

# Interpretive Methods in the Septuagint of the Prophetic Books

*Martin Meiser*

A cautious and proper description of continuity and discontinuity in Jewish thinking and belief during the distinct époques of Jewish history belongs to an adequate reconstruction of Second Temple Judaism. This is also one of the important issues for modern scholarship on the Septuagint.

## 1. The Septuagint within Early Jewish Literature

To compare the Septuagint with other Early Jewish literature related to the sacred traditions of Israel we must first note the scholarly debates on the character of distinct texts within that corpus. The terms “rewritten Bible” and “parabiblical literature”, coined to address features of this literature, have meanwhile themselves become subject of debate. The main problem is one of criteria for classification. Especially the term “rewritten Bible” raises questions if understood as literary genre.<sup>1</sup> For there was no Bible in the sense of a “fixed collection of fixed books”. Therefore the term “rewritten Bible” is sometimes replaced by “rewritten Scripture”.<sup>2</sup> Concerning the issue of dealing with collections, this is an improvement, but it does not do justice to an important point made by Moshe Bernstein: “One group’s rewritten Bible could very well be another’s biblical text!”<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Pace D.J. HARRINGTON, “The Bible Rewritten (Narratives),” in *Early Judaism and Its Modern Interpreters* ed. R.A. Kraft and G.W.E. Nickelsburg (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), 239–247 (243).

<sup>2</sup> J.C. VANDERKAM, “The Wording of Biblical Citations in Some Rewritten Scriptural Works,” in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries* ed. E.D. Herbert/E. Tov (London: British Library, 2002), 41–56 (42–43).

<sup>3</sup> M.J. BERNSTEIN, “‘Rewritten Bible’: A Generic Category Which Has Outlived Its Usefulness?,” *Textus* 22 (2005), 169–196 (175).

There is for instance no consensus in scholarship concerning the status of 4QRP.<sup>4</sup> Similarly, 1Q22, 11Q19/20 and the Book of Jubilees do not understand themselves as application of a given revelation but as revelation itself – and some other authors did not hesitate to acknowledge such claims: According to Jan Doehorn, the book of Jubilees instead of Genesis could serve as canonical Vorlage for the Greek “Life of Adam and Eve”.<sup>5</sup> As Karlheinz Müller demonstrated, the concept of Torah in Second Temple Judaism does not necessarily include the notion of a fixed text.<sup>6</sup> The well-known pluriformity of biblical texts excludes by no means their estimation as sacred texts for their users.

If, then, “a fixed text does not exist, can it be rewritten?”<sup>7</sup> “The boundary between biblical texts and non-biblical texts was not as fixed as we would have liked for the purpose of our scholarly analysis.”<sup>8</sup> Therefore, perhaps it is helpful to replace the term “rewritten Bible” by “Bible-like literature”. By choosing this term, I intend to take seriously the uncertain question of self-claimed authority in many of these texts. I propose the following classification of biblical and Bible-related texts: biblical texts, florilegia, biblical translations, Bible-like literature, commentaries, and para-biblical literature.

If we distinguish between para-biblical literature and Bible-like literature according the criterion of nearness to a biblical text,<sup>9</sup> the Septuagint is of course closer to rewritten Bible than to para-biblical literature. Moshe Bernstein excluded translation from the category “rewritten Bible”.<sup>10</sup> With regard to genre, this seems wise; with regard to techniques of interpretation, we can look for analogies with regard to method. According to Robert Hanhart, the Septuagint is at least with regard to the prophets the earliest interpretation of the Old Testament.<sup>11</sup> In summarizing his study *Prophetic Interpretation in the Septuagint* F.F. Bruce refers to the “new ways of understanding the prophecies in the light

---

<sup>4</sup> E. TOV, “Rewritten Bible Compositions and Biblical Manuscripts, with Special Attention to the Samaritan Pentateuch,” *DSD* 5 (1998), 334–354 (338), includes 4QRP under that category; according to BERNSTEIN, “Rewritten Bible” (note 3), 183, the character of 4QRP remains unclear.

<sup>5</sup> J. DOCHHORN, *Die Apokalypse des Mose. Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar*, TSAJ 106 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 217.

<sup>6</sup> K. MÜLLER, “Beobachtungen zum Verhältnis von Tora und Halacha in frühjüdischen Quellen,” in *Jesus und das jüdische Gesetz* ed. I. Broer (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1992), 105–134.

<sup>7</sup> S. WHITE CRAWFORD, “The Rewritten Bible at Qumran,” in *The Hebrew Bible and Qumran* ed. J.H. Charlesworth (Richland Hills: Bibal Press, 1998), 173–195 (177).

<sup>8</sup> E. TOV, “Rewritten Bible Compositions” (note 4), 336.

<sup>9</sup> WHITE CRAWFORD, “Rewritten Bible,” (note 7) 177.

<sup>10</sup> BERNSTEIN, ““Rewritten Bible”” (note 3), 177.

<sup>11</sup> R. HANHART, “Der Prophet, die Septuaginta und Platon,” *NZStH* 32 (1990), 113–114 (113).

of changing events, changing attitudes and changing exegetical methods”<sup>12</sup> sometimes visible in the Septuagint. Robert Hanhart, however, was cautious not to exaggerate this aspect. Similarly, Edward Glenny warns against an over-estimation of this topic: there is not a “programmatically ‘fulfillment interpretation’ approach”,<sup>13</sup> no consistent theology in the prophetic books, at least in the Twelve. In sum, the ambiguity of texts discussed here requires careful attention to method.

## 2. Methodological Considerations

Embedding the study of the Septuagint<sup>14</sup> in a proper reconstruction of the history of Jewish literature requires keeping some caveats in mind.

1. The Septuagint “is a translation and not an original composition”.<sup>15</sup> Even the translators who intended a target-oriented translation did not intend to give an exegesis<sup>16</sup>, at least no thoroughgoing exegesis. The sheer fact that translators were dealing with a Vorlage which they considered authoritative set serious limits to the degree to which they could incorporate into their translations their own independent views.

2. Not all the deviations from the Vorlage qualify as exegesis. In any case, we should distinguish between textual and theological variants.<sup>17</sup> To claim deliberate change on the part of the translator is possible only if we can exclude all the other possibilities to explain a deviation from the Vorlage, such as misreading<sup>18</sup> and misunderstanding, inner-Greek variation, but also simply

<sup>12</sup> F.F. BRUCE, “Prophetic Interpretation in the Septuagint,” in ‘*The place is too small for us.*’ *The Israelite prophets in recent scholarship*, ed. R.P. Gordon, Sources for biblical and theological study 5 (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1995), 539–546 (546).

<sup>13</sup> W.E. GLENNY, *Hosea. A Commentary based on Hosea in Codex Vaticanus*, Septuagint Commentary Series (Leiden: Brill 2013), 21.

<sup>14</sup> The English translation of Septuagint text in the following study are gratefully borrowed from *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under That Title* ed. A. PIETERSMA/B.G. WRIGHT (New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

<sup>15</sup> A. PIETERSMA, “A Panel Presentation on Ronald Troxel’s LXX-Isaiah,” in Albert Pietersma, *A Question of Methodology. Collected Essays on the Septuagint*, ed. C. Boyd-Taylor, BToSt 14 (Leuven/Paris/Walpole: Peeters, 2013), 339–358 (343; Italics A.P.).

<sup>16</sup> M. TILLY, *Einführung in die Septuaginta* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2005), 67.

<sup>17</sup> A. SCHENKER, “What Do Scribes, and What Do Editors Do,” in *After Qumran. Old and Modern Editions of the Biblical Texts. The Historical Books*, ed. H. Ausloos et al., BEThL 246 (Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters, 2012), 275–293.

<sup>18</sup> Misreadings are debated also with regard to theologically important Biblical references, c.f. A. SCHAT, “The Jewish and the Christian Greek Versions of Amos,” in *Septuagint Research. Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures*, ed. W. Kraus/

linguistic nearness.<sup>19</sup> The increasing polarization between maximalists and minimalists in the last two decades<sup>20</sup> in Septuagint scholarship is regrettable in this regard. Methodological soberness on the base of Pyrrhonian skepticism is required.

3. Among Septuagint specialists, it is a well-known problem whether a deviation of the Masoretic text is a result of translation or a consequence of a deviating Hebrew source. Differences between MT and readings in Qumran or in the Samaritanian Pentateuch underline the vitality of reflection within Hebrew tradition. Sometimes the Septuagint is a witness of one part of this inner-Hebrew tradition, not simply a witness for Hellenistic Judaism, and some scribes within inner-Hebrew tradition felt freer to make changes than most of the translators into Greek.<sup>21</sup> Given the faithfulness of the Septuagint translations to their source text, we have to show why the divergences between Septuagint and Masoretic Text “cannot have originated with the Vorlage.”<sup>22</sup> In many cases, it does not seem possible to decide whether the translator or his Vorlage is responsible for the alteration against the MT.

4. Scholarship on the Septuagint has drawn more and more attention to fundamental problems and issues which must be borne in mind in any discussion. The Septuagint is not one book but a collection of writings made by different translators at different times and different places.<sup>23</sup> Why translations at all? Why translations at a distinct period?<sup>24</sup> Are there similar reasons for translation

---

R. Glenn Wooden, SBL.SCS 53 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), 157–177 (168–169), on Amos 4:13: Instead of מַה־שֵׂחֹרוֹ, “what his thoughts are,” the Greek translator reads מֵשֹׁחֵרוֹ “his Messiah.”

<sup>19</sup> E. TOV, “Theologically Motivated Exegesis Embedded in the Septuagint,” in *The Greek and Hebrew Bible. Collected Essays on the Septuagint*, VT.Sup 72 (Leiden/Atlanta: Brill/Society of Biblical Literature, 1999), 257–269 (262).

<sup>20</sup> CAMERON BOYD-TAYLOR, “Introduction,” in *A Question of Methodology* (note 15), XI–XXI (XI).

<sup>21</sup> S. KREUZER, “Das frühjüdische Textverständnis und die Septuaginta-Versionen der Samuelbücher. Ein Beitrag zur textgeschichtlichen und übersetzungstechnischen Bewertung des Antiochenischen Textes und der *Kaige*-Rezension an Hand von 2Sam 15,1–12,” in *La Septante en Allemagne et en France/Septuaginta Deutsch und Bible d’Alexandrie n the Trail of the Septuagint Translators*, ed. W. Kraus/O. Munnich, OBO 238 (Freiburg/Göttingen: Academic Press/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009), 3–28.

<sup>22</sup> A. AEJMELAEUS, “What Can We know about the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Septuagint,” repr. in ead., *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1999), 77–115 (92).

<sup>23</sup> E. TOV, “Reflections on the Septuagint with Special Attention Paid to the Post-Pentateuchal Translations,” in *Die Septuaginta. Texte, Theologien, Einflüsse*, ed. W. Kraus/M. Karer, WUNT 252 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 3–22 (16–17).

<sup>24</sup> Cf. J.M. DINES, *The Septuagint*, ed. M. Knibb (London/New York: T&T Clark, 2004), 50: “What suddenly stimulated interest in these books (viz. the prophetic books) around the mid-second century BCE?” In her view the answer lies in the different historical situation. Whereas the third century was a relatively stable time, the second century “was marked by

with regard to the distinct genres (Torah<sup>25</sup>, historical books<sup>26</sup>, prophets<sup>27</sup>, Psalms, Wisdom literature<sup>28</sup>)? What about the apparent hermeneutical changes, e.g. in prophetic books?<sup>29</sup> Are there translators who translated more than just one book or part of a book? Some scholars suggest, for instance, that the translator of the Minor Prophets translated also (parts of) Jeremiah<sup>30</sup> and/or Ezekiel,<sup>31</sup> but there is no consensus within Septuagint scholarship. Further, we cannot give a chronological history of Old Greek translations of Israel's sacred Scripture beyond the Pentateuch. Many scholars would agree with the thesis that at least some of the translators of the post-Pentateuchal books used the translation of Pentateuch in both semantics and techniques of interpretation. The debate on some literary dependencies within the post-Pentateuchal books, however, has not achieved a consensus. To give just one example: did the translator of Isaiah use the translation of the Twelve,<sup>32</sup> or did the Translator of the

---

struggles between the Ptolemies and Seleucids and the Maccabean Revolt." According to W. Edward Glenny, perhaps this time of "turmoil, uncertainty and conflicting loyalties [...] within and without Judaism caused the new generation to feel a need for the old prophecies to speak to them" (GLENNY, *Hosea* [note 13], 19).

<sup>25</sup> Cf. G. DORIVAL, "New light about the origin of the Septuagint?," in *Die Septuaginta* (note 23), 36–47.

<sup>26</sup> Perhaps these books were translated as source texts for educational purposes; cf. Sir 44:2; 1 Macc 2:51–60.

<sup>27</sup> According to Arie van der Kooij, the books of the prophets were translated because their announcements had come true, cf. A. VAN DER KOOIJ, "The Old Greek of Isaiah and Other Prophecies Published in Ptolemaic Egypt," in *Die Septuaginta* (note 23), 72–84 (76). A similar hypothesis could be made for the book of Jeremiah, cf. 2Chr 36:22. J. ROSS WAGNER, *Reading the Sealed Book. Old Greek Isaiah and the Problem of Septuagint Hermeneutics*, FAT 88 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 234, conjectures a setting in worship and study in the Hellenistic synagogue. We do not, however, know anything about regular reading of Haftarat at this time.

<sup>28</sup> These books were translated as source texts for purposes of moral education; cf. Sir, prol.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. A. VAN DER KOOIJ, "The Septuagint of Isaiah and the Mode of Reading Prophecies in Early Judaism. Some Comments on LXX Isaiah 8–9," in *Die Septuaginta* (note 23), 597–611 (598): "The (ancient) prophecies were considered to be a source of hope which was based on a reading of the prophecies 'as fulfilled in contemporary (or imminently expected) events' of one's own day." Arie van der Kooij bases his thesis on BenSira 36:13–20; Tobit 14:3–5; Dan 9; 1QpHab vii, 4–5 (598–601).

<sup>30</sup> H. ST JOHN THACKERAY, "The Greek translators of the prophetic Books," *JThSt* 4 (1903): 578–585 (579).

<sup>31</sup> M. KONKEL, "Ezechiel/Jezekiel. Einleitung," in *Septuaginta Deutsch. Erläuterungen und Kommentare zum griechischen Alten Testament* (henceforth LXX.E), ed. M. Karrer/W. Kraus (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2011), 2849–2854 (2850).

<sup>32</sup> I.L. SEELIGMANN, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah. A Discussion of Its Problems* (Mededelingen en Verhandelingen van het Vooraziatisch-Egyptisch Genootschap "Example Oriente Lux" 9 (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1948; repr. in: idem, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah and Cognate Studies*, ed. R. Hanhart/H. Spieckermann, FAT 40 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 119–294 (226).

Twelve use the translation of Isaiah,<sup>33</sup> or are the translations independent from one another?<sup>34</sup> In this study, I arrange the material according to systematic issues, only in order to avoid repetitions.

5. Given the pluriform Hebrew text tradition within Second Temple Judaism, it is important to assess the propriety of a text form from case to case rather than to operate from general assumptions about textual priority. The Masoretic Text, for instance, also includes changes, as discussed below in this study. We are far from reaching any certainty on such fundamental questions as the growth of the book of Jeremiah or the correct order within Ezek 37–40.<sup>35</sup>

6. Concerning single readings, arguments are often reversible. Concerning general tendencies, we should always bear in mind our own subjectivity. Comparing Septuagint and other early Jewish literature, however, can reduce the degree of subjectivity.

### 3. Issues of Interpretation

#### 3.1 Exegesis and History

##### 3.1.1 Harmonization within the same book

Examples of such harmonization, well-known already from the Septuagint of the Pentateuch (cf. Gen 2:2LXX, that avoids conflict with the Sabbath commandments), are also to be found in the Septuagint of the prophets.

Zech 5:1 mentions a scroll which contains woes against the whole earth. The translator knows that in the last days many nations shall flee to the Lord for refuge and shall become a people to him (Zech 2:15). Therefore he substitutes the scroll by the sickle.<sup>36</sup> There is also an intertextuality between Nah 1:12 (κύριος κατάρχων υδάτων πολλῶν) and Zech 9:10 (καὶ κατάρξει υδάτων ἕως θαλάσσης). In Isa 1:4LXX, the “wicked seed” is a harmonization with

---

<sup>33</sup> T. MURAOKA, “Isaiah 2 in the Septuagint,” in *Isaiah in Context* (FS Arie van der Kooij, ed. M.N. van der Meer et al., VT.Sup 138 (Leiden: Brill 2010), 317–340 (319).

<sup>34</sup> C. DOGNIÉZ, “L’indépendance du traducteur grec d’Isaïe,” in *Isaiah in Context* (note 33), 229–246 (230).

<sup>35</sup> The arrangement in Papyrus 967 can be a secondary attempt to put Ez 37 as witness for the resurrection of the dead after the final battle with Gog and Magog. On the other hand, however, the arrangement of MT can be secondary. According to J.W. OLLEY, *Ezekiel. A Commentary based on Iezekiël in Codex Vaticanus* (Septuagint Commentary Series; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 32, it is likely that the rearrangement (to MT order) “was a result of the religious and political crisis in the time of Antiochus IV. Epiphanes [...] Jews had been back in the Land of Israel for over 300 years, enjoying religious freedom and peace with the Temple rebuilt – and so one could say that in some ways a national ‘resurrection’ had taken place – but now the experience is attack.”

<sup>36</sup> On further intra-textual relations within the Twelve cf. GLENNY, *Hosea* (note 13), 7–13.

Isa 14:20: Because of its wickedness, Israel is put on a par with the royal house of Babylon!<sup>37</sup> The translation of Isa 8:19 is influenced by the Hebrew text of Isa 29:4; the stereotypical formulation οἱ φονοῦντες ἐκ τῆς γῆς influences also Isa 19:3.<sup>38</sup> Such harmonization is debated also concerning Jer 52 (within the theoretical frame of MT-priority<sup>39</sup>) and with regard to Dan 10:1: the reading “In the first year of Cyrus” (Dan 10:1LXX diff. MT + Theodotion) is possibly an accommodation to Dan 1:21 (Daniel rested until to the first year of Cyrus). An inner-Greek misreading (from τωτριτωι to τωπρωτωι), however, is also discussed.<sup>40</sup>

### 3.1.2 Harmonization with Pentateuch

Within the Twelve we find such harmonization, e.g.<sup>41</sup> in Hos 13:4<sup>42</sup> and Jonah 4:7.<sup>43</sup> The example of Hosea 13:4 underlines the possibility of such changes also in the Hebrew textual tradition: the expansion is to be found also in 4QXIc. Within the Septuagint of Isaiah, harmonization with the Pentateuch is discussed e.g. with regard to Isa 1:2<sup>44</sup>; 11:1<sup>45</sup>; 19:20.<sup>46</sup> The translator of Jeremiah derived יהא in Jer 1:6; 4:10 from יהיא in Exod. 3:14 and rendered the

<sup>37</sup> A. VAN DER KOUIJ/F. WILK, “Jesaja/Esaias,” LXX.E, 2506.

<sup>38</sup> C. DOGNEZ, “La nécromancie dans la LXX d’Isaïe,” in *Die Septuaginta* (note 23), 576–589 (589).

<sup>39</sup> According to A. ROFÉ, “Not Exile but Annihilation for Zedekiah’s People: The Purport of Jeremiah 52 in the Septuagint,” in *VIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies Paris 1992*, ed. L. Greenspoon/O. Munnich, SBL.SCS 41 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 165–170 (167), the omission of the exile of the Judeans (Jer 52:15, 27b, 28–30 MT) in LXX is the result of some so-called Deuteronomistic speeches within the book of Jeremiah (Jer 21:1–7; 27; 34:8–22).

<sup>40</sup> S. PACE JEANSONNE, *The Old Greek Translation of Daniel 7–12*, CBQ.MS 19 (Washington: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1988), 99–100.

<sup>41</sup> For further examples of harmonization with the Pentateuch cf. T. MURAOKA, “Introduction aux douze petits prophètes,” in *Les Douze Prophètes. Osée*, ed. E. Bons et al., BdA 23.1 (Paris: Cerf, 2002), I–XXIII (XIII–XVI).

<sup>42</sup> Ad vocem πορεύεσθαι ὀπίσω αὐτῶν, cf. e.g. Deut 6:14; 8:19 etc.

<sup>43</sup> Ad vocem σκόληξ (“worm”), cf. Exod 16:20. Perhaps the analogous situation, Jonah’s grumbling and Israel’s grumbling in the wilderness, was responsible.

<sup>44</sup> Ad vocem γεννάω, cf. Deut 32:18.

<sup>45</sup> J. SCHAPER, “Messianism in the Septuagint of Isaiah and Messianic Intertextuality in the Greek Bible,” in *The Septuagint and Messianism*, ed. M. Knibb, BEThL 195 (Leuven/Paris/Dudley: Leuven University Press, 2006), 371–380 (377): ἀναβήσεται recalls Gen 49:9–10. According to O. MUNNICH, “Le Messianisme à la lumière des livres prophétiques de la Bible grecque,” in *The Septuagint and Messianism* (note 45), 327–355 (345), Isa 11:1 recalls Num 17:23. R. SOLLAMO, Messianism and the ‘Branch of David’ – Isaiah 11,1–5 and Genesis 49,8–12, in *The Septuagint and Messianism* (note 45), 357–370 (360), does not mention this possible intertextuality.

<sup>46</sup> SCHAPER, “Messianism” (note 45), 377–378: ἄνθρωπος recalls Num. 24:17.

wording יהיה אדני יהוה by Ὁ Ὄν δέσποτα κύριε.<sup>47</sup> In Ezek 28:13LXX, the robe of the ruler of Tyrus is accommodated to the high priest's robe in Exod 28:17–20, perhaps in order to underline the deep downfall of his ruler.

### 3.1.3 Harmonization with Past History

The second criterion of true prophecy according to Deut 18:22 transfers what is an evaluating criterion concerning present prophecy to apply it to evaluating authoritative prophecy in the past. The effectiveness of this criterion is evident in Sir 48:25 [28] and Tob 14:4 (“Indeed, everything that was spoken by the prophets of Israel, whom God sent, will occur. None of their words will fail, but all will come true at their appointed times”). Therefore harmonization according to real history is not surprising. We can observe such harmonization at both macro- and micro-level.

There are different modes of arranging the corpus of the so-called latter prophets as a whole, and arranging the distinct parts of the Twelve. The great codices Alexandrinus, Sinaiticus, Vaticanus offer different arrangements of the corpus propheticum as a whole; beginning with the great prophets (Sinaiticus) may be a result of the relevance especially of Isaiah already in Judaism; beginning with the Twelve (Vaticanus; Alexandrinus) is a secondary harmonization with history: Hosea was one of the predecessors of Isaiah. But also within the Twelve, the arrangement of Hosea, Amos, and Micah is based on arguments of chronology.<sup>48</sup> Papyrus 967 inserts Dan 7; 8 before Dan 5, intending an arrangement according to the chronological order: The translator intended to locate the visions during Belshazzar's lifetime before the report of his death.<sup>49</sup>

The principle of historical harmonization is evident also at the micro-level. In Amos 7:14, the present tense “I am no prophet” of MT is changed to the past tense: after his call Amos is indeed a prophet. In Isa 7:9b, the Septuagint reads: “And if you do not believe, neither shall you understand.” The Davidic dynasty had not survived until the time of the translator, and it is impossible that a prophet would prophesy something not in accordance with real future history.<sup>50</sup> Therefore the translator changed the phrase. In Jer 6:13, the rendering

---

<sup>47</sup> E. TOV, “The Impact of the Septuagint Translation of the Torah on the Translation of the Other Books,” in idem, *The Greek and Hebrew Bible. Collected Essays on the Septuagint*, VT.S 72 (Leiden: E.J. Brill/Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999), 183–194 (193); H.-J. STIPP, “Gottesbildfragen in den Lesartendifferenzen zwischen dem masoretischen und dem alexandrinischen Text des Jeremiabuches,” in *Text-Critical and Hermeneutical Studies in the Septuagint*, ed. J. Cook/H.-J. Stipp, VT.S 157 (Leiden/Boston: E. J. Brill, 2012), 237–274, 240.

<sup>48</sup> GLENNY, *Hosea* (note 13), 6.

<sup>49</sup> S. KREUZER, “Papyrus 967. Bemerkungen zu seiner buchtechnischen, textgeschichtlichen und kanongeschichtlichen Bedeutung,” in *Die Septuaginta* (note 23), 64–82 (75–76).

<sup>50</sup> Cf. Tob 14:4–8.



ψευδοπροφήτης derives from the notion, that in describing of the people who did the wrong, the term προφήτης would include Jeremiah himself!

Another kind of historical harmonization is to be seen in Jer 33 (26):2. The translator omits the reference to the “cities” of Judah, because a “city” cannot be thought of as within the forecourt of the temple.<sup>51</sup> In Dan 2:7LXX, ὄραμα (vision) is more precise than ἄνυπνιον Th (dream).

### 3.2 Orientation towards Torah

Harmonizing with Torah had been an issue in early Jewish literature already since Chronicles.<sup>52</sup> Orientation towards Torah was a common issue in early Jewish literature (cf. Tob 6,13LXX; Tob 1,8 cod. S; Bar 4:4; Sir 19:19; 24 etc.). Within the Septuagint,<sup>53</sup> Torah-orientation is to be seen in the term ἀνομία, which is used to render ca. 20 Hebrew words<sup>54</sup>, e.g. for רשע (Ezek 3:19; Psalm 5:4; Mi 6:10), חמס (Ezek 7:23), תסויעבה (Ezek 8:6, 9)<sup>55</sup>, and πρόσταγμα to render דבר in Dan 9:12 etc. Torah-oriented harmonization is to be found e.g. in Isa 1:16<sup>56</sup>; 3:20<sup>57</sup>. An addition clarifying the woe against the treacherous is made in Isa 24:16 (ἀθετοῦντες τὸν νόμον). In Jer 19:15 דברי is rendered by ἐντολαί. Within the book of Ezekiel the commandments concerning the first-fruits (Ezek 44:30) are harmonized with Deut 12:6, 17, and the commandments concerning the tributes for offerings are harmonized with Deut 14:23; Lev 27: 32. Further, Ezek 46:14–15 avoids any conflict with Exod 29:38–42; Num 28:3–8.<sup>58</sup> In Dan 12:3, the reading οἱ κατισχύοντες τοὺς λόγους μου (“those who strengthen my words” instead of “those who lead the many to righteousness”) may have a counterpart in the Hebrew Vorlage (רמזיקי דברי).

<sup>51</sup> Jerome, in *Jer.*, CC.SL 74, 253.

<sup>52</sup> Cf. I. KALIMI, *Zur Geschichtsschreibung des Chronisten. Literarisch-historiographische Abweichungen der Chronik von ihren Paralleltextrn in den Samuel- und Königsbüchern*, BZAW 226 (Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1995), 115–143.

<sup>53</sup> In general, cf. L. PRIJS, *Jüdische Tradition in der Septuaginta* (Leiden: Brill, 1948), 62–67.

<sup>54</sup> F. SIEGERT, *Zwischen Hebräischer Bibel und Altem Testament. Eine Einführung in die Septuaginta* (MjSt 9; Münster: Lit Verlag, 2001), 237.

<sup>55</sup> Cf. M.V. SPOTTORNO, “Some Lexical Aspects in the Greek Text of Ezekiel,” in *Ezekiel and his Book. Textual and Literary Criticism and their Interrelation*, ed. J. Lust (BETHL 74, Leuven: Peeters, 1986), 78–84 (81). OLLEY, *Ezekiel* (note 35), 24, offers an exhaustive list.

<sup>56</sup> Ad vocem καθαροὶ γένεσθε, cf. the commandments on purity in *Leviticus*.

<sup>57</sup> Cf. M.N. VAN DER MEER, “Trendy Translations in the Septuagint. A Study of the Vocabulary of the Greek Isaiah 3,18–23,” in *Die Septuaginta* (note 23), 581–596 (588), on intertextual relations between Isa 3:20 and Exod 35:20/Num. 31:50: “In that case, a sharp distinction arises between the devout Israelite women from the Pentateuch who dedicate all their precious belongings to the Tabernacle in the desert on the one hand, and the lofty leading ladies of Jerusalem, *nota bene* the city of the Temple, who show off their private properties proudly.”

<sup>58</sup> KONKEL, “Ezechiel/Jezekiel” (note 31), 2850.

### 3.3 Contemporizing

We distinguish different kinds of contemporizing: sometimes the translators actualize their source text by introducing external enemies of Israel of their own time; sometimes we can detect allusions to inner-Israelite struggles or references to an actual state without emphasizing enemies.

The first kind of actualization is well-known: very often פלשהים is rendered by ἀλλόφυλοι, and פלש, by Σύρια.<sup>59</sup> In the translation of Isa 9:11, the “Philistines” are rendered by Ἑλληνες.<sup>60</sup>

There is debate about the extent to which the translations of Amos 1:15; Isa 8:6, 9:4 are intended to target inner-Israelite enemies. In Amos 1:15, the Septuagint reads οἱ βασιλεῖς αὐτῆς (Pl. instead of Sg.). The Ammonite rulers are most likely the Tobiad supporters of Antiochus IV. Epiphanes.<sup>61</sup> Isa 8:16 is ad vocem τοῦ μὴ μαθεῖν targeting the Jewish radical reformers who are described also in 1 Macc 1:11–15.<sup>62</sup> Maybe the same is true for Isa 9:4 according to Arie van der Kooij and Florian Wilk: Iason and Menelaos bought the στολή of the high priest (2Macc 4,7.23–24), and the translator criticizes it.<sup>63</sup>

In Old Greek of Zech 1–6 Joshua “... is depicted as father of postexilic Judaism. God installs him much like Moses ordained Aaron, and God grants the high priesthood a greater role in Judah’s affairs. LXX/OG Zech 1–6 presents the reestablishment of the temple cult, with Zerubbabel as an important assistant and with Joshua as a co-leader in the political realm and as the cultic authority of the Jewish people. By expanding the understanding of Joshua, LXX/OG Zech 1–6 presents a belief that corresponds to a religious reality of Hellenistic Judaism.”<sup>64</sup> The king named in Zech 9:9–10 was interpreted as the

<sup>59</sup> On the other hand, the translators avoided the rendering of ἄλλοφυλοι by “king” not only in the Pentateuch (cf. e.g. Deut 17:14–21) but also in the later translated books. Perhaps εἰρήνη (for פלש) is chosen in order to avoid the politically suspicious σωτηρία/σωτηρίων (SIEGERT, *Einführung* [note 54], 275).

<sup>60</sup> TILLY, *Einführung* (note 16), 77.

<sup>61</sup> W.E. GLENNY, *Amos. A Commentary based on Amos in Codex Vaticanus*, Septuagint Commentary Series; Leiden: Brill 2013), 52.

<sup>62</sup> A. VAN DER KOOIJ, “Zur Theologie des Jesajabuches in der Septuaginta,” in *Theologische Probleme der Septuaginta und der hellenistischen Hermeneutik*, ed. H. Graf Reventlow, VGTWTh 11 (Gütersloh: Kaiser/Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1997), 9–25 (14–15); SIEGERT, *Einführung* (note 54), 331.

<sup>63</sup> VAN DER KOOIJ, “The Septuagint of Isaiah” (note 29), 609; WILK/VAN DER KOOIJ, LXX.E, 2528.

<sup>64</sup> P. AHEARNE-KROLL, “LXX/OG Zechariah 1–6 and the Portrayal of Joshua Centuries after the Restoration of the Temple,” in *Septuagint Research. Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures*, ed. W. Kraus/R.G. Wooden, SBL.SCS 53 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), 179–192 (192). She bases her thesis on ποδήρης in Zech (cf. Zech 3:4 with Exod 25:7, ποδήρης always refers to the robe of the ephod that only Aaron wears) and κίδαρις (cf. Zech 3:5 with Lev 16:4).

high priest Simon<sup>65</sup>; in Zech 14:14 Ἰουδας instead of Ἰουδα is a reference to Judas Maccabaeus.<sup>66</sup> Ezek 21:25–28 is interpreted as support for the legitimation of Maccabean claims of rule by Arie van der Kooij<sup>67</sup>. There is, however, no consensus concerning the interpretation of this passage.<sup>68</sup> In Isa 19:19 the “altar for the Lord in the land of Egypt” may refer to the temple of Leontopolis.<sup>69</sup>

A general accommodation to contemporary use of language is to be seen in the wording θεὸς μέγας<sup>70</sup> and in the designation ὑψιστος. On the other hand, the wording μετὰ μάταια αὐτῶν, ἃ ἐποίησαν in Amos 2:4 refers to idols as works of human beings – a challenge in the time of the Septuagint of the Twelve.<sup>71</sup>

### 3.4 The Notion of God

Changes concerning the notion of God refer to distinct issues: transcendence, cruelty, and avoiding despotism.

Probably the increasing consciousness of God’s transcendence<sup>72</sup> is responsible for changes concerning the concept of a physical God. In Amos 6:8 “the MT and very probably also the LXX *Vorlage* stated that יהוה has sworn by his נַפְשׁוֹ, ‘soul’. LXX translates with the functional equivalent καθ’ ἑαυτοῦ, ‘by himself’, thereby avoiding the implication that God has a soul.”<sup>73</sup> But there was “no systematic suppression of the concept of a physical God in LXX Amos.”<sup>74</sup>

---

<sup>65</sup> A. VAN DER KOOIJ, “The Septuagint of Zechariah as Witness to an Early Interpretation of the Book,” in *The Book of Zechariah and its Influence*, ed. C.M. Tuckett (Aldershot/Burlington: Ashgate, 2003), 53–64.

<sup>66</sup> T. POLA, “Von Juda zu Judas. Das theologische Proprium von Sach 14,14–21 LXX,” in *Die Septuaginta* (note 23), 572–580 (574), referring also to Ps 60<sup>MT</sup>(59<sup>LXX</sup>):9 = 108<sup>MT</sup>(107<sup>LXX</sup>):9 (576).

<sup>67</sup> A. VAN DER KOOIJ, “The Septuagint of Ezekiel and Hasmonean Leadership,” in *Interpreting Translation*, FS J. Lust, ed. F. García Martínez/M. Vervenne, BETHL 192 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2005), 437–446.

<sup>68</sup> OLLEY, *Ezekiel* (note 35), 380: “the passage is far more concerned with the ‘turban’ than the ‘crown’”.

<sup>69</sup> Perhaps the Septuagint of Isaiah is originated in this milieu, cf. A. VAN DER KOOIJ, *Die alten Textzeugen des Jesajabuches. Ein Beitrag zur Textgeschichte des Alten Testaments*, OBO 35 (Freiburg: Universitätsverlag/Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1981), 52–60.

<sup>70</sup> Isa 26:4; 33:22, cf. Deut 7:21; 10:17, but also Dan 2:34; 9:4; Sir 39:6; cf. VAN DER KOOIJ, “Theologie” (note 62), 12.

<sup>71</sup> GLENNY, *Amos* (note 61), 58; cf. EpJer, *passim*; 2Makk 12:39–45.

<sup>72</sup> Cf. Aristobul, in Euseb., *praep. Ev.* VIII 10,2–3, GCS 43/1, 451.

<sup>73</sup> SCHAT, “Versions of Amos” (note 18), 165.

<sup>74</sup> SCHAT, *ibid.*

In Zech 2:12LXX the notion of touching God is avoided,<sup>75</sup> in Isa 57:15 the motive of “dwelling with those who are contrite and humble in spirit”, and in Jer 38[MT:31]:20 (ἔσπευσα), the notion of κοιλία of JHWH.<sup>76</sup> The fact is well known that not all anthropomorphic terms are avoided and I suggest that sometimes not anthropomorphism but missing realism was a problem for translators.<sup>77</sup> The translation in Isa 59:1LXX is shaped by reflection on reality: for the sake of saving, the hand must be strong enough, whereas shortness is not always a problem. God’s superiority over human beings is emphasized in Hosea 8:4LXX<sup>78</sup>; God’s superiority over seraphs, in Isa 6:6<sup>79</sup>; God’s might in history and creation in the large expansion in Hos 13:4; similarly there is a stronger focus on theoretic monotheism in Isa 44:28. The term παντοκράτωρ, comprehending all things being under God’s creative power,<sup>80</sup> is sometimes avoided, probably to avert polytheistic understandings.<sup>81</sup>

The concept of God’s benignity, a central issue of Plato’s philosophy<sup>82</sup>, became also important for Jewish theology. As a result transmitters and translators sometimes<sup>83</sup> modified the text.

In order to avoid any suspicion of despotism, the translator of Amos changed the ironic imperatives in Amos 4:4 to indicatives and rendered אולי (“perhaps”) in Amos 5:15 by ὅπως: God’s reaction to human repentance is not to be qualified by “perhaps”! In Isa 6:9–10 the theory of divine hardening is avoided.<sup>84</sup> The translator of Ezekiel altered Ezek 21:3, 4 [8, 9]. According to MT God will destroy the righteous and the wicked whereas the Septuagint alters: God will destroy the unrighteous and the wicked.

---

<sup>75</sup> M. CIMOSA, “Observations on the Greek Translation of the Book of Zechariah,” in *IX Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies Cambridge 1995*, ed. B.A. Taylor, SBL.SCS 45 (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1997), 91–108 (96–97).

<sup>76</sup> STIPP, “Gottesbildfragen” (note 47), 263.

<sup>77</sup> M. MEISER, “Theologische Anmerkungen in alexandrinischer Homerphilologie und theologische Korrekturen in der Septuaginta”, in *Worte der Weissagung. Studien zu Septuaginta und Johannesoffenbarung*, FS Martin Karrer, ed. J. Elschenbroich/J. de Vries, ABG 47 (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2014), 108–36 (122–123).

<sup>78</sup> “(They made kings) and I did not know” (MT) is replaced by “[...] they did not inform me”; cf. E. BONS, “Osee/Hosea,” *LXX.E*, 2287–2338 (2315).

<sup>79</sup> Jes 6,6 MT: Then one of the seraphs flew to me. LXX: Then one of the seraphin was sent to me.

<sup>80</sup> TOV, “Theologically Motivated Exegesis” (note 19), 263.

<sup>81</sup> H. SPIECKERMANN, “Vom Herrn der Heerscharen zum Allmächtigen. Die Septuaginta als Wegbereiterin einer christlichen Gotteslehre I: Der Alttestamentliche Befund,” in *Die Septuaginta und das frühe Christentum/The Septuagint and Christian Origins*, ed. T.S. Cauley/H. Lichtenberger, WUNT 277 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 119–139 (119).

<sup>82</sup> Plato, *rep.*, 379a–383c.

<sup>83</sup> Not all problematic texts are subjected to such change, e.g. Isa 11:4; 45:7.

<sup>84</sup> Jerome, in *Is.*, CC.SL 73, 91.

Concerning the Septuagint on Jeremiah, an adequate description of the notion of God depends on the presupposed concept of textual history. If we assume the priority of MT, some texts imply changes reducing God's cruelty, e.g. Jer 6:12<sup>85</sup>; 15:17<sup>86</sup>; 19:9. If we assume the priority of the *Vorlage* of the Septuagint, the notion of God in MT is corrected towards a strong emphasizing of God's might, sometimes including his cruelty, perhaps originating from the tradents' own sense of political powerlessness.<sup>87</sup> This would be in accordance with Exod 15:3, where not pacifism but God's victory is responsible for the finishing of war.<sup>88</sup>

### 3.5 God's love for Israel and Israel's Dissociation from the Nations

The gift of Torah to Israel is an honor for Israel (Bar 4:4; Sir 24:8[13]). A specific Israel-orientation is discussed with regard to Hos 5:2; 7:12–16; Isa 1:9; 19:25; and 25:6–8. According to the Septuagint of Hosea, God's punishments of Israel are not total destructions but actions of humiliation (Hos 5:5; 7:10; 14:9) and education (Hos 7:12, 15; 10:10). In Hos 5:2, God is seen as παιδευτής of Israel. There are parallels to this idea in PsSol 8:29<sup>89</sup> and 2 Macc 6:12. Rethinking history leads to piety: God had punished Israel by exiling and martyrdom; Israel, however, had not been totally destroyed but was alive. In Isa 1:9, the Greek translator deliberately left out the modifier "little" because he "actualized the text in the light of a very considerable Jewish community in Palestine and the Diaspora, which was, for the translator, no small thing".<sup>90</sup> In Isa 19:25 the translator avoided the notion of Egypt as God's people. Isa 25:6–8

---

<sup>85</sup> Instead of "I destroy the daughter Zion" (MT), the LXX reads: καὶ ἀφαιρεθήσεται τὸ ὕψος, θύγατερ Σιων ("your loftiness, O daughter Zion, shall be removed"). A. VONACH, "Jeremia/Jeremias", *LXXE*, 2725, evaluates it a theological correction. Perhaps also another idea is ruling: God had punished Israel but Israel was still alive, and a prophecy of a true prophet which did not become true is impossible.

<sup>86</sup> Cf. G. FISCHER, "Die Diskussion um den Jeremiatext," in *Die Septuaginta* (note 23), 612–629 (625).

<sup>87</sup> STIPP, "Gottesbildfragen" (note 47), 273. Some counter-examples, implying attenuation of God's cruelty, are collected by H.-J. STIPP, "Zur aktuellen Diskussion um das Verhältnis der Textformen des Jeremiabuches," in *Die Septuaginta* (note 23), 630–653 (652).

<sup>88</sup> L. PERKINS, "'The Lord is a Warrior' – 'The Lord Who Shatters Wars': Exod 15:3 and Jdt 9:7; 16:2," *BIOSCS* 40 (2007), 107–120.

<sup>89</sup> GLENNY, Hosea (note 13), 103. BONS et al., Osée (BdA 23.1, 98), refer on Jerome, in Hos. 5.3, CC.SL 75, 51–2: Ego sum magister uester, immo eruditor, qui emendare cupiam, non punire; et saluare, non perdere.

<sup>90</sup> D.A. BAER, "'It's all about us!': Nationalistic exegesis in the Greek Isaiah (chapters 1–12)," in *As Those Who a Taught': The Interpretation of Isaiah from the LXX to the SBL*, ed. C. Mathews McGinnis/P.K. Tull, SBLSymS 27 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), 29–48 (32).

does not mean salvation for the nations but judgment.<sup>91</sup> The motive of Israel's superiority is inserted into the translation of Dan 1:20: according to Dan 1:20 MT/Theodotion the "wisdom" of enchanters and magicians, but according to the Septuagint, the wisdom of savants and scholars, is compared with Daniel's wisdom: for Jews do not partake in magical practices at all.<sup>92</sup> The addition at the end of this verse (καὶ ἐδόξασεν αὐτοὺς ὁ βασιλεὺς ...) is an implicit praise of Israel over against the nations.

Dissociation from the nations is mirrored sometimes also terminologically: the translators of Septuagint avoid the term μάντις for "prophet".<sup>93</sup>

### 3.6 Authorization of a Prophet

This topic, known from Tob 14:4 (see above), caused changes in Amos 5:1;<sup>94</sup> Jer 1:1; 45:27;<sup>95</sup> 51:29.<sup>96</sup> Some of them may reflect a diverging *Vorlage*;<sup>97</sup> in other cases this is uncertain. A clarifying rendering can be intended in Jer 33 (26):7, where נביא is translated by ψευδοπροφήτης.<sup>98</sup> It is not possible that a prophet who is really sent by God would partake in the priests' activity against Jeremiah.

Isa 2:1 (ὁ λόγος ὁ γινόμενος παρὰ κυρίου instead of הדבר אשר הזה) offers, in my view, a double translation due to an uncertainty with regard to the third Hebrew word; graphical nearness to הזה (γινόμενος = היה/παρὰ κυρίου = מיהיה) points in this direction. The divine authorization of the prophet would be a non-intentional (but of course hallowed) result of his translation.

---

<sup>91</sup> W. DE ANGELO CUNHA, "Greek Isaiah 25:6–8 and the Issue of Coherence," in *XIV Congress of the IOSCS, Helsinki, 2010*, ed. M.K.H. Peters, SBL.SCS 59 (Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature 2013), 277–290 (290). For a negative interpretation of Isa 25:6–8LXX cf. also M.P. MAIER, "Festbankett oder Henkersmahl? Die zwei Gesichter von Jes 25:6–8," *VT* 64 (2014), 445–464 (446) who concludes that this negative Septuagintal interpretation is not really in discordance with the MT.

<sup>92</sup> K. KOCH, *Daniel*, BK AT XXII/1 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1986), 11.

<sup>93</sup> SIEGERT, *Einführung* (note 54), 276.

<sup>94</sup> λόγος κυρίου instead of דבר הזה.

<sup>95</sup> λόγος κυρίου instead of דבר.

<sup>96</sup> Jeremiah's ordering to Seraja is replaced by the wording JHWHs to Jeremiah, to give an order to Seraja; STIPP, "Gottesbildfragen" (note 47), 271.

<sup>97</sup> STIPP, "Gottesbildfragen" (note 47), 244, commenting Jer 1:1.

<sup>98</sup> The main problem concerning this rendering is the problem, why the translator did not choose this rendering always when evidently false prophets are meant.

### 3.7 Messianism and Eschatology Debated

Concerning this topic it is widely acknowledged that messianism was by no means an indispensable part of ancient Judaism even in the times of the Maccabean revolt.<sup>99</sup> With regard to the issue of messianism in the Septuagint, there is accordingly no consensus; the former joy of detection has been replaced by skepticism. According to Johan Lust, “in most cases, the LXX does not add to the messianic character of those texts which are traditionally seen as proclamations of the coming of an individual royal, prophetic, or priestly messiah who will definitely establish the Lord’s kingdom on earth. In fact, the LXX often makes it more difficult to recognize a reference to an eschatological messiah in such texts.”<sup>100</sup> The term *προσοδοκία* in Gen 49:10 presupposes *ἐλπίς* (hope) instead of *ὑπακούω* (obedience)<sup>101</sup>; the term *ἀνατολή* (for *ἡλίου*) in Jer 23:5–6 and Zech 3:8 called to the mind the image of the rising sun<sup>102</sup> though read within a Christian frame of reference it could be taken as reference to Jesus and his supernatural character. Dan 9,24–27LXX refers to the time of Antiochus IV. Epiphanes.<sup>103</sup> The variant *τὸν χριστὸν αὐτοῦ* in Amos 4:13 was unknown for a long time and had no relevance for the development of messianism even in early Christian periods.<sup>104</sup> Amos 8:8 does not describe eschatology, but Israel’s end within history.<sup>105</sup>

In other cases we have varying messianic concepts. Perhaps in the Hebrew *Vorlage* of Amos 7:1 *גזי* was read as *גג*. In Amos 8:7 *לנצח* is translated as *εἰς ἄϊκος*. Perhaps the eschatological victory over God’s enemies is in mind. According to Amos 9:11–12 the expected “political (‘messianic’) restoration of

<sup>99</sup> J.J. COLLINS, “The Messiah in Ancient Judaism,” *BThZ* 31 (2014), 19–40 (21), referring on the book of Daniel and 1Hen 85–90.

<sup>100</sup> J. LUST, “‘And I shall Hang Him on a Lofty Mountain.’ Ezek 17:22–24 and Messianism in the Septuagint,” in *IX Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* (note 75), 231–250 (231). Cf. also TILLY, *Einführung* (note 16), 77.

<sup>101</sup> RAIJA SOLLAMO, “Messianism” (note 45), 369.

<sup>102</sup> J. LUST, “Messianism and the Greek Version of Jeremiah,” in *VII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies Leuven 1989*, ed. C.E. Cox, SBL.SCS 31 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991) 87–122 (99); AHEARNE-KNOLL, “LXX/OG Zechariah 1–6” (note 64), 186; M. CIMOSA, “Observations on the Greek Translation of the Book of Zechariah,” in *IX Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* (note 75), 91–108 (98–99), offers a messianic reading of Zech 3:8.

<sup>103</sup> MUNNICH, “Messianism” (note 45), 331–333; I. SPANGENBERG, “The Septuagint Translation of Daniel 9: Does it Reflect a Messianic Interpretation?,” in *The Septuagint and Messianism*, ed. M. Knibb, BETHL 195 (Leuven/Paris/Dudley: Leuven University Press, 2006), 431–442 (435–440).

<sup>104</sup> M.KARRER/W. KRAUS, “Umfang und Text der Septuaginta. Erwägungen nach dem Abschluss der deutschen Übersetzung,” in *Die Septuaginta* (note 23), 8–62 (57–58).

<sup>105</sup> GLENNY, *Amos* (note 61), 140.

the Davidic rulership<sup>106</sup> motivates the other nations to seek the God of Israel. In Ezek 21 an originally priestly concept, underlying the Hebrew *Vorlage* of Old Greek is transmuted in MT to a concept of a royal messiah.<sup>107</sup> In Isa 11:1 the intertextual relation to Num 17:23 ad voces *ράβδος* and *ἄνθος* implies a concept of a priestly figure;<sup>108</sup> in Isa 9:5 the term *παιδίον* recalls Isa 7:16<sup>109</sup>, the name *Μεγάλης βουλῆς ἄγγελος* recalls 1QpHab VII 4–5<sup>110</sup> In van der Kooij's view the same is true for Isa 25:1 (*βουλὴν ἀρχαίαν ἀληθινὴν*): the high priest has knowledge of God's counsel like the priestly teacher of righteousness in Qumran.<sup>111</sup> According to Martin Rösel, Dan 8–12LXX differs in its eschatological concept from Dan 8–12 MT.<sup>112</sup> Terms like *ἀνάστασις* have also evoked eschatological interpretations.<sup>113</sup> Texts like Isa 26:19, however, are interpreted in a non-eschatological way.<sup>114</sup> Secondary Jewish changing of texts to counter Christian messianism is possibly also part of the textual history of the Old Testament.<sup>115</sup>

---

<sup>106</sup> W. KRAUS, "The Role of the Septuagint in the New Testament: Amos 9:11–12 as a Test Case," in *Translation is Required. The Septuagint in Retrospect and Prospect*, ed. R.J.V. Hiebert, SBL.SCS 56 (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2011) 171–190 (182).

<sup>107</sup> J. LUST, "Messianism in LXX-Ezekiel: Towards a Synthesis," in *The Septuagint and Messianism* (note 103), 417–440.

<sup>108</sup> MUNNICH, "Messianism" (note 45), 345. In addition, SCHAPER, "Messianism" (note 45), 376, refers ad vocem *ράβδος* on Ps 44:7LXX and Ps 109:2LXX. SOLLAMO, "Messianism" (note 45), 360, does not mention this possible intertextuality.

<sup>109</sup> SCHAPER, "Messianism" (note 45), 372.

<sup>110</sup> VAN DER KOOIJ, "Theologie" (note 70), 19. The interpretation of Isa 9:5–6 with reference to a priestly figure is missing in MUNNICH, "Messianism" (note 45), 344. Munnich does not integrate explicitly Isa 9:4 in his contribution.

<sup>111</sup> A. VAN DER KOOIJ, "Wie heißt der Messias? Zu Jes 9,5 in den alten griechischen Versionen," in *Vergegenwärtigung des Alten Testaments. Beiträge zur biblischen Hermeneutik*, FS R. Smend, ed. C. Bultmann et al. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2002), 156–169 (160–163).

<sup>112</sup> M. RÖSEL, "Theology after the Crisis: The Septuagint Version of Daniel 8–12," in *Text-Critical and Hermeneutical Studies in the Septuagint*, ed. J.Cook/H.-J. Stipp, VT.S 157 (Leiden/Boston: E. J. Brill, 2012), 207–219.

<sup>113</sup> KARRER/KRAUS, "Umfang" (note 104), 51–53.

<sup>114</sup> Jes 26:19LXX is a metaphorical text in analogy to Ez 37, due to the parallelism between "the dead" and "those on earth", not to be literally understood; cf. VAN DER KOOIJ, "Theologie" (note 70), 23–24.

<sup>115</sup> According to H.-J. FABRY, "Messianism in the Septuagint," in *Septuagint Research. Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures*, ed. W. Kraus/R.G. Wooden; SBL.SCS 53 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), 193–205 (202), some mss. in Mi 5:4 read *κύριος* instead of *κυρίου*, perhaps in order to refute Christian usage of Mi 5 for Messianic proofs: God himself, and not an agent of God, is acting.



## 4. Conclusion

Harmonizing, contemporizing, and correcting have been the main focus of debate in relation to techniques of interpretation in the Septuagint of the prophets. Harmonizing within the same book was intended to bring a higher degree of coherence, harmonizing with the Pentateuch, to strengthen links to the formative tradition of Israel. Contemporizing was applied in different directions, mostly to emphasize Israel's oppression by external and internal enemies. Corrections with regard to adequate notions of God concerned his uniqueness and transcendence, but also questions of benevolence vs. despotism. Probably it was pedagogic interests which lead sometimes to enhancement of Israel's dissociation from the nations. Concerning messianism there is no unambiguous tendency to be seen in the Septuagint. In this respect the Septuagint reflects the ambiguity of early Jewish literature in general.

The Septuagint is not a para-Biblical text: the literary frame is retained. The Septuagint is not a Bible-like text, whose status within the community of recipients would remain unclear. Most of the translations are best understandable if we presuppose that the Vorlage was a sacred text for the translator. Nevertheless, some of the issues at play are also those evident in para-Biblical texts.<sup>116</sup>

---

<sup>116</sup> I warmly thank Bill Loader, Perth, for correcting my English.