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This impressive collection of the proceedings of the IOSCS congress is divided into three sections: “Textual Criticism,” “Philology,” and “Interpretation and Reception.” The introduction conveniently summarizes all contributions and connect the papers to current trends in LXX research.

Textual Criticism

M. Sigismund, “Der antiochenische Text im Buch Josua\textsuperscript{LXX} und seine Bedeutung für die älteste Septuaginta—Eine erste Reevaluation,” reports about a project directed by S. Kreuzer. On the basis of an electronic comparison of manuscript data with Theodoret’s Joshua quotations, he suggests that Margolis’s S-group can be qualified as Antiochene, not in the sense of a conscious revision but rather as the outcome of a text-historical process. Simplex-compositum interchange and Atticizing forms are rightly considered Antiochene characteristics, but it is at least thinkable that a “purer” Greek text form (represented by Ant) became “contaminated,” especially in an Egyptian environment.

S. Sipilä, in “How to Find Out the Transgressor? A Textual Problem of Josh 7:14–18,” focuses on the specific text-critical problems of Josh 7:14–18. The internal tensions and anomalies of MT preclude a facile theory of one editor being responsible for MT. Since OG displays similar problems, the rule of \textit{lectio difficilio melior} does not help. Dismissing the common explanation of \textit{parablepesis} for the...
shorter Greek text of these verses as problematic, Sipilä suggests that a model of different editions is preferable over a model of textual priority to explain both MT and OG.

In “Reconsidering the Relationship of A and B in LXX Judges,” N. LaMontagne argues that the acceptance of B as a revision of A is flawed because only A and B are being compared. Drawing on previous research (notably of the Song of Deborah), he includes the reconstructed OG in the discussion. LaMontagne believes that OG and B were two originally independent translations and that A (possibly Origenic) blends readings from OG with those of B.

A. Aejmelaeus’s “Lectio difficilior and the Difficulties of a Critical Text: A Case Study from the Septuagint of 1 Samuel 14:47” presents a sample of her work on the critical text edition of the Old Greek of 1 Samuel for the Göttingen edition. Like Sipilä, she finds the rule lectio difficilior melior of little help as various reconstructions and retroversions are equally unconvincing. Cautiously, she suggest that neither B nor L but the majority reading may be original, Καὶ Σαοῦλ ἔλαχεν τοῦ βασιλεύειν ἐπὶ Ισραηλ.

J. Koulagna, in “Literary Problems in the Textual Transmission of 1 Kings: The MT and the LXX,” also provides a sample of text-critical work, in the framework of the Hebrew Bible: A Critical Edition (formerly known as The Oxford Hebrew Bible). Koulagna shows that textual discrepancies often arise as a result of editorial activity prior to translation. It is challenging to separate and also integrate textual and literary criticism.

S. Olofsson’s “The Translation of υψη and the Homogeneity of LXX Psalms” observes that the translator first wavered in his preference for either ἁσεβής or ἁμαρτωλός and then settled for ἁμαρτωλός. He did this for liturgical (its use as a prayer book) and theological (preference for a relational term) reasons. This shift, which moves away from the LXX Pentateuch, demonstrates the translator’s growing confidence in the course of the work. He did not align the earlier occurrences in light of his later strategy, which speaks against the idea that the translator was revising his text. I think further research is needed to see if there are other signs of evolution, since the picture of a massively systematic translator who changed his mind on only one point is not likely.

L. Cuppi’s “Scribes and Translators: Text-Critical Use of Translations of a Translation; Proverbs 8:31 as a Case Study” reads as an appeal to the editors of the Göttingen Proverbia not to a priori exclude readings not attested in Greek manuscripts from the eclectic text. Departing from Prov 8:31, Cuppi demonstrates that original readings can be found in the Latin and Sahidic (secondary) versions that are not preserved in post-Nicene manuscripts.

In “The Significance of RA 788 for a Critical Edition of the Hexaplaric Fragments of Job,” J. Meade argues that this recently rediscovered tenth-century catena manuscript is the purest witness to the
α-Vorläuferkaterne of Job. It is the (indirect) ancestor of RA 250. This analysis is relevant for a critical edition of the Hexaplaric fragments of Job, since RA 788 generally preserves correct Hexaplaric attributions, correct readings of fragments, and even proper placement of Hexaplaric signs. RA 788 will be fully incorporated into the forthcoming critical edition of the Hexaplaric fragments of Job.

P. J. Gentry argues that an answer to “Did Origen Use the Aristarchian Signs in the Hexapla?” can only be found through distinguishing between an original Hexapla and a later, shortened Tetrapla and through studying the colophons of the Syro-Hexapla, which is derived from this later version. Only then can attempts be made to answer the questions of the Aristarchean signs.

E. Kellenberger’s “Die griechischen und syrischen Erzählvarianten in ‘Bel et Draco’ als Hinweise auf den Charakter des Überlieferungsprozesses” continues his defense of an interaction of oral (retelling) and written (rewriting) transmission as the background of the differences between the two Greek versions and the Peshitta of this passage. He concludes that the “floating” of narrative variants makes the quest for an Urtext obsolete.

J. Harjumäki, in “The Armenian 1 Samuel,” discusses differences between the (Lucianic-Hexaplaric) Greek and (fifth century CE) Armenian versions. Most of them are occasioned by language differences. It appears that the literalizing second phase of the Armenian translation history left the strongest stamp on 1 Samuel. The translator sometimes employs specifications (termed “interpretative readings”). This essay would be stronger if it had a solid linguistic underpinning.

P. Cowe, in “The Strata of the Armenian Version of Cantica Examined for Contrasting Translation Technique and Witness to their Greek Parent Texts,” presents the Arm version of Songs as a conflation of two versions, an idiomatic original and its literalizing revision. Arm1 aligns with the OG, Theodotion, and the Peshitta and shows proximity to the Antiochene tradition, whereas Arm2 aligns with the Hexaplaric revision. Their predictable translation strategies allow us to isolate them and use them in the reconstruction of the Greek parent text.

In “Die altlateinischen Übersetzungen des Buches Esdras A’ in ihrer Beziehung zur griechischen Vorlage,” B. Gesche examines the Vetus Latina of that book and their relation to their Greek Vorlage in the light of the studies that trace Hebrew readings in Kingdoms and Sirach via the Old Greek preserved in the Vetus Latina. The question is more easily raised than answered, since the variants between the Latin and Greek of 1 Esdras can also be explained on the basis of inner-Latin and contextual developments (editors’ abstract).

N. Dundua surveys “The Textual Value of the Old Georgian Version of Ecclesiastes,” which she collated for the Göttingen Ecclesiastes. Against the older consensus, she suggests that the Old Georgian was translated from Greek independently of the Armenian version and aligns “with early
members of the Egyptian text group” (such as 998, Vaticanus and Sinaiticus). Examples from the book of Ecclesiastes serve to support this evaluation. The use of “AGeo” as an abbreviation of Old Georgian (?) is confusing.

A. Kharanauli’s “Battling the Myths: What Language Was the Georgian Amos Translated From?” pursues her thesis that the Old Georgian version derives directly from the Old Greek, now for the book of Amos. This she does on the basis of mistakes, structural and semantic calques of Greek words found in Geo. Similarities between Geo and Arm do not prove dependence but can be explained otherwise.

According to R. Ceulemans’s “Theodoret and the Antiochene Text of the Psalms,” Rahlfs correctly considered Theodoret’s Psalms commentary as the key to the recovery of the Antiochene text. However, it is only available in an unreliable edition (Schulze, 1769), which offers a text that was brought in alignment with the dominant koine text. A fresh edition of Theodoret, based on new manuscript evidence, can help to blow the dust off the biblical lemmas and help to reconstruct the true Antiochene psalter text.

Philology

J. Aitken, in “The Septuagint and Egyptian Translation Methods,” shows how Bickerman’s and Rabin’s subscription to Kahle’s theory of oral translations was supplied with incorrect assumptions to arrive at the “dragoman” theory. Nevertheless, their intention to place the LXX endeavor in its social context was right. If contemporary translations from Demotic into Greek are compared to the LXX Pentateuch, the same features can be detected: register, lexical (in)consistency, transliteration, inflection of noun phrases, awkward prepositions, and so on. Aitken tends to explain these as features of the local koine or of (professional) translators’ habits, not as the outcome of translation procedures.

The contribution of T. Muraoka, “Passivization in Septuagint Greek,” does not treat Hebrew verbs in active stems that are rendered with Greek passives (as one might think), but how Greek verbs occur both in active and passive voice in different passages. He makes observations about the valency of these verbs, especially in the case of pseudo-bitransitive verbs: verbs that emerge with an accusative both in active and passive voices.

In “Reflexive Pronouns in the Greek Pentateuch,” R. Sollamo finds that the LXX translators were well aware of the reflexivity in the parent text but used Greek reflexives sparingly. The preponderance of forms with ἐ- (ἐαυτοῖς, etc.), which does not parallel papyri of the third century BCE, is a testimony to the colloquial style that became common from the second century BCE onward. It is hard to detect differences between translated books of the Pentateuch. The paper also
discusses editorial choices (Rahlfs versus Wevers) with respect to aspiration, which was not marked in uncial manuscripts (see Exod 21:6, where Wevers reads αὐτῷ and Rahlfs αὑτῷ).

Ph. Le Moigne’s “Pour une poétique du nominatif absolu dans la LXX d’Ésaïe” suggests that the translator employed the absolute nominative or nominativus pendens on purpose as a poetical feature. At the same time he candidly concedes that the phenomenon is hard to explain and that he really did not try (340). Le Moigne does not engage with grammars of nonbiblical Greek and overlooks much relevant literature on LXX Isaiah. This paper would have gained in relevance had Le Moigne taken translational issues into account. What I observe from a process-oriented perspective is that the nominativus pendens has three different roots: (1) it results from literal translation, whereby the translator does not supply a copula in verbless clauses; (2) it is a way to address translation problems on clause level; (3) transcending clause level, the use of the nominative is a convenient strategy to “park” syntactical difficulties until the syntactical dénouement (hence the awkward syntax).

W. A. Ross discusses the “Lexical Possibilities in LXX Research: Revision and Expansion,” affirming the essential accuracy of John Lee’s methodology and conclusions. The exponential increase in publications of documentary papyri and the technological developments that allow for retrieval of these new data call for “revision and expansion” of this type of research. Diachronic semantics could be called in to find out, for example, which text of Judges is older.

M. Dhont’s “Literary Features in the First Cycle of Speeches in LXX Job” looks at the use of literary features in Job 3–14, especially related to word order (symmetry and chiasmus) and lexical repetitions (anaphora and epiphora). She discusses instances where the translator, by mostly minor shifts, made parallel clauses more parallel or, contrariwise, introduced stylistic variation (which characterizes LXX Job as a literary creation). Dhont does not discover consistency in this regard and wisely refrains from claims about the translator’s intentions.

In “Translation Technique in the Minor Prophets,” W. E. Glenny surveys recent studies related to this topic (Joosten, Gelston, Glenny, Van der Kooij, Muraoka, Dogniez, Dines, Bons, Theocharous) and synthesizes their findings to arrive at a comprehensive picture of the translator of the Twelve.

D. Scialabba answers the question “What Does the Noun ἀγνόημα Mean in Judith 5:20?” (i.e., does it mean “oversight” or “serious sin”?). She surveys LXX and nonbiblical usage. In contemporary sources, the lexeme denotes both factual errors and unintentional crimes that need addressing. She suggests that ἀγνόημα in Jdt 5:20 lies halfway those meanings or rather combines them. On the participant level (the pagan Achior speaking to the pagan Holofernes), it is an unintentional crime that requires amnesty, while on the level of the author’s message it denotes serious infidelity (as it functions as an antonym of ἐπίγνωσις [τοῦ θεοῦ]).
A. van der Kooij focuses “On the Use of ἀλλόφυλος in the Septuagint.” Its use as a standard rendering for the Philistines (except in the Pentateuch and Joshua) is commonly viewed as antagonism toward inhabitants of the Hellenistic coastal cities in Seleucid times. Van der Kooij rebuts this notion by showing that anti-Hellenistic overtones of the term are only present in the antithetical book 2 Maccabees, not in the rest of LXX, which follows the use of ἀλλόφυλος in 1 Maccabees as “foreign enemies.” His discussion of LXX Isaiah is somewhat obscure and seems to reintroduce through the back door the theory that Van der Kooij seeks to expel.

A. Bowden’s “A Semantic Investigation of Desire in 4 Maccabees and Its Bearing on Romans 7:7” shows how both 4 Maccabees and Paul discuss ἐπιθυμία in a remarkably similar way, that is, in the framework of mastery and rule. This foil brings out the difference that for 4 Maccabees the law comes to the aid of reason that masters passions whereas for Paul sin’s passions work through the law and can only be overcome through the Spirit.

J. A. E. Mulroney explains “The Standardisation of Translation Choice for חלילה within the LXX Pentateuch: הָיָה תִּי as a Neo-linguistic Phrase” with (1) the translators’ desire for standardization and (2) an appeal to the Aramaic background of the Pentateuch translators (and their influence on subsequent translators). To the background of Aramaic חלילה, the translators coined the novel phrase הָיָה תִּי, which became possible through the increasingly vague function of הָיָה in Koine Greek. For Herride, the neologism תי שתי was minted through a similar, though less transparent procedure.

P. Pouchelle, in “The Use of νουθετέω in the Old Greek of Job,” argues that the Greek translator of Job broke with some Pentateuch standard renderings by deliberately replacing παιδεύω and its cognates with νουθετέω for Hebrew רסי and יב hitpael. He did this, in contrast to the Proverbs translator, because νουθετέω better reflected the nuances of רסי (including corporal punishment). Pouchelle presents this as a new argument for the claim that the translators of Proverbs and Job were different.

C. Fresch’s “The Peculiar Occurrences of οὖν in Septuagint Genesis and Exodus” studies its discourse-pragmatic function to mark both continuity and development. οὖν does not render a Hebrew lexeme (not even התע, which the translator in Fresch’s view did not view as a discourse marker) but is used spontaneously to mark thematic development. Its use implies that the translators were aware of the context and its place in the wider discourse. It also appears that direct speech generates more freedom in translation.

In “The Meanings of the Noun σκάνδαλον in the Book of Judith,” E. Bons observes that the use of this vox biblica in three passages (5:1, 20; 12:2) is not wholly in line with earlier LXX usage. Bons suggests that the writer adopted σκάνδαλον from earlier translated books but employed it differently. An obstacle to Bons’s viewpoint is that in 5:1 σκάνδαλον would have been taken from metaphorical contexts to function in a literal sense (“trap”), which is highly exceptional, cross-
linguistically speaking. The conclusion is inescapable that \( \sigma \chi \alpha \nu \sigma \alpha \lambda \nu \) is only a *vox biblica* to modern researchers.

P. Danove, in “A Case Frame Description of the Usages of \( \tau \iota \theta \eta \mu \) in the Septuagint,” explains how \( \tau \iota \theta \eta \mu \) presents the broadest range of licensing properties of any verb in the Septuagint. He resolves the occurrences into twelve usages that grammaticalize seven events and describes the syntactic and semantic requirements for the verb with each usage. He also identifies the lexical realizations of required complements and illustrates occurrences of the verb with the usage.

M. Tucker’s “Using Recurring Hebrew Phrases to Evaluate a Septuagint Translation: Jeremiah 11:1–14 as a Case Study” considers the value translations of Deuteronomistic formulas to determine the relationship between different translated books. With examples of varying convincingness, he suggests that the Jeremiah translator knew and used LXX Deuteronomy, was attuned to the literalizing character of Kingdoms, but also displays distinctive features.

*Interpretation and Reception*

In “Deuteronomy Reworked, or Composition of the Narrative in the Letter of Aristeas,” E. Matusova suggests that Aristeas was familiar with a parabiblical reworking of Deut 30:1–5 and 4:5–8, wherein the themes of return from captivity and the preeminence of Jewish legislation are being elaborated.

J. M. Zurawski’s “From *Musar* to *Paideia*, from *Torah* to *Nomos*: How the Translation of the Septuagint Impacted the Paideutic Ideal in Hellenistic Judaism” describes how the “shifts in meaning” from chastisement (חביב) to the contents of instruction (παιδεία) and from instruction (הרות) to custom and law (แนะן) enabled Hellenistic diaspora Jews (Aristobulus, Philo) to present their pedagogy in philosophical (“law of nature”) terms rather than a set of particularistic laws intended for a minority.

J. Joosten, in “Legal Hermeneutics and the Tradition Underlying the Septuagint,” criticizes the common view (harking back to Frankel) that the LXX Pentateuch reflects “Palestinian exegesis.” He conducts a close reading of the Greek text of the law of the Hebrew slave, Exod 21:2–11, compares it to the Hebrew original, and places it within its own LXX context. We then see a reinterpretation of the Hebrew law to harmonize it with Deut 15 that is different from rabbinic exegesis but likely originated in the Egyptian Jewish diaspora.

M. N. van der Meer’s “Literary and Textual History of Joshua 2” exposes the shortcomings of both the theories that ascribe the (sometimes large) pluses in MT to a later Hebrew editor and the converse notion of shortening on the Greek side. After providing a literary-critical analysis of the chapter, Van der Meer shows that the Greek translator tried to strengthen the inner coherence and narrative progression of this redactionally layered text. Van der Meer’s paper is thorough and does not lack in flamboyance and humor where he engages in critical dialogue with the present reviewer.
S. Lesemann, in “Und Gideon starb in einem guten Greisalter: Ein Fall von theological exegesis in LXX Ri 8,32a?” compares the three variant Greek renderings for Comparator: בַּשֵּׂרֵת טוֹבָה: EN ΠΟΛΙΑΙ ΑΓΑΘΗΙ “in good old age” (Alexandrine tradition), EN ΠΟΛΕΙ ΑΥΤΟΥ “in his town” (kaige), EN ΠΟΛΕΙ ΑΓΑΘΗΙ “in a good town” (koine group). He finds scribal processes on the basis of similar letters improbable and claims that “in his town” reflects the revisor’s theological judgement (echoed in early Jewish literature) that Gideon did not deserve to die in good old age.

M. Meiser’s “The Septuagint Translation of the Books of Kings in the Context of the History of Early Jewish Literature” asks why the books of Kings were translated in the same period that historical texts were reworked (e.g., Chronicles, Eupolemus, Sirach, Josephus). A brief discussion of writings in chronological order leads to the conclusion that both processes were operative with different sets of interests. Meiser is not very explicit about the differences, though.

P. Chalupa, in “Erzählung und Gesetz im Buch Esther,” examines the relationship between narrative and law in the different versions of Esther (MT, LXX, Alpha-text, Josephus). Chalupa shows how the MT emphasis on Persian legislation decreases in the Old Greek and Alpha-text versions of the book of Esther, whereas for Josephus the whole narrative is presented as the consequences of those laws (editors’ abstract).

Th. J. Kraus’s “Harry Potter—Septuaginta—Mythologie: Der Basilisk—Fabelwesen, König der Schlangen, Inkarnation des Bösen oder was?” explores βασιλισκός in LXX Ps 90 and Isa 59 and its reception-historical afterlife up until its most recent appearance in the Potter movie.

In “Between Text and Interpretation: An Exegetical Commentary on LXX Proverbs,” J. Cook presents a pilot study for the SBL Commentary. Cook summarizes his viewpoints on the Einleitungsfragen and uses his analysis of Prov 1:1–4 as a building block of a (forthcoming) theology of LXX Proverbs.

In “Strange Interpretations in LXX Proverbs,” S. A. Bledsoe offers a refreshing critique of the claims of the preceding paper. He shows how the translator consistently altered verses containing words for strangers (ריע, נבר) into more neutral terms (ἀλλότριος). According to Bledsoe, the source text is thus assimilated to the target culture, a thesis that presents a challenge to Cook’s antithetical interpretation of LXX Proverbs.

M. Cimosa and G. Bonney, in “Hope in the LXX Version of Job and in Some Texts of the Fathers of the Church,” endeavor to show that to the Greek translator of Job, hope was intrinsically connected with the resurrection from the dead, a theme that he added in 42:17A and 19:26. To the background of ancient views of afterlife, they discuss how LXX Job bolstered faith in the resurrection, as seen in the Testament of Job and in patristic commentaries on Job by John Chrysostom and Olympiodorus of Alexandria.
A. T. Ngunga’s “Πνεῦμα in the Old Greek of Isaiah” examines LXX Isa 25:4–5; 44:3–4; 57:15–16; 63:10–14 and observes theological shifts in the rendering of πνεῦμα as πνεῦμα. First, spirit/breath is metaphorically associated with relief (for those oppressed); second, it is attributed to the Lord himself. These renderings served for the benefit of the injured Jewish community of Alexandria longing for redemption. Unfortunately, the methodological backbone of this paper is weak. In my view, some of the “shifts” are rather the message of the context than a particular microlevel transformation. In one example the rendering is simply literal (57:16), whereas the “disappearance” of πνεῦμα is overlooked in another (57:15). Finally, the paper lacks a historical positioning: What is the alleged distress of Alexandrian Jewry that the shifts seek to soothe?

J. Verburg, in “Truths Translated: Notes on LXX Isaiah 2:6–21,” suggests that the translator, in view of his puzzling source text, used its lexemes as building blocks for his own message, geared to the religio-political situation of his audience. To his credit, Verburg finds it not easy to determine what that situation was, not even with Seeligman and Van der Kooij in hand.

In “Dodekapropheton Quotations in Matthew’s Gospel,” G. Steyn notes that these often differ from the extant textual witnesses of the Greek Dodekapropheton and may reflect a testimonium collection. Steyn concludes with some interesting observations regarding Matthew’s modus operandi in quoting from the Twelve.

With respect to the general scope, the editors refer to my RBL review of the prior congress volume: “Scholars who have pleaded for a return to central questions of Septuagint research will be pleased to see a large part of the papers devoted to issues of textual criticism and syntax of the Septuagint” (2; see https://www.bookreviews.org/pdf/9117_10051.pdf). Attention to the Greek Pentateuch, for which that review explicitly called, remains scant, though. Noteworthy is the attention given to daughter versions of the Septuagint, to philology, and to glimpses from work in progress on several major research projects. Minor criticisms are that some papers could have profited from careful proofreading (Chalupa, Harjumäki, Kharanauli) and that the practice of copy-paste from Bible software results in Hebrew words or phrases taken out of context but with Masoretic vocalization. Scholars should know better. All in all, this volume is a worthwhile testimony to the vitality of Septuagint studies.