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4QLXXNum and 4QLXXLevα are extensively analyzed below, and it is concluded that these manuscripts are best understood as either stylistic or clarifying revisions of the OG and that the OG is better represented by Gεd. As such, this work substantiates and builds upon the previous conclusions of Patrick Skehan and John Wevers, while the conclusions of Eugene Ulrich, who found the idiosyncratic nature of these two manuscripts to be indicative of their primacy, are necessarily opposed. In addition, the proposals that Ulrich has offered to the effect that a variant Hebrew Vorlage underlies these texts are shown to be inadequate. Besides these text-critical considerations, it will be shown that 4QLXXLevα in particular exhibits some significant instances of stylistic translation technique.
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1. Introduction

The discovery of Greek translations of the Pentateuch at Qumran was a momentous event. Dating approximately four centuries prior to the oldest codices, these documents became no less significant after it was determined that they were in fact septuagintal in nature. Two of these fragmentary documents have drawn the most scrutiny to date: 4QLXXNum (4Q121 = Rahlfs 803) and 4QLXXLevα (4Q119 = Rahlfs 801).¹ Other significant finds are pap4QLXXLevβ (4Q120 = Rahlfs 802), pap7QLXXExod, which covers Exod 28:4–7, and 4QLXXDeut, which is identified solely by Deut 11:4.² Concerning 4QLXXNum, Patrick Skehan originally thought


². All of these texts, except for pap7QLXXExod, were published in the same DJD volume just cited, while pap7QLXXExod was published quite early on in Les Petites Grottes de Qumran.
“that a somewhat awkward Greek rendering of Numbers has been reworked anciently to yield the recension contained in our later codices.” [3]

By 1977, Skehan had fully altered this earlier assessment, saying: “[Rahlfs 803’s] text is not such as can be supposed to underlie the form presented in later Septuagint codices; it is instead a considerable reworking of the original LXX to make it conform both in quantity and in diction to a Hebrew consonantal text nearly indistinguishable, within the limited scope of our evidence, from that of MT.” [4] Shortly after this in 1982, John Wevers agreed with the essentials of this assessment, concluding that our LXX manuscript tradition best represents the OG and that 803 is in fact “an early revision of the Septuagint of Numbers.” [5]

In 1990, Eugene Ulrich offered a detailed analysis of 801 and 803, in which he argued for an opposite conclusion: “I am not certain, but I propose that 4QLXXLeva penetrates further behind our oldest witnesses” and that it (along with 803) offers a “superior witness to the Old Greek translation.” [6] In this assessment, Ulrich analyzed the manuscripts while focusing on this question: does “an alternative Hebrew text [to the MT] . . . lie behind the OG[,] or [had an alternative text such as this] influenced the Greek variants?” [7] Thus, Ulrich’s intent is twofold: (1) to demonstrate that these Qumran manuscripts represent the OG and (2) to show that these manuscripts were translated from a Hebrew text different from the MT. Ulrich clearly states this intent as follows:

It is from this perspective—that Greek texts must be evaluated in the light of the possibility that they represent a faithful translation of an ancient Hebrew text at variance with the Massoretic textus receptus—

(by M. Baillet, J. T. Milik, and R. de Vaux; DJD 3/1; Oxford: Clarendon, 1962), 142–43. Little can be said about 4QLXXDeut. Pap4QLXXLevb, on the other hand, would best be examined in conjunction with 4QLXXNum and 4QLXXLeva. Nevertheless, a fuller treatment of these lengthy remaining fragments must be left aside for now. As for pap7QLXXExod, it is quite evident that it is both septuagintal in nature (repeating, as it does, unique septuagintal phraseology) and yet revised in the direction of a Hebrew Vorlage like that of the MT. Even the first word of the fragment, though it is a restoration from two possibly remaining letters, would reflect MT’s ÛyIa, which is not reflected in G. It may be emphasized that this note is restricted to an account of the pentateuchal fragments from Qumran, and thus the momentous impact that came from the Twelve Prophets Scroll (8HevXIIgr) need not be curtly summarized here.


4. Ibid., emphasis mine.


7. Ibid., 52, emphasis mine.
that I propose a reassessment of the value of the variants of the LXX mss from Qumran.\(^8\)

Ulrich takes issue with Wevers’s approach, albeit cordially, in that Ulrich sees Wevers as too often relying on the MT as though that same text lay before the original translators.\(^9\)

1.2. Reception of Ulrich’s Proposals

Ulrich’s views have been well received as can be seen in Leonard Greenspoon’s endorsement on both of the points specified above: “In our opinion, there is force to Ulrich’s arguments in favor of the originality of these Qumran readings as constituting the Old Greek text and as accurate reflections of a Hebrew Vorlage at variance with the MT.”\(^10\) In 1999, Ulrich republished his original article in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*,\(^11\) which included praise on the back cover from Florentino García Martínez, Frank Moore Cross, and Emanuel Tov. A little before this (1997), Wevers had notably accepted 2 of the 15 variants of 4QLXXLeva as representative of the OG,\(^12\) but as Metso and Ulrich put it, “he resisted the remainder.”\(^13\) Emanuel Tov, although notably questioning whether anything definitive could be said about 4QLXXNum on this matter, stated in 2001 that 4QLXXLeva and pap4QLXXLevb are “probably” better reflections of the OG:

Two of the Qumran texts probably reflect the Old Greek translation better than the manuscript tradition contained in the later uncial manuscripts (4QLXXLeva, 4QpapLXXLevb; the evidence for 4QLXXNum is less clear). Furthermore, the transliteration of the

\(^8\) Ibid., 65.

\(^9\) For this position, see, for example, the following citation of Wevers: “A Masoretic text of the entire Hebrew canon is available, and though it is not the exact form of the text which the translators rendered into Greek, it is an invaluable guide to it. The editor usually knows the parent [Hebrew] text which was being translated and this serves as a reliable guide for eliminating various scribal errors from the Greek text tradition” (J. W. Wevers, “Die Methode,” *Das Göttinger Septuaginta-Unternehmen* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977], 18), as cited in Ulrich, “Septuagint Manuscripts,” 65. Thus, Wevers sees the MT as being “not the exact form” that the OG translators had before them but “an invaluable guide to it” and believes furthermore that one “usually knows the parent text which was being translated.” These can be called high views of the MT and of the possibility of recovering the OG LXX largely from it.


\(^12\) John W. Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Leviticus* (Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series 44; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997).

tetragrammaton in 4QpapLXXLev as IAΩ presumably represents an earlier text as well. By implication, these three texts should also share certain features, but the evidence is too limited.14

The newest update on the issue from Ulrich comes from an article that he cowrote with Sarianna Metso.15 This article depends on the older work’s detailed analysis of the variants in 801, while its focus is on developing some of the results of that conclusion, as well as providing a fuller and up-to-date overview of the issues. Metso and Ulrich have added two more variants to the four that Ulrich listed earlier as constituting the chief evidence for their conclusions: (1) ἡμιος (in Lev 26:5) and (2) προστάγμασι (in Lev 26:15), “since κρίμα became the recensional standard.”16

1.3. Preliminary Conclusions

Two conclusions are reached herein. First, 4QLXXNum and 4QLXXLev do not better represent the OG than do the presently published Göttingen edition texts of Leviticus and Numbers (G ed), which were based on an assessment of all available later witnesses. Instead, 803 and 801 are best understood as representing revised texts, either toward a clearer Greek (803) or toward a better style of Greek (801). Second, the arguments that Ulrich has put forth to the effect that a variant Hebrew Vorlage underlies these texts are shown to be inadequate. As for 803, the analysis below builds on Skehan’s and Wevers’s work. As for 801, Ulrich was the first to draw some significant conclusions from this text. Wevers made his thinking known by not having chosen any of 801’s variants for the Göttingen edition, and yet, as we saw, he later accepted two of the variants while rejecting the others. Although Wevers’s Notes offered some responses to the arguments put forth by Ulrich, there has not been, till now, an extended analysis of 4QLXXLev that argues for an alternative position. In the case of the one significant variant that Wevers accepted as better representing the OG in 4QLXXLev, I will argue that this variant has a plausible explanation. Most importantly, it will be argued that 4QLXXLev is a highly stylized text; recognizing this point helps to explain some of its apparent oddities, although its stylistic nature remains a significant point in its own right.17

16. Ibid., 264.
17. In some instances, Wevers (Notes) ascribed a variant in 801 to considerations of stylistic revision, and even Ulrich lists a surprising number of instances in which a variant (usually in option “a”) could be understood in terms of a stylistic revision (not that he adopted those). Thus, this possibility has been recognized, although it has not been explicitly argued for as yet. A selective representation of the variant LXX readings will be presented here, being restricted for the most part to the scroll, G ed, the MT, and the Samaritan Pentateuch (hereafter, SamP). A double underline (x) indicates DJD’s open circle under a letter. I have striven to make the subsequent analysis intelligible on its own, but of course, a fuller grasp of what follows...
2.1. Numbers 3:40: 803 col. I 2

[λέγων] ἁρπήμασον [παν πρωτοτοκον ἀρσεν]/[παν υἱὸν Ἰσραήλ . . .] ἐπισκεψαί πάν πρωτοτοκον ἀρσεν τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ. G<sup>ed</sup>; Ἰησοῦς καὶ ὁ ἄντων ἔδωκεν καὶ Λυδίαν . . .<sup>4QLXXNum</sup>

2.1.1. The Renderings of ἐπισκέπτεσθαι in G<sup>ed</sup> and the Variant Tradition, Wevers’s Conclusions

Wevers has done a good service by listing all of the textual variants for the ἁρπήμαται/ἐπισκέπτεσθαι renderings of ἐπισκέπτεσθαι in the Greek Numbers tradition. It is only in chaps. 1–4 of Numbers (if we exclude 7:2, in which the variants were only marginal) that this variant fluctuation occurs; even Num 26 surprisingly lacks this variant. Never does ἁρπήμαται render ἐπισκέπτεσθαι within Vaticanus or Sinaiticus, while this does occur in Alexandrinus 12 times (from 2:4 to 3:22). As such, 803 is not alone in having this type of reading, although it is notably the only manuscript that has this kind of reading in Num 3:40. Skehan observed: “The practice is not that of the three later translators α’, α’ and θ’ . . . which should suffice to establish that the three worked regularly with forms related to ἐπισκέπτεσθαι.”

Concerning the dearth of instances in which the root of ἁρπήμαται was used as a rendering for ἐπισκέπτεσθαι throughout the entirety of G<sup>ed</sup>, Wevers states that “Ἀρπήμαται/Ἀρπήμαται are not normally used in LXX as renderings for ἐπισκέπτεσθαι” and that outside the Numbers variant tradition only four instances occur as such: 1 Chr 21:6; 2 Chr 17:14, 25:5, 26:11. As an aside, the 2 Chr 26:11 instance is noteworthy in that the semantic relationship between number and muster is portrayed in the Hebrew text: כִּמְסָר פִּסְמָר, “An army that goes out as a troop by the number of their mustering.” Wevers then points out how meager these 4 occurrences of ἁρπήμαται are when compared to 196 times in which ἐπισκέπτεσθαι is employed and then states, “It is obvious from this that ἐπισκέπτεσθαι was considered to be a standard equivalent for ἐπισκέπτεσθαι.”

Wevers concludes by stating:

As in the case of ἀρθρψα, so this variant seems to be rooted in the desire to clarify the Greek text. It is not the kind of variant which is more Hebraic than [Numbers of G<sup>ed</sup>] as would be expected from the so-called καίρυς recension; rather it is a variant clarifying a Hebraic kind of Greek by a more idiomatic text.
Wevers defines “idiomatic text” in this instance as a clearer, de-Semiticized translation. It clarifies both the Greek text and “a Hebraic kind of Greek.” This conclusion qualified and altered part of Skehan’s revised position: 803 did not just “conform both in quantity and in diction to [a text resembling MT],” because a purely conformist text does little to clarify.24

2.1.2. Ulrich’s Analysis on This Variant
Ulrich gives five arguments for why he considers the 803 variant to be a better representative of the OG. These arguments will be considered below, but it may be said from the start that Ulrich says little about Wevers’s observations on this variant, even though those observations constituted a thorough examination of the textual evidence. Thus, the number of times ἐπισκέπτεσθαι and ἀραθμεῖν rendered ἡσύχας in the textual tradition of Num 1–4, or even the many occurrences in Alexandrinus in which the ἀραθμεῖν variant occurs (as it does in 803), remain without comment.

Argument 1: A “rule of thumb” is appealed to, traced, according to Ulrich, to Lagarde, according to which “the freer rendering is (other things being equal) to be selected as the OG and the literal rendering is to be seen as secondary revision toward the MT.”25 The problem with this rule is that it does not take into account clarifying or stylistic revisional possibilities. Indeed, in the case of 803, Wevers had already concluded that it represented a “more idiomatic text,” as we saw above.

Argument 2: A clever point is made that the traditional name of the book, Ἀραθμοί, should be expected to derive “from occurrences of the word in the text.”26 Although this statement is true, it is incorrect to conclude that, therefore, the title must have been drawn from one of the instances in which the Hebrew text had ἡσύχας. No one has claimed that it is rare for the roots ἀραθμεῖν and ῥψ to occur in the Pentateuch; what has been argued is that it is rare for the root ἀραθμεῖν to render ἡσύχας. And thus Ulrich’s argument would only work if it could be shown that a form of the root ἀραθμεῖν is unlikely to have been selected for this book’s title, for whatever reason. With this said, it seems clear that the title Ἀραθμοί did indeed come from an occurrence of this word in the text, but the Hebrew word it rendered was not ἡσύχας. Given the practice of naming a book from an opening verse, it is quite likely that Num 1:2 was an inspiration for this title, where ”κατὰ ἀραθμίον ἢ ἡσύχας αὐτῶν” is rendered κατὰ ἀραθμοῖς ἡσύχας. The text is thus “Take a census . . . according to the number of their name(s).” It may be further noted that it is in the very next verse (1:3) that ἡσύχας occurs for the first time in Numbers: μετρήσετε ἁπαντὰς ἀραθμοῖς, “you shall number/muster them according to their armies,” which is rendered in Ged as ἐπισκέψασθε αὐτοῖς. It is notable that μετρήσετε (and, reflecting it, Ged’s ἀραθμοῖς) occurs in the text

26. Ibid.
before ἐπισκέπτεσθαι occurs, and thus ἐπισκέπτεσθαι and ἀριθμεῖν are given first place in the book of Numbers but at the dictation of the Hebrew text.

Argument 3: Ulrich speaks of ἐπισκέπτεσθαι becoming a recensional equivalent for ἐπισκέπτεσθαι, but he admits that “a principle of the recensionists was to choose one of the several OG precedents and [to] standardise it as the recensional equivalent.”

Besides this admission, why should we throw out the idea that the original LXX (OG) had its own standard equivalents? For instance, the fact that the noun ἐπίσκεψις is only used in Ἐδ to render a form of ἐπισκέπτεσθαι (e.g., ἑπισκέπτεσθαι and ἐπισκέπτεσθαι) speaks of a significant standard equivalent.

These same points apply to Ulrich’s fourth argument.

Argument 5: Ulrich’s last argument stems from the occurrence in 2 Sam 24:1–9 of both ἀριθμεῖν and ἐπισκέπτεσθαι. He argues that, because this passage is considered recensional, this double occurrence indicates that it somehow escaped revision and thus represents the OG and that this itself supports 801 as representing the OG in Numbers:

Insofar as this passage falls in a section usually considered recensional, the most logical explanation would be that the occurrences of both ἀριθμεῖν and ἐπισκέπτεσθαι together represent the OG unrevised in that passage, and that this in turn argues in favor of ἀριθμεῖν in 4QLXXNum as the OG revised in ᾲΒ.

There are a number of critical steps that Ulrich makes in this passage that are highly questionable. For one, Ulrich effectively states that a recensional passage could not have ἀριθμεῖν and ἐπισκέπτεσθαι occur together in the same passage, but this is simply not true (see the next paragraph below). But even if we were to concede this point, would not the fact that
Ulrich’s desired variant (which goes against the mainstream of standard equivalencies in Ged) occurred in a recensional passage provide one of the best reasons for rejecting that variant as representing the OG? This begs the question: based on what solid methodological principle can one excerpt passages that are thought to be recensional and proceed to classifying them as “unrevised”? But even if we were to concede this point as well, by what means does one variant in 2 Samuel tell us what the OG must be in the Pentateuch? It seems that Ulrich was already persuaded that almost all of Ged is a highly revised text. This would explain why he overlooked the hundreds of instances in Ged (and especially in the Pentateuch) that would argue against his position, while trumpeting this single passage as somehow representing the OG.

Notwithstanding these concerns, the occurrence of both ἀρθημένιν and ἐπισκέπτεσθαι in 2 Sam 24:1–9 is entirely insignificant—all that matters is precisely what Hebrew words were rendered by these two Greek words. What we find in this passage is the same expected standard equivalents: מָסַר is always rendered by ἐπισκέπτεσθαι, while other Hebrew words (יָדַע and רָפָא) are rendered by ἀρθημένιν:

24:2: τὸν καὶ ἐπισκέπτεσθαι τὸν λαόν
24:4: τὸν, ἐπισκέπτεσθαι τὸν λαόν
24:1: ἔριθησαν τὸν Ἰσραήλ, ἀρθημένιν τὸν Ἰσραήλ
24:10: καὶ τοῦ ὑποτάσσεται τὸν λαόν

So here we have an interesting occurrence in the Hebrew of not only two but three verbs for “count” (יָדַע, רָפָא, and מָסַר), and yet מָסַר is always rendered in the Septuagint by ἐπισκέπτεσθαι. Unless Ulrich had been implying that the Hebrew of the MT calls for emendation, then we can see that the occurrence of ἀρθημένιν and ἐπισκέπτεσθαι flowed directly from the Hebrew in perfect accord with the standard equivalencies. The only fluctuation that matters is the translation of מָסַר by any word other than ἐπισκέπτεσθαι, which does not occur in 2 Sam 24.

2.1.3. Conclusion
For Ulrich’s argument to be considered viable, we must address why Vaticanus never has a מָסַר/ἀρθημένιν equivalent other than what occurs in Chronicles. Was this codex thoroughly revised on this point, with every מָסַר/ἀρθημένιν equivalent smoothed over and revised? It makes more sense to see 803 as “a variant clarifying a Hebraic kind of Greek.”

2.2. Numbers 4:6: 803 col. II 18

[αἰτήσας] τοῖς ἄναφους Ged; רב MT. Equivalent ἄρτηρ/ἄναφος variants for רב in Num 4:8, 11. Num 4:12: ἐπί ἄναφους Ged; על קמות MT

2.2.1. Ulrich’s Analysis and the Question of Stylistic Revisions

In this second major variant in 803, the poles of the ark (םיידב), or its carrying frame (םייד), are rendered four times by the rare word עזרה. The arguments that Ulrich offers for the primacy of 803 again revolve around recensio nal/revisional considerations.

1) Although sporadic revision certainly occurred in the interests of clearer Greek in specific cases, Symmachus is our only ancient example of systematic recension for clearer Greek, and even he retains a large measure of Hebrew recensional material. 2) More importantly, עזרה is clearly used as a recensional substitute: Aquila uses it but never עזר for רב.32

As for Ulrich’s second point, he has done nothing to prove that עזרה is a recensional substitute, for we can only claim knowledge of “substitutes” after we have evidence of an earlier word or usage that then began to be substituted. As for Aquila (and whatever preceded him), the fact that he too employs עזרה is only significant if it can be shown why this might seem unlikely. Even a radical, literalistic reviser such as Aquila can still be called a reviser—he was still influenced by the OG that preceded him, chiefly when the LXX did not transgress his principles. Concerning Ulrich’s first point, it must be proved that revision toward clearer Greek was only “sporadic.” That clarifying revisions of this sort occurred, however, is precisely what we are arguing for in 803. Concerning Symmachus and the claim that he “is our only ancient example of systematic recension for clearer Greek,” “systematic recension” is an unnecessary, or at least problematic, qualification to make when applied to texts as early as 803. As for instances of idiomatic Greek, it is well known that the Antiochian(Lucianic) recension follows a principle of stylistic improvement. More important is that the proto-Lucianic revision “also has a stylistic component that tends to improve the Greek of the translation.”33

2.2.2. The Overall Provenance of These Texts

Discussion of whether or not stylistic concerns played a role in these early Greek translations from Qumran inevitably brings one to ponder what Greek biblical translations were doing at Qumran and in Judea in the first place.34 The real problem implicit in this question can be posed as follows:

33. Natalio Fernández Marcos, The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Versions of the Bible (trans. Wilfred G. E. Watson; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 248. Regardless of how divided scholarly opinion is on the issue of “proto-Lucianic” texts, that some of these early texts have demonstrated stylistic tendencies has bearing on this question.
34. The parchments themselves may inform us of something with regard to their overall provenance. The statement that “Frg. 7 [of 4QLXXNum] seems to betray that the manuscript had been ruled and that the scribe, in the Hebrew style, suspended the letters from the lines” must work into our considerations (Skehan, Ulrich, and Sanderson, Qumran Cave 4.IV, 187). This observation was significant enough for Skehan that he placed fragment 7 at the top margin of col. II (Skehan, “4QLXXNum,” 45). If this fragment can be shown to have been ruled as such
Was Greek in sufficient usage in these locales to explain a find such as this? To this we may answer that evidence has been gathering for some time now that Greek was indeed used by a significant portion of its inhabitants (before 70). Thus, Joseph Fitzmyer wrote concerning the ossuary inscriptions in the vicinity of Jerusalem:

In several cases the Greek inscriptions on these ossuaries have outnumbered those in Aramaic or Hebrew, and it is unlikely that the language chosen for most of these crudely incised identifications was merely the *lingua franca* of the day. Rather, they bear witness to the widespread and living use of Greek and Roman names by many of them in this period.35

One of the most striking finds in this regard was the Theodotus inscription in Jerusalem.36 It is tempting, for heuristic purposes, to place 803 and 801 in the context of that synagogue. The first reason listed for the building of this synagogue was: *EIS AN\[AG\]N[Ω]\[Σ]\[I\]N NOMOU* (lines 4–5), “for the reading of the Torah.” We might imagine that, although the standard LXX was read on the Shabbat in their services, some were not satisfied with the lower style of the LXX and pined for a more stylistic text to read on other days of the week, such as 4QLXXLev⁵ seems to represent. Whatever the case may be, the fact that Greek Scriptures were found in Judea or Galilee should not be so surprising. To the contrary, the pervasive use of Greek in both domestic and religious settings in this time and region should make the find of 4QLXXLev⁵ and 4QLXXNum in early-first-century Judea quite fitting.

2.2.3. Analysis of Ἀριθμός

Ἀριθμός is a rare word, never occurring in Philo or Josephus and only once in Ge⁶ at Neh 4:11.37 Wevers observes that the formation of this word is and if the letters were suspended “in the Hebrew style,” some implications follow: The most natural of these is that this text’s providence was from somewhere in Israel, which is what made it possible for the translator to be influenced by Hebraic scribal practices. Fragment 7 of 803 is quite small, however, and so Skehan’s observations need to be validated on this point.

35. Joseph Fitzmyer, “The Languages of Palestine in the First Century A.D.,” in *A Wandering Aramean: Collected Aramaic Essays* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1979), 35(–38). Lee Levine places the number of Greek ossuary inscriptions in Jerusalem (including the bilingual ones) at approximately 37 percent of those found and states: “Since most of these inscriptions were found on ossuaries and sarcophagi, primarily for the practical purpose of identification, it is likely that the families and relatives of the interred were most familiar with the Greek language” (Lee I. Levine, *Judaism and Hellenism in Antiquity: Conflict or Confluence?* [Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1998], 76). See also Tov, “Nature of the Greek Texts,” 9, for the conclusion (although this regards a later time) that “Greek was in active use in all sites in the Judean Desert.”

36. Though we could have surmised that there were some significant bodies of Greek-speaking Jews in Jerusalem from some of Luke’s indications, such as Acts 6:1: ἐγένετο γονατισμὸς τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαίῳ κατά τόν Ἐβραίον.

37. A search on this was done, as with many other searches represented below, with the morphologically tagged texts of Philo (based on *The Philo Concordance Database* [ed. Peder Borgen, Kåre Fuglseth, and Roald Skarsten, 2005]) and Josephus as they appear in BibleWorks 7.
The -τηρ suffix was commonly used in Hellenistic Greek for names of utensils (this was already true in Attic Greek), and so the meaning 'instrument for carrying' was perfectly clear. It is Wevers’s contention that ‘the reviser felt ἀναφορεῖς was an agent noun, i.e. a carrier’ rather than the means of carrying; in fact, in v. 12 the [Ged] text could easily be interpreted as referring to the bearers instead of the carrying staves. If this suggestion is accepted, it would then present good evidence that 803 had both the Hebrew text and the OG (represented in this case by Ged) before him. By use of ἄρτηρ—an object for lifting—the reviser would better communicate the Hebrew to the reader while removing the possibility of an agent understanding (a problem that arose from the Greek translation).

For this point to be valid, however, one thing first needs to be demonstrated with regard to this suffix. Although it can have an instrumental meaning, nouns formed from the -τηρ suffix can also in fact represent an agent, as Smyth states: “2. δότηρ giver . . . [in LXX, only δότης, n.p.], σωτήρ savior (ἀγ. Ἶσω).” Consider also Smyth 863 a. 3: “7. τηρ: primary, to denote the agent (839 a. 2), often regarded as the instrument: ἡστηρ hammer . . . ἄρτηρ ladle.” If the main intent of 803 in employing ἄρτηρ was to make clearer the instrumental meaning of this noun over against a possible agent meaning (as we are arguing with Wevers), then this issue must be addressed. For even if the -τηρ suffix were to refer (let us say) half of the time to instruments, its employment would hardly clarify anything because an agent use would still be just as possible. According to my search, the nouns formed with the -τηρ suffix in Ged can be split into the following three groups. Of the instrumental objects, it becomes obvious that cultic objects dominate, and thus the division that follows:

1. -τηρ suffix nouns representing cultic objects (although some of these can also have a noncultic usage): ἄναλημπτήρ, διωτήρ, ἐπαρυστήρ, καλυπτήρ, κλιμακτήρ, λουτήρ, μωζητήρ, ποδιστήρ, σφαιροτήρ, ύπογυτήρ, ψυκτήρ, ψωμιτήρ
2. -τηρ suffix nouns representing noncultic objects: ὄνυγστήρ, ἄρτηρ (Neh 4:11), ἀστήρ, φωστήρ, γαστήρ, λαμπτήρ, μυκτήρ
3. -τηρ suffix nouns representing human agents: σωτήρ, ἄρτηρ

The word σωτήρ itself is authentic to Classical Greek (e.g., LS: h.Hom. 2:5 — σ. τῆς, Ἐλλάδας). Given this survey, it becomes evident that (a) the

39. Ibid., 236*–37*.
41. The words παρσύρ, μῆτηρ, and θεοφάτηρ are not, as it may seem, -τηρ suffix nouns. These are rather stems that end in -τη in -τηρ when a vowel precedes (thus, ἄνωτηρ is of the same class), although the vowel is lengthened in the nominative. The genitive of true -τηρ suffix nouns keeps the long η throughout (thus σωτηρός, opposite θεοφάτερος, or contracted θεοφάτος).
agent usage in the LXX is hardly substantial and (b) the instrumental usage is dominated by cultic objects. If 803’s intent was to avoid an agent meaning, he would have succeeded in using a -τηρ suffix noun such as ἄρτηρ, at least as we can judge from Ged.

In addition to this point made by Wevers, we may also see a reaction to Ged by 803’s word choice. There is little doubt that the reviser would have had a number of other equivalencies he could have used for רָב and וּשָׁן. In fact, we have preserved for us two other Greek words that were used to translate רָב in Ged (all in the Pentateuch): δεώστηρ, occurring five times in Exod 38–40, and σκυτάλη, occurring twice in Exod 30:4, 5. All of these concern the same poles of the ark, as in 30:4, τὸ ἱλαστήριον τῆς κομάντας καὶ τὰς σκυτάλας ὡστε αἱρεῖν αὐτὸ ἐν ἀφταις. Neither of these words has the meaning “lifting” or “bearing” in its root, just as רָב lacks any meaning of this sort. Yet if we derive ἄρτηρ from ἄρω (i.e., aorist stem ἄρω-), and if we also adopt Wevers’s understanding of the -τηρ suffix as representing an object, then a clear semantic connection appears between Ged’s substantive use of the root ἀναφέρειν and 803’s substantive use of ἄρω. This last word is, of course, defined as “to lift, raise up.”

The question is was this rare word chosen (over against the other already-occurring options) due to influence of Ged’s ἀναφέρειν, so that the meaning “lift up” in ἀναφέρειν was maintained? One conclusion of this article is that 803 was significantly influenced by the septuagintal text. If this is an accurate assessment, then it would not be surprising for 803 to have been influenced by Ged’s ἀναφέρειν.

2.3. Revisions toward the MT in 4QLXXNum

Concerning the two other variants that Ulrich addressed in 803, Ged departs from the MT in both instances, while 803 reflects the MT in at least one of them. Concerning the second of these (καὶ τὰ ση[. . .]), Wevers states that Skehan’s restoration “is fully possible” and that “if correct [it] is a better rendering for the fourth item; it would then be a correction towards the Hebrew,” even though we cannot be sure of this restoration. On the other hand, the οὐκ ἐκνεῦτην[ν] variant is a certain instance in which 803 reads with MT against Ged. Ulrich says of these two instances: “It is impossible to decide with the evidence available” which text better represents the OG. To me, it looks like 803 tends to revise toward the Hebrew. Besides these two variants, however, there are a number of other instances (these were already noted by Wevers) in which 803 presented a reading in unison with MT opposite Ged.

42. LSJ s.v.
44. Wevers, “An Early Revision,” 236.
2.3.1. Numbers 3:42: 803 col. I 10

According to the reconstructed text, 803 contains \textit{αυτοι}, rendering \textit{ταοι}.\textsuperscript{46} Ged does nothing to render this word. It should be noted that the reconstructed text in DJD has a lacuna in the brackets immediately before \textit{αυτοι}, which indicates the divine name (not preserved in 803), not restorational uncertainty. If \textit{κυριος} was used, the letter count to this line would be 29.\textsuperscript{47} Taking into consideration that the MT of 3:42 is not complex, the restoration of \textit{αυτοι} at this point is hard to avoid. As such, it forms an important instance of a reading that is closer to the MT over against Ged.

2.3.2. Numbers 4:7: 803 col. II 21

The reconstruction of lines 20b–21 follow: «\textit{\(\text{line 20b}\) . . . \text{има}\textit{\(\text{line 21}\)} \text{на влкунг ик}}\textit{\(\text{line 21}\)} [\textit{non kai dwsousin} \textit{ap a\textsubscript{thn} trubli}.}» Rahlfs 803 remarkably restores the verb that was left unaccounted for in Ged corresponding to \textit{Wntnw}. The letter count with \textit{dwsousin} is 29. \textit{α\textsubscript{thn}} likely requires a verb preceding it. This is another warranted reconstruction that shows 803 to be closer to MT than is Ged.

2.3.3. Numbers 4:12: 803 col. III 10

Rahlfs 803 renders \textit{Wntnw} (of \textit{tlkt dgbAla} \textit{Wntnw}) with \textit{και qh\textsubscript{5}ousin} instead of Ged's \textit{ejmbalou\textsubscript{5}}. Wevers rightly calls this “a literalism, particularly in view of the \textit{ε\textsubscript{5}π\textsubscript{5}ν} construction which follows the verb.”\textsuperscript{49}

2.3.4. Numbers 4:12: 803 col. III 13

This instance should be added to Wevers's category “Lexical and Syntactical Revisions in 803 towards MT.” In 4:6, 8, and 11, Ged rendered \textit{\(\text{τα вд хот} \text{тв\textsubscript{5}}\)} with \textit{και θασου\textsubscript{5}ιν} instead of Ged's \textit{ε\textsubscript{5}μβαλο\textsubscript{5}ιν}. Wevers rightly calls this “a literalism, particularly in view of the \textit{ε\textsubscript{5}π\textsubscript{5}ν} construction which follows the verb.”\textsuperscript{49}

\textsuperscript{46} See Wevers, “An Early Revision,” 235*.
\textsuperscript{47} The letter count of lines 7–13 in this column is as follows (the restored \textit{αυτοι} is in line 7, here underlined): 30, 33, 32, 29, 28, 30, 32. It should be noted that the 33-letter count of line 8 is exceptional: although even a 34-letter count occurs in the larger col. II, according to my count, there never is a 33 or even a 32 count there, and even the 34-letter count has only one certain letter preserved (line 31 of frag. 14, which also comes at the end of that column). Thus, a 27(–28)-letter count and a 32–34-letter count are on the fringe.
\textsuperscript{48} See ibid.
\textsuperscript{49} Ibid., 236*.
\textsuperscript{50} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{51} To our misfortune, Ged has two substantial variants in Num 4:13–14 that narrowly escaped preservation in the fragmentary remains of 803. (1) Ged significantly deviates from the MT at Num 4:13, where \textit{δια} is radically changed to \textit{και των καλου\textsubscript{5}ηρα}
2.4. Concluding Remarks on 803

It may be concluded that a concern of this author was that his text be intelligible in the target language (Greek). This necessitated that some of the more egregious standard equivalents be abandoned. Despite this concern for clarity, the author still seems to have adhered closely to his base scriptural texts, and this resulted in a number of literalistic renderings. Furthermore, even when he abandoned a standard equivalent, his alternative translation did not go far beyond the meaning implicit in the base text. As an example of his concern for clarity, we may cite the ἀρνητικοί variants, in which 803's desire to more accurately communicate the Hebrew text's רוח (which is not an agent-noun), and thus to avoid Ged's ἀναφορέως (which can easily be interpreted as an agent), shows the translator's clarifying the text when compared with Ged. Of course, the most significant variant illustrating this clarifying concern was the rendering of יַרְשָׁ by ἀρνητικοί instead of by ἐποκέπασθη. This Semiticism must have been a jarring one for a Greek speaker to hear, much less to understand, and so 803's variant is easily understood as a clarification of the text. Opposite these clarifying tendencies, we have seen that 803 can still be quite literalistic. One instance of this would be the reading in Num 4:12 (§2.3.3 above), where 803 used θηροσονίν for τῇ, instead of Ged's ἔμμαθεπιστ. Ἐμμαθέπιστ sounds better in Greek and is more picturesque, but a literal rendering was still chosen. This translator was also deeply affected by the LXX, and so he often followed it even when it did not literally follow the MT (see p. 493 n. 55 and p. 509 n. 94).

As for Ulrich's proposal that a variant Hebrew Vorlage may underlie 4QLXXNum, it is clear that 803 offers no such evidence, and in fact, the opposite case should be made. The evidence presented in §2.3 above makes it clear that 803 frequently reads closer to the MT than does Ged. We may conclude, then, that Skehan was correct when he stated that 803 does not “underlie the form presented in later Septuagint codices” but is rather “a considerable reworking of the original LXX to make it conform both in quantity and in diction to a Hebrew consonantal text nearly indistinguishable . . . from

...
that of MT.”52 Wevers’s work refined this view by showing that 803 exhibits a concern for clearer Greek as well, and as such the translator’s intent was not just with “mak[ing] it conform,” in a rigid manner, to the Hebrew text. Nonetheless, the research just offered has only confirmed the two primary conclusions given by Skehan: (a) 4QLXXNum is a “considerable reworking” of the OG. It is in no small part a revisionary text; (b) 4QLXXNum’s underlying Vorlage was “indistinguishable . . . from that of MT.”

4QLXXLEVA

3.1. Leviticus 26:4: 801 3

[kai δοῦσαι τον αυτὸν τῷ γνηματα αὐτῆς καὶ τῷ γνηματα αὐτῆς καὶ ταξιδεύον αυτῶν] [και δοσω τον uJeto;n uJm∂n ejn kairåÅ aujtouÅ; Rahlfs 801 reads (hyper-literally): “the rains to your land” (i.e., in a possessive sense) as opposed to Gεδ’s “the rains to you” (i.e., your rains). The difference is what possesses the rains. In 801, it is the “land’s rain,” while the land itself is possessed by the people. Rahlfs 801’s reading is not without precedent, as Ulrich points out: “4QLXXLeva can be seen as a free translation of the sense of the same Hebrew. Occurrences, however, such as . . . in the similar list of covenant blessings in Deut 28:12, demonstrate that 4QLXXLeva could also be reflecting more literally a different Hebrew Vorlage.”53 There are in fact three occurrences of ηρημ in the MT, all of which occur within Deuteronomy: 11:14, 28:12, and 28:24. Furthermore, there are four occurrences in the MT in which a syntactic construction similar to ηρημ occurs (i.e., [τώ ή άλλα χρηματα] + [μεταίχο] or [μεταήχο]); Lev 26:4; Ezek 22:24, 34:26; and Zech 10:1. Given the frequent similarity in language or thought between Leviticus and Ezekiel, the fact that two of these four occurrences appear in Ezekiel is worthy of mention. We may conclude that Ulrich’s suggestion that a different Hebrew Vorlage underlies 801 in this instance is possible in terms of Hebrew usage, although both positions find equal support in this regard.54

3.2. Leviticus 26:4: 801 3–4

[kai η γη δοσαι τα γενηματα αυτης καὶ τον ηρημ ηρημ και τα ξωαι τον πεωιν αποδοσει τον θαρπν αυτων] [και η γη δοσαι τα γενηματα αυτης και η γη δοσει τα γενηματα αυτης και τα θαρπν τον πεωιν άποδοσει τον θαρπν αυτων Gεδ;; ΣαμΠ]

52. Skehan, “4QLXXNum,” 39, emphases mine.
54. Wevers’s response to Ulrich was “I am, however, as a general rule, chary of retroversions [to a different Hebrew Vorlage] without any extant remains” (Notes, 438). It may be noted here that this variant was mistakenly listed in Notes as [τ]ης [γης; instead of [τ]ης [γη (ibid.).
55. Fortunately, the preliminarily published reading of this variant (δολον εν και) was corrected after examination of the infrared photograph and reinspection of the manuscript (Skehan, Ulrich, and Sanderson, Qumran Cave 4.IV, 163).
According to Ulrich, this variant should be read as “arboreal fruit.”\(^56\) Wevers renders this unusual phrase as follows: “If 801 did read τὸν ξύλινον καρπὸν it would mean ‘the wooden fruit,’ and then by extension fruit wooden in source, i.e., ‘tree fruit.’”\(^57\) Ulrich considered this variant to be one of four (and now one of six) primary instances supporting his conclusions.\(^58\) As will be demonstrated below, I believe that, to the contrary, this variant stands as one of the prime examples in 801 of idiomatic revision.

3.2.1. Usage of ξύλινος in Greek

The word ξύλινος has two basic usages as is clear from LSJ.\(^59\) The first use is defined as “of wood, wooden.” Herodotus (\textit{Hist.}) uses ξύλινος in this sense at 4:108, where he speaks of wooden houses (οἰκία ξύλινα), “wooden shrines” (νησίσι ξύλινασι), and so on. This usage is not idiomatic; a literal and straightforward translation of this into other languages produces no problem. The second usage is listed as “ὁ ξύλινος καρπός—produce of trees, i.e. fruit, wine, or oil, opp. ξηρός . . . Str.15.1.20: pl., ξ. καρποί, opp. σιτικοί, Id.5.4.2, cf. D.S.3.63” (emphasis mine). In the last passage cited for Strabo (5.4.2), he speaks of the Picentine country (next to the Alps, he says), of which he states τὴν χώραν, ἀγαθὴν πρὸς ἀπαντα, βελτίω ἔκ τοῖς ξύλινοις καρποῖς ἥ τοῖς σιτικοῖς, “the country, [which] is good for every (use), although it is better for tree produce than it is for grain [produce].” Here we see ξύλινος (as an adjective) modifying its noun, in contrastive parallel to σιτικός (as an adjective) modifying the same noun (i.e., σιτικοῖς [καρποῖς]).

Synonymous with the usage of σιτικός just given is ξηρός (as in the entry above). In the LSJ entry on ξύλινος, we see this adjective paired with καρπός: “καρπός ξηρός, i.e., cereal, opp. κ. ξύλινος, produce of trees, i.e. fruit, wine, or oil, ξ. χόρος hay . . . ξηροί καρποί, opp. οἶνος, ἔλαιον.”

After the analysis given above, it becomes clear that the phrase ξύλινος καρπός is a Greek idiom that serves to differentiate between two basic types of produce. First, there is the produce that comes from trees (but also from wood in general, to include a vine). This type of produce is a liquid, such as wine or oil. Second, there is produce that derives from plants that grow straight from the ground, such as corn or wheat, and that contrarily constitute a dry produce. This phrase can be called an idiom inasmuch as the technical expression is unique to Greek: Hebrew speakers, just as with English speakers, do not talk of “tree-ish fruit,” or “wooden fruit,” although the concept (opposite the linguistic expression) may or may not be familiar to those groups.

\(^{56}\) Ulrich, “Septuagint Manuscripts,” 54.
\(^{57}\) Wevers, \textit{Notes}, 438.
\(^{58}\) Ulrich, “Septuagint Manuscripts,” 75–76.
\(^{59}\) Though these usages are not numbered separately, being as they are within the first paragraph of the LSJ entry (entry #1), it is clear that they are presented as discrete usages.
3.2.2. Usage of ξυλίνος in the LXX and Ulrich’s Argument on This Variant

An analysis of the occurrences of ξυλίνος throughout G\textsuperscript{ed} confirms the adequacy of the entry on this word in the Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint.\textsuperscript{60} That entry lists “of wood, wooden Lev 11:32; of a tree Lev 27:30; growing on trees Sir 22:16; τὰ ξύληνα trees, Deut 28:42; θεοί ξύλινοι wooden images of gods, wooden idols LTJer 3.” Two basic usages are thus described: (1) the basic adjectival use (= LSJ usage #1) and (2) a substantival use of the adjective (i.e., τὰ ξύληνα, trees). The important point is that LSJ usage #2 is never attested in G\textsuperscript{ed}. As for ξυλίνος and καρπὸς occurring in conjunction in G\textsuperscript{ed}, this happens only at Lev 27:30 and in the Apocrypha at 1 Macc 10:30. We will look at these references further below, but it may first be added that the only place in Philo where ξύλινος and καρπὸς occur in conjunction is in Congr. 1:95, where Philo happens to be citing Lev 27:30: πᾶσα γὰρ φυτεύμα τὸν ἀπὸ τῶν σπάρματος καὶ τῶν καρπῶν τοῦ ξύλινου ἐστὶν ἄγιον τῷ κυρίῳ. Thus, Philo reproduces the critical phrase of Lev 27:30 verbatim with the G\textsuperscript{ed} reading. Because Ulrich’s argument largely depends on reference to Lev 27:30 (see immediately below), this precise citation by Philo is noteworthy.

Ulrich not only thinks 801’s reading better represents the OG, but he also thinks that 801’s ξυλίνος καρπὸν may reflect a different Hebrew Vorlage: “With regard to the Hebrew Vorlage, the similar phrase τοῦ καρποῦ τοῦ ξύλινου = ‘עָ֫נָ֫ו נִמְס’ in the next chapter (Lev 27:30) shows that 4QLXXLev\textsuperscript{a} may perhaps depend upon a slightly different Hebrew text,” in which case “G\textsuperscript{ed} is probably the result of a revision toward the MT.”\textsuperscript{61} If the scroll is original, 801 may “possibly [be] a literal reflection of a different Hebrew Vorlage.”\textsuperscript{62} Ulrich commits to this position further (than is indicated by “perhaps”) by listing this variant as one of four (and later six) that he thinks best support 801 as representing the OG.

As for Ulrich’s suggestion that 801’s variant reading “may perhaps depend upon a slightly different Hebrew text,” it is notable that Ulrich never explicitly proposes what a variant Hebrew reading of this sort would have been—does Ulrich mean to suggest that the reading of MT at Lev 27:30 represents the presumed parent text of 801? But even if this is the suggestion (it is hard to imagine what else could be), 801’s ξύλινος καρπὸς is hardly a straightforward translation of ὁ γάρ τὸν νῦν. We would rather expect one of the following: (a) exactly what G\textsuperscript{ed} has for this in 27:30: ὁ τοῦ σπάρματος τῆς γῆς καὶ τοῦ καρποῦ τοῦ ξύλινου, where ξύλινος is used substantively, (b) καὶ τοῦ καρποῦ τοῦ ξύλου, with the noun τὸ ξύλον, or (c) καὶ τοῦ καρποῦ τοῦ δέντρου, with the noun τὸ δέντρον.

\textsuperscript{60} Johan Lust, Erik Eynikel, and Katrin Hauspie, Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint (rev. ed.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2003).
\textsuperscript{61} Ulrich, “Septuagint Manuscripts,” 54.
\textsuperscript{62} Ibid.
In summary, the following four points show Ulrich’s appeal to Lev 27:30 as failing to support his conclusions: (1) an adequate proposal for a parent text of 801’s variant is difficult to suggest; (2) the use of ἔξολον in 801 is not comparable to the substantival use of ἔξολον in Lev 27:30, to which Ulrich makes a comparison; and (3) Ged’s translation of Lev 27:30 is what we would expect to render the Hebrew, not 801’s reading. Although the use of a noun such as τὸ ἔξολον or τὸ δέντρον may occur more frequently, the substantival use of ἔξολον is not unusual. Last of all, (4) the close proximity of Lev 27:30 (which provides one of only two instances throughout Ged in which ἔξολον and καρπὸς occur in conjunction) with Lev 26:4 is explained by considerations of the expression “fruit of” (i.e., the close proximity of these passages is due to the Hebrew text itself).

Concerning the last point, the expression “fruit of” occurs a number of times throughout Ged, such as in Gen 3:3, יָדַעְתִּי עֵץ אַשֵּׁר בָּאַרְנָן. Yet this expression is only one of a number of these “fruit of” expressions. We also have: “fruit of the earth (תַּחְנוֹן),” “fruit of the land (רֹאשׁ),” and even “fruit of the womb.” The following is a list of all expressions of this sort: Gen 3:3; 4:3; Exod 10:15; Lev 27:30; Num 13:20, 26; Deut 1:25; 26:2, 10; Ps 127:3; Isa 4:2; Jer 7:20; Ezek 36:30; Mal 3:11. Given the spread of these occurrences (noting especially those in the Pentateuch), we would expect there to have been one or two “fruit of” expressions represented in Leviticus. That the topic of Lev 27 is votive offerings and tithes made it a prime place in fact for an occurrence of this expression.

Concerning points 2 and 3 (and in continuation of what was said earlier concerning ἔξολον in the LXX), a listing of the occurrences of ἔξολον in the Pentateuch may be illustrative: Lev 11:32, 15:12, 26:30, 27:30; Num 31:20, 35:18; Deut 10:1, 28:42. Looking at these pentateuchal instances, we find 5 adjectival uses of ἔξολον (e.g., “wooden vessel”; Lev 11:32, 15:12; Num 31:20, 35:18; Deut 10:1) and 3 substantival uses (e.g., “a tree”; Lev 26:30, 27:30; Deut 10:1). It may also be noted that the translator of Leviticus in the Ged text makes use of this word half of all the times it occurs in the Pentateuch, making its occurrence in Lev 27 less noteworthy.

3.2.3. 1 Maccabees and Josephus
As we have seen, 1 Macc 10:30 attests the only occurrence of ἔξολον and καρπὸς in conjunction in the Apocrypha. The speaker of 1 Macc 10:30 is Demetrius the Seleucid king:

καὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ τρίτου τῆς σπορᾶς καὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἡμίσους τοῦ καρποῦ τοῦ ἔξολου τοῦ ἐπιβάλλοντος μοι λαβεῖν ἄφημι ἀπὸ τῆς στίμης... 

And instead of collecting the third of the grain and the half of the fruit of the tree that I should receive, I release them from this day and...

The key phrase here is identical with that of Lev 27:30, and both are substantival usages of ἔξολον. This letter is preserved elsewhere by Josephus,
but his text varies in some notable ways from that of 1 Maccabees. Jewish Antiquities 13:49 reads:

καὶ ἀντὶ τῶν τρίτων τοῦ καρποῦ καὶ τοῦ ἡμίσους τοῦ ξυλίνου καρποῦ, τὸ γινόμενον ἕμοι μέρος, ὑμῖν ἀφίμη ἀπὸ τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας.

And instead of the third of the produce and the half of the tree produce,
I dismiss you this day from the portion which is due to me.

In Josephus's reworking of this text, it is likely that he has recovered for us the original Greek idiom of this phrase. As for 1 Maccabees, however, the Greek usages in King Demetrius's letter were most likely lost in their translation into Hebrew and were not then recovered in their retroversion back into Greek.63 As such, it is not surprising to find that 1 Maccabees reads τοῦ καρποῦ τοῦ ξυλίνου, which reflects the Hebraic נְפָרָן (exactly as in Lev 27:30). Even so, the conception expressed in this passage, where a third of the dry produce (ζηρὸς καρπός[]) is pitted against the half of the tree produce, correlates with the classic example of LSJ usage #2. This opposing between the two kinds of produce perfectly corresponds to the usage we saw earlier in Strabo. Because the Greek expression (which is our main concern) could not exist in Hebrew ("the wooden-fruit," "המר נטע!"), it naturally was rendered to reflect a more customary נְפָרָן, which correlates to similar expressions we have seen above (e.g., נְפָרָן רן). Nevertheless, it would appear that Josephus would not do with this Hebraic retroversion, and so he restored the Greek expression: “ἡμίσους τοῦ ξυλίνου καρποῦ.”

3.2.4. Conclusion
The Hebrew of Lev 26:4 (עֲשֵׂה הַגְּדֹל הַשָּׁרוֹן) was faithfully rendered by Ged with καὶ τὰ ξύλα τῶν πεδίων ἀποδόσει τῶν καρπῶν αὐτῶν. What otherwise looked to be an odd rendering in 801, “κἀ̃ τὸν ξύλινον καρπὸν . . .” is explained by the existence of this Greek idiom. The translator of 801 obviously felt no need to give a word-for-word translation but was rather more interested in rendering the biblical text into good Greek. Josephus appears to have performed the same revision at a later time. This variant constitutes significant evidence that 4QLXXLev is best understood in terms of revision in the direction of Greek idiomatic style.

3.3. Leviticus 26:8: 801 12
καὶ διοῖσθαι πεντε ὡμον εκ[(ατον . . .)] ἐκ ὡμον πέντε Ged; הַשְּׁמֵשׁ הָבָכֶת MT, SamP

63. This scenario follows standardly accepted views, and thus “the Greek documents are retroversions, not the verbatim transmitted originals” in 1 Maccabees (Thomas Fischer, “First and Second Maccabees,” in The Anchor Bible Dictionary [ed. David Noel Freedman; 6 vols.; New York: Doubleday, 1996], 4:440).
“Five of you shall chase a hundred”

Ged quite literally reflects the MT here. The Hebrew syntax poignantly contrasts the small number of Israelites who will vanquish their many numbered foes with the construction in the MT, the force of the syntax is contained in its immediate juxtaposition of *five* and *hundred*, with no intermediate words. In this manner, it is not just *five* that is stressed but *five* in its comparison to a *hundred*, making the *five* seem all the more remarkable (an unstressed syntax would simply have had *hundred*). In precisely following the MT's syntax, Ged maintains the same syntactic poignancy of the MT (but with a loss of clarity). Rahlfs 801, however, opts for the clearer reading, as Wevers comments: “What is surprising is that more copyists did not do so [i.e., read like 801], since it is an obvious improvement in style over [septuagintal Leviticus]. In fact, only the larger context makes clear that it is not ‘five-hundred of you that will pursue,’ but rather that ‘five will pursue a hundred’ that is intended.”

Ulrich asks: “Is a variant Hebrew Vorlage for the scroll’s reading likely? It is possible, but there is no reason to suppose so.” Even though Ulrich did not accept that possibility, it seems to me that we can be confident in rejecting the possibility that a variant Vorlage underlies 801. We have already noted the force of the Hebrew syntax, but even further, the whole verse forms a chiasm, with the verb *παρακατέβησαν* being in the first and last position and *προς* being at the end of stich one and the beginning of stich two. The construction of the MT is forceful and poetic, and as such, a Vorlage that reads like 801 would present an inferior reading.

There may be a testimony to the Septuagint’s reading in Philo, *Praem.* 94:

Φιλός γὰρ ἀντιμαχόμενοι προσπαθεῖν πρὸς πεν-τῶν ἑκατοντάδων καὶ πρὸς ἑκατοντάδων μιριάδων.

For having been confronted by a might (i.e., an army) stronger than theirs, a hundred shall flee headlong away from five, and from a hundred (shall) ten thousand (flee).

Philo was obviously putting this into his own words (as usual), and thus the object of the scriptural text is the subject in Philo’s text (which fit the Philonic context)—the 100 and then the 10,000 enemies are for him the subject. What is significant is that it seems Philo was attempting to keep the same order as we have it in Ged, where no gap exists between the *five* and the *hundred* (the key words have been underlined). However, we cannot be certain about this, because Ged and the MT do not have the immediate juxtaposition in stich two, as Philo does, nor does Philo repeat the verb in stich two (making this harder to assess). Nonetheless, I think this citation deserves consideration when examining this variant.

64. Wevers, *Notes*, 440, emphasis mine.
3.4. Leviticus 26:9: 801 15

καὶ ἐστὶν μοι ἡ διαθήκη εἰς ὑμᾶς καὶ στήσω τὴν διαθήκην μου μεθ' ὑμῶν

3.4.1. Expressions in the MT with הָרִיב and an Analysis of Variant Vorlage Proposals

As was the case in §3.2 above, this translator once again demonstrates his willingness to rework the text quite radically. The MT and G ed read identically in having God as the subject who declares: “I shall establish my covenant.” In 801, it is instead the covenant (ἡ διαθήκη) that is the subject. Ulrich has proposed what is probably the best argument that can be made for making 801 reflect a Vorlage at variance with the MT. In this scenario, it would be the Hebrew Vorlage itself that gave rise to 801’s variant translation. Ulrich suggests: “the scroll’s reading probably reflects a Hebrew not far from רָבדה אֲחַרְמֵךְ וּרְאֵהוּ הָרִיב וְהָבִיתוֹ (cf. Ezek 37:26) or רָבדִי אֲחַרְמֵךְ וְהָבִיתוֹ.” These proposals will be examined below, and we may begin by considering the following. The Hebrew covenantal language most often speaks of either cutting a covenant (זרוק) or of setting up (_keyboard:ками) a covenant, although there are many other expressions, such as to enter (בוא) a covenant, to give (≧תנ) a covenant, or to break (❖▌מ) a covenant. The expressions with הָרִיב are especially numerous. With these points in mind, we may consider the second of Ulrich’s Hebrew Vorlage proposals: רָבדִי אֲחַרְמֵךְ, that is, “And my covenant [shall be] with you.” There is no problem with הָרִיב acting as a subject in the MT (as 801 has it). On the other hand, it turns out that only rarely is a covenant simply said to be with (‒) someone, that is, when הָרִיב occurs in conjunction with ‒ as a particle preposition “with,” not the direct object marker) without a corresponding verb (such as those listed above and excluding the verb to be, stated or implied). Simply put, only rarely do we see something like “A covenant shall be with you,” as opposed to “I shall raise/cut a covenant with you.” Our passage (Lev 26:9) is a good example of the typical construction; or consider Exod 34:27: יָרֵד לְפָנָי אֲדֹנָי אֲבָרָחָם.

Within the Pentateuch there are 16 (relevant) occurrences with הָרִיב and ‒ (homonym #2) in conjunction: Gen 6:18; 9:9, 11; 15:18; 17:4, 19, 21; (Exod 2:24);67 6:4; 34:27; Lev 26:9, 44; Deut 5:3; 28:69 2x; 29:13; 31:16.68 Out

66. Ibid.
67. In the Exod 2:24 instance (יָרֵד לְפָנָי אֲדֹנָי אֲבָרָחָם אֲבָרָחָם אֲבָרָחָם אֲבָרָחָם), the main clause states that God remembered the covenant (as a direct object); what follows is the equivalent of a truncated relative clause in which either expression could be implied (i.e., with the typical verb [e.g., יָרֵד] or with the copulative usage [e.g., a covenant is]). As such, the passage could read “Thus God remembered his covenant [‘that was with’ or ‘that he cut with’] Abraham.” Exodus 2:24 as such cannot be listed for either option.
68. It should be noted that this search was done in BibleWorks 7, which is based on the Groves-Wheeler Westminster Theological Seminary Hebrew Morphology (WT) database. Despite this database’s high degree of accuracy, it is not entirely without errors, and this holds especially true for homonyms, and even more so for ‒ (!). Thus, the Ezek 37:26 instance...
of these, there is only one instance where a verb of this sort is absent, Gen 17:4: אָיִן הָיָה יְהֹוָה אֶלֶךָ. Even there, however, the full phraseology had just been used two verses prior (with הָיָהוּ). Following is the same search throughout the rest of the Bible:

With verb: Judg 2:1; 2 Sam 3:12, 13, 21; 1 Kgs 15:19; 2 Kgs 17:15, 35, 38; 2 Chr 16:3; Isa 28:15, 18; Jer 11:10; 14:21; 31:31, 32 (2×), 33; 33:21; 34:8, 13; Ezek 16:8, 60 (2×), 62; 17:13, 16; Zech 11:10

Without verb: Isa 59:21; Ezek 30:5; 37:26; Mal 2:4, 5

The two notable instances in the group without a verb are the two occurring in Malachi:

Mal 2:4: לֹא חָלָתוּ בְּרִית אֲלֵיהֶם, “so that my covenant may be with Levi” (nrsv: “That my covenant with Levi may hold”)

Mal 2:5: בְּרִיתָהּ בָּרוּ הָאָמָם לְמַאָרֵי יְהוָה, “My covenant was with him, [my covenant, that is,] of life and of peace, and I gave them to him [for the sake of] fear, and he did [indeed] fear me.”

It is notable that the Mal 2:5 occurrence (ברית היהת אמת) forms a kind of mix between Ulrich's two suggested readings, the second of those being בְּרִיתָה הָאָמָם. This shows that the best reading would probably be (to argue the case with Ulrich for the moment) בְּרִיתָה הָאָמָם, which Ulrich posited to fit 801's וּכְנֹם יְבֹעָל. I exclude בְּרִיתָה הָאָמָם because of the seven verses in which וּכְנֹם and בְּרִית occur together in the MT, a construction such as this never occurs, where a בְּרִית is said to be in the midst (בִּתְבוּאָת בְּרִית) of something or someone. The typical Hebrew terminology, as we have already seen in abundance, uses לא in conjunction with בְּרִית, not מִכֹּל בְּרִית.

Concerning Ulrich's first suggestion, the reference to Ezek 37:26 is not really appropriate with respect to בְּרִית לְמַאָרֵי יְהוָה. Ezekiel 37:26 reads: צַלְמֹת צְלֹם עֹלֶם הָאָדָם הָאָדָם וְאָדָם הָאָדָם וְאָדָם הָאָדָם וְאָדָם הָאָדָם. The only thing that will be “in your midst” (i.e., וְכַנְו יִבּוּא) is the mikdash, not the covenant. However, this verse is one of the five listed above that would

mentioned below is incorrectly tagged as homonym #1 in the WT database. As for the degree to which the WT database may be lacking with regard to this homonym, Abraham Even-Shoshan's A New Concordance of the Bible (Jerusalem: Kibbutz Gezer, 1985) lists 938 occurrences of homonym #2 against WT's 888 occurrences—which is 50 short of Even-Shoshan's count. For the pentateuchal instances just listed, I checked all the occurrences of וְכַנְו and הָא (regardless of homonym listing), and so this list should be complete, but the same has not been done for the search throughout the Bible that follows.

69. There is some uncertainty in a number of cases. For instance, I excluded 2 Kgs 13:23 (לֹא בְּרִית וְכַנְו). Instances in which the covenantal expression is dictated by prepositions (such as וְכַנְו) are best treated distinctly (unlikely is וְכַנְו רָיִשׁ אֶרֶץ אֲבָרֶם). Although Isa 59:21 (וְכַנְו אֲדָם אֲדָם) has been included, the lack of the verb here is also due to the secondary nature of the clause (as the immediate use of the colon in the nrsv demonstrates); so implied may be וְכַנְו אֲדָם אֲדָם. The Ezek 30:5 instance is not so applicable here as well. Opposite these instances are the two in Malachi that constitute full-fledged, copulative usages (without the other verbs).
provide credibility to Ulrich’s suggested variant Vorlage reading because it is said that “a covenant shall be with you” (without the common verb such as תָּרֵךְ being employed). Nevertheless, as we have already noted with the only construction of this sort that appears in the Pentateuch (Gen 17:4), this instance in Ezekiel was also immediately preceded by the standard usage (where a תָּרֵךְ was said to be cut or set up). In fact, the “eternal covenant” in the first clause of Ezek 37:26 stands parallel to the “covenant of peace” of the second clause. As such, the fact that the first covenant was cut has bearing on the second covenant.

Concerning Ged’s rendering of μηκτή with μεθ’ ὑπονόον, Wevers points out that Genesis uses πρὸς for this in 6:18, 9:11, and 17:21. 70 This rendering in Leviticus is then explained as reflecting “the much more isolate type of translation found in [Leviticus of Ged].” 71 On 801’s placement of μου in μου η διάθηκη, Wevers notably attributes this to style: “The difference in word order is common in Hellenistic Greek, but in the Greek of LXX it is much more unusual. The change is probably stylistic.” 72

3.4.2. Conclusion

Ulrich’s proposed Hebrew Vorlage behind 801 is not impossible: something like יְהוָה יְהֹוִי בְּרֶשֶׁת אֲמֵן would not be without precedent. Nevertheless, the weight of the evidence makes a reading of this sort unlikely. To judge from the Pentateuch, the odds would be one to 15 in favor of the MT’s reading (not to mention that this one occurrence in Genesis was immediately preceded by the standard usage, as we have noted). It seems more likely that 801, faced as it was with the difficulties of translating the Hebrew covenantal language, simply chose to present a more intelligible Greek text. More than that, however, 801 exhibits in this variant a willingness to significantly reshape the received text by altering what was the original subject and object of the sentence. At the end of each variant Ulrich gives conclusions based on whether (a) Ged represents the original Greek or (b) the scroll is original. In this case, Ulrich states “If Ged is original,” then among other possibilities 801 may be “a revision for style or theological nuance, or an error.” 73 I think the most likely possibility is precisely the former, that 801 represents “a revision for style or theological nuance.” 74

70. Wevers, Notes, 441.
71. Ibid. On this point, Wevers states that “compared to Gen and Exod, Lev is much more isolate than contextual in character,” and he defines isolate: “A purely ‘isolate’ translation would simply be a word for word set of equivalences for Hebrew lexemes in the Greek with little regard for the context in which such were used” (ibid., ix).
72. Ibid. (emphasis mine), where this variant is mistakenly listed as “[μο]υ την διαθήκην.”
74. The Lev 26:12 variant that immediately follows this variant (καὶ εἰσοχθεῖ ὡς ἐθέως;) may represent a similar theological nuance, as Ulrich himself admits (ibid., 60). In addition, the former variant at Lev 26:10, εἰσοχθεῖ μετὰ τῶν νεοφ, likely represents a stylistic variant, of which Wevers states: “I suspect that the copyist was trying to improve the text” (Notes, 442). We also see that, in the immediately preceding clause, Ged renders ἵνα πληρωθῇ μετὰ τῶν νεοφ with an expansive καὶ παλαιὰ παλαιῶν, which looks to be a Semitic-styled superlative. If we go with the
3.5. Leviticus 26:11: 801 1, 17

καὶ ὁ βασιλεύσας ὁμᾶς καὶ ἐσοφ[αὶ ὑμῖν θεοὶ] καὶ ὁ βασιλεύσας ἡ ψυχὴ ὑμῶν ὡμᾶς Ἡρῴδης ἔστη τῆς θάνατος ΜΤ

The conclusion we have taken with the last considered variant (§3.4) will be taken here as well: it is not impossible to accept 801's reading ("I shall abhor," rather than "my soul shall abhor") as stemming from a different Hebrew Vorlage, but it is unlikely. It is much easier to accept that 801, in wrestling with this exclusively Semitic expression, opted to render it into a more acceptable Greek, just as many modern English translations do (e.g., RSV, NIV). Ulrich states "Both readings occur in both Hebrew and Greek," and he goes on to cite Amos 6:8 (which does not have the nepeś usage, and thus it supports 801's reading), and Ps 107:18 (which has the nepeś usage, and thus it supports the MT and G\textsuperscript{ed}). He concludes: "so it is difficult to decide whether the difference is here due to Vorlage, style, or theological influence."\textsuperscript{75} There is a critical problem with this analysis, however: the only verb Ulrich analyzes (with Amos 6:8 and Ps 107:18) happens to be a different verb (בָּשָׂם) from what occurs in Lev 26:11 (גָּנֶל)! To posit that 801's underlying text had some verb synonymous to גָּנֶל is worth consideration, but (1) Ulrich did not state that he was exchanging these verbs with this point in mind, and (2) Ulrich's suggested Vorlage reading still ends up being from גָּנֶל, not from בָּשָׂם: "If the scroll is original . . . then it is probably a translation from a Hebrew text such as גָּנֶל.\textsuperscript{76}"

Some points with regard to בָּשָׂם should be considered so as to judge how fitting it is as a proposed Hebrew variant. Throughout the Bible, this verb occurs in 20 different verses (21 counting Amos 6:8), while only 2 of these occur in the Pentateuch, which are both in Deuteronomy (7:26, 23:8). Out of these 20 or so occurrences, only once does בָּשָׂם take נֶפֶס as a subject: Ps 107:18.\textsuperscript{77} These points cast doubt on the aptness of considering בָּשָׂם as a viable replacement for גָּנֶל, because (1) this verb only occurs twice in the Pentateuch (only in Deuteronomy) opposite a more frequent occurrence outside of the Pentateuch (18 times), and (2) the fact that this replacement verb only rarely takes נֶפֶס as a subject (if at all, see n. 83 below)

restored text (which cannot fit 16 extra letters here), it appears that 801 chose simply to omit any rendering of בָּשָׂם. The result is a simpler and clearer reading.

\textsuperscript{75} Ulrich, “Septuagint Manuscripts,” 59.  
\textsuperscript{76} Ibid., emphasis mine.  
\textsuperscript{77} Unfortunately, this casts even more doubt on Ulrich's analysis. If we assume for the moment that בָּשָׂם was the pertinent verb in this passage, Ulrich indicates that בָּשָׂם takes נֶפֶס as a subject the same number of times as it does not. It is on this basis that he concludes that this variant could support either position. However, as was just indicated, out of the 20 or so occurrences of this verb in the Bible, it only takes נֶפֶס as a subject this one time, in Ps 107:18. But even here, this psalm is characterized by making the soul the subject (the soul fainted; the hungry soul; the soul abhored food; the soul melted), which means that this verb is never uniquely associated with this “soul usage” (no more than the verb נָחַל is). The implication is that, if בָּשָׂם had been the verb in Lev 26:11, it would have overwhelmingly supported Ulrich's case. So why did he make the matter out to be equivocal?
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would make its employment an instance of fitting the evidence to one's desired outcome, meaning that, although a replacement of this sort cannot be ruled out, neither can much of anything be proved from this.

Let us now consider לָהַע. This verb occurs eight times in the Qal, once in the Niphal, and once in the Hiphil. In the eight occurrences in the Qal, five are within this very chapter! These occurrences are Lev 26:11, 15, 30, 43, 44; Jer 14:19; Ezek 16:45 (2×). It would thus be untenable to suggest that לָהַע be replaced with מֵאָב in v. 11 without suggesting the same throughout the chapter. What immediately attracts our attention is the fivefold occurrence in Lev 26. One must wonder why Ulrich did not point this out in his analysis. Most important is that, in the first four of the five occurrences of לָהַע in this chapter, the MT contains the Semitic expression "(my) soul shall (not) abhor." Furthermore, Ĝed exactly follows the MT in every case. Nonetheless, in the fifth and last occurrence of this verb, the idiom (with its use of נֵפֶס) is not employed: לָהַעַמִּית לְאָבֵן לָכִּי לְמַעַר בִּי מַחְצָמַת "But I will not loathe them (so far as) to totally destroy them, breaking (thereby) my covenant with them" (v. 44). It is for this reason that we cannot fully rule out the suggestion that לָהַע may have appeared here without נֵפֶס as a subject. Nonetheless, the evidence is against it. The fourfold occurrence with נֵפֶס makes for a clear refrain repeated throughout the passage: v. 11: וְנֵפֶס נַפְשִׁי נַפְשִׁי v. 15: וְאַיָּה גִּיא נַפְשִׁי נַפְשִׁי v. 30: וְאַיָּה גִּיא נַפְשִׁי נַפְשִׁי v. 43: וְאַיָּה גִּיא נַפְשִׁי נַפְשִׁי.

The fact that Ĝed consistently rendered with the MT in all five of these cases, departing from the idiomatic usage only in the single instance in which the MT itself did not use the idiom, clearly shows that Ĝed had an identical Vorlage to that of the MT. Further, this shows that one of the points Ulrich mentioned should be excluded: "If Ĝed is original, then it is a literal reflection of a text like the MT or possibly a free translation of a text with לָהַע." 78

With regard to the fact that both Ĝed and 801 render לָהַע with βασιλείσσωμαι here, Wevers states that "somewhat more appropriate would have been προσογήθω which occurs for this verb at vv. 15, 20, 43, 44." 79 It may be considered that the (Ĝed) translator’s love of variation, as Wevers has pointed out, is at work here, but whatever the case may be, it is notable that 801 also employs this somewhat less-than-appropriate verb.

3.5.1. Conclusion

One of the surest tests of whether a translation is idiomatic is if it adequately smooths over Semiticisms. We are fortunate, then, to have had this passage preserved. After having witnessed the accentuated idiomatic tendencies of this translator, it should come as no surprise to see that he transformed this passage into acceptable Greek. There should be little question of an alternative Hebrew text being at the source of 801’s reading. Rather,

78. Ibid., emphasis mine.
79. Wevers, Notes, 442.
801 was simply smoothing over this Semitic expression. It should also not be overlooked that the MT, the Hebrew text used by Ged (as we have shown), and the Samaritan Pentateuch all agree here.

3.6. Leviticus 26:12: 801 18

καὶ ἦμετερος ἔσασθαι μοι εἰθν[ος . . ]] καὶ ἦμετερος ἔσασθαι μοι λαός Ged, ἔλαττον τελεῖν λείπον; MT, SamP, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔσονται μοι λαός 2 Cor 6:16

3.6.1. The ἔθνος/Λαός Variant in the LXX

It is rare for ἔθνος to render λαός in the manuscript tradition when Israel is the subject. Ulrich shows that this does happen, however, “at least once in Leviticus (19:16),” to which can be added 20:2, and 21:1.80 Even in these three instances, it should be noted that they do not represent the more dignified connotations that were associated with this word (i.e., “The People of God”). Thus, when ἔθνος renders λαός in 20:2, we read: λαός ἐν ἀνθρώποις (who are to stone a worshiper of Molech), and in 21:1, ἐνθαρρυνόμενοι λαός (where the people are associated with something negative again, a dead person, as was also the case in 19:16, a slanderer). This contextual pattern thus provides an explanation for what seemed exceptional.

Besides these few instances, we must not lose sight of the preponderance of the reverse identification. From Lev 19–27, the formal identification between ἔθνος and λαός occurs in 19:8, 18; 20:3, 5, 6; 21:4, 15; 23:29, 30; 26:12; and in the rest of Leviticus (chaps. 1–18) approximately 20 other times, for a total of approximately 30 identifications of this sort in Leviticus alone. In addition, the context of this particular verse makes it about the last place in which we would expect ἔθνος to be rendered by ἔθνος: ἐλαττομός γίνεται τίς ἐστιν ἐν ἀνθρώποις (I shall be unto you a God, and you shall be unto me a people), where Israel is specially highlighted in their role as the people of God.

3.6.2. Ulrich and Wevers’s Analyses

Ulrich argues that 801 represents the OG in this variant, saying “it is very difficult to imagine ἔθνος being substituted—intentionally or in error—for an original λαός.”81 Wevers was later convinced of this point, as he states:

Unfortunately, λαός can also be called into question. . . . MT reads λαός, which is rendered elsewhere in the book by λαός six times, but by ἔθνος five times (though three times referring to foreign nations). Either is acceptable, but since 801 is so much older its reading ought to be adopted, all other matters being equal. I would now read ἔθνος.82

Wevers was obviously not overwhelmingly convinced on this point. For instance, he states that “either is acceptable,” and he speaks of “all other matters being equal.” It seems, however, that an error was made, and this

81. Ibid., 61.
82. Wevers, Notes, 443.
may have affected Wevers’s decision: he is right in saying that ἤθνως renders ἸΣ five times in Leviticus; however, his statement that “ἸΣ . . . is rendered elsewhere in the book by λαῶς six times” must be an error. We have seen that this number should be in the 30s, a far cry from six. Now clearly Wevers was aware of this basic equivalency, as can be seen even in the same work where he states, “The usual LXX rendering for ἸΣ is λαῶς (1621 times) or ἤθνως (159 times).”83 Nevertheless, to judge by his words here, Wevers seems to have been under the impression that the renderings of ἸΣ in Leviticus were roughly split between λαῶς and ἤθνως (5 to 6).

With regard to the main point made by Ulrich (that it is “difficult to imagine ἤθνως being substituted”), I admit that this looks to be an aporia. Nonetheless, I would first call to mind that it is 801 that contains the irregular reading, while the other texts (MT, Gst) all look fully legitimate. Furthermore, while 801 has no variants to support it, a Greek text as early as 2 Cor 6:16 supports Gst. Last of all, the ἸΣ/λαῶς identification is an exemplum of the standard equivalents in the LXX; anyone wishing to assign this and other standard equivalents to later revisionistic tendencies will encounter some great difficulties in upholding that position.84

3.6.3. ἤθνως and λαῶς in Other Jewish-Hellenistic Works
As was indicated previously, I believe there is a likely explanation for this variant. According to this explanation, the author of 801 could have penned ἤθνως in his translation, even though he read λαῶς in the standard septuagintal text and ἸΣ in his Hebrew text. In a number of Jewish-Hellenistic works, the word ἤθνως, although often carrying a pejorative sense (i.e., “heathen”), could also refer to the Jewish nation in a glorified sense as well (i.e., parallel to λαῶς). Our survey here will be of “1–4 Maccabees.”85

In 1 Maccabees, the first two chapters (our test sample for the immediate comparison) witness 8 occurrences of λαῶς and 16 occurrences of ἤθνως. In every case (minus perhaps one or two ambiguous instances), λαῶς refers to the people of Israel, and ἤθνως refers to the Gentiles. This fact alone shows that there is a strong and early basis for the septuagintal identification (or standard equivalent) that is witnessed to throughout Gst. This is especially significant because it shows that this semantic sensibility was not just a literary or translational one as it is represented in this historical work. One insightful instance that reveals the semantic difference that was perceived to exist between these two words is 1 Macc 2:67–68. The speaker is the dying Mattathias:

83. Ibid., xxi.
84. See the discussion on standard equivalents in §§2.1.2 and 2.1.3 above.
85. The first two works should probably bear greater significance because they are early and native to Israel, although I would personally place 3 Maccabees in an early period as well. 4 Maccabees is later, dating approximately to the first half of the first century A.D. (certainly pre-70, with Bickermann). It must be stressed that we are dealing with four completely distinct works; the misnomer “1–4 Maccabees” is an unfortunate nuisance.
2:67: καὶ ἐκδίκησατε ἐκδίκησιν τοῦ λαοῦ ὑμῶν, “And you [the fellows of Judas Maccabeus] shall take vengeance for your people.”

2:68: ἀνταπόδοσε ἀνταπόδομα τῶν θίνασιν καὶ προσέχετε εἰς πρόστασιμα τοῦ νόμου, “Pay back the due-payment to the Gentiles, and pay heed to the commandments of the Law!”

Thus, we have (if I may put it loosely): “Avenge our laos! But pay back those ethnos!” Despite this clear-cut pattern, the nation of Israel could still be called an ethnos in a glorified fashion by both foreigners (8:23, 10:20) and themselves (11:21, 14:29):

8:23: καὶ ὅ χάνει Ἑρώται καὶ τῷ ἔθνει Ἰσραὴλ, “May all go well with the Romans and with the Nation of the Jews.”

10:20: καὶ τὸν καθιστάχαμεν σε σήμερον ἀρχαρέα τοῦ ἔθνους σου, “So then we have set you up today as the High Priest of your nation.”

11:21: καὶ ἐπορευθησάν τινες μισούντες τὸ ἔθνος αὐτῶν ἀνδρεῖς, “But certain men went out because they hated their nation [Israel].”

14:29: καὶ δόξης μεγάλη ἐδύσασαν τῷ ἔθνος αὐτῶν, “[Simon and others] . . . and they glorified their nation [Israel] with great glory.”

In 2 Maccabees, laos is only used to refer to the nation of Israel. A high view of the nation is always expressed in these instances, as we see in 1:26: ὑπὲρ παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ σου Ἰσραὴλ. Most pertinent to our discussion, however, are the numerous instances in which ἔθνος refers to the Nation of Israel:

5:19: ἄλλοι δὲ τὸν τόπον τὸ ἔθνος ἄλλα διὰ τὸ ἔθνος τὸν τόπον ὁ κύριος ἐξελέξατο, “But it was not on behalf of the place that [the Lord] chose the nation, but, rather it was on behalf of the nation that the Lord chose the place.”

7:37: πνεῦμα προδίδομα περὶ τῶν πατρίων νόμων ἐπικαλοῦμενος τὸν θεὸν ἔλεος ταχύ τῷ ἔθνος γενέσθαι, “I deliver my life on behalf of the ancestral laws, beseeching God that he swiftly be merciful to the nation.”

These instances present a very high view of the term ἔθνος for the author of 2 Maccabees and thus for his time and place. The ethnos is in fact said to be of greater preeminence than the temple (5:19). See also 5:20, 6:31, 10:8, 11:27, 14:34.

The same thing can be said about 3 Maccabees. See for instance 1:11, 2:27, and 2:33, the last of which reads καὶ ὃς πολέμιος τοῦ ἔθνος ἔκρινον, “And they [the resolute Jews] considered [the Jewish traitors] to be enemies of the nation.” 4 Maccabees has only one occurrence of λαὸς (which again refers to Israel). This stands in contrast to 17 instances of ἔθνος. Most all of these refer to Israel. Here is a selection of these occurrences from the beginning and the end of the book: 1:11; 3:7; 4:1; 15:29; 16:16; 17:8; 20; 18:4. In 15:29, the mother of the seven sons is glorified in the following terms: ὅ μητρ ἔθνους, ἔκδικε τοῦ νόμου, “Oh mother of the nation, vindicator of the law.”

86. This is a beautifully expressed sentiment—we can detect that the author put much feeling into this point.
3.7. Conclusions on the "Ethνος Variant and on 801 in General

Given the fact that the term ἐθνος was frequently employed in an elevated sense (parallel to λαός) throughout the Judeo-Hellenistic literature, it would not be surprising if our translator used ἐθνος for Ἰ in Lev 26:12. A translator who (a) shows some degree of concern for idiom and (b) is not overly concerned with this and other standard equivalencies could reasonably make a translation such as this. Indeed, in 1 Maccabees we see that the Jewish nation (τὸ ἐθνὸς) had already been “glorified with great glory,” and the author of 2 Maccabees was of the mind that the “beth-mikdash” itself was secondary in preeminence to this same ethnos. Concerning 4QLXXLevα as a whole, we have seen how this author sometimes radically transformed his base texts in order to produce a stylized translation. The τὸν ἔθνον καρπον passage (§3.2) and the [ἐσται μὲν ἡ διαθήκη ἐν μιᾷ] passage (§3.4) attest to this author’s (Greek) stylistic sensibilities and to his willingness to jettison the syntax of the parent text to this end. On a separate (but related) track, we have seen how 4QLXXLevα dealt with the Semiticisms that confronted him. In §3.3, 801 cleared up the less-than-intelligible syntax of both the MT and Ged (Ged, ἐξ ὧμων πίνετε ἐκκατόν). And in §3.4, our author’s solution to the Semitic covenantal language of the MT and the LXX was not only to sweep away the Hebraic expression but to rework the entire syntax in a creative fashion. Finally, 801 smoothed over the Semiticism with which it was confronted in §3.5, just like most modern translations do. The pattern thus becomes clear. 4QLXXLevα repeatedly upgraded the style of the OG that came before it, while smoothing over many of the Semiticisms or idiomatic difficulties it encountered.

4. Concluding Remarks

With regard to the overall placement of 4QLXXLevα and 4QLXXNum, it might be said that these revised translations were not primarily “conformist” in nature. Although they had two traditions to work with, the parent Hebrew text and the distinguished OG (likely in that order), the new translation must have intended to fill a void. In some cases, the purpose was to clarify either the Hebrew or the older Greek translation. In other cases, the purpose was to make stylistic or even Greek-idiomatic improvements to the text. The variants of 803 are best interpreted according to the first category: they primarily demonstrate a concern with clarification of (both) the received Hebrew and OG texts. Neither an idiomatic translation nor a rigidly literal correspondence to the parent Hebrew text was his primary concern.87 We have seen, nonetheless, that 803 still adhered somewhat closely to his base texts. As for 4QLXXLevα, this translator seems to have

87. One instance in which 803 has an addition to both the MT and Ged illustrates this point. In Num 4:7, 803 col. II 23, the MT simply has κοῦρων τῆς φωλικῆς τραπεζῆς, which the NRSV translates: “and the flagons for the drink offering.” Ged liberally adds κοῦρων τῆς σπονδείας ἐν ὧμοις κατέχοντοι. Rahlfs 803 apparently thought that even more clarification was needed than this(?!): “(line 22) . . . (line 23) [νοῦ σπονδείας ἐν ὧμοις κατέχοντοι ἐν ἐντόσες].” Like Wevers said, this was “quite unnecessary,” but it also shows how this translator was willing (a) to make an addition to what either the MT or
known Greek quite well. Many of the variants in this text seem to have been aimed at producing an impressionable Greek translation of Scripture. 88

As a final note, the number of instances in which 803 and 801 agree with the MT against Ged should not be disregarded. In the case of 4QLXXNum, Patrick Skehan (who knew this text as well as anyone has) had already concluded that 803’s underlying Vorlage was “indistinguishable . . . from that of MT.” The analysis given above has only confirmed that conclusion. 89

There is less to work with in this regard with 801, but the Lev 26:5–6 πολεμοῖς variant is notable, because instances of a scrambled sentence-clause order is the kind of thing we would expect to remain untouched by an idiomatic revision. 90

88. One omission made by 801 at Lev 26:3 may give one last demonstration of this translator’s stylistic concerns. Where the MT has μὴ μακραίων ἰσχύσαι taw, Ged accurately reflects the final clause with καὶ πολεμοῖς αὐτῶς. In Greek, as in English, this final clause sounds repetitive—the NIV simply omits it. It is obvious that our translator did the same, which made for “a shorter, superior reading” (Skehan, Ulrich, and Sanderson, Qumran Cave 4 IV, 163). Although this omission occurs in the restored text, 801’s line 2 simply has no room for 16 extra letters.

89. Skehan, “4QLXXNum,” 39. See §2.4 for more on this point.

90. Only shortly before the publication of this article did I discover that Emanuel Tov had offered an important analysis of these manuscripts: “The Greek Biblical Texts from the Judean Desert,” in The Bible as Book: The Transmission of the Greek Text (ed. Scot McKendrick and Orlaith A. O’Sullivan; London: British Library / Grand Haven: Oak Knoll, 2003). See pp. 106–10 for Tov’s analysis of 4QLXXLev and pp. 114–16 for the analysis of 4QLXXNum. Although this paper presents a fresh and comprehensive assessment of these documents (much of which will benefit all sides of this discussion), his conclusions are almost identical to his previous ones (see p. 484 above) and are basically the same as Ulrich’s conclusions (as Tov explicitly states, ibid., 120 n. 24). The possibility of there being clarifying or stylistic revisions seems to have been out of the question. The result of this is that all variants in these manuscripts that are not as literalistic as Ged are concluded to represent the OG. And yet even in one case in which 4QLXXNum has a literal rendering of the MT (πηγάζων, opposite Ged’s ἵππαλοντος; see §2.3.3), instead of recognizing this as a revision toward the MT, Tov surprisingly argues that “the unusual equivalent of 4QLXXNum may point to its original character” (ibid., 115). One important development occurs in Tov’s analysis of the 4QLXXLev χύνον καὶ (καρπον) variant, where Tov recognized that this phrase “is frequently used in secular Greek . . . and may therefore reflect a free rendering” (ibid., 109). As such, Tov recognized this possibility some years prior to the analysis offered above. Nonetheless, Tov then seems to have gone in a different direction by positing that this variant “probably reflects a Hebrew variant” (ibid.; this phrase is from the subheading under which this variant is placed). Last of all, one newer work that deals with 4QLXXLev should be cited here: John B. Faulkenberry Miller, “4QLXXLev and Proto-Septuagint Studies: Reassessing Qumran Evidence for the Urtext Theory,” in Qumran Studies (ed. Michael Thomas Davis and Brent A. Strawn; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 1–28. Although I disagree with Miller’s main argument (that the septuagintal texts from Qumran do not necessarily support de Lagarde’s Urtext theory), this paper is important because it throws a wrench into efforts to make Ged out to be a revisional document. See ibid., 20–24, and particularly Miller’s variant listings 1, 6, and 11 (more could be added to these). The problem that Miller raises is a significant one, but a simpler and more explanatory answer is found in positing that 4QLXXLev is a stylistic revision.