An Analysis of Two Early LXX Manuscripts from Qumran: 4QLXXNum and 4QLXXLevᵃ in the Light of Previous Studies

NICHOLAS PETERSEN

CINCINNATI, OHIO

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

Key Words: Septuagint, revision, 4QLXXLevᵃ, 4QLXXNum, Old Greek, Vorlage, Masoretic Text

1. INTRODUCTION

The discovery of Greek translations of the Pentateuch at Qumran was a momentous event. Dating approximately four centuries prior to the oldest codices, these documents became no less significant after it was determined that they were in fact septuagintal in nature. Two of these fragmentary documents have drawn the most scrutiny to date: 4QLXXNum (4Q121 = Rahlfs 803) and 4QLXXLevᵃ (4Q119 = Rahlfs 801).[1] Other significant finds are pap4QLXXLevᵇ (4Q120 = Rahlfs 802), pap7QLXXExod, which covers Exod 28:4–7, and 4QLXXDeut, which is identified solely by Deut 11:4.[2] Concerning 4QLXXNum, Patrick Skehan originally thought

---

1. 4QLXXNum corresponds to the following biblical passages as presented in Patrick W. Skehan, Eugene Ulrich, and Judith E. Sanderson, *Qumrân Cave 4.IV: Palaeo-Hebrew and Greek Biblical Manuscripts* (DJD 9; Oxford: Clarendon, 1992): Num 3:40–43; 4:1?, 5–9, 11–16 (3:39?, 50–51?). 4QLXXLevᵃ corresponds to a single fragmentary passage: Lev 26:2–16.

2. All of these texts, except for pap7QLXXExod, were published in the same DJD volume just cited, while pap7QLXXExod was published quite early on in *Les Petites Grottes de Qumran*

"that a somewhat awkward Greek rendering of Numbers has been re-worked anciently to yield the recension contained in our later codices."[3] By 1977, Skehan had fully altered this earlier assessment, saying: "[Rahlfs 803's] text is not such as can be supposed to underlie the form presented in later Septuagint codices; *it is instead a considerable reworking of the original LXX* to make it conform both in quantity and in diction to a Hebrew con-sonantal text nearly indistinguishable, within the limited scope of our evi-dence, from that of MT."[4] Shortly after this in 1982, John Wevers agreed with the essentials of this assessment, concluding that our LXX manu-script tradition best represents the OG and that 803 is in fact "an early revision of the Septuagint of Numbers."[5]

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

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

(by M. Baillet, J. T. Milik, and R. de Vaux; DJD 3/1; Oxford: Clarendon, 1962), 142–43. Little can be said about 4QLXXDeut. Pap4QLXXLev[b], on the other hand, would best be examined in con-junction with 4QLXXNum and 4QLXXLev[a]. Nevertheless, a fuller treatment of these lengthy remaining fragments must be left aside for now. As for pap7QLXXExod, it is quite evident that it is both septuagintal in nature (repeating, as it does, unique septuagintal phraseology) and yet revised in the direction of a Hebrew Vorlage like that of the MT. Even the first word of the frag-ment, though it is a restoration from two possibly remaining letters, would reflect MT's אָחִיךָ, which is not reflected in G[ed]. It may be emphasized that this note is restricted to an account of the pentateuchal fragments from Qumran, and thus the momentous impact that came from the *Twelve Prophets Scroll* (8HevXIIgr) need not be curtly summarized here.

    3. Patrick W. Skehan, "The Qumran Manuscripts and Textual Criticism," in *International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament: Congress Volume, Strasbourg 1956* (VTSup 4; Leiden: Brill, 1957), 157; as cited in idem, "4QLXXNum: A Pre-Christian Reworking of the Septuagint," *HTR* 70 (1977): 39.

    4. Ibid., emphasis mine.

    5. John W. Wevers, "An Early Revision of the Septuagint of Numbers," *ErIsr* 16 (Orlinsky Volume; 1982): 235*.

    6. Eugene Ulrich, "The Septuagint Manuscripts from Qumran: A Reappraisal of Their Value," in *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings: Papers Presented to the International Sympo-sium on the Septuagint and Its Relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings (Manchester, 1990)* (ed. George J. Brooke and Barnabas Lindars; Septuagint, Scrolls, and Cognate Studies 33; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 75–76.

    7. Ibid., 52, emphasis mine.

that I propose a reassessment of the value of the variants of the LXX mss from Qumran.[8]

Ulrich takes issue with Wevers's approach, albeit cordially, in that Ulrich sees Wevers as too often relying on the MT as though that same text lay before the original translators.[9]

1.2. Reception of Ulrich's Proposals

Ulrich's views have been well received as can be seen in Leonard Greenspoon's endorsement on both of the points specified above: "In our opinion, there is force to Ulrich's arguments in favor of the originality of these Qumran readings as constituting the Old Greek text and as accurate reflections of a Hebrew Vorlage at variance with the MT."[10] In 1999, Ulrich republished his original article in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*,[11] which included praise on the back cover from Florentino García Martínez, Frank Moore Cross, and Emanuel Tov. A little before this (1997), Wevers had notably accepted 2 of the 15 variants of 4QLXXLev[a] as representative of the OG,[12] but as Metso and Ulrich put it, "he resisted the remainder."[13] Emanuel Tov, although notably questioning whether anything definitive could be said about 4QLXXNum on this matter, stated in 2001 that 4QLXXLev[a] and pap4QLXXLev[b] are "probably" better reflections of the OG:

> Two of the Qumran texts probably reflect the Old Greek translation better than the manuscript tradition contained in the later uncial manuscripts (4QLXXLev[a], 4QpapLXXLev[b]; the evidence for 4QLXXNum is less clear). Furthermore, the transliteration of the

8. Ibid., 65.

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

10. Leonard J. Greenspoon, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Greek Bible," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (ed. P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam; vol. 1; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 109–10.

11. Eugene Ulrich, "The Septuagint Manuscripts from Qumran: A Reappraisal of Their Value," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Leiden: Brill / Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 165–83.

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

13. Sarianna Metso and Eugene Ulrich, "The Old Greek Translation of Leviticus," in *The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception* (ed. Rolf Rendtorff, Robert A. Kugler, and Sarah S. Bartel; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 264.

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

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

1.3. Preliminary Conclusions

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

---

14. Emanuel Tov, "The Nature of the Greek Texts from the Judean Desert," *NovT* 43 (2001): 10.

15. "The Old Greek Translation," 247–68.

16. Ibid., 264.

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

4QLXXNUM

2.1. Numbers 3:40: 803 col. I 2

[λεγων] ἀριθμησο‿ [παν πρωτοτοκον αρσεν]/[των υι]ων Ισραηλ . . .]] ἐπί-
σκεψαι πᾶν πρωτο͞τοκον ἄρσεν τῶν υἱῶν Ισραηλ G^ed; פְּקֹד כָּל־בְּכֹר זָכָר לִבְנֵי
יִשְׂרָאֵל MT, SamP

2.1.1. *The Renderings of* פקד *in G^ed and the*
Variant Tradition, Wevers's Conclusions

Wevers has done a good service by listing all of the textual variants for the
ἀριθμεῖν/ἐπισκέπτεσθαι renderings of פקד in the Greek Numbers tradi-
tion.[18] It is only in chaps. 1–4 of Numbers (if we exclude 7:2, in which the
variants were only marginal) that this variant fluctuation occurs; even
Num 26 surprisingly lacks this variant.[19] Never does ἀριθμεῖν render פקד
within Vaticanus or Sinaiticus, while this does occur in Alexandrinus 12
times (from 2:4 to 3:22). As such, 803 is not alone in having this type of
reading, although it is notably the only manuscript that has this kind of
reading in Num 3:40. Skehan observed: "The practice is not that of the
three later translators α', σ' and θ' . . . which should suffice to establish that
the three worked regularly with forms related to ἐπισκέπτειν."[20]

Concerning the dearth of instances in which the root of ἀριθμεῖν was
used as a rendering for פקד throughout the entirety of G^ed, Wevers states
that "Ἀριθμεῖν/ἀριθμός are not normally used in LXX as renderings for
פקד" and that outside the Numbers variant tradition only four instances
occur as such: 1 Chr 21:6; 2 Chr 17:14, 25:5, 26:11.[21] As an aside, the 2 Chr
26:11 instance is noteworthy in that the semantic relationship between
number and *muster* is portrayed in the Hebrew text: במספר פקדתם, "An army
that goes out as a troop by the *number* of their *musterings*." Wevers then
points out how meager these 4 occurrences of ἀριθμεῖν are when compared
to 196 times in which ἐπισκέπτεσθαι is employed and then states, "It is ob-
vious from this that ἐπισκέπτεσθαι was considered to be a *standard equiva-
lent* for פקד."[22] Wevers concludes by stating:

> As in the case of αρτηρ, so this variant seems to be rooted in the desire
> to clarify the Greek text. It is not the kind of variant which is *more He-
> braic* than [Numbers of G^ed] as would be expected from the so-called
> καίγε recension; rather it is a variant clarifying a Hebraic kind of
> Greek by a more idiomatic text.[23]

must necessitate some familiarization with the main works of Ulrich, Wevers, Skehan, and of
the critical DJD texts.

18. Wevers, "An Early Revision," 237*.
19. Ibid., 238*.
20. Skehan, "4QLXXNum," 42.
21. Wevers, "An Early Revision," 238*.
22. Ibid., emphasis mine.
23. Ibid., emphasis mine.

Wevers defines "idiomatic text" in this instance as a clearer, de-Semiticized translation. It clarifies both the Greek text and "a Hebraic kind of Greek." This conclusion qualified and altered part of Skehan's revised position: 803 did not just "conform both in quantity and in diction to [a text resembling MT]," because a purely conformist text does little to clarify.[24]

2.1.2. Ulrich's Analysis on This Variant

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

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

Argument 2: A clever point is made that the traditional name of the book, Ἀριθμοί, should be expected to derive "from occurrences of the word in the text."[26] Although this statement is true, it is incorrect to conclude that, *therefore*, the title must have been drawn from one of the instances in which the Hebrew text had פקד. No one has claimed that it is rare for the roots ἀριθμ- and ספר *to occur* in the Pentateuch; what has been argued is that it is rare for the root ἀριθμ- to render פקד. And thus Ulrich's argument would only work if it could be shown that a form of the root ἀριθμ- is unlikely to have been selected for this book's title, for whatever reason. With this said, it seems clear that the title Ἀριθμοί did indeed come from an occurrence of this word in the text, but the Hebrew word it rendered was not פקד. Given the practice of naming a book from an opening verse, it is quite likely that Num 1:2 was an inspiration for this title, where במספר שמות is rendered κατὰ ἀριθμὸν ἐξ ὀνόματος αὐτῶν. The word מספר is precisely the Hebrew word we would have expected to underlie ἀριθμός. The text is thus "Take a census . . . *according to the number* of their name(s)." It may be further noted that it is in the very next verse (1:3) that פקד occurs for the first time in Numbers: תפקדו אתם לצבאתם, "you shall *number/muster* them according to their armies," which is rendered in G[ed] as ἐπισκέψασθε αὐτούς. It is notable that מִסְפַּר (and, reflecting it, G[ed]'s ἀριθμός) occurs in the text

---

24. Skehan, "4QLXXNum," 39, emphasis mine.
25. Ulrich, "Septuagint Manuscripts," 70.
26. Ibid.

before פקד and ἐπισκέπτειν occur, and thus פקד and ἀριθμεῖν are given first place in the book of Numbers but at the dictation of the Hebrew text.

Argument 3: Ulrich speaks of ἐπισκέπτεσθαι becoming a recensional equivalent for פקד, but he admits that "a principle of the recensionists was to choose one of the several OG precedents and [to] standardise it as the recensional equivalent."[27] Besides this admission, why should we throw out the idea that the original LXX (OG) had its own standard equivalents? For instance, the fact that the noun ἐπίσκεψις is only used in G^ed to render a form of פקד (e.g., פְּקֻדָּה and מִפְקָד) speaks of a significant standard equivalent.[28] These same points apply to Ulrich's fourth argument.

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

> Insofar as this passage falls in a section usually considered recensional, the most logical explanation would be that the occurrences of both αριθμειν and επισκεπτεσθαι together represent the OG unrevised in that passage, and that this in turn argues in favor of αριθμειν in 4QLXXNum as the OG revised in G^B.[29]

There are a number of critical steps that Ulrich makes in this passage that are highly questionable. For one, Ulrich effectively states that a recensional passage could not have ἀριθμεῖν and ἐπισκέπτεσθαι occur together in the same passage, but this is simply not true (see the next paragraph below).[30] But even if we were to concede this point, would not the fact that

27. Ibid., 80 n. 23.

28. To continue this example, outside Numbers, ἐπίσκεψις (as a noun) occurs 3 times in Exodus (30:13, 14; 38:26), once in 2 Samuel (24:9), 6 times in 1 Chronicles (21:5; 23:11, 24; 24:3, 19; 26:30), and 4 times in Jeremiah (11:23, 23:12, 48:44, 51:18). This makes for a total of 14 occurrences of ἐπίσκεψις outside Numbers, and every one of these occurrences renders a form of the root פקד. Within Numbers, ἐπίσκεψις occurs 41 times, all of these occurring within chaps. 1–4 and 26, except for a single occurrence in 16:29. Throughout the entirety of G^ed then, ἐπίσκεψις occurs 55 times, and it is notable that in every instance it renders the root פקד. Is it plausible to suppose that the texts from which G^ed is made (from the Pentateuch to Chronicles) were so thoroughly harmonized and revised as to produce a result such as this? This would, of course, go against everything we know about the unhomogenistic nature G^ed, where significant tendencies exist in certain groupings of books, in individual books, and in unique sections of those books. It is easier to conclude that standard equivalencies existed from the origins of the LXX (i.e., the OG). Without doubt, most of the precedents would have been established with the translation of the Torah in Alexandria. For finding equivalencies between the LXX and the Hebrew text, I have made use of *The Revised CATSS Hebrew/Greek Parallel Text* (ed. Emanuel Tov and Frank Polak; 2005) made available through the "Parallel BHS and LXX Module" in *BibleWorks 7*. Although the *CATSS* text is based on Rahlfs's text, I will still simply refer to the occurrences found in *CATSS* as being from G^ed. Those who have assiduously labored on the *CATSS* texts should be commended for making such a dynamic tool available.

29. Ulrich, "Septuagint Maunscripts," 71–72.

30. These words can occur in close proximity *regardless* of whether the passage is considered to be recensional. This chapter forms part of the well-known βγ section (2 Sam 11:2–1 Kgs 2:11), which exhibits the καίγε revisional trend.

Ulrich's desired variant (which goes against the mainstream of standard equivalencies in G^ed) occurred in a recensional passage provide one of the best reasons for *rejecting* that variant as representing the OG? This begs the question: based on what solid methodological principle can one excerpt passages that are thought to be recensional and proceed to classifying them as "unrevised"? But even if we were to concede this point as well, by what means does one variant in 2 Samuel tell us what the OG must be in the Pentateuch? It seems that Ulrich was already persuaded that almost all of G^ed is a highly revised text. This would explain why he overlooked the hundreds of instances in G^ed (and especially in the Pentateuch) that would argue against his position, while trumpeting this single passage as somehow representing the OG.

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

24:2: ‏ופקדו את־העם, καὶ ἐπίσκεψαι τὸν λαόν
24:4: ‏לפקד את־העם, ἐπισκέψασθαι τὸν λαόν
24:1: ‏מנה את־ישׂראל ואת־יהודה, ἀρίθμησον τὸν Ισραηλ
24:10: ‏אחרי־כן ספר את־העם, μετὰ τὸ ἀριθμῆσαι τὸν λαόν

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

2.1.3. Conclusion

For Ulrich's argument to be considered viable, we must address why Vaticanus never has a פקד/ἀριθμεῖν equivalent other than what occurs in Chronicles. Was this codex thoroughly revised on this point, with every פקד/ἀριθμεῖν equivalent smoothed over and revised? It makes more sense to see 803 as "a variant clarifying a Hebraic kind of Greek."[31]

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

[α]ρτηρας] τοὺς ἀναφορεῖς G^ed; בד MT. Equivalent ἀρτήρ/ἀναφορεύς variants for בד in Num 4:8, 11. Num 4:12: ε[π] αρτηρος] ἐπὶ ἀναφορεῖς G^ed; על־המוט MT

---

31. Wevers, "An Early Revision," 238*.

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

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

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

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

2.2.2. The Overall Provenance of These Texts

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

32. Ulrich, "Septuagint Manuscripts," 73.

33. Natalio Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Versions of the Bible* (trans. Wilfred G. E. Watson; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 248. Regardless of how divided scholarly opinion is on the issue of "proto-Lucianic" texts, that some of these early texts have demonstrated stylistic tendencies has bearing on this question.

34. The parchments themselves may inform us of something with regard to their overall provenance. The statement that "Frg. 7 [of 4QLXXNum] seems to betray that the manuscript had been ruled and that the scribe, in the Hebrew style, suspended the letters from the lines" must work into our considerations (Skehan, Ulrich, and Sanderson, *Qumran Cave 4.IV,* 187). This observation was significant enough for Skehan that he placed fragment 7 at the top margin of col. II (Skehan, "4QLXXNum," 45). If this fragment can be shown to have been ruled as such

Was Greek in sufficient usage in these locales to explain a find such as this? To this we may answer that evidence has been gathering for some time now that Greek was indeed used by a significant portion of its inhabitants (before 70). Thus, Joseph Fitzmyer wrote concerning the ossuary inscriptions in the vicinity of Jerusalem:

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

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

2.2.3. *Analysis of Ἀρτήρ*

Ἀρτήρ is a rare word, never occurring in Philo or Josephus and only once in G[ed] at Neh 4:11.[37] Wevers observes that the formation of this word is

---

and if the letters were suspended "in the Hebrew style," some implications follow: The most natural of these is that this text's providence was from somewhere in Israel, which is what made it possible for the translator to be influenced by Hebraic scribal practices. Fragment 7 of 803 is quite small, however, and so Skehan's observations need to be validated on this point.

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

36. Though we could have surmised that there were some significant bodies of Greek-speaking Jews in Jerusalem from some of Luke's indications, such as Acts 6:1: ἐγένετο γογγυσμὸς τῶν Ἑλληνιστῶν [sc. Ιουδαίων] πρὸς τοὺς Ἑβραίους.

37. A search on this was done, as with many other searches represented below, with the morphologically tagged texts of Philo (based on *The Philo Concordance Database* [ed. Peder Borgen, Kåre Fuglseth, and Roald Skarsten, 2005]) and Josephus as they appear in *BibleWorks 7*.

well understood: "The -τηρ suffix was commonly used in Hellenistic Greek for names of utensils (this was already true in Attic Greek), and so the meaning 'instrument for carrying' was perfectly clear."[38] It is Wevers's contention that "the reviser felt ἀναφορεύς was an agent noun, i.e. a 'carrier' rather than the means of carrying; in fact, in v. 12 the [G^ed] text could easily be interpreted as referring to the bearers instead of the carrying staves."[39] If this suggestion is accepted, it would then present good evidence that 803 had both the Hebrew text and the OG (represented in this case by G^ed) before him. By use of ἀρτήρ—an *object* for lifting—the reviser would better communicate the Hebrew to the reader while removing the possibility of an agent understanding (a problem that arose from the Greek translation).

For this point to be valid, however, one thing first needs to be demonstrated with regard to this suffix. Although it can have an instrumental meaning, nouns formed from the -τηρ suffix can also in fact represent an agent, as Smyth states: "2. δοτήρ *giver* . . . [in LXX, only δοτής, n.p.], σωτήρ *savior* (σῴ-ζω)."[40] Consider also Smyth 863 a. 3: "7. τηρ: primary, to denote the agent (839 a. 2), often regarded as the instrument: ῥαστήρ hammer . . . ἀρυτήρ ladle." If the main intent of 803 in employing ἀρτήρ was to make clearer the *instrumental* meaning of this noun over against a possible *agent* meaning (as we are arguing with Wevers), then this issue must be addressed. For even if the -τηρ suffix were to refer (let us say) half of the time to instruments, its employment would hardly clarify anything because an agent use would still be just as possible. According to my search, the nouns formed with the -τηρ suffix in G^ed can be split into the following three groups. Of the instrumental objects, it becomes obvious that cultic objects dominate, and thus the division that follows:

1. -τηρ suffix nouns representing *cultic objects* (although some of these can also have a noncultic usage): ἀναλημπτήρ, δίωστήρ, ἐπαρυστήρ, καλυπτήρ, κλιμακτήρ, λουτήρ, μυξωτήρ, ποδιστήρ, σφαιρωτήρ, ὑποχυτήρ, ψυκτήρ, φυσητήρ
2. -τηρ suffix nouns representing *noncultic objects*: ὀνυχιστήρ, ἀρτήρ (Neh 4:11), ἀστήρ, φωστήρ, γαστήρ, λαμπτήρ, μυκτήρ
3. -τηρ suffix nouns representing human agents: σωτήρ, ἀροτήρ [41]

The word σωτήρ itself is authentic to Classical Greek (e.g., LSJ: *h.Hom.* 22.5—σ. τῆς, Ἑλλάδος). Given this survey, it becomes evident that (a) the

38. Wevers, "An Early Revision," 237*.

39. Ibid., 236*–37*.

40. Herbert Weir Smyth, *A Greek Grammar for Colleges* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956), 839 a. 2.

41. The words πατήρ, μήτηρ, and θυγάτηρ are not, as it may seem, -τηρ suffix nouns. These are rather stems that end in -ερ but in -τερ when a vowel precedes (thus, ἀνήρ is of the same class), although the vowel is lengthened in the nominative. The genitive of true -τηρ suffix nouns keeps the long η throughout (thus σωτῆρος opposite θυγατέρος, or contracted θυγατρός).

agent usage in the LXX is hardly substantial and (b) the instrumental usage is dominated by cultic objects. If 803's intent was to avoid an agent meaning, he would have succeeded in using a -τηρ suffix noun such as ἀρτήρ, at least as we can judge from G[ed].

In addition to this point made by Wevers, we may also see a *reaction to G[ed]* by 803's word choice. There is little doubt that the reviser would have had a number of other equivalencies he could have used for בד and מוט. In fact, we have preserved for us two other Greek words that were used to translate בד in G[ed] (all in the Pentateuch): διωστήρ, occurring five times in Exod 38–40, and σκυτάλη, occurring twice in Exod 30:4, 5. All of these concern the same poles of the ark, as in 30:4, והיה לבתים לבדים לשאת אתו בהמה, καὶ ἔσονται ψαλίδες ταῖς *σκυτάλαις* ὥστε αἴρειν αὐτὸ ἐν αὐταῖς. Neither of these words has the meaning "lifting" or "bearing" in its root, just as בד lacks any meaning of this sort. Yet if we derive ἀρτήρ from αἴρω (i.e., aorist stem αρ-), and if we also adopt Wevers's understanding of the -τηρ suffix as representing an object, then a clear semantic connection appears between G[ed]'s substantive use of the root ἀναφέρ- and 803's substantive use of αἴρω. This last word is, of course, defined as "to lift, raise up."[42] The question is was this rare word chosen (over against the other already-occurring options) due to influence of G[ed]'s ἀναφορεύς, so that the meaning "lift up" in ἀναφέρειν was maintained? One conclusion of this article is that 803 was significantly influenced by the septuagintal text. If this is an accurate assessment, then it would not be surprising for 803 to have been influenced by G[ed]'s ἀναφορεύς.

2.3. *Revisions toward the MT in 4QLXXNum*

Concerning the two other variants that Ulrich addressed in 803,[43] G[ed] departs from the MT in both instances, while 803 reflects the MT in at least one of them. Concerning the second of these (και τα σπ[. . .), Wevers states that Skehan's restoration "is fully possible" and that "if correct [it] is a better rendering for the fourth item; it would then be a correction towards the Hebrew," even though we cannot be sure of this restoration.[44] On the other hand, the υ[α]ϙινθι[νον] variant is a certain instance in which 803 reads with MT against G[ed]. Ulrich says of these two instances: "It is impossible to decide with the evidence available" which text better represents the OG.[45] To me, it looks like 803 tends to revise toward the Hebrew. Besides these two variants, however, there are a number of other instances (these were already noted by Wevers) in which 803 presented a reading in unison with MT opposite G[ed].

---

42. LSJ s.v.
43. Num 4:7: υ[α]ϙινθι[νον]; Num 4:14: και τα σπ[ονδεια] (or: και τας π[. . .]).
44. Wevers, "An Early Revision," 236*.
45. Ulrich, "Septuagint Manuscripts," 74.

2.3.1. *Numbers 3:42: 803 col. I 10*

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

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

The reconstruction of lines 20b–21 follow: «(*line 20b*) . . . ιμ]ᾱτιον υ[α]κ̣ινθι (*line 21*) [νον και **δωσουσιν επ α]υ̱τη̱ν̱** τα τ[ρ]υ̱βλι».[48] Rahlfs 803 remarkably restores the verb that was left unaccounted for in G[ed] corresponding to **וְנָתְנוּ עָלָיו**. The letter count with δωσουσιν is 29. "α]υτην" likely requires a verb preceding it. This is another warranted reconstruction that shows 803 to be closer to MT than is G[ed].

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

Rahlfs 803 renders **וְנָתְנוּ** (of בגד תכלת אל־בגד) with και θησουσιν instead of G[ed]'s ἐμβαλοῦσιν. Wevers rightly calls this "a literalism, particularly in view of the εἰς construction which follows the verb."[49]

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

This instance should be added to Wevers's category "Lexical and Syntactical Revisions in 803 towards MT." In 4:6, 8, and 11, G[ed] rendered אֶת־בַּדָּיו with τοὺς ἀναφορεῖς. In 4:12, however, a different Hebrew word is used: מוֹט. G[ed] smoothed this over once again with ἀναφορεῖς (same noun, again in the plural). Rahlfs 803, however, rendered this with the *singular* α̱ρ̱τ̱ηρος. Wevers stated that "it is quite possible that this is a scribal error for -ρας, which is the 803 reading in the other three instances."[50] Rather, this should be understood as reflecting the singular noun of the MT. [51]

---

46. See Wevers, "An Early Revision," 235*.

47. The letter count of lines 7–13 in this column is as follows (the restored αυτωι is in line 7, here underlined): 30, 33, 32, <u>29</u>, 28, 30, 32. It should be noted that the 33-letter count of line 8 is exceptional: although even a 34-letter count occurs in the larger col. II, according to my count, there never is a 33 or even a 32 count there, and even the 34-letter count has only one certain letter preserved (line 31 of frag. 14, which also comes at the end of that column). Thus, a 27(–28)-letter count and a 32–34-letter count are on the fringe.

48. See ibid.

49. Ibid., 236*.

50. Ibid.

51. To our misfortune, G[ed] has two substantial variants in Num 4:13–14 that narrowly escaped preservation in the fragmentary remains of 803. (1) G[ed] significantly deviates from the MT at Num 4:13, where ודשנו את־המזבח of 13a is radically changed to καὶ τὸν καλυπτῆρα

2.4. Concluding Remarks on 803

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

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

ἐπιθήσει. Although the reconstruction by Skehan reads with the MT (reconstructing εκσποδιασουσιν), Wevers shows that this "begs the question"; the evidence does not support either reading (ibid.). (2) In Num 4:14, G^ed (and SamP) has an expansive addition at the end of that verse. This addition is not supported by 803 *if the present placement of fragment 20 is correct.* Nevertheless, this fragment need only be moved down a little for it to read with the addition present in G^ed (this fragment definitely corresponds to the following verse, Num 4:15, *but no overlap* occurs between fragment 20 and the previous fragment). Thus, Wevers's advice should be heeded: "For purposes of assessing 803 quantitatively, it would be safer not to take this [variant] into consideration" (ibid.). Although the variants that were listed above concerned instances in which 803 read closer to the MT, Wevers demonstrates a number of variants in which 803 reads *with* G^ed against the MT, such as Num 4:6, 803 col. II 18, where 803 agrees with G^ed in that it "did not have αυτου . . . correspond to the pronominal suffix" of MT's בדיו (ibid., 235*). This also occurs in Num 4:8 (ibid.). Elsewhere, G^ed and 803 have an addition to what appears in the MT: in Num 4:7, 803 col. II 20, G^ed and 803 add ἐπ᾽ αὐτὴν (only in the restored text of 803), and in Num 4:8, 803 col. II 28, G^ed and 803 add δι᾽ αὐτῆς (again, only in the restored text, but quite likely).

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

4QLXXLev[a]

3.1. Leviticus 26:4: 801 3

[καὶ δωσω τον υετον **τ]ηι γηι υμων** εν καιρωι αυ[του . . .]; T[Jon]] καὶ δώσω **τὸν ὑετὸν ὑμῖν** ἐν καιρῷ αὐτοῦ G[ed]; וְנָתַתִּי גִשְׁמֵיכֶם בְּעִתָּם MT, SamP

Rahlfs 801 reads (hyper-literally): "the rains to your land" (i.e., in a possessive sense) as opposed to G[ed]'s "the rains to you" (i.e., your rains). The difference is what possesses the rains. In 801, it is the "land's rain," while the land itself is possessed by the people. Rahlfs 801's reading is not without precedent, as Ulrich points out: "4QLXXLev[a] can be seen as a free translation of the sense of the same Hebrew. Occurrences, however, such as מטר־ארץ . . . in the similar list of covenant blessings in Deut 28:12, demonstrate that 4QLXXLev[a] could also be reflecting more literally a different Hebrew *Vorlage*."[53] There are in fact three occurrences of מטר or גשם in direct construct with ארץ in the MT, all of which occur within Deuteronomy: 11:14, 28:12, and 28:24. Furthermore, there are four occurrences in the MT in which a syntactic construction similar to גִשְׁמֵיכֶם בְּעִתָּם occurs (i.e., [עת or another temporal noun, such as יום] + ב + [גשם or מטר]): Lev 26:4; Ezek 22:24, 34:26; and Zech 10:1. Given the frequent similarity in language or thought between Leviticus and Ezekiel, the fact that two of these four occurrences appear in Ezekiel is worthy of mention. We may conclude that Ulrich's suggestion that a different Hebrew Vorlage underlies 801 in this instance is possible in terms of Hebrew usage, although both positions find equal support in this regard.[54]

3.2. Leviticus 26:4: 801 3–4

[καὶ η γη δωσει τα γενηματα αυτης **κ]αι τον ξυλινον καρ**ο[(καρπον?)]] καὶ ἡ γῆ δώσει τὰ γενήματα αὐτῆς **καὶ τὰ ξύλα τῶν πεδίων** ἀποδῶσει **τὸν καρπὸν** αὐτῶν G[ed]; וְעֵץ הַשָּׂדֶה יִתֵּן פִּרְיוֹ MT, SamP[55]

52. Skehan, "4QLXXNum," 39, emphases mine.

53. Ulrich, "Septuagint Manuscripts," 53.

54. Wevers's response to Ulrich was "I am, however, as a general rule, chary of retroversions [to a different Hebrew Vorlage] without any extant remains" (*Notes*, 438). It may be noted here that this variant was mistakenly listed in *Notes* as [τ]ης γης instead of [τ]ηι γηι (ibid.).

55. Fortunately, the preliminarily published reading of this variant (ξυλον εν κα[) was corrected after examination of the infrared photograph and reinspection of the manuscript (Skehan, Ulrich, and Sanderson, *Qumrân Cave 4.IV*, 163).

According to Ulrich, this variant should be read as "arboreal fruit."[56] Wevers renders this unusual phrase as follows: "If 801 did read τον ξυλινον καρπον it would mean 'the wooden fruit,' and then by extension fruit wooden in source, i.e., 'tree fruit.'"[57] Ulrich considered this variant to be one of four (and now one of six) primary instances supporting his conclusions.[58] As will be demonstrated below, I believe that, to the contrary, this variant stands as one of the prime examples in 801 of idiomatic revision.

3.2.1. Usage of ξύλινος in Greek

The word ξύλινος has two basic usages as is clear from LSJ.[59] The first use is defined as *"of wood, wooden."* Herodotus (*Hist.*) uses ξύλινος in this sense at 4:108, where he speaks of wooden houses (οἰκίαι ξυλίναι), "wooden shrines" (νηοῖσι ξυλίνοισι), and so on. This usage is not idiomatic; a literal and straightforward translation of this into other languages produces no problem. The second usage is listed as "ὁ ξύλινος καρπός—produce *of trees*, i.e. fruit, wine, or oil, opp. ξηρός . . . Str.15.1.20: pl., ξ. καρποί, opp. σιτικοί, Id.5.4.2, cf. D.S.3.63" (emphasis mine). In the last passage cited for Strabo (5.4.2), he speaks of the Picentine country (next to the Alps, he says), of which he states τὴν χώραν, ἀγαθὴν πρὸς ἅπαντα, βελτίω δὲ τοῖς ξυλίνοις καρποῖς ἢ τοῖς σιτικοῖς, "the country, [which] is good for every (use), although it is better for tree produce than it is for grain [produce]." Here we see ξύλινος (as an adjective) modifying its noun, in contrastive parallel to σιτικός (as an adjective) modifying the same noun (i.e., σιτικοῖς [καρποῖς]). Synonymous with the usage of σιτικός just given is ξηρός (as in the entry above). In the LSJ entry on ξύλινος, we see this adjective paired with καρπός: "καρπὸς ξηρός, i.e., cereal, opp. κ. ξύλινος, produce of trees, i.e. fruit, wine, or oil, ξ. χόρος *hay* . . . ξηροι καρποί, opp. οἶνος, ἔλαιον."

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

---

56. Ulrich, "Septuagint Manuscripts," 54.
57. Wevers, *Notes*, 438.
58. Ulrich, "Septuagint Manuscripts," 75–76.
59. Though these usages are not numbered separately, being as they are within the first paragraph of the LSJ entry (entry #1), it is clear that they are presented as discrete usages.

3.2.2. Usage of ξύλινος in the LXX and
Ulrich's Argument on This Variant

An analysis of the occurrences of ξύλινος throughout G[ed] confirms the adequacy of the entry on this word in the *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*.[60] That entry lists *"of wood, wooden* Lev 11:32; *of a tree* Lev 27:30; *growing on trees* Sir 22:16; τὰ ξύλινα *trees*, Deut 28:42; θεοὶ ξύλινοι *wooden images of gods, wooden idols* LtJer 3." Two basic usages are thus described: (1) the basic adjectival use (= LSJ usage #1) and (2) a substantival use of the adjective (i.e., τὰ ξύλινα, *trees*). The important point is that LSJ usage #2 is never attested in G[ed]. As for ξύλινος and καρπός occurring in conjunction in G[ed], this happens only at Lev 27:30 and in the Apocrypha at 1 Macc 10:30. We will look at these references further below, but it may first be added that the only place in Philo where ξύλινος and καρπός occur in conjunction is in *Congr.* 1:95, where Philo happens to be citing Lev 27:30: πᾶσα γάρ φησιλέγω δεκάτη τῆς γῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ σπέρματος καὶ τοῦ καρποῦ τοῦ ξυλίνου ἐστὶν ἅγιον τῷ κυρίῳ. Thus, Philo reproduces the critical phrase of Lev 27:30 verbatim with the G[ed] reading. Because Ulrich's argument largely depends on reference to Lev 27:30 (see immediately below), this precise citation by Philo is noteworthy.

Ulrich not only thinks 801's reading better represents the OG, but he also thinks that 801's ξύλινον καρπόν may reflect a different Hebrew Vorlage: "With regard to the Hebrew *Vorlage*, the similar phrase του καρπου του ξυλινου = 'מפרי העץ' in the next chapter (Lev 27:30) shows that 4QLXXLev[a] may perhaps depend upon a slightly different Hebrew text," in which case "G[ed] is probably the result of a revision toward the MT."[61] If the scroll is original, 801 may "possibly [be] a literal reflection of a different Hebrew Vorlage."[62] Ulrich commits to this position further (than is indicated by "perhaps") by listing this variant as one of four (and later six) that he thinks best support 801 as representing the OG.

As for Ulrich's suggestion that 801's variant reading "may perhaps depend upon a slightly different Hebrew text," it is notable that Ulrich never explicitly proposes what a variant Hebrew reading of this sort would have been—does Ulrich mean to suggest that the reading of MT at Lev 27:30 represents the presumed parent text of 801? But even if this is the suggestion (it is hard to imagine what else could be), 801's ξύλινος καρπός is hardly a straightforward translation of פְּרִי הָעֵץ. We would rather expect one of the following: (a) exactly what G[ed] has for this in 27:30: ἀπὸ τοῦ σπέρματος τῆς γῆς καὶ τοῦ καρποῦ τοῦ ξυλίνου, where ξύλινος is used substantivally, (b) καὶ τοῦ καρποῦ τοῦ ξύλου, with the noun τὸ ξύλον, or (c) καὶ τοῦ καρποῦ τοῦ δένδρου, with the noun τό δένδρον.

---

60. Johan Lust, Erik Eynikel, and Katrin Hauspie, *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (rev. ed.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2003).

61. Ulrich, "Septuagint Manuscripts," 54.

62. Ibid.

In summary, the following four points show Ulrich's appeal to Lev 27:30 as failing to support his conclusions: (1) an adequate proposal for a parent text of 801's variant is difficult to suggest; (2) the use of ξύλινος in 801 is not comparable to the substantival use of ξύλινος in Lev 27:30, to which Ulrich makes a comparison; and (3) G^ed's translation of Lev 27:30 is what we would expect to render the Hebrew, not 801's reading. Although the use of a noun such as τὸ ξύλον or τὸ δένδρον may occur more frequently, the substantival use of ξύλινος is not unusual. Last of all, (4) the close proximity of Lev 27:30 (which provides one of only two instances throughout G^ed in which ξύλινος and καρπός occur in conjunction) with Lev 26:4 is explained by considerations of the expression "פְּרִי הָעֵץ" (i.e., the close proximity of these passages is due to the Hebrew text itself).

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

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

3.2.3. 1 Maccabees and Josephus

As we have seen, 1 Macc 10:30 attests the only occurrence of ξύλινος and καρπός in conjunction in the Apocrypha. The speaker of 1 Macc 10:30 is Demetrius the Seleucid king:

> καὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ τρίτου τῆς σπορᾶς καὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἡμίσους τοῦ καρποῦ τοῦ ξυλίνου τοῦ ἐπιβάλλοντός μοι λαβεῖν ἀφίημι ἀπὸ τῆς σήμερον . . .

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

The key phrase here is identical with that of Lev 27:30, and both are substantival usages of ξύλινος. This letter is preserved elsewhere by Josephus,

but his text varies in some notable ways from that of 1 Maccabees. *Jewish Antiquities* 13:49 reads:

καὶ ἀντὶ τῶν τρίτων <u>τοῦ καρποῦ καὶ τοῦ ἡμίσους τοῦ ξυλίνου καρποῦ</u>, τὸ γινόμενόν ἐμοὶ μέρος, ὑμῖν ἀφίημι ἀπὸ τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας.

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

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

3.2.4. Conclusion

The Hebrew of Lev 26:4 (ועץ השדה יתן פריו) was faithfully rendered by G^{ed} with **καὶ τὰ ξύλα τῶν πεδίων** ἀποδώσει **τὸν καρπὸν** αὐτῶν. What otherwise looked to be an odd rendering in 801, "κ]αι τον ξυλινον καρο[. . .]" is explained by the existence of this Greek idiom. The translator of 801 obviously felt no need to give a word-for-word translation but was rather more interested in rendering the biblical text into good Greek. Josephus appears to have performed the same revision at a later time. This variant constitutes significant evidence that 4QLXXLev^a is best understood in terms of revision in the direction of Greek idiomatic style.

3.3. Leviticus 26:8: 801 12

και διωξ]ονται **πεντε υμων** εκ[ατον . . .]] ἐξ **ὑμῶν πέντε** G^{ed}; מִכֶּם חֲמִשָּׁה MT, SamP

---

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

καὶ διώξονται **ἐξ ὑμῶν** πέντε ἑκατόν καὶ ἑκατὸν ὑμῶν διώξονται μυριάδας
G^{ed}; ‏וְרָדְפוּ מִכֶּם חֲמִשָּׁה מֵאָה וּמֵאָה מִכֶּם רְבָבָה יִרְדֹּפוּ‎ MT
"Five of you shall chase a hundred"

G^{ed} quite literally reflects the MT here. The Hebrew syntax poignantly contrasts the small number of Israelites who will vanquish their many numbered foes with the construction ‏ורדפו מכם חמשה‎; the force of the syntax is contained in its immediate juxtaposition of *five* and *hundred*, with no intermediate words. In this manner, it is not just *five* that is stressed but five in its comparison to *a hundred*, making the *five* seem all the more remarkable (an unstressed syntax would simply have had ‏ורדפו חמשה מכם‎). In precisely following the MT's syntax, G^{ed} maintains the same syntactic poignancy of the MT (but with a loss of clarity). Rahlfs 801, however, opts for the clearer reading, as Wevers comments: "What is surprising is that more copyists did not do so [i.e., read like 801], since it is an obvious improvement in style over [septuagintal Leviticus]. In fact, only the larger context makes clear that it is not *'five-hundred* of you that will pursue,' but rather that *'five will pursue a hundred'* that is intended."[64] Ulrich asks: "Is a variant Hebrew *Vorlage* for the scroll's reading likely? It is possible, but there is no reason to suppose so."[65] Even though Ulrich did not accept that possibility, it seems to me that we can be confident in rejecting the possibility that a variant Vorlage underlies 801. We have already noted the force of the Hebrew syntax, but even further, the whole verse forms a chiasm, with the verb ‏רדף‎ being in the first and last position and ‏מֵאָה‎ being at the end of stich one and the beginning of stich two. The construction of the MT is forceful and poetic, and as such, a Vorlage that reads like 801 would present an inferior reading.

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

ῥώμη γὰρ ἀντιβιασθέντες κραταιοτέρᾳ <u>φεύξονται</u> προτροπάδην πρὸς <u>πεν-</u>
<u>τάδων ἑκατοντάδες</u> καὶ πρὸς <u>ἑκατοντάδων μυριάδες</u>.

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

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

64. Wevers, *Notes*, 440, emphasis mine.
65. Ulrich, "Septuagint Manuscripts," 58.

3.4. Leviticus 26:9: 801 15

[και εσται μο]υ η διαθηκη εν υμι<u>ν</u>] καὶ στήσω τὴν διαθήκην μου μεθ' ὑμῶν G^{ed};
וַהֲקִימֹתִי אֶת־בְּרִיתִי אִתְּכֶם MT, SamP

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

As was the case in §3.2 above, this translator once again demonstrates his willingness to rework the text quite radically. The MT and G^{ed} read identically in having God as the subject who declares: "I shall establish my covenant." In 801, it is instead the covenant (ἡ διαθήκη) that is the subject. Ulrich has proposed what is probably the best argument that can be made for making 801 reflect a Vorlage at variance with the MT. In this scenario, it would be the Hebrew Vorlage itself that gave rise to 801's variant translation. Ulrich suggests: "the scroll's reading probably reflects a Hebrew not far from והי(ת)ה בריתי בתוככם (cf. Ezek 37:26) or ובריתי אתכם."[66] These proposals will be examined below, and we may begin by considering the following. The Hebrew covenantal language most often speaks of either *cutting* a covenant (כרת) or of *setting up* (הקים) a covenant, although there are many other expressions, such as *to enter* (בוא) a covenant, *to give* (נתן) a covenant, or *to break* (הפר) a covenant. The expressions with כרת are especially numerous. With these points in mind, we may consider the second of Ulrich's Hebrew Vorlage proposals: ובריתי אתכם, that is, "And my covenant [shall be] with you." There is no problem with ברית acting as a subject in the MT (as 801 has it). On the other hand, it turns out that only rarely is a covenant simply said *to be* with (את) someone, that is, when ברית occurs in conjunction with את (as a particle preposition "*with*," not the direct object marker) without a corresponding verb (such as those listed above and excluding the verb *to be*, stated or implied). Simply put, only rarely do we see something like "A covenant *shall be with you*," as opposed to "I shall *raise/cut* a covenant *with you*." Our passage (Lev 26:9) is a good example of the typical construction; or consider Exod 34:27: כי על־פי הדברים האלה כרתי אתך ברית ואת־ישראל .

Within the Pentateuch there are 16 (relevant) occurrences with ברית and את (homonym #2) in conjunction: Gen 6:18; 9:9, 11; 15:18; 17:4, 19, 21; (Exod 2:24);[67] 6:4; 34:27; Lev 26:9, 44; Deut 5:3; 28:69 2×; 29:13; 31:16.[68] Out

---

66. Ibid.

67. In the Exod 2:24 instance (ויזכר אלהים את־בריתו את־אברהם את־יצחק ואת־יעקב), the main clause states that God remembered the covenant (as a direct object); what follows is the equivalent of a truncated relative clause in which *either* expression could be implied (i.e., with the typical verb [e.g., כרת] or with the copulative usage [e.g., a covenant *is*]). As such, the passage could read "Thus God remembered his covenant ['that <u>was</u> with' or 'that <u>he cut</u> with'] Abraham." Exodus 2:24 as such cannot be listed for either option.

68. It should be noted that this search was done in *BibleWorks 7*, which is based on the Groves-Wheeler Westminster Theological Seminary Hebrew Morphology (WT) database. Despite this database's high degree of accuracy, it is not entirely without errors, and this holds especially true for homonyms, and even more so for את (!). Thus, the Ezek 37:26 instance

of these, there is only one instance where a verb of this sort is absent, Gen 17:4: אני הנה בריתי אתך. Even there, however, the full phraseology had just been used two verses prior (with נתן: ואתנה בריתי ביני ובינך). Following is the same search throughout the rest of the Bible:

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

> Without verb: Isa 59:21; Ezek 30:5; 37:26; Mal 2:4, 5[69]

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

> Mal 2:4: להיות בריתי את־לוי, "so that my covenant may be with Levi" (NRSV: "That my covenant with Levi may hold")
> Mal 2:5: בריתי היתה אתו החיים והשלום ואתנם־לו מורא וייראני, "My covenant was with him, [my covenant, that is,] of life and of peace, and I gave them to him [for the sake of] fear, and he did [indeed] fear me."

It is notable that the Mal 2:5 occurrence (בריתי היתה אתו) forms a kind of mix between Ulrich's two suggested readings, the second of those being והי(ת)ה בריתי בתוככם. This shows that the best reading would probably be (to argue the case with Ulrich for the moment) והיתה בריתי אתכם. I exclude בתוככם— which Ulrich posited to fit 801's εν υμιν—because of the seven verses in which תוך and ברית occur together in the MT, a construction such as this never occurs, where a ברית is said to be *in the midst* (בתוך) of something or someone. The typical Hebrew terminology, as we have already seen in abundance, uses את in conjunction with ברית, not תוך with ברית.

Concerning Ulrich's first suggestion, the reference to Ezek 37:26 is not really appropriate with respect to בְּתוֹכָם. Ezekiel 37:26 reads: וכרתי להם ברית שלום ברית עולם יהיה אותם ונתתים והרביתי אותם ונתתי את־מקדשי בתוכם לעולם. The only thing that will be "in your midst" (i.e., ἐν ὑμίν) is the *mikdash*, not the covenant. However, this verse is one of the five listed above that would

---

69. There is some uncertainty in a number of cases. For instance, I excluded 2 Kgs 13:23 (למען בריתו את־אברהם). Instances in which the covenantal expression is dictated by prepositions (such as למען) are best treated distinctly (unlikely is למען בריתו הַכָּרוּת את־אברהם). Although Isa 59:21 (ואני זאת בריתי אותם) has been included, the lack of the verb here is also due to the secondary nature of the clause (as the immediate use of the colon in the NRSV demonstrates); so implied may be אשר אכרת אותם. The Ezek 30:5 instance is not so applicable here as well. Opposite these instances are the two in Malachi that constitute full-fledged, copulative usages (without the other verbs).

provide credibility to Ulrich's suggested variant Vorlage reading because it is said that "a covenant *shall be* with you" (without the common verb such as כרת being employed). Nevertheless, as we have already noted with the only construction of this sort that appears in the Pentateuch (Gen 17:4), this instance in Ezekiel was also immediately preceded by the standard usage (where a בְּרִית was said to be *cut* or *set up*). In fact, the "eternal covenant" in the first clause of Ezek 37:26 stands parallel to the "covenant of peace" of the second clause. As such, the fact that the first covenant was *cut* has bearing on the second covenant.

Concerning G^{ed}'s rendering of אתכם with μεθ' ὑμῶν, Wevers points out that Genesis uses πρός for this in 6:18, 9:11, and 17:21.[70] This rendering in Leviticus is then explained as reflecting "the much more isolate type of translation found in [Leviticus of G^{ed}]."[71] On 801's placement of μου in μο]υ η διαθηκη, Wevers notably attributes this to style: "The difference in word order is common in Hellenistic Greek, but in the Greek of LXX it is much more unusual. The change is *probably stylistic*."[72]

3.4.2. Conclusion

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

---

70. Wevers, *Notes*, 441.

71. Ibid. On this point, Wevers states that "compared to Gen and Exod, Lev is much more isolate than contextual in character," and he defines *isolate*: "A purely 'isolate' translation would simply be a word for word set of equivalences for Hebrew lexemes in the Greek with little regard for the context in which such were used" (ibid., ix).

72. Ibid. (emphasis mine), where this variant is mistakenly listed as "[μο]υ την διαθηκην."

73. Ulrich, "Septuagint Manuscripts," 58, emphasis mine.

74. The Lev 26:12 variant that immediately follows this variant (και εσομ[αι (υμιν θεος?)]) may represent a similar theological nuance, as Ulrich himself admits (ibid., 60). In addition, the former variant at Lev 26:10, εξοισετ]ε μετα των νεων, likely represents a stylistic variant, of which Wevers states: "I suspect that the copyist was trying to improve the text" (*Notes*, 442). We also see that, in the immediately preceding clause, G^{ed} renders נוֹשָׁ of ואכלתם ישן נושן with an expansive καὶ παλαιὰ παλαιῶν, which looks to be a Semitic-styled superlative. If we go with the

3.5. *Leviticus 26:11: 801 1, 17*

καὶ **ου βδελυξομαι** υμας και εσομ[αι υμιν θεος]] καὶ **οὐ βδελύξεται ἡ ψυχή μου**
ὑμᾶς G^(ed); וְלֹא־תִגְעַל נַפְשִׁי אֶתְכֶם MT

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

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

---

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

75. Ulrich, "Septuagint Manuscripts," 59.

76. Ibid., emphasis mine.

77. Unfortunately, this casts even more doubt on Ulrich's analysis. If we assume for the moment that תעב was the pertinent verb in this passage, Ulrich indicates that תעב takes נפשׁ as a subject the same number of times as it does not. It is on this basis that he concludes that this variant could support either position. However, as was just indicated, out of the 20 or so occurrences of this verb in the Bible, it only takes נפשׁ as a subject this one time, in Ps 107:18. But even here, this psalm is characterized by making the soul the subject (the soul fainted; the hungry soul; the soul abhored food; the soul melted), which means that this verb is never uniquely associated with this "soul usage" (no more than the verb *melt* is). The implication is that, if תעב had been the verb in Lev 26:11, it would have overwhelmingly supported Ulrich's case. So why did he make the matter out to be equivocal?

would make its employment an instance of fitting the evidence to one's de-
sired outcome, meaning that, although a replacement of this sort cannot be
ruled out, neither can much of anything be proved from this.

Let us now consider געל. This verb occurs eight times in the Qal, once
in the Niphal, and once in the Hiphil. In the eight occurrences in the Qal,
five are within this very chapter! These occurrences are Lev 26:11, 15, 30,
43, 44; Jer 14:19; Ezek 16:45 (2×). It would thus be untenable to suggest that
געל be replaced with תעב in v. 11 without suggesting the same throughout
the chapter. What immediately attracts our attention is the fivefold occur-
rence in Lev 26. One must wonder why Ulrich did not point this out in his
analysis. Most important is that, in the first four of the five occurrences of
געל in this chapter, the MT contains the Semitic expression "(my) soul shall
(not) abhor." Furthermore, G^ed exactly follows the MT in every case. None-
theless, in the fifth and last occurrence of this verb, the idiom (with its use
of *nepeš*) is not employed: לא־מאסתים ולא־געלתים לכלתם להפר בריתי אתם, "But
I will not loathe them (so far as) to totally destroy them, breaking (thereby)
my covenant with them" (v. 44). It is for this reason that we cannot fully
rule out the suggestion that געל may have appeared here without *nepeš* as
a subject. Nonetheless, the evidence is against it. The fourfold occurrence
with *nepeš* makes for a clear refrain repeated throughout the passage: v. 11:
וגעלה נפשי אתכם; v. 15: ואם את־משפטי תגעל נפשכם; v. 30: ולא־תגעל נפשי אתכם;
v. 43: ואת־חקתי געלה נפשם.

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

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

3.5.1. Conclusion

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

78. Ibid., emphasis mine.
79. Wevers, *Notes*, 442.

801 was simply smoothing over this Semitic expression. It should also not be overlooked that the MT, the Hebrew text used by G^{ed} (as we have shown), and the Samaritan Pentateuch all agree here.

3.6. *Leviticus 26:12: 801 18*

καὶ υμεις εσεσθε **μοι εθν**[ος . . .]] καὶ ὑμεῖς ἔσεσθέ **μου λαός** G^{ed}; וְאַתֶּם תִּהְיוּ־לִי
לְעָם MT, SamP; καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔσονταί **μου λαός** 2 Cor 6:16

3.6.1. *The Ἔθνος/Λαός Variant in the LXX*

It is rare for ἔθνος to render עם in the manuscript tradition when Israel is the subject. Ulrich shows that this does happen, however, "at least once in Leviticus (19:16)," to which can be added 20:2, and 21:1.[80] Even in these three instances, it should be noted that they do not represent the more dignified connotations that were associated with this word (i.e., "The People of God"). Thus, when ἔθνος renders עם in 20:2, we read: עם הארץ (who are to stone *a worshiper of Molech*), and in 21:1, לנפש לא־יטמא בעמיו (where the *people* are associated with something negative again, *a dead person*, as was also the case in 19:16, *a slanderer*). This contextual pattern thus provides an explanation for what seemed exceptional.

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

3.6.2. *Ulrich and Wevers's Analyses*

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

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

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

---

80. Ulrich, "Septuagint Manuscripts," 60.
81. Ibid., 61.
82. Wevers, *Notes*, 443.

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

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

3.6.3. Ἔθνος *and* λαός *in Other Jewish-Hellenistic Works*

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

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

---

83. Ibid., xxi.

84. See the discussion on standard equivalents in §§2.1.2 and 2.1.3 above.

85. The first two works should probably bear greater significance because they are early and native to Israel, although I would personally place 3 Maccabees in an early period as well. 4 Maccabees is later, dating approximately to the first half of the first century A.D. (certainly pre-70, with Bickermann). It must be stressed that we are dealing with four completely distinct works; the misnomer "1–4 Maccabees" is an unfortunate nuisance.

2:67: καὶ ἐκδικήσατε ἐκδίκησιν *τοῦ λαοῦ ὑμῶν*, "And you [the fellows of Judas Maccabeus] shall take vengeance for *your people*."

2:68: ἀνταπόδοτε ἀνταπόδομα *τοῖς ἔθνεσιν* καὶ προσέχετε εἰς πρόσταγμα τοῦ νόμου, "Pay back the due-payment *to the Gentiles*, and pay heed to the commandments of the Law!"

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

8:23: καλῶς γένοιτο Ῥωμαίοις καὶ *τῷ ἔθνει Ιουδαίων*, "May all go well with the Romans and with *the Nation of the Jews*."

10:20: καὶ νῦν καθεστάκαμέν σε σήμερον *ἀρχιερέα τοῦ ἔθνους* σου, "So then we have set you up today as the High Priest of *your nation*."

11:21: καὶ ἐπορεύθησάν τινες μισοῦντες *τὸ ἔθνος* αὐτῶν ἄνδρες, "But certain men went out because they hated *their nation* [Israel]."

14:29: καὶ δόξῃ μεγάλῃ ἐδόξασαν *τὸ ἔθνος* αὐτῶν, "[Simon and others] . . . and they glorified *their nation* [Israel] with great glory."

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

5:19: ἀλλ᾽ οὐ διὰ τὸν τόπον *τὸ ἔθνος ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ ἔθνος* τὸν τόπον ὁ κύριος ἐξελέξατο, "But it was not on behalf of the place that [the Lord] chose *the nation*, but, rather it was *on behalf of the nation* that the Lord chose the place."[86]

7:37: ψυχὴν προδίδωμι περὶ τῶν πατρίων νόμων ἐπικαλούμενος τὸν θεὸν ἵλεως ταχὺ *τῷ ἔθνει* γενέσθαι, "I deliver my life on behalf of the ancestral laws, beseeching God that he swiftly be merciful *to the nation*."

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

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

---

86. This is a beautifully expressed sentiment—we can detect that the author put much feeling into this point.

3.7. *Conclusions on the* Ἔθνος *Variant and on 801 in General*

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

4. Concluding Remarks

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

---

87. One instance in which 803 has an addition to both the MT and G[ed] illustrates this point. In Num 4:7, 803 col. II 23, the MT simply has וְאֵת קְשׂוֹת הַנָּסֶךְ, which the NRSV translates: "and the flagons for the drink offering." G[ed] liberally adds καὶ τὰ σπονδεῖα ἐν οἷς σπένδει. Rahlfs 803 apparently thought that even more clarification was needed than this(!): "(*line 22*) . . . (*line 23*) [τα σπονδεια εν οις σπε]νδει εν αυτοις." Like Wevers said, this was "quite unnecessary," but it also shows how this translator was willing (a) to make an addition to what either the MT or

known Greek quite well. Many of the variants in this text seem to have been aimed at producing an impressionable Greek translation of Scripture.[88]

As a final note, the number of instances in which 803 and 801 agree with the MT against G[ed] should not be disregarded. In the case of 4QLXXNum, Patrick Skehan (who knew this text as well as anyone has) had already concluded that 803's underlying Vorlage was "indistinguishable . . . from that of MT." The analysis given above has only confirmed that conclusion.[89] There is less to work with in this regard with 801, but the Lev 26:5–6 πολεμος variant is notable, because instances of a scrambled sentence-clause order is the kind of thing we would expect to remain untouched by an idiomatic revision.[90]

G[ed] had and (b) to abandon any semblance of idiom for the sake of greater clarity ("An Early Revision," 236*).

88. One omission made by 801 at Lev 26:3 may give one last demonstration of this translator's stylistic concerns. Where the MT has ואת מצותי תשמרו ועשיתם אתם, G[ed] accurately reflects the final clause with καὶ ποιήσητε αὐτάς. In Greek, as in English, this final clause sounds repetitive—the NIV simply omits it. It is obvious that our translator did the same, which made for "a shorter, superior reading"(Skehan, Ulrich, and Sanderson, *Qumran Cave 4.IV*, 163). Although this omission occurs in the restored text, 801's line 2 simply has no room for 16 extra letters.

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

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