

Samouēlos	39	11
Sedekias	33	7
Selemias	27	6
Simōn	9	2, 5, 6
Somoēlos	39a	2, 6
Theopilos	19	9
Theodosios	17	3, 8, 12
Theodotos	18	8
Zacharias	11	1, 6, 10

THE RABBINIC TRADITION CONCERNING THE
"ALTERATIONS" INSERTED INTO THE GREEK
PENTATEUCH AND THEIR RELATION TO THE
ORIGINAL TEXT OF THE LXX*

BY

EMANUEL TOV

Jerusalem

Various passages within rabbinic literature cite a tradition of a series of alterations which were inserted into the Greek translation of the Torah. In these passages a list of 10(11), 13, 15 or 18(16) such alterations appears along with a brief account of the circumstances under which they were inserted in the translation. The present paper seeks to understand the background of this rabbinic tradition, as well as its importance for Septuagint studies. Special attention is given to the implications of certain details in the list for the original form of the LXX.

The Sources

The principal sources for the rabbinic tradition are as follows: b. Meg.9a; y. Meg. 1, 1, 4., p. 72a; Mek. Exod 12, 40; Midr. Hagadol Exod 4, 20; Abot de-R. Nat. version B., chap. 37; Sop. 1. 7; Yal. Shim. Gen, 3; Midr. Tan. Exod para 22. Additional sources are listed in HIGGER, *Soferim*, 101¹).

* For the translation of the text of this article I am indebted to Mr. P. LIPPI, for that of the notes to Mr. G. MARQUIS.

¹) The following bibliographical abbreviations are used:

APTOWITZER = V. APTOWITZER, "Die rabbinischen Berichte über die Entstehung der Septuaginta", *Hagedem* 2 (1909), 11-27, 102-122; 3 (1910), 4-17.
GEIGER = A. GEIGER, *Urschrift und Übersetzungen der Bibel* (Breslau 1857).
HIGGER = M. HIGGER, *Soferim* (New York 1937).
TALMON = S. TALMON, "The Three Scrolls of the Law that were found in the Temple Court", *Textus* 2 (1962), 14-27.
MÜLLER = K. MÜLLER, "Die rabbinischen Nachrichten über die Anfänge der Septuaginta", *Forschung zur Bibel, Festschrift J. Ziegler* (Würzburg 1972), 73-93.
FRIEDMANN = M. FRIEDMANN, *Onkelos und Akylas* (Wien 1896).
FRANKEL = Z. FRANKEL, *Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta* (Leipzig 1841).

The List

The various sources cite a different number of alterations and at times explicitly state the number at the head of the list. Such is the case with Abot de-R. Nat. and Midr. Tan. Exod para 22 which speak of 10 alterations (though the list itself includes either 11 or 14 instances), and Midr. Hagadol on Exod 4, 20 and Deut 4, 19 which speak of 18 alterations (though the list in Exod includes only 16 alterations). Other sources do not indicate any number at the head of their lists even though the alterations themselves are mentioned there: b. Meg. 9a; Mek. Exod 12, 40; Yal. Shim. Gen, 3.

It would be natural to assume that the shortest list (10 or 11 alterations) reflects the original formulation of the rabbinic tradition, and that the longer lists expanded it; however, there is no certainty that this assumption is correct, since the list and the story associated with it developed not only by expansion but also by abridgment.

The sources which know of 13 or 15 alterations are the most wide-spread and presumably reflect the central tradition. The difference between these two traditions lies in the inclusion or exclusion of the biblical passages numbered 10 and 11, to be mentioned below. Attention should be drawn to the fact that the list having 16 alterations (Midr. Hagadol Exod 4, 20) came about as a result of the addition of biblical passages similar to those originally in the list, hence that list is secondary. Among the other traditions, 10 or 18 alterations are mentioned in the headings of the list (though the lists themselves contain some other figure); it would appear that these figures have been influenced by other lists of 10 items in the context (Abot de-R. Nat. *ibid.*; Abot chap. 5, 1-9) and in the same way by the list of 18 emendations of the scribes in the Hebrew text of the Bible which, too, is known from rabbinic literature²). The tendencies toward expansion and abridgment are also noticeable in the items comprising the list themselves, both regarding the biblical citations and their explanations. This problem is particularly acute

²) See Mek. on Exod 15, 7, Sifre on Num 10, 35 *et al.* These lists have been frequently studied, cf. GEIGER, 231-261; B. KELLER, "Fragment d'un traité d'exégèse massorétique", *Textus* 5 (1966), 60-84; W. E. BARNES, "Ancient Corrections in the Text of the O.T.", *JTS* 1 (1900), 379-414; W. MCKANE, "Observations on the Tikḵûnê Sôp'rim", *Festschrift Eugene A. Nida* (The Hague-Paris 1974), 53-77.

in light of the fact that certain citations reflect more than one alteration (see footnotes 34, 35).

In view of the above it is impossible to determine with certainty which among the above-mentioned lists is the original or the nearest to it. The lists in b. Meg., y. Meg. and in Mek. are the most ancient among the sources, but we lack proven criteria in order to evaluate the differences between these sources themselves. Furthermore, each list itself is transmitted in various forms, both in manuscripts and printed editions, so it is hard to put one's finger on the original form of each list, if that existed at all. Furthermore, there are also mutual influences between the various lists, at least on the level of isolated manuscripts.

Despite these difficulties, it is possible to describe the relationship between the different sources in general lines. This issue has been dealt with by several scholars, among whom FRANKEL, FRIEDMANN, GEIGER, APTOWITZER and MÜLLER (see footnote 1). The investigators previous to APTOWITZER were mostly of the opinion that the relatively short baraita (13 biblical passages) in y. Meg. (and similarly the list in Mek.) reflects a more original form than the other sources, but APTOWITZER rather considered the baraita in b. Meg. more original. These two opinions are supported by different arguments (see APTOWITZER 3 (1910), 102 ff.); evidently the main problem is the inclusion or exclusion of biblical passages 10 and 11, for which see below. In b. Meg. these passages are included in the list, while in y. Meg. and in Mek. they are lacking. Going by their contents, these passages belong in the list, but to determine if they also appeared at the earliest stage of its development is a quandary³). Even if these passages were added to the list only at a later stage, the discussion will turn out to be profitable if it is based on the longest of the ancient lists. To that end, the 15 biblical passages included in the list of b. Meg. 9a are cited below according to their sequence in the Talmud. The list is based on the Vilna edition of tractate Meg. Under each biblical passage both variant readings from the München MS of tractate Meg. and deviations

³) Regarding this detail, is the list of Yer more original since the problematic passages are not found there; or perhaps were they omitted from the list in Yer because they were problematic? Similarly, passage 15 appears in its present place in b. Meg. out of the verse order and should thus be considered an addition. On the other hand, it appears in y. Meg. in its proper place according to the order of the passages. Was it inserted here later or is this its original place?

from the tradition in b. Meg. appearing in other sources are listed. (The external form of this notation is determined solely by considerations of convenience; those who are familiar with the techniques of notation employed in textual criticism realize that this notation in no way constitutes the taking of a stance concerning the relationship between the various sources.) The notation employed below is not complete: only differences among the principal⁴) sources which offer the rabbinic tradition are listed, and these are quoted from the printed editions mentioned below. Manuscripts of Sop. and the München MS of b. Meg. cited in the critical editions will also be noted. In the writer's opinion, this lack of completeness in notation does not impinge on the subsequent discussion.

The notation is based on the following sources: the base text for the discussion is the baraita in b. Meg. 9a according to the Vilna edition (the München MS is here quoted as ms M from RABINOWITZ, *דקדוקי סופרים*, vol. 8, München, 1877). The other texts cited are as follows:

y. Meg. 1, 1, 4., p. 71b;

Mek. Exod 12, 40 according to the edition of HOROWITZ-RABIN² (Jerusalem 1960);

Midr. Hagadol Exod 12, 40 according to the edition of MARGOLIOUTH (Jerusalem 1967);

Abot de-R. Nat., version B., chap 37 according to the edition of SCHECHTER (Wien 1887);

Sop. 1.7 according to M. HIGGER, *מסכת סופרים*, New York, 1937 (isolated mss are here quoted as: Sop., mss);

Yal. Shim. Gen, 3 according to the edition of the Rav Kook Institute (Jerusalem 1973);

Midr. Tan. Exod para 22.

⁴) A perusal of the various manuscripts of these sources reveals that the many variant readings listed below as variants between the different lists appear also as variants within the tradition of b. Meg. (and also in other traditions; for the variants of tractate Sopherim see the edition of Higger). This was pointed out to me by Mr. E. SEGAL who kindly listed such variants from his collection of photographs of manuscripts of b. Meg. For this I thank him, and also for his valuable comments. These manuscripts of b. Meg. are not listed below; for example, if for passage 4, it is written, according to our principles, that the words "ולא כתבו כראם" are lacking in ms M. of b. Meg. it should be pointed out that they are actually lacking in all the major manuscripts. With the aid of Mr. Segal I was able to examine the different readings in the manuscripts of b. Meg. and some of them are mentioned in the notes.

- (1) אלהים כרא כראשית (Gen 1, 1)
- (2) אעשה אדם בצלם וכדמות (Gen 1, 26)
Abot de-R. Nat.: ודמות. Sop. pr.: ויאמר אליהם. Midr. Hagadol Exod adds: ויברא אלהים את האדם בצלם וכדמות (Gen 1, 27).
- (3) ויכל כיום הששי וישבות כיום השביעי (Gen 2, 2)
y. Meg. and Sop.: ויכל כששי וישב(ו)ה בשביעי. Note that in most traditions (except for Midr. Hagadol Exod) the word אלהים of MT is lacking. In y. Meg., Mek., Midr. Hagadol Exod and Tan., biblical passages 3 and 4 are cited in inverted order. In Abot de-R. Nat. this passage is wanting.
- (4) זכר ונקבו כרא ולא כתבו כראם (Gen 5, 2)
y. Meg.: ונקבו; Mek., Midr. Hagadol Exod, Yal. Shim. and Sop.: ונקבו (thus also Gen Rab. 8, 11). Mek. and Sop.: כראם; Midr. Hagadol Exod: כרא אותו (the full text there is: זכר ונקבו כרא אותו זכר ונקבו כראו).
[ולא כתבו כראם] these words are lacking in ms M of b. Meg., y. Meg., Mek., Abot de-R. Nat., Sop. and Yal. Shim.
- (5) הכה אררה ואבלה שם שפתם (Gen 11, 7)
[ואבלה-שפתם] these words are lacking in y. Meg. and Abot de-R. Nat.
- (6) ותצחק שרה בקרוביה (Gen 18, 12)
y. Meg., Mek., and Sop. add: לאמר.
- (7) כי באפם הרגו שור וכרצונם עקרו אבם (Gen 49, 6)
[איש] mss of Mek. and Sop.:
- (8) ויקח משה את אשתו ואת בניו וירכיבם על נושא בני אדם (Exod 4, 20)
[ויקח בניו] these words are missing in Abot de-R. Nat.
[נושא בני אדם] ms M of b. Meg., Mek., Midr. Hagadol Exod. Abot de-R. Nat. and Sop.: נושא(ו) אדם.
[נושא] y. Meg. and Yal. Shim.:
- (9) ומושב בני ישראל אשר ישבו במצרים וכשאר ארצות שלשים שנה וארבע שנה (Exod 12, 40)
y. Meg.: וככל [וכשאר ארצות, בארץ מצרים, במצרים] ובארץ כנען; Mek.: וכשאר הארצות; Midr. Hagadol Exod: הארצות; ובארץ כנען; Sop.: ובארץ (נו)שן; mss of Sop.: בארץ כנען ובארץ מצרים.
- (10) וישלח זמטו בני ישראל (Exod 24, 5)
[זמטו] Midr. Hagadol Exod: זעמטו; Yal. Shim.: זמטו. The entire passage is lacking in y. Meg., Mek., Abot de-R. Nat. and Sop.

- (11) ואל זאטוטי בני ישראל לא שלח ידו (Exod 24, 11)
 זאטוטי | Midr. Hagadol Exod: זעטוטי; Yal. Shim.: זוטוטי. The entire passage is lacking in y. Meg., Mek., Abot de-R. Nat. and Sop.
- (12) לא חמור אחד מהם נשאתו (Num 16, 15)
 חמור | Mek.: חמור. Tan. lacks the entire passage.
- (13) אשר חלק ה' אלהיך אותם להאיר לכל עמום (Deut 4, 19)
 אלהיך | Abot de-R. Nat. adds: בהם. y. Meg., Abot de-R. Nat., Sop. and Tan. add: תחת (כל) השמים.
- (14) ויילך ויעבר אלהים אחרים אשר לא צויתו לעבדם (Deut 17, 3)
 ויילך-אחרים | these words are lacking in y. Meg., Mek., Midr. Hagadol Exod and Tan.; ms M of b. Meg. and Yal. Shim. omit the words אלהים אחרים.
 ולשמש או לירח או לכל זכא השמים אשר לא צויתו | Sop.: ויילך לעבדם
 | y. Meg., Mek., and Midr. Hagadol Exod: לעבדם (לעבדן); לעבדם
 לאומות לעבדם (לעבדן)
- (15) וכתבו לו צעירת הרגלים ולא כתבו את הארנבת (Lev 11, 6 (5); Deut 14, 7; the continuation of the passage is quoted below).
 ואת הארנבת את צעירת הרגלים | y. Meg.: ואת הארנבת
 | Sop. and Yal. Shim.: ואת צעירת הרגלים. In y. Meg. and Sop. this passage comes after passage 9; in Abot de-R. Nat. it comes after passage 12.

The Circumstances under Which the Alterations Were Inserted in the LXX

The circumstances under which the alterations were inserted in the LXX are described in the introduction to the list of changes, whether in brief or in detail. Furthermore, the name King Ptolemy, "for" whom the translators "wrote" their translation, is mentioned in some way in all the descriptions.

The short descriptions speak only of "writing", as in Mek. ("and this is one of the things they wrote for King Ptolemy. Similarly they wrote him...") or of an "alteration" as in y. Meg.: "thirteen details were changed by the sages for King Ptolemy; they wrote for him...".

The longer descriptions relate the story about the writing of the LXX known also from other sources, both Hebrew and Greek⁵),

⁵) See P. WENDLAND, *Aristeae ad Philocratem Epistula cum ceteris de origine versionis LXX interpretum Testimoniis* (Lipsiae 1900); H. St. J. THACKERAY, *The Letter of Aristeas, Translated with an Appendix of Ancient Evidence on the Origin of the Septuagint* (London 1918). (I am grateful to Mr. D. SATRAN for referring me to this book.)

although the differences in outlook and emphasis between the rabbinic account and the other sources are considerable⁶). B. Meg. relates the following account: "It has been taught, the story goes that King Ptolemy assembled seventy-two elders and lodged them in seventy-two rooms without disclosing to them the reason for assembling them, and he went into each one individually and ordered them 'write me the Torah of your Teacher Moses'. The Hole One, blessed be He, put wisdom in the heart of each one so that they agreed with one accord and wrote for him..." (at this place follows the list of alterations).

This account describes the circumstances under which the Greek translation of the Pentateuch was prepared, and if not all the details of this story are mentioned in every single source, it is often alluded to in such phrases as "they wrote for Ptolemy". Furthermore, Midr. Hagadol Exod 4, 20 says explicitly: "this is one of the eighteen details which our Rabbis changed in the Torah for King Ptolemy when they wrote him the Torah in Greek". Significantly, in Sop. 1, 7 this story is mentioned together with another one which speaks explicitly concerning the circumstances in which the LXX was produced (1, 7: "Thus goes the story about five elders who wrote the Torah for King Ptolemy in Greek etc."; after it comes the story under consideration here beginning with the words "Another story about King Ptolemy..").

Writing or Alteration?

A few traditions speak of the "writing" of the above-listed biblical passages, while others speak of the "change" from the Hebrew Pentateuch (see above). It would seem that even if it is not stated explicitly that the sages/elders/our Rabbis inserted alterations, such a claim is inherent in the very formulation of the list. First, all the biblical passages mentioned in the list differ from MT. Second, respecting two passages it is explicitly stated what the translators wrote instead of other details: (4) "male and female he created him" and they did not write "he created them" (Gen 5, 2; the final three words are lacking in many sources); (15) and they wrote for him "צעירת רגלים" and they did not write "ארנבת" (Lev 11, 6(5), Deut 14, 7; the various traditions differ, but all of them refer to both expressions in one form or another).

⁶) See APTOWITZER, 3 (1910), 4 ff.

Thus, the story preserved in rabbinic literature does tell about the alterations which were inserted by the translators over against the Hebrew Torah. In point of fact, it was only natural that people should soon recognize the existence of differences between the Hebrew and Greek Pentateuch. (The latter, too, was "Jewish" at its source, even though the Jews distanced themselves from it at a later date.) Furthermore, it was also natural that every difference between the Hebrew Pentateuch—being in the language in which the words were originally written—and the Greek Pentateuch should be thought of as an alteration in the Greek. The real background of the aforementioned differences between the Hebrew and the Greek Pentateuch will be dealt with on p. 82. Apparently, some of these differences do indeed stem from alteration, but others (and it seems that they are in the majority) stem from Hebrew variants, from translation technique and from an incorrect understanding of certain translation equivalents in the LXX. All the same, the differences mentioned in the list as "alterations" are described as such in the present article, because this is how rabbinic tradition understood them. Here it may be appropriate to add that Christian tradition also took similar differences between the "Jewish" and "Greek" (from their viewpoint: Christian) Bible to be alterations, but in the opposite direction: a few Church Fathers claimed the LXX reflects the true form of God's words, and that it was the Jews who had falsified them in their Bible⁷).

The Original Language of the Biblical Passages Mentioned in the List

The list contains a number of altered passages, inserted by the translators and differing from the Hebrew Pentateuch—thus according to rabbinic tradition—and it can indeed be verified that all the passages differ from MT. Therefore the biblical passages listed in Hebrew refer to the Greek translation of the Pentateuch, which is quoted in the list in Hebrew retroversion. Interestingly enough, a few researchers hold to the opinion, for reasons which will be treated later, that we are not dealing at all with citations from a Greek translation, but rather alterations on the Hebrew level⁸).

⁷) See, for example, Justin Martyr, *Dialogue with Trypho*, 3.1; see also P. BENOIT, "L'Inspiration des LXX d'après les Pères", *Mélanges H. de Lubac*, I (Paris 1963), 169-187.

⁸) FRANKEL, 31; FRIEDMAN, 23 ff.; TALMON, 26. APTOWITZER, 2 (1909), 7 ff., discusses this view in detail and does not accept it.

This opinion does not appear likely, however, in view of the fact that the introduction to the list explicitly refers to a Greek translation. In addition to this, from some details in the list it also clearly emerges that the citations come from a Greek translation:

1. Five of the biblical passages are identical with passages in the LXX (3, 8, 10, 11, 112, 15), with another (9) being close to it.
2. The supposition that the list goes back to Greek words that were here translated into Hebrew is well substantiated by passage 15. There it is said that the translators wrote צעירת רגלים (young-footed) "and they did not write ארנבה (hare) since Ptolemy's wife's name was 'hare', that he might not say 'the Jews have mocked me by putting my wife's name in the Torah'" (b. Meg.). In fact, the people nicknamed Ptolemy's wife (actually his mother) not ארנבה but they used a Greek equivalent (λαγωός). Therefore, if ארנבה refers to λαγωός, then the phrase צעירת רגלים can point to nothing other than a Greek word of equivalent value. Indeed, it is possible to identify the Greek word behind צעירת רגלים: the Greek equivalent for ארנבה in the LXX of Lev 11, 6(5) and Deut 14, 7 is δασύποδα, whose meaning is "hairy-footed" (שעירת רגלים in Hebrew). Undeniably this is the phrase צעירת רגלים in the words of the sages, presented thus by a phonetic interchange of ש/צ⁹). Furthermore, the equation of צעירת רגלים with δασύποδα appears reasonable in light of what is known about the use of compound words in the LXX and about the translation of these words in Hebrew and Aramaic: many pairs of two or more Hebrew words are translated in the LXX by compound words of the type ככד לשון - βραδύγλωσσος (Exod 4, 10)¹⁰). Alternately, compound Greek words were many times translated by a phrase of two Hebrew or Aramaic words, as can be recognized for instance in the Syriac translation of the Hexapla, the Syrohexapla¹¹). Moreover, the translation of δασύποδα in rabbinic literature needs to be seen in the

⁹) Cf., e.g. Num 16:30 ופצתה as against the reading of the Sam. Pent. פצתה: 2 Sam 8, 3 והשיב as against להשיב in 1 Chr 18, 3. See also שחקו in the baraita itself and cf. for this issue A. BENDAVID, *Biblical Hebrew and Mishnaic Hebrew 2* (Tel-Aviv 1971), 441 (Hebrew). The correct identification of צעירת רגלים with שעירת רגלים was first made by G. TYCHSEN, *Tentamen de variis codicum hebraicorum ... generibus* (Rostock 1772), 52 (and there a discussion on the rabbinic tradition).

¹⁰) See my article "Compound Words in the LXX Representing Two or More Hebrew Words", *Biblica* 58 (1977), 189-212.

¹¹) E.g. Exod 1, 10: ככד פה וככד לשון - ισχνόφωνος και βραδύγλωσσος - קשא קרא - αληροστράχηλος - קשא קרא; passim in the LXX: קשא קרא - קשא קרא; קשא קרא - קשא קרא.

light of the LXX's vocabulary of equivalents in which πους generally reflects רנל and δασς reflects שעיר as in Gen 27, 11 (cf. also Gen 25, 25; 2 Kgs 1, 8).

3. The assumption that the biblical passages mentioned in the list reflect Greek and not Hebrew words emerges also from passage 12: חכוד mentioned there stands against ἐπιθμμημα in the LXX (MT: חכוד). Within the LXX the root חכוד is generally translated by ἐπιθμμημα—and so the word חכוד is translated in Isa 32, 12 by ἐπιθμμημα. Therefore the reconstructed process חכוד (the conjectural origin of the LXX) = ἐπιθμμημα = חכוד (= the rabbinic list) points to a translation process.

4. Ostensibly, the change of word order in passage 1 (בראשית) and the expressions (8) בני אדם = ὑποζύγια and (7) אבוס = αστευτός (see p. 79) can only be understood by the assumption that what we have are translations from the Greek.

The List of Alterations and the Question of the Original Text of the LXX

Even if in the past scholars observed that the list contains passages which agree with the LXX, they shirked from applying this description to the entire list, since in actuality the majority of its details go against the transmitted text of the LXX. A comparison of the biblical passages with the LXX shows that nine passages in the list differ from the LXX, while five passages agree with it (3, 8, 10 [see p. 88], 12, 15), with one passage being close (9).

If our analysis up to this point is correct, it is difficult to avoid the unconventional assumption that the nine biblical passages which do not agree with the transmitted text of the LXX reflect another textual form of that translation. This other text of the LXX evidently contained the original text of the translation which differs from its form which has been handed down in all the manuscripts. This assumption is strengthened by what we know about the textual development of the translation during the first centuries of its existence. This question is now briefly considered¹².

It is reasonable to hypothesize with LAGARDE¹³ that the manuscripts of most septuagintal books, if not all of them, reflect

¹² A more comprehensive survey of the study of this problem is found in *Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum*, part I, section II (in press).

¹³ P. A. de LAGARDE, *Anmerkungen zur griechischen Übersetzung der Proverbien* (Leipzig 1863), 1-4.

in one form or another the first formulation of the LXX, which we may denote for the purpose of discussion as "the original translation". This original translation was not preserved in its pure form for an extended period because from the beginning of its dissemination in different scrolls, the textual transmission split off into several secondary traditions. In the pre-Christian period and the first century C.E. various types of corrections were then entered into individual scrolls of every one of the septuagintal books. As a result of these corrections, as far as one can tell, there were no two scrolls in existence identical or nearly identical for any book of the LXX¹⁴. In contrast to this situation, by the second and third century C.E., a recognizable unity had come about in the textual tradition of the LXX which later disappeared under influence of the revisions of Origen and Lucian.

For the present discussion it is of importance to know which types of alterations were inserted in the textual witnesses of the LXX. The evidence shows that in isolated scrolls many alterations were inserted which bring the LXX into conformity with the Hebrew Bible. Such alterations sometimes involve isolated words, and sometimes entire books; consequently they are recognizable in different forms, and this lack of uniformity is further underlined by the different character of the manuscripts and also of the septuagintal canon as a whole. A few revisions of entire books entered the canon of the LXX¹⁵, while others are reflected in individual manuscripts, as GOODING demonstrated in relation to mss AFM in Exod-Deut¹⁶. Furthermore, it is permissible to suppose that similar corrections were also inserted in the conjectured original (archetype) of all manuscripts of every individual book of the LXX. In other words, even if in a certain verse all the manuscripts of the LXX agree with MT, there is no certainty that the first translator

¹⁴ This point was emphasized by E. J. BICKERMAN, "Some Notes on the Transmission of the Septuagint", *A. Marx Jubilee Volume* (New York 1950), 149-178.

¹⁵ This situation is recognizable in the "LXX" of the following books: parts of Samuel and Kings, parts of the books of the latter prophets, Daniel, Ruth, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs *et al.* The current research has been summarized by K. G. O'CONNELL, *IDBS* (Abingdon 1976), s.v. Greek Versions (Minor); R. A. KRAFT, *ibid.*, s.v. Septuagint, B., Earliest Greek Versions ("Old Greek"); E. Tov, *The Septuagint Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch*, Harvard Semitic Monographs 8 (Missoula, Mont. 1976).

¹⁶ D. W. GOODING, *Revisions of the Septuagint Pentateuch*, Tyndale Lecture 1954 (London 1955).

indeed produced this rendering, because it is always possible that the first rendering was corrected in accordance with MT. This assumption receives support from the recent find of 4QLXXLev^{a17}), which witnesses to this conjectured process. In a few places this scroll reflects a Greek text different from that of the transmitted LXX, when the latter is close to MT and patently corrected toward it¹⁸).

Accordingly, in view of this situation, we may presume that the biblical passages mentioned in the list of alterations reflect the original text of the LXX, while the archetype of all manuscripts known to us was corrected to MT. In favor of this assumption is the fact that rabbinic tradition speaks explicitly of *differences* between the Hebrew Pentateuch and the LXX, hence this description should be given confidence.

Here it is relevant to remark: the surprising thing is that two thirds of the biblical passages in the list were changed in the course of the textual tradition of the LXX, and if this is really so, then clearly the original text of the LXX completely differed from the translation known to us from the manuscripts. Indeed, the original translation possibly differed much from the earliest attestations of that translation which are known to us, but it is also possible that the rabbinic list does not reflect the picture in its entirety. The fact of the matter is that we have no real information on the changes which were inserted in the LXX during the first centuries of its existence, neither on their character and frequency, nor their consistency¹⁹). Most likely some of the passages in the list were emended precisely because they arouse wonderment; perhaps they were even emended *in the wake* of rabbinic tradition. If so, the assumption that two thirds of the biblical passages in the list were emended in the archetype of Septuagint manuscripts is not illustrative of the frequency of such emendations.

In accordance with the above statements we now turn to the said ten biblical passages that differ from the transmitted formulation of the LXX; among other things we shall try to *reconstruct their original*

¹⁷) P. W. SKEHAN, "The Qumrân MSS. and Textual Criticism", *SVT* 4 (1957), 155-160.

¹⁸) Thus SKEHAN, who also published the scroll. The alternative view, which asserts that the scroll reflects an early revision towards a freer rendering of MT, does not, in my opinion, fit the evidence.

¹⁹) On this question see my study referred to above (n. 15), pp. 44-45.

form on the basis of the rabbinic tradition. The discussion turns also to passage 9, which agrees with the LXX only to a limited extent.

The reconstructions of the original formulation of the translation presented below are tentative: sometimes they are quite likely, at other times they reflect only one possibility among many. Our retroversions from the Hebrew of the list to the Greek of the LXX are based primarily on the vocabulary of Hebrew-Greek equivalents which served the translators. It is needless to remark that the following reconstructions encounter the same methodological difficulties as do retroversions in the reverse direction, that is the retroversion of the Hebrew text lying before the Greek translators. As there so it is the case here that the degree of reliability of the reconstruction depends on the degree of exactness in the translation. It is therefore important to emphasize that the Hebrew translation in the list of Greek biblical passages appears to be exact. This exactitude is recognizable in the literal translation of the two elements of $\delta\alpha\sigma\upsilon\pi\omicron\delta\alpha$ (15) by $\text{שְׁעִירַת רִגְלִים} = \text{צְעִירַת רִגְלִים}$ (see p. 73) and in the translation from the Greek (possibly: $\tau\omicron\upsilon \lambda\alpha\tau\tau\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\iota\nu \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$) reflected in לְעִבְרָם (14)—such a reading is indeed reflected in a Hebrew source (Sip. Deut 19, 19). It seems that only in one biblical passage is a Greek word conveyed by a free translation: $\text{כִּנִּי אֲדָמָה} = \text{נוֹשְׂאֵי אֲדָמָה}$ (8). If this description proves correct and the Hebrew translation in the list is indeed literal, then our reconstruction stands on a firm basis. In actuality, the very nature of the list demands that the translation incorporated in it always be exact, since the list purports to faithfully represent the differences between the Hebrew and Greek Pentateuch.

In this section a tentative reconstruction is presented of the original text of those passages in the list which differ from the transmitted text of the LXX. These reconstructions are accompanied by remarks on the problems involved in retroverting. The background of the retroverted translations is dealt with in the ensuing sections.

The transmitted text of the LXX is registered below on the first line next to MT. On the second line the reconstructed text of the LXX is registered next to its Hebrew translation in rabbinic tradition:

(1) Gen 1, 1 LXX: $\epsilon\acute{\nu} \acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\eta\tilde{\iota} \epsilon\pi\omicron\iota\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu \acute{\omicron} \theta\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\varsigma = \text{MT:}$

reconstr.:

$\acute{\omicron} \theta\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\varsigma \epsilon\pi\omicron\iota\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu \epsilon\acute{\nu} \acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\eta\tilde{\iota} = \text{list:}$

$\text{בְּרֵאשִׁית בְּרָא אֱלֹהִים}$
 $\text{אֱלֹהִים בְּרָא בְּרֵאשִׁית}$

- (2) Gen 1, 26 LXX: ποιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον κατ'εἰκόνα ἡμετέραν καὶ καθ'ὁμοίωσιν
 = MT : נעשה אדם בצלמנו כדמותנו
 reconstr.: ποιήσω ἄνθρωπον κατ'εἰκόνα καὶ καθ'ὁμοίωσιν
 = list : אעשה אדם בצלם וכדמות

One difference between the LXX (= MT) and the reconstructed LXX (= list) concerns the person of the verb (see p. 85). The reconstruction does not relate to prepositions in the list: כ...ב (MT כ...ב; LXX apparently כ...ב), because it is impossible to be precise in regard to this type of grammatical phenomena. It is reasonable to presume that the other difference between MT (= LXX) and the retroverted LXX is based on a reliable tradition, see p. 85.

- (4) Gen 5, 2 LXX: ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς = MT:
 זכר ונקבה בראם
 reconstr.: ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτόν = list:
 זכר ונקבה בראו

The reconstruction is based on the text of b. Meg. See also note 34.

- (5) Gen 11, 7 LXX: δεῦτε καὶ καταβάντες συγγέωμεν ἐκεῖ αὐτῶν τὴν γλῶσσαν
 = MT: הכה נדרה ונבלה שם שפתם
 reconstr.: δεῦτε καὶ καταβάς συγγέω... = list:
 הכה ארדה ואבלה שם שפתם
 (6) Gen 18, 12 LXX: ἐγένεσεν δὲ Σαρρα ἐν ἑαυτῇ = MT:
 ותצחק שרה בקרבה
 reconstr. (?): ἐγένεσεν δὲ Σαρρα ἐν/πρὸς/ἐπὶ τοῖς/τοῦς ἔγ-
 γιστα αὐτῆς
 = list: ותצחק שרה בקרוביה

It is difficult to explain the nature of the difference between the reading of MT (= LXX) and that of the list (בקרוביה). Three explanations come in for consideration:

- 1) If בקרוביה in the list refers to people standing near Sarah (see the early commentators on the rabbinic list) or to her relatives, the meaning of the passage is that Sarah laughs to these people. In this case it is possible to reconstruct the original text of the LXX as written above.
- 2) Most modern interpreters hold that the difference between the passage quoted in the list and MT does not bear on the quoted words, but rather on the continuation of the biblical passage. Indeed, in the continuation of the sentence the LXX differs (οὐπω μὲν μοι γέγονεν ἕως τοῦ νῦν) in three details from MT (בלתי היתה לי עֲדָנָה) in three details from MT

(אחרי): אחרי is not represented in the translation, instead of בלתי the translator read בלתי, and instead of עֲדָנָה he read עֲדָנָה (= עדר הנה).
 3) Possibly the two words differ solely in their pattern (בקרוביה/בקרבה), their meanings being identical. Compare this point to the transcription of בקרב by βεακρβ in the second column of the Hexapla in Ps 36(35), 2 and notice similar phonetic shifts in mishnaic Hebrew²⁰. It is appropriate to point out that also the MT of Isa and 1QIs^a differ in many instances as to noun patterns²¹) and that such differences are also to be assumed at the base of the relationship between MT and the transcriptions in the second column of the Hexapla²²). Having said this, even if בקרוביה reflects nothing but a different pattern of the word in MT, we are permitted to surmise that the original translation is to be understood as "people standing nearby" or "relatives".

- (7) Gen 49, 6 LXX: ὅτι ἐν τῷ θυμῷ αὐτῶν ἀπέκτειναν ἀνθρώπους καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐπιθυμίᾳ αὐτῶν ἐνευροκόπησαν ταῦρον (ταυρούς 458 340...)²³
 = MT: כי כאפם הרנו איש וברצנם עקרו שור
 reconstr.: ...ἐνευροκόπησαν σιτευτόν ...
 = list: (כי כאפם הרנו שור וברצינם) עקרו אכוס

The point of departure of the reconstruction is אכוס (= אכוס = fattened = σιτευτός) which appears in all sources of the list (in most of the lists שור comes in the first hemistich, while in some of them appears איש as in MT [see note 35]). An examination of the translation equivalents of the LXX shows that אכוס in the list may reflect σιτευτός which in the LXX also translates שור (that is, אכוס in the list = σιτευτός in the reconstructed LXX = שור in the Hebrew Bible). This assumption is based on the following equivalents: Judg 6, 25 כר השור - τὸν μόσχον τὸν σιτευτόν according to the text of A (cf.

²⁰ See G. MERCATI, *Psalterii Hexapli Reliquiae*, Roma 1958; and also E. Y. KUTSCHER, *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa^a)* (Leiden 1974).

²¹ See KUTSCHER, *Language* (preceding note), 396-398.

²² See E. BRONNO, *Studien über Hebräische Morphologie und Vocalismus, auf Grundlage der Mercatischen Fragmente der zweiten Kolumne der Hexapla des Origenes* (Leipzig 1943); Z. BEN-HAYYIM, *Studies in the Traditions of the Hebrew Language* (Madrid-Barcelona 1954); A. SPERBER, *A Historical Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (Leiden 1966).

²³ The LXX of the Pent. is quoted according to J. W. WEVERS, *Septuaginta, Vetus Testamentum Graecum etc.*, vol. I- (Göttingen 1974-).

²⁴ The vocalization of the Adler ms (אכוס), like the orthography of ms. Columbia X 893 - T 141 (אכוס) are apparently secondary.

the text of B: τὸν μόσχον τὸν ταῦρον); 1 Kgs 5, 3 אַבְרָם...אֲבוֹתָי - πρόβατα ... σιτευτά; Prov 15, 17 ... מִשׁוֹר אֲבוֹתָי - ... ὑπὲρ βουῶν σιτευτόν (attributed to Aquila and Theodotion; a similar translation is handed down as ε').

(9) Exod 12, 40LXX: ἡ δὲ κατοίκησις τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ ἦν κατώκησαν ἐν γῆ Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ ἐν γῆ Χανααν τετρακόσια τριάκοντα

MT: וּמוֹשֵׁב בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲשֶׁר יָשְׁבוּ בְּמִצְרַיִם שְׁלֹשִׁים שָׁנָה
וְאַרְבַּע מֵאוֹת שָׁנָה

reconstr. (a): ἐν (γῆ) Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ (ἐν) ταῖς καταλοιπίαις
χώραις (τῶν χώρων)

= list: בְּמִצְרַיִם וּבְשָׂר אֶרֶצוֹת

reconstr. (b): ἐν (γῆ) Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν ταῖς χώραις = list
in

y. Meg.: בְּמִצְרַיִם וּבְכָל הָאֶרֶצוֹת

reconstr. (c): ἐν (γῆ) Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ ἐν ταῖς χώραις ταῖς ἐτέραις

reconstr. (d): ἐν γῆ Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ ἐν Χανααν καὶ ἐν γῆ Γεσεμ

Reconstructions a-c are founded on the assumption that the translation in the list is exact. Whether the majority reading *וּבְשָׂר* is more original than *וּבְכָל הָאֶרֶצוֹת* in y. Meg. is indeterminate. Both readings could have stemmed from *ἐτέραις* in reconstruction c. It should be observed that *שָׂר אֶרֶצוֹת* does not occur in the Bible and the absence of the article in *אֶרֶצוֹת* points to mishnaic Hebrew (against this, ms Columbia X 893 - T 141 of bab. reads: *וּשְׂאֵר כָּל הָאֶרֶצוֹת*).

Reconstruction d is based on the assumption that the Hebrew translation in the list is free. It is then possible to reconstruct the Greek text according to the LXX of the passage, according to the reading in Mek. (*בְּמִצְרַיִם וּבְאֶרֶץ כְּנַעַן וּבְאֶרֶץ נֶשֶׁן*); thus also in Tan. with inverted word order), and according to the Sam. Pent. *ad loc.* (*בְּאֶרֶץ כְּנַעַן וּבְאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם*).

(11) Exod 24, 11 LXX: καὶ τῶν ἐπιλέκτων τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ οὐ διεφώνησεν οὐδὲ εἰς

MT: וְאֵל אֲצִילֵי בְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לֹא שָׁלַח יְדוֹ

reconstr.: ... τῶν νεανίσκων / τῶν ἐλαττουμένων ...

= list: וְאַטְוִי (בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל)...

Passage 10 is treated on p. 88 together with Exod 24, 5, similar to the present passage. Since *וְעִטְוִי-וְאַטְוִי* is attested in Hebrew and Aramaic as 'small', it is reasonable to suppose that it goes back to *νεανίσκοι* in the LXX of vs. 5. In accordance with passage 11 in the

list, it may be surmised that this word appeared also in the LXX of our passage, but here the problems are more involved than in vs. 5.

From a linguistic viewpoint it is decidedly possible that the Greek translator would translate *אֲצִילֵי* by a Greek word which would be retroverted in the list as *וְאַטְוִי*. Certainly the root *אצל*, which is related to the preposition *אצל*, appears both in the sense of 'to lack' (Eccl. 42, 21) and in the sense of 'to set aside' (Gen 27, 36; Num 11, 17). From this it can be conjectured that the original equivalent of *אֲצִילֵי* was *ἐλαττουμένων*, cf. Eccl. 42, 21 *וְלֹא נֶאֱצַל* - οὐτε προσετέθη οὔτε ἠλαττώθη (the words *לֹא נֶאֱצַל* are retroverted according to the LXX there, and support is now forthcoming for this retroversion from the ben Sira scroll, found at Masada, which reads *לֹא נֶאֱצַל*). Consequently the following process is reconstructed: *אֲצִילֵי* in the Hebrew Bible = *ἐλαττουμένων* in the reconstructed LXX = *וְאַטְוִי* in the list. Having said this it is also possible that *νεανίσκοι* appeared in this place, as in vs. 5, if we surmise that the translator identified *בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל* (vs. 11) with *נַעֲרֵי בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל* (vs. 5).

It is no easy matter to reconstruct the original equivalent of *אֲצִילֵי* because the construction of the verse is entirely different in its Greek translation. Actually, *אֲצִילֵי* has a double representation in the present translation: it is rendered by *ἐπιλέκτων* (chosen ones) which reflects the accepted interpretation of *אֲצִילֵי*, equally it seems that it is also concealed behind the verb *διεφώνησεν*: as against *וְאֵל אֲצִילֵי בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לֹא שָׁלַח יְדוֹ* comes a Greek translation which we can translate thus: "and from the chosen of Israel not one was lacking"²⁵). Because the root *אצל* has the meaning 'to lack', it can be inferred that *διεφώνησεν* somehow reflects *אצל* (and is not a paraphrase of *לֹא שָׁלַח יְדוֹ* or a reflection of a Hebrew variant). The precise reconstruction of the translation process of the verse as a whole is difficult; among other things one does not know if the translation does not also express tendentious exegesis. It should be noticed that other translations in the immediate context do exhibit

²⁵ See the similar use of the verb *διαφωνέω* in LXX Num 31, 49: *כִּמְטֵי אִישׁ - καὶ οὐ διαπεφώνηκεν ἀπ' αὐτῶν οὐδὲ εἰς*; Jos 23, 14: *לֹא נֶפֶשׁ מִכְּמֵת דְּבַר אֶחָד - καὶ οὐ διαπεφώνηκεν ἐξ αὐτῶν*; see also 1 Sam 30:19; 1 Kgs 8:56.

a clear-cut exegetical tendency²⁶). To reconstruct an individual detail in the verse is all the more abstruse²⁷).

(13) Deut 4, 19 LXX: ἃ ἀπένειμεν κύριος ὁ θεός σου αὐτὰ πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν τοῖς ὑποκάτω τοῦ οὐρανοῦ

MT: אשר חלק ה' אלהיך אהם לכל העמים החתה כל השמים

reconstr.: ...αὐτὰ + τοῦ φωτίζεσθαι + πᾶσιν ἔθνεσιν = list: = + להאיר ל.

The equivalent האיר - φωτίζεσθαι also occurs in Num 8, 2; Ps 13(12), 3.

(14) Deut 17, 3 LXX: καὶ ἀπελθόντες λατρεύσωσιν θεοῖς ἑτέροις ... ἃ οὐ προσέταξα (-ξε(ν) BG...; + σοί FMV...)

MT: וילך ויעבד אלהים אחרים... אשר לא צויתי

reconstr.: ... ἑτέροις + τοῦ λατρεύειν αὐτοῖς ... = list: + לעבד ל

The equivalent עבד - λατρεύειν appears among other places in Deut 28, 14; Judg 2, 19.

See also below p. 89 on the earlier formulation of the LXX to passage 15.

The Background of the Differences between MT and the LXX Enumerated in the List

The lists in rabbinic literature speak of alterations that were inserted in the translation and it has already been stated above that at the time the sages regarded every *difference* between the Hebrew and Greek Pentateuch as a *change* inserted in the translation. In light of what has been stated above, the renewed discussion of the actual background of these differences now disregards the notion that they reflect alterations carried out by the translators²⁸). This renewed discussion is now made possible since the original text of

²⁶ See especially v. 10: ויראו את אלהי ישראל - καὶ εἶδον τὸν τόπον οὗ εἰστήκει (ἐκεῖ) ὁ θεός τοῦ Ἰσραήλ and also v. 11: ויהיו את האלהים - καὶ ὤφθησαν ἐν τῷ τόπῳ τοῦ θεοῦ. This verse and similar translations are discussed by Ch. T. FRITSCH, *The Anti-anthropomorphisms of the Greek Pentateuch* (Princeton 1943), 45.

²⁷ See also p. 79.

²⁸ The recent discussions of the differences between the rabbinic tradition and MT, like the traditional interpretations of the rabbinic tradition, presuppose that all of the variants discussed actually reflect changes made by the translators. See, e.g. GEIGER, 282-287; A. KAHANA, *Hasefarim Hahisoniyyim*, 2 (Tel-Aviv 1960), 16-17; M. H. SEGAL, *Mavo' Hammiqra'*, 4 (Jerusalem 1960), 928-930 (Hebrew).

the passages in the LXX (later corrected towards MT) has been reconstructed above.

The above-mentioned differences between the Hebrew Pentateuch and the LXX derive from the following factors: (a) translations deviating from MT based on Hebrew variant readings; (b) translations deviating from MT arising either from Hebrew variant readings or from exegesis; (c) exegetical translations; (d) Greek equivalents which were unjustifiably interpreted by rabbinic tradition as differences between the LXX and the Hebrew Pentateuch. This delineation raises most of the possibilities for the differences between MT and the LXX, both in the Pentateuch and in other books, aside from errors on the part of the translators and copyists.

The contents of lists of this type are largely a matter of chance, as is also the case with the list of the "emendations of the scribes" (see note 2). This list does not purport to represent the most conspicuous alterations and indeed the interested reader will easily find much more far-reaching differences between the LXX and MT, as for instance the order of chapters and subject matter at the end of Exod. On the other hand, what the biblical passages in the list have in common is that they pertain to some central issues. It is not hard to understand how *post factum* one would explain these differences as alterations (like the "emendations of the scribes"; see note 2); however, this explanation holds true only in a few instances.

(a) Translations Deviating from MT Based on Hebrew Variant Readings

The Hebrew variant readings reflected in the LXX (and in the other ancient versions) either are faithful to their Hebrew source that differed from MT, or they reflect a misreading by the translators. In the latter case, one usually does not speak of conscious changes on the part of the translators, but some variant readings reflected in the translation show the exegesis of the translator who preferred one reading over another (if, for example, he must decide between a *daleth* or *resh*)²⁹). The following biblical passages in the list most likely reflect Hebrew variant readings:

(12) Num 16, 15 MT: לא חמור אחר מהם נשאתי

LXX (reconstr.): לא חמור אחר מהם נשאתי = list

Possibly the reading חמור was produced when a copyist or translator, after weighing the evidence, chose to reject החמור, while

²⁹ See my article "On 'Pseudo-variants' Reflected in the Septuagint", *JSS* 20 (1975), 165-177.

exchanging the *resh* for a *daleth*. Nevertheless, to prove this type³⁰⁾ of conjecture is very difficult, because the letters *daleth* and *resh* interchange frequently and freely on every level of the textual transmission of the Hebrew Bible, and they are also reflected in the LXX. Notice for instance the similar interchanges in Gen 49, 14 חמר נרם - τὸ καλὸν ἐπεθύμησεν = חמ(ו)ר נרם (cf. similar linguistic exegesis in the LXX of Ps 119, 20 נרסה - ἐπεπόθησεν)³¹⁾ and Isa 27, 2 כרם חמר - ἀμπελών καλὸς ἐπιθύμημα ...

The vs. according to MT apparently reflects the original intention of the text: Moses emphasizes that he has not taken for himself even a small thing like an ass. His words are similar to those of Samuel before his death: וחמר מי לקחתי (1 Sam 12, 3 MT = LXX).

(13) Deut 4, 19 MT: לכל העמים אשר חלק ה' אלהיהך

LXX (reconstr.): + להאיר =list

The added להאיר is also reflected in Midr. Hagadol to this verse (see also Rashi). This word evidently testifies to a somewhat tendentious early variant: one is not permitted to worship stars: the host of heaven are given only "to shine".

(14) Deut 17, 3 MT: וילך ויעבד אלהים אחרים... אשר לא צוית

LXX (reconstr.): לעבדם + =list

Also in this instance it is possible that the additional לעבדם is an early variant echoed in Sip. 148 on Deut 19, 19. Compare also Deut 28, 14 ללכת אחרי אלהים אחרים לעבדם.

The addition is occasioned by linguistic considerations because אשר לא צוית has a certain syntactical oddness about it and begs, as it were, to be completed. The additional word is taken from the context (ועבד אלהים אחרים אשר לא צוית + לעבדם), for which cf. early commentators who also added it. There is no change in content with the addition of לעבדם as it is purely a linguistic adaptation.

(b) *Translations Deviating from MT Arising either from Hebrew Variant Readings or from Exegesis*

Often one cannot determine if a specific difference between MT and the ancient versions attests to a Hebrew variant or perhaps

³⁰⁾ According to rabbinic tradition, both here and in passage 8 (Exod 4, 20) the translation does not list חמר in relation to Moses, but it seems that this situation does not support the assumption that any bias is evident in the translation.

³¹⁾ This process of contextual exegesis together with the interchange of consonants is described in my above-mentioned article (n. 29), 175-177. It is difficult to assume that this interchange was tendentious; it is more probable that it derived from difficulties in identifying the rare word נרם (cf. also LXX of 2 Kgs 9, 13).

reflects the exegesis of the translators. This holds true especially in regard to differences in certain grammatical categories such as changes in the number of nouns, differences in possessive pronouns and in the tenses of the verb, representation of prepositions, etc. It has now become clear, especially in light of the analysis of the variant readings incorporated in 1QIs^a that we do not have sufficient criteria to judge the textual value of these kinds of differences which are found in the ancient versions³²⁾. A few of the biblical passages in the list belong to this group (note that the list did not intend to reconstruct the Hebrew original from which the LXX was made, but rather to communicate a "contemporary" Hebrew translation of some points of interest in the LXX).

(2) Gen 1, 26 MT: נעשה אדם בצלמנו כדמותנו

LXX (reconstr.): ποιήσω ἄνθρωπον κατ' εἰκόνα καὶ καθ' ὁμοίωσιν

(list: אעשה אדם בצלם וכדמות)

(5) Gen 11, 7 MT: הכה נרדה ונבלה

LXX (reconstr.): δεῦτε καὶ καταβάς συγγέω (list:

הכה ארדה ואבלה)

In these two instances the translation avoids adopting the plural as in MT. The translator either inserted this alteration on his own initiative, or he found such a Hebrew text in front of him. It is pertinent to remark here that in b. San. 38b, Gen 1, 26.27 and 11, 5.7 are cited together as examples of the use of plural forms in reference to God.

Besides the difference in the person of the verb, an additional difference is noticeable in biblical passage 2: according to the list, the possessive pronouns in MT are not transmitted in the LXX (בצלם as against כדמותנו in MT). This lack is possibly based on an early Hebrew variant, for also in rabbinic literature the דמות and the צלם are sometimes described in an abstract way, without possessive pronouns or article (notice, for example, Abot 3, 21 חכיב אדם שנברא בצלם שנאמר כי בצלם אלהים עשה את האדם).

However, it is also conceivable that the translator did not represent the pronouns in order to avoid an anthropomorphic description, as happened in other places in the LXX³³⁾.

³²⁾ The importance of this group as a separate unit for the textual evaluation of ancient translations was first recognized by M. GOSHEN-GOTTSTEIN, "Theory and Practice of Textual Criticism", *Textus* 3 (1963), 130-158; id., *The Book of Isaiah - Sample Edition with Introduction* (Jerusalem 1965), 22-23.

³³⁾ Additional examples of such translations are brought by FRITSCH (above, n.

According to the list in Midr. Hagadol Exod 4, 20, the pronouns are lacking in the following vs. (27) of the LXX as well: ויברא אלהים את האדם בצלם וכדמותו. If the tradition concerning the Greek translations of vs. 26 is correct, logically v. 27 was also formulated in the same way (this is not to say that this detail was necessarily included in the original list of differences between the LXX and the Hebrew Pentateuch).

(3) Gen 2, 2 MT: ויכל ביום השביעי

LXX: καὶ συνετέλεσεν ὁ θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἕκτῃ
(list: ויכל ביום השביעי)

Ancient as well as modern interpreters were aware of the exegetical difficulty raised by MT, from which it is possible to conclude that God worked also on the seventh day. This difficulty is eliminated in the LXX. The Greek translation may be based on a Hebrew variant reading (השביעי) also found in the Sam. Pent., but it is equally feasible that the translator interpreted as he did without depending on such a variant reading.

(4) Gen 5, 2 MT: וזכר ונקבה בראם

LXX (reconstr.): ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτόν (list:
זכר ונקבה בראם)

To determine whether the reconstructed translation ἐποίησεν αὐτόν reflects a variant ברא or results from exegesis is perplexing. Either way, at base of the translation one should probably posit an understanding which interprets this vs. as referring to an androgynous creature as in Gen Rab. 8, 10. However, it could also be that the variant reading or the tendency lying at the base of the translation did not stem from contextual exegesis, but from syntactical exegesis since the previous vs. speaks of the man in the singular, while vs. 2 speaks in the plural (ויברך אותם ויקרא את שמם). The passage under consideration comes between these two passages and hence it is quite foreseeable that in some source a variant or an explanation ברא would develop over against MT בראם. The variant ונקביו/נקביו included in many sources of the list apparently reflects a secondary stage in the development of that list³⁴).

26). See especially p. 11, n. 6. Mentioned there are omissions of the possessive pronoun in relation to God (LXX Exod 15, 7; 23, 27; Deut 32, 10). In other cases an element is added in the translation between two words in order to tone-down an anthropomorphic description of God.

³⁴) If this detail is indeed reliable, its inclusion in the list constitutes a rather

(9) Exod 12, 40 MT: (שלושים) כמזרים (ישבו) אשר ישראל אשר ישבו) LXX (reconstr.): see the four possible reconstructions on p. 69.

Whether the difference between MT and the LXX is to be attributed to an exegetically motivated alteration or to a translation of a Hebrew variant like that appearing in the Sam. Pent. (כמזרים וכארץ כנען וכארץ נשן) or in Mek. (כמזרים וכארץ כנען וכארץ מצרים) thus also in Tan. with inverted order) is unclear.

(c) Exegetical Translations

(1) Gen 1, 1 MT: בראשית ברא אלהים

LXX (reconstr.): ὁ θεὸς ἐποίησεν ἐν ἀρχῇ (list:
אלהים ברא בראשית)

In many sentences the LXX translators inverted the order of elements in the Hebrew whether from syntactical or exegetical considerations (although usually the translators strove to preserve the order of elements in the sentence even where the translation is free). In this instance the inversion of the word order can be ascribed to the exegetical motivation of the translator who, it seems, wanted to begin the Pentateuch with ὁ θεός.

(d) Greek Equivalents which were Unjustifiably Interpreted by Rabbinic Tradition As Differences between the LXX and the Hebrew Pentateuch

In the four following examples the translators chose equivalents which in fact have nothing about them to arouse wonder, but in rabbinic tradition they were interpreted—incorrectly—as reflecting differences between the LXX and the Hebrew Pentateuch.

(7) Gen 49, 6 MT: כי באפם הרגו איש וברצנם עקרו שור

LXX (reconstr.): ... ἐνευροκόπησαν σιτευτόν = list

עקרו אבום...

successful retroversion of a Hebrew word close to that of MT. It may be possible to say that the graphic similarity between נקביו/נקביו and the word יוף of MT itself casts suspicion on the possibility of retroversion since the word נקביו/נקביו is very rare. Almost certainly, נקביו/נקביו was formed during the textual transmission of the list (interchange of וי/וי), perhaps when it became unclear what the exact difference between LXX and MT was (a similar confusion is reflected in the addition of וי/וי in the list, a formula recurring only concerning passage 15). It appears that נקביו/נקביו refers to the female orifices of the primeval man who was thus androgynous (see Gen. Rabb. 8, 10). Worthy of note is the fact that נקביו/נקביו does not appear in any similar meaning in the Bible, and in rabbinic literature it is used only in connection with the male sexual organ.

στυπτός (= אכזב) in the Greek Pentateuch was apparently interpreted as an alteration of the parallel word in the Hebrew (שור) since it was generally understood as שור = wall (Onqelos, Peshitta, Aquila, Symmachus, Vulgate; see also Gen Rab. *ad loc.*). Consequently, according to rabbinic tradition, the LXX reflects an alteration, but actually the translation is based on a certain tradition of vocalization, which is also reflected in MT (שור)³⁵.

(8) Exod 4, 20 MT: החמר

LXX: τὰ ὑποζύγια (list: נושאוי בני אדם)

If one takes τὰ ὑποζύγια as a literal translation of the original Greek translation, it may be reconstructed as *ἀνθρωποφάρος or *φορᾶνθρωπος, though neither of these words is attested in the Greek language. It appears that in this instance the Hebrew translation in the list is not literal, but emphasizes the interpretative dimension of the Greek word. Etymologically the meaning of ὑποζύγιον is a "yoke (ζυγόν)-bearing animal", and as such designates various animals. In contrast to this, its meaning in Egypt is restricted to "ass", or at least this meaning was prevalent there³⁶. For this reason חמר is often translated in the LXX by ὑποζύγιον (note, however, that the equivalent חמר-δνος is more frequent in the LXX, with the exception of Exod in which the passage under consideration appears)³⁷.

We may infer that this use of ὑποζύγιον was unknown in Palestine and so the sages wondered about the use of בני אדם (this is how they understood ὑποζύγιον) and not of δνος, as usual.

(10) Exod 24, 5 MT: נערי (בני ישראל)

LXX: τοὺς νεανίσκους = list: זאמטי

The equivalent נער = νεανίσκος/νεανίας is quite wide-spread in the LXX (although the use of παῖδες is more frequent). Therefore the use of νεανίσκος need not have raised any difficulty on the linguistic level, but on the exegetical level it was apparently considered unusual, because these נערים were usually taken to mean

³⁵ The main difference between LXX and the Hebrew Pent. is indeed אכזב on the one hand and שור on the other. But in the parallel (first) colon שור instead of MT's איש (= ἀνθρώπος in LXX) appears in several lists. Apparently, שור is secondary here and was entered under the influence of שור at the end of the verse (where it was replaced by אכזב). It is unlikely that the original list intended to ascribe this variant to the LXX. See also the preceding note.

³⁶ See the lexicons and particularly J. H. MOULTON and G. MILLIGAN, *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament* (London 1930), with examples from papyri of the 3rd century B.C.E. See especially papyrus Hib I 73⁹ where ὑποζύγιον and δνος are synonymous.

³⁷ See also Jud 19, 3, 10: חמר = ms B: δνος; ms A: ὑποζύγιον.

"select men" (see, for example, Onqelos בכורי and Zeb. 115b) and not "little ones". Against this background, we presume, the sages remarked that the translators altered נערי, writing in its place זאמטי, that is, "little ones"³⁸. This same thing occurred in passage 11.

(15) Lev 11, 6(5)³⁹ Deut 14, 7 MT: ארנבה

LXX: δασύποδα = list

שעירת רגלים = צעירה רגלים

δασύπους appropriately communicates ארנבה⁴⁰ and therefore may reflect the original Greek translation cited in the list by means of a literal retranslation of its two elements. Rabbinic tradition emphasizes that the translators avoided writing ארנבה in this place (that is λαγών); it may be that this claim is nothing but a *post factum* explanation; on the other hand, it is just possible that λαγών is the original translation of ארנבה which was later supplanted by δασύποδα.

³⁸ Much has been written on the background of this word; see APTOWITZER, 2 (1909) 104-106; GEIGER, 36; TALMON, 26; MÜLLER, 81-83, and the bibliography there. I do not think that the word is originally Greek (ζητήτης; see, e.g. the dictionary of LEWY), because it is difficult to find what could be common to the Hebrew נערי and the Greek word (inquirer), and since זאמטי is indeed attested in Hebrew (IQM, 11(7):3: (וכל נער ועמט ואשר לא יבוא למחנותם כצאם) and in Aramaic (the data are given by S. KRAUSS, *Griechische und Lateinische Lehnwörter im Talmud, Midrasch und Targum* (Berlin 1899); see, e.g., the Targum to Cant. 6, 5 (ועמטין). This word is apparently derived from Aramaic זמא (many mss. of b. Meg. indeed read זמטי and not זאמטי as in the printed editions). Even more has been written concerning נערי, that is, one of the three scrolls found in the Temple Court according to rabbinic tradition:

ג' ספרים מצאו בעורה, ספר מעוני וספר זמטי וספר דין. באחד מצאו כחוב מעון אלהי קדם וכשנים כחוב מענה אלהי קדם, וקיימו שנים וביטלו אחד. באחד מצאו כחוב וישלח את זמטי בני ישראל, וכשנים כחוב וישלח את נערי בני ישראל, וקיימו שנים וביטלו אחד. באחד מצאו כחוב חשע הוא וכשנים כחוב אחת עשרה היא, וקיימו שנים וביטלו אחד. (y. Ta'anit 4.2, 68a and see the parallels in Abot de-R. Nathan, version B, chap. 46; Sifre 356 on Deut 33, 27; Sop. 6, 4). See TALMON and the bibliography there. It is difficult to discern what was the character of *Sefer Za'atute* and whether it was related somehow to the LXX (perhaps it contained certain details from the LXX?). In any case, this pericope apparently does not touch on an explanation of the significance of passages 10 and 11 in the list under discussion. At the most it can be claimed that these passages do not belong to this list (note that they are lacking in Y. Meg. and in Mek.); however, such a claim is improbable in view of the parallel between זאמטי in the list and νεανίσκος in Exod 24, 5.

³⁹ The LXX to Lev changes the order of verses 5 and 6. For the equivalent שם = χοιροφυλλίος cf. Prov 30, 26 (24, 61) and Ps 104(103), 18.

⁴⁰ The word is translated in the Syro-Hexapla of Deut 14, 7 by ארנבה (with δασύποδα added in the margin). See A. VÖÖBUS, *The Pentateuch in the Versions of the Syro-Hexapla, A Fac-simile Edition of a Midyat MS. Discovered 1964*, CSCO 369 (Louvain 1975).