν
41:18	וּבְתוֹךְ בִּקְעוֹת מַעֲיִנוֹת	καὶ ἐν μέσῳ πεδίων πηγᾶς

Three times בתוך is translated without μέσος:

7:6	וְנִמְלִיךְ מֶלֶךְ בְּתוֹכָהּ	καὶ βασιλεύσομεν αὐτῆς
16:3	צֶלֶךְ בְּתוֹךְ צְהָרִים	ἐν μεσημβρινῇ σκοτίας
19:19	יְהִיָּה מִזְבַּח לַיהוָה	ἔσται θυσιαστήριον τῷ κυρίῳ
	בְּתוֹךְ אֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם	ἐν χώρᾳ Αἰγυπτίων

Throughout the entire Septuagint בתוך is in more than 70 percent of its occurrences rendered literally by an expression including μέσος.<sup>76</sup>

<sup>75</sup> בתוך is a minus in LXX Isa 61:9.

<sup>76</sup> Sollamo, *Semi-prepositions*, 263.

b. מתוך

In Isaiah we find three examples of מתוך. In the Greek it is twice reproduced freely, a rendering of the noun תוך being absent:

24:18 והעולה מתוך הפחת      ὁ δὲ ἐκβαίνων **ἐκ** τοῦ βοθύτου  
 58:9 אִם-תִּסִּיר מִתּוֹכָךְ מוֹטָה      ἐὰν ἀφέλῃς **ἀπὸ** σοῦ σὺνδεσμος

Once מתוך has given rise to a literal translation:

52:11 צאו מתוכה      ἐξέλθατε **ἐκ** μέσου αὐτῆς

### 5.7.6 Conclusion to 5.7

The rendition of semi-prepositions illustrates the ambiguity that typifies the translation technique of LXX Isaiah. Sometimes these prepositions have been rendered in a quite literal or even Hebraistic way—the meaning of the original noun being reflected in the Greek, while at other times they have received a free translation by a preposition only. Nonetheless, cases of a free translation seem to be in the majority. Of the semi-prepositions discussed above, almost 70 percent have as their Greek counterparts a plain preposition. This is a higher rate than in many other books of the Septuagint, which have applied extremely literal translations of semi-prepositions much more often than LXX Isaiah.<sup>77</sup> Moreover, the Isaiah translator in rendering semi-prepositions usually seems to have taken into account the rules for a correct use of the Greek language. That is, he has represented them in a literal way almost solely when this in principle did not produce unidiomatic Greek (even though it may have generated *uncommon* Greek). This applies, for instance, to the rendering of בִּיד, which in LXX Isaiah is translated literally with the help of an expression containing χεῖρ exclusively when it denotes “in the possession of,” in conformity with the use of prepositional expressions which include χεῖρ in secular Greek literature.

<sup>77</sup> Sollamo gives for the relative frequency of “slavish renderings” of semi-prepositions in LXX Isaiah a rate of 30.9%. Of the twenty-six biblical books she lists, sixteen have a rate of “slavish renderings” higher than this. The highest rate she observes is in LXX Jeremiah, being 80.4%. The relative frequency of *free* renderings in LXX Isaiah is 43.6%, in which this translation is number six in the priority list of “free translations.” See Sollamo, *Semi-prepositions*, 281–82.

## 5.8 The omission of Hebrew idiomatic expressions and formulae

### 5.8.1 The omission of לֵאמֹר

The prepositional expression לֵאמֹר, which is composed of an infinitive construct with a prefixed preposition ל and literally means “in saying,”<sup>78</sup> is used in Hebrew to introduce direct speech, and thus usually comes after verbs of speaking. In the book of Isaiah לֵאמֹר is utilised almost thirty times in this manner. The Greek translation of Isaiah renders this typical Hebrew phenomenon in the following ways:

- With the help of a predicative participle of λέγω, for example λέγων—“saying.” This has happened in 50 percent of the instances of לֵאמֹר, that is, in fourteen of the twenty-eight cases.<sup>79</sup> Also outside of LXX Isaiah this is the Septuagint’s most common rendering of לֵאמֹר. In secular Greek, however, a participle in the sense of “to speak” appears only sporadically after a finite verb of speaking.<sup>80</sup> The representation of לֵאמֹר by λέγων therefore seems to be the result of the LXX translators’ attempt to render the Hebrew phrase with an existing, albeit rare, Greek construction, which would approximate to לֵאמֹר as nearly as possible without being grammatically incorrect.
- By means of an independently used attributive participle of λέγω, such as ὁ λέγων—“he who says,” or οἱ λέγοντες—“they who say.” This is found in LXX Isa 30:21.
- By means of a finite verb form of λέγω, for instance καὶ εἶπεν. This way of rendering fits within the limits of a natural use of the Greek. In LXX Isaiah it occurs four times (see 3:7; 23:4; 29:12; and 37:21).
- By the conjunction ὅτι, thus used as a “ὅτι recitativum,” in 36:15; 37:8; and 44:19. Also this rendition produces stylistically good Greek.<sup>81</sup>
- In six instances (which is more than 20 percent of all of its attestations) לֵאמֹר seems to have been left out in the Greek Isaiah, namely in the following verses:

8:5	ויסף יהוה דבר אלי עוד לֵאמֹר יען כי מאס העם הזה ...	Καὶ προσέθετο κύριος λαλῆσαι μοι ἔτι Διὰ τὸ μὴ βούλεσθαι τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον ...
14:24	נשבע יהוה צבאות לֵאמֹר אם-לא כאשר דמיתן בן היתה	τάδε λέγει κύριος σαβαωθ “Ὅν τρόπον εἶρηκα, οὕτως ἔσται

<sup>78</sup> Joüon §103b.

<sup>79</sup> See 4:1; 7:2, 5, 10; 8:11; 9:8(9); 19:25; 20:2; 29:11; 36:18; 37:9, 10, 15; and 38:4. See also 26:1 where λέγοντες—introducing direct speech—is a plus.

<sup>80</sup> For sources, see BDR §420.1. See also E. Kieckers, “Zur oratio recta in den indogermanischen Sprachen I,” *Indogermanische Forschungen* 35 (1915): 34–41; Antonius Hilhorst, *Sémitismes et latinismes dans le Pasteur d’Hermas* (Nijmegen: Dekker & Van de Vegt, 1976), 78.

<sup>81</sup> See Aejmelaeus, “Ὅτι recitativum,” 80–81.



16:14	ועתה דבר יהוה <u>לאמר</u>	καὶ νῦν λέγω
	בשלש שנים כשני שכיר ...	Ἐν τρισὶν ἔτεσιν ἐτῶν μισθωτοῦ ...
36:21	כי־מצות המלך היא <u>לאמר</u>	διὰ τὸ προστάξαι τὸν βασιλέα
	לא תענהו	μηδὲνα ἀποκριθῆναι.
37:10	כה תאמרון אל־חזקיהו	Οὕτως ἐρέϊτε Εἰς ἐκία
	מלך־יהודה <u>לאמר</u> אל־ישאך	βασιλεῖ τῆς Ἰουδαίας Μή σε ἀπατάτω
	אלהיך	ὁ θεός σου
56:3	ואל־יאמר בן־הנכר הנלוח	μὴ λεγέτω ὁ ἀλλογενὴς ὁ προσκείμενος
	אל־יהוה <u>לאמר</u> הבדל יבדילני	πρὸς κύριον Ἀφοριεῖ με ἄρα
	יהוה מעל עמו	κύριος ἀπὸ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ.

The explanation for these omissions can possibly be found in the circumstance that whatever literal rendering with the help of λέγω the translator had given of לאמר, each one of them would have tended to give rise to a somewhat forced and pleonastic Greek formulation. Even though, as noted, a participle of a verb of speaking does occur now and then in secular Greek after a finite form of speaking to introduce what is going to be said, speech is most commonly announced by way of the conjunction *ὅτι*,<sup>82</sup> or simply indicated by a punctuation mark.

So, although the translator gave a literal translation of לאמר in a considerable number of its cases, he may have *limited* the occurrence of this Hebraism by means of omitting לאמר now and then.

### 5.8.2 The omission of הנה(ו) and הן

#### a. הנה

In Hebrew the interjection הנה (“behold”) serves to attract the attention of the listener to the words that follow.<sup>83</sup> The lexicon of Brown, Driver, and Briggs lists three ways in which the interjection appears:<sup>84</sup>

- (a) Pointing to persons or things (see Isa 6:8).
- (b) Introducing clauses involving predication (see Isa 7:14).
- (c) ... והנה in historical style, succeeding especially (but not exclusively) verbs of seeing or discovering, making the narrative vivid and achieving an effect of surprise on the reader (see Isa 5:30 ונבט לארץ והנה־חשך צר).<sup>85</sup>

<sup>82</sup> See section 4.2.1b.

<sup>83</sup> Joüon §105d.

<sup>84</sup> BDB 243–44.

<sup>85</sup> For an extensive discussion of הנה, see M. Johannesson, “Der Wahrnehmungssatz bei den Verben des Sehens in der hebräischen und griechischen Bibel,” *ZVS* 64 (1937): 179–215; idem, “Das biblische καὶ ἰδοὺ in der Erzählung samt seiner hebräischen Vorlage,” *ZVS* 66 (1939): 145–95; 67

A Greek expression that parallels הנה is formed by ἰδοῦ. In the Septuagint this word appears abundantly. In secular language, by contrast, the use of ἰδοῦ was considered a vulgarism. It was employed frequently in colloquial speech (which is shown by its regular occurrence in the Gospels and in the Greek papyri) but avoided as much as possible in literature.<sup>86</sup>

Even if the widespread use of ἰδοῦ in the Septuagint can be considered a Hebraism, the expression in itself cannot by definition be seen as grammatically incorrect. The situation changes, though, when the Greek as a rendering of הנה is applied in the final one of the three above-mentioned functions of the Hebrew formula, offers the phrase καὶ ἰδοῦ. On such occasions it is a question of an ungrammatical Greek construction, since this kind of use of ἰδοῦ is foreign to Greek.<sup>87</sup> In secular Greek ἰδοῦ is never even preceded by καί.<sup>88</sup> As rightly suggested by Elias Bickerman the unusualness of καὶ ἰδοῦ also explains why that construction in the LXX of Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy in about sixty of the ninety occurrences of הנה has been avoided. Nonetheless, in the LXX of Genesis καὶ ἰδοῦ can still be encountered in twenty places. According to Bickerman it has been utilised there with the purpose of dramatising the situation described.<sup>89</sup>

In the MT of Isaiah הנה features almost eighty times. If the word fulfils the first or second of the three functions mentioned above—which happens in somewhat more than sixty cases—LXX Isaiah almost consistently translates הנה as ἰδοῦ. Only in four places has the word received a different rendering,<sup>90</sup> while in the next six instances הנה is not represented at all:

38:7–8	הנני משיב את־צל המעלות אשר ירדה במעלות אחז בשמש אחרנית עשר מעלות	τῇν σκιὰν τῶν ἀναβαθμῶν, οὓς κατέβη ὁ ἥλιος, τοὺς δέκα ἀναβαθμοὺς τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ πατρὸς σου, ἀποστρέψω τὸν ἥλιον τοὺς δέκα ἀναβαθμούς. <sup>91</sup>
41:27	ראשון לציון הנה הנם	ἀρχὴν Σιων δώσω

(1942): 30–84. According to Johannesson הנה appears especially after clauses of observation, clauses in which a verb of movement occurs, and nominal clauses which announce the appearance of a person. In the Hebrew Bible the construction seems to develop into a mere “Verknüpfungsmittel zwischen zwei Geschehnissen” (“Das biblische καὶ ἰδοῦ,” ZVS 66 [1939]: 149).

<sup>86</sup> See Bickerman, “The Septuagint as a Translation,” 187 n.55.

<sup>87</sup> Johannesson, “Der Wahrnehmungssatz,” 200; Peter Fiedler, *Die Formel “Und siehe” im Neuen Testament* (SANT 20; München: Kösel, 1969), 25; Bickerman, “The Septuagint as a Translation,” 187; Hilhorst, *Sémitismes*, 153–54; BDR §442 n.15.

<sup>88</sup> Fiedler, *Die Formel “Und siehe,”* 21, 25; Hilhorst, *Sémitismes*, 154.

<sup>89</sup> Bickerman, “The Septuagint as a Translation,” 187–88.

<sup>90</sup> A translation of הנה other than by ἰδοῦ is found in 37:11 (ἡ οὐκ), 48:7 (ὅτι καί), 52:6 (הנני /πάρεμι), and 65:1 (εἶμι).

<sup>91</sup> Perhaps הני was skipped over by the translator together with the preceding words אשר דבר on account of an *aberratio oculi*: משיב את־צל הנני אשר דבר הזה; see section 11.3.

	ולירושלם מבשר אתן	καὶ Ἱερουσαλημ παρακαλέσω εἰς ὁδόν. <sup>92</sup>
62:11	הנה יהוה השמיע אל-קצה הארץ אמרו לבת-ציון הנה ישעך בא הנה שכרו אתו	ἰδοὺ γὰρ κύριος ἐποίησεν ἀκουστὸν ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς Εἶπατε τῇ θυγατρὶ Σιών Ἰδοὺ σοι ὁ σωτὴρ παραγίνεται ἔχων τὸν ἑαυτοῦ μισθόν <sup>93</sup>
65:1	אמרתי הנני הנני	εἶπα Ἰδοὺ εἰμι <sup>94</sup>
65:17	כי-הנני בורא שמים חדשים	ἔσται γὰρ ὁ οὐρανὸς καινός

In 38:17 the entire clause in which הנה appears is absent in LXX Isaiah:

38:17	הנה לשלום מר-לי מר ואתה חשקת נפשי	εἴλου γάρ μου τὴν ψυχὴν
-------	--------------------------------------	-------------------------

הנה used in the third function—that is, as the narrative formula והנה—is attested in Isaiah fourteen times. Only in a minority of these cases does the LXX give a rendering by καὶ ἰδοῦ:

5:26	ושרק לו מקצה הארץ והנה מהרה קל יבוא	καὶ συριεῖ αὐτοῖς ἀπ' ἄκρου τῆς γῆς, <b>καὶ ἰδοῦ</b> ταχὺ κούφως ἔρχονται.
5:30	ונבט לארץ והנה-חשך צר	καὶ ἐμβλέψονται εἰς τὴν γῆν, <b>καὶ ἰδοῦ</b> σκότος σκληρόν
8:22	ואל-ארץ יביט והנה צרה וחשכה	καὶ εἰς τὴν γῆν κάτω ἐμβλέψονται, <b>καὶ ἰδοῦ</b> θλίψις καὶ στενοχωρία καὶ σκότος
21:8–9	אנכי עמד תמיד יומם ועל-משמרתִי אנכי נצב כל-הלילות והנה-זה בא רכב איש צמד פרשים	Ἔστην διὰ παντὸς ἡμέρας καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς παρεμβολῆς ἔστην ὄλην τὴν νύκτα, <b>καὶ ἰδοῦ</b> αὐτὸς ἔρχεται ἀναβάτης συνωρίδος.

In both 5:30 and 8:22 there is mention of an actual *seeing*. Likewise, 21:8–9 speaks about a watcher who is peering from his post. This may have provided a justification for the translator to render והנה by καὶ ἰδοῦ. In 5:26 the fact that והנה appears in a prophecy (in accordance with the second mentioned function of (הנה) may have accounted for a translation with καὶ ἰδοῦ.

Regularly the translator has replaced והנה by a verb phrase (see 5:7; 17:14; 22:13; 37:36; and 59:9 below), or a conjunction (5:7 and 29:8), or has not represented it at all (29:8 and 49:12):

5:7	ויקו למשפט והנה	ἔμεινα τοῦ ποιῆσαι κρίσιν, <b>ἐποίησε δὲ</b>
-----	-----------------	--

<sup>92</sup> הנה was perhaps not omitted, but rendered by παρακαλέσω through the association with נחם (transposition of ה and נ, and change of gutturals).

<sup>93</sup> The third הנה may have been omitted for the sake of condensation or reduction of repetition (see sections 7.3.2 and 8.7).

<sup>94</sup> Probably deleted in order to eliminate the geminatio (see section 8.7).

	משפח לצדקה והנה צעקה	ἀνομίαν καὶ οὐ δικαιοσύνην ἀλλὰ κραυγὴν.
17:14	לעת ערב והנה בלהה	πρὸς ἑσπέραν ἔσται πένθος
22:13	והנה ששון ושמחה	αὐτοὶ δὲ ἐποίησαντο εὐφροσύνην καὶ ἀγαλλίαμα
29:8	והיה כאשר יחלם הרעב והנה אוכל והקיץ וריקה נפשו וכאשר יחלם הצמא והנה שתה והקיץ והנה עיף	καὶ ἔσονται ὡς οἱ ἐν ὕπνῳ πεινῶντες καὶ ἔσθοντες, καὶ ἐξαναστάντων μάταιον αὐτῶν τὸ ἐνύπνιον, καὶ ὃν τρόπον ἐνυπνιάζεται ὁ διψῶν ὡς πίνων καὶ ἐξαναστὰς ἔτι διψᾷ καὶ ἐξαναστάντες τὸ πρῶτ
37:36	וישכימו בבקר והנה כלם פגרים מתים	καὶ ἐξαναστάντες τὸ πρῶτ εὗρον πάντα τὰ σώματα νεκρά.
49:12	הנה-אלה מרחוק יבאו והנה-אלה מצפון ומים	ἰδοὺ οὗτοι πόρρωθεν ἔρχονται, οὗτοι ἀπὸ βορρᾶ
59:9	נקוה לאור והנה-חשך	ὑπομεινάντων αὐτῶν φῶς ἐγένετο αὐτοῖς σκοτός

In short, when הנה is used in a narrative context in the form of והנה, the Isaiah translator in the majority of cases has avoided a literal translation using καὶ ἰδοὺ, thus escaping a Hebraistic and incorrect use of the Greek language. Nonetheless, in instances of הנה without waw and fulfilling other functions, he has mostly translated the interjection in a literal way by ἰδοὺ, most likely in view of the fact that in such situations ἰδοὺ could be applied in agreement with proper (albeit vernacular) Greek.<sup>95</sup>

#### b. הן

Just like הנה, הן also is a deictic interjection pointing to the word or phrase which it precedes.<sup>96</sup> In the book of Isaiah it appears twenty-seven times, thirteen times of which it is mirrored by ἰδοὺ in the LXX.<sup>97</sup> In twelve places the Greek represents הן in a distinct way, practically always by εἰ—thus reflecting the Aramaic meaning of הן (“if”)<sup>98</sup>—or by another conjunction.<sup>99</sup> In the remaining two instances הן does not have any match in the Greek text:

<sup>95</sup> A few times ἰδοὺ even appears as a plus: see 26:1; 44:22 (ἰδοὺ γάρ; compare the plus ἴδετε in 44:20); 49:6, 18 (probably contextual harmonisation with 49:12, 16, 18, 21, 22); 60:4 (probably harmonisation with 49:12, 18, and in parallelism to 60:4a); and 66:9 (contextual harmonisation with 66:12). In 41:28 ἰδοὺ renders וארא. The plural imperative ἴδετε is a plus in 44:20 and 57:1.

<sup>96</sup> HALOT 1:251.

<sup>97</sup> See Isa 32:1; 33:7; 41:11; 49:16; 50:1, 2, 9, 9, 11; 54:15, 16; 55:4; and 64:4(5).

<sup>98</sup> See 40:15 and 58:4. Also in 23:13 the word may have been interpreted in this way. In that verse the Greek text is elliptic, implying a conditional “if.” Maybe this implicit “if” echoes הן understood as “if.”

42:1            **הַן** עבדי אתמך־בו    *Ἰακωβ ὁ παῖς μου, ἀντιλήμψομαι αὐτοῦ·*  
 55:5           **הַן** גוי לא־תדע תקרא    *ἔθνη, ἃ οὐκ ᾔδεισάν σε, ἐπικαλέσονται σε*

In 42:1 **הַן** may have been omitted so as to balance the parallelism with the ensuing line (בְּחִירִי רִצְתָּהּ נִפְשִׁי), which does not start with **הַן** either. The absence of **הַן** in 55:5 might be related to the fact that already verse 4 has been introduced by **הַן**; perhaps the translator wanted to remove the repetition, or wished to draw the two verses together more closely by deleting **הַן**.

All in all, it appears that the translator was apt not to reproduce **הַן** by its literal counterpart ἰδοὺ, but to render it in a variant way or to remove the interjection. In this way he avoided a rendition by ἰδοὺ in more than half of the instances of **הַן**. One reason for this could be that he may occasionally have interpreted **הַן** according to its Aramaic sense—"if." This would elucidate the frequent translation of the Hebrew interjection with a Greek conjunction. Another reason might be that in this manner he deliberately attempted to reduce the number of occurrences of the vulgar expression ἰδοὺ.

### 5.8.3 The omission of **אֵן**

**אֵן** is an interjection adding an entreating nuance to the word which it follows. It is used often with the volitive moods.<sup>100</sup> The Hebrew text of Isaiah contains seventeen instances of **אֵן**. In the Greek the particle is most commonly—that is, in fourteen cases—not represented.<sup>101</sup> Only in three places does **אֵן** have a Greek counterpart: in Isa 5:1 **אֵן** δὴ, in 7:13 **אֵן** δὴ, and in 47:12 **אֵן** νῦν. Both renderings, by **δὴ** and by **νῦν**, can properly be used in Greek after an imperative: **δὴ** in order to attribute more urgency to the order,<sup>102</sup> and **νῦν** to express that a command has to be obeyed immediately.<sup>103</sup> Nevertheless, the stressing of an imperative by means of a particle occurs much less often in Greek than in Hebrew, which may have accounted for the frequent omission of **אֵן** in LXX Isaiah.

### 5.8.4 The omission of **כִּן** in indications of descent

When the name of a person is accompanied by the notification of whose son or daughter he or she is, in Classical and Koinē Greek it is customary to express

<sup>99</sup> Isa 23:13 καί; 40:15 καί; 41:24 ὅτι; 41:29 γάρ; 44:11 καί; 49:21 δέ; 56:3 ὅτι; 58:3 γάρ; 64:8(9) καί νῦν. In 59:1 **הַן** has perhaps been read as the interrogative particle **ה** and is on those grounds translated **Μή**.

<sup>100</sup> Joüon §105c.

<sup>101</sup> See Isa 1:18; 5:3, 5; 7:3; 19:12; 29:11, 12; 36:4, 8, 11; 38:3; 47:13; 51:21; and 64:8(9).

<sup>102</sup> Walter Bauer, *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur* (rev. reprint of the 5th ed.; Berlin: De Gruyter, 1971), 353.

<sup>103</sup> Bauer, *Wörterbuch*, 1079.

this relationship by way of a possessive genitive without υῖός or θυγάτηρ. The regular supply of υῖός in the Septuagint is rather Semitic than typically Greek.<sup>104</sup> This could explain why בן used in patronyms is now and then not represented in LXX Isaiah.<sup>105</sup>

7:1	אֲחִיז בְּנֵי־יֹתָם	Ἀχαζ τοῦ Ἰωθαμ
36:3	אֵלִיקִים בְּנֵי־חֲלָקִיהוּ	Ἐλιακίμ ὁ τοῦ Χελκίου
36:3	וְיֹאחַז בְּנֵי־אַסָּף	καὶ Ἰωαχ ὁ τοῦ Ἀσαφ
36:22	אֵלִיקִים בְּנֵי־חֲלָקִיהוּ	Ἐλιακίμ ὁ τοῦ Χελκίου
36:22	וְיֹאחַז בְּנֵי־אַסָּף	καὶ Ἰωαχ ὁ τοῦ Ἀσαφ

However, the Isaiah translator usually did translate בן in indications of descent. Of the twenty-one examples of such a use of the noun, he has provided υῖός fifteen times.<sup>106</sup> This includes seven occurrences of the phrase ישעיהו בן-אמוץ / Ἡσαίας υῖός Ἀμωζ.<sup>107</sup>

### 5.8.5 The omission of בן when used with a meaning other than “son”

In addition to its primary meaning of “son,” the noun בן can also have other connotations. If, for instance, it governs another noun, it can denote the membership of a nation (for example, בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל), or that one belongs to a certain group or type, or it may introduce a quality or characteristic of someone.<sup>108</sup> In line with this, the Greek υῖός (or τέκνον) is also occasionally applied with one of these meanings. Yet, this is largely a form of Semiticism.<sup>109</sup> In LXX Isaiah we come across such a figurative use of υῖός and τέκνον with regularity, not only where the Hebrew offers בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל,<sup>110</sup> but also in a number of other cases.<sup>111</sup> Notwithstanding this, in twelve places (which is circa 50 percent of all cases) the noun has been glossed by a periphrastic translation or has simply been omitted in the Greek Isaiah.<sup>112</sup>

<sup>104</sup> Moulton, *Grammar*, 3:207; BDR §162.

<sup>105</sup> In LXX Isa 20:2 an equivalent is missing to the entire apposition specifying Isaiah’s descent, i.e. בן-אמוץ. The apposition may have been left out in harmonisation with places where the name of Isaiah appears without בן-אמוץ (see 7:3; 20:3; 37:5, 6; 38:4, 21), but its absence can also be due to a different *Vorlage*. In LXX Isa 7:5 the words אֲפִרַּים וּבְנֵי־רַמְלִיָּהוּ are missing.

<sup>106</sup> See LXX Isa 1:1; 2:1; 7:1(2x), 4, 6, 9; 8:2, 6; 13:1; 20:2; 37:2, 21; 38:1; and 39:1.

<sup>107</sup> See LXX Isa 1:1; 2:1; 13:1; 20:2; 37:2, 21; and 38:1.

<sup>108</sup> BDB 121; *HALOT* 1:138.

<sup>109</sup> Bauer, *Wörterbuch*, 1650; BDR §162.

<sup>110</sup> See 17:3, 9; 27:12; and 66:20. This includes all occurrences of בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל in Isaiah, except for 31:6 where בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל is a minus in the LXX. Compare also the plus τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ in LXX Isa 45:25.

<sup>111</sup> See 1:4; 11:14; 30:1, 9; 51:12; 57:3; 60:14; and 62:8. Also compare the literal rendering of the figuratively used יֵלֶד in 57:4. In 19:11 בֵּן is probably meant in a literal way.

<sup>112</sup> In LXX Isa 31:6 and 37:12 the entire phrase governed by בן / בְּנֵי is absent.

5:1	בקרן בן־שמן	ἐν κέρατι ἐν τόπῳ πίονι
11:14	את־בני־קדם	καὶ τοὺς ἀφ' ἡλίου ἀνατολῶν
14:12	בן־שחר	ὁ πρωὶ ἀνατέλλων
30:9	בנים לא־אבו שמוע	οἱ οὐκ ἠβούλοντο ἀκούειν
	תורת יהוה	τὸν νόμον τοῦ θεοῦ
52:14	מבני אדם	ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων
56:2	ובן־אדם	καὶ ἄνθρωπος
56:3	בן־הנכר	ὁ ἀλλογενὴς
56:6	ובני הנכר	καὶ τοῖς ἀλλογενέσι
60:10	בני־נכר	ἀλλογενεῖς
61:5	ובני נכר	καὶ ἀλλόφυλοι
65:20	הנער בן־מאה שנה	ὁ νέος ἑκατὸν ἐτῶν
65:20	בן־מאה שנה	ἑκατὸν ἐτῶν

## 5.9 Conclusion

In this chapter we have looked at the Isaiah translator's method of rendering a number of typical idiomatic and grammatical features of the Hebrew, with the purpose of finding out how literal or free he has been in translating his *Vorlage*. We have focused on those features that, if translated in a free way, would lead to a “plus” or a “minus” in the Greek (even if those terms are in fact not always properly applicable when dealing with a free translation). Our analysis has made clear that, as it concerns this subject, the Greek Isaiah is characterised by ambiguity. Sometimes it exhibits a free way of rendering, but about as often it translates typical Hebrew aspects in a very literal way, displaying a Hebraistic use of the Greek language. This double nature of LXX Isaiah is revealed in the outline below, where the features analysed—as far as they can be presented statistically—are divided into the categories “free” and “literal” as regards their translation:

<b><i>Retrospective pronoun or adverb in the relative clause</i></b>	<b>circa</b>
Literal translation (representation of the retrospective pronoun)	20 %
Free translation (omission of the retrospective pronoun or variant translation)	80 %
<b><i>Infinitive absolute construction</i></b>	
Literal translation (translation of the infinitive by a noun or a participle)	40 %
Free translation (omission of the infinitive or translation by an adverb)	60 %
<b><i>Semi-prepositions</i></b>	
Literal translation (representation of the original noun)	30%
Free translation (translation by a mere preposition)	70%

**לֵאמֹר**

Literal translation (translation by a participle form of λέγω)	40%
Free translation (omission of לֵאמֹר or translation by εἶπῃ or a finite form of λέγω)	60%

**וְהִנֵּה**

Literal translation (translation of וְהִנֵּה by καὶ ἰδοὺ)	30%
Free translation (omission of וְהִנֵּה or translation by a verb phrase or conjunction)	70%

**בֶּן in indications of descent**

Literal translation (translation of בֶּן as υἱός)	75%
Free translation (omission of בֶּן)	25%

**בֶּן with a meaning other than “son”**

Literal translation (translation of בֶּן as υἱός)	50%
Free translation (omission of בֶּן or periphrastic translation)	50%

**Total**

Literal translation	40%
Free translation	60%

As can be seen, the ratio of literal and free translations of the features listed above is not far from fifty-fifty. A free rendering is only slightly overrepresented. Of course these statistics should not be taken too seriously, as the aspects that have been treated in the present chapter are just an arbitrary choice from the many Hebrew grammatical and idiomatic constructions that could have been examined for the same purpose, and hence they offer just a limited perspective on the translator's style of translation. Besides, they present a rather simplified picture of the material discussed. They conceal, for instance, the fact that the Isaiah translator, even when translating in a literalistic way, was usually still concerned to employ the Greek language in a grammatically correct way. Although he did not mind occasionally using uncommon, Hebraistic expressions, he tended only to apply them in a way in which they *could* be used in secular Greek as well. This is shown for instance by the translation of semi-prepositions, which he practically only rendered in a literalistic manner when this was going to result in an existing Greek construction. Also the rendering of הִנֵּה may exemplify this. This Hebrew interjection generated the equivalent ἰδοὺ almost exclusively when this permitted a genuine usage of the Greek interjection.

The question remains as to *why* the Isaiah translator sometimes gave a free and at other times a literal translation. Was this variation purely random, or may there have been a purpose behind it? Might the translator, for instance, have translated in a literal way when he wanted to emphasise what was said?



However interesting this issue is, further investigation has to be deferred to another study.



## Chapter 6.

# DOUBLE TRANSLATION

### 6.1 Introduction

#### 6.1.1 Terminology

The well-known phenomenon that one segment of the Hebrew text is represented twice in a Greek translation has received different names in Septuagint studies. Except for “double translation,” terms such as “doublet,” “translation doublet,” “double reading,” “*Doppelung*,” and “*Doppelübersetzung*” have also turned up. The following list will give some examples of terms and definitions that have been offered by various scholars (italics are mine):<sup>1</sup>

#### **Seeligmann:**

*Doublets* are “the juxtaposed double renderings of certain Hebrew words and phrases.” The origin of these can lie in the work of the translator himself, or in the revision(s) to which the translation was subjected after it had gone into circulation.<sup>2</sup>

#### **Tov:**

According to Tov

The LXX exhibits several types of *doublets*:

- a. The LXX reflects a faithful (literal) rendering of a doublet in its Hebrew or Aramaic *Vorlage* ...
- b. The LXX *adds* to the translated reading of MT an element based on a different Hebrew reading, possibly found in a different Hebrew manuscript.

---

<sup>1</sup> The reason why double translation is the first translation technique to be discussed in this study is that it is likewise the first one treated in the *Untersuchungen* of Ziegler. One should not conclude from this that it is also the technique most often applied by the Isaiah translator.

<sup>2</sup> Seeligmann, *Septuagint Version*, 31.

- c. The LXX contains two or more alternative translations based on the *same* Hebrew *Vorlage*. This is a *translation doublet* which pertains to the translation technique of the LXX and not to its parent text.<sup>3</sup>

### **Ziporah Talshir:**

*Double translation* takes place in the target language and is caused (intentionally or unintentionally) by the translator or a later redactor. A *double-reading* implies a *Vorlage* that differs from the MT.<sup>4</sup>

### **Shemaryahu Talmon:**

*Double translations* are “usually the work of copyists who combined alternative renderings of a single Hebrew word or a single Hebrew expression found in different MSS of the version in question”; *conflate translations of synonymous readings* are doublets created by the translator “to preserve two alternative Hebrew traditions which he found in different MSS of the original, because he would not presume to prefer the one to the other”; *translations of double readings* concern double readings “which had already been incorporated as such in the Hebrew MS used by the translator.”<sup>5</sup>

Out of this potpourri of denotations I have chosen two terms to employ in the present study: Firstly, *doublet*, which is a neutral expression, and can be used properly if one does not wish to insinuate anything about the origin of the duplication. Secondly, I will use the term *double translation* when referring to a doublet which in my eyes presumably has been created by the translator himself.

### **6.1.2 Various explanations of doublets in the Septuagint**

The occurrence of a doublet in the Septuagint where it is absent from the MT, can be explained in various ways:

#### *a. The doublet was already present in the Hebrew Vorlage of the translation*

The doublet may have been extant in the *Vorlage* of the Greek translation, while it was missing in the MT tradition. This could have happened in either of the following two ways: (a) The doublet is secondary and was introduced into the Hebrew parent text of the LXX by a copyist who inserted an alternative reading from another Hebrew manuscript; (b) the single reading of the MT is secondary and brought about by a scribe who omitted the second element, because he, for instance, considered it redundant.

<sup>3</sup> Tov, *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint*, 129.

<sup>4</sup> Ziporah Talshir, “Double Translations in the Septuagint,” in *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies. Jerusalem 1986* (SCS 23; ed. Claude E. Cox; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1987), 22–23, 27–29.

<sup>5</sup> Shemaryahu Talmon, “Double Readings in the Massoretic Text,” *Textus* 1 (1960): 151.

*b. The doublet was created by a later reviser of the translation*

A doublet may have been the work of a later reviser, scribe, or reader of the Greek text, who, for instance, moved an alternative reading from the margin of the translation into the main text, or adopted into his copy two different renderings of one specific Hebrew expression, which he found in different Greek manuscripts (conflation).<sup>6</sup> The motivation behind this was usually to bring the Greek text in closer proximity to the MT.

*c. The doublet was created by the translator himself*

The Greek translator may have produced a double translation for several reasons:

- He had trouble choosing between two Greek renderings for one Hebrew expression, and hence used them both.
- He considered one Greek expression as insufficient to convey the exact or complete meaning of a particular Hebrew lexeme, and on those grounds offered an extra rendering.
- He wanted to express two different meanings of one Hebrew word.
- He wanted to express two different *readings* of one Hebrew word, for example both a literal and a “midrashic” reading.

## 6.2 Doublets and double translations in LXX Isaiah

The Septuagint of Isaiah displays a remarkably large number of doublets or double translations. This has been noted earlier by, among others, Fischer, Ziegler and Seeligmann. Fischer offers a list of more than thirty places where he found doublets in LXX Isaiah. He perceives them mainly as the work of later generations who elaborated on the text of the Greek Isaiah, writing “corrections” above the lines or in the margins, that were later on adopted into the main text. Only sporadically does he think a doublet derives from the original translator.<sup>7</sup> Also Ziegler considers most doublets in LXX Isaiah to be created by later revisers.<sup>8</sup> Seeligmann is somewhat more nuanced in his convictions, acknowledging that it is often impossible to distinguish between doublets that are an elaboration on the part of a later reviser, a creation of the LXX translator, or part of the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX. Yet, he believes that at least a considerable proportion of the doublets in the Greek Isaiah are of a secondary nature. Frequently they entail supplements by a later reader or reviser of the Greek text, providing the translation with commentary, or adding a more exact

<sup>6</sup> Talmon, “Double Readings,” 150; Talshir, “Double Translations,” 28–29.

<sup>7</sup> Fischer, *In welcher Schrift*, 13–14.

<sup>8</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 57.

Greek equivalent to a rather free rendering of the Hebrew. The latter Seeligmann thinks to be the case when “we come across more lengthy doublets that do not merely constitute a different rendering, but actually give evidence of a totally different system of translation.”<sup>9</sup> In those doublets a paraphrasing translation is accompanied by a more literal one, which, according to Seeligmann, was added at a later date to the sometimes quite liberal Septuagint, in order to correct this version in line with the Hebrew text. Several examples that Seeligmann presents can be found in Isa 7:16; 14:19; and 42:10.<sup>10</sup> One might argue against his hypothesis, though, that the side-by-side existence of free and literal translation in the same document does not necessarily indicate the insertion of later elements: it could as well derive from a translator who was combining two methods of rendition. In most cases such an explanation seems more likely to me as it concerns the Greek translation of Isaiah.<sup>11</sup>

In the continuation of this chapter I will present a list of doublets that can be found in the Old Greek of Isaiah. These doublets will be categorized according to the way in which they appear in the text: as two coordinated phrases; in a genitival relationship; as two distinct grammatical units in the same clause; or in consecutive clauses. Among these categories, a further distinction will be made between the following two conditions:

- a. Both Greek renderings reflect the same interpretation of the Hebrew; they are generally more or less synonymous, sometimes merely emphasising different nuances of the same Hebrew expression. Most commonly (but not always) they translate this expression in a literal way.

<sup>9</sup> Seeligmann, *Septuagint Version*, 33.

<sup>10</sup> Isa 7:16 בטרם ידע הנער מאס ברע ובחר בטוב / διότι πρὶν ἢ γνῶναι τὸ παιδίον ἀγαθὸν ἢ κακὸν ἀπειθεῖ πονηρίᾳ τοῦ ἐκλέξασθαι τὸ ἀγαθόν. Here Seeligmann tries to distinguish “an attempt at combining two separate translations, i.e. an older one, γνῶναι τὸ παιδίον ἀγαθὸν ἢ κακόν, under the influence of Genesis 2.9. and 17, 3.5, and one added later, which may originally have read: ἀπειθεῖν πονηρίᾳ καὶ ἐκλέξασθαι (ἐκλέγεσθαι) τὸ ἀγαθόν, but which was later adapted to fit into the context.” Isa 14:19 ואתה השלכת מקברך כנצר נתעב לבוש הרגים מטעני חרב ירדי אל אבני בור כפגר מובס לא תחד / οὐ δὲ ριψήσῃ ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν ὡς νεκρὸς ἐβδελυγμένος μετὰ πολλῶν τεθνηκότων ἐκκεκεντημένων μαχαίραις καταβαινόντων εἰς ᾄδου. ὃν τρόπον ἱμάτιον ἐν αἵματι πεφυρμένον οὐκ ἔσται καθαρόν, οὕτως οὐδὲ σὺ ἔσῃ καθαρός, διότι τῇν γῆν μου ἀπώλεσας καὶ τὸν λαόν μου ἀπέκτεινας. Whereas ὃν τρόπον ἱμάτιον ... ἔσῃ καθαρόν would form the original, midrashic translation of כפגר מובס, a subsequently added, more literal rendering of the same Hebrew words would have read μετὰ πολλῶν τεθνηκότων. Isa 42:10 שירי ליהוה שיר חדש תהלתי מוקצה הארץ / Ὑμνήσατε τῷ κυρίῳ ὕμνον καινόν, ἡ ἀρχὴ αὐτοῦ· δοξάζετε τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἀπ’ ἄκρου τῆς γῆς. While ἡ ἀρχὴ αὐτοῦ according to Seeligmann might form the older version—reflecting an erroneous reading תחלתו תהלתי—to this the words δοξάζετε τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ were added at a later date as a corrective translation (Seeligmann, *Septuagint Version*, 34–35).

<sup>11</sup> For a discussion on the intermingling of free and literal translation in LXX Isaiah, see section 1.3.2d.

- b. The two Greek expressions represent two distinct readings or interpretations of the single Hebrew expression. When the Greek offers two distinct *interpretations* of the Hebrew, the translator (or editor) may have wanted to supplement the meaning of a homonym. Or, he may have noticed two possible ways of vocalising one Hebrew word and represented both of these in his text. When the Greek reflects two different *readings* of the Hebrew, this entails that the translator read the consonant text in two alternative ways, for instance, in a literal as well as in an associative way—slightly deviating from the Hebrew text as it stands—and then adopted a translation of both readings into his manuscript.<sup>12</sup>

### 6.3 The two renderings are joined in coordination

#### a. Two coordinate renderings reflect a similar interpretation of the Hebrew

The plainest form of a doublet is when one Hebrew expression matches two Greek equivalents that are joined in coordination and bear a similar meaning. If such doublets have been produced by the translator himself, he may have offered two renderings instead of one in order to express the content of a Hebrew word more precisely. But his motives may have been stylistic as well: perhaps he wanted to form a synonymous word pair, to extend an enumeration, or to “ameliorate” a parallelism (see 2:12; 8:22; and 22:5 below).<sup>13</sup> Furthermore, a synonym has sometimes been added in harmonisation with other Scriptural texts where the same two expressions are equally joined together (see 2:12,19 below).

The following outline will offer some examples of doublets in LXX Isaiah that consist of two coordinate synonymous elements:

2:12	על כל־גאה ורם ועל כל־נשא ושפל	ἐπὶ πάντα ὑβριστήν καὶ ὑπερήφανον καὶ ἐπὶ πάντα ὑψηλὸν καὶ μετέωρον, καὶ ταπεινωθήσονται
------	-------------------------------------	--

The translator has probably added καὶ μετέωρον so as to create a twin-pair parallel to ὑβριστήν καὶ ὑπερήφανον in the preceding colon. Besides, the addition may have been influenced by הרמים והנשאים / τῶν ὑψηλῶν καὶ μετεώρων in verse 13.

2:19	ובאו במערות צרים	εἰσενέγκαντες εἰς τὰ σπήλαια καὶ εἰς τὰς σχισμὰς τῶν πετρῶν
------	---------------------	--

<sup>12</sup> For the Isaiah translator’s manoeuvring with the form of Hebrew words, see section 1.3.2d.

<sup>13</sup> See sections 8.3.1.2c; 8.3.2.1a, and 8.5.1.

According to Ziegler σπήλαια is a later insertion meant to bring the LXX in line with the MT. He argues this on the grounds that σπήλαιον is a more usual translation of מערה than σχισμή (see 32:14).<sup>14</sup> It is likewise possible, though, that εἰς τὰ σπήλαια was the translator's primary rendering of במערות, to which he added καὶ εἰς τὰς σχισμὰς in analogy to verse 21, where one finds the same wording καὶ εἰς τὰς σχισμὰς τῶν πετρῶν.

3:2 גבור ואיש מלחמה γίγαντα καὶ ἰσχύοντα καὶ ἄνθρωπον πολεμιστήν

Seeligmann believes the original reading to be γίγαντα, which was afterwards elucidated by the more literal and less mythological ἰσχύοντα.<sup>15</sup> But it may also have been the translator himself who supplemented καὶ ἰσχύοντα, namely with the aim of further increasing the number of forms related to ἰσχύω in this passage (counting five in the LXX), thus emphasising the repetition even more.<sup>16</sup>

8:22 והנה צרה וחשכה καὶ ἰδοὺ θλίψις καὶ στενοχωρία καὶ σκότος,  
מעוף צוקה ואפלה ἀπορία στενὴ καὶ σκότος

By supplying καὶ στενοχωρία the translator has created a tricolon, comparably to the next line, which includes three expressions for distress or darkness as well: ἀπορία, στενὴ and σκότος.<sup>17</sup> Maybe he was also inspired by Isa 30:6 Ἐν τῇ θλίψει καὶ τῇ στενοχωρίᾳ, and 30:20 ἄρτον θλίψεως καὶ ὕδωρ στενόν. It is arguable that καὶ στενοχωρία does not form a second translation of צרה, but is a plain addition, perhaps reflecting Hebrew צוקה (see צוקה / στενοχωρία in 30:6, and צוקה / στενὴ in 8:22); yet, the possibility that the noun derives from צרה is favoured by the matching of יצרי with στενοχωρήσει in 49:19, and of צר with στενός in 49:20.

10:18 וכבוד יערו וכרמלו ἀποσβεσθήσεται τὰ ὄρη καὶ οἱ βουνοὶ καὶ οἱ δρυμοί

The translator has understood כרמל as the mountain Carmel rather than as a “plantation,” which is suggested by the occurrence of τὰ ὄρη (see 29:17; 32:15). The neighbouring phrase καὶ οἱ βουνοί seems to be a plus. In LXX Isaiah βουνός very often accompanies ὄρος: see 2:2, 14; 10:32; 30:17, 25; 40:4; 41:15; 44:23<sup>18</sup>; 49:13; 54:10; 55:12; and 65:7. Among these verses βουνός is a

<sup>14</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 61.

<sup>15</sup> Seeligmann, *Septuagint Version*, 33.

<sup>16</sup> See section 8.3.2.1a.

<sup>17</sup> See section 8.5.3b.

<sup>18</sup> In 44:23 βουνός seems to render יער וכל-עץ בו יער פצחו הרים רנה / βοήσατε, ὄρη, εὐφροσύνην, οἱ βουνοὶ καὶ πάντα τὰ ξύλα τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς. If the same equivalency applies to 10:18, it would not be וכרמלו but יערו that received a double translation.



plus in 49:13 too. It may be that the frequent appearance of this word combination has prompted the translator also here to attach οἱ βουνοί to τὰ ὄρη.<sup>19</sup>

- 13:10                      כִּי־כּוּכְבֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם                      οἱ γὰρ ἀστέρες τοῦ οὐρανοῦ  
                                   וּכְסִילֵיהֶם                      καὶ ὁ Ὑρίων καὶ πᾶς ὁ κόσμος τοῦ οὐρανοῦ  
                                   לֹא יִהְיוּ אִוָּרִים                      τὸ φῶς οὐ δώσουσι

καὶ πᾶς ὁ κόσμος τοῦ οὐρανοῦ may have been supplemented to ὁ Ὑρίων in order to explain the *plural* of the Hebrew form וּכְסִילֵיהֶם. Compare Job 38:31, where Ὑρίων forms a translation of כִּסִּיל *singular*.<sup>20</sup> In Ziegler's view the Greek phrase is an interpreting gloss adopted from 24:21 (עַל־צִבְאָה הַמְרוֹם / ἐπὶ τὸν κόσμον τοῦ οὐρανοῦ).<sup>21</sup> See also Gen 2:1 (וְהָאָרֶץ וְהַשָּׁמַיִם / ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ καὶ πᾶς ὁ κόσμος αὐτῶν).<sup>22</sup>

- 22:5                      כִּי יוֹם מְהוּמָה                      ὅτι ἡμέρα ταραχῆς καὶ ἀπωλείας  
                                   וּמְבוּסָה וּמְבוּכָה                      καὶ καταπατήματος καὶ πλάνησις  
                                   לֵאדְנִי יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת בְּגִי אֶחָד                      παρὰ κυρίου σαβαωθ ἐν φάραγγι Σιών.

The addition of καὶ ἀπωλείας has provided this sentence line with two parallel word pairs. In Deut 32:35; Job 21:30; Jer 18:17; 26(46):21; and Obad 1:12, 13 one encounters a similar, but shorter eschatological expression, namely ἡμέρα ἀπωλείας.<sup>23</sup>

- 22:21                      וּמִמְשַׁלְתָּ אֶת־נֶפֶשׁ                      καὶ τὸ κράτος καὶ τὴν οἰκονομίαν σου δώσω  
                                   בְּיָד                      εἰς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ

τὴν οἰκονομίαν σου has presumably been extrapolated from verse 19.

- 23:8                      מִי יַעַן זֹאת עַל־צָר                      τίς ταῦτα ἐβούλευσεν ἐπὶ Τύρον;  
                                   הַמַּעֲטִירָה                      μὴ ἦσσαν ἐστὶν ἢ οὐκ ἰσχύει;

Both μὴ ἦσσαν ἐστὶν and οὐκ ἰσχύει hint at a reading of המַעֲטִירָה as though it were המַעֲטִיפָה—a Hif'il participle of עָטַף—"to be weak" (with a *h* interrogative).<sup>24</sup>

<sup>19</sup> For the combination of ὄρος with δρύμος, see 29:17 and 37:24; δρύμος and βουνός are found together in 9:18.

<sup>20</sup> HUB Isa, 50.

<sup>21</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 64.

<sup>22</sup> See section 9.4.1.1a.

<sup>23</sup> See sections 9.4.3.3 and 9.4.5.4.

<sup>24</sup> For a somewhat deviating explanation, see van der Kooij, *Oracle of Tyre*, 59: "The Greek μὴ ἦσσαν seems to reflect המַעֲטַת in Hebrew ... The second clause, ἢ οὐκ ἰσχύει, may well have been

24:8 חַדַּל שֹׁאֵן עַל־יָדָיו πέπνυται αὐθάδεια καὶ πλοῦτος ἀσεβῶν

The translator appears to have correlated שֹׁאֵן (“rumour”) with חַדַּל (“at ease,” “careless,” “arrogant”), and hence rendered the noun by (a) αὐθάδεια—“arrogance” (which noun figures only here in the LXX), and (b) πλοῦτος (“richness”) (for a similar match, see 32:9, 18 and 33:20). Another route by which he may have arrived at αὐθάδεια is through the association of שֹׁאֵן with a derivation of the root נָשָׂא—“to raise,” for instance with תָּשָׂא—“elevation.”<sup>25</sup>

30:22 תִּזְרֶם כְּמוֹ דוֹה λεπτὰ ποιήσεις καὶ λικμήσεις ὥς ὕδωρ ἀποκαθημένης

תִּזְרֶם—coming from the root זָרָה, which means “to scatter,” “to winnow”—is rendered in a literal way by λικμήσεις, but may additionally lie at the basis of λεπτὰ ποιήσεις (“you will make small”).

34:12 חֲרִיָּה וְאִין־שֵׁם מְלוּכָה יִקְרָאוּ וְכָל־שְׂרָיָה  
יהיו אִפְסֵי οἱ ἄρχοντες αὐτῆς οὐκ ἔσονται· οἱ γὰρ  
βασιλεῖς αὐτῆς καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες αὐτῆς καὶ οἱ  
μεγιστᾶνες αὐτῆς ἔσονται εἰς ἀπώλειαν.

Whereas the Hebrew offers merely one designation for leaders (שְׂרָיָה), the Greek gives an enumeration of three: οἱ γὰρ βασιλεῖς αὐτῆς (= מְלוּכָה), οἱ ἄρχοντες αὐτῆς, and οἱ μεγιστᾶνες αὐτῆς.

35:10 וְנָסוּ יַגֹּן וְאַנְחָה ἀπέδρα ὀδύνη καὶ λύπη καὶ στεναγμός.

Compare 51:11 below.

39:2 וִירָאֻם אֶת־בֵּית נֹכַח וִירָאֻם אֶת־הַכֶּסֶף  
וְאֶת־הַזָּהָב וְאֶת־הַבְּשָׂמִים וְאֶת־הַשֶּׁמֶן הַטוֹב  
καὶ ἔδειξεν αὐτοῖς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ νεχῶθα  
καὶ τῆς στακτῆς καὶ τῶν θυμιαμάτων  
καὶ τοῦ μύρου καὶ τοῦ ἀργυρίου  
καὶ τοῦ χρυσίου

נֹכַח (read נִכְחוּ from נֹכַח—“treasure-house”) is in the first place represented by the transcription νεχῶθα, but in the second place perhaps also by στακτῆ—“oil of myrrh.”<sup>26</sup> The explanation for the latter rendering is that the translator probably linked נֹכַח with נִכְאָה, which is the name of a spice, maybe a “resin

added as a parallel expression for the sake of elucidating the first part of the sentence.” For the combination of ἰσχύω with ἡττάω, see 8:9.

<sup>25</sup> For the expression πλοῦτος ἀσεβῶν, see 29:5.

<sup>26</sup> A list of LXX examples of doublets formed by a translation plus a transcription of one Hebrew word is given by Franz Wutz, *Die Transkriptionen von der Septuaginta bis zu Hieronymus* (BWAT NF 9; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1933), 54–61.

of the cistus rose.”<sup>27</sup> This name appears in Gen 37:25 and 43:11 in a list of expensive spices. The LXX of Genesis in both of these verses translates נכאת with θυμίαμα (“incense”), but in the same lists—as a rendering of טל (some sort of a spice of which the precise meaning is unknown)—also the noun στακτή occurs.<sup>28</sup> Possibly, the Isaiah translator did not exactly know the meaning of נכאת/נכתה, then related these words to טל with which נכאת appears in conjunction in the mentioned texts in Genesis, and gave נכתה in his own text the same translation as טל in LXX Genesis, that is by στακτή.<sup>29</sup>

46:1–2 נשאתיכם עמוסות משא לעיפה קרסו כרעו יחדו      αἴρετε αὐτὰ καταδεδεμένα ὡς φορτίον  
κοπιῶντι καὶ πεινῶντι καὶ ἐκλελυμένῳ  
οὐκ ἰσχύοντι ἅμα

לעיפה in the first instance generated κοπιῶντι, and secondarily probably also πεινῶντι. Although πεινάω more commonly matches רעב, it corresponds to הָיָה in LXX Isa 5:27; 28:12; and 40:28, 29, 30, 31 as well. Of those verses Isa 5:27 and 40:28, 30, 31 likewise contain the combination of κοπιᾶω with πεινάω.

51:11 נסו יגן ואנחה      ἀπέδρα ὀδύνῃ καὶ λύπῃ καὶ στεναγμός.

Compare 35:10 above.

60:5 כִּי־הִפְךָ עַל־יָד הַמּוֹן יִם חֵיל גּוֹיִם יִבְאוּ לָךְ      ὅτι μεταβαλεῖ εἰς σὲ πλοῦτος θαλάσσης  
καὶ ἐθνῶν καὶ λαῶν.

Two Hebrew clauses have been contracted into one in the LXX, the verb phrase יִבְאוּ לָךְ as well as the noun חֵיל of the second clause having been omitted, and גּוֹיִם (= ἐθνῶν) having been attached as an attribute to הַמּוֹן / πλοῦτος in the preceding clause, in juxtaposition to יִם / θαλάσσης.<sup>30</sup> To this couple a third attribute has been added: καὶ λαῶν.

65:2 אֶל־עַם סוֹרֵר הַהֲלָכִים הַדֶּרֶךְ לֹא־טוֹב      πρὸς λαὸν ἀπειθοῦντα καὶ ἀντιλέγοντα,  
οἳ οὐκ ἐπορεύθησαν ὁδῷ ἀληθινῇ

סורר presents two Greek counterparts: (a) ἀπειθοῦντα (for the same equivalency, see LXX Isa 1:23) and (b) ἀντιλέγοντα.<sup>31</sup> The coordination of

<sup>27</sup> HALOT 1:697.

<sup>28</sup> Gen 37:25 נכאת וצרי ולט / καὶ αἱ κάμηλοι αὐτῶν ἔγεμον θυμιαμάτων καὶ ῥητίνης καὶ στακτῆς; 43:11 נכאת ולט ובטנים ושקדים / καὶ καταγάγετε τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ δῶρα, τῆς ῥητίνης καὶ τοῦ μέλιτος, θυμίαμα καὶ στακτὴν καὶ τερέμινθον καὶ κάρυα.

<sup>29</sup> See section 9.4.1.1c.

<sup>30</sup> See section 7.6.2c.

<sup>31</sup> Elsewhere in the LXX ἀντιλέγω corresponds to the Nif'al of סוּג or the Hif'il of רִיב.

these two participles may echo the Hebrew word pair סורר ומורה, which is attested several times in the Hebrew Bible: see Deut 21:18, 20; Jer 5:23; and Ps 78:8.<sup>32</sup> It may well be that the translator wanted to reproduce that phrase by giving a twofold rendering of סורר, through reading the form not just in the way as it stands, but also in an associative way as מורה. In doing this, he may additionally have been influenced by Isa 50:5, where we come across a similar combination of ἀπειθέω with ἀντιλέγω: ἐγὼ δὲ οὐκ ἀπειθῶ οὐδὲ ἀντιλέγω (MT: ואנכי לא מריתי אחר לא נסוגתי). Yet, in another possible scenario the translator may have read both participles—סורר as well as מורה—in his Hebrew manuscript or in two different manuscripts. This option might get support from the Isaiah Scroll, which shows the reading אל עמ סורה ההולכים הדרך לוא טוב. The form סורה looks much like מורה and could easily have been confused with it, either by a Hebrew copyist or by the translator himself.<sup>33</sup>

*b. Two coordinate renderings reflect distinct readings or interpretations of the Hebrew*

Doublets in the Greek Isaiah that consist of two coordinate items sometimes reveal two distinct readings or interpretations of the Hebrew text. Such doublets could occasionally be the product of later revisions of LXX Isaiah, correcting the translation in line with the MT, but in other cases they may have been the achievement of the translator himself, who perhaps wished to incorporate in his text alternative ways of reading or understanding the Hebrew.

21:2 כל-אנחתה השבתי νῦν στενάξω καὶ παρακαλέσω ἑμαυτόν.

אנחתה, stemming from the root אנה—“to sigh,” finds it equivalent in στενάξω as well as in παρακαλέσω, which latter verb has presumably been linked to אנחתה by way of root association of אנה with נחם—“to console.”

27:3 אני יהוה נצרה ἐγὼ πόλις ἰσχυρά, πόλις πολιορκουμένη

The Masoretic נצרה—a Qal participle of נצר (“to preserve”)—is in LXX Isaiah mirrored by (a) πολιορκουμένη, translating נצרה, a Nif'al participle of צור—“enclosed,” and (b) ἰσχυρά, reflecting a reading as בצרה—“inaccessible.” The form בצרה has precedents in Isa 25:2; 36:1; and 37:26, even if in those verses

<sup>32</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 78–79; *HUB Isa*, 285.

<sup>33</sup> Rather than סורה, Ziegler thinks he can make out מורה on the photo of the Scroll. From this he concludes that the Isaiah translator read both forms—סורר of the MT as well as מורה of 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>—in his *Vorlage*. According to Ziegler only the form of the MT is original. See Joseph Ziegler, “Die Vorlage der Isaias-Septuaginta (LXX) und die erste Isaias-rolle von Qumran (1QIsa<sup>a</sup>),” *JBL* 78 (1959): 57.

the Greek offers *ὀχυρός* rather than *ισχυρός*. The former is also the reading attested in 27:3 by the uncials A and S.

28:16      יסד בציון אבן      ἐγὼ ἐμβαλῶ εἰς τὰ θεμέλια Σιών  
                  אבן בחן פנת יקרת      λίθον πολυτελή ἐκλεκτόν ἀκρογωνιαίον ἔντιμον

בחן (“a tried and tested stone”) finds its closest correspondence in *πολυτελή* (“very costly”), but besides, the adjective *ἐκλεκτόν* probably derives from it too, perhaps via the root בחר—“to choose,”<sup>34</sup> or just as a slightly free rendition of בחן.<sup>35</sup>

30:21      ואזניך תשמענה      καὶ τὰ ὦτά σου ἀκούσονται  
                  דבר מאחריך      τοὺς λόγους τῶν ὀπίσω σε πλανησάντων

*πλανησάντων* might constitute a second rendering of מאחריך, developed from that Hebrew participle through association with מאשרי (from אשר—“to seduce”).<sup>36</sup> The latter verb likewise matches *πλανάω* in 9:15(16)<sup>37</sup>: ומאשרי מבליעים / καὶ πλανῶσιν ὅπως καταπίωσιν αὐτούς (see also 3:12). For a possible stylistic motivation behind this addition, see section 8.3.1.1c.

40:27      ומאלהי משפטי יעבור      καὶ ὁ θεός μου τὴν κρίσιν ἀφείλε καὶ ἀπέστη;

יעבור (“he/it passes by”) appears to have been read as a Hif’il form יעביר—“he has taken away,” which is implied by its rendering as *ἀφείλε*. This demands a reading with ואלהי instead of ומאלהי: “And *my God* has taken away my judgement.” In the second instance, the verb was probably—in accordance with the MT reading—also identified as a Qal, which formed the basis for *ἀπέστη*—“he/it has withdrawn.” The idea of the withdrawal of judgement the translator may have adopted from LXX Isa 59:9, 11, 14, where a form of *ἀφίγημι* is used in combination with *κρίσις* too.<sup>38</sup>

41:15      הנה שמתיד למורג חרוץ      ἰδοὺ ἐποίησά σε ὡς τροχὸς ἀμάξης  
                  חדש בעל פיפיות      ἀλοῶντας καινοὺς πριστηροειδεῖς,  
                  תדוש הרים      καὶ ἀλοήσεις ὄρη

<sup>34</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 67.

<sup>35</sup> For *λίθος πολυτελής*, see 1Chr 29:2; Esth 5:3; Job 31:24; Prov 3:15; 8:11; 31:10; Dan 11:38; Jdt 10:21; and Sir 45:11; 50:9.

<sup>36</sup> I could not, however, find a parallel in LXX Isaiah for association by way of the change of a π into a ψ.

<sup>37</sup> The verse numbering of the LXX (Göttingen edition), when deviating from the MT, is shown between brackets.

<sup>38</sup> For a further discussion of this case, see Ottley, *Book of Isaiah*, 2:300–301; Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 71; Seeligmann, *Septuagint Version*, 36; Baer, *When We All Go Home*, 132–40.

This is one of the three examples of what he calls “translation doublets” which are discussed by Troxel.<sup>39</sup> Because later in the same verse the translator renders תדוש by ἀλοήσεις, Troxel thinks that the previous form ἀλοῶντας suggests that he read חדש as הדש, while καινούς would be a second rendering of חדש, read this time as it stands.<sup>40</sup> Even though, in my eyes, this surely could be true, and is favoured by many similar cases of double translation in LXX Isaiah in which the same Hebrew root is read in two different ways, it is also possible that ἀλοῶντας (“threshing”) renders חרץ, understood in its connotation of “threshing sledge” (rather than as “sharp”). In that case ἀμάξης (“cart”) would translate למורג (“threshing sledge”), while τροχούς (“wheels”) would be a plus.

47:10            חכמתך ודעתך      γνώθι ὅτι ἡ σύνεσις τούτων καὶ ἡ πορνεία σου  
                       היא שובבתך      ἔσται σοι αἰσχύνῃ.

דעת (“your knowledge”) has given rise to γνώθι—deriving from a reading with דַע—as well as to ἡ πορνεία σου,<sup>41</sup> which echoes ורעתך (compare ברעתך earlier in verse 10, and see for a similar association 44:20).

51:23            ושמתיא      καὶ ἐμβαλῶ αὐτὸ εἰς τὰς χεῖρας  
                       בִּיד-מוֹגִיךָ      τῶν ἀδικησάντων σε καὶ τῶν ταπεινωσάντων σε

The participle מוֹגִיךָ (Hif'il יגה—“to cause grief”) is in the first place represented by τῶν ἀδικησάντων σε, and next to that by τῶν ταπεινωσάντων σε. According to Goshen-Gottstein the latter rendering stems from a reading מעניך.<sup>42</sup> The translator may actually have encountered that phrase in his *Vorlage*, since it is evidenced by 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>. The matching of ענה with ταπεινός has precedents in 51:21, and in 60:14 (of which also the content is near to that of 51:23: כל-מנאצִיךָ והלכו אליך שחוה בני מעניך והשתחוהו על-כפות רגליך / καὶ πορεύσονται πρὸς σὲ δεδαικότες υἱοὶ ταπεινωσάντων σε καὶ παροξυνάντων σε). It is likewise conceivable that the translator was faced with both Hebrew readings, מוֹגִיךָ as well as מעניך, in different Hebrew manuscripts, and that he reproduced both of them in Greek. Alternatively, a later reviser may have supplied either of the participles.

<sup>39</sup> Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation*, 120; see section 6.1.1.

<sup>40</sup> Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation*, 120.

<sup>41</sup> I follow here the reading of Rahlfs. In the Göttingen edition Ziegler gives ἡ πονηρία σου, but that reading is only attested by ms 233 and Theodotion.

<sup>42</sup> *HUB Isa*, 237.

66:7 בטרם תחיל ילדה בטרם יבוא      πρὶν ἐλθεῖν τὸν πόνον τῶν  
חבל לה והמליטה זכר      ὠδίνων, ἐξέφυγε καὶ ἔτεκεν ἄρσεν.

The Greek displays two variant interpretations of the root מלט: Firstly, ἐξέφυγε—“she fled,” tracing back to the Nif'al of מלט—“to get oneself to safety”; and secondly, καὶ ἔτεκεν—“and she gave birth,” resting on the Hif'il of מלט—“to give birth to.”

#### 6.4 The two Greek renderings are in genitival relationship

*a. Two renderings in genitival relationship reflect a similar interpretation of the Hebrew*

9:18(19) בעברת יהוה צבאות      διὰ θυμὸν ὀργῆς κυρίου

The expression θυμὸν ὀργῆς is most likely formed in assimilation to the common Hebrew formulations אף חרון and חרי-אף, which are attested in the MT approximately forty times. In Isaiah they figure in 7:4 and 13:9, 13.<sup>43</sup>

17:13 ורדף כמץ הרים      καὶ πόρρω αὐτὸν διώξεται ὡς χνοῦν ἀχύρου  
לפני-רוח      λιγμῶντων ἀπέναντι ἀνέμου

Both χνοῦν (= “dust,” “chaff”) and ἀχύρου (“chaff”) probably render כץ (= “chaff”), while הרים was in all likelihood associated with זרים and translated λιγμῶντων (see 41:16).<sup>44</sup>

45:25 כל-זרע ישראל      πᾶν τὸ σπέρμα τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραηλ.

τὸ σπέρμα τῶν υἱῶν might be the outcome of a twofold rendition of זרע, albeit τῶν υἱῶν may also simply be an addition. In 1:4 the two Greek nouns appear in parallelism: σπέρμα πονηρόν, υἱοὶ ἄνομοι.

58:7 ומבשרך      καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν οἰκείων τοῦ σπέρματός σου  
לא תתעלם      οὐχ ὑπερόψη.

ומבשרך has counterparts in both ἀπὸ τῶν οἰκείων (“family members”) and τοῦ σπέρματός σου. Compare 31:9 Μακάριος ὃς ἔχει ἐν Σιων σπέρμα καὶ οἰκέλους ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ, and Lev 18:6 πρὸς πάντα οἰκεῖα σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ,<sup>45</sup> and compare also 45:25 above.

<sup>43</sup> See section 9.5.

<sup>44</sup> For a more extensive analysis of this translation, see section 8.5.1a.

<sup>45</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 130.

66:7 בטרם יבוא חבל לה πρὶν ἐλθεῖν τὸν πόνον τῶν ὠδίνων

Since חבל means “labour pains,” the Greek τὸν πόνον τῶν ὠδίνων ought perhaps to be seen as a circumscriptive translation rather than as a double translation. Nevertheless, in the other places in Isaiah where the same Hebrew noun occurs, that is, in 13:8 and 26:17, the Greek gives merely ὠδίν.

*b. Two renderings in genitive relationship reflect distinct readings or interpretations of the Hebrew*

2:16 ועל כל-שכיות החמדה καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσαν θέαν πλοίων κάλλους.

LXX Isaiah offers two different interpretations of שכיות: (a) a plural form of שכיה—“ship” (= πλοίων); and (b) a (not attested) substantive noun from the root שכה (“to look at”), meaning “images” (≈ θέαν).<sup>46</sup>

3:20 הפארים καὶ τὴν σύνθεσιν τοῦ κόσμου τῆς δόξης

The LXX translator may have coupled פאר (MT: פָּאָר—“head-dress”) to κόσμος (“adornment”) on the basis of the root פאר in its sense of “to beautify.” Furthermore, he may have glossed the same Hebrew noun with δόξα, thus expressing an alternative signification of פאר, that is, “to glorify.”<sup>47</sup>

5:2 ויטעהו שרק καὶ ἐφύτευσα ἄμπελον σωρηχ

Besides ἄμπελον, שרק (“chosen vine”) has also generated σωρηχ. At first glance, σωρηχ looks like a transcription of the Hebrew noun, but, strictly speaking, it cannot be considered as such, since the ק is never transcribed by a χ in Greek (see *Odes of Solomon* 10:2, where a transcription of שרק appears in the form of σωρηκ). σωρηχ probably means the name of a place, and has been connected to שרק on the grounds of the phonetic resemblance between the two words.

28:7 תעו מן-השכר ἐσείσθησαν ἀπὸ τῆς μέθης τοῦ σικερα

ἀπὸ τῆς μέθης τοῦ σικερα may be a double translation of מן-השכר, the noun σικερα giving a literal interpretation of שכר (“strong drink”), while μέθη goes back to the related form שכרון (“drunkenness”).<sup>48</sup> However, the addition of μέθη could also have occurred just for the sake of explication.

<sup>46</sup> Compare Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 61. Goshen-Gottstein, on the contrary, thinks that πλοίων is a plain addition, not deriving from שכיות (*HUB Isa*, 8).

<sup>47</sup> See also Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 205.

<sup>48</sup> The Göttingen edition follows mss A and S here, being the only two manuscripts that offer ἀπὸ τῆς μέθης.



31:4            ומהמונם לא יענה            καὶ τὸ πλῆθος τοῦ θυμοῦ ἐπτοήθησαν

In this verse המון means “roar,” but in other contexts it may signify “crowd.” The latter connotation seems to be expressed by the Greek πλῆθος. Besides, θυμοῦ may also have been obtained from המון, through the association of המון with חמה—“anger.”

### 6.5 Two renderings of one Hebrew expression form different grammatical units within the same sentence

In the Greek Isaiah double translation repeatedly involves a single Hebrew expression being rendered in the same sentence by two Greek expressions which form distinct units with a different grammatical status. In most of these cases the duplication can be considered as the work of the translator himself. Since the two renderings both have their own function in the sentence and are each in their own way integrated into its syntax, it is often impossible to leave out one of the two without disturbing the entire sentence construction. This makes it usually unlikely that either of the two was inserted by a later editor, for it is improbable that an editor would change the syntax of a complete clause in order to add one element. Of course the possibility still remains that some of these doublets in LXX Isaiah are in fact conflated readings, based upon two variant Hebrew readings, encountered in different manuscripts, and in the translation incorporated into one sentence. However, the number of this kind of doublets in the Greek Isaiah is too large to suppose that they all arose through conflation.<sup>49</sup>

The next pages will list a number of examples in which two renderings of one Hebrew unit appear in distinct syntactical parts of the sentence. In some of them the two renderings are identical or synonymous, in others they are based on different readings or interpretations of one Hebrew expression.

#### *a. Two renderings forming different grammatical units reflect a similar interpretation of one Hebrew expression*

11:11            לקנות את־שאר            τοῦ ζηλῶσαι τὸ καταλειφθὲν ὑπόλοιπον τοῦ  
                         עמו אשר ישאר מאשור            λαοῦ, ὃ ἂν καταλειφθῇ ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀσσυρίων

ὑπόλοιπον may be a second rendering of either שאר (perhaps read as a Nif'al form נשאר) or of אשר ישאר. It has possibly been interpolated with the purpose

---

τοῦ σικερα; in the other mss τοῦ σικερα is missing. Possibly, τοῦ σικερα has been added in A and S in order to approximate the translation to the Hebrew text.

<sup>49</sup> For a similar reasoning, see Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation*, 121.

of highlighting the role of the “remnant.” This emphasis is in Hebrew achieved by the repetition of the sounds ש, א and ר.

26:5                      **כִּי הִשָּׁח**                      δς **ταπεινώσας κατήγαγες**  
                                   **ישבי מרום**                      τοὺς ἐνοικοῦντας ἐν ὑψηλοῖς·

To the הִשָּׁח of the MT two verb forms correspond in the Greek: (a) *ταπεινώσας* (see 2:11, 17; 5:15; 25:12), and (b) *κατήγαγες* (which nowhere else in LXX Isaiah renders שָׁח). The translator (or editor) has most likely added either of the two under the influence of the related texts in 25:12 and 26:5b.

30:27                      **וכבד משאה שפתי**                      μετὰ δόξης **τὸ λόγιον** τῶν χειλέων αὐτοῦ,  
                                   **מלאו זעם**                      **τὸ λόγιον** ὀργῆς πληῖρες

Both occurrences of τὸ λόγιον seem to have come from משאה, read as though it were מִשָּׂא—“pronouncement.”

30:29                      **לֵילִי**                      הַשִּׁיר יִהְיֶה לָכֶם **כָּלִיל**                      μὴ **διὰ παντός** δεῖ ὑμᾶς εὐφραίνεισθαι  
                                   **הַתְּקַדְשׁ-חַג**                      **καὶ εἰσπορεύεσθαι εἰς τὰ ἁγία μου διὰ παντός**

Rather than לֵילִי (“as the night”) the Isaiah translator has read כָּלִיל (“completely”), which he has reproduced twice as διὰ παντός.

51:12                      **מִי־אֵת וְתִירָאִי**                      γινῶθι τίνα **εὐλαβηθεῖσα ἐφοβήθης**  
                                   **מֵאֲנוּשׁ יָמוֹת**                      ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπου θνητοῦ

εὐλαβηθεῖσα ἐφοβήθης might result from a twofold rendering of וְתִירָאִי, but can be explained in a simpler way as being influenced by 57:11: וְאֵת־מִי דִּאֲגַת וְתִירָאִי / τίνα εὐλαβηθεῖσα ἐφοβήθης.

*b. Two renderings forming different grammatical units reflect distinct readings or interpretations of one Hebrew expression*

1:22                      **סָבֵאךְ**                      מֵהוּל בָּמִים                      **οἱ κάπηλοί σου** μίσγουςι **τὸν οἶνον** ὕδατι·

It is not clear whether סָבֵאךְ (“your beer”) is translated somewhat freely by τὸν οἶνον, whether it was read as סָבֵרִיךְ and then rendered by οἱ κάπηλοί σου (“your merchants”), or that it corresponds to both of these phrases. The latter possibility seems most plausible to me, since each of the Greek phrases mirrors a separate aspect of the Hebrew: while οἱ κάπηλοί σου has the same position in the clause and contains the same possessive pronoun as סָבֵאךְ, τὸν



- 10:22–23      **כליון** חרוץ שוטף      **λόγον** γὰρ **συντελῶν** καὶ συντέμνων  
                  צדקה כי כלה ונחרצה      ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, ὅτι λόγον συντετμημένον  
                  אדני יהוה צבאות עשה      ποιήσῃ ὁ θεὸς  
                  בקרב כל־הארץ      ἐν τῇ οἰκουμένῃ ὅλη.

The *grammatical* match of כליון (“annihilation”) consists of λόγον (this noun is repeated in the sentence following, where it may translate כלה). According to Fischer, the translator has misread the Hebrew noun as מליון (“word”).<sup>55</sup> Yet, the root of כליון—being כלה—is similar in meaning to συντελέω, likewise denoting “to finish.”<sup>56</sup>

- 14:19                      **כפגר**      ὃν τρόπον ἱμάτιον ἐν αἵματι  
                  **מובס**      **πεφυρμένον** **οὐκ ἔσται καθαρόν**

Whereas grammatically seen מובס (“trodden,” a Hof'al of בוס) is parallel to πεφυρμένον (“stained”), from a semantic point of view it might be related to οὐκ ἔσται καθαρόν, which rendering could stem from the Polal of בוס, bearing the connotation of “to desecrate” (see 63:18).<sup>57</sup>

- 14:23                      **ושמתי**      καὶ θήσω τὴν Βαβυλωνίαν  
                  **למורש** קפד      **ἐρημον** ὥστε **κατοικεῖν** ἐχίνους

Despite its deviating content, ἐρημον (“desert, desolated place”) might still have been prompted by מורש (“inheritance”). This is favoured by the identical function and location of both nouns, following as object complements after the verb phrase. Possibly, the two were connected via the root שמד (“to exterminate”) arrived at through the replacement in מורש of the ר by a ד, and the transposition of the מ and the ש by way of metathesis.<sup>58</sup> This very root שמד comes up later on in the same verse, having as its Greek counterpart the noun ἀπώλεια. In addition to ἐρημον, a second rendering of מורש can be detected in κατοικεῖν—“to live,” which is nearer to מורש in meaning.<sup>59</sup>

<sup>55</sup> Fischer, *In welcher Schrift*, 26–27.

<sup>56</sup> Compare Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 140; Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation*, 284–85. חרוץ has probably been rendered συντέμνων: see ונחרצה / συντετμημένον in the succeeding clause. For כלה / συντελέω, see Isa 1:28.

<sup>57</sup> See Jer 12:10 בוסטו / ἐμόλυναν (= “they defiled”).

<sup>58</sup> ἐρημον can also be seen as an addition for the sake of explicitation (under the influence of eg. Isa 13:9). But even then, the selection of exactly this noun might have been supported by the association of מורש with שמד.

<sup>59</sup> For ירש / κατοικέω, see 34:11.

16:2–3 מעברת לארנון הביאו עצה **ἔπειτα** δέ, Ἀρνων, **πλείονα** βουλεύου

מעברת (“fords”) might have been employed twice by the translator, both times in an associative way: firstly, in order to arrive at the adverb ἔπειτα (“then”), which he possibly linked to מַעְבָּר—“beyond”<sup>60</sup>; and secondly, to achieve the form πλείονα, perhaps going back to a form such as תעברת—“you have to continue.”

17:3 כבוד בני־ישראל יהיו **οὐ γὰρ σὺ βελτίων εἶ** τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ  
**καὶ τῆς δόξης αὐτῶν.**

As Troxel has rightly observed, כבוד lies behind both **οὐ γὰρ σὺ βελτίων εἶ** and **τῆς δόξης αὐτῶν**.<sup>61</sup> While **τῆς δόξης αὐτῶν** represents כבוד literally (albeit a pronoun has been added in the LXX), it may be possible to trace back **οὐ γὰρ σὺ βελτίων εἶ** to an interpretation of the Hebrew phrase as a verb form of the root כבד—“to be heavy,” “to be honoured.”

21:6 לך העמד המצפה **Βαδίσας σεαυτῷ** στήσον σκοπὸν

לך forms the basis of **Βαδίσας** (בָּדַל) as well as **σεαυτῷ** (שָׂדַל). It is conceivable that the translator has read לך לך in his *Vorlage*, the MT having lost one of the two words through haplography.

23:17(16) ושב לאתננה **καὶ πάλιν ἀποκατασταθήσεται** εἰς τὸ ἀρχαῖον

ושב was not only understood as a verbal form of שׁוּב—“to return” (which is represented in the translation by a passive voice of ἀποκαθιστάνω—“to be restored”), but similarly as an adverbially used form of שׁוּב, in the sense of “again,” echoed by πάλιν in the Greek.

26:14 מתים בליחי **οἱ δὲ νεκροὶ ζῶν** οὐ μὴ ἴδωσιν

That the translator identified יחי as a form of חיה—“to live”—is made evident by the rendering ζῶ—“life.” Yet, the appearance of ἴδωσιν makes one suspect that he also read the verb as יחזו—“they will see.” The latter reading may have been influenced by the occurrence of חזו in verse 11, or by the words ἀρρήτω ὁ ἀσεβής, ἵνα μὴ ἴδῃ τὴν δόξαν κυρίου in verse 10. Another possibility is that we do not have a case of double translation here, but simply a translation *ad sensum*, the expression “they will live” having been paraphrased as “they will see life” (see Job 10:22). But also on that occasion, the formal proximity

<sup>60</sup> Goshen-Gottstein relates πλείονα to מַעְבָּר (*HUB Isa*, 61).

<sup>61</sup> Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation*, 120; see also *HUB Isa*, 65.

between יחיו and יחו may have served as a legitimation for such a free rendering.

27:4 מי־תנני שמיר שית τίς με θήσει φυλάσσειν καλάμην ἐν ἀγρῷ;

While שית (“thorn-bushes”) may have been connected with שדי (= ἐν ἀγρῷ),<sup>62</sup> שמיר appears to have been linked to both לשמור (φυλάσσειν) and עמיר (“fallen grain,” more or less equivalent to καλάμην).<sup>63</sup> Another way to explain this peculiar translation is to conceive of ἐν ἀγρῷ as an addition, and καλάμην as a somewhat liberal rendering of שית.

27:10(11) וכלה סעפיה οὐκ ἔσται ἐν αὐτῇ πᾶν χλωρόν

The verb phrase וכלה (“and it will end”) has perhaps not just generated οὐκ ἔσται but also πᾶν (= כל).

28:29 הגדיל תושיה ὑψώσατε ματαιὰν παράκλησιν.

From a grammatical point of view, the noun that corresponds to תושיה (“success”) is παράκλησιν (“comfort”). But probably also the adjective ματαιὰν is prompted by the Hebrew noun, that is, through association with the root שוא—“vanity.”<sup>64</sup>

29:11 ותהי לכם חזות הכל καὶ ἔσονται ὑμῖν πάντα τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα  
כדברי הספר החתום ὡς οἱ λόγοι τοῦ βιβλίου τοῦ ἐσφραγισμένου τούτου

חזות was presumably understood in its literal sense of “vision,” and translated freely as τὰ ῥήματα.<sup>65</sup> Besides, it may have been correlated with חזתה, which would explain the insertion of ταῦτα by the LXX. At the same time, the formula πάντα τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα as a whole might have been invented in assimilation to the familiar phrase כל-הדברים האלה, which is attested more than thirty times in the MT (although nowhere in Isaiah).<sup>66</sup> For a further explanation of this translation, see section 9.4.1.2b.

29:13 מצות אנשים מלמה διδάσκοντες ἐντάλματα ἀνθρώπων  
καὶ διδασκαλίας.

<sup>62</sup> See the translation in LXX Isa 33:12 of שיד (“lime”) by ἐν ἀγρῷ: והיו עמים משרפות שיד קוצים כסוחים: καὶ ἔσονται ἔθνη κατακεκαυμένα ὡς ἄκανθα ἐν ἀγρῷ ἐρριμμένη καὶ κατακεκαυμένη.

<sup>63</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 89.

<sup>64</sup> Compare Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 147; *HUB Isa*, 112.

<sup>65</sup> ῥήμα and חזות are never equated elsewhere in the LXX. But compare משה / ῥήμα in 14:28 and 17:1 (*HUB Isa*, 116).

<sup>66</sup> In the LXX as a whole πάντα τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα is found nine times.

Both διδάσκοντες and διδασκαλίας seem to originate from מלמד. διδάσκοντες can be reconstructed in Hebrew as מְלַמְּדִים—“teaching,” and διδασκαλίας as מַלְמָדָה—“what is taught.”

30:15                    בהשקט ובבטחה                    καὶ γνώση ποῦ ἦσθα· ὅτε ἐπεποίθεις ἐπὶ τοῖς ματαίοις,  
                                  תהיה גבורתכם                    ματαία ἢ ἰσχύς ὑμῶν ἐγενήθη.

As happens regularly in the LXX of Isa 30, the Hebrew text has undergone a complete rearrangement. The Greek comprises two double translations, which both concern a Hebrew verb form that is not alone represented by a Greek verb, but also by a word meaning “idle(ness).” This applies in the first place to בהשקט, being translated by ὅτε ἐπεποίθεις (to which it is related semantically; see 14:6), as well as by ἐπὶ τοῖς ματαίοις, through a link with בשקר. In the second place it pertains to תהיה, which is translated by both ἐγενήθη and ματαία. The Greek adjective reflects a reading of תהיה as תהו (see 59:4).<sup>67</sup>

30:17                    עד אס-נותרתם                    ἂν καταλειφθῇτε  
                                  כתרן על-ראש ההר                    ὡς ἰστὸς ἐπ’ ὄρους  
                                  וכנס על-הגבעה                    καὶ ὡς σημαίαν φέρων ἐπὶ βουνού.

Perhaps the LXX translator has supplied a form of φέρω with the aim of assimilating his text to the familiar expression נשא נס—“to raise a signal”—which in Isaiah is attested in 5:26; 11:12; 13:2; and 18:3 (even if in the LXX it usually appears as αἶρω σημείον), and elsewhere in Jer 4:6; 50:2; and 51:12, 27. Compare also Isa 33:23 where the LXX adds to נס / σημείον a form of αἶρω. Possibly both φέρω in 30:17 and αἶρω in 33:23 are second translations of נס, with which these verbs were connected by means of their Hebrew equivalent נשא, showing a formal similarity to נס. Compare the note on 33:23 in section 6.7c.

30:33                    העמיק הרחב                    φάραγγα βαθεῖαν, ξύλα κείμενα

φάραγγα as well as βαθεῖαν echo העמיק: The former through the noun עמק—“valley,” and the latter through the adjective of the same Hebrew root, meaning “deep.”

31:4                    כאשר יהגה האריה והכפיר                    “Ὅν τρόπον ἐὰν βοήσῃ ὁ λέων ἢ ὁ σκύμνος

The Greek represents two possible meaning nuances of כאשר: “as” and “when.” See 57:8.

<sup>67</sup> Compare Ottley, *Book of Isaiah*, 2:256; Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 147; Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation*, 93.

32:7            ובדבר אביון משפט      καὶ διασκεδάσαι λόγους ταπεινῶν ἐν κρίσει

The most obvious match for **ובדבר** lies in **λόγους**. Additionally, the Hebrew infinitive finds a grammatical parallel in **διασκεδάσαι** (“to scatter,” “to destroy”). This form likely goes back to the Aramaic root **בדר**—“to scatter,” which the translator connected with **דבר** by means of metathesis.<sup>68</sup>

32:10            כי כלה בציר אסף      ἀνήλωται ὁ τρύγητος, **πέπαυται ὁ σπόρος**

Koenig assumes that **πέπαυται ὁ σπόρος** constitutes a double translation of **אסף** (“harvest”), which was rendered firstly by **σπόρος**, and secondly, via the root **אפס** (“to stop”)—arrived at through the transposition in **אסף** of the **ס** and **פ**—by **πέπαυται**.<sup>69</sup> Nevertheless, the double translation could also be located in **כלה**, of which two conjugations might be represented in the Greek: (a) The Pi’el of **כלה**—“to destroy” (= **ἀνήλωται**), and (b) the Qal of **כלה**—“to come to an end” (= **πέπαυται**).

33:2            היה זרעם      ἐγενήθη τὸ σπέρμα  
                 לבקרים      **τῶν ἀπειθούντων εἰς ἀπώλειαν**

Once again the content of the Greek text is quite different from the Hebrew. Besides that **זרעם** was read in the sense of “seed” rather than as “arm” (see 17:5), the phrase **לבקרים** received two renderings that can be related to it only by formal association: while **τῶν ἀπειθούντων** may echo **בגדים**—a Qal pt. of **בגד**, meaning “to deal faithlessly,” **εἰς ἀπώλειαν** might be obtained from **לבקרים** via the noun **שקר**—“lies.” The latter noun is used in parallelism to **שעשע** = **ἀπώλεια** in Isa 57:4.

33:18–19            איה ספר      ποῦ ἐστὶν ὁ ἀριθμῶν  
                 **אתה מגדלים את-עם נועז**      **τοὺς συστρεφόμενους** μικρὸν καὶ **μέγαν** λαόν;

**המגדלים** (MT: **הַמִּגְדָּלִים**—“towers”) may underlie both **τοὺς συστρεφόμενους** and **μέγαν**. Perhaps the translator has vocalised the Hebrew noun as **הַמִּגְדָּלִים**—“the ones who bring up,” which in Greek equals **τοὺς τρεφόμενους**. That form may then, through inner Greek association, have led to **τοὺς συστρεφόμενους** (“the ones who gather”).<sup>70</sup> **μέγαν** is tied in with **המגדלים** in that it is allied to the Hebrew **גדול**, stemming from the same root **גדל**.

<sup>68</sup> Compare Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 69; Koenig, *L'herméneutique analogique*, 154.

<sup>69</sup> Koenig, *L'herméneutique analogique*, 158–59.

<sup>70</sup> Rahlfs offers the reading **τοὺς τρεφόμενους**. That form could derive from **המגדלים** directly, but is especially attested by Hexaplaric witnesses, and hence probably an Hexaplaric correction in line with the MT. **συστρεφόμενους** is supported by the main part of the Alexandrian tradition, but is hard to explain from the Hebrew. Ottley suggests that the original reading may have been



34:15 אֲדָשִׁם נִקְבְּצוּ דִּוּת      ἐκεῖ ἔλαφοι συνήντησαν  
אִשָּׁה רְעוּתָהּ      καὶ εἶδον τὰ πρόσωπα ἀλλήλων.

In addition to ἀλλήλων, εἶδον may also come from רְעוּתָהּ. The Greek verb may have been extracted from the Hebrew via a link with ראו (although by way of the same link εἶδον could also be coupled to דִּוּת<sup>71</sup>).

41:4 קרא הדרות מראש      ἐκάλεσεν αὐτήν ὁ καλῶν αὐτήν ἀπὸ γενεῶν ἀρχῆς

קרא seems to have produced ἐκάλεσεν αὐτήν (קרא) as well as ὁ καλῶν αὐτήν (קרא), with αὐτήν probably deriving from the article ה in הדרות, which was understood as a pronoun suffix to קרא.<sup>72</sup> The formulation ἐκάλεσεν αὐτήν will additionally have been influenced by verse 2, where—just as in verse 4—it is righteousness that is called: ἐκάλεσεν αὐτήν κατὰ πόδας αὐτοῦ. Compare also verse 9 (even if in that verse the object is Israel): καὶ ἐκ τῶν σκοπιῶν αὐτῆς ἐκάλεσά σε.<sup>73</sup>

41:24 הִנֵּה-אַתָּה מֵאֵין      ὅτι πόθεν ἐστὲ ὑμεῖς  
וּפְעַלְכֶם מֵאֵפֶס      καὶ πόθεν ἡ ἐργασία ὑμῶν; ἐκ γῆς.

The LXX translator has obviously understood מֵאֵין as “from where” = πόθεν (see 39:3 בָּאוּ אֵלֶיךָ (וּמֵאֵין) rather than as “nothing,” and accordingly connected מֵאֵפֶס (“nothing”) with the late Hebrew מֵאֵפֶס, which denotes “from where” as well. מֵאֵפֶס may furthermore underlie ἐκ γῆς via the Aramaic noun אֶרֶץ—“earth.”<sup>74</sup>

45:9 הוּא רַב אֶת־יָצְרוֹ      Ποῖον βέλτιον κατεσκεύασα ὡς πηλὸν κεραμέως;

The translator has provided יָצְרוֹ (“his former”) with a near translation as κεραμέως (“of the potter”), but in addition to that, he may have used the noun in order to create the verb phrase κατεσκεύασα = יָצַרְתִּי. The reason for the supply of this verb may be that he conceived רַב as an adverb in the sense of “better” instead of as a participle meaning “he who strives,” and read for הוּא an interrogative מֶה or זֶה אִי, so that the clause such as he understood it (“What better than his former?”) was elliptic, and in need of a verb phrase.

συντρεφόμενους—“the ones who raise together,” attested by ms 86. This form could easily have been corrupted to συστρεφόμενους, and is also understandable from the perspective of the Hebrew (see Ottley, *Book of Isaiah*, 2:273).

<sup>71</sup> Thus *HUB Isa*, 146.

<sup>72</sup> It is also possible that the translator read דִּוּת in his *Vorlage*.

<sup>73</sup> See further LXX Isa 42:6; 43:22; and 51:2; and section 9.2.3.

<sup>74</sup> Compare Fischer, *In welcher Schrift*, 55; Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 152.



himself, who may have made use of this method so as to be able to exploit two possibilities which the Hebrew text, in his eyes, allowed.

**6.6.1 A Hebrew expression at the end of one clause is rendered in the translation not only in the same clause but also at the beginning of the next one**

a. The two renderings reflect a similar interpretation of the Hebrew

9:20–21	אִישׁ בשר־זרעו יאכלו מנשה את־אפרים	ἄνθρωπος ἔσθων τὰς σάρκας τοῦ βραχίονος αὐτοῦ. <u>φάγεται</u> γὰρ Μανασση τοῦ Εφραιμ
35:10	ובאו ציון ברנה ושמחת עולם על־ראשם שישון ושמחה ישיגו	καὶ ἤξουσιν εἰς Σιών μετ’ εὐφροσύνης, καὶ εὐφροσύνη αἰώνιος ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς αὐτῶν· <u>ἐπὶ γὰρ κεφαλῆς αὐτῶν</u> αἶνεσις <i>καὶ ἀγαλλίαμα,</i> <u>καὶ εὐφροσύνη</u> καταλήμψεται αὐτοῦς

Compare 51:11 in section 6.6.2a below.

51:17	אשר שתית מיד יהוה את־כוס חמתו את־קבעת כוס התרעלה שתית מצית	ἡ πιοῦσα τὸ ποτήριον τοῦ θυμοῦ ἐκ χειρὸς κυρίου· <u>τὸ ποτήριον γὰρ τῆς πτώσεως,</u> τὸ κόνδυ τοῦ θυμοῦ ἐξέπιες καὶ ἐξεκένωσας.
-------	--	---

As regards their location—following on מִיד יְהוָה—the words אֶת־כּוֹס חֲמָתוֹ seem to find their equivalent in τὸ ποτήριον τῆς πτώσεως (“the cup of ruin”); on the grounds of their meaning and syntactical function, however, they are nearer to τὸ ποτήριον τοῦ θυμοῦ (“the cup of wrath”). Perhaps the LXX doublet is affected by the twofold mention in the second part of the Hebrew verse of a “cup,” namely קבעת (maybe represented by τὸ ποτήριον τῆς πτώσεως) and (התרעלה) כוס (mirrored by τὸ κόνδυ τοῦ θυμοῦ).<sup>75</sup>

63:7	כעל כל אשר־גמלנו יהוה ורב־טוב לבית ישראל	ἐν πᾶσιν, οἷς ὁ <u>κύριος</u> ἡμῖν ἀνταποδίδωσι· <u>κύριος</u> κριτῆς ἀγαθὸς τῷ οἴκῳ Ἰσραὴλ
------	---	--

The LXX translator clearly did not read רַב־טוֹב as רַב־טוֹב (“and the greatness of his goodness”), as the MT did, but as רַב־טוֹב—“and a good judge.”<sup>76</sup> He

<sup>75</sup> See 51:22.

<sup>76</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 147.

then repeated יהוה, so that it could function as a subject to those words.<sup>77</sup> See 30:18 יהוה משפט יהוה / διότι κυρίου ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν ἐστι, and 33:22 כִּי יהוה שפוטנו / κυρίου ἡμῶν ὁ θεός.<sup>78</sup>

*b. The two renderings reflect two different readings or interpretations of the Hebrew*

8:18	הנה אנכי והילדים אשר נתן־לי יהוה לאותות ולמופתים בישראל	ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ καὶ τὰ παῖδια, ἃ μοι ἔδωκεν ὁ θεός, <u>καὶ ἔσται</u> εἰς σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ Ἰσραὴλ
------	--	--

יהוה is rendered by ὁ θεός and additionally—read in the form of יהיה—by καὶ ἔσται (see 28:21). Compare 49:1 in section 6.6.2b below.

10:10	כאשר מצאה ידי לממלכת האליל ופסיליהם מירושלם ומשמרון	ὅν τρόπον ταύτας ἔλαβον, καὶ πάσας τὰς χώρας λήψομαι. <u>ὀλολύξατε</u> , τὰ γλυπτὰ ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ καὶ ἐν Σαμαρείᾳ.
-------	--	--

האליל (“the idol”) has been connected with, first, the demonstrative אֵלֶּה, which has resulted in the translation ταύτας,<sup>79</sup> and, secondly, with the imperative הילילו (“wail,” see 13:6; 23:1, 6, 14), leading to a rendering as ὀλολύξατε at the beginning of the succeeding sentence.

15:9	כִּי־אשית על־דימוֹן נוספות לפליטת מואב אריה	ἐπάξω γὰρ ἐπὶ Πεμμων <b>Ἀραβας</b> <u>καὶ ἄρῶ</u> τὸ σπέρμα Μωαβ καὶ Αριηλ
------	--	---

The syntactical equivalent of נוספות is Ἀραβας, but also καὶ ἄρῶ seems to have arisen from this Hebrew lexeme, that is, via the root תָּסַק—“to take.”<sup>80</sup>

27:2	ביום ההוא כרם חמד ענו־ל תְּהִי הַיּוֹם	τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἀμπελῶν <b>καλός</b> . <u>ἐπιθύμημα</u> ἐξάρχειν κατ' αὐτῆς.
------	--	---

The noun חמד (“beauty”) is in the initial clause reproduced by καλός, and in the subsequent one by ἐπιθύμημα—“desire” (from the root חָמַד—“to desire”).

<sup>77</sup> He also omitted the waw in ורבי־טוב.

<sup>78</sup> See *HUB Isa*, 279.

<sup>79</sup> Contra *HUB Isa*, 39.

<sup>80</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 29.

30:28	ורוחו כנחל שוטף עד-צואר יחצה להנפה גוים בנפת שוא	καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ ὡς ὕδωρ ἐν φάραγγι σῦρον <u>ῥῖξει</u> ἕως τοῦ τραχήλου <u>καὶ διαιρεθήσεται</u> τοῦ ἔθνη ταραῖται ἐπὶ πλανήσει ματαία
-------	---	--

LXX Isaiah gives two different connotations of the root חצה: firstly, “to reach to” (ῥῖξει ἕως), and secondly, “to divide” (καὶ διαιρεθήσεται at the beginning of the next clause).

41:7	מחליק פטיש את-הולם פעם אמר לדבק טוב הוא	τύπτων σφύρη <u>ἄμα</u> ἐλαύνων· <u>ποτέ</u> μὲν ἐρεῖ Σύμβλημα καλόν ἐστιν·
------	--	--

פעם has been perceived as אחת פעם (“at the same time”; see Isa 66:8), which is similar in meaning to ἄμα, but is later repeated in the form of ποτέ—“sometimes,” which embodies an alternative signification of the Hebrew adverb.

44:11–12	יבשו יחד חרש ברזל מעצד ופעל בפחם	καὶ αἰσχυνθήτωσαν <u>ἄμα</u> . ὅτι <u>ῥῥυνε</u> τέκτων σίδηρον, σκεπάρνῳ εἰργάσατο αὐτὸ
----------	--	---

The Isaiah translator may have read יחד not just as an adverb meaning “together” (= ἄμα), but also as a Hif’il imperfect form of the root חדד, in the sense of “he sharpened” (= ῥῥυνε).<sup>81</sup> This verb he has regarded as the opening word of the sentence, having as its subject חרש (“artisan”) and as its object ברזל (“iron”) (whereas in the MT חרש ברזל is a word combination denoting a “smith”). In this way his clause read יחד חרש ברזל—“The artisan sharpened the iron.” מעצד (“axe” = σκεπάρνῳ) he appears to have perceived as the first word of the next clause.

### 6.6.2 A Hebrew expression at the beginning of one clause is rendered in the translation not only in the same clause but also at the end of the preceding one

a. The two renderings reflect a similar interpretation of the Hebrew

1:1	חזון ישעיהו בן-אמון אשר חזה על-יהודה וירושלם	“Ορασις, <u>ἦν εἶδεν</u> Ἡσαίας υἱὸς Ἀμώς, <u>ἦν εἶδε</u> κατὰ τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ κατὰ Ἱερουσαλὴμ
-----	---	--

ἦν εἶδεν may have been interpolated after “Ορασις in analogy to 13:1 “Ορασις, ἦν εἶδεν Ἡσαίας υἱὸς Ἀμώς κατὰ Βαβυλῶνος.

<sup>81</sup> See *HUB Isa*, 200. Compare for similar forms Ezek 21:14–16 (Hof’al) and Prov 27:17 (cj.).



The term פגול designates “meat for a sacrifice which has become unclean because it has been kept too long” (see Lev 7:18; 19:7; Ezek 4:14).<sup>83</sup> In the Greek version of the present verse פגלים may in the first place be translated by θυσιαῶν—“sacrifices.” However, as it concerns its location, the noun rather seems to be equated with μεμολυμμένα—“polluted,” since that form accordingly turns up at the beginning of a new clause. Ziegler assumes that the translator has connected פגלים to the root גאל (“to become unclean”), and for that reason rendered it by a form of μολύνω.<sup>84</sup> Such an explanation is not necessary, though, since the content of פגול itself already incorporates an aspect of uncleanness which could provide the link with μεμολυμμένα. The translator may have rendered פגול not just by θυσιαῶν but additionally by μεμολυμμένα in order better to express the different facets of the Hebrew term.<sup>85</sup>

*מִצּוֹר* has in the first place generated (πᾶσα) συναγωγῇ (ὑδατος), which is already suggested by the identical sentence position of the two phrases. The Greek wording possibly results from the association of *מִצּוֹר* with *אָצַר*—"to collect";<sup>86</sup> this verb is rendered in Isa 23:18 and 39:6 by a form of *συνάγω*.<sup>87</sup> A precedent for the rendering of *מִצּוֹר* by *συναγωγῇ ὑδατος* can be found in Isa 37:25. But in addition to *συναγωγῇ ὑδατος*, Isa 19:6 shows yet another, semantically more accurate, translation of *מִצּוֹר*, namely αἱ διώρυγες τοῦ ποταμοῦ, an expression that occurs at the end of the preceding clause.<sup>88</sup>

<sup>88</sup> The wording of LXX Isa 19:6 has probably also been influenced by passages from Exodus: see section 9.4.1.2b.





49:1 והקשיבו לאמים καὶ προσέχετε, ἔθνη.  
מרחוק יהוה מבטן קראני διὰ χρόνου πολλοῦ **στήσεται**, λέγει κύριος

49:25      גַּם־שְׂבִי גְבוּר יִקָּח      Ἐάν τις αἰχμαλωτεύσῃ γίγαντα, λήμψεται σχυλὰ·  
 וּמִלְכוּת עָרִיץ יִמָּלֵךְ      λαμβάνων δὲ παρὰ ἰσχύοντος σωθήσεται·

### 6.7 With a second rendering of a Hebrew phrase or clause a new clause is formed

- One word or phrase is used a second time and complemented with extra words to form a new clause.
- A single clause is turned into two clauses which both include a rendering of the same part of the original sentence.
- The same Hebrew clause or a large part of the clause is translated twice.

<sup>93</sup> Also compare e.g. Exod 8:6: ἵνα εἰδῆς ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλος πλὴν κυρίου.

<sup>94</sup> Compare Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 76.



46:10 **ומקדם אשר לא־נעשו** ἀναγγέλλων πρότερον τὰ ἔσχατα  
πρὶν αὐτὰ γενέσθαι,  
καὶ ἅμα συνετελέσθη·

[illegible]

7:16 כי בטרם ידע הנער דיότι πρὶν ἢ γινῶναι τὸ παιδίον ἀγαθὸν ἢ κακόν  
מאס ברע ובחר בטוב ἀπειθεῖ πονηρίᾳ τοῦ ἐκλέξασθαι τὸ ἀγαθόν<sup>100</sup>

15:1-2      כי בליל שדד      νυκτὸς γὰρ ἀπολεῖται  
                 קיר-מואב נדמה      τὸ τεῖχος τῆς Μωαβίτιδος.

<sup>100</sup> For the insertion of ἀγαθὸν ἢ κακόν, see also sections 9.4.1.1a and 9.4.1.2b.

עלה            λυπεῖσθε ἐφ' ἑαυτοῖς,  
 הבית ודיבן    ἀπολείται γὰρ καὶ Λεβηδων.  
 הבמות לבכי   οὗ ὁ βωμὸς ὑμῶν, ἐκεῖ ἀναβήσεσθε κλαίειν.

λυπεῖσθε ἐφ' ἑαυτοῖς seems to reflect עלה נדמה, of which נדמה—which is a Nif'al of דמם (“to be destroyed”)—may have been read in the Qal sense of the same root (“to be struck dumb in amazement and fear”), while עלה was understood as the preposition על plus a third feminine singular suffix—“on her.”<sup>101</sup> Later on in the text עלה appears to have been used once more, this time with the same function as it has in the Hebrew, namely as a verb form: ἀναβήσεσθε. With the help of this addition an extra clause has been moulded: ἐκεῖ ἀναβήσεσθε κλαίειν.

17:13    לאמים כשאון מים רבים    ὡς ὕδωρ πολὺ ἔθνη πολλά,  
    ὡς ὕδατος πολλοῦ βίᾳ καταφερομένου.  
 24:15                                    שם יהוה                                    τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου ἐνδοξον ἔσται  
    ἁלהי ישראל                                    Κύριε ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραηλ  
 31:4    כאשר יהגה האריה והכפיר    “Ὁν τρόπον ἐὰν βοήσῃ ὁ λέων ἢ ὁ σκύμνος  
    על-טרפו אשר יקרא                                    ἐπὶ τῇ θήρᾳ, ἢ ἔλαβε,  
    עליו     καὶ κεκράξῃ ἐπ' αὐτῇ

Troxel posits that in 31:4 the translator took advantage of the ambiguous derivation of יקרא from קרה (“to meet”) or קרא (“to call”), providing representations of both these roots in his translation, in the form of ἔλαβε and κεκράξῃ, respectively.<sup>102</sup> From the second rendering he has formed a new clause.

33:7                                    מלאכי                                    ἄγγελοι γὰρ ἀποσταλήσονται  
    שולם                                    ἀξιοῦντες εἰρήνην  
    מר יבביון                                    πικρῶς κλαίοντες  
        παρακαλοῦντες εἰρήνην.  
 33:21                                    בל־תלך בו                                    οὐ πορεύσῃ ταύτην τὴν ὁδόν,  
    אנ־שיט                                    οὐδὲ πορεύσεται πλοῖον ἐλαῦνον.  
 46:8                                    השיבו פושעים                                    μετανοήσατε, οἱ πεπλανημένοι,  
    על־לב                                    ἐπιστρέψατε τῇ καρδίᾳ.

<sup>101</sup> If this is indeed the case, the second ἀπολείται renders הבית, which was perhaps read as though it were הביד (< האבד); Goshen-Gottstein thinks that הבית may have been associated with הבת or תִּשְׁבֵּת, or derived by etymology from the root בת (see Isa 5:6 בתה—“destruction”) (*HUB Isa*, 59). Alternatively, ἀπολείται may match נדמה (both verbs having a similar meaning), in which case λυπεῖσθε would be a plus and הבית a minus.

<sup>102</sup> Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation*, 120–21.





### 6.8 Two Greek renderings each reflect a different aspect of one Hebrew expression

A peculiar feature that can be distinguished in a considerable number of the doublets discussed above, is that they are constituted of two Greek renderings which each reflect a separate aspect of the same Hebrew expression. Often this implies, that either of the two Greek phrases accords with the Hebrew as regards its content and/or its syntactical function but not with regard to its place in the sentence, while the other parallels the Hebrew concerning its location, yet has a different content. This phenomenon is illustrated by the following examples: 1:22; 3:10; 3:24; 10:22–23; 14:19; 14:23; 17:3; 26:14; and 30:15 in section 6.5b; 51:17 in section 6.6.1a; 65:4 in section 6.6.2a; 19:6; 49:1; and 49:25 in section 6.6.2b; 15:1–2 and 54:17 in section 6.7a; and 22:24 in section 6.7c. See also 57:11 in section 6.9.4a below.

## 6.9 Repetitive rendering

### 6.9.1 Introduction

The term “repetitive rendering” was introduced by Tov in his work *Computerized Database for Septuagint Studies* in order to denote cases in which the Hebrew uses an expression in a distributive way—that is to say that it also functions in a subsequent (parallel) phrase or clause even if it is not explicitly mentioned there—whereas in the translation this expression is repeated.<sup>108</sup>

The reason why a discussion of this topic is included in the present chapter on double translation, is that repetitive rendering involves the representation of one Hebrew element by two Greek equivalents. Nevertheless, this technique could just as well have been discussed in chapter 2, which deals with the making explicit in the translation of elements that are only implicit in the source text. However, explication<sup>109</sup> is not the only possible motivation for the application of repetitive rendering. In LXX Isaiah the technique often seems to have been employed for *stylistic* reasons too, that is, with the purpose of creating or ameliorating a parallelism.<sup>110</sup>

Among the examples in LXX Isaiah of repetitive rendering that will be catalogued in the present paragraph, not only will instances be included in which distributively functioning words have been reiterated in an *identical* way, but also those in which the repetition has taken place by means of a *synonym*. Furthermore, I will make a distinction between:

<sup>108</sup> Tov, *Computerized Data Base*, 61–62.

<sup>109</sup> For the use of this term, see section 2.1.

<sup>110</sup> See section 8.5.

- Repetitive rendering in parallel (coordinate) *phrases*: One Hebrew word (for example, a preposition) that governs two coordinate nouns, in the translation appears twice (see LXX Isa 3:14 “*with* the elders of the people and *with* their rulers”).
- Repetitive rendering in parallel *clauses*: A sentence element (such as a subject, object, or verb phrase) that forms part of one clause, yet is also implied by the following or preceding one, has been made explicit in the latter (see LXX Isa 57:4 “And *against* whom have you opened your mouth wide? And *against* whom have you let loose your tongue?”)

### 6.9.2 Repetitive rendering of a preposition in parallel phrases

According to Moulton’s *Grammar* a preposition governing more than one phrase is usually not repeated in Greek. Although repetition of the preposition could be used in order to attribute emphatic prominence to each of the united ideas, in the papyri—especially in the unofficial style of writing—the preposition is generally mentioned only once. Iteration of the preposition is largely a peculiar feature of Biblical Greek, Moulton points out.<sup>111</sup> In conformity with this, the rare examples of the addition of a repetitive preposition in LXX Isaiah (quoted below) are perhaps to be seen as adjustments to biblical style. Alternatively, they may have been added for rhetorical reasons, for instance with the aim of ameliorating a parallel construction or emphasising an enumeration (see 66:19):

3:14	עַם־זִקְנֵי עַמּוֹ וּשְׂרָיו	μετὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ μετὰ τῶν ἀρχόντων αὐτοῦ
5:1	בִּקְרֶן בֶּן־שֹׁמֶן	ἐν κέρατι ἐν τόπῳ πίονι
17:8	אֱלֹהֵי־הַמְּזַבְּחֹת מַעֲשֵׂה יָדָיו	ἐπὶ τοῖς βωμοῖς οὐδὲ ἐπὶ τοῖς ἔργοις τῶν χειρῶν αὐτῶν
18:7	עַם מַמְשֵׁךְ וּמֹרֶסֶת וּמַעַם נוֹרָא	ἐκ λαοῦ τεθλιμμένου καὶ τετιλμένου καὶ ἀπὸ λαοῦ μεγάλου
63:17	לִמְעַן עֲבֹדֶיךָ שְׁבִי נַחֲלֶתְךָ	διὰ τοὺς δούλους σου, διὰ τὰς φυλάς τῆς κληρονομίας σου
66:19	אֱלֹהֵי־הַגּוֹיִם תִּרְשִׁישׁ פֹּל תַּבַּל וְלוּד מִשְׁכֵּי קֶשֶׁת וְיוֹן הָאִיִּים הַרְחָקִים	εἰς τὰ ἔθνη, εἰς Θαρσῖς καὶ Φουδ καὶ Λουδ καὶ Μοσοχ καὶ Θοβελ καὶ εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα καὶ εἰς τὰς νήσους τὰς πόρρω

In 5:1; 17:8; and 63:17 given above the preposition is not placed in front of a coordinated noun phrase, but before an apposition. Hence, the translator also altered the grammatical construction there.

<sup>111</sup> James H. Moulton, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek* (7 vols.; Edinburgh: Clark, 1906–1976), 3:275. See also section 7.6.1c.



Sometimes a preposition is repeated merely because it precedes an indeclinable place-name; see 66:19 above (before *Θαρσις*), as well as 1:1 and 2:1 below:<sup>112</sup>

1:1	על־יהודה וירושלם	κατὰ τῆς Ιουδαίας καὶ κατὰ Ιερουσαλημ
2:1	על־יהודה וירושלם	περὶ τῆς Ιουδαίας καὶ περὶ Ιερουσαλημ

### 6.9.3 Repetitive rendering of the subject

The following list will show some cases where in the Hebrew two clauses are governed by the same subject that is only mentioned by way of a (pro)noun phrase in the first clause, whereas in the translation this subject is made explicit in the second clause as well.<sup>113</sup>

#### a. The subject is repeated in a (nearly) identical way

24:3	הבוק תבוק הארץ והבו תבו	φθορᾶ φθαρῆσεται ἡ γῆ, καὶ προνομῆ προνομευθήσεται ἡ γῆ.
34:4	וכל־צבאם יבול כנבל עלה מגפן וכנבלת מתאנה	καὶ πάντα τὰ ἄστρα πεσεῖται ὡς φύλλα ἐξ ἁμπέλου καὶ ὡς πίπτει φύλλα ἀπὸ συκῆς.
40:12–14	מִי־מדד בשעלו מים ושמים בזרת תכן וכל בשלש עפר הארץ ושקל בפלס הרים וגבעות במאזנים מִי־תכן את־רוח יהוה ואיש עצתו יודיענו את־מי נועץ ויבינהו וילמדהו בארח משפט וילמדוהו דעת ודרך תבונות יודיענו	Τίς ἐμέτρησε τῇ χειρὶ τὸ ὕδωρ καὶ τὸν οὐρανὸν σπιθαμῇ καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν δρακί; τίς ἔστησε τὰ ὄρη σταθμῶ καὶ τὰς νάπας ζυγῶ; τίς ἔγνω νοῦν κυρίου, καὶ τίς σύμβουλος αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, ὃς συμβιβᾷ αὐτόν; ἢ πρὸς τίνα συνεβουλεύσατο καὶ συνεβίβασεν αὐτόν; ἢ τίς ἔδειξεν αὐτῷ κρίσιν; ἢ ὁδὸν συνέσεως τίς ἔδειξεν αὐτῷ;

<sup>112</sup> Compare Wilk, "Vision wider Judäa und wider Jerusalem," 18.

<sup>113</sup> One could dispute whether it is justifiable to speak of a "plus" when a subject that in the original is only marked by the verb, is in the translation made explicit by means of a noun phrase or an independent pronoun phrase. Indeed, the subject—even if only implicit—is grammatically still extant in the original. However, in such cases there *is* mention of a plus in a *quantitative* sense. This is because with Hebrew and Greek we are dealing with "null subject languages": languages in which the person, gender and number of the subject are expressed within the verb, which makes a separate pronoun phrase redundant. See for a discussion of this issue also sections 2.1 and 2.4.

43:9	מי בהם יגיד זאת וראשנות ישמיענו	τίς ἀναγγελεῖ ταῦτα; ἢ τὰ ἐξ ἀρχῆς <u>τίς</u> ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν;
49:12	הנה-אלה מרחוק יבאו והנה-אלה מצפון ומים ואלה מארץ סינים	ἰδοὺ <u>οὗτοι</u> πόρρωθεν ἔρχονται, <u>οὗτοι</u> ἀπὸ βορρᾶ καὶ <u>οὗτοι</u> ἀπὸ θαλάσσης, <u>ἄλλοι</u> δὲ ἐκ γῆς Περσῶν.

*b. The subject is repeated by means of a synonym*

22:2	חלליך לא חללי-חרב ולא מתי מלחמה	οἱ τραυματῖαι σου οὐ τραυματῖαι μαχαίρας, οὐδὲ <u>οἱ νεκροί σου</u> νεκροὶ πολέμου.
40:30	ויעפו נערים ויגעו	πεινάσουσι γὰρ <u>νεώτεροι</u> , καὶ κοπιάσουσι <u>νεανίσκοι</u>

#### 6.9.4 Repetitive rendering of the object

Repetitive rendering of the object<sup>114</sup> concerns cases where in the Hebrew the object of one clause also counts for the subsequent or preceding clause, yet is not mentioned there, while in the Greek the object occurs in both clauses.

*a. The object is repeated in a (nearly) identical way*

57:4	על-מי תתענגו על-מי תרחיבו פה תאריכו לשון	ἐν <u>τίνι</u> ἐνετρυφήσατε; καὶ ἐπὶ <u>τίνα</u> ἡνοίξατε τὸ στόμα ὑμῶν; καὶ ἐπὶ <u>τίνα</u> ἐχαλάσατε τὴν γλῶσσαν ὑμῶν;
57:6	גם-להם שפכת נסך העלית מנחה	<u>καὶ</u> <u>καίνοις</u> ἐξέχεας σπονδὰς <u>καὶ</u> <u>καίνοις</u> ἀνήνεγκας θυσίας.
57:11	ואותי לא זכרת לא-שמת על-לבך	καὶ οὐκ ἐμνήσθης <u>μου</u> οὐδὲ ἔλαβές <u>με</u> εἰς τὴν διάνοιαν
57:17	בעון בצעו קצפתי ואכרה	δι' ἁμαρτίαν βραχύ τι ἐλύπησα <u>αὐτόν</u> καὶ ἐπάταξα <u>αὐτόν</u>

Note that all of the above-mentioned instances of the literal repetition of the object can be found in LXX Isa 57. In that chapter the translator appears to be particularly prone to level parallelisms.

<sup>114</sup> Among “object” I include direct, indirect, adverbial and prepositional objects.

*b. The object is repeated by means of a synonym*

45:25	ביהוה יצדקו ויתהללו כל-זרע ישראל	ἀπὸ κυρίου δικαιοθήσονται καὶ ἐν τῷ θεῷ ἐνδοξασθήσονται πᾶν τὸ σπέρμα τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραηλ.
-------	--	--

**6.9.5 Repetitive rendering of the verb phrase**

Also when the Hebrew does not repeat a verb phrase for a later (or earlier) subject or object that governs, or is governed by, that same verb phrase, the translator sometimes complements this verb:

*a. The verb phrase is repeated in a (nearly) identical way*

3:25	מתוך בחרב יפלו וגבורתך במלחמה	καὶ ὁ υἱός σου ὁ κάλλιστος, ὃν ἀγαπᾷς, μαχαίρα πεσεῖται, καὶ οἱ ἰσχύοντες ὑμῶν μαχαίρα <u>πесοῦνται</u>
9:20–21	איש בשר-זרעו יאכלו מנשה את-אפרים	ἄνθρωπος ἔσθων τὰς σάρκας τοῦ βραχίονος αὐτοῦ. <u>φάγεται</u> γὰρ Μανασσὴ τοῦ Εφραιμ
13:12	אוקיר אנוש מפז ואדם מכתם אופיר	καὶ ἔσονται οἱ καταλελειμμένοι ἔντιμοι μᾶλλον ἢ τὸ χρυσίον τὸ ἄπυρον, καὶ ὁ ἄνθρωπος μᾶλλον <u>ἐντιμος ἔσται</u> ἢ ὁ λίθος ὁ ἐκ Σουφίρ.
14:29	כי-משרש נחש יצא צפע ופריו שרף מעופף	ἐκ γὰρ σπέρματος ὄφειν <u>ἐξελεύσεται</u> ἔκγονα ἀσπίδων, καὶ τὰ ἔκγονα αὐτῶν <u>ἐξελεύσονται</u> ὄφεις πετόμενοι.
17:3	ונשבת מבצר מאפרים וממלכה מדמש	καὶ οὐκέτι ἔσται ὀχυρὰ τοῦ καταφυγεῖν Εφραιμ, καὶ οὐκέτι ἔσται βασιλεία ἐν Δαμασκῷ
17:6	ונשאר-בו עוללת כנקף זית שנים שלשה גרגרים בראש אמיר ארבעה חמשה בסעפיה פריה	καὶ καταλειφθῇ ἐν αὐτῇ καλάμη ἢ ὡς ῥώγες ἐλαίας δύο ἢ τρεῖς ἐπ' ἄκρου μετεώρου ἢ τέσσαρες ἢ πέντε ἐπὶ τῶν κλάδων αὐτῶν <u>καταλειφθῇ</u> .
24:2	והיה כעם ככהן כעבד כאדוני	καὶ ἔσται ὁ λαὸς ὡς ὁ ἱερεὺς καὶ ὁ παῖς ὡς ὁ κύριος

	כשפחה כגברתה כקונה כמוכר	καὶ ἡ θεράπεινα ὡς ἡ κυρία, <u>ἔσται</u> ὁ ἀγοράζων ὡς ὁ πωλῶν
35:7	והיה השרב לאגם וצמאון למבועי מים	καὶ ἡ ἄνυδρος <u>ἔσται</u> εἰς ἔλγῃ, καὶ εἰς τὴν διψῶσαν γῆν πηγὴ ὕδατος <u>ἔσται</u> .
47:11	ובא עליך רעה לא תדעי שחרה ותפל עליך הוה לא תוכלי כפרה	καὶ ἡξεί ἐπὶ σέ ἀπώλεια, καὶ οὐ μὴ γνῶς, βόθυνος, καὶ ἐμπεσῇ εἰς αὐτόν. <u>καὶ ἡξεί ἐπὶ σέ</u> ταλαιπωρία, καὶ οὐ μὴ δυνήσῃ καθαρὰ γενέσθαι. <sup>115</sup>
59:9	נקוה לאור והנהיחשך לנגהות באפלות נהלך	<u>ὑπομεινάντων</u> αὐτῶν φῶς ἐγένετο αὐτοῖς σκότος, <u>μείναντες</u> αὐγὴν ἐν ἁωρίᾳ περιεπάτησαν.
60:17	תחת הנחשת אביא זהב ותחת הברזל אביא כסף ותחת העצים נחשת ותחת האבנים ברזל	καὶ ἀντὶ χαλκοῦ <u>οἴσω σοι</u> χρυσίον, ἀντὶ δὲ σιδήρου <u>οἴσω σοι</u> ἀργύριον, ἀντὶ δὲ ξύλων <u>οἴσω σοι</u> χαλκόν, ἀντὶ δὲ λίθων σίδηρον.
63:15	איה קנאתך וגבורתך המון מעיד ורחמך	<u>ποῦ ἐστιν</u> ὁ ζῆλός σου καὶ ἡ ἰσχὺς σου; <u>ποῦ ἐστι</u> τὸ πλῆθος τοῦ ἐλέους σου καὶ τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν σου

*b. The verb phrase is repeated by means of a synonym*

11:6	וגר זאב עס־כבש ונמר עס־גדי ירֶבץ ועגל וכפיר ומריא יחדו	καὶ <u>συμβοσκηθήσεται</u> λύκος μετὰ ἀρνός, καὶ πάρδαλις <u>συναναπαύσεται</u> ἐρίφω, καὶ μοσχάριον καὶ ταῦρος καὶ λέων ἅμα <u>βοσκηθήσονται</u>
------	---	--

<sup>115</sup> The MT considers שחרה (Qal infinitive שחר—"to expel" + suffix third person feminine singular) to be the final word of the sentence, and הוה ("disaster") the subject of תפל עליך: "But evil shall come upon you, which you cannot expel; disaster shall fall upon you, which you will not be able to ward off." The LXX translator, on the contrary, has segmented and interpreted the Hebrew text in the following way:

ובא עליך רעה לא תדעי	But evil shall come upon you, and you will not know it;
שחרה ותפל עליך	a pit (שחת)—and you shall fall into it;
הוה לא תוכלי כפרה	and wretchedness—and you will not be able to become clean of it.

Not only did he follow a different sentence division, but the translator also interpreted שחרה in a different way, namely as שחת—"pit, trap," which he rendered by βόθυνος ("pit"), and then related to תפל עליך. This left ἡ / ταλαιπωρία without a verb phrase, which prompted the translator to complement καὶ ἡξεί ἐπὶ σέ: "And wretchedness *shall come upon you*, and you will not be able to become clean of it."

### 6.9.6 Repetitive rendering of οὐδέ

Where in continuation of a preceding אֲלֵ, the Hebrew text equally implies a negation for a following phrase or clause, but does not indicate it there, the Isaiah translation now and then provides an extra conjunction in the form of οὐδέ:

23:4      לא־יָלַדְתִּי וְלֹא־יָגְדַלְתִּי בְחֻרִים  
             רוממתי בתולות

Οὐκ ὥδινον οὐδέ ἐτερον  
οὐδέ ἐξέθρεψα νεανίσκους  
οὐδέ ὑψωσα παρθένους.

<sup>116</sup> It is also possible that *νοσσοποιήσουσιν* renders (ענגו) *ענגו*; see 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> ותנים בהיכלו ענגו.

<sup>117</sup> The Hebrew was probably understood by the translator to consist of two clauses, even if in the MT it actually encompasses one sentence. 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> reads היום אבוחיכה ואשר אצרו אבוחיכה עד היום ונשארו כול אשר בביתכה ואשר אצרו בביתכה עד היום. *הזה בבל יבואו*. See section 12.3.1.1.

<sup>118</sup> While in the MT דָּמָם וּבָעֵסִים is the object of יִשְׁכְּרוּן, the translator seems to have regarded it as a second object of וְהֵאכְלִיתִי וּיִשְׁכְּרוּן as a new, separate clause: “And I will make your oppressors eat their own flesh and as young wine their blood. And they shall be drunk.” To fill in the ellipsis that thus came to exist, he added to דָּמָם וּבָעֵסִים דָּמָם / ὥς οἶνον νέον τὸ αἷμα αὐτῶν the verb phrase καὶ πίνονται.

38:18	כי לא שאול תודך מות יהללך לא־ישברו יורדי־בור אל־אמתך	οὐ γὰρ οἱ ἐν ᾧ̇δου αἰνέσουσί σε, <u>οὐδὲ</u> οἱ ἀποθανόντες εὐλογήσουσί σε, <u>οὐδὲ</u> ἐλπιούσιν οἱ ἐν ᾧ̇δου τὴν ἐλεημοσύνην σου. <sup>119</sup>
45:19	לא בסתר דברתי במקום ארץ חשך	οὐκ ἐν κρυφῇ λελάληκα <u>οὐδὲ</u> ἐν τόπῳ γῆς σκοτεινῷ.
60:18	לא־ישמע עוד חמס בארצך שד ושבר בגבולֶיך	καὶ οὐκ ἀκουσθήσεται ἔτι ἀδικία ἐν τῇ γῇ σου <u>οὐδὲ</u> σύντριμμα <u>οὐδὲ</u> τάλαιπωρία ἐν τοῖς ὁρίοις σου

οὐδέ sometimes also renders ו when that conjunction continues the negation, see 28:27; 42:8; 49:10; 60:18 (above); and 65:19.

## 6.10 Conclusion

Although Fischer, Ziegler and Seeligmann believe most of the doublets in the LXX of Isaiah to be of a secondary character—betraying the work of later revisers who attempted to correct the Greek Isaiah in line with the MT—a significant number of the doublets found in the translation cannot be explained in such a way. Only in cases where a single Hebrew word, phrase or clause is represented by two *coordinate* ones in the Greek, is it relatively easy to suppose either of the two to have been supplied by a later Greek editor, especially when one component offers a free translation, while the other one, supposedly inserted later, renders the Hebrew in a literal way. However, the majority of doublets in LXX Isaiah are not composed of a pair of renderings in coordination, but of two units that each have their own, separate syntactical function in one clause or in consecutive clauses. Often it is impossible to remove either of the two without changing or ruining the entire sentence construction. This makes it hard to imagine that one of the two elements would have been added by a later hand. Such doublets rather reveal the work of the translator himself, applying double translation as a technique for rearranging the Hebrew text. Moreover, the fact that many doublets in LXX Isaiah present two alternative renderings of the same Hebrew expression, often a literal one besides a free or associative one, does not necessarily point in the direction of a later “corrective” addition. Rather, the amalgamating of a literal with an associative, midrashic-like way of translating seems to be quite typical of the translator of Isaiah.<sup>120</sup> Such an approach he

<sup>119</sup> QIsa<sup>a</sup> reads כִּי־לֹא שְׂאוֹל תִּדְבַּר מוֹת יִהְיֶה־לְךָ.

<sup>120</sup> See section 1.3.2d.

could implement especially well in double translation, taking advantage of the different ways of understanding one Hebrew expression.

Finally, even doublets consisting of two coordinate items can mostly be explained as having been the work of the translator himself. He may, on some occasions, have added a synonymous expression for stylistic reasons, in order to create a figure of *synonymia*, or to make a line more parallel to a neighbouring one.<sup>121</sup> Or else, he may have offered a second rendering because he wished to express the meaning of a Hebrew word in a more precise way.

Still, it is probable that some doublets already existed in the *Vorlage* of the Isaiah translator. They may have been introduced into the Hebrew parent text of the LXX by a copyist who added a different reading from another Hebrew manuscript. Or the translator himself may have had two different Hebrew readings at his disposal, both of which he wanted to integrate into his translation. Yet, because of the abundance of doublets in LXX Isaiah, and also because the way in which they are constructed often fits well within the picture we have of the method applied by the Isaiah translator (that is, when they betray alternative ways of reading the Hebrew), it is reasonable to suppose that most of them are generated by a translation technique.

A category related to doublets involves cases of “repetitive rendering.” This concerns the phenomenon in which elements that function in the Hebrew distributively are filled out in the translation. Here again, most of the LXX Isaiah instances point to the translator himself as having complemented the implied words, with the aim of making his text more explicit, or in order to balance a parallelism. Those two tactics—explicitation and stylistic embellishment of the text—are tendencies that recur throughout the Greek Isaiah as a whole. They receive a more extensive treatment in another part of this study.

---

<sup>121</sup> See sections 8.3.1.2c and 8.5.





## Chapter 7.

# CONDENSATION

### 7.1 Introduction

While in the previous chapter we have looked at the tendency of the Isaiah translation to render a single Hebrew expression by two Greek ones, the present chapter will show that the reverse pattern also typifies the Greek Isaiah, that is, the rendering of two synonymous or identical Hebrew elements by only one in the translation. The frequent occurrence of this phenomenon in LXX Isaiah has been observed by, *inter alia*, Ziegler, van der Kooij, and Goshen-Gottstein.<sup>1</sup> In the present study I will indicate this technique with the term *condensation*. The same term has previously been used by Polak and Marquis in their *Classified Index of the Minuses of the Septuagint*. These authors define condensation as “a deliberate omission of apparently redundant words by the translator and/or the Hebrew scribe.”<sup>2</sup> Albeit in the Greek Isaiah most instances of the reduction of synonymous or identical elements seem to go back to the translator, there will also be some that find their origin in the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the translation or have been made by a later editor of the Greek text.

The abundant examples of condensation that occur in LXX Isaiah will in the continuation of this chapter be divided into five groups:

- a. The reduction of synonymous elements.
- b. The reduction of identical elements.
- c. The combination of two phrases or clauses into one.
- d. The cancelling of *paronomasia*.
- e. Cases of distributive rendering.

---

<sup>1</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 53, 56; van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 70; *HUB Isa*, xxxi. Goshen-Gottstein uses the term “condensed rendering.”

<sup>2</sup> Polak and Marquis, *Minuses of the Septuagint*, 1:29; see also 41.

## 7.2 The reduction of synonymous elements

### 7.2.1 The reduction of synonymous elements in coordination

The Greek Isaiah has many examples where the Hebrew offers two (or more) synonymous or closely related elements<sup>3</sup> which are joined in coordination, whereas the translation offers only one. On such occasions it might be that the Greek has preserved the more original text, while the MT presents a double reading. However, as the reduction of synonymous elements seems to be characteristic of LXX Isaiah, most of such minuses may be considered to have been made by the translator himself.

When two synonymous, coordinated units in the source text have merely one corresponding unit in the translation, it is often difficult (and mostly senseless) to distinguish which one of the two has been “omitted” by the translator. In a very strict sense, one can even ask if it is correct to speak about “omissions” in this circumstance: maybe the translator did not even intend to *leave out* one element, but just tried to render two words with the help of a single Greek equivalent that would cover the meaning of both (see 19:21 below). But leaving this aside, in the lists below I will for the sake of practicability mark the second item each time as a minus, except when that element reflects the Hebrew more adequately than the first one, in which case the first item will be underlined.

#### a. The reduction of synonymous words or phrases in coordination

5:19	<u>ותקרב ותבואה</u> עצת קדוש ישראל	<u>καὶ ἐλθάτω</u> ἡ βουλὴ τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰσραὴλ
9:4(5)	והיתה <u>לשרפה</u> מאכלת אש	καὶ θελήσουσιν εἰ ἐγενήθησαν <u>πυρίκαυστοι</u> .
10:25	כִּי־עוֹד <u>מעט מעער</u> וכלה זעם	ἔτι γὰρ <u>μικρὸν</u> καὶ παύσεται ἡ ὀργή <sup>4</sup>
14:22	והכרתי לבבל שם ושאר <u>ונין</u> <u>ונכד</u>	καὶ ἀπολῶ αὐτῶν ὄνομα καὶ κατὰλειμμα <u>καὶ σπέρμα</u>
16:6	גאותו <u>ונאוו</u> ועברתו	<u>τὴν ὑπερηφανίαν</u> ἐξῆρας. <sup>5</sup>
16:14	ושאר <u>מעט מעער</u> לוא כביר	καὶ καταλειφθήσεται <u>ὀλιγοσστός</u> καὶ οὐκ ἔντιμος.
17:1	והיתה <u>מע</u> מפלה	καὶ ἔσται εἰς <u>πτῶσιν</u> <sup>6</sup>

<sup>3</sup> “Synonymous” has been used here in a wide sense: It also includes words of the same semantical category, as for instance the names of “related” animals or body parts (see e.g. 1:11 and 29:13).

<sup>4</sup> See 16:14 and 29:17.

<sup>5</sup> The LXX translator has perhaps linked ועברתו (“his arrogance”) to the Hif’il of עבר—“to make go by,” and then rendered it by ἐξῆρας (from ἐξαιρέω—“to take away”). Or else, he may have derived ἐξῆρας from גאותו or גאווה, of which the root is גאה—“to raise.”

<sup>6</sup> Probably מעי has to be read as לעי or עי—“heap of ruins.” This was perhaps also the reading of the translator, who then may have omitted the noun because of its closeness to מפלה (“ruin”).

19:21	ועבדו זבח <u>ומנחה</u> ונדרו־נדר ליהוה	καὶ ποιήσουσι <b>θυσίας</b> καὶ εὕξονται εὐχὰς τῷ κυρίῳ
22:15	<u>לך־בא</u> אל־הסכן הזה על־שבנא	<b>Πορεύου</b> εἰς τὸ παστοφόριον πρὸς Σομναν
22:25	תמוש היתד התקועה	Κινηθήσεται ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὁ ἐστηριγμένος
24:4	במקום נאמן <u>ונדעה</u> ונפלה אבלה <u>נבלה</u> הארץ תבל אמללה <u>נבלה</u>	ἐν τόπῳ πιστῷ <b>καὶ πεσεῖται</b> <b>ἐπένθησεν</b> ἡ γῆ, καὶ <b>ἐφθάρη</b> ἡ οἰκουμένη <sup>7</sup>
25:9	נגילה <u>ונשמחה</u> בישועתו	καὶ <b>ἡγαλλιώμεθα</b> ἐπὶ τῇ σωτηρίᾳ ἡμῶν. <sup>8</sup>
25:12	משגב	καὶ τὸ ὕψος τῆς καταφυγῆς τοῦ τοίχου σου <b>ταπεινώσει</b> , καὶ καταβήσεται <b>ἕως τοῦ ἐδάφους</b> . <sup>9</sup>
26:17	כמו הרה תקריב ללדת <u>תחיל</u> תזעק בחבליה	καὶ ὥς ἡ ὠδίνουσα <b>ἐγγίξει τοῦ τεκεῖν</b> καὶ <b>ἐπὶ τῇ ὠδίνι αὐτῆς ἐκέκραξεν</b>
29:17	הלוא־עוד מעט <u>מוצר</u> ושב לבנון	οὐκέτι <b>μικρὸν</b> καὶ μετατεθήσεται ὁ Λίβανος
33:9	<u>אבל אמללה</u> ארץ החפיר לבנון	<b>ἐπένθησεν</b> ἡ γῆ, ἡσχύνθη ὁ Λίβανος
34:6	הדשנה מחלב <u>מדם</u> כרים ועתודים מחלב כליות אילים ונטה עליה	ἐπαχύνθη <b>ἀπὸ στέατος</b> ἀρνῶν καὶ <b>ἀπὸ στέατος</b> τράγων καὶ κριῶν. <sup>10</sup>
34:11	<u>קורתו</u> ואבני־בהו	καὶ ἐπιβληθήσεται ἐπ' αὐτὴν <b>σπαρτίον γεωμετρίας ἐρήμου</b> <sup>11</sup>
36:6	אשר יסמך איש עליו	ὃς ἂν ἐπ' αὐτὴν ἐπιστηρισθῇ,
37:27	<u>ובא בכפו</u> ונקבה וישביהו קצרי־יד <u>חתו</u> ובשו	<b>εἰσελεύσεται εἰς τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ</b> · ἀνῆκα τὰς χεῖρας, καὶ <b>ἐξηράνθησαν</b> <sup>12</sup>
37:37	<u>ויסע וילך</u> וישב סנחריב מלך־אשור	καὶ ἀποστραφεῖς <b>ἀπηλθε</b> βασιλεὺς Ἀσσυρίων
39:7	ומבניך <u>אשר יצאו ממך</u> אשר תוליד יקחו	ὅτι καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν τέκνων σου, <b>ὧν ἐγέννησας</b> , λήμψονται

Alternatively, the translator has discarded מעי because he did not understand this obscure form (thus Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 52); see section 10.1.

<sup>7</sup> See 33:9.

<sup>8</sup> Rahlfs reads καὶ ἡγαλλιώμεθα καὶ εὐφρανθήσόμεθα ἐπὶ τῇ σωτηρίᾳ ἡμῶν. The second verb seems however to be the outcome of a Hexaplaric correction in line with the MT. It is also offered by Theodotion.

<sup>9</sup> According to Talmon the MT displays a doublet caused by conflation (Talmon, “Double Readings,” 177); see 26:5.

<sup>10</sup> For στέατος ἀρνῶν, see Isa 1:11 and Deut 32:14; see for a further discussion section 9.4.1.2a.

<sup>11</sup> LXX reads καὶ ἐξηράνθησαν τὰς χεῖρας, καὶ εἰσελεύσεται εἰς τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ. This might find its equivalent in καὶ ὀνοκένταυροι οἰκήσουσιν ἐν αὐτῇ (following on σπαρτίον γεωμετρίας ἐρήμου), which would derive from the Hebrew through the association of ברו with בה (= ἐν αὐτῇ) and of ואבני with אים (= ὀνοκένταυροι). Yet, more likely, the Greek clause forms a plus, and was inserted under the influence of 13:21–22 (see section 9.3.1).

<sup>12</sup> LXX Isaiah renders ובשו as though it were ויבשו—“they will dry out”; for the rendering of יבש by ξηραίνω, see 19:5, 7.

40:17	כל־הגוים כאין נגדו	καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ὡς οὐδέν εἰσι
	<b>מאפס ותהו</b> נחשבו־לו	καὶ <b>εἰς οὐθὲν</b> ἐλογίσθησαν.
41:29	הן כלם און אפס מעשיהם	οὐθὲν γὰρ οἱ ποιοῦντες ὑμᾶς,
	<b>רוח ותהו</b> נסכיהם	καὶ <b>μάτην</b> οἱ πλανῶντες ὑμᾶς.
42:13	<b>יריע אף־יצריו</b> על־איביו	καὶ <b>βοήσεται</b> ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐχθροὺς αὐτοῦ
	יתגבר	μετὰ ἰσχύος
42:23	מי בכס יאזין זאת	τίς ἐν ὑμῖν, ὃς ἐνωτιεῖται ταῦτα,
	<b>יקשב וישמע</b> לאחור	<b>εἰσακούσεται</b> εἰς τὰ ἐπερχόμενα;
44:17	<b>יסגד־לו ושתחו</b> ויתפלל אליו	καὶ <b>προσκυνεῖ αὐτῷ</b> καὶ προσεύχεται
46:7	<b>ישאהו</b> על־כתף <b>יסבלהו</b>	<b>αἰρουσιν αὐτὸ</b> ἐπὶ τῶν ὤμων
49:8	וביום ישועה <b>עזרתך ואצרך</b>	καὶ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ σωτηρίας <b>ἐβοήθησά σοι</b> <sup>13</sup>
53:7	<b>נפש והוא נענה</b> ולא	καὶ <b>αὐτὸς διὰ τὸ κεκαχώσθαι</b> οὐκ
	יפתח־פיו	ἀνοίγει τὸ στόμα·
59:18	כעל גמלות כעל ישלם	ὡς ἀνταποδώσων ἀνταπόδοσιν
	<b>חמה לצריו נמול לאיביו</b>	<b>ὄνειδος τοῖς ὑπεναντίοις.</b>

In many of the above examples, one can detect a *third* synonym, or a repetition of either of the two synonymous elements present in the same verse; see 16:6 וועברתו; 16:14 לוא כביר; 19:21 נדר; 22:25 תמוש; 24:4 אמללה; 25:12 להגיע לארץ; 33:9 ההפיר; 34:6 מחלב; 37:27 קצרי־י; 37:37 וישב; 40:17 כאין; 41:29 הן כלם און; 42:23 יאזין; 44:17 ויתפלל אליו; and 59:18 גמלות. Apparently, the translator regarded more than two words or phrases with a similar content in the same verse as too much of the same thing.

By means of the omission of a synonym, the translator sometimes balanced a parallelism. That is, when the first of two parallel stichs presented a synonymous word pair, in the place where the second line offered merely one word, the translator occasionally deleted either of the two synonyms in the first line (or *vice versa*), so that the two stichs became equal again: see 19:21; 40:17; and 41:29.

#### *b. The omission of elements from an enumeration*

Also from sequences of synonymous or closely related words the translator has regularly left out one or more components:

1:11	ודם פרים וכבשים ועתודים	καὶ αἷμα ταύρων καὶ τράγων <sup>14</sup>
25:6–7	שמרים משתה שמנים משתה	πίονται εὐφροσύνην, πίονται οἶνον,

<sup>13</sup> It is also possible that ואצרך was dropped through haplography due to the subsequent ואתנך; see section 11.1.

<sup>14</sup> See Isa 34:6 and Deut 32:14, and see section 9.4.1.2a. According to Wildberger וכבשים is a later addition to the Hebrew text in order to complete the enumeration; see Hans Wildberger, *Jesaja* (3 vols.; BKAT 10; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1972–1982), 1:33.

	שמנים ממחים שמרים מזקקים	χρίσονται μύρον.
28:25	חטה שורה ושערה נסמן ובסמת	πυρὸν καὶ κριθήν καὶ ζέαν <sup>15</sup>
30:32	בתפים ובכנרות ובמלחמות תנופה	μετὰ αὐλῶν καὶ κιθάρας <sup>16</sup>
37:12	אלהי הגוים אשר השחיתו אבותי	οἱ θεοὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν, οὓς οἱ πατέρες
	את־גוֹזֵן	μου ἀπώλεσαν, τήν τε Γῶζαν
	ואת־חֹרֶן ורצף ובני־עֵדן	καὶ Χαρραν καὶ Ραφες
37:27	עשב שדה וירק דשא חציר גגות	ὡς χόρτος ξηρὸς ἐπὶ δωμάτων
	ושדמה לפני קמה	καὶ ὡς ἄγρωστις. <sup>17</sup>
41:19	אתן במדבר ארו	θήσω εἰς τήν ἄνυδρον γῆν κέδρον
	שטה והדס ועץ שמן	καὶ πύξον καὶ μυρσίνην
	אשים בערבה ברוש תדהר ותאשור יחדו	καὶ κυπάρισσον καὶ λεύκην
44:12	גס־רעב ואין כח	καὶ πεινάσει καὶ ἀσθενήσει
	לא־שתה מים וייעף	καὶ οὐ μὴ πίη ὕδωρ.
52:13	ירום ונשא וגבה	καὶ ὑψωθήσεται καὶ δοξασθήσεται
	מאד	σφόδρα.

*c. Two parallel clauses are reduced to one*

In the following verses one of two (or more) parallel or synonymous *clauses* is missing in the LXX:

1:4	עזבו את־יהוה נאצו את־קדוש ישראל נזרו אחור	ἐγκατελίπατε τὸν κύριον καὶ παρωργίσατε τὸν ἅγιον τοῦ Ἰσραηλ. <sup>18</sup>
3:15	נאם־אדני יהוה צבאות ויאמר יהוה	Τάδε λέγει κύριος
14:16	ראיך אליך ישגיחו אליך יתבוננו	οἱ ἰδόντες σε θαυμάσουσιν ἐπὶ σοὶ
14:23–24	נאם יהוה צבאות נשבע יהוה צבאות לאמר	τάδε λέγει κύριος σαβαωθ
16:10	ובכרמים לא־ירנן לא ירעע	καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀμπελώσί σου οὐ μὴ εὐφρανθήσονται

<sup>15</sup> See also section 10.1.

<sup>16</sup> See also section 10.1.

<sup>17</sup> ושדמה probably has to be read as וּשְׁדָפָה—“dried corn.” χόρτος ξηρὸς ἐπὶ δωμάτων seems to render חציר גגות, while ἄγρωστις (“grass”) translates either וירק דשא (“young green”) or עשב שדה (“herbs of the field”).

<sup>18</sup> See section 12.2.

21:5	ערך השלחן <u>צפה הצפית</u>	ἐτοίμασον τὴν τράπεζαν·
22:2	תשאות מלאה עיר <u>הומיה קריה עליזה</u>	ἐνεπλήσθη ἡ πόλις βοώντων·
22:14	אמר אדני יהוה צבאות כה אמר אדני יהוה צבאות	Τάδε λέγει κύριος σαβαωθ
23:18	לא יאצר <u>ולא יחסן</u>	οὐκ αὐτοῖς συναχθήσεται
25:9	הנה אלהינו זה קוינו לו <u>ויושיענו זה יהוה קוינו לו</u>	Ἴδου ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν, ἐφ' ᾧ ἡλπίζομεν
26:5	כי השח יושבי מרום קריה נשגבה ישפילנה ישפילה עד־ארץ <u>יגיענה עד־עפר</u>	ὅς ταπεινώσας κατήγαγες τοὺς ἐνοικοῦντας ἐν ὑψηλοῖς· πόλεις ὀχυρὰς καταβαλεῖς καὶ κατὰξεις ἕως ἐδάφους <sup>19</sup>
29:9	התמהמהו ותמהו <u>השתעשעו ושעו</u>	ἐκλύθητε καὶ ἔκστητε
31:3	וכשל עוזר <u>ונפל עזר</u>	καὶ κοπιᾶσουσιν οἱ βοηθοῦντες <sup>20</sup>
34:3–4	ונמקו כל־צבא השמים ונגלו כספר השמים	καὶ ἐλιγύσεται ὁ οὐρανὸς ὡς βιβλίον
40:11	בזרעו יקבץ תלאים <u>ובחיקו ישא</u>	καὶ τῷ βραχίονι αὐτοῦ συνάξει ἄρνας
40:14	וילמדהו בארח משפט <u>וילמדהו דעת</u>	ἢ τίς ἔδειξεν αὐτῷ κρίσιν;
	ודרך תבונות יודיענו	ἢ ὁδὸν συνέσεως τίς ἔδειξεν αὐτῷ;
40:19	וצרף בזהב ירקענו <u>ורתקות כסף צורף</u>	ἢ χρυσοχόος χωνεύσας χρυσίον περιεχύρωσεν αὐτόν

<sup>19</sup> In 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> ישפילה fails: עפר יגיענה עדי עפר: כי השח יושבי מרום קריה נשגבה ישפילנה עדי ארץ יגיענה עדי עפר.

<sup>20</sup> The translator may have read עזר as עֲזָר ("helper") instead of as עֲזָרָה—"the one being helped"—as the MT gives; this has made the clause עזר ונפל parallel to the preceding one as regards its content as well, which could have prompted the translator to leave it out.

41:26	אָ אַיִן־מגיד <u>אָ אַיִן משמע</u> אָ אַיִן־שמע אמריכם	οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ προλέγων οὐδὲ ὁ ἀκούων τοὺς λόγους ὑμῶν.
41:29	<u>הוּ כָּל־אֵן</u> אָפֶס מעשׂיהם	οὐθὲν γὰρ οἱ ποιοῦντες ὑμᾶς
43:23	וּבְחִיד לֹא כִבְדֹתִי <u>לֹא הִעֲבַדְתִּיךָ בַּמִּנְחָה</u> וְלֹא הוֹנַעְתִּיךָ בַּלְבוֹנָה	οὐδὲ ἐν ταῖς θυσίαις σου ἐδόξασάς με, οὐδὲ ἔγκοπον ἐποίησά σε ἐν λιβάνῳ
44:13	חֲרַשׁ עֲצִים נָטָה קוֹ יִתְאַרְהוּ בִּשְׂרָד <u>יַעֲשֶׂהוּ בַּמִּקְצָעוֹת</u> <u>וּבַמַּחֲוֶה יִתְאַרְהוּ</u> וַיַּעֲשֶׂהוּ כְּתַבְנִית אִישׁ	ἔστησεν αὐτὸ ἐν μέτρῳ καὶ ἐν κόλλῃ ἐρρύθμισεν αὐτό, ἐποίησεν αὐτὸ ὡς μορφὴν ἀνδρὸς
44:15	אָ־יַפְעֵל־אֵל וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוֶה <u>עֲשֶׂהוּ פֶסֶל וַיִּסְגְּדוּ־לָמוֹ</u>	τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν εἰργάσαντο εἰς θεούς, καὶ προσκυνοῦσιν αὐτούς.
46:13	קִרְבִּיתִי צִדְקָתִי <u>לֹא תִרְחַק</u> וּתְשׁוּעָתִי לֹא תֵּאָחֵר	ἤγγισα τὴν δικαιοσύνην μου καὶ τὴν σωτηρίαν τὴν παρ' ἐμοῦ οὐ βραδυνῶ.
59:6	מַעֲשֵׂי־אֵן מַעֲשִׂיהֶם <u>וּפַעַל חֶמֶס בַּכִּפְיָהֶם</u>	τὰ γὰρ ἔργα αὐτῶν ἔργα ἀνομίας.
59:17	וַיִּלְבַּשׁ בְּגָדִי נָקֶם תִּלְבַּשׁ <u>וַיַּעַט כַּמְעִיל קִנְיָה</u> כַּעַל גַּמְלוֹת כַּעַל יִשְׁלֵם חֶמֶה לְצַרְיוֹ <u>גִּמְלוֹל לְאִיבֵי</u> <u>לְאִיִּם גִּמְלוֹל יִשְׁלֵם</u>	καὶ περιεβάλετο ἱμάτιον ἐκδικήσεως καὶ τὸ περιβόλαιον ὡς ἀνταποδώσω ἀνταπόδοσιν ὄνειδος τοῖς ὑπεναντίοις. <sup>21</sup>
60:13	לִפְאָר מִקוֹם מִקְדָּשִׁי <u>וּמִקוֹם רְגִלִּי אֲכַבֵּד</u>	δοξάσαι τὸν τόπον τὸν ἁγίόν μου. <sup>22</sup>
61:7	<u>תַּחַת בִּשְׁתַּכֶּם מִשְׁנָה</u> <u>וּכְלָמָה יִרְנוּ חִלְקֶם</u> לִכֵּן בְּאַרְצֶם מִשְׁנָה יִירָשׁוּ שִׂמְחַת עוֹלָם תִּהְיֶה לָהֶם	οὕτως ἐκ δευτέρας κληρονομήσουσι τὴν γῆν, καὶ εὐφροσύνη αἰώνιος ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς αὐτῶν.

<sup>21</sup> According to Ziegler (*Untersuchungen*, 17) גמול לאיים in the MT is a gloss that had not entered the *Vorlage* of LXX Isaiah. Another possibility is that גמול לאיביו לאיים was omitted mistakenly, due to its resemblance to the preceding כעל גמלות כעל ישלם; see section 11.3.

<sup>22</sup> Goshen-Gottstein (*HUB Isa*, 270–71) suggests that ומקום רגלי אכבד was removed so as to avoid an anthropomorphic imagery. See however section 10.3.2.

62:4	כי לך יקרא חפצי־בה ולארצך בעולה <u>בי־חפץ יהוה בך</u> <u>וארצך תבעל</u>	σοὶ γὰρ κληθήσεται Θέλημα ἐμόν, καὶ τῇ γῇ σου Οἰκουμένη.
62:10	פנו דרך העם <u>סלו סלו המסלה</u>	καὶ ὁδοποιήσατε τῷ λαῷ μου <sup>23</sup>
65:18	כי־אם־שישו וגילו עדי־עד <u>אשר אני בורא</u> כי הנני בורא את־ירושלם גילה	ἀλλ' εὐφροσύνην καὶ ἀγαλλίαμα εὐρήσουσιν ἐν αὐτῇ. ὅτι ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ποιῶ Ἱερουσαλημ ἀγαλλίαμα

In several of the examples mentioned the absence of a parallel clause in the translation might as well have occurred erroneously. The translator could have skipped over part of the text due to a similar beginning (*homoeoarkton*) or ending (*homoeoteleuton*) of two clauses. This is a possible explanation for the minuses in 14:23–24 (יהוה צבאות); 22:14–15 (אמר אדני יהוה) צבאות; 25:9 (קוֹיִנו) (לו); 31:3 (עזר/עוזר); 41:26 (אף אין); 44:13 (ויעשהו); and 62:4 (תבעל/בעולה) (the similar words are shown between brackets). Haplography (the accidental skipping of one of two similar adjacent text elements) may have occurred in 22:14–15 and 65:18. For a further discussion, see chapter 11.

Note that there are three places where the MT has two consecutive messenger formulae—both at the end of a section and at the beginning of the next one—while the LXX offers only one: in 3:15–16; 14:23–24; and 22:14–15.

## 7.2.2 The reduction of synonymous elements that are not joined in coordination

### a. The reduction of synonymous words in a construct state conjunction

13:4	קול <u>שאנן</u> ממלכות	φωνῇ βασιλείων <sup>24</sup>
13:9	ועברה <u>חרון אף</u>	θυμοῦ καὶ ὀργῆς <sup>25</sup>
13:13	וביום <u>חרון אפו</u>	τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, ἣ ἂν ἐπέλθῃ ὁ θυμὸς αὐτοῦ.
13:19	<u>תפארת נאמן</u> כשדים	ἣ καλεῖται ἔνδοξος ὑπὸ βασιλείως Χαλδαίων
20:4	וחשופי <u>שת ערות</u> מצרים	ἀνακεκαλυμμένους τὴν αἰσχύνην Αἰγύπτου.
21:4	את <u>נשף חשקי</u> שם לי לחרדה	ἢ ψυχῇ μου ἐφέστηκεν εἰς φόβον. <sup>26</sup>

<sup>23</sup> ἐκ τῆς ὁδοῦ. was presumably considered the first word of the next clause, where the LXX represents it as

<sup>24</sup> שאנן may have been omitted so as to make the clause in which it appears more parallel to the preceding one: φωνῇ ἐθνῶν πολλῶν ... // φωνῇ βασιλείων καὶ ἐθνῶν συνηγμένων.

<sup>25</sup> The reverse has happened in Isa 9:18(19), where בעברת is rendered θυμὸν ὀργῆς.



- 24:4 אמללו מרום עַם־הארץ ἐπένθησαν οἱ ὕψηλοι τῆς γῆς.<sup>27</sup>  
 28:1 וציץ נבל צבי תפארתו τὸ ἄνθος τὸ ἐκπεσὸν ἐκ τῆς δόξης  
 37:24 ואבוא מרום קצו יער כרמלו καὶ εἰσῆλθον εἰς ὕψος μέρους τοῦ δρυμοῦ<sup>28</sup>

*b. Other examples of the reduction of synonymous elements that are not joined in coordination*

- 4:4 אם רחץ אדני את צאת בנות ציון ὅτι ἐκπλυνεῖ κύριος τὸν ῥύπον τῶν υἱῶν  
 ואת־דמי ירושלם ידיח מקרבה καὶ τῶν θυγατέρων Σιών  
 10:26 ועורר עליו יהוה צבאות καὶ τὸ αἶμα ἐκαθαριεῖ ἐκ μέσου αὐτῶν  
 שוט כמכת מדין καὶ ἐπεγερεῖ ὁ θεὸς ἐπ' αὐτούς  
 13:19 והיתה בבל צבי ממלכות κατὰ τὴν πληγὴν τὴν Μαδιαμ<sup>29</sup>  
 תפארת נאון כשדים καὶ ἔσται Βαβυλών,  
 15:1 כי בליל שדד ער מואב נדמה ἢ καλεῖται ἔνδοξος ὑπὸ βασιλέως Χαλδαίων  
 15:6 כִּי־יבש חציר כלה דשא Νυκτὸς ἀπολείται ἢ Μωαβίτις  
 ירק לא היה καὶ ὁ χόρτος αὐτῆς ἐκλείψει·  
 23:17 וזנתה את־כל־ממלכות χόρτος γὰρ χλωρὸς οὐκ ἔσται.<sup>30</sup>  
 הארץ על־פני האדמה καὶ ἔσται ἐμπόριον πάσαις ταῖς βασιλείαις  
 26:19 יחיו מתוך τῆς οἴκουμένης.  
 נבלתי יקומון ἀναστήσονται οἱ νεκροί,  
 הקיצו ורגנו שכני עפר καὶ ἐγερθήσονται οἱ ἐν τοῖς μνημείοις,  
 28:27–28 כי במטה יחבט קצח καὶ εὐφρανθήσονται οἱ ἐν τῇ γῇ·  
 וכמן בשבט לחם יודק ἀλλὰ ῥάβδω ἐκτινάσσεται τὸ μελάνθιον,  
 29:13 יען כי גש העה הזה בפני τὸ δὲ κύμινον μετὰ ἄρτου βρωθήσεται.<sup>31</sup>  
 ובשפתיו כבדוני Ἐγγίξει μοι ὁ λαὸς οὗτος,  
 τοῖς χεῖλεσιν αὐτῶν τιμῶσί με

<sup>26</sup> The translator may have read נשף as though it were נפש, and considered this synonymous to קשקש (“my desire”).

<sup>27</sup> 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> reads עַם־הארץ; see section 12.3.1.2.

<sup>28</sup> Probably the LXX translator did not think קצו to be a form of קץ (“end,” “top”) but of קצה (“end,” “border,” “entirety”), and consequently translated the noun by μέρους (“region”). He may then have connected קצו as a genitive attribute to מרום: “the height of the region of the wood,” while he left out כרמלו (“his plantation”), perhaps in view of its closeness in meaning to יער.

<sup>29</sup> Maybe שוט was deleted in order to assimilate 10:26a to the final line of verse 24: πληγὴν γὰρ ἐγὼ ἐπάγω ἐπὶ σέ.

<sup>30</sup> In the MT this text comprises three small clauses; כִּי־יבש חציר; כִּי־יבש דשא; and ירק לא היה. The translator, however, seems to have regarded דשא as the beginning of a new sentence and as the subject of ירק לא היה, reading ירק as ירק—“green” = χόρτος (rather than as the masoretic יֶרֶק—“verdure”); he may have perceived כלה as an apposition to חציר, and hence as governed by חציר too (“Because the grass is dried, *withered*. The herb is not green”). He may then have omitted כלה with the aim of condensing his text.

<sup>31</sup> The translator perhaps thought לחם יודק formed one clause with וכמן בשבט rather than constituting a separate one.

32:2	וסתר <u>זרם</u> כפלג־מים	καὶ κρυβήσεται ὡς ἀφ' ὕδατος φερομένου·
32:3	ואזני <u>שמעים</u> תקשבנה	ἀλλὰ τὰ ὦτα δώσουσιν ἀκούειν.
37:31	ויספה <u>פליטת</u> בית־יהודה הנשארה שרש למטה	καὶ ἔσονται οἱ καταλελειμμένοι ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ φυήσουσι ῥίζαν κάτω

More examples can be found in section 7.6 below.

### 7.3 The reduction of (nearly) identical elements

#### 7.3.1 The reduction of (nearly) identical elements in coordination

When in the Hebrew text a word, phrase or clause is repeated literally in such a way that the repeated elements follow upon each other directly—a figure called *geminatio*—, the Greek translation often lacks such a repetition, but offers a single representation of the specific element instead. This might in some cases be due to an unintentional omission by the translator (or a Hebrew scribe), resulting from haplography or *parablepsis* (see 21:7; 24:16; and 39:1 below, and see also chapter 11). Yet, in most instances the translator has probably removed cases of *geminatio* deliberately, namely for stylistic reasons, since this kind of repetition may have been “overdone” in his eyes. For a further discussion, see section 8.7.

21:9	נפלה <u>נפלה</u> בבל	Πέπτωκε Βαβυλών
21:11	שמר מה־מלילה <u>שמר מה־מליל</u>	Φυλάσσετε ἐπάλξεις.
25:7	פני־הלז <u>הלז</u> על־כל־העמים	παράδος ταῦτα πάντα τοῖς ἔθνεσιν·
26:3	יצר סמוך תצר <u>שלום</u>	ἀντιλαμβάνόμενος ἀληθείας καὶ φυλάσσω εἰρήνην.
28:10	צו לצו <u>צו</u> לקו לקו <u>צו</u> לקו לקו	θλιῖψιν ἐπὶ θλιῖψιν προσδέχου, ἐλπίδα ἐπ' ἐλπίδι <sup>32</sup>
28:13	צו לצו <u>צו</u> לקו לקו <u>צו</u> לקו לקו	θλιῖψις ἐπὶ θλιῖψιν, ἐλπίς ἐπ' ἐλπίδι
28:16	פנת יקרת מוסד <u>מוסד</u>	ἔντιμον εἰς τὰ θεμέλια αὐτῆς
29:1	הוי אריאל <u>אריאל</u>	Οὐαὶ πόλεις Ἀριηλ
38:11	לא־אראה יה <u>יה</u> בארץ החיים	Οὐκέτι μὴ ἴδω τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς <sup>33</sup>
38:19	חי <u>חי</u> הוא יודך	οἱ ζῶντως εὐλογήσουσί σε
43:11	אנכי <u>אנכי</u> יהוה	ἐγὼ ὁ θεός
48:11	למעני <u>למעני</u> אעשה	ἔνεκεν ἐμοῦ ποιήσω σοι

<sup>32</sup> One of the final two occurrences of קו has probably generated προσδέχου, through a link with נקו —“to hope,” “to wait on.”

<sup>33</sup> 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> likewise mentions the divine name only once: יהוה אֵל אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ; see section 12.3.1.2. For the supposed addition of τὸ σωτήριον, see section 10.3.2.

48:15	אני <u>אני</u> דברתי אף־קראתיו	ἐγὼ ἐλάλησα, ἐγὼ ἐκάλεσα
57:6	הם <u>הם</u> גורלך	οὗτός σου ὁ κλήρος
57:14	סל־סלן פנו־דרך	Καθαρίσατε ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ ὁδοὺς
62:10	עברו <u>עברו</u> בשערים	πορεύεσθε διὰ τῶν πυλῶν μου <sup>34</sup>

Also compare the following cases where a *nearly* identical adjacent phrase or clause is removed in the translation:

19:7	עלות <u>על־יארור</u> על־פי יארור	καὶ τὸ ἄχι τὸ χλωρόν πᾶν τὸ κύκλῳ τοῦ ποταμοῦ
21:7	והקשיב <u>קשב</u> רב־קשב	ἀκρόασαι ἀκρόασιν πολλήν
22:14–15	אמר <u>אדני יהוה צבאות</u> כה אמר אדני יהוה צבאות	Τάδε λέγει κύριος σαβαωθ <sup>35</sup> καὶ ἄρξει, καὶ οὐκ ἔσται ὁ ἀντιλέγων.
22:22	ופתח ואין סגר וסגר <u>ואין פתח</u>	Οὐαὶ τοῖς ἀθετοῦσιν, οἱ ἀθετοῦντες τὸν νόμον.
24:16	בגדו ובגד <u>בוגדים בגדו</u>	ὁ θεὸς ὁ μέγας ὁ αἰώνιος καὶ μεταθήσω αὐτοὺς
26:4	כי ביה <u>יהוה</u> צור עולמים	καὶ μαρῶδαχ υἱὸς τοῦ Λααδαν
29:14	הפלא <u>ופלא</u>	οὐ μὴ ἐκλίπη <u>ἐκ</u> τοῦ στόματός σου
39:1	מרדך <u>בלאדן</u> בן־בלאדן	καὶ <u>ἐκ</u> τοῦ στόματος τοῦ σπέρματός σου
59:21	לא־ימושו <u>מפיד</u> ומפי זרעך <u>ומפי זרעך</u>	οὐκ ἔστι γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅμοιος
62:6	אל־דמי לכם <u>ואל־תתנו דמי לו</u>	

### 7.3.2 The reduction of (nearly) identical elements that are not joined in coordination

Also of two (nearly) identical words, phrases or clauses that in the Hebrew occur in close proximity to each other yet not in coordination, often one is lacking in LXX Isaiah. The origin of such minuses will usually be deliberate condensation, or, in some cases an *aberratio oculi* of the translator or the scribe of his *Vorlage*. In the examples below, omission on account of *parablepsis* may have taken place in 41:13–14 (אל־תירא) and 62:4 (וארצך תבעל/ולארצך בעלה), while the minuses in 24:21; 26:6; and 38:8 could have been caused by haplography.<sup>36</sup>

10:21	שאר ישוב <u>שאר</u> יעקב אל־אל גבור	καὶ ἔσται τὸ καταλειφθὲν τοῦ Ιακωβ ἐπὶ θεὸν ἰσχύοντα.
14:18	כל־מלכי גוים <u>כלם</u> שכבו בכבוד	πάντες οἱ βασιλεῖς τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐκοιμήθησαν ἐν τιμῇ <sup>37</sup>

<sup>34</sup> 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> similarly presents only one imperative: עברו בשערים.

<sup>35</sup> See 3:15–16 and 14:22.

<sup>36</sup> See chapter 11.

<sup>37</sup> In 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> כלם is not represented either: כול מלכי גוים שכבו בכבוד; see section 12.3.1.2.

- 15:8 כִּי־הִקִּיפָה הַזַּעֲקָה אֶת־גִּבּוֹל מוֹאֵב עַד־אֲגָלִים לִלְתָהּ וּבֹאֵר אֵילִים לִלְתָהּ  
 21:3 צִירִים אַחֲזוּנִי כַצִּירִי יוֹלְדָה  
 24:21 יִפְקֹד יְהוָה עַל־צִבְאָה הַמְרוֹס בַּמְרוֹס  
 וְעַל־מַלְכֵי הָאָדָמָה עַל־הָאָדָמָה  
 25:4 כִּי־הִיִּית מַעוֹן לְדֹל מַעוֹן לְאֲבוֹנִין בַּצִּרְלוֹ מַחֲסֵה מִזֶּרֶם  
 26:6 תִּרְמַסְנָהּ רֶגֶל רִגְלִי עֲנִי פַעֲמֵי דָלִים  
 26:19 כִּי טַל אֹרֶת טֶלֶךְ  
 28:16 הֲנִנִי יֹסֵד בְּצִיּוֹן אֲבֵן  
 29:2 וְהַצִּיקוּתִי לְאֲרִיאל וְהִיתָה תֵּאֲנִיָּה וְאֵנִיָּה וְהִתָּה לִי  
כְּאֲרִיאל  
 30:26 וְאֹרֶר הַחֲמָה יִהְיֶה שִׁבְעָתִים  
כְּאֹרֶר שִׁבְעָת הַיָּמִים  
 בְּיוֹם חֲבַשׁ יְהוָה  
 32:7 וְכָלִי כָּלִי רַעִים הוּא זְמוּת יַעֲזֹק  
 37:33–34 לֹא יִבּוֹא אֱלֹהֵי־הָעִיר הַזֹּאת וְלֹא־יִזְרָה שָׁם חָץ ...  
 בַּדֶּרֶךְ אֲשֶׁר־בָּא בָּהּ יָשׁוּב וְאֱלֹהֵי־הָעִיר הַזֹּאת לֹא יִבּוֹא  
 38:8 וְתִשָּׁב הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ עֶשֶׂר מַעֲלֹת  
בַּמַּעֲלֹת אֲשֶׁר יֵרֵד  
 39:8 וַיֹּאמֶר חֲזִקִּיהוּ אֶל־יִשְׁעִיהוּ טוֹב דְּבַר־יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּרֶת  
וַיֹּאמֶר כִּי יִהְיֶה שָׁלוֹם וְאִמְתּוּ בִימֵי
- συνῆψεν γὰρ ἡ βοή τὸ ὄριον τῆς Μωαβίτιδος τῆς Αγαλλιμ καὶ ὀλολυγμός αὐτῆς ἕως τοῦ φρέατος τοῦ Αἰλιμ.<sup>38</sup>  
 καὶ ὠδῖνες ἔλαβόν με ὡς τὴν τίκτουσαν.<sup>39</sup>  
 καὶ ἐπάξει ὁ θεὸς ἐπὶ τὸν κόσμον τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τὴν χεῖρα καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς· ἐγένου γὰρ πάσῃ πόλει ταπεινῇ βοηθός καὶ τοῖς ἀθυμήσασιν διὰ ἔνδειαν σκέπη<sup>40</sup> καὶ πατήσουσιν αὐτὰς πόδες πραέων καὶ ταπεινῶν.<sup>41</sup>  
 ἡ γὰρ δρόσος ἡ παρὰ σοῦ ἱάμα αὐτοῖς ἐστίν ἐγὼ ἐμβαλῶ εἰς τὰ θεμέλια Σιών λίθον πολυτελῆ ἐκλεκτὸν ἀκρογωνιαίον ἔντιμον ἐκθλίψω γὰρ Ἀριήλ, καὶ ἔσται αὐτῆς ἡ ἰσχὺς καὶ τὸ πλοῦτος ἐμοί.  
 καὶ τὸ φῶς τοῦ ἡλίου ἔσται ἑπταπλάσιον  
 ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, ὅταν ἰάσῃται κύριος ἡ γὰρ βουλή τῶν πονηρῶν ἄνομα βουλευσεται  
 Οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθῃ εἰς τὴν πόλιν ταύτην οὐδὲ μὴ βάλῃ ἐπ’ αὐτὴν βέλος ... ἀλλὰ τῇ ὁδῷ, ᾧ ἦλθεν, ἐν αὐτῇ ἀποστραφήσεται.  
 καὶ ἀνέβη ὁ ἥλιος τοὺς δέκα ἀναβαθμούς, οὓς κατέβη ἡ σκιά.  
 καὶ εἶπεν Εζεκίας πρὸς Ησαιαν Ἀγαθὸς ὁ λόγος κυρίου, ὃν ἐλάλησε· γενέσθω δὴ εἰρήνη καὶ δικαιοσύνη ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις μου.<sup>42</sup>

<sup>38</sup> It seems as if the translator has moved the first יללתה to the following sentence, rendering it there by ὀλολυγμός αὐτῆς. However, at the very end of the second Hebrew clause יללתה appears once again.

<sup>39</sup> For the omission of a resumptive noun in a comparison, see section 7.5 below.

<sup>40</sup> According to Coste the first מעוֹן was read as though it were מעִיר and rendered by πόλει, while the second was translated by βοηθός (Coste, “Le texte grec d’Isaïe XXV, 1–5,” 41–42).

<sup>41</sup> רגל is also absent in QIsa<sup>a</sup>: תִּרְמַסְנָהּ רִגְלִי עֲנִים; see section 12.3.1.2.

41:13–14	<b>אֶל־תִּירָא אֲנִי עֲזָרְתִּיךָ</b> אל־תִּירָאִי תוֹלַעַת יַעֲקֹב מִתִּי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲנִי עֲזָרְתִּיךָ	<b>Μὴ φοβοῦ, Ἰακωβ,</b> ὀλιγοστός Ἰσραηλ· <b>ἐγὼ ἐβοήθησά σοι</b>
42:15	<b>אֶחָרִיב הָרִים וּגְבֻעוֹת</b> <b>וְכָל־עֲשָׂבִים אֹבִישׁ</b> ושַׁמְתִּי נְהָרוֹת לֵאֵיִם <b>וְאֲנָמִים אֹבִישׁ</b>	καὶ θήσω ποταμούς εἰς νήσους <b>καὶ ἔλῃ ξηρανῶ.</b> ἰδοὺ οὗτοι πόρρωθεν ἔρχονται, οὗτοι ἀπὸ βορρᾶ καὶ οὗτοι ἀπὸ θαλάσσης <sup>43</sup> <b>διὰ τοῦτο</b> γινώσκεται ὁ λαός μου τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ <sup>44</sup> καθότι <b>ῥῶμοσα</b> αὐτῶ ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ ἐκείνῳ τῇ γῇ μὴ θυμωθήσεσθαι ἐπὶ σοὶ <sup>45</sup> καὶ ὅσοι μὴ ἔχετε ἀργύριον, <b>βαδίσαντες</b> <b>ἀγοράσατε</b> καὶ πῖετε ἄνευ ἀργυρίου <sup>46</sup> κύριος ὑψιστος ἐν ἀγίοις ἀναπαυόμενος
49:12	<b>הִנֵּה־אֱלֹה מֵרְחוֹק יִבְאוּ</b> <b>וְהִנֵּה־אֱלֹה מִצָּפוֹן וּמִיָּם</b>	
52:6	<b>לִכֹּן יָדַע עָמִי</b> שְׁמִי <b>לִכֹּן</b> בְּיוֹם הַהוּא	
54:9	<b>אֲשֶׁר נִשְׁבַּעְתִּי</b> מֵעַבֵּר מִיַּנְח עוֹד עַל־הָאָרֶץ <b>כֵּן נִשְׁבַּעְתִּי</b> מִקְצֵף עֵלֶיךָ וְאֲשֶׁר אֵין־לּוֹ כֶּסֶף <b>לָכוּ</b> <b>שִׁבְרוּ וְאָכְלוּ וּלְכוּ שִׁבְרוּ</b> בלֹא־כֶסֶף	
55:1	<b>שִׁבְרוּ וְאָכְלוּ וּלְכוּ שִׁבְרוּ</b> בלֹא־כֶסֶף	
57:15	<b>וְאַתְּ־דָכָא וּשְׁפַל־רוּחַ</b> לְהַחֲיוֹת רוּחַ שְׁפִלִים וְלַהַחֲיוֹת לֵב נִדְכָּאִים	καὶ ὀλιγοψύχοις διδούς μακροθυμίαν καὶ διδούς ζῶην <b>τοῖς συντετριμμένοις</b> τὴν καρδίαν καὶ ἔσται ὡς κῆπος μεθύων καὶ ὡς πηγὴ ἣν μὴ ἐξέλιπεν ὕδωρ. συνηγμένα τὰ τέκνα σου· ἰδοὺ <b>ἦκασι</b> πάντες οἱ υἱοί σου μακρόθεν σοὶ γὰρ κληθήσεται <b>Θέλημα ἐμόν,</b> <b>καὶ τῇ γῇ σου Οἴκουμένη.</b>
58:11	<b>וְהָיִית כִּגֵּן רוּחַ וּכְמוֹצָא מִיָּם</b> אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יִכְזָבו מִיָּמִי	
60:4	<b>כֻּלָּם נִקְבְּצוּ בְּאֶרֶץ־לֶךְ</b> בְּנֶיךָ מֵרְחוֹק יִבְאוּ	
62:4	<b>כִּי לֶךְ יִקְרָא חֲפְצִי־בָהּ</b> וּלְאַרְצָךְ בְּעוֹלָה <b>כִּי־חֲפֹץ יִהְיֶה בְךָ וְאַרְצְךָ תִּבְעַל</b>	

<sup>42</sup> In the Greek version of the parallel text 2 Kgs (4 Kgdms) 20:19 a rendering of the second וַיִּאֲמַר fails as well.

<sup>43</sup> See 62:11 below.

<sup>44</sup> **לִכֹּן** may have been omitted because its function in the Hebrew is unclear. See 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> שְׁמִי יָדַע עָמִי / שְׁמִי בְיוֹם הַהוּא.

<sup>45</sup> According to Ziegler (*Untersuchungen*, 50) the minus in the LXX is due to an “Abirung” of the translator from the first נִשְׁבַּעְתִּי to the second. This would also explain the absence of a translation of מִיָּמִים. However, this supposition is made improbable by the fact that עַל־הָאָרֶץ, which is also located in between the two verb forms, did receive a rendering in the LXX (i.e. by τῇ γῇ). The words ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ ἐκείνῳ could echo מֵעַבֵּר, associated with עָבַר in its connotation of the passing of time, see 16:2 מֵעַבְרַת לֶאֱרֹנוֹן / ἔπειτα δέ, Ἀρῶν. The alternative is that מֵעַבֵּר is a minus and ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ ἐκείνῳ a plus.

<sup>46</sup> 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> has וְאֲשֶׁר אֵין לּוֹ כֶּסֶף שִׁבְרוּ בִלְוֹא כֶּסֶף; see section 12.3.1.2.

62:11	הנה ישעך בא הנה שכרו אתו	Ἰδοὺ σοι ὁ σωτὴρ παραγίνεται ἔχων τὸν ἑαυτοῦ μισθὸν <sup>47</sup>
-------	-----------------------------	--

Three times an introductory והיה (“and it will come to pass that”) is left out in the Greek,<sup>48</sup> probably in view of the occurrence of another form of היה in the next clause expressing the main thought. Note that in LXX Isaiah the rendering of this main verb in all three cases is located in the place where והיה is found in the Hebrew, namely at the head of the sentence.

2:2	והיה באחרית הימים נכון יהיה הר בית-יהוה	“Οτι ἔσται ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις ἐμφανὲς τὸ ὄρος τοῦ κυρίου
3:24	והיה תחת בשם מק יהיה	καὶ ἔσται ἀντὶ ὁσμῆς ἡδείας κονιορτός <sup>49</sup>
16:2	והיה כעון-נודד קן משלח תהייה בנות מואב	ἔσθι γὰρ ὡς πετεινοῦ ἀνιπταμένου νεοσσός ἀφηρημένος, θύγατερ Μωαβ.

For more examples of the reduction of identical elements, see sections 7.5 and 7.6 below.

## 7.4 Two phrases or clauses are combined into one

In the next instances the translator seems to have collapsed two (often parallel) phrases or clauses, composing one new phrase or clause out of them.

### 7.4.1 Two phrases are combined into one

3:3	ונשוא פנים יועץ	καὶ θαυμαστὸν σύμβουλον <sup>50</sup>
7:3	אל-קצה תעלת הברכה העליונה אל-מסלת שדה כובס	πρὸς τὴν κολυμβήθραν τῆς ἄνω ὁδοῦ τοῦ ἀγροῦ τοῦ γναφέως
8:1	למהר שלל חש בז	Τοῦ ὀξέως προνομήν ποιῆσαι σκύλλων. <sup>51</sup>
8:21	ועבר בה נקשה ורעב	καὶ ἥξει ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς σκληρὰ λιμός <sup>52</sup>

<sup>47</sup> See 49:12.

<sup>48</sup> The 1 however did receive a rendering.

<sup>49</sup> 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> reads יהיה תחת הבשם מק; see section 12.3.1.2.

<sup>50</sup> For θαυμαστός as a rendering of נשוא פנים, see e.g. Deut 28:50. For θαυμαστὸς σύμβουλος, see Isa 9:5(6) יועץ פלא, even though in the LXX this is reproduced freely as Μεγάλης βουλῆς ἄγγελος (except in A and S<sup>2</sup>, which attest to θαυμαστὸς σύμβουλος). The condensation in 3:3 may have had as an (extra) underlying motive that in this way the phrase, just as the following two, is composed of a name of a profession together with a specification of it; this has resulted in a sequence of three identically constructed phrases (*tricolon*): καὶ θαυμαστὸν σύμβουλον καὶ σοφὸν ἀρχιτέκτονα καὶ συνετὸν ἀκροατήν.

<sup>51</sup> Possibly ψ is not a minus, but rendered by πάρεστι γάρ in the following sentence; see Deut 32:35 and section 9.4.5.2.

9:5(6)	פלא יועץ אל גבור	Μεγάλης βουλῆς ἄγγελος <sup>53</sup>
43:17	חיל ועוז	καὶ ὄχλον ἰσχυρόν
55:5	למען יהוה אלהיך ולקדוש ישראל	ἔνεκεν τοῦ θεοῦ σου τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰσραηλ

#### 7.4.2 Two clauses are combined into one

At times, two clauses have in the translation been joined together into one clause through the omission of overlapping elements:

5:30	והנה־חשך צר ואור חשך בעריפיה	καὶ ἰδοὺ σκότος σκληρόν ἐν τῇ ἀπορίᾳ αὐτῶν. <sup>54</sup>
7:22	והיה מרב עשות חלב יאכל חמאה בי־חמאה ודבש יאכל כל־הנותר בקרב הארץ	καὶ ἔσται ἀπὸ τοῦ πλεῖστον ποιεῖν γάλα βούτυρον καὶ μέλι φάγεται πᾶς ὁ καταλειφθεὶς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. <sup>55</sup>
10:15	כהניף שבט ואֶת־מִרְמִיּוֹ כהרים מטה ל־אֶעֱץ	ὡσαύτως ἐάν τις ἄρῃ ῥάβδον ἢ ξύλον.
15:8	בי־הקיפה הזעקה את־גבול מואב עד־אגלים יל־תה	συνῆψεν γὰρ ἡ βοή τὸ ὄριον τῆς Μωαβίτιδος τῆς Ἀγαλλίμ
22:10	את־בתי ירושלם ספרתם ותתצו הבתים לבצר החומה	καὶ ὅτι καθεύλοσαν τοὺς οἴκους Ἱερουσαλημ εἰς ὀχύρωμα τοῦ τείχους τῇ πόλει.
23:13	עֲרֹו ארמנותיה שמה למפלה	ὅτι ὁ τοῖχος αὐτῆς πέπτωκεν. <sup>56</sup>

<sup>52</sup> A literal retroversion of the Greek into Hebrew would give ועבר בה רעב קשה.

<sup>53</sup> βουλῆς derives from יועץ which has been linked to עצה. ἄγγελος forms a rendering of (גבור) אל. For a thorough analysis of this translation, see van der Kooij, “Wie heißt der Messias?,” 158. Van der Kooij thinks that the translator alludes to a high priest here (van der Kooij, “Wie heißt der Messias?,” 160–63). Lust, however, believes him to hint at a royal person. He thinks that the translator has changed the text in order to avoid any suggestion that this new-born prince should be seen as a god; see Johan Lust, “A Septuagint Christ Preceding Jesus Christ? Messianism in the Septuagint Exemplified in Isa 7,10–17,” in *Messianism and the Septuagint. Collected Essays by J. Lust* (ed. Katrin Hauspie; BETL 178; Leuven: Peeters, 2004), 217.

<sup>54</sup> In Ziegler’s opinion (*Untersuchungen*, 138) ואור חשך is a gloss in the MT adopted from verses such as 8:23; 9:1(2); and 60:2.

<sup>55</sup> Wildberger (*Jesaja*, 1:302) means that יאכל חמאה was omitted due to an *aberratio oculi* (see section 11.3).

<sup>56</sup> For a discussion on this verse, see van der Kooij, *Oracle of Tyre*, 143–45.

24:11	ערבה כל־שמחה <u>גלה משוב הארץ</u>	πέπαυται πᾶσα εὐφροσύνη τῆς γῆς.
26:9	<u>נפשי אוֹתִיד בלילה</u> <u>אֶפְרוּחִי בַקְרָבִי אֲשַׁחֲד</u>	ἐκ νυκτὸς ὀρθρίζει τὸ πνεῦμά μου πρὸς σέ, ὁ θεός <sup>57</sup>
26:15	יספת לגוי יהוה יספת לגוי <u>נִכְבַּדַת רַחֲקַת כ־קְצוֹי־אֶרֶץ</u>	πρόσθες αὐτοῖς κακά, κύριε, πρόσθες κακά πᾶσι τοῖς ἐνδόξοις τῆς γῆς.
27:10–11	וכלה סעפיה <u>בִּיבֶשׁ קְצִירָה תִּשְׁבְּרָנָה</u>	καὶ μετὰ χρόνον οὐκ ἔσται ἐν αὐτῇ πᾶν χλωρόν διὰ τὸ ξηρανθῆναι.
28:7	כהן ונביא <u>שגו בשכר</u> נבלעו מן־היין	ἱερεὺς καὶ προφήτης ἐξέεστησαν διὰ τὸν οἶνον
28:12	זאת המנוחה <u>הֵנִיחוּ לַעִיף</u>	Τοῦτο τὸ ἀνάπαυμα τῷ πεινῶντι
29:2	והיתה תאניה ואניה <u>והיתה לִי בִּאֲרִיאֵל</u>	καὶ ἔσται αὐτῆς ἡ ἰσχύς καὶ τὸ πλοῦτος ἐμοί.
35:2	פרח תפרח ותגל <u>אֶף גִּלְתָּ וּרְנָן</u>	καὶ ἐξανθήσει καὶ ἀγαλλιάσεται τὰ ἔρημα τοῦ Ἰορδάνου. <sup>58</sup>
37:8–9	כי שמע כי נסע <u>מלכיש</u> <u>וישמע על־תרהקה מלך־כוש</u> <u>לאמר יצא להלחם אתך</u>	καὶ ἤκουσε βασιλεὺς Ἀσσυρίων ὅτι ἐξῆλθε Θαρακα βασιλεὺς Αἰθιοπῶν πολιορκῆσαι αὐτόν.
37:17	<u>הטה יהוה אֶזְנְךָ וּשְׁמַע</u> <u>פִּקֵּחַ יהוה עֵינְךָ וְרֵא</u>	εἰσάκουσον, κύριε, εἰσβλεψον, κύριε
44:14	לכרת־לו ארזים <u>וִיקַח תְּרֹזָה וְאֵלֶּון</u> <u>וַיֹּאמְרוּ בְעֵצֵי־יַעַר</u>	ὁ ἔκοψε ξύλον ἐκ τοῦ δρυμοῦ
45:5	ואין עוד זולתי <u>אֵין</u> אלהים	καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἔτι πλὴν ἐμοῦ θεός
46:9	ואין עוד <u>אלהים</u> נאפס כמוני	καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἔτι πλὴν ἐμοῦ
48:12	אני־הוא <u>אֲנִי רֵאשׁוֹן</u>	ἐγὼ εἰμι πρώτος

<sup>57</sup> The translator may have been additionally motivated to abbreviate the text on account of the similar preceding clause: לשמך ולזכרך תאונתנפש / ἡλπίσαμεν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί σου καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ μνείᾳ, ἣ ἐπιθυμεῖ ἡ ψυχὴ ἡμῶν.

<sup>58</sup> The rendering by Ἰορδάνου suggests that ורנן was read as ירדן. τὰ ἔρημα is a plus.



51:3	וּישם מדברה כעדן וערבתה כג'יהוה	καὶ θήσω τὰ ἔρημα αὐτῆς ὡς παράδεισον κυρίου·
65:6–7	לֹא אַחֲשֶׁה כִּי אֶסְלַמְתִּי עֲוֹנֵיכֶם וְשַׁלַּמְתִּי עַל־חִיקֶם וְעֹנֹת אֲבוֹתֵיכֶם יַחַד	Οὐ σιωπήσω, ἕως ἂν ἀποδῶ εἰς τὸν κόλπον αὐτῶν τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν πατέρων αὐτῶν
66:3	שׁוּחַט הַשּׁוֹר מִכַּה־אַיִשׁ זֹבַח הַשֶּׁה עֶרְף כֶּלֶב	ὁ δὲ ἄνομος ὁ θύων μοι μόσχον ὡς ὁ ἀποκτένων κύνᾱ <sup>59</sup>

For the contraction of two clauses into one through the omission of the verb phrase of either of the two, see section 7.6.2c below.

### 7.5 The cancelling of paronomasia

*Paronomasia* is a typically Hebrew construction, in which a noun stems from the same root as the verb that refers to it (see יוֹסֵף חִלּוֹם in Gen 37:5).<sup>60</sup> When *paronomasia* occurs in the Hebrew text of Isaiah, the LXX frequently renders only one of the two derivations, most commonly the verb. This happens especially in the following situations:

a. When a verb in a relative clause comes from the same root as the noun to which it refers

In four cases LXX Isaiah has omitted the *relativum* together with the verb:

11:16	לְשֹׂאֵר עֲמוֹ אֲשֶׁר יִשְׂאָר מֵאֲשׁוּר	τῷ καταλειφθέντι μου λαῷ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ
28:4	אֲשֶׁר יִרְאֶה הָרָאָה אוֹתָהּ	ὁ ἰδὼν αὐτὸ
30:23	אֲשֶׁר־תִּזְרַע אֶת־הָאֲדָמָה זֶרַעַךְ	τῷ σπέρματι τῆς γῆς σου
38:7	אֶת־הַדְּבָר הַזֶּה אֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר	τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο

In three other cases the noun is missing:

17:9	כַּעֲזֹבָת הַחֶרֶשׁ וְהָאֲמִיר	ὄν τρόπον ἐγκατέλιπον οἱ Ἀμορραῖοι καὶ οἱ Εὐαῖοι
------	-----------------------------------	---

<sup>59</sup> ἄνομος may be the outcome of a linking of שׁוּחַט with שָׁחַת ("to destroy"). מַכָּה may be represented by ὁ θύων.

<sup>60</sup> Lett §79f. Another form of *paronomasia* occurs when the infinitive absolute is combined with a finite verb form of the same root (*qatal qatalti*). See for LXX Isaiah minuses related to that construction, section 5.6a.

	<u>אשר עזבו</u> מפני בני ישראל	ἀπὸ προσώπου τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραηλ
19:16	מפני <u>תנופת</u> יד־הוה	ἀπὸ προσώπου τῆς χειρὸς κυρίου
	צבאות אשר־הוא <u>מניף</u> עליו	σαβαωθ, ἦν αὐτὸς <u>ἐπιβαλεῖ</u> αὐτοῖς. <sup>61</sup>
36:4	מה <u>הבטחון</u> הזה אשר <u>בטחת</u>	Τί <u>πεποιθώς</u> εἶ;

Also compare 25:7, where a passive participle, stemming from the same root as the noun to which it is attached, is not represented in LXX Isaiah:

25:7 ההמסכה הנסוכה על־כל־הגוים     ἡ γὰρ βουλή αὕτη ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη.

*b. When in a comparative sentence the verb is resumed by a cognate noun ("He runs like the running of a horse")*

In such situations the noun in the comparison has occasionally been deleted in the LXX:

10:14	<u>וכאסף</u> ביצים עזבות	καὶ ὡς καταλελειμμένα ῥᾶ
	כל־הארץ אני <u>אספתי</u>	<u>ἀρῶ</u>
10:16	<u>יקד יקד</u> <u>כִּיקוד</u> אש	πῦρ καιόμενον <u>καυθήσεται</u> .
17:12	ושאון לאמים <u>כשאון</u>	καὶ νῶτος ἐθνῶν πολλῶν
	מים כבירים <u>ישאון</u>	ὡς ὕδωρ <u>ἡχίσει</u> .
27:7	<u>הכמכת</u> <u>מכהו</u>	μὴ ὡς αὐτὸς <u>ἐπάταξε</u> ,
	הכהו	καὶ αὐτὸς οὕτως πληγθήσεται;
	אס־ <u>כִּהרג</u> <u>הרגיו</u> הרג	καὶ ὡς αὐτὸς <u>ἀνείλεν</u> , οὕτως ἀναιρεθήσεται;
34:4	וכל־צבאם <u>יבול כנבל</u> עלה	καὶ πάντα τὰ ἄστρα <u>πεσεῖται</u> ὡς φύλλα
	מגפן	ἐξ ἀμπέλου

*c. When an object follows a verb from the same root*

Five times an object from the same root as the verb by which it is governed, is absent in LXX Isaiah:

7:6	ונמליך <u>מלך</u> בתוכה את	καὶ <u>βασιλεύσομεν</u> αὐτῆς
	בן־טבאל	τὸν υἱὸν Ταβεγλ
10:1	הוי <u>החקקים</u> <u>חקקי־און</u>	οὐαὶ <u>τοῖς γράφουσι</u> πονηρίαν.
24:3	כי יהוה <u>דבר</u> את־ <u>הדבר</u> הזה	τὸ γὰρ στόμα κυρίου <u>ἐλάλησε</u> ταῦτα.

<sup>61</sup> The translation may also have been influenced by 11:15 והניח ידו על־הנהר בעים רוחו / καὶ ἐπιβαλεῖ τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸν ποταμὸν πνεύματι βιαίῳ; see van der Kooij, "The Old Greek of Isaiah 19:16–25," 131–32.

24:22	ואספו <u>אספה</u> אסיר	καὶ <u>συνάξουσιν</u> καὶ ἀποκλείσουσιν
	על-בור	εἰς ὄχυρμα <sup>62</sup>
30:2	לעז <u>במעז</u> פרעה	τοῦ <u>βοηθηθῆναι</u> ὑπὸ Φαραώ

On another five occasions the verb has not been rendered:

10:6	לשלל שלל <u>ולבז</u> בז	ποιῆσαι σκῦλα καὶ <u>προνομήν</u>
24:22	<u>וסגרו</u> על-מסגר	καὶ <u>εἰς δεσμωτήριον</u>
30:1	<u>ולנסך</u> מסכה ולא רוחי	καὶ <u>συνθήκας</u> οὐ διὰ τοῦ πνεύματός μου
32:19	ובשפלה <u>תשפל</u> העיר	ὥς οἱ ἐν <u>τῇ πεδινῇ</u> .
57:7	גם-שם עלית <u>לזבח</u> זבח	ἀκαεὶ ἀνεβίβασας <u>θυσίας</u> .

#### d. When a subject governs a verb from the same root

In the following instance of *paronomasia* the subject does not have a counterpart in the Greek:

16:10	יין ביקבים לא-ידרך <u>הדרך</u>	καὶ οὐ μὴ <u>πατήσουσιν</u> οἶνον εἰς τὰ ὑπολήνια <sup>63</sup>
-------	--------------------------------	---

Nevertheless, in a number of other places where a Hebrew noun appears in combination with a verb from a cognate root, the noun and verb have in LXX Isaiah both received a translation, either by two Greek forms of the same derivation (see 14:26; 16:13; 17:10; 19:17, 21; 21:7; and 32:1), or by two unrelated forms (see 10:6; 37:22; and 39:8).

## 7.6 Distributive rendering

When faced with two consecutive, parallel phrases or clauses, the translator has regularly left out one word or a group of words from either of the two, the function of which was then adopted by the corresponding word(s) in the other one. This way of translating has by some been called “distributive rendering.”<sup>64</sup> It may have been motivated by the translator’s wish to formulate his text in a more compact and terse way than the Hebrew text did.

Words that have been omitted on account of distributive rendering are sometimes exactly identical with their counterparts in the parallel phrase or clause, but more often they are synonymous.

<sup>62</sup> See section 7.6.2c.

<sup>63</sup> A translation of הדרך may also have been left out under the influence of the related text Jer 48:33, see section 9.4.3.1.

<sup>64</sup> Tov, *Computerized Data Base*, 59.

### 7.6.1 Distributive rendering in parallel phrases

A particular word that in the Hebrew is repeated in a parallel, coordinate phrase, has in the translation sometimes been removed the second time, so that the word in the first phrase counts for both phrases.

#### a. Distributive rendering of the possessive pronoun

Where the Hebrew contains two coordinate phrases, both composed of a noun with an attached suffix, the translator has now and then rendered the suffix only once, by way of one possessive pronoun applying to both nouns. In doing this, he has adjusted his text to match the stylistically correct Koinē usage, as in Greek (contrary to Hebrew) possessive pronouns are commonly not repeated in coordinate items.<sup>65</sup>

14:3	מעצבך ומרגוך	ἐκ τῆς ὀδύνης καὶ τοῦ θυμοῦ σου
16:9	על-קיצר ועל-קצירך	ἐπὶ τῷ θερισμῷ καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ τρυγήτῳ σου
23:18	סחרה ואתננה	αὐτῆς ἡ ἐμπορία καὶ ὁ μισθὸς
26:8	לשמך וליוכרך	ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί σου καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ μνείᾳ
36:16	איש-גפנו ואיש תאנתו	ἕκαστος τὴν ἄμπελον αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰς συκάς
49:19	חרבתך ושמתך	τὰ ἔρημά σου καὶ τὰ διεφθαρμένα
	וארץ הרסתך	καὶ τὰ πεπτωκότα
63:15	מזבל קדשך ותפארתך	ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ ἁγίου σου καὶ δόξης.

#### b. Distributive rendering of a substantive noun

While the Hebrew shows two coordinate phrases containing a synonymous or identical noun, each followed by an attribute, the translation occasionally omits the noun of the second phrase, having both attributes modify the first noun:

20:4	את-שבי מצרים ואת-גלות כוש	τὴν αἰχμαλωσίαν Αἰγύπτου καὶ Αἰθιοπῶν
26:6	רגלי עני פעמי דלים	πόδες πραέων καὶ ταπεινῶν
30:9	בנים כחשים בנים לא-אבו שמוע יהוה	υἱοὶ ψευδεῖς, οἳ οὐκ ἠβούλοντο ἀκοῦειν τὸν νόμον τοῦ θεοῦ
30:22	את-צפוי פסילי כספך ואת-אפדת מסכת זהבך	τὰ εἰδῶλα τὰ περιηργυρωμένα καὶ τὰ περιεχρυσωμένα
31:7	אלילי כספו ואלילי זהבו	τὰ χειροποίητα αὐτῶν τὰ ἀργυρᾶ καὶ τὰ χρυσᾶ

<sup>65</sup> Raija Sollamo, "The Koinē Background for the Repetition and Non-Repetition of the Possessive Pronoun in Co-Ordinate Items," in *Studien zur Septuaginta. Robert Hanhart zu Ehren* (ed. Detlef Fraenkel, Udo Quast, and John W. Wevers; AAWG 190, MSU 20; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990), 52, 62.

36:17	אֶרֶץ דָּגָן וְתִירוֹשׁ	γῆ σίτου καὶ οἴνου
	אֶרֶץ לֶחֶם וְכֶרֶם	καὶ ἄρτων καὶ ἀμπελώνων
37:13	מֶלֶךְ-חַמַּת וּמֶלֶךְ אֶרֶפַד	οἱ βασιλεῖς Εμαθ καὶ Αρφαδ
	וּמֶלֶךְ לַעִיר סַפְרִים הֵנֶּעַ וְעוּהָ	καὶ πόλεως Σεπφარიμ, Αναγ, Ουγαυα
65:7	עֹנֹתֵיכֶם	τὰς ἀμαρτίας αὐτῶν
	וְעֹנֹת אֲבוֹתֵיכֶם יַחַד	καὶ τῶν πατέρων αὐτῶν

### c. Distributive rendering of the preposition

As mentioned previously, a preposition that governs more than one phrase is usually not repeated in secular Koinē. Repetition of the preposition is a typical feature of Biblical Greek, reflecting the Hebrew language.<sup>66</sup> In LXX Isaiah one can find various examples in which the repetition of a preposition has been deleted:

4:4	בְּרוּחַ מִשְׁפָּט וּבְרוּחַ בַּעַר	ἐν πνεύματι κρίσεως καὶ πνεύματι καύσεως
4:6	מִזֶּרֶם וּמִמְטָר	ἀπὸ σκληρότητος καὶ ὑετοῦ
8:18	לְאַתּוֹת וּלְמוֹפְתִים	εἰς σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα
9:8(9)	בְּגֹאֵה וּבְגֹדֶל לֵב	ἐφ' ὕβρει καὶ ὑψηλῇ καρδίᾳ
11:11	מֵאֲשׁוּר וּמִמִּצְרַיִם	ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀσσυρίων καὶ ἀπὸ Αἰγύπτου
	וּמִפְתּוֹרֵס וּמִכּוֹשׁ	καὶ Βαβυλωνίας καὶ Αἰθιοπίας
	וּמֵעֵילִים	καὶ ἀπὸ Αἰλαμιτῶν
	וּמִשְׁנַעַר וּמִחֻמַּת וּמֵאֵי הַיָּם	καὶ ἀπὸ ἡλίου ἀνατολῶν καὶ ἐξ Ἀραβίας
14:2	לְעַבְדִּים וּלְשִׁפְחוֹת	εἰς δούλους καὶ δούλας
18:2	אֶל-גּוֹי מִמֶּשֶׁךְ וּמוֹרֵט	πρὸς ἔθνος μετέωρον
	אֶל-עַם נוֹרָא	καὶ ξένον λαὸν καὶ χαλεπόν
29:6	בְּרַעַם וּבְרַעַשׁ	μετὰ βροντῆς καὶ σεισμοῦ
30:5	לְבִשֶׁת וּגְסִי-לְחֹרֶפֶה	εἰς αἰσχύνην καὶ ὄνειδος
30:6	עַל-כֶּתֶף עֵרִים ...	ἐπ' ὄνων
	וְעַל-דִּבְשֶׁת גַּמְלִים	καὶ καμήλων
30:32	בְּתַפִּים וּבְכִנּוֹרוֹת	μετὰ αὐλῶν καὶ κιθάρων
36:9	לְרֶכֶב וּלְפָרָשִׁים	εἰς ἵππον καὶ ἀναβάτην
55:1	בְּלוֹא-כֶסֶף וּבְלוֹא מַחִיר	ἀνευ ἀργυρίου καὶ τιμῆς

### 7.6.2 Distributive rendering in parallel clauses

Distributive rendering in parallel clauses entails that the translator has left out a specific syntactic unit (that is, a subject, object, verb phrase, or adverbial) from one clause, the function of which was then taken over by the parallel unit in the preceding or following clause. The two expressions may be either identical or

<sup>66</sup> See section 6.9.2.

synonymous to each other, or they may consist of a noun and a pronoun (for instance an object suffix) referring to the same entity. This way of rendering often results in the two clauses in the Hebrew being in the translation condensed into one.

*a. Distributive rendering of the subject*

5:13	וכבודו מתי רעב והמונו צחה צמא	καὶ πλῆθος ἐγενήθη νεκρῶν διὰ λιμὸν καὶ δίψαν ὕδατος. <sup>67</sup>
23:8	אשר סחריה שרים כנעניה נכבדי־ארץ	οἱ ἔμποροι αὐτῆς ἔνδοξοι, ἄρχοντες τῆς γῆς. <sup>68</sup>
24:19–20	רעה התרעעה הארץ פור התפוררה ארץ מוט התמוטטה ארץ נוע תנוע ארץ כשכור	ταραχῇ ταραχθήσεται ἡ γῆ, καὶ ἀπορία ἀπορηθήσεται ἡ γῆ. ἔκλινεν καὶ σεισθήσεται ὡς ὄπωροφυλάκιον ἡ γῆ
29:5	והיה כאבק דק המון זריך וכמוץ עבר המון עריצים	καὶ ἔσται ὡς κονιορτὸς ἀπὸ τροχοῦ ὁ πλοῦτος τῶν ἀσεβῶν καὶ ὡς χνοῦς φερόμενος
32:11	חרדו שאננות רגזה בטחות	ἔκστητε, λυπήθητε, αἱ πεποιθυῖαι
34:7	ורותה ארצם מדם ועפרם מחלב ידשן	καὶ μεθυσθήσεται ἡ γῆ ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ στέατος αὐτῶν ἐμπλησθήσεται.
34:13	ועלתה ארמנתיה סירים קמוש וחוח במבצריה	καὶ ἀναφύσει εἰς τὰς πόλεις αὐτῶν ἀκάνθινα ξύλα καὶ εἰς τὰ ὄχυράματα αὐτῆς
36:16	ואכלו איש־גפנו ואיש תאנתו	καὶ φάγεσθε ἕκαστος τὴν ἄμπελον αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰς συκάς
37:14	ויקח חזקיהו את־הספרים ויפרשהו חזקיהו לפני יהוה ...	καὶ ἔλαβεν Εἰςεκίας τὸ βιβλίον ... καὶ ἤνοιξεν αὐτὸ ἐναντίον κυρίου <sup>69</sup>

<sup>67</sup> Whether καὶ πλῆθος renders וכבודו (which occurs in the equivalent place) or והמונו (the content of which it shares) is dubious. It seems as if the translator has regarded the two nouns as synonyms and hence omitted one; see section 1.3.2d.

<sup>68</sup> The renderings of שרים (= ἄρχοντες) and נכבדי (= ἔνδοξοι) are transposed in the LXX. See for this minus 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>, which reads ארץ (ה) נכבדי שרים כנעניה סחריה (see section 12.3.1.2).

<sup>69</sup> In 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> חזקיהו is likewise missing in the second line, but has been complemented by a later hand: לפני יהוה חזקיהו; see section 12.3.1.2.

54:15      הן גור יגור אפס מאותי      **προσῆλυτοι** προσελεύσονται σοι δι' ἐμοῦ  
                  **מיגר אתך** עליך יפול      ἰδοὺ καὶ ἐπὶ σέ καταφεύξονται.<sup>70</sup>

*b. Distributive rendering of the object*<sup>71</sup>

10:14      ותמצא כקן ידי      καὶ **τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην** καταλήμψομαι  
                  **לחיל העמים**      τῇ χειρὶώς νοσσιὰν  
                  וכאסף ביצים עזבות      καὶ ὡς καταλελειμμένα ὦα  
                  **כל־הארץ** אני אספתִי      ἄρῳ

14:2      ולקחום עמים      καὶ λήμψονται **αὐτούς** ἔθνη  
                  והביאום אל־מקומם      καὶ εἰσάξουσιν εἰς τὸν τόπον αὐτῶν,  
                  והתנחלום **בית־ישראל**      καὶ κατακληρονομήσουσι<sup>72</sup>

26:14      לכן פקדת ותשמידם      διὰ τοῦτο ἐπήγαγες καὶ ἀπώλεσας  
                  תאבד **כל־זכר למו**      καὶ ἥρας **πάν ἄρσεν αὐτῶν**.

29:19      ויספו ענוים ביהוה      καὶ ἀγαλλιάσονται πτωχοὶ **διὰ κύριον**  
                  שמחה      ἐν εὐφροσύνῃ  
                  ואבינוי אדם **בקדוש ישראל**      καὶ οἱ ἀπηλπισμένοι τῶν ἀνθρώπων  
                  יגיל      ἐμπλησθήσονται εὐφροσύνῃς.

30:6      ישאו על־כתף עירים **חילהם**      οἱ ἔφερον ἐπ' ὄνων  
                  ועל־דבשת גמלים **אוצרתם**      καὶ καμῆλων **τὸν πλοῦτον αὐτῶν**

30:10      דברו־לנו **חלקות**      ἀλλὰ ἡμῖν λαλεῖτε  
                  חזו מהתלות      καὶ ἀναγγέλλετε ἡμῖν **ἐτέραν πλάνησιν**

31:9      אשר־אור לו בציון      Μακάριος **ὃς ἔχει** ἐν Σιων σπέρμα  
                  ותנור לו בירושלם      καὶ οἰκείους ἐν Ἱερουσαλημ.

34:17      והוא־הפיל **להן** גורל      καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπιβαλεῖ **αὐτοῖς** κλήρους,  
                  וידו חלקתה **להם** בקו      καὶ ἡ χεὶρ αὐτοῦ διεμέρισε βόσκεισθαι.

34:17      עד־עולם יירשוה      εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα χρόνον κληρονομήσετε,  
                  לדור ודור ישכנו־בה      εἰς γενεὰς γενεῶν ἀναπαύσονται **ἐπ' αὐτῆς**.

37:26      הלוא־שמעת      οὐ ταῦτα ἤκουσας  
                  למרחוק אותה **עשיתי**      **πάλαι, ἃ ἐγὼ ἐποίησα;**  
                  מימי קדם ויצרתֶהָ      ἐξ ἀρχαίων ἡμερῶν συνέταξα

<sup>70</sup> LXX Isaiah has interpreted גור in the sense of “to dwell” rather than as “to attack,” in which latter sense it is used in the MT. For the translation of נפל by καταφεύγω, see Jer 37(44):13,14 and 38(45):19 where the same Hebrew root is rendered φεύγω. For a discussion on this verse, see also section 9.4.1.2b.

<sup>71</sup> Under “object” I include direct, indirect, adverbial and prepositional objects.

<sup>72</sup> For an analysis of this translation, see section 9.3.1.

40:22	הנוטה כדק שמים וימתחם כאהל לשבת	ὁ στήσας ὡς καμάραν <b>τὸν οὐρανὸν</b> καὶ διατείνας ὡς σκηνὴν κατοικεῖν
41:20	כי יִדְהוּהוּ עשתה זאת וקדוש ישראל בראה	ὅτι χεὶρ κυρίου ἐποίησε <b>ταῦτα πάντα</b> καὶ ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ κατέδειξεν.
43:7	ולכבודי בראתיו יצרתין אף-עשיתיו	ἐν γὰρ τῇ δόξῃ μου κατεσκεύασα <b>αὐτόν</b> καὶ ἔπλασα καὶ ἐποίησα <b>αὐτόν</b> .
43:25	אנכי אנכי הוא מחה פשעֶיךָ למעני וחטאתיך לא אזכר	ἐγὼ εἰμι ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ἐξαλείφων <b>τὰς ἀνομίας σου</b> καὶ οὐ μὴ μνησθήσομαι.
44:17	יסגד־לוֹ וישתחו ויתפלל <b>אליו</b>	καὶ προσκυνεῖ <b>αὐτῷ</b> καὶ προσεύχεται
47:6	ואתנם בידך לא־שמת להם רחמים	ἐγὼ ἔδωκα εἰς τὴν χεῖρά σου, σύ δὲ οὐκ ἔδωκας <b>αὐτοῖς</b> ἔλεος
49:26	כי אני יהוה מושיעך וגאלך אביר יעקב	ὅτι ἐγὼ ὁ ῥυσάμενός <b>σε</b> καὶ ἀντιλαμβάνόμενος ἰσχύος Ἰακωβ.
55:7	וישב אֱלֹהֵיהוּ וירחמהו <b>ואל־אלהינו</b> כי־ירבה לסלוח	καὶ ἐπιστραφήτω <b>ἐπὶ κύριον</b> , καὶ ἐλεηθήσεται, ὅτι ἐπὶ πολὺ ἀφήσει τὰς ἀμαρτίας ὑμῶν.
59:16	ותושע לוֹ זרעו וצדקתו היא סמכתהו	καὶ ἡμύνατο <b>αὐτούς</b> τῷ βραχίονι αὐτοῦ καὶ τῇ ἐλεημοσύνῃ ἐστηρίσατο.
61:2	לקרא שנת־רצון ליהוה ויום נקם <b>לאלהינו</b>	καλέσαι ἐνιαυτὸν <b>κυρίου</b> δεκτὸν καὶ ἡμέραν ἀνταποδόσεως
61:9	ונודע בגוים זרעם <b>וצאצאיהם בתוך העמים</b>	καὶ γνωσθήσεται <b>ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι</b> τὸ σπέρμα αὐτῶν καὶ τὰ ἔκγονα αὐτῶν.

*c. Distributive rendering of the verb phrase*

9:2(3)	שמחו לפניך כשמחת בקציר כאשר <b>צילו</b> בחלקם של	καὶ <b>εὐφρανθήσονται</b> ἐνώπιόν σου ὡς οἱ εὐφραινόμενοι ἐν ἀμῇτῃ καὶ ὃν τρόπον οἱ διαιρούμενοι σκῦλα.
10:6	לשלל שלל <b>ולבו</b> בז	<b>ποιῆσαι</b> σκῦλα καὶ προνομήν



16:4	כִּי־אִפְסָה הַמָּץ כֹּלָה שֶׁד <u>תָּמוּ</u> רַמְס מִן־הָאֶרֶץ	ὅτι <u>ἤρθη</u> ἡ συμμαχία σου, καὶ ὁ ἄρχων <u>ἀπώλετο</u> ὁ καταπατῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.
17:10	עַל־כֵּן <u>תַּטְעִי</u> נְטִיעַ נְעֻמִּים וְזָמַרְתָּ זֶרֶךְ <u>תּוֹרַעֲנִי</u>	διὰ τοῦτο <u>φυτεύσεις</u> φύτευμα ἄπιστον καὶ σπέρμα ἄπιστον·
22:19	וְהַדְפַּתִּיךְ מִמִּצְבְּךָ <u>יִהְיֶה</u> וּמִמְעוֹדֶיךָ	καὶ <u>ἀφαιρεθήσῃ</u> ἐκ τῆς οἰκονομίας σου καὶ ἐκ τῆς στάσεώς σου.
24:5	כִּי־עָבְרוּ תוֹרַת חֻלּוֹת חֶק <u>הַפָּרוּ</u> בְּרִית עוֹלָם	διότι <u>παρέβησαν</u> τὸν νόμον καὶ <u>ἥλλαξαν</u> τὰ προστάγματα, διαθήκην αἰώνιον.
24:22	וְאִסְפוּ אֶסְפָּה אֲסִיר עַל־בּוֹר <u>וְסָגְרוּ</u> עַל־מִסְגֵּר	καὶ <u>συνάξουσιν</u> καὶ <u>ἀποκλείσουσιν</u> εἰς ὄχυρῶμα καὶ εἰς δεσμωτήριον <sup>73</sup>
28:25	וְהַפִּיץ קֶצֶף <u>יִזְרֹק</u> וְכִמְנוֹ	τότε <u>σπείρει</u> μικρὸν μελάνθιον καὶ κύμινον <sup>74</sup>
29:9	שָׂכְרוּ וְלֹא־יִיץ <u>נָעַן</u> וְלֹא שָׂכַר	καὶ <u>κραιπαλήσατε</u> οὐκ ἀπὸ σικερα οὐδὲ ἀπὸ οἴνου·
29:16	כִּי־אִמַּר מַעֲשֵׂה לַעֲשׂוֹ לֹא עֲשִׂי וַיִּצֵּר <u>אָמַר</u> לְיוֹצְרוֹ לֹא הָבִין	μὴ <u>ἔρεϊ</u> τὸ πλάσμα τῷ πλάσαντι Οὐ σύ με ἔπλασας; ἢ τὸ ποίημα τῷ ποιήσαντι Οὐ συνετῶς με ἐποίησας;
30:1	לַעֲשׂוֹת עֲצָה וְלֹא מִנִּי <u>וְלִנְסֵךְ</u> מִסַּכָּה וְלֹא רוּחִי	<u>ἐποιήσατε</u> βουλήν οὐ δι' ἔμοῦ καὶ συνθήκας οὐ διὰ τοῦ πνεύματός μου
30:8	כִּתְבָּהּ עַל־לֹחַ אֶתֶם וְעַל־סֵפֶר <u>חֻקָּהּ</u>	<u>γράψον</u> ἐπὶ πυξίου ταῦτα καὶ εἰς βιβλίον
31:1	עַל־סוּסִים יִשְׁעֻנוּ <u>וַיִּבְטְחוּ</u> עַל־רֶכֶב	οἱ ἐφ' ἵπποις <u>πεποιθότες</u> καὶ ἐφ' ἄρμασιν <sup>75</sup>

<sup>73</sup> Distributive rendering is involved if the translator read or interpreted אֲסִיר as אֶסְרוּ and translated this form by ἀποκλείσουσιν; וְסָגְרוּ would then be a minus. Alternatively, אֲסִיר is a minus, וְסָגְרוּ being reproduced by καὶ ἀποκλείσουσιν, and עַל־בּוֹר / עַל־חֻרְמָה having been moved to a position behind וְסָגְרוּ / καὶ ἀποκλείσουσιν. In IQIsa<sup>a</sup> אֲסִיר is missing: וְסָגְרוּ עַל בּוֹר וְסָגְרוּ עַל חֻרְמָה. Seeligmann thinks that אֲסִיר is a corrupted variant gloss of וְסָגְרוּ, which in its original form read וְסָגְרוּ (Seeligmann, *Septuagint Version*, 63).

<sup>74</sup> יִזְרֹק ("he will toss") is perhaps not a minus, but may have been moved to the next sentence and be represented there by σπείρει (perhaps reflecting a reading of יִזְרֹק as יָרַע).

34:11	וירשוה קאת וקפוד וינשוף וערב <u>ישכנובה</u>	καὶ κατοικήσουσιν ἐν αὐτῇ ὄρνεα καὶ ἐχῖνοι καὶ ἴβεις καὶ κόρακες <sup>76</sup>
35:3	חזקו ידים רפות וברכים כשלות <u>אמצו</u>	ἰσχύσατε, χεῖρες ἀνειμέναι καὶ γόνατα παραλελυμένα·
40:12	מי־מדד בשעלו מים ושמים בזרת <u>תכן</u> וכל בשלש עפר הארץ	Τίς ἐμέτρησε τῇ χειρὶ τὸ ὕδωρ καὶ τὸν οὐρανὸν σπιθαμῇ καὶ πᾶσαν τῆν γῆν δρακί; <sup>77</sup>
40:29	נתן ליעף כח ולאין אונים עצמה <u>ירבה</u>	διδούς τοῖς πεινώσιν ἰσχύν καὶ τοῖς μὴ ὀδυνωμένοις λύπην.
41:19	אתן במדבר ארז שטה והדס ועץ שמן <u>אשים בערבה</u> ברוש תדהר ותאשור יחדו	θήσω εἰς τὴν ἄνυδρον γῆν κέδρον καὶ πύξον καὶ μυρσίνην καὶ κυπάρισσον καὶ λεύκην
43:24	אך <u>העבדתני</u> בחטאותיך הוגעתני בעונתיך	ἀλλὰ ἐν ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις σου καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἀδικίαις σου <u>προέστην σου</u> . <sup>78</sup>
43:27	אביך הראשון <u>חטא</u> ומליצך פשעו בי	οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν πρῶτοι καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες αὐτῶν <u>ἠνόμησαν εἰς ἐμέ</u>
44:25	מפר אתות בדים וקסמים <u>יהולל</u>	τίς ἕτερος <u>διασκεδάσει</u> σημεῖα ἐγγαστριμύθων καὶ μαντείας ἀπὸ καρδίας <sup>79</sup>
45:12	אנכי עשיתי ארץ ואדם עליה <u>בראתי</u>	ἐγὼ <u>ἐποίησα</u> γῆν καὶ ἄνθρωπον ἐπ' αὐτῆς
45:18	לא־תהו בראה לשבת <u>יצרה</u>	οὐκ εἰς κενὸν <u>ἐποίησεν αὐτήν</u> ἀλλὰ κατοικεῖσθαι
51:4	כי תורה מאתי תצא ומשפטי לאור עמים <u>ארניע</u>	ὅτι νόμος παρ' ἐμοῦ <u>ἐξελεύσεται</u> καὶ ἡ κρίσις μου εἰς φῶς ἐθνῶν. <sup>80</sup>

<sup>75</sup> Possibly a rendering of יבטחו was avoided for stylistic reasons: through its omission the verse line has become more parallel to the next one, in which a verb fails as well: καὶ ἐφ' ἄρμασιν, ἔστιν γὰρ πολλά // καὶ ἐφ' ἵπποις, πλεῖθος σφόδρα; see section 8.5.1a.

<sup>76</sup> Maybe καὶ κατοικήσουσιν ἐν αὐτῇ should be seen as a rendering of ישכנובה rather than of וירשוה, although it is found in the same place as the latter (see section 7.7 below).

<sup>77</sup> The verb form וכל ("he has enclosed") has perhaps been read as כל = "all" and rendered καὶ πᾶσαν.

<sup>78</sup> הוגעתני may have been read as הגיעתי—a Hif'il of הגע: "I have reached."

<sup>79</sup> ἀπὸ καρδίας is most likely an addition; see sections 9.3 and 9.4.4.2.

<sup>80</sup> Rather than having been omitted, ארניע may have been reproduced by ταχύ, the second word of the succeeding clause; the Hebrew form could have been read as ארניע or have been conceived as an adverbially used verb; see Jer 49:19 (LXX 29:20 [Rahlf's:30:13]) (see *HUB Isa*, 233).

60:5	כִּי־הִפָּךְ עֲלִידִּי הַמּוֹן ים חֵיל גּוִים יִבְאוּ לָךְ	ὅτι μεταβαλεῖ εἰς σέ πλοῦτος θαλάσσης καὶ ἐθνῶν καὶ λαῶν. <sup>81</sup>
60:14	והלכו אליך שחות בני מעריך והשתחוּ על־כפות רגלֶיךָ כל־מנאצריך	καὶ πορεύσονται πρὸς σέ δεδοικότες υἱοὶ ταπεινωσάντων σε καὶ παροξυνάντων σε
61:6	ואתם כהני יהוה תקראו משרתי אלהינו יאמר לכם	ὁμεῖς δὲ ἱερεῖς κυρίου κληθήσεσθε, λειτουργοὶ θεοῦ.
61:10	כי הלבישני בגדי־ישע מעיל צדקה יעטני	ἐνέδυσσε γάρ με ἱμάτιον σωτηρίου καὶ χιτῶνα εὐφροσύνης
61:11	כי כארץ תוציא צמחה וכגנה זרועיה תצמיח	καὶ ὡς γῆν αὕξουσιν τὸ ἄνθος αὐτῆς καὶ ὡς κῆπος τὰ σπέρματα αὐτοῦ
65:4	היִשְׁבִּים בַּקְּבָרִים ובנצורים ילינו	καὶ ἐν τοῖς μνήμασι καὶ ἐν τοῖς σπηλαίοις κοιμῶνται δι' ἐνύπνια

*d. The parallel clause merely mentions the adjective, omitting the noun to which it refers*

In a few places two parallel Hebrew clauses both contain a noun phrase pertaining to the same entity, and being composed of a noun plus an attribute (in the case of 17:6 only the second noun phrase contains an attribute), while in the translation the second clause offers solely the (substantivated) attribute, without the noun:

17:6	ונשאר־בו עוללת כנקי זית שנים שלשה נרגרים בראש אמיר	καὶ καταλειφθῇ ἐν αὐτῇ καλάμη ἢ ὡς ῥῶγες ἐλαίας δύο ἢ τρεῖς ἐπ' ἄκρου μετεώρου
37:30	אכול השנה ספח ובשנה השנית שחיס ובשנה השלישית זרעו וקצרו	φάγε τοῦτον τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν ἃ ἔσπαρκας, τῷ δὲ ἐνιαυτῷ τῷ δευτέρῳ τὸ κατάλειμμα, τῷ δὲ τρίτῳ σπείραντες ἀμήσατε
54:1	כִּי־רַבִּים בְּנֵי־שׁוֹמְמָה מבני בעולה	ὅτι πολλὰ τὰ τέκνα τῆς ἐρήμου μᾶλλον ἢ τῆς ἐχούσης τὸν ἄνδρα

<sup>81</sup> Also חֵיל was left out on account of condensation.

### 7.7 A single Greek rendering represents two Hebrew expressions, reflecting the location of the one and the syntactical function or content of the other

In several of the examples of condensation which have been discussed in this chapter, one can discern that the two Hebrew expressions which in the translation have been reduced to one, are reflected each by another aspect of the single Greek rendering. Usually the Greek phrase agrees with the first Hebrew expression as regards its place in the sentence, while it forms a syntactical equivalent or gives a semantically more adequate rendering of the second (or *vice versa*). A related phenomenon we have already noticed when considering double translations in LXX Isaiah. Quite a number of these appeared to represent two different aspects of one Hebrew expression. What we concluded on these instances of double translation, may also apply to cases of condensation; it may well be that the translator has used such a specific way of translating as a strategy in order to “authorise” his quantitative divergence from the Hebrew.

For examples, see the following verses:

- 5:13 (see section 7.6.2a): *καὶ πλῆθος* occurs in the same place as *וּכְבוֹדוֹ* but shares its meaning with *וְהַמוֹנוֹ*.
- 10:14 (see 7.6.2b): *τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην* is in content similar to *כְּלִי-הָאָרֶץ*, yet its syntactical function accords with that of *לְחִיל־הָעַמִּים*.
- 15:8 (see 7.3.2): The sentence position of *καὶ ὁλολυγμὸς αὐτῆς* is equivalent to that of the first *לִלְתָּהּ*, whereas syntactically seen—as the subject of the predicate *ἕως τοῦ φρέατος τοῦ Αἰλίου* = *וְבֹאֵר אֵילִים*—the Greek phrase is a counterpart to the second *לִלְתָּהּ*.
- 17:9 (see 7.5a): While from a grammatical point of view *ἐγκατέλιπον* matches *עָזַבוּ*, its location corresponds to that of *בְּעֶזְבֶּת*.
- 24:22 (see 7.6.2c): *καὶ ἀποκλείουσιν* occupies the position in the sentence of *אָסִיר*, but carries the meaning of *וּסְגָרוּ*.
- 26:19 (see 7.3.2): *δρόσος ἢ παρὰ σοῦ* is a literal translation of *טֶל*, but appears at the beginning of the sentence just as does *טל*.
- 34:11 (see 3.6.2c): the content of *κατοικήσουσιν ἐν αὐτῇ* corresponds to *יִשְׁכְּנוּ-בָהּ*, but its location to that of *וִירְשׁוּהָ*.
- 58:11 (see 3.3.2): *ὑδωρ* is located where in the Hebrew *מִמֵּי* is found, although in conformity with the earlier appearing *מִים* it lacks a possessive pronoun.
- 60:4 (see 3.3.2): *ἡκασί* occurs in a position similar to that of *בְּאוֹ-לֶךְ* (directly preceding *בְּנֵיךְ* = *πάντες οἱ υἱοί σου*) and is in accordance with that verb a past tense; still, in the respect that it is governed by the subject “(all) your sons” and is not followed by a prepositional phrase “to you,” it is nearer to *יְבֹאוּ*.

## 7.8 Conclusion

The Greek translation of Isaiah has a substantial number of cases in which one out of two (or more) synonymous or identical elements is absent in the translation. In some of these, the origin of the minus may lie in a different *Vorlage*: the LXX might have preserved the original text, whereas the MT displays a double reading, caused, for instance, by conflation. This could especially be true in places where the Hebrew offers two synonymous, coordinate units. Yet, such a scenario is less probable in the many cases where the condensation forms part of an entire reformulation of the Hebrew text. On such occasions one must be cautious about perceiving the Greek text as the more original one.

Moreover, since the lack of representation of identical or synonymous expressions is so widespread in LXX Isaiah, one is led to assume that most of these minuses are omissions by the translator himself, who was apt to remove overlapping elements from his text. His application of condensation was probably mainly motivated by stylistic considerations: the abundant use of repetitive words may have seemed inelegant in his eyes. This could have some bearing on the fact that in Greek rhetoric it was considered a “sin” against good style to repeat too much in a text or to write in a redundant, pleonastic way. *Narratio brevis*, in contrast, was regarded as one of the three main virtues of a text.<sup>82</sup> Another reason for condensation may have been that the translator sometimes could not think of a proper Greek synonym, although this argument may sell short his dexterous command of the Greek language. Finally, the absence of an identical or synonymous expression will now and then have been caused by an unintentional omission of the translator due to *parablepsis* or haplography. This topic will be discussed further in chapter 11 on translation mistakes.

A remarkable aspect that should be noted, is that a tendency to condensation can also be found in the Great Isaiah Scroll of Qumran. Kutscher mentions fourteen places in 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> where a repeated word or clause has been elided.<sup>83</sup> Of these, five accord with minuses in LXX Isaiah.<sup>84</sup> Those shared minuses do not

---

<sup>82</sup> Heinrich Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik. Eine Grundlegung der Literaturwissenschaft* (2 vols.; München: Hueber, 1960), 1:169–77 (§§297–314); 178 (§318). See also section 8.7.

<sup>83</sup> Kutscher mentions 6:2, 3; 7:2; 26:3, 5, 6; 35:8; 37:18, 29; 38:11; 48:19; 55:1; 57:19; and 62:10. This only includes the repetition of (nearly) identical elements, not synonymous ones; see E. Y. Kutscher, *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa<sup>a</sup>)* (rev. and enl. ed.; STDJ 6; Leiden: Brill, 1974), 554.

<sup>84</sup> 26:3–4, 6; 38:11; 55:1; and 62:10. Other cases of condensation in which the two versions accord—not mentioned by Kutscher—can be found in 3:24; 14:18; 24:4 (before the correction); 24:22(?); 37:14 (before the correction); and 52:6. For a more extensive discussion, see section 12.3.1.

automatically point in the direction of a common Hebrew *Vorlage* underlying 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and LXX Isaiah, but are rather the outcome of the employment of a similar technique by the scribe of the Scroll and the LXX translator. We will continue on this subject in chapter 12.

## Chapter 8.

# PLUSES AND MINUSES CREATING OR IMPROVING RHETORICAL FIGURES

With one of the most beautiful poetic parts of Scripture before him, the Greek translator of the book of Isaiah was faced with a challenging task. This makes one wonder how he was to deal with the special nature of his text. Was he to be concerned to reflect the poetic features of the Hebrew in his translation? And what role might have been played by the rules concerning style and literature current in his own time?

Hardly any investigations have yet been made into this stylistic or poetic aspect of the LXX of Isaiah. When scholars did acknowledge it, it was often in a negative way. The LXX translator would have disregarded the norms of Hebrew poetry, neglecting parallelism and repetition and correcting poetic ellipsis.<sup>1</sup> Yet, is this negative judgement of the translator's attitude towards poetry justifiable? Or have LXX Isaiah's literary qualities been underestimated for a long time? In the present chapter I will search for answers to these intriguing questions.

---

<sup>1</sup> See e.g. Fischer, *In welcher Schrift*, 7: "Für den Parallelismus hatte er wenig Empfinden"; Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 51: "An vielen Stellen unterläßt die LXX ein synonymes Wort im parallelen Satzglied; sie legt also keinen besonderen Wert auf den parallelen Satzbau." Baer, *When We All Go Home*, 24: "He routinely discards the intricate parallelism that he discovers in Hebrew Isaiah, collapsing poetic structures into an abbreviated prose that usually says much the same thing, but without the poetic balance or repetition of his source. On the other hand, we shall see that this disregard for the norms of Hebrew poetry is not confined to abridgement. With roughly the same frequency, he expands the text vis-à-vis the MT in order to "correct" poetic ellipsis ... His text has moved him, but not in the direction of literary appreciation." The Isaiah translator has been taken more seriously in this respect by Le Moigne and van der Louw. Le Moigne offers an extensive treatment of the figure of chiasmus in LXX Isaiah (Le Moigne, "Livre d'Ésaïe," 433–571). Van der Louw pays attention to the stylistic side of the translation in his analysis of LXX Isaiah 1: "The translator occasionally goes beyond naturalness and aims for ease and beauty of *style*, which brings him within the realm of ancient rhetorica" (van der Louw, "Transformations," 196). At the same time, van der Louw thinks that "from a stylistic point of view the text does not stand out as ornate" ("Transformations," 129).

### 8.1 LXX Isaiah and classical rhetoric

In the Hellenistic times in which the translator of Isaiah was living the system which was providing contemporary rules and norms regarding literature was the discipline of classical rhetoric. Classical rhetoric had developed in Ancient Greece in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C.E. as the art of public speaking. As such, it was used especially in the civic life of the Athenian democracy. The main purpose of rhetoric was to persuade the public. But persuasion meant more than converting people to a certain idea. Teaching, entertaining and impressing the public were also part of this spectrum.

Whereas at first rhetoric was specifically concerned with oral skills and public speaking, in Hellenistic times attention shifted towards written texts. This shift is sometimes called the *letteraturizzazione*: the adaptation of rhetoric to literary compositions. From then on, the purpose of rhetoric no longer consisted of persuasion, but of narration, the act of putting ideas into words.<sup>2</sup> The influence of rhetoric on literary composition was, according to the classicist George Kennedy, a striking feature of Greek and Latin literature from the first century B.C.E. to late antiquity. It is displayed, for instance, in the use of topics, the presentation of ethos and pathos, in patterns of arrangement, in features of declamation, and above all, in the application of tropes, figures, and sententiae.<sup>3</sup>

It was also during this Hellenistic period that ancient rhetoric was crystallized into a detailed system. It was divided into five main categories, one of which was called “style.” “Style” concerned the choice and combination of words into clauses, periods, and figures. One of the subcategories of style involved the *ornamentation* of a text. A text could be ornamented by the use of *tropes* and *figures*. In a *trope* one word is replaced by a different word with a distinct, but semantically related meaning. An example of a trope is the metaphor (“I am the bread of life,” John 6:35). *Figures*, on the other hand, relate to the combination of words. Some well-known examples of figures are repetition, parallelism, asyndeton and ellipsis.<sup>4</sup>

In the Greek translation of Isaiah we find many such rhetorical figures. Often they already existed in the Hebrew text and were simply transposed into the translation, but at other times they were modified by the translator or even introduced into the text by him. There is of course always the possibility that these apparent changes already existed in the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the translator,

<sup>2</sup> George A. Kennedy, *Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times* (rev. and enl. ed.; Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999), 1–3, 128–30.

<sup>3</sup> Kennedy, *Classical Rhetoric*, 129.

<sup>4</sup> Galen O. Rowe, “Chapter 5, Style,” in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C.–A.D. 400* (ed. Stanley E. Porter; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 121–50.



but in view of the large number of them, they would rather seem to indicate a tendency on the part of the translator to enhance the rhetorical nature of the text.

The fascinating question arises of whether the Isaiah translator, living as he did in a Hellenistic period and area, was familiar with the Greek terminology for these rhetorical figures and the classical rules concerning their use. Or, alternatively, did he know these figures only from the Hebrew Bible? In my opinion, it is certainly possible that he was acquainted with rhetorical rules and terminology, for he is likely to have been a learned person, moving in intellectual Alexandrian circles, familiar not only with Jewish literature, but also with Greek literary art.<sup>5</sup> This is supported by the fact that the Isaiah translator was writing in good Koinē Greek, as was pointed out by Thackeray more than a century ago.<sup>6</sup>

In the present chapter I will offer a number of the many examples I have found of rhetorical figures which have been modified, and no doubt in his opinion “improved,” by the Greek translator of Isaiah, as well as some created by him. In this I have confined myself to cases in which the improvement or creation of the figure has been accomplished by an apparent addition to or an omission from the underlying Hebrew text, that is the pluses and minuses. Without this restriction, many more examples could be given of rhetorical figures in LXX Isaiah.

For denoting figures I will use the terminology of classical rhetoric. This is not to suggest that I am certain of the translator having known this terminology, but merely because these classical terms are in common usage to define literary figures.

## 8.2 Division of figures

In ancient rhetoric, figures are classified into three principle groups:<sup>7</sup>

- (a) Figures of addition (adiectio)
- (b) Figures of omission (detractio).
- (c) Figures of transposition (transmutatio).

<sup>5</sup> For the idea that the LXX Isaiah translator was a learned scribe, see e.g. van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 66; idem, *Oracle of Tyre*, 107–9 (for a summary of van der Kooij’s view, see further section 10.1). See also Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation*, e.g. 290–91; Troxel believes that the Isaiah translator was influenced by the Alexandrian scholars of his time, called the γραμματικοί, who had their centre of research in the Alexandrian Museum.

<sup>6</sup> Henry St. J. Thackeray, “The Greek Translators of the Prophetic Books,” *JTS* 4 (1903): 583; idem, *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint* 1. *Introduction, Orthography and Accidence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909), 13.

<sup>7</sup> Lausberg, *Handbuch*, 1:310 (§606); Rowe, “Style,” 129.

These are subdivided in the following way:<sup>8</sup>

A. Word figures of addition (adiectio):

- Repetition
  - a. Repetition of the same words:
    - Geminatio<sup>9</sup>
    - Inclusio
    - Anaphora
    - Epiphora
    - Reduplicatio
  - b. Repetition of words with relaxed word-equivalence:
    - Annominatio
    - Polyptoton and derivatio
    - Synonymia
- Accumulation
  - a. Coordinating accumulation:
    - Enumeratio
    - Distributio
  - b. Subordinating accumulation:
    - Epitheton
    - Polysyndeton

B. Word figures of omission (detractio):

- Ellipsis
- Zeugma
- Asyndeton

C. Word figures of transposition (transmutatio):

- Parallelism
- Chiasmus
- Tricolon

This classification will be used as a starting-point in the next discussion on the formation and expansion of word figures in the LXX of Isaiah.

Beside figures at word level, at the end of this chapter one stylistic device at another level will shortly be dealt with, that is the repetition of sentences (see section 8.6).

---

<sup>8</sup> This division is based upon Lausberg's exposition of word figures; see Lausberg, *Handbuch*, 1:310–74 (§§604–754).

<sup>9</sup> For a discussion on geminatio in LXX Isaiah, see section 8.7.

### 8.3 Word figures of addition

Word figures of addition are created either by the repetition of equivalent words or word groups, or by the accumulation of different words or word groups.<sup>10</sup>

#### 8.3.1 Repetition

The frequent repetition of words is a characteristic feature of Biblical Hebrew literature. Repetition was also part of Greek theories about the ornamentation of a text, though to a lesser degree. Words could be repeated in order to draw attention to a passage and to imbue it with strength and pathos.<sup>11</sup> They could be repeated in exactly the same form, but also with a variation in inflexion (polyptoton) or conjugation (derivatio). Besides, repetition can pertain to words which are (almost) identical in form but different in meaning (paronomasia), as well as to words having a different form but a similar meaning (synonymia).<sup>12</sup> It can be found at the beginning, middle or end of a (syntactical or metrical) unity that is superior to the repeated element; this unity can be a clause, colon, or verse, but also a strophe or a group of verses.<sup>13</sup>

The LXX of Isaiah contains plenty of examples of repetition, of which a significant number appears to have been invented or modified by the translator, through the addition of words or phrases. In the continuation of this paragraph some examples will be listed, and grouped according to the kind of repetition they exhibit.

##### 8.3.1.1 Repetition of the same words

When words with the same form and the same meaning are repeated,

the equivalence of the repetition implies an emotive redundancy: the first position of the word has the normal semantic informative function ... , the second placing of the same word presupposes the informative function of the first placing, and has a reinforcing emotive function ... beyond the merely informative.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> Lausberg, *Handbuch*, 1:310 (§607).

<sup>11</sup> Lausberg, *Handbuch*, 1:311 (§612).

<sup>12</sup> Lausberg, *Handbuch*, 1:310–11 (§§608–610).

<sup>13</sup> Heinrich Lausberg, *Elemente der literarischen Rhetorik. Eine Einführung für Studierende der klassischen, romanischen, englischen und deutschen Philologie* (3rd ed.; München: Hueber, 1967), 80.

<sup>14</sup> Heinrich Lausberg, *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric. A Foundation for Literary Study* (ed. David E. Orton and R. Dean Anderson; trans. Matthew T. Bliss, Annemiek Jansen, and David E. Orton; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 275 (§612).

Repetition of identical words can take several forms, among which *inclusio*, *anaphora*, *epiphora*, and *reduplicatio*.

### a. *Inclusio*

*Inclusio*<sup>15</sup> is a form of repetition, in which the same word or phrase is used at the beginning as well as at the end of a clause or a verse, thus forming a parenthesis.<sup>16</sup> In the Hebrew Bible we encounter many cases of *inclusio*. In biblical poetry this was an important figure of speech, used to demarcate poetic unities.<sup>17</sup>

The examples below demonstrate that the translator of Isaiah did not only recognise this figure, but also improved and sometimes even established new cases of *inclusio*.

#### *Isa 17:6*

The first example of the creation of an *inclusio* occurs in Isa 17:6, a text in which the remnant of Israel is compared to some berries left on the branches of an olive tree:

17:6      καὶ καταλειφθῇ ἐν αὐτῇ καλὰ μὴ ἢ ὡς ῥῶγες ἐλαίας  
              δύο ἢ τρεῖς ἐπ' ἄκρου μετεώρου  
              ἢ τέσσαρες ἢ πέντε ἐπὶ τῶν κλάδων αὐτῶν καταλειφθῇ.

Due to the addition of *καταλειφθῇ* this word forms a parenthesis around the verse. Moreover, it has provided the verse with a chiastic arrangement:

A	καὶ καταλειφθῇ ...
B	δύο ἢ τρεῖς ἐπ' ἄκρου μετεώρου
B'	ἢ τέσσαρες ἢ πέντε ἐπὶ τῶν κλάδων αὐτῶν
A'	καταλειφθῇ

At both extremities of the verse we see the verb *καταλειφθῇ*, while in the centre the parallel phrases *δύο ἢ τρεῖς ἐπ'* and *ἢ τέσσαρες ἢ πέντε ἐπὶ* are found.

<sup>15</sup> Other names for the same figure are “epanalepsis,” “prosapodosis,” “epanadiplosis,” and “restitutio”; see Lausberg, *Handbuch*, 1:317 (§625); Josef Martin, *Antike Rhetorik. Technik und Methode* (HdA 3; München: Beck, 1974), 301, 303; Rowe, “Style,” 130; Gideon O. Burton, “Silva Rhetoricae,” n.p. [cited 28 April 2009]. Online: <http://rhetoric.byu.edu>.

<sup>16</sup> Lausberg, *Handbuch*, 1:317–18 (§§625–627).

<sup>17</sup> See e.g. Jan Fokkelman, *Dichtkunst in de bijbel. Een handleiding bij literair lezen* (Zoetermeer: Meinema, 2000), 116–17, 121.

*Isa 13:9–13*

It is not just a clause or a verse, but also a larger division of the text that can be framed by an inclusio, such as a strophe or a stanza. In Isa 13:9–13 an example can be discovered of the framing of a stanza, consisting of two strophes:

ἰδοὺ γὰρ **ἡμέρα κυρίου** ἀνίατος **ἔρχεται**  
 θεῖναι τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην ἔρημον  
 οἱ γὰρ ἀστέρες τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ὁ Ὠρίων  
 καὶ σκοτισθήσεται τοῦ ἡλίου ἀνατέλλοντος  
 καὶ ἐντελοῦμαι τῇ οἰκουμένῃ ὅλη κακὰ  
 καὶ ἀπολῶ ὕβριν ἀνόμων

**θυμοῦ καὶ ὀργῆς**  
 καὶ τοὺς ἁμαρτωλοὺς ἀπολέσαι ἐξ αὐτῆς.  
 καὶ πᾶς ὁ κόσμος τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τὸ φῶς οὐ δώσουσι  
 καὶ ἡ σελήνη οὐ δώσει τὸ φῶς αὐτῆς.  
 καὶ τοῖς ἀσεβέσι τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν·  
 καὶ ὕβριν ὑπερηφάνων ταπεινώσω.

καὶ ἔσονται οἱ καταλελειμμένοι ἔντιμοι  
 καὶ ὁ ἄνθρωπος μᾶλλον ἔντιμος ἔσται  
 ὁ γὰρ οὐρανὸς θυμωθήσεται  
 διὰ **θυμὸν ὀργῆς κυρίου** σαβασθ

μᾶλλον ἢ τὸ χρυσίον τὸ ἄπυρον,  
 ἢ ὁ λίθος ὁ ἐκ Σουφίρ.  
 καὶ ἡ γῆ σεισθήσεται ἐκ τῶν θεμελίων αὐτῆς  
 τῇ **ἡμέρᾳ, ἣ ἂν ἐπέλθῃ** ὁ θυμὸς αὐτοῦ.

The two strophes in LXX Isaiah 13:9–13 have as their subject the coming of the day of the Lord. Their arrangement exhibits a chiasmic ABC/C'B'A' pattern:

A	The day of the Lord (verse 9a)
B	What will happen to heaven and earth (verses 9b–10)
C	What will happen to the sinful people (verse 11)
C'	What will happen to the pious people (verse 12)
B'	What will happen to heaven and earth (verse 13a)
A'	The day of the Lord (verse 13b)

The five verses are framed by a clause on the day of the Lord, which, as mentioned, forms their subject. A similar framing is also present in the Hebrew text. There the words יום, יהוה, עברה, and אָ, which appeared in verse 9a, are reiterated in verse 13b:

13:9a	ועברה וחרון אָ	הנה יום־יהוה בא אכזרי
...		
13:13b	ביום חרון אָפו	בעברת יהוה צבאות

In LXX Isaiah, however, this inclusio has been further strengthened. This has been achieved by way of the addition in verse 13b of two *extra* words corresponding to expressions in verse 9, namely ὀργῆς and ἐπέλθῃ (see in verse 9 ὀργῆς and ἔρχεται).

*Isa 49:14–15*

A second illustration of an inclusio framing a larger unit occurs in LXX Isa 49:14–15. In this beautiful passage God compares himself to a woman, who will never forget her child:

- 14 **Εἶπε δὲ Σιών**  
 Ἐγκατέλιπέ με κύριος,  
 καὶ ὁ κύριος ἐπελάθετό μου.
- 15 μὴ ἐπιλήσεται γυνὴ τοῦ παιδίου αὐτῆς<sup>18</sup>  
 τοῦ μὴ ἐλεῆσαι τὰ ἔκγονα τῆς κοιλίας αὐτῆς;  
 εἰ δὲ καὶ ἐπιλάβοιτο ταῦτα γυνή,  
 ἀλλ' ἐγὼ οὐκ ἐπιλήσομαί σου,  
**εἶπε κύριος.**

Again these verses display a chiasmic structure. This structure emphasises the contradiction between, on the one hand, what Sion says, and, on the other hand, what God says. In the LXX this structure has been extended by the addition of *εἶπε κύριος* at the end, which forms an inclusio with *Εἶπε δὲ Σιών* at the beginning. Schematically the chiasmus can be depicted in the following way:

- |    |                            |
|----|----------------------------|
| A  | Εἶπε δὲ Σιών               |
| B  | ὁ κύριος ἐπελάθετό μου.    |
| C  | ἐπιλήσεται γυνή            |
| C' | ἐπιλάβοιτο γυνή            |
| B' | ἐγὼ οὐκ ἐπιλήσομαί σου     |
| A' | <b><u>εἶπε κύριος.</u></b> |

Verse 14 introduces Sion as speaker (A) and formulates the thought of Sion that the Lord has forgotten her (B); verse 15a is a rhetorical question: Could a woman ever forget her child? (C); verse 15b focuses on the statement, that, even if a mother could forget her child (C'), God would not forget Sion (B'). The verse then concludes by identifying the one speaking in verse 15 as the Lord himself (A').

In the Greek text there is yet another plus which articulates the chiasmic structure: in C' the noun *γυνή* seems to have been added, parallel to *γυνή* in C.

<sup>18</sup> I have offered here the reading of Rahlfs, who gives *μὴ ἐπιλήσεται γυνή* τοῦ παιδίου αὐτῆς. The Göttingen edition, however, has chosen the alternative attestation *μήτηρ* instead of *γυνή*. This might reflect the more original reading, since *γυνή* could be a correction in line with the MT. Nevertheless, it is equally possible that the reading with *μήτηρ* is the outcome of a later adjustment for the sake of content, as the clause “Will a *mother* forget her child” sounds more natural than “Will a *woman* forget her child.” The Alexandrian recension is divided on this issue. Part of it (e.g. A) attests to *μήτηρ* and another part (e.g. Q and S) to *γυνή*.

In the Hebrew we find **נשא**—the equivalent of *γυνή*—only in the C part, and not in C'. On the contrary, C' in the Hebrew text refers to a *plural* feminine subject (**הַנַּחֲשִׁים הָאֵלֶּם**).

*Isa 19:18 and 25:1*

Two additional illustrations of *inclusio* come from 19:18 and 25:1:

19:18 **Πόλις**—*ασεδεκ κληθήσεται ἡ μία πόλις*.

25:1 **Κύριε** ὁ θεός μου,  
δοξάσω σε,  
ὕμνήσω τὸ ὄνομά σου,  
ὅτι ἐποίησας θαυμαστὰ πράγματα,  
βουλὴν ἀρχαίαν ἀληθινήν·  
γένοιτο, **κύριε**.

## b. Anaphora

Anaphora<sup>19</sup> is the repetition of the same word or group of words at the beginning of successive verses, clauses, or commata. It may also occur at the beginning of unities superior to verses, such as strophes or stanzas. This kind of repetition can give a strong emotional effect to the text.<sup>20</sup> In the LXX of Isaiah I could detect more than twenty cases of anaphora that are extra to or more extensive than the MT:

- 2:6–8      6 ὅτι **ἐνεπλήσθη** ὡς τὸ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς **ἡ χώρα αὐτῶν** κληδονισμῶν  
ὡς ἡ τῶν ἀλλοφύλων,  
καὶ τέκνα πολλὰ ἀλλόφυλα ἐγενήθη αὐτοῖς.
- 7 **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 ἁρμάτων αὐτῶν·
- 8 **καὶ ἐνεπλήσθη ἡ γῆ** βδελυγμάτων  
τῶν ἔργων τῶν χειρῶν αὐτῶν

In 2:6–8 the repetition of a similar verb phrase at the outset of four subsequent bicola has in LXX Isaiah been elaborated by the addition of *ἡ χώρα αὐτῶν* in verse 6. As a result, the first lines of the first two bicola contain the words

<sup>19</sup> Also called “epanaphora,” or “epibole.”

<sup>20</sup> Lausberg, *Handbuch*, 1:318–20 (§§629–630); Edward P. J. Corbett, *Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1965), 435.

ἐνεπλήσθη ... ἡ χώρα αὐτῶν, while the first lines of the last two bicola start with καὶ ἐνεπλήσθη ἡ γῆ.

A second anaphora in these verses concerns the repetition in the two interior bicola of the words καὶ οὐκ ἦν ἀριθμὸς τῶν.

- 3:14 Ὑμεῖς δὲ  
τί ἐνεपुरίσατε τὸν ἀμπελῶνά μου  
καὶ ἡ ἀρπαγὴ τοῦ πτωχοῦ ἐν τοῖς οἴκοις ὑμῶν;  
τί ὑμεῖς ἀδικεῖτε τὸν λαόν μου  
καὶ τὸ πρόσωπον τῶν πτωχῶν καταισχύνετε;

By virtue of the addition of τί there can, besides anaphora, also be detected a chiasmic scheme in this verse, consisting of the words Ὑμεῖς / τί // τί / ὑμεῖς. Furthermore, there is repetition of πτωχοῦ / πτωχῶν.

- 17:3 καὶ οὐκέτι ἔσται ὄχυρά τοῦ καταφυγεῖν Εφραιμ,  
καὶ οὐκέτι ἔσται βασιλεία ἐν Δαμασκῷ
- 21:10 ἀκούσατε, οἱ καταλειμμένοι καὶ οἱ ὀδυνώμενοι,  
ἀκούσατε ἃ ἤκουσα παρὰ κυρίου σαβαωθ.<sup>21</sup>
- 21:15 διὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν φευγόντων  
καὶ διὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν πλανωμένων  
καὶ διὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῆς μαχαίρας  
καὶ διὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν τοξευμάτων τῶν διατεταμένων  
καὶ διὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν πεπτωκότων ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ.<sup>22</sup>
- 23:15 καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ  
καταλειφθήσεται Τύρος ἕτη ἐβδομήκοντα  
ὡς χρόνος βασιλείας,  
ὡς χρόνος ἀνθρώπου.  
καὶ ἔσται μετὰ ἐβδομήκοντα ἕτη  
ἔσται Τύρος ὡς ἄσμα πόρνης

Two successive sentences, as well as two successive phrases within the first sentence start with identical words.

<sup>21</sup> MT: ... מדשתי ובגרגני אשר שמעתי מאת יהוה צבאות.

<sup>22</sup> The MT has a rather divergent text: כבד ומפני קשת דרוכה ומפני חרב נטושה ומפני חרב נטושה and חרב in the first and second lines by πλῆθος through association with מרבית and חרב, respectively. τῶν πλανωμένων may translate נטושה, linked to נטו ("to turn," "to deviate"). See also section 6.7c.



26:2-3 ἀνοιξατε πύλας, εἰσελθάτω λαὸς  
φυλάσσω δικαιοσύνην καὶ φυλάσσω ἀλήθειαν  
ἀντιλαμβάνόμενος ἀληθείας καὶ φυλάσσω εἰρήνην.

Also the repetition of ἀλήθεια is extra in comparison to the Hebrew.<sup>23</sup>

26:11–13

11	<b>κύριε</b> , ὑψηλός σου ὁ βραχίων, γνόντες δὲ αἰσχυνθήσονται· ζῆλος λήμψεται λαὸν ἀπαίδευτον,	καὶ οὐκ ᾔδεισαν,  καὶ νῦν πῦρ τοὺς ὑπεναντίους ἔδεταί.
12	<b>κύριε ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν</b> , πάντα γὰρ ἀπέδωκας ἡμῖν.	εἰρήνην δὸς ἡμῖν,
13	<b>κύριε ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν</b> , <b>κύριε</b> , ἐκτὸς σοῦ ἄλλον <u>οὐκ οἶδαμεν</u> ,	κτῆσαι ἡμᾶς· τὸ ὄνομά σου ὀνομάζομεν.

The appending of  $\theta$  θεός ἡμῶν to κύριε in verse 12 has made this and the ensuing verse both open with κύριε  $\theta$  θεός ἡμῶν, followed by an imperative with an object pronoun in the first person plural. An ABBA pattern is provided by the words κύριε / κύριε  $\theta$  θεός ἡμῶν // κύριε  $\theta$  θεός ἡμῶν / κύριε.<sup>24</sup> An inflection of οἶδα comes up both in the first and final line of this unit (οὐκ ᾔδεισαν and οὐκ οἶδαμεν, respectively), thus creating an inclusio.

26:16 κύριε,  
 ἐν θλίψει ἐμνήσθην σου,  
 ἐν θλίψει μικρᾷ ἢ παιδείᾳ σου ἡμῖν.<sup>25</sup>

27:9 καὶ τοῦτο ἐστὶν ἡ εὐλογία αὐτοῦ,  
ὅταν ἀφέλωμαι αὐτοῦ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν,  
ὅταν θῶσι πάντας τοὺς λίθους τῶν βωμῶν  
κατακεκομμένους ὡς κονίαν λεπτήν.<sup>26</sup>

<sup>23</sup> MT: פתחו שערים ויבא גוי־צדיק שמר אמני יצר סמוך תצר שלום שלום. Possibly, the adjective צדיק (“righteous”) is not represented by a mere δικαιοσύνη, but was freely translated as φυλάσσων δικαιοσύνην—“the one who keeps justice,” in which case φυλάσσων would not be a real plus. ἀντιλαμβάνόμενος probably derives from יצר by way of association with נצר (“to keep”). Also תצר has likely been linked to נצר, resulting in a rendering with φυλάσσων.

<sup>24</sup> In the MT the anaphora is only threefold, as verse 13b offers אֲדֹנִים—"lords"—rather than יהוה—"O Lord."

<sup>25</sup> The MT has a different text: יהוה בצר פקדוך צקון לחש מוסרך למו.

<sup>26</sup> MT: וזה כל-פרי הסר חטאתו בשומו כל-אבני מזבח כאבני-גר מנפצות.

33:10–11 **νῦν** ἀναστήσομαι, λέγει κύριος,  
**νῦν** δοξασθήσομαι,  
**νῦν** ὑψωθήσομαι·  
**νῦν** ὅψεσθε,  
**νῦν** αἰσθηθήσεσθε.<sup>27</sup>

Besides the beginnings of these lines, the ends are also repetitious, namely as regards the endings of the verbs: in the first three lines this is (τ/θ)ήσομαι, in the final two (ψ/σ)εσθε.

40:12–14 **Τίς** ἐμέτρησε τῇ χειρὶ τὸ ὕδωρ  
καὶ τὸν οὐρανὸν σπιθαμῇ καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν δρακί;  
**τίς** ἔστησε τὰ ὄρη σταθμῶ καὶ τὰς νάπας ζυγῶ;  
**τίς** ἔγνω νοῦν κυρίου,  
καὶ **τίς** σύμβουλος αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, ὃς συμβιβᾷ αὐτόν;  
ἢ πρὸς **τίνα** συνεβουλεύσατο καὶ συνεβίβασεν αὐτόν;  
ἢ **τίς** ἔδειξεν αὐτῶ κρίσιν; ἢ ὁδὸν συνέσεως **τίς** ἔδειξεν αὐτῶ;

In these verses not only the anaphora of τίς catches the attention, but also the parallelism in the arrangement of σύμβουλος / συμβιβᾷ // συνεβουλεύσατο / συνεβίβασεν (emphasised by the sound repetition of συμ/συν, which returns in συνέσεως), as well as the chiasmic construction of the final line: ἢ τίς ἔδειξεν αὐτῶ / κρίσιν // ἢ ὁδὸν συνέσεως / τίς ἔδειξεν αὐτῶ.

#### 45:2–13

In verses 2–8 and 12–13 of LXX Isa 45 the pronoun ἐγώ appears as many as twelve times, including four times as a plus. Usually it is placed at the outset of the clause:

2 **Ἐγώ** ἔμπροσθέν σου πορεύσομαι καὶ ὄρη ὁμαλιῶ,  
Θύρας χαλκᾶς συντρίψω καὶ μοχλοὺς σιδηροῦς συγκλάσω  
3 καὶ δώσω σοι θησαυροὺς σκοτεινούς, ἀποκρύφους ἀοράτους ἀνοίξω σοι,  
ἵνα γνῶς ὅτι **ἐγώ** κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὁ καλῶν τὸ ὄνομά σου, θεὸς Ἰσραὴλ.

<sup>27</sup> The last two lines are different in the MT:  $\text{קָם וַיִּדּוּ תְּהַי וַיִּשְׁמַע}$ . The LXX translator may have connected  $\text{וַיִּשְׁמַע}$  with  $\text{וַיִּחַח}$ , translating it by ὅψεσθε.  $\text{וַיִּשְׁמַע}$  he may have related to  $\text{וַיִּחַח}$ —“to feel”—which could explain the rendering by αἰσθηθήσεσθε (see *HUB Isa*, 138).  $\text{קָם}$  he likely moved to the next sentence, where he seems to have glossed it as *ματαία* ἔσται.

- 4 ἔνεκεν Ἰακωβ τοῦ παιδὸς μου καὶ Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ ἐκλεκτοῦ μου  
ἐγὼ καλέσω σε τῷ ὀνόματί σου καὶ προσδέξομαί σε,  
 σὺ δὲ οὐκ ἔγνων με.
- 5 ὅτι ἐγὼ κύριος ὁ θεός, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἔτι πλὴν ἐμοῦ θεός,  
 καὶ οὐκ ἤδεις με,
- 6 ἵνα γνῶσιν οἱ ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν ἡλίου καὶ οἱ ἀπὸ δυσμῶν  
 ὅτι οὐκ ἔστι πλὴν ἐμοῦ· ἐγὼ κύριος ὁ θεός, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἔτι·  
 7 ἐγὼ ὁ κατασκευάσας φῶς καὶ ποιήσας σκότος,  
 ὁ ποιῶν εἰρήνην καὶ κτίζων κακὰ·  
ἐγὼ κύριος ὁ θεός ὁ ποιῶν ταῦτα πάντα.
- 8 εὐφρανθήτω ὁ οὐρανὸς ἄνωθεν, καὶ αἱ νεφέλαι ῥανάτωσαν  
 δικαιοσύνην· ἀνατειλάτω ἡ γῆ ἔλεος καὶ δικαιοσύνην ἀνατειλάτω ἅμα·  
ἐγὼ εἰμι κύριος ὁ κτίσας σε.  
 ...
- 12 ἐγὼ ἐποίησα γῆν καὶ ἄνθρωπον ἐπ' αὐτῆς,  
ἐγὼ τῇ χειρὶ μου ἐστερέωσα τὸν οὐρανόν ἐγὼ πᾶσι τοῖς ἄστροις ἐνετείλαμην.  
 13 ἐγὼ ἡγείρα αὐτὸν μετὰ δικαιοσύνης, καὶ πᾶσαι αἱ ὁδοὶ αὐτοῦ εὐθεῖαι·
- 47:11 καὶ ἥξει ἐπὶ σέ ἀπώλεια, καὶ οὐ μὴ γνῶς,  
 βόθυνος, καὶ ἐμπεσῇ εἰς αὐτόν·  
 καὶ ἥξει ἐπὶ σέ ταλαιπωρία, καὶ οὐ μὴ δυνήσῃ καθαρὰ γενέσθαι·  
 καὶ ἥξει ἐπὶ σέ ἐξαίφνης ἀπώλεια, καὶ οὐ μὴ γνῶς.

This verse stands out because of its threefold beginning repetition of καὶ ἥξει ἐπὶ σέ, and the framing by the practically identical first and last bicola.<sup>28</sup>

- 48:5 μὴ εἴπῃς ὅτι Τὰ εἰδωλά μου ἐποίησαν,  
 καὶ μὴ εἴπῃς ὅτι Τὰ γλυπτὰ καὶ τὰ χωνευτὰ ἐνετείλατό μοι.
- 49:12 ἰδοὺ οὗτοι πόρρωθεν ἔρχονται,  
 οὗτοι ἀπὸ βορρᾶ  
 καὶ οὗτοι ἀπὸ θαλάσσης,  
 ἄλλοι δὲ ἐκ γῆς Περσῶν.
- 51:4 ἀκούσατέ μου  
 ἀκούσατε, λαός μου,  
 καὶ οἱ βασιλεῖς, πρὸς με ἐνωτίσασθε·

<sup>28</sup> For a comparison with the MT, see section 6.9.5a.

This verse further exhibits an inclusio in the synonymous phrases ἀκούσατε μου and πρὸς με ἐνωτίσασθε.<sup>29</sup>

57:4 ἐν τίνι ἐνετρυφήσατε;  
καὶ ἐπὶ τίνα ἡνοίξατε τὸ στόμα ὑμῶν;  
καὶ ἐπὶ τίνα ἐχαλάσατε τὴν γλῶσσαν ὑμῶν;

57:6 ἐκείνη σου ἡ μερίς,  
οὗτός σου ὁ κληῖρος,  
καῖκεῖνοις ἐξέχεας σπονδὰς  
καῖκεῖνοις ἀνήνεγκας θυσίας.  
ἐπὶ τούτοις οὖν οὐκ ὀργισθήσομαι;

63:15 ποῦ ἐστιν ὁ ζῆλος σου καὶ ἡ ἰσχὺς σου;  
ποῦ ἐστι τὸ πλῆθος τοῦ ἐλέους σου καὶ τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν σου,  
ὅτι ἀνέσχου ἡμῶν;

Like the repetition of ποῦ ἐστι, the iterative use of σου also is not just arbitrary, but infuses the supplication with more power and emotion. Also the assonance and end rhyme in ὁ ζῆλος σου / τὸ πλῆθος τοῦ may serve this same purpose.

### *Repetition at the beginning of strophes*

From time to time expressions are repeated at the beginning of poetic units superior to verses. This happens in the following places:

13:12–16

In LXX Isa 13 two consecutive strophes—verses 12–13 and 14–16—begin with the words καὶ ἔσονται οἱ καταλελειμμένοι.<sup>30</sup>

καὶ ἔσονται οἱ καταλελειμμένοι ἔντιμοι  
καὶ ὁ ἄνθρωπος μᾶλλον ἔντιμος ἔσται  
ὁ γὰρ οὐρανὸς θυμωθήσεται  
διὰ θυμὸν ὀργῆς κυρίου σαβαωθ

μᾶλλον ἢ τὸ χρυσίον τὸ ἄπυρον,  
ἢ ὁ λίθος ὁ ἐκ Σουφίρ.  
καὶ ἡ γῆ σεισθήσεται ἐκ τῶν θεμελίων αὐτῆς  
τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, ἣ ἂν ἐπέλθῃ ὁ θυμὸς αὐτοῦ.

καὶ ἔσονται οἱ καταλελειμμένοι  
καὶ ὡς πρόβατον πλανώμενον,  
ὥστε ἄνθρωπον εἰς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ἀποστραφῆναι

ὡς δορκάδιον φεύγον  
καὶ οὐκ ἔσται ὁ συνάγων,  
καὶ ἄνθρωπον εἰς τὴν χώραν αὐτοῦ διώξαι

<sup>29</sup> Note that verse 1a and verse 7 likewise start with ἀκούσατέ μου, while verse 1b, 2 and 6b all start with ἐμβλέψατε.

<sup>30</sup> For a discussion on these verses, see also section 8.3.1.1a.

41:2–4

- 2 *τίς ἐξήγειρεν ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν δικαιοσύνην,  
ἐκάλεσεν αὐτήν* κατὰ πόδας αὐτοῦ,  
καὶ πορεύσεται;

...

- 4 *τίς ἐνήργησε καὶ ἐποίησε ταῦτα;  
ἐκάλεσεν αὐτήν* ὁ καλῶν αὐτήν  
ἀπὸ γενεῶν ἀρχῆς

55:2–3

*ἀκούσατέ μου*  
καὶ φάγεσθε ἀγαθά,  
καὶ ἐντρυφήσει *ἐν ἀγαθοῖς ἢ ψυχῇ ὑμῶν.*

*προσέχετε* τοῖς ὠτίοις ὑμῶν  
καὶ ἐπακολουθήσατε ταῖς ὁδοῖς μου.

*ἐπακούσατέ μου,*  
καὶ ζήσεται *ἐν ἀγαθοῖς ἢ ψυχῇ ὑμῶν*  
καὶ διαθήσομαι ὑμῖν διαθήκην αἰώνιον,  
τὰ ὅσα Δαυὶδ τὰ πιστά.

These three adjacent strophes all start with a summons to the people to listen. The initial lines of the first and third strophes are nearly the same: *ἀκούσατέ μου* and *ἐπακούσατέ μου* (while in the MT they read *יְלֵא שְׁמוֹ שְׁמוֹ* and *וְשָׁמַע*, respectively). They are both succeeded by two promises, which will be fulfilled when the people obey the command to hear. One of these contains the words *ἐν ἀγαθοῖς ἢ ψυχῇ ὑμῶν*.

### c. Epiphora

A third word figure that can regularly be observed in the Greek translation of Isaiah is an epiphora.<sup>31</sup> Epiphora is the repetition of the final word or group of words in successive verses or cola. The repeated element is given special emphasis, both by way of the repetition, and by its position at the end of the sentence.<sup>32</sup> In LXX Isaiah I found among fifteen examples of this figure created or extended by the translator:

24:3–6

In 24:3–6—a passage that describes the destruction of the earth—the noun *ἔρῃ* / *γῆ* often turns up at the end of the clause, with the Greek mirroring the repetition

<sup>31</sup> Also called “antistrophe” or “conversio.”

<sup>32</sup> Lausberg, *Handbuch*, 1:320–21 (§§631–632); Corbett, *Classical Rhetoric*, 435–36.

in the Hebrew. But in verse 3 the translator inserts yet another γῆ in that position, thus expanding the epiphora. Besides γῆ one can repeatedly find derivations of οἰκέω at the end of the lines: see verses 4b, 5a, 6b and 6c.

- 3     φθορᾶ φθαρήσεται ἡ γῆ,  
καὶ προνομῆ πρόνομευθήσεται ἡ γῆ·  
τὸ γὰρ στόμα κυρίου ἐλάλησε ταῦτα.
- 4     ἐπένθησεν ἡ γῆ,  
καὶ ἐφθάρη ἡ οἴκουμένη,  
ἐπένθησαν οἱ ὑψηλοὶ τῆς γῆς.
- 5     ἡ δὲ γῆ ἠνόμησε διὰ τοὺς κατοικοῦντας αὐτήν,  
διότι παρέβησαν τὸν νόμον  
καὶ ἥλλαξαν τὰ προστάγματα, διαθήκην αἰώνιον.
- 6     διὰ τοῦτο ἀρὰ ἔδεται τὴν γῆν,  
ὅτι ἡμάρτοσαν οἱ κατοικοῦντες αὐτήν·  
διὰ τοῦτο πτωχοὶ ἔσονται οἱ ἐνοικοῦντες ἐν τῇ γῇ,  
καὶ καταλειφθήσονται ἄνθρωποι ὀλίγοι.

33:7     ἄγγελοι γὰρ ἀποσταλήσονται                     ἀξιοῦντες εἰρήνην  
                 πικρῶς κλαίοντες                                     παρακαλοῦντες εἰρήνην.

The LXX deviates widely from the Hebrew, which offers the much shorter text מלאכי שלום מר יבכיון. The verse is beautifully composed in the Greek. It includes two bicola, the second parts of which are parallel in form and both end with εἰρήνην. In the first bicolon there is alliteration of the ἀ, and in the second of the π.<sup>33</sup>

- 44:5     οὗτος ἐρεῖ Τοῦ θεοῦ εἰμι,  
καὶ οὗτος βοήσεται ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι Ιακωβ,  
καὶ ἕτερος ἐπιγράψει Τοῦ θεοῦ εἰμι,  
ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι Ισραηλ.

The four lines of this verse alternate as regards their final words. This has been achieved by means of the addition of εἰμι in the third line, and the omission of יכנה in the final line:

MT:                     זה יאמר ליהוה אני  
                              זה יקרא בשם יעקב  
                              זה יכתב ידו ליהוה  
                              ובשם ישראל יכנה

<sup>33</sup> On the use of alliteration in the LXX, see Takamitsu Muraoka, "Literary Device in the Septuagint," *Textus* 8 (1973), 29–30.

A second omission from the Hebrew concerns the noun phrase יְיָ. By means of its deletion the third clause has become more parallel to the second one.

45:4–5 ἔνεκεν Ἰακωβ τοῦ παιδὸς μου  
καὶ Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ ἐκλεκτοῦ μου  
ἐγὼ καλέσω σε τῷ ὀνόματί σου  
καὶ προσδέξομαι σε,  
σὺ δὲ οὐκ ἔγνωνς με.  
ὅτι ἐγὼ κύριος **ὁ θεός**,  
καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἕτι πλὴν ἐμοῦ **θεός**,  
καὶ οὐκ ἴδεις με

While the sixth and seventh lines close with θεός (which is once a plus), the fifth and eighth lines have με (preceded by a verb in the sense of “to know”) as their final expression. As a consequence, the concluding words of these four lines form a chiasmus: οὐκ ἔγνωνς με / θεός // θεός / οὐκ ἴδεις με. Also the first four lines resemble as regards the end words: μου / μου / σου / σε.

46:4 ἕως γήρους **ἐγὼ εἰμι**, καὶ ἕως ἂν καταγηράσῃτε, **ἐγὼ εἰμι**.  
ἐγὼ ἀνέχομαι ὑμῶν, ἐγὼ ἐποίησα  
καὶ ἐγὼ ἀνήσω, ἐγὼ ἀναλήμψομαι καὶ σώσω ὑμᾶς.

In the LXX an epiphora has been produced by means of the addition of ἐγὼ εἰμι at the end of the first bicolon. Besides the epiphora there is also an anaphora to be found in this verse: ἕως is repeated at the beginning of both parts of the first bicolon, and ἐγὼ at the beginning of both parts of the second and third bicola. Even though the Hebrew text also contains anaphora, the repetition of words has been increased by the translator.

51:13 καὶ ἐφόβου αἰεὶ πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας  
τὸ πρόσωπον τοῦ θυμοῦ τοῦ θλίβοντός **σε**.  
ὃν τρόπον γὰρ ἐβουλεύσατο τοῦ ἄραί **σε**,  
καὶ νῦν ποῦ **ὁ θυμὸς τοῦ θλίβοντός σε**;

52:1–2

- 1 Ἐξεγείρου ἐξεγείρου, **Σιων**,  
ἐνδυσαι τὴν ἰσχὺν σου, **Σιων**,  
καὶ ἐνδυσαι τὴν δόξαν σου, **Ιερουσαλημ πόλις ἡ ἁγία**.  
οὐκέτι προστεθήσεται διελθεῖν διὰ σοῦ ἀπερίτμητος καὶ ἀκάθαρτος.
- 2 ἐκτίναξαι τὸν χοῦν καὶ ἀνάστηθι κάθισον, **Ιερουσαλημ**.  
ἔκδυσαι τὸν δεσμὸν τοῦ τραχήλου σου, **ἡ αἰχμάλωτος θυγάτηρ Σιων**.

The LXX of Isa 52:1–2 comprises a pattern of imperatives plus vocatives concerning Sion/Jerusalem:

A	2x imperative	+ Σιων	x
B	1x imperative ἔνδυσαι τὴν ἰσχύν σου	+ Σιων	x'
B'	1x imperative ἔνδυσαι τὴν δόξαν σου	+ Ιερουσαλημ πόλις ἡ ἁγία	y
X	middle clause without imperative		
A'	3x imperative	+ Ιερουσαλημ	y'
B''	1x imp. ἔκδυσαι τὸν δεσμὸν τοῦ τραχήλου σου	+ ἡ αἰχμάλωτος θυγάτηρ Σιων	x''

There are three clauses, indicated as B in the outline above, that each contain only one imperative, which in all three cases is derived from ἐκ/ένδύω (by contrast, the Hebrew shows two different roots: יור and תתה). These imperatives are all followed by an object specified by the pronoun σου and are directed against respectively Σιων, Ιερουσαλημ πόλις ἡ ἁγία and ἡ αἰχμάλωτος θυγάτηρ Σιων. In between one finds two clauses—indicated as A in the outline—that both include more than one imperative, and are addressed to Σιων and Ιερουσαλημ. Due to the addition of Σιων at the end of the first line, all imperatives are accompanied by a vocative, each time at the very end of the sentence.

A further stylistic detail in the Greek text is that in the second bicolon of verse 1 the Hebrew בגדי does not have an equivalent in the translation. On account of this omission the parallelism with the preceding clause has been ameliorated:

MT: לְבָשִׁי צִיץ צִיּוֹן  
לְבָשִׁי בְּגָדֵי תַפְאֶרֶת יְרוּשָׁלַם עִיר הַקֹּדֶשׁ

LXX: ἔνδυσαι τὴν ἰσχύν σου, Σιων,  
καὶ ἔνδυσαι (–) τὴν δόξαν σου, Ιερουσαλημ πόλις ἡ ἁγία

### *Repetition in a different inflexion or conjugation*

In the next few cases of epiphora words are repeated in a different inflexion (polyptoton) or conjugation (derivatio):

3:25 καὶ ὁ υἱός σου ὁ κάλλιστος, ὃν ἀγαπᾷς, **μαχαίρα πεσεῖται**,  
καὶ οἱ ἰσχύοντες ὑμῶν **μαχαίρα πεσοῦνται**.

5:29 ὁρμῶσιν ὡς **λέοντες**  
καὶ παρέστηκαν ὡς σκύμνος **λέοντος**.



8:17–18

- a* Μενῶ τόν θεόν  
*b* τὸν ἀποστρέψαντα τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ **ἀπὸ τοῦ οἴκου Ιακωβ**  
*c* καὶ πεποιθώς ἔσομαι ἐπ' αὐτῷ.  
*d* ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ καὶ τὰ παιδία, ἃ μοι ἔδωκεν ὁ θεός,  
*e* καὶ ἔσται εἰς σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα **ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ Ισραὴλ**  
*f* παρὰ κυρίου σαβαωθ, ὃς κατοικεῖ **ἐν τῷ ὄρει Σιών**.

Lines *b*, *e* and *f* all close with a prepositional phrase referring to Israel. In *b* as well as *e* this phrase contains the noun οἶκος.<sup>34</sup>

- 10:10        ὃν τρόπον ταύτας **ἔλαβον**,  
                καὶ πάσας τὰς χώρας **λήμψομαι**.<sup>35</sup>

19:18–22

LXX Isa 19:18–22 is frequently interspersed with the words κύριος and Αἴγυπτος / Αἴγυπτιοί. These nouns often form the end words of the clauses. In order to reinforce their repetition, the translator has probably supplied an extra κύριος in verse 20, and has twice omitted תיבאר following יהוה (in verses 18 and 20). In addition to that, he has once left out גרר preceding מצרים (verse 18):

- 18    τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἔσονται πέντε πόλεις ἐν (–) Αἰγύπτῳ  
        λαλοῦσαι τῇ γλώσσῃ τῇ Χανανίτιδι  
        καὶ ὁμνῶνσαι τῷ ὀνόματι **κυρίου** (–).  
        Πόλις ἀσεδεκ κληθήσεται ἢ μία πόλις.  
  
 19    τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἔσται θυσιαστήριον **τῷ κυρίῳ** ἐν χώρᾳ Αἰγυπτίων  
        καὶ στήλη πρὸς τὸ ὄριον αὐτῆς **τῷ κυρίῳ**  
 20    καὶ ἔσται εἰς σημεῖον εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα **κυρίῳ** (–) ἐν χώρᾳ Αἰγύπτου,  
        ὅτι κεκραῖνονται πρὸς **κύριον** διὰ τοὺς θλίβοντας αὐτούς,  
        καὶ ἀποστελεῖ αὐτοῖς **κύριος** ἄνθρωπον,  
        ὃς σώσει αὐτούς, κρίνων σώσει αὐτούς.

<sup>34</sup> I present here the reading of Rahlfs. In the Göttingen edition οἶκω is absent in verse 18, which probably reflects the original reading, since in the main part of the Alexandrian manuscripts οἶκω is missing.

<sup>35</sup> MT: מלכות האלהים. Rahlfs has ὃν τρόπον ταύτας ἔλαβον ἐν τῇ χειρὶ μου καὶ πάσας τὰς ἀρχὰς λήμψομαι.

- 21 καὶ γνωστὸς ἔσται **κύριος** τοῖς Αἰγυπτίοις,  
καὶ γνώσονται οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι τὸν **κύριον** ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ  
καὶ ποιήσουσι θυσίας καὶ εὕξονται εὐχὰς **τῷ κυρίῳ**  
καὶ ἀποδώσουσι.
- 22 καὶ πατάξει **κύριος** τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους πληγῇ μεγάλη  
καὶ ἰάσεται αὐτοὺς ἰάσει,  
καὶ ἐπιστραφήσονται πρὸς **κύριον**,  
καὶ εἰσακούσεται αὐτῶν  
καὶ ἰάσεται αὐτούς.

Verses 19–20b can be patterned ABC/B/ABC/B:

- 19a ἔσται / τῷ κυρίῳ / ἐν χώρᾳ Αἰγυπτίων //
- 19b τῷ κυρίῳ //
- 20a ἔσται / κυρίῳ / ἐν χώρᾳ Αἰγύπτου //
- 20b κύριον

20:3–5

- A Ὅν τρόπον πεπόμευται Ἡσαίας ὁ παῖς μου *γυμνὸς καὶ ἀνυπόδετος* τρία ἔτη,  
B ἔσται σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα **τοῖς Αἰγυπτίοις καὶ Αἰθίοψιν**.  
C ὅτι οὕτως ἄξει βασιλεὺς Ἀσσυρίων τὴν αἰχμαλωσίαν **Αἰγύπτου καὶ Αἰθιοπῶν**,  
D νεανίσκους καὶ πρεσβύτας, *γυμνοὺς καὶ ἀνυποδέτους*  
E ἀνακεκαλυμμένους τὴν αἰσχύνῃν **Αἰγύπτου**.  
F καὶ αἰσχυνηθήσονται ἡττηθέντες **οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι ἐπὶ τοῖς Αἰθίοψιν**,  
G ἐφ' οἷς ἦσαν πεποιοότες **οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι**,  
H ἦσαν γὰρ αὐτοῖς δόξα.

MT:	a	ערום ויחף	כאשר הלך עבדי ישעיהו
	b	על-מצרים ועל-כוש	שלוש שנים אות ומופת
	c	את-שבי מצרים ואת-גלות כוש	כן ינהג מלך-אשור
	d	ערום ויחף	נערים וזקנים
	e	ערום מצרים	וחשופי שת
	f	ומן-מצרים תפארתם	וחתו ובשו מכוש מבטם

While the Hebrew gives a geographical name referring to Egypt and/or Ethiopia at the end (or nearly at the end) of four out of six successive bicola (and of five out of twelve successive cola), in LXX Isaiah the text has been changed in such a way that this repetition has received even more prominence: Firstly, the noun *γλῶτ* governing *כוש* in the second part of the third bicolon in the MT (cβ) has no equivalent in the Greek, with as a consequence that *Αἰγύπτου καὶ Αἰθιοπῶν* are directly juxtaposed (see C). Something similar is achieved in the second part of

the second bicolon (*bβ*), where the preposition before Ethiopia (ἔν) is not represented, resulting in τοῖς Αἰγυπτίοις καὶ Αἰθίοψιν in the LXX (see B). Furthermore, in line *f* (=F) the LXX has added οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι, making this line conclude with two plural denominations of the Egyptians and the Ethiopians as well. Finally, the translator formed out of מִצְרַיִם (in the MT the last word of *fα*) and וּמִן־מִצְרַיִם (in the MT the first words of *fβ*) a new clause, likewise ending with “the Egyptians”: ἐφ’ οἷς ἦσαν πεποιθότες οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι (G). Thanks to this inventiveness the LXX has three lines close with a phrase that combines in it “(the) Egypt(ians)” and “the Ethiopians,” while two end with only “Egypt” or “the Egyptians.” Aside from that, two lines have as their final words “naked and barefoot.”

30:20–21

καὶ οὐκέτι μὴ ἐγγίσωσίν σοι οἱ **πλανῶντές σε**·  
 ὅτι οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ σου ὄψονται τοὺς **πλανῶντάς σε**,  
 καὶ τὰ ὦτά σου ἀκούσονται τοὺς λόγους τῶν ὀπίσω **σε πλανησάντων**

The insertion of πλανησάντων in VERSE 21 has produced a set of three cola that each end with a participle of πλανάω. The third participle phrase relates in a chiasmic way to the first and second ones, as the object comes before rather than after the verb.

24:4–14

The last example of epiphora concerns a case where the repeated words occur at the conclusion of consecutive strophes:

- I    4    ἐπένθησεν ἡ γῆ,  
          καὶ ἐφθάρη ἡ οἰκουμένη,  
          ἐπένθησαν οἱ ὑψηλοὶ τῆς γῆς.  
      5    ἡ δὲ γῆ ἠνόμησε διὰ τοὺς κατοικοῦντας αὐτήν,  
          διότι παρέβησαν τὸν νόμον  
          καὶ ἥλλαξαν τὰ προστάγματα, διαθήκην αἰώνιον.  
      6    διὰ τοῦτο ἀρὰ ἔδεται τὴν γῆν,  
          ὅτι ἡμάρτοσαν οἱ κατοικοῦντες αὐτήν·  
          διὰ τοῦτο πτωχοὶ ἔσονται οἱ ἐνοικοῦντες ἐν τῇ γῇ,  
          καὶ **καταλειφθήσονται** ἄνθρωποι ὀλίγοι.
- II    7    πενθήσει οἶνος,  
          πενθήσει ἄμπελος,  
          στενάξουσιν πάντες οἱ εὐφραινόμενοι τὴν ψυχὴν.  
      8    πέπαυται εὐφροσύνη τυμπάνων,

- πέπαυται αὐθάδεια καὶ πλοῦτος ἀσεβῶν,  
 πέπαυται φωνὴ κιθάρας.
- 9 ἡσυχύνθησαν, οὐκ ἔπιον οἶνον,  
 πικρὸν ἐγένετο τὸ σικερα τοῖς πίνουσιν.
- 10 ἡρημώθη πᾶσα πόλις,  
 κλείσει οἰκίαν τοῦ μὴ εἰσελθεῖν.
- 11 ὀλολύζετε περὶ τοῦ οἶνου πανταχῇ·  
 πέπαυται πᾶσα εὐφροσύνη τῆς γῆς.
- 12 καὶ **καταλειφθήσονται** πόλεις ἔρημοι,  
 καὶ οἶκοι **ἐγκαταλειμμένοι** ἀπολοῦνται.
- III 13 ταῦτα πάντα ἔσται ἐν τῇ γῇ ἐν μέσῳ τῶν ἐθνῶν,  
 ὃν τρόπον ἐάν τις καλαμῆσται ἐλαίαν,  
 οὕτως καλαμῆσονται αὐτούς,
- 14 καὶ ἐὰν παύσῃται ὁ τρύγητος.  
 οὗτοι φωνῇ βοήσονται,  
οἱ δὲ **καταλειφθέντες** ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς εὐφρανθήσονται ἅμα  
 τῇ δόξῃ κυρίου.

24:4–14 can be divided into three strophes, the first one (verses 4–6) announcing the destruction of the earth and her inhabitants, the second one (verses 7–12) dealing with the ceasing of wine drinking and joyfulness, and the third one (verses 13–14) drawing a comparison with the harvest of olives. Each of these three strophes includes in its final sentence a form of *καταλείπω*: The first strophe has *καταλειφθήσονται*, the second *καταλειφθήσονται* and *ἐγκαταλειμμένοι*, and the last one *καταλειφθέντες*, which is a plus. In addition to this epiphora, the passage holds yet more notable repetitions, of which some have already been mentioned earlier in this chapter. In the first strophe we find a fourfold repetition of derivations of *οἰκέω*, an epiphora of *ἡ γῆ*, and an anaphora of *ἐπένθησεν* / *ἐπένθησαν*. The second strophe presents two cases of anaphora involving *πενθήσει* and *πέπαυται*, as well as in verses 10 and 12 a parallelistic arrangement of the words *πόλις* / *οἰκίαν* // *πόλεις* / *οἶκοι*, and a chiasmic arrangement of *ἡρημώθη* / *πόλις* // *πόλεις* / *ἔρημοι*. The words *γῆ*, *εὐφροσύνη* / *εὐφραίνω*, *πᾶς*, *παύω* and *πενθέω* are scattered throughout the entire passage.<sup>36</sup>

<sup>36</sup> Another eye-catching detail of this passage is the frequent repetition of the *π* as the beginning sound of words: In 24:4–14 not less than twenty-one words start with the *π*.

#### d. Reduplicatio

Reduplicatio<sup>37</sup> is the repetition of the last member of a syntactic or metrical word group at the beginning of the immediately following syntactic or metrical word group.<sup>38</sup> In LXX Isaiah fresh cases of this figure, generated by means of an addition, occur only sporadically:

The first instance can be found in 3:13–14. The pronoun αὐτοῦ is resumed at the opening of the following sentence, even if in a different inflexion (polyptoton):

3:13–14 ἀλλὰ νῦν καταστήσεται εἰς κρίσιν κύριος  
καὶ στήσει εἰς κρίσιν τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ,  
αὐτὸς κύριος εἰς κρίσιν ἥξει  
μετὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων τοῦ λαοῦ  
καὶ μετὰ τῶν ἀρχόντων αὐτοῦ

Equally noteworthy are the repetitions of (καθ)ίστημι, μετά, and εἰς κρίσιν (the latter phrase recurs three times in the LXX of these verses, while in the MT it corresponds to three different phrases). The third line is chiasmic in relation to the first one: καταστήσεται / εἰς κρίσιν / κύριος // αὐτὸς κύριος / εἰς κρίσιν / ἥξει.

14:13 καθιῶ ἐν ὄρει ὑψηλῷ  
ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρη τὰ ὑψηλὰ τὰ πρὸς βορρᾶν

Also in 14:13 the similar items in reduplicatio are repeated in a different inflexion.

A third case of reduplicatio arrived at by an addition is afforded by 14:29, although this is not an entirely pure example, since the repeated words do not appear at the very end and the subsequent beginning of the two lines:

14:29 ἐκ γὰρ σπέρματος ὄφρων ἐξελεύσεται ἔκγονα ἀσπίδων,  
καὶ τὰ ἔκγονα αὐτῶν ἐξελεύσονται ὄφεις πετόμενοι.

#### e. Other forms of repetition of the same words

Aside from the patterns described above, repetition can also appear in other forms, for instance, in the middle of successive sentences (sometimes called “mesodiplosis”), at the beginning and middle of successive sentences (“mesarchia”), or at the end and middle of successive sentences

<sup>37</sup> Also called “anadiplosis” or “epanadiplosis.”

<sup>38</sup> Lausberg, *Handbuch*, 1:314–15 (§§619–622).

(“mesoteleuton”).<sup>39</sup> The present paragraph will examine some examples—all of them involving a plus or a minus—of such other types of repetition, as well as a few cases in which various kinds of repetition are combined.

1:1           “Ορασις, ἦν εἶδεν Ησαιας υἱὸς Αμως,  
              ἦν εἶδε κατὰ τῆς Ιουδαίας καὶ κατὰ Ιερουσαλημ

2:2–3

2a	“Οτι ἔσται ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις	
b	ἐμφανὲς <u>τὸ ὄρος τοῦ κυρίου</u> <sup>40</sup>	<u>καὶ ὁ οἶκος τοῦ θεοῦ</u> ἐπ’ ἄκρων τῶν ὀρέων
c	καὶ ὑψωθήσεται ὑπεράνω τῶν βουνῶν.	καὶ ἤξουσιν ἐπ’ αὐτὸ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη,
3a	καὶ <u>πορεύσονται</u> ἔθνη πολλὰ	καὶ ἐροῦσι
b	Δεῦτε καὶ ἀναβῶμεν εἰς <u>τὸ ὄρος κυρίου</u>	<u>καὶ εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ</u> Ιακωβ,
c	καὶ ἀναγγελεῖ ἡμῖν τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ,	καὶ <u>πορευσόμεθα</u> ἐν αὐτῇ.

Through the addition of *κυρίου καί* in verse 2b, the Hebrew phrase *הר בית־יהוה* has in LXX Isaiah been split into *τὸ ὄρος τοῦ κυρίου* on the one hand, and *καὶ ὁ οἶκος τοῦ θεοῦ* on the other. In this way, verse 2b has been harmonised with verse 3b: Both sentences are now composed of an α-colon concluding with “the mountain of the Lord,” followed by a β-colon starting with “the house of God.” Thanks to this repetition, LXX Isa 2:2–3 displays a parallel arrangement of words, in that several expressions in the indirect speech are resumed in direct speech:

2b–3a (indirect speech)	τὸ ὄρος τοῦ κυρίου	ὁ οἶκος τοῦ θεοῦ	πορεύσονται
3b–c (direct speech)	τὸ ὄρος κυρίου	τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ	πορευσόμεθα

6:8

καὶ ἤκουσα τῆς φωνῆς κυρίου	λέγοντος
Τίνα ἀποστείλω,	καὶ τίς <u>πορεύσεται πρὸς τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον;</u> <sup>41</sup>
καὶ εἶπα	
Ἴδού εἰμι ἐγώ.	ἀπόστειλόν με.
καὶ εἶπε	
<i>Πορεύθητι</i>	καὶ εἰπὸν <b>τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ</b>

<sup>39</sup> See Ethelbert W. Bullinger, *Figures of Speech Used in the Bible. Explained and Illustrated* (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1898; repr., Grand Rapids, Mich: Baker Book House, 1968), 261; Burton, “Silva Rhetoricae” (rhetoric.byu.edu).

<sup>40</sup> Rahlfs has *τὸ ὄρος κυρίου* (instead of *τὸ ὄρος τοῦ κυρίου*) in verse 2b, just as in verse 3b. A reading with *τὸ ὄρος τοῦ κυρίου* is however supported by the majority of the Alexandrian witnesses.

<sup>41</sup> The MT has *וְיִשְׁמַע אֶת־קוֹל אֲדָנָי אֱמַר אֶת־מִי וְיִלְכֹּד לִי*. I have taken *וְיִלְכֹּד* to be a minus and *πρὸς τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον* to be a plus; one could also however consider these as corresponding to each other.

The reiteration of ἀποστέλλω, πορεύομαι and ὁ λαὸς οὗτος has resulted in a parallelistic scheme: ἀποστείλω / πορεύεται / τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον // ἀπόστειλόν / Πορεύητι / τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ.

9:5(6) ἐγὼ γὰρ ἄξω **εἰρήνην** ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄρχοντας,  
**εἰρήνην καὶ ὑγίειαν αὐτῷ.**<sup>42</sup>

10:15–18

- καὶ οὐχ οὕτως,  
16 ἀλλὰ ἀποστελεῖ κύριος σαβαωθ εἰς τὴν σὴν τιμὴν ἀτιμίαν,  
καὶ εἰς τὴν σὴν δόξαν **πῦρ καιόμενον** καυθήσεται·
- 17 καὶ ἔσται τὸ φῶς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ εἰς **πῦρ**  
καὶ ἀγιάσει αὐτὸν ἐν **πυρί καιομένῳ**  
καὶ **φάγεται** ὡσεὶ χόρτον τὴν ὕλην.
- 18 τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἀποσβεσθήσεται τὰ ὄρη καὶ οἱ βουνοὶ καὶ οἱ δρυμοί,  
καὶ **καταφάγεται** ἀπὸ ψυχῆς ἕως σαρκῶν·  
καὶ ἔσται ὁ φεύγων ὡς ὁ φεύγων **ἀπὸ φλογὸς καιομένης**·

In the Hebrew text—which differs from the Greek in quite a number of aspects—the repetition of an adjective in the sense of “burning,” as it occurs in the LXX, is missing.<sup>43</sup> Maybe this repetition was invented so as to compensate for the two figures of paronomasia that the Hebrew contains: כִּיקַד יִקַּד יִקַּד (verse 16) and כָּסַס כָּסַס (verse 18). Besides πῦρ and καιόμενος the verb form (κατα)φάγεται is also reiterated in the translation.

- 11:6–7 καὶ **συμβοσκηθήσεται** λύκος μετὰ ἄρνός,  
καὶ **πάρδαλις** συναναπαύσεται ἐρίφῳ,  
καὶ **μοσχάριον** καὶ ταῦρος καὶ λέων **ἅμα βοσκηθήσονται**,  
καὶ **παιδίον** μικρὸν ἄξει αὐτούς·
- καὶ **βοῦς** καὶ ἄρκος **ἅμα βοσκηθήσονται**,  
καὶ **ἅμα** τὰ **παιδιά** αὐτῶν ἔσονται,  
καὶ **λέων** καὶ **βοῦς ἅμα** **φάγονται** ἄχυρα.

- 11:14 καὶ ἐπὶ Μωαβ **πρῶτον** τὰς χεῖρας ἐπιβαλοῦσιν,  
οἱ δὲ υἱοὶ Ἀμμων **πρῶτοι** ὑπακούσονται.

<sup>42</sup> MT: וְאֵנִי שְׁלֵמוֹת; for an explanation of this remarkable translation, see section 6.7a.

<sup>43</sup> The MT has וְיִשְׁלַח הָאֱדוֹן יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת בְּמִשְׁמְנֵי רוּחַ וְתַחַת כְּבֹדוֹ יִקַּד יִקַּד כִּיקַד אֵשׁ וְהָיָה אֹרֶז־יִשְׂרָאֵל לְאֵשׁ וְקִדְשׁוֹ לְלֹהֶבֶת וּבִעֵרָה וְאִכְלָה שִׁיתוֹ וּשְׁמִירֹו בְּיוֹם אֶחָד וּכְבוֹד יַעֲרֹ וּכְרַמְלֹו מִנֶּפֶשׁ וְעַד־בֶּשֶׂר יִכְלָה וְהָיָה כְּמִסַּס נִסִּס וְקִדְשׁוֹ לְלֹהֶבֶת וּבִעֵרָה וְאִכְלָה שִׁיתוֹ וּשְׁמִירֹו בְּיוֹם אֶחָד וּכְבוֹד יַעֲרֹ וּכְרַמְלֹו מִנֶּפֶשׁ וְעַד־בֶּשֶׂר יִכְלָה וְהָיָה כְּמִסַּס נִסִּס.

- 12:4–5 **Ὑμνεῖτε** κύριον,  
βοᾶτε **τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ**,  
*ἀναγγεῖλατε ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι τὰ ἔνδοξα αὐτοῦ*  
*μιμνήσκεσθε, ὅτι ὑψώθη **τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ**.*  
**ὑμνήσατε τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου**,  
ὅτι ὑψηλὰ ἐποίησεν.  
*ἀναγγεῖλατε ταῦτα ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῇ.*

These two verses abound in repetition. The first two bicola both end with **τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ**, while **τὸ ὄνομα** turns up once again in the middle of the third one (mesoteleuton). The first and third bicola each start with an imperative form of ὑμνέω, and the second bicolon as well as the final colon open with the imperative ἀναγγεῖλατε. The two parts of the second bicolon both conclude with αὐτοῦ, and this is also the closing word of the first bicolon. ὑψηλὰ in the second part of the third bicolon relates to ὑψώθη in the corresponding part of the second bicolon; the two forms accordingly appear in a subordinate clause introduced by ὅτι. Finally, there is alliteration of the ὑ, especially in the third bicolon.<sup>44</sup>

- 14:8 καὶ τὰ ξύλα **τοῦ Λιβάνου** ἠϋφράνθησαν ἐπὶ σοὶ  
καὶ ἡ κέδρος **τοῦ Λιβάνου**
- 14:26 αὕτη ἡ βουλή, ἣν βεβούλευται κύριος ἐπὶ **τὴν οἰκουμένην** ὅλην,  
καὶ αὕτη ἡ χεὶρ ἡ ὑψηλὴ ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη **τῆς οἰκουμένης**.
- 14:29 ἐκ γὰρ σπέρματος ὄψεων **ἐξελεύσεται ἔκγονα** ἀσπίδων,  
καὶ τὰ **ἔκγονα** αὐτῶν **ἐξελεύσονται** ὄφεις πετόμενοι.

LXX Isa 14:29b is presented as a carefully constructed verse: It contains middle repetition of ἐξελεύσεται/ἐξελεύσονται and ἔκγονα (by virtue of two additions), as well as of ὄψεων/ὄφεις. Besides, it exhibits reduplicatio (although not in a “pure” form), since ἔκγονα (plus)—almost at the end of the first line—returns at the outset of the second line. These various repetitions have generated a chiasmic pattern in the sequence of ὄψεων / ἐξελεύσεται / ἔκγονα // ἔκγονα / ἐξελεύσονται / ὄφεις.

- 14:31 ὀλολύζετε, πύλαι **πόλεων**,  
κεκραγέτωσαν **πόλεις** τεταραγμέναι, οἱ ἀλλόφυλοι πάντες<sup>45</sup>

<sup>44</sup> Also the alliteration of the ἐ in ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι τὰ ἔνδοξα may have been invented deliberately.

<sup>45</sup> The alliteration of the π may serve to emphasise the repetition and parallelism.



<sup>46</sup> MT: ונשתרמים מהים ונהר יחרב ויבש והאזניהו נהרות דללו וחרבו יאירי מצור קנה וסוף קמלו ערות עליאור: על־פי יאיר וכל מזרע יאור ייבש נדף ואינו קמלו, see 33:9; for a further discussion of the translation, see section 6.6.2b.

The words αὐτῆς ἡ ἐμπορία / τῷ κυρίῳ // ἔναντι κυρίου / ἡ ἐμπορία αὐτῆς are arranged chiasmically. At the end of the verse ἔναντι κυρίου turns up once again, this time as a plus.<sup>47</sup>

25:2–4 ὅτι ἔθηκας **πόλεις** εἰς χῶμα,  
**πόλεις** ὀχυράς τοῦ πεσεῖν αὐτῶν τὰ θεμέλια·  
 τῶν ἀσεβῶν **πόλεις** εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα οὐ μὴ οἰκοδομηθῇ.  
 διὰ τοῦτο εὐλογήσῃ σε ὁ λαὸς ὁ πτωχός,  
 καὶ **πόλεις** ἀνθρώπων ἀδικουμένων εὐλογήσουσί σε·  
 ἐγένου γὰρ πάσῃ **πόλει** ταπεινῇ βοηθός  
 καὶ τοῖς ἀθυμήσασι διὰ ἔνδειαν σκέπη<sup>48</sup>

25:4–5 ἀπὸ **ἀνθρώπων** πονηρῶν ῥύσῃ αὐτούς,  
 σκέπη **διψώντων** καὶ πνεῦμα **ἀνθρώπων** ἀδικουμένων.  
 ὡς **ἄνθρωποι** ὀλιγόψυχοι **διψῶντες** ἐν Σιων  
 ἀπὸ **ἀνθρώπων** ἀσεβῶν, οἷς ἡμᾶς παρέδωκας.

Rather striking in these verses is the fourfold mentioning of the ἄνθρωποι, referring to the “evil people” on the one hand, and the weak and thirsty ones on the other. The latter are—in a literary, but possibly also in a symbolic sense—*enclosed* by the evil:

A	ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπων πονηρῶν
B	διψώντων
C	ἀνθρώπων ἀδικουμένων
C'	ἄνθρωποι ὀλιγόψυχοι
B'	διψῶντες
A'	ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπων ἀσεβῶν

Even if it does not show this chiasmatic construction, the Hebrew also offers a beautifully embellished text here. It stands out especially by its play on the sounds ז, ר, and מ in זרם (“downpour”), זרים (“strangers”), and זמיר (“singing”), and on the צ in בצר, צל (2x), בציון, and עריצים (2x):

מֵעוּז לַאֲבוֹן בְּצָר-לוֹ	כִּי-הָיָה מֵעוּז לְדָל
צָל מַחֲרָב	מַחֲסֵה מִזֶּרֶם
כַּחֲרָב בְּצִיּוֹן	כִּי רוּחַ עֲרִיצִים כֹּזֵרִים קִיר
	שֶׁאוֹן זֵרִים תִּכְנִיעַ
זִמְרֵי עֲרִיצִים יַעֲנֶה	חֲרָב בְּצָל עֵב

<sup>47</sup> Van der Kooij thinks that the second ἔναντι κυρίου is not a plus, but mirrors עתִּיק in the Hebrew; see van der Kooij, *Oracle of Tyre*, 148, and section 9.4.1.2b.

<sup>48</sup> See section 7.3.2.

It may be that the repetition in the LXX version of these verses was introduced by the translator in order to compensate for this Hebrew sound play.

29:13 Ἐγγίζει **μοι** ὁ λαὸς οὗτος  
τοῖς χεῖλεσιν αὐτῶν τιμῶσί **με**,  
ἢ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν πόρρω ἀπέχει ἀπ' ἐμοῦ·  
μάτην δὲ σέβονται **με**  
διδάσκοντες ἐντάλματα ἀνθρώπων καὶ διδασκαλίας.

30:27 Ἴδου τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου διὰ χρόνου ἔρχεται πολλοῦ,  
καιόμενος ὁ θυμός,  
μετὰ δόξης **τὸ λόγιον** τῶν χειλέων αὐτοῦ,  
**τὸ λόγιον ὀργῆς** πλήρες,  
καὶ ἡ **ὀργή** τοῦ θυμοῦ ὡς πῦρ ἔδεται.<sup>49</sup>

A pattern of repetition is formed by the words ὁ θυμός / τὸ λόγιον / τὸ λόγιον / ὀργῆς / ὀργή / τοῦ θυμοῦ.

32:7 καταφθεῖραι ταπεινοὺς ἐν **λόγοις** ἀδίκους  
καὶ διασκεδάσαι **λόγους** ταπεινῶν ἐν κρίσει.

In the LXX these parallel cola disclose a chiasmic repetition in the words ταπεινοὺς / λόγοις // λόγους / ταπεινῶν.<sup>50</sup>

32:13–14

a	ἡ γῆ τοῦ λαοῦ μου	
b	ἄκανθα καὶ χόρτος ἀναβήσεται,	καὶ ἐκ πάσης οἰκίας <u>εὐφροσύνη ἀρθήσεται</u> .
c	<b>πόλις</b> πλουσία,	<b>οἴκοι</b> ἐγκαταλελειμμένοι
d	πλοῦτον <b>πόλεως</b>	<u>καὶ οἴκους ἐπιθυμητοὺς</u> ἀφήσουσι.
e	καὶ ἔσονται αἱ κῶμαι σπήλαια	ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος,
f	<u>εὐφροσύνη</u> ὄνων ἀγρίων,	βοσκήματα ποιμένων

In the third and fourth lines (c and d) both first parts contain a form of πόλις, and the second parts a form of οἶκος (plur.). In the second half of b the related noun οἰκία appears. Furthermore, there is repetition of εὐφροσύνη, and a reversed repetition in πόλις πλουσία / πλοῦτον πόλεως. ἀρθήσεται may have been supplied

<sup>49</sup> MT: תהנה שם־יהוה בא ממרחק בער אפו וכבד משאה שפתיו מלאו עמ ולשונו כש אכלת. In the LXX ὁ θυμός is rendered ἡ ὀργή τοῦ θυμοῦ.

<sup>50</sup> MT: שפס אביון בשפס ובדבר אביון בשפס. The infinitive ובדבר was probably rendered by λόγους, as well as—via the Aramaic root בדר (“to scatter”)—by καὶ διασκεδάσαι; see section 6.5b.

in parallelism to ἀναβήσεται. The end rhyme and assonance between the two verbs are also striking.

34:4      καὶ πάντα τὰ ἄστροα πεσεῖται ὡς **φύλλα** ἐξ ἀμπέλου  
καὶ ὡς πίπτει **φύλλα** ἀπὸ συκῆς.

Note the ABC/BAC-pattern in πεσεῖται / ὡς / φύλλα // ὡς / πίπτει / φύλλα.

35:1–2    Εὐφράνθητι, **ἔρημος** διψῶσα,  
ἀγαλλιᾶσθω **ἔρημος**  
καὶ ἀνθείτω ὡς κρίνον,  
καὶ ἐξανθήσει καὶ ἀγαλλιᾶσεται τὰ **ἔρημα** τοῦ Ιορδάνου.<sup>51</sup>

In addition to the mesoteleuton of ἔρημος, these verses comprise a chiasmic arrangement of the words ἀγαλλιᾶσθω / ἀνθείτω // ἐξανθήσει / ἀγαλλιᾶσεται.

35:8–9    **ἐκεῖ** ἔσται ὁδὸς καθαρὰ  
καὶ ὁδὸς ἁγία κληθήσεται,  
καὶ οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ **ἐκεῖ** ἀκάθαρτος,  
οὐδὲ ἔσται **ἐκεῖ** ὁδὸς ἀκάθαρτος.  
οἱ δὲ διεσπαρμένοι πορεύσονται **ἐπ' αὐτῆς**  
καὶ οὐ μὴ πλανηθῶσι.  
καὶ οὐκ ἔσται **ἐκεῖ** λέων,  
οὐδὲ τῶν θηρίων τῶν πονηρῶν  
οὐ μὴ ἀναβῇ **ἐπ' αὐτήν**  
οὐδὲ μὴ εὐρεθῇ **ἐκεῖ**,  
ἀλλὰ πορεύσονται **ἐν αὐτῇ** λελυτρωμένοι.

In this strophe five out of the eleven cola include ἐκεῖ (once as a plus), and three a prepositional phrase with αὐτή (twice a plus). Other repetitions concern the words καθαρὸς/ἀκάθαρτος (once a plus), ὁδὸς (once a plus),<sup>52</sup> and πορεύσονται. Something else that typifies this section is the frequent appearance of a negation in variant forms: οὐ μὴ / οὐδέ / οὐ μὴ / οὐκ / οὐδέ / οὐ μὴ / οὐδέ μὴ.

<sup>51</sup> For a note on the translation, see section 7.4.2.

<sup>52</sup> ὁδὸς possibly reflects ὁδῖ, which the MT presents in the subsequent clause.

37:4

εἰσακούσαι **κύριος ὁ θεός σου**  
 οὓς ἀπέστειλε βασιλεὺς Ἀσσυρίων  
 καὶ ὀνειδίζειν **λόγους**,  
 δεηθῇ πρὸς **κύριον τὸν θεόν σου**

τοὺς **λόγους** Ραψακου,  
 ὀνειδίζειν θεὸν ζῶντα  
 οὓς ἤκουσε **κύριος ὁ θεός σου**· καὶ  
 περὶ τῶν καταλελειμμένων τούτων.

Thanks to the plus *πρὸς κύριον τὸν θεόν σου* the divine title *κύριος ὁ θεός σου* is found three times in this verse. The words *εἰσακούσαι* / *λόγους* / *ὀνειδίζειν* // *ὀνειδίζειν* / *λόγους* / *ἤκουσε* are arranged chiasmatically.

43:25–26 ἐγὼ εἰμι ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ἐξαλείφω **τὰς ἀνομίας σου**  
 καὶ οὐ μὴ μνησθήσομαι.  
σύ δὲ μνησθήτι καὶ κριθῶμεν·  
 λέγε **σύ τὰς ἀνομίας σου** πρῶτος, ἵνα δικαιωθῇς.

The addition of *τὰς ἀνομίας σου* and *σύ* has supplied the Greek with two extra repetitions as compared to the Hebrew.<sup>53</sup> Moreover, the verse now contains an AB/CB/CA-pattern in the sequence of the words *τὰς ἀνομίας σου* / *μνησθήσομαι* // *σύ* / *μνησθήτι* // *σύ* / *τὰς ἀνομίας σου*. These repetitions strengthen the opposition in this verse between on the one hand God (ἐγὼ), who does *not* remember the sins of his people, and on the other hand, the people themselves (σύ), who *ought to* remember their own sins.

49:13 εὐφραίνεσθε, οὐρανοί,  
 καὶ ἀγαλλιášθω ἡ γῆ,  
 ῥηξάτωσαν τὰ ὄρη εὐφροσύνην  
 καὶ οἱ βουνοὶ δικαιοσύνην,<sup>54</sup>  
 ὅτι ἠλέησεν ὁ θεὸς **τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ**  
 καὶ τοὺς ταπεινοὺς **τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ** παρεκάλεσεν.

In accordance with other sections in Isaiah that call upon nature or people to rejoice, these lines are also abundantly decorated with word figures.<sup>55</sup> Besides the mesoteleuton of *τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ* / *τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ*, there is a synonymia of *εὐφραίνεσθε*, *ἀγαλλιášθω* and *ῥηξάτωσαν εὐφροσύνην* (see section 8.3.1.2c below). Furthermore, the final two cola are composed chiasmatically: *ὅτι ἠλέησεν ὁ θεὸς / τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ* // *καὶ τοὺς ταπεινοὺς τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ / παρεκάλεσεν*.

<sup>53</sup> MT: אנכי אנכי הוא מכה פשעך למעני וקחתי לך זכר הזכירני נשפטה יחד ספר אתה למען תצדק.

<sup>54</sup> καὶ οἱ βουνοὶ δικαιοσύνην is present in Rahlfs' edition, but is left out in the Göttingen edition. See the footnote in section 8.3.2.1b.

<sup>55</sup> See e.g. 12:4–6; 35:1–2; 42:11–12; 44:23; 45:8; 54:1; and 66:10–11.

59:19 καὶ φοβηθήσονται οἱ ἀπὸ δυσμῶν **τὸ ὄνομα** κυρίου  
καὶ οἱ ἀπ' ἀνατολῶν ἡλίου **τὸ ὄνομα** τὸ ἔνδοξον.<sup>56</sup>

60:17 καὶ ἀντὶ χαλκοῦ **οἶσω σοι** χρυσίον,  
ἀντὶ δὲ σιδήρου **οἶσω σοι** ἀργύριον,  
ἀντὶ δὲ ξύλων **οἶσω σοι** χαλκόν,  
ἀντὶ δὲ λίθων σίδηρον.

### 8.3.1.2 Repetition of words with relaxed word-equivalence

The relaxation of word-equivalence can apply to either the form or the meaning of the repeated word.<sup>57</sup> In the present section I will treat three figures that involve a change of *form*, namely annominatio, polyptoton (derivatio), and synonymia.

#### a. Annominatio

Annominatio or paronomasia is the use of words which sound almost the same but differ in meaning. This creates etymology between the words. The words may be related to each other or not.<sup>58</sup> One example from secular Hellenistic Greek comes from Thucydides 2:62:

ιέναι δὲ τοῖς ἐχθροῖς ὁμοσε μὴ φρονήματι μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ καταφρονήματι

[You must] meet the enemy not only with confidence [φρονήματι] but also with contempt [καταφρονήματι].<sup>59</sup>

Also in LXX Isaiah paronomastic word combinations can be encountered with regularity, some of them newly invented by way of an addition. Of course it is not always easy to ascertain whether such combinations were the product of the translator's artful formulation, or have arisen from mere coincidence. Yet, some instances seem too ingenious to be accidental:

8:18 καὶ ἔσται εἰς σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα **ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ** Ἰσραὴλ  
παρὰ κυρίου σαβαωθ, **ὃς κατοικεῖ ἐν τῷ ὄρει** Σιων.

<sup>56</sup> MT: וַיִּירָאוּ מִמַּעֲרֵב אֶת־שֵׁם יְהוָה וּמִמְזַרְח־שֵׁם אֶת־כְּבוֹדוֹ. Perhaps the translation was also influenced by 24:15 τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου ἔνδοξον ἔσται.

<sup>57</sup> Lausberg, *Handbuch*, 1:322 (§635); idem, *Handbook*, 285 (§635).

<sup>58</sup> Lausberg, *Handbuch*, 1:322 (§637); Lausberg, *Elemente*, 90; Rowe, "Style," 132. In Hebrew grammar the term paronomasia in the first place refers to cases in which a verb is formed of the same root as the noun to which it refers (e.g. יוֹסֵף חָלַם; Gen 37:5); see Lett §79f, and see section 7.5.

<sup>59</sup> Cited from Rowe, "Style," 132.

οἶκω (which is offered by Rahlfs, but is absent in the Göttingen edition)<sup>60</sup> has probably been complemented by the translator—or, more likely, by a later editor—in parallel to ὄρει. He may have opted to add a phonetically similar phrase with the purpose of highlighting the parallelism.

14:31      ὁλολύζετε, **πύλαι πόλεων**,  
κεκραγέτωσαν **πόλεις** τεταραγμένοι, οἱ ἀλλόφυλοι πάντες

The insertion of πόλεων may have been influenced by the phonetical nearness of this noun to πύλαι. Also noticeable is the sound play between κεκραγέτωσαν and τεταραγμένοι.

53:2–3

οὐκ ἔστιν <b>εἶδος</b> αὐτῶ	οὐδὲ δόξα·
καὶ <b>εἶδομεν</b> αὐτόν,	καὶ οὐκ εἶχεν <b>εἶδος</b> οὐδὲ κάλλος·
<u>ἀλλὰ τὸ <b>εἶδος</b> αὐτοῦ</u> ἄτιμον	ἐκλείπον παρὰ πάντας ἀνθρώπους,
ἄνθρωπος ἐν πληγῇ ὦν	καὶ <b>εἰδῶς</b> φέρειν μαλακίαν

These verses, on the despised appearance of the servant of the Lord, show a word play between εἶδος (“form,” “appearance”), εἶδομεν (“we see”) and εἰδῶς (“known with”). Through this paronomasia the paradox in the sentence has been sharpened: “We saw him (εἶδομεν), yet he had no appearance (εἶδος).”

58:13      οὐκ ἀρεῖς τὸν πόδα σου **ἐπ’ ἔργω**  
οὐδὲ λαλήσεις λόγον **ἐν ὀργῇ** ἐκ τοῦ στόματός σου<sup>61</sup>

The resemblance in sound between ἐν ὀργῇ and ἐπ’ ἔργω (displaying a reversal of the *o*- and *e*-sound), gives prominence to the parallelism.

To conclude this section, I will offer one example of paronomasia in LXX Isaiah, which—even though no plus or minus is involved—favours my assumption that the translator loved to play with sounds in his text:

52:7      ὡς **ᾠρα** ἐπὶ τῶν **ὀρέων**,  
ὡς πόδες εὐαγγελιζομένου ἀκοὴν εἰρήνης,  
ὡς εὐαγγελιζόμενος ἀγαθὰ

<sup>60</sup> It is likely that οἶκω has been added by a later editor of the LXX, as the noun is absent in the most important Alexandrian manuscripts (A and Q), while it is supported especially by Hexaplarian and Lucianic witnesses.

<sup>61</sup> MT: וכבדתו מעשות דרכך ממצוא חפצך ודבר דבר. Probably ἐκ τοῦ στόματός σου translates ממצוא חפצך, read in an associative way as מפֿיך מוהוציא מפֿיך.

ὥρα, meaning “spring,” in the Hebrew corresponds to נָחַם—“to be lovely.” The link between these two words was probably formed by ὡραῖος—“beautiful,” “lovely.” In any case, ὥρα assonates rather smoothly with ὀρέων. Besides, it alliterates with ὥς, which is three times a plus. Together the similar sounds in this verse produce a “light-footed” effect.

## b. Polypoton and derivatio

*Polypoton* denotes that a noun or pronoun is repeated in another inflexion (case, gender or number). One speaks of *derivatio* when a verb recurs in a different conjugation. Polypoton and derivatio serve the variation within a text. They occur in all categories of repetition (such as inclusio, anaphora, epiphora).<sup>62</sup> Examples of polypoton and derivatio have already been given in the sections discussing those various categories.

## c. Synonymia

Synonymia is the repetition by way of a word with a different form but a similar meaning.<sup>63</sup> It has the aim of making the public aware of something, and is applied “wenn man glaubt, mit einem einzigen Wort nicht genug an Würde und Größe zum Ausdruck bringen zu können.”<sup>64</sup> Generally, synonymous words do not completely cover each other’s meaning, but show subtle semantic variations. The synonymia can be exploited to illuminate these variations. Synonyms are often joined in coordination, but they can also occur in other kinds of word repetition, such as inclusio, anaphora, epiphora, and reduplicatio.<sup>65</sup>

When in LXX Isaiah a plus accounts for the creation of a synonymous word pair, the synonym may have been added by the translator with the purpose of introducing a word figure. However, some of these “double translations” can also be explained in other ways. A more profound discussion on this issue, as well as more extensive comments on the examples below, are offered in chapter 6 Double translation.

### *Synonymia in geminatio*

Below are listed several examples in LXX Isaiah of two synonyms in coordination (*geminatio*), of which one is a plus:

<sup>62</sup> Lausberg, *Handbuch*, 1:325–29 (§§640–648).

<sup>63</sup> Lausberg, *Handbuch*, 1:330 (§650).

<sup>64</sup> Martin, *Antike Rhetorik*, 306.

<sup>65</sup> Lausberg, *Handbuch*, 1:330–31 (§§650–651).



- 22:18 καὶ ῥίψει σε εἰς χώραν μεγάλην καὶ ἀμέτρητον  
 22:21 καὶ τὸ κράτος καὶ τὴν οἰκονομίαν σου δώσω εἰς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ  
 51:23 καὶ ἐμβαλῶ αὐτὸ εἰς τὰς χεῖρας τῶν ἀδικησάντων σε καὶ τῶν  
ταπεινωσάντων σε  
 57:11 οὐδὲ ἔλαβες με εἰς τὴν διάνοιαν οὐδὲ εἰς τὴν καρδίαν σου;  
 60:5 ὅτι μεταβαλεῖ εἰς σὲ πλοῦτος θαλάσσης καὶ ἐθνῶν καὶ λαῶν.  
 65:2 πρὸς λαὸν ἀπειθοῦντα καὶ ἀντιλέγοντα, οἳ οὐκ ἐπορεύθησαν ὁδῷ ἀληθινῇ<sup>66</sup>

In 9:5(6) both components of the synonymia are pluses:

- 9:5(6) ἐγὼ γὰρ ἄξω εἰρήνην ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄρχοντας, εἰρήνην καὶ ὑγίειαν αὐτῶ.<sup>67</sup>

In places where the Hebrew already contains a synonymous word pair, the LXX has occasionally added an *extra* synonym. The expressive effect of such a cumulation has in some cases been strengthened even further by means of alliteration (see the italicised letters below):

- 2:12 ἐπὶ πάντα ὑβριστὴν καὶ ὑπερήφανον καὶ ἐπὶ πάντα ὑψηλὸν καὶ μετέωρον  
 2:19 εἰς τὰ σπήλαια καὶ εἰς τὰς σχισμὰς τῶν πετρῶν καὶ εἰς τὰς τρώγλας τῆς  
 γῆς  
 8:22 καὶ ἰδοὺ θλιῖψις καὶ στενοχωρία καὶ σκότος, ἀπορία στενὴ καὶ σκότος  
 22:5 ὅτι ἡμέρα ταραχῆς καὶ ἀπωλείας καὶ καταπατήματος καὶ πλάνησις  
 23:18 φαγεῖν καὶ πεινᾶν καὶ ἐμπλησθῆναι  
 34:12 οἳ γὰρ βασιλεῖς αὐτῆς καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες αὐτῆς καὶ οἱ μεγιστᾶνες αὐτῆς  
ἔσονται εἰς ἀπώλειαν.<sup>68</sup>  
 35:10 ἀπέδρα ὁδύνῃ καὶ λύπῃ καὶ στεναγμός.  
 37:3 Ἡμέρα θλίψεως καὶ ἀνειδισμοῦ καὶ ἐλεγμοῦ καὶ ὀργῆς ἢ σήμερον ἡμέρα<sup>69</sup>  
 46:1–2 ὡς φορτίον κοπιῶντι καὶ πεινῶντι καὶ ἐκλελυμένῳ οὐκ ἰσχύοντι ἄμα  
 51:11 ἀπέδρα ὁδύνῃ καὶ λύπῃ καὶ στεναγμός.

### *Synonymia in inclusio*

One example of synonymous words framing a literary unit can be detected in Isa 4:5–6, where God's glory is depicted as overshadowing Israel:

<sup>66</sup> See section 9.4.1.2b.

<sup>67</sup> MT: וְיָשַׁב עַל-כִּסְאוֹ; for an analysis of the translation, see section 6.7a.

<sup>68</sup> MT: וְיָשַׁב עַל-כִּסְאוֹ וְיָשַׁב עַל-כִּסְאוֹ וְיָשַׁב עַל-כִּסְאוֹ. The noun מְלִכּוּת ("kingdom") is most likely reflected by οἱ βασιλεῖς αὐτῆς. For a further explanation of the translation, see section 6.3a.

<sup>69</sup> This verse displays inclusio as well, as it both begins and ends with ἡμέρα.

4:5–6

- 5     καὶ ἥξει,  
καὶ ἔσται πᾶς τόπος τοῦ ὄρους Σιων  
καὶ πάντα τὰ περικύκλῳ αὐτῆς  
σκιᾶσει νεφέλῃ ἡμέρας  
καὶ ὡς καπνοῦ καὶ ὡς φωτὸς πυρὸς καιομένου νυκτός·  
πάσῃ τῇ δόξῃ σκεπασθήσεται·
- 6     καὶ ἔσται εἰς σκιάν ἀπὸ καύματος  
καὶ ἐν σκέπῃ καὶ ἐν ἀποκρύφῳ  
ἀπὸ σκληρότητος καὶ ὕετοῦ.

The second tricolon is framed by the verb forms *σκιᾶσει* and *σκεπασθήσεται*, owing to the addition of *σκιᾶσει*. These two verbs are synonyms, both meaning “to overshadow” or “to cover.” Note that in the final two lines two nouns occur that correspond to these verbs, namely *σκιᾶ* and *σκέπη*.<sup>70</sup>

A further instance can be found in 11:6:

- 11:6     καὶ συμβοσκηθήσεται λύκος μετὰ ἀρνός,  
καὶ πάρδαλις συναναπαύσεται ἐρίφῳ,  
καὶ μοσχάριον καὶ ταῦρος καὶ λέων ἅμα βοσκηθήσονται

### *Synonymia in anaphora*

In the next five cases synonymous expressions form the beginning of successive clauses:

- 22:2     οἱ τραυματῖαι σου οὐ τραυματῖαι μαχαίρας,  
οὐδὲ οἱ νεκροί σου νεκροὶ πολέμου.
- 44:9     οἱ πλάσσοντες καὶ γλύφοντες, πάντες μάταιοι  
οἱ ποιοῦντες τὰ καταθύμια αὐτῶν, ἃ οὐκ ὠφελήσκει αὐτούς·
- 45:25     ἀπὸ κυρίου δικαιοθήσονται  
καὶ ἐν τῷ θεῷ ἐνδοξασθήσονται πᾶν τὸ σπέρμα τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ.
- 49:26     καὶ φάγονται οἱ θλίψαντές σε τὰς σάρκας αὐτῶν  
καὶ πίνονται ὡς οἶνον νέον τὸ αἶμα αὐτῶν  
καὶ μεθυσθήσονται

<sup>70</sup> The synonymia is accentuated by the alliteration of the *σκ*, which is the beginning sound not only of *σκιᾶσει*, *σκεπασθήσεται*, *σκιάν*, and *σκέπη*, but also of *σκληρότητος*. Besides, there is alliteration of the *κ* in *καπνοῦ*, *καιομένου*, and *καύματος*.

59:17 **καὶ ἐνεδύσατο** δικαιοσύνην ὡς θώρακα  
**καὶ περιέθετο** περικεφαλαίαν σωτηρίου ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς  
**καὶ περιβάλετο** ἱμάτιον ἐκδικήσεως

### *Synonymia in epiphora*

An illustration of synonymous phrases appearing at the end of consecutive sentences is afforded by 15:2–3:

15:2–3

<p><i>a</i> <b>λυπεῖσθε</b> ἐφ' ἑαυτοῖς,  <i>b</i> οὐδ' ὁ βωμὸς ὑμῶν,  <i>c</i> ἐπὶ Ναβου τῆς Μωαβίτιδος  <i>d</i> ἐπὶ πάσης κεφαλῆς φαλάκρωμα,  <i>e</i> ἐν ταῖς πλατείαις αὐτῆς  <i>f</i> ἐπὶ τῶν δωματίων αὐτῆς  <i>g</i> πάντες <b>ὀλολύζετε</b> μετὰ κλαυθμοῦ.</p>	<p>ἀπολεῖται γὰρ Λεβηδων·  ἐκεῖ <b>ἀναβήσεσθε κλαίειν</b>·  <b>ὀλολύζετε</b>  πάντες βραχίονες κατατετμημένοι·  <b>περιζώσασθε σάκκους καὶ κόπτεσθε</b>,  καὶ ἐν ταῖς ῥύμαις αὐτῆς</p>
---	--

In LXX Isaiah the first bicolon (*a*) starts, and three following bicola (*b*, *c* and *e*), as well as the final colon (*g*) close with a verb phrase in the sense of “to mourn.” Each of these phrases includes a plural imperative, which is twice a plus in the Greek text.<sup>71</sup> Lines *c*–*f* also show corresponding initial words, namely the prepositions ἐπὶ / ἐπὶ / ἐν / ἐπὶ / ἐν. This repetition may echo the alternation in the Hebrew of על / ב / ב / על as the opening words of four consecutive lines (preceded by a first sentence starting with עלה):

<p>MT:  הבמות לבכי  מואב ייליל  כל-זקן גרועה  חגרו שק  כלה ייליל ירד בבכי</p>	<p>עלה הבית ודיבן  על-נבו ועל מידבא  בכל-ראשיו קרחה  בחוצתיו  על גותיה וברחבתיה</p>
---	---

LXX Isa 40:30 presents a second case of synonyms placed in epiphora:

40:30 πεινάσουσι γὰρ **νεώτεροι**,  
καὶ κοπιάσουσι **νεανίσκοι**

### *Synonymia in reduplicatio*

13:22 καὶ ὀνοκένταυροι ἐκεῖ **κατοικήσουσι**,  
καὶ **γοσσοποιήσουσιν** ἐχῖνοι ἐν τοῖς οἴκοις αὐτῶν.

<sup>71</sup> Possibly λυπεῖσθε ἐφ' ἑαυτοῖς is not a plus but a rendering of עלמה נדמה; see section 6.7b.

51:11 καὶ ἥξουσιν εἰς Σιών μετ' εὐφροσύνης καὶ ἀγαλλιάματος αἰωνίου·  
ἐπὶ γὰρ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτῶν ἀγαλλίασις καὶ αἴνεσις,  
καὶ εὐφροσύνη καταλήμψεται αὐτούς<sup>72</sup>

### 8.3.2 Accumulation

In figures of accumulation words supplement each other semantically. There are two kinds of accumulation: coordinating accumulation and subordinating accumulation.<sup>73</sup>

#### 8.3.2.1 Coordinating accumulation

Coordinating accumulation pertains to the listing of related words, phrases, or clauses. It is distinct from synonymia in that coordinating accumulation has different words express different objects, while in synonymia different words refer to the same object.<sup>74</sup> Two figures in which coordinating accumulation is involved, are enumeratio and distributio.

#### a. Enumeratio

In enumeratio the listed components constitute coordinated parts of a whole. This whole is often an abstract, collective term (for instance “all”), which is not necessarily expressed in the text.<sup>75</sup> Enumerations in the book of Isaiah from time to time seem to have been extended by the translator, as is made clear by the following examples:<sup>76</sup>

3:1–3 Ἰδοὺ δὴ ὁ δεσπότης κύριος σαβαωθ ἀφελεῖ  
ἀπὸ τῆς Ιουδαίας καὶ ἀπὸ Ιερουσαλημ  
ἰσχύοντα καὶ ἰσχύουσιν,  
ἰσχὺν ἄρτου καὶ ἰσχὺν ὕδατος,  
γίγαντα καὶ ἰσχύοντα  
καὶ ἄνθρωπον πολεμιστὴν καὶ δικαστὴν  
καὶ προφήτην καὶ στοχαστὴν καὶ πρεσβύτερον  
καὶ πεντηκόνταρχον καὶ θαυμαστὸν σύμβουλον  
καὶ σοφὸν ἀρχιτέκτονα καὶ συνετὸν ἀκροατὴν·

καὶ ἰσχύοντα has been interpolated as an extra component to this enumeration, which lists all sorts of powerful things. Consequently, five out of the fifteen

<sup>72</sup> For remarks on the translation, see section 6.6.2a.

<sup>73</sup> Lausberg, *Handbuch*, 1:336 (§665).

<sup>74</sup> Lausberg, *Handbuch*, 1:336 (§666).

<sup>75</sup> Lausberg, *Handbuch*, 1:337 (§669).

<sup>76</sup> For a discussion of most of these cases, see section 6.3a.

parts consist of a derivation of ἰσχύω. The translator has probably also left out a translation of כָּל before the third and fourth listed elements (MT כָּל מִשְׁעָן־לְחֶם וְכָל מִשְׁעָן־מִים = LXX ἰσχὺν ἄρτου καὶ ἰσχὺν ὕδατος) in order to balance out the various parts.

3:18–24

The most famous example of enumeratio in Isaiah is probably Isa 3:18–24, the passage on the daughters of Sion and their luxurious jewelry and dresses. The Isaiah translator has translated this pericope in a free way. The Hebrew adornments are often replaced in Greek by names of other kind of luxuries, which may have been more familiar to the Hellenistic public. An additional explanation for some of the many omissions, insertions and variant translations in these verses might be that the translator has attempted to systematise the enumeration: It seems as if he wished to divide the women's property into three categories: jewelry that hangs down, jewelry in the form of a ring, and garments. This division, which is absent in the Hebrew, has been marked in a few places by specific “demarcation words,” namely κόσμος and δόξα:

καὶ ἀφελεῖ κύριος  
τὴν δόξαν τοῦ ἱματισμοῦ αὐτῶν  
καὶ τοὺς κόσμους αὐτῶν

And the Lord will take away  
the glory of their attire,  
and their adornments,

#### ***A. Jewelries that are hanging down***

καὶ τὰ ἐμπλόκια  
καὶ τοὺς κοσύμβους  
καὶ τοὺς μηνίσκους  
καὶ τὸ κάθεμα  
καὶ τὸν κόσμον τοῦ προσώπου αὐτῶν

and the braids,  
and the tassels,  
and the crescents;  
and the necklace,<sup>77</sup>  
and the adornment of their face;

#### ***B. Jewelries having a ring form***

καὶ τὴν σύνθεσιν τοῦ κόσμου τῆς δόξης  
καὶ τοὺς χλιδῶνας  
καὶ τὰ ψέλια  
καὶ τὸ ἐμπλόκιον

and the collection of glorious adornment,  
and the bracelets,  
and the armlets,  
and the braiding [diadem],<sup>78</sup>

<sup>77</sup>Michael van der Meer renders κάθεμα as a “necklace with loose chains hanging down”; with this connotation, the word would fit even better into the category of jewellery that hangs down; see Michael van der Meer, “Trendy Translations in the Septuagint of Isaiah. A Study of the Vocabulary of the Greek Isaiah 3,18–23 in the Light of Contemporary Sources,” in *Die Septuaginta. Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D). Wuppertal 20–23. Juli 2006* (WUNT 219; ed. Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 585.

καὶ τὰ περιδέξια  
καὶ τοὺς δακτυλίους  
καὶ τὰ ἐνώτια

and the bangles,  
and the rings,  
and the earrings;

### C. *Garments*

καὶ τὰ περιπόρφυρα  
καὶ τὰ μεσπορφυρα  
καὶ τὰ ἐπιβλήματα τὰ κατὰ τὴν οἰκίαν  
καὶ τὰ διαφανῆ Λακωνικά  
καὶ τὰ βύσσινα  
καὶ τὰ ὑακίνθινα  
καὶ τὰ κόκκινα  
καὶ τὴν βύσσον  
σὺν χρυσίῳ καὶ ὑακίνθῳ συγκαθυφασμένα  
καὶ θέριστρα κατὰκλιτα.

and the garments trimmed with purple  
and the garments blended with purple;  
and the housecoats  
and the transparent Laconian fabrics;  
and the garments blended of fine linen,  
both the blue ones  
and the scarlet ones;  
and the fine linen  
embroidered with gold and blue thread;  
and the light flowing garments.

### D. *What will come in place of it*

καὶ ἔσται ἀντὶ ὁσμῆς ἡδέας  
κονιορτός,  
καὶ ἀντὶ ζώνης  
σχοινίῳ ζώσῃ  
καὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ **κόσμου** τῆς κεφαλῆς τοῦ χρυσίου  
φαλάκρωμα ἔξεις διὰ τὰ ἔργα σου  
καὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ χιτῶνος τοῦ μεσοπορφύρου  
περιζώσῃ σάκκον.

And instead of a pleasant scent  
there will be dust;  
and instead of a girdle  
you will gird yourself with a rope;  
and instead of a head adornment of gold,  
you will have baldness through your works;  
and instead of a robe blended with purple,  
you will gird yourself about with sackcloth.

8:23(9:1)

Whereas in the MT Isa 8:23(9:1) is composed of a comparative clause mentioning the names of two areas, followed by the main clause in which the names of three areas are given, the translator has rearranged and expanded the text in such a way, that the verse in Greek is made up of only one clause, comprising a series of seven different geographical entities:<sup>79</sup>

MT:

כעת הראשון הקל  
ארצה זבלון  
וארצה נפתלי

<sup>78</sup> According to Michael van der Meer ἐμπλόκιον might denote a kind of a chain that was entwined into the hair. With such a meaning the ἐμπλόκιον would have the form of a ring as well (van der Meer, "Trendy Translations," 590–91).

<sup>79</sup> See for a further discussion on the translation, section 9.4.4.2.

והאחרון הכביד  
 דדר הים  
 עבר הירדן  
 גליל הגוים

LXX: Τοῦτο πρῶτον ποίει, ταχὺ ποίει,  
 χώρα Ζαβουλων,  
 ἢ γῆ Νεφθαλιμ  
 ὁδὸν θαλάσσης  
 καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ οἱ τὴν παραλίαν κατοικοῦντες  
 καὶ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου,  
 Γαλιλαία τῶν ἐθνῶν,  
τὰ μέρη τῆς Ἰουδαίας.

10:17–18 τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἀποσβεσθήσεται  
 τὰ ὄρη καὶ οἱ βουνοὶ καὶ οἱ δρυμοί

21:15 διὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν φευγόντων  
 καὶ διὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν πλανωμένων  
καὶ διὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῆς μαχαίρας  
 καὶ διὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν τοξευμάτων τῶν διατεταμένων  
 καὶ διὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν πεπτωκότων ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ.

The LXX translator has prefixed τὸ πλῆθος to each part of the enumeration and has supplemented it with a fifth constituent.<sup>80</sup>

39:2 καὶ ἔδειξεν αὐτοῖς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ νεχωθα  
καὶ τῆς στακτῆς  
 καὶ τῶν θυμιαμάτων  
 καὶ τοῦ μύρου  
 καὶ τοῦ ἀργυρίου  
 καὶ τοῦ χρυσίου  
 καὶ πάντας τοὺς οἴκους τῶν σκευῶν τῆς γάξης  
 καὶ πάντα, ὅσα ἦν ἐν τοῖς θησαυροῖς αὐτοῦ·  
 καὶ οὐκ ἦν οὐθέν, ὃ οὐκ ἔδειξεν Ἐζεκιᾶς ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ.

This enumeration lays emphasis on the fact that Hezekiah shows the messengers the *entire* range of his treasures. This is stressed even more by the anaphora of καὶ πάντας/καὶ πάντα, and the parenthetic repetitions of ἔδειξεν and τὸν οἶκον/τῷ οἴκῳ.<sup>81</sup>

<sup>80</sup> See sections 8.3.1.1b above, and 6.7c.

<sup>81</sup> For more comments on this translation, see sections 6.3a and 9.4.1.1c.

## b. Distributio

Distributio<sup>82</sup> is the listing of coordinated parts, divided over different cola.<sup>83</sup> In the two instances below the Isaiah translator seems to have amplified this figure by way of an addition:

19:8–10

- 8     καὶ στενάξουσιν οἱ ἄλεῖς,  
       καὶ στενάξουσι πάντες οἱ βάλλοντες ἄγκιστρον εἰς τὸν ποταμόν,  
          καὶ οἱ βάλλοντες σαγήνας  
       καὶ οἱ ἀμφιβολεῖς πενθήσουσι.
- 9     καὶ αἰσχύνῃ λήμψεται τοὺς ἐργαζομένους τὸ λίνον τὸ σχιστὸν  
          καὶ τοὺς ἐργαζομένους τὴν βύσσον,
- 10    καὶ ἔσονται οἱ διαζόμενοι αὐτὰ ἐν ὁδύνῃ,  
       καὶ πάντες οἱ τὸν ζῦθον ποιοῦντες λυπηθήσονται  
       καὶ τὰς ψυχὰς πονέσουσι.<sup>84</sup>

The noun phrase καὶ οἱ ἀμφιβολεῖς—which is perhaps a second translation of מַכְמֶרֶת וּפְרָשִׁי מַכְמֶרֶת, besides οἱ βάλλοντες σαγήνας—may have been inserted by the translator to let verse 8, in conformance with verses 9–10a, contain the names of four professions. While verses 9–10a give four terms denoting weavers and beer makers, verse 8 offers four designations of fishermen. Of all of those professionals it is said that they are in a distressed mood. Both of the two sections—the one about the fishermen as well as the one about the weavers—include the following items:

- a. Four names of professions.
- b. One clause comprising
  - a finite verb + participle *x* + participle object *a*
  - participle *x* + participle object *b*.

In the first section this clause is:

καὶ στενάξουσι πάντες οἱ βάλλοντες ἄγκιστρον εἰς τὸν ποταμόν,  
       καὶ οἱ βάλλοντες σαγήνας

<sup>82</sup> Also called “diaeresis” or “merismus.”

<sup>83</sup> Lausberg, *Handbuch*, 1:340–41 (§675).

<sup>84</sup> MT: ואנו הדיגים ואבלו כל־משליכי ביאור חכה ופרשי מכמרת על־פני־מים אמללו ובשו עבדי פשחים שריקות וארגים. חורי והיו שתתיה מדכאים כל־עשי שכר אגמי־נפש. The translation is set out in section 6.7a.



In the second section this clause is:

καὶ αἰσχύνῃ λήμψεται τοὺς ἐργαζομένους τὸ λίνον τὸ σχιστὸν  
καὶ τοὺς ἐργαζομένους τὴν βύσσον.

- c. A short final colon composed of καί + a plural subject + a finite verb in the third person plural starting with the π.

In the first section this is:

καὶ οἱ ἀμφιβολεῖς πενθήσουσι.

In the second section this is:

καὶ τὰς ψυχὰς πονέσουσι.

- d. Once the word πάντες.<sup>85</sup>

A second illustration of a distributio being elaborated, is afforded by 49:13:

49:13 εὐφραίνεσθε, οὐρανοί, καὶ ἀγαλλιášθω ἡ γῆ,  
ῥηξάτωσαν τὰ ὄρη εὐφροσύνην καὶ οἱ βουνοὶ δικαιοσύνην<sup>86</sup>

The use of distributio lends emphasis to the idea that all nature should rejoice.

### 8.3.2.2 Subordinating accumulation

#### a. Epitheton

Epitheton concerns the addition of an attribute (usually an adjective or an apposition) to a noun with the purpose of ornamenting the text.<sup>87</sup> Although in LXX Isaiah attributes may primarily have been supplied in order to make the text more explicit,<sup>88</sup> in the instances below stylistic motives may also have played a role. This could particularly be true in cases where the added attribute alliterates or assonates with neighbouring words (see the italicised letters in 1:31; 3:16; 7:20; 17:13; and 28:25 below):

<sup>85</sup> Also note the alliteration of the π in these verses, and the anaphora of στενάξουσιν(ν) in verse 8. On the possible influence of Hab 1:14–15 on the rendition, see section 9.4.5.6.

<sup>86</sup> καὶ οἱ βουνοὶ δικαιοσύνην is printed in Rahlfs' edition, but omitted in the Göttingen edition. Ziegler assumes that it has been adopted from Ps 71:3. Although the Alexandrian witnesses are divided on this issue, in some very important ones (i.e. A, Q and Cyr<sup>lem</sup>) the words are absent. Besides, the plus is especially attested by Lucianic manuscripts, which tend to make improvements of a stylistic nature. For these two reasons it is more likely that the plus is an addition by a later editor.

<sup>87</sup> Lausberg, *Handbuch*, 1:341 (§676); Martin, *Antike Rhetorik*, 307; Rowe, "Style," 134.

<sup>88</sup> See section 2.2.

- 1:31 καὶ ἔσται ἡ ἰσχὺς αὐτῶν ὡς **καλάμη στιππύου** καὶ αἱ ἐργασίαι αὐτῶν ὡς **σπινθήρες πυρός**
- 3:16 καὶ τῇ **πορείᾳ τῶν ποδῶν** ἅμα σύρουσαι τοὺς χιτῶνας καὶ τοῖς ποσὶν ἅμα παίζουσαι<sup>89</sup>
- 5:28 οἱ πόδες τῶν ἱππῶν αὐτῶν ὡς **στερεὰ πέτρα** ἐλογίσθησαν<sup>90</sup>
- 5:30 καὶ βοήσεται δι' αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ὡς φωνὴ **θαλάσσης κυμαινούσης**
- 7:20 ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ξυρήσει κύριος **τῷ ξυρῷ τῷ μεγάλῳ** καὶ **μεμεθυμένῳ**, ὃ ἐστι πέραν τοῦ ποταμοῦ βασιλέως Ἀσσυρίων, τὴν κεφαλὴν καὶ τὰς τρίχας τῶν ποδῶν καὶ τὸν πῶγωνα ἀφελεῖ.<sup>91</sup>
- 8:1 Λαβὲ σεαυτῷ **τόμον καινοῦ μεγάλου**<sup>92</sup>
- 17:13 ὡς **χνοῦν ἄχýρου** λικμώντων ἀπέναντι ἀνέμου καὶ ὡς κονιορτὸν τροχοῦ καταγιγίς φέρουσα.<sup>93</sup>
- 19:22 καὶ πατάξει κύριος τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους **πληγῇ μεγάλῃ**
- 28:25 τότε σπείρει **μικρὸν μελάνθιον καὶ κύμανον**
- 30:23 καὶ βοσκηθήσεται σου τὰ κτήνη τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ **τόπον πίονα καὶ εὐρύχωρον**
- 34:13 καὶ ἀναφύσει εἰς τὰς πόλεις αὐτῶν **ἀκάνθινα ξύλα**<sup>94</sup>

## b. Polysyndeton

Polysyndeton is the constant placement of a conjunction between coordinated words, phrases, or clauses.<sup>95</sup> This may produce various effects. On the one hand, it can infuse the text with stateliness, solemnity, or slowness, and on the other hand it can express flow and continuity.<sup>96</sup>

In the LXX of Isaiah it happens regularly that coordinated phrases or clauses display more conjunctions than in the Hebrew. Obviously, one cannot always ascribe these pluses to the translator's wish to create or expand a polysyndeton, since differences in the use of conjunctions can more readily be explained in

<sup>89</sup> MT: וברגליהם תעכסנה תלכנה. הלוך וטפ תלכנה. Perhaps the alliteration of the π in the Greek serves to imitate the "tapping" of the feet.

<sup>90</sup> See also 2:21; 50:7; and 51:1; and see sections 2.2.2 and 9.4.1.2a.

<sup>91</sup> In this verse, four successive word couples alliterate, starting with ξ/ξ; μ/μ; π/π; and π/π. In the Hebrew one can observe alliteration of the ב, which appears four times as the initial consonant of a word.

<sup>92</sup> For the somewhat curious addition of καινοῦ, see Wildberger, *Jesaja*, 1:311.

<sup>93</sup> The many u-sounds in the Greek are in accordance with the Hebrew, which repeats this sound too: in וְדָךְ, רוּחַ, וּכְנַלְגַל, and סוּפָה. Maybe the repetition of the u was meant to imitate the sound of the roaring storm.

<sup>94</sup> MT: ועלתה ארמנתיה סירים. For the relation of the Greek to the Hebrew, see sections 7.6.2a and 2.2.2.

<sup>95</sup> Lausberg, *Handbuch*, 1:345 (§686).

<sup>96</sup> Corbett, *Classical Rhetoric*, 433–34; Martin, *Antike Rhetorik*, 308.

other ways, such as by a deviating *Vorlage*, or by grammatical considerations.<sup>97</sup> Still, the following verses may be convincing as actual cases of the addition of *καί* for reasons of ornamentation, as they show a repetition of the conjunction which is rather prominent and intensifies the message of the text.

### 3:1–3

The MT version of this list—summing up what will be taken away from Judah and Jerusalem—comes to fifteen items, joined by means of not less than ten conjunctions. The Greek has even increased the number of conjunctions, making them twelve. In this manner the large number of things and persons being removed is underlined:

Ἰδοὺ δὴ ὁ δεσπότης κύριος σαβαωθ

ἀφελεῖ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλημ

ἰσχύοντα **καὶ** ἰσχύουσιν,  
γίγαντα **καὶ** ἰσχύοντα  
**καὶ** δικαστὴν **καὶ** προφήτην  
**καὶ** πεντηκόνταρχον  
**καὶ** σοφὸν ἀρχιτέκτονα

ἰσχὺν ἄρτου **καὶ** ἰσχὺν ὕδατος,  
**καὶ** ἄνθρωπον πολεμιστὴν  
**καὶ** στοχαστὴν **καὶ** πρεσβύτερον  
**καὶ** θαυμαστὸν σύμβουλον  
**καὶ** συνετὸν ἀκροατήν.

### 3:18–23

Because of several additions of *καί*, in the enumeration of the jewelry and garments of the daughters of Sion (see section 8.3.2.1a above) all the elements listed are connected by a conjunction in the LXX. The figure of polysyndeton has clearly been used to accentuate the abundance of the women's luxuries.

### 5:5–6

νῦν δὲ ἀναγγελῶ ὑμῖν τί ποιήσω τῷ ἀμπελῶνί μου·

ἀφελῶ τὸν φραγμὸν αὐτοῦ

**καὶ** ἔσται εἰς διαρπαγὴν,

**καὶ** καθελῶ τὸν τοῖχον αὐτοῦ

**καὶ** ἔσται εἰς καταπάτημα,

**καὶ** ἀνήσω τὸν ἀμπελῶνά μου

**καὶ** οὐ μὴ τμηθῇ οὐδὲ μὴ σκαφῇ,

**καὶ** ἀναβήσεται εἰς αὐτὸν ὡς εἰς χέρσον ἄκανθα·

**καὶ** ταῖς νεφέλαις ἐντελοῦμαι τοῦ μὴ βρέξαι εἰς αὐτὸν ὑετόν.

<sup>97</sup> See section 4.1.

Through the twofold addition of *καί* these clauses describing what God will do to his beloved vineyard, are all connected by a conjunction. Maybe this polysyndeton is intended to intensify the expression of God's fierceness and vehemence.

### 8.4 Word figures of omission (*detractio*)

In word figures of omission, sentence elements are left out that normally would be necessary. The aim of this is to give an unexpected turn to the sentence and to achieve an effect of surprise with the reader. The omission also serves the *brevitas* (briefness) of the text,<sup>98</sup> one of the three necessary virtues to which—according to the rules of classical rhetoric—a good composition has to conform.<sup>99</sup> The present paragraph will discuss three such figures: ellipsis, zeugma, and asyndeton, and investigate how these have been used by the Isaiah translator.

#### a. Ellipsis

Ellipsis designates the omission of a word (often a verb) which can easily be understood in the context.<sup>100</sup> A few examples of ellipsis in the Greek where it cannot be encountered in the Hebrew are the following:<sup>101</sup>

9:4(5)

ὅτι πᾶσαν στολὴν ἐπισυνηγμένην δόλω  
καὶ ἱμάτιον μετὰ καταλλαγῆς  
ἀποτείσουσιν

Because every garment acquired by deceit  
and cloak with profit<sup>102</sup>  
they shall repay

<sup>98</sup> Lausberg, *Handbuch*, 1:346 (§688).

<sup>99</sup> These three virtues of a composition are: *narratio brevis*, *narratio aperta* (clarity), and *narratio probabilis* (credibility); see Lausberg, *Handbuch*, 1:168–85 (§§294–334).

<sup>100</sup> Lausberg, *Handbuch*, 1:346 (§690); Corbett, *Classical Rhetoric*, 432; Martin, *Antike Rhetorik*, 300; Rowe, “Style,” 135; Burton, “Silva Rhetoricae” ([rhetoric.byu.edu](http://rhetoric.byu.edu)).

<sup>101</sup> Among the examples offered, only in 10:7, 14 and 58:7 does the ellipsis arise from the omission of an element from an otherwise corresponding Hebrew text. Such cases are not so common. It appears that the translator was rather inclined to make his text more explicit than to make it elliptic (even though he did regularly apply zeugma, see section 8.4b below). In the other examples the ellipsis forms part of a reformulation of the Hebrew.

<sup>102</sup> *NETS* translates *καταλλαγῆς* as “reconciliation,” while it provides in the footnote the option “merchandise.” I have chosen a translation “profit,” though, basing my reasons on the assumption that the translator has interpreted the underlying Hebrew noun דמים as “profit” (compare Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 195).

**και θελήσουσιν**

εἰ ἐγενήθησαν πυρίκαυστοι.

and they will be willing [to do so]

[even] if they have been burned by fire.

MT: כי כל־סאון סאן ברעש ושמלה מגוללה בדמים והיתה לשרפה מאכלת אש

10:7

αὐτὸς δὲ οὐχ οὕτως ἐνεθυμήθη  
καὶ τῇ ψυχῇ οὐχ οὕτως λελόγισται,  
ἀλλὰ **ἀπαλλάξαι ὁ νοῦς αὐτοῦ**<sup>103</sup>  
καὶ τοῦ ἐξολεθρεῦσαι ἔθνη οὐκ ὀλίγα.

But he himself did not plan thus,  
nor has he reasoned thus in his soul;  
but **his mind [planned] to remove,**  
even to destroy utterly nations not a few.

MT: והוא לא־כן ידמה ולבבו לא־כן יחשב כי להשמיד בלבבו ולהכרית גוים לא מעט

10:14

καὶ τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην  
καταλήμψομαι τῇ χειρὶ ὡς νοσσιὰν  
**καὶ ὡς καταλελειμμένα ᾠὰ ἄρῳ**

and the whole world  
I will take with my hand like a nest,  
and seize [her] like forsaken eggs

MT: ותמצא כקן ידי לחיל העמים וכאסף ביצים עזבות כל־הארץ אני אספתי

13:2

**Ἀνοίξατε**, οἱ ἄρχοντες.

**Open [the gates]**, you rulers

MT: ויבאן פתחי נדיבים<sup>104</sup>

13:9

ἰδοὺ γὰρ ἡμέρα κυρίου ἀνίατος  
ἔρχεται **θυμοῦ καὶ ὀργῆς**

For behold, the incurable day of the Lord  
comes, **[a day] of wrath and anger**

MT: הנה יום־יהוה בא אכזרי ועברה וחרון אף

58:7

ἐὰν ἴδῃς γυμνόν, **περίβαλε**

If you see one naked, **clothe [him]**

MT: כִּי־תראה ערם וכסיתו

<sup>103</sup> ἀπαλλάξαι is however a conjecture by Ziegler. Rahlfs has ἀπαλλάξει, in accordance with the manuscripts.

<sup>104</sup> The translator seems to have read פתחי (MT פתחי—“gates”) as though it were פתחו (“open”).

## b. Zeugma

A figure is called zeugma when

one part of speech (most often the main verb, but sometimes a noun) governs two or more other parts of a sentence (often in a series) ... The zeugma figures are of two types: those in which the governing word is the main verb (in which case these are subsequently categorized according to the position of that governing verb), and those in which the governing word is another part of speech (usually the subject noun).<sup>105</sup>

### a. Zeugma in which one verb governs several clauses

On various occasions LXX Isaiah's omission of a verb has resulted in the occurrence of zeugma. One clear instance can be found in 29:16:

29:16

מִלֵּי עֲשֵׂה לְפָנַי  
 וְלֹא יִשְׁמַע  
 וְלֹא יִשְׁמַע  
 וְלֹא יִשְׁמַע

Shall the thing formed say to the one who formed it,  
 "You did not form me";  
 or [shall] the thing made[say] to the one who made it,  
 "You made me with no understanding"?

MT: כִּי־אָמַר מַעֲשֵׂה לַעֲשֹׂהוּ לֹא עָשִׂי וְיִצָּר אֲמַר לְיוֹצְרוֹ לֹא הָבִין

Other examples are to be found in the following verses:

30:1	לַעֲשׂוֹת עֲצָה וְלֹא מִנִּי וְלִנְסֹךְ מִסְכָּה וְלֹא רוּחַ	ἐποιήσατε βουλὴν οὐ δι' ἐμοῦ καὶ συνθήκας οὐ διὰ τοῦ πνεύματός μου
40:12	מִי־מִדֹּד בְּשַׁעֲלוּ מִים וְשָׁמַיִם בִּזְרָח תִּבְנוּ וְכָל בְּשָׁלַשׁ עֶפְרָה אֶרֶץ	Τίς ἐμέτρησε τῇ χειρὶ τὸ ὕδωρ καὶ τὸν οὐρανὸν σπιθαμῇ καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν δρακί; <sup>106</sup>
40:29	נָתַן לֵיעָף כַּח וְלֹאִין אֲוִנִים עֲצָמָה יִרְבֶּה	διδούς τοῖς πεινῶσιν ἰσχὺν καὶ τοῖς μὴ ὀδυνωμένοις λύπην.
43:27	אֲבִיךָ הָרָאשׁוֹן חֲסָא וּמְלִיצִיךָ פִּשְׁעוֹ בִּי	οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν πρῶτοι καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες αὐτῶν ἠνόμησαν εἰς ἐμέ
51:4	כִּי תוֹרָה מֵאֵתִי חֲסָא וּמִשְׁפָּטִי לְאוֹר עַמִּים אֲרָנִיעַ	ὅτι νόμος παρ' ἐμοῦ ἐξελεύσεται καὶ ἡ κρίσις μου εἰς φῶς ἐθνῶν. <sup>107</sup>

<sup>105</sup> Burton, "Silva Rhetoricae" ([rhetoric.byu.edu](http://rhetoric.byu.edu)). Compare also Lausberg, *Handbuch*, 1:347 (§692). In a number of cases zeugma corresponds to a technique which we have earlier designated as "distributive rendering." See sections 7.6.2b and c.

<sup>106</sup> The translator probably read the verb form וְכָל ("and he has enclosed") as וְכָל = "and all" and rendered it καὶ πᾶσαν.

61:11      כי בארץ תוציא צמחה      και ὡς γῆν **αὕξουσας** τὸ ἄνθος αὐτῆς  
                     וכגנה זרועיה **תצמיח**      και ὡς κῆπος τὰ σπέρματα αὐτοῦ

*b. Zeugma in which a single subject governs several verbs or verbal constructions (diazeugma)*

LXX Isa 1:23 illustrates the realisation of diazeugma through the omission of a subject:

1:23

**οἱ ἄρχοντές σου** ἀπειθοῦσι,  
 κοινωνοὶ κλεπτῶν,  
 ἀγαπῶντες δῶρα,  
 διώκοντες ἀνταπόδομα,  
 ὀρφανοῖς οὐ κρίνοντες  
 καὶ κρίσιν χηρῶν οὐ προσέχοντες.

**Your rulers** are disobedient:

companions of thieves,  
 loving gifts,  
 running after a reward,  
 not defending orphans,  
 and not paying attention to the widows' cause.

MT:

וחברי גנבים  
 ורדף שלמנים  
**ורבי אלמנה** לא־יבוא אליהם

**שריך** סוררים  
**כלו** אהב שחד  
 יתום לא ישפטו

In the Hebrew the subject of the first bicolon is שריך—"rulers," which governs two predicates: סוררים and וחברי גנבים. In the second bicolon this subject is resumed by כלו. The final colon has the subject change into רבי אלמנה. The Greek translation, by contrast, maintains the same subject throughout the entire verse: οἱ ἄρχοντές σου governs no less than six predicates. This has been accomplished by the omission of כלו in the third colon, and by the free translation of רבי אלמנה לא־יבוא אליהם as καὶ κρίσιν χηρῶν οὐ προσέχοντες, turning the "rulers" from the object into the subject of this clause too.

Another peculiar detail of this passage is the alliteration in the Greek text. While in the second and fifth/sixth lines one can detect a beginning repetition of the *κ*, in the first line the *ἀ* alliterates. Furthermore, in the third and fourth lines there is a chiasmic alliteration of *ἀ/δ/δ/ἀ*. The translator may have applied this sound repetition in order to compensate for the repetition of sibilants in the Hebrew text.

### c. Asyndeton

Various factors can explain the occasional lack of representation of the Hebrew conjunction ו in the LXX of Isaiah. One of them concerns the tendency for the ו to be overlooked, so that the letter may regularly have been skipped over by a

<sup>107</sup> See for a note on this translation, section 7.6.2c.

Hebrew scribe or by the translator himself.<sup>108</sup> In other cases, the conjunction has been omitted intentionally, for reasons of style. This may happen in the first instance because the Greek language employs the copulative conjunction in a lower frequency than Biblical Hebrew does. In the second instance, the translator may now and then have omitted the *ו* in order to produce or to strengthen an *asyndeton*. This figure—involving the deliberate omission of conjunctions, especially of “and,” between a series of related clauses or phrases—infuses the sentence with a hurried rhythm, and intensifies pathos.<sup>109</sup> The following four cases might exemplify the application of asyndeton by the Isaiah translator:

1:22–23	שריך סוררים וחברי גנבים כלו אהב שחד ורדף שלמנים יתום לא ישפטו ורבי אלמנה לא־יבוא אליהם	οἱ ἄρχοντές σου ἀπειθοῦσι, κοινωνοὶ κλεπτῶν, ἀγαπῶντες δῶρα, διώκοντες ἀνταπόδομα, ὀρφανοῖς οὐ κρίνοντες καὶ κρίσιν χηρῶν οὐ προσέχοντες.
---------	---	--

The corruptness of the leaders is stressed in the LXX by the uninterrupted listing of their offensive features, almost without the use of conjunctions.

14:13–14

Εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀναβήσομαι,  
ἐπάνω τῶν ἄστρων τοῦ θεοῦ θήσω τὸν θρόνον μου,  
καθιῶ ἐν ὄρει ὑψηλῇ ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρη τὰ ὑψηλὰ τὰ πρὸς βορρᾶν,  
ἀναβήσομαι ἐπάνω τῶν νεφελῶν,  
ἔσομαι ὅμοιος τῷ ὑψίστῳ.

MT: השמים אעלה  
ממעל לכוכבי־אל ארים כסאי  
ואשב בהר־מועד בירכתי צפון  
אעלה על־במתי עב  
אדמה לעליון

In this series of five parallel clauses only one starts with a conjunction in the Hebrew. In the LXX even this one is omitted, resulting in a ceaseless torrent of boasting utterances coming from the mouth of the king of Assur.

<sup>108</sup> See section 4.1.

<sup>109</sup> Denniston, *Greek Particles*, xlv; Lausberg, *Handbuch*, 1:353 (§709); Corbett, *Classical Rhetoric*, 433; Rowe, “Style,” 136.



26:20	תְּמַי בֹּא בַּחֲדָרֶיךָ וְגִבֹּרֶתְךָ בַּעֲדָךְ כִּבִּי כַּמְעַרְגָּה עַד־יַעֲבֹר־עָלֶיךָ	βάδιζε, λαός μου, εἴσελθε εἰς τὰ ταμίειά σου, ἀπόκλεισον τὴν θύραν σου, ἀποκρύβηθι μικρὸν ὅσον ὅσον, ἕως ἂν παρέλθῃ ἡ ὁργὴ κυρίου.
-------	--	--

Due to the absence of conjunctions between these four commands in the LXX, the warning to the people to hide themselves acquires a hasty character.

47:1–5

For a final example we will look at Isa 47:1–5, a poem about the humiliation of the daughter of Babylon:

A	Κατάβηθι κάθισον ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, εἴσελθε εἰς τὸ σκότος, ὅτι οὐκέτι προστεθήσῃ κληθῆναι	παρθένος θυγάτηρ Βαβυλῶνος, θυγάτηρ Χαλδαίων, ἀπαλὴ καὶ τρυφερά.
B	λαβέ μύλον, ἀποκάλυψαι τὸ κατακάλυμμά σου, ἀνάστυραι τὰς κνήμας,	ἄλεσον ἄλευρον, ἀνακάλυψαι τὰς πολιάς, διάβηθι ποταμούς.
B'	ἀνακαλυφθήσεται ἡ αἰσχύνῃ σου, τὸ δίκαιον ἐκ σοῦ λήμψομαι, εἶπεν ὁ ῥυσάμενός σε, Ἰσραὴλ	φανήσονται οἱ ὀνειδισμοί σου· οὐκέτι μὴ παραδῶ ἀνθρώποις. κύριος σαβαωθ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, ἅγιος
A'	Κάθισον εἴσελθε εἰς τὸ σκότος, οὐκέτι μὴ κληθήσῃ	κατανενογμένη, θυγάτηρ Χαλδαίων, ἰσχυρὴ βασιλείας.

MT:	בְּתוֹלַת בַּת־בָּבֶל אֵיךְ־כֶּסֶף בַּת־כִּשְׁדִּים רַכָּה וְעַגְגָּה  וְחִנִּי קִמַּח חֲשִׁפִי־שֶׁבֶל עֲבִרִי נְהָרוֹת  גַּם תִּרְאֶה חֲרַפְתָּךְ וְלֹא אֶפְגַּע אָדָם קְדוֹשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל	רַדִּי וְשָׁבִי עַל־עֵפֶר שְׁבִי־לָאֶרֶץ כִּי לֹא תוֹסִיפִי יִקְרְאוּ־לְךָ  קָחִי רַחִים גְּלִי צַמְתֶּךָ גְּלִי־שׁוֹק  תִּגַּל עֲרוֹתֶךָ נִקֵּם אֶקֶח גְּאֻלְנוּ יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת שְׁמוֹ
-----	--	--

וּבֹאֵי בַחֲשָׁךְ בְּתַכְשָׁדִים  
גְּבֵרַת מַמְלָכוֹת

שְׁבִי דוֹמָם  
כִּי לֹא תוֹסִיפִי יִקְרְאוּלֶּךָ

The LXX of these verses is composed as follows: The first strophe (A) is made up of three bicola, the first two of which open with one or two imperative(s) (Κατάβηθι κάθισον / εἴσελθε) addressed to the daughter of Babylon (θυγάτηρ Χαλδαίων), and the last one of which announces how she will no more be called (ὅτι οὐκέτι προστεθήσῃ κληθήσῃ). The second strophe (B) is formed out of six cola that each start with an imperative, among others λαβέ and ἀνακάλυσψαι. After that follows a third strophe (B'), whose first four cola reveal what will happen to the daughter of Babylon—repeating the verbs ἀνακαλύπτω and λαμβάνω from B—while the final two declare from whom these pronouncements derive. The fourth strophe (A') begins, in accordance with the first one, with two bicola governed by an imperative (Κάθισον / εἴσελθε) and ends with declaring how the daughter of Babylon (θυγάτηρ Χαλδαίων) will no more be called (οὐκέτι μὴ κληθήσῃ):

- A    Κατάβηθι κάθισον / εἴσελθε  
      θυγάτηρ Χαλδαίων  
      οὐκέτι προστεθήσῃ κληθήσῃ
- B        λαβέ / ἀνακάλυσψαι
- B'       ἀνακαλυφθήσεται / λήμψομαι
- A'    Κάθισον / εἴσελθε  
      θυγάτηρ Χαλδαίων  
      οὐκέτι μὴ κληθήσῃ

Because the translator omitted no less than four conjunctions, all lines in this song are coordinated asyndetically. This abruptness of the Greek text, even more than the Hebrew, conveys a raw and remorseless atmosphere.

### 8.5 Word figures of transposition (*figurae per ordinem*)

Figures of transposition involve a *change*, especially affecting the arrangement of the words.<sup>110</sup> In this study I will limit myself to discussing only one form of this figure, which features most frequently in Scripture, namely parallelism.

<sup>110</sup> Bullinger, *Figures of Speech*, 6; Lausberg, *Handbuch*, 1:355 (§712).

### 8.5.1 Parallelism

Parallelism is a modern term to denote the similarity of structure in a pair or series of related words, phrases, or clauses.<sup>111</sup> In Hebrew poetry we find parallelism mainly in the figure of *parallelismus membrorum*, which pertains to parallelism between successive clauses. This characteristic feature of Biblical Hebrew poetry is defined by Adele Berlin, a specialist in Hebrew parallelism, as “the repetition of the same or related semantic content and/or grammatical structure in consecutive lines or verses.”<sup>112</sup> A classical figure that more or less corresponds to this, is called an isocolon, although in fact, an isocolon requires the equivalent poetic units not only to possess the same grammatical structure, but also to have the same length (that is, the same number of words or syllables).<sup>113</sup> The Greek rhetor Aquila, however, distinguished between isocolon (similar number of words) and parison, which permits dissimilarity in the number of words.

As noted, parallelism may occur not only between clauses, but also between words or phrases. In line with this, we can classify the figure into two groups:

- a. *Major parallelism*: Two or more consecutive and coordinated *clauses* have the same syntax. See Isa 1:3 “but Israel does not know, my people do not understand.”
- b. *Minor parallelism*: Between several *words* or *phrases* in the same syntactical position there exists a parallel construction in the way they correspond to each other semantically.<sup>114</sup> See Isa 22:5 “For the Lord GOD of hosts has a day of *tumult and trampling and confusion*.”

In either of these two forms, parallelism can be employed in various fashions: besides in isocolon and parison, also in several other figures (some of which have been treated earlier in this chapter), such as synonymia, zeugma, tricolon and chiasmus.

The figure of parallelism can be accentuated by blending it with other strategies:

- *Homoeoteleuton*: The homonymous ending of successive cola.<sup>115</sup>
- *Homoeoptoton*: According to some rhetoricians this means that consecutive parallel cola or commata end with a word in the same case.

<sup>111</sup> Corbett, *Classical Rhetoric*, 429.

<sup>112</sup> Adele Berlin, “Parallelism” in: *ABD* 5 (New York, 1992), 155.

<sup>113</sup> Lausberg, *Handbuch*, 1:360 (§721); Corbett, *Classical Rhetoric*, 429; Rowe, “Style,” 137.

<sup>114</sup> Lausberg, *Elemente*, 111.

<sup>115</sup> Lausberg, *Handbuch*, 1:361–62 (§725).

Others speak of homoeoptoton also when other words in a parallel position or adjacent words have similar case endings.<sup>116</sup>

- *Paromoeosis*: Parallelism of sound between the words of adjacent clauses whose lengths are equal or approximate to one another. The combination of isocolon and assonance.<sup>117</sup>

In the book of Isaiah, just as in all poetic texts of the Hebrew Bible, parallelism between neighbouring phrases and clauses can be observed on a grand scale. The Greek translator of the book has frequently “improved” forms of parallelism, making the constituents in a Hebrew parallel construction even more parallel to each other in Greek. This tendency explains more than a hundred of LXX Isaiah’s pluses and minuses. Some of these have already been set out in the earlier paragraphs,<sup>118</sup> while a substantive number of others will be listed in the subsequent pages.

#### a. Parallelism at clause level

Quite often details have been added or omitted in LXX Isaiah with the purpose of balancing two parallel clauses, while in a few cases a new parallel construction has been introduced:

1:13–14

A	{	x	חדש ושבת	τὰς νομηνίας <u>ὑμῶν</u> καὶ τὰ σάββατα
		y	קרא מקרא	<u>καὶ</u> ἡμέραν μεγάλην
B			לֹא־אוֹכֵל אוֹן וְעֹצְרָה	οὐκ ἀνέχομαι.
A'	{	y'		νηστείαν καὶ ἀργίαν
		x'	חדשיכם ומועדיכם	<u>καὶ</u> τὰς νομηνίας <u>ὑμῶν</u> καὶ τὰς ἐορτὰς ὑμῶν
B'			שנאה נפשי	μισεῖ ἡ ψυχὴ μου.

<sup>116</sup> Lausberg, *Handbuch*, 1:363–64 (§729–731); Rowe, “Style,” 138; Burton, “Silva Rhetoricae” ([rhetoric.byu.edu](http://rhetoric.byu.edu)). See also Martin, *Antike Rhetorik*, 311: Homoeoptoton means “... daß im dem gleichen Satz zwei oder mehr Wörter mit gleichem Kasus gebraucht werden ... Das *ὁμοιόπτωτον* ist an keinen bestimmten Ort des Satzes gebunden. Die Entsprechung kann am Anfang, in der Mitte oder am Schluß stehen. Es gibt auch Variationsmöglichkeiten, so daß die Mitte eines Satzes mit dem Anfang oder das Ende mit der Mitte eines anderen korrespondiert.”

<sup>117</sup> Burton, “Silva Rhetoricae” ([rhetoric.byu.edu](http://rhetoric.byu.edu)); see also Lausberg, *Handbuch*, 1:364 (§732).

<sup>118</sup> This concerns most of the cases mentioned in the paragraphs on synonymia (section 8.3.1.2c), enumeratio, (section 8.3.2.1a), and distributio (section 8.3.2.1b), as well as several mentioned in the paragraphs on the repetition of identical words, e.g. LXX Isa 24:3; 26:2–3; 27:9; 29:13; 44:5; 46:4; 48:5; 49:12; 52:1; 57:4, 6; 60:17; and 63:15.

As a result of the insertion of ὑμῶν both parallel sentences AB and A'B' comprise the expression τὰς νουμηνίας ὑμῶν. They are further balanced out by the addition of καὶ in the second part of A'B' (= x'). Moreover, the transposition of the words νηστεῖαν καὶ ἀργίαν (/ וַעֲצָרָה וְאֶרְגָּל) to the beginning of the second sentence has created a chiasmus within the parallelism, since now καὶ ἡμέραν μεγάλην in AB corresponds to νηστεῖαν καὶ ἀργίαν in A'B' (all being singular nouns), and τὰς νουμηνίας ὑμῶν καὶ τὰ σάββατα in AB to καὶ τὰς νουμηνίας ὑμῶν καὶ τὰς ἑορτὰς ὑμῶν in A'B' (being plurals).

1:15

A	ובפרשכם כפִּיכם	ὅταν τὰς χεῖρας ἐκτείνητε <b>πρὸς με,</b>
B	אעלים עיני מכם	ἀποστρέψω τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς μου <b>ἀφ' ὑμῶν,</b>
A'	גם כִּי־תרבו תפלה	καὶ ἐὰν πληθύνητε τὴν δέησιν,
B'	אינני שמע	οὐκ εἰσακούσομαι <b>ὑμῶν.</b>

In the Greek the insertion of πρὸς με, opposite to ἀφ' ὑμῶν, sharpens the contrast between the people's approach on the one hand and the turning away of God on the other. Besides, now the same number of words is found in A and B, making it a "real" Hellenistic isocolon. The addition of ὑμῶν in the second part of the second bicolon (B') has made this colon more closely parallel to the second part of the first bicolon (B).

1:22–23	סבאך מהול במים שריך סוררים	<u>οἱ κάπηλοι σου</u> μίσγουσι τὸν οἶνον ὕδατι· <u>οἱ ἄρχοντές σου</u> ἀπειθοῦσι <sup>119</sup>
---------	-------------------------------	--

1:31	והיה החסן לנערת ופעלו לניצוח	καὶ ἔσται ἡ ἰσχὺς <u>αὐτῶν</u> ὡς καλάμη <u>στιππύου</u> καὶ αἱ ἐργασίαι <u>αὐτῶν</u> ὡς σπινθῆρες <u>πυρός</u>
------	---------------------------------	--

The parallelism in these two cola has been ameliorated in LXX Isaiah by the addition of the pronoun αὐτῶν to the noun ἰσχὺς in the first line, corresponding to αἱ ἐργασίαι αὐτῶν in the second line. Furthermore, a genitive construction has been created in the second line by way of the plus πυρός, corresponding to the genitive construction καλάμη στιππύου in the first line.

2:4	לֹא־יִשָּׂא גוי אֶל־גוי חרב ולא־יִלְמְדוּ עוד מלחמה	καὶ οὐ λήμψεται <u>ἔτι</u> ἔθνος ἐπ' ἔθνος μάχαιραν, καὶ οὐ μὴ μάθωσιν <u>ἔτι</u> πολεμεῖν.
-----	--	--

<sup>119</sup> The first line in the MT reads "Your wine is mixed with water." LXX Isaiah has changed the passive construction into an active one. See further section 6.5b.

3:12	עמי נגשיו מעולל ונשים משלו בו	λαός μου, οἱ πράκτορες ὑμῶν καλαμῶνται <u>ὑμᾶς</u> , καὶ οἱ ἀπαιτοῦντες κυριεύουσιν ὑμῶν.
	עמי מאשריך מתעים ודרך ארחתיך בלעו	λαός μου, οἱ μακαρίζοντες ὑμᾶς πλανῶσιν <u>ὑμᾶς</u> καὶ τὸν τρίβον τῶν ποδῶν ὑμῶν ταράσσουσιν.

Three of the four parallel lines in the LXX—that is, the first, third and fourth ones—are similar to each other in length, each numbering seven words. The reiteration of the sounds π and κ reinforces the close connection between these clauses.

4:6	וסכה תהיה לצל-יומם מחרב ולמחסה ולמסתור מזרם וממטר	καὶ ἔσται εἰς σκὰν ἀπὸ καύματος καὶ ἐν σκέπη καὶ ἐν ἀποκρύφῳ ἀπὸ σκληρότητος καὶ ὑετοῦ.
-----	---	---

יום may have been omitted in the Greek because the parallel colon does not give an equivalent phrase (“at night”).<sup>120</sup> This verse is richly supplied with the sounds σκ and κ; there is also a sound play between ἀπὸ καύματος and ἀποκρύφῳ.

5:24	לכן כאכל קש לשון אש וחשש להבה ירפה	διὰ τοῦτο ὃν τρόπον καυθήσεται καλάμη <u>ὑπὸ ἄνθρακος πυρὸς</u> καὶ συγκαυθήσεται <u>ὑπὸ φλογὸς ἀνειμένης</u>
------	--	--

The Greek has both parallel clauses end with a prepositional object indicating what will burn the stubble. This object is governed by ὑπό, which is followed by a noun plus an attribute (of which ἀνειμένης in the second clause is a plus).

5:28	אשר חציו שנונים וכל-קשתתיו דרכות פרסות סוסיו כצר נחשבו וגלגליו כסופה	ὧν <u>τὰ βέλη</u> ὀξεῖά ἐστι καὶ <u>τὰ τόξα</u> αὐτῶν ἐντεταμένα, οἱ πόδες <u>τῶν ἵππων αὐτῶν</u> ὡς στερεὰ πέτρα ἐλογίσθησαν, οἱ τροχοὶ <u>τῶν ἀρμάτων αὐτῶν</u> ὡς καταιγίς.
------	---	---

While in the second line כל may have been left out for the sake of parallelism, in the fourth line τῶν ἀρμάτων has been interpolated on the same grounds.

<sup>120</sup> Wildberger, by contrast, thinks that יום is secondary (Wildberger, *Jesaja*, 1:152).

14:6

מכה עמים  
בעברה מכת בלתי סרה  
מרדף רדה באף גוים מרדף  
בלי חשך

πατάξας ἔθνους  
θυμῷ πληγῇ ἀνιάτω,  
παίων ἔθνους  
πληγῇ θυμοῦ, ἣ οὐκ ἐφείσατο

In the Greek version both cola are composed of:

- A participle in the sense of “to beat” (πατάξας resp. παίων).
- The noun ἔθνους.
- The noun πληγῇ (meaning “blow”). This is a plus in the second colon. Both times πληγῇ is modified by an attribute describing the violence of this blow.
- The noun θυμός:

πατάξας	ἔθνους	θυμῷ	πληγῇ		ἀνιάτω
παίων	ἔθνους		πληγῇ	θυμοῦ	ἣ οὐκ ἐφείσατο

Apart from the plus πληγῇ, there is a minus in that there is no translation of מרדף. This also can be explained by a desire to upgrade the parallelism, for if מרדף had been rendered, it might have been considered to have spoiled an otherwise neat parallelism.

17:3 ונשבת מבצר מאפרים      καὶ οὐκέτι ἔσται ὄχυρά τοῦ καταφυγεῖν Εφραιμ,  
וממלכה מדמשק      καὶ οὐκέτι ἔσται βασιλεία ἐν Δαμασκῷ

The addition of οὐκέτι ἔσται has ameliorated the parallelism, as well as having generated anaphora.

17:13

A	x	ורדף כמץ הרים	καὶ πόρρω αὐτὸν διώξεται <u>ὡς χνοῦν ἀχύρου</u>
	y	לפני־רוח	ליχμῶντων ἀπέναντι ἀνέμου
B	x'	וכגלגל	καὶ <u>ὡς κονιορτόν τροχού</u>
	y'	לפני סופה	καταιγὶς <u>φέρουσα</u> .

In fact, this text is not more parallel in the LXX than in the MT, but the translation clearly illustrates that the translator, albeit rephrasing the text, tried to preserve the parallelistic construction of it. ἀχύρου (“chaff”) rather than representing הרים, probably stems from that a wheel itself can hardly be “blown up” by the storm, the translator has placed κονιορτόν (“dust”) in front of τροχός, (thus making “dust of a wheel” of it), parallel to χνοῦν preceding ἀχύρου in the first part (A). Also λιχμῶντων in the first part has received a parallel in the second one, namely in φέρουσα.

In the first three cola homoeoptoton/ homoeoteleuton can be observed in that they each close with a genitive noun ending on -οῦ. The same sound returns

in the fourth colon (y') in φέρουσα, and is also present in χνοῦν in the first colon (x). Besides, in part A the α-sound comes up repeatedly at the beginning of words, namely in ἀχύρου, ἀνέμου and ἀπέναντι.

19:22

ונגף יהוה את־מצרים נגף ורפוא	καὶ πατάξει κύριος τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους πληγῇ μεγάλῃ καὶ ἰάσεται <u>αὐτούς ἰάσει</u>
---------------------------------	--

Where the MT offers only one sentence, the LXX has made two parallel clauses out of it.

22:2    חלל־ך לא חלל־יחרב ולא מתי מלחמה	οἱ τραυματῖαι σου οὐ τραυματῖαι μαχαίρας, οὐδὲ <u>οἱ νεκροὶ σου</u> νεκροὶ πολέμου.
--	--

22:18

ושמה מרכבות כבודך קלון בית אדניך	καὶ θήσει τὸ ἄρμα σου τὸ καλὸν εἰς ἀτιμίαν καὶ τὸν οἶκον τοῦ ἄρχοντός σου <u>εἰς καταπάτημα</u>
-------------------------------------	--

The occurrence of καὶ θήσει implies that the translator has perceived ושמם (“and there”) as a form of the root שים—“to put.” קלון (“O you disgrace”) he has taken to be the closing word of the preceding sentence, where he translated it as εἰς ἀτιμίαν. Parallel to εἰς ἀτιμίαν, he has supplemented εἰς καταπάτημα to the second line. Both lines in the LXX cover fifteen syllables, which makes this parallelism an isocolon.

23:4                    לא־חלתי ולא־ילדתי	Οὐκ ὤδινον <u>οὐδὲ</u> ἔτεκον
ולא גדלתי בחורים רוממתי בתולות	<u>οὐδὲ</u> ἐξέθρεψα νεανίσκους <u>οὐδὲ</u> ὕψωσα παρθένους.

In Greek each part of the first bicolon numbers two words, and each part of the second one three. Both bicola exhibit homoeoteleuton.

29:15                    הוי המעמיקים מיהוה לסתר עצה היה במחשך מעשיהם	οὐαὶ οἱ βαθέως <u>βουλὴν</u> ποιοῦντες <u>καὶ</u> οὐ διὰ κυρίου. <u>οὐαὶ</u> οἱ ἐν κρυφῇ <u>βουλὴν</u> ποιοῦντες <u>καὶ</u> ἔσται ἐν σκότει τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν
--	--

29:16    כי־אמר מעשה לעשהו לא עשני ויצר אמר ליוצרו לא הבין	μὴ ἔρεῖ τὸ πλάσμα τῷ πλάσαντι Οὐ σύ <u>με ἔπλασας</u> ; ἢ τὸ ποίημα τῷ ποιήσαντι Οὐ συνετῶς <u>με ἐποίησας</u> ;
---	---



This parallelistic construction attracts extra attention by its repetition of sounds:

μή ἐρεῖ ἡ	τὸ πλάσμα τὸ ποίημα	τῷ πλάσαντι τῷ ποιήσαντι	Οὐ σύ Οὐ συνετῶς	με ἐπλάσας με ἐποίησας
29:22	לא-עתה יבוש יעקב ולא עתה פניו יחורו	Οὐ νῦν αἰσχυνθήσεται <b>Ἰακωβ</b> , οὐδὲ νῦν τὸ πρόσωπον μεταβαλεῖ <b>Ἰσραηλ</b> .		
30:1	לעשות עצה ולא מני ולנסך מסכה ולא רוחי	ἐποίησατε βουλήν οὐ <b>δι'</b> ἐμοῦ καὶ συνθήκας οὐ <b>διὰ</b> τοῦ πνεύματός μου		

30:10–11

1	אשר אמרו לראים	A	οἱ λέγοντες τοῖς προφήταις
2	לא תראו	x	B Μὴ ἀναγγέλλετε <b>ἡμῖν</b> ,
3	ולחזים	A'	καὶ τοῖς τὰ ὀράματα ὁρῶσι
4	לא תחזוֹלנוּ נבחות	y	B' Μὴ λαλεῖτε <b>ἡμῖν</b> ,
5	דברוֹלנוּ חלקות	y'	ἀλλὰ <b>ἡμῖν</b> λαλεῖτε
6	חזו מהתלות	x'	καὶ ἀναγγέλλετε <b>ἡμῖν</b> ἑτέραν πλάνησιν
7	סורו מניִדוך	z	καὶ ἀποστρέψατε <b>ἡμῶς</b> ἀπὸ τῆς ὁδοῦ ταύτης,
8	הטו מניִארח	z'	ἀφέλετε <b>ἀφ' ἡμῶν</b> τὸν τρίβον τοῦτον
9	השביתו מפנינו את־קדוש ישראל	z''	καὶ ἀφέλετε <b>ἀφ' ἡμῶν</b> τὸν ἅγιον τοῦ Ἰσραηλ.

The first four lines of 30:10–11 relate to each other in a parallel manner (AB/A'B'), while the second, fourth, fifth and sixth lines constitute a chiasmus, due to the LXX alteration of the verbs ἀναγγέλλω and λαλέω (xy/y'x'). Within the fourth and fifth lines (y and y') a chiasmus can be distinguished as well: λαλεῖτε / ἡμῖν // ἡμῖν / λαλεῖτε. The final three lines (z/z'/z'') are parallel to each other, and also to the preceding sixth line (x'). All four are governed by a plural imperative starting with the αἰ, succeeded by a pronoun in the first person plural (which is three times a plus) and an object.

30:16	ותאמרו לֹא־כִי עַל־סוֹס נָוֹס עַל־כֵּן תִּנּוּסוֹן	<b>ἀλλ' εἶπατε</b> 'Εφ' ἵππων φευξόμεθα· διὰ τοῦτο φεύξεσθε·
	ועל-קל נרכב על-כן יקלו דרפּיכם	<b>καὶ εἶπατε</b> 'Επὶ κούφοις ἀναβάται ἐσόμεθα· διὰ τοῦτο κοῦφοι ἔσονται οἱ διώκοντες ὑμᾶς·
30:17	אלף אחד מפני גערת אחד מפני גערת חמשה תנסו	διὰ φωνὴν ἐνὸς <b>φεύγονται</b> χίλιοι, καὶ διὰ φωνὴν πέντε <b>φεύγονται</b> πολλοί·

31:1

הוי הירדים מצרים לעזרה  
על-סוסים ישענו  
ויבטחו על-רכב  
כי רב  
ועל פרשים  
כיעצמו מאד  
ולא שעו על-קדוש ישראל  
ואת-יהוה לא דרשו

Οὐαὶ οἱ καταβαίνοντες εἰς Αἴγυπτον ἐπὶ βοήθειαν,  
οἱ ἐφ' ἵπποις **πεποιθότες**  
**καὶ ἐφ' ἄρμασιν,**  
**ἔστιν γὰρ πολλὰ,**  
**καὶ ἐφ' ἵπποις,**  
**πληθὺς σφόδρα,**  
καὶ οὐκ ᾔσαν **πεποιθότες** ἐπὶ τὸν ἅγιον τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ  
καὶ τὸν θεὸν οὐκ ἐξεζήτησαν.

The two bicola in the centre of this verse (printed in bold) are balanced in the LXX by the omission of ויבטחו. The deletion of this verb entails that both lack a verb and are still dependent on **πεποιθότες** in the previous colon. Furthermore, each of them ends with a word expressing abundance; these adjectives—**πολλὰ** and **σφόδρα**—display paromoeosis. Finally, a clause containing the participle **πεποιθότες** follows as well as precedes the two, providing the verse with a chiasmic structure.<sup>121</sup>

32:5 לא-יקרא עוד לנבל נדיב  
ולכילי לא יאמר שוע

καὶ **οὐκέτι** μὴ εἴπωσι τῷ μωρῷ ἄρχειν,  
καὶ **οὐκέτι** μὴ εἴπωσιν οἱ ὑπηρέται σου Σίγα.

34:1 קרבו גוים לשמע  
ולאמים הקשיבו

**Προσαγάγετε,** ἔθνη,  
καὶ **ἀκούσατε,** ἄρχοντες·

תשמע הארץ ומלאה  
תבל וכל-צאצאיה

ἀκουσάτω ἡ γῆ καὶ οἱ ἐν αὐτῇ,  
ἡ οἰκουμένη καὶ ὁ λαὸς ὁ ἐν αὐτῇ.

35:2 כבוד הלבנון נתן-לה  
והשרון הדר הכרמל

καὶ ἡ δόξα τοῦ **Λιβάνου** ἐδόθη αὐτῇ  
καὶ ἡ τιμὴ τοῦ **Καρμύλου**

38:14 כסוס עגור כן אצפף  
אהגה כיונה

ὡς χελιδών, **οὕτως** φωνήσω,  
καὶ ὡς περιστερά, **οὕτως** μελετήσω·

40:3 קול קורא  
במדבר פנו דרך יהוה  
ישרו בערבה מסלה לאלהינו

φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ  
Ἔτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου,  
εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν·

The LXX interpretation of this famous verse deviates slightly from the MT. In contrast to the MT, the translator has regarded **במדבר** as belonging to the clause **קול קורא** rather than to **פנו דרך יהוה**. Consequently, from the perspective of the

<sup>121</sup> These two clauses are chiasmic in relation to each other as well: ἐφ' ἵπποις / πεποιθότες // πεποιθότες / ἐπὶ τὸν ἅγιον τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ.

translator בערבה in the third line did not have a counterpart in the parallel second line. This may have prompted him to leave out a rendering of בערבה.

- 40:4 כל-גיא ינשא כל-הר וגבעה ישפלו  
והיה העקב למישור והרכסים לבקעה
- 40:5 ונגלה כבוד יהוה וראו כל-בשר יחדו
- 40:30 ויעפו נערים ויגעו
- 41:11 הן יבשו ויכלמו כל הנחרים בך יהיו כאין ויאבדו אנשי ריבך
- 43:26 הזכירני נשפטה יחד ספר אתה למען תצד
- 44:4 וצמחו בבין חציר כערבים על-יבלי-ימים
- 44:11 יתקבצו כלם יעמדו יפחדו יבשו יחד
- 46:6 ישכרו צורף ויעשה אל יסגדו אף-ישתחוו<sup>125</sup>
- πᾶσα φάραγξ πληρωθήσεται  
καὶ πᾶν ὄρος καὶ βουνὸς ταπεινωθήσεται,  
καὶ ἔσται πάντα τὰ σκολιὰ εἰς εὐθεΐαν  
καὶ ἡ τραχεῖα εἰς ὁδούς λείας.
- καὶ ὀφθήσεται ἡ δόξα κυρίου,  
καὶ ὄψεται πᾶσα σὰρξ τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ.<sup>122</sup>
- πεινάσουσι γὰρ νεώτεροι,  
καὶ κοπιήσουσι νεανίσκοι
- ἰδοὺ αἰσχυνηθήσονται καὶ ἐντραπήσονται  
πάντες οἱ ἀντικείμενοί σοι·  
ἔσονται γὰρ ὡς οὐκ ὄντες καὶ ἀπολοῦνται  
πάντες οἱ ἀντίδικοί σου.<sup>123</sup>
- σὺ δὲ μνησθήτι  
καὶ κριθῶμεν·  
λέγε σὺ τὰς ἀνομίας σου πρῶτος,  
ἵνα δικαιωθῇς.
- καὶ ἀνατελοῦσιν ὡσεὶ χόρτος ἀνά μέσον ὑδάτος  
καὶ ὡς ἰτέα ἐπὶ παραρρέον ὑδωρ.<sup>124</sup>
- συναχθήτωσαν πάντες  
καὶ στήτωσαν ἄμα,  
ἐντραπήτωσαν καὶ αἰσχυνηθήτωσαν ἄμα.
- καὶ μισθωσάμενοι χρυσοχόον  
ἐποίησαν χειροποίητα  
καὶ κύψαντες  
προσκυνοῦσιν αὐτοῖς.

<sup>122</sup> יחדו may have been read as יהוה and translated τοῦ θεοῦ.

<sup>123</sup> 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> supports the LXX: כול אנשי ריבכה; see section 12.3.1.1.

<sup>124</sup> Perhaps ὡσεὶ was not added, but derived from the ב in בבין, read as ב.

<sup>125</sup> 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> gives ישכרו צורף ויעשה אל (see section 12.3.1.2). Possibly LXX Isaiah's reading derives from a Vorlage reading ישכרו צורף ויעשו אל.



50:4	יעיר בבקר בבקר יעיר לי און לשמע כלמודים	ἔθῃκέ <u>μοι</u> πρώι, προσέθηκέ <u>μοι</u> ὥτιον ἀκούειν.
50:8	מי־יריב אתי נעמדה יחד מי־בעל משפטי יגש אלי	τίς ὁ κρινόμενός <u>μοι</u> ; ἀντιστήτω <u>μοι</u> ἅμα. καὶ τίς ὁ κρινόμενός <u>μοι</u> ; ἐγγισάτω <u>μοι</u> .
50:9	הן כלם כבגד יבלו עש יאכלם	ἰδοὺ πάντες ὑμεῖς ὥς ἱμάτιον παλαιωθήσεσθε, καὶ ὥς σῆς καταφάγεται ὑμᾶς.
54:6	כי־כאשה עזובה ועצובת רוח קראך יהוה ואשת נעורים כי תמאס אמר אליך	οὐχ ὥς γυναῖκα καταλελειμμένην καὶ ὀλιγόψυχον κέκληκέ σε κύριος οὐδ' ὥς γυναῖκα ἐκ νεότητος μεμισημένην, εἶπεν ὁ θεός σου.
54:7–8		
1	ברגע קטן עזבתך	χρόνον <u>μικρόν</u> κατέλιπόν σε
2	וברחמים גדלים אקבצך	καὶ μετὰ ἐλέους μεγάλου ἐλεήσω σε,
3	בשצף קצף הסתרתני פני <u>רגע</u> מך	ἐν θυμῷ <u>μικρῷ</u> ἀπέστρεψα τὸ πρόσωπόν μου ἀπὸ σοῦ
4	ובחסד עולם תיחמתך	καὶ ἐν ἐλέει αἰωνίῳ ἠλέησά σε

In addition to the omission of רגע from the third line (possibly for reason that it is not paralleled by adverbs modifying the verb phrase in the other clauses), these four lines have in the Greek been made more similar to each other by the repetition of several words: μικρόν/μικρῷ in the first and third lines, and ἐλέους/ἐλέει and ἐλεήσω σε/ἠλέησά σε (note the paronomasia) in the second and fourth lines.

56:10	A	צפו עורים כלם	ἴδετε ὅτι πάντες ἐκτετύφλωνται,
	B	לא ידעו	οὐκ ἔγνωσαν <u>φρονῆσαι</u> ,
	A'	כלם כלבים אלמים	πάντες κύνες ἐνεοί,
	B'	לא יוכלו לנבח	οὐ δυνήσονται <u>ύλακτεῖν</u>

The translator has brought this pair of bicola more into balance by means of two subtle moves. In the first place he has supplied an infinitive form φρονῆσαι in B, parallel to ύλακτεῖν in B'; secondly, he has rendered צפו (read צפוי—'his

watchers”) in A as ἴδετε ὅτι, thus making כלם = πάντες into the subject of the clause, parallel to A’.

- 57:11 ואֶת־מִי דֹאגַת וּתִירָאִי      τίνα εὐλαβηθεῖσα ἐφοβήθης;  
 כִּי תִכְזֹּבִי      καὶ ἐψεύσω με<sup>128</sup>  
 וְאוֹתִי לֹא זָכַרְתָּ      καὶ οὐκ ἐμνήσθης μου  
 לֹא־שָׁמַת עַל־לִבְךָ      οὐδὲ ἔλαβες με εἰς τὴν διάνοιαν  
    οὐδὲ εἰς τὴν καρδίαν σου;
- 59:9 נָקוּה לְאוֹר      ὑπομεινάντων αὐτῶν φῶς  
 וְהִנֵּה־חָדָשׁ      ἐγένετο αὐτοῖς σκότος,  
 לִגְגָהּוֹת      μείναντες αὐγὴν  
 בַּאֲפִלּוֹת נֶהְלַךְ      ἐν ἁωρίᾳ περιεπάτησαν.
- 60:19 לֹא־יִהְיֶה־לְךָ עוֹד הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ      καὶ οὐκ ἔσται σοι ὁ ἥλιος  
 לְאוֹר יוֹמָם      εἰς φῶς ἡμέρας,  
 וּלְגִגָּה הַיָּרֵחַ      οὐδὲ ἀνατολὴ σελήνης  
 לֹא־יֵאִיר לְךָ      φωτιεῖ σοι τὴν νύκτα<sup>129</sup>
- 60:20 לֹא־יָבֹוא עוֹד שֶׁמֶשׁךָ      οὐ γὰρ δύσεται ὁ ἥλιός σοι,  
 וַיִּרְחַךְ לֹא יֵאָסֶף      καὶ ἡ σελήνη σοι οὐκ ἐκλείψει.<sup>130</sup>
- 62:8 אִם־אַתָּן אֶת־דִּגְגֶנְךָ עוֹד      Εἰ ἔτι δώσω τὸν σῆτόν σου  
 מֵאֵכָל לְאִיבֶיךָ      καὶ τὰ βρώματά σου τοῖς ἐχθροῖς σου,  
 וְאִם־יֵשְׁתוּ בְּנִי־נֹכַר תִּירוּשָׁךְ      καὶ εἰ ἔτι πίνονται υἱοὶ ἀλλότριον τὸν οἶνόν σου  
 אֲשֶׁר יִגְעַת בּוֹ      ἐφ’ ᾧ ἐμόχθησας.
- 65:1 נִדְרַשְׁתִּי לָלוּא שְׂאֵלוֹ      Ἐμφανὴς ἐγενόμην τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ζητοῦσιν,  
 נִמְצָאתִי לָלוּא בִקְשָׁנִי      εὐρέθην τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ἐπερωτῶσιν.
- 66:16 כִּי בָאֵשׁ יִהְיֶה נִשְׁפָּט      ἐν γὰρ τῷ πυρὶ κυρίου κριθήσεται πᾶσα ἡ γῆ  
 וּבִחְרָבוֹ אֶת־כָּל־בָּשָׂר      καὶ ἐν τῇ ῥομφαίᾳ αὐτοῦ πᾶσα σάρξ;

<sup>128</sup> The translator may have conceived the verb ending י in תִּכְזֹּבִי as an object suffix of the first person singular. See also section 6.6.2a.

<sup>129</sup> 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> accords with the LXX: לֹא יִהְיֶה לְךָ הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ לְאוֹר יוֹמָם וּלְגִגָּה הַיָּרֵחַ לֹא יֵאִיר לְךָ (see section 12.3.1.1).

<sup>130</sup> In 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> עוֹד is missing correspondingly: לֹא יָבֹוא שֶׁמֶשְׁךָ (see section 12.3.1.2).

*b. Parallelism at word or phrase level*

Parallel constructions at word or phrase level have also regularly been “improved” in LXX Isaiah:

2:12	כי יום ליהוה צבאות על כל-גאה ורם ועל כל-נשא	ἡμέρα γὰρ κυρίου σαβαωθ ἐπὶ πάντα <u>ὑβριστὴν καὶ ὑπερήφανον</u> καὶ ἐπὶ πάντα <u>ὑψηλὸν καὶ μετέωρον</u>
------	---	---

The insertion of *καὶ μετέωρον* has provided the second colon with a synonymous word pair, parallel to the previous one. Moreover, the plus in the Greek has caused the two cola to contain an equal number of syllables (thirteen). This verse also affords an example of homoeoteleuton, namely in the adjectives *ὑπερήφανον* and *μετέωρον*.

4:5	וברא יהוה על כל-מכון הר-ציון ועל-מקראה ענן יומם	καὶ ἥξει, καὶ ἔσται <u>πᾶς</u> τόπος τοῦ ὄρους Σιων καὶ <u>πάντα</u> τὰ περικύκλω αὐτῆς σκιάσει νεφέλη ἡμέρας
-----	--	--

13:14	והיה כצבי מדח וכצאן ואין מקבץ	καὶ ἔσονται οἱ καταλελειμμένοι ὡς δορκάδιον <u>φεύγον</u> καὶ ὡς πρόβατον <u>πλανώμενον</u> , καὶ οὐκ ἔσται ὁ συνάγων
-------	--	--

29:7	והיה כחלום חזון לילה המון כל-הגוים הצבאים על-אריאל וכל-צביה ומצדתה והמציקים לה	καὶ ἔσται ὡς ὁ ἐνυπνιαζόμενος ἐν ὕπνῳ ὁ πλοῦτος τῶν ἐθνῶν <u>πάντων</u> , <u>ἄσσοι</u> ἐπεστράτευσαν <u>ἐπὶ</u> Αριηλ, καὶ <u>πάντες</u> οἱ στρατευσάμενοι <u>ἐπὶ</u> Ἱερουσαλημ καὶ <u>πάντες</u> οἱ συνηγμένοι <u>ἐπ’</u> αὐτήν καὶ θλίβοντες αὐτήν.
------	---	---

In the final four parallel cola of this verse, the first and second correspond as regards their use of the verb *στρατεύω* followed by *ἐπὶ* plus a geographical name (owing to the rendering of the suffix ה in צביה as Ἱερουσαλημ in the second colon); the second and third agree giving *πάντες* plus a participle in the nominative plural starting with an σ. The third and the fourth lines have in common that they both end with *αὐτήν*.

29:10	ויעצם את־עיניכם את־הנביאים ואת־ראשיכם החזים כסה	καὶ καμμύσει τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς <b>αὐτῶν</b> καὶ τῶν προφητῶν <b>αὐτῶν</b> καὶ τῶν ἀρχόντων <b>αὐτῶν</b> , οἱ ὁρώντες τὰ κρυπτά.
30:17	עד אִם־נותרתם כתִּן על־ראשׁ ההר וכנס על־הגבעה	ἕως ἂν καταλειφθῇτε ὥς ἰστὸς <b>ἐπ' ὄρους</b> καὶ ὥς σημαίαν φέρων <b>ἐπὶ βουνοῦ</b> .
35:2	המה יראו כבוד־יהוה הדר אלהיִן	καὶ ὁ λαὸς μου ὄψεται <b>τὴν δόξαν κυρίου</b> καὶ <b>τὸ ὕψος τοῦ θεοῦ</b> .
51:22	הנה לקחתי מידך את־כוס התרעלה את־קבעת <u>כוס</u> חמתִי ל־אִתּוֹסִיפִי לשתותה עוד	Ἴδου εἴληφα ἐκ τῆς χειρός σου <b>τὸ ποτήριον τῆς πτώσεως,</b> <b>τὸ κόνδυ τοῦ θυμοῦ,</b> καὶ οὐ προσθήσῃ ἔτι πιεῖν αὐτό.

For additional instances of the creation or extension of parallelism at phrase level, see the sections on synonymia (8.3.1.2c) and enumeratio (8.3.2.1a).

*c. Parallelism between the beginning lines of successive sections*

In LXX Isa 21 the beginning lines of several consecutive sections show a parallel pattern.

In the MT Isa 21 can be separated into five sections, each opening with a messenger formula. The initial words of these formulae—being מֵשָׁא and כִּי־כֹה אָמַר—display an ABAAB sequence:

21:1	מֵשָׁא מְדַבְּרִים	A
21:6	כִּי כֹה אָמַר אֵלֵי אֲדָנִי	B
21:11	מֵשָׁא דוֹמָה	A'
21:13	מֵשָׁא בַעֲרָב	A''
21:16	כִּי־כֹה אָמַר אֵלֵי אֲדָנִי	B'

In the LXX a similar alternation can be observed, with the difference that מֵשָׁא בַעֲרָב in verse 13 is not represented in the Greek. This has resulted in merely four sections introduced by a messenger formula—the third and fourth sections having been combined into one. As a consequence, the four remaining opening sentences in LXX Isaiah are related to each other in a parallel way:



21:1	Τὸ ὄραμα τῆς ἐρήμου.	A
21:6	ὅτι οὕτως εἶπε κύριος πρὸς με	B
21:11	Τὸ ὄραμα τῆς Ἰδουμαίας.	A'
21:16	ὅτι οὕτως εἶπέ μοι κύριος	B'

### 8.5.2 Tricolon

One speaks of a “tricolon” if there are three rather than two parallel phrases or clauses of the same length in a series.<sup>131</sup> It is hard to discover any “true” tricolon in LXX Isaiah being generated or improved by way of a plus or a minus—that is, one that counts exactly the same number of words or syllables in all three of its components—yet, without this restriction, there are various examples to be found of the amelioration or production of threefold parallelistic constructions in the translation. A few of these will be offered below.<sup>132</sup>

#### a. Tricolon at clause level

1:25	καὶ ἐπάξω τὴν χειρὰ μου ἐπὶ σὲ καὶ πυρώσω σε εἰς καθαρὸν,  <b>τοὺς δὲ ἀπειθοῦντας ἀπολέσω</b> <b>καὶ ἀφελῶ πάντας ἀνόμους ἀπὸ σοῦ</b> <b>καὶ πάντας ὑπερηφάνους ταπεινώσω.</b>
------	---

MT:  
ואשיבה ידי עליך  
ואצרף כבר סיגך  
ואסירה כל-בדילך

Albeit in a different fashion, the Hebrew and Greek versions each contain a tricolon. While in the Hebrew it embodies the verse as a whole, in LXX Isaiah it concerns the last three clauses, the third one of which has been added. The first two lines of the LXX tricolon correspond to each other chiasmatically.<sup>133</sup>

22:16	כי־חצבת לך פה קבר חצבי מרום קברו חקקי בסלע משכן לו	ὅτι ἐλατόμησας <b>σεαυτῷ</b> ὥδε μνημεῖον καὶ ἐποίησας <b>σεαυτῷ</b> ἐν ὑψηλῷ μνημεῖον καὶ ἔγραψας <b>σεαυτῷ</b> ἐν πέτρᾳ σκηνήν;
-------	--	---

**σεαυτῷ** in the second line might be a rendering of the suffix ך in קברו rather than a plus. However that may be, the translator may have opted for this particular translation in order to align the three clauses.

<sup>131</sup> Lausberg, *Handbuch*, 1:364–65 (§733).

<sup>132</sup> For an additional case of tricolon ameliorated by the translator, see 57:4 in section 8.3.1.1b above.

<sup>133</sup> For an inquiry into the translation, see section 9.3.1,

24:2	והיה כעם ככהן	καὶ ἔσται ὁ λαὸς ὡς ὁ ἱερεὺς
	כעבד כאדניו	καὶ ὁ παῖς ὡς ὁ κύριος
	כשפחה כגברתה	καὶ ἡ θεράπαινα ὡς ἡ κυρία,
	כקונה כמוכר	ἔσται ὁ ἀγοράζων ὡς ὁ πωλῶν
	כמלוה כלוה	καὶ ὁ δανείζων ὡς ὁ δανειζόμενος
	כנשה כאשר נשא בו	καὶ ὁ ὀφείλων ὡς ὃ ὀφείλει.

This verse is composed of two tricola, the first one describing three hierarchical relationships, and the second one three commercial relationships. LXX Isaiah has marked the transition to the second tricolon by means of the repetition of ἔσται. In the Greek all six cola contain six words, except for the first one that has seven words. Besides, it displays polysyndeton, resulting from a fourfold addition of καί.

34:14–15

אֲנִי־שֶׁם הַרְגִיעָה לַיְלִית	ἐκεῖ ἀναπαύσονται ὀνοκένταυροι,
וּמִצֵּאָה לֵה מְנוּחַ	εὖρον γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἀνάπαυσιν.
שֶׁמָּה קִנְנָה קִפּוּז	ἐκεῖ ἐνόσσευσεν ἐχῖνος,
וּתְמַלֵּט וּבִקְעָה וּדְגָרָה בַצֵּלָה	καὶ ἔσωσεν ἡ γῆ τὰ παιδία αὐτῆς μετὰ ἀσφαλείας
אֲנִי־שֶׁם נִקְבְּצוּ דְיוֹת	ἐκεῖ ἔλαφοι συνήνησαν
אִשָּׁה רַעוּתָהּ	καὶ εἶδον τὰ πρόσωπα ἀλλήλων.

By virtue of the creation of an extra colon, LXX Isa 34:14–15 incorporates three bicola, all starting with ἐκεῖ. The first parts of these each comprise three words.

44:19	וּלֹא־יֵשִׁיב אֶל־לְבוֹ	καὶ οὐκ ἐλογίσατο τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ
	וּלֹא דַעַת	οὐδὲ ἀνελογίσατο ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ αὐτοῦ
	וּלֹא־תִבּוֹנָה	οὐδὲ ἔγνω τῇ φρονήσει

*b. Tricolon at word or phrase level*

43:10	לִמְעַן תִּדְעוּ	ἵνα γνῶτε
	וּתְאִמְּנוּ <u>לִי</u>	καὶ πιστεύσητε
	וּתְבִינוּ	καὶ συνῆτε
	כִּי־אֲנִי הוּא	ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι

The lack of representation of לִי has made this series of three parallel verb phrases an actual tricolon, with each of its members numbering two words.

The next cases of tricolon have been set out earlier as examples of synonymia or enumeratio.<sup>134</sup>

- 8:22            καὶ ἰδοὺ θλίψις καὶ στενοχωρία καὶ σκότος  
 10:17–18      τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἀποσβεσθήσεται τὰ ὄρη καὶ οἱ βουνοὶ καὶ οἱ  
                   δρυμοὶ  
 23:18           φαγεῖν καὶ πιεῖν καὶ ἐμπλησθῆναι<sup>135</sup>  
 34:12           οἱ γὰρ βασιλεῖς αὐτῆς καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες αὐτῆς καὶ οἱ  
                   μεγιστᾶνες αὐτῆς ἔσονται εἰς ἀπώλειαν.  
 35:10=51:11   ἀπέδρα ὀδύνη καὶ λύπη καὶ στεναγμός.

### 8.5.3 Chiasmus

The term “chiasmus” is applied when in the second of two coordinate clauses the grammatical units of the first part are repeated in inverted order (AB/BA).<sup>136</sup> Chiasmus is a modern denotation, invented only in the nineteenth century. In antiquity the word *χιασμός* was used with a different meaning.<sup>137</sup>

The Hebrew Bible frequently employs the figure of chiasmus, especially with the aim of accentuating a contrast (antithesis).<sup>138</sup> Two other functions of chiasmus are:

- To express synonymia or to mark a unity of which the extremes are mentioned (merism).
- To announce a change of subject, or to bring a subject to an end; this is contrary to parallelism, which rather indicates continuation.<sup>139</sup>

When the adjacent clauses in a chiasmus do not just reverse the syntactical order of words, but also *repeat* the reversed words, this is called “antimetabole.”<sup>140</sup> The following Bible verse can illustrate this figure.<sup>141</sup>

<sup>134</sup> See sections 8.3.1.2c and 8.3.2.1a.

<sup>135</sup> Also the Hebrew text contains a tricolon here, but not entirely equivalent to the Greek one: לֹא־כָל לְשִׁבְעָה וּלְמַכְסָּה עֵתִיק (see section 9.4.1.2). Perhaps the translator has introduced an alternative tricolon in order to compensate for the Hebrew figure.

<sup>136</sup> Lausberg, *Handbuch*, 1:361 n.1 (§723); Rowe, “Style,” 137.

<sup>137</sup> Lausberg, *Handbuch*, 1:361 n.1 (§723): “Der Terminus *χιασμός* bezieht sich bei Herm.inv.4,3 nur auf den (ohne Bedeutungsänderung der Gesamtperiode) überkreuzweise durchführbaren Austausch der ganzen Kola in einer aus four Kola bestehenden Periode ... , nicht auf die Stellung der Satzglieder innerhalb der Kola.” See also Lausberg, *Handbuch*, 2:893.

<sup>138</sup> Bullinger, *Figures of Speech*, 317.

<sup>139</sup> Le Moigne, “Livre d’Ésaïe,” 452–87.

<sup>140</sup> Corbett, *Classical Rhetoric*, 437; see also Lausberg, *Elemente*, 129.

<sup>141</sup> Bullinger, *Figures of Speech*, 317.

And the Lord had regard for Abel and his offering,  
But for Cain and his offering, he had no regard (Gen 4:4–5).

It is needless to say that in the book of Isaiah we can also find plentiful instances of chiasmus and antimetabole. Here again the Greek translator has occasionally “upgraded” such cases by way of an addition or an omission, and has now and then realised a new chiastic construction. How he did this can be viewed in the instances below:

*a. Chiasmus at clause level*

8:21–22      ופנה למעלה      *καὶ ἀναβλέψονται εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἄνω*  
                  ואל-ארץ יביט      *καὶ εἰς τὴν γῆν κάτω ἐμβλέψονται*

The Greek contains two pluses: εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν has been added in the first line, parallel to εἰς τὴν γῆν in the second line, while in the second line κάτω is inserted, parallel to ἄνω in the first line. Both sentences comprise the same number of words in the Greek.

9:17      כִּי־בַעֲרָה כֹּאשׁ רִשְׁעִי      *καὶ καυθήσεται ὡς πῦρ ἡ ἀνομία*  
                  שִׁמְרִי וְשִׁית תֹּאכֹל      *καὶ ὡς ἄγρωστις ξηρὰ βρωθήσεται ὑπὸ πυρός.*

LXX Isaiah’s rephrasing of the second colon has made this clause form a chiasmus with the preceding one.

Due to the alteration of (συγ)καίω and πῦρ, verses 17–18 have a chiastic word pattern (ABB/A/ABA) as well:

*καὶ καυθήσεται ὡς πῦρ ἡ ἀνομία*  
*καὶ ὡς ἄγρωστις ξηρὰ βρωθήσεται ὑπὸ πυρός.*  
*καὶ καυθήσεται ἐν τοῖς δάσεσι τοῦ δρυμοῦ,*  
*καὶ συγκαταφάγεται τὰ κύκλω τῶν βουνῶν πάντα.*  
*διὰ θυμὸν ὀργῆς κυρίου συγκέκασται ἡ γῆ ὅλη,*  
*καὶ ἔσται ὁ λαὸς ὡς ὑπὸ πυρός κατακεκαυμένος.*

Also the arrangement of ὡς, πῦρ, and ὑπό is noteworthy:

ὡς πῦρ / ὡς / ὑπὸ πυρός / ὡς ὑπὸ πυρός

13:22

וְעֵנָה אֵיִים בְּאַלְמְנוּתָיו      *καὶ ὀνοκένταυροι ἐκεῖ κατοικήσουσι,*  
                  תִּנְיִם בְּהִיכְלֵי עֲנָנִים      *καὶ νοσσοποιήσουσιν ἐχθῖνοι ἐν τοῖς οἴκοις αὐτῶν.*

In κατοικήσουσι and νοσσοποιήσουσιν paromoeosis can be observed, brought about by the assonance of οι and ή, and the similar ending of the two verbs.

14:29	כִּי־מִשְׁרַשׁ נַחֵשׁ יֵצֵא צַפֵּעַ וּפְרִי שֶׁרֶף מְעוֹפֵף	ἐκ γὰρ σπέρματος ὄφεων <u>ἐξελεύσεται ἔκγονα</u> ἀσπίδων, καὶ τὰ <u>ἔκγονα</u> αὐτῶν <u>ἐξελεύσονται</u> ὄφεις πετόμενοι.
-------	--	--

The repeated words in LXX Isaiah establish an antimetabole (ABC/CBA).

18:6	וְקֶץ עָלִיו הָעִיט וְכָל־בְּהֵמַת הָאָרֶץ עָלִיו תַּחֲרֹץ	καὶ συναχθήσεται ἐπ' αὐτούς <u>τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ,</u> καὶ <u>πάντα τὰ θηρία τῆς γῆς</u> <u>ἐπ' αὐτόν ἵξει.</u> <sup>142</sup>
19:6–7	דָּלּוּ וַחֲרָבוּ יֵאֵרִי מִצּוֹר קִנְהָ וְסוֹף קִמְלוּ עֲרוֹת עַל־יְאֹוֹר עַל־פִּי יְאֹוֹר וְכָל מְזֹרַע יְאֹוֹר יִיבֹשׁ נֶדֶף וְאִינָנוּ	καὶ <u>ξηρανθήσεται</u> <u>πᾶσα</u> συναγωγὴ ὕδατος <u>καὶ ἐν παντί ἔλει</u> καλάμου καὶ παπύρου. καὶ τὸ ἄχι τὸ χλωρὸν <u>πᾶν</u> τὸ κύκλω τοῦ ποταμοῦ καὶ <u>πᾶν</u> τὸ σπειρόμενον διὰ τοῦ ποταμοῦ <u>ξηρανθήσεται</u> ἀνεμόφθορον.

In the final two of these five lines, a pair of words from the first line, *πᾶς* and *ξηραίνω*, return in reverse order (antimetabole). *πᾶς* is present in the other two cola as well. As a result of these repetitions, an ABB/BBA word recapitulation has been realised in this verse: *ξηρανθήσεται / πᾶσα / παντί // πᾶν / πᾶν / ξηρανθήσεται*. Also from a syntactical perspective these five lines are related to each other chiasmatically, as both exterior cola contain a verb, while all interior cola lack a verb, and are dependent on the previous respectively ensuing clause.<sup>143</sup>

19:23	וּבִא־אֲשׁוּר בַּמִּצְרַיִם וּבַמִּצְרַיִם בִּאֲשׁוּר	καὶ <u>εἰσελεύσονται</u> Ἀσσύριοι εἰς Αἴγυπτον, καὶ Αἰγύπτιοι <u>πορεύσονται</u> πρὸς Ἀσσυρίους
-------	--	--

According to its syntax, this isocolon can be patterned ABC/BAC: verb / subject / prepositional object // subject / verb / prepositional object. From a semantical point of view, however, it displays an ABC/CAB sequence: To go / Assyrians / Egypt // Egyptians / to go // Assyrians.

<sup>142</sup> The addition of τοῦ οὐρανοῦ may additionally have taken place in harmonisation with τοῖς πετεινοῖς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ in the preceding sentence.

<sup>143</sup> Note also the alliteration between πᾶσα συναγωγὴ in the first line and πᾶν τὸ σπειρόμενον in the final line, and the beginning repetition of the π throughout the entire passage.



Additionally, an ABC/CAB pattern of word repetition can be viewed in the first and third line in οἱ πλάσσοντες / καὶ γλύφοντες / πάντες // πάντες / οἱ πλάσσοντες / καὶ γλύφοντες. The plus οἱ ποιοῦντες forms an anaphoric synonymia with οἱ πλάσσοντες:

1	οἱ πλάσσοντες καὶ γλύφοντες	πάντες μάταιοι
2	οἱ ποιοῦντες τὰ καταθύμια αὐτῶν,	ἃ οὐκ ὠφελήσει αὐτούς·
3	<b>ἀλλὰ αἰσχυνθήσονται</b>	πάντες οἱ πλάσσοντες θεόν
		καὶ γλύφοντες ἀνωφελῆ,
4	καὶ πάντες ὅθεν ἐγένοντο	<b>ἐξηράνθησαν</b>
		<b>καὶ κωφοὶ ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπων·</b>

44:13	חרשׁ עצים נטה קו יתארהו בשדד	ἐκλεξάμενος τέκτων ξύλον <b>ἔστησεν αὐτὸ ἐν μέτρῳ</b> <sup>145</sup> καὶ ἐν κόλλῃ <b>ἐρρύθμισεν αὐτό</b>
-------	------------------------------------	--

45:3	ונתתי לך אוצרות חשך ומטמני מסתרים	<b>καὶ δώσω σοι</b> θησαυροὺς σκοτεινοὺς, ἀποκρύφους ἀοράτους <b>ἀνοίξω σοι</b>
------	--------------------------------------	--

65:6–7	לא אֶחָשׂוּ כִּי אֶסְלַמְתִּי וּשְׁלַמְתִּי עַל־חִיקִם עוֹנֵתִיכֶם וְעוֹנֵת אֲבוֹתֵיכֶם יַחַד אמר יהוה  אשר קטרו על־ההרים ועל־הגבעות חרפוני ומדתי פעלם <b>ראשנה</b> על־חִיקִם	Οὐ σιωπήσω, ἕως ἂν <b>ἀποδῶ εἰς τὸν κόλπον αὐτῶν</b>  τὰς ἀμαρτίας αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν πατέρων αὐτῶν, λέγει κύριος,  οἱ ἐθυμίασαν ἐπὶ τῶν ὀρέων καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν βουνῶν ὠνείδισάν με, <b>ἀποδώσω τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν</b> <b>εἰς τὸν κόλπον αὐτῶν.</b>
--------	--	---

The first and the final sentences reveal an ABC/ACB-structure:

ἀποδῶ / εἰς τὸν κόλπον αὐτῶν / τὰς ἀμαρτίας αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν πατέρων αὐτῶν  
ἀποδώσω / τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν / εἰς τὸν κόλπον αὐτῶν.

Perhaps in order to align these two sentences even more, the Hebrew words ושלמתי, ועונתי, and יחדו, and ראשנה have not been translated.

The bicolon in between the two members of the chiasmus is in itself composed in a chiasmic way as well:

οἱ ἐθυμίασαν / ἐπὶ τῶν ὀρέων // καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν βουνῶν / ὠνείδισάν με.

<sup>145</sup> 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> has חרשׁ עצים נטה קו (see section 12.3.1.1).





22 (κάτω / ἄνω); 13:22 (κατοικήσουσι / νοσσοποιήσουσιν); 19:23 (εἰσελεύσονται / πορεύσονται); 31:1 (πολλά / σφόδρα); 32:13 (ἀναβήσεται / ἀρθήσεται); 47:2 (ἀνακάλυψαι / ἀνάσσει); and 63:15 (ὁ ζῆλος σου / τὸ πλῆθος τοῦ).

Now and then, the translator might possibly have adjusted a parallel structure to the conditions to which the Hellenistic isocolon had to meet, that is, by making the members of the parallelism similar in length (according to their number of words or syllables). This may have happened in 5:28; 22:2; 23:4; 26:2; 40:30; 46:10; 47:3; 48:15; 49:11, 23; 50:8; 57:4, 6; and 60:17 above.

In addition to cases of “improvement,” we can find a few examples of *newly created* parallelisms in LXX Isaiah, in places where the Hebrew does not present this figure: see 19:22; 22:18; 40:5; and 46:8. Apart from that, there are some instances in which the translator has supplemented an existing parallelism with an extra constituent: see 2:12; 8:22; 10:18; 23:18; 26:2; 34:12; 35:10; 51:11; and 57:11.

### 8.6 Repetition of clauses: the refrain

While in the preceding paragraphs we have examined different kinds of *word* figures, the present section will treat one figure at another level, that is at the level of clauses. This figure that will be discussed concerns the stylistic device of the *refrain*. The application of this device involves the repetition of the same clause at the end of successive paragraphs (strophes, stanzas), with as its purpose the demarcation of the various segments of a poem.<sup>149</sup> In common with poetry from all cultures and centuries, the refrain is employed frequently in Biblical Hebrew verse. A well-known example can be found in Ps 42–43, in the verses 42:5, 11 and 43:5:

Why are you cast down, O my soul,  
and why are you disquieted within me?

It is typical of the Hebrew refrain that the repeated lines disguise slight variations. These usually have a specific function, for instance to serve the variation within the poem, or to highlight the distinct elements. Also in the book of Isaiah we encounter this strategy. The Greek translation, however, has regularly “smoothed away” those differences, supposedly with the aim of restoring the repetition. A few examples of this tendency will follow here.<sup>150</sup>

<sup>149</sup> George B. Gray, *The Forms of Hebrew Poetry. Considered with Special Reference to the Criticism and Interpretation of the Old Testament* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1915), 189; Theodore H. Robinson, *The Poetry of the Old Testament* (2nd ed; New York: AMS Press, 1977), 43–44.

<sup>150</sup> See also section 5.2.

**2:10**

In the Hebrew text of Isa 2 several strophes conclude with the following refrain:

מפני פחד יהוה  
ומהדר גאון  
בקומו לערץ הארץ

This refrain can be found in verses 19 and 21, and also in verse 10, although there the final part (לערץ הארץ בקומו) is missing in the MT. In the LXX this line has been supplemented, however, so that verse 10 is exactly identical to verses 19 and 20:

ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ φόβου κυρίου  
καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς δόξης τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ,  
ὅταν ἀναστῇ θραῦσαι τὴν γῆν.

**5:7**

In the song of the vineyard (Isa 5:1–7) the first and second strophe (verses 1–2 and 3–4, respectively) end with clauses that are almost identical to each other. Also the final line of the fourth strophe (verse 7) starts in a similar way, that is with ויקו. However, whereas in verses 2 and 4 two forms of עשה follow, in verse 7 this verb is entirely missing. This disruption of the pattern may have encouraged the LXX translator to add τοῦ ποιῆσαι and ἐποίησε in verse 7:

5:2	ויקו לעשות ענבים ויעש באשים	καὶ ἔμεινα τοῦ ποιῆσαι σταφυλήν, <u>ἐποίησε δὲ ἀκάνθας.</u>
5:4	מדוע קויתי לעשות ענבים ויעש באשים	διότι ἔμεινα τοῦ ποιῆσαι σταφυλήν, <u>ἐποίησε δὲ ἀκάνθας.</u>
5:7	ויקו למשפט והנה משפט	<u>ἔμεινα τοῦ ποιῆσαι</u> κρίσιν, <u>ἐποίησε δὲ ἀνομίαν</u>

**30:5–6**

The first two strophes of Isa 30 encompass verses 1–5 and 6–7. In the LXX the middle of the second strophe seems to have been adjusted to the similar conclusion of the first strophe through the supply of the words αὐτοὺς εἰς βοήθειαν, ἀλλὰ εἰς αἰσχύνην καὶ ὄνειδος:

30:4–5	... μάτην κοπιάσουσι πρὸς λαόν, <b>δς οὐκ ὠφελήσει αὐτοὺς</b> <b>οὔτε εἰς βοήθειαν οὔτε εἰς ὠφέλειαν,</b> <b>ἀλλὰ εἰς αἰσχύνην καὶ ὄνειδος.</b>
--------	---

30:6–7

... πρὸς ἔθνος **ὃ οὐκ ὠφελήσκει αὐτοὺς εἰς βοήθειαν,**  
**ἀλλὰ εἰς αἰσχύνην καὶ ὄνειδος.**

Αἰγύπτιοι μάταια καὶ κενὰ ὠφελήσουσιν ὑμᾶς·  
 ἀπάγγελον αὐτοῖς ὅτι Ματαία ἡ παράκλησις ὑμῶν αὕτη.

**52:3–5**

In Isa 52:3–5 divine speech is introduced four times by way of a messenger formula. The LXX translator has harmonised these opening lines to each other by each time using a mere κύριος for the divine name, omitting יְיָ in the second formula:

כִּי־כֹה אָמַר יְהוָה  
 חָנַם נִמְכַּרְתֶּם  
 וְלֹא בַכֶּסֶף תִּגְאָלוּ

כִּי כֹה אָמַר אֲדֹנָי יְהוָה  
 מִצָּרִים יִרְדֵּעֲמִי בְרֹאשׁוֹנָה  
 לְגֹור שָׁם  
 וְאִשׁוּר בְּאַפִּס עֲשָׂקוּ  
 וְעַתָּה מִי־לִי־פָה

נְאֻם־יְהוָה  
 כִּי־לִקַּח עָמִי חָנַם  
 מִשְׁלֹי יְהִלְלִי

נְאֻם־יְהוָה  
 תִּתְמִיד כָּל־הַיּוֹם  
 שְׁמִי מְנַאֵם

**ὅτι τάδε λέγει κύριος**

Δωρεάν ἐπράθητε  
 καὶ οὐ μετὰ ἀργυρίου λυτρωθήσεσθε.

**οὕτως λέγει κύριος**

Εἰς Αἴγυπτον κατέβη ὁ λαός μου τὸ πρότερον  
 παροικῆσαι ἐκεῖ,  
 καὶ εἰς Ἀσσυρίους βία ἤχθησαν·  
 καὶ νῦν τί ὧδέ ἐστε;

**τάδε λέγει κύριος.**

ὅτι ἐλήμφθη ὁ λαός μου δωρεάν,  
 θαυμάζετε καὶ ὀλολύζετε·

**τάδε λέγει κύριος.**

δι' ὑμᾶς διὰ παντὸς  
 ὄνομά μου βλασφημεῖται τοῖς ἔθνεσι.

**23:13**

A possible case of a *newly invented* refrain, occurs in 23:13. Nearly at the end of this verse the clause οὐδὲ ἐκεῖ σοι ἀνάπαυσις ἔσται, which already appeared at the end of 23:12 in part of the Greek manuscript tradition,<sup>151</sup> turns up a second time, thus forming a kind of a refrain:

23:12

Οὐκέτι μὴ προσθῆτε τοῦ ὑβρίζειν  
 καὶ ἀδικεῖν τὴν θυγατέρα Σιδῶνος·  
 καὶ ἐὰν ἀπέλθῃς εἰς Κιτιεῖς,  
**οὐδὲ ἐκεῖ σοι ἀνάπαυσις ἔσται·**

<sup>151</sup> Ziegler has not adopted this plus in his edition, assuming that the words may have been extrapolated from verse 12. The clause is absent in the Alexandrian witness Q, yet in some other important representatives of the Alexandrian recension, including A and S, it is present. It may be secondary, however, as the clause interrupts the continuation of the Greek text.

23:13           καὶ εἰς γῆν Χαλδαίων,  
καὶ αὕτη ῥήμωται ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀσσυρίων,  
οὐδὲ ἐκεῖ σοι ἀνάπαυσις ἔσται,  
ὅτι ὁ τοῖχος αὐτῆς πέπτωκεν.

### 8.7 The deletion of rhetorical figures

In the earlier part of this chapter I presented a substantial number of cases of the improvement or creation of rhetorical figures in the LXX of Isaiah, trying to convince the reader that the Isaiah translator was apt to ornament his text with such figures of speech. However, this study would not give a complete picture of the translation if I did not also pay attention to those instances in which word figures have by contrast been *deleted*, because the deletion of rhetorical figures also seems to have occurred regularly in LXX Isaiah, particularly in relation to repetition. Especially striking is the attitude of the Isaiah translator towards the figure of *geminatio*. Geminatio is the immediate repetition of a word or a phrase,<sup>152</sup> such as, for instance, in Isa 40:1 “Comfort, comfort my people.” In the Hebrew text of Isaiah this kind of repetition has been used quite a number of times; I counted thirty-five examples of it (6:3; 8:9; [15:1]; 21:7, 9, 11; 24:16; 25:7; 26:3, 15; 27:1; 28:10 [2x], 13 [2x], 16; 29:1; 38:11, 19; 40:1; 43:11, 25; 48:11, 15; 51:9, 12, 17; 52:1, 11; 57:6, 14, 19; 62:10 [2x]; and 65:1). It is worth noting that, contrary to other kinds of repetition, in the Greek Isaiah no further examples can be found of *geminatio*; that is, examples which are not attested in the Hebrew text, but have been established by the translator himself. Moreover, as many as twenty-two of the thirty-five cases of *geminatio* noted have been removed in the Greek translation. Mostly this has been done by simply leaving out one of the two repeated items:<sup>153</sup>

21:9	נפלה נפלה בבל	Πέπτωκε Βαβυλῶν
21:11	שמר מה-מלילה שמר מה-מליל	Φυλάσσετε ἐπάλλξεις.
25:7	פני-הלוט הלוט על-כל-העמים	παράδος ταῦτα πάντα τοῖς ἔθνεσιν.
26:3	יצר סמוך תצר שלום שלום	ἀντιλαμβανόμενος ἀληθείας καὶ φυλάσσων εἰρήνην.
28:10	כי צו לצו צו לצו קו לקו קו לקו	θλίψιν ἐπὶ θλίψιν προσδέχου, ἐλπίδα ἐπ’ ἐλπίδι
28:13	צו לצו צו לצו קו לקו קו לקו	θλίψις ἐπὶ θλίψιν, ἐλπίς ἐπ’ ἐλπίδι
28:16	פנת יקרת מוסד מוסד	ἔντιμον εἰς τὰ θεμέλια αὐτῆς
29:1	הוי אריאל אריאל	Οὐαὶ πόλις Αριηλ

<sup>152</sup> See Lausberg, *Handbuch*, 1:312 (§616).

<sup>153</sup> For comments on the translation of these verses, see section 7.3.1.

38:11	לֹא־אֵרָאָה יְהוָה יְהוָה	Οὐκέτι μὴ ἴδω τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ
	בִּארְץ הַחַיִּים	ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς
38:19	חַי הוּא יוֹדֵךְ	οἱ ζῶντας εὐλογῇσουσί σε
43:11	אֲנֹכִי אֲנֹכִי יְהוָה	ἐγὼ ὁ θεός
48:11	לִמְעַנִּי לִמְעַנִּי אַעֲשֶׂה	ἐνεκεν ἐμοῦ ποιήσω σοι
48:15	אֲנִי אֲנִי דִּבַּרְתִּי אֶף־קִרְאַתִּיו	ἐγὼ ἐλάλησα, ἐγὼ ἐκάλεσα
57:6	הֵם גּוֹרֵלֶךְ	οὗτός σου ὁ κληρὸς
57:14	סִלּוּ־סִלּוּ פְּנוּ־דֶרֶךְ	Καθαρίσατε ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ ὁδοὺς
62:10	עֲבְרוּ עֲבְרוּ בַשְּׁעָרִים	πορεύεσθε διὰ τῶν πυλῶν μου
65:1	אֲמַרְתִּי הֲנִי הֲנִי	εἶπα Ἰδοὺ εἰμι

In two cases words have been placed in between the reiterated expressions, which has annulled the geminatio:

8:9	הַתְּאֹזְרוּ וַחֲתוּ הַתְּאֹזְרוּ וַחֲתוּ	ἰσχυρότεες ἤτταῖσθε <u>ἐὰν γὰρ πάλιν</u> ἰσχύσητε, <u>πάλιν</u> ἤττηθήσεσθε.
57:19	שָׁלוֹם לְרַחוּק וּלְקָרֹב	εἰρήνην <u>ἐπ'</u> εἰρήνην τοῖς μακρὰν καὶ τοῖς ἐγγύς οὖσι.

In 62:10 both constituents of the geminatio are absent in the LXX:

62:10	פְּנוּ דֶרֶךְ הָעַם סִלּוּ סִלּוּ הַמַּסְלָה	καὶ ὁδοποιήσατε τῷ λαῷ μου <sup>154</sup>
-------	---	---

Also compare the translation of these “pseudogeminations”:<sup>155</sup>

15:1	כִּי בִלִּיל שָׂדֵד עַר מוֹאֵב <u>נִדְמָה</u> כִּי בִלִּיל שָׂדֵד קִיר־מוֹאֵב <u>נִדְמָה</u>	Νυκτὸς ἀπολεῖται ἡ Μωαβίτις, νυκτὸς γὰρ ἀπολεῖται τὸ τεῖχος τῆς Μωαβίτιδος.
19:7	עֲרוֹת עַל־יְאֹוֹר <u>עַל־פִּי יְאֹוֹר</u>	καὶ τὸ ἄχρῃ τὸ χλωρὸν πᾶν τὸ κύκλῳ τοῦ ποταμοῦ
21:7	וְהִקְשִׁיב <u>קֶשֶׁב</u> רַב־קֶשֶׁב	ἀκρόασαι ἀκρόασιν πολλήν
24:16	בְּגָדִים בְּגָדוֹ <u>וּבְגָד בְּגָדִים בְּגָדוֹ</u>	Οὐαὶ τοῖς ἀθετοῦσιν, οἱ ἀθετοῦντες τὸν νόμον.
27:5	יַעֲשֶׂה שָׁלוֹם לִי שָׁלוֹם יַעֲשֶׂה־לִּי	ποιήσωμεν εἰρήνην αὐτῷ, ποιήσωμεν εἰρήνην.
29:14	לִּכְן הֲנִי יוֹסֵף	διὰ τοῦτο ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ προσθήσω

<sup>154</sup> The הַמַּסְלָה was presumably taken to be the first word of the next clause, in which the LXX may represent it as ἐκ τῆς ὁδοῦ.

<sup>155</sup> For comments on the translation of these verses, see section 7.3.1; for the possibility of haplography, see section 11.1.

	להפליא את־העם־הזה	τοῦ μεταθεῖναι τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον
	הפלא ופלא	καὶ μεταθῆσω αὐτοὺς
59:21	לא־ימושו מפֿיך	ἃ ἔδωκα ἐκ τοῦ στόματός σου
	ומפי	καὶ ἐκ τοῦ στόματος
	זרעך ומפי זרע זרעך	τοῦ σπέρματός σου

In 26:5 the nearly identical verbs *ישפילנה* and *ישפילה* are translated by two different Greek ones, and separated by means of a conjunction:

26:5	ישפילנה	πόλεις ὀχυράς καταβαλεῖς
	ישפילה עד־ארץ	καὶ κατὰξεις ἕως ἐδάφους

Also other forms of repetition have now and then been deleted in LXX Isaiah, such as anaphora (see 10:21 שאר; 14:18 כל / כלם; 49:12 הנה / והנה; 52:6 לבן; 62:11 הנה), epiphora (15:8 יללתה), reduplicatio (28:16 אבן; 55:1 לכו ואכלו; 65:6 ולכו שברו / שברו), mesarchia (25:4 מעון), and synonymia.<sup>156</sup>

As well as deleting some repetition, the translator has also removed or reduced instances of parallelism. This he sometimes achieved by the omission of an entire parallel clause (for a list of some thirty examples, see section 7.2.1c), and in other cases by the omission of one or more synonymous elements from either of the two members of the parallelism (of this around fifty instances are mentioned in section 7.6.2).

How can this deletion of rhetorical figures be explained? Possibly, the translator sometimes considered the frequent repetitions of identical or synonymous expressions in the Hebrew Isaiah somewhat redundant and so occasionally left them out of his translation. In this way he avoided any suggestion of over-ornamentation in his text, a fault known in Greek rhetoric as *κακόζηλια*. One of the symptoms of *κακόζηλια* was an exaggerated use of figures, especially of repetition, which could lead to *pleonasmus*—the use of more words than is necessary semantically, and *homoeologia*—tedious and inane repetition. When the translator avoided *geminatio*, he probably wanted to escape what he felt would be an excessive and unnecessary repetition. In cases where he reduced or deleted parallelism he may in particular have wanted to avoid the vice *tautologia*, which is “the repetition of the same idea in different words, but (often) in a way that is wearisome or unnecessary.”<sup>157</sup>

Even though the use of rhetorical figures was sometimes toned down in LXX Isaiah, there are in fact still fewer cases of deletion than there are of figures which have been created or improved. Therefore, in my opinion, it remains clear

<sup>156</sup> For the reduction of synonymous expressions in LXX Isaiah, see section 7.2; for the reduction of identical expressions, see section 7.3.

<sup>157</sup> Burton, “Silva Rhetoricae” ([rhetoric.byu.edu](http://rhetoric.byu.edu)).

that maintaining what figures he had in his Hebrew text and supplementing them with others was a highly valued literary priority for the Isaiah translator.

## 8.8 Conclusion

In this chapter I have tried to show that the translator of Isaiah was fully conscious of and deeply appreciated the poetic character of the text that lay before him. In general, he was concerned to render or to compensate in his translation the poetic figures that the Hebrew contains by applying these figures in his Greek text as well. Moreover, he occasionally “improved” word figures which were already present in the Hebrew, and sometimes even introduced new cases. This pertains in particular to forms of repetition, such as anaphora, epiphora, inclusio, and synonymia, and also to the figures of parallelism and chiasmus.

There is of course always the possibility that these apparent changes already formed part of the Hebrew manuscript of the translator, but in view of their large number, they rather seem to indicate a tendency on the part of the translator to ameliorate the rhetorical nature of the text.

Yet, the translator’s attitude towards rhetorical figures is not free from ambiguity, as we also encounter a considerable number of cases in which figures have been reduced or deleted in the translation. One important reason for this may have been that the translator wanted to avoid superfluity of ornamentation. This can perhaps be explained in the light of the hesitance of classical rhetoric as regards such stylistic abundance.

This brings me back to a question I raised before, of whether the translator of Isaiah was familiar with the rules of Greek rhetoric, and perhaps even of its terminology. Because the examples of the creation or improvement of figures that I have given in this chapter can be classified and explained within the framework of classical rhetoric, and because the other side of the same coin—the translator’s avoidance of over-ornamentation—accords with the rules of Greek rhetoric as well—I have been led to think that Isaiah’s translator may indeed have applied that same system in his translation. Besides, the proficiency of the translator in writing Koinē Greek, and the impression he makes through his work of being an educated, intellectual scribe, additionally support the assumption that he had been well instructed in the Hellenistic techniques of rhetoric. Nevertheless, this does not exclude the possibility that he was acquainted with some stylistic devices especially or purely through Hebrew literature, of which—as a Jewish scholar—he had a thorough knowledge as well. This applies, for instance, to the figure of chiasmus, a figure with which the Greek themselves were not familiar.





## Chapter 9.

# ANAPHORIC TRANSLATION

### 9.1 Introduction

#### 9.1.1 Terminology

The present chapter will discuss pluses and minuses in the Greek translation of Isaiah that may be related to the translator's borrowing of elements from other places in the Bible. This adoption of textual elements from elsewhere in Scripture is a well-known phenomenon in early Bible translations. In studies on the Septuagint it has been designated in various ways, for instance the following:

#### *Anaphoric translation*

Homer Heater: "As a translation technique, 'anaphoric translation' refers to the interpolation or adaptation of words or phrases from other passages of Scripture where the underlying idea is the same or similar."<sup>1</sup>

Theo van der Louw: "Anaphoric translation is a transformation whereby a TL [target language] element seems to be a rendering of an SL [source language] element elsewhere or is influenced by a related passage in the same book or from a different text."<sup>2</sup>

#### *Harmonizations*

Tov: "Harmonizations, that is, secondary approximations of details, may take place within one text—in one sentence or chapter—or between two remote texts. In all instances they can be presented schematically as detail *a* which has been

---

<sup>1</sup> Homer Heater Jr., *A Septuagint Translation Technique in the Book of Job* (CBQMS 11; Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1982), 6.

<sup>2</sup> van der Louw, "Transformations," 72.

altered (added, omitted) in some or all witnesses of text A in accordance with detail *b* in text B.”<sup>3</sup>

*Emprunts scripturaires analogiques*

Koenig: “Le texte de G a subi, en de nombreux endroits, dans des proportions et selon des modalités variables, des influences scripturaires qui proviennent soit d’autres passages du même prophète, soit d’autres livres bibliques, sous leur forme tantôt hébraïque, tantôt grecque.”<sup>4</sup> Koenig calls these influences “emprunts scripturaires analogiques.”

*Intertextual and contextual exegesis*

Eugene Ekblad uses the term “contextual exegesis” for indicating “changes based on the immediate literary context, e.g. harmonizing,” while he employs “intertextual exegesis” for “changes based on scriptural borrowings from the broader literary context.”<sup>5</sup>

When using any of these terms, it is necessary to take into account the subtle distinction that exists between “harmonisation” on the one hand, and terms such as “intertextual exegesis” or “anaphoric translation” on the other. This distinction entails that harmonisation presupposes two texts that are parallel or at least closely related to each other as regards their formulation. Through harmonisation, the translator makes the text on which he is working more similar to the other, parallel text. When, on the other hand, he applies “intertextual exegesis” or “anaphoric translation” this also permits cases where the passage used does not resemble his own text in wording, but is utilised for other reasons, for instance because the translator perceived a thematic relationship between this text and his translation.

For the title of this chapter I have chosen the term “anaphoric translation.” This is because it is a compact term, which encompasses both the adoption of elements from within the same book as well as from other books. Furthermore, it does not only include cases of harmonisation, but of other kinds of influence, too. Besides using this term, I will also often speak of the “borrowing” or “adoption” of elements from other biblical texts, or the “influence of other biblical texts” if pluses or minuses can be explained as being imported from elsewhere in Scripture. These too are meant as broad circumscriptions including instances where the translation depends on a passage that is not parallel to it.

<sup>3</sup> Emanuel Tov, “The Nature and Background of Harmonizations in Biblical Manuscripts,” *JSOT* 31 (1985): 3.

<sup>4</sup> Koenig, *L’herméneutique analogique*, 3.

<sup>5</sup> Ekblad, *Isaiah’s Servant Poems*, 28. See also Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (rev. and enl. ed; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), 125–27.

Additionally, I will sometimes apply the term “harmonisation,” but only in its strict sense.

### ***9.1.2 How did elements from other biblical texts enter the translation?***

Elements from other Scriptural sections may have entered the Greek translation in various ways:

#### *a. They were already present in the Hebrew Vorlage of the LXX, which differed from the MT*

According to Aejmelaeus, borrowed elements most commonly were already present in the *Vorlage* of Greek translations. She posits that the translators of biblical manuscripts were rather limited in their range of vision and could not permit themselves to concentrate on anything else than the words they were translating, such as the searching for connections with other biblical passages. For that reason the search for parallel passages may rather have been the preoccupation of Hebrew *copyists*, who knew the biblical texts by heart and did have their thoughts free to discover such parallels.<sup>6</sup>

Also Tov is cautious in ascribing harmonisations to the LXX translators. He thinks this to be a probable option only if the passage that is supposed to be dependent on another Greek text largely corresponds to the latter:

If the translator took care to use the same Greek equivalents in both passages, and if at least a few equivalents are unique to the two parallel passages, harmonization in other details, too, is at least a possibility. If the translator varied the translation vocabulary of the two sections, harmonization is still possible, but unlikely.<sup>7</sup>

Ziegler holds the theory that some of the additions and variants in LXX Isaiah that rely on other biblical texts were already extant in the translator’s Hebrew manuscript in the form of *glosses* (marginal notes).<sup>8</sup> This “gloss theory” seems less likely, however, by the discovery of the Qumran scrolls, where no such marginal notes could be detected.

#### *b. The Greek translator himself has introduced elements from other texts*

During the translation process the translator may have been reminded of another passage in Scripture and have imported elements from that text into his translation. This may have happened in several ways:

---

<sup>6</sup> Aejmelaeus, “What Can We Know,” 69–71.

<sup>7</sup> Tov, “Nature and Background,” 20.

<sup>8</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 105.

- The translator was merely inspired by the *memory* of a specific Scriptural passage.<sup>9</sup> This may be true if the dependence only concerns the adoption of a certain concept or theme from that text, and not the copying of a formulation.
- The translator adopted an expression from the *Hebrew* text of a certain passage and then rendered it into Greek himself. This is the most likely option if the borrowed phrase reflects a locution elsewhere in the Bible as regards its content and syntax, yet the words used are different from the ones in the Greek version of its supposed source.
- The translator quoted words from the *Greek* translation of a biblical document. This possibility exists provided that the borrowed text displays literal correspondences with the phraseology of the Greek translation from which it is assumed to be adopted.

As it concerns the Greek translation of Isaiah, most scholars agree that at least some of the instances suggesting dependence on other Scriptural texts, find their origin in the translation process, and not in the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the translator.<sup>10</sup> According to some, such as Ziegler and Zillesen, the explanation for this reliance on other texts lies occasionally in the translator's lack of understanding of the Hebrew text.<sup>11</sup> Koenig, however, has criticised this—what he calls—“préjugé empiriste” of his predecessors. He thinks that scholars such as Ziegler too easily attribute variants in LXX Isaiah to an inadequate knowledge or to the indifference of the translator. In his own view “emprunts scripturaires analogiques” were rather applied *intentionally*. They were the product of learned investigation, justified by a hermeneutical method which was part of the religious community.<sup>12</sup> This method was known in Rabbinical exegesis as “scriptural analogy”—the projection of the meaning of one text upon another; it is discussed, among others, in the collection of rules of Hillel dating from the first century B.C.E.<sup>13</sup> According to Koenig this hermeneutical method of biblical analogy was also practiced by the Isaiah translator, with the purpose of transforming his translation into a religiously educating text, a kind of a Targum,

---

<sup>9</sup> See Seeligmann, *Septuagint Version*, 48.

<sup>10</sup> E.g. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 134; Seeligmann, *Septuagint Version*, 45–47; Koenig, *L'herméneutique analogique*, 26, etc.

<sup>11</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 107, 108, 114. Alfred Zillesen, “Bemerkungen zur alexandrinischen Übersetzung des Jesaja (c. 40–66),” *ZAW* 22 (1902): 261–62. Compare also M. Flashar, “Exegetische Studien zum Septuagintapсалтер,” *ZAW* 32 (1912): 183; Emanuel Tov, “The Impact of the LXX Translation of the Pentateuch on the Translation of the Other Books,” in *Mélanges Dominique Barthélemy. Études Bibliques offertes à l'occasion de son 60<sup>e</sup> anniversaire* (ed. Pierre Casetti, Othmar Keel and Adrian Schenker; OBO 38; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981), 578; Olofsson, *LXX Version*, 26.

<sup>12</sup> Koenig, *L'herméneutique analogique*, 3–12, 26–37.

<sup>13</sup> Koenig, *L'herméneutique analogique*, 48–49.

in which deviations from the Hebrew were allowed for the sake of the education of the community.<sup>14</sup>

The theory that Jewish exegetical rules on the use of other Scriptural passages were applied to Greek Bible translations has earlier been advocated by Prijs. In his work *Jüdische Tradition in der Septuaginta* Prijs remarks that the adaptation to parallel Bible texts is evidenced by the Peshitta and the Targumim as well. In his opinion this indicates that:

mindestens ein Grossteil der Parallelergänzungen auch in der LXX ursprünglich sind und dass alle Übersetzungen hier ein exegetisches Prinzip anwenden, das als 17. der 32 exegetischen Regeln (מדות) des R. Elieser ... schriftlich fixiert wurde: ... *Etwas, was an einer Stelle des Bibeltextes nicht genügend erklärt wird und an einer anderen Stelle ausführlicher gesagt wird.* Das an jener Stelle ergänzend Ausgeführte gilt dann auch für die kürzere Stelle.<sup>15</sup>

*c. The elements from other biblical passages were added by a Greek editor*

A final possibility as regards the authorship of borrowings is that they were interpolated by later Greek editors who were making “corrections” to existing Greek translations. This option has been advanced especially to elucidate cases in which the influence seems to derive from sections further on in the same biblical book. On such occasions the question arises of whether it is reasonable to suppose that a translator took elements from passages that he had not yet translated.<sup>16</sup> Regarding the Greek Isaiah, Seeligmann assumes that such borrowings from later sections may sometimes have been the work of a “second translator,” editing the text of his predecessor.<sup>17</sup> This theory of Seeligmann will be further discussed later on in the present chapter (see 9.3.2).

Mostly it is quite complex to determine whether an anaphoric translation has been carried out by a Hebrew copyist, the LXX translator, or a later Greek editor. Hence, when this study attributes such a rendition to the LXX translator, this always remains a form of speculation, and hardly ever can the possibility be excluded that in fact it may originate from a different *Vorlage* or from an intervention of a later Greek editor.

<sup>14</sup> Koenig, *L'herméneutique analogique*, 73.

<sup>15</sup> Prijs, *Jüdische Tradition*, 84.

<sup>16</sup> See e.g. Aejmelaeus, “What can we know,” 70.

<sup>17</sup> Seeligmann, *Septuagint Version*, 71.

### 9.1.3 *Different levels of influence*

Anaphoric translation may have taken place on several levels, depending upon the source from which the imported words or ideas originate:

- (a) The adoption of elements from the near context.
- (b) The adoption of elements from the same Scriptural book.
- (c) The adoption of elements from other Scriptural books.<sup>18</sup>

This division forms the basis of the overview offered below, which will present LXX Isaiah's pluses and minuses that might be the outcome of anaphoric translation.

## 9.2 **The adoption of elements from the near context: LXX Isaiah's pluses and minuses caused by contextual harmonisation and exegesis**

A considerable number of the pluses in LXX Isaiah seem to have been supplied from a nearby verse or the same verse. Likewise, some elements are omitted in analogy to a preceding or following clause. This may have been done for various reasons:

### *a. Contextual exegesis*

The text was interpreted or explained with the help of information from the context, with the aim of creating a coherent, clear and understandable text.<sup>19</sup>

### *b. Contextual harmonisation*

Words were added, omitted, or changed to bring the text more into agreement with another, related passage close at hand. By approximating separate units within one section, the connection between these different parts could be strengthened. This gave the translator a means to improve the internal unity within his text.

Contextual harmonisation is a technique that is employed with frequency in ancient Bible translations. It has been used particularly often when in a discourse something is reported twice, in which case the translator tended to make the two accounts more similar to each other. Some other occasions in which it was applied regularly are indicated by Tov as follows:

- Command and fulfilment are harmonised with each other.
- References to earlier statements are assimilated to these.
- Differences in major details are removed.

---

<sup>18</sup> This division is based upon Tov's classification of harmonisation in Tov, "Nature and Background," 5.

<sup>19</sup> See Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 125–27.

- Schematic descriptions, such as lists of names, are presented in an even more schematic way.<sup>20</sup>

In addition to this, elements from surrounding text may have been adopted for mere *stylistic* reasons. Words have sometimes been reiterated to create a figure of repetition or to balance parallel statements. Such instances of repetition for reasons of style will not be dealt with in the present chapter, but have already been listed in chapter 8.

In order to illustrate the Isaiah translator's use of contextual harmonisation, I will start with a small case study on the application of this technique in LXX Isa 36–39.

### 9.2.1 Contextual harmonisation in LXX Isa 36–39

Isaiah 36–39 are four historical chapters which centre around Hezekiah, king of Judah. These chapters have attracted special scholarly interest by virtue of the fact that in 2 Kgs 18:17–20:19 a parallel text can be found.<sup>21</sup> This makes the comparison of the Hebrew to the Greek even more intricate, but also more intriguing.

The Greek translation of these Isaianic chapters tends to be somewhat more literal than that of the preceding part of the book. Nonetheless, when examining these chapters in their LXX version, I got the impression that they hide relatively many cases of contextual harmonisation. Several of those—that is, the ones involving pluses or minuses—will be elaborated in the present paragraph. For that purpose, I will first discuss each chapter within Isa 36–39 separately, focusing on the possible cases of contextual harmonisation that occur in it. Afterwards, I will mention some harmonisations that the translator may have applied in order to tie the various chapters to each other more closely. The

<sup>20</sup> Tov, "Nature and Background," 7–9.

<sup>21</sup> For studies in the connection between Isa 36–39 and 2 Kgs 18–20, see e.g. Harry M. Orlinsky, "The Kings-Isaiah Recensions of the Hezekiah Story," *JQR* 30 (1939): 33–49; Otto Kaiser, "Die Verkündigung des Propheten Jesaja im Jahre 701," *ZAW* 81 (1969): 304–15; Julio C. Treballe Barrera, "La expedición de Senaquerib contra Jerusalén. Reflexiones en torno a un libro reciente," *EstBib* 45 (1987): 7–22; Alessandro Castañini, *Isaia ed Ezechia. Studio di storia della tradizione di II Re 18–20 // Is. 36–39* (SS 6; Rome: Università degli studi "La Sapienza," 1989); Raymond F. Person, Jr., *The Kings—Isaiah and Kings—Jeremiah Recensions* (BZAW 252; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1997). Castañini is of the opinion that of the various versions of the Hezekiah narratives LXX Isaiah and 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> preserve the earliest textual form, after which follows MT Isaiah, which "represents a developed form of the text, but one preserving several earlier textual peculiarities." MT 2 Kings he thinks to contain the most developed form (Castañini, *Isaia ed Ezechia*, 324). Also Person thinks that MT 2 Kings reflects the latest form, while LXX Isaiah in many cases preserves the earliest reading (Person, *Kings*, 114). My own impression is somewhat divergent, in that I assume LXX Isaiah to contain a number of secondary harmonisations.

inquiry will also involve the parallel passage in (LXX) 2 Kings, as well as the text as attested by the Isaiah Scroll from Qumran (1QIsa<sup>a</sup>).

### 9.2.1.1 Contextual harmonisation in LXX Isa 36

Isaiah 36 contains a dramatic dialogue between Rabshakeh—a messenger of the Assyrian king Sennacherib—and Eliakim, Shebna and Joah—delegates of king Hezekiah of Israel, in which Rabshakeh urges Hezekiah to surrender to the king of Assur.

The dialogue between Rabshakeh and the Judean delegates is enclosed by narrative text, which starts and concludes the chapter. The dialogue itself is divided into four parts. According to their content, the six parts of the chapter form a chiastic pattern. This pattern is highlighted by the reiteration of various expressions:

#### A Narrative introduction (36:1–3)

Ελιακιμ ... καὶ Σομνας ... καὶ Ἰωαχ ...

... אליקים ושבנא ... ויואח ...

#### B Speech of Rabshakeh: the words of the king (36:4–10)

καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Ραβσακῆς ...

... ויאמר אליהם רבישקה

Τάδε λέγει ὁ βασιλεὺς ὁ μέγας βασιλεὺς Ἀσσυρίων ...

כה־אמר המלך הגדול מלך אשור...

#### C Plea of Eliakim, Shebna, and Joah to Rabshakeh (36:11)

καὶ εἶπε πρὸς αὐτὸν

ויאמר

Ελιακιμ καὶ Σομνας καὶ Ἰωαχ

אליקים ושבנא ויואח אל־רבישקה

Δάλῃσον ... καὶ μὴ λάλει ... καὶ ἵνα τί λαλεῖς

דברנא ... ואל־תדבר ...

εἰς τὰ ὦτα τῶν ἀνθρώπων τῶν ἐπὶ τῷ τείχει

באזני העם אשר על־החומה

#### C' Answer of Rabshakeh to Eliakim, Shebna and Joah (36:12)

καὶ εἶπε Ραβσακῆς πρὸς αὐτούς ...

... ויאמר רבישקה

λαλῆσαι ...

לדבר ...

πρὸς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τοὺς καθημένους ἐπὶ τῷ τείχει ...

על־האנשים הישבים על־החומה

#### B' Speech of Rabshakeh: the words of the king (36:13–20)

καὶ ἔσθη Ραβσακῆς ... καὶ εἶπεν

ויעמד רבישקה ... ויאמר

Ἀκούσατε τοὺς λόγους τοῦ βασιλέως

שמעו את־דברי המלך הגדול

τοῦ μεγάλου βασιλέως Ἀσσυρίων

מלך אשור

Τάδε λέγει ὁ βασιλεὺς ...

כה אמר המלך ...

#### A' Narrative conclusion (36:21–22)

Ελιακιμ ... καὶ Σομνας ... καὶ Ἰωαχ ...

ושבנא ... אליקים ... ויואח



The linkages between the several parts of Isa 36 have apparently been recognised by the LXX translator, since it seems that he has tried to make the parallel sections resemble each other even more. For this purpose he has applied some small modifications to the text of Isa 36:

a. Harmonisation of 36:12 to 36:11

While 36:11 (C in the outline above) contains a request by the delegates of Hezekiah to Rabshakeh, verse 12 (C') offers Rabshakeh's harsh reaction. In this reaction several words of the preceding request are repeated in the Hebrew. The LXX translator has made even more connections between request and answer by departing from the Hebrew in two respects:

- In verse 12 he has supplemented *πρὸς αὐτούς* to *καὶ εἶπεν Ραψακῆς*, aligning this clause to *καὶ εἶπε πρὸς αὐτόν Ελιακίμ καὶ Σομνας καὶ Ἰωαχ* in verse 11 (where *πρὸς αὐτόν* renders *אל־רב־שקה*).<sup>22</sup>
- In verse 11 he has freely translated *העם* as *τῶν ἀνθρώπων*, bringing the phrase *εἰς τὰ ὧτα τῶν ἀνθρώπων τῶν ἐπὶ τῷ τείχει* more in accordance with *πρὸς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τοὺς καθημένους ἐπὶ τῷ τείχει* in verse 12:

36:11

ויאמר אליקים	καὶ <b>εἶπε</b> πρὸς αὐτόν Ελιακίμ
ושבנא ויואח אל־רב־שקה	καὶ Σομνας καὶ Ἰωαχ
דבר־נא אל־עבדיך ארמית	Λάλησον πρὸς τοὺς παῖδάς σου Συριστί,
כי שמעים אנחנו	ἀκούομεν γὰρ ἡμεῖς,
ואל־תדבר אלינו יהודית	καὶ μὴ λάλει πρὸς ἡμᾶς Ἰουδαῖστί·
באזני העם	καὶ ἵνα τί λαλεῖς εἰς τὰ ὧτα <b>τῶν ἀνθρώπων</b>
אשר על־החומה	τῶν ἐπὶ τῷ τείχει;

36:12

ויאמר רב־שקה	καὶ <b>εἶπε</b> Ραψακῆς <b>πρὸς αὐτούς</b>
האל אדניך ואל־יך	Μὴ πρὸς τὸν κύριον ὑμῶν ἢ πρὸς ὑμᾶς
שלחני אדני	ἀπέσταλκέ με ὁ κύριός μου
לדבר את־יהדברים האלה	λαλῆσαι τοὺς λόγους τούτους;
הלא על־האנשים	οὐχὶ πρὸς <b>τοὺς ἀνθρώπους</b>
הישיבים על־החומה ...	τοὺς καθημένους ἐπὶ τῷ τείχει ...

In the parallel text of Isa 36:12, 2 Kgs 18:27, a prepositional object likewise appears. This is the case in both the Hebrew and Greek versions of 2 Kgs 18:27:

MT 2 Kgs 18:27	ויאמר אליהם רב־שקה
LXX 2 Kgs 18:27 <sup>23</sup>	καὶ <b>εἶπεν</b> πρὸς αὐτούς Ραψακῆς

<sup>22</sup> 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> 36:11 presents ויאמרו אליו אליקים ושבנא ויואח.

One could posit that this agreement between LXX Isa 36:12 and 2 Kgs 18:27 contradicts the supposition that *πρὸς αὐτοὺς* in Isa 36:12 concerns a harmonising addition by the translator of Isaiah, and that it rather indicates that the insertion of *πρὸς αὐτοὺς* goes back to LXX Isaiah's Hebrew *Vorlage*. Still, another way to explain the identical pluses in LXX Isa 36:12 and 2 Kgs 18:27 is that also the translator of 2 Kings added *πρὸς αὐτοὺς* in verse 27 in harmonisation with the preceding verse (in this case parallel to *πρὸς Παψακῆς*).

The second deviation—the rendition in LXX Isa 36:11 of *העם* as *τῶν ἀνθρώπων*—is not supported by LXX 2 Kgs 18:26, which provides *τοῦ λαοῦ* here. 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>, on the contrary, does mirror the reading of LXX Isa 36:11, offering *האנשים*. But again, this does not necessarily imply that 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and LXX Isaiah based this reading on their (in this respect common) *Vorlage*. Rather, the Isaiah translator and 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> scribe have both harmonised their texts separately.<sup>24</sup> This becomes evident from the fact that 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> 36:11 contains yet another harmonising divergence from the MT, one which is absent in LXX Isaiah: in 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> 36:11 *היושבים* forms a plus; this noun may well have been added by the scribe with the aim of approximating verse 11 to verse 12, where *היושבים* also appears:

MT Isa 36:11	באזני העם אשר על-החומה
MT Isa 36:12	על-האנשים הישבים על-החומה
1QIsa <sup>a</sup> 36:11	באזני האנשים היושבים על החומה
1QIsa <sup>a</sup> 36:12	על האנשים היושבים על-החומה

If the occurrence of *τῶν ἀνθρώπων* in LXX Isa 36:11 were the outcome of the translator's reading *האנשים* instead of *העם* in his *Vorlage*—which would in this aspect agree with 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>—one would also expect LXX Isaiah to provide an equivalent to 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>'s harmonising plus *היושבים*. Yet, since this plus is absent from LXX Isaiah, it is more plausible that the harmonisations in LXX Isaiah and 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> 36:11 came into existence independently of each other.

#### b. Harmonisation of 36:16 to 36:4

A small harmonising minus can be detected in LXX Isa 36:16.

The verses 4–10 (B in the outline above) and 13–20 (B') both comprise a speech of Rabshakeh in which he conveys the message of Sennacherib to the delegates of Hezekiah. Both speeches begin with a messenger formula,

<sup>23</sup> For the sake of clarity and convenience I have, in this chapter, quoted texts from the Greek version of 2 Kgs as “LXX 2 Kgs” rather than as “4 Kgdms.”

<sup>24</sup> See Person, *Kings*, 60–61.

introducing the king's persuasive words. In the Hebrew these formulae read as follows:

MT Isa 36:4                      כה־אמר המלך הגדול מלך אשור  
MT Isa 36:16                    כי כה אמר המלך אשור

In the LXX version of 36:16 an equivalent for כי is absent. This omission has assimilated the formula in verse 16 to that in verse 4:<sup>25</sup>

36:4	אמר־נא אל־חזקיהו כה־אמר המלך הגדול מלך אשור	Εἶπατε Εξεκία Τάδε λέγει ὁ βασιλεὺς ὁ μέγας βασιλεὺς Ἀσσυρίων
36:16	אל־תשמעו אל־חזקיהו כי כה אמר המלך אשור	μὴ ἀκούετε Εξεκίου. τάδε λέγει ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἀσσυρίων

This minus is not attested in the parallel texts in 2 Kings, that is, MT and LXX 2 Kgs 18:31. Those texts agree with MT Isa 36:16 in having the messenger formula start with a conjunction. Also 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> 36:16 offers כי in line with the MT. This strengthens the inference that the lack of representation of כי in LXX Isa 36:16 is due to an omission by the Isaiah translator, who may have left it out with the aim of bringing verse 16 into alignment with verse 4.

#### c. Harmonisation of 36:13b–14a to 36:14b–16a

In Isa 36:13–16 Rabshakeh contrasts the king of Judah with the king of Assur: in verses 13–14a—where he announces the message of Sennacherib—he mentions the Assyrian king three times, each time honouring him with the title “king.” In verses 14b–16a—where Rabshakeh refers to Hezekiah and to what he has said to his people—Hezekiah is likewise mentioned in threefold, but each time *without* the title of “king.” Besides, the section on Sennacherib starts with the command שִׁמְעוּ אֶת־דְּבַר הַמֶּלֶךְ הַגָּדוֹל מֶלֶךְ אַשּׁוּר (verse 13), whereas the section about Hezekiah ends with the warning אַל־תִּשְׁמְעוּ אֶל־חִזְקִיָּהוּ (verse 16a), making it more than clear that the people ought to listen to the king of Assur, but that they *should not listen* to their own king Hezekiah.

In the Greek text of Isaiah this contrast between the two kings—to the disadvantage of Hezekiah—has been sharpened even further. This is the outcome of two departures from the Hebrew, resulting in two additional expressions from verses 13b–14a being repeated in 14b–16a:

<sup>25</sup> Also compare כה אמר המלך in 36:14.

- In verse 15 **ואליבטח אתכם חזקיהו אליהוה** has received a variant translation as *καὶ μὴ λεγέτω ὑμῖν Εζεκιας*. On account of this rephrasing, the Greek clause in an antithetical way repeats the words *Τάδε λέγει ὁ βασιλεὺς* in verse 14: the king of the Assyrians says such and such, but Hezekiah *should not say* such and such.
- In verse 14b the Greek version shows an additional *λόγοις*. This is a negative reprisal of *λόγους* in verse 13: whereas authority is bestowed upon the words of the Assyrian king, the words of Hezekiah are rejected:

36:13b–14a

שמעו את־דברי המלך הגדול מלך אשור כה אמר המלך	<i>Ἀκούσατε τοὺς <b>λόγους</b> τοῦ βασιλέως τοῦ μεγάλου βασιλέως Ἀσσυρίων Τάδε <b>λέγει</b> ὁ βασιλεὺς</i>
--	--

36:14b–16a

אלישא לכם חזקיהו כי לא־יוכל להציל אתכם ואליבטח אתכם חזקיהו אליהוה לאמר הצל יצילנו יהוה לא תנתן העיר הזאת ביד מלך אשור אל־תשמעו אל־חזקיהו	<i>Μὴ ἀπατάτω ὑμᾶς Εζεκιας <b>λόγοις</b>, οἳ οὐ δυνήσονται ῥύσασθαι ὑμᾶς· καὶ <b>μὴ λεγέτω</b> ὑμῖν Εζεκιας ὅτι Ῥύσεται ὑμᾶς ὁ θεός, καὶ οὐ μὴ παραδοθῇ ἡ πόλις αὕτη ἐν χειρὶ βασιλέως Ἀσσυρίων <b>μὴ ἀκούετε</b> Εζεκιου.</i>
--	--

The plus *λόγοις* occurs in the Greek version of 2 Kgs 18:29 as well. Yet, as to the translation of **ואליהוה חזקיהו אתכם חזקיהו** LXX 2 Kgs 18:30 is closer to the MT, having *καὶ μὴ ἐπελπιζέτω ὑμᾶς Εζεκιας πρὸς κύριον*, contrary to the harmonising translation by *μὴ λεγέτω ὑμῖν Εζεκιας* such as LXX Isa 36:15 presents. The MT of 2 Kgs 18:28–31 and 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> are in conformity with MT Isaiah. So what we see here again, is that of the various harmonisations that LXX Isaiah discloses some are also present in the LXX of 2 Kings, but others are not.

### 9.2.1.2 Contextual harmonisation in LXX Isa 37

In Isa 37 the delegates of Hezekiah communicate to their king the threatening statements of king Sennacherib which he had spoken through Rabshakeh. They are sent to consult Isaiah, and return his prophetic message to Hezekiah. The Judean king prays to his God for protection.

#### Harmonisation of 37:17 to 37:4

Two verses in Isa 37 that have a corresponding content are verse 4 and verse 17. While 37:4 tells of the delegates expressing to Isaiah their wish that God may hear the reviling utterances of Rabshakeh, in verse 17 Hezekiah asks in his

prayer the same thing of God. In the Greek translation of these verses a few alterations seem to have been carried out in order to further extend the connections between the two verses, making Hezekiah's wish even more similar to the wish of the delegates in verse 4:

- In verse 4a (see below) אולי is omitted, which has adjusted the words *εἰσακούσαι κύριος ὁ θεός σου* to *εἰσάκουσον, κύριε* in verse 17a.
- אדני in verse 4c is omitted in adjustment to verse 17d, where after the naming of the Assyrian king an apposition such as אדני does not follow either.
- In verse 4c the suffix in שלחו is not represented, in keeping with שלח / *ἀπέστειλε* in verse 17d. As a result, in LXX Isa 37:4 the antecedent of the relative clause (who or what has been sent by the king) is not Rabshakeh—as in MT Isa 37:4—but *the words* of Rabshakeh, which is more in agreement with verse 17.
- The LXX has transformed סנחריב in verse 17c from a genitive attribute modifying “the words” (“the words of Sennacherib”) into the subject of the succeeding relative clause (d) (“the words that Sennacherib has sent”), so that the Assyrian king in both verse 4c and verse 17d forms the explicit subject of the verb “to send” in a relative clause referring to “the words.”
- In verse 17a–c הטָה, אָנֹכְךָ, and the second ושמע are omitted, in line with verse 4, where a jussive verb in the sense of “to hear”—referring to God and with as its object “the words”—occurs only once as well.
- Analogous to את דברי / *τοὺς λόγους* in verse 4b, in verse 17c כל־ preceding דברי is not rendered in the LXX:<sup>26</sup>

37:4	a	אולי ישמע יהוה אלהיך	<i>εἰσακούσαι κύριος ὁ θεός σου</i>
	b	את דברי רב־שקה	<i>τοὺς λόγους Ραψάκου,</i>
	c	אשר שלחנ מלך־אשור אֲדֹנִי	<i>οὓς ἀπέστειλε βασιλεὺς Ἀσσυρίων</i>
	d	לחרף אלהים חי	<i>ὀνειδίζειν θεὸν ζῶντα</i>
	e	והוכיח בדברים	<i>καὶ ὀνειδίζειν λόγους,</i>
	f	אשר שמע יהוה אלהיך	<i>οὓς ἤκουσε κύριος ὁ θεός σου.</i>
37:17	a	הטָה יהוה אָנֹכְךָ ושמע	<i>εἰσάκουσον, κύριε,</i>
	b	פקח יהוה עינך וראה	<i>εἰσβλεψον, κύριε, καὶ ἰδὲ</i>
	c	ושמע את כל־דברי סנחריב	<i>τοὺς λόγους,</i>
	d	אשר שלח	<i>οὓς ἀπέστειλε Σενναχηριμ</i>
	e	לחרף אלהים חי	<i>ὀνειδίζειν θεὸν ζῶντα.</i>

<sup>26</sup> See also 36:13 Ἀκούσατε τοὺς λόγους τοῦ βασιλέως τοῦ μεγάλου βασιλέως Ἀσσυρίων.

Otherwise also noteworthy is a pattern of word repetition within verse 4 itself. The Hebrew text of Isa 37:4 comprises a chiasmic repetition (AB/BA) formed of the following words:

אולי ישמע יהוה אלהיך / את דברי // בדברים / שמע יהוה אלהיך

In the Greek version the repetition has been expanded by means of translating והוכיח as *ὀνειδίζειν*. This has resulted in a pattern ABC/CBA:

*εἰσακούσαι κύριος ὁ θεός σου / τοὺς λόγους / ὀνειδίζειν*  
*ὀνειδίζειν / λόγους / ἤκουσε κύριος ὁ θεός σου*

The 2 Kings passages parallel to Isa 37:4 and 17, namely 2 Kgs 19:4 and 16, mainly reflect MT Isaiah. The MT of 2 Kings only differs from the latter in that 2 Kgs 19:4 displays כל- before דברי, while in 2 Kgs 19:16 כל- is missing in front of דברי (so it offers the converse situation to MT Isa 37:4 and 17). Furthermore, we find in MT 2 Kgs 19:16 the verb שלחו with a third person singular suffix attached, contrary to שלח in MT Isa 37:17. The scribe of MT 2 Kgs 19 might have supplied a suffix to שלח in verse 16 in assimilation to שלחו in verse 4. If this is indeed the case, he has made a harmonisation in the very opposite direction of the LXX, which has left out the suffix in verse 4.

MT 2 Kgs 19:4                      אולי ישמע יהוה אלהיך  
   את כל-דברי רב-שקה  
   אשר שלחו מלך-אשור אדניו  
   לחרף אלהים הי

MT 2 Kgs 19:16                   הטה יהוה אזנך ושמע  
   פקח יהוה עיניך וראה  
   ושמע את דברי סנחריב  
   אשר שלחו לחרף אלהים הי

The LXX of 2 Kgs 19:4 and 16 is quite close to the MT of these verses, except that verse 16 does not reflect the suffix in שלחו, in which respect this verse agrees with the MT of Isa 37:17:

LXX 2 Kgs 19:4                   εἰ πως εἰσακούσεται κύριος ὁ θεός σου  
   πάντας τοὺς λόγους Ραψακου,  
   **δν ἀπέστειλεν αὐτὸν** βασιλεὺς Ἀσσυρίων ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ  
   ὀνειδίζειν θεὸν ζῶντα

LXX 2 Kgs 19:16                   κλῖνον, κύριε, τὸ οὖς σου καὶ ἄκουσον·  
   ἄνοιξον, κύριε, τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς σου καὶ ἰδὲ  
   καὶ ἄκουσον τοὺς λόγους Σενναχηριμ,  
   **οὓς ἀπέστειλεν** ὀνειδίζειν θεὸν ζῶντα.

Hence, of the six harmonisations that the Greek translation of Isaiah reveals in these verses, none is present in the Greek version of 2 Kings.

1QIsa<sup>a</sup> does not display any of the harmonisations mentioned either.

### 9.2.1.3 Contextual harmonisation in LXX Isa 38

Isaiah 38 recounts that Hezekiah became seriously ill and prayed to God for mercy. The prophet Isaiah appears to announce that the king's prayer has been heard and that he will be healed. Hezekiah gives thanks to his God in a prayer of thanksgiving (Isa 38:9–20).<sup>27</sup>

Harmonisation of 38:11b–12a to 38:10

The text of LXX Isa 38:11b–12a is somewhat distinct from the MT:

לֹא אֲבִיט אָדָם עוֹד	οὐκέτι μὴ ἴδω ἄνθρωπον
עַם-יֹשְׁבֵי חֲדָל	ἐκ τῆς συγγενείας μου.
דּוּרִי נִסַּע	κατέλιπον τὸ λοιπὸν τῆς ζωῆς μου.
וּנְגִלָה מִנִּי	ἐξῆλθε καὶ ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ' ἐμοῦ
כֹּהֵל רַעִי	ὥσπερ ὁ καταλύων σκηνήν πῆξας

MT Isa 38:11b–12a: I shall look upon mortals no more  
among the inhabitants of the world.  
My dwelling is plucked up and removed from me  
like a shepherd's tent

LXX Isa 38:11b–12a: no longer shall I see a man from my kindred.  
I have left behind the rest of my life:  
it has gone out and departed from me  
like the one who having pitched a tent takes it down.

The way in which the translator has arrived at *κατέλιπον* (“I have left”) may be through a link between the somewhat mysterious lexeme *חֲדָל* (which perhaps comes from *חָדַל*—“world”)<sup>28</sup> and the root *חדל*, meaning “to fail.” Rather than as the final word of the clause, he appears to have taken it as the initial word of a subsequent sentence.<sup>29</sup> The words *דּוּרִי נִסַּע וּנְגִלָה מִנִּי כֹהֵל רַעִי* (“My dwelling is plucked up and removed from me like a shepherd's tent”) he has demetaphorised, replacing them by more concrete language (“I have left behind the rest of my life: it has gone out and departed from me ...”). Possibly, the noun *דּוּר*, which besides meaning “dwelling” (in which sense it is used in the MT) also denotes “generation,” was understood by him in this latter connotation,

<sup>27</sup> The prayer of Hezekiah is absent in 2 Kings.

<sup>28</sup> Wildberger, *Jesaja*, 3:1442.

<sup>29</sup> See *HUB Isa*, 167.

for which reason he may have rendered it by ζωή (“life”). He may then have placed τὸ λοιπὸν in front of it. Another possibility is that he represented דור (interpreted as “my generation”) by τῆς συγγενείας μου (“my kindred”), and supplied τὸ λοιπὸν τῆς ζωῆς μου.<sup>30</sup> Whatever the case, the reformulation of Isa 38:11 has caused this verse to echo 38:10, since that verse likewise includes an expression in the sense of “leaving behind the rest of one’s life”:

38:10	בדמי ימי אלכה בשערי שאול פקדתי יתר שנותי	Ἐν τῷ ὕψει τῶν ἡμερῶν μου ἐν πύλαις ᾗδου καταλείψω τὰ ἔτη τὰ ἐπίλοιπα.
-------	--	--

#### 9.2.1.4 Contextual harmonisation in LXX Isa 39

In Isa 39 Hezekiah proudly displays all of his storehouses to the envoys of Merodach, king of Babylon. The prophet Isaiah turns up again and proclaims that the king will be punished for his arrogance.

#### Harmonisation of 39:2 to 39:4

While Isa 39:2 tells of Hezekiah showing the entirety of his treasures to the envoys from Babylon, 39:4 has a comparable content, but this time forming part of Hezekiah’s answer to Isaiah’s question as to what he has shown to the envoys. These two reports—the one of the storyteller in verse 2 and that of the king in verse 4—seem to have been harmonised in the LXX by way of several slight adjustments:

- In 39:4 the words ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ μου are complemented, in assimilation to ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ in verse 2.
- באוצרותי in verse 4 has been elaborated into ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ ἐν τοῖς θησαυροῖς μου, which has approximated this phrase to καὶ πάντα, ὅσα ἦν ἐν τοῖς θησαυροῖς αὐτοῦ in verse 2.
- ובכל-ממשלתו in verse 2 has no counterpart in the LXX, which has brought the words καὶ οὐκ ἦν οὐθέν, ὃ οὐκ ἔδειξεν Εἰζεκίας ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ more into agreement with καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ μου ὃ οὐκ εἶδον in verse 4 (where “and in his kingdom” is not present either).

By means of these moves the account of the storyteller and the account of Hezekiah are in the LXX each composed of three parts:

<sup>30</sup> However, ἐκ τῆς συγγενείας μου already seems to reproduce עַם-יִשְׂרָאֵל.



- a. Hezekiah has shown / the envoys have seen the things that are in “the house.”
- b. He has also shown / they have also seen everything that is in the storehouses.
- c. There is nothing in the house that he has not shown / that they have not seen:

39:2 *The account of the storyteller*

- |    |  |   |
|----|--|---|
| a. | ויראם את־בית נכתה<br>את־הכסף ואת־זהב<br>ואת־הבשמים<br>ואת השמן הטוב<br>ואת כל־בית כליו<br>ואת כל־אשר<br>נמצא באצרתיו<br>ל־אִהִיה דבר<br>אשר ל־אִהִיראם חזקיהו<br>בביתו ובכל־ממשלתו | καὶ ἔδειξεν αὐτοῖς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ νεχωθα<br>καὶ τῆς στακτῆς καὶ τῶν θυμιαμάτων<br>καὶ τοῦ μύρου καὶ τοῦ ἀργυρίου<br>καὶ τοῦ χρυσίου<br>καὶ πάντα τοὺς οἴκους τῶν σκευῶν τῆς γάζης<br>καὶ πάντα, ὅσα<br>ἦν ἐν τοῖς θησαυροῖς αὐτοῦ.<br>καὶ οὐκ ἦν οὐθέν,<br>ὃ οὐκ ἔδειξεν Εἰζεχίας<br>ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ. |
|----|--|---|

39:4 *The account of Hezekiah*

- |    |  |   |
|----|--|---|
| a. | את כל־אשר בביתי ראו<br>ל־אִהִיה דבר<br>אשר ל־אִהִיראיתם<br>באוצרתי | Πάντα τὰ ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ μου εἶδον,<br>καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ μου<br>ὃ οὐκ εἶδον,<br><u>ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ ἐν τοῖς θησαυροῖς μου.</u> |
|----|--|---|

The 2 Kings recension of these verses, which consists of 2 Kgs 20:13 and 15, does not comprise any of these harmonising variants with regard to the MT. The LXX of 2 Kgs 20:13 and 15, however, has two of the three harmonisations mentioned in common with LXX Isaiah. Firstly, in LXX 2 Kgs 20:15 ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ μου likewise appears as a plus, and secondly, in the same verse באוצרתי has also been altered into ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ ἐν τοῖς θησαυροῖς μου. Yet, contrary to what is the case in LXX Isa 39:2, one does find an equivalent for ובכל־ממשלתו in LXX 2 Kgs 20:13:<sup>31</sup>

<sup>31</sup> According to Person (*Kings*, 73) ובכל־ממשלתו was not omitted in LXX Isaiah, but forms an addition in MT Isaiah, 1QIsaiah<sup>a</sup>, MT 2 Kings, and LXX 2 Kings, “making the consequences of Hezekiah’s action for ‘his whole kingdom’ more explicit.” This seems improbable to me, though, as it is the evidence of four against one. Moreover, the absence of an equivalence of ובכל־ממשלתו in LXX Isaiah through contextual harmonisation provides a plainer explanation.

- LXX 2 Kgs 20:13      καὶ ἔδειξεν αὐτοῖς ὅλον τὸν οἶκον τοῦ νεχωθα,  
τὸ ἀργύριον καὶ τὸ χρυσίον, τὰ ἀρώματα καὶ τὸ ἔλαιον τὸ  
ἀγαθόν, καὶ τὸν οἶκον τῶν σκευῶν  
καὶ ὅσα ἡρέθη ἐν τοῖς θησαυροῖς αὐτοῦ·  
οὐκ ἦν λόγος, ὃν οὐκ ἔδειξεν αὐτοῖς Εἰσεκίας  
ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ **καὶ ἐν πάσῃ τῇ ἐξουσίᾳ αὐτοῦ.**
- LXX 2 Kgs 20:15      Πάντα, ὅσα ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ μου, εἶδον·  
οὐκ ἦν ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ μου ὃ οὐκ ἔδειξα αὐτοῖς,  
**ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ ἐν τοῖς θησαυροῖς μου.**

Once again, some harmonising details are shared by the LXX of Isaiah and 2 Kings, whereas some others that are found in LXX Isaiah are missing in LXX 2 Kings.<sup>32</sup>

#### 9.2.1.5 Pluses and minuses strengthening the internal ties between LXX Isa 36–39

LXX Isaiah 36–39 include several pluses and minuses that increase or enforce the ties between these chapters among themselves. These links may have been invented by the translator in order to strengthen the unity of this section as a whole.

##### a. Harmonisation of 37:21 to 38:5

In Isa 37:21 the prophet Isaiah finds his way to king Hezekiah to tell him that his prayer has been heard. This announcement has a parallel in 38:5, where Isaiah for the second time receives a divine order to go to Hezekiah with the message that God has answered the king's prayer. In 37:21 the plus "Ἦκουσα may be an addition by the translator imported from 38:5, with the aim of making the connection between these two verses even stronger.<sup>33</sup>

- |        |  |   |
|--------|--|---|
| 37:21  | וישלח ישעיהו בן-אמוץ<br>אל-חזקיהו לאמר<br>כה-אמר יהוה אלהי ישראל<br>אשר התפללת אלי<br>אל-סנחריב מלך אשור | Καὶ ἀπεστάλη Ἡσαιας υἱὸς Αμωσ<br>πρὸς Εἰσεκιαν καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ<br>Τάδε λέγει κύριος ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραὴλ<br><b>"Ἦκουσα</b> ἃ προσηύξω πρὸς με<br>περὶ Σενναχωριμ βασιλέως Ἀσσυρίων. |
| 38:4–5 | ויהי דברי-יהוה<br>אל-ישעיהו לאמר<br>הלוך ואמרת אל-חזקיהו   | καὶ ἐγένετο λόγος κυρίου<br>πρὸς Ἡσαιαν λέγων<br>Πορεύθητι καὶ εἰπὸν Εἰσεκία  |

<sup>32</sup> In all aspects mentioned 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> reflects the MT, except that in verse 2 it reads ממלכתו for ממשלתו.

<sup>33</sup> Besides, it is an explicating addition, clarifying the elliptic Hebrew text.

כה־אמר יהוה	Τάδε λέγει κύριος
אלהי דוד אביך	ὁ θεὸς Δαυὶδ τοῦ πατρὸς σου
שמעתי את־תפלתך	<b>ἤκουσα</b> τῆς φωνῆς τῆς προσευχῆς σου
ראיתי את־דמעתך	καὶ εἶδον τὰ δάκρυά σου.

In LXX 2 Kgs 19:20 ἤκουσα is a plus as well: Ἐὰν προσήξω πρὸς με περὶ Σενναχηριμ βασιλέως Ἀσσυρίων, ἤκουσα. 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> 37:21 mirrors the MT (except that it reads אֱלִי for אֱלִי).

#### b. Harmonisation of 39:1 to 38:1

In LXX Isa 39:1 the rumour that Hezekiah has fallen ill seems to have been complemented with information adopted from the announcement of Hezekiah's disease in 38:1.<sup>34</sup>

39:1	בעת ההוא שלח מרדך בלאדן בן־בלאדן מלך־בבל ספרים ומנחה אל־חזקיהו וישמע כי חלה ויחזק	Ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ ἀπέστειλε Μαρωδαχ υἱὸς τοῦ Λααδαν ὁ βασιλεὺς τῆς Βαβυλωνίας ἐπιστολὰς καὶ πρέσβεις καὶ δῶρα Εἰζεκια· ἤκουσε γὰρ ὅτι ἐμαλακίσθη <u>ἕως θανάτου</u> καὶ ἀνέστη.
38:1	בימים ההם חלה חזקיהו למות	Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ ἐμαλακίσθη Εἰζεκιας <u>ἕως θανάτου</u> .

A similar plus cannot be found in MT and LXX 2 Kgs 20:12, nor in 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>.

#### c. Harmonisation of 39:2 to 38:3

LXX Isa 39:2 conveys the news that Hezekiah rejoices over the Babylonian messengers “with great joy.” The words χαρὰν μεγάλην are extra as compared to the MT. Perhaps they were added so as to sharpen the contrast between Hezekiah's current joy and his earlier sadness after hearing the tidings of his disease in 38:3. Possibly the translator in this way sought to stress the overconfidence of the king, so shortly after divine mercy had been shown to him through his miraculous healing:

39:1–2	בעת ההוא שלח מרדך בלאדן ... ספרים ומנחה אל־חזקיהו וישמע כי חלה	Ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ ἀπέστειλε Μαρωδαχ ... ἐπιστολὰς καὶ πρέσβεις καὶ δῶρα Εἰζεκια· ἤκουσε γὰρ ὅτι ἐμαλακίσθη ἕως θανάτου
--------	--	---

<sup>34</sup> See also Catastini, *Isaia ed Ezechia*, 93.



LXX Isaiah and LXX 2 Kings having some, but not all, harmonising additions and omissions in common—can be clarified in various ways, such as the following:

- The harmonisations in LXX Isaiah are due to a Hebrew parent text in which they were already extant. LXX 2 Kings sometimes echoes this LXX Isaiah *Vorlage*, displaying similar harmonisations, but at other times it offers a reading reflecting the tradition of MT Isaiah and MT 2 Kings, without the harmonisation.
- Some of LXX Isaiah's harmonising variants, especially the ones that it shares with the LXX of 2 Kings, were already present in its Hebrew *Vorlage*. Others, which are missing in LXX 2 Kings, have been invented by the Isaiah translator himself.
- The translator of 2 Kings was acquainted with the Greek translation of Isaiah and was occasionally influenced by it, adopting some of its harmonising variants.
- The agreement between a number of harmonising pluses and minuses in LXX Isaiah and LXX 2 Kings is mainly a matter of coincidence. The translators of both documents each made harmonising adjustments to their texts now and then, and sometimes in the same place.

Of these possibilities, the final one seems implausible. The agreement between the harmonising pluses and minuses of LXX 2 Kings and LXX Isaiah is too extensive to originate from coincidence. Also the first option appears unfeasible to me. The many cases of contextual harmonisation in LXX Isa 36–39, as well as within the other chapters of the Isaiah translation (which will be discussed in the following paragraphs), make it likely that its translator was inclined to apply harmonisation to his work. This LXX Isaiah tendency towards harmonisation prohibits the attribution of the preponderance of harmonising variants to a different *Vorlage*. This leaves us with the second and third possibilities. Of these, the second may be the plainest one, although the third option should not be ruled out too easily, as it is quite conceivable that the translator of 2 Kings was familiar with and made use of the Septuagint of Isaiah.

### 9.2.2 Contextual harmonisation in LXX Isa 44:14–19

Another outstanding example of a passage in the Greek Isaiah in which contextual harmonisation has been applied extensively is LXX Isa 44:14–19. This is not surprising in view of the fact that these verses present three accounts of the same event: three times the story is told of an artisan who takes wood to make a fire for himself (for baking food on or for warming himself), and out of the rest of the wood makes an idol to worship. The way in which these three

accounts—in verses 14–15, verses 16–17, and verse 19b—have been aligned to each other in the Greek is shown in the diagram below:

**a. 44:14–15**

ὁ ἔκοψε ξύλον ἐκ τοῦ  
δρυμοῦ, ὃ ἐφύτευσε κύριος  
καὶ ὑετὸς ἐμήκυνεν, ἵνα ᾗ  
ἀνθρώποις εἰς καὶ· καὶ  
λαβὼν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἐθερμάνθη

**καὶ καύσαντες ἐπέσαν  
ἄρτους ἐπ' αὐτῶν.**

**τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν εἰργάσαντο  
εἰς θεούς, καὶ προσκυνοῦσιν  
αὐτούς.**

לכרת־לו אֲרִים וקח תרין  
ואלון ויאמְצִלו בעצ־יָער  
נָטַע אֶרֶן וגשם יגדל והיה לֹאֵם  
לבער ויקח מהם ויחם אֶף־ישִׁיק  
ואפה לֹחַם אֶף־יַעֲלֶאל וישתחו  
עשהו פסל ויסג־דלֶמו

**b. 44:16–17**

οὗ τὸ ἥμισυ αὐτοῦ  
κατέκαυσαν ἐν πυρὶ

**καὶ καύσαντες ἐπέσαν·  
ἄρτους ἐπ' αὐτῶν**

καὶ ἐπ' αὐτοῦ κρέας ὀπτήσας  
ἔφαγε καὶ ἐνεπλήσθη· καὶ  
θερμανθεὶς εἶπεν Ἡδύ μοι ὅτι  
ἐθερμάνθην καὶ εἶδον πῦρ.

**τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν ἐποίησεν  
εἰς θεὸν γλυπτὸν καὶ προσκυνεῖ  
αὐτῷ καὶ προσεύχεται λέγων**  
Ἐξέλοῦ με, ὅτι θεός μου εἶ σύ.

חציו שרף במ־אש על־חציו בשר  
יאכל יצלה צלי וישבע אֶף־יחם ויאמר  
האח חמותי ראיתי אור ושארתיו לֹאֵל  
עשה לפסלו ויסג־דלו וישתחו ויתפלל  
אֲלֵן ויאמר הצילני כי אלי אתה

**c. 44:19b**

ὅτι τὸ ἥμισυ αὐτοῦ  
κατέκαυσεν ἐν πυρὶ

**καὶ ἐπέψεν ἐπὶ τῶν  
ἀνθρώπων αὐτοῦ  
ἄρτους**

καὶ ὀπτήσας κρέας  
ἔφαγε

**καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν αὐτοῦ  
εἰς βδέλυγμα ἐποίησε  
καὶ προσκυνοῦσιν αὐτῷ.**

חציו שרפתי במ־ראש  
וּפִיתִי על־גחליו לֹחַם  
אצלה בשר ואכל ויתרו  
לתועבה אעשה לבול  
עץ אסגוד

The following harmonising adjustments seem to have been made in the Greek. Firstly, the baking of bread on the fire (shown in bold italics in the diagram above) is in LXX Isaiah not only mentioned in accounts *a* and *c*, but also in *b*. Secondly, the idea that the idol is made out of the *rest* (λοιπόν) of the wood (shown in bold), can in the Greek be read not only in *b* and *c* but also in *a*. Furthermore, the clause **חציו שרף במ־אש על־חציו בשר יאכל יצלה צלי** / καὶ ἐπ' αὐτοῦ κρέας ὀπτήσας ἔφαγε in *b* (verse 16; shown in shadow script) has been adapted to **אצלה בשר ואכל** / καὶ ὀπτήσας κρέας ἔφαγε in verse 19b (*c*) by means of the omission of **חץ** and **צלי**.<sup>37</sup> Lastly, in the clause **עץ אסגוד לבול** in verse 19b (*c*) **עץ** does not have an equivalent in the LXX, so the Greek version of these words (καὶ προσκυνοῦσιν αὐτῷ) was harmonised to καὶ προσκυνεῖ αὐτῷ in verse 17 (*b*). In account *a* too

<sup>37</sup> Also 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> displays harmonising variants in Isa 44:14–19, but these are different from the ones in LXX Isaiah: 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> seems to have adapted account *b* (verses 16–17) to account *c* (verse 19b) by reading **חציו שרף במ־אש על־חציו בשר יאכל** וְעַל גַּחְלֵיו וְעַל בְּשַׁר וְיֹאכַל בְּשַׁר חֲצִי וְיִשְׁבַּע חֲצִי for the Masoretic **חציו שרף במ־אש על־חציו בשר יאכל יצלה צלי וישבע אֶף־יחם** in verse 16, and by reading **עץ אסגוד לבול** instead of the Masoretic **עץ אסגוד** in verse 17.

the text has been altered so as to create a similar clause, namely through the rendering of *וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוֶה פָּסֶל וַיִּסְגְּדוּ לָמוֹ* in verse 15 by *καὶ προσκυνοῦσιν αὐτούς*.

### 9.2.3 Other examples of contextual harmonisation and exegesis in LXX Isaiah

In numerous other places, scattered throughout the entire translation of Isaiah, one can also find instances of pluses and minuses caused by contextual harmonisation or exegesis. As regards pluses, this involves the addition of expressions which appear in the near context—in a similar formulation or touching on the same topic. With respect to minuses, it concerns cases in which words seem to have been omitted in assimilation to parallel formulations nearby. Defining what exactly one means with “nearby” or “the near context” is a somewhat subjective matter. For the sake of convenience, I will reckon here as such the entire chapter to which a verse belongs.<sup>38</sup>

In the following overview of LXX Isaiah’s additions and omissions that may have arisen from contextual borrowing, the verses from which expressions have been adopted or to which they have been adjusted are presented in the column on the right:

1:21	πόλις πιστὴ <u>Σιών</u>	1:26	μητρόπολις πιστὴ Σιών
2:2	Ὅτι ἔσται ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις ἐμφανὲς τὸ ὄρος τοῦ κυρίου <u>καὶ</u> ὁ οἶκος τοῦ <u>θεοῦ</u> ἐπ’ ἄκρων τῶν ὀρέων <sup>39</sup>	2:3	Δεῦτε ἀναβῶμεν εἰς τὸ ὄρος κυρίου καὶ εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ Ἰακωβ
3:7	Οὐκ ἔσομαι <u>σου</u> ἀρχηγός· οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ μου ἄρτος οὐδὲ ἱμάτιον·	3:6	Ἰμάτιον ἔχεις, ἀρχηγὸς ἡμῶν γενοῦ, καὶ τὸ βρώμα τὸ ἐμὸν ὑπὸ σὲ ἔστω.

LXX Isa 3:6 comprises a plea to a “brother” to be the leader of the people (MT: *קצין תהיה־לנו*). Verse 7 gives the negative answer of this person (MT: *לֹא־אֶהְיֶה חֵבֶשׁ*). In the LXX this answer has been adapted to the previous question by way of the addition of a genitive pronoun *σου* to *ἀρχηγός*, parallel to *ἀρχηγὸς ἡμῶν* in verse 7.

<sup>38</sup> Contrary to Tov, who considers as “harmonization within the same context” only harmonisations which occur within the same verse or in adjacent verses (Tov, “Nature and Background,” 5).

<sup>39</sup> See sections 8.3.1.1e and 9.4.5.5.

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 13:5 ἔρχεσθαι ἐκ γῆς πόρρωθεν ἀπ' ἄκρου <u>θεμελίου</u> τοῦ οὐρανοῦ  | 13:13 ὁ γὰρ οὐρανὸς θυμωθήσεται καὶ ἡ γῆ σεισθήσεται ἐκ τῶν <u>θεμελίων</u> αὐτῆς |
| 13:9 θεῖναι <u>τὴν οἰκουμένην δλην</u> ἔρημον                        | 13:5 τοῦ καταφθεῖραι <u>τὴν οἰκουμένην δλην</u> .                                 |
| 13:11 καὶ ἐντελοῦμαι <u>τῇ οἰκουμένῃ δλη</u> κακὰ                    |   |
| 14:4 καὶ ἐρεῖς <u>ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ</u>                             | 14:3 Καὶ ἔσται <u>ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ</u>  |
| 14:12 συνετρίβη εἰς τὴν γῆν ὁ ἀποστέλλων πρὸς <u>πάντα τὰ ἔθνη</u> . | 14:26 καὶ αὕτη ἡ χεὶρ ἡ ὑψηλὴ ἐπὶ <u>πάντα τὰ ἔθνη</u> τῆς οἰκουμένης.            |
| 14:17 ὁ θεὸς <u>τὴν οἰκουμένην δλην</u> ἔρημον                       | 14:26 αὕτη ἡ βουλή, ἣν βεβούλευται κύριος ἐπὶ <u>τὴν οἰκουμένην δλην</u>          |
| 15:7 <u>ἐπάξω γὰρ</u> (–) ἐπὶ τὴν φάραγγα ᾧ Ἀραβας                   | 15:9 <u>ἐπάξω γὰρ ἐπὶ</u> Ρεμμων ᾧ Ἀραβας   |

The MT reading of the clause cited from 15:7 is וַיִּבְרַח לְהַגִּיד לָהֶם. The LXX has apparently read וַיִּבְרַח as a first person singular perfect verb with a third person plural suffix (although not representing the suffix) rather than as a noun phrase in the sense of “their possession,” as the MT vocalises the form. The rendering of וַיִּבְרַח by ἐπάξω γὰρ ἐπὶ has taken place in harmonisation with 15:9, where the LXX shows a similar verb phrase, this time as a fairly literal translation of the Hebrew (וַיִּבְרַח לְהַגִּיד לָהֶם).

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 15:8 καὶ ὀλολυγμὸς αὐτῆς <u>ἕως</u> τοῦ φρέατος τοῦ Αἰλιμ. <sup>40</sup>     | 15:4 <u>ἕως</u> Ιασσα ἠκούσθη ἡ φωνὴ αὐτῆς.<br>15:5 ἡ καρδία τῆς Μωαβίτιδος βοᾷ ἐν αὐτῇ <u>ἕως</u> Σηγαρ |
| 21:16 ᾧ ἐνιαυτὸς ὡς ἐνιαυτὸς μισθωτοῦ, ἐκλείψει ἡ δόξα <u>τῶν υἱῶν</u> Κηδαρ | 21:17 καὶ τὸ κατάλοιπον τῶν τοξευμάτων <u>τῶν</u> ἰσχυρῶν <u>υἱῶν</u> <u>Κηδαρ</u> ἔσται ὀλίγον          |
| 22:21 καὶ τὸ κράτος <u>καὶ τὴν οἰκονομίαν σου</u> δώσω εἰς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ  | 22:19 καὶ ἀφαιρεθήσῃ ἐκ <u>τῆς οἰκονομίας σου</u> καὶ ἐκ τῆς στάσεώς σου.                                |

<sup>40</sup> MT: וּבְאֵר אֵילִים לְהָלֵל.



In Isa 22:17–19 God announces to the steward Somna (Shebna) that he will remove from him his insignia. In the ensuing verses— verses 20–24—he threatens to give them to Eliakim instead. By way of the insertion of *οἰκονομίαν* in verse 21 the translator has made these passages resemble each other even more in the Greek than they already do in the Hebrew:

*17–19 What God takes away from Somna      20–24 What God will give to Eliakim*

τὴν στολὴν σου (17)

τὸν στέφανόν σου τὸν ἔνδοξον (18)

τῆς οἰκονομίας σου (19)

τὴν στολὴν σου (21)

τὸν στέφανόν σου (21)

τὴν οἰκονομίαν σου (21)

24:14 **οἱ δὲ καταλειφθέντες ἐπὶ  
τῆς γῆς** εὐφρανθήσονται  
ἅμα τῇ δόξῃ κυρίου.

24:6 διὰ τοῦτο πτωχοὶ ἔσονται οἱ  
ἐνοικοῦντες **ἐν τῇ γῇ**, καὶ **κατα-  
λειφθήσονται** ἄνθρωποι ὀλίγοι.

26:5a δς **ταπεινώσας κατήγαγες**  
τοὺς ἐνοικοῦντας ἐν ὑψηλοῖς.

26:5b πόλεις ὀχυρὰς **καταβαλεῖς** καὶ  
**κατάξεις** ἕως ἐδάφους<sup>41</sup>

With the MT of 26:5a reading **כִּי הִשָּׁה יְשִׁבִי מְרוֹם**, the LXX seems to represent the verb **הִשָּׁה** by both **ταπεινώσας** and **κατήγαγες**.<sup>42</sup> This may be in conformity to LXX Isa 26:5b, which accordingly offers two verb forms in the sense of “to bring down.” Compare also 25:12: καὶ τὸ ὕψος τῆς καταφυγῆς τοῦ τοίχου σου **ταπεινώσει**, καὶ **καταβήσεται** ἕως τοῦ ἐδάφους.<sup>43</sup>

26:19 ἀναστήσονται **οἱ νεκροί** (–),  
καὶ ἐγερθήσονται οἱ ἐν τοῖς  
μνημείοις (–)

26:14 **οἱ δὲ νεκροί** ζωὴν οὐ μὴ ἴδωσιν,  
οὐδὲ ἱατροὶ οὐ μὴ ἀναστήσωσι.

The lack of representation of the suffix in **מתים** (οἱ νεκροί) and **נבלתי** (οἱ ἐν τοῖς μνημείοις) in 26:19 may be the result of harmonisation with **מתים** / **οἱ δὲ νεκροί** in verse 14.

27:8 οὐ σὺ ἤσθα ὁ μελετῶν τῷ  
πνεύματι τῷ σκληρῷ **ἀνελεῖν**  
**αὐτούς** πνεύματι θυμοῦ;<sup>44</sup>

27:7 καὶ ὡς αὐτὸς **ἀνείλεν**, οὕτως  
ἀναιρεθήσεται;

27:9 καὶ οὐ μὴ μείνη τὰ δένδρα  
αὐτῶν, καὶ τὰ εἰδῶλα

27:9 ὅταν θῶσι πάντας τοὺς λίθους τῶν  
βωμῶν **κατακεκομμένους** ὡς

<sup>41</sup> MT: קריה נשגבה ישפילנה ישפילה עד־ארץ גיענה עד־עפר.

<sup>42</sup> See section 6.5a.

<sup>43</sup> The MT of 25:12 reads **השח השפיל הגיע לארץ עד־עפר**.

<sup>44</sup> MT: הגה ברוחו הקשה ביום קדים.

αὐτῶν ἐκκεκομμένα  
ὥσπερ δρυμὸς μακράν.<sup>45</sup>

κονίαν λεπτήν·

28:17b–18 καὶ οἱ πεποιθότες μάτην  
ψεύδει· ὅτι οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ  
ὑμᾶς καταγίγς, μὴ καὶ ἀφέλῃ  
ὑμῶν τὴν διαθήκην τοῦ  
θανάτου, καὶ ἡ ἐλπὶς ὑμῶν ἡ  
πρὸς τὸν ἄδην οὐ μὴ ἐμμείνη·  
καταγίγς φερομένη ἐὰν ἐπέλθῃ,  
ἔσεσθε αὐτῇ εἰς καταπάτημα.

28:15 Ἐποιήσαμεν διαθήκην μετὰ τοῦ  
ἄδου καὶ μετὰ τοῦ θανάτου  
συνθήκας, καταγίγς φερομένη ἐὰν  
παρέλθῃ οὐ μὴ ἔλθῃ ἡμῖν,  
ἐθήκαμεν ψεῦδος τὴν ἐλπίδα ἡμῶν  
καὶ τῷ ψεύδει σκεπασθησόμεθα

The MT of Isa 28:17b–18 reads as follows:

יֵיעָה בָּרֵד מַחֲסֵה כֹּזֵב  
וּסְתֵר מִיֵּם יִשְׁטְפוּ  
וּכְפַר בְּרִיתְכֶם אֶת־מָוֶת  
וּחֻזְתְּכֶם אֶת־שְׁאוֹל לֹא תִקּוּם  
שׁוֹט שׁוֹטֶף כִּי יַעֲבֵר  
וְהִיִּיתֶם לוֹ לְמַרְמָס

hail will sweep away the refuge of lies,  
and waters will overwhelm the shelter.  
Then your covenant with death will be annulled,  
and your agreement with Sheol will not stand;  
when the overwhelming scourge passes through  
you will be beaten down by it

The Greek text of 28:17b (καὶ οἱ πεποιθότες μάτην ψεύδει· ὅτι οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ ὑμᾶς καταγίγς) is rather divergent from the MT (יֵיעָה בָּרֵד מַחֲסֵה כֹּזֵב וּסְתֵר מִיֵּם יִשְׁטְפוּ). It is not easy to find out how the translator has construed this content out of the Hebrew. The noun phrase οἱ πεποιθότες he may have derived from מַחֲסֵה, connecting the meaning of the root חָסָה = “to hide” with “to trust” (compare 30:3 וְהַחֲסוּת / τοῖς πεποιθόσιν). μάτην seems to be a plus, whilst ψεύδει forms an equivalent of כֹּזֵב (“lie”).<sup>46</sup> Whether the words ὅτι οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ ὑμᾶς καταγίγς can be matched to וּסְתֵר מִיֵּם יִשְׁטְפוּ is dubious. καταγίγς may correspond to יִשְׁטְפוּ, linked to שׁוֹט שׁוֹטֶף (“the overwhelming scourge”) in verse 18, which has been rendered there as καταγίγς φερομένη. Nevertheless, one could as well posit that the Greek clause is a plus and the Hebrew one a minus. Whatever the case, the Greek line obviously points back to the similar formulation καταγίγς φερομένη ἐὰν παρέλθῃ in verse 15. Whereas the latter verse expresses the (false) hope of the people that danger will not reach them, in verses 17b–19 God pronounces that the contrary will be the case. In his reaction to the bold statements of the people, God makes use of some of their words in order to contradict them. By the reformulation of verse 17b this repetition has been

<sup>45</sup> MT: לֹא יִקְמוּ אֲשֶׁרִים וְחֻמִּים כִּי עֵיר בְּצוּרָה בָּדָד.

<sup>46</sup> One could also posit that the Greek clause as a whole forms an interpretation of the Hebrew clause as a whole, which was considered to be metaphorical.

increased by the translator. The contrast between the people's hope and God's threat is even more accentuated by virtue of the fact that in the LXX these verses relate to each other in a chiastic way:

28:15

A	Ἐποίησαμεν <b>διαθήκην</b> μετὰ τοῦ <b>ἔθου</b>	καὶ μετὰ τοῦ <b>θανάτου</b> συνθήκας,
B	καταιγίς φερομένη ἐὰν παρέλθῃ	οὐ μὴ ἔλθῃ ἡμῖν,
C	<b>ἐθήκαμεν</b> ψεύδος τὴν <b>ἐλπίδα</b> ἡμῶν	καὶ τῷ <b>ψεύδει</b> σκεπασθισόμεθα

28:17–18a

C'	καὶ <b>θήσω</b> κρίσιν εἰς <b>ἐλπίδα</b> , καὶ οἱ πεποιθότες μάτην <b>ψεύδει</b> .	ἡ δὲ ἐλεημοσύνη μου εἰς σταθμούς,
B'	ὅτι οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ ὑμᾶς καταιγίς,	
A'	μὴ καὶ ἀφέλῃ ὑμῶν καὶ ἡ ἐλπίς ὑμῶν ἢ πρὸς <b>τὸν ἄδην</b>	τὴν <b>διαθήκην τοῦ θανάτου</b> , οὐ μὴ ἐμμείνη·

28:18b–19

B''	καταιγίς φερομένη ἐὰν ἐπέλθῃ, ὅταν παρέλθῃ, λήμψεται ὑμᾶς πρῶι πρῶι παρελεύσεται ἡμέρας,	ἔσεσθε αὐτῇ εἰς καταπάτημα. καὶ ἐν νυκτὶ ἔσται ἐλπίς πονηρά·
-----	--	---

32:19 καὶ ἔσονται οἱ ἐνοικοῦντες  
ἐν τοῖς δρυμοῖς πεποιθότες  
ὥς οἱ ἐν τῇ πεδινῇ.

32:17 καὶ **πεποιθότες** ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος·  
32:18 καὶ κατοικήσει ὁ λαὸς αὐτοῦ ἐν  
πόλει εἰρήνης καὶ **ἐνοικήσει**  
**πεποιθώς**

The final words of 32:19 in the Hebrew—היער ובשפלה תפלה הער—have been entirely rearranged in the Greek. While היער and בשפלה are used with a different function, תפלה has been omitted. The new sentence in the LXX has been complemented with the words καὶ ἔσονται οἱ ἐνοικοῦντες and πεποιθότες ὥς, which may additionally serve to tie verse 19 to verses 17–18 more closely. Also in those verses it is said of God's people that they will dwell in confidence.

41:4 τίς ἐνήργησε καὶ **ἐποίησε**  
**ταῦτα;**

41:20 ἵνα ἴδωσι καὶ γινῶσι καὶ  
ἐννοηθῶσι καὶ ἐπιστῶνται ἅμα  
ὅτι χεὶρ κυρίου **ἐποίησε ταῦτα**  
πάντα

In 41:20 an answer is given to the question posed in verse 4. Probably the Isaiah translator has added ταῦτα in verse 4 in analogy to verse 20, so as to give prominence to the connection between the two verses.

41:4 ἐκάλεσεν αὐτήν ὁ καλῶν  
αὐτήν ἀπὸ γενεῶν ἀρχῆς

41:2 τίς ἐξήγειρεν ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν  
δικαιοσύνην, **ἐκάλεσεν αὐτήν**  
κατὰ πόδας αὐτοῦ

The Hebrew version of the clause from 41:4 quoted above reads קרא הדרות שאל. The LXX represents the participle **κρά** twice, with on the one hand **ὁ καλῶν**, and on the other **ἐκάλεσεν αὐτήν**. The latter rendering can be assumed to have been affected by **ἐκάλεσεν αὐτήν** in verse 2.

41:5 εἶδον ἔθνη καὶ  
ἐφοβήθησαν, τὰ ἄκρα τῆς  
γῆς ἤγγισαν καὶ ἤλθον  
**ἅμα**

41:20 ἵνα ἴδωσι καὶ γινώσι καὶ ἐννοηθῶσι  
καὶ ἐπιστῶνται **ἅμα**

41:23 εὖ ποιήσατε καὶ κακώσατε, καὶ  
θαυμασόμεθα καὶ ὀψόμεθα **ἅμα**.

As in 41:20 and 23, the adverb **ἅμα** in verse 5 is joined to a couple of parallel verbs. Each time these verbs express the people's realisation of the power of God (41:5, 20), or of the lack of power of the idols (41:23).

41:17 ἐγὼ κύριος **ὁ θεός**, ἐγὼ  
ἐπακούσομαι, **ὁ θεός**  
Ἰσραὴλ

41:4 ἐγὼ **θεός** πρῶτος

41:10 ἐγὼ γάρ εἰμι **ὁ θεός** σου ὁ  
ἐνισχύσας σε

41:21 Ἐγγίζει ἡ κρίσις ὑμῶν,  
λέγει κύριος **ὁ θεός**.

41:13 ὅτι ἐγὼ **ὁ θεός** σου ὁ κρατῶν τῆς  
δεξιᾶς σου

41:14 ἐγὼ ἐβοήθησά σοι, λέγει **ὁ θεός**  
ὁ λυτρούμενός σε, Ἰσραὴλ.

LXX Isa 41 exhibits a preference for (κύριος ὁ) θεός as a denomination for God. While in verses 17 and 21 θεός is a plus, in verses 4 and 14 it renders הוה.

41:23 **ἀναγγεῖλατε ἡμῖν** τὰ  
ἐπερχόμενα ἐπ' ἐσχάτου,  
καὶ γνωσόμεθα ὅτι θεοί  
ἐστε.

41:22 ἐγγισάτωσαν καὶ  
**ἀναγγεῖλάτωσαν ὑμῖν** ἃ  
συμβήσεται, ἢ τὰ πρότερα τίνα ἦν  
εἶπατε, καὶ ἐπιστήσομεν τὸν νοῦν  
καὶ γνωσόμεθα τί τὰ ἔσχατα,  
καὶ τὰ ἐπερχόμενα εἶπατε ἡμῖν.

In 41:22a Isaiah addresses the people, insisting that the idols have to prove themselves to them. In verses 22b–23 he addresses the idols themselves with the same challenge. The LXX translator—or a later editor<sup>47</sup>—may have supplemented an object ἡμῖν to ἀναγγεῖλατε in verse 23 so as to assimilate this command to ἀναγγεῖλάτωσαν ὑμῖν in verse 22.<sup>48</sup>

<sup>47</sup> The Göttingen edition has left out ἡμῖν in 41:23. The manuscript tradition is divided on this issue, although the two most important Alexandrian witnesses A and Q, are in favour of a reading without ἡμῖν. The pronoun may have been added by a later editor of the LXX.

<sup>48</sup> Additionally, ἡμῖν may have been added parallel to the preceding clause καὶ τὰ ἐπερχόμενα εἶπατε ἡμῖν.

41:28 ἀπὸ γὰρ τῶν ἐθνῶν,  
 ἰδοὺ οὐθίς, καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν  
 εἰδώλων αὐτῶν οὐκ  
 ἦν ὁ ἀναγγέλλων· καὶ  
 ἐὰν ἐρωτήσω αὐτούς  
Πόθεν ἐστέ, οὐ μὴ  
 ἀποκριθῶσί μοι.

41:23–24 ἀναγγείλατε τὰ ἐπερχόμενα  
 ἐπ’ ἐσχάτου, καὶ γνωσόμεθα ὅτι  
 θεοί ἐστε· εὖ ποιήσατε καὶ  
 κακώσατε, καὶ θαυμασόμεθα καὶ  
 ὀψόμεθα ἅμα· ὅτι πόθεν ἐστέ  
 ὑμεῖς καὶ πόθεν ἡ ἐργασία ὑμῶν;

The MT of these verses reads as follows:

MT Isa 41:23–24 וְגִידוּ הָאֱתוּנוֹת לְאֶחָד וְנִדְעָה כִּי אֱלֹהִים אַתֶּם אֲהִי־יִשְׁבִּי וְתִרְעוּ  
 וְנִשְׁתַּעַה וְנִרְאָה וְנִרְאָה יַחֲדוֹ הִיאֲתֶם מֵאֵין וּפַעֲלֶכֶם מֵאִפֶּס תּוֹעֲבָה יִבְחַר בָּכֶם

MT Isa 41:28 וְאֵרָא וְאֵין אִישׁ וּמֵאֵלָה וְאֵין יוֹעֵץ וְאֵשְׂאֵלֶם וְיִשְׁבִּי דְבַר

In 41:28 ומאלה (“and from among these”) is rendered καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν εἰδώλων, as though the Hebrew reads ומאלים or ומאלהים (“and from among the gods”). Besides that, Πόθεν ἐστέ has been inserted in the LXX. Both changes have apparently been made in harmonisation with verse 24, where in the Greek the gods are also asked where they come from: ὅτι πόθεν ἐστέ ὑμεῖς καὶ πόθεν ἡ ἐργασία ὑμῶν; here the first πόθεν derives from מֵאֵין, understood in the sense of “whence” rather than as “nothing” (see 39:3 יבא אליך (וּמֵאֵין), while the second πόθεν stems from מֵאִפֶּס (“nothing”), read as מֵאִפֶּס—“from whence.”

43:10 γένεσθέ μοι μάρτυρες, καγὼ  
μάρτυς, λέγει κύριος ὁ θεός,  
 καὶ ὁ παῖς, ὃν ἐξελεξάμην,  
 ἵνα γνῶτε καὶ πιστεύσητε καὶ  
 συνῆτε ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι, ἔμπροσθέν  
 μου οὐκ ἐγένετο ἄλλος  
 θεὸς καὶ μετ’ ἐμὲ οὐκ ἔσται.

43:12 ἀνήγγειλα καὶ ἔσωσα, ἐνώτισα καὶ  
 οὐκ ἦν ἐν ὑμῖν ἀλλότριος· ὑμεῖς  
 ἐμοὶ μάρτυρες καγὼ μάρτυς,  
 λέγει κύριος ὁ θεός.

καγὼ μάρτυς in verse 10 has been copied from verse 12, where these words render וְאֵין.

44:7 στήτω καλεσάτω καὶ  
 ἐτοιμασάτω μοι ἄφ’  
 οὗ ἐποίησα ἄνθρωπον  
 εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα<sup>49</sup>

44:11 συναχθήτωσαν πάντες καὶ  
στήτωσαν ἅμα,  
 ἐντραπήτωσαν καὶ  
 αἰσχυνθήτωσαν ἅμα.

<sup>49</sup> MT: וְיִגִּד וְיִרְכַּב לִי מִשּׁוּמֵי עַם-עוֹלָם. I have considered στήτω as a plus, καλεσάτω as a rendering of קרא, and וְיִגִּד as a minus (i.e. an omission for the sake of condensation). Alternatively, στήτω could be perceived as translating קרא (perhaps read as קרה).

45:5 ὅτι ἐγὼ κύριος ὁ θεός, καὶ  
οὐκ ἔστιν ἔτι πλὴν ἐμοῦ  
θεός, (–) καὶ οὐκ ἤδεις με

45:14–15 Οὐκ ἔστι θεός πλὴν σοῦ· σὺ  
γὰρ εἶ θεός, καὶ οὐκ ἤδειμεν, ὁ  
θεός τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ σωτήρ.<sup>50</sup>

In LXX Isa 45:5 an equivalent to the Hebrew verb אָזַן (“I will gird you”) is missing:

MT Isa 45:5 אֲנִי יְהוָה וְאֵין עוֹד זֹלָתִי אֵין אֱלֹהִים וְלֹא יִדְעָנִי

The omission of this verb has aligned verse 5 to verse 15, since there, too, the declaration of the divineness and uniqueness of God is immediately followed by the statement that the people have not known him. In verse 15 οὐκ ἤδειμεν translates מסתתר (“he who hides himself”). This rendering in its turn is probably encouraged by וְלֹא יִדְעָנִי / καὶ οὐκ ἤδεις με in verse 5. So, between these two verses a kind of cross-pollination seems to have occurred.

45:21 (–) Ἐγὼ ὁ θεός, καὶ οὐκ  
ἔστιν ἄλλος (–) πλὴν  
ἐμοῦ.

45:5 ὅτι ἐγὼ κύριος ὁ θεός, καὶ οὐκ  
ἔστιν ἔτι πλὴν ἐμοῦ θεός  
45:6 ἐγὼ κύριος ὁ θεός, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν  
ἔτι.  
45:7 ἐγὼ κύριος ὁ θεός ὁ ποιῶν  
ταῦτα πάντα.  
45:8 ἐγὼ εἰμι κύριος ὁ κτίσας σε.  
45:18 Ἐγὼ εἰμι, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἔτι.  
45:19 ἐγὼ εἰμι ἐγὼ εἰμι κύριος λαλῶν  
Δικαιοσύνην  
45:22 ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ θεός, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν  
ἄλλος.

In LXX Isa 45:21 some words are missing as compared to the Hebrew:

Isa 45:21 הֲלוֹא אֲנִי יְהוָה וְאֵין עוֹד אֱלֹהִים מִבְּלַעַדִּי

These two minuses have approximated 45:21 to other verses in the same chapter in which God similarly declares that there is no god beside him. In those verses God's self revelation is affirmative rather than interrogative, which may have prompted the translator to leave out the question particle הֲלוֹא in verse 21. אֱלֹהִים he has omitted in analogy to 45:6, 18 and 22 (in 45:5 θεός has been added, however).

<sup>50</sup> MT: ואֵין עוֹד אַפֶּס אֱלֹהִים אֲכַן אַתָּה אֵל מִסְתַּתֵּר אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל מוֹשִׁיעַ.

47:1 **εἴσελθε εἰς τὸ σκότος, (–)**  
θυγάτηρ Χαλδαίων

47:5 **εἴσελθε εἰς τὸ σκότος,**  
θυγάτηρ Χαλδαίων

The words spoken to the daughter of Babylon in Isa 47:1—in Hebrew **בְּתוּלַת בָּבֶל שְׁבִי לְאֶרֶץ כְּשָׁדִים**—have in the Greek been altered to **εἴσελθε εἰς τὸ σκότος, θυγάτηρ Χαλδαίων**. Both the rendering of **שְׁבִי לְאֶרֶץ** as **εἴσελθε εἰς τὸ σκότος** and the omission of **כְּשָׁדִים** have made this verse conform to verse 5:

47:1

a רְדִי וּשְׁבִי עַל־עַפְרָא  
בְּתוּלַת בָּבֶל  
b **שְׁבִי לְאֶרֶץ כְּשָׁדִים**  
בְּתוּלַת  
c כִּי לֹא תוֹסִיפִי יִקְרְאוּ־לְךָ  
רַכָּה וְעַגְגָּה

Κατάβηθι *κάθισον* ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν,  
παρθένος θυγάτηρ Βαβυλῶνος,  
**εἴσελθε εἰς τὸ σκότος,**  
**θυγάτηρ Χαλδαίων,**  
ὅτι οὐκέτι προστεθήσῃ *κληθήναι*  
ἀπαλὴ καὶ τρυφερά.

47:5

a שְׁבִי דוֹמָם  
b וּבֹאִי בַחֶשֶׁךְ  
c כִּי לֹא תוֹסִיפִי יִקְרְאוּ־לְךָ

*Κάθισον* κατανενογμένη,  
**εἴσελθε εἰς τὸ σκότος,**  
*οὐκέτι μὴ κληθήσῃ*

Remarkably enough, the only expression that is precisely identical in the Hebrew versions of 47:1 and 5, namely **כִּי לֹא תוֹסִיפִי יִקְרְאוּ־לְךָ**, received a somewhat varying translation in the LXX. In verse 1 it became *ὅτι οὐκέτι προστεθήσῃ κληθήναι*, in verse 5 *οὐκέτι μὴ κληθήσῃ*.<sup>51</sup>

47:10 σὺ γὰρ εἶπας **Ἐγὼ εἰμὶ,**  
**καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἑτέρα.**<sup>52</sup>

47:8 ἡ λέγουσα ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῆς  
**Ἐγὼ εἰμὶ, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἑτέρα.**

49:5 καὶ νῦν **οὕτως λέγει**  
**κύριος**<sup>53</sup>

49:7 **Οὕτως λέγει κύριος**  
49:8 **οὕτως λέγει κύριος**  
49:22 **Οὕτως λέγει κύριος**

49:7 **Οὕτως λέγει κύριος ὁ**  
**ῥυσάμενός σε ὁ θεὸς** Ἰσραὴλ

49:26 ὅτι ἐγὼ ὁ **ῥυσάμενός σε** καὶ  
ἀντιλαμβάνόμενος ἰσχύος Ἰακωβ.

The translator has adapted 49:7 to verse 26 by expanding the phrase **יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ** into **ὁ ῥυσάμενός σε ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραὴλ**.<sup>54</sup> Compare for **ὁ ῥυσάμενός σε**

<sup>51</sup> For a further analysis of these verses, see section 8.4c.

<sup>52</sup> MT: **אָמַרְתִּי אֲנִי**. Perhaps **אָנִי** (Ἐγὼ εἰμὶ), while **אָנִי** was rendered **καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν**.

<sup>53</sup> 1QIsa<sup>b</sup> has **כֹּה אָמַר יְיָ**; see section 12.3.2.1.

(usually in combination with ἅγιος [θεός] Ἰσραηλ) also 47:4; 48:17; and 54:5, 8.

51:7 ἀκούσατέ μου, οἱ εἰδότες  
κρίσιν, **λαός μου**, οὗ ὁ νόμος  
μου ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμῶν.

51:4 ἀκούσατέ μου ἀκούσατε, **λαός μου**  
51:16 Σιων **Λαός μου** εἰ σύ.

51:9 Ἐξεγείρου ἐξεγείρου,  
**Ἱερουσαλημ**

51:17 Ἐξεγείρου ἐξεγείρου ἀνάστηθι,  
**Ἱερουσαλημ**<sup>55</sup>

51:18 καὶ οὐκ ἦν ὁ ἀντι-  
λαμβάνόμενος τῆς χειρός  
σου οὐδὲ ἀπὸ πάντων  
**τῶν υἱῶν σου**, ὧν ὑψώσας.

51:20 **οἱ υἱοί σου** οἱ ἀπορούμενοι, οἱ  
καθεύδοντες ἐπ' ἄκρου πάσης  
ἐξόδου

55:11 ὁ **ἔαν** ἐξέλθῃ ἐκ τοῦ  
στόματός μου

55:10 ὥς γὰρ **ἔαν** καταβῇ ὑετός ἡ χιὼν  
ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ

In Isa 55:10–11 a simile is presented, whereby verse 10 gives the image and verse 11 its signification. The wording of the explanation of this simile has in LXX Isaiah been adjusted to that of the image by way of the addition of ἔαν in verse 11. For the same reason ושממה in verse 10 and ריקם in verse 11 have not been translated:

55:10, image:

כי כאשר ירד הגשם והשלג מן־השמים  
**ושממה** לא ישוב  
כי אס־הרורה את־הארץ  
והולידה והצמיחה  
ונתן זרע לזרע  
ולחם לאכל

ὥς γὰρ **ἔαν** καταβῇ ὑετός ἡ χιὼν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ  
καὶ οὐ **μὴ** ἀποστραφῇ,  
**ἕως ἄν** μεθύσῃ τὴν γῆν,  
καὶ ἐκτέκῃ καὶ ἐκβλαστήσῃ  
καὶ δῶ σπέρμα τῷ σπεύροντι  
καὶ ἄρτον εἰς βρώσιν

55:11, meaning:

כן יהיה דברי  
אשר יצא מפי  
לא־ישוב אלי ריקם  
כי אס־עשה את־דאשר חפצתי

οὕτως ἔσται τὸ **ῥήμά** μου,  
ὁ **ἔαν** ἐξέλθῃ ἐκ τοῦ στόματός μου,  
οὐ **μὴ** ἀποστραφῇ,  
**ἕως ἄν** συντελεσθῇ ὅσα ἡβέλῃσα

<sup>54</sup> The MT of 49:7 reads: כה אמר־יהוה גאל ישראל קדושו. An alternative explanation for the LXX rendering would be that the translator has based ὁ θεός on his *Vorlage*. He may have had a text in front of him similar to 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>, which offers יהוה גואל־כַּח יִשְׂרָאֵל, and then have changed the order of these words (thus Kutscher, *Language and Linguistic Background*, 542); see section 12.3.1.1.

<sup>55</sup> Compare also 52:1 Ἐξεγείρου ἐξεγείρου, Σιων, ἐνδύσαι τὴν ἰσχύν σου, Σιων, καὶ ἐνδύσαι τὴν δόξαν σου, Ἱερουσαλημ πόλις ἡ ἁγία.



- 55:11 καὶ εὐδοῶσω τὰς ὁδοὺς σου καὶ τὰ ἐντάλματά μου.<sup>56</sup>
- 55:7 ἀπολιπέτω ὁ ἀσεβὴς τὰς ὁδοὺς αὐτοῦ
- 55:8 οὐδὲ ὥσπερ αἱ ὁδοὶ ὑμῶν αἱ ὁδοὶ μου
- 55:9 οὕτως ἀπέχει ἡ ὁδός μου ἀπὸ τῶν ὁδῶν ὑμῶν
- 56:6 καὶ πάντας τοὺς φυλασσομένους τὰ σάββατά μου μὴ βεβηλοῦν καὶ ἀντέχο- μένους τῆς διαθήκης μου
- 56:4 ὅσοι ἂν φυλάξωνται τὰ σάββατά μου καὶ ἐκλέξωνται ἃ ἐγὼ θέλω καὶ ἀντέχωνται τῆς διαθήκης μου
- 57:15b Ἁγίος ἐν ἀγίοις ὄνομα αὐτῷ
- 57:15a Τάδε λέγει κύριος ὁ ὑψίστος ὁ ἐν ὑψηλοῖς κατοικῶν τὸν αἰῶνα<sup>57</sup>
- 58:10 καὶ ὧς πεινῶντι τὸν ἄρτον ἐκ ψυχῆς σου<sup>58</sup>
- 58:7 διὰθρυπτε πεινῶντι τὸν ἄρτον σου
- 63:16 ἀπ' ἀρχῆς τὸ ὄνομά σου ἐφ' ἡμᾶς ἐστίν.
- 63:19 ἐγενόμεθα ὡς τὸ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, ὅτε οὐκ ἤρξας ἡμῶν οὐδὲ ἐπεκλήθη τὸ ὄνομά σου ἐφ' ἡμᾶς.<sup>59</sup>
- 64:8(9) μὴ ὀργίζου ἡμῖν σφόδρα καὶ μὴ ἐν καιρῷ μνησθῆς ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν.
- 64:6(7) ὅτι ἀπέστρεψας τὸ πρόσωπόν σου ἀφ' ἡμῶν καὶ παρέδωκας ἡμᾶς διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν.
- 65:9 καὶ ἐξάξω τὸ ἐξ Ἰακωβ σπέρμα καὶ τὸ ἐξ Ἰουδα, καὶ κληρονομήσει τὸ ὄρος τὸ ἁγίόν μου<sup>60</sup>
- 65:11 ὑμεῖς δὲ οἱ ἐγκαταλιπόντες με καὶ ἐπιλανθανόμενοι τὸ ὄρος τὸ ἁγίόν μου
- 65:25 οὐδὲ μὴ λυμаноῦνται ἐπὶ τῷ ὄρει τῷ ἁγίῳ μου

<sup>56</sup> MT: והצליח אשר הלחתי. Also Isa 48:15 may have figured in the realisation of this rendering: אני דברתי בראיתי והצליחתי / ἐγὼ ἐλάλησα, ἐγὼ ἐκάλεσα, ἤγαγον αὐτὸν καὶ εὐδόωσα τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ.

<sup>57</sup> MT: כי בה אמר רם ונשא שכן עד.

<sup>58</sup> MT: ותפק לרעב נפשי.

<sup>59</sup> Compare Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 78.

<sup>60</sup> MT: והוצאתי מיעקב זרע ומיהודה יורש הרי.

65:7c ἀποδώσω τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν  
εἰς τὸν κόλπον αὐτῶν.

65:6–7a Οὐ σιωπήσω, ἕως ἂν ἀποδῶ (–)  
εἰς τὸν κόλπον αὐτῶν· τὰς  
ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν πατέρων  
αὐτῶν

In Isa 65:7c רשנה is not represented in the LXX. This may be the result of assimilation to 65:6, where a comparable clause appears without this adverb:

MT Isa 65:6–7a

לֹא אֶחְשֶׁה כִּי אֶסְלַמְתִּי  
וּשְׁלַמְתִּי עַל־חִיקֶם עֲוֹנֵיכֶם  
... וְעֹנַת אֲבוֹתֵיכֶם יַחְדּוּ

MT Isa 65:7c

וּמִדַּתִּי פַעֲלָתָם רִשְׁנָה עַל־חִיקֶם

66:9 οὐκ ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ γεννῶσαν  
καὶ στεῖραν ἐποίησα;  
εἶπεν ὁ θεός.<sup>61</sup>

66:12 ὅτι τάδε λέγει κύριος Ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ  
ἐκκλίνω εἰς αὐτοὺς ὡς ποταμὸς  
εἰρήνης

66:23 καὶ ἔσται μῆνα ἐκ μηνὸς  
καὶ σάββατον ἐκ σαββάτου  
ἥξει πᾶσα σὰρξ ἐνώπιόν  
μου προσκυνῆσαι ἐν  
Ἱερουσαλημ, εἶπε κύριος.<sup>62</sup>

66:20 καὶ ἄξουσιν τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς ὑμῶν  
ἐκ πάντων τῶν ἔθνων δῶρον κυρίῳ  
μεθ' ἵππων καὶ ἁρμάτων ἐν  
λαμπήναις ἡμιόνων μετὰ σκιαδίων  
εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν πόλιν Ἱερουσαλημ

### 9.2.4 Conclusion to 9.2

Contextual harmonisation and exegesis form an important source for pluses and minuses in the Septuagint of Isaiah. Contextual *harmonisation* occurs especially when the text contains two parts that are closely related to each other, displaying similar statements. Sometimes the two related parts consist of a question and the answer to it (see LXX Isa 3:6, 7; 36:11, 12; 41:2, 4; and 41:4, 20), a simile and its explanation (55:10, 11), or a speech and the reference to it by another figure (see 28:15, 17–18 and 37:4, 17). Also when the text presents several accounts of the same event these different reports are occasionally harmonised to each other (see 39:2, 4 and 44:14–19). Through contextual harmonisation the translator (or a later editor) may have sought to strengthen the links between the different sections of the discourse, and so to attain a greater consistency and coherence.

<sup>61</sup> MT: אֶסְלַמְתִּי אֶמַר אֱלֹהִים. Another possibility is that ἰδοὺ is not a plus, but that the translator read הִנֵּנִי אֲנִי (compare הִנֵּנִי in verse 12). For other cases of ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ, see 54:11 (הִנֵּה) and 54:16 (אֲנִי).

<sup>62</sup> See also 27:13 καὶ προσκυνήσουσι τῷ κυρίῳ ἐπὶ τὸ ὄρος τὸ ἅγιον ἐν Ἱερουσαλημ.

Also contextual *exegesis* has been applied in order to strengthen or extend intertextual relations. Words that appear earlier or later in the same text are repeated so as to make a connection to the passage where they come from, or to explain the one passage with the help of the other.

By employing contextual harmonisation and exegesis the Isaiah translator showed himself to be part of a wider tradition. In other ancient witnesses and translations of the Bible, such as, for instance, the Samaritan Pentateuch, these techniques were practiced regularly as well.<sup>63</sup> Also the Great Isaiah Scroll displays a relatively large number of cases where an extra word or expression seems to derive from the same or a nearby verse.<sup>64</sup>

### 9.3 The adoption of elements from passages elsewhere in Isaiah

Besides elements from the immediate context, the translator has often introduced into his text elements from passages elsewhere in the book of Isaiah. This gave him a means to clarify and interpret difficult portions with the help of other, related passages, but also to create linkages to other sections in Isaiah, thus improving the unity of his translation. The borrowing of elements from elsewhere in Isaiah has earlier been studied by, among others, Zillesen, Ziegler and Koenig.<sup>65</sup> The outline below will list those cases where this technique has led to pluses and minuses in the translation.<sup>66</sup>

#### 9.3.1 A survey of pluses and minuses resulting from the adoption of elements from elsewhere in Isaiah

1:10 προσέχετε νόμον θεοῦ (–),  
λαδς Γομορρας.

30:9 ὅτι λαδς ἀπειθῆς ἐστιν, υἱοὶ ψευδεῖς,  
οἱ οὐκ ἠβούλοντο ἀκούειν τὸν νόμον  
τοῦ θεοῦ

<sup>63</sup> See Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 85–89.

<sup>64</sup> Kutscher mentions thirty-four cases in 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> where the extra (group of) word(s) turns up in the same or a nearby verse, and another five where the word is found in the same chapter or on the same subject. This covers almost 40 percent of the total number of pluses he has perceived in 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> (Kutscher, *Language and Linguistic Background*, 545). Strikingly enough, of these harmonising pluses 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> has only a few in common with LXX Isa (see section 12.3.1.1). This confirms the idea that most harmonising pluses and minuses in LXX Isaiah were created by the translator or by a later Greek editor rather than that they are due to a different *Vorlage*.

<sup>65</sup> Zillesen, “Bemerkungen,” 238–63; Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 134–75; Koenig, *L’herméneutique analogique*, 3–103.

<sup>66</sup> For a discussion of pluses and minuses resulting from intertextual borrowing within Isa 36–39, see section 9.2.2.5 above.

The MT of Isa 1:10 has **האזינו תורת אלהינו עם עמרה**. Perhaps the suffix in **אלהינו** did not receive a translation in the LXX so as to arrive at the expression **νόμον θεοῦ**, similar to **νόμος τοῦ θεοῦ** in 30:9 and in other Scriptural passages (for example in Josh 24:26; 2 Esdr 18:8, 18).<sup>67</sup>

1:20 τὸ γὰρ στόμα κυρίου  
ἐλάλησε **ταῦτα**.

58:14 τὸ γὰρ στόμα κυρίου  
ἐλάλησε **ταῦτα**.

24:3 τὸ γὰρ στόμα κυρίου ἐλάλησε  
**ταῦτα**.

The formula **כִּי פִי יְהוָה דִּבֶּר** appears three times in the book of Isaiah: in Isa 1:20; 40:5; and 58:14. In 1:20 and 58:14 the LXX supplies **ταῦτα**, probably in harmonisation with **הוּא דִּבֶּר אֶת־הַדְּבָר הַזֶּה** / τὸ γὰρ στόμα κυρίου ἐλάλησε **ταῦτα** in 24:3 (where **στόμα** is a plus in the LXX). See also the discussion of 24:3 and 40:5 below.

1:25 καὶ ἐπάξω τὴν χεῖρά μου  
ἐπὶ σὲ καὶ πυρώσω σε εἰς  
καθαρόν, τοὺς δὲ  
ἀπειθοῦντας **ἀπολέσω**  
καὶ ἀφελῶ πάντας  
άνόμους ἀπὸ σοῦ καὶ  
πάντας ὑπερηφάνους  
**ταπεινώσω**.

10:33 καὶ οἱ ὑψηλοὶ τῇ ὕβρει  
συντριβήσονται, καὶ οἱ ὑψηλοὶ  
**ταπεινωθήσονται**  
13:11 καὶ **ἀπολῶ** ὕβριν **άνόμων** καὶ ὕβριν  
**ὑπερηφάνων ταπεινώσω**.  
29:20 ἐξέλιπεν **άνομος**, καὶ **ἀπώλετο**  
**ὑπερήφανος**, καὶ ἐξώλεθρεύθησαν οἱ  
άνομοῦντες ἐπὶ κακία

The Hebrew version of 1:25 presents a metaphor, picturing God's punishment of his people as the refinement of metal: **ואשיבה ידי עליך ואצרר ואסירה כל־בדיליך**. The LXX translator has offered an interpretative translation of this verse. He has read the homonym **בר** in its connotation of "purity" rather than as "Iye," and rendered it by **εἰς καθαρόν**. **יְצִיגְךָ** ("your dross") he has associated with **סוּג** ("to turn away") and translated as **τοὺς ἀπειθοῦντας**, starting a new clause with this noun phrase, which he complemented with the verb form **ἀπολέσω**. The words **ואסירה כל־בדיליך** ("and I will remove all your alloy") he glossed by **καὶ ἀφελῶ πάντας άνόμους ἀπὸ σοῦ**, while he appended to this a parallel clause **καὶ πάντας ὑπερηφάνους ταπεινώσω**. In using this phraseology for rendering 1:25 he was probably inspired by Isa 13:11 and 29:20.<sup>68</sup>

<sup>67</sup> See Wilk, "Vision wider Judäa und wider Jerusalem," 21.

<sup>68</sup> Compare van der Kooij, "Interpretation of Metaphorical Language," 180–81; Wilk, "Vision wider Judäa und wider Jerusalem," 26–27; van der Louw, "Transformations," 177–79.

3:14 τί ἐνεπυρίσατε **τὸν**  
**ἀμπελῶνά μου**

5:1 Ἰαίσω δὴ τῷ ἡγαπημένῳ ἄσμα  
τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ **τῷ ἀμπελῶνί μου.**

In LXX Isa 5:1–7 ὁ ἀμπελῶν μου is used five times as a metaphor representing the people of Israel. When encountering כְּכַרְךָ in Isa 3:14, the translator may have been reminded of this symbolism, which might have encouraged him to add a possessive pronoun in the first person singular to the noun.

5:28 οἱ τροχοὶ **τῶν ἀρμάτων**  
**αὐτῶν** ὡς καταγιγίς.

66:15 καὶ ὡς καταγιγίς **τὰ ἄρματα αὐτοῦ**

The words כְּסוּפָה וְכַלְכָּלָה—“and *his wheels* [are] like the whirlwind”—in 5:28 may have sounded somewhat curious in the ears of the translator, because the possessive pronoun “his” refers to a human being, namely “the one whose arrows are sharp” in 5:28a, by which the Hebrew text suggests that this person himself has wheels. In order to explain away this curiosity, the translator has changed the expression into “the wheels of *their chariots*,” supplying τῶν ἀρμάτων αὐτῶν from LXX Isa 66:15.<sup>69</sup>

7:19 καὶ ἀναπαύσονται ἐν ταῖς  
φάραγξι τῆς χώρας καὶ ἐν  
ταῖς τρώγλαις τῶν  
πετρῶν **καὶ εἰς τὰ σπήλαια**

2:19 εἰσενέγκαντες **εἰς τὰ σπήλαια** καὶ εἰς  
τὰς σχισμὰς τῶν πετρῶν καὶ εἰς τὰς  
τρώγλας τῆς γῆς

8:22 καὶ ἰδοὺ **θλίψις καὶ**  
**στενοχωρία** καὶ σκότος,  
ἀπορία στενὴ καὶ  
σκότος ὥστε μὴ βλέπειν

30:6 Ἐν τῇ **θλίψει καὶ τῇ στενοχωρίᾳ**  
30:20 καὶ δώσει κύριος ὑμῖν ἄρτον **θλίψεως**  
καὶ ὕδωρ **στενόν**

The LXX reproduces הַצָּר in 8:22 by the doublet θλίψις καὶ στενοχωρία. This word pair also turns up in Isa 30:6, rendering הַצָּר וְהַצָּר.<sup>70</sup>

9:3(4) διότι **ἀφήρηται ὁ ζυγὸς**  
ὁ ἐπ’ αὐτῶν κείμενος καὶ  
ἡ ῥάβδος ἡ ἐπὶ τοῦ  
τραχήλου αὐτῶν.

10:27 **ἀφαιρεθήσεται ὁ φόβος αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ**  
**σοῦ καὶ ὁ ζυγὸς αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὤμου**  
**σου**

11:13 καὶ **ἀφαιρεθήσεται ὁ ζῆλος (A:**  
**ζυγὸς) Εφραιμ**

14:25 καὶ **ἀφαιρεθήσεται ἀπ’ αὐτῶν ὁ**

<sup>69</sup> An additional motive for the insertion of τῶν ἀρμάτων αὐτῶν may have been to improve the parallelism with the preceding line οἱ πόδες τῶν ἵππων αὐτῶν ὡς στερεὰ πέτρα ἐλογίσθησαν (see section 8.5.1a). For comparable expressions, see Isa 28:27 (הָלַךְ בַּיּוֹמִי / τροχὸς ἀμάξης) and Jer 4:13.

<sup>70</sup> See section 6.3a. See also Prov 1:27.

**ζυγὸς** αὐτῶν, καὶ τὸ κύδος αὐτῶν  
ἀπὸ τῶν ὤμων **ἀφαιρεθήσεται**.

13:2 Ἐπ' ὄρους πεδινοῦ ἄρατε  
σημεῖον, ὑψώσατε τὴν  
φωνὴν αὐτοῖς, **μὴ**  
**φοβεῖσθε**, παρακαλεῖτε  
τῇ χειρί

35:4 παρακαλέσατε, οἱ ὀλιγόψυχοι τῇ  
διανοίᾳ· ἰσχύσατε, **μὴ φοβεῖσθε**·

40:9 ἐπ' ὄρος ὑψηλὸν ἀνάβηθι, ὁ  
εὐαγγελιζόμενος Σιών· ὑψώσον  
τῇ ἰσχύϊ τὴν φωνὴν σου, ὁ  
εὐαγγελιζόμενος Ἱερουσαλημ·  
ὑψώσατε, **μὴ φοβεῖσθε**·

13:14 καὶ ἔσονται οἱ  
καταλελειμμένοι ὡς  
δορκάδιον φεῦγον καὶ **ὡς**  
**πρόβατον πλανώμενον**<sup>71</sup>

53:6 πάντες **ὡς πρόβατα ἐπλανήθημεν**,  
ἄνθρωπος τῇ ὁδῷ αὐτοῦ **ἐπλανήθη**·

14:1–2 Καὶ ἐλεήσει κύριος τὸν  
Ἰακωβ καὶ ἐκλέξεται ἔτι  
τὸν Ἰσραηλ, καὶ ἀναπαύ-  
σονται ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς αὐτῶν,  
καὶ ὁ γιώρας προστεθήσε-  
ται πρὸς αὐτοὺς καὶ προς-  
τεθήσεται πρὸς τὸν οἶκον  
Ἰακωβ, καὶ λήμψονται  
αὐτοὺς ἔθνη καὶ εἰσάξουσιν  
(–) εἰς τὸν τόπον αὐτῶν,  
καὶ κατακληρονομήσουσι  
(–) **καὶ πληθυνθήσονται**  
**ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς** τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς  
δούλους καὶ δούλας· καὶ  
ἔσονται αἰχμάλωτοι οἱ  
αἰχμαλωτεύσαντες αὐτούς,  
καὶ κυριευθήσονται οἱ  
κυριεύσαντες αὐτῶν.

6:12 καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα μακρυνεῖ ὁ θεὸς  
τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, καὶ οἱ  
καταλειφθέντες **πληθυνθήσονται**  
**ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς**.<sup>72</sup>

The Greek text of 14:2 deviates from the Hebrew in that it displays an extra verb phrase καὶ πληθυνθήσονται, and does not represent the subject לַאֲרָשֵׁי and the object suffixes in וְהַבְּיָאוּם and וְהַתְּחַנְּלוּם:

<sup>71</sup> For the verb πλανᾶω used in combination with πρόβατον, see also LXX Ps 118(MT 119):176 (see section 9.4.2), and LXX Jer 27 (MT 50):17 (see section 9.4.3.3).

<sup>72</sup> MT: וְהַתְּחַנְּלוּם וְהַבְּיָאוּם וְהַתְּחַנְּלוּם וְהַבְּיָאוּם וְהַתְּחַנְּלוּם וְהַבְּיָאוּם.

MT Isa 14:2

ולקחום עמים	And the nations will take them
והביאום אל־מקומם	and bring <u>them</u> to their place,
והתנחלום בית־ישראל	and <u>the house of Israel</u> will possess <u>them</u>
על אדמת יהוה לעבדים ולשפחות	in the Lord's land as male and female slaves;
והיו שבים לשביהם	they will take captive those who were their captors
ורדו בנגשיהם	and rule over those who oppressed them.

To be able to clarify these variations, we first have to find out how Isa 14:1–2 was interpreted, both by the Masoretes and by the LXX translator.

In the Hebrew the subject of והתנחלום is “the house of Israel,” whilst the object suffix in this verb makes reference to “the people”: the house of Israel will inherit the people as male and female slaves. In the Greek, however, “the house of Israel” is missing, which obscures who it is that forms the subject of κατακληρονομήσουσι: is it the people of Israel, or the foreign people? Besides, in the Greek an extra verb phrase comes up: καὶ πληθυνθήσονται—“and they will be multiplied.” On the origin of this plus, as well as of the minuses mentioned, different theories have been brought forward:

- Seeligmann is of the opinion that בית־ישראל was left out by the LXX translator because he regarded the idea of Israel making Gentile peoples their slaves as offensive. On the same grounds the translator would have omitted לעבדים ולשפחות, but those words were subsequently added again by a later corrector. According to Seeligmann the LXX implies the subject of καὶ κατακληρονομήσουσι καὶ πληθυνθήσονται to be the remnant of Israel together with the proselytes who joined them.<sup>73</sup>
- Also Ziegler thinks that the ones who “will inherit and will be multiplied” in the LXX are the remnant of the people of Israel; καὶ πληθυνθήσονται would have been interpolated by the translator under the influence of Isa 6:12: καὶ οἱ καταλειφθέντες πληθυνθήσονται ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς (see above). Nevertheless, this way of understanding the Greek leads to the difficulty that in such a case it would be said of the remnant of Israel that they will become *slaves*. This may seem somewhat awkward at first sight, but can be explained in the light of Isa 65:9, where the title “slave” is used to designate the *servants of God*:

והוצאתי מיעקב זרע	καὶ ἐξάξω τὸ ἐξ Ἰακωβ σπέρμα
ומיהודה	καὶ τὸ ἐξ Ἰουδα,
יורש הרי	καὶ κληρονομήσει τὸ ὄρος τὸ ἅγιόν μου,

<sup>73</sup> Seeligmann, *Septuagint Version*, 35, 117.

וירשוה בחירי	καὶ κληρονομήσουσιν οἱ ἐκλεκτοὶ μου
ועבדי	καὶ οἱ <b>δοῦλοι</b> μου
ישכנו־שמה	καὶ κατοικήσουσιν ἐκεῖ.

δοῦλος is likewise employed in the sense of a servant of God in 42:19; 48:20; 49:3, 5; 56:6; and 63:17.

- An alternative possibility is that the “original” Hebrew version of 14:2 did not yet contain בית־ישראל, and that the LXX translator had such a manuscript without בית־ישראל in front of him. This text was ambiguous as to who had to be conceived of as the subject and object of והתנחלום: shall the foreign people inherit Israel, or shall Israel inherit the foreign people? Both the scribe of the MT and the Greek translator chose—independently of each other—their own method to solve this problem. The Hebrew scribe made the subject of והתנחלום explicit by adding בית־ישראל, so that it became obvious that Israel would inherit the people, and not the other way around. The LXX translator, by contrast, continued with the subject עמים and considered this also to govern והתנחלום. At the same time he omitted the object suffix in והתנחלום, and added 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: “and they [= the foreign people] will inherit and they will be multiplied on the land of God into male and female slaves.” The thought that foreigners in future would serve Israel is not strange to the book of Isaiah: it can equally be found in Isa 60:12 and 61:5. Another text in which foreigners who cling to the God of Israel and receive blessings are called “male and female slaves” is LXX Isa 56:6. The “female slaves” in this verse are absent in the Hebrew, which offers merely לעבדים. The translator may have added καὶ δούλας in harmonisation with 14:2, which would support the assumption that in 14:2, as in 56:6, the “male and female slaves” are to be seen as the foreign people:

56:6	ובני הנכר	καὶ τοῖς ἀλλογενέσι
	הגלום עליהוה לשרתו	τοῖς προσκειμένοις κυρίῳ δουλεύειν αὐτῷ
	ולאהבה את־שם יהוה	καὶ ἀγαπᾶν τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου
	להיות לו לעבדים	τοῦ εἶναι αὐτῷ εἰς <b>δούλους καὶ δούλας</b>

15:2–3 ἐπὶ πάσης κεφαλῆς  
φαλάκρωμα, πάντες  
βραχίονες  
κατατετμημένοι.

22:12 κλαυθμόν καὶ **κοπετόν** καὶ ξύρησιν  
καὶ ζῶσιν σάκκων  
32:11–12 ἔκστητε, λυπήθητε, αἱ  
πεποιθυῖαι, ἐκδύσασθε, γυμναί



ἐν ταῖς πλατείαις  
 περιζώσασθε σάκκους  
καὶ κόπτεσθε<sup>74</sup>

γένεσθε, περιζώσασθε σάκκους  
 τὰς ὁσφύας καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν μαστῶν  
κόπτεσθε

16:12 καὶ εἰσελεύσεται εἰς τὰ  
 χειροποίητα αὐτῆς ὥστε  
 προσεύξασθαι, καὶ οὐ μὴ  
 δύνηται ἐξελεῖσθαι αὐτόν.

4:17 τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν ἐποίησεν εἰς θεὸν  
 γλυπτὸν καὶ προσκυνεῖ αὐτῷ καὶ  
 προσεύχεται λέγων **Ἐξελοῦ με**, ὅτι  
 θεός μου εἶ σύ.  
 57:13 ὅταν ἀναβοήσης, ἐξελεσθωσάν σε ἐν  
 τῇ θλίψει σου.

The verb ἐξαίρῶ is used repeatedly in LXX Isaiah in texts on the powerlessness of idols: see besides the verses cited above, also 44:20 and 47:14. A statement that is comparable as regards its content can be found in 46:7: καὶ ὁς ἂν βοήσῃ πρὸς αὐτόν, οὐ μὴ εἰσακούσῃ, ἀπὸ κακῶν οὐ μὴ σῶσῃ αὐτόν.

17:13 καὶ πόρρω αὐτόν  
 διώξεται ὡς χνοῦν ἀχύρου  
 λιχμώντων ἀπέναντι  
 ἀνέμου καὶ ὡς **κονιορτὸν**  
**τροχοῦ καταιγὶς φέρουσα**.

29:5–6 καὶ ἔσται ὡς **κονιορτὸς ἀπὸ τροχοῦ**  
 ὁ πλοῦτος τῶν ἀσεβῶν καὶ ὡς χνοῦς  
**φερόμενος**, καὶ ἔσται ὡς στιγμὴ  
 παραχρῆμα παρὰ κυρίου σαβαωθ·  
 ἐπισκοπὴ γὰρ ἔσται μετὰ βροντῆς  
 καὶ σεισμοῦ καὶ φωνῆς μεγάλης,  
**καταιγὶς φερομένη** καὶ φλόξ πυρὸς  
 κατεσθίουσα.

The MT of Isa 17:13 and 29:5–6 reads as follows:

17:13

ורדף כמץ הרים לפני־רוח  
 וכגלגל לפני סופה

chased like chaff on the mountains before the wind  
 and like a wheel plant<sup>75</sup> before the storm.

29:5–6

והיה כאבק דק המון זרִיך  
 וכמץ עבר המון עריצים  
 והיה לפתע פתאום  
 מעם יהוה צבאות תפקד  
 ברעם וברעש וקול גדול  
 סופה וסערה ולהב אש אוכלה

But the multitude of your foes shall be like small dust,  
 and the multitude of tyrants like flying chaff.  
 And in an instant, suddenly,  
 you will be visited by the LORD of hosts  
 with thunder and earthquake and great noise,  
 whirlwind and tempest and the flame of devouring fire

<sup>74</sup> See also section 9.4.3.1.

<sup>75</sup> This is the translation of גלגל that HALOT 1:190 proposes for Isa 17:13. The NRSV gives “whirling dust.”

In the LXX these two passages appear to have mutually influenced each other.<sup>76</sup>

In 17:13 the translator has in all likelihood understood גלגל (in the Hebrew probably used in the sense of “wheel plant”) as “wheel” (τροχός). Given that a storm generally does not chase a wheel (as the translator’s interpretation of וּבִגְלָל לִפְנֵי סוֹפָה would imply), but may chase the *dust* of a wheel, he inserted κονιορτόν (“dust”) before τροχός, perhaps also under the influence of כַּאֲבָק = ὡς κονιορτός in 29:5. Also φέρουσα in the phrase ὡς κονιορτόν τροχοῦ καταιγὶς φέρουσα he may have adopted from 29:6, where one finds the similar expressions ὡς χνοῦς φερόμενος (וּכְמִיץ עֶבֶר) and καταιγὶς φερομένη וְסַעֲרָה (סוֹפָה). However, καταιγὶς φέρουσα / φερομένη in 17:13 and 29:6 could likewise have been imported from two other verses in (LXX) Isaiah that also depict a rushing storm:<sup>77</sup>

28:15	שׁוּט שׁוּטָף כִּי־עֶבֶר	καταιγὶς φερομένη ἂν παρέλθῃ
28:18	שׁוּט שׁוּטָף כִּי יַעֲבֹר	καταιγὶς φερομένη ἂν ἐπέλθῃ

In 29:5 ἀπὸ τροχοῦ (“from a wheel”) forms a variant rendering of דָּק (“thin”), which is, in its turn, possibly influenced by τροχοῦ in 17:13. A further text in which we encounter the noun τροχός in a similar setting is Isa 41:15–16. That passage too pictures the threshing wheels of a cart, and chaff that is left over from winnowing and taken by the wind.<sup>78</sup> The rendering of this passage may well be interlinked with that of Isa 17:13 and 29:5–6:

41:15–16

הָנָה שְׂמַתִּיךָ לְמוֹרֵג חֲרוּץ	ἰδοὺ ἐποίησά σε ὡς τροχούς ἀμάξης ἀλοῶντας
חֲדָשׁ בַּעַל פִּיפִּיּוֹת תְּדוּשׁ הָרִים	καινοὺς πριστηροειδεῖς, καὶ ἀλοήσεις ὄρη
וְתִדָּק וּגְבֻעוֹת כֶּמֶץ תִּשִּׂים	καὶ λεπτυνεῖς βουνούς καὶ ὡς χνοῦν θήσεις·
תִּזְרֵם וְרוּחַ תִּשְׂאֵם	καὶ λιγμῆσεις, καὶ ἄνεμος λήμψεται αὐτούς,
וְסַעֲרָה תִּפְיֹץ אוֹתָם	καὶ καταιγὶς διασπερεῖ αὐτούς

20:4	ἀνακαλυμμένους (–) τὴν αἰσχύνην Αἰγύπτου.	47:3	ἀνακαλυφθήσεται ἡ αἰσχύνῃ σου
------	--	------	-------------------------------

The MT offers in Isa 20:4 עֲרוֹת מִצְרַיִם שֶׁ תִּשְׁפֹּץ.<sup>79</sup>

<sup>76</sup> For a discussion of these verses, see also Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 93.

<sup>77</sup> For the image of a storm, see also 57:13 and 64:5(6).

<sup>78</sup> For another related verse, see LXX Isa 5:24 where the combination of ὡς χνοῦς and ὡς κονιορτός occurs too.

<sup>79</sup> See section 7.2.2a.

24:3 τὸ γὰρ στόμα κυρίου  
ἐλάλησε ταῦτα.

25:8 τὸ γὰρ στόμα κυρίου  
ἐλάλησε.

1:20 τὸ γὰρ στόμα κυρίου ἐλάλησε  
ταῦτα.

58:14 τὸ γὰρ στόμα κυρίου ἐλάλησε  
ταῦτα.

The MT presents in 24:3 **כִּי יְהוָה דִּבֶּר אֶת־הַדָּבָר הַזֶּה** and in 25:8 **כִּי יְהוָה דִּבֶּר**. Ziegler posits that the appearance of στόμα may be the effect of a double translation of **כִּי**, read not only as a conjunction, but also as **פִּי**.<sup>80</sup> The opposite situation can be observed in 40:5, where the LXX renders **כִּי פִי יְהוָה דִּבֶּר** as **ὅτι κύριος ἐλάλησε** (see 40:5 below).

24:14 οὗτοι φωνῇ βοήσονται,  
οἱ δὲ καταλειφθέντες ἐπὶ  
τῆς γῆς εὐφρανθήσονται  
ἅμα τῇ κυρίου.<sup>82</sup>

25:11 καὶ ταπεινώσει τὴν ὕβριν  
αὐτοῦ ἐφ' ἃ τὰς χεῖρας  
ἐπέβαλε.<sup>84</sup>

26:9 διότι φῶς τὰ προστάγ-  
ματά σου ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.<sup>85</sup>

26:15 πρόσθετες αὐτοῖς κακά,  
κύριε, πρόσθετες κακά πᾶσι  
τοῖς ἐνδόξοις τῆς γῆς.<sup>86</sup>

52:8 καὶ τῇ φωνῇ ἅμα εὐφρανθήσονται.<sup>81</sup>  
52:9 ῥηξάτω εὐφροσύνην ἅμα τὰ ἔρημα  
Ιερουσαλημ, ὅτι ἠλέησε κύριος δόξην  
αὐτὴν.<sup>83</sup>

5:25 καὶ ἐπέβαλε τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἐπ'  
αὐτοῦς

11:8 καὶ ἐπὶ κοίτην ἐκγόνων ἀσπίδων  
τὴν χεῖρα ἐπιβαλεῖ.

11:14 καὶ ἐπὶ Μωαβ πρῶτον τὰς χεῖρας  
ἐπιβαλοῦσιν

11:15 καὶ ἐπιβαλεῖ τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ  
τὸν ποταμὸν πνεύματι βιαίῳ

19:16 ἀπὸ προσώπου τῆς χειρὸς κυρίου  
σαβασθ, ἣν αὐτὸς ἐπιβαλεῖ αὐτοῖς.

51:4 ὅτι νόμος παρ' ἐμοῦ ἐξελεύσεται  
καὶ ἡ κρίσις μου εἰς φῶς ἐθνῶν.

13:11 καὶ ἐντελοῦμαι τῇ οἰκουμένη ὅλη  
κακά

31:2 καὶ αὐτὸς σοφὸς ᾗ γεν ἐπ' αὐτοῦς  
κακά

<sup>80</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 66.

<sup>81</sup> MT: ושא קול יחדו ירגנו.

<sup>82</sup> MT: המה ישא קולם ירגנו.

<sup>83</sup> MT: פצחו רגנו יחדו חרבות ירושלם כִּי־נחם יהוה.

<sup>84</sup> MT: והשפיל גאותו עם ארבות ידיו.

<sup>85</sup> MT: כִּי כאשר משפטיך לארץ. Maybe φῶς is not a plus, but a rendering of **כִּי** as **כִּי** read as **כִּי**. See also section 9.4.2.1.

<sup>86</sup> MT: יספת לגוי יהוה יספת לגוי נבבדת רחוקת כל־קצו־ארץ. See also section 9.4.1.2a.

27:4 τοῖνυν διὰ τοῦτο ἐποίησε  
κύριος ὁ θεὸς πάντα, ὅσα  
συνέταξε. κατακέκαυμαι<sup>87</sup>

37:26 οὐ ταῦτα ἤκουσας πάλαι, ἃ ἐγὼ  
ἐποίησα; ἐξ ἀρχαίων ἡμερῶν  
συνέταξα, ἐπέδειξα ἐξερημῶσαι  
ἔθνη ἐν ὄχυροῖς καὶ ἐνοικοῦντας  
ἐν πόλεσιν ὄχυραῖς.<sup>88</sup>

The LXX reformulation of Isa 27:4 may have been encouraged by Isa 37:26, a text in which the king of Assur threatens to destroy Jerusalem. According to Ziegler, a later reader of the Hebrew perceived 27:2–5—verses describing a captured city—as a fulfilment of the threat in 37:26, and on those grounds added the words **צוה יהוה ... השג**, which are echoed by LXX Isa 27:4.<sup>89</sup> Nevertheless, it may just as well have been the translator himself who saw a linkage between these two verses and introduced the plus.

28:2 ἰδοὺ ἰσχυρὸν καὶ σκληρὸν  
ὁ θυμὸς κυρίου ὡς χάλαζα  
καταφερομένη οὐκ ἔχουσα  
σκέπη, βία καταφερομένη·  
ὡς ὕδατος πολὺ πλῆθος  
σῦρον χώραν τῇ γῇ  
ποιήσει ἀνάπαυσιν<sup>90</sup>

30:30 καὶ τὸν θυμὸν τοῦ βραχίονος αὐτοῦ  
δείξει μετὰ θυμοῦ καὶ ὀργῆς καὶ  
φλογὸς κατεσθιούσης· κεραυνώσει  
βιαίως καὶ ὡς ὕδωρ καὶ χάλαζα  
συγκαταφερομένη βία.

29:24 καὶ γνώσονται οἱ τῷ  
πνεύματι πλανώμενοι  
σύνεσιν, οἱ δὲ γογγύ-  
ζοντες μαθήσονται  
ὑπακούειν  
[καὶ αἱ γλώσσαι αἱ  
ψελλίζουσαι μαθήσονται  
λαλεῖν εἰρήνην].<sup>92</sup>

32:4 καὶ ἡ καρδία τῶν ἀσθενούντων  
προσέξει τοῦ ἀκούειν, καὶ αἱ  
γλώσσαι αἱ ψελλίζουσαι ταχὺ  
μαθήσονται λαλεῖν εἰρήνην.<sup>91</sup>

<sup>87</sup> The MT of Isa 27:4 reads: **צוה יהוה ... השג**. For **συντάσσω** (πάντα,) ὅσα with as its subject κύριος, see e.g. Exod 31:6; 35:29; 36:1, 5; Num 2:34; 19:2; and Josh 9:24. Another text that may have played a role in the formation of LXX Isa 27:4 is Lam 2:17, which, in accordance with Isa 27, has an eschatological perspective, declaring that God is doing what he has told before: **עשה יהוה אשר זכר** (see Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 90). For a further analysis of the translation, see section 6.7a.

<sup>88</sup> The MT of 37:26 reads: **והיה עתה הבאתיה ויהי להשאות** ויהי קדם ויצרתיה עתה וישמעת למרחוק אותה עשיתי מימי קדם ויצרתיה עתה הבאתיה ויהי להשאות. Note that in the LXX **συνέταξα** is not a literal representation of the Hebrew, but translates **ויצרתיה**.

<sup>89</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 90; see HUB Isa, 102.

<sup>90</sup> MT: **הנה חזק ואמץ לאדני כורם בך שער קטב כורם מים כבירים שטפים הניח לארץ ביד**.

<sup>91</sup> MT: **ולבב נמהרים יבין לדעת ולשון עלגים תמהר לדבר צחות**.

30:6 Ἐν τῇ θλίψει καὶ τῇ  
στενοχωρίᾳ, λέων καὶ  
σκύμνος λέοντος ἐκεῖθεν  
καὶ ἀσπίδες καὶ ἔκγονα  
ἀσπίδων πετομένων<sup>94</sup>

11:8 καὶ παιδίον νήπιον ἐπὶ τρώγλῃν  
ἀσπίδων καὶ ἐπὶ κοίτην ἐκγόνων  
ἀσπίδων τὴν χεῖρα ἐπιβαλεῖ.<sup>93</sup>  
14:29 ἐκ γὰρ σπέρματος ὄφειον  
ἐξελεύσεται ἔκγονα ἀσπίδων,  
καὶ τὰ ἔκγονα αὐτῶν ἐξελεύσονται  
ὄφεις πετόμενοι.<sup>95</sup>

The plus *ἔκγονα* appears to have entered 30:6 by way of an intertextual mingling of various texts:

- In 11:8 the phrase *ἐκγόνα ἀσπίδων* turns up for the first time in LXX Isaiah. Here it probably renders גְּמוּלִי צִפְּעוֹנִי. Whereas גְּמוּלִי (“weaned child”) in the Hebrew forms the subject of the clause וְעַל מְאֻרֶּת צִפְּעוֹנִי יָדוּ הַדָּה גְּמוּלִי (“and the weaned child shall put his hand on the adder’s den”), the Greek has joined it as an apposition to צִפְּעוֹנִי גְּמוּלִי—“an adder, a young one.”
- The second time that *ἐκγόνα ἀσπίδων* appears, is in 14:29. In the Hebrew it matches צִפֶּה (“adder”), so *ἐκγόνα* is a plus here too. It may have been added in analogy to *ἐκγόνων ἀσπίδων* in 11:8, or it resumes וּפְרִי / καὶ τὰ ἔκγονα αὐτῶν in 14:29 itself.
- The translation of וְשָׂרָף מְעוֹפֵף as *ἔκγονα ἀσπίδων πετομένων* in 30:6 may have been accomplished in assimilation to *ἔκγονα ἀσπίδων* in 11:8 and 14:29, especially motivated by the fact that—in accordance with 14:29—30:6 speaks of a “flying serpent” (וְשָׂרָף מְעוֹפֵף).<sup>96</sup>

30:17 ἕως ἂν καταλειφθῇτε ὡς  
ἱστὸς ἐπ’ ὄρους καὶ ὡς  
σημαῖαν φέρων ἐπὶ βουνοῦ.

18:3 κατοικηθήσεται ἡ χώρα αὐτῶν ὥσεί  
σημεῖον ἀπὸ ὄρους ἄρθῃ

30:18 διότι κριτὴς κύριος ὁ θεὸς  
ἡμῶν ἐστὶ<sup>97</sup>

33:22 κριτὴς ἡμῶν κύριος, ἄρχων ἡμῶν  
κύριος, βασιλεὺς ἡμῶν κύριος<sup>98</sup>

<sup>92</sup> In the Göttingen edition Ziegler has put this clause between square brackets and thus marked it as a secondary rendering, even though it is attested by the large majority of Greek manuscripts.

<sup>93</sup> MT: וְשָׂרָף יוֹנָק עַל־חֶר פֶּתַח וְעַל מְאֻרֶּת צִפְּעוֹנִי גְּמוּלִי יָדוּ הַדָּה.

<sup>94</sup> MT: בְּאֶרֶץ צָרָה וְצוּקָה לְבִיא וְלִישׁ מִהֶם אִפְעָה וְשָׂרָף מְעוֹפֵף.

<sup>95</sup> MT: כִּי־מִשְׁרַשׁ נֶחֱשׁ יֵצֵא צִפֶּה וּפְרִי שָׂרָף מְעוֹפֵף.

<sup>96</sup> An extra reason for the insertion of *ἔκγονα* may have been the wish to make the phrase *ἔκγονα ἀσπίδων* parallel to the preceding one *σκύμνος λέοντος*.

<sup>97</sup> MT: כִּי־אֱלֹהֵי מִשְׁפַּט יְהוָה.

<sup>98</sup> MT: כִּי יְהוָה שְׁפִטְנוּ יְהוָה מִחֻקָּנוּ יְהוָה מַלְכֵנוּ.

30:18 καὶ πάλιν μενεῖ ὁ θεὸς τοῦ  
οἰκτιρῆσαι ὑμᾶς καὶ διὰ  
τοῦτο ὑψωθήσεται τοῦ  
ἐλεῆσαι ὑμᾶς· διότι κριτῆς  
κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν ἐστίν,  
**καὶ ποῦ καταλείψετε τὴν**  
**δόξαν ὑμῶν;**

10:3 καὶ τί ποιήσουσιν ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς  
ἐπισκοπῆς; ἡ γὰρ θλιῖσις ὑμῖν  
πόρρωθεν ἤξει· καὶ πρὸς τίνα  
καταφεύξεσθε τοῦ βοηθηθῆναι;  
**καὶ ποῦ καταλείψετε τὴν δόξαν**  
**ὑμῶν**

The clause appended to LXX Isa 30:18 may have been extrapolated from 10:3. Yet, it is not so clear why the translator would have added a line from precisely that verse. Did he perceive a link between 30:18 and 10:3? The only possible linkage I myself could detect, does not occur in 30:18 itself, but earlier in the same chapter, namely in 30:2. That verse speaks of the vain hope of the people to receive help from Egypt: οἱ πορευόμενοι καταβῆναι εἰς Αἴγυπτον ... τοῦ βοηθηθῆναι ὑπὸ Φαραῶ ... Maybe the translator connected this content to the theme of 10:3, where Israel looks in vain for help (note the identical infinitive βοηθηθῆναι).

31:6 ἐπιστράφητε, οἱ τὴν  
**βαθεῖαν βουλὴν** βουλευ-  
όμενοι καὶ ἄνομον.<sup>99</sup>

29:15 οὐαὶ οἱ **βαθέως βουλὴν** ποιοῦντες  
καὶ οὐ διὰ κυρίου· οὐαὶ οἱ ἐν κρυφῇ  
**βουλὴν** ποιοῦντες<sup>100</sup>

31:7 ὅτι τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ  
ἀπαρνήσονται οἱ ἄνθρω-  
ποι τὰ χειροποίητα  
αὐτῶν τὰ ἀργυρᾶ καὶ  
τὰ χρυσᾶ, **ἃ ἐποίησαν**  
(-) **αἱ χεῖρες αὐτῶν** (-).

2:8 καὶ ἐνεπλήσθη ἡ γῆ βδελυγμά-  
των τῶν ἔργων τῶν χειρῶν αὐτῶν,  
καὶ προσεκύνησαν **οἷς ἐποίησαν**  
**οἱ δάκτυλοι αὐτῶν**<sup>101</sup>  
17:8 καὶ οὐ μὴ πεποιθότες ὧσιν ἐπὶ τοῖς  
βωμοῖς οὐδὲ ἐπὶ τοῖς ἔργοις τῶν  
χειρῶν αὐτῶν, **ἃ ἐποίησαν οἱ**  
**δάκτυλοι αὐτῶν**<sup>102</sup>

The final clause of Isa 31:7 reads in the Hebrew אִשָּׁר עָשׂוּ לָכֶם יְדִיכֶם אֲשֶׁר. The words לָכֶם and אֲשֶׁר do not have an equivalent in the LXX. This may be the result of adjustment to similar expressions in Isa 2:8 and 17:8, where such complements are absent as well.<sup>103</sup>

<sup>99</sup> MT: שׁוּבוּ לְאִשֶּׁר הָעַמִּיקוּ סֵרָה בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל.

<sup>100</sup> MT: הָיוּ הַמַּעֲמִיקִים מִיְהוּהוּ לְסֹתֵר עֲצָה.

<sup>101</sup> MT: וְתַמְלֵא אֶרְצוֹ אֱלִילִים לְמַעַשְׂה יְדֵיו יִשְׁתַּחֲווּ לְאִשֶּׁר עָשׂוּ אֲצַבְעֵתָיו.

<sup>102</sup> MT: וְלֹא יִשְׁעָה אֱלֹהֵי־מִזְבְּחוֹת מַעַשְׂה יְדֵיו וְאִשֶּׁר עָשׂוּ אֲצַבְעֵתָיו לֹא יִרְאֶה.

<sup>103</sup> Ziegler (*Untersuchungen*, 54) considers אֲשֶׁר in the MT to be an addition by a later reader with the purpose of labelling the actions of the idol worshippers as sinful.

- 32:2 καὶ κρυβήσεται ὡς ἀφ' ὕδατος φερομένου· καὶ φανήσεται ἐν Σιων ὡς ποταμὸς φερόμενος ἐνδοξος ἐν γῇ διψώση.<sup>104</sup>
- 60:2 ἰδοὺ σκότος καὶ γνόφος καλύψει γῆν ἐπ' ἔθνη· ἐπὶ δὲ σὲ φανήσεται κύριος, καὶ ἡ δόξα αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ σὲ ὀφθήσεται.
- 32:13 καὶ ἐκ πάσης οἰκίας εὐφροσύνη ἀρθήσεται.<sup>105</sup>
- 16:10 καὶ ἀρθήσεται εὐφροσύνη καὶ ἀγαλλίαμα ἐκ τῶν ἀμπελώνων σου
- 33:4 νῦν δὲ συναχθήσεται τὰ σκῦλα ὑμῶν μικροῦ καὶ μεγάλου· ὃν τρόπον ἐάν τις συναγάγῃ ἀκρίδας, οὕτως ἐμπαίξουσιν ὑμῖν.<sup>106</sup>
- 17:5 καὶ ἔσται ὃν τρόπον ἐάν τις συναγάγῃ ἀμνητὸν ἐστηκότα καὶ σπέρμα σταχύων ἀμήση, καὶ ἔσται ὃν τρόπον ἐάν τις συναγάγῃ στάχυν ἐν φάραγγι στερεᾷ
- 33:11 ματαία ἔσται ἡ ἰσχὺς τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν, πῦρ ὑμᾶς κατέδεται.
- 30:15 ματαία ἡ ἰσχὺς ὑμῶν ἐγενήθη.

The MT version of the sentence quoted from 33:11 offers **אש וסכך** *מחבא דרוח וסתר*; *ματαία* in all probability renders **שק** (“stubble”), the final word of the preceding clause in the MT. In the LXX ἡ ἰσχὺς may have been added under the influence of LXX Isa 30:15: *ματαία ἡ ἰσχὺς ὑμῶν ἐγενήθη*, although these words do not reflect the Hebrew in a literal way either, the MT of 30:15 offering **בהשק ובבטחה תהיה גבורתכם**. Perhaps both verses have been inspired by Lev 26:20. The possible link between that Pentateuchal verse and LXX Isa 30:15 and 33:11 will be discussed in section 9.4.1.2b.

- 34:11 καὶ κατοικήσουσιν ἐν αὐτῇ ὄρνεα καὶ ἐχῖνοι καὶ ἴβεις καὶ κόρακες, καὶ ἐπιβλήθησεται ἐπ' αὐτὴν σπαρτίον γεωμετρίας ἐρήμου, καὶ
- 13:21–22 καὶ ἀναπαύσονται ἐκεῖ σειρήνες, καὶ δαιμόνια ἐκεῖ ὀρχήσονται, καὶ ὄνοκένταυροι ἐκεῖ κατοικήσουσιν, καὶ νοσοποιήσουσιν ἐχῖνοι ἐν τοῖς οἴκοις αὐτῶν.<sup>107</sup>

<sup>104</sup> MT: והיה-איש כמחבא-רוח וסתר זרם כפלג-מים בציון כצל-סלע-כבד בארץ עיפה. The noun סתר (“hiding place”) has probably been rendered by κρυβήσεται (= Pi’el סתר), the noun רם (“wind”) by φερομένου (= רם—“pouring down,” see 28:2; 30:30), and ציון by ἐν Σιων (= ציון). See LXX Zeph 2:11.

<sup>105</sup> MT: כי על-כלי-בתי משוך.

<sup>106</sup> MT: ואסו שללכם אסו החסיל כמשך גבים שוקק בו. The verb form שוקק (“leap”) is represented by ἐμπαίξουσιν (= שחק), and כמשך (“as a locust”) by ὃν τρόπον ἐάν τις συναγάγῃ (perhaps by way of שקה = “to collect”). The verb συναγάγῃ may—besides under the influence of 17:5—also have been chosen because this verb likewise occurs earlier in the same verse.

ὄνοκένταυροι οἰκήσουσιν  
ἐν αὐτῇ.<sup>108</sup>

34:16 ὅτι (–) κύριος ἐνετείλατο  
αὐτοῖς

23:11 κύριος σαβαωθ ἐνετείλατο περὶ  
Χανααν

13:4 κύριος σαβαωθ ἐντέταλται ἔθναι  
ὁπλομάχῳ

Contrary to the Greek, in the Hebrew the formula in 34:16 speaks of the “mouth” of God that has commanded: כִּי־פִי הוּא צוֹה. In the LXX פִּי may have been left out in assimilation to 13:4 and 23:11. Compare also 40:5 below. The pronoun הוּא (perhaps with the yod of פִּי prefixed to it) was presumably read as יְהוּ and translated κύριος.

38:11 Οὐκέτι μὴ ἴδω τὸ  
σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπὶ  
τῆς γῆς.<sup>110</sup>

52:10 καὶ ὄψονται πάντα τὰ ἄκρα τῆς γῆς  
τὴν σωτηρίαν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ.<sup>109</sup>

40:5 καὶ ὄψεται πᾶσα σὰρξ  
τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ.<sup>111</sup>

40:5 ὅτι (–) κύριος ἐλάλησε.

1:2 ὅτι κύριος ἐλάλησεν.  
21:17 διότι κύριος ἐλάλησεν ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραηλ.  
22:25 ὅτι κύριος ἐλάλησεν.

Comparably to the case in 34:16 which we have just discussed, in 40:5 פִּי in the formula כִּי פִי יְהוָה דָּבַר does not have a corresponding word in the Greek. Exactly the opposite move took place in 24:3 and 25:8, where to the words כִּי יְהוָה דָּבַר the LXX rather seems to have *added* a word for “mouth” (see 24:3 above). The latter two instances also argue against the hypothesis that in 40:5 פִּי would have been removed in order to escape anthropomorphism.<sup>112</sup> Throughout LXX Isaiah the formula כִּי (פִּי) יְהוָה דָּבַר is rendered as follows:

<sup>107</sup> MT: שכנו שם בנות יענה ושעירים ירקדו־שם וענה איים באלמנותיו ותנים בהיכלי ענן.

<sup>108</sup> MT: וירשוה קאת וקפוד וינשוף וערב ישכנו־בה וגטה עליה קריתוהו ואבני־בהו. It is unlikely that καὶ ὄνοκένταυροι οἰκήσουσιν ἐν αὐτῇ renders ואבני־בהו (“the plummet of chaos”).

<sup>109</sup> MT: וראו כל־אפסי־ארץ את ישועת אלהינו.

<sup>110</sup> MT: ל־אֶרְאָה יְהוָה בֶּאֱרֶץ הַחַיִּים.

<sup>111</sup> MT: וראו כל־בשר יחדו. The final word יחדו was probably read as יהוה. Perhaps the addition of τὸ σωτήριον also served to improve the parallelism with the preceding line יהוה כבוד יהוה / καὶ ὁφθῆσεται ἡ δόξα κυρίου. See sections 8.5.1a, 9.4.2.1, and 10.3.2.

<sup>112</sup> See section 10.3.2.



כי פי יהוה דבר	τὸ γὰρ <b>στόμα</b> κυρίου ἐλάλησε	1:20; 58:14
	ὅτι κύριος ἐλάλησε	40:5
כי יהוה דבר	τὸ γὰρ <b>στόμα</b> κυρίου ἐλάλησε	24:3; 25:8
	διότι / ὅτι κύριος ἐλάλησεν	1:2; 21:17; 22:25

The translation of this formula typically illustrates the fact that the LXX translator did not always render his text in a concordant and consistent way.

40:27 Ἀπεκρύβη ἡ δόδος μου ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ ὁ θεός μου <b>τὴν κρίσιν</b> ἀφείλε <b>καὶ ἀπέστη</b> ; <sup>113</sup>	59:9 διὰ τοῦτο <b>ἀπέστη ἡ κρίσις</b> ἀπ' αὐτῶν 59:11 ἀνεμείναμεν <b>κρίσιν</b> , καὶ οὐκ ἔστι· σωτηρία μακρὰν <b>ἀφέστηκεν</b> ἀφ' ἡμῶν. 59:14 καὶ <b>ἀπεστήσαμεν</b> ὀπίσω τὴν <b>κρίσιν</b> , καὶ ἡ δικαιοσύνη μακρὰν <b>ἀφέστηκεν</b>
41:28 ἀπὸ γὰρ <b>τῶν ἐθνῶν</b> ἰδοὺ οὐδεὶς <sup>114</sup>	63:3 καὶ <b>τῶν ἐθνῶν</b> οὐκ ἔστιν ἀνὴρ μετ' ἐμοῦ <sup>115</sup>
42:1 <b>Ἰακωβ</b> ὁ παῖς μου, ἀντιλήμφομαι αὐτοῦ· <b>Ἰσραηλ</b> ὁ ἐκλεκτός μου, προσεδέξατο αὐτὸν ἡ ψυχὴ μου. <sup>116</sup>	41:8 Σὺ δέ, <b>Ἰσραηλ</b> , παῖς μου <b>Ἰακωβ</b> , <b>ὃν</b> <b>ἐξελεξάμην</b> 44:1 νῦν δὲ ἄκουσον, παῖς μου <b>Ἰακωβ</b> καὶ <b>Ἰσραηλ</b> , <b>ὃν</b> ἐξελεξάμην· 44:2 μὴ φοβοῦ, παῖς μου <b>Ἰακωβ</b> καὶ ὁ ἡγαπημένος <b>Ἰσραηλ</b> , <b>ὃν</b> ἐξελεξάμην· 44:21 Μνήσθητι ταῦτα, <b>Ἰακωβ</b> καὶ <b>Ἰσραηλ</b> , ὅτι παῖς μου εἶ σύ· 45:4 ἔνεκεν <b>Ἰακωβ</b> τοῦ παιδός μου καὶ <b>Ἰσραηλ</b> τοῦ ἐκλεκτοῦ μου ἐγὼ καλέσω σε τῷ ὀνόματί μου
42:10 Ὑμνήσατε τῷ κυρίῳ ὕμνον καινόν· <b>δοξάζετε</b> <b>τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ</b> ἀπ' ἄκρου τῆς γῆς <sup>117</sup>	25:1 Κύριε ὁ θεός μου, <b>δοξάσω</b> σε, ὕμνήσω <b>τὸ ὄνομά σου</b>

<sup>113</sup> MT: נסתרה דרכי מיהוה ומאלהי משפטי יעבור. For more comments on the translation, see section 6.3b.

<sup>114</sup> MT: וארא ואין אש.

<sup>115</sup> MT: ומעמים אידאיש אתי. Compare Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 152–53 (who thinks that מעמים entered 41:28 as a gloss from 63:3), and Zillesen, “Bemerkungen,” 255.

<sup>116</sup> Compare Zillesen, “Bemerkungen,” 243.

<sup>117</sup> MT: שירו ליהוה שיר חדש תהלתו מקצה הארץ. The noun phrase תהלתו (“his praise”) was probably linked to הללו and translated **δοξάζετε**. See section 6.6.2b.

43:10 ἔμπροσθέν μου οὐκ  
ἐγένετο ἄλλος θεός<sup>118</sup>

45:21 Ἐγὼ ὁ θεός, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλος  
πλὴν ἐμοῦ.

45:22 ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ θεός, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλος.

44:13 ἐκλεξάμενος τέκτων ξύλον  
ἔστησεν αὐτὸ ἐν μέτρῳ<sup>119</sup>

40:20 ξύλον γὰρ ἄσηπτον ἐκλέγεται  
τέκτων<sup>120</sup>

44:19 καὶ οὐκ ἐλογίσατο τῇ  
καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ οὐδὲ ἀνελο-  
γίσατο ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ αὐτοῦ  
οὐδὲ ἔγνω τῇ φρονήσει<sup>121</sup>

10:7 αὐτὸς δὲ οὐχ οὕτως ἐνεθυμήθη καὶ  
τῇ ψυχῇ οὐχ οὕτως λελόγισται

44:23 εὐφράνθητε, οὐρανοί, ὅτι  
ἠλέησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν  
Ἰσραηλ· σαλπίσατε,  
θεμέλια τῆς γῆς,  
βοήσατε, ὄρη, εὐφροσύνην,  
οἱ βουνοὶ καὶ πάντα τὰ  
ξύλα τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς

49:13 εὐφραίνεσθε, οὐρανοί, καὶ  
ἀγαλλιᾶσθω ἡ γῆ, ῥηξάτωσαν τὰ  
ὄρη εὐφροσύνην, ὅτι ἠλέησεν ὁ θεός  
τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ

52:9 ῥηξάτω εὐφροσύνην ἅμα τὰ ἔρημα  
Ιερουσαλημ, ὅτι ἠλέησε κύριος  
αὐτὴν<sup>122</sup> καὶ ἐρρύσατο Ιερουσαλημ.

The words ὅτι ἠλέησεν ὁ θεός τὸν Ἰσραηλ in LXX Isa 44:23 represent  $\text{וַיַּחַן}$   $\text{יְהוָה}$  in the MT. Apparently,  $\text{וַיַּחַן}$  has been altered to ἠλέησεν and complemented with an object Ἰσραηλ analogously to 49:13 and 52:9.<sup>123</sup>

44:25 τίς ἕτερος διασκεδάσει ση-  
μεῖα ἐγγαστριμύθων καὶ  
μαντείας ἀπὸ καρδίας<sup>124</sup>

59:13 ἐλαλήσαμεν ἄδικα καὶ ἠπειθήσαμεν,  
ἐκύομεν καὶ ἐμελετήσαμεν ἀπὸ  
καρδίας ἡμῶν λόγους ἀδίκους.

In both texts the origin of evil words is considered to be the heart. Compare for ἀπὸ καρδίας also Judg 16:17,18 (A); 1 Kgs 12:33; Jer 23:16; and Ezek 13:3.

45:9 μὴ ὁ ἀροτριῶν ἀροτριάσει  
τὴν γῆν ὀλὴν τὴν ἡμέραν;<sup>125</sup>

28:24 μὴ ὀλὴν τὴν ἡμέραν μέλλει ὁ  
ἀροτριῶν ἀροτριάει;<sup>126</sup>

<sup>118</sup> Compare Exod 8:6.

<sup>119</sup> MT:  $\text{וַיַּחַן}$   $\text{קוֹ}$   $\text{עֲצִים}$   $\text{נֹטֶה}$ —"The carpenter stretches a line." While in the MT  $\text{וַיַּחַן}$  is an attribute to  $\text{וַיַּחַן}$  ("a worker in wood"), the LXX has regarded it as an object.

<sup>120</sup> MT:  $\text{וַיַּחַן}$   $\text{קוֹ}$   $\text{עֲצִים}$   $\text{נֹטֶה}$ .

<sup>121</sup> MT:  $\text{וַיַּחַן}$   $\text{קוֹ}$   $\text{עֲצִים}$   $\text{נֹטֶה}$ .

<sup>122</sup> MT:  $\text{וַיַּחַן}$   $\text{קוֹ}$   $\text{עֲצִים}$   $\text{נֹטֶה}$ .

<sup>123</sup> Compare Zillesen, "Bemerkungen," 256–57; Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 156; *HUB Isa*, 203.

<sup>124</sup> MT:  $\text{וַיַּחַן}$   $\text{קוֹ}$   $\text{עֲצִים}$   $\text{נֹטֶה}$ .

The translator or a later editor<sup>127</sup> may have been led to 28:24 by way of a link between תפתח־אֶרֶץ in 45:8 and יפתח וישדד אדמתו in 28:24.<sup>128</sup>

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>45:16 αἰσχυνθήσονται καὶ ἐν-<br/>τραπήσονται <u>πάντες οἱ</u><br/><u>ἀντικείμενοι αὐτῷ</u> καὶ πο-<br/>ρεύσονται ἐν αἰσχύνη.<sup>129</sup></p> <p>45:16 <u>ἐγκαινίζεσθε πρὸς με,</u><br/>νῆσοι.<sup>132</sup></p> <p>46:6 οἱ συμβαλλόμενοι<br/>χρυσίον ἐκ μαρσιππίου<br/>καὶ ἀργύριον ἐν ζυγῷ<br/>στήσουσιν <u>ἐν σταθμῷ</u></p> <p>46:11 ἔκτισα καὶ ἐποίησα,<br/><u>ἤγαγον αὐτὸν καὶ</u><br/><u>εὐόδωσα τὴν ὁδὸν</u><br/><u>αὐτοῦ.</u><sup>134</sup></p> | <p>41:11 ἰδοὺ αἰσχυνθήσονται καὶ ἐντραπή-<br/>σονται <u>πάντες οἱ ἀντικείμενοί σοι</u>.<br/>ἔσονται γὰρ ὡς οὐκ ὄντες καὶ ἀπο-<br/>λοῦνται πάντες οἱ ἀντίδικοί σου.<sup>130</sup></p> <p>41:1 Ἐγκαινίζεσθε πρὸς με, νῆσοι.<sup>131</sup></p> <p>40:12 τίς ἔστησε τὰ ὄρη <u>σταθμῷ</u> καὶ τὰς<br/>νάπας <u>ζυγῷ</u>;</p> <p>48:15 ἐγὼ ἐλάλησα, ἐγὼ ἐκάλεσα, <u>ἤγαγον</u><br/><u>αὐτὸν καὶ εὐόδωσα τὴν ὁδὸν</u><br/><u>αὐτοῦ.</u><sup>133</sup></p> <p>55:11 <u>καὶ εὐοδώσω τὰς ὁδοὺς σου</u> καὶ τὰ<br/>ἐντάλματά μου.<sup>135</sup></p> |
|--|--|

<sup>125</sup> The MT has חֶרֶשׁ אֶתְחַרְשִׁי אֶדְמָה—“a vessel among earthen vessels”(“?”), חֶרֶשׁ and אֶתְחַרְשִׁי having been interpreted as derivations of the root חֶרֶשׁ—“to plough”—in the LXX.

<sup>126</sup> MT: הַכֵּל הַיּוֹם יִחְרֹשׁ הַחֶרֶשׁ לְיָרֵעַ.

<sup>127</sup> The Göttingen edition has not printed ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν in 45:9. Although it is present in several Alexandrian manuscripts (as well as in a number of Hexaplaric and Lucianic ones), it is not evidenced by the two most important ones, A and Q. Therefore the phrase may well be a harmonising addition by a later editor of the LXX.

<sup>128</sup> Compare Goshen-Gottstein, “Theory and Praxis,” 154–55.

<sup>129</sup> MT: בּוֹשׁוּ וְגַם־נִכְלְמוּ כָל־יְחִידֵי הַלֵּכוֹ בְּכָל־מָה. Instead of a plus, οἱ ἀντικείμενοι αὐτῷ may be a rendering of יְחִידֵי, linked to נַחֲרִים (“those who strive against you,” see 41:11).

<sup>130</sup> MT: הֵן יִבְשׁוּ ויִכְלְמוּ כָל הַנַּחֲרִים בְּךָ יִהְיוּ כְּאֵץ ויִאֲבְדוּ אֲנֹשֵׁי רִיבֶךָ.

<sup>131</sup> MT: הַחֶרֶשׁ אֵלֵי אֵיִם. As in 45:16, the translation reflects חֶדֶשׁ rather than חֶרֶשׁ.

<sup>132</sup> MT: חֲרָשֵׁי צִירִים—“the makers (I. יַצֵּרִי) of idols.” The LXX has connected חֶרֶשׁ with חֲדָשׁוּ—“be renewed”; the noun צִירִים seems to be related to אֵיִם (= νῆσοι).

<sup>133</sup> MT: אֲנִי דִבַּרְתִּי אֶף־קִרְאָתִי הַבִּיאָתִי וְהַצִּלֵּיתִי דַרְכּוֹ.

<sup>134</sup> MT: יִצְרֵתִי אֶף־אֲעֲשֶׂנָּה. The Göttingen edition has not printed this plus in LXX Isa 46:11. However, the clause is evidenced by all Alexandrian witnesses, and hence has a good chance of reflecting the original LXX text.

<sup>135</sup> MT: וְהַצִּלֵּיתִי אֲשֶׁר שְׁלַחְתִּי. Compare for a related verse also 45:13 ἐγὼ ἤγειρα αὐτὸν μετὰ δικαιοσύνης, καὶ πᾶσαι αἱ ὁδοὶ αὐτοῦ εὐθεῖαι.

- 47:13 στήτωσαν καὶ σωσάτω-  
σάν σε οἱ ἀστρολόγοι  
τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, οἱ ὄρωντες  
τοὺς ἀστέρας **ἀναγγει-  
λάτωσάν σοι** (–) τί  
μέλλει ἐπὶ σέ ἔρχεσθαι.<sup>136</sup>
- 48:5 καὶ ἀνήγγειλά σοι πάλαι,  
πρὶν **ἐλθεῖν ἐπὶ σέ** ἀκουσ-  
τόν σοι ἐποίησα.
- 48:14 ἀγαπῶν σε ἐποίησα τὸ  
θέλημά σου ἐπὶ Βαβυ-  
λῶνα **τοῦ ἄραι σπέρμα**  
Χαλδαίων.<sup>140</sup>
- 49:7 Οὕτως λέγει κύριος **ὁ**  
**ῥυσάμενός σε ὁ θεός**  
**Ισραηλ**<sup>141</sup>
- 49:11 καὶ θήσω **πᾶν ὄρος** (–)  
εἰς ὁδὸν καὶ πᾶσαν  
τρίβον εἰς βόσκημα  
αὐτοῖς.
- 19:12 ποῦ εἰσι νῦν οἱ σοφοί σου; καὶ  
**ἀναγγειλάτωσάν σοι** καὶ εἰπάτωσαν  
τί βεβούλευται κύριος σαβαωθ ἐπ’  
Αἴγυπτον.
- 41:22 ἐγγισάτωσαν καὶ **ἀναγγειλάτωσαν**  
**ὑμῖν** ἃ συμβήσεται, ἢ τὰ πρότερα  
τίνα ἦν εἶπατε
- 41:23 **ἀναγγειλατε ἡμῖν** τὰ ἐπερχόμενα  
ἐπ’ ἐσχάτου, καὶ γνωσόμεθα ὅτι  
θεοὶ ἐστε.<sup>137</sup>
- 44:7 στήτω καλεσάτω καὶ ἐτοιμασάτω  
μοι ἄφ’ οὗ ἐποίησα ἄνθρωπον εἰς τὸν  
αἰῶνα, καὶ τὰ ἐπερχόμενα πρὸ  
τοῦ ἐλθεῖν **ἀναγγειλάτωσαν ὑμῖν**.<sup>138</sup>
- 47:13 ἀναγγειλάτωσάν σοι τί μέλλει **ἐπὶ σέ**  
**ἔρχεσθαι**.
- 15:9 ἐπάξω γὰρ ἐπὶ Ρεμμων Ἰαραβας καὶ  
**ἄρῶ τὸ σπέρμα** Μωαβ καὶ Αἰριηλ καὶ  
τὸ κατάλοιπον Αδαμα.<sup>139</sup>
- 54:5 καὶ **ὁ ῥυσάμενός σε ἅγιός θεός**  
**Ισραηλ**, πάσῃ τῇ γῇ κληθήσεται.
- 40:4 καὶ **πᾶν ὄρος** καὶ βουνὸς ταπεινω-  
θήσεται, καὶ ἔσται πάντα τὰ σκολιὰ  
εἰς εὐθεῖαν καὶ ἡ τραχεῖα εἰς ὁδοὺς  
λείας.

<sup>136</sup> MT: יבאו עליך מנשימים וישיעו הברו שמים החיים בכוכבים מוידעים מלפניך מאשר יבאו עליך. See also 48:5.

<sup>137</sup> In the Göttingen edition ἡμῖν is absent; it may be a secondary reading; see the footnote at 41:23 in section 9.2.3 above.

<sup>138</sup> ὑμῖν renders למו.

<sup>139</sup> ἄρῶ is not a literal rendering of the Hebrew, which reads נוספות לפליטת מואב כראשית ערד-ימון נוספות ולשארי אדמה אריה. Probably it reflects נוספות, which was linked to חסא. See section 6.6.1b.

<sup>140</sup> MT: יהוה אהבו עשה חפצו בבבל וזרעו כשדים.

<sup>141</sup> MT: כה אמר-יהוה גאל ישראל קדושו. For other related texts (albeit not all of them containing ὁ θεός), see 44:6; 47:4; 48:17; 49:26; and 54:8. See also the discussion of 49:7 in section 9.2.3 above.

$\pi\tilde{\alpha}\nu$  ὅρος in 49:11 matches כְּלִי־הָרַי in the MT. The translator may have changed the plural into a singular and omitted the possessive pronoun in assimilation to 40:4, since that verse too speaks about the transformation of “every mountain” (MT: וְכָל־הָרַי).

49:13 εὐφραίνεσθε, οὐρανοί,  
καὶ ἀγαλλιᾶσθω ἡ γῆ,  
ῥηξάτωσαν τὰ ὄρη  
εὐφροσύνην καὶ οἱ  
βουνοὶ δικαιοσύνην,  
ὅτι ἠλέησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν  
λαὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ τοὺς  
ταπεινοὺς τοῦ λαοῦ  
αὐτοῦ παρεκάλεσεν.<sup>142</sup>

44:23 εὐφράνθητε, οὐρανοί, ὅτι ἠλέησεν ὁ  
θεὸς τὸν Ἰσραὴλ· **σαλπίσατε, θεμέλια**  
**τῆς γῆς, βοήσατε, ὄρη, εὐφροσύνην,**  
**οἱ βουνοὶ καὶ πάντα τὰ ξύλα τὰ ἐν**  
**αὐτοῖς, ὅτι ἔλυτρώσατο ὁ θεὸς τὸν**  
**Ἰακωβ. καὶ Ἰσραὴλ δόξασθήσεται.**

45:8 εὐφρανθήτω ὁ οὐρανὸς ἄνωθεν, καὶ αἱ νεφέλαι ῥανάτωσαν **δικαιοσύνην**. ἀνατειλάτω ἡ γῆ ἔλεος καὶ **δικαιοσύνην** ἀνατειλάτω ἡμᾶς.

55:12 ἐν γὰρ **εὐφροσύνῃ** ἐξελεύσεσθε καὶ  
ἐν **χαρᾷ** διδαχθήσεσθε· **τὰ** γὰρ **ὄρη**  
**καὶ οἱ βουνοὶ** ἐξαλοῦνται  
προσδεχόμενοι ὑμᾶς ἐν **χαρᾷ**

49:13 ὅτι ἡλέησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν  
λαὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ τοὺς  
ταπεινοὺς τοῦ λαοῦ  
αὐτοῦ παρεκάλεσεν.

14:32 ὅτι κύριος ἐθεμελίωσε Σιών, καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ σωθήσονται οἱ ταπεινοὶ τοῦ λαοῦ.<sup>143</sup>

51:2 ἐμβλέψατε εἰς **Ἀβραάμ**  
τὸν πατέρα ὑμῶν καὶ εἰς  
Σαρραν τὴν ὠδίνουσαν  
ὑμᾶς· ὅτι εἷς ἦν, καὶ  
ἐκάλεσα αὐτὸν καὶ  
εὐλόγησα αὐτὸν **καὶ**  
**ἡγάγησα αὐτὸν** καὶ  
ἐπλήθυνα αὐτόν.<sup>144</sup>

41:8 Σὺ δέ, Ἰσραηλ, παῖς μου Ἰακωβ, ὃν  
ἐξελεξάμην, σπέρμα **Αβρααμ**, ὃν  
**ἠγάπησα**

51:9 Ἐξεγείρου ἐξεγείρου,  
Ιερουσαλημ, καὶ ἔνδυσαι.

51:17 Ἐξεγείρου ἐξεγείρου ἀνάστηθι,  
Ιερουσαλημ

<sup>142</sup> καὶ οἱ βουνοὶ δικαιοσύνην is printed in Rahlfs' edition, but omitted in the Göttingen edition. See the footnote in section 8.3.2.1b.

<sup>143</sup> MT: *כִּי יִהְיֶה יֶסֶד צִיּוֹן וְבָהּ יִחָסוּ עַמִּי עֲמֻן*; for the lack of representation of the suffix in LXX Isaiah, see section 3.2.1.

<sup>144</sup> For the relation of the Greek to the Hebrew, see section 6.7c.

- τὴν ἰσχὺν τοῦ βραχίονός σου.<sup>145</sup>
- 52:1 Ἐξεγείρου ἐξεγείρου, Σιών, ἔνδυσαι τὴν ἰσχὺν σου, Σιών, καὶ ἔνδυσαι τὴν δόξαν σου, **Ἱερουσαλημ** πόλις ἡ ἁγία
- 51:12 γινῶθι **τίνα εὐλαβηθεῖσα ἐφοβήθης** ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπου θνητοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ υἱοῦ ἀνθρώπου<sup>146</sup>
- 57:11 **τίνα εὐλαβηθεῖσα ἐφοβήθης** καὶ ἐψεύσω με καὶ οὐκ ἐμνήσθης μου
- 56:6 καὶ τοῖς ἄλλογενέσι τοῖς προσκειμένοις κυρίῳ δουλεύειν αὐτῷ καὶ ἀγαπᾶν τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου τοῦ εἶναι αὐτῷ **εἰς δούλους καὶ δούλας**
- 14:2 καὶ λήμψονται αὐτοὺς ἔθνη καὶ εἰσάξουσιν εἰς τὸν τόπον αὐτῶν, καὶ κατακληρονομήσουσι καὶ πληθυνθήσονται ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς τοῦ θεοῦ **εἰς δούλους καὶ δούλας**
- Goshen-Gottstein assumes that the appending of καὶ δούλας in 56:6 was prompted by the word pair υἱῶν καὶ θυγατέρων in verse 5.<sup>147</sup> However, it is equally possible that through this insertion the translator sought to join 56:6 to 14:2, where exactly the same word couple δούλους καὶ δούλας is present. For a further discussion of the possible connection between these two verses, see at 14:2 above.
- 56:10 ἴδετε ὅτι πάντες ἐκτετῶνται, **οὐκ ἔγνωσαν φρονῆσαι**<sup>148</sup>
- 44:18 **οὐκ ἔγνωσαν φρονῆσαι**, ὅτι ἀπημαυρώθησαν τοῦ βλέπειν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς αὐτῶν<sup>149</sup>
- 57:17 δι' ἁμαρτίαν βραχύ τι ἐλύπησα αὐτὸν καὶ ἐπάταξα αὐτὸν καὶ **ἀπέστρεψα τὸ πρόσωπόν μου ἀπ' αὐτοῦ**, καὶ ἐλυπήθη<sup>150</sup>
- 54:8 ἐν θυμῷ μικρῷ **ἀπέστρεψα τὸ πρόσωπόν μου ἀπὸ σοῦ** καὶ ἐν ἐλπίδι αἰωνίῳ ἐλεήσω σε
- 58:9 τότε βοήσῃ, καὶ ὁ θεὸς εἰσακούσεται σου· **ἔτι**
- 65:24 καὶ ἔσται πρὶν κεκραῖσαι αὐτοὺς ἐγὼ ἐπακούσομαι αὐτῶν, **ἔτι**

<sup>145</sup> For additional verses enclosing an imperative addressed to Jerusalem, see 52:2; 60:1; and 66:10.

<sup>146</sup> MT: מִיִּרְאָתָא וּמִבְּרִיחַת יְמוֹת מַאֲנוּשׁ וּמִבְּרִיחַת יְמוֹת מַאֲנוּשׁ.

<sup>147</sup> HUB Isa, 252.

<sup>148</sup> MT: שָׁפַע עוֹרִים כְּלָם לֹא יָדָעוּ.

<sup>149</sup> MT: ... לֹא יָדָעוּ וְלֹא יָבִינוּ.

<sup>150</sup> MT: בָּעֵן בְּעָעוּ קִצְפָּתִי וְאִכְהוּ הַסֶּתֶר וְאִקְצָא. See also section 9.5 below.

λαλοῦντός σου ἐρεῖ Ἰδοὺ  
πάρειμι.<sup>151</sup>

λαλούντων αὐτῶν ἐρῶ τί ἐστι;

58:13 οὐκ ἀρεῖς τὸν πόδα σου  
ἐπ' ἔργῳ οὐδὲ λαλήσεις  
λόγον ἐν ὀργῇ **ἐκ τοῦ**  
**στόματός σου**<sup>152</sup>

45:23 Ἡ μὲν ἐξελεύσεται **ἐκ τοῦ στόματός**  
**μου** δικαιοσύνη, οἱ λόγοι μου  
οὐκ ἀποστραφήσονται

48:3 Τὰ πρότερα ἔτι ἀνήγγειλα, καὶ **ἐκ**  
**τοῦ στόματός μου** ἐξῆλθε

55:11 οὕτως ἔσται τὸ ῥήμά μου, ὃ ἐὰν  
ἐξέλθῃ **ἐκ τοῦ στόματός μου**, οὐ μὴ  
ἀποστραφῇ

59:21 καὶ τὰ ῥήματα, ἃ ἔδωκα εἰς τὸ  
στόμα σου, οὐ μὴ ἐκλίπῃ **ἐκ τοῦ**  
**στόματός σου**

63:7 **κύριος** κριτῆς ἀγαθός  
τῷ οἴκῳ Ἰσραὴλ<sup>153</sup>

30:18 διότι **κριτῆς κύριος** ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν  
ἐστι<sup>154</sup>

33:22 **κριτῆς** ἡμῶν **κύριος**<sup>155</sup>

64:11(12) καὶ **ἐπὶ πᾶσι** τούτοις  
ἀνέσχου, κύριε, καὶ  
ἐσιώπησας

9:16(17) **ἐπὶ πᾶσι** τούτοις οὐκ ἀπεστράφη  
ὁ θυμός, ἀλλ' ἔτι ἡ χεὶρ ὑψηλή.<sup>156</sup>

65:2 ἐξεπέτασα τὰς χειράς  
μου ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν  
πρὸς λαὸν **ἀπειθοῦντα**  
**καὶ ἀντιλέγοντα**, οἱ  
οὐκ ἐπορεύθησαν ὁδῷ  
ἀληθινῇ, ἀλλ' ὀπίσω  
τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν.<sup>157</sup>

50:5 καὶ ἡ παιδεία κυρίου ἀνοίγει μου  
τὰ ὦτα, ἐγὼ δὲ οὐκ **ἀπειθῶ οὐδὲ**  
**ἀντιλέγω**.

<sup>151</sup> Compare Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 173–74.

<sup>152</sup> MT: דבר דבר פהץ ממצוא מכות דרכך וכבדת מעשות דרכך. Possibly ἐκ τοῦ στόματός σου is not a plus, but a rendering of פהץ ממצוא, read in an associative way as פהץ מפי' יהוה.

<sup>153</sup> MT: ורבו טוב לבית ישראל. LXX Isaiah has read ורבו טוב (MT: ורבו טוב—“the greatness of favour”) as ורבו טוב—“and a good judge” (Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 147); κύριος is probably a second translation of יהוה, which is located at the end of the previous sentence. Compare *HUB Isa*, 279.

<sup>154</sup> MT: כִּי־אֱלֹהֵי מִשְׁפַּח יְהוָה.

<sup>155</sup> MT: כִּי יְהוָה שַׁפְּטֵנוּ.

<sup>156</sup> See also 9:11(12), 20(21) and 10:4: ἐπὶ τούτοις πᾶσιν οὐκ ἀπεστράφη ὁ θυμός, ἀλλ' ἔτι ἡ χεὶρ ὑψηλή.

<sup>157</sup> See Deut 21:18, 20; Jer 5:23; and Ps 78(77):8, and for more comments, see section 9.4.1.2b.

65:18 ἀλλ' εὐφροσύνην καὶ  
ἀγαλλίαμα εὐρήσουσιν  
ἐν αὐτῇ.<sup>159</sup>

51:3 εὐφροσύνην καὶ ἀγαλλίαμα  
εὐρήσουσιν ἐν αὐτῇ<sup>158</sup>

65:24 καὶ ἔσται πρὶν κεκραῖσαι  
αὐτοὺς ἐγὼ ἐπακούσομαι  
αὐτῶν, ἔτι λαλούντων  
αὐτῶν ἐρῶ Τί ἐστι;

58:9 τότε βοήσῃ, καὶ ὁ θεὸς εἰσακούσεταιί  
σου· ἔτι λαλούντός σου ἐρεῖ Ἴδου  
πάρεμι.

While in 58:9 ἔτι has been added in approximation to 65:24 (see at 58:9 above), through the addition of Τί ἐστι the translator at the same time appears to have aligned 65:24 to 58:9. Even if Τί ἐστι in 65:24 does not have a literal match in the LXX of 58:9—which has Ἴδου πάρεμι in the corresponding place—it does seem to render the *Hebrew* reading of the latter words, which consists of the interjection וַיִּהְיֶה.<sup>160</sup> The rendering of וַיִּהְיֶה as Τί ἐστι has precedents in Gen 31:11; 46:2; and Exod 3:4.

66:3 καὶ οὗτοι ἐξελέξαντο τὰς  
ὁδοὺς αὐτῶν καὶ τὰ βδε-  
λύγματα αὐτῶν, ἢ ἢ  
ψυχὴ αὐτῶν ἠθέλησε<sup>162</sup>

65:12 καὶ ἐποιήσατε τὸ πονηρὸν ἐναντίον  
ἐμοῦ καὶ ἂ οὐκ ἐβουλόμην  
ἐξελέξασθε.<sup>161</sup>

66:18 ἀγῶν τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν καὶ  
τὸν λογισμόν αὐτῶν  
ἐπίσταμαι.<sup>163</sup>

37:28 νῦν δὲ τὴν ἀνάπαυσίν σου καὶ τὴν  
ἐξοδὸν σου καὶ τὴν εἰσοδὸν σου  
ἐγὼ ἐπίσταμαι.

66:20 καὶ ἄξουσι (–) τοὺς  
ἀδελφούς ὑμῶν ἐκ

43:6 ἄγε τοὺς υἱούς μου ἀπὸ γῆς  
πόρρωθεν

<sup>158</sup> MT: ששון ושמחה ימצא בה.

<sup>159</sup> MT: כִּי־אִם־יִשְׂשׁוּ וְגִילּוֹ עַד־יָעַד. The verb יִשְׂשׁוּ seems to have produced the noun εὐφροσύνην, and גִּילּוֹ καὶ ἀγαλλίαμα. עַד־יָעַד has no equivalent in the Greek. For the word pair εὐφροσύνη καὶ ἀγαλλίαμα, see LXX Isa 16:10; 22:13; and 51:11; see also 35:10 and 60:15.

<sup>160</sup> One could also conclude from this, however, that the translator read וַיִּהְיֶה in his *Vorlage* of 65:24. This would elucidate the different rendering of this Hebrew expression in the LXX of 65:24 and 58:9. For, if the translator in 65:24 was influenced by 58:9, one might expect him to have been influenced by the Greek version of the latter verse and so to have added Ἴδου πάρεμι instead of Τί ἐστι.

<sup>161</sup> MT: וַתַּעַשׂ הָרַע בְּעֵינֵי וּבִאֲשֶׁר לֹא־חִפְצָתִי בַחֲרָתִם.

<sup>162</sup> MT: וַתַּעַשׂ הָרַע בַּחֲרָתִם בְּדַרְכֵיהֶם וּבִשְׂקֻצֵיהֶם נַפְשָׁם חִפְצָה. The translator most likely considered נַפְשָׁם חִפְצָה to be a asyndetic relative clause, even if in the MT it is part of the main clause (“... and in their abominations their soul takes delight”); see section 5.2.

<sup>163</sup> See also LXX Deut 31:27 ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐπίσταμαι τὸν ἐρεθισμόν σου καὶ τὸν τράχηλόν σου τὸν σκληρόν; and Ps 94(93):11 (see section 9.4.2.1).



πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν  
δῶρον κυρίῳ

49:22 καὶ ἄξουσιν τοὺς υἱούς σου ἐν κόλπῳ  
60:9 ἀγαγεῖν τὰ τέκνα σου μακρόθεν

LXX Isa 66:20 displays a minus in that it does not offer an equivalent for כָּל in the phrase אֶת־כָּל־אֲחִיכֶם, which forms part of the Hebrew clause וְהֵבִיאוּ אֶת־כָּל־אֲחִיכֶם מִכָּל־הַגּוֹיִם מִנַּחָה לִיהוָה. An explanation for this minus can be discovered in Isa 43:6; 49:22; and 60:9, which similarly speak of the bringing of the Israelites from all places of the earth. Also in these verses כָּל is missing before the object.

66:23 καὶ ἔσται μῆνα ἐκ μηνὸς  
καὶ σάββατον ἐκ σαββά-  
του ἥξει πᾶσα σὰρξ  
ἐνώπιόν μου προσκυνή-  
σαι ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ

27:13 καὶ προσκυνήσουσι τῷ κυρίῳ ἐπὶ  
τὸ ὄρος τὸ ἅγιον ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ.

### 9.3.2 Conclusion to 9.3

In this paragraph some eighty cases have been listed where *pluses* in the Greek Isaiah seem to have arisen from the borrowing of text from passages elsewhere in the book of Isaiah. It has been shown that the sections from which components were adopted are usually related in content to those to which they were imported, but sometimes the translator merely seems to have copied phraseology, without connecting the two texts on an exegetical level (see 1:20; 8:22; 24:3; 25:8, 11; 44:19; and 58:13 above). Also some *minuses* are the outcome of intratextual borrowing. This concerns the omission of elements in harmonisation with similar locutions in other parts of the translation (see 1:10; 20:4; 31:7; 34:16; 40:5; 49:11; and 66:20 above).

Passages from which expressions have been taken or to which they have been adjusted can often be found in nearby chapters. Especially in LXX Isaiah chapters 41–49 many additions and omissions appear that elaborate the internal connections within this section.

In some cases “cross-pollination” has occurred, two verses having influenced each other mutually. Examples of this can be found in 1:20/24:3; 17:13/29:5–6; 11:8/14:29/30:6; and 58:9/65:24 above.

By creating and enhancing intratextual links, the translator could in the first place strengthen the internal unity of his work, and in the second place interpret the often complex Hebrew text, explaining one passage with the help of another.

Intratextual additions and omissions in LXX Isaiah do not only betray the influence of passages in *preceding* parts of the translation, but also that of *later* chapters. The question has been raised of whether also in the latter case pluses and minuses could be the work of the translator himself, as he had not yet

arrived at that part of his translation where the changes are based. According to some scholars LXX translators can hardly be considered to have used elements from posterior sections of their work. Seeligmann, for instance, suggests that such borrowings from later parts of LXX Isaiah may have been the work of a so-called “second translator,” revising the translation of his predecessor.<sup>164</sup> Aejmelaes even regards the influence of later passages as an argument against the idea *per se* that intratextual translations are the accomplishment of the LXX translators themselves. She argues that they may rather be the work of Hebrew copyists.<sup>165</sup> Yet, the number of pluses and minuses in LXX Isaiah that reveal the influence of chapters further on in the book is so substantial that one can hardly escape the conclusion that the translator has indeed utilised subsequent parts of his translation in earlier sections.<sup>166</sup> Apparently, he did not proceed his work by simply starting at the first page and continuing until the final word, after which he had for once and for all finished his entire work. This would be a far too simple picture of the translation process in the LXX translator’s time, which would underestimate the precision and accuracy with which translators worked. The translation process must have been much more complex, including stages of the translator’s rereading, editing and improving of his own work. It was probably during this reworking of his translation that the translator inserted elements from subsequent chapters. It is also possible that during the translation process he was reminded of a certain passage further on in the book, then glanced through that passage, and translated it first (just in his mind or actually in his script), after which he integrated it into the earlier verse.<sup>167</sup>

In his extensive use of intratextuality, the Isaiah translator does not stand alone. Other ancient Bible versions display the same tendency. The Isaiah Scroll from Qumran comprises approximately twenty pluses which demonstrate this technique.<sup>168</sup>

---

<sup>164</sup> Seeligmann, *Septuagint Version*, 71.

<sup>165</sup> Aejmelaes, “What can we know,” 70–71.

<sup>166</sup> In the outline above at least thirty of the around eighty instances concern pluses and minuses influenced by later chapters: see 1:10, 20, 25; 3:14; 5:28; 8:22; 9:2(3); 13:2, 14; 15:2–3; 17:13; 20:4; 24:14; 26:9; 27:4; 28:2; [29:24]; 30:18; 32:2; 38:11; 40:27; 41:28; 43:10; 44:23, 25; [46:11]; 49:7; 51:9; 51:12; and 58:9.

<sup>167</sup> See also Baer, *When We All Go Home*, 25: “He leaves evidence that his translation did not proceed systematically from front to back. On at least one occasion, translation of a given text is carried out in a manner that suggests that a Greek translation of a similar passage *later* in the book already existed and lay before him.”

<sup>168</sup> Kutscher, *Language and Linguistic Background*, 545.

#### 9.4 The adoption of elements from other biblical books

One of the most intriguing features of the Septuagint of Isaiah is the intricate web of relationships that the translation reveals with other biblical books. The Isaiah translator appears to have been well educated in Scripture, and has woven in elements of biblical stories, songs and prophecies from elsewhere all throughout his translation. The Greek Pentateuch in particular seems to have had a large impact on him. This earliest one of the Greek Bible translations was probably widely known among Hellenistic Jews, and has influenced other subsequent translations as well.<sup>169</sup> While it is evident that the Pentateuch was consulted by the Isaiah translator in its Greek version, of the other parts of Scripture, traces of which can be found in LXX Isaiah, there is less evidence to indicate whether they stem from the Greek translations of these books or only from the Hebrew. This issue is especially relevant as it concerns Psalms, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the Twelve Prophets. Those texts are considered by several scholars to have been sources of inspiration for the Isaiah translator in composing his work, either in their Greek or in their Hebrew form.<sup>170</sup> One difficulty in determining which version the translator has used for other biblical books, is the fact that the date of origin of most Greek Bible translations is controversial, so that there is no external evidence available to assist in ascertaining the possibility of dependence on the Greek. Another complexity is that often “die Argumente Schlüsse nach beiden Seiten zulassen,” as Wevers formulates it.<sup>171</sup> That is, when one thinks that the Greek translation of a specific text in Isaiah relies on a passage in the Greek translation of another biblical book, often the reversed hypothesis is also possible, namely that this other translation depends on the LXX of Isaiah. Yet, this complication does not exist when in the Greek Isaiah a *plus* or a *minus* is supposed to have been influenced by another Greek translation. In such a case the direction of the dependency is obvious. Therefore, in order to shed more light on the relationship between the various Greek translations, the search for pluses and minuses that may be the result of intertextual borrowing is particularly important.

In order to investigate critically whether a plus or minus in LXX Isaiah has truly been caused by the influence of texts elsewhere in Scripture, one should ask whether this variant could not be the result of another process or technique, such as the assimilation to a set phrase, the explicitation of the text, or the addition or omission of elements for stylistic motives. Sometimes such alternative explanations make it unnecessary to attribute a plus or minus to intertextuality. In other cases, the alternative clarification may be

<sup>169</sup> Tov, “Impact of the LXX Translation,” 578.

<sup>170</sup> Compare e.g. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 103–6; Seeligmann, *Septuagint Version*, 71–75.

<sup>171</sup> John W. Wevers, “Septuaginta-Forschungen,” *TRu*, NF 22 (1954): 180.

complementary, however, and exist side by side with the intertextual one. For instance, the translator may have sought to ameliorate the parallelism between two lines, and for that purpose have added an expression that he detected in a related passage elsewhere in Scripture.

Another possible way to explain correspondences of LXX Isaiah with other texts, is to posit that the congruence is just accidental. However, the more extensive and precise the resemblance between the two texts is (also including the context of both), the smaller the chance that it is merely a matter of coincidence.

If a plus or minus in LXX Isaiah indeed seems to have an intertextual background, one can try to find out whether it goes back to the Hebrew version of a book or to the Greek rendition of it. As will be clear, if the text in LXX Isaiah and its parallel in the Greek translation of the other document present literal correspondences in their vocabulary and phraseology, it is most likely that the Isaiah translator was relying on the Greek version. If, on the other hand, the two Greek texts do not correspond in a formal way, but only as regards their content, it is more plausible that the Isaiah translator depended on the *Hebrew* text, or that he was merely reminded of the contents of the other passage rather than using its exact formulation.

Although most intertextual adjustments to the Greek Isaiah have probably been made by the LXX translator himself, it is conceivable that some of them were already present in the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the translation: a Hebrew scribe may have added or omitted text under the influence of passages elsewhere in Scripture. Also a later Greek editor of the LXX may have sought to extend the ties of the Isaianic text to other sections of the Bible.

#### 9.4.1 *LXX Isaiah and the Pentateuch*

The Greek Pentateuch is the oldest translation of the Hebrew Bible into Greek and can be dated around 250 B.C.E. Septuagint scholars today are convinced that the Greek Pentateuch has had a significant impact on subsequent Greek translations of the Old Testament. This influence of the Pentateuch can be explained in the light of the important function of the Torah in the Jewish community of the Hellenistic period.<sup>172</sup> According to some, such as Mozley, Katz, and more recently, Rabin and Tov, the Greek Pentateuch even served as some sort of “lexicon” or “text book” for later translators.<sup>173</sup> But the Greek

<sup>172</sup> Tov, “Impact of the LXX Translation,” 578.

<sup>173</sup> Francis W. Mozley, *The Psalter of the Church* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1905), 13; Peter Katz, “The Recovery of the Original Septuagint. A Study in the History of Transmission and Textual Criticism,” in *Actes du premier congrès de la Fédération internationale des associations d'études classiques 1950* (FIEC; Paris: Klincksieck, 1951), 178; Chaim Rabin, “The

Torah did not only affect the adoption of vocabulary and quotations, it may also have exercised influence on an exegetical level.<sup>174</sup>

In the LXX of Isaiah traces of the Greek Pentateuch can also be discovered. This has been pointed out by, among others, Thackeray, Brockington, Ziegler, Seeligmann, and Koenig.<sup>175</sup> Seeligmann in particular has investigated the connection of the Greek translation of Isaiah to the Pentateuch. He thinks that the Isaiah translator may have been inspired by this part of the Bible by building forth on memories he had in his mind of the Torah but also by borrowing literal formulations from it.<sup>176</sup> Arie van der Kooij too is of the opinion that the translator imported elements from the Greek Pentateuch, because as a learned scribe and scholar the Isaiah translator was familiar with this part as well as with other parts of Scripture.<sup>177</sup>

In the continuation of this paragraph I will list a number of pluses and minuses in LXX Isaiah that may have entered the translation as a result of the translator's dependence on the Pentateuch (which for the sake of practicability will be divided into the book of Genesis on the one hand and the four subsequent books on the other). Many more examples could be afforded to illustrate this dependence, but given the scope of my work, I will have to limit myself to examining the pluses and minuses.

#### 9.4.1.1 Genesis

The Isaiah translator seems to have had a special interest in some famous narratives that are written down in the book of Genesis. Two of those are the stories of the creation and of the building of the tower of Babel. When he was translating the Isaianic text these stories may have sprung to mind, which resulted in his adopting themes or expressions from these texts into his translation, or sometimes in his omitting words in harmonisation with similar

---

Translation Process and the Character of the Septuagint," *Textus* 6 (1968): 22; Tov, "Impact of the LXX Translation," 578. See also Olofsson, *LXX Version*, 26.

<sup>174</sup> Tov, "Impact of the LXX Translation," 578.

<sup>175</sup> Thackeray, "Greek translators of the Prophetic Books," 583; L. H. Brockington, "Septuagint and Targum," *ZAW* 66 (1954): 84–85; Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 103; Seeligmann, *Septuagint Version*, 45–48; Koenig, *L'herméneutique analogique*, e.g. 87–100.

<sup>176</sup> Seeligmann, *Septuagint Version*, 48.

<sup>177</sup> See Arie van der Kooij, "Perspectives on the Study of the Septuagint. Who are the translators?," in *Perspectives in the Study of the Old Testament and Early Judaism. A Symposium in Honour of Adam S. van der Woude on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday* (ed. Florentino García Martínez and Ed Noort; VTSup 73; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 214–29, esp. 219–20. Van der Kooij posits that the prologue to the Wisdom of Ben Sira offers a clear reference to such a learned scholar. In lines 7–11 the grandson praises his grandfather as a scholar "who had devoted himself for a long time to the reading of the Law, the Prophets, and the other books of our ancestors, and developed a thorough familiarity with them."

formulations that occur in those texts. The pluses and minuses that have been generated in this way will be the focus of the present paragraph.

#### a. Influence of Gen 1–3 The creation story

**Isa 7:16**      **כי בטרם ידע הנער**      **διότι πρὶν ἢ γινῶναι τὸ παιδίον** **ἀγαθὸν ἢ κακόν**  
**מאס ברע ובחר בטוב**      **ἀπειθεῖ πονηρίᾳ τοῦ ἐκλέξασθαι τὸ ἀγαθόν**

Isa 7:16 forms part of the well-known Isaianic passage describing a divine sign that a young woman would become pregnant and bear a son who would be named Emmanuel. Already in the early Church these verses were regarded as a prophecy of the birth of Jesus Christ. This interpretation was facilitated by the LXX translation of this passage, which in verse 14 represents the noun לַמָּע ("young woman") by παρθένος, meaning "virgin." On the Greek translation of these verses and the issue of whether or not the LXX of Isa 7:14 warrants a Messianic interpretation, extensive investigation has been carried out by various scholars, including van der Kooij, Martin Rösel, Troxel, and Lust.<sup>178</sup>

As far as Isa 7:16 is concerned, the translator has switched the emphasis of its content by changing the text in a subtle way: whereas in the Hebrew the expression "before the child knows how to refuse the evil and choose the good" is meant merely as a (neutral) definition of time, namely before the boy has reached a certain age, in the LXX stress is laid upon the boy choosing the right (already in his youth). Seeligmann thinks that the Isaiah translator in his reformulation of 7:16 may have been reminded of the knowledge of good and evil in the biblical account of the sin of the first man in Gen 3:<sup>179</sup>

**Gen 3:5**      **כי ידע אלהים**      ἥδει γὰρ ὁ θεὸς  
**כי ביום אכלכם ממנו**      ὅτι ἐν ἧ ἡμέρᾳ φάγητε ἀπ' αὐτοῦ,  
**ונפקוהו עיניכם**      διανοιχθήσονται ὑμῶν οἱ ὀφθαλμοί,  
**והייתם כאלהים ידעי טוב ורע**      καὶ ἔσεσθε ὡς θεοὶ **γινώσκοντες καλὸν**  
**καὶ πονηρόν.**

**Gen 3:22**      **הן האדם היה כאחד ממנו**      Ἴδοὺ Ἀδὰμ γέγονεν ὡς εἷς ἐξ ἡμῶν  
**לדעת טוב ורע**      τοῦ **γινώσκειν καλὸν καὶ πονηρόν**

<sup>178</sup> Arie van der Kooij, "Die Septuaginta Jesajas als Dokument jüdischer Exegese. Einige Notizen zu LXX-Jes. 7," in *Übersetzung und Deutung. Studien zu dem Alten Testament und seiner Umwelt Alexander Reinard Hulst gewidmet von Freunden und Kollegen* (ed. H. A. Brongers et al.; Nijkerk: Callenbach, 1977), 91–102; Martin Rösel, "Die Jungfrauengeburt des endzeitlichen Immanuel. Isaiah 7 in der Übersetzung der Septuaginta," *JBTh* 6 (1991): 135–51; Ronald L. Troxel, "Isaiah 7,14–16 through the Eyes of the Septuagint," *ETL* 79 (2003): 1–22; idem, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation*, 139–45; Lust, "A Septuagint Christ," 218–25.

<sup>179</sup> Seeligmann, *Septuagint Version*, 46.

Nonetheless, since the correspondence between these texts in Genesis and LXX Isa 7:16 is not literal—LXX Isaiah displaying the words ἀγαθὸν ἢ κακόν where Gen 3 has καλὸν καὶ πονηρόν—it is questionable whether the Isaiah translator actually wanted to allude to Gen 3. It is more likely that he drew upon three other verses in the Pentateuch, namely LXX Num 14:23; 32:11; and Deut 1:39. The discussion of the relation between those three verses and LXX Isa 7:16 will be resumed in 8.4.1.2b below.

Isa 13:10	כִּי־כּוֹכְבֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם וּכְסִילֵיהֶם לֹא יִהְיוּ אֹרֶם	οἱ γὰρ ἀστέρες τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ὁ Ὠρίων καὶ πᾶς ὁ κόσμος τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τὸ φῶς οὐ δώσουσι
-----------	--	---

וּכְסִילֵיהֶם seems to have been rendered by both ὁ Ὠρίων<sup>180</sup> and καὶ πᾶς ὁ κόσμος τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.<sup>181</sup> The latter rendering might be based upon Gen 2:1. Also that verse speaks of “all the ornament” of heaven:

Gen 2:1	וַיִּכְלֹ הַשָּׁמַיִם וְהָאָרֶץ וּכְל־צִבְאָם	Καὶ συνετελέσθησαν ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ καὶ πᾶς ὁ κόσμος αὐτῶν.
---------	--	--

Another option, proposed by Ziegler, is that the extra words have entered Isa 13:10 from Isa 24:21, although there the word כל / πᾶς is missing:<sup>182</sup>

Isa 24:21	יִפְקַד יְהוָה עַל־צִבְאָ הַמְרוֹם בְּמִרוֹם	καὶ ἐπάξει ὁ θεὸς ἐπὶ τὸν κόσμον τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τὴν χεῖρα
-----------	---	---

Isa 18:6	יַעֲזֹבוּ יַחְדוֹ לַעֵיט הָרִים וּלְבִהֶמַת הָאָרֶץ וּקָץ עֲלִיוֹ הָעֵיט וּכְל־בִּהֶמַת הָאָרֶץ עָלָיו תַּחֲרֹץ	καὶ καταλείψει ἄμα τοῖς πετεινοῖς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τοῖς θηρίοις τῆς γῆς, καὶ συναχθήσεται ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ πάντα τὰ θηρία τῆς γῆς ἐπ’ αὐτὸν ἥξει.
----------	--	---

Where the MT reads הָעֵיט (“birds of prey”), LXX Isaiah has τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. The translator may have chosen these words so as to repeat τοῖς πετεινοῖς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ earlier in verse 6. However, there too the phrase does not form a literal rendering of the Hebrew, which offers לַעֵיט הָרִים (“the birds of the mountains”). Perhaps the LXX phraseology was borrowed from the passage on the creation of the animals in Gen 1:30. The effect of that text may also extend to the translation of בִּהֶמַת הָאָרֶץ (“the cattle of the earth”) as τὰ θηρία τῆς γῆς (“the wild beasts of the earth”) within the same verse in LXX Isaiah:

<sup>180</sup> See Job 38:31.

<sup>181</sup> See section 6.3a.

<sup>182</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 64.





## b. Influence of Gen 11:1–9 The tower of Babel

Isa 9:9(10)	בָּנִים נִפְּלוּ וְגִיַת נִבְנָה שְׁקִמִּים גִּדְעוּ וְאֲרָזִים נִחְלִי	Πλίνθοι πεπτώκασιν, <del>ἀλλὰ</del> δεῦτε λαξεύσωμεν λίθους καὶ ἐκκόψωμεν συκαμίνους καὶ κέδρους καὶ οἰκοδομήσωμεν ἑαυτοῖς πύργον.
-------------	--	---

In the LXX of Isa 9:10 (MT Isa 9:9) the status of οἰκοδομήσωμεν (“let us build”) is obscure. Perhaps it is equivalent to נחלי (“we will replace”). Even if it is not connected to that verb in a semantic sense, both verbs appear in the same place, and are equal from a grammatical point of view, both being future verbs in the first person plural. Alternatively, οἰκοδομήσωμεν might reflect נבנה, which, in conformity with the Greek verb, is a first person plural verb form denoting “let us build.” However, נבנה is located elsewhere in the verse, and seems already to be represented by λαξεύσωμεν (albeit נבנה and λαξεύσωμεν have a different meaning, and merely agree in their grammatical form and sentence position). Koenig overcomes this problem by suggesting that the translator has transposed the renderings of נחלי and נבנה, and read נחלי with the connotation of a homonymous Aramaic root חלף—“to cut down,” translating it by λαξεύσωμεν.<sup>186</sup>

Whatever the case, one thing that seems to be evident, is that the translator in rendering Isa 9:9(10) draws inspiration from the story of the building of a tower in Gen 11:1–9, in particular from verses 3–4:<sup>187</sup>

Gen 11:3–4	וַיֹּאמְרוּ אִישׁ אֶל־רֵעֵהוּ הִבָּה נִבְנֶה לְבָנִים וְנִשְׂרָפָה לְשִׂרְפָּה וְתִהְיֶה לָּהֶם הֶלְבְּנָה לְאֶבֶן וְהַחֲמֵר הִיא לָּהֶם לְחֵמֶר וַיֹּאמְרוּ הִבָּה נִבְנֶה־לָּנוּ עִיר וּמִגְדָּל וְרִאשׁוֹ בַּשָּׁמַיִם	καὶ εἶπεν ἄνθρωπος τῷ πλησίον Δεῦτε πλινθεύσωμεν πλίνθους καὶ ὀπτήσωμεν αὐτάς πυρί. καὶ ἐγένετο αὐτοῖς ἡ πλίνθος εἰς λίθον, καὶ ἄσφαλτος ἦν αὐτοῖς ὁ πηλός. καὶ εἶπαν Δεῦτε οἰκοδομήσωμεν ἑαυτοῖς πόλιν καὶ πύργον, οὔ ἡ κεφαλὴ ἔσται ἕως τοῦ οὐρανοῦ <sup>188</sup>
------------	--	---

The reason why the translator connected Isa 9:9(10) with Gen 11:1–9, may be that Isa 9:8(9)–9(10) focuses on the theme of human arrogance. This becomes clear, for instance, in the first part of Isa 9:8(9):

Isa 9:8(9)	וַיִּדְעוּ הָעָם כָּלֹּ אַפְרַיִם וַיּוֹשֶׁב שְׁמֶרֶן בְּגֹאוֹה וּבְגִדָּל לִבָּב לֵאמֹר	καὶ γνώσονται πᾶς ὁ λαὸς τοῦ Εφραιμ καὶ οἱ ἐγκαθήμενοι ἐν Σαμαρείᾳ, ἐφ' ὅβρει καὶ ὑψηλῇ καρδίᾳ λέγοντες
------------	--	---

<sup>186</sup> Koenig, *L'herméneutique analogique*, 93–96.

<sup>187</sup> Compare Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 109; Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation*, 147–48.

<sup>188</sup> Note that LXX Isa 9:10 merely mentions the building of a “tower” and not of a “city” of which Gen 11:4 additionally speaks.

It was most probably this theme that provided the link to Gen 11:1–9, since the story of the tower building has traditionally been interpreted as demonstrating human pride.

**Isa 10:9**      **הלא ככרכמיש**      **Οὐκ ἔλαβον τὴν χώραν τὴν ἐπάνω Βαβυλώνος**  
**כלנו**      **καὶ Χαλαννὴ, οὗ ὁ πύργος ὠκοδομήθη;**

Seeligmann assumes that the Isaiah translator regarded כלנו in Isa 10:9 as identical to the geographical name כלנא / Χαλαννή in Gen 10:10. The latter verse reports that Calneh and Babylon are situated in the land of Sinear, the area where—according to Gen 11:2ff.—the building of the tower took place:<sup>189</sup>

Gen 10:10      ותהי ראשית ממלכתו      καὶ ἐγένετο ἀρχὴ τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ  
                          בבל וארך ואכד      Βαβυλὼν καὶ Ὀρεχ καὶ Ἀρχὰδ  
                          וכלנא בארץ שנער      καὶ Χαλαννὴ ἐν τῇ γῇ **Σενναάρ**.  
  
 Gen 11:2–4      ויהי בנסעם      καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ κινῆσαι αὐτοὺς  
                          מקדם וימצאו בקעה      ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν εὖρον πεδῖον  
                          בארץ שנער וישבו שם ...      ἐν γῇ **Σενναάρ** καὶ κατῴκησαν ἐκεῖ ...  
                          ויאמרו הבה נבנה-לנו      καὶ εἶπαν Δεῦτε **οἰκοδομήσωμεν ἑαυτοῖς**  
                          עיר ומגדל      **πόλιν καὶ πύργον,**  
                          וראשו בשמים      οὗ ἡ κεφαλὴ ἔσται ἕως τοῦ οὐρανοῦ

This indirect link of כלנו in Isa 10:9 to the tower of Babel, may have prompted the translator to interpolate in Isa 10:9 words that go back to Gen 11:1–9: compare οὗ ὁ πύργος ὠκοδομήθη in LXX Isa 10:9 with οἰκοδομήσωμεν ἑαυτοῖς πόλιν καὶ πύργον in Gen 11:4 (cited above) and compare also Gen 11:5:

Gen 11:5      וירד יהוה לראת      καὶ κατέβη κύριος ἰδεῖν  
                          את־העיר ואת־המגדל      τὴν πόλιν καὶ τὸν **πύργον,**  
                          אשר בנו בני האדם      **ὃν ὠκοδόμησαν** οἱ υἱοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

#### c. Influence of other texts in Genesis

**Isa 3:24–25**      **כִּי־תחת יפי**      **καὶ ὁ υἱός σου ὁ κάλλιστος, ὃν ἀγαπᾷς,**  
                          **מתוך בחרב יפלו**      **μαχαίρα πεσεῖται**

The LXX translator has probably understood יפי מתוך (MT: “a burning mark [?]. Your men”) as “the beauty (יפי) of your men,” which he then explained in the sense of “the most beautiful of your men” and translated as ὁ υἱός σου ὁ

<sup>189</sup> Seeligmann, *Septuagint Version*, 47; see also Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation*, 145–48. Note that the idea that the building of the tower took place in the very city of Χαλαννή does not occur in the book of Genesis.

κάλλιστος. The plus *ὃν ἀγαπᾷς* may rest upon Gen 22:2, a text which, in accordance with Isa 3:25, deals with the imminent death of a beloved son:

Gen 22:2	קחנא את־בנך את־יחידך אשר־אהבת את־יצחק ולד־לך אל־ארץ המריה והעלהו שם לעלה על אחד ההרים אשר אמר אליך	Λαβὲ τὸν υἱόν σου τὸν ἀγαπητόν, <i>ὃν ἠγάπησας</i> , τὸν Ἰσαάκ, καὶ πορεύθητι εἰς τὴν γῆν τὴν ὑψηλὴν καὶ ἀνένεγκε αὐτὸν ἐκεῖ εἰς ὄλοκάρπωσιν ἐφ' ἐν τῶν ὁρέων, ὧν ἂν σοι εἴπω.
----------	--	--

Isa 39:2	ויראם את־בית נכתה את־הכסף ואת־הזהב ואת־הבשמים ואת השמן הטוב	καὶ ἔδειξεν αὐτοῖς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ νεχωθα <i>καὶ τῆς στακτῆς</i> καὶ τῶν θυμιαμάτων καὶ τοῦ μύρου καὶ τοῦ ἀργυρίου καὶ τοῦ χρυσοῦ
----------	--	--

נכתה (l. נכתו from נכת—“treasure-house”) is represented twice in the LXX: as the transcription νεχωθα, and as *καὶ τῆς στακτῆς* (“oil of myrrh”);<sup>190</sup> the latter rendition supposedly results from the association of נכתה with נכאת, the name of a spice, maybe a “resin of the cistus rose.”<sup>191</sup> In Gen 37:25 and 43:11 נכאת is mentioned in a list of costly spices. It is translated there by θυμίαμα (“incense”), a noun that appears in LXX Isa 39:2 as well. The Greek versions of the lists in Genesis also include στακτῆ, in both cases as renderings of the Hebrew לט (a kind of spice of which the precise meaning is unknown):

Gen 37:25	וגמליהם נשאים נכאת וצרי ולט	καὶ αἱ κάμηλοι αὐτῶν ἔγεμον θυμιαμάτων καὶ ῥητίνης καὶ στακτῆς.
Gen 43:11	והורידו לאיש מנחה מעט צרי ומעט דבש נכאת ולט בטנים ושקדים	καὶ καταγάγετε τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ δῶρα, τῆς ῥητίνης καὶ τοῦ μέλιτος, θυμίαμα καὶ στακτῆν καὶ τερέμινθον καὶ κάρυα.

In order to render נכתה in Isa 39:2 the LXX translator may with στακτῆ have opted for a word that he encountered in Gen 37:25 and 43:11, in the first place because those texts—like Isa 39:2—name expensive merchandise, and, in the second place, because of the formal resemblance between נכתה in Gen 37:25 and 43:11 and נכאת in Isa 39:2.

Isa 48:19	ויהי כחול זרעך וצאצאי מעדך כמעתי	καὶ ἐγένετο ἂν ὡς ἡ ἄμμος τὸ σπέρμα σου καὶ τὰ ἐκγονα τῆς κοιλίας σου ὡς ὁ χοῦς <i>τῆς γῆς</i>
-----------	-------------------------------------	---

<sup>190</sup> See section 6.3a.

<sup>191</sup> HALOT 1:697.

The attribution of τῆς γῆς to ὁ χοῦς could be inspired by the stories of the patriarchs, in which Abraham and Jacob are promised that their offspring will be as innumerable as the dust of the earth:

Gen 13:16	ושמתי את־זרעך כעפר הארץ אשר אס־יוכל איש למנות את־עפר הארץ גם־זרעך ימנה	καὶ ποιήσω τὸ σπέρμα σου ὡς τὴν ἄμμον τῆς γῆς· εἰ δύναται τις ἐξαριθμῆσαι τὴν ἄμμον τῆς γῆς, καὶ τὸ σπέρμα σου ἐξαριθμηθήσεται.
Gen 28:14	והיה זרעך כעפר הארץ	καὶ ἔσται τὸ σπέρμα σου ὡς ἡ ἄμμος τῆς γῆς

Nevertheless, the words עפר הארץ appear in other places in the Hebrew Bible as well, which makes it likewise imaginable that the addition of τῆς γῆς, rather than having been influenced by one or two specific verses, was merely made in assimilation to a fixed biblical phrase.<sup>192</sup>

Isa 66:19	ושלחתי מהם פליטים אל־הגוים תרשיש פול ולוד משכי קשת תבל ויון האיים הרחקים אשר לא־שמעו את־שמעי ולא־דאו את־כבודי והגידו את־כבודי בגוים	καὶ ἐξαποστελῶ ἐξ αὐτῶν σεσωσμένους εἰς τὰ ἔθνη, εἰς Θαρσις καὶ Φουδ καὶ Λουδ καὶ Μοσοχ καὶ Θοβελ καὶ εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα καὶ εἰς τὰς νήσους τὰς πόρρω, οἳ οὐκ ἀκηκόασί μου τὸ ὄνομα οὐδὲ ἐωράκασιν τὴν δόξαν μου, καὶ ἀναγγελοῦσίν μου τὴν δόξαν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι.
-----------	--	---

Isa 66:19 offers an enumeration of nations to whom will be declared God's glory. In this list משכי קשת ("they who draw the bow") is rendered by the name Μοσοχ. This rendition can be clarified through the appearance of מַשַּׁח / Μόσσοχ in Gen 10, where it forms part of a genealogy naming the sons of Noah and the people that have descended from them:<sup>193</sup>

Gen 10:2–6	בני יפת גמר ומגוג ומדי ויון ותבל ומשך ותירס ובני גמר אשכנז וריפת ותגרמה ובני יון אלישה ותרשיש כתים ודדנים מאלה נפרדו איי הגוים בארצות אש	Υἱοὶ Ἰάφεθ· Γάμερ καὶ Μαγῶγ καὶ Μαδαὶ καὶ Ἰωυάν καὶ Ἑλισὰ καὶ Θοβέλ καὶ Μόσσοχ καὶ Θιράς καὶ υἱοὶ Γάμερ· Ασχανάζ καὶ Ῥιφὰθ καὶ Θοργαμά. καὶ υἱοὶ Ἰωυάν· Ἑλισὰ καὶ Θαρσίς, Κίτιοι, Ῥόδιοι. ἐκ τούτων ἀφωρίσθησαν νῆσοι τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐν τῇ γῇ αὐτῶν, ἕκαστος
------------	--	---

<sup>192</sup> See section 9.5.

<sup>193</sup> So *HUB Isa*, 296. Another possibility is that the Isaiah translator deduced Μόσσοχ from משכי קשת by himself, independently from Gen 10.

ללשנו למשפחתם	κατὰ γλῶσσαν ἐν ταῖς φυλαῖς αὐτῶν
בגויהם ובני חם כוש	καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν αὐτῶν. Υἱοὶ δὲ Χάμ· Χοῦς
ומצרים ופוט וכנען	καὶ Μεσράיμ, Φοῦδ καὶ Χανάαν.

#### 9.4.1.2 Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy

The Pentateuchal accounts of Israel's flight from Egypt and their dwelling in the desert have supplied the Isaiah translator with a rich source of inspiration. It is not surprising that he has alluded to those stories especially when passages in the book of Isaiah deal with Egypt. But other parts of the Pentateuch, containing laws and prescriptions for the people, have also been referred to with regularity. One chapter in particular turns out to have been utilised, namely Deut 32. We will start this paragraph with a discussion of the relation between this Deuteronomic chapter and LXX Isaiah.

##### a. Influence of Deut 32:1–43: The song of Moses

One text from the Pentateuch that has received special scholarly attention as regards its relation to the LXX of Isaiah is Deut 32:1–43, the Song of Moses. This song tells how God has shown loyalty to his people in history. Yet, the people have forsaken him and gone to serve other gods. This is why God is provoked by his people, and threatens to bring judgement on them. Still, in the end he will bring salvation to Israel.

Both Ziegler and Seeligmann have noted several points of agreement between the Greek translation of this song and the translation of Isaiah. I will present below some of the links that these scholars have found between the two texts, and complement these with a few additional examples which I have discovered myself, restricting these to the ones entailing pluses or minuses. After that, I will try to elucidate why it seems to be this Pentateuchal passage in particular that had this influence on the Isaiah translator.

The first example of a case where the translator may have adjusted his text to the Greek of Deut 32 can be found in Isa 1. This first chapter of Isaiah has several thematic and idiomatic aspects in common with Deut 32: in both texts Israel is accused of being a sinful people because they have forsaken the Lord (see Deut 32:15,18 and Isa 1:4); they have infuriated him by serving idols (see Deut 32:16ff. and Isa 1:29); and in both the idea is conveyed that God has brought forth his people (see Deut 32:18 and LXX Isa 1:2).

In Isa 1:11 God expresses his detestation of the offerings made to him:

Isa 1:11	שבעתי עלות אילים והלב מריאים	πλήρης εἰμί δλοκαυτωμάτων κριῶν καὶ στέαρ ἀρνῶν
----------	---------------------------------	--

ודם פרים וכבשים ועתודים לא חפצתי	καὶ αἷμα ταύρων καὶ τράγων οὐ βούλομαι
-------------------------------------	---

This text is reminiscent of Deut 32:14 where it is said of Jacob that he was fed with the blood and fat of sheep and goats:

Deut 32:14	חמאת בקר וחלב צאן עם-חלב כרים ואילים בני-בשן ועתודים עם-חלב כליות חטה ודם-ענב תשתה-חמר	βούτυρον βοῶν καὶ γάλα προβάτων μετὰ στέατος ἀρνῶν καὶ κριῶν, σὺν ταύρων καὶ τράγων μετὰ στέατος νεφρῶν πυροῦ, καὶ αἷμα σταφυλῆς ἔπιον οἶνον.
------------	--	---

In the Greek Isaiah פרים וכבשים ועתודים (“bulls, lambs, and goats”) is rendered by just ταύρων καὶ τράγων (“bulls and goats”), so an equivalent of וכבשים (“lambs”) is missing at this point (it does however occur earlier in the verse as a non-literal rendering of מריאים). One explanation for this minus is that the translator may have borrowed the word combination ταύρων καὶ τράγων—“bulls and goats”—from Deut 32:14, where this phrase appears as well. This could have prompted him to omit “the lambs” from the phrase in question.<sup>194</sup>

Isa 26:15	יספת לגי יהוה יספת לגי נכבדת רחקת כל-קצוי-ארץ	πρόσθες αὐτοῖς <u>κακά</u> , κύριε, πρόσθες <u>κακά</u> πᾶσι τοῖς ἐνδόξοις τῆς γῆς.
-----------	---	---

A second point of agreement concerns Isa 26:15 and Deut 32:23. In Isa 26:15 the Hebrew offers a clause that seems elliptic: “But you have added to the nation, O LORD.” The Greek translation has complemented this clause with an object *κακά*. Ziegler believes this plus to go back to a Hebrew *Vorlage* in which רעות was added under the influence of Deut 32:23:<sup>195</sup>

Deut 32:23	אספה עלימו רעות חצי אכלה-בם	συνάξω εἰς αὐτοὺς <u>κακά</u> , καὶ τὰ βέλη μου συντελέσω εἰς αὐτούς.
------------	--------------------------------	--

The association of Isa 26:15 with this verse in Deuteronomy has according to Ziegler been triggered by the verbal forms יספת and אספה which appear in the respective texts. Ziegler thinks that a Hebrew editor saw a connection between those two verbs, as he would have taken אספה to derive from אסף (rather than from ספה, from which it actually stems), which would be related to יסף because both verbs may signify “to add.” For that reason, the editor correlated Isa 26:15

<sup>194</sup> Van der Louw (“Transformations,” 154) suggests that וכבשים has been omitted because it is semantically superfluous: “Only male sheep ... were sacrificed, and these have already been mentioned in the Greek text.”

<sup>195</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 118.

with Deut 32:23, and added from the latter רעות as a gloss to Isa 26:15. The Hebrew manuscript containing this gloss would have formed the *Vorlage* of LXX Isaiah, and this is why the Greek text of Isa 26:15 presents κακά in Ziegler's view. He bases this idea that κακά had not been added just during translation, but was already present in its *Vorlage*, on the fact that the verbs יספה and יספת have different translations in the Greek versions of Deut 32 and Isa 26, that is, by προστίθῃμι and συνάγω, respectively. If it had been the translator himself who had made the link between the two texts, he would have translated the two verbs in the same way, Ziegler apparently reasons. Yet, in my opinion this presumption is not necessarily true. The observation that יספת and יספה derive from different roots (albeit with an overlapping meaning) may have provided sufficient grounds for the translator to render them diversely. Apart from that, the theory that Hebrew manuscripts contained glosses, as advanced by Ziegler, has been made implausible by the discovery of the Qumran scrolls, in which none of such marginal notes can be detected. Hence, in my opinion κακά is rather an addition by the translator himself. He may have supplied κακά under the influence of Deut 32:23, but also of other texts, as the same object appears several times more in LXX Isaiah itself; see, for example, Isa 13:11 and 31:2:

Isa 13:11	ופקדתי על־תבל רעה	καὶ ἐντελοῦμαι τῇ οἰκουμένη ὅλη κακά
Isa 31:2	ויבא רע	ἤγεν ἐπ' αὐτούς κακά

Isa 34:6	הדשנה מחלב כרים ועתודים	ἐπαχύνθη ἀπὸ στέατος ἀρνῶν
	מחלב כליות אילים	καὶ ἀπὸ στέατος τράγων καὶ κριῶν.

The formulation ἀπὸ στέατος ἀρνῶν in LXX Isa 34:6 might have bearing on כרים עִם־חלב / μετὰ στέατος ἀρνῶν in Deut 32:14. This would throw light on the lack of representation of מִדָּם in the Greek translation of the Isaianic verse:

Deut 32:14	עִם־חלב כרים ואילים	μετὰ στέατος ἀρνῶν καὶ κριῶν
------------	---------------------	------------------------------

Especially chapters 41–49 of LXX Isaiah contain many correspondences with Deut 32. The explanation for this lies in the observation that these two sections are close to each other from a thematic point of view, and that also in the Hebrew they occasionally display common phraseology. A few instances of shared themes are as follows: God is the only god, besides him there is no other (see Deut 32:39; Isa 43:10,11; 44:6, 8; 45:5, 6, 14, 18, 21, 22; 46:9); God is the one who has created human beings (Deut 32:6; Isa 44:2; 45:8; 46:11); he is the creator and origin of everything (Deut 32:39; Isa 45:7, 12, 18; 48:13); the people have served other gods (Deut 32:16–17, 21.; Isa 42:17; 44:9–20; 45:20; 46:5–7; etc.), which has provoked God to anger (Deut 32:19–22; Isa 42:25; 47:6; 48:9;

etc.); the gods are challenged to prove that they are real gods (see Deut 32:38; Isa 41:22–24; 44:7).

One example of an addition within these Isaianic chapters that has probably been taken from Deut 32 can be discovered in Isa 44:2:

Isa 44:2      אֶל־תִּירָא עַבְדִּי יַעֲקֹב      μὴ φοβοῦ, παῖς μου Ἰακώβ  
                   יִשְׂרָוֹן בַּחֲרָתִּי בּוֹ      καὶ ὁ ἡγαπημένος Ἰσραηλ, ὃν ἐξελεξάμην.

As a designation for the people, the MT of Isa 44:2 uses the poetic title יִשְׂרָוֹן, meaning “upright one.” The LXX rendering of this title is ὁ ἡγαπημένος. Ziegler and Seeligmann think this rendering depends on Deut 32:15,<sup>196</sup> since also in the Greek version of that Deuteronomic verse יִשְׂרָוֹן is rendered ὁ ἡγαπημένος, in addition to its primary translation as Ἰακώβ:

Deut 32:15      וַיִּשְׂמֹן יִשְׂרָוֹן      καὶ ἔφαγεν Ἰακώβ καὶ ἐνεπλήσθη,  
                   וַיִּבְעֹט      καὶ ἀπελάκτισεν ὁ ἡγαπημένος

When one looks closer, one can see that the congruence goes still further, because just like the Greek text of Deuteronomy, LXX Isaiah has translated יִשְׂרָוֹן twice: firstly, by ὁ ἡγαπημένος, and secondly, by a proper name, Ἰσραηλ. It thus seems that the Septuagint of Isaiah has adopted the Greek Deuteronomy’s double translation of יִשְׂרָוֹן.<sup>197</sup>

The same designation ὁ ἡγαπημένος is attested twice more in LXX Isaiah, both times in Isa 5:1, where God compares Israel to his beloved vineyard. Here ὁ ἡγαπημένος matches the Hebrew לִידִידִי, “my beloved.” It may well be that the translator omitted the possessive pronoun in לִידִידִי because he wanted to reproduce Israel’s title of honour ὁ ἡγαπημένος as encountered in LXX Deut 32:<sup>198</sup>

Isa 5:1      אֲשִׁירָה נָא לִידִידִי      Ἄισω δὲ τῷ ἡγαπημένῳ  
                   שִׁירַת דּוּדִי לְכַרְמוֹ      ἄσμα τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ τῷ ἀμπελώνί μου.  
                   כֶּרֶם הִיא לִידִידִי      ἀμπελῶν ἐγενήθη τῷ ἡγαπημένῳ  
                   בְּקֶרֶן בֶּן־שֹׁמֶן      ἐν κέρατι ἐν τόπῳ πίοι.

A further Isaianic section that displays several parallels with the Song of Moses is Isa 65. Like Deut 32, this chapter speaks of the people having sinned and having enraged God because they have forsaken him to serve other gods. This is why God will be avenged on his people and his anger will burn like a fire.

<sup>196</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 126; Seeligmann, *Septuagint Version*, 48.

<sup>197</sup> Elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible the name Jeshurun occurs only in Deut 33:5, 26. There the LXX has rendered the name with a mere ὁ ἡγαπημένος.

<sup>198</sup> The omission of the possessive pronoun could however also be a matter of style, see section 5.5f.



In Isa 65:3 we hear about Israel's pagan sacrifices that have provoked God to anger. In the Greek of this verse an extra element can be observed in that these offerings were dedicated to "demons that do not exist":

Isa 65:3	העם המכעיסים אותי על־פני תמיד זבחים בגנות ומקטרים על־הלבנים הישובים בקברים ובנצורים ילינו	ὁ λαὸς οὗτος ὁ παροξύνων με ἐναντίον ἐμοῦ διὰ παντός, αὐτοὶ θυσιάζουσιν ἐν τοῖς κήποις καὶ θυμιῶσιν ἐπὶ ταῖς πλίνθοις <u>τοῖς δαιμονίοις, ἃ οὐκ ἔστι·</u> καὶ ἐν τοῖς μνήμασι καὶ ἐν τοῖς σπηλαίοις κοιμῶνται δι' ἐνύπνια
----------	--	---

As Goshen-Gottstein has suggested, this extra element might be an addition by Isaiah's translator under the influence of Deut 32:17, where it says that the people "sacrificed to demons," thus provoking God:<sup>199</sup>

Deut 32:16–19	יקנאהו בזרים בתועבת יכעסהו יזבחו לשדים לא אלהים לא ידעום ... צור ילדך תשי ותשכח אל מחללך וירא יהוה וינאץ מכעס בניו ובנותיו	παρώξυνάν με ἐπ' ἄλλοτρίοις, ἐν βδελύγμασιν αὐτῶν ἐξεπύκρυνάν με· ἔθυσαν δαιμονίοις καὶ οὐ θεῶ, θεοῖς, οἷς οὐκ ᾔδεισαν... θεὸν τὸν γεννήσαντά σε ἐγκατέλιπες καὶ ἐπελάθου θεοῦ τοῦ τρέφοντός σε. καὶ εἶδεν κύριος καὶ ἐξήλωσεν, καὶ παρωξύνθη δι' ὄργην υἱῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ θυγατέρων·
---------------	--	---

The motif of offering to demons also figures later on in the same Isaianic chapter: in LXX Isa 65:11. There the noun δαίμων (rather than δαιμόνιον as we find in verse 3) renders גַּד, which is the name of a Babylonian god. Nowhere else in the Septuagint has גַּד been translated as δαίμων or δαιμόνιον, so here too the image may derive from Deut 32:<sup>200</sup>

Isa 65:11	ואתם עזבי יהוה השכחים את־הר קדשי הערכים לגד שלחן והממלאים למני מסד	ὕμεῖς δὲ οἱ ἐγκαταλιπόντες με καὶ ἐπιλανθανόμενοι τὸ ὄρος τὸ ἅγιόν μου καὶ ἐτοιμάζοντες τῷ δαίμονι τράπεζαν καὶ πληροῦντες τῇ τύχῃ κέρασμα
-----------	---	---

Note that in the Greek translation of Isa 65:11, in order to express the idea that the people had forsaken the Lord, two verbs have been used that are exactly identical to the ones employed in Deut 32:18: ἐγκαταλείπω and ἐπιλανθάνομαι.

<sup>199</sup> HUB Isa, 286. Ziegler (*Untersuchungen*, 79) thinks that the plus may derive from a "Randglosse" יהוה לשדים לא יהוה (יהיה > יהוה) based upon Deut 32:17.

<sup>200</sup> Sacrificing to demons is not a common biblical notion. Besides in the places mentioned it only figures in LXX Ps 105:37.

Especially with regard to the use of ἐγκαταλείπω this may not have been just a random choice by the Isaiah translator, as this verb appears only sixteen times in the LXX of Isaiah as compared to the much more common καταλείπω which numbers forty-six instances. So, perhaps also the preference for ἐγκαταλείπω in this verse has been encouraged by Deut 32:18.

### στερεὰ πέτρα

A final illustration of a possible linkage between the Greek versions of Isaiah and Deut 32 resulting in a plus or a minus pertains to the several occurrences of the phrase στερεὰ πέτρα in LXX Isaiah. This phrase can be encountered in four places in the Isaiah translation, three times as an equivalent for צור/צור and once as a rendering of חלמיש ("flint"):

2:21	לבוא בנקרות הצרים	τοῦ εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὰς τρώγλας τῆς <u>στερεᾶς πέτρας</u>
5:28	כצר נחשבו	ὡς <u>στερεὰ πέτρα</u> ἐλογίσθησαν
50:7	על-כן שמתי פני כחלמיש	ἀλλὰ ἔθηκα τὸ πρόσωπόν μου ὡς <u>στερεὰν πέτραν</u>
51:1	הביטו אל-צור חצבתם	ἐμβλέψατε εἰς τὴν <u>στερεὰν πέτραν</u> , ἣν ἐλατομήσατε

This translation with στερεὰ πέτρα is striking because elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible צור is generally rendered by a mere πέτρα without στερεά.<sup>201</sup> Outside the Greek Isaiah the exact word combination στερεὰ πέτρα is attested only once, in Deut 32:13, translating צור חלמיש:

Deut 32:13	וינקרו דבש מסלע ושמן מחלמיש צור	ἐθήλασαν μέλι ἐκ πέτρας καὶ ἔλαιον ἐκ <u>στερεᾶς πέτρας</u>
------------	------------------------------------	--

It is indeed conceivable that the translation of צור/צור or חלמיש by στερεὰ πέτρα in LXX Isaiah is dependent upon this rendition in Deut 32.

### b. Influence of other texts in Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy

Isa 1:9	לולי יהוה צבאות הותיר לנו שריד <u>כמעט</u> כסדם היינו לעמרה דמינו	καὶ εἰ μὴ κύριος σαβαωθ <u>ἐγκατέλιπεν</u> ἡμῖν σπέρμα, ὡς Σοδομα ἂν ἐγενήθημεν καὶ ὡς Γομορρα ἂν ὠμιοῦνθμεν.
---------	--	--

<sup>201</sup> In the book of Isaiah, see 2:10, 19 and 18:14.

The absence of כמעט is possibly related to the occurrence of similar phraseology (“to leave seed”) in Deut 3:3, where this word does not follow שריד either:<sup>202</sup>

Deut 3:3	ונכהו	καὶ ἐπατάξαμεν αὐτὸν
	עד-בלתי השאיר-לו שריד	ἕως τοῦ μὴ καταλιπεῖν αὐτοῦ σπέρμα.

Isa 3:8	כִּי-לִשְׁוֹנָם וּמַעַלְלֵיהֶם	καὶ αἱ γλῶσσαι αὐτῶν μετὰ ἀνομίας,
	אֱלֹהֵיהּ לַמְרוֹת	τὰ πρὸς κύριον ἀπειθοῦντες.
	עֵינֵי בְכוּד	διότι νῦν ἐταπεινώθη ἡ δόξα αὐτῶν

The appearance in the Greek of ἐταπεινώθη implies that the translator has interpreted עני as a derivation of ענה—“to humiliate” rather than in the sense of “the eyes of,” as the MT vocalises the form.<sup>203</sup> כִּי-לִשְׁוֹנָם וּמַעַלְלֵיהֶם he may have connected to מעל—“infidelity” (from the root מעל) instead of to מעלל (“deed,” from עלל), albeit it is also possible that he simply translated the latter noun in a free way. The translation of אֱלֹהֵיהּ לַמְרוֹת as τὰ πρὸς κύριον ἀπειθοῦντες might be influenced by Deut 9:7. This Deuteronomic verse is embedded in a speech of Moses in which he blames Israel for being an obstinate and stubborn people, who do not deserve the land promised to them:<sup>204</sup>

Deut 9:7	זכר אֱלֹהֶיךָ	μνήσθητι μὴ ἐπιλάβῃ
	אֶת אֲשֶׁר-הִקְצַפְתָּ אֶת־יְהוָה	ὅσα παρώξυνας κύριον
	אֱלֹהֶיךָ בַּמִּדְבָּר	τὸν θεόν σου ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ
	לִמְנֵי-הַיּוֹם אֲשֶׁר־יִצְאָתָּ מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם	ἀφ’ ἧς ἡμέρας ἐξήλθετε ἐξ Αἰγύπτου
	עַד־בָּאֲכֶם עַד־הַמָּקוֹם הַזֶּה	ἕως ἧλθετε εἰς τὸν τόπον τοῦτον,
	מִמֵּרִים הָיִיתָ עִם־יְהוָה	ἀπειθοῦντες διετελεῖτε τὰ πρὸς κύριον

Isa 4:5	וּבְרָא יְהוָה	καὶ ἥξει,
	עַל כָּל־מִכּוֹן הַר־צִיּוֹן	καὶ ἔσται πᾶς τόπος τοῦ ὄρους Σιών
	וְעַל־מִקְרָאָהּ	καὶ πάντα τὰ περικύκλω αὐτῆς
	עֵנִי יִזְמַם	σκιάζει νεφέλῃ ἡμέρας
	וְעֵשֶׂן וּנְגָה אֵשׁ לַהֲבֵה לַיְלָה	καὶ ὡς καπνοῦ καὶ ὡς φωτὸς πυρὸς καιομένου νυκτός.
	כִּי עַל־כִּיבוֹד חָפֵה	πάσῃ τῇ δόξῃ σκεπασθήσεται.

<sup>202</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 106. Van der Louw (“Transformations,” 151) assumes that the absence of כמעט may bear on the syntactical ambiguity of the word, as it is unclear where it belongs syntactically.

<sup>203</sup> Compare Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 137; Seeligmann, *Septuagint Version*, 50. Koenig (*L’herméneutique analogique*, 115–16) thinks that the variant translation of עני was meant to remove the anthropomorphism from the Hebrew text (“the eyes of God”); see however section 10.3.2.

<sup>204</sup> Also Hos 5:3–5 could have played a role in the translation of Isa 3:8; see section 9.4.5.1.

Isa 4:5 betrays the influence of Pentateuchal passages narrating how God during Israel's journey through the desert revealed his presence by way of a pillar of cloud by day and a pillar of fire by night; see Exod 13:21–22; 14:24; 16:10; 24:15–18; 33:9–10; and 40:34–38, and see also the following verses in Numbers from which the translator may have borrowed the verb σκιαζω:

Num 9:16–18	כִּן יִהְיֶה תָמִיד הָעֲנָן יִכְסֶּנּוּ וּמִרְאֵה־אֵשׁ לַיְלָה ... כְּלִימֵי אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁכֵּן הָעֲנָן עַל־הַמִּשְׁכָּן יִחֲנוּ	οὕτως ἐγένετο διὰ παντός· <b>ἡ νεφέλη</b> ἐκάλυπτεν αὐτὴν <b>ἡμέρας</b> καὶ εἶδος πυρός τὴν νύκτα. ... <b>πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας</b> , ἐν αἷς <b>σκιάζει ἡ νεφέλη</b> ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς, παρεμβαλοῦσιν οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ
Num 10:34(36) <sup>205</sup>	וְעֲנַן יְהוָה עֲלֵיהֶם יוֹמָם בְּנִסְעָם מִן־הַמַּחֲנֶה	καὶ <b>ἡ νεφέλη</b> ἐγένετο <b>σκιάζουσα</b> ἐπ' αὐτοῖς <b>ἡμέρας</b> ἐν τῷ ἔξαιρειν αὐτοὺς ἐκ τῆς παρεμβολῆς.

Isa 7:16	כִּי בִטְרָם יָדַע הָנֶעַר מֵאֵס בָּרַע וּבָחַר בְּטוֹב	διότι πρὶν <b>ἢ γινῶναι τὸ παιδίον ἀγαθὸν ἢ κακόν</b> <b>ἀπειθεῖ</b> πονηρίᾳ τοῦ ἐκλέξασθαι τὸ ἀγαθόν
----------	--	--

As noted earlier, the interpolation of ἀγαθὸν ἢ κακόν, resulting in a text that—contrary to the Hebrew—speaks about the *knowing of good or evil* of the boy, might have been influenced by Gen 3:3, 22.<sup>206</sup> Yet, a more precise correspondence can be distinguished in another text in the Pentateuch, that is, in Deut 1:39.<sup>207</sup> That verse refers to the Israelite children during the journey through the desert, who did not yet know good or evil, and, for that reason, were allowed to enter the promised land. This knowledge of “good or evil” specifies, according to Troxel, “culpability acquired at a certain stage of maturation,” involving the loss of childish innocence:<sup>208</sup>

Deut 1:39	וּבְנֵיכֶם אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יָדְעוּ הַיּוֹם טוֹב וְרַע הַמָּה יָבֹאוּ שָׁמָּה וְלֹהֶם אֲתַנְנָה	καὶ πᾶν <b>παιδίον</b> νέον, ὅστις <b>οὐκ οἶδεν</b> σήμερον <b>ἀγαθὸν ἢ κακόν</b> , οὗτοι εἰσελεύσονται ἐκεῖ, καὶ τούτοις δώσω αὐτήν
-----------	---	--

The same theme of knowing good and evil appears in the LXX of Num 14:23 and 32:11 as well. In both verses it is integrated into a plus, probably additions inspired by Deut 1:39.<sup>209</sup>

Num 14:23	אִם־יִרְאוּ אֶת־הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר נִשְׁבַּעְתִּי לֵאמֹר	ἢ μὴν οὐκ ὄψονται τὴν γῆν, ἢν ὥμοσα τοῖς πατράσιν αὐτῶν,
-----------	---	---

<sup>205</sup> The numbering of the LXX is put between brackets.

<sup>206</sup> See section 9.4.1.1a.

<sup>207</sup> Troxel, “Isaiah 7,14–16,” 2–7; idem, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation*, 139–45.

<sup>208</sup> Troxel, “Isaiah 7,14–16,” 5.

<sup>209</sup> Troxel, “Isaiah 7,14–16,” 3–6.

		<u>ἀλλ' ἢ τὰ τέκνα αὐτῶν, ἃ ἔστιν μετ' ἐμοῦ</u> <u>ὧδε, ὅσοι οὐκ οἶδασιν ἀγαθὸν οὐδὲ κακόν,</u> <u>πᾶς νεώτερος ἅπειρος,</u> <u>τούτοις δώσω τὴν γῆν,</u> πάντες δὲ οἱ παροξύναντές με οὐκ ὕφονται αὐτήν.
Num 32:11	אם־יראו האנשים העלים ממצרים מבן עשרים שנה ומעלה	Εἰ ὕφονται οἱ ἄνθρωποι οὗτοι οἱ ἀναβάντες ἐξ Αἰγύπτου ἀπὸ εἰκοσαετοῦς καὶ ἐπάνω, <u>οἱ ἐπιστάμενοι τὸ κακὸν καὶ τὸ ἀγαθόν,</u> τὴν γῆν, ἣν ὤμοσα τῷ Ἀβραάμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ, οὐ γὰρ συνεπηκολούθησαν ὀπίσω μου
	וכל־מנאצי לא יראוה	
	את האדמה אשר נשבעתי לאברהם ליצחק וליעקב כי לא־מלאו אחרי	

Of the three verses mentioned, only Deut 1:39 exhibits an exact agreement with LXX Isa 7:16 in presenting the words ἀγαθὸν ἢ κακὸν and παιδίον.

Isa 8:14	ולאבן נגף ולצור מכשול	καὶ οὐχ ὡς λίθου προσκόμματι <u>συναντήσεσθε αὐτῷ</u> <u>οὐδὲ ὡς πέτρας πτώματι.</u>
----------	--------------------------	---

Koenig posits that נגף (“striking”) in the LXX of Isa 8:14 has received a twofold translation: not only has it been reproduced in a literal way by προσκόμματι, but also—through association with the root נגג—“to wound”—by συναντήσεσθε αὐτῷ. The connection between נגף and συναντάω (“to encounter”) he bases on the observation that in Exod 9:14 the word מגפתי (“my plague”), which likewise stems from the root נגף, matches τὰ συναντήματά μου:<sup>210</sup>

Exod 9:14	כי בפעם הזאת אני שלח את־כל־מגפתי אל־לבך ובעבדיך ובעמך	ἐν τῷ γὰρ νῦν καιρῷ ἐγὼ ἐξαποστέλλω πάντα τὰ συναντήματά μου εἰς τὴν καρδίαν σου καὶ τῶν θεραπόντων σου καὶ τοῦ λαοῦ σου
-----------	--	---

This linking of LXX Isa 8:14 to Exod 9:14 seems somewhat far-fetched to me, however, since the two verses do not contain any other aspect which they share with each other.

Isa 10:2	להטות מִדֵּן דלים ולגל משפט עניי עמי להיות אלמנות שללם ואת־יתומים יבזו	ἐκκλίνοντες κρίσιν πτωχῶν, ἄρπάζοντες κρίμα πενήτων τοῦ λαοῦ μου ὥστε εἶναι αὐτοῖς <u>χήραν</u> εἰς ἄρπαγὴν καὶ <u>ὀρφανόν</u> εἰς προνομήν.
----------	---	---

<sup>210</sup> Koenig, *L'herméneutique analogique*, 126.

The slightly free rendition of דלים מדין להטות—“to turn aside the needy from justice”—as ἐκκλίνοντες κρίσιν πτωχῶν—“turning aside the cause of the poor” (ידין having been altered into a direct object) may be the outcome of the adoption of juridical phraseology from the book of Deuteronomy.<sup>211</sup>

Deut 16:19	לֹא־תטה משפט	οὐκ ἐκκλινουσιν κρίσιν
Deut 24:17	לֹא תטה משפט גר יתום	Οὐκ ἐκκλινεῖς κρίσιν προσηλύτου καὶ ὀρφανοῦ καὶ χήρας
Deut 27:19	ארור מטה משפט גר־יתום ואלמנה	Ἐπικατάρατος ὅς ἂν ἐκκλίνη κρίσιν προσηλύτου καὶ ὀρφανοῦ καὶ χήρας.

Isa 10:24	אֲל־תִּירָא עַמִּי יֵשֶׁב צִיּוֹן מֵאֲשׁוּר בְּשֶׁבֶט יִכְכֶּה וּמִטְּהוֹ יִשְׂאֵעִילָךְ בְּדֶרֶךְ מִצְרַיִם	Μὴ φοβοῦ, ὁ λαός μου οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐν Σιων, ἀπὸ Ἀσσυρίων, ὅτι ἐν ῥάβδῳ πατάξει σε. πληγὴν γὰρ ἐγὼ ἐπάγω ἐπὶ σὲ <u>τοῦ ἰδεῖν ὁδὸν Αἰγύπτου.</u>
-----------	---	---

The insertion of τοῦ ἰδεῖν may be founded upon Deut 28:68, where the Israelite people are threatened with a return to Egypt if they do not obey God’s laws.<sup>212</sup>

Deut 28:68	והשיבך יהוה מצרים באניות בדרך אשר אמרתי לך לֹא־תִסִּיף עוֹד לְרִאֲתָהּ	καὶ ἀποστρέψει σε κύριος εἰς Αἴγυπτον ἐν πλοίοις καὶ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ, ἣν εἶπα Οὐ προσθήσεσθε ἔτι ἰδεῖν αὐτήν.
------------	---	--

Such an interpretation of LXX Isa 10:24 in the light of Deut 28:68 favours Seeligmann’s hypothesis that LXX Isa 10:24 presents an actualising translation, in that the “plague,” which would entail that the people would see “the road of Egypt,” would allude to a Jewish emigration from Palestine to Egypt so as to escape the religious persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes.<sup>213</sup>

Isa 19:6	והאזניחו נהרות דללו וחרבו יארי מצור קנה וסוף קמלו	καὶ ἐκλείψουσιν οἱ ποταμοὶ καὶ αἱ διώρυγες τοῦ ποταμοῦ, καὶ ξηρανθήσεται <u>πᾶσα συναγωγὴ ὕδατος</u> <u>καὶ ἐν παντί</u> ἔλει καλάμου καὶ παπύρου.
----------	---	---

LXX Isa 19:6 diverges from the Hebrew as regards its sentence division and idiom. ξηρανθήσεται (“and they will dry out”) might be a condensed rendering of

<sup>211</sup> Besides in the quoted texts, the exact formulation ἐκκλίνω κρίσιν appears only in Exod 23:2; Lam 3:35; and Mal 3:5. Comparable expressions can be found in 1 Kgdms 8:3; Prov 17:23; and 18:5.

<sup>212</sup> Compare HUB Isa, 42.

<sup>213</sup> Seeligmann, *Septuagint Version*, 85.

יחברו (“they will diminish and dry up”).<sup>214</sup> ἔλει (“marsh”) may echo קמלו (“they will rot away”), which equivalency has a probable precedent in Isa 33:9. What is equally possible is that the translator selected ἔλος on account of καλάμος (“reed”), since in LXX Isa 35:7 these two nouns appear in close context to each other as well (ἔπαυλις καλάμου καὶ ἔλη). The words πᾶσα συναγωγὴ ὕδατος most likely reproduce יארי מצור, just as in Isa 37:25.<sup>215</sup> In both 19:6 and 37:25 the translator has linked מצור to the root אצר—“to collect,” which elucidates the use of συναγωγή.<sup>216</sup> However, in Isa 19:6 יארי מצור seems to have received a second translation, that is, as αἱ διώρυγες τοῦ ποταμοῦ.

The choice of vocabulary in LXX Isa 19:6 has probably been guided by intertextual factors as well: the expressions πᾶσα συναγωγὴ ὕδατος and ἐν παντὶ ἔλει have in all likelihood been used in analogy to Exod 7:19 and 8:1. Those texts accordingly name various kinds of waters which Egypt possesses, and exhibit similar phraseology:<sup>217</sup>

Exod 7:19	קח מטך ונטה-ידך על-ימימי מצרים על-נהרותם על-יאריהם ועל-אגמיהם ועל כל-מקוה מימיהם	Λαβὲ τὴν ῥάβδον σου καὶ ἔκτεινον τὴν χειρὰ σου ἐπὶ τὰ ὕδατα Αἰγύπτου καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς ποταμούς αὐτῶν καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς διώρυγας αὐτῶν καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ ἔλη αὐτῶν καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶν συνεστηκὸς ὕδωρ αὐτῶν
Exod 8:1	נטה את-ידך במטך על-נהרת על-היארים ועל-האגמים	Ἐκτεινον τῇ χειρὶ τὴν ῥάβδον σου ἐπὶ τοὺς ποταμούς καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς διώρυγας καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ ἔλη

The dependence of LXX Isa 19 on Exod 7 is further suggested by the translation in LXX Isa 19:7 of על-פי יאור as τὸ κύκλω τοῦ ποταμοῦ:

Isa 19:7	ערות על-יאור על-פי יאור	καὶ τὸ ἄχι τὸ χλωρὸν πᾶν τὸ κύκλω τοῦ ποταμοῦ
----------	----------------------------	--

This locution has supposedly been derived from Exod 7:24:

Exod 7:24	ויחפרו כל-מצרים סביבת היאר מים לשות	ὥρυξαν δὲ πάντες οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι κύκλω τοῦ ποταμοῦ ὥστε πιεῖν ὕδωρ,
-----------	--	---

<sup>214</sup> Or, καὶ ξηρανθήσεται renders וחברו, while דללו is represented by καὶ ἐκλείψουσιν, and ויהאזיחו (“they will become foul”) is a minus.

<sup>215</sup> Isa 37:25 reads: יארי מצור / ויאחרב בכף-פעמי כל יארי מצור / ויאחרב בכף-פעמי כל יארי מצור / ויאחרב בכף-פעמי כל יארי מצור. Compare *HUB Isa*, 71.

<sup>216</sup> For אצר / συναγωγή, see also Isa 23:18 and 39:6.

<sup>217</sup> See also M. Croughs, “Intertextuality in the Septuagint: The Case of Isaiah 19,” *BIOSCS* 34 (2001): 85–87.

כי לא יכלו לשבת	καὶ οὐκ ἡδύναντο πιεῖν
ממימי היאר	ὕδωρ ἀπὸ τοῦ ποταμοῦ.

Another Pentateuchal text to which the use of συναγωγῇ ὕδατος in LXX Isa 19:6 and 37:25 can be allied, is Lev 11:36. This is the only place in the Greek Bible that provides an exact parallel:<sup>218</sup>

Lev 11:36	אך מעין ובור	πλὴν πηγῶν ὑδάτων καὶ λάκκου
	מקוה־מים יהיה טהור	καὶ συναγωγῆς ὕδατος, ἔσται καθαρόν.

Isa 23:18	כי ישבים לפני יהוה	ἀλλὰ τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν ἔναντι κυρίου
	יהיה סחרה	πᾶσα ἡ ἐμπορία αὐτῆς
	לאכל לשבעה	φαγεῖν καὶ πιεῖν καὶ ἐμπλησθῆναι
	ולמכסה עתיק	εἰς συμβολὴν μνημόσυνον ἔναντι κυρίου.

The final words of Isa 23:18 in the Greek—εἰς συμβολὴν μνημόσυνον ἔναντι κυρίου (“as a covenant, a memorial, in the presence of the Lord”)—are markedly distinct from the Hebrew, which offers ולמכסה עתיק (“for fine clothing”) in this place. This peculiar translation has been analysed by several scholars, such as Scholz, Ziegler, Seeligmann, and van der Kooij. Van der Kooij is of the opinion that ולמכסה (MT: מְכַסֶּה—“covering”) was read by the translator as מְכַסֶּה or מְכַסֶּה, denoting “contributed portion,” “regular contribution,” “tax” (see Num 31:28), which he then translated as συμβολή, bearing the same meaning of “contribution.”<sup>219</sup> The adverb עתיק (“eminent,” “choice”) the translator has, in van der Kooij’s view, connected with the Aramaic adjective עתיק—“old”—and related to “the Ancient of Days” (עתיק יומין) in Dan 7:9, which is used there as a designation for God. The latter association could explain the rendering of עתיק by ἔναντι κυρίου in LXX Isa 23:18.<sup>220</sup>

An alternative explanation comes from Ziegler. Even if Ziegler, in agreement with van der Kooij, believes that the translator read ולמכסה rather than ולמכסה, he still supposes that this noun’s Greek equivalent συμβολή was not used here according to its primary meaning of “Beitrag,” “Beisteuer,” but in line with its secondary meaning, “Mahl” (see Prov 23:20; Sir 18:32). This can be understood in the light of Ziegler’s perception that the translator would recognise in Isa 23:18 the portrayal of a holy banquet. Ziegler considers the words ἔναντι κυρίου to be a plus, reflecting a gloss in the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX stemming from Pentateuchal texts describing banquets and containing

<sup>218</sup> See also Gen 1:9 Συναχθήτω τὸ ὕδωρ τὸ ὑποκάτω τοῦ οὐρανοῦ εἰς συναγωγὴν μίαν.

<sup>219</sup> van der Kooij, *Oracle of Tyre*, 74, 148.

<sup>220</sup> van der Kooij, *Oracle of Tyre*, 148. Van der Kooij bases his opinion on Scholz, *Alexandrinische Uebersetzung*, 13.



similar expressions, such as Exod 18:12; Deut 12:7,18; 15:20; and 27:7.<sup>221</sup> However, in my opinion these texts may also have influenced the translator directly:

Exod 18:12	ויבא אהרן וכל זקני ישראל לאכל-לחם עם-חתן משה לפני האלהים	παρεγένετο δὲ Ἀαρὼν καὶ πάντες οἱ πρεσβύτεροι Ἰσραὴλ συμφαγεῖν ἄρτον μετὰ τοῦ γαμβροῦ Μωυσῆ <b>ἐναντίον τοῦ θεοῦ.</b>
Deut 12:7	ואכלתם-שם לפני יהוה אלהיכם	καὶ φάγεσθε ἐκεῖ <b>ἐναντίον κυρίου</b> τοῦ θεοῦ ὑμῶν
Deut 12:18	כי-אם-לפני יהוה אלהיך תאכלנו במקום אשר יבחר יהוה אלהיך בו	ἀλλ' ἢ <b>ἐναντίον κυρίου</b> τοῦ θεοῦ σου φάγη αὐτὰ ἐν τῷ τόπῳ, ὅ ὃν ἐκλέξεται κύριος ὁ θεός σου αὐτῷ
Deut 15:20	לפני יהוה אלהיך תאכלנו שנה בשנה	<b>ἐναντι κυρίου</b> τοῦ θεοῦ σου φάγη αὐτὸ ἐνιαυτὸν ἐξ ἐνιαυτοῦ
Deut 27:7	ואכלת שם ושמחת לפני יהוה אלהיך	καὶ φάγη καὶ ἐμπλησθήσῃ ἐκεῖ καὶ εὐφρανθήσῃ <b>ἐναντίον κυρίου</b> τοῦ θεοῦ σου.

Besides these passages, Ziegler as well as Seeligmann mentions Num 31:54 as a text that could have been of influence.<sup>222</sup> In conformity with LXX Isa 23:18, this verse, relating how Moses makes plundered gold into a memorial, gives *ἐναντι κυρίου* in combination with *μνημόσυνον*:<sup>223</sup>

Num 31:54	ויקח משה ואלעזר הכהן את-הזהב מאת שרי האלפים והמאות ויבא אתו אל-אהל מועד זכרון לבני-ישראל לפני יהוה	καὶ ἔλαβεν Μωυσῆς καὶ Ελεάζαρ ὁ ἱερεὺς τὸ χρυσίον παρὰ τῶν χιλιάρχων καὶ παρὰ τῶν ἑκατοντάρχων καὶ εἰσήνεγκεν αὐτὰ εἰς τὴν σκηνὴν τοῦ μαρτυρίου <b>μνημόσυνον</b> τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ <b>ἐναντι κυρίου.</b>
-----------	--	---

Finally, the following texts in Exodus in which both *ἐναντι κυρίου/θεοῦ* and *μνημόσυνον* occur, may have played a role in the appearance of these same words in LXX Isa 23:18:

<sup>221</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 116–17.

<sup>222</sup> Seeligmann, *Septuagint Version*, 47.

<sup>223</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 116–17.

Exod 28:12	ונשא אהרן את־שמותם לפני יהוה על־שתי כתפיו ליזכרן	καὶ ἀναλήμψεται Ἀαρὼν τὰ ὀνόματα τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ <b>ἔναντι κυρίου</b> ἐπὶ τῶν δύο ὤμων αὐτοῦ, <b>μνημόσυνον</b> περὶ αὐτῶν.
Exod 28:29(23)	ונשא אהרן את־שמות בני־ישראל בחשן המשפט על־לבו בבאו אל־הקדש ליזכרן לפני־יהוה תמיד	καὶ λήμψεται Ἀαρὼν τὰ ὀνόματα τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ ἐπὶ τοῦ λογίου τῆς κρίσεως ἐπὶ τοῦ στήθους, εἰσιόντι εἰς τὸ ἅγιον <b>μνημόσυνον ἔναντι τοῦ θεοῦ.</b>
Exod 30:16	ולקחת את־כסף הכפרים מאת בני ישראל והיה לבני ישראל ליזכרון לפני יהוה	καὶ λήμψῃ τὸ ἀργύριον τῆς εἰσφορᾶς παρὰ τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ ... καὶ ἔσται τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραὴλ <b>μνημόσυνον ἔναντι κυρίου</b>

Still, the *primary* cause for the presence of ἔναντι κυρίου in LXX Isa 23:18 does not lie in the Pentateuchal texts quoted, but in the attestation of identical words earlier in the same verse: in ἀλλὰ τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν ἔναντι κυρίου (לישבים לפני יהוה). Perhaps this phraseology reminded the translator of the above-mentioned passages from the Torah in which ἔναντι κυρίου likewise occurs. Given that in many of those ἔναντι κυρίου is combined with μνημόσυνον, this could have motivated the translator to apply the same noun in Isa 23:18 as well.

Isa 29:1–2	הוי אריאל אריאל קרית חנה דוד ספו שנה על־שנה חגים ינקפו והציקותי לאריאל	Οὐαὶ πόλις Αριηλ, ἣν Δαυιδ ἐπολέμησε· <b>συναγάγετε γενήματα</b> ἐνιαυτὸν ἐπ' ἐνιαυτόν, φάγεσθε γὰρ σὺν Μωαβ. ἐκθλίψω γὰρ Αριηλ
------------	--	---

The translation by συναγάγετε γενήματα suggests that the translator has read the Hebrew ספו (“add”) as אספו (“gather”), and has complemented the latter verb with an object γενήματα (“crops”). חגים ינקפו (“let the feasts run their round”) has generated a completely different Greek text: φάγεσθε γὰρ σὺν Μωαβ. The use of the name Μωαβ implies that the city of Ariel, which is mentioned twice in Isa 29:1–2, was not regarded by the translator as referring to Jerusalem—such as is the case in the Hebrew—but was perceived as a Moabite city.<sup>224</sup> A similar

<sup>224</sup> Also the translation in verse 1a of הוי אריאל אריאל קרית חנה דוד (“Woe, Ariel, Ariel, the city where David encamped”) as Οὐαὶ πόλις Αριηλ, ἣν Δαυιδ ἐπολέμησε (“Ah, city of Ariel, against which David waged war”) suggests that LXX Isaiah did not interpret Ariel as Jerusalem. This likewise applies to the translation in verse 3 of וחגתי כדור עליך (“And I will encamp against you

connection between *Μωαβ* and *Αριηλ* is made in the Greek version of Isa 15:9 (לפליטת מואב אריה / τὸ σπέρμα Μωαβ καὶ Αριηλ) and of 2 Sam 23:20 (“the two sons of Ariel the Moabite”). Ziegler notes that also the patristic exegesis related Ariel to Moab, identifying the former with Areopolis, the capital city of Moab.<sup>225</sup>

The Greek sentence “Gather crops year by year, for you will eat with Moab” was probably meant as a threat: Israel will reap what they sow, their iniquity will return to them, and the same misfortune as that of Moab will await them. Compare for a related concept LXX Isa 3:10–11: τοῖνυν τὰ γενήματα τῶν ἔργων αὐτῶν φάγονται. οὐαὶ τῷ ἀνόμῳ· πονηρὰ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν αὐτοῦ συμβήσεται αὐτῷ. At the same time, the insertion of exactly the object *γενήματα* may have been elicited by the occurrence of the phrase *συνάγω τὰ γενήματα* in the Pentateuch:<sup>226</sup>

Exod 23:10	ושש שנים תזרע את-ארצך ואספת את-תבואתה	Ἐξ ἔτη σπερεῖς τὴν γῆν σου καὶ <b>συνάξεις τὰ γενήματα</b> αὐτῆς
Lev 25:20	מה-נאכל בשנה השביעת הן לא נזרע ולא נאסף את-תבואתנו	Τί φαγόμεθα ἐν τῷ ἔτει τῷ ἐβδόμῳ τούτῳ, ἐὰν μὴ σπειρώμεν μηδὲ <b>συναγάγωμεν τὰ γενήματα</b> ἡμῶν;

For the combination of *γενήμα* with *ἐνιαυτὸν ἐπ’ ἐνιαυτόν*, see Deut 14:22:

Deut 14:22(21)	עשר תעשר את כל-תבואת זרעך היצא השדה שנה שנה	Δεκάτην ἀποδεκατώσεις παντὸς <b>γενήματος</b> τοῦ σπέρματός σου, τὸ <b>γένημα</b> τοῦ ἀγροῦ σου <b>ἐνιαυτὸν κατ’ ἐνιαυτόν</b>
----------------	--	--

Isa 29:10–11	ועצם את-עיניכם אתה-נביאים ואת-דאשיכם החזים כסה ותהי לכם חזות הכל כדברי הספר החתום	καὶ καμμύσει τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν προφητῶν αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν ἀρχόντων αὐτῶν, οἱ ὁρῶντες <b>τὰ κρυπτά</b> . καὶ ἔσονται ὑμῖν <b>πάντα τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα</b> ὡς οἱ λόγοι τοῦ βιβλίου τοῦ ἐσφραγισμένου τούτου
--------------	---	---

חזות (“vision”) seems to have received a twofold rendering in the LXX: by *ταῦτα* (החזות < חזות הוואת <), as well as by *τὰ ῥήματα*, probably a free translation of חזות. The resulting phrase—*πάντα τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα*—is not uncommon in the

round about”) as *καὶ κυκλώσω ὡς Δαυὶδ ἐπὶ σέ* (“and like David I will surround you”), possibly alluding to 2 Sam 8:2 on David’s beating the Moabites.

<sup>225</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 68.

<sup>226</sup> For *συνάγω τὰ γενήματα*, see, besides the verses quoted, only Jer 8:13.

LXX, but can be found in eight other places.<sup>227</sup> It generally renders the fixed biblical phrase כַּל־הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה, which the MT offers thirty-four times (albeit nowhere in Isaiah). One of the places where πάντα τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα / כַּל־הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה can be encountered, is Deut 30:1. That verse, as well as the preceding ones (Deut 29:28–9) might have exercised influence on the formulation in Isa 29:11,<sup>228</sup> the more so as the two passages are additionally related in that they both speak of “hidden things” (τὰ κρυπτά). Perhaps the Isaiah translator identified the “sealed book” of Isa 29:11 with the Law of Moses that Deut 29:28–29 refers to (compare οἱ λόγοι τοῦ βιβλίου τοῦ ἐσφραγισμένου τούτου in Isa 29:11 with πάντα τὰ ῥήματα τοῦ νόμου τούτου in Deut 29:29):

Deut 29:28(29)–30:1

הנסתרת ליהוה אלהינו	τὰ κρυπτά
והנגלת לנו ולבנינו	κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν,
עד-עולם לעשות את-כל-דברי	τὰ δὲ φανερά ἡμῖν καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις ἡμῶν
התורה הזאת	εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, ποιεῖν πάντα τὰ ῥήματα
והיה כִּי־יבאו עליך	τοῦ νόμου τούτου.
כל-הדברים האלה	Καὶ ἔσται ὡς ἂν ἔλθωσιν ἐπὶ σὲ
הברכה והקללה ...	πάντα τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα,
	ἢ εὐλογία καὶ ἢ κατὰρα ...

For the reference to the Law of Moses by τό βιβλίον, see Deut 28:58 and 31:24:

Deut 28:58	אם-לא תשמר לעשות	ἐὰν μὴ εἰσακούσῃτε ποιεῖν
	את-כל-דברי התורה הזאת	πάντα τὰ ῥήματα τοῦ νόμου τούτου
	הכתובים בספר הזה	τὰ γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τούτῳ
Deut 31:24	ויהי ככלות משה לכתב	Ἦνίκα δὲ συνετέλεσεν Μωυσῆς γράφω
	את-דברי התורה הזאת	πάντας τοὺς λόγους τοῦ νόμου τούτου
	על-ספר עד תמם	εἰς βιβλίον ἕως εἰς τέλος,

Isa 30:22	וטמאתם את-צפוי	καὶ ἐξαρεῖς τὰ εἰδωλα
	פסילי כסף	τὰ περιηργυρωμένα
	ואת-אפדת מסכת זהבך	καὶ τὰ περιεχρυσωμένα,
	תזרם כמו	<u>λεπτά ποιήσεις καὶ</u> λιχμήσεις ὡς ὕδωρ
	דוח צא תאמר לו	ἀποκαθήμενης καὶ ὡς κόπρον ὥσεις αὐτά.

Isa 30:22, which instructs the people to grind and scatter their idols, recalls the story in Exod 32 of Moses destroying the golden calf that Aaron had made as a cult image for the Israelites.<sup>229</sup> Both that text and Isa 30:22 use the verb זרה to

<sup>227</sup> See Gen 20:8; Exod 4:30; Deut 30:1; 1 Kgdms 19:7; 25:9; Job 42:7; Jer 16:10; and Jdt 10:1.

<sup>228</sup> HUB Isa, 115.

<sup>229</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 121; HUB Isa, 125.

depict the scattering of the remnants of the idols. The supposed insertion of *λεπτά ποιήσεις* in the Greek translation of Isa 30:22 has perhaps been inspired by this Deuteronomic text, where a similar performance is executed on the idols: *καὶ κατήλεσεν αὐτὸν λεπτόν*. Also the addition of *ὕδωρ* might be traceable back to Exod 32:20, for that verse too speaks of “water” (albeit in a different setting):

Exod 32:20	וַיִּקַּח אֶת־הַעֲגֹל אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה וַיִּשְׂרֹף בָּאֵשׁ וַיִּטְחֵן עַד אֲשֶׁר־דָּק וַיִּזְרַק עַל־פְּנֵי הַמַּיִם וַיִּשַׁק אֶת־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל	<i>καὶ λαβὼν τὸν μόσχον, ὃν ἐποίησαν, κατέκαυσεν αὐτὸν ἐν πυρὶ, καὶ κατήλεσεν αὐτὸν λεπτόν, καὶ ἔσπειρεν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸ ὕδωρ, καὶ ἐπότισεν αὐτὸ τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραὴλ</i>
------------	---	---

Isa 33:11	תִּהְיוּ חֲשֵׁשׁ תִּלְדוּ קֶשֶׁת רוּחַכֶּם אֶשׁ תֹּאכֲלֶנָּה	<i>νῦν ὄψεσθε, νῦν αἰσθηθήσεσθε· ματαία ἔσται ἡ ἰσχὺς τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν, πῦρ ὑμᾶς κατέδεται.</i>
-----------	---	---

Once again a verse whose content and formulation in the Greek are largely divergent from the Hebrew. The LXX seems to give an explanation of the metaphor that the Hebrew presents, interpreting the burning up of straw as the annihilation of power. For this purpose the translator has glossed the noun קֶשֶׁת (“stubble of straw”) as *ματαία*—“idleness,” “worthlessness.” He probably based his understanding of Isa 33:11 on LXX Isa 1:31. There the weakening of power is symbolised as flax on fire:

Isa 1:31	וְהָיָה הַחֹסֶן לְנִעֲרָה וּפְעֵלוֹ לְנִיצוֹץ וּבִעֲרוּ שְׂנֵיהֶם יַחַד	<i>καὶ ἔσται ἡ ἰσχὺς αὐτῶν ὡς καλάμη στιλπνίου καὶ αἱ ἐργασίαι αὐτῶν ὡς σπινθήρες πυρός, καὶ κατακαυθήσονται οἱ ἄνομοι καὶ οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἅμα</i>
----------	---	---

A second verse he may have relied on is Isa 30:15:<sup>230</sup>

Isa 30:15	בַּהֲשֵׁקֶט וּבְבִטְחָה תִּהְיֶה גְבוּרַתְכֶם	<i>ὅτε ἐπεποίθεις ἐπὶ τοῖς ματαίοις, ματαία ἡ ἰσχὺς ὑμῶν ἐγενήθη.</i>
-----------	--	---

So, all three LXX Isa 1:31; 30:15; and 33:11 convey the idea of the degeneration of power into idleness. This idea may have its roots in Lev 26:20:<sup>231</sup>

Lev 26:20	וְתָם לְרִיק כֹּחֶם וְלֹא־תֵתֵן אֶרְצְכֶם אֶת־יְבוּלָהּ	<i>καὶ ἔσται εἰς κενὸν ἡ ἰσχὺς ὑμῶν, καὶ οὐ δώσει ἡ γῆ ὑμῶν τὸν σπόρον αὐτῆς</i>
-----------	--	--

<sup>230</sup> For a more detailed analysis of this verse, see section 6.5b.

<sup>231</sup> Compare Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 147 (who assumes that the text from Lev 26:20 was added as a gloss to the *Vorlage* of LXX Isaiah); Seeligmann, *Septuagint Version*, 46.

Isa 36:9	ואיך תשיב את פני פחת אחד עבדי <u>אדני הקטנים</u> ותבטח לך על-מצרים לרכב ולפרשים	καὶ πῶς δύνασθε ἀποστρέψαι εἰς πρόσωπον τοπάρχου ἑνός; <i>οἰκέται εἰσὶν</i> <i>οἱ πεποιθότες ἐπ' Αἰγυπτίους</i> εἰς ἵππον καὶ ἀναβάτην.
----------	---	---

The appearance in LXX Isa 36:9 of *οἰκέται* is striking: the term *οἰκέτης* (“house slave”) figures nowhere else in the Greek Isaiah; its Hebrew source עבד is in LXX Isaiah usually represented by παῖς (19x) or δοῦλος (9x). Also the entire sentence in which *οἰκέται* occurs—*οἰκέται εἰσὶν οἱ πεποιθότες ἐπ' Αἰγυπτίους*—is remarkable, being rather distinct from the Hebrew.<sup>232</sup> Its subject, *οἱ πεποιθότες ἐπ' Αἰγυπτίους*, is a free rendering of תבטח לך על-מצרים. The Hebrew phrase אדני הקטנים is not represented in the Greek. The LXX sentence might have bearing on texts in the Pentateuch on the slavery of the Israelites under Egypt. In those texts *οἰκέτης* is found quite frequently.<sup>233</sup> See for instance:

Deut 6:21	עבדים היינו לפרעה במצרים	<i>Οἰκέται ἤμεν τῷ Φαραῶ ἐν γῇ Αἰγύπτῳ,</i>
Deut 5:15; 15:15; 16:12; 24:18,22	וזכרת כי עבד היית בארץ מצרים / במצרים	καὶ μνησθήσῃ ὅτι <i>οἰκέτης ἦσθα</i> ἐν γῇ <i>Αἰγύπτου</i>

By means of this allusion the translator perhaps wanted to insinuate that if Israel were to trust Egypt, they would become Egyptian slaves again, just as in the past.

Isa 42:13	יהוה כגבור יצא <u>כאיש</u> מלחמות יעיר קנאה יריע אף-יצריח על-איביו יתגבר	κύριος ὁ θεὸς τῶν δυνάμεων ἐξελεύσεται <i>καὶ συντρίψει πόλεμον</i> , ἐπεγερεῖ ζῆλον καὶ βοήσεται ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐχθροὺς αὐτοῦ μετὰ ἰσχύος.
-----------	---	--

<sup>232</sup> The Hebrew of 36:9 reads in translation: “How then can you repulse a single captain among the least of my master’s servants, when you rely on Egypt for chariots and for horsemen?”; the Greek has: “How then are you able to turn back to the face of one governor? Those who trust in Egypt for horse and rider are house servants.”

<sup>233</sup> For a discussion of *οἰκέτης* and other words for “slave” in the Greek Pentateuch, see Arie van der Kooij, “Servant or Slave? The Various Equivalents of Hebrew ‘Ebed in the Septuagint of the Pentateuch,” in *XIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies. Ljubljana 2007* (ed. Melvin K. H. Peters; SCS 55; Atlanta: SBL, 2008). Van der Kooij states—on the grounds of *int.al.* a text of Philo—that *οἰκέτης* designates “a slave belonging to a particular household permanently, a setting implying loyalty and strict obedience to the master” (*op.cit.* p.231). This permanent status of the *οἰκέτης* may put extra weight on the use of the term in LXX Isa 36:9.

In contrast to the MT of Isa 42:13, where God is portrayed as a warrior, in the LXX God *makes an end* to the war. This pacification has probably been copied from a parallel text in LXX Exod 15:3:<sup>234</sup>

Exod 15:3	יהוה איש מלחמה יהוה שמו	κύριος <u>συντρίβων</u> πολέμους, κύριος ὄνομα αὐτῷ.
-----------	----------------------------	---

LXX Exod 15:3 in its turn may have adopted the concept of God as the one who “breaks war” from Hos 2:20:<sup>235</sup>

Hos 2:20(18)	וקשת וחרב ומלחמה אשבור מן-הארץ	καὶ τόξον καὶ ῥομφαία καὶ πόλεμον συντρίψω ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς
--------------	-----------------------------------	---

Isa 48:21	ולא צמאו בחרבות הוליים מים מצור הזיל למו ויבקע צור ויזבו מים	καὶ ἐὰν διψήσωσι, δι' ἐρήμου ἄξει αὐτούς, ὕδωρ ἐκ πέτρας ἐξάξει αὐτοῖς· σχισθήσεται πέτρα, καὶ ῥυήσεται ὕδωρ, <u>καὶ πίεται ὁ λαός μου.</u>
-----------	---	--

Isa 48:21 touches on the account in Exod 17:1–7 of Moses beating on the rock in Massah and Meribah, so that water flowed out of it. The plus καὶ πίεται ὁ λαός μου in the LXX of Isa 48:21<sup>236</sup> has undoubtedly been extrapolated from this Pentateuchal text:

Exod 17:6	הגני עמד לפניך שם על-הצור בחרב והכית בצור ויצאו ממנו מים ושתה העם ויעש כן משה לעיני זקני ישראל	ὁδὲ ἐγὼ ἔστηκα πρὸ τοῦ σὲ ἐλθεῖν ἐπὶ τῆς πέτρας ἐν Χωρήβ καὶ πατάξεις τὴν πέτραν, καὶ ἐξελεύσεται ἐξ αὐτῆς ὕδωρ, <u>καὶ πίεται ὁ λαός μου.</u> ἐποίησεν δὲ Μωυσῆς οὕτως ἐναντίον τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ.
-----------	--	---

<sup>234</sup> Compare Johann F. Schleusner, *Novus thesaurus philologico-criticus sive lexicon in LXX et reliquos interpretes graecos ac scriptores apocryphos Veteris Testamenti* (5 vols.; Leipzig: Weidmann, 1820–21), 3:202; Thackeray, “Greek translators of the Prophetic Books,” 583; Ottley, *Book of Isaiah*, 2:308; Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 125; Seeligmann, *Septuagint Version*, 118; Koenig, *L’herméneutique analogique*, 59–60; HUB Isa, 189; Baer, *When We All Go Home*, 87–98. For further influence of LXX Exod 15 on LXX Isaiah, see Brockington, “Septuagint and Targum,” 84; Baer, *When We All Go Home*, 90–91.

<sup>235</sup> Baer thinks that the Isaiah translator may well have been influenced by LXX Hos 2:20 *directly*, and not only indirectly via Exod 15:3 (Baer, *When We All Go Home*, 87–98); see section 9.4.5.1 below. See also Ps 76(75):4.

<sup>236</sup> This plus has been indicated by Ziegler as a secondary reading, as he assumes that the clause has been taken from Exod 17:6. It is, however, witnessed by all Greek manuscripts except for V. Probably it belongs to the original LXX text.

Isa 54:15 **הן גור יגור אפס מאותי** **ἰδοὺ προσήλυτοι προσελεύσονται σοι δι' ἑμοῦ**

The verb **יגור**, stemming from **גור II**—"to attack," has been conceived of by the Isaiah translator as a derivation of **גור I**—"to sojourn." In a like manner he has read **גור** (infinitive absolute of **גור II**) as **גַּר**—"stranger." Interpreting the text in such a way, he may have thought of passages in the Pentateuch offering rules that concern strangers living in Israel. Also the object **סוי** he may have added in analogy to those verses, since they speak about strangers who will come "to you" (even though this is the second person *plural* rather than singular); see especially the similar dative form in Lev 19:33:

Exod 12:48–49	וכי־יגור אתך גר ועשה פסח ליהוה המול לו כל־זכר ... תורה אחת יהיה לאזרח ולגר הגר בתוכם	ἐὰν δέ τις προσέλθῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς προσήλυτος ποιῆσαι τὸ πασχα κυρίῳ, περιτεμεῖς αὐτοῦ πᾶν ἀρσενικόν ... νόμος εἷς ἔσται τῷ ἐγχωρίῳ καὶ τῷ προσελθόντι προσηλύτῳ ἐν ὑμῖν.
Lev 19:33	וכי־יגור אתך גר בארצכם לא תונו אותו	Ἐὰν δέ τις προσέλθῃ προσήλυτος ὑμῖν ἐν τῇ γῇ ὑμῶν, οὐ θλίψετε αὐτόν. <sup>237</sup>
Num 9:14	וכי־יגור אתכם גר ועשה פסח ליהוה כחקת הפסח וכמשפטו כן יעשה	ἐὰν δὲ προσέλθῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς προσήλυτος ἐν τῇ γῇ ὑμῶν καὶ ποιήσῃ τὸ πασχα κυρίῳ, κατὰ τὸν νόμον τοῦ πασχα καὶ κατὰ τὴν σύνταξιν αὐτοῦ, οὕτως ποιήσῃ αὐτό.

From the fact that LXX Isa 54:15 renders **יגור** by a form of *προσέρχομαι* ("they will go") rather than by a verb that means "to live" in accordance with the literal meaning of **גור I**, one can conclude that the words under consideration in LXX Isa 54:15 depend on the *Greek* translation of the Pentateuch, since there one comes across exactly the same unexpected translation of **יגור**.

Isa 65:2 **פרשתי ידי כל־היום** **ἐξεπέτασα τὰς χεῖράς μου ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν**  
**אל־עם סורר** **πρὸς λαὸν ἀπειθοῦντα καὶ ἀντιλέγοντα,**  
**ההלכים הדרך לא־טוב** **οἱ οὐκ ἐπορεύθησαν ὁδὸν ἀληθινῇ,**  
**אחר מחשבתיהם** **ἀλλ' ὀπίσω τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν.**

**סורר** in LXX Isa 65:2 matches the doublet *ἀπειθοῦντα καὶ ἀντιλέγοντα*.<sup>238</sup> This rendition may have been affected by LXX Isa 50:5, where the verbs *ἀπειθέω* and *ἀντιλέγω* are likewise coordinated: *ἐγὼ δὲ οὐκ ἀπειθῶ οὐδὲ ἀντιλέγω* (MT: **אֲנִי**

<sup>237</sup> For possible influence of Lev 19, see also Isa 41:5–6 and 48:11.

<sup>238</sup> See section 6.3a.



(לא מריתי אחר לא נסוגתי). Besides, also Deut 21:18 and 20 may have been of an influence: here the Hebrew gives the word pair סורר ומורה:<sup>239</sup>

Deut 21:18	כִּי־יְהִי לְאִישׁ בֶּן סורר ומורה איננו שמע בקול אביו ובקול אמו	Ἐὰν δέ τινι ᾗ υἱὸς ἀπειθῆς καὶ ἐρεθιστής οὐχ ὑπακούων φωνῇ πατρὸς καὶ φωνῇ μητρὸς
Deut 21:20	בִּנְנוּ זֶה סורר ומורה איננו שמע בקלנו זולל וסבא	Ὁ υἱὸς ἡμῶν οὗτος ἀπειθεῖ καὶ ἐρεθίζει, οὐχ ὑπακούει τῆς φωνῆς ἡμῶν, συμβολοκοπῶν οἶνοφλυγεῖ.

Given that the word pair in LXX Isa 65:2 differs from the ones in the Greek text of the Deuteronomic verses cited, it is more reasonable to assume that the translator borrowed the words from the *Hebrew* version of Deuteronomy and translated them into Greek himself.

Isa 66:20–21	כַּאֲשֶׁר יָבִיאוּ בְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶת־הַמִּנְחָה בְּכָל־יְהוָה בֵּית יְהוָה וְגַם־מֵהֶם אֶקַּח לְכַהֲנִים לְלוֹיִם אֲמַר יְהוָה	ὥς ἂν ἐνέγκαισαν οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ ἐμοὶ τὰς θυσίας αὐτῶν μετὰ ψαλμῶν εἰς τὸν οἶκον κυρίου. καὶ ἀπ' αὐτῶν λήμψομαι ἐμοὶ ἱερεῖς καὶ Λευίτας, εἶπεν κύριος.
--------------	---	---

The insertion of ἐμοὶ in LXX Isa 66:21 may rest upon Num 8:14–16, a passage that is concerned with the appointment of the Levites. In those verses too, God announces that he will take *for himself* Levites from among the sons of Israel:<sup>240</sup>

Num 8:14–16	וְהַבְדַּלְתָּ אֶת־הַלְוִיִּם מִתּוֹךְ בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְהָיוּ לִי הַלְוִיִּם ... כִּי נִתְּנִים נִתְּנִים הֵמָּה לִי מִתּוֹךְ בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל תַּחַת פִּטְרָת כָּל־רֶחֶם בְּכוֹר כָּל מִבְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לִקְחָתִי אֹתָם לִי	καὶ διαστελεῖς τοὺς Λευίτας ἐκ μέσου τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ, καὶ ἔσονται ἐμοὶ ... ὅτι ἀπόδομα ἀποδοσμένοι οὗτοί μοι εἰσιν ἐκ μέσου υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ. ἀντὶ τῶν διανοιγόντων πᾶσαν μήτρην πρωτοτόκων πάντων ἐκ τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ εἰληφα αὐτούς ἐμοί.
-------------	--	--

Compare also Num 3:41:

<sup>239</sup> For סורר ומורה, see also Ps 78:8 and Jer 5:23 (Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 78–79; *HUB Isa*, 285). For ἀντιλέγω, see LXX Isa 22:22 καὶ οὐκ ἔσται ὁ ἀντιλέγων (MT: וְאִין סַנְר).

<sup>240</sup> However, it is also conceivable that the translator has read לִי in his *Vorlage*: See 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>: וְנִי לְכֹהֲנִים לְלוֹיִם (Pesh. and Targ. = MT).

Num 3:41	ולקחת את־הלויים לי אני יהוה תחת כל־בכר בבני ישראל	καὶ λήμψῃ τοὺς Λευίτας ἐμοί, ἐγὼ κύριος, ἀντὶ πάντων τῶν πρωτοτόκων τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ
----------	---	---

#### 9.4.1.3 Conclusion to 9.4.1

The translator of Isaiah has made extensive use of the Pentateuch as a source. Certain Pentateuchal sections in particular have attracted his attention, such as the Genesis narratives on the creation (Gen 1–3) and the building of a tower (Gen 11), as well as the Song of Moses in Deut 32. He has mostly consulted Pentateuchal passages that display a *thematic* (and often also lexical) correspondence to the Isaianic passage he was dealing with. The elements that seem to have been adopted generally involve expressions which are (nearly) identical to the ones in the *Greek* version of the Torah, for which reason they can be assumed to rely on the Greek rather than on the Hebrew text of the Pentateuch (see Isa 1:9, 11; 3:8; 4:5; 7:16[/Deut 1:39]; 9:9[10]; 10:9; 19:6; 29:11; 34:6; 36:9; 42:13; 44:2; 48:19, 21; 54:15; 65:3, 22; and 66:19, 21 above). Nevertheless, LXX Isaiah also includes extra elements that merely reflect the same *idea* as can be encountered in the Pentateuch, without displaying identical words. In such cases the translator may have borrowed formulations from the *Hebrew* version of the Torah and rendered those into Greek himself, or he may just have been reminded of a certain Pentateuchal theme, which he formulated in his own words and then implemented in his translation (see Isa 7:16[/Gen 3:5]; 30:22; 33:11; and 65:2 above). Finally, the Greek Isaiah contains some references to the Pentateuch that are purely *lexical*, the words quoted being embedded in an entirely different context. These cases may affirm the hypothesis that the translator used the Greek Pentateuch as a kind of lexicon (see Isa 2:21; 5:28; 10:2; 13:10; 29:1; 39:2; 50:7; and 51:1 above).

#### 9.4.2 LXX Isaiah and the Psalms

In addition to the Pentateuch, the book of Psalms also has probably played an important role in the religious life of the Jewish community. One of the indications that leads to this thought is the fact that in Qumran many copies have been found of fragments of the Psalms. It would not be surprising, from this perspective, if the translator of LXX Isaiah in producing his translation had been influenced by the Psalms now and then. But whether he was already familiar with the book of Psalms in its *Greek* version is uncertain. The feasibility of this depends on the date of origin of LXX Psalms.

Discussion on the genesis of the Greek Psalms is still in progress. One century ago, Swete placed its origin in the second half of the second century

B.C.E.<sup>241</sup> But after him many other dates were proposed. Van der Kooij, for instance, maintained that the book of Psalms was not translated into Greek until the first century B.C.E. This he based on the close relationship he discerned between the Greek translation and the *καργέ* recension of the Psalms, which, in his eyes, indicated “a congenial, Pharisaic milieu common to both.”<sup>242</sup> Also Olivier Munnich saw a relation between the LXX of the Psalms and the *καργέ* group. He believed the LXX translators of the Psalms to be the predecessors of the *καργέ* recension; the latter would have been influenced by the LXX translators in their translation procedures and in specific renderings, such as the translation of יהוה צבאות as κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων. On basis of such lexicographical observations, Munnich thought the date of the Greek Psalms to be as early as the beginning of the second century B.C.E.<sup>243</sup> The connection between the Greek Psalms and the *καργέ* recension which van der Kooij and Munnich supposed to exist, was called into question, though, by Joachim Schaper. According to this scholar, LXX Psalms contains allusions to historical events that took place at the time of the evolving Hasmonaean dynasty. This would point to the second half of the second century B.C.E. as the most likely time of origin of the Greek Psalms.<sup>244</sup>

Returning to the earlier question: could the translator of Isaiah have been familiar with the Psalms in their Old Greek version? As the LXX of Isaiah itself is generally dated around the middle of the second century B.C.E.,<sup>245</sup> such a

<sup>241</sup> Henry B. Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (rev. by Richard R. Ottley; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1914), 25.

<sup>242</sup> Arie van der Kooij, “On the Place of Origin of the Old Greek of Psalms,” *VT* 33 (1983): 73. In a later publication, van der Kooij proposes an earlier date, namely the second half of the second century B.C.E., in accordance with Schaper’s view. This he bases on a quotation of LXX Ps 78:2–3 in 1 Macc 7:17 which gives rise to the assumption that the LXX of the Psalms was produced in pro-Maccabaeen circles, or was at least available in their time; see Arie van der Kooij, “The Septuagint of Psalms and the First Book of Maccabees,” in *The Old Greek Psalter. Studies in Honour of Albert Pietersma* (ed. Robert J. V. Hiebert, Claude E. Cox, and Peter J. Gentry; JSOTSup 332; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 229–47.

<sup>243</sup> Gilles Dorival, Marguerite Harl, and Olivier Munnich, *La Bible grecque des Septante. Du judaïsme hellénistique au christianisme ancien* (ICA; Paris: Éditions du CERF / Éditions du C.N.R.S., 1994), 96–97.

<sup>244</sup> Joachim Schaper, “Der Septuaginta-Psalter als Dokument jüdischer Eschatologie,” in *Die Septuaginta zwischen Judentum und Christentum* (ed. Martin Hengel and Anna Maria Schwemer; WUNT 72; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994), 59–61; idem, *Eschatology in the Greek Psalter* (WUNT 76; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995), 34–45.

<sup>245</sup> Thackeray: Early in the second century B.C.E. (Henry St J. Thackeray, review of R. R. Ottley, *The Book of Isaiah according to the Septuagint*, *JTS* 10 [1909]: 303); Seeligmann: Middle of the second century B.C.E. (Seeligmann, *Septuagint Version*, 91); van der Kooij: 140 B.C.E. (van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 73); Bickerman: 170–150 B.C.E. (Elias Bickerman, “Some Notes on the Transmission of the Septuagint,” in *Studies in Jewish and Christian History* [3 vols.; AGJU 9; Leiden: Brill, 1976], 1:147; repr. from *Alexander Marx. Jubilee Volume on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday* [ed.

familiarity would be impossible if one accepts for the LXX of the Psalms an origin later than that. In such a case even the reverse hypothesis could be posited, namely that it was the translator of the Psalms who relied on the Greek Isaiah. This is exactly what Mozley and Flashar advocated at the beginning of the previous century.<sup>246</sup>

Nevertheless, a number of other scholars do think that the Isaiah translator was acquainted with (part of) the Greek translation of the Psalms. They base this idea on their conviction that LXX Isaiah reveals elements that can be traced back to the Greek Psalter. One of the first to defend this view, was Seeligmann:

our translator depended, in the case of certain passages, upon translations that have been handed down to us in the Septuagint of the Psalms, which does not necessarily imply that the whole of the Septuagint of the Psalms had already been completed, and was in circulation, during the translator's own period.<sup>247</sup>

Albeit even more cautious in his formulation, Ziegler also believes in the possibility that the Isaiah translator relied on the Greek version of the Psalms:

Es ist ... sehr leicht möglich, daß Teile des Psalters, die als Gesänge für den Gottesdienst in Frage kamen, schon vor der Js-LXX ins Griech. übersetzt waren<sup>248</sup>

Recently, this theory received support in an article by Tyler Williams. In Williams's view, the Greek Psalms form a homogenous unity, originating in the second century B.C.E. One important reason for coming to this conclusion he finds in external citations of and allusions to the Greek Psalms in other ancient writings, such as the LXX of Isaiah. In support of his opinion, Williams offers a number of examples to demonstrate the dependence of LXX Isaiah on the Greek Psalter.<sup>249</sup> Besides Williams, the Finnish scholar Staffan Olofsson also concurs with the idea that the Greek Isaiah postdates the Septuagint of the Psalms.<sup>250</sup>

Saul Lieberman; New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1950)]; Fischer: 250–201 B.C.E. (Fischer, *In welcher Schrift*, 6); Harl: Somewhere between 170 and 132 B.C.E. (Dorival, Harl and Munnich, *La Bible grecque*, 97).

<sup>246</sup> Mozley, *Psalter*, 182 n.1; Flashar, "Exegetische Studien," 181–82. According to Flashar the uncommon translation of עִים ("heap of stones") as ὀπωροφυλάκιον ("watcher's hut") in LXX Ps 78:1 may rely on the occurrence of the same Greek noun in LXX Isa 1:8, where ὀπωροφυλάκιον forms a semantically apt equivalent of מְלוּנָה.

<sup>247</sup> Seeligmann, *Septuagint Version*, 72–73.

<sup>248</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 105.

<sup>249</sup> Tyler F. Williams, "Towards a Date for the Old Greek Psalter," in *The Old Greek Psalter. Studies in Honour of Albert Pietersma* (ed. Robert J. V. Hiebert, Claude E. Cox, and Peter J. Gentry; JSOTSup 332; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 248–68. Williams presents the following examples: the rendering in Isa 32:4 of לְדָבָר צְהוּתָה by λαλεῖν εἰρήνην may be based on LXX Ps 27:3 and 84:9; the usage in Isa 29:1 of ποτίζω for נָסַךְ, as well as the use of the rare word κατάνυξις suggest a

In summary, there is no scholarly consensus over the date of the Greek Psalms and their relation to the LXX of Isaiah. Nevertheless, the current trend favours a dating of this translation anterior to the Greek Isaiah.

In the survey that will follow below, a number of cases will be treated in which the Isaiah translator has possibly adopted elements from the Psalms into his text—either from its Hebrew or from its Greek version—which has given rise to a plus or a minus. In each case I will try to find out from which of those two versions the influence may derive. This I will consider merely on the basis of internal factors, omitting the question of dating. In this way, perhaps a slight contribution can be made to the complicated discussion of the relationship between LXX Isaiah and LXX Psalms.

#### 9.4.2.1 An outline of pluses and minuses resulting from possible influence of the Psalms

**Isa 9:1(2)**      **ישבי בארץ צלמות**      **οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐν χώρᾳ καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου**

The expression ἐν χώρᾳ καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου, arrived at through the addition of καὶ (and through the interpretation of צלמות—“deep shadow”—as צל מות—“shadow of death”) echoes formulations such as חשך וצלמות / ἐν σκότει καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου, which can repeatedly be observed in the Psalms. See for instance:<sup>251</sup>

Ps 107(6):10<sup>252</sup>      **ישבי חשך וצלמות**      **καθημένους ἐν σκότει καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου**

Ps 107(6):14      **יציאם מחשך**      **καὶ ἐξήγαγεν αὐτοὺς ἐκ σκότους**

Ps 88(87):7      **וצלמות**      **καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου**  
**במחשכים במצלות**      **ἐν σκοτεινοῖς καὶ ἐν σκιᾷ θανάτου.**

Similar phraseology features twice in the book of Job:

Job 3:5      **יגאלהו חשך וצלמות**      **ἐκλάβοι δὲ αὐτὴν σκότος καὶ σκιά θανάτου**

Job 28:3      **אבן אפל וצלמות**      **λίθος σκοτία καὶ σκιά θανάτου**

Ps 107(6):10 in particular may have served as a model for the rendering in LXX Isa 9:2, since, in conformity to the Isaiah verse, the Hebrew version of the

---

connection with LXX Ps 59:5; the employment in Isa 6:4 of ἐπαίρω to render נוּע may be inspired by LXX Ps 23:7, and the rendering in Isa 26:14 of רפאים as ἰατροί by LXX Ps 87:11. The translation in Isa 1:8 of מלוּנָה as ὁπωροφυλάκιον might draw upon LXX Ps 78:1 (although, in theory, the direction of the dependence could also be the reverse, as Mozley suggests).

<sup>250</sup> Staffan Olofsson, *God is my Rock. A Study of Translation Technique and Theological Exegesis in the Septuagint* (ConBOT 31; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1990), 23.

<sup>251</sup> Even if LXX Isaiah in this very clause gives the words ἐν χώρᾳ rather than ἐν σκότει, the latter phrase does appear in the beginning of the verse, namely in ὁ λαὸς ὁ πορευόμενος ἐν σκότει.

<sup>252</sup> The numbering of the LXX is mentioned between brackets.



Isa 13:2      **וַיִּבְאוּ פֶתַח נְדִיבִים**      Ἀνοίξατε, οἱ ἄρχοντες.

The occurrence in the Greek of Ἀνοίξατε suggests that the translator has read פתח as though it were פתחו—a plural imperative of פתח, in the sense of “open!” (with as its implied object probably “the gates”). וַיִּבְאוּ does not have a Greek counterpart. Goshen-Gottstein connects this translation with the following verses in Psalms:<sup>256</sup>

Ps 24(23):7	שאו שערים ראשיכם והנשאו פתחי עולם ויבוא מלך הכבוד	ἄρατε πύλας, οἱ ἄρχοντες ὑμῶν, καὶ ἐπάρθητε, πύλαι αἰώνιοι, καὶ εἰσελεύσεται ὁ βασιλεὺς τῆς δόξης.
Ps 24(23):9	שאו שערים ראשיכם ושאו פתחי עולם ויבא מלך הכבוד	ἄρατε πύλας, οἱ ἄρχοντες ὑμῶν, καὶ ἐπάρθητε, πύλαι αἰώνιοι, καὶ εἰσελεύσεται ὁ βασιλεὺς τῆς δόξης.
Ps 118(7):19	פתחו־לי שערי־צדק אבא־בם אודה יה	ἀνοίξατέ μοι πύλας δικαιοσύνης· εἰσελθὼν ἐν αὐταῖς ἐξομολογήσομαι τῷ κυρίῳ.

In line with LXX Isa 13:2, the LXX of these verses gives a command—in LXX Ps 23:7, 9 directed to “the leaders”—to “open” or “raise” the gates. This is different in the Hebrew version of Ps 24(23):7 and 9, where only the gates themselves are addressed:

MT Ps 24:7, 9      Lift up your heads, O gates! and be lifted up, O ancient doors! that the King of glory may come in.

LXX Ps 23:7, 9      Raise the gates, O rulers of yours! And be raised up, O perpetual gates!

Hence, if these verses did indeed influence LXX Isa 13:2, it was in their Greek version rather than in the Hebrew, at least as regards Ps 23(24):7 and 9. Nevertheless, one might argue against such a dependence that none of the verses from the Psalms mentioned contains a clause that exactly corresponds to the one in LXX Isa 13:2. Notwithstanding the fact that LXX Ps 117:19, just as does LXX Isa 13:2, opens with the imperative ἀνοίξατέ, and LXX Ps 23:7 and 9 present the vocative οἱ ἄρχοντες, in none of these Greek Psalms does one meet the exact words Ἀνοίξατε, οἱ ἄρχοντες.

Isa 13:14      **וְהָיָה כְּצִבִּי מִדָּבָר      καὶ ἔσονται οἱ καταλελειμμένοι ὡς δορκάδιον φεῦγον  
וּכְצִבִּי      καὶ ὡς πρόβατον πλανώμενον**

The same picture of “wandering sheep” features in Ps 119(118):176:

<sup>256</sup> HUB Isa, 49.

Ps 119(118):176 תעיתי כשה אבד ἐπλανήθην ὡς πρόβατον ἀπολωλός·

Since the expressions concerned in the LXX of Psalms and Isaiah do not correspond to each other literally, it is improbable that LXX Isa 13:14 draws upon the *Greek* version of Ps 119.

A text that can be more easily thought to have played a role is LXX Jer 27:17:

Jer 50(27):17 שה פזורה ישראל Πρόβατον πλανώμενον Ισραηλ

But the plainest option is that the Isaiah translator copied the imagery of wandering sheep from a passage in the book of Isaiah itself: in Isa 53:6 it can be found in the clause πάντες ὡς πρόβατα ἐπλανήθημεν (MT: כלנו כצאן תעינו).

Isa 18:6 וקץ עליו וקץ העט  
וכל־בהמת הארץ עליו תחרף  
καὶ συναχθήσεται ἐπ' αὐτούς  
τὰ πετεινά τοῦ οὐρανοῦ,  
καὶ πάντα τὰ θηρία τῆς γῆς ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἔξει.

The phrase τὰ πετεινά τοῦ οὐρανοῦ has parallels in the following Psalms:<sup>257</sup>

Ps 8:9	צפור שמים ודגי הים	τὰ πετεινά τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τοὺς ἰχθύας τῆς θαλάσσης
Ps 50(49):11	ידעתי כ־עוף הרים וזיו שדי עמדי	ἔγνωκα πάντα τὰ πετεινά τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ ὡραιότης ἀγροῦ μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐστίν.
Ps 79(78):2	מאכל לעוף השמים בשר חסידים לחית־ארץ	βρώματα τοῖς πετεινοῖς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, τὰς σάρκας τῶν ὁσίων σου τοῖς θηρίοις τῆς γῆς·
Ps 104(3):11–12	ישקו כ־חיתו שדי עליהם ... עוף־השמים ישכון	ποτιοῦσιν πάντα τὰ θηρία τοῦ ἀγρου ... ἐπ' αὐτὰ τὰ πετεινά τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατασκηνώσει

However, as mentioned earlier, the same words likewise appear in Genesis—that is in Gen 1:28,30 and 9:2,<sup>258</sup> so they may have been extrapolated from those famous verses as well. Alternatively, the Isaiah translator was just using common biblical vocabulary, without alluding to any specific text.

Isa 23:15 והיה ביום ההוא  
ונשכחת צר שבעים שנה  
כימי מלך אחד  
καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ  
καταλειφθήσεται Τύρος ἔτη ἑβδομήκοντα  
ὡς χρόνος βασιλέως, ὡς χρόνος ἀνθρώπου·

In his monograph *The Oracle of Tyre* van der Kooij defines the plus ὡς χρόνος

<sup>257</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 114.

<sup>258</sup> See section 9.4.1.1a.



ἀνθρώπου in LXX Isa 23:15 as “an exegetical addition in order to make clear that the expression, ‘like the lifetime of a king’, is to be taken as the lifespan of a man, and not as the reign of a king.”<sup>259</sup> For the notion of a human lifespan of seventy years he refers to Ps 90(89):10:

Ps 90(89):10	ימֵי־שְׁנוֹתֵינוּ בְּהֵם שְׁבַעִים שָׁנָה	αἱ ἡμέραι τῶν ἐτῶν ἡμῶν, ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐβδομήκοντα ἔτη
--------------	--	---

Possibly the Isaiah translator has integrated this idea into his translation of Isa 23:15, though without using the diction of the Psalm.

Isa 25:4–5	כֹּזֶם קִיר כְּחָרֵב בְּצִיּוֹן שֶׁאֵין זֵרִים תְּכַנִּיעַ	ὡς ἄνθρωποι ὀλιγόψυχοι διψῶντες ἐν Σιών ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπων ἀσεβῶν, οἷς ἡμᾶς παρέδωκας.
------------	---	--

Here we have another example of a text in LXX Isaiah where the Greek, even though it has represented most of the separate words of the Hebrew text, diverges substantially from the Hebrew as regards its content. This concerns, among other things, the unexpected rendering of תְּכַנִּיעַ (“you subdued”) as οἷς ἡμᾶς παρέδωκας. Ziegler supposes that in choosing these words the translator had a number of Psalm texts in his mind on the righteous one asking God not to deliver him into the hands of his enemies:<sup>260</sup>

Ps 27(26):12	אֶל־תַּתְּנֵנִי בִנְפֹשׁ צָרִי	μὴ παραδῶς με εἰς ψυχὰς θλιβόντων με
Ps 41(40):3	וְאֶל־תַּתְּנֵהוּ בִנְפֹשׁ אִיבָיו	καὶ μὴ παραδῶῃ αὐτόν εἰς χεῖρας ἐχθροῦ αὐτοῦ.
Ps 119(8):121	בִּלְתִּינִיחַי לַעֲשֹׂי	μὴ παραδῶς με τοῖς ἀδικοῦσίν με.

But in this case too, it is open to question whether the formulation of LXX Isa 25:4–5 was indeed influenced by (the Greek version of) these Psalms: firstly, because the use of παραδίδωμι in LXX Isa 25:5 could also simply have been related to the translator’s preference for using that verb in general:<sup>261</sup> παραδίδωμι belonged to his collection of favourite words; in his translation he has employed this verb as many as eighteen times, as a rendering of eleven different Hebrew roots.<sup>262</sup> Secondly, the idea of God’s delivery of his people into the hands of evil

<sup>259</sup> van der Kooij, *Oracle of Tyre*, 146.

<sup>260</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 117.

<sup>261</sup> Compare Coste, “Le texte grec d’Isaïe XXV 1–5,” 44.

<sup>262</sup> See Isa 19:4 (סָכַר); 25:5 (כָּנַע); 33:1 (שָׁדַד), 23 (חָלַק); 34:2 (נָתַן); 36:15 (נָתַן); 37:10 (נָתַן); 38:12 (שָׁלַם), 13 (שָׁלַם); 47:3 (פָּנַע); 53:6 (פָּנַע), 12 (עָרַה); 64:5(6) (מָגַן?); 65:12 (מָנַה). In 23:7 and 33:6 παραδίδωμι does not have a clear Hebrew equivalent; in 25:7 it matches the noun פָּנִי.

ones is not limited to the Psalms and Isaiah, but can additionally be found in the following texts in Ezekiel:

Ezek 11:9	καὶ παραδώσω ὑμᾶς εἰς χεῖρας ἀλλοτρίων
Ezek 16:27	καὶ παραδώσω σε εἰς ψυχᾶς μισούντων σε,
Ezek 23:28	Ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ παραδίδωμι σε εἰς χεῖρας ὧν μισεῖς
Ezek 31:11	καὶ παρέδωκα αὐτὸν εἰς χεῖρας ἄρχοντος ἐθνῶν,
Ezek 39:23	καὶ παρέδωκα αὐτοὺς εἰς χεῖρας τῶν ἐχθρῶν αὐτῶν

Isa 26:9	כִּי בִאשֶׁר מִשְׁפֹּטֶיךָ לְאָרֶץ	διότι φῶς τὰ προστάγματα σου ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.
	צדק לְמוֹד	δικαιοσύνην μάθετε,
	יִשְׁבִּי תֵּבֶל	οἱ ἐνοικοῦντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.

In the LXX of Isa 26:9 God's ordinances are called a "light" on the earth.<sup>263</sup> This metaphor may draw on Ps 37(36):6 and Ps 119(118):105, in which God's righteousness and his word are compared to light:<sup>264</sup>

Ps 37(36):6	וְהוֹצִיא כְּאוֹר צְדָקָךְ וּמִשְׁפָּטְךָ כְּצַהֲרִים	καὶ ἐξοίσει ὡς φῶς τὴν δικαιοσύνην σου καὶ τὸ κρίμα σου ὡς μεσημβρίαν.
Ps 119(8):105–6	נִרְ-לִרְגְלִי דְבַרְךָ וְאוֹר לְנִתְיָבְתִּי נִשְׁבַּעְתִּי וְאִקִּימָהּ לִשְׁמֶר מִשְׁפָּטִי צְדָקָךְ	Λύχνος τοῖς ποσίν μου ὁ λόγος σου καὶ φῶς ταῖς τρίβοις μου. ὁμώμοκα καὶ ἔστησα τοῦ φυλάξασθαι τὰ κρίματα τῆς δικαιοσύνης σου.

Ps 37(36) in particular may have had an influence on LXX Isa 26:9, since that Psalm has in common with Isa 26:9 its focus on the theme of the righteous ones trusting God, as opposed to the ungodly people. Nonetheless, a nearer source is revealed in the book of Isaiah itself, namely in Isa 51:4: *ὅτι νόμος παρ' ἐμοῦ ἐξελεύσεται καὶ ἡ κρίσις μου εἰς φῶς ἐθνῶν* (MT: *כי תורה מאתי תצא ומשפטי לאור עמים ארע*).

Isa 26:10	יְחֹן רִשְׁעַ	πέπαιται γὰρ ὁ ἀσεβής,
	בִּלְלִמְד צְדָק	οὐ μὴ μάθῃ δικαιοσύνην ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς,

<sup>263</sup> Rather than a plus, φῶς in LXX Isa 26:9 may be a representation of בִּאשֶׁר read as though it were כְּ(שֶׁ)אֹר (perhaps under the influence of Isa 51:4 and the Psalms quoted). Compare Koenig, *L'herméneutique analogique*, 136–41.

<sup>264</sup> According to Baer "there are indications in the details of LXX Isa 26.9 that the translator is influenced by the vocabulary of psalmody. He may allude to Ps. 37(36) and perhaps also to Ps 63(62)." Besides the addition of φῶς, Baer also mentions "the otherwise unprecedented use of ὁρβρίζειν for חָרַר—an equivalency that appears elsewhere only in Ps 63(62), 78(77), and twice in Job—and the unauthorized addition of πρὸς σέ, ὁ θεός" (Baer, *When We All Go Home*, 30).

בארץ נכחות יעול      ἀλήθειαν οὐ μὴ ποιήσῃ·  
ובל־יראה גאות יהוה      ἀρθήτω ὁ ἀσεβής, ἵνα μὴ ἴδῃ τὴν δόξαν κυρίου.

LXX Isa 26:10 conveys the message that the ungodly one will meet his end and will be taken away. Remarkably enough, this is quite in contrast to the MT, in which favour is shown to the wicked one. The deviation of the LXX possibly has its origin in Ps 37(36). That Psalm, in accordance with LXX Isa 26:7–10, deals with the righteous people trusting in God, versus the ungodly (רשע) who will perish (as I have already noted above when comparing Isa 26:9 to Ps 37[36]:6). This is made clear especially in the following verses:

- Ps 37(36):9–10      כִּי־מִרְעִים יִכְרֹתוּן      ὅτι οἱ πονηρευόμενοι ἐξολεθρευθήσονται,  
   וְקוֹי יְהוָה      οἱ δὲ ὑπομένοντες τὸν κύριον  
   הִמָּה יִירָשׁוּ־אֶרֶץ      αὐτοὶ κληρονομήσουσιν γῆν.  
   וְעוֹד מַעַט      καὶ ἔτι ὀλίγον  
   וְאִין רָשַׁע      καὶ οὐ μὴ ὑπάρξῃ ὁ ἁμαρτωλός,  
   וְהַתְּבוֹנֶנֶת עַל־מְקוֹמוֹ      καὶ ζητήσεις τὸν τόπον αὐτοῦ  
   וְאִינֹנוּ      καὶ οὐ μὴ εὕρῃς·
- Ps 37(36):20      כִּי רָשָׁעִים יֵאָבְדוּ      ὅτι οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἀπολοῦνται,  
   וְאִיבֵי יְהוָה      οἱ δὲ ἐχθροὶ τοῦ κυρίου  
   כִּיקָר כְּרִים      ἅμα τῷ δοξασθῆναι αὐτούς καὶ ὑψωθῆναι  
   כָּלוּ בַעֲשָׂן כָּלוּ      ἐκλιπόντες ὥσει καπνὸς ἐξέλιπον.
- Ps 37(36):35–36      רֵאִיתִי רָשַׁע עֹרֵץ      εἶδον ἀσεβῆ ὑπερυψούμενον  
   וּמִתְעַרָּה כְּאֹרַח רַעְנָן      καὶ ἐπαιρόμενον ὡς τὰς κέδρους τοῦ Λιβάνου·  
   וַיַּעֲבֵר וְהָנָה אִינֹנוּ      καὶ παρήλθον, καὶ ἰδοὺ οὐκ ἔν
- Ps 37(36):38      וּפְשָׁעִים נִשְׁמְדוּ      οἱ δὲ παράνομοι ἐξολεθρευθήσονται  
   יִחְדּוּ אַחֲרֵית      ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό, τὰ ἐγκαταλείμματα  
   רָשָׁעִים נִכְרְתָה      τῶν ἀσεβῶν ἐξολεθρευθήσονται.

Despite the thematic correspondence of these verses with LXX Isa 26:10, the vocabulary used in their respective Greek versions differs between the two documents: nowhere in LXX Ps 36 can the exact words ἀρθήτω ὁ ἀσεβής be found. Hence, it is implausible that the plus in LXX Isa 26:10 is the outcome of a dependence on the Greek translation of Ps 36. If the Isaiah translator was actually inspired by Ps 37(36), it was rather by its Hebrew version, or merely by the ideology in this Psalm. But it is likewise possible that he changed the text of Isa 26:10 on his own initiative, independently of Ps 37, perhaps for the reason that he thought the Hebrew text of this verse too lenient on the ungodly ones.

Isa 28:28	כי לא לנצח אדוש ידושנ והמם גלגל עגלתו ופרשיו לא ידקנו	οὐ γὰρ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ἐγὼ ὑμῖν ὀργισθήσομαι, <sup>265</sup> οὐδὲ φωνὴ τῆς πικρίας μου καταπατήσῃ ὑμᾶς.
-----------	--	--

The LXX appears to interpret the metaphorical language of the Hebrew.<sup>266</sup>

MT Isa 28:28      No, he does not thresh it for ever; when he drives his cart wheel over it with his horses, he does not crush it

LXX Isa 28:28      For I will not be angry with you forever, nor will the voice of my bitterness trample you.

The translator may have explicated the Hebrew in this way by means of the association of עגלתו (“his cart”) with עברתו (“his anger”), which is reflected in τῆς πικρίας μου (compare the rendering of עבדתו as ἡ πικρία αὐτοῦ in verse 21). Besides, as Goshen-Gottstein suggests, the following Psalm texts could have played a role in the LXX formulation:<sup>267</sup>

Ps 85(84):6	הלעולם תאנה-בנו תמשך אפך לדר ודר	μὴ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ὀργισθήσῃ ἡμῖν ἢ διατενεῖς τὴν ὀργὴν σου ἀπὸ γενεᾶς εἰς γενεάν; <sup>268</sup>
-------------	--	---

Ps 103(2):9	לא-לנצח יריב ולא לעולם יטור	οὐκ εἰς τέλος ὀργισθήσεται οὐδὲ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα μνησιέ·
-------------	--------------------------------	--

Yet, the primary source for the rephrasing of Isa 28:28 can be found in Isaiah itself: see Isa 57:16 Οὐκ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ἐκδικήσω ὑμᾶς οὐδὲ διὰ παντὸς ὀργισθήσομαι ὑμῖν (MT: כי לא לנצח אקצוף ולא לעולם אריב).<sup>269</sup>

Isa 30:4–5	כִּיהִיו בַּצֵּעַן שָׂרִין וּמִלֵּאכִין חֲנַס יִגְעֻוּ בְּלִי הַבְּאִישׁ הַבִּישׁ עַל-עַם לֹא-יִוְעִילוּ	ὅτι εἰσὶν ἐν Τάνει ἀρχηγοὶ ἄγγελοι πονηροί· μάτην κοπιᾶσους πρὸς λαόν, ὃς οὐκ ὠφελήσῃ αὐτοὺς
------------	---	---

Isa 30:4–5 is translated in a somewhat free and associative way: the Hebrew place name חנס may have been linked to הנם (“in vain”), and hence rendered

<sup>265</sup> Perhaps the translator has read אדוש—which is an infinitive absolute of דוש—as a 1. singular imperfect form.

<sup>266</sup> For the LXX Isaiah tendency to interpret metaphors, see Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 81–91, and Arie van der Kooij, “The Interpretation of Metaphorical Language. A Characteristic of LXX-Isaiah,” in *Jerusalem, Alexandria, Rome. Studies in Ancient Cultural Interaction in Honour of A. Hilhorst* (ed. Florentino García Martínez, and Gerard P. Luttikhuisen; JSJSup 82; Leiden: Brill, 2003).

<sup>267</sup> *HUB Isa*, 112.

<sup>268</sup> In Ps 85(84):4 the noun עברה—“anger”—can be found: אספת כל-עברתך השיבות מחרון אפך.

<sup>269</sup> Compare Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 119–20; Ziegler also mentions Jer 3:12 as a related verse.

μάτην. The verb גיעו was probably understood to stem from גע—“to grow weary” (instead of from געג—“to reach”), and thus reproduced as κοπιᾶσουσι. הבאש, rather than as an inflection of the root בוש—“to be ashamed”—was perceived as a derivation of באש, which in Aramaic means “to be evil.” The latter connotation is expressed in πονηροί, though that adjective appears in the LXX in the preceding clause. The attribution of πονηροί to ἄγγελοι may draw upon Ps 78(77):49:<sup>270</sup>

Ps 78(77):49	ישלחם חרון אפו	ἐξαπέστειλεν εἰς αὐτοὺς ὄργην θυμοῦ
	עברה וזעם וצרה	αὐτοῦ, θυμὸν καὶ ὄργην καὶ θλίψιν,
	משלחת מלאכי רעים	ἀποστολὴν δι' ἄγγέλων πονηρῶν.

Ps 78(77) offers a view on Israel's exodus from Egypt. It describes the plagues that God let loose on the Egyptians, including “a company of destroying angels.” In conformity with this Psalm, Isa 30:4–5 also deals with Egypt, judging the futile trust that the Israelites have in this people. So, this focus on Egypt may provide an extra link between the two passages.

Apart from in LXX Ps 77:49 and LXX Isa 30:4 ἄγγελος πονηρός occurs nowhere else in the Septuagint. Hence, there is a considerable chance that the Isaiah translator indeed borrowed this expression from Ps 78(77):49. But whether he used the Hebrew or the Greek version of this Psalm remains the question: ἄγγέλων πονηρῶν is a predictable translation of מלאכי רעים and could also have been the translator's own rendition of the Hebrew formulation.

**Isa 32:3** **לֹא תִשְׁעִינָה עֵינַי רָאִים** **καὶ οὐκέτι ἔσονται πεποιοθέντες ἐπ' ἀνθρώποις**

Also in this verse most separate Hebrew words have received a variant translation in the LXX, giving rise to a Greek text that differs substantially from the Hebrew. In the first place, תשענה (from שעע—“to be smeared over,” “to be blinded”) was probably read as if it were תשענה—a Nif'al form of שׁען—“to trust”—and has accordingly been rendered by ἔσονται πεποιοθέντες. In the second place, ראים may have been altered into אדם by means of metathesis and interchange of the resh and the dalet, and then have been translated ἀνθρώποις.<sup>271</sup> עיני seems to lack a Hebrew counterpart. The resulting clause καὶ οὐκέτι ἔσονται πεποιοθέντες ἐπ' ἀνθρώποις echoes a thought expressed in Ps 118(7):8:

Ps 118(7):8	טוב לחסות ביהוה	ἀγαθὸν πεποιθέναι ἐπὶ κύριον
	מבטח באדם	ἢ πεποιθέναι ἐπ' ἄνθρωπον.

Compare also Ps 146(145):3:

<sup>270</sup> Compare *HUB Isa*, 120.

<sup>271</sup> See Koenig, *L'herméneutique analogique*, 149.

אֶל־תַּבְּטִחוּ בַּנְּדִיבִים      **μὴ πεποιθᾶτε** ἐπ' ἄρχοντας  
בְּבָנ־אָדָם שֶׁאֵין לוֹ תְּשׁוּעָה      **καὶ ἐφ' υἱοὺς ἀνθρώπων**, οἷς οὐκ ἔστιν σωτηρία.

The fact that the vocabulary used in the various verses differs from one to the other—LXX Isa 32:3 has ἀνθρώποις where Ps 118(7):8 offers a singular ἄνθρωπον and Ps 146:3 the compound phrase υἱοὺς ἀνθρώπων—makes it more feasible that the Isaiah translator merely reproduced a Psalmic motif rather than importing literal phraseology from the above Psalms. Furthermore, the warning not to trust in men is close to the more general principle of the futility of trusting others than God (idols, leaders, other people, etc.) which is central to (LXX) Isaiah (see, for instance, 10:20; 17:8; 30:3; 31:1; 36:6, 9). Hence, the translator could also have remained within the scope of his own text in reformulating Isa 32:3.

Isa 38:11      **לֹא־אֶרְאֶה יְהוָה**      **Οὐκέτι μὲν ἴδω τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ**  
בָּאֶרֶץ הַחַיִּים      ἐπὶ γῆς γῆς

Isa 40:5      **וְרָאוּ כְּלִבְשֵׁר יַחַד**      **καὶ ὄψεται πᾶσα σὰρξ τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ**

In the LXX of both Isa 38:11 and 40:5 τὸ σωτήριον appears as a plus before τοῦ θεοῦ. In 40:5 τοῦ θεοῦ probably originates from יַחַד, read as if it were יהוה.<sup>272</sup> The expression ὁράω τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ in both verses might have been borrowed from Ps 98(97):3:

Ps 98(97):3      **רָאוּ כְּלִא־פִסְיָאֲרָן**      **εἶδον πάντα τὰ πέρατα τῆς γῆς**  
אֶת יְשׁוּעַת אֱלֹהֵינוּ      **τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ** ἡμῶν.

τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ further appears in LXX Ps 49:23, but there it is not governed by ὁράω.<sup>273</sup>

Ps 50(49):23      **וְשֵׁם דֶּרֶךְ**      **καὶ ἐκεῖ ὁδός,**  
אֶרְאֵנוּ בִישַׁע אֱלֹהִים      **ἢ δέξω αὐτῷ τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ.**

Notwithstanding the striking resemblance to the verses quoted from the Psalms, τὸ σωτήριον could have been inserted in LXX Isa 38:11 and 40:5 independently of these. In 40:5 it may have been added in parallelism to ἡ δόξα κυρίου in the preceding line (although this does not exclude the possibility of the influence of the Psalm). Moreover, the use of ὁράω τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ might have its origin in the Greek Isaiah itself, that is, in 52:10, despite the fact that there one finds the noun σωτηρία rather than σωτήριον, and a somewhat different grammatical construction: **καὶ ὄψονται πάντα τὰ ἄκρα τῆς γῆς τὴν σωτηρίαν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ** (MT: וְרָאוּ כְּלִא־פִסְיָאֲרָן אֶת יְשׁוּעַת אֱלֹהֵינוּ).

<sup>272</sup> For the omission of ה, see section 8.7.

<sup>273</sup> Apart from the verses mentioned τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ has no other occurrences in the LXX.



**Isa 44:4** וצמחו בבן חציר *καὶ ἀνατελοῦσιν ὥσει χόρτος ἀνὰ μέσον ὕδατος*

The Greek clause cited, denoting “And they shall spring up like grass in the midst of water,” departs slightly from the Hebrew—“They shall spring up between grass.” The LXX imagery of springing up *like* grass has a precedent in Ps 92(91):8.<sup>277</sup>

Ps 92(91):8 בפרח רשעים ἐν τῷ ἀνατεῖλαι τοὺς ἁμαρτωλοὺς  
כמו עשב ὥς χόρτον

Although this verse is linked to LXX Isa 44:4 as regards its vocabulary, the context in which it is applied is rather distinct from Isa 44. In LXX Isa springing up like grass is used as a comparison for the increase of Israel’s offspring. The simile in Ps 92(91):8, conversely, has a negative connotation, saying of the *sinner*s that they will spring up like grass. This different use of ἀνατέλλω (ὥς) χόρτον makes it less likely that the Isaiah translator has adopted this expression from Ps 92(91). A further argument, which contradicts influence from the *Greek* text of Ps 91:8, is that the Psalm verse offers the comparative particle ὥς, whereas LXX Isa 44:4 has ὥσει.

**Isa 45:13** גלותי ישלח *καὶ τὴν αἰχμαλωσίαν τοῦ λαοῦ μου ἐπιστρέψει*<sup>278</sup>

This is one of the cases which Seeligmann discusses so to confirm his theory that the Greek Isaiah relies on the Greek Psalms. Seeligmann suggests that in LXX Isa 45:13 τοῦ λαοῦ μου has been appended to τὴν αἰχμαλωσίαν in harmonisation with Ps 14(13):7 and Ps 53(52):7, and also with Amos 9:14,<sup>279</sup> verses which likewise contain the statement that God will “turn back the captivity of his people.” The influence of these verses could also clarify the uncommon translation of ישלח (“he will let go”) by ἐπιστρέψει (“he will turn back”) in the Isaianic verse.<sup>280</sup>

Ps 14(13):7 בשוב יהוה ἐν τῷ ἐπιστρέψαι κύριον  
שבות עמו τὴν αἰχμαλωσίαν τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ

Ps 53(52):7 בשוב אלהים ἐν τῷ ἐπιστρέψαι κύριον  
שבות עמו τὴν αἰχμαλωσίαν τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ

<sup>277</sup> For the springing up *of* grass, see Ps 147(146):8 המצמיח הרים חציר / τῷ ἐξαντέλλοντι ἐν ὄρεσι χόρτον. For a text in Isaiah with a similar syntax, see Isa 53:2 ἀνηγγεῖλαμεν ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ ὥς παιδίον, ὥς ῥίζα ἐν γῇ διψώσῃ (in the Göttingen edition Ziegler proposes as a conjecture ἀνέτειλε μέν instead of ἀνηγγεῖλαμεν). Texts in Isaiah where the words ὥς/ὥσει χόρτος likewise appear, can be found in Isa 37:27 and 51:12.

<sup>278</sup> Also the Targum shows this plus.

<sup>279</sup> See section 9.4.5.3.

<sup>280</sup> Seeligmann, *Septuagint Version*, 72.



As Amos 9:14 offers similar phraseology, the plus τοῦ λαοῦ μου in LXX Isa 45:13 cannot provide firm evidence of a reliance of LXX Isaiah on the Greek Psalms, for the translator might just as well have copied τὴν αἰχμαλωσίαν τοῦ λαοῦ μου ἐπιστρέφω from LXX Amos as from LXX Psalms. Or, he may have based his translation on a mere memory of this well-known biblical locution, without being conscious of where it was to be located in Scripture. The latter reflects the opinion of Wevers, who thinks that the usage of τὴν αἰχμαλωσίαν ἐπιστρέφω in 45:13 is nothing more than an *Anklang* to the familiar Hebrew idiom שבות שוב.<sup>281</sup>

Isa 53:2–3	לֹא תִתְאָדָר לוֹ וְלֹא תִדְרֹג וְלֹא תִמְרָא וְנִחְמְדָהּ נִבְזָה וְחָדַל אִישִׁים	οὐκ ἔστιν εἶδος αὐτῷ οὐδὲ δόξα· καὶ εἶδομεν αὐτόν, καὶ οὐκ εἶχεν εἶδος οὐδὲ κάλλος· ἀλλὰ τὸ εἶδος αὐτοῦ ἄτιμον ἐκλείπον παρὰ πάντας ἀνθρώπους
------------	--	---

Ziegler seeks to connect the translation of וְלֹא תִמְרָא וְנִחְמְדָהּ (“and no beauty that we should desire him”) by καὶ οὐκ εἶχεν εἶδος οὐδὲ κάλλος (“he had no form or beauty”) to Ps 45(44):3, a Psalm passage which, in conformance with Isa 53, alludes to a messianic figure:<sup>282</sup>

Ps 45(44):3	יִפְּיֵית מְבִנֵי אֶדֶם הוֹצֵק חֵן בְּשִׁפְתוֹתָיִךְ עַל־כֵּן בֵּרַכְךָ אֱלֹהִים לְעוֹלָם	ὥραϊος κάλλει παρὰ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἐξεχύθη χάρις ἐν χεῖλεσίν σου· διὰ τοῦτο εὐλόγησέν σε ὁ θεὸς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.
-------------	---	---

Under the influence of this same Psalm a number of LXX Isaiah manuscripts have in Isa 53:3 altered παρὰ πάντας ἀνθρώπους to παρὰ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῶν ἀνθρώπων. Still, it is not quite evident whether the translator himself already saw a connection between Isa 53:2 and Ps 45(44). The rendering of וְנִחְמְדָהּ by κάλλος he could also have figured out himself, without depending on the Psalm verse, since κάλλος is a common equivalent for נחמה, which stems from the same root as וְנִחְמְדָהּ. The translator might have preferred to translate the Hebrew verb with a noun because he wanted to make the line in which the form appears more parallel to the preceding line in verse 2b, by means of having both of them contain two coordinate nouns:

<sup>281</sup> Wevers, “Septuaginta Forschungen,” 180.

<sup>282</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 128.



doubtful in view of the fact that whereas LXX Isa 57:9 and MT Ps 9:19 have used the verb “to return” in an active sense, the LXX of Ps 9:19 offers a passive verb.

**Isa 63:19(64:1)–64:1(2)**

לוא־קרעת שמים ירדת	ἐὰν ἀνοίξης τὸν οὐρανόν, τρόμος λήμψεται
מפניך הרים נולו	ἀπὸ σοῦ ὄρη, καὶ ταχέσονται,
כקדח אש המסים	ὡς κηρός ἀπὸ πυρὸς τήκεται.
מים תבעה־אש	καὶ κατακαύσει πῦρ τοὺς ὑπεναντίους

The LXX presents a text that diverges from the MT in various aspects:

MT Isa 63:19–64:1      O that you would tear open the heavens and come down, so that the mountains would quake at your presence—as when fire kindles brushwood and the fire causes water to boil—to make your name known to your adversaries

LXX Isa 64:1–2      If you should open heaven, trembling from you would seize the mountains, and they would melt as wax melts from the fire. And fire shall burn up your adversaries

In the Greek version τρόμος λήμψεται may stem from ירדת via רעד/רעד<sup>285</sup> or רד<sup>286</sup> (both meaning “to tremble”). ταχέσονται (from τήκω—“to melt”) supposedly reproduces נולו (Nif'al of ללל—“to quake”), even if in other places τήκω usually matches מסה/מסס (“to melt”). Maybe the use of a verb in the sense of “to melt” is brought about by the occurrence of המסים (“brushwood”) in verse 2, which might have been associated with מסס. The verb form תבעה was probably read as though it were תבער (Pi'el בער—“to burn up”) and translated as κατακαύσει. The vision of mountains melting as wax before the Lord offered by the Greek version of Isa 64:2, is missing in the Hebrew text. We do, however, find the same image in Ps 97(96):5:

Ps 97(96):5	הרים כדונג נמסו	τὰ ὄρη ἐτάκhsαν ὡσεὶ κηρός
	מלפני יהוה	ἀπὸ προσώπου κυρίου,
	מלפני אדון כל־הארץ	ἀπὸ προσώπου κυρίου πάσης τῆς γῆς.

Also the words ὡς κηρός ἀπὸ πυρὸς τήκεται have a parallel in the Psalms: they return almost literally in Ps 68(67):3:

Ps 68(67):3	כהנדי עשן תנדי	ὡς ἐκλείπει καπνός, ἐκλιπέτωσαν·
	כהמס דונג מפני־אש	ὡς τήκεται κηρός ἀπὸ προσώπου πυρός,
	יאבדו רשעים	οὕτως ἀπόλιντο οἱ ἀμαρτωλοὶ
	מפני אלהים	ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ θεοῦ.

<sup>285</sup> See Isa 33:14 חנפים / אחזה לעדה, חנפים / λήμψεται τρόμος τοὺς ἀσεβεῖς.

<sup>286</sup> See Isa 19:16 מפני תנופת ידיהוה צבאות / וחרד / ἐν φόβῳ καὶ ἐν τρόμῳ ἀπὸ προσώπου τῆς χειρὸς κυρίου σαβαωθ.

The simile of melting wax additionally features in the following Psalm verses:

Ps 22(21):15	היה לבי כדונג נמס בתוך מעי	ἐγενήθη ἡ καρδία μου ὥσει κηρὸς τηκόμενος ἐν μέσῳ τῆς κοιλίας μου.
Ps 58(57):9	כמו שבלול תמס יהלך נפל אשת בל-חזו שמש	ὥσει κηρὸς ὁ τακεῖς ἀνταναιρεθήσονται. ἐπέπεσε πῦρ, καὶ οὐκ εἶδον τὸν ἥλιον.

Aside from these Psalms, Mic 1:4 should also be mentioned. Here a picture comparable to that of Ps 97(96):5 and LXX Isa 64:1–2 occurs:

Mic 1:4	ונמסו ההרים תחתיו והעמקים יתבקעו כדונג מפני האש כמים מגרים במורד	καὶ σαλευθήσεται τὰ ὄρη ὑποκάτωθεν αὐτοῦ, καὶ αἱ κοιλάδες τακήσονται ὡς κηρὸς ἀπὸ προσώπου πυρὸς καὶ ὡς ὕδωρ καταφερόμενον ἐν καταβάσει.
---------	---	---

Still, regarding its content LXX Isa 64:1–2 agrees more precisely with LXX Ps 97(96):5 than with LXX Mic 1:4, given that in Ps 97(96):5, in agreement with the Isaianic passage, it is the “mountains” that are subject to melting, and not, as in LXX Mic 1:4, the “valleys.”<sup>287</sup> Since the vocabulary of the Greek version of the Psalms quoted corresponds closely to that of LXX Isa 64:1–2, it is certainly conceivable that the Isaiah translator relied on the LXX of the Psalms in translating these verses.<sup>288</sup>

Isa 66:2	ואת-כל-אלה ידי עשתה ויהיו כל-אלה נאם-יהוה	πάντα γὰρ ταῦτα ἐποίησεν ἡ χεὶρ μου, καὶ ἔστιν ἐμὰ πάντα ταῦτα, λέγει κύριος.
----------	--	--

Ziegler mentions as a possibility that in LXX Isa 66:2 ἐμὰ was added in harmonisation with Ps 50(49):10.<sup>289</sup>

Ps 50(49):10	כי-לי בל-חיתו-יער בהמות בהר-רי-אלף	ὅτι ἐμὰ ἔστιν πάντα τὰ θηρία τοῦ δρυμοῦ, κτήνη ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν καὶ βόες.
--------------	---------------------------------------	--

Compare also Ps 50(49):12:

Ps 50(49):12	כי-לי תבל ומלאה	ἐμὴ γάρ ἔστιν ἡ οἰκουμένη καὶ τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτῆς.
--------------	--------------------	--

In favour of the dependence of LXX Isa 66:2 on Ps 50(49) is the fact that the contexts of both verses expose the same theme, that is, God’s contempt for

<sup>287</sup> In the MT of Mic 1:4, on the contrary, it is the mountains that are melting.

<sup>288</sup> Ziegler, by contrast, suggests that the Hebrew *Vorlage* of Isaiah may already have contained this imagery (Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 100). For a more extensive discussion of these verses, see Baer, *When We All Go Home*, 181–92.

<sup>289</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 79.

sacrifices. On the other hand, the Hebrew clause ויהיו כל־אלה is elliptic and strongly insinuates לִי, which makes it likewise imaginable that the Isaiah translator has added ἐμέ independently of Ps 50, simply in order to clarify his text. Maybe he also wished to make the line καὶ ἔστιν ἐμὰ πάντα ταῦτα more analogous in content to the preceding one πάντα γὰρ ταῦτα ἐποίησεν ἡ χεὶρ μου. An explanation for the additional ἐμέ can further be sought in a difference of *Vorlage*. Perhaps לִי got lost in the MT tradition, giving rise to the somewhat obscure Hebrew text we have now.

**Isa 66:16**      כי באש יהוה נשפט      ἐν γὰρ τῷ πυρὶ κυρίου κριθήσεται πᾶσα ἡ γῆ  
 ובחרבו את־כל־בשר      καὶ ἐν τῇ ῥομφαίᾳ αὐτοῦ πᾶσα σὰρξ·

The supply of a subject πᾶσα ἡ γῆ to the verb κριθήσεται may be related to the following verses from Psalms, which similarly concentrate on the theme of God's judgment of the world:

Ps 82(81):8	קומה אלהים שפטה הארץ כי־אתה תנחל בכל־הגוים	ἀνάστα, ὁ θεός, <b>κρίνων</b> <b>τὴν γῆν</b> , ὅτι σὺ κατακληρονομήσεις ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν.
Ps 94(93):2	הנשא שפט הארץ השב גמול על־גאים	ὑψώθητι, <b>ὁ κρίνων τὴν γῆν</b> , ἀπόδος ἀνταπόδοσιν τοῖς ὑπερηφάνοις.
Ps 96(95):13	לפני יהוה כי בא כי בא לשפט הארץ ישפט־תבל בצדק ועמים באמונתו	πρὸ προσώπου κυρίου, ὅτι ἔρχεται, ὅτι ἔρχεται <b>κρίναι τὴν γῆν</b> · κρινεῖ τὴν οἰκουμένην ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ λαοὺς ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ αὐτοῦ.
Ps 98(97):9	כי בא לשפט הארץ ישפט־תבל בצדק ועמים במישרים	ὅτι ἔχει <b>κρίναι τὴν γῆν</b> · κρινεῖ τὴν οἰκουμένην ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ λαοὺς ἐν εὐθύτητι.

Of these verses Ps 94(93):2 contains an extra link to LXX Isa 66:16, in that it deals with God's retribution on his enemies, using the verb השיב / ἀπόδιδωμι. This same theme and the same verb occur in Isa 66:15, that is, in the verse preceding the one under discussion.

Notwithstanding this, the following points argue against the reference back to the Psalms already mentioned:

- In the above Psalms πᾶσα as an adjective to ἡ γῆ is missing.
- Gen 18:25 contains a comparable expression, which, in contrast to the quotations from LXX Psalms, does mention "the whole earth": ὁ κρίνων πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν οὐ ποιήσεις κρίσιν;.

- $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\sigma\alpha$  ἢ γῆ may well have been inserted in LXX Isa 66:16 parallel to  $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\sigma\alpha$  σάρξ in the succeeding line.

Isa 66:18

ואנכי מעשיהם  
ומחשבתיהםκαὶ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν  
καὶ τὸν λογισμὸν αὐτῶν ἐπίσταμαι.

Even though it is possible that LXX Isaiah's underlying Hebrew manuscript offered an equivalent for ἐπίσταμαι, it is more likely that the translator himself has supplied this verb, namely, with the aim of "correcting" the ellipsis of the Hebrew. He might have opted for a verb in the sense of "to know" on the grounds that Isa 66:18 reminded him of Ps 94(93):11, a verse that speaks of God's knowledge of man's thoughts. Both Ps 94(93):11 and Isa 66:18 present the noun מחשבה.<sup>290</sup>

Ps 94(93):11

יהוה ידע מחשבות  
אדם כִּי־המה הבלκύριος γινώσκει τοὺς διαλογισμοὺς  
τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὅτι εἰσὶν μάταιοι.

If the plus in LXX Isa 66:18 indeed goes back to Ps 94(93):11, the translator will probably have used the *Hebrew* text of this Psalm instead of the Greek, as the wording of the two translations differs, LXX Isa 66:18 having λογισμός and γιγνώσκω, where LXX Ps 93:11 has διαλογισμός and ἐπίσταμαι, respectively. However, rather than from Ps 94(93), the translator may have imported ἐπίσταμαι from a verse in Isaiah itself—Isa 37:28: νῦν δὲ τὴν ἀνάπαυσίν σου καὶ τὴν ἔξοδόν σου καὶ τὴν εἴσοδόν σου ἐγὼ ἐπίσταμαι.

#### 9.4.2.2 Conclusion to 9.4.2

This paragraph has reviewed about twenty-five cases of plus and minus in the Greek Isaiah that may have arisen from the translator's adoption of elements from the book of Psalms, or by his omission of words in harmonisation with a text from Psalms. For every instance the question was raised of whether the LXX deviation from the MT could equally be explained in another way than by such a reliance on the Psalter. It turned out that in many cases alternative clarifications can be found for pluses or minuses in LXX Isaiah, making the supposition of a relation between LXX Isaiah and (LXX) Psalms unnecessary. Often a plus or minus could be elucidated by influence from closer by, that is, from the book of Isaiah itself.

If a relation of dependency on the Psalms still seemed to provide the most plausible explanation for a plus or minus, I have attempted to find out whether the Isaiah translator has made use of either the Hebrew or the Greek text of the

<sup>290</sup> Compare *HUB Isa*, 296.

Psalms. The outcome of this inquiry is that proof of LXX Isaiah's dependency on the *Greek* version of the Psalms cannot be given here; as in almost all cases of supposed reliance, the translator of Isaiah could just as well (or rather) have used the *Hebrew* text of the Psalms. Nevertheless, the possibility of LXX Isaiah's reliance on the Greek Psalms should not entirely be erased. A handful of instances may still point in such a direction. This especially pertains to those cases where the vocabulary applied in both translations is mutually similar and in which also the contexts of both passages under consideration show a close connection. Among the examples discussed LXX Isa 13:2; 30:4–5; 53:8; 64:1–2; and 66:2 especially may meet these criteria.

#### 9.4.3 LXX Isaiah and Jeremiah

Since there is quite some interface between the prophetic works of Isaiah and Jeremiah, it can be expected that the translator of Isaiah, apt as he was to integrate Scriptural elements from elsewhere into his text, has also drawn inspiration from the book of Jeremiah now and then. But whether he was acquainted with that work only in its Hebrew or also in its Greek version is again the question. Ziegler leaves some room for the possibility that the translator was familiar with a *Greek* translation of Jeremiah; although a direct connection with the LXX of Jeremiah, in his view, cannot readily be proven,<sup>291</sup> he offers some instances which exhibit parallels between the two Greek texts. Prior to Ziegler, a contrary opinion was defended by Thackeray. This scholar maintained that it is impossible for LXX Isaiah to depend on LXX Jeremiah, because Isaiah was the first of the prophetic books to be translated into Greek. This he deduced from LXX Isaiah's "greater ease of style, and the tendency to give a free rather than a *verbatim* rendering," which he considers to be marks of a comparatively early date. The other Greek prophets are, according to Thackeray, characterised by a more literal style of rendering, which he regards as indicating a later date of composition.<sup>292</sup>

On the pages below a number of cases will be examined in which the Isaiah translator possibly adopted elements from the book of Jeremiah, resulting in pluses or minuses in his translation. When discussing these cases, I will attempt to investigate critically whether the additions and omissions may relate to either the Hebrew or the Greek text of Jeremiah.

---

<sup>291</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 105.

<sup>292</sup> Thackeray, "Greek Translators of the Prophetic Books," 583.

## 9.4.3.1 Influence of Jer 48(31) on Isa 15 and 16

Jeremiah 48(31) elaborates upon the same subject as Isa 15–16, that is, the destruction of Moab. Not only do these two texts share a common theme, but their vocabulary also shows agreements. Isa 15–16 seem to possess even more linkages to Jer 48(31) in their Greek translation. This suggests that Jer 48 has had some influence on the LXX of Isa 15 and 16. The following examples of pluses and minuses may illustrate this assumption:

Isa 15:2–3	על-נבו ועל מידבא מואב יליל בכל-ראשו קרחה כל-זקן גרעה בחוצתיו חגרו שק על גותיה וברחבתיה כלה יליל ירד בבכי	ἐπὶ Ναβαυ τῆς Μωαβίτιδος ὀλολύζετε. ἐπὶ πάσης κεφαλῆς φαλάκρωμα, πάντες βραχίονες κατατετμημένοι· ἐν ταῖς πλατείαις αὐτῆς περιζώσασθε σάκκους <u>καὶ κόπτεσθε</u> , ἐπὶ τῶν δωμάτων αὐτῆς καὶ ἐν ταῖς ῥύμαις αὐτῆς πάντες ὀλολύζετε μετὰ κλαυθμοῦ.
------------	--	---

The extra phrase *καὶ κόπτεσθε* in LXX Isa 15:3 might be traceable back to Jer 48(31):37–38. Just as Isa 15:2–3, this Jeremianic text depicts people lamenting for Moab, and lists a number of mourning rituals, of which some are identical to those in Isa 15:2–3:

## Jer 48(31):37–38

כי כל-ראש קרחה וכל-זקן גרעה על כל-ידיים גדות ועל-מתנים שק על כל-גגות מואב וברחבתיה כלה <b>מספד</b> כישברתי את-מואב ככלי אי'חפץ בו נאס'יהוה	πᾶσαν κεφαλὴν ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ ξυρήσονται, καὶ πᾶς πώγων ξυρηθήσεται, καὶ πᾶσαι χεῖρες <b>κόψονται</b> , καὶ ἐπὶ πάσης ὀσφύος σάκκος. καὶ ἐπὶ πάντων τῶν δωμάτων Μωαβ καὶ ἐπὶ πλατείαις αὐτῆς, ὅτι συνέτριψα τὸν Μωαβ, φησὶ κύριος, ὡς ἀγγεῖον, οὗ οὐκ ἔστι χρεῖα αὐτοῦ.
---	--

If the Isaiah translator was indeed influenced by Jer 48(31):37, it is more plausible that he used its Hebrew text rather than the Greek one, as several expressions that are the same in the MT versions of Isa 15:2–3 and Jer 48:37 have received different translations in the Greek (*קרחה* aligns with *ξυρήσονται* in LXX Jeremiah, but with *φαλάκρωμα* in LXX Isaiah; *וכל-זקן גרעה* matches *καὶ πᾶς πώγων ξυρηθήσεται* in LXX Jeremiah, but *πάντες βραχίονες κατατετμημένοι* in LXX Isaiah; *וברחבתיה* is translated by *καὶ ἐπὶ πλατείαις αὐτῆς* in LXX Jeremiah, but by *καὶ ἐν ταῖς ῥύμαις αὐτῆς* in LXX Isaiah). However, whereas the Greek text of Jer 48(31):37–38 displays *κόψονται*, the Hebrew version of this passage does



not contain an expression close to *καὶ κόπτεσθε*; the nearest equivalent it offers is *מספד* in 48:38, a noun coming from the root *ספד*—“to lament.”<sup>293</sup>

Rather than from Jer 48(31):37 the translator may therefore have imported *καὶ κόπτεσθε* from other places in the book of Jeremiah. A similar combination of an imperative of *κόπτω* with an imperative of *περιζώννυμι* *σάκκους* to that which LXX Isa 15:3 displays, is attested in LXX Jer 4:8 and 49(30):3:

Jer 4:8	על־זאת חגרו שקים ספדו והילילו	ἐπὶ τούτοις <i>περιζώσασθε σάκκους</i> <i>καὶ κόπτεσθε καὶ ἀλαλάξατε</i>
Jer 49(30):3	צעקנה בנות רבה חגרנה שקים ספדנה והתשוטטנה בגדרות	<i>κεκράξατε, θυγατέρες Παββαθ,</i> <i>περιζώσασθε σάκκους</i> <i>καὶ κόψασθε</i>

Moreover, LXX Isaiah itself contains texts presenting this same combination, namely in Isa 22:12 and 32:11–12 (see section 9.3.1); so in LXX Isa 15:2 *καὶ κόπτεσθε* may also have been added under the influence of those Isaianic verses. In summary, the plus in LXX Isa 15:3 cannot provide convincing evidence of the dependence of LXX Isaiah on (LXX) Jer 48(31):37–38 or on other Jeremianic texts.<sup>294</sup>

Isa 15:5	כי דרך חורנים ועקת־שבר יעירו	τῇ ὁδῷ Ἀρωνιμ βοᾷ <i>σύντριμμα καὶ σεισμός.</i>
----------	---------------------------------	--

Contrary to the Hebrew, the Greek version of Isa 15:5 includes direct speech:

MT Isa 15:5	For on the road to Horonaim they raise a cry of destruction;
LXX Isa 15:5	By the way of Haroniim she cries aloud, “Destruction and an earthquake!”

The LXX reformulation has been achieved by the translation of the verb *יעירו* (“they raise”) by the noun *σεισμός* (“earthquake”)—perhaps through linking *יעירו* to *סערה* (“tempest”), and of the noun *ועקת* by the verb *βοᾷ*. The syntactical construction of the Greek sentence may have been copied from Jer 48(31):3:

<sup>293</sup> Ziegler (*Untersuchungen*, 27) remarks that in LXX Isa 15:2–3 some deviations from the MT correspond with the MT of Jer 48:37 (e.g. πάντες βραχίονες κατατετμημένοι in LXX Isa 15:2 corresponds more closely to על כלי־ידים גודת in MT Jer 48:37 than to its counterpart גרועה כלי־זקן in MT Isa 15:2). In his eyes this may indicate that the Vorlage of LXX Isa 15:2–3 was not the MT of Isa 15:2, but a text similar to Jer 48(31):37. Also the occurrence of *καὶ κόπτεσθε* in LXX Isa 15:3 would be the outcome of such a deviating Hebrew manuscript, in which a word such as *ספדו* or *מספד* was already present (perhaps in the form of a gloss).

<sup>294</sup> For the combination of *κόπτω* with *περιζώννυμι*, see also 2 Kgdms 3:31 and Joel 1:13 (*περιζώσασθε καὶ κόπτεσθε*).



ובכרמים לא־ירנן לא ירעע יין ביקבים לא־ידרך מִדֶּבֶר הַיַּד השבתי	καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀμπελῶσί σου οὐ μὴ εὐφρανθήσονται καὶ οὐ μὴ πατήσουσιν οἶνον εἰς τὰ ὑπολήνια, πέπαιται γάρ.
--	---

The lack of an equivalent for דרך in LXX Isa 16:10 may be elucidated by reference to a closely related text in Jer 48(31):33:

Jer 48(31):33 ונאספה שמחה וגיל מכרמל ומארץ מואב ויין מיקבים השבתי לא־ידרך הידד הידד לא הידד	συνεψήσθη χαρμοσύνη καὶ εὐφροσύνη ἐκ γῆς Μωαβίτιδος, καὶ οἶνος ᾗ ἐπὶ ληνοῖς σου. πρῶτὶ οὐκ ἐπάτησαν· αἰδεδ αἰδεδ, οὐκ [ἐποίησαν] αἰδεδ.
---	---

In the penultimate clause of this Jeremianic verse, which shares with Isa 16:10 its theme of the ceasing of joy and wine production, the grammatical subject of the wine treading is undefined (MT: לא־ידרך; LXX: πρῶτὶ οὐκ ἐπάτησαν). Maybe the Isaiah translator wanted to mirror this formulation in Jer 48(31):33 through omitting דרך in the clause לא־ידרך דרך. Also the omission of הידד may be in adjustment to Jer 48(31):33: now not only in MT Jer 48:33 but also in LXX Isa 16:10 the “stopping” (השבתי) concerns the wine treading, and not the “vintage shout.”

Supposing that there is a relation between LXX Isa 16:10 and Jer 48(31):33, the most likely explanation is that the Isaiah translator relied on the *Hebrew* text of Jer 48, given the distinct translations of השבתי by πέπαιται in LXX Isa 16:10 and by ᾗ in LXX Jer 31:33, and the rendering of יקבים by ὑπολήνια in LXX Isaiah and by ληνοῖς in LXX Jeremiah. Besides, the virtually identical initial clauses of both texts (ונאספה שמחה וגיל מִן־הכרמל) in Isa 16:10 and (ונאספה שמחה וגיל מכרמל) in Jer 48:33 are also reproduced differently in either of the Greek translations.

To conclude this section, I will offer one example which contains no pluses or minuses, but may additionally illustrate the influence of Jer 48 on LXX Isa 15–16:

Isa 16:7 לכן יליל מואב למואב כלה יליל לאשישי קִרְח־רֶשֶׁת תהגו אֶךְ־נִבְאִים	ὀλολύξει Μωαβ, ἐν γὰρ τῇ Μωαβίτιδι πάντες ὀλολύξουσιν. τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν Ἀδεδεθ μελετήσεις καὶ οὐκ ἐντραπήσῃ.
---	---

It may be that the translator read לאשישי (“raisin cakes”) as if it were לאנשי, and on those grounds translated the phrase by τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν.<sup>296</sup> He may have done

<sup>296</sup> It is likewise conceivable, however, that the translator did not perceive לאשישי as being derived from אשישה—“raisin cake,” but from אשיש, which in later Hebrew is used in the sense of “adult male” and with this connotation appears repeatedly in Qumran manuscripts (especially in 4Q502,

this under the influence of Jer 48(31):31 and 36, perhaps additionally motivated by the consideration that the mourning over the *residents* of Qir Chareset makes more sense than the mourning over the *raisin cakes* of this Moabite place.

Jer 48(31):31	עֲלֵיכֶן עַל־מִוּאָב אֵילִיל וּלְמִוּאָב כֹּלָה אֲזַעֵק אֶל־אֲנָשֵׁי קִיר־חֶרֶשׁ יִהְיֶה	διὰ τοῦτο ἐπὶ Μωαβ ὀλολούζετε πάντοθεν, βοήσατε <b>ἐπ' ἄνδρας κῖρ Αδας</b> αὐχμοῦ.
Jer 48(31):36	עֲלֵיכֶן לְבִי לְמִוּאָב כַּחֲלִילִים יִהְיֶה וּלְבִי אֶל־אֲנָשֵׁי קִיר־חֶרֶשׁ כַּחֲלִילִים יִהְיֶה	διὰ τοῦτο καρδιά μου, Μωαβ, ὥσπερ αὐλοὶ βομβήσουσιν, καρδιά μου <b>ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους κῖρ Αδας</b> ὥσπερ αὐλὸς βομβήσει.

Again, this case hints at the reliance on the Hebrew text of Jeremiah rather than on its Greek translation, as LXX Isa 16:7 offers τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν where LXX Jer 31:31 and 36 have ἄνδρας and ἀνθρώπους respectively, and as the two documents show a different transcription of the place-name (ת)קִיר־חֶרֶשׁ.

#### 9.4.3.2 Influence of Jer 10 on LXX Isa 44 and 46

A further chapter in Jeremiah that has close ties to sections within the book of Isaiah is Jer 10. This chapter conveys the same theme as Isa 44:6–20 and 46:1–7: the vain trust of the people in idols which they have made themselves and which are in fact mere images, powerless and not able to achieve anything. The Greek translation of Isa 44 and 46 holds several pluses and minuses which indicate that the Isaiah translator was not merely aware of the resemblance between these texts, but even created some extra links:

Isa 44:14	לְכַרְתִּלּוֹ	δ ἔκοψε
	<u>אֲרָזִים וִיקַח תְּרוּזָה וְאֵלֶּן</u>	
	<u>וַיֹּאמְרוּ בְעַצִּייעֵר נָטַע אֲרָן</u>	ξύλον ἐκ τοῦ δρυμοῦ, δ ἐφύτευσε κύριος

The LXX has omitted several words, probably with the purpose of abridging the Hebrew. Besides, it has read אֲרָן as אֲדָן and rendered the noun by κύριος.<sup>297</sup> The formulation δ ἔκοψε ξύλον ἐκ τοῦ δρυμοῦ may show a connection with Jer 10:3. Both that text and Isa 44:4 speak of the cutting down of a tree from the forest for making an idol.<sup>298</sup>

where it can be found ten times). This too could explain the translation of לאֲשִׁישִׁי by τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν.

<sup>297</sup> HUB Isa, 201.

<sup>298</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 126.

Jer 10:3 כִּי־חֲקוֹת הָעַמִּים הַבֵּל הוּא      ὅτι τὰ νόμιμα τῶν ἐθνῶν μάταια·  
 כִּי־עֵץ מִיַּעַר כִּרְתּוּ      ξύλον ἐστὶν ἐκ τοῦ δρυμοῦ ἐκκεκομμένον,  
 מַעֲשֵׂה יַד־חָרֶשׁ בַּמַּעַצ      ἔργον τέκτονος καὶ χώνευμα·

Isa 46:6–7 הַזֵּלִים זֶהָב מְכִיס      οἱ συμβαλλόμενοι χρυσίων ἐκ μαρσιππίου  
 וְכֶסֶף בְּקֶנֶה יִשְׁקְלוּ      καὶ ἀργύριον ἐν ζυγῷ στήσουσιν ἐν σταθμῷ  
 יִשְׁכְּרוּ צוּרָה      καὶ μισθωσάμενοι χρυσοχόον  
 וַיַּעֲשׂוּהוּ אֵל      ἐποίησαν χειροποίητα  
 יִסְגְּדוּ אֶף־יִשְׁתַּחֲווּ      καὶ κύψαντες προσκυνοῦσιν αὐτοῖς.  
 יִשְׁאַהוּ עַל־כֶּתֶף      αἴρουσιν αὐτὸ ἐπὶ τῶν ὤμων, καὶ πορεύονται.  
 יִסְבְּלוּהוּ וַיַּנְיְחוּהוּ תַּחְתָּיו      ἂν δὲ θῶσιν αὐτό,  
 וַיַּעֲמֵד מִמָּקוֹמוֹ לֹא יָמִישׁ      ἐπὶ τοῦ τόπου αὐτοῦ μένει, οὐ μὴ κινήθῃ·

Isa 46:6–7 portrays a procession in which idols are being carried around because they cannot move of their own accord. In the LXX καὶ πορεύονται appears as a plus.<sup>299</sup> Ziegler points to the occurrence of the same verb in the Greek version of Jer 10:9, a verse that similarly speaks of motionless idols of silver and gold made by human hands:<sup>300</sup>

Jer 10:9 כֶּסֶף מְרַקֵּעַ מִתְרַשֵּׁשׁ יוֹבֵא      ἀργύριον τορευτὸν ἐστίν, οὐ πορεύονται·  
 וְזָהָב מֵאוֹפֵז מַעֲשֵׂה חָרֶשׁ      ἀργύριον προσβλητὸν ἀπὸ Θαρσὶς ἥξει,  
 וַיַּדִּי צוּרָה      χρυσίων Μωφὰζ καὶ χεὶρ χρυσοχῶων,  
 תְּכַלֶּת וַאֲרָגְמָן לְבוֹשֶׁם      ἔργα τεχνιτῶν πάντα·  
 מַעֲשֵׂה חֲכָמִים כֻּלָּם      ὑάκινθον καὶ πορφύραν  
    ἐνδύσουσιν αὐτά·

Compare also Jer 10:5:

כְּתֹמֶר מִקֶּשֶׁה הֵמָּה וְלֹא יִדְּבֹרוּ      αἰρόμενα ἀρθήσονται, ὅτι οὐκ ἐπιβήσονται  
 נִשְׂוֹא יִנְשׂוּא כִּי לֹא יַעֲדֻדוּ

It is unclear, though, whether in LXX Isaiah and LXX Jeremiah the verbs in the sense of “to go” refer to the same group. In LXX Jer 10:9 the subject of πορεύονται is the images themselves who do not go forward, but remain in the same place. In LXX Isa 46:7, by contrast, καὶ πορεύονται may refer to the carriers of the images, who *do* proceed in the procession. This difference could invalidate the connection between the two Greek texts. Nevertheless, one could also posit that καὶ πορεύονται in LXX Isa 46:7 likewise pertains to the idols, who move because they are carried by humans. But even then it is uncertain whether

<sup>299</sup> One could also argue that καὶ πορεύονται is not a plus, but a rendering of יִסְבְּלוּהוּ. However, it is hard to find a link between those two verbs. More likely the latter form has been left out for reasons of condensation.

<sup>300</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 127

LXX Isaiah has taken *πορεύονται* from LXX Jer 10:9. Since in the latter verse the verb is a plus too, the influence could have come from either direction.

<p><b>Isa 46:7</b>    <b>יִשְׂאָהוּ עַל־כַּתְּף יִסְבְּלוּ</b>  <b>וַיִּנְחָהוּ תַּחְתִּיו וַיַּעֲמֵד</b>  <b>מִמֶּקְוָמוֹ לֹא יָמִישׁ</b></p>	<p><b>αἴρουσιν αὐτὸ ἐπὶ τῶν ὤμων, καὶ πορεύονται·</b>  <b>ἐὰν δὲ θῶσιν αὐτό, ἐπὶ τοῦ τόπου αὐτοῦ μένει,</b>  <b>οὐ μὴ κινήθῃ·</b></p>
--	---

A second distinction between the Greek and Hebrew versions of Isa 46:7 which could be clarified with the help of Jer 10, pertains to the minus *מִמֶּקְוָמוֹ*. By way of the omission of that phrase on the one hand, and the slightly free rendering of *מוֹשׁ* (“depart”) as a passive tense of *κινέω* on the other, the Isaiah translator might have attempted to harmonise his text towards the formulation *καὶ οὐ κινήθησονται* in LXX Jer 10:4, thus expressing in the same way as the Jeremican verse the inability of idols to move:

<p><b>Jer 10:4</b>    <b>בַּכֶּסֶף וּבִזְהָב יִיפְהוּ</b>  <b>בַּמַּסְמְרוֹת וּבַמִּקְבוֹת יִחְזָקוּם</b>  <b>וְלֹא יִפְּקוּ</b></p>	<p><b>ἀργυρίῳ καὶ χρυσίῳ κεκαλλωπισμένα ἐστίν·</b>  <b>ἐν σφύραις καὶ ἥλοις ἐστερέωσαν αὐτά,</b>  <b>καὶ οὐ κινήθησονται·</b></p>
--	---

In this case it is less feasible that the Isaiah translator relied on the *Hebrew* text of Jer 10:4, as that version presents in place of *κινήθησονται* an inflection of *פָּקַע*—“to totter,” which is a somewhat unexpected source for *κινέω* and has not generated this Greek verb anywhere else in the LXX.<sup>301</sup>

#### 9.4.3.3 Influence of other texts in Jeremiah

<p><b>Isa 2:1</b>    <b>הַדְּבָר אֲשֶׁר חָזָה</b>  <b>יִשְׁעִיָּהוּ בֶן־אָמוֹן</b></p>	<p><b>Ὁ λόγος ὁ γενόμενος παρὰ κυρίου</b>  <b>πρὸς Ἡσαιοῦν υἱὸν Ἀμώς</b></p>
--	--

The initial words of MT Isa 2:1—*הַדְּבָר אֲשֶׁר חָזָה*—appear somewhat awkward: how can one *see* a word? Commonly, formulae introducing prophecies or visions have as the object of the verb *חָזָה* the nouns *חֶזֶן*<sup>302</sup> or *מִשָּׁא*,<sup>303</sup> whereas *חָזַר* in such formulations generally governs the verb *הָיָה*.<sup>304</sup> This peculiarity of the Isa 2:1 wording may have prompted the Isaiah translator to change the formula and adapt it to an introduction frequently used in the Greek Jeremiah: *Ὁ λόγος ὁ γενόμενος παρὰ κυρίου πρὸς*:

<sup>301</sup> An alternative explanation for the omission of *מִמֶּקְוָמוֹ* would be that this phrase was omitted because it overlaps with *תַּחְתִּיו* in the preceding clause.

<sup>302</sup> See Isa 1:1 and Ezek 12:27.

<sup>303</sup> See Isa 13:1 and Hab 1:1.

<sup>304</sup> *וַיְהִי דְּבַר־יְהוָה אֵלַי*; *דְּבַר־יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר הָיָה אֵלַי*; see Jer 1:1, 4, 11, 13; 11:1; etc.; Ezek 1:3; 6:1; etc.; Hos 1:1; Joel 1:1; Jonah 1:1; 3:1; Mic 1:1; Zeph 1:1; Hag 1:1; 2:11,21; Zech 1:1, 7; 8:1.

Jer 11:1; 18:1; 21:1; 32(39):1; 40(47):1

הדבר אשר היה	Ὁ λόγος ὁ γενόμενος
אל־ירמיהו מאת יהוה (לאמר)	παρὰ κυρίου πρὸς Ἱερεμیان (λέγων)

It is notable that in all the above-mentioned attestations of this formula in Jeremiah the phrases אל־ירמיהו and מאת יהוה have in the translation had a change of position as compared to the Hebrew.<sup>305</sup> LXX Isa 2:1 reflects the order of the *Greek* version of the Jeremianic formula, which might betray that the Isaiah translator relied on the Greek text of Jeremiah rather than on the Hebrew.

Isa 8:15–16	ונלכדו	καὶ ἀλώσονται ἄνθρωποι ἐν ἀσφαλείᾳ ὄντες.
צור תעודה חתום תורה		Τότε φανεροὶ ἔσονται οἱ σφραγιζόμενοι τὸν νόμον
בלמדי		τοῦ μὴ μαθεῖν.

The translator may have read תעודה (“testimony”) as תועדה—a third person feminine singular imperfect of the Nif’al of ידע—“she will be known,”<sup>306</sup> or as תועדיה—an imperfect of the Hif’il of that same root, and hence have given a rendering by φανεροὶ ἔσονται. A similar translation can be found in Isa 64:1(2), where לצריך matches καὶ φανερόν ἐσται τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου. The preceding verbal form צור (an imperative of צר—“to wrap”) he presumably identified as the noun צור—“rock” (see ולצור in verse 14), interpreting this as a metaphor for safety, and basing on it a translation with ἐν ἀσφαλείᾳ.<sup>307</sup> With the help of ἐν ἀσφαλείᾳ he formed a subject to the verb ונלכדו (“they will be captured,” in the MT belonging to the previous clause), namely ἄνθρωποι ἐν ἀσφαλείᾳ ὄντες.<sup>308</sup> The supply of ἄνθρωποι may, according to Ziegler, be connected to Jer 5:26 and 6:11. These verses correspondingly depict people that are going to be seized:

<sup>305</sup> In LXX Jer 37:1 (MT: 30:1); 41:1, 8 (MT: 34:1, 4); and 42:1 (MT: 35:1) one finds similar formulae reflecting the same order as the MT: Ὁ λόγος ὁ γενόμενος πρὸς Ἱερεμیان παρὰ κυρίου.

<sup>306</sup> See Exod 33:16 and Prov 14:33.

<sup>307</sup> Fischer, *In welcher Schrift*, 23; van der Kooij, “Isaiah in the Septuagint,” 526–27.

<sup>308</sup> The expression ἄνθρωποι ἐν ἀσφαλείᾳ ὄντες in its entirety might echo the common biblical phraseology “to live in security” (ל[ב]טח / ישב / שכן); see e.g. Lev 25:18,19; 26:5; Deut 12:10; 33:12,28; Judg 18:7; 1 Sam 12:11; 1 Kgs 5:5; Ps 16:9; Prov 1:33; 3:29; Isa 47:8; Jer 23:6; 32:37; 33:16; 49:31; Ezek 28:26; 34:25, 28; 38:8, 11, 14; 39:6, 26; Zeph 2:15; and Zech 14:11. For a related expression in Isa itself, see Isa 47:8 עדינה היושב לבטח / ἡ τρυφερά ἡ καθημένη πεποιθυῖα. In the Pentateuch a secure living forms part of God’s blessing of the people for keeping his laws, contrasted by a curse that if they do not obey the law, they will be delivered into the hands of their enemies (see e.g. Lev 25:18, 19; 26:5, 17; Deut 12:10). In the prophetic books the theme of an attack against people living in safety recurs repeatedly; see e.g. Jer 49:31; and Ezek 38:11; 39:6, 26.

Jer 5:26	כִּי־נמצאו בעמי רשעים ישור כשך יקושים הציבו משחית אנשים ילכדו	ὅτι εὐρέθησαν ἐν τῷ λαῷ μου ἄσεβεῖς, καὶ παγίδας ἔστησαν διαφθεῖραι <b>ἄνδρας</b> καὶ <b>συνελαμβάνουσιν</b>
Jer 6:11	שפך על־עולל בחוץ ועל סוד בחורים יחדו כִּי־גם־איש עס־אשה ילכדו זקן עס־מלא ימים	ἐκχεῶ ἐπὶ νήπια ἔξωθεν καὶ ἐπὶ συναγωγὴν νεανίσκων ἅμα, ὅτι <b>ἄνῃρ</b> καὶ γυνή <b>σὺλλημφθήσονται</b> , πρεσβύτερος μετὰ πλήρους ἡμερῶν.

Ziegler assumes that the Isaiah translator read אנשים as a gloss from Jer 5:26 in his *Vorlage*.<sup>309</sup> However I do not think this is convincing: LXX Isa 8:15–16 as a whole forms a quite free and associative translation; the addition of ἄνθρωποι is rather a mere element of this rephrasing of the Hebrew. Moreover, the addition of ἄνθρωποι seems to be tendentious for LXX Isaiah. For more examples, see section 2.7.

Isa 9:12(13)	ואת־יהוה <b>צבאות</b> לא דרשו	καὶ ὁ λαὸς οὐκ ἀπεστράφη, ἕως ἐπλήγη, καὶ τὸν κύριον οὐκ ἐξεζήτησαν.
--------------	-------------------------------	---

The missing of a counterpart to צבאות in LXX Isa 9:13 can perhaps be explained in the light of Jer 10:21. In that verse we find an almost identical clause, but without צבאות:

Jer 10:21	כי נבערו הרעים ואת־יהוה לא דרשו	ὅτι οἱ ποιμένες ἡφρονεύσαντο καὶ τὸν κύριον οὐκ ἐξεζήτησαν.
-----------	------------------------------------	--

Isa 9:17(18)	כִּי־בערה כאש רשעה שמיר ושית תאכל ותצת בסבכי היער ויתאכבו גאות עשן	καὶ καυθήσεται ὡς πῦρ ἡ ἀνομία καὶ ὡς ἄγρωςτις ξηρὰ βρωθήσεται ὑπὸ πυρός. καὶ καυθήσεται ἐν τοῖς δάσεσι τοῦ δρυμοῦ, καὶ <b>συγκαταφάγεται τὰ κύκλω</b> <b>τῶν βουνῶν πάντα</b> . <sup>310</sup>
--------------	--	---

The Hebrew sentence ויתאכבו גאות עשן (“and they swirled upward in a column of smoke”) is represented, in what at first glance seems a curious manner, by καὶ συγκαταφάγεται τὰ κύκλω τῶν βουνῶν πάντα (“and it will devour everything around the hills”). This translation appears to be the outcome of a complex interplay of associative and anaphoric manoeuvres. The first word of the

<sup>309</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 62.

<sup>310</sup> Perhaps τὰ κύκλω in LXX Isa 9:18 is not a plus, but a rendering of בסבכי, read as מסביב—the Hebrew equivalent for τὰ κύκλω. Arguing against this, though, is the fact that בסבכי occurs in another sentence, and is already represented there by ἐν τοῖς δάσεσι. For τὰ κύκλω, see also LXX Isa 19:7, which deals with destruction too: καὶ τὸ ἄχι τὸ χλωρὸν πᾶν τὸ κύκλω τοῦ ποταμοῦ ... ξηρανθήσεται ἀνεμόφθορον (MT: ייבש נדף ואיננו) ... ערות על־יארור על־פי יארור.



clause—וּיִתְאָכְלוּ—was perhaps linked to וּיִתְאָכְלוּ, and translated συγκαταφάγεται.<sup>311</sup> Also the occurrence of תֹּאכַל earlier in verse 18 may have encouraged this rendering. The use of βουνός will have been triggered by גְּאוֹת, which was interpreted as a substantivated adjective feminine plural “the heights” (גְּאוֹת) instead of as a singular noun גְּאוֹת (“column”).<sup>312</sup> Besides, in the selection of this Greek noun, and in the formation of the Greek text of Isa 9:17(18) in general, a role may have been played by LXX Isa 10:18. This verse too threatens the people with the burning of hills and forests in the future:<sup>313</sup>

Isa 10:18	וּכְבוֹד יֵעָרוּ וּכְרֵמָיו מִנֶּפֶשׁ וְעַד־בֶּשֶׂר יִכְלֶה	τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἀποσβεσθήσεται τὰ ὄρη καὶ οἱ βουνοὶ καὶ οἱ δρυμοί, καὶ καταφάγεται ἀπὸ ψυχῆς ἕως σαρκῶν.
-----------	---	--

The picture of a forest fire may further have reminded the translator of two passages in Jeremiah, from which he possibly obtained the words τὰ κύκλω ... πάντα:<sup>314</sup>

Jer 21:14	וְהָצַתִּי אֶשׁ בִּיעֶרָה וְאָכְלָה כָּל־סִבְיָיָהּ	καὶ ἀνάψω πῦρ ἐν τῷ δρυμῷ αὐτῆς, καὶ ἔδεται πάντα τὰ κύκλω αὐτῆς.
Jer 50(27):32	וְהָצַתִּי אֶשׁ בְּעָרָיו וְאָכְלָה כָּל־סִבְיָיָתָיו	καὶ ἀνάψω πῦρ ἐν τῷ δρυμῷ αὐτῆς, καὶ καταφάγεται πάντα τὰ κύκλω αὐτῆς.

Isa 13:14	וְהָיָה כָצֵי מִדְּחַ וּכְצֵאן	καὶ ἔσονται οἱ καταλελειμμένοι ὡς δορκάδιον φεῦγον καὶ ὡς πρόβατον <u>πλανώμενον</u>
-----------	-----------------------------------	---

The only other place in the LXX where one comes across the exact phrase πρόβατον πλανώμενον is LXX Jer 27:17:

Jer 50(27):17    שֶׁה פְּזוּרָה יִשְׂרָאֵל    Πρόβατον πλανώμενον Ἰσραὴλ

Because πλανώμενον (“wandering”) in LXX Jer 27:17 is not a very strict rendering of פְּזוּרָה (“scattered”)—this verb in the LXX mostly parallels (δια)σπείρω or διασκορπίζω—<sup>315</sup> the supposition arises that the translator has imported the words πρόβατον πλανώμενον from the Greek rather than from the Hebrew text of Jer 50(27):17. Nonetheless, the addition of πλανώμενον could

<sup>311</sup> George Buchanan Gray, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Isaiah* (2 vols.; ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1912), 1:188.

<sup>312</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 109; Koenig, *L'herméneutique analogique*, 14.

<sup>313</sup> In Isa 10:18 βουνός does, however, not form a straightforward translation of the Hebrew either, but renders—together with τὰ ὄρη—וּכְרֵמָיו (see also section 6.3a).

<sup>314</sup> Compare Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 110; in Ziegler's view the text of these Jeremianic verses may already have been extant in the Hebrew *Vorlage* of LXX Isaiah in the form of a gloss.

<sup>315</sup> For פִּזַּר / (δια)σπείρω, see Esth 3:8; Prov 11:24; and Joel 4:2. For פִּזַּר / διασκορπίζω, see Ps 53(52):6; 89(88):11; 112(111):9; and 141(140):7.

also be due to *intratextual* borrowing, as we find related phraseology in LXX Isa 53:6 (πάντες ὡς πρόβατα ἐπλανήθημεν). Also in Ps 119(118):176 we have noticed a similar expression (see section 9.4.2). Last but not least, πλανώμενον could have been added in LXX Isa 13:14 independently from any other biblical text, merely on the grounds that it is parallel to φεύγον in the preceding line.

Isa 22:5	כי יום מהומה ומבוסה ומבוכה לאדני יהוה צבאות בגיא חזיון	ὅτι <u>ἡμέρα ταραχῆς καὶ ἀπωλείας</u> καὶ καταπατήματος καὶ πλάνησις παρὰ κυρίου σαβαωθ ἐν φάραγγι Σιων.
----------	--	--

The expression *ἡμέρα ταραχῆς καὶ ἀπωλείας* is reminiscent of the apocalyptic phrase *ἡμέρα ἀπωλείας* in Jer 18:17 and 46(26):21:

Jer 18:17	כְּרוּח־קִדִּים אֲפִצִּם לִפְנֵי אוֹיֵב עָרָה וּלְאֲדָנִים אֲרָאם בְּיוֹם אִידִם	ὡς ἄνεμον καύσωνα διασπερῶ αὐτοὺς κατὰ πρόσωπον ἐχθρῶν αὐτῶν, δεῖξω αὐτοῖς <u>ἡμέραν ἀπωλείας</u> αὐτῶν.
Jer 46(26):21	כי יום אידם בא עליהם עת פקדתם	ὅτι <u>ἡμέρα ἀπωλείας</u> ἦλθεν ἐπ' αὐτοὺς καὶ καιρὸς ἐκδικήσεως αὐτῶν.

However, this phraseology is not exclusive to the book of Jeremiah: it can also be found in Deut 32:35 and Obad 1:12, 13.<sup>316</sup> As the expression in LXX Isa 22:5 does not exactly match *ἡμέρα ἀπωλείας*, it is moreover doubtful if it has anything to do with the specific verses mentioned. It could equally have been the translator's own creation, perhaps affected by a biblical style of writing.

Isa 25:1	יהוה אלהי אתה ארוממך אודה שמך כי עשית פלא עצות מרחוק אמונה אמן	Κύριε ὁ θεός μου, δοξάσω σε, ὑμνήσω τὸ ὄνομά σου, ὅτι ἐποίησας θαυμαστά πράγματα, βουλὴν ἀρχαίαν ἀληθινήν· <u>γένοιτο, κύριε.</u>
----------	---	--

The Isaiah translator has understood אמן (MT: אֱמֵן “faithfulness”) as though it were vocalised אָמֵן (“Amen” = γένοιτο), and has complemented this optative with the addressee κύριε.<sup>317</sup> The phrase γένοιτο, κύριε finds its only parallels in Ps Sol 4:14,25 and LXX Jer 3:19 and 11:5:

Jer 3:19	ואנכי אמרתי	καὶ ἐγὼ εἶπα <u>Γένοιτο, κύριε.</u>
Jer 11:5	ואען ואמר אמן יהוה	καὶ ἀπεκρίθην καὶ εἶπα <u>Γένοιτο, κύριε.</u>

<sup>316</sup> See section 9.4.5.4.

<sup>317</sup> κύριε may additionally (or better) have been added for stylistic reasons, see section 8.3.1.1a.

Still, it is far from certain whether the Isaiah translator was familiar with this formula through the Greek text of Jeremiah, or just because it belonged to the religious jargon of his time.<sup>318</sup>

Isa 34:15–16	אֲדָשִׁים נִקְבְּצוּ דִּיּוֹת אִשֵּׁה רַעוּתָהּ דְּרָשׁוּ מֵעַל־סֵפֶר יְהוָה וּקְרָאוּ אֶחָת מֵהֵנָּה לֹא נִעְדְּרָה	ἐκεῖ ἔλαφοι συνήντησαν καὶ εἶδον τὰ πρόσωπα ἀλλήλων· ἀριθμῶ παρῆλθον, καὶ μία αὐτῶν οὐκ ἀπώλετο
--------------	---	--

The first line of verse 16 in the LXX—ἀριθμῶ παρῆλθον (“They have passed by in [their full] number”)—is fairly different from the Hebrew דְּרָשׁוּ מֵעַל־סֵפֶר יְהוָה וּקְרָאוּ (“Seek from the book of the LORD and read”). The one word that seems to link these two clauses is סֵפֶר, which was in all likelihood associated with מִסְפָּר—“number”—and then translated ἀριθμῶ. Despite its divergent content, the Greek sentence fits perfectly well in the context: it is congruent with the imagery of the gathered animals contained in the preceding verse, and is logically connected to the succeeding words καὶ μία αὐτῶν οὐκ ἀπώλετο (“and not one of them has perished”). The MT counterpart דְּרָשׁוּ מֵעַל־סֵפֶר יְהוָה וּקְרָאוּ, in contrast, turns up somewhat unexpectedly against the background of the surrounding text. It was probably this seeming discontinuity that made the Isaiah translator reformulate the Hebrew. In doing this, Ziegler believes him to have drawn inspiration from Jer 33(40):13, where animals are counted by letting them pass under the hands of the one who counts them:<sup>319</sup>

Jer 33(40):13	עַד תַּעֲבִרְנָה הַצֶּאֱן עַל־יָדַי מוֹנֵה אֹמֵר יְהוָה	ἔτι παρελεύσεται πρόβατα ἐπὶ χειρᾶ ἀριθμοῦντος, εἶπε κύριος.
---------------	--	---

In opposition to such a connection between LXX Isa 34:16 and Jer 33(40):13 is the fact that even though from a formal perspective ἀριθμῶ in LXX Isa 34:1 resembles the ἀριθμοῦντος of LXX Jer 40:13, yet the connotation these words bear, is different: the passing by “in [full] number” of the animals in LXX Isa 34:16 does not necessarily presuppose their being “counted,” as is mention of in Jer 33(40):13. From this point of view, the words ἀριθμῶ παρῆλθον may equally well have been chosen by the Isaiah translator without reference to Jer 33(40):13, simply because they went together well with the ensuing clause καὶ μία αὐτῶν οὐκ ἀπώλετο, and because of the link between סֵפֶר and מִסְפָּר.

<sup>318</sup> Coste (“Le texte grec d’Isaïe XXV 1–5,” 38) thinks that the translator in employing ἔνεοιτο, κύριε was led by liturgical habits.

<sup>319</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 122–23.

Isa 36:22	ויבא אליקים בן-חלקיהו אשר-על-הבית ושבנא הסופר ויואח בן-אסף המוכיר אל-חזקיהו קרועי בגדים	Καὶ εἰσῆλθεν Ἐλιακὶμ ὁ τοῦ Χελκιου ὁ οἰκονόμος καὶ Σομνας ὁ γραμματεὺς <u>τῆς δυνάμεως</u> <sup>320</sup> καὶ Ἰωαχ ὁ τοῦ Ἀσαφ ὁ ὑπομνηματογράφος πρὸς Ἐζεκιαν ἐσχισμένοι τοὺς χιτῶνας
-----------	---	---

The designation ὁ γραμματεὺς τῆς δυνάμεως has its only precedent in Jer 52:25 (even if there the plural of δυνάμεις has been used):

Jer 52:25	ושבעה אנשים מראי פני-המלך אשר נמצאו בעיר ואת ספר שר הצבא המצבא את-עם הארץ	καὶ ἑπτὰ ἄνδρας ὀνομαστοὺς ἐν προσώπῳ τοῦ βασιλέως τοὺς εὐρεθέντας ἐν τῇ πόλει καὶ τὸν γραμματέα τῶν δυνάμεων τὸν γραμματεῦντα τῷ λαῷ τῆς γῆς
-----------	--	--

Given that the conformity merely applies to the Greek versions of the expression—the Hebrew of Jer 52:25 offering **שר הצבא** ואת **ספר שר**—the Isaiah translator has more likely relied on the *Greek* text of Jer 52:25.<sup>321</sup>

Isa 37:4	ונשאת תפלה בעד השארית הנמצאה	καὶ δεηθήσῃ πρὸς κύριον τὸν θεόν σου περὶ τῶν καταλειμμένων τούτων.
----------	---------------------------------	--

The primary clarification for the plus πρὸς κύριον τὸν θεόν σου in LXX Isa 37:4 is that these words have been supplied in repetition of the two earlier occurrences of κύριος ὁ θεός σου in the same verse. Simultaneously, the Greek text yields a striking resemblance with Jer 42:2, which hints at the influence of that Jeremican verse as an additional factor:<sup>322</sup>

Jer 42(49):2	תפליגא חתנתנו לפניך והתפלל בעדנו אליהוה אלהיך בעד כל-השארית הזאת כי-נשארנו מעט מהרב	Πεσέτω τὸ ἔλεος ἡμῶν κατὰ πρόσωπόν σου καὶ πρόσευξαι πρὸς κύριον τὸν θεόν σου περὶ τῶν καταλοίπων τούτων, ὅτι κατελείφθημεν ὀλίγοι ἀπὸ πολλῶν
--------------	--	--

The feasibility of the dependence of LXX Isa 37:4 on Jer 42(49):2 is sustained by the variant translation of **נמצאה השארית** בעד in the former as *περὶ τῶν καταλειμμένων τούτων*, which may have been realised in analogy to **נמצאה השארית הזאת** in Jer 42:2. The distinct vocabulary of the two Greek texts (*δεηθήσῃ* versus *πρόσευξαι*, *καταλειμμένων* versus *καταλοίπων*) points in the

<sup>320</sup> In the LXX version of 2 Kgs 18:37—which is parallel to Isa 36:22—the plus is missing.

<sup>321</sup> Jer 52:25 has a parallel in 2 Kgs (4 Kgdms) 25:19. In the LXX of that verse the Hebrew is translated in a literal way, that is, by τὸν γραμματέα τοῦ ἄρχοντος τῆς δυνάμεως. So שר did receive a rendering there.

<sup>322</sup> Compare *HUB Isa*, 156.

direction of the Hebrew text of Jeremiah having served as an example for the Isaiah translator.<sup>323</sup>

**Isa 45:13**      גְּלוּתֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל      καὶ τὴν αἰχμαλωσίαν τοῦ λαοῦ μου ἐπιστρέψει<sup>324</sup>

The words “the captivity of my people” are attested in a number of Psalms and in Amos 9:14, and besides, also in Hos 6:11 and Jer 30(37):3. According to Zillesen, the Isaiah translator may have added τοῦ λαοῦ μου in LXX Isa 45:13 in harmonisation with that Jeremianic text:

Jer 30(37):3	ושבתי את־שבֹּת עמי ישראל ויהודה אמר יהוה והשבתי את־הארץ אשר־נתתי לאבותם וירשוה	καὶ ἀποστρέψω τὴν ἀποικίαν λαοῦ μου Ἰσραὴλ καὶ Ἰουδα, εἶπε κύριος, καὶ ἀποστρέψω αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν γῆν, ἣν ἔδωκα τοῖς πατράσιν αὐτῶν, καὶ κυριεύσουσιν αὐτῆς.
--------------	--	--

For a further discussion of this plus, see sections 9.4.2.1 and 9.4.5.3.

**Isa 57:20**      והרשעים בִּים נגרשׁ      οἱ δὲ ἄδικοι οὕτως κλυδωνισθήσονται  
כי השקט לא יוכל      καὶ ἀναπαύσασθαι οὐ δυνήσονται.  
ויגרשו מימיו רפשׁ וטיט

The LXX of Isa 57:20 does not provide an equivalent to בִּים and נגרשׁ מימיו רפשׁ וטיט.<sup>325</sup> Perhaps these words were left out after the example of a related text in LXX Jer 30:23. The Hebrew version of that verse, in conformity to the MT of Isa 57:20, compares confused people with the troubled sea. In the Greek translation of the Jeremianic verse, just as in the LXX of Isa 57:20, the comparison has been removed through the omission of a word for “sea”:

Jer 49:23(30:12)	נמגו בִּים דאגה השקט לא יוכל	ἐξέστησαν, ἐθυμώθησαν, ἀναπαύσασθαι οὐ μὴ δύνωνται.
------------------	---------------------------------	--

This case however leaves uncertainty about the direction of the dependence: it also allows that it was the translator of LXX Jeremiah who based his omission of בִּים on LXX Isaiah.

<sup>323</sup> However, LXX Isaiah accords with the *Greek* text of Jeremiah in that it speaks of “these left ones,” rather than of “all these left ones,” such as MT Jer offers.

<sup>324</sup> Also the Targum shows this plus.

<sup>325</sup> Perhaps בִּים is not a minus, but was read as כּמו and represented by οὕτως.

#### 9.4.3.4. Conclusion to 9.4.3

The translator of LXX Isaiah appears to have occasionally elaborated the extant links between the prophetic works of Isaiah and Jeremiah in his translation through changing, adding or omitting elements in analogy to a Jeremianic passage. This in particular concerns the related chapters Jer 48 and Isa 15–16 (on the destruction of Moab), as well as Jer 10 and Isa 44 and 46 (on the production of idols). In the Greek translation of those Isaianic chapters a relatively large number of additional allusions to Jeremiah can be found.

The added or omitted elements in LXX Isaiah in some cases seem to derive from the *Hebrew* version of Jeremiah, in that they merely produce or strengthen a correspondence with a Jeremianic text in *content*, while in the mutual Greek translations the vocabulary differs. This we encounter strikingly often in the instances of the possible influence of Jer 48 on LXX Isa 15 and 16: see Isa 15:2–3/Jer 48(31):37; Isa 15:5/Jer 48(31):3; Isa 16:7/Jer 48(31):31,36; and Isa 16:10/Jer 48(31):33. Apart from these cases, this happens in only one other place: Isa 37:4/Jer 42(49):2.

Nevertheless, other examples permit the possibility of the Isaiah translator having brought in elements from the *Greek* text of Jeremiah; this is a plausible option when the two translations exhibit precise similarity in their wording: see Isa 9:12(13)/Jer 10:21; Isa 9:17(18)/Jer 21:14; 50(27):32; Isa 25:1/Jer 3:19; 11:5; Isa 34:15–16/Jer 33(40):13; Isa 36:22/Jer 52:25; and Isa 44:14/Jer 10:3. The reliance of LXX Isaiah on the Greek Jeremiah is even more feasible when a plus or minus in LXX Isaiah accords with the LXX of Jeremiah, yet deviates from Jeremiah's Hebrew text, which is the case in Isa 2:1/Jer 11:1, etc.; Isa 13:14/Jer 50(27):17; Isa 36:22/Jer 52:25; Isa 46:7/Jer 10:4; and Isa 57:20/Jer 49:23 (30:12).

As a conclusion, this modest investigation seems to indicate that the Isaiah translator in composing his translation made use of both the Hebrew and Greek versions of Jeremiah as his sources of inspiration.

#### 9.4.4 LXX Isaiah and Ezekiel

As is the case for the majority of Greek Bible translations, the date of origin of the Septuagint of Ezekiel is also a matter of disputation. Nor is it established yet whether Ezekiel was translated into Greek prior to the book of Isaiah or after it. As noted in the previous paragraph, Thackeray has advanced the opinion that the prophetic works of Ezekiel, Jeremiah, and the Twelve Prophets were rendered into Greek in a later period than Isaiah, which he concluded on basis of the freer translation style of the latter.<sup>326</sup> Notwithstanding this, Thackeray also believed

<sup>326</sup> Thackeray, "Greek translators of the Prophetic Books," 583.

that the Greek translations of some of the Prophets contained early sections that were already in circulation before the prophetic books had been translated in their entirety. Those sections would have functioned in the synagogue as part of the worship from an early period and were later on adopted by the LXX translators of the Prophets and integrated into their translations.<sup>327</sup> As an example Thackeray mentions Ezek 36:24–38, “where the LXX version of an early Christian Pentecost lesson ..., the lectionary use of which was inherited from Judaism, is clearly marked off from its context by peculiarities of style.”<sup>328</sup> Arguing from this point of view, if such older Greek translation fragments actually existed, they might already have been familiar to the translator of Isaiah. Nonetheless, this thesis of Thackeray on the existence of earlier sections within the Greek translations of the prophetic books is nowadays rather controversial.<sup>329</sup>

A different view is held by Seeligmann. This scholar posits that the entire translation of the Greek Ezekiel (as well as the LXX of the Twelve Prophets) was already circulating at the time of the Isaiah translator, and has even had an influence on the Greek Isaiah. In order to defend his theory Seeligmann provides some examples of renderings in LXX Isaiah which, in his eyes, could be considered as being based upon the Greek Ezekiel.<sup>330</sup> In the present paragraph I will examine several of these cases, in addition to a number of other ones in which a plus or minus in LXX Isaiah might be explained as having been influenced by the book of Ezekiel. While analysing these instances, I will seek to find out whether the Isaiah translator has indeed made use of Ezekiel, and if so, whether this was in its Hebrew or in its Greek version (or in both).

#### 9.4.4.1 Influence of Ezek 16 and 23

Two chapters in Ezekiel which concentrate on themes that also play an important role in the book of Isaiah are Ezek 16 and 23. Ezek 16 tells the story of a woman—symbolising Jerusalem—who is rejected as a child, but taken by God to be his wife. But the woman commits adultery and prostitutes herself with

<sup>327</sup> Thackeray, *Grammar*, 1:10–12; Henry St. J. Thackeray, *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship. A Study in Origins* (Schweich lectures 1920; London: Oxford University Press, 1923), 28; idem, “The Bisection of Books in Primitive Septuagint Mss.” *JTS* 9 (1908): 88–98.

<sup>328</sup> Henry St. J. Thackeray, “Primitive Lectionary Notes in the Psalm of Habakkuk,” *JTS* 12 (1911): 210; see also idem, “The Greek Translators of Ezekiel,” *JTS* 4 (1903): 407–8.

<sup>329</sup> See Dorival, Harl and Munnich, *La Bible grecque*, 100–1.

<sup>330</sup> Seeligmann (*Septuagint Version*, 74) mentions *καὶ ἐπλήθυνας τὴν πορνείαν σου* in LXX Isa 57:9, which would have been borrowed from LXX Ezek 16:25 and 23:19 (see the discussion of these verses below); *καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ οἱ τὴν παραλίαν κατοικοῦντες* in LXX Isa 9:1, adopted from LXX Ezek 25:16 (see below); and *καὶ ἐν τοῖς προθύροις ἔσθοντες κρέας ὕειον καὶ τὰ βδελύγματα* in LXX Isa 66:17, influenced by LXX Ezek 8:10.

strange people. Because of this God delivers her into the hands of her enemies. Ezek 23 presents a similar parable, but this time involving two women, representing Jerusalem and Samaria. Motifs in these two chapters that also feature in Isaiah are the woman as a symbol for a group of people (see for instance Isa 47; 54:6; and 57:6–13), the going for help to enemies such as Egypt and Assur (compare Ezek 16:26 with Isa 20:6; 30:2–7,32; and 31:1–3) and the bringing of offerings to idols.

In the following cases a plus or minus in LXX Isaiah may be dependent upon Ezek 16 and/or 23:

#### Isa 14:19–20

ואתה השלכת מקברך  
כנצר נתעב לבוש  
הרגים מטעני חרב  
יורדי אל-אבני-בור  
כפגר מובס

σὺ δὲ ριφήσῃ ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν  
ὡς νεκρὸς ἐβδελυγμένος μετὰ πολλῶν  
τεθνηκότων ἐκκεκεντημένων μαχαίραις  
καταβαίνοντων εἰς ἔδου.  
ὃν τρόπον ἱμάτιον ἐν αἵματι πεφυρμένον οὐκ  
ἔσται καθαρόν, οὕτως οὐδὲ σὺ ἔσῃ καθαρὸς

The LXX presents a text that in some points deviates markedly from the Hebrew; especially the extra words at the end of verse 20 are notable:

MT Isa 14:19–20: but you are cast out, away from your grave, like loathsome carrion, clothed with the dead, those pierced by the sword, who go down to the stones of the Pit, like a corpse trampled underfoot.

LXX Isa 14:19–20: but you will be cast out on the mountains, like an abominable corpse, with many dead, those pierced with swords, who go down into Hades. As a cloak stained with blood will not be clean, so neither will you be clean

How did the translator arrive at this remarkable translation? לבוש הרגים (“clothed with the slain”) he probably paraphrased as μετὰ πολλῶν τεθνηκότων (“with many dead”). פֶּגֶר (“corpse”) he may have linked to בָּגָד and translated by ἱμάτιον (“robe”);<sup>331</sup> מובס (“trodden,” Hof. בּוּס) he has perhaps associated with the Hitpolel of בּוּס, meaning “to flounder,” which may have prompted a rendering by πεφυρμένον (“stained”; see below); he might additionally have translated מובס as οὐκ ἔσται καθαρόν, by means of the association with the Polel of בּוּס—“to desecrate.” An alternative solution is proposed by Seeligmann, who contends that לבוש הרגים is rendered twice: (a) by μετὰ πολλῶν τεθνηκότων and

<sup>331</sup> For the image of a robe stained with blood, compare also MT Isa 9:4 ושמלה מגוללה בדמים (LXX: καὶ ἱμάτιον μετὰ καταλλαγῆς). It is possible that the translator, in rendering 14:19, was influenced by this Hebrew wording; compare its Greek translation by Aquila: καὶ ἱματισμός πεφυρμένος ἐν αἵμασιν. Perhaps he was also inspired by the text in Gen 37:31 on Joseph’s robe: “Then they took Joseph’s robe, and killed a goat, and dipped the robe in the blood.”



(b) by a “paraenetic meditation” *ὃν τρόπον ἱμάτιον ἐν αἵματι πεφυρμένον οὐκ ἔσται καθαρόν, οὕτως οὐδὲ σὺ ἔσῃ καθαρός* (שבוי = “garment”).<sup>332</sup>

Outside of LXX Isa 14:19 the expression “stained with blood” occurs in LXX Ezek 16.<sup>333</sup> There too a participle perfect of *φύρομαι* represents an inflection of בוס, in this case מתבוססת, which is a Hitpolel with the meaning of “to flounder”:

Ezek 16:6 *וּאֵרָאךְ מִתְבֹּסֶסֶת בַּדִּמְיָךְ* *καὶ εἶδόν σε πεφυρμένην ἐν τῷ αἵματί σου*

Ezek 16:22 *וַעֲרִיָה מִתְבֹּסֶסֶת בַּדִּמְיָךְ הַיֵּית* *καὶ πεφυρμένη ἐν τῷ αἵματί σου ἔζησας.*

It may well be that the occurrence of the root בוס in Isa 14:19 reminded the Isaiah translator of these passages in Ezekiel, and that on those grounds he rendered מובס in the same way as מתבוססת in Ezek 16:6, 22—that is, by a participle of *φύρομαι*—and added *ἐν αἵματι* in analogy to those verses as well. Aside from the appearance of בוס, a metaphor that both texts contain may also have served as a link: the depiction in Isa 14:19 of a man who is cast out on the mountains (or—in the Hebrew—away from his grave) may have recalled the imagery in Ezek 16:5 of a new-born baby cast out in the open fields:

Ezek 16:5 *וְתִשְׁלַכִּי אֶל-פְּנֵי הַשָּׂדֶה בְּגֵעַל נַפְשֶׁךְ בְּיוֹם הַלֵּדְתְּ אֶתְךָ* *καὶ ἀπερρίψης ἐπὶ πρόσωπον τοῦ πεδίου σκολιότητι τῆς ψυχῆς σου τῇ ἐν ᾗ ἡμέρᾳ ἐτέχθης.*

Isa 14:19 *וְאַתָּה הַשְׁלַכְתָּ מִקְבְּרֶךְ* *σὺ δὲ ῥιφήσῃ ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν*

Isa 32:9–10 *נָשִׁים שֹׂאֲנוֹת קִמְנָה שִׁמְעָנָה קוֹלִי בָנוֹת בַּטְחוֹת הָאֲזֹנָה אִמְרָתִי יָמִים עַל-שָׁנָה תִּרְגְּזֶנָּה בַּטְחוֹת* *Γυναῖκες πλούσιαι, ἀνάστητε καὶ ἀκούσατε τῆς φωνῆς μου. θυγατέρες ἐν ἐλπίδι, ἀκούσατε τοὺς λόγους μου. ἡμέρας ἐνιαυτοῦ μνηλεὴν ποιήσασθε ἐν ὀδύνῃ μετ’ ἐλπίδος.*

Whereas the final line in the Hebrew (יָמִים עַל-שָׁנָה תִּרְגְּזֶנָּה בַּטְחוֹת) reads in translation “In little more than a year you will shudder, you complacent women,” the Greek offers *ἡμέρας ἐνιαυτοῦ μνηλεὴν ποιήσασθε ἐν ὀδύνῃ μετ’ ἐλπίδος*—“Mention the days of a year in pain with hope.” Probably the translator has reached this translation by converting the verb form תִּרְגְּזֶנָּה (from רגז—“to quiver,” “to be agitated”) into the semantically related ἐν ὀδύνῃ—“in pain”; in

<sup>332</sup> Seeligmann, *Septuagint Version*, 34.

<sup>333</sup> Besides in Ezek 16:6, 22 and Isa 14:19 *φύρομαι* in combination with *αἷμα* only appears in 2 Kgdms 20:12 (*πεφυρμένος ἐν τῷ αἵματι*; MT: מתגלל בדם), and Job 39:30(33).

addition, he may have rendered the same verb by *μνείαν ποιήσασθε*, arrived at through the association with תִּזְכְּרָנָה (changing the ל of תִּרְגֹּנָה into a כ, and transposing the ר and the ז). The use of an imperative in the sense of “to remember” addressed to the “daughters in hope,” may be founded on Ezek 16:22 and 43. In those verses God blames the faithless woman Jerusalem for not having remembered the days of her youth. Even though the vocabulary in these verses in Ezekiel does not exactly correspond to that of LXX Isa 32:10, and even if a broader connection between the passages in Ezekiel and Isaiah is not immediately visible, still it is possible that the Isaiah translator has been influenced by Ezek 16:22 and 43, the more so as he appears to have utilised Ezek 16:22 before, that is, in translating Isa 14:19 (see above).

Ezek 16:22	וְאֵת כָּל־תּוֹעֲבֹתֶיךָ וְתִזְכְּרֶינָה לֹא זָכַרְתִּי אֶת־יְמֵי נְעוּרֶיךָ בְּהִיּוֹתְךָ עַרְם וְעִרְיָה מִתְּבוֹסֶסֶת בְּדַמְךָ הָיִיתָ	τοῦτο παρὰ πᾶσαν τὴν πορνείαν σου, καὶ οὐκ ἐμνήσθης τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς νηπιότητός σου, ὅτε ἦσθα γυμνὴ καὶ ἀσχημονοῦσα καὶ πεφυρμένη ἐν τῷ αἵματί σου ἕζησας.
Ezek 16:43	יֶעַן אֲשֶׁר לֹא־זָכַרְתִּי אֶת־יְמֵי נְעוּרֶיךָ וְתִרְגֹּנִי־לִי בְּכָל־אֵלָה	ἀνθ' ὧν οὐκ ἐμνήσθης τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς νηπιότητός σου καὶ ἐλύπεις με ἐν πᾶσι τούτοις

Two additional links between Isa 32 and Ezek 16 are, firstly, the use of the form תִּרְגֹּנִי (Hif'il רגנ) in Ezek 16:43, which finds a parallel in תִּרְגֹּנָה (Qal רגנ) in Isa 32:10, and secondly, the nakedness of the adulterous woman by which God will humiliate her in front of her lovers in Ezek 16:37,39 as compared to the nakedness of the women as a sign of mourning in Isa 32:11:

Isa 32:11	חֲרָדוּ שְׂאֲנֹנֹת רִגּוּהַּ בַּטְחוֹת פִּשְׁטָה וְעִרְיָה	ἔκστητε, λυπήθητε, αἱ πεποιθυῖαι, ἐκδύσασθε, γυμναὶ γένεσθε
Ezek 16:37	וְגִלִּיתִי עֶרְוַתְךָ אֵלֶיךָ וְרָאוּ אֶת־כָּל־עֶרְוַתְךָ	καὶ ἀποκαλύψω τὰς κακίας σου πρὸς αὐτούς, καὶ ὄψονται πᾶσαν τὴν αἰσχύνην σου.
Ezek 16:39	וְהִנְחוּךָ עִירָם וְעִרְיָה	καὶ ἀφήσουσί σε γυμνὴν καὶ ἀσχημονοῦσαν.

In Ezek 23—the allegory on the women Oho'lah and Ohol'ibah—the expression “to remember the days” can likewise be found:

Ezek 23:19	וְתִרְבָּה אֶת־תּוֹנוֹתֶיהָ לִזְכֹּר אֶת־יְמֵי נְעוּרֶיהָ אֲשֶׁר זָנְתָה בְּאַרְץ מִצְרַיִם	καὶ ἐπλήθυνας τὴν πορνείαν σου τοῦ ἀναμνησθαι ἡμέρας νεότητός σου, ἐν αἷς ἐπόρνευσας ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ <sup>334</sup>
------------	---	--

<sup>334</sup> Elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible זָכַר (את) is attested in Deut 32:7; Ps 143:5; Qoh 5:19; 11:8; Isa 63:11; and Lam 1:7. For *μνείαν ποιέω*, see Job 14:13 and Ps 110:4.

## Isa 47:10

חכמתך  
ודעתך היא שובבתך

γνώθι ὅτι ἡ σύνεσις τούτων  
ἡ πορνεία σου ἔσται σοι αἰσχύνη.

The Greek translation has been achieved by way of a twofold rendering of דעתך (“your knowledge”) as on the one hand γνώθι—based on a reading with דע (see 44:20), and on the other hand ἡ πορνεία σου<sup>335</sup>—deriving from ורעתך (see ברעתך earlier in the same verse). The verb phrase שובבתך (“she led you astray”) was probably rendered αἰσχύνη through a linking to בוש.<sup>336</sup> The rearrangement of Isa 47:10 as a whole might have been inspired by Ezek 16 and 23. In agreement with those chapters, Isa 47 relates the story of an overindulged woman—representative of a people—who will be punished and humiliated by God because of her immoral behaviour. Compare, for instance, Isa 47:10 with Ezek 16:36–37:

## Ezek 16:36–37

יען השפך נחשתך  
ותגלה ערותך  
בתזנותך על־מאהביך ...  
לכן הנני מקבץ  
את־כל־מאהביך  
אשר ערכת עליהם  
... וגליתי ערותך אליהם  
וראו את־כל־ערוותך

Ἀνθ' ὧν ἐξέχεας τὸν χαλκὸν σου,  
καὶ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται ἡ αἰσχύνη σου  
ἐν τῇ πορνείᾳ σου πρὸς τοὺς ἑραστάς σου ...  
διὰ τοῦτο ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐπὶ σέ συνάγω  
πάντας τοὺς ἑραστάς σου,  
ἐν οἷς ἐπεμείγης ἐν αὐτοῖς  
... καὶ ἀποκαλύψω τὰς κακίας σου πρὸς αὐτούς,  
καὶ ὄψονται πᾶσαν τὴν αἰσχύνην σου.

Points of contact between LXX Isa 47 and Ezek 16 and 23 can further be found in LXX Isa 47:2–3. Just as Ezek 16:36 (see above) and Ezek 23:10,29 (see below) these Isaianic verses mention the exposure of the “shame” of the woman. Moreover, they contain the promise that the woman will not be delivered to her enemies anymore. This promise can be found only in the Greek text of Isa 47:3, which offers οὐκέτι μὴ παραδῶ ἀνθρώποις (whereas the Hebrew reads וְאִנִּי אֶפְדֶּה אֶת־אָדָם—“and I will spare no one”). Maybe this Greek wording bears the mark of Ezek 16:39 and 23:9, 28:

Isa 47:2–3 קחי רחים וטחני קמח  
גלי צמתך  
חשפ־שב־  
גלישוק עברי נהרות  
תגל ערוותך  
גם תראה חרפתך

λαβὲ μύλον, ἄλεσον ἄλευρον,  
ἀποκάλυψαι τὸ κατακάλυμμα σου,  
ἀνακάλυψαι τὰς πολιάς,  
ἀνάσுραι τὰς κνήμας, διάβηθι ποταμούς·  
ἀνακαλυφθήσεται ἡ αἰσχύνη σου,  
φανήσονται οἱ ὀνειδισμοί σου.

<sup>335</sup> I follow here the reading of Rahlfs. In the Göttingen edition Ziegler gives ἡ πορνεία σου, but that reading is attested only by ms 233 and Tht.

<sup>336</sup> HUB Isa, 216.

	נקם אקח ולא אפגע אדם	τὸ δίκαιον ἐκ σοῦ λήμψομαι, <b>οὐκέτι μὴ παραδῶ ἀνθρώποις.</b>
Ezek 16:39	ונתתי אותך בידם והרסו גבך ונתצו רמתך והפשטו אותך בגדיך ולקחו כלי תפארתך והניחוך עירם ועריה	καὶ <b>παραδῶσω σε εἰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν,</b> καὶ κατασκάψουσιν τὸ <b>πορνεῖόν σου</b> καὶ καθελοῦσι τὴν βάσιν σου καὶ ἐκδύσουσί σε τὸν ἱματισμόν σου καὶ λήμψονται τὰ σκεύη τῆς <b>καυχήσεώς σου</b> καὶ ἀφήσουσί σε γυμνὴν καὶ <b>ἀσχημονοῦσαν.</b>
Ezek 23:9–10	לכן נתתיה ביד־מאהביה ביד בני אשור אשר עגבה עליהם המה גלוי ערותה	διὰ τοῦτο <b>παρέδωκα αὐτὴν</b> <b>εἰς χεῖρας τῶν ἐραστῶν αὐτῆς,</b> εἰς χεῖρας υἱῶν Ἀσσυρίων, ἐφ' οὓς ἐπετίθετο. αὐτοὶ <b>ἀπεκάλυψαν τὴν αἰσχύνην αὐτῆς</b>
Ezek 23:28–30	הנני נתנך ביד אשר שנאת ביד אשר־נקעה נפשך מהם ועשו אותך בשנאה ולקחו כלי־גידך ועזבוך עירם ועריה ונגלה ערות זנוניך וזמתך ותזנותך עשה אלה לך בזנותך אחרי גוים על אשר־נטמאת בגלוליהם	Ἴδού ἐγὼ <b>παραδίδωμί σε</b> <b>εἰς χεῖρας ὧν μισεῖς,</b> ἀφ' ὧν ἀπέστη ἡ ψυχὴ σου ἀπ' αὐτῶν. καὶ ποιήσουσιν ἐν σοὶ ἐν μίσει καὶ λήμψονται πάντας τοὺς πόνοὺς σου καὶ τοὺς μόχθους σου, καὶ ἔσῃ γυμνὴ καὶ <b>ἀσχημονοῦσα,</b> καὶ <b>ἀποκαλυφθήσεται αἰσχύνη πορνείας σου</b> καὶ ἀσέβειά σου. καὶ ἡ πορνεία σου ἐποίησε ταῦτά σοι ἐν τῷ ἐκπορνεῦσαί σε ὀπίσω ἐθνῶν καὶ ἐμιαίνου ἐν τοῖς ἐνθυμήμασιν αὐτῶν.

Aside from Isa 47, Isa 57 also displays close ties to Ezek 16 and 23. Similar to these chapters in Ezekiel, Isa 57 tells about a woman who has left her husband and plays the harlot with foreign people. As the operating base of this woman both Ezek 16:24 and Isa 57:7 mention a high place; in Ezek 23:17 as well as Isa 57:7–8 the bed of the harlot is mentioned. In both Isa 57:9 and Ezek 23:16, 40 the woman sends messengers to remote places. The statement that she has forgotten her husband (God) is made in Isa 57:11 as well as in Ezek 23:35. Finally, in all three of the chapters the bringing of child sacrifices plays a role (see Isa 57:5; Ezek 16:21; 23:39). A possible lexical linkage can be detected between LXX Isa 57:9 and Ezek 16:25:

Isa 57:7–9	על הר־גבה ונשא שמת משכבך גם־שם עלית לובח זבח ואחר הדלת והמזוזה	ἐπ' ὄρος ὑψηλὸν καὶ μετέωρον, ἐκεῖ σου ἡ κοίτη, <b>κακεῖ ἀνεβίβασας θυσίας.</b> καὶ ὀπίσω τῶν σταθμῶν τῆς θύρας σου
------------	---	--

שמת זכרוןך כי מאתי גלית ותעלי הרחבת משכבך ותכרת לך מהם אהבת משכבם יד חזית ותשרי למלך בשמן ותרבי רקחך	ἔθηκας μνημόσυνά σου· ᾧ σου ὅτι ἐὰν ἀπ' ἐμοῦ ἀποστῇς, πλεῖόν τι ἔξεις·  ἠγάπησας τοὺς κοιμωμένους μετὰ σοῦ καὶ ἐπλήθυνας τὴν πορνείαν σου μετ' αὐτῶν  καὶ πολλοὺς ἐποίησας τοὺς μακρὰν ἀπὸ σοῦ
---	--

In LXX Isa 57:9 it is hard to discover the Hebrew source of the words καὶ ἐπλήθυνας τὴν πορνείαν σου μετ' αὐτῶν. Perhaps they form an interpretation of the somewhat enigmatic clause יד חזית. Or, maybe they render הרחבת משכבך in verse 8, in which רחב—“to broaden”—may have been connected with πλῆθυνω—“to make plenty.” Alternatively, the clause could be considered a plus. In any case, it seems plain that the translator has adopted this Greek formulation from Ezek 16:25 and 23:19:<sup>337</sup>

Ezek 16:24–25 ותבנילך גב ותעשילך רמה בכל־רחוב אלי־כל־ראש דרך בנית רמתך ותתעבי את־יפיך ותפשקי את־רגליך לכל־עובר ותרבי את־תונתך	καὶ ὠκοδόμησας σεαυτῇ οἶκημα πορνικὸν καὶ ἐποίησας σεαυτῇ ἔκθεμα ἐν πάσῃ πλατείᾳ καὶ ἐπ' ἀρχῆς πάσης ὁδοῦ ὠκοδόμησας τὰ πορνείᾳ σου καὶ ἔλυμῃν τὸ κάλλος σου καὶ διήγαγες τὰ σκέλη σου παντὶ παρόδῳ καὶ ἐπλήθυνας τὴν πορνείαν σου·
Ezek 23:19 ותרבה את־תזנותיה ליזכר את־ימי נעוריה אשר זנתה בארץ מצרים	καὶ ἐπλήθυνας τὴν πορνείαν σου τοῦ ἀναμνηῆσαι ἡμέρας νεότητός σου, ἐν αἷς ἐπόρνευσας ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ

#### 9.4.4.2 Influence of other texts in Ezekiel

Isa 8:23(9:1) כעת הראשון הקל ארצה ובלון וארצה נפתלי והאחרון הכביד דרך היס  עבר הירדן גליל הגוים	Τοῦτο πρῶτον ποίει, ταχὺ ποίει, χώρα Ζαβουλων, ἡ γῆ Νεφθαλιμ ὁδὸν θαλάσσης καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ οἱ τὴν παραλίαν κατοικοῦντες καὶ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, Γαλιλαία τῶν ἐθνῶν, τὰ μέρη τῆς Ἰουδαίας.
--	--

The list of areas in Isa 8:23(9:1) has in the Greek been extended by, in the first place, τὰ μέρη τῆς Ἰουδαίας, and, in the second, οἱ λοιποὶ οἱ τὴν παραλίαν κατοικοῦντες. The latter words perhaps go back to the Hebrew והאחרון הכביד:

<sup>337</sup> Compare Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 129.

while οἱ λοιποὶ may come from והאחרון read as והאחרי, τὴν παραλίαν might have been generated by הכביד, read as though it were החון. In spite of the fact that הכביד and החון are rather distant from each other in form, the translator may still have wanted to arrive at החון because “the coast” is a regular component in similar biblical lists of (Israelite) areas or tribes, in which also the names of Zebulon, Naphtali, or the “land beyond the Jordan” often occur.<sup>338</sup> Yet, even if the people “living on the coast” figure repeatedly in the Bible, “the *remaining* ones living on the coast” can be found in only one place outside of LXX Isa 9:1—that is in LXX Ezek 25:16:<sup>339</sup>

Ezek 25:16	הנני נוטה ידי	Ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐκτενῶ τὴν χεῖρά μου
	על-פלשתים	ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀλλοφύλους
	והכרתי את-כרתים	καὶ ἐξολεθρεύσω Κρήτας
	והאבדתי את-שארית	καὶ ἀπολῶ τοὺς καταλοίπους
	חון הים	τοὺς κατοικοῦντας τὴν παραλίαν.

The fact that a comparable phrase appears solely in LXX Isa 9:1 and LXX Ezek 25:16 makes it plausible that a relationship exists between these two verses. Still, if there is indeed dependency involved, the question is, what would be the direction of it. As a matter of fact, this case allows for the possibility that it was Ezekiel’s translator who adopted the expression under consideration from LXX Isaiah rather than *vice versa*. For in the LXX of Ezekiel τοὺς κατοικοῦντας is likewise a plus. Moreover, LXX Ezekiel has not represented the Hebrew הים—which has approximated the phrase in LXX Ezekiel to the one in LXX Isaiah.<sup>340</sup> If such a reliance of the Ezekiel translator on LXX Isaiah has indeed occurred, this would disturb our picture of the two translations, as in some other instances, we have discussed how LXX Isaiah seemed to rely on the Greek Ezekiel. This difficulty can be approached in several ways. Firstly, one can maintain that of the two translations LXX Ezekiel is the older one, and that the rendering by the phrase οἱ λοιποὶ οἱ τὴν παραλίαν κατοικοῦντες in LXX Isa 9:1 has been influenced by LXX Ezek 25:16. In such a case, the plus and minus in the latter verse would have been produced by the Ezekiel translator independently of LXX Isa 9:1 (but maybe inspired by other biblical texts which mention “the ones living on the coast”). A second solution is to presuppose that at the time of the Isaiah translator only certain parts of the book of Ezekiel existed in a Greek translation. Those fragments he may have used in his translation. The Septuagint of Ezekiel

<sup>338</sup> See e.g. Gen 49:3–28, especially verse 13; Judg 5:14–18; and Jdt 1:7–9; 2:28. Expressions comparable to τὴν παραλίαν κατοικέω / παράλιον κατοικέω occur in Gen 49:13; Deut 33:19; Ezek 25:16; and Jdt 1:7; 2:28; 5:22; see also Josh 9:1 and Judg 5:17.

<sup>339</sup> Compare Seeligmann, *Septuagint Version*, 74.

<sup>340</sup> The omission of הים could however also be just a matter of free translation: παραλία already implies “the sea,” so the separate mention of that noun is not necessary.

as a whole, though, would have been completed *subsequently* to LXX Isaiah. This would have as a consequence that the translator of Ezekiel may have utilised the Greek translation of Isaiah, for instance in the case of Ezek 25:16. As noted before, a similar theory was once proposed by Thackeray. Another possibility is that the Isaiah translator was influenced by the *Hebrew* text of Ezek 25:16, which is what Wevers assumes.<sup>341</sup> Finally, it is possible that both translators produced the text concerned on their own, without consulting the translation of the other.

Isa 17:1–2	הנה דמשק מוסר מעיר והיתה מעי מפלה עזבות ערי ערער לעדריס תהיינה ורבו ואין מחרד	Ἰδοὺ Δαμασκὸς ἀρθήσεται ἀπὸ πόλεων καὶ ἔσται εἰς πτῶσιν, καταλελειμμένη εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, εἰς <u>κοίτην</u> ποιμνίων καὶ ἀνάπαυσιν, καὶ οὐκ ἔσται ὁ διώκων.
------------	---	--

Goshen-Gottstein refers for the insertion in LXX Isa 17:2 of *κοίτην* to Ezek 25:5.<sup>342</sup> Also that verse compares the ruined state of a city to a dwelling of flocks:

Ezek 25:5	ונתתי את־רובה לנוה גמלים ואת־בני עמון למרב־צאן	καὶ δώσω τὴν πόλιν τοῦ Ἀμμων εἰς νομὰς καμήλων καὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἀμμων εἰς νομὴν προβάτων.
-----------	--	---

If the Isaiah translator actually drew upon Ezek 25:5, it was most likely on the Hebrew reading of this verse, since the two texts in their Greek translation display significant differences in vocabulary: where LXX Isaiah uses *ἀνάπαυσις* to denote a resting place, LXX Ezekiel offers *νομή*, and where LXX Isaiah employs the noun *ποίμνιον* for sheep, LXX Ezekiel has *πρόβατον*.

Isa 32:13–14	על אדמת עמי קוץ שמיר תעלה כי על־כל־בתי משוש קריה עליזה כי־ארמון נטש המון עיר עזב	ἡ γῆ τοῦ λαοῦ μου ἄκανθα καὶ χόρτος ἀναβήσεται, καὶ ἐκ πάσης οἰκίας εὐφροσύνη ἀρθήσεται· πόλις πλουσία, οἴκοι ἐγκαταλελειμμένοι πλοῦτον πόλεως <u>καὶ οἴκους ἐπιθυμητούς</u> ἀφήσουσι·
--------------	---	---

In Isa 32:14 *καὶ οἴκους ἐπιθυμητούς* stems from no obvious Hebrew equivalent. The “desirable houses” may have been juxtaposed to “a city’s wealth” in analogy to some other texts in LXX Isaiah, where, in a comparable setting

<sup>341</sup> Wevers, “Septuaginta-Forschungen,” 180.

<sup>342</sup> HUB Isa, 65.

describing the destruction of an area, there is likewise mention of the desolation of the “houses” of the city (see 6:11; 22:8–10; and 24:10, 12).<sup>343</sup> Compare also the מִשׁוּשׁ in 32:13. These connections simultaneously explain the rendering of אַרְמוֹן as οἶκοι at the beginning of verse 14. The use of the adjective ἐπιθυμητής may have been stimulated by the occurrence of ἑλ-ישׁח-חַמַּד / ἀπὸ ἀγροῦ ἐπιθυμημάτων in verse 12. Furthermore, it is possible that the translator’s choice of οἶκους ἐπιθυμητούς was influenced by LXX Ezek 26:12. In that text, which in accordance with Isa 32:13–14 prophesies the destruction of a city, a similar expression appears:<sup>344</sup>

Ezek 26:12	ושללו חילך ובזו רכלתך והרסו חומותיך ובתי חמדתך יתצו	καὶ προνομεύσει τὴν δυνάμιν σου καὶ σκυλεύσει τὰ ὑπάρχοντά σου καὶ καταβαλεῖ σου τὰ τείχη καὶ τοὺς οἶκους σου τοὺς ἐπιθυμητούς καθελεῖ
------------	--	---

It is not evident, though, whether it was the Hebrew or the Greek text of Ezek 26:12 that may have played a role. Since ἐπιθυμητής is a common translation of חַמַּד,<sup>345</sup> the Isaiah translator could just as well have based his addition in Isa 32:14 on ובתי חמדתך, as he encountered it in the Hebrew text of Ezek 26:12.

Isa 33:15	הלך צדקות ודבר מישרים מאס בבצע מעשקות נער כפיו מתמך בשחד אטם אזנו משמע דמים ועצם עיניו מראות ברע	πορευόμενος ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, λαλῶν εὐθεῖαν ὁδόν, μισῶν ἀνομίαν καὶ ἀδικίαν καὶ τὰς χεῖρας ἀποσειόμενος ἀπὸ δώρων, βαρύνων τὰ ὦτα ἵνα μὴ ἀκούσῃ κρίσιν αἵματος, καμμύων τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἵνα μὴ ἴδῃ ἀδικίαν
-----------	---	---

The expression κρίσις αἵματος in LXX Isa 33:15 has only one parallel in the Septuagint, that is, in LXX Ezek 44:24, in a section listing prescriptions for the Levites. There it does not precisely match the MT either, which offers a plain רִיב. A Hebrew parallel is contained in Ezek 7:23, where one finds the term משפט דמים (“litigation about blood guilt”).<sup>346</sup>

<sup>343</sup> A phrase comparable to οἶκους ἐπιθυμητούς can be found in 22:8: τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς οἶκους τῆς πόλεως.

<sup>344</sup> Except for the instances in Isa 32:14 and Ezek 26:12 an expression similar to οἶκους ἐπιθυμητούς is unparalleled in the LXX.

<sup>345</sup> See 2 Chr 32:27; 36:10; Ps 106(105):24; Jer 12:10; Ezek 26:12; Dan 11:8; Hos 13:15; and Nah 2:9(10).

<sup>346</sup> See also κρίμα αἵματος (MT: חרב) in LXX Ezek 33:2 (A) (B: ῥομφαίαν); see Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 122.



Ezek 44:24	ועל־דיב המה יעמדו לשפט במשפט ושפטהו ואת־תורתִי ואת־חקתִי בכל־מועדי ישמרו ואת־שבֹתותִי יקדשו	καὶ ἐπὶ <b>κρίσιν αἵματος</b> οὗτοι ἐπιστήσονται τοῦ διακρίνειν· τὰ δικαιώματά μου δικαιώσουσι καὶ τὰ κρίματά μου κρινοῦσι καὶ τὰ νόμιμά μου καὶ τὰ προστάγματά μου ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἑορταῖς μου φυλάσσονται καὶ τὰ σάββατά μου ἀγιάσουσι.
Ezek 7:23	עשה הרתוק כי הארץ מלאה <b>משפט דמים</b> והעיר מלאה חמס	καὶ ποιήσουσι φυρμόν, διότι ἡ γῆ πλήρης λαῶν, καὶ ἡ πόλις πλήρης ἀνομίας.

Although it might be that the Isaiah translator has adopted the idea of a “case of blood-guilt” from the Hebrew text of Ezek 7:23, or perhaps even from the Greek of Ezek 44:24, he could as easily have based the addition of κρίσιν on his own interpretation of דמים, independent of Ezekiel. Another text of which he may have been reminded is Deut 17:8, which describes judicial cases on bloodshed (ῥῆμα ἐν κρίσει ἀνὰ μέσον αἷμα αἵματος). Lastly, it is possible that κρίσις αἵματος was a common juridical term in his time.

Isa 34:12	חריה ואין־שם מלוכה יקראו וכל־שריה יהיו אפס	οἱ <b>ἄρχοντες</b> αὐτῆς <b>οὐκ ἔσονται</b> οἱ γὰρ βασιλεῖς αὐτῆς καὶ οἱ <b>ἄρχοντες</b> αὐτῆς <b>καὶ οἱ μεγιστᾶνες αὐτῆς ἔσονται εἰς ἀπώλειαν.</b>
-----------	--	---

The LXX of Isa 34:12 reflects a Hebrew text as though it were אין חריה ומלכיה. This transformation may have been accomplished under the influence of LXX Ezek 30:13. In agreement with Isa 34:12 that passage forms part of an oracle on the destruction of a people. While in Isa 34 the oracle of doom is directed against Edom, in the case of Ezek 30:13 it concerns Egypt:

Ezek 30:13	והאבדתי גלולים והשבתי אלילים מנף ונשיא מארץ־מצרים לא יהיה־עוד ונתתי יראה בארץ מצרים	Καὶ <b>ἀπολῶ μεγιστᾶνας</b> ἀπὸ Μέμφεως καὶ <b>ἄρχοντας</b> ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου, καὶ <b>οὐκ ἔσονται ἔτι.</b>
------------	--	---

Because the MT of Ezek 30:13 refers to the destroying of “idols” and “a prince” rather than to the “nobles” and “rulers” of which there is mention in the LXX of both Ezek 30:13 and Isa 34:12, in the case of dependency the Isaiah translator will have relied on the *Greek* text of Ezekiel.<sup>347</sup>

<sup>347</sup> Alternatively, one could posit that LXX Ezekiel relies on LXX Isaiah, which would explain the former’s variant rendering of גלולים by μεγιστᾶνας, and of נשיא by καὶ ἄρχοντας. The wording οἱ ἄρχοντες αὐτῆς οὐκ ἔσονται in LXX Isaiah, however, rather suggests the influence of LXX Ezekiel (καὶ οὐκ ἔσονται ἔτι) on the Greek Isaiah.

Isa 44:25	מפר אתות בדים וקסמים יהולל משיב חכמים אחור ודעתם ישכל	τίς ἕτερος διασκεδάσει σημεῖα ἐγγαστριμύθων καὶ μαντείας <i>ἀπὸ καρδίας</i> , <sup>348</sup> ἀποστρέφων φρονίμους εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω καὶ τὴν βουλήν αὐτῶν μαρεύνων
-----------	--	---

The words “from his/their hearts” recur repeatedly in the Bible.<sup>349</sup> But, applied in the context of false prophecy, such as in Isa 44:25, we find them exclusively in Ezek 13:3, 17 and Jer 23:16. Perhaps these verses served as a model for the addition in LXX Isa 44:25:

Ezek 13:3	הוי על־הנביאים הנבלים אשר הלכים אחר רוחם ולבלתי ראו	Οὐαὶ τοῖς προφητεύουσιν <i>ἀπὸ καρδίας</i> αὐτῶν καὶ τὸ καθόλου μὴ βλέπουσιν
Ezek 13:17	ואתה בן־אדם שים פניך אל־בנות עמך המתנבאות מלבהן והנבא עליהן	καὶ σύ, υἱὲ ἀνθρώπου, στήρισον τὸ πρόσωπόν σου ἐπὶ τὰς θυγατέρας τοῦ λαοῦ σου τὰς προφητευσούσας <i>ἀπὸ καρδίας</i> αὐτῶν καὶ προφήτευσον ἐπ’ αὐτάς
Jer 23:16	אל־תשמעו על־דברי הנבאים הנבאים לכם מהבליים המה אתכם חזון לבם ידברו לא מפי יהוה	Μὴ ἀκούετε τοὺς λόγους τῶν προφητῶν, ὅτι ματαιοῦσιν ἑαυτοῖς ὄρασιν, <i>ἀπὸ καρδίας</i> αὐτῶν λαλοῦσιν καὶ οὐκ ἀπὸ στόματος κυρίου.

Isa 51:2	הביטו אל־אברהם אביכם ואל־שרה תחוללכם כי־אחד קראתיו ואברכהו וארבהו	ἐμβλέψατε εἰς <i>Αβρααμ</i> τὸν πατέρα ὑμῶν καὶ εἰς <i>Σαρραν</i> τὴν ὠδίνουσαν ὑμᾶς· <i>ὅτι εἰς ἕν, καὶ ἐκάλεσα αὐτόν</i> καὶ εὐλόγησα αὐτόν καὶ ἡγάπησα αὐτόν καὶ ἐπλήθυνα αὐτόν.
----------	---	---

The somewhat cryptic Hebrew clause כי־אחד קראתיו—meaning “because one I have called,” or maybe “when he was one, I have called him”—has in LXX Isaiah been glossed by *ὅτι εἰς ἕν, καὶ ἐκάλεσα αὐτόν*—“because he was one, and I called him.” The verb form *ἕν* may have been supplied purely with the purpose of making the text more explicit, but there is also a chance that Ezek 33:24 (MT or LXX) has played a role:<sup>350</sup>

<sup>348</sup> The omission of יהולל is likely to be a case of distributive rendering: see section 7.6.2b.

<sup>349</sup> See e.g. Num 16:28; 24:13; LXX Judg 16:17, 18; 3 Kgdms 12:33; Neh 6:8 (= 2 Esd 16:8); LXX Ps 30:13; Qoh 11:10; Isa 59:13; Lam 3:33; Bar 3:7; Jdt 13:19; Sir 50:27; and Wis 16:6. See also section 9.3.1; Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 126; Goshen-Gottstein, “Theory and Praxis,” 152; *HUB Isa*, 204.

<sup>350</sup> *HUB Isa*, 232. Targum and Peshitta reflect a text similar to the LXX.

Ezek 33:24      אחד היה אברהם      Εἰς ἣν Αβρααμ  
                           וירש את-הארץ      καὶ κατέσχε τὴν γῆν

Isa 52:5      ותמיד כל-היום      δι' ὑμᾶς διὰ παντὸς τὸ ὄνομά μου  
                           שמי מנאץ      βλασφημεῖται ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν.

The phrasing βλασφημέω ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν which LXX Isa 52:5 exhibits, is unprecedented in the LXX. Nevertheless, a related formulation, βεβηλώω τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, can be observed several times in Ezek 36:<sup>351</sup>

Ezek 36:21      ואחמל      καὶ ἐφεισάμην αὐτῶν  
                           על-שם קדשי      διὰ τὸ ὄνομά μου τὸ ἅγιον,  
                           אשר חללוהו בית ישראל בגוים      ὃ ἐβεβήλωσαν οἶκος Ισραηλ ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν,  
                           אשר-באו שמה      οὗ εἰσήλθοσαν ἐκεῖ.

Ezek 36:22      לא למענכם אני עשה      Οὐχ ὑμῖν ἐγὼ ποιῶ,  
                           בית ישראל      οἶκος Ισραηλ,  
                           כי אשר חללתם אים-לשם-קדשי      ἀλλ' ἢ διὰ τὸ ὄνομά μου τὸ ἅγιον,  
                           בגוים      ὃ ἐβεβηλώσατε ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν,  
                           אשר-באתם שם      οὗ εἰσήλθετε ἐκεῖ.

Ezek 36:23      וקדשתי את-שמי הגדול      καὶ ἀγιάσω τὸ ὄνομά μου τὸ μέγα  
                           המחלל בגוים      τὸ βεβηλωθὲν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν,  
                           אשר חללתם בתוכם      ὃ ἐβεβηλώσατε ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν<sup>352</sup>

#### 9.4.4.3 Conclusion to 9.4.4

The previous investigation of pluses and minuses in the Greek Isaiah that possibly have bearing on (the Greek version of) Ezekiel cannot satisfactorily clarify the relation between the Greek translation of Isaiah and LXX Ezekiel. This lack of a clear outcome is in the first place connected to the more general complication applying to this entire chapter, that this sort of inquiry involves a high degree of speculation, as one is never sure whether there is in fact a relation of dependency between two texts, or that the conformity has arisen from coincidence. Secondly, it has to do with the ambiguous results of the instances analysed above: on the one hand, several of them seem to betray the influence of the Greek Ezekiel on LXX Isaiah (see Isa 14:20/Ezek 16:6, 22; Isa 34:12/Ezek 30:13; Isa 44:25/Ezek 13:3; and Isa 57:9/Ezek 16:25; 23:19). But in other cases

<sup>351</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 77; *HUB Isa*, 239. The expression βεβηλώω τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν has no parallels elsewhere in the LXX.

<sup>352</sup> Also compare Ezek 20:9, 14, 22 לעיני הגוים שמי לבלתי החל לעיני / καὶ ἐποίησα ὅπως τὸ ὄνομά μου τὸ παράπαν μὴ βεβηλωθῇ ἐνώπιον τῶν ἐθνῶν.

the Isaiah translator rather appears to have relied on the *Hebrew* text of Ezekiel (see Isa 17:2/Ezek 25:5; and Isa 32:9–10/Ezek 16:22,43). Besides, in many cases it is doubtful which version he used (see Isa 32:14/Ezek 26:12; Isa 33:15/Ezek 7:23; 44:24; Isa 44:25/Ezek 13:17; Isa 47:10 / Ezek 16:36; 23:29; and Isa 51:2/Ezek 33:24). One example has been dealt with which allows for the possibility that the translator of Ezekiel may have drawn upon the LXX version of Isaiah rather than *vice versa* (see Isa 8:23[9:1]/ Ezek 25:16).<sup>353</sup> A possible solution to this paradoxical issue would be that in the time of the Isaiah translator only parts of the book of Ezekiel existed in a Greek translation, and that the translator made use solely of those parts. The entire translation may have been completed only after the realisation of LXX Isaiah, with as a consequence that the Greek Isaiah could have been used by the LXX translator of Ezekiel. Yet, it may be more reasonable to assume that this one example is not sufficient to prove the influence of LXX Isaiah on the Greek Ezekiel, and that LXX Isaiah is more likely to be the posterior one of the two translations. The Isaiah translator may then occasionally have copied elements from the book of Ezekiel, sometimes from its Hebrew version, and at other times from the Greek translation of it.

#### 9.4.5 LXX Isaiah and the Twelve Prophets

The final biblical corpus that I will deal with on the grounds that its relation to the LXX of Isaiah has repeatedly formed a topic of discussion, is the book of the Twelve Prophets.

As mentioned before, it is the opinion of Thackeray that the Twelve Prophets were rendered into Greek only after the translation of Isaiah was finished. Ziegler, on the contrary, conceives the more recent of the two translations to be LXX Isaiah, because some of its renderings would indicate that the Isaiah translator was familiar with the Twelve Prophets in their Greek form.<sup>354</sup> This assumption is defended by Seeligmann, who offers a number of correspondences between LXX Isaiah and the LXX of the Twelve Prophets which are to “justify the theory that our translator was acquainted with the Septuagint of the Dodekapropheton and that this work reveals traces of its influence.”<sup>355</sup>

<sup>353</sup> Possibly also the case of Isa 34:12/Ezek 30:13 allows for such a hypothesis.

<sup>354</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 104–5.

<sup>355</sup> Seeligmann, *Septuagint Version*, 73. The examples that are particularly significant in Seeligmann’s view are the formulation *καὶ τὴν αἰχμαλωσίαν τοῦ λαοῦ μου ἐπιστρέψει* in LXX Isa 45:13, which may have been adopted from LXX Amos 9:14 (see below), the translation by *καὶ τέκνα πολλὰ ἀλλόφυλα ἐγενήθη αὐτοῖς* in LXX Isa 2:6, based on LXX Hos 5:7, and the translation by *ταχὺ ἔρχεται καὶ οὐ χρονιεῖ* in LXX Isa 13:22, echoing Hab 2:3 (see below) (Seeligmann, *Septuagint Version*, 72). Also Baer suspects that LXX Isaiah was influenced by the Greek Twelve Prophets: see Baer, *When We All Go Home*, 94–95; 209–12.

In a recent article by Cécile Dogniez this idea of the dependence of LXX Isaiah upon the Greek Twelve Prophets has, however, been called into question. Dogniez is not convinced of the examples Seeligmann provides in order to establish his view, because these could also be explained in a different way. She finds her scepticism on an analysis of LXX Isa 8 and 9, focusing on the possible connections that can be discovered in those chapters with the Greek version of the Twelve Prophets. Her conclusion is that LXX Isa 8 and 9 do not reveal any reliance on the Greek Twelve.<sup>356</sup> As an additional argument for casting doubt on Seeligmann's theory, Dogniez points to the fact that the divine epitheton **עֲבֹאוֹת** is in LXX Isaiah represented by the transcription *σαβαωθ*, whereas the Greek Twelve reproduce this term by way of the interpretative translation *παντοκράτωρ*. This makes one wonder why the Isaiah translator, if he were familiar with the Greek translation of the Twelve, would have maintained the more "primitive" transliteration with *σαβαωθ*.<sup>357</sup> One could counter this argumentation of Dogniez by saying that the Isaiah translator, even if he were acquainted with the connotation of **עֲבֹאוֹת**, for specific reasons still choose to represent it by means of a transcription, just as some modern translations do, despite the fact that the meaning of this noun is common knowledge nowadays.

In short, the scholarly opinions on the relation between the Septuagint translations of Isaiah and the Twelve Prophets are rather varied. On the following pages I will again seek to get a clearer insight into this issue by means of a study of the pluses and minuses in LXX Isaiah which could possibly be traced back to the (Greek) Twelve Prophets.

#### 9.4.5.1 Hosea

<b>Isa 3:8</b> <b>כִּלְשׁוֹנָם וּמַעֲלִיָּהֶם</b> <b>אֲלִיָּהוּ לְמָרוֹת</b> <b>עֵינֵי כְבוֹדוֹ</b>	<b>καὶ αἱ γλῶσσαι αὐτῶν μετὰ ἀνομίας,</b> <b>τὰ πρὸς κύριον ἀπειθοῦντες·</b> <b>διότι νῦν ἐταπεινώθη ἡ δόξα αὐτῶν</b>
--	---

It might be that in his reformulation of Isa 3:8 the translator has drawn inspiration from Hos 5:3–5. That passage shares with Isa 3:8 its focus on Israel's apostasy, as well as its use of the noun phrase **כִּלְשׁוֹנָם וּמַעֲלִיָּהֶם**. Through the influence of Hos 5:5 the translator may have associated **עֵינֵי** ("the eyes of") in Isa 3:8 with the verb **עָנָה** ("to humiliate"), on which grounds he rendered the noun by *ἐταπεινώθη*.<sup>358</sup> The conjunction *διότι νῦν* could have been supplied by the

<sup>356</sup> Cécile Dogniez, "Le traducteur d'Isaïe connaissait-il le texte grec du Dodekapropheton?," *Adamantius* 13 (2007): 34.

<sup>357</sup> Dogniez, "Le traducteur d'Isaïe," 37

<sup>358</sup> For more notes on the translation, see section 9.4.1.2b.

translator just for the sake of the discourse, but an additional factor might have been the occurrence of the same conjunction in LXX Hos 5:3.<sup>359</sup>

Hos 5:3–5	אני ידעתי אפרים וישראל לא־נכחד ממני כי עתה הזנית אפרים נטמא ישראל לא יתנו מעלליהם לשוב אל־אלהיהם כי רוח זנונים בקרבם ואת־יהוה לא ידעו וענה גאון־ישראל בפניו וישראל ואפרים יכשלו בעונם כשל גס־יהודה עמם	ἐγὼ ἔγνων τὸν Εφραιμ, καὶ Ἰσραὴλ οὐκ ἄπεστιν ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, <b>διότι νῦν</b> ἐξεπόρνευσεν Εφραιμ, ἐμιάνθη Ἰσραὴλ· οὐκ ἔδωκαν τὰ διαβούλια αὐτῶν τοῦ ἐπιστρέψαι πρὸς τὸν θεὸν αὐτῶν, ὅτι πνεῦμα πορνείας ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐστὶ, τὸν δὲ κύριον οὐκ ἐπέγνωσαν. καὶ <b>ταπεινωθήσεται</b> ἡ ὕβρις τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ εἰς πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ, καὶ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ Εφραιμ ἀσθενήσουσιν ἐν ταῖς ἀδικίαις αὐτῶν, καὶ ἀσθενήσει καὶ Ἰουδας μετ' αὐτῶν.
-----------	--	--

It has to be admitted, though, that the points of contact between these two texts are only subtle. The Isaiah translator may as well have created the clause *διότι νῦν ἐταπεινώθη ἡ δόξα αὐτῶν* by himself, without the influence of Hosea, and merely encouraged by the resemblance of עני to ענה. He could also have made a link to Isa 5:15:

Isa 5:15	ועיני גבהים תשפלנה	καὶ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ οἱ μετέωροι <b>ταπεινωθήσονται</b> ·
----------	--------------------	--

Isa 42:13	יהוה כַּבּוֹר יֵצֵא כַּאֲשֶׁר מַלְחָמוֹת יַעֲרֵךְ קִנְיָה	κύριος ὁ θεὸς τῶν δυνάμεων ἐξελεύσεται <b>καὶ συντρίψει πόλεμον</b> , ἐπεγερεὶ ζῆλον
-----------	--	---

Earlier in this chapter I have discussed the possible correlation of the Greek translation of Isa 42:13 with the LXX of Exod 15:3. After the example of that Pentateuchal verse, the LXX of Isa 42:13 may also have altered the image of YHWH as a warrior into a more peaceful description of the Divine as the one who *crushes* war. The latter representation of God has its roots in Hos 2:20, from which the translator of Exodus may have adopted his formulation:<sup>360</sup>

Hos 2:20 (18)	ומלחמה אשבור מִן־הָאָרֶץ	καὶ <b>πόλεμον συντρίψω</b> ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς
---------------	--------------------------	---

According to Baer this text in LXX Hos 2:20 did not only have an *indirect* influence on the Isaiah translator (via Exod 15:3), but was also consulted by him

<sup>359</sup> *διότι νῦν* occurs only sporadically in the LXX: besides in Isa 3:8 and Hos 5:3 only in Gen 26:22, Hos 10:3, Mic 4:10; 5:3; and Zech 9:8. This favours the surmise that in LXX Isa 3:8 the conjunction was added after the example of LXX Hos 5:3.

<sup>360</sup> See section 9.4.1.2b.

directly. This Baer supposes for the reason that the Greek Hosea displays a singular noun πόλεμον, which accords with the noun that LXX Isaiah employs to render the plural form מלחמות. The Greek text of Exod 15:3, conversely, has a plural πολέμους. So in this respect, Baer argues, the Isaiah translator has followed LXX Hosea rather than LXX Exodus.<sup>361</sup> As further argumentation for the influence of LXX Hosea on LXX Isa 42:13 he notes that Hos 2:20

shares imagery and vocabulary which are very similar to Deutero-Isaiah's own. Second, both passages are concerned with the renewal of covenant. Finally, LXX 42.13 hews very close to LXX Hos. 2.18, grammatically speaking. Συντρίψω and συντρίψει differ *only* in grammatical person. Each has accusative singular πόλεμον.<sup>362</sup>

Although the translator could have been influenced by the Hebrew text of Hos 2:20 alone, Baer thinks that this case still provides supporting evidence for the view that LXX Isaiah came into existence after the translation of the Minor Prophets.<sup>363</sup>

#### 9.4.5.2 Joel

Isa 8:1	קח־לך גִּלְיוֹן גדול וכתב עליו בחרט אנוש למהר שלל חש בז	Λαβὲ σεαυτῷ τόμον καινοῦ μεγάλου καὶ γράψον εἰς αὐτὸν γραφίδι ἀνθρώπου Τοῦ ὀξέως προνομήν ποιῆσαι σκύλων· <i>πάρεστι γάρ.</i>
---------	---	--

Whether *πάρεστι γάρ* renders חש (“to hurry”) or concerns a plus (while חש was omitted because it overlaps with למהר) can be disputed. In opposition to the first option is the fact that חש is not located at the very end of the verse, as *πάρεστι γάρ* is. Whatever the case, Seeligmann thinks that the Isaiah translator has imported the Greek expression from LXX Joel 2:1, where a similar formulation occurs within a like eschatological setting:

Joel 2:1	תקעו שופר בציון והריעו בהר קדשי ירגזו כל ישבי הארץ כי־בא יום־יהוה כי קרוב	Σαλπίζατε σάλπιγγι ἐν Σιων, κηρύξατε ἐν ὄρει ἁγίῳ μου, καὶ συγχυθήτωσαν πάντες οἱ κατοικοῦντες τὴν γῆν, διότι <i>πάρεστιν ἡμέρα κυρίου</i> , ὅτι ἐγγύς
----------	--	---

The assumed linkage between the two texts is supported by the correspondence that the beginning of Joel 2:2 exhibits with Isa 8:22:

<sup>361</sup> Baer, *When We All Go Home*, 93–94.

<sup>362</sup> Baer, *When We All Go Home*, 94.

<sup>363</sup> Baer, *When We All Go Home*, 94–95.

Isa 8:22	והנה צרה וחשכה מעוף צוקה ואפלה מנדח	καὶ ἰδοὺ θλίψις καὶ στενοχωρία καὶ σκότος, ἀπορία στενὴ καὶ σκότος ὥστε μὴ βλέπειν
Joel 2:2	יום חשך ואפלה יום ענן וערפל	ἡμέρα σκοτὸς καὶ γνόφου, ἡμέρα νεφέλης καὶ ὀμίχλης.

Nonetheless, the Isaiah translator may just as well have modelled his use of *πάρεστι* on other biblical passages, as a comparable application of this expression is not unique to LXX Joel 2:1, but also occurs in LXX Lam 4:18, and, what is more, in LXX Isa 63:4:

Isa 63:4	כי יום נקם בלבי ושנת גאולי באה	ἡμέρα γὰρ ἀνταποδόσεως ἐπῆλθεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἐνιαυτὸς λυτρώσεως <b>πάρεστι</b> .
----------	-----------------------------------	---

Besides, influence on LXX Isa 8:1 is very likely to stem from the Septuagint of Deuteronomy: in LXX Deut 32:35 *πάρεστιν* appears as a rendering of *שח*.<sup>364</sup>

Deut 32:35	כי קרוב יום אידם וחש עתדת למי	ὅτι ἐγγὺς ἡμέρα ἀπωλείας αὐτῶν, καὶ <b>πάρεστιν</b> ἔτοιμα ὕμιν.
------------	----------------------------------	---

This equivalency at the same time supports the view that *πάρεστι* in Isa 8:1 is not a plus, but a translation of *שח*.

Isa 63:2–3	מדוע אדם ללבושך ובגדך כדרך בגת פורה דרכת לבדי ומעמים אין־איש אתי	διὰ τί σου ἐρυθρὰ τὰ ἱμάτια καὶ τὰ ἐνδύματά σου ὡς ἀπὸ πατητοῦ ληνοῦ; <u>πλήρης καταπεπατημένης</u> , καὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν οὐκ ἔστιν ἀνὴρ μετ' ἐμοῦ
------------	---	---

Ziegler relates the distinct rendering of *פורה דרכת לבדי* (“I have trodden the wine press alone”) by *πλήρης καταπεπατημένης* (“full of a trampled”) in LXX Isa 63:3 to Joel 4:13.<sup>365</sup> In accordance with that verse, LXX Isa 63:3 depicts the treading of a winepress, employing the adjective *πλήρης*. In both texts this metaphor is used to symbolise the judgment of God:<sup>366</sup>

Joel 4(3):13	באו רדו כ־מלאה גת השיקו היקבים כי רבה רעתם	εἰσπορεύεσθε <b>πατεῖτε</b> , διότι <b>πλήρης ἡ ληνός</b> . ὑπερεκχεῖται τὰ ὑπολήνια, ὅτι πεπλήθυνται τὰ κακὰ αὐτῶν.
--------------	---	---

Notwithstanding this lexical agreement between the two texts, they each use *πλήρης* in a different way. Whereas LXX Isaiah speaks about a person who is

<sup>364</sup> For LXX Isaiah's dependence on LXX Deut 32, see section 9.4.1.2a.

<sup>365</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen* 132; compare also *HUB Isa*, 278.

<sup>366</sup> Of the combination of *(κατα)πατέω* with *πλήρης* no parallels can be found elsewhere in the LXX.



“full of a trampled (winepress),” in Joel the fullness refers to the winepress itself. It may be more reasonable, therefore, to suppose that what is involved here is nothing more than the application of the same metaphor rather than a direct relationship between the LXX of Isa 63:3 and Joel 4:13.

#### 9.4.5.3 Amos

Isa 25:6      **משתה שמנים משתה שמרים**      *πίονται εὐφροσύνην, πίονται οἶνον,*  
                  **שמנים ממחים שמרים מזקקים**      *χρίσονται ἑλῖον.*

In their description of a future feast on Mount Zion, the Hebrew and Greek versions show some differences. The noun **משתה** (“feast”) is in the LXX represented by *πίονται*, reflecting a verb form from the same root **שתה**. The first occurrence of **שמנים** (“fat things”) was probably connected with **ממחים** and rendered by *εὐφροσύνην*, while the second occurrence of this word has received a more accurate semantic equivalent in *ἑλῖον* (“oil”). The participle **ממחים** (“full of marrow”) appears to have generated *χρίσονται* (“to anoint”), while **שמרים מזקקים** does not have a Greek counterpart at all.

The portrayal of a banquet with its guests drinking wine and being anointed with oil, can be encountered repeatedly in the Hebrew Bible, for instance in 1 Chr 29:22, Ps 23:5, and Mic 6:15. In the book of Isaiah the motif of eating, drinking and being joyful is present in 5:12,22; 21:5; 22:13; 23:18; and 49:26. But the very combination of the phrases *πίνω οἶνον* and *χρίω ἑλῖον*, as it is found in LXX Isa 25:6, has merely one parallel, namely in Amos 6:6. This is the reason why Ziegler presumes that the Isaiah translator has taken that passage as an example in rendering Isa 25:6:<sup>367</sup>

Amos 6:6      **השתים במזרקי יין**      *οἱ πίνοντες τὸν διυλισμένον οἶνον*  
                  **וראשית שמנים ימשחו**      *καὶ τὰ πρῶτα μύρα χρίόμενοι*

Still, this link is not firm enough to demonstrate convincingly that the Isaiah translator depended upon the Greek Amos: he may equally well have used the Hebrew text of this book, or the congruence might be accidental.

Isa 45:13      **וגלותי ישלח**      *καὶ τὴν αἰχμαλωσίαν τοῦ λαοῦ μου ἐπιστρέψει*  
                  **לא במחיר ולא בשחד**      *οὐ μετὰ λύτρων οὐδὲ μετὰ δώρων*

Besides the pluses in Isa 3:8 and 8:1—which have been discussed above—another one of the cases that Seeligmann presents so as to affirm his hypothesis of LXX Isaiah’s reliance on the Greek Twelve, concerns the translation in LXX Isa 45:13 of **וגלותי ישלח** as *καὶ τὴν αἰχμαλωσίαν τοῦ λαοῦ μου ἐπιστρέψει*. In

<sup>367</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 117.

Seeligmann's view this rendering makes allusion to Amos 9:14. Not only the insertion of τοῦ λαοῦ μου, but also the unusual rendering of יִשָּׁל ("he will let go") as ἐπιστρέψει ("he will turn back") could be clarified by that text:<sup>368</sup>

Amos 9:14      ושבתי את־שבות      **καὶ ἐπιστρέψω τὴν αἰχμαλωσίαν**  
                          עמי ישראל      **λαοῦ μου** Ἰσραηλ

However, a similar expression appears in LXX Ps 13:7 and 52:7 and Hos 6:11.<sup>369</sup> Those texts too could have served as a model for the translator. Or, possibly, he did not think of any specific Bible verse at all, but just assimilated his text to the common Hebrew phraseology שׁוּב שׁוּב, as Wevers and Dogniez suggest.<sup>370</sup> According to Dogniez, the translation of Isa 45:13 does not show LXX Isaiah's dependence on LXX Twelve, but a harmonisation by the translator or a copyist of LXX Isaiah (or of a Hebrew *Vorlage*) to the usual formulation of this expression as it is often attested in Scripture.<sup>371</sup>

#### 9.4.5.4 Obadiah

Isa 22:5      **כִּי יוֹם מְהוּמָה**      **ὅτι ἡμέρα ταραχῆς καὶ ἀπωλείας**  
                          **ומבוסה ומבוכה**      **καὶ καταπατήματος καὶ πλάνησις**  
                          **לאדני יהוה צבאות בגיא חזיון**      **παρὰ κυρίου σαβαωθ ἐν φάραγγι Σιών.**

This verse has already received consideration when we reflected on the formulation ἡμέρα ταραχῆς καὶ ἀπωλείας and the possible influence that was exercised on it by the expression ἡμέρα ἀπωλείας in Jer 18:17 and 26(46):2 (see section 9.4.3.3). Besides in these Jeremianic passages ἡμέρα ἀπωλείας also figures in Deut 32:35 and in Obad 1:12, 13:

Obad 1:12, 13      **ואל־תשמח לבני־יהודה**      **καὶ μὴ ἐπιχαρῆς ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰουδα**  
                          **ביום אבדם**      **ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἀπωλείας αὐτῶν**  
                          **ואל־תגדל פיך**      **καὶ μὴ μεγαλορρημονήσης**  
                          **ביום צרה ...**      **ἐν ἡμέρᾳ θλίψεως ...**  
                          **ואל־תשלחנה בחילו**      **μηδὲ συνεπιθῇ ἐπὶ τὴν δύναμιν αὐτῶν**  
                          **ביום אידו**      **ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἀπωλείας αὐτῶν.**

The same reservations that were expressed in 8.4.3.3 also apply to this case: it is more likely that the translator in Isa 22:5 has adopted a biblical style of writing rather than that he was influenced by one of these specific verses.

<sup>368</sup> Seeligmann, *Septuagint Version*, 72. Zillesen ("Bemerkungen," 253) and Ziegler (*Untersuchungen*, 127) assume that the text from Amos 9:14 may have been present in the margin of the *Vorlage* of LXX Isaiah.

<sup>369</sup> See section 9.4.2.1.

<sup>370</sup> Wevers, "Septuaginta-Forschungen," 180; Dogniez, "Le traducteur d'Isaïe," 30.

<sup>371</sup> Dogniez, "Le traducteur d'Isaïe," 30.

## 9.4.5.5 Micah

**Isa 2:2**      והיה באחרית הימים      Ὅτι ἔσται ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις  
 נכון יהיה הר בית־יהוה      ἐμφανὲς τὸ ὄρος τοῦ κυρίου καὶ ὁ οἶκος τοῦ θεοῦ  
 בראש ההרים      ἐπ' ἄκρων τῶν ὀρέων

Isa 2:2–4, which contains a prophecy on the restoration of Judah, can be found in nearly identical form in Mic 4:1–3. Perhaps this could throw some light on the appearance in LXX Isa 2:2 of τὸ ὄρος τοῦ κυρίου where the MT has הר בית־יהוה, since virtually the same Greek phrase is found in LXX Mic 4:1. However, in that verse too τὸ ὄρος τοῦ κυρίου translates הר בית־יהוה, with בית being a minus. Therefore, if these texts have indeed influenced each other, it is unclear what has been the direction of the influence:

**Mic 4:1**      והיה באחרית הימים      Καὶ ἔσται ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν  
 יהיה הר בית־יהוה      ἐμφανὲς τὸ ὄρος τοῦ κυρίου,  
 נכון בראש ההרים      ἔτοιμον ἐπὶ τὰς κορυφὰς τῶν ὀρέων,

Contrary to LXX Micah, LXX Isaiah does give a rendering of בית later on in the same sentence: there the noun is elaborated into the phrase καὶ ὁ οἶκος τοῦ θεοῦ. Because of this significant difference from LXX Mic 4:1, it seems more likely that, rather than having been affected by each other, the translators of Isaiah and Micah have both on their own initiative replaced the unusual phrasing הר בית־יהוה by the more common one τὸ ὄρος τοῦ κυρίου.<sup>372</sup> The same phrase also returns in the ensuing context of both verses, namely in Isa 2:3 and Mic 4:2. Hence, an extra motivation for the translators to use τὸ ὄρος τοῦ κυρίου was probably the wish to harmonise their texts to these later verses:<sup>373</sup>

**Isa 2:2**      ἐμφανὲς τὸ ὄρος τοῦ κυρίου καὶ ὁ οἶκος τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπ' ἄκρων  
 τῶν ὀρέων  
**Isa 2:3**      Δεῦτε καὶ ἀναβῶμεν εἰς τὸ ὄρος κυρίου καὶ εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ  
 θεοῦ Ἰακωβ  
**Mic 4:1**      ἐμφανὲς τὸ ὄρος τοῦ κυρίου, ἔτοιμον ἐπὶ τὰς κορυφὰς τῶν ὀρέων  
**Mic 4:2**      Δεῦτε ἀναβῶμεν εἰς τὸ ὄρος κυρίου καὶ εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ  
 θεοῦ Ἰακωβ

**Isa 10:21**      שאר ישוב שאר יעקב      καὶ ἔσται τὸ καταλειφθέν τοῦ Ἰακωβ  
 אל־אל גבוּר      ἐπὶ θεὸν ἰσχύοντα.

<sup>372</sup> For τὸ ὄρος (τοῦ) κυρίου see Gen 22:14; Num 10:33; Ps 23:3; Isa 2:3; 30:29; Mic 4:2; and Zech 8:3. The phrase τὸ ὄρος (τοῦ) θεοῦ appears in Exod 4:27; 18:5; 19:3; 24:13; Ps 67:16; and Ezek 28:14,16. For ὄρος οἴκου τοῦ κυρίου, see only 2 Chr 33:15.

<sup>373</sup> See sections 8.3.1.1e and 9.2.3.

Words close to *καὶ ἔσται τὸ καταλειφθὲν τοῦ Ιακωβ* present themselves in LXX Mic 5:6–7:

Mic 5:6–7	והיה שארית יעקב בקרר עמים רבים כטל והיה שארית יעקב בגוים בקרר עמים רבים כאריה	<i>καὶ ἔσται τὸ ὑπόλειμμα τοῦ Ιακωβ</i> ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἐν μέσῳ λαῶν πολλῶν ὡς δρόσος ... <i>καὶ ἔσται τὸ ὑπόλειμμα τοῦ Ιακωβ</i> ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἐν μέσῳ λαῶν πολλῶν ὡς λέων
-----------	--	--

It could be that the Isaiah translator in reformulating Isa 10:21 has drawn upon these verses. If such is the case, the fact that the noun for “remnant” differs in the Greek versions of Micah and Isaiah (being respectively *ὑπόλειμμα* and *καταλειφθέν*), would point in the direction of LXX Isaiah resting on the *Hebrew* text of Micah. Nonetheless, the reformulation of Isa 10:21 can also be explained without the interference of Mic 5:6–7, since *ישׁאר ישוב* may well have been omitted just for the sake of condensation, the resemblance that exists between the two texts being merely coincidental.

Isa 63:19–64:1	לוא־קרעת שמים ירדת מפניך הרים נולו כקדח אש המסים	<i>ἐὰν ἀνολίξης τὸν οὐρανόν, τρόμος λήμψεται ἀπὸ σοῦ ὄρη, καὶ τακῆσονται, ὡς κηρὸς ἀπὸ πυρὸς τήκεται.</i>
----------------	--	---

In Isa 63:19–64:1 (64:1–2) the Greek applies a somewhat different imagery from the Hebrew, involving the melting of the mountains like wax.<sup>374</sup> In addition to Ps 97(96):5 and Ps 68(67):3 (see section 9.4.2.1), Mic 1:4 also shows quite some overlap in vocabulary with these verses in LXX Isaiah:

Mic 1:4	ונמסו ההרים תחתיו והעמקים יתבקעו כדונג מפני האש כמים מגרים במורד	<i>καὶ σαλευθήσεται τὰ ὄρη ὑποκάτωθεν αὐτοῦ, καὶ αἱ κοιλάδες τακῆσονται ὡς κηρὸς ἀπὸ προσώπου πυρὸς καὶ ὡς ὕδωρ καταφερόμενον ἐν καταβάσει.</i>
---------	---	---

In view of the fact that the verb form *τακῆσονται* appears exactly the same in both LXX versions, and given the virtually identical phrases *ὡς κηρὸς ἀπὸ πυρὸς* and *ὡς κηρὸς ἀπὸ προσώπου πυρὸς*, this example might well support the dependency of LXX Isaiah on the Greek translation of Micah.

#### 9.4.5.6 Habakkuk

Isa 13:22	וקרוב לבוא עתה וימיה לא ימשכו	<i>ταχὺ ἔρχεται καὶ οὐ χρονιεῖ.</i>
-----------	-------------------------------	-------------------------------------

The Greek text of Isa 13:22 calls to mind LXX Hab 2:3:

<sup>374</sup> For an analysis of the translation, see section 9.4.2.1.

Hab 2:3 כִּי־בֹא יבֹא לֹא יֵאָחַר ὅτι ἐρχόμενος ἤξει καὶ οὐ μὴ χρονίση.

The congruence between the two Greek translations is considered by Seeligmann as evidence in favour of the reliance of LXX Isaiah on LXX Habakkuk.<sup>375</sup> A point of critique on this assumption has been raised by Wevers. He notes that the correspondence might only indicate that LXX Isaiah was acquainted with the *Hebrew* Habakkuk, and not necessarily with its Greek rendition.<sup>376</sup> This criticism is justified, for χρονίζω is a common translation of אָחַר in the Septuagint,<sup>377</sup> and hence could just as well have been the Isaiah translator's *own* rendering of the Hebrew verb in Hab 2:3, provided that he has used that text for his translation. But even the existence of a relationship between LXX Isa 13:22 and the *Hebrew* version of Hab 2:3 can be questioned, as is done by Dogniez. She argues that this link may have been unintentional, or is just reflecting an exegesis which was current at the time of the translator. She also points to LXX Isa 51:14 which expresses a similar idea.<sup>378</sup>

<p>Isa 19:8 ואנו הדיגים ואבלו כל־משלִיכי ביאור חכה ופרשי מכמרת על־פני־מים אמללו</p>	<p>καὶ στενάξουσιν οἱ ἄλκις, καὶ στενάξουσι πάντες οἱ βάλλοντες ἄγκιστρον εἰς τὸν ποταμόν, καὶ οἱ βάλλοντες σαγήνας καὶ οἱ ἀμφιβολεῖς πενήθουσιν.</p>
---	---

The Hebrew words ופרשי מכמרת (“who spread nets upon the water”) seem to have generated two Greek phrases: (a) οἱ βάλλοντες σαγήνας (“they who cast nets”) and (b) οἱ ἀμφιβολεῖς (“fishermen”). Although פרש is not reproduced anywhere else in the LXX by an inflection of ἀμφιβάλλω, it is rendered in a few places by the related verb περιβάλλω (“to throw round”).<sup>379</sup> The prepositional phrase על־פני־מים seems not to be represented in the Greek.

The supply of καὶ οἱ ἀμφιβολεῖς may be connected to LXX Hab 1:14–15. LXX Hab 1:15 mentions the names of three fishing tools: ἄγκιστρος (“hook”), σαγήνη (“drag-net”), and ἀμφιβλήστρος (“cast-net”). In LXX Isa 19:8 we rediscover two of those tools, namely ἄγκιστρος and σαγήνη, forming part of the descriptions of fishermen, while the third one—ἀμφιβλήστρος—is represented in ἀμφιβολεῖς. Would it be too speculative to presume that the Isaiah translator adopted this triad from LXX Habakkuk, and that this would elucidate the addition of καὶ οἱ ἀμφιβολεῖς in LXX Isa 19:8?

<sup>375</sup> Seeligmann, *Septuagint Version*, 72. Also Goshen-Gottstein thinks that the wording of LXX Isaiah has been taken from Hab 2:3 (*HUB Isa*, 51). Ziegler (*Untersuchungen*, 112) assumes that the translator found Hab 2:3 in the margin of his Hebrew manuscript and integrated it into the main text.

<sup>376</sup> Wevers, “Septuaginta-Forschungen,” 180.

<sup>377</sup> See Gen 32:5; 34:19; Deut 23:22; Judg 5:28; Ps 40(39):18; 70(69):6; Qoh 5:3; and Dan 9:19.

<sup>378</sup> Dogniez, “Le traducteur d’Isaïe,” 31. Compare also Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 112.

<sup>379</sup> See Ruth 3:9; 2 Kgs/4 Kgdms 8:15; and Ezek 32:3.

Hab 1:14–15	ותעשה אדם כדגי הים כרמש לא־משל בו כלה בחכה העלה יגרוו בחרמו ויאספהו במכמתו	καὶ ποιήσεις τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ὡς τοὺς ἰχθύας τῆς θαλάσσης καὶ ὡς τὰ ἔρπετὰ τὰ οὐκ ἔχοντα ἡγούμενον. συντέλειαν ἐν ἀγκίστρῳ ἀνέσπασε καὶ εἴλκυσεν αὐτὸν ἐν ἀμφιβλήστρῳ καὶ συνήγαγεν αὐτὸν ἐν ταῖς σαγήναις αὐτοῦ. <sup>380</sup>
-------------	---	---

Such a hypothesis would be advocated by the circumstance that the verb ἀμφιβάλλω and its derivations are rare in the Septuagint: ἀμφιβάλλω can only be found in Hab 1:17; ἀμφιβλήστρον, besides in Hab 1:15,16,17, only in Ps 140:10 and Qoh 9:12, while ἀμφιβολεύς, apart from in LXX Isa 19:8 occurs nowhere else in the Septuagint. Furthermore, if the Isaiah translator were *not* influenced by LXX Habakkuk, but just wanted to employ two different words for “net,” he could just as well have chosen δίκτυον, which is a more usual word for “(fishing) net” than σαγήνη in the LXX.<sup>381</sup> Yet, admittedly, the appearance in LXX Isaiah and LXX Habakkuk of three similar words in the domain of fishing could still be fortuitous.<sup>382</sup>

#### 9.4.5.7 Zephaniah

Isa 16:12	והיה כִּי־נראה כִּי־נלאה מואב על־הבמה ובא אל־מקדשו להתפלל ולא יוכל	καὶ ἔσται εἰς τὸ ἐντραπήῃναί σε, ὅτι ἐκοπίασε Μωαβ ἐπὶ τοῖς βωμοῖς καὶ εἰσελεύσεται εἰς τὰ χειροποίητα αὐτῆς ὥστε προσεύξασθαι, καὶ οὐ μὴ δύνῃται ἐξελεῖσθαι αὐτόν.
-----------	--	---

A clause that is practically identical to οὐ μὴ δύνῃται ἐξελεῖσθαι αὐτόν in LXX Isa 16:12, and which likewise describes the inability of things valued by people to save them, comes up in LXX Zeph 1:18:<sup>383</sup>

Zeph 1:18	גם־כספם גם־זהבם לא־יוכל להצילם ביום עברת יהוה	καὶ τὸ ἀργύριον αὐτῶν καὶ τὸ χρυσίον αὐτῶν οὐ μὴ δύνῃται ἐξελεῖσθαι αὐτούς ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὀργῆς κυρίου
-----------	---	--

The idea that the Isaiah translator has borrowed words from the Greek translation of Zeph 1:18 might be sustained by the employment in LXX Isaiah of

<sup>380</sup> The nouns σαγήνη and ἀμφιβλήστρος, as well as the verb ἀμφιβάλλω are extant in LXX Hab 1:16–17 as well: ἔνεκεν τούτου θύσει τῇ σαγήνῃ αὐτοῦ καὶ θυμιάσει τῷ ἀμφιβλήστρῳ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐλίπανεν μερίδα αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὰ βρώματα αὐτοῦ ἐκλεκτά· διὰ τοῦτο ἀμφιβαλεῖ τὸ ἀμφιβλήστρον αὐτοῦ καὶ διὰ παντὸς ἀποκτενεῖν ἔθνη οὐ φείσεται.

<sup>381</sup> δίκτυον has twenty-two occurrences in the LXX; σαγήνη occurs, besides in Isa 19:8 and Hab 1:15–16, only in Qoh 7:26 and Ezek 26:5, 14; 47:10.

<sup>382</sup> For a stylistic explanation of the plus in Isa 19:8, see section 8.3.2.1b.

<sup>383</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 65.

δύνηται—a verb form in the singular, referring to a *plural* (albeit neutral) subject (τὰ χειροποίητα αὐτῆς). In Zeph 1:18 the same singular verb appears, but in this case referring to a singular subject.<sup>384</sup>

A plainer solution, however, is that the addition of ἐξελεῖσθαι αὐτόν in LXX Isa 16:12 was inspired by passages in the book of Isaiah itself: a similar theme, encompassing the false hope of being saved by idols, features, for instance, in Isa 44:17,20 and 46:6–7 (see section 9.3.1). Nevertheless, those texts do not reveal as close a correspondence with LXX Isa 16:12 as the LXX of Zeph 1:18.

Isa 63:4	כִּי יוֹם נִקְם בְּלִבִּי וּשְׁנַת גְּאוּלִּי בִּאֵה	ἡμέρα γὰρ ἀνταποδόσεως ἐπῆλθεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἐνιαυτὸς λυτρώσεως πάρεστι.
----------	---	---

The LXX of Isa 63:4 may have been adapted in line with Zeph 2:2. Both verses announce the coming of the day of the Lord's judgement:

Zeph 2:2	בְּטֶרֶם לֹא־יָבוֹא עֲלֵיכֶם יוֹם אֶף־יְהוָה	πρὸ τοῦ ἐπελθεῖν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἡμέραν θυμοῦ κυρίου.
----------	---	---

Given that LXX Isaiah employs the verb ἐπέρχομαι instead of the more common ἔρχομαι, one might assume that the translator drew inspiration from Zeph 2:2's *Greek* version.

#### 9.4.5.8 Conclusion to 9.4.5

Also as regards the relationship between the Greek translation of Isaiah and the Book of the Twelve Prophets this investigation may have raised more questions than it answers. It is unsure, or even questionable, whether the majority of the examples presented above can confirm the hypothesis of the dependence of LXX Isaiah on either the Hebrew or the Greek text of the Twelve Prophets. Yet, there are some instances that may still leave some room for the idea that the Isaiah translator has made use of the Twelve. These texts, because of literal correspondences between the Greek versions of both documents, may point to the translator's familiarity with the Twelve Prophets in their *Greek* version: see Isa 16:12/Zeph 1:18; Isa 19:8/Hab 1:14–15; Isa 63:4/Zeph 2:2; and Isa 64:1–2/Mic 1:4 above.

<sup>384</sup> *χειροποίητα* is a noun in the neuter plural, therefore able to govern a plural as well as a singular verb. Elsewhere in LXX Isaiah *χειροποίητα* occurs once as the subject of a plural verb (21:9), and also once as the subject of a singular verb (19:1). Outside of LXX Isaiah, the noun functions as a subject in merely one place, that is, in Dan 6:28, governing a plural verb.

### 9.5 Assimilation to fixed biblical phrases

In some instances—of which several have already been examined in the previous paragraphs—the translator did not adopt elements from one *specific* biblical text, but merely adjusted his translation in line with locutions that figure in Scripture repeatedly.<sup>385</sup> Such assimilation to set phrases, as far as it concerns pluses and minuses, occurs in LXX Isaiah in the following places:

3:9	כִּי־גִמְלוּ לָהֶם רָעָה	διότι <u>βεβούλουνται βουλήν</u> πονηράν καθ' ἑαυτῶν
7:5	יֵעָן כִּי־עָץ עֵלִיד אָרַם רָעָה	ὅτι <u>ἐβουλεύσαντο βουλήν</u> πονηράν περὶ σοῦ
31:6	לֹא־שָׁר הָעַמִּיקוּ סָרָה	οἱ τὴν βαθεῖαν <u>βουλήν βουλευόμενοι</u> καὶ ἄνομον.

βουλεύομαι βουλήν reflects the Hebrew idiom עָץ עָץ. In (LXX) Isaiah this phrase can further be found in 8:10; 14:26; 19:17 (LXX); and 31:6 (LXX). Beyond Isaiah it appears in 2 Sam 16:23; 17:7; 1 Kgs 1:12 (MT); 12:8, 13; 2 Chr 10:8; Jer 49:20(29:21); 49:30(30:8); 50:45(27:45); Ezek 11:2; and Dan 6:5 (LXX).

9:18(19)	בַּעֲבֶרֶת יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת	διὰ <u>θυμὸν ὀργῆς</u> κυρίου
	נֶעֱתַם אָרָה	συγκέκεαυται ἡ γῆ ὅλη

The words θυμὸν (τῆς) ὀργῆς also feature in LXX Isa 13:13, and elsewhere in the Septuagint in almost twenty other places. The related expression ὀργῇ (τοῦ) θυμοῦ comes up about thirty times. In the MT the equivalent expressions הָרִוּן וְהָרִי־אֵשׁ are attested approximately forty times.

14:3	וְהָיָה בְּיוֹם הַנִּחַי יְהוָה לֵךְ	Καὶ <u>ἔσται ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ</u> ἀναπαύσει σε ὁ θεός
30:25	בְּיוֹם הָרָג רַב	<u>ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ</u> , ὅταν ἀπόλωνται πολλοὶ

For (ἐν) τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ (and, printed in italics, ἔσται ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ), see in LXX Isaiah: 2:11,17,20; 3:7, 18; 4:2; 5:30; 7:18,20,21,23; 10:17,20,27; 11:10,11; 12:1, 4; 14:4; 17:4, 7, 9; 19:18, 19, 21, 23, 24; 22:8, 12, 20, 25; 23:15; 25:9; 26:1; 27:1, 2, 12, 13; 28:5; 29:18; 30:23; 31:7; 38:12; and 52:6. Across the LXX as a whole (ἐν) τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ occurs hundreds of times.

19:18	וְנִשְׁבַּעוּת לַיהוָה צְבָאוֹת	καὶ <u>ὁμνύουσαι τῷ ὀνόματι</u> κυρίου.
-------	---------------------------------	---

The expression ὁμνύω τῷ ὀνόματι κυρίου/τοῦ θεοῦ/μου—mirroring נִשְׁבַּע בִּשְׁם יְהוָה—has parallels in the LXX of Deut 10:20; Lev 19:12; 1 Kgdms 20:42; Prov 30:22; Isa 48:1; Jer 12:16; 51(44):26; Zech 5:4; and Mal 3:5.<sup>386</sup>

<sup>385</sup> For the distinction between “harmonisation” and “assimilation,” see Tov, “Nature and Background,” 5.

<sup>386</sup> Compare van der Kooij, “The Old Greek of Isaiah 19:16–25,” 135–36.



32:11 וחגורה על-חלצים      περιζώσασθε σάκκους τὰς ὁσφύας

Within LXX Isaiah περιζωννύω σάκκους/σάκκων returns in 3:24 and 15:3. Outside of Isaiah, one comes across this expression in the LXX of 2 Kgdms 3:31; 3 Kgdms 20:27; 21:32; Jer 4:8; 6:26; 30:3; Lam 2:10; Ezek 7:18; and Joel 1:8.

39:2 וישמח עליהם חזקיהו      καὶ ἐχάρη ἐπ' αὐτοῖς Εἰζεκίας χαρὰν μεγάλην

Perhaps the Isaiah translator based his insertion of χαρὰν μεγάλην on a Hebrew manuscript in which he read שמחה גדולה. Alternatively, the words may be an addition in assimilation to the phrase שמחה גדולה שמח, of which the Hebrew Bible has several occurrences: see 1 Kgs 1:40; 1 Chr 29:9; Neh 12:43; and Jonah 4:6. In the LXX this phrase is usually rendered with the help of the verb εὐφραίνω. The expression χαίρω χαρὰν μεγάλην, as it appears in Isa 39:2, can further only be found in Jonah 4:6, as well as once in the New Testament, namely in Matt 2:10.<sup>387</sup>

41:4 מי־פעל ועשה      τίς ἐνήργησε καὶ ἐποίησε ταῦτα;  
41:20 כי יִדְי־הוּהוּ עֲשֵׂתָה זֹאת      ὅτι χεὶρ κυρίου ἐποίησε ταῦτα πάντα

Phrases such as “God who has done (all) these things” recur repeatedly throughout the Bible, particularly in wisdom texts on God’s inapprehensible greatness. Within Isaiah, see 9:6; 37:32; and 45:7, and elsewhere, for instance, in Deut 32:27; Jer 14:22; Dan 3:28; and Jdt 8:14; 15:10.

43:28 ואחלל שרי קדש      καὶ ἐμίαναν οἱ ἄρχοντες τὰ ἁγία μου

In the Greek Isaiah τὰ ἁγία μου has additional occurrences in 30:29 and 62:9. The phrase further appears frequently in the Greek Ezekiel and a few times in Leviticus.

44:28 והיכל תוסד      καὶ τὸν οἶκον τὸν ἁγίον μου θεμελιώσω.<sup>388</sup>

ὁ οἶκος ὁ ἁγίος μου is paralleled in the LXX of Deut 26:15; Isa 63:15; and Mic 1:2. Compare τὰ ἁγία μου above.

45:11 שאלוני על-בני      Ἐρωτήσατέ με περὶ τῶν υἱῶν μου  
καὶ περὶ τῶν θυγατέρων μου

The word couple “sons and daughters” has more than one hundred instances in the MT.

<sup>387</sup> For a third explanation of this plus, see section 9.2.1.5.

<sup>388</sup> 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> has והיכל תיסד. It is unclear, though, whether the suspended yod belongs to either תיסד or והיכל; see section 12.3.1.1.

48:11                      כי איך יחל            ὅτι τὸ ἐμὸν ὄνομα βεβηλοῦται

For the phraseology “to defile (God’s, my, etc.) name,” compare Lev 18:21; 19:12; 20:3; 21:6; and 22:2, 32. In the Book of Ezekiel the same expression is used several times too: in Ezek 20:44; 36:20; 39:7; and 43:8. Compare also βλασφημέω τὸ ὄνομά μου in Isa 52:5.

48:19                      ויהי כחול זרעך            καὶ ἐγένετο ἂν ὡς ἡ ἄμμος τὸ σπέρμα σου  
ווצאצאי מעיך כמעתי            καὶ τὰ ἔκγονα τῆς κοιλίας σου ὡς ὁ χοῦς τῆς γῆς.

The Hebrew equivalent for ὁ χοῦς τῆς γῆς—רֶפֶר (ה) אֶרֶץ—has attestations in Gen 13:16; 28:14; Exod 8:12,13; 2 Sam 22:43; 2 Chr 1:9; Job 14:19; Isa 40:12; and Amos 2:7. For χοῦς (τῆς) γῆς, see the LXX of 2 Kgdms 22:43; 2 Chr 1:9; Amos 2:7; and Sir 44:21.

49:5                      ועתה אמר יהוה            καὶ νῦν οὕτως λέγει κύριος

The messenger formula οὕτως λέγει κύριος is regular phraseology in LXX Isaiah, employed around twenty-six times. In the other books of the LXX one finds only nine examples of it (four in 2 Chronicles and five in Jeremiah). The insertion of οὕτως in the verse under consideration may principally be a matter of contextual harmonisation: see οὕτως λέγει κύριος in verses 7, 8, and 22.

55:11                      והצליח אשר            καὶ εὐοδώσω τὰς ὁδοὺς σου  
שלחתי                      καὶ τὰ ἐντάλματά μου.

A nearly identical expression—καὶ εὐόδωσα τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ—figures in LXX Isa 48:15. Comparable phrases can further be encountered in Gen 24:21, 40, 42, 48, 56, and Deut 28:29.

57:17                      הסתר                      καὶ ἀπέστρεψα τὸ πρόσωπόν μου ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ,  
59:2                      וחסא ותיכם הסתירו            καὶ διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας ὑμῶν ἀπέστρεψε  
                         פנים מכם משמוע            τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ἀφ’ ὑμῶν τοῦ μὴ ἐλεῆσαι.

The verb phrase הסתיר פנים מן / ἀποστρέφω τὸ πρόσωπόν μου ἀπό with God as its subject has precedents in, among others, Deut 31:17, 18; 32:20; Ps 13(12):2; 22(21):25; 27(26):9; 51(50):11; 69(68):18; 88(87):15; 102(101):3; 143(142):7; Isa 8:17; 54:8; 64:6(7); Jer 33(40):5; Ezek 7:22; 39:23, 24, 29; and Mic 3:4. In the Greek version of the formulation πρόσωπον is almost always followed by a possessive pronoun.

66:9 אִם-אֲנִי הַמּוֹלִיד וְעַצְרָתִי οὐκ ἰδοὺ ἐγώ γεννῶσαν καὶ στεῖραν ἐποίησα;

The interjection ἰδοὺ ἐγώ recurs more than two hundred times throughout the LXX, seven times of which are in LXX Isaiah (aside from 66:9, also in 28:16; 37:7; 54:11, 16; 65:18; and 66:12). In the case of 66:9 the supplying of ἰδοὺ may be in adjustment to ἰδοὺ ἐγώ in verse 12.

## 9.6 Conclusion

Anaphoric translation—that is, the borrowing of elements from other biblical texts, both from within the book of Isaiah as well as from beyond—is one of the main tendencies displayed by LXX Isaiah, accounting for a substantial part of the pluses and minuses that can be found in the translation. Sections that have been used for borrowing mostly concern Scriptural passages which exhibit a thematic correspondence with the Isaianic text for which they have been employed. The borrowed elements usually consist of words or expressions, but sometimes a mere theme or thought seems to have been adopted. Besides, the translator has occasionally applied *harmonisation*, in which case he has approximated a formulation to a parallel one elsewhere, often in the near context or in a nearby chapter. Finally, LXX Isaiah contains references to other texts that are (almost) solely lexical, without the occurrence of two similar contexts. This mainly pertains to a number of borrowings from the Greek Pentateuch, a work which was probably utilised by the translator as a kind of lexicon.

Aside from the adoption of expressions or themes from *specific* parts of the Bible, a related category concerns the assimilation to phrases that occur repeatedly across the entire Hebrew Bible, and which may have been fixed formulations. Yet, it is sometimes hard to distinguish whether a plus belongs to the former or to the latter group.

Another difficulty lies in determining whether anaphoric translations in LXX Isaiah are based on either the Hebrew or on the Greek version of a certain text. This problem principally applies to cases of *intertextuality*, though hardly to cases of contextual or intratextual borrowing, for it is obvious that when the translator took elements from the book of Isaiah itself, he commonly made use of his own translation, also when he drew on passages later on in the book. When, however, he relied on scriptures outside of Isaiah, it is not always clear which version he had in front of him. In the case of the Pentateuch he has generally quoted the Greek version, in the case of the prophetic books and the Psalms he might have utilised both versions or only the Hebrew.

When attributing pluses and minuses to anaphoric translation, one has to bear in mind that elements which appear to be derived from other Scriptural texts, are sometimes explainable in another way as well, for instance as being

caused by stylistic motives. Nevertheless, such alternative explanations can often exist side by side. The translator may, for example, have wished to ameliorate his text stylistically and for that purpose have used words that he detected in a related text somewhere else in Scripture.

Although this chapter, in a somewhat simplistic way, generally speaks of the *translator* as the one who extrapolated expressions from biblical passages elsewhere, in most instances it is also possible that it was a later editor who practised this technique. Besides, some anaphoric elements may already have been present in the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the translator, having been introduced into it by a copyist. However, as anaphoric translation occurs so frequently in the LXX of Isaiah, the majority of cases can be assumed to originate from the translator himself.

## **Chapter 10.**

### **SOME OTHER FACTORS THAT MAY HAVE MOTIVATED THE TRANSLATOR TO ADD OR OMIT ELEMENTS**

In the previous part of this study we looked at various tendencies that the LXX of Isaiah displays, giving rise to pluses and minuses in the translation. It became clear that certain factors in particular seem to have motivated the translator to add or omit elements, such as his wish to produce correct Koinē Greek, regularly embellished with rhetorical figures; his concern to extend the number of allusions to other biblical passages; and his inclination to make his text more explicit, but, on the other hand also to abbreviate the translation and to remove redundant or repetitious information from it. Nevertheless, there are several other factors that may have prompted the translator to shorten or expand his text, which have until now not received much attention in this work. Firstly, one of these motives—which has often been singled out in older studies on the Greek Isaiah—is the translator’s supposed deficient knowledge of the Hebrew language. This lack of knowledge would have led him to omit words that he did not understand. In the second place, even if his knowledge of the Hebrew had been excellent, sometimes the Hebrew text presents formulations that seem obscure or illogical. These may have encouraged the translator to “ameliorate” the text by inserting or removing specific words. A third possible reason for his adding or omitting of elements pertains to the theological and ideological considerations that the Isaiah text may have aroused in his mind, and which he may have wanted to incorporate into his translation. These three additional motives—the translator’s supposed lack of understanding of the Hebrew, his inclination to improve or delete vague Hebrew expressions, and his theological and ideological considerations—will be subjected to a short analysis in the paragraphs that follow, and be illustrated with the help of some examples of plus and minus that may be the outcome of them.

### 10.1 Additions and omissions related to the translator's supposed deficient understanding of the Hebrew

In earlier studies on the Greek Isaiah, variants and omissions in the translation were often attributed to the translator's supposed lack of knowledge of the Hebrew language. It was argued that Hebrew was not the regular language of the Jews in Egypt, and that translators could only cope with the usual Hebrew.<sup>1</sup> According to Ziegler, the translator's ignorance of certain Hebrew words is one of the main reasons for minuses in LXX Isaiah.<sup>2</sup> Thackeray, Swete, Ottley, Fischer, and Seeligmann were also convinced of the deficiency of the Isaiah translator in this respect.<sup>3</sup> Where the translation deviates in a significant way from the Hebrew, they considered this in many cases to be the result of the translator's incompetence to deal with rare or complex Hebrew expressions, which would have driven him to conjecture and "stop-gap rendering."<sup>4</sup>

Nowadays, scholars usually display more caution in estimating the level of Hebrew knowledge of the LXX translators. The fact has been pointed out that the Jews in the Hellenistic period were much closer than we are to the time in which Hebrew was a commonly used language.<sup>5</sup> What is more, in Judea Hebrew was probably still a living spoken language at the time of origin of the LXX.<sup>6</sup> Apart from that, we have to bear in mind that our contemporary perspective of the knowledge of Hebrew of the LXX translators may be somewhat blurred, as we tend to compare their standard of Hebrew to the stage of this language that we ourselves are particularly familiar with, that is the Classical Hebrew of the Bible. However, the Hebrew of the translators' generation belonged to another, later phase, in which the language had undergone various changes, and became intermingled with Aramaic. In this later stage some classical words had received a different meaning. This sometimes provides an explanation of why specific words in the Septuagint are rendered in a particular way, which does not reflect their biblical meaning, yet does accord with the later connotation. In a similar way words from Scripture have in the LXX occasionally been interpreted on the

<sup>1</sup> E.g. Frankel, *Vorstudien*, 191–93; Swete, *Introduction*, 319; Ottley, *Book of Isaiah*, 1:36, 51; idem, *Handbook*, 112; Seeligmann, *Septuagint Version*, 49.

<sup>2</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 7, 46–47, 52–53.

<sup>3</sup> Thackeray, "Greek Translators of the Prophetical Books," 583; Swete, *Introduction*, 316; Ottley, *Book of Isaiah*, 1:49–50, etc.; Fischer, *In welcher Schrift*, 5, 7, 9, etc.; Seeligmann, *Septuagint Version*, 49, 56–57. See section 1.1.

<sup>4</sup> See e.g. Ottley, *Book of Isaiah*, 1:50.

<sup>5</sup> Wevers, "Septuaginta-Forschungen," 178.

<sup>6</sup> On the use of Hebrew alongside Aramaic as a popular language in Israel until the fourth century C.E., see e.g. M. H. Segal, *A Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1927), 5–20; Jehoshua M. Grintz, "Hebrew as the Spoken and Written Language in the Last Days of the Second Temple," *JBL* 79 (1960): 32–47; Miguel Pérez Fernández, *An Introductory Grammar of Rabbinic Hebrew* (trans. John Elwolde; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 2–4.

basis of later (Aramaic) homonyms.<sup>7</sup> This difference in perspective also implies that we have to be careful in presuming that the translator did not understand certain “rare” Hebrew words. After all, it could well be that a (late) Hebrew word or phrase that is rare in Scripture—and hence complex from *our* point of view—was common in the dialect of the translator. This can be illustrated by the phenomenon that several Scriptural *hapaxlegomena* are attested in some Qumran Scrolls, reflecting a later stage of the Hebrew, in a much higher frequency.

In line with the above arguments, variants in the Septuagint of Isaiah are in most recent works no longer so readily ascribed to the supposed inadequate command of Hebrew of the translator. Some scholars, such as Koenig<sup>8</sup> and van der Kooij, now even assume that the Isaiah translator must have mastered the Hebrew language quite well. In the latter’s opinion, one can expect his level of proficiency to have reflected the supposition that the translator was probably a member of a circle of Jewish intellectuals originating from the priestly milieu in Jerusalem.<sup>9</sup> An intermediate position between the highly positive image of van der Kooij and Koenig and the rather negative valuation of the translator’s intellectual competence that Ziegler and Ottley give, is taken by Baer. He thinks that “mistakes and a not quite victorious struggle with the book’s difficult Hebrew appear to lie at the root of many of the LXX deviations. These coexist, however, with theological concerns and exegetical practice that produce a work

<sup>7</sup> See e.g. Frankel, *Vorstudien*, 201; Fischer, *In welcher Schrift*, 9–10; Seeligmann, *Septuagint Version*, 49–50; Brockington, “Septuagint and Targum,” 84. For a discussion of this topic, see Jan Joosten, “The Knowledge and Use of Hebrew in the Hellenistic Period. Qumran and the Septuagint,” in *Diggers at the Well. Proceedings of a Third International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira* (ed. Takamitsu Muraoka and John F. Elwolde; STDJ 36; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 115–30. In LXX Isaiah a wealth of examples can be found of Hebrew words that are reinterpreted according to their late Hebrew or Aramaic meaning or to a later homonym, see e.g. 3:8 עֵינַי (“eyes”) / ἐταπεινώθη (Aram. עֵינַי—“bowed down”); 4:2 צֶמַח (“sprout”) / ἐπιλάμψει (Aram. צֶמַח—“brilliance”); 6:10 צִי (“beauty”) / βουλή (Aram. צִי—“counsel”); 9:4(5) בְּדָמִים (“blood”) / μετὰ καταλλαγῆς (late Hebr. “price”); 22:3 נִמְצְאוּךְ (“those who are found in you”) / οἱ ἰσχύοντες ἐν σοὶ (Aram. מְצִי—“to be strong”); 29:15 הִפְכֵם (“perversity”) / ποιοῦμεν (Aram. הִפְכֵם—“to be engaged in”); 30:4 הַבָּאִישׁ (Hof’al בָּאֵשׁ—“to come to shame”) / πονηροί (Aram. בָּאֵשׁ—“to be bad”); 38:16 יַחֲיוּ (“to live”) / ἀνγγέλοι (Aram. חֲיוּ—“to make known”); 53:10 דָּבַח (Pi’el דָּבַח—“to crush”) / καθαρίσαι αὐτὸν (Aram. דָּבִי—“to be pure”).

<sup>8</sup> Koenig, *L’herméneutique analogique*, 23.

<sup>9</sup> van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 66; idem, *Oracle of Tyre*, 107–9. According to van der Kooij the translator belonged to a group of Jews—a priestly circle—around the high priest Onias, who left Jerusalem for Egypt. In the time of the LXX priests were the intellectuals of society; this implies that they must have had a good knowledge of Hebrew. The latter view is also supported by the idea that they came from Jerusalem, where in that period Hebrew was still in use as a spoken language (see the footnote above).

that can only be fully appreciated when allowed *bona fide* status as ancient Jewish biblical interpretation.”<sup>10</sup>

In the following pages we will look at some places in LXX Isaiah where expressions might have been left out because the translator was not acquainted with them. Ziegler mentions about twenty cases where in his opinion the translator omitted words because of their rareness or complexity. Several of those are included in the following list:<sup>11</sup>

17:1 והיתה מע מפלה και ἔσται εἰς πτώσιν

The form מע occurs nowhere else in the Hebrew Bible. Probably it has to be read as ע(ל), which means “heap of ruins.” Ziegler posits that the translator has discarded the obscure word because he did not recognise it.<sup>12</sup> Nonetheless, he might just as well have read or recognised לע or ע in it, which he then omitted in order to condense the text, since the meaning of that noun is similar to מפלה.<sup>13</sup>

23:13 אשור יסרה לציים και αὕτη γρημωται ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀσσυρίων,  
הקימו בחיניו  
עברו ארמנותיה שמה למפלה ὅτι ὁ τοῖχος αὐτῆς πέπτωκεν.

Also בחיני is a scriptural *hapaxlegomenon* with an unclear meaning.<sup>14</sup> One could therefore suspect that the Isaiah translator was not familiar with the word and so removed it. However, as noted before, the fact that a word appears only sporadically in Scripture, does not necessarily imply that it was unknown to the translator. Hence, a better explanation may be that he left out בחיניו (together with its neighbouring words) so as to abbreviate the text.

24:16 חזילי חזילי  
אוי לי בגדים בגדו Οὐαὶ τοῖς ἀθετοῦσιν, οἱ ἀθετοῦντες τὸν νόμον.

<sup>10</sup> Baer, *When We All Go Home*, 17.

<sup>11</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 47–53. In addition to the minuses in 17:1; 28:25; 30:6, 32; 57:19, 20; and 59:10, which are treated in the present paragraph, Ziegler also mentions 16:10 הידד (for my own explanation of this minus, see section 9.4.3.1); 17:6 גרגרים (see section 7.6.2d); 19:16 תנופה (see section 7.5a); 20:4 שת (see section 9.3.1); 21:4 חשקי (see section 7.2.2a); 23:2 מלאוך; 30:14 מיקוד (see section 3.6.2); 30:22 צפוי and אפדת (these are no real minuses, however, but their meaning is integrated into τὰ περιγεγραμμένα and τὰ περιεχόμενα); 30:24 ברחת ובמורה; 41:19 where the LXX gives five instead of seven names of trees (see section 7.2.1b); 47:14 לחמם; 48:6 חזה; 55:2 בלא-לחם; 56:11 לבצעו; 57:8 יד חזית (see section 10.2); and 64:4(5) שש (see section 12.2).

<sup>12</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 52

<sup>13</sup> See section 7.2.1a.

<sup>14</sup> See HALOT 1:118.



28:25 **וּשְׁמִי חַטָּה וְשַׁעֲרָה נִסְמָן** καὶ πάλιν σπείρει πυρὸν καὶ κριθήν  
וּכְסַמְתָּ גְבֻלְתּוֹ καὶ ζέαν ἐν τοῖς ὁρίοις σου;

30:6 ישאו על-בַּת עִירִים חִלָּהֶם  
ועל-דְּבִשָׁת גַּמְלִים אוֹצְרָתָם

30:32 ובמלחמות בתפים ובכנרות תנופה נלחם-בה αὐτοὶ μετὰ αὐλῶν καὶ κιθάρας  
πολεμήσουσιν αὐτὸν

<sup>15</sup> See e.g. Georg Fohrer, *Das Buch Jesaja* (3 vols.; ZBK AT; Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1960–1964), 2:10; Wildberger, *Jesaja*, 2:932–33; *HALOT* 2:1210.

<sup>16</sup> See e.g. סֵּתֵר in Sir 8:18 (LXX: *κρυπτόν*), and compare the Aramaic nouns סֵּתֵר and סֵּתֵרָה, meaning “secret,” in Dan 2:18,19,27–30,47; and 4:6. Also Theodotion appears to have interpreted סֵּתֵר in Isa 24:16 as “secret,” since he translates the word by *το μυστήριον μου εμοι*.

<sup>17</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 52.

<sup>18</sup> See section 3.3.1.

<sup>19</sup> *HALOT* 1:569, 589.

<sup>20</sup> Compare Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 52.

40:19	הפסל נסך חרש וצרף בזהב ירקענו ורתקות כסף צורף	μη εἰκόνα ἐποίησε τέκτων, ἢ χρυσοχόος χωνεύσας χρυσίον περιεχρύσωσεν αὐτόν
-------	---	--

Another example of a *hapaxlegomenon* with an opaque meaning in Isaiah concerns רתקה in 40:19. Fischer suggests that the rareness of this word has caused the omission in the LXX of the entire clause in which it appears.<sup>21</sup>

57:18–19	ואשלם נחמים לו ולאבליו בורא נוב שפתים	καὶ ἔδωκα αὐτῷ παράκλησιν ἀληθινήν
----------	--	------------------------------------

The form נוב is unknown to us. The Masoretes proposed reading it as נִיב—“fruit.” Maybe the Isaiah translator was puzzled by the noun, too, which moved him to omit נוב together with its surrounding words. It is likewise imaginable that he was confused by the phraseology “fruit of the lips.”<sup>22</sup>

57:20	והרשעים בים נגרש כי השקט לא יוכל ויגרשו מימיו רפש וטיט	οἱ δὲ ἄδικοι οὕτως κλυδωνισθήσονται καὶ ἀναπαύσασθαι οὐ δυνήσονται.
-------	--	--

Both Fischer and Ziegler think that the translator could not handle the clause ויגרשו מימיו רפש וטיט, and therefore did not give any rendering of it.<sup>23</sup>

59:10–11	באשמנים כמתים נהמה כדבים כלנו וכיונים הגה נהגה	ὥς ἀποθνήσκοντες στενάξουσιν. ὥς ἄρκος καὶ ὥς περιστέρα ἅμα πορεύονται.
----------	--	---

The minus באשמנים comes from the *hapax* אשמנ\*, the meaning of which is unknown. If the translator was equally baffled, this may be the reason why the phrase was not represented in LXX Isaiah.

## 10.2 Additions and omissions related to the translator’s “improvement” or deletion of obscure or (seemingly) “incorrect” Hebrew

The Isaiah translator may sometimes have “corrected” what he considered an ungrammatical or unclear Hebrew text by way of an addition or omission. This could have happened, for instance, in places where the Hebrew appears elliptic and the translator has complemented the implied words,<sup>24</sup> or on occasions where

<sup>21</sup> Fischer, *In welcher Schrift*, 7.

<sup>22</sup> Compare Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 50.

<sup>23</sup> Fischer, *In welcher Schrift*, 7; Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 50.

<sup>24</sup> For examples, see section 6.9 and chapter 2.

the text contains obscure or illogical constructions or vague phrases which he wanted to repair or to remove. Identifying cases of the latter phenomenon is made complex, however, through the alternative possibility that the corruption was not yet present in the *Vorlage* of the translator, but only occurred in the MT tradition. In this respect, a comparison of LXX Isaiah with 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> could give some indication, were it not that 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> seems to display a similar tendency towards ameliorating unclear Hebrew texts.<sup>25</sup>

The following list of pluses and minuses in LXX Isaiah that are possibly connected to the translator's "correction" of illogical, vague or ungrammatical texts is far from exhaustive, but is just meant to give a glimpse into this feature in LXX Isaiah:

7:23	והיה ביום ההוא <u>יהיה</u> כל־מקום אשר יהיה־שם אלף גפן באלף כסף לשמיר ולשית יהיה	καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ πᾶς τόπος, οὗ ἂν ὦσι χίλια ἄμπελοι χιλίων σίκλων, εἰς χέρσον <u>ἔσονται</u> καὶ εἰς ἄκανθαν. <sup>26</sup>
------	---	--

The translator has probably left out יהיה in the first line because of the occurrence of the same verb at the very end of the sentence, which seems an erroneous repetition.

26:8	אף ארח משפטיך יהיה <u>קיונך</u> לשמך ולזכרך תאות־נפש	ἡ γὰρ ὁδὸς κυρίου κρίσις· <u>ἡλπίσσαμεν</u> ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί σου καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ <u>μνείᾳ</u> , ἣ ἐπιθυμεῖ ἡ ψυχὴ ἡμῶν.
------	--	--

The suffix in קיונך appears superfluous, since the object of קוה—"to hope"—seems already to be embodied in ארח משפטיך, or, in conformity with the interpretation of LXX Isaiah, in לשמך ולזכרך. By not representing the suffix the translator presumably tried to "improve" the text.<sup>27</sup>

29:9	שכרו ולא־יין נעו ולא שכר	καὶ κραιπαλήσατε οὐκ <u>ἀπὸ</u> σικερα οὐδὲ <u>ἀπὸ</u> οἴνου.
------	-----------------------------	--

The translator has supplemented the missing prepositions.<sup>28</sup>

41:3	יעבור שלום ארח ברגליו <u>לא יבוא</u>	καὶ διελύσεται ἐν εἰρήνῃ ἡ ὁδὸς τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ.
------	---	---

<sup>25</sup> Kutscher, *Language and Linguistic Background*, 30–39, 546. See also section 12.3.1.3.

<sup>26</sup> In 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> the first יהיה is missing correspondingly: והיה ביום ההוא כול המקום אשר יהיה שמ אלף גפן; see section 12.3.1.2.

<sup>27</sup> Compare 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>: אפ אורח משפטיך יהוה קיונך לשמך ולתורתך תאית נפש (see section 12.3.1.2).

<sup>28</sup> Compare 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>: שכרון ולא יין נעו ולשכר (see section 12.3.1.1).

This sentence contains an odd construction. Maybe **ברגליו לא יבוא** is meant as an asyndetic relative clause: “He passes on safely, on a way on which he has not (yet) gone with his feet.” Ziegler thinks that the translator was also troubled by the formulation, and for that reason omitted **לֹא יָבֹא**.<sup>29</sup>

55:9      כִּי־גָבְהוּ שָׁמַיִם מֵאָרֶץ      ἄλλ’ ὥς ἀπέχει ὁ οὐρανὸς ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς  
             כֵּן גָּבְהוּ דַּרְכֵי מְדַרְכֵיכֶם      οὕτως ἀπέχει ἡ ὁδὸς μου ἀπὸ τῶν ὁδῶν ὑμῶν<sup>30</sup>

A comparison such as we encounter in 55:9, presenting **כֵּן** in the apodosis, yet not being introduced by **כַּאֲשֶׁר**, is highly unusual in Hebrew.<sup>31</sup> The translator may have supplied the particle.

57:8      אַהֲבַת מִשְׁכָּבם יָד חֲזִית      ἡγάπησας τοὺς κοιμωμένους μετὰ σοῦ

The translator may have elided the cryptic expression **יָד חֲזִית** because he did not grasp its sense in the context.<sup>32</sup>

63:1      זֶה הַדּוֹר בִּלְבוּשׁוֹ צִעָה בָּרַב כָּחוֹ      οὕτως ὥραϊος ἐν στολῇ, βίᾳ μετὰ ἰσχύος;

The meaning of **צִעָה**—“fettered” (see Isa 51:14)—does not seem to fit in the context in which it figures here (“fettered in his great might”). The *BHS* proposes to read the form as **צַעַד**—“to stride.” The misplacement of the word may have induced the Isaiah translator to leave it out.

63:11      וַיִּזְכֹּר יְמֵי־עוֹלָם מֹשֶׁה עַמּוֹ      καὶ ἐμνήσθη ἡμερῶν αἰωνίων

The MT reading, which reads in translation “And he remembered the days of old, of *Moses his people*,” is awkward. Rather than **עַמּוֹ** one would expect **עַבְדּוֹ**—“his servant”—as a specification of **מֹשֶׁה**. Perhaps it was this textual curiosity that prevented the LXX translator from rendering the entire phrase.<sup>33</sup>

<sup>29</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 52.

<sup>30</sup> Compare 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>: **כִּי־בִגְבֹהֶה שָׁמַיִם מֵאָרֶץ כֵּן גָּבְהוּ דַּרְכֵי מְדַרְכֵיכֶם** (see section 12.3.1.1).

<sup>31</sup> Joüon §174e.

<sup>32</sup> See also Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 50, 53. An alternative explanation is that the translator wanted to avoid the inference of a sexual meaning to this clause; see Edward J. Kissane, *The Book of Isaiah. Translated from a Critically Revised Hebrew Text with Commentary* (2 vols.; Dublin: Browne & Nolan, 1941–1943), 2:223; Baer, *When We All Go Home*, 179–81.

<sup>33</sup> Compare Fischer, *In welcher Schrift*, 7.

### 10.3 Additions and omissions related to ideological or theological considerations

Various Septuagint scholars, such as Seeligmann, van der Kooij, and Baer, have tried to reconstruct from the Isaiah translation the theological and ideological thoughts that its translator cherished.<sup>34</sup> The LXX of Isaiah lends itself to such an analysis, as it gives a free rendering of the Hebrew, regularly interspersed with the translator's own ideas and interpretations. Yet, it seems to me that the number of pluses and minuses in LXX Isaiah that have as their background a change of content for ideological or theological reasons is relatively limited. More commonly such changes were realised by means of the reshaping of entire sentences rather than by the addition or omission of a mere word or a few words.<sup>35</sup> Nevertheless, one could still list quite a number of examples in LXX Isaiah of additions or omissions in this area. In the present study I will mention only a few of these, as restrictions in time and space limit me to dealing with just three topics within this interesting field of the *Weltanschauung* of the translator. In the choice of these topics I have been inspired by Baer's monograph *When We All Go Home*, in which the author discusses several homiletic and theological tendencies that can be discerned in the Greek Isaiah. Three of those tendencies which he advances and which I will discuss here, are the translator's particularistic attitude, his image of God, and his avoidance of mythological language.

#### 10.3.1 Additions and omissions related to the translator's nationalistic attitude

According to Baer, one of the typical features of the Isaiah translation is "a nationalistic tendency towards disdain of the Gentiles and an exaltation of Israel/Judah and Jerusalem/Zion." Of this particularistic attitude the translation gives several illustrations.<sup>36</sup> The most obvious one can be found in 19:25:

19:25	בְּרוּךְ עַמִּי מִצָּרִים וּמַעֲשֵׂה יְדֵי אִשּׁוּר וְנַחֲלָתִי יִשְׂרָאֵל	Εὐλογημένος ὁ λαὸς μου ὁ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ ὁ ἐν Ἀσσυρίοις καὶ ἡ κληρονομία μου Ἰσραὴλ.
-------	--	---

<sup>34</sup> See e.g. Seeligmann, *Septuagint Version*, especially 95–121; Arie van der Kooij, "Zur Theologie des Jesajabuches in der Septuaginta," in *Theologische Probleme der Septuaginta und der hellenistischen Hermeneutik* (ed. Henning Graf Reventlow; VWGT 11; Gütersloh: Kaiser, Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1997), 9–25; as well as many other publications from the same author; Baer, *When We All Go Home*.

<sup>35</sup> See section 1.3.2d.

<sup>36</sup> Baer, *When We All Go Home*, 199–230 (230).

Whereas in the Hebrew, Egypt is called “my [= God’s] people,” and Assur is called “the work of my hand,” in the Greek translation the divine blessing only applies to the *Israelite* people.<sup>37</sup>

Another example of this nationalistic penchant giving rise to a minus, is encountered by Baer in 61:7:

61:7 תחת בשחכם משנה

וכלמה ירנו חלקם

לכן בארצם משנה ירשו

שמחת עולם תהיה להם

οὕτως ἐκ δευτέρας κληρονομήσουσι τὴν γῆν,

καὶ εὐφροσύνη αἰώνιος ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς αὐτῶν.

In Baer’s view the translator has left out the first line of 61:7 possibly because he thought it too negative in tone about Zion’s lot, in a context that is otherwise extremely positive for its rebuilders.<sup>38</sup>

Two additional illustrations of elements that may have been inserted or removed in order to safeguard Israel can be found in 41:14 and 54:6:

41:(13–)14 אל־תִּירָאִי תולעת יעקב

מתי ישראל

Μὴ φοβοῦ, Ιακωβ,

ὀλιγοστός Ισραηλ.

תולעת (“worm”) might have been elided on the grounds that it was perceived too dishonourable a title for Jacob.<sup>39</sup>

54:6

כִּי־כָאֲשֶׁה עֲזוּבָה

ועצובת רוח קראך יהוה

ואשת נעורים

כי תמאס אמר אלהיך

οὐχ ὡς γυναῖκα καταλελειμμένην

καὶ ὀλιγόψυχον κέκληκέν σε κύριος

οὐδ’ ὡς γυναῖκα ἐκ νεότητος

μεμισημένην, εἶπεν ὁ θεός σου.

Ziegler assumes that the translator has made this sentence negative because the idea that God would have called Israel as an abandoned and hated woman was offensive to him.<sup>40</sup>

### 10.3.2 Additions and omissions related to the translator’s image of God

A further pattern that Baer distinguishes in the Greek Isaiah is its modification of texts that could put the Divine in an unfavourable light. This Baer observes especially in the translator’s avoidance of anthropomorphic or anthropopathic descriptions of God, and of descriptions that could suggest limits to divine

<sup>37</sup> Compare also L. Mongsengwo-Pasinya, “Isaie xix 16–25 et universalisme dans la LXX,” in *Congress Volume Salamanca 1983* (ed. J. A. Emerton; VTSup 36; Leiden: Brill, 1985), 198–207; van der Kooij, “The Old Greek of Isaiah 19:16–25,” 156.

<sup>38</sup> Baer, *When We All Go Home*, 228–29.

<sup>39</sup> Compare Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 52.

<sup>40</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 96.

perception or power.<sup>41</sup> In order to illustrate the first category—the circumvention of anthropomorphism—he offers several examples of cases where body parts referring to God are not represented in the translation. He believes that these cases, considered in their context, might display a “modest *Tendenz* towards anti-anthropomorphism” of the Greek Isaiah:<sup>42</sup>

34:16	כִּי־פִי הוּא צוֹה	ὅτι κύριος ἐνετείλατο αὐτοῖς
37:17	הִטָּה יִהְיֶה אָזְנוֹךָ וּשְׁמָע פִּקֹּחַ יִהְיֶה עֵינֶיךָ וּרְאָה	εἰσάκουσον, κύριε, εἰσβλεψον, κύριε
40:5	כִּי פִי יִהְיֶה דִבָּר	ὅτι κύριος ἐλάλησε
57:16	כִּירוּחַ מִלִּפְנֵי יַעֲטוּךָ	πνεῦμα γὰρ παρ’ ἐμοῦ ἐξελεύσεται
60:13	לִפְאֹר מְקוֹם מִקְדָּשִׁי וּמִקּוֹם רַגְלֵי אֲכַבְדָּ	δοξάσαι τὸν τόπον τὸν ἁγίόν μου.
62:2	אֲשֶׁר פִּי יִהְיֶה יִקְבְּנוּ	ὁ ὁ κύριος ὀνομάσει αὐτό
63:19 (64:1)	לֹא־קִרְעַת שָׁמַיִם יִרְדַּת מִפְּנֵי הָרִים נִזְלוּ	ἐὰν ἀνοίξης τὸν οὐρανόν, τρόμος λήμψεται ἀπὸ σοῦ ὄρη, καὶ τακήσονται

Baer also notes that in each of the four instances in Isaiah where it is said that something is good or evil in the eyes of God, the word for “eyes” was given no counterpart in the Greek:<sup>43</sup>

38:3	וְהָטוֹב בְּעֵינֶיךָ עֲשִׂיתִי	καὶ τὰ ἀρεστὰ ἐνώπιόν σου ἐποίησα·
59:15	וִירָא יִהְיֶה וִירַע בְּעֵינֶיךָ	καὶ εἶδεν κύριος, καὶ οὐκ ἤρεσεν αὐτῷ
65:12	וּתְעָשׂוּ הָרַע בְּעֵינֶיךָ	καὶ ἐποιήσατε τὸ πονηρὸν ἐναντίον ἐμοῦ
66:4	וַיַּעֲשׂוּ הָרַע בְּעֵינֶיךָ	καὶ ἐποίησαν τὸ πονηρὸν ἐναντίον μου

In addition to the above examples cited by Baer, the following instances of the omission of body parts pertaining to God may also be mentioned

<sup>41</sup> Baer, *When We All Go Home*, 85–86. An anti-anthropomorphic tendency is also attributed to LXX Isaiah by Charles T. Fritsch, “The Concept of God in the Greek Translation of Isaiah,” in *Biblical Studies in Memory of H. C. Alleman* (ed. Jacob M. Myers, O. Reimherr, and H. N. Bream; GTS; New York: Augustin, 1960), 155–69. However, Fritsch errs in also perceiving as evidence of this tendency the free translation of *semiprepositions* referring to God (that is, the rendering of these prepositions without a representation of the body part they include, e.g. בְּעֵינֶיךָ becomes ἐν). Yet, semiprepositions in about seventy percent of their occurrences have been translated in a free way in LXX Isaiah, also when referring to beings other than God; see section 5.7. Fritsch is criticised by Harry M. Orlinsky, “The Treatment of Anthropomorphisms and Anthropopathisms in the Septuagint of Isaiah,” *HUCA* 27 (1956): 193–200, who argues that the cases which Fritsch takes to be “anti-anthropomorphisms” have nothing to do with theology or philosophy but merely with stylism and intelligibility.

<sup>42</sup> Baer, *When We All Go Home*, 103. I have only mentioned Baer’s examples that involve a minus.

<sup>43</sup> Baer, *When We All Go Home*, 106.

(semiprepositions—which in LXX Isaiah are most commonly rendered without the representation of the body part—are excluded):<sup>44</sup>

13:9	הנה יוֹם־יהוה בא אֲכֹרֵי ועברה וחרון אַף	ἰδοὺ γὰρ ἡμέρα κυρίου ἀνίατος ἔρχεται θυμοῦ καὶ ὀργῆς
13:13	וביום חרון אַף	τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, ἣ ἂν ἐπέλθῃ ὁ θυμὸς αὐτοῦ.
25:10	כִּי־תִנּוּחַ יְד־יהוה	ὅτι ἀνάπασιν δώσει ὁ θεὸς
29:23	מעשה יְדִי	τὰ ἔργα μου
30:2	וְפִי לֹא שָׁאֲלוּ	ἐμὲ δὲ οὐκ ἐπηρώτησαν
37:29	ושאננך עלה בַּאֲזִי	καὶ ἡ πικρία σου ἀνέβη πρὸς με
63:9	ומלאך פְּנֵי הוֹשִׁיעַם	οὐδὲ ἄγγελος, ἀλλ' αὐτὸς κύριος ἔσωσεν αὐτοὺς

However, as Baer himself also acknowledges,<sup>45</sup> the Isaiah translator is far from systematic in removing body parts described as belonging to God. In the majority of cases they are rendered literally in the Greek.<sup>46</sup> Furthermore, in the Greek text of 24:3 there is mention of God's mouth without any prompting from the Hebrew:

24:3	כִּי יְהוה דבר את־הדבר הזה	τὸ γὰρ <u>στόμα</u> κυρίου ἐλάλησε ταῦτα.
------	----------------------------	---

Besides, one can hardly be certain that the omission of divine body parts actually took place for the sake of avoiding anthropomorphic descriptions of God, because, when relating to beings other than the Divine One, body parts are also regularly omitted in LXX Isaiah, namely, in cases where they are not necessary for a right understanding of the text (see 10:10,13,27; 22:22; 24:18; 30:6, 29; 34:6; and 38:17). They were probably left out for the purpose of abbreviating the text, or rendered freely in analogy to semiprepositions.<sup>47</sup>

Hence, in my opinion, it is a rather complicated matter to ascertain whether the Isaiah translator truly wanted to escape the attribution of body parts to God. Nonetheless, some other examples can be found that in a less ambiguous way may show the translator's uneasiness with the text when it pictures God in a too human way:

38:11	לֹא־אֵרָאָה יְהוה בִּארְץַּ הַחַיִּים	Οὐκέτι μὴ ἴδω <u>τὸ σωτήριον</u> τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς
-------	--	--

Maybe τὸ σωτήριον was added because the notion of seeing God in “the land of the living” was inappropriate in the translator's view. Compare also 40:5 for the

<sup>44</sup> See section 5.7.

<sup>45</sup> Baer, *When We All Go Home*, 159.

<sup>46</sup> See e.g. 1:20,25; 5:12,25; 9:12(11),17(16),21(20); 10:4; 11:4, 11,15; 14:26, 27; 19:16; 24:21; 25:8, 11; 26:11; 31:3; 34:17; 40:2, 12; 41:10, 20; 43:13; 45:11, 12, 23; 48:3, 13; 49:2, 16, 22; 50:2; 51:16, 17; 55:11; 58:14; 59:1; 62:3, 8; 63:12; 64:8(7); 65:2; and 66:2, 14 (semiprepositions are excluded).

<sup>47</sup> See sections 7.2.2a; 3.3.1; and 5.7.



translator's possible discomfort with the idea of the perception of the Divine by human beings:

40:5                      ונגלה כבוד יהוה                      καὶ ὁφθήσεται ἡ δόξα κυρίου,  
                                    וראו כל-בשר יחדו                      καὶ ὄψεται πᾶσα σὰρξ **τὸ σωτήριον** τοῦ θεοῦ.

Possibly the translator read יחדו in 40:5 as יהוה, and—considering as improper the thought of seeing the Divine Being himself—made “the *salvation* of God” into the object of observation, thus creating phraseology similar to 38:11. But also when having read יחדו as it stands, and regarding the יהוה כבוד as the entity that will be seen by all flesh, the translator may have wanted to replace this abstraction by something that was less easy to be identified with God himself.

However, the idea that God can be perceived by human eyes has not been removed everywhere in LXX Isaiah. It can still be found in the translation of 6:5: καὶ τὸν βασιλέα κύριον σαβαωθ εἶδον τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς μου. Maybe we have to conclude from this that the addition of τὸ σωτήριον in 38:11 and 40:5 does not go back to any antropomorphistic tendency of the translator. Perhaps it is just linked to his interest in the theme of “seeing God’s salvation.” The same theme features in Isa 52:10: καὶ ὄψονται πάντα τὰ ἄκρα τῆς γῆς τὴν σωτηρίαν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ.

An instance where the translator may have omitted text in order to delete an image of God that was negative in his eyes can be detected in Isa 53:4 within a passage focusing on the suffering servant:

53:4                      ואנחנו חשבנהו נגוע                      καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐλογισάμεθα αὐτὸν εἶναι ἐν πόνῳ  
                                    מכה **אלהים** ומענה                      καὶ ἐν πληγῇ καὶ ἐν κακώσει.

The Hebrew text insinuates that it was *God* who caused the servant to suffer. The translator may have disliked this idea, and hence banned it from his translation.

Something similar has happened in verse 10:

53:10                      ויהיה חפץ **דכאו**                      καὶ κύριος βούλεται **καθαρίσαι αὐτὸν**  
                                    החלי                      τῆς πληγῆς.<sup>48</sup>

Whereas in the Hebrew it pleases God to *crush* the servant, the Greek softens the text by stating that God wants to *purify* him.

Two other examples where the translator may have eliminated words because they clashed with his image of God, appear in 37:28–29 and 59:13:

<sup>48</sup> καθαρίσαι reflects the Aramaic root דכא or ככא—“to cleanse” (see Seeligmann, *Septuagint Version*, 50). That the translator rendered the verb in this way *intentionally* and not because he was unfamiliar with its Biblical Hebrew meaning “to crush,” is indicated by the fact that in Isa 57:15 he did translate דכא in its Hebrew sense, i.e. by means of the verb συντριβω.

37:28–29 ואת התרגוך אלי יען התרגוך אלי ὁ δὲ θυμός σου, ὃν ἐθυμώθης

The omission of אלי might be for the reason that anger directed towards God was too disrespectful in the eyes of the translator.

59:13 פשע וכחש ביהוה ונסוג ἡσεβήσαμεν καὶ ἐψευσάμεθα καὶ ἀπέστημεν  
מאחר אלהינו ἀπὸ ὀπισθεν τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν.

Possibly the translator regarded the idea of lying to God himself as verging on blasphemy, and therefore removed ביהוה.

### 10.3.3 Additions and omissions in the context of pagan or mythological elements

To conclude this chapter, I will present a few examples of a third pattern that Baer thinks he can detect in the Greek Isaiah: the translator's inclination towards downgrading idolatrous practices and avoiding mythological language. In his monograph Baer offers several illustrations of this kind, but here I shall just very briefly mention the ones that entail a plus or a minus.

16:12 והיה כי־נראה καὶ ἔσται εἰς τὸ ἐντραπῆναί σε,  
כי־נלאה מואב על־הבמה ὅτι ἐκοπίασε Μωαβ ἐπὶ τοῖς βωμοῖς  
ובא אל־מקדשו καὶ εἰσελεύσεται εἰς τὰ χειροποίητα αὐτῆς  
להתפלל ὥστε προσεύξασθαι,  
ולא יוכל καὶ οὐ μὴ δύνηται ἐξελεῖσθαι αὐτόν.

In contrast to the MT, which speaks of Moab who cannot pray, in the LXX—thanks to the insertion of ἐξελεῖσθαι αὐτόν—it is idols made by the hand of man that are “not able to save.” In this way the translator has seized on the possibility of ridiculing the Moabite cult.<sup>49</sup>

45:20 ומתפללים אל־אל ומתפללים אל־אל καὶ προσευχόμενοι ὡς πρὸς θεούς,  
לא יושיע לא יושיע οἱ οὐ σώζουσιν.

Perhaps ὡς has been added to stress that they are not real gods who are being worshipped.<sup>50</sup>

51:9–10 הלוא את־היא המחצבת רהב מחוללת תנן הלא את־היא המחצבת ים  
מי תהום רבה οὐ σὺ εἴ ἡ ἐρημοῦσα θάλασσαν,  
השמה מעמקיים ὕδωρ ἀβύσσου πλῆθος;  
דרך לעבר גאולים ἡ θεῖσα τὰ βάθη τῆς θαλάσσης  
ὁδὸν διαβάσεως ῥυομένοις

<sup>49</sup> Baer, *When We All Go Home*, 173–75.

<sup>50</sup> See Baer, *When We All Go Home*, 175–76.

Rather than erroneously through *homoeoarkton*, Baer thinks that the translator has intentionally omitted the words מחוללת תנין רהב את-היא המחצבת רהב (“Was it not you who cut Rahab in pieces, who pierced the dragon?”). This could have been an anti-mythological manoeuvre of his.<sup>51</sup> The omission of these words could however also have another background, because whereas in the MT the subject of this clause, as well as of the preceding ones, is God, in the LXX it is Jerusalem (see verse 9 Ἐξεγείρου ἐξεγείρου, Ἱερουσαλημ). It may be that the translator has erased the sentence because he thought that Jerusalem as a subject would not fit with the destroying of Rahab.

65:3                      זבחים בגנות                      αὐτοὶ θυσιάζουσιν ἐν τοῖς κήποις  
                                 ומקטרים על-הלבנים                      καὶ θυμιῶσιν ἐπὶ ταῖς πλίνθοις  
                                 τοῖς δαιμονίοις, ἃ οὐκ ἔστι·

The Greek text supplies the verse with an indirect object, thus stating that the burning of incense upon the bricks is performed for the sake of “the demons who do not exist.” Baer rightly observes that in this way the translation does not only ascribe a demonic element to pagan cult, but also derides it by claiming that the demons that are worshipped do not exist at all.<sup>52</sup>

A final example can be found in 8:14, where the translator has twice inserted a negation, apparently in order to side-step the comparison of God to a stone, as this could arouse pagan associations:<sup>53</sup>

8:14                      והיה למקדש                      ἔσται σοι εἰς ἀγίασμα,  
                                 ולאבן נגף                      καὶ οὐχ ὥς λίθου προσκόμματα συναντήσεσθε αὐτῷ  
                                 ולצור מכשול                      οὐδὲ ὥς πέτρας πτώματι·

A similar avoidance of the metaphor “rock” for denoting God can be observed in Isa 17:10; 26:4; 30:29; and 44:8:

17:10                      וצור מעוז לא זכרת                      καὶ κυρίου τοῦ βοηθοῦ σου οὐκ ἐμνήσθης.  
26:4                      כי ביה יהוה צור עולמים                      ὁ θεὸς ὁ μέγας ὁ αἰώνιος  
30:29                      לבוא בהר־יהוה                      εἰσελθεῖν μετὰ αὐλοῦ εἰς τὸ ὄρος τοῦ κυρίου  
                                 אל-צור ישראל                      πρὸς τὸν θεὸν τοῦ Ἰσραηλ;  
44:8                      ואתם עדי הִישׁ אֱלֹהִים                      μάρτυρες ὑμεῖς ἔστε, εἰ ἔστι θεὸς  
                                 מבלעדי ואין צור בלי־דעתִי                      πλὴν ἐμοῦ· καὶ οὐκ ἦσαν τότε

<sup>51</sup> Baer, *When We All Go Home*, 170–71.

<sup>52</sup> Baer, *When We All Go Home*, 176–77.

<sup>53</sup> Compare Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 95–96; Seeligmann, *Septuagint Version*, 57; Fritsch, “Concept of God,” 162–63.

### 10.4 Conclusion

In this chapter I have discussed three additional factors which may have motivated the Isaiah translator to add or omit elements from his text, but which play only a minor role in the clarification of pluses and minuses in LXX Isaiah. In the first place, this is the translator's possible failure to understand the Hebrew text in some places. The translator may have left out certain expressions, because he was not acquainted with them. Yet, we have to be modest in ascertaining which words the translator may not have been familiar with, as this always remains a rather subjective matter. In the second place, the Isaiah translator may sometimes have "corrected" what he considered an ungrammatical or unclear Hebrew text by way of an addition or omission. Thirdly, the translator will at times have added or omitted text for ideological or theological motives, arising, for instance, from his particularistic attitude, his image of God, or his wish to avoid mythological language. It seems, however, that a relatively limited number of pluses and minuses has been produced by such motivations, as these have generally led to the reformulation of entire sentences or passages rather than to the mere implementation or omission of one or two words.

## Chapter 11.

### PLUSES AND MINUSES CAUSED BY TRANSLATION MISTAKES

Besides elements which the translator added to or omitted from his text deliberately and for specific reasons, another category of additions and omissions consists of those that he may have caused erroneously. Two kinds of such errors which regularly occur in translations, and which result in missing text units, are haplography and *parablepsis*. Below one will find a collection of minuses in the Greek Isaiah that could be the outcome of these translation mistakes.

#### 11.1 Haplography

Haplography entails that the copyist or translator accidentally skipped one of two identical or similar adjacent text elements, which was thus not represented in his text.<sup>1</sup> Often it is hard to determine, however, whether the single representation in the LXX of two similar MT elements actually indicates haplography on the part of the translator, or that it was rather the result of dittography—which is the erroneous *double* writing of an element—in the MT tradition, while the LXX has preserved the original text. In addition to that, it is also possible that some errors of haplography had already been made by the copyist of LXX Isaiah's Hebrew *Vorlage*. Moreover, many of the minuses that might be due to haplography, could in fact also be explained as intentional omissions by the translator in order to condense his text, leaving out information that he considered redundant (see 16:10; 22:14; 26:4, 6; 41:26; 49:8; 59:21; 62:7; and 65:18 below, and see also section 7.3.1). For similar reasons, I have not included in the list below possible cases of haplography where the Hebrew displays an immediate and precise repetition of an expression while the Greek

---

<sup>1</sup> See Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 237.

renders only one of its two occurrences. Since the deletion of this kind of repetition (*geminatio*) occurs so often in LXX Isaiah, it rather seems to point to a deliberate policy of the translator.<sup>2</sup> This makes it unnecessary to consider whether such cases may be attributed to a translational error.

Under the reservations mentioned above, the following minuses in LXX Isaiah could have been the consequence of an error of haplography:

2:14	ועל כלההרים הרמים	καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶν ὄρος
15:2	על־נבו ועל מידבא מואב ייליל	ἐπὶ Ναβαυ τῆς Μωαβίτιδος ὀλολύζετε
16:10	יין ביקבים לא־ידרך	καὶ οὐ μὴ πατήσουσιν οἶνον
	הדרך	εἰς τὰ ὑπολήνια <sup>3</sup>
21:16	וכלה כל־כבוד קדר	ἐκλείψει ἢ δόξα τῶν υἱὼν Κηδαρ <sup>4</sup>
22:14–15	אמר אדני יהוה צבאות	Τάδε λέγει κύριος σαβαωθ
	כה אמר אדני יהוה צבאות	ὅτι ἀπώλετο, καὶ οὐκέτι ἔρχονται
23:1	כי שדד מבית מבוא	ἐκ γῆς Κιτιέων·
	מארץ כתים	ἀλλὰ τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν ἔναντι κυρίου
23:18	כי לישבים לפני יהוה יהיה	πᾶσα ἡ ἐμπορία αὐτῆς
	סחרה	ὅτι ἐπὶ σοὶ ἤλπισαν, κύριε,
26:3–4	כי בך בטוח בטחו ביהוה	ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος <sup>5</sup>
	עדי־עד	καὶ πατήσουσιν αὐτοὺς πόδες πραέων
26:6	תרמסנה רגל רגלי עני	καὶ ταπεινῶν. <sup>6</sup>
	פעמי דלים	οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ προλέγων
41:26	אף אינ־מגיד אף אין משמיע	οὐδὲ ὁ ἀκούων τοὺς λόγους ὑμῶν.
	אף אינ־שמע אמריכם	ἐβοήθησά σοι καὶ ἔδωκά σε
49:8	עזרת־ך ואצרך ואתנך	εἰς διαθήκην ἑθνῶν
	לברית עם	καὶ ἐκ τοῦ στόματος τοῦ σπέρματός σου
59:21	ומפי זרעך ומפי זרע זרעך	οὐκ ἔστι γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅμοιος
62:6–7	אל־דמי לכם	
	ואל־תתנו דמי לו	
65:18	כי־אם־שישו וגילו	ἀλλ' εὐφροσύνην καὶ ἀγαλλίαμα
	עדי־עד אשר אני בורא	εὐρήσουσιν ἐν αὐτῇ·
	כי הנני בורא את־ירושלם גילה	ὅτι ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ποιῶ Ἱερουσαλημ ἀγαλλίαμα

<sup>2</sup> See section 8.7.

<sup>3</sup> For another explanation, see section 9.4.3.1.

<sup>4</sup> Compare 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>: יכלה כבוד קדר (see section 12.3.1.2). For the lack of representation of כל, see section 3.4.

<sup>5</sup> Compare 1QIsa<sup>b</sup>: כי בכה בטחו ביהוה (see section 12.3.1.2). For an alternative explanation, see section 5.6a.

<sup>6</sup> Compare 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>: תרמסנה רגלי עניים (see section 12.3.1.2).

## 11.2 Parablepsis

*Parablepsis*—also called *homoeoteleuton* or *homoeoarkton*—refers to the phenomenon where “the eye of the copyist (or translator) jumped from the first appearance of a word (or words) to its (their) second appearance, so that in the copied text (or translation) the intervening section was omitted together with one of the repeated elements.”<sup>7</sup>

This error may have accounted for some seventeen minuses in LXX Isaiah. Among these one can find relatively many large ones:

6:13	כאלה וכאלון אשר בשלכת <u>מצבת</u> במ זרע קדש <u>מצבתה</u>	ὡς τερέβινθος καὶ ὡς βάλανος ὅταν ἐκπέσῃ ἀπὸ τῆς θήκης αὐτῆς. <sup>8</sup>
10:21	<u>שאר ישוב שאר</u> יעקב אל-אל גבור	καὶ ἔσται τὸ καταλειφθὲν τοῦ Ἰακώβ ἐπὶ θεὸν ἰσχύοντα.
11:15	בעים רוחן והכהו לשבעה נחלים	πνεύματι βιαίῳ <u>καὶ</u> πατάξει ἐπτά φάραγγας <sup>9</sup>
14:23–24	נאם יהוה <u>צבאות</u> <u>נשבע יהוה צבאות</u>	τάδε λέγει κύριος σαβαωθ <sup>10</sup>
25:9	הנה אליהו זה <u>קוינו לו</u> וישיענו זה יהוה <u>קוינו לו</u>	Ἰδοὺ ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν, ἐφ’ ᾧ ἠλπίζομεν
30:26	ואור החמה יהיה <u>שבעתים כאור שבעת הימים</u> ביום חבש יהוה	καὶ τὸ φῶς τοῦ ἡλίου ἔσται ἐπταπλάσιον ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, ὅταν ἰάσῃται κύριος
31:3	וכשל <u>עוזר</u> ונפל <u>עוזר</u> ויחדו כלם יכליון	καὶ κοπιήσουσιν οἱ βοηθοῦντες, καὶ ἅμα πάντες ἀπολοῦνται.
36:10–11	ועתה המבלעדי יהוה עליתי על-הארץ הזאת <u>להשחיתה יהוה אמר אלי עלה</u> <u>אל-הארץ הזאת והשחיתה</u> ויאמר אליקים	καὶ νῦν μὴ ἄνευ κυρίου ἀνέβημεν ἐπὶ τὴν χώραν ταύτην πολεμῆσαι αὐτήν;  καὶ εἶπε πρὸς αὐτὸν Ἐλιακίμ

<sup>7</sup> Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 238.

<sup>8</sup> See K. Budde, “Über die Schranken, die Jesajas prophetischer Botschaft zu setzen sind,” ZAW 41 (1923): 167; Wildberger, *Jesaja*, 1:234; J. A. Emerton, “The Translation and Interpretation of Isaiah vi. 13,” in *Interpreting the Hebrew Bible. Essays in Honour of E. I. J. Rosenthal* (ed. J. A. Emerton and Stefan C. Reif; UCOP 32; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 88–89; see also section 12.2.

<sup>9</sup> Compare 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>: בעיים רוח.

<sup>10</sup> Compare Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 48.

- 38:14–15 ערבני מה־אדבר ואמר־לי והוא עשה אדדה כל־שנותי על־מר נפשי και ἀφείλατό μου τῇν ὁδύνην τῆς ψυχῆς.<sup>11</sup>
- 40:7–8 יבש חציר נבל ציץ כי רוח יהוה נשבה בו אכן חציר העם יבש חציר נבל ציץ ודבר־אלהינו יקום לעולם ἐξηράνθη ὁ χόρτος, και τὸ ἄνθος ἐξέπεσε  
τὸ δὲ ῥῆμα τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.<sup>12</sup>
- 41:13–14 אל־תירא אני עזרתֶךָ אל־תיראי תולעת יעקב Μὴ φοβοῦ, Ιακωβ<sup>13</sup>
- 44:8–9 ואין צור בל־ידעתני יצרי־פסל και οὐκ ᾔσαν τότε οἱ πλάσσοντες και γλύφοντες<sup>14</sup>
- 44:9 וחמודיהם בל־יועילו ועדיהם המה בל־יראו ובל־ידעו למען יבשו οἱ ποιοῦντες τὰ καταθύμια αὐτῶν, ἃ οὐκ ὠφέλησει αὐτούς· ἀλλὰ αἰσχυνθήσονται
- 44:13 יתארהו בשרד יעשהו במקצעות ובמחוגה יתארהו ויעשהו כתבנית איש και ἐν κόλλῃ ἐρρυθμίσεν αὐτό, ἐποίησεν αὐτὸ ὡς μορφὴν ἀνδρὸς<sup>15</sup>
- 51:9–10 הלוא את־היא המחצבת רהב מחוללת תנץ הלוא את־היא המחרבת ים οὐ σὺ εἶ ἡ ἐρημοῦσα θάλασσαν
- 62:4 כי לך יקרא חפצי־בָּה ולארצך בעולה כי־חפץ יהוה בך וארצך תבעל σοὶ γὰρ κληθήσεται Θέλημα ἐμόν, και τῇ γῇ σου Οἴκουμένη.
- 66:3 שוחט השור מכה־איש זובח השה ערף כלב ὁ δὲ ἄνομος ὁ θύων μοι μόσχον ὡς ὁ ἀποκτέννων κύνα

As is the case with haplography, some minuses that in theory could have arisen from *parablepsis*, may in fact have originated from the translator's intentional condensation of the text; see 14:24; 25:9; 31:3; 44:13; 62:4; and 66:3.<sup>16</sup>

<sup>11</sup> HUB Isa, 169.

<sup>12</sup> Compare 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>: אלוהינו יקום לעולם: יבש חציר נבל ציץ (ודבר) .... נשבה בוא הכן חציר העם יבש חציר נבל ציץ ודבר אלוהינו. See section 12.2 and 12.3.1.2.

<sup>13</sup> TOL may have been omitted because the translator considered it too offensive a designation for Israel (see section 10.3.2).

<sup>14</sup> HUB Isa, 199.

<sup>15</sup> Compare Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 49.

<sup>16</sup> See sections 7.2.1c and 7.4.2.



### 11.3 Other possible cases of translational errors

Besides the cases mentioned above, there are several other minuses that may likewise have been brought about by a reading error on the part of the translator as a consequence of the occurrence of similar words, even though they strictly speaking cannot be attributed to *parablepsis* or haplography:

5:30	והנה <u>חשך</u> צר ואור <u>חשך</u> בעריפיה	καὶ ἰδοὺ σκότος σκληρόν ἐν τῇ ἀπορίᾳ αὐτῶν.
7:8	כי ראש ארם דמשק <u>וראש דמשק רצין</u>	ἀλλ' ἡ κεφαλὴ Ἀραμ Δαμασκός
7:22	והיה מרב עשות חלב <u>יאכל חמאה כיחמאה</u> ודבש יאכל כל-הנותר בקרב הארץ	καὶ ἔσται ἀπὸ τοῦ πλεῖστον ποιεῖν γάλα βούτυρον καὶ μέλι φάγεται πᾶς ὁ καταλειφθεὶς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. <sup>17</sup>
21:13	משא <u>בערב</u> ביער <u>בערב</u> תלינו	ἐν τῷ δρυμῷ ἐσπέρας κοιμηθήσῃ <sup>18</sup>
38:7–8	וזה-לך האות מאת יהוה אשר יעשה יהוה את-הדבר הזה <u>אשר דבר הנני</u>	τοῦτο δέ σοι τὸ σημεῖον παρὰ κυρίου ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ποιήσει τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο·
42:19	מי עור כי אס-עבדי <u>וחרש כמלאכי אשלח מי עור</u> כמשלם ועור כעבד יהוה	καὶ τίς τυφλὸς ἀλλ' ἡ οἱ παῖδές μου καὶ κωφοὶ ἀλλ' ἡ οἱ κυριεύοντες αὐτῶν; καὶ ἐτυφλώθησαν οἱ δοῦλοι τοῦ θεοῦ.
45:5	אני יהוה ואין עוד זולתי <u>אין</u> אלהים <u>אאזרד</u> ולא ידעתני	ὅτι ἐγὼ κύριος ὁ θεός, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἕτι πλὴν ἐμοῦ θεός, καὶ οὐκ ἦδεις με
47:12	<u>אולי תוכלי</u> הועיל <u>אולי תערוצי</u>	εἰ δυνήσῃ ὠφεληθῆναι.
55:1	ואשר אין-לו כסף <u>לכו שברו</u> ואכלו <u>ולכו שברו</u> בלוא-כסף	καὶ ὅσοι μὴ ἔχετε ἀργύριον, βαδίσαντες ἀγοράσατε καὶ πίετε ἀνευ ἀργυρίου <sup>19</sup>
59:18	כעל גמלות כעל ישלם חמה <u>לצריו גמול לאיביו לאיים גמול ישלם</u>	ὥς ἀνταποδώσω ἀνταπόδοσιν ὄνειδος τοῖς ὑπεναντίοις.

<sup>17</sup> Wildberger (*Jesaja*, 1:302) thinks that part of the text is missing in the translation on account of an *aberratio oculi*. However, the translator may just as well have omitted the words intentionally so as to abbreviate his text (see section 7.4.2).

<sup>18</sup> Compare Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 48.

<sup>19</sup> 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> offers ואשר אין לו כסף לכו שבורו בלוא כסף.

### 11.4 Conclusion

Approximately forty minuses might have originated in accidental omission by the translator due to similar words appearing in his text. Yet, a considerable number of these could equally well have been the result of the translator's tendency to condense his text. Besides, it is probable that some of the errors of haplography and *parablepsis* had already been made by the copyist of the Hebrew manuscript underlying LXX Isaiah.

## Chapter 12.

# PLUSES AND MINUSES CAUSED BY A DIFFERENT *VORLAGE*

### 12.1 Introduction

Everyone engaged in the study of ancient Bible translations knows how complicated this research is made by the everlasting uncertainty surrounding the origin of variant readings. Have they been caused by the translator himself or by an underlying Hebrew text that was different from the MT? This complication also affects the Greek translation of Isaiah. Even if there is some consensus on the idea that the majority of its numerous variants are the achievement of the translator, the possibility of a different *Vorlage* should not too easily be dismissed.

In order to identify pluses, minuses and variant readings in LXX Isaiah as the outcome of a different *Vorlage*, two criteria may be of help. These are, in the first place, the lack of a translation tendency or pattern that can explain the plus or minus, and secondly, the attestation of a similar variant in one of the Qumran manuscripts of Isaiah. If a plus or minus is supported by a Qumran document, and cannot be clarified by one of the translation tendencies LXX Isaiah displays, one may reasonably suspect this plus or minus to be due to a Hebrew text deviating from the MT. Obviously, these criteria can still not save us from speculation, and if one were able to take a glimpse into the translator's Hebrew manuscript, one would, without doubt, be confronted with some unexpected findings. Nonetheless, these two principles may be a first step in the direction of determining in which places the LXX Isaiah *Vorlage* has deviated from the MT.

There is a third situation in which LXX variants are occasionally ascribed to a different Hebrew text, namely when the MT seems to contain a textual error that can be demonstrated to have developed from the retroverted Greek variant.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Tov, *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint*, 82.

Yet, this criterion is not reliable as it concerns the LXX of Isaiah, because its translator betrays an inclination to “improve” Hebrew texts that were difficult or ambiguous to him. One example to illustrate this is the following:

48:14    יהוה אהבו יעשה חפצו    ἀγαπῶν σε ἐποίησα τὸ θέλημά σου  
           בבבל וזרעו כשדים        ἐπὶ Βαβυλῶνα τοῦ ἄραι σπέρμα Χαλδαίων.

The Hebrew text is peculiar: “He shall perform his purpose on Babylon, *and his arm* the Chaldeans.” It could be conjectured, as is done by, among others, Duhm, Fohrer, and Hermisson,<sup>2</sup> that one has to read וזרעו for זרעו, and interpret זרע as “seed” rather than as “arm”: “and (on) *the seed* of the Chaldeans.” This also appears to have been the reading of the LXX. Still, the Isaiah translator may have had a Hebrew text in front of him which was similar to the MT, and which he “corrected” himself, just as he regularly did in complex textual situations.<sup>3</sup> The latter assumption is supported by 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>, which offers זרועו, and hence—in accordance with the MT—does display a suffix in the noun.

In the continuation of this chapter the two criteria proposed for establishing pluses and minuses in LXX Isaiah to derive from a different *Vorlage* will be discussed in more detail. Additionally, some examples will be offered of cases which meet with either of both.

## 12.2 A plus or minus can not be explained by one of the translation tendencies LXX Isaiah displays

With respect to the addition or omission of elements in the translation, the main tendencies that LXX Isaiah appears to exhibit, as discussed in the previous chapters, are: explicitation; implicitation; the addition or omission of certain particles; free translation of Hebrew grammatical and idiomatic features; double translation; condensation; the creation or improvement of rhetorical figures; contextual harmonisation and the borrowing of elements from other biblical texts (both from within and beyond the book of Isaiah). Besides these, there are some pluses and minuses that may have their origin in the translator’s solution of ambiguous or complex Hebrew formulations, as well as some that might derive from translational mistakes. Finally, a number of cases of plus and minus in LXX Isaiah are bound to a rearrangement of the Hebrew text. Pluses and

<sup>2</sup> Bernhard Duhm, *Das Buch Jesaja* (3<sup>rd</sup> enl. ed.; HKAT 1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1914), 336; Fohrer, *Jesaja*, 3:115; Karl Elliger and Hans-Jürgen Hermisson, *Deuterojesaja* (2 vols.; BKAT 11; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1978–2003), 2:256. *BHS* proposes וזרעו. Marti proposes to read a verb form יגלה prior to זרעו: “dass er seinen Willen ausrichte an Babel Und seinen Arm offenbare an den Chaldäern”; see Karl Marti, *Das Buch Jesaja* (KHC 10; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1900), 324.

<sup>3</sup> For more examples, see section 10.2.

minuses which may be considered not to be assignable to one of these categories, are, for instance, the following:

1:4                      עזבו את־יהוה              ἐγκατελίπατε τὸν κύριον  
נאצו את־קדוש ישראל נורו אחור              καὶ παρωργίσατε τὸν ἅγιον τοῦ Ἰσραηλ.

According to Duhm, Ziegler, and Watts the Isaiah translator may not have read נורו אחור in his Hebrew manuscript,<sup>4</sup> as “the two words appear to exceed the metric form and the compact composition and probably should be judged a gloss.”<sup>5</sup> In Ziegler’s view the words may have entered the MT version from Isa 42:17 (נסגו אחור).<sup>6</sup> The Qumran manuscripts of Isaiah agree with the MT, however. Hence, it seems more likely to me that the translator omitted the clause in order to shorten the text, because in content נורו אחור is close to the two preceding lines.

4:1                      והחזיקו שבע נשים              καὶ ἐπιλήμψονται ἑπτὰ γυναῖκες  
באיש אחד ביום ההוא לאמר              ἀνθρώπου ἐνὸς λέγουσαι

ביום ההוא may be a secondary addition in the MT, which is often the case with this formula.<sup>7</sup> Perhaps it was inserted in the parent text of the MT in analogy to ביום ההוא in verse 2. Nevertheless, 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> offers the phrase as well.

8:2                      ואעידה לי עדים נאמנים              καὶ μάρτυράς μοι ποιήσον πιστοὺς ἀνθρώπους,  
את אוריה הכהן              τὸν Ουριαν  
ואת־זכריהו בן יברכיהו              καὶ τὸν Ζαχαριαν υἱὸν Βαραχίου.

Also in 2 Kgs 16:10–16 the name אוריה is accompanied by the profession הכהן (LXX: Ουρίας ὁ ἱερεὺς). Maybe הכהן was inserted in the manuscript tradition of MT Isa 8:2 in assimilation to that passage.<sup>8</sup> 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> supports the MT, however.

14:2                      ולקחום עמים              καὶ λήμψονται αὐτοὺς ἔθνη  
והביאום אל־מקומם              καὶ εἰσάξουσιν εἰς τὸν τόπον αὐτῶν,  
בית־ישראל              καὶ κατακληρονομήσουσι

<sup>4</sup> Duhm, *Jesaja*, 3; Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 53; John D. W. Watts, *Isaiah 1–33* (WBC 24; Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1985), 14. According to Marti all three lines are later additions (Marti, *Jesaja*, 4–5); Gray thinks that “one at least of the last three lines of v.4 is probably not original” (Gray, *Isaiah*, 1:10). Wildberger, by contrast, assumes that נורו אחור is original, and that an equivalent of it is missing in the LXX because of the difficulty of the text (Wildberger, *Jesaja*, 1:18).

<sup>5</sup> Watts, *Isaiah 1–33*, 14.

<sup>6</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 53.

<sup>7</sup> Thus Wildberger, *Jesaja*, 1:146. For the lack of representation of ביום ההוא in LXX Isaiah, see 20:6 and 24:21.

<sup>8</sup> Thus Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 53.

על אדמת יהוה	καὶ πληθυνθήσονται ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς τοῦ θεοῦ
לעבדים ולשפחות	εἰς δούλους καὶ δούλας.

A Hebrew scribe subsequent to the LXX might have supplied בית־ישראל so as to identify the subject of והתנחלום as the “house of Israel” (contrary to the LXX, where the ones who will inherit seem to be the foreign people). However, 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> gives בית־ישראל too.<sup>9</sup>

20:2	בעת ההיא דבר יהוה	τότε ἐλάλησε κύριος
	בִּיד ישעיהו בן־אמוץ	πρὸς Ἡσαϊαν λέγων

Besides in 20:2, the name of Isaiah is followed by the patronym בן־אמוץ / υἱὸς Ἀμώς in 1:1; 2:1; 13:1; 37:2, 21; and 38:1. Without this specification it is found in Isa 7:3; 20:3; 37:5, 6; 38:4, 21; and 39:3, 5, 8. The absence of the patronym in the LXX of Isa 20:2 may reflect a deviation in the Hebrew parent text of LXX Isaiah, even though it is equally conceivable that the translator left it out intentionally, because elsewhere in Isaiah בן־אמוץ only appears in redactional sections and in headings, but not in dialogues. 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> accords with the MT.

48:1	שמעו־זאת בית־יעקב	Ἀκούσατε ταῦτα, οἶκος Ἰακωβ
	הנקראים בשם ישראל	οἱ κεκλημένοι τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰσραηλ
	וממי יהודה יצאו	καὶ οἱ ἐξ Ἰουδα ἐξεληθόντες

The content of the clause וממי יהודה יצאו—“they have gone out from the waters of Judah”—seems somewhat curious on the surface, as it hard to imagine what is meant by “the waters of Judah.”<sup>10</sup> Perhaps וממי has to be perceived as a secondary reading, having entered the manuscript tradition of the MT by way of dittography of the *mem*, the original reading being a mere preposition (׳)מ. Such an explanation would be favoured by the LXX, in which a word in the sense of “waters” is missing. Yet, it is opposed by 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>, which agrees with the MT. Therefore, it is more plausible that the Isaiah translator did read וממי in his Hebrew text, but because of the same embarrassment with the text as we ourselves experience—or perhaps accidentally, on account of haplography—left “the waters” out of his translation.

<sup>9</sup> For a further discussion, see section 9.3.1.

<sup>10</sup> Marti (*Jesaja*, 321), Duhm (*Jesaja*, 332), Fohrer (*Jesaja*, 3:110), Westermann (Claus Westermann, *Isaiah 40–66. A Commentary* [OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1969], 194), BHS, Beuken (W. A. M. Beuken, *Jesaja* [4 vols.; POuT; Nijkerk: Callenbach, 1989], 2<sup>a</sup>:282), and others propose to read וממעי—“from the inside of.” Koole thinks it possible to maintain the MT, and to perceive Judah’s “waters” as the catastrophe of Judah’s and Jerusalem’s destruction; see J. L. Koole, *Jesaja* 2 (2 vols.; COuT; Kampen: Kok, 1985–1990), 1:418.

64:4(5) פגעת **אֶת־שֵׁשׁ** וְעֵשָׂה צֶדֶק συναντήσεται γὰρ τοῖς ποιοῦσι τὸ δίκαιον

The Masoretic **שש ועשה** has regularly been labelled as a corrupt reading. The original version would have read **עשי** instead, in line with the LXX.<sup>11</sup> Yet, the Isaiah texts from Qumran reflect the MT. Maybe the rendering of the LXX is an “elusive abbreviation to escape a syntactical difficulty.”<sup>12</sup>

### *Large minuses in LXX Isaiah*

Among the minuses in LXX Isaiah which cannot easily be ascribed to a translation tendency, one finds relatively many large ones, that is, missing elements embracing an entire sentence or an even larger textual unit. As a whole, the Greek Isaiah does not contain many of such extensive minuses, the preponderance of the units which are not represented in the translation numbering not more than three words. Some examples of large minuses in LXX Isaiah that might have their roots in a different *Vorlage* are the following:<sup>13</sup>

<sup>11</sup> Thus e.g. Marti (*Jesaja*, 398), Duhm (*Jesaia*, 441), Fohrer (*Jesaja*, 3:253), and BHS. Ziegler (*Untersuchungen*, 53) thinks that **שש** derives from dittography of **עש** (ה). Koole (J. L. Koole, *Jesaja* 3 [COuT; Kampen: Kok, 1995], 366–67) and Beuken (*Jesaja*, 3<sup>b</sup>:34) follow the MT.

<sup>12</sup> Jan de Waard, *A Handbook on Isaiah* (TCT 1; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1997), 218; see also Dominique Barthélemy, ed., *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament 2. Isaïe, Jérémie, Lamentations* (OBO 50.2; Fribourg: Éditions Universitaires / Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986), 447–48.

<sup>13</sup> Larger minuses can further relatively often be found in places where the Hebrew offers two parallel or nearly identical clauses which the translator seems to have reduced to one in order to condense his text (see e.g. 25:9; 26:9; 34:3–4; 37:8–9, 33–34; 42:15; 44:13, 14; 59:18; 60:13; 61:7; 62:4; and see section 7.2.1c), and in places where parablepsis, haplography or a related translation mistake might have occurred (see 6:13; 14:24; 22:14–15; 25:9; 36:10–11; 38:15; 40:7–8; 41:13–14; 42:19; 44:8–9, 13; 51:9–10; 59:18, 21; 62:4, 7; 65:18; and 66:3; and see chapter 11). Sometimes a minus can be explained by both of these two possibilities. It is remarkable that quite some large minuses are found in the chapters on Hezekiah (Isa 36–39): see 36:7; 37:8–9, 14, 33–34; and 38:15, 17. On the relative scarcity of large minuses in LXX Isaiah, see also Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 47; Johan Lust, “Exegesis and Theology in the Septuagint of Ezekiel. The Longer ‘Pluses’ and Ezek 43:1–9,” in *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies. Jerusalem 1986* (ed. Claude E. Cox; SCS 23; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1987), 203–4; and Baer, *When We All Go Home*, 15 n.18. Lust offers a scheme, based upon the aligned Hebrew-Greek computer-readable text of Tov and Kraft, in which the pluses and minuses in the LXX of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel are compared. This scheme distinguishes between “long” pluses or minuses—stretching out over at least four Hebrew words—and “short” ones, numbering less than four words. This model attributes to LXX Isaiah 994 short minuses, as compared to fifty long ones, and 1011 long pluses, as compared to only nineteen long ones.

2:22 תדלו לכם מן־האדם אשר נשמה באפו כי־במה נחשב הוא

According to Duhm, Marti, Gray, Wildberger, and Ulrich this text is a late addition to the MT which as yet did not form part of the Hebrew manuscript of LXX Isaiah.<sup>14</sup> An argument against this, however, is the fact that the sentence is attested by 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>. Van der Kooij therefore assumes that it was left out by the LXX translator himself. He would have done this for rhetorical reasons:

The plus of “and now” in verse 10, which means that the Lord is going to act, right now, against every one that is high and arrogant, makes the call of verse 22, not to rely on man (understood as the powerful and the arrogant), superfluous. The wording of verse 10 (see verse 5) actually implies that the house of Jacob put their trust in the Lord, and no longer in those who did them wrong ...<sup>15</sup>

6:13	ועוד בה עשריה ושבה והיתה לבער כאלה וכאלון אשר בשלכת מצבת במ זרע קדש מצבתה	καὶ ἔτι ἐπ’ αὐτῆς ἔστι τὸ ἐπιδέκατον, καὶ πάλιν ἔσται εἰς προνομῆν ὡς τερέβινθος καὶ ὡς βάλανος ὅταν ἐκπέσῃ ἀπὸ τῆς θήκης αὐτῆς.
------	--	---

The LXX reading ὅταν ἐκπέσῃ ἀπὸ τῆς θήκης αὐτῆς has often been thought to render the penultimate line of this difficult Hebrew verse, namely אשר בשלכת במ מצבת. The final line in the MT—זרע קדש מצבתה—was then regarded as a minus in the LXX. An explanation for this minus coming from Brownlee held that the LXX was based on a Hebrew text in which these final words were missing.<sup>16</sup> However, as rightly advanced by Budde and Emerton, ἀπὸ τῆς θήκης αὐτῆς probably represents מצבתה rather than מצבת במ, since αὐτῆς reflects the suffix in מצבתה, and not במ. The words in between אשר בשלכת and מצבתה—זרע קדש מצבת במ—have in all likelihood been omitted by the LXX translator due to parablepsis.<sup>17</sup>

36:7	וכִּי־תֹאמַר אֱלִי אֱלִי־הוּא אֱלֹהֵינוּ בטחנו הלוֹא־הוא אשר הסיר חזקיהו אֶת־בִּמְתֵּנוּ וְאֶת־מִזְבַּחַתֵּנוּ וַיֹּאמֶר לַיהוָה וּלְיִרְשָׁלַם לִפְנֵי הַמִּזְבֵּחַ הַזֶּה תִּשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ	εἰ δὲ λέγετε Ἐπὶ κύριον τὸν θεὸν ἡμῶν πεποιθάμεν
------	--	---

<sup>14</sup> Duhm, *Jesaia*, 21; Marti, *Jesaja*, 33; Gray, *Isaiah*, 1:57; Wildberger, *Jesaja*, 1:95; Eugene Ulrich, “The Developmental Composition of the Book of Isaiah. Light from 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> on Additions in the MT,” *DSD* 8 (2001): 292–93.

<sup>15</sup> van der Kooij, “Isa 2:22 and 36:7,” 382.

<sup>16</sup> William H. Brownlee, *The Meaning of the Qumrân Scrolls for the Bible. With Special Attention to the Book of Isaiah* (The James W. Richard Lectures; New York: Oxford University Press, 1964), 237.

<sup>17</sup> Budde, “Über die Schranken,” 167; Emerton, “Isaiah vi.13,” 88–89; de Waard, *Handbook on Isaiah*, 30. 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> offers במה זרע הקודש מצבת אשר בשלכת מצבת במ כאלה וכאלון; for a detailed discussion of this Qumran reading, see Emerton, “Isaiah vi.13,” 100–103.



Also this minus is taken by some to be a later expansion of the MT.<sup>18</sup> Catastini, for instance, believes the shorter form to be the more original one because he thinks it implausible that the statement on the centralisation of the cult would have been removed by a later post-exilic editor at a time in which this very issue had become so significant.<sup>19</sup> Van der Kooij, on the contrary, perceives the longer version to be original. He comes to this conclusion because in his view the shorter version makes less sense in the context. One misses in it a continuation in which Rabshakeh addresses the issue of trust in the Lord. The concluding lines of 36:7 have, in van der Kooij's opinion, been elided by the LXX translator, who would have done this because they claim Jerusalem to be the only place for an altar of the Lord. Such an idea would be in disfavour with the group of Jews to whom van der Kooij thinks the translator belonged, who had their own temple in Leontopolis, built by the priest Onias (see LXX Isa 19:19).<sup>20</sup>

37:14	ויקח חזקיהו את־הספרים מִיד הַמַּלְאכִים וַיִּקְרָאֻהוּ וַיַּעַל בֵּית יְהוָה וַיִּפְרְשֵׁהוּ חֲזַקְיָהוּ לִפְנֵי יְהוָה	καὶ ἔλαβεν Εἰζεκίας τὸ βιβλίον παρὰ τῶν ἀγγέλων καὶ ἤνοιξεν αὐτὸ ἐναντίον κυρίου
-------	---	--

Rather than that these words were absent in his Hebrew parent text, the translator may have accidentally skipped them due to the similarity of the verbs ויקראהו and ויפרשהו.<sup>21</sup>

38:14–15	עֲרַבְנִי מִה־אֲדַבֵּר וְאֶמְרִי לוֹהוּא עֲשֵׂה אֲדָדָה כָּל־שְׁנוֹתַי עַל־מֶר נַפְשִׁי	καὶ ἀφείλατό μου τῇν ὁδύνην τῆς ψυχῆς.
----------	--	---

38:17	הִנֵּה לְשֹׁלֹם מִרְיָלִי מֵר וְאַתָּה חֲשַׁקְתָּ נַפְשִׁי מִשַּׁחַת בְּלִי	εἴλου γάρ μου τῇν ψυχῇν, ἵνα μὴ ἀπόληται
-------	---	---

These two large minuses in Isa 38:15 and 17 might, on the one hand, be additions to the Hebrew text which were later than the LXX. This is what Duhm posits.<sup>22</sup> Nonetheless, the Greek rendering of the prayer of Hezekiah (Isa 38:10–

<sup>18</sup> E.g. Marti, *Jesaja*, 250; Duhm, *Jesaja*, 235; Ulrich, "Developmental Composition," 296.

<sup>19</sup> Catastini, *Isaia ed Ezechia*, 268.

<sup>20</sup> van der Kooij, "Isa 2:22 and 36:7," 382–84. See also van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 60–61. 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> accords with the MT.

<sup>21</sup> 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> reflects the MT.

<sup>22</sup> Duhm, *Jesaja*, 254–55. Marti (*Jesaja*, 264) considers only the minus in 38:17 to be a later addition; Wildberger (*Jesaja*, 3:1445) thinks that sentence to be original except for the first מֵר.

20) as a whole is quite divergent from the MT, so these minuses may well form part of the translator's entire rearrangement of the Hebrew text.<sup>23</sup>

40:7–8	יבש חציר	ἐξηράνθη ὁ χόρτος,
	נבל ציץ <u>כי רוח יהוה נשבה</u>	καὶ τὸ ἄνθος ἐξέπεσε,
	<u>בו אכן חציר העם יבש חציר נבל ציץ</u>	
	ודבר-אלהינו	τὸ δὲ ῥῆμα τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν
	יקום לעולם	μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

1QIsa<sup>a</sup> has יבש חציר נבל ציץ (ודבר) כי רוח .... נשבה בוא הכן חציר העם יבש חציר נבל ציץ ודבר-אלהינו יקום לעולם, with the same section that is missing in the LXX plus the words ודבר-אלהינו added in superscript. In the original version of the Scroll these words (except for אלהינו) may have gotten lost through parablepsis. They have been supplied supralinearly by a second hand, making the text to accord with the MT. The corrector has erroneously doubled אלהינו.

The Isaiah translator probably fell prey to the same error of parablepsis as the original scribe of 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> had made. This is not surprising from the perspective that the text of Isa 40:7–8, because of all of its repetitions, is confusing. Still, many exegetes think that the fact that text is missing in both 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and LXX Isaiah may indicate that the shorter text is the older one, and that it was later on supplemented with a gloss.<sup>24</sup>

56:12 אתיו אקחהיין ונסבאה שכר והיה כזה יום מחר גדול יתר מאד

It is hard to find an explanation for this large minus. According to Ziegler the translator did not read the text in his *Vorlage*.<sup>25</sup> Nevertheless, we do find these words in both 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and 1QIsa<sup>b</sup>.

### Complications

One difficulty in attributing a plus or a minus to a translation tendency of LXX Isaiah is that often the same plus or minus could equally be clarified by a converse process having occurred in the reading tradition of the MT. When, for instance, a plus in the Greek is ascribed to double translation by the translator,

<sup>23</sup> In Isa 38:15 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> is similar to the MT; in 38:17 the Scroll offers מן לשלום מר ליא מאודה. The minus in 38:15 could be the result of an error of homoeoarkton on account of מה and מר (see also *HUB Isa*, 169 and section 11.2).

<sup>24</sup> See e.g. Fohrer, *Jesaja*, 3:20; Beuken, *Jesaja*, 2<sup>a</sup>.25. Koole (*Jesaja* 2,1:33–35), in contrast, thinks the longer reading of the MT to be original, and suspects an *aberratio oculi* in LXX Isaiah and 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>; for a discussion of this case, see also Ulrich, "Developmental Composition," 299–301.

<sup>25</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 47. Duhm, however, thinks that the sentence fits well within the context (Duhm, *Jesaja*, 395).

theoretically seen the same plus could likewise be regarded as a product of condensation applied to the *Vorlage* of the MT. In a similar way, when one thinks a minus may be caused by haplography on the part of the translator, its actual cause might have been dittography from the side of the MT scribe. The same pertains to the techniques of explication and implicitation. Also, if one supposes the translator to have solved a difficulty of the Hebrew text, it may well be that this difficulty actually never existed at all in his *Vorlage* but was only extant in the MT tradition, or the text repair may perhaps already have been carried out in the Hebrew parent text of the translator. These complications make it very complex—if not impossible—ever to be completely certain about the nature of pluses and minuses in an ancient translation, and they demand a high degree of modesty in the interpretation of them.

Despite these reservations, we will have to make do with the rule of thumb that when a certain phenomenon occurs fairly frequently in LXX Isaiah and seems to point in the direction of a translation tendency, there is a greater chance that a plus or minus fitting into its pattern is the outcome of this translation tendency rather than of a different *Vorlage*.

### 12.3 The plus or minus has a parallel in one of the Qumran manuscripts

When a plus or a minus has a parallel in another ancient version, particularly in one of the Isaianic Qumran manuscripts, this could be an argument for establishing that the *Vorlage* of LXX Isaiah deviated from the MT. However, corresponding variants of the Greek Isaiah and the Qumran documents may also be the result of certain practices that the scribes of the scrolls and the Isaiah translator had in common. To offer one example, the technique of contextual harmonisation—which has been applied abundantly in the Greek translation of Isaiah—is also frequently displayed in the Great Isaiah Scroll.<sup>26</sup> Another tactic that these two documents seem to share is condensation. Just as in LXX Isaiah, so also in the Scroll many minuses are related to an inclination to reduce identical or synonymous text elements. Hence, in the continuation of this paragraph, which lists the pluses and minuses of LXX Isaiah that find support in Qumran manuscripts, each case needs to be examined to find out whether this correspondence may actually indicate a similar *Vorlage* for both LXX Isaiah and the Qumran document under consideration, or whether the plus or minus should rather be explained by a commonly applied technique.

---

<sup>26</sup> Kutscher, *Language and Linguistic Background*, 545.

### 12.3.1 Pluses and minuses which LXX Isaiah shares with 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>

The most important Qumran manuscript attesting the Isaianic text is the Great Isaiah Scroll, abbreviated as 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>. This document, which originates from the late second century B.C.E., comprehends the entire text of Isaiah. On the whole, the Scroll reflects a free approach towards its supposed *Vorlage*.<sup>27</sup>

The following two paragraphs contain cases of plus and minus in LXX Isaiah which are supported by 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>.<sup>28</sup>

#### 12.3.1.1 Pluses which LXX Isaiah shares with 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>

1:31	MT Isa	והיה החסן לנערת ופעלו לניצוץ
	1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	והיה החסנכם לנעורת ופעלכם לניצוצ
	LXX Isa	καὶ ἔσται ἡ ἰσχὺς αὐτῶν ὡς καλάμη στιππύου καὶ αἱ ἐργασίαι αὐτῶν ὡς σπινθῆρες πυρός

The Isaiah translator may have had a Hebrew manuscript in front of him that had a pronoun suffix joined to החסן, in accordance with the Scroll. Yet, it is more plausible that both the translator and the scribe added this pronoun in parallelism to ופעלכם/ופעלו in the succeeding line. This presumption is advocated by the fact that 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and LXX Isaiah differ in the possessive pronouns they use, and additionally by the fact that the presence of the article in החסן makes the supposed original attachment of a suffix to this form ungrammatical. The fact that 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> has kept the definite article in החסנכם shows the secondary character of the suffix.<sup>29</sup>

7:4	MT Isa	בחר־אף
	1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	בִּי בחורי אפ
	LXX Isa	ὅταν γὰρ ὁργὴ τοῦ θυμοῦ μου γένηται, πάλιν ἰάσομαι.

The reading γὰρ of the LXX may be based on a Hebrew parent text differing from the MT and agreeing with 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>.

<sup>27</sup> Arie van der Kooij, "The Old Greek of Isaiah in Relation to the Qumran Texts of Isaiah. Some General Comments," in *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings. Papers Presented to the International Symposium on the Septuagint and its Relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings (Manchester, 1990)* (ed. George J. Brooke and Barnabas Lindars; SCS 33; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1992), 195–97.

<sup>28</sup> Pluses or minuses consisting of the conjunctions καὶ/η as well as of articles are excluded. Text from 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> has been cited from Donald W. Parry and Elisha Qimron, eds., *The Great Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa)*. A New Edition (STDJ 32; Leiden: Brill, 1999). For a further discussion on pluses and minuses shared by 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and LXX Isaiah, see Kutscher, *Language and Linguistic Background*, 536–54, and Ziegler, "Die Vorlage der Isaias-Septuaginta," 38–45.

<sup>29</sup> See Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament*, 2:11–12; de Waard, *Handbook on Isaiah*, 11.

9:13(14)	MT Isa	ויכרת יהוה מִיִּשְׂרָאֵל רֹאשׁ וְזֶנֶב כַּפֶּה וְאֶגְמוֹן יוֹם אֶחָד
	1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	ויכרת יהוה מִיִּשְׂרָאֵל רֹאשׁ וְזֶנֶב כַּפֶּה וְאֶגְמוֹן בְּיוֹם אֶחָד
	LXX Isa	καὶ ἀφείλεν κύριος ἀπὸ Ἰσραὴλ κεφαλὴν καὶ οὐράν, μέγαν καὶ μικρὸν <u>ἐν μιᾷ ἡμέρᾳ</u>

The correspondence between 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and LXX Isaiah cannot give any clue about the *Vorlage* of the latter, since the LXX translator could just as well have read יום אחד, which he naturally corrected by adding a preposition.

11:15	MT Isa	וְהִדְרִיךְ בְּנִעְלִים
	1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	וְהִדְרִיכָן בְּנִעְלִים
	LXX Isa	ὥστε διαπορεύεσθαι <u>αὐτὸν</u> ἐν ὑποδήμασι.

Both the Greek translator and the scribe of the Scroll may have supplied an object because they considered their Hebrew *Vorlage*, as reflected by the MT, elliptic.

12:2	MT Isa	הִנֵּה אֵל יִשׁוּעָתִי אֲבֹטָח
	1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	הִנֵּה <u>אֵל</u> אֵל יִשׁוּעָתִי אֲבֹטָח
	LXX Isa	ἰδοὺ ὁ θεός μου σωτήρ μου κύριος, πεποιθὼς ἔσομαι <u>ἐπ’ αὐτῷ</u>

Here too the agreement between the pluses of LXX Isaiah and 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> does not necessarily imply that the Greek translation had a parent text similar to the Scroll. The two documents rather offer alternative solutions to a seemingly elliptic Hebrew text: LXX Isaiah by adding a prepositional object ἐπ’ αὐτῷ to πεποιθὼς ἔσομαι / אֲבֹטָח (“God is my salvation, I will trust *in him*”), and 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>—apparently interpreting אֲבֹטָח אֵל יִשׁוּעָתִי as “(In) the God of my salvation I will trust” instead of as “God is my salvation, I will trust”—by placing the preposition אֵל before “God.”<sup>30</sup>

12:2	MT Isa	כִּי־עוֹזי וְזִמְרַת יְהוָה
	1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	כִּי־אֵז עוֹזִי וְזִמְרַתִּי יְהוָה
	LXX Isa	διότι ἡ δόξα μου καὶ <u>ἡ αἰνεσίς μου</u> κύριος

The form זִמְרַת in the MT is awkward; one would rather expect זִמְרַתִּי, parallel to עוֹזִי. That the form may still be original is suggested by the fact that similar phraseology appears in Exod 15:2 and Ps 118:14. The obscurity of the Hebrew could have encouraged both the scribe of 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> (who was corrected by a later

<sup>30</sup> Another possibility, though, is that 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> reflects the original reading, the MT reading having come into existence by haplography.

hand, suspending the ה) and the LXX translator to attach to זמרת the yod of the following יה as a possessive pronoun.<sup>31</sup>

13:22	MT Isa	... וענה איים באלמנותיו ותנים בהיכלי ענג וקרוב ...
	1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	... וענה א'ם באלמנותו ותנים בהיכלן ענוגו קרוב ...
	LXX Isa	καὶ νοσσοποιήσουσιν καὶ ὄνοκένταυροι ἐκεῖ κατοικήσουσι, ἐχῖνοι ἐν τοῖς οἴκοις αὐτῶν· ταχὺ ἔρχεται ...

Syntactically seen, the reading καὶ νοσσοποιήσουσιν ἐχῖνοι ἐν τοῖς οἴκοις αὐτῶν of LXX Isaiah is closer to that of the Scroll (presenting ותנים בהיכלו ענוגו—"and jackals will be daintily bred in his palace") than to that of the MT. The former two have in common that they echo or display a verb ענו(ו)ג instead of a noun ענג, most likely because they regarded the *waw* which in the MT is the first letter of the succeeding word וקרוב, to be the final letter of the preceding form ענג. Besides, they both have a possessive pronoun joined to היכל (even if LXX Isaiah implies a reading with בהיכליהם, whereas 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> gives בהיכלו). Perhaps these two deviations from the MT have their origin in the Hebrew manuscript tradition underlying 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and LXX Isaiah. Yet, the possessive pronoun to היכל could also have been added by both composers of these documents in parallelism to באלמנותו/באלמנות in the previous line (although that phrase is rendered by ἐκεῖ in the LXX).

18:7	MT Isa	בעת ההיא יובל־שי ליהוה צבאות עם ממשד ומורט ומעם נורא
	1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	בעתה ההיא יובל שי ליהוה צבאות מעם ממשד ומרט ומעם נורא
	LXX Isa	ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ ἀνενεχθήσεται δῶρα κυρίῳ σαβαωθ ἐκ λαοῦ τεθλιμμένου καὶ τετιλμένου καὶ ἀπὸ λαοῦ μεγάλου

1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and LXX Isaiah might reflect a comparable interpretation or exegetical change: the gift that in Isa 18:7 is offered to the Lord will not embody the nation itself, but will come *from* that nation. Maybe this seemed a more suitable picture in the eyes of the copyist and translator.<sup>32</sup> Barthélemy and de Waard, by contrast, give some arguments in favour of 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> presenting the more original reading, stating that only the 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> reading respects the parallelism between this verse and verse 2, and that the MT reading can be explained as a graphical error in view of the following ומעם.<sup>33</sup>

<sup>31</sup> Also Barthélemy (*Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament*, 2:87–90) and de Waard (*Handbook on Isaiah*, 58) think that a reading with זמרת is original, because "scribes were accustomed to omitting a last character when the first character of the next word was the same," and because "the reduplication of the divine name is also found elsewhere in Isa (26.4 and 38.11) and it can therefore be considered as a literary characteristic of the book" (de Waard, *Handbook on Isaiah*, 58).

<sup>32</sup> See Ziegler, "Die Vorlage der Isaias-Septuaginta," 42.

<sup>33</sup> Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament*, 2:135–37; de Waard, *Handbook on Isaiah*, 83.

29:9	MT Isa	שכרו ולא שכר
	1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	שכרון ולוא שכר
	LXX Isa	καὶ κραιπαλήσατε οὐκ <u>ἀπὸ</u> σικερα οὐδὲ ἀπὸ οἴνου.

Cases in which the LXX and 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> may both have supplied an (in their eyes) necessary preposition which is missing in the MT, can additionally be found in 9:14(13) (see above), and in 31:1; 37:38; 43:23; 45:18; 55:9; 57:15; and 62:5 below. See also 18:7 and 49:4.

31:1	MT Isa	הוי הירדים מצרים לעזרה
	1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	הוי הירדים למצרים לעזרה
	LXX Isa	Οὐαὶ οἱ καταβαίνοντες <u>εἰς Αἴγυπτον</u> ἐπὶ βοήθειαν

See the comment at 29:9.

37:9	MT Isa	וישמע וישלח מלאכים אל־חזקיהו לאמר
	1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	וישמע <u>ישב</u> וישלח מלאכים אל יחזקיה לאמר
	LXX Isa	καὶ ἀκούσας <u>ἀπέστρεψε</u> καὶ ἀπέστειλεν ἀγγέλους πρὸς Εἰζεκιαν λέγων

The agreement between 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and LXX Isaiah possibly indicates a common *Vorlage* at variance with the MT. This *Vorlage* may have contained a conflated reading, which combined the MT wording וישמע וישלח מלאכים with that of the parallel in MT 2 Kgs 19:9 וישב וישלח מלאכים.<sup>34</sup>

37:38	MT Isa	ויהי הוא משתחוה בית נסרך אלהיו
	1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	ויהי הואה משתחוה בבית נסרך אלוהיו
	LXX Isa	καὶ ἐν τῷ αὐτὸν προσκυνεῖν <u>ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ Νασαραχ</u> τὸν παταχρον αὐτοῦ

The preposition ב might have been dropped from the MT through haplography, whereas the text lying in front of the LXX translator had preserved the original preposition, just as 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>. Alternatively, the translator and scribe may have read a text identical to the MT, which they “corrected” by adding a preposition. See the comment at 29:9.

<sup>34</sup> See Shemaryahu Talmon, “Aspects of the Textual Transmission of the Bible in the Light of Qumran Manuscripts,” *Textus* 4 (1960): 107–8. See also Ziegler, “Die Vorlage der Isaias-Septuaginta,” 56; according to Ziegler 2 Kgs 19:9—where וישמע is missing—gives the original form of the text, since וישמע can already be found at the beginning of verse 9, and in Ziegler’s opinion it is improbable that this would be said twice in the same verse.

38:8	MT Isa	במעלות אחז
	1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	במעלות <u>עלית</u> אחז
	LXX Isa	τοὺς δέκα ἀναβαθμοὺς <u>τοῦ οἴκου</u> τοῦ πατρός σου

The Isaiah translation and the Scroll offer a plus in the same place but with a different meaning: where 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> has עלית—a construct state of עליה (“upper room”)—LXX Isaiah offers τοῦ οἴκου—“of the house” (the two versions also differ in that the former continues with “Achaz” and the latter with “of your father”). Clearly, both inserted a specification of מעלות independently from each other with the purpose of making their texts more explicit.

38:18	MT Isa	כי לא שאול תודך מות יהלךך לא־ישברו יורדי־בור אל־אמתך
	1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	כיא לוא שאול תודכה <u>ולוא</u> מות יהלכה ולוא ישברו יורדי בור אל אמתכה
	LXX Isa	οὐ γὰρ οἱ ἐν ἔδου αἰνέσουσί σε, <u>οὐδὲ</u> οἱ ἀποθανόντες εὐλογήσουσί σε, οὐδὲ ἐλπιοῦσιν οἱ ἐν ἔδου τὴν ἐλεημοσύνην σου.

In all probability it was the scribe and the translator themselves who supplied a negation at the beginning of the second clause, thus harmonising this line to the preceding and subsequent one. Yet, it is also conceivable that this negation was already present in their Hebrew parent texts. Compare 58:13.

39:6	MT Isa	ונשא כל־אשר בביתך ואשר אצרו אבתיך עד־היום הזה בבל
	1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	ונשאו כול אשר בביתכה ואשר אצרו אבותיכה עד היום הזה בבל <u>יבואו</u>
	LXX Isa	καὶ λήμψονται πάντα τὰ ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ σου, καὶ ὅσα συνήγαγον οἱ πατέρες σου ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης, εἰς Βαβυλῶνα <u>ἔξει</u>

Whereas the MT incorporates just one sentence including a twofold object, the texts of 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and LXX Isaiah consist of two clauses each with its own object. The second one of these two lines is governed by the verbs יבואו / ἔξει, which are pluses in comparison to the MT. This congruity between 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and the Greek Isaiah could point to an underlying Hebrew text departing from the MT, which has in its favour the fact that the two versions also agree in presenting at the beginning of the sentence a *plural* verb ונשאו / καὶ λήμψονται as against the singular ונשא of the MT. Notwithstanding this, the pluses may equally well be



the result of an addition by the Qumran scribe and the translator because they thought the Hebrew text to be composed of two clauses of which the second one was elliptic on account of a missing verb.

41:11	MT Isa	וַיֵּאבְדוּ אִנְשֵׁי רִיבֶךְ
	1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	יִבְדּוּ כּוֹל אִנְשֵׁי רִיבְכָה
	LXX Isa	καὶ ἀπολοῦνται <u>πάντες</u> οἱ ἀντίδοκοί σου.

In the Qumran Scroll and the Greek translation a word for “all” may have been interpolated in parallelism to כּוֹל / πάντες in the previous line. For the frequent addition of πᾶς in LXX Isaiah, see section 2.3.

42:14	MT Isa	הַחֲשִׁיתִי מֵעוֹלָם אַחֲרֵי שׁ אֶת־אֶפֶק
	1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	אֲחֲשִׁיתִי <u>אֶךְ</u> מֵעוֹלָם אַחֲרֵי שׁ אֶת־אֶפֶק
	LXX Isa	ἐσιώπησα, <u>μή</u> <u>αὐα</u> αἰσιωπήσομαι καὶ ἀνέξομαι;

The translator presumably read אֶךְ in his Hebrew manuscript, in accordance with 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>. Two other verses in which he has represented אֶךְ by means of a question are 36:5 (μή) and 63:8 (οὐχ).

43:23f.	MT Isa	לֹא־הִבִּיאַת לִי שָׁה עֲלִיתִךְ וּזְבַחִיךָ לֹא כִבְדַתִּנִּי לֹא הָעִבְדַתִּיךָ בַּמִּנְחָה וְלֹא הוֹגַעְתִּיךָ בַּלְבֹּנָה לֹא־קִנִּיתָ לִי בַכֶּסֶף קֵנָה וְחֵלֶב זֶבַחִיךָ לֹא הָרִוּיתִנִּי אֶךְ הָעִבְדַתִּנִּי בַּחֲטָאוֹתֶיךָ הוֹגַעְתִּנִּי בַּעֲוֹנוֹתֶיךָ
---------	--------	--

1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	לֹא הִבִּיאֹתָה לִי שָׁה לְעוֹלָה וּזְבֻחִיכָה לֹא כִבְדַתִּנִּי וְלֹא עֲשִׂיתָה לִּיא מִנְחָה וְלֹא הוֹגַעְתִּיכָה בַּלְבֹּנָה לֹא קִנִּיתָה לִּיא בַכֶּסֶף קֵנָה וְחֵלֶב זְבַחִיכָה לֹא הָרִוּיתִנִּי אֶךְ הָעִבְדַתְתִּנִּי בַּחֲטָאוֹתֶיכָה וְהוֹגַעְתִּנִּי בַּעֲוֹנוֹכָה
--------------------	---

LXX Isa	οὐκ ἔμοι πρόβαρα τῆς ὀλοκαρπώσεώς σου, οὐδὲ <u>ἐν ταῖς θυσίαις</u> σου ἐδόξασάς με, οὐδὲ ἔγχοπον ἐποίησά σε ἐν λιβάνῳ, οὐδὲ ἐκτήσω μοι ἀργυρίου θυμίαμα, οὐδὲ τὸ στέαρ τῶν θυσιῶν σου ἐπεθύμησα,
---------	--

ἀλλὰ ἐν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις σου  
καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἀδικίαις σου προέστην σου.

The composers of 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and LXX Isaiah probably placed a preposition before זבחך so as to assimilate this clause to the ensuing lines, most of which contain a prepositional object starting with ב as well, and also in view of the fact that the absence of a preposition in זבחך seems grammatically incorrect. Compare לעול in the first line of 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>, where the scribe appears to have prefixed a preposition too. That the MT provides the more original reading is further suggested by the fact that in the sixth line of this series—וּחֵלֶב זֶבַחֶיךָ לֹא הִרִיתִנִּי—the object זבחך חלב does not start with ב either, even if one were to expect it there (“and *with* the fat of your sacrifices you have not satisfied me”). See the comment at 29:9.

44:13	MT Isa	חַרֵּשׁ עֲצִים נֹטָה קו
	1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	חַרֵּשׁ עֲצִים נֹטָהֲנָ קו <sup>(1)</sup>
	LXX Isa	ἐκλεξάμενος τέκτων ξύλον ἔσκησεν <u>αὐτὸ</u> ἐν μέτρῳ

The translator and scribe may have encountered a pronominal suffix joined to נטה in their Hebrew manuscripts, but could as easily have added the object themselves, in order to approximate the clause to the succeeding ones; there an object pronoun follows the verb too (יְעֲשֶׂהוּ בְּמִקְצֻעוֹת וּבְמַחוּגָה (יתאדוּוֹ)).

44:28	MT Isa	וְהִכַּל תּוֹסֵד
	1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	וְהִכַּל־תִּסְדֹּד
	LXX Isa	καὶ τὸν οἶκον τὸν ἅγιόν <u>μου</u> θεμελιώσω.

It is unclear whether the suspended *yod* in 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> belongs to either תִּסְדֹּד or וְהִכַּל. In the latter case, the reading of the Scroll (with correction) would be mirrored by καὶ τὸν οἶκον τὸν ἅγιόν μου in the LXX. In both versions the possessive pronoun may have been added for explicitation.

45:18	MT Isa	לֹא־תְהוּ בְּרָאָה
	1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	לֹא <u>לְ</u> תְהוּ בְּרָאָה
	LXX Isa	οὐκ <u>εἰς</u> <u>κενὸν</u> ἐποίησεν αὐτὴν

The ל might have got lost in the MT due to haplography. See, however, the comment at 29:9.

48:8	MT Isa	כִּי יִדְעֹתִי בְּגוֹד תִּבְגּוֹד
	1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	כִּי־א יִדְעֹתִי בְּגוֹד <u>כִּי־א</u> תִּבְגּוֹד
	LXX Isa	ἔγνω γὰρ <u>ἦτι</u> ἀθετῶν ἀθετήσεις

The presence of  $\delta\tau\iota$  in LXX Isaiah does not necessarily mean that its *Vorlage* read  $\text{כִּי}$  (א) in this place together with 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>. The word may just as well have been added by the translator because he saw himself obliged to provide a conjunction in order not to produce improper Greek. Also the scribe of the Scroll may have inserted  $\text{כִּי}$  for grammatical considerations.

48:17	MT Isa	מלמדך להועיל מדריךך בדרך תלך
	1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	מלמדכה להועיל הדריכה בדרך אשר תלך בה
	LXX Isa	δέδειχά σοι τοῦ εὐρεῖν σε τὴν ὁδόν, ἐν ᾗ πορεύσῃ ἐν αὐτῇ.

It is indeed possible that the Isaiah translator had a Hebrew manuscript in front of him that offered  $\text{בה}$  (אשר)  $\text{תלך}$  in accordance with 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>, so presenting a retrospective pronoun in the relative clause ( $\text{ἐν αὐτῇ} = \text{בה}$ ). This can be deduced from the fact that in places in MT Isaiah where the relative clause contains a retrospective pronoun, the LXX usually does not give a rendering of it.<sup>35</sup> This makes it improbable that if the Hebrew had *not* provided such a pronoun, the LXX would still have added one.

49:4	MT Isa	לריק יגעתי לתהו והבל כחי כליתי
	1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	לריק יגעתי לתהו וללהבל כוחי כליתי
	LXX Isa	Κενῶς ἐκοπίασα καὶ εἰς μάταιον καὶ εἰς οὐδὲν ἔδωκα τὴν ἰσχύ μου.

The insertion of a preposition before  $\text{הבל}$  may have been realised in harmonisation to the two preceding phrases. See also the comment at 29:9.

49:7	MT Isa	כה אמר־יהוה גאל ישראל קדושו
	1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	כוה אמר אדוני יהוה גואל־כה ישראל קדושו
	LXX Isa	Οὕτως λέγει κύριος ὁ ῥυσάμενός σε ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραηλ Ἀγιάσατε ...

The attestation in 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and LXX Isaiah of a second person singular object to the verb “to save,” which is absent in the MT, could hint at a common reading of the former two versions, differing from the latter. Another possibility is that in both texts this object was added in assimilation to related verses in Isaiah which designate “the holy God of Israel” as the one “who saves you”: see 48:17; 49:26; and 54:5, 8, and compare also 44:6 and 47:4.

49:9	MT Isa	על־דרכים ירעו ובכל־שפיים מרעיתם
	1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	על בול־הרים ירעו ובכול שפאים מרעיתם

<sup>35</sup> In only a few places does LXX Isaiah translate the retrospective pronoun: see Isa 8:20; 37:10,29; and 62:2; see section 5.4.

LXX Isa     καὶ ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτῶν βοσκηθήσονται,  
καὶ ἐν πάσαις ταῖς τρύβις ἢ νομῇ αὐτῶν.

The extra כּוֹל in 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and πάσαις in LXX Isaiah are presumably additions for the sake of parallelism. See 41:11 above.

51:23     MT Isa     וּשְׁמַתִּיהָ בִיד־מוֹגִיךָ  
1QIsa<sup>a</sup>     וּשְׁמַתִּיהָ בִיד־מוֹגִיךָ וּמַעֲנִיךָ  
LXX Isa     καὶ ἐμβάλῳ αὐτὸ εἰς τὰς χεῖρας τῶν ἀδικησάντων σε  
καὶ τῶν ταπεινωσάντων σε

The plus shared by LXX Isaiah and 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> could well evidence a similar Hebrew text at variance with the MT. In the MT וּמַעֲנִיךָ may have been eliminated by homoeoteleuton.<sup>36</sup> Another—less plausible—option would be that the composers of the two versions have complemented מוֹגִיךָ with the synonymous form מַעֲנִיךָ / τῶν ταπεινωσάντων σε both on their own initiative, under the influence of Isa 60:14.<sup>37</sup>

53:10–11     MT Isa     וְחָפַץ יְהוָה בִּידוֹ יַצְלַח מַעֲמָל נַפְשׁוֹ יִרְאֶה  
1QIsa<sup>a</sup>≈1QIsa<sup>b</sup>≈4QIsa<sup>d</sup>     וְחָפַץ יְהוָה בִּידוֹ יַצְלַח מַעֲמָל נַפְשׁוֹ יִרְאֶה אוֹר  
LXX Isa     καὶ βούλεται κύριος ἀφελεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ πόνου  
τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ, δεῖξαι αὐτῷ φῶς

Seeligmann posits that φῶς is a later insertion by the LXX translator, who would have had a theological preoccupation with the notion of light as knowledge (compare the plus in 26:9 and in some manuscripts in 51:5, and the motif of light in 50:10,11).<sup>38</sup> However, an equivalent plus is attested by three Qumran scrolls, namely 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>, 1QIsa<sup>b</sup> and 4QIsa<sup>d</sup>, which exhibit אוֹר in this place. This has given rise to the assumption that אוֹר belonged to a pre-Masoretic text tradition of Isaiah.<sup>39</sup> According to van der Kooij, the plus may however still be secondary. This he contends because the expression “to see light” would not really suit within the content of the Hebrew text, since the verb יִרְאֶה has not been used there to refer to the gaining of knowledge—which would be the

<sup>36</sup> Thus Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament*, 2:377, and de Waard, *Handbook on Isaiah*, 190.

<sup>37</sup> See section 6.3b. According to Talmon (“Aspects of the Textual Transmission,” 108) וּמַעֲנִיךָ in 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> may be an interpretative gloss of the *hapaxlegomenon* מוֹגִיךָ.

<sup>38</sup> Seeligmann, *Septuagint Version*, 108.

<sup>39</sup> This is the opinion of e.g. Jan de Waard, “Old Greek Translation Techniques and the Modern Translator,” *The Bible Translator* 41/3 (1990): 312. See also Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament*, 2:403–7; van der Kooij, “The Old Greek of Isaiah in Relation to the Qumran Texts,” 199; de Waard, *Handbook on Isaiah*, 196–97. Barthélemy and de Waard suggest that the MT has been subject to an error or to a correction of theological nature.

connotation of “to see light”—but must be understood in the perspective of the preceding verse (verse 10), which reads, “he will see *offspring*, prolong his days.”<sup>40</sup>

53:12	MT Isa	ולפשיעים יפגיע
	1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	ולפשעיהמה יפגיע
	1QIsa <sup>b</sup> ≈4QIsa <sup>d</sup>	ולפשעיהם יפגיע
	LXX Isa	καὶ διὰ τὰς ἀμαρτίας αὐτῶν παρεδόθη.

καὶ διὰ τὰς ἀμαρτίας αὐτῶν in LXX Isaiah echoes (ה)ולפשעיהמה, which is the reading of 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>, 1QIsa<sup>b</sup>, and 4QIsa<sup>d</sup>. The translator seems to have interpreted the form as deriving from פֶּשַׁע—“crime”—rather than as a participle form of פָּשַׁע, in the sense of “rebellious ones,” such as the MT offers. In this way the phrase has become parallel in meaning to חטא (“sin”) in the preceding clause והוא חטא־רבים נשא. Hence, one could argue that the translator has added a genitive attribute to פֶּשַׁע in order to ameliorate the parallelism with חטא־רבים in the preceding line. However, this is opposed by the fact mentioned that three Qumran documents likewise evidence a possessive pronoun to פֶּשַׁע. It is not so credible that the composers of all four documents have added such a pronoun independently from each other. A possible solution is given by van der Kooij, who holds that the original form was spelled defectively, as פֶּשַׁעִים. This would elucidate both interpretations: “sinners” (פֶּשַׁעִים) as well as “their sins” (פֶּשַׁעִים).<sup>41</sup> Something which argues against this, however, is the fact that פֶּשַׁעִים is a singular noun, whereas the Qumran manuscripts and the LXX reflect a plural noun. Barthélemy and de Waard think it more likely that the Qumran texts are original. The MT reading could, in their eyes, be either due to an assimilation to פֶּשַׁעִים in the preceding line or to a correction of a theological nature.<sup>42</sup>

54:9	MT Isa	אשר נשבעתי מעבר מי־נח עוֹד על־הארץ כן נשבעתי מקצף עליך
	1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	אשר נשבעתי מעבור מי נוח עוֹד על הארץ כן נשבעתי מקצופ עוֹד עליך
	LXX Isa	καθότι ὥμοσα αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ ἐκεῖνῳ ὅτι ἢ μὴ θυμωθήσεται ἐπὶ σοὶ <u>ἐγώ</u>

<sup>40</sup> Arie van der Kooij, “The Text of Isaiah and its Early Witnesses in Hebrew,” in *Sôfer Mahîr. Essays in Honour of Adrian Schenker. Offered by Editors of Biblia Hebraica Quinta* (ed. Yohanan A. P. Goldman, Arie van der Kooij, and Richard D. Weis; VTSup 110; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 150–51.

<sup>41</sup> van der Kooij, “The Text of Isaiah and Its Early Witnesses,” 152.

<sup>42</sup> Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament*, 2:403–7; de Waard, *Handbook on Isaiah*, 197.

עוד and ἔτι have perhaps been added in harmonisation to the first part of the comparison where the same adverb appears (even if this first part is absent in the LXX).

55:9	MT Isa	כִּי־גִבְהוֹ שָׁמַיִם מֵאֶרֶץ כֵּן גִּבְהוֹ דַּרְכֵי מִדְרָכֵיכֶם
	1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	כִּי־גִבְהוֹ שָׁמַיִם מֵאֶרֶץ כֵּן גִּבְהוֹ דַּרְכֵי מִדְרָכֵיכֶם
	LXX Isa	ἀλλ' ὡς ἀπέχει ὁ οὐρανὸς ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς οὕτως ἀπέχει ἡ ὁδὸς μου ἀπὸ τῶν ὁδῶν ὑμῶν

The LXX translator and Qumran scribe may both have read a כ prefixed to גובה/גבהו in their Hebrew manuscript. Alternatively, a particle of comparison was supplemented by both, as it is presupposed by the Hebrew text. For a similar case, see 62:5 below.

56:7	MT Isa	עולתיהם וזבחיהם לרצון על-מזבחי
	1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	עולותיהם וזבחיהם <u>יעלו</u> לרצון על מזבחי
	LXX Isa	τὰ ὀλοκαυτώματα αὐτῶν καὶ αἱ θυσίαι αὐτῶν <u>ἔσονται</u> δεκταὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου μου.

Most likely, the copyist and translator both in their own way filled in the ellipsis of the MT.<sup>43</sup> For the addition of forms of “to be” in LXX Isaiah, see section 2.6.1a.

57:15	MT Isa	מְרוֹם וְקֹדֶשׁ אֶשְׁכֵּן
	1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	בְּמְרוֹם וּבְקֹדֶשׁ יֶשְׁכֵּן
	LXX Isa	κύριος ὑψιστος <u>ἐν ἁγίοις</u> ἀναπαυόμενος

The surmise that the Isaiah translator read בקודש in his *Vorlage*—in conformity with 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and as against the Masoretic קדוש—is favoured by the fact that elsewhere in the Septuagint *ἅγια* regularly also renders קודש (see Exod 15:11; 29:30; 30:29). Although in this aspect the ancestor text of LXX Isaiah may have agreed with 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>, it has differed from the latter in that the translator seems not to have read the first word of the clause as במרום, as the Scroll offers, but as מְרוֹם, in accordance with the MT, since LXX Isaiah displays the adjective ὑψιστος here. Another option is that LXX Isaiah and 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> in fact both had a text in front of them that was identical to the MT, but made changes to it to make it easier to understand. See the comment at 29:9.

58:13	MT Isa	אִם־תֵּשִׁיב מִשְׁבַּת רִגְלֶךָ עֲשׂוֹת חֲפִצִּיךָ בְּיוֹם קֹדֶשׁ
	1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	אִם תֵּשִׁיב מִשְׁבַּת רִגְלֶךָ <u>מַעֲשׂוֹת</u> חֲפִצִּיךָ בְּיוֹם קֹדֶשׁ

<sup>43</sup> Ziegler, on the other contrary, thinks that the translator has read יעלו in his *Vorlage*, in accordance with 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> (Ziegler, “Die Vorlage der Isaias-Septuaginta,” 43).

LXX Isa      ἐὰν ἀποστρέψῃς τὸν πόδα σου ἀπὸ τῶν σαββάτων  
**τοῦ μὲν ποιεῖν** τὰ θελήματά σου ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἀγίᾳ

With מעשות = **τοῦ μὲν ποιεῖν** 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and LXX Isaiah may have preserved the original form of the text. Alternatively, the two versions have aligned the apparently defective form to מעשות and ממצוא in the ensuing sentence וכבדתו מעשות דרכיך ממצוא חפצך.

60:19      MT Isa      לא־יהיה־לך עוד השמש לאור יומם  
 ולנגה הירח לא־יאיר לך

1QIsa<sup>a</sup>      לוא יהיה לך השמש לאור יוממ  
 ולנִגָּה הירח **בלילה** לוא יאיר לך

LXX Isa      καὶ οὐκ ἔσται σοι ὁ ἥλιος εἰς φῶς ἡμέρας,  
 οὐδὲ ἀνατολῇ σεληνης φωτιεῖ σοι **τὴν νύκτα**

A word for “night” may already have been extant in the Hebrew manuscripts underlying LXX Isaiah and 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>, or was added in each of these versions so as to enhance the parallelism.<sup>44</sup>

62:5      MT Isa      כִּי־יִבְעַל בַּחֹר בַּתּוֹלָה יִבְעֹלֹךְ בִּנְיָ  
 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>      כִּי־אֶבְעֹל בַּחֹר בַּתּוֹלָה יִבְעֹלֹכִי בִּנְיָ  
 LXX Isa      καὶ **ὡς συνουῶν** νεανίσκος παρθένω,  
 οὕτως κατοιχήσουσιν οἱ υἱοί σου μετὰ σοῦ.

Compare 55:9 above. Possibly כ has disappeared from the MT on account of haplography.

62:9      MT Isa      כִּי מֵאֶסְפִּיּוּ יֵאָכְלוּ  
 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>      כִּי־אֶמֶ מֵאֶסְפוּהִי יֵאָכְלוּהִי  
 LXX Isa      **ἀλλ' ἡ** οἱ συνάγοντες φάγονται αὐτὰ

The LXX translator may have read כִּי־אֶמֶ with 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>.

64:1(2)      MT Isa      מִים תִּבְעֶה־אֵשׁ לְהוֹדִיעַ שְׁמִךְ לְצָרִיךְ  
 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>      מִים תִּבְעֶה אֵשׁ **לְצָרִיכֶה** לְהוֹדִיעַ שְׁמִכָּה לְצָרִיכָה  
 LXX Isa      καὶ κατακαύσει πῦρ **τοὺς ὑπεναντίους**,  
 καὶ φανερόν ἔσται τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου ἐν τοῖς ὑπεναντίοις.

<sup>44</sup> Barthélemy and de Waard consider the MT as the original reading, because the frequency and naturalness of the combination of “sun” and “moon” makes the omission of the words “during the night” less likely than their addition. Moreover, the addition is redundant since נגה expresses already a nocturnal light of either moon or stars (Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament*, 2:420–21; de Waard, *Handbook on Isaiah*, 205).

Talmon holds the theory that the version of 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and LXX Isaiah with twice the form לצריך has been caused by the conflation of two different readings: להודיע and שמך לצריך.<sup>45</sup>

64:9(10) MT Isa	ציון מדבר היתה
1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	ציון במדבר הייתה
LXX Isa	Σωσὺς ὡς ἔρημος ἐγενήθη

For the Isaiah translator's inclination to turn metaphors into similes by adding a particle of comparison, see section 4.2.2.

65:1 MT Isa	נדרשתי ללוא שאלו נמצאתי ללא בקשני
1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	נדרשתי ללא שאלוני נמציתי ללוא בקשוני
LXX Isa	Ἐμφανῆς ἐγενόμην τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ζήτοῦσιν, εὐρέθην τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ἐπερωτῶσιν.

1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and LXX Isaiah will have complemented שאלו with an object in parallelism to בקשוני.

65:3 MT Isa	זבחים בגנות
1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	המה זובחים בגנות
LXX Isa	αὐτοὶ θυσιάζουσιν ἐν τοῖς ἀγίοις

Possibly LXX Isaiah read המה in his Hebrew manuscript in conformity with 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>.

66:3 MT Isa	שוחט השור מכה-איש זובח השא ערף כלב
1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	שוחט השור במכה איש זובח השא עורפ כלב
LXX Isa	ὁ δὲ ἄνομος ὁ θύων μοι μὸςχον ὡς ὁ ἀποκατένωνον κύνα

Compare 64:9(10) above.

66:21 MT Isa	וגם-מהם אקח לכהנים ללויים
1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	וגם מהמה אקח לכהנים ללויים
LXX Isa	καὶ ἀπ' αὐτῶν λήμψομαι ἔμοι ἱερεῖς καὶ Λευίτας

Perhaps the plus ἐμοί in LXX Isaiah stems from a Hebrew manuscript attesting (א)לי, just as 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> does. But in both versions the prepositional phrase could equally be an addition in harmonisation to Num 8:14–16.<sup>46</sup>

<sup>45</sup> Talmon, "Aspects of the Textual Transmission," 115.



12.3.1.2 Minuses which LXX Isaiah shares with 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>

The following elements are lacking in both LXX Isaiah and 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> as opposed to the MT:<sup>47</sup>

3:24	MT Isa	והיה תחת בשם מק יהיה
	1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	ויהיו תחת הבשם מק (–)
	LXX Isa	καὶ ἔσται ἂντις ὁσμῆς ἡδέας κοινोटός (–)

The Qumran scribe has substituted the consecutive perfect והיה with an imperfect + *waw* (conjunctive) ויהיו. He has regularly removed consecutive forms, which can be explained by the fact that in the period in which he lived these forms were not in common use anymore.<sup>48</sup> Because in the verse under consideration he has also changed the function of the initial verb (from an introductory “and it will happen that” into the main verb of the clause—“and they will be”), היה at the end of the sentence became redundant and was omitted. Something comparable has happened in LXX Isaiah, where the translator in the place of והיה installed the main verb of the clause: καὶ ἔσται—“and there will be.”<sup>49</sup>

5:27	MT Isa	ואין כושל בו
	1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	ואין כושל (–)
	LXX Isa	οὐδὲ κοπιᾶσουσιν (–)

The lack of representation of בו in the Greek Isaiah is probably just an element of the variant translation of ואין כושל בו (“and none among them [?] will stumble”) by οὐδὲ κοπιᾶσουσιν (“they will not get tired”) rather than resulting from a *Vorlage* in which the preposition was lacking. In the Scroll בו may have been deleted because it is somewhat difficult to comprehend (“over him” does not make sense in the context), and because it has no parallel in the preceding line (אין-עף).

7:23	MT Isa	והיה ביום ההוא יהיה כל-מקום אשר יהיה-שם אלף גפן באלף כסף לשמיר ולשית יהיה
	1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	והיה ביום ההוא (–) כול המקום אשר יהיה שמ אלף גפן באלף כסף לשמיר ולשית יהיה

<sup>46</sup> See section 9.4.1.2b.

<sup>47</sup> For a discussion of minuses shared by LXX Isaiah and 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>, see also Ziegler, “Die Vorlage der Isaías-Septuaginta,” 43–45, and Kutscher, *Language and Linguistic Background*, 547–55.

<sup>48</sup> Kutscher, *Language and Linguistic Background*, 350–52, 354–55, 357–58.

<sup>49</sup> See 7:23, and see section 7.3.2.

LXX Isa     καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ (–)  
                  πᾶς τόπος, οὗ ἐὰν ὦσι χίλιαι ἄμπελοι χιλίων σίκλων,  
                  εἰς χέρσον ἔσσονται καὶ εἰς ἄκανθαν.

The composers of LXX Isaiah and 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> most likely deleted יהיה because they considered it an ungrammatical repetition. Compare 3:24 above.

11:15     MT Isa     ... והניף ידו על־הנהר בעים רוחו והכהו  
                  1QIsa<sup>a</sup>     ... והניף ידיו על הנהר בעיים רוח (–) והכהו  
                  LXX Isa     καὶ ἐπιβαλεῖ τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸν ποταμὸν πνεύματι  
                  (–) βιαίῳ καὶ πατάξει ...

In (the manuscript tradition of) 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and LXX Isaiah the suffix in רוחו possibly got lost on account of haplography. Or, conversely, in the MT the *waw* has been doubled due to dittography. But it is imaginable as well that the possessive pronoun was left out by the LXX translator and Qumran scribe intentionally, on the grounds that they preferred to interpret רוח as “wind” rather than as God’s “spirit,” and because “his wind” would produce a somewhat curious text in their eyes. In their interpretation of רוח as “wind” they may have been influenced by Exod 14:21 כלה־לילה עזה קדים ברוח אתהים ויולך יהוה את־ידו על־הים ויט משה את־ידו על־הים ויולך יהוה אתהים ברוח קדים עזה כלה־לילה (LXX: ... ἐν ἀνέμῳ νότῳ βιαίῳ ...).

13:9     MT Isa     וחטאים ישמיד ממנה  
                  1QIsa<sup>a</sup>     וחטאים (–) ישמיד ממנה  
                  LXX Isa     καὶ τοὺς ἁμαρτωλοὺς (–) ἀπολέσαι ἐξ αὐτῆς.

The lack of (representation of) a suffix in וחטאים and τοὺς ἁμαρτωλοὺς may be the consequence of a ה/ס interchange in the Hebrew manuscript tradition, unless the scribe of the Scroll and the translator discarded the suffix intentionally, considering its reference to “the world” as pleonastic.<sup>50</sup> Compare Ps 104:35 יתמו חטאים מן־הארץ

14:18     MT Isa     כל־מלכי גוים כלם שכבו בכבוד  
                  1QIsa<sup>a</sup>     כול מלכי גוים (–) שכבו בכבוד  
                  LXX Isa     πάντες οἱ βασιλεῖς τῶν ἐθνῶν (–) ἐκοιμήθησαν ἐν τιμῇ

The absence of כלם in 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and of its equivalent in the Greek translation might indicate a divergence in the Hebrew *Vorlage*,<sup>51</sup> but could also be caused by the application of condensation in both versions.

<sup>50</sup> See section 5.5.

<sup>51</sup> It is conceivable that the MT version is the result of conflation between two readings: כל־מלכי גוים (1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and LXX Isaiah) and כלם שכבו בכבוד.

14:19	MT Isa	יורדי אל- <b>אבני</b> -בור
	1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	יורדו [אל] <b>אבני</b> בור
	LXX Isa	καταβαινόντων εἰς (–) ἄδου.

LXX Isaiah reflects the reading of 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> before the correction. It may well be that **אבני** was lacking in the parent text of both.

21:14	MT Isa	<b>בלחמן</b> קדמו נדד
	1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	<b>בלחם</b> (-) קדמו נודד
	LXX Isa	<b>ἄρτοις</b> (–) συναντᾶτε τοῖς φεύγουσι

The MT form **בלחמן** might be corrupt, 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and LXX Isaiah bearing witness to the more original reading **בלחם**. Yet, the latter two may also have omitted the suffix deliberately, on account of its obscurity, and perhaps also in parallelism to **מים** in the preceding line **לקראת צמא התיו מים**.

21:16	MT Isa	ובלה <b>כל</b> -כבוד קדר
	1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	יכלה (-) כבוד קדר
	LXX Isa	ἐκλείψει (–) ἡ δόξα τῶν υἱῶν Κηθαρ

Here again we come across a case where a word for “all” is absent in both LXX Isaiah and 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> (see 14:18 above). This word is regularly missing in each of the two versions (in 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>, see 2:12; 11:9; 14:18; 21:16; 23:17; 56:6; and 66:20;<sup>52</sup> as regards LXX Isaiah, see section 3.4).

23:8	MT Isa	אשר <b>סחריה</b> שרים כנעניה נכבדי-ארץ
	1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	אשר <b>סחריה</b> שרים כנעניה נכבדי (ה) ארץ
	LXX Isa	οἱ ἔμποροι αὐτῆς ἐνδοξοί, (–) ἄρχοντες τῆς γῆς.

Similar to 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> 23:8 before the correction, and contrary to the MT, LXX Isaiah presents only one phrase in the sense of “her merchants.” It is doubtful, however, whether the minus in the Greek consists of **סחריה**, as in 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>, or of **כנעניה**. The latter option is more probable, as in the equivalent place of **סחריה** the phrase **οἱ ἔμποροι αὐτῆς** appears. Both versions will have omitted either of the two synonyms for the sake of condensation.

24:4	MT Isa	אמללו מרום <b>עם-הארץ</b>
	1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	אמלל מרום <b>עם</b> <b>הארץ</b>
	LXX Isa	ἐπένηθησαν οἱ ὑψηλοὶ (–) <b>τῆς γῆς</b> .

<sup>52</sup> See Kutscher, *Language and Linguistic Background*, 554.

The agreement of the LXX with the reading of 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> (before its correction) may be due to a common *Vorlage* of the two documents,<sup>53</sup> or to the omission of עם in parallelism to the preceding lines (נבלה הארץ אמללה נבלה תבל). Barthélemy and de Waard suggest that the LXX translator and the copyist of 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> deliberately omitted עם in order to avoid the pejorative connotation “people not educated in the Torah” which the phrase עם-הארץ could evoke in post-exilic times.<sup>54</sup>

26:3–4	MT Isa	כי בך בטוח בטחו ביהוה
	1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	כי בכה (-) בטחו ביהוה
	LXX Isa	ὅτι ἐπὶ σοὶ (-) ᾗλπισαν, κύριε

The LXX translator regarded בטוח as a finite form rather than as an imperative, while probably interpreting the preceding בטוח as a paranomastically used infinitive absolute instead of as a passive participle. This would elucidate the lack of representation of בטוח in the Greek, given that the translator frequently avoided rendering the infinitive absolute.<sup>55</sup> The absence of בטוח in 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> can be explained in a similar way: since the infinitive absolute was no longer utilised in the time of the scribe, he has often refrained from using this construction, generally by substituting another verb form for it,<sup>56</sup> but in this case by simply leaving out the form which he probably thought of as an infinitive absolute.<sup>57</sup>

26:6	MT Isa	תרמסנה רגל רגלי עני פעמי דלים
	1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	תרמסנה (-) רגלי עניים פעמי דלים
	LXX Isa	καὶ πατήσουσιν αὐτοὺς (-) πόδες πραέων καὶ ταπεινῶν.

The missing of (an equivalent to) רגל may be accounted for by a deliberate abbreviation of the text on the part of the scribe and the translator, because it was too repetitious in their eyes. In LXX Isaiah פעמי also is omitted for that same

<sup>53</sup> According to Talmon (“Aspects of the Textual Transmission,” 118) “עם הארץ) may be conceived of as a parallel of מרום (הארץ) which in Is-a was collated between the lines from a not anymore extant text-type. At a subsequent copying for which a MS of the Is-a type served as *Vorlage*, the superscribed variant was misconstrued as a corrected omission, and was reinstated in the text proper. This resulted in a doublet, as exhibited by the present MT.”

<sup>54</sup> Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament*, 2:172–74; de Waard, *Handbook on Isaiah*, 104.

<sup>55</sup> See section 5.6.

<sup>56</sup> Kutsch, *Language and Linguistic Background*, 346–48.

<sup>57</sup> Another possible explanation is that either of the two verb forms is a variant reading which was circulating in the manuscript tradition, and was added to the original reading in the MT. This seems less possible to me, however, since both forms have their own object and are integrated into a separate clause.

reason. Talmon, however, thinks that רגל in the MT is a variant of רגלי, which was inserted into the text base.<sup>58</sup>

26:8 MT Isa אף ארח משפטיך יהוה קיונך  
לשמך ולזכרך תאות־נפש

1QIsa<sup>a</sup> אפ אורח משפטיך  
יהוה קיונו (-) לשמך ולתורתך תאית נפש

LXX Isa ἡ γὰρ ὁδὸς κυρίου κρίσις·  
ἡλπίζαμεν (-) ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί σου καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ μνηίᾳ

1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and LXX Isaiah may both have sought to “improve” the Hebrew text by not representing the object suffix in קיונך, as this suffix seems superfluous. The object of קוה is already incorporated in ארח משפטיך, or—as perceived by the composers of the two versions themselves (1QIsa<sup>a</sup> displaying an extra spacing after ארח משפטיך)—in לשמך ולזכרך.<sup>59</sup>

28:16 MT Isa לכן כה אמר אדני יהוה  
1QIsa<sup>a</sup> לכן כה אמר אחני יהוה  
LXX Isa διὰ τοῦτο οὕτως λέγει κύριος (-)

The absence of אדני preceding יהוה can in 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> additionally be observed in 3:15;<sup>60</sup> 28:22; 30:15; 49:22; 52:4; 61:1; and 65:13,<sup>61</sup> each time—except in 28:22 and 61:1—in places where the Hebrew offers the messenger formulae כה אמר יהוה. In all of these places the Greek translation likewise gives one divine name only.<sup>62</sup> This agreement between LXX Isaiah and (the first hand of) 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> does not signify, however, that the LXX translator had a Hebrew text in front of him in which אדני was also missing here, since LXX Isaiah in nearly all instances where the Hebrew presents the combinations אדני יהוה, האדון יהוה, or יה יהוה, translates this with only one divine name.<sup>63</sup> Hence, in the Greek Isaiah the shortening of the name of God seems to be an overall tendency. Besides, in most of its instances the absence of אדני in 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> can be explained in the light of similar formulae in the near context where אדני is also missing (in the MT too), and to which the scribe may have wanted to assimilate the expression (see 30:15; 49:22; 52:4; and 65:13). Also as regards the verse under

<sup>58</sup> Talmon, “Aspects of the Textual Transmission,” 121.

<sup>59</sup> See section 10.2.

<sup>60</sup> 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> gives in 3:15 יהוה צבאות אדני with אדני suspended.

<sup>61</sup> Also compare 38:11, cited below.

<sup>62</sup> In the LXX of Isa 3:15–16 the two consecutive formulae יהוה צבאות ויאמר יהוה are represented by only one: Τάδε λέγει κύριος.

<sup>63</sup> In only three of the nearly thirty occurrences of יהוה אדני יהוה, האדון יהוה, or יה יהוה does the Greek translate these as ὁ δεσπότης κύριος; see section 3.2.3a.

consideration—Isa 28:16—harmonisation may be at stake, namely to שמעו דבר־יהוה in verse 14, where God is designated by a mere יהוה as well.

28:22	MT Isa	כִּי־כֹלָה וְנִחְרָצָה שְׁמַעְתִּי מֵאֵת <u>אֲדֹנִי יְהוָה</u> צְבָאוֹת עַל־כָּל־הָאָרֶץ
	1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	כִּי כֹלָה וְנִחְרָצָה שְׁמַעְתִּי מֵאֵת (-) <u>יְהוָה</u> צְבָאוֹת עַל כָּל הָאָרֶץ
	LXX Isa	διότι συντετελεσμένα καὶ συντετμημένα πράγματα ἤκουσα παρὰ (-) κυρίου σαβαωθ, ἃ ποιήσει ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν.

See the discussion above.

30:15	MT Isa	כִּי כֹה־אָמַר <u>אֲדֹנִי יְהוָה</u> קְדוֹשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל
	1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	כִּי כֹה אָמַר <u>אֲדֹנִי יְהוָה</u> קְדוֹשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל
	LXX Isa	οὕτως λέγει (-) <u>κύριος</u> ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Ἰσραῆλ

See 28:16 above. אֲדֹנִי may have been left out in conformity with the messenger formulae in 30:1 and 12, where this title does not appear either.

37:14	MT Isa	וַיִּפְרֹשֶׁהוּ <u>חֲזַקְיָהוּ</u> לִפְנֵי יְהוָה
	1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	וַיִּפְרוּשֶׁה <u>חֲזַקְיָה</u> לִפְנֵי יְהוָה
	LXX Isa	καὶ ἤνοιξεν αὐτὸ (-) ἐναντίον κυρίου

The name of Hezekiah has perhaps been deleted in LXX Isaiah and 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> (before the correction) in order to avoid repetitious language, as it also appears in a previous and subsequent sentence.

38:11	MT Isa	לֹא־אֶרְאֶה יְהוָה בְּאֶרֶץ הַחַיִּים
	1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	לֹא אֶרְאֶה יְהוָה (-) בְּאֶרֶץ חַיִּים
	LXX Isa	Οὐκέτι μὲν ἴδω τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ (-) ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς

It might be assumed that haplography or dittography has occurred here. It is also possible that the scribe of 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> as well as the Greek translator have erroneously read יהוה instead of יה. But they may also have left out יה intentionally, so as to remove the repetition; for a similar deletion of the figure of geminatio, compare 62:10 below.<sup>64</sup>

40:7–8	MT Isa	יְבֹשֶׁת חֲצִיר נָבֵל צִיץ <u>כִּי רוּחַ יְהוָה נִשְׁבָּה בּוֹ אֲכַן חֲצִיר הָעֵם יִבֶּשׂ חֲצִיר נָבֵל צִיץ</u> <u>וְדִבְרֵי־אֱלֹהֵינוּ יָקוּם לְעוֹלָם</u>
--------	--------	---

<sup>64</sup> See also section 8.7.

1QIsa<sup>a</sup> יבש חציר נבל ציצ  
(ודבר) כי רוח .... נשבה בוא הכן חציר העם יבש חציר נבל ציצ  
ודבר אלוהיט אלוהינו יקום לעולם

LXX Isa ἐξηράνθη ὁ χόρτος, καὶ τὸ ἄνθος ἐξέπεσε,  
(-) τὸ δὲ ῥῆμα τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

The words in superscript were added to the Qumran text by a later hand. The original scribe may have accidentally skipped them (except for אלוהינו) due to parablepsis. A similar mistake appears to have been made in LXX Isaiah. For more comments, see 12.2.

42:3 MT Isa קנה רצון לא ישבור ופשתה כהה לא יכבנה  
1QIsa<sup>a</sup> קנה רצוצ לוא ישבור ופשתה כהה לוא יכבה (-)  
LXX Isa κάλαμον τεθλασμένον οὐ συντρίψει  
καὶ λίνον καπνιζόμενον οὐ σβέσσει (-)

The seemingly redundant object pronoun in יכבנה may have been left out in parallelism to ישבור in the preceding line.

44:20 MT Isa ולא יאמר הלא שקר בימיני  
1QIsa<sup>a</sup> ולוא יואמר (-) שקר בימיני  
LXX Isa ἴδετε, οὐκ ἐρεῖτε ὅτι (-) Ψεῦδος ἐν τῇ δεξιᾷ μου;

In the *Vorlage* of LXX Isaiah הלא might have been absent, in accordance with 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>.<sup>65</sup>

46:6 MT Isa ישכרו צורף ויעשהו אל  
1QIsa<sup>a</sup> ישכורו צורפ ויעשה (-) אל  
LXX Isa καὶ μισθωσάμενοι χρυσοχόον ἐποίησαν (-) χειροποίητα

Although 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and LXX Isaiah concur in not representing the suffix in ויעשהו, the grammatical number of the verb differs in both documents, being singular in the Scroll and plural in the translation. This makes one suspect that they both created their own variant out of the more original MT reading: whereas in 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> ויעשהו was altered into ויעשה, in the LXX it was turned into ויעשו. LXX Isaiah has thus harmonised this clause to the surrounding ones, in which the subject is a third person plural as well.

<sup>65</sup> Ottley suggests that the translator has read הלא as if it were יראו, which would be reflected in ἴδετε (Ottley, *Book of Isaiah*, 2:317).

48:15	MT Isa	אני אני דברתי אף-קראתי
	1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	אני אני דברתי אף קראתי (-)
	LXX Isa	ἐγὼ ἐλάλησα, ἐγὼ ἐκάλεσα (-)

The object of the verb “to call” may have been left out in 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and LXX Isaiah to make the clause “I have called (him)” more parallel to the preceding one “I have spoken.”

49:22	MT Isa	כה-אמר אדני יהוה
	1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	כה אמר (-) יהוה
	LXX Isa	οὕτως λέγει (-) κύριος

Possibly the Qumran scribe did not represent אדני because he wished to align this formula to the ones in verses 7,8, and 25, reading יהוה אמר (כי) / οὕτως λέγει κύριος. See 28:16.

52:4	MT Isa	כי כה אמר אדני יהוה
	1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	כיא כה אמר (-) יהוה
	LXX Isa	οὕτως λέγει (-) κύριος

אדני has perhaps been deleted in assimilation to יהוה אמר כי in verse 3 and to נאם־יהוה in verse 5, where אדני is absent too. See the discussion at 28:16 above.

52:6	MT Isa	לכן ידע עמי שמי לכן ביום ההוא
	1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	לכן ידע עמיא שמי (-) ביום ההוא
	LXX Isa	διὰ τοῦτο γινώσεται ὁ λαός μου τὸ ὄνομά μου (-) ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ

The second לכן gives the impression of being a somewhat peculiar and unnecessary reiteration. This may have encouraged the 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and LXX Isaiah composers to omit the word.

55:1	MT Isa	ואשר אין־לו כסף לכו שברו ואכלו ולכו שברו בלוא־כסף בלוא מחיר יין וחלב
	1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	ואשר אין לו כסף לכו שבורו (-) בלוא כסף ובלוא מחיר יין וחלב
	LXX Isa	καὶ ὅσοι μὴ ἔχετε ἀργύριον, βαδίσαντες ἀγοράσατε καὶ πίετε (-) ἀνευ ἀργυρίου καὶ τιμῆς οἴνου καὶ στέαρ.



Whereas in 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> the minus encompasses **שברו ולכו שברו**, in LXX Isaiah it concerns only the words **שברו ולכו** (**שברו** being represented by *πίτετε*). In both documents the words may have been omitted so as to avoid repetition, although in the Scroll *homoeoteleuton* might also have taken place.

60:20	MT Isa	לא־יבוא <b>עוד</b> שמשך
	1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	לוא יבוא (-) שמשך
	LXX Isa	οὐ γὰρ δύσεται (-) ὁ ἅγιός σοι

The absence of **עוד** in 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and of its counterpart *ἔτι* in LXX Isaiah could point to a Hebrew *Vorlage* without this adverb, or may be an adjustment to balance this line to the succeeding parallel one **וירחך לא יאסף**.

61:1	MT Isa	רוח <b>אדני</b> יהוה עלי
	1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	רוח (-) יהוה עלי
	LXX Isa	Πνεῦμα (-) κυρίου ἐπ' ἐμέ

See the discussion at 28:16 above.

62:10	MT Isa	<b>עברו עברו</b> בשערים
	1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	<b>עבורו</b> (-) שערים
	LXX Isa	<b>πορεύεσθε</b> (-) διὰ τῶν πυλῶν μου

For a similar case of the elimination of geminatio, see 38:11 above.

63:11	MT Isa	איה <b>המעלם</b> מים את רעי צאנו
	1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	איה <b>המעלה</b> (-) מים את רועי צ'א(ו)נו
	LXX Isa	<b>ὁ ἀναβιβάσας</b> (-) ἐκ τῆς γῆς τὸν ποιμένα τῶν προβάτων.

The object suffix in **המעלם** might have been considered redundant, the object of **עלה** already being expressed in **רעי צאנו**. Alternatively, a ה/ם interchange may have occurred in the Hebrew manuscript tradition.

65:13	MT Isa	לכן כה־אמר <b>אדני</b> יהוה
	1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	לכן כוה אמר <b>אחני</b> יהוה
	LXX Isa	Διὰ τοῦτο τάδε λέγει (-) κύριος

See 28:16 above. The scribe and translator perhaps wanted to approximate the formula to **כה־אמר יהוה** in verses 7,8, and 25.

### 12.3.1.3 Conclusion to 12.3.1

A survey of the cases discussed above leads us to conclude that most of the pluses and minuses which 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and LXX Isaiah have in common, rather than

stemming from a corresponding *Vorlage* that differed from the MT, could equally well derive from certain techniques that both the scribe of the Scroll and the Isaiah translator have applied to their texts, and in particular the following:

1. *Condensation/implication*: According to Kutscher, 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> offers fourteen examples of the removal of one out of two identical expressions.<sup>66</sup> LXX Isaiah includes an abundance of such cases, as well as of the reduction of synonyms.<sup>67</sup> Also when expressions may have seemed superfluous because the information they give has already been provided by other elements in the text, they have often been omitted in both documents.<sup>68</sup> For shared instances of condensation or implication, see 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and LXX Isa 3:24; 7:23; 13:9; 14:18; 23:8; 26:6, 8; 37:14; 38:11; 42:3; 52:6; 55:1; 62:10; and 63:11 above.
2. *Contextual harmonisation or the “improvement” of parallelism*: In both 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and LXX Isaiah words have frequently been deleted or inserted in order to make a clause more parallel to a previous or subsequent one, or to harmonise expressions to related ones nearby. Kutscher gives circa forty examples of pluses in the Scroll resulting from this tendency. Of these circa twelve likewise occur in LXX Isaiah: see the pluses in 1:31; 38:18; 41:11; 43:23; 44:13; 49:7, 9; 54:9; 58:13; 60:19; and 65:1. Minuses common to both texts and related to this pattern can be detected in 5:27; 21:14; 24:4; 42:3; 48:15; and 60:20. To these can be added several cases in which an equivalent to אֲדֹנִי is missing in the combination יהוה אֲדֹנִי appearing in messenger formulae, perhaps in harmonisation to similar formulae nearby where אֲדֹנִי is absent too: see 28:16; 30:15; 49:22; 52:4; and 65:13.
3. *Explication or deletion of a difficult or elliptic Hebrew text*: Both the LXX translation and the Isaiah Scroll regularly seem to have “corrected” what they regarded as an unclear or ungrammatical Hebrew text, or have made an (elliptic) expression more explicit. The two versions are congruent in this as it concerns the pluses in Isa 9:13(14); 11:15; 12:2; 31:1; 37:38; 38:8, 18; 39:6; 43:23; 44:28; 45:18; 48:8; 55:9; 56:7; 57:15; 58:13; and 62:5(?), and the minuses in 5:27; 7:23; 21:14; 26:8; and 52:6. Relatively many pluses entail the supply by the scribe and the translator of—in their eyes—a necessary, yet missing preposition in the Hebrew: see 9:13(14); 18:7; 29:9; 31:1; 37:38; 43:23; 45:18; 55:9; 57:15; and 62:5. In 26:3 the scribe as well as the translator did not represent a form which they presumably considered as an infinitive absolute, possibly because it may have sounded unnatural in the ears of speakers of later Hebrew or when literally translated into Greek.

<sup>66</sup> Kutscher, *Language and Linguistic Background*, 554.

<sup>67</sup> See chapter 7, Condensation.

<sup>68</sup> For more examples of implication in LXX Isaiah, see chapter 3.

4. The inclination of the Qumran scribe to simplify difficult texts has received an extensive treatment by Kutscher. Kutscher remarks that the scribe was apt to emend texts which he found complex, and to replace rare words by more common ones. In order to “correct” the text he also made additions.<sup>69</sup> Despite the fact that such a tendency for ameliorating obscurities in the Hebrew seems to characterise both documents, of course the possibility remains that some of the pluses and minuses shared by LXX Isaiah and 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> which in this chapter are attributed to that trend, may in fact have been a corruption in the *Vorlage* of the MT that had never entered the ancestor texts of the Scroll and the translation.
5. A word in the sense of “all” is often missing in both versions. In 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> this happens seven times (see 2:12; 11:9; 14:9[?]; 21:16; 23:17; 56:6; and 66:20),<sup>70</sup> in LXX Isaiah around thirty times.<sup>71</sup> Corresponding minuses in this realm can be found in 14:18 and 21:16. Both documents have a word in the sense of “all” *extra* in 41:11 and 49:9.<sup>72</sup> The addition or omission of “all” is regularly related to the wish to ameliorate a parallelism.
6. In the divine title יהוה ידני אדני the first name—אדני—often has no counterpart in the Scroll and the Greek translation. In LXX Isaiah this happens in the overwhelming majority of the approximately thirty Masoretic occurrences of this combination. In 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> it can be found about eight times (mostly in formulae introducing divine speech): see Isa 3:15; 28:16,22; 30:15; 49:22; 52:4; 61:1; and 65:13. In all of these cases an equivalent to אדני is missing in LXX Isaiah as well. The correspondence between the two documents in this regard does not necessarily imply that they had a common *Vorlage* displaying only one divine name in the places mentioned, for, as noted, the omission of אדני seems a more general tendency of the Isaiah translator.<sup>73</sup>
7. *Intertextuality*: In a few places, that is, in Isa 11:15; 49:7; and 66:21, the Scroll and the Isaiah translation possibly reveal a similar influence of texts elsewhere in Scripture, either from within Isaiah, or from beyond. In 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> Kutscher distinguishes approximately twenty cases of the former and ten of the latter phenomenon.<sup>74</sup> The abundant instances of anaphoric translation in LXX Isaiah have been listed in chapter 9.
8. A shared plus betraying an exegetical change might be present in 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and LXX Isa 18:7.

<sup>69</sup> Kutscher, *Language and Linguistic Background*, 30–39, 546.

<sup>70</sup> Kutscher, *Language and Linguistic Background*, 554.

<sup>71</sup> See section 3.4.

<sup>72</sup> In 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> כל appears four times as a plus: besides in 41:11 and 49:9, also in 39:2 and 60:14. In LXX Isa πᾶς is a plus more than twenty times; see section 2.3.

<sup>73</sup> Ziegler, on the contrary, thinks that in these places LXX Isaiah had a *Vorlage* with only one divine name (Ziegler, “Die Vorlage der Isaias-Septuaginta,” 57–58).

<sup>74</sup> Kutscher, *Language and Linguistic Background*, 545.

A comparable reading mistake, such as parablepsis or haplography, may account for the minuses in 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and LXX Isa 11:15; 18:7(?); 38:11; 40:7–8; and 55:1.

That 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and LXX Isaiah had a similar Hebrew text in front of them that deviated from the MT may be the most likely situation with regard to the pluses in 7:4; 13:22(?); 18:7; 37:9; 42:14; 48:17; 51:23; 53:11,12; 57:15; 62:5(?),9; 64:1(2); 65:3; and 66:21, and the minuses in 13:9(?); 14:19; and 44:20.<sup>75</sup>

All in all, this short study confirms the hypothesis of van der Kooij, that the affinities between the Isaiah Scroll and the Greek translation are often the result of a similar kind of free approach towards their Hebrew texts by the composers of these two documents.<sup>76</sup> Several techniques, such as condensation, explicitation, contextual harmonisation, and intertextuality were applied to their text by both of them, though by the LXX translator mostly to a greater degree.

### *12.3.2 Pluses and minuses which LXX Isaiah shares with Isaianic Qumran manuscripts other than 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>*

In addition to the Great Isaiah Scroll, some other manuscripts which also witness the text of Isaiah were discovered in Qumran. These are, however, all fragmentary, containing only parts of the Isaianic text. The majority of them were found in Cave 4, and are accordingly numbered as 4QIsa<sup>a-o</sup>.<sup>77</sup> Their text seems to be closer to the MT than to 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>. In addition, a more extensive fragment, encompassing a fifth of the book, was detected in Cave 1. This manuscript, named 1QIsa<sup>b</sup>, displays a conservative attitude towards its supposed *Vorlage*, and is for that reason believed to reflect an archaic or “pre-Masoretic” version of the Isaianic text.<sup>78</sup> This could be of importance for the comparison with the Greek Isaiah, as it would enhance the possibility that pluses or minuses which this manuscript has in common with the LXX translation evidence a more original Hebrew text. Yet, with the exception of several cases involving the conjunction ׀ (which are not dealt with in this study), only a handful of pluses

<sup>75</sup> According to Ziegler, 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and LXX Isaiah have preserved the original reading where it concerns the shared pluses in 49:9; 51:23; 53:11; and 60:19, and the minus in 40:7–8 (he has not involved in his discussion all of the instances that are treated in the present chapter, however). Also in the places where the MT offers אָדֹנִי יְהוֹה, whereas in the two other versions (a representation of) אָדֹנִי is absent, he thinks that the latter two attest to the more original form of the text (Ziegler, “Die Vorlage der Isaías-Septuaginta,” 43, 45, 58).

<sup>76</sup> van der Kooij, “The Old Greek of Isaiah in Relation to the Qumran Texts,” 208. See also van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 112–13.

<sup>77</sup> One tiny fragment is found in Cave 5 and is named 5QIsa (see van der Kooij, “The Old Greek of Isaiah in Relation to the Qumran Texts,” 195).

<sup>78</sup> See van der Kooij, “The Old Greek of Isaiah in Relation to the Qumran Texts,” 197; idem, “The Text of Isaiah and Its Early Witnesses,” 152.

and minuses can be found in 1QIsa<sup>b</sup> that agree with those attested in the Greek Isaiah. In the Isaianic Qumran manuscripts from Cave 4 we also encounter only few quantitative differences from the MT concurring with the LXX. These various cases are listed below.<sup>79</sup>

*12.3.2.1 Pluses which LXX Isaiah shares with Isaianic Qumran manuscripts other than 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>*

49:5	MT Isa	ועתה אמר יהוה
	1QIsa <sup>b</sup>	ועתה <u>בה</u> אמר יהוה
	LXX Isa	καὶ νῦν <u>οὕτως</u> λέγει κύριος

1QIsa<sup>b</sup> and LXX Isaiah may both have applied contextual harmonisation: compare יהוה (אדני) כה אמר in verses 7, 8, and 22.

53:11	MT Isa	מעמל נפשו יראה
	1QIsa <sup>b</sup>	מעמל נפשו יראה <u>אור</u>
	4QIsa <sup>d</sup>	מעמל נפשו יראה <u>אור</u>
	LXX Isa	θεῖται αὐτῷ <u>φῶς</u>

אור is also attested in 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>; see section 12.3.1.1 above.

53:12	MT Isa	ולפשעים יפגיע
	1QIsa <sup>b</sup>	ולפשעיהם יפגיע
	4QIsa <sup>d</sup>	ולפשעיהם יפגיע
	LXX Isa	καὶ διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας <u>αὐτῶν</u> παρεδόθη.

1QIsa<sup>a</sup> reads ולפשעיהמה; see 12.3.1.1 above.

*12.3.2.2 Minuses which LXX Isaiah shares with Isaianic Qumran manuscripts other than 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>*

3:14	MT Isa	יהוה במשפט יבוא עם־זקני עמן
	4QIsa <sup>b</sup>	(-) עם זקני עם (-)
	LXX Isa	αὐτὸς κύριος εἰς κρίσιν ἔξει μετὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων <u>τοῦ λαοῦ</u> (-)
8:11	MT Isa	<u>כי</u> כה אמר יהוה אלי
	4QIsa <sup>f</sup>	(-) כה אמר יהוה
	LXX Isa	(-) Οὕτως λέγει κύριος

<sup>79</sup> Text from 1QIsa<sup>b</sup> and the Isaiah scrolls found in Cave 4 has been quoted from Eugene Ulrich, ed., *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls. Transcriptions and Textual Variants* (VTSup134; Leiden: Brill, 2010).

In MT Isaiah the formula **כִּי אִמַּר** appears almost fifty times, including only fourteen cases in which the expression starts with **כִּי**. In eight of those fourteen instances the LXX does not represent the conjunction (8:11; 30:15; 36:16; 45:18; 49:25; 52:4; 56:4; and 57:15). Perhaps in those places the translator sought to adjust the formula to its most common appearance or to harmonise it to a similar formula close by that did not open with **כִּי**.<sup>80</sup> A comparable motivation may have prompted the omission of **כִּי** in 4QIsa<sup>f</sup>, although it is also possible that the particle was absent in the Hebrew *Vorlage* of 4QIsa<sup>f</sup> and LXX Isaiah.

49:12	MT Isa	הנה־אלה מרחוק יבאו <u>והנה־אלה</u> מצפון
	4QIsa <sup>d</sup>	הנה־אלה (-) מצפון
	LXX Isa	ἰδοὺ οὗτοι πόρρωθεν ἔρχονται, (-) οὗτοι ἀπὸ βορρᾶ

The second **הנה** may have been elided for the purpose of condensation.

## 12.4 Conclusion

In this chapter I have proposed two criteria that may help to establish whether pluses and minuses in LXX Isaiah are caused by a Hebrew *Vorlage* deviating from the MT. The first is that a plus or minus cannot simply be explained by one of the translation tendencies that LXX Isaiah displays, and the second that the plus or minus is also attested in one of the Isaianic Qumran manuscripts. Considering the cases which meet with the first criterion, three aspects stand out. In the first place, I could find only a small number of these. Secondly, all of the instances listed consist of minuses, and thirdly, compared to other minuses in LXX Isaiah many of them are relatively large: more than 50 per cent consist of an entire clause (or an even larger unit), whereas the overwhelming majority of minuses in the Isaiah translation are formed of only one or two words. Perhaps this affirms the supposition that the translator was not apt to leave out extensive parts of the Hebrew text intentionally, as this would clash with his reverential approach towards Scripture.<sup>81</sup>

<sup>80</sup> See section 4.3.1.

<sup>81</sup> See Aejmelaeus, "What Can We Know," 68: "Now, knowing that the translators considered the text they translated to be authoritative Scripture and, on the other hand, that most of them, after all, were fairly literal, it would seem to be a good rule of thumb to start with the assumption that larger divergences from the MT mainly come from the *Vorlage*, and only exceptionally and with imperative reasons to attribute them to the translator." Whereas Aejmelaeus takes as a starting-point that larger minuses are mostly caused by a different *Vorlage*, in my study I found out that many large minuses in LXX Isaiah may indeed have a different *Vorlage* as their background, although another part of them may be caused by condensation or parablepsis.

As regards the comparison of the LXX translation with the Isaiah manuscripts from Qumran, the main role is played by the Great Isaiah Scroll. It has been shown that the pluses and minuses which LXX Isaiah shares with this document should not too easily be assigned to a similar *Vorlage* at variance with the MT, as most of them can likewise be attributed to certain practices that the Qumran scribe and LXX translator seem to have had in common. These include, for instance, an inclination towards condensation, contextual harmonisation, “improvement” of parallelism, the solution of difficult Hebrew texts, and the addition or omission of words in the sense of “all.” Nevertheless, in a limited number of cases there is sufficient reason to suspect that a different underlying Hebrew manuscript is the cause of a plus or minus exhibited by both LXX Isaiah and 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>.





## Chapter 13.

### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In this study I have attempted to provide a systematic and comprehensive survey of the pluses and minuses in the Greek translation of Isaiah. For this purpose I have collected and compared as many cases of pluses and minuses in the translation as possible. After having done this, it appears to me that the large majority of these cases can be assigned to one of the following twelve categories, which indicate their possible origin:

1. *Explicitation*: Quite often the Isaiah translator has added expressions which are implied by the Hebrew but not stated explicitly. In this way he has attempted to elucidate the Hebrew text or make it more specific. I have listed almost five hundred pluses that may have this tendency as their background.

2. *Implication*: The translator has now and then also exposed his text to implication (though to a much lesser degree than to explicitation), leaving out words that were already presupposed by the context, or information he may have considered to be familiar to his readers. Occasionally he has omitted specifying details that were not vital for the message and content of the text, such as specifications of body parts. Such “redundant” words he may have removed in order to arrive at a more concise text. In this study I have offered circa two hundred examples of implication in LXX Isaiah.

3. *The addition or omission of particles*: The Isaiah translator has frequently supplied particles—especially conjunctions—to his text, with the apparent aim of clarifying or creating relationships between the different parts of his discourse. Also some minuses consisting of particles can be found, in particular the Hebrew conjunction וְ.

4. *Free translation of Hebrew grammatical and idiomatic features*: For the sake of a correct use of the Greek language and with the purpose of avoiding Hebraisms, the Isaiah translator has repeatedly rendered typically Hebrew

constructions in a free way, leading to “pluses” and “minuses” in his translation. This pertains, for instance, to the rendition of the asyndetic relative clause, the retrospective pronoun in the relative clause, nominal suffixes, the infinitive absolute, semiprepositions, and several Hebrew idiomatic expressions and formulae. Roughly speaking, LXX Isaiah has given a free rendering in somewhat more than half of the occurrences of these constructions. In this sense, the Greek Isaiah could be typified as a “moderately free” translation.

5. *Double translation*: At least 120 examples can be found in LXX Isaiah of pluses that may be the result of double translation. The second rendering of a Hebrew expression in the LXX sometimes forms a synonym of the first one, but on many other occasions it reflects a different reading or interpretation of the Hebrew word or phrase. Although the two renderings are regularly joined in coordination, the second rendering can also be located elsewhere in the same sentence, at the beginning of the subsequent clause, or at the end of the preceding one.

Doublets can have multiple backgrounds. At times they may reflect a conflation of different readings, but mostly they are the creation of the Isaiah translator himself, who adopted them to express the meaning of a Hebrew word in a more precise way, or—particularly when the two renderings reflect two different readings or interpretations of the Hebrew—who made use of double translation as a tool to interpret the Hebrew in alternative ways.

A phenomenon related to double translation is “repetitive rendering,” which means that the Greek fills out the ellipsis of the Hebrew by repeating a word from a neighbouring phrase or clause (by means of an identical expression or a synonym). This could serve the purpose of clarifying the text, and often of “improving” a parallelism. This technique can be detected in at least fifty instances in LXX Isaiah.

6. *Condensation*: As has already been pointed out in earlier publications, the Isaiah translator shows an inclination to reduce identical or synonymous expressions in the Hebrew. Not only does this concern similar words or phrases, but also parallel sentences. In LXX Isaiah I have counted roughly three hundred examples of minuses that can be explained by this technique.

7. *The creation or improvement of rhetorical figures*: Although the stylistic aspirations of the Isaiah translator have regularly been undervalued in works on the Greek Isaiah, hundreds of pluses and a few dozens of minuses can be found in the translation which probably have arisen from the translator’s wish to “ameliorate” or to introduce rhetorical figures in his work. These figures include word repetition, synonymia, parallelism, and chiasm. The other side of the same coin is that in a number of cases the translator rather seems to have deleted figures of style, especially where one encounters in the Hebrew examples of

geminatio, and additionally in some instances of parallelism. Yet, those instances may also illustrate the translator's effort to stay in line with the prescriptions of Greek style, as he may now and then have omitted figures in order to avoid superfluity in ornamentation, which was considered a sin against good style in classical rhetoric.

8. *Anaphoric translation*: The adoption of elements from other Scriptural passages, both from within Isaiah and from beyond, accounts for a significant number of the pluses and minuses of the Isaiah translation. Sometimes formulations have been assimilated to similar ones elsewhere (harmonisation), while at other times ideas or expressions have been adopted from texts which do not show a literal correspondence in wording, but are related to the Isaianic text only as regards their content. Besides these, some instances can also be distinguished where the borrowing seems to be purely lexical, without the occurrence of similar contexts.

While it is evident that the translator in rendering his text has made extensive use of elements from the surrounding text and from passages elsewhere in Isaiah, his borrowing from other biblical books raises further questions. Obviously, the Isaiah translator was familiar with and employed the Greek Pentateuch, but it is less clear whether he made use of other documents, such as the Psalms, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and the Twelve Prophets, and—if he did—whether this was only in their Hebrew version or already in a Greek translation. Still, there are some pluses and minuses which might point to the Isaiah translator's reliance on the LXX version of these books, although this remains a rather speculative matter.

9. *Several other possible reasons for the translator to add or omit elements* can be mentioned, which play a minor role in the clarification of pluses and minuses in LXX Isaiah. One of them is the translator's possible failure to understand the Hebrew text in some places. Furthermore, the translator may at times have added or omitted text for ideological or theological motives, although such a motivation has more often led to the reformulation of entire sentences or passages rather than to the mere implementation or omission of one or two words.

10. *Rearrangement*: Many extra and missing elements in the Greek Isaiah cannot be isolated to be explained on their own, but are integrated within and dependent upon a greater rearrangement of the Hebrew text by the translator. Such rearranged texts consist of translation units in which most separate Hebrew words or phrases did receive counterparts in the Greek, but often ones which deviate semantically and/or grammatically from their Hebrew source. Besides, the way in which they are joined together into a sentence also differs from the *Vorlage*. This has resulted in clauses which have not only a distinct syntax but

also a different content from their Hebrew original. Rearrangements may regularly have been made in order to “manipulate” the content of the Hebrew, not because the translator deliberately wanted to stray from his source, but because he wished to reveal a different level of meaning of the text, for instance a meaning which was important for his own time and community. In such rearrangements the identification of added and omitted elements is often quite complicated, and it is sometimes doubtful whether they can still be called “pluses” and “minuses” in a proper way.

*11. Translation mistakes:* Apart from pluses and minuses that may have been created through deliberate interventions of the translator, this study has listed circa forty minuses that are possibly accounted for by translation errors such as *parablepsis* and haplography. Nevertheless, a considerable number of these could equally be attributed to the translator’s intentional abbreviation of the text. Besides, some errors of *parablepsis* and haplography may already have been made by the copyist of the Hebrew manuscript underlying LXX Isaiah.

*12. A different Hebrew Vorlage:* Pluses and minuses that cannot be attributed to one of the above-mentioned translation patterns have a greater chance of having been caused by a different Hebrew *Vorlage*. The same applies to quantitative differences in the translation which are supported by one of the Isaiah scrolls from Qumran. Of elements which meet the former criterion only a small number can be found. They turn out to consist principally of *minuses*, and, what is more, often of relatively large ones (of which there are not so many to be found in LXX Isaiah). This suggests that the translator of Isaiah had a Hebrew text in front of him that—in comparison to the MT—lacked a number of clauses or sentences (or, in other words, that the MT was based on a manuscript that contained some extra sentences as compared to the *Vorlage* of LXX Isaiah). As regards the second criterion—that a plus or minus is also attested in an Isaianic Dead Sea Scroll, in particular 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>—one has to take into account the possibility that the scribe of the Scroll and the translator of Isaiah may have had some scribal techniques in common. These include, for instance, an inclination to abbreviate the text and to adopt elements from elsewhere in Isaiah.

Considered on the whole, it seems that only a minority of pluses and minuses in LXX Isaiah are due to a *Vorlage* differing from the MT.

This classification sets out to make a contribution to and to complement the discussion of pluses and minuses in LXX Isaiah which Ziegler presented in his *Untersuchungen*. He was of course more restricted to limits of space in his treatment of pluses and minuses, since his work also comprehends many other facets of the Greek Isaiah. In the first place I have included in my investigation more cases of pluses and minuses than Ziegler did, meaning that I attempted to

treat as many cases as possible, even if it turned out to be impossible to treat all of them (also because it is unclear whether many elements can properly be defined as pluses or minuses or not). Besides this, I have offered a greater number of categories. One of the extra groups I have introduced is that of pluses and minuses which may have a rhetorical background, thus touching upon a topic which Ziegler has barely dealt with. I have tried to assign each plus or minus in the Isaiah translation to one of these categories, or sometimes to more than one. In this way I have sought to obtain a more complete and more systematic overview of the tendencies and techniques behind the pluses and minuses of the Greek Isaiah.

However, this classification is only intended to provide a general picture of the patterns displayed by the pluses and minuses of the Isaiah translation, and offers a provisional suggestion for their explanation. It is inevitable that some elements will have been ascribed to a specific translational pattern unjustly, because in reality they may have been the result of another consideration of the translator, or of a different Hebrew *Vorlage*. Nevertheless, the frequent occurrence of certain tendencies and the apparent frequency in the application of particular techniques have led me to attribute individual cases to the categories mentioned.

One thing that stands out when one surveys these various classes of pluses and minuses in LXX Isaiah is that several tendencies seem to be discrepant from each other. While, on the one hand, the translator is concerned to abbreviate his text and to remove synonymous or identical words from it, on the other hand, one can also find in his text plenty of examples of double translation. Something similar applies to his penchant for explicitation, which is counterbalanced by a (minor) inclination towards making text elements implicit. Does this (seeming) inconsistency of the translator point to an unsystematic approach, or can it be explained otherwise? I think the latter is the case. Although it is beyond the scope of this study to uncover the motives underlying the translator's manipulation of the text, it has already become clear that he regularly employed certain techniques to serve 'secondary' purposes. For instance, he has added explicating words—or, on the contrary, left out "insignificant" ones—if this appeared to serve the clarity of the discourse or the parallelism of his text, or with the aim of assimilating his text to another passage nearby. Additionally, his use of these techniques has in some cases probably been guided by issues of content, since the application of a particular technique might have given him the means to influence the text and to integrate his own ideas in it. For such a purpose he has, for instance, frequently exploited the device of double translation.

What is the significance of this categorisation of pluses and minuses in the Greek Isaiah? I think this extends to at least three areas. In the first place, it has

text-critical value. If words are lacking or extra in the translation as compared to the MT, and if their absence or presence can be clarified by one of the translation techniques frequently applied in LXX Isaiah, which I have listed in this work, then it is implausible that the translation was based on a *Vorlage* differing from the MT. The fact that the preponderance of pluses and minuses in LXX Isaiah can indeed be explained by one of the techniques given, confirms the hypothesis that the *Vorlage* of the Greek Isaiah did not differ much from the MT, but that most deviations derive from the translator himself.

In the second place, a study of the pluses and minuses of LXX Isaiah may contribute to the knowledge of the Septuagint in general. It may help to map translation methods used by LXX translators, and thus help to elucidate ways of rendering the text in other Greek translations. Besides, it can possibly throw more light on the chronological order in which the Greek Bible translations were accomplished, as some pluses and minuses in LXX Isaiah suggest that this document was influenced by other Greek translations, such as the LXX of Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the Twelve Prophets, which, for that reason, should perhaps be dated as being anterior to the Greek Isaiah. In this way, a study of LXX Isaiah's pluses and minuses could help to fix a date for other Greek Bible translations.

In the third place, this categorisation provides more insight into the character of the Greek Isaiah on its own, and into the person behind this translation. The fact that the overwhelming majority of the pluses and minuses of the translation can be classified into one of the several categories of translation techniques discussed points to the unity and methodology of this work. It demonstrates that its translator, even if rendering his text in a free way, did not realise his translation at random, adding and omitting expressions whenever he wished to, but, on the contrary, was bound by a limited number of tactics and "rules." His creativity and inventiveness, as well as his inclination to interpret the text were confined by certain techniques, which he felt it was permissible to apply. So, to express it differently, although by adding or omitting elements he took the liberty of changing the biblical text—in just a subtle way or more thoroughly—it should be possible to justify the addition or omission by way of a number of "accepted" translation techniques. In this way he restricted himself in the number of text elements which he added or omitted. Even whenever he created a text that, on the surface, differed vastly from the Hebrew, both in syntax and in content, he limited the number of pluses and minuses, as in such "rearrangements" he still stuck to the Hebrew to a large degree, re-using Hebrew words to transform them into Greek expressions which were related to them in an indirect way. Thus, even in such texts most Hebrew words are represented in the Greek, while most Greek words reflect a Hebrew one.

It has also been shown that the Isaiah translator can be seen to have worked in a quite deliberate way. He has made considered choices in rendering each phrase and sentence of his source text, and there can be found a policy behind almost every plus and minus. Aside from this scrupulous approach, he also exhibits a high proficiency in both Hebrew and Greek. Not only does he strive for a correct and proper use of the Greek language (though this is regularly balanced by his wish to render the Hebrew literally), he even shows sensitivity to the literary, poetic side of his text, heeding the prescripts of classical rhetoric. At the same time, his many borrowings from other biblical passages reveal a thorough acquaintance with (Hebrew) Scripture, and his use of a midrashic technique such as formal association (see section 1.3.2d) indicates that he was also well rooted in Jewish exegesis. In all these aspects the translator proves himself to have been a broadly educated and skilled intellectual, well grounded in both Hebrew and Greek literature.





## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aejmelaeus, Anneli. "Οτι causale in Septuagintal Greek." Pages 115–32 in *La Septuaginta en la investigación contemporánea (V Congreso de la IOSCS)*. Edited by Natalio Fernández Marcos. Textos y estudios "Cardenal Cisneros" 34. Madrid: Instituto "Arias Montano," 1985.
- . "Οτι recitativum in Septuagintal Greek." Pages 74–82 in *Studien zur Septuaginta. Robert Hanhart zu Ehren. Aus Anlaß seines 65. Geburtstages*. Edited by Detlef Fraenkel, Udo Quast, and John W. Wevers. Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen 190. Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens 20. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990.
- . "The Significance of Clause Connectors in the Syntactical and Translation-Technical Study of the Septuagint." Pages 361–80 in *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies. Jerusalem 1986*. Edited by Claude E. Cox. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 23. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.
- . "What Can We Know about the Hebrew Vorlage of the Septuagint?" *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 99 (1987): 58–89.
- Baer, David A. *When We All Go Home. Translation and Theology in LXX Isaiah 56–66*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 318. The Hebrew Bible and Its Versions 1. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- Barr, James. *The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations*. Nachrichten von der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen 11. Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens 15. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979.
- Barthélemy, Dominique, ed. *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament 2. Isaïe, Jérémie, Lamentations*. Orbis biblicus et orientalis 50.2. Fribourg: Éditions Universitaires / Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986.
- Bauer, Walter. *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur*. Revised reprint of the 5th ed. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1971.
- Berlin, Adele. "Parallelism." Pages 155–62 in vol. 5 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David N. Freedman, et al. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Beuken, Willem A. M. *Jesaja*. 4 vols. De Prediking van het Oude Testament. Nijkerk: Callenbach, 1979–1989.
- Bickerman, Elias. "The Septuagint as a Translation." Pages 167–200 in vol. 1 of *Studies in Jewish and Christian History*. 3 vols. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 9. Leiden: Brill, 1976. Repr. from *Proceedings of the American Academy of Jewish Research* 28 (1959): 1–39.
- . "Some Notes on the Transmission of the Septuagint." Pages 137–66 in vol. 1 of *Studies in Jewish and Christian History*. 3 vols. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 9. Leiden: Brill, 1976. Repr. from pages 149–78 in

- Alexander Marx. *Jubilee Volume on the Occasion of his Seventeenth Birthday*. Edited by Saul Lieberman. New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1950.
- Blass, Friedrich, Albert Debrunner, and Friedrich Rehkopf, eds. *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*. 17th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990.
- Blum-Kulka, Shoshana. "Shifts of Cohesion and Coherence in Translation." Pages 17–35 in *Interlingual and Intercultural Communication. Discourse and Cognition in Translation and Second Language Acquisition Studies*. Edited by Juliane House and Shoshana Blum-Kulka. Tübinger Beiträge zur Linguistik 272. Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 1986.
- Bosman, Hendrik Jan, and Constantijn J. Sikkels. "A Discourse on Method. Basic Parameters of Computer-Assisted Linguistic Analysis on Word Level." Pages 85–113 in *Corpus Linguistics and Textual History. A Computer-Assisted Interdisciplinary Approach to the Peshitta*. Edited by P. S. F. van Keulen and W. Th. van Peursen. *Studia semitica neerlandica* 48. Assen: Van Gorcum, 2006.
- . "Reading Authors and Reading Documents." Pages 113–33 in *Bible and Computer. The Stellenbosch AIBI-6 Conference. Proceedings of the Association Internationale Bible et Informatique "From alpha to byte". University of Stellenbosch 17-21 July, 2000*. Edited by Johann Cook. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Brock, Sebastian. "Towards a History of Syriac Translation Technique." Pages 1–14 in *III<sup>e</sup> Symposium Syriacum 1980. Les contacts du monde syriaque avec les autres cultures (Goslar 7-11 Septembre 1980)*. Edited by René Lavenant. Rome: Pontificium Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1983. *Orientalia christiana analecta* 221.
- Brockelmann, Carl. *Grundriß der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen*. 2 vols. Berlin: Reuther & Reichard, 1908–1913.
- Brockington, Leonard H. "Septuagint and Targum." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 66 (1954): 80–86.
- Brown, Francis, Samuel R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs, eds. *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament. With an Appendix Containing the Biblical Aramaic. Based on the Lexicon of William Gesenius as translated by Edward Robinson*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1979.
- Brownlee, William H. *The Meaning of the Qumrân Scrolls for the Bible. With Special Attention to the Book of Isaiah*. The James W. Richard Lectures. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.
- Budde, Karl. "Über die Schranken, die Jesajas prophetischer Botschaft zu setzen sind." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 41 (1923): 154–203.
- Bullinger, Ethelbert W. *Figures of Speech Used in the Bible. Explained and Illustrated*. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1898. Repr., Grand Rapids, Mich: Baker Book House, 1968.
- Burton, Gideon O. "Silva Rhetoricae." No pages. Cited 28 april 2009. Online: <http://rhetoric.byu.edu>.
- Catastini, Alessandro. *Isaia ed Ezechia. Studio di storia della tradizione di II Re 18–20 // Is. 36–39*. *Studi semitici* 6. Rome: Università degli studi "La Sapienza," 1989.
- Corbett, Edward P. J. *Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1965.
- Coste, Jean M. "Le texte grec d'Isaïe XXV, 1–5." *Revue biblique* 61 (1954): 36–66.
- das Neves, Joaquim C. M. *A Teologia da Tradução Grega dos Setenta no Livro de Isaías*. Lisbon: Universidade Católica Portuguesa, 1973.
- Croughs, Mirjam. "Intertextuality in the Septuagint: The Case of Isaiah 19." *Bulletin for the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 34 (2001): 81–94.
- Denniston, John D. *The Greek Particles*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1934.
- Dogniez, Cécile. "Le traducteur d'Isaïe connaissait-il le texte grec du Dodekapropheton?" *Adamantius* 13 (2007): 29–34.

- Dorival, Gilles, Marguerite Harl, and Olivier Munnich. *La Bible grecque des Septante. Du judaïsme hellénistique au christianisme ancien*. Initiations au christianisme ancien. Paris: Éditions du CERF / Éditions du C.N.R.S., 1994.
- Duhm, Bernhard. *Das Buch Jesaja*. 3rd enl. ed. Handkommentar zum Alten Testament 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1914.
- Eklblad, Eugene R. *Isaiah's Servant Poems according to the Septuagint. An Exegetical and Theological Study*. Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 23. Leuven: Peeters, 1999.
- Elliger Karl, and Hans-Jürgen Hermisson. *Deuterojesaja*. 2 vols. Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament 11. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1978–2003.
- Emerton, John A. "The Translation and Interpretation of Isaiah vi. 13." Pages 85–118 in *Interpreting the Hebrew Bible. Essays in Honour of E. I. J. Rosenthal*. Edited by J. A. Emerton and Stefan C. Reif. University of Cambridge Oriental Publications 32. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Fiedler, Peter. *Die Formel "Und siehe" im Neuen Testament*. Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testaments 20. München: Kösel, 1969.
- Fischer, Johann. *In welcher Schrift lag das Buch Isaia den LXX vor? Eine textkritische Studie*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 56. Giessen: Töpelmann, 1930.
- Flashar, Martin. "Exegetische Studien zum Septuagintapsalter." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 32 (1912): 81–116, 161–189, 241–268.
- Fohrer, Georg. *Das Buch Jesaja*. 3 vols. Zürcher Bibelkommentare Altes Testament. Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1960–1964.
- Fokkelman, Jan. *Dichtkunst in de bijbel. Een handleiding bij literair lezen*. Zoetermeer: Meinema, 2000.
- Frankel, Zacharias. *Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta. Historisch-kritische Studien zu der Septuaginta. Nebst Beiträgen zu den Targumim*. Leipzig: Vogel, 1841.
- Friberg, Timothy, Barbara Friberg, and Neva F. Miller, eds. *Analytical Lexicon of the Greek New Testament*. Bibloi 8.00. 2004. Print ed.: Timothy Friberg, Barbara Friberg, and Neva F. Miller, eds. *Analytical Lexicon of the Greek New Testament*. Baker's Greek New Testament Library 4. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker, 2000.
- Fritsch, Charles T. "The Concept of God in the Greek Translation of Isaiah." Pages 155–69 in *Biblical Studies in Memory of H. C. Alleman*. Edited by Jacob M. Myers, O. Reimherr, and H. N. Bream. Gettysburg Theological Studies. New York: Augustin, 1960.
- Gesenius, Wilhelm, Emil Kautzsch, and Arthur E. Cowley. *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar. As Edited and Enlarged by the Late E. Kautzsch*. 2nd English edition. Revised in accordance with the 28th German ed. (1909) by A. E. Cowley. Oxford: Clarendon/Oxford University Press, 1910.
- Goshen-Gottstein, Moshe H. "Theory and Praxis of Textual Criticism. The Text-critical Use of the Septuagint." *Textus* 3 (1963): 130–58.
- . ed. *The Book of Isaiah*. Hebrew University Bible. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1995.
- Gray, George B. "The Additions in the Ancient Greek Version of Job." *The Expositor* VIII, 19 (1920): 422–38.
- . *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Isaiah*. 2 vols. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: Clark, 1912.
- . *The Forms of Hebrew Poetry. Considered with Special Reference to the Criticism and Interpretation of the Old Testament*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1915.
- Grintz, Jehoshua M. "Hebrew as the Spoken and Written Language in the Last Days of the Second Temple." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 79 (1960): 32–47.
- Hanhart, Robert. "Die Septuaginta als Interpretation und Aktualisierung." Pages 331–46 in vol. 3 of *Isac Leo Seeligmann Volume. Essays on the Bible and the Ancient World*. Edited by Alexander Rofé and Yair Zakovitch. 3 vols. Jerusalem: E. Rubinstein's Publishing, 1983.

- Heater, Homer Jr. *A Septuagint Translation Technique in the Book of Job*. The Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 11. Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1982.
- Hilhorst, Antonius. *Sémitismes et latinismes dans le Pasteur d'Herma*s. Nijmegen: Dekker & Van de Vegt, 1976.
- Jenner, Konrad D., Wido Th. van Peursen, and Eep Talstra. "CALAP. An Interdisciplinary Debate between Textual Criticism, Textual History and Computer-Assisted Linguistic Analysis." Pages 13–44 in *Corpus Linguistics and Textual History. A Computer-Assisted Interdisciplinary Approach to the Peshitta*. Edited by P. S. F. van Keulen and W. Th. van Peursen. Studia semitica neerlandica 48. Assen: Van Gorcum, 2006.
- Johannessohn, Martin. "Das biblische  $\chi\alpha\iota$   $\iota\delta\acute{o}\upsilon$  in der Erzählung samt seiner hebräischen Vorlage." *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete der Indogermanischen Sprachen* 66 (1939): 145–95; 67 (1942): 30–84.
- . "Der Wahrnehmungssatz bei den Verben des Sehens in der hebräischen und griechischen Bibel." *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete der Indogermanischen Sprachen* 64 (1937): 145–260.
- Joosten, Jan. "The Knowledge and Use of Hebrew in the Hellenistic Period. Qumran and the Septuagint." Pages 115–30 in *Diggers at the Well. Proceedings of a Third International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira*. Edited by Takamitsu Muraoka and John F. Elwolde. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 36. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Jouön, Paul. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. Translated and revised by T. Muraoka. 2 vols. Subsidia biblica 14/1–2. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1991.
- Kadushin, Max. *The Rabbinic Mind*. New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1952.
- Kaiser, Otto. "Die Verkündigung des Propheten Jesaja im Jahre 701." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 81 (1969): 304–15.
- Katz, Peter. "The Recovery of the Original Septuagint. A Study in the History of Transmission and Textual Criticism." Pages 165–82 in *Actes du premier congrès de la Fédération internationale des associations d'études classiques 1950*. Fédération internationale des associations d'études classiques. Paris: Klincksieck, 1951.
- Kennedy, George A. *Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times*. Rev. and enl. ed. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999.
- Kieckers, Ernst. "Zur oratio recta in den indogermanischen Sprachen I." *Indogermanische Forschungen* 35 (1915): 1–93.
- Kissane, Edward J. *The Book of Isaiah. Translated from a Critically Revised Hebrew Text with Commentary*. 2 vols. Dublin: Browne and Nolan, 1941–1943.
- Klaudy, Kinga. "Explicitation." Pages 80–84 in *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. Edited by Mona Baker. New York: Routledge, 1998.
- Koenig, Jean. *L'herméneutique analogique du Judaïsme antique d'après les témoins textuels d'Isaïe*. Vetus Testamentum: Supplements 33. Leiden: Brill, 1982.
- Kooij, Arie van der. *Die alten Textzeugen des Jesajabuches. Ein Beitrag zur Textgeschichte des Alten Testaments*. Orbis biblicus et orientalis 35. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981.
- . "The Interpretation of Metaphorical Language. A Characteristic of LXX-Isaiah." Pages 179–85 in *Jerusalem, Alexandria, Rome. Studies in Ancient Cultural Interaction in Honour of A. Hilhorst*. Edited by Florentino García Martínez and Gerard P. Luttikhuisen. Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods: Supplements 82. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

- . "Isaiah in the Septuagint." Pages 513–29 in vol. 2 of *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah. Studies of an Interpretive Tradition*. Edited by Craig C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans. 2 vols. *Vetus Testamentum: Supplements* 70. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- . "The Old Greek of Isaiah 19:16–25. Translation and Interpretation." Pages 127–66 in *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies. Jerusalem 1986*. Edited by Claude E. Cox. *Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 23. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.
- . "The Old Greek of Isaiah in Relation to the Qumran Texts of Isaiah. Some General Comments." Pages 195–213 in *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings. Papers Presented to the International Symposium on the Septuagint and Its Relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings (Manchester, 1990)*. Edited by George J. Brooke and Barnabas Lindars. *Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 33. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.
- . "On the Place of Origin of the Old Greek of Psalms." *Vetus Testamentum* 33 (1983): 67–74.
- . *The Oracle of Tyre. The Septuagint of Isaiah XXIII as Version and Vision*. *Vetus Testamentum: Supplements* 71. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- . "Perspectives on the Study of the Septuagint. Who Are the Translators?" Pages 214–29 in *Perspectives in the Study of the Old Testament and Early Judaism. A Symposium in Honour of Adam S. van der Woude on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday*. Edited by Florentino García Martínez and Ed Noort. *Vetus Testamentum: Supplements* 73. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- . "The Septuagint of Isaiah and the Hebrew Text of Isaiah 2:22 and 36:7." Pages 377–401 in *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, and the Septuagint Presented to Eugene Ulrich*. Edited by Peter W. Flint, Emanuel Tov, and James C. VanderKam. *Vetus Testamentum: Supplements* 101. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- . "The Septuagint of Psalms and the First Book of Maccabees." Pages 229–47 in *The Old Greek Psalter. Studies in Honour of Albert Pietersma*. Edited by Robert J. V. Hiebert, Claude E. Cox, and Peter J. Gentry. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series* 332. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- . "Die Septuaginta Jesajas als Dokument jüdischer Exegese. Einige Notizen zu LXX–Jes. 7." Pages 91–102 in *Übersetzung und Deutung. Studien zu dem Alten Testament und seiner Umwelt Alexander Reinard Hulst gewidmet von Freunden und Kollegen*. Edited by H. A. Brongers et al. Nijkerk: Callenbach, 1977.
- . "'The Servant of the Lord.' A Particular Group of Jews in Egypt According to the Old Greek of Isaiah. Some Comments on LXX Isa 49,1–6 and Related Passages." Pages 383–96 in *Studies in the Book of Isaiah. Festschrift William A.M. Beuken*. Edited by J. van Ruiten and M. Vervenne. *Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium* 132. Leuven: Peeters, 1997.
- . "Servant or Slave? The Various Equivalents of Hebrew 'Ebed in the Septuagint of the Pentateuch." Pages 225–38 in *XIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies. Ljubljana 2007*. Edited by Melvin K. H. Peters. *Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 55. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008.
- . "The Text of Isaiah and Its Early Witnesses in Hebrew." Pages 143–52 in *Sôfer Mahîr. Essays in Honour of Adrian Schenker. Offered by Editors of Biblia Hebraica Quinta*. Edited by Yohanan A. P. Goldman, Arie van der Kooij, and Richard D. Weis. *Vetus Testamentum: Supplements* 110. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- . "Wie heißt der Messias? Zu Jes 9,5 in den alten griechischen Versionen." 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.

- . “Zur Theologie des Jesajabuches in der Septuaginta.” Pages 9–25 in *Theologische Probleme der Septuaginta und der hellenistischen Hermeneutik*. Edited by Henning Graf Reventlow. Veröffentlichungen der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft für Theologie 11. Gütersloh: Kaiser, Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1997.
- Koole, Jan L. *Jesaja 2*. 2 vols. Commentaar op het Oude Testament. Kampen: Kok, 1985–1990. Koole, Jan L. *Jesaja 3*. Commentaar op het Oude Testament. Kampen: Kok, 1995.
- Kraft, Robert A., and Emanuel Tov. “Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint Studies.” *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 14 (1981): 22–40.
- Kutscher, Ezekiel Y. *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa<sup>a</sup>)*. Rev. and enl. ed. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 6. Leiden: Brill, 1974.
- Lausberg, Heinrich. *Elemente der literarischen Rhetorik. Eine Einführung für Studierende der klassischen, romanischen, englischen und deutschen Philologie*. 3rd ed. München: Hueber, 1967.
- . *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric. A Foundation for Literary Study*. Edited by David E. Orton and R. Dean Anderson. Translated by Matthew T. Bliss, Annemiek Jansen, and David E. Orton. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- . *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik. Eine Grundlegung der Literaturwissenschaft*. 2 vols. München: Hueber, 1960.
- Le Déaut, Roger. “La Septante. Un Targum?” Pages 147–95 in *Études sur le judaïsme hellénistique. Congrès de Strasbourg (1983)*. Edited by Raymond Kuntzmann et al. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1984. *Lectio divina* 119.
- Le Moigne, Philippe. “Le Livre d’Ésaïe dans la Septante. Ecdotique, stylistique, linguistique ou esquisse d’une poétique de la Septante.” PhD diss., l’École Pratique des Hautes Études, Paris, 2001.
- Lettinga, Jan Pieter. *Grammatica van het Bijbels Hebreeuws*. Revised by T. Muraoka with the assistance of W. Th. van Peursen. 10th ed. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Liddell, Henry George, and Robert Scott, eds. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Revised and augmented throughout by Sir Henry Stuart Jones with the assistance of Roderick McKenzie. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.
- Louw, Theo van der. “Transformations in the Septuagint. Towards an Interaction of Septuagint Studies and Translation Studies.” PhD diss., Universiteit van Leiden, 2006.
- Lust, Johan. “Exegesis and Theology in the Septuagint of Ezekiel. The Longer ‘Pluses’ and Ezek 43:1–9.” Pages 201–32 in *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies. Jerusalem 1986*. Edited by Claude E. Cox. *Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 23. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.
- . “A Septuagint Christ Preceding Jesus Christ? Messianism in the Septuagint Exemplified in Isa 7, 10–17.” Pages 211–26 in *Messianism and the Septuagint. Collected Essays by J. Lust*. Edited by Katrin Hauspie. *Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium* 178. Leuven: Peeters, 2004.
- Marti, Karl. *Das Buch Jesaja*. Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament 10. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1900.
- Martin, Josef. *Antike Rhetorik. Technik und Methode*. Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft 3. München: Beck, 1974.
- Meer, Michael van der. “Trendy Translations in the Septuagint of Isaiah. A Study of the Vocabulary of the Greek Isaiah 3, 18–23 in the Light of Contemporary Sources.” Pages 581–96 in *Die Septuaginta. Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D). Wuppertal 20.–23. Juli 2006*. Edited by Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus. *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament* 219. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 2008.

- Mongsengwo-Pasinya, Laurent. "Isaïe xix 16–25 et universalisme dans la LXX." Pages 192–207 in *Congress Volume Salamanca 1983*. Edited by J. A. Emerton. Vetus Testamentum: Supplements 36. Leiden: Brill, 1985.
- Moulton, James H. *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*. 7 vols. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1906–1976.
- Mozley, Francis W. *The Psalter of the Church*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1905.
- Muraoka, Takamitsu. "Literary Device in the Septuagint." *Textus* 8 (1973): 20–30.
- Olofsson, Staffan. *God Is My Rock. A Study of Translation Technique and Theological Exegesis in the Septuagint*. Coniectanea Biblica, Old Testament Series 31. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1990.
- . *The LXX Version. A Guide to the Translation Technique of the Septuagint*. Coniectanea Biblica, Old Testament Series 30. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1990.
- Orlinsky, Harry M. "The Kings-Isaiah Recensions of the Hezekiah Story." *Jewish Quarterly Review* 30 (1939): 33–49.
- . "The Treatment of Anthropomorphisms and Anthropopathisms in the Septuagint of Isaiah." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 27 (1956): 193–200.
- Ottley, Richard R. *A Handbook to the Septuagint*. London: Methuen, 1920.
- . *The Book of Isaiah according to the Septuagint (Codex Alexandrinus)*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1904–1906.
- Parry, Donald W., and Elisha Qimron, eds. *The Great Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa). A New Edition*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 32. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Pérez Fernández, Miguel. *An Introductory Grammar of Rabbinic Hebrew*. Translated by John Elwolde. Leiden: Brill 1997.
- Person, Raymond F. Jr. *The Kings-Isaiah and Kings-Jeremiah Recensions*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 252. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1997.
- Peursen, Wido Th. van. *Language and Interpretation in the Syriac Text of Ben Sira. A Comparative Linguistic and Literary Study*. Monographs of the Peshitta Institute Leiden 16. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Pietersma, Albert, ed. *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Pisano, Stephen. *Additions or Omissions in the Books of Samuel. The Significant Pluses and Minuses in the Massoretic, LXX and Qumran Texts*. Orbis biblicus et orientalis 57. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984.
- Polak, Frank, and Galen Marquis. *A Classified Index of the Minuses of the Septuagint*. 2 vols. Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint Studies, Basic Tools 4. Stellenbosch: CATSS, 2002.
- Prijs, Leo. *Jüdische Tradition in der Septuaginta*. Leiden, Brill: 1948.
- Rabin, Chaim. "The Translation Process and the Character of the Septuagint." *Textus* 6 (1968): 1–26.
- Robinson, Theodore H. *The Poetry of the Old Testament*. 2nd ed. New York: AMS Press, 1977.
- Rösel, Martin. "Die Jungfrauengeburt des endzeitlichen Immanuel. Isaiah 7 in der Übersetzung der Septuaginta." *Jahrbuch für Biblische Theologie* 6 (1991): 135–51.
- Rowe, Galen O. "Chapter 5, Style." Pages 121–57 in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C.–A.D. 400*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Schaper, Joachim. *Eschatology in the Greek Psalter*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 76. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1995.
- . "Der Septuaginta-Psalter als Dokument jüdischer Eschatologie." Pages 38–61 in *Die Septuaginta zwischen Judentum und Christentum*. Edited by Martin Hengel and Anna Maria Schwemer. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 72. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1994.



- Schleusner, Johann F. *Novus thesaurus philologico-criticus sive lexicon in LXX et reliquos interpretes graecos ac scriptores apocryphos Veteris Testamenti*. 5 vols. Leipzig: Weidmann, 1820–1821.
- Scholz, Anton. *Die Alexandrinische Uebersetzung des Buches Jesaias. Rede zur Feier des 298. Stiftungstages der Kgl. Julius-Maximilians-Universität*. Würzburg: Woerl, 1880.
- Seeligmann, Isaac L. *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah. A Discussion of Its Problems*. Mededeelingen en verhandelingen van het Vooraziatisch-Egyptisch Gezelschap “Ex Oriente Lux” 9. Leiden: Brill, 1948.
- . *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah and Cognate Studies*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 40. Edited by Robert Hanhart and Hermann Spieckermann. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 2004.
- Segal, Moses H. *A Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1927.
- Sikkel, Constantijn J. “Lexeme Status of Pronominal Suffixes.” Pages 59–67 in vol. 3 of *Foundations for Syriac Lexicography. Colloquia of the International Syriac Language Project*. Edited by Janet Dyk and Wido van Peursen. 3 vols. Perspectives on Syriac Linguistics 4. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2008.
- Soisalon-Soininen, Ilmari. “Die Auslassung des Possessivpronomens im griechischen Pentateuch.” *Studia orientalia* 55 (1984): 277–94.
- . “The Rendering of the Hebrew Relative Clause in the Greek Pentateuch.” Pages 401–6 in vol. 1 of *Proceedings of the Sixth World Congress of Jewish Studies*. Edited by Avigdor Shinan. 4 vols. Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1975–1980.
- . “Zurück zur Hebraismenfrage.” Pages 35–51 in *Studien zur Septuaginta. Robert Hanhart zu Ehren. Aus Anlaß seines 65. Geburtstages*. Edited by Detlef Fraenkel, Udo Quast, and John W. Wevers. Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen 190. Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens 20. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990.
- Sollamo, Raija. “The Koinē Background for the Repetition and Non-Repetition of the Possessive Pronoun in Co-Ordinate Items.” Pages 52–63 in *Studien zur Septuaginta. Robert Hanhart zu Ehren. Aus Anlaß seines 65. Geburtstages*. Edited by Detlef Fraenkel, Udo Quast, and John W. Wevers. Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen 190. Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens 20. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990.
- . “The LXX Renderings of the Infinitive Absolute Used with a Paronymous Finite Verb in the Pentateuch.” Pages 101–13 in *La Septuaginta en la investigación contemporánea (V Congreso de la IOSCS)*. Edited by Natalio Fernández Marcos. Textos y estudios “Cardenal Cisneros” 34. Madrid: Instituto “Arias Montano,” 1985.
- . “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. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 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 Greenspoon and Olivier Munnich. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 41. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.
- . *Renderings of Hebrew Semiprepositions in the Septuagint*. Annales academiae scientiarum fennicae 19. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedakatemia, 1979.
- . “Some ‘Improper’ Prepositions, Such as ἐνώπιον, ἐναντίον, ἐναντι, etc., in the Septuagint and Early Koinē Greek.” *Vetus Testamentum* 25 (1975): 773–81.



- Swete, Henry B. *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*. Revised by Richard R. Ottley. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1914.
- Talmon, Shemaryahu. "Aspects of the Textual Transmission of the Bible in the Light of Qumran Manuscripts." *Textus* 4 (1960): 95–132.
- . "Double Readings in the Massoretic Text." *Textus* 1 (1960): 144–84.
- Talshir, Ziporah. "Double Translations in the Septuagint." Pages 21–63 in *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*. Jerusalem 1986. Edited by Claude E. Cox. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 23. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.
- Thackeray, Henry St. J. "The Bisection of Books in Primitive Septuagint Mss." *Journal of Theological Studies* 9 (1908): 88–98.
- . *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint* 1. *Introduction, Orthography and Accidence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909.
- . "The Greek Translators of Ezekiel." *Journal of Theological Studies* 4 (1903): 398–411.
- . "The Greek Translators of the Prophetical Books." *Journal of Theological Studies* 4 (1903): 578–85.
- . "Primitive Lectionary Notes in the Psalm of Habakkuk." *Journal of Theological Studies* 12 (1911): 191–213.
- . "Renderings of the Infinitive Absolute in the Septuagint." *Journal of Theological Studies* 9 (1908): 597–601.
- . Review of R. R. Ottley, *The Book of Isaiah according to the Septuagint*. *Journal of Theological Studies* 10 (1909): 299–304.
- . *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship. A Study in Origins*. The Schweich Lectures 1920. London: Oxford University Press, 1923.
- Torczyner, Harry. "Al tikrei." Page 776 in vol. 2 of *Encyclopaedia Judaica*. Edited by Cecil Roth, et al. 16 vols. Jerusalem: Keter Publishing House, 1971–1972.
- Tov, Emanuel. "Computer Assisted Alignment of the Greek-Hebrew Equivalents of the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint." Pages 221–42 in *La Septuaginta en la investigación contemporánea (V Congreso de la IOSCS)*. Edited by Natalio Fernández Marcos. Textos y estudios "Cardenal Cisneros" 34. Madrid: Instituto "Arias Montano," 1985.
- . *A Computerized Data Base for Septuagint Studies. The Parallel Aligned Text of the Greek and Hebrew Bible*. Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint Studies 2. Stellenbosch: CATSS, 1986.
- . "The Impact of the LXX Translation of the Pentateuch on the Translation of the Other Books." Pages 577–92 in *Mélanges Dominique Barthélemy. Études bibliques offertes à l'occasion de son 60<sup>e</sup> anniversaire*. Edited by Pierre Casetti, Othmar Keel, and Adrian Schenker. *Orbis biblicus et orientalis* 38. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981.
- . "The Nature and Background of Harmonizations in Biblical Manuscripts." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 31 (1985): 3–29.
- . "Renderings of Combinations of the Infinitive Absolute and Finite Verbs in the LXX. Their Nature and Distribution." Pages 64–73 in *Studien zur Septuaginta. Robert Hanhart zu Ehren. Aus Anlaß seines 65. Geburtstages*. Edited by Detlef Fraenkel, Udo Quast, and John W. Wevers. *Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen* 190. *Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Untermehmens* 20. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990.
- . *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*. Rev. and enl. ed. Jerusalem Biblical Studies 8. Jerusalem: Simor, 1997.
- . *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. Rev. and enl. ed. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.
- . "The Use of a Computerized Data Base for Septuagint Research. The Greek-Hebrew Parallel Alignment." *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 17 (1984): 36–47.

- Trebolle Barrera, Julio C. "La expedición de Senaquerib contra Jerusalém. Reflexiones en torno a un libro reciente." *Estudios Bíblicos* 45 (1987): 7–22.
- Troxel, Ronald L. "Isaiah 7,14–16 through the Eyes of the Septuagint." *Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses* 79 (2003): 1–22.
- . *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation. The Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah*. Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods: Supplements 124. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Ulrich, Eugene. "The Developmental Composition of the Book of Isaiah. Light from 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> on Additions in the MT." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 8 (2001): 288–305.
- . "Light from 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> on the Translation Technique of the Old Greek Translator of Isaiah." Pages 193–204 in *Scripture in Transition. Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Rajja Sollamo*. Edited by Anssi Voitila and Jutta Jokiranta. Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods: Supplements 126. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- , ed. *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls. Transcriptions and Textual Variants*. Vetus Testamentum: Supplements 134. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- ; et al. *Qumran Cave 4. Part 10 The Prophets*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 15. Oxford: Clarendon, 1997.
- Vinay Jean-P., and Jean Darbelnet. *Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais. Méthode de traduction*. Bibliothèque de stylistique comparée 1. Paris: Didier, 1958.
- Waard, Jan de. *A Handbook on Isaiah*. Textual Criticism and the Translator 1. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1997.
- . "Old Greek Translation Techniques and the Modern Translator." *The Bible Translator* 41/3 (1990): 311–19.
- . "Translation Techniques Used by the Greek Translators of Ruth." *Biblica* 54 (1973): 499–515.
- Watson, Wilfred G. E. *Traditional Techniques in Classical Hebrew Verse*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 170. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.
- Watts, John D. W. *Isaiah 1–33*. Word Biblical Commentary 24. Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1985.
- Westermann, Claus. *Isaiah 40–66. A Commentary*. Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1969.
- Wevers, John W. "Septuaginta-Forschungen," *Theologische Rundschau*, Neue Folge 22 (1954): 85–138, 171–90.
- . "The Use of Versions for Text Criticism. The Septuagint." Pages 15–24 in *La Septuaginta en la investigación contemporánea (V Congreso de la IOSCS)*. Edited by Natalio Fernández Marcos. Textos y estudios "Cardenal Cisneros" 34. Madrid: Instituto "Arias Montano," 1985.
- Wildberger, Hans. *Jesaja*. 3 vols. Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament 10. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1972–1982.
- 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 Judaico-Hellenisticum Novi Testamenti*. Edited by Wolfgang Kraus and Karl-Wilhelm Niebuhr. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 162. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 2003.
- Williams, Tyler F. "Towards a Date for the Old Greek Psalter." Pages 248–76 in *The Old Greek Psalter. Studies in Honour of Albert Pietersma*. Edited by Robert J. V. Hiebert, Claude E. Cox, and Peter J. Gentry. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 332. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.

- Wutz, Franz. *Die Transkriptionen von der Septuaginta bis zu Hieronymus*. Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten Testament, Neue Folge Heft 9. Texte und Untersuchungen zur vormasoretischen Grammatik des Hebräischen 2. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1933.
- Ziegler, Joseph. *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias*. Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen XII,3. Münster: Aschendorffschen Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1934.
- . "Die Vorlage der Isaias-Septuaginta (LXX) und die erste Isaias-rolle von Qumran (1QIsa<sup>a</sup>)."  
*Journal of Biblical Literature* 78 (1959): 34–59.
- , ed. *Isaias*. 2nd ed. Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graece Auctoritate Academiae Litterarum Gottingensis editum 14. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967.
- Zillessen, Alfred. "Bemerkungen zur alexandrinischen Übersetzung des Jesaja (c. 40–66)."  
*Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 22 (1902): 238–263.



# Scripture Index

## 1. HEBREW BIBLE/OLD TESTAMENT

The LXX numbering, when different from the MT, is mentioned between brackets.

### Genesis

1–3	388
1:9	378n218
1:20	362n183
1:28	362n183, 394
1:30	361–62, 394
10:2–6	366
10:10	362
11	388
11:1–9	363
11:2	362
11:2–4	362
11:3–4	363
11:5	362
13:16	366, 452
17:3	144n10
17:5	144n10
18:25	407
19:8	25n84
2:1	147, 361
2:8	362
2:9	144n10, 362
3:5	360, 388
3:22	360, 362
3:24	362
8:21	157n54
9:2	362n183, 394

20:8	382n227
22:2	365
22:14	445n372
24:21	452
24:40	452
24:42	452
24:48	452
24:56	452
26:22	440n359
28:14	366, 452
31:11	354
32:5	447n377
34:19	447n377
37:5	248n58
37:25	149, 149n28, 365
37:31	426n331
43:11	149, 149n28, 365
46:2	354
49:3–28	432n338
49:13	432n338
50:9	24n83
50:17	55n113

### Exodus

3:4	354
3:5	105
4:27	445n372
4:30	382n227
7:19	377
7:24	377
8:1	377
8:6	38n37, 171n93, 348n118
8:12	452

## (Exodus, continued)

8:13	452
8:20	24n83
9:14	375
10:14	24n83
12:38	24n83
12:48–49	386
13:21–22	374
14:21	500
14:24	374
15:1	115
15:2	488
15:3	385, 440–41
15:11	496
16:10	373
17:1–7	385
17:6	385, 385n236
18:5	445n372
18:12	379
19:3	445n372
23:2	376n211
23:10	54n105, 381
24:13	445n372
24:15–18	373
28:12	380
28:29	380
29:30	496
30:16	380
30:29	496
31:6	342n87
32	382
32:20	383
32:32	55n113
33:9–10	373
33:16	417n306
35:29	342n87
36:1	342n87
36:5	342n87
40:34–38	373

**Leviticus**

4:20	55n113
5:6	55n113
11:36	378
18:6	153

18:21	452
19:12	450, 452
19:22	55n113
19:33	386
20:3	452
21:6	452
22:2	452
22:32	452
25:18	417n308
25:19	417n308
25:20	54n105, 381
26:5	417n308
26:17	417n308
26:20	345, 382n227, 383

**Numbers**

2:34	342n87
3:41	387–88
8:14–16	387, 498
9:14	386
9:16–18	374
10:33	445n372
10:34(36)	374
11:33	38n35
13:30	115
14:19	55n113
14:23	361, 374
16:28	436n349
19:2	342n87
20:20	24n83
24:13	436n349
31:28	378
31:54	379
32:11	361, 375

**Deuteronomy**

1:39	361, 388
2:7	379
3:3	373
4:22	54n105, 381
5:15	384
5:20	379
6:12	384
6:19	376

6:21	384	32:19	369
7:8	435	32:20	452
9:7	373	32:23	368–69
10:9	68n13	32:27	451
10:20	450	32:35	147, 200n51, 420, 442, 444
11:24	19	32:38	370
12:10	417n308	32:39	369
12:18	379	33:5	370n197
18:2	68n13	33:12	417n308
21:18	150, 353n157, 387	33:19	432n338
21:20	150, 353n157, 387	33:26	370n197
23:22	447n377	33:28	417n308
24:17	376		
24:18	384	<b>Joshua</b>	
24:22	384	1:3	19
26:15	451	9:1	432n338
27:7	379	9:24	342n87
27:19	376	17:13	115
28:29	452		
28:35	19	<b>Judges</b>	
28:50	200n50	5:14–18	432n338
28:56	19	5:17	432n338
28:58	382	5:28	447n377
28:65	19	6:34	176
28:68	376	9:15	25n84
29:28–29	382	16:17	348, 436n349
29:28–30:1	382	16:18	348, 436n349
30:1	382, 382n227	18:1	417n308
31:17	452	18:7	417n308
31:18	452		
31:24	382	<b>Ruth</b>	
31:27	354n163	3:9	447n379
32	388		
32:1–43	367–372	<b>1 Samuel (1 Kingdoms)</b>	
32:6	369	4:10	38n35
32:7	428n334	4:17	38n35
32:13	38n38, 372	6:19	38n35
32:14	189n10, 190n14, 368, 369	8:3	376n211
32:15	367, 370	12:11	417n308
32:16	367, 369	19:7	382n227
32:16–17	55n116	20:42	450
32:16–19	371	25:9	382n227
32:17	371, 371n199		
32:18	367, 371–72		

**2 Samuel (2 Kingdoms)**

3:31	411n294, 451
8:2	381n224
14:25	19
16:23	450
17:7	450
20:12	427n333
22:8	37n24
22:43	452
23:20	381

**1 Kings (3 Kingdoms)**

1:12	450
1:40	451
5:5	417n308
12:8	450
12:13	450
12:33	348, 436n349
17:1	401n275
20:27	451
21:32	451

**2 Kings (4 Kingdoms)**

8:13	73n30
8:15	447n379
8:27	50n79
9:20	401n275
16:10–16	480
18:17–20:19	305
18:27	307–8
18:29–31	310
18:31	309
18:37	422n320
19:4	312–13
19:9	489, 489n34
19:16	312–13
19:20	317
20:6	318n36
20:12	317
20:13	315–16, 318, 318n36
20:15	315–16
20:19	199n42
20:20	54n104

25:19 422n321

**1 Chronicles**

29:2	151n35
29:9	451
29:22	443

**2 Chronicles**

1:9	452
10:8	450
21:14	38n35
32:27	434n345
33:15	445n372
36:10	434n345

**Nehemiah (2 Esdras)**

6:8 (16:8)	436n349
12:43	451

**Esther**

3:8	419n315
5:3	151n35

**Job**

3:5	391
10:22	159
14:13	428n334
14:19	452
21:30	147
28:3	391
31:24	151n35
38:31	147, 361n180
39:10	37n21
39:30(33)	427n333
42:7	382n227
42:10	55n113

**Psalms**

8:9	362, 394
9:18	404
9:19	405



12:15	25n84	62:3	392
13:2	452	62:7	392
13:7	444	63	396n264
14:7	402	63:3	96n264
16:9	417n308	63:8	25n84
17:8	25n84	67:16	445n372
22:15	406	68:3	405, 446
22:25	452	69:18	452
23:3	445n372	70:6	447n377
23:5	443	71:3	259n85
23:7	391n249	76:4	385n235
24:7	393	77:49	399
24:9	393	78	396n264, 399
24:18	55n113	78:1	390n246, 391n249
27:3	390n249	78:2	362
27:9	452	78:2–3	389n242
27:12	395	78:8	150, 353n157, 387n239
30:13	436n349	78:49	399
31:5	55n113	79:2	394
36:8	25n84	79:5	401n275
37	396n264	79:8	401n275
37:6	396, 397	79:15	401n275
37:9–10	397	79:20	401n275
37:20	397	82:8	407
37:35–36	398	83:9	401n275
37:38	397	84:9	390n249
38:23	401	85:4	398n268
40:18	447n377	85:6	398
41:3	395	87:11	391n249
42:5	291	88:7	391
42:11	291	88:9	401n275
43:5	291	88:15	452
45:3	403	89:11	419n315
50:10	406	90:10	395
50:11	362, 394	91:1	25n84
50:12	406	92:8	402
50:23	400	94:2	407
51:11	452	94:11	354n163
52:7	444	96:13	407
53:6	419n315	97:5	405, 446
53:7	402	98:3	400
58:6	401n275	98:9	407
58:9	406	102:3	452
59:5	391n249	103:9	398
61:8	392	103:12	362

## (Psalms, continued)

104:7	68n13
104:11–12	394
104:21	68n13
104:35	500
105:37	371n200
106:24	434n345
107:10	391
107:14	391
110:4	428n334
112:9	419n315
118:8	399
118:14	488
118:19	393
119	404
119:50	404
119:67	404n284
119:71	404n284
119:75	404n284
119:92	404
119:105–6	396
119:121	395
119:141	404n284
119:153	404n284
119:176	336n71, 393–94, 420
136:23	404
140:10	448
141:7	419n315
143:5	428n334
143:7	452
146:3	399–400
147:8	402n277
151:3	68n13

**Proverbs**

1:27	335n70
1:33	417n308
3:15	151n35
3:29	417n308
8:11	151n35
11:24	419n315
14:33	417n306
17:23	376n211
18:5	376n211
23:20	378

27:17	167n81
30:22	450
31:10	151n35

**Qohelet**

5:3	447n377
5:19	428n334
7:26	448n381
9:12	448
11:10	436n349
11:8	428n334

**Isaiah**

1	367
1:1	104, 105, 105n18, 136nn106–7; 167, 179, 240, 416n302, 480
1:2	346, 347, 367
1:3	17, 49, 88, 89, 113
1:4	19, 104n18, 136n111, 153, 191, 367, 479
1:6	19, 69
1:7	59, 78n55, 105n18
1:8	390n246, 391n249
1:9	372–73, 388
1:10	112n34, 113, 333–34, 355, 356n166
1:11	189n10, 190, 367–68, 388
1:11–13	86
1:12	84–86, 126
1:12–14	86
1:13	33, 36
1:13–14	270–71
1:14	54
1:15	49, 52, 54, 80, 84, 85, 96, 109, 271
1:16	18, 33
1:18	88, 135n101
1:19	52
1:20	49, 52, 52n96, 334, 341, 347, 355, 356n166, 466n46
1:21	93n34, 102, 107, 321

1:22	48, 156, 177	3:2	146
1:22–23	266, 271	3:3	200, 200n50
1:23	20, 72, 74, 149, 265, 290, 290n148	3:6	58, 59, 127, 321, 332
1:24	67, 84, 85	3:7	34, 36, 39, 84, 130, 321, 332, 450
1:25	88, 89, 283, 334, 356n166, 466n46	3:8	93, 94, 373, 388, 440n359, 439–40, 440n359, 444, 457n7
1:26	321	3:9	59, 450
1:27	84, 85n9, 105n18	3:10	23–24, 26n85, 157, 177
1:28	158n56	3:10–11	381
1:29	33, 36, 47, 187n2, 367	3:12	53, 54, 151, 272
1:30	106	3:13	19, 36, 93
1:31	16, 18, 34, 37, 61, 259, 260, 271, 383, 486, 508	3:13–14	239
2:1	136nn106–7; 179, 416– 17, 424, 480	3:14	34, 47, 68n13, 113, 178, 226, 290, 290n147, 335, 356n166, 511
2:2	41n45, 87, 88, 146, 200, 321, 445	3:15	194, 503
2:2–3	240	3:15–16	191, 197n35, 503n62
2:3	321, 445, 445n372	3:16	37, 43, 118, 259–60
2:4	271	3:17	68n15
2:5	93, 482	3:18	450
2:6	21n72, 47, 104n18, 438n355	3:18–23	261
2:6–8	225–26	3:18–24	255–56
2:7	47n62	3:20	154
2:7–8	113	3:23	38, 157
2:8	344	3:24	57, 157, 177, 200, 215n84, 451, 499, 508
2:10	93, 122, 292, 372n201, 482	3:24–25	364–65
2:11	84, 85, 88, 89, 156, 450	3:25	181, 234
2:12	145, 251, 281, 290–91, 501, 509	4:1	130n79, 479
2:13	145	4:2	48n66, 68n15, 88, 450, 457n7
2:14	146, 472	4:3	48n66
2:16	154	4:4	128, 195, 207
2:17	41, 42, 71, 156, 450	4:5	41, 42, 91, 373–74, 281, 388
2:19	122, 145, 251, 292, 335, 372n201	4:5–6	251–52
2:20	84, 104n18, 450	4:6	207, 272
2:21	38, 122, 146, 260n90, 292, 372, 388	4:17	339
2:22	482	5:1	34n8, 114, 135, 137, 178, 335, 370
3:1	67, 72, 74, 94, 96	5:1–7	335
3:1–3	254–55, 261	5:2	96, 128, 154, 292
		5:3	34n8, 93n34, 135n101

(Isaiah, continued)	7:2	121, 130n79, 215n83
5:4 34n8	7:3	71, 135n101, 136n105, 200, 480
5:5 34n8, 75, 93n34, 135n101	7:4	37n23, 84, 85, 136n106, 153, 486–87, 510
5:5–6 261–62	7:5	47n63, 59, 130n79, 450
5:6 34n8, 49, 54, 61	7:6	128, 136n106, 204
5:7 56, 133, 292	7:7	40, 47, 66, 95n48
5:8 127	7:8	41, 475
5:9 49, 57, 84, 85, 85n9	7:9	136n106
5:11 84, 85	7:10	130n79
5:12 84, 85, 443, 466n46	7:13	96, 113
5:13 1, 24, 26n85, 54, 56, 208, 214	7:14	47n60, 68n13, 360
5:15 156, 440	7:16	96, 112, 122, 144, 144n10, 173, 360–61, 388
5:17 78n55		
5:18 37	7:17	68n15, 89, 105
5:19 188	7:18	56, 58, 450
5:21 120n51, 123	7:19	335
5:22 34, 443	7:20	38, 56, 96, 102, 259–60, 450
5:24 272, 340n78	7:21	450
5:25 40, 109, 111, 128, 466n46	7:22	48n66, 95, 127, 201, 475
5:26 131, 133, 161	7:23	106, 450, 461, 499–500, 508
5:27 34, 149, 499, 508	7:25	84, 85
5:28 37, 38, 56, 72, 74, 106, 260, 272, 291, 335, 356n166, 372, 388	8–9	439
5:29 37, 91, 234	8:1	84, 85, 200, 260, 441– 42, 444
5:30 38, 131, 133, 201, 260, 292, 450, 475	8:2	60, 68, 136n106, 479–80
6:1 105	8:4	113, 120
6:2 54, 109, 215n83	8:5	130
6:3 43, 215n83, 294	8:6	39, 136n106
6:4 71, 391n249	8:7	72, 74
6:5 57, 128, 467	8:8	19
6:6 58, 102, 109	8:9	72, 84, 85, 148n24, 294– 95
6:8 39, 240–41		
6:9 39, 118	8:10	39, 47n64, 48, 49, 450
6:10 39, 84, 85, 109, 120n51	8:11	39, 77, 95, 95n48, 130n79, 511–12
6:11 434	8:12	39, 56, 84, 85
6:12 48n66, 68n15, 127, 336– 38	8:13	47n60, 56, 68, 75
6:13 56, 473, 481n13, 482	8:14	49, 88, 89, 375, 468–69
7:1 136, 136n106	8:15	21n72
	8:15–16	417–18

8:16	60, 78n53, 94	10:6	205, 210
8:17	35n17, 58, 59, 452	10:7	96, 262n101, 263, 348
8:17–18	235	10:8	96
8:18	56, 166, 207, 248–49	10:9	58, 59, 364, 388
8:19	96	10:10	42, 166, 235, 466
8:20	84, 85, 107, 493n35	10:11	18, 84, 85
8:21	83n1, 113, 200	10:12	71
8:21–22	286, 290	10:13	65, 466
8:22	133, 145–46, 251, 285, 291, 335, 355, 356n166, 441–42	10:14	43, 76, 109, 204, 209, 214, 262n101, 263
8:23 (9:1)	201n54, 256–57, 392, 431–33, 438	10:15	201
9:1(2)	201n54, 391–2, 425n330	10:15–18	241
9:2(3)	102, 120, 210, 356n166	10:16	66, 67n11, 90, 204
9:3(4)	47, 77, 84, 85, 105n18, 335	10:17	91, 450
9:4(5)	21n72, 188, 262–63, 426n331, 457n7	10:17–18	257, 285
9:5(6)	84, 85, 104, 172, 200n50, 201, 241, 251	10:18	146, 146n18, 291, 418n310, 419
9:6(7)	34, 50n81, 451	10:19	48n66
9:8(9)	130n79, 207, 363	10:20	48n66, 68n15, 71, 400, 450
9:8–9	363	10:21	48n66, 56, 68n15, 197, 296, 445–46, 473
9:9(10)	89, 90n21, 363, 388	10:22	84, 85, 96
9:11(12)	109, 111, 353n156, 466n46	10:22–23	158, 177
9:12(13)	68, 418, 424	10:23	43, 67, 68, 68n15, 127
9:13(14)	487, 508	10:24	66, 84, 85n8, 87, 95n48, 195n29, 376
9:15(16)	39, 151	10:25	96, 188
9:16(17)	109, 111, 353	10:26	68, 68n15, 195, 195n29
9:17(16)	286, 418–19, 424, 466n46	10:27	70, 121, 335, 450, 466
9:18(19)	37, 37nn25, 29; 42, 68, 147n19, 153, 194n25, 418n310, 450	10:28	41, 84, 85
9:19(20)	87	10:31	392n253
9:20(21)	58, 84, 85n9, 87, 109, 111, 353n156, 466n46	10:32	104n18, 109, 146
9:20–21	165, 181	10:33	67, 84, 85, 334
10:1	84, 85n8, 204	11:1	111
10:2	375–76, 388	11:4	170n92, 109, 466n46
10:3	49, 105n19, 344	11:5	109
10:4	109, 111, 353n156, 466n46	11:6	182, 252
		11:6–7	241
		11:7	43, 290, 290n148
		11:8	110, 341, 343, 355
		11:9	501, 509
		11:10	450
		11:11	113, 155, 188n3, 207, 450, 466n46

(Isaiah, continued)

11:12	161, 176	13:20	49, 54, 65n3
11:13	335	13:21	65
11:14	110, 136n111, 137, 241, 341	13:21–22	189n11, 345
11:15	49, 69, 204n61, 341, 466n46, 473, 487, 500, 508–10	13:22	34, 76, 182, 253, 286– 87, 291, 438n355, 446– 47, 488, 510
11:16	203	14:1	96
12:1	450	14:1–2	336–38
12:2	34, 49, 66, 392, 487–88, 508	14:2	207, 209, 336–38, 352, 480
12:4	450	14:3	68n15, 105n19, 206, 322, 450
12:4–5	242, 290, 290n147	14:4	322, 450
12:4–6	247n55	14:6	59, 161, 273
12:5	43	14:8	36n20, 242
12:6	105n18, 128, 392n253	14:8–21	44
13:1	136nn106–7; 167, 416n303, 480	14:9	509
13:2	111, 147, 161, 176, 263, 336, 356n166, 361, 388, 393, 409	14:10	88, 89
13:3	43, 47	14:11	88
13:4	194, 346	14:12	42, 42n47, 137, 322
13:5	37, 43, 322	14:13	59, 239
13:6	92, 166	14:13–14	266
13:8	59, 154	14:14	71
13:9	37n23, 42, 84, 85, 112, 158n58, 194, 263, 322, 466, 500, 508, 510	14:15	37n24, 93, 96
13:9–13	153, 223	14:16	59, 191
13:11	42, 322, 334, 341, 369	14:17	42, 112, 322
13:12	47n65, 48n66, 104n18, 181	14:18	72, 197, 215n84, 296, 500, 501, 508, 509
13:12–16	230–31	14:19	71, 144, 144n10, 158, 177, 426n331, 427, 427n333, 501, 510
13:13	37, 37nn23, 29; 105, 194, 322, 450, 466	14:19–20	426–27
13:14	47, 48n66, 72, 281, 290, 336, 356n166, 393–94, 419, 424	14:20	59, 104n18, 437
13:15	72, 84	14:21	35n13, 69, 70
13:16	124	14:22	80, 188, 197n35
13:17	78	14:23	61, 105n18, 158, 177
13:18	34	14:23–24	191, 194, 473
13:19	105n18, 194, 195	14:24	130, 481n13
		14:25	110, 335
		14:26	36, 37, 41n45, 43, 47n64, 48, 205, 242, 322, 450, 466n46
		14:27	78, 110, 466n46
		14:28	105, 160n65
		14:29	181, 239, 242, 287, 343,

	355	17:1–2	433
14:30	60, 71	17:2	438
14:31	36, 37, 37n27, 242, 249	17:3	84, 85, 136n110, 159, 177, 181, 226, 273
14:32	37n32, 65, 95n45, 113, 351	17:4	450
15	424	17:5	21n72, 105n18, 162, 345, 345n106
15–16	410–14, 424	17:6	65, 181, 213, 222, 458n11
15:1	95, 195, 294, 295	17:7	450
15:1–2	173, 177	17:8	34, 36, 178, 344, 400
15:2	84, 85, 411n293, 411n293, 472	17:9	34, 122, 136n110, 203, 214, 450
15:2–3	253, 338, 356n166, 410– 11, 411n293, 424	17:10	205, 211, 392n255, 468– 69
15:3	411n293, 451	17:11	21n72, 88, 91, 105
15:4	87, 322	17:12	92, 204
15:5	84, 85, 85n9, 95, 322, 411–12, 424	17:12–13	243
15:6	34, 84, 95, 195	17:13	36, 37, 120, 120n51, 153, 174, 259, 260, 273– 74, 290, 339–40, 339n75, 355, 356n166
15:7	79, 85n9, 322, 412, 412n295	17:14	71, 134
15:8	198, 201, 214, 296, 322	18:2	84, 85, 94, 123, 207
15:9	166, 322, 350, 381	18:3	42n51, 161, 176, 343
16	424	18:4	56, 95n48
16:1	91	18:5	38, 95, 120, 290
16:2	88, 89, 199n45, 200	18:6	287, 361–62, 394
16:2–3	159	18:7	56, 60, 105, 178, 488, 489, 508–10
16:3	21n72, 25–26, 26n85, 128	18:14	372n201
16:4	36, 122, 211	19:1	122, 127, 449n384
16:6	111, 188, 190	19:3	34, 36, 127
16:7	84, 85n9, 96, 413–14, 424	19:4	60, 66, 67n11, 125, 392n253
16:8	84, 85, 85n9, 95	19:5	48, 189n12
16:9	206	19:5–7	243
16:10	76, 77, 84, 85, 85n9, 191, 205, 345, 354n159, 412–13, 424, 458n11, 471–72	19:6	169, 169n87, 177, 376– 77, 388
16:11	91	19:6–7	287
16:12	58, 339, 448–49, 468	19:7	41, 42, 189n12, 197, 295, 377, 418n310
16:13	205	19:8	123, 447–48, 448nn381– 82; 449
16:14	76, 93n34, 131, 188, 188n4, 190	19:8–10	258–59
17:1	160n65, 188, 458, 458n11		

(Isaiah, continued)		21:11	196, 294
19:9	105n18	21:12	96
19:10	172	21:13	475
19:11	34, 56, 96, 136n111	21:14	501, 508
19:12	50n86, 135n101	21:15	24n83, 95, 121, 175, 226, 257, 290, 290n147
19:13	112		
19:14	43, 84, 85n9, 127	21:16	72, 74, 95n48, 322, 472, 501, 509
19:16	88, 122, 204, 341, 405n286, 458n11, 466n46	21:17	71, 288, 322, 346–47
19:17	68, 68nn17–19; 121, 205, 450	22:2	180, 192, 252, 274, 291
19:17–22	68n17	22:3	72, 74, 457n7
19:18	68, 71, 225, 450	22:5	66, 105n19, 145, 147, 251, 420, 444
19:18–22	235–36	22:7	34, 116
19:19	128, 450, 483	22:8	54n104, 434n343, 450
19:20	47n64, 48, 53, 54, 60, 68, 121	22:8–10	434
19:21	188–90, 205, 214, 450	22:9	37, 54, 87
19:22	38, 54, 118, 260, 274, 291	22:9–10	87, 88
19:23	182, 287, 291, 450	22:10	54n104, 87, 201
19:24	106, 127, 450	22:11	49
19:25	130n79, 463–64	22:12	66, 338, 411, 450
20:1	105	22:13	134, 354n159, 443
20:2	68, 124, 130n79, 136nn106–7; 480	22:14	48, 55n113, 57n124, 87, 471
20:3	56, 136n105, 480	22:14–15	192, 194, 197, 472, 481n13
20:3–5	236–37	22:15	58, 66, 95n48, 189
20:4	87, 194, 206, 340, 355, 356n166, 458n11	22:15–16	59
20:5	48, 84, 85, 85n9, 104	22:16	49, 54, 283
20:6	106, 121, 392n253, 426, 478n7	22:17	40, 94
21:1–16	282–83	22:17–18	118
21:2	94, 150	22:17–19	323
21:3	198	22:18	251, 274, 291
21:4	194, 458n11	22:19	211, 322
21:5	192, 443	22:20	83n1, 450
21:6	95n48, 159	22:20–24	323
21:7	196–97, 205, 294–95	22:21	125, 147, 251, 322–23
21:8	59, 75, 449n384	22:22	70, 71, 197, 387n239, 466
21:8–9	133	22:24	104n18, 175, 177
21:9	196, 294	22:25	189, 190, 346–47, 450
21:10	48n66, 226	23:1	166, 472
		23:2	458n11
		23:3	65, 91
		23:4	130, 182, 274, 290–91,



23:5	88		466n46, 478n7
23:6	166	24:22	205, 211, 214, 215n84
23:6–7	168	24:23	65, 68, 114
23:7	56, 102, 395n262	25:1	60, 225, 347, 420–21, 424
23:8	107, 147, 208, 501, 508	25:2	150
23:9	79	25:2–4	244
23:10	84, 85	25:4	25n84, 42, 60, 60n135, 170, 198, 244, 296
23:11	40, 88, 89, 102, 346	25:4–5	244, 395
23:12–13	293–94	25:5	60, 60n135, 395, 395n262
23:13	20, 87, 134n98, 135n99, 201, 458	25:6	41n45, 443
23:14	166	25:6–7	190
23:15	83n1, 226, 394–95, 450	25:7	41n45, 196, 294, 395n262
23:17	68n15, 123, 159, 195, 501, 509	25:8	41–43, 67, 113, 341, 346–47, 355, 466n46
23:18	42, 49, 54, 120, 169, 169n87, 192, 206, 243–44, 251, 285, 291, 377n216, 378, 443, 472	25:9	102, 114n37, 189, 192, 194, 450, 473, 481n13
24:2	106, 113, 181, 284	25:10	68n15, 69, 70, 77, 127n73, 341, 355, 466, 466n46
24:3	49n73, 118, 179, 204, 270n118, 334, 341, 346–47, 355, 466	25:12	156, 189–90, 323, 323n43
24:3–6	231–32	26:1	34, 130n79, 134n95, 450
24:4	71, 189–90, 195, 215n84, 501–2, 508	26:2	291
24:4–14	237–38, 238n36	26:2–3	227, 270n118
24:5	211, 392n253	26:3	196, 215n83, 294, 508
24:6	87, 323, 392n253	26:3–4	117, 215n84, 472, 502
24:8	148	26:4	67, 197, 468–69, 471
24:9	79	26:5	156, 189n9, 192, 215n83, 296, 323
24:10	72, 434	26:6	198, 206, 215nn83–84, 471–72, 502, 508
24:11	202	26:7	56, 60n133
24:12	434	26:7–10	397
24:13	95, 127–28	26:8	206, 461, 503, 508
24:14	43, 47, 48, 88, 89, 323, 341, 356n166	26:8–9	34
24:15	174, 248n56	26:9	104, 105n18, 127n73, 202, 341, 356n166, 396, 396nn263–64, 397, 481n13, 494
24:16	196–97, 294–95, 458–59, 458n16	26:10	84, 85, 85n9, 159, 396–97
24:18	37n24, 69, 129, 466		
24:19	118		
24:19–20	116, 208		
24:20	84, 85, 112		
24:21	68n15, 147, 198, 361,		

(Isaiah, continued)

26:11	93, 159, 466n46	28:14	39
26:11–13	227	28:15	96, 324–25, 332, 340
26:12	39, 96, 114n37	28:16	34, 53, 66, 95n48, 151, 196, 198, 294, 296, 453, 503–4, 506, 508–9
26:13	38n37, 114n37, 171, 290, 290n148	28:17	34
26:14	65n4, 88, 159, 177, 209, 323, 391n249	28:17–18	324–25, 332
26:15	202, 294, 341, 368–69	28:18	96, 340
26:16	227	28:18–19	325
26:17	121, 154, 189	28:19	95
26:19	49, 56, 65, 195, 198, 214, 323	28:21	76, 95, 166, 171
26:20	37, 77, 267, 290, 290n147	28:22	43, 60, 66, 503–4, 509
26:21	77, 112	28:24	348
27:1	111, 294, 450	28:25	38, 94n41, 191, 211, 259–60, 458n11, 459
27:2	166, 450	28:26	114n37
27:2–5	342	28:27	184, 335n70
27:3	88, 89, 150–51	28:27–28	195
27:3–4	170	28:28	116, 398
27:4	74, 160, 172, 342, 342n87, 356n166	28:29	160
27:5	295	29:1	39, 54, 84, 85, 105, 196, 294, 388, 390n249
27:6	34, 69, 70, 204, 323	29:1–2	380–81
27:8	323	29:2	84, 198, 202
27:9	34, 36, 56, 72, 182, 227, 270n118, 323	29:3	380n224
27:10	91, 160, 164	29:5	148n25, 208
27:10–11	202	29:5–6	339–40, 355
27:11	78	29:6	84, 85, 207
27:12	136n110, 450	29:7	41n45, 42, 61, 281
27:13	71, 332n62, 355, 450	29:8	41n45, 134
28:1	195	29:9	192, 211, 461, 489, 496, 508
28:2	37n29, 54, 342, 345n104, 356n166	29:10	282
28:4	58, 77, 107, 203	29:10–11	381–82
28:5	48n66, 450	29:11	58, 60, 75, 130n79, 135n101, 160, 388
28:6	58	29:12	39, 60, 130, 135n101
28:7	84, 96, 154, 202	29:13	39, 49, 53, 160, 188n3, 195, 245, 270n118
28:8	84, 85, 85n9	29:14	39, 112, 197, 295
28:10	95, 196, 294	29:15	54, 274, 344, 457n7
28:11	39, 87, 88, 95	29:16	37n31, 113, 211, 264, 274–75, 290
28:12	149, 202	29:17	41, 146, 147n19, 188n4, 189
28:13	39, 196, 294		

29:18	450	30:21	130, 151
29:19	209	30:22	92, 148, 206, 382–83, 388, 458n11
29:20	72, 74, 95, 334	30:23	34, 38, 94, 203, 260, 450
29:21	42	30:24	34, 36, 458n11
29:22	95n48, 110, 275	30:25	146, 450
29:23	65, 70, 127, 466	30:26	105n19, 198, 473
29:24	342, 356n166	30:27	111, 156, 245
30:1	54n106, 136n111, 205, 211, 264, 275, 504	30:28	167
30:2	70, 71, 85n8, 205, 344, 466	30:29	65, 156, 445n372, 451, 466, 468–69
30:2–7	426	30:30	65, 68n15, 71, 342
30:3	71, 84, 324, 400	30:31	49, 102–3
30:4	399, 457n7	30:32	50, 106, 191, 207, 426, 458n11, 459
30:4–5	398–99	30:33	37n29, 77, 161
30:4–6	292–93	31:1	56, 95, 211, 276, 291, 400, 489, 508
30:5	53n100, 96, 101–2, 103n14, 207	31:1–3	426
30:6	37, 53, 54, 69, 71, 90, 90n21, 101–2, 103n14, 145–46, 207, 209, 335, 343, 355, 458n11, 459, 466	31:2	50, 60, 96, 341, 369
30:7	53, 87, 88	31:3	50, 192, 194, 466n46, 473
30:8	87, 94n37, 211	31:4	95n48, 155, 161, 174
30:9	101–2, 136n111, 137, 206, 333–34	31:5	68, 116
30:10	38, 54, 79, 90, 209	31:6	136nn110, 112; 206, 175, 344, 450
30:10–11	275	31:7	77, 79, 355, 450
30:11	39, 49, 54, 121	31:8	112, 122
30:12	61, 87, 88, 95n48, 504	31:9	84, 88, 89, 153, 209
30:13	106	32:1	84, 85, 134n97, 205
30:14	56, 77, 79, 458n11	32:2	196, 356n166
30:15	66, 94, 95, 95n48, 161, 177, 324, 345, 383, 503– 4, 508–9, 512	32:3	196, 399
30:16	58, 59, 95, 275	32:4	342, 390n249
30:17	48, 69, 121, 146, 161, 176, 275, 282, 290, 343	32:5	276
30:18	56, 72, 114n37, 166, 324–25, 343–44, 353, 356n166	32:6	60, 288
30:19	38, 49, 54, 96, 118–19	32:7	84, 162, 198, 245
30:20	49, 145–46, 335	32:9	148
30:20–21	237	32:9–10	427–28, 438
		32:10	95, 162
		32:11	54, 208, 428, 451
		32:11–12	338, 411
		32:12	434
		32:13	96, 290, 290n148, 291, 345, 434
		32:13–14	245, 433–34

(Isaiah, continued)

32:14	95, 146, 290, 290n147, 434n344, 438	34:10	60
32:15	146	34:11	158n59, 189, 212, 214, 288, 345
32:17	325	34:12	72, 74, 84, 148, 251, 285, 291, 435, 437, 438n353
32:18	148, 325	34:13	38, 208, 260
32:19	205, 325, 345	34:14	96
33:1	53, 92, 395n262	34:14–15	284
33:2	84, 162	34:15	96, 163
33:3	36	34:15–16	421, 424
33:4	92, 93, 345	34:16	50, 54, 69, 70, 76, 346, 355, 465
33:5	95	34:17	60, 209, 466n46
33:6	395n262	35:1–2	246, 247n55
33:7	84, 85, 94, 134n97, 174– 75, 232	35:2	16, 61, 113, 113n36, 117, 202, 276, 282, 290
33:7–8	85	35:3	212
33:8	34, 50, 84	35:4	114n37, 336
33:9	92, 189n7, 189–90, 243n46, 377	35:6	19
33:10–11	228, 290, 290n148	35:7	182, 377
33:11	94, 383, 388	35:8	88, 89, 215n83
33:12	77, 79, 160n62, 173	35:8–9	246
33:14	87, 88, 405n285	35:9	50, 54
33:14–15	110	35:10	84, 85, 148–49, 165, 251, 285, 291, 354n159
33:15	60, 434–35, 438	36–39	305–19, 481n13
33:17	111	36:1	73, 150
33:18	56	36:1–3	306
33:18–19	162	36:3	136
33:20	37, 72, 74, 101, 148	36:4	95n48, 135n101, 204, 308–9, 318n36
33:21	50, 57, 174	36:4–10	306, 308–9
33:22	47n64, 95, 166, 343, 353	36:5	96, 491
33:23	87, 88, 94, 161, 176, 395n262	36:6	57, 189, 400
33:24	50, 55n113, 64n2, 76, 77, 84, 85	36:7	77, 114n37, 120n51, 481n13, 483
34:1	72, 74, 276	36:8	135n101
34:2	37n29, 41n45, 72, 395n262	36:9	207, 384, 388, 400
34:3–4	192, 481n13	36:10	93n34
34:4	112, 179, 204, 246	36:10–11	473, 481n13
34:5	95	36:11	135n101, 306–8, 307n22, 318n36, 332
34:6	65, 71, 189–90, 190n14, 369, 388, 466	36:12	50, 306–8, 318n36, 332
34:7	35, 113, 208	36:13	311n26, 318n36
34:8	105n19		

36:13–16	309–10	37:22	205
36:13–20	306, 308–9	37:22–30	44–45
36:14	95n48, 96n49, 104, 309n25, 318n36	37:23	35, 36, 111
36:15	117, 125, 130, 395n262	37:24	84, 87, 111, 114, 124, 147n19, 195
36:16	95, 95n48, 96n49, 206, 208, 308–9, 512	37:25	76, 169, 377, 377n215
36:17	207	37:26	88, 104, 150, 173n98, 209, 342, 342n88
36:18	114n37, 126, 130n79	37:27	90, 120n51, 189–91, 402n277
36:19	41, 57, 96, 126	37:28	93, 354
36:20	126	37:28–29	77, 467–68
36:21	77, 131	37:29	70, 81, 107, 107n24, 215n83, 466, 493n35
36:21–22	306	37:30	213
36:22	136, 422, 422n320, 424	37:31	48n66, 196
37:1	111	37:32	48n66, 50n81, 451
37:2	136nn106–7; 480	37:33	95n48, 318n36
37:3	95n48, 105n19, 251	37:33–34	198, 481n13
37:4	39, 48n66, 50n79, 54, 54n108, 68, 73n31, 106, 114n37, 247, 310–13, 318n36, 332, 422–24	37:34	20, 90, 107, 107n24, 318n36
37:5	69, 136n105, 480	37:35	318n36
37:6	95n48, 121, 136n105, 480	37:36	134
37:7	453	37:37	69, 189–90
37:8	48, 130	37:38	71, 489–90, 508
37:8–9	202, 481n13	38:1	88, 95n48, 136nn106–7; 317, 480
37:9	130n79, 489, 510	38:1–3	317–18
37:10	75, 107, 114n37, 125, 130n79, 131, 318n36, 395n262, 493n35	38:2	35n17
37:11	43, 76, 78, 132n90	38:3	120, 123, 135n101, 465
37:12	41, 136n112, 191	38:4	130n79, 136n105, 480
37:13	57, 207	38:4–5	316–17
37:14	70, 120, 126, 208, 215n84, 481n13, 483, 504, 508	38:5	68n22, 95n48, 316–17
37:15	130n79	38:6	318n36
37:17	73, 202, 310–13, 332, 465	38:7	203
37:18	43, 84, 215n83	38:7–8	131–32, 475
37:19	96	38:8	37, 48, 198, 490, 508
37:20	75, 114n37, 126	38:9–20	313
37:21	95n48, 130, 136n106–7, 316–17, 480	38:10	111, 313–14
		38:10–20	484
		38:11	55n110, 196, 215nn83– 84; 294–95, 346, 356n166, 400, 466–67, 503n61, 504, 507–8, 510
		38:11–12	313–14

(Isaiah, continued)

38:12	395n262, 450	40:11	192
38:13	73, 84, 395n262	40:12	71, 110, 212, 264, 290, 290n147, 349, 452, 466n46
38:14	37, 58, 84, 85, 92, 276, 290	40:12–14	179, 228
38:14–15	474, 483	40:13	103
38:15	110, 481n13, 484n23	40:14	71, 192
38:16	84, 85, 457n7	40:15	41n45, 42, 134n98, 135n99
38:17	70, 76, 131, 133, 466, 481n13, 483, 484n22	40:16	42, 65
38:18	184, 490, 508	40:17	41n45, 42, 42n47, 77, 190
38:19	76, 84, 85, 294–96	40:19	192, 460
38:20	50, 50n79, 401	40:20	35, 36, 77, 84, 104, 348
38:21	50n79, 54, 79, 136n105, 480	40:21	37n24
38:22	39	40:22	210
39:1	136n106, 196–97, 317	40:23	88, 89
39:1–2	317–18	40:24	84, 96
39:2	148, 257, 314–16, 318n36, 332, 365, 388, 451, 509n72	40:25	93, 94
39:3	163, 327, 480	40:26	42
39:4	48, 50n79, 54, 90, 314– 16, 332	40:27	84, 151, 347, 356n166
39:5	16, 480	40:28	93, 149
39:6	58, 59, 88, 89, 169, 169n87, 182, 377n216, 490–91, 508	40:29	212, 264
39:6–7	89	40:30	117, 149, 180, 253, 277, 290–91
39:7	35n13, 87, 189	40:31	149
39:8	95n45, 96, 198, 205, 480	41–49	369
40:1	114, 294	41:1	40n41, 94, 349
40:2	73, 74, 126, 466n46	41:2	120, 325–26, 332
40:3	114n37, 276–77	41:2–4	231
40:4	42, 146, 277, 290, 350– 51	41:3	103–4, 461–62
40:5	54, 69, 70, 74, 277, 290– 91, 334, 341, 346–47, 355, 400, 465, 467	41:4	50, 163, 325–26, 332, 451
40:6	61	41:5	43, 326
40:7–8	474, 481n13, 484, 504– 5, 510, 510n75	41:5–6	386n237
40:8	114n37	41:6	114
40:9	114n37, 336	41:7	43, 60, 167
40:10	66, 110, 120	41:8	102, 106, 176, 347, 351
		41:9	75
		41:10	75, 102–3, 114n37, 326, 466n46
		41:11	42, 42n51, 74n38, 84, 134n97, 277, 349, 349n129, 491, 494, 508– 9, 509n72

41:12	79, 84, 105	42:23	102–3, 190
41:13	67, 114n37, 326	42:24	53, 102
41:13–14	199, 464, 474, 481n13	42:25	48, 50, 369
41:14	326, 464	43:1	40, 52, 54, 75, 93n34, 95n48
41:15	146, 151	43:2	75, 96
41:15–16	340	43:3	40n41, 114n37
41:17	40, 46, 84, 85, 326	43:4	123
41:18	90, 128	43:5	75
41:19	74, 191, 212, 458n11	43:6	60, 354–55
41:20	42, 42n48, 50n81, 210, 325–26, 332, 451, 466n46	43:7	210
41:21	40, 326	43:9	41n45, 180, 288
41:22	50n86, 110, 326, 349	43:10	38, 114, 120, 170, 284, 327, 348, 356n166, 369
41:22–24	370	43:11	196, 294–95, 369
41:23	50n86, 75, 326, 327n47, 349, 350n137	43:12	76, 327
41:23–24	327	43:13	126, 466n46
41:24	87, 88, 135n99, 163	43:14	40, 95n48
41:25	37, 46, 88, 92, 168, 290	43:15	40
41:26	57, 84, 87, 88, 123, 193– 94, 471–72	43:16	95n48
41:27	131–32	43:17	201
41:28	50, 134n95, 327, 347, 347n115, 356n166	43:19	102–3
41:29	84, 135n99, 190, 193	43:21	102
42:1	50, 103–4, 135, 347	43:22	94n38, 163n73
42:3	39n39, 40n42, 78, 90, 95n48, 505, 508	43:23	193, 489, 491, 508
42:6	40, 163n73	43:24	96, 212
42:8	40, 57, 184	43:25	210, 294
42:9	102–3	43:25–26	45, 247
42:10	144, 144n10, 170, 347	43:26	55, 74, 88, 89, 277
42:11	392n253	43:27	212, 264
42:11–12	247n55	43:28	35, 35n11, 451
42:13	40, 190, 384–85, 388, 401, 440–41	44	414–16, 424
42:14	491–92, 510	44:1	93n34, 101–2, 347
42:15	199, 481n13	44:2	40, 95n48, 101, 347, 369–70, 388
42:16	101–4, 120n51	44:3	46
42:16–17	45	44:4	90, 277, 402
42:17	57, 75, 88, 369, 479	44:5	75, 77, 79, 232–33, 270n118
42:19	338, 475, 481n13	44:6	68n15, 95n48, 350n141, 369, 493
42:21	40	44:6–20	414
42:22	43, 50, 84, 102–3	44:7	77, 78, 327, 349, 370
		44:8	75, 94, 369, 468–69
		44:8–9	474, 481n13

(Isaiah, continued)

44:9	53, 102–3, 252, 288n144, 369, 474	45:12	466n46 46, 46n59, 112, 212, 369, 466n46
44:9–11	288–89	45:13	46n59, 60n133, 347n135, 402, 423, 438n355, 443–44
44:11	43, 135n99, 277, 327		
44:11–12	167	45:14	40, 57, 58, 59, 87, 95n48, 96, 369
44:12	50, 54, 87, 191	45:14–15	328
44:13	50, 54, 193–94, 289, 348, 474, 481n13, 492, 508	45:16	74, 347n131, 349
44:14	21, 202, 362, 414–15, 424, 481n13	45:18	46n59, 90, 95, 95n48, 212, 328, 369, 489, 508, 512
44:14–19	319–21, 320n37, 332	45:19	46, 46n59, 176, 184, 328
44:15	50, 53, 193	45:20	101, 369, 468
44:16	87, 88, 104	45:21	38n37, 46n59, 50, 50n81, 171, 328, 348, 369
44:16–17	320n37	45:22	38n37, 46n59, 73, 75, 171, 328, 348, 369
44:17	111, 190, 210, 449	45:23	35, 353, 466n46
44:18	352	45:24	96, 290, 290n148
44:19	87, 130, 284, 348, 355	45:25	136n110, 153, 181, 252
44:20	35, 36, 87, 88, 110–11, 134n95, 152, 339, 449, 505, 510	46	414–16, 424
44:21	347	46:1–2	149, 251
44:22	84, 134n95	46:1–7	414
44:23	146, 146n18, 247n55, 348, 351, 356n166	46:2	103
44:24	95n48	46:4	46, 50, 176, 233, 270n118
44:25	212, 348, 356n166, 436– 38	46:5	369
44:28	35, 451, 508	46:6	53, 79, 277, 349, 505
45:1	40, 95n48, 110, 120	46:6–7	415, 449
45:2	46n59, 120	46:7	190, 339, 416, 424
45:2–13	228–29	46:8	174, 278, 291
45:3	40, 46n59, 182, 289	46:9	75, 202, 369
45:4	46, 105, 347	46:10	42, 43, 173, 278, 291
45:4–5	233	46:11	77, 78, 349, 356n166, 369
45:5	40, 46n59, 87, 202, 328, 369, 475	46:13	193
45:6	40, 46n59, 328, 369	47	426
45:7	40, 42n50, 46, 46n59, 328, 369, 451	47:1	329
45:8	46n59, 247n55, 328, 351, 369	47:1–5	267–68
45:9	37n31, 163, 348	47:2	290, 290n147, 291
45:11	40, 87, 95n48, 451,	47:2–3	429
		47:3	96, 278, 291, 340,



	395n262	49:5	93n34, 96n49, 114n37,
47:4	330, 350n141, 493		123, 329, 338, 452, 511
47:5	95, 329	49:6	51, 134n95
47:6	47, 88, 125, 210, 369	49:7	51, 53, 95n48, 96n49,
47:8	93n34, 329, 417n308		329, 330n54, 350,
47:9	51n87, 74, 93		350n141, 356n166, 452,
47:10	46n58, 47, 84, 152, 329,		493, 506, 508–9
	429–30, 438	49:8	95n48, 96n49, 105n19,
47:11	51n87, 182		190, 329, 452, 471–72,
47:12	135, 475		506
47:13	50, 51n87, 74, 135n101,	49:9	42, 65n5, 278, 494, 508–
	350		9, 509n72, 510n75
47:14	42, 87, 88, 126–27, 339,	49:10	78, 96, 184
	458n11	49:11	42, 51, 65, 278, 291,
47:15	88, 111		350–51, 355
48:1	68n18, 71, 450, 480–81	49:12	134, 134n95, 180, 199,
48:2	95		200n47, 229, 270n118,
48:3	353, 466n46		296, 512
48:4	47, 75	49:13	36, 37, 146–47, 247,
48:5	51, 59, 87, 88, 229,		259, 290, 290n147, 348,
	350n136, 270n118, 350		351
48:6	90, 458n11	49:14–15	224–25
48:7	87, 88, 120n51, 132n90	49:15	48, 58, 59
48:8	87, 118, 493, 508	49:16	35, 110, 134n97, 466n46
48:9	369	49:18	134n95
48:11	48, 51, 196, 294–95,	49:19	95, 145–46, 206,
	387n239, 452		392n253
48:12	75, 104, 176, 202	49:20	84, 105, 146
48:13	75, 369, 466n46	49:21	51, 51n90, 54, 88,
48:14	350, 478		135n99, 278
48:15	77, 78, 197, 278, 291,	49:22	66, 95n48, 96n49, 329,
	294–95, 331n56, 349,		354–55, 452, 466n46,
	452, 506, 508		503, 506, 508–9
48:16	66, 93n34	49:23	64n2, 76, 77, 107, 278,
48:17	67, 75, 95n48, 101, 108,		291
	114n37, 330, 350n141,	49:25	95, 95n48, 96, 96n49,
	493, 510		171, 177, 506, 512
48:19	94, 123, 215n83, 365–	49:26	182, 210, 252, 329,
	66, 388, 452		350n141, 443, 493
48:20	338	50:1	95n48, 107, 134n97
48:21	385, 388	50:2	117, 134n97, 161,
49:1	58, 59, 166, 171, 177		466n46
49:2	25n84, 466n46	50:3	90
49:3	107, 338	50:4	51, 54, 66, 279
49:4	114n37, 489, 493	50:5	66, 150, 353, 387

(Isaiah, continued)

50:7	38, 66, 260n90, 372, 388	52:4	67, 95, 95n48, 96n49, 503, 506, 508–9, 512
50:8	51, 54, 87, 279, 291	52:5	51, 55, 93n34, 96n49, 437, 452, 506
50:9	42n51, 66, 90, 92n30, 134n97, 279	52:6	132n90, 199, 215n84, 296, 450, 506, 508
50:10	113n36, 114, 494	52:6–7	90
50:11	101, 126, 134n97, 494	52:7	35, 87, 88, 114n37, 249–50
51:1	38, 101, 260n90, 372, 388	52:8	43n54, 341
51:2	103–4, 163n73, 176, 351, 436–38	52:9	43n54, 80, 341, 348
51:3	94, 203, 354	52:10	41n45, 55n110, 113n36, 114, 124, 346
51:4	35n12, 212, 229, 264, 330, 341, 396, 396n263	52:11	129, 294
51:5	494	52:12	39, 120
51:6	61, 392n253	52:13	191
51:7	35, 36, 36n18, 101, 330	52:14	137
51:9	294, 330, 351, 356n166	52:15	51
51:9–10	468–69, 474, 481n13	53:2	120, 402n277, 403–4
51:11	148–49, 168, 254, 285, 291, 354n159	53:2–3	249, 403
51:12	101, 136n111, 156, 161, 294, 352, 356n166, 402n277	53:3	35, 35n17, 47, 48, 58, 90, 90n21, 110–11, 403, 404n284
51:13	51, 53, 93, 122, 233	53:4	58, 404n284, 467
51:14	84, 85, 447, 462	53:5	73n32
51:15	67, 114n37	53:6	42n51, 73, 74, 336, 394, 395n262
51:16	35n12, 330, 466n46	53:7	92, 110, 120, 190, 404n284
51:17	84, 85, 125n69, 165, 177, 294, 330, 351, 466n46	53:8	404
51:18	35, 101, 330	53:9	58
51:20	37n29, 39, 113n36, 114, 330	53:10	120n51, 457n7, 467
51:21	135n101, 152	53:10–11	494–95
51:22	95n48, 114, 282	53:11	172, 510, 510n75, 511
51:23	120n51, 125, 152, 251, 494, 510, 510n75	53:12	35, 395n262, 495, 510–11
51:27	161	54:1	77, 79, 84, 85, 213, 247n55
52:1	71, 95, 270n118, 294, 330n55, 352	54:5	60, 350, 493
52:1–2	233–34	54:6	95, 114n37, 279, 426, 464
52:2	352n145	54:7–8	279
52:3	95n48, 506	54:8	35n17, 330, 350n141, 352, 452, 493
52:3–5	293	54:9	51, 95, 164, 199, 495–

	96, 508		162, 178, 180, 230, 270n118, 291
54:10	35, 84, 85, 95, 146	57:5	35, 73, 74, 430
54:11	51, 332n61, 453	57:6	180, 197, 230, 270n118, 290–91, 290n147, 294– 95
54:13	35n13	57:6–13	426
54:14	96	57:7	205, 430
54:15	119, 134n97, 209, 386, 388	57:7–8	430
54:16	111, 134n97, 332n61, 453	57:7–9	430–31
54:17	47, 88, 89, 102–4, 173, 177, 330	57:8	161, 164, 458n11, 462
55:1	73, 199, 207, 215nn83– 84; 296, 475, 506–8, 510	57:9	404, 425n330, 430, 437
55:2	117, 458n11	58:10	94n41, 331
55:2–3	231	58:11	65, 106, 114n37, 199, 214
55:3	52, 54	58:12	35
55:4	134n97	58:13	35n16, 55, 114n37, 249, 353, 355, 490, 496–97, 508
55:5	51, 52, 54, 67, 102, 114n37, 135, 201	58:14	49n73, 52, 334, 341, 347, 466n46
55:6	51, 78	57:10	87, 88
55:7	55, 210, 331	57:10–11	51
55:8	91, 331, 489	57:11	51, 54, 168, 175, 177, 180, 251, 280, 291, 352, 430
55:9	92, 462, 496–97, 508	57:12	103n14, 104
55:10	96, 330, 332	57:13	339, 340n77
55:11	330–32, 349, 353, 452, 466n46	57:14	197, 294–95
55:12	84, 120n51, 146, 351	57:15	95, 95n48, 96n49, 199, 331, 467n48, 489, 496, 508, 510, 512
55:13	88, 89	57:16	51, 95, 96, 123, 398, 465
56:1	95n48, 96n49	57:17	35n17, 51, 54, 55, 180, 352, 452
56:2	73, 74, 78, 137	57:18–19	460
56:3	75, 87, 88, 117, 131, 135n99, 137	57:19	96n49, 215n83, 294–95, 458n11
56:4	35n15, 47, 95, 95n48, 96n49, 331, 512	57:20	92, 423–24, 460
56:6	35, 36, 78, 137, 331, 338, 352, 501, 509	57:21	39, 96n49, 114
56:7	41n45, 57, 496, 508	58:2	94, 114n37
56:8	67, 87, 88, 96n49	58:3	35, 36, 58, 59, 135n99
56:10	58, 87, 88, 279–80, 352	58:4	52, 134n98
56:11	458n11	58:5	105n19
56:12	484	58:6	42, 47, 58, 59, 90
57	430		
57:1	122, 134n95		
57:3	136n111		
57:4	35, 75, 110, 136n111,		

(Isaiah, continued)

58:7	78, 96, 153, 262n101, 263, 331	60:18	184
58:8	120	60:19	113n36, 114, 280, 497, 508, 510n75
58:9	52, 129, 352, 354, 354n160, 355, 356n166	60:20	84, 280, 507–8
59:1	135n99, 466n46	61:1	67, 76, 503, 507, 509
59:2	35, 110, 111, 114, 452	61:2	105n19, 210
59:3	88, 89	61:5	137
59:4	87	61:6	113n36, 114, 213
59:6	84, 193	61:7	113, 193, 464, 481n13
59:7	88, 89	61:9	128n75, 210
59:8	73, 84, 103	61:10	52, 54, 103–4, 113n36, 114, 118, 213
59:9	134, 151, 182, 280, 347	61:11	41n45, 67, 213, 265
59:10	458n11	62:2	35, 69, 70, 73, 74, 107, 465, 493n35
59:10–11	460	62:3	114n37, 466n46
59:11	43, 73, 74, 117, 151, 347	62:4	48n66, 95, 95n44, 194, 199, 474, 481n13
59:12	78	62:5	93, 114, 489, 496–97, 508, 510
59:13	35, 36, 77, 79, 81, 110, 114n37, 348, 436n349, 467–68	62:6	57, 103
59:14	151, 347	62:6–7	197, 472
59:15	123, 465	62:7	84, 85, 471, 481n13
59:16	111, 210	62:8	106, 136n111, 280, 466n46
59:17	110, 182, 193, 253	62:9	78, 451, 497, 510
59:18	114, 190, 475, 481n13	62:10	36, 194, 197, 215nn83– 84; 294–95, 504, 507–8
59:19	248	62:11	84, 120, 131, 133, 199n43, 200, 296
59:21	57, 84, 111, 197, 296, 353, 471, 472, 481n13	63:1	111, 462
60:1	352n145	63:2–3	442–43
60:2	95, 201n54, 345	63:3	111, 347, 347n115
60:4	35n13, 42, 61, 73, 134n95, 199, 214	63:4	105n19, 442, 449
60:5	110, 149, 213, 251	63:6	63n2, 80
60:9	35n13, 95, 111, 114, 354–55	63:7	165, 353
60:10	111, 137	63:8	96, 491
60:11	112	63:8–9	115
60:12	118	63:9	47n60, 68n13, 466
60:13	193, 465, 481n13	63:11	57, 79, 127, 428n334, 462, 507–8
60:14	73, 74, 136n111, 152, 213, 494, 509n72	63:12	122, 466n46
60:15	354n159	63:15	57, 87, 88, 182, 206, 230, 270n118, 291, 451
60:17	52, 182, 248, 270n118, 290, 290n147, 291	63:16	52, 57, 90, 331

63:17	158, 178, 338	65:20	137
63:19 (64:1)	121, 331, 465	65:21	36
63:19–64:1	405, 446	65:21–22	46
64:1	121	65:22	57, 362, 388
64:1–2	449	65:23	88, 89
64:1(2)	122, 497–98, 510	65:24	52, 83n1, 352, 354, 354n160, 355
64:2(3)	121	65:25	94, 111, 331, 507
64:3(4)	102	66:1	95n48
64:4(5)	84, 134n97, 458n11, 481	66:2	290, 406, 466n46
64:5(6)	42n51, 340n77	66:3	52, 88, 89, 91, 103, 203, 354, 474, 481n13, 498
64:6(7)	35n17, 120n51, 124, 331, 395n262, 452	66:4	53, 54, 103n15, 112, 124, 465
64:7(8)	88, 93n34, 466n46	66:6	114
64:8(9)	36, 52, 87, 135nn99,101; 331	66:7	153–54
64:9(10)	498	66:8	43n55
64:11	353	66:9	88, 113n36, 114, 134n95, 332, 453
65	370	66:10	352n145
65:1	52, 54, 131, 132n90, 133, 280, 290, 294– 95, 498, 508	66:10–11	247n55
65:2	149, 251, 353, 386–88, 466n46	66:12	95n48, 134n95, 332, 453
65:3	39, 47, 55, 123, 371, 388, 468–69, 498, 510	66:13	107
65:4	42, 55, 164, 169, 177, 213	66:14	466n46
65:5	52	66:15	37n22, 335, 407
65:6	120, 296	66:16	280, 407
65:6–7	203, 289, 332	66:17	425n330
65:7	146, 207, 332, 507	66:18	41n45, 354, 408
65:8	57, 95n48, 507	66:19	178, 366, 388
65:9	331, 337	66:20	41n45, 52, 136n110, 332, 354–55, 501, 509
65:11	331, 371	66:20–21	387
65:12	47, 53, 103n15, 124, 354, 395n262, 465	66:21	52, 96, 388, 498, 509–10
65:13	67, 95n48, 503, 507–9	66:22	120
65:14	36, 110	66:23	120, 332, 355
65:15	67		
65:16	36, 84, 85, 95		
65:17	36, 110, 131, 133		
65:18	194, 354, 453, 471–72, 481n13		
65:19	184		
		<b>Jeremiah</b>	
		1:1	416n304
		1:4	416n304
		1:11	416n304
		1:13	416n304
		2:24	404
		3:12	398n268
		3:19	420, 424
		4:6	161

## (Jeremiah, continued)

4:8	411, 451
4:13	335n69
5:23	150, 353n157, 387n239
5:26	417–18
6:11	417–18
6:26	451
8:13	54n105, 381n226
10	414–16, 424
10:3	414–15, 424
10:4	416, 424
10:5	415
10:9	415
10:13	362n184
10:21	68n14, 418, 424
11:1	416n304, 417, 424
11:5	420, 424
12:10	158n57, 434n345
12:16	450
14:22	451
16:10	382n227
18:1	417
18:6	37n31
18:8	175n103
18:17	147, 420, 444
21:1	417
21:14	419, 424
23:6	417n308
23:16	348, 436
30(37):1	417n305
30(37):3	423
32(39):1	417
32:37	417n308
33(40):5	452
33(40):13	424
33(40):16	417n308
34(41):1	417n305
34:4 (41:8)	417n305
35(42):1	417n305
37(44):13	209n70
37(44):14	209n70
38(45):19	209n70
40(47):1	417
42(49):2	54n108, 422–24
44(51):25	115

44(51):26	450
46(26):2	444
46(26):21	147, 420
48(31)	410–14, 424
48(31):3	411–12, 424
48(31):8	412, 412n295
48(31):31	414, 424
48(31):33	205n63, 413, 424
48(31):36	414, 424
48(31):37	411n293, 424
48(31):37–38	410–11
49(30):3	411, 451
49:19 (29:20)	212n80
49:20 (29:21)	450
49:23 (30:12)	423–24
49:30 (30:8)	450
49:31	417n308
50(27):17	336n71, 394, 419, 424
50(27):32	419, 424
50(27):45	450
52:25	422, 422n321, 424

**Lamentations**

1:7	428n334
2:10	451
2:17	342n87
3:33	436n349
3:35	376n211

**Ezekiel**

1:3	416n304
6:1	416n304
7:18	451
7:22	452
7:23	434–35, 438
8:10	425n330
11:2	450
11:9	396
12:27	416n302
13:3	348, 436–37
13:17	436, 438
16	425–31
16:5	427
16:6	427, 427n333, 437

16:21 430  
 16:22 427n333, 427–28, 437–38  
 16:24 430  
 16:24–25 431  
 16:25 425n330, 430–31, 437  
 16:26 426  
 16:27 396  
 16:36 438  
 16:36–37 429  
 16:37 428  
 16:39 428, 430  
 16:43 428, 438  
 20:9 437n352  
 20:14 437n352  
 20:22 437n352  
 20:44 452  
 21:14–16 167n81  
 23 425–31  
 23:9–10 430  
 23:16 430  
 23:17 430  
 23:19 425n330, 428, 431, 437  
 23:28 396  
 23:28–30 430  
 23:29 438  
 23:35 430  
 23:39 430  
 23:40 430  
 25:5 433, 438  
 25:16 425n330, 432n338, 432–33, 438  
 26:5 448n381  
 26:12 434, 434nn344–45; 438  
 26:14 448n381  
 27:22 157n51  
 28:14 445n372  
 28:16 445n372  
 28:26 417n308  
 30:13 435, 437, 438n353  
 31:11 396  
 31:12 25n84  
 31:17 25n84  
 32:34 47n379  
 33:2 434n346

33:24 436–38  
 34:25 417n308  
 34:28 417n308  
 36:20 452  
 36:21 437  
 36:22 437  
 36:23 437  
 36:24–38 425  
 38:8 417n308  
 38:11 417n308  
 38:14 417n308  
 39:6 417n308  
 39:7 452  
 39:23 396, 452  
 39:24 452  
 39:26 417n308  
 39:29 452  
 43:8 452  
 44:24 434–35, 438  
 47:10 448n381

**Daniel**

2:18 458n16  
 2:19 458n16  
 2:22 25  
 2:27–30 458n16  
 2:47 458n16  
 3:28 451  
 4:6 458n16  
 6:5 450  
 6:28 449n384  
 7:9 378  
 9:19 447n377  
 11:8 434n345  
 11:38 151n35

**Hosea**

1:1 416n304  
 2:18 440–41  
 2:20(18) 385, 440–41  
 4:13 25n84  
 5:3 439–40, 440n359  
 5:3–5 373n204, 439–40  
 5:5 439–40

**(Hosea, continued)**

5:7	438n355
6:11	423, 444
10:3	440n359
11:7	175
13:15	434n345
14:8	25n84

**Joel**

1:1	416n304
1:8	451
1:13	411n293
2:1	441–42
2:2	441–42
2:14	175n103
4:2	419n315
4(3):13	442–43

**Amos**

2:7	452
6:6	443
9:14	403, 423, 438n355, 444, 445n372

**Obadiah**

1:12	147, 420, 444
1:13	147, 420, 444

**Jonah**

1:1	416n304
3:1	416n304
4:6	451

**Micah**

1:1	416n304
1:2	451
1:4	406, 406n287, 446, 449
3:4	452
4:1	445
4:1–3	445
4:2	445, 445n372
4:7	68n20

4:10	440n359
5:3	440n359
5:6–7	446
6:15	443

**Nahum**

Nah 2:9(10)	434n345
-------------	---------

**Habakkuk**

1:1	416n303
1:14–15	259n85, 447–49
1:15	448
1:15–16	448n381
1:16	448
1:16–17	448n380
1:17	448
2:3	76n43, 438n355, 446– 47, 447n375

**Zephaniah**

1:1	416n304
1:18	448–49
2:2	449
2:11	345n104
2:15	417n308

**Haggai**

1:1	416n304
2:11	416n304
2:21	416n304

**Zechariah**

1:1	416n304
1:7	416n304
5:4	450
8:1	416n304
8:3	445n372
9:8	440n359
14:11	417n308

**Malachi**



3:5 376n211, 450

## 2. DEUTEROCANONICAL BOOKS

### Baruch

3:7 436n349

### 1 Esdras

8:83 157n54

9:46 68n15

### 1 Maccabees

7:17 389n242

### Judith

1:7 432n338

1:7–9 432n338

2:28 432n338

5:22 432n338

8:14 451

10:1 382n227

10:21 151n35

13:19 436n349

15:10 451

### Sirach

8:18 458n16

18:32 378

44:21 452

45:11 151n35

50:9 151n35

50:27 436n349

### Wisdom of Solomon

16:6 436n349

## 4. NEW TESTAMENT

### Matthew

2:10 451

### John

6:35 218

## 3. OLD TESTAMENT PSEUDEPIGRAPHA

### *Odes of Solomon*

10:2 154



## Index of Authors

- Aejmelaesus, Anneli, 27, 28, 28n87,  
83n1, 84n2, 87n12, 88n15,  
95nn45–46; 130n81, 301, 301n6,  
303n16, 356, 356n165, 512n81
- Baer, David A., 9–10, 9nn36, 38–40;  
11, 22n75, 23n80, 151n38, 217n1,  
356n167, 385nn234–235; 398n264,  
401, 401n276, 406n288, 438n355,  
440–41, 441nn361–363; 441nn361–  
363; 457, 458n10, 462n32, 463,  
463nn34, 36; 464, 464n38, 465,  
465nn41–43; 466, 466n45, 468,  
468nn49–50; 469, 469nn51–52;  
481n13,
- Barr, James, 15n58, 16n59, 20, 20n68,  
23, 23nn78, 79
- Barthélemy, Dominique, 481n12,  
486n29, 488nn31, 33; 494nn36,  
39; 495, 495n42, 497n44, 502,  
502n54
- Bauer, Walter, 135nn102, 103;  
136n109
- Berlin, Adele, 269, 269n112
- Beuken, Willem A. M., 480n10,  
481n11, 484n24
- Bickerman, Elias, 100n5, 116n42, 132,  
132nn 86–87, 89; 389n245
- Blass, Friedrich, 55n117, 106n22,  
130n80, 132n87, 136nn104, 109
- Blum-Kulka, Shoshana, 31n1
- Bosman, Hendrik Jan, 17nn60–61
- Briggs, Charles A., 53n102, 95n45,  
131, 131n84, 136n108
- Brock, Sebastian, 15n58
- Brockelmann, Carl, 119n49
- Brockington, Leonard H., 359,  
359n175, 385n234, 457n7
- Brown, Francis, 53n102, 95n45,  
131n84, 136n109
- Brownlee, William H., 482, 482n16
- Budde, Karl, 473n8, 482, 482n17
- Bullinger, Ethelbert, W., 240n39,  
268n110, 285nn138, 141
- Burton, Gideon O., 99nn2–3; 222n15,  
240n39, 262n100, 264n105,  
270nn116–117; 296n157
- Catastini, Alessandro, 305n21,  
317n34, 483, 483n19
- Corbett, Edward P. J., 225n20,  
231n32, 260n96, 262n100,  
266n109, 269nn111, 113;  
285n140
- Coste, Jean M., 170n89, 198n40,  
395n261, 421n318
- Cowley, A. E., 119n48
- Croughs, Mirjam, 377n217
- Darbelnet, Jean, 31n1, 63n1
- Debrunner, Albert, 55n117, 106n22,  
130n80, 132n87, 136nn104, 109
- Denniston, John D., 84n2, 85n6,  
88nn17–18; 89n20, 266n109
- Dogniez, Cécile, 438–39, 439nn356–  
357; 444, 444nn370–371; 447,  
447n378
- Derival, Gilles, 100n5, 389n243,  
390n97, 425n329
- Driver, Samuel R., 53n102, 95n45, 131,  
131n84, 136n108

- Duhm, Bernhard, 478, 478n2, 479, 479n4, 480n10, 481n11, 482, 482n14, 483, 483nn18, 22; 484n25
- Ekblad, Eugene R., 11n45, 300, 300n5
- Elliger Karl, 478n2
- Emerton, John A., 464n37, 473n8, 482n17
- Fiedler, Peter, 132nn87–88
- Fischer, Johann, 4, 4nn11–14; 11, 11n46, 24n82, 28n88, 43n7, 60n134, 91n25, 102n12, 118n46, 143, 157n52, 158, 158n55, 163n74, 184, 217n1, 390n245, 417n307, 456, 456n3, 457n7, 460, 460nn21, 23; 462n33
- Flashar, Martin, 390, 390n246
- Fohrer, Georg, 459n15, 478, 478n2, 480n10, 481n11, 484n24
- Fokkelman, Jan, 222n17
- Frankel, Zacharias, 22, 22n75, 109n30, 115n39, 457n7
- Friberg, Barbara, 93n33
- Friberg, Timothy, 93n33
- Fritsch, Charles T., 465n41, 469n53
- Gesenius, Wilhelm, 119n48
- Goshen-Gottstein, Moshe H., 8–9, 8n33, 9n34, 11, 21n69, 77n50, 152, 154n46, 159n60, 173, 174n101, 187, 187n1, 193n22, 348n128, 349n128, 352, 371, 393, 398, 433, 436n349, 447n375
- Gray, George B., 291n149, 419n311, 479n4, 482, 482n14
- Grintz, Jehoshua M., 456n6
- Hanhart, Robert, 7, 7n24
- Harl, Marguerite, 100n5, 389n243, 390n97, 425n329
- Heater, Homer Jr., 299, 299n1
- Hermisson, Hans-Jürgen, 478, 478n2
- Hilhorst, Antonius, 130n80, 132nn87–88
- Jenner, Konrad D., 15n57
- Johannessohn, Martin, 131n85, 132nn85, 87
- Joosten, Jan, 457n7
- Joüon, Paul, 40n43, 41; 67n12, 75nn39–40; 76n42, 78n55, 101n10, 106nn20–21; 115n38, 130n78, 131n83, 135n100, 462n31
- Kadushin, Max, 22n73
- Kaiser, Otto, 305n21
- Katz, Peter, 358, 358n173
- Kautzsch, Emil, 119n48
- Kennedy, George A., 218, 218nn2–3
- Kieckers, Ernst, 130n80
- Kissane, Edward J., 462n32
- Klaudy, Kinga, 31n1
- Koenig, Jean, 7, 7n25, 8, 8nn31–32; 11, 22n75, 162, 162nn68–69; 300, 300n4, 302, 302nn10, 12, 13; 303n14, 333, 333n65, 359, 359n175, 363, 363n186, 373n203, 375, 375n210, 385n234, 396n263, 399n271, 419n312, 457, 457n8
- Kooij, Arie van der, 7, 7n27, 8, 8nn29–30; 20n67, 22, 22n75, 28n88, 38n35, 60n134, 90n23, 93n35, 147n24, 172n96, 187, 187n1, 201nn53, 56; 204n61, 219n5, 244n47, 334n68, 359, 359n177, 360, 360n178, 378, 378nn219–20; 384n233, 389, 389nn242, 245; 394, 395n259, 398n266, 417n307, 450n386, 457, 457n9, 463, 463n34, 464n37, 482–83, 482n15, 483n20, 486n27, 494–95, 494n39, 495nn40–41; 510, 510nn76–78
- Koole, Jan L., 480n10, 481n11, 484n24
- Kraft, Robert A., 13, 13n51, 481n13
- Kutscher, Ezekiel Y., 215nn83–84; 216, 318, 318nn35–36; 330n54, 333n64, 356n168, 461n25, 485n26, 486n28, 499nn47–48; 501n52, 502n56, 508, 508n66, 509, 509nn69–70, 74
- Lausberg, Heinrich, 215n82, 219n7, 220n8, 221nn10–14; 222nn15–16; 225n20, 231n32, 239n38, 248nn57–58; 250nn62–63, 65; 254nn73–75; 258n83, 259n87; 260n95, 262nn98–99; 264n105; 266n109; 268n110; 269nn113–115; 270n116, 283n131, 285nn136–137, 140; 294n152
- Le Déaut, Roger, 22, 22n75

- Le Moigne, Philippe, 10, 10n41, 12, 85,  
85nn7, 9; 88nn18–19, 90n21, 93n36,  
94nn37, 39, 42–43; 97, 97n53,  
217n1, 285n139
- Lettinga, Jan Pieter, 55n118, 101nn9–  
10; 106n20, 203n60, 248n58,
- Liddell, Henry George, 88n18, 93n33
- Louw, Theo van der, 157n51, 217n1,  
299, 299n2, 334n68, 368n194,  
373n202
- Lust, Johan, 201n53, 360, 360n178,  
481n13
- Marti, Karl, 482, 482n14, 483nn18, 22
- Martin, Josef, 222n15, 250n64, 259n87,  
260n96, 262n100, 270n116
- Marquis, Galen, 13–14, 13n52, 14n53,  
15n55, 19n65
- Meer, Michael van der, 255n77–78
- Miller, Neva F., 93n33
- Mongsengwo-Pasinya, Laurent, 464n37
- Moulton, James H., 99n5, 122, 122n57,  
136n104, 178, 178n111
- Mozley, Francis W., 358, 358n173,  
390, 390n246, 391n249
- Munnich, Olivier, 100n5, 389n243,  
390n97, 425n329
- Muraoka, Takamitsu, 232n33
- Olofsson, Staffan, 27n86, 390, 391n250
- Orlinsky, Harry M., 305n21, 465n41
- Ottley, Richard R., 3–4, 3nn8–9, 4n10,  
8, 11, 11n46, 15n56, 24n82, 28n88,  
100n5, 151n38, 157n52, 161n67,  
162n70, 170n89, 385n234,  
389nn241, 245; 456–57, 456n1, 3–  
4; 505n65
- Parry, Donald W., 486n28
- Pérez Fernández, Miguel, 456n6
- Person, Raymond F. Jr., 305n21
- Peursen, Wido Th. van, 15n57, 19n64,  
32n2, 63n2
- Pisano, Stephen, 12, 12n48, 13nn49–50
- Polak, Frank, 13–14, 13n52, 14n53,  
15n55, 19n65
- Prijs, Leo, 22, 22n75, 303, 303n15
- Qimron, Elisha, 486n28
- Rabin, Chaim, 358, 358n173
- Rehkopf, Friedrich, 55n117, 106n22,  
130n80, 132n87, 136nn104, 109
- Robinson, Theodore H., 291n149
- Rösel, Martin, 360, 360n178
- Rowe, Galen O., 218n4, 219n7,  
222n15, 248n58–59, 259n87,  
262n100, 266n109, 269n113,  
270n116, 285n136
- Schaper, Joachim, 389, 389n242, 244
- Schleusner, Johann F., 385n234
- Scholz, Anton, 2–3, 2nn4–5; 3nn6–7,  
24n82, 102n12, 157n52, 378,  
378n220
- Scott, Robert, 88n18, 93n33
- Seeligmann, Isac L., 6, 6n22–23, 7n24,  
11, 11n46, 141, 141n2, 143–44,  
144n9–10, 146, 146n15, 151n38,  
157, 157n53, 170n91, 172, 172n95,  
184, 211n73, 302nn9–10; 303,  
303n17, 337, 337n73, 356, 356n164,  
357n170, 359, 359nn175–76; 360,  
360n179, 364, 364n189, 367, 370,  
370n196, 373n203, 376, 377n213,  
378–79, 380n222, 383n231,  
385n234, 389n245, 390, 391n247,  
401n276, 402, 402n280, 425–26,  
425n330, 426n332, 433n339, 438–  
39, 438n355, 441, 444, 444n368,  
447, 447n375, 456, 456nn1, 3;  
457n7, 463, 463n34, 467n48,  
469n53, 494, 494n38
- Segal, Moses H., 456n6
- Sikkel, Constantijn J., 17n60, 61
- Soisalon-Soininen, Ilmari, 100n5,  
108n26, 109n30
- Sollamo, Raija, 100n5, 108, 108nn26–  
29; 115–16, 115n39, 116nn41–42;  
119, 119nn48–50; 120nn52–53;  
121n54, 122, 122nn55–56; 123n60,  
124, 124nn 61–63; 125nn66–68;  
126, 126nn70–72; 128n76, 129n77,  
206n65
- Swete, Henry B., 100n5, 388, 389n241,  
456, 456nn1, 3
- Talmon, Shemaryahu, 142, 142n5,  
143n6, 189n9, 489n34, 494n37, 498,  
498n45, 502n53, 503, 503n58
- Talshir, Ziporah, 142, 142n4, 143n6

Talstra, Eep, 15n57

Thackeray, Henry St. J., 99n5, 100n5–6; 115, 115n39, 116n40, 219, 219n6, 359, 359n175, 385n234, 389n245, 409, 409n292, 424, 424n326, 425, 425n327–28, 433, 438, 456, 456n3

Torczyner, Harry, 22n74

Tov, Emanuel, 13, 13n51, 15, 15nn54–55; 22, 22n75, 24nn81–82; 27, 27n86, 115, 115n39, 116nn40, 43; 141, 142n3, 157n52, 177, 177n108, 205n64, 299, 300nn3, 5; 301, 302nn7, 11; 304, 304nn18–19; 305n20, 321n38, 333n63, 357n169, 358, 358n172, 359nn173–74; 450n385, 471n1, 473n7, 477n1, 481n13,

Trebolle Barrera, Julio C., 305n21

Troxel, Ronald L., 10–11, 10nn42–43; 11n44, 21n69, 22n75, 24nn81–82; 84n3, 90n22, 152, 152nn39–40; 155n49, 158n56, 159, 159n61, 161n67, 170n89, 174, 174n102, 219n5, 360, 360n178, 363n187, 364n189, 374, 374nn207–9

Ulrich, Eugene 28n87, 482, 482n14, 483n18, 484n24, 511n79

Vinay Jean-P., 31n1, 63n1

Waard, Jan de, 32, 32n4, 481n12, 482n17, 486n29, 488, 488nn31, 33; 494nn36, 39; 495, 495n42, 497n44, 502, 502n54

Watson, Wilfred G. E., 290n146

Watts, John D. W., 479, 479nn4–5

Westermann, Claus 480n10

Wevers, John W., 27, 27n86, 88n15, 357, 358n171, 403, 403n281, 433, 433n341, 444, 444n370, 447, 447n376, 456n5

Wildberger, Hans, 57n124, 66nn6–7; 68n16, 190n14, 201n55, 260n92, 272n120, 313n28, 459n15, 473n8, 475n17, 479nn4, 7; 482, 482n14, 483n22

Wilk, Florian, 157n51, 179n112, 334nn67–68

Williams, Tyler F., 390, 390n249

Wutz, Franz, 148n26

Ziegler, Joseph, 1–2, 1nn1–3; 5–6, 5nn15–20; 6n21, 8, 11, 11n46, 24n82, 28n88, 29, 30, 36n20, 38n33, 41n44, 44, 44n57, 49n72, 58n129, 59n131, 74n37, 91nn24–25, 27–28; 92nn29–30; 107, 107n24, 119n46, 141n1, 143, 143n8, 146, 146n14, 147, 147n21, 150nn32–33; 151nn34, 38; 152n41, 153n45, 154nn46–47; 157, 157nn51–52, 54; 158n56, 160nn63–64; 161n67, 162n68, 163n74, 165n76, 166n80, 169, 169n84, 170n91, 171n94, 172, 172n97, 176, 176n106, 184, 187, 187n1, 189n6, 193n21, 199n45, 201n54, 217n1, 259n86, 262n102, 263n103, 293n151, 301, 301n8, 302, 302nn10–11; 331n59, 333, 333n65, 337, 340n76, 341n80, 342, 342nn87, 89; 343n92, 344n103, 347n115, 348n123, 353nn151, 153; 357n170, 359, 359n175, 361, 361n182, 362n185, 363n187, 367, 368–69, 369n195, 370, 370n196, 371n199, 373nn202–3, 378–79, 380nn221, 223; 381, 381n225, 382n229, 383n231, 385nn234, 236; 387n239, 390, 391n248, 394n257, 395, 395n260, 398n266, 398n269, 402n277, 403, 403n282, 406, 406n288–89, 409, 409n291, 411n293, 412n295, 414n298, 415, 416n300, 417, 418, 418n309, 419nn312, 314; 421, 422n319, 430n335, 431n337, 434n346, 436n349, 437n351, 438, 438n354, 442, 442n365, 443, 443n367, 444n368, 447nn375, 378; 448n383, 456–60, 456n2, 458nn11–12; 459nn17, 20; 460nn22–23; 462, 462nn29, 32; 464, 464nn39–40; 469n53, 473n10, 474n15, 475n18, 479, 479nn4, 6, 8; 481n11, 13; 484, 484n25, 486n28, 488n32, 489n34, 496n43, 499n47, 509n73, 510n75, 518–19

Zillesen, Alfred, 302n11, 333n65,  
347nn115–16; 348n123, 444n368





## Index of Subjects

- abbreviation 69, 502, 518. *See also*  
     condensation  
 accumulation 220, **254–262**  
 actualisation 6, 7, 22, 30  
 addition  
     definition of 3, **14–15**, 32  
     of adjectives 38  
     of appositions 39  
     of appositions to geographical names  
         41  
     of attributes 33–41  
     of demonstratives 39, 61  
     of divine titles 39–40  
     of genitive pronouns 33–36, 61  
     of infinitives 58  
     of nominal objects 54–55, 61  
     of nominal subjects 47–48  
     of nouns in the genitive 36–37  
     of objects 49–55, 61  
     of particles 84–95  
     of particles of comparison 90–93  
     of pleonastic nouns 6, 36, 38, 59–60,  
         61  
     of pronominal objects 49–54  
     of pronominal subjects 44–47  
     of verb phrases 55–59  
     of verbs replacing “to be” 57–58  
     of ἀλλά 89–90  
     of ἄμα 43, 61  
     of ἄνθρωπος 60  
     of γάρ 84–86, 97  
     of δέ 88–89, 97  
     of δὴ 94  
     of εἰμί or γίνομαι 56–57, 61  
     of καί 84, 97  
     of λέγω 58  
     of νῦν 93–94  
     of ὅλος **42–43**, 61  
     of ὅτι 87–88  
     of πᾶς 6, **41–42**, 61, 509, 513  
     of τότε 94  
 addition or omission of “all” 509, 513  
     *See also* addition of πᾶς, omission  
     of ὅς  
*al tiqre* 22  
 alliteration 232, 242, 242n44, 242n45,  
     251, 252n70, 259, 259n85,  
     260n89, 260n90, 260n91, 265,  
     287n143  
 analogy 8, 300, 302. *See also* anaphoric  
     translation, influence of other  
     Biblical texts  
 anaphora 220, **225–231**, 233, 238, 250,  
     252–253, 257, 273, 296, 297  
 anaphoric translation 4, 5, 9, 10, 11, 29,  
     61, **299–454**, 517. *See also*  
     influence of other Biblical texts  
 annominatio 220, **248–250**  
 anthropomorphism, avoidance of 70,  
     464–67  
 anthropopathism, avoidance of 464–67  
 antimetabole 285–86, 287  
 antithesis 285  
 Aquila 99, 269  
 Aramaic 456–57  
 assimilation 40, 43, 53, 61, 67, 80, 90,  
     111, 357, 366, **450–53**, 493, 503,  
     506, 507, 519

- association 9, **21**, 21n72, 145, 148, 150–53, 155, 159, 160, 162, 169, 170, 176, 184, 334, 365, 368, 375, 378, 398, 405, 412, 418, 421, 426, 427, 439, 521
- associative rendering. *See* association
- assonance 243, 246, 259, 270, 287
- asyndesis. *See* asyndeton
- asyndetic relative clause 101–4, 516
- asyndeton 101, 103, 218, 220, **265–68**
- atomistic approach 7
- avoidance of repetition. *See* repetition, reduction or deletion of
  
- barbarism 99
- biblical poetry. *See* Hebrew poetry
- book of Ezekiel 357, **424–25**, 437–38, 453
- book of Jeremiah 357, **409**, 424, 453
- book of Psalms 357, **388–91**, 408–9, 453
- borrowings. *See* anaphoric translation, influence of other Biblical texts
- brevitas 205, 215, 262
- briefness of the text. *See* brevitās
  
- Cave 4 510
- chiasmus 10, 220, 224, 226, 228, 233, 237, 238, 239, 242, 244, 245, 246, 247, 265, 269, 271, 275, 276, 278, 283, **285–90**, 290–91, 297, 516
- chiastic structure. *See* chiasmus
- chronological order of Greek translations 520
- clarification 31, 47, 61, 97, 515, 516
- classical rhetoric **218–20**, 297, 517, 521. *See also* rhetoric
- coherence 31, 39, 61–62, 63, 77, 80, 332
- cohesion. *See* coherence
- compact translation. *See* brevitās
- comparison. *See* simile
- condensation 21, 29, 81, **187–216**, 471, 474, 476, 485, 500, 501, 508, 510, 512, 513, 516
- condensed rendering. *See* condensation
- conflated reading. *See* conflation
- conflation 142, 143, 489, 498, 516
- construct state 104–5
- contemporisation. *See* actualisation
- content analysis 30
- contextual approach 7
- contextual exegesis: 300, **304–33**. *See also* contextual harmonisation
- contextual harmonisation 10, 30, 36, 47, 61, 299–301, **304–33**, 490, 492, 493, 496, 504, 505, 508, 510, 513,
- contraction
  - of two clauses 201–3
  - of two phrases 200–201
- coordinating accumulation 220, **254–59**
- coordination 516
  - of doublets 144, 145–53, 184–85
- copulative conjunctions 83–84
- copyist. *See* revision
- correct use of the Greek 83, 97, **99–138**, 460–62, 470, 489, 509, 513, 515, 521
- correction of the Hebrew **460–62**, 489, 509, 513. *See also* difficulties in the Hebrew
- correctness. *See* correct use of the Greek
- corrupt reading 481
  
- derivatio 220, **221**, 234, 250
- diazeugma 265
- difficulties in the Hebrew 455, **460–62**, 470, 478, 480, 481, 485, 487, 492, 508, 513. *See also* correction of the Hebrew
- discourse, amelioration of the 97, 515, 519
- distributio **220**, 257–59
- distributive rendering 76, 80, **205–13**
  - in parallel clauses 207–13
  - in parallel phrases 206–7
  - of objects 209–10
  - of possessive pronouns 206

- of prepositions 207
- of subjects 208–9
- of substantive nouns 206–7
- of verb phrases 210–13
- dittography 4, 9, 164, 471, 485, 503, 504
- divine titles 39–40, 509
- Doppelübersetzung 141. *See also*
  - double translation
- Doppelung 141. *See also* double translation
- double reading 9, 141–42, 164. *See also* double translation
- double translation 4, 6, 9, 21, 29, **141–85**, 484, 516, 519
- doublets **141–85**, 516. *See also* double translation
- ellipsis 217, 218, 220, **262–63**, 487, 491, 496, 508, 516
- end rhyme 243, 246
- enumeratio 220, **254–57**, 285. *See also* enumeration
- enumeration 145, 178, 190–91
- epergesis 79
- epiphora 220, **231–38**, 250, 253, 296, 297
- epitheton 220, **259–60**
- Erfüllungsinterpretation* 6, 10
- errors. *See* mistakes of the translator
- etymological interpretation 10, 248. *See also* midrashic exegesis
- exegetical additions 2, 5, 27, 81, 326
- exegetical changes 488, 509
- exegetical omissions 81
- explicitation 2, 6, 29, **31–62**, 85, 177, 185, 357, 485, 492, 508, 510, 515, 519
  - of subjects 44–48
  - without the occurrence of a plus 60
- figures of style. *See* rhetorical figures
- formal association. *See* association
- free translation 5, 10, 14, 20, 23, 28, 29, **99–138**, 515. *See also* literal
  - versus free translation
- fulfilment of ancient prophecies 6, 10
- geminatio 196, 250, **294–96**, 472, 507, 517
- generalisation 64, 65, 80
- geographical names 70
- glosses 3, 5, 5n19, 301, 369, 418
- Gospels 132
- Great Isaiah Scroll 8, 215–16, 306, 333, 356, 461, 484, 485, **486–510**, 518
- Greek editor. *See* revision
- Greek literature 219
- Greek papyri 121, 122, 132
- Greek Pentateuch. *See* Greek translation of Pentateuch
- Greek translation
  - of 1–2 Kingdoms 118, 318–19
  - of Deuteronomy 108, 132
  - of Exodus 108, 132
  - of Ezekiel 357, **424–25**, 437–38, 453, 517, 520
  - of Genesis 108, 132
  - of Jeremiah 118, 357, **409**, 424, 453, 517, 520
  - of Job 12
  - of Leviticus 108
  - of Numbers 108, 132
  - of Pentateuch 13, 108, 117, 357, **358–59**, 367, 387, 453, 517
  - of Psalms 357, **388–91**, 408–9, 453, 517
  - of Samuel 12–13
  - of Twelve Prophets 357, 424, **438–39**, 449, 453, 517, 520
- hapaxlegomena 457, 458, 459, 460
- haplography 4, 9, 13, 92, 194, 196, 197, 215, **471–72**, 476, 480, 485, 489, 492, 497, 500, 504, 510, 518
- harmonisation 110, 145, 171, **299–301**, 517. *See also* influence of other Biblical texts
- Hebraism 69, **99**, 104, 119, 122, 129,

(Hebraism, continued)

134, 136, 515

Hebrew knowledge of the translator 3,  
4, 5, 9, 11, 29, 215, 302, 455, **456–60**, 470, 521

Hebrew poetry 222, 269, 291

homoeoarkton 194, 469, **473–74**

homoeologia 296

homoeoptoton **269–70**, 273, 290–91

homoeoteleuton (translation mistake) 9,  
194, **473–74**, 494, 507

homoeoteleuton (stylistic device) **269**,  
273, 274, 281, 290

homonyms 8, 145

identical elements, reduction of. *See*  
repetition, reduction or deletion of  
ideological considerations of the  
translator 9, 22, 29, 30, 455, **463–69**, 470, 517

idiomatic expressions 130–37, 516

image of God **464–68**, 470

implication 29, 63, **63–81**, 485, 508,  
515, 519

of subjects 74–77

inclusio 220, **222–25**, 230, 250, 251–  
52, 297

incompetence of the translator. *See*  
Hebrew knowledge of the  
translator

independent pronouns 74–76

infinitive absolute **115–19**, 137, 502,  
508, 516

influence of other Biblical texts 299–  
350

outside of Isaiah 356–449, 500

within Isaiah 333–56, 494

within the near context 304–33

inner Greek association 162

inner Greek changes 9

intensification of the text 62

interpreting additions. *See* exegetical  
additions

interpreting omissions 81

intertextual exegesis. *See* intertextuality

intertextuality 30, 300, **333–56**, 357,  
453, 509, 510. *See also* influence  
of other Biblical texts

isocolon **269**, 270, 271, 274, 287, 291

Jewish exegesis 302–3, 521. *See also*  
midrashic exegesis, Rabbinical  
exegesis

καὶ γέ recension of the Psalms 389

κακόζηλια 296

knowledge of Hebrew. *See* Hebrew  
knowledge of the translator

Koinē Greek 108, 116, 121, 122, 125,  
135, 219, 297

lack of knowledge of the translator. *See*  
Hebrew knowledge of the  
translator

large minuses **481–84**, 512, 518

literal versus free translation 4, 9–10,  
14, 20, 23, 28, 81, **99–138**, 144,  
145, 184. *See also* free translation  
literary quality 217. *See also* style

merism 285

mesarchia **239**, 243, 296

mesodiplosis **239**, 242

mesoteleuton **240**, 243, 246, 247

messenger formula 194, 282, 452, 503,  
504, 508

metaphors 69, 90, 109, 124, 398, 498

metathesis 8, 21, 21n72

middle repetition. *See* mesodiplosis

midrashic exegesis 8, 9, **22**, 143, 184,  
521

midrashic techniques. *See* midrashic  
exegesis

minus, definition of 14–15, 16, 26

mistakes of the translator 5, 9, 21, 27,  
29, 83, **471–76**, 483, 510, 518.

*See also* dittography, haplography,  
homoeoteleuton, parablepsis

mythological language, avoidance of  
**468–69**, 470

- narratio brevis. *See* brevitās
- nationalism 9, **463–64**, 470
- obscure Hebrew. *See* difficulties in the Hebrew
- omission
- definition of 3, **14–15**, 188
  - of appositions 66–69
  - of attributes 64–69
  - of divine names 66–68
  - of genitive pronouns 108–115
  - of governed nouns in a genitival relationship 65–66
  - of governing nouns in a genitival relationship 69–74
  - of Hebrew idiomatic expressions and formulae 130–37
  - of infinitive absolute 115–17, 137
  - of names for body parts 64, 69–70
  - of nominal objects 79–80
  - of nominal subjects 76–77
  - of nominal suffixes 64–65
  - of objects 77–80
  - of particles 95–96
  - of pronominal objects 77–79
  - of pronominal subjects 74–76
  - of retrospective pronouns 105–8, 137
  - of אָךְ 96
  - of בִּן־ 135–37
  - of גַּם 96
  - of הֵן 134–35
  - of הֵן(ו) 131–34, 137
  - of וְ 83–84, 97
  - of יחד 74
  - of כִּי 95–96, 97
  - of כֹּל 72
  - of לְאִמֶּר 130–31, 137
  - of נָא 96, 135
  - of רַב 74
- ornamentation of the text 218, 221
- paralepsis 196, 197, 215, 471, **473–74**, 476, 482, 484, 505, 510, 518
- parallelism 9, 36, 43, 53, 61, 73–74, 76, 77, 80, 145, 177, 178, 180, 185, 190, 217, 218, 220, 233, 234, 238, 241, 243, 246, 249, **269–83**, 290–91, 296, 297, 358, 486, 488, 491, 494, 495, 497, 498, 499, 501, 502, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 513, 516, 517, 519
- at clause level 270–81
  - at word or phrase level 281–83
  - between the beginning lines of successive sections 282–83
- paraphrase 20, 144
- parataxis 84, 101
- parison 269
- paromoeosis 276, 290
- paronomasia (cancelling of) 203–5
- paronomasia (stylistic device) 221, 241, 243, **248**, 279 *See also* annominatio
- particles 10, 29, **83–97**, 515
- of comparison 498
- particularism of the translator **463–64**, 470
- pathos 221, 266
- Pentateuch 357, **358–59**, 367, 387. *See also* Greek translation of the Pentateuch
- pleonasm 108, 131, 215, 296, 500. *See also* pleonastic additions
- pleonastic additions 6, 36, 38, **59–60**
- plus, definition of **14–15**, 16, 26
- poetic features. *See* rhetorical figures, style
- poetry 217. *See also* rhetorical figures, style
- polyptoton 220, 221, 234, **250**
- polysyndeton 220, **260–62**, 284
- quantitative approach 16, **26–27**, 32, 44
- Qumran manuscripts of Isaiah 477, 479, **485–512**, 518
- Qumran scrolls 301, 369, 457
- Rabbinical exegesis 302–3. *See also* midrashic exegesis
- rearrangement **20–26**, 184, 517–18, 520

- reduction of identical elements. *See*  
 repetition, reduction or deletion of
- reduction of synonyms. *See* synonyms,  
 reduction of
- redundancy, avoidance of 65, 66, 74,  
 77, 80. *See also* condensation
- reduplicatio 220, **239**, 242, 250, 253–54
- reformulation 9, 10, 21n69, 215, 470.  
*See also* rearrangement
- refrain 291–94
- relative clauses 104–5
- relative particles 101
- repetition 9, 177–84, 217, 218, 516  
 as a rhetorical figure 220, **221–54**  
 of clauses 291–94  
 of identical elements 187, 196–200,  
 205–13, 215, 220, 221–48  
 of sounds. *See* sound play  
 of words with relaxed word-  
 equivalence 220, 248–54  
 reduction or deletion of **187–216**,  
 294–97, 504, 506, 507. *See*  
*also* repetition
- repetitive rendering **177–84**, 185, 516  
 in parallel phrases 178  
 in parallel clauses 178  
 of prepositions 178–79  
 of objects 180  
 of subjects 179–80  
 of verb phrases 181–84  
 of οὐδέ 183
- retrospective pronouns 516. *See also*  
 omission of retrospective  
 pronouns
- reviser. *See* revision
- revision of the translation 141, 150,  
 164, 172, 184, 303, 356, 358, 454,  
 518
- rhetoric 12, 29, 30, 99, 215, **217–97**.  
*See also* rhetorical figures,  
 classical rhetoric, style
- rhetorical figures **217–97**, 516, 519  
 of addition 221–62  
 of omission 220, 262–68  
 of transposition 220, 268–91  
 deletion of 294–97
- Samaritan Pentateuch 333
- segmentation of the source text 15–28
- semantic approach 16
- semi-prepositions **119–29**, 137, 516  
 with יד 124–27  
 with עינים 123–24  
 with פנים 120–23  
 with קרב 127–28  
 with תוך 128–29
- Semitism. *See* Hebraism
- sentence division 22, 86
- shortening of the text. *See* abbreviation
- simile 90–93, 332, 498
- simplification of the text 9, 69
- sound play 228, 244, 245, 249–50,  
 272, 273–74, 275. *See also*  
 alliteration, annominatio
- status constructus. *See* construct state
- stop-gap words 3, 10
- style 11, 23, 30, 64, 83, 84, 99, 177,  
 178, 185, 196, 215, **217–97**, 305,  
 357, 454, 482, 517. *See also*  
 classical rhetoric, rhetoric,  
 rhetorical figures,
- subordinating accumulation 220, **259–**  
**62**
- subordination 84, 101
- suffixes 516
- superfluity in ornamentation 517
- synonym clauses, reduction of 191–94
- synonymia (stylistic device) 185, 220,  
 221, 247, **250–54**, 269, 285, 296,  
 297, 516. *See also* synonyms
- synonymous word pairs 145–50, 190,  
 215
- synonyms. *See also* synonymia  
 in Greek 144, 145–50, 153–54, 155–  
 56, 165–66, 167–69, 177, 180,  
 181, 182–83, 185  
 in Hebrew 2, 5, 11, 188–96  
 reduction of 187, **188–96**, 485, 508,  
 516, 519

- Targum 302–3
- tautological infinitive. *See* infinitive
  - absolute
- text editions 30
- textual criticism 520
- textual errors in the MT 477
- theological considerations of the
  - translator 9, 22, 29, 30, 455, **463–69**, 470, 494, 495, 517
- translation
  - at clause level 20
  - at phrase level 18–19
  - at word level 17–18
- translation doublets 141–142. *See also*
  - double translation
- translation mistakes. *See* mistakes of the translator
- translation techniques 9, 27, 29, 216, 477, 478, 484, 485, 508, 512, 519–20
- translation tendencies. *See* translation techniques
- transposition of consonants 4
- tricolon 146, 220, 269, **283–85**
- tropes 218
- Twelve Prophets 357, 424, **438–39**, 449, 453. *See also* Greek translation of Twelve Prophets
- unclear Hebrew text. *See* difficulties in the Hebrew
- unintentional omissions. *See* mistakes of the translator
- unity of the translation 304, 333, 355
- Vorlage* 4, 6, 7–8, 9, 15, 21, 27–28, 29, 30, 61, 72, 81, 83, 97, 117, 141, 142, 143–44, 164, 185, 215, 216, 218, 261, 301, 303, 358, 369, 454, 461, 471, 476, **477–513**, 518, 520
- word order 22
- word play. *See* annomination
- zeugma 220, **264–65**, 269