The Catholic Biblical Quarterly
Monograph Series
44

# Studies in the Greek Bible

Essays in Honor of
Francis T. Gignac, S.J.

EDITED BY

Jeremy Corley
and
Vincent Skemp

Produced in the United States of America

# Contents

*v*

# Foreword

It is both a joy and an honor for me to write the Foreword as well as an article for this Festschrift honoring my esteemed colleague and long-time friend (for over forty years): The Reverend Francis T. Gignac, S.J., Professor of Biblical Studies at The Catholic University of America, Washington, DC. Father Gignac, known by all as Frank, was born in Detroit, Michigan, on February 24, 1933. It is my hope that these few words may convey some idea of my profound appreciation for the major contributions to Biblical Studies and to the Church at large that Father Gignac has made and continues to make.

He entered the Society of Jesus on August 8, 1950, and was ordained a priest on June 14, 1967. He received his B.A. in Latin from Loyola University, Chicago, 1955; his Ph.L. in Philosophy from West Baden College, Indiana, 1957; his M.A. in Classics from Loyola University, Chicago, 1957 (his thesis: "The Decipherment of Mycenaean Greek in the Linear B Script and Its Consequences in the Field of Homeric Scholarship"); his D.Phil. in Greek Philology from Oxford University, England, 1964 (his dissertation: "The Language of the Post-Christian Greek Papyri: Phonology and Accidence"); his S.T.L. from the Jesuit School of Theology, Chicago, 1968; and his M.A. in Theology from Loyola University, Chicago, 1968. He has held teaching positions at Loyola University, Chicago, the University of Detroit, Fordham University, Union Theological Seminary, New York, and finally at The Catholic University of America where he joined the faculty in 1974 and has remained ever since.

A well-liked and born teacher, Father Gignac has taught undergraduate courses in Greek, the Gospel of John, the Letters of Paul, and Introduction to the Old Testament and the New Testament. His consummate skills, however, are more prominent in his graduate courses

in the Language of the Nonliterary Greek Papyri, Semitic Interference in Biblical Greek, the History of the Greek Language, Problems in Greek Old Testament Versions, and Intermediate and Advanced Biblical Greek.

Father Gignac has also been an accomplished administrator, serving as Vice Chair of the Department of Theology at Fordham University, 1968-69. He also served in various capacities at Harlem College Extension of Fordham University, Marymount Manhattan College, and the College of Mount Saint Vincent, 1969-74. He was a member of the Coordinating Committee, which was responsible for establishing the Department of Biblical Studies at The Catholic University of America, 1974-76, and has served with distinction as chair of the Department of Biblical Studies in the School of Religious Studies, and as a member of the Executive Council, 1976-2002. From 1978 to 1981, he served as a member of the Academic Senate. Ever since a major reorganization in 2002, Father Gignac has served as the director of the Biblical Studies program in what is now called the School of Theology and Religious Studies.

Father Gignac is well known for his contributions in several Bible translations. He was a member of the Review Committee, United Bible Societies' *Today's English Version* of the Deuterocanonical Books of the Old Testament, 1977-79. He chaired the Board of Editors for the revision of the *New American Bible New Testament*, 1979-87, a widely acclaimed translation. Among his other responsibilities he was chair of the Board of Editors for the revision of the Lectionary, National Conference of Catholic Bishops, 1987-89; a member of the Board of Control, the *New American Bible*, 1988-present; and a member of the Board of Editors for the Revision of the *New American Bible Old Testament* (Deuterocanonicals), 1994-present.

Father Gignac holds memberships in the Philological Society in Great Britain, The American Society of Papyrologists, Association Internationale de Papyrologues, and The Catholic Biblical Association of America. He has delivered major addresses, mostly on papyrology, in several other learned societies as well, and has received numerous awards from foundations to support his research and travel. Among his listings in biographical reference works, to name but a few, are: *Dictionary of International Biography, World Dictionary of Linguists, Directory of American Scholars, Who's Who in Education, Who's Who in Religion,*

*American Catholic Who's Who, International Who's Who in Community Service, Community Leaders of America, and Notable Americans.* Something of a perennial and enthusiastic athlete, Father Gignac still jogs daily, and in past years he ran in a large number of marathons. His "diplomas" for having completed these marathons hang in various offices in Caldwell Hall.

Father Gignac is no stranger to pastoral life and ministry, for he continues to serve as weekend associate at St. Nicholas Parish, Laurel, Maryland, where he celebrates the Liturgy every weekend. In addition, he has presented at his parish many lectures on the Bible. In a number of other parishes in the Washington area he has also given conferences to adult education classes. Because of his outgoing and affable personality, he has been much in demand to celebrate weddings, funerals, and other liturgical services. Notwithstanding all these activities, Father Gignac remained a faithful and attentive son, visiting his aged mother at least once a day for many years prior to her death in 2005, at the age of 106.

His Bibliography at the end of this volume attests only to some of Francis T. Gignac's academic accomplishments. A first-rate scholar and outstanding teacher for many decades, he has likewise been a mentor and friend of hundreds of undergraduate students, not to mention the many dozens of graduate and doctoral students he has shepherded through to the Ph.D. Always accessible and friendly to students as well as colleagues and knowledgeable as regards sometimes involved procedures, Father Gignac has rendered invaluable service to Biblical Studies at The Catholic University of America as well as to the Church in the United States.

May the Lord grant him many more years of productive service in his career as educator, administrator, and pastoral associate.

Alexander A. Di Lella, O.F.M.
Professor Emeritus of Biblical Studies
The Catholic University of America

# Introduction

This Festschrift honors a great scholar, educator, and Jesuit. For several decades Francis T. Gignac has been an inspiring teacher of students at all levels of higher education, from undergraduates to doctoral researchers. At the Catholic University of America, where he chaired the Biblical Studies Department for many years, he is often the first faculty member that students get to know well through his rigorous Greek language courses in New Testament and Septuagint. All who have learned from him have been inspired by him to deeper study. As supervisor or reader for numerous dissertations, he is known for his thoroughness, accessibility, rapidity in returning work (always a major concern for doctoral students), astute comments,—particularly in matters of Greek language and grammar—and fairness. He is a scholar with an unrivaled knowledge of the Greek language, and his grammar of the Greek papyri remains a landmark work. He has also served the Church as chair of the *New American Bible* Revision Committee for the New Testament. Alongside his love of Greek, anyone acquainted with him knows his other passion: running. He has taken part in a number of marathons, even at a mature age. At one stage the editors of this volume thought of calling the book "Running the Race."

In bringing this volume together, it has been impossible to represent all Professor Gignac's intellectual interests, which include the historical development of the Greek language, the grammar of the papyri, textual criticism, and comparative linguistics. To do justice to all these interests would have required a highly detailed work. Instead, the aim of the Festschrift is more modest. This volume takes its inspiration from the honoree's long career teaching Septuagintal and New Testament Greek. These studies in the Greek Bible shed light on linguistic aspects of a variety of texts from Genesis to Revelation.

Several of Professor Gignac's specializations in his various writings are represented here: history of the Greek language (Aitken), verbal aspect (Porter, Skemp), Semitic interference (Maloney, Corley); Coptic (Timbie); lexicography (O'Connor); and translation technique (Flynn). The honoree's years of teaching Septuagintal Greek are reflected in other essays on the LXX (Dines, Hayward, Di Lella). In addition, because Professor Gignac has been involved in the Church's academic life, it is fitting that some essays touch on contemporary issues, such as the ideology of martyrdom (Whitters) and the theology of the diaconate (Koet). Thus, the diversity of subject matter is a testimony to the broad interests and competences of the honoree.

On a personal note the editors wish to acknowledge the help, advice, and encouragement in the planning of the volume, which they received from the late Michael O'Connor. It is a great sadness that he did not live to see the publication of this book. May he rest in peace.

The editors are grateful to all contributors who wrote articles to honor the dedicatee. They would also like to thank Deirdre Blair Brennan and Joseph E. Jensen for expert typographical assistance, and Patrick Welsh for help with proofreading. They are grateful to Patricia Klucas, theology student at the College of St. Catherine, for assistance with the index of Ancient Sources, and to the College of St. Catherine for the Arts and Humanities Collaborative Research Grant awarded to Ms. Klucas and Prof. Skemp for their work on that index. In addition, gratitude is due to Professor Mark Smith for accepting this volume in the Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series. But above all, the Festschrift is offered in grateful tribute to Professor Frank Gignac, inspiring teacher and great scholar.

Jeremy Corley and Vincent Skemp, editors

# Part One

---

# Genesis Creation Traditions

# Creation under Control: Power Language in Genesis 1:1–2:3

JENNIFER M. DINES

By the time the seventh day arrives, the climax of the story-line of Gen 1:1–2:3, God is ready to take a break. The work inaugurated on Day One is complete: heaven and earth have been created and their component parts given functions. In the heavens is a firmament whose task is to separate the upper and lower waters and constitute the sky (1:6-8), thus providing a space where the luminaries can regulate time and provide light (1:14-19). On the earth, both dry land and sea have produced living things capable of reproduction (1:11, 20, 24), and human beings have been put in charge (1:26, 28). All parts of this cosmos have been given functions, but only two groups have received authority: the luminaries and human beings.

The main purpose of the following study is to examine the language in which God devolves power in the opening chapters of Septuagint (LXX) Genesis and to draw out some of the implications.[1] First, however, I propose to set the scene by considering 1:1–2:3 in the Masoretic Text (MT) because, although the LXX is a text in its own right, it is still instructive to read Greek and Hebrew as contrasting versions: the Septuagintal portrayal of the first creation narrative stands out even more clearly when read in partnership with the more familiar MT.[2]

---

[1] An earlier version of this paper was read at the July 2001 meeting of the Society for Old Testament Study.

[2] My emphasis is on the two texts as we now read them in the standard editions (for the LXX, Alfred Rahlfs, *Septuaginta: Id est Vetus Testamentum graece* [Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1935]; John William Wevers, *Septuaginta. Vetus*

## The Language of Power in Gen 1:14-19, 24-28 MT

*a. Gen 1:14-19*

Throughout the first three days of creation (Gen 1:1-13), Elohim has been in sole charge.[3] The events of the fourth day partly follow previous patterns: Elohim first states his wish that there should be "luminaries," or "lamps" in the sky (1:14; cf. 1:3, 6, 9, 11) and defines their purpose (1:14-15, cf. 1:6).[4] He then carries out his own command (1:16, cf. 1:7). The functions of these "lamps" are, however, described in unprecedented detail. Not only are they to divide day from night;[5] they are also to act as portents, mark special occasions, days and years (1:14) and shed light on the earth (1:15).

When Elohim actually makes "the two great lamps . . . and the stars" (1:16), the former (clearly the sun and moon) receive an additional function: each is to exercise "rule" (ממשלת) over daytime and night-time. Here, the language of power occurs for the first time. Until

---

*Testamentum Graecum, 1 Genesis* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1974], both based on Codex Alexandrinus; for the MT, K. Elliger and W. Rudolph, *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* [Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1967], following Codex Leningradensis). I set aside issues concerning the textual relationship between the two versions, and for the most part I leave open the question whether differences in the LXX have come from the translator or were already in the latter's Hebrew *Vorlage*. For some significant recent studies which address the text-critical issues (and come to differing conclusions), see William P. Brown, *Structure, Role, and Ideology in the Hebrew and Greek Texts of Genesis 1:1-2:3* (SBLDS 132; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993 [the translator's *Vorlage* differed from and antedated that of the MT]); Martin Rösel, *Überlieferung als Vollendung der Auslegung: Studien zur Genesis-Septuaginta* (BZAW 223; Berlin/New York: W. De Gruyter, 1994 [the translator deliberately adjusted a Hebrew text virtually identical with the MT]); Ronald S. Hendel, *The Text of Genesis 1-11: Textual Studies and Critical Edition* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998 [the translator used a Hebrew text dependent on the proto-MT, marked especially by harmonizations]).

[3] This divine title, probably a "plural of majesty," is used consistently by the Priestly author in Gen 1:1–2:3. It is a broad, somewhat mysterious, term for divinity, but may also, and appropriately here, carry a nuance of "the one in authority," as in some non-divine contexts where it designates a ruler or judge (e.g., Exod 21:6 [?]; 22:8). The idea of supremacy is prominent in rabbinic explanations; see (e.g.) Meir Zlotowitz, *Bereishis/Genesis* (New York: Mesorah Publications, 1977) 32-33.

[4] The choice of מארות seems to emphasise the luminaries as serviceable objects. However, as discussion of the MT in this article is only preliminary to that of the LXX, no detailed discussion of individual words is offered here or in subsequent verses. For the issues touched on, the standard commentaries may be consulted.

[5] Thus taking over Elohim's own activity in 1:4; so Brown, *Structure*, 38.

now, power has been expressed only through the divine jussives ("let there be . . .") which create what they command; any suggestion that the craftsman God of 1:1 (if this is the root meaning of Hebrew ברא) is also an absolute monarch has been no more than a delicate hint.[6] With the noun ממשלת ("rule," derived from משל) in 1:16, and with the verb itself in 1:18, the theme of power becomes explicit.

This idea of power may be reinforced when, in 1:17, Elohim "sets" the luminaries in the firmament, using an apparently neutral verb (נתן "give," "put"). But נתן may also suggest the "appointment," by a superior, of high officials or even kings, as when Pharaoh "sets" Joseph over all Egypt (Gen 41:41), or when Saul is presented to the people as the king whom Yhwh has "given" (1 Sam 12:13), or when David blesses Yhwh for "giving" his successor (1 Kgs 1:48). Although not widespread, this usage of נתן plausibly colors Gen 1:16.[7] What is this "appointment"? In 1:14, the luminaries are to "separate day and night," "be portents," and "give light". In 1:17-18, the order is reversed: they are first to shine, and lastly to divide. But whereas, in 1:14, their central task is to "be portents" and so make time possible, in 1:17 it is more actively to "rule." "Being portents" and "ruling" are the central points of the chiasm, suggesting that the "rule" of the luminaries is, in fact, their astronomical behavior.

### b. Gen 1:26-28

There are no more power words until the creation of human beings on the sixth day. Perhaps adopting the royal "we" used by Persian (and later by Hellenistic) kings, as in, for instance, Ezra 4:18 (cf. 1 Macc 10:19), Elohim states his intention of making humankind and giving them "dominion."[8] Whatever else may be implied, the making of "adam" in the image of Elohim clearly suggests the concept, and the language, of

---

[6] "[W]ithout using the word, the author of Gen 1 celebrates the Creator as King, supreme in all the qualities which belong to the ideal of kingship"; Robert Murray, *The Cosmic Covenant* (Heythrop Monographs 7; London: Sheed & Ward, 1992) 98.

[7] Other occurrences include Num 14:4 (a military commander); Ezra 8:20 (temple servants); Neh 13:4 (a priest).

[8] To be sure, there are other explanations for the enigmatic "we." See Monique Alexandre, *Le Commencement du Livre: Genèse I-V. La version grecque de la Septante et sa réception* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1988) 169-75.

ancient kingship, where the king is the "image" of the patron deity, on whose behalf he rules.[9]

The blessing in 1:28 does not initially mark humans out as different from the other creatures with "breath" (נפש), since these have already been blessed and commanded to reproduce (1:22). The difference comes with the addition that humans are to "subdue" (כבש) the earth and "have dominion" (רדה, as in 1:26). In marked contrast to the creation of the heavenly bodies, Elohim provides no reasons for making humans but, if there are echoes here of ancient Near Eastern stories like those in *Atrahasis* or *Enuma Elish*, where humans are created to be the gods' menial servants, then the work which humans are expected to take off the divine shoulders in Gen 1:26, 28 is far from paltry.[10]

Explicit power language, then, occurs only in the creation of the luminaries (משל, ממשלת) and human beings (כבש, רדה). But, by appointing "lamps" to "rule" and humans to "have dominion" and to "subdue," Elohim has effectively created a system for the command of the whole cosmos: the luminaries have authority "in the sky" and humans exercise power "on the earth." Humans on earth thus match the luminaries in heaven. The use of different verbs, however, also establishes a distance between them so that the two realms are kept separate. The implications of the three verbs used (כבש, רדה, משל) repay brief consideration.

### 1. משל

This verb, like מלך, is used generally for "ruling." It is, however, striking that, apart from Gen 1:18, all occurrences have a personal subject, whether divine or human. There may, therefore, be a suggestion

---

that the luminaries too are in some sense personified.[11] At any rate, the verb makes it clear that the functions of the luminaries are analogous to the rule exercised elsewhere by personalities. In the rest of Genesis there are two types of usage. One involves mastery: man is to dominate woman (3:16); Cain is to dominate "sin" (4:7); Joseph's brothers understand very well that "bowing down" means being dominated by him (37:8). The other denotes the exercise of responsible power under a superior: Abraham's old retainer "rules" over the household (24:2); Joseph's mandate is for all Egypt (45:8, 26). It is within this second category that Gen 1:18 finds its place: the luminaries are responsible for the smooth running of Elohim's world.

## 2. רדה

Unlike משל, this verb, also meaning "rule," seems to have an inherent sense of domination. It occurs only here within Genesis.[12] Elsewhere, it always appears in contexts where power is exerted over others who are forcibly subjected to it. Examples include: Solomon's dominion (1 Kgs 5:4 [NRSV 4:24]); the activity of Solomon's slave-overseers (1 Kgs 9:23; rather too benignly rendered by NRSV as "having charge"); Israel's eschatological domination of their oppressors (Isa 14:2). The verb is used with approval, from the perspective of the "dominator," as in Pss 72:8; 110:2 (Israel's king is to dominate his foes). The tone is not, however, always triumphalistic. Thus, Ezek 34:4 condemns Israel's "shepherds" for ruling oppressively; Lev 25:43 forbids "ruling" debt-slaves harshly, while the penalty for disobeying God in Lev 26:17 is that "your foes will rule over you" (cf. Neh 9:6).[13] Human domination of the natural world in Genesis 1 has surely to be seen in the light of a consistent imagery of conqueror and conquered. Although it is evidently presented in a positive way, the warnings of Leviticus and Ezekiel cast something of an ominous shadow over Elohim's decision.

---

[11] For מארות as angels (or the sphere of angels) in later interpretations, see J. M. Dines, "Light from the Septuagint on the New Testament—or *vice versa*?" in *Voces Biblicae* (ed. Jan Joosten and Peter Tomson; CBET 49; Leuven: Peeters, 2007) 17–34.

[12] It may have been the original verb behind the second occurrence of ורבו in 9:7, but this is a conjecture, not supported by the LXX or other witnesses.

[13] Lev 25:43 LXX revealingly renders רדה by κατατείνειν, "stretch," "torture," a technical term for overworking a laborer in *P. Tebt* 61⁶ 197 (2ⁿᵈ century *B.C.E.*); cf. Ezek 34:4 LXX, κατεργάζεσθαι, "wear down," "subdue with toil."

3. כבש

The final verb, too, occurs uniquely here within Genesis, but other contexts give it a sense similar to רדה. In several places it is a technical term for enforced, and sometimes illegal, debt enslavement, strongly disapproved of in Jer 34:11, 16; 2 Chr 28:10; Neh 5:5. In Esth 7:8, it describes a supposed sexual assault (rape is also listed among the results of enslavement in Neh 5:5). The most frequent sense, however, is of conquest by warfare, as in Num 32:22, 29; Josh 18:1; 2 Sam 8:11; 1 Chr 22:18; perhaps Zech 9:15. The underlying image may be of trampling (Mic 7:19 speaks of God metaphorically treading Judah's sins underfoot).[14] All the contexts again suggest something potentially, perhaps uncomfortably, aggressive in Gen 1:28. Although there is as yet no hint of the earth producing thorns (3:18), or of human strife (4:8), and although 1:29-30 suggest that there is no hunting—or being hunted—for food, Elohim is apparently taking no chances. His kingly "image" is to be a warrior, conquering and subduing all other creatures. This aggressive language is often interpreted in terms of stewardship or of the benign responsibilities of the Davidic king. But the theme of stewardship, in the technical sense of managing a property on behalf of its owner, although possible for רדה (Gen 24:2), is more prominent in Gen 2:15, while Psalm 72, where the king is to judge his people as Elohim judges (72:1-2), and care for the poor (72:3, 12-14), as well as defeating his enemies and ruling an empire (72:8-11), provides a more rounded view of the nature and responsibilities of kingship. Genesis 1:26-28 can certainly be read in this wider perspective, as Robert Murray eloquently demonstrates.[15] But the fact remains that the vocabulary here stresses the more violent aspects. In addition, despite the assertion that the human "image" was created "male and female" (1:27), the verbs of 1:28 suggest that the authority of the "adam" ("humankind," the universalized and democratized "king") doubtless requires the aggressive work of male persons.

In summary, it can be seen that two different strategies have been employed by Elohim for those creatures that are to take over his work as supreme commander ("let there be . . ."). The luminaries are to "rule" through the regularity of their behavior. Humans, ostensibly

---

[14] This is explicit in Aramaic and Syriac; cf. also כֶּבֶשׁ as the footstool of Solomon's throne (2 Chr 9:18).

[15] Murray, *Cosmic Covenant*, 98-99.

both sexes, but in reality doubtless only the male, are to "subdue" and "dominate" in a more aggressive way. We are now in a position to see how the LXX presents this devolution of power.

## The Language of Power in Gen 1:14-19, 24-28 LXX

The first significant difference is that, whereas the MT employs three different verbs for "rule" (רדה, משל, and כבש), the LXX uses only two. Where משל and רדה occur (1:18, 26, 28), the LXX has ἄρχειν and where כבש occurs (1:28), it has κατακυριεύειν. The Hebrew distinction between the "rule" of the luminaries (1:18, משל) and that of humans (1:26, 28, רדה, כבש) is thus overridden; the use of ἄρχειν in both passages unifies the realms of heaven and earth.[16] A detailed examination of the two Greek verbs will highlight further differences.

### *1. ἄρχειν*

In 1:18, this verb is a suitable parallel to משל. Although the primary meaning is "begin," it easily extends into "have primacy," "rule," "govern."[17] It does not, however, have the implication of force inherent in רדה, so in 1:26, 28 it is a less obvious choice. The translator could, of course, have chosen a different verb in both passages, since Greek is rich in this semantic area—κρατεῖν, for instance, or ἡγεῖσθαι, or δυναστεύειν, or ἡγεμονεύειν. It will shortly become clear why he did not.

### 1.1 *εἰς ἀρχάς*

But first a question must be asked about the relationship between εἰς ἀρχάς and לממשלת in 1:16. This is a strange equivalence, with significant interpretational consequences. There are two uncertainties: (1) the Hebrew behind ἀρχάς, and (2) the force of both εἰς and ἀρχάς since each is ambiguous: εἰς could point to either function ("for") or

---

[16] Philippe Lefebvre, "Les mots de la Septante, ont-ils trois dimensions?" in *Selon la Septante* (ed. Gilles Dorival and Olivier Munnich; Paris: Cerf, 1995) 299-320, here 311, 318.

[17] John William Wevers (*Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis* [SBLSCS; Atlanta GA: Scholars Press, 1993] 9), distinguishes "sharply" (his own word) between ἀρχεῖν "begin" and ἀρχεῖν "rule," but this seems an unnecessary distinction.

identity ("as"), while ἀρχάς could mean either "rule," "rulers," or "beginning(s)."[18]

(1) In the MT מֶמְשֶׁלֶת is a singular form, a construct of מֶמְשָׁלָה, "rule," "dominion." But the unpointed consonants could be taken as a plural, מֶמְשְׁל(ו)ת, and this is what exegetes often assume. Psalm 136:9 MT can be cited in support, although the plural is not found in all witnesses. It is not, however, necessary to suppose a plural, as the Genesis translator does not always match singulars and plurals; for example, οὐρανός translates שמים (1:1); βίβλος תולדות (2:4); τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ מלאכתו (2:1); ἅρματα רכב (50:9). So ἀρχαί could have been chosen as an "abstract plural," matching Hebrew's abstract singular.[19]

What complicates the issue is that ἀρχαί can also refer to those who exercise power—"magistrates," "authorities," or even "rulers" (cf. ἄρχοντες)—and this was how the phrase was sometimes understood in early interpretations.[20] It is possible, although unverifiable, that the translator too may have had this in mind (there were, after all, long-established Jewish traditions of star-angels to draw on).[21] Plato considered the stars to be animate and rational (as, later, did Philo). The choice of φωστῆρ(ες) for מאר(ות) may also be significant. Although an exact (even prosaic) rendering ("light-giver," "lamp"), it is attested at least once referring metaphorically to a king (Themistocles *Or.* 16.204C).

But why choose a form of ἀρχή at all? The word has already been used in 1:1, in the sense of "beginning," for Hebrew ראשית. It is true that the translator sometimes uses one Greek word for two different Hebrew ones, for instance ποιεῖν for both ברא and עשה. There, how-

---

[18] Marguerite Harl, *La Genèse* (La Bible d'Alexandrie I; Paris: Cerf, 1986) 92; so Rösel, *Überlieferung*, 44.

[19] So Wevers, *Notes*, 9. H. W. Smyth (*Greek Grammar* [rev. ed; Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1959] 270, #1000[3]) gives examples, although none involves the plural of ἀρχή. An instance occurs, however, in Sophocles *Ant.* 744: ἁμαρτάνω γὰρ τὰς ἐμὰς ἀρχὰς σέβων; ("am I wrong to respect my own authority?"). Or, one might suppose a "plural of majesty," of the kind listed by Smyth, *Grammar* 270, #1006, intended "to lend dignity"; cf. Sophocles *Ant.* 1041; Aeschylus *Ag.* 1265, both with θρόνοι.

[20] Especially in Origen; see *Philocalia* 1.20; *Peri Archon* 1.7 (SC 302 [1983] 422-24). For other patristic evidence, see Dines, "Light from the Septuagint."

[21] See Bernard Teyssèdre, *Anges, astres et cieux: Figures de la destinée et du salut* (Paris: Albin Michel, 1986) esp.105-6; cf. Wis 13:2, φωστῆρας οὐρανοῦ πρυτάνεις κόσμου, "luminaries of heaven, rulers of the cosmos."

ever, both biblical words belong to the same semantic area of "making," whereas ראשית ("beginning") and ממשלה ("rule") appear to be quite different. But perhaps, for the translator, they were not so far apart semantically: both ראש and ἀρχή can express status, a sense which could have affected both בראשית and ἐν ἀρχῇ in 1:1.[22]

Whatever the reason for the choice, we have a phrase in Greek which blurs the distinction between the role of the luminaries as "ruling" and as "inaugurating" day and night.[23] Other passages in the LXX show that both senses are possible. In Lam 2:19, εἰς ἀρχάς (rendering ראשים) is temporal ("the beginnings of your watch"); Exod 6:25 implies that ἀρχαί are both "originators" and "leaders". Philo, too, exploits the versatility of ἀρχή by treating the four "heads" or ἀρχαί (ראשים) of the rivers in Gen 2:4 as four types of rule.[24]

(2) If the presence of משל behind εἰς ἀρχάς tips the scales in favor of "rule" as being at least partly what the translator wanted to convey, it still does not solve the problem of whether the plural is abstract ("for governing"), or personal ("as rulers"). In the former case, the function of the luminaries is the focus of attention; in the latter it is the luminaries themselves.[25] Once again the question must be asked, why choose a rendering open to so much ambiguity? Why this assonance and echo between ἐν ἀρχῇ and εἰς ἀρχάς?

---

[22] Later understandings of ἀρχή in Gen 1:1 as a "power" by which (ἐν) God created the universe involve the figure of wisdom (Prov 8:22-31; Bar 3:20-32) and lead to the identification of Christ as ἀρχή (Col 1:15-18, where the dual sense of ἀρχή is exploited to the full). See Lefebvre, 'Les mots,' 309, 317; Harl, *La Genèse*, 86. For Jewish interpretations of בראשית along parallel lines, see (e.g.) Targum Neofiti; cf. Alexandre, *Le Commencement*, 67. Philo seems to exclude this approach (*Opif.* 23).

[23] It may be noted, too, that the LXX has not reproduced the chiastic arrangement of the Hebrew. The addition of εἰς φαῦσιν τῆς γῆς ("for illumination of the earth") in 1:14 creates a new pattern where the emphasis is on light-giving rather than, as in the MT, division. For a discussion of the translator's *Vorlage* here, see Hendel, *Text*, 28-29.

[24] According to Philo, *Leg.* I.65, ἀρχὰς δὲ οὐ τὰς τοπικὰς λαμβάνει ἀλλὰ τὰς ἡγεμονικάς, "'heads' [Moses] takes not in the sense of locality but of sovereignty" (note the abstract plurals); cf. F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker, *Philo, Vol. 1* (LCL, 226; Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1929; reprint 1991) 189. The four heads are equated with the Stoic cardinal virtues. A further ambiguity is that τὰς ἀρχὰς often means 'at first' (e.g., Polybius 16.22.8); cf. uncertainty over the translation of τὴν ἀρχήν in John 8:25.

[25] In 1 Chr 12:33 εἰς ἀρχάς apparently has a personal sense (MT ראשיהם), possibly echoing Gen 1:16 (εἰς τοὺς καιρούς also occurs). The text is, however, problematic, and Rahlfs adopts the majority reading, εἰς τὰς ἀρχὰς αὐτῶν.

The answer must lie with the translator's wider use of ἀρχεῖν and ἀρχή throughout Gen 1:1–2:3, representing both "begin" and "rule," and rendering a variety of Hebrew terms. This can be demonstrated as follows:

| | LXX | MT |
|---|---|---|
| 1:1 | ἐν ἀρχῇ (beginning) | בראשית (beginning) |
| 1:16 | εἰς ἀρχάς (beginning/rule) | לממשלת (rule) |
| 1:18 | ἀρχεῖν (rule) | למשל (rule) |
| 1:26 | ἀρχέτωσαν (rule) | וירדו (dominate) |
| 1:28 | ἄρχετε (rule) | ורדו (dominate) |
| 2:3 | ἤρξατο (begin) | ברא (create) [26] |

A striking inclusio between 1:1 and 2:3 is established in the MT by the use of ברא and, more subtly, in the LXX by ἐν ἀρχῇ and ἤρξατο. Between these two markers in the LXX runs a thread which suggests that "primacy," whether temporal or honorific, is important in the translator's understanding of creation. He not only links the "ruling" function of luminaries and humans, but also perhaps sees "beginning" in terms of "ruling," of establishing order.[27] This translator is certainly capable of thinking on a grand scale, and of creating resonances not in the parent text. A striking example is the repetition of ἐπεφέρετο in 1:2 and 7:18 (the movement of the divine πνεῦμα, MT מרחפת, "hovering" (?), and of the ark, MT הלך, "went").[28] He is also sensitive to context, as may be seen in, for instance, various renderings in 1:2.[29] Lefebvre is surely right to suggest that the blurring of distinctions between the two senses of ἀρχή is deliberate.[30] The ambiguity was certainly picked up as soon as the Greek text was read apart from, or in ignorance of, the

---

[26] Cf. Lefebvre, "Les mots," 304-6.

[27] The verb ברא in 2:3 seems to have been deliberately "reread" to echo בראשית so as to produce the anomalous ἤρξατο. The MT's final word, לעשׂות, has been rendered ποιῆσαι as usual. The translator has both avoided the MT's tautology and created his own link with 1:1. Wevers (*Notes,* 21) comments that בראשית actually starts with the consonants of ברא. For the nuances of ἤρξατο, see Harl, *La Genèse*, 99. Brown (*Structure*, 56, n. 79) remarks on the *inclusio*, as do Wevers and Lefebvre; but neither Brown nor Lefebvre sees any correlation between בראשית and ἤρξατο.

[28] On this Greek verb and its Coptic rendering see the article by Janet Timbie in the present volume.

[29] See J. M. Dines, "Imaging Creation: The Septuagint Translation of Genesis 1:2," *HeyJ* 36 (1995) 439-50.

[30] Lefebvre, "Les mots," 311, 318.

Hebrew. But, again, it may be a mistake to read Gen 1:1 (in either version) in too crudely temporal a way. As Philo, for one, point outs, time as such begins only with the creation of the luminaries on the fourth day. What happens on "day one" is of a different order: the determinative event, "prime time" (*Opif.* 15,26-28).[31]

To sum up this discussion of the implications of ἀρχεῖν (and ἀρχαί): the "rule" of the luminaries in the LXX is infused more than in the MT with the idea of "initiating" as well as of "ordering," and conversely, the very beginning of the process of creation may carry a clearer overtone of authority. The "rule" of humans is also expressed through ἀρχεῖν, which both puts them on the same level as the luminaries and softens the aggressive implications of רדה.[32] It remains to examine the other verb used in Gen 1:28 LXX.

### *2. κατακυριεύειν*

In 1:28, the compound κατακυριεύειν ("subdue," "exercise dominion") is an interesting choice for כבש. It is difficult to assess the force of the prefix. Κατα- here may merely reflect a penchant for compound verbs typical of Koine and very frequent in the LXX. Or it may radicalize the simple verb κυριεύειν to suggest "absolute mastery" (as in Diodorus Siculus 14.64, where Syracusan raiders "gain complete control" of a ship).[33] Or, it may attempt to capture the "trampling down" effect suggested by כבש since this verb is strikingly rendered by κατα- compounds in nearly all its occurrences.[34]

---

[31] Alexandre (*Le Commencement*, 130-40); Harl (*La Genèse*, 92-93); Lefebvre ("Les mots," 304) all acknowledge the ambiguity of εἰς ἀρχάς. Wevers (*Notes*, 9) seems, strangely, to exclude it by stating that in 1:16 "beginning" would make no sense.

[32] Alexandre, however (*Le Commencement*, 189), thinks that ἄρχειν is more "abstract."

[33] This is the only non-biblical reference given by LSJ for the rare compound. LSJ list as the chief senses of κατα- (1) "down(wards)"; (2) "in accordance with"; (3) "against"; (4) "back"; or (5) as simply strengthening the idea of the simple verb (cf. Walter Bauer in *BDAG*³, 1999, xviii; so Rösel, *Überlieferung*, 51).

[34] 2 Kgdms 8:11 and Neh 5:5 (καταδυναστεύειν); 2 Chr 28:10 (κατακτᾶσθαι); Mic 7:19 (καταδύ[ν]ειν); Zech 9:15 (καταχωννύναι) all have verbs prefixed with κατα-; cf. Esth 7:8 (ἐκ- A); 1 Chr 22:18 (ὑπο-). These references account for almost all occurrences of כבש. However, Alexandre (*Le Commencement*, 202) thinks that the "ownership" sense of κυριεύειν softens the impact; again, she calls this a more "abstract" rendering. And see below, n. 39.

The verb κατακυριεύειν itself (rare in Koine) recurs in Genesis only once, in 9:1, a plus over against the MT. Here, καὶ κατακυριεύσατε αὐτῆς ("and subdue it [i.e., the earth]") completes the blessing of Noah and his sons with a more exact repetition of 1:28. Coming immediately before the permission to eat meat in 9:3, the words which follow the blessing in 9:2 ("the fear and dread of you shall rest on every animal") well suggest the implications of κατακυριεύειν.[35] Only in Jer 3:14 where, uniquely, it renders בעל, does the verb have a benign sense, interestingly matching the "ownership" sense inherent in both Greek and Hebrew roots. That it belongs primarily to the field of triumphant kingship (evoked metaphorically in Gen 1:28; 9:1 by the "conquest" of the animals, and in 9:2 by their "fear") is demonstrated in, for instance, Ps 71(72):8, where it represents רדה (the verb rendered by ἀρχεῖν in Gen 1:26, 28).[36] Other Septuagintal examples include Ps 9:26 (MT 10:5), of enemies, apparently interpreting (and intensifying?) פוח, "scoff"; Ps 48(49):15;[37] 109(110):2 (both rendering רדה). Other contexts involving force and conquest include Ps 18:14 (MT 19:13, משל); 118(119):133 (שלט); LXX Dan 11:39 (משל); and 1 Macc 15:30.[38] There is presumably no such nuance in Gen 1:28 but, as with the Hebrew verbs used here, other passages cast their shadow, and it does look as if κατακυριεύειν is more forceful than κυριεύειν alone.[39]

---

[35] Cf. Rösel, *Überlieferung*, 194-195. For the question of the *Vorlage* see Hendel, *Text*, 30-31. There is an echo of the juxtaposition in Sir 17:4.

[36] The theme of the relationship with animals is thoroughly discussed by Alexandre, *Le Commencement*, 89-192.

[37] The MT's reading here, וירדו בם, is often questioned, but the LXX's κατακυριεύσουσιν already supposes the root רדה.

[38] An oppressive sense is found also in the NT, e.g., Mark 10:42; 1 Pet 5:3; cf. Lev 25:43.

[39] The simple verb κυριεύειν, meaning "to be lord/master," is much more frequently used than the compound. It is found in the writings of Aristotle and Xenophon and in papyri from the third century B.C.E., in domestic, political and military contexts. It can have an oppressive sense, as in Gen 3:16; 37:8 (the only two occurrences of the verb in Genesis, rendering משל each time). Mainly, however, it expresses the (legitimized) power of ownership, however that may have been acquired; cf. Gen 3:16, of the man as master of his wife, where there may be overtones of a power-relationship not intended by God at the beginning. But κατακυριεύειν does not occur here, and the only places where κατακυριεύειν renders משל in the LXX are Ps 18(19):13 and Dan 11:39 (both of unjust oppressors). A reverse situation to Gen 3:16 is mentioned by Diodorus Siculus: an Egyptian claim that wives legitimately "lord it" (κυριεύειν) over their husbands, thanks to the prominent role of Isis after the death of Osiris (1.27.2).

As early as the first century C.E., Philo shows himself sensitive to some of the implications. He stresses the royal nature of the first humans, and supposes the animals to have been instantly tamed, recognizing "a born ruler or master" (ἡγεμόνα φύσει καὶ δεσπότην).⁴⁰ Humankind, he says, has been expressly appointed by God to be king (βασιλεῦς) over all other creatures (he is, of course, thinking in exclusively masculine terms). Human rule (ἀρχή) is, however, demonstrated not by force but by the ability to tame animals. The absolute power suggested by κατακυριεύειν (although Philo does not use this verb) is toned down and put in perspective: humankind is "like a governor (ὕπαρχος) subordinate to the chief and great King" (*Opif.* 83-88). It is striking that, through the use of κατακυριεύειν, the LXX gives "the man/human being" (τὸν ἄνθρωπον) the role of a master (κύριος) several verses before God receives this title: the Tetragrammaton in MT 2:4 is still rendered as ὁ θεός and only in 2:8 as κύριος—appropriately, for God here is a landowner, planting his lordly estate (παράδεισος, cf. 3:16).⁴¹

To sum up, κατακυριεύειν in Gen 1:28 suggests that humans are put to work in the world as successful warrior kings with ownership rights; this expands on the more neutral use of ἄρχειν in 1:26, 28—a verb which, I have suggested, was chosen primarily to maintain the leitmotiv of ruling/beginning developed by the translator from 1:1 to 2:3.

## Conclusion

In conveying God's means of ensuring that "heaven and earth" are able to function smoothly, the MT distinguishes between the heavenly and earthly spheres: in the former, the luminaries "rule" (מָשַׁל) in their capacity as astronomical signs and light-givers; in the latter, the king-like control accorded to humans is underlined by the complementary verbs רדה and כבש. In the LXX, heavenly and earthly realms are

---

⁴⁰ The Philo references in this paragraph are from *Opif.* 83-88.

⁴¹ In Genesis 1, ὁ θεός as the rendering of אלהים is usually taken to designate divinity in its broadest sense, although the presence of the definite article (absent in the MT) might have a particularizing effect. But θεός quite often occurs in Koine as a royal title (e.g., Πτολεμαῖος ὑπάρχων θεὸς ἐκ θεοῦ καὶ θεᾶς, *OGI* 90.10, Egypt, 196 *B.C.E.*). It does not seem impossible that—*pace* Philo, who often attempts to distinguish between θεός as benevolent creator and κύριος as punitive judge (e.g., *Leg.* I.95-96)—the designation in Genesis 1 contributes something of a kingly sense to the LXX's portrait of God, especially if Genesis was translated in Ptolemaic Egypt.

more closely related as a single cosmos, since the repetition of ἄρχειν in 1:16-18 and 1:26-28 equates the power exercised by luminaries and human beings alike. That the idea of "primacy" was important for the translator is further indicated by the binding together of 1:1 and 2:3 with ἐν ἀρχῇ and ἤρξατο. If אלהים carries a nuance of lordship, ὁ θεός has possibly made it more prominent. If, by re-using ἄρχειν in 1:26, the translator has sacrificed the stronger sense of רדה, he has, in 1:28, compensated by choosing κατακυριεύειν for כבש, a forceful verb suggesting legal ownership as well as physical might rather more clearly than the Hebrew.

In both versions, however, 1:16-19 and 1:26-28 mark the two moments when God passes responsibility for the long-term maintenance of the cosmos to his creatures. To what extent the LXX already thinks of the luminaries as "rulers," animate and even personal, depends on what exactly is meant by εἰς ἀρχάς and, although this remains unclear, the ambiguity is probably deliberate. What is clear is that the humans created in the divine image are given the status of kings, in terms suggestive of at least one aspect of the ideology of kingship expressed most fully in Pss 71(72) and 88(89):1-37. These humans, who are to maintain order (ἄρχειν, 1:26, 28; cf. 1:18) by the exercise of force and ownership (κατακυριεύειν, 1:28), are not mere servants, or even stewards or overseers (2:15; cf. Matt 25:14). Nor do they merely "help" God: the language of "helping" appears only in 2:18, and then it is in the context of human relationships, not of the governing of the world.[42] According to Gen 1:1–2:3, God does not share power; he really hands it over to his creatures. There is no hint yet that human behaviour will require intervention of the most drastic kind (Gen 6:5-8, 11-13). God can, therefore, rest on the first Sabbath (2:2-3), secure that what he has just made with so much satisfaction (1:31) will not, in the meantime, revert to the chaos (1:2) from which it was brought.

---

[42] It is striking that no power words occur in 2:21-24.

# Guarding Head and Heel: Observations on Septuagint Genesis 3:15

C. T. ROBERT HAYWARD

The Hebrew text of Gen 3:15 presents a number of difficulties which the LXX translators resolved in a quite distinctive manner.[1] This essay attempts to elucidate one particular aspect of the LXX translation of that verse, the rendering of the rare Hebrew verb שׁוּף by the common Greek word τηρεῖν. The verse reports God's solemn address to the serpent, cursing it for its deception of Eve by putting enmity between the serpent and the woman, between the serpent's seed and hers, and predicting: הוא ישופך ראש ואתה תשופנו עקב, words commonly translated as "it shall bruise your head, and you shall bruise its heel."[2] The notion that the woman's offspring would hit the serpent's head, while the serpent's offspring would do damage to human heels, might be nothing more than a commonplace observation: people and serpents will always be enemies. Such an understanding of the verse evokes no

---

[1] The Masoretic Text of the Hebrew Bible (MT) is cited from *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (ed. K. Elliger and W. Rudolph; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1967-77), and the LXX from *Septuaginta, Vetus Testamentum Graecum* (ed. J. Ziegler et al.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1931-).

[2] See, for example, the translation of the Hebrew in M. Rosenbaum and A. M. Silbermann, *Pentateuch with Targum Onkelos, Haphtaroth and Rashi's Commentary, Genesis* (New York: Hebrew Publishing Company, 1952) 15. The Samaritan Pentateuch offers the same consonantal text as the MT: no biblical manuscript from Qumran containing this verse has survived.

problems.[3] On the surface, then, this common translation of the MT appears to be free of problems.

But some ancient exegetes were not satisfied with such a matter-of-fact interpretation of God's words, for they are the first divine sayings which Scripture records with future reference. They have a prophetic quality, underscored by their solemn, poetic formal style with its carefully crafted language.[4] Furthermore, God's first words of cursing are addressed to the serpent, not to the human pair; and they involve wordplay and the *repetition* of a rare verbal stem whose meaning is neither clear nor unequivocal. The precise significance of the words, therefore, would be a matter of importance.

The forms ישופך and תשופנו are generally believed to derive from the stem שוף, found only twice elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible. In Ps 139:11, the poet expresses the sentiment אך חשך ישופני, usually translated "surely darkness will conceal me."[5] This offers no help in translating Gen 3:15, where the meaning "conceal" or "cover" is simply inappropriate. Job 9:17 makes the suffering hero say of the Deity that ישופני בִּשְׂעָרָה, which may mean "He would bruise me with a storm wind": but the image is decidedly odd,[6] leading many commentators to vocalize the first Hebrew word (against MT and in agreement with Targum and Peshitta) as בְּשַׂעֲרָה to yield "He crushes me for a hair," a good parallel to the following "He wounds me much for no reason."[7] If such a reading is adopted, then it seems reasonable to ascribe the meaning "crush" or "bruise" to the stem שוף in this verse; yet such a

---

[3] This common sense explanation is suggested by the rendering of the verse as well as the comment by Jon D. Levenson in *The Jewish Study Bible* (ed. Adele Berlin and Marc Z. Brettler; Oxford: University Press, 2004) 8-101, here 17, and by the initial remarks of J. W. Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis* (SBLSCS 35; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993) 44.

[4] See G. J. Wenham, *Genesis 1-15* (WBC 1; Waco: Word Books, 1987) 79-81.

[5] So *The Jewish Study Bible* (ed. Berlin and Brettler), 1437, following Rashi and Ibn Ezra, and noting that the meaning of the Hebrew is uncertain. "Conceal" or "cover" are meanings most invoked (see, e.g., RSV), though commentators sometimes suggest emending to ישׁוכני, thus ensuring this very sense: see, e.g., H.-J.Kraus, *Psalmen* (2 vols.; BKAT 15; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1961) 2.914.

[6] One might think, however, of the "great wind" that destroyed Job's children in the Prologue (Job 1:19).

[7] See discussion in D. J. Clines, *Job 1-20* (WBC 17; Waco: Word Books, 1989) 218, recalling E. Dhorme, *Le Livre de Job* (Paris: Gabalda, 1926) on this verse; see also the translation in *The Jewish Study Bible* (ed. Berlin and Brettler) 1516.

meaning does not necessarily sit easily with the MT's vocalization of
בשערה (= "with a storm wind"), an observation which suggests that if
MT's vocalization is retained, then ישופני here might better be under-
stood as a form of שאף ("gasp, pant, long after").[8] There is doubt,
therefore, about the precise sense of שוף in Job 9:17, and the verse con-
sequently provides a somewhat uncertain guide to the meaning of the
stem when it occurs in Gen 3:15.

## The LXX Translation of Genesis 3:15

This discussion, however, does not prepare us for the oldest known
translation of the Hebrew of Gen 3:15. LXX translated the final words
of this verse as *αὐτός σου τηρήσει κεφαλήν καὶ σὺ τηρήσεις αὐτοῦ πτέρναν*,
"he shall watch over/guard/keep your head, and you shall watch over/
guard/keep his heel." In Septuagintal usage, *τηρεῖν* has a number of
overlapping senses, including "guard, keep, take care of, keep a watch
over, protect, observe."[9] Determining its exact meaning in the Greek
Pentateuch is nonetheless made difficult by the fact that, although the
word is common in the Greek tongue and in the Greek translation of
the Bible overall, it is found in the translation of the Pentateuch only
at Gen 3:15. John Wevers renders it as "watch carefully," dubbing it a
"neutral" translation indicating the wary relationship between people
and snakes.[10] Even so, some commentators have suggested that what
confronts us in LXX Gen. 3:15 is an error, and that we should instead
read *τειρήσει/τειρήσεις*, "he/you shall bruise, wear away, distress."[11]
Others hint that LXX discerned in the Hebrew text שאף ("gasp, pant,
long for") and translated with "watch, keep, guard" with that stem

---

[8] See S. R. Driver and G. B. Gray, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on
the Book of Job* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1921) 57-58 (Part II: Philological
Notes).

[9] See J. Lust, E.Eynikel, and K. Hauspie, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septu-
agint* (2 vols.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1992-1996) 2.475.

[10] See Wevers, *Notes*, 44.

[11] See Lust, Eynikel, and Hauspie, *Lexicon*, 2.475. According to H. Riesenfeld,
"*τηρέω*," in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, vol. 8 (ed. G. Friedrich,
trans. G. W. Bromiley; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972) 141, *τηρεῖν* in Gen 3:15 means
"aim at something" (cf. Philo, *Leg.* 3. 184, 188-189). While Philo does not precisely sup-
port Riesenfeld's interpretation, the latter's intuition may be significant (see discus-
sion below).

in mind.[12] Whatever factors influenced their translation, LXX almost certainly used words deriving from τηρεῖν, since Philo, quoting and commenting on Gen 3:15, cited the LXX version familiar to us, was evidently concerned about it, and showed no knowledge of any other reading.[13]

The Jewish writings commonly designated Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha display little interest in Gen 3:15. The reworking of the story of the expulsion from Eden in *Jubilees* (*Jub.* 3:17-31) hardly notes the saying, though it records that God cursed the serpent "and was angry with it forever" (*Jub.* 3:23).[14] While *1 Enoch* pays some attention to the earlier part of Gen 3:15, it has nothing of value for our present purposes. The *Apocalypse of Moses* (*Apoc. Mos.* 26:4), however, quotes the latter part of Gen 3:15 according to the LXX version with an addition: M. D. Johnson translates the relevant section as "he [the serpent] shall beware of your head and you [of] his heel until the day of judgment."[15] The date of this text is difficult to fix, but recent research suggests that it be placed in the first or early second century C.E.[16] The LXX translation of Gen 3:15, therefore, was known to Philo and to the compiler(s) of the *Apocalypse of Moses*: these seem to be the principal authorities making use of the translation before the early second century C.E.

---

[12] See J. Skinner, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1912) 79-80; E. Tov, *The Text-critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (Jerusalem Bible Studies 3; Jerusalem: Simor, 1981) 248; Wevers, *Notes*, 44; and B. Grossfeld, *The Targum Onqelos to Genesis* (The Aramaic Bible 6; Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1988) 47; cf. Lust, Eynikel, and Hauspie, *Lexicon*, 2.475.

[13] See Philo, *Leg.* 3.182-199; *Agr.* 107-109. No reference to such variants in ancient witnesses to LXX Gen 3:15 appears in Wevers, *Notes*, 44-45.

[14] O. S. Wintermute, "Jubilees", in *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; 2 vols.; New York: Doubleday, 1983-1985) 2.35-142, here 2.60, noting R. H. Charles's suspicion of a lacuna in the text at this point. On this, and what follows, see also J. Michl, "Der Weibessame (Gen 3,15) in spätjüdischer und frühchristlicher Auffassung," *Bib* 33 (1952) 381-86.

[15] See M. D. Johnson, "Life of Adam and Eve", in *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, (ed. J. H. Charlesworth) 2.249-95, here 2.285, where he notes that "the verb *tērēsei* is from Gen 3:15, LXX."

[16] See E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*, vol. III.2 (rev. and ed. G. Vermes, F. Millar and M. Goodman; Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1987) 757-59; J. R. Levison, "Adam and Eve, Life of," in *Anchor Bible Dictionary* (ed. D. N. Freedman; 6 vols.; New York: Doubleday, 1992) 1.64-66; cf. Johnson, "Life of Adam and Eve," 252.

## Other Ancient Interpretations of Genesis 3:15

Other early Jewish sources, however, understood that Gen 3:15 concerned the crushing or bruising of the serpent's head and the human person's heel. This is evident not only in the Greek versions of Gen 3:15 by Aquila and Symmachus, who for Hebrew ישופך translated προστρύψει ("shall bruise") and θλύψει ("shall press, afflict") respectively;[17] but particularly in the elaborate account of God's curse on the serpent preserved in Josephus (*Ant.* 1.50-51). This last is especially noteworthy for its use of traditions which re-appear in later classical Jewish sources.[18] Josephus reverses the order of the biblical punishments (Gen 3:14-19), beginning with God's words to Adam, moving to the condemnation of Eve, and culminating in the curse of the serpent (*Ant.* 1.46-50). This includes extra-biblical traditions current in the author's day, and doubtless known to Jews earlier in the first century C.E. First, we learn that God, made angry by the serpent's ill-will towards Adam, removed its power of speech and put poison under its tongue, thereby appointing it as one hostile to human beings. God then advised the human pair to bring blows on the serpent's head, the place where the serpent's evil towards people is concentrated, and where it would be easiest for those avenging themselves of the serpent to bring about its end. Finally, God cut off the serpent's feet.

Each of these embellishments found in Josephus is recorded elsewhere in Jewish tradition, such as the Targumim and Midrashim. Thus, *Jub.* 3:28 tells how all animals were deprived of speech at this time; *Tg. Ps.-J.* Gen 3:14 and *Pirqe R. El.* 14:3 relate that poison was now placed in the serpent's mouth; *Targums Pseudo-Jonathan*, *Neofiti*, and the *Fragment Targums* of Gen 3:15 state that human beings are destined to strike the serpent on the head to kill it; and *Tg. Ps.-J.* Gen 3:14, along

---

[17] See A. Salvesen, *Symmachus in the Pentateuch* (Journal of Semitic Studies Monograph 15; Manchester: University of Manchester Press, 1991) 14-15. She also remarks that Rom 16:20, where the apostle Paul prays that God συντρύψει ("crush") Satan under the feet of believers, is probably indebted to Gen 3:15. Note that Aquila's translation involves a word not used elsewhere in what survives of his version: that word never occurs in the LXX.

[18] Josephus was born in 37/38 C.E. and published his *Antiquities* in 93/94 C.E.: see E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*, vol. 1 (rev. and ed. G. Vermes and F. Millar; Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1973) 43, 48.

with *Midr. Gen. Rab.* 20:5; *Pirqe R. El.* 14:3; *Abot R. Nat. B* 42:117 and *Apoc. Mos.* 26:2-3 describe how the serpent's feet were cut off. In other words, the information provided by Josephus demonstrates that, by the mid-first century C.E. at the latest, Gen 3:14-15 had engendered a goodly corpus of interpretation. To this, we may add the declaration of *Apoc. Mos.* 26:4 that human beings and serpents will watch each other in respect of head and heel "until the day of judgment," with its family resemblance to *Jub.* 3:23 (dating from the mid-second century B.C.E. at the latest) that God cursed the serpent "forever." Both these texts indicate that their author-compilers viewed Gen 3:15 as having a strong reference to the future, even to the final days.

What might have this to do with the LXX translation of Gen 3:15? The accumulation of interpretative tradition around Gen 3:14-15, some of it dating from the second century B.C.E., raises the question whether LXX's distinctive translation of the final words of that verse may not have something to do with a tradition of interpretation of the serpent's curse? We should recall that LXX never used τηρεῖν elsewhere in the translation of the Pentateuch; and that the resulting Greek translation using that verb is by no means straightforward, either as a direct rendering of the Hebrew, where the meaning "bruise" or "crush" for the stem שׁוּף might reasonably be preferred, or as a piece of Greek whose sense is clear and unambiguous.[19] When, however, we find a verb whose meaning is certainly "watch, guard, observe" used to translate forms of שׁוּף in Gen 3:15 in an undoubtedly exegetical enterprise, then we need to consider very carefully the LXX's possible reasons for adopting this verb.

## *Targum Onqelos* of Genesis 3:15

Thus prepared, we can consider *Targum Onqelos* of Gen 3:15, which reads:

---

[19] A sense of guarding or watching out for someone or something in a cautious, wary manner is not foreign to τηρεῖν as Lust, Eynikel, and Hauspie, *Lexicon*, 2.475 intimate; yet the word most often signifies keeping, protecting, observing or keeping watch over in a good sense, with the idea that the person or thing being kept is worthy of protection. But the most "obvious" sense of τηρεῖν in LXX Gen 3:15 seems to be "watch to destroy": so Philo, *Leg.* 3.189 (cf. Salvesen, *Symmachus*, 14).

> And I shall put enmity between you [= the serpent] and the
> woman, and
> between your sons and her sons: he [woman's son] will be
> remembering what
> you did to him from ancient times; and you shall be guard-
> ing/observing/keeping
> him to/for (*variant reading*: at, in) the end.[20]

The Targum uses the common term נטר for "guarding," its choice of verb undeniably recalling the LXX translation; and the use by *Targum Onqelos* of "remember" to translate the first occurrence of Hebrew שוף coincides very neatly with a sense of "keep, preserve, retain (i.e., in mind)."[21] At this stage of our investigation, *Tg. Onq.* Gen 3:15 yields the first Jewish interpretation of the verse not written in Greek to explain the two forms of the verb שוף by words which signify keeping, guarding, or preserving. While the final redaction of *Targum Onqelos* is commonly dated to the third century C.E., the Targum most probably originated sometime in the late first or early to mid-second century C.E.[22] That is to say, its origins apparently lie in a period when Jewish interpreters also took Gen 3:15 to refer to crushing or bruising carried out on, or by, the serpent. Noteworthy also is this Targum's perception in the scriptural verse of a polarity between "ancient times" and the end: the Hebrew of Gen 3:15 utilizes the words ראש ("head") and עקב ("heel") without suffixes, enabling the translator (*meturgeman*) to represent these words as signifying "start" and "end" respectively.[23]

---

[20] All citations of *Targum Onqelos* are from A. Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic. I: The Pentateuch According to Targum Onkelos* (Leiden; Brill, 1959). Translations are mine.

[21] Note the similar use of a compound form of τηρεῖν in Luke 2:51, where the mother of Jesus διετήρει πάντα τὰ ῥήματα ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῆς ("kept/observed all these words/things in her heart").

[22] See Grossfeld, *The Targum Onqelos*, 30-35; M. Taradach, *Le Midrash* (Le Monde de la Bible 22; Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1991) 67; P. S. Alexander, "Targum, Targumim", in *Anchor Bible Dictionary* (ed. D. N. Freedman) 6.321-22; A. Salvesen, "Symmachus and the Dating of Targumic Traditions," *Journal for the Aramaic Bible* 2/2 (2000) 233-45; but note also C. Müller-Kessler, "The Earliest Evidence for Targum Onqelos from Babylonia and the Question of its Dialect and Origin," *Journal for the Aramaic Bible* 3/1-2 (2001) 181-98.

[23] See the first paragraph of the present article. The common English translation given there obscures the sense of the individual Hebrew words, which may be literally represented as "it shall bruise you, head: and you shall bruise it, heel." "Head"

Bernard Grossfeld comments that *Targum Onqelos* had in mind the creation and the Messianic era; indeed, both *Apoc. Mos.* 26:4 and *Jub.* 3:23, as we have seen, understood this verse as referring among other things to the distant future or the Day of Judgment.[24] Some such idea is almost certainly in the mind of *Targum Onqelos*, as is apparent from the very next occurrence of the verb נטר in the Targum at Gen 4:7, where God declares to the jealous Cain:

> Is it not the case that if you make good your deeds it will be
>> forgiven you?
> But if you do not make good your deeds, the sin is kept/
>> preserved (נטיר) for
> the Day of Judgment: it is destined that punishment be
>> exacted of you if you
> do not repent; but if you do repent, it shall be forgiven you.[25]

In light of this, the closing words of *Tg. Onq.* Gen 3:15 should be understood as meaning that the serpent will be watching the woman's offspring at the end of days, observing or keeping in store whatever sins that offspring might have committed throughout the ages. By contrast, the woman's offspring will be remembering, that is, keeping in mind, what the serpent did: the two occurrences of the original Hebrew root שוף are thus regarded from the human point of view first in a good and wise sense as regards future human action inspiring caution; and then in a negative sense, when it comes to the serpent's activities described by this rare verb. With this in mind, we may now consider Philo's exposition of Gen 3:15 set out in his work on allegorical interpretation (*Leg.* 3.188-189).

---

(Hebrew ראש) led the Targumist to think of the creation story with its opening Hebrew word בראשית, which *Targum Onqelos* rendered with בקדמין, "in ancient times." Close in sound and form to Hebrew עקב ("heel") is Aramaic עקבא, which may mean "end, future," as well as "heel."

[24] See Grossfeld, *The Targum Onqelos*, 47, where he further explains *Targum Onqelos's* translations "remember" and "keep" by suggesting that the Targumist understood the verbs in Gen 3:15b as deriving from the Hebrew stem שאף ("long for"). While this stem may have influenced the Targumist, other factors seem to have played their part (see discussion below).

[25] Some witnesses to *Targum Onqelos* read "your sin" instead of "the sin." For this Targum's strategies to interpret the Hebrew of the verse, see Grossfeld, *The Targum Onqelos*, 48-49.

## Philo's Exposition of Genesis 3:15

As the title of his treatise (*Legum allegoriae*) suggests, Philo presents his readers with an allegorical reading of Gen 3:15. It should never be forgotten, however, that Philo is a biblical exegete, as well as a philosopher engaging with the intellectual currents of his day: he does not regard biblical texts simply as pegs on which to hang philosophical arguments and doctrines, but as sacred words which the exegete must expound in a responsible manner.[26] For him, the Greek translation represented by the Septuagint Pentateuch was holy writ, divinely inspired in every word (*Mos.* 2.25-44). Allegorical exegesis might be used to reveal its "symbolic" meaning; but this did not absolve the interpreter of confronting difficulties raised by the wording of the text. Thus Philo begins his treatment of "he shall watch your head, and you shall watch his heel" in *Leg.* 3.188 with the observation that the language used here is a barbarism, though its sense is correct. God is speaking to the serpent about the woman; but the woman cannot be represented by the αὐτός, "he" of LXX Gen 3:15. What then is to be said? Philo answers that the masculine pronoun here means that God has stopped speaking about the woman, and has now transferred his attention ἐπὶ τὸ σπέρμα καὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν αὐτῆς, "to her seed and beginning."

His reference to "her beginning" sounds odd, until we recall that the word "head," ראש, found in the Hebrew text at this point, was understood by some Jewish exegetes precisely as "beginning": we have already observed this in the case of *Targum Onqelos*, and by implication in those texts which understood the verse as having a temporal dimension.[27] But once Philo has introduced the notion of "beginning," he can talk of the mind which, in his philosophy, is the "beginning of sense-perception": the word for mind is masculine in Greek, and thus he can take LXX Gen 3:15 to mean that "he," the mind, will watch over "the head," now understood as τὸ κεφάλαιον καὶ ἡγεμονικὸν δόγμα, "the

---

[26] Note particularly the "question and answer" format in *Leg.* 3.188, representing an exegetical and interpretative technique found also in rabbinic literature and in Greek commentaries on philosophical and poetic writings. See P. Borgen, *Philo of Alexandria, An Exegete for His Time* (Leiden: Brill, 1997) 80-101 (with a reference to *Leg.* 3.188 on p. 91), and his remarks on p. 154 about the technical exegetical term ἴσον ("equal to"), which Philo employs in *Leg.* 3.189.

[27] See the earlier discussion of Gen 3:15 in other ancient interpretations and in *Targum Onqelos*.

capital and authoritative doctrine." The closing words of the verse are then explained as meaning that humans shall watch over the mind while it bases itself on accepted supports.

If we inquire what "the capital and authoritative doctrine" might be, Philo provides an answer in *Spec.* 2.63. It is the Torah of Moses, summarized there in classical form as duty toward God (piety and holiness) and toward neighbor (philanthropy and justice), characterized by Philo as "the two principal heads of rational discourses and doctrines" (λόγων καὶ δογμάτων δύο τὰ ἀνωτάτω κεφάλαια).[28] Philo's particular terminology, which is indebted both to allegory and to philosophy, has a "plain" sense: Gen 3:15 teaches that human beings are to use their minds to study Torah and to observe, keep, guard and watch over its teachings.[29]

The next section (*Leg.* 3.189) develops these insights. Philo again begins with the wording of the verse, remarking that "shall watch" (τηρήσει) represents two senses, the first a positive one of "guard" and "keep safe (in memory)," the second a negative one of "watch out to effect destruction." The two senses of the word refer to the two types of mind, the foolish and the serious. The foolish mind guards and keeps pleasure, whereas the serious mind watches to destroy it. Philo then offers a second interpretation: pleasure keeps safe the foolish mind, but watches out to destroy the principled life of the wise mind. This double interpretation of the words allows Philo to offer a final twist to his exegesis and to represent pleasure and its evil intent with reference to the "heel," the πτέρνη of LXX Gen 3:15, by linking this word to key aspects of his thought about Israel. Thus Philo explains (*Leg.* 3.190) that pleasure supposes it will trip from the heel (πτερνίζειν) and deceive the sensible person, only to find that it will itself be tripped up from the heel by Jacob, who is practiced in wrestling, this wrestling consisting in a fight and struggle against the passions.[30]

Philo here has in mind the biblical account of Jacob's nocturnal wrestling bout with a mysterious character over whom he gains victory and from whom he is granted the name of Israel (Gen 32:23-33). He

---

[28] See also *Decal.* 19-20; 106-110 for Philo's "summary" of the Torah, and comments by V. P. Furnish, *The Love Command in the New Testament* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1972) 62.

[29] A similar use of the verb appears in LXX Prov 3:1, 21.

[30] On Philo's interpretation of Jacob see P. von Gemünden, "La figure de Jacob à l'époque hellénistico-romaine: l'exemple de Philon d'Alexandrie," in *Jacob: Commentaire à plusieurs voix de Gen 25-36. Mélanges offerts à A. de Pury* (ed. J.-D. Macchi and T. Römer ; Geneva: Labor et Fides, 2001) 358-70.

almost invariably explains the name Jacob as meaning "the practicer," one who trains himself like an athlete to wrestle against the passions. From this viewpoint, Gen 32:23-33 records Jacob's success in this wrestling match and his acquisition of the name Israel which, Philo tells his readers again and again, means "one who sees God."[31] Thus, Gen 3:15 is interpreted in light of one of Philo's central concerns, the subduing of the passions by the "ascetic" Jacob and his consequent acquisition of the vision of God with his new name Israel. One cannot envisage a more striking means whereby God's words to the serpent could be associated with the highest calling of the Jewish people, the experience called by Philo "seeing God." Philo continues the theme of the "heel" by invoking also Jacob's struggle with Esau, who represents passion: he recalls that Jacob does not let go of his opponent's heel until Esau admits that he has twice been tripped up at the heel and overcome (such is his interpretation of LXX Gen 27:36), Jacob here representing the sensible person whose practiced stratagems against the passions have been entirely successful.[32]

Philo's complex and sophisticated interpretation of Gen 3:15 may be expressed more simply as follows. The verse concerns "watching" and "guarding" in their various senses. The sensible person will guard or keep the commandments of the Torah, what Philo calls the "capital and authoritative doctrine"; and this person, whose mind is wise, lies in wait for and fights pleasure and the passions in the manner of Jacob, who fought Esau their representative, overcame them, and was rewarded with the name Israel, "one who sees God." Philo does not make this explicit here, but he so often refers to the significance of Jacob's change of name to Israel in his writings that he might reasonably expect his readers to understand the point he is making. By way of contrast, the foolish mind guards pleasure, which in its turn watches to destroy the one whose mind is wise. The antidote to pleasure and its schemes is thus Jacob's pugilistic attitude toward it. In short, the Torah and its commandments, if observed, will watch for the passions,

---

[31] See especially *Mut.* 81-88; *Ebr.* 80-83; *Somn.* 1.79, 129-131, 171; cf. C. T. R. Hayward, *Interpretations of the Name Israel in Ancient Judaism and some Early Christian Writings* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005) 156-93.

[32] See *Leg.* 3.190-191. The frequency of words related to πτέρνη in this section (3.188-191) is remarkable, as is the language of the wrestling bout and other Greek athletic terminology: Philo can employ these terms because LXX Gen 32:25 declared that Jacob's opponent *wrestled* with him. On Philo's use of athletic language, see H. A. Harris, *Greek Athletics and the Jews* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1976) 69-72.

destroy them, and make into "one who sees the God" the person who is faithful to it.

## Palestinian Targumim of Genesis 3:15

Philo's exegesis here bears a remarkable resemblance to the Palestinian Targumim of Gen 3:15, which offer the meaning "watch" or "keep" as one of a series of interpretations of the Hebrew words derived from the stem שוף. As representative of them, *Targum Neofiti* may be cited: the translation will be presented in numbered sections to make the groundwork of the exegesis clearer.[33]

> And enmity I shall place between you and the woman, and
>      between your sons
> and her sons. (i) And it shall happen, when her sons shall be
>      *keeping* the Torah
> (נטרין אורייתא) and doing the commandments, (ii) they shall
>      be *directing*
> *themselves* towards you and (iii) *smiting* you on your head
>      and killing you. But
> when (i) they shall be leaving [i.e., not *keeping*] the com-
>      mandments of the Torah,
> (ii) you shall be *directing yourself* and (iii) biting him on his
>      heel and making him
> sick. Nevertheless, for her son (iv) there will be *healing*, but
>      for you, O serpent,
> (iv) there will not be *healing*; for they are destined (v) to
>      make a *concordat* at the
> end, on the day of the King Messiah.[34]

---

[33] The Aramaic text is cited from A. Díez Macho, *Neophyti I. Targum Palestinese Ms de la Biblioteca Vaticana. Génesis* (Madrid-Barcelona: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1968): translations are mine.

[34] The main variations in the other Palestinian Targumim are as follows. The marginal glosses of *Targum Neofiti* have: ". . . laboring in the Torah and keeping the commandments"; ". . . the sons of the woman themselves refuse to labor in the Torah and keep the commandments, you shall be directing . . ."; ". . . and you shall bite them on the[ir] heel and make them sick. Nevertheless, for the woman's sons there shall be healing; but for you, O serpent, there shall not be healing. But they are destined, the former and the latter, to make a con[cordat]. . . ." The *Fragment Targum* in MS Paris 110 includes material almost identical with that recorded in the Neofiti glosses:

The italicized words in subsections (i)-(iv) represent multiple interpretations of the Hebrew words ישופך and תשופנו, and it will be noted how carefully the Targum has preserved the formal characteristics of the Hebrew original, which resembles the two leaves of a diptych. To this, a final fifth element is added, which speaks of a "concordat" or "compromise" (Aramaic שפיותיה) in the Messianic days. The structure of the Targum's exegesis is quite clear; and it depends for its force on the notions of "keeping" and "not keeping" the commandments. In other words, the exegesis of שוף in the sense of "keep" or "guard" is primary and central here, and we shall need to ask how and why the *meturgeman* has resorted to it. For compared with the four other interpretations of the stem שוף given by the Palestinian Targums, the sense of "watch" or "keep" remains obscure. This can be appreciated when the linguistic logic underlying the other multiple interpretations of the verbs is set out.

First, the notion that the verse has to do with *smiting* and *killing* will have been suggested by the Rabbinic Hebrew stem שוף II, meaning "rub, grind, crush, stamp," and its Aramaic cognate שוף II with the same range of meanings: we should also note the Rabbinic Hebrew stem שפי or שפה I, meaning "crush," and its Aramaic cognate שפי or שפא I, "crush, rub, grind," as well as the stem שפף, found in both languages with the meaning "crush, rub." Next, the idea of *healing* will have been conveyed by the Rabbinic Hebrew stem שפי or שפה II, meaning "be quiet, be at ease, be relieved," and its Aramaic cognate שפי or שפא II "be quiet, be at ease": in the *pael* conjugation, this Aramaic form means "make quiet, pacify," and its corresponding noun is the word rendered above as *concordat*, שפיותיה in *Targum Neofiti's* version.[35] Given that no fewer than three verbal stems in both Hebrew and Aramaic offer the meaning of "crush" or "grind," it is noteworthy that these meanings do not stand first in the exegesis of the several *meturgemanim*.

From which verbal root, then, might the exegetes have derived the sense of "keep"; and what is their source for the verb "direct"? A most

---

see M. L. Klein, *The Fragment-Targums of the Pentateuch* (AnBib 76; 2 vols.; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1980) 1.46; so also the *Fragment Targum* in Vatican MS 440 as given by Klein, *The Fragment-Targums*, 1.127. For *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan*, see *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan of the Pentateuch* (ed. E. G. Clarke, W. E. Aufrecht, et al.; Hoboken: Ktav, 1984) 4, where a somewhat "streamlined" version of the same exegesis appears.

[35] On the orthography of this word, and its various senses as they relate to the end of days, see further Michl, "Der Weibessame," 379-80.

thorough and learned analysis of the Palestinian Targumim of Gen 3:15 has been prepared by Avigdor Shinan.[36] He suggests that those Targumim which speak here of "laboring" in the Torah have done so by discerning in the two Hebrew words which concern us the root שאף ("gasp, pant"), understood as referring to effort and exertion; and the notion of "directing oneself" they derived from the same root, this time with sense of "aspiration, longing."[37] As to "keeping," Shinan notes its appearance in *Targum Onqelos* and the Septuagint of this verse; but he does not point to any particular Hebrew stem which may have suggested to the *meturgemanim* a meaning of "keep" or "guard."[38] What might the solution be?

Let us begin with the comment, found in all the Targumim except *Targum Onqelos*, that if the woman's sons observe the Torah and commandments, then they shall be *directing themselves*: (*Tg. Neof.*, *Frg. Tg. (Paris)*, *Frg. Tg. (Vatican)* מתכוונין; *Tg. Ps.-J.* מכוונין). The Aramaic stem כון, from which these forms derive, and the cognate Hebrew stem, also express the idea of *intention*, particularly as regards prayer: the Aramaic noun כוונתא (= Hebrew כוונה) expresses the ideals of concentration, focused intention and devotion which make prayer effective. The importance of this observation will be clear from the following well-known Mishnah (*m. Ber.* 5:1):

> One should not stand to pray [the Amidah] except with
> utmost seriousness.
> The former *Hasidim* would wait for one hour and then pray
> [the Amidah], in
> order to direct their heart (כדי שיכונו את לבם) to the Omni-
> present. Even if the
> king were to offer greeting, he [the Hasid] would not return
> it. And even if a

---

[36] See A. Shinan, *The Aggadah in the Aramaic Targums to the Pentateuch* (2 vols.; Jerusalem: Makor, 1979) 2.211-13 [Hebrew].

[37] For "laboring" in Torah, see the variations in the Palestinian Targumim noted above, and the remarks in Shinan, *The Aggadah*, 2.212; cf. M. McNamara, *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Genesis* (The Aramaic Bible 1B; Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1992) 27.

[38] See Shinan, *The Aggadah*, 211. As already remarked, Grossfeld invokes שאף as the "springboard" for *Targum Onqelos's* translation of "keep."

serpent were entwined about his heel, he would not inter-
rupt [his recitation].[39]

Much might be said about the relationship between this Mishnah
and the Targumim discussed here; for present purposes, however, we
must limit observations to the fact that intense devotion in prayer pre-
vails over the serpent, and that the Targumim themselves suggest as
much: the woman's sons, by *directing themselves*, that is, by concen-
trated intention in their prayer, will smite the serpent. Failure in this
matter means that the serpent will be able to *direct himself* at them.
It would appear, then, that the Targumic defence against the serpent
is that trustworthy pair, study of Torah and prayer: and from this, we
may more easily discover the final piece in the puzzle. For there is a
Hebrew word that has to do with "keeping" and "watching," and that
has the closest conceivable links with both study of Torah and prayer;
and that word is נשף.

To some modern commentators this might appear strange, since the
primary sense of this stem is "blow." It yields, however, the noun נשף
("twilight"), that stage of illumination which precedes both dawn in
the morning and darkness in the evening (Job 3:9; 7:4). Consequently,
it has associations with the *watches* of the night, and thus Rashi could
use it to explain the occurrence of ישופני in Ps 139:11, following the
investigation of the word by Menahem ben Saruq: the latter took נשף
to be equivalent to אשמורה ("watch").[40] Much becomes clearer when
we consider Ps 119:145-152, a section devoted to prayer (calling upon the
Lord and his response) and study of the Torah. Thus we read:

> [145]I called with my whole heart: hear me, O Lord, your stat-
>   utes will I keep.
> [146]I called you, O save me! And I will keep (ואשמרה) your
>   testimonies.
> [147]I rose before the twilight (בנשף) and cried out: I hoped
>   for your word.

---

[39] Cited from H. Albeck, *Shishah Sidre Mishnah: Seder Zeraim* (Jerusalem/Tel
Aviv: Bialik Institute, 1957); the translation is mine.
[40] See discussion by M. I. Gruber, *Rashi's Commentary on Psalms* (Leiden: Brill,
2004) 733, 736.

[148]My eyes forestalled the watches (אשמרות): to meditate on
    your word.

[149]Hear my voice according to your love: O Lord, give me
    life according to your judgment.

[150]Wicked persecutors drew near: they were far off from
    your Torah.

[151]You are near, O Lord: and all your commandments are
    true.

[152]Long ago I learned from your decrees: for you have estab-
    lished them forever.

From this, ancient exegetes might justifiably conclude that נשׁף and
forms which might appear to derive from it could mean much the same
as שׁמר ("watch, guard, keep, observe"); and once its presence was
perceived in Gen 3:15, the resulting Targumic commentary would be
straightforward to construct. The question which now confronts us is
whether the LXX translators were operating with this same exegetical
possibility in mind?

There is no *a priori* reason why the LXX translators should not
have perceived in Gen 3:15 two words deriving from נשׁף, which they
then associated with watching and keeping in the manner described
above: they certainly knew the Hebrew Scriptures sufficiently well
to be able to do so. While that in itself proves little, the evidence
reviewed earlier should be recalled. First, although a translation
indicating *bruising* or *crushing* would make excellent sense (being
attested in Jewish tradition by Josephus, Aquila, and Symmachus),
the LXX resorted to a peculiar rendering which Philo declared a
"barbarism." Second, nowhere else in LXX Pentateuch is τηρεῖν
found. Third, *Targum Onqelos* also translated the verb as "watch";
and in the Palestinian Targumim "watch" provides indispensable
foundations for a carefully structured exegesis relating Gen 3:15 to
the keeping of the Torah and its commandments. Fourth, stripped
of philosophical-allegorical language, Philo's interpretation of Gen
3:15 has undoubted affinities with the Palestinian Targumim of that
verse. Finally, the verse was understood from around the mid-second
century B.C.E. as referring to a remote future.

## The Significance of LXX Genesis 3:15

Genesis 3:15 apparently engendered interpretation from early times. The translation of the two rare Hebrew verbal forms by "watch, guard" in *both* the LXX *and* the Targumim can reasonably be explained if both ancient versions ultimately depended on a common understanding of those verbal forms which was older than either of them. The *meturgemanim* felt that *explanation* of "watch, guard" was required. Thus, *Targum Onqelos* gave the sense "keep in mind" to the activity of the woman's offspring, who will remember the serpent's past actions: the serpent will then guard itself against the woman's offspring. The Palestinian Targumim developed "watch, guard" further, with reference to the Torah and the commandments, an approach to the verse current in Philo's day. All the Targumim retained "keep" as the *primary* sense of the Hebrew verbal forms, while providing it with necessary *explication*.

The LXX, however, *did not directly explain* "keep." It remained ambiguous, either as a commonplace, or as a "barbarism" implicitly demanding interpretative endeavor which, in Philo's hands, resulted in exegesis closely resembling that of the Palestinian Targumim. Now such ambiguity on LXX Pentateuch's part in respect of the unique verb $\tau\eta\rho\epsilon\hat{\iota}\nu$ is of a piece with the translators' peculiar description of the serpent in Gen 3:1 as $\phi\rho o\nu\iota\mu\dot\omega\tau\alpha\tau o\varsigma$ ("most sagacious"): this is a thoroughly *good* word, which the Pentateuch translators would use only once again in their whole undertaking, to refer to Joseph (Gen 41:33, 39) as one specially equipped for rulership.[41] So they depicted the serpent as a potentially wise ruler, who speaks as humans do and (by implication) stands upright. Its advice, however, led not to preservation of life, like Joseph's sagacity (Gen 41:57; Ps 105:21-22), but ultimately to death for the human pair who did not keep God's commandment. Ostensibly declaring the truth that the human pair will not die on the day they disobey (Gen 3:4), while concealing the reality of their ultimate decease

---

[41] See further M. Alexandre, *Le Commencement du Livre: Genèse I-V. La Version grecque de la Septante et sa reception* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1988) 297; M. Harl, *La Bible d'Alexandrie. 1: La Genèse* (Paris: Cerf, 1994) 107.

(Gen 5:5), this supposedly sagacious serpent is utterly deceitful: the sensible approach to it will be careful watching.[42]

Like other rulers abusing their positions, the serpent is dramatically *brought low* (see Isa 14:3-21): presumably once upright, it is to move henceforth on breast and belly (LXX Gen 3:15), confined to the ground.[43] But it is not killed; causing harm through speech, it induced a non-keeping of God's commands, and it could repeat its deception, "watching" for the heels of the unwary. Hence the need for watching on humanity's part; and the most efficacious watching will be a keeping of God's commandments, the first of which the serpent, with a tongue in its head, had inveigled the human pair into breaking. The genuine ruler should keep the Torah and observe its commandments (Deut 17:14-20), like Joseph, whose conduct was dictated by God's Law (Gen 39:9). And the thoughtful reader of LXX Gen 3:1, 14, 15 might well perceive a sophisticated, if understated, meditation on the serpent, symbol of Egyptian royal power and rulership, and the divine curse; on true and false advice; and on keeping and not keeping God's commandments—a meditation which other traditional Jewish writings would share for generations to come.

---

[42] On the serpent's utterance of the truth here, see R. W. L. Moberly, "Did the Serpent Get it Right?" *JTS* 39 (1988) 1-27.

[43] Professor William Horbury in private conversation suggested that this amplification of the Hebrew may indicate the translators' knowledge of the tradition that the serpent was deprived of arms and legs.

# "What is ⲈⲠⲒ ⲪⲈⲢⲈ?" Genesis 1:2b in the Sahidic Version of the LXX and the *Apocryphon of John*

Janet Timbie

Basil of Caesarea (ca. 360 C.E.), in *Homilies on the Hexaemeron*, grapples with the interpretation of Gen 1:2b: "And the spirit of God, he [Moses] said, was borne upon the water." After reviewing various interpretations of "spirit of God," Basil turns to his preferred interpretation, namely that it refers to the Holy Spirit, and then asks, "How, then, was it borne (ἐπεφέρετο) upon the water?"[1] How could one person of the Trinity be said to be "borne upon" the water, in an apparently physical sense? Basil appeals to a certain "Syrian" for help, who explains that the Syriac translation of Genesis (much closer to the Hebrew in the Syrian's opinion) indicates that the Spirit "warms and makes alive the substance of the waters."[2] The image is one of a mother bird sitting on her eggs.

At approximately the same time as Basil, the Coptic translator of the *Apocryphon of John* (hereafter abbreviated *Ap. John*), but only in the

---

[1] Text from Stanislas Giet, *Homélies sur l'Hexaéméron: Basile de Césarée* (SC 26; 2d ed.; Paris: Cerf, 1968) 166-69.

[2] Ibid., 168. The interesting question, "who is the Syrian?" has not received a definitive answer; see Giet, *Homélies*, 169. Zlatko Pleše, *Poetics of the Gnostic Universe: Narrative and Cosmology in the Apocryphon of John* (Leiden: Brill, 2006) 225-26, summarizes the entire range of orthodox Christian interpretation of Gen 1:2b and its verb during the patristic period. On the image of God's Spirit as a mother bird in Syriac Christianity see Robert Murray, *Symbols of Church and Kingdom* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975) 313.

text of the Berlin Codex 8502 (=BG),[3] produces a passage in which the disciple John, in dialogue with a Christ-figure, asks, "Christ, what is ⲉⲡⲓⲫⲉⲣⲉ?"[4] For the moment, I set aside the question of how the Coptic translator understood the Greek loanword and leave it untranslated. The Coptic text of *Ap. John* in BG retains the Greek word that probably was present in its Greek exemplar, while the other surviving Coptic versions of this passage translate the Greek word with a Coptic word (ϣⲉⲉⲓ) that usually means "come and go" or "wander."[5] John has just listened to a long account of cosmology, leading up to the point at which the revealer says (in BG), "The Mother began to ⲉⲡⲓⲫⲉⲣⲉ."[6] John perhaps recognizes the allusion to Gen 1:2b and seems to find the verb problematic in context—as Basil did—and so asks, "Christ, what is ⲉⲡⲓⲫⲉⲣⲉ?" The revealer's answer proves that Gen 1:2b is the context:

> He smiled and said, "Do you think that it is as Moses said, 'above the waters'? No, rather, she [the Mother] saw the wickedness and the rebellion that would happen through her son and she repented. Coming and going in the darkness of ignorance, she began to be ashamed and did not dare to return; rather, she was coming and going (ⲛⲉⲥⲛⲁ ⲉⲥⲛⲏⲩ ⲡⲉ). But her coming and her going, this is ⲉⲡⲓⲫⲉⲣⲉ."

The revealer seems to explain the Greek word by means of a short Coptic phrase in the BG version. In contrast, the other Coptic versions of *Ap. John* have an entirely Coptic question and answer. "Lord, what is 'she was coming and going' (ⲁⲥϣⲉⲉⲓ)? . . . . Do not think that it is as Moses said, 'above the waters.' No, rather, . . . she did not dare to return, but she was going in motion. The movement (ⲕⲓⲙ) is the coming and going (ϣⲉⲉⲓ)."[7]

---

[3] For a thorough description of Codex Papyrus Berolinensis 8502 (BG), see the introduction to the critical edition of *Ap. John* in *Apocryphon of John* (ed. Michael Waldstein and Frederik Wisse; NHS 33; Leiden: Brill, 1995) 2-4. The BG manuscript is dated to the fifth century C.E. on the basis of paleography and codicology, while the BG text has linguistic features such as dialectal variants that are also found in the Nag Hammadi texts. The Nag Hammadi codices are usually dated to the latter half of the fourth century C.E.

[4] *Apocryphon of John*, 80 (this is manuscript page 45 in BG 8502). I rely on the NHS edition of the texts, but all translations from Coptic are mine.

[5] See *Apocryphon of John*, 81, for the parallels from Nag Hammadi manuscripts, and Walter E. Crum, *A Coptic Dictionary* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1939) 547.

[6] *Apocryphon of John*, 78. The following longer quotation is from p. 80.

[7] Ibid., 81 (this page presents parallel text from Nag Hammadi manuscripts: NHC II.13 and NHC IV.21). The NHS edition facilitates comparison of all different ver-

The original Greek text of *Ap. John* probably had ἐπεφέρετο in both the long and short versions that have come down to us through BG, the Nag Hammadi texts, and the version known to Irenaeus when he wrote *Against Heresies*.[8] Coptic translators therefore were aware of the way the text comments on Gen 1:2b both through the reference to Moses and through the presence of a word, ἐπεφέρετο, that is otherwise very rare in the LXX.[9] The BG version retains the Greek word and seems to gloss it by means of a phrase that may echo the Sahidic version of Gen 1:2b; thus, the BG translator uses early Coptic biblical translation/interpretation to "solve" an interpretative problem in the LXX. A thorough investigation of this interpretative move in Coptic must be based on an understanding of the form in which Greek loanwords occur in Coptic, the meaning of ἐπιφέρω in Greek and Coptic sources, and a review of the surviving witnesses for the LXX Genesis in all Coptic dialects. Only then is it possible to return to the BG text of *Ap. John* and fully appreciate the interpretation of ⲉⲡⲓϥⲉⲣⲉ by ⲛⲉⲥⲛⲁ ⲉⲥⲛⲏⲩ ("coming and going").

## I. Greek Loanwords in Coptic

Coptic vocabulary includes words of Egyptian origin and words of Greek origin. Bentley Layton, in his *Coptic Grammar*, remarks, "The Greek word stock seems to occur as frequently in native Coptic authors as in literature translated from Greek and so must be considered a

---

sions of *Ap. John*. Other works include parallel passages from the different versions for the purpose of analysis; among the most important are Antonio Orbe, "Spiritus Dei ferebatur super aquas. Exegesis gnostica de *Gen.* 1,2b," *Greg* 44 (1963) 691-730, esp. 707-8, and *Écrits gnostiques. Codex de Berlin* (ed. Michel Tardieu; Paris: Cerf, 1984) 117-18. This passage in *Ap. John* is also discussed in recent work by Pheme Perkins, "Christian Books and Sethian Revelations," in *Coptica-Gnostica-Manichaica: Mélanges offerts à Wolf-Peter Funk* (ed. Louis Painchaud and Paul-Hubert Poirier; BCNH, section "Études" 7; Québec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval; Louvain: Peeters, 2006) 697-730, esp. 710-11; Karen L. King, "Approaching the Variants of the *Apocryphon of John*," in *The Nag Hammadi Library after Fifty Years* (ed. John D. Turner and Anne McGuire; NHMS 44; Leiden: Brill, 1997) 105-37; Pleše, *Poetics of the Gnostic Universe*, 226-34.

[8] See the introduction to *Apocryphon of John*, 1-8, for a description of the various texts and manuscripts. For a recent commentary and English translation, see Karen L. King, *The Secret Revelation of John* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006).

[9] Besides Gen 1:2, the only occurrences in the LXX Pentateuch are in Gen 7:18 and 37:22.

real part of the Coptic literary lexicon."[10] Yet Walter E. Crum did not include any Greek words in the *Coptic Dictionary* (see his preface for a statement of intent).[11] Greek words in Coptic texts occur in fixed forms, with some dialectal variation. Substantives and adjectives appear as the Greek nominative singular; verbs resemble the Greek active imperative singular.[12] The Greek verb in Coptic therefore also resembles the verb stem and it is not surprising to find ⲉⲡⲓ ⲫⲉⲣⲉ in the Coptic translation where the Greek original probably read ἐπεφέρετο.[13]

## II. ἐπιφέρω/ⲉⲡⲓ ⲫⲉⲣⲉ in Greek and Coptic Sources

In the standard Greek lexicon (LSJ), the middle-passive form of this verb appears with the meaning of "borne onwards," as in a passage from Herodotus describing the motion of a raft.[14] There are no citations of this middle-passive form of the verb in either the *Patristic Greek Lexicon* (= *PGL*), or the *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (= BDAG).[15] The *Concordance to the Septuagint* (= HRCS) cites the passage in question, Gen 1:2b, and also Gen 7:18 ("the ark was borne upon the water").[16] These two verses have the same struc-

---

[10] Bentley Layton, *A Coptic Grammar* (2d ed.; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2004) 3.

[11] Crum, *Coptic Dictionary*, viii. Werner Vycichl included some Greek words in his Coptic etymological dictionary, but these are mainly proper nouns and words that he believes have a different meaning in Coptic as compared to Greek sources; see his *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue copte* (Leuven: Peeters, 1983) 483-86.

[12] Layton, *Coptic Grammar*, 12, 155.

[13] With reference to bilingual interference in the Greek papyri, Francis T. Gignac noted an abnormal form of the Greek infinitive, εν not ειν, and remarked that "non-contract thematic Greek verbs incorporated as loanwords in three dialects of Coptic end in ⲉ." He also states that it is unclear whether the Coptic usage derives from the infinitive or imperative of the Greek verb. See Francis T. Gignac, *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods* (2 vols.; Milan: Cisalpino, 1976-81) 2. xxi. See also 1. 46-48.

[14] *Greek-English Lexicon*, 9th ed., 670, citing Herodotus 2.96.

[15] *Patristic Greek Lexicon* (ed. Geoffrey W. H. Lampe; Oxford: Clarendon, 1961); the *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (ed. Walter Bauer, William F. Arndt, F. W. Gingrich, and Frederick Danker; 3rd ed.; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000) 386, has an entry but without special reference to middle-passive meaning.

[16] *Concordance to the Septuagint* (ed. Edwin Hatch and Henry A. Redpath; 2d ed.; Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 1998) 538. The English translation of LXX Gen 7:18 appears in *The Septuagint with Apocrypha: Greek and English*, trans. Launcelot L. Brenton (1851; reprint, Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1986).

ture in Greek, though different Hebrew verbs are present in the Maso-
retic Text.[17] These are the only instances of this precise form of the
verb in the LXX, at least according to the texts surveyed in HRCS.
Takamitsu Muraoka, in the *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*,
distinguishes a passive sense, "to be borne along," from a middle, "to
move along," while citing only the above-mentioned passages from
Genesis.[18]

The Greek papyri from the Hellenistic, Roman, and Byzantine peri-
ods are another potential source of evidence for the meaning of the
verb. The foundational work of Friedrich Preisigke on the vocabulary
of the Greek papyri contains dozens of citations of papyri from the
first through seventh centuries C.E. using ἐπιφέρω in all voices.[19] The
meaning in these documentary texts (letters, wills, and other trans-
fers of property) is "hand over" or "be handed over," "deliver," and
"publish," with reference to an official decree. The later work of Ser-
gio Daris collects many more citations of documentary papyri using
ἐπιφέρω, but still with the same range of meaning as in Preisigke.[20]
Coptic documentary papyri contain many Greek loanwords and could
offer valuable evidence for the meaning of a specific Greek loanword
for Coptic readers, and thus for the readers of *Ap. John*. But Hans
Förster, in *Wörterbuch der griechischen Wörter in den koptischen
dokumentarischen Texten*, cites no uses of ∈ΠΙϕ∈Ρ∈ in Coptic texts.[21]

---

[17] Critical edition from John W. Wevers, *Genesis* (Septuaginta: Vetus Testamen-
tum Graece 1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974). Useful discussion of the
relationship between Hebrew and Greek at this point is also found in the commen-
tary to the French translation of the LXX by Marguerite Harl, *La Genèse* (La Bible
d'Alexandrie 1; Paris: Cerf, 1986) 87, 135; see also Jennifer Dines, *The Septuagint* (Lon-
don: T & T Clark, 2004) 123.

[18] Takamitsu Muraoka, *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint Chiefly of the
Pentateuch and the Twelve Prophets* (Leuven: Peeters, 2002) 225.

[19] Friedrich Preisigke, *Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden* (4 vols.;
Berlin: privately published, 1925) 1. 585-86.

[20] Sergio Daris, *Spoglio lessicale papirologico* (3 vols.; Milan: Istituto di Papirolo-
gia, 1968) 2. 108.

[21] Hans Förster, *Wörterbuch der griechischen Wörter in den koptischen doku-
mentarischen Texten* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002), includes all attested spellings (and
misspellings) of the Greek words listed and thus provides more evidence for the pro-
nunciation of Greek in the Roman and Byzantine period, which was also an impor-
tant contribution of the first volume of Gignac's *Grammar of the Greek Papyri* (on
phonology).

## III. Genesis in Coptic

Coptic Bible translation, both Old and New Testaments, began in the third century C.E. and gained momentum in the fourth century.[22] Thus, this translational activity coincides with the translation and copying of the Nag Hammadi texts, which occurred after the mid-to-late third century, according to Stephen Emmel.[23] The choice of Coptic equivalents for Greek ἐπιφέρω indicates the way the verb was understood at that time in the bilingual environment of Egypt, whether it was encountered in a Greek text or as a loanword in a Coptic text. Because translation activity took place in regional centers throughout Egypt using local dialects, not in one authoritative center, it is unclear how much of the Bible was translated into each dialect.[24] Only Sahidic and Bohairic spread beyond regional centers, at different times, and each eventually produced a complete translation of the New Testament. The entire Old Testament, on the other hand, was available in Sahidic translation, but not in Bohairic.[25]

There seem to be no occurrences of ⲉⲡⲓⲫⲉⲣⲉ as a loanword from Greek in Coptic biblical texts.[26] The Greek index to Crum's *Coptic*

---

[22] J. Neville Birdsall, "Versions, Ancient (Survey)," *Anchor Bible Dictionary* (ed. David Noel Freedman; 6 vols.; New York: Doubleday, 1992) 6. 790.

[23] Stephen Emmel, "Religious Tradition, Textual Transmission, and the Nag Hammadi Codices," in *The Nag Hammadi Library after Fifty Years* (ed. Turner and McGuire) 34-43, here 37.

[24] Peter Nagel, "Old Testament, Coptic Translations of," *Coptic Encyclopedia* (ed. Aziz S. Atiya; 8 vols.; New York: Macmillan, 1991) 6. 1836-40; Bruce Metzger, "New Testament, Coptic Versions of," ibid., 6. 1787-89.

[25] See Nagel, "Old Testament," for discussion of translations and preservation of biblical texts in different dialects. The best resource for locating Sahidic Bible manuscripts is the multi-volume, ongoing series *Biblia Coptica* (ed. Karlheinz Schüssler; 3 vols.; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1995-2004). It is more difficult to locate biblical fragments in other dialects; the Metzger and Nagel articles cited (see previous footnote) offer a starting point, then see the volumes containing the Acts of the International Congress of Coptic Studies, which provide bibliography for Coptic biblical studies every four years. The most recent publication is *Actes du huitième congrès international d'études coptes* (ed. Nathalie Bosson and Anne Boud'hors; 2 vols.; Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 162-63; Leuven: Peeters, 2007).

[26] A concordance of Greek words in the Sahidic New Testament makes it easy to survey that source; all other Coptic biblical texts must be checked by working back from the concordances to the Greek biblical texts. See *Concordance du Nouveau Testament sahidique: Les mots d'origine grecque* (ed. Louis-Théophile Lefort; CSCO 124; Louvain: Durbecq, 1950). The concordance to the Bohairic New Testament is more

*Dictionary* shows how the Greek ἐπιφέρω is translated in a set of bibli-
cal texts.[27] The active form of the verb is translated with Coptic verbs
meaning "bring" or "bring on" in Jer 42:17 (∈Ι Ν∈ ∈ΧΝ, "bring on"), Rom
3:5 (∈Ι Ν∈, "bring"), and Jude 9 (∈Ι Ν∈ ∈2ΡΑΙ ∈ΧΝ, "bring down on").
There is one anomalous example, LXX Job 15:12, in which the Greek
ἐπιφέρω is translated with Coptic ∈Ι ΩΡΜ, "stare at," in the Sahidic ver-
sion, while the Bohairic has ΧΟΥΩΤ, "look at," in this passage.[28]

The remaining Coptic equivalents are found in the only two LXX
passages in which the Greek middle-passive ἐπεφέρετο is used: Gen
1:2b and Gen 7:18. Beginning with Gen 7:18, where the Greek has καὶ
ἐπεφέρετο ἡ κιβωτὸς ἐπάνω τοῦ ὕδατος ("and the ark was borne upon
the water"),[29] one Sahidic manuscript reads ΑC2ΛΟΟΛ∈ Ν̄6Ι ΤΚΙΒΩΤΟC
ΑΥΩ Ν∈CΝΑ ∈CΝΗΥ Μ̄Ν̄ΠΜΟΟΥ ("the ark *floated* and *it was coming*
and *going* with the water").[30] A critical edition of Bohairic Genesis
was published by Melvin Peters, with the reading ΟΥΟ2 ΝΑCΝΗΟΥ
ΝΧ∈ΤΚΥΒΩΤΟC CΑΠΩ̣ΩΙ Μ̄ΠΜΩΟΥ ("and the ark *was going* above the
water"); variant readings are presented in notes, such as ΟΥΟ2 ΝΑCΝΑ
ΝΑCΝΗΟΥ ΝΧ∈ΤΚΥΒΩΤΟC CΑΠΩ̣ΩΙ Μ̄ΠΜΩΟΥ ("and the ark *was coming*
and *going* above the water").[31]

While the Greek of Gen 1:2b has πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἐπεφέρετο ἐπάνω τοῦ
ὕδατος ("the spirit of God was borne upon the water"), it is more

---

limited; see Gertrud Bauer, *Konkordanz der nichtflektierten griechischen Wörter im
bohairischen Neuen Testament* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1975).

[27] Crum, *Coptic Dictionary*, 901, for Greek index entry ἐπιφέρειν, pointing to pp.
78b, 79a, 80a, 84b, 217b, 220b, 468b, 669a.

[28] Ibid., 84b and 837a. It is not surprising that this anomaly is found in the Cop-
tic versions of Job, given its complicated textual history. Perhaps LXX Job 15:12 has
read a different verb from the MT; cf. Johan Lust, Erik Eynikel, and Katrin Hauspie,
*A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (2 vols.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesell-
schaft, 1992-1996) 1. 177.

[29] Following Wevers, *Genesis.*

[30] Sahidic text in *Sacrorum Bibliorum fragmenta copto-sahidica Musei Borgiani*
(ed. Agostino Ciasca; 3 vols.; Rome: S. Congregationis, 1885-1904) 1. 5. There is no criti-
cal edition of Sahidic Genesis; the same verse is also preserved in a Chester Beatty
manuscript; see Albert Pietersma and Susan T. Comstock, "New Fragments of Gen-
esis in Sahidic," *Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 23 (1986) 137-47. The
Chester Beatty text is shorter and uses a different verb: ΤΚΙΒΩΤΟC Δ∈ Ν∈CΩ∈∈Ι Π∈
2ΙΧΜ̄ ΠΜΟΟΥ ("the ark was going to and fro on the water").

[31] *A Critical Edition of the Coptic (Bohairic) Pentateuch. Volume 1, Genesis* (ed.
Melvin K. H. Peters; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1985) 18. The Bohairic manuscripts
surveyed for this edition date from the fourth to seventeenth centuries.

difficult to find this text in Sahidic. No strictly biblical manuscript survives for Sahidic at this point, but there is an extended paraphrase of Genesis 1 in a text edited by A. Hebbelynck, which includes the following: ⲡⲉⲡⲛⲁ̅ ⲉϥⲛⲁ ⲉϥⲛ̄ⲏⲩ ϨⲓϪⲛ ⲙⲙⲟⲟⲩ ("the spirit of God *is coming and going* upon the waters").[32] Bohairic is better attested: ⲟⲩⲡⲛⲉⲩⲙⲁ ⲛⲧⲉ ⲫⲛⲟⲩϯ ⲛⲁϥⲛ̄ⲏⲟⲩ ϨⲓϪⲉⲛⲛⲓⲙⲱⲟⲩ ("a spirit of God was going upon the waters").[33] However, the details of one Bohairic variant for Gen 1:2b (from a fourth century Bodmer manuscript) are interesting: ⲟⲩⲡ̄ⲛⲁ̅ ⲛⲧⲉⲫϯ {ⲉ}ⲛⲁϥ {ⲉϥ}ⲛ̄ⲏⲟⲩ ϨⲓϪⲉⲛⲛⲓⲙⲱⲟⲩ, in which the editor puts braces on letters to be deleted in order to correct the text in the manuscript. The correction tends to conform the reading to the main Bohairic text tradition, and thus the editor understands the passage as "a spirit of God came upon the waters" (my English translation of the French in the edition).[34] Other emendations seem possible, for example {ⲉ} ⲛⲁϥ<ⲛⲁ> ⲉϥⲛ̄ⲏⲟⲩ, meaning "was coming and going," as in the Hebbelynck Sahidic text (though here preteritized) and in *Ap. John* (BG).[35] This would also agree somewhat with the Bohairic text of Gen 7:18 cited earlier, ⲛⲁⲥⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲥⲛⲏⲟⲩ ("was coming and going"), referring to the ark and also translating Greek *ἐπεφέρετο*.[36]

Just as it was possible to find examples of the use of *ἐπιφέρω* in non-biblical Greek sources and so understand its meaning in Genesis, there are examples of Coptic use of the verbal combination ⲛⲁ/ⲛⲏⲩ outside the Bible and the Nag Hammadi texts.[37] A work by Shenoute of Atripe

---

[32] Adolphe Hebbelynck, *Les mystères des lettres grecques* (Louvain: Istas, 1902) 24. This text is an analysis of the mystical significance of the Greek alphabet; in the process, it quotes many verses of Genesis using a text that conforms to surviving Sahidic biblical manuscripts. The author of *Les mystères* simply changes the tense to suit the context, which is why we read ⲉϥⲛⲁ ⲉϥⲛ̄ⲏⲩ (present) where other versions have a preterite form such as ⲛⲁϥⲛⲏⲩ. The text, perhaps translated from Greek in the fourth or fifth century, is found in a fourteenth-century manuscript.

[33] *Coptic (Bohairic) Pentateuch* (ed. Peters) 1.

[34] *Papyrus Bodmer III, Évangile de Jean et Genèse I-IV, 2 en bohaïrique* (2 vols.; ed. Rodolphe Kasser; CSCO 177-78; Louvain: Secretariat du CorpusSCO, 1958) 1. 5 (text); 2. 41 (translation). For a discussion of the relationship between this manuscript and other witnesses, see Melvin K. H. Peters, "The Textual Affiliations of Genesis 1:1-4:2 according to Papyrus Bodmer III," in *De Septuaginta: Studies in Honour of John William Wevers on his Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (ed. Albert Pietersma and Claude E. Cox; Mississauga: Benben, 1984) 233-46.

[35] I use pointed brackets for additions and braces for needed omissions, as in CSCO 177 (see previous footnote).

[36] See *Coptic (Bohairic) Pentateuch* (ed. Peters) 18.

[37] Crum, *Coptic Dictionary*, 217b, 219b; the uses of the verb forms are surveyed.

(died ca. 465)[38] is preserved in which he criticizes the lack of supervision of unmarried daughters by their fathers, at a time when local villagers have taken refuge in the monastery of Shenoute to avoid the attacks of desert nomads. Shenoute complains that men with whom the daughters are engaged in illicit sexual conduct are treated as guests by the parents and given easy access to the family residence: "Not only does [the father] accept the one who fornicates with his daughter, but he even likes him and eats and drinks with him, while [the fornicator] comes and goes (ⲉϥⲛⲁ ⲉϥⲛⲏⲩ) in the father's house like a son and a brother."[39] This original Coptic example suggests that the phrase was used in everyday speech to mean "come and go" in the sense of going freely back and forth, in and out. It is unlikely to be a phrase created to solve a translation problem in the Coptic version of Genesis.

## IV. *Apocryphon of John* as Commentary on Genesis 1:2b

In *Ap. John* (BG), the problem is posed: "But I [John] said, 'Christ, what is "rushing over" (ⲉⲡⲓⲫⲉⲣⲉ)?' And he [Christ] laughed and said, 'Do you think that it is as Moses said, "upon the waters"? No, rather, she [the Mother] saw the evil . . . of her son. She repented and was coming and going (ⲉⲥⲛⲁ ⲉⲥⲛⲏⲩ) in the dark. . . . Her coming and going, this is "rushing over" (ⲉⲡⲓⲫⲉⲣⲉ).'"[40] Whereas at the beginning of this essay I left ⲉⲡⲓⲫⲉⲣⲉ untranslated, here I offer a translation guided by recent studies, especially that of Zlatko Pleše.[41]

Many modern scholars have noted that *Ap. John* is re-writing the first chapters of Genesis.[42] But the *early* reader of the Coptic transla-

---

[38] For the chronology of the life of Shenoute, see Stephen Emmel, *Shenoute's Literary Corpus* (2 vols.; CSCO 599-600; Leuven: Peeters, 2004) 1. 6-12.

[39] The Coptic text of Shenoute's sermon, "Continuing to Glorify the Lord," is from *Sinuthii Archimandritae Vita et Opera Omnia* (ed. Johannes Leipoldt; CSCO 42; Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1908) 76; the translation is mine. For a description of this sermon, see Emmel, *Shenoute's Literary Corpus*, 1. 591.

[40] My translation is based on text in *Apocryphon of John*, 80. I translate the key verb, ⲉⲡⲓⲫⲉⲣⲉ, as "rushed over" on the basis of LSJ and the translation of Pleše, *Poetics of the Gnostic Universe*, 224. Basil of Caesarea, in the work that was discussed at the beginning of this essay (see above), assumes another meaning, "borne upon," which is also attested in LSJ.

[41] Pleše, *Poetics of the Gnostic Universe*, 224.

[42] Gerard P. Luttikhuizen, *Gnostic Revisions of Genesis Stories and Early Jesus Traditions* (NHMS 58; Leiden: Brill, 2006) 2. Later in his book, Luttikhuizen describes the pattern: "Moses' account is rejected as a superficial, if not erroneous, understand-

tion of *Ap. John* would also need to recognize the Genesis background in order to appreciate the re-written message. Louis Painchaud has analyzed the role of quotations and allusions in Gnostic literature and argued that "allusions, although they are difficult to recognize, are no less relevant for the understanding of the use of Scripture than are explicit quotations. On the contrary, their identification as allusions is absolutely necessary for the understanding of a given text."[43] This statement is made in the context of a study of quotation and allusion in *Ap. John* and in another Nag Hammadi Gnostic text, *On the Origin of the World* (NHC II.5; XIII.2). Painchaud is especially interested in formulating principles for identifying allusions and offers "objective criteria."[44] While the allusion to Gen 1:2b in *Ap. John* (BG) is not difficult to identify—due to ⲉⲡⲓ ⲫⲉⲣⲉ, rather than "as Moses said"—one of the proposed criteria helps us understand the structure of this passage. Painchaud suggests that "a word or a group of words intended as an allusion must show some degree of strangeness or peculiarity in their context; they must appear as incomprehensible, or at least unexpected, their very strangeness being a hint, a signal directed toward the reader."[45] The Greek loanword ⲉⲡⲓ ⲫⲉⲣⲉ is indeed strange in this context. Though it was a common word in documentary texts, as shown above, it is rare in the Bible, at least in the middle-passive form found in Gen 1:2b.

How would this word and the accompanying allusion sound in the bilingual context of fourth or fifth century Egypt? Rafaella Cribiore

---

ing of the event in question. Thereupon Christ gives an elaborate explanation of what really happened" (p. 18). Søren Giversen, "The Apocryphon of John and Genesis," *ST* 17 (1963) 60-76, offered one of the first explorations of the problem. Significant later discussion is found in Birger A. Pearson, "Use, Authority, and Exegesis of Mikra in Gnostic Literature," in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading, and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (ed. Martin Jan Mulder; CRINT 2/1; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1988; reprint, Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2004) 635-52; Peter Nagel, "Die Septuaginta in den Nag Hammadi-Teksten," in *The Nag Hammadi Texts in the History of Religions* (ed. Søren Giversen, Tage Petersen, and Jørgen Podemann Sørensen; Historisk-filosofiske Skrifter 26; Copenhagen: Reitzel, 2002) 164-82; and especially, Pleše, *Poetics of the Gnostic Universe.*

[43] Louis Painchaud, "The Use of Scripture in Gnostic Literature," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 4 (1996) 129-47, here 131.

[44] Ibid., 136.

[45] Ibid. The other two criteria are: (2) light is shed on the meaning of the text by the identification of the allusion in it; and (3) presence within the same context of other allusions to the same biblical text.

has shown that in some cases instruction in Greek and Coptic was carried out side-by-side during the first stage of education in Egyptian towns.[46] At other times, both Greek speakers in Egypt and native Coptic speakers might only achieve literacy in Greek.[47] The Pachomian Rule prescribes the following for a new member of the community (beginning in the fourth century): "If he is illiterate, he shall go at the first, third, and sixth hours to someone who can teach and has been appointed for him."[48] This passage leaves the language of literacy unspecified; however, the majority of the members of the Pachomian community were certainly Coptic speakers, and so there is the possibility of exclusively Coptic literacy. But given the overall picture of education in Egypt at this time, it is quite possible that the early readers of *Ap. John* in Coptic were also somewhat literate in Greek, and when they encountered a biblical allusion, both the Greek and Coptic Bible were "in play." At the highest level of Coptic literacy, Shenoute of Atripe, the fifth-century abbot of the White Monastery near Sohag, demonstrated awareness of both the Greek and Sahidic LXX in his work and seems to have written in both Greek and Coptic.[49]

If the readers of *Ap. John* in BG were aware of both the Greek and Coptic Bible, they would have a different experience than the readers of the other versions of *Ap. John* (those found at Nag Hammadi). Much more work needs to be done on how these Coptic Gnostic texts function as part of Coptic literature, as Emmel has noted.[50] He goes on to say that we need a "theory of Coptic reading and Coptic readers . . . to help us understand how an ancient reader of these books would have reacted to what we judge to be obvious oddities," such

---

[46] Rafaella Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001) 157. For a recent discussion of the problems of identifying instructional material, see Scott Bucking, "A Sahidic Coptic Manuscript in the Private Collection of Lloyd E. Cotsen and the Limits of Papyrological Interpretation," *Journal of Coptic Studies* 8 (2006) 55-78.

[47] Cribiore, *Gymnastics*, 176, argues that students learned literacy through their weaker language. For native Coptic speakers, in a bilingual environment, this would be Greek. The question of oral bilingualism is different; see Roger S. Bagnall, *Egypt in Late Antiquity* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993) 259, for the argument that it was possible to get by with only Greek in urban communities. Many villagers, on the other hand, knew nothing but spoken Egyptian.

[48] Precept 139 in *Pachomian Koinonia* (trans. Armand Veilleux; 3 vols.; Cistercian Studies 45-47; Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 1981) 2. 166.

[49] See Leo Depuydt, "In Sinuthium graecum," *Or* 59 (1990) 67-71.

[50] Emmel, "Religious Tradition," 42.

as dialect mixture and obscure expressions.[51] When the BG version of *Ap. John* asks, "what is ⲉⲡⲓ ⲫⲉⲣⲉ?" and answers with "her coming and going, this is ⲉⲡⲓ ⲫⲉⲣⲉ," there is obvious obscurity since the Greek loanword does not mean "come and go."[52] But once it is recognized that the "come and go" language (Coptic ⲛⲁ/ⲛⲏⲩ) appears in a Sahidic version of Gen 1:2b (and perhaps in an early Bohairic manuscript), then the early reader may be using one version to understand the other.[53] In this text, Christ explains a puzzling term in Greek Genesis with words drawn from Coptic Genesis.

Birger Pearson has argued that in Gnostic texts such as *Ap. John*, "the use of Genesis often involves a 'reverse' interpretation . . . not a rejection of Genesis, or a revision of its text, but 'secret doctrine.'"[54] Yet "reverse" does not quite capture the effect if two versions of the Bible text are utilized. In this case it is reminiscent of Basil's appeal to a certain Syrian, who explains Gen 1:2b by means of linguistic tools from his Syriac translation of Genesis, which is a kind of lateral move rather than a reverse. Basil does not reject or reverse the Greek text of Gen 1:2b, but finds that it can be understood to include the meaning his Syrian friend supplies. Coptic and Greek Bible translations work side by side in *Ap. John* (BG), which is just what we might expect in a bilingual society where some readers could have both versions in mind.

---

[51] Ibid.

[52] This is noted by Pleše, *Poetics of the Gnostic Universe*, 224 n. 85, with reference to the Coptic verb ⲱⲉⲉⲓ used in the Nag Hammadi versions of *Ap. John*. Pleše consistently translates the Greek verb as "rush over." The passages from *Ap. John* (BG) are found in *Apocryphon of John*, 80.

[53] See above discussion of the Bohairic text in P. Bodmer.

[54] Pearson, "Mikra," 648.

# Part Two

---

# Later Septuagintal Books

# A Textual and Literary Analysis of the Song of the Three Jews in Greek Daniel 3:52-90

ALEXANDER A. DI LELLA, O.F.M.

The Song of the Three Jews in the fiery furnace in Greek Dan 3:52-90 is a gem of Jewish poetry and piety. Part of the Song (3:57-90), called by its Latin title, the *Benedicite*, is recited or sung in the Morning Prayer of the Liturgy of the Hours (or Divine Office) on the first and third Sundays of the four-week cycle of Psalms and on feasts and solemnities.[1] What makes the Song unique is that the composer/poet boldly calls upon all creatures, and not just the pious or just the earth, to praise the Creator.

The Song is extant in LXX-Daniel [= LXX], Theodotion-Daniel [= Theod.-Dan],[2] Vulgate [= Vulg], Syriac Peshitta [= Syr], and other ancient versions as well as a medieval Aramaic text found in *The*

---

[1] Curt Kuhl (*Die drei Männer im Feuer [Daniel Kapitel 3 und seine Zusätze]* [BZAW 55; Giessen: Töpelmann, 1930] 111) states that according to tradition and the usage of the church, what he calls the Hymn begins not in v. 52 but in v. 57. I agree, however, with those scholars (e.g., John J. Collins, *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* [Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993] 204-7, and Mathias Delcor, *Le livre de Daniel* [SB; Paris: Gabalda, 1971] 103-5), whose studies I examine below, that vv. 52-56 also belong to the Song.

[2] For a study of these two Greek texts, see Alexander A. Di Lella, "The Textual History of Septuagint-Daniel and Theodotion-Daniel," in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception* (ed. John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint; Formation and Interpretation of Old Testament Literature; 2 vols.; VTSup 82/1-2; Leiden: Brill, 2001) 2. 586-607.

*Chronicle of Jerahmeel.*[3] Scholars, not surprisingly, are not in total agreement on the question of the original language of the Song. But there is a widely held consensus that the original was written not in Greek but in a Semitic language, very probably Hebrew.[4]

Scholars have analyzed the Song in different ways. Carey A. Moore, for example, argues that what he calls the Ode, vv. 52-56, was originally a separate and independent work. Then he sees four strophes or stanzas in the second part of the Song, which he calls the Psalm: (1) 3:57-63, creatures in highest heaven are to praise God; (2) vv. 64-73, creatures coming from heaven should praise God; (3) vv. 74-81, earthly creatures should praise God; and (4) vv. 82-90, all humankind should praise God.[5] John J. Collins proposes a modified structure, dividing the Song into two sections: (1) 3:52-56, a declarative praise of the Lord; and (2) 3:57-90, imperatives to praise the Lord which, after an introductory v. 57, appear in four stanzas—(i) vv. 58-63, heavens and heavenly bodies; (ii) vv. 64-73, natural elements; (iii) vv. 74-81, earth and earthly bodies; and (iv) vv. 82-90, human beings.[6] Elmer B. Christie discusses briefly 3:52-56 after vv. 57-90, the *Benedicite*, which he divides into two halves: vv. 57-73, and vv. 74-90. He then argues that 3:57-90 form "a

---

[3] For the Greek texts I employed the critical edition found in Joseph Ziegler and Olivier Munnich, *Susanna, Daniel, Bel et Draco* (Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum 16/2; 2d ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999). For the Vulg, I used *Biblia Sacra iuxta Vulgatam versionem* (ed. Robert Weber; 2 vols.; 2d ed.; Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1975) 2. 1349-51; and for the Syr, *The Old Testament in Syriac, III/4: Dodekapropheton—Daniel-Bel-Draco* (Leiden: Brill, 1980). The text of *The Chronicle of Jerahmeel* was originally published by Moses Gaster, "The Unknown Aramaic Original of Theodotion's Additions to the Book of Daniel," *Proceedings of the Society for Biblical Archaeology* 16 (1894) 280-317; 17 (1895) 75-91; the text is reprinted in Klaus Koch, *Deuterokanonische Zusätze zum Danielbuch* (2 vols.; AOAT 38/1-2; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1987), vol. 1, in synopsis with the two Greek forms, the Vulg, and Syr. Collins incorporates into his critical translation of the Song (*Daniel*, 196-98) the Aramaic evidence from *The Chronicle* as well as variant readings in the Theod.-Dan, LXX, Vulg, and Syr.

[4] Kuhl (*Drei Männer*, 128-33 and 158) rather successfully retroverted the Greek text of the Song into poetic Hebrew. As Carey A. Moore (*Daniel, Esther and Jeremiah: The Additions* [AB 44; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1977] 75) observes, Kuhl's rendering "is perhaps the strongest argument for the [Song] having originally been in Hebrew." See also Collins, *Daniel*, 205.

[5] Moore, *Daniel*, 75.

[6] Collins, *Daniel*, 204-5. Dieter Bauer (*Das Buch Daniel* [Neuer Stuttgarter Kommentar/ Altes Testament 22; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1996] 105) presents a similar structure.

four-stanza poem of 28 verses (seven in each stanza)."[7] Mathias Delcor prefers to see six stanzas in the Song: (1) praise of God (3:52-56); (2) heavenly creatures (vv. 57-63); (3) natural phenomena (vv. 64-66, 69-73 [he leaves out vv. 67-68 because some MSS of Theod.-Dan omit these verses]); (4) terrestrial creatures (vv. 74-81); (5) human beings (vv. 82-88); (6) conclusion (vv. 89-90).[8] As we shall see, I shall argue for a different strophic structure.

The somewhat eclectic text I present below is taken principally from the pre-Hexaplaric LXX Papyrus 967, which was discovered in Egypt in 1931. Since it "was written as early as the second century and no later than the first half of the third century," it is centuries older than the Hexaplaric LXX witnesses (MS 88 and the Syro-Hexapla [= Syh]).[9] The text of LXX-Dan is beyond question older than Theod.-Dan.[10] Papyrus 967 has a better ordering of the material and in many verses it has generally better contents than what we find in 88-Syh and Theod.-Dan (for instance, it omits v. 53). The English translation below is my own. In the Greek text, I indicate a significant variant from the other witnesses, 88 and Syh as well as from Theod.-Dan, Syr, and Vulg, by a superscript asterisk ([*]), and then I describe these variants in a section at the end of the Greek and English columns below. In the discussion I shall also indicate several other variants.

In Papyrus 967, the Song divides neatly into seven stanzas, or strophes, each with five bicola, for a total of 35 bicola. (1) The first stanza is a declaration of praise of the Lord (3:52-56). The following six stanzas (vv. 57-87) invite various creatures to praise the Lord: (2) vv. 57-61; (3) vv. 64-68 (vv. 62 and 63 appear after v. 78 in the fifth stanza; see below, especially the textual note on v. 61); (4) vv. 69-73; (5) vv. 74-78; (6) vv. 62-63, 79-81; (7) vv. 82-84 (967 omits v. 85), 87, 86 (the order found in 967).[11] This strophic structure enhances the beauty and rhetorical

---

[7] Elmer B. Christie, "The Strophic Arrangement of the Benedicite," *JBL* 47 (1928) 188-93, here 191.

[8] Delcor, *Le livre de Daniel*, 104.

[9] Di Lella, "Textual History," 2. 590; see also Pierre-Maurice Bogaert, "Daniel 3 LXX et son supplément grec," in *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings* (ed. Adam S. van der Woude; BETL 106; Leuven: Peeters, 1993) 13-37, here 15-16.

[10] Di Lella, "Textual History," 2. 590-91; see also Bogaert, "Daniel 3 LXX," 15-16.

[11] Bogaert ("Daniel 3 LXX," 28-31) was the first, as far as I know, to call for a renewed study of the Song, emphasizing especially the importance of Papyrus 967. In my essay, I develop some of the basic points found in Bogaert's article, which deals all too briefly with the analysis of the seven stanzas.

elegance of the Song. The addition in 3:88-90 was probably inserted into the Song later, with v. 88 serving to connect the Song with the three faithful Jews who had been thrown into the furnace;[12] this verse was presumably added by the person who inserted the Song into Daniel 3.[13] The wording of 3:89b, ὅτι εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ, "for his mercy is forever" (which appears again in 3:90), is an exact quotation of LXX Pss 105:1b; 106:1b; and 135:1b; and v. 90, quoting the words "God of gods" from LXX Ps 135:2a, serves as a doxology.[14]

## Text and Translation of Dan 3:52-90

### Stanza 1

*3:52ab* εὐλογητὸς εἶ, κύριε ὁ θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν, καὶ αἰνετὸς καὶ ὑπερυψούμενος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.

*3:52cd* εὐλογημένον τὸ ὄνομα* τῆς δόξης σου τὸ ἅγιον καὶ ὑπεραινετὸν καὶ ὑπερυψωμένον εἰς πάντας τοὺς αἰῶνας.*

*3:54* εὐλογημένος εἶ ἐπὶ θρόνου τῆς δόξης τῆς βασιλείας σου καὶ ὑπερυμνητὸς καὶ ὑπερυψωμένος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.

*3:55* εὐλογημένος εἶ, ὁ* βλέπων ἀβύσσους καθήμενος ἐπὶ χερουβιν, καὶ αἰνετὸς* καὶ ὑπερυψώμενος εἶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.

*3:56* εὐλογητὸς εἶ ἐν τῷ στερεώματι καὶ ὑμνητὸς καὶ δεδοξασμένος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.

### Stanza 1

*3:52ab* Blessed are you, O Lord, the God of our fathers, and praiseworthy and highly exalted forever.

*3:52cd* Blessed is the holy name of your glory, and most praiseworthy and highly exalted for all ages.

*3:54* Blessed are you on the throne of the glory of your kingdom, and highly lauded and highly exalted forever.

*3:55* Blessed are you who look into the depths, seated upon the cherubim, and praiseworthy and highly exalted forever.

*3:56* Blessed are you in the firmament, and lauded and glorified forever.

---

[12] See W. H. Bennett, "The Prayer of Azariah and the Song of the Three Young Children," in *APOT* 1. 625-37, here 637.

[13] See Collins, *Daniel*, 205.

[14] See Bennett, "Prayer," 637.

## Stanza 2

*3:57 εὐλογεῖτε, πάντα τὰ ἔργα τοῦ κυρίου, τὸν κύριον· ὑμνεῖτε καὶ ὑπερυψοῦτε αὐτὸν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.*

*3:58 εὐλογεῖτε, ἄγγελοι κυρίου,\* τὸν κύριον· ὑμνεῖτε καὶ ὑπερυψοῦτε αὐτὸν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.*

*3:59 εὐλογεῖτε, οὐρανοί, τὸν κύριον· ὑμνεῖτε καὶ ὑπερυψοῦτε αὐτὸν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.*

*3:60 εὐλογεῖτε, ὕδατα πάντα τὰ ἐπάνω τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, τὸν κύριον· ὑμνεῖτε καὶ ὑπερυψοῦτε αὐτὸν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.*

*3:61 εὐλογεῖτε, πᾶσαι αἱ δυνάμεις κυρίου,\* τὸν κύριον· ὑμνεῖτε καὶ ὑπερυψοῦτε αὐτὸν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.\**

## Stanza 3

*3:64 εὐλογεῖτε,\* πᾶς ὄμβρος καὶ δρόσος, τὸν κύριον· ὑμνεῖτε καὶ ὑπερυψοῦτε αὐτὸν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.*

*3:65 εὐλογεῖτε, πάντα τὰ πνεύματα,\* τὸν κύριον· ὑμνεῖτε καὶ ὑπερυψοῦτε αὐτὸν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.*

*3:66 εὐλογεῖτε, πῦρ καὶ καῦμα, τὸν κύριον· ὑμνεῖτε καὶ ὑπερυψοῦτε αὐτὸν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.*

*3:67 εὐλογεῖτε, ῥῖγος καὶ ψῦχος, τὸν κύριον· ὑμνεῖτε καὶ ὑπερυψοῦτε αὐτὸν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.*

## Stanza 2

*3:57* Bless the Lord, all you works of the Lord; praise and highly exalt him forever.

*3:58* You angels of the Lord, bless the Lord; praise and highly exalt him forever.

*3:59* You heavens, bless the Lord; praise and highly exalt him forever.

*3:60* All you waters above the heavens, bless the Lord; praise and highly exalt him forever.

*3:61* All you hosts of the Lord, bless the Lord; praise and highly exalt him forever.

## Stanza 3

*3:64* Every shower and dew, bless the Lord; praise and highly exalt him forever.

*3:65* All you winds, bless the Lord; praise and highly exalt him forever.

*3:66* Fire and heat, bless the Lord; praise and highly exalt him forever.

*3:67* Frost and cold, bless the Lord; praise and highly exalt him forever.

*3:68 εὐλογεῖτε, δρόσοι καὶ νιφετοί, τὸν κύριον· ὑμνεῖτε καὶ ὑπερυψοῦτε αὐτὸν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.*

3:68 Dews and snow showers, bless the Lord; praise and highly exalt him forever.

## Stanza 4

*3:69 εὐλογεῖτε, πάγοι καὶ ψῦχος,\* τὸν κύριον· ὑμνεῖτε καὶ ὑπερυψοῦτε αὐτὸν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.*

3:69 Frosts and cold, bless the Lord; praise and highly exalt him forever.

*3:70 εὐλογεῖτε, χιόνες καὶ πάχναι, τὸν κύριον· ὑμνεῖτε καὶ ὑπερυψοῦτε αὐτὸν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.*

3:70 Snows and hoarfrosts, bless the Lord; praise and highly exalt him forever.

*3:71 εὐλογεῖτε, νύκτες καὶ ἡμέραι, τὸν κύριον· ὑμνεῖτε καὶ ὑπερυψοῦτε αὐτὸν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.*

3:71 Nights and days, bless the Lord; praise and highly exalt him forever.

*3:72 εὐλογεῖτε, σκότος καὶ φῶς, τὸν κύριον· ὑμνεῖτε καὶ ὑπερυψοῦτε αὐτὸν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.*

3:72 Darkness and light, bless the Lord; praise and highly exalt him forever.

*3:73 εὐλογεῖτε, ἀστραπαὶ καὶ νεφέλαι, τὸν κύριον· ὑμνεῖτε καὶ ὑπερυψοῦτε αὐτὸν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.*

3:73 Lightnings and clouds, bless the Lord; praise and highly exalt him forever.

## Stanza 5

*3:74 εὐλογείτω ἡ γῆ τὸν κύριον· ὑμνείτω καὶ ὑπερυψούτω αὐτὸν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.*

3:74 Let the earth bless the Lord; let it praise and highly exalt him forever.

*3:75 εὐλογεῖτε, ὄρη καὶ βουνοί, τὸν κύριον· ὑμνεῖτε καὶ ὑπερυψοῦτε αὐτὸν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.*

3:75 Mountains and hills, bless the Lord; praise and highly exalt him forever.

*3:76 εὐλογεῖτε, πάντα τὰ φυόμενα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, τὸν κύριον· ὑμνεῖτε καὶ ὑπερυψοῦτε αὐτὸν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.*

3:76 Everything growing on the earth, bless the Lord; praise and highly exalt him forever.

*3:77 εὐλογεῖτε, αἱ πηγαί,\* τὸν κύριον· ὑμνεῖτε καὶ ὑπερυψοῦτε αὐτὸν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.*

3:77 You springs, bless the Lord; praise and highly exalt him forever.

*3:78 εὐλογεῖτε, θάλασσαι καὶ ποταμοί, τὸν κύριον· ὑμνεῖτε καὶ ὑπερυψοῦτε αὐτὸν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.*

3:78 Seas and rivers, bless the Lord; praise and highly exalt him forever.

## Stanza 6

*3:62 εὐλογεῖτε, ἥλιος καὶ σελήνη, τὸν κύριον· ὑμνεῖτε καὶ ὑπερυψοῦτε αὐτὸν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.*

3:62 Sun and moon, bless the Lord; praise and highly exalt him forever.

*3:63 εὐλογεῖτε, ἄστρα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, τὸν κύριον· ὑμνεῖτε καὶ ὑπερυψοῦτε αὐτὸν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.*

3:63 Stars of heaven, bless the Lord; praise and highly exalt him forever.

*3:79 εὐλογεῖτε, κήτη καὶ πάντα τὰ κινούμενα ἐν τοῖς ὕδασι, τὸν κύριον· ὑμνεῖτε καὶ ὑπερυψοῦτε αὐτὸν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.*

3:79 You sea monsters and all that move in the waters, bless the Lord; praise and highly exalt him forever.

*3:80 εὐλογεῖτε, πάντα\* τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, τὸν κύριον· ὑμνεῖτε καὶ ὑπερυψοῦτε αὐτὸν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.*

3:80 All you birds of heaven, bless the Lord; praise and highly exalt him forever.

*3:81 εὐλογεῖτε, τὰ τετράποδα καὶ τὰ κτήνη καὶ τὰ θηρία τῆς γῆς, τὸν κύριον· ὑμνεῖτε καὶ ὑπερυψοῦτε αὐτὸν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.*

3:81 You quadrupeds and cattle and wild beasts of the earth, bless the Lord; praise and highly exalt him forever.

## Stanza 7

*3:82 εὐλογεῖτε, οἱ υἱοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, τὸν κύριον· ὑμνεῖτε καὶ ὑπερυψοῦτε αὐτὸν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.*

3:82 You children of men, bless the Lord; praise and highly exalt him forever.

*3:83 εὐλογεῖτε, Ισραηλ, τὸν κύριον· ὑμνεῖτε καὶ ὑπερυψοῦτε αὐτὸν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.*

3:83 O Israel, bless the Lord; praise and highly exalt him forever.

*3:84 εὐλογεῖτε, ἱερεῖς, δοῦλοι κυρίου, τὸν κύριον· ὑμνεῖτε καὶ ὑπερυψοῦτε αὐτὸν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.\**

3:84 Priests, servants of the Lord, bless the Lord; praise and highly exalt him forever.

*3:87 εὐλογεῖτε, ὅσιοι καὶ ταπεινοὶ καρδίᾳ,τὸν κύριον· ὑμνεῖτε καὶ ὑπερυψοῦτε αὐτόν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.\**

3:87 Holy ones and humble of heart, bless the Lord; praise and highly exalt him forever.

*3:86 εὐλογεῖτε, πνεύματα\* καὶ ψυχαὶ δικαίων, τὸν κύριον· ὑμνεῖτε καὶ ὑπερυψοῦτε αὐτὸν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.*

3:86 Spirits and souls of the righteous, bless the Lord; praise and highly exalt him forever.

## An Addition

## An Addition

*3:88 εὐλογεῖτε, Ανανια, Αζαρια, Μεισαηλ, τὸν κύριον· ὑμνεῖτε καὶ ὑπερυψοῦτε αὐτὸν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, ὅτι ἐξείλατο ἡμᾶς ἐξ ᾅδου καὶ ἔσωσεν ἡμᾶς ἐκ χειρὸς θανάτου καὶ ἐρρύσατο ἡμᾶς ἐκ μέσου καιομένης φλογὸς καὶ ἐλυτρώσατο ἡμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ πυρὸς.*

3:88 Hananiah, Azariah, Mishael, bless the Lord; praise and highly exalt him forever. For he has rescued us from the nether world, and saved us from the power of death, and he has freed us from the burning flame and delivered us from the fire.

*3:89 ἐξομολογεῖσθε τῷ κυρίῳ, ὅτι χρηστός, ὅτι εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ.*

3:89 Proclaim the Lord, for he is good, for forever is his mercy.

*3:90 εὐλογεῖτε, πάντες οἱ σεβόμενοι τὸν κύριον τὸν θεὸν τῶν θεῶν· ὑμνεῖτε\* καὶ ἐξομολογεῖσθε, ὅτι εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τῶν αἰώνων.*

3:90 All you who worship the Lord, bless the God of gods; praise and proclaim him, because forever is his mercy and forever and ever.

*Textual Notes*

*3:52c*: 967 adds *σου*.
*3:52d*: 967 omits v. 53, found in 88-Syh (= Theod.-Dan and Vulg; see Syr).
*3:55a*: 967 omits.
*3:55b*: 967 omits *καὶ αἰνετός*, found in 88-Syh.
*3:58a*: 88 and Theod.-Dan; 967 and Syh omit *κυρίου*.
*3:61a*: 88-Syh; 967 omits *κυρίου*.

*3:61b*: In 967, vv. 62-63 come after v. 78, a more logical order in terms of Gen 1:16; see commentary.

*3:64a*: 88-Syh; 967 εὐλογείτω.

*3:65a*: 88-Syh, Theod.-Dan, Syr, and Vulg; 967 πνεύμα, as also in v. 86a.

*3:69a*: 88; 967 πάγη καὶ ψῦχη.

*3:77a*: Theod.-Dan; 88 ὄμβρος καὶ αἱ πηγαί; 967 ποταμοὶ καὶ πηγαί.

*3:80a*: 88; 967 and Syh omit.

*3:84b*: 967 omits v. 85, found in 88-Syh = Theod.-Dan (but MS 410 omits the v.), Syr, and Vulg.

*3:86a*: 88-Syh; 967 πνεύμα, as in v. 65a.

*3:87, 86*: the order found in 967.

*3:90*: 88-Syh; 967 omits.


## Commentary


In Stanza 1 (3:52-56; see the textual notes on v. 52) the poet declares that the "Lord, the God of our fathers" and the holy name of the Lord, who is seated on his royal throne upon the cherubim, looking into the depths, is blessed and praiseworthy and highly exalted and glorified in the firmament forever. The wording of the two bicola in 3:52 is clearly related to Greek I of Tob 8:5: καὶ ἤρξατο Τωβίας λέγειν εὐλογητὸς εἶ, ὁ θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν, καὶ εὐλογητὸν τὸ ὄνομά σου τὸ ἅγιον καὶ ἔνδοξον εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας· εὐλογησάτωσάν σε οἱ οὐρανοὶ καὶ πᾶσαι αἱ κτίσεις σου,[15] "And Tobiah began to say: 'Blessed are you, God of our fathers, and blessed is your holy and glorious name forever; let the heavens and all your creatures bless you' " (my translation). Moore writes that the second part of Tobiah's prayer calling on the heavens and all creatures to bless the Lord "is in capsule form what the [Song] elaborates in detail. Thus, Tobit 8:5. . . may have been the inspiration for the [Song]."[16]

The title, κύριε ὁ θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν, "Lord, the God of our Fathers" (3:52a), with the first-person plural pronoun, appears also in

---

[15] Text from Robert Hanhart, *Tobit* (Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum 8/5; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983) 128-29; the text of Greek II is slightly different.

[16] Moore, *Daniel*, 69. Collins (*Daniel*, 205) disagrees, noting: "The reverse is no less plausible: Tobit may be making a summary reference to the Song. It is also possible . . . that both are adapting traditional liturgical formulas."

the Prayer of Azariah (3:26a). This exact title is not common, recurring only six other times in the LXX: Deut 27:7; 2 Chr 13:11, 12; 20:6; 1 Esdras 9:8; 2 Esdras [= Ezra] 7:27. But with the second-person plural pronoun, the title appears twelve times: Exod 3:15, 16; Deut 1:11, 21; 4:1; 12:1; 26:7; Josh 1:11; 2 Chr 28:9; 29:5; 2 Esdras 8:28; 10:11.

The expression τὸ ὄνομα τῆς δόξης σου τὸ ἅγιον, "the holy name of your glory" (3:52c), recurs nowhere else in the LXX. A similar phrase is found in LXX Ps 71:19a: εὐλογητὸν τὸ ὄνομα τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ, "blessed be the name of his glory." The more "usual" expression is ἕνεκα τῆς δόξης τοῦ ὀνόματός σου, "for the glory of your name" (LXX Ps 78:9b). The expression ἐπὶ θρόνου τῆς δόξης τῆς βασιλείας σου, "on the throne of the glory of your kingdom" (v. 54a), finds an echo in the words of Jesus in Matt 25:31: when the Son of Man comes, "he will sit on the throne of his glory," καθίσει ἐπὶ θρόνου δόξης αὐτοῦ.[17] The mention of the Lord seated upon the cherubim (v. 55a),[18] harks back to 1 Sam 4:4; 2 Sam 6:2; 2 Kgs 19:15; Pss 80:2 and 99:1.[19] The Ark of the Covenant, which was covered by the outspread wings of the cherubim (Exod 25:18-22; 37:7-9), serves as the mobile element of the divine "chariot."[20]

In the list of creatures called upon to praise God in the next six stanzas, there is a noteworthy progression that is based roughly on the order in which the various creatures appear in the creation narrative of Genesis 1. In Stanza 2 (3:57-61), "all the works of the Lord" (v. 57), which borrows the phrase from LXX Ps 102:22a, embraces the totality of creation. Then follow "the angels of the Lord" (3:58; see LXX Ps 102:20a); in Theod.-Dan (and its daughter translation, the Syr) v. 58 comes after v. 59. The order of the verses in the LXX and Vulg seems more logical, for the implication is that angels are the most sublime of God's creatures, and accordingly deserve top billing. Then come "the heavens" (3:59), a text that harks back to Gen 1:1, and the "waters above the heavens" (v. 60), a clear reference to Gen 1:7 (see also LXX Ps 148:4b). The mention of "all the hosts [or powers, δυνάμεις] of the Lord" (v. 61a; see LXX Ps 102:21a) forms an allusion to Gen 2:1. For the wording of v. 61a see LXX Ps 102:21a (see also LXX Ps 148:2 where ἄγγελοι and δυνάμεις appear in successive cola).

---

[17] Collins (*Daniel*, 206) also refers to a similar passage in *1 Enoch* 62:2, 3, 5.

[18] See Carol Meyers, "Cherubim," *ABD* 1. 899-900.

[19] Collins, *Daniel*, 206.

[20] See Bogaert, "Daniel 3 LXX," 28.

Stanza 3 (3:64-68; see the textual note on 3:61) speaks chiefly of meteorological creatures that derive from water that is found on high. First come ὄμβρος καὶ δρόσος, "shower and dew" (v. 64), which have their origin in the heavens or sky but then come down on the earth. For other references to shower and dew, see, for example, LXX Deut 32:2, where the same two nouns recur, and also Deut 11:11, "rain from the heavens" (see also Gen 1:7); Isa 45:8, "Pour down, O heavens, from above"; and Dan 4:12, 20, 22, 30, "the dew of heaven." Dew was vital in the rainless summer of Palestine; perhaps that is why the noun "dew(s)" is mentioned twice: at the beginning, v. 64, and at the end of this stanza, v. 68, thus forming an inclusio. As regards "all the winds" (3:65) in relation to the heavens, see Dan 7:2; 8:8; Zech 2:10; 6:5.

The following verses (vv. 66-68) list the various natural forces that recur on earth: πῦρ καὶ καῦμα, "fire and heat" (3:66, a word pair that appears nowhere else in the Greek versions); ῥῖγος καὶ ψῦχος, "frost and cold" (v. 67, another phrase that is a *hapax legomenon*); and δρόσοι καὶ νιφετοί, "dews and snow showers" (v. 68, words recurring also in LXX Deut 32:2 = Ode 2:2). In LXX Ps 148:8a πῦρ, χάλαζα, χιών, κρύσταλλος, "fire, hail, snow, ice," are likewise invited to praise the Lord.

The order of the creatures in this stanza seems unusual. Bogaert sees (rightly in my judgment) the following pattern: 3:66, "fire and heat," is at the center with v. 64, "shower and dew," and v. 68, "dews and snow showers," serving as a symmetrical frame; while v. 65, "all the winds," connects with v. 61, "all the powers of the Lord" (in Stanza 2), and v. 67, "frost and cold," connects with v. 69, "frosts and cold" (in Stanza 4), all elements that are opposed to "fire and heat" in v. 66. To these meteorological forces we can add v. 60 (in Stanza 2), "all the waters above the heavens," and v. 70, "snows and hoarfrosts" (in Stanza 4) that surround Stanza 3 to correspond to the episode of the divine protection of the three Jews in the blazing furnace.[21] The poet mentions "fire and heat" in only one verse, probably because in the story into which the Song was inserted, Nebuchadnezzar prescribed those very elements in order to execute the three Jews for disobeying his command to worship the gold statue he had set up (Dan 3:1-21).

Stanza 4 (3:69-73) again speaks of meteorological elements in vv. 69-70, 73. The phrase πάγοι καὶ ψῦχος, "frosts and cold" (v. 69), is

---

[21] Ibid., 29.

found only one other time in the LXX (Zech 14:6), while the word pair χιόνες καὶ πάχναι, "snows and hoarfrosts" (v. 70), is a *hapax legomenon*. The poet apparently enjoyed winter weather, for he mentions in four different verses across Stanzas 3 and 4: "frost and cold" (v. 67), "dews and snow showers" (v. 68), "frosts and cold" (v. 69), and "snows and hoarfrosts" (v. 70). More meteorological phenomena follow in v. 73: ἀστραπαὶ καὶ νεφέλαι, "lightnings and clouds," a word pair that recurs also in LXX Exod 19:16, but with the second noun in the singular.

The words, νύκτες καὶ ἡμέραι, "nights and days" (v. 71), and σκότος καὶ φῶς, "darkness and light" (v. 72, which only 967 has in that order to match "nights and days"), clearly hark back to Gen 1:5. Both in v. 72 and in Gen 1:5, "darkness" is a creature of God (see also Isa 45:7), and thus has a positive connotation. The placement of "night" before "day" reflects Genesis 1 once again, for in 1:5, 8, 13, 19, 23, 31, the day is said to begin with evening, in keeping with the ancient Jewish reckoning that a day begins with sunset.

Stanza 5 (3:74-78) calls upon various earthly creatures to praise the Lord, beginning with ἡ γῆ, "the earth" (v. 74; see Gen 1:10). Here instead of the second-person imperative plural, εὐλογεῖτε, which is used throughout the other verses in 3:57-90, the poet employs the third-person imperative singular in both cola: εὐλογείτω (v. 74a), and ὑμνείτω and ὑπερυψούτω (v. 74b), to agree with the subject, ἡ γῆ. Then follow ὄρη καὶ βουνοί, "mountains and hills" (v. 75), two creatures that are also invited in LXX Ps 148:9 to praise the Lord. In LXX Ps 113:4, 6, mountains and hills are dramatically personified. In the history of Israel, "mountains and hills" had been the locale of idolatrous worship (see Deut 12:2; Isa 65:7; Jer 3:23; and Hos 4:13). Next to be called upon are πάντα τὰ φυόμενα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, "everything growing on the earth"[22] (v. 76; see Gen 1:11-12). The poet then returns to water again: αἱ πηγαί, "springs" (v. 77; see the textual note), and θάλασσαι [see Gen 1:10] καὶ ποταμοί, "seas and rivers" (v. 78).

Stanza 6 (3:62-63, 79-81; see the textual note on v. 61) includes the phenomena of the heavens (sun and moon and stars) and then the water

---

[22] Moore (*Additions*, 72) translates this phrase "that grow in the ground," and states: "Most English translations erroneously translate this as 'that grow on the earth'; but cf. Gen 2:9, 19:25, and Job 5:6 where the LXX uses [γῇ] to render the Heb. ʾdmh, 'soil.'" I fail to see why his translation is any different from mine in terms of meaning.

creatures as well as birds and animals. In the correct order of verses in 967—ἥλιος καὶ σελήνη, "sun and moon" (v. 62), and ἄστρα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, "stars of heaven" (v. 63)—these items appear in the same sequence that is found on the fourth day of creation in Gen 1:16; see also LXX Pss 135:8-9; 148:3. In pagan antiquity, sun and moon and stars were worshipped as gods—an abomination also practiced at times in Israel where it was roundly condemned (see Deut 4:19; 17:3; Job 31:26-28).

Daniel 3:79, mentioning κήτη καὶ πάντα τὰ κινούμενα ἐν τοῖς ὕδασι, "sea monsters and all that move in the waters," vividly brings to mind the text of Gen 1:21, on the fifth day of creation, with κήτη being the same noun found in LXX Gen 1:21. Sea monsters in antiquity were considered in mythical thought as creatures to be feared, like Rahab (Job 9:13; 26:12), a poetical personification of primeval chaos (see Gen 1:2), and Leviathan (Job 3:8). LXX Ps 148:7 calls upon δράκοντες καὶ πᾶσαι ἄβυσσοι, "sea monsters [or dragons] and all the depths," to praise the Lord. In Dan 3:80, πάντα τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, "all the birds of heaven," likewise refers back to Gen 1:21, where the birds are created right after the sea monsters on the fifth day; see also LXX Ps 148:10b.

The sequence of τὰ τετράποδα καὶ τὰ κτήνη καὶ τὰ θηρία τῆς γῆς, "quadrupeds and cattle and wild beasts of the earth" (3:81), employs much of the same vocabulary and follows roughly the same sequence found in LXX Gen 1:24-25, the first creatures made on the sixth day. (The word τετράποδα, an adjective here used as a noun, recurs in LXX Gen 34:23.) In LXX Ps 148:10a, we find a similar grouping of animals invited to praise the Lord: τὰ θηρία καὶ πάντα τὰ κτήνη, "the wild beasts and all the cattle."

Stanza 7 (3:82-84, 87-86, in that order; see the textual notes), the climax of the Song, invites all human beings without exception to praise the Lord. Since God created men and women in his own image and likeness (Gen 1:26-27), they are indeed the pinnacle of creation; so the poet now urges them to bless and praise the Lord of all peoples and nations (3:82). Israel (v. 83), of course, became God's Chosen People (see, for example, Gen 12:1-3; 15:1-6); accordingly, they must take the lead in worshipping the Lord. In fact, in the last verse (v. 90) of the Addition that was inserted in the Song (see above), we read: "All you who worship the Lord, bless the God of gods; praise and proclaim him, because forever is his mercy and forever and ever." The priests

(3:84) are then called upon to praise the Lord. As Collins mentions, "[T]he progression from Israel to priests is common in the Psalms (Pss 115:9-10; 118:2-3; 135:19-20) and is natural if the hymn was meant to be sung in the temple."[23] Next to be called upon in this biblical order are the "holy ones and humble of heart" (3:87), who can be identified with the people cited in LXX Ps 117:4: "Let all those who fear the Lord say, 'He is good, for his mercy endures forever.' " Fear of the Lord forms the basis of OT faith; see, for example, Exod 14:31; Deut 6:2; 10:12; 17:19; 31:12-13; Josh 24:14; 1 Sam 12:14; Prov 14:2; Pss 66:11; 112:1; 128:1; but above all Sir 1:11-30.[24] The Prayer of Azariah in similar fashion contains the expression "with contrite [literally, crushed] soul and humbled spirit," ἐν ψυχῇ συντετριμμένῃ καὶ πνεύματι τεταπεινωμένῳ (3:39 in 88-Syh); these spiritual attitudes make one acceptable to the Lord. The call to the "spirits and souls of the righteous" to praise the Lord (3:86) brings the Song to its theological climax. Indeed, the righteous alone can render the kind of praise and worship that are befitting the Lord (see Sir 15:9; 35:1-5).

## Conclusion

The seven stanzas of the Song of the Three Jews, with the numerous intertextual references especially to Genesis 1 that we noted above, reflect the seven days of creation. On that score, the Song may be seen as a hymn in which various creatures are commanded to praise the Lord (see Psalm 104). What is unique about the Song, however, is the number of creatures that are called upon in a single poem to bless and praise the Lord: in the eclectic Greek text (essentially from Papyrus 967) given above, there are forty-four different creatures mentioned. As far as I could determine, no other single OT composition calls upon that many creatures to sing praise to the Lord.

The following is a list of those creatures together with the number of occurrences of each:

---

[23] Collins, *Daniel*, 206.

[24] Alexander A. Di Lella, "Fear of the Lord as Wisdom: Ben Sira 1,11-30," in *The Book of Ben Sira in Modern Research: Proceedings of the First International Ben Sira Conference, 28-31 July 1996, Soesterberg, Netherlands* (ed. P. C. Beentjes; BZAW 255; Berlin/ New York: de Gruyter, 1997) 113-33.

ἄγγελος angel = 1

ἀστραπή lightning = 1

ἄστρον star = 1

βουνός hill = 1

γῆ earth = 3

δοῦλος servant = 1

δρόσος dew = 2

δύναμις power = 1

ἔργον work = 1

ἥλιος sun = 1

ἡμέρα day = 1

θάλασσα sea = 1

ἱερεύς priest = 1

Ἰσραήλ Israel = 1

καῦμα heat = 1

κτήνη cattle = 1

κῆτος sea monster = 1

νεφέλη cloud = 1

νιφετός snowfall = 1

νύξ night = 1

ὄμβρος rainshower = 1

ὄρος mountain = 1

οὐρανός heaven = 4

ὅσιοι holy ones = 1

πάγος frost = 1

πάντα τὰ κινούμενα ἐν τοῖς ὕδασι all that move in the waters = 1

πάντα τὰ φυόμενα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς everything growing on the earth = 1

πάχνη frost = 1

πετεινόν bird = 1

πηγή spring = 1

πνεῦμα spirit = 2

ποταμός river = 1

πῦρ fire = 2

ῥῖγος cold = 1

σελήνη moon = 1

σκότος darkness = 1

ταπεινοὶ καρδίᾳ humble of heart = 1

τετράποδα quadrupeds = 1

ὕδωρ water = 2

υἱοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων children of men = 1

φῶς light = 1

χιών snow = 1

ψυχή soul = 1

ψῦχος cold = 2

We can now see why this vast array of creatures who are called upon to bless and praise the Lord has made the *Benedicite* section of the Song a favorite of many people, especially those who recite or sing the Morning Prayer in the Liturgy of the Hours.

## APPENDIX
### Canticle of Brother Sun

Dan 3:52-90 is most likely one of the sources of inspiration for the magnificent "Canticle of Brother Sun" (one of the first compositions in the Italian language, probably written in the winter of 1224-25) by St. Francis of Assisi (died 1226): "Most High, omnipotent, good Lord,/ Yours are the praises,/ the glory, the honor,/ and all blessing./ To You alone, Most High, do they belong,/ and no human being is worthy/ to mention Your name./ Be praised, my Lord, with all Your creatures,/ especially my lord Brother Sun,/ who brings the day, and You give light through him./ And he is beautiful, radiant in great splendor!/ Of You, Most High, he bears the likeness./ Praised be You, my Lord, for Sister Moon and the Stars,/ in heaven you formed them clear/ and precious and beautiful./ Praised be You, my Lord, for Brother Wind,/ and for air and cloud/ and serene and all weather/ through which You give sustenance to Your creatures./ Praised be You, my Lord, for Sister Water,/ which is very useful and humble/ and precious and chaste./ Praised be You, my Lord, for Brother Fire,/ through whom You light the night,/ and he is beautiful and playful/ and robust and strong./ Praised be You, my Lord, for our Sister Mother Earth,/ who sustains us and governs us/ and produces varied fruits/ with colored flowers and herbs./ Praised be You, my Lord, for those who grant pardon/ for Your love,/ and bear infirmity/ and tribulation./ Blessed are those who endure in peace,/ for by You, Most High, they shall be crowned./ Praised be You, my Lord, for our Sister/ Bodily Death,/ from whom no one living can escape./ Woe to those who die/ in mortal sin!/ Blessed are those whom death will find in Your most holy will,/ for the second death/ shall do them no harm./ Praise and bless my Lord,/ and give Him thanks/ and serve Him with great humility" (my translation).

# Septuagintalisms, Semitic Interference, and the Original Language of the Book of Judith

## Jeremy Corley

In his well-regarded 1985 commentary on the Book of Judith, Carey Moore provides a useful list of more than thirty linguistic features suggesting a Hebrew background to the book.[1] The list consists of three parts: conjectured translation errors; Hebraic idioms; and Hebraic syntactic features. Because of these characteristics, Moore proposes that the Greek Book of Judith is a translation of a lost Hebrew original. Here he follows the previous consensus about the language in which the book was composed. Until recently, the general view has been that the original language of the Book of Judith was Hebrew, from which it was translated into Greek (possibly by way of Aramaic). Thus, Robert Pfeiffer declares: "The Greek text is manifestly a very close and faithful rendering from the Hebrew."[2] Similarly, Robert Hanhart asserts that the Greek form of the Book of Judith is a translation-text, while Benedikt Otzen states that "the character of the Greek versions of the Book of Judith makes it more than likely that the Greek is a transla-

---

[1] Carey A. Moore, *Judith* (AB 40; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1985) 66-67. This listing partly follows Robert H. Pfeiffer, *History of New Testament Times, with an Introduction to the Apocrypha* (New York: Harper, 1949) 298-99. See also Claudia Rakel, *Judit—über Schönheit, Macht und Widerstand im Krieg: Eine feministisch-intertextuelle Lektüre* (BZAW 334; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003) 34-35. My thanks are due to Pancratius Beentjes, Patricia McDonald, Vincent Skemp, and Patrick Welsh for bibliographical assistance and comments on a draft of this article.

[2] Pfeiffer, *History*, 298.

tion from either Hebrew or Aramaic."[3] Over the past two centuries, scholars have often explained difficulties in the Greek of Judith by recourse to a conjectured original Hebrew form of the book.[4] Accordingly, Moore claims that "the LXX version of Judith gives every indication of being a translation of a Hebrew text."[5]

In recent years, however, several studies have challenged this apparent consensus of a Hebrew *Vorlage* for Judith, and instead scholarship has moved toward the hypothesis that the original language of the Book of Judith was Greek. Thus, Toni Craven is "no longer convinced that we should assume a Hebrew original" and considers that "the Greek text could have been written from the outset in elegant hebraicised Greek."[6] This change of outlook is exemplified by Erich Zenger, who previously stated that the likely original language was Hebrew, but who has latterly asserted that the earliest form of the book was probably in Greek.[7] In a similar vein, other recent German scholarship

---

[3] Robert Hanhart, *Text und Textgeschichte des Buches Judith* (Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens 14; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979) 9; Benedikt Otzen, *Tobit and Judith* (Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha; New York: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002) 140. The theory of an Aramaic origin goes back to Jerome's declaration in his Preface to Judith that he translated Judith from the "Chaldean" in one short night's work; cf. Moore, *Judith*, 95-101. For discussion of Jerome's similar words about his translation of Tobit, see Vincent T. M. Skemp, *The Vulgate of Tobit Compared with Other Ancient Witnesses* (SBLDS 180; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000) 15-21.

[4] See Franz Carl Movers, "Über die Ursprache der deuterocanonischen Bücher des A.T.," *Zeitschrift für Philosophie und katholische Theologie* 13 (1835) 31-48; Otto F. Fritzsche, *Die Bücher Tobit und Judith* (Kurzgefasstes Exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen des Alten Testamentes 2; Leipzig: Hirzel, 1853) 115-16, 137, 140; Frank Zimmermann, "Aids for the Recovery of the Hebrew Original of Judith," *JBL* 57 (1938) 67-74; Morton S. Enslin and Solomon Zeitlin, *The Book of Judith* (Jewish Apocryphal Literature 8; Leiden: Brill, 1972) 40-41. Moreover, André Marie Dubarle has proposed that the medieval Hebrew versions of Judith derive from a lost early Hebrew text; see his *Judith: Formes et sens des diverses traditions* (AnBib 24; 2 vols.; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1966) xxi. However, most scholars consider that these medieval versions derive from the Vulgate; cf. Moore, *Judith*, 101-3.

[5] Moore, *Judith*, 66. An analogy could be drawn with another Second Temple period Jewish tale, the Book of Tobit, where Qumran discoveries have yielded four Aramaic texts and one Hebrew manuscript, indicating a Semitic original for the work. Unlike the Book of Tobit, however, the Dead Sea discoveries have hitherto yielded no Semitic form of the Book of Judith.

[6] Toni Craven, *Artistry and Faith in the Book of Judith* (SBLDS 70; Chico, CA: Scholars, 1983) 5.

[7] For the former opinion see Erich Zenger, *Das Buch Judit* (JSHRZ 1/6; Gütersloh: Mohn, 1981) 430-31; for the later view see his article, "Judith/Judithbuch," in *TRE* 17 (1988) 404-8, esp. 404-7.

has suggested that Judith was originally composed in Greek, for reasons we will consider below.[8]

Given the divergence of opinion, I will re-examine the nature of Judith's Greek, to consider whether it is likely a translation of a Hebrew original or was composed in Greek. If the theory of a Greek origin is to be sustained, an explanation needs to be given for over thirty Hebraic features noted by Moore in the Greek of the narrative. This article attempts to show, often by analogy with similar cases in the NT, that Semitic features may be examples, not of direct translation from a lost Hebrew text, but either of Septuagintalisms or of Semitic interference in the Greek.[9] A Septuagintalism may be considered as a characteristic expression found in the LXX, often different from classical Greek idiom, and sometimes making a specific biblical allusion, while a Semitism may be understood (according to Max Wilcox) as "a word or phrase whose use or construction departs from normal idiomatic Greek usage in such a way as to conform with normal idiomatic Semitic usage."[10] A Semitism in a Greek text may derive either as a result of a translation of a written Semitic text or from Semitic interference in the Greek author's patterns of thinking and writing. Francis Gignac provides a concise explanation for Semitic interference in NT texts (and in the Book of Judith in my view): "Greek was the second and acquired language of the writers," who often employed non-Greek idioms that follow Semitic patterns.[11]

Accordingly, this study will analyze Moore's list of Hebraic features, showing that most of them also occur in works originally composed in Greek under Semitic (or "biblical") influence. Thus, these Hebraic

---

[8] Helmut Engel, "'Der Herr ist ein Gott, der Kriege zerschlägt': Zur Frage der griechischen Originalsprache und der Struktur des Buches Judit," in *Goldene Äpfel in silbernen Schalen* (ed. K.-D. Schunck and M. Augustin; Frankfurt a.M.: Lang, 1992) 155-68; Rakel, *Judit*, 36-40; Barbara Schmitz, *Gedeutete Geschichte: Die Funktion der Reden und Gebete im Buch Judit* (Herders Biblische Studien 40; Freiburg i.B.: Herder, 2004) 2.

[9] In fact, many Septuagintalisms can also be examples of Semitic interference. Cf. Henry S. Gehman, "The Hebraic Character of Septuagint Greek," in *The Language of the New Testament: Classic Essays* (ed. Stanley E. Porter; JSOTSup 60; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991) 163-73.

[10] Max Wilcox, *The Semitisms of Acts* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1965) 17.

[11] Francis T. Gignac, *An Introductory New Testament Greek Course* (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1973) 168. On bilingual interference see idem, *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods* (2 vols; Milan: Istituto Editoriale Cisalpino-La Goliardica, 1976-1981) 1. 46-48.

stylistic features are consonant with Greek composition, albeit in a style influenced by Semitic idioms.[12] By no means do I deny the strong influence of the Hebrew Bible on the author of the Book of Judith, but my claim is that the influence generally comes by way of the LXX; hence, in this article my scriptural references will be to the Greek version of the OT. In my view, while the author may have known Hebrew and been heavily influenced by its linguistic patterns, the actual composition of the book was most likely in Greek.

A comparable question arises in NT studies. Apart from the Synoptic tradition of Jesus' teaching, most NT texts are generally regarded as Greek compositions, even if they retain a strong Semitic flavor.[13] The question arises, for example, in the case of Luke-Acts. In his Anchor Bible commentaries, Joseph Fitzmyer has listed Lukan Semitisms, most of which he regards as Septuagintalisms.[14] If the Greek of Luke-Acts, often regarded as one of the finest linguistic specimens in the NT, has Semitic expressions that are largely borrowed from the LXX, it is quite possible that the Hebraisms detected in Judith may also be a case of Septuagintal influence rather than translation-Greek. This case is strengthened if (as I will attempt to show) multiple instances can be found where the phraseology of the Book of Judith is identical to other LXX passages.

A striking feature of the narrative of Judith is the abundant use of imitation of earlier biblical models. Such imitation occurs to some extent in previous biblical writings; for instance, the portrayal of Eli-

---

[12] In addition, we shall see that some features claimed as Semitisms (e.g., hendiadys; repetition of "all"; cf. Moore, *Judith*, 67) are not distinctively Semitic, since they occur in classical Greek texts as well.

[13] See, for instance, the chapter on Semitisms in C. F. D. Moule, *An Idiom Book of NT Greek* (2d ed.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959) 171-91; cf. Gignac, *Greek Course*, 167-71; Maximilian Zerwick, *Biblical Greek* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1963) #494. A recent attempt to see Mark's Gospel as a Greek translation from a Hebrew original has not found much favor; see Jean-Marie Van Cangh and Alphonse Toumpsin, *L'Evangile de Marc: Un original hébreu?* (Brussels: Safran, 2005).

[14] Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke* (2 vols.; AB 28, 28A; New York: Doubleday, 1980-1985) 1. 113-25; idem, *The Acts of the Apostles* (AB 31; New York: Doubleday, 1998) 114-16. See also the finding of Chang-Wook Jung, *The Original Language of the Lukan Infancy Narrative* (JSNTSup 267; London/ New York: Clark, 2004) 212: "In conclusion, there is no sufficient evidence for the argument that Luke translated or used Semitic source(s). Rather, the Greek of Luke's infancy narrative most probably reflects the influence of the LXX."

jah in 1 Kings 17—2 Kings 2 has many echoes of the depiction of Moses in the Pentateuch.[15] Possibly under the influence of Hellenistic narrative practice of mimesis, the literary use of imitation became widespread in Second Temple Jewish narrative.[16] In various ways also, the gospels present Jesus with features of Israel's heroes such as Moses and Elijah.[17]

Many scholars have pointed out how the plot and characterization of the Book of Judith are modeled on earlier biblical material.[18] Indeed, as the leading character in the narrative, Judith has features, not only of numerous biblical heroines (e.g., Sarah, Miriam, Jael, Deborah, Abigail, and Esther), but also of several male leaders (e.g., Abraham, Moses, Ehud, Samson, and David).[19] For instance, Judith's beheading of Holofernes provides an unobtrusive echo of David's decapitation of

---

[15] Dale C. Allison, *The New Moses: A Matthean Typology* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1993) 39-45.

[16] For example, the character of Tobit is presented with several aspects of the Genesis patriarchs; cf. Irene Nowell, "The Book of Tobit: An Ancestral Story," in *Intertextual Studies in Ben Sira and Tobit* (ed. Jeremy Corley and Vincent Skemp; FS Alexander A. Di Lella; CBQMS 38; Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2005) 3-13, esp. 4-6.

[17] Allison, *The New Moses*, 137-270 (Moses as a model in Matthew); Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 1. 213-15 (Elijah as a model in Luke). See also Thomas L. Brodie, "Greco-Roman Imitation of Texts as a Partial Guide to Luke's Use of Sources," in *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature* (ed. Charles H. Talbert; New York: Crossroad, 1984) 17-46. A clear example of mimetic style occurs in the opening chapters of Luke's Gospel, where the author first crafts a fine periodic sentence (1:1-4), but then shifts to an imitation of the sacred texts of the LXX by mimicking Septuagintal Greek (1:5—2:52). Cf. Fearghus Ó Fearghail, "The Imitation of the Septuagint in Luke's Infancy Narrative," *Proceedings of the Irish Biblical Association* 12 (1989) 58-78, esp. 73.

[18] Rakel, *Judit*, 228-90; Dubarle, *Judith*, 1. 137-64; Zenger, *Das Buch Judit*, 439-46; Otzen, *Tobit and Judith*, 74-79; Sidnie A. White, "In the Steps of Jael and Deborah: Judith as Heroine," in *"No One Spoke Ill of Her": Essays on Judith* (ed. James C. VanderKam; SBLEJL 2; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1992) 5-16. George Nickelsburg has observed that "Judith herself appears to be a personification of several Israelite heroines" (e.g., Miriam, Deborah and Jael), though he adds in a footnote: "Judith also recalls certain Israelite [male] heroes" (e.g., Samson and David); cf. George W. E. Nickelsburg, "Stories of Biblical and Early Post-Biblical Times," in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (ed. Michael E. Stone; CRINT 2/2; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1984) 33-87; quotations from p. 48 and p. 49 n. 86.

[19] Jeremy Corley, "Judith: An Unconventional Heroine," *ScrB* 31/2 (2001) 70-85, here 77. The imitation includes echoes of the portrayal of Judas Maccabeus in 1 Maccabees; cf. Moore, *Judith*, 50; Zenger, *Das Buch Judit*, 442.

Goliath, since the same phrase appears in the Greek of 1 Sam 17:51 and in Jdt 13:8: ἀφεῖλεν τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ ("he/she cut off his head").[20]

It is significant that in several cases where the LXX differs from the Hebrew, the Book of Judith alludes to the Greek version. For instance, when Jdt 10:3 reports the beginning of Judith's process of beautification by saying: "she took off the garments (ἐξεδύσατο τὰ ἱμάτια) of her widowhood," it is echoing a similar process reported in LXX Esth 15:1: "she took off the garments (ἐξεδύσατο τὰ ἱμάτια) of her worship," whereas this detail is absent from the parallel Hebrew text of Esth 5:1. To take another example, Jdt 16:12 sings: "Sons of maidservants (υἱοὶ κορασίων) stabbed them, and pierced them like children of deserters (αὐτομολούντων)," echoing the Greek form of 1 Sam 20:30, where Saul calls his own child Jonathan υἱὲ κορασίων αὐτομολούντων ("son of treacherous maidservants").[21] Since many such instances recall the specific wording of the LXX, even when it differs from the Hebrew text, these echoes most naturally suggest that the Book of Judith was composed in Greek (unless a very skilled translator recognized all these allusions and checked the LXX rendering).[22]

Perhaps the clearest Septuagintal allusion occurs in Judith's victory song (Jdt 16:1-17), which has several echoes of the Song of Moses and Miriam at the Red Sea (Exod 15:1-21).[23] In particular, Jdt 16:2 asserts: θεὸς συντρίβων πολέμους κύριος ("The Lord is a God who crushes wars"). Here the saying alludes to the Greek form of Exod 15:3: κύριος συντρίβων πολέμους ("the Lord who crushes wars"), since the Hebrew text differs by having a more bellicose phrase, יהוה איש מלחמה ("Yhwh is a man of war").[24]

---

[20] In this article the biblical translations are mine, unless otherwise stated. The text of Judith is based on Robert Hanhart, *Iudith* (Vetus Testamentum Graecum 8/4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979), while the text of the remaining LXX books usually follows Alfred Rahlfs, *Septuaginta* (2 vols.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1935; one-volume edition, 1979).

[21] Schmitz, *Gedeutete Geschichte*, 385; Rakel, *Judit*, 142-43. In the Hebrew of 1 Sam 20:30, Saul calls Jonathan "son of a perverted woman of rebellion." Unlike the Hebrew, the Greek text strangely has "maidservants" in the plural.

[22] The following three Septuagintal allusions (Exod 15:3; Gen 34:7; Num 23:19) are noted by Engel, "Der Herr," 157-58; cf. Pfeiffer, *History*, 298.

[23] Moore, *Judith*, 256-57; Zenger, *Das Buch Judit*, 445-46; Rakel, *Judit*, 249-60; Patrick W. Skehan, "The Hand of Judith," *CBQ* 25 (1963) 94-110, here 96.

[24] Rakel, *Judit*, 106-10. The exact phrase from LXX Exod 15:3 appears in Jdt 9:7. This phraseology is less likely a case of a translator's adjustment of an allusion to match the Septuagintal wording, since the key word συντρίβω ("crush") occurs 23x in

Another Septuagintal allusion appears in Judith's reference to the Dinah story in Genesis 34.[25] There is an exact borrowing from LXX Gen 34:7 in Jdt 9:2, where Judith refers to the rape of Dinah: οὐχ οὕτως ἔσται ("It shall not be thus"). Since the Hebrew text of Gen 34:7 employs a different verb: כן לא יעשה ("It shall not be done thus"), the borrowing is clearly from the Greek version.[26]

There is also an echo of LXX Num 23:19 in Jdt 8:16. In the Hebrew text of Num 23:19, Balaam asserts: "God is not a man that he would lie, or a son of man that he would relent," whereas the Greek says: οὐχ ὡς ἄνθρωπος ὁ θεὸς διαρτηθῆναι οὐδὲ ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἀπειληθῆναι ("Not like a human being is God to be misled, nor like a son of man to be threatened"). Judith 8:16 skillfully employs an inverted quotation of LXX Num 23:19: οὐχ ὡς ἄνθρωπος ὁ θεὸς ἀπειληθῆναι οὐδὲ ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου διαρτηθῆναι ("Not like a human being is God to be threatened, nor like a son of man to be misled").[27] Here, in face of the threat to the people of Israel, Judith takes on the role of Balaam.[28]

The influence of the LXX on the Book of Judith goes wider than a few specific phrases. In fact, the book is replete with verbal echoes of many Septuagintal narratives, as we shall see. Elsewhere, however, the Septuagintalisms reflect the general vocabulary of the LXX. One example of such a Septuagintalism is the expression κύριος παντοκράτωρ ("the Lord Almighty": Jdt 4:13; 8:13; 15:10; 16:6, 17).[29] Where these expressions recall Septuagintal usage, they can be seen as supporting a Greek origin for the book.

---

1 Maccabees (e.g., 1 Macc 7:43), which may have been one of the models for the Judith story; cf. Moore, *Judith*, 50-51; Zenger, *Das Buch Judit*, 442-43.

[25] On the deliberate contrast of the Book of Judith with the Dinah story, see Moore, *Judith*, 190-92; Rakel, *Judit*, 194-95; Schmitz, *Gedeutete Geschichte*, 244-45, 270-71; Corley, "Judith," 77; Dubarle, *Judith*, 1. 141.

[26] By contrast, for a more precise rendering of a comparable Hebrew phrase referring to the rape of Tamar, the Greek of 2 Sam 13:12 has: οὐ ποιηθήσεται οὕτως ("It shall not be done thus"); cf. Engel, "Der Herr," 167 n. 16.

[27] Whereas Hanhart (*Iudith*, 99) follows most MSS in reading the final verb as διαιτηθῆναι ("to be entreated"), the verb διαρτηθῆναι ("to be misled") in Codex Venetus and most Lucianic witnesses is preferable here according to Schmitz, *Gedeutete Geschichte*, 166-67. For other biblical instances of inverted quotations, see Pancratius C. Beentjes, "Inverted Quotations in the Bible: A Neglected Stylistic Pattern," *Bib* 63 (1982) 506-23.

[28] Schmitz, *Gedeutete Geschichte*, 189.

[29] Engel, "Der Herr," 158. A comparable longer phrase occurs as a Septuagintalism in the Book of Revelation: κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ ("the Lord God, the Almighty": e.g., Rev 4:8; 21:22).

This article will note that the Book of Judith borrows many features of plot and characterization from earlier biblical texts, to such an extent that we can talk in terms of the author's use of the technique of literary imitation and mimesis of Greek style. Moreover, the book has a significant number of passages where the exact wording (or idiom) of an earlier LXX passage is copied in a mimesis of Septuagintal Greek. Although elements of Hebraic syntax or style could reflect a Hebrew original, the presence of similar features in NT writings such as Luke, and sometimes in the papyri, means that a Hebrew original is hardly required.

To limit the scope of this essay and to avoid an article devoted entirely to a detailed methodological discussion, my treatment of methodology will be brief. In a helpful analysis, James Davila has sought "to construct a strict methodology for establishing Semitic interference due to translation from a Semitic *Vorlage*" by applying ten criteria.[30] His sixth and seventh criteria are particularly relevant here: "All Semitisms that are used commonly in the LXX ('Septuagintalisms') should be set apart as a special category. Likewise, Semitisms that appear in only one or a few LXX passages, but passages frequently quoted . . . , should be set apart with the Septuagintalisms." His eighth criterion also applies: "Some control has to be introduced to factor out interference from the language of the LXX. . . . The more non-Septuagintal Semitisms and the fewer Septuagintalisms in our corpus, the more persuasive our case [that the text is translation-Greek] will be." In addition, the ninth criterion is pertinent: "Controls also have to be introduced to factor out bilingual interference." If these criteria are applied, most of the arguments in favor of translation-Greek for the Book of Judith are set aside.

While the Hebraic features of the book are undeniable, explanations of their origin as translation-Greek have generally ignored these methodological questions. In my view, advocates of the hypothesis of a lost Hebrew original have usually not taken sufficient account of either

---

[30] James R. Davila, "(How) Can We Tell if a Greek Apocryphon or Pseudepigraphon has been Translated from Hebrew or Aramaic?" *JSP* 15/1 (2005) 3-61, with quotations in this paragraph from pp. 56-57. As indicators of translation-Greek, 17 stylistic criteria have been claimed by Raymond A. Martin, *Syntactical Evidence of Semitic Sources in Greek Documents* (SBLSCS 3; Cambridge, MA: Society of Biblical Literature, 1974) 5-43. However, these criteria could have been employed by an author seeking to imitate Septuagintal style according to Davila, "(How) Can We Tell," 36-37.

the book's mimesis of Septuagintal style or the phenomenon of Semitic interference. I will illustrate the point by referring to the example of causal ὅτι ("because," used in a weakened sense instead of γάρ, "for"), found in the Book of Judith (e.g., Jdt 1:11; 2:7, 12; 4:3; 7:24). While this usage may indirectly reflect the Hebrew word כִּי ("because, for"), it need not be an indicator of translation-Greek, since it also appears in composition-Greek (e.g., Wis 1:2, 4, 6, 7; Rom 6:15; 1 Cor 1:25; 4:9; 10:17), owing either to the influence of Septuagintal wording or to Semitic interference.[31]

While Hebraic idioms and syntax could be evidence of translation-Greek, they could also indicate Semitic interference in the writing of an author whose first language was Hebrew, or they could be imitation of the style of earlier Septuagintal books which are themselves influenced by Hebrew usage. If such Hebraic idioms and syntactical features occur in Greek-written parts of the NT, the hypothesis of a lost Hebrew original is shown to be unnecessary, and it is wiser to speak of Semitic interference. Moreover, if exact phrases in the Book of Judith match the phraseology of earlier Septuagintal texts, mimesis of the LXX can be proposed, particularly where a character's actions are modeled on a figure from Israelite biblical history. Finally, if a conjectured mistranslation from Hebrew can better be seen as an unrecognized Septuagintal allusion, the hypothesis of a lost Hebrew original loses weight. Nevertheless, in the absence of any Semitic MS of Judith from the Second Temple period, it is impossible to determine beyond all doubt the original language of the Book of Judith.[32]

A brief word on the question of the book's dating is necessary. Since the work echoes the narrative of the defeat of Nicanor in 1 Maccabees 7, a date after the battle in 161 B.C.E. is required.[33] On the other hand, since the character of Judith is mentioned with Esther in *First Clement* (*1 Clem.* 55:4-5) around 100 C.E., it can hardly be after the end of the

---

[31] Anneli Aejmelaeus, "ὅτι *causale* in Septuagintal Greek," in her *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1993) 17-36, esp. 36; cf. Davila, "(How) Can We Tell," 35-36.

[32] It is unclear why Judith is unattested among the Dead Sea Scrolls. It could have been absent by mere chance or it could have been deliberately excluded for ideological reasons. Since small portions from the LXX Pentateuch (Leviticus to Deuteronomy, 4Q119-122) have been discovered at Qumran, as well as a Greek fragment from the Letter of Jeremiah (7Q2 = Bar 6:43-44), it is uncertain if the language of Judith caused its non-attestation there.

[33] Moore, *Judith*, 50-51; Zenger, *Das Buch Judit*, 442-43.

first century C.E. With the majority of scholars I assume that the book was composed in the Hasmonean era, some time between the defeat of Nicanor by Judas Maccabeus (161 B.C.E.) and the Roman conquest of Jerusalem (63 B.C.E.).[34]

A detailed consideration of linguistic usages in the book might potentially shed light on the date and milieu of origin of the Greek text. For example, Vaticanus (G$^B$) and Alexandrinus (G$^A$) employ the Hellenistic form δέκα δύο for "twelve" (Jdt 2:5, 15; 7:2), whereas the Lucianic witnesses (except MS 319) exhibit an Atticizing tendency in their use of the classical form δώδεκα.[35] We may compare this situation with what we find in the Greek papyri from Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt: "The numeral 12 fluctuates in papyri of the Roman period between the classical δώδεκα and the later δεκαδύο. . . . This also represents a difference from the Ptolemaic papyri, in which δεκαδύο is alone used, except in traditional expressions."[36] Normal usage in the LXX and NT is δώδεκα, though the form δέκα δύο appears in LXX Chronicles (e.g., 1 Chr 6:48[6:63]; 9:22; 2 Chr 33:1) as well as Judith.[37]

The remainder of the article will be devoted to evaluating the multiple pieces of evidence given by Moore to suggest that there was a Hebrew original text behind the Greek of Judith. Moore groups his evidence into three paragraphs, dealing first with conjectured mistranslations from Hebrew, then Hebraic idioms, and finally Hebraic syntax. The major sections of this study will deal with these three kinds of evidence. Since the question of conjectured mistranslations is the most speculative, I will deal first with the topics of Hebraic idiom

---

[34] Otzen, *Tobit and Judith*, 132-34; Moore, *Judith*, 67-70. The fact that the high priest had a military as well as a priestly role (Jdt 4:6-8) suggests to Rakel a date for the book in the Hasmonean age, and she suggests perhaps the reign of John Hyrcanus in the later second century B.C.E. (Rakel, *Judit*, 69). Moore (*Judith*, 51) considers it likely that John Hyrcanus' defeat of Samaria by 107 B.C.E. occurred sometime before the composition of the Book of Judith, since Samaria is regarded as being under the control of Jerusalem (Jdt 4:4-7). In general, I find persuasive the view that the work was composed as propaganda on behalf of Queen Salome Alexandra (Shelamzion), probably just before her accession in 76 B.C.E.; cf. Tal Ilan, *Integrating Women into Second Temple History* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2001) 150-51.

[35] Hanhart, *Text und Textgeschichte*, 33, 44. For reasons of space, the discussion in this article will be mostly confined to the three great early uncial MSS (Vaticanus = G$^B$, Sinaiticus = G$^S$, and Alexandrinus = G$^A$).

[36] Gignac, *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri*, 2. 194.

[37] James H. Moulton and George Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1930) [henceforth MM] 139.

and syntax, before looking at the subject of conjectured mistranslations. Admittedly, in a short article it is impossible to give an exhaustive analysis of every linguistic feature. Rather, the aim is to show that the hypothesis of a Hebrew origin for Judith is neither necessary nor compelling.

## I. Hebraic Idioms in Judith

As evidence for a lost Hebrew *Vorlage* of Judith, Moore proposes fourteen cases regarded as reflecting Hebraic idioms.[38] However, we shall see that some idioms match NT phraseology (such as the Lukan Septuagintalisms), and therefore do not serve as firm evidence of Hebraic origin.[39] Moreover, in many cases identical wording appears in the LXX, particularly in the earlier narrative books (e.g., Genesis, Exodus, and Judges) from which the author gathered many motifs of plot and character.

First, Moore refers to the phrase "all flesh" (2:3), which is a Biblicism.[40] By way of comparison, this common Biblicism occurs ten times in the NT. While five of these cases involve clear OT quotations,[41] the other five instances more likely exhibit Semitic interference (Matt 24:22; Mark 13:20; John 17:2; 1 Cor 1:29; 15:39), but while these NT texts show Semitic influence, most (if not all) were presumably composed originally in Greek. Hence the single occurrence of "all flesh" in Jdt 2:3 can not be cited as evidence to posit a Hebrew origin for the Book of Judith.

Second, Moore notes "the many idioms involving the word 'face' (2:7, 19, 25; 3:2, 9; 10:23 [three times!]; 11:5; 16:15)," and in a footnote he observes that "there are sixty-eight occurrences of the Greek πρόσωπον in Judith."[42] While such an idiom can certainly reflect Hebraic style,

---

[38] Moore, *Judith*, 66-67. Moore's transliteration of Greek and Hebrew words is replaced here by the original fonts.

[39] For a list of Lukan Septuagintalisms see Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1. 114-16; idem, *Acts*, 115.

[40] The phrase in Jdt 2:3 may possibly be an allusion to LXX Gen 9:15, with the implication that Holofernes intends to reverse God's promise to Noah.

[41] Luke 3:6 (= Isa 40:5); Acts 2:17 (= Joel 3:1); Rom 3:20 and Gal 2:16 (both = Ps 143:2); 1 Pet 1:24 (= Isa 40:6).

[42] Moore, *Judith*, 66 and n. 46, referring to Enslin and Zeitlin, *The Book of Judith*, 131. Sometimes a phrase may be a Septuagintal allusion; for instance, καὶ ἐξῆλθεν

Luke-Acts employs the idiom κατὰ πρόσωπον with the genitive ("before the face of" = "in the sight of," Luke 2:31; Acts 3:13; 25:16),[43] and the expression πρὸ προσώπου with the genitive ("before the face of" = "before," Luke 1:76 MSS; 7:27; 9:52; 10:1; Acts 13:24).[44] In addition, the idiom ἀπὸ προσώπου with the genitive ("from the face of": e.g., Jdt 2:14; 4:2) also appears three times in Acts (3:19; 5:41; 7:45). Luke 21:35 further employs the idiom "the face of all the earth" (cf. Acts 17:26), similar to phraseology found in Judith (2:7, 19; 5:10; 6:3; 7:18). In some cases, the usage may be a Hellenistic idiom; for example, Jdt 4:11 states that all the Israelites prostrated themselves κατὰ πρόσωπον τοῦ ναοῦ ("before the face of the sanctuary"), just as a Ptolemaic-era papyrus has the phrase [κα]τὰ πρόσωπον τοῦ ἱεροῦ ("in front of the temple").[45] Such idioms, therefore, can hardly be used to prove that the Greek Book of Judith is a translation from a Hebrew original.

Third, Moore mentions various expressions involving the "eye" (2:11; 3:4; 12:14; [13:20]).[46] Here again we probably have a combination of Septuagintal allusion and Semitic interference. For instance, Jdt 2:11 reports Nebuchadnezzar's words: "But toward those who rebel, your eye shall not be forbearing (οὐ φείσεται ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου)." This phrase offers an ironic parody of LXX Deut 7:16, where Moses commands the Israelites to conquer the pagan nations: "Your eye shall not be forbearing (οὐ φείσεται ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου) toward them."[47] Moreover, the idiom ἐν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς αὐτοῦ ἀρεστόν ("pleasing in his eyes," Jdt 12:14) is an instance of Semitic interference rather than translation-Greek, since

---

Ὀλοφέρνης ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοῦ ("And Holofernes went out from the presence of his lord") in Jdt 2:14 may perhaps be a subtle echo of LXX Gen 4:16: ἐξῆλθεν δὲ Κάιν ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ θεοῦ ("But Cain went out from the presence of God").

[43] See Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1. 115; idem, *Acts*, 115. This idiom appears in Jdt 1:7; 2:23, 25; 4:6, 11 *bis*, 13; 6:4; 7:6; 10:23; 11:5; 12:13 G^BA; 15:2; 16:20. Comparison with the papyri suggests that the phrase κατὰ πρόσωπον in Acts 3:13 and 25:16 represents technical judicial phraseology (MM 553).

[44] Cf. Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1. 115; idem, *Acts*, 115. This expression occurs in Jdt 1:11; 3:3; 8:15; 10:13. While Luke 7:27 quotes Mal 3:1, the other Lukan cases of πρὸ προσώπου (Luke 1:76 MSS; 9:52; 10:1; Acts 13:24) may also be indirect echoes of the same passage.

[45] The papyrus (P Petr 3.1.2.8) is quoted in MM 553.

[46] Though Moore lists Jdt 13:20 here (*Judith*, 66), that text has the Semitism "soul/life" rather than "eye."

[47] Schmitz, *Gedeutete Geschichte*, 39. In Jdt 2:11 the phrase ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῇ σου ("in all your land") is reminiscent of the words ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ("upon the land") in Deut 7:13.

the almost identical phrase ἀρεστὸν ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς σου ("pleasing in your eyes") occurs in the composition-Greek of Wis 9:9.[48]

Fourth, Moore refers to the idiom "as *someone/something* lives" for oaths (2:12; 11:7; 12:4; 13:16). Since this idiom is frequent in the LXX, these four cases in Judith may be Septuagintal allusions. Moore himself elsewhere recognizes that Jdt 2:12 (ζῶν ἐγὼ . . . ἐν χειρί μου, "as I live . . . with my hand") echoes LXX Deut 32:39-41, with King Nebuchadnezzar making a blasphemous parody of the divine threat of vengeance (ζῶ ἐγὼ . . . ἡ χείρ μου, "as I live . . . my hand").[49] Moreover, Judith's response to Holofernes in Jdt 12:4 has the phrase ζῇ ἡ ψυχή σου, κύριέ μου ("as your soul lives, my lord"), using identical wording to the appeal made by the wise woman of Tekoa to King David in the Greek of 2 Sam 14:19 (cf. LXX 1 Sam 1:26).[50]

Fifth, Moore mentions the phrase "it was without number" in 2:17 (ὧν οὐκ ἦν ἀριθμός, literally, "of which there was no number"); a similar expression appears in 2:20 and 5:10. This phrase is a Biblicism.[51] It is noteworthy that the idiom in 2:17 is placed in parallel with another Septuagintal phrase, πλῆθος πολὺ σφόδρα ("an extremely numerous multitude"), which occurs elsewhere in the book (1:16; 7:2, 18; 15:7).[52]

Sixth, Moore notes the expression ἐπ' ἀριστερᾷ ("on the left") for "north" (2:21 G^BA; G^S employs ἐν).[53] There is possibly an allusion to a

---

[48] The Hebraism in Wis 9:9 is noted by David Winston, *The Wisdom of Solomon* (AB 43; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1979) 205. Although Winston observes 17 examples of Hebraisms in the Septuagintal Book of Wisdom (p. 15 n. 2), he asserts that the work was written originally in Greek rather than Hebrew (p. 3, p. 17). The comparable idiom ἀγαθὸν ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς [with a genitive] ("good in the eyes [of someone]": Jdt 3:4) also appears in LXX 2 Sam 24:22.

[49] Moore, *Judith*, 134. In addition, Jdt 11:7 may perhaps allude to LXX 2 Sam 15:21.

[50] Note that much of Jdt 13:16 echoes Jacob's vow in LXX Gen 28:20 (though the idiom "as the Lord lives" is absent there).

[51] Comparable expressions occur in LXX Gen 41:49; Judg 6:5; 7:12; 1 Chr 22:4, 16; 2 Chr 12:3; Job 5:9; 9:10; 34:24; Ps 39(40):12; 103(104):25; 104(105):34; Isa 2:7 *bis*; 1 Macc 5:30.

[52] The latter phrase combines two Septuagintal expressions, πλῆθος πολὺ ("a numerous multitude"): Gen 48:16; Deut 26:5; 2 Chr 9:9; 11:23; 13:8; 14:10(11); 20:2, 12 (cf. Mark 3:8; Luke 6:17; Acts 17:4), found in Jdt 5:10, and πλῆθος σφόδρα ("an extreme multitude"): 2 Chr 11:12; 16:8 (cf. 1 Kgs 7:48 MS).

[53] A similar expression appears in Tob 1:2 G^S: "from the left of Phogor," i.e., "north of Peor."

comparable expression (ἐν ἀριστερᾷ) in LXX Gen 14:15, especially since the story in Genesis 14 is echoed elsewhere in Judith.[54]

Seventh, Moore quotes the idiom "put to the mouth of the sword" in 2:27. In fact, this is an allusion to the Greek form of the Book of Judges, from which the Book of Judith derives much material.[55] Thus, Jdt 2:27 has the wording ἐπάταξεν . . . ἐν στόματι ῥομφαίας ("he struck . . . by the mouth of the sword"), echoing the phrase ἐπάταξαν . . . ἐν στόματι ῥομφαίας ("they struck . . . by the mouth of the sword") recurring in LXX Judges (Judg 1:8, 25; 18:27; 20:37, 48).

Eighth, Moore refers to the expression μῆνα ἡμερῶν ("for a month of days") in 3:10. However, his comment on the verse notes that this Hebraic idiom occurs elsewhere in the Bible, where it is reflected in the LXX (Gen 29:14; Deut 21:13; 2 Kgs 15:13 MSS),[56] so the phrase is to be regarded as a Septuagintalism.

Ninth, Moore mentions the phrase "image of the heart" (8:29). There the Greek employs an idiom (τὸ πλάσμα τῆς καρδίας σου) that the NRSV renders "your heart's disposition." In my view, the phrase goes back to LXX Ps 32(33):15, where God is called ὁ πλάσας κατὰ μόνας τὰς καρδίας αὐτῶν ("he who alone forms their hearts"),[57] where the verb πλάσσω represents the Hebrew verb יצר ("to form, fashion").

Tenth, Moore quotes the idiom εἰς γενεὰς γενεῶν ("to generations of generations," i.e., "generation to generation") in 8:32. In fact, LXX Dan 6:26(27) uses the identical phrase, which is not in Theodotion or MT here. A similar expression occurs in LXX Ps 71(72):5, γενεὰς γενεῶν ("for generations of generations"). We may mention a comparable idiom in Luke 1:50 G^B: εἰς γενεὰς καὶ γενεὰς ("to generations and generations"), though G^A here has the same idiom as in Jdt 8:32. Note also the fine Greek wordplay in Jdt 8:32 between γενεά ("generation") and γένος ("people"), plus the end-rhyme: εἰς γενεὰς γενεῶν / υἱοῖς τοῦ γένους ἡμῶν ("to generations of generations / for the children of our people").

---

[54] For a list of parallels see Zenger, *Das Buch Judit*, 441; Dubarle, *Judith*, 1. 139. In particular, Uzziah's blessing of the triumphant Judith (Jdt 13:18) strongly recalls Melchizedek's blessing of the victorious Abraham (Gen 14:19-20); cf. Moore, *Judith*, 233. Moreover, the place name Χωβά (= Hobah in Gen 14:15 MSS) also appears in Jdt 4:4; 15:4, 5.

[55] Zenger, *Das Buch Judit*, 440-41; Otzen, *Tobit and Judith*, 76; White, "In the Steps," 5-16; Corley, "Judith," 78, 82-83.

[56] Moore, *Judith*, 144.

[57] Dubarle, *Judith*, 1. 158. A doctrine of creation based on this Psalm is also evident in the echo of LXX Ps 32(33):9 in Jdt 16:14 (Moore, *Judith*, 250).

Eleventh, Moore refers to the expression ἀπὸ μικροῦ ἕως μεγάλου ("from small to great": 13:4, 13), which is in fact a common Septuagintal phrase.[58] Thus, the idiom appears in Heb 8:11 in a quotation of Jer 31:34 (LXX 38:34), as well as in Acts 8:10, where it is a Septuagintalism.[59]

Twelfth, Moore notes the use of "Amen" (literally, "may it be") in 13:20 (γένοιτο γένοιτο) and 15:10 (γένοιτο). This hymnic concluding motif copies the Greek equivalent to "Amen" found in Septuagintal doxologies (e.g., LXX Pss 40[41]:13; 71[72]:19). Indeed, the hypothesis of a Semitic origin is not helped by the fact that the text of Judith avoids the transliterated form ἀμήν found even in the NT Apocalypse (Rev 1:6, 7; 7:12; 19:4; 22:20 G^BA; 22:21 G^S).[60]

Thirteenth, Moore refers to the Hebraic idiom λαλῆσαι μετ' αὐτῆς εἰρήνην ("to speak peace with her") in 15:8. In Judith the phrase is used in the sense of "greet" or "wish well" or even "congratulate," and similar phraseology appears in LXX Ps 84(85):9.[61]

Fourteenth, Moore observes the idiom ἡμέρας πολλάς ("for many days") that closes the book in 16:25, but the phrase is also found in the LXX (e.g., Hos 3:4). The negative form, οὐ πολλὰς ἡμέρας ("for not many days"), occurs in John 2:12, while the expression μεθ' ἡμέρας πολλὰς ("after many days") appears in the Greek of 1 Kgs 18:1.[62] In addition, Luke 2:36 describes the prophetess Anna with the expression προβεβηκυῖα ἐν ἡμέραις πολλαῖς ("advanced in many days"), while Acts 16:18 (cf. Josephus, *A.J.* 18.57) employs the phrase ἐπὶ πολλὰς ἡμέρας ("over many days"). Evidently this Semitic-sounding idiom, perhaps a Septuagintalism, was not unusual in Jewish Greek around the turn of the era.[63]

---

[58] The idiom occurs in LXX Gen 19:11; 1 Sam 5:9; 30:2, 19; 2 Kgs 23:2; 25:26; 2 Chr 34:30; Isa 22:5, 24; Jer 6:13; 31(38):34; 42(49):1, 8; 44(51):12; Bar 1:4; Jonah 3:5 MSS; 1 Macc 5:45.

[59] F. F. Bruce, *The Acts of the Apostles* (2d ed.; Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1952) 185.

[60] A Semitic background also underlies some OT allusions in the Apocalypse, according to G. K. Beale, *John's Use of the Old Testament in Revelation* (JSNTSup 166; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998) 62.

[61] Moore, *Judith*, 246.

[62] F. C. Conybeare and St G. Stock, *Grammar of Septuagint Greek* (Boston: Ginn, 1905; repr., Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1988) #86.

[63] This idiom also occurs in LXX 2 Sam 14:2, at the opening of the story of the wise woman of Tekoa who disguises herself so as to outwit King David. The Book of Judith also concerns a wise woman who disguises herself so as to outwit a powerful military commander.

We may add a fifteenth case of Semitic influence, the commonly-occurring phrase υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ ("sons of Israel").[64] Since this phrase occurs very often in the LXX, its usage in Judith may be intended to evoke the LXX and add a biblical sonority to the narrative. By way of comparison, in some cases in the NT, the idiom seems to evoke the LXX in a general way (Matt 27:9; Acts 9:15; 10:36; Rev 7:4; 21:12). However, in many other NT occurrences of this idiom we may suspect direct or indirect echoes of the terminology found in specific LXX passages.[65]

In summary, although these idioms ultimately reflect Hebrew expressions, they often occur in the LXX, from where they probably derive. While these idioms sometimes appear in allusions to specific Septuagintal passages, at other times they occur as more generalized Biblicisms so as to add a scriptural resonance to the narrative. In many cases similar expressions also appear in NT writings originally composed in Greek, albeit under Semitic influence. While these idioms have a biblical sound, they are hardly evidence of direct Hebrew composition, since they could just as well be Septuagintalisms.

## II. Hebraic Syntax in Judith

As further evidence for a lost Hebrew *Vorlage* of Judith, Moore proposes ten aspects of Hebrew syntax or style.[66] Clearly, many of these points do indeed reflect a Semitic (even Hebraic) stylistic background. However, an actual Hebrew *Vorlage* is not a necessary presupposition, since Jewish Greek underwent Semitic interference, while other Greek documents (like the NT writings) exhibit similar phenomena without having been translated from Hebrew.[67] Moreover, the influence of the Septuagint is often apparent in a general imitation of biblical style.

---

[64] E.g., Jdt 4:1, 8; 7:1, 4, 6, 19; 15:3, 5, 7, 8; cf. Zenger, *Das Buch Judit*, 431; Rakel, *Judit*, 35. Another comparable phrase, πᾶς ἀνὴρ Ἰσραὴλ ("every man of Israel"), occurs in Judith (e.g., 4:9, 11), also echoing Septuagintal usage (e.g., Deut 29:10).

[65] See Luke 1:16 (cf. Hos 3:5); Acts 5:21 (cf. Exod 3:16; 12:21); 7:23 (cf. Exod 2:11); 7:37 (cf. Deut 18:6); Rom 9:27 (cf. Hos 2:1); 2 Cor 3:7, 13 (both cf. Exod 34:35); Heb 11:22 (cf. Gen 50:25); Rev 2:14 (cf. Num 31:16).

[66] Moore, *Judith*, 67.

[67] Gignac, *Greek Course*, 167-71; Zerwick, *Biblical Greek*, #494.

First, as an example of the book's literalistic rendering of Hebrew syntax, Moore refers to "the ubiquitous paratactic construction, with almost every other sentence beginning with a καὶ, 'and,' followed immediately by the verb (i.e., the so-called *waw* consecutive of Hebrew)."[68] The use of this Hebraic syntax in LXX Genesis 1 shows that translation-Greek is indeed a possible explanation. However, multiple examples from the gospels (e.g., Mark 2:18-19; 3:1-6; Luke 2:25-28; John 1:20-21; 19:3-4) show that this phenomenon may be a case of Semitic interference or imitation of the LXX rather than translation-Greek.[69]

A particular case of the paratactic construction is the phrase καὶ ἐγένετο, equivalent to the Hebrew form ויהי, "and it happened" (Jdt 2:4; 5:22; 10:1, 18; 12:10; 13:12; 16:21). Here the author may intentionally be imitating Septuagintal style. For instance, there are two cases of the phrase καὶ ἐγένετο ὡς ἐπαύσατο ("and it happened when he/she ceased," 5:22 and 10:1) with Septuagintal echoes. Thus, the phrase καὶ ἐγένετο ὡς ἐπαύσατο Ἀχιὼρ λαλῶν ("and it happened when Achior ceased speaking," 5:22) echoes the description of Samson's activity, καὶ ἐγένετο ὡς ἐπαύσατο λαλῶν ("and it happened when he ceased speaking," Judg 15:17 G^B). In Jdt 10:1 there is a longer narration of the ending of Judith's prayer, καὶ ἐγένετο ὡς ἐπαύσατο βοῶσα πρὸς τὸν θεὸν Ἰσραὴλ καὶ συνετέλεσεν πάντα τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα ("and it happened when she ceased crying out to the God of Israel and she finished all these words"); this expression combines the Septuagintal phrase just mentioned with an echo of 1 Sam 24:17(16): καὶ ἐγένετο ὡς συνετέλεσεν Δαυιδ τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα ("and it happened when David finished these words").[70] Moreover, the Hebraic idiom καὶ ἐγένετο appears frequently in the Greek-written gospels as a clear instance of Semitic interference.[71] According to Joseph Fitzmyer, the three sorts of construction with καὶ ἐγένετο (or its equivalent ἐγένετο δὲ), used abundantly by Luke, are to be understood as Septuagintalisms.[72]

---

[68] Moore, *Judith*, 67; cf. Gehman, "Hebraic Character," 163-65.

[69] Zerwick, *Biblical Greek*, #454.

[70] On David as a model for the character of Judith, see Zenger, *Das Buch Judit*, 440; Corley, "Judith," 83.

[71] E.g., Mark 1:9; 2:23; 4:4, 39; 9:7 *bis*; 9:26; Luke 1:23, 41, 59, 65; 2:15, 46; 4:36; 5:12, 17; 6:49; 7:11.

[72] Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1. 118-19; cf. Henry St J. Thackeray, *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek According to the Septuagint, vol. 1* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909) 50-52. See also Gignac, *Greek Course*, 171; Elliott C. Maloney, *Semitic Interference in Marcan Syntax* (SBLDS 51; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981) 81-86.

Second, in some passages (Jdt 2:13; 6:4; 7:15; 9:4) Moore detects the Hebrew reinforcing repetitious infinitive, or infinitive absolute construction. Such an idiom, however, also appears in the NT (e.g., Matt 2:10; Mark 5:42).[73] For instance, while Jdt 2:13 uses a reinforcing participle, ἐπιτελῶν ἐπιτελέσεις ("completing you shall complete" = "you shall surely complete"), a similar construction with different verbs occurs in Acts 7:34 (citing Exod 3:7) and in Heb 6:14 (quoting Gen 22:17).[74] While Jdt 6:4 employs a cognate noun in the dative, ἀπωλείᾳ ἀπολοῦνται ("with destruction they shall be destroyed"), similar usages with different verbs appear in the NT (e.g., Luke 22:15; John 3:29; Acts 5:28).[75] Moreover, while Jdt 7:15 employs a cognate accusative with an adjective, ἀνταποδώσεις αὐτοῖς ἀνταπόδομα πονηρὸν ("you shall recompense an evil recompense to them"), it is a standard Septuagintal idiom for the verb ἀνταποδίδωμι to appear with ἀνταπόδομα as its object.[76] Finally, while Jdt 9:4 has ἐζήλωσαν τὸν ζῆλόν σου ("they were zealous/jealous with zeal/jealousy for you"), 2 Cor 11:2 has a comparable expression with a dative rather than an accusative, ζηλῶ γὰρ ὑμᾶς θεοῦ ζήλῳ ("for I am zealous/jealous for you with God's zeal/jealousy").

Third, Moore asserts that in 5:19, and less exactly in 7:10, οὗ . . . ἐκεῖ (literally, "where . . . there") renders the Hebrew pleonastic construction שם . . . אשר (literally, "which . . . there").[77] This construction appears in several other Septuagintal passages (e.g., Gen 20:13; 33:19; Exod 20:24; 1 Sam 9:10).[78] The phrase in Jdt 5:19, οὗ διεσπάρησαν ἐκεῖ ("where they were dispersed [there]") echoes a Greek biblical phrase, occurring for instance in Theodotion Dan 9:7, οὗ διέσπειρας αὐτοὺς ἐκεῖ ("where you dispersed them [there]"), though LXX Dan 9:7 employs a different verb, εἰς ἃς διεσκόρπισας αὐτοὺς ἐκεῖ ("to which you scattered

---

However, comparable idioms also sometimes appear in Greek papyri from Egypt (Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1. 118).

[73] Zerwick, *Biblical Greek*, ##60-63; cf. Gehman, "Hebraic Character," 167.

[74] Zerwick, *Biblical Greek*, #369.

[75] For further LXX and NT examples of a cognate dative, see Conybeare and Stock, *Grammar*, #61.

[76] See Gen 50:15; 2 Chr 32:25 MSS; Ps 136(137):8; Sir 17:23 MSS; Joel 4:4 *bis*, 7; Obad 15; Jer 28(51):6; 1 Macc 2:68. For other LXX and NT instances of a cognate accusative, see Conybeare and Stock, *Grammar*, #56 (cf. Mark 4:41; Luke 2:9).

[77] Moore, *Judith*, 67; cf. Gehman, "Hebraic Character," 165.

[78] F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and Robert W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961; henceforth BDF) #297; Conybeare and Stock, *Grammar*, #87.

them [there]").[79] In addition, Jdt 7:10 G$^{BS}$ pleonastically refers to the mountains ἐν οἷς αὐτοὶ ἐνοικοῦσιν ἐν αὐτοῖς ("in which they themselves dwell [in them]") , but this phrase largely follows the same idiom as Judg 6:10 G$^A$, ἐν οἷς ὑμεῖς ἐνοικεῖτε ἐν τῇ γῇ αὐτῶν ("among whom you yourselves dwell in their land").

Fourth, Moore refers to the use of resumptive pronouns (Jdt 10:2; 16:3, 15), sometimes occurring in relative clauses (as in the first two of these cases). Thus, Jdt 10:2 speaks of the heroine going to the house ἐν ᾧ διέτριβεν ἐν αὐτῷ ("in which she used to spend time [in it]"), while Jdt 16:3 speaks of the army of the Assyrians ὧν το πλῆθος αυτῶν ("of whom the multitude [of them]") blocked the wadis. Such a construction occurs elsewhere in the LXX, as in Gen 28:13: ἡ γῆ ἐφ᾽ ἧς σὺ καθεύδεις ἐπ᾽ αὐτῆς ("the land upon which you are sleeping [upon it]"), and Isa 1:21 (where the Hebrew lacks the relative): πόλις . . . ἐν ᾗ δικαιοσύνη ἐκοιμήθη ἐν αὐτῇ) ("[the] city . . . in which righteousness lodged [in it]"). Similar constructions also appear in the NT (e.g., Mark 7:25; John 1:33; Rev 13:8).[80] A superfluous pronoun may also serve to resume a preceding dative phrase. Thus, Jdt 16:15 G$^A$ asserts: ἔτι δὲ τοῖς φοβουμένοις σε, σὺ εὐιλατεύσεις αὐτοῖς ("But still to those who fear you, you yourself will be merciful [to them]"). A comparable superfluous use of the dative pronoun appears, for instance, in Rev 2:7, 17 G$^A$: τῷ νικῶντι δώσω αὐτῷ ("to the one who conquers, I shall give [to him]").[81]

Fifth, Moore mentions the superabundance of σφόδρα (equivalent to Hebrew מאד, "very"), since the word appears at least twenty-five times in the book (28x G$^{BA}$; 25x G$^S$), compared to only eleven times in the whole NT (including 7x in Matthew).[82] While the word might be an indicator of translation-Greek, it might also be evidence of a bilin-

---

[79] A comparable pleonastic idiom for "where" as a relative (ὅπου . . . ἐκεῖ) appears in the NT only in the Apocalypse (Rev 12:6, 14).

[80] Cf. Gignac, *Greek Course*, 170-71 (with an example from an Oxyrhynchus papyrus); Conybeare and Stock, *Grammar*, #69; Zerwick, *Biblical Greek*, #201. Note that Luke 3:16 copies the superfluous use of "his" (αὐτοῦ) [sandals] from Mark 1:7, whereas the parallel text in Matt 3:11 omits αὐτοῦ.

[81] For other resumptive uses of the pronoun in the LXX and NT, see Conybeare and Stock, *Grammar*, #66; cf. BDF #297.

[82] While 1 Maccabees (probably deriving from a Semitic original) employs σφόδρα thirty-seven times, 2-4 Maccabees (all Greek-composed) contain five occurrences of the word altogether. Whereas the Greek-written Book of Wisdom lacks σφόδρα completely, so does the Sinaiticus form of the Book of Tobit (Greek II), even though the latter is likely a translation of a Semitic original.

gual author who thought in Hebrew or wished to give the narrative a Hebraic coloring. The doubled form σφόδρα σφόδρα ("very much") in Jdt 4:2 matches the idiom found elsewhere in the LXX (Gen 30:43; Exod 1:7, 12; Num 14:7; Ezek 9:9).[83] In addition, there may be echoes of Septuagintal language in some of the usages, such as the phrase ἐφοβήθησαν σφόδρα σφόδρα ("they were very much afraid"), found in Jdt 4:2 (cf. 2:28), perhaps with an echo of the Israelites' fear of Pharaoh in Exod 14:10: ἐφοβήθησαν σφόδρα ("they were very afraid"; cf. Matt 17:6; 27:54). In addition, the phrase ἐξέστη πᾶς ὁ λαὸς σφόδρα ("all the people were very astonished") in Jdt 13:17 copies exactly the expression in Exod 19:18, suggesting a kind of divine revelation in Judith's victory over Holofernes.[84] Moreover, Jdt 8:7 describes the heroine as ὡραία τῇ ὄψει σφόδρα ("very beautiful in appearance"), using the feminine form of a Septuagintal phrase applied to Joseph and Adonijah (Gen 39:6; 1 Kgs 1:6).[85] Furthermore, the description of the result of Israel's victorious plundering of the Assyrians (Jdt 15:6), ἐπλούτησαν σφόδρα ("they grew very rich"), recalls the report of Jacob's becoming wealthy on Laban's farm (Gen 30:43): ἐπλούτησεν ὁ ἄνθρωπως σφόδρα σφόδρα ("the man grew extremely rich"). Finally, the phrase ἐδίψησεν σφόδρα ("the people thirsted very much") in Jdt 8:30 G^B may be an echo of the story of Samson in Judg 15:18, ἐδίψησεν σφόδρα ("he thirsted very much").[86]

Sixth, Moore notes the use of various forms of πᾶς (equivalent to Hebrew כל, "all," "every"), for example in Jdt 1:7, 12; 2:2, 19; 3:8; 11:7. In fact, a comparable frequent usage also appears in some of the Pauline letters. While Jdt 1:12 employs the word "all" five times (πᾶσαν . . . πάντα . . . πάντας . . . πᾶσαν . . . πάντας), First Corinthians makes fourfold use in 9:22-23 (πᾶσιν . . . πάντα . . . πάντως . . . πάντα) and in 13:7 (4x πάντα), and 2 Cor 9:8 has a fivefold instance: "every . . . in everything at all time [having] all . . . every" (πᾶσαν . . . ἐν παντὶ πάντοτε πᾶσαν . . .

---

[83] Conybeare and Stock, *Grammar*, #85.

[84] There is irony here, since the theophany on Mount Sinai was preceded by the instruction to the Israelite men: "Do not go near a woman" (Exod 19:15), whereas the divine deliverance manifested in Judith 13 comes precisely through a woman.

[85] The simpler phrase ὡραία τῇ ὄψει ("beautiful in appearance") occurs in Gen 26:7 and 29:17 to depict Rebekah and Rachel.

[86] For other links to the Samson story see Corley, "Judith," 82-83. When Jdt 14:19 describes the consternation of the leaderless Assyrian army with the phrase ἐταράχθη αὐτῶν ἡ ψυχὴ σφόδρα ("their soul was greatly shaken"), it is echoing the dismay of Pharaoh after his dream of famine in Egypt (Gen 41:8), ἐταράχθη ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ ("his soul was shaken").

πᾶν). Since this feature occurs in some Greek-written parts of the NT, it may easily be a Greek stylistic feature.[87]

Seventh, Moore posits that the phrase καὶ νῦν ("and now"), which occurs 17x in Judith, may represent the Hebrew wording ועתה ("and now").[88] But this phrase hardly proves Hebrew composition, since Paul's farewell discourse at Miletus twice has καὶ νῦν ἰδοὺ ("and now, behold," Acts 20:22, 25), itself probably a Septuagintal echo of Samuel's farewell speech where the identical phrase appears twice (1 Sam 12:2, 13).

Eighth, Moore also proposes that ἰδοὺ ("behold"), which occurs 11x in Vaticanus, represents the Hebrew word הנה ("behold").[89] However, apart from 13:15 the author of Judith avoids the expected combination καὶ ἰδοὺ ("and behold"), often preferring instead ἰδοὺ γὰρ ("for behold," 5:23; 9:7; 12:12), a phrase occurring six times in Luke-Acts (Luke 1:44, 48; 2:10; 6:23; 17:21; Acts 9:11).[90] It is well known that ἰδοὺ occurs frequently in the NT (Matthew 61x; Luke 57x; Revelation 26x), often as a Septuagintalism. In some cases in Judith, the usage may also be a deliberate reminiscence of the LXX. For instance, the announcement ἰδοὺ ἡ κεφαλὴ Ὀλοφέρνου ("behold, the head of Holofernes," 13:15) echoes the Septuagintal declaration ἰδοὺ ἡ κεφαλὴ Μεμφιβόσθε ("behold, the head of Mephibosheth [= Ish-bosheth]," 2 Sam 4:8), since in both cases the severed head is a vivid illustration to Israel's authorities that the enemy leader is dead.

Ninth, as evidence of Hebraic syntax, Moore refers to eleven diverse instances of hendiadys.[91] This is not conclusive proof of Hebrew origin, since classical Greek authors sometimes used hendiadys.[92] Judith 10:13 employs the expression ῥήματα ἀληθείας ("words of truth" = "reliable information"), which is comparable to the expanded phrase in Acts 26:25, ἀληθείας καὶ σωφροσύνης ῥήματα ("words of truth and sobriety").

---

[87] See further Acts 21:28: "everyone everywhere" (πάντας πανταχῇ); 24:3: "in every way and everywhere . . . all" (πάντῃ τε καὶ πανταχοῦ . . . πάσης). We may also compare Plato, *Menex.* 247A (διὰ παντὸς πᾶσαν πάντως: "always . . . all . . . by all means"; cf. BDF #488 (1a).

[88] Jdt 5:19, 20; 7:11, 25, 26; 8:12, 13, 24, 31; 10:15; 11:2, 3, 9, 11, 17, 23; 14:8.

[89] Jdt 2:5; 3:2, 3, 4; 5:23; 9:6, 7; 12:12; 13:15 *bis*; 14:18.

[90] Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1. 121.

[91] Jdt 2:12; 7:18; 8:5; 9:8, 13, 14; 10:3, 13; 14:10; 16:1, 16. Whereas some instances use coordination ("and"), others use the genitive case. On hendiadys in biblical Greek, see Zerwick, *Biblical Greek*, #460.

[92] Herbert W. Smyth, *Greek Grammar* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1959) #3025.

Moreover, some cases are clearly Septuagintal allusions. For instance, Jdt 8:5 and 10:3 employ the phrase τὰ ἱμάτια τῆς χηρεύσεως [αὐτῆς], "the garments of [her] widowhood" (= "her widow's clothing") in a direct allusion to the story of Tamar in LXX Gen 38:14, 19 (the only other Septuagintal occurrence of the phrase), since both texts share the same motif of disguise for seductive purposes, so as to fight injustice.[93] In another case, Jdt 14:10 speaks of Achior's conversion to Judaism in these words: περιετέμετο τὴν σάρκα τῆς ἀκροβυστίας αὐτοῦ ("he had the flesh of his uncircumcision circumcised"), in imitation of the command for the eight-day-old Israelite boy in Lev 12:3: περιτεμεῖ τὴν σάρκα τῆς ἀκροβυστίας αὐτοῦ ("one shall circumcise the flesh of his uncircumcision"). Note that the story of Dinah (an inverse model for the Judith narrative) describes a similar event among the men of Shechem (Gen 34:24): περιετέμοντο τὴν σάρκα τῆς ἀκροβυστίας αὐτῶν ("they had the flesh of their uncircumcision circumcised").[94]

Tenth, the final piece of evidence of Hebraic syntax adduced by Moore is "the variety of ways in which ἐν (= Hebrew ‫ב‬, 'in,' 'at,' 'among,' 'with,' 'by,' 'according to,' etc.) is used."[95] Among the most common features of Semitic interference in Judith is the instrumental use of ἐν (= "by means of"), as in 8:33 and 9:9 (ἐν χειρί μου = "by my hand"). A comparable instrumental usage of ἐν, unnecessary in Greek, also appears in Luke 22:49 (ἐν μαχαίρῃ, "with a sword"), as well as in Gen 48:22 (ἐν μαχαίρᾳ μου, "with my sword") and 2 Kgs 19:37 (ἐν μαχαίρᾳ, "with the sword").[96] Moreover, in 8:28 Judith is praised for speaking everything ἐν ἀγαθῇ καρδίᾳ ("with a good heart"), which loosely echoes the formulation of the Shema in Matt 22:37, ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ καρδίᾳ σου ("with your whole heart").[97] In addition, the Book of Judith employs the ἐν of accompanying circumstances, a usage appearing elsewhere in biblical Greek as well as in some Egyptian papyri.[98] Thus, Jdt 16:3 says: "He came with myriads (ἐν μυριάσιν) of his force," just as Jude 14 declares: "He came with myriads (ἐν μυριάσιν) of his holy ones" (cf. *1 Enoch* 1:9).

---

[93] Rakel, *Judit*, 130; Dubarle, *Judith*, 1. 141-42.

[94] Similar phraseology appears in Gen 17:11, 14, 24, 25, while Col 2:13 has the reversed phrase τῇ ἀκροβυστίᾳ τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν ("in the uncircumcision of your flesh").

[95] Moore, *Judith*, 67. On the use of ἐν in the Greek Bible, see Gignac, *Greek Course*, 170; Zerwick, *Biblical Greek*, ##116-19; Gehman, "Hebraic Character," 165-66.

[96] Gignac, *Greek Course*, 170 (quoting a possible parallel in a Ptolemaic papyrus).

[97] Cf. Gignac, *Greek Course*, 35.

[98] Thackeray, *Grammar*, 47. As an example, 1 Cor 4:21 copies the Greek of 1 Sam 17:43 in its phrase ἐν ῥάβδῳ ("with a stick").

Here it is also appropriate to consider an eleventh point (noted elsewhere by Moore), the shortage of Greek particles in Judith: "There are only fourteen instances of δή. . . . The particle μέν appears but once (5:20), while ἄρα, οὖν, and τέ do not occur at all."[99] It is instructive to make a comparison with the frequency of such particles in the Gospels of Mark and John, as well as the Book of Revelation. For instance, the particle δή ("now therefore": 14x in Judith) never appears in Mark or John or Revelation, while ἄρα ("then": never in Judith) occurs only twice in Mark and never in John or Revelation.[100] The classical particle μέν ("on the one hand"), which appears 5x in Mark and 8x in John (but never in Revelation), occurs once in Judith in the phrase εἰ μὲν, "if on the one hand" (5:20), contrasted with εἰ δὲ, "if on the other hand" in 5:21.[101] Finally, οὖν ("therefore": never in Judith) appears only 5x in Mark and 6x in Revelation[102] (though frequently in John), while τέ ("and": never in Judith) occurs thrice in John, once in Revelation, and never in Mark. Since the shortage of these particles in Judith often finds general parallels in the usage of Mark and John and Revelation, it can not serve as conclusive evidence that the Greek text of Judith is a translation from Hebrew.

As a whole, these examples of Hebraic-style syntax are insufficient to prove a Hebrew origin for the Book of Judith. In many cases Judith seems to be imitating biblical style, as found in the LXX. Often such constructions also appear in NT writings originally composed in Greek, and the Semitic influence does not necessitate a previous composition in Hebrew or Aramaic.

## III. Conjectured Mistranslations from Hebrew in Judith

More speculative (though potentially more significant) than elements of Hebraic idiom and syntax are claims of mistranslation from a lost

---

[99] Moore, *Judith*, 92-93. In this paragraph the figures for gospel usage of particles are based on the text in Eberhard Nestle (ed.), *Novum Testamentum Graece* (27th ed.; revised by Kurt Aland et al.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1993). Notice that there are variations in NT MSS, such as in the occurrences of οὖν in Mark's Gospel.

[100] By way of comparison, the Book of Wisdom employs δή only thrice (Wis 8:21 G$^S$; 15:12 G$^{BA}$; 17:15) and ἄρα only twice (5:6; 6:20 G$^A$), even though the work was composed in Greek.

[101] A similar contrast appears in Wis 13:3-4; Acts 18:14-15; 25:11.

[102] 4x in G$^S$ Revelation.

Hebrew original. As evidence for a Hebrew *Vorlage* of Judith, Moore proposes fifteen examples of mistranslation or misreading of a Hebrew original, including two cases which he regards as doubtful.[103] Thus, he asserts: "There are variant readings in the LXX which reflect different underlying Hebrew terms. These, in turn, are often similar in sound and spelling, and probably arose through some common scribal error from a common original." I will initially examine the seven cases listed in support of this assertion (7:9; 8:21; 10:3; 12:16; 13:19; 16:11; 16:15), before considering other passages said to point to a misunderstanding of a supposed original Hebrew (1:8; 2:2; 3:9; 6:2; 10:8; 12:7; 15:12; 16:11). It is my common experience in researching these points that these supposed difficulties are to be considered as Septuagintalisms. More specifically, they are better understood as Septuagintal echoes. Subsequent scribal variants are generally explicable as inner-Greek changes.

First, Moore refers to the phrase "will suffer no losses" in 7:9. My translation reads: "Now let our master hear a word, so that there may not be destruction (θραῦσμα) in your force" (7:9). Moore comments: "Instead of θραῦσμα, several manuscripts have θραῦσις, 'a fragmentation'; both Greek words can go back to Hebrew שבר, 'destruction.'"[104] Elsewhere in the LXX, however, neither of these Greek terms ever represents the Hebrew noun שבר. In my view, this variation is an inner-Greek stylistic change, possibly under the influence of LXX 2 Sam 17:9 and 18:7 (where θραῦσις occurs). In any case, the noun "destruction" (θραῦσμα) occurs once more in Judith's short prayer in 13:5 G[A], where the heroine notes that the time has come to do her design εἰς θραῦσμα ἐχθρῶν ("for the destruction of enemies"). The cognate verb appears in 13:14, where it echoes the use of θραύω ("destroy, shatter") in the Song of Moses (LXX Exod 15:6). Thus, the presence of cognates of θραύω suggests a Septuagintal echo of Exodus 15, but the variation between θραῦσμα and θραῦσις seems like an inner-Greek stylistic variant.

Second, Moore makes reference to the phrase "will be exposed" in 8:21. My translation reads: "Because if we are taken, all Judea will be situated thus (οὕτως καθήσεται), and our holy things will be plun-

---

[103] For the first thirteen instances, see Moore, *Judith*, 66 (the source of the next quotation). Many of his examples depend on Zimmermann, "Aids," 67-74.

[104] Moore, *Judith*, 173; cf. Zimmermann, "Aids," 68.

dered" (8:21 G^BSA).[105] This expression attested in the earliest uncial MSS underwent clarifications in later copies of the LXX, with some MSS having λημφθήσεται ("will be taken") or κλιθήσεται ("will lie prostrate"). Hence Moore notes Zimmermann's suggestion that "the variant readings . . . go back to a confusion of the two Hebrew roots ישב, 'to sit,' and שבה, 'to carry off.'"[106] However, Moore retains the reading of G^BSA, namely "will sit" (hence his rendering "will be exposed"), commenting: "Probably some word like Hebrew בדד, 'alone,' has dropped out of the Hebrew text." Since the reading of G^BSA can be understood to make sense, while the later Greek variants are comprehensible as clarifications, no recourse to Hebrew confusion is necessary here.

Third, Moore mentions the description of Judith fixing her hair (10:3). In my view, Sinaiticus probably preserves the earliest reading: "She combed (διέξανε G^S) the hairs of her head" (10:3 Rahlfs), while Vaticanus and Alexandrinus replace the Septuagintal *hapax legomenon* διαξαίνω ("comb") with the better known verb διατάσσω ("arrange"): "she arranged (διέταξεν G^BA) the hairs of her head" (10:3 Hanhart). The general sense of either Greek reading is clear, and an inner-Greek change from the *hapax* διέξανε to the more common διέταξεν is easily comprehensible. To explain this change it is unnecessary to resort to Zimmermann's conjectural three-stage corruption, mentioned by Moore: "Hebrew ותסך 'she anointed,' > ותסדר, 'she arranged,' > ותסרק, 'she combed.'"[107]

Fourth, Moore refers to the phrase "have relations with her" in 12:16, though really the relevant term means "to seduce her."[108] The earliest form of the text reads: "He was observing (ἐτήρει) a time to seduce (ἀπατῆσαι) her" (12:16 G^BSA), whereas subsequent MSS have: "he was seeking (ἐζήτει) a time to meet (ἀπαντῆσαι) her" (12:16 Origenic MSS). Moore refers to Zimmermann's clever explanation of the diverse read-

---

[105] The same verb κάθημαι ("sit, be situated") appears in a comparable sense in Jdt 5:3. Curiously, rather similar wording to Jdt 8:21 is applied to Jesus in John 4:6: "he was sitting down thus (ἐκαθέζετο οὕτως) beside the well." With Jdt 8:21 we may also compare Homer's reference to a command to a dead person: κεῖσ' οὕτως ("Lie thus": *Il.* 21.184; cf. *Od.* 5.146).

[106] This quotation and the next come from Moore, *Judith*, 183; cf. Zimmermann, "Aids," 72.

[107] Moore, *Judith*, 200, with reference to Zimmermann, "Aids," 69.

[108] So Moore, *Judith*, 225.

ings, whereby the variant "presupposes Hebrew ויבקש לעדתה, 'he sought to meet her,' while the LXX presupposes ויבקש לדעתה, 'he sought to know her,' i.e., to have sexual relations with her."[109] While this explanation is not impossible, the later variant is more likely to have been simply the result of euphemism on the part of a Christian copyist, concerned about both the sexual and the deceptive aspects of Judith's activity.[110] A similar concern appears in the textual witnesses of 10:4, where G^SA reads: "She very much beautified herself for the seduction (εἰς ἀπάτησιν) of the eyes of males, as many as might see her." In G^B the euphemistic reading is "for the meeting (εἰς ἀπάντησιν) of the eyes of males." Further textual variants appear in the four Judith passages using the cognate term ἀπάτη ("deceit" or "seduction": 9:3, 10, 13; 16:8). Thus, the inner-Greek textual variation probably points to scribal sensitivities to issues of deceit and seduction, rather than misunderstandings of an original Hebrew text.[111]

Fifth, Moore refers to the phrase "to praise you" in the Origenic MSS of 13:19. My translation of the earliest MSS reads: "Because your hope (or: hope in you) will not depart (οὐκ ἀποστήσεται ἡ ἐλπίς σου) from the heart of human beings remembering God's strength for ever" (13:19 G^BSA). This sentiment in the uncial MSS is a clear allusion to LXX Prov 23:18: "If you observe these things, you will have descendants, and your hope will not depart (ἡ δὲ ἐλπίς σου οὐκ ἀποστήσεται)."[112] The Book of Judith elsewhere recalls cumulatively elements from the same admonition to wise conduct (LXX Prov 23:15-21). Thus Jdt 8:8 says of the heroine: "she used to fear God (ἐφοβεῖτο τὸν θεὸν) very much," while LXX Prov 23:17 advises: "Be in the fear of the Lord (ἐν φόβῳ κυρίου) the whole of the day." While Uzziah comments on Judith's "wisdom" (σοφία, 8:29), LXX Prov 23:19 urges the disciple to be "wise" (σοφὸς). Since Jdt 12:20 says of Holofernes, "He drank very much wine (ἔπιεν

---

[109] Ibid.; cf. Zimmermann, "Aids," 70.

[110] On ancient and modern concerns over the morality of the heroine's conduct, see David A. deSilva, *Introducing the Apocrypha: Message, Context, and Significance* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2002) 99-102.

[111] Jerome omits the offending phrase from the Vulgate of 12:16, but inserts a gloss to 10:4; cf. Moore, *Judith*, 100, 201; Otzen, *Tobit and Judith*, 109. In 16:22 Jerome adds mention of the virtue of chastity, not found in the LXX. A comparable process is evident in Jerome's addition in Tob 8:4 concerning three days of prayerful abstinence before consummation of marriage; cf. Skemp, *Vulgate*, 267.

[112] In a private communication, Pancratius Beentjes suggests that here we have an inverted quotation, as in the echo of LXX Num 23:19 in Jdt 8:16 (already noted).

οἶνον πολὺν σφόδρα),” Judith’s abstention from alcohol contrasts with Holofernes’ overindulgence in his drinking, in line with the words of LXX Prov 23:20: “Do not be a wine-bibber (οἰνοπότης).”[113] In light of the various allusions to the wording and thought of LXX Prov 23:15-21, there is no need to change LXX Jdt 13:19. While some Greek MSS and ancient versions have “your praise” instead of “your hope,” this could be a *lectio facilier* on the part of scribes who missed the allusion to Prov 23:18.[114] Moore claims that Zimmermann “has ended all debate on the LXX’s ambiguous reading by showing that the LXX’s ἡ ἐλπίς σου, ‘your hope’ (= Hebrew תקותך[ו]), represents a misreading of Hebrew תהלתך, ‘your praise,’ a reading attested by a number of ancient texts.”[115] However, if the phrase “your hope” is part of the author’s deliberate Septuagintal allusion to Prov 23:15-21, there was no misreading of a supposed Hebrew original.

Sixth, Moore mentions the expression ἐπτοήθησαν (“they cowered in fear”) in 16:11 GᴮᴬA, where some later MSS have ἡττήθησαν (“they were defeated”). Moore again refers to Zimmermann’s explanation: “πτοέω of the LXX and its variant ἡττάω . . . are both legitimate translations of the same Hebrew verb, חתת.”[116] However, LXX Isa 31:4 has both verbs, so it may be a case of inner-Greek confusion or substitution.

Seventh, Moore refers to the conjectured phrase “like water” in his translation of 16:15. Actually, the Greek of 16:15 says: ὄρη γὰρ ἐκ θεμελίων σὺν ὕδασιν σαλευθήσεται (“For mountains will be shaken from foundations with waters”). In his commentary, Moore asserts: “The LXX’s σὺν ὕδασιν, ‘with waters,’ is awkward. Paul Joüon . . . was probably correct in suggesting that an original Hebrew כמים, ‘like water/s,’ which would nicely parallel ‘like wax,’ was misread as במים, ‘with water/s.’”[117] This suggestion is possible but inconclusive. In fact, the Greek preposition σύν (“with”) hardly fits this proposal, because the Hebrew word במים (literally, “in waters”) would more likely have been rendered ἐν ὕδασι[ν], as in Ps 76(77):20 and Ps 103(104):3. Judith

---

[113] In addition, the situation of Holofernes προπεπτωκὼς (“fallen forward”) in a drunken stupor (13:2) might recall the mention of ὑπνώδης (“sleepiness”) in Prov 23:21.

[114] In fact, the variant could easily have arisen as a Greek misreading of ἡ ἐλπίς σου, “your hope,” as ὁ ἔπαινος σου, “your praise.”

[115] Moore, *Judith*, 233, echoing Zimmermann, “Aids,” 71.

[116] Moore, *Judith*, 249-50, following Zimmermann, “Aids,” 70.

[117] Moore, *Judith*, 251. The reference is to Paul Joüon, “Judith 16,15 (Vg. 18),” *Bib* 3 (1923) 112; cf. Zimmermann, “Aids,” 73; Rakel, *Judit*, 35.

16:15 is reminiscent of certain passages from the Psalter; for instance, Ps 23(24):2 speaks of the origin of the world: "He himself founded (ἐθεμελίωσεν) it upon seas," while Ps 135(136):6 offers praise "to the one who set the earth firm upon the waters (ἐπὶ τῶν ὑδάτων)." Moreover, Ps 17:8(18:7) describes a storm theophany with comparable vocabulary: τὰ θεμέλια τῶν ὀρέων ἐταράχθησαν καὶ ἐσαλεύθησαν ("The foundations of the mountains were disturbed and shaken"). Accordingly, the suggested emendation is hardly necessary.

Eighth, Moore mentions the description of the Israelite women performing a dance (15:12), "where the Syriac reading presupposes a Hebrew reading similar in appearance to the Hebrew phrase posited for the *Vorlage* of the LXX."[118] The supposed confusion depends on the ambiguity of the Greek noun χορός which in the LXX (as also in secular Greek) can mean "dance" (LXX Exod 15:20) or "choir" (LXX 2 Sam 6:13, not in MT). While the Greek of Jdt 15:12 recalls Exod 15:20 and presumably refers primarily to dancing, the Syriac text has: "they chose from themselves groups of singers."[119] In many cultures, singing and dancing are often connected, and it seems unnecessary to posit textual confusion here. Moore refers to Zimmermann's suggestion "that the Syriac reading results from a misreading of Hebrew מחלות, 'dances,' as מהללות, 'singers of praise.'"[120] However, the ambiguity of the Greek noun χορός is the most likely explanation for the possible difference between the Greek and the Syriac here, reflecting diverse cultural backgrounds.

Ninth, Moore refers to the phrase "among the peoples of" in 1:8, as the first of three "awkward words and phrases which are best explained by positing the translator's misreading of a Hebrew word which resembled in appearance (but not meaning) the one presupposed by the extant Greek rendering."[121] My translation of 1:7-8 reads: "Nebuchadnezzar

---

[118] Moore, *Judith*, 66. On the echoes of Exod 15:20-21 and 1 Sam 18:6-7 in Jdt 15:12-14 see Rakel, *Judit*, 230-32.

[119] Moore, *Judith*, 243. I would see the Syriac rendering as perhaps reflecting the ascetic tradition of early Syriac Christianity, where dancing may sometimes have been frowned upon, but where women often belonged to choirs, such as those established by Ephrem; cf. Robert Murray, *Symbols of Church and Kingdom: A Study in Early Syriac Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975) 30 n. 1.

[120] Moore, *Judith*, 246, echoing Zimmermann, "Aids," 71.

[121] Moore, *Judith*, 66. In Jdt 1:8 he follows a suggestion of Fritzsche and others, who have proposed as original בהרי ("in the mountains of") or בערי ("in the cities

king of the Assyrians sent a message to . . . those among the Gentiles (ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν) of Carmel and Gilead and the Upper Galilee and the great Plain of Esdraelon . . . ." Probably the plural term τὰ ἔθνη ("the peoples") has its idiomatic Jewish meaning, "the Gentiles" (as often in 1-2 Maccabees and the NT), here referring to non-Jews living in territories regarded as belonging to the Jewish Promised Land.[122] We may compare Jdt 4:12, where the Israelites pray that the temple may not be profaned as ἐπίχαρμα τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, "an object of malicious joy to the Gentiles." In view of the common Jewish-Greek idiomatic usage of τὰ ἔθνη to denote "the Gentiles," Fritzsche's suggestion is unnecessary.

Tenth, Moore refers to Nebuchadnezzar's activity in 2:2: συνετέλεσεν πᾶσαν τὴν κακίαν τῆς γῆς ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ. Moore renders the phrase: "With his own lips he reviewed for them the full insult of that entire region." More literally the Greek text says: "Out of his own mouth he reckoned up all the evil of the land."[123] Similar language appears in the Greek of 1 Sam 25:17 from the Abigail story: "Evil has been reckoned up (συντετέλεσται ἡ κακία) against our master and against his house" (cf. 1 Sam 20:7, 9, 33).[124] The image is probably of an accountant reckoning up the total amount (in this case, of the harm done). While the exact sense of the verb συντελέω ("complete, pay, reckon up") is unclear, the verb recurs in Judith (2:4; 10:1; 15:4). Fritzsche posits an error on the part of a translator, who could have read ויכלה ("and he completed") instead of ויגלה ("and he revealed"). While this suggestion is possible, it ignores the possible Septuagintal echo and is unnecessary.

Eleventh, Moore mentions the conjectural phrase "from the uncleanness" in his translation of 12:7.[125] His conjecture arises because the same phrase ἐν τῇ παρεμβολῇ ("in the camp"), occurs twice in 12:7, where the second occurrence (omitted by the Origenic witnesses) is awkward:

---

of") instead of בעמי ("among the peoples/Gentiles of"); cf. Fritzsche, *Die Bücher*, 137; Moore, *Judith*, 126; Zenger, *Das Buch*, 452.

[122] The phrase ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ("among the Gentiles") appears in 2 Macc 1:27 and is common in the NT (Acts 15:12; 21:19; Rom 2:24 [= Isa 52:5]; 1 Cor 5:1; Gal 1:16; 2:2; Col 1:27; 1 Pet 2:12). On the term ἔθνος in Judith, see Schmitz, *Gedeutete Geschichte*, 313.

[123] Moore, *Judith*, 66; cf. Zimmermann, "Aids," 72-73; Fritzsche, *Die Bücher*, 140. See the discussion in Schmitz, *Gedeutete Geschichte*, 11-12.

[124] Other echoes of 1 Samuel 25 in Judith are noted by Dubarle, *Judith*, 1. 148-49; Corley, "Judith," 79.

[125] Moore, *Judith*, 66, 219; cf. Movers, "Über die Ursprache," 46.

"she used to bathe herself in the camp at the spring of water." We know from elsewhere that the spring of water is precisely outside of the camp (13:10). Perhaps copyists have assimilated the second occurrence to the first, thereby corrupting an original form ἔξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς ("outside of the camp").[126] Admittedly, the conjecture of Movers is possible, whereby מהנדה ("from the uncleanness") was misread as במחנה ("in the camp"), but this is not the only possible explanation for the textual difficulty, which may be an inner-Greek scribal error. Indeed, Moore notes another case of dittography in 6:12, where the phrase ἐπὶ τὴν κορυφὴν τοῦ ὄρους ("upon the summit of the mountain") occurs twice in one sentence, though the Origenic witnesses omit the first occurrence.[127]

Twelfth, as possible evidence of a Hebrew *Vorlage* Moore refers with some hesitation to the phrase in 3:9, πλησίον τῆς Δωταίας, ἥ ἐστιν ἀπέναντι τοῦ πρίονος τοῦ μεγάλου τῆς Ἰουδαίας ("near Dothan, which is opposite the great ridge of Judea"). Since the word here understood as "[serrated] ridge" (πρίων) means "saw" (Hebrew מַשּׂוֹר) in Isa 10:15, Fritzsche has suggested that this is a misreading of "plain" (Hebrew מישור).[128] This suggestion has not won universal approval, and modern translations often retain "ridge" (e.g., NAB, NRSV). Far more plausible, however, is the suggestion of an inner-Greek corruption, noted in Hanhart's critical apparatus to his text edition, whereby πρηῶνος (from πρηών, "headland") has been written as πριόνος through itacism, and then misunderstood as πρίονος.[129] The headland in question would presumably be Mount Carmel, since 3:10 mentions the adjacent town Geba.[130]

Thirteenth, Moore also refers with some hesitation to the phrase οἱ μισθωτοὶ τοῦ Ἐφράιμ ("Ephraimite mercenaries") in the uncial MSS of 6:2. This phrase appears in LXX Isa 28:1 (cf. 28:3), where the Hebrew expression שכורי אפרים ("drunkards of Ephraim") has been misread

---

[126] The motif of going outside of the camp for washing echoes priestly law codes (e.g., Lev 14:8; 16:26, 28; Num 19:7; 31:24). For instance, Lev 16:26 says that the person who sets the scapegoat free shall bathe his body in water before re-entering the camp, while Num 31:24 stipulates that troops returning from battle with booty shall wash before being readmitted to the camp.

[127] Moore, *Judith*, 167.

[128] Fritzsche, *Die Bücher*, 143.

[129] Hanhart, *Iudith*, 66. The genitive form πρηόνος occurs in Callimachus (*Dian.* 196).

[130] On the location of Geba near Mount Carmel, see Moore, *Judith*, 143.

by the LXX translators as שכירי אפרים ("mercenaries of Ephraim").[131] If the reading of the uncial MSS ("Ephraimite mercenaries") is correct, there is an allusion to Isa 28:1 in Greek (not Hebrew) form.

Fourteenth, in his commentary on 10:8, where the uncial MSS have προσεκύνησεν τῷ θεῷ ("she bowed to God"), Moore mentions the conjectural reading "she bowed to them," which presumes that the Hebrew word אליהם ("to them") was misread as לאלהים ("to God").[132] A comparable situation appears in 1 Sam 3:13, where the Hebrew text says that Eli's sons were "blaspheming for themselves (להם)", but the Greek of 1 Sam 3:13 has "blaspheming God (= אלהים)." However, the text of LXX Jdt 10:8 makes adequate sense as it is, and the possible emendation is not absolutely necessary.

Fifteenth, in his commentary on 16:11, where the major LXX MSS read ἐφοβήθησαν ("they were afraid"), Moore follows Codex Venetus and Hanhart in reading the verb ἐβόησαν ("shouted"), noting: "So reads the variant to the LXX; the LXX reading . . . is not an appropriate parallel to its preceding clause."[133] However, it is possible that "they were afraid" is a reference to the fear of God, and the LXX reading of the whole verse 16:11 does make adequate sense.[134]

While some of these conjectured misunderstandings are possible, none of them is overwhelmingly necessary, and most of these cases can be better understood as inner-Greek changes, often arising in the

---

[131] Charles J. Ball, "Judith," in *Apocrypha of the Speaker's Commentary, vol. 1* (ed. Henry Wace; London: Murray, 1888) 241-360, here 295; cf. Moore, *Judith*, 166. Under the influence of 6:5, where Achior is addressed as μισθωτὲ τοῦ Ἀμμών ("Ammonite mercenary"), the Origenic and Lucianic MSS read "Ammonite mercenaries" also in 6:2. See also Michael Heltzer, "Μισθωτός im Buche Judith," in *Roma Renascens: Beiträge zur Spätantike und Rezeptionsgeschichte* (ed. Michael Wissemann; FS Ilona Opelt; Frankfurt a.M.: Lang, 1988) 118-24.

[132] Moore, *Judith*, 201-2; Movers, "Über die Ursprache," 46; cf. Pancratius C. Beentjes, "Bethulia Crying, Judith Praying: Context and Content of Prayers in the Book of Judith," in *Prayer from Tobit to Qumran* (ed. Renate Egger-Wenzel and Jeremy Corley; Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Yearbook 2004; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004) 231-54, here 242.

[133] Moore, *Judith*, 249; cf. Zimmermann, "Aids," 70 (who presupposes confusion between וייראו, "and they were afraid," and ויריעו, "and they shouted").

[134] There are other variants that look like inner-Greek corruptions; for instance, in 16:10 Moore adopts the reading of G^A, ἐταράχθησαν ("they were daunted"), where G^BS has ἐρράχθησαν ("they shivered"); cf. Moore, *Judith*, 244. Another likely example of an inner-Greek change appears in 5:14 , where the uncial MSS have εἰς ὁδὸν τοῦ Σεινὰ ("on the way to Sinai") but some later MSS read εἰς τὸ ὄρος τὸ Σινά ("to Mount Sinai").

course of transmission because of a copyist's non-recognition of a Septuagintal allusion.

## Conclusion

This essay has attempted to show that the proposed instances of Hebraic style and phraseology in the Greek text of Judith do not necessarily indicate a Hebrew origin for the book, since they can easily be evidence of either mimetic appreciation of Septuagintal style or Semitic interference. Many cases of exact echoes of Septuagintal phrases have been noted, and in three significant cases the LXX is quoted where it differs from the Hebrew text (Exod 15:3 in Jdt 9:7 and 16:2; Num 23:19 in Jdt 8:16; Gen 34:7 in Jdt 9:2). Accordingly, a Hebrew *Vorlage* can not be presumed, while a Greek origin can be suggested as very possible. Evidently in a short article it is not possible to investigate every case of Hebraic style in the book, but the fact that so many usages also appear in Greek-written passages of the NT advises caution in appealing for a Hebrew origin.

What Francis Gignac wrote about the NT applies (I believe) also to the Book of Judith: "The NT was not written by Greeks but by Jews, whose native idiom interfered with their Greek extensively. NT Greek cannot be interpreted as pure Greek, but must be read in light of Semitic language patterns."[135] From this perspective, the strong Hebraic coloring of the Book of Judith makes sense, and thus it is unnecessary to seek a Hebrew origin for the book.

---

[135] Gignac, *Greek Course*, 171. I offer this article as a token of gratitude to Fr. Gignac for encouraging my biblical studies at the Catholic University of America.

# Martyrdom as Cultic Death in the Books of Maccabees: Antecedents and Later Developments

MARK F. WHITTERS

The image of the religious "martyr" has vaulted itself into the public spotlight in the early 21st century, prompting modern secular people to recoil at the brutality and violence of the word. For Jews, Christians, and Muslims, martyrdom evokes a powerful idealism that lends religious pedigree and legitimacy to their respective religions, and even the secularized world stands in awe of a belief that religious people would die for. In such a context, the goal of this article is to reconsider the meaning and history of that ideal.

The task is a vast one that will require certain topical boundaries of time and culture, lest the essay get swallowed up by an overly ambitious scope. For one thing, I will focus on only a part of the history, the Jewish and Christian traditions, mostly in the form of biblical texts. For another, I will adopt a simple working hypothesis: the theological motif that bridges the world before the Jewish and Christian martyrs and the bridge to the world thereafter (primarily Islamic) is built on the public cult.[1] By public cult, I mean the institutions of the religious

---

[1] For background on general theories of public cult, sacrifice, and cultic death, see Robert G. Hamerton-Kelly, ed., *Violent Origins: Walter Burkert, René Girard, and Jonathan Z. Smith on Ritual Killing and Social Formation* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1987). Burkert and Girard are particularly helpful for setting the perspective of this article, Burkert on ritual in sacrifice and Girard on violence and religious deaths. For more specific treatment of both of these scholars' views, see their seminal works: Walter Burkert, *Homo Necans: The Anthropology of Ancient*

community, such as personnel, practices, and places. The components on which I concentrate in this article are priests, sacrifices, and sanctuaries. I will argue that it is the public cult that forms the background for martyrdom and that best interprets the claims that Jews, Christians, and eventually Muslims make for its ownership.

The task will unfold in four parts. First, I will give some general sense of the current discussion of the topic, that is, the complications involved in deriving a definition that envelops the word's long and controversial history. Second, I will begin to amplify the hypothesis by spotlighting various examples of how Greeks commemorated heroes and heroines who voluntarily died in a cultic way. Third, I will give attention to texts from the pre-Christian biblical world that seem to fulfill this cultic role as inherited from Greco-Roman traditions. Fourth, I will briefly and selectively focus on martyrdom among Christians and Jews of the NT era to highlight how the cultic bridge had carried the ideal to later biblical traditions and beyond. The evidence for the bridge will mostly come from ancient texts, but we will first need to explore a theoretical framework to discuss martyrdom and cultic death.

## A. Definition Problems

The term "martyr" is notoriously fraught with semantic and historical difficulties. Jan Willem van Henten attempts a synchronic definition of the term: "A martyr is a person who in an extremely hostile situation prefers a violent death to compliance with a demand of the (usually pagan) authorities."[2] This definition reflects the semantic perspective of the early Church, formally attested to for the first time in the *Martyrdom of Polycarp* (ca. 155 C.E.) and subsequently in the *acta* and *passiones/martyria* of Christian devotional literature until the emergence of hagiographies in the fourth century.[3] One problem

---

*Greek Sacrificial Ritual and Myth* (trans. Peter Bing; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983); René Girard, *Violence and the Sacred* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1977).

[2] Jan Willem van Henten and Friedrich Avemarie, *Martyrdom and Noble Death* (London/New York: Routledge, 2002) 3.

[3] One generally agreed-upon feature of martyrdom accounts in the early second century and beyond is that they often give an authentic account of an adversarial legal

with van Henten's definition is that it does not tell us about the connection with the original Greek meaning of μάρτυς, a "witness" in an adjudicatory process.[4] Therefore the synchronic focus is too narrow and inadequate to take into account all the sources that flow into the martyrdom ideal as it gets passed down to later religious communities. For example, van Henten's definition ignores voluntary sacrificial deaths on behalf of an authority or institution, an aspect that is often part of the martyrdom ideal as I will show below. Nor does it say much about why cultic motifs consistently attach themselves to the martyrs across the cultural and historical spectrum.[5] Why do feast days or commemorative games or new temples (or churches) emerge from these kinds of deaths? Why are their deaths referred to in traditional sacrificial imagery?[6] Why do the martyrs attract a cult of veneration

---

process resulting in the condemnation and death of a hero or heroine. Thus, the word "martyr" is first unequivocally used in its modern sense as referring to death as well as to testimony (μάρτυς, "witness"). While this much is true, a synchronic definition must not leave out the dimension of cult that accompanies the story, and makes its way into Christian hagiographic and later Islamic literature.

[4] See Stephen Todd, "Witnesses in Greek Trials," in *Nomos: Essays in Athenian Law, Politics, and Society* (ed. Paul Cartledge, Paul Millett, and Stephen Todd; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990) 19-39; Hermann Strathmann, "μάρτυς, κτλ.," *TDNT* 4. 474-514; Norbert Brox, *Zeuge und Märtyrer* (SANT 5; Munich: Kösel, 1961).

[5] Both van Henten and Avemarie (*Martyrdom*, 5) admit that their definition leaves out the organic connection between Jewish and Christian martyr texts and Greco-Roman sources. This essay tries to address this deficiency by calling attention to the cultic as the common element uniting the Greco-Roman sources with the religious traditions for Jews and Christians.

[6] The religious terminology of Christian martyrologies is a direct heir to many words that derive from the Greco-Roman ideal of noble death and self-sacrifice. For example, the oath of a gladiator or soldier to fight is called the *sacramentum*, the soldier who is under solemn oath *miles sacratus*, the power of the oath-taker to follow up on the oath *fides*, the dedication of the soldier to pay the ultimate price of death for victory in battle *devotio*. All these terms find their way into the early Church. They suggest, as noted by Carlin Barton ("Honor and Sacredness in the Roman Christian Worlds," in *Sacrificing the Self* [ed. Margaret Cormack; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002] 23-38, esp. 30), that "we tend to draw a sharper border between the human and the divine, the sacred and profane, than the ancient Romans. . . . For the Roman, as for the early Christian, the victim was conspicuously central and active: the more actively voluntary, the more effective the sacrifice. Sacrifice exalted the victim and rendered him or her divine. For the Roman, *sacrificare* still emphasized its root meaning 'holy making.'" For examples of dying on behalf of the homeland in the context of the Greco-Roman civic cult utilizing the expressions that Paul uses in the NT, see Jeffrey Gibson, "Paul's 'Dying Formula': Prolegomena to an Understanding of Its Import and Significance," in *Celebrating Romans—Template for Pauline Theology:*

around them, sometimes involving remembrance rituals like celebratory meals, story-telling, pilgrimage, relics, and special intercessory patronage?

Moreover, van Henten's Christian-era definition is anachronistic in its explanation of why overt hostility was not always present in the story of the hero's or heroine's self-sacrificial death that serves as the background to martyrologies. I will give several examples below where there is no mention of cruelty or coercion, though the context might imply opposition of some sort. The heroic figure irenically chooses death for domestic reasons, such as the good of the people. Both of these dimensions, self-sacrifice and heroic idealism, are crucial for understanding martyrdom.[7]

For the most part, scholars in recent years have debated whether martyrdom had authentic Jewish roots before the emergence of Christianity. Glen W. Bowersock represents one position, namely, that martyrdom did not develop in Jewish circles, but emerged only after the death of Jesus and the development of martyrology in the early (Greco-Roman) church from its contacts with Roman sources and then the much later synagogue's interaction with it.[8] W. H. C. Frend takes the opposite position, namely, that the Christians' sense of martyrology was founded in the late Second Temple Jewish faith and crystallized as a hermeneutic in the wake of the death of Jesus.[9] An in-between position was taken by Daniel Boyarin and Shmuel Shepkaru: both groups interact and develop notions of martyrology in a centuries-long conversation with each other.[10]

---

*Essays in Honor of Robert Jewett* (ed. Sheila E. McGinn; Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2004) 20-41, esp. 28-30.

[7] Another approach for identifying martyrdom was put forward by Arthur J. Droge and James D. Tabor (*A Noble Death: Suicide and Martyrdom among Christians and Jews in Antiquity* [New York: HarperSanFrancisco, 1992] 75). They say that there are five characteristics of martyrs: 1. opposition and persecution for the martyr; 2. a choice for the martyr to die; 3. the martyr's eagerness to die; 4. vicarious benefit resulting from the death of the martyr; 5. the hero's expectation of vindication. The fourth point is more open to incorporating aspects of cultic death than van Henten's definition.

[8] Glen W. Bowersock, *Martyrdom and Rome* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).

[9] W. H. C. Frend, *Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church: A Study of a Conflict from the Maccabees to Donatus* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1967).

[10] Daniel Boyarin, *Dying for God: Martyrdom and the Making of Judaism and Christianity* (Pasadena: Stanford University Press, 1999). This position seems also to

In this article I take a broader perspective of martyrdom by considering voluntary sacrificial deaths as precedents for martyrdom. By the same token, I focus only on those deaths that seem to carry implications for the public cult. My thesis is that the concept of martyrdom grew out of the death of a heroic figure that justified changes in the public cult. This ancient pattern was widespread by the time of the Maccabees, and was incorporated into late biblical traditions. That Greco-Romans had a sense for the term, even as van Henten inadequately and anachronistically defines it, is really not in question.[11] What has not been sufficiently pointed out about self-sacrifice is the cultic interpretation given to it by Hellenistic culture, which then would serve as background to biblical literature.

I will pay attention to one particular cultic function attributed to heroic self-sacrifice that has been otherwise neglected: when a hero or heroine dies as a voluntary victim, the event (mythical or historical) generates new cultic practices. This function then may have found its way into the theologies of later Septuagint and Jewish writings, where already there may have been sympathetic ideals in the Hebrew traditions that connect human sacrifice with things like new cultic sites and seasons. As examples we may refer to the *Aqedat Yitshaq*, the "Suffering Servant" of Isaiah, the murdered prophet, and perhaps the scapegoat of Yom Kippur.[12] The bottom line is that I will suggest that

---

be the one taken by Shmuel Shepkaru (*Jewish Martyrs in the Pagan and Christian Worlds* [Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006]).

[11] For some surveys of examples of self-sacrifice in Greco-Roman civilization and how it developed, see Jan Bremmer, "Scapegoat Rituals in Ancient Greece," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 87 (1983) 299-320. In the epic tradition, see Gregory Nagy, *The Best of the Achaeans*, (Baltimore/London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979; rev. ed. 1999) 279-307. In drama, see E. A. M. E. O'Connor-Visser, *Aspects of Human Sacrifice in the Tragedies of Euripides* (Amsterdam: Grüner, 1987). For Greco-Roman examples from the world of the philosophers in the first three centuries of the Common Era, see Herbert A. Musurillo, *The Acts of the Pagan Martyrs* (Salem, NH: Ayer, 1988); Bowersock, *Martyrdom*, 16-17; Brox, *Zeuge*, 175-82. For Greco-Roman myths of suicide and noble deaths with vicarious results, see Anton J. L. van Hooff, *From Autothanasia to Suicide: Self-killing in Classical Antiquity* (London/New York: Routledge, 1990); for their possible relation to the biblical tradition, see Martin Hengel, *The Atonement: The Origins of the Doctrine in the New Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981) 1-32; Jan Willem van Henten, *The Maccabean Martyrs as Saviours of the Jewish People* (JSJSup 57; Leiden: Brill, 1997) 125-59.

[12] The *Aqedat Yitshaq* (Gen 22:1-19, esp. vv. 2, 14) is connected to the foundation of the temple site in 2 Chr 3:1; *Jub.* 18:13; cf. 2 Sam 24:16; 1 Chr 21:25-26. In the history of Judaism the *Aqedah* was supposed to outlaw human sacrifice in the public cult. In

first-century Jews and Christians were quite familiar with martyrdom as an extension of their public cult.

## B. The Greco-Roman Background

There were numerous myths concerning heroic suicide and noble death in the Greco-Roman world.[13] The heroic figures of these stories offered up their lives for city, laws, cult, and people. However, in the cases I give below, the decisive element (as well as my chief concern) is ritual self-sacrifice, not just the inspiring example, demonstrated by the heroic figure(s). There is no hostile authority in the narrative of the story, and often there is no hostile violence, but only a hero, a death, and change of the cult generated by the death. These cases serve as antecedents for the modern sense of the martyr.

The change of cult may involve several things: the sacrifice may involve dedicating a new place for the cult, or it may involve a change of cult personnel, or it may cause a change of time or season. If the public cult itself changes, or if it changes things for the public weal as a result of the voluntary death, then it is logical to associate the victim with the priest as well as with the shrine itself. Thus, the Greco-Roman

---

the biblical tradition it seems to have been a precedent for David's offer to sacrifice himself to propitiate the angel of destruction (1 Chr 21:17), and David's *aqedah*-like offer of self-sacrifice now contributes to the etiology for the Jerusalem temple. The "Suffering Servant" passages are interpreted throughout the NT as the ground for universalistic salvation and for human atonement. The murdered prophet symbolizes the utter rejection of the Law by the people and an imminent period of punishment (e.g., the Deuteronomic History, esp. 2 Kgs 17:13-14; cf. *Lives of the Prophets*, *Martyrdom and Ascension of Isaiah*). While Yom Kippur does not involve human sacrifice, it is reinterpreted by the early Church (e.g., Heb 9:11-15; *Let. Barn.* 7) as the rationale for the death of Jesus, and Yom Kippur leads to a season of blessing (e.g. 11QMelch; see below my analysis of *Ass. Mos.* 10:1-10).

[13] For a comprehensive study of suicide in the ancient Greco-Roman world, see van Hooff, *Autothanasia*. Of the 923 cases collected from literary sources by van Hooff, 52 (6%) have *devotio* or a vow to the deity associated with the death; slightly less, 45 (5%) have *fides* or loyalty to comrades. *Devotio* would be the likeliest category for a discussion of cultic death, but van Hooff does not so elaborate. Noble death is also well covered in the scholarly discussions. See David Seeley, *The Noble Death: Graeco-Roman Martyrology and Paul's Concept of Salvation* (JSNTSup 28; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990). For a general discussion of the Greek terms connected with ritualized heroic death, see Walter Burkert, *Structure and History in Greek Mythology and Ritual* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979) 64, 70. Also, see n. 6 above for how martyrologies utilize this vocabulary.

stories I highlight are not merely edifying tales, but are foundational or performative for the cult in order to effect its benefits. Thus, the hero or heroine is often identified as a priest, and they establish new religious institutions, even as they serve as victims of the sacrifice.

The handbooks on Greco-Roman myth are full of stories about new rites that are inaugurated by priests or priestesses who sacrifice themselves.[14] There were several versions of the story of Iphigeneia, daughter of Agamemnon. When the Achaean ships could not sail because of a lack of wind, Agamemnon determined to sacrifice Iphigeneia. Under the ruse that she is pledged in marriage to Achilles, she innocently comes to Aulis where her father lies in wait to slaughter her in sacrifice. However, Euripides (*Iphigeneia at Aulis*, 1378-84) describes a different fate for her: the goddess Artemis rescues her and makes her a *priestess* for the sanctuary at Tauris among the non-Greeks of Scythia. This divine commission means that she who was once a sacrificial victim is whisked away to preside in a new cult for a new people.

Some 450 years later in the Roman world of Pompeii, a fresco in the "House of the Tragic Poet" showed Iphigeneia on a pyre. Calchas, the stereotypical Achaean priest and prophet, is ready to strike with his sacrificial dagger, representing the "old religion," but Artemis the goddess is breaking through the clouds to help her devotee establish a new religion—a new priesthood, new victims (without human sacrifice), at a new temple for new worshippers. Iphigeneia's story is also mentioned in other Roman-era sources such as Apollodorus' *Library* and Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, evidence that her tale was well-known throughout the Mediterranean world of the Roman Empire.

Another chain of priestly self-sacrifice myths begins its literary career in a famous conversation that Solon had with Croesus, as recorded by Herodotus (*Hist.* 1:31-32). A happy life, says Solon, can

---

[14] There are numerous references to the role of self-sacrifice in textbooks on Greek mythology. For example, Joseph Campbell (*The Hero with a Thousand Faces* [2nd ed.; Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968]; *The Masks of God: Occidental Mythology* [New York: Penguin, 1964]) is known for his Jungian interpretations of myth. Robert Graves (*The Greek Myths* [London: The Folio Society, 1996]) finds in the myths popular explanations for dance, mime, and ritual conducted in public spectacles and festivals. Similarly, Sir James G. Frazer (*The Golden Bough* [3d ed.; 12 vols.; London: Macmillan, 1914]; cf. the one-volume abridgment *The New Golden Bough* [ed. Theodor H. Gaster; New York: Criterion, 1959]) believes that myth and religious rites are bound firmly together, esp. in the context of fertility and new beginnings. For this paper I consulted the anthology of myths found in Graves.

only be determined if it ends well. (A similar saying is found in Sir 11:28.) To prove his point, he cites Cleobis and Biton, youthful brothers who died in front of the temple of Hera after they had fulfilled their filial and pious duties. The tale was retold in various ways over time, and soon a treasury of divine lore associated the brothers with priesthood. Moreover, they were thematically linked to other celebrity twins associated with unorthodox (and thus new) cult activities, such as child-sacrifice, the establishment of new temples, and new cult rites (e.g., Castor and Polydeuces—the "Dioscuri" or sons of Zeus granted divine status; Agamedes and Trophonius).[15] The notion of a priestly self-sacrifice in these stories implied divine favor upon them and upon their shrines and correspondingly the inferiority of past worship (at the same sites).

Robert Graves details many examples of voluntary self-sacrifice that bring about fundamental changes in Greek religion. Most of Graves' examples involve women (the three priestess-daughters of Erechtheus; the granddaughters of Orpheus; the priestess Agraulos; the two priestesses of Thebes) who were called to sacrifice themselves to avert danger, plague, or famine. Graves speculates that their death had something to do with the transition from matriarchal to patriarchal religion, and so these heroines represented primordial female goddesses as priestesses. Moreover, all the aforementioned were connected with new sanctuaries and worship rites that commemorated their deaths and invoked their intercession.[16] While Graves' speculation remains just that, his point on changes in the cult, reflected in priest, sacrifice, and temple, is a valid one.

Gregory Nagy speaks of another well-known hero in the ancient world whose death inaugurated athletic games and triggered a volte-face on the battlefield: Patroklos. While space does not allow an adequate treatment, suffice it to say that Patroklos represented a θεράπων, a ritual substitute for some other threatened party who dies not so much because of "the narrative traditions of epic literature but by ritual demands of cult."[17] The notion is not far removed from priestly intercessor and sacrificial victim, and the death brings about a change in cult and the celebration of the games (*Iliad* 23). Nagy also notes that

---

[15] Graves, *Myths*, 266-67.
[16] Ibid., 99-101, 164, 310-11, 423.
[17] Nagy, *Achaeans*, 295.

the death of Patroklos (*Il.* 16.791-92; 18.28-31, 175-77) bears resemblance to the sacrifice of a bull (*Od.* 3.447-55), and this resemblance holds true in iconographic representations and other hero tales as well.[18] In Greek mythic tradition new seasons, new years, and new ages often were commemorated by the sacrificial killing of a representative of the old order. Jan Bremmer writes that there is "no new beginning before a complete katharsis of the old situation. This applies . . . as well to special occasions when a new beginning had to be established after the disturbance of the seasonal and cosmic order . . . ."[19]

## C. The Maccabean Martyrs

Since the topic of martyrdom in the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures would require at least an article in itself, I will instead focus on one legend, often considered a prototypical Jewish martyr account. The story is told in Jewish circles over many years and plays upon the same cultic features found among the Greco-Roman examples detailed above.

The earliest narration of the tale is found in 2 Maccabees.[20] The turning point of the plot in 2 Maccabees comes when a "scribe of high standing" and seven pious sons of a widow die (6:18—8:4) instead of apostatize against the Law. The text does not use the word "martyr" to describe any of them, yet it is clear that their deaths ultimately benefit their co-religionists. The reader or audience easily interprets their choice to die as self-sacrifice in a cultic sense, too, even though conventional cultic vocabulary is not used.

---

[18] Gregory Nagy, "Introduction," *The Iliad*, translated by Robert Fitzgerald (Everyman Library; London: Random Century, 1992) x-xii.

[19] Bremmer, "Scapegoat," 320. Biblical commentators who generally echo Bremmer include Hengel, *Atonement*, 24-28; Lawrence M. Wills, *The Quest of the Historical Gospel* (London/New York: Routledge, 1997) 36-37; and van Henten, *Maccabean Martyrs*.

[20] Second Maccabees most likely stems from temple society of the early first century B.C.E. For the provenance see Robert Doran, *Temple Propaganda: The Purpose and Character of 2 Maccabees* (CBQMS 12; Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1981). The author seems quite familiar with Hellenistic Greek style, *topoi* and themes, even if there is no reason to doubt its Jerusalem origin. For the dating see van Henten, *Maccabean Martyrs*, 50-53. For a very different view of the tradition history of 2 Macc 6-7, see Shepkaru, *Martyrs*, 25-33; Bowersock, *Martyrdom and Rome*, 11.

The word that comes closest to cultic language is καταλλάσσω (2 Macc 7:33; 8:29), though that word primarily means "change" (LSJ, 1996) and then secondarily "reconcile" or "be atoned."[21] The derived noun καταλλαγή is used in 2 Macc 5:20. In the context of the book's Deuteronomic theology (e.g., 2 Macc 5:20; 7:37-38), both senses are implied: the temple sacrifices have been discontinued and so there is no way to bring about reconciliation with God, while the cult needs to be re-started in a new way. There is need for some kind of new and alternative atoning process, and the Maccabean martyrs serve as a symbol and mechanism of change. Thus, in context, an argument can be made for a cultic connotation for the word, both in terms of atonement (e.g., 2 Macc 5:20; 7:33; cf. 8:5b) and rededication (e.g., 2 Macc 10:1-9) as the culmination of the whole Deuteronomic process at work in the middle section of 2 Maccabees (4:1—10:9).

The interpretation of the martyrs' deaths as cultic self-sacrifices is reasonable for three reasons. First, like the Greek models considered above, their deaths result in a new sense of Jewish religion and civic identity.[22] The temple (and nation) is reborn under the Maccabees who mostly appear in the narrative *after* the martyrdoms. Second, after the martyrs die in the middle of the book, Israel's dire circumstances are reversed and the Maccabees begin to win military victories, as if the martyrdoms accomplish this result. The youngest of the seven sons prays that through their deaths, they might "bring to an end the wrath of the Almighty that has justly fallen on our whole nation" (2 Macc 7:38), and in the following two chapters Judas Maccabeus wins victory and Antiochus is punished with a painful death. Van Henten suggests that "the most probable reading is that the turning away of the wrath of the Lord was caused by the intercessory prayer and death of the martyrs."[23]

---

[21] Friedrich Büchsel, "καταλλάσσω," *TDNT* 1. 254-59.

[22] In general, see Etienne Nodet, *La crise maccabéene* (Paris: Cerf, 2005). Nodet's thesis is that the form of Judaism and Jewish state emerging from "the Maccabean crisis" supplants all earlier forms of Jewish cult and polity, and that 1-2 Maccabees taken together give a foundational story involving a temple, feasts, and rituals intended to replace the status quo. In such a context the martyrdoms serve as part of the foundational story. Nodet (p. 300) insists that this sense of a regime change replete with a new cult is a common feature of Semitic societies, citing Josephus' report of King Hiram (*Ap.* 1.118-19) who replaced the old cult with a new one when he took power in Tyre.

[23] Van Henten, *Maccabean Martyrs*, 27.

Third, there are a host of literary cues that the author intends to focus on the public cult. Two festal letters (2 Macc 1:1—2:18) written by priests begin the composition, and such missives would require authorization from cultic authorities.[24] The narrative that accompanies such letters often explains why the change in the cult is necessary, and such narratives feature the accounts of heroes who have been vindicated and delivered by God. Jewish festal letters, in other words, are a way for the cultic institution to advocate reform while maintaining authority.[25]

Another literary cue to the cultic context is the attention given to priests as role-models. For example, the one who can rightly be called a hero in the first half of the book is a priest by the name of Onias.[26] Once he is murdered in the narrative of 2 Maccabees, the temple cult is overwhelmed with strife and corrupt politics. The first "martyr" to die in the central section of the book is Eleazar, a name associated in the biblical tradition with priests, esp. the grandson of Aaron.[27] Thus, even though Eleazar is only "a scribe in high standing" (2 Macc 6:18), he may be symbolic of the whole temple system.

The definitive clue that the martyrs of 2 Maccabees were interpreted as cultic offerings, true self-sacrifices, is found in retellings of the story. The evidence that the Jewish world interpreted the seven sons as priests who die as sacrificial martyrs is found in 4 Maccabees (esp. 1:11; 6:29; 17:21-22). Unfortunately the dating of that document cannot be verified beyond controversy, and it is possible that its composition was influenced by reports of the death of Jesus. So I will discuss 4 Maccabees in section E below.

However, another book stands midway in time and message between 2 and 4 Maccabees, and that is *Assumption of Moses* (or *Testament of*

---

[24] See Mark F. Whitters, "Some New Observations about Jewish Festal Letters," *JSJ* 32 (2001) 272-88.

[25] Festal letters or announcements in the Greek world also came from the public authorities, usually in behalf of temples that were rescued or feasts that needed to be commemorated. For evidence, see John Dillery, "Greek Sacred History," *AJP* 126 (2005) 505-26, esp. 507, 514; also van Henten, *Maccabean Martyrs*, 47.

[26] See Lawrence M. Wills, *The Jewish Novel in the Ancient World* (Ithaca/ London: Cornell University Press, 1995) 195-201.

[27] When 4 Maccabees retells the martyrdoms of 2 Maccabees 6—7, three times it calls Eleazar a priest (5:4; 7:6, 12), in addition to being a scribe. Eleazar is also a priest in 3 Macc 6:1 and in the *Letter of Aristeas*, although the story presented there is different.

*Moses*).[28] There the parent of the seven is named Taxo, and his seven sons are the seven martyrs (*Ass. Mos.* 9:1-7). Taxo and his sons decide to accept death rather than compromise their observance of the Law. They withdraw from public life and go into a cave to die. They seem to believe that their death will trigger the dawning of a new age of priestly intercession, accompanied by a theophany and the destruction of the old order (*Ass. Mos.* 9:7—10:10). The cultic implication of their death is signaled by a reference to the "hands of the messenger [being] filled" (10:2). This is a biblical expression that undoubtedly points to the ordination of a priest (Exod 28:41; 32:29; Lev 8:33; Judg 17:5, 12; 1 Kings 13:33; cf. *T. Levi* 8:10).

Why is the reader supposed to envision cultic self-sacrifice in *Assumption of Moses* 9? After all, the passage (9:6) says that the cave is "in the field" (*in agro*), not in the temple. The rest of the evidence, however, supports the more familiar context of public cult. First, the text (9:1) calls Taxo "a man from the tribe of Levi" (*homo de tribu Levvi*), a description not given to anyone else in the book. Though Levites did not necessarily have priestly status, what is emphasized here is their access to sacred space.[29] Second, the immediate context (9:6) suggests a cultic ritual (e.g., a three-day fast) and a cultic vocabu-

---

[28] George W. E. Nickelsburg (*Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah* [2nd ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005] 74-76, 247-48) has proposed a two-stage composition for *Assumption of Moses*, first during the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes and then later during the Herodian period; while Kenneth Atkinson ("Taxo's Martyrdom and the Role of the *Nuntius* in the *Testament of Moses*: Implications for Understanding the Role of Other Intermediary Figures," *JBL* 125 (2006) 453-76, esp. 457-67) holds that the entire composition most likely comes from the early first century C.E. Either approach is acceptable for this article. For the close links among the three books, see Norbert Johannes Hofmann, *Die Assumptio Mosis: Studien zur Rezeption massgültiger Überlieferung* (JSJSup 67; Leiden: Brill, 2000) 255-56, 270. Hofmann says that the key part of the tradition passed on from 2 Maccabees to *Assumption of Moses* to 4 Maccabees is precisely the martyr texts.

[29] On *Ass. Mos.* 9:1, 4-5 see the comments by Johannes Tromp, *The Assumption of Moses: A Critical Edition with Commentary* (SVTP 10; Leiden: Brill, 1993) 224, 226. He concludes that *Ass. Mos.* 10 gives evidence for Taxo's "heavenly priest" status (pp. 228-231). Stefan Schreiber ("Hoffnung und Handlungsperspektive in der *Assumptio Mosis*," *JSJ* 32 [2001] 252-71, esp. 262-63), who is doubtful of any nuance concerning atoning sacrifice, agrees that Taxo and his sons were probably priests; Atkinson ("Taxo's Martyrdom," 470-72) assumes that Taxo was an acting Levitical priest who in turn caused an intervention by a heavenly priestly counterpart.

lary (*intremus*).[30] It is important to note that the word usually translated as "Lord" (*Dominum*) is in fact "house" (*domum*) in the Latin text (9:3), used elsewhere (*Ass. Mos.* 2:9; 5:3; cf. Matt 12:4; 21:13; Acts 7:47; Heb 3:2) to refer to the temple. Third, in its overall message and literary structure, *Assumption of Moses* addresses the public cult and its reform—hence the turning point that comes with Taxo the Levite and his sons.[31]

Now, how to explain the cave in the field (*Ass. Mos.* 9:6)? Normally exegetes suggest that the cave is a refuge in times of crisis,[32] and biblical passages can be listed to show this meaning (e.g., Josh 10:16-27; 1 Sam 13:6; 22:1; 24:4-11; 2 Sam 23:13; 1 Kgs 18:4, 13). However, Günter Reese observes that the connotation of a "safe house" is not present in *Ass. Mos.* 9:1-7, but rather the notion of religious ceremony and worship. In the end, Reese says that Taxo and his group may have given up on the Jerusalem temple because of its corruption, much like the stories Josephus tells of prophets who went into the wilderness with their followers to wait for redemption.[33] Therefore it is conceiv-

---

[30] Günter Reese, *Die Geschichte Israels in der Auffassung des frühen Judentums* (BBB 123; Berlin: Philo, 1999) 83-84, 87.

[31] Moses' prophecy begins in 1:5-9 with a concern for both the temple and land, and the cycle of sin, punishment, repentance, and restoration involves both things. For the literary structure that undergirds this cycle, see Hofmann, *Die Assumptio Mosis*, 68-69; Heinrich Hoffmann, *Das Gesetz in der frühjüdischen Apokalyptik* (SUNT 23; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999) 204-6, 209-10. Nickelsburg, *Literature*, 76-77, says that "a consuming interest in temple matters . . . runs through the Testament of Moses . . . ." Ostensibly Joshua is the recipient of Moses' prophecy at the beginning and end of *Assumption of Moses* (1:5; 12:3), but the story of Taxo and his sons as Levites and the focus on the temple suggest that the cult is a priority. While Joshua may be a warrior and protector, he cannot do the job delegated to Taxo as a Levite (e.g., Num 4:1-4). He would also be a suitable successor to Moses as priestly intercessor (*Ass. Mos.* 11:17; 12:6). Schreiber ("Hoffnung," 268-69) disputes whether Taxo and his sons have a cultic role as priests (or victims), though their exemplary deaths are inspirations and teachings about the perils of keeping the Law during the last days.

[32] See Hofmann, *Assumptio*, 255; Tromp, *Assumption*, 227; Schreiber, "Hoffnung," 261, 267-68; John Priest, "Testament of Moses," *OTP* 1. 919-34, here 1. 931 (note f on 9:6).

[33] Reese, *Geschichte*, 83-84. He also suggests that Taxo and his group are fleeing the desecrated temple to the wilderness in the spirit of Qumran, but he does not develop the thought. For the function of the wilderness as a place of suffering, purification, and revelation in the late Second Temple period, esp. in the DSS, see Hindy Najman,

able that the self-sacrifice of Taxo and his sons represents Jews who believe in the primitive wilderness tabernacle of the Pentateuch and who believe that their priestly self-sacrifice would precipitate a new age of faith for Israel.[34] Indeed, the text about priestly ordination in the Bible specifically says that Aaron and his sons would not die in this atonement process (Lev 8:35), and perhaps this assurance explains how the *nuntius* is ordained as the priest of the theophanic age following Taxo and his sons' heroic act (*Ass. Mos.* 10:2).[35]

Another indication that the martyrdom of the seven sons had cultic significance is found in the Slavonic account of Josephus' *Jewish War.* There Mattathias and Judas, the Maccabean heroes, make the following speech:

> It is a fine thing to die for the Law of our fathers. For immortal glory will follow; we shall die, and our souls will have eternal joy. . . . Come, men of Judaea, now is the time for men to behave like men, to show what reverence we have for the Law of Moses. Let not our race be shamed, let us not bring disgrace on our Lawgiver. Let us take as the model for our exploits Eleazar first and the seven Maccabean brothers and the mother who made men of them. For, when Antiochus had conquered and subjugated our land and was ruling over us, he was defeated by these seven youths and [their] old teacher [French translation: "master"] and an old woman. Let us also be worthy of them, let us not prove weaker than a woman. But even if we are to be tortured [French translation: "martyred"] for our zeal for God, a greater wreath has been plaited for us.[36]

---

"Towards a Study of the Uses of the Concept of Wilderness in Ancient Judaism," *Dead Sea Discoveries* 13 (2006) 99-114.

[34] This thought is echoed by Atkinson ("Taxo's Martyrdom," 469-71), who cites 4Q390, 1QM 3:13-4:17, 4QMMT C6-32, esp. C 20-21 as instances where the DSS scribes see the wilderness as the place where the group must go because of the transgressions within the Jerusalem temple.

[35] Tromp (*Assumption*, 230-31) makes the connection between *nuntius* and priest. Against other views that the *nuntius* is a heavenly warrior or angel, he suggests that Taxo is the successor of Moses, also called a *nuntius* (*Ass. Mos.* 11:17), and is the most natural candidate in the composition to fulfill this role. However, he does not link Taxo and his sons' ordeal at the cave to Lev 8:33-36 and the process of ordination.

[36] Henry and Kate Leeming, eds., *Josephus' Jewish War and Its Slavonic Version* (AGAJU 46; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2003) 228-29. See also: Nodet, *Crise*, 53-54, citing Viktor M. Istrin, André Vaillant, Pierre Pascal, *La "Prise de Jérusalem" de Josèphe*

This speech is interesting for several reasons. First, it connects the martyrdom of Eleazar with the seven brothers and their mother, even though 2 Maccabees does not explicitly show this connection. Second, this connection is reinforced by calling Eleazar the "teacher" or "master" of the later martyrs. It is reasonable to assume that this Slavonic source sees the seven young priest-martyrs as disciples of Eleazar. Such a master might well have been a "father" or "abba" to his disciples, as the *Assumption of Moses* tells the story. Third, as Nodet points out, Mattathias and Judas here promote martyrdom as a source of deliverance and redemption, connected with the Law. No longer is the martyrdom only an inspiring example, but it is a sacrificial action to persuade the deity to change direction and bless the martyrs. The provenience of this text is not clear, though both Nodet and the original Russian editor suggest that the Slavonic predates the accepted Josephus manuscript.[37]

In addition to this tale in 2 Maccabees and its later conversation partners, there are other non-fiction reports among the Jews that give evidence of the same beliefs. For example, Josephus points out several times that priests sacrificed themselves at the time of the Roman invasion of Judea. Their blood was spilled just outside the temple precinct or on Masada, their last stronghold after the temple fell (*B.J.* 1.4-5 §148, 150; 6.5.1 §280; *A.J.* 14.4.3-4 §§66-70; cf. *A.J.* 10.8.2 §140; 10.8.5 §§149-50). When David Goodblatt looked at the Roman histories of the period, the same reports arose: the Jewish priests had thrown themselves upon the Roman swords, in a kind of passive suicide (e.g., Dio Cassius, *Historia Romana*, 66.6.2-3).[38] When he looked at the testimony of the rabbis alongside other sources, he found that there were indications that they believed that God would not allow the destruction of the city as long as the priestly rituals were being carried out. But when the sins of the people mounted, God allowed the priests to die in order for the temple to be desecrated. The deaths of the priests therefore were a sign

---

le Juif (2 vols.; Paris: Institut d'Études Slaves, 1934-38). This speech is *not* in *B.J.* 1.33.2 §650 (Greek).

[37] Nodet, *Crise*, 53 n. 1; Leeming, *Jewish War*, 41-47 (citing the original editor, N. A. Meščerskij).

[38] David Goodblatt, "Suicide in the Sanctuary: Traditions on Priestly Martyrdom," *JJS* 46 (1995) 10-29, esp. 14.

of God's abandonment of his sanctuary and of an imminent time of punishment.[39]

Other sources (most likely contemporary to the NT and yet Jewish) take a different tack for reporting the deaths of the priests. For example, *2 Apoc. Bar.* 10:18 says that the priests cast their keys up to heaven, perhaps signifying that their deaths were justly required from them for mismanaging the temple. What is the connection between the priests and their keys? For "Baruch" the loss of the keys shows that God has rejected the temple and its caretakers due to their corruption.

## D. Jesus' Passion as a Cultic Death

The death of Jesus and the accounts of it in the NT epitomize the next link in the traditions leading to second-century martyrologies. These accounts (mostly in the four gospels) are not full-blown martyrologies, but they incorporate many of the strands of cultic death shown in the examples above. Taken together the canonical gospels present a "passion narrative" that not only inspires later martyrologies, but is itself a repository of the cultic death traditions.

The Gospel of Mark is illustrative of the trajectory.[40] While its passion narrative cannot simply be isolated to one genre, it is safe to say that, at the very least, the story of the suffering righteous one (*der leidende Gerechte*) was a paradigm used in the composition of the gospels.[41] This paradigm story is not the same as martyrdom, but the

---

[39] Ibid., 15-20.

[40] Though I focus on the Gospel of Mark, there are other places in the NT that show the influence of cultic death. For example, the Gospel of John has subtle references to Jesus as the sacrificial lamb of God (John 1:29, 36), or as a scapegoat figure (11:50), or as a new Passover sacrifice (19:14). For the role of self-sacrifice in the other gospels, see Jon D. Levenson, *Death and Resurrection of the Beloved Son: The Transformation of Child Sacrifice in Judaism and Christianity* (New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 1993) 174-232. Some expressions in Pauline letters also illustrate the trajectory (e.g., Rom 3:25; 1 Cor 5:7; 15:3; cf. Col 1:24). For discussion of Pauline materials and cultic death, see Jerry L. Sumney, "'I Fill Up What Is Lacking in the Afflictions of Christ': Paul's Vicarious Suffering in Colossians," *CBQ* 68 (2006) 664-80; also Gibson, "Formula"; Seeley, *Death*.

[41] George W. Nickelsburg, "The Genre and Function of the Markan Passion Narrative," *HTR* 73 (1980) 153-84, esp. 158-59, 160-66, 174-76. His argument was reprinted and reaffirmed 23 years later in *George W. E. Nickelsburg in Perspective: An Ongoing Dialogue of Learning* (ed. Jacob Neusner and Alan J. Avery-Peck; 2 vols.; JSJSup

two ideas are not far apart, as many commentators have pointed out.[42] Commentators suggest that the themes of martyrology figured into the passion narrative behind the canonical gospels. Although "suffering righteous one" or even "martyr" may not be the only genre, typology, or motif at work,[43] it is a helpful scholarly context for explaining the cultic dimension of the death of Jesus.

When the passion narrative of the Gospel of Mark begins, the reader detects subtle but significant references to cult. First, Jesus is accused before the priests of threatening to destroy the temple (14:58), and the reference surfaces again in the crowd's and priests' mockery

---

80; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2003) 2. 473-520. The paradigm of the suffering righteous one was first explored by German scholars such as Lothar Ruppert, *Jesus als der leidende Gerechte? Der Weg Jesu im Lichte eines alt- und zwischentestamentlichen Motivs* (SBS 59; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1972); idem, *Der leidende Gerechte: Eine motivgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum alten Testament und zwischentestamentlichen Judentum* (FB 5; Würzburg: Echter, 1972); idem, *Der leidende Gerechte und seine Feinde: Eine Wortfelduntersuchung* (Würzburg: Echter, 1973); idem, "Der leidende (bedrängte, getötete) Gerechte nach den Spätschriften des Alten Testaments (inclusiv Septuaginta) und der (nichtrabbinischen) Literatur des Frühjudentums unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Gottesbildes," in *Die Entstehung der jüdischen Martyrologie* (ed. Jan Willem van Henten; SPB 38; Leiden: Brill, 1989) 76-87.

[42] German scholarship has taken the two ideas as closely linked. See Eduard Lohse, *Märtyrer und Gottesknecht: Untersuchungen zur urchristlichen Verkündigung vom Sühnetod Jesu Christi* (FRLANT 64; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1955); Eduard Schweizer, *Erniedrigung und Erhöhung bei Jesus und seinen Nachfolgern* (ATANT 28; Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1962). Before them, the groundwork was laid by Wolfgang Wichmann, *Die Leidenstheologie, eine Form der Leidendeutung im Spätjudentum* (BWA[N]T 53; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1930). Contra Schweizer above, Ruppert denied that the motif of the "suffering righteous one" could by itself inspire the passion narrative(s) of Jesus (*Jesus als der leidende Gerechte?*, 42-44). Instead he argued that the NT added an apocalyptic overlay of a murdered prophet (ibid., 42-44; 74-75) and the idea of the martyr contributed to the passion narrative(s). For the image of a murdered prophet, see Odil H. Steck, *Israel und das gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten* (WMANT 23; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1967).

[43] The connection between the passion narrative and martyrdom was developed first by Martin Dibelius (*Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums* [Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1959] 195-97, 202-203), while Ruppert was among the earliest to suggest the connection with the "suffering righteous one." See Jan Willem van Henten, "Jewish Martyrdom and Jesus' Death," in *Deutungen des Todes Jesu im Neuen Testament* (ed. Jörg Frey and Jens Schröter; WUNT 181; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005) 140-68, esp. 166 n. 118, for a history of both interpretations in German scholarship. More recent commentators see a mixture of genres in the passion narrative: Frank J. Matera, *Passion Narratives and Gospel Theologies* (New York/Mahwah, NJ: Paulist, 1986); A. Yarbro Collins, "From Noble Death to Crucified Messiah," *NTS* 40 (1994) 481-503; Hengel, *Atonement*, 41-42; van Henten, "Jewish Martyrdom," 167.

of Jesus on the cross (15:29-31). Then the curtain of the temple, the barrier between sacred and profane courts, tears just as Jesus dies on the cross (Mark 15:38). All these probably serve as synecdochical references to the old institutions of sacrifice, priest, and temple. When the tearing happens precisely at the time of the death of Jesus, it is hard to escape the implication that the death of Jesus is a sacrifice that initiates a new or reformed cult. Whatever the reader makes of the hermeneutics—what is the change Jesus represents, what is the validity of then-current Jewish worship rites—the episode plays upon a sense of cultic imagination.

There is yet another major clue for a cultic understanding of Jesus' death in the Gospel of Mark. Jesus had indicated that his life was given as a "ransom for the many" (λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν: 10:45; cf. 14:24). This phrase has two relevant dimensions: first, he is an offering that allows freedom for others. While I cannot here go into the ramifications of "ransom," the semantic range facilitates a sacrificial or atonement nuance.[44] Second, he acts on behalf of "the many." Not only does this term lend itself to a concept of vicarious sacrifice,[45] but it seems to suit a cultic setting for the mission of Jesus. In the Gospel of Mark, Jesus seems to speak not only to his fellow Jews but to the surrounding Gentiles. For instance, when Jesus throws out the money-changers

---

[44] Otto Procksch ("λύτρον," *TDNT* 4.329-31) finds that its Hebrew equivalent is *kōper* (a cultic word) whenever an exchange is to be made for a human life, and thus a good background for Mark 10:45. In support, see Adela Yarbro Collins, *The Beginning of the Gospel: Probings of Mark in Context* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992) 68-71; Hengel, *Atonement*, 34, 45; van Henten, *Maccabean Martyrs*, 157. This understanding is not shared by Morna Hooker, *Message of Mark* (London: Epworth, 1983) 93-94; Seeley, *Death*; Francis J. Moloney, *The Gospel of Mark* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2002) 207-8, 214, 329; Scot McKnight, *Jesus and His Death* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2005) 159-75, 338, 356-60. Recently, Brant Pitre (*Jesus, the Tribulation, and the End of the Exile* [WUNT 2/204; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005] 384-455) cogently interpreted the word primarily from a non-cultic context, whereby the death of Jesus brings about a release from captivity. Two biblical images illuminate Pitre's understanding: the release of Israel from Egypt in the Book of Exodus and the release of the saints going through the tribulation in Daniel 7. Nonetheless he finds a secondary cultic implication because the Exodus involved the offering of the Passover lamb, and so there are grounds for a nuance of sacrificial atonement. I would also point out that even the second image of a son of man approaching the Ancient of Days in the midst of the persecution and martyrdom was certainly read in a cultic context (cf. Revelation 4–5).

[45] "For the many" is a common Semitic way of saying "for all people." See Joachim Jeremias, "πολλοί," *TDNT* 6.536-45.

in the temple, he quotes from Isa 56:7, "My house shall be called a house of prayer," but uniquely adds in the Gospel of Mark, "for all peoples" (11:17). This phrase makes the reader reflect on the efficacy of Jesus' promise about the temple rites. These words will come back to mind when the Roman centurion makes his statement after the curtain of the temple tears.[46] Now there can be a sense of the "house of prayer for all nations," for both Jew and Greek are included (Mark 11:17). The intelligent reader will see that truly the cultic death of Jesus now answers the charge made against Jesus that he would destroy the temple and build another one not made by human hands (14:58).

## E. Martyrdom Accounts after the Death of Christ

Contemporaneous to the NT and written in the wake of the death of Christ are at least two other references to martyrs. The first most likely goes back to late first century, *1 Clement* 5—6. In this passage are references to Peter and Paul as models of martyrs "of our own generation" (thus presumably indicating an apostolic-era dating), as well as a cryptic reference to the first women martyrs. The passage makes clear that bearing witness here has to do with martyrdom, and it also suggests that their deaths allowed them to be "taken up to the Holy Place," an expression that must point to Jesus' experience after his own martyrdom (Luke 9:51; Acts 1:2, 11, 22; 1 Tim 3:16; cf. Mark 16:19). In other words, the martyrs in *1 Clement* 5—6 follow the lead of their protomartyr Jesus, and enter into a cultic place, as shown below:

---

[46] Perhaps the cross then would serve as the true ἱλαστήριον ("propitiation"), to borrow the term used elsewhere in the NT (Rom 3:25 and Heb 9:5), a point of access for the Gentiles, as suggested by J. B. Yates, *The Spirit and the Kingdom* (London: SPCK, 1963) 233, 236. This would fit the Day of Atonement theological interpretation of the episode. Others who suggest that the tearing of the curtain implies both vindication and a revelation of salvation for the Gentiles include William D. Davies and Dale C. Allison, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew* (3 vols.; ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988-1997) 3. 631; Jack Dean Kingsbury (*Matthew as Story* [2nd ed.; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988] 88; Donald A. Carson, "Matthew," in *The Expositors Bible, vol. 8* (ed. Frank Gaebelein; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984) 3-599, here 580; Harry L. Chronis, "The Torn Veil: Cultus and Christology in Mark 15:37-39," *JBL* 101 (1982) 97-114, here 111; Warren Carter, *Matthew: Storyteller, Interpreter, Evangelist* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1996) 221. The torn curtain now can reveal things hitherto unknown or unknowable, presumably including the Gentiles' salvation.

[V] But, to finish with ancient examples, let us come to the ath-
letes of the recent past; let us take the noble examples of our own
generation. Through jealousy and envy the greatest . . . pillars
were persecuted and contended unto death. Let us set before our
eyes the good apostles: Peter, who because of unrighteous jeal-
ousy suffered . . . , and having given his testimony (μαρτυρησάς)
went to the glorious place which was his due. . . . Paul showed the
way to the prize of endurance; seven time he was in bonds, he was
exiled, he was stoned, . . . and when he had reached the limits of
the West he gave his testimony (μαρτυρησάς) before the rulers and
thus passed from the world and was taken up into the Holy Place
(εἰς τόν ἅγιον τόπον ἀνελήμφθη). . . . [VI] Associated with these
men of holy life is a great multitude of the elect, who because of
jealousy have suffered many indignities and tortures and have set
a very noble example in our midst. Because of jealousy women
were persecuted, who . . . safely completed the race of faith and,
though weak in body, received a noble reward of honour.[47]

Yet another early church example comes from Ignatius' *Letter to
the Romans*, probably written during the reign of Trajan in the early
second century (Ign., *Rom.* 4:1-2):

I am dying willingly for God's sake, if you do not hinder it. I
beseech you, be not "an unseasonable kindness" to me. Suffer me
to be eaten by the beasts, through whom I can attain to God. I
am God's wheat, and I am ground by the teeth of wild beasts that
I may be found pure bread of Christ. . . . Beseech Christ on my
behalf, that I may be found a sacrifice through these instruments
[i.e., the wild beasts].[48]

The cultic features to note here are the sacrificial death and the met-
aphor of wheat and bread. It was common practice that cult sacrifices
led to public games, festivals, and banquets. This phenomenon led to

---

[47] William K. Lowther Clarke (trans.), *The First Epistle of Clement to the Corin-
thians*, 51-52, cited in *A New Eusebius* (ed. James Stevenson; London: SPCK, 1980) 4.

[48] Kirsopp Lake (trans.), *Apostolic Fathers* (LCL; 2 vols.; New York: Macmillan,
1912-1913) 1. 231.

the practice of initiation dinners for mystery cults, allowing devotees to share in the benefits of the sacrificed hero.[49]

We cannot pass the literature of this NT era without considering the impact of 4 Maccabees. We postponed its discussion above because of its possible dependence on the passion narrative of the Gospels. It is clear that 4 Maccabees had an influence on *First Clement* and the letters of Ignatius, as well as the *Martyrdom of Polycarp* (not considered here due to its second-century date).[50] Most modern commentators detect a first-century context for the composition of 4 Maccabees.[51] The cultic features of the seven martyrs are easy enough to see and fit into the earlier traditions of self-sacrifice. For one thing, all seven are described as priests. Furthermore, there are numerous phrases that have to do with cultic practice.[52] I will simply highlight these phrases in the two quoted sections below.

> [25] There they burned him with maliciously contrived instruments, threw him down, and poured stinking liquids into his nostrils. [26] When he was now burned to his very bones and about to expire, he lifted up his eyes to God and said, [27] "You know, O God, that though I might have saved myself, I am dying in burning torments for the sake of the law. [28] Be merciful to your people, and let our punishment suffice for them. [29] *Make my blood their purification,*

---

[49] Van Henten and Avemarie (*Martyrdom*, 109) note that scholars often find eucharistic significance in Ign. *Rom.* 4:1.

[50] See Frances M. Young, *The Use of Sacrificial Ideas in Greek Christian Writers from the New Testament to John Chrysostom* (Patristic Monograph Series 5; Cambridge: Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, 1979) 223-27.

[51] For a discussion of the influence and dating of 4 Maccabees, see David A. deSilva, *4 Maccabees: Introduction and Commentary on the Greek Text in Codex Sinaiticus* (Leiden/ Boston: Brill, 2006) xiv-xvii. DeSilva believes that a date before 70 C.E. is reasonable. The other major modern commentator, van Henten (*Maccabean Martyrs*, 77) finds a date after 70 more reasonable. Both agree that 4 Maccabees had a profound influence on later martyr literature, but deSilva goes further and claims that there are "verbal parallels" with (and perhaps "direct influence" on) NT writings such as Hebrews and the Pastoral Epistles (*4 Maccabees*, xvi-xvii). Bowersock (*Martyrdom*, 12) believes that the influence is in fact an opposite flow from NT to 4 Maccabees.

[52] In addition to the textual indications of cultic significance, the tombs of the Maccabean martyrs at Modein soon become well-noted in the ancient literature and are ranked along with other pilgrimage sites connected to martyrs. For other examples of tombs (esp. those of martyrs) as cultic centers, see Josephus, *A.J.* 7.15.3 §394; 16.7.1 §182, et al.; Matt 23:29; *Lives of the Prophets* 1:8; 2:2; 3:3-4; 6:3; 7:3.

and *take my life in exchange for theirs*." ³⁰After he said this, the holy man died nobly in his tortures; even in the tortures of death he resisted, by virtue of reason, for the sake of the law (4 Macc 6:25-30 *NRSV*).

²⁰ These, then, who have been consecrated for the sake of God, are honored, not only with this honor, but also by the fact that because of them our enemies did not rule over our nation, ²¹ the tyrant was punished, and *the homeland purified*—they having become, as it were, a *ransom for the sin of our nation*. ²² And through the blood of those devout ones and *their death as an atoning sacrifice* (ἱλαστηρίου),⁵³ divine Providence preserved Israel that previously had been mistreated (4 Macc 17:20-22 *NRSV*).

In addition there are the frequent references to the *Aqedat Yitshaq* in the death of the seven martyrs. For example, 4 Macc 13:12 reads, "Remember where you came from and at what father's hand Isaac gave himself to be sacrificed for the sake of piety." Further in 16:20, the mother of the youths reminds her sons that Isaac "did not duck" "seeing the father's blade-wielding hand descending upon him."⁵⁴

---

⁵³ This word, seeming invented by the LXX, clearly has cultic overtones, describing the place where the atoning sacrifice of Yom Kippur occurred (e.g., Exod 25:16[17]; Lev 16:2). In the NT it signifies the sacrifice—the death of Jesus (Rom 3:25)—or the place of the atoning sacrifice (Heb 9:5). The precise nature of its cultic function in 4 Macc 17:22 has been disputed, although there is no dispute that the public cult is central to its meaning; cf. deSilva, *4 Maccabees*, 250-53; Levenson, *Death and Resurrection*, 189. See also Daniel P. Bailey, *Jesus as the Mercy Seat: The Semantics and Theology of Paul's Use of Hilasterion in Romans 3:25* (Ph.D. diss., University of Cambridge, 1999) 133; forthcoming as *Jesus as the Mercy Seat: Paul's Use of Hilasterion in Romans 3:25 with an Analysis of 4 Maccabees 17:22 and Patristic Interpretation* (WUNT; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

⁵⁴ Other *Aqedah* citations are frequent: 4 Macc 7:14; 14:20; 15:28; 16:25; 17:6; 18:11, 23. The murals of Dura-Europos show that the *Aqedat Yitshaq* scene was very much alive in the imagination of mid-third century Jews. Intriguingly, a Dura-Europos painting shows a woman, probably Sarah, looking on from her tent as her son is going to be slaughtered. If the stories of the mother and her seven lost sons—often compared to Abraham and Isaac in 4 Maccabees—circulated in outer Syria, then it is no wonder that the *Aqedah* mural would include Sarah as mother. Later rabbinic tradition also plays upon the role of the mother as a type of Sarah grieving her slain son. See various rabbinic stories about the slaughter of Isaac in van Henten and Avemarie, *Martyrdom*, 141-76, esp. 150 (*Lamentations Rabbah*). Levenson (*Death*, 190-99) notices that Isaac's role grows in the later *midrashim*, whereby he actively accepts his death and even offers himself as he plays the role of the martyr. In other words, he evolves from hapless victim to quasi-priest.

At this point the survey comes to an end. Full-blown martyrologies begin to appear in the mid-second century in Greek and two decades later in Latin. The word μάρτυς begins to be used in the literature in a new way. Nonetheless, the martyrologies found many traditions to build upon, especially traditions that featured practices such as those that the second-century readers could identify with the public cult. In the stories of heroes and heroines they found models of figures that died like Christ. Thus the writers of martyrologies were inspired to imitate their spiritual ancestors, particularly those in the biblical traditions. Some of those features now appeared connected to the μάρτυς, not only in the phrases of the texts, but in the devotional practices of the early Church, such as *refrigeria*, relics, feast days, and special patronage of the saints. Even the rabbinic Jews absorbed some of these updated practices. As hard as many Muslims worked to stamp out such things, the practices crept into their folk pieties as well and are observed in certain places to this day.

## F. Conclusion

The meaning of martyrdom needs to take into account its cultic roots if it is to be understood properly. Those roots show that the victim often was not simply at the mercy of despotic authorities, but often freely chose this ultimate personal act and thereby represented someone of priestly status. Moreover, this act often served as a foundational story that enabled the public cult to be established or changed. The evidence I marshaled here suggested that the most obvious path for the "empowerment" of the victim or martyr came through the ancient Greek and Roman world. The world of Second Temple Judaism possibly had rehearsed the cultic teaching of self-sacrifice in antecedent narratives, and certainly adopted it in the stories of the early Jewish martyrs. By the time of Jesus, the tradition from Greco-Roman and various Second-Temple sources was established and utilized in the gospel passion narrative and in the later stories of Christians and Jews. The cult then served as bridge between Greece and Rome, Judaism and Christianity, and eventually the later Church and rabbinic martyrs, and finally Islam.

# Part Three

---

# New Testament Texts

# Verbal Aspect and Discourse Function in Mark 16:1-8: Three Significant Instances

STANLEY E. PORTER

I am grateful to be able to make this modest contribution to a Festschrift in honor of Francis Gignac. When I first published my *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament*,[1] Professor Gignac wrote a very positive review of this volume,[2] and since that time we have been in contact several times. I have benefited greatly from the work that he has done on the Greek of the time around the advent of Christianity, including his fundamental volumes on the phonology and morphology of the papyri and his many articles on various particular linguistic issues. His work is distinguished by an attention to detail that is awe-inspiring, but he never loses sight of the larger issue that he is exploring and illuminating. I offer this paper in honor of the work that he has done and continues to do for Greek, for scholarship as a whole, and for the Church.

## 1. Introduction

In the years since publication of my *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament*, I regularly have been asked by students and

---

[1] Stanley E. Porter, *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament, with Reference to Tense and Mood* (Studies in Biblical Greek 1; New York/Bern/Frankfurt am Main/Paris: Lang, 1989).

[2] Review of Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, in *CBQ* 54 (1992) 366-67.

other scholars whether I have modified or changed my mind regarding my views on verbal aspect. These questions are no doubt prompted by several factors. One is that I have continued to work in the area, creating the possibility that further research might lead to a modified position.[3] Another reason is that, since I published my major work, there have been others who have addressed this topic in the Greek of the New Testament, who may have convinced me to alter my position.[4] A third might be recent developments in the study of Greek that have

---

[3] Besides some of the works mentioned below, see Stanley E. Porter, "Tense Terminology and Greek Language Study: A Linguistic Re-Evaluation," in *Sheffield Working Papers in Language and Linguistics 3* (1986) 77-86; repr. in Stanley E. Porter, *Studies in the Greek New Testament: Theory and Practice* (Studies in Biblical Greek 6; New York: Peter Lang, 1996) 39-48; Stanley E. Porter, "Vague Verbs, Periphrastics, and Matthew 16:19," *Filología Neotestamentaria* 1 (1988) 155-73; repr. in Porter, *Studies in the Greek New Testament*, 103-24; "Verbal Aspect in NT Greek and Bible Translation: A Review of Research," *TIC Talk* 15 (Spring 1991) 1-3; S. E. Porter and J. T. Reed, "Greek Grammar since BDF: A Retrospective and Prospective Analysis," *Filología Neotestamentaria* 4 (8; 1991) 143-64; Stanley E. Porter, "Greek Language and Linguistics (Keeping up with Recent Studies 17)," *ExpTim* 103 (7; 1991–92) 202-208; repr. in Porter, *Studies in the Greek New Testament*, 7-20; *Idioms of the Greek New Testament* (Biblical Languages: Greek 2; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992; 2nd ed., 1994) esp. 20-49; "In Defence of Verbal Aspect," in *Biblical Greek Language and Linguistics: Open Questions in Current Research* (ed. S. E. Porter and D. A. Carson; JSNTSup 80; Studies in New Testament Greek 1; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993) 26-45; repr. in Porter, *Studies in the Greek New Testament*, 21-38; "The Greek Language of the New Testament," in *Handbook to Exegesis of the New Testament* (ed. S. E. Porter; NTTS 25; Leiden: Brill, 1997) 99-130; "A Modern Grammar of an Ancient Language: A Critique of the Schmidt Proposal," *Forum NS* 2.2 (1999) 201-13; "Greek of the New Testament," in *Dictionary of New Testament Background* (ed. C. A. Evans and S. E. Porter; Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2000) 426-35; "New Perspectives on the Exegesis of the New Testament: Anglo-American Insights," in *Herkunft und Zukunft der neutestamentlichen Wissenschaft* (ed. O. Wischmeyer; Neutestamentliche Entwürfe zur Theologie 6; Tübingen: Francke, 2003) 63-84; "Linguistics and Biblical Interpretation," in *Methods of Biblical Interpretation* (ed. Douglas A. Knight and John H. Hayes; Nashville: Abingdon, 2004) 35-40; "Greek Grammar and Syntax," in *The Face of New Testament Studies: A Survey of Recent Research* (ed. S. McKnight and G. R. Osborne; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2004) 76-103; "Time and Order in Participles in Mark and Luke: A Response to Robert Picirilli," *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 17.2 (2007).

[4] The major treatments are Buist M. Fanning, *Verbal Aspect in New Testament Greek* (Oxford Theological Monographs; Oxford: Clarendon, 1990); Kenneth Leslie McKay, *A New Syntax of the Verb in New Testament Greek* (Studies in Biblical Greek 5; New York: Lang, 1994); Rodney J. Decker, *Temporal Deixis of the Greek Verb in the Gospel of Mark with Reference to Verbal Aspect* (Studies in Biblical Greek 10; New York: Lang, 2001).

pushed discussion further.[5] My answer is so far always the same—and that is that I have *not* changed my mind in any material ways that would mitigate or compromise my original sustained proposal. In fact, the further research that I have done has only served to strengthen my opinions that Greek verbal aspect lies at the heart of the use of the Greek language, and that the aspectual network encapsulates a variety of aspectual systems that function independently of the other verbal system networks of the language, such as voice/causality and mood/attitude,[6] and even of lexical choice.[7] In my subsequent work I have also tried to develop further the importance of verbal aspect by emphasizing the role that it plays in discourse.[8] It is the function of aspect in discourse, and in one discourse in particular, Mark 16:1-8, that I wish to explore in this paper.

Greek verbal aspect "is a synthetic semantic category (realized in the forms of verbs) used of meaningful oppositions in a network of tense systems to grammaticalize the author's reasoned subjective choice of conception of a process."[9] In other words, "verbal aspect is defined as a semantic (meaning) category by which a speaker or writer grammaticalizes (i.e. represents a meaning by choice of a word-form) a perspective on an action by the selection of a particular tense-form in the verbal system."[10] The choice of verbal aspect—whether conscious or not—is concerned to express the author or writer's perspective on an event, by means of choice among three verbal aspects. These aspects constitute two major systems of choices within the semantic network

---

[5] I believe that it has been well-established in scholarship that verbal aspect is the major semantic category governing use of the Greek verb, even if all scholars involved in such research do not have identical definitions or conceptions of aspect and how it works.

[6] See Stanley E. Porter and Matthew B. O'Donnell, "The Greek Verbal Network Viewed from a Probabilistic Standpoint: An Exercise in Hallidayan Linguistics," *Filología Neotestamentaria* 14 (2001) 3-41.

[7] See Stanley E. Porter, "Aspect Theory and Lexicography," in *Biblical Greek Language and Lexicography: Essays in Honor of Frederick W. Danker* (ed. B. A. Taylor, J. A. L. Lee, P. R. Burton, and R. E. Whitaker; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2004) 207-22.

[8] See, for example, Porter, *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*, 298-307, esp. 301-3, 304-5; Stanley E. Porter and Matthew B. O'Donnell, *Discourse Analysis and the Greek New Testament* (forthcoming).

[9] Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 88. The network is diagrammed on p. 109. This is modified and brought up to date in Porter and O'Donnell, "Greek Verbal Network," 41.

[10] Porter, *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*, 20-21.

concerning ASPECTUALITY. The first aspectual choice (ASPECT 1) is between +perfective and -perfective aspect. Perfective aspect is realized by the aorist tense-form. The second aspectual choice (ASPECT 2) is between +imperfective and +stative aspect. Imperfective aspect is realized by the present/imperfect tense-forms, while stative aspect is realized by the perfect/pluperfect tense-forms (the imperfect and the pluperfect have the added semantic feature of +remoteness).[11] By means of contrastive semantic substitution,[12] I have established both the aspectual nature of ancient Greek and the non-temporal nature of the use of the individual tense-forms, including those used in the indicative mood form. Various discourse sensitive features, including deictic indicators, are necessary to establish temporal reference in Greek discourse.[13] Rather than indicating absolute temporal reference, the verbal aspects grammaticalize the author or writer's choice of perspective on the event. Verbal aspect, as noted above, is a morphologically based or synthetic semantic feature of the individual tense-forms. However, verbal aspect, like other systems within the Greek verbal network, also functions at levels higher than that of simple morphology. Aspect may function up to the level of the clause complex, and probably beyond, and is used by the author to indicate the relative prominence of events or elements that are being narrated or described.[14] Thus, verbal aspect is one of several linguistic means—yet one of the most important—by which the author shapes discourse and indicates prominence. Confluences of marked elements, among the elements of verbal aspect, causality, attitude, along with syntactical features including clausal ordering and element exemplification, among many others, are used to indicate the relative prominence of elements of the discourse. I have found the terminology of background, foreground and frontground helpful in distinguishing various levels that may be highlighted by means of aspect and other linguistic features.[15] These various ground-

---

[11] On the remoteness semantics of the imperfect and pluperfect tense-forms, the closest that Greek comes to grammaticalizing temporal reference in verbal forms, see Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 198-208.

[12] Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 75-76, 83.

[13] See Porter (*Verbal Aspect*, 98-107) regarding deictic indicators and literary types.

[14] See Porter and O'Donnell, *Discourse Analysis and the Greek New Testament*, ch. 4 (forthcoming).

[15] Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 92-93.

ings are often related to the choice of verbal aspect, with the perfective aspect indicating background, the imperfective foreground, and the stative frontground.[16] Prominence is indicated by motivated markedness within a given discourse. Verbal aspect may constitute one of the motivated marked elements that are given prominence as a result.

With this verbal aspectual framework in mind, I wish to examine Mark 16:1-8, to see how the choice of verbal aspect is used by the author to shape the discourse and indicate a number of important features of the text.

## 2. Verbal Aspect and Mark 16:1-8

I wish to use a single passage to illustrate the significance of verbal aspect in discourse creation and analysis, Mark 16:1-8, the final pericope of the Gospel—at least as it has been transmitted to us.[17] In this passage, there are three significant instances of usage of verbal aspect that I wish to note. There are of course other significant discourse features that I could also concentrate upon, but I will only draw these in as necessary to help exemplify what I wish to say about verbal aspect. The focus here is on the function of choice of verbal aspect as an indicator of conceptual narrative prominence in this discourse regarding the women arriving at the tomb on Easter Sunday. Although I include some comments on Synoptic parallels, that is not the primary focus of this study.[18]

The episode, the final one of the Gospel, begins with Mark's usual paragraph marker, the introductory καί ("and").[19] This is followed by a genitive absolute that performs two significant functions: it pro-

---

[16] For more on the meaning of the individual tense-forms, see Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, chs. 2, 4-5; *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*, ch. 1.

[17] For discussion of the ending of Mark's Gospel, see N. Clayton Croy, *The Mutilation of Mark's Gospel* (Nashville: Abingdon, 2003).

[18] On the relations of the Synoptics in the resurrection account, see Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV* (AB 28A; New York: Doubleday, 1985) 1532-43.

[19] On the use of καί in Mark as a paragraph marker, see Stanley E. Porter, "The Use of Pericope Markers to Identify the Paragraph, and its Linguistic Implications" in *The Impact of Unit Delimitation on Exegesis* (eds. Raymond de Hoop, Marjo C.A. Korpel, Josef M. Oesch, and Stanley E. Porter; Pericope 7; Leiden: Brill, forthcoming 2008).

vides cohesion with the preceding episode concerning the burial of Jesus and it establishes the background against which the new action takes place—the Sabbath was now over (διαγενομένου τοῦ σαββάτου).[20] The first primary clause[21] has Subject–Predicator–Complement structure, with the Subject grammaticalized. This placement as the first element in the clause establishes the theme of this clause complex as Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of Jacob, and Salome.[22] These three women bought (ἠγόρασαν; narrative aorist) spices and, early on the first day of the week, were coming (ἔρχονται; narrative present)[23] to the tomb, just as the sun was rising. The use of a second genitive absolute (ἀνατείλαντος ἡλίου) is unusual so deeply embedded in the paragraph,[24] but is used here to close off the introductory material with a temporal reference that establishes the time of the events that are being recounted. The use of this genitive absolute helps to clarify the action that follows by establishing that it was dawn, and that the events that follow are not those of mistaken identity or mis-direction on the basis of it being dark (this also provides cohesion with the previous episode). Instead, the focus is upon the women approaching the tomb. The imperfect tense-form, which indicates remote imperfective action, is used to introduce what they are saying to themselves (ἔλεγον πρὸς ἑαυτάς). Their question is not about whether they should be there

---

[20] For recent discussion of the use of the genitive absolute, or better genitive construction, see Lois K. Fuller, "The 'Genitive Absolute' in New Testament/Hellenistic Greek: A Proposal for Clearer Understanding," *Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism* 3 (2006) 142-67. She argues that the genitive construction is useful in three ways: (1) to establish background information, (2) to create textual cohesion, and (3) to provide confirmatory details.

[21] I use the terminology and categories of OpenText.org (www.opentext.org) throughout this paper. The major categories include the language of the word group (head-term, with its various modifiers, classified in terms of specifier, definer, qualifier, relater), clausal components (Subject, Predicator, Complement, Adjunct), and clause types (primary, secondary and embedded). One area needing modification is that the OpenText.org functional displays do not include verbal tense-forms in embedded clauses, only those in primary and secondary clauses. The discourse model of Porter and O'Donnell (*Discourse Analysis*, ch. 4) illustrates that the force of the aspectual semantics reaches to the level of the clause complex, and even higher.

[22] See Porter and O'Donnell, *Discourse Analysis*, ch. 3.

[23] On the semantics of the narrative (or "historic") present, see Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 189-98; *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*, 30-31. Cf. Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 226-39, esp. 232, 233.

[24] Fuller ("Genitive Absolute," 164) notes that this is the only instance of a genitive absolute concluding a sentence, apart from an example in Mark 16:20.

at the tomb, whether they will recognize the tomb in which Jesus has been laid, even whether Jesus is really dead or if something else has happened to him, or undoubtedly not whether he has been resurrected. The women know the tomb, have business to perform, and, whether willingly or not, accept the fact that Jesus is certainly dead. Thus, their concern is with the tomb stone that had been previously placed in front of the entrance to the tomb, and who could be expected to be able to roll it away from the door.[25] Three women would not be able to do so. I turn now to the three instances of significant aspectual usage.

## a. Mark 16:4

The narrative to this point sets the stage for the first significant use of verbal aspect that I wish to draw attention to in the observation by the women of the stone (Mark 16:4). The author states that the women, "having looked up" (ἀναβλέψασαι; aorist participle), "were observing" (θεωροῦσιν; narrative present) that the stone "stood rolled away" (ἀποκεκύλισται; perfect passive).[26] The sequencing of tense-forms is too obvious to miss. The aorist participle, in an embedded participial clause, identifies the preliminary or scene-setting action that the women performed of physically looking.[27] In this regard, the perfective aspect as the background aspect is being used as it often is (with the participle preceding the main verb to which it is syntactically linked) to indicate background and often antecedent action.[28] Thus the embedded participial clause, preceding the Predicator of its primary clause, is both syntactically specified as providing vertical off-line material, and

---

[25] See Ezra P. Gould, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Mark* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1901) 300; Ernst Lohmeyer, *Das Evangelium des Markus* (17th ed.; KEK; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967) 353.

[26] There are a number of textual variants in this verse, including whether one should read ἀνακεκύλισται ((ℵ) B L 2427) or ἀποκεκύλισται (A C W Ψ f[1, 13] 33 Maj). See Henry Barclay Swete, *The Gospel According to St Mark* (3rd ed.; London: Macmillan, 1913) 396, for discussion. He makes a convincing case for ἀνακεκύλισται, which probably should be read here.

[27] So Marie-Joseph Lagrange, *Évangile selon Saint Marc* (EBib; Paris: Gabalda, 1947) 445.

[28] On the ordering of participle and its main verb, see Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 377-90; "Time and Order" (note 3 above).

semantically specified as indicating background material. The present indicative draws attention to the facts that not only were they physically looking but they were observing or watching. The discourse is lexically, syntactically and semantically indicated as moving from the background act of physical observation to the foreground act of cognitive observation. The new lexical item of observation is the Predicator of the primary clause, and is in the present tense-form indicating imperfective aspect and foregrounded material. The perfect indicative in the secondary clause focuses upon the state of the stone. Verbal aspect, though morphologically grounded, is a semantic category that is activated from the morphological up to the clause complex level (and even higher), especially if supported by other syntactical indicators of prominence. The stative verb is the prime element in this secondary clause, and indicates the material that this secondary clause is focused upon. A secondary clause is not conceptually secondary to a primary clause, but performs a different function in discourse, one of providing further developmental material. Here the stative verb indicates the state of the stone as standing rolled away from the front of the tomb, which state is thereby placed in the frontground, or, as Swete says, it "adds to the vividness of the narrative."[29] The use of the passive voice of the perfect tense-form is so that explicit agency can be grammatically demoted. No doubt, some force was at work in its removal, but that is not the grammatical emphasis.[30] The emphasis is upon the fact that the stone is simply standing there, removed. After all, as the narrator tells us, the stone was very large. The aspectual sequence is from the background to the foreground to the frontground tense-forms. The perfective aspect conveys the natural sequence of events of this episode, while the imperfective is used to focus the general act of looking up and observing what they saw. The stative emphatically answers the primary question in the women's mind by indicating that the stone was entirely removed.

---

[29] Swete, *Mark*, 396; Vincent Taylor, *The Gospel According to St. Mark* (2nd ed.; London: Macmillan, 1966) 650. Of course, Swete and Taylor do not arrive at this conclusion on the basis of aspectual theory, but on the basis of their realizing the importance of the function of the perfect tense-form. They also make reference to Mark 15:44 and 47, for similar use.

[30] See Richard T. France, *The Gospel of Mark* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002) 678.

This Markan verse does not have a synoptic parallel in Matthew,[31] but does have one in Luke 24:2. The traditional argument for Markan priority is that Mark's language is often more unrefined, whereas the later, dependent Gospels have refined his writing. This pattern may also be the case in this instance, although something has been lost in Luke's account. Luke states that the women "found" (εὗρον; narrative aorist) the stone, "standing rolled away" (ἀποκεκυλισμένον; perfect participle) from the tomb. If Luke is here dependent upon Mark, he has conflated the use of the aorist participle and the present indicative into the single aorist indicative for the verb-form of his Predicator,[32] while retaining the use of the perfect participle to describe the stone. There is also an apparent conflation of the three clauses of Mark—embedded, primary and secondary—into the two clauses—primary and embedded—of Luke. For Luke, the description of the stone as "rolled away from the tomb" is grammaticalized by the embedded clause. The verbal aspectual semantics are now in two stages—the perfective description of the act of finding and the description of the state of the stone as rolled away. The use of the embedded clause is, within the syntactical parameters of the primary clause, focused upon what the women found, but the stative aspect is still prominent as frontground material due to its being the prime element of the embedded clause.

In the light of this significant and noteworthy tense-form usage, it comes as somewhat of a surprise and certainly a disappointment to see how badly this Markan sequence is handled in the major commentaries. I have not studied every piece of secondary literature, but it is clear that most interpreters of this passage have failed to appreciate the aspectual and discourse semantics. Most commentators say nothing of significance about the tense-form usage in this verse. Besides those mentioned above, C.S. Mann recognizes that in this instance "Mark is capable of this striking use of the appropriate tense [referring to the perfect form]," but then misconstrues the meaning of the perfect

---

[31] See John Nolland (*The Gospel of Matthew* [NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005] 1246) who refers to Mark's "historic presents which added emphasis to the coming to the tomb." Contra Nolland, the καί ἰδού of Matt 28:2, whether emphatic or not, is not equivalent.

[32] Darrell Bock (*Luke* [BECNT 3A, B; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1996] 1888) says that Luke uses εὗρον "in contrast" to Mark's ἀναβλέψασαι θεωροῦσιν. He does not say what this contrast is, apart from the lexical difference of the words.

tense-form.[33] Robert Gundry states that the women's question regarding who would roll the stone away "sets the stage for their 'looking up' and seeing 'that the stone is rolled away [ἀποκεκύλισται, perfect tense].' Who rolled it away? . . . Mark does not say . . . He is interested only in the phenomenon as such. So he emphasizes it with the historical present tense in θεωροῦσιν, 'they observe.'"[34] Gundry notes the narrative present but misses the force of the perfect tense-form.

### b. Mark 16:5

The Markan narrative continues with the second significant instance of aspectual usage in the description of the youth in the tomb (Mark 16:5). This one is simpler than the first one, but nevertheless has a progression from perfective to stative aspect, from background to frontground material. By using an embedded clause with an aorist participle ("entering"; εἰσελθοῦσαι) and a narrative aorist ("saw"; εἶδον) in the Predicator of the primary clause, the women, still as the theme of the paragraph unit, observe a "young man" (νεανίσκον is the head-term of the Complement, with two embedded clauses). He is described in the two embedded clauses first simply with an aspectually vague verb, though in prime position, as "sitting (καθήμενον) on the right,"[35] but secondly, and more importantly, as, again with the verb form in prime position, "clothed" (περιβεβλημένον; perfect participle) in a white garment. The two participles are rank-shifted embedded clauses that serve as modifiers (definers) of the head-term νεανίσκον ("young man"). The young man is sitting there, but what is brought to the frontground by the stative aspectual verb is that he is clothed in a particular way. The fact that Mark does not indicate the identity of the young man

---

[33] C. Stephen Mann (*Mark. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* [AB 27; New York: Doubleday, 1986] 666) describes the meaning of the perfect tense-form as "a past event, with lasting effects." This is a traditional, but now a widely disputed, characterization. For discussion and refutation, see Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 245-59; Decker, *Temporal Deixis*, 108-11, esp. 110. Fanning (*Verbal Aspect*, 416-18) tries to retain the traditional definition against his better judgment and examples.

[34] Robert H. Gundry, *Mark: A Commentary on His Apology for the Cross* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1993) 990.

[35] On aspectually vague verbs, see Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 442-47. I do not include κάθημαι there, but it should be included as an aspectually vague verb, as it does not have an aorist/imperfect opposition and has a single set of forms for the non-indicative mood forms.

has often troubled commentators, to the point of some worrying that Mark in some ways is uncertain of his identity.[36] The linguistic structure of the passage makes it clearer than some commentators realize. The women enter and see a young man. What is significant is not that he is sitting where he is, as he could have been sitting or standing, but that he is clothed in a white garment. This youth dressed in a white garment, rather than Jesus lying dead, is what causes them to be startled or distressed (note use of the passive voice, ἐξεθαμβήθησαν).

As in the first episode above, and perhaps even more so, both Matthew and Luke lose the significance of the choice of verbal aspect in Mark. Matthew (28:3) changes the wording entirely, by using a verbless or elliptical primary clause.[37] Luke (24:4) uses an embedded clause with a present participle ("flashing"; ἀστραπτούσῃ) to modify the word for "garment" (ἐσθῆτι),[38] which through tense-form reduction shifts the aspectual semantics down from frontground to foreground material. Whereas there are a number of commentators who draw attention to the clothing of the Markan young man,[39] none that I checked drew attention to how the use of the tense-forms was intentional to attract the reader's notice.

### c. Mark 16:6

The Markan narrative picks up the element of the women's distress and leads to the third and final significant aspectual usage. There is a

---

[36] See, for example, France, *Mark*, 678.

[37] Cf. William D. Davies and Dale C. Allison, Jr. (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew* [3 vols.; ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988, 1991, 1997] 3.666) strangely state that Mark 16:5, with its phrase "dressed in a white robe," is, in contrast to Matt 28:3, "less dramatic." The reason for this conclusion is not stated. It appears to be that their reasoning is simply that Matthew uses more words (with only a single verb, the aspectually vague ἦν), while the Markan passage uses the marked perfect participle. This alone would qualify the Markan passage as linguistically more "dramatic," even if Matthew's passage were theologically more significant.

[38] Luke Timothy Johnson (*The Gospel of Luke* [SacPag 3; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 1991] 387) states that the participle of ἀστράπτω here "suggests" that the two at the tomb "be understood as supernatural figures." I do not think that we need a new category of the "supernatural participle." What Johnson seems to mean is that the use of this particular lexical item in the participial form is often linked to contexts where the supernatural is at play, rather than the participle suggesting this.

[39] E.g., France, *Mark*, 678-79.

shift in theme in Mark 16:6, with the reduced pronominal use of the article, ὁ, used to shift from the women to the young man who speaks. In a Subject–Predicator–Complement structure, with the narrative present in the Predicator (λέγει), the author introduces embedded speech. The young man directs the women not to be distressed (using the same verb as was used of the women in v. 5, an instance of lexical cohesion), and tells them that they are seeking Jesus the Nazarene, the crucified one. The syntax is discontinuous in this last clause, with the Predicator placed within the Complement (or the Complement discontinued), so that the structure is Complement–Predicator–Complement (continuation). The Complement itself consists of a head-term, Ἰησοῦν, and two definers, one the word group, τὸν Ναζαρηνὸν ("the Nazarene"), and the other the rank-shifted participial embedded clause, τὸν ἐσταυρωμένον ("the crucified one"; perfect participle). On the basis of syntax and semantics alone, this is anything but a matter-of-fact statement,[40] but draws attention to the one being sought, who is characterized as the one in the crucified state. Using asyndeton three times, the author then states regarding Jesus that he is raised, he is not here, behold the place where they put him. The prominent notion, as established by the use of the stative verbal aspect within the embedded clause, is the front-grounded description of Jesus as the crucified one.

When I was teaching this passage recently in a Greek exegesis class, one of the students raised the excellent and very logical question of why it is that the emphasis by means of verbal aspect is upon Jesus as the crucified one, rather than upon Jesus as the raised one. After all, this brief passage in Mark is the so-called resurrection section. This is an excellent question, and goes to the heart of the nature of verbal aspect, in terms of both its use and its interpretation. Verbal aspect grammaticalizes the speaker or writer's conception of the process, not the interpreter's, and so the author has a choice of aspects to use in a given context, whether this choice is made consciously, subconsciously or unconsciously. In this context, Mark emphasizes Jesus the Nazarene as the crucified one. The emphasis upon crucifixion found throughout Mark's Gospel continues in this passage as well. Not only has the Gospel been characterized as a Passion account with a prologue,[41] but

---

[40] Contra Craig A. Evans, *Mark 8:27–16:20* (WBC 34B; Dallas: Word, 2001) 537.

[41] Martin Kähler is credited with the phrase that Mark's Gospel is a "passion narrative with an extended introduction" (see Morna D. Hooker, *The Gospel According*

there is a distinct emphasis upon Jesus' expected death, as seen in a number of proleptic passages (e.g. Mark 6:19; 8:31; 9:31; 10:34; 14:1). This is, as Lohmeyer points out, the way that the early Church knew Jesus. For example, Paul refers to Christ the crucified in 1 Cor 1:23 (Χριστὸν ἐσταυρωμένον), Jesus Christ crucified in 1 Cor 2:2 (Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν . . . ἐσταυρωμένον) and Jesus Christ the crucified in Gal 3:1 (Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς . . . ἐσταυρωμένος)—note the use of the perfect participle in all three instances, as in Mark 16:6—and Acts 4:10 refers to Jesus Christ the Nazarene, who was crucified.[42] The perfective aspect verb ἠγέρθη ("was raised"), which lexical form is also used in Acts 4:10 in its following description of Jesus,[43] grammaticalizes the sense of Jesus simply as the one raised, with the passive voice used without explicit indication of the agent of the action.[44] The aspectual choice between these two verbs is clearly intentional, as it need not be phrased in this way. For example, in 1 Cor 15:4, Paul shifts the aspectual emphases by stating that Christ "was buried" (ἐτάφη) and that he "was raised" (ἐγήγερται; cf. v. 20) on the third day, shifting from aorist to perfect tense-forms, and shifting the focus from Jesus' burial to his resurrection.[45] The stative aspect verb in Mark 16:6, however, grammaticalizes the sense of Jesus as being the one in a crucified state, that is, he is the one who stands

---

to Saint Mark [BNTC; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991] 9). See also Werner H. Kelber (*The Oral and the Written Gospel: The Hermeneutics of Speaking and Writing in the Synoptic Tradition, Mark, Paul, and Q* [original publication, Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983; new edition, Bloomington, IN: Indiana University, 1997] 188-89) for pursuit of this idea in scholarship.

[42] Lagrange, *Évangile selon Saint Marc*, 446. Lohmeyer (*Evangelium des Markus*, 354) also notes the more limited reference to Jesus as the Nazarene, found only in Matt 2:23 (though being from Nazareth is referred to in many places, including Acts 4:10). Cf. Mann, *Mark*, 668.

[43] In Acts 4:10, Luke explicitly states that God raised Jesus from the dead.

[44] There has been much use of the term "divine passive" in various commentators and other writers. The divine passive appears to be a fairly recent scholarly theological invention (that is probably questionable at best), but it is definitely not a grammatical category. There is no grammatical difference between a normal and a divine passive form. On this topic, see Marius Reiser, *Jesus and Judgment: The Eschatological Proclamation in its Jewish Context* (trans. Linda M. Maloney; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997) 267-73. Cf. Charles E. B. Cranfield, *The Gospel According to St Mark* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959) 466, who seems conflicted over the issue of agency with the passive voice of this verb.

[45] See Swete, *Mark*, 397; Taylor, *Mark*, 607. Contra Hugh Anderson, *The Gospel of Mark* (NCB; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1976) 356.

crucified. It is the crucified one whom the women were seeking, but who is no longer there.[46]

In this instance, Matthew (28:5) retains the same aspectual sense as does Mark, by having the "angel" stating that he knows (οἶδα; a perfect indicative)[47] that "you are seeking Jesus the crucified one (τὸν ἐσταυρωμένον)."[48] However, the clausal structure is altered, the components in Matthew being ordered Complement–Predicator, rather than having the discontinuous structure. The ordering puts the complete Complement in the prime position.[49] Then Matthew has the angel also state: "He is not here. He is raised (ἠγέρθη)," using the same wording as does Mark, but with the clauses reversed. Luke is the Gospel that significantly alters the wording. Luke 24:5 has a question, rather than a statement, that shares little significant tense-form related wording (only the verb ζητεῖτε). Instead, Luke places the emphasis upon Jesus as the living one, with a present participle, rather than the perfect participle, possibly another instance of tense-form reduction.[50] The unit or pericope closes with a series of aorist tense-form verbs regarding the going, fleeing and speaking of the women, with two clauses using imperfects drawing attention to trembling and astonishment grabbing them and their being afraid.[51]

---

[46] William L. Lane (*The Gospel According to Mark* [NICNT; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1974] 588) contends that the strong affirmation of Jesus' crucifixion also allows for "no equivocation" concerning his resurrection. Although Lane is mistaken in attributing the most emphasis to the statements regarding resurrection, his point may be true from a theological or even historical standpoint, but it is not the case linguistically.

[47] This verb is, indeed, a perfect. See Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 281-87. Cf. Wolfgang Wiefel, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* (THKNT 1; Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1998) 490.

[48] Donald A. Hagner (*Matthew 14–28* [WBC 33B; Dallas: Word, 1995] 869) states that Jesus can only "remarkably" be called "the crucified one," claiming that "the perfect participle reflect[s] his ongoing status as such; the same form is used in describing the heart of the kerygma in 1 Cor 1:23; 2:2; cf. Gal 3:1."

[49] See Robert H. Gundry (*Matthew: A Commentary on his Literary and Theological Art* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982] 588) who sees the clausal structure as emphatic.

[50] Alfred Plummer (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S. Luke* [ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1896] 548) and many commentators since, take the question as a reproach of the women.

[51] The question regarding the grammatical likelihood of Mark's Gospel ending with γάρ cannot be treated here.

## 3. Conclusion

The use of verbal aspect has the power to shape a discourse, and, by selecting certain verbal tense-forms, in conjunction with utilizing other linguistic features, to govern the reader's response. Sometimes such linguistic choice and shaping is unconscious or subconscious, but sometimes it appears to be conscious and explicit. In the examples noted above, whether we can finally decide if they were conscious or not, it appears that the author of Mark's Gospel utilized patterns of verbal usage to guide the reader through the women's encounter of Jesus' empty tomb. The other Synoptic accounts sometimes choose to shape their accounts similarly, while at other times making their own verbal and other syntactical and semantic choices. What is surprising in some ways is how little the various linguistic elements of the passage—including not only verbal aspect but such things as clause relations, clause structure and even word-group formation—have been noticed, described and appreciated for their interpretative force. I believe that close attention to these elements of the very wording of a passage such as this has great potential for influencing interpretation and helping it to come to terms with the shape and meaning of the text. Sometimes such linguistic analysis may reinforce traditional interpretations, while at other times it may force us as exegetes to revisit previous conclusions and arrive at new estimations of the meaning of the text.

# The "Impersonal" Plural Active of the Verb in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts: Semitic Interference?

Elliott C. Maloney O.S.B.

In 1898 Gustav Dalman claimed that at times in the Gospel sayings of Jesus the passive voice is used as a reverent circumlocution for the name of God, a construction that was later tagged the "divine" or "theological" passive.[1] Dalman further claimed that such a passive would have been used by NT writers to translate an Aramaic third plural *active* verb whose subject was not specified. He saw a literal rendering of this usage in Luke 6:38: "a good measure . . . will (they) give [δώσουσιν] into your lap," where the subject of δώσουσιν is not specified and quite unclear.[2] Julius Wellhausen then identified eleven texts in the Synoptic Gospels in which he found "die dritte Pluralis Activi mit unbestimmten Subjekt," because he thought the passive tends to be avoided in Aramaic.[3] Cuthbert H. Turner defined this as the "imper-

---

[1] This study started out as an examination of the grammatical phenomenon known as the "divine" passive, but in order to do that, one had to first examine the unusual indefinite use of the third person plural *active* form of the verb in Hebrew and Aramaic. If Fr. Gignac taught us one thing, it was that we must be thorough when studying the language of the NT. So, having actually examined all of the texts cited over the years by scholars, and having adduced new data that show some interesting differences in the use of the indefinite third plural active, I find that the "divine" passive will have to wait for another day. There simply is no room left to discuss it here.

[2] Gustav Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1898) 183; (English translation): *The Words of Jesus* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1902) 224.

[3] Julius Wellhausen, *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien* (Berlin: Reimer, 1905) 25; (2d ed.; Berlin: Reimer, 1911) 18. The passive is used only infrequently in the Late

sonal plural," namely, "the use of a plural [active] verb with no subject expressed and no subject implied other than the quite general one 'people.'"[4] An example of the "impersonal plural" occurs in Mark 5:35: "While he was still speaking, (people) arrive (ἔρχονται with no subject expressed) from the synagogue official's house." Completing the circle that started with Dalman, Max Zerwick claimed that this active voice "pluralis indefinitus" may be used in a few texts as a circumlocution to avoid naming God as the subject.[5]

A host of scholars has followed this trajectory and claims that this indefinite plural is the result of Semitic interference.[6] Wilbert F. How-

---

Aramaic of the Talmud. Since Wellhausen's time, however, the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls has changed our perspective on the stages of the Aramaic language. One great difference of Middle Aramaic (200 B.C.E.—200 C.E.) is the frequent use of passive verbal forms.

[4] Cuthbert H. Turner, "Marcan Usage: Notes, Critical and Exegetical, on the Second Gospel: Part I," *JTS* 25 (1924) 377-86, here 378.

[5] Max Zerwick, *Graecitas biblica Novi Testamenti exemplis illustratur* (3rd ed.; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1955) #2. "At times the 3rd pl. may be used circumspectly for God's own action, and so his name rather than οἱ ἄνθρωποι is to be understood," according to Nigel Turner, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek. III. Syntax* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1963) 293; cf. Joachim Jeremias, *New Testament Theology* (New York: Scribner, 1971) 9.

[6] These include Matthew Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* (3rd ed.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967) 126-28; Friedrich Blass and Albert Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (trans. and rev. Robert W. Funk; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961) #130.2; Robert H. Charles, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St. John* (ICC; New York: Scribner, 1920) 362; John C. Doudna, *The Greek of the Gospel of Mark* (JBLMS 12; Philadelphia: SBL, 1961) 5-8; Manuel Guerra Gómez, *El Idioma del Nuevo Testamento* (3d ed.; Burgos: Aldecoa, 1981) 329; Wilbert F. Howard, "Semitisms in the New Testament," in James H. Moulton, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek. II. Accidence and Word-Formation* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1929) 447-48; Jeremias, *New Testament Theology*, 9; Marie-Joseph Lagrange, *Evangile selon Saint Marc* (EBib; Paris: Gabalda, 1929) xcii; J. A. Montgomery, *The Origin of the Gospel According to St. John* (Philadelphia: Winston, 1923) 16; Charles F. D. Moule, *An Idiom-Book of New Testament Greek* (2nd rev. ed.; Cambridge: University Press, 1959) 28; Marius Reiser, *Jesus and Judgment : The Eschatological Proclamation in Its Jewish Context* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997) 273; Eduard Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik* (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft 2/1; Munich: Beck, 1939) 245 (who says that the spread of the usage in the NT is from Semitic); Steven Thompson, *The Apocalypse and Semitic Syntax* (SNTSMS 52; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985) 18-22; Cuthbert H. Turner, "Marcan Usage," 377-86; Nigel Turner, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek. IV. Style* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1976) 12; idem, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek. III. Syntax* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1973) 292-93; Francesco M. Uricchio and Gaetano M. Stano, *Vangelo secondo Marco* (La Sacra Bibbia; Rome: Marietti, 1966) 55 and 59; James W. Voelz, "The Language of the New

ard asserts that "this use is uncommon in Greek apart from λέγουσι, φασί,"[7] and Nigel Turner calls the usage "strictly a Semitism, for it reflects a Hebrew idiom in the LXX, as well as Aramaic."[8] Wellhausen listed four Marcan examples: 6:14; 10:13; 13:26; 15:27. C. H. Turner contributes 22 more examples of what he called "the impersonal plural": Mark 1:22, 30, 32, 45; 2:3, 18; 3:2, 21, 32; 5:14, 35; 6:33, 43, 55; 7:32; 8:22; 10:2, 49; 13:9; 14:2, 12; 15:10. To these, Marie-Joseph Lagrange adds Mark 1:21, John C. Doudna appends Mark 12:13, and Nigel Turner adds Mark 13:11 and 15:14. Wellhausen additionally claimed Matt 1:23; 5:15; 24:9, to which Howard added Matt 7:16 as an "[i]mpersonal use of 3ʳᵈ plur.act. in place of passive." Matthew Black adds Matt 9:17 and Nigel Turner Matt 2:20 and 9:2. Wellhausen cited Luke 6:44; 12:20; 14:35; 18:33; 23:31, and Howard further claims Luke 12:11, 48; 16:9; 17:23. Nigel Turner appends Luke 6:38, and Lars Rydbeck adds Luke 13:29; 16:4; 17:27, 28; 18:15; 21:12, 16; 23:29, 30. Howard claims Acts 3:2 and Max Wilcox mentions Acts 13:28, 29; 19:19 for consideration. Howard also cites John 15:6; 20:2, to which J. A. Montgomery adds John 12:16. To this list we must add Matt 8:16 and Luke 8:35, parallels to Marcan texts which also use the unusual Marcan indefinite plural. This gives us a total of 65 texts to examine.[9] Zerwick thinks that in Luke 6:38; 12:20, 48 and 23:31 (Nigel Turner adds 16:9) the third plural active is a circumlocution for "God's own action."[10]

Holding the contrary opinion, Stanley Porter apparently would eliminate Semitic interference in all cases. When speaking of "impersonal verbs" he says, "Even though 'they' might be an appropriate translation, besides the fact that a subject can often be found for the third person plural verb, the use of the third person plural verb in extra-biblical

---

Testament," *ANRW* 2.25.2 ("secondary Semitisms") 961; Max Wilcox, *The Semitisms of Acts* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965) 127; Zerwick, *Graecitas*, ##1-6.

[7] Howard, "Semitisms," 448.

[8] Nigel Turner, *Style*, 12. We shall see below that the LXX usually does *not* translate the indefinite plural literally.

[9] The total list of 65 texts is: Mark 1:21, 22, 30, 32, 45; 2:3, 18; 3:2, 21, 32; 5:14, 35; 6:14, 33, 43, 55; 7:32; 8:22; 10:2, 13, 49; 12:13; 13:9, 11, 26; 14:2, 12; 15:10, 14, 27; Matt 1:23; 2:20; 5:15; 7:16; 8:16; 9:2, 17; 24:9; Luke 6:38, 44; 8:35; 12:11, 20, 48; 13:29; 14:35; 16:4, 9; 17:23, 27, 28; 18:15, 33; 21:12, 16; 23:29, 30, 31; Acts 3:2; 13:28, 29; 19:19; John 12:16; 15:6; 20:2.

[10] Zerwick, *Graecitas,* #2; Nigel Turner, *Syntax,* 293; also Jeremias, *New Testament Theology,* 9.

writers (e.g., Teles) minimizes the possible Semitic influence."[11] Charles F. D. Moule says that "it is possible, though hardly demonstrable, that Semitic influence has made this trick more frequent in the N.T. than it otherwise would have been."[12] In this study we shall attempt to discover where Semitic interference is demonstrable.

## A. The Greek Evidence

### 1. Some Misidentified Texts

In order to tackle this problem we must first make a clarification. The indefinite use of the third person plural active verb is *not the same* in all the texts cited above, and in most texts it should certainly not be called "impersonal."[13] As we shall see, in some texts the implied subject clearly is personal, in others the general idea of "people" is meant, and in still others it is not clear what person or persons are behind the action, and the matter might be better expressed in Greek by a passive. Before we begin, however, we must first eliminate some of the texts cited above because they have simply been misidentified by Cuthbert H. Turner, Nigel Turner, and others.

As is well known, the subject of a verb is usually omitted and a pronoun is unnecessary when the subject is implied in the context. In the following texts the implied subject of the verb *is clearly mentioned*, usually in a previous clause, as is quite normal in Greek. We give them here with their implied subject and its location in parentheses:

> Mark 1:21—"And they (Jesus and the disciples in v. 20) enter (εἰσπορεύονται) Capernaum";

---

[11] Stanley E. Porter, *Idioms of the Greek New Testament* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992) 77 n. 1. Unfortunately he gives no examples from the third-century B.C.E. Cynic writer, Teles! See our comments on Teles below near the end of note 21.

[12] Moule, *Idiom Book,* 181. Similarly, Lars Rydbeck thinks that this usage in Luke "für die normale hellenistische und kaiserzeitliche Wissenschaftsprosa belegt ist" (*Fachprosa, vermeintliche Volkssprache und Neues Testament* [Acta Universitatis Upsaliens, Studia Graeca Upsaliensia 5; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1967] 42).

[13] "The subject of a true impersonal verb is a vague notion that cannot be supplied from the context: . . . [e.g.,] it did not go well with him" (Herbert W. Smyth, *Greek Grammar* [Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1956] #932).

Mark 1:30—"and immediately they ("Simon" and companions in
v. 29) tell (λέγουσιν) him about her";

Mark 3:21—"For they ("his relatives" in v. 21a) were saying (ἔλεγον)
that he was out of his mind";[14]

Mark 3:32—"and they ("the crowd" in v. 32a) say (λέγουσιν) to
him";

Mark 6:43—"and they ("the disciples" in v. 41) picked up (ἦραν)
twelve baskets";

Mark 10:2—"and *the Pharisees* (most MSS) / *they* ("the crowds" in
v. 1 of D it sy) asked (ἐπηρώτων) him";

Mark 10:49—"And they ("the crowd" in v. 46) call (φωνοῦσιν) the
blind man";

Mark 12:13—"and they ("the chief priests, scribes and elders" in
11:27; "them" in 11:29, 31 and 12:1, 12) send (ἀποστέλλουσιν) to
him some of the Pharisees";

Mark 13:11—"And when they (the people of v. 9) lead you away
(ἄγωσιν) to hand you over";

Mark 14:2—"For they ("the chief priests and scribes" in v. 1) were
saying (ἔλεγον), 'Not during the festival'";

Mark 14:12—"when they ("the chief priests" in v. 10) used to sacri-
fice (ἔθυον) the paschal lamb";[15]

Mark 15:10—"For he knew that the *chief priests* (absent only in B sy)
had handed him over (παραδεδώκεισαν)";

Mark 15:14—"but they (the "crowd" in v. 8) only shouted (ἔκραξαν)
louder";

Mark 15:27—"and with him they ("the soldiers" in v. 16) crucify
(σταυροῦσιν) two bandits";[16]

Matt 2:20—"for *those seeking* (οἱ ζητοῦντες) to kill the child have
died (τεθνήκασιν)";

---

[14] For a conclusive explanation that the subject of ἔλεγον is not indefinite here or in
14:2, see Joel Marcus, *Mark 1-8: A New Translation with Introduction and Commen-
tary* (AB 27; New York: Doubleday, 1999) 270-71.

[15] A close parallel occurs in a parenthetical remark in Philostratus' *Heroikos* (53.13):
"for they ("the Thessalians" mentioned earlier in 53.9) used to sacrifice (ἔθυον) this
sacrifice as to a god."

[16] We consider this verse (15:27) to be normal Greek usage even though the subject
understood for the (historical present) verb σταυροῦσιν is expressed some ten verses prior
to 15:27. Both Matthew and Luke have changed it to a passive, and Howard, Black, and
Doudna consider it indefinite. Nevertheless, οἱ στρατιῶται, the subject of 15:16 is implied
in the verb in each verse from v. 16 to v. 25, and the interruption of v. 26 (with a singular
verb) does not break the implication of "the soldiers" as subject of v. 27.

Luke 18:33—"and they ("the Gentiles" in v. 32) will kill (ἀποκτενοῦσιν) him";

John 12:16—"His disciples . . . remembered . . . that they ("a great crowd" in v. 12) had done (ἐποίησαν) this for him";[17]

Acts 13:28—"they ("the people of Jerusalem" in v. 27) asked (ἠτήσαντο) Pilate to have him put to death";

Acts 13:29—"they ("the people of Jerusalem" in v. 27) placed (ἔθηκαν) him in a tomb";

Acts 19:19b—"they ("those who had practiced magic" in v. 19a) calculated (συνεψήφισαν) their (= "the books'") value and found (εὗρον) it to be fifty thousand silver pieces."[18]

We shall omit these 20 texts from further consideration in our study. This leaves us with a more manageable 45 texts to examine.

## 2. *Texts with Present Tense "General Indefinite" Plural Verbs*

The first group in the remaining texts which seem to exhibit an unusual use of the indefinite third person plural active verb may be called "general indefinite plurals." As is well known, when the subject of a sentence has not been previously introduced, it may be omitted (to quote Herbert Smyth) "when it is a general idea of person, and usually in the third person plural of verbs of *saying* and *thinking*: ὡς λέγουσιν, *as they say*" (= "as people say," Demosthenes 5.18).[19]

Rydbeck has found about a dozen texts in classical Greek in which verbs other than the usual *verba dicendi* indicate some generic action

---

[17] There is some ambiguity about the subject of ἐποίησαν here, as well as what "these things" (ταῦτα) were that "they" did for Jesus. The subject probably refers to "the great crowd" (v. 12) or "the disciples" in v. 16 itself.

[18] Although this would be smoother as the passive in English ("its value was calculated and found to be X"), the sentence is grammatically correct in Greek.

[19] Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, #931d; cf. Howard, "Semitisms," 448. Kühner and Gerth say that the indefinite subject "one (man in German) may be expressed in Greek in four ways: 1) by the indefinite pronoun τις, 2) by a 3rd sing. passive, 3) by the 2nd sing. optative or indicative with the particle ἄν, or 4) by the 3rd plural active, when the idea of 'people' (die Menschen, Leute) is meant by [German] man," and "when the speech is about general tradition, opinion, nomenclature, e.g., λέγουσι, φασί, ὀνομάζουσιν" (R. Kühner, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache, II* [2 vols.; ed. B. Gerth; Hannover and Leipzig: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1898-1904] 2:36, Anm. 4).

that is done by "people" or "one," e.g., Νικόστρατος δὲ τοῖς λοιποῖς κατὰ τὰς ἄνω πύλας ᾗ ἐπὶ Ποτειδαίας ἔρχονται, προσεκάθητο τῇ πόλει, "With the rest of the army Nicostratos besieged the city at the gates where (people) *go* to Potidaia" (Thuc. 4.130.2). The truly indefinite classical examples he cites all use the present tense of the verb.[20]

Rydbeck goes on to show how later (post-classical) Greek further expanded the usage, by employing a large variety of verbs indefinitely in the third plural active. He cites some twenty-five Hellenistic literary and technical (*Fachprosa*) texts in which verbs other than *verba dicendi* occur, "wo man es ganz deutlich mit solcher generellen 3. Pers. Plur. zu tun hat." With one or two exceptions, all the truly indefinite verbs he cites are in the present tense, and, as he himself claims, "Es scheint mir leichter, die unpersönliche generelle Bedeutung intuitive zu verstehen, wenn das Verbum im Präsens steht."[21]

---

[20] Rydbeck, *Fachprosa*, 31-35. One of Rydbeck's classical examples, the only one that does not use the present tense of the verb, is in fact not indefinite but has a clear antecedent in the passage in question: "it is not surprising if they (= "the Lacedemonians" mentioned in the previous sentence) uprooted (ἐξέκοπτον) the sacred olives at that time" (Lysias 7.7). Apparently Rydbeck himself eliminated another two examples given incorrectly by Kühner-Gerth as examples of subjectless general verbs: (1) "They judged (ἔκρινον) him the most eager" (Xenophon, *Anab.* 1.9.5, also cited by Basil L. Gildersleeve, *Syntax of Classical Greek* [New York: American Book Company, 1900] #82), where "they" = "the men and boys" at the king's court mentioned at the beginning of the paragraph; and (2) "When you are appointed to authority, have no dealings with any evil person in your affairs; for they will blame you for the causes of whatever harm that person may do," ὧν γὰρ ἂν ἐκεῖνος ἁμαρτῇ, σοὶ τὰς αἰτίας ἀναθήσουσιν (Isocrates 1.37), where "they" = "the multitude" (τὸ πλῆθος) in the previous and following sentences.

[21] Rydbeck, *Fachprosa*, 41. He cites the following Hellenistic texts (pp. 28-29, 37-39): Dioscurides, *De mat. med.* 1.13.9; 1.12.6; 1.25.14; 1.28.8; 1.40.16; 1.59.21; 1.76.3; 1.88.12. 2.127.12; 2.164.1; 2.171.10; 2.226.6; 2.252.20 (with verbs like δολίζουσι, χρῶνται, μίσγουσιν, ἀναλαμβάνουσιν, "they counterfeit, experience, mix, undertake"); Aristotle, *Hist. Anim.* 514 b 2 (ἀπολύονται); Hippocrates, *Art.* 71 (ἐλλείπουσιν); Philo Byz., *Belopoeica* 71.15 (κατάγουσιν); Strabo 2.5.17 (ἀφικνοῦνται); Plutarch, *Cons. ad uxor.* 612 A (τοῖς νηπίοις οὔτε χοὰς ἐπιφέρουσιν οὔτε δρῶσι); four texts from Galen (πίνουσιν, ἁλοῦσι, συντιθέασιν, and καίουσιν); Ptolemaeus, *Synt. math.* 1.202.14 (κἂν ἀκρίβως μεθοδεύωνται), Andronicus of Rhodes 30.11 (παρασκευάζουσιν), and several from Aspasius. All of these examples use the present tense.

However, Rydbeck adduces four texts as indefinite third plurals with a past tense. He is mistaken in a couple of examples. First, in Origen's *De oratione* 14.4, there is a compound predicate the subject of which is οἱ ἐκ τῆς περιτομῆς, even though it occurs after the second verb, ἀντιλέγουσιν: "And since those of the circumcision marked (as spurious) the named (passage) in Daniel as not in the Hebrew and (since they, those of the circumcision) reject the one from Tobit as uncanonical, I shall quote another."

From the examples of Rydbeck and others, we may conclude that Hellenistic Greek does indeed use more verbs with a general indefinite subject in the third plural active than classical Greek did, but only *in*

---

Rydbeck mistranslates a second text: οὐδαμῇ γὰρ ἰδεῖν ἔστι τοῖς φαύλοις τὰς τιμὰς διδομένας οὐδὲ ὑφ᾽ ὧν μηδὲν εὖ πεπόνθασιν (Dio Chrysostom, *Rhod*. 31 [64]). We translate: "For in no case does one see that honors are given to the worthless nor (are they given) by those who have not at all had a good experience" (= "who have not at all been treated well"), where Rydbeck would misconstrue the subject of πεπόνθασιν as an indefinite "sie." He translates: "Denn nirgends kann man sehen, dass Ehrenbezeugungen schlechten Menschen erwiesen und auch nicht solchen, von denen sie nichts Gutes erfahren haben (man . . . erfahren hat)" (*Fachprosa*, 28).

Rydbeck's third text, Hippocrates, *Epidemics*, uses a past tense several times, not to state a generality, but to narrate a certain discrete past action: "they gave (προσήνεγκαν) him broth" (7.14); "they led him out (ἐξῆγον) to urinate" (7.85). Clearly in the mind of Hippocrates, and thus the implied subject of the verb, are those ("they") attending the sick in the plague and recording their symptoms in page after page of minute detail; see in the same chapter: "they could not (ἐδύναντο) take it away" (7.11) and compare: "it was necessary (ψωμίζειν ἄλλον δεῖ—a true impersonal construction!) for someone else to feed him" (7.3); "after the seventh day of relapse juices were brought" (προσφέροντο—passive voice—7.2), and, in contrast, 6.8.3—"I went to his house."

Rydbeck's fourth example is in fact one text in which a general statement is made without a subject and in a past tense: "Indeed (they) used to praise (ἐμακάριζον) the kings of Persia for wintering in Babylon" (Plutarch, *De exilio*, 604C). We note, however, that it is a *verbum dicendi*.

Ernest C. Colwell (*The Greek of the Fourth Gospel: A Study of Its Aramaisms in Light of Hellenistic Greek* [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1931] 60) would add two texts from Epictetus. The first is a present general, just like Rydbeck's texts: "Again (they = people) write (γράφουσι) these things about Diogenes" (4.11.21). The second, however, which has a past (aorist) verb, in fact has an implied subject in the previous sentences, namely "Triptolemus" (the demigod who invented farming) and ὁ θεός, constituting an implied plural subject, "the gods": "But because they (= the gods) gave (ἔδωκαν) a vine or wheat, we desire eagerly on account of this, that they produce such fruit in human thought whereby they (= the gods) intended to show us the truth" (1.4.32).

Porter (*Idioms of the Greek New Testament*, 77 n. 1) cites the third-century B.C.E. Cynic Teles as one who uses the "third person plural verb" in this way, but Teles uses only "present general" tense verbs like λέγουσι, φάσι, κιθαρίζουσι, πράττουσι (etc.), "they say, they play the cithara, they do," in a way completely similar to the texts cited by Rydbeck, i.e., not parallel to the texts of Mark and Luke with past and future verbs that we discuss below in sections 3 to 6.

Finally, we may add a few non-literary papyrus examples that use the *present tense*: ἀπαιτοῦσι (P. Oxy. 8.1157.15); λέγουσι (P. Fay. 3.14: also P. Leid C = UPZ 77.1.12); ἔχουσι (P. Fay. 117.8); καίουσιν (P. Hib. 27.167); Μὴ ἀγωνιά<ση>ς ἐὰν ὅλως εἰσπορεύονται, ἐγὼ ἐν Ἀλεξανδρέα μενῶ, "Do not worry if altogether (they) enter ("wenn man allgemein einzieht"—Edwin Mayser, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit* [2nd ed.; Berlin/ Leipzig: de Gruyter, 1926-38] 2.3.3), I will remain in Alexandria" (P. Oxy. 4.744.4).

*the present tense*, as examples of what grammarians call the "present of customary action."[22] Although as we shall see below, this usage does coincide with Semitic usage, the following seven examples are too few to warrant their being called a "secondary" (or "frequency") Semitism, and hence may also be omitted from our list of texts:

> Matt 5:15—"nor do (people) light (καίουσιν) a lamp" (almost an exact parallel to Rydbeck's example, "the hearth upon which (people) light (καίουσιν) the fire" in Galen 14.17);
>
> Matt 7:16—"Do (people) pick (συλλέγουσιν) grapes from thorn bushes?";
>
> Matt 9:17—"Nor do (people) put (βάλλουσιν) new wine into old wineskins";
>
> Luke 6:44—"(people) do not pick (συλλέγουσιν) figs from thorn bushes";
>
> Luke 14:35—"(people) throw (βάλλουσιν) it (tasteless salt) out";
>
> Luke 23:31—"for if (people) do (ποιοῦσιν) these things with the green wood, what will happen with the dry?";
>
> John 15:6—"If anyone does not remain in me, he will be thrown out (ἐβλήθη—a passive) like a branch and withered; (people) both gather (συνάγουσιν) them (the branches) and throw (βάλλουσιν) them into a fire, and they are burned (καίεται— passive!)."[23]

With the elimination of these cases, our list of possible "indefinite third plural" Semitisms is reduced to 38.

## 3. General Indefinite Third Plurals in the Past Tense

Many of the general indefinite third plurals in the texts we are discussing, however, are cast in the past or in the future tenses, usages

---

[22] See Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, #1876. Thus we are only in partial agreement with Thompson when he says that "Rydbeck has succeeded in legitimizing the construction ["the impersonal (*sic!*) third-person plural verbs"] in literary secular Greek" (*Apocalypse*, 21). The construction is in fact attested (with one exception found by scholars!) only in the present tense in literary and technical Greek.

[23] We agree with Raymond E. Brown that the active verbs are in the "general present" tense. We also concur with Brown that their particular use here in John's Gospel may be due to "the Semitic custom of using the third person plural for the passive," but, as we have seen, such present tense verbs also occur in non-biblical Greek. See Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel according to John XIII-XXI* (AB 29A; New York: Doubleday, 1970) 661-62.

that we do not find in the non-biblical literary or technical Koine. Let us look at the past tense examples first:

Mark 1:45—"and (people) were coming (ἤρχοντο) to him from everywhere";

Mark 6:14—"his name had become famous and (people) were saying (ἔλεγον), 'John has been raised'";

Luke 17:27—"in the days of Noah . . . (people) were eating, drinking, marrying, giving in marriage" (ἤσθιον, ἔπινον, ἐγάμουν, ἐγαμίζοντο);

Luke 17:28—"in the days of Lot (people) were eating, drinking, etc." (ἤσθιον, ἔπινον, κτλ.);

Acts 3:2—"And a certain crippled man . . . was carried (ἐβαστάζετο—passive) whom (people) used to place (ἐτίθουν) at the gate every day."

All five of these texts use the imperfect tense normally ("customary" or "iterative" imperfects). However, since "people" in general are implied as the actors, we would expect such statements in non-biblical Greek to have the subject of the action expressed somewhere in the context. We shall have to revisit these five texts.

### 4. General Indefinite Third Plurals with a Future Sense

The following texts exhibit the general indefinite plural verb with a future sense:

Mark 13:9—"(people) will hand you over (παραδώσουσιν) to courts";

Mark 13:26—"and then (people) will see (ὄψονται) the Son of Man coming";

Matt 1:23—"and (people) will call (καλέσουσιν) his name Emmanuel";

Matt 24:9—"Then (people) will hand you over (παραδώσουσιν) to persecution";

Luke 12:11—"When (people) take (εἰσφέρωσιν) you before synagogues";

Luke 13:29—"and (people) will come (ἥξουσιν) from the east";

Luke 16:4—"that (people) may welcome (δέξωνται) me into their homes";

Luke 17:23—"and (people) will say (ἐροῦσιν) to you, 'Look, there he is!'";

Luke 21:12—"(people) will seize (ἐπιβαλοῦσιν) you and persecute (διώξουσιν)";

Luke 21:16—"you will be handed over (παραδοθήσεσθε, a passive!) . . . and (people) will kill (θανατώσουσιν) some of you";

Luke 23:29—"days are coming when (people) will say (ἐροῦσιν)";

Luke 23:30—"Then (people) will begin (ἄρξονται) to say to the mountains."

In these twelve texts "some people" are in mind as the future actors, but they would normally be identified expressly if the action were not indicated in the passive voice.[24] Thus we must return to these twelve texts later.

### 5. General Indefinite Plural Active Verbs in Place of Passives

In four Lucan texts an indefinite third plural active verb is used where it is not at all clear what plural subject would have been meant. A passive would almost have to be used in non-biblical Greek if some *plural* agent like "the heavenly court/celestial beings" were not somehow implied. We indicate the indefinite subject with the parenthetical "(they?)":

Luke 6:38—"good measure . . . (they?) will give (δώσουσιν) into your lap";

Luke 12:20—"This night (they?) will demand (ἀπαιτοῦσιν) your life";

Luke 12:48—"to whom much is given much will be required (two passives!), and from the one to whom (they?) entrusted (παρέθεντο) much, even more will (they?) demand (αἰτήσουσιν)";

Luke 16:9—"so that . . . (they?) may welcome (δέξωνται) you into eternal dwellings."

---

[24] Doudna claims to have found one Egyptian papyrus text with an indefinite verb in the future: ἐὰν δὲ θελήσῃς μὴ ἀναβῆναι πέμψουσιν στρατιώτην μετ' ἐμοῦ πρὸς σέ. However, the implied subject is clearly mentioned earlier in the paragraph: "if you do not wish to come up, they (= "the court arbitrators" mentioned earlier in line 5 [μεσίτων]) will send a soldier with me to you" (*BGU* 1676.13).

These four texts are almost unintelligible in Greek, and we shall return to them later.

## 6. Indefinite Third Plurals in Place of Constructions with τινες

Finally, in still other texts under discussion the subject is indefinite, but not general (= "one"); it is particular to the story ("some people"), implying some particular persons who did a specific, discrete, action that is narrated in past time. To clarify the difference let us compare two texts with the exact same verb form, ἔρχονται, namely Rydbeck's text from Thucydides 4.130.2 (cited above) and Mark 2:18: "Now the disciples of John and the Pharisees used to fast, and (some people) come (ἔρχονται) and say to him, 'Why do the disciples of John and the Pharisees fast?'" In the Marcan text ἔρχονται is a historical present (= "came"), that is, it refers, however vividly, to a one-time discrete action in the past. Furthermore, the indefinite subject of the verb has some finite number of actors in mind in that particular event (= "some people, certain persons"), even though it does not identify them. This kind of indefinite subject is normally expressed by the indefinite pronoun τινες in Greek, e.g., καὶ ἤρξαντό τινες ἐμπτύειν αὐτῷ, "and *some* began to spit on him" (Mark 14:65).

In Rydbeck's text, on the other hand, ᾗ ἐπὶ Ποτειδαίας ἔρχονται, "where (people) go to Potidaia," although the verb form is identical, it is a true present tense that indicates a *recurrent*, in fact indefinitely repeatable, action: it identifies the gate that people *always* use to go to Potidaia. The indefinite subject refers to all the people, or anyone at all ("one," = *man* in German, as Rydbeck maintains).

In twelve Marcan texts, however, we have a quite unusual use of the indefinite third plural active verb in a past tense that narrates an action of a certain group of people in the author's mind ("some people"), but without the usual indefinite pronoun τινες. Where Luke and Matthew take over these texts, they almost always change them by adding a named or implied subject or by using the passive voice. Each has two exceptions (which are marked as parallel to the respective texts below):

Mark 1:22—"and they (some people) were amazed (ἐξεπλήσσοντο) at his teaching";

Mark 1:32—"when the sun went down they (some people) were bringing (ἔφερον) to him all who were sick" = Matt 8:16 "they (some people) brought (προσένεγκαν—changed to aorist) to him many demoniacs";

Mark 2:3—"and they (some people) come (ἔρχονται, historical present) bringing (participle) a paralytic to him" = Matthew 9:2—"and behold they (some people) were bringing (προσέφερον) him a paralytic";

Mark 2:18—"and they (some people) come (ἔρχονται, historical present) and say to him";

Mark 3:2—"and they (some people) were watching (παρετήρουν) him closely";

Mark 5:14—"and they (some people) came (ἦλθον) to see what had happened" = Luke 8:35—"and they (some people) came out (ἐξῆλθον) to see what had happened";

Mark 5:35—"they (some people) from the ruler of the synagogue come (ἔρχονται, historical present)";

Mark 6:33—"and they (some people) saw (εἶδον) them going";

Mark 6:54-55—"recognizing him they (some people) ran about (ἐπιγνόντες αὐτὸν περιέδραμον)";

Mark 7:32—"and they (some people) bring (φέρουσιν, historical present) him a deaf mute man";

Mark 8:22—"and they (some people) bring (φέρουσιν, historical present) him a blind man";

Mark 10:13—"and they (some people) were bringing (προσέφερον) children to him" = Luke 18:15—"and they (some people) were also bringing (προσέφερον) children to him."

Finally, there is one text in the Gospel of John where Mary Magdalene says: "they (some people) took (ἦραν) the Lord from the tomb and we do not know where they put (ἔθηκαν) him" (20:2).

From the Egyptian Greek papyri Edwin Mayser has adduced several texts with *past tense* verbs in which he claims that the subject is omitted, as he says, "wobei οἱ ἄνθρωποι oder ein anderer Begriff aus dem Zusammenhang zu ergänzen ist."[25] We list them here with our translation and his comments (in German):

---

[25] Mayser, *Grammatik*, 2.3.3.

P. Leid. C = UPZ 77.1.8-9: ἠβουλόμην ἐπιστρέψαι ἔλεγον ὅτι ταῦτα πάντα τὰ πολλὰ ἐννέα εἰσί [In a dream] "I wished to return; I said that all these many things were nine."—The form ἔλεγον is probably not an indefinite third plural, but in the first person like the verb that precedes it.

P. Tebt. 15.10: πυνθανομένων δ' ἡμῶν ἔφησαν "when we inquired they (= ὄχλος τῶν ἐκ τῆς κώμης in the previous lines) said."—We agree that the implied subject here is ὄχλος and thus discount this text along with P. Leid. C above.

P. Eleph. 9.2: "When we arrived in Apollinopolis," . . . ἔφασαν σε εἶναι ἐν Συήνηι, "they (some people) said that you were in Syene."

P. Tebt. 58.38: γέγραπται ὁ μερίσμος καὶ δέδωκαν τῶι Μέλανι καὶ ἐπιβεβῃ [= ἐπιβέβληκαν] ἡμῖν ογβ "The share (of the wheat) has been written up and they (= "die teilenden Beamten") gave to Melas and they assigned to us ογβ (a numerical amount)."

From Colwell we may add P. Oxy I.119: πεπλάνηκαν ἡμῶς [read ἡμῖν] ἐκε[ῖ] τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ιβ ὅτι ἔπλευες, "they tricked us there, on the twelfth, when you sailed."

In all the Greek texts adduced by scholars working on the question of the indefinite third plural, the unusual usage of an indefinite subject in the seventeen Gospel texts we have cited in this section (normally expressed by τινες) is paralleled only in three non-literary papyri. Such texts, whose grammar and spelling is frequently incorrect, do not legitimate the usage as permissible in first-century Hellenistic Greek.[26] We must conclude, then, that these texts do not follow normal Greek usage.

---

[26] Moreover, as Thomas O. Lambdin points out, the Coptic language of Egypt "has no real passive conjugations. The passive is expressed by using the 3rd pers. pl. of the active form in an indefinite sense" (*Introduction to Sahidic Coptic* [Macon: Mercer University Press, 1983] 49. A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* (4th ed.; London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1923) 820, agrees that the third plural active is "the usual idiom in Coptic in lieu of the absence of the passive." It is much more likely that these three examples in the Egyptian papyri (of indefinite third plural active past tense verbs where normal Greek would name the subject or have to use a passive) are to be considered as also aberrant. Perhaps the interference of Egyptian has resulted in usage coincidentally parallel to the equally unusual Greek of the known Semitizing writer of the Gospel of Mark. For similar cases see Francis T. Gignac, *An Introductory New Testament Greek Course* (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1973) 169-71.

In our examination of the Greek evidence we have identified 38 texts in the Gospels and Acts that have an unusual use of an indefinite third plural active verb in one of four categories (described in our sections 3-6 above). We may now turn to the Semitic evidence that bears upon these atypical Greek constructions.

## B. The Hebrew Evidence

In biblical Hebrew the third plural masculine active forms of the verb are used to express at least two kinds of indefinite subjects, according to Gesenius-Kautzsch-Cowley (= GKC): 1) "the indefinite personal subject" and 2) "an indefinite subject where the context does not admit of a human agent or at least not of several."[27]

### 1. The Indefinite Personal Third Plural

GKC maintains that "the indefinite personal subject (our [= English] *they*, *one*, the French *on*, and the German *man*) is expressed . . . [v]ery frequently by the 3rd plural masculine."[28] In the examples they give we would make the following distinctions:

a) Some texts refer to "people generally" (what we have called the "general present" in Greek in our section A.2 above): Isa 38:16—

---

[27] Emil Kautzsch, ed., *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar* (2nd ed. rev. by A. E. Cowley; Oxford: Clarendon, 1910) #144d-g (= GKC). Reiser considers the usage as interchangeable with the passive voice: "Semitic languages also have the third person plural [active] available for cases in which the agent is intended to remain indeterminate" (*Jesus and Judgment*, 272).

[28] GKC #144d and f. As a matter of fact, of the 12 examples GKC presents in #144f, we may eliminate more than half (seven) of them. Two of them, Job 18:18 and 34:20, are also cited (and more correctly—see below) as examples of indefinites that do "not admit of a human agent." We may rule out another five of their examples because an implied subject is given earlier in the text: Gen 26:18—"And Isaac dug the wells of water that they ("his father's servants" in v. 15) had dug"; Gen 29:2—"and from that well they watered the flocks" (the implied subject is "the sons of the East" in v. 1); Gen 35:5—"the terror of God was on the cities round about them, and they did not pursue" (the subject is clearly implied as the populace of "the cities"); Gen 49:31—"There they buried Abraham" (the implied subject is from v. 29—"and he charged them" [= "the twelve tribes" in v. 28]); Hos 12:9—"(?) All my riches shall not suffice for me the guilt of sin" (text very uncertain).

"O Lord, by these things (people) live (*yiḥyû*)." To this we add another example: Job 35:9—"From the multitude of crimes (people) cry out (*yazʿîqû*)."

b) Not cited by GKC is an example of an action by "people generally" but in the past (= the "customary imperfect" in Greek like those in our section A.3 above): Job 29:21—"To me (people) used to listen (*šāmĕʿû*)."

c) Some texts have indefinite personal subjects, but they imply discrete actors (not "people generally"), and they narrate *past* stories (constructions that would require the indefinite pronoun in Greek, like those in our section A.6 above):

> Gen 41:14—"And Pharaoh sent and called Joseph and (some people) brought him out."—Here we can imagine that it was Pharaoh's servants who brought Joseph out, but *grammatically*, a subject for the third plural suffixed verb *wayerîṣūhû* is lacking.

To this we would add 1 Kgs 1:1—"And King David was old and advanced in days and (some people) covered him (*yĕkassūhû*—with suffix) with clothes."

d) GKC cite three examples of an indefinite jussive form:

> 1 Kgs 1:2—"And his servants said to him, 'Let (some people) search (*yĕbaqšû*) for my lord the king'";
>
> Esth 2:2—"And then the servants of the king who ministered to him said, 'Let (some people) seek (*yĕbaqšû*) young virgins for the king'";
>
> Neh 2:7—"And I said to the king, 'If it please the king, let (some people) give (*yittĕnû*) me letters to the governors.'"

There are no texts in the Gospels and Acts in which we have found the corresponding Greek usage (an indefinite imperative or hortatory subjunctive).

e) GKC would add four examples of this indefinite personal plural expressed in noun clauses by a plural *participle* in the active voice, but we accept only two of them:

> Jer 38:23—"and (they shall be) bringing out (*mōṣîʾîm*—hiphil participle) all your wives and children to the Chaldeans."—

> Compare this with v. 22—"and behold, all the women . . . (shall be) brought out" (*mûṣāʾôt*—hophal participle).
>
> Neh 6:10—"Let the doors of the temple be shut for (they shall be) coming (*bāʾîm*) to kill you."[29]

These indicate future action to be accomplished by "some people" (like the Greek examples in our section A.4 above).

Although other examples could surely be found, the fact of the matter is that in the Hebrew OT there are very few indefinite personal third plurals (and participles with indefinite antecedents that could be translated into Greek as third plural indicatives). For example, an examination of the Elijah-Elisha cycle (1 Kgs 17:1—2 Kgs 8:15) turns up no indefinite plurals (indicatives or participles) at all. In those fourteen chapters it is always clear what the subject or implied subject of every verb is; for instance, "people" (*ʿam*) is often supplied as a subject.[30] The probability of such verbs as source of Hebrew interference in the Gospels and Acts is even further reduced when we look below at their translations in the Septuagint.

Hebrew written in the first centuries B.C.E. and C.E. does not use indefinite plural active verbs in these ways. An examination of the Qumran documents 1QS, 1QM and 1QH shows that third plurals always have an expressed or implied subject, usually the members of

---

[29] GKC #144i. We cannot accept Isa 32:12 as an example because the text is too unsure for a study like ours. We may also eliminate Ezek 13:7 because the main subject of the sentence "you" is clearly implied in the plural participle: "have you not spoken (*ʾămartem*—qal perfect) a lying divination, and (you are) saying (*ʾōmĕrîm*—qal participle), 'Word of the Lord.'" GKC (#116t) also lists some texts "in which some undefined subject is to be supplied with the (plural) participle," but each of the participles clearly has an expressed antecedent. The texts are: Exod 5:16—"There is no straw given to your servants and they ("the taskmasters" in v. 14) are saying (*ʾōmĕrîm*—qal participle) to us, 'Make bricks'"; Jer 38:23—"They ("the princes of the king of Babylon" in v. 22) are bringing out (*môṣīʾîm*—hiphil participle) all your wives and you shall not be delivered out of their hand"; Ezek 36:13—"Thus says the Lord YHWH, 'because they ("the men who walk upon you" in v. 12) are saying (*ʾōmĕrîm*) to you'"; Ezek 37:11—"These bones are all the house of Israel; behold they ("the house of Israel") are saying (*ʾōmĕrîm*), 'Our bones are dried.'" Thus we may omit all of these texts from further mention in our study.

[30] Thus the claim of GKC #144f that this construction occurs "very frequently" in biblical Hebrew is false. In fact, few true examples of it have been brought forth by grammarians. Hence we disagree also with Thompson (*Apocalypse*, 21) who reproduces this opinion of GKC #144f.

"the Community," "the Many," or some group described earlier in the text.[31]

## 2. *The Indefinite "Impersonal" Third Plural Used for Passive*

GKC (#144g) adduces the following texts where "the 3rd plur. also is sometimes used to express an indefinite subject, where the context does not admit of a human agent or at least not of several":

> Gen 34:27—"The sons of Jacob came upon the slain and destroyed the city because they had defiled (*ṭimmĕʾû*) their sister."—We omit this text because the subject ("the slain" in the city) is implied in the first part of the sentence.[32]
>
> Job 4:19—"Also those who dwell in houses of clay . . . whom they(?) crush (*yĕdakkĕʾûm*—with suffix) more easily than the moth";
>
> Job 6:2—"O that my grief be truly weighed (*yiššāqēl*—niphal!) and that they(?) lay (*yiśĕʾû*) my calamity together with it in the scales!";
>
> Job 7:3—"So I have been made to possess (*honḥaltî*—hophal!) months of vanity and they(?) have appointed (*minnû*—piel) nights of misery for me";
>
> Job 18:18—"They(?) shall drive him (*yehdĕpūhû*—with suffix) from light to darkness and they shall expel him";
>
> Job 19:26—"And after my skin they(?) shall destroy this."—The text is too poorly preserved to be used in a grammatical study such as this.
>
> Job 34:20—"the people shall be troubled (*yĕgōʿăšû*—pual!) and pass away and they(?) shall remove (*yāsîrû*—hiphil) the mighty not by (human) hand";

---

[31] Gad B. Sarfatti has written on "The Forms *pʿlhw, ypʿlhw* and the Search for the Indefinite Subject in the Manual of Discipline" (*Lešʾ* 32 [1968] 63-66 [Hebrew]), but all the third plurals in the passages he cites have a clearly implied subject.

[32] Gen 34:27 is an example of the alternation of implied subjects common in Hebrew and not uncommon in Greek; the implied subject of the verb in question is clear, and so we shall omit it from our study. This is in agreement with James G. Williams, "A Critical Note on the Aramaic Indefinite Plural of the Verb," *JBL* 83 (1964) 180-82, here 182 n. 11.

Ezek 32:25—"In the midst of the slain they(?) have given (*nātĕnû*) a bed to her";

Ps 63:11—"They(?) shall make him fall (*yaggîrūhû*—hiphil with suffix) upon the sword";

Prov 2:22—"The wicked shall be cut off (*yikkārētû*—niphal!) from the earth and the transgressors they(?) shall tear out (*yissĕḥû*) of it";

Prov 9:11—"For by me shall your days become many and they(?) shall add (*yôsîpû*—hiphil) to you years of life."

In these ten texts it is not at all clear who the (plural) subjects are thought to be, and the verbs, often in parallel with a passive form, are usually best translated into English by a passive. Thus these examples correspond to the Greek texts listed in our section A.5 above.

Even though most of the examples adduced by GKC are from the Book of Job, a close reading of the last sections of that text (chaps. 32—42) turns up only one indefinite personal third plural, Job 35:9 (cited above as an example of a "general present"). In contrast, passive forms of the verb abound there.[33] Thus this indefinite "impersonal" construction, too, occurs very *infrequently* in the Hebrew Bible, as James Williams also points out.[34]

## C. The Evidence from Middle Aramaic

Just as in Hebrew, in Aramaic a third plural active verb may be used indefinitely, with no subject expressed in the context.[35] In fact, certain Middle Aramaic texts are much freer than Hebrew (and Greek!) when it comes to leaving undefined the subject of a sentence. Similarly, the action of a nominal sentence may be expressed by a participle that has no subject and no antecedent in the context. In these cases the subject

---

[33] See Job 38:13, 15, 24 (all with niphal); 38:14 and 41:11 (both with hitpael); 41:1 (with pual).

[34] Williams, "A Critical Note," 181.

[35] Emil Kautzsch says that in these cases, "[d]as Subjekt kann jedoch auch unbestimmt gelassen oder doch nur aus dem Charakter der betreffenden Handlung zu erschliessen sein" (*Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramäischen* [Leipzig: Vogel, 1884] #96.1.c).

may be the general idea of "people," or the construction may merely be used to paraphrase a passive that completely takes the focus off the doer of the action.[36]

## 1. The Indefinite Personal Third Plural Indicative/Plural Participle

As is well known, Semitic distinguishes morphologically only between perfected and non-perfected action in the indicative. Similarly, the participle has no tense of its own, but may indicate past, present or future time in its context.[37] Thus for our purposes we may cite Middle Aramaic texts with indefinite *personal* subjects as corresponding to the various nuances of verbal action in our list of Greek indefinites above. These Aramaic texts may:

a) refer to "people" generally and their customary action (= the "present general" of our section A.2 above): 11QtgJob 26.3 (= MT Job 35:9)—"Because of the multitude [of crimes] they (= "people") cry out (*[yz]'qwn*)";

b) refer to "people" generally but in the past (= the indefinite "customary imperfect" of our section A.3 above): Ezra 6:3—"Let the house be built where they (= people) used to offer (*dābĕḥîn*—a participle) sacrifices";

c) have indefinite personal subjects, but imply discrete actors (not "people generally") who acted in the past (plural constructions that would require the indefinite pronoun τινες in Greek, like those in our section A.6 above). These abound in Biblical Aramaic, e.g., Ezra 4:19—"And from me the decree went out and

---

[36] Cf. Kautzsch, *Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramäischen*, #76.1.e. An admittedly partial explanation for the necessity of these indeterminate active participles is because "der passive Nominal durchweg perfektische Bedeutung hat und ein passiver Aorist im Bibl.-aram. fehlt"; so Hans Bauer and Pontus Leander, *Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramäischen* (Halle/Saale: Niemeyer, 1927) #80g. Williams speculates that the possible origin of this usage may be from "long contact with and function in a culture, the Mesopotamian, that is generally supposed to have been characterized by a slavish mentality . . . when a power (or powers) from above, either human or divine, impinges upon men" ("A Critical Note," 181-82). One cannot help but think of the American jingle, "What'cha gonna do when *they* come for you?!"

[37] See Bauer and Leander, *Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramäischen*, #81a.

(they) searched (*baqqarû*) and (they) found (*haškaḥû*) that this city rebelled."[38]

d) Some texts are indefinite but have personal subjects acting in the future (corresponding to the texts in our section A.4 above), e.g., Ezra 6:5—"(They) shall restore (*yahătîbûn*) the vessels which Nebuchadnezzar had taken out."[39]

## 2. Indefinite "Impersonal" Plural Active (Equivalent to a Passive)

Not infrequently a third plural active verb (or a participle without any antecedent in a nominal sentence) may be used to express an action that is done to the actual subject of the story, but it does not indicate in any fashion the identity of the supposed doers of the action.[40] Since we are left clueless as to their identity (they are not "some people"), these examples are truly the equivalent of a passive, and are often paralleled by passive verbs, as we point out in the examples that follow:

Dan 5:20—"He was deposed (*honḥat*—hophal!) from the throne of his kingdom and (they) took (*heʿdî[w]*) his dignity from him"

Dan 5:21—"And he was driven (*ṭĕrîd*—peil!) from the sons of men and (they) made (*šawwî[w]*) his heart like the beasts."[41]

## D. The Old Greek Versions

If we look at the ten Hebrew examples of the "indefinite personal" we identified in our section B.1 above, we find that LXX translates with a third plural active in Greek only six times: Gen 41:14; 1 Kings [= 3 Kgdms] 1:1 and 1:2; Neh 6:10 [= 2 Esdr 16:10]; Jer 38:23 and Job

---

[38] Other examples are Ezra 6:1; Dan 2:13; 5:3, 23, 29; 6:17, 25 (all indicatives).

[39] So also Dan 2:18—"and they(?) will not destroy (*yĕhōbĕdûn*—haphel) Daniel." According to Joseph A. Fitzmyer (*The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave I: A Commentary* [2nd, rev. ed.; BibOr 18A; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1971] 130), two more examples of "the indefinite 3 pl. . . . used in a jussive form" occur in 1QapGen 20.15—"and let (them) know (*yndʿwk*—with suffix *k*) about you," and 20.25—"Let (them) return (*ytbw*) Sarai to Abram."

[40] Kautzsch, *Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramäischen,* #96.1.c says: "Nicht selten steht so die 3. Pluralis ohne jede Bezugnahme auf das wirkliche Subjekt der Handlung lediglich, um den Vollzug derselben auszudrücken und somit als Aequivalent eines Passivum."

[41] Other examples are (indicatives) Dan 2:30; 4:13, 22; 7:12, 13; and (participles) Dan 3:4; 4:22, 28, 29; 7:5; and possibly Ezra 7:24.

29:21. The construction does not appear in the other four texts: Neh 2:7 [= 2 Esdr 12:7] changes the verb to the singular; Esth 2:2 substitutes a passive; Job 35:9 adds a subject; and the text is thoroughly changed in Isa 38:16.

Of the nine Hebrew examples of the indefinite "impersonal" we authenticated in section B.2 above, we find that all of them have been changed in the Septuagint: Ps 63:11; Prov 2:22; 9:11; Job 7:3 have been changed to passives; Job 4:19 and 18:18 are changed to singular; Job 6:2 to εἰ τις; Job 34:20 is given an antecedent; and Ezek 32:25 omits that part of the verse.

With regard to the eleven Aramaic indefinite personal actives we have cited above in our section C.1, LXX translates as follows: a) with a passive six times (Ezra 6:5; Dan 2:13, 18; 5:3, 23; 6:25); b) a subject is expressed three times (Ezra 4:19; 6:1; Dan 5:29); c) that part of the verse is omitted once (Dan 6:17); d) the third plural active is retained only once (Ezra 6:3). In the seven Daniel passages, the more literal Theodotion retained the indefinite third plural active four times (Dan 2:13; 5:23; 6:17, 25), translated with a passive twice (Dan 2:18; 5:3), and changed the subject to singular once (Dan 6:17).

Of the thirteen "impersonal" indefinites we found in Biblical Aramaic above in section C.2, LXX *never* translates with a third plural active, but changes to a passive five times (Ezra 7:24; Dan 2:30; 3:4; 4:16 [= MT 13], 31[28]), supplies a subject five times (Dan 4:25[22] *bis*, 32[29]; 7:5, 12), and omits the text three times (Dan 5:20, 21; 7:13). Theodotion's Daniel retains the indefinite plural in five of the texts (Dan 4:25[22] *bis*, 31[28], 32[29]; 7:5), but changes to a passive in six texts (3:4; 4:16[13]; 5:20, 21; 7:12, 13) and changes to another construction in 2:30.

In light of the paucity of unusual third plural active forms in the LXX, whether translated from a Hebrew or an Aramaic original, we may rule out the stylistic influence of the LXX on the NT evangelists in this usage.

## E. Conclusion

We conclude that in certain instances the indefinite use of the third plural active form of the verb in the Gospels and Acts is the result of Aramaic interference. While the present general ("gnomic" or "custom-

ary" present) was quite common in the Hellenistic Greek of the period, we have distinguished, according to the canons of Greek grammar, four different kinds of indefinites that are truly unusual and virtually unattested in non-biblical Greek: (1) the past general (the "iterative" or "customary" imperfects of our section A.3 above); (2) a future general (which predicts what "people" will do [A.4]); (3) an indefinite "impersonal" futuristic plural (where no human persons are meant [A.5]); and (4) an indefinite personal (where normal Greek would have to use the indefinite pronoun τινες or some substitute as subject [A.6]) in a narrative tense. For these we may rule out the interference of Hebrew since the usage is very infrequent in Biblical Hebrew, and virtually absent from first-century Hebrew. Moreover, the Old Greek versions of the Bible rarely translate literally when the construction does occur in either Hebrew or Aramaic. By contrast, it is in the Biblical Aramaic of the Book of Ezra, and especially the Middle Aramaic of the Book of Daniel and some non-biblical texts among the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls, that we find such usage at home. We may thus conclude that most of the unusual usage of the indefinite third person plural active verbs in the Gospels is the result of the interference of Aramaic, whether in the evangelists' own composition or in their use of (Aramaic or Aramaizing Greek) sources.

Taking seriously the insight of recent Gospel study that we must consider the four evangelists to be real authors and not mere collectors and/or "cut and paste" redactors, we should expect the final product of each to reflect their different background and familiarity with the Greek language. We presume that each one tried to write a coherent and acceptable text for their readers of Greek.[42] This is exactly what we find in this particular usage in the Gospels and Acts: the evangelists took over their sources (whether Greek or Aramaic) and translated and/or composed in Greek in their own way.[43]

The results of our study are quite interesting. As we have seen, the Marcan indefinite third plurals are almost always corrected by Mat-

---

[42] "Mark made use of existing material which he not only arranged in the form of a story about Jesus, but also wrote down in his own words and in his own Greek"; so Willem S. Vorster, *Speaking of Jesus: Essays on Biblical Language, Gospel Narrative and the Historical Jesus* (ed. J. Eugene Botha; NovTSup 92; Leiden: Brill, 1999) 36.

[43] For the range of possible Semitic interference in the Gospel of Mark (Hebraism, Aramaism, Semitism, Septuagintalism), see Elliott C. Maloney, *Semitic Interference in Marcan Syntax* (SBLDS 51; Chico: Society of Biblical Literature, 1981) 244-45.

thew and Luke when they take them over.[44] Mark was probably an Aramaic speaker with Greek as a second language. Not always perceiving the finer nuances of Greek, Mark probably did not realize that a native Greek speaker or writer would have used an indefinite pronoun (τινες) to tell a story. Instead, Mark saw nothing wrong with the Aramaic usage of subjectless plural verbs in past time narrative in the twelve examples we examined above in our section A.6. Similarly, Mark's two past general and two future general indefinites (Mark 1:45; 6:14 and 13:9, 26) were probably subjectless in his (Aramaic or Aramaizing Greek) sources, and since their content indicates clearly enough that "some people" used to do (or would be doing) the stated actions, he did not feel a need to add the subjects that are required in such Greek usage.

Matthew errs in his use of the indefinite only four times, three times taking over a faulty text from Mark, "correcting" it—but not quite enough.[45] In the fourth text Matthew adapts LXX Isa 7:14 ("the virgin . . . will call his name") to "they will call his name," perhaps having in mind "his people" in a preceding verse (Matt 1:21).[46] It may be that he is just distracted enough in adapting his sources, and is so present to the context in doing so, that he fails in these four instances to correct for the missing subject or change to the passive as he usually does.

The sole instance in the Fourth Gospel, a subjectless aorist (20:2), presumes the obvious actors in such a deed of skullduggery, but is nevertheless quite unusual Greek—even for John's Gospel.

Luke's facility with the Greek language is well known, as is his ability to imitate the Greek of the LXX. The majority of Luke's 17

---

[44] We believe that our findings make a strong case for Marcan Priority in the Synoptic Question. Furthermore, the two Lucan improper indefinites in the Double Tradition (Luke 13:29 and 17:27—but not so in Matthew) favor the Two-Document Hypothesis, but not as conclusively here with only two examples.

[45] In Matt 8:16 he changes Mark's imperfect to the more correct aorist; in 9:2 he eliminates the pleonastic ἔρχομαι and turns the participle into his main verb; in 24:9 he abbreviates Mark 13:9-12 (which he has used in his Missionary Discourse in chap. 10), joining the indefinite third plural active forms of Mark 13:9 and 13:12. As a matter of fact, Matthew has fully corrected Mark's only other indefinite future general by adding a subject (πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαί) in Matt 24:30//Mark 13:26.

[46] Richard Beaton also posits "contextual concerns to avoid confusion [with] the naming of Jesus in 1.21," noting that "minor adjustments of tense, person and subject to accommodate the context are common in Jewish texts of this period" (*Isaiah's Christ in Matthew's Gospel* [SNTSMS 123; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002] 90).

questionable indefinite third plurals are in his own special sources or composition, and almost all of them are futures (our sections A.4 and A.5).[47] Since this construction appears only very rarely in LXX, we must assume that Luke's sources (including Mark 13:9, 12 and 26) used it in some sayings of Jesus.[48] Luke evidently liked the sound of this indefinite future and used it more freely even than Mark in his reporting of Jesus' language. As for his indefinite plurals in the past tense (two texts from Mark and one each from Q and L, along with Acts 3:2), we can only speculate that Luke considered that the context made the agents ("people" or "some people") clear, and neglected to indicate the subject.

Finally, there is no reason to consider the use of the third plural in Luke 6:38; 12:20, 48; 16:9 as a circumlocution for and reverent omission of God's name. Θεός appears frequently in the Gospels, and Hebrew ʾēl and Aramaic ʾēlāh are used freely in all manner of first-century Semitic texts.[49] Rather, Luke (or his sources) chose to use the exotic-sounding constructions to focus on the eschatological actions themselves, not needing to name the only One who could bring them about.

---

[47] They are: (section A. 3 above) customary imperfects in Luke 17:27 (from Q); 17:28 (L); Acts 3:2; (A.4) future personals in Luke 12:11 (Mark); 13:29 (Q); 16:4 and 17:23 (L); 21:12 and 16 (Mark); 23:29 and 30 (L); (A. 5) "future active for passive" in Luke 6:38; 12:20, 48; 16:9 (all from L); and (A. 6) past personals from Mark in Luke 8:35 and 18:15.

[48] Although Luke takes over Mark 13:26 word for word, the insertion of his v. 26 expresses the subject (ἀνθρώπων) implied in Luke 21:27 (// Mark 13:26).

[49] The indefinite plural subject is quite usual for the actions of God in the Talmud and the ("divine") passive occurs rarely (Hermann L. Strack and Paul Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch* [6 vols.; Munich: Beck, 1922-61] 1. 443). This fact, however, is not important for our study, since the Talmud belongs to a later stage of Aramaic ("Late Aramaic"). As we have noted in n. 3 above, all the passive forms occur with frequency in Middle Aramaic.

# Luke 10:38-42 and Acts 6:1-7:
# A Lukan Diptych on διακονία

BART J. KOET

Before writing his classic works, Karl Marx made a journey to Great Britain and the Netherlands. On this journey his encounter with the poverty arising out of the industrial revolution prompted deeper reflection. The result of his experience is well known. Around the same time, another German journeyed to the Netherlands and Great Britain. This was Theodor Fliedner (1800-1864). But the response of Fliedner to the poverty of the period differed from that of Marx. On returning to his homeland, Fliedner founded a movement for women who would care for forsaken children, the disheartened poor, and for prisoners. Inspired by Acts 6, he called these women deaconesses.[1] Eventually, and in large part as a result of Fliedner's initiative, διακονία ("service") became a general term for merciful and loving assistance.

## I. Lexicography

In his linguistic study of διακονία, the Australian scholar John N. Collins argued that this pastoral endeavor, and its success among German Lutherans, led to the linguistic study of Wilhelm Brandt which presented διακονία in early Christian writings as a specific and distinctive

---

[1] On Fliedner, see Martin Gerhardt, *Theodor Fliedner. Ein Lebensbild* (2 vols.; Düsseldorf-Kaiserswerth: Buchhandlung der Diakonissen-Anstalt, 1933-1937); Anna Sticker, *Theodor Fliedner* (6th ed.; Düsseldorf: Diakoniewerk Kaiserswerth, 1975).

expression of the Christian conception of service.[2] In a highly influential and widely cited study by Hermann W. Beyer, Brandt's ideas were broadly disseminated.[3] Collins has accurately recorded how this definition of διακονία as Christian service became an accepted "fact" of Christian lexicography, with the result that neologisms like the German 'Diakonie' began to appear.[4] In recent decades, both in churches and theology, the word *diakonia* is often synonymous with lowly service either within the church or expressed more broadly toward the needy in society. In theological discourse *diakonia* became a general word for merciful and loving assistance.

Collins, however, opposes such a signification. In his study he analyzes usage of the Greek διακον-words in the literature of antiquity. Through meticulous research into the meaning of the διακον-clusters in ancient literature, the extent to which the "Christian" Greek of the NT differs from common early usage becomes clear. In two appendices to his book Collins provides a survey of the possible uses of the διακον-words in the NT.[5]

The first meaning for the noun διακονία offered by the *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* is "waiting at table" with "a rather wider sense 'provision for bodily sustenance.'"[6] The second usage recorded is "'discharge of service' in genuine love." The third usage is described as "discharge of certain obligations in the community" (e.g., the office of being an apostle). A fourth quite specific usage is given in relation to the collection for Jerusalem and is depicted as "a true act of love" (Rom 15:30-32; 2 Cor 8:1-6, esp. 8:4; 9:1, 12-15).

For the verb διακονέω, *TDNT* explains that the first meaning is "in the original sense of "to wait at table," while the second represents a change to "the wider sense of 'to be serviceable.'"[7] In third place, the verb is rendered generally as "to serve." But in *TDNT* we see in regard

---

[2] Wilhelm Brandt, *Dienst und Dienen im Neuen Testament* (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1931); cf. John N. Collins, *Diakonia. Re-interpreting the Ancient Sources* (New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990) 11.

[3] Hermann W. Beyer, *"diakoneō,"* *TWNT* 2 (1935) 81-93; Engl. transl., *TDNT* 2 (1964) 81-93.

[4] Collins, *Diakonia*, 11.

[5] Ibid., 335-37.

[6] For the four meanings mentioned in this paragraph, see *TDNT* 2.87-88.

[7] Ibid., 2.84-85. Beyer argues that the concept of "waiting at tables" underlies all other usages in the NT: "The same change in evaluation as we find in respect of waiting at table applies everywhere in the NT to διακονεῖν in the wider sense of 'to be

to the verb an emphasis on the aspect of lowly, caring service. To show that serving and being happy cannot go together, Beyer quotes from a dialogue of Plato: "How can a man be happy when he has to serve someone?" (*Gorg.* 491e). However, the verb used here is δουλόω and not διακονέω. Such a low estimation of the meaning of service among pre-Christian Greeks allows Beyer to envisage a higher value of service among early Christians influenced, as it is, by the "loving service/ *diakonia*" evident in the life and death of Jesus. According to Beyer, as a result, Christian use of διακονέω represents a whole new semantic field.

The consequence of Beyer's linguistic study was a taken-for-granted interpretation of διακονία as lowly, caring service. As already noted, Collins has seriously questioned any such assumption. He examined the διακον-words against the background of Greek literary activity across 800 years in the classical and Hellenistic eras. Collins' most important conclusion is that the Greek διακον-terms were "floaters."[8] Context determines the sense of each instance and, as Collins puts it, ". . . to come closer to what the Greek word said to the Greek mind we need to reach out into the range of ideas it is associated with."[9] He adds, "To know a word, it helps to know the company it keeps." In light of this methodology, Collins concludes that the διακον-terms were not used specifically to express a notion of loving and caring service. Rather, because of their indeterminate character, the terms can assume a variety of contexts. They occur in Plato as designations of commercial functions (*Resp.* 370e) because of their capacity to connote the idea of exchange. Similarly, however, Plato calls divination "part of a 'diakonic' skill" because the diviner, as an interpreter of the gods, is also engaged in a process of exchange (*Pol.* 290c-d).[10]

---

serviceable.' Sometimes the link with waiting at table may still be discerned . . . (e.g., Lk 8:3)" (ibid., 2.85).

[8] In his discussion of Plato, Collins even refers to the word *diakonos* as a "colourless" term (*Diakonia*, 79, subsection heading). However, he shows that quite often, according to context, *diakon-* can introduce quite strong color to a particular context: there can be mutual interchange between the term and the context, the one "coloring" the other. He later refers to a quite telling example (ibid., 106) and argues that *diakonia* can designate Constantine's mission from God to extend the sway of Christian truth.

[9] This quotation and the next are from Collins, *Diakonia*, 3.

[10] Ibid., 77-89 (on Plato's use of *diakonos*).

However, the verb can also designate the carrying out of orders and the performance of deeds.[11] These deeds vary widely between such things as contract killings and waiting-on at a meal or banquet. It seems possible to find a common denominator in this range of activities by describing them as being of an "in-between" kind. Central notions expressed by διακονία might cluster around notions of "mediation, intercession, agency, and mission in the name of a principal." Thus the notion of "mandate" can be prominent.[12] Commensurate with this is the fact that the διακον-words often designate honorable tasks of duty or office. Such a usage was not part of everyday language but had a more formal character and included a recognizable place in religious contexts.

In the years after its publication, Collins' stimulating study caused, in some theological circles, a significant shift in the understanding of διακονία.[13] The material he has collected is extensive and well-documented. His book is important not only for exegesis of the NT but for all disciplines depending on such study, for example, ecclesiology. Within Scripture circles the work deserves wide discussion, part of which would obviously comprise the testing of his theses in passages of the NT. In this article I will use Collins' book as background to my investigations of Luke-Acts. However, although I accept Collins' main thesis that διακονία is not merely a designation of merciful and loving assistance to the needy, I do not share his interpretation of διακονία in Acts 6. One reason for this is that Collins has not dealt with the relationship between Acts 6 and Luke 10, a relationship essential to a correct reading of the former passage.

---

[11] Ibid., 89.

[12] In a certain sense this definition resembles the description given in the older lexicon of Carolus Gottlieb Bretschneider, *Lexicon manuale Graeco-Latinum in libros Novi Testamenti, I* (2d ed.; Leipzig: Barth, 1829), where the entry for διάκονος says that a deacon is *cursor, qui mittitur ut nunciet, faciat, adportet aliquid* ("a runner who is sent to announce or do or bring something"). See also LSJ, 398 (on διάκονος).

[13] See Anton Houtepen, "Diakonia als Einladung Gottes. Über den Diakonat als eine missionarische und katechumenale Aufgabe," *Diaconia Christi* 30/3-4 (1995) 33-45; for διακονία in 2 Corinthians, see Reimund Bieringer, "Paul's Understanding of Diakonia in 2 Corinthians 5,18," in *Studies on 2 Corinthians* (ed. Reimund Bieringer and Jan Lambrecht; BETL 112; Leuven: Peeters, 1994) 413-28; see also Dieter Georgi, *The Opponents of Paul in Second Corinthians. A Study of Religious Propaganda in Late Antiquity* (Studies in the New Testament and Its World; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1986).

In this article I will use the research of Collins that focuses on διακονία in Acts 6. Starting with a summary of his thesis regarding Acts 6,[14] I will develop the argument by focusing on the relationship between Luke 10:25-42 and Acts 6:1-7. Some commentators have already established a connection between these two passages, and I would like to examine the implications of that connection more closely and within the specific terms of our own question. Within this context I will try to show that in the two passages Luke (as I will call the author of Luke-Acts) makes a connection between the ministry of the word and the ministry of deeds. Such a connection will be seen to resemble comparable discussions in the later rabbinic tradition concerning the relation between studying and doing.

## II. Acts 6:1-7 as a Narrative about Ministry of the Word within the Book of Acts

Although quite clearly connected to the context, Acts 6:1-7 is, relatively speaking, a literary unity.[15] This unity is above all apparent from the correspondence between 6:1 and 6:7. These notes on the growth of the number of disciples constitute a literary inclusion, but alongside such similarities there is also one important difference: it seems that the growth mentioned in 6:1 was itself the reason for the problems. Acts 6:7 suggests that the solution of the problem leads to further growth. It is significant that 6:1 is the first place in Acts to use the term οἵ μαθηταὶ ("the disciples"). In the Gospel of Luke this term serves to describe the followers of Jesus. Because Jesus is a teacher, his followers are supposed to learn from him. The summary in Acts 6:7 repeats the theme of the growth of the "disciples" (mentioned both in 6:1 and in 6:2). This indicates that the growth of Jesus' teaching concerning the Word of God is one of the primary themes of this passage. Related to the remarks about the spreading of the Word of God, is the pronouncement of the apostles that they will give themselves continually to διακονία of the Word (6:2, 4).

---

[14] See Collins, *Diakonia*, 230-32, and the notes about usage on p. 329.

[15] For the context and literary unity of this passage, see Ralph Neuberth, *Demokratie im Volk Gottes. Untersuchungen zur Apostelgeschichte* (SBB 46; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2001) 20-34.

The corresponding verses 6:1 and 6:7 frame a story on the installation of the Seven. In literature it is often argued that this story has quite a few reminiscences to comparable stories from the OT. Thus, Ralph Neuberth describes Acts 6:1-7 as an installation story,[16] and OT parallels include Gen 41:29-43; Exod 18:13-26; Num 11:1-25; 27:15-23; and Deut 1:9-18.[17] An installation story can be divided into three phases: first, a certain need is recognized in leadership; second, a solution is proposed (in direct speech); and third, the solution is effected by the installation of wise persons as substitutes or assistants to the leader(s). Because of the limitations of this article I will not deal extensively with the structure of OT background models for this passage.[18] However, the fact that OT installation stories are quite clearly presupposed as background to Acts 6:1-7 helps us to interpret this passage. The OT models suggest that in Acts 6:1-7 the service at stake is more like serving as a minister to the Crown than as an attendant in a soup kitchen. Just as Joseph became minister of Pharaoh, just as the seventy are made rulers assisting Moses, and just as the seventy are made prophets, so the seven men in Acts are installed to a public function under someone's direction, as ministers of the apostles and as prophets of the Word of the Lord. Our investigation of the use of the term διακονία in Acts 6:1-7 will corroborate this interpretation.[19]

---

[16] Neuberth, *Demokratie im Volk Gottes,* 54: "Ingesamt weist Apg 6,1-7 aber auch erhebliche Analogien zur Gattung der atl. Bestallungserzählung bzw. zum Einsetzungsbericht auf, auch wenn sich die atl. Parallelen meist etwas umfangreicher präsentieren."

[17] Rudolf Pesch, *Die Apostelgeschichte (Apg 1-12)* (EKKNT 5/1; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1986) 225-226. For a comparison between the vocabulary of Acts 6:1-7 and the passages in the LXX, see Neuberth, *Demokratie im Volk Gottes*, 53-64, esp. 56-64. For the laying-on of hands, see Joseph Coppens, "L'imposition des mains dans les Actes des Apôtres," in *Les Actes des Apôtres. Traditions, rédaction, théologie* (ed. Jacob Kremer; BETL 48; Leuven: Peeters, 1979) 405-38.

[18] See also David Daube, "A Reform in Acts and Its Models," in *Jews, Greeks, and Christians* (ed. Robert Hamerton-Kelly and Robin Scroggs; Leiden: Brill, 1976) 151-63, here 152-53. He argues that the narrative of Acts 6:1-7 is influenced by three OT stories, describing the installation of judges (Exodus 18), the seventy elders (Num 11:24-30), and the officers of the tribes (Deuteronomy 1). Regarding Acts 6:1 he says, that "'murmuring' definitely is not an ordinary term. It recalls the situation in Exodus and Numbers, especially Num 11:1, where the people murmured. The grievance of the people concerns the provision of food, and so, apparently, does the grievance in Acts; compare 'daily diakonia' with collection of Manna (Exod 16:5: 'for day unto day')."

[19] Here there is no space to deal with the use of the verb διακονέω in Luke-Acts (where Luke 22:24-27 is especially important). See Bart J. Koet and Wendy E. S. North,

In his 1990 book Collins argues that with regard to Acts 6:1-7 Luke uses the semantic field διακον- to frame and comment upon the important statement he is making about development and change. In Acts 1:17, 25 the word διακονία designates a function that can be interpreted as synonymous with apostleship (1:25).[20] In Acts 6, in a context of "ministry" and "ministering," Luke returns to the theme of the Twelve and introduces the new theme of the Seven. Because of the solemn character of Acts 6:4 it seems that here διακονία also refers to apostleship. Collins argues that if we are to think that Luke is writing only about the "daily distribution of food" (6:1 NIV; in Greek: διακονία) then there is a surprising inconsistency with the previous and more solemn sense.[21] Translations of the διακον- terms here as "distribution" (6:1), "to give out food" and "to wait at table" (6:2) do not seem to harmonize with the more formal meaning of διακονία in 6:4. Collins argues that in 6:1 as well as in 6:4 διακονία indicates a duty, a public function under someone's direction. In his later books Collins elaborates on this interpretation.[22] In Acts 6:1 we read: "because their widows [i.e., of the *Hellenists*!] were neglected in the daily ministration" (KJV; διακονία). In modern translations of Acts 6:1-7 the Greek word διακονία appears as a broad range of activities—from something like a soup kitchen to the apostolic preaching: "(a) a distribution of food to needy widows; (b) the activity of serving this food at tables; and (c) the prime responsibility of the Twelve."[23]

As mentioned above, Collins suggests that in Acts Luke uses the διακον- terms as code words for the ministry (διακονία) in the sense of "sacred commissions of one kind or another."[24] His ancient audience would relate διακονία in Acts to other kinds of Greek historical and romantic narrative where διακονία held the same connotations.[25] In Acts the word marks major stages in the spread of the Word of God

---

"The Image of Martha in Luke 10,38-42 and in John 11,1-12,8," in *Miracles and Imagery in Luke and John* (ed. Gilbert van Belle et al.; FS Ulrich Busse; BETL 218; Leuven: Peeters, 2008), 47-66.

[20] Collins, *Diakonia*, 213.

[21] Ibid., 230.

[22] John N. Collins, *Deacons and the Church. Making Connections between Old and New* (Leominster: Gracewing, 2002) 47-58; cf. John N. Collins, *Are All Christians Ministers?* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1992) 36-40.

[23] Collins, *Deacons and the Church*, 50.

[24] Ibid., 57.

[25] Ibid.

(Acts 1:17, 25; 6:4; 20:24; 21:19).[26] In Acts 6:1 the translation "distribution of food" does not appear to do justice to this concept.[27] Accordingly, Collins sketches a different interpretation. He argues that in Acts 6 the Greek-speaking members of the community complained against those who spoke Aramaic that their own housebound or shut-in widows were being overlooked in the great preaching that was going on day by day in the environment of the Temple. This is related to the preceding verse (5:42), where we learn that the apostles did not cease to teach daily in the Temple and in every "house." Collins claims a firm connection between 5:42 and Acts 6. Just as in Acts 5 (vv. 12, 18, 29, 40), in Acts 6:2 the apostles are the protagonists.

Because these Greek-speaking widows were without the same freedoms enjoyed by the Jewish women, they were, according to Collins, not free to attend the gatherings in the Temple and he also supposes that they could not understand the apostles. Thus, these widows were in need of preachers who could teach them in Greek when, as Greek-speakers, they came together at their tables (6:2).[28] The Seven are the new group of preachers; they guarantee the increase of the Word: according to Collins, that is what their service at table constitutes.

Collins' argumentation is original and compelling. Part of the scenario of Luke's Gospel is Jesus' long journey through Israel to Jerusalem. Indeed, this is one of the most distinctive features of his gospel. In Acts there is a comparable movement: the long journey of the Word through the world, with Rome as its aim (and new beginning: Acts 28:16-31; see 19:21 and 23:11). Collins rightly stresses that Acts 6 represents a crucial phase in this journey and that the Seven, as a new group of preachers, make a decisive contribution to this continuity.

Concerning Collins' argumentation I have some questions. To me it seems more appropriate to assume that the widows in Acts 6 are Jewish, albeit Greek-speaking.[29] It is quite common to say that by Acts

---

[26] Ibid., 54.

[27] Likewise he argues that διακονία in Acts 11:29 and 12:25 does not refer to help for the needy, but indicates a formal mission, and both accounts include some other indications as to the formal character of the undertaking (ibid., 66-68).

[28] "As speakers of Greek and, further, as widows without the same freedom as Jewish women to take part in the kind of public life that temple worship was, they were neither free to attend the large gatherings in the temple forecourts nor linguistically equipped to understand what these Aramaic preachers were saying" (ibid., 57).

[29] It seems to me that this is exactly the reason for Collins' supposition that they were bound by Greek custom in regard to appearing in public places. I am not so sure

6 the mission among the Gentiles had not yet emerged as an issue, since this mission starts a little bit later. After the spreading of Jesus' teaching exclusively among Jews comes Philip's preaching among the Samaritans (Acts 8:1-5). The move to "the Gentiles" unfolds in the sequence of Acts, beginning with Peter's visit to Cornelius.[30] However, it seems to me that Collins has it right when he refers to the fact that language plays a role in this passage. It is no accident that in 6:9 there is reference to the synagogues of diaspora communities.

Regarding Collins' treatment of διακονία in Acts 6:1, I have further reservations. I think that some material care for the widows is at stake in this story. Within the limitations of this article I will elaborate only one argument. This will be to claim that the interpretation of Acts 6:1-7 could be more reliably developed in light of a parallel text in the Gospel of Luke, the previously mentioned pericope 10:38-42.[31] In approaching this, I will try to show how in both passages we are presented with a discussion about the relationship between learning and doing.[32]

---

that these Greek-speaking Jewish women in Jerusalem would have had less freedom of movement than other Jewish women. For a more general picture, see S. Safrai, "Relations between the Diaspora and the Land of Israel," in *The Jewish People in the First Century. Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions* (ed. S. Safrai and M. Stern; CRINT 1/1; Assen: van Gorcum, 1974) 184-215.

[30] See Bart J. Koet, *Five Studies on Interpretation of Scripture in Luke-Acts* (SNTA 14; Leuven: Peeters, 1989) 143-50; Günter Wasserberg, *Aus Israels Mitte—Heil für die Welt* (BZNW 92; Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 1998) 273-305.

[31] The connection between the two passages is already noted in exegetical literature. Here I refer to an article of Veronica Koperski (although she does not offer an exegesis of these passages): "Luke 10,38-42 and Acts 6,1-7. Women and Discipleship in the Literary Context of Luke-Acts," in *The Unity of Luke-Acts* (ed. Joseph Verheyden; BETL 142; Leuven: Peeters, 1999) 517-44. On the connection between Luke 10:38-42 and Acts 6, Koperski refers to Birger Gerhardsson, *Memory and Manuscript. Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity* (ASNU 22; Uppsala: Gleerup, 1961) 234-45, esp. 239-41. Gerhardsson is one of the few scholars to mention that both texts deal with comparable problems: occupation with the Word of God is placed on a higher level than mundane duties. Neuberth (*Demokratie im Volk Gottes*, 36-39) does show some parallels in vocabulary, but stresses above all the opposition between service of the Word (*Wortdienst*) and table service (*Tischdienst*).

[32] In *A Feminist Companion to Luke* (ed. Amy-Jill Levine; Feminist Companion to the New Testament and Early Christian Writings 3; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002) we find three articles on Luke 10:38-42: Loveday C. Alexander, "Sisters in Adversity: Retelling Martha's Story," 197-213; Warren Carter, "Getting Martha out of the Kitchen," 215-31; Pamela Thimmes, "The Language of Community: A Cautionary Tale (Luke 10:38-42)," 232-45. These authors do not pay much attention to the connections between Luke 10:38-42 and Acts 6:1-7. However, Carter ("Getting Martha out of

## III. Luke 10:38-42

Luke 10:38-42 is part of a larger unit. When we compare the Gospel of Mark with that of Luke, two well-known features emerge. First is "the great omission": the text of Mark 6:45—8:26 does not appear in Luke 9:17-18. Whereas Luke's multiplication of bread (ending at Luke 9:17) is parallel to Mark 6:30-44, and Peter's confession in Luke (beginning at Luke 9:18) parallels Mark 8:27-30, between these two pericopes Mark 6:45—8:26 deals quite extensively with dietary laws and with certain remarkable words and actions of Jesus (including Jesus' voyage to non-Jewish land in Mark 7:24-31). The second important feature in Luke's Gospel is the so-called "great interpolation" (Luke 9:51—19:28). Since Friedrich Schleiermacher, the name of the middle section of Luke's Gospel in exegetical literature has been the "Travel Narrative."[33] In an interesting study Reinhard von Bendemann raises questions about the correctness of this designation.[34] He argues that, especially in regard to Luke 11:1—18:30, other themes are more important than traveling, such as the instruction of the disciples, the call to repentance, and judgment announcements.[35] Though relying on them, the following discussion cannot take von Bendemann's ideas further.

In Luke 10:38-42 a certain motif draws attention to a theme of "learning" that can be of decisive importance for the interpretation of this pericope.[36] Learning is not an insignificant aspect of the preceding pas-

---

the Kitchen," 220-23) does signal the fact that the use of *diakonia* in Luke 10:40 is connected to the use in Acts 6:1-4 and that this connection indicates that in 10:40 *diakonia* does not necessarily mean a preoccupation with kitchen tasks. He argues that Acts 6 and the subsequent narrative show the futility of attempting to differentiate rigidly between these two types of ministry.

[33] Friedrich Schleiermacher, *Über die Schriften des Lukas: Ein kritischer Versuch, I* (Berlin: Reimer, 1817) 161; see Adelbert Denaux, "Old Testament Models for the Lukan Travel Narrative: A Critical Survey," in *The Scriptures in the Gospels* (ed. Christopher M. Tuckett; BETL 131; Leuven: Peeters, 1997) 271-330. For an account of historical-critical research into the Lukan Travel Narrative, see Filip Noël, *The Travel Narrative in the Gospel of Luke: Interpretation of Lk 9,51-19,28* (Collectanea Biblica et Religiosa Antiqua 5; Brussels: Voor Wetenschappen en Kunsten, 2004).

[34] Reinhard von Bendemann, *Zwischen* ΔΟΞΑ *und* ΣΤΑΥΡΟΣ. *Eine exegetische Untersuchung der Texte des sogenannten Reiseberichts im Lukasevangelium* (BZNW 101; Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 2001).

[35] For an extensive review of von Bendemann's book, see Noël, *Travel Narrative*, 208-353.

[36] On the coherence of these passages see Ulrich Busse, "Die Unterweisung im sogenannten 'Reisebericht.' Dargestellt an Lk 10,25-42," in *Die Weisheit—Ursprünge und Rezeption* (ed. Martin Fassnacht et al.; Münster: Aschendorff, 2003) 139-53.

sage also. In the parable of the Good Samaritan (Luke 10:25-37) a certain lawyer comes with a question about "doing": "Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal *life*?" In response, Jesus asks: "What is written in the Law: How readest thou?" (10:26 KJV). The lawyer answers (10:27) by combining a quotation from Deut 6:5 with one from Lev 19:18. The first command stresses the love of YHWH by means of a total personal response with the four faculties of an individual (heart, soul, might, and mind). The love of God is a quite significant Deuteronomic theme.[37] Jesus announces that the lawyer has given the right answer and adds: "*Do* this and you shall live" (10:28). Doing and thus living (sometimes even in combination with learning) is also quite a prominent Deuteronomic theme.[38]

But in 10:28 the interchange between the lawyer and Jesus is not yet over. The man comes up with another question: "Who is my neighbor?" Jesus answers by telling the familiar story, at the end of which the word "doing" is again significantly present. To Jesus' question ("Which of these three, thinkest thou, was neighbor unto him that fell among the thieves?"), the lawyer replies: "He that *did* (ποιήσας) mercy unto him." Jesus concludes: "Go, and *do thou* likewise" (10:37 KJV). In this passage we can see a relation between interpretation of the Torah (ἐν τῷ νόμῳ, 10:26) and praxis; between learning and doing. These elements are quite clear Deuteronomic features. Indeed, a Deuteronomic element in this Lukan story is the actualization of Deuteronomic wisdom, whereby doing leads to living.[39]

In the following pericope (Luke 10:38-42), a relationship between doing and learning is also at stake, but this time from a different angle.[40] On his journey to Jerusalem (cf. 9:51) a certain woman named

---

[37] See, e.g., Deut 11:13, 22; 19:9; 30:16.

[38] Deut 4:1; 5:1-3; 6:24-25; 8:1; 11:8; 12:1; 31:12-13.

[39] Between the composition of Deuteronomy and the rise of the NT, most of Israel's wisdom literature came into being. Although there is not so much overt appeal to the traditions of Israel, there are some parallels, such as between Proverbs and other biblical books. Deuteronomy is an important locus of such parallels, as has been shown by Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972) 62-65. For Luke as using Deuteronomic material, see David P. Moessner, *Lord of the Banquet. The Literary and Theological Significance of the Lukan Travel Narrative* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989).

[40] Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke* (2 vols.; AB 28, 28A; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1981-1985) 2.891, argues that this story is unrelated to the preceding passages. However, for their close connection with Luke 10:38-42, see Carter, "Getting Martha out of the Kitchen," 216-18.

Martha (which means something like "mistress")[41] receives Jesus in her home.[42] Carter rightly argues that Martha thus appears here as an embodiment of the positive responses named throughout chapter 10: "In *receiving* Jesus, Martha is a child of peace (Lk. 10:6) who has encountered God's reign (Lk. 10:9)."[43] He adds that Martha's *receiving* (ὑπεδέξατο) of Jesus signifies an embracing of his eschatological mission: a fact evident from the six uses of *dechomai* prior to chapter 10 (see Luke 2:28; 8:13; 9:48 [4x]). It also expresses openness to the Word of God. Carter concludes that Martha appears as a model disciple in contrast to those who do not receive Jesus' messengers (9:52-53; 10:10).[44]

This woman has a sister named Mary.[45] Mary is first described as Martha's sister and only after this receives her name. This construction and the beginning rhyme of these names (*Mar*tha and *Mar*y) suggest that these two sisters have a special relation, and we will see that the attitudes they seem to represent are not oppositional but are in a relationship of kinship. Carter argues that Mary, like Martha, is responding in a positive way to Jesus. The verb used to denote her listening (10:39: ἤκουεν) appears in Luke 10:16 as an antonym for "rejecting" the disciples, Jesus, and God, and hence as a synonym for "receiving them" (see also Luke 10:23-24). To hear is the desired response to Jesus and his

---

[41] Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 2.893; Koet and North, "The Image of Martha."

[42] Note that some important manuscripts underline Martha's independent position by including the phrase "into the house" (P³ S) or "into her house" (A D W).

[43] Carter, "Getting Martha out of the Kitchen," 217.

[44] Ibid., 218. It is interesting to note that Cyril of Alexandria in his homily on Luke 10:38-42 (*Hom. 69 In Lucam*) sees this passage as a story about Christ as the one who is received; for the text, see Jean-Baptiste Chabot, *S. Cyrilli Alexandrini Commentarii in Lucam, Pars Prior* (CSCO 70; Louvain: Imprimerie Orientaliste, 1961) 273-77.

[45] Because of the limited objective of this article I cannot deal with the interesting role of this passage in feminist exegesis. Besides the articles previously noted in *A Feminist Companion to Luke* (ed. Amy-Jill Levine), see also Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her. A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins* (London: SCM, 1983) 165; for a critical review of her position, see John N. Collins, "Did Luke Intend a Disservice to Women in the Martha and Mary Story," *BTB* 28/3 (1998) 104-11. For other literature from a feminist angle, see Turid Karlsen Seim, *The Double Message: Patterns of Gender in Luke-Acts* (Edinburgh: Clark, 1994) 97-118; Barbara E. Reid, *Choosing the Better Part? Women in the Gospel of Luke* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1996) 144-62; Sabine Bieberstein, *Verschwiegene Jüngerinnen—vergessene Zeugnissen. Gebrochene Konzepte im Lukasevangelium* (NTOA 38; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998) 123-43.

teaching. Carter suggests that this indicates the joint participation of the sisters in the community of the disciples of Jesus.[46]

Mary sits down at the feet of "the Lord" (so P³ S) and is listening to his Word. Birger Gerhardsson suggests that she sits among the other disciples.[47] To be "sitting at (his) feet" is to assume the position of a disciple at the feet of the master (cf. Luke 8:35), just as Paul declares that he was "brought up in this city at the feet of Gamaliel" (Acts 22:3).[48] "Mistress/Boss" Martha is wheeling about with much serving.[49] She is the one who receives Jesus as a guest (Luke 10:38). Her activities are summarized as "much serving" (πολλὴν διακονίαν).[50] She reproaches Jesus: "Lord, dost thou not care that my sister left me to minister (διακονεῖν)?" (10:40 KJV).[51]

Jesus calls Martha twice by name. Elsewhere in Scripture, such a double naming can be the beginning of a call narrative, as in the case of Moses (Exod 3:4) and of the apostle Paul (Acts 9:4; 22:7; 26:14).[52] Jesus answers her that she is being anxious (μεριμνᾷς)[53] and that she is troubled (θορυβάζῃ; NT *hapax*) about much, but that only one thing is necessary. Mary has chosen that good part which will not be taken away (οὐκ ἀφαιρεθήσεται) from her.[54] From this we see that being a disciple, on the one hand, and being engaged in ministering and doing, on the other, seem to be in opposition: Mary is learning and Martha has a certain διακονία.

---

[46] Carter, "Getting Martha out of the Kitchen," 218.

[47] Gerhardsson (*Memory and Manuscript,* 239) refers to Harald Riesenfeld's observation that the formula ἢ καὶ, "who also" (which is not in all the manuscripts), seems to imply that she is not sitting alone at the feet of the Master, but with other disciples.

[48] For comparable rabbinic usage see *m. Abot* 1:4.

[49] For this translation, see also 10:40 Vulg.: *Martha autem satagebat circa frequens ministerium* ("Martha however was busied with constant serving"). It will be not coincidental that the verb περισπάω is often used in a military context, for instance, to describe the activities of a general (LSJ 1386).

[50] Bieberstein (*Verschwiegene Jüngerinnen,* 137) rightly refers to the fact that in 10:38-42 Martha's qualities are above all positive. As one of her arguments she uses the meaning of Martha's name.

[51] Here we find the same verb as in Acts 6.

[52] Compare the double naming of Abraham in Gen 22:11.

[53] On this verb see LSJ 1104.

[54] The difficulty in interpreting (or digesting) this sentence is clear from the number of Greek textual variants; cf. Reid, *Choosing the Better Part?*, 149.

Jesus stresses that listening to the "Word" (his teaching) is the good part.[55] As Joseph Fitzmyer argues, in a way it is to repeat the Lukan message of 8:15, 21.[56] However, this is not to say that the status quo of the relationship between the sisters remains. Although the good part will not be taken from Mary, there is room left for Martha. She can become Jesus' disciple too. In this story Jesus emphasizes that the learning process is the better part. This part can not be taken away from anyone. This concurs to a certain extent with Jesus' enigmatic pronouncement in Luke 19:26 KJV (// Matt 25:29): "Unto every one which has shall be given, and from him that has not, even that he has shall be taken away" ($ἀρθήσεται$; this Greek word is, however, not derived from the same root as in 10:42).

Luke 10:38-42 can thus be considered—although to say so may be a slight exaggeration—as Martha's call to discipleship. Martha's work is certainly not to be described as lowly service. She is the mistress, the house-owner, the boss, who can receive such an important guest as Jesus, who can have the management of a house, and who dares to admonish her guest and to ask him to teach Mary a lesson. The opposition apparent in this is not a contrast between low work and high position; rather, the opposition is between doing and learning as two possible aspects of being a disciple.

## IV. Acts 6:1-7 as a Narrative about Ministry of the Word in Light of Luke 10:38-42

Martha's occupation or business is described in Luke 10:40 by the Greek word $διακονία$. It is the only place in the gospels that this noun appears. However, in Acts (which, with most NT scholars, I regard as the sequel to the Gospel of Luke) it occurs eight times. The most important parallel to Luke 10:38-42 is Acts 6 where an opposition is at stake, resembling the one in Luke 10:38-42. In Acts 6 the theme of murmuring recalls the people's murmuring in the desert (Num 11:1). However, to a certain extent, reproaching is also part of the link between Acts 6:1-7 and Luke 10:38-42. Martha's reproach of Jesus is one of the key elements in this episode and the occasion for Jesus' answer.

---

[55] See Neuberth, *Demokratie im Volk Gottes*, 74.
[56] Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 2.892; see Carter, "Getting Martha out of the Kitchen."

Apart from the thematic parallels, it is also important to note quite a few remarkable similarities between the words chosen in Acts 6:1-7 and those used in Luke 10:38-42. In her question to Jesus, Martha combines the verb διακονέω with the verb καταλείπω ("leave").[57] The latter verb appears in Matt 19:5 and Mark 10:7, the famous quotation from Gen 2:24 regarding a man's leaving of his parents and his cleaving to his wife. Elsewhere in the NT, καταλείπω occurs in other situations dealing with important choices. In Luke 5:28 Levi has to leave everything when he follows Jesus, while in 15:4 the shepherd leaves ninety-nine sheep in his choice for the lost sheep. To be sure, in Acts 6:2 and Luke 10:40 there is the important choice between two different forms of διακονία. In both passages the notion of "Word" is important: in Luke 10:39 it is indicating Jesus' teaching, while in Acts 6:2, 4, 7 it refers to the teaching of the apostles. In both passages a crucial role is played by the word χρεία ("need" or "task").[58] Finally, in both texts we hear explicitly about choices: Mary chooses to be a disciple, while the whole multitude chooses (ἐκλέγομαι)[59] the seven men. The fact that Acts 6:1 is the first time that the term "disciple," so well-known from the gospels, appears in Acts contributes to the whole context of learning (see also Acts 6:7).

These similarities of vocabulary and theme between the two passages can be taken as an indication that Luke seems to have made a connection between them, thus inviting his readers to enter into a comparison. Thus, the passage Luke 10:38-42 (and its context) lends itself to being interpreted by Acts 6:1-7 (and vice versa). This is, more often than not, Luke's strategy. For example, he divides allusions and quotations among several phases of his story. In the presumed source of Luke 8:1-15 (namely Mark 4:1-20), we find an extended allusion to Isa 6:9 (cf. the quotation in Matt 13:14-15). Luke cuts this allusion down and postpones an elaborate use of the text to the last chapter of Acts by quoting Isa 6:9-10 in Acts 28:25c-27.[60] We can conclude that in both

---

[57] This verb appears 4x in Matthew; 4x in Mark; 4x in Luke; 5x in Acts; 7x elsewhere in the NT; see Acts 6:2.

[58] This noun occurs 7x in Luke; 5x in Acts; 37x elsewhere in the NT.

[59] This verb is present 1x Mark; 4x Luke; 5x John; 7x Acts; 5x elsewhere in the NT.

[60] See Bart J. Koet, "Isaiah in Luke-Acts," in *Isaiah in the New Testament* (ed. Steve Moyise and Maarten J. J. Menken; London/New York: Clark, 2005) 79-100, esp.

of our passages there is a comparable opposition or contrast. In Luke 10:38-42 Martha's διακονία is more or less contrasted with the discipleship of Mary, while in Acts 6:1-7 the διακονία of the Word (Acts 6:4) is likewise contrasted with the "ministering of tables" (διακονεῖν τραπέζαις, 6:2).

The introduction to the latter passage mentions that at a time of significant growth in the number of disciples there was "murmuring among the Hellenists" (γογγυσμὸς τῶν Ἑλληνιστῶν) against the "Hebrews."[61] The widows of the "Hellenists" were neglected in the daily διακονία. The apostles call the multitude of the disciples together and argue that it is not acceptable (or "pleasing") that the apostles leave the Word in order to minister at tables. Therefore, the multitude of disciples has to look for seven men of honest report (*boni testimonii* in the Vulgate) whom the apostles may appoint to meet this "need" (6:3).[62] The apostles themselves are planning to "adhere firmly" (προσκαρτερέω)[63] to prayer and to the διακονία of the Word (6:4); for adhering firmly to prayer, we may compare Acts 1:14 and 2:42.[64]

In Acts 6 the διακονία of the Word and the ministering of tables are to a certain extent in competitive tension. Collins saw in the ministering of tables a kind of house-preaching to the Hellenists' widows, who were in need of preachers who could teach them in Greek. However, the quite strong parallel with Luke 10:38-42 suggests something else. In that passage Martha's διακονία—in other words, her being a mistress of the house—is opposed to Mary's listening as a disciple to Jesus' Word. Martha's service is clearly not—as is quite often suggested—a housewifely job or, even worse, some work usually done by "slaves." As the

---

95-99; reprinted in Bart J. Koet, *Dreams and Scripture in Luke-Acts: Collected Essays* (CBET 42; Leuven: Peeters, 2006) 51-79.

[61] For text-critical remarks and analysis of the structure of the passage, see Neuberth, *Demokratie im Volk Gottes*, 1-92.

[62] For a discussion of Acts 6, see Gottfried Schille, "Konfliktlösung durch Zuordnung. Der Tischdienst der Sieben nach Apg 6," in *Diakonie—biblische Grundlagen und Orientierungen. Ein Arbeitsbuch* (ed. Gerhard K. Schäfer and Theodor Strohm; Veröffentlichungen des Diakoniewissenschaftlichen Instituts an der Universität Heidelberg 2; 3d ed.; Heidelberg: Winter, 1998) 243-59.

[63] On this verb see LSJ 1515.

[64] Besides prayer, Acts 2:42 also mentions adhering firmly to the teaching of the apostles and the fellowship and the breaking of bread (cf. 2:46). In Acts 6 prayer belongs to the *diakonia* of the Word and the ministering of the tables. In Jewish tradition there is a triangle of Torah, prayer and service (*m. Abot* 1:2).

owner of the house, she is in charge and responsible for the material care of guests during Jesus' visit (a quite clear "learning session").[65] The apostles stress that the διακονία of the Word takes precedence, but not at the expense of the ministering of tables. In Acts 6 it is a service to the widows.

At this point in the discussion, I think it may be worthwhile to ponder the symbolic value of the widows who are in need within the narrative. Elsewhere in Scripture (Exod 22:22; Deut 10:18; 14:29; Isa 1:17; Jas 1:26-27), a widow is often a symbol of somebody with material need. Although it is quite clear that the laws of charity toward widows were aimed at caring for those who were deprived of the financial care of a husband, it should also be remembered that in days of famine widows were the first to suffer (1 Kgs 17:1, 8-24; Luke 4:25-26).[66]

Another argument, then, for the thesis that the ministering of tables involves material care seems to be the use of the word τράπεζα ("table") elsewhere in biblical literature.[67] Here it seems to me sufficient only to mention the fact that in Luke-Acts the word τράπεζα is used exactly in a context of material care, whether in sharing food (Luke 16:21; 22:21, 30; Acts 16:34; cf. Matt 15:27; Mark 7:28; Tob 2:2) or for business (Luke 19:23/ Matt 21:12/ Mark 11:15). In this context it is also quite illuminating to see how Ben Sira employs the word τράπεζα in the context of hospitality and thus material care, referring to table situations where there is a lack or an abundance of food (Sir 6:10; 14:10; 29:26; 31:12; 40:29 LXX).[68]

In Acts 6, the seven men are chosen to meet the needs of hungry widows. However, as we will see in the surrounding chapters of Acts, there is no exclusive division between material care and the διακονία of the Word.[69] Such can be determined from Acts 5:1-2. Here Ananias

---

[65] Perhaps in this sense we may also understand the role of Phoebe, who is called "deacon of the church in Cenchreae" (Rom 16:1) as well as "patron" (Rom 16:2).

[66] For widows in Luke as persons in need, see also Luke 7:11-17; 18:1-8; 21:1-4, esp. 21:4; cf. Mark 12:40. In Codex D and some other manuscripts of Mark 12:40 we find the addition "orphans," which stresses the connotation that a widow could be seen as a person in need.

[67] See also LSJ 1810.

[68] On the banquet tradition in Ben Sira, see Dennis E. Smith, *From Symposium to Eucharist: The Banquet in the Early Christian World* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003) 134-44.

[69] For their election some qualifications are required; they have to be πλήρεις πνεύματος [ἁγίου] καὶ σοφίας ("full of the [Holy] Spirit and wisdom": Acts 6:3). These

brings a part of his money and lays it at the feet of the apostles (the place where disciples are supposed to be and where learning is the issue; see Acts 22:3), thus suggesting that the apostles are responsible for the material side of the nascent and growing community. This indicates that the same part of their responsibility is also at stake in Acts 6:2. However, if this part of their responsibility seems to be at the expense of their preaching and learning, then the apostles argue that this διακονία of the Word *here* takes precedence over the ministering of tables. The seven men from Acts 6 get the commission to replace the apostles and thus to share with them the διακονία of the table. In Acts 6:1-7 they take over a material part-time responsibility of the apostles, but in the following chapters it becomes clear that they also share in the διακονία of the Word. In Acts 6, as in Luke 10:38-42, we find a plea for the importance of the Word (either in the form of learning, of preaching, or of something else), although the importance of the Word does not prevent material care from being a part of it.[70]

Moreover, elsewhere in Luke-Acts the verb διακονέω ("minister")[71] is related to "caring for" people. In Luke 8:1-3 we read of how some women who have been healed by Jesus share their "substance" with him and the Twelve. The women mentioned here are quite clearly comparable to the wealthy women of Acts. Turid Karlsen Seim rightly argues that the expression ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐταῖς ("from their substance" or "from the things belonging to them") presupposes that these women have means at their own disposal.[72] As in Luke 10:38-42, sharing belongings (including one's wealth) is related to the verb διακονέω. So then, the women in 8:3 are depicted, like Martha in 10:38-42, as women who are independent in means and socially well-to-do. Sharing wealth with such an important teacher as Jesus is not the same as doing lowly housekeeping like the laundry.[73] Dirk Jonas argues that Jesus, in his

---

qualifications indicate that the Seven have to be qualified for being leaders or teachers. For this background, see Axel von Dobbeler, *Der Evangelist Philippus in der Geschichte des Urchristentums: eine prosopographische Skizze* (Texte und Arbeiten zum neutestamentlichen Zeitalter 30; Tübingen: Francke, 2000) 258-63.

[70] Collins (*Diakonia,* 245) argues that in the gospel, the words mainly designate menial attendance of one kind or another.

[71] The verb occurs 37x in the NT (6x Matthew; 5x Mark; 8x Luke; 3x John; 2x Acts; 5x Paul; 3x Pastoral Epistles; 2x Hebrews; 3x First Peter).

[72] Seim, *The Double Message*, 64.

[73] Therefore I disagree with Seim, *The Double Message*, 72, who argues that the healing of the women had the effect of confirming their conventional role. In Luke

answer to Martha, does not pick up the semantic field of service.[74] However, Jonas fails to recognize that Luke does use this field because he lets Jesus refer (via his mentioning of the better part) to listening to the Word in 10:39. This listening to the Word is, for him, part of the semantic field of διακονία in Acts 6:1-7. It is exactly because Jonas limits διακονία too much to service that he fails to make the link between the two different attitudes of *diakonia* at stake in Luke 10:38-42.

Nevertheless, material care and the διακονία of the Word are like sisters: they belong together. In Luke 10 and Acts 6 it is argued that in their relation there may even be, not a difference of importance, but (as I would like to suggest) a difference in time. In Luke 10:38-42 and in Acts 6:1-7, it is assumed that the διακονία of the Word (in a sense, a kind of collective noun for Jesus' teachings) precedes material care. Indeed, we find that the διακονία of the Word precedes doing, since elsewhere in the Gospel (for instance, in Luke 6:47 and 8:21) there is a stress on the fact that listening comes before doing (compare Luke 18:18, and see Deut 5:1).

## V. Epilogue: Learning and Doing in Rabbinic Judaism

In rabbinic tradition the relation between learning and doing is hotly debated. There is a discussion among the rabbis about the question whether learning or doing is more important. We can find an example of such a discussion in an explanation of Deuteronomy, the *Sifre* to Deuteronomy.[75] At the beginning of this discussion Deut 11:13 is quoted: "And it will come to pass, if you shall hearken diligently unto

---

10:38-42 as well in Luke 8:3 this seems not to be the case. It could be even argued as a consequence that the use of διακονέω in Luke 4:39 does not indicate that Peter's mother-in-law has a traditional serving role in the family.

[74] For the cognate terms, see Dirk Jonas, "Diakonein—Diakonia—Diakonos. Studien zum Verständnis des Dienstes ('Diakonie') bei Markus und Lukas," in *Diakonische Konturen. Theologie im Kontext sozialer Arbeit* (ed. Volker Herrmann et al.; Veröffentlichungen des Diakoniewissenschaftlichen Instituts an der Universität Heidelberg 18; Heidelberg: Winter, 2003) 63-126, esp. 94.

[75] *Sifre to Deuteronomy*, Piska 41 (a commentary on Deut 11:13). The *Sifre* is a running exegetical Midrash to the Book of Deuteronomy, often expounding verse by verse and chapter by chapter. It is a collection of various interpretations of Deuteronomy. Because the *Sifre* to Deuteronomy and to Numbers were not cited in the Talmudim, it seems that they were arranged and edited no earlier than the end of the fourth century C.E.

my commandments."[76] As a first interpretation the rabbinic preacher argues that this verse is connected with Deut 5:1,[77] and the preacher quotes the last phrase: "that you may learn them and keep on doing them." After quite a number of references to other scriptural passages, the following discussion is put forward to support and explain this statement.

> Once Rabbi Tarfon, Rabbi Akiba and Rabbi Jose the Galilean were reclining at Bet' Aris in Lod, when this question was presented to them: What is greater: learning or doing?[78] Rabbi Tarfon said: greater is doing. Rabbi Akiba said: greater is learning. Every one present agreed that study is great; for study leads to doing.[79]

Rabbi Tarfon is the first to answer. He argues that the doing (i.e., practice) is great(er). Rabbi Akiba, however, votes for learning, but before the reader gets the impression that it is about real alternatives, all together answer: great is learning, because it leads to practice. This way the statement of Rabbi Akiba is deepened. At first it is said that learning is more important than doing. Consequently it is explained why: learning leads to doing, which in a certain sense even suggests that doing and practice may be the most important. Regarding this text, Pierre Lenhardt and Peter von der Osten-Sacken stress that the most important factor is that this learning and doing are not (simply) opposed, but that their relationship is depicted as complementary. In other words, learning is not played off against doing, nor are study and practice put in opposition; rather, they belong together in Jewish tradition.[80]

---

[76] The following statement is left out: "which I command you this day to love your God and to serve him with all your heart and with all your soul."

[77] "Hear O Israel, the statutes and judgments which I speak in your ears this day, that you may learn them and keep on doing them."

[78] Here and in the next sentences: literally "great" instead of "greater."

[79] The translation is mine. For the Hebrew text with German translation and notes, see Pierre Lenhardt and Peter von der Osten-Sacken, *Rabbi Akiba. Texte und Interpretationen zum rabbinischen Judentum und Neuen Testament* (ANTZ 1; Berlin: Institut Kirche und Judentum, 1987) 200-21, esp. 202-203. The fact that there are several variants of this discussion indicates that it was an important issue.

[80] Lenhardt and von der Osten-Sacken, *Rabbi Akiba*, 214.

Although the words and ideas used are not always the same, the relationship between these two aspects appears elsewhere in rabbinic traditions. In the well-known tractate *Pirqe Abot*, one of the first statements is by Simeon the Righteous, who used to say: "On three things does the world stand: (1) on the Torah, (2) and on Temple service, (3) and on acts of loving kindness" (*m. Abot* 1:2).[81] We see here the combination of study, praying, and charity. An interesting saying regarding the relationship between studying and doing is also to be found in *m.Abot.* 1:17. Simeon, the son of Gamaliel says: "(1) All my life I grew up among the sages and have found nothing better for a person [the body] than silence. (2) And not the learning is the main thing but the doing. (3) And whoever talks too much causes sin" (*m. Abot* 1:17).[82] The examples mentioned here point to a discussion in Jewish circles concerning the relationship between learning the Torah and doing its commandments. It is an essential characteristic of rabbinic literature that no one statement expresses the whole truth, but that the juxtaposition of different points of view is passed on. From the times of the Deuteronomist the theme of learning and doing was important. The texts of *Sifre*, and maybe also the texts of *Pirqe Abot*, belong to that chain of discussions.

It is argued by the great Jewish scholar, Abraham Joshua Heschel, that Jewish thinking and living can only be adequately understood in terms of a dialectic pattern, containing opposite or contrasted properties.[83] As in a magnet, the ends of which have opposite magnetic qualities, these terms are opposite to one another and exemplify a polarity which lies at the very heart of Judaism. We can find in the above-mentioned rabbinic texts (and their parallels) a dilemma which has quite a few elements in common with Luke 10:38-42 and Acts 6:1-7.[84] In the NT we find analogous discussions, albeit with different terms (which is to

---

[81] Jacob Neusner, *The Mishnah: A New Translation* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1988) 673.

[82] Ibid., 674.

[83] Abraham Joshua Heschel, *God in Search of Man. A Philosophy of Judaism*, (New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 1976 [first edition 1955]) 336-40.

[84] Although this text is admittedly much later than our texts from the NT, the discussions are certainly older than their final redaction. Between the two passages from Luke-Acts on the one hand and the rabbinic text on the other there are some rather remarkable conceptual resemblances. A discussion about learning at table—quite comparable with a symposium—was not totally unknown to the rabbis. We find such learning discussions also in the NT (e.g., Luke 14:1-24).

be expected because the texts of the NT are in Greek, and the rabbinic writings in Hebrew or Aramaic), but with comparable concepts.[85]

In the parable of the Good Samaritan, the narration revolves around the question: what am I to do to inherit eternal life? Jesus answers by referring to Deuteronomy. In this book, but also elsewhere in the OT and in Jesus' teaching, we find clues about the things to *do*. In this teaching (Luke 10:27), Jesus refers to Deut 6:5, and the message of the whole passage can be summarized in the phrase: "praxis is more important." However, as is clear from the following passage, the story of Mary and Martha, learning of the Word is the better part. Jesus stresses the fact that Mary may keep her part. Implicitly the possibility remains open that Martha too can start to sit down at the Lord's feet, because everybody can become a disciple of Jesus. Mary and Martha are sisters within a family; similarly in their story, their attitudes— the busy διακονία of Martha and the learning of Mary—are related: these attitudes belong together. As elsewhere in his two-volume work, Luke gives his readers the opportunity to interpret a passage from the Gospel with one from Acts. Even more than in Luke 10:38-42, in Acts 6:1-7 the διακονία of the Word (semantically related with teaching and preaching Jesus' lessons; cf. Acts 5:42) happens to take precedence. Yet the serving at the tables, the caring for the widows has also to be provided.

Now I will return briefly to the work of Collins. He has delivered a very important contribution to the "demythologizing" of the concept of διακονία. Although he rightly stresses that in Acts 6 διακονία and its cognates do not refer to lowly forms of service, I do not think that they refer only to the preaching of the Word. In Acts 6 the widows also have a material problem. The apostles, who are also responsible for the economic welfare and financial administration of the communities (as is clear from Acts 5), start to share this responsibility with the Seven. This arrangement facilitates their concentration on preaching.

However, in line with Jesus and his Old Testament inspiration, this preaching calls for action, particularly on behalf of widows (and orphans). In Acts 6 the Seven start with taking care of material needs on behalf of the apostles but, as becomes clear from the narrative of Acts, this is not their only task. Just like Martha, they are also invited

---

[85] Besides Jas 1:22-27, see also Jas 2:20-25 and its "counterparts" in Gal 2:15-21 and Rom 2:13.

to embrace both responsibilities, not only the διακονία at table but also the responsibility for the Word. Immediately after Acts 6 we read that both Stephen and Philip begin to evangelize. That these Seven are meant not only for material care is also suggested by the writer of Acts when the story later returns to Philip. The narrative mentions that Philip is one of the Seven but calls him first Philip the evangelist (Acts 21:8). In this last reference to the Seven, it is also clear that they have an important responsibility for the Word. Luke T. Johnson argued that the problem of Acts 6:1-7 is that there is no obvious relation between the purported role of the Seven and their actual function.[86] I would like to argue that attending to material care and attending to the Word of God have a dialectic relation, and thus they belong together.[87]

---

# Participial Aspect and the Lamb's Paradigmatic Witness in Revelation 13:8

VINCENT SKEMP

This essay examines the ambiguous syntax of Rev 13:8b, focusing particularly on the difficulty of making sense grammatically of the neuter, attributive, perfect middle-passive participle *τοῦ ἐσφαγμένου* when it is read with the prepositional phrase *ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου*. The Greek of Rev 13:8 (Nestle-Aland 27ᵗʰ edition) is as follows: *καὶ προσκυνήσουσιν αὐτὸν πάντες οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς οὗ οὐ γέγραπται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τῆς ζωῆς τοῦ ἀρνίου τοῦ ἐσφαγμένου ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου.* (I withhold translations deliberately at this point.) The syntactical problem *in nuce*: should one take the prepositional phrase *ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου* with the perfect indicative passive *γέγραπται*, as is the case in the almost identical clause in Rev 17:8, or with the immediately preceding words, *τοῦ ἀρνίου τοῦ ἐσφαγμένου*, in which case there is the unexpected notion that the Lamb was slaughtered or was to be slaughtered from the foundation of the world? The syntax is ambiguous and can be read either way.[1] The latter reading of the syntax, however, leads to christological and soteriological questions that require a grammatical explanation: Does the clause situate the cross before time or beyond

---

[1] On the fluidity of word order in Greek prose, see John Dewar Denniston, *Greek Prose Style* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1952, repr. 1960) 8, 42; Kenneth James Dover, *Greek Word Order* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1960). An early form of this study was presented at the Catholic Biblical Association meeting on August 8, 2004, in Halifax, Nova Scotia. I am grateful to Jeremy Corley and Deirdre Blair Brennan for commenting on drafts of this essay.

time in pre-history/meta-history or does it refer to God predetermining the Lamb's death?

While examining the history of interpretation of this syntactical problem, I have noticed two problematic tendencies. First, both those in favor of and those against reading τοῦ ἀρνίου τοῦ ἐσφαγμένου with ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου have tended to bypass discussion of the aspectual force and relative temporal valency of the perfect participle τοῦ ἐσφαγμένου. Second, there is a curious tendency to read the preposition ἀπό ("from") as semantically equivalent to πρό ("before"). While presuppositions regarding verbal aspect and tense guide understandings of the perfect participle, imprecise readings of the preposition ἀπό seem to derive from 1 Pet 1:20, a text that is often proposed as analogous to Rev 13:8, and/or possibly from the RSV translation.[2] While it is beyond the scope of this study to provide a comprehensive solution to the syntactical problem, my aim is to challenge questionable tendencies in some interpretations. In particular, I want to emphasize that the prepositions ἀπό and πρό are semantically distinct and that the aspectual force of the perfect participle should not be ignored.

My overarching thesis is twofold. First, John inserts τοῦ ἀρνίου τοῦ ἐσφαγμένου here (though not in 17:8) precisely to connect Christ's witness with the exhortation to the audiences to perseverance, ὑπομονή, in 13:10. The phrase τοῦ ἀρνίου τοῦ ἐσφαγμένου, in tandem with the narrator's dramatic direct address to the audiences in vv 9-10, belongs with the notion of Christ's witness as paradigmatic for the conduct of the holy ones facing *thlipsis* (1:9; 2:9; 7:14, distress, trouble)[3] in the communities of western Asia Minor (1:2, 5, 9; 5:5-6; 11:7-8; 12:10-11; cf. 3:14; 22:20).[4] This part of my thesis stands, I will argue, regardless of how

---

[2] The influential clause in 1 Pet 1:20 reads, προεγνωσμένου μὲν πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, "He was foreknown before the foundation of the world." The RSV translation of Rev 13:8b is: ". . . every one whose name has not been written before the foundation of the world in the book of life of the Lamb that was slain."

[3] Scholars today are quick to point out that evidence of systematic persecution of the tiny Jesus movement communities during Domitian's reign is hard to come by. See Leonard L. Thompson, *The Book of Revelation: Apocalypse and Empire* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990) esp. 95-115, 171-201. Adela Yarbro Collins (*Crisis and Catharsis: The Power of the Apocalypse* [Philadelphia: Westminster, 1984] 84-110) writes of a "perceived crisis."

[4] This part of my thesis is in substantial agreement with Loren T. Stuckenbruck ("Revelation" in *Eerdmans Commentary on the Bible* [ed. James D. G. Dunn, John W. Rogerson; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003] 1535-72, here 1556) and his doctoral

one reads the syntax. Second, commentators who opt for the more difficult reading, viz., taking τοῦ ἀρνίου τοῦ ἐσφαγμένου with ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, must explain their reasoning without bypassing the problem of the participle. At issue is whether the more difficult reading makes sense grammatically in terms of verbal aspect and a participle's relative temporal valency. I shall argue that this more difficult reading is a viable option grammatically and that one need not resort to Semitic interference to explain John's use of the perfect participle here. The perfect system in Greek was often used to express complexity[5] and John's Apocalypse employs the perfect participle of the verb σφαζεῖν to refer to the first element of the complex reality of the Lamb's death-resurrection.

This study is divided into the following sections. First, a brief overview of the history of interpretation of this verse provides a framework for the current debate. Ancient commentators anticipate modern questions and concerns even as their mode of interpretation reflects different presuppositions. Meanwhile the relatively recent debate on Greek aspect has largely been ignored by modern scholars, who instead have tended to propose parallels in 1 Pet 1:20, *Ass. Mos.* 1:14, and *Gos. Phil.* 53, 8-9 to understand Rev 13:8b. A closer look at these texts is necessary to determine whether the parallels actually shed light on the verse. This first section on the history of interpretation concludes by considering an understanding of Rev 13:8 that has become relatively common recently: that the verse refers to the Lamb's death in pre- or meta-history. The second part of this essay provides a closer look at the participle τοῦ ἐσφαγμένου in Rev 13:8 with special attention to presuppositions regarding aspect in general and participial aspect in particular. The goal of this section is to inject grammatical considerations regarding Greek aspect into the christological debate. Part three examines whether

---

student Ronald Herms (*An Apocalypse for the Church and for the World: The Narrative Function of Universal Language in the Book of Revelation* [BZNW 143; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006] 215), who understand the verse as referring to Christ's paradigmatic witness for the communities in Asia Minor. In my view, however, Christ's paradigmatic witness can be inferred in 13:8 without reading τοῦ ἀρνίου τοῦ ἐσφαγμένου with ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου. See also Brian K. Blount, *Can I Get A Witness. Reading Revelation through African American Culture* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2005) x and 69-89; Mathias Rissi, *Time and History. A Study on the Revelation* (trans. Gordon Winsor; Richmond, VA: John Knox, 1966) 88.

[5] Stanley E. Porter, *Idioms of the Greek New Testament* (Biblical Languages: Greek 2; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992) 23-24.

Semitic interference might factor into the grammatical function of the participle in this verse. The fourth and last section of this study examines Rev 13:8 in its wider literary context in John's Apocalypse. It is in this section that I shall examine a few instances of the perfect participles elsewhere in the Apocalypse; provide an explanation for John's use of the aorist to refer to the Lamb's death in certain circumstances in comparison with his preference elsewhere for employing the perfect participle to refer to the death-resurrection; and explore how 13:8 functions within its immediate context of 13:1-10, where the beast parodies the Lamb (13:1-6), the holy ones are defeated (13:7), and John addresses the ancient audiences directly in 13:9-10.

## I. A Brief Overview of the History of Interpretation of Rev 13:8

### (a) Interpretations in the First Millennium

Some ancient interpreters noted the syntactical ambiguity of Rev 13:8b while others bypassed the problem.[6] Among the more interesting ancient readings of 13:8 is that of Oecumenius (6th century), who inserts τοῦ οὐρανοῦ in place of τοῦ ἀρνίου, which is an effort to read Rev 13:8-10 via Luke 10:20 and avoid the problem.[7] In the early 8th century the

---

[6] Ancient commentators who address Rev 13:8 but are silent on the grammatical ambiguity include Caesarius of Arles (early 6th century; PL 35, Homilia X); Andrew of Caesarea in Cappadocia (late 6th century; PG 106 §56); and Primasius of Hadrumetum (6th century; CCSL XCII, 196). For a listing of ancient commentaries on John's Apocalypse, see Charles Kannengiesser, *Handbook of Patristic Exegesis: The Bible in Ancient Christianity* (2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 2004) 1.368-73; Henry Barclay Swete, *The Apocalypse of St. John. The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes, and Indices* (London: MacMillan & Co., 1906) cxciii-ccii. The bibliography by Francis X. Gumerlock ("Ancient Commentaries on the Book of Revelation: A Bibliographical Guide," paper given at the Southeastern Regional Meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society, Bryan College, Dayton, TN, March 7-8, 2003, available on-line at http://www .tren.com) lists at least thirty commentaries on the Apocalypse in the first millennium, three of which are virtually inaccessible. See also the introduction, appendix, and bibliographies in William C. Weinrich, ed., *Revelation. Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture* (New Testament XII; Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2005). Many of the ancient commentaries on Revelation lack critical editions.

[7] For the critical edition, see Marc De Groote, ed., *Oecumenii Commentarius in Apocalypsin* (Traditio Exegetica Graeca 8; Louvain: Peeters, 1999) chapter 7, §13, lines 357-59; 368-71, page 188.

Venerable Bede understood the phrase *occisus est ab origine mundi* in terms of its analogue in 1 Pet 1:19-20, a common reading strategy to this day, but Bede also acknowledges the alternative reading of the syntax: *Alia enim editio agnum "signatum" ab origine mundi transtulit. Potest et per hyperbaton intellegi, quod sanctorum ab initio nomina sint in libro vitae conscripta.*[8]

Ambrose Autpert (8th century) comments extensively on 13:8 with the help of earlier commentators, including Bede.[9] He understands (§§55-70) the verse to refer to predestination and sees Eph 1:3-6 and Rom 8:28-30 as analogous texts. That the Lamb is pronounced slain *ab origine mundi* is interpreted as prefigured either in the lamb that Abel offered or in Abel himself. For Ambrose the lamb can also refer to Christ suffering when Christians suffer for their faith. He appeals to Acts 9:4 and asserts, *totiens enim Agnus iste occiditur, quotiens in membris suis conpatitur.*[10]

Haimo of Auxerre (late 9th century) struggles with the Lamb's death *ab origine mundi* in 13:8, focusing on Abel in Genesis as had Ambrose Autpert. He comes up with four possibilities. First, the lamb is a figurative reference to the death of God's faithful throughout time, such as Abel and those persecuted by the apostle Paul (Acts 9:4). Second, the verse may refer to the Lamb's death as predestined, a reading of the text with many adherents even today. Third, he thinks it might refer to the lamb that Abel sacrificed. Lastly, "Abel, of course, was innocent, (so I truly affirm), killed by his brother; it could refer to him."[11]

---

[8] "Another edition, however, rendered the Lamb 'designated' from the foundation of the world. It can also be understood through transposition of words that the names of the saints have been written from the beginning in the book of life." All translations from Latin and Greek are my own unless otherwise indicated. Latin text derived from: Roger Gryson, *Bedae Opera. Pars II, 5. Bedae Presbyteri. Expositio Apocalypseos. Ad fidem codicum manuscriptorum edidit adnotationibus criticus instruxit prolegomenis munivit* (Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina 121A; Turnhout: Brepols, 2001) 405.

[9] Robert Weber, ed., *Ambrosii Autperti Opera. Pars II. Expositionis in Apocalypsin Libri VI-X* (Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Mediaevalis 27A; Turnhout: Brepols, 1975) 501, esp. §§35-70.

[10] "For this Lamb is slain as often as he suffers with his members" (§§144-45).

[11] For the Latin text, see PL 117, *Haymonis Halberstat, Expositio in Apocalypsim*, 937-1220, here 1097-98. The mention of Abel here is influenced by Luke 11:50-51, which names the Genesis character as the first of those whose blood was poured out "from [not before!] the foundation of the world."

Also in the 9th century, Berengaudus of Ferrières refers to predestination regarding the book of life and then asks the question, "How can the Lamb, that is, Christ, be said to be slain from the foundation of the world?" He provides a lengthy answer in two parts. First, the Lamb's death prefigures the patriarchs at the commencement of humankind (the first man, Abel, Isaac, Joseph). Exactly how the Lamb's death prefigures the patriarchs is not explained.[12] Second, "and yet it can be understood more simply so that it does not say the Lamb was slain from the foundation of the world, rather the names of the saints were written from the foundation of the world in the book of the Lamb who was slain for their salvation."[13] Berengaudus' second point anticipates the position of many modern commentators.

In his Greek commentary on the Apocalypse, Arethas of Caesarea in Cappadocia (10th century) acknowledges the syntactical problem in a way similar to Bede—reading the prepositional phrase with γέγραπται in light of hyperbaton, i.e., transposition of words. In contrast to Bede, Arethas flatly denies the alternative reading in which the Lamb was slaughtered from the foundation of the world: "for the slaughter of the Lamb did not happen from the foundation of the world."[14] Arethas's objection anticipates many modern commentators.

In summary, the eighth and ninth century commentators Ambrose Autpert, Haimo, and Berengaudus appeal to figurative understandings of the Lamb slain *ab origine mundi*. Ernest-Bernard Allo, O.P., seems to allude to such readings as "le beau sens mystique que cela a fourni à

---

[12] Martin Luther referred to Rev 13:8 as a basis for his understanding that Christ was present in the faith of the patriarchs and that Christ suffered for them. Luther took the prepositional phrase with τοῦ ἀρνίου τοῦ ἐσφαγμένου: "Das lam Gottes, wilchs von der welt anfang ist erwuerget gewest." See *D. Luthers Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe* (65 vols.; Weimar: Hermann Böhlaus, 1883-1966; vol. 17, 1927) 17 II, 236, lines 33-35. Hans-Ulrich Hofmann (*Luther und die Johannes-Apokalypse* [BGBE 24; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1982] 344) refers to Luther's reading of Rev 13:8 as grammatically possible but not intended by the author of the Apocalypse.

[13] For the Latin, see PL 17, 843-970, here 885. Gumerlock ("Ancient Commentaries on the Book of Revelation," 19) notes that PL mistakenly attributed the work to Saint Ambrose of Milan.

[14] PG 106. 675-76 (Greek text with Latin translation). For text-critical notes on Arethas's Greek text, see Josef Schmid, ed., *Der Apokalypsetext des Arethas von Kaisareia und einiger anderer jüngerer Gruppen* (Texte und Forschungen zur byzantinischneugriechischen Philologie 17; Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des griechischen Apokalypsetextes 1; Athens: Byzantinisch-neugriechische Jahrbücher, 1936).

d'anciens commentateurs," even as he finds them unconvincing.[15] Bede and Arethas anticipate the concerns of many recent exegetes who find it unintelligible that the Lamb could have been slain from the foundation of the world. With the exception of Oecumenius and Arethas, the ancient commentators reviewed here interpreted Scripture from the Latin Vulgate. None of them, not even Oecumenius and Arethas, bring Greek grammar into the discussion.

## (b) Interpretations of Rev 13:8 in Recent Scholarship

Taking γέγραπται as Antecedent of the Preposition

Assessing the *status quaestionis* in the 1920s, R. H. Charles stated that virtually all commentators read the prepositional phrase with γέγραπται, although Charles himself could not decide.[16] More than a few modern scholars read ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου with γέγραπται, including the influential RSV translation ("everyone whose name has not been written before the foundation of the world in the book of life").[17] The strengths of reading the syntax this way are obvious: grammatically it shares the syntax of 17:8, and theologically it avoids the problem of having to explain how the Lamb could have been slain from the foundation of the world. The most often noted weakness is that the prepositional phrase is separated from the governing verb by several words. The obvious rebuttal to this point is that Greek syntax is fluid. Although there are syntactical tendencies in Greek,[18] it is not uncommon to have a temporal prepositional phrase separated from its govern-

---

[15] Ernest Bernard Allo, *Saint Jean L'Apocalypse* (ÉBib; Paris: Gabalda, 1933) 209. Allo does not actually name any ancient commentators.

[16] Robert Henry Charles, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St. John* (2 vols.; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1920) 1.353-54.

[17] So also NRSV, NAB; David E. Aune, *Revelation 6-16* (WBC 52B; Nashville: Nelson, 1998) 746-48; Heinrich Kraft, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes* (HNT 16a; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1974) 177; Ulrich B. Müller, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes* (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1995) 252; Heinz Giesen, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes, Übersetzt und Erklärt* (Regensburg: Pustet, 1997) 308; James Resseguie, *Revelation Unsealed. A Narrative Critical Approach to John's Apocalypse* (Leiden/New York: Brill, 1998) 95-96; Jürgen Roloff, *The Revelation of John. A Continental Commentary* (trans. John Alsup; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993) 153, 158; Bernhard Weiss, *Die Johannes-Apokalypse* (Text-kritische Untersuchungen und Textherstellung; Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1891; 2d ed., 1902) 194; Swete, *Apocalypse,* 164.

[18] See Porter, *Idioms,* 286-97.

ing lexeme by several words. In Rev 17:8 the same prepositional phrase is governed by the same verb separated by several words (γέγραπται τὸ ὄνομα ἐπὶ τὸ βιβλίον τῆς ζωῆς ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου). At the forefront of the reply to those who object to the separation of the phrase from the verb should be the grammatical answer: temporal phrases in Greek can be and sometimes are separated in such a way.[19] There is no question that this is the simplest way of reading the syntax of Rev 13:8.

Rev 13:8 as Predetermination of the Cross

A growing number of modern scholars take τοῦ ἀρνίου τοῦ ἐσφαγμένου with the immediately following prepositional phrase ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, as it is rendered in KJV, NIV, AV, REB.[20]

Caird's perspective summarizes a prevailing view of those who read the syntax this way: "If the names of the redeemed are included in the predestined purpose of God, why not also the means of their redemption?"[21] Gerard Mussies provides a gloss that indicates his embrace of a predeterminationist reading: "the Lamb which was to be slaughtered from the foundation of the world."[22] Mussies is one of the

---

[19] So Acts 23:23; Luke 8:43; Matt 11:12. Although John's Apocalypse tends to vary the word order within pairs or series of coordinated elements, in the case of Rev 13:8 and 17:8 the matter concerns the addition of a phrase. On variation of word order in the Apocalypse, see Gerard Mussies, "The Greek of the Book of Revelation" in *L'Apocalypse johannique et l'Apocalyptique dans le Nouveau Testament* (ed. J. Lambrecht; BETL 53; Louvain: Louvain University, 1980) 167-77, here 176.

[20] So George Bradford Caird, *A Commentary on the Revelation of St. John the Divine* (New York: Harper & Row, 1966) 168; Robert H. Mounce, *The Book of Revelation* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1977) 256; J. P. M. Sweet, *Revelation* (Philadephia: Westminster, 1979) 212; Mitchell Reddish, *Revelation* (Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys, 2001) 255; Steven J. Friesen, *Imperial Cults and the Apocalypse of John* (Oxford: Oxford University, 2001) 197; Leonard L. Thompson, *Revelation* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1998) 140; Gregory K. Beale, *The Book of Revelation* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998) 701-703; Eugene Boring, "Narrative Christology in the Apocalypse" *CBQ* 54 (1992) 702-23, here 714; Charles Homer Giblin, *The Book of Revelation. The Open Book of Prophecy* (Good News Studies 34; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1991) 133-34; Wilfrid J. Harrington, *Revelation* (SacPag 16; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1993) 139; Ben Witherington III, *Revelation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003) 138; Christopher Rowland, "The Book of Revelation," in *The New Interpreter's Bible* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1998) 12.503-743, here 657; Grant R. Osborne, *Revelation* (Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament; Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2002) 503.

[21] Caird, *St. John the Divine*, 168.

[22] Gerard Mussies, *The Morphology of Koine Greek As Used in the Apocalypse of St. John. A Study in Bilingualism* (NovTSup 27; Leiden: Brill, 1971) 348.

few scholars to note the problem that the participle poses with regard to the possibility of Semitic interference, to which we will return later, and to emphasize the passive voice of the participle.

David Aune points to a central weakness with this reading of the syntax, remarking (his italics): "it is logically and theologically impossible to make sense of the statement that the Lamb 'was slaughtered *before* the foundation of the world.'" He goes on to assert: "While it is possible to think of Christ as *destined* to die for the sins of the world, it is quite another thing to say that he was slain before the creation of the world."[23] Aune's remark may have merit, but it also demonstrates a puzzling tendency among some exegetes to translate ἀπό with "before" or to understand the English "from" as identical with "before," as though the two prepositions are interchangeable, which is not the case in either Greek or English.[24] The problem may derive in part from the RSV translation of Rev 13:8b, which errantly reads "before the foundation of the world" even though there is no evidence for an ἀπό–πρό interchange in the way there is with ἀπό and ἐκ.[25] At stake is whether commentators are making decisions on the basis of an English gloss rather than the Greek lexeme.[26] Or, possibly those who lapse into translating ἀπό with "before" may be influenced by the preposition πρό in 1 Pet 1:20, the most common analogue for those who read the syntax by taking the prepositional phrase with τοῦ ἀρνίου τοῦ ἐσφαγμένου. Additionally, Eph 1:4 contains the notion that God chose the Ephesians to be holy and blameless πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, "before

---

[23] Aune, *Revelation*, 2.746-47.

[24] Commentators who make this mistake found in the RSV include Aune, *Revelation*, 2.746-48; Bruce Malina and John Pilch, *Social-Science Commentary on the Book of Revelation* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000) 171; Boring, "Narrative Christology," 722; Beale, *Revelation*, 702; Rowland, "Revelation," 657. On these prepositions, see for instance, A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* (3d ed.; London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1919) 574-580, 596-600.

[25] The close semantic relation between ἀπό and ἐκ, including the fact that the prepositions are sometimes used interchangeably, is often noted: e.g., Francis Gignac, *An Introductory New Testament Greek Course* (Chicago: Loyola, 1973) 42; Porter, *Idioms*, 154.

[26] If an exegete is thinking in terms of an English gloss for the preposition, it does not inspire confidence in that exegete's analysis of the participle. On this general problem applied to the lexeme γῆ, see Eugene A. Nida and Johannes P. Louw, *Lexical Semantics of the Greek New Testament* (SBLRBS 25; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992) 42.

the foundation of the world." Sean McDonough proposes that John may be playing with two traditions concerning καταβολῆς κοσμου. "In one, Christians are chosen before the foundation of the world (e.g., Eph 1:4). In the other, Christ is predestined for sacrifice before the foundation of the world (1 Pet 1:20; cf. Acts 2:23). John refers to the first in 17:8 and the second in 13:8."[27] The problem with this proposal is that neither Rev 13:8 nor 17:8 use the preposition πρό. A closer look at the supposed parallel in 1 Peter is in order.

Supposed Parallels in 1 Pet 1:20, *Ass. Mos.* 1:14,
and *Gos. Phil.* 53, 8-9

Although 1 Pet 1:20 and Rev 13:8b contain the anarthrous phrase καταβολῆς κόσμου, the prepositions and participles differ: πρό instead of ἀπό and προεγνωσμένου instead of ἐσφαγμένου. First Peter 1:20 refers to the Lamb (ἀμνός) as "foreknown before καταβολῆς κόσμου," whereas Rev 13:8 describes the Lamb (ἀρνίον) as "slain from καταβολῆς κόσμου." Thus Revelation does not explicitly refer to God foreknowing the Lamb, as is the case in 1 Pet 1:20.[28]

Additionally, the noun κόσμος differs in meaning in these texts. John Elliott notes that κόσμος in 1 Pet 1:20 "refers simply to the inhabited world, the orderly universe . . . with no negative valuation, as found for instance in Paul and the Johannine writings."[29] In contrast to this neutral meaning of κόσμος in First Peter, κόσμος in Rev 13:8b unambiguously has a negative nuance if the prepositional phrase is governed by τοῦ ἀρνίου τοῦ ἐσφαγμένου, in which case the κόσμος refers to the spatial location of the Lamb's slaughter. Within the context of the clause in Revelation 13, the κόσμος is the place of *thlipsis* for God's holy ones who are defeated by the beast (13:5-7) and where all the inhabitants of the earth will render obeisance to the beast (v 8a προσκυνήσουσιν). The κόσμος as the spatial realm opposed to the will of God also occurs in 11:15, where the βασιλεία τοῦ κοσμοῦ stands in contrast to the βασιλεία

---

[27] Sean M. McDonough, *YHWH at Patmos. Rev 1:4 in its Hellenistic and Early Jewish Setting* (WUNT 2/107; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999) 210 n. 48.

[28] Witherington (*Revelation,* 183) thinks Rev 13:8 refers to God's foreknowledge of the fall. The later and theologically loaded term "fall" should not be brought into an already difficult text. Osborne (*Revelation,* 504) similarly appeals to God's knowledge of the fall. The Apocalypse is not systematic theology.

[29] John Elliott, *1 Peter* (AB 37B; New York: Doubleday, 2001) 376.

of God and the Messiah.[30] Of the three occurrences of κόσμος in the Apocalypse, only 17:8 may bear a neutral sense.[31]

Alongside the κόσμος as negative location is the temporal element that comes with ἀπὸ καταβολῆς.[32] This element is more difficult to explain as it relates to how one understands the perfect participle governing the phrase. If the perfect participle refers to the Lamb's state or status as slain from the foundation of the world, the prepositional phrase may allude to the notion that the κόσμος has always been the realm of the beast where God's righteous have suffered at the hands of those who follow the beast. In this reading of the clause in its immediate context, κόσμος is linked with γῆ in v 3 as semantically similar lexemes that stand in contrast to the dwelling place of God's holy ones, τοὺς ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ σκηνοῦντας, in v 6. Just as the Lamb was slain (v 8), so also God's holy ones suffer defeat (v 7 νικῆσαι), as did the righteous of earlier days alluded to in vv 5-6 and in 11:7-10.[33] The Apocalypse holds this negative valuation of the κόσμος in tension with the paradox that defeat is actually victory for Christ and for his followers if they follow his example by conquering as he did (νικῶν 2:11,26; 3:5,12,21; 21:7; τῷ νικῶντι 2:7,17; τοὺς νικῶντας 15:2).

In summary, commentators who read the prepositional phrase with τοῦ ἀρνίου τοῦ ἐσφαγμένου often appeal to 1 Pet 1:20, a text in which the Lamb's blood is God's predetermined means of salvation. However, the different participles and prepositions make 1 Pet 1:20 an inexact parallel. Moreover, the κόσμος was not the realm of the beast before the foundation of the world in John's Apocalypse.

Two texts outside the NT often serve as analogues to Rev 13:8 for those who think the verse refers to a predetermination of the cross. *Assumption of Moses* 1:14 presents God as preparing Moses *ab ini-*

---

[30] Rev 11:15 may point to the arrival of God's βασιλεία in the liturgical setting in which the Apocalypse was read aloud. See David Barr, "The Apocalypse as a Symbolic Transformation of the World: A Literary Analysis," *Int* 38 (1984) 39-50. The communities of western Asia Minor experience a foretaste of the transformation of the world in their sacred gatherings.

[31] See Aune, *Revelation*, 2.638.

[32] Thompson (*Book of Revelation*, 85) argues that the "permanence of the crucified Lamb" is captured in spatial, not temporal, imagery because John does not locate the crucifixion in time with phrases such as "under Pontius Pilate."

[33] The allusions to Daniel 7 in Rev 13:1-7 evoke the *thlipsis* under Antiochus IV, precursor to the beast of Revelation 13.

*tio orbis* for his role as covenant mediator.[34] While both texts tie the central figure, Moses and the Lamb respectively, to the phrase "from the beginning of the world," the parallel only has merit if one can establish grammatically that τοῦ ἐσφαγμένου refers to predetermination. In contrast to the view of R. H. Charles,[35] recent scholarship maintains that *Ass. Mos.* 1:14 does not refer to Moses' preexistence.[36] John's Apocalypse seems to refer to Christ's preexistence elsewhere: "the beginning of the creation" (3:14); cf. possibly also "the Alpha and the Omega" (22:13); "the First and the Last" (1:7; 2:8). However, the syntactical ambiguity of *Ass. Mos.* 1:14 makes it precarious to use as an analogue to Rev 13:8. The starting point should be the grammar of Rev 13:8 rather than the uncertain parallel of *Ass. Mos.* 1:14.

Those who think Rev 13:8 refers to predetermination of the cross sometimes appeal to the *Gospel of Philip*, a late third century C.E. Coptic-Gnostic catechetical document. Wesley W. Isenberg renders the Coptic of *Gos. Phil.* 53,8-9 (# 5) as follows: "It was not only when he [Christ] appeared that he voluntarily laid down his life, but he voluntarily laid down his life from the very day the world came into being."[37] Although both texts share a negative understanding of the world as corrupt, (a viewpoint not exclusive to Gnostic documents), Rev 13:8 lacks the explicit christology of preexistence and emphasis

---

[34] The Latin from the critical edition of Johannes Tromp, *The Assumption of Moses. A Critical Edition with Commentary* (SVTP 10; Leiden: Brill, 1993) 6-7: *Itaque excogitavit et invenit me qui ab initio orbis terrarium praeparatus sum ut sim arbiter testamenti illius.* Tromp's translation: "Therefore, [God] has devised me and invented me, I who have been prepared from the beginning of the world to be mediator of his covenant."

[35] R. H. Charles, *The Assumption of Moses. Translated from the Latin Sixth Century MS., the Unemended Text of which is Published Herewith, Together with the Text in its Restored and Critically Emended Form* (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1897) 6.

[36] So David L. Tiede, "The Figure of Moses in the Testament of Moses," in *Studies on the Testament of Moses* (ed. George W. Nickelsburg; SBLSCS 4; Cambridge, MA: Society of Biblical Literature, 1973) 86-92, here 90; Tromp, *Assumption,* 143.

[37] Wesley W. Isenberg, "The Gospel of Philip (II,3)," in *The Nag Hammadi Library* (James M. Robinson, ed.; third revised edition; New York: HarperCollins, 1990) 139-160, here 142. Andrew Phillip Smith (*The Gospel of Philip, Annotated & Explained* [Woodstock, VT: SkyLight Paths, 2005]) renders saying 5.12 as follows: "Not only did he lay down his soul when he appeared, as he wished, but he had laid it down since the day that the world began." For the Coptic, see Bentley Layton, ed., *Nag Hammadi Codex II, 2-7, I, Together with XIII,2, Brit. Lib. Or. 4926(1), and P.Oxy. 1, 654. 655* (Leiden/New York: Brill, 1989) 144.

on the death as voluntary that is found in *Gos. Phil.* 53:8-9. If one could establish a wider influence of John's Apocalypse on the *Gospel of Philip*, one might argue that *Gos. Phil.* 53:8-9 is the earliest extant interpretation of Rev 13:8. Even then we would be no closer to establishing the elusive authorial intent for Rev 13:8.

In summary, none of the often proposed analogous texts resolves the syntactical problem of Rev 13:8. This verse does not explicitly state God's predetermination of the Lamb's death. The starting point for explication of Rev 13:8 should be the grammar of the verse. One should acknowledge the preposition ἀπό, and make explicit one's understanding of the participle τοῦ ἐσφαγμένου.

Rev 13:8 as Depicting the Cross in Pre- or Meta-history

There have been recent efforts to understand the same reading of the syntax in ways other than predetermination. Thus, for instance, Leonard Thompson has argued that the crucifixion in John's Apocalypse should not be seen as a specific event in time but as a recurring element in the deep structure of the text: "the crucifixion is much more than a momentary event in history . . . The Lamb was not slain at a particular moment in time; rather the Lamb was slain before time."[38] Loren Stuckenbruck's similar view is worth quoting at length[39]:

> John's understanding of Jesus' death, mentioned only briefly (in 11:8), went well beyond his consideration of a crucifixion at a single point in time . . . Rather than being a moment in history, Jesus' death became the basis through which reality—past, present, and future—was redefined. And so, the Lamb, who 'was slain from before [*sic*] the foundation of the world' (13:8), became the yardstick against which the unfaithfulness of those whose names 'are not written in the book of life' (13:8; 17:8) was to be measured. A decisively historical occurrence in the history of salvation was, for John, transformed into a principle of conquering death through which the cosmos was transfigured.

---

[38] Thompson, *Book of Revelation*, 85.
[39] Stuckenbruck, "Revelation: Historical Setting and John's Call to Discipleship," *Leaven* 8/1 (2000) 27-31, here 29-30.

Michael Gilbertson suggests that the death of the Lamb is depicted "not only as an event in earthly history, but also an event in the wider cosmic drama,"[40] a perspective that differs from that of Thompson and Stuckenbruck insofar as Gilbertson makes greater allowance for a temporal element to the death as an event in history.[41] As intriguing as these readings of Rev 13:8 may be, lacking is an accompanying grammatical explanation. Can the perfect participle in Rev 13:8 bear such a reading?

Summary of Modern Scholarship on Rev 13:8

Despite the lack of consensus on how to read the syntax of Rev 13:8, there are tendencies among exegetes. First, commentators often provide a *theological* reason for the choice of syntax but fail to discuss the participle in any detail. Exegetes who examine the participle commonly presuppose a 19th century understanding of the perfect as an event in the past, related in its effects to the present.[42] This grammatical presupposition tends to yield the argument that it is impossible to take the prepositional phrase with τοῦ ἀρνίου τοῦ ἐσφαγμένου because it makes no sense that the Lamb was slaughtered from the foundation of the world.[43] The crucifixion, such readings presuppose, occurred at

---

[40] Michael Gilbertson, *God and History in the Book of Revelation. New Testament Studies in Dialogue with Pannenberg and Moltmann* (SNTSMS 124; Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2003) 124.

[41] Gilbertson (ibid., 124, n. 35) expressly distances his own view from Thompson's. He ends up embracing a predeterministic reading of the Lamb's death when he writes that 13:8 "may simply suggest a sense of fore-ordination in the death of the Lamb."

[42] This understanding of the perfect system is found, for instance, in C. F. D. Moule, *An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek* (2d ed.; Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1959) 13; BDF §340; Buist M. Fanning, *Verbal Aspect in New Testament Greek* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1990) 103-20; Basil G. Mandilaras, *The Verb in the Greek Non-Literary Papyri* (Athens: Hellenistic Ministry of Culture and Sciences, 1973) 221, §461. This understanding of the perfect participle as it relates to Rev 13:8 is maintained by Daniel J. Harrington, "The Slain Lamb (Rev 5,6.12; 13,8) As an Image of Christian Hope," in *Il Verbo di Dio è vivo: Studi sul Nuovo Testamento in onore del Cardinale Albert Vanhoye, S.I.* (eds. José Enrique Aguilar Chiu, Franco Manzi, Filippo Urso, Carlos Zesati Estrada; Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2007) 511-19, here 512. For a critique of this understanding of the perfect, see Stanley E. Porter, *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament, with Reference to Tense and Mood* (Studies in Biblical Greek 1; New York: Peter Lang, 1989) 252-59.

[43] Müller (*Offenbarung*, 252) refers to this reading as "natürlich Unsinn," which echoes Arethas' comment in the 10th century: *ita enim oportet intelligere, non ut scriptura habet, quia neque ab origine mundi facta est agni occisio.*

a fixed point in time. In this reading of the syntax, the verb γέγραπται governs the prepositional phrase.

The more difficult option, viz., taking the prepositional phrase with τοῦ ἀρνίου τοῦ ἐσφαγμένου, is found in the KJV and has gained ground recently among exegetes. This way of reading the syntax is divided between those who think the verse refers to predetermination of the cross and those who think it refers to the Lamb's death as a cosmic principle rooted in pre-history or beyond history. Despite the shift in the past thirty years toward the more difficult option, no consensus seems forthcoming. Thus Pierre Prigent asserts that neither reading can make a definitive claim to the original author's intent,[44] while Ernst Lohmeyer tries to have both readings of the syntax—John was deliberately ambiguous in order to create an intentional double meaning.[45]

John's Apocalypse uses the perfect middle-passive participle more often than any other NT document,[46] and yet scant attention is devoted to the aspectual and temporal challenges it poses for a reading of Rev 13:8. Thus a closer look at the attributive, perfect middle-passive participle in general and in the Apocalypse is warranted as we try to understand this verse within John's Lamb christology.

## II. A Closer Look at ἐσφαγμένου

### (a) Presuppositions Regarding Aspect

The Greek verbal system expresses aspect, a kind of action that is semantically nontemporal.[47] The participle in Greek is aspectually

---

[44] Pierre Prigent, *Commentary on the Apocalypse of St. John* (trans. Wendy Pradels; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001) 410-11.

[45] Ernst Lohmeyer, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes* (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1970) 112.

[46] Mussies (*Morphology*, 48) counts 67 instances of the middle-passive participle in John's Apocalypse, Codex Alexandrinus.

[47] A concise survey of some of the major aspectual theories is found in Jeffrey T. Reed and Ruth A. Reese, "Verbal Aspect, Discourse Prominence, and the Letter of Jude," in *Filología Neotestamentaria* 9 (1996) 181-99. For an overview of the debate on Greek aspect between Stanley Porter and Buist Fanning, see Stanley E. Porter and Donald A. Carson, eds., *Biblical Greek Language and Linguistics. Open Questions in Current Research* (JSNTSup 80; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993). For different approaches to aspect from Porter and Fanning but with certain important similarities, see Kenneth Leslie McKay, *New Syntax of the Verb in New Testament*

based even as it never loses its grammatical function as a participle.[48] Since elements other than verbal aspect are the primary conveyors of temporal information in Greek,[49] and since a participle has no time reference independent of its context,[50] one must assess the relative temporal value of τοῦ ἐσφαγμένου based on its context and with the ambiguous syntax taken into consideration.[51]

Maximilian Zerwick attempts to capture the aspectual force of the perfect system in a traditional manner: "[the perfect is] not a past tense but a present one, indicating not the past action as such but the present 'state of affairs' resulting from the past action."[52] It is commonly acknowledged that the perfect system expresses the state or condition of the subject of the verb. Or, as Porter puts it, "the Perfect grammaticalizes the state or condition of the grammatical subject as conceived by the speaker."[53] More debated is the sphere of activity that the perfect system covers. For Porter, the perfect system includes past, present, future, omnitemporal (i.e., continuous or gnomic action) and

---

*Greek: An Aspectual Approach* (Studies in Biblical Greek 5; New York: Peter Lang, 1994) 27-38. For a recent contribution to aspectual theory, see Constantine R. Campbell, *Verbal Aspect, the Indicative Mood, and Narrative. Soundings in the Greek of the New Testament* (Studies in Biblical Greek 13; New York: Peter Lang, 2007). For an effort to defend the traditional approach to aspect, see Chrys C. Caragounis, *The Development of Greek and the New Testament. Morphology, Syntax, Phonology, and Textual Transmission* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004; repr. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2006). On the important distinction between Aktionsart and aspect, see Porter, *Verbal Aspect,* 17-73; Campbell, *Verbal Aspect,* 10-12.

[48] Kenneth Leslie McKay, *Greek Grammar for Students: A Concise Grammar of Classical Attic with Special Reference to Aspect in the Verb* (Canberra: Australian National University, 1974) 219-20; Robertson, *Grammar,* 1110-11.

[49] Porter, *Idioms,* 25-26; idem., *Verbal Aspect,* 260-70.

[50] Kenneth Leslie McKay ("On the Perfect and Other Aspects in New Testament Greek," *NovT* 23 [1981] 289-329, here 296) writes, "it is always the context, of which the verb tense is only one element, which reveals the time reference." Cf. Porter, *Idioms,* 187; Robertson, *Grammar,* 1111.

[51] Porter (*Idioms,* 25) writes of relative tense: "This presupposes that in Greek the temporal ordering of events is not measured in relation to a fixed point (absolute time), but by the relations established among the involved events with regard to each other and to the context." It is widely recognized that tense is expressed through the use of a variety of contextual temporal indicators.

[52] Maximilian Zerwick, S.J., *Biblical Greek. Illustrated by Examples* (English Edition Adapted from the Fourth Latin Edition; Scripta Pontificii Instituti Biblici 114; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1990) 96, §285.

[53] Porter, *Verbal Aspect,* 257, 259.

timeless action.[54] And yet, as McKay notes, *in some circumstances* the perfect has an added strong reference to an event which is already past.[55] Such logically seems to be the case with the participle in Rev 13:8. A closer look is warranted, however, because Greek sometimes uses the perfect system to express complexity, particularly to express a complex theological notion.[56]

### (b) Participial Aspect and the Attributive Participle

In contrast to circumstantial participles, it is often not important to establish the temporal reference of an attributive participle to understand a clause or sentence.[57] When taken with the prepositional phrase, τοῦ ἀρνίου τοῦ ἐσφαγμένου would logically seem to convey temporal anteriority. As a result, we have seen that it is often assumed without argument that τοῦ ἀρνίου τοῦ ἐσφαγμένου must refer to the historical crucifixion, the one-time event that occurred just outside Jerusalem. But even if the participial clause in Rev 13:8 refers to a past event, still unsettled is the matter of the precise aspect of the participle, the speaker's subjective conception of the process or event, that is, how the speaker, author, or narrator views the action or process in relation to the context.[58] Can the perfect participle bear the aspectual nuance in which the Lamb's death is a timeless reality, the yardstick for discipleship, a principle of conquering death through which the cosmos was reconfigured?[59]

---

[54] See Porter, *Idioms,* 39-42 and *Verbal Aspect,* 257-80. Porter (*Verbal Aspect,* 394-400) provides examples of uses of perfect participles in context. In his shorter grammatical handbook (*Idioms,* 42), he gives examples of the perfect used in a timeless sense, writing, "whereas all usage of tense-forms in Greek is in one sense timeless (since they do not carry any independent time-orienting information), there are several significant instances where the timeless nature of an action is focused upon." McKay (*New Syntax,* 49) writes of the perfect: "it applies the state principle of the perfect aspect to present time, timeless situations, extensions from past to present, and the implication of future reference . . . ."

[55] McKay, *New Syntax,* 49.

[56] Porter, *Idioms,* 23-24.

[57] Ibid., 187-88.

[58] Aspect is not nullified by temporal reference. See K. L. McKay, "The Use of the Ancient Greek Perfect down to the End of the Second Century A.D.," *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 12 (1965) 1-21.

[59] So Stuckenbruck, "Revelation," 29-30.

We now turn to the following three questions: Is the semantic value of the participle affected by Semitic interference? Does John's use of the perfect participle elsewhere shed light on its use here? Are there discourse features in addition to the prepositional phrase that allow the interpreter to narrow down the aspect of the participle?[60]

## III. Semitic Interference

With any analysis of the Greek of the Apocalypse one runs into the contentious debate over whether Semitic interference plays a role in the sometimes awkward grammar. Here I focus solely on the perfect passive participle in Rev 13:8 and set aside the larger debate on the Greek of the Apocalypse as a whole. Gerard Mussies and Steven Thompson offer similar explanations for the use of the perfect middle-passive participle in John's Apocalypse. For Mussies, this participle "reflects certainly the Semitic gerundive qātul," with the participle in Rev 13:8 provided as one of the two examples of such use.[61] Thompson argues that the attributive perfect passive participle came to be used more frequently in biblical Greek under the influence of the Hebrew qal passive participle. He then extrapolates that the perfect passive participles in the Apocalypse are formal translation equivalents of the Hebrew qal passive participle.[62] The problem, however, is that the perfect passive participle in the Apocalypse falls within the range of legitimate Greek uses in the first century.[63] I would not argue against the thesis that the Apocalypse contains Semitisms, but there is no need to appeal to Semitic interference in the case of the participle in 13:8. Minimally, Semitic interference should only be used to explain grammatical con-

---

[60] "Discourse features" is a term used in discourse analysis. See Stephen H. Levinsohn, *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek. A Coursebook on the Information Structure of New Testament Greek* (2d ed; Dallas, TX; SIL International, 2000); Stanley Porter and D. A. Carson, eds., *Discourse Analysis and Other Topics in Biblical Greek* (JSNTSup 113; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995).

[61] Mussies, *Morphology,* 348.

[62] Steven Thompson, *The Apocalypse and Semitic Syntax* (SNTSMS 52; Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1985) 71.

[63] See Stanley Porter, "The Language of the Apocalypse in Recent Discussion" *NTS* 35 (1989) 582-603, esp. 587-89. For an excellent overview of bilingualism in NT Greek, see Francis Gignac, "Semitic Interference in New Testament Greek" in his *Introductory New Testament Greek,* 167-71.

structions in NT Greek that are common to Aramaic or Hebrew and, simultaneously, not otherwise understandable in first-century Greek.

## IV. Rev 13:8 in its Literary-Rhetorical Contexts

However one reads the syntax of Rev 13:8, one's reading must make sense beyond the primary unit of study, the clause within the sentence. This last section thus focuses on Rev 13:8 in relation to both its immediate context in Revelation 13 and to verbal and thematic links to chapters 5 and 11.

### (a) Use of the Perfect Participle Elsewhere in the Apocalypse

The touchstone of John's Christology is Christ's death-resurrection, expressed in the phrase in 5:6, ἀρνίον ἑστηκὸς ὡς ἐσφαγμένον, "a Lamb standing as one who was slain."[64] The particle ὡς presents difficulties, but a gloss that might be accidentally construed as docetism should be avoided (so RSV "as though"; NAB "seemed"). The Lamb really was slain even as the current state of the Lamb is "standing," that is, risen. Thus, ὡς is best understood as a particle that describes the risen state of the Christ "as the one who" was slain.[65] At its core, it is a resurrection statement of the Lamb's victory over death. The stative aspect of the perfect participle ἑστηκός reflects the risen reality of the Lamb (cf. ἕστηκα in Rev 3:20 and ἑστός in Rev 14:1).[66] The anarthrous perfect participle ἐσφαγμένον reflects the state or reality of the risen Lamb as the one who "was slain." The Lamb is standing precisely because he was slain: his death was the result of his faithful witness.

The next use of this participle, τὸ ἀρνίον τὸ ἐσφαγμένον in the hymn of 5:12, reflects on the slain Lamb's rewards for his faithful witness: τὴν δύναμιν καὶ πλοῦτον καὶ σοφίαν καὶ ἰσχὺν καὶ τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν καὶ εὐλογίαν.

---

[64] "Standing" describes Jesus' risen state in John 20:14 (ἑστῶτα); 21:4 (ἔστη); Luke 24:36 (ἔστη).

[65] A comparable use of ὡς occurs in Luke 22:27.

[66] Mussies (*Morphology*, 347) notes that the perfective value of ἕστηκα was disappearing in Koine Greek, by which he likely means that only the stative meaning is denoted, without implying a prior action. Although I would deny that the perfect denotes a prior action in all instances, the stative value of verbs ἵστημι and οἶδα is not a debated point.

Just as the Lamb, the faithful witness (1:5 and 3:14), is rewarded for his fidelity with resurrection (he is firstborn of the dead, 1:5), so also all faithful witness in imitation of the Lamb will be rewarded (2:7,11, 17,26; 3:5,12,21; 21:6-7). The stative aspect of the attributive participle τὸ ἐσφαγμένον reflects the christological idea that the risen Lamb is indeed also the slain Lamb; the two realities, risen and slain, are linked christologically and aspectually by the perfect participles in 5:6 and 5:12.

The Apocalypse twice links the Lamb's death to killing of the Lamb's followers via the use of the same perfect participle (6:9 τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν ἐσφαγμένων and 18:24 πάντων τῶν ἐσφαγμένων ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς). The verb σφαζεῖν, often glossed either with "to slaughter" or "to slay," seems primarily to refer to the Lamb's death as murder[67] (σφάξευσιν in 6:4 refers to killing in war), and in turn, the death of his followers as murder. In 6:9 and 18:24 the murdered state of those killed is emphasized by the same perfect participle. Those under the altar in 6:9 (τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν ἐσφαγμένων) cry out to God for vengeance on the inhabitants of the earth. In 18:24 the blood of the prophets and holy ones and "all those slain upon the earth" (πάντων τῶν ἐσφαγμένων ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς) is blamed on "Babylon," John's symbolic designation for Rome.

In summary, John's Apocalypse uses the perfect participles of σφάζω and ἵστημι to refer to the complex reality of the Lamb's death-resurrection. The ancient author does not want the audiences to separate the risen state of the Lamb from his murder at the hands of empire, his faithful witness unto death. The perfect participle emphasizes the present state of the Lamb as risen; the risen Lamb is the same Lamb as the one who was slain.

## (b) The Aorist in Reference to the Lamb's Death

Twice John employs an aorist passive verb to refer to the death of the Lamb (5:9) and the Lord (11:8). Although the aorist per se does not denote a fixed temporal value, in these contexts each seems to convey

---

[67] For a non-sacrificial, non-atonement reading of the Lamb imagery of the Apocalypse, see Loren L. Johns, *The Lamb Christology of the Apocalypse of John* (WUNT 2/167; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003); Blount, *Can I Get A Witness*, esp. 75-79. A sacrificial reference has also been understood on the basis of the Septuagintal usage of the verb (e.g., Lev 1:5, 11; 9:8, 12).

a past event.[68] The only occurrence of the aorist of the verb σφαζεῖν is found in the hymn of 5:9, where the Lamb is worthy to open the seal "for you were slain" (ὅτι ἐσφάγης). The aorist is used here as the background tense[69] that carries the discourse of the sacred hymn, in this case, to refer to the event that provides the reason the Lamb is worthy to open the seal. In no way does the use of the aorist lessen the significance of the event. At issue is the planes of discourse open to the speaker; had the speaker wanted to refer to the death in a more contoured and complex way, he may well have used the perfect, as he does in all the other instances of this verb.

Revelation 11:8 is the only explicit reference to the crucifixion in the Apocalypse. In this verse "the great city" is καλεῖται πνευματικῶς Σόδομα καὶ Αἴγυπτος ὅπου καὶ ὁ κύριος αὐτῶν ἐσταυρώθη, "called spiritually 'Sodom' and 'Egypt,' where indeed their Lord was crucified." As with 5:9, the speaker chooses the background plane of discourse to refer to the event of crucifixion in its entirety as completed. In the choice of the default (aorist) tense, we can assume that John had no reason to choose a different plane of discourse. These two references demonstrate that the ancient author thought of the death as a reality in history, an event that was completed in the past, even as he uses perfect participles to link the death to the risen state of the Lamb so as to express the complex notion of death-resurrection that transcends time and place. As the foreground aspect, the perfect is chosen to refer to the death-resurrection in a more discrete, contoured way.

The Apocalypse's use of symbolic language makes it precarious to argue for simple one-to-one correspondence in its imagery in 11:8.[70] Despite the fact that the Lord was crucified outside of Jerusalem, the

---

[68] Aune (*Revelation*, 638) seems to be among those who embrace the assumption that the aorist is always a past tense. The aorist is actually the default aspect without fixed temporal nuance. Although it often is used in past contexts, there are many exceptions. See Porter, *Verbal Aspect,* 182-88; Campbell, *Verbal Aspect,* 103-21.

[69] On the background, foreground, and frontground planes of discourse, see Porter, *Verbal Aspect,* 92-93; idem., *Idioms,* 23-25.

[70] On multivalency in John's Apocalypse, see in particular Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *Revelation. Vision of a Just World* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991); eadem., *The Book of Revelation: Justice and Judgment* (2d ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1998). See also David Barr, *Tales of the End. A Narrative Commentary on the Book of Revelation* (Santa Rosa, CA: Polebridge, 1998); Richard Bauckham, *The Theology of the Book of Revelation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1993) esp. 17-22.

primary referent for the great city in 11:8 is not easily pinpointed.[71] The phrase "the Great City" elsewhere always refers to Babylon the Great, that is, Rome (14:8; 16:19; 17:18; 18:10, 16, 18, 19, 21). In the final form of the Apocalypse the adverb πνευματικῶς indicates that the place should not be understood literally as Jerusalem or at least not solely as Jerusalem (despite the Temple imagery in 11:1-2 and the reference to where the Lord was crucified). The Great City may refer to the earthly *polis* (including Rome and Roman controlled Jerusalem) that finds its counterpart in the heavenly Jerusalem.

## (c) The Beast Parodies the Lamb

Revelation 13:1-8 provides contrasting descriptions of the sea beast vis-à-vis the slaughtered Lamb; indeed, the beast is often referred to as a literary parody of the Lamb.[72] The description of the beast's enthronement by the dragon in v 2 is reminiscent of the depiction of the Lamb in the divine throne room scene of Revelation 5, where the Lamb shares God's power, throne, authority, and honor much as the beast receives δύναμις, θρόνος, and great ἐξουσία from Satan the dragon. The beast of 13:3 is described as ἐσφαγμένην, "slaughtered," the same perfect participle used of the Lamb in 5:6 and 13:8b, and the beast, like the Lamb, overcomes the slaughter: one of the heads of the beast in 13:3 is ὡς ἐσφαγμένην εἰς θάνατον καὶ ἡ πληγὴ τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ ἐθεραπεύθη, "as one who was slain to death but its mortal wound had been healed." The allusion to this Caesar as *redivivus* mimics the Lamb's death-resurrection in 5:6, ἑστηκὸς ὡς ἐσφαγμένον. This parody of the Lamb by the beast thus presupposes the underlying traditions regarding Jesus' death-resurrection and Caesar's revivification. The perfect participle of the first element, the death, is matched in the parody, whereas the perfect participle of the second element, the resurrection, is not matched (ἐθεραπεύθη, aorist indicative passive). If I am correct that John uses the

---

[71] Some argue the Great City here refers to Jerusalem (e.g., Charles, Swete, Aune, Friesen) because of the reference to the Temple in 11:1-2 and "where the Lord was crucified" in v 8. Others (e.g., Schüssler Fiorenza, Caird, Mounce) think it refers to Rome, as it always does elsewhere. Another option, however, is to see it as a reference to the ungodly realm of the earthly city that finds its counterpart in the heavenly city, God's βασιλεία, the New Jerusalem (so Bauckham, Roloff, Sweet, Resseguie).

[72] See the chart comparing Christ and the Beast in Resseguie, *Revelation Unsealed,* 124.

perfect participle as the foreground aspect to express the reality of the Lamb as slain yet risen, the omission of the second element as foreground may point to the speaker's desire to underscore that the parody falls far short of the risen reality of the Lamb.

With most Apocalypse scholars, I identify the sea beast of 13:1 with the Roman Empire.[73] An important aspect of this identification derives from John's use of several OT texts in 13:1-2, largely Dan 7:1-7 ($\theta$ and OG are very close there). Daniel 7:1-7 refers to four beasts, each of which represents an empire; these beasts rise up from the sea before God's kingdom arrives on earth. The fourth beast who speaks arrogantly and wages war on the "holy ones," οἱ ἁγίοι, is Antiochus IV Epiphanes. John combines the four beasts of Daniel 7 into one beast at the eschaton, the Roman Empire. This recontextualization of Daniel 7 serves multiple purposes including the identification of the holy ones in John's communities with the covenant people, Israel. Thus the perceived oppression of the holy ones in the western Asian province of the Roman Empire is connected to the persecution of the "holy ones" in Jewish history by previous empires. John's rhetorical goal was to open his audiences' eyes to see the Roman Empire as the oppressor of God's holy ones and as diametrically opposed to the empire of God and the Lamb.

In 13:1-7 the background narrative contains heavy use of the aorist default tense to review the past experiences of the suffering of Israel's holy ones. There is an implied connection of these past experiences of God's holy ones with the audiences' present experience of suffering at the hands of the beast, a recontextualization of the persecution under Antiochus IV Epiphanes. There are two significant shifts away from the background default tense. First, in v 8 the future form προσκυνήσουσιν occurs in connection with πάντες to highlight the surety of the expectation that "*all* the inhabitants of the earth" are going to be corrupted by the beast. Only here does the phrase "inhabitants of the earth" (always negative in the Apocalypse) contain the adjective πάντες. The author grammaticalizes the feature of expectation by using the future form, which, in this case, coupled with the adjective, actually refers at least in part to the present situation for John, for the eschaton is underway in the death-resurrection and "the time is near" (ὁ καιρὸς

---

[73] See the treatment of the various possibilities in Aune, *Revelation*, 2.732-33.

ἐγγύς, 1:3; 22:10) for the final eschatological events to occur, viz., the descent of the New Jerusalem to earth at the parousia.[74] Thus Rev 13:8 refers to the beginning of the world with the prepositional phrase and the eschatological transformation of the world that is already underway with the future form of the verb. Second, the section culminates in a dramatic direct address to the audiences in 13:8b-10 in which the speaker shifts to the foreground tense, the present, in order to exhort the audiences to embrace suffering rather than answer violence with violence (with Codex Alexandrinus).[75]

In summary, the Lamb's slaughter in Rev 13:8b is connected to the past (13:5-6) and present experiences of suffering (13:7, 9-10) at the hands of empire. The precise protology of the verse depends on the syntax. If one reads τοῦ ἀρνίου τοῦ ἐσφαγμένου with ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, the Lamb's death is connected to the beginning (cf. 3:14) to highlight the parody made by the beast and the reality of the Lamb's suffering as paradigmatic for God's holy ones from the beginning of the world. If one reads τοῦ ἀρνίου τοῦ ἐσφαγμένου separately from ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, the Lamb's death is still paradigmatic for the holy ones but the scope is less christologically sweeping, as the Lamb in that case is not connected with the beginning of the world.[76]

### (d) The Inhabitants of the Earth vis-à-vis the Holy Ones

The beast's parody of the Lamb is an antithetical parallelism that extends to their respective followers. The addressees in the communities of western Asia Minor, referred to as οἱ ἅγιοι in 13:7, stand in contrast to the beast's followers, who are given the semi-technical and

---

[74] In contrast to the perspectives of Aune (*Revelation,* 2.746) and Osborne (*Revelation,* 502) the future form here does not expressly refer to the future only but has a strong element of the present. On the future form as not always future-referring, see Porter, *Idioms,* 43-45.

[75] The textual tradition in 13:10 is uncertain. Some ancient witnesses refer to Jeremiah's captivity to denote the inevitable suffering of the faithful. Codex Alexandrinus alludes to the saying in Matt 26:52, in which case this parenesis is a call to non-retaliation in the face of *thlipsis.*

[76] As noted above, three times John connects Christ to the beginning and end events with the Christological titles "the alpha and the omega" (22:13), "the first and the last" (1:7; 2:8). Revelation 3:14 refers to Christ as "the beginning of creation." On the "protological" Christology of the Apocalypse (events that occur at or before the creation of the world), see Eugene Boring, "Narrative Christology," 702-23, esp. 714.

always negative term οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, "the inhabitants upon the earth." John's prophetic critique of the communities in Revelation 2–3 implies that errant community members are included among the inhabitants of the earth, who have compromised their allegiance to the Lamb by failing to withdraw from Roman society; they are not among the holy ones of God who will receive the kingdom, as Dan 7:18 and Rev 19:8 attest, but rather they are among the πάντες.

*(e) The Defeat of the Holy Ones in v 7 and the Theme of Suffering Witness*

There is direct relationship between suffering and faithful witness to Christ in the Apocalypse.[77] As Loren Johns notes, "Jesus' death is consistently tied to the language of witness and of victory."[78] In chapters 2-3 in particular, the Risen Christ speaks through John to exhort the communities to embrace a life that will inevitably result in suffering and conflict but also victory. Christ's own witness is held up as the example for emulation, as is indicated by the first christological title in the Apocalypse, ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστός, "the faithful witness" (1:5). This precise title is repeated of Christ in 3:14 and is alluded to for those who are slain (6:9, μαρτυρίαν); for those whose witness is such that they do not even shrink from death (12:11, μαρτυρίας αὐτῶν); for those who suffer "war" (12:17, ἐχόντων τὴν μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦ); and for the beheaded (20:4, μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦ). Witnessing in the Apocalypse is thus connected to Christ's own witness. To be a witness is to be willing to suffer in emulation of Christ's faithful witness.[79]

Rev 13:7-10 supports the theme of suffering as faithful witness by the use of the title "the Lamb who was slaughtered." Regardless of how one solves the syntactical dilemma, the Lamb's death is held up as an example for the holy ones who are defeated by the beast in 13:7 and 11:8 (cf. 12:17). When the prepositional phrase is read with this title and

---

[77] See Susan Matthews, "Salvific Suffering in John's Apocalypse" in *The Bible and Suffering. Social and Political Implications* (ed. Anthony Tambasco; New York/Mahwah, NJ: Paulist, 2001) 188-209.

[78] Johns, *Lamb Christology,* 169.

[79] For Blount (*Can I Get A Witness,* x), the Slaughtered Lamb is "the prototypical witness figure, who models the ethic of confrontation that John expects" from his hearers.

the aspectual nuance mentioned above, the audiences are reminded that their seeming defeat is the way the world has always been, as the Lamb's death attests.

## *(f) Direct Address to the Audiences in 13:9-10*

The shift to direct address in 13:9-10 is a dramatic instance of paranesis that calls the communities to faithful endurance. The adjectival noun οἱ ἅγιοι, "holy ones," in vv 7 and 10 acts as an inclusio binding the defeat of the holy ones at the hands of the beast to the call for faithful endurance (cf. 12:17). The ancient audiences would have heard the passage within the context of the larger work, and thus the defeats that God's holy ones have experienced (v 7) and the *thlipsis* they are experiencing in the κόσμος, will cease when God's empire descends to earth to become the kingdom of the κόσμος (Revelation 21-22). Until this transformation, the parenesis of 13:10 exhorts the holy ones to endure the suffering faithfully.

The reference to the slaughter of the Lamb in v 8 links Jesus' witness to their suffering witness. The value of witnessing in the Apocalypse depends on it being a continuation of Jesus' witness.[80] It thus makes sense for John to link the hearers' suffering and defeat with Christ's death. Revelation 13:7-10 exhorts the audiences to recognize their suffering as an imitation of the Lamb's witness.

## Conclusions

First, the easiest solution to the syntactical problem of Rev 13:8b is to read the prepositional phrase ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου with γέγραπται.

Second, however one reads the syntax, the preposition ἀπό is not synonymous with πρό and ἀπό does not bear the meaning "before." This common mistake may reflect the influence of the RSV translation or hasty efforts to understand the verse in terms of 1 Pet 1:20.

Third, it is difficult to determine the best translation for τοῦ ἀρνίου τοῦ ἐσφαγμένου. The gloss "the Lamb [who] is slaughtered" is weighted to the parenesis in 13:10 with its present verbs in the direct address to the

---

[80] Bauckham, *Theology,* 75.

audience. Also possible is the gloss, "the Lamb [who] was slaughtered," in which case the past context of the narrative is established by the temporal anteriority of the crucifixion as it is linked to the past experiences of the suffering of Israel's holy ones in 13:1-7 (with heavy use of default aorist in those verses). Moreover, when τοῦ ἀρνίου τοῦ ἐσφαγμένου is read with ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου a past tense gloss is required, but it would be a mistake to assume that the phrase even in this case must refer *solely* to the time-bound event of the historical crucifixion. John of Patmos was capable of thinking of the crucifixion as an event in history (5:6) that transcends place (11:8) and perhaps even time (13:8).

Fourth, this study has emphasized the relative temporal valency of the Greek participle and has presupposed that aspect in Greek is essentially non-temporal and concerns the subjective conception of the process as conveyed by the speaker. Whether the event of the crucifixion is being referred to in 13:8b as a specific event at a fixed point in time cannot be determined by the aspectual force of the participle but rather is a matter of lexis in context.[81] As strange as it may seem *prima facie*, the phrase τοῦ ἀρνίου τοῦ ἐσφαγμένου may not refer solely to the historical event of the crucifixion, in which case it can be read with ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου. In particular, the stative aspect of the perfect participle may support the reading that the Lamb's death transcends time and place, as Thompson and Stuckenbruck have maintained but without applying grammatical reasoning. It is significant that the crucifixion symbolically transcends place in Rev 11:8. Nonetheless, even if one embraces the understanding of the aspect of the perfect participle as stative, which is not universally accepted,[82] it must be admitted that John twice anchors the Lamb's death as an event in history (5:9 and 11:8; cf. 1:5).

John seems to have chosen the perfect aspect in 13:8 *to allow* the Lamb's slaughter to be conceptualized in a way that is larger than a specific event fixed in time while in no way denying historical anteriority. I have thus argued that it is *possible* to make sense grammatically of reading τοῦ ἀρνίου τοῦ ἐσφαγμένου with ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου. There is a difference, of course, between what is possible and what is probable. My point here is only that scholars should be up-front about the

---

[81] See Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 259.

[82] Campbell, for instance, argues against stativity as aspectual. See his *Verbal Aspect, the Indicative Mood, and Narrative*, esp. 166-75.

grammatical basis for whatever position is taken regarding this verse, which requires clarification about where one stands in the ongoing debate about aspect theory for understanding the Greek verbal system. The debate about perfect aspect in particular is far from settled.[83]

In utilizing discourse analysis, I have argued that John's Apocalypse consistently uses the foreground aspect, the perfect participle of σφαζεῖν and of ἵστημι, to refer to the reality of the Lamb's death-resurrection in a discrete and contoured way (so 5:6, 12; 13:8) rather than the background default aspect available in the aorist system (employed in 5:9). The perfect system expresses the theological complexity of the death-resurrection, the crucified and risen state of the Lamb in 5:6, 12 and 13:8. That is, John employs perfect participles to describe the Lamb's condition as risen and slain: the Lamb is in a risen state despite and as a result of the slain condition. No other verbal aspect communicates this theological idea in Greek better than the perfect.

Fifth, there is no need to appeal to Semitic interference to explain the use of the perfect passive participle in Rev 13:8 as it falls within the range of legitimate Greek uses of the perfect. This conclusion in no way detracts from the highly Semitic flavor of this ancient text.

Sixth, Rev 13:8 depicts the Lamb's slaughter as paradigmatic of faithful witness in the face of the destructive drive of the beast against the holy ones throughout history. John inserts τοῦ ἀρνίου τοῦ ἐσφαγμένου in 13:8 (and not in 17:8) primarily to link the Lamb's slaughter to the witness of the holy ones in the direct address to the audience in 13:9-10. The Lamb's suffering is paradigmatic for the ancient audiences' faithful endurance unto death at the hands of the beast, the Roman Empire. Revelation 13:8-10 is part of the theme of linking Christ's faithful witness unto death with the patient endurance of the holy ones, who will likewise experience resurrection and the rewards of God's βασιλεία (1:2, 5, 9; 5:5-6; 11:7-8; 12:10-11; cf. 3:14; 22:20).

Seventh, the lexeme κόσμος has a strong negative connotation when the prepositional phrase is read with τοῦ ἀρνίου τοῦ ἐσφαγμένου. If the perfect participle relates the Lamb's state or status as slain "from the foundation of the world," the prepositional phrase alludes to the κόσμος as the place that has always been the realm of the beast, where God's

---

[83] It is sobering to read Campbell's characterization of the perfect as "unquestionably one of the most controversial and difficult facets of the Greek verbal system" (ibid., 161).

righteous have always suffered at the hands of those who follow the beast. In this reading, the κόσμος is the place of *thlipsis* for God's holy ones who suffer defeat (11:7-10 and 13:5-7), as did the Lamb, and where all the inhabitants of the earth give obeisance to the beast. Rev 13:1-10 focuses on both the agent of the violent actions, the beast/empire, and on the object of the actions, the Lamb and his holy ones. The extended parody of the beast with the Lamb includes the defeat of the holy ones by the beast (v 7) and an exhortation to the audience (v 10) to imitate the Lamb's faithful witness when confronted by violence. The Apocalypse emphasizes the paradox that defeat is actually victory for Christ and for his followers if they follow his example by conquering as he did (νικῶν 2:11, 26; 3:5, 12, 21; 21:7; τῷ νικῶντι 2:7,17; τοὺς νικῶντας 15:2; ἐνίκησαν 12:11). The ancient audiences are exhorted not to take up the sword against God's enemies (13:10), "for such is the endurance of the holy ones."

# Part Four

---

# Linguistic Studies

# The Language of Creation
## in Ben Sira: חלק = *κτίζω*

M. O'Connor

Although LXX Gen 1:1 employs the verb ποιέω "to make, do" to represent the Hebrew term ברא "to create," the common Septuagintal and NT word for "create" is κτίζω. Among its more than sixty Septuagintal occurrences are 23 in Ben Sira, including 15 where a Hebrew text is extant. What is unusual is that at least six times in the book κτίζω represents חלק, a Hebrew verb not attested with the meaning "create" in the MT.[1]

---

[1] Greek κτίζω is used to render a variety of other Hebrew terms in Ben Sira: 10:18, "Arrogance is not fitting (נאוה) for humans," Greek, "He did not create arrogance for humans"; 33:10, "From the dust humankind was formed (נוצר)," Greek, "From the earth Adam was created"; 38:4, "God draws (מוציא) healing things from the earth," margin, "God created (ברא) spices from the earth," Greek, "God created from the earth medicines"; 38:12, "For of him too there is a need," Greek, "For surely the Lord created him"; 39:21, "Everything was chosen (נבחר) for its purpose (צרכו)," Greek, "All things were created for their services"; 39:29, "These were created (נבראו) for a reason (?, משפט)," Greek, "All these were created for vengeance"; 40:10, "For the wicked evil was created (נבראה)," Greek, "All these things were created for the lawless"; 49:14, Hebrew, "Few were created (נוצר[ו]) on earth like Enoch," Greek, "None was created like Enoch." Other examples of the verb in Greek have no corresponding extant Hebrew text. For comments on the use of צרך, see Menahem Kister, "Some Notes on Biblical Expressions and Allusions and the Lexicography of Ben Sira," in *Sirach, Scrolls, and Sages* (ed. Takamitsu Muraoka and John F. Elwolde; STDJ 33; Leiden: Brill, 1999) 160-87, here 164 n. 16. For an earlier review of the occurrences of *ḥlq* in Ben Sira, with references to older literature, see Gian Luigi Prato, *Il problema della teodicea in Ben Sira* (AnBib 65; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1975) 389-91. In his list, note that the first case (6:16) should be 16:16, while the twelfth (6:23) should be 26:3, and also that the occurrence in 15:9 is taken from the margin. Prato's inclina-

To be sure, the words used of divine creation are diverse; sometimes ordinary vocabulary of making and doing is used, and sometimes specialized vocabulary is preferred. In English the basic contrast is between the Germanic word stock (e.g., 'to make') and the Latinate word stock (e.g., 'to create'). In the classical Semitic languages similar alternations between ordinary and specialized terms are also found. In Hebrew, the common verb עשה "to make, do" can be used of divine action: when Job makes his profession of innocence in Job 31:15, he claims that he was fair in his treatment of each of his servants, male and female, because of divine precedent: הלא־בבטן עשני עשהו ("Did not the one who made me in the womb make him?"). Biblical Hebrew also has a specialized term, ברא, used of divine creation, chiefly in Second Isaiah and in the Priestly writer's contributions to the Pentateuch. However, I want to discuss here another Hebrew word generally restricted to divine creation.

The basic Arabic term for divine acts of creation is *xalaqa*, seen in the usual translations of the opening of Genesis *fī l-badʾi xalaqa llāhu l-samawāti wa-l-ʾarḍa* ("In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth").[2] The grammatical problem in the Hebrew text (the rare use of a construct noun before a verb) is reflected in Saadia Gaon's translation: *ʾawwalu maʾ xalaqa ʾallāhu ʾal-samāʾwāti waʾal-ʾarḍa* ("First God created the heavens and the earth").[3] A cognate of

---

tion is to underestimate the number of instances of "create," but his arguments are incomplete.

[2] With minor variants (*l-badī*, *l-samāʾa*), this is the translation found in (a) the Roman translation of the Arabic Bible, *Biblia sacra arabica* (Rome: Propaganda fidei, 1671), a translation begun under the aegis of Urban VIII in 1625; (b) the Jesuit translation, *Biblia arabica* (1st ed., Mosul, 1871; 1st Beirut ed., Beirut: Missionary Press, 1879; 2d Beirut ed., Beirut: Missionary Press, 1883); (c) the *New Arabic Version* (New Cairo: United Bible Societies, 1988, 2d ed. 2003). For help with these materials in the Semitics/ICOR Library at the Catholic University, I am grateful to my colleagues in Semitics, Drs. Shawqi Talia and Monica Blanchard.

[3] I have loosely reflected Saadia's Hebrew orthography in normalizing his Arabic. Saadia Gaon, *Oeuvres complètes de R. Saadia ben Iosef al-Fayyoumi. Vol I. Version arabe de Pentateuque* (ed. Joseph Derenbourg; Paris: Leroux, 1893), 1. A less successful attempt to reflect the problem is found in Brian Walton's London Polyglot, *ʾawwalu mā xalaqa llāhu l-samāʾu wa-l-ʾarḍu*; the accompanying Latin gloss renders this, "Primum quod creavit Deus, fuit caelum et terra"; see Brian Walton, ed., *The London Polyglot* (London: Roycroft, 1657), based on the Paris Polyglot and the Selden manuscripts at Oxford. On the grammatical problem in the Hebrew, see, e.g., Bruce

this Arabic verb is found in Hebrew but only rarely and only in the late Second Temple period.

## I. The Semitic Roots in *xlq* and *ḥlq*

A given Semitic language may have identical configurations of radicals (root-shapes) with distinct senses. Some such developments can be explained as the result of phonological changes (generally, mergers), but some have no clear or plain explanation and are simply a fact of the language.[4] A well-known example is Heb *mšl* I "to compare" (Common Semitic *mθl*) and *mšl* II "to rule" (no evidence for the root outside Northwest Semitic); the two roots, aside from their shared shape, have no relationship. The problem of root-shapes is related to the more notorious problems of homonymy (involving, roughly, distinct lexical entries, e.g., *kôs* "cup" and *kôs* "screech owl") and polysemy (involving distinct lexical "senses," e.g., *báyit* "house (physical structure)"; "household, family").[5] Judgments about these matters are determined by the available span of data. Hebrew words in *ʿlm* might seem to refer to age and time, but in truth *ʿélem* "youth" and *ʿôlām* "eternity" are not historically related, as Arabic *ġulām* "youth" and *ʿālam* "world" (also the sense in later Hebrew) indicate.

The Common Semitic root-shape *xlq* is associated with four apparently distinct roots: (1) Akkadian *ḫalāqu* "to disappear, be lost," with cognates in Ugaritic and Ethiopic; (2) Arabic *xalaqa* "to create," the topic here; (3) Arabic *xalaqa* "to be smooth," cognate to Heb *ḥālaq* "to be smooth, slippery, deceitful"; and (4) Arabic *xalaqa* "to measure," cognate to Hebrew *ḥālaq* "to divide, apportion" and Aramaic "to assign, destine."[6] The root-shape *ḥlq* "to shave, peel" is best attested

---

K. Waltke and M. O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990) 645.

[4] M. O'Connor, "Semitic Lexicography: European Dictionaries of Biblical Hebrew in the Twentieth Century," in *Semitic Linguistics: The State of the Art at the Turn of the Twenty-First Century* (ed. S. Izreel; Israel Oriental Studies 20; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2002) 173-212, here 179-81.

[5] Ibid., 175 n. 2.

[6] The diversity of meanings for the last of these is worth a fuller study. Gad B. Sarfatti, in "Mishnaic Vocabulary and Mishnaic Literature as Tools for the Study of Biblical Semantics," in *Studies in Ancient Hebrew Semantics* (ed. Takamitsu Muraoka; Abr-Nahrain Supplement 4; Louvain: Peeters, 1995) 33-48, here 37, notes, "The dialectic

in Arabic; its occurrence elsewhere is unclear and disputed. Arguments drawing together one or another of the four senses isolated here for *xlq* could be formulated, but these four senses seem to be distinct.[7]

Various proposals have been made in recent decades proposing "new" roots and "new" senses for Biblical Hebrew *ḥlq*, but none of these stand up to scrutiny. BDB's account of *ḥlq* I "to divide, share" and *ḥlq* II "to be smooth, slippery" is basically correct.[8] The more elaborate accounts in *HALAT/ HALOT* and the Sheffield Dictionary are unnecessary, despite the difficulty of some of the passages involved in the new proposals.[9] In particular, Biblical Hebrew has no root *\*ḥālaq* III "to perish," Piel "to destroy" (proposed for, e.g., Isa 57:6; Lam 4:16).

## II. Ancient Hebrew *ḥlq* "to create"

Given that *xalaqa* is used chiefly of creation in Arabic and that it seems not to be found in older Northwest Semitic material with this sense, it is a surprise to find it used in the Hebrew and perhaps the Aramaic of the Late Second Temple Period. The term is translated κτίζω, so it seems to have been familiar to a range of educated Jews in the ancient period. This view is generally accepted.[10] The term is found

---

and legal vocabulary of MH [Mishnaic, strictly Tannaitic, Hebrew] . . . was nearly entirely built up by changing the meaning of Biblical words from abstract to concrete." One of his examples is "*ḥlq* = divide > contradict."

[7] For fuller discussion with references, see M. O'Connor, "Polysemy in the Hebrew Lexicon: The Case of Root-Shape *ḥlq*," in *". . . der seine Lust hat am Wort des Herrn!" Festschrift für Ernst Jenni zum 80. Geburtstag* (ed. J. Luchsinger et al.; AOAT 336; Münster: Ugarit, 2007) 258-68. To the discussion of the Amarna occurrence (EA 274:14) there (in note 19), add Anson F. Rainey, *Canaanite in the Amarna Tablets* (Handbuch der Orientalistik 1.25; 4 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1996) 2. 69-70.

[8] These attempts are reviewed in O'Connor, "Polysemy." To the discussion, the study of Norman M. Bronznick, "The Meaning of *dwršy ḥlqwt*," *Tarbiz* 60 (1990) 653-57 should be added. Bronznick's argument connects the Rabbinic usage of *ḥlqwt* "smooth > empty things" to the Qumran phrase *dwršy ḥlqwt* "seekers after smooth things" > "vacuous exegetes." His attempt to connect this semantic extension to the isolated phrase Ugaritic *yn xlq*, rendering it "flat wine" (p. 654) is, given the exiguous character of the Ugaritic accounting documents, difficult to argue for. His proposal that *ḥlq* in Sir 33:13 means "empty," so that after creation a human being appears "empty > shapeless" before God, seems unrelated to his basic semantic proposal and most unlikely.

[9] The Sheffield dictionary, still underway, is David J. A. Clines and John Elwolde, et al., *Dictionary of Classical Hebrew* (6 vols. +; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993-).

[10] There has been some hesitation. For example, the great Theodor Nöldeke, in an early study on Ben Sira ("Bemerkungen zum hebräischen Ben Sira," *ZAW* 20

in Ben Sira, in the medieval Hebrew manuscripts. This proposal was, however, roundly rejected by Patrick W. Skehan: "*ḥlq* in the meaning 'create' is no part of the authentic language of Ben Sira, even in those passages where G[reek] uses *ktizein* to translate the verb."[11] The logic is unparsable.[12] If the language is not "authentic," are we to think of the usage as contamination in the medieval manuscripts by Arabic-speaking scribes? But the author(s) of the Greek Ben Sira knew the word: how could they know it authentically without Ben Sira's knowing it as well?[13]

Ben Sira is familiar with the biblical vocabulary of division and allotment.[14] In the sense "to divide" the verb occurs in 45:22, where Aaron does not share in the tribal land division; the Greek uses a different construction. It is also found in 16:16, referring to "his light and

---

(1900) 81-94, here 85), argued that the Hebrew occurrences of *ḥlq* "to create" are the end of a development from "divide" to "assign" to "establish," but this hardly explains the translation of the occurrences by κτίζω (and Syriac *brʾ*), and the rethinking of the semantics of the root that Nöldeke claims to see is not reflected in the ancient translations. Nöldeke cautions, "Die Bedeutungsentwicklung kann durchs Arabische nicht beeinflusst worden sein" (p. 86), but the present proposal does not require such influence. A simple fact is worth repeating: the ancient Hebrew lexicon is only partially known to us.

[11] See Patrick W. Skehan and Alexander A. Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira* (AB 39; New York: Doubleday, 1987) 396, cf. 441. So too Prato, *Il problema della teodicea*, 390.

[12] It is possible that Skehan is simply following Nöldeke's view ("Bemerkungen," 86): "Von einem Arabismus bei einem so alten hebräischen Schriftsteller zu reden, wäre ungefähr, als wollte man bei Herodot einen Latinismus nachweisen," but Nöldeke seems to allow for the meaning "create."

[13] It may not be generally appreciated that Skehan was himself skilled in Arabic and directed the dissertation that resulted in Richard M. Frank's edition of the Arabic Ben Sira, *The Wisdom of Jesus Ben Sirach (Sinai Ar. 155, ixth/xth Cent.)* (2 vols.; CSCO 357-358, Ar. 30-31; Leuven: CSCO, 1974).

[14] The Hebrew is cited from Zeev Ben-Ḥayyim, *The Book of Ben Sira* (Historical Dictionary of the Hebrew Language; Jerusalem: Academy of the Hebrew Language and the Shrine of the Book, 1973), and the Greek from Joseph Ziegler, *Sapientia Jesu Filii Sirach* (Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum 12/2; 2d ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980); for the passages where Ziegler has renumbered the Greek to agree with the Hebrew, the page number of his edition is given. The basic commentary remains that of Skehan and Di Lella, although Di Lella and his students have written a great deal since, and interest in Ben Sira in both Europe and Israel continues to grow. For the CUA graduates and some Europeans, see *Intertextual Studies in Ben Sira and Tobit: Essays in Honor of Alexander A. Di Lella, O.F.M.* (ed. Jeremy Corley and Vincent T. M. Skemp; CBQMS 38; Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2005). For the Israelis and other Europeans, see below. The older commentary and edition of Moshe Z. Segal remains useful, *The Complete Book of Ben Sira* (2d ed.; Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 1958 [Hebrew]).

his darkness" being apportioned (Heb חלק, Greek ἐμέρισε) to human-kind.[15] In the medieval Hebrew manuscripts the noun *ḥēleq* "portion" is found about six times, of the priestly portion (7:31, priests in general; 45:20, Aaron); of tribal divisions (44:23); and of a person's allotment in life, 14:9; 26:3; 41:4 (specifically of death as a universal human share).[16] In 14:9 Ben Sira repeats the term three times:[17]

| | |
|---|---|
| Sir 14:9a | בעין כושל מעטהו חלקו |
| Sir 14:9b | ולוקח חלק רעהו מאבד חלקו |

In the eye of the stumbler his portion is too small.[18]
The one who seizes his friend's share destroys his own share.

The use of כושל "stumbler" for an evil or lazy person is not common, but it is understandable.[19] The word play is heightened by the use of לקח in the second line. The Greek is quite different, although the common wisdom theme of evil being its own punishment shines through here.

| | |
|---|---|
| Sir 14:9a | πλεονέκτου ὀφθαλμὸς οὐκ ἐμπίπλαται μερίδι |

The eye of the covetous is not satisfied with a portion.

The unusually punning Hebrew was endorsed by Moshe Z. Segal but dispatched by Skehan, a typical disagreement between these authorities.[20] One further example of *ḥéleq*, in 33:13d, is very difficult.[21] The

---

[15] Read for MS A's ושבחו "and his praise" the form suggested by Skehan and Di Lella, וחשכו "and his darkness" (*Ben Sira*, 268); they also suggest that 16:15-16 is a gloss (p. 270). It may be that *ḥlq* here should be rendered "he created"; note that the first line of the verse refers to בריותיו "his creatures," translated with κτίσις.

[16] Note the proximity of the Hebrew noun in 45:20 to the verb in 45:22; the Greek uses a verb in 45:20 and a noun in 45:22. Ordinarily the noun is rendered μερίς, but in 41:4 we have κρίμα (perhaps rendering חוק rather than חלק). In 26:3, Segal (*Ben Sira*, 156) reads בחיק, i.e., "she [the good wife] is put in the bosom of the God-fearer."

[17] On the Syriac of this verse, see Prato, *Il problema della teodicea*, 389 n. 8.

[18] Following the Hebrew Academy edition, take מעטהו as מעט הוא.

[19] See Segal, *Ben Sira*, 90, for parallels. The common extended meaning in the Bible has to do with weakness; see Christoph Barth, "*kāšal*," *TDOT* 7 (1995) 353-60, here 355. Stumbling and making others stumble (scandalizing) does play a role in Proverbs 4; cf. Barth, "*kāšal*," 357.

[20] See Segal, *Ben Sira*, 90; Skehan and Di Lella, *Ben Sira*, 258.

[21] Much of the Hebrew of the verse is damaged, although the relevant line, the last one, is preserved. The Greek of 33:13d (Ziegler, *Sapientia Jesu Filii Sirach*, 279)

noun *mḥlqt* "portion" is also found in 41:21, while the same noun appears in the sense of "division" in 42:3.[22]

The remaining seven or so verbal uses of *ḥlq* are best taken as "to create" and are rendered with κτίζω.[23] Both Qal and Niphal forms are found, and the subject, when it is explicit, is always God. It is doubtless possible to argue that one instance or another can just as well be rendered "to allot" but the weight of the examples together makes such arguments difficult.

In the Qal examples, the objects can be abstract, "good things" and "great struggle."

| | |
|---|---|
| Sir 39:25a | . . . לטוב חלק מראש |
| | ἀγαθὰ τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς ἔκτισται ἀπ' ἀρχῆς |
| | Good things are created for the good from the beginning.[24] |
| Sir 40:1a | עסק גדול חלק אל |
| Sir 40:1b | ועול כבד על בני אדם |
| | ἀσχολία μεγάλη ἔκτισται παντὶ ἀνθρώπῳ |
| | καὶ ζυγὸς βαρὺς ἐπὶ υἱοὺς Αδαμ |
| | Great struggle was created for every human |
| | and a heavy yoke upon the children of Adam.[25] |

here has ἀποδοῦναι αὐτοῖς κατὰ τὴν κρίσιν αὐτου "[for God] to give to them according to his judgment" (cf. *NRSV*, "to be given whatever he decides"); the fragmentary Hebrew is להתיצב מפניו חלק "to set up from him a portion." See Skehan and Di Lella, *Ben Sira*, 396. Following the Hebrew Academy edition, the Sheffield dictionary (4. 243b) takes the word here as *ḥālāq* "creature" and renders, "that a creature may stand before him." Bronznick ("The Meaning of *dwršy ḥlqwt*") proposes "to stand before him devoid of shape," which seems unlikely. Tadeusz Penar's proposal to take *ḥlq* as "Creator" seems improbable, and the grammar of his translation of *mpnyw ḥlq* as "in front of his Creator" is dubious (*Northwest Semitic Philology and the Hebrew Fragments of Ben Sira* [BibOr 28; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1975] 55). On this crux, see also Prato, *Il problema della teodicea*, 15, 20, 42-43 n. 60.

[22] The Greek of 41:21 has μερίς.

[23] Three of these are cited in *HAL* as examples of Hebrew *ḥlq* "to divide, allot": 38:1; 39:25; 44:2.

[24] The Hebrew of the first line of the verse is broken, and the contrast in the following line is not clear: in fact, the Hebrew seems to claim that God created both good and bad things for the wicked (כן לרעים טוב ורע), while the Greek claims that sinners get only bad things (οὕτως τοῖς ἁμαρτωλοῖς κακά); see further Segal, *Ben Sira*, 264, and Skehan and Di Lella, *Ben Sira*, 455.

[25] The term עסק apparently reflects both biblical עשׂק and עשׁק; thus the exact sense is not clear. Cf. "a great anxiety," Skehan and Di Lella, *Ben Sira*, 462, and "hard work," *NRSV*.

The objects in other cases are more concrete, the "eye" and the "physician."

Sir 31:13b      רע מעין לא חלק אל
God created nothing more evil than the eye.

Sir 31:13b      *πονηρότερον ὀφθαλμοῦ τί ἔκτισται;*[26]
What was created more evil than the eye?

The Greek is framed as a question, perhaps to cushion suspicions of blasphemy; elsewhere in the verse, the Greek refers to the ὀφθαλμὸς πονηρός "the evil eye," a favorite (and safer) theme in Ben Sira.

Sir 38:1a      רעי רופא לפני צרכו
Sir 38:1b      גם אתו חלק אל
Care for the doctor according to[27] his need.
God created him as well.

Sir 38:1a      *τίμα ἰατρὸν πρὸς τας χρείας αὐτοῦ,*
Sir 38:1b      *καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸν ἔκτισεν κύριος*
Honor the doctor for his services,[28]
for surely the Lord created him.

Similarly in the Niphal cases the objects may be abstract ("work") or concrete ("wine").

Sir 7:15a      אל תאיץ בצבא מלאכת עבדה
Sir 7:15b      הי כאל נחלקה
Do not hurry the service of the job of work[29]
for it was created as if from God.[30]

---

[26] Ziegler, *Sapientia Jesu Filii Sirach*, 270. The Hebrew manuscript of 31:13 also has the saying: "God hates the evil-eyed, and more evil than him he has not created (ברא)."

[27] Probably read לפי, with Skehan and Di Lella, *Ben Sira*, 438-39.

[28] A variant adds *τιμαῖς αὐτοῦ* "with his honoraria"; for this sense of *τιμή*, see BDAG, "*τιμή*," 2*a* and 3.

[29] Is there a double reading here, in the sense of Shemaryahu Talmon's "synonymous reading"? See his "Synonymous Readings in the Textual Traditions of the Old Testament," in *Studies in the Bible* (ed. Chaim Rabin; ScrHier 8; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1961) 335-83.

[30] Skehan and Di Lella, *Ben Sira*, 198, propose reading מאל, perhaps correctly.

Sir 7:15a   μὴ μισήσῃς ἐπίπονον ἐργασίαν
Sir 7:15b   καὶ γεωργίαν ὑπὸ ὑψίστου ἐκτισμένην
            Do not hate hard work
            and farming, created by the Most High.

Sir 31:27c   חיי מה לחסר תירוש
Sir 31:27d   והוא לגיל נחלק מראש
Sir 31:27c   τίς ζωὴ ἐλασσουμένῳ οἴνῳ;
Sir 31:27d   καὶ αὐτὸς ἔκτισται εἰς εὐφροσύνην ἀπ' ἀρχῆς[31]
             What is life to one who lacks wine?
             It was created for joy from the beginning.

These six cases of Heb *ḥlq* rendered by Greek κτίζω refer always to divine action, and the objects of the action are equally divided between abstract and concrete objects. There is one remaining case in which the Greek uses a form of κτίζω, probably wrongly, having mistaken the syntax of the passage. It involves the long and complex catalogue that opens the Praise of the Ancestors passage (Sir 44:1—49:16).[32] Since there is not sufficient space to rehearse fully the relevant difficulties, only the basic facts will be presented. The Greek read a verb.

Sir 44:2a   πολλὴν δόξαν ἔκτισεν ὁ κύριος,
Sir 44:2b   τὴν μεγαλωσύνην αὐτοῦ ἀπ' αἰῶνος
            The Lord created much glory,
            his own majesty from the ages.

The preceding verse speaks of the revered ancestors in general, and the following verse begins the catalog of various categories of ancestors, beginning with civil rulers. The Greek seems to treat v. 2 as a digression, hardly an inspiring translation.[33] The Hebrew can be taken

---

[31] Ziegler, *Sapientia Jesu Filii Sirach*, 273. In most manuscripts the sentence ends with ἀνθρώποις "for human beings."

[32] I am grateful here to Charles Sommer, who is preparing a dissertation on kingship in the Praise of the Ancestors, for his assistance, though I am solely responsible for this presentation. 44:2 is discussed in Patrick W. Skehan, "Staves, and Nails, and Scribal Slips (Ben Sira 44:2-5)," *BASOR* 200 (1970) 66-71, here 70-71. Skehan's hermeneutical key here is Deut 32:7-9.

[33] This problem is acknowledged by Skehan ("Staves," 71), who identifies all Israel as *ḥlq ʿlywn*, "the Most High's portion." Surely the point of the poem is that the spe-

rather as specifying terms that elucidate the relationship of these people to God, just as the previous verse speaks of them as אבותינו "our ancestors." This involves reading חלק not as a verb but as a noun and taking the two clauses as verbless.

| Sir 44:2a | רב כבוד חלק עליון |
|---|---|
| Sir 44:2b | וגדלו מימות עולם |
| | The Most High's portion is weighty glory. |
| | His greatness is eternal. |

The godly men (אנשי חסד), who are ancestors to us, are God's glory and greatness.

There may be Aramaic evidence for the verb *ḥlq* "to create" from Ben Sira's time or slightly later. In the portions of the Enochic Book of Watchers found at Qumran, Enoch announces his divine commission in these terms: "Accordingly *he has created me and given me* the word of understanding so that I may reprimand the Watchers, the children of heaven" (*1 Enoch* 14:3, Ethiopic).[34] The Aramaic fragments at Qumran include the equivalent of the italicized words, but the formulation is quite different: ליא חלק ועבד וברא, which Jozef T. Milik renders, "so He has decreed and made and created me."[35] Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar similarly render, "he has intended and made and created me."[36] The use of חלק in immediate proximity to other words of making raises the suspicion that Aramaic (or at least literary Aramaic) of the Second Temple Period also used *ḥlq* 'to create', but the question deserves further study by Aramaists.

---

cial categories of people to be identified in the catalog (and thus *not* all Israel) constitute the real glorification of God.

[34] Ephraim Isaac, "1 (Ethiopic Apocalypse of) Enoch," *OTP* (ed. James H. Charlesworth; 2 vols.; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983-1985) 1. 5-89, here 1. 20. Italics added.

[35] For the text of 4QEnᶜ 1 vi (= *1 Enoch* 13:6—14:16), see Jozef T. Milik, with Matthew Black, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976), 192-99, text 193, translation 195. Milik comments that "חלק is not the Hebrew 'to divide out, to give,' but the Aramaic 'to decree, to destine, to predestine'" (p. 197). Milik's restorations of the verb and related nouns elsewhere in this passage are omitted here.

[36] See Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1997) 1. 415.

# III. The Vocabulary of Late Second
# Temple Period Hebrew

With the full publication of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Ben Sira has suddenly come to have a literary context, and the Hebrew of the late Second Temple period has been closely studied in recent years. The results of much of this work have been published in the proceedings of three conferences organized by Takamitsu Muraoka and John F. Elwolde.[37] The Qumran scrolls and Ben Sira document the era after Biblical Hebrew and prior to Tannaitic Hebrew, and recent descriptions of syntax, lexicon, and literary usage demonstrate that there were various lines of development underway, few of them straightforward or entirely predictable.[38]

The evidence is valuable. As Elisha Qimron has insisted, the Dead Sea Scrolls (including the Masada Ben Sira but not the medieval Ben Sira manuscripts) are the largest body of archeologically dated Hebrew.[39] At the same time, the evidence is often thin, and the interpretation remains in early stages.[40] "The data," as John F. Elwolde notes, "enable

---

[37] Besides their volume *Sirach, Scrolls, and Sages* (already noted), see Takamitsu Muraoka and John F. Elwolde, eds., *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira* (STDJ 26; Leiden: Brill, 1997); Muraoka and Elwolde, eds., *Diggers at the Well* (STDJ 36; Leiden: Brill, 2000).

[38] For John F. Elwolde's survey of Hebrew vocabulary based on the first seven letters of *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew* (Sheffield), see his "Developments in Hebrew Vocabulary Between Bible and Mishnah," in *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira* (ed. Muraoka and Elwolde), 17-55. He isolates the four subcorpora of Classical Hebrew texts in the Sheffield dictionary (Bible, Ben Sira, DSS, inscriptions), but is very cautious about periodizations of Hebrew's history (pp. 48-55).

[39] See especially Elisha Qimron, "The Biblical Lexicon in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Dead Sea Discoveries* 2 (1995) 295-329; idem, "Observations on the History of Early Hebrew (1000 B.C.E.-200 C.E.) in Light of the Dead Sea Documents," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research* (ed. Devorah Dimant and Uriel Rappaport; STDJ 10; Leiden: Brill, 1992) 349-61.

[40] It is for the last reason that many have criticized the mixture of language material found in the Sheffield dictionary; see O'Connor, "Semitic Lexicography," with references; for a contrary view, see Steven E. Fassberg, "Review of Sheffield I 1992," *Dead Sea Discoveries* 2 (1995) 355-57. David J. A. Clines, the initiator and head of the project, was concerned to step away from allowing canonical determinations to be involved in lexicography. One can endorse this concern without feeling that he and his team properly thought through the consequences of their decision.

only the most tentative conclusions to be drawn."[41] Ben Sira's use of *ḥlq* "to create" must play some role in the accounting for the history of the Hebrew lexicon, but it must be a modest one. The fullest recent account of Ben Sira's work in terms of the history of Hebrew language and literature is Menahem Kister's essay, and he includes *ḥlq* "to create" in the small sample of expressions "attested neither in Hebrew nor in Aramaic."[42] The evidence of translations with κτίζω is crucial to this understanding.[43]

---

[41] Elwolde, "Developments," 18. A distinctive form of argumentation, responsive to the character of the Qumran community as a Tanakh-reading body, is offered in Shelomo Morag's last paper, "On Some Concepts in the World of Qumran: Polysemy and Semantic Development," in *Diggers at the Well* (ed. Muraoka and Elwolde), 178-92. For a perspective based in a long view of post-exilic Hebrew, see Avi Hurvitz, "The Linguistic Status of Ben Sira as a Link Between Biblical and Mishnaic Hebrew: Lexicographic Aspects," in *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira* (ed. Muraoka and Elwolde), 72-86.

[42] See Kister, "Some Notes on Biblical Expressions and Allusions," 161. Kister, following Z. Ben-Ḥayyim, alludes to the Enoch fragment cited above as evidence of *ḥlq* "to create" in Qumran Aramaic; as already noted, this requires further study.

[43] It is the sad duty of the editors to add that Prof. O'Connor passed away on June 16, 2007. May he rest in peace.

# The Septuagint as Interpretative Translation and the Complex Background to *κατανύσσομαι* in Acts 2:37

SHAWN W. FLYNN

The verb *κατανύσσομαι* occurs once in the NT, describing the crowd's reaction to Peter's Pentecost speech: "They were stabbed (*κατενύγησαν*) to the heart and said to Peter and the rest of the apostles: 'Brothers, what must we do?'" (Acts 2:37).[1] The context here is generally positive, since the listeners seem to be responding to the risen Christ. But they are also responding to the charge of being responsible for Christ's death (Acts 2:23, 36), and as a result they are told by Peter to repent (Acts 2:37). Various NT commentators believe that the verb has a wide range of meaning.[2] Yet the usage of *κατανύσσομαι* in a particular context

---

[1] The Greek witnesses agree in attesting the neologism, despite some textual differences in the wording surrounding it. The Latin translates the verb *compuncti sunt* ("they were punctured through"); hence the English word "compunction." On the Greek verb see Marguerite Harl, "Les origins greques du mot et de la notion de 'componction' dans la Septante et chez ses commentateurs (KATANYSSESTHAI)," *Revue des études augustiniennes* 32 (1986) 3-21.

[2] Due to the seeming inconsistencies between the LXX and MT where this verb occurs, various NT commentators (perhaps not fully understanding the situation in the LXX) suggest that the neologism has a broad range of meaning in the LXX. See Ben Witherington, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998) 153 n. 89. Luke Timothy Johnson also believes the neologism has wide possibility in meaning, citing the cases in the LXX, and he translates it as "they were stunned" (*The Acts of the Apostles* [SacPag 5; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1992] 56-57). Joseph A. Fitzmyer (*The Acts of the Apostles* [AB

of sin, and individual self-realization of that sin, parallels many uses of the verb in the LXX. It seems that the NT author has retained the semantic meaning of "to be stabbed" in a metaphorical sense from the LXX and also retained the type of context in which κατανύσσομαι often appears.

Yet to assess the significance of these shared contexts, a more detailed discussion is required of the LXX as translational literature and its relation to its *Vorlage*. The author of Acts here employs a verb that can be classified as a Septuagintal neologism.[3] The lexeme occurs eighteen times in the LXX (including Theodotion Daniel), where it represents as many as seven Hebrew verbs. This article will analyze the complex Septuagintal background of the verb, primarily by attempting to determine which Septuagintal instances are interpreting their *Vorlage* and which are literally translating the *Vorlage*. Hence we will first consider the LXX as a translation and a work of interpretation, before introducing the Septuagintal cases of the neologism in light of some problems of method. Thereafter we will examine each of the eighteen Septuagintal instances, in the hope that this analysis may shed some light on the NT use of the verb.

## I. Translation and Interpretation in the Septuagint

When using the LXX one cannot automatically assume that it is a literal (or quantitative) rendering of the Hebrew text it translated. There are too many examples (especially in Isaiah)[4] showing this is not the case. That there are interpretative elements in translational litera-

---

31; New York: Doubleday, 1998] 265) uses "they were cut to the quick," which parallels the translation of Gen 27:38 and 34:7 in Robert J.V. Hiebert, "Genesis," in *A New English Translation of the Septuagint* (ed. Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright; New York: Oxford University Press, 2007) 6-42, here 24, 29.

[3] Cf. Johan Lust, Erik Eynikel, and Katrin Hauspie, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (2 vols.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1992, 1996) 2. 240. It is always possible that the "neologism" already existed outside of the LXX, though no such occurrence is known. Given the wide range of Greek literature available to us, none of which has the neologism, the assumption that the LXX translators coined the word is accepted here.

[4] Isaiah is generally considered a freer text in regards to LXX translation; cf. Jennifer M. Dines, *The Septuagint* (London/ New York: T. & T. Clark, 2004) 22. For a recent discussion of translation technique in LXX Isaiah, see David A. Baer, *When We All Go Home: Translation and Theology in LXX Isaiah 56-66* (JSOTSup 318; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001).

ture such as the LXX is inevitable. Yet we cannot assume, every time the LXX/OG differs from its *Vorlage*, that interpretation is occurring on the part of the translator. First, other options must be considered, such as changes that are unintentional (transmission mistakes or the translator's misunderstanding of the *Vorlage*) and changes arising from linguistic or contextual problems.

The separation between these two schools of thought—LXX as interpretation versus LXX as literal translation—is a scholarly construction that serves to categorize and work with material.[5] Various studies of the LXX show that the translators are following their parent text, at times differing from it due to linguistic problems or in reconciliation with the context, and at other times being interpretative, sometimes in a theological sense.[6] Thus the half-truth of generalization is particularly problematic in LXX scholarship.

For some time Septuagint studies have recognized the problems with claiming that there is a theological *Tendenz* in the LXX. The problems are so apparent that an outline of them has become part of introductory texts.[7] To access those interpretative cases, the first task is to conduct

---

[5] A current debate in LXX scholarship concerns the extent of interpretation on the part of the LXX translators. The projected Commentary on the Septuagint will seek to identify moments when the translation is being interpretative and when it is not; see: "A Prospectus for a Commentary on the Septuagint," online posting, May 05, 2007 [<http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/ioscs/commentary/prospectus.html> last modified: April 05, 2007; accessed May 14, 2007.] For a related discussion, see Albert Pietersma, "A New Paradigm for Addressing Old Questions: The Relevance of the Interlinear Model for the Study of the Septuagint," in *Bible and Computer. The Stellenbosch AIBI-6 Conference. Proceedings of the Association Internationale Bible et Informatique "From Alpha to Byte"* (ed. Johann Cook; Leiden: Brill, 2002) 337-64. Also see Emanuel Tov, "Theologically Motivated Exegesis Embedded in the Septuagint," in his volume *The Greek and the Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (VTSup 72; Leiden: Brill, 1999) 257-69. Tov prefers to see deviations between the LXX and its *Vorlagen* due to other factors rather than theological, yet he admits that theological exegesis is present on occasion.

[6] Instead of being a maximalist regarding how far the LXX translator is effectively an author, I prefer the minimalist approach. Yet the LXX contains instances of possible interpretation that cannot be ignored even if a given instance goes against the general trend of the translator; the lexeme κατανύσσομαι seems to be one of those cases. The question remains how independent the LXX was from its Hebrew *Vorlage*. On this problem, see Albert Pietersma, "Septuagintal Exegesis and the Superscriptions of the Greek Psalter," in *The Book of Psalms: Composition and Reception* (ed. Peter W. Flint and Patrick D. Miller; VTSup 99; Leiden: Brill, 2005) 443-75.

[7] Karen H. Jobes and Moisés Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2000) 289. For earlier studies on translation technique, foundational to discussions of a theological *Tendenz*, see the essays in *Symposium on Trans-*

text-criticism of the LXX so as to have a "secure" text to work with. That is, one must establish the OG (Old Greek) which is the text at its inception, not the text as utilized by later communities. Then, discussion of what constitutes a *Vorlage* and problems with methods of retroversion must be engaged. After a tentative *Vorlage* is reached, the LXX can begin to be assessed for whether the differences between it and its *Vorlage* may be interpretative, and then to what degree.

Despite the complexity of identifying such instances of interpretation, doing so is rewarding for multiple areas of scholarship. First, such work helps us understand the formation of the LXX and its value for OT textual criticism. Second, such discussion assists NT/Early Christian studies toward understanding the text some NT and early Church writers were likely working from. Third, it potentially gives further insight into the Jewish community at Alexandria. Finally, it gives methodological insight into ways of studying other biblical versions as interpretative translations. How can similar discussions of the versions as interpretative translations be informed from the successes and limitations of LXX scholarship?

While one study cannot solve all of these problems, hopefully this article can offer a smaller contribution—identifying a possible moment of interpretation in LXX translation. Here we will study the Septuagintal neologism *κατανύσσομαι* and ask why it occurs, what if any interpretation is occurring in its use by the LXX translators, and how any interpretative uses of the neologism may be classified. The context for this discussion is the verb's occurrence in Acts 2:37.

## II. The Use of the Neologism

When the LXX employs the verbal root *κατανύσσω* ("to stab, pierce"), it is always in the passive (or middle) voice. The verb appears sixteen times in the LXX (as well as in two further passages in Theodotion Daniel).[8] But how are we to understand this lexeme and its

---

*lation Technique: LXX VI Congress of the IOSCS Jerusalem 1986* (ed. Claude E. Cox; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987) esp. 337-444.

[8] Gen 27:38; 34:7, Lev 10:3, LXX 1 Kgs 20:27, 29, LXX Ps 4:5; 29:13; 34:15; 108:16, Sir 12:12; 14:1; 20:21; 47:20, Isa 6:5; 47:5; Theod. Dan 10:9, 15; LXX/Theod. Dan 13:10.

complex use in the LXX, when various translators employ it in a wide variety of contexts and at different periods of time?

Part of the problem in understanding this verb is that its occurrence in the LXX seems to be a neologism, consisting of the verb νύσσω ("to pierce") with κατα– as prefix. Liddell and Scott's Greek lexicon (LSJ) struggles to define this neologism in the LXX, since it lists two semantic ranges. The first is to stab or prick and often in a metaphorical sense (Sir 20:21), while the second is the sense of bewilderment (even silence) in which Isa 29:10 serves as an example.[9] The difference of meaning between "to be bewildered/ astonished" and "to be stabbed" shows the difficulty for LSJ in attempting to define this neologism.

Recourse to the Hebrew *Vorlage* raises further questions. For instance, there is a struggle in understanding the relationship between the semantic ranges of κατανύσσομαι and דמם, which appears in the *Vorlage* of four κατανύσσομαι occurrences (Lev 10:3; LXX Ps 4:5; 29:13; 34:15; cf. Isa 47:5).[10] The root דמם generally means "to be silent," but also has the semantic range of "to moan, wail" (e.g., Isa 23:2; perhaps Lev 10:3), and in some cases "to be devastated." In utilizing LSJ for LXX lexicography, scholars now recognize that the lexicon often struggles with various LXX examples and problematically uses the Hebrew lexeme (and its presumed meaning in its Hebrew context) to understand a Greek lexeme. But Greek lexemes must be first defined within Greek parameters.

---

[9] Henry G. Liddell and Robert Scott., *A Greek-English Lexicon* (2 vols.; 9th ed.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966) 1. 903.

[10] The related noun κατάνυξις appears twice in the LXX (Isa 29:10 and LXX Ps 59:3), as well as in Rom 11:8. Since the meaning "stabbing" is problematic in these cases, the word might be regarded as functionally equivalent to a form κατανύσταξις ("drowsiness"). Admittedly, such a lexeme is not listed in LSJ 1. 903, though the verb κατανυστάζω ("fall asleep") appears there. On an underlying confusion between νύσσω ("pierce") and νυστάζω ("be drowsy") in Rom 11:8, see William Sanday and Arthur C. Headlam, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (ICC; 5th ed.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1902) 314-15. In fact, Rom 11:8 has a conflated text from Deut 29:3; Isa 29:10 and Ps 69:23-24; cf. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Romans* (AB 33; New York: Doubleday, 1993) 606. The noun in LXX Isa 29:10 represents the Hebrew term תרדמה ("deep sleep"), from the root רדם ("sleep") rather than from דמם ("be silent"). While confusion could have arisen in Greek terminology through the similarity of the root verbs κατανύσσω ("stab") and κατανυστάζω ("fall asleep"), there may have been as well some confusion in the *Vorlage* between the Hebrew roots דמם ("be silent") and רדם ("sleep").

With Greek usage in non-translational literature as a reference, κατανύσσομαι seems to mean "to be stabbed/ pricked," sometimes metaphorically, without much reference to the semantic ranges of bewilderment, silence, or wailing; this is evident in the unprefixed root verb of κατανύσσομαι, although the full form only appears in the LXX and the NT. Νύσσω ("to prick or stab")—originally νύττω in classical form—is utilized mostly in a literal sense outside of the LXX, but does have some metaphorical usage in wider Greek literature, especially in 200-300 c.e. For example, the first-century b.c.e. teacher Philodemus in Περὶ Παρρησίας ("Concerning Freedom of Speech") 24b.11, and the third-century c.e. philosopher Porphyrius Tyrius in *De Abstinentia* ("On Abstinence") 1.49 employ it in the sense of "stinging." Metaphorical uses are evident in the third-century c.e. philosopher Alexander Aphrodisiensis in *De Anima Libri* ("On the Free Soul") 130.15 with the sense of impinging upon one's impressions.[11] Further metaphorical use occurs in the second-century c.e. sophist Lucianus' *Hermotimus* 71, regarding being prodded in the ribs by an argument.[12] But in both literal and metaphorical categories the sense of "bewilderment" or "silence" does not seem to be within the semantic range in wider Greek literature.

## III. Considerations of Method

From Greek semantic fields, κατανύσσομαι can be understood predominantly as "be stabbed" or "be pricked," with attestation in a metaphorical sense. Yet because this is a neologism in the LXX one cannot rule out the sense of bewilderment/silence as a potential understanding. Possibly the LXX translators may be giving a particular semantic range to the neologism, different from its literal Greek meaning. Additionally, it must be expected that various LXX translators understand different semantic ranges for the neologism. In short, the use of a neologism by a variety of translators suspends the possibility of forcing a single semantic range. Each example must be studied through the literary contexts in which the neologism appears in the LXX— remembering its previous dominant meaning in Greek literature as a

---

[11] LSJ, 2. 1185.
[12] Cf. K. Kilburn, *Lucian: Hermotimus* (LCL; London: Heinemann, 1959) 393.

guide—as the sources for coming to know how the LXX translators understood κατανύσσομαι.

By literary context we mean the setting of the literary work (passage or section) that the translator is translating. While such context cannot be the primary determinant for the meaning of a Greek term (since sometimes the translator may be ignoring the context), it is equally likely that the translator was aware of the context. Hence the possibility must be explored, so as to assess any patterns of usage.[13]

Because other contexts besides the literary setting deserve proper attention, this study will be attentive to the likely situation in the *Vorlage* of that translator. Accordingly, we will divide the rest of this study into general sections that correspond to the supposed grouping of translational activity within the LXX (Pentateuch; Samuel-Kings; Psalms; Isaiah; Daniel; Sirach). This is to ensure that we are not assuming at the outset cohesiveness through all the passages, since a variety of translators were at work, even sometimes within a single book.[14] Such divisions help organize the discussion and provide some boundaries; for example, we can be fairly certain that the translation of the Pentateuch was first among the LXX texts and has a different set of translators than later works like Sirach. Once we come to a better understanding of how particular translators employed κατανύσσομαι in their respective contexts, then we can begin to understand if and/or to what extent each translator uses κατανύσσομαι to interpret/ translate their *Vorlage*. As with the possible variety of meanings for κατανύσσομαι, the lexeme as interpretation must be expected to have variation in each example

---

[13] "The problem with the argument from context . . .is that it makes assumptions of the textual linguistic character of the text before the textual character is actually assessed. The argument would appear to be: the translation has to make sense, therefore we (the readers) have to make sense of the translation." So Wade A. White, "Heads or Tails: Another Look at the Role of the Hebrew Text in Greek Lexicography and the 'Original Meaning' of a Translated Text," in a paper presented at the 2006 annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature; International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies program unit, Washington, DC(November 20, 2006). To be sure, we cannot assume that the translator was paying attention to context, and thus the meaning of a Greek lexeme cannot rely *solely* on context. But, with a likely meaning of κατανύσσομαι first constructed from non-translational wider Greek literature, context is still a valid source for seeking meaning, as long as it is balanced with other factors and is always open to other explanations. Note in some examples from the Psalter below, this study admits such exceptions.

[14] See Natalio Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Versions of the Bible* (Leiden: Brill, 2000) 22-26.

and be graded on a continuum, whether it is interpretative at all, or whether to a greater or lesser degree.

## IV. The First Pentateuchal Case (Gen 27:38)

In Gen. 27:38, after the Hebrew of ברכני גם אני אבי ("bless me too, my father"), the LXX includes the neologism in the phrase κατανυχθέντος δὲ Ισαακ ("but while Isaac was silent/ astonished/ pained").[15] This phrase is absent in all the other versions.[16] Contextually, Esau seeks a blessing from his father who refuses. In response Esau raises his voice and weeps aloud. Before he raises his voice and weeps, the LXX addition occurs, though the exact meaning of the neologism is unclear.[17] Some interpret the phrase to mean: "but while Isaac was pained."[18]

---

[15] The phrase (already in Vaticanus) likely belongs to OG rather than being later addition. The plus is in Codex Cottonianus (fifth century) and Codex Bodleianus (ninth-tenth century); cf. Henry Barclay Swete, *The Old Testament in Greek* (3 vols.; 2d ed.; London: Cambridge University Press, 1895) 1. 49. The plus is also attested in the fourth-century Papyrus 961 (Chester Beatty IV); cf. Albert Pietersma, *Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri IV and V: A New Edition with Text-Critical Analysis* (ASP 16; Toronto: Samuel Stevens Hakkert, 1977) 37. The plus is included in the reconstructed text of John William Wevers, *Genesis* (Vetus Testamentum Graecum 1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974) 266. While Wevers mentions nothing of Cottonianus, he indicates that Alexandrinus omits this phrase along with the rest of the line, though other minuscules retain the addition. It seems that Alexandrinus suffered from parablepsis, since it lacks the rest of the line after the plus, whereas the plus is attested in Vaticanus, Papyrus 961, and other uncials and minuscules.

[16] Such as the Peshitta and Targumim (*Tg. Onq.*, *Tg. Ps.-J.*, and *Tg-Neof.*). Unfortunately 4QGen-Exodᵃ (4Q1) does not have this portion of the line extant. The closest fragment (Plate I, frg. 2) only has the last word of v. 38 and the first word of v. 39, and there is not enough surrounding material for a hypothetical reconstruction; cf. Eugene Ulrich and Frank Moore Cross, *Qumran Cave 4, VII: Genesis to Numbers* (DJD 12; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994) 11.

[17] LXX Genesis sometimes employs neologisms elsewhere. See Robert J.V. Hiebert, "To the Reader of Genesis" in *A New English Translation of the Septuagint* (ed. Pietersma and Wright), 1-6, here 2-3.

[18] Cf. Marguerite Harl, *La Genèse* (La Bible d'Alexandrie 1; Paris: Cerf, 1986) 219. In her footnote on Gen 27:38, she refers to the neologism translated as "Isaac fut pénétré de douleur" ("Isaac was pierced with sorrow"), following more the sense of "stab" rather than "silence" (discussed below). This understanding suspends the presumed Hebrew *Vorlage* (see below) and attempts a semantic range more in line with wider Greek usage of νύσσω. In one lexicon, under κατανύσσομαι the semantic range of "stabbed" is understood, in this case "durchbohrt" ("pierced through"); so Friedrich Rehkopf, *Septuaginta-Vokabular* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989) 157.

Others, however, translate it: "Isaac said nothing."[19] Yet this latter option is a problematic translation based on an equivalence we will examine later. For now, is κατανύσσομαι likely an addition on the part of the LXX translator, or is it merely a representation of a fuller text in the *Vorlage* that has not found its way into the other versions?

The likelihood that a verbal equivalent did appear in the *Vorlage* is seemingly well supported. Beyond Greek MS evidence discussed above, consider how the phrase κατανυχθέντος δὲ Ισαακ follows a common Septuagintal pattern for representing the *Vorlage*. The construction (verb–δὲ–noun) appears at least sixty-eight times in LXX Genesis (e.g., Gen 6:5; 12:18; 14:13). The *Vorlage* likely had וידם יצחק ("and Isaac was silent"). This is in keeping with a similar construction in LXX Gen 27:38a where εἶπεν δὲ Ησαυ translates ויאמר עשו ("and Esau said"). Moreover, the Pentateuch (probably the earliest LXX portion to be translated) is less likely to have interpretative additions since it is generally a literal translation. While none of the other versions attests the phrase, it seems most likely that the equivalent וידם יצחק was in the *Vorlage*. But even if this is the case, why does the LXX use a neologism if another equivalence could have been used, like ἀπολιθόομαι ("become petrified") for דמם in Exod 15:16, or other options for "silence" like σιωπάω ("be silent")? Did κατανύσσομαι merely serve as a standard equivalence for the LXX translator, or is there more going on in the use of κατανύσσομαι?

## V. Problems with Verbal Equivalence

But before continuing with other Pentateuchal examples, we must refine the definition of equivalence. Either there is a general agreement in the semantic range of κατανύσσομαι with its corresponding lexeme in the *Vorlage* and thus no interpretation is occurring, or it possesses a semantic range diverging from the lexeme in the *Vorlage* and can be assessed as a possible interpretative moment. Thus, while there may be a lexeme in the *Vorlage* corresponding to κατανύσσομαι in the

---

Some prefer the more idiomatic phrase, "And with Isaak cut to the quick" (Hiebert, "Genesis," 24).

[19] Cf. Ephraim A. Speiser, *Genesis* (AB 1; New York: Doubleday, 1964) 207; Gerhard von Rad, *Genesis* (OTL; London: SCM, 1972) 279.

LXX, this in itself does not constitute equivalence in terms of meaning. It must be shown that the semantic ranges of the terms also generally correspond; that is, the LXX translators must have intentionally sought to represent the semantic range of the lexeme in their *Vorlage* in order for interpretative translation to be unlikely. Yet if the lexeme in the *Vorlage* carries a different meaning than κατανύσσομαι, an interpretative moment could be occurring. Such questions are complicated by the assumption that the LXX translators were always aware of the semantic ranges of a particular Hebrew verb.[20] Often, this assumption is difficult to prove with any certainty, yet consistent trends or patterns may reveal what is occurring.

At this point the argument may be made that κατανύσσομαι should be equated with דמם (apart from in the presumed *Vorlage* of Gen 27:38) because the LXX employs this equivalence four times (Lev 10:3; LXX Ps 4:5; 29:13; 34:15; cf. Isa 47:5), thus making discussions of interpretative translation irrelevant. But the question is not so simple. Even if דמם is in the *Vorlage* of the LXX translators who use the neologism, this does not suspend possibilities of interpretation on the part of these translators. We must still ask why κατανύσσομαι was chosen (or even created) for certain contexts. Then from those uses the intended semantic range of κατανύσσομαι can be constructed.

Do we have reasons, beyond counting occurrences of correspondence, to suppose equivalence between דמם and κατανύσσομαι? Such equivalence is complicated by the semantic ranges of דמם which has one of three possibilities according to Koehler-Baumgartner's (KB) three definitions: "to be silent," "to wail," or "to perish."[21] Let us take the first since it is the most pervasive sense. This line of reasoning would

---

[20] See comments regarding the LXX translators' understanding of their *Vorlagen* by Emanuel Tov, "Biliteral Exegesis of Hebrew Roots in the Septuagint?" in *Reflection and Refraction: Studies in Biblical Historiography in Honour of A. Graeme Auld* (ed. Robert Rezetko et al.; VTSup 113; Leiden: Brill, 2007) 459-82. Also see Emanuel Tov, "Did the Septuagint Translators Always Understand Their Hebrew Text?" in his, *The Greek and the Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (VTSup 72; Leiden: Brill, 1999) 203-18.

[21] Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner, *HALOT* (3d ed.; Leiden: Brill, 2001) 226. For a detailed study of the Hebrew root in the second sense, see Baruch A. Levine, "Silence, Sound, and the Phenomenology of Mourning in Biblical Israel," *JANES* 22 (1993) 89-106. On the basis of several texts (e.g., Lev 10:3; Isa 23:2), Levine concludes: "We have found a home in biblical Hebrew for *d-m-m* II, 'to mourn, moan,' in contexts of mourning and sadness" (p. 106).

suggest an entry for κατανύσσομαι in an LXX lexicon with the sense of דמם ("be silent"). Yet there are problems in equating κατανύσσομαι with the semantic range "silence." There is reason to believe the LXX translators understood κατανύσσομαι in the sense of "stab" or "pierce," particularly since this is the dominant semantic range in wider Greek literature (as discussed above). Thus, there is a lack of overlap in the semantic ranges.

Some may wish to construct Greek lexemes in the LXX only in reference to a Hebrew text. Yet this must be done cautiously since we cannot ignore the reality that these translators had a target language. It is problematic to suspend the likely Greek meaning of a Greek lexeme in favor of a Hebrew semantic range. This assumes that the translators were working without reference to their own language and culture. A Greek meaning must first be considered dominant. Such caution must be extended, when the *Vorlage* and the LXX only show correspondence between the neologism and דמם in certain cases; various times דמם occurs when the LXX translators did not choose to employ κατανύσσομαι as an equivalent, and often κατανύσσομαι appears and דמם is not in the *Vorlage* (as noted below). Moreover, assuming κατανύσσομαι is unique to the LXX (which is likely until the first century C.E.), we are analyzing a neologism. If so, the translators created the neologism, either to struggle with a meaning of a lexeme in the *Vorlage* they did not understand in its context, or to capture a particular context or feeling in the text that they felt the neologism expressed better than the *Vorlage* (or both).

While equivalence between κατανύσσομαι and דמם is weak when we assume the semantic range of "silence" for דמם, what about other semantic ranges for the Hebrew term? Is it possible that κατανύσσομαι is merely reflecting a different sense of the semantic range of דמם? The semantic ranges of דמם and κατανύσσομαι may overlap if דמם can mean not only "to be silent" but also "to be devastated," since the latter meaning would parallel well the metaphorical sense of "to be stabbed." An example from Jer 25:37 can demonstrate this point. It would appear that silence and devastation are related semantically since in this example one could translate דמם as "be silent" or "be desolate." Here shepherds are used as a metaphor for military leadership. YHWH brings war on them and their fields are devastated. The final image is the fury of YHWH over their pastures; they are "devastated/

silent" (ונדמו) as a result of YHWH's wrath. Either sense would suffice in such a context.

Yet careful analysis of the examples which best warrant the semantic range of "to be devastated" for דמם must be reckoned outside the consideration of the LXX translators when using κατανύσσομαι. There is sharp contextual difference between the examples in KB's second definition ("to wail") and third meaning ("to be devastated/to perish") and the uses in the *Vorlagen* of the LXX that employ κατανύσσομαι. While this line of argument utilizes context, assuming the LXX translator was aware of it, as we will see, there is a reason to suppose this is occurring in most uses of κατανύσσομαι. There is a consistency throughout the individual books and indeed the whole LXX in what type of context warrants κατανύσσομαι. Such a coincidence cannot be ignored. Often the contexts for the neologism express the personal reaction of an individual to a situation frequently involving sin. That is, the individual reacts to a situation by "being stabbed" due to the inner workings of the heart, mind, or conscience.

This contrasts with the uses of דמם that warrant the semantic range "to be devastated" or "to be silent" as a result of devastation. Most of the examples KB gives for its third definition are being "made silent" or "destroyed" in a context of war (e.g., Jer 8:14; 48:2; 1 Sam 2:9). Therefore, a state of silence is externally acting upon an individual as a result of being devastated or perishing in a military context. This contrasts the uses of κατανύσσομαι that occur in contexts of self-induced feeling or emotion.

Further, an equivalence of κατανύσσομαι with דמם is problematic when we consider all the other times that the neologism is used in the LXX when דמם is not in the *Vorlage*. Other equivalents are possible like עצב ("be vexed": Gen 34:7), כנע ("be humbled": MT 1 Kgs 21:29/ LXX 3 Kgdms 20:29), דמה ("be destroyed": Isa 6:5), and כאה ("be downhearted": Ps 108:16). There are too many examples when דמם is not in the *Vorlage* for a simple equivalence with it to be assumed.

Finally, equivalence is complicated when one takes into account the occurrences of דמם versus the instances of κατανύσσομαι, realizing that many times the translators choose not to employ κατανύσσομαι to translate דמם. Although the latter root appears twenty-nine times in the MT, only five of those times the LXX chooses to use the neolo-

gism.[22] While each example must be studied, the LXX translators did not consider the equivalence in every case. Because of these considerations the equivalence of דמם for κατανύσσομαι cannot be applied in all instances. Rather than being a verbal equivalence (in the sense of overlapping semantic ranges) where one might expect ἀπολιθόομαι for דמם (as in Exod 15:16), the LXX translators seem to choose when to employ κατανύσσομαι. While דמם prompts κατανύσσομαι in some cases, this does not automatically imply that there is equivalence of meaning between the two; hence we cannot speak of it as an equivalent of the neologism that suspends interpretative possibility.

For this study, therefore, we will suspend our understandings of דמם in the sense of "to be destroyed/ perish" and its semantic overlap with "silence" since such a semantic range is associated with contexts different from the contexts that warrant κατανύσσομαι. We will give the LXX translators who were using the neologism the benefit that they were careful enough to understand the predominant use of the verb דמם as "silence," unless clear indications in the examples suggest otherwise.[23] This assumption will be supported by the consistent type of context in which κατανύσσομαι appears and will become clearer at the end of this study.

## VI. Other Pentateuchal Examples

Κατανύσσομαι is also employed when Moses relays to Aaron the words of YHWH regarding those who approach the divine presence (Lev 10:3). While the MT (according to most interpretations of the verb)

---

[22] Lev 10:3; LXX Ps 4:5; 29:13; 34:15; cf. Isa 47:5 (adverb). The total reaches six, if we include Gen 27:38 in which there is a text-critical problem discussed above.

[23] A study of the possible meanings of דמם shows that few examples justify the sense of "to wail/moan" (which KB suggests in definition two). Primarily, the lexeme has "to be still" as the most pervasive and indisputable meaning; for example, Jer 47:6 says: "be at rest and be still" (הרגעי ודמי). Many other occurrences clearly mean "be silent/ still": Exod 15:16; Josh 10:12, 13; 1 Sam 14:9; Ps 30:13; 35:15; 62:6: 131:2; Job 29:21; 31:34; Lam 2:18. Some instances could mean either "be silent" or "be devastated": 1 Sam 2:9; Jer 25:37; Ps. 31:18; 37:7; Job 30:27; Lam 3:28. A few occurrences clearly mean "be devastated/ perish": Jer 8:14; 48:2; 49:26; 50:30; 51:6; Ps 4:5. Nevertheless, Levine suggests the meaning "moan" or "mourn" in Lev 10:3; Isa 23:2; Ezek 24:17; Lam 2:10 ("Silence," 89, 94, 95, 100).

says that Aaron said nothing (וידם), the LXX uses *κατανύσσομαι*. Thus the LXX states: *καὶ κατενύχθη Ααρων* ("and Aaron was stabbed/ bewildered/ devastated").[24] There is little doubt here that דמם is in the *Vorlage*. *Κατανύσσομαι* could have the sense of bewilderment or of being stabbed. The former meaning would fit well the semantic range of דמם ("be silent") and make it less likely that a high level of interpretation is occurring.[25] Yet as discussed above, in order to argue this, one must problematically suspend the dominant Greek usage and likely meaning of *κατανύσσομαι*.[26] Why employ a neologism when other options (as in Exod 15:16) are likely known to the translators? The combined Pentateuchal examples begin to show that more is occurring than quantitative-equivalent representation of the *Vorlage*.

Another Pentateuchal example that helps clarify the situation occurs in Gen 34:7. Here the MT reads כשמעם ויתעצבו ("upon their hearing, then they were vexed") and the LXX says *ὡς δὲ ἤκουσαν κατενύχθησαν* ("but when they heard, they were stabbed/ bewildered/ devastated"). This case illustrates how problematic is the equivalence between *κατανύσσομαι* and דמם, since the latter only occurs in the *Vorlage* of *κατανύσσομαι* infrequently. In this case the meaning of being "vexed" (עצב) seems to fit the likely meaning of *κατανύσσομαι* ("being stabbed" or "pierced," metaphorically) as understood by the LXX translator. Then, if the Greek version of the Pentateuch was one of the more literal or quantitative projects by the LXX translators, and the semantic ranges of עצב and *κατανύσσομαι* share meaning more closely than the semantic ranges of *κατανύσσομαι* and דמם, would not a more likely equivalence in terms of meaning be the former combination rather than the latter? Considering the overlap of semantic range in Gen 34:7 and the lack of such overlap in the semantic range of *κατανύσσομαι* and דמם in Lev 10:3 and Gen 27:38, there may be more interpretative ten-

---

[24] For the rendering, "Aaron was shocked" (Lev 10:3), see Dirk Büchner "Leuitikon," in *A New English Translation of the Septuagint* (ed. Pietersma and Wright), 82-106, here 91.

[25] Similarly, Targum Onqelos here has the root שתק ("be silent"). However, Levine renders the Hebrew phrase in Lev 10:3: "And Aaron mourned" ("Silence," 89).

[26] Although arguments cannot be based solely on dominant usage, since this depends on what has been handed down to us, in this case all the uses in compositional Greek literature to assist defining *κατανύσσομαι* have limited or no correspondence with the dominant meaning of דמם.

dency within the use of the neologism in Gen 27:38 and Lev 10:3 than was occurring in Gen 34:7.

When we consider the Pentateuchal contexts in which κατανύσσομαι occurs, we find they are similar in both the Genesis and Leviticus examples. All these contexts involve a sense of emotional distress dealing with familial relations. Esau has just been refused a blessing in Gen 27:38. Then in Gen 34:7, Jacob's sons hear the news that Dinah their sister was raped, and in Lev 10:3 Aaron has just learned about the death of his sons Nadab and Abihu (LXX Abiud). A picture emerges in which the literary context of emotional distress in the Pentateuchal examples warrants κατανύσσομαι more than a particular equivalence in the *Vorlage*. So: in what ways is κατανύσσομαι interpretative—and to what degree in each case?

It seems odd that in Lev 10:3 Aaron's response to the death of his sons and Moses' explanation is mere silence.[27] Since דמם is likely in the *Vorlage*, is this not a moment that would invite interpretation by a translator? Indeed, if the contemporary reader asks why Aaron was silent (assuming this is the translator's understanding of the lexeme) when he heard Moses' explanation for the death of the two sons, it seems fair to consider whether the ancient translator asked the same question. More concretely, what is the purpose of the Pentateuchal translator(s) linking κατανύσσομαι (with a likely meaning of "stab" or "pierce") to literary contexts that deal with related cases of emotional distress, given that such usage seems to explain or interpret the silence of a character in the text they are translating?

In LXX Genesis generally, the use of a Greek lexeme is commonly determined by a particular lexeme in the *Vorlage*, and the frequent practice of the translator(s) is to utilize a strict equivalence with the *Vorlage*.[28] Indeed, in translational literature words are often chosen on the basis of their source text. But this cannot be limited to lexical correspondence, as we must also consider that the translator was aware of the literary context, especially when the examples under discussion have a pattern. While literary context cannot be the sole determinant for the meaning of κατανύσσομαι, its consistency must be accounted

---

[27] So NRSV: "And Aaron was silent." The strangeness of this response might be an argument for proposing here the meaning "mourn/ moan" for דמם (as in Isa 23:2); cf. Levine, "Silence," 89.

[28] Cf. Dines, *The Septuagint*, 14.

for, along with the reality that the use of κατανύσσομαι deviates from translational norms in its corpus.

In the Pentateuchal instances of this Greek verb, Gen 34:7 offers a more likely equivalence of κατανύσσομαι with the *Vorlage* than in Gen 27:38 and Lev 10:3. But the fact that a neologism appears in Gen 34:7, in a context of emotional familial distress paralleling all other uses in the Pentateuch, reveals a possible thought process by the translator(s), explaining why this context warranted κατανύσσομαι. Yet Gen 34:7 is interpretative to a lesser degree than Gen 27:38 and Lev 10:3, which interpret the silence of the characters in their *Vorlage* with κατανύσσομαι to better fit the context and situation of the passage.

## VII. Kings

The examples in 1 Kings show that while דמם may have warranted κατανύσσομαι in certain cases, not all occurrences of κατανύσσομαι can be confined to a single Hebrew semantic range. The text of LXX 3 Kgdms 20:27 (= MT 1 Kgs 21:27) understands the tearing of a cloak to warrant κατανύσσομαι. Here the Hebrew text reports Ahab's reaction in response to learning that his wife used his name to cause Naboth's death: ויקרע בגדיו ("and he tore his garments"). Elijah accuses Ahab of the crime—with this and other sins—and Ahab repents by tearing his cloak. The act of remorse actually helps suspend God's judgment on Ahab. In various ways the LXX disagrees with the MT, but particularly the LXX has a different text than the Hebrew with the addition: κατενύγη Αχααβ ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ κυρίου καὶ ἐπορεύετο κλαίων ("Ahab was stabbed before the Lord and went about weeping").[29] Is κατανύσσομαι interpreting the situation in its *Vorlage* or not?

Here there is no attested Hebrew *Vorlage* and due to the length of the addition in which the neologism occurs we are likely dealing with an interpretative gloss by the LXX translator rather than a represen-

---

[29] For the rendering, "Achaab was smitten with remorse" (3 Kgdms 20:27), see Bernard Taylor, "3 Reigns," *A New English Translation of the Septuagint* (ed. Pietersma and Wright), 298-318, here 316. While the supposed *kaige* section (2 Samuel 11—1 Kgs 2:11) cannot be considered here, this passage is also unlikely to be Lucianic or Antiochene since there is no adjustment toward the Hebrew text. The problems and challenges for reconstructing a Lucianic text are discussed in Jobes and Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint*, 282.

tation of a *Vorlage*. The likelihood of this as an addition is increased since κατανύσσομαι recurs two verses later (see below) and the gloss in 3 Kgdms 20:27 is likely reconciling the situation of Ahab's distress with the original use of κατανύσσομαι in 3 Kgdms 20:29 which did have a *Vorlage*. This is possible since the gloss in 3 Kgdms 20:27 also shares common language (ἀπὸ προσώπου) with the original occurrence of κατανύσσομαι in 3 Kgdms 20:29.

In 3 Kgdms 20:29 (= MT 1 Kgs 21:29) Elijah notices that Ahab was affected by the words of the prophet. Thus, the LXX reports: ἑώρακας ὡς κατενύγη Αχααβ ἀπὸ προσώπου μου ("have you seen how Ahab was stabbed [with pain] before me?"), which corresponds with the Hebrew reading: "have you not seen that Ahab has humbled himself (נכנע) before me?" (MT 1 Kgs 21:29). The semantic range of "stabbed" in the metaphorical sense communicates well the sense in 3 Kgdms 20:27 and 20:29, and corresponds to the semantic range of כנע in this context.[30] While the passive of כנע only means "to be subdued" or "to submit," the literary Hebrew context allows the reader (ancient or modern) to understand the reason for being humble. Ahab humbled himself in realization of something. Whether this is his own sin (LXX 3 Kgdms 20:26) or his wife's sin that he feels responsible for cannot be determined. But the Septuagintal use of κατανύσσομαι reveals awareness by this translator of the literary context, since the use of the neologism interprets the feelings associated with the action of humbling oneself by connecting it to the realization of sin. This increases the possibility that the translator is aware of the literary context and takes this into consideration in the translation, since the neologism in its likely meaning reflects a specific literary context. Thus while a Hebrew lexeme like כנע prompts κατανύσσομαι, it is again the context that warrants κατανύσσομαι rather than a particular Hebrew lexeme.

Whether a later scribe added the gloss in 20:27 in response to the use of the neologism in 20:29 or the same translator is responsible for both instances of the term, two conclusions are evident. First, this neologism meaning "stabbed" metaphorically in such a context represents well the significance of כנע. In this sense κατανύσσομαι is not as interpretative as it may be when used to represent דמם in the *Vorlage*. But

---

[30] Although κατανύσσομαι (as we have defined it) may overlap better with a form of תבר ("be broken") in the Targum and the Peshitta form כחא ("be ashamed": 1 Kgs 21:29), both of these choices (like κατανύσσομαι) seem to be dependent on the context.

second, here we saw a specific case showing the translator was aware of the literary context in the choice of κατανύσσομαι by being attentive to the reason why Ahab was humbled. Even though the *Vorlage* and the LXX neologism offer different points of emphasis, the semantic ranges overlap considerably, and so this example is interpretative to a lesser degree. Further we observe a broader consistency in the 1 Kings examples and the Pentateuch instances where the literary context, rather than verbal equivalence, warrants κατανύσσομαι.

## VIII. Psalms

In Ps 4:5, within the general context of sin, the speaker gives the command to tremble and not to sin and then to say in your heart "upon your bed and be silent" (על משכבכם ודמו: Ps 4:5). Here the MT uses the imperative of דמם ("be silent"). The LXX rather similarly says: ἐπὶ ταῖς κοίταις ὑμῶν κατανύγητε (literally, "upon your beds be stabbed").[31] Here, we see again that the Hebrew verb "be silent" is likely in the *Vorlage*. But once more (as in LXX 3 Kgdms 20:27, 29) the Septuagintal translator is using κατανύσσομαι with the sense of being "stabbed" or "pierced" in a context that deals with emotional distress and sin.[32] The translator may be attempting to reconcile the known semantic understanding of דמם as referring to "silence" with the context of the passage via the use of κατανύσσομαι, following a solution that they possibly knew from the Pentateuch.

In MT Ps 109:16 (= LXX Ps 108:16), the attacker is described as pursuing the "daunted/broken of heart to kill [him]" (נכאה לבב למותת).

---

[31] There is an orthographic variation in Alexandrinus: κατανοίγητε ("be opened"); cf. Alfred Rahlfs, *Psalmi cum Odis* (Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum 10; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967) 84.

[32] "[T]here is no obvious semantic connection between Greek κατανύσσω ("to stab, gouge") and Hebrew דמם ("be silent" [I] and "wail" [II]). Nor can a kinship be established on the basis of דמה ("be like" [I] and "cease" [II]. . . The sense of Ps 4.5 would seem to be that while anger and indignation are permissible, to sin as a result of impetuosity and lack of sober reflection is culpable"; so Albert Pietersma, "Psalm 4," online posting, March 2002, Draft Commentary on the Psalms [<http://www.chass.utoronto.ca/~pietersm/>; accessed May 10, 2007]. However, Levine understands this Hebrew verb in Ps 4:5 in the sense of "sigh" or "moan" ("Silence," 97).

The LXX's change to *κατανενυγμένον τῇ καρδίᾳ* ("stabbed in heart")[33] from the MT's "daunted/broken of heart" or "disheartened" seems to communicate well the feeling of the text. This would represent possible attention to context, but a less interpretative use than Ps 4:5 since the semantic ranges of *κατανύσσομαι* and the passive of כאה overlap. Thus the use of *κατανύσσομαι* in LXX Ps 108:16 would be similar to its employment in Gen 34:7.

Yet the Psalter has some exceptions to what we see as the general trend. In two cases, the semantic range of "silence" could be the preferred meaning and *κατανύσσομαι* in the metaphorical sense of "to stab" makes little sense in the context. Unlike the rest of the Septuagintal examples, LXX Ps 29:13 (MT Ps 30:13) employs *κατανύσσομαι* in a context of praise. At the end of a Psalm, the worshipper "will not be silent" (לא ידם).[34] The LXX uses *οὐ μὴ κατανυγῶ* ("I shall not be stabbed/ pained/ silent"). Did this translator understand the dominant contexts in which *κατανύσσομαι* typically occurs, or were they merely aware of the use of the neologism with דמם and assumed a semantic range of "silence" for *κατανύσσομαι*, or were they more likely unaware of any semantic ranges and merely utilized the equivalence based on their knowledge of its use in other cases? What are the possibilities for this latter option?

In MT Ps 35:15 (= LXX Ps 34:15) the context has returned to one of emotional distress. The psalmist has been surrounded by slanderers who verbally attack the speaker, "and they did not become silent" (ולא ידמו). Thus, the phrase *καὶ οὐ κατενύγησαν* (LXX Ps 34:15) cannot mean "and they were not stabbed," but must in this context (assuming the LXX translator did not misunderstand the *Vorlage*—a possibility to be retained) have the sense that the attackers were not quiet ("and they were not silent"). It seems that in these final two examples from the Psalter the translator was aware of the other instances when *κατανύσσομαι* was used with דמם but was either not aware of the semantic range of "stab" or merely chose to give the neologism another sense in a different context.

---

[33] An almost identical Greek expression appears in Acts 2:37; cf. Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 265.

[34] Unfortunately, breaks and lacunae occur in the DSS both for Ps 29:13 (MT 30:13) in 4QPsʳ, and for Ps 34:15 (MT 35:15) in 4QPs�q.

The possibility must be left open that in these last two examples the LXX translator(s) did not pay attention to the literary context they were translating and merely assumed an equivalence of κατανύσσομαι with דמם. If this is the case then the LXX translator is now again in line with the general tendency, particularly in the Psalms, to translate a *Vorlage* based on a standard equivalence. Whether we accept that the translator was aware of the literary context or merely just employing this equivalence without regard for semantic range or literary context, both these examples from the Psalter deviate from the general trend we have seen in the use of κατανύσσομαι. Unfortunately, oftentimes there is not enough information to make a final decision on what the translator was doing. Yet in Ps 4:5 and Ps 108:16 (MT 109:16), we see examples of κατανύσσομαι employed in similar contexts, and in an interpretative way to a greater (Ps 4:5) or lesser degree (Ps 108:16). In Ps 29:13 (MT 30:13) and 34:15 (MT 35:15), however, the translator deviates from this trend and may just be using κατανύσσομαι for דמם without precise regard for meaning or context, leaving little room for interpretative use as a possibility.

## IX. Isaiah

Despite the two exceptions in the Psalms, both the Isaiah examples return to the common Septuagintal use of κατανύσσομαι for "stab" in a metaphorical sense and in contexts dealing with sin and emotional distress. In Isa 47:5 the daughter of the Chaldeans (here Babylon) is commanded to sit in darkness and told she will no longer be "queen of the kingdoms." She is represented as a mere slave (Isa 47:2) who will be shamed (Isa 47:3). Where MT Isa 47:5 has an imperative and adverb in its phrase שבי דומם ("sit silently"),[35] the LXX translator states with the imperative and passive participle κάθισον κατανενυγμένη ("sit stabbed/ pained/ silenced").[36] Is this a case where the LXX translator accorded the semantic range of "be silent" to κατανύσσομαι rather than the metaphorical sense of "stab"? At this point we may be able to judge this situa-

---

[35] A Qumran text is lacking (because of breaks in the MSS) both for Isa 6:5 in 4QIsaᵃ and 4QIsaᶠ (damaged), and for Isa 47:5 in 4QIsaᵈ.

[36] Moisés Silva renders as "Sit distressed" (Isa 47:5), but footnotes another possibility for the neologism: "stunned into silence." Moisés Silva, "Esaias," *A New English Translation of the Septuagint* (ed. Pietersma and Wright), 825-875, here 860.

ation in light of our other examples. While it is problematic to assume standardization through a variety of LXX translators, it is noteworthy that all occurrences of κατανύσσομαι (with the exception of one Psalm example, LXX Ps 29:13) are in contexts dealing with emotional distress and sin and do not require the use of דמם in the *Vorlage*. Such consistency does not prove that in this instance the LXX translator was following the general view, but in my mind makes it more likely. If this is the case, then again the LXX translator is interpreting "silence" as emotional distress via the neologism, with context as a guide.

Such likelihood increases with a clearer example in the context of Isaiah's prophetic call (Isa 6:5). In the presence of the Divine he becomes aware of his great sin and refers to himself as a man of unclean lips. Just before this, the MT states אוי־לי כי־נדמיתי ("Woe to me because I am ruined"). While it is true there is some uncertainty regarding the meaning of the verb דמה, in this context it cannot refer to silence (nor probably to bewilderment). The woe interjection of the prophet from a realization of his sin must have some relation to a negative emotion or event, and the sense of "ruined/destroyed" better fits the context of sin. Thus, the LXX here says, "Woe to me because I have been stabbed (κατανένυγμαι)."[37]

Thus, in Isa 47:5 we may have an interpretative element by the translator in their use of κατανύσσομαι, whereas in Isa 6:5 it is clearer that the LXX translator is less interpretative given the semantic overlap of κατανύσσομαι with דמה. In those cases where the semantic range of the LXX translator is more certain and differs from the semantic range of the *Vorlage*, we begin to see moments of interpretation. But as with Isa 6:5, while there is some "interpretative" element involved in using the neologism in a particular context, this example is a less interpretative use of κατανύσσομαι than in Isa 47:5.

## X. The Greek Texts of Daniel

The verb κατανύσσομαι appears in Theodotion Daniel to describe the prophet's reaction to seeing the angelic figure beside the River Tigris (Theod. Dan 10:9, 15). According to MT Dan 10:9, the prophet declares ואני הייתי נרדם ("and I was put into a deep sleep"). The two Greek

---

[37] For the rendering, "I am stunned" (Isa 6:5), see Silva, "Esaias," 830.

translations diverge here. Whereas LXX Dan 10:9 says: "I was made prostrate," Theod. Dan 10:9 has: ἤμην κατανενυγμένος ("I was silenced/ bewildered/ stabbed").[38] A few verses later, MT Dan 10:15 reports the prophet's response to the angelic figure's declaration with the word נאלמתי ("I was dumbfounded/ silenced"). Here LXX Dan 10:15 has ἐσιώπησα ("I became silent"), while Theod. Dan 10:15 (Alexandrinus) has κατενύγην ("I was silenced/ stabbed"). The verb κατανύσσομαι describes Daniel's reaction of bewilderment or astonishment, perhaps implying that he was unable to speak.

Again, it is important to note the context. While Daniel is not stabbed because of sin, the context of the vision is impending warfare (Dan 10:1) that causes mourning and fasting (Dan 10:2-3). Thus, when Daniel first meets this angel with a message of war, did the Greek translator envision that Daniel was "stabbed" because the prophet anticipates the angel of war would bring a negative message, thus justifying the use of the neologism? Yet this must be tempered by the second case, in which Daniel has been comforted by the angel and may now just be in shock. But both uses still share a context of emotional distress, even if the second may mean "silent/ shocked" while the former may mean "stabbed/ worried/ concerned." Although this use of the neologism by Theodotion disrupts the trend of the semantic range meaning "stabbed," it still appears in a specific context of emotional distress, albeit void of sin.

Later, in both Greek forms of Daniel, the neologism appears in the deuterocanonical account of Susanna (Dan 13:10). For the story of Susanna, there is no Hebrew text to work with, and it is quite likely that the text was originally Greek. This one example provides an interesting insight into what warranted κατανύσσομαι for a Greek author who did not have the burden of being a translator. When the two old men lust after Susanna, to describe that desire the neologism is used: ἦσαν κατανενυγμένοι περὶ αὐτῆς ("they were stabbed concerning her").[39]

---

[38] A comparison with the Hebrew here suggests that there may be confusion with the verb κατανυστάζω ("fall asleep").

[39] While Susanna exists in two versions, LXX (OG) and Theodotion, they both agree here with regard to κατανύσσομαι; cf. Alfred Rahlfs, *Septuaginta 2: Libri poetici et prophetici* (Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1949) 865. Given the context of sexual sin and the wider Greek meaning of "stabbed," we prefer this translation to the more idiomatic "transfixed" or the footnoted "bedazzled" in the

In the context of sin and specifically sexual sin, κατανύσσομαι occurs. As with many of the instances above that relate to the individual emotions in the context of sin, this example fits well. In this way the Greek understanding of "stabbed [by sin]" would be an appropriate meaning for κατανύσσομαι. Here and in Sirach, the use of κατανύσσομαι takes on a more narrowly defined sense.[40]

## XI. Sirach

The Greek text of Sirach has four instances of the verb (Sir 12:12; 14:1; 20:21; 47:20). Fortunately for our study, three of the four passages that employ κατανύσσομαι have extant Hebrew texts. Both Sir 12:12 and 47:20 seem to share the same lexical root in their *Vorlage*, since the former (Genizah MS A) represents the verb אנח (in the hitpael: "and you will groan"),[41] while the latter (Genizah MS B) renders the noun אנחה ("groaning").[42] It is interesting that in both cases the contexts

---

NETS translation; cf. R. Timothy McLay, "Sousanna," in *A New English Translation of the Septuagint* (ed. Pietersma and Wright), 987-990, here 988.

[40] To argue the story of Susanna has a Semitic *Vorlage*, Frank Zimmermann ("The Story of Susanna and its Original Language," *JQR* 48 [1957-58] 236-41, here 239-40) suggests that κατανύσσομαι is merely a confusion by the LXX translator of the Hebrew חלה ("to be sick," in a possible *Vorlage* of v. 10) with חלל ("be wounded/pierced"), thus translating κατανύσσομαι. For the discussion regarding whether Susanna is a translation, see Carey A. Moore, *Daniel, Esther and Jeremiah: The Additions* (AB 44; New York: Doubleday, 1977) 81-84. Moore suggests one of the reasons for seeing a Semitic *Vorlage* is that puzzling Greek phrases, such as Dan 13:10, are best explained as misunderstanding of a Hebrew *Vorlage* (ibid., 83). But given the use of κατανύσσομαι elsewhere as "stabbed" in context of sin (3 Kgdms 20:29) that could have been known to the writer of Susanna, the context in which it appears in Susanna is appropriate. Thus its use does not prove a misunderstanding of a *Vorlage*.

[41] For the Hebrew text of Sirach, see Pancratius C. Beentjes, *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew: A Text Edition of All Extant Hebrew Manuscripts and a Synopsis of All Parallel Hebrew Ben Sira Texts* (VTSup 68; Leiden: Brill, 1997). The line in Genizah MS A reads ולאנחתי תתאנח ("and at my groaning you will groan"), while the Greek text has ἐπὶ τῶν ῥημάτων μου κατανυγήσῃ ("and over my words you will be stabbed"). For a discussion of the Hebrew manuscripts available for Sirach see Patrick W. Skehan and Alexander Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira* (AB 39; New York: Doubleday, 1987) 51-62. On the grandson's translation technique, see Benjamin G. Wright, *No Small Difference: Sirach's Relationship to Its Hebrew Parent Text* (SBLSCS 26; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989).

[42] Note that several MSS in the Lucianic tradition have the infinitive κατανυγῆναι ("to be stabbed"), whereas Vaticanus, Sinaiticus, and Alexandrinus read κατενύγην ("I was stabbed").

warranting the neologism still retain the sense of an individual being affected by a situation connected with sin, even though there is a clear *Vorlage* and likely no interpretative translation being made. The first example is the teaching of the sage on true and false friends. The sage gives instruction to keep clear of false friends and tells the listener that on account of these words, "you will be stabbed [with regret]" (κατανυγήσῃ), presumably because he ends up not heeding the advice and regrets it. But regret is linked to becoming involved with a false friend that is inevitably a path to sin, and such a false friend is explicitly described as a sinner in Sir 12:14. The second example, Sir 47:20, is specifically related to Solomon's sin bringing a painful result upon himself and his descendants.

Sirach 14:1 also retains this context of sin. But the *Vorlage* (at least as preserved in Genizah MS A) seems to have a different term rather than "groaning". Here the sage speaks of the happiness of someone whose mouth has not "caused him pain" (עצבו), before adding (in the strained wording of the Genizah MS): "and whose heart has not consented to judgment against him" (ולא אבה עליו דין לבו). Better sense is obtained by emending the text in two places to read: "and whose heart has not brought upon him sorrow" (ולא הביא עליו דון לבו).[43] The Hebrew text is slightly different than the reading in the LXX: καὶ οὐ κατενύγη ἐν λύπῃ ἁμαρτιῶν ("and he was not stabbed in grief for sins"). Indeed, the difference between the LXX and the Genizah MS (beginning at אבה until the end of the verse) indicates the possibility of corruption here. If אבה is a misreading of אנח and this initial misreading gave rise to an attempted explanation of the former, this could explain the differences after the verb. If this is correct, in all three Sirach cases, the *Vorlage* is some form of אנח "to groan."[44]

The Hebrew for Sir 20:21 is unavailable. Yet here again the context is sin, but through avoiding it the person "will not be stabbed" (οὐ κατανυγήσεται) by it. If we can assume that the translator is working off similar principles as we have seen above, we can imagine that some other word was in the *Vorlage* rather than a literal equivalent meaning

---

[43] For this understanding, see Skehan and Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 252. The Genizah MS has אבה ("he consented") instead of הביא ("he brought"), and דין ("judgment") instead of דון ("sorrow").

[44] Particular thanks to Jeremy Corley for his observations regarding the Sirach passages, specifically his suggestion regarding Sir 14:1 as a misreading.

"to pierce" for κατανύσσομαι (such as רצע or חלף) or a lexeme that is being interpreted by the translator. More likely in the *Vorlage* is the hitpael imperfect of אנח ("he will groan"), as in Sir 12:12.

These Sirach examples retain the sense of κατανύσσομαι describing the individual's reaction to a negative situation. Yet they narrow the semantic range for the neologism by using it with a particular equivalent and in a specific context of sin. Thus, there is less interpretation since κατανύσσομαι seems to have secured a meaning for this translator and has become a true equivalent with אנח both in consistency and overlapping semantic range in regards to what is being communicated by "groaning" or "being stabbed" metaphorically in these particular contexts. This later narrowing use of the term compared to the other biblical texts may show standardization of κατανύσσομαι by the time of this translator.

## XI. Conclusions

Hopefully, this journey through the complexity of the LXX, highlighting its nuances as a translational corpus, illuminates the use of the neologism in the NT. As in the LXX, so in Acts 2:37, κατανύσσομαι appears in a particular context of sin and individual realization of that sin. Through this LXX discussion, we understand that the neologism in such a context is not arbitrary, but part of a longer historical usage. The NT instance may be an example of solidification of its semantic range by this time, following the increasing standardization witnessed in the LXX. Given the shared context of personal realization of sin, and also the progressive standardization in the later LXX literature, I suggest that the neologism in Acts is unlikely to have a wide variety of meanings as hypothesized by some NT scholars. In fact, the NT (compositional) use of the neologism accords well with the trends in the translational literature of the LXX.

Did the Septuagintal translators employ κατανύσσομαι as a standard equivalent of a Hebrew lexeme without regard for literary context? Or is it used to struggle with a meaning of a lexeme in the *Vorlage* that they did not understand? Or did they employ the neologism to express a particular feeling of the literary context that they felt κατανύσσομαι captured better? Such questions are often problematic unless assump-

tions are clarified; it is often the case where we assume the translator always had a logical intention in their usage of a lexeme. Yet in some cases like LXX Pss 29:13 and 34:15, we see that it is possible there is no intention for the use of κατανύσσομαι to make sense in its literary context or that there is not enough information to decide. These possibilities admitted, it is curious that there is a generally consistent use of the neologism in similar literary contexts in a translational corpus of literature; this must be accounted for. Thus the present study has attempted to show that κατανύσσομαι likely retains the metaphorical sense of "being stabbed" for the LXX translators. Further, we have learned that, except in two instances (Ps 29:13 [MT 30:13]; 34:15 [MT 35:15]), κατανύσσομαι appears in similar contexts dealing with emotional distress. While we are not arguing that the literary setting is the main determinant for understanding the meaning of κατανύσσομαι, when these literary contexts are studied with the likely meaning of κατανύσσομαι constructed from non-translational/ compositional Greek literature, we see that there is general correspondence in how the translators utilize κατανύσσομαι.

From these observations, a picture forms of when κατανύσσομαι is interpretative and to what degree. Often, the use of κατανύσσομαι is contrary to some general presuppositions that the LXX translator is always trying to account for the Hebrew the best they can and thus lacking interpretative decisions in their translations. While there is much evidence for this perspective in a variety of Septuagintal books, such a general approach must not limit the possibilities of interpretative translation when there is sufficient evidence to show it is occurring.

At those times when the semantic range of κατανύσσομαι overlaps with the semantic range of the Hebrew *Vorlage*, there is more intention by the translators to represent their *Vorlage*. This can be classed interpretative to a lesser degree since the translator is still choosing to employ the neologism in a particular context.[45] Yet at those times when κατανύσσομαι is in semantic disagreement with its corresponding lexeme in the *Vorlage*, we see moments of interpretation. This is not to argue that the interpretative uses of κατανύσσομαι are on a theological

---

[45] On the degrees of interpretation, see Pietersma, "Septuagintal Exegesis and the Superscriptions," 451. But his categories of level 0-3 may be too sharply defined to apply in the case of this neologism, though his distinctions of source-orientated versus target-orientated may be helpful (pp. 453-73).

level, but it shows that κατανύσσομαι seems to interpret the *Vorlage* more than just struggling with the translation of the parent text. Various examples indicate that the neologism κατανύσσομαι interprets the feelings of characters and the type of emotions. In the case of this neologism, its occurrences where דמם is present in the *Vorlage* show when the LXX translator interpreted the "silence" as emotional distress via the neologism, with context as a guide.

Following a usage that is common in later Septuagintal books (especially Sirach), the single use of κατανύσσομαι in the NT (Acts 2:37) appears in a particular context of sin. While the NT author has kept the frequent Septuagintal meaning of "being stabbed" in a metaphorical sense, he has also retained the type of context in which κατανύσσομαι often appears, involving individual realization of sin. Thus, the Septuagintal background of the neologism explains the nuances of this word in its single occurrence in the NT.[46]

---

# Phonological Phenomena in Greek Papyri and Inscriptions and their Significance for the Septuagint

JAMES K. AITKEN

It has been recognized for more than a century that documentary evidence is our prime, or in some cases the only, source for determining periods in the history of the Greek language.[1] As new material has been published and studied, this finding has been confirmed by continued insights into the history of the language. In particular, the letters and documentary sources provide a valuable insight into non-standardized features of the language, which are only occasionally represented in literary works.[2] Professor Gignac's particular contribution to this area has been his provision of the most systematic analysis of linguistic phenomena in the Greek papyri from Roman and Byzantine Egypt, including the identification of bilingual interference from Coptic.[3] Gignac has not confined his work to the linguistic data alone, however, but has applied his insights to the study of the NT text and

---

[1] Cf. Francis T. Gignac, "The Papyri and the Greek Language," *Yale Classical Studies* 28 (1985) 155–66.

[2] Most *koine* literary words are in a fairly standardized language, although the NT and the *Discourses* of Epictetus are prime examples of literature with non-standardized grammatical features. For a brief overview of the contribution of the different sources for evidence of *koine*, see Robert Browning, *Medieval and Modern Greek* (2d ed.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983) 22–23.

[3] On bilingual interference, see Gignac, "The Papyri and the Greek Language," 157 and 165.

language.[4] It is an appropriate tribute to his work, therefore, to see how far some of the features that have been identified for the Roman period can be traced into the Hellenistic, and accordingly how a perspective on the developments in Greek from the Hellenistic into the Roman period can illuminate the text of the LXX.

The insights from documentary evidence are still rarely applied in biblical studies, and where they are, they are often dependent upon older studies, repeating without renewed examination the results from them. John Lee has recently lamented that in the thirty years since his study, which employed the papyri for illustrating the Greek of the LXX,[5] little advance has been made.[6] There have been very few studies since then that have sought similar goals, despite the increase in documentary material published.

The importance of this material cannot be underestimated. It confirms that the Greek of the LXX, although displaying interference from its Hebrew *Vorlage*, was not a peculiar Jewish dialect but representative of *koine* of the time. As new discoveries are made and continue to be published, there is an opportunity for scholars to utilize such evidence in the interpretation of the Bible and its Greek. Indeed, the quantity of such data is so great that it could present a significant advance in the study of biblical and *koine* Greek, if only its importance were recognized. That it has not offered such a revolution lies partly in the difficulty in handling such a vast amount of complex data, and partly owing to a lack of training in the material for biblical scholars. Since there are no up-to-date dictionaries for *koine* Greek, individual researchers must undertake the research *de novo* for themselves. Ever

---

[4] Idem, "Morphological Phenomena in the Greek Papyri Significant for the Text and Language of the New Testament," *CBQ* 48 (1986) 499–511; idem, "Phonological Phenomena in the Greek Papyri Significant for the Text and Language of the New Testament," in *To Touch the Text. Biblical and Related Studies in Honor of Joseph A. Fitzmyer, S.J.* (ed. Maurya P. Horgan and Paul J. Kobelski; New York: Crossroad, 1989) 33–46.

[5] John A. L. Lee, *A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch* (SBLSCS 14; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983).

[6] Idem, "*A Lexical Study* Thirty Years On, with Observations on 'Order' Words in the LXX Pentateuch," in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (ed. Shalom M. Paul, Robert A. Kraft, Lawrence H. Schiffman and Weston W. Fields; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2003) 513–24. Although the *Lexical Study* was published in 1983, it was in fact an unrevised version of his 1970 doctoral dissertation.

since the appearance of the first volume of Gignac's *magnum opus* in 1976,[7] there has been a surge in publications of new finds, requiring renewed examination of the data. That Gignac worked before the days of electronic texts that can be easily searched makes his work all the more impressive, but now with the advent of computerized documentary texts, allowing for a greater capability of lexical searches, we may examine and test earlier insights.

## I. Papyri and Inscriptions in Biblical Research

Space does not permit a comprehensive survey of the application of documentary sources to the study of biblical Greek, but the key studies are few enough to allow for a representative summary. Although the insights from inscriptions had been noted in NT research since the eighteenth century,[8] the rapid publication of Greek papyri in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries stimulated major studies of the language and setting of the Greek Bible. Prominent in this endeavor was Adolf Deissmann, whose work on the language of the NT[9] was matched by lexical studies on the LXX, showing that the Greek was representative of the language of the time and that many peculiarities could be accounted for by recourse to documentary sources.[10]

Perhaps owing to the breadth and depth of Deissmann's work, which could be taken as indicative that he had sufficiently made his case, there have been few that have subsequently taken up this approach consistently. Those that have followed in his footsteps have largely concentrated on the papyri.[11] Thus, Orsolina Montevecchi has

---

[7] Francis T. Gignac, *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods, vol. 1: Phonology; vol. 2: Morphology* (2 vols.; Testi e documenti per lo studio dell'antichità 55; Milan: Istituto Editoriale Cisalpino-La Goliardica, 1976, 1981).

[8] E.g., J. E. I. Walch, *Observationes in Matthaeum ex graecis inscriptionibus* (Jena: apud viduam Crockeri, 1779).

[9] G. Adolf Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten: das Neue Testament und die neuentdeckten Texte der hellenistisch-römischen Welt* (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1908).

[10] Idem, *Bibelstudien: Beiträge, zumeist aus den Papyri und Inschriften, zur Geschichte der Sprache, des Schrifttums und der Religion des hellenistischen Judentums und des Urchristentums* (Marburg: N. G. Elwert'sche, 1895); idem, *Neue Bibelstudien* (Marburg: N. G. Elwert'sche, 1897). See too James H. Moulton, *From Egyptian Rubbish-Heaps: Five Popular Lectures on the New Testament* (London: Charles H. Kelly, 1916).

[11] Gregory H. R. Horsley, "The Origin and Scope of Moulton and Milligan's *Vocabulary of the Greek Testament*, and Deissmann's Planned New Testament Lexi-

illuminated many biblical uses and origins of terms from a study of Egyptian papyri, but her work is now almost fifty years old, despite a recent publication of her unrevised papers in a volume.[12] Anna Passoni dell'Acqua continues to apply papyrological insights to the material, as does John Lee in a number of lexicographic studies, but given the advances in the fields of epigraphy and papyrology their work is only the beginning.[13] Gregory Horsley has also contributed many insights from both papyri and inscriptions, and remains one of the few who introduces inscriptions into the discussion.[14]

As an illustration of the extent of the new material, we may note two words to which Deissmann originally alerted his readers, and compare his evidence with the material available to us now. The two Septuagintal words are εὐείλατος (or εὐίλατος, "merciful," Ps 98[99]:8; 1 Esdr 8:53) and ἀντιλήμπτωρ (or ἀντιλήπτωρ, "helper, protector," e.g., Ps 3:4; 17[18]:3; 41[42]:10). Before the time of Deissmann these words had both appeared to be coinages of the LXX translators, or at the least so rare as to be attested only in the LXX and in Christian sources that were themselves dependent on Septuagintal language. Deissmann, however, was able to find both words in sources that had come to light in his

---

con: Some Unpublished Letters of G. A. Deissmann to J. H. Moulton," *BJRL* 76 (1994) 187–216, explains that Deissmann, as shown in his correspondence with J. H. Moulton, was intending to draw upon epigraphical evidence for his lexicon of the NT. One of the few studies utilizing inscriptions, although primarily for historical rather than linguistic evidence, is Emilio Gabba's *Iscrizioni greche e latine per lo studio della Bibbia* (Sintesi dell' Oriente e della Bibbia 3; Milan: Marietti, 1958). Gabba's work has been revised by his pupil Laura Boffo: *Iscrizioni greche e latine per lo studio della Bibbia* (Biblioteca di storia e storiografia dei tempi biblici 9; Brescia: Paideia, 1994); cf. Gregory H. R. Horsley, "Epigraphy as an Ancilla to the Study of the Greek Bible: A Propos of a Recent Anthology of Inscriptions," *Bib* 79 (1998) 258–67.

    [12] Orsolina Montevecchi, *Bibbia e papiri. Luce dai papiri sulla Bibbia greca*, a cura di A. Passoni Dell'Acqua (Estudios de Papirologia Y Filologia Biblica 5; Barcelona: Institut de Teologia fondamental—Seminari de papirologia, 1999).

    [13] E.g., Anna Passoni Dell'Acqua, "Ricerche sulla versione dei LXX e i papiri: I Pastophorion," *Aegyptus* 61 (1981) 1–2, 171–211; eadem, "Il Pentateuco dei LXX testimone di istituzioni di età tolemaica," in *Septuaginta. Libri sacri della diaspora giudaica e dei cristiani. Atti della III Giornata di studio, Milano 11.5.99 Università Cattolica, Annali di Scienze religiose* (1999) 171–200; cf. Lee, *A Lexical Study*; idem, "*A Lexical Study* Thirty Years On." Lee is also collaborating with G. H. R. Horsley on a new edition of Moulton & Milligan: see "A Lexicon of the New Testament with Documentary Parallels: Some Interim Entries, 1," *Filología Neotestamentaria* 10 (1997) 55–84.

    [14] See G. H. R. Horsley, S. R. Llewelyn et al., *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity* (9 vols.; North Ryde, NSW: Ancient History Documentary Research Centre, Macquarie University/ Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976–2002).

day and to conclude that they had been taken up and adapted by the LXX translators from contemporary Greek. For the word εὐείλατος he recorded in 1895 one example among the Flinders Petrie collection of papyri from Egypt,[15] and by 1897 he had found an additional case.[16] Subsequently the word has come to light in many inscriptions such that we now have at least thirty-seven instances in sources between the third century B.C.E. and the first century C.E.[17] Twenty-three of these are in the same collection of inscriptions,[18] but nonetheless the number is impressive and does not include occasional later examples.[19] The geographical spread of the word is indicated by its presence in inscriptions from Egypt, Attica, Asia Minor and even Pompeii.[20] For ἀντιλήμπτωρ Deissmann also found one example in a papyrus petition of the second century B.C.E..[21] Given that there are now nine attestations in documentary papyri (the earliest being from Memphis in 158 B.C.E.),[22] and a number of later instances in Christian inscriptions,[23] this word provides a further illustration of the remarkable increase during the past century of examples from which we might draw. Therefore, despite the important work of Deissmann, there remains much to be explored and many words to be investigated that have come to light subsequently.

It is not only the recent publication of new sources, however, that calls for renewed study of this material, but also the lack of complete concordances for papyri and inscriptions. Epigraphists might sometimes note in their edition of an inscription the appearance of a rare word, but this information is not then always found by lexicographers. The existence of a word in a documentary source can lie unnoticed, unless its presence has been drawn to the attention of the editors of

---

[15] Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, 119.

[16] Idem, *Neue Bibelstudien*, 85.

[17] The earliest are all third-century Egyptian: PCair, Zen 1 59034 l. 19 (12th Feb, 257 B.C.E.); PPetr, vol. 2 13 Fr19, l. 3 (256–255 B.C.E.); PSI vol. 4 392 l. 6 (242–241 B.C.E.).

[18] From Knidos in Asia Minor; see Wolfgang Blümel, ed., *Die Inschriften von Knidos*, 1 (Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien, 41; Bonn: Habelt, 1992).

[19] E.g., Plovdiv in Bulgaria: see Georgius Mihailov, *Inscriptiones Graecae in Bulgariae repertae* 1 (2nd ed.; Sofia: Bulgarian Academy of Letters, 1970) 930 line 2; and Palestine: see *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum* 8: 346, line 5 (5th century).

[20] For Pompeii, a first-century B.C.E. graffito, see *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum* 30: 1180.

[21] Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, 86.

[22] Ulrich Wilcken, ed., *Urkunden der Ptolemäerzeit (ältere Funde) I, Papyri aus Unterägypten* (Berlin/ Leipzig: de Gruyter, 1927; repr. 1977) 14r 2.18.

[23] E.g., *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum* 34: 1668, B 2.

the Supplements of Liddell and Scott. Thus, the word ἐκλοχίζω ("to select"), appearing in the LXX only at Cant 5:10, is attested in an inscription published as early as 1915.[24] The inscription is a first-century B.C.E. list of officials from Hermopolis Magna in Upper Egypt, and provides a precise parallel to the example in Canticles, but has remained unknown in LXX studies.[25] Not only does it confirm the existence of the term in non-biblical Greek, but it provides evidence for a military connotation to the word. Likewise, the lexeme ὀχληρία ("annoyance") has languished in a papyrus since 1954,[26] although this attestation confirms the existence of the word. It is important evidence since ὀχληρία appears in the majority of witnesses at Eccl 7:25, but Rahlfs in his edition of the LXX favors the conjecture σκληρία, meaning "hardness" (which is indeed a *hapax legomenon* in all of Greek), and relegates ὀχληρία to the *apparatus criticus*.[27]

## II. Phonology and the Dating of the Septuagint

It is a notable feature of LXX studies that we know remarkably little about the time and place of most of the translations. Whilst it seems likely that the Pentateuch was translated in Alexandria some time before the second century B.C.E.,[28] for the other books there is

---

[24] Friedrich Preisigke, *Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden aus Aegypten: 1. Urkunden* (Strassburg/Berlin: Trübner, 1913–1915) 4206, line 239. It has been republished by Étienne Bernand, *Inscriptions grecques d'Hermoupolis Magna et sa nécropole* (Bibliothèque d'Études 123; Cairo: Institut français d'Archéologie orientale, 1999). It should be noted that the first century B.C.E. is the date often assigned to Greek Canticles too.

[25] Johan Lust, Erik Eynikel, and Katrin Hauspie, *A Greek–English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (Rev. ed.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2003) 184 class the word as a neologism. This inscriptional occurrence has now been recorded in Francisco R. Adrados et al., eds., *Diccionario griego-español* (Madrid: Instituto Antonio de Nebrija, 1980–) 1377.

[26] PHamb 2:182 fr. A, line 2. See Bruno Snell, *Griechische Papyrusurkunden der Hamburger Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek II mit einigen Stücken aus der Sammlung Hugo Ibscher* (Veröffentlichungen aus der Hamburger Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek 4; Hamburg: Augustin, 1954) 158–59.

[27] Alfred Rahlfs, *Septuaginta: id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes* (2 vols.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1935) 2. 252.

[28] In addition to the tradition as recorded in Aristeas, one can cite the second-century B.C.E. Greek papyri fragments of Deuteronomy (PRyl 458) as a *terminus ante quem*. The language also conforms to a date of the third century for the Pentateuch.

little secure data other than the translation technique itself. The identification of particular linguistic features would then seem to offer the possibility of placing a translation within a certain era, even if it cannot provide precise conclusions. Language has accordingly often been appealed to as one of the few indicators of the date for the various books in the LXX. Phonological phenomena as revealed in the spelling and morphology are usually cited, since certain changes can be detected in different periods. Indeed, it is possible that such evidence might also contribute to the wider picture of transitional stages in the language of *koine*. For instance, Lee has recently suggested that we might draw a distinction between phases within *koine* itself,[29] taking up an older idea of Albert Thumb, who had suggested a division be made between the first century B.C.E. and the first century C.E.[30] Lee expands this proposal and identifies an Early (third to first centuries B.C.E.), Middle (first to third centuries C.E.), and Late (fourth to sixth centuries C.E.) *koine*. The phonological evidence conforms to some degree with these phases.

We shall see examples below where the application of lexical and phonological evidence to the LXX has influenced reference works, or has been used in passing by scholars. It has been applied particularly in larger studies where there are few certain grounds for a date other than these linguistic criteria, and phonology has therefore been popular in LXX scholarship when it is so notoriously difficult to date a translation by other means. Gillis Gerleman in his various studies on Septuagintal books sensibly utilized such phenomena, although not always with due caution or the latest data.[31] In the case of Proverbs, however,

---

See Lee, *A Lexical Study*, 139–44; Trevor V. Evans, *Verbal Syntax in the Greek Pentateuch: Natural Greek Usage and Hebrew Interference* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001) 263–64.

[29] John A. L. Lee, "ἐξαποστέλλω," in *Voces Biblicae: Septuagint Greek and its Significance for the New Testament* (ed. Jan Joosten and Peter Tomson; CBET 49; Leuven: Peeters, 2007) 99–114, here 114.

[30] Cf. Albert Thumb, *Die griechische Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus: Beiträge zur Geschichte und Beurteilung der Koine* (Strassburg: Trübner, 1901) 9–10; cf. 249, where he speaks of the high-point of *koine* in the first half of the first century C.E.: "als die Vollendung der alten κοινή betrachtet werden."

[31] His use of lexical evidence from Egypt to suggest a setting for Greek Chronicles in his *Studies in the Septuagint, 2: Chronicles* (Lunds universitets årsskrift. N.f., 1/43/3; Lund: Gleerup, 1946) has been recently criticized. See Sarah Pearce, "Contextualising Greek Chronicles," *Zutot: Perspectives on Jewish Culture* 1 (Dordrecht: Kluwer, 2001) 22–28.

he disagreed with Henry Thackeray, who had invoked orthography to argue that Proverbs is not older than 100 B.C.E.[32] Gerleman indicates that some of Thackeray's examples can be disproved and that to use orthography is problematic when scribal habits would have varied in the different textual witnesses (a point of which Thackeray was not unaware).[33] We shall return shortly to his arguments. Nevertheless, the examples given by Thackeray have been used for dating other Septuagintal books.[34] In the case of the Wisdom of Solomon, which as a sapiential work is to an extent timeless and therefore difficult to locate, lexical evidence has been appealed to particularly. The suggestion has been that many of the words are not attested before the first century C.E. and thus are indicative of a date for the book of at least the Augustan era.[35] Indeed, Lester Grabbe suggests that language is the "strongest argument," although he also admits its limitations.[36] It can be seen, therefore, that these issues are still important in scholarship, although the precise value of lexical data for dating is disputed. It is necessary accordingly to consider the limits of such material (and precautions to take when using it) before returning afresh to some key phonological features that have been discussed.

## III. Problems of Method

There are a number of problems with using phonological evidence for determining the date of books, some of which have been noted

---

[32] Henry St. J. Thackeray, *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint, vol. 1, Introduction, Orthography and Accidence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909) 61.

[33] Gillis Gerleman, *Studies in the Septuagint, 3: Proverbs* (Lund: Gleerup, 1956) 58.

[34] E.g., Jay C. Treat, "Aquila, Field, and the Song of Songs," in *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments. Papers Presented at the Rich Seminar on the Hexapla, Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies, 25th July−3rd August 1994* (ed. Alison Salvesen; TSAJ 58; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998) 135–76, here 135.

[35] David Winston, *The Wisdom of Solomon: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 43; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1979) 22–23.

[36] Lester L. Grabbe, *The Wisdom of Solomon* (Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha; Sheffield: Academic Press, 1997) 89. Contrast William Horbury, "The Christian Use and the Jewish Origins of the Wisdom of Solomon," in *Wisdom in Ancient Israel. Essays in Honour of J. A. Emerton* (ed. John Day, Robert P. Gordon, and Hugh G. M. Williamson; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995) 182–96. Horbury admits that there exists little Greek literature from the first century B.C.E., and suggests that Gignac has disproved Thackeray's second-century B.C.E. date (183–84).

already by those considering this feature. The conservatism of spelling conventions can mask a phonological change until some time after it has become the norm, or in some cases never display a change. For our purposes this is not of importance, since it is the representation in the sources that is our concern. Even if we cannot determine when precisely a phonological change came about, which is naturally important for those working on the history of the language, we can determine when it begins to affect orthography. This will allow us to identify phases in the orthography even if it does not provide precise dates for those interested in phonology.

Codices, as opposed to contemporary sources, do not always represent the text as written (as recognized by Thackeray) and are not definitive guides, therefore, to the original writing of a text. As Thackeray shows, writing conventions can change even within the same codex so that we cannot be sure at all if a literary work preserved for us in a later manuscript or codex does display certain phonological features.[37] Nevertheless, even though a particular spelling might have been introduced by a copyist rather than the author, the preservation of conventions that are no longer in use at the time of copying a manuscript suggests that the orthography could go back to the early stages of the history of the text.

Given these problems, it is not sufficient to rely on one orthographic item, even though some conclusions have been based on such tentative evidence. Such an example can form part of a larger argument for dating, but only as a support or indication that conforms to other data rather than a decisive factor. As ever, statistics have to be handled very carefully. There are periods when there are fewer sources in general, and the haphazard nature of finds has to be taken into consideration. Notably, the distribution of the surviving papyri from the Ptolemaic period indicates a significant decline in the centuries preceding the Common Era. As we shall see below, this is the very period when Thackeray saw a decrease in the use of particular features, but this can only be argued if the relative proportions of extant data are taken into account. Thus, Wolfgang Habermann has recently shown the variation in the number of datable papyri, since 3,662 papyri can be placed in the third century B.C.E., whereas 1,085 are dated to the first century

---

[37] Thackeray, *Grammar*, 64–65.

B.C.E.[38] This same time period also shows a decrease in the number of extant literary sources. The number of papyri, however, that can be dated to the first century C.E. rises to 2,478, and to as high as 8,435 in the second century. The reasons why some centuries yield more than others must be put down to the chances of discovery, and perhaps the climatic conditions in certain centuries. Nevertheless, it is a factor that has to be borne in mind.

## IV. Reexamination of the Evidence for οὐθείς and οὐδείς

The intention here is to review the examples already used in LXX scholarship and see how the conclusions ought to be modified in light of recent discoveries. We will then finish by asking how these features conform to other indicators of date for particular books. Our starting point will be Thackeray's work, since, although many features had been observed earlier, even with reference to the Greek Bible,[39] it was Thackeray who systematically applied them to the dating of books.

One of the parade features for Thackeray was the interchange between *delta* and *theta* in the words οὐθείς and οὐδείς ("no one") that had long been recognized in *koine*.[40] It was an ideal example for him since he could trace the history of the rarer form οὐθείς "from its cradle to its grave."[41] The origins of this interchange lie in the assimilation of /d/ before a rough breathing, and this accounts for its particular presence in the case of the negative οὐδείς. Although the form οὐδείς had existed since the origins of Greek, the composite parts were revitalized with the innovation of the emphatic sense "not one" for οὐδείς in the fifth century. An original οὐδ(έ) preceding εἷς led to the assimilated

---

[38] Wolfgang Habermann, "Zur chronologischen Verteilung der papyrologischen Zeugnisse," *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 122 (1998) 144–60, with a helpful chart on 147. See also Eleanor Dickey, "Latin Influence on the Greek of Documentary Papyri: An Analysis of its Chronological Distribution," *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 145 (2003) 249-57, here 251. I am grateful to Dr. Trevor Evans for these references.

[39] E.g., Deissmann, *Neue Bibelstudien*, 9–13.

[40] Thackeray, *Grammar*, 58–62, 66. Thackeray is himself heavily dependent on Edwin Mayser, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit* (Leipzig: de Gruyter, 1898–1906). A well-known NT instance of this interchange is the occurrence of οὐθέν ("nothing") in 1 Cor 13:2 and οὐδὲν in 1 Cor 13:3.

[41] Thackeray, *Grammar*, 58.

form οὐθείς. It is not the result of aspiration of the /d/, which can be seen in later Greek,[42] and therefore the feminine, in which there is no rough breathing, is always written as οὐδεμία.[43] The development is usually considered to be an Attic feature, notable in fourth- and third-century B.C.E. Attic inscriptions, and the influence of Attic on *koine* gave rise to its widespread appearance in the latter.[44]

Thackeray recorded how οὐθείς, the alternate form to οὐδείς, is first found in an inscription from 378 B.C.E., and how, up to the period 132–100 B.C.E., δ forms appear and are found side by side with θ forms. Menander (ca. 342–291 B.C.E.) exhibits this development in using both forms, reflecting their parallel usage for a time.[45] But, according to Thackeray, in Attic inscriptions δ forms are entirely absent between 300 and 60 B.C.E., and throughout the first century B.C.E. and the beginning of the first century C.E. δ forms are hardly attested. From the first century C.E., however, δ forms are on the ascendancy again, and by the end of second century C.E. οὐθείς has almost completely disappeared. Indeed the θ form is attested in the first to second centuries primarily in the expression μηθὲν ἧσσον ("no less"). We thus see a period of dominance of οὐθείς in the late second to first century B.C.E., a time when the prestige of Attic Greek was still dominant in *koine*. It was to lose ground in the course of the first century C.E. to οὐδείς, when the latter began to be reintroduced in inscriptions. After this time the spelling οὐθείς rapidly diminished in frequency (with "sporadic recurrences in Byzantine documents").[46]

Thackeray's high figures for the θ form in papyri of the second century B.C.E. in comparison to its rarity in the first century needs to be seen in light of the decrease in the number of extant papyri in general. This decline can already be suspected given a comparable decline in that period in δ forms also. Variation in manuscripts between οὐδείς and οὐθείς (notably biblical manuscripts of the second century C.E.) can

---

[42] Interchange between the dentals θ and δ is common in the Roman period. For examples, see Gignac, *Grammar*, 1.96–97.

[43] Gignac, *Grammar*, 1.97.

[44] For a summary of the origins of the form, see Carl D. Buck, *The Greek Dialects: Grammar, Selected Inscriptions, Glossary* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955) 61 (§ 66); Geoffrey Horrocks, *Greek: A History of the Language and its Speakers* (Longman Linguistics Library; London/New York: Longman, 1997) 44–45 (§ 4.6.2 [8b]).

[45] Horrocks, *Greek*, 53.

[46] See Mayser's table of statistics: *Grammatik 1.2*, 182; and the tables in Thackeray, *Grammar*, 58–60.

be ascribed to carelessness on the part of revisers as they progressed through a work. The more recent spellings (not just for οὐδείς but also for ἐναντίον, "before," and ὅς ἐάν, "whoever"), generally appear in the first portion of each book of the Pentateuch, while in the second the Hellenistic orthography is to be found.[47] From this phonological variation, Thackeray was able to confirm some of the traditional dates for the translation of books. Thus, since some books were translated in the early centuries of the Common Era, notably Ecclesiastes, which had been recognized as bearing an imprint similar to the second-century reviser Aquila, and the Theodotion translation of Daniel, he surmised that οὐδείς had probably been written by the translator himself, since οὐθείς by this time was in serious decline.[48] And indeed in the case of Ecclesiastes, all the uncials do read οὐδείς.[49] For Greek Proverbs, on the other hand, the presence of οὐδείς in the witnesses suggested to Thackeray that it is no earlier than 132 B.C.E., and more likely no earlier than 100 B.C.E., when οὐδείς began to reappear alongside οὐθείς.[50]

The influence of Thackeray is probably to be seen in some of the entries on οὐθείς in reference works that have appeared subsequently.[51] LSJ is striking for its summary that represents very much the statistics and conclusions of Thackeray:[52]

> οὐθείς, οὐθέν, later form for οὐδείς, οὐδέν, found in Att. Inscr. from 378 *B.C.* onwards along with οὐδείς, which it supersedes entirely

---

[47] Elias J. Bickerman, *Studies in Jewish and Christian History*, Part 1 (Leiden: Brill, 1976) 159 and n. 103, notes that in Polybius οὐθείς is rare in the first seven books, but predominates in the last books (with reference to Friedrich Kaelker, *Quaestiones de elocutione Polybiana* [Leipzig: Hirschfeld, 1880] 230).

[48] Thackeray, *Grammar*, 60.

[49] Ibid.

[50] For Proverbs, the two most recent major studies now place it much earlier in the century: Johann Cook, *The Septuagint of Proverbs: Jewish and/or Hellenistic Proverbs? Concerning the Hellenistic Colouring of LXX Proverbs* (VTSup 69; Leiden: Brill, 1997); David-Marc d'Hamonville, *La Bible d'Alexandrie: Les Proverbes* (Bible d'Alexandrie 17; Paris: Cerf, 2000). For the problems in using the orthography for dating purposes, see also Cook, "The Dating of Septuagint Proverbs," *ETL* 69 (1993) 383–99, here 383–85.

[51] E.g, Félix-Marie Abel, *Grammaire du grec biblique: suivie d'un choix de papyrus* (Paris: Gabalda, 1927) §4b; Procope S. Costas, *An Outline of the History of the Greek Language: with Particular Emphasis on the Koine and the Subsequent Periods* (Chicago: Ukrainian Academy of Sciences of America, 1936) 61; Leonard R. Palmer, *The Greek Language* (London: Bristol Classical Press, 1980) 189.

[52] LSJ 1269.

from about 325 B.C. to 100 B.C.E. (forty examples of θ, none of δ); οὐθείς is in a majority in Ptolemaic papyri up to about 130 B.C.E., after which οὐδείς begins to be common, but does not prevail until i C.E.; the evidence of non-Att. Inscrr. is in general agreement with the foregoing; codd. of Th., Antipho, And., Lys., and Hdt. never have οὐθείς, but the θ forms are freq. in those of Pl., X., Isoc., D., Hyp., Arist., and Thphr., freq. as variants for the δ forms; also in Hellenistic writers, Teles, Plb., etc.; the frequency of θ forms in the uncials of LXX varies roughly according to the date (known or probable) of the translation of the book in question (though the δ forms are in a large majority in the LXX as a whole); the θ forms are rare in codd. of Str. and later writers.

Compared to other entries in LSJ, this is remarkable and distinct. Its focus on the LXX itself is unique, and its detailed discussions of dating and the witness of the uncials are unparalleled. This entry may be contrasted with the one found in the earlier edition of Liddell and Scott, where we find a very simple explanation and no reference to inscriptions, papyri, the LXX, or later codices:

> οὐθείς, οὐθέν, later form for the common οὐδείς, οὐδέν, freq., esp. in Prose, after the time of Aristot. and Theophrast., Lob. Phryn. 182, cf. Göttling Arist. Pol. p. 278: the fem. οὐδεμία never passed into οὐθεμία.[53]

The degree of the expansion of the entry from the original LSJ to the revised version is striking. Its detailed discussion of the LXX, uncharacteristically for that lexicon, and of the variation in codices is no doubt down to Thackeray's work. Likewise, Moulton and Milligan

---

[53] 2nd edition 1845, s.v. There is a question whether a dictionary should discuss the distribution of spelling variants in the first place. The presence of this head-word in LSJ goes back to the appearance of a separate entry in the original Liddell and Scott, no doubt itself deriving it from Franz Passow's *Handwörterbuch der griechischen Sprache* (4th ed.; Leipzig: Vogel, 1831). Notably, the recent Italian dictionary of Greek merely refers the reader under οὐθείς to the entry on οὐδείς, and under the latter contains no discussion of the orthography. See Franco Montanari, *Vocabolario della lingua greca. Con la collaborazione di Ivan Garofalo e Daniela Manetti; fondato su un progetto di Nino Marinone* (Turin: Loescher, 1995) 1431, 1432.

seem entirely reliant on Thackeray for their very similar discussion.[54] Recently, Thackeray has also been called in support of a late date for the translation of the Song of Songs with its preference for ἐξουδενέω.[55] There is nothing improper in such use of the data, since more recent work has generally confirmed Thackeray's observations. Similar statements to his can be found in standard reference works,[56] and documentation for particular sources has been gathered.[57]

A major problem in Thackeray's approach is that we find οὐθείς evenly distributed in LXX books, if we follow the uncial codices, and therefore it is not a promising feature for internal dating of the LXX. Thus, in perhaps some of the earliest translations (those of the Pentateuch from the third century B.C.E.), there are to be found at least fifteen cases of the θ form (e.g., Gen 30:31; 31:32; Exod 5:11; Lev 26:17; Num 17:5; Deut 28:55). It is also attested in such diverse books as Joshua, the Minor Prophets, Kingdoms, Chronicles, Isaiah, 1 Esdras and Maccabees, as well as undoubtedly later books such as the Theodotion translations and the Wisdom of Solomon (5:11; 17:11). In searching for examples in later books alone, he has excluded contrary evidence in other texts that might have called into question the dates of the books. Nevertheless, it is worth investigating how far this criterion can be applied in a diachronic analysis at all, and then considering whether it can show conformity to, rather than actual confirmation of, a date suspected by other criteria.

With a reexamination of the evidence, we can find a much earlier example than the Attic inscription from 378 B.C.E. that is normally cited. An archaic legal inscription (IG 4.1607) from Cleonae in the Pelo-

---

[54] James Hope Moulton and George Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-Literary Sources* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1930) 465. They also make the mistake of reading the years 5/4 B.C.E. as the fifth or fourth centuries B.C.E., thus confusing the evidence; see A. L. Connolly, "οὐθείς again," in *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity: Vol. 4, A Review of the Greek Inscriptions and Papyri Published in 1979* (ed. Gregory H. R. Horsley; North Ryde, NSW: Ancient History Documentary Research Centre, Macquarie University/Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987) 164–65.

[55] Treat, "Aquila, Field, and the Song of Songs," 135.

[56] E.g., Horrocks, *Greek*, 44–45 (§ 4.6.2 [8b]).

[57] E.g., Gignac, *Grammar*, 1.97; Sven-Tage Teodorsson, *The Phonology of Ptolemaic Koine* (Göteborg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis, 1977) 178–79; Leslie Threatte, *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions* (Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 1980–1996) 472.

ponnese, whose script can be dated to some time before the mid-sixth century B.C.E., has preserved the earliest surviving example of οὐθείς in two instances:[58]

> αἰ ἄ[νθρ]οπον α[μάξι]
> ποιήσαντα χρῆμα **μηθ**-
> **έν**· μιαρὸν εἶμεν[· αἰ δὲ]
> [κατάρ]ατον, **μηθὲν** π[αράν]-
> [ο]μον εἶμεν . . . (lines 6–10)

If he slits the throat of a man that was doing nothing, he shall be defiled. But if the man is cursed, there will be nothing illegal about it . . .

This one inscription is not sufficient evidence to derive any theory from it, but indicates the difficulty in using such data. Did the writer of this inscription preserve a dialectal pronunciation that is not attested elsewhere? Was the θ form a phonological tendency in Greek in some regions, or did the writer simply make a mistake? Whatever the explanation, it does extend the chronological range of this form further.

Nevertheless, apart from this example, the next case might well be the inscription from 378 B.C.E. and the subsequent examples.[59] The general trend recorded by Thackeray and his predecessors can still be upheld, but the idea that οὐδείς almost entirely gave way to οὐθείς for approximately two centuries might be questioned. Leslie Threatte's study of Attic inscriptions has shown how οὐθείς is the only form

---

[58] Max Fränkel, ed., *Inscriptiones Argolidis, consilio et auctoritate Academiae Litterarum Regiae Borussicae. Vol. 1, Inscriptiones Graecae Aeginae, Pityonesi, Cecryphaliae, Argolidis* (Inscriptiones Graecae 4 ; Berlin: Reimer, 1902). The inscription has been republished in Franciszek Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées des cités grecques* (Paris: de Boccard, 1969) 56; *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum* 25 (1971) 358. Lilian H. Jeffery, *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece, a Study of the Origin of the Greek Alphabet and its Development from the Eighth to Fifth Centuries BC* (Oxford Monographs on Classical Archaeology; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961) 148, 150 n. 6, hesitatingly attributes the script to ca. 570–550 B.C.E.. The date is also discussed by Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées*, who places it ca. 575–550, and in *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum* 42 (1992) 1734, where the distinctive shape of the *theta* and dotted *omicron* are noted as conclusive evidence for dating.

[59] It is possible, however, that there is an example also from the fifth century B.C.E., although the dating is uncertain: see Ernest Kalinka, ed., *Tituli Asiae Minoris* I (Vienna: Hoelder, 1901) 65.35.

attested in his corpus for the third and second centuries B.C.E., and that from the first century B.C.E. οὐδείς begins to reappear, which would seem to support the earlier evidence.[60] The spelling οὐδείς, however, clearly appears well beyond the confines of Attica in the Hellenistic period, being well attested in the Peloponnese, Macedonia, Thessaly, Asia Minor and the islands, to name but some locations.

Putting all this material together, we cannot produce definitive figures, given the scale of the material and the uncertainty of some readings or of future discoveries. Nevertheless, from an examination and classification of the evidence from papyri and inscriptions, we can now gain a broader picture of the phenomenon. Precise figures are after all not necessary, since it is the mere appearance of a form that is needed to prove the point. Some indication of the frequency is nonetheless helpful to appreciate the ratio between the two forms and accordingly the likelihood of one form or another appearing.

What is remarkable now is that the form οὐδείς is present continually throughout the period, with witnesses to it in both the third century (e.g., IG II 698, line 8) and the second century B.C.E. (e.g., *SEG* 29: 127 ii 82). There is a substantial decline in the number of $\theta$ forms at the time when the $\delta$ forms are meant to be in decline, so that there are approximately 100 $\theta$ forms in the third century B.C.E., but merely 30 in the second century B.C.E. It seems that in general our sources are more limited for this period, as already noted with the decline in the number of extant papyri. As a result it does not seem to be the case that οὐθείς particularly predominates over οὐδείς. Both are in decline in terms of the number of attestations, and οὐθείς is marginally more frequent for a period but they are both attested at the same time. οὐθείς continues for some centuries after this, being attested each century to the fifth century C.E. Thus, this example is very poor for any definitive dating, and an appearance of one form or another could be dated to any century between the fourth century B.C.E. and the fifth century C.E.

Just as we may question the distribution of these forms in the sources, as well as the distribution that Thackeray saw in the LXX, we might look again at the use of the evidence from the codices. Thackeray had suggested that there were some inconsistencies in the codices arising from a scribe's carelessness as he progressed in copying. However, his

---

[60] Threatte, *Grammar*, 472–76.

work was considering primarily Hellenistic authors such as Polybius and the NT. If we turn to classical authors, we encounter a problematic situation indeed. Thus, we find the form οὐθείς in many authors of the fourth century and earlier, including Plato (e.g., *Alcibiades* 141d) and especially Aristotle, as well as the earlier Aeschylus (Frag. 69, line 5) and Parmenides (Frag. 25, line 2). For a fourth-century writer it would have been possible to use οὐθείς, but less likely before the end of the fourth century (as Menander shows). It is noticeable that for earlier writers, such an occurrence is usually where they are preserved in fragment form by later writers. It thus seems that it might be difficult to distinguish between the form written by the actual author and the later editing by scribes, leaving little confidence in this evidence.

An additional complication is the possibility that authors could on occasion have chosen the form that suited their literary tastes, even if they were aware that one form might have sounded archaic. Thus, in Alexandrinus and the first hand of Vaticanus, the ending of Jer 2:6 (". . . in the land in which nothing traveled in it and no human being dwelled there") reads:

> . . . ἐν γῇ, ἐν ᾗ οὐ διώδευσεν ἐν αὐτῇ οὐθὲν καὶ οὐ κατῴκησεν ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖ;

οὐθὲν ("nothing") here translates Hebrew *ish* ("man"), and the translator is aiming for stylistic variation between the personal ἄνθρωπος ("human being") and the impersonal (and hence neuter) οὐθὲν. This has been called "a praiseworthy literary achievement."[61] The choice of the θ form might have been to preserve a θ sound that reappears in the noun ἄνθρωπος.[62]

Other words derived from οὐθείς have sometimes been noted, especially ἐξουθενέω for ἐξουδενέω ("to set at nought"), which are themselves influenced by the negative particles and seem to display similar trends. Most of these cases are too few, however, to construct a comprehensive picture, but it can be observed too that the distribution is broad, and little distinction between uses can be identified.[63]

---

[61] Takamitsu Muraoka, "Literary Device in the Septuagint," *Textus* 8 (1973) 20–30, here 25.

[62] Literary variation might also account for the alternation already noted between the two forms of the word in 1 Cor 13:2-3.

[63] See the discussion of the appearance of both forms in the W version of the *Vita Aesopi* from the second century C.E. in Gregory H. R. Horsley, *New Documents Illus-*

## V. Reexamination of the Evidence for
## Contraction of Adjacent Vowels

A second feature is the contraction of adjacent vowels when a vowel and a diphthong are in conjunction. In this practice, *koine* follows the Attic habit of contraction, but thereby introducing new forms of a word. Greek has continued to the modern day contracting vowels that come into contact with each other through the loss of a consonant, and accordingly producing a simplified form (e.g., λέτε from λέγετε, "you say").[64] A particular case in antiquity was the positioning of a Greek ι adjacent to the diphthong ει, since in *koine* these both would have been pronounced as /i/. The two vowels were then simplified to a simple /i/, represented by either ι or ει. Examples in *koine* include the noun ταμιεῖον ("storehouse") becoming ταμεῖον (and with itacism ταμῖον), the verbal infinitive πιεῖν ("to drink") becoming πεῖν (and πῖν) and the noun ὑγίεια ("health") becoming ὑγεῖα (and ὑγῖα).

This feature was taken up by Thackeray, who observed in the case of the contracted ταμεῖον that it only began to appear in papyri from the first century C.E. onward, until by the fourth century only the shorter form was evident. Similar results were found by him for πιεῖν and ὑγίεια, as well as for Σαραπιεῖον ("temple of Serapis").[65] A systematic study of this feature would have to take into account a wide range of examples of words with these adjacent vowels (e.g., Ἀσκληπιεῖον, Ἀσταρτιεῖον, Δημητριεῖον, Σουχιεῖος), although if it appears in one word, it is likely to be a universal phenomenon found in others. Nevertheless, to indicate how Thackeray's results in this case remain largely accurate, let us take one reasonably frequently-occurring word, Ἰσιεῖον ("temple of Isis"). The uncontracted spelling Ἰσιεῖον is well-attested in the third century (more than 50 times) and second century B.C.E. (more than 15 times), declining in number by the first century B.C.E. (fewer than 10), although this also reflects the decline in the number of papyri extant, as noted before. Nevertheless, Ἰσιεῖον continues into the first century C.E. (e.g., POxy 2: 250, r 5; POxy 8: 1124, 1), and attestations have been preserved

---

*trating Early Christianity: Volume 2, A Review of the Greek Inscriptions and Papyri Published in 1977* (North Ryde, NSW: Ancient History Documentary Research Centre, Macquarie University/Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982) 83.

[64] This practice is discussed by Gignac, *Grammar*, 1.295–96, who gives the example from Modern Greek. See also Teodorsson, *Phonology*, 98–99.

[65] Thackeray, *Grammar*, 63–64.

(one for each century) up to the fourth century C.E.[66] It therefore does not disappear entirely until late on, although it is in conformity with Thackeray's evidence of ταμεῖον disappearing from the third and fourth centuries. The contracted form ταμεῖον, meanwhile, appears from the first century B.C.E. (e.g., POxy 12: 1453, 6) and is frequent in the second and third centuries C.E., suggesting it is the preferred form by this period. Once more no definitive dating can be drawn from the appearance of one form or the other in a text, since both forms appear side by side. The fact that the contracted form is not attested before the first century B.C.E., however, does at least provide a *terminus post quem* for it. After this date, the appearance of either form can suggest the likelihood of a certain date, such as earlier in the Roman period if it is the uncontracted form, but it cannot exclude other dates.

## VI. Linguistic Evidence and the Dating of the Septuagint

The evidence discussed so far has been shown to contribute a broad range for dating of sources, but it is neither conclusive, given the continuance of features rather than their complete disappearance for a time, nor comprehensive, focused as it is on just one linguistic feature. Studies that in the past have cited such phonological phenomena alone are in that respect insufficient for offering any serious conclusions. This does not mean that linguistic evidence cannot be used in the dating of LXX books, although it has rarely been invoked in detail. Changes in a language can usually only be observed over a period of a century or longer, and therefore with a limited corpus such as the LXX, most of it having been presumably translated within two centuries (from the third to first centuries B.C.E.), we are unlikely to detect any significant differences within the corpus itself. Syntactic change is often more conservative than vocabulary, especially as vocabulary can change through invention (of something that requires a name) or

---

[66] For the first to second century: Preisigke, *Sammelbuch* 12: 11067, 19; third century: Rosario Pintaudi and Pieter J. Sijpesteijn, eds., *Ostraka greci de Narmuthis (OGN I)* (Pisa: Giardini, 1993) 100, 2; fourth century: Preisigke, *Sammelbuch* 3: 6662, 3. An inscription of the third or fourth century also exists: Evaristo Breccia, *Iscrizioni greche e latine* (Catalogue géneral des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée d'Alexandrie; Cairo: Museum of Alexandria, 1911) 48.

be extended through generalization and abstraction.[67] Unless there is a datable invention or political change that heralds new terms, it is difficult even to use vocabulary to identify any date. Attempts have been made, for example, to establish a change in use of the office of the ἀρχισωματοφύλαξ ("chief bodyguard") into a distinct court rank after 157 B.C.E.,[68] and to use that for the dating of the *Letter of Aristeas*,[69] but even that might not be possible.[70] However, relation of the language of the LXX to *koine* more generally can be observed and its place within it could be argued for.[71] Certainly, the presence of some of these phonological changes in the books of the LXX, if they are original rather than later scribal features, does assist in placing some of them closer to Roman *koine* than to the earlier Hellenistic period.

Despite the relatively close time-frame within which many of the LXX books were translated, we still have some that were translated a few centuries after the Pentateuch. If the Pentateuch was translated in the third century B.C.E., and if those works reflecting a developed form of the *kaige* tradition, close in style to Aquila (e.g. Ruth, Song of Songs, Ecclesiastes),[72] can be dated to at least the first centuries C.E., then we have a three to four century period in which to detect change. This should be a sufficiently large time-frame in which to trace some linguistic change. Nevertheless, there is little noticeable innovation in this period beyond the phonological phenomena already noted, and

---

[67] See Carl D. Buck, *Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1933) for examples in ancient Greek.

[68] Leon Mooren, *The Aulic Titulature in Ptolemaic Egypt: Introduction and Prosopography* (Verhandelingen van de Koninklijke Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van België, Klasse der Letteren, 37/78; Brussels: Paleis der Academiën, 1975) 78–79.

[69] E.g, Sylvie Honigman, *The Septuagint and Homeric Scholarship in Alexandria: A Study in the Narrative of the Letter of Aristeas* (London: Routledge, 2003) 129.

[70] See Jane Rowlandson, "The Character of Ptolemaic Aristocracy: Problems of Definition and Evidence," in *Jewish Perspectives on Hellenistic Rulers* (eds. Tessa Rajak, Sarah J. Pearce, James K. Aitken, and Jennifer Dines; Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007) 29–49, here 33–34.

[71] As such, Evans, *Verbal Syntax*, is able to show that the Greek of the Pentateuch reflects the earlier stages of *koine*, a conclusion that is in conformity with the traditional dating of the Pentateuch translation to the third century B.C.E..

[72] Cf. Dominique Barthélemy, *Les devanciers d'Aquila: première publication intégrale du texte des fragments du Dodécaprophéton, trouvés dans le désert de Juda, précédée d'une étude sur les traductions et recensions grecques de la Bible réalisées au premier siècle de notre ère sous l'influence du rabbinat palestinien* (VTSup 10; Leiden: Brill, 1963) 33–34, 158–160.

if a new phase of *koine* from the first century was only beginning, its traces might not have yet left their mark on the language of these later books.

The one exception might well be the Book of Ecclesiastes, traditionally ascribed to Aquila or to a school close to his, and therefore often placed in the second century C.E., or more cautiously in the first.[73] In this book there are a number of syntactic features that cumulatively point to a period later than the other LXX books, and this phenomenon can be illustrated here by one small example. The employment of the subjunctive for future becomes a feature of Greek in the Roman period,[74] and seems to be attested in Greek Ecclesiastes. In Eccl 3:13, for instance, the subjunctive follows two futures, and the subjunctive in 9:15 is followed by a future (cf. 9:14 [3x]; 12:5, 7). Although this case permits of alternative interpretations, it might indicate that the future and subjunctive were deemed to be equivalent at this time. The decline in the infinitive and its replacement by ἵνα plus subjunctive (eventually resolving into *dēmotikē na*) is also attested in Ecclesiastes (e.g., 5:14: ἵνα πορευθῇ, "in order to go"). In Eccl 3:14 the expression ἐποίησεν ἵνα φοβηθῶσιν ("he made them fear") might also suggest this, and may be contrasted with the comparable expression in Job 5:18 (ἀλγεῖν ποιεῖ, "he causes to be in pain"), where the infinitive is employed. A development in the language seems to have occurred from the expression in Job to its employment in Ecclesiastes.

It is such instances of linguistic change (be they semantic or syntactic) that can be placed alongside the phonological evidence to create a cumulative argument for dating. In the case of Ecclesiastes, there seems to be a correspondence between the phonological data as adduced by Thackeray and other linguistic features. Whilst the phonological data might offer little on their own, especially given the lack of definitive conclusions from such material, their conformity with other evidence is a useful contribution to a field where we have such slender witnesses.

---

[73] This was first argued for by Bernard De Montfaucon, *Hexaplorum Origenis quae supersunt* (Paris: Nicolaum Simart, 1714) *ad* 7.23, and was given impetus by Heinrich Graetz, *Kohelet*—קהלת—*oder der Salomonische Prediger. Uebersetzt und kritisch Erlaeutet* (Leipzig: C.F. Winter'sche, 1871) 174. The precise dating remains a matter of dispute but the consensus seems to place the translation either in the first or the second century C.E.

[74] Cf. Costas, *Outline*, 68.

## VII. Conclusions

It can be seen that the developments in phonological phenomena identified by Thackeray and his predecessors largely hold true to this day. The greater quantity of sources that we now have does mean, however, that we cannot be as definite as he might have been in allocating a feature to a particular century. There appears to be a preference for one particular form or another in different periods, but most forms seem to co-exist alongside each other for most of the Greco-Roman period. The tendency of some scholars to rely on one phonological feature alone does not provide sufficient data for deriving the date of a particular LXX book. There still might be some hope in determining such dates, but a cumulative case must be made from a variety of linguistic phenomena. Gignac himself was not as convinced as some other biblical scholars as to how far such conclusions could be drawn, and remained cautious in his understanding of the application of the data.

A notable aspect of the two phenomena that have been considered here, the temporary appearance of the form οὐθείς and the contraction of two adjacent /i/ sounds, is that they seem to develop at approximately the same time period. The form οὐθείς is predominant in the first century B.C.E., at precisely the time when the contracted form Ἰσεῖον appears. οὐθείς quickly loses ground again, although it is still to be found for some time, whilst the contracted Ἰσεῖον predominates, only to ensure the disappearance of uncontracted Ἰσιεῖον in the fourth century, when ταμεῖον was seen to have disappeared too. The material presented here fits, therefore, the pattern that Lee has proposed of an Early (third to first centuries B.C.E.), Middle (first to third centuries C.E.), and Late (fourth to sixth centuries C.E.) *koine*. οὐθείς and the contracted forms appear in the transition period between Early and Middle *koine*, and it is in the time of the Late *koine* that we see the resolution of one or other form.

# Bibliography of
# Francis T. Gignac, S.J.

## 1957

"Some Ramifications of Linear B," *The Classical Bulletin* 33 (1957) 37-44.

## 1958

"The Decoding of Linear B," *Thought* 33 (1958) 255-71.

## 1965

Review of Maximilian Zerwick, *Biblical Greek* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1963) in *TS* 26 (1965) 335.

Review of Bo Reicke, *The Epistles of James, Peter, and Jude* (AB 37; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1964) in *Review for Religious* 24 (1965) 294-95.

Review of Joseph A. Grispino, *The Old Testament Complete with Annotations* (New York: Guild Press, 1961) in *Review for Religious* 24 (1965) 655.

Review of Hans Küng, *Justification: The Doctrine of Karl Barth and a Catholic Reflection* (New York: Nelson, 1964) in *Review for Religious* 24 (1965) 661-62.

## 1966

Review of Thomas Corbishley and Robert Speaight, *Ronald Knox: The Priest, The Writer* (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1965) in *Review for Religious* 25 (1966) 353.

Review of David M. Stanley, *The Apostolic Church in the New Testament* (Westminster, MD: Newman, 1965) in *Review for Religious* 25 (1966) 354.

Review of Bruce M. Metzger, *The New Testament: Its Background, Growth, and Content* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1965) in *Review for Religious* 25 (1966) 930.

Review of Eugene Van Ness Geotchius, *The Language of the New Testament* (New York: Scribner's, 1965) in *Review for Religious* 25 (1966) 935.

Review of J. W. Wenham, *The Elements of New Testament Greek* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965) in *TS* 27 (1966) 309.

Review of F. Wilbur Gingrich, *Shorter Lexicon of the Greek New Testament* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965) in *TS* 27 (1966) 309-10.

Review of Eugene Van Ness Geotchius, *The Language of the New Testament* (New York: Scribner's, 1965) in *TS* 27 (1966) 724.

## 1967

(With Joseph J. DeVault)  Review of Alexander Jones, ed., *The Jerusalem Bible* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1966) in *Review for Religious* 26 (1967) 364-65.

## 1970

"Bilingualism in Greco-Roman Egypt," in *Actes du Xème Congrès International des Linguistes* (Bucharest: Academy of the Socialist Republic of Romania, 1970) 4.677-82.

"The Text of Acts in Chrysostom's Homilies," *Traditio* 26 (1970) 308-15.

"The Language of the Non-Literary Greek Papyri," in *Proceedings of the Twelfth International Congress of Papyrology* (ed. D. H. Samuel; ASP 7; Toronto: Hakkert, 1970) 139-52.

"The Pronunciation of Greek Stops in the Papyri," *TPAPA* 101 (1970) 185-202.

Review of Quentin Quesnell, *The Mind of Mark: Interpretation and Method through the Exegesis of Mark 6,52* (AnBib 38; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1969) in *TS* 31 (1970) 753-54.

## 1972

Review of Elinor M. Husselman, *Papyri from Karanis*, Third Series (Michigan Papyri, Vol. 9; Cleveland: Case Western Reserve University, 1971) in *The Classical World* 65 (1971-72) 102.

Review of J. H. Houlden, *Paul's Letters from Prison: Philippians, Colossians, Philemon, and Ephesians* (Pelican Commentaries; Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1970) in *TS* 33 (1972) 139-40.

## 1973

*An Introductory New Testament Greek Course* (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1973).

Review of Guy Bourgeault, S.J., *Décalogue et morale chrétienne: Enquête patristique sur l'utilisation et l'interprétation chrétienne du décalogue de c. 60 à c. 220* (Paris/Tournai: Desclée; Montreal: Bellarmin, 1971) in *TS* 34 (1973) 161-63.

(With G. S. Glanzman)  Review of Peter Walters [= Katz], *The Text of the Septuagint: Its Corruptions and Their Emendation* (ed. D. W. Gooding; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1973) in *TS* 34 (1973) 755-56.

## 1974

"Loss of Nasal Consonants in the Language of the Papyri," in *Akten des XIII. Internationalen Papyrologenkongresses* (ed. Emil Kiessling and Hans-Albert Rupprecht; Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und Antiken Rechtsgeschichte 66; Munich: Beck, 1974) 137-46.

## 1975

"Messina, Biblioteca Universitaria, Cod. gr. 71 and the Rough Recension of Chrysostom's *Homilies on Acts*," in *Studia Patristica* 12 (TU 115; Berlin: Akademie, 1975) 30-37.

"A Sixth-Century Letter in the Michigan Papyrus Collection," *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 17:1 (1975) 10-14.

Review of Max Zerwick and Mary Grosvenor, *A Grammatical Analysis of the Greek New Testament*, Vol. 1: *Gospels-Acts* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1974) in *TS* 36 (1975) 160-61.

Review of Jack Finegan, *Encountering New Testament Manuscripts: A Working Introduction to Textual Criticism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974) in *TS* 36 (1975) 381.

Review of H. F. D. Sparks, *The Johannine Synopsis of the Gospels: The Gospel according to John with the Synoptic Parallels* (New York: Harper & Row, 1975) in *TS* 36 (1975) 813-14.

## 1976

"A Sale of Land from the Michigan Collection," *BASP* 13:3 (1976) 45-48.

"Private Letter," in *Collectanea Papyrologica: Texts Published in Honor of H. C. Youtie* (ed. Ann Ellis Hanson; Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen 19-20; 2 vols.; Bonn: Habelt, 1976) 1.331-34 & Pl. XVIII. "A Document from the Reign of Caracalla in the Michigan Collection," *BASP* 13:3 (1976) 93-99.

*A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*. Vol. 1: *Phonology* (Testi e Documenti per lo Studio dell' Antichità 55; Milan: Instituto Editoriale Cisalpino—La Goliardica, 1976).

Review of Sakae Kubo, *A Reader's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and a Beginner's Guide for the Translation of New Testament Greek* (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1975) in *TS* 37 (1976) 361-62.

## 1977

Review of Nigel Turner, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, Vol. 4: *Style* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1976) in *CBQ* 39 (1977) 165-67.

Review of Stanley B. Marrow, *Basic Tools of Biblical Exegesis: A Student's Manual* (Subsidia Biblica 2; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1976) in *TS* 38 (1977) 196-97.

Review of Fritz Rienecker, *A Linguistic Key to the Greek New Testament*, Vol. 1: *Matthew through Acts* (ed. Cleon L. Rogers, Jr.; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1976) in *TS* 38 (1977) 199.

## 1978

Review of Matthias Stehle, *Greek Word-Building* (ed. Herbert Zimmermann; SBLSBS 10; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1976) in *CBQ* 40 (1978) 138.

## 1979

"Two Papyri from the Michigan Collection," *BASP* 16:3 (1979) 193-97.

Review of David Holly, *A Complete Categorized Greek-English New Testament Vocabulary* (Greenwood, SC: Attic Press, 1978) in *CBQ* 41 (1979) 649-50.

Review of Friedrich Blass and Albert Debrunner, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch* (ed. Friedrich Rehkopf; 14th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975) in *The Classical World* 72 (1978-79) 244.

## 1980

Review of William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Translation and adaptation of the fourth revised and augmented edition of Walter Bauer's *Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur* (2nd ed., rev. F. Wilbur Gingrich and Frederick W. Danker; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979) in *CBQ* 42 (1980) 555-58.

Review of Max Zerwick and Mary Grosvenor, *A Grammatical Analysis of the Greek New Testament*, Vol. 2: *Epistles – Apocalypse* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1979) in *TS* 41 (1980) 440-41.

## 1981

"Some Interesting Morphological Phenomena in the Language of the Papyri," in *Proceedings of the XVI International Congress of Papyrology* (ed. Roger S. Bagnall et al.; ASP 23; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981) 199-207.

Review of five volumes of New Testament Message series (*The Acts, Romans, 1 and 2 Thessalonians, The Johannine Epistles, 1 Corinthians*) in *New Catholic World* (1981).

Review of Ceslas Spicq, *Notes de lexicographie néo-testamentaire*, I & II (OBO 22/1-2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978) in *JBL* 100 (1981) 486-87.

*A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*. Vol. 2: *Morphology* (Testi e Documenti per lo Studio dell' Antichità 55; Milan: Instituto Editoriale Cisalpino—La Goliardica, 1981).

## 1983

Review of Nigel Turner, *Christian Words* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1980) in *CBQ* 45 (1983) 332-34.

## 1984

Review of Frederik Wisse, *The Profile Method for Classifying and Evaluating Manuscript Evidence* (SD 44; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982) in *Patristics* 13:1 (1984) 4-5.

## 1985

"The Papyri and the Greek Language," *Yale Classical Studies* 28 (1985) 155-66.

"The Transformation of the Second Aorist in Koine Greek," *BASP* 22 (1985) 49-54.

Review of Ceslas Spicq, *Notes de lexicographie néo-testamentaire. Supplément* (OBO 22/3; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982) in *JBL* 104 (1985) 139-40.

Review of Alessandro Biondi, *Gli Accenti nei Papiri Greci Biblici* (Papyrologica Castroctaviana Studia et Textus 9; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute; Barcelona: Papyrologica Castroctaviana, 1983) in *JBL* 104 (1985) 549-50.

## 1986

"Codex Monacensis Graeca 147 and the Text of Chrysostom's *Homilies on Acts*," in *Diakonia: Scholarship in the Service of the Church: Studies in Honor of Robert T. Meyer* (ed. Thomas Halton and Joseph P. Williman; Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1986) 14-21.

"Morphological Phenomena in the Greek Papyri Significant for the Text and Language of the New Testament," in *A Wise and Discerning Heart: Studies Presented to Joseph A. Fitzmyer, S.J. in Celebration of His Sixty-fifth Birthday* (ed. Raymond E. Brown, S.S., and Alexander A. Di Lella, O.F.M.) = *CBQ* 48:3 (July 1986) 499-511.

## 1987

"Analogical Levelling in *-MI* Verbs," in *Candida Munera: Miscel·lània Papirològica en Homentage al Dr. Roman Roca-Puig* (ed. Sebastià

Janeras; Barcelona: Fundació Salvador Vives Casajuana, 1987) 133-40.

Chairman of Board of Editors for *The Revised New Testament of the New American Bible* (The Confraternity of Christian Doctrine and the National Conference of Catholic Bishops; New York: Catholic Book Publishing, 1987).

"The New Critical Edition of Chrysostom's *Homilies on Acts*: A Progress Report," in *Texte und Textkritik: Eine Aufsatzsammlung* (ed. Jürgen Dummer, Johannes Irmscher, Franz Paschke and Kurt Treu; TU 133; Berlin: Akademie, 1987) 165-68.

## 1989

"The Development of Greek Phonology: The Fifteenth Century B.C. to the Twentieth Century A.D.," in *Daidalikon: Studies in Honor of Rev. Raymond V. Schoder, S.J.* (Wauconda, IL: Bolchazy-Carducci, 1989) 131-37.

"Phonological Phenomena in the Greek Papyri Significant for the Text and Language of the New Testament," in *To Touch the Text: Biblical and Related Studies in Honor of J. A. Fitzmyer* (ed. Maurya P. Horgan and Paul J. Kobelski; New York: Crossroad, 1989) 101-14.

## 1990

"Towards a Study of Hebrew and Jewish Aramaic Influence on Koine Greek," *Jewish Language Review* 10 (Haifa: Association for the Study of Jewish Languages, 1990).

Review of Robert T. Meyer, ed., *Palladius: Dialogue on the Life of St. John Chrysostom* (ACW 45; New York/Mahwah: Newman, 1985) in *CHR* 76:1 (January 1990) 103-4.

## 1991

"The Influence of Coptic on the Phonology of the Greek of Egypt," in *The Coptic Encyclopaedia* (ed. Aziz S. Atiya; 8 vols.; London/New York: Macmillan, 1991) 8.186-88.

Review of Johannes P. Louw and Eugene A. Nida, eds., *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Based on Semantic Domains* 1: *Introduction & Domains*; 2: *Indices* (2 vols.; New York: United Bible Societies, 1988) in *CBQ* 53 (1991) 334-36.

Review of Günter Neumann and Jürgen Untermann, eds., *Die Sprachen im römischen Reich der Kaiserzeit* (Beihefte der Bonner Jahrbücher 40; Cologne: Rheinland; Bonn: Habelt, 1980) in *BO* 48 (1991) 229-30.

## 1992

Review of Stanley E. Porter, *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament, with Reference to Tense and Mood* (Studies in Biblical Greek 1; New York/Bern/Frankfurt am Main/Paris: Lang, 1989) in *CBQ* 54 (1992) 366-67.

## 1993

"Greek," in *The Oxford Companion to the Bible* (ed. Bruce M. Metzger and Michael D. Coogan; London/New York: Oxford University Press, 1993) 262-63.

Review of Eugene A. Nida and Johannes P. Louw, *Lexical Semantics of the Greek New Testament: A Supplement to the Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains* (SBLRBS 25; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992) in *CBQ* 55 (1993) 602-3.

Review of Naphtali Lewis, Yigael Yadin, and Jonas C. Greenfield, *The Documents from the Bar Kochba Period in the Cave of Letters: Greek Papyri; Aramaic and Nabataean Signatures and Subscriptions* (JDS 2; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1989) in *BASOR* 290-291 (1993) 139-40.

## 1994

Review of Bart D. Ehrman, Gordon D. Fee, and Michael W. Holmes, *The Text of the Fourth Gospel in the Writings of Origen*, Vol. 1 (SBLNTGF 3; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992) in *CBQ* 56 (1994) 790-91.

Review of Marie-Emile Boismard, *Moses or Jesus: An Essay in Johannine Christology* (trans. Benedict T. Viviano; BETL 84A; Leuven: Leuven University Press/Peeters, 1993) in *LS* 19 (1994) 76.

Review of Raymond E. Brown, *The Death of the Messiah: From Gethsemane to the Grave: A Commentary on the Passion Narratives in the Four Gospels* (2 vols.; Anchor Bible Reference Library; New York: Doubleday, 1994) for Catholic News Service, 1994.

## 1995

Review of Jan Lambrecht, ed., *The Truth of the Gospel (Galatians 1:1—4:11)* (Monographic Series of *Benedictina* 12; Rome: St. Paul's Abbey, 1993) in *CBQ* 57 (1995) 625-26.

## 1996

"McKenzie, John Lawrence," in *New Catholic Encyclopedia [supplement], vol. 19* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1996) 262-63.

## 1997

"Mary as the Mother of the Church: Biblical Perspectives," lead article in a booklet published in honor of Our Lady of Vailankanni (Washington, DC: Basilica of the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception, August 1997).

## 1998

"Evidence for Deliberate Scribal Revision in Chrysostom's *Homilies on the Acts of the Apostles*," in *Nova & Vetera: Patristic Studies in Honor of Thomas Patrick Halton* (ed. John Petruccione; Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1998) 209-25.

## 2001

"The Lord's Prayer," in *The Living Light* 38/2 (Winter 2001) 29-34.

## 2002

Review of Paul Tavardon, *Sens et enjeux d'un conflit textuel: Le texte occidental et le texte alexandrin des Actes de Apôtres* (CahRB 44; Paris: Gabalda, 1999) in *CBQ* 64 (2002) 183-84.

## 2003

"Greek Language, Biblical," in *New Catholic Encyclopedia* (2d ed.; 15 vols.; Farmington Hills, MI: Gale, 2003) 6.438.

(With H. Dressler) "Greek Language, Early Christian and Byzantine," in *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, 6.438-39.

## 2005

"The Use of Verbal Variety in the Fourth Gospel," in *Transcending Boundaries: Contemporary Readings of the New Testament* (ed. Rekha M. Chennattu and Mary L. Coloe; Rome: Libreria Ateneo Salesiano, 2005) 191-200.

## In Preparation

*A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods,* Vol. 3: *Syntax* (Testi e Documenti per lo Studio dell' Antichità 55; Milan: Instituto Editoriale Cisalpino—La Goliardica).

*A Critical Edition of St. John Chrysostom's Homilies on the Acts of the Apostles* (Corpus Christianorum: Series Graeca; Turnhout: Brepols).

(Bibliography does not include scores of articles on each of the Sundays of Advent and Lent and major feast days published 1995-2003 and syndicated in dozens of diocesan newspapers in the United States.)

# Contributors

James K. Aitken,
University of Cambridge,
Cambridge, England

Jeremy Corley,
Ushaw College,
Durham, England

Alexander A. Di Lella,
Catholic University of America,
Washington, DC

Jennifer M. Dines,
University of Cambridge,
Cambridge, England

Shawn W. Flynn,
University of Toronto,
Toronto, Canada

C. T. Robert Hayward,
University of Durham,
Durham, England

Bart J. Koet,
University of Tilburg,
Netherlands

Elliott Maloney,
St. Vincent Seminary,
Latrobe, Pennsylvania

M. O'Connor†,
Catholic University of America,
Washington, DC

Stanley E. Porter,
McMaster Divinity College,
Hamilton, Canada

Vincent Skemp,
The College of St. Catherine,
St. Paul, Minnesota

Janet Timbie,
Catholic University of America,
Washington, DC

Mark F. Whitters,
Eastern Michigan University,
Ypsilanti, Michigan

# Index of Ancient Sources

## New Testament and Related Texts

# Index of Authors

Abel, F.-M., 267
Adrados, F. R., 261
Aejmelaeus, A., 73
Aguilar Chiu, J. E., 199
Aitken, J. K., 275
Aland, K., 87, 186
Albeck, H., 31
Alexander, L. C., 171
Alexander, P. S., 23
Alexandre, M., 5, 11, 13-14, 33
Allison, D. C., 69, 115, 133
Allo, E. B., 191-92
Anderson, H., 135
Arndt, W. F., 38
Atiya, A. S., 40
Atkinson, K., 108, 110
Aufrecht, W. E., 29
Augustin, M., 67
Aune, D. E., 192, 194, 196, 206-9
Avemarie, F., 98-99, 117-18
Avery-Peck, A. J., 112

Baer, D. A., 230
Bagnall, R. S., 45
Bailey, D. P., 118
Ball, C. J., 95
Barr, D., 196, 206
Barth, C., 222
Barthélemy, D., 275
Barton, C., 99
Bauckham, R., 206-7, 211

Bauer, D., 50
Bauer, G., 41
Bauer, H., 157
Bauer, W., 13, 38,
Baumgartner, W., 238
Beale, G. K., 79, 193-94
Beaton, R., 161
Beentjes, P. C., 62, 71, 90, 95, 251
Bendemann, R. von, 172
Ben-Hayyim, Z., 221, 228
Bennett, W. H., 52
Berlin, A., 18
Bernand, E., 261
Beyer, H. W., 164-65
Bickerman, E. J., 267
Bieberstein, S., 174-75
Bieringer, R., 166
Billerbeck, P., 162
Birdsall, J. N., 40
Black, M., 139-40, 142, 226
Blass, F., 82, 139
Blount, B. K., 188, 205, 210
Blümel, W., 260
Bock, D., 131
Boffo, L., 259
Bogaert, P.-M., 51, 58
Borgen, P., 25
Boring, E., 193-94, 209
Bosson, N., 40
Botha, J. E., 160
Boud'hors, A., 40

*304*

# Index of Subjects

# The Catholic Biblical Quarterly
## Monograph Series (CBQMS)

1. Patrick W. Skehan, *Studies in Israelite Poetry and Wisdom* (CBQMS 1) $9.00 ($7.20 for CBA members) ISBN 0-915170-00-0 (LC 77-153511)

2. Aloysius M. Ambrozic, *The Hidden Kingdom: A Redactional-Critical Study of the References to the Kingdom of God in Mark's Gospel* (CBQMS 2) $9.00 ($7.20 for CBA members) ISBN 0-915170-01-9 (LC 72-89100)

3. Joseph Jensen, O.S.B., *The Use of tôrâ by Isaiah: His Debate with the Wisdom Tradition* (CBQMS 3) $3.00 ($2.40 for CBA members) ISBN 0-915170-02-7 (LC 73-83134)

4. George W. Coats, *From Canaan to Egypt: Structural and Theological Context for the Joseph Story* (CBQMS 4) $4.00 ($3.20 for CBA members) ISBN 0-915170-03-5 (LC 75-11382)

5. O. Lamar Cope, *Matthew: A Scribe Trained for the Kingdom of Heaven* (CBQMS 5) $4.50 ($3.60 for CBA members) ISBN 0-915170-04-3 (LC 75-36778)

6. Madeleine Boucher, *The Mysterious Parable: A Literary Study* (CBQMS 6) $2.50 ($2.00 for CBA members) ISBN 0-915170-05-1 (LC 76-51260)

7. Jay Braverman, Jerome's Commentary on Daniel: A Study of Comparative Jewish and Christian Interpretations of the Hebrew Bible (CBQMS 7) $4.00 ($3.20 for CBA members) ISBN 0-915170-06-X (LC 78-55726)

8. Maurya P. Horgan, *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books* (CBQMS 8) $6.00 ($4.80 for CBA members) ISBN 0-915170-07-8 (LC 78-12910)

9. Harold W. Attridge and Robert A. Oden, Jr., *Philo of Byblos,* The Phoenician History (CBQMS 9) $3.50 ($2.80 for CBA members) ISBN 0-915170-08-6 (LC 80-25781)

10. Paul J. Kobelski, *Melchizedek and Melchireša^c* (CBQMS 10) $4.50 ($3.60 for CBA members) ISBN 0-915170-09-4 (LC 80-28379)

11. Homer Heater, *A Septuagint Translation Technique in the Book of Job* (CBQMS 11) $4.00 ($3.20 for CBA members) ISBN 0-915170-10-8 (LC 81-10085)

12. Robert Doran, *Temple Propaganda: The Purpose and Character of 2 Maccabees* (CBQMS 12) $4.50 ($3.60 for CBA members) ISBN 0-915170-11-6 (LC 81-10084)

13. James Thompson, *The Beginnings of Christian Philosophy: The Epistle to the Hebrews* (CBQMS 13) $5.50 ($4.50 for CBA members) ISBN 0-915170-12-4 (LC 81-12295)

14. Thomas H. Tobin, S.J., *The Creation of Man: Philo and the History of Interpretation* (CBQMS 14) $6.00 ($4.80 for CBA members) ISBN 0-915170-13-2 (LC 82-19891)

15. Carolyn Osiek, *Rich and Poor in the Shepherd of Hermes* (CBQMS 15) $6.00 ($4.80 for CBA members) ISBN 0-915170-14-0 (LC 83-7385)

16. James C. VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition* (CBQMS 16) $6.50 ($5.20 for CBA members) ISBN 0-915170-15-9 (LC 83-10134)

17. Antony F. Campbell, S.J., *Of Prophets and Kings: A Late Ninth-Century Document (1 Samuel 1-2 Kings 10)* (CBQMS 17) $7.50 ($6.00 for CBA members) ISBN 0-915170-16-7 (LC 85-12791)

18. John C. Endres, S.J., *Biblical Interpretation in the Book of Jubilees* (CBQMS 18) $8.50 ($6.80 for CBA members) ISBN 0-915170-17-5 (LC 86-6845)

19. Sharon Pace Jeansonne, *The Old Greek Translation of Daniel 7-12* (CBQMS 19) $5.00 ($4.00 for CBA members) ISBN 0-915170-18-3 (LC 87-15865)

20. Lloyd M. Barré, *The Rhetoric of Political Persuasion: The Narrative Artistry and Political Intentions of 2 Kings 9 -11* (CBQMS 20) $5.00 ($4.00 for CBA members) ISBN 0-915170-19-1 (LC 87-15878)

21. John J. Clabeaux, *A Lost Edition of the Letters of Paul: A Reassessment of the Text of the Pauline Corpus Attested by Marcion* (CBQMS 21) $8.50 ($6.80 for CBA members) ISBN 0-915170-20-5 (LC 88-28511)

22. Craig Koester, *The Dwelling of God: The Tabernacle in the Old Testament, Intertestamental Jewish Literature, and the New Testament* (CBQMS 22) $9.00 ($7.20 for CBA members) ISBN 0-915170-21-3 (LC 89-9853)

23. William Michael Soll, *Psalm 119: Matrix, Form, and Setting* (CBQMS 23) $9.00 ($7.20 for CBA members) ISBN 0-915170-22-1 (LC 90-27610)

24. Richard J. Clifford and John J. Collins (eds.), *Creation in the Biblical Traditions* (CBQMS 24) $7.00 ($5.60 for CBA members) ISBN 0-915170-23-X (LC 92-20268)

25. John E. Course, *Speech and Response: A Rhetorical Analysis of the Introductions to the Speeches of the Book of Job, Chaps. 4 - 24* (CBQMS 25) $8.50 ($6.80 for CBA members) ISBN 0-915170-24-8 (LC 94-26566)

26. Richard J. Clifford, *Creation Accounts in the Ancient Near East and in the Bible* (CBQMS 26) $9.00 ($7.20 for CBA members) ISBN 0-915170-25-6 (LC 94-26565)

27. John Paul Heil, *Blood and Water: The Death and Resurrection of Jesus in John 18 – 21* (CBQMS 27) $9.00 ($7.20 for CBA members) ISBN 0-915170-26-4 (LC 95-10479)

28. John Kaltner, *The Use of Arabic in Biblical Hebrew Lexicography* (CBQMS 28) $7.50 ($6.00 for CBA members) ISBN 0-915170-27-2 (LC 95-45182)

29. Michael L. Barré, S.S., *Wisdom, You Are My Sister: Studies in Honor of Roland E. Murphy, O.Carm., on the Occasion of His Eightieth Birthday* (CBQMS 29) $13.00 ($10.40 for CBA members) ISBN 0-915170-28-0 (LC 97-16060)

30. Warren Carter and John Paul Heil, *Matthew's Parables: Audience-Oriented Perspectives* (CBQMS 30) $10.00 ($8.00 for CBA members) ISBN 0-915170-29-9 (LC 97-44677)

31. David S. Williams, *The Structure of 1 Maccabees* (CBQMS 31) $7.00 ($5.60 for CBA members) ISBN 0-915170-30-2

32. Lawrence Boadt and Mark S. Smith (eds.), *Imagery and Imagination in Biblical Literature: Essays in Honor of Aloysius Fitzgerald, F.S.C.* (CBQMS 32) $9.00 ($7.20 for CBA members) ISBN 0-915170-31-0 (LC 2001003305)

33. Stephan K. Davis, *The Antithesis of the Ages: Paul's Reconfiguration of Torah* (CBQMS 33) $11.00 ($8.80 for CBA members) ISBN 0-915170-32-9 (LC 2001007936)

34. Aloysius Fitzgerald, F.S.C., *The Lord of the East Wind* (CBQMS 34) $12.00 ($9.60 for CBA members) ISBN 0-915170-33-7 (LC 2002007068)

35. William L. Moran, *The Most Magic Word: Essays on Babylonian and Biblical Literature* (CBQMS 35) $11.50 ($9.20 for CBA members) ISBN 0-915170-34-5 (LC 2002010486)

36. Richard C. Steiner, *Stockmen from Tekoa, Sycomores from Sheba: A Study of Amos' Occupations* (CBQMS 36) $10.50 ($8.40 for CBA members) ISBN 0-915170-35-3 (LC 2003019378)

37. Paul E. Fitzpatrick, S.M., *The Disarmament of God: Ezekiel 38–39 in Its Mythic Context* (CBQMS 37) $11.50 ($9.20 for CBA members) ISBN 0-915170-36-1 (LC 2004005524)

38. Jeremy Corley and Vincent Skemp (eds.), *Intertextual Studies in Ben Sira and Tobit* (CBQMS 38) $13.00 ($10.40 for CBA members) ISBN 0-915170-37-x (LC 2004018378)

39. Michael L. Barré, S.S., *The Lord Has Saved Me: A Study of the Psalm of Hezekiah (Isaiah 38:9-20)* (CBQMS 39) $12.00 ($9.60 for CBA members) ISBN 0-915170-38-8 (LC 2005005066)

40. Gordon J. Hamilton, *The Origins of the West Semitic Alphabet in Egyptian Scripts* (CBQMS 40) $18.00 ($14.40 for CBA members) ISBN 0-915170-40-x (LC 2006017360)

41. Gregory Tatum, O.P., *New Chapters in the Life of Paul: The Relative Chronology of His Career* (CBQMS 41) $9.00 ($7.20 for CBA members) ISBN 0-915170-39-6 (LC 2006034840)

42. Joan Cecelia Campbell, *Kinship Relations in the Gospel of John* (CBQMS 42) $12.00 ($9.60 for CBA members) ISBN 0-915170-41-8 (LC 2007007259)

43. Lance Byron Richey, *Roman Imperial Ideology and the Gospel of John* (CBQMS 43) $13.00 ($10.40 for CBA members) ISBN 0-915170-43-4 (LC 2007035049)