

The Septuagint and the Text of the Old Testament

PETER J. GENTRY

SOUTHERN BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, LOUISVILLE

This paper assesses the importance and relative worth of the witness of the Septuagint to the text of the OT. Proper methodology is established for using a version as a textual witness, and general guidelines are given concerning the relationship between the Septuagint and Masoretic Text and the worth of the Septuagint in relation to other witnesses to the text of the OT (Dead Sea Scrolls, Syriac, Targums, Vulgate).

Key Words: Septuagint, OT Textual Criticism, Ancient Versions

INTRODUCTION

The term *Septuagint* normally refers to the Greek version or versions of the Hebrew Scriptures. Uncertainties about the history of the process of translation are responsible for lack of precision in exactly what is meant by the term *Septuagint*. It is generally agreed that the Pentateuch or Torah was translated from its Hebrew original into Greek during the reign of Ptolemy II Philadelphus (283–246 B.C.), possibly around 280, according to reliable patristic testimony.¹ The books in the Prophets and Writings were translated later, probably all of them by about 130 B.C. as suggested by the Greek Prologue to Ben Sira.² Thus, while the term *Septuagint* is applicable

Author's note: Paper given at annual meeting of IBR, November 20, 2004. I acknowledge gratefully constructive criticisms from Daniel I. Block, Duane Garrett, John Meade, Elizabeth Robar, Andrew Teeter, and Nancy Woods, who graciously read preliminary drafts of this paper. Naturally, I bear full responsibility for inaccuracies that remain.

1. N. L. Collins, "281 BCE: The Year of the Translation of the Pentateuch in Greek under Ptolemy II," in *Septuagint, Scrolls, and Cognate Writings* (ed. George J. Brooke and Barnabas Lindars; SCS 33; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 403–503. A recent reanalysis of the *Letter of Aristeas* and the origins of the Septuagint is Sylvie Honigman, *The Septuagint and Homeric Scholarship in Alexandria: A Study in the Narrative of the Letter of Aristeas* (London: Routledge, 2003). Her conclusions do not challenge a date in the early third century B.C. as the proposed time of translation.

2. See Robert Hanhart, "Introduction," in *The Septuagint as Christian Scripture: Its Prehistory and the Problem of Its Canon* by Martin Hengel (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 2002), 2. Obviously the grandson of Ben Sira does not give a book-by-book enumeration as does Jerome, but if changes occurred in the books contained in these divisions between Ben Sira and Jerome, the burden of proof would lie upon scholars to show this. The natural assumption is that this corpus remained stable.

in a technical sense only to the Greek Pentateuch, it is employed loosely for the Greek translations of the OT as a whole. This can be confusing, for before all the books had been translated, revisions were already being made of existing translations. The precise line of demarcation between original translations and revisions in this body of texts has not yet been clearly established. The problem of distinguishing original translations from later revisions is compounded by the fact that we have critical, scientific editions for only two-thirds of the books in this corpus.

With such caveats in mind concerning the referent of the term *Septuagint*, it is nonetheless clear that, in spite of the riches available now through the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Septuagint remains in many cases the earliest witness to the text of the OT and therefore of immense significance and value.

Before we can assess the value of the Septuagint as a witness to the text of the OT, an issue of fundamental importance must be addressed: the Septuagint is not a Hebrew text fitting somewhere into the history of the transmission of that text but, rather, a translation made from a Hebrew parent text—that is to say, it is a version. In order, therefore, to discover the value of the Septuagint as a witness to the text of the OT, we must first delineate how one can and may use a version as a witness to its parent text. This may be stating what is obvious, but current discussions frequently reveal that the foundational principles are often forgotten.

THE TEXT-CRITICAL USE OF THE VERSIONS

The following points are fundamental to the proper use of the ancient versions in the textual criticism of the Hebrew OT:³

Source and Target Languages as Codes of Communication

(1) One must compare and contrast source and target languages as codes of communication. This point may be rudimentary but can be overlooked. Two examples may illustrate sufficiently. One cannot use the Latin Vulgate to determine whether the Hebrew parent text used by Jerome had the article or not, since Latin has no definite article. In Greek, nouns are inflected for case but not in Hebrew. Thus, when rendering a prepositional phrase such as *עַל הַקֶּזֶבֶת*, a literal translator would probably use the preposition *ἐπί* but would then have to decide which case to use after *ἐπί*—that is, *τοῦ θουσιαστηρίου*, *τῷ θουσιαστηρίῳ*, or *τὸ θουσιαστήριον*.

3. J. W. Wevers, "The Use of Versions for Text Criticism: The Septuagint," in *Septuaginta en la investigacion contemporanea (V Congreso de la IOSCS)* (ed. Natalio Fernández Marcos; Madrid: C.S.I.C., 1985), 15–24.

Inner Greek Corruptions

(2) By *version* one can only mean the actual translation itself and not later corruptions or revisions of it arising from the scribal transmission of that version. Once again, space permits only a couple of examples:⁴

2 Chronicles 31:6

MT ^a	גַּם־הֵם מֵעֶשֶׂר בְּקָר וְצֹאֵן	LXX ^b	καὶ αὐτοὶ ἤνεγκαν ἐπιδέκατα μόσχων καὶ προβάτων
	וּמֵעֶשֶׂר קָדָשִׁים הַמִּקְדָּשִׁים לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֵיהֶם		καὶ ἐπιδέκατα αἰγῶν καὶ ἠγίασαν τῷ κυρίῳ θεῷ αὐτῶν
They, too, [brought] a tenth of herds and flocks, and a tenth of <u>holy things</u> devoted to YHWH their God.		They, too, brought tenths of bulls and sheep and tenths of <u>goats</u> and they devoted [them] to the Lord their God.	

LXX Apparatus: ΑΙΓΩΝ] ΑΓΙΩΝ 93^c

a. K. Elliger and W. Rudolph et al., eds., *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1967/77, 1983) is cited as the putative parent text of the Greek translation. Obviously the manuscripts used by the translator were not graphemically pointed, but the Masoretic vocalization is retained to aid the modern reader. English translations for both Hebrew and Greek texts are my own.

b. Cited according to A. Rahlfs, ed., *Septuaginta, Id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes* (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1935). All citations of the Septuagint are from this edition unless the critical editions in the Göttingen Septuaginta are available.

c. I am grateful to Professor Dr. Robert Hanhart of the Septuaginta-Unternehmen, Göttingen, Germany for verifying the evidence for this variant in the manuscript tradition.

The original text from the hand of the translator almost certainly had ἀγίον for קָדָשִׁים and not αἰγῶν (goats). Early in the history of the textual transmission, a Greek scribe with no access to the Hebrew parent text misread ΑΓΙΩΝ as ΑΙΓΩΝ on paleographical grounds, since characters in the square series are easily confused in papyri and uncials. The mention of herds and flocks in the context also leads one naturally to think of goats. This error occurred so early that it dominated most of the extant manuscript tradition.

4. The example in 2 Chr 31:6 is adapted from N. Fernández Marcos, "Some Pitfalls of Translation Greek," paper presented to XII Congress of the IOSCS, Leiden, July 30, 2004.

Ecclesiastes 4:9–10

MT

טוֹבִים הַשְּׁנַיִם מִן־הָאֶחָד [9]
אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁלָהֶם שְׂכָר טוֹב בְּעֵמְלָם

[10] כִּי אִם־יִפְלוּ הָאֶחָד יִקַּם

אֶת־חֲבֵרוֹ
וְאִילוּ הָאֶחָד שִׁפּוֹל וְאֵין
שְׁנֵי לְהִקְיָמוֹ

Two are better than one,
because they have a good reward
for their work.

For if they fall, the one will raise up
his partner.

But alas for him, the one who falls,
and there is not another to raise
him up.

LXX

ἀγαθοὶ οἱ δύο ὑπὲρ τὸν ἕνα,
οἷς ἔστιν αὐτοῖς μισθὸς ἀγαθὸς ἐν
μόλῳ αὐτῶν·

ὅτι ἐὰν πέσωσιν, ὁ εἷς ἐγερεῖ τὸν
μέτοχον αὐτοῦ,

καὶ οὐαὶ αὐτῷ τῷ ἑνὶ, ὅταν πέσῃ
καὶ μὴ ἦ δεύτερος τοῦ ἐγεῖραι αὐτόν.

Two are better than one,
because they have a good reward
in their work.

For if they fall, the one will raise up
his partner.

But woe to him, the one, when he
falls, and there is not another to
raise him.

LXX Apparatus for 4:10b:^a

πέσωσιν] absc 870 Did; πεση 411 C⁻⁽¹³⁹⁾ 299 (-σει 609) b⁽¹²⁵⁾ (-σει 261) Did Ps.CatA 283 LatAmb Ep 81,3,6 ter Inst virg 11,74 BenA Conc 3,3 Chrom Matth 22,3,5,6 ter ConcilTol 366 Eugip Reg 41,14 GregM Rg 4,172 Hi Ep 76,1 PetrChr 170,5 Ruf Reg S Bas 3,8 174,8 Arm Hil^{em} et comm 286,116 287,140 Sang = Ald Vulg l ὁ εἷς] inc C; > 534; + ο ετερος 411 C⁻⁽¹³⁹⁾ 299 b⁽¹²⁵⁾ LatAmb Inst virg 11,74 Chrom Matth 22,3,5 (sed hab Amb Ep 81,3) = Ald

a. Provisionally, from my forthcoming edition of Ecclesiastes for the Göttingen Septuaginta. The abbreviations follow the format of the Göttingen Editions. Details may be found in J. Ziegler, "Der Gebrauch des Artikels in der Septuaginta des Ecclesiastes," in *Studien zur Septuaginta: Robert Hanhart zu Ehren* (ed. D. Fraenkel, U. Quast, and J. W. Wevers; Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse 190; Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens 20; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990), 109–10.

The literalistic translator of Qoheleth has provided a rendering quantitatively identical to MT. When the Greek version is taken on its own terms, with no possible reference to the parent text, a reader may naturally construe ὁ εἷς as subject of the first verb in v. 10b—hence the 3 sg. πέση witnessed mainly by MSS of the Catena Group and the Latin Fathers. The majority of these same witnesses have also supplied ὁ ἕτερος as an explicit subject for the second verb.

These examples illustrate how inner-Greek corruptions arise in the textual transmission. In order to discuss the importance of the Septuagint for the text of the OT, we need to base our research and study upon critical editions of the text of the Septuagint. Recently, E. Tov has discussed large-

scale differences between the LXX and MT, Syriac Bible, Targum, and Vulgate.⁵ He claims, and perhaps rightly so, that the LXX is the single most important source that preserves material relevant for earlier or later literary editions of certain books. Yet critical editions exist at the present time for only 22 of the 36 projected volumes, and this covers only Jeremiah and Ezekiel of the 11 books where such issues arise and debates presently rage. Thus no firm conclusions can be reached for the problems in Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, and Proverbs until critical editions are available.

Differences Due to Factors in Translation

(3) Before a translation can be properly used in the text criticism of the text of a source language, one must fully understand just how and from what points of view this translation was done by a particular translator.⁶ Many differences between the resultant translation and original source text are due to the task of translation and do not constitute genuine textual variants. The following illustrations provide a classified sampling of issues in translation technique.

Pluses and Minuses

The most obvious quantitative difference between our present Hebrew text and the Greek translation consists in the pluses and minuses. Origen attempted to mark all of these in his famous Hexapla in the third century. Yet the majority of them are due to issues in translation and do not bear witness to a different parent text.

The book of Job is a star example. The earliest Greek translation of Job is about one-sixth shorter than the Hebrew text of the MT. For almost one hundred years, the standard view among Septuagint scholars was that the Greek translator had used a different parent text, and some thought that the MT was derivative and secondary to the Hebrew base of the Septuagint.⁷ Yet painstaking comparison of our Greek and Hebrew texts clearly showed that the differences were due to a functional equivalence approach to translation in which many of the long, windy speeches were made more manageable for a Hellenistic readership. Consider, for example, Job 20:2-4:⁸

5. Emanuel Tov, "The Nature of the Large-Scale Differences between the LXX and MT S T V, Compared with Similar Evidence in Other Sources," in *The Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible: The Relationship between the Masoretic Text and the Hebrew Base of the Septuagint Reconsidered* (ed. Adrian Schenker; SCS 52; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2003), 121-44.

6. Wevers, "The Use of Versions for Text Criticism: The Septuagint," 20.

7. See, for example, Edwin Hatch, "On Origen's Revision of the LXX Text of Job," in *Essays in Biblical Greek* (ed. Edwin Hatch; Oxford, 1889; reprint, Amsterdam: Philo, 1970), 215-45.

8. Taken from my *Asterisked Materials in the Greek Job* (SCS 38; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 386.

MT

20:2a	לְכֹן שְׁעָפִי יְשִׁיבוּנִי	Therefore my anxious thoughts answer me;
20:2b	וּבְעֵבוֹר חוּשֵׁי בִי	And because of my feelings in me,
20:3a	מוֹסֵר כְּלִמְתֵי אֲשָׁמַע	I hear admonition that humiliates me;
20:3b	וְרוּחַ מִבִּינְתִּי יַעֲנֵנִי	And a spirit from my understanding answers me.
20:4a	הֲזֹאת יָדַעְתָּ מִנִּי־עַד	Did you know this from of old?
20:4b	מִנִּי שִׁים אָדָם עַל־אָרֶץ	From the placing of mankind upon the earth?

Ecclesiastical Text Derived from Origen

20:2a	Οὐχ οὕτως ὑπελάμβανον ἀντρεπεῖν σε ταῦτα,	I was not, was I, responding so to dispute you in these things?
20:2b	καὶ οὐχὶ συνίετε μᾶλλον ἢ καὶ ἐγώ.	and surely you do not understand more than me,
20:3a	* παιδείαν ἐντροπῆς μου ἀκούσομαι, ✓	[I will heed discipline from my humiliation,
20:3b	* καὶ πνεῦμα ἐκ τῆς συνέσεως ἀποκρίνεταιί μοι. ✓	and a spirit from my understanding will answer me.
20:4a	* μὴ ταῦτα ἔγνων ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔτι, ✓	You do not know these things, do you, from the hereafter?]
20:4b	ἀφ' οὗ ἐτέθη ἄνθρωπος ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς;	from the time man was placed upon the earth?

Six lines from the MT have been condensed by the O(ld) G(reek) translator⁹ of Job into three: OG 20:4b renders MT 20:4b, OG 20:2b is derived from MT 20:4a,¹⁰ and OG 20:2a is based largely on MT 20:2a.¹¹ Origen equated OG 20:2b and MT 20:2b and consequently supplied 3a, 3b, and 4a from Theod(otion). These lines he marked with an asterisk and metobelus. His intent was to align the OG quantitatively with the MT, but on a different level he was wrong on several accounts: (1) essentially OG 20:2b and Theod 20:4a translate the same line in the MT; (2) while the OG and Theod are comprehensible taken by themselves, the hybrid text transmitted by

9. The text of Job transmitted by the Christian church (called here the Ecclesiastical text) is an amalgam of the earliest Greek translation and additions from the translation of Theodotion inserted by Origen. The Aristarchian signs in Origen's Hexapla that distinguish the additions from Theodotion are absent in most manuscripts. The siglum OG designates the part of the Ecclesiastical text that derives from the first Greek translation—that is, without the additions from Theodotion.

10. Dhorme, following Bickell, believes the OG read *הזאת ידעתם מני*; see Édouard Dhorme, *A Commentary on the Book of Job* (trans. H. Knight; ed. H. H. Rowley; 1967; reprint, Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1984), 289.

11. Dhorme suggests the OG read *לֹא־כֵן* rather than *לְכֹן*; see *ibid.*

the Christian church from Origen's work is a hopeless mismatch and does not make sense; (3) both the OG and Theod obviously intended to supply a rendering of the Hebrew, albeit according to entirely different principles of translation.

Frank Polak of Tel Aviv is currently attempting to develop criteria to distinguish redactional from translational issues in the matter of minuses in the LXX.¹²

Interpretation Based on Meaning in Postbiblical Hebrew or Aramaic

Exodus 12:22

MT	LXX ^a
וְלָקַחְתֶּם אֲגָדַת אֶזוֹב	λήμψεσθε δὲ δεσμὴν ὑσσώπου
וְטָבַלְתֶּם בָּדָם אֲשֶׁר בַּסֵּף	καὶ βάψαντες ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ παρὰ τὴν θύραν
וְהִנַּעְתֶּם אֶל-הַמַּשְׁקוּף	καὶ θίξετε τῆς φλιᾶς
וְאֶל-שְׁתֵּי הַמְּזוּזוֹת מִן-הַדֶּרֶם	καὶ ἐπ' ἀμφοτέρων τῶν σταθμῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος, ὃ ἔστιν παρὰ τὴν θύραν.
וְאֲשֶׁר בַּסֵּף	
And you shall take a bunch of hyssop and dip [it] in the blood in <u>the basin</u> and touch [it] to the lintel and to the two doorposts from the blood in the basin.	And you shall take a bundle of hyssop and dipping from the blood <u>beside the door</u> and you shall touch the lintel and on both doorposts from the blood that is beside the door.

a. John W. Wevers, ed., *Exodus* (Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum 2/1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991).

Hebrew has homonymous nouns **בַּסֵּף** = 'basin' and **בַּסֵּף** = 'sill, threshold'.¹³ Akkadian has both nouns, too, but not in homonymous form.¹⁴ Aramaic, however, only has **בַּסֵּף** = 'sill, threshold', while Phoenician only has **בַּסֵּף** = 'basin'.¹⁵ Only the Aramaic noun was known to the Exodus translator, and guided by the context, he made the best sense he could with that meaning. Nonetheless, the point is that the Greek testifies to the same parent text as in the MT.

12. F. Polak, "The Minuses of the LXX on Joshua: Classification and Comparison," paper presented to XII Congress of the IOSCS, Leiden, July 30, 2004.

13. L. Koehler, W. Baumgartner, and J. J. Stamm, "I בַּסֵּף" and "II בַּסֵּף," *HALOT* 2:762–63.

14. In Akkadian *s/šappu(m)* is 'basin' and *sippu(m)* is 'doorpost'; see W. von Soden, *AHW*, 1027, 1049, 1175.

15. See J. Hoftijzer and K. Jongeling, *DNWSI*, 2:796–97; and Charles R. Krahmalkov, *Phoenician-Punic Dictionary* (Leuven: Peeters, 2000), 347.

Jan Joosten's excellent work on Aramaizing renderings in the LXX reveals that several issues may be involved at the same time. Consider the following examples:¹⁶

Jeremiah 31[38]:13

MT—Jeremiah 31:13	LXX—Jeremiah 38:13 ^a
אָז תִּשְׂמַח בְּתוֹלָהּ בְּמַחֲוֹל	τότε χαρήσονται παρθένοι ἐν συναγωγῇ νεανίσκων,
וּבְחָרִים וּבְקַנְיִים יַחְדָּו	καὶ πρεσβῦται χαρήσονται.
Then maidens will rejoice with dancing, and young and old men <u>together</u> .	The virgins will rejoice in the gathering of young men, and old men will <u>rejoice</u> .

a. Joseph Ziegler, ed., *Ieremias, Baruch, Threni, Epistula Ieremiae* (Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum 15; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957, 1976).

Joosten notes that the Greek translation reflects a 3 m. pl. of the Aramaic verb חרה 'to rejoice' instead of the adverb יחדו 'together' in the MT.¹⁷ Exegetes debate whether the rendering in the Septuagint reflects the intended meaning of the Hebrew text or diverges from it. Joosten points out that the idiomatic use of the adverb 'together' fits usage elsewhere in Jeremiah.¹⁸ We do not need, however, to resolve the debate to see that the Greek translator had the same consonantal text as is preserved in the MT. The issue of different vocalization will be taken up shortly.

Psalm 60[59]:10

MT—Psalm 60:10	LXX—Psalm 59:10 ^a
מוֹאֵב סִיר רְחֻצִי	Μωαβ λέβηθς τῆς ἐλπίδος μου
Moab is my <u>wash</u> basin	Moab is the cauldron of my <u>hope</u>

a. Alfred Rahlfs, ed., *Psalmi cum Odis* (Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum 10; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1931, 1967).

The Hebrew root רחץ 'to wash' is correctly rendered νίπτομαι in Ps 26[25]:6, 58[57]:11, and 73[72]:13. Here in Ps 60 the rendering ἐλπίς 'hope' is based on the Aramaic meaning of this root.¹⁹ In 1912, M. Flashar argued that the

16. Drawn from Jan Joosten, "On Aramaizing Renderings in the Septuagint," in *Hamlet on a Hill: Semitic and Greek Studies Presented to Professor T. Muraoka on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (ed. M. F. J. Baasten and W. T. van Peursen; Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 587–600.

17. Joosten, "On Aramaizing Renderings in the Septuagint," 589.

18. E.g., Jer 13:14 and cf. 6:12, 21; 31:8; 48:7(Q); 49:3. See Joosten, "On Aramaizing Renderings in the Septuagint," 589–90 and n. 11.

19. See M. Sokoloff, *A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic* (2nd ed.; Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press, 2002), s.v. רחץ. The observation was also noted in Franz Wutz, *Die Transkriptionen von der Septuaginta bis zu Hieronymus* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1933), 151.

Greek translation was based on theological considerations since the translator hesitated to speak of God as having a washbasin.²⁰ Thus the Greek Psalter is based on the same Hebrew text that we have in the MT, but the apparent divergence is based both on Aramaic influence as well as exegetical issues.

Translation Influenced by Interpretive Tradition = Rabbinic Interpretation

The issue of early Jewish interpretive traditions influencing the Greek translation is worth exploring further in a couple of examples before turning to other factors.

Micah 5:[6]7

<p>MT—Micah 5:7</p> <p style="text-align: center;">כָּטַל מֵאֵת יְהוָה כְּרִבִּיִּים עַל־יַעֲשֹׁב</p> <p>As dew from the Lord, as <u>showers</u> upon the grass</p>	<p>LXX—Micah 5:6</p> <p style="text-align: center;">ὡς δρόσος παρὰ κυρίου πίπτουσα καὶ ὡς ἄρνες ἐπὶ ἄγρωστιν</p> <p>As dew falling from the Lord and as <u>lambs</u> upon the field grass</p>
---	---

Although at first glance the rendering of רִבִּיִּים by ἄρνες seems to indicate a possible divergence between the parent text of the LXX and MT, again, in certain Aramaic dialects of Palestine at a later time, רִבִּיב had the meaning ‘lamb’.²¹ We are certain, then, that the parent text of LXX is the same as that represented by the MT. Yet what motivated this translation? The language of Mic 5:6 immediately recalls that of Deut 32:2:

MT	תִּזַּל כְּטַל אֶמְרָתִי וְכַרְבִּיבִים עַל־יַעֲשֹׁב	יַעֲרֶף כְּמָטָר לְקֹחִי כְּשַׁעִירִים עַל־דָּשָׂא
----	---	---

May my teaching drop like the rain;
may my speech drip like the dew,
Like drizzle upon the vegetation,
like showers upon the grass.

As Jan Joosten has shown,²² an early interpretation of Deut 32:2 preserved in *Sifre Deuteronomy* (Pisqa 306)²³ and also the Samaritan Targum construes רִבִּיבִים as lambs. By way of illustration, the Samaritan Targum reads:

20. M. Flashar, “Exegetische Studien zum Septuagintapsalter,” ZAW 32 (1912): 241–68, esp. 251.

21. See F. Schulthess, *Lexicon Syropalaestinum* (Berlin: Reimer, 1903), 188.

22. Jan Joosten, “L’Ondée et les Moutons: La Septante de Michée 5,6 et l’Exégèse Juive Traditionnelle,” REJ 162 (2003): 357–63.

23. Joosten cites *Sifre* on Deuteronomy as follows:

כשעירים עלי דשא—כשאדם הולך ללמוד תורה תחילה אינו יודע מה לעשות והיא קשה עליו כשעיר עד ששונה שני ספרים או שני סדרים ואחר כך נמשכת אחריו כרוויים לכן נאמר כרוויים עלי עשב.

(Jan Joosten, “L’Ondée et les Moutons,” 362)

כצפירים עלוי יאר וכטלין עלוי עסב²⁴

like goats upon the verdure and like lambs upon the grass²⁵

Thus the rendering of the LXX in Mic 5:6 is an Aramaizing rendering but one that is based upon an intertextual link or what might be called the mi-drashic principle of *Gezerah shawah*.²⁶ Many apparent divergences between the LXX and MT are, in fact, interpretive renderings based on intertextual links and do not provide support for a different Hebrew parent text.

Different Reading

In other places, clear differences between the OG and the MT are based upon a different vocalization of the same consonantal text. One example from Theodotion Job²⁷ and one from Samuel are given to illustrate this.

Job 18:15b

MT	LXX ^a
יִזְרָה עַל-יְוָהוּ גַפְרִית	※ κατασπαρήσονται τὰ εὐπρεπῆ αὐτοῦ θεῖω. ✓
Brimstone will be scattered over his dwelling.	His good looks will be sprinkled with burning sulphur.

a. Joseph Ziegler, ed., *Job* (Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum 12/4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982).

While *nāwēhû* in MT is derived generally from *nāweh* ('dwelling'), Theodotion has understood either *nā'weh* or *nā'wā* from נאה ('be lovely'). Yet how and why has Theodotion interpreted the object of the preposition על as the subject of the verb, rather than גַפְרִית, which he treats instead as an adverbial modifier? And is על ignored by Theod? Apparently he vocalized יזרה—a *Pual* imperfect 3 m. sg. in MT—as active and having an indefinite

It should be noted that the words עליו קשה והיא קשה are relegated to the apparatus in the edition of Finkelstein; see L. Finkelstein, *Sifre on Deuteronomy* (Berlin, 1939; reprint, New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 2001), 339. On this text, R. Hammer notes, "This homily is best read as a continuation of the one above. It refers to both parts of the verse and interprets *sē'ir* as a demon, and *rabīb* as a pet animal: when you begin to study, Torah is so difficult that it attacks you like a demon; after you learn a little, it becomes as tame as a pet ewe that follows after you" (Reuven Hammer, *Sifre: A Tannaitic Commentary on the Book of Deuteronomy* [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986], 492 n. 41).

24. Cited according to A. Tal, *The Samaritan Targum of the Pentateuch*, Part II (Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University Press, 1981). The reading וכטלין is based upon MS E, for which MS J has וכטביים and MS V' has וכרביבין. English translation is mine.

25. Translation mine.

26. On *Gezerah shawah*, see David Instone Brewer, *Techniques and Assumptions in Jewish Exegesis before 70 CE* (TSAJ 30; Tübingen: Mohr, 1992), 17–18.

27. Gentry, *The Asterisked Materials in the Greek Job*, 221. Although Theodotion is a later Jewish reviser, this text is incorporated into the ecclesiastical Greek text recognized as the LXX.

subject. Interpreting his parent text as “one shall scatter brimstone upon his good looks,” he furnished “his good looks will be sprinkled with burning sulphur” as a passive transform.²⁸ The verb is conformed to the plural subject with no regard for the *Schema Atticum*.²⁹ At first glance, then, the rendering of Theod looks quite different from our MT. Yet clearly he had the same consonantal text but vocalized the verb as active and construed the noun from a different root. Thus he could well have been reading a Hebrew manuscript from the proto-Masoretic family.

1 Samuel 2:31^a

MT	LXX
<p>הִנֵּה יָמִים בָּאִים וְגִדַעְתִּי אֶת־זְרַעְךָ וְאֶת־זְרַע בֵּית אָבִיךָ מִקִּדְוֹת זִקְנֵךָ בְּבִיתְךָ</p>	<p>ἰδοὺ ἡμέραι ἔρχονται καὶ ἔξολεθρεύσω τὸ σπέρμα σου καὶ τὸ σπέρμα οἴκου πατρὸς σου,</p>
<p>Behold days are coming when I will destroy your <u>arm</u> [= power] and the <u>arm</u> of your father's house . . .</p>	<p>Behold days will come and I will destroy your <u>seed</u> and the <u>seed</u> of your father's house</p>

a. Adapted from Fernández Marcos, “Some Pitfalls of Translation Greek.”

Here the Greek translator has obviously vocalized his parent text as זָרַע ('seed') rather than as זְרַע ('arm') as in MT. (The last part of v. 31 and the first part of v. 32 are also absent from the LXX, possibly due to a parablepsis in reading its Hebrew text in translation or in early transmission of the Greek text).

It is a well-known fact of the history of the transmission of the Hebrew Scriptures that the text was graphemically unvocalized at this stage. Apart from the plene spelling traditions in some of the Dead Sea Scrolls, no vowels were marked. Now, while it is unwise to suggest that the Greek translators had no reading tradition, occasionally their vocalization is different from that transmitted by the Masoretes. That is not to say *a priori* that it is either inferior or superior in any given instance. The main point is that differences in the Greek translation do not necessarily derive from a Hebrew manuscript different from the precursors to our Masoretic Text.

Confusion of Similar Letters

Some divergences between the LXX and MT are based upon differences in the consonantal text being read. Yet even here, some of these are caused

28. See the text of Theodotion at Job 9:15a for the same translation technique. This text is given in the Second Apparatus of the Göttingen Edition, ad loc. See Ziegler, *Iob*.

29. For analysis of the *Schema Atticum* in Theodotion Job, see my *Asterisked Materials in the Greek Job*, 225–27.

by factors responsible for copyists' errors in the transmission of the Hebrew text.

Proverbs 23:7

MT

LXX

כִּי כְמוֹ-שֶׁעַר בְּנִפְשׁוֹ כֶּן-הוּא ὄν τρόπον γὰρ εἴ τις καταπίοι τρίχα,
אָכַל וּשְׁתָּה יֹאמַר לְךָ וְלִבּוֹ בַל-עֲמִיד οὕτως ἐσθίει καὶ πίνει.

For as he calculates in himself, so is he. for as one might swallow a hair, he.

Eat and drink, he says to you, but his heart is not with you. so he eats and drinks.

This proverb is a *crux criticorum*, as a glance at one or two commentaries quickly reveals.³⁰ The pointing transmitted in the MT yields a difficult text, and proverbs are notoriously hard to interpret since context is so limited. The central problem is שֶׁעַר vocalized in the MT as a perfect verb, 3 m. sg. According to the lexica, there are three homonymous roots: (1) the root of the noun שֶׁעַר meaning 'gate'; (2) the root of two nouns and one adjective, each occurring once in Jeremiah and meaning something like 'horrible'; and (3) the root of both a segholate noun occurring once in Gen 26:12 and the verb found only here in Prov 23:7, usually explained as cognate to the Aramaic verb 'calculate' or 'estimate'.

The rendering in the Septuagint is based upon reading שֶׁעַר 'hair'. A literal translation would yield 'for like a hair in the throat, so is he'.³¹ The Greek translator of Proverbs, however, is no literal translator and offers as a rendering: 'for as if one might swallow a hair, so he eats and drinks'. The author of a brief lexical study in the *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis* says, "the LXX differs here."³² This statement is unhelpful and may be misleading. There is, in fact, absolutely no difference graphemically between the manuscript that the LXX translator used and what would have been the proto-MT at this time. Distinction between ש and שׁ is part of the Masoretic pointing. One may suggest that the Greek translator had a different reading tradition or just stumbled over a ἄπαξ λεγόμενον. If anything, the apparent difference points to a common parent text.

Two examples from Zechariah show the LXX occasionally based upon a parent text different from that of the MT but quite secondary due to the kind of mistakes commonly made by scribes.

30. See William McKane, *Proverbs: A New Approach* (OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1970), 384–85; Roland E. Murphy, *Proverbs* (WBC 22; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1998), 173; Otto Plöger, *Sprüche Salomos (Proverbia)* (BKAT 17; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1984), 263, 271–72.

31. Compare with the NRSV: "for like a hair in the throat, so are they." On נֶפֶשׁ meaning 'throat', see L. Koehler, W. Baumgartner, and J. J. Stamm, "נֶפֶשׁ," *HALOT*, 2:711–12.

32. Russell Fuller, "שׁער," *NIDOTTE*, 4:208.

Zechariah 1:21[2:4]

<p>MT 1:21</p> <p style="text-align: center;">וַיָּבֹאוּ אֵלֶיהָ לְהַחֲרִיד אֹתָם . . . לְיָדוֹת אֶת־קַרְנוֹת הַגּוֹיִם . . .</p> <p>And these came to <u>terrify</u> them <u>by</u> <u>casting down</u> the horns of the nations . . .</p>	<p>LXX 2:4^a</p> <p>καὶ εἰση̄λθον οὗτοι τοῦ ὄξυναι αὐτὰ εἰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν τὰ τέσσαρα κέρατα</p> <p>And these came to <u>sharpen</u> them— the four horns—<u>into their hands</u>.</p>
--	--

a. Joseph Ziegler, ed., *Duodecim Prophetae* (Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum 13; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1943, 1967).

The rendering in the LXX is based upon reading לְהַחֲרִיד from חָרַד ‘be sharp’ and is due to the confusion easily made between *dalet* and *resh*. He also vocalized יָדוֹת ‘hands’ and supplied a possessive pronoun rather than the Piel Bound Infinitive of יָדָה that we find in the MT. The number four is supplied from the context. The text offered by the LXX is obviously inferior and can be easily shown to be a secondary development from the text in the MT by common errors in textual transmission. At the same time, it is clear that in reality it witnesses to the same text transmitted in the MT and is not a serious witness to a different textual tradition.

Zechariah 2:4[2:8]

<p>MT 2:4</p> <p style="text-align: center;">פְּרָזוֹת תִּשָּׁב יְרוּשָׁלַם מְרֹב אָדָם וּבְהֵמָה בְּתוֹכָהּ</p> <p>Jerusalem will inhabit <u>the open</u> <u>country</u> on account of <u>the multi-</u> <u>tude</u> of humans and animals in her midst.</p>	<p>LXX 2:8^a</p> <p>κατακάρπως κατοικηθήσεται Ἱερουσαλημ ἀπὸ πλήθους ἀνθρώπων καὶ κτηνῶν ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῆς</p> <p>Jerusalem will be inhabited <u>fruit-</u> <u>fully</u> from the multitude of <u>humans</u> <u>and</u> <u>cattle</u> in her midst.</p>
---	---

a. Joseph Ziegler, ed., *Duodecim Prophetae* (Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum 13; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1943, 1967).

Here instead of the difficult and uncommon word פְּרָזוֹת , which specifies the fields around a walled town,³³ the LXX translator apparently read *yodh* rather than *zayin* and construed a form from פָּרָה ‘be fruitful’. Again the rendering of the LXX is not only inferior and based upon an obvious mistake, but the difference witnesses indirectly to the better tradition transmitted in the MT.

33. The English version of Koehler-Baumgartner *Lexicon* incorrectly renders the German original in the definition of פְּרָזוֹת so that “das **offene Land**, im Gegensatz zu ummauerten Städten” is translated as “the **open country**, as distinct from unwallled towns.” Cf. L. Koehler, W. Baumgartner, and J. J. Stamm, *HALAT* (3rd ed.; Leiden: Brill, 1967–96), 3:909; and “פְּרָזוֹת,” *HALOT*, 3:965.

One final example involving confusion of consonants is given to show that sometimes the confusion is based upon letters similar in the Paleo-Hebrew script.

Genesis 46:16^a

MT	אָצְבֹן (= Tg. Onq., Tg. Neof., Tg. Ps.-J., Sam., and Syr. [אצבון] ^b) Ešbon
LXX	θασοβαν ^c Thasoban = תצבן

a. Adapted from Emanuel Tov, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (2nd ed. revised and enlarged; Jerusalem: Simor, 1997), 150.

b. In Aramaic square script: אצבעון.

c. According to the critical text of John W. Wevers, ed., *Genesis* (Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum 1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974). Numerous variations in spelling are found in the textual tradition.

Again the rendering in the LXX is inferior textually and based upon confusion of א and ת in Paleo-Hebrew script. Most of the Dead Sea Scrolls written in this older script are books of the Torah,³⁴ and therefore, one need not posit a date for this error much earlier than the examples just given from Zechariah.

THE TEXT-CRITICAL VALUE OF THE SEPTUAGINT VERSION

Different Parent Text

We come now to individual instances where the parent text of the LXX is different from that of the MT. One example must suffice as a general illustration; two instances will be considered where one can possibly or probably show that the Vorlage of the LXX is superior to that in the MT.³⁵

2 Samuel 22:43

4QSam ^a	פני ארץ / [כעפר על]	LXX ^L	ὡς χνοῦν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον ἀνέμου
	as dust <u>on the surface</u> of the way / <u>wind</u>		as dust <u>on the face</u> of the <u>wind</u>
MT	כעפר־ארץ	LXX ^{rel}	ὡς χνοῦν γῆς ^a
	as the dust of the earth		as the dust of the earth

a. This is the text of Rahlfs, ed., *Septuaginta*. LXX^L is the Lucianic or Antiochian Text cited from N. Fernández Marcos and José Ramón Busto Saiz, *El Texto Antioqueno de la Biblia Griega, I: 1–2 Samuel* (Madrid: C.S.I.C., 1989), 15–24.

34. Fragments of 12 biblical scrolls in the Paleo-Hebrew script have been found at Qumran; all but one (4QpaleoJob^b) are from books of the Torah. See Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (2nd ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 104–5.

35. The example in 2 Sam 22:43 is adapted from Fernández Marcos, "Some Pitfalls of Translation Greek."

MT *Psalm 18:43*

LXX *Psalm 17:43*^a

וְאֲשַׁחֲקֵם כְּעָפָר עַל-פְּנֵי-רוּחַ
καὶ λεπτονῶ αὐτοὺς ὡς χοῦν κατὰ
πρόσωπον ἀνέμου,

I will beat them fine like dust
before the wind

I will beat them fine, like dust
before the wind^b

a. Alfred Rahlfs, ed., *Psalmi cum Odis* (Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum 10; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1931, 1967).

b. Translation from A. Pietersma, *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under That Title: The Psalms* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000). NETS differs from the NRSV only when the Greek differs from our Hebrew Text (MT).

The text of Samuel transmitted by the MT is more problematic than that transmitted in many other parts; similarly in the case of the Septuagint we are plagued by the lack of a critical edition and the problem of recensions. Some manuscripts represent the Antiochian or Lucianic recension, while others transmit the so-called *καίγε* recension. It is difficult to identify an original Greek translation in our present manuscript tradition. Nevertheless, although partly reconstructed, the text of 4QSam^a (50–25 B.C.) is clearly aligned with the putative parent text of the Lucianic Greek text, while that of the MT is aligned with the non-Lucianic Greek tradition.³⁶ This difference is not due to factors in the Greek textual transmission or to issues of translation technique. There is a real difference in the Hebrew parent text of the OG and MT that must be evaluated by principles of textual criticism.

Two examples are drawn from Isaiah, where Barthélemy and the Committee of the Hebrew Old Testament Text Project sponsored by the United Bible Societies propose that the parent text represented by the LXX is superior and the text of the MT is secondary. The first example is Isa 19:10. Verses 9 and 10 in the MT and v. 10a in the LXX provide the context, followed by the analysis of the committee designated by *CTAT* (*Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament*). The sources for the relevant witnesses are cited last.

Isaiah 19:10

MT

LXX^a

[9] וּבִשּׁוּ עֲבָדֵי פִשְׁתִּים שְׂרִיקוֹת וְאֲרָגִים
חוּרֵי:

[10] וְהָיוּ שְׂתַחְיָה מְדַכְּאִים
καὶ ἔσονται οἱ διαζόμενοι αὐτὰ ἐν
ὄδῳ

כָּל-עֵשִׂי שְׂכָר אֲגַמֵּי-נֶפֶשׁ:

36. Eugene C. Ulrich Jr., *The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus* (HSM 19; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1978), 104, 130.

Those who work with combed flax
will despair,
as well as those who weave white
fabric;

And her foundations will be
dejected;
all her wage-earners are people who
are like murky pools.

And those weaving (set the warp
in the loom) them will be in pain

CTAT:

19,10 cor שְׁתִּתִּיָּהּ [C] 1Q^a 4Q^b G T // assim Ps 11,3: M שְׁתִּתִּיָּהּ / exeg: Th Aq(?) V /
deform-int: g t / constr: S

MT שְׁתִּתִּיָּהּ

1Q^a שְׁתִּתִּיָּהּ

1Q^b שְׁתִּתִּיָּהּ

4Q^b שְׁתִּתִּיָּהּ

LXX οἱ διαζόμενοι αὐτά

Targ. בֵּית־שְׁתִּי מְחָא (MS Urbinates 1; 1st/2nd Rabbinic Bible)

a. Joseph Ziegler, ed., *Isaias* (Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum 14; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1939, 1967).

The excellent analysis and discussion of Barthélemy in *Critique Textuelle de l'Ancien Testament* and de Waard's *Handbook on Isaiah* need only be summarized here.³⁷ The vocalization of 1Q^b is unknown, but the plene spelling of 1Q^a and 4Q^b clearly indicate the vocalization שְׁתִּתִּיָּהּ and support, therefore, the rendering in the LXX and Targum.

The Dead Sea Scrolls, LXX, and Targum have preserved the original text. The rarer verb 'to weave' is also the *lectio difficilior*. The vocalization behind the Dead Sea Scrolls, LXX, and Targum was lost early. The renderings in the Syriac, Latin Vulgate, and Jewish revisers are based on construing the form from the more commonly known root שְׁתִּי 'to drink'. The MT seems to have correlated the text with Ps 11:3, the only other occurrence of the noun שְׁת 'foundation':

כִּי הַשְׁתּוֹת יִהְרָסוּן צְדִיק מֵהֶפְעֵל

For the foundations are being demolished

What did/(will?) the righteous do?

Another example, taken from Isa 53:8, concerns the consonantal text and not just a difference in vocalization. The relevant sources are cited, followed by the summary analysis of CTAT:

37. Dominique Barthélemy, *Critique Textuelle de l'Ancien Testament*, vol. 2: *Isaïe, Jérémie, Lamentations* (Rapport final du Comité pour l'analyse textuelle de l'Ancien Testament hébreu institué par l'Alliance Biblique Universelle; ed. Alexander R. Hulst et al.; OBO 50/2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986), 139–41; and Jan de Waard, *A Handbook on Isaiah* (Textual Criticism and the Translator 1; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1997), 85–86.

Isaiah 53:8

MT	מִפְשַׁע עַמִּי נִגַּע לְמוֹ
1Q ^a (c)	מפשע עמו נוגע למו
1Q ^b	מפשע עמו נגע למו
4Q ^d	מפ[שע] עמו נוגע למו
LXX	ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνομιῶν τοῦ λαοῦ μου ἤχθη εἰς θάνατον ^a
Aq	ἀπὸ ἀθεσίας λαοῦ μου ἦψατο αὐτῶν
Sym	διὰ τὴν ἀδικίαν τοῦ λαοῦ μου πληγὴ αὐτοῖς
Theod	ἀπὸ ἀθεσίας τοῦ λαοῦ μου ἦψατο αὐτῶν
MT	because of the transgression of my people, the blow was <u>his/theirs</u>
LXX	because of the sins of my people, he was led <u>to death</u>

CTAT:

53,8B cor לְמוֹת נִגַּע [C] G // err-graph: 1Q^a(corr) למו נוגע → harm-int: M 1Q^b 4Q^d
Sym; למו נִגַּע לְמוֹ, ThAq V S T: clav למו נוגע / lacun: 1Q^{a*}

a. The text of the LXX as well as of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion are all cited from Joseph Ziegler, ed., *Isaias* (Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum 14; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1939, 1967).

Once again, the problem is handled well in CTAT. The proposed parent text for the LXX entails reading a *Pual* perfect 3 m. sg. of נגע plus the prepositional phrase לְמוֹת. The passive voice in its translation is based upon its parent text although the lexical choice of ἄγω is inspired by his rendering of יִבְכַּל in v. 7 rather than the root נגע. Although 1Q^a has a lacuna at this point, the reading of a corrector of 1Q^a may represent an intermediate step: *taw* is lost due to accidental mutilation. The plene spelling נוגע may indicate that the verb is a *Pual* perfect and not a noun as in the MT.³⁸ Without *taw*, the object of the preposition is then construed as a pronominal suffix and the consonants נגע vocalized as a noun, although the versions and Jewish revisers render it as an active verb. 1Q^b and 4Q^d probably support

38. Kutscher, in his detailed study of 1Q^a, argues that according to the orthography of the scroll some nouns normally beginning with an *A* vowel are spelled instead with a *U* vowel. His comment is worth citing in full:

It is likely that we have examples of קטל—קטל in the Scr. בורך *vide* p. 201; מור = MT מר, *vide* p. 378 *s.v.*; רוגע = MT רגע liv 7, 8 (but in the second column = *pege*, Brönnro p. 128); נוגע = MT נגע liii 18[sic]; ארט (ל) = MT אט (ל) viii 6, *vide* p. 390. Unfortunately there are no parallels to most of these words in other Semitic languages, and so we cannot be certain. We cannot be sure that the change נוגע for example, was not due to a different textual interpretation (participle?). (E. Y. Kutscher, *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll [1Q^a]* [STDJ 6; Leiden: Brill, 1974], 477)

This evidence is extremely scanty, there is no cross-linguistic support, and Kutscher himself suggests that a different text may be represented by the scroll. Barthélemy's proposal is far more convincing and likely.

the MT. Thus, although not all critics are persuaded,³⁹ the difference in the LXX is probably due to a different Hebrew parent text that preserves the original reading.

Differences, therefore, between the LXX and other witnesses to the text that are genuine textual variants should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis, and one should not prefer *a priori* either the LXX or the MT.

The most knotty problems concern what have been called large-scale differences between the LXX and MT. Before considering these, we must pause to summarize the main results to this point and make some general statements about the transmission-history of the OT text as a whole in the light of prevalent trends and theories in this field of study.

While the focus of this article is the LXX and the text of the OT, the witness of the Dead Sea Scrolls must be discussed, although concerns of space and time permit only the briefest of statements. The issues presented so far will be correlated with some theories of Tov and Ulrich.

Emanuel Tov has broadly classified the various witnesses found at Qumran according to a theory of text-groups as follows:⁴⁰

<i>Q-Practice</i>	<i>Proto-MT</i>	<i>Pre-Samaritan</i>	<i>Close to LXX</i>	<i>Non-aligned</i>
35%	20%	5%	5%	35%

Such a presentation can give the impression that we are lacking a standardized text of the OT in the Maccabean and Hasmonean periods. We may even wonder if strong attestation for an early pristine text can be found. Two considerations must suffice to show that this portrayal of the text-history may be misleading.

First, these data can be assessed differently. Qumran practice refers to manuscripts exhibiting a different approach to orthography and grammar, but this does not mean a different text. The pre-Samaritan tradition does offer real textual variants but, when compared with the MT, by and large represents a Hebrew text updated grammatically and lexically as well as in other ways.⁴¹ The fact that the Hebrew text later known as the MT was being updated grammatically and lexically in the third/second century B.C. shows that it was already an ancient tradition at that time. Thus, the Samaritan Pentateuch witnesses indirectly to the antiquity of the MT. The fact that only 5% of texts among the Dead Sea Scrolls are close to the par-

39. Ekblad acknowledges the possibility that the parent text of the LXX had $\eta\chi\theta\eta$ but argues that, since neither $\eta\chi\theta\eta$ or any form of $\alpha\gamma\omega$ matches אגו anywhere in the LXX, the Greek translator may have mistaken אגו as the perfect of אג . This is not probable as an error of either hearing or sight and overlooks the fact that the rendering in v. 9 is inspired by that in v. 7. See Eugene Robert Ekblad Jr., *Isaiah's Servant Poems according to the Septuagint: An Exegetical and Theological Study* (Leuven: Peeters, 1999), 235–36 and nn. 278–79.

40. Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (2nd ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 114–17.

41. See Bruce K. Waltke, "The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Text of the Old Testament," in *New Perspectives on the Old Testament* (ed. J. Barton Payne; Waco: Word, 1970), 212–39.

ent text of the LXX shows alignment only with those instances where the LXX differs textually from the MT. The agreement between the LXX and MT is overwhelming. The category “non-aligned” needs to be reexamined to determine whether the kind of variants included here are real textual variants, singular variants of no particular value, or aspects of interpreting the text to a particular audience or subgroup within Second Temple Judaism. What we may have instead are texts copied within temple circles and those copied without, where adaptations were freely made to suit various subcommunities of the faithful.

Second, Bruno Chiesa’s important criticisms of Tov must be heeded.⁴² We cannot simply count variations between texts or groups of texts. Each variation must be thoroughly analyzed and scrutinized for its worth in determining textual relationship. Chiesa argues cogently that two fundamental principles have been forgotten. First, only deviation from the original text can be used to determine genetic relations. He provides an excellent example where 2QJer (DJD 3, 62–69) shares a variant with the LXX in Jer 47 MT (29 LXX):⁴³

Jeremiah 47:3b–4 MT

לֹא הִפְנוּ אָבוֹת אֶל־בְּנֵי מִרְפִּיּוֹן יְדִים:
[4] עַל־הַיּוֹם הַבֹּא לְשָׂדוֹד אֶת־כָּל־פְּלִשְׁתִּים
לְהַכְרִית לְצָר וּלְצִידוֹן כָּל שָׂרִיד עֵזֶר

Fathers will not turn to their children,
their hands hang paralyzed to help
because of the coming day to destroy all the Philistines,
to cut off all survivors giving help to Tyre and Sidon.

להכרית MT] והכרת] 2QJer = καὶ ἀφανῶ LXX^a

a. The MT has ‘to cut off’, while 2QJer and the LXX have ‘and I will cut off’.

Soderlund argues cogently that the reading in 2QJer and the LXX breaks the parallelism and introduces a clumsy change of subject that must be expressed in the form of an intrusive and inexplicable quote. The author of the composition cannot be blamed for this, and hence the reading is clearly secondary.⁴⁴ What matters here is not a literary-critical argument but the fact that 2QJer and the LXX share a certainly erroneous reading. This is primary evidence for a common ancestor somewhere in the history of these two witnesses, in spite of the fact that the fragment from Qumran does not agree with the LXX in the order of the chapters. And it is this common ancestor that witnesses a reading secondary to the MT, despite

42. Bruno Chiesa, “Textual History and Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Old Testament,” in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18–21 March, 1991* (ed. Julio Treballe Barrera and Luis Vegas Montaner; 2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 1:257–72.

43. Adapted from *ibid.*, 267–68.

44. Sven Soderlund, *The Greek Text of Jeremiah: A Revised Hypothesis* (JSOTSup 47; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985), 215–16.

the singular readings in 2QJer. Thus, as Chiesa reminds us, “in textual criticism what matters is not the number of agreements and disagreements between the various witnesses, but the nature of their variant readings and/or errors.”⁴⁵

The second fundamental principle easily forgotten, according to Chiesa, is that many so-called unique readings used to classify the manuscripts are far from being unique and are not reliable for establishing the position of a witness within the text history of that biblical book. As an example, he points to K. A. Mathews’s article, where the main results of his *editio maior* are made available to a wider circle of readers.⁴⁶ I cite Chiesa in full:

According to the editor 15 *lectiones singulares* are to be found in his scroll. But, five of these readings are certainly not «unique»: nr. 6 appears also in a Genizah fragment; nr. 14 in a De Rossi manuscript; nr. 38 is quite certainly shared by LXX; nr. 42 by the same witness as well as by the Vulgata; nr. 48 is to be found in some Kennicott manuscripts. Of the remaining ten «unique» readings, one is clearly the result of a mechanical error (14), and in four other cases (29, 39, 48, 55) what is concerned is the presence or the absence of נכ (*nota accusativi*). Only five «unique» readings are left—not very safe ground for declaring this manuscript to be an independent text of *Leviticus*.⁴⁷

When we keep in mind Chiesa’s reminder concerning unique readings, the category of “non-aligned texts” provided by Tov needs reexamination. One must weigh the variants, not count them. This category does not support the idea of a nonstandard text at this time.

With this brief critique of the data as presented by Tov, we may now summarize the argument to this point. Although a multitude of apparent differences exist between the LXX and MT or other Hebrew witnesses, we must first eliminate issues arising from differences between source and target languages as codes of communication, corruption within the transmission of the Greek version, and differences that are translational and not genuinely textual.⁴⁸ When such differences are eliminated (as more than 25 years of careful, patient, and painstaking comparison of the LXX and MT have shown), the first datum from this study is the high level of agreement between the two. The claim made by Gilles Dorival in his research on the text of the Greek Psalter is that the majority of differences between it and the MT are translational.⁴⁹ The same is true in Job, as I concluded in

45. Chiesa, “Textual History and Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Old Testament,” 267.

46. “The Leviticus Scroll (11QpaleoLev) and the Text of the Hebrew Bible,” *CBQ* 48 (1986): 171–207.

47. Chiesa, “Textual History and Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Old Testament,” 269.

48. Tov readily acknowledges both points; see E. Tov, “The Contribution of the Qumran Scrolls to the Understanding of the Septuagint,” in *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (ed. E. Tov; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 285–300.

49. Gilles Dorival, “Septante et Texte Massorétique: Le Cas des Psaumes,” in *Congress Volume: Basel 2001* (ed. A. Lemaire; VTSup 92; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 139–61.

my own extensive study.⁵⁰ In Proverbs, two major recent studies conducted independently of each other concluded that the LXX is a creative reshaping of the MT to strengthen the attribution to Solomon.⁵¹ A dissertation just completed on Lamentations by Kevin J. Youngblood involving exhaustive analysis of translation technique did not find many differences that were genuinely textual.⁵² It is in the nature of things that textual critics focus on differences. Let us not forget that the LXX witnesses to the fact that our Hebrew text is, for the most part, ancient and pristine.

Large-Scale Differences between the LXX and MT

Finally, something should be said, however brief and inadequate for so large a topic, about those situations where we observe a group of real textual variants between the LXX and our Hebrew Texts that belong to a pattern, so that the only explanation is that the one or the other apparently represents a different edition or recension in the history of a biblical book. Important scholars such as Eugene Ulrich use the witness of the Dead Sea Scrolls, the LXX, and other witnesses to stress that in both canon and text, the Scriptures were fluid and pluriform until A.D. 70 or 100, or perhaps even A.D. 135.⁵³ Instead of grouping our witnesses according to families or text-types as in table 1, Ulrich argues we must recognize evidence for different editions of a text in its development or literary history, as in

50. See my *Asterisked Materials in the Greek Job*.

51. See J. Cook, *The Septuagint of Proverbs: Jewish and/or Hellenistic Proverbs? Concerning the Hellenistic Colouring of LXX Proverbs* (VTSup 69; Leiden: Brill, 1997); and H. C. Washington, *Wealth and Poverty in the Instruction of Amenemope and the Hebrew Proverbs: A Comparative Case Study in the Social Location and Function of Ancient Near Eastern Wisdom Literature* (Ph.D. diss., Princeton Theological Seminary, 1992), 194–97. The most recent summary of all the research is B. K. Waltke, *The Book of Proverbs: Chapters 1–15* (NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004). Also noteworthy is Ruth Scoralick, “Salomos griechische Gewänder: Beobachtungen zur Septuagintafassung des Sprichwörterbuches,” in *Rettenendes Wissen: Studien zum Fortgang weisheitlichen Denkens im Frühjudentum und im frühen Christentum* (ed. K. Löning and M. Faßnacht; AOAT 300; Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2002), 43–75. She analyzes the intentional composition in LXX Prov 15:27–16:9 compared with the MT. This removes a major plank in Tov’s argument for the recensional differences between the parent text of the LXX and the MT (see E. Tov, “Recensional Differences between the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint of Proverbs,” in *Of Scribes and Scrolls: Studies on the Hebrew Bible, Intertestamental Judaism, and Christian Origins, Presented to John Strugnell on the Occasion of His Sixtieth Birthday* (ed. H. W. Attridge, J. J. Collins, and T. H. Tobin; College Theology Society Resources in Religion 5; Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1990), 43–56. On the other side, the research of M. Fox is also important, showing that in spite of the translational issues, cases exist where real textual variants obtain between the LXX and MT in which the LXX has the superior reading. See Michael V. Fox, “LXX-Proverbs as a Text-Critical Resource” (paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, Atlanta, November 25, 2003).

52. Kevin J. Youngblood, *Translation Technique in the Greek Lamentations* (Ph.D. diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2004).

53. Eugene Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans / Leiden: Brill, 1999), 31. See also idem, “The Text of the Hebrew Scriptures at the Time of Hillel and Jesus,” in *Congress Volume: Basel 2001* (ed. A. Lemaire; VTSup 92; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 85–108.

TABLE 1. *Grouping of Manuscripts according to Text-Types*

Q Practice	Proto-MT	Pre-Samaritan	Close to G	Non-aligned
1QIsa ^a	1QIsa ^b	4QpaleoExod ^m	4QDeut ^q	4QDeut ^{b,c,h}
4QSam ^c	4QJer ^{a,c}	4QNum ^b	4QSam ^a	4QIsa ^c
4QIsa ^c	4QEzra		4QJer ^{b,d}	4QDan ^a

TABLE 2. *Grouping of Manuscripts according to Editions*

Edition						
n+1 ^a	⊖-Exod	Ⓜ-Num	4QJosh ^a , Josephus	⊖-Jer	Ⓜ-Dan	Ⓜ-Pss
n+2	Ⓜ-Exod	4QNum ^b	[SamPent, OL]	Ⓜ-Jer	⊖-Dan	11QPs ^a
n+3	4QpaleoExod ^m		⊖-Josh			
n+4	SamPent-Exod		Ⓜ-Josh			

a. Ulrich explains, "The 'n+1' type of designation for successive editions of a text assumes that there has been a series of editions during the composition of the text which constitutes its growth leading up to the first extant witness to a given book." See Ulrich, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Biblical Text," 85 n. 21.

table 2.⁵⁴ According to table 1, various witnesses may be grouped into families of texts which may then be derived from a single archetype. By contrast, the various witnesses according to table 2 may represent different stages in the literary history of individual books.

Earlier I drew attention to a study by Tov in which he gives a brief descriptive list and preliminary discussion of large-scale differences between the LXX on the one hand and the MT, Syr., Tg., and Vulg. on the other. The LXX contributes far more large-scale differences than any other witness including the Dead Sea Scrolls. Well-known examples are: (1) the shorter LXX Jeremiah, (2) the shorter LXX Ezekiel, and (3) the shorter LXX 1 Sam 16–18.⁵⁵ Moreover, the LXX version of both Joshua and Judges offers a pattern of textual variants that, according to some, attest a different stage in the redactional history.⁵⁶ According to Pohlmann and Böhler, the literary shape of several chapters of 1 Esdras is older than the MT edition of the

54. Idem, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Biblical Text," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (ed. Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam; 2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 1:79–100, esp. 84–85.

55. Tov, "The Nature of the Large-Scale Differences between the LXX and MT S T V, Compared with Similar Evidence in Other Sources," 126.

56. Ibid., 127. See also Natalio Fernández Marcos, "The Hebrew and Greek Texts of Judges," in *The Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible: The Relationship between the Masoretic Text and the Hebrew Base of the Septuagint Reconsidered* (ed. Adrian Schenker; SCS 52; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2003), 1–16; and Kristin De Troyer, *Rewriting the Sacred Text: What the Old Greek Texts Tell Us about the Literary Growth of the Bible* (SBL Text-Critical Studies 4; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003), 29–58.

parallel chapters in Ezra–Nehemiah and Chronicles.⁵⁷ All of these are extremely knotty problems, and each one would require not just an entire paper of this sort, but a dissertation or two to analyze seriously. What compounds the situation in the majority of these cases is the lack of a critical edition of the LXX and the lack of exhaustive studies on translation technique to clear the way to examine real textual variants and evidence for different editions. Because of the Lucianic and *καίτε* recensions in the LXX of Samuel–Kings, we may not even possess in our present textual tradition any more than traces of the original Greek translation.⁵⁸

Space and time allow me to make only a few suggestions to point scholars in a direction different from the picture painted by Ulrich. The question to be faced squarely is this: if we can demonstrate that a group of real textual variants represents a different edition of a biblical book, what is the textual value of such a witness? At least three works have appeared in the last year that seek to address precisely such a question: (1) a collection of essays on different biblical books, by seven eminent scholars;⁵⁹ (2) a short work containing essays on Joshua, Esther, and 1 Esdras, by Kristin De Troyer;⁶⁰ and (3) a monograph on the LXX as the oldest form of the text of the books of Kings by Adrian Schenker.⁶¹ These books/essays represent a variety of conclusions so that in some cases our MT is seen to be secondary, and in other cases, the parent text behind the LXX is secondary. What can guide us through this maze? It is doubtful that assured results are possible with the evidence, editions, and research in hand at the present time. Nonetheless, some clear principles can give proper direction to our thinking.

Many scholars, including those (such as Sanders and Ulrich) who believe both canon and text were fluid at this time, classify our textual witnesses from 300 B.C. to A.D. 100 according to two types: (1) manuscripts that represent a simple, straightforward copying and transmitting of the

57. K.-F. Pohlmann, *Studien zum dritten Esra: Ein Beitrag zur Frage nach dem Schloss des chronistischen Geschichtswerkes* (FRLANT 104; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970); and Dieter Böhler, "On the Relationship between Textual and Literary Criticism. The Two Recensions of the Book of Ezra: Ezra–Neh (MT) and 1 Esdras (LXX)," in *The Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible: The Relationship between the Masoretic Text and the Hebrew Base of the Septuagint Reconsidered* (ed. Adrian Schenker; SCS 52; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2003), 35–50.

58. See Paul McLean, *The Greek *καίτε* Version of 2 Reigns 11:1–3 Reigns 2:11: A Study of Its Constituent Translation Technique and Semantic Variations from Its Hebrew Vorlage Using the Interlinear Paradigm for A New English Translation of the Septuagint (NETS)* (Ph.D. diss., University of Toronto, 2003).

59. Adrian Schenker, ed., *The Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible: The Relationship between the Masoretic Text and the Hebrew Base of the Septuagint Reconsidered* (SCS 52; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2003).

60. De Troyer, *Rewriting the Sacred Text: What the Old Greek Texts Tell Us About the Literary Growth of the Bible*.

61. Adrian Schenker, *Älteste Textgeschichte der Königsbücher: Die hebräische Vorlage der ursprünglichen Septuaginta als älteste Textform der Königsbücher* (OBO 199; Fribourg: Academic Press / Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004).

text as received, and (2) manuscripts that represent scribes revising and updating the text to make it relevant to the current circumstances and generation. Sanders labels the former the *repetition* factor and the latter the *resignification* factor.⁶² Such a classification is extremely helpful in evaluating the apparent chaos in the witnesses but does not necessarily lead to the conclusions of Sanders and Ulrich.

In many ways, the story of the biblical text at this time is not dissimilar to walking into a Christian bookstore today. I often wonder what archaeologists would conclude after excavating the remains of a contemporary Christian bookstore some 2000 years hence.

The number and variety of modern translations of the Bible seems overwhelming to the average person of today, not to mention some future historian of the text. Here are some examples of what one may encounter:

The New Student Bible
 Life Application Bible (Take the Next Step)
 Psalty's Kids' Bible
 NIV Young Discoverer's Bible
 The Adventure Bible
 The Full Life Study Bible
 Disciple's Study Bible
 Women's Devotional Bible
 The Family Worship Bible
 The Dramatized Bible
 Youth Bible
 The Discovery Bible
 The Daily Bible
 The One Year Bible
 The Spirit Filled Life Bible
 The Orthodox Study Bible
 Rainbow Bible
 Precious Moments
 Mother's Love N.T. and Psalms

62. James A. Sanders, *Canon and Community: A Guide to Canonical Criticism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 22; and Eugene Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans / Leiden: Brill, 1999), 11. This classification is not dissimilar to the description of B. K. Waltke, who notes two tendencies at work in the early history of the transmission of the text—one to copy and preserve the text exactly and precisely as received and one to revise and update the text to make it understandable to the next generation. The *Tendenz* to revise and update may be limited to alterations to the form of the text such as switching from Paleo-Hebrew script to Aramaic square script and *plene* spelling, or may involve updating in geography, grammar, and lexicon, or may go as far as reinterpreting the text for a contemporary subcommunity within Second Temple Judaism. Beyond the far end of the spectrum in resignification would be the so-called parabiblical texts found at Qumran (cf. Bruce K. Waltke, "Old Testament Textual Criticism," in *Foundations for Biblical Interpretation* [ed. David S. Dockery, Kenneth A. Mathews, and Robert B. Sloan; Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1994], 156–86.

The same categories used to classify texts at Qumran exist in Bible editions currently published: Bibles that offer a standard text, unadorned and uninterpreted, and Bibles that adorn and decorate, paraphrase, interpret, and rearrange the text for the audience and culture of our times. Do we conclude from this that both canon and text are fluid? Hardly.

Above, I mentioned interesting and stimulating studies that have just come out on situations where a group of differences between the LXX and MT form a pattern. We need to apply to these studies in an exacting and rigorous way the categories of repetition and resignification and carefully look at the assumptions and methodologies of those who are attempting to combine literary-critical and redaction theories with textual criticism. I can only suggest a few guidelines for assessing this evidence:

(1) It is possible for a text to be resignified in the process of transmission. Therefore, when the Greek version agrees with a Hebrew Text from Qumran this may mean nothing more than the fact that it is a translation of a resignified text, not a better text. On the other side, the MT may be the resignified text. Yet in his analysis of the large-scale differences between the LXX and MT, Tov shows, at the very least, that the arguments for a Maccabean dating of the MT are one-sided.⁶³

(2) It is possible for a text to be resignified in the process of translation.⁶⁴

(3) It is possible for a translation to be resignified. According to (2) and (3), the LXX may entail a resignification involving one or two stages.⁶⁵

(4) It is possible that the parent text behind the LXX represents an earlier stage. This does not automatically mean a superior text. The biographical notes in the book of Jeremiah clearly indicate that the work was rewritten several times. The book was sent to the exiles in Babylon, but Jeremiah himself migrated to Egypt. This history in itself suggests that perhaps the version in Egypt is not the canonical version.⁶⁶

63. Tov, "The Nature of the Large-Scale Differences between the LXX and MT S T V, Compared with Similar Evidence in Other Sources," 121–44, esp. 142.

64. Turkanik, in a recent doctoral dissertation, argues that many differences between the Gamma-Gamma section of 3 Reigns LXX and 1 Kings MT are due to resignification—that is, they are issues of translation rather than of different text traditions. See Andrzej Szymon Turkanik, "Issues in Text and Translation Technique in the Gamma-Gamma Section of 3 Reigns (1 Kings)," *TynBul* 55 (2004): 157–60, for a summary of his dissertation completed at the University of Cambridge, 2002.

65. As examples, De Troyer, *Rewriting the Sacred Text*, offers the Old Greek of Esther as a resignification of a Hebrew Text and the final chapter of the Alpha Text of Esther as a resignification of a Greek translation.

66. Admittedly, the article by Tov, "The Nature of the Large-Scale Differences between the LXX and MT S T V, Compared with Similar Evidence in Other Sources," only attempts to provide a brief overview and summary. Nonetheless, he presents as established fact the view that the shorter LXX Jeremiah is an earlier edition, while that of MT is a later edition that "added various new ideas" (p. 126). This problem Tov has studied in depth himself; see E. Tov, *The Septuagint Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch: A Discussion of an Early Revision of the LXX of Jeremiah 29–52 and Baruch 1:1–3:8* (HSM 8; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1976); idem, "The Characterization of the Additional Layer of the Masoretic Text of Jeremiah," *ErIsr* 26 (Frank Moore

(5) The *Letter of Aristeas*, which purports to relate the history of the LXX translation, is a piece of propaganda to authenticate the Greek version in terms of both its sources and the quality of the translation. Likely this propaganda was necessary because both of these were under scrutiny. They may have had to use manuscripts outside the standard texts from the circle of the temple scribes. There may have been more freedom for resignification outside of the circle of temple scribes. We cannot *a priori* assume that an earlier edition or an older text is better. It may be a resignified text. There are no doubt places where the tradition in the MT is poor and other sources may be better. But we have to show first that these sources are more along the lines of repetition than resignification. The history of the textual transmission is highly complex and we are only beginning to sort it out. In any case, we need not think that the LXX constitutes evidence that our Hebrew text on the whole does not go back to an early and fairly pristine source.

Cross Volume; 1999): 55–63; idem, “Exegetical Notes on the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Septuagint of Jeremiah 27 (34),” in *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (ed. E. Tov; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 315–32; and idem, “The Literary History of the Book of Jeremiah in Light of Its Textual History,” in *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (ed. E. Tov; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 363–84. See also Young-Jin Min, *The Minuses and Pluses of the LXX Translation of Jeremiah as Compared with the Massoretic Text: Their Classification and Possible Origins* (Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1977). Tov’s view is supported in studies by P.-M. Bogaert, for example: “La *vetus latina* de Jérémie: texte très court, témoin de la plus ancienne Septante et d’une forme plus ancienne de l’hébreu (Jer 39 et 52),” in *The Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible: The Relationship between the Masoretic Text and the Hebrew Base of the Septuagint Reconsidered* (ed. Adrian Schenker; SCS 52; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2003), 51–82. Yet recent (major) studies on LXX Jeremiah reveal how complex the textual transmission of Jeremiah is and show that the problem is far from solved: Sven Soderlund, *The Greek Text of Jeremiah: A Revised Hypothesis* (JSOTSup 47; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985); Louis Stulman, *The Other Text of Jeremiah: A Reconstruction of the Hebrew Text Underlying the Greek Version of the Prose Sections of Jeremiah with English Translation* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1985); H.-J. Stipp, *Das masoretische und alexandrinische Sondergut des Jeremiabuches: Textgeschichtlicher Rang, Eigenarten, Triebkräfte* (OBO 136; Fribourg: Éditions Universitaires / Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994). J. Lundbom has also done extensive research and claims that 1,700 of the 2,700 words by which LXX Jeremiah is shorter than the MT can be explained by haplography—a problem to be expected in the transmission of a text whose chief literary feature is repetition; see J. Lundbom, “Haplography in the Hebrew *Vorlage* of Septuagint Jeremiah” (paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, San Antonio, November 22, 2004; and David Noel Freedman and Jack R. Lundbom, “Haplography in Jeremiah 1–20,” *Erlsr* 26 (Frank Moore Cross Volume; 1999): 28*–38*. Two doctoral students working under A. Pietersma at the University of Toronto have done extensive further research: Marc Saunders and Tony S. L. Michael. T. Michael suggested from his studies that the LXX Jeremiah belongs more to the classification of a resignified text (private communication). A. Pietersma (“Greek Jeremiah and the Land of Azazel,” in *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, and the Septuagint, Presented to Eugene Ulrich* [ed. Peter W. Flint, Emanuel Tov, and James C. VanderKam; VTSup 101; Leiden: Brill, 2006], 403–13) also offers good evidence that differences between the LXX and MT may be translational rather than textual.