



Taylor, Bernard A., ed.

***X Congress of the International Organization for
Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Oslo, 1998***

Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and
Cognate Studies 51

Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001. Pp.
xviii + 581. Cloth. \$69.96. ISBN 1589830202.

R. Timothy McLay
St. Stephen's University

This volume is a collection of thirty-three essays delivered at the tenth congress meeting for Septuagint specialists held in Oslo in 1998. The papers reflect the variety of interests within the field and offer the reader a way into understanding the present state of Septuagint research.

The relationship between the Greek versions and the MT of different passages is the subject of a number of the papers. The first paper, delivered by then-vice-president of the IOSCS and coordinator of the congress, Johan Lust, "The Delight of Ezekiel's Eyes: Ez 24:15–24 in Hebrew and in Greek," suggests that the Old Greek (OG) translation preserves an earlier version of the narrative than the MT and uncovers evidence of the reworking of the text within the MT. In "Die zwei Erzählungen von Joabs Tod (I Kön 2:28–34) im Masoretischen Text und in der LXX" Adrian Schenker argues that the MT is a later reworking of the longer *Vorlage* of the LXX. The Hebrew and Greek texts are separate revisions of a common text is the conclusion of Frank H. Polak in "The Septuagint Account of Solomon's Reign: Revision and Ancient Recension," while Hans Ausloos sees the plus in OG Num 14:23 as evidence for a Deuteronomistic redaction of its *Vorlage* in "LXX Num 14:23: Once More a 'Deuteronomist' at Work?" Another interesting investigation of the use of the Hebrew texts is offered in "A Touch of Chronicles: The Provenance of 3 Reigns 10:26–26a," by P. S. F. van Keulen, who argues

that this passage is actually a translation of 2 Chr 9:25–26. In his paper “Jeremiah 52: A Test Case for Jer LXX,” Georg Fischer challenges the scholarly consensus that OG Jeremiah is a translation of a shorter *Vorlage*. Assuming the dependence of Jer 52 on 2 Kgs 24, Fischer argues that OG Jer 52 is “an abbreviating and occasionally modifying translation of Jer 52 H” (43) and that these results apply to the whole book.

The comparison of the ancient texts means that scholars have to be sensitive to the interplay between textual criticism and literary criticism. Based on his literary-critical study of Josh 1:7, Michaël N. van der Meer argues that the LXX represents a specific interpretation by the translator of Josh 1:1–9 in “Textual Criticism and Literary Criticism in Joshua 1:7 (MT and LXX).” Bénédicte Lemmelijn also investigates the texts with literary concerns at the forefront in his study, “The So-Called ‘Major Expansions’ in SamP, 4QpaleoExod^m and 4QExod^j of Ex 7:14–11:10: On the Edge between Textual Criticism and Literary Criticism.”

The concerns raised by literary criticism in the analysis of the differences between the MT and the OG/LXX relate specifically to the issue whether variant readings are based in textual differences or whether the Greek represents a reinterpretation of the text due to the ideology of the translator. Three papers focused particularly on this issue. Kristin De Troyer argues that the longer text of the LXX in Esth 6:13 is an interpretive translation of the MT and is not based on a different *Vorlage* in “Translation or Interpretation? A Sample from the Books of Esther.” According to Johann Cook in “The Ideology of Septuagint Proverbs,” the translator of Proverbs was a conservative Jew whose ideology is apparent in his amplification of the law in a progressively hostile Hellenistic environment. Frank Austermann examines the interplay of translation and interpretation in Ps 1 in “Deshalb werden nicht aufstehen Frevler im Gericht: Zur Übersetzungsweise und Interpretation im ersten Septuaginta-Psalm.”

In addition to the focus on comparing particular texts, a Congress on LXX studies would not be complete without papers that focus particularly on methodological issues. For example, “The Renderings of the Circumstantial ׀ Clauses in the LXX of Joshua and Judges” by Seppo Sipilä and “πίπτω ἐπὶ πρόσωπόν μου: A Set Phrase in Ezekiel?” by Katrin Hauspie examine issues of translation technique within particular books. “Lexical Inconsistency: Towards a Methodology for the Analysis of the Vocabulary of the Septuagint” by Tim McLay employs linguistic principles to compare the wisdom vocabulary in the two Greek translations of Daniel. Jan Joosten provides examples where translators were fooled because of the changes in the meaning of terms that happened diachronically in “On the LXX Translators’ Knowledge of Hebrew.” In “A Peculiar Word Order Rule for the Septuagint,” Georg Walser argues that the translators of the Pentateuch normally followed the word order of the Hebrew when they employed predicative aorist participles to render a Hebrew consecutive and that this influenced some subsequent translators as well as some syntactical usage in the New Testament

Gospels and Acts. “Lexical Variants in the Greek Text of Reigns and Chronicles” by M^a Victoria Spottorno considers the contributions of the Antiochene text to Greek lexicography and provides examples of a Greek-Hebrew Index of the Antiochene text in preparation. This is reported on by Natalio Fernández Marcos in “A Greek-Hebrew Index of the Antiochene Text.” Anneli Aejmelaeus makes another contribution to the broader understanding of translation technique in “What We Talk about When We Talk about Translation Technique.”

One of the most interesting aspects of the congress was the lively discussion about the recent translation projects of the Septuagint into English and French. The aims and principles of the two endeavors were set forth by Margarite Harl in “La Bible d’Alexandrie: 1. The Translation Principles” and Albert Pietersma in “A New English Translation of the Septuagint.” The aims of the translations were also illustrated in several papers. Cecile Dogniez offered a sample of the new French edition in “Select Passage: Sophonie (Zephaniah) 3,8–11” and “Fautes de traduction, ou bonnes traductions? Quelques exemples pris dans la LXX des Douze Petits Prophètes,” while “Translating a Translation: The Septuagint of Genesis and the NETS Project” by Robert Hiebert and “Interim Report: NETS Leviticus” by Dirk Büchner demonstrated the principles adopted in the English project. The major difference between the two is that *La Bible d’Alexandrie* attempts to translate the Septuagint primarily as a literary document within its Greek context, whereas NETS is concerned to indicate ways that the Septuagint is dependent upon the Hebrew text. These issues were addressed in the papers by Arie van der Kooij and Natalio Fernández Marcos, who responded to the initial presentations.

The remaining papers deal with a variety of subjects related to Septuagint Studies. “The Letter of Aristeas and the Origin of the Septuagint” by Raija Sollamo examines the origins of the LXX, and “Patristic Evidence of the Difficulties in Understanding the LXX: Hadrian’s Philological Remarks in *Isagoge*” by Alex Leonas identifies some principles of Hellenistic philology that inform the way in which the LXX was read by its Greek audience. Contributions by Albert Pietersma, “Exegesis and Liturgy in the Superscriptions of the Greek Psalter,” and Harry F. van Rooy, “The Psalm Headings in Book One of the Syro-Hexapla Psalms,” explore the transmission history of the Greek text. R. B. ter Haar Romeney and Peter Gentry report on a preliminary database for a new collection of Hexapla fragments in “Towards a New Collection of Hexaplaric Materials for the Book of Genesis,” and M. A. Zipor considers matters of textual criticism in “The Use of the Septuagint As a Textual Witness: Further Considerations.”

A compilation of this magnitude from such a diversity of Septuagint specialists working in ten different countries makes this a required volume for students and specialists in the field. Bernard Taylor is to be congratulated for the fine quality of the finished product.