Die Septuaginta – Texte, Theologien, Einflüsse

Herausgegeben von
WOLFGANG KRAUS und MARTIN KARRER
unter Mitarbeit von
MARTIN MEISER

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament
252

Mohr Siebeck

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament

252

Die Septuaginta – Texte, Theologien, Einflüsse

2. Internationale Fachtagung
veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D),
Wuppertal 23. – 27. 7. 2008

Herausgegeben von

Wolfgang Kraus und Martin Karrer

unter Mitarbeit von

Martin Meiser

Mohr Siebeck

Wolfgang Kraus: Geboren 1955; ist Professor für Neues Testament an der Universität des Saarlandes, Saarbrücken.

Martin Karrer: Geboren 1954; ist Professor für Neues Testament an der Kirchlichen Hochschule Wuppertal-Bethel.

Martin Meiser: Geboren 1957; ist apl. Professor für Neues Testament an der Universität des Saarlandes.

e-ISBN PDF 978-3-16-151541-5
ISBN 978-3-16-150225-5
ISSN 0512-1604 (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament)

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliographie; detaillierte bibliographische Daten sind im Internet über *http://dnb.d-nb.de* abrufbar.

Das Buch wurde von Gulde-Druck in Tübingen auf alterungsbeständiges Werkdruckpapier gedruckt und von der Großbuchbinderei Spinner in Ottersweier gebunden.

Vorwort

Der Einladung zur zweiten von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D) veranstalteten internationalen Fachtagung in Wuppertal (23.–27. Juli 2008) sind wieder namhafte Vertreter verschiedener wissenschaftlicher Disziplinen und Repräsentanten der bekannten neueren Übersetzungs- und Forschungsprojekte gefolgt; dementsprechend facettenreich wurde die Septuaginta unter einer Vielzahl von Aspekten in den Blick genommen. Der vorliegende Band dokumentiert einen Großteil der Vorträge und legt ein beredtes Zeugnis von der genannten Vielfalt der Aspekte ab.

Im ersten Teil wird zunächst die Frage nach dem Anlass der Übersetzung in den Blick genommen; sodann werden Hintergründe antiker Philologie wie Historiographie ausgeleuchtet.

Der zweite Teil gibt einen Eindruck von dem Reichtum der weit verzweigten Textgeschichte ebenso wie von der Vielzahl der Aspekte, die in der textkritischen Methodik berücksichtigt werden müssen.

Im philologisch orientierten dritten Teil dieses Aufsatzbandes finden sich Beiträge zur Grammatik, zur Übersetzungstechnik wie zur Lexikographie der Septuaginta.

Der vierte Teil enthält Studien zu einzelnen Texten und Textgruppen unter theologischen und religionsgeschichtlichen Gesichtspunkten. Aktuelle Herausforderungen für die antiken Übersetzer treten ebenso ans Licht wie ihre theologischen und kulturellen Leitlinien.

Der fünfte Teil thematisiert die Wirkungsgeschichte im hellenistischen Judentum, im Neuen Testament und in der patristischen Literatur, schließlich anhand eines Fallbeispieles nochmals die verschiedenen modernen Übersetzungsprojekte.

Wieder sind die erheblichen Fortschritte der Septuagintaforschung in den letzten Jahren sichtbar geworden; deutlich wurde aber auch, dass eine Reihe bisher unhinterfragter grundlegender Voraussetzungen der Arbeit an der Septuaginta neu zur Disposition stehen, die nur unter Beteiligung der verschiedenen wissenschaftlichen Disziplinen angemessen weiter geklärt werden können. Wenn dieser Tagungsband dazu hilft, das bisher Erreichte zu dokumentieren und zu weiterer Forschung anzuregen, dann hat er seinen Zweck erfüllt.

Die Tagung und die Veröffentlichung der Beiträge wäre nicht möglich gewesen ohne finanzielle Unterstützung durch die Deutsche Forschungsgemein-

schaft, die Stiftung der Kirchlichen Hochschule Wuppertal-Bethel, die Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft Stuttgart, die Sparkasse Wuppertal, das Ministerum für Bildung, Kultur und Wissenschaft in Saarbrücken und die Universitäten in Koblenz-Landau, Saarbrücken und Wuppertal. Den Sponsoren sei hiermit ausdrücklich Dank gesagt.

Den Mitarbeiterinnen und Mitarbeitern der Kirchlichen Hochschule danken wir erneut für die gastfreundliche Aufnahme in Wuppertal, dem damaligen Geschäftsführer von Septuaginta Deutsch, Wolfgang Dorp, für die Organisation im Vorfeld und während der Tagung, Assistierenden und studentischen Hilfskräften – Gabriel Becker, Franziska Beetschen, Darius Müller, Sarah Quirin, Sara Schäfer, Maike Scherhans, Johannes de Vries – aus Saarbrücken und Wuppertal für ihre Unterstützung dabei. Die Formatierung einer druckreifen Vorlage lag in den Händen von Dorothea Schönau (Wuppertal) und Martin Meiser (Saarbrücken). Unser Dank geht an Christoph Aschoff, Christian Lustig, Daniela Mütz, Sarah Quirin, Yannis Petsch, Kertin Ringeisen, Marlen Wagner (alle Saarbrücken) für ihre vorzügliche Mithilfe bei der Erstellung der Register und der Gesamtbibliographie. Diese ist abrufbar unter www.septuagintaforschung.de/lxxd/veroeffentlichungen.

Schließlich danken wir allen Autorinnen und Autoren für ihre Beiträge und den Herausgebern der Reihe „Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament“ für die Bereitschaft zur Veröffentlichung sowie Herrn Dr. Henning Ziebritzki und den Mitarbeitern des Verlages Mohr Siebeck für die inzwischen bewährte Zusammenarbeit.

April 2010 *Wolfgang Kraus, Martin Karrer, Martin Meiser*

Inhalt

Textgeschichte

Lexikographie und Übersetzungstechnik

Theologie und Religionsgeschichte

Wirkungsgeschichte

Allgemeines und Geschichte

Emanuel Tov

Reflections on the Septuagint with Special Attention Paid to the Post-Pentateuchal Translations

I. Introduction

One of the core questions of LXX research is "What *is* the LXX?" This question refers to such matters as the nature of the individual translation units, their place of origin, the relation between the translation units, the nature of Greek Scripture as a whole, and the possible development of the translation enterprise. The case of the Greek Pentateuch is clearer than that of the post-Pentateuchal books and therefore it is on these that we will focus. These general questions are of limited relevance for the *kleinphilologische* comparison of the LXX with Hebrew texts, but they do pertain to an analysis of the language of the LXX, its relation with the NT, and for many aspects that interest textual critics, historians, and exegetes.

The minimal points most scholars agree on regarding Greek Scriptures are: (1) the translation of the Torah was probably created in Alexandria;[1] (2) the name "Septuaginta", although originally attached only to the translation of the Pentateuch, came to denote early on the Greek version of *all* the canonical books of Hebrew Scripture as well as some writings originally composed in Greek; (3) the translations of most if not all canonical books had been completed when Ben Sira's grandson wrote the introduction to his translation in *c.* 116 BCE; (4) the text of the original translations was constantly revised towards an ever-changing text of the Hebrew Bible by known and anonymous revisers; (5) the present collection of Greek Scripture includes some of these revisions that replaced the original translations. If we accept these five points, by necessity we posit that the collection of Greek writings named the "LXX" is far from unified and does

[1] For an updated summary of the positions, see ARIE VAN DER KOOIJ, "The Septuagint of the Pentateuch and Ptolemaic Rule," in *The Pentateuch as Torah: New Models for Understanding Its Promulgation and Acceptance* (ed. G.N. Knoppers/B.M. Levinson; Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 2007), 289–300. Beyond the Alexandrian option, VAN DER KOOIJ mentions the possibility that the translation was solicited by "the leading priests in Jerusalem" (297).

not do justice to its name. After all, the legendary seventy-two translators did not translate the post-Pentateuchal books to which we now turn.

Most of the circumstances surrounding the creation of the various books of Greek Scripture are unknown since we possess no external data about the translators and translations. The only extant information is embedded in legendary miracle stories about the creation of the Greek Torah included in the Epistle of Aristeas and subsequent sources.[2] However, the minimal information contained in these sources is analyzed time and again as if it is reliable and pertains also to the post-Pentateuchal books. Schenker discredits that story as well as other explanations given in the past for the very initiative to render the Hebrew Torah into Greek.[3] His own view is that the translation of the Torah was created as a "light to the nations" as prescribed in Deut 4:6–8. Be that as it may, the Epistle of Aristeas has greatly influenced the analysis of the Greek translation of the Torah. We suggest that it also influenced the analysis of the post-Pentateuchal books.

The approach of many modern scholars towards the post-Pentateuchal versions was already shaped in antiquity. In the second century CE the story of the seventy translators was referred to as applying also to these books. In his Apology (*c.* 152–155 CE), *Justin Martyr* extends the story of the translation initiated by King Ptolemy to all the Greek Old Testament writings that in his treatise are considered "prophetic writings," presenting prophecies about the coming of Christ.[4] This tendency is continued in Justin's later treatise *Dialogue with Trypho*.[5] The same tendency is visible in Epiphanius, *De mensuris et ponderibus,* §§ 3, 6. However, it would take a long time before the exact contents of the Christian canon were fixed. At the synod of Carthage (397) the Christian canon was more or less finalized, but the exact list was only completed at the council of Trent in 1546. Consequently, the earliest comprehensive manuscripts of the LXX from

[2] For modern discussions of this source, see MARTIN HENGEL, *The Septuagint as Christian Scripture: Its Prehistory and the Problem of Its Canon* (trans. M. E. Biddle; Edinburgh/New York: T & T Clark, 2002), 75–80; ABRAHAM WASSERSTEIN and DAVID WASSERSTEIN, *The Legend of the Septuagint: From Classical Antiquity to Today* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006).

[3] Adrian SCHENKER, "Wurde die Tora wegen ihrer einzigartigen Weisheit auf Griechisch übersetzt? Die Bedeutung der Tora für die Nationen in Dt 4:6–8 als Ursache der Septuaginta," *FZPhTh* 54 (2007): 327–47.

[4] For a detailed analysis, see HENGEL, *Septuagint,* 25–36.

[5] For example, in *Dialog* 68:7 Justin Martyr explicitly refers to the Greek rendering of Isa 7:14 as having been produced by the seventy elders who produced their translation for the Egyptian king Ptolemy. See further HENGEL, *Septuagint,* 30, n. 14. For a detailed and updated analysis of the texts used by Justin Martyr, see OSKAR SKARSAUNE, *The Proof from Prophecy: A Study in Justin Martyr's Proof-Text Tradition, Text-Type, Provenance, Theological Profile* (NTSup 56; Leiden: Brill, 1987).

the fourth and fifth centuries CE, A, B, and S, differ in the choice and sequence of the canonical and apocryphal books.

The LXX was a Jewish translation, but when we encounter the completed collection of Greek Scripture for the first time in manuscript form, the majority tradition of B and others was shaped as a Christian collection in which the order of the books follows Christian perceptions.

Although modern scholars realize that the expansion of the *name* Septuagint to include the post-Pentateuchal books is secondary, they are often unconsciously influenced by that name in their analysis of the later translations.

II. The post-Pentateuchal versions

There are many open questions relating to the post-Pentateuchal versions: Are they Jewish? Are they Alexandrian? Were they produced within official projects? And are they homogeneous? Also, what is known about the compilation of the collection of translations, and what do we know about the Hebrew text underlying these translations? When addressing these issues we realize that there are more questions than answers.[6]

1. *Are the post-Pentateuchal versions Jewish?* The Jewish character of the Pentateuch translation is well established, while that of the post-Pentateuchal books is not, although this assumption is almost certainly correct.

The translation of the Torah was a Jewish venture, created for Jews and probably also Gentiles.[7] The translation contains some Aramaic words reflecting the language spoken by the Jews,[8] and in some cases it reflects Midrash-like exegesis that is also found in rabbinic sources.[9] Aptowitzer[10]

---

[6] It is rare to find such a realistic note as in OTTO EISSFELDT, *The Old Testament, An Introduction* (trans. P.R. Ackroyd; New York/Evanston: Harper and Row, 1965), 703: "But with few exceptions (pp. 575, 592, 597) we know nothing at all about the persons, period and method of working of the individual translators, and hence are here entirely dependent upon investigation of the individual books of G itself."

[7] SYLVIE HONIGMAN, *The Septuagint and Homeric Scholarship in Alexandria: A Study in the Narrative of the Letter of Aristeas* (London: Routledge, 2003) suggests that the LXX was prepared against the background of Homeric scholarship.

[8] For example, σάββατα (Hebrew *shabbat* and Aramaic *shabta'*) and πάσχα (Hebrew *pesaḥ*, Aramaic *pasḥa'*).

[9] Jewish exegesis is visible wherever a special interpretation of the LXX is known also from rabbinic literature. Such exegesis reveals the Palestinian background or influence of at least some of the translators. For example, the "second tithe" in the LXX of Deut 26:12 (MT *shenat ha-ma'aser*, "the year of the tithe," read as *shenit ha-ma'aser*, as if, "second, the tithe") represents the rabbinic term *ma'aser sheni* ("second tithe"). For examples relating to the Torah, see ZACHARIAS FRANKEL, *Über den Einfluss der palästinischen Exegese auf die alexandrinische Hermeneutik* (Leipzig: Barth, 1851); JULIUS

and Prijs[11] provide examples for the post-Pentateuchal books, but the evidence is not impressive.

The Greek Torah reflects neologisms in the Greek language meant to represent some of the special Jewish customs or terms, such as the names of the festivals, for which no words existed in the Greek language.[12] This translation was used by Jews in their weekly ceremonial reading from the first century BCE onwards.[13] Likewise, Philo refers to this custom in Alexandria[14] and 4Macc 18:10–18, possibly written in Egypt in the first century CE, expressly mentions the reading of the Law accompanied by reflections taken from the Prophets, Psalms, and Hagiographa.

At the same time, the Jewish background of the post-Pentateuchal books cannot be proven as conclusively, although we have little doubt that Jews translated these books in the third and second pre-Christian centuries. There probably were no Gentiles in Egypt or elsewhere who would have had the skills to make such a trans-cultural translation, or would have had an incentive to do so.

FÜRST, "Spüren der palästinisch-jüdischen Schriftdeutung und Sagen in der Übersetzung der LXX," in *Semitic Studies in Memory of Rev. Dr. Alexander Kohut* (ed. G.A. Kohut; Berlin: S. Calvary, 1897), 152–66; LEO PRIJS, *Jüdische Tradition in der Septuaginta* (Leiden: Brill, 1948); SHMUEL SAFRAI, "Halakha," in *The Literature of the Sages* (ed. S. Safrai; CRINT, Section Two, 3 (Assen-Maastricht/Philadelphia: Van Gorcum/ Fortress Press, 1987) 137–9. Additional literature published before 1948 on rabbinic exegesis is mentioned by PRIJS, *Jüdische Tradition,* xiii and 105.

[10] VICTOR APTOWITZER, "Rabbinische Parallelen und Aufschlüsse zu Septuaginta und Vulgata, I. Die Bücher Samuelis," *ZAW* 29 (1909): 241–52.

[11] PRIJS, *Jüdische Tradition*, especially relating to Psalms and Proverbs.

[12] For example, the word ὁλοκαύτωμα ("whole-burnt offering") was probably coined by the translators to reflect the special meaning of the *'olah* offering. Further, the Greek Torah made a distinction between two types of "altar" (*mizbeaḥ*), a Jewish one which is rendered θυσιαστήριον, and a pagan altar rendered βῶμος. The Aramaic Targumim likewise distinguished between the Jewish *madb^{e}ḥa'* and the pagan *'agora'* (literally "heap of stones"). This distinction derived from the translators' wish to differentiate between terms relating to the Jewish religion and those relating to the religions of the non-Jews.

[13] Early papyri of the Pentateuch from Egypt (P.Ryl. Gk. 458 [200–150 BCE] and P.Fouad 266a-c [1st century BCE]) show that the Greek translation was known in various parts of the country, but they do not necessarily prove use in religious gatherings. On the other hand, MARTIN RÖSEL, *Übersetzung als Vollendung der Auslegung. Studien zur Genesis-Septuaginta* (BZAW 223; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1994) 256 does not believe that the Torah was read publicly in Greek in the pre-Christian centuries.

[14] Philo, *Prob.* 81–82: "They use these laws (scil. those of the Torah) to learn from at all times, but especially each seventh day, since the seventh day is regarded as sacred. On that day they abstain from other work and betake themselves to the sacred places which are called synagogues ... Then one of them takes the books and reads." See further Philo, *Hypoth.* 7:13; *Moses* 2:215. The existence of Greek Torah scrolls is also referred to in *m. Meg*. 1.8; 2.1 and *t. Meg.* 4.13. See further WASSERSTEIN and WASSERSTEIN, *Legend*, 11–12.

Support for the assumption of the Jewish background of the later translations comes from the following areas:[15]

a. Reliance on the Greek Torah by the later translators.[16]

b. Midrashic tendencies to a very limited extent.[17]

c. The Jewish background of the translation of Isaiah, as laid out in detail by I.L. Seeligmann, is reflected in several terms and ideas.[18]

d. The Greek version of Proverbs includes Jewish exegesis.[19]

2. *Place of origin of the post-Pentateuchal books*. The Alexandrian background of the post-Pentateuchal books is presupposed by many or most scholars, but this assumption is very unlikely. The evidence for such an assumption, which is not supported by any hard data, has not been formulated, but the assumption could be supported by the following arguments:

a. Analogy to the story about the Egyptian translation of the Torah, although this translation itself was probably produced by Palestinian experts.

---

[15] Liturgical use is indicated by details in the superscriptions of many Psalms in the LXX beyond those in MT. See the views of van der Kooij described in n. 32 below. See also n. 36 below. However, this liturgical use can only have been Christian.

[16] See my study "The Impact of the LXX Translation of the Pentateuch on the Translation of the Other Books," in *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (VTSup 72; Leiden/Boston/Cologne: Brill, 1999), 183–94.

[17] The evidence pertains mainly to Joshua and 1 Kings: EMANUEL TOV, "Midrash-Type Exegesis in the LXX of Joshua," in *The Greek and Hebrew Bible* (1999), 153–63; DAVID WILLOUGHBY GOODING, "Problems of Text and Midrash in the Third Book of Reigns," *Textus* 7 (1969): 1–29, in both cases involving mainly Midrash-*like* exegesis.

[18] ISAC L. SEELIGMANN, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah* (Mededelingen en Verhandelingen van het Vooraziatisch-Egyptisch Genootschap "Example Oriente Lux" 9; Leiden: Brill, 1948), 70–121.

[19] Most of the discrepancies between the Hebrew and Greek versions of this book probably derived from the free translation character of the LXX, which gives us insights into the exegetical and theological world of the Alexandrian-Hellenistic Jewish community. This pertains especially to the trend in stressing the virtues of the pious and vices of the impious (see 1:10, 18, 19, 22, 31, 32) as well as to adherence to the νόμος. Thus, in 17:11 the translation implies that the *mal'akh* ("messenger," "angel") of MT is sent by the Lord. See further JOHANN COOK, *The Septuagint of Proverbs – Jewish and/or Hellenistic Proverbs? Concerning the Hellenistic Colouring of LXX Proverbs* (VTSup 69; Leiden/New York/Cologne: Brill, 1997).

b. "Alexandrian" characteristics[20] pertaining to the Egyptian-Greek language[21] and connections with the Egyptian demotic language have often been invoked.[22]

The assumption of an Alexandrian background of the translation is so strong that one often speaks about the "Alexandrian version."[23] Further-

[20] For a very helpful summary, see GILLES DORIVAL in Marguerite Harl and Gilles Dorival and Olivier Munnich, *La Bible grecque des Septante: Du judaïsme hellénistique au christianisme ancien* (Paris: CERF, 1988), 55–6.

[21] JOHN A.L. LEE, *A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch* (SCS 14; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983) showed that the LXX of the Torah reflects in many words and technical terms the Greek language of its time, that of the third century, but he did not always stress the Egyptian background, even though the parallels were found in papyri found in Egypt. Anna Passoni dell'Acqua stressed the Egyptian background of the LXX vocabulary in a long series of studies on individual words appearing in *different* books of the LXX, e.g. "La versione dei LXX e i papyri: note lessicali," in *Proceedings of the Sixteenth International Congress of Papyrology, New York, 24–31 July 1980* (ed. R.S. Bagnall et al.; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981), 621–32; "Richerche sulla versione dei LXX e i papiri, I Pastophorion. II Nomos. III Andrizesthai," *Aegyptus* 61 (1981): 171–211; 62 (1982): 178–94; "La terminologia dei reati nei προστάγματα dei Tolemei e nella versione dei LXX," in *Proceedings of the XVIII International Congress of Papyrology, Athens 25–31 May 1986,* III (Athens 1988), 335–50; "Notazioni cromatiche dall' Egitto greco-romano. La versione del LXX e i papiri," *Aegyptus* 78 (1998): 77–115. See further the bibliography given by MARGUERITE HARL, "La langue de la Septante," in Harl and Dorival and Munnich, *Septante*, 243. A special type of Egyptian *couleur locale* is assumed by JAN JOOSTEN, "Language as Symptom. Linguistic Clues to the Social Background of the Seventy," *Textus* 24 (2007): 69–80. According to Joosten, "… the group among which the version came into being consisted largely of soldiers" (p. 80).

[22] Several examples are unconvincing, and most of them pertain to the Torah (Niv Alon of the Hebrew University kindly helped me to analyze these cases). The main arguments were provided by SIEGFRIED MORENZ, "Ägyptische Spuren in der Septuaginta," *Mullus, Festschrift T. Klauser* (JbAC, Ergänzungsband I; 1964), 250–58 = id., *Religion und Geschichte des alten Ägypten. Gesammelte Aufsätze* (ed. E. Blumenthal et al.; Cologne: Böhlau, 1975), 417–28. See further: MANFRED GÖRG, "Die Septuaginta im Kontext spätägyptischer Kultur - Beispiele lokaler Inspiration bei der Übersetzungsarbeit am Pentateuch," in *Im Brennpunkt: Die Septuaginta - Studien zur Entstehung und Bedeutung der Griechischen Bibel* (ed. H.-J. Fabry and U. Offerhaus; BWANT 153; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2001), 115–30. The examples mentioned by Görg pertain to the representation of צפנת פענח with ψονθομφανηχ in Gen 41:45, the rendering of רפאים as "embalmers" (ἐνταφιασταί) in Gen 50:2, the occurrence of the *ibis* in Lev 11:17 (ינשוף), and seven additional individual renderings. YVAN KOENIG, "Quelques 'égyptianismes' de la Septante," *BIFAO* 98 (1998): 223–32 (the strongest examples are the transcription Μωυσῆς for משה and θιβις for the תבה in Exodus). For a summary of the arguments used, see FOLKER SIEGERT, *Zwischen Hebräischer Bibel und Altem Testament. Eine Einführung in die Septuaginta* (Münsteraner Judaistische Studien 9; Münster u.a.: Lit Verlag, 2001), 186–91.

[23] Thus, e.g., PAUL DE LAGARDE, *Anmerkungen zur griechischen Übersetzung der Proverbien* (Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1863), 2; HENRY BARCLAY SWETE, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (2nd ed.; Cambridge: University Press, 1914), 1–28 ("The Al-

more, not only has the Greek version been dubbed "Alexandrian," but its Hebrew/Aramaic *Vorlage* has been likewise so named.

The following general problems should be raised against the assumption that the translation of the later Greek books was Alexandrian.

a. Are any unmistakable Alexandrian features in the realia, vocabulary, or ideas reflected in the post-Pentateuchal books? In my view, there is very little evidence. At least in the case of the Egyptian-Greek language and the possible connections with the Egyptian demotic language no convincing proofs have been provided. Below (p. 13) we will return to this issue.

b. If, as according to tradition, the Torah translators came from Jerusalem, why were the post-Pentateuchal books translated by Alexandrians? In other words, if Alexandria did not produce scholars who were able to translate the Torah, why would such translators be available after many decennia for the later books?

c. A related question: Should the canonical conception behind the LXX, different from that of MT, be considered Alexandrian even if it does not reflect any Alexandrian features?

There are no clear answers to these questions. I suggest that the default assumption for the post-Pentateuchal books should be that they were produced in Palestine, and not in Alexandria or any other part of the Jewish Diaspora (in the latter case, there is no positive evidence in favor of such an assumption). We first list the books of a probable or possible *Palestinian* origin, in order of decreasing probability.

i. The manuscripts of the Greek Esther contain a colophon[24] that states at the end that "it was translated by Lysimachus, the son of Ptolemaius, of the people in Jerusalem (τῶν ἐν Ιερουσαλημ)." Most scholars accept this

---

exandrian Greek version"); HENRY ST. JOHN THACKERAY, *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship – A Study in Origins* (The Schweich Lectures 1920; London: British Academy, 1921), 13 ("Alexandrian Bible") and passim. My own statement in *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (2d rev. ed.; Minneapolis/Assen: Fortress Press/Royal Van Gorcum, 2001), 134 is similarly imprecise: "G is a Jewish translation which was made mainly in Alexandria." Equally imprecise is my statement concerning the *Vorlage* of the LXX of Jeremiah: "It was still known in the second century BCE in Egypt, when it served as the *Vorlage* for the LXX translation." (*The Greek and Hebrew Bible,* 364). Some of the references to Alexandria and Egypt were probably made inadvertently such as in the name of the following book: HERMANN-JOSEF STIPP, *Das masoretische und alexandrinische Sondergut des Jeremiabuches – Textgeschichtlicher Rang, Eigenarten, Triebkräfte* (OBO 136; Freiburg/Göttingen: Universitätsverlag/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994).

[24] Cf. ELIAS BICKERMAN, "The Colophon of the Greek Book of Esther," *JBL* 63 (1944): 339–62 = id., *Studies in Jewish and Christian History, Part One* (AGJU 9; Leiden: Brill, 1976), 225–45; R. MARCUS, "Dositheus, Priest and Levite," *JBL* 64 (1945): 269–71.

colophon as pointing to a Palestinian origin.[25] Likewise, Hengel considers the translation of Esther to be a "piece of Hasmonaean propaganda among the Jews of Egypt."[26]

ii. The "LXX" of Ecclesiastes was probably translated in Palestine by either Aquila or *kaige*-Th.[27]

iii. Sections of the "LXX" of Samuel–Kings, ascribed in modern research to *kaige*-Th (2Sam 11:2–1Kgs 2:1 and 1Kgs 22:1–2Kgs 24:15),[28] were translated in Palestine like the following three books.

iv. The "LXX" of Canticles.[29]

v. The "LXX" of Lamentations.[30]

vi. The "LXX" of Ruth.[31]

---

[25] On the other hand, BENNO JACOB, "Das Buch Esther bei den LXX," *ZAW* 10 (1890): 280–90 tried to demonstrate the Egyptian character of the language of this book. This attempt has been refuted by Elias J. Bickerman who demonstrated that the words that Jacob considered to be Egyptian were common-Hellenistic: ELIAS J. BICKERMAN, "Notes on the Greek Book of Esther," *PAAJR* 20 (1951): 101–133 (115) = id., *Studies*, 246–74 (258). See further LEWIS B. PATON, *Esther* (ICC; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1908), 30–1.

[26] MARTIN HENGEL, *The 'Hellenization' of Judaea in the First Century after Christ* (London/Philadelphia: SCM/Trinity Press International, 1989), 24–5.

[27] See DOMINIQUE BARTHÉLEMY, *Les devanciers d'Aquila* (VTSup 10; Leiden: Brill, 1963), 32–3 (note the subtitle of this monograph: "sous l'influence du rabbinat palestinien"); HENGEL, *"Hellenization,"* 25, referring also to Canticles and Lamentations (without arguments). KYÖSTI HYVÄRINEN, *Die Übersetzung von Aquila* (ConBOT; Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1977), 89–99 provides arguments against the assumption that Aquila had rendered this book, but in the case of the "LXX" of Ecclesiastes he assumes a "rabbinic recension." Aquila was originally from Asia Minor (see SWETE, *Introduction*, 31–3) and so was the historical Theodotion (see Swete, ibid.).

[28] The first to recognize the connection between the *kaige*-Th sections in Samuel-Kings with Palestine was THACKERAY, *The Septuagint*, 17–8; id., "The Greek Translators of the Four Books of Kings," *JTS* 8 (1907): 262–78 (276–7). The main arguments were provided later by BARTHÉLEMY, *Devanciers*, passim; EMANUEL TOV, "The Methodology of Textual Criticism in Jewish Greek Scriptures, with Special Attention to the Problems in Samuel–Kings: The State of the Question: Problems and Proposed Solutions," in *The Greek and Hebrew Bible* (1999), 489–99. DORIVAL in Harl and Dorival and Munnich, *Septante*, 105 states that Thackeray and Barthélemy ascribe these sections to Alexandria, but Thackeray, ibid. actually ascribed the original translation to Alexandria and the revised sections (later named *kaige*-Th) to an "Asiatic-Palestinian school." Barthélemy only speaks about Palestine.

[29] BARTHÉLEMY, *Devanciers,* 33–4; MARGUERITE HARL, "La version LXX du Cantique des Cantiques et le groupe Kaige-Théodotion - Quelques remarques lexicales," *Textus* 18 (1995): 101–20 ascribes this version to Theodotion.

[30] BARTHÉLEMY, *Devanciers,* 33–4; ROLF SCHÄFER in *Biblia Hebraica Quinta* (ed. A. Schenker et al.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2004ff.), *Part 18: General Introduction and Megilloth* (ed. P.B. Dirksen et al.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2004) 19*.

[31] BARTHÉLEMY, *Devanciers,* 33–4.

vii. Several scholars suggested that the Greek version of the Psalter originated in Palestine.[32] Pointing out several characteristic *kaige*-Th equivalents in the OG Psalter, among them the rendering of גם and אף with καὶ γάρ,[33] Venetz claimed that that version, like the *kaige*-Th revision, originated in Palestine.[34] This view was accepted by van der Kooij who added the argument that the Psalms headings to Psalms 24 (23), 48 (47), 94 (93), 93 (92), 92 (91) reflect a Palestinian reading cycle for the days of the week also prescribed by *m. Tamid* 7.4 (with additional days of the week).[35] Schaper suggests that the Psalms were translated in Palestine in the second half of the second century BCE.[36] In spite of all this, in my view there are no convincing arguments in favor of a Palestinian origin of this book.[37]

viii. Wacholder extends the evidence relating to the Greek Esther (above, i) to 1 Esdras and Daniel. These three books may have been rendered by the same hand, or at least they may have belonged to the same literary circle.[38] This assumption is possible but has not been proven.[39]

ix. The slavishly literal LXX translation of 1 Maccabees may have been produced in Palestine.[40]

x. Judith and Tobit were ascribed to Palestine by Mussies and Hengel.[41]

---

[32] HERMANN-JOSEF VENETZ, *Die Quinta des Psalteriums. Ein Beitrag zur Septuaginta- und Hexaplaforschung* (Hildesheim: Gerstenberg, 1974), 80–84; ARIE VAN DER KOOIJ, "On the Place of Origin of the Old Greek of Psalms," *VT* 33 (1983): 67–74.

[33] For example, Ps 16 (15):6; 19 (18):12; 25 (24):3.

[34] VENETZ, *Quinta*, 80–84, emphasized greatly the Palestinian background of the noun βᾶρις. Venetz's assumption was preceded by BARTHÉLEMY, *Devanciers*, 41–3.

[35] ALBERT PIETERSMA, "David in the Greek Psalms," *VT* 30 (1980): 213–26: (214) considers these subscriptions secondary, while van der Kooij maintains their original status.

[36] JOACHIM SCHAPER, "Der Septuaginta-Psalter als Dokument jüdischer Eschatologie," in *Die Septuaginta zwischen Judentum und Christentum* (ed. M. Hengel and A.M. Schwemer; WUNT 72; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994) 38–61.

[37] See OLIVIER MUNNICH, "La LXX des Psaumes et le groupe *kaige*," *VT* 33 (1983): 75–89. For a summary of the counterarguments, see DORIVAL in HARL and DORIVAL and MUNNICH, *Septante* 104. Dorival himself remained undecided.

[38] BEN Z. WACHOLDER, *Eupolemus, A Study of Judaeo-Greek Literature* (Cincinnati u.a.: Hebrew Union College - Jewish Institute of Religion, 1974), 279. Thus also HENGEL, *Hellenization*, 25 (without arguments).

[39] DORIVAL in Harl and Dorival and Munnich, *Septante*, 106 is undecided.

[40] Thus BICKERMAN, "Colophon," 357 = id., *Studies,* 240–41; GERARD MUSSIES, "Greek in Palestine and the Diaspora," in *The Jewish People in the First Century*, (ed. S. Safrai and M. Stern; CRINT, II/2; Assen/Amsterdam: Van Gorcum, 1976), 1040–64 (1054); HENGEL, *Hellenization*, 25 (both without arguments). DORIVAL in Harl and Dorival and Munnich, *Septante*, 105 is undecided.

[41] MUSSIES, "Greek in Palestine," 1054 and HENGEL, *'Hellenization,'* 25 (both without arguments). However, other scholars ascribe these books to Alexandria. See below.

Negative arguments relating to the assumption of an Egyptian origin are also relevant: The translation could not have been produced by local Egyptians, among whom the knowledge of Hebrew no longer existed.[42] Further, the moving on from the translation of the Torah to that of the post-Pentateuchal books was not necessarily a logical step in Alexandria since the later books did not have the same authority as the Torah.[43] For example, in 50 BCE, Philo quoted mainly from the Torah and much less so from the post-Pentateuchal books,[44] possibly because he commented mainly on the Torah.

In any event, the Palestinian participation in the creation of the LXX was significant enough for Wacholder in order to claim that "[i]t becomes clear then that the putative attribution of the Greek Bible exclusively to 'Alexandrian' translators is misleading, if not false."[45]

There seems to be less evidence[46] for the production of translations in Egypt:[47]

i. The grandson of Ben Sira asserts that coming from Jerusalem to Egypt he translated there the book of his grandfather on behalf of those "living abroad" (Preface to the book, 28, 34).[48]

ii. An Egyptian background of Isaiah has been suggested in detailed studies of Ziegler and Seeligmann,[49] involving evidence from Egyptian papyri (see especially Ziegler's analysis of the jewels in chapter 3).

---

[42] The great majority of the synagogue and grave inscriptions as well as nearly all known proper names in Egypt are Greek; see WILLIAM HORBURY and DAVID NOY, *Jewish Inscriptions of Graeco-Roman Egypt* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992) and the catalog of names in VICTOR AVIGDOR TCHERIKOVER and ALEXANDER FUKS, *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum* III (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1964), 167–96. See further HENGEL, *Septuagint*, 80.

[43] Thus BARTHÉLEMY, "Pourquoi la Torah a-t-elle été traduite en grec?," in *Études*, 322–40.

[44] From a total of about 2050 Biblical references in Philo's writings, about 2000 pertain to the Torah and only about 50 to the other books, that is, a ratio of 40:1. See W.L. KNOX, "A Note on Philo's Use of the Old Testament," *JTS* 41 (1940): 30–34; FRANCIS HENRY COLSON, "Philo's Quotations from the Old Testament," *JTS* 41 (1940): 237–51.

[45] WACHOLDER, *Eupolemos*, 276.

[46] The list of probable Alexandrian books given by DORIVAL in Harl and Dorival and Munnich, 105–7 is somewhat exaggerated. For example, LEE, *Lexical Study*, 148 does not say that Judges is Alexandrian; Dorival does not provide real arguments in favor of the Alexandrian background of Jeremiah, Baruch, Epistle of Jeremiah, and Ezekiel.

[47] There is no support for the assumption that the LXX was prepared in Leontopolis; see WASSERSTEIN and WASSERSTEIN, *Legend,* 12; DORIVAL in Harl and Dorival and Munnich, *Septante*, 102–3.

[48] The Greek translator of Sir 50:27 refers to his grandfather as "Iesous son of Sirach, Eleazar the *Hierosolymite*," but this indication of the author's origin, referring to the Hebrew text, is found only in the LXX, and not in the corresponding Cairo Geniza Hebrew text.

iii. McGlinchey pointed to words and ideas that in his view show the reliance of the LXX of Proverbs on ancient Egyptian wisdom, which could point to an Egyptian background of the translation.[50]

iv. On the basis of several equivalents, Thackeray,[51] Gerleman,[52] and Allen[53] claim that the Greek translation of Chronicles displays Alexandrian characteristics.[54]

v. The Minor Prophets, as suggested by Thackeray.[55]

vi. 3 Maccabees.[56]

vii. 2 Maccabees written in Greek.[57]

viii. The Wisdom of Solomon, composed in Egypt, as suggested by Larcher.[58]

ix. Daniel as suggested by Eissfeldt.[59]

---

[49] JOSEPH ZIEGLER, *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias* (ATA XII, 3; Münster i. W.: Verlag der Aschendorffschen Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1934), 175–212 (pp. 203–12 refer to Isaiah 3); SEELIGMANN, *Isaiah*, 70–91. DORIVAL in Harl and Dorival and Munnich, *Septante*, 107 is undecided.

[50] JAMES M. MCGLINCHEY, *The Teaching of Amen-em-Ope and the Book of Proverbs* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1939), 17–19, 28 reviewed critically by GILLIS GERLEMAN, *Studies in the Septuagint*, III. *Proverbs* (LUÅ NF I, 52, 3; Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1956), 8.

[51] HENRY ST. JOHN THACKERAY, "The Greek Translators of the Four Books of Kings," *JTS* 8 (1906–1907): 262–78.

[52] GILLIS GERLEMAN, *Studies in the Septuagint*, II. *Chronicles* (LUÅ NF I, 43, 3; Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1946), 14–21.

[53] Most of Gerleman's examples, some of them first suggested by Thackeray, were strengthened by LESLIE C. ALLEN, *The Greek Chronicles*, I–II (VTSup 25, 27; Leiden: Brill, 1974), I.21–23. The most telling examples are διάδοχος and φίλος (Ptolemaic court titles), ἱερόν (temple), παστοφόριον (= לשכה), and ὑπομνηματογράφος (= מזכיר), as well as the names of two African peoples.

[54] On the other hand, HENGEL, *Hellenization*, 25 (without arguments) considers this book to be Palestinian.

[55] THACKERAY, *The Septuagint*, 13, 28.

[56] See EMIL SCHÜRER, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.–A.D. 135)*, *A New English Version Revised and Edited by Géza Vermès, Fergus Millar, and Martin Goodman* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1986) III.i.,537–42; DORIVAL in Harl and Dorival and Munnich, *Septante*, 105.

[57] For a thorough analysis, see SCHÜRER, *History*, III.i.,531–37.

[58] CHRYSOSTOME LARCHER, *Le Livre de la Sagesse ou la sagesse de Salomon* (Paris: Gabalda, 1983) [*non vidi*].

[59] EISSFELDT, *Introduction*, 704: "That of Daniel is almost a paraphrase rather than a translation, and in fact in general G is in many respects more a witness to the exegesis of the Hebrew text reflecting Egyptian conditions and very Greek in spirit, than a testimony to the text itself." He quotes GEORG BERTRAM, "Die religiöse Umdeutung altorientalischer Lebensweisheit in der griechischen Übersetzung des ATs," *ZAW* 54 (1936): 153–67. However, this study merely refers to the change from oriental to Hellenistic terminology and ideas and not to its possible Alexandrian background. See further R.

x. Tobit as suggested by Festugière.[60]

Summarizing this section, it seems that a better case can be made for a Palestinian rather than an Egyptian background of most books.[61] At the same time, Hengel concludes that "it is not so simple to distinguish between the 'Jewish-Hellenistic literature of the Diaspora' and the 'genuine Jewish literature' of Palestine."[62] Was there any cooperation between the two centers? In those days a bi-national cooperation enterprise seems unlikely,[63] so we are left with the assumption that the translation enterprise was either mainly Palestinian or mainly Egyptian. The people involved were either Jewish sages residing in Palestine or learned men who traveled from Palestine to Egypt for this express purpose. These two options are not mutually exclusive, as the post-Pentateuchal translations may have been produced at different places on which we shall say more below.

We have evidence for the temporary move of at least the translator of Ben Sira from Palestine to Egypt in order to translate his grandfather's book. Wacholder extends this assumption to Esther, and in the wake of these two books he suggests: "It is likely that Lysimachus of Jerusalem, to whom the Greek Esther is attributed, and Ben Sira's grandson, who translated Ecclesiasticus, were typical; and that the work was usually done by men who had resided both in Jerusalem and in Egypt."[64] Larcher extended this view to Wisdom, translated by an Alexandrian Jew of Palestinian origin.[65] Whatever we may think of the circumstances surrounding the translation of Esther,[66] there must have been close cultural ties between the two communities. Palestinian sages probably translated some books in Pa-

---

MARCUS, "Jewish and Greek Elements in the Septuagint," *L. Ginzberg Jubilee Volume* (New York: The American Academy for Jewish Research, 1945) I., 227–45.

[60] ANDRÉ-JEAN FESTUGIÈRE, *Les romans juifs: Tobit, Judith, Esther, Jonas* (Apt: Morel, 1976) [*non vidi*]. DORIVAL in Harl and Dorival and Munnich, *Septante*, 106 is undecided.

[61] Thus WACHOLDER, *Eupolemus,* 274–9 ("Judaean Part in the Making of the Septuagint") and previously Martin HENGEL, *Judaism and Hellenism, Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974), 100–102 based on his *Judentum und Hellenismus* (WUNT 10; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1969), 186–90.

[62] HENGEL, *Hellenization,* 26.

[63] On the other hand, WACHOLDER, *Eupolemos*, 276 believes in collaboration: "A reasonable solution may be that the Septuagint represented a work of collaboration between the two main centers of third century Judaism." However, this idea is not supported by any evidence.

[64] WACHOLDER, *Eupolemus*, 278–9.

[65] Thus DORIVAL in Harl and Dorival and Munnich, *Septante*, 108.

[66] However, in my view, the implication of the colophon of Esther is that the translation was produced in Jerusalem and later deposited in Egypt. Wacholder's scenario is somewhat different.

lestine and others in Egypt, and somehow the two sets of books were viewed as one group in Egypt, which had a larger Greek-speaking community than the land of Israel, although it is not impossible that they were combined in Palestine.

In order to be in a better position to evaluate the evidence for either Palestine or Egypt, the Greek language of Palestine needs to be contrasted with that of Egypt. It may well be that the Greek of the two countries differed little. Since we happen to know more about the language of Egypt, we are more easily inclined to ascribe LXX words to an Egyptian background.[67] At the same time, also in certain technical areas (irrigation, administration, clothing), the terminology of the Greek Torah is probably typically Egyptian if no opposition to Palestinian Greek can be established. Thus שקל כסף was rendered in Gen 23:15 with δίδραχμων ἀργυρίου, the local currency in Hellenistic Egypt. Further, words with the compound ἀρχι-, especially such professions as τοπάρχης – פקיד (Gen 41:34 and beyond), ἀρχιδεσμοφύλαξ – שר בית הסהר (Gen 39:21–23), etc. are known from Egypt.[68] The ἐργοδιῶκται used for נגשים (taskmasters) of Exod 3:7; 5:6–13 are also known from Egyptian papyri.

The analysis of the place of origin of the individual Septuagintal books runs parallel to that of the collection as a whole, especially the question of whether or not it reflects a so-called Alexandrian canon. The common view that the LXX reflects such a canon is difficult from the outset because it is very unlikely that a Diaspora community that had to rely on Palestinian translators would have been sophisticated enough to have its own tradition on the scope of its sacred writings in the second century BCE. Besides, the Greek books themselves are linked more to Palestine than Egypt. The main argument in favor of an Alexandrian canon seems to be the fact that that country had a greater Greek-speaking Jewish community than did Palestine. The idea of an Alexandrian canon was rejected by Sundberg in a very impressive study[69] that has convinced many scholars.[70]

---

[67] Thus John Lee (private communication, January 2008). To give an example, Lee describes the background of the verbs for command in the Greek Torah against the background of the vocabulary of Ptolemaic Egypt, but he might have reached a similar conclusion for Palestine had we possessed better sources for that region: JOHN LEE, "*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. S.M. Paul et al.; VTSup 94; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2003), 512–24.

[68] See RÖSEL, *Genesis*, 243.

[69] ALBERT C. SUNDBERG, *The Old Testament of the Early Church* (HTS 20; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964) updated by id., "The Septuagint: The Bible of Hellenistic Judaism," in *The Canon Debate* (ed. L. McDonald and J.A. Sanders; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2002) 68–90. The kernel of Sundberg's ideas was foreshadowed by

3. *The nature of the translation enterprise*. Probably the most pervasive influence from the Epistle of Aristeas on the understanding of the post-Pentateuchal books is in the general perception of the nature of the undertaking. In the scholarly mind, the translations of these books were produced as official projects, like that of the Torah. Thackeray reflects this view when describing the translation of the Prophets as a "semi-official production" produced by a "second company, analogous to the pioneering body responsible for the Greek Pentateuch."[71] In his view, yet another company produced the books of the Kingdoms.[72] However, there is no proof that these books were rendered by groups of translators, and therefore I prefer to think in terms of individual units. I noticed, for example, that the translations of Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the Minor Prophets have in many ways a common vocabulary,[73] which may well point to a single translator. The individual books assigned to the revisional activity of *kaige*-Th (see § 2 above) come closest to the perception of a group, but even there the nature of the relationship between these books is unclear.

We need not think in terms of projects, neither with regard to the Torah nor the post-Pentateuchal books. Scholars are unconsciously influenced by modern parallels involving such parameters as official beginnings and endings of projects, deadlines, and quality control. However, none of these conditions would have pertained to the ancient translators. If the translation of the Torah was indeed created within an official project, cooperation between translators may be assumed, as well as some form of quality control. However, I believe that there is sufficient evidence to show that the translation of the five books of the Torah was a one-time effort by five different translators[74] who did not revise their own work.[75] It is even more

---

PAUL KATZ, "The Old Testament Canon in Palestine and Alexandria," *ZNW* 47 (1956): 191–217.

[70] See, e.g., DORIVAL in Harl and Dorival and Munnich, *Septante*, 112–19; ROGER BECKWITH, *The Old Testament Canon of the New Testament Church and its Background in Early Judaism* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1986), 382–6; HENGEL, *Septuagint*, 20.

[71] THACKERAY, *The Septuagint*, 13, 28–9.

[72] This translation was produced in Egypt (p. 17).

[73] See *The Septuagint Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch: A Discussion of an Early Revision of Jeremiah 29–52 and Baruch 1:1–3:8* (HSM 8; Missoula, Mont. 1976), 135–55. The following groups of books may also have been rendered by one individual each: 1 Maccabees – 1 Esdras – Daniel, Job–Proverbs. See DORIVAL in Harl and Dorival and Munnich, *Septante*, 108.

[74] Thus HAYEON KIM, *Multiple Authorship of the Septuagint Pentateuch*, unpubl. Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 2007.

[75] This supposition is supported by cases such as the rendering of *mittah* "bed," a relatively rare word in Late Hebrew that was not understood by the translator of Genesis. This translator identified מטה as *matteh* in 47:31 ("staff" – ῥάβδος as in the earlier

likely that the translations of the post-Pentateuchal books were one-time translations that were not revised subsequently by the original translators or others. This is the only assumption that provides an explanation for the frequent mistakes in the understanding of grammar, words, and contexts that were not corrected subsequently.[76] Each translator followed his own systems and used his own vocabulary[77] and there is no proof of cooperation between them although sometimes clusters of books display shared equivalents, such as פלשתי – ἀλλόφυλος from Judges onwards as opposed to Φυλιστιειμ in the Greek Torah. Such cooperation would have been difficult if these translations were produced at different times in different localities. Only in the case of the Greek Torah may we assume influence of its vocabulary on that of the later books.[78] Influence at the level of translations should, of course, be distinguished from influence at the Hebrew level, as in the case of Jer 9:22–23 that was inserted in the Hebrew parent text of the LXX of the Song of Hannah (1Sam 2:10).

4. *Heterogeneity of Greek Scripture.* When reviewing the nature of the collection of Greek Scripture, we are struck by its heterogeneous character. This lack of unity was caused by lack of planning at all stages of the enterprise, including the choice of the Hebrew base texts and that of the composition of the archetype of the canonical collection, and is best visible in the post-Pentateuchal books. In my opinion, from a *textual* point of view, the choice of the texts included in this collection is coincidental,[79] like that in the Hebrew collection, since their contents were often not planned in the modern sense of the word.[80] The different books of Greek Scripture are

---

contexts Gen 38:18, 25), thus creating an unusual context: "Then Israel bowed at the head of the bed (JPS)" - "and Israel did obeisance at the top of his staff (NETS)." Two verses later (48:2) as well as in 49:33 the translator correctly identified this word as "bed" (κλίνη), but he did not correct the earlier incorrect renderings of this word. I owe this example to JAMES BARR, "Vocalization and the Analysis of Hebrew among the Ancient Translators," *VTSup* 16 (1967): 1–11 (3). By the same token, transliterations of unknown Hebrew words, such as כברת – χαβραθα in Gen 35:16; 48:7 and המחבר – τὸ μαχμα in 2 Kings 8:15, were not replaced by Greek equivalents. See my study "Loanwords, Homophony and Transliterations in the Septuagint," in *The Greek and Hebrew Bible,* 165–82.

[76] See my study "Did the Septuagint Translators Always Understand Their Hebrew Text?" in *The Greek and Hebrew Bible,* 203–18.

[77] For an example of such translator independence note the occurrence of λοιμός from 1 Samuel onwards as "pestilent", "pestilence" (e.g. 1Sam 1:16).

[78] See the study quoted in n. 16.

[79] See my study "The Coincidental Textual Nature of the Collections of Ancient Scriptures," in *Congress Volume Ljubliana 2007* (ed. A. Lemaire; VTSup 133; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 153–69.

[80] Textual transmission is likewise plagued by coincidence, as are all archeological excavations. See ALAN MILLARD, "Only Fragments from the Past: The Role of Accident in Our Knowledge of the Ancient Near East," in *Writing and Ancient Near Eastern*