PROBLEMS AND PERSPECTIVES IN MODERN SEPTUAGINT RESEARCH

Isaac L. Seeligmann

In ancient times man conceived of world history as a gigantic contest between East and West. For the modern mind, East and West converge in European civilization. The conquest of Egypt and Asia Minor by Alexander the Great opened a decisive phase in the processes of elimination and absorption. The Hellenistic culture in these dominions shaped the Oriental content into a Western mold. Oriental mental and emotional life were forced to express themselves in Greek and thus found their way into European culture. No document has been of such far-reaching influence in this fusion of East and West as the translation of the Bible, the Septuagint: "das Buch, ohne das Christentum und abendländische Kultur undenkbar sind". Therefore a survey in this annual of the manifold problems which the LXX poses to the modern reader hardly needs any justification as it is the pre-em-
inent aim of *Ex Oriente Lux* to account for the contribution Eastern culture made to Western civilization.

In the maze of broad and narrow paths which seem to meet in the field of Septuagint studies, one can identify some starting points which define the ken of the researcher and determine the direction he is headed in. For many, the study of the LXX has the character of an ancillary science. The *Old Testament* scholar looks for reflections of old forms of the biblical text, of the pre-Massoretic pronunciation of the Hebrew language, or a reflection of the phase in Hebrew lexicography when the Hebrew-Aramaic was still the vernacular. The *New Testament* scholar discovers in the language of the LXX elements which elucidate the idiom of the New Testament, whereas in its content he finds the pre-history of religious concepts of early Christianity. Others pursue Septuagint studies for their own sake: the cultural historian is fascinated by the grappling of the translators with the difficulties which the earliest rendering of a Semitic book in a western language entail, while the results of these endeavors offer the scholar of history of religions a classical example of hermeneutic theology: a philosophy of life which orients itself towards the interpretation of a religious document. The scholar of Jewish history, on the other hand, will try by means of the LXX to reconstruct the type of Jewish Hellenistic exegesis of Alexandria, which he will set off through a comparison with contemporary Bible exegesis in Palestine. The Septuagint indeed merits a study in its own right even if we do not make it instrumental to the understanding of either Old or New Testament. The following survey aims at placing the various problems in Septuagint studies according to their actual importance, regardless of which field of research they originated in. It has been impossible to strive for completeness in citing modern literature. This attempt is original in as much as it deals with the question in how far the LXX reflects the new meaning the Bible had attained for the translators, in making its content appropriate to the prevailing circumstances and viewpoints of the community in the Hellenistic Jewish diaspora, as well as by transposing the religious concepts of the Bible into a Hellenistic atmosphere.

---

2I quote with satisfaction one of the theses appended to a Ph. D. dissertation which has recently been submitted to the University of Leiden, though it runs only partly parallel to our discussion: "Independent commentaries of the Septuagint are a desideratum, as a source of knowledge of Hellenistic Judaism and as the Bible of the ancient church," see: W. S. van Leeuwen, *Eirene in het Nieuwe Testament* (Wageningen 1940).
I The Septuagint in ancient tradition and evaluation

There are two possible ways of penetrating the secrets of the genesis and character of the LXX: the one is an external historical research of the ancient traditions about the Septuagint; the other — an internal, critical analysis of the text itself. As not uncommon in literary history in situations such as this, the second method can be of avail in refining the results attained by the first. We would recommend as an initial step to outline, at the hand of the historical material, a tentative general exposition, which may in turn offer points of contact with the questions to be dealt with in later paragraphs.

1. Jewish Hellenistic tradition

When the grandson of Jesus Sira wrote his prologue to the Greek translation of his grandfather’s book of proverbs – sometime after 116 B.C.E. according to Wilcken’s argumentation – he mentions an already circulating translation of the Torah, the Prophets and "the rest of the books". In addition to this actual datum we have a description of the genesis of the Septuagint in the letter attributed to Aristeas. In two articles, greatly diverse in exposition though much similar in their final conclusion, Bickermann and Momigliano have made it plausible that this piece of Jewish Hellenistic literature was written between 150 and 110 B.C.E. Thus it is not too distant in time from the events described therein, and depicts in a fairly accurate manner the administration, court-ceremonies and the like of the Ptolemies. Nevertheless, the document should not be regarded as

3The prologue, a fine sample of Jewish Hellenistic παιδεία καὶ σοφία, mentions the arrival of the author in Egypt ἐκ τοῦ Ἐφερήτου βασιλέως. In Hellenistic times, dates from the king’s lifetime were given in the genitivus only, whereas if the king had died there would be ἐκ τοῦ genitivus; thus the prologue was written after the death of Ptolemaeus Euergetes. See: U. Wilcken, Archiv für Papyrologie 3 (1906) 321.

3a[See now: M. Hadas, Aristeas to Philocrates (New York 1951) 86ff.]

4We can deal with only few of the problems concerning the 'Letter of Aristeas'. For an orientating summary more thorough than original see: H. G. Meecham, The Oldest Version of the Bible (London 1932). Lumbroso has pointed out a resemblance to the papyri which lends the 'Letter of Aristeas' a 'Schein von Wirklichkeit', see: G. Lumbroso, Recherches sur l'économie politique de l'Egypte sous les Lagides (Turin 1870). Cf. U. Wilcken, Philologus 53 (1894) III. Bickermann suggests a date between 145 and 127 on
reliable. There is manifold evidence that the content of this epistle cannot be accepted uncritically: the fact that its author, obviously being a Jew, passes himself off as a Greek; his naivety in speaking of twelve tribes in the days of Ptolemy Philadelphus; and last but not least, his ignorance in presenting Demetrius of Phaleron (345-283 B.C.E.), the protégé and advisor of Ptolemy Soter, as the librarian of Philadelphus (285-246 B.C.E.) when in reality he was exiled by him. However, the historical value of a source of this kind does not lie only in its authentic information, but mainly in its predominant tendency which discloses the values held by the author and his contemporaries. The Letter of Aristeas has been considered a noteworthy example of the widespread apologetic method of exalting the Torah to the Heathens in an appealing style.

The content of the book can be summarized as follows: Demetrius of Phaleron makes Ptolemy Philadelphus aware that in the famous royal library of Alexandria only highly defective translations of the Jewish Law obtain. At the king's request, the High Priest in Jerusalem sends seventy-two men of learning from Palestine commissioned to prepare a new translation of the Torah. The author of the Epistle passes himself off as one of the envoys sent to convey the king's request to the High Priest, and it is as such that he avails himself of the occasion to give a detailed description of Palestine, Jerusalem and the Temple. On arriv-

grounds of an epistolographic analysis of the fictitious documents included in the book as well as on the grounds of the historico-geographic conditions which are assumed in the descriptions of Palestine; see: E. Bickermann, "Zur Datierung des Pseudo-Aristeas," ZNW 29 (1930) 280-296. Momigliano takes the affinity between I Macc 10:37 and the Epistle 37 as a starting point: A. Momigliano, "Per la data e la caratteristica della lettera di Aristeas," Aegyptus 12 (1932) 161-172. H. Willrich, Judaica (Gottingen 1900) 111-130, has seen this affinity but misinterpreted it. Stein finds in the fact that in the comments on the Bible contained in the Letter of Aristeas, use is made of the symbolic method but not of the allegoric method – an indication that the Epistle was written before 100 B.C.E.; see: E. Stein, כֶּלֶל מקדֵּשׁ אֲשֶׁר בָּרָא, Zion 1 (1935) 129-147.

5See: W. L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem (Cambridge 1925) 25. Regarding the apologetic character see specially Stein (above, n. 4). In my opinion Momigliano (ibidem) has not succeeded in demonstrating that the tendency of the Epistle was against the Leontopolis schism. It seems that the Epistle is older than III Macc, see: E. Bickermann, Gymnos 5 (1929) 685. This fact contradicts Tracy’s assumption that the Epistle aims at a synthesis between Judaism and Hellenism by attempting to mollify the provocations of III Macc; see: S. Tracy, "III Maccabees and Pseudo Aristeas," Yale Classical Studies I (1928) 241-252.
ing in Alexandria, the wise men from Palestine are honored with a banquet at
which they display their sagacity and erudition by answering profoundly and
with wit the king's questions on themes of popular philosophy. After the feast,
they conclude their translation of the Torah in seventy-two days, a translation
which fills the king and the representatives of the Jewish community with
enthusiastic admiration. The representatives of the community sanction the trans-
lation, imprecating whoever dares to add or detract from, or to introduce any
change in it. Loaded with gifts, the wise men then leave the capital.

The description of the translation of the Torah does not take up more than one-
twentieth of the book; one-eighth is a description of Palestine as the ideal state,
and three-eighths depict the feast and the philosophical debates. "Hauptstück
und damit Ziel und Zweck des Ganzen ist die Symposion-Schilderung". Aristeas
couched his description of the translation of the Torah for the Alexandrian li-
brary in a topos favorite with Greek literature: the story of seven wise men ban-
queting with an ostentatious king. In the history of this genre the Letter of Aris-
teas stands as a transition between two literary methods: the linking together of
short apophthegmata on the one hand, and the recounting of long philosophical
debates on the other. The alertness, common sense and piety displayed here by
the Jewish wise men from Palestine constitute one of the most glorious triumphs
in the propaganda for Judaism. The author could not conceive of a more striking
proof of the excellence of the translation than the fact that King Ptolemy, patron
of learning, thought it worthy of being included in the famous library of Alex-
andria.

Josephus Flavius basically follows the version of the Epistle of Aristeas, re-
casting it only to suit his own apologetical trend. An outstanding witness to the
esteem in which the LXX was held by Hellenistic Judaism is Philo Judaeus. To
him the translation is the work of supernatural inspiration, and he tells of the

---

6 On the place of the Letter of Aristeas in the literary history of the 'symposium' genre
see: J. Martin, Symposion (Paderborn 1931) 266ff.; F. Dornseiff, Echtheitsfragen der antik-
griechischen Literatur (Berlin 1939) 69. Dornseiff assumed a crossing of Greek and oriental
motifs. To my mind, the story about the Tobides Hyrcanus at the Ptolemaic court
(Josephus, Antiquitates XII: 4,2, ed. Niese §§ 169ff), which Dornseiff quotes as a good par-
allel, has a Semitic origin.

7 Josephus, Antiquitates XII: 2 (ed. Niese §§ 111-118); cf. G. Stählin, "Josephus und der
Aristeasbrief," ThStK 102 (1930) 323-331.
yearly celebration held on the isle of Pharos – where the translation was prepared – commemorating its conclusion.\textsuperscript{8}

2. \textit{Rabbinic Tradition}

In rabbinic literature one reads what Aristeas told about the translation, though in a slightly different version. First, two versions are related side by side, one mentioning seventy-two translators, the other five. There may well be a certain connection between the two, as five is a recurrent figure in rabbinic sources since it denotes the number of members chosen as a commission from among the seventy-one members of the Great Sanhedrin. Besides this, we find here a motif lacking in Aristeas' account, but which seems already to have been known to Philo: the translators had been isolated in separate cells, yet their translations were identical. When we think of a committee of five there would be no reason to ridicule this motif. Its tendency in the Talmud differs completely from that in later Christian literature. King Ptolemy summons the wise men without informing them of his intentions. After having locked them into separate cells he commissions them with the preparing of a translation: "God then prompted each one of them and all conceived the same idea and wrote for him".\textsuperscript{9} Aristeas depicts king Ptolemy as an exemplary philosemitic; however, an attentive reading of the rabbinic tradition reveals that the king has the translation of the Torah made out of a suspicion that its content may endanger the State. He isolates the translators in order to ascertain the authenticity of their rendition. This motif is still reflected in the writings of Irenaeus, the first Christian author to mention the isolation of the translators. In the Arabic tradition, reproduced by Jossipon, the king threatens to put the translators to death in case of the slightest divergence in their translations. Al-Bir\üni (973-1048) relates, following a Jewish tradition current in

\textsuperscript{8}Philo, \textit{De Vita Mosis II}: 5-7 (CW, §§ 25-44).

\textsuperscript{9}B. \textit{Megilla 9a}; Y. \textit{Megilla} 1.9, 71d; Sopherim 1.7 e.a.; Aptowitzer attempts a literary-critical handling of this material explaining its historical tendency; see: V. Aptowitzer, "Die rabbinischen Berichte über die Entstehung der Septuaginta," \textit{Hakeden} 2 (1908) 11-27, 102-122; 3 (1909) 4-17; former literature on the subject is quoted there. It would be worthwhile to go into the inner correlation between the various rabbinic sources and their attitude towards the Jewish-Hellenistic tradition. Regarding the history of rabbinic evaluation of the Septuagint see in addition: M. Joel, \textit{Blicke in die Religionsgeschichte I} (Breslau-Leipzig 1880). This is a fascinating book, though not everywhere convincing.
his days, that the wise men had consented to translate only after having been threatened by the king. Even if, according to this original Palestinian version, Ptolemy’s motives differed greatly from those attributed to him by the Alexandrian version, offered by Aristeas, no doubt as to the very value of the translation is as yet expressed in the Palestinian form of the tradition. Criticism of the translation takes shape among the Jews only when it comes to light that in many instances the translation deviates from the Hebrew text as canonized in Palestine. This criticism leads to the undertaking of new Greek translations of the Bible which better conform with the biblical interpretation of Ptolemaic Judaism. The fact that the LXX becomes the authoritative Bible of the young Christian church all the more sustains Jewish opposition to this translation. It transpires that from the second or third century on, the Jews of Rome refrained from using on tombstones Bible quotes from the LXX, by now discredited as being Christian, and used Aquila’s translation instead.

Highly instructive is a Palestinian reflection from the second half of the fourth century when the Jewish-Christian polemic assumes vehement dimensions. In those days the Church stigmatizes the Jewish nation as ‘the rejected Israel’, laying claim to the title of ‘the true Israel’ for itself. “The Holy One, blessed be his name, foresaw that the gentiles would translate (in other locations one even reads ‘would falsify’) the Torah, read it in Greek and say: ‘We are the true Israel, we are God’s chosen children...’. The Arabic tradition of the Middle Ages still reflects clearly enough the diverging appraisals of the Greek translation: the negative attitude of the Jews and the positive one of the Christians.

11 A. Deissmann, in: N. Müller, N. A. Bees, Die Inschriften der Jüdischen Katakomben am Monteverde zu Rom (Leipzig 1919) 7, 108. The personalities and tendencies of the authors of later versions will not be dealt with here.
3. Christian Tradition

The acceptance of the LXX by the Christian church occurred very naively. The Old Testament was pre-eminently suitable – mainly so in the decennia prior to the composition of the New Testament – to command enlightened pagans into awe and admiration for monotheism. Obviously, only a Greek text could be considered for this purpose, and although by no means all the quotes were taken from the LXX, as will be seen below, this translation was quite soon authorized as the authentic Bible text. The church fathers held the Hebrew text to be falsified by the Jews, whereas the text of the LXX was considered divinely inspired. Irenaeus and Pseudo-Justinus are the first to propagate the argument that the concurrence of so many translations, prepared in isolation, could only be explained by inspiration.\(^{13}\)

The work of Origen no doubt originated in the onset of a critical awareness. About 240 C.E., in Caesarea, he compiled the so-called Hexapla in six columns, side by side: the Hebrew text in Hebrew characters, the Hebrew text transliterated into Greek characters, the translations of Aquila, Symmachus, the LXX and Theodotion. The aim of this edition was to enable the Christians to be aware of the interrelation between the LXX and the Hebrew text in their religious controversies with the Jews. Where he found the LXX lacking components extant in the Hebrew, he supplemented the missing elements, mainly adopted from the translation of Theodotion, marking the additions with an asteriskos. Elements found in the LXX but lacking in the Hebrew were marked by an obelos. Moreover, he replaced certain words by others, and changed the order of text elements. It stands to reason that a work of such scope never existed in more than one exemplar. Separately, however, Origen entered into circulation copies of the LXX which he had revised according to the Hebrew text. Jerome relates that Eusebius prepared an edition of this text which was used in Palestine, Lucian edited the text which governed the entire region between Antioch and Con-

stantinople, while Hesychius was responsible for the recension which circulated in Egypt. The immense esteem in which the church fathers held the LXX was liable eventually to lead to a misjudgment of Origen's intentions. The way Epiphanius and Rufinus represent the matter suggests that the sole purport of the Hexapla was to prove the authority of the LXX on the one hand, and the falsifications of the text by the Jews on the other. Only with Jerome did the work of Origen find a worthy continuation. Due to his aspiration to base his Latin translation upon the original Hebrew text, the LXX became but one among the existing Greek translations — all inferior to the Hebraica veritas. When, about 400 C.E., in the light of Christian views based on the New Testament, the Bible finds a new formulation in the Vulgate, Christianity emancipates itself from the LXX. Thus, the Septuagint, which had once been the new phase in Hellenistic Bible

---

14 On the remnants of Origen's work see n. 25. For the best survey of Origen and the recensions see: H. B. Swete, Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek (Cambridge 1914) 59-86. Origen gives an apologetic purpose for the compilation of the Hexapla in his Epistola ad Africanum § 5. In Halévy's opinion the main aim was a critical text improvement of the LXX; see: J. Halévy, "L'origine de la transcription du texte hébreu en caractères grecs dans les Hexapla d'Origène," JAs IX, 17 (1901). As against this Orlinsky believes that the design and arrangement of the versions in the Hexapla served to qualify it as a textbook for the study of the Hebrew (language); see: H. M. Orlinsky, "The Columnar order of the Hexapla," JQR NS 27 (1936) 137-149. Origen himself speaks about his work-methods: Origines ad Matth XV:14; cf. Eusebius, Historia Ecclesiastica VI:16; Hieronymus, Epistula 106 ad Sunniam et Fretelam 7; A. Rahlfis, Septuaginta Studien I (Göttingen 1904) 71-77. We cannot enter here the disputed question as to which was first, the Tetrapla or the Hexapla or vice versa; see recently: O. Procksch, "Tetraplarische Studien: ZAW 53 (1935) 240-269; 54 (1936) 61-90; H. M. Orlinsky, JBL 56 (1937) X. Procksch and Orlinsky are of the opinion that the Tetrapla is older; they base themselves upon the witness of Eusebius as well as upon inner-textual criteria. On the testimony of Eusebius see: E. Schwartz, GGN (1903) 692. This problem is in a way related to the question whether the Hexapla already contains a corrected edition of the LXX. See M. L. Margolis,"Hexapla and Hexaplaric," AJSL, 32 (1916) 126-140. Pretzl believes that the Tetrapla was younger than the Hexapla and contained a more thoroughly corrected edition of the LXX. See: O. Pretzl, "Septuagintaprobleme im Buch der Richter," Biblica 7 (1926) 233ff.; 353-383. Regarding the three recensions we have: Hieronymi testimonia vel tironibus nota (according to de Lagarde), and, among others, Praefatio paralipomenis praemissa.
translation is now, in turn, superseded by the next phase, that of Christian Bible translations.\textsuperscript{15}

\section*{II. The Text History of the Septuagint}

The interest in the text history of the LXX is rooted in the insight "dass die LXX nur in ihrer ursprünglichen gestalt zur kritik unserer masoretischen diaskeuse angewandt werden darf, wollen wir über den hebräischen text ins klare kommen, so gilt es zunächst die yrform der griechischen übersetzung zu finden."\textsuperscript{16} The great master of classical philology once declared as to the aspiration to reconstruct the original text of the LXX "dass es eine schwerere und darum schönere Aufgabe für die Textkritik überhaupt nicht gibt".\textsuperscript{17} Indeed, the endeavors of many scholars who devoted themselves to this task, have called into being a richly branched science, imbued with ensnaring problems.

Whoever wishes to give a survey of this field of studies will at once find himself facing great methodological problems, entailed by any attempt to view the text of the LXX as an isolated subject.

Gewiss hat die LXX ihre innere Geschichte durchgemacht. Aber die LXX ist in erster Linie als Übersetzung zu werten. Eine Übersetzung kann niemals losgelöst vom Originaltext textkritisch beurteilt werden. Wer nicht eine Vorstellung von ihrer Eigenart mitbringt, ist in vielen Fällen nicht in der Lage auszumachen welche Lesart gut und welche Lesart schlecht ist.\textsuperscript{18}

The exposition in the two next chapters tries to fuse the data regarding the transmission of the text of the LXX with what can be determined about its character as a translation. Reconnoitering the field of textual criticism has to be done by groping backwards step after step. The following topics will be discussed: edi-

\textsuperscript{15}On this development see: P. Wendland, ZNW I (1900) 267-290; G. Bertram, "Zur Septuaginta-Forschung, II," ThB 5 (1933) 180.

\textsuperscript{16}See: P. de Lagarde, Anmerkungen zu der griechischen Übersetzung der Proverben (Leipzig 1863) 2; J. A. Bewer, Der Text des Buches Ezra (Göttingen 1922) 2-5, where instructive examples of erroneous corrections in the Hebrew text, based on corrupt LXX readings, are adduced.

\textsuperscript{17}The eulogy at the grave of de Lagarde: U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Erinnerungen (Berlin 1928) 233.

\textsuperscript{18}The quotation is from: A. Allgeier, "Deuteronomium 25:1-3 im Manchester - Papyrus," Biblica 19 (1938) 8.
tions, state of transmission, text-history, the presumed genesis of the LXX and its claims as translation.

1. Text editions:

The result of scientific text research can be expressed in text editions of two kinds: the text of a certain codex can be printed as precisely as possible, supplemented by one or more types of apparatus criticus holding all variant readings and possible conjectures, thus enabling the reader to form for himself a picture of the proto-text and text history; or a text can be printed in which, through the combination of readings from various codices and the application of emendations, an endeavor is made to come close to what had been written by the author, while a text-critical apparatus accounts for the readings found in the various MSS.¹⁹

The comprehensive edition, The Old Testament in Greek of the Cambridge University Press is based on the first principle. A. E. Brooke and N. McLean were in charge from 1895 and H. St. J. Thackeray since 1927. The British scholars deemed an attempt at a critical text edition premature from the outset. Thus, they reproduced the codex Vaticanus 1209 (B), the renowned manuscript from the fourth century; in those sections in which this manuscript is missing they used the codex closest to B in age: Sinaiticus or Alexandrinus even though there is no affinity between these texts and B. It would certainly have been more in line with the character of the Cambridge edition to print one of the minuscules which reflect the text type of B in those instances in which B is incomplete. All data concerning the direct and indirect transmission of the text, data instrumental to the culling of a critically 'clean' text are classified in three apparatuses: 'ein Magazin aus dem Generationen von Forschern das Material nehmen können'. The concise edition of H.B. Swete can be considered a forerunner of this edition.²⁰

¹⁹On the pros and cons of both methods see O. Stählin, Editionstechnik (Leipzig 1914) 38-42.

As against this approach, the Göttinger Septuaginta Unternehmen, initiated in 1908 by Rudolf Smend, regarded it as its task to carry out the scientific will of Paul de Lagarde. They undertook to prepare an edition which attempted a critical reconstitution of the text. This was done in those volumes of the large Göttinger Septuaginta edition published so far and in a more concise form in the completed shorter edition of Rahlfı. After numerous preliminary studies, Margolis prepared an, as yet incomplete, critical edition of the book of Joshua, a text of utmost significance to the text criticism of the LXX due to its wealth of proper names. S.S. Tedesche prepared a critical edition of I (III) Esdras, a text rich in proper names and comparative material, thus offering special potential.  

More than once in the course of events the Göttinger LXX Unternehmen was compelled to modify its methods and the character of its editions. This was brought about in part by the unfavorable external conditions during and after the First World War but also by the failing of the originally drafted working hypothesis. In addition there were those who regardless of the merits and shortcomings of the volumes published by the Unternehmen, as a matter of principle called into question the right, or the very feasibility, of a critical text-reconstruction. Even the supporters admitted "die besonderen Schwierigkeiten und bleibenden Schranken für die Herstellung eines kritisch gesicherten Textes der LXX."  

In order to facilitate our forming of an opinion about these issues, we

---


22 P. Katz, ThLZ 61 (1936) 265-287, in a review on A. Rahlfı, Septuaginta I-II (Stuttgart 1935). This article contains a wealth of data for many problems of the LXX criticism. The principal problem is clearly formulated in the reviews by A. Allgeier on volume X of the Göttingen edition: "Swete und Holmes-Parsons geben B, Grabe A wieder, Rahlfı von allem etwas aber keinen Text der einmal Wirklichkeit war... Nicht bloss der Philologe dem es
should juxtapose the programme as originally drafted by Paul de Lagarde, and repeatedly reformulated by Alfred Rahlfs, with the situation and history of transmission of the text.

2. Paul de Lagarde and the ideal of an Urtext of the LXX

For more than forty years the ideal to reconstruct the original text of the LXX has been the mainspring of the eventful scholarly life of Paul de Lagarde. It is only natural that during this long period of time his concepts underwent modifications. Here, I would like to touch upon few of the landmarks only. In an early stage he aimed at separately utilizing individual MSS towards a reconstruction of the LXX text. He set methodological rules which should enhance the probability of text corrections attained by either comparison of MSS or per divinationem. At a later stage he classified the various MSS on the ground of their history of transmission. He demands: "zu fragen welches die gestalt der Septuaginta in den einzelnen verwaltungsbezirken der kirche gewesen ist". At this stage the sigla in the apparatus of a critical edition would refer to such recensiones — not to individual MSS. Stated more precisely, this is a demand to reconstruct the recensions of Eusebius, Lucian and Hesychius mentioned by Jerome. Behind these three, the proto-Septuagint text is concealed, and this original is reached in those instances in which the three versions concur. If this is not the case, comparisons and emendations "aus inneren Gründen" will help to pave the path towards the Urtext. Previously, de Lagarde had already advised to reconstruct Origen's Hexapla, it being the crucial phase in the history of the LXX. The edition would include the remnants of those secondary translations used by Origen for his comparative studies.  


23 The development as outlined here does not run entirely parallel to Rahlfs' fascinating exposition: Paul de Lagarde's wissenschaftliches Lebenswerk (MSU, IV;1; Berlin 1928). Cf. also: P. de Lagarde (above, n. 16); idem, Praefatio secunda, Genesis graece (Lipsiae
3. The state of transmission

The overwhelming amount of material available to the researcher venturing to reconstruct the original text of the LXX, is most certainly enough to bewilder him. At the disposal of the LXX text criticism stands an almost inestimable direct transmission besides an indirect line of transmission. The "Ausgangspunkt der Septuagintkritik", the collation of MSS by R. Holmes, continued by J. Parsons (1789-1827), already comprised 311 codices by their count – 297 in reality – of which are twenty uncial. In 1914 Alfred Rahlf's published a list describing all the complete and fragmentary MSS of the LXX which had come to his attention. It lists between fifteen and sixteen hundred items, including Catenae and Bible commentaries. Valuable in their own right are those codices with Hexaplaric additions in margine, in which comparative notes from Aquila, Theodotion and Symmachus obtain, even as they are found in the Syro-Hexapla. Such marginal notes, together with quotes found in the church fathers, constitute our sole source for the remnants of these translations. The famous uncial codices B (Vaticanus),

1868); idem, Ankündigung einer neuen Ausgabe der griechischen Übersetzung der Bibel (Göttingen 1882). Among the numerous studies of Rahlf's the most important for fundamental issues would perhaps be his Studie über den griechischen Text des Buches Ruth (MSU III:2; Berlin 1922). The most important among Margoli's works: M. L. Margoli, "Specimen of a New Edition of the Greek Joshua," Jewish Studies in Memory of Israel Abrahams (New York 1927) 307-323.

24See: A. Rahlf's, Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften des Alten Testaments (MSU II; Berlin 1914 [1915]), including a survey of the monographs dealing with specific codices.

25Since the collection of Field (F. Field, Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt I-II [Oxford 1875]) Mercati found in 1895 in the Ambrosiana of Milan Hexaplaric fragments of the Psalms. See: G. Mercati, "D'un palimpsesto ambrosiano dei Salmi esapleri," Atti della Reale Accademia di Scienze di Torino 31 (1896), (not yet published). Palimpsests found in the Geniza of Cairo hid fragments of Aquila's translation of Kings (ed. F. G. Burkitt, Fragments of the Books of Kings according to the Translation of Aquila [Cambridge 1897]) and of Psalms (ed. G. Taylor, Hebrew-Greek Cairo Genizah Palimpsests [Cambridge 1900]). In 1914 G. Smidt found in the monastery of Mt. Sinai a ms. with, for the greater part unknown, hexaplaric marginal to Is. 1:2 - 16:4. These were edited by: L. Lütkenmann and A. Rahlf's, Hexaplarische Randnoten zu Isaias i-xiii (MSU II:6; Berlin 1915). The codex of Eusebius' commentary on Isaiah (Cod. Laur. Plut. XI 4; see: ZNW 33 (1934) 87ff.), discovered by Möhle, contains numerous fragments from the younger Bible
A (Alexandrinus), S (Sinaiticus), G (Saravianus), and Q (Marchalianus) have been made accessible in facsimile editions and are dealt with in monographs. However, it would be wrong to limit the study of the transmission to the uncial. Paul de Lagarde, before suggesting the division of MSS according to church provinces, had once written: "dass keine hds. der LXX so gut ist, dass sie nicht oft genug schlechte lesarten, keine so schlecht dass sie nicht mitunter ein gutes körnchen böte." This pronouncement may be somewhat exaggerated, but it clarifies that when looking for a 'good grain' no MSS should be neglected a priori on the one hand, and on the other hand, it draws awareness to the difficulty in classifying MSS into groups. And indeed, almost any single LXX MS is a class in itself as it shows some, often unimportant, divergencies. Moreover, occasionally one MS may derive from several sources, and as a result its various components should be rated differently. A famous example is MSS 19 and 108 in the apparatus of Holmes-Parsons. On the basis of quotes found in the church fathers, Cererani, Field and de Lagarde had rightly concluded that I-IV Kingdoms in these MSS contain the text of the LXX according to the recension of Lucian. On ground hereof, de Lagarde used these entire MSS for his edition of the Lucianic text. In 1910 Hautsch proved that in the Octateuch these MSS do follow the Lucianic text. In translations. For samples cf. A. Möhle, "Ein neuer Fund zahlreicher Stücke aus den Jesajaversetzungen des Akulas, Symmachos und Theodotion," ZAW NF 2 (1934) 176-183. These citations in full are to be found in the apparatus of Ziegler (above, n. 21); see also idem, "Textkritische Notizen zu den jüngeren griechischen Übersetzungen des Buches Isaia," GGN (1940 V 1-4).

26 According to de Lagarde: "eine Ansicht die sich freilich kaum in vollem Mass bestätigen wird" (above, n. 16) 3 n. 1. See also: O. Stählin (above, n. 19) 36. Smend makes noteworthy remarks as to the need to collate the minuscule carefully, cf. R. Smend, "Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirah," GGA 168 (Berlin 1906) 766; cf. Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach (Berlin 1906) xc. Beirich believes the minuscule of the LXX still evince traces of independent, originally complete, chronological systems which have disappeared from the rest of the tradition as a result of erroneous corrections; cf. J. Beirich, Die Chronologie der Könige von Israel und Juda (Tübingen 1929). See also A. Sperber, Septuagintaprobe (BWANT 3:13; Stuttgart 1929) 57.

26a Only one manuscript of Isa. 8:21 from the 13th century preserved the correct and important reading παραγον - ἐλπίς in Aramaic (idol); cf. P. de Lagarde, Gesammelte Abhandlungen (Leipzig 1866), p. 79. With the aid of Theodotion's reading Rahlfis found the word in 37:38 as well. It seems that the word in the Marchalianus ms. ad loc. reflects an actualization.]
1922 Rahlfs convincingly demonstrated that the dividing line is in Ruth 4:11.\(^{27}\) It is thus impossible to set up general guidelines for categorizing the LXX MSS. The history of transmission of the LXX requires an individual description, analysis and classification for each of the books of the Bible. Such discourses could then, in turn, form a basis for the necessary text-critical and philological commentaries on the separate books of the LXX text.\(^{28}\) The errors obtaining in the LXX can be schematically divided into two: *mechanical* and *intentional*. The first category comprises the types which reveal themselves in the transmission of almost all Greek texts: permutations caused by incorrect hearing or as the result of resemblance in the uncial or cursive script, substitution of any final consonants which indicate a tendency of the copist to shorten the ends of words, interchange of letters within a word, of words or other elements within the text, of haplography or sometimes components of the text have been omitted as the result of homoioteleuton, which may happen through the wandering of the copyst's eye to similar text elements in the immediate surrounding.\(^{29}\)

In addition to these mechanical errors there are the intentional changes; the majority of these are closely bound up with the special character of the LXX as a Bible translation. It is this very character of the translation which has greatly increased the number of doublets in the text. At times, two variants occurred side

\(^{27}\) E. Hauth, *Die Lukiantext des Octateuch* (MSU 1:1; Berlin 1910); A. Rahlfs (above, n. 23) 74ff. See also: E. Nestle, *Septuaginta Studien V* (Stuttgart 1907) 12.

\(^{28}\) See the cited works of Smend on Ben Sira (above, n. 26), Rahlfs on Ruth (above, n. 23) and Margolis on Joshua (above, n. 23). See also: M. L. Margolis, "The K text of Joshua" *AJSL* 28 (1911) 1-55. On Ezekiel see: C. H. Cornill, *Das Buch des Propheten Ezekiel* (Leipzig 1886), Prolegomena 13-109. For the books of Kings – A. Rahlfs, *Septuaginta-Studien I* (Göttingen 1904); III, (Göttingen 1911). On Psalms, *idem, Septuaginta-Studien II* (Göttingen 1907). See also Rahlfs's introduction to his Psalms edition (above, n. 21). On Isaiah, J. Ziegler the introduction to his edition (above, n. 21). Cf. also: O. Pretzl, "Septuagintaprobleme im Buch der Richter," *Biblica* 7 (1926) 233-269; *idem, Die griechischen Handschriftgruppen im Buche Josue,...*, *Biblica* 9 (1928) 377-427. Margolis (above, n. 21) and Pretzl (his article from 1928) have independently made almost the same division of the MSS of Joshua into four practically identical groups, though their evaluation of these MSS is not entirely the same.

by side already in the Hebrew text from which the translator worked. The translator, who was ignorant of the origin of such doublets, rendered both while trying to harmonize them. In other instances the choice between two renderings of one expression was so difficult that both were entered. Other doublets in the text of the LXX originated from the penetration of elements from younger Greek translations. It is in this way that the LXX of Job was supplemented by numerous passages from Theodotion.\textsuperscript{30} Hereby we reach the revision process which the LXX underwent. More than once readings in later books of the Bible were harmonized with older parts of the translation. Free translations and deviations from the Hebrew text were emended according to the MT. To illustrate this, here is one out of many examples: the MT of Jud. 9:13 reads: "my new wine which gladdens God and men", and this is presented in codex B. However, this rendering is secondary to the version of cod. A which, in order to prevent anthropomorphism, reads: "the joy which God gave men" (cf. also the translation of v. 9 in B). Other changes were introduced in order to give the translation a Christian turn. The appellation of the king of Judah in Lam. 4:20 is: "the breath of our life the Lord's anointed" – all MSS of the LXX read χρυσός κόριος, a reading already adopted by Origen and Theodoretus (the Vulgate renders: "Spiritus oris nostri Christus Dominus captus est in peccati nostris"); the same textual change shows in the LXX of Ps. Sol. 17:36.\textsuperscript{31} More or less counter to this is the tendency to purify the Greek of the translation: the orthography of words is freely modernized, and words which in the original translation had simply been transliterated are now


\textsuperscript{31} On the reading in Ps. Sol. cf. the commentary of Ryle-James from 1891, on Lamentations see Rudolph's commentary of 1939; Rahlf's, in my opinion wrongly explains the deviation as paleographical. On interpolations and Christian emendations see among others: A. Rahlf's, Septuaginta-Studien II (Göttingen 1907) 223-224; see also Rahlf's Septuaginta X, Psalmi cum Odis § 4, 4.
recast into Greek words externally similar to the transliteration; to improve the style pronouns are added, words are transposed, etc.\textsuperscript{32}

4a. Emendations – method and tools

This perfunctory survey of the most frequent types of errors throws light on the difficulties in giving a general guide-line for the emendation of the LXX MSS. Hence the famous rules of de Lagarde lose much of their applicability: of two contradictory renderings the one paraphrasing the content more freely is older than the word for word translation, and the translation diverging from the MT is more original than the one concurring with it. More than once the awkward Greek of the slavish translator is older than emendations of style which betray a later hand. The decision in most cases can be made only on grounds of laboriously gained insight into the specific character of the translation of the biblical book in question.

Obviously, in those instances in which the methods of internal text-criticism meet with difficulties, the solution was found in the indirect transmission, and this all the more so when, as a result of the authority and circulation of the LXX, it gained in scope and meaning. Josephus used the LXX, Philo could read the Bible only in Greek, the LXX is at the root of many citations in the New Testament as well as of the exegetical and theological reflections of the church fathers. Small wonder that one looked into this wealth of quotations not only for material that could be used to correct controversial passages in the LXX, but also hoped to be able, through a systematical analysis of all Bible quotations from specific authors, to establish which text-form of the LXX circulated in their times and places. However, the path toward this aim as well proved thick with obstacles. Frequently citations by a certain church father are taken from more than one MS; moreover, quite often quotations were made by heart, and were thus inaccurate. This last circumstance does not necessarily mean a disadvantage for LXX text criticism. The greatest predicament in using indirect sources lies in the fact that medieval copyists more often than not harmonized the quotations obtaining in the church fathers with the biblical text current in their own days. Now, free

\textsuperscript{32}On the modernization of the orthography see: H. St. J. Thackeray, \textit{A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek} I (Cambridge 1909) 55-70. On the graecizing of Hebrew transcriptions see Wutz (above, n. 29) 47ff.
quotations and allusions quite often escape the alertness of such correctors. Thus, in these circumstances where they betray a certain reading in a LXX text, they may be of special value.33

A second form of indirect transmission are the translations of the LXX. Utmost care must, of course, be taken when drawing conclusions from a foreign language. Even in the case of a verbatim correspondence with the Greek, it must be determined whether this is due to a principle or a result of linguistic inability. If the latter is the case, the translation will bristle with inconsistencies.34

4b. Classification of the MSS

When classifying MSS the accepted auxiliary applied inevery type of textual criticism is the tracing of shared errors, or of errors which derive from each other. With regard to the LXX, mistakes made in the copying of proper names hold pride of place. Linked up with this is the fact that the various methods by which proper names and untranslated Hebrew words in the LXX are transliterated form a trail which leads towards different – chronologically divergent – stages in the transmission of the text.35 The central question was whether and to what extent these subdivisions, classified by means of internal criteria, converge with the recensions which had been identified by the aid of other external criteria, as postulated by Paul de Lagarde on grounds of the information derived from Jerome.

In order to trace which texts belong to the Lucianic recension and which to that of Hesychius, citations showing in the church fathers were analyzed; these were taken from church fathers who wrote after 400 C.E. in the provinces which Jerome indicated as the domain of these recensions. A great number of citations in


34 On this subject see: Rahlfs (above, n. 33) 157-159.

35 On this subject see the studies of Margolis on Joshua (above, n. 23). See also: Wutz (above, n. 29) 8-10; Pretzl, "Josue" (above, n. 28) 379ff. See especially: A. Sperber, *Septuagintaprobleme* (Stuttgart 1929) 3ff.
the Syrian church fathers Chrysostom and Theodoret pointed towards the Lucianic recension. An even sharper criterion was attained by the comparison of the commentaries on the Dodekapropheton written by Cyril (patriarch of Alexandria in 412-444) and Theodoretus (bishop of Kyrrhos from 423). Here the quotations reflected many – by no means minor – deviations, a fact which contributed much towards the characterization of Lucian and Hesychius. And indeed, we can form a rather clear picture as to the text-form of certain books which were considered the work of Lucian. In the Lucianic recension an attempt is made to do justice to the Greek idiom by replacing certain grammatical forms and words by others; contradictions and possible misunderstandings were done away with by additions and emendations. Less tangible are the figure and activity of Hesychius: in 1907 Rahlfs attempted a reconstruction of Hesychius’ recension of the Psalms; however, in his large edition of 1931 he had given up on the idea.

The textual criticism of the LXX took one more step back towards the original text in its endeavor to carefully ponder the text material from the time before and after Origen’s text-critical activity. Into the Syrian translation which Paul of Tella made in 616 out of the Hexaplaric text of the LXX he copied the asteriskoi and obeloi which Origen had provided in the LXX text. Hence most of these signs found their way into the transmission of the Syrohexapla. They are found in later Greek codices as well; their placing does not always go back to that of Origen and does not lack arbitrariness and inconsequences. It was mainly Rahlfs who, at the hand of these asteriskoi and obeloi, reconstructed pre-hexaplaric and hexaplaric texts; he also availed himself of information scattered in later authors, mainly in Jerome.

36See Sperber (above, n. 33).

37Rahlfs expressed himself sceptically regarding the characteristics of the Lucianic recension: Septuaginta-Studien III (Gottingen 1911) 293-294; 176-182; 281-283; O. Procksch, Studien zur Geschichte der Septuaginta (Leipzig 1910) 81ff. Rahlfs, Ruth (above, n. 21) 84-88; Pretzl “Richter” (above, n. 28) 267; idem, “Joshua” (above, n. 28) 424; Margolis (above, n. 23) 313. See also Rahlfs’ surmises regarding Hesychius: Septuaginta-Studien II (Gottingen 1907) 227. [Cf. now: S. Jellicoe, “The Hesychian Recension Reconsidered,” JBL 82 (1963) 409-418].

38Methodically instructive is Rahlfs’ study on Ruth (above, n. 21) 54-67.
5. Textual Variants before Origen:

Later, it became obvious that the road which Paul de Lagarde had mapped out for the text research of the LXX was no longer practicable; in the more recent phase of the research his postulates were strongly undermined. Various factors contributed to this situation: the character of the individual MSS, the discovery of papyri from before Origen's time, the type of mutual discrepancies between the various codices of the LXX, as well as novel notions regarding the history and original character of the LXX.

Even when the characterizing features of one of the well-known LXX recensions had been discovered in a particular codex, this very codex showed so many divergencies and peculiarities that it could by no means be considered as a pure representative of a certain text-type. Not without justification have all the LXX MSS been designated *Mischtexte.*

Moreover, the *Chester-Beatty* and *Scheide* papyri which have been found in recent years brought to light fragments of MSS older than Origen. These finds initiated a provisional, though already rich literature; one of its most remarkable conclusions is that in pre-hexaplaric MSS readings obtained which, on grounds of earlier research, had always been regarded as hexaplaric. These papyri have furthermore proven that behind our oldest codices lies a long development of the Greek text of the LXX, during which attempts had been made to eliminate too slavish renderings and to adapt blatant linguistic inaccuracies to the spirit of the Greek language. The fact that this tendency had existed long before Origen led Allgeier to the conclusion (which Wendland had accidentally drawn forty years before) that such liberty with existing MSS probably preceded the days when the LXX text achieved its more or less authoritative standing.

---

39 From among Sperber's studies the most fundamental is A. Sperber, "Probleme einer Edition der Septuaginta," *Festschrift P. Kahle* (Leiden 1935). Even Margolis, one of the representatives of de Lagarde's opinions in their classical form has to admit: "In view of the mixture of types to which almost all our MSS have been exposed no complete unanimity among the constituent members of the class is to be expected"; see Margolis (above, n. 37) 311.

40 The Chester-Beatty and the Scheide papyri are of common origin. The first announcement of the sensational find appeared in the *Times* on November 9, 1931 i.e., exactly fifty years after de Lagarde's *Ankündigung* (above, n. 23)! In the comprehensive literature
tion gives ground to the assumption that the recensions of Lucian, Hesychius, Eusebius and probably of the Bible translations which Origen used in his endeavor at constructing a purified Bible-text, all go back to a branch of a transmission of the LXX which had produced a great variety of text-forms even before the Christian era. Pretzl asked the question whether under the homogeneous reworking of the recensions by Origen, Lucian and Hesychius, one can still point out elements which betray the origin of the heterogeneous text-types of the MSS they had used for each of the books of the Bible. 41 Hedley goes even further in pointing out that the codices which follow the Lucianic recension often stand by themselves in avoiding errors of later transmissions; moreover, the text of Lucian preserves readings which were found in the first century, or earlier, in Josephus, the New Testament and the Psalms of Solomon. 42 In the oldest indirect tradition which is reflected in citations from the Bible one can pin-point traces of the diversity of text-forms of the LXX which preceded the translation of the second century and the work of Origen. The quotations from the Greek Bible in both Philo and Paul at times show affinity with the LXX, at times with (preliminary phases of) the translations of Theodotion, Symmachus and Aquila; in Philo’s tradition the citations have often been harmonized with the LXX. On occasion these quotations evince text-forms unknown to us from other sources. 43 Recently, it

41 See Pretzl, "Josue" (above, n. 28) 377-378.
43 On Josephus Flavius see: A. Mez, Die Bibel des Josephus (Basel 1895). For critique and supplements to this study see: A. Rahlfs, Septuaginta-Studien III (Gottingen 1911) 80-111.
has been shown in a stimulating study that the Bible quotations in *Sapientia Salomonis* partly concur with the text of the LXX, partly with the translation known to us as the translation of Symmachus.44

In certain instances it seems that the nature of the mutual discrepancies between the famous codices of the LXX suggest that the first MSS of the LXX are based on different translations. Sperber, when accounting for all the variants in the LXX transmission, once argued that all LXX MSS go back to independent translations of Hebrew texts slightly at variance with each other. Not unjustly, this thesis was sharply criticized by Rahlfis on account of its generalization.45 Moore and de Lagarde, too, appraised codices A and B in the book of Judges as the text of two different translations; Pretzl, however, on grounds of sound documentatioin, opposed this opinion.46 In this context Gordis' observations deserve more attention than they have been paid so far. He proves, to my mind in an irrefutable way, that at least in many of the cases the *Ketib-Qere* in the


45See Sperber (above, n. 35) especially 79; as against this see: A. Rahlfis, *THLZ* 55 (1930) 106; see also: J. Hempel, *ZA* 48 (1930) 199.

46See: Pretzl, "Richter" (above, n. 28).
Massoretic recensions of the Hebrew text reflect variants of pre-Massoretic MSS. He also stated that the Hebrew MSS used by the LXX showed Qere readings in its text and that in the text of the LXX the discrepancies between codices B and A correspond with the disparities between Ketib and Qere texts in which neither of the texts consistently follows either all Ketib or all Qere forms. To my mind, these considerations inevitably lead to the conclusion that part of the variants in the LXX stem from diversities in pre-Massoretic Hebrew texts; there is no question here of later correction of the LXX MSS: These diversities stand at the initial stage of the text history because various primarily independent translations go back to different text-forms of the Hebrew. Lately, Sperber has postulated that the LXX reflects a Samaritan type of the Hebrew text current in Alexandria, and that the citations in the Gospels are a Judean text-form circulating in Syria.

The recensions and the work of Origen conceal a heterogeneity, not a homogeneity. This fact finds its explication in a theory regarding the literary character and original form of the LXX; at the same time this fact lends the theory its strength. Modern research has reached this thesis by entirely different paths. From this standpoint modern research had already earlier dared an attack on de Lagarde's hypotheses.

In order to utilize these theories for our discourse of the text history we should first outline them.

III. Literary criticism and the character of the LXX as translation.

1. Distinguishing different hands in the LXX

The natural starting point for the literary criticism of the LXX was a comparison of completely or almost identical passages obtaining in different books of the Bible. On the ground of such a comparison Hody wrote already in 1705: "librorum diversorum et partim etiam diversarum eiusdem libri diversos fuisse interpretes;


48See the resumé mentioned above (above, n. 43) pp. VI-VII. The speculative theory is dealt with, in different context, in section IV.
nec iudicio umquam reliquorum submissos fuisse singulorum interpretum versiones, demonstratur ex diversa et prosus contraria in quamplurimis locis interpretandi ratione".49 In 1882 Paul de Lagarde maintained that he could identify almost all translators of entire books or whole passages.50 The state of research today no longer affords us such optimism. The question whether the translation of a certain book of the Bible is the work of one or more translators has in several cases become the topic of lively controversies. Actually, the British scholar H.J.St. Thackeray has in a number of studies argued that the historical books and the prophets Jeremiah,50a and Ezekiel were rendered by different translators. His main arguments were the obvious diversity in language and style featuring in different parts of these books in the LXX. He also adduced the fact that up to a clearly distinct dividing line in one book, certain frequently obtaining expressions were translated in one manner, but altogether differently thereafter.51 Similarly, though with far less convincing examples of divergencies in the translation, Herrmann and Baumgärtel believe they can show the hand of different translators at work in the books of Isaiah and the Dodekapropheton.52 Herrmann and Thackeray, therefore, considered the LXX of the books of the prophets the product of a team of translators who had agreed to distribute the work among themselves.53

49H. Hodius, De Bibliorum textibus originalibus, versionibus graecis..., libri IV (Oxford 1705) 201 (the title of book II, chap. 10).
50J. P. de Lagarde, Ankündigung (above, n. 23) 32.
50a[Cf. J.J. Kneucker, Das Buch Baruch (Leipzig 1879) 83, n. 8].
52J. Herrmann - F. Baumgärtel "Beiträge zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Septuaginta" (BWAT NF 5; Stuttgart 1923); O. J. Baab, "A Theory of Two Translators for the Greek Genesis" JBL 52 (1933) 239-243; F. Danielsmeyer, Studien zur Septuaginta des Buches Ezekiel, diss. (Münster 1935).
53See Herrmann - (Baumgärtel) (above, n. 52) 40; see also Thackeray's book of 1921 (above, n. 51) 28-29.
J. Ziegler controverts the theories of Herrmann and Baumgärtel concerning Isaiah and the Dodekapropheton.\textsuperscript{54} By this time the Scheide Papyri have cast doubt upon Thackeray’s thesis regarding the book of Ezekiel. This manuscript, which is not later than the beginning of the third century, does not yet evince any changes in the translation of the Divine name, which is always rendered χριστός, the variants in later codices seem to be the result of subsequently introduced corrections. These papyri were excellently edited at Princeton University. In the introduction, E. H. Kase, one of the editors, argues on the ground hereof, as well as on the ground of inconsistencies in the use of certain words in chapters which are on both sides of the dividing line drawn by Thackeray, in favor of the unity of the translation of the book of Ezekiel. According to him Thackeray and Herrmann were unsuccessful in citing reasons which would account for a distribution of work among the translators (far less one by which a first translator worked on over half of the book, a second translated the next quarter, with the final part done again by the first translator). The text of the Scheide Papyri and all we know about the shape of ancient scrolls, make a different theory possible, namely, that different parts of the translation circulated on separate scrolls, of which some were corrected by a later hand while others were not. The fact that these corrections remained incomplete could then explain the differences in translation methods.\textsuperscript{55} In connection herewith it should be remembered that Rost had assumed such incomplete corrections of the Pentateuch, though in an altogether different context. According to him, in the books Genesis through Numbers the word ἐκκλησία had everywhere been replaced by the word συναγωγή. Earlier, Churgin had demonstrated that up to the end of the book of Joshua whenever the word βόωμος indicated a pagan altar it was replaced by θυσιοτήτιον.\textsuperscript{56}

\textsuperscript{54}See already G. Bertram, DLZ 45 (1925) 705 and elsewhere J. Fischer, \textit{In welcher Schrift lag das Buch Isaias den LXX vor?} (BZA W 56; Giessen 1930) 2-5; J. Ziegler, \textit{Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias} (AA XII:3; Münster in WF 1934) 31-46; \textit{Die Einheit der Septuaginta zum Zwölffprophetenbuch}, Vorlesungen-Verzeichnis (Braunsberg 1934-1935) (Kirchhain 1934).

\textsuperscript{55}A. C. Johnson, H. S. Gehman and E. H. Kase Jr. (above, n. 40) 48-73.

2. The origin of the LXX as a Targum

Up to the present the opponents of Thackeray's theory have not been successful in refuting his arguments concerning the remarkable discrepancies in idiom and style which reveal themselves in the various parts of the books Jeremiah and Kingdoms. Besides, not withstanding internal flaws in the way Thackeray presented the genesis of the written LXX, these do not actually impair his theory that the translation grew out of the need of the Alexandrian Jewish synagogue.57

This theory is linked with the notion, advanced by other scholars, which, on the basis of parallels, directed the historical-literary research into the origin of the LXX along lines analogous with the earliest history of the Bible translation in Palestine. Already in 1869 Diestel wrote: "Wie aber schon in der Synagoge Palästinas die Lesung des Textes eine begleitende Übersetzung ins Aramäische erforderte, die leicht zur Paraphrase wurde, so auch auf griechischem Boden."58 This already implies a theory which was later on developed mainly by Kahle, Baumstark and their pupils.59 When the Hebrew known by the Jews of Alexandria no longer sufficed to follow the reading of the Pentateuch in its original language it became customary to give a Greek paraphrase after every sentence or two. The character of this rather free rendering was similar to that of the Aramaic Targumim in Palestine, which were as such interwoven with homiletic digressions and commentaries for religious purposes. Such a paraphrase, more or less improvised during the service, could never display the strict uniformity of a written text; however, with time, a certain tradition consolidates for the rendering of certain expressions. When the need was gradually felt to replace these


58 L. Diestel, Geschichte des Alten Testaments in der Christlichen Kirche (Jena 1869) 10.

59 P. Kahle, "Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Pentateuchtextes" ThStKr 88 (1915) 410-411. A. Sperber, Das Alphabet der Septuaginta-Vorlage, OLZ (1929) 533-549. A. Baumstark, "Neue orientalische Probleme biblischer Textgeschichte," ZDMG 89 (1935) 89-118; Rost (above, n. 56) 133-134; see already: A. Geiger, Umschrift und Übersetzungen der Bibel (Breslau 1857) 159ff. As Kahle stated in the preface to the second edition of this book (Frankfurt a. M. 1928), here the theory of the Targumic character of the LXX is formulated in a classical way.
improvised oral recitations by a written translation, various written residues came into being, which at first circulated side by side.

3. Arguments favoring the Targum character:

Thus, according to these hypotheses, which were based on the methods of literary comparisons, it is not a unity which stands at the outset of the text history of our LXX, but rather a diversity of text-forms. This throws, therefore, a new light on the conclusion reached in the previous section according to which the translations of the second century, as well as the work of Origen and later recensions, go back to an early branching in the LXX tradition. On the other hand these hypotheses are confirmed by the aforementioned manifold text-types diverging from our LXX, as they show in quotations from the Greek Bible found in the oldest indirect tradition. The advocates of this theory concerning the genesis of the LXX of the Pentateuch deduce an additional argument from information obtaining in the Letter of Aristeas. The theory may also find support from the character of the oldest text fragment of the LXX to be found so far, as well as from certain features in the translation technique of the LXX.

a. Following those scholars who maintain that the LXX of the Pentateuch has its roots in what we would like to call a "Greek Targum", the purport of the Letter of Aristeas was not solely the exaltation of the Jewish people and its Teaching; rather, this epistle bans all translations preceding the LXX, vindicating the authority of the text of the LXX as against other circulating versions. Evidence in favor of such a view is found in paragraphs 310 – 314 of the Letter of Aristeas which tell how the assembled people, on hearing the translation read to them, ask for a copy for the leaders of the community, and proclaim the translation authentic and unchangeable. As this account is not relevant for the main purport of the document – the exaltation of Jews and Judaism – it may lay claim to a certain historicity. Here the narrator unwittingly discloses that the decisive factor for the making of the LXX had not been the demand of the king but rather the need of the Jewish community.60

60See: Kahle (above, n. 59) 413f.; Herrmann-Baumgärtel (above, n. 52) 44-50; Baumstark (above, n. 59) 99. On Bible translations before the LXX cf. also remarks by W. Michaelis, "Bibelübersetzungen," Encyclopaedia Judaica IV (Berlin 1930) 557ff.;
b. There is no hope of clearly seeing our way through the wilderness of texts which stands at the beginning of the text history of the LXX. A glimpse has been offered us by the remarkable, almost sensational, finds of tiny fragments of the LXX text of Deuteronomy, PRG 458, written not later than 150 B.C.E., that is only about one century younger than the oldest attempt at translating the Bible into Greek. Hempel finds in the conformity of these fragments with our LXX text support for the thesis of an Urtext of the LXX. In my opinion, this similarity proves no more than that already in the second century B.C.E. an older phase of the text known to us as the LXX circulated in Egypt; although probably one of many, it was held in esteem. This fact, however, had long been established through the use of what is known to us as the LXX by the Jewish Hellenistic historians Demetrius (ca. 220 B.C.E.) and Eupolemus (ca. 150 B.C.E.) who are the oldest witnesses of our indirect tradition of the LXX. Besides, these fragments are so scanty and so badly tattered as to render the drawing of further conclusions extremely hazardous. We should not assume these remnants to be indeed completely identical with the text-type so far known to us as the LXX tradition. Almost the only verse for which a characterization of its text-type has been worthwhile, and attempted, is Deut. 25:2. In the about fifteen words which have been preserved in PRG 458 there are four deviations from the prevalent textform; for three of them the papyrus is our only source. Allgeier has demonstrated that the most important of these singular readings should be explained as an individual attempt to interpret the verse with the aim of bringing about certain consequences for religious practice. By his conception the finds do indeed confirm our thesis regarding the Targum character of the oldest LXX.

F. Dornseiff, Echtkeitsfragen (1939) 49-50. Dornseiff certainly goes too far; the whole problem cannot be discussed here.

c. Similarly, certain peculiarities of the translating technique which have been retained in our entire tradition of the LXX, are most plausibly explained on the assumption that the beginnings of the LXX had been a Targum. In their turn these peculiarities corroborate the supposition as to the liturgical origin of the LXX. The circumstance, for example, that there are terms which occur in the LXX in a great variety of translations, whereas others have consequently been rendered in the same way, completely conforms with the above mentioned assumption that the written translation goes back to a reworking of oral paraphrases which displayed no uniformity, even if a tradition had consolidated regarding the rendition of certain expressions.\textsuperscript{65} The character of a number of doublets in the text of the LXX led de Boer to conclude that: "These phenomena indicate (oral) tradition, also of the translation which preceded our recension".\textsuperscript{66} There is no certainty as to the origin of these doublets. It may well be that those who first prepared a written translation derived them from differing orally circulating renditions. On the other hand, the possibility exists that with time glosses were entered into existing written texts in the course of their liturgical use. The same certainty rules regarding what I believe to be the most conclusive evidence proving the 'Targum' character of the LXX, namely, that the translation of many instances evinces an addition which does not obtain in the Hebrew text of those passages, but derives from a different, often removed context.\textsuperscript{67} The fact, which probably lies at the root of this phenomenon is that the oldest homilies which were interwoven in, or immediately followed upon the Targumic paraphrase of the text, originated in a text comparison: a brief or enigmatic phrase was explicated by another which was clearer or more detailed. Thus, to choose just a few examples out of many, in the LXX to Exod 23:22 a complete sermon taken from Exod 19:5-6 has been inserted; the force of the command in Exod 20:10 is determined by a supplement from Deut 5:14; the function of Deut 24:7 is to define the drift of Exod 21:16. The synagogue sermon looking for compelling digressions did

\textsuperscript{64}[Now the fragments found in Qumran should be taken into consideration].
\textsuperscript{65}Rost (above, n. 56) 133-134.
\textsuperscript{66}P. A. H. der Boer, Research into the Text of 1 Sam. 1-16 (Amsterdam 1938) 55.
\textsuperscript{67}Ch. Heller, Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta (Berlin 1932) 21-22. Cf. also Ziegler's study (above, n. 30) 290-292.
not fail to mention, in an independent paraphrase, on LXX Exod 38:22 (cf MT 38:30) that the copper sheets plating the altar in the tabernacle were made of the fire-pans of Korah and his people, even though this detail obtains in the MT only after the Korah episode in Num 17:2ff. By the same token, a homiletic reflection derived from Ps 71 (MT 72): 3 was appended to Isa 49:13.

4. Translation character of the various books:

As has been stressed many a time, the picture drawn here of the beginnings of the LXX pertains in the first place to the Pentateuch. However, the text character of the translation of the prophets, despite all mutual discrepancies, points to the likelihood that this too originated in the oldest sermons in the synagogue.\textsuperscript{68} This is partly true for the historical books as well; still, here the tendency of the translators to reshape the narrative independently, resulted in great freedom of rendering.\textsuperscript{69} From the Hagiographa the Psalms are translated quite literally, though liturgical instructions and theological interpretations have been added.\textsuperscript{70} Yet, in the book of Proverbs a number of sayings have been freely reproduced in the LXX to resemble dactylic or iambic verses;\textsuperscript{71} whereas the book of Job, which in places almost impresses one as being original Greek poetry, is so freely translated that later hands, often not very skillfully, supplemented it from Theodotion.\textsuperscript{72} Then again, the strictly verbatim translation of Ecclesiastes and Song of Songs reminds one of the style of Aquila.\textsuperscript{73} In these extremely concise observations it is impossible indeed to do justice to the specific qualities of the translation of each particular book in the LXX. For this, we should refer to the commentaries on the various books.

\textsuperscript{68}See Thackeray's book of 1921 (above, n. 51); see also: A. Kaminka, \textit{Studien zur Septuaginta an der Hand der Zwölf Kleinen Prophetenbücher} (Frankfurt a. M. 1928) 30ff.

\textsuperscript{69}Thackeray 1921; according to de Boer (above, n. 66) "the translator knows himself as a narrator," see p. 51 and 68.


\textsuperscript{72}J. Ziegler, "Der textkritische Wert der LXX des Buches Job," \textit{Miscellanea Biblica II} (Rome 1934) 279ff.; [367 n. 15.]

\textsuperscript{73}J. Reider, \textit{Prolegomena to a Greek Hebrew Index to Aquila} (Philadelphia 1916) 96.
The genesis of the LXX out of the uncontrolled growth of a Targum tradition, constantly revised and added to, makes a dating of its distinct parts very hazardous. In about 220 B.C.E. Demetrius is familiar with a text related to our LXX of the Pentateuch; in about 150 B.C.E. Eupolemus knows a translation of Chronicles. Most of the translations of the biblical books had been committed to writing before Jesus ben Sira's grandson wrote his prologue, after 116 B.C.E. Occasionally, a comparison between various locations in books of the LXX affords conclusions regarding the sequences of their coming into being. At times hints pertaining to certain historical circumstances can serve a probable terminus ante quem; by this criterion, from the way the Septuagint refers to Carthage in Isaiah 23 we may assume that this part of the translation dates from before the battle of Zama in 201 B.C.E.  

If, after the discussion in the previous two paragraphs concerning the state of the tradition, the text history, the genesis and technique of translation of the LXX, we look back and ask the question posed at the opening of the previous paragraph: which is the preferable method for the LXX research – either collecting the text historic material available or reconstructing an Urtext – in my opinion, we can not escape Baumstark's conclusion:

Es ist, auch wenn mit ihm der Name eines Grossen wie P. de Lagarde verbunden ist, und auch wenn auf ihm heute wesentlich die textkritische Konstruktion der Göttinger LXX-Ausgabe aufgebaut wird ein verhängnisvoller Irrtum zu glauben, dass jenseits der drei "Rezensionen" des Origenes, Lukianos und Hesychios etwas wie eine einheitliche Erscheinung höherer Literatur gestanden habe, die sich... wie auf Grund einer divergierenden dreifachen handschriftlichen Überlieferung rekonstru-

---

74 Cf. for the time being: E. Schürer, Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes III (Leipzig 1909) 426-427; and e.g. also J. Fischer (above, n. 54) 5-6. [The problem concerning the dating of the various parts of the LXX has been touched upon in too brief a way. It would have been in order here to deal with the question whether a close lexicological study of the terminology used in the various books provides information for the dating of independent translations, at least towards their relative sequence. Recently a comparison which has been made of parallel passages obtaining in various places has not yielded any results for dating. In the text of this paragraph there is a disturbing inaccuracy: following J. Fischer, I have accepted as the dating of the LXX of Isaiah a date before 201 B.C.E., when in chap. VI in the rendition of Isa 14:20, we are to see a hint to the death of Antiochus IV, Epiphanes in 163 B.C.E. Further study of the LXX of Isaiah as a historical source has convinced me that the translation in the form it is known to us is certainly not older than the