Jewish Reception of Greek Bible Versions

Edited by
NICHOLAS DE LANGE,
JULIA G. KRIVORUCHKO
and CAMERON BOYD-TAYLOR

Texts and Studies in Medieval and Early Modern Judaism

Edited by

Ivan G. Marcus · Peter Schäfer

23

Jewish Reception
of Greek Bible Versions

Studies in Their Use in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages

Edited by

Nicholas de Lange, Julia G. Krivoruchko
and Cameron Boyd-Taylor

Mohr Siebeck

NICHOLAS DE LANGE is Professor of Hebrew and Jewish Studies at the University of Cambridge, UK.

JULIA G. KRIVORUCHKO is Research Associate in the Centre for Advanced Religious and Theological Studies at the University of Cambridge, UK, and Senior Teaching Fellow at the University of Haifa.

CAMERON BOYD-TAYLOR is Research Associate in the Centre for Advanced Religious and Theological Studies at the University of Cambridge, UK.

Preface

This collection of studies was conceived and executed in the framework of the research project 'The Greek Bible in Byzantine Judaism', which was funded by a research grant from the Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC) and based in the Centre for Advanced Religious and Theological Studies (CARTS) within the Faculty of Divinity of the University of Cambridge.

Most of the studies originated as papers read to an international colloquium held in Wolfson College, Cambridge, from 9 to 11 July, 2007, as part of the project. Additional funding for this colloquium was provided by the British Academy, and administrative support was supplied by the University of Cambridge's Centre for Research in the Arts, Social Sciences and Humanities (CRASSH).

A few studies were originally presented to seminars of the project. One (Veltri) was specially written for this collection.

The main purpose of the project is to collect and publish scattered remains of the Greek Bible versions used by Byzantine Jews. We also attach great importance, however, to detailed study of these scanty relics of a once far more extensive literature, including setting them in their context within biblical studies, Byzantine studies, Jewish studies and indeed the history of scholarship in these various areas. The present volume is directed to this end. The contributors have been deliberately drawn from a wide range of disciplines; several of them had not previously considered the issues discussed, and we are particularly grateful to them for their willingness to examine from a novel point of view materials with which they were familiar.

We regret that it was not possible, for various reasons, to publish all the papers read at the colloquium and the various seminars.

The editors would like to express their gratitude to all the institutions mentioned above for their invaluable support. They also wish to thank the series editor, Peter Schäfer, for accepting the volume, as well as Dr Henning Ziebritzki, the Editorial Director for Theology and Jewish Studies, and other members of the staff of Mohr Siebeck, for their unfailing helpfulness and courtesy.

<div align="right">
Nicholas de Lange
Julia G. Krivoruchko
Cameron Boyd-Taylor
</div>

Cambridge, August 2008

Table of Contents

Introduction

by

Nicholas de Lange

The transmission and use of Greek Bible translations by Jews in the Middle Ages is a subject that has so far received very little scholarly attention. The purpose of this collection of studies is to contribute to a better understanding of it by setting it within its various contexts, tackling it from a broad and interdisciplinary perspective, and devoting special attention to a number of key aspects.

'Cambridge has been for many years the home of Septuagint study,' wrote a prominent American specialist in 1910[1]. Cambridge holds a special place in the study of the medieval Jewish tradition of Greek Bible translation, if only because so many of the manuscripts (mainly but not exclusively those from the Cairo Genizah) are kept there. William Horbury rightly draws attention to the importance of Cambridge in the story of study of the Greek Bible in general, beginning in the earliest days of the University in the thirteenth century. From the point of view of our subject, however, it is the nineteenth century developments that are of greatest interest, starting with Frederick Field and his edition of the remains of Origen's Hexapla (1875), and continuing through the arrival in Cambridge in 1897 of the vast haul of mainly fragmentary manuscripts from the Cairo Genizah under the aegis of Charles Taylor, through the hard work of Solomon Schechter and with the practical support of the University Librarian Francis Jenkinson. The same year, astonishingly, F.C. Burkitt managed to publish his edition of some Genizah fragments of Kings in Aquila's translation, and some further fragments of Aquila's translation of the Psalms appeared three years later, in 1900. In due course the Genizah was to yield more fragments testifying to continuing use of Greek translations in the tradition of Aquila, as noted by Horbury, who draws particular attention to the fruitful co-operation in Cambridge between Jewish and non-Jewish scholars.

The wider history of research is discussed by Natalio Fernández Marcos, whose pioneering introduction to the Greek versions of the Bible (first

---

[1] Edgar J. Goodspeed, *Classical Philology* 5 (1910), 239.

published in 1979) for the first time set forth the Jewish transmission of
such versions in parallel to the better known Christian transmission. In his
essay '*Non placet Septuaginta*' he insists on an unbroken chain of Jewish
Greek Bible translations linking the ancient Alexandrian version of the
Pentateuch to that printed in Constantinople in 1547. Key names in this
story are those of the second-century CE revisers Aquila and Symmachus,
representing two different and in a sense opposed approaches to the task of
revision. For Aquila the goal is to reproduce the original Hebrew as faith-
fully as possible, while for Symmachus it is to achieve a more elegant and
appealing Greek style. Of the two, it was Aquila whose model secured last-
ing influence in the Jewish tradition, while that of Symmachus was per-
haps more present in the Christian Church. Turning to the medieval heri-
tage, Fernández Marcos distinguishes two types of evidence, both consist-
ing largely of stray words and phrases: those written in Hebrew characters,
most of them recovered from the Cairo Genizah, and those inscribed in
Greek characters in the margins of Christian biblical manuscripts. A spe-
cial case is the so-called 'Graecus Venetus', a translation of the Pentateuch
and some other books of the Bible written in Greek characters and follow-
ing the tradition of Symmachus in paying close attention to Greek style,
even if it also occasionally betrays the influence of Aquila; this version
was probably made by a Christian translator who had made a study of Jew-
ish exegesis. All these various translations attest dissatisfaction with the
Septuagint. And yet in some ways this ancient Jewish version was the most
successful of all: unlike the medieval Jewish versions and the Constantin-
ople Pentateuch it liberated itself from the Hebrew and replaced it, for a
time in synagogues and more lastingly in Christian churches.

Although the main focus of our project is on the Middle Ages, the an-
cient roots of Byzantine civilization can never be ignored, and the Jewish
Bible translations are no exception in this respect. James Aitken concludes
from a close study of citations of the Book of Proverbs as well as the ex-
tant Aramaic and Syriac translations that the extant Greek version did not
leave a mark on Jewish literature until the first century CE, and that it con-
tinued to be known and cited (side by side with Aquila and other, un-
named, versions) into Late Antiquity. Particularly interesting is his discov-
ery of citations based on the Greek in rabbinic writings. This is a subject
that deserves to be investigated further, and extended to the whole Bible.
The relationship between the Greek translation and the targum is another
subject that he recommends for further research.

The rabbinic movement within Judaism is often portrayed, mislead-
ingly, as being in open conflict with Greek-speaking Judaism. Particularly
interesting in this regard is the attitude of the Rabbis to the translation of
the biblical books into Greek. The Greek translation of Lamentations,

Philip Alexander suggests, was made in the decades following the destruction of the Jerusalem temple with a liturgical end in view, in connection with the commemoration of the destruction in Greek-speaking synagogues: it is part of the 'outreach' of the fledgling rabbinic movement to the Greek Diaspora. The Rabbis, he argues, sponsored new translations of the biblical books to replace the Septuagint, and they encouraged public reading of the books in Hebrew. The Greek version of Lamentations may have been promulgated by the rabbis so as to counter the extreme theology of the catastrophe being promoted by contemporary apocalyptic works such as 2 Baruch.

Christian witnesses play a key role in unravelling the history of Jewish translations. Origen, in the third century, incorporated a number of Jewish translations in his monumental Hexapla (extant only in fragments), notably the versions of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion, known collectively as 'the Three'. An intriguing later phenomenon is the presence in the margins of some Christian biblical manuscripts of readings that bear a distinctive similarity to the medieval Jewish versions. The best-known of these manuscripts is the early uncial Codex Ambrosianus, known as F. The marginal annotations have been given the siglum F^b. Some of them have similarities with Aquila and Symmachus, others with the Constantinople Pentateuch of 1547. Alison Salvesen classifies some readings from Exodus, illustrating the diversity of connections. Is it possible that they were all taken from a single medieval Jewish translation? In that case the translation in question combined a surprising and somewhat incoherent variety of approaches to translation. An alternative explanation is that the readings come from different sources, reflecting Jewish and Christian traditions. Either way, it is clear that some, at least, of the readings derive from a medieval Jewish version or versions, and (if we can distinguish these readings from others perhaps drawn from elsewhere) provide valuable evidence about such versions.

One of the most valuable sources of evidence for Greek-speaking Judaism in Late Antiquity is the epigraphic record. Silvia Cappelletti examines as an epigraphist the biblical quotations found in Greek Jewish inscriptions. The rarity of such quotations is intriguing: clearly reference to the Bible was not a marker of Jewish identity. But how widely was the Bible known? And which translations were used? The meagre evidence indicates knowledge of the Septuagint, Aquila, and some unidentified versions.

Giuseppe Veltri investigates explicit references to the Greek translations in rabbinic sources. These differ from Greek Jewish and Christian sources in identifying the aim of the translation as being for Ptolemy (presumably for his personal use), rather than for the royal library of Alexandria. The general attitude to the translation in the rabbinic sources is very positive,

or at least neutral; a small number of late texts presenting a negative vision of the translation are associated with the elaboration of a liturgy for the Fast of Tevet.

The Jews of the Byzantine empire constitute a missing chapter in the Jewish history of the Middle Ages: that is why we felt it was important in this volume to present the basic facts about this forgotten Jewry. David Jacoby surveys the physical presence of Jews in the Byzantine empire and in closely related areas such as the Venetian islands of Crete and Negroponte (Euboea). It emerges that Jewish communities were widely dispersed throughout the Byzantine world, and were overwhelmingly urban. There were very few obstacles to their mobility, and so they moved freely from town to town, both within the empire and across its borders. While Jews spoke vernacular Greek in their everyday life, Hebrew was the language of Jewish liturgy and written culture in the Byzantine world from the ninth or tenth century on. The use of Hebrew facilitated communication between Byzantine Jews and Jews elsewhere, and indeed between Rabbanites and Karaites within the empire. The general level of scholarship seems to have been high, to judge by the fact that scholars and schools were to be found not only in large urban centres but also in small communities. This is the concrete setting against which the evidence for use of Greek Bible versions has to be set.

The nine letters from the Cairo Genizah published by Ben Outhwaite help to flesh out this account, with personal details and local colour. Because they were discovered in Old Cairo, the letters bring out an aspect that might have otherwise eluded us, the close contacts between Jews in Byzantium and in Egypt, where several Byzantine Jewish families seem to have lived more or less permanently. But they also shed light on everyday Jewish life in Byzantium.

The reworking of Josephus known as *Sefer Yosippon*, probably the first extant Hebrew work written in Europe, originated in an area of Italy where both Greek and Latin were known. It was widely copied and read by Jews in Byzantium and in other regions. Saskia Dönitz suggests that its success is due in part to the use it makes of stories from the Greek Bible (perhaps in Latin translation) which are lacking in the Hebrew, notably 1–2 Maccabees and the additions to Esther. It is unclear whether the author knew these works from Jewish tradition or discovered them from the Christian environment. A much later Italian author, Jerahmeel, who took an interest in the additions to Daniel in the Greek Bible, states that these texts were translated by Todos (i.e. Theodotion), a clear indication that he was familiar with the Christian Bible, where this translation of Daniel had generally replaced the Septuagint version; the author of *Sefer Yosippon*, however, was working at a time when among Jews Hebrew was just beginning to

replace Greek and Romance languages in Italy, and so the possibility re-mains that part of his aim was to rescue the living but threatened heritage of Greek-reading Judaism for a Hebrew-reading posterity.

Patrick Andrist examines the Christian literature in which a Christian is shown debating with a Jew, and asks whether the Jewish character ever quotes a biblical text which is different from the Bible of the Christian, i.e. the Septuagint. Generally the answer is negative. Yet, in the face of seem-ingly insuperable difficulties, a small number of cases can be assembled in which there is a disagreement between the two speakers about the text of the Bible, and in some of these there is at least a distinct possibility that genuine Jewish readings are preserved in the Christian polemical texts. So it turns out that this is a potentially fruitful line of enquiry after all.

T.M. Law scrutinizes one of the Cairo Genizah fragments containing Greek biblical glosses in the context of the diversity of Greek versions known to have circulated nearly a thousand years earlier. He shows that, in contrast to the practice in the Christian churches, where essentially a single Greek version held sway, among the Jews the old diversity persisted, and what is more that the influence of the ancient versions, not only Aquila and Symmachus but also Theodotion and other, unnamed, versions, was still felt in the Middle Ages.

As mentioned earlier, the 14th-century 'Graecus Venetus' is often con-sidered to be a Christian translation, despite the presence in it of certain Jewish elements. Dries De Crom, in his minute study of the translation of the Song of Songs, detects traces of Aquila and Symmachus as well as the Septuagint, but also of medieval Jewish exegesis. Moreover the book, al-though in Greek, is written from right to left like a Hebrew book. Turning in a postscript to the vexed question of the authorship of the translation, and noting the presence of both Christian and Jewish elements, he endorses an earlier suggestion that the translator was a convert from Judaism to Christianity.

The earliest printed text of the Greek Bible, the Complutensian Poly-glot, is the subject of a second contribution by Natalio Fernández Marcos. Among the various manuscript sources on which this edition was based, at least one displays striking similarities with a medieval Jewish text of Exo-dus which is partially preserved in additions to the previously-mentioned Codex Ambrosianus. This text has left no other surviving traces. Did the Complutensian editors know it from the Codex Ambrosianus, or from an-other source, now lost? This is only one of the intriguing issues associated with the Complutensian edition.

Clearly there is a long way to go before all the questions raised by the medieval Jewish translations can be answered. Indeed, given the very

fragmentary nature of the surviving evidence it is likely that some of them will never be resolved. Certain key points arise, however, from the contributions to this book.

Firstly, it is clear that Greek-speaking Jews throughout the Middle Ages made use of translations of the biblical books from Hebrew into Greek. We are not in a position to determine whether this situation prevailed throughout the Greek-speaking regions of the world; in the absence of indications to the contrary it is probably safe to assume that it did.

Secondly, there was not a single, authorised translation (such as existed in the Greek Church), but there were several circulating side by side. Some of the sources, both Jewish and Christian, cite alternative renderings of the same Hebrew word.

Thirdly, while they present some novel features, these translations were generally very traditional, and retain clear traces of the ancient translations and revisions, and notably that of Aquila, which is cast in very distinctive Greek and follows a distinctive approach to the task of translation. In the sixth century it seems that the translation of Aquila itself was in use (to judge by the palimpsest fragments found in the Cairo Genizah). Later, however, Aquilanic renderings are just one element, combined with other features, including words that only entered the Greek language after Aquila's time, and morphological features belonging to medieval vernacular Greek.

Fourthly, while these translations were made from the Masoretic Hebrew text, the books and parts of books present in the Septuagint but absent from the Masoretic Text were not entirely forgotten among Jews.

Finally, the use of these translations was not limited to the Jewish communities. They found their way into the hands of Christian scribes and scholars, and have left a distinct trace in some Christian Bibles.

History of Research

The Septuagint in Cambridge

by

William Horbury

To a volume with a focus on Byzantine Jewish bible-reading this theme brings no more than echoes of Byzantium; but sometimes they are clear. Thus when an Old Testament in Greek was first printed in Cambridge in 1665, the broader context of the publication included English contact with the eastern church in Constantinople and the Levant. The Septuagint was of course received in the University of Cambridge at a much earlier date. The phases in its reception picked out here range from the western Greek study of the crusading period, through sixteenth- and seventeenth-century biblical scholarship and ecclesiastical interest in the eastern church, to nineteenth- and twentieth-century renewal of the approach to the Septuagint through Philo and Josephus, the Greek Fathers and the manuscript tradition. This tradition was predominantly shaped by Byzantine Christian copyists; but it also permitted a reconsideration of the place of the Septuagint in the ancient Jewish community, and an encounter, through Cambridge Genizah fragments, with the Greek Bible as current among Byzantine Jews.

I

Some thirteenth- and fourteenth-century Cambridge awareness of the Greek Bible seems probable on general grounds. The beginnings of the university in the early thirteenth century had coincided with a revival of both Hebrew and Greek study, including a concern with the Greek Bible and little-known biblical books current in Greek, such as 3–4 Maccabees and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. In England this concern was influentially exhibited by Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln, and the Oxford Franciscan Roger Bacon.[2]

---

[2] R. Weiss, 'The Study of Greek in England during the Fourteenth Century', reprinted from *Rinascimento* 2 (1951), 209–39 in R. Weiss, *Medieval and Humanist Greek: Collected Essays* (Medioevo e umanesimo 8, Padova, 1977), 80–107 (81–9); H. J. de Jonge,

A Byzantine reminder of it, now in Cambridge, is the tenth-century
Greek manuscript Cambridge University Library MS Ff.1.24, procured
from Athens by Grosseteste in 1235 as a basis for translation of the Testa-
ments of the Twelve Patriarchs into Latin; the manuscript also includes
LXX Chronicles and the *Hypomnesticon Biblion* of Josippus. This book,
attributed to the library of Michael Choniates (c.1138–c.1222), Archbishop
of Athens, passed with other books of Grosseteste to the Oxford Francis-
cans; then in 1574 it was given by Matthew Parker to the Cambridge Uni-
versity Library.[3] Other reminders among Cambridge manuscripts are a
Greek psalter which may have belonged to Grosseteste, and a bilingual
Latino-Greek psalter written entirely in Latin characters belonging to
Gregory of Huntingdon, prior of Ramsey in the late thirteenth century;
both these were given by Parker to Corpus Christi College.[4] A concern
with Hebrew appears in some thirteenth- and fourteenth-century members
of the Cambridge theological faculty, especially in its strong Franciscan
element, as exemplified by the Old Testament exegetes William Milton or
Middleton and Henry Cossey; it seems likely that some in these circles will
have been aware of the Greek as well as Hebrew biblical interests repre-
sented by Grosseteste and Bacon.

II

The sixteenth century brings a phase of reception documented by contem-
porary Cambridge writing and book-collection. Against the background of
renewed Greek and Hebrew study, biblical translation and ecclesiastical
reform, Tudor Cambridge shared in the revival of old controversies over
the inspiration and accuracy of the Septuagint. Like many other Greek

---

'Die Patriarchentestamente von Roger Bacon bis Richard Simon', in M. de Jonge (ed.),
Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Text and Interpretation (Studia in
Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha 3, Leiden, 1975), 3–42 (4–11); R. W. Southern,
Robert Grosseteste: the Growth of an English Mind in Medieval Europe (2nd edn, Ox-
ford, 1992), 13–19, 181–6.

  [3] H. J. de Jonge, 'La bibliothèque de Michel Choniatès et la tradition occidentale des
Testaments des XII Patriarches', reprinted from *Nederlandsch Archief voor Kerk-
geschiedenis* 53 (1973), 171–80 in M. de Jonge, *Studies*, 97–106; J. C. T. Oates, *Cam-
bridge University Library: A History from the Beginnings to the Copyright Act of Queen
Anne* (Cambridge, 1986), 106–7.

  [4] M. R. James, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Corpus
Christi College, Cambridge* (2 vols., Cambridge, 1912), vol. 2, pp. 399–403 (MS 468,
Gregory of Huntingdon's Latino-Greek Psalter), 422–4 (MS 480, Greek psalter with can-
ticles associated with Oxford); Weiss, 'The Study of Greek in England during the Four-
teenth Century', 82, 89, 93 n. 89.

texts, the Septuagint had had to wait until this period to appear in print; but the early editions were soon represented in Cambridge.

In 1529 a gift of books to the University Library by Cuthbert Tunstall, Bishop of London and later of Durham, included the first printed Septuagint, the Septuagint column of the four-part Old Testament of the Complutensian Polyglot of 1514–17, issued in 1522.[5] Another copy which in 1529 had been in use already in Cambridge belonged to George Stafford, Fellow of Pembroke and a sympathizer with what became the reform movement.[6] His vivid lectures on St Paul and the evangelists were remembered for his knowledge of Hebrew, Greek and Latin, and also for his anecdotes.[7] When Stafford died in 1529 he left his Complutensian Polyglot to Pembroke with other books (a Hebrew Bible with Targums, and works of St Cyprian and St Augustine); they were chained by 1530. This Polyglot is no longer in the college library, but Pembroke possesses a Complutensian Polyglot which could have been used later in Tudor Cambridge, bequeathed by Archbishop Whitgift.[8]

At least four other known copies were or could have been in use in Cambridge before the death of Henry VIII (1547). The clearest instance is one of five books given to Christ's by John Fisher (1469–1535), Bishop of Rochester and Chancellor of the university, who had assisted in the college's 1505 re-founding.[9] Then what seems to be another copy probably in Cambridge under Henry VIII belonged to an owner surnamed Nevell, of Trinity Hall (his Christian name is not preserved), according to an inven-

---

[5] Oates, *Cambridge University Library*, 67: 'it must certainly have been one of the earliest copies to reach England'.

[6] J. B. Mullinger, *The University of Cambridge from the Earliest Times to the Royal Injunctions of 1535* (Cambridge, 1873), 567–8, 608–9.

[7] Thomas Becon (*c.* 1511–1567), *The Jewel of Joy*, quoted by Mullinger, *University of Cambridge*, 567–8; G. Corrie (ed.), *Sermons by Hugh Latimer, Bishop of Worcester. Martyr, 1555* (Parker Society; Cambridge, 1844), 440 (Latimer tells a story used by Stafford to illustrate Rom. 12:20–21).

[8] For Stafford's copy see Matthew Wren's 1641 list of benefactors to Pembroke and their gifts, in P. D. Clarke (ed.), with an Introduction by Roger Lovatt, *The University and College Libraries of Cambridge* (Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues 10; London, 2002), 416–442 (441–2, no. 42); the same book figures in the inventory made for the 1557 Marian visitation of the university, printed ibid., p. 401, with photograph, plate 7, now simply specifying 'quarta pars veteris testamenti'. This wording is close to that of the colophon of the fourth part, and may imply that the whole Old Testament was present, but it suggests that the New Testament part at least was already missing. Miss J. S. Ringrose kindly discussed this point with me and supplied photocopies of the two copies of the Marian list from Pembroke Archives, boxes Q6 and Q7. Whitgift's Complutensian Polyglot is now Pembroke LC. 152–6. I am most grateful to Patricia Aske for help in Pembroke library.

[9] 1623 register of donors, in Clarke (ed.), *University and College Libraries*, 118, no. 44, identified with a copy now in the college library.

tory of his books (92 titles, including a good deal of Hebrew and Greek) prepared for probate in 1548; for he had 'biblia hebraica graeca et latina in quatuor voluminibus', which at this date can only be the Complutensian Polyglot.[10] For two further copies the date of acquisition is not known, but the owners held office in Henrician Cambridge. One of these copies was owned by George Day, Fellow of St John's from 1522, a chaplain to Fisher, Provost of King's from 1538, and later Bishop of Chichester (deprived by Edward VI for opposition to reform, but restored by Queen Mary); he left the book to St John's at his death in 1556.[11] The other such copy is from the library of Matthew Parker (1504–75), Fellow of Corpus from 1527 and Master 1544–53; as a married priest he held no office under Queen Mary, but he became Archbishop of Canterbury from 1559 under Queen Elizabeth.[12] In all six instances the owner is known to have had a concern with Greek as well as Hebrew, as would be expected.

In the 1520s, however, the Aldine Greek Bible of 1518, presenting the Septuagint together with the New Testament, had also already reached Cambridge. A copy was among the books of Henry Bullock, Fellow of Queens', associate of Erasmus and patron of John Siberch's Cambridge press, which were purchased by Queens' after Bullock's death in 1526; they also include other Aldine Greek texts.[13]

The Complutensian and the Aldine texts were followed by several editions dependent mainly on these printed texts rather than manuscripts. The first such edition was the Old Testament of the Greek Bible issued by J. Lonicer (with the New Testament, 4 volumes; Strassburg: Wolfius Cephalaeus, 1524–6).[14] Lonicer mainly followed the Aldine text, but added IV

---

[10] E. S. Leedham-Green, *Books in Cambridge Inventories: Book-lists from Vice-Chancellor's Court Probate Inventories in the Tudor and Stuart Periods* (2 vols., Cambridge, 1986), vol. 1, 99–101 (no. 38).

[11] D. McKitterick, 'Two Sixteenth-Century Catalogues of St John's College Library', *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 7 (1978), 135–55 (140, 155); he notes that the work was missing from the library by 1707.

[12] S. Gaselee, *The Early Printed Books in the Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1921), no. 281; the title can be seen in the photograph of the Corpus copy of the register of Parker's books prepared after his death (CCCC MS 575, p.1), in R. I. Page, *Matthew Parker and his Books*, with photographs by Mildred Budny (Kalamazoo, Michigan, 1993), plate 1.

[13] No. 9 in the list of Bullock's books made by Simon Heynes, later President of Queens' (d. 1552), published with comments by E. P. Goldschmidt, *The First Cambridge Press in its European Setting* (Cambridge, 1954), 69–71, and republished by Clare Sargent, 'Two Sixteenth-Century Book Lists from the Library of Queens' College, Cambridge', *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 12.2 (2001), 161–79 (167–70); she notes that it is not mentioned in the 1580 inventory of the college library.

[14] The arrangement of the contents is fully described from the Duke of Sussex's copy by T. J. Pettigrew, *Bibliotheca Sussexiana* (2 vols., London, 1827), i, 233–4.

Maccabees. One copy of this edition used in Cambridge, now in Lambeth Palace Library, was among a number of Greek books owned by the first Regius Professor of Hebrew, Thomas Wakefield, who held the chair from 1540. It has been shown to offer a tantalizing glimpse of textual study of the Septuagint in Tudor Cambridge.[15] Thomas Wakefield noted in the margin of its printed text of Genesis some variant readings from 'a very old copy', *antiquissimum exemplar.* This appears to be none other than the illustrated uncial codex which would later become famous as the Cotton Genesis, and would largely perish in the Ashburnham House fire of 1731.[16] The readings in Wakefield's marginalia agree with Grabe's collation of the Cotton Genesis, Wakefield signed the last folio of the manuscript, and there is a good case for supposing that he was one of its sixteenth-century owners.[17] Wakefield's Cambridge colleague Edward Wygan, the first Regius Professor of Divinity, also possessed 'biblia greca in 4or voluminibus', according to a 1545 inventory of his books; given the date, it seems that this too must be a copy of Lonicer's text.[18]

The next such edition, again dependent on the Aldine text, and the fourth printed text of the Septuagint by date, was in the Greek Bible issued with a preface by Melanchthon, *Divinae Scripturae*, *Veteris ac Novi Testamenti*, *omnia* (Basle, 1545). A copy was among the books of Matthew Parker.[19] Three Greek Old Testament manuscripts from his collection were mentioned above in part I. Among his printed books was a copy of the Complutensian Polyglot, as already noted. He also owned copies of the Latin version of the Septuagint from this Polyglot as reissued separately by the printer Andreas Cratander, an associate of Oecolampadius (Basle,

---

[15] J. Carley, 'Religious Controversy and Marginalia: Pierfrancesco di Piero Bardi, Thomas Wakefield, and their Books', *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 12.3 (2002), 206–45 (208–12, 237); id., 'Thomas Wakefield, Robert Wakefield and the Cotton Genesis', *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 12.3 (2002), 246–66 (251 and plate I, showing Thomas Wakefield's marginal note in the Lonicer text of the reading in Gen. 2:24 πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, as in J. E. Grabe's collation of the Cotton Genesis).

[16] On the history of the manuscript see K. Weitzmann and H. L. Kessler, *The Cotton Genesis: British Library Codex Cotton Otho B.VI* (The Illustrations in the Manuscripts of the Septuagint, 1, Princeton, 1986), 3–7.

[17] Carley, 'Thomas Wakefield'.

[18] Leedham-Green, *Cambridge Inventories*, vol. 1, 38–42 (no. 79).

[19] It is mentioned on p. 1 of the Corpus copy of the Parker register (n. 11, above). Unambiguous internal traces of his ownership have not been noted in either of two copies now in Corpus Christi College Library (A.3.23–4); both were rebound in the eighteenth century, and A.3.23 was identified as Parker's copy by a mitre stamp after rebinding. A.3.24 bears an old classmark, 24, on the fore-edges, and has been marked with attention to the numbering of the psalms. For help in Corpus library I am most grateful to Gill Cannell and Dr Suzanne Paul.

1526), of the Latin text of the Letter of Aristeas in the collection *Mikro-presbytikon* (Basle, 1550), and of the Antwerp Polyglot of 1569–73.[20]

Parker was not only a great head of house, archbishop, and assembler of sources for the history of the English church and nation, but also a biblical scholar and translator. The Bishops' Bible of 1568 was issued under his aegis and through his active participation in the work. His printed books comprise among other things a collection of exegetical works, from the Gloss and Nicholas de Lyra to Sebastian Munster and the Old Testament commentaries of the early Lutheran biblical scholar and reformer J. Bugenhagen (1485–1558). The strong representation of the Septuagint among his printed and manuscript books shows how, despite the emphasis on *Hebraica veritas* which sixteenth-century Old Testament interpretation both inherited and renewed, the Greek Old Testament had attained clear importance for translators and exegetes.

Correspondingly, the translation of the Seventy receives passing but honourable mention in Parker's preface to the Old Testament in the Bishops' Bible (1568). Like Cranmer before him in the preface (1540) to the Great Bible, he quotes Chrysostom to encourage Bible-reading; but by contrast with Cranmer he chooses a passage where Chrysostom speaks of the providence which wonderfully preserved the scriptures when other books were lost.[21] God inspired a man 'to repair these miraculous scriptures, Esdras I mean, who of their leavings set them together again. After that, he provided that the Seventy Interpreters should take them in hand. At the last came Christ himself ...'[22] So the Septuagint forms a link in the chain of the providential preservation of the Bible. It reappeared in this connection in the fount of Elizabethan 'euphuistic' literature. John Lyly, who migrated from Oxford to Cambridge, presented the survival of the biblical books through the translation of the Seventy as one of the arguments against atheism in his *Euphues* (1578).[23]

---

[20] The Latin Septuagint and the Antwerp Polyglot are both also mentioned on p. 1 of the Corpus copy of the Parker register (n. 11, above), the *Mikropresbytikon* on p. 4. The three books are identified with copies now in the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, classmarks Y.2.14, A.2.1–8, and B.4.25, respectively.

[21] Chrysostom, *in Heb. Hom.* VIII; Greek text in F. Field (ed.), *Sancti Patris Nostri Johannis Chrysostomi ... Interpretatio omnium Epistolarum Paulinarum per Homilias facta*, VII (Oxford, 1862), 111; Latin version probably used by Parker in Erasmus's edition of Chrysostom in Latin, *Opera D. Ioannis Chrysostomi* (5 vols., Basle, 1539), vol. 4, col. 1399 (Parker's copy, mentioned in the Corpus copy of the Parker Register, p. 4, is identified with Corpus B.2.20–24).

[22] The preface was reprinted as Appendix, no. 83 by John Strype, *The Life and Acts of Matthew Parker* (1711, reprinted in 3 vols., Oxford, 1821), vol. 3, 236–53 (see p. 241).

[23] See 'Euphues and Atheos' in John Lyly, *Euphues: the Anatomy of Wit* (1578–80, reprinted, ed. E. A. Arber, Birmingham, 1868), 169; here the Greek translation is the means of preserving the scriptures when 'the Hebrew tongue lay not only unesteemed but

The early printed Septuagints exemplify varying sixteenth-century attitudes to the Septuagint in particular and the project of biblical translation in general. In the prologue to the Complutensian Polyglot, with celebrated scorn, Cardinal Cisneros had associated the Septuagint with the schismatical Eastern Church, and the Hebrew text with the Jewish Synagogue; the Greek and the Hebrew were printed (he wrote) on either side of the Vulgate, representing the Roman or Latin Church with its unique constancy to the true understanding of scripture, just as the two thieves were placed on either side of Christ.[24] Then the 1526 Basle reissue of the Complutensian Latin translation of the Septuagint was prefaced by a discussion of the authority of the Septuagint, noting the praise of St Augustine as well as the reservations of St Jerome. Finally, Melanchthon's 1545 preface accepts that the Hebrew original must be preferred, but notes the utility of the Septuagint as the text used by the Greeks now and the apostles heretofore. Here we have reached the opposite pole from Cisneros; the link between the Septuagint and the Greek church (now implicitly praised as continuing apostolic usage) is valued by western Christians who, like the Greeks, are viewed as schismatic in Rome.

Within this spectrum of opinion, in the late 1520s John Fisher argued for the inspiration of the Seventy, with Philo and St Augustine; but towards the end of the century William Fulke (Master of Pembroke), defending such English versions as the Great Bible (1539–40), the Geneva Bible (1560) and the Bishops' Bible (1568), stressed the shortcomings of the Septuagint as we have it, with St Jerome.[25]

The reception of the Septuagint traversed, however, the confessional division which in Cambridge as elsewhere became central in this period. Luther was excommunicated in 1520, in 1533–4 Henry VIII asserted royal supremacy over the English church, and in 1553–4 a return to papal allegiance was initiated by Queen Mary. Most of those named above in connection with the Septuagint in early sixteenth-century Cambridge were or

---

also unknown'. Lyly was incorporated as a Cambridge M.A. in 1579, the year after publication of the first part of *Euphues*; see C. H. Cooper and T. Cooper, *Athenae Cantabrigienses*, ii (Cambridge, 1861), 325–6.

[24] A handwritten marginal note at this point in Whitgift's copy (n. 7, above) begins (I have expanded contractions): *Non est hoc verum quod dicit de Romana ecclesia / erravit enim illa foede*. The damaging character of the association of the Septuagint with schismatics is underlined by N. Fernández Marcos, 'La edición de textos bíblicos en Espana', in N. Fernández Marcos and E. Fernández Tejero (eds.), *Biblia y humanismo: Textos, talantes y controversias del siglo XVI espanol* (Madrid, 1997), 261–73 (263).

[25] R. Rex, 'St John Fisher's Treatise on the Authority of the Septuagint', *JTS* N.S. 43 (1992), 55–116 (suggesting that Fisher used the Complutensian Polyglot); W. Fulke, *A Defence of the Sincere and True Translations of the Holy Scriptures into the English Tongue*, *against the Cavils of Gregory Martin* (1583, repr. Cambridge, 1843), 48–58.

at least seem to have been conservative in this matter. Bullock, who died in 1526, wrote against Luther at Cardinal Wolsey's behest, and was a commissioner for the public burning of Luther's books in London (1521).[26] Fisher wrote against Luther and was beheaded under Henry VIII; Tunstall and Day held bishoprics under Mary; and Thomas Wakefield continued in his chair throughout her reign.[27] Stafford, however, was a friend of the incipient reform movement; and Parker, who as a married priest lost his preferments under Mary, represents the definite but moderate church reform which would characterize the Elizabethan settlement after Mary's death in 1558.

III

A second period of change, comprising the reign of Charles I (1625–49), the Interregnum under Oliver and Richard Cromwell, and the Restoration settlement under Charles II (1660 onwards), is best known in regard to biblical scholarship as a great age of Christian Hebraism; but it was also a stirring time for the Septuagint in England, and something of this particular liveliness was felt in Cambridge.

In the early years of Charles I the attention of Septuagintal students had for some time been drawn especially to Codex Vaticanus. This manuscript had formed the main basis of the Sixtine or Roman Septuagint, published under the aegis of Sixtus V in Rome, 1587–8, and now reissued by Jean Morin in Paris, 1628. The Sixtine edition succeeded to the place formerly occupied by the Complutensian and the Aldine texts, that of a primary edition which other printed texts could follow.

Now in England, however, there emerged another great uncial codex of seemingly comparable age, Codex Alexandrinus. The gift of Cyril Lucaris, Patriarch of Constantinople, it was originally intended for James I, but on his death was sent to Charles I, who received it in 1627. The king's librarian, Patrick Young of St Andrew's, published from it first the epistles of Clement (1633).

The background of this gift was the situation glimpsed at a much earlier stage in Melanchthon's preface. The Patriarch had wished to gain western support for the Greek church, beleaguered as it now was by Rome in eastern Europe, above all through the formation of a Uniate body; and some leaders in the reformed churches of western Europe had correspondingly hoped for links with the eastern church. Cyril also hoped that the printing

---

[26] C. H. Cooper and T. Cooper, *Athenae Cantabrigienses*, vol. 1 (Cambridge, 1858), 33–4; Goldschmidt, *First Cambridge Press*, 16.

[27] Cooper and Cooper, *Athenae Cantabrigienses*, vol. 1, 337–8.

of Greek biblical and patristic texts in England would help to supply the great need of the Greek church for printed books.[28] At the same time a few selected younger Greek clergy were sent to England for training, and Young, looking after their interests in London, became known as 'the Patriarch of the Greeks'.[29]

Wider public interest in the Septuagint was a function of the intense contemporary interest in the Bible. It is suggested by the posthumous publication, also in 1633, of I. Done, *The ancient history of the Septuagint...*, John Donne's English translation of the Letter of Aristeas. By this time the substantial paragraph on the Septuagint in the translators' preface to King James's English Bible of 1611 (the Authorized Version) will have become well known.[30] Here the Septuagint figures as the first and greatest precedent for translation of the biblical books into the vernacular, and as the instrument of divine providence for the teaching of the gentiles; it 'prepared the way for our Saviour among the Gentiles by written preaching, as Saint John Baptist did among the Jews by vocal'. The reverence felt for this version in the early church is then illustrated from Epiphanius and Augustine, and from Justinian's Novella 146 on the translators rendering 'as it were enlightened with prophetical grace', προφητικῆς ὥσπερ χάριτος περιλαμψάσης αὐτούς. The preface now however firmly notes, with Jerome, 'that the Seventy were interpreters, they were not prophets'. This is then a modified but still a strikingly affirmative form of what has been studied as 'the legend of the Septuagint'.[31] The inclusion of Justinian among the authorities recalls the respect accorded to him in reformed circles as a godly prince and law-giver, and the shock caused (at a time when this preface was much read) when in 1623 the papal librarian Niccolò Alemanni seemed to undermine him by editing for the first time Procopius's *Secret History*; a reply in the emperor's defence was published in London shortly before Codex Alexandrinus arrived.[32]

---

[28] H. R. Trevor-Roper, 'The Church of England and the Greek Church in the time of Charles I', reprinted from *Studies in Church History* 15 (1978) in H. R. Trevor-Roper, *From Counter-Reformation to Glorious Revolution* (London, 1992), 83–111.

[29] Trevor-Roper, 'Church of England', 95 n.

[30] The quotations below are from the translators' preface in *The Holy Bible, containing the Old Testament and the New, Newly translated ...* (Cambridge: Thomas and John Buck, printers to the University of Cambridge; undated), preceded by the Prayer-book and followed by Sternhold and Hopkins's Psalms (Cambridge, 1633). The popularity of the Authorized Version in these years is underlined by H. S. Bennett, *English Books and Readers 1603 to 1640* (Cambridge, 1970), 95.

[31] Sixteenth and seventeenth-century developments are sketched, without discussion of this preface, by A. Wasserstein and D. J. Wasserstein, *The Legend of the Septuagint from Classical Antiquity to Today* (Cambridge, 2006), 238–59.

[32] Thomas Ryves, *Imperatoris Iustiniani Defensio adversus Alemannum* (London, 1626).

It will then have been in a setting of widespread public interest that Young planned an edition of the whole Old Testament text of Alexandrinus with critical notes. In the end he issued only the text of Job, in his edition of catenae on Job in 1637. This publication was intended by Archbishop Laud both for English use and as an *antidoron* for the Patriarch.[33] Young's notes, complete as far as the fifth chapter of Numbers, were published posthumously by Brian Walton in the last volume of his Polyglot (1657).

A steady flow of Septuagintal texts and studies followed in the mid-century. These include the first separate edition of the Septuagint in England (London, 1653), and the Septuagintal columns of Walton's Polyglot (London, 1654–7); both followed the Sixtine text, but Walton throughout quoted the variants of Codex Alexandrinus, and he added printed collations of other manuscripts including the Cotton Genesis and the Cambridge text of Chronicles once owned by Grosseteste, both noted above. Walton's oversight of this great collaborative work can with some caution be related to Cambridge biblical study. His initial planning of the Polyglot is plausibly linked with his friendship with orientalists like Edward Pococke, arising from Walton's years in Oxford (1643 onwards) when the court was there; but his original education had been in Cambridge, at Magdalene for two years and then (1618 onwards) at Peterhouse.[34]

Meanwhile the first edition of Codex Alexandrinus of Judges and Esther, with a dissertation showing that none of the three primary editions (Complutensian, Aldine, Sixtine) represents the Septuagint in a pure state, was published by archbishop Ussher (1655); the original translation of the books of Moses by the Seventy in Ussher's view was lost, and an inferior ancient Jewish Greek version of the law, the prophets and the writings had replaced it. After the Restoration, on the other hand, came an ardent but controversial commendation of the Septuagint as the truest representative of the biblical texts by a Dutch scholar with one foot in England, Isaac Voss (1661), and a posthumously issued English treatise on the Septuagint by John Gregory, chaplain of Christ Church, Oxford, who had died in 1646 (1664).[35] The third printing of the Septuagint in England soon followed (Cambridge, 1665).

---

[33] Trevor-Roper, 'Church of England', 106 n.

[34] D. S. Margoliouth, revised by Nicholas Keene, 'Walton, Brian (1600–1661)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, vol. 57 (Oxford, 2004), 191–4.

[35] I. Voss, *De Septuaginta Interpretibus, earumque tralatione et chronologia dissertatio* (The Hague, 1661); J. Gregory, *A Discourse of the LXX Interpreters; the Place and Manner of their Interpretation* [1664], reprinted in *The Works of the Reverend and Learned Mr John Gregorie* (4th edn, London, 1684). Isaac Voss became a canon of Windsor in 1673.

Two Cambridge names, those of James Duport (1606–79) and John Pearson (1613–86), stand out not only in connection with this first Cambridge Septuagint, but also in some of the activity which surrounded the earlier publications. Duport was Regius Professor of Greek, 1639–54. He may well have found it best to resign the chair then because of his royalist sympathies (it is not clear that he was deprived), but he continued to be a Fellow of Trinity until and after the Restoration; he was Master of Magdalene from 1668.[36] He appears to have encouraged the university printers of his time in the direction of Greek texts, including those with a biblical connection.[37] Little and full of jokes (G. V. M. Heap pictured him as 'robin-like'), and 'so much the more prized by others, for his modest undervaluing his own worth' (Thomas Fuller), he would range from Homer and Demosthenes to the Septuagint and the church fathers to illustrate ancient Greek usage.[38] In verse composition his accomplishments included Homeric biblical paraphrase, supplying, as in Christian antiquity, a want suggested by the non-classical character of Septuagintal Greek.

The printer of the London Septuagint of 1653 was Roger Daniel, formerly printer to the University of Cambridge, but dismissed in 1650 partly for having printed in the royalist cause in 1642.[39] In 1646 as university printer he had issued Duport's ΣΟΛΟΜΩΝ ΕΜΜΕΤΡΟΣ, a Greek hexameter version of Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and the Song of Solomon. After his dismissal he moved to London. His 1653 Septuagint followed in the main the Sixtine edition. Changes were made towards the chapter-order of the Hebrew text, and towards the segregation of apocryphal from canonical books, on the lines often followed since Lonicer's 1524 rearrangement of the Aldine text. The printing was corrected by a needy scholar who was constantly in and out of prison on suspicion of Socinian heresy, John Biddle (unnamed in the text). Daniel dedicated the edition to the boys of

---

[36] Conflicting accounts of the end of his tenure of the chair are discussed by R. O'Day, 'Duport, James (1606–1679)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, vol. 17 (Oxford, 2004), 371–3.

[37] His influence in this direction in the first years after the Restoration is noted by D. McKitterick, *A History of Cambridge University Press* (3 vols., Cambridge, 1992, 1998, 2004), vol. 1, 336–7.

[38] A vivid account is given by G. V. M. Heap, 'James Duport's Cambridge Lectures on Theophrastus', in H. W. Stubbs (ed.), *Pegasus: Classical Essays from the University of Exeter* (Exeter, 1981), 84–97; the quotation is from Duport's contemporary Thomas Fuller, *The History of the University of Cambridge* (1655, reprinted with notes by J. Nichols, London, 1840), 176. Duport was attractively portrayed in Rose Macaulay's novel *They Were Defeated* (1932, reprinted with an introduction by C. V. Wedgwood, London, 1960).

[39] McKitterick, *Cambridge University Press*, vol. 1, 303–6.

Westminster School.[40] This was Duport's old school, as it was for many of his Trinity colleagues; and a little later Duport's *Homeri Gnomologia* (Cambridge, 1660) was published on the advice of its famous head Dr Busby (who like Duport had been a survivor in office during the Interregnum).[41] It seems worth asking if Duport himself was not one of those behind Daniel's Septuagintal venture.

Duport can be associated with the Cambridge Septuagint of 1665 not only on account of his general influence noted above, but also because the university printer (now John Field) issued the biblical text, an elegantly-printed duodecimo, together with Duport's new Greek version of the Book of Common Prayer, printed uniformly with it (Cambridge, 1665); the chapter-orders were conformed to the Hebrew, and the Apocrypha were collected separately, as in Daniel's 1653 text. The Septuagint in this edition, the Greek Prayer-book and a Greek New Testament sometimes together made up a three-volume set.[42] This Greek Prayer-book, succeeding earlier Greek versions by William Whittaker (1569) and Elias Petley (1638), took into account the revisions made to the English Prayer-book for the Restoration settlement in 1662.[43] The task of making the Latin version of the 1662 book had been entrusted to Pearson. The background of the Greek version is in zeal for the use of Greek, in universities, colleges and schools (so formerly Whittaker's Greek Prayer-book had been issued 'in iuventutis Graecarum literarum studiosae gratiam'), and by individuals in the community of learning (compare Lancelot Andrewes's composition of his *Preces Privatae* in Greek, with much Septuagintal quotation, as well as Latin); but this zeal could be combined with that ecumenical awareness of the Greek east which has been noted already.

The scholar who is more expressly linked with the 1665 Septuagint, however, is John Pearson, at that time Master of Trinity. His initials stand at the end of what became a famous preface to this edition. The preface was reprinted six times, down to the mid-nineteenth century, and in 1902 (just after the appearance of H. B. Swete's *Introduction*) it was still, in E.

---

[40] For school reading of the Septuagint compare, later on, Dr Arnold's teaching of the Septuagint Psalms in the sixth form, noted by A. P. Stanley, *The Life and Correspondence of Thomas Arnold* (5th edn, 2 vols., London, 1845), vol. 1, 155.

[41] T. Cooper, 'Duport, James', *Dictionary of National Biography* (repr. London, 1937–8), vol. 6, 239–41 (240) (originally issued 1888). G. M. Trevelyan, *Trinity College: An Historical Sketch* (Cambridge, 1943), 49 notes that 'between 1600 and 1700 very nearly half the Fellows of Trinity were old Westminsters'.

[42] J. F. Bethune-Baker in E. Nestle and J. F. Bethune-Baker, 'The Cambridge Septuagint of 1665 and 1684: A Bibliographical Query', *JTS* 6 (1905), 611–14.

[43] For descriptions of these two versions see C. Marshall and W. W. Marshall, *The Latin Prayer Book of Charles II* (Oxford, 1882), 42–3 (with the judgment that 'Duport is largely indebted to Petley').

Nestle's opinion, perhaps the best summary of reasons for studying the Septuagint.[44] It is a document of Christian Hebraism as well as the work of a consummate Greek scholar.

The Septuagint is useful and even necessary, Pearson says in conclusion, for a just consideration of the problems of the Hebrew text and its interpretation, *ad Hebraicam veritatem probe perspiciendam* (in the Preface he has shown, drawing especially on accords between Septuagintal and Targumic and mediaeval Jewish renderings, that St Jerome's strictures on individual renderings attributed to the Septuagint are not always justified); for confirmation of the authority of Old Testament quotations in the apostolic writers; for a right understanding of the special style of the New Testament; for an adequate treatment of the Greek and Latin Fathers; and finally for the knowledge and criticism of the Greek language (in this last reason one sees, as in Duport, a recognition of the status of the Septuagint as part of Greek literature as a whole). He ends by noting that, since the three primary editions and Codex Alexandrinus differ considerably among themselves, we need an edition which takes into account the manuscripts in their variety, and also Philo, Josephus, early patristic material, and the explanations gathered by lexicographers (Pearson had considered biblical glosses handed down in connection with Hesychius's lexicon and elsewhere earlier in the preface); he wishes that Isaac Voss might undertake this task.

In this elegant but unassuming guise the 1665 Cambridge Septuagint did something to meet continuing English demand for access to the Roman edition. At the same time, however, it put the Septuagint in the context of Greek and Semitic-language Jewish writings, the New Testament and the Greek and Latin Fathers, and, more broadly, in the context of Byzantine biblical and philological study and textual transmission. This publication, in combination with the New Testament and the Prayer book, was also a point of contact with the heritage of Byzantium in the contemporary Greek church.

Pearson, who received from Bentley the famous praise that the very dust of his writings is gold, is perhaps best known for his often-reprinted *Exposition of the Creed* (1659), with its rabbinical and Jewish as well as patristic and mediaeval learning; for his critical investigation of the Ignatian epistles, *Vindiciae Ignatianae* (1672); and for his classical scholarship,

---

[44] E. Nestle, 'Septuagint', in J. Hastings (ed.), *A Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. 4 (Edinburgh, 1902), 437–54 (437). For the passages from Pearson's preface summarized below see Η ΠΑΛΑΙΑ ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ ΚΑΤΑ ΤΟΥΣ ΕΒΔΟΜΗΚΟΝΤΑ. *Vetus Testamentum Graecum ex Versione Septuaginta Interpretum. Iuxta Exemplar Vaticanum Romae Editum* (Cambridge, 1665), separately paginated Praefatio paraenetica, 18–19.

rated at the highest level by Eduard Fraenkel.[45] Biblical concerns can how-
ever be traced in his eventful earlier career. In Cambridge in his early thir-
ties he was a boldly outspoken defender of the principle of a Prayer-book
(1643), and then left to act as a chaplain to the king's forces in the west.
During the Interregnum he emerges as a friend of Henry Hammond, the
biblical commentator and thinker from the Great Tew circle who in those
years, in H. R. Trevor-Roper's phrase, was 'the philosopher and propagan-
dist of the underground Anglican Church'.[46] Pearson, like Hammond, gave
himself to biblical scholarship as well as theology, supporting Walton's
Polyglot with a completion of Abraham Whelock's edition of the gospels
in Persian (1654) and with a preface to the companion volumes of *Critici
Sacri* (1660).[47]

Yet when Pearson was writing his classic commendation of the Septua-
gint in Trinity, the great Hebraist John Lightfoot (1602–75) had been
elaborating a critique of the Septuagint in St Catharine's. In an addendum
to his *Horae Hebraicae* on I Corinthians, issued in 1664, he discussed an-
cient Jewish biblical reading in the synagogues, and urged that, contrary to
widely held views, this would have been in Hebrew rather than Greek; He-
brew then was the (unknown) 'tongue' to which the Apostle refers in his
attempts to regulate divine service at Corinth (1 Cor 14:2, etc.). Lightfoot
politely doubted some of the assertions of the Letter of Aristeas, and com-
pared with it the two stories from the tractate Sopherim, on translation by
five elders and by seventy-two elders respectively.[48] He urged that the Sep-
tuagint was not the genuine version of the Seventy, but rather (as might be
suggested on the basis of Sopherim) the work of five Jewish elders who
had made changes such as are recorded in rabbinic tradition. Hence in
many other places too the Septuagint can be seen to reproduce Jewish tra-
ditions and preferred renderings, and sometimes it is clearly in error. Thus
the Septuagint is indeed an interpretation reflecting Jewish practice and
tradition, but agreements with Jewish rendering of the kind which Pearson
uses to defend the Septuagint are for Lightfoot indications rather of its
secondary character; it cannot be viewed as a true representation of the
Hebrew. Lightfoot developed these observations into a separate short trea-

---

[45] H. de Quehen, 'Pearson, John (1613–1686)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biog-
raphy*, vol. 43 (Oxford, 2004), 324–7.

[46] H. R. Trevor-Roper, 'The Great Tew Circle', in H. R. Trevor-Roper, *Catholics, An-
glicans and Puritans* (Chicago and London, 1987), 166–230 (221; quotation from 219).

[47] On Pearson and Whelock see Oates, *Cambridge University Library*, 209–10.

[48] Sopherim 1.7–8 in the text of the minor tractates printed in the Romm/Wilna edi-
tion of the Babylonian Talmud, fol. 35a; discussed by G. Veltri, *Eine Tora für den König
Talmai* (TSAJ 41, Tübingen, 1994), 114–18, 236–9.

tise on the Septuagint, published after his death.[49] In what he says specifically about the Septuagint and the Letter of Aristeas he appears in some sense a successor of Ussher, and a predecessor of Humphrey Hody – even though Hody reaffirmed the reading of Greek versions of scripture in the ancient synagogues.[50]

The 1684 reprint of the Cambridge Septuagint of 1665 appeared in the same year as the young Humphrey Hody's dissertation 'against the history related in the Letter of Aristeas', and the inception of a new phase of Septuagintal discussion and publication.[51] The eighteenth century would bring some abiding landmarks in Septuagintal and ancillary studies: Hody's complete *De Bibliorum Textibus Originalibus* (Oxford, 1705); the presentation of the whole Old Testament from Codex Alexandrinus, with suggested corrections on the basis of other sources, and Prolegomena including a reprint of Pearson's preface, by J. E. Grabe, Francis Lee, and William Wigan (4 vols., Oxford, 1707–20); Bernard de Montfaucon's edition of Origen's Hexapla (Paris, 1713); P. Sabatier's collection of evidence for the Old Latin (3 vols, Rheims 1743, 1749; Paris, 1751); new editions of early witnesses to the Greek Old Testament texts, including Philo (T. Mangey, London, 1742), Josephus (J. Hudson, Oxford, 1720), and Clement of Alexandria (J. Potter, Oxford, 1715); and at the end of the century the great collection of variants by R. Holmes and J. Parsons (5 vols., Oxford, 1798–1827). This selective account moves now, however, to the nineteenth century, and the years after the work of Holmes and Parsons was complete.

IV

The place of the Septuagint in mid-nineteenth-century Cambridge can be illustrated by three names: Frederick Field (1801–85), elected Fellow of Trinity in 1824 (the same year as T. B. Macaulay); J. A. Jeremie (1802–72), elected Fellow of Trinity in 1826; and William Selwyn (1806–75),

---

[49] J. Lightfoot, *Horae Hebraicae et Thalmudicae impensae in Epistolam Primam S. Pauli ad Corinthios* (1664), reprinted in id., *Opera Omnia,* ed. J. Leusden, 2nd edn (2 vols., Utrecht, 1699), vol. 2, 879–940 (929–40), E.T. in Lightfoot, *Works*, English translation ed. G. Bright and J. Strype (2 vols., London, 1684), 734–811 (794–811); J. Lightfoot, Λείψανα *de rebus ad Versionem Graecam* τῶν Ο′ *spectantibus*, ed. J. Strype in J. Lightfoot, *Opera Omnia*, vol. 2, in the separately paginated *Opera Posthuma*, 1–14.

[50] Lightfoot is noted in connection with Hody on this point by V. Colorni, 'L'uso del greco nella liturgia del giudaismo ellenistico e la Novella 146 di Giustiniano', reprinted from *Annali di storia del diritto*, 8 (1964) in id., *Judaica Minora* (Milan, 1983, repr. 2000), 1–65 (3–4).

[51] Hody's *Dissertatio adversus Historiam Aristeanam* (Oxford, 1684) was revised and reissued as the first part of his *De Bibliorum Textibus Originalibus* (Oxford, 1705).

elected Fellow of St John's in 1829. Of these three, only Field is still well known as a Septuagintalist.

Jeremie wrote, but could hardly ever bring himself to publish. He was valued, however, as an accomplished classic and divine, and a memorable lecturer and preacher; and he became Regius Professor of Divinity and Dean of Lincoln. He is still gratefully remembered in Cambridge for his 1870 foundation of the Jeremie Prizes for knowledge of Septuagintal and Hellenistic Greek. This benefaction, now also used for special Septuagintal lectures, was made late in his life; but its suggestion of sympathy with Septuagintal study serves to indicate something of the broader interest which sustained Cambridge Septuagintal study throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Against the general background of classical culture and polish exemplified by Jeremie, a great many people concerned in theological and biblical study found the Septuagint a fascinating phenomenon.

Field, by contrast with Jeremie, steadfastly opted for the *vita umbratilis*. His deafness may have contributed to his resolve. He stands out, however, as someone who not only eschewed high office, but also had the perseverance to use the leisure which he gained. He was pre-eminently a scholar who got things done.[52]

Field learned Latin, Greek and Hebrew as a schoolboy at Christ's Hospital, and at Cambridge in 1823 gained, as well as a first class in mathematics, the Chancellor's Medal for classical studies, and Tyrwhitt's Hebrew scholarship. During the first part of his life, as Fellow of Trinity and later as incumbent of Reepham in Norfolk, he produced new critical texts of Chrysostom's homilies on St Matthew and St Paul, superseding Bernard de Montfaucon's edition, for the Oxford Library of the Fathers. The Matthaean homilies were printed at Field's own expense at the Cambridge University Press, but also issued by J. H. Parker of Oxford (3 vols., 1839); the Pauline homilies appeared from the University Press at Oxford (7 vols., 1845–62).

While Field was still working on Chrysostom, he published in 1859 his first specifically Septuagintal work, a revised edition of Grabe's Septuagint on the basis of fresh comparison of Codex Alexandrinus and other witnesses.[53] The work was issued under the auspices of the Society for

---

[52] See his autobiography of 1874 in F. Field (ed.), *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt* (2 vols., Oxford, 1875), vol. 1, pp. vi–viii, reprinted in id., *Notes on the Translation of the New Testament* (Otium Norvicense, Pars Tertia, reprinted with additions by the author) (Cambridge, 1899), vii–x; also J. Hawke, 'Field, Frederick (1801–1885)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, vol. 19 (Oxford, 2004), 468.

[53] *Vetus Testamentum Graece iuxta LXX interpretes. Recensionem Grabianam ad fidem codicis Alexandrini aliorumque denuo recognovit* F. Field (Oxford, 1859).

Promoting Christian Knowledge (S.P.C.K.). As with some seventeenth-century Greek biblical printing noted above, Greek Orthodox use was at least partly in view. The object of the Society was 'to produce such a text, as might be both serviceable to biblical students at home, and also acceptable, at the same time, to the Greek Church' – for which the S.P.C.K. had already printed an edition of the Septuagint in Athens. On a plan laid down by the Society, and strongly advocated by E. W. Grinfield, author of the *Apology for the Septuagint*, the Greek in this new edition was presented as far as possible in accordance with the Hebrew text.[54] In this requirement 'biblical students at home' were clearly in view, but care was taken to show that the separate printing of the Apocrypha was not opposed by the Greeks. The Hebrew chapter-order was therefore followed (with retention of the usual Septuagintal chapter-numbers in addition), and the Apocrypha were separated, as in the Strassburg and later editions in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

Field's faithful adherence to these norms, even though he might well not have chosen them himself, formed the background of Paul de Lagarde's near-exasperated description of him as 'weltfremd'.[55] How else could it be (from Lagarde's point of view) that in 1868 Field, having received from Lagarde a letter of criticism on the 1859 Septuagint, could simply reply that he was not personally identified with the plan laid down by the S.P.C.K., but had never himself declared any general views on the subject? Lagarde in his criticism will have emphasized, no doubt forcefully, the importance of Greek textual witness which seems *dis*cordant with the Hebrew. Field himself, looking back in his 1874 autobiography on the reception of the 1859 Septuagint, did not mention Lagarde at all in this connection (although he had cited him regularly for other reasons in the work on the Hexapla in which the autobiography first appeared); but he noted that, although the S.P.C.K. Septuagint had followed a plan which others had prescribed, some merit in the work had been recognized by C. Tischendorf in his 1869 Prolegomena to the Septuagint.[56]

A Cambridge reader of the 1859 edition half a century later, R. B. Townshend, noted Field's 'crushing severity' in stigmatizing the errors of an earlier attempt (Oxford, 1817) to reprint the Septuagint of Codex Alex-

---

[54] See the report of the Foreign Translation Committee to the Board of the S.P.C.K. on the 1859 Septuagint, reprinted by P. de Lagarde, *Septuagintastudien,* Erster Theil (Göttingen, 1891), 6–8.

[55] Lagarde, *Septuagintastudien,* Erster Theil, 8.

[56] Field (ed.), *Origenis Hexaplorum*, i, p. vii, reprinted in id., *Notes on the Translation*, ix.

andrinus on the basis of Grabe's text.[57] The same stringency in marking
what earlier editors had done amiss emerges in Field's remarks on de
Montfaucon in the prefaces to Chrysostom.[58] This judgment on errors and
omissions belongs to the genre of the preface, and by the same token is
valued by those who have to do with the earlier editions discussed; but in
this case it was also the simple counterpart of Field's own devotion to
ἀκρίβεια. His strictures are expressed in the sinewy and pungent prose
which caught Townshend's attention, and which well suits Field's own
place in the line of Trinity scholars between Bentley ('the great glory and
scourge of our Society', as Field put it) and A. E. Housman.[59]

Having now formed the design of editing afresh what could be recov-
ered of Origen's Hexapla, Field resigned Reepham (1863) and went to live
in early retirement at Norwich. Once again, as in his work on Chrysostom,
he was replacing a famous edition by Bernard de Montfaucon, in this case
the 1713 Hexapla mentioned already. De Montfaucon's reconstruction had
gathered up and extended earlier attempts to publish Hexaplaric material,
beginning with the Sixtine Septuagint of 1587; but it was now open to
criticism, as Field notes, not only on account of some editorial oversights,
but also because much new material had become available, especially from
the Syriac translation of the Septuagint column of the Hexapla (the Syro-
Hexaplar version). This was then being re-edited by A. M. Ceriani, whose
help Field warmly acknowledged.

The first-fruits of Field's Hexaplaric studies were accordingly an at-
tempted retroversion into Greek of fragments of Aquila, Symmachus and
Theodotion preserved in the Syro-Hexaplar version. He published this
work under the modest heading *Otium Norvicense* (Oxford, 1864). Field
had been a Hebraist 'man and boy', but Syriac he learned later on, as he
says in the preface. Another source from which he added to the material
for his reconstruction was the abundant Greek witness to the renderings of
Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion either printed by Holmes and Parsons
from the manuscripts they collated, or preserved in their handwritten notes.
His main new source, however, was the Syro-Hexaplar version. Twenty-
five years later a newly-found Cambridge Greek palimpsest fragment of
Aquila bore out Field's suggestion, made on the basis of the Syriac (and
against Greek witness attributed to Eusebius), that in Ps 91:6 Aquila ren-

---

[57] R. B. Townshend, 'The Fourth Book of Maccabees', in R. H. Charles (ed.), *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English* (2 vols., Oxford, 1913), vol. 2, 653–85 (664).

[58] For example, F. Field (ed.), *Sancti Patris Nostri Joannis Chrysostomi Archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani Homiliae in Matthaeum* (3 vols, Oxford and Cambridge, 1839), vol. 3, pp. v–vi, xiii–xvi.

[59] Field (ed.), *Chrysostomi Homiliae in Matthaeum*, vol. 3, p. xvii ('Societatis nostrae grande decus et flagellum').

dered ἀπὸ λοιμοῦ. The editor of the palimpsest, Charles Taylor, having used Field's work constantly, well called him 'Dr Field, accurate in scholarship and happy in conjecture'.[60]

From 1870 Field was also an active corresponding member of the Old Testament Committee for the preparation of the Revised Version. Nevertheless, within ten years (1864–74) the great work on the Hexapla was finished. Through Robert Scott, collaborator with H. G. Liddell in the famous *Lexicon*, the Delegates of the Clarendon Press undertook the publication (2 vols., 1875). Further evidence for the text of the Hexapla soon began to accumulate from manuscript discoveries, including palimpsests of parts of the Hexapla of the Psalter from Milan (150 verses) and Cambridge (a Cairo Genizah fragment with three verses from Ps 22(21), edited by Taylor as cited above); but the continuing value of Field's work was attested ninety years on by its reprint (Hildesheim, 1964).[61]

Towards the end of his life Field read through a range of classical and Hellenistic authors for the illustration of the New Testament; but, as might be expected, the Septuagint also plays a part in the resulting *Notes on the New Testament* (1881), issued shortly after the appearance of the Revised Version of the New Testament. These last fruits of Field's 'Norwich leisure' were reprinted posthumously, with the author's final additions, by his own university press (Cambridge, 1899).

Field was a giant, but William Selwyn perhaps exhibited more typically the Cambridge share in the Septuagintal interests of nineteenth-century biblical students. In 1854–7 he published notes on the Septuagint of Exodus, Numbers and Deuteronomy to form what he called a little handbook. In these notes he compared the Septuagint with the Hebrew text, gave an anthology of the most interesting variants from Holmes and Parsons, and discussed Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion. At the same time Selwyn also issued a reprint of Pearson's introduction with Edward Churton's notes (Cambridge, 1855). Selwyn, like Jeremie, is remembered as a benefactor; to his liberality is largely owed the building of the Divinity School by Basil Champneys in St John's Street.[62] His bust in the present Divinity Faculty building deserves honour, however, not just from those who care for the study of divinity in general, but from Septuagintalists in particular.

---

[60] Charles Taylor (ed.), *Hebrew-Greek Cairo Genizah Palimpsests from the Taylor-Schechter Collection, including a Fragment of the Twenty-second Psalm according to Origen's Hexapla* (Cambridge, 1900), pp. vi, 73.

[61] Developments since Field are considered by contributors to A. Salvesen (ed.), *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments* (Tübingen, 1998).

[62] C. N. L. Brooke, *A History of the University of Cambridge*, vol. 4, *1870–1990* (Cambridge, 1993), 141–2.

Field's work on the Hexapla was the crown of this mid-nineteenth-century Cambridge Septuagintal study; but its publication in 1875 also marked the beginning of a new efflorescence of Cambridge work on text and interpretation. This was simply one part of a broader British and continental revival of work on the biblical texts and versions, but in Cambridge it manifested itself especially in connection with the smaller Cambridge Septuagint (first issued 1887–94) and the larger Cambridge Septuagint (1906–1940). It received further impetus from the Cairo Genizah manuscripts brought to Cambridge through Solomon Schechter and Charles Taylor (1897).

The Cambridge Septuagint and the scholars involved in it have received considerable discussion.[63] In 1875 F. H. Scrivener, well-known for his work on New Testament manuscripts and textual criticism, had submitted to the Cambridge University Press a proposal for an edition of the Septuagint. He was in the end unable to carry it out himself, and in 1883 H. B. Swete (1835–1917) was appointed editor. Meanwhile the scheme had been slightly modified by F. J. A. Hort, who had influentially reassessed the relation of uncial and cursive manuscripts, with emphasis on the quality of Vaticanus, Sinaiticus and Alexandrinus, in the edition of the New Testament which he had just issued jointly with B. F. Westcott (1881). The new Cambridge Septuagint was to appear in two editions with a common text. The aim was 'to exhibit the text of one of the great uncial codices with a precision corresponding to our present knowledge, together with a full apparatus of the variants of the other MSS ...'.[64] Selected variants would appear in the manual edition, but the full Apparatus was reserved for the larger edition. Hort was the leading member of a committee which laid down the guidelines of this edition (1891). The emphasis in the earlier statement on precise exhibition of the text of a particular manuscript reflects the often-noted imperfections of the Sixtine edition as a representation of Vaticanus, but also opened the project to the objections levelled at any diplomatic edition.[65] Meanwhile in Göttingen Lagarde issued his edition of

---

[63] P. Katz, 'Septuagintal Studies in the Mid-Century: Their Links with the Past and their present Tendencies', in W. D. Davies and D. Daube (edd.), *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology: in honour of Charles Harold Dodd* (Cambridge, 1956), 176–208 (177–86); Peter Walters (formerly Katz), ed. D. W. Gooding, *The Text of the Septuagint: Its Corruptions and their Emendation* (Cambridge, 1973), 2–3, 6–10, 22–3; S. Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (Oxford, 1968), 21–5, 269–97; K. H. Jobes and M. Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint* (Grand Rapids and Carlisle, 2000), 247–52.

[64] H. B. Swete (ed.), *The Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint*, vol. 1 (2nd edn, Cambridge, 1895), p. xi.

[65] See for example F. Siegert, *Zwischen Hebräischer Bibel und Altem Testament. Eine Einführung in die Septuaginta* (Munsteraner Judaistische Studien 9, Münster, 2001), 109.

Genesis to Esther (1883), with the aim, rather, of reconstructing a Lucianic text; and after his death the Göttingen Septuaginta-Unternehmen (founded 1908), following up his work under the direction of Alfred Rahlfs, would begin the preparation of a critical rather than a diplomatic edition. In the 1920s and 1930s contact was maintained between the two projects.[66]

When Swete took on the Cambridge Septuagint, he was Rector of Ashdon in Essex, and known especially for his edition (1880–2) of Theodore of Mopsuestia on the minor Pauline epistles (the University Press supported the expense of a curate so that the new work could be expeditiously finished); like Field, Swete came to Septuagintal work through Antiochene exegesis.[67] The 'smaller or manual edition', as Swete called it, began to appear from the press in 1887. In 1890, however, Swete succeeded Westcott as Regius Professor of Divinity, and it was in this capacity that he completed the three-volume manual edition. The first parts to appear were criticized for inaccuracies, but improvements were made in the second edition of the first two volumes (1895–6). The third volume (1894) included all four books of the Maccabees and the ecclesiastical canticles, from Codex Alexandrinus; and from other sources the Psalms of Solomon, and also, in the second edition (1899), the Greek fragments of Enoch as then known. Uniform with this text was Swete's *Introduction to the Septuagint* (1900, revised edition 1914, reprinted 1989), a mine of information which is still in some ways unrivalled, and extends into such areas as the influence of the Septuagint on Christian literature and hermeneutics.

It was considered from the start that the larger Cambridge Septuagint 'must necessarily be the labour of many years and of a variety of hands'.[68] Volume I, the Octateuch, was edited in four Parts (1906–1917) by A. E. Brooke (1863–1939), Dean and later (1926–33) Provost of King's (the uncle of Rupert Brooke), and Norman McLean (1865–1947), Lecturer in Aramaic and Fellow and later (1927–36) Master of Christ's (making a fictional appearance as the Master who is an Orientalist in C. P. Snow's novel set in the 1930s, *The Light and the Dark*). Then Brooke and McLean were joined as co-editor by H. St. J. Thackeray (1869–1930) for Volume II, the later historical books (four Parts, 1927–35). Finally, Esther, Judith and Tobit, the last books to be issued (1940), formed the first Part of Volume III. In the years following McLean's death the project failed to attain revival, but the volumes available are 'a great treasure', in the words of K. H. Jobes and M. Silva, especially for the books not yet edited at Göttingen.[69]

---

[66] Walters (Katz), ed. Gooding, *Text of the Septuagint*, 3 (noting the acknowledgements to Göttingen in each part of the larger Cambridge vol. 2, 1927–35).

[67] *Henry Barclay Swete, A Remembrance* (London, 1918), 45, 114–117.

[68] Swete, *Old Testament in Greek*, vol. 1, p. xii.

[69] Jobes and Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint*, 72.

Work on the Cambridge Septuagint was surrounded by an abundance of related publication. This included the edition of the Psalms of Solomon with a commentary by H. E. Ryle and M. R. James (1891); Ryle's *Philo and Holy Scripture* (1895), on Philo's biblical quotations; then two Genizah publications, F. C. Burkitt's *Fragments of the Books of Kings according to the Translation of Aquila*, with a preface by Charles Taylor (1897), and Taylor's *Hebrew-Greek Cairo Genizah Palimpsests from the Taylor-Schechter Collection* (1900), quoted above; then Israel Abrahams's studies of the Letter of Aristeas (1902) and (with a Septuagintal section) rabbinic aids to exegesis (1909);[70] the Septuagintal and Old Latin sections of Burkitt's 'Text and Versions' in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica* iv (1903), taken further in a number of his later notes and studies;[71] R. R. Ottley's commentary on the Septuagint of Isaiah (1904–6), and later on his revision of Swete's *Introduction* (1914) and his own *Handbook to the Septuagint* (1920); and then J. H. A. Hart's fascinating work (1909) on the longer Greek text of Ecclesiasticus, originally encouraged by Solomon Schechter; the book is an implicit criticism of any undue concentration on the great uncials, and an exploration of the Greek text as a document of ancient Judaism.[72]

J. Rendel Harris's studies of the use of Testimonia from the Greek and Latin Bible *adversus Iudaeos*, with his suggestion that the quotations were drawn from an early florilegium, were summed up in his *Testimonies* (with Vacher Burch; 2 vols., 1916, 1920); and the Septuagint and its revisions, with the church's acceptance of the Greek biblical texts of the Jews, formed a major theme of Burkitt's essay 'The Debt of Christianity to Judaism' (1928).[73]

The brilliant and fecund H. St. J. Thackeray (1869–1930), mentioned already as a co-editor of the larger Cambridge Septuagint, until 1921 pursued Septuagintal study in the spare time of a civil servant.[74] His first book, however, on *The Relation of St Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought* (1900), formed (in F. C. Burkitt's words) 'the first indication of his interest in that Greek-speaking and often Greek-thinking Judaism, with

---

[70] I. Abrahams, 'Recent Criticism of the Letter of Aristeas', *JQR* 14 (1902), 321–42; id., 'Rabbinic Aids to Exegesis', in H. B. Swete (ed.), *Essays on Some Biblical Questions of the Day by Members of the University of Cambridge* (London, 1909), 161–92.

[71] See 'Professor Burkitt's Writings', *JTS* 36 (1935), 337–46 (338–41).

[72] J. H. A. Hart, *Ecclesiasticus: the Greek Text edited with a textual commentary and Prolegomena* (Cambridge, 1909).

[73] F. C. Burkitt, 'The Debt of Christianity to Judaism', in *The Legacy of Israel*, planned by the late Israel Abrahams and edited by E. R. Bevan and Charles Singer (Oxford, 1927), 69–96; the frontispiece of the book is a photograph of the palimpsest text of Aquila edited by Burkitt.

[74] See F. C. Burkitt, 'H. St. John Thackeray and his Work', *JTS* 32 (1931), 225–7.

the study of which his name will always be associated'.[75] This interest informed his specifically Septuagintal writings. His edition of the Letter of Aristeas in Swete's *Introduction* (1900) was followed by preparation for *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint*, i (1909), which set the Septuagint in the context of the papyri.[76] Later came his translation of the Letter of Aristeas 'with an appendix of ancient evidence on the origin of the Septuagint' (1917), then *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship: a Study in Origins* (1921) (here, like Hart, he concentrates on the Greek text as a witness to Jewish life and thought), the Arthur Davis memorial lecture *Some Aspects of the Greek Old Testament* (1927), and lastly *Josephus, the Man and the Historian* (1929), including a treatment of Josephus's biblical text and its alliance with Lucianic manuscripts of the Septuagint.

V

The cornucopian abundance of 1875–1930 was followed by a period in which the Septuagint may have come to seem less central in Cambridge, but was still eliciting work of the highest value. Thackeray died in 1930, Burkitt in 1935. Yet Burkitt was succeeded by a distinguished Oxford New Testament scholar and Septuagintalist, C. H. Dodd (1884–1973); and soon Cambridge Septuagintal studies were also fortified by the presence of the gifted German specialist Peter Katz, later Walters. Their joint contribution, from the pre-war to the post-war years, covered a time of change in the characteristic interests of biblical scholars.

The general atmosphere of these researches in Cambridge had long included a sense for Hellenism and for the Jewish share in it. The Jeremie prizes already attest this sense. Scholars in whom it is evident include Swete, J. H. A. Hart, Thackeray and Burkitt, together with Israel Abrahams and A. D. Nock, and then in Dodd's time Wilfred Knox and Herbert Loewe. As these names show, biblical studies, Jewish studies and classics were all involved. The Septuagint was widely viewed as a continuously formative element in the Judaism of the Greek and Roman worlds, and a clue to this Judaism. Dodd himself and Knox maintained this sense, and in the next Cambridge generation it was continued by Henry Chadwick and H. St. J. Hart; but New Testament interest in the years after 1935 tended to move from Hellenism and Greek-speaking Judaism towards rabbinic Juda-

---

[75] Burkitt, 'H. St. John Thackeray', 225.
[76] Assessed with warm appreciation in Walters (Katz), ed. Gooding, *Text of the Septuagint*, 18–25.

ism and then (also) to the Qumran texts, and perhaps post-war Septuagintal study became rather more of a special enclave as a result.

Dodd's book *The Bible and the Greeks* (1935) had just been published when he came to Cambridge. He argued here for the influence of the Septuagint on the Hermetic literature, and in connection with the New Testament he also discussed Septuagintal vocabulary and, to use a debated term, theology. These last two areas of Septuagintal work were important for Dodd's sympathetic yet critical approach to the *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, issued 1932–73, in which Septuagintal usage plays a big part, and for his own study of Johannine thought, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (1953). At the same time he had reconsidered Rendel Harris's testimony-book theory in his *According to the Scriptures* (1952). Dodd suggested instead that very early Christian biblical scholarship selected certain large sections of the Old Testament for interpretation.

Peter Katz was one of thirty-three 'non-Aryan' refugee German pastors whose resettlement in England had been made possible by the Bishop of Chichester (G. K. A. Bell). In November 1938 Bell had given a personal guarantee of financial responsibility for them.[77] Katz expressed his gratitude with depth and restraint in two Septuagintal publications. The first, in 1942, was his contribution to a Festschrift for Bishop Bell, written by eleven of the pastors.[78] The second, in 1950, was his book *Philo's Bible*, which he dedicated to the Bishop of Chichester. This book deals with 'aberrant', Aquila-like biblical quotations found in parts of the manuscript tradition of Philo, a topic brought to Katz's notice by Paul Kahle at an Oxford conference in 1940. It represents, however, part of Katz's criticism of Kahle's theory of Septuagintal origins, for it argues that the 'aberrant' quotations reflect post-Philonic correction, perhaps under the influence of Antiochene exegesis in Syria or Palestine between the late fourth and the early sixth century – whereas for Kahle the 'aberrant' quotations represent the Jewish revisions of the Septuagint which Philo himself would have known, and it is the quotations in accord with the Septuagint which arise from later correction.[79] The preface of this book expresses not only the au-

---

[77] F. Hildebrandt, 'A Letter of Introduction', in F. Hildebrandt (ed.), *'And Other Pastors of thy Flock': a German Tribute to the Bishop of Chichester* (Cambridge: printed for the subscribers, 1942), ix–x; R. C. D. Jasper, *George Bell, Bishop of Chichester* (London, 1967), 144–5 (a further account by Hildebrandt), 158–9 (1947 statement by Bell, giving the number as '90 people, 33 men with their wives and children').

[78] P. Katz, 'Eyes to the Blind, Feet to the Lame', in Hildebrandt (ed.), *'And Other Pastors of thy Flock'*, 1–5 (emendations to LXX Num. 10:31; Prov. 26:7, 30:15–16).

[79] Kahle responded in his *The Cairo Geniza* (2nd edn, Oxford, 1959), 247–9. Katz had expressed his more general criticism of Kahle in 'The Recovery of the Original Septuagint', *Actes du premier Congrès de la Fédération internationale des Associations d'Études Classiques* (Paris, 1950), 165–82.

thor's gratitude to Bell, but also his appreciation of Dodd's keen interest in his work. If Dodd carried on Burkitt's union of early Christian and Septuagintal interests, Katz produced a stream of Septuagintal publications somewhat as Thackeray had done.[80]

When Katz died in 1962 he had worked intensively to revise for publication his Cambridge Ph.D. thesis of 1945, but had not finished the task. Thanks to his former pupil D. W. Gooding the revised and edited thesis was posthumously published under the title *The Text of the Septuagint: Its Corruptions and their Emendation* (1973).[81] Katz concentrated, with a wealth of examples and against the background of the development of Greek usage, on grammatical corruptions and on different kinds of Semitisms. Gooding's own work on *The Account of the Tabernacle* (1959) (attributing the Septuagint account to early rearrangement of a translation which had followed the order of the Hebrew as now known) was published by Dodd in the second series of Texts and Studies.

VI

With the generation of Katz's hearers this account enters more recent times. S. P. Brock, who attended Katz's lectures, wrote his doctoral thesis on the recensions of the Greek version of I Samuel in Oxford, but came back to Cambridge as lecturer in Hebrew and Aramaic (1967–74). In these years there appeared his edition of the Testament of Job (1967), and the *Classified Bibliography of the Septuagint* (1973) which he prepared with C. T. Fritsch and S. Jellicoe. Similarly some roots of L. C. Allen's Septuagintal work lie in Cambridge in the 1950s; the second volume of his *The Greek Chronicles* (2 vols., 1974) is dedicated to the memory of Katz. Meanwhile the line of Dodd's researches on the New Testament biblical quotations had been carried on by Barnabas Lindars in his *New Testament Apologetic* (1961), and specifically Septuagintal study always formed an element in his work, especially in connection with Judges.[82] Then the many studies of Septuagint lexicography by J. A. L. Lee include his Cam-

---

[80] Thirty-four items published from 1935 to 1960 (not including the 1942 essay cited in n. 76) are listed by D. W. Gooding in Walters (Katz), ed. Gooding, *The Text of the Septuagint*, 350–51.

[81] See the review by S. P. Brock, *JTS* N.S. 25 (1974), 148–52.

[82] See the 1958–87 bibliography in D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson (edd.), *It is Written: Scripture citing Scripture. Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars, SSF* (Cambridge, 1988), xiii–xvi; G. J. Brooke and B. Lindars (edd.), *Septuagint, Scrolls, and Cognate Writings* (Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series 38; Atlanta, 1992); B. Lindars, ed. A. D. H. Mayes, *Judges 1–5: a new Translation and Commentary* (Edinburgh, 1995).

bridge dissertation of 1970, printed as *A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch* (1983).[83]

In Cambridge since the late 1960s a strong interest in the Septuagint has been taken by the two successive Regius Professors of Hebrew, J. A. Emerton (from 1968) and R. P. Gordon (from 1995). The Septuagintal study in Emerton's text-critical work on the Hebrew biblical books is matched by his separate investigations of the second column of the Hexapla.[84] Gordon's concern with the Septuagint was evident for instance in his *1 and 2 Samuel* (1986), and he has supervised a series of Septuagintal dissertations. Cambridge Old Testament work more broadly continued to include much study of the Septuagintal witness to the text, exemplified in work by G. I. Davies, among others. At the same time the sorting and cataloguing of the Cambridge Genizah, including some texts in Greek, was proceeding apace under the supervision of S. C. Reif.

The study of the ancient versions as interpretations for the Jewish and Christian communities had been a notable element in the Septuagintal work of J. H. A. Hart and H. StJ. Thackeray, and it was encouraged generally by the 1928 reissue of A. Geiger's *Urschrift und Übersetzungen der Bibel* (1857), with a new introduction by Kahle; but it first clearly became more central after the Second World War, as attested by I. L. Seeligmann's *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah* (1948). In post-war Cambridge this interest was part of D. W. Gooding's Septuagintal work, and in Henry Chadwick's Philonic studies it converged with the continuing interest in Greek-speaking Judaism noted above.[85] From the sixties and seventies onwards much Cambridge attention was concentrated on the Targums, studied in this way by John Bowker, R. P. Gordon, Andrew Chester and others. This aspect of the Septuagint also played a part, however, in Cambridge Old and New Testament study, and it was described with careful discrimination in S. P. Brock's contribution to the essays in honour of Barnabas Lindars (1988).[86]

---

[83] Cambridge is recalled in J. A. L. Lee, '*A Lexical Study* Thirty Years on, with Observations on "Order" Words in the LXX Pentateuch', in S. M. Paul, R. A. Kraft, L. H. Schiffman and W. W. Fields (eds.), *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in honor of Emanuel Tov* (SVT 94, Leiden and Boston, 2003), 513–24.

[84] J. A. Emerton, 'The Purpose of the Second Column of the Hexapla', *JTS* N.S. 7 (1956), 79–87; id., 'Were Greek Transliterations of the Hebrew Old Testament used by Jews before the Time of Origen?', *JTS* N.S. 21 (1970), 17–31; id. 'A Further Consideration of the Second Column of the Hexapla', *JTS* N.S. 22 (1971), 15–28.

[85] For instance H. Chadwick, 'Philo and the Beginnings of Christian Thought', in A. H. Armstrong (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Later Greek and Early Mediaeval Philosophy* (Cambridge, 1967), 133–92.

[86] S. P. Brock, 'Translating the Old Testament', in Carson and Williamson (edd.), *It is Written*, 87–98.

Concern with Greek-speaking Judaism continued throughout this period in Cambridge. Henry Chadwick's pupil Nicholas de Lange, lecturer in rabbinics from 1971, brought to the forefront of his work the Hellenistic interests which had earlier been evident in Israel Abrahams and Herbert Loewe. His *Origen and the Jews* (1976), and his edition with M. Harl of Origen's letter to Africanus (1983), are works with a strong Septuagintal aspect; in 1987 he founded, with Judith Humphrey, the *Bulletin of Judaeo-Greek Studies*. Concern with Greek-speaking Jews appeared likewise in the Divinity Faculty's Jewish Inscriptions Project (1989 onwards), involving David Noy and others, and the three volumes collecting inscriptions which arose from it began with one on Graeco-Roman Egypt (1992). At the same time study of canon, apocrypha, and ancient interpretation of scripture was proceeding.[87]

Two books of the mid-1990s represent trends which are still strong at the time of writing. Joachim Schaper's Cambridge dissertation, published as *Eschatology in the Greek Psalter* (1995), studied the Greek psalms as an interpretation reflecting the Judaism of the time of the translators. Here the approach which in Cambridge goes back at least to Thackeray and J. H. A. Hart was being renewed. At the same time the book reflected the broader post-war trend just noted, and by the same token has helped to stir a current debate on method among Septuagintalists.[88] In Cambridge itself the study of the Septuagint as an interpretation has elicited further dissertations, in New Testament as well as Old Testament work.[89] This approach is also important, with special regard to reception, in the project for study of the exegetical encounter between Jews and Christians in antiquity, directed by Edward Kessler (see his own study of Jewish and Christian reception of the Akedah narrative), and in the first volume of the forthcoming *New Cambridge History of the Bible*, edited by Joachim Schaper and James Carleton Paget.[90]

---

[87] See for instance J. F. Procopé, 'Greek Philosophy, Hermeneutics and Alexandrian Understanding of the Old Testament', and J. Carleton Paget, 'The Christian Exegesis of the Old Testament in the Alexandrian Tradition', in M. Saebo (ed.), *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation*, vol. 1 (Göttingen, 1996), 451–77 and 477–542, respectively.

[88] See the references to his work in the index of M. Knibb (ed.), *The Septuagint and Messianism* (BETL 195, Leuven, 2006), p. 524.

[89] Examples are D. A. Baer, *When We All Go Home: translation and theology in LXX Isaiah 56–66* (JSOT Supplement Series 313, Sheffield, 2001); R. Gheorghita, *The Rôle of the Septuagint in Hebrews: an investigation of its influence with special consideration of the use of Hab. 2:3–4 in Heb. 10:37–8* (WUNT 2.160, Tübingen, 2003).

[90] E. Kessler, *Bound by the Bible: Jews, Christians and the Sacrifice of Isaac* (Cambridge, 2004).

Then, secondly, Nicholas de Lange's substantial *Greek Jewish Texts from the Cairo Genizah* (1996) includes, among its editions of Byzantine Jewish manuscripts written in Hebrew characters, texts which witness to the reading and study of the biblical books in Greek. Such texts are also studied in a number of his articles. His research project for work on the Greek Bible in Byzantine Judaism brings a distinctive emphasis into Cambridge Septuagintal study. Meanwhile his pupil J. K. Aitken has written on a range of questions concerning apocrypha, Septuagint lexicography, and the character of Septuagintal translations;[91] and Cambridge has been the setting in which Jennifer Dines completed her introduction, *The Septuagint* (2004). Septuagintal discussion has been further enriched by the presence of the scholars participating in the two projects just mentioned – Helen Spurling, Emmanouela Grypeou, Julia Krivoruchko, and Cameron Boyd-Taylor. A joint seminar organized by research students in Classics and Divinity also helps to foster an atmosphere in which the Septuagint can receive attention.

VII

It can then be hoped that the phases of the reception of the Septuagint in Cambridge may continue. The Byzantine and Jewish context of the Greek Bible has come to the fore in recent work, but echoes of Byzantium which could already be heard in the past have now been noticed. Thus in Cambridge as elsewhere emphasis fell repeatedly on the arrival of books from Byzantium – acquired by Grosseteste, amassed by Parker, sent by Cyril Lucaris, acquired in re-used fragments by Taylor and Schechter. Other echoes were heard in the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century concern with the eastern church, and with the Septuagint as a nodal point in its links with the non-Roman Catholic west; this concern was renewed in Field's 1859 Septuagint. Byzantium again made possible the early modern and modern Cambridge approaches to the Septuagint through what were or became monuments of Byzantine biblical culture – the letter of Aristeas, the Hexapla and the Syro-Hexaplar version, the great uncial codices and many cursive manuscripts, Justinian's Novella 146, and the interpretations of Philo, Josephus and the Greek Fathers.

These echoes accompanied work which has come back again and again to problems of the text. In Tudor Cambridge scholars confronted them-

---

[91] See for example J. K. Aitken, 'The Language of the Septuagint: Recent Theories, Future Prospects', *Bulletin of Judaeo-Greek Studies* 24 (1999), 24–33; id., 'σχοῖνος in the Septuagint', *VT* 50 (2000), 433–44; id., 'Rhetoric and Poetry in Greek Ecclesiastes', *BIOSCS* 38 (2006), 55–78.

selves, through the Complutensian Polyglot and other printed texts, with the variations between the Hebrew and Greek Bibles as they have been transmitted. Then in the age of Walton's Polyglot both Pearson and Lightfoot emphasized, from opposing viewpoints, that Semitic-language as well as Greek-language Jewish interpretation is important for assessment of the Septuagint; and in modern Cambridge the use of the Septuagint in the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible has been central. The variation between witnesses to the Greek Old Testament itself was likewise to the fore from the time of Henry VIII onwards. Thomas Wakefield collated the Cotton Genesis with Lonicer's text, Pearson pled for an edition which would assemble all the witnesses, and the collection and assessment of textual witness was a prime task of Field, Swete, Thackeray, Brooke, McLean and others. An aspect of this activity was the consideration of the Septuagintal books as monuments of Greek literature, already impressively evident in Pearson and carried further in modern times by Thackeray, Katz, and others.

Yet from the sixteenth century onwards the Septuagint was also considered in Cambridge as an interpretation. In Tudor and Stuart modification of the Septuagint legend, it might not be prophecy, but it was a link in the providential preservation of the scriptures and enlightenment of the gentiles, and an inspiring model of what a translation might be permitted to accomplish. Its character as an interpretation for the Judaism of its time, however, was unmistakable, for good or ill, as John Lightfoot emphasized. In modern Cambridge this aspect of the Septuagint came to the fore in more positive appreciation; for the Greek-speaking Judaism which passed in due course into Byzantine culture, and from which the Septuagint originally emerged, became the subject of special study. It cannot be separated, however, from the Judaism associated with Hebrew and Aramaic literature. Abrahams in the twentieth century, like Pearson and Lightfoot in the seventeenth, noted accord between the Septuagint and rabbinic tradition.[92]

Cambridge recognition of this point has been facilitated by co-operation between Jewish and non-Jewish scholars, especially from the nineteenth century onwards. Such co-operation forms the framework of much in the current phase of Cambridge Septuagintal study. The Genizah, correspondingly, has brought to Cambridge the echoes of Jewish as well as Christian biblical study in Byzantium.[93] Cambridge has often been close to general

---

[92] Pearson, Praefatio paraenetica, 1–4 (mainly drawing on Onkelos, but also citing Rashi and Ibn Ezra); Lightfoot, as cited above (n. 48); Abrahams, 'Rabbinic Aids, 172–5 (LXX and rabbinic biblical quotations).

[93] For study of a palimpsest text of a Jewish glossary against the background of Genizah palimpsest texts with Christian contents see N. Tchernetska, J. Olszowy-Schlanger

trends in the reception of the Septuagint; but perhaps it has had particular good fortune in the availability of printed books and manuscripts, and the combination of scholarship in classics, divinity and Jewish studies.[94]

Non placet Septuaginta: Revisions and New Greek Versions of the Bible in Byzantium*

by

Natalio Fernández Marcos

At the risk of hyperbole, we can safely say that the revision of the Septuagint – originally limited to the Pentateuch – began on the day following the appearance of the translation. There are, indeed, remnants of Jewish papyri from as early as the second century BCE,[1] with traces of both Hebraising and stylistic or literary correction. It is, however, true that there are differences of opinion as to whether some of these texts are really corrections or different forms of the first translation, the so-called Old Greek. That said, by the end of the second century BCE certain Jewish circles were well aware that the translation was not sufficiently faithful to the original Hebrew. This is how the grandson of Ben Sira puts it in the prologue to his translation, 'Because those words said in the original Hebrew do not have the same force when translated into another tongue. But more than that, even the Law, the Prophets and the other books are very different in the original' (§§ 21–26*)*. It is also clear from the Letter of Aristeas that corrections made to the Septuagint were commonplace at the time (in the second half of the second century BCE). He put all his efforts into trying to show that the originals used by those who translated the Pentateuch were excellent texts brought from Jerusalem and that the seventy/seventy-two translators were extremely competent and men of great wisdom and piety, and that their work was a model of accuracy. As Aristeas has it, the solemn proclamation of the translation included a curse 'on all who would touch a letter of text, adding, subtracting or changing anything; an excellent way to ensure its integrity' (§ 311).

---

[1] N. Fernández Marcos, *Introducción a las versiones griegas de la Biblia*. Second edition revised and augmented (Madrid, 1998), 255–56, and S. Honigman, *The Septuagint and Homeric Scholarship in Alexandria. A study in the narrative of the Letter of Aristeas* (London/New York, 2003), 123 and 127.

With the publication of the Qumran documents, more specifically the Greek fragments of the Twelve Prophets from Nahal Hever, we have definitive proof, from the first century BCE, that certain Jewish circles felt the need to revise the ancient Septuagint in order to bring it closer to the original Hebrew. However, there were others in the Jewish community such as Philo who, in the first century CE, was quite opposed to any kind of correction, declaring that the Greek translation was as inspired a work as the original. The two opposite points of view continue to be found together in the Judaism of the Hellenistic and Roman era.[2] In this paper I shall concentrate on those groups of Jewish or Christian revisers and translators who were not satisfied with the first translation of the Bible into Greek, concretely in the Byzantine period.

Another curious fact emerges at an early stage, namely, that the text of the Old Greek underwent two types of correction which were approached from quite different angles: on the one hand, the revision towards the Hebrew attested by the *kaige* text, interpreted in such a brilliant way by D. Barthélemy in his famous monograph;[3] and on the other hand, the stylistic improvement of the language and the elimination of a good number of the Semitic features (Semitisms) prevalent in translation Greek. The Proto-Lucianic text can be attributed to this latter tendency at an early stage, certainly in Jewish circles.[4]

The line of revision towards the Hebrew initiated with the *kaige* text culminated in the new translation by Aquila in the early part of the second century CE. For this reason we can say that Aquila had his 'predecessors'. I have also expressed my belief that Symmachus also had his, that is to say, that we can detect Symmachian readings before the historic Symmachus (end of the second century CE), and that Symmachus probably already knew the revised Septuagint.[5] What is most interesting from our perspective is that both of these new Jewish translations of the second century CE perpetuate the two tendencies of translation mentioned previously – Aquila completing his revision with extreme literalism, and Symmachus searching for a new Greek lexicon and style more to the taste of his second

---

[2] S. P. Brock, 'To Revise or not to Revise: Attitudes to Jewish Biblical Translation', in G. J. Brooke and B. Lindars (eds), *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Studies* (SCS 33; Atlanta, GA, 1992), 301–38, 309.

[3] D. Barthélemy, *Les devanciers d'Aquila* (VTS 10; Leiden, 1963).

[4] S. P. Brock, 'Lucian redivivus: some reflections on Barthélemy's Les devanciers d'Aquila', *Studia Evangelica* 5 (1968) = *TU* 103, 176–81.

[5] N. Fernández Marcos, 'Símmaco y sus predecesores judíos', in A. Vivian, ed., *Festschrift für Paolo Sacchi* (Biblische und judaistische Studien 26; Frankfurt/Bern/New York/Paris, 1990), 193–202.

century readers than the Semiticized language of the Old Greek.[6] Symmachus is translating for Hellenized Jews who were not happy with the stylistic approach of the Septuagint, and his task, even though it was translation, was to aspire to a dignified position among the Greek literary authors of his time.[7]

These new translations into Greek demonstrate that the prestige of the Greek language renders it unique when it comes to the translation of the Torah. There are no signs that there was any rejection of the Greek or the Septuagint among the rabbis before the sixth century, and then only in certain circles.[8] The Greek translations, especially Aquila, continued to be used among the Jews; proof of this is found in *Novella* 146 of Justinian, the fragments and palimpsests of the book of Kings and the Psalms discovered by F. C. Burkitt and C. Taylor among the materials of the Cairo Genizah of the sixth and seventh centuries, and the Greek glosses to the book of Proverbs from the same Genizah used by the Jews in the twelfth century and published by H. P. Rüger.[9]

The use of these new versions is well attested in the Christian tradition through the Hexapla. General opinion has it that Origen preferred to use Theodotion for his correction of the Septuagint, while Lucian favoured Symmachus. The use of the Hexapla in Christian circles is not in doubt, not only from the constant references to these translators in the biblical commentaries of the Fathers, but also from the testimony of the Hexaplaric fragments of the Psalter discovered by G. Mercati in the palimpsest O.39 of the Ambrosian Library of Milan.[10] Symmachus is also clearly present in the translation into Latin by Jerome at the end of the fourth century.[11] It could be said that Jerome, with his new Latin translation of the Bible, reacts in the same way to the Old Latin as Symmachus had to the Septuagint. Both attempt to emulate the classics with a style that is more readable and closer to the exigencies of the target language.

But even in the two most important Christian recensions, the Hexapla and the Antiochene or Lucianic text, we notice that the corrections follow both the directions mentioned previously, since they were apparent in the first revisions – on the one hand, the revision towards the Hebrew which is

---

[6] It is worth emphasizing that Symmachus's floruit coincides with the floruit of the Atticistic literary tradition and the Second Sophistic.

[7] J. R. Busto Saiz, *La traducción de Símaco en el libro de los Salmos* (Madrid, 1978), 308 and 325.

[8] G. Veltri, *Eine Tora für den König Talmai* (TSAJ 41; Tübingen, 1994), 214.

[9] Fernández Marcos, *Introducción a las versiones*, 123–24.

[10] Fernández Marcos, *Introducción a las versiones*, 216–20.

[11] A. Salvesen, 'A convergence of the ways? The Judaizing of Christian scripture by Origen and Jerome', in A. B. Becker and A. Yoshiko Reed (eds), *The Ways that Never Parted* (TSAJ 95; Tübingen, 2003), 233–59.

the driving force behind the Hexaplaric recension, and, on the other, the
stylistic corrections which are characteristic of the Lucianic recension
(alongside revision to the Hebrew through the use of Hexaplaric mate-
rial).[12]

Thus far we have outlined the panorama of a fairly complicated history
of the transmission and reception of the Septuagint from the perspective of
the different attitudes towards the ancient translation, the Old Greek. I
would now like to tread new territory, or at least territory which has only
been explored to some extent in the last few decades. We know that
Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion all had predecessors in their attempt
to produce a better translation of the Bible into Greek. But did they also
have 'continuators'? Can we find in Byzantine Judaism or Christianity any
trace of a survival of those Greek versions, or new attempts at a translation
of the Bible into medieval Greek or even into neo-Greek? What happened
to the magnificent Hellenistic Judaism, which has not raised its head since
the fall of Jerusalem in 70 and the revolt of 115–17 CE?

The traditional answer to these questions tends to follow the view that
after the fall of Jerusalem and the Temple the Jewish intelligentsia rallied
around the original text of the Bible at a time when the Hebrew language
was undergoing a renaissance. The Septuagint was eventually adopted as
the official Bible of early Christianity, and the new religion became the
heir to Hellenistic Judaism. Philo and Josephus were passed on through
Christian hands, while fragments of other Hellenistic Jewish authors have
been preserved thanks to Christian writers (the *Stromata* of Clement of
Alexandria and the *Praeparatio Evangelica* of Eusebius of Caesarea).
However, this is not quite exact. The prestige of spoken Greek throughout
Palestine right up to the time of the Arab invasion continued to have a
strong influence on Jewish writers; this can be seen in the numerous loan-

---

[12] Beyond the Christian recensions there are a few indicators of a more radical inter-
vention which emphasize a dissatisfaction with the Septuagint in some circles of the
Christian world: a) the Paraphrase of Ecclesiastes by Gregory Thaumaturgos, written
towards the end of the third century CE, to render the text of Qohelet acceptable to Chris-
tian readers from the point of view of language and doctrine, and to adapt it to the lin-
guistic taste of Late Antiquity; and b) several attempts at the versification of the Bible
with the aim of 'Homerising' it. The best known of these is by Apollinarios of Laodicea.
According to Sozomenos, *Ecclesiastical History* V,18, he composed in 24 songs an he-
roic epic in Hexameters on the Hebrew history until Saul, cf. Fernández Marcos, *Intro-
ducción a las versiones*, 343–45. With the exception of the Greek Psalter (1450) and the
Graecus Venetus (see below), no other versions of the Bible in the Byzantine period are
mentioned in A. Delicostopulos, 'Major Greek Translations of the Bible', in J. Krasovec,
ed, *The Interpretation of the Bible. The International Symposium in Slovenia* (Sheffield,
1998), 297–316.

words in the Targum and in the collections of Midrashim.[13] Moreover, more recent discoveries and studies in relation to the Byzantine Jews demonstrate that the Jews continued the work of translation into Greek under the Byzantine Empire, and that this culminated in the publication of the Constantinople polyglot edition of the Pentateuch in 1547, which includes in one of its columns a translation into neo-Greek with Hebrew characters. All this points to a continuity in the Greek versions of the Bible during the Byzantine period, whose remnants still remain scattered in the margins of the Greek manuscripts, or hidden under the *aljamiado* veil, that is, beneath the Hebrew script which was commonly used for these versions.[14] Greek never ceased to be a language of Jews. Let us take a closer look at those developments which may help to confirm our working hypothesis.

There are two channels which allow us to detect the presence and activity of the Byzantine Jews in the transmission of biblical texts. On the one hand, a series of fragmentary literal translations and Greek glosses written in Hebrew characters spread over a period stretching from the tenth century to the Constantinople Pentateuch of 1547. Although D. S. Blondheim first drew attention to these texts in 1924, it is only in the last few decades that scholars such as N. de Lange, N. Fernández Marcos and C. Aslanov have studied and published new texts, most of which come from the Cairo Genizah and which confirm Blondheim's view.

Another channel of transmission which uncovers the Jewish presence is the transmission of the Septuagint. Marginal annotations in certain manuscripts show, apart from Hexaplaric readings, other Greek readings which are more recent, remnants of very literal translations into medieval Greek and neo-Greek, very much in the style of Aquila.[15] And we have still not

---

[13] Apart from the classical work of S. Krauss, *Griechische und lateinische Lehnwörter im Talmud, Midrasch und Targum* I and II (Berlin, 1898 and 1899 = Hildesheim, 1964), cf. J. Fürst, *Glossarium graeco-hebraeum oder der griechische Wörterschatz der jüdischen Midraschwerk* (Strassburg, 1890); D. Sperber, *A Dictionary of Greek and Latin Legal Terms in Rabbinic Literature* (Jerusalem, 1984); L. Girón, 'Vocablos griegos y latinos en Exodo Rabbah I', *Sefarad* 46 (1986), 219–28; idem, 'Vocablos griegos y latinos en Cantar de los Cantares Rabbah', *Sefarad* 54 (1994), 271–306; J. J. Alarcón Sainz, 'Vocablos griegos y latinos en los Proemios (Petihot) de Lamentaciones Rabbah', *Sefarad* 49 (1989), 194–216; idem, 'Vocablos griegos y latinos en el Targum de Lamentaciones', *Sefarad* 52 (1992), 15–19; J. P. Brown, 'The Septuagint as a Source of the Greek Loan-Words in the Targums', *Biblica* 70 (1989), 194–216.

[14] See N. de Lange, 'Jewish Use of Greek in the Middle Ages: Evidence from Passover Haggadoth from the Cairo Genizah', *JQR* 96 (2006), 490–97, 490: 'The Jews of the Byzantine Empire did not normally write their spoken language Greek. If they wrote at all, they tended to write in Hebrew, which is clearly the only language in which they were educated. What written Greek they have left us is generally couched in Hebrew characters and is embedded within what can be considered as primarily Hebrew texts.'

[15] Fernández Marcos, *Introducción a las versiones*, 182–83.

yet considered the Jewish traces in the first two columns of the Hexapla, in which the transliterations of the *secunda* were probably the fruit of Jewish intellectuals. This second column facilitated the reproduction of the sounds of the Hebrew script even by readers who did not understand the Hebrew language. In this way, the first two columns represent two different means of registering the single Hebrew text and reinforce the role of Hebrew as a holy language, both natural and divine, and which to be effective should be spoken aloud.[16]

The most important Byzantine and neo-Greek documents written in *al-jamiado* Greek are: the fragments of the translation of Qoh 2:13–23 from the Taylor-Schechter collection of the University of Cambridge, edited by Blondheim and presented in a new edition with transcriptions and commentaries by de Lange, which I believe give a true picture of the state of the language between 600 and 1100 CE;[17] the interlinear translation of the *aljamiado* neo-Greek of the book of Jonah published by Hesseling in 1901 and which probably dates from the twelfth century; and the *aljamiado* neo-Greek translation in the Constantinople Pentateuch, which, given the absence of loan-words from the Turkish, brings us closer to a medieval tradition.[18]

These testimonies have been enriched by the addition of new fragments from the Cairo Genizah which were deciphered and edited by N. de Lange. They are all in Hebrew characters (de Lange excluded from his collection texts written in Greek characters).[19] According to de Lange, the Qohelet fragments as well as the biblical glossary with fragments from Job and the Minor Prophets have their source in a Greek Bible close to Aquila, or which, at least, follows his line of literal translation. Other glossaries in parallel columns with names in Hebrew and Greek have anonymous Greek glosses which fall into the tradition of the Three.[20] De Lange also edited Greek annotations to the Pentateuch and Greek glosses to 1 Kings concerning the construction of the Temple (1 Kgs 6:20–8:37). Finally, C. Aslanov studied new Greek glosses to the commentary of Reu'el on Ezekiel and the Twelve Prophets which also came from the Cairo Genizah. He insists on the importance of these tenth and twelfth century glosses which do not

---

[16] M. J. Martin, 'Origen's Theory of Language and the First Two Columns of the Hexapla', *HTR* 97 (2004), 99–106.

[17] See R. Browning, *Medieval and Modern Greek*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge, 1983), 53–68.

[18] Fernández Marcos, *Introducción a las versiones*, 184–89.

[19] N. de Lange, *Greek Jewish Texts from the Cairo Genizah* (Tübingen, 1996).

[20] See the Cairo Genizah Fragment Cambridge UL ms TS F 17.4, and N. de Lange, 'An Early Hebrew-Greek Bible Glossary from the Cairo Genizah and its Significance for the Study of Jewish Bible Translations into Greek', in M. F. J. Baasten & R. Munk (eds), Studies in Hebrew literature and culture *presented to Albert van der Heide on the occasion of his sixty-fifth birthday* (Dordrecht, 2007), 31–9.

constitute a single model of the language of the period, but which vary between a demotic form with characteristics of the southern dialect and a purer style, strongly influenced by the Greek of the Septuagint or the other Jewish translations which were in current use. When all is said and done, the Jewish colouring of these glosses is undeniable and is proof of the existence of Greek Jewish versions of the Bible in the Jewish communities of the Byzantine Empire.[21]

This chain of Jewish translations into Greek, whose links have been uncovered for their most part in the last few decades, culminated in the neo-Greek translation of the Constantinople Pentateuch (1547). Another polyglot Pentateuch had been published in Constantinople in 1546, in Hebrew, Aramaic, Persian and Arabic, with a view to unifying the Jews of the eastern part of the Byzantine Empire in a common liturgy. The second Pentateuch, in Hebrew, Aramaic (Targum Onqelos), Ladino (or Judeo-Spanish) and Greek was published to similar ends for the Jews in the West, as is explained in the Hebrew title of the work: 'So that it may be of use to the young Israelite, so they may learn to speak correctly, it seemed to us a necessary task to publish this translation of the Holy Scripture in the Greek language and in the foreign language, both languages being used by our people in captivity, for the descendants of Judah and Israel who live in Turkish lands.' In the middle of the sixteenth century the Jewish community in Constantinople was the most numerous of the period, due to the immigration of Jews from the western kingdoms. Under the reign of Suleiman the Magnificent (Sultan from 1520 to 1566) all the Jews in the Mediterranean region lived under a single empire and a stable government which protected the basic rights of the individual. This Pentateuch is the first book in Greek printed in a country whose language was Greek, and the second in which a part of the Bible is printed in vulgar Greek.[22] But it is in the Jewish tradition of literal translation handed down from Aquila which continued throughout the Byzantine era. Although it reflects the Greek which was spoken in Constantinople in the middle of the sixteenth century, the fact that not a single word of Turkish is found in it is proof that it has its origin in an earlier tradition, one that is for the most part unknown to us due to the fact that eastern Greek culture disappeared before the invention of the printing process. I have discussed elsewhere the linguistic phenomena of this Greek Pentateuch, the state of the language it

---

[21] C. Aslanov, 'Notes sur les gloses judéo-helléniques du Commentaire de Reu'el sur Ézechiel et les Petits Prophètes', *REJ* 157 (1998), 7–45, 40 and 44–45. The commentary has been edited by de Lange, *Greek Jewish Texts*, 165–294.

[22] The first was a version of the Psalms into neo-Greek by Agapius, a monk on the island of Crete, printed in Venice in 1543.

represents and the cultural importance of this edition.[23] But I would not like to finish this section without once again evoking the brilliant path followed by Hellenistic Judaism. It somehow survived through the mutterings and snippets of Judeo-Greek culture found in Byzantium and which lead finally to the Constantinople edition of the Pentateuch.

Between the first translation of the Torah into Greek in Ptolemaic Alexandria of the third century BCE and the neo-Greek of the Constantinople Pentateuch there are parallels which cannot be ignored. Both versions were the work of Jews of the Diaspora, with the same cultural, liturgical and pedagogic aims. The Septuagint probably served as a legal framework for the Jews in the Ptolemaic court. In the genesis of the Constantinople Pentateuch there are also certain indications of a policy of unification of the different Jewish communities in the capital creating a melting pot, an immigrant population of very different origins. But nor can the differences be hidden. The Septuagint became an autonomous translation which was soon to replace the Hebrew Bible. The Greek version of the Constantinople edition, on the other hand, never broke away from or replaced the Hebrew text; it was merely considered as an instrument to understand the Hebrew. Moreover, the use of Hebrew characters prevented its use by non-Jews and excluded any intention of proselytism.

So far we have been considering fragments or complete Greek translations of just part of the Bible which stand out for their literal nature, which are following in the footsteps of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion, and also which have been passed down to us in Hebrew Characters. But there is another channel of transmission in which we can detect the hand of Jewish correctors, which is in the pure literal tradition of Aquila and chronologically takes us into the medieval period. The readings appear in the margins or appendices of some of the manuscripts of the Septuagint and are therefore written in Greek characters and transmitted together with Hexaplaric readings.

In the margins of the Manuscript F of the Ambrosian Library of Milan, a fragmentary Octateuch of the fifth century, there is a series of annotations in cursive script which are the work of a medieval corrector (F[b] in Wevers's edition) who was well versed in the traditional Jewish transla-

---

[23] N. Fernández Marcos, 'El Pentateuco griego de Constantinopla', *Erytheia. Revista de Estudios Bizantinos y Neogriegos* 6 (1985), 185–203. Cf. C. Aslanov, 'The Judeo-Greek and Ladino Columns in the Constantinople Edition of the Pentateuch (1547): A linguistic Commentary on Gn 1:1–5', *REJ* 158 (1999), 385–97, 387: 'I shall stress the specific way the authors [of the Greek and Ladino columns] of the translations reproduced in the columns combined two antagonistic attitudes towards those older versions [the Septuagint and the Vulgate]: on the one hand they did reproduce a lot of translations patterns, but on the other they tried sometimes to react against the pressure of the Christian Bibles.'

tion. The text covers Gen 31:15 to Josh 12:12 with readings in the margins throughout. These readings are in the tradition of ancient Jewish versions and, more importantly, the lexicon has particular similarities to the Greek text of the Constantinople edition of the Pentateuch, although the language is at an earlier stage of evolution. Of the 488 readings which F[b] preserves in the book of Exodus, 100 are shared with the Constantinople Pentateuch.[24] Despite the anonymous character of these glosses, the scribe identifies the author in a passage of Gen 47:31 and twice in Ex 16:31 as τὸ ιουδ′ (= τὸ ἰουδαικόν). It is my opinion that these readings are post-Hexaplaric, remnants of Jewish translations that were in circulation in the Byzantine period and which also left traces in the margins of certain other manuscripts such as M and i. A later corrector produced a new Hebraising translation of Exodus 36:3–39:19 (= F[h]) which has a close link to the Greek text of the Complutensian polyglot. In Wevers's opinion, one of the sources of the *Complutensis* must have shared, in the stemmata, a text also used by F[h].[25] D. Fraenkel came to the same conclusion in his extensive and well-documented publication.[26]

There is another manuscript, *Vat. Graecus* 343, containing a translation of the Psalter κατὰ τὴν νῦν κοινὴν τῶν Γραικῶν φωνήν, with the Odes, which for the history of the Greek language has the advantage of being dated: at the end it bears the date 22 April 1450. It is probable that it was translated into modern Greek from the Septuagint, for it includes Odes 7, 8 and 9 which have no Hebrew *Vorlage*. The language it reproduces lies at a stage halfway between the interlinear translation of Jonah and the Constantinople Pentateuch.[27]

In the last years of the Byzantine Empire and after the *Halosis*, many members of the Byzantine intelligentsia started to arrive in the West. Greek manuscripts were also deposited in the libraries of Venice, Florence,

---

[24] J. W. Wevers, 'A secondary text in Codex Ambrosianus of the Greek Exodus', in R. Gryson, ed, *Philologia Sacra. Biblische und patristische Studien für Hermann J. Frede und Walter Thiele zu ihrem siebzigsten Geburtstag* (Freiburg, 1993), 36–48.

[25] 'This must mean that one of the sources of Compl[utensian] must have shared in its stemmata a parent text which also lay in the textual ancestry of Fh. That source is not one of the extant identified sources of Compl[utensian] for the Pentateuch, viz. ms 108 and some of the f mss., but one no longer extant', J. W. Wevers, 'A secondary text in Codex Ambrosianus', 48.

[26] 'Weil nicht völlig ausgeschlossen werden kann, dass die Bearbeiter der Complutensis sei es den Codex selbst, sei es die wahrscheinlich jüdische Tradition, auf die sich der Text von F[b,h] gründet, kannten', D. Fraenkel, 'Die Quellen der asterisierten Zusätze im zweiten Tabernakelbericht Exod 35–40', in D. Fraenkel, U. Quast, J. W. Wevers (eds), *Studien sur Septuaginta – Robert Hanhart zu Ehren* (MSU 20; Göttingen, 1990), 140–86, 176.

[27] R. Devreesse, *Bibliothecae Apostolicae Vaticanae Codices Vaticani Graeci. Tomus II: Codices 330–603* (Vatican City, 1937), 18.

Milan and Rome. Cardinal Bessarion's legacy constituted the basis of the Marcian Library of Venice. Several Spanish humanists and collaborators on the Alcalá polyglot studied in Italy in the second half of the fifteenth century and at the beginning of the sixteenth. Although we have no definitive proof, it is possible that these collaborators on the Alcalá polyglot had access to manuscripts corrected according to the Hebrew, and to the medieval Jewish traditions of interpretation of the biblical text.[28]

As in antiquity, two ways of breaking with the tradition of the Septuagint are attested in Byzantine Judaism, both favouring greater closeness to the Hebrew text. One is the return to a more literal interpretation according to the paradigm of interlinearity, following the model of Aquila: this can be seen in the *aljamiado* Greek version and in what is left of the medieval Jewish versions transmitted through certain Septuagint manuscripts. The second tendency links a literal translation to stylistic improvement of the Septuagint itself. This tendency is present in *Graecus Venetus* (*Gr. VII*: Pentateuch, Proverbs, the five Megillot except Esther, and Daniel), a single manuscript in the Marcian Library of Venice (fourteenth century)[29], which transmits a humanistic concern that makes use of classical Greek terminology and poetry in place of the Hellenistic vocabulary of the Septuagint. It also resorts to older devices already used in the epic, in particular by Homer, such as enclitics and variation of particles, to bring the new Greek version closer to the Hebrew. If we have to look among the ancient Jewish translators, then the translator of *Graecus Venetus*, with his desire to improve the style of the Greek of the Septuagint, could be considered in some ways the true continuator of Symmachus, as his editor recognizes.

On several occasions, the search for syntactic equivalents gives rise to false interpretations, given the different structure of Greek and Hebrew. The translator of the *Graecus Venetus* even resorts to the use of isosyllabism, takes advantage of prosody and phonetic syntax, and uses rhythm and musical effects which coincide with those used in rhythmic Greek prose. This can be explained by the fact that as early as the fourth century CE Greek prose writers had started to make use of phonetic syntax in order to move from musical accentuation to one of stress.

---

[28] J. Signes Codoñer, 'Translatio studiorum: la emigración bizantina a Europa Occidental en las décadas finales del Imperio (1353–1453)', in P. Bádenas and I. Pérez Martín, eds, *Constantinopla 1453. Mitos y realidades* (Nueva Roma 19; Madrid, 2003), 187–246, and C. Förstel, 'La transmission des manuscrits grecs de Byzance en Italie', in L. Giard and C. Jacob (eds), *Des Alexandries I. Du livre au texte* (Paris, 2001), 411–24.

[29] Edited by O. Gebhardt, *Graecus-Venetus. Pentateuchi Proverbiorum Ruth Cantici Ecclesiasticae Threnorum Danielis versio graeca ...* (Leipzig, 1875). In the Prolegomena Gebhardt deals extensively with the characteristics of the translation and the problem of its authorship.

In short, the translator of the *Graecus Venetus* considered translation to be a new poetic creation. He goes so far as to use the Doric dialect to translate the parts of the Book of Daniel written in Aramaic. This translation fills an important gap on the Hellenistic literary horizon and is an integral part of a tradition of Jewish translation, despite its author's probably being a Christian. According to G. Mercati[30] the translator was Simone Atumano, an apostate who rose to the highest ranks of the ecclesiastic hierarchy, as Bishop of Thebes and the papal representative in the East for the unification of the churches. While it is true that his translation is of scant interest as far as the history of the Greek language is concerned (he contrived to re-establish classical forms, including the optative), its importance from the cultural standpoint cannot be denied. It stands at the crossroads between the traditional methods of Jewish translation of the Scriptures (a very literal translation reproducing the interpretations of Rashi and especially David Kimhi) and the very learned but ludic approaches of Byzantine humanism at a time when this humanism was preparing to spread its wings towards the West. As C. Aslanov so rightly puts it, the translator (probably Simone Atumno), 'a sans doute voulu établir une équation entre la sainteté de la lettre hébraïque et la beauté de la langue grecque'.[31] It is a humanist attempt at fidelity to the original Hebrew combined with the need to write in a cultured, i.e. classical, Greek. The translator tries to invest the translation with a particular style which was lacking in the Septuagint, but which, in his view, was the only one which could do justice to the dignity of the holy language.[32]

We can therefore conclude that both Hellenistic Judaism and the Three had their continuators throughout the Middle Ages and into the Renaissance. The chosen option is that initiated by Aquila, the literal translation. The Jewish-Greek versions, whether preserved in Greek or in Hebrew script, served as instruments to facilitate understanding of the Hebrew text

---

[30] G. Mercati, 'Chi sia l'autore della nova versione dall'ebraico del codice veneto greco VII', *RB* 13 (1916), 510–26, and G. Mercati, *Se la versione dall' ebraico del Codice Veneto Graeco VII sia di Simone Atumano, Arcivescovo di Tebe* (ST 30; Roma, 1916). The question of the authorship of this translation has been very vexed and until now it has not found a satisfactory answer. The author could be a Jew or a Christian convert from Judaism. The editor of the manuscript, O. Gebhardt, preferred to leave the question open, although F. Delitzsch in the preface to the edition pointed to Elisaeus Judaeus, the teacher of G. Gemistos Plethon. However P. F. Frankl in his review of Gebhardt's edition in *MGWJ* 24 (1875), 513–19, pointed rather to a Christian of Greece, perhaps a cultured and pedantic monk.

[31] C. Aslanov, 'La place du Venetus Graecus dans l'histoire des traductions grecques de la Bible', *Revue de Philologie, de Littérature et d'Histoire Anciennes* 73 (1999), 155–74, 173.

[32] Remember the opinion of Rabbi Simeon, son of Gamaliel, for whom Greek was the only language, because of its beauty, worthy to be used to translate the Torah (bMeg 9b).

– a way to keep this text up to date, but not to replace it. We may say that they play a subsidiary role and that they are at the service of the holy language. There was, however, a second option, that of being more faithful to the original than the Septuagint, while, at the same time, trying to improve the Greek style of the latter. Following this line, it could be said that the translator of *Graecus Venetus* is a true continuator of the ancient translator Symmachus. A true humanistic exercise, whose aim was no doubt, if not to replace the Hebrew of the liturgy, then at least to give a classical aura to the Greek translation which would satisfy the literary taste of the humanistic and academic circles. So there were continuators, and the strongest proof of this is the Greek of the Constantinople Pentateuch: a monument of the Greek language, the culmination of a whole chain of Jewish literal translations into Greek.

Despite all these worthy attempts, none could reach the splendid heights of the first Alexandrian translation of the Torah. This, notwithstanding the Hellenistic language and Hebraising style of some of its translations, finally took the place of the Hebrew text. Its greatest honour in the history of the transmission of the biblical text was the enthusiastic reception it received, first among Jews and then among Christians.

The Background in Late Antiquity

The Jewish Use of Greek Proverbs[1]

by

James K. Aitken

Introduction

It has been recognised by some scholars in recent years that the traditional picture of Jewish abandonment of the Septuagint once it had been adopted by Christianity at the end of the first century may be misleading.[2] Veltri in particular has shown that negative attitudes to the Septuagint in rabbinic literature are really only to be found in the latest layers of the tradition (notably in the late works of *Sopherim*, *Sepher Torah*, *Massekhet Ta'anit*).[3] There is, by contrast, some approval in the earlier rabbinic traditions of the translation. Certainly the high status of some Greek translations can be identified, with Aquila recognised by Christians as the main Jewish version and approved by the rabbis.[4] It is striking that in bMegillah the adop-

---

[1] Earlier versions of this paper were given at Cambridge on May 1st 2007 and at SBL, San Diego on November 24th 2007. I am grateful all participants at these seminars for questions and discussions, and especially for the strong criticisms by Professors Michael V. Fox and Jan Joosten.

[2] The view that the Septuagint became a Christian text is still, nevertheless, dominant. As much is summarily proposed in a recent introduction to the Septuagint: 'In effect, by the end of the second century the Septuagint had passed into the care and keeping of the Christian Church' (K. H. Jobes and Moisés Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint* (Grand Rapids, 2000), 83). Cf. p. 38: 'The rise of Christianity from Judaism in the first century of our era is usually given as the reason new Greek versions of the Hebrew Bible were needed […] the resulting tension between Christians and Jews, both of whom used the Greek Bible but understood it differently, was the primary reason that the synagogue abandoned the "Septuagint" to the Church and produced a new translation of the Hebrew texts.'

[3] G. Veltri, *Eine Tora für den König Talmai: Untersuchungen zum Übersetzungsverständnis in der jüdisch-hellenistischen und rabbinischen Literatur* (Tübingen, 1994). Cf. G. Veltri, *Libraries, translations, and 'canonic' texts: the Septuagint, Aquila, and Ben Sira in the Jewish and Christian traditions* (Leiden and Boston, 2006).

[4] It is Aquila's version that is cited in Justin Marytr's *Dialogue*, and appropriately Aquila is the name attributed to the interlocutor of the *Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila*. On rabbinic approval of Aquila, see jMeg. I:9(8) and P. S. Alexander, 'How did the rab-

tion of the targumim as a written source, against earlier disapproval of these Aramaic translations,[5] is justified by recourse to the later Greek versions. It appears that the names given to targum Onqelos and targum Jonathan are derived from the Greek versions, and their authority is dependent upon the status of those versions. The passage in bMeg. 3a, and elsewhere, has been discussed as to whether or not Aquila was the author of the targum, but it is also significant for the evidence it sheds on the authority of the Greek versions.[6]

In considering the Septuagint as opposed to the later versions, Justinian's well-known *Novella* 146 (dated the 8th February 553) seems to have arisen from a dispute over the use of a Hebrew or a Greek version in a synagogue, probably in Constantinople. Justinian legislates for this synagogue, but with consequences for others, that the Septuagint itself or Aquila's version should be used, the former however being preferred for primary use.

From their own complaints which have been brought to us, we have understood that some only speak Hebrew, and wish to use it for the sacred books, and others think that a Greek translation should be added, and that they have been disputing about this for a long time. […]

This (i.e. the LXX) they shall primarily use, but that we may not seem to be forbidding all other texts we allow the use of that of Aquila, though he was not of their people, and his translation differs not slightly from that of the Septuagint.

It is possible that this dispute arose when an attempt was made to impose Hebrew on a Greek-speaking synagogue,[7] although we cannot be sure which Greek version was actually being used before the legislation.

---

bis learn Hebrew?', in W. Horbury (ed.), *Hebrew study from Ezra to Ben-Yehuda* (London, 1999), 83–84.

[5] On the initial ban on written targumim and their gradual acceptance in a liturgical setting, see W. Smelik, *The Targum of Judges* (Leiden, 1995), 24–41.

[6] M. Friedmann, *Onkelos und Akylas* (Veinna, 1896) and A. E. Silverstone, *Aquila and Onkelos* (Manchester, 1932), both argued for Aquila as being the author of the targum, but they have not been followed by any in recent years. For the significance of this talmudic passage see W. Smelik, 'Translation as innovation in BT Meg. 3', in L. Teugels and R. Ulmer, *Recent developments in midrash research: proceedings of the 2002 and 2003 SBL consultation on midrash* (Piscataway, NJ, 2005), 25–49.

[7] This suggestion was made to me by N. de Lange. Some have doubted the evidence of the *Novella* as informing on Jewish history, but have seen it as a piece of Christian self-definition, in the manner of Jewish–Christian disputations; see on this G. Veltri, 'Die Novelle 146 "peri Ebraion": das Verbot des Targumvortrags in Justinians Politik', in M. Hengel and A. M. Schwemer (eds), *Die Septuaginta zwischen Judentum und Christentum* (Tübingen, 1994), 125; L. V. Rutgers, 'Justinian's Novella 146 between Jews and Christians', in R. Kalmin and S. Schwartz (eds), *Jewish culture and society under the Christian Roman Empire* (Leuven, 2003), 385–407. Certainly Justinian emphasizes that the LXX is preferred because of its authority within Christianity: 'We make this proviso that

Other evidence of Jewish use of Greek versions comes in the form of the fragments and glosses such as those from the Cairo Genizah that indicate a continuing use of the Greek Bible amongst Jews. But these traces of evidence raise as many questions as they answer. Veltri, for example, has been criticized for not discussing internal evidence for the use of the LXX in rabbinic literature,[8] since he merely studies the approach to the LXX from external evidence, namely the small list of references to verses in the LXX and the legend of the creation of the translation.[9] We do not have as yet rabbinic evidence of actual use of the Septuagint beyond such citations. Second, it is not as yet clear whether the Greek Bible that we have in the Byzantine age forms part of an unbroken tradition from Graeco-Roman antiquity of the continuing use of the LXX by Jews. Third, where Greek texts have been used by Jews it often seems to be the version by Aquila, confirming the accusation made by the Jewish interlocutor in Justin's Dialogue (*Dial.*, 68).[10] Only Justinian's *Novella* and the discussion of errors in rabbinic literature imply the use of the Septuagint as such. Was the Septuagint, that is to say the ancient version that was adopted by Christianity, also consulted by or known to Jews?

Proverbs in Jewish tradition

Proverbs would seem to be an appropriate choice of book to trace its reception history within Jewish tradition. The liking for Greek gnomic literature in general is a noted feature of rabbinic literature,[11] and the book of

---

those who use Greek shall use the text of the seventy interpreters, which is the most accurate translation, and the one most highly approved …'. For discussion of the *Novella*, see N. de Lange, 'Jews in the age of Justinian', in M. Maas (ed.), *The Cambridge companion to the age of Justinian* (Cambridge, 2005), 417–8, and the bibliography cited there.

[8] E. Tov, 'Eine Tora für den König Talmai', in E. Tov, *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: collected essays on the Septuagint* (Leiden, 1999), 76.

[9] On which, see E. Tov, 'The rabbinic tradition concerning the "alterations" inserted into the Greek Pentateuch and their relation to the original text of the LXX', *JSJ* 15 (1984), 65–89.

[10] Cf. M. Hengel, 'The Septuagint as a collection of writings claimed by Christians: Justin and the Church Fathers before Origen', in J. D. G. Dunn (ed.), *Jews and Christians: the parting of the ways, A.D. 70 to 135: The Second Durham-Tübingen Research Symposium on Earliest Christianity and Judaism (Durham, September 1989)* (Grand Rapids, MI, 1999), 39–84.

[11] Lieberman long ago showed how the rabbis quoted proverbs and Greek legislation and literature: S. Lieberman, *Greek in Jewish Palestine: studies in the life and manners of Jewish Palestine in the II–IV Centuries C. E.* (New York, 1942), 37–9 and 144–5; cf.

Proverbs was an ideal source of maxims that could be applied to almost any situation for a biblical justification of a rabbinic standpoint. The liking for the book of Proverbs can be illustrated by mishnah Aboth chapter 6, admittedly a late addition to Aboth. In Aboth 6:7 there are no fewer than eight quotations of Proverbs in a series to justify one point, and in Aboth 6:8 a further four quotations are given, including Prov 17:6 to which we shall return later. Although Proverbs is used frequently, we should not see the rabbinic sayings generally as types of proverbs in the biblical sense.[12] Even so, the popularity of proverbial and ethical maxims in the Roman world might in part account for the frequent use of sayings and of the book of Proverbs in rabbinic literature.[13] Nevertheless, there has been no systematic tracing of the Jewish reception of the Greek version of Proverbs, despite the popularity of the book in Rabbinic literature. D'Hamonville, in his otherwise excellent commentary on Septuagint Proverbs,[14] only cites the patristic use of the version, while Weingreen's early study notes rabbinic-like features in the Greek, but does not investigate whether it influenced later rabbinic interpretation.[15]

LXX and MT differences

The divergences between our extant witnesses to the Greek and the MT ought to allow for identification to be easily made between the texts that later interpreters are using. The situation, however, is complicated, since many scholars see the differences between MT and LXX of Proverbs as recensional,[16] although others have argued for exegetical expansions on the

---

J. N. Sevenster, *Do you know Greek? How much Greek could the first Jewish Christian have known?* (Leiden, 1968), 38–61.

[12] See J. Neusner, 'Types and forms in ancient Jewish Literature: Some comparisons', *History of Religions* 11 (May, 1972), 360–361.

[13] On such popular sayings, see T. Morgan, *Popular morality in the early Roman Empire* (Cambridge, 2007).

[14] David-Marc d'Hamonville, *Les Proverbes* (La Bible d'Alexandrie; Paris, 2000).

[15] J. Weingreen, 'Rabbinic-type commentary in the LXX version of Proverbs', in *Proceedings of the Sixth World Congress of Jewish Studies* 6.1 (Jerusalem, 1977), 407–15. I am told that André Lelièvre has recently written on the subject, but I have not been able to track his discussion down.

[16] E.g., E. Tov, 'Recensional differences between the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint of Proverbs', in Harold W. Attridge et al. (eds), *Of scribes and scrolls: studies on the Hebrew Bible, intertestamental Judaism, and Christian origins, presented to John Strugnell* (Lanham, MD, 1990), 43–56; M.V. Fox, 'LXX-Proverbs as a text-critical resource', *Textus* 22 (2005), 95–128.

part of the translator.[17] The two Qumran manuscripts (4Q102 and 4Q103) that are extant display close affinities to the MT, indicating that the form of the MT is early, and it is likely that the MT was the dominant recension by the rabbinic period.[18] On the other hand, a quotation in 4Q271 5.1.14–15 (CD 11:20–21) echoes Prov 15:8, although the wording is different from the MT. Fox also discusses traditional forms of the text beyond MT, giving particular attention to the Old Greek (OG) and Peshitta Proverbs.[19] Fox argues that OG Proverbs is a translation of a base text that deviated from MT Proverbs in terms of arrangement and content. The reconstructed Hebrew base text is described as a 'recension' of the book of Proverbs on a par with MT Proverbs. As such he sees that it is worthy of attention in its own right, not only as a quarry of materials of use in reconstructing the archetype anterior to it and MT.

In sum, Fox comments on three Hebrew text types of the book of Proverbs: MT Proverbs, the reconstructed *Vorlage* of OG Proverbs, and a text of Proverbs which is neither one nor the other, but which merits consideration as a plausible reconstruction of the text from which the other two, in specific instances, derive. Given this complexity, we need to be aware of variant text types available to the sources under consideration. The problem here is that early correspondences with the LXX text might not be the result of an author drawing on the LXX, but on a variant Hebrew text with which they were familiar. Nonetheless, it does also allow one to identify differences between the different versions and which version is the one most likely being used by a source. At the same time it seems to be clear that some differences are not recensional, but some may be the result of interpretation and expansion by the Greek translator.[20]

Jewish sources in the Hellenistic and early Roman period

The evidence for the use of the Greek translation of Proverbs in the second temple and early Roman period is slight. An obvious place to begin is with proverbial literature such as Ben Sira, but this provides little insight. The Hebrew of Ben Sira (c. 190 BCE) undoubtedly reflects something of the

---

[17] E.g., J. Cook, 'The Greek of Proverbs – evidence of a recensionally deviating Hebrew text?', in Shalom M. Paul et al. (eds), *Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in honor of Emanuel Tov* (Leiden, 2003), 605–618.

[18] There is rabbinic awareness of inconsistencies in the thought of Proverbs (e.g., bShabb 30b) but not in textual type.

[19] Michael V. Fox, *Proverbs 1–9* (Anchor Bible, 18A; New York, 2000), 360–423, especially 364.

[20] On the reliability of the MT, see B. K. Waltke, *The Book of Proverbs, chapters 1–15* (Grand Rapids and Cambridge, 2004), 7–8.

book of Proverbs, but the Greek, translated after 132 BCE and therefore later than traditional dates for the Greek translation of Proverbs,[21] does not seem dependent upon it. Wright's analysis of the Greek translation of Ben Sira concludes that, if anything, the translator probably knew Psalms, but that even then his dependence was minimal.[22] In part this arises from his attempt to integrate biblical allusions rather than merely quote biblical verses. It is notable that in Sir 46:11, where the wording is similar to Prov 10:7 (on which see below) the translator does not follow the LXX translation of Proverbs, but chooses a more accurate translation (εὐλογία) that was later also chosen by Aquila.

A more likely proverbial source for using Proverbs is Pseudo-Phocylides, composed as it is of Greek gnomic material that probably derives from a Jewish author.[23] The difficulty with Pseudo-Phocylides is that his writing has reshaped each source into the author's own wording, with the consequence that no one sentence can be said to be a precise allusion to a biblical passage, although many might ultimately derive from the Bible.[24] Indeed, there may have been a lost compendium of Jewish law from which the author took his examples.[25] Thus we find the sentences, for example, on the beggar (Ps.-Phoc. 22–23) reflecting Prov 3:27–28. Yet it is difficult to dissociate common Greek gnomic material from genuine biblical allusion. Ps.-Phoc. 164–174 discusses the industriousness of the ants and the bees: its source is usually taken to be Prov 6:6–8, where the LXX adds to the saying about an ant one about a bee.[26] Nevertheless, such proverbial creatures are common, found in various types of wisdom literature including at Sir 11:3[27] and in Greek literature.[28]

---

[21] Both Cook and d'Hamonville date LXX Proverbs to the early second century BCE: see Johann Cook, 'The dating of Septuagint Proverbs', *EThL* 69 (1985), 383–99; d'Hamonville, *Les Proverbes*, 22–24.

[22] B. G. Wright, *No small difference: Sirach's relationship to its Hebrew parent text* (Atlanta, GA, 1989), 227–8, 247–8.

[23] The main studies are P. W. van der Horst, *The Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides: with introduction and commentary* (Leiden, 1978); W. T. Wilson, *The mysteries of right-eousness: the literary composition and genre of the Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides* (Tübingen, 1994); W. T. Wilson, *The Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides* (New York and Berlin, 2005).

[24] Wilson, *Sentences*, 17–18, lists the most likely parallels, whilst recognising most are 'implicit'.

[25] Wilson, *Sentences*, 19–22.

[26] Van der Horst, *Sentences*, 222–25.

[27] On the image in Proverbs and wisdom literature, see R. L. Giese, 'Strength through wisdom and the bee in LXX-Prov 6,8a–c', *Biblica* 73 (1992), 404–11; J. Cook, *The Septuagint of Proverbs*, 164–6; J. Cook, 'Textual diversity and canonical uniformity', in J.-M. Auwers and M. de Jonge (eds), *The biblical canons* (Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 141. Cf.

Philo of Alexandria draws on works other than the Pentateuch far less, and only seems to draw on Proverbs four times, not always in direct quotation:[29] *Ebr.* 84 (Prov 1:8; 3:4; 4:3), *Congr.* 177 (Prov 3:11, 12), *Suppl. Gen.* IV 129 (Prov 19:14) and *Ebr.* 31 (8:22–23).[30] We will return below to the use of non-standard texts in Philo's commentaries. In similar fashion to Philo and Pseudo-Phocylides, the New Testament reflects passages similar to Proverbs,[31] but few seem to be dependent on the text or quote it explicitly. Strikingly, Hebrews 12:5–6 does seem to be dependent on Prov 3:11–12, but the Greek vocabulary is so different that the author is not necessarily drawing on the LXX. Nevertheless, there are clear cases of correspondences in phrases and vocabulary, such as the use of Prov 3:34 in Jas 4:6 (cf. 1 Pet 5:5) and Prov 11:31 in 1 Pet 4:18.

Wisdom of Solomon

Of all Hellenistic-Roman Jewish sources, it is perhaps unsurprising that the Wisdom of Solomon is the one most dependent on Proverbs in Greek. A sapiential work from the first centuries BCE or CE and showing a command of Greek that suggests it was composed originally in Greek, it would be natural for it to be dependent on the LXX of Proverbs. Nevertheless, Skehan has argued that the author is dependent on the *Hebrew* of Proverbs, and Clifford has recently worked from the Hebrew of Proverbs and noted general thematic connections.[32] There is no need to examine all of Ske-

---

T. Forti, 'Bee's honey – from realia to metaphor in biblical wisdom literature', *VT* 56 (2006), 327–41.

[28] E.g., Aristotle, *Historia animalium* 622B; Plutarch, *Mor.* 32e, 79d, 145b, 467c, 765d. On Plutarch, see E. K. Borthwick, 'Bee imagery in Plutarch', *The Classical Quarterly* 41 (1991), 560–62.

[29] N. G. Cohen, 'Earliest evidence of the Haftarah Cycle for the Sabbaths between the 17th of *Tammuz* and *Sukkoth* in Philo', *JJS* 48 (1997), 239; and generally, *Philo's scriptures: citations from the Prophets and Writings: evidence for a Haftarah cycle in Second Temple Judaism* (Leiden, 2007).

[30] See J. Laporte 'Philo in the tradition of Wisdom', in R. L. Wilken, *Aspects of wisdom in Judaism and early Christianity* (Notre Dame, IN, 1975), 103–141. Also *Virt.* 62 alludes to Prov 8:22–23, but does not quote it.

[31] An extensive list in E. Nestle and K. Aland, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 26th edition (Stuttgart, 1979), 757–8.

[32] P. W. Skehan, 'The literary relationship of the Book of Wisdom to earlier wisdom writings', in *Studies in Israelite Poetry and Wisdom* (Washington, DC, 1971), 172–236, esp. 173–91; R. J. Clifford, 'Proverbs as a source for the Wisdom of Solomon', in N. Calduch-Benages and J. Vermeylen (eds), *Treasures of Wisdom* (BETL 143; Leuven, 1999), 255–63.

han's examples here, but it may suffice to note some places where it seems clear that the LXX is the source of inspiration for the author of Wisdom.

Holmes has already listed some examples where Wisdom is dependent on the LXX, including the portrayal of Wisdom in Wis 6:9–16 deriving from Proverbs 1 and 8.[33] Gerleman has expounded on one of Holmes' examples that neatly shows dependence on the vocabulary of the Greek text in distinction from the Hebrew.[34] The Greek of Prov 1:21 renders the public space of jurisdiction, 'the gate' (שׁער) in the Hebrew, by a stereotyped translation, but one that nevertheless provides equivalents for the Hebrew:[35]

ἐπ' ἄκρων δὲ τειχέων κηρύσσεται,
ἐπὶ δὲ πύλαις δυναστῶν παρεδρεύει,
ἐπὶ δὲ πύλαις πόλεως θαρροῦσα λέγει

The second colon appears to be one translation of the Hebrew colon, and the third Greek one a doublet that probably reflects a more accurate translation of the Hebrew. The sense of the second colon, the wise person attending to rulers, reappears later in LXX Prov 8:3, and, of relevance for our purposes, in Wis 6:14:

ὁ ὀρθρίσας πρὸς αὐτὴν οὐ κοπιάσει·
πάρεδρον γὰρ εὑρήσει τῶν πυλῶν αὐτοῦ.

The image of Wisdom as a πάρεδρος at the (city) gates undoubtedly derives from Septuagint Proverbs, especially as the addressees in this part of the book of Wisdom are the rulers (6:9, ὦ τύραννοι). The verse in Wisdom is not a translation of the Hebrew, but appears to be an adaptation of the Greek.

A second example will show how the author of Wisdom has read Proverbs and adapted it for his argument. In demonstrating God's mercy to different groups, the author considers the Canaanites, referring to the conquest of the land and the removal of the Canaanites in the following terms (Wis 12:3–5):

[3] καὶ γὰρ τοὺς πάλαι οἰκήτορας τῆς ἁγίας σου γῆς

---

[33] S. Holmes, 'The Wisdom of Solomon', in R. H. Charles (ed.), *The Apocrypha & Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English* (Oxford, 1913), I, 520. Among his examples are Wis 3:11 (Prov 1:7); 6:12c (Prov 8:12b); 6:15 (Prov 8:34), and 6:14 (Prov 1:21).

[34] G. Gerleman, *Studies in the Septuagint III: Proverbs* (Lunds Universiteits Årsskrift, 1.52.3.; Lund, 1956), 59, cf. 34. I am grateful to Jan Joosten for drawing my attention to this discussion.

[35] Gerleman, *Studies*, 35, suggests that Proverbs might here have been alluding to a saying in popular proverbial use, quoted by Plato (*Republic* 489b) and ascribed to Simonides by Aristotle (*Rhet.* 1391a).

⁴ μισήσας ἐπὶ τῷ ἔχθιστα πράσσειν,
ἔργα φαρμακειῶν καὶ τελετὰς ἀνοσίους.

³ Those who were dwellers long ago in your holy land
⁴ you hated for their detestable practices,
their works of sorcery and unholy rites.

The source of this passage in Wisdom, justifying the expulsion of the Canaanites as being lawless, appears to be Proverbs 2, where we strikingly find the Greek noun οἰκήτωρ 'inhabitant', attested in the LXX only in these two passages.[36] Proverbs explicitly speaks of the righteous dwelling in the land and the wicked and lawless being expelled.

²⁰ εἰ γὰρ ἐπορεύοντο τρίβους ἀγαθάς, εὕροσαν ἂν τρίβους δικαιοσύνης λείους.
²¹ χρηστοὶ ἔσονται οἰκήτορες γῆς, ἄκακοι δὲ ὑπολειφθήσονται ἐν αὐτῇ, ὅτι εὐθεῖς κατασκηνώσουσι γῆν, καὶ ὅσιοι ὑπολειφθήσονται ἐν αὐτῇ,
²² ὁδοὶ ἀσεβῶν ἐκ γῆς ὀλοῦνται, οἱ δὲ παράνομοι ἐξωσθήσονται ἀπ' αὐτῆς.
(Prov 2:20–22)

²⁰ For if they had walked in the good paths,
they would have found smooth paths of justice.
²¹ The good will be dwellers in the land,
and the innocent will remain in it;
   [and the upright will dwell in the land
and the holy will be left behind in it][37]
²² the ways of the wicked will be destroyed off from the land,
and the lawless will be banished from it.

It seems that Proverbs is the inspiration, or at least the justification, for the author of Wisdom to account for the expulsion of the Canaanites.

Late antique Jewish inscriptions

In moving on to consider late antique inscriptions,[38] we are embarking on a consideration of an important source for our argument. Inscriptions of late antiquity come from the very time frame in which the Septuagint was traditionally thought to have been abandoned by Jews and are contemporary with the writing down of much of rabbinic literature. Indeed, they are our only Jewish Greek sources from this period (third to seventh centuries). Their significance, nevertheless, is open to dispute on a number of

---

[36] The noun is well attested, nonetheless, in Classical Greek literature (see LSJ 1203) and inscriptions (e.g., *SEG* 49:911, l. 38).

[37] The second part of this verse is a doublet in the Greek, but emphasises all the more the contrast between the righteous dwellers and the lawless that will be expelled.

[38] For fuller discussion of the use of the bible in Jewish inscriptions, see the paper by Silvia Cappelletti in this volume.

grounds. As we shall see, the inscriptions display a variety of wording, indicating either fluidity in the writing of verses from the bible, or an oral tradition rather than a working from a written text. Such an oral tradition can easily be posited when favoured verses seem to be those repeatedly chosen, and therefore these inscriptions need not support recourse to a written text. Second, even where we can be confident that the inscription was commissioned by a Jew (say for a Jewish burial), it does not guarantee that the engraver was Jewish or that the text was chosen by the Jewish benefactor. The local engraver might not have been Jewish and might have selected the verse from a copy of the bible or a model inscription that he had access to. The presence of Hebrew in an inscription makes it more likely that the engraver was Jewish, but even then a Hebrew text could have been copied. Third, most of these inscriptions come from Italy, since Greek inscriptions from Israel do not contain quotations of Proverbs,[39] and therefore are culturally and geographically far removed from the rabbinic literature that we will consider below.

The evidence of inscriptions, and their particular use of Proverbs, has been clearly and succinctly described by van der Horst.[40] Meanwhile, Roth-Gerson has proposed from her studies of inscriptions in Syria and Palestine that a distinction can be seen in inscriptions from Israel and those from the diaspora, both between Hebrew or Aramaic inscriptions in Israel and Greek ones in the diaspora, and between those in Greek in both places.[41] From this we might suspect that those from Israel would be based on Aquila and those from the diaspora on the LXX. In the case of allusions to Proverbs, however, this does not seem to be the case. The lack of examples from Israel does not allow definitive conclusions,[42] but the variety of wording in the diaspora inscriptions indicates that no formal or conclusive distinction can be made between the two regions.

One phrase that we may now discount as a biblical allusion is the appearance in inscriptions of the expression (εἰς) τέκνα τέκνων and variations (e.g., τέκνων τέκνοις), an apparent derivation from Prov 17:6 and other biblical passages (Prov 17:6: στέφανος γερόντων τέκνα τέκνων;

---

[39] *CIJ* (2) 892 is a Hebrew inscription from Jaffa, probably dating to the second–third century, that has a partial allusion to Prov 10:7, in wording reflected in other texts as well (Sir 46:11; bQidd 31b).

[40] P. W. van de Horst, *Ancient Jewish epitaphs: an introductory survey of a millennium of Jewish funerary epigraphy (300 BCE–700 CE)* (Kampen, 1991), 37–38.

[41] L. Roth-Gerson, 'Similarities and differences in Greek synagogue inscriptions of Eretz-Israel and the diaspora' [Hebrew], in A. Kasher, A. Oppenheimer, Uriel Rapaport (eds), *Synagogues in Antiquity* (Yerushalayim, 1987), 141–42.

[42] On the progress towards an edition of inscriptions in Judaea/Palestine see H. Cotton, L. di Segni, B. Eck, B. Isaac, 'Corpus Inscriptionum Judaeae/Palestinae', *ZPE* 127 (1999), 307–308.

cf. Exod 34:7). Although this expression usually appears in non-Jewish curse inscriptions, the phrase has been considered Jewish,[43] **and it is thought that, where it appears, it would have been borrowed from Jewish epitaphs or neighbours in Asia Minor.[44] Strubbe has shown, however, that the phrase is frequent in Greek literature and inscriptions to denote posterity, and consequently cannot be used as a sign of biblical influence.[45] On the contrary, its frequency in Greek facilitated its choice as a translation equivalent in the Septuagint.**

By far the most popular biblical verse in Jewish inscriptions is the frequent quotation in epitaphs of Prov 10:7:

Prov 10:7   יֵכֶר צַדִּיק לִבְרָכָה וְשֵׁם רְשָׁעִים יִרְקָב
The memory of the righteous one is for a blessing
and the name of the wicked will rot

LXX: μνήμη δικαίων μετ' ἐγκωμίων, ὄνομα δὲ ἀσεβοῦς σβέννυται
The memory of the righteous ones is with praises,
but the name of the wicked is extinguished

In the recensional history of this verse, there are two main variants that allow us to indentify in inscriptions which tradition is being followed. In place of the plural δικαίων **it is recorded that hoi loipoi read the singular** δικαίου **in line with the Hebrew, and that Aquila, for the Hebrew** לִבְרָכָה, **where the LXX has** μετ' ἐγκωμίων **'with praises', translated the Hebrew more accurately as** εἰς εὐλογίαν **'for a blessing'.[46] Two inscriptions extant from western Europe contain the plural 'righteous', as the LXX. One is in a late bilingual inscription (seventh-eighth centuries) but only in the Latin[47]:**

Hebrew: נזכר צדיק לברכה אנתולי
"May the righteous man Anatolius be remembered for a blessing"
Latin: memoria ius|torum ad be|[nedictionem]

---

[43] E.g., P. R. Trebilco, Jewish communities in Asia Minor (Cambridge, 1991), 69–74. Further bibliography in J. H. M. Strubbe, 'Curses against violation of the grave in Jewish epitaphs of Asia Minor', in W. van Henten, and P. W. van der Horst (eds), Studies in early Jewish epigraphy (Leiden, 1994), 79.

[44] E.g., Trebilco, Jewish communities, 72–73.

[45] J. H. M. Strubbe, 'Curses against violation of the grave', 73–83. Strubbe lists all the examples of this phrase within curses.

[46] F. Field, Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt; sive veterum interpretum Graecorum in totem Vetus Testamentum fragmenta (Oxford, 1875), II, 329.

[47] JIWE 1: 120 (from Taranto, Italy). It should be noted that the Latin does not correspond to the Vulgate: memoria iusti cum laudibus.

The second inscription has the plural in the Hebrew itself (זכר צדיקים לברכה).[48] These reflect the variation on that word which is understandable when it refers to the deceased person or persons. A feminine form, for example, is found in one inscription (צדקת).[49] We cannot therefore conclude from this that the engraver was using a recension of the Greek to modify the Hebrew. It is also important to note that where there is a Hebrew quotation with parallel Greek and Latin translations, those translations often provide cultural equivalents rather than a literal translation of the Hebrew or a quotation of the LXX or Vulgate. Thus, in JIWE I:122 the biblical expression is rendered by the Latin idiom benememorio. JIWE I:120, on the other hand, does include an equivalent in Latin to the Hebrew phrase.

The evidence from the inscriptions may be summarized and categorized. Excluding the Hebrew and Latin quotations of Prov 10:7 just mentioned, there are three quotations from Western Europe with the verse, and each of these quotations differs from the other. One from Vigna Randanini in Rome, dating to the third-fourth century, contains the LXX reading with ἐγκώμιον, although in the singular rather than the plural and with the singular δικαίου:[50]

μνήμη δικαίο[υ] σ[ὺ]ν | ἐνκωμίῳ

Meanwhile, one from Monteverde also in Rome of the third-fourth century follows the reading of Aquila:[51]

μνία δικαίου εἰς | εὐλογίαν· ἐν ἰρή|νη ἡ κοίμισί<ς> σου.

Finally, the third example, once more from Vigna Randanini of the third-fourth century, seems to be a combination of both versions, Septuagint and Aquila:[52]

μνήμη | δικαίου ἰς εὐλογιάν οὐ ἀληθῆ τὰ ἐνκώμια

It is likely that there was a degree of adaptability in phrasing, seen already in the Hebrew and Latin versions. It is possible too that the phrase was preserved in oral tradition, remembered rather than necessarily being cited

---

[48] JIWE I: 133 (Taranto; 7–8 centuries). See too L. Roth-Gerson, Jews of Syria as reflected in the Greek inscriptions [Hebrew], (Yerushalayim, 2001), 108.

[49] JIWE I: 183 (Tortosa, Spain; 5–6 (?) centuries. Hebrew, Latin, Greek).

[50] JIWE II: 307 (LXX).

[51] JIWE II (Rome): 112.

[52] JIWE II: 276.

directly from a text. Nevertheless, even within that oral tradition the two different versions were known. In Crete of the fourth-fifth century the expression is partially preserved and combined with other elements, representing further adaptability:[53]

μνήμη δικέας | ἰσ ἐῶνα

Rabbinic literature

So far, the sources considered have been written in Greek or in primarily Greek-speaking contexts (the western Roman empire). In turning to rabbinic literature, written in Hebrew and Aramaic, and in sources where the Septuagint is sometimes condemned,[54] a case for use of the Septuagint is much more difficult to maintain. Any correspondence between a Septuagint text and a rabbinic passage can be explained by many different reasons. It is possible that the Septuagint text, for example, represents a divergent Hebrew text that was known to the rabbis, although by the Talmudic period there seems to have been great conformity between biblical manuscripts. Thus, correspondences, for example, between Prov 11:13 and mSanh 3:7 might have arisen from such textual variations. In Prov 11:13a we find the addition of 'in the sanhedrin', which might have been a known textual variant, and an interpretation of a רָכִיל as δίγλωσσος 'double-tongued, i.e. deceitful' (equivalent of בעל שתים; cf. Sir 5:9, 14, 15; 28:13), which could have been a common reading:

MT: הוֹלֵךְ רָכִיל מְגַלֶּה-סּוֹד וְנֶאֱמַן-רוּחַ מְכַסֶּה דָבָר

LXX: ἀνὴρ δίγλωσσος ἀποκαλύπτει βουλὰς ἐν συνεδρίῳ
πιστὸς δὲ πνοῇ κρύπτει πράγματα

In the Mishnah, in a ruling that a judge who is over-ruled should not continue to complain about the judgement, two passages are brought as justification (hence in a legal context as specified by the LXX addition). The first (Lev. 19:16a) forbids him from being a talebearer (a רָכִיל), whilst the second passage (Prov 11:13) specifies the meaning of a רָכִיל as that of a person divulging confidential information (i.e. the equivalent of an ἀνὴρ δίγλωσσος). The definition is transferred from Proverbs to Leviticus, thus making it applicable to the theme of court deliberations (i.e. an informer,

---

[53] IJO I: CRE 3 (Epitaph of Sophia of Gortyn).

[54] See A. Wasserstein and D. J. Wasserstein, The legend of the Septuagint: from classical antiquity to today (Cambridge, 2006), 69–70, 82–83.

rather than a slanderer, as it would be in Hebrew Proverbs).[55] Therefore, in this case, although there is correspondence between the mishnah and LXX proverbs, it can be accounted for either as familiarity with a divergent Hebrew text, or through internal Hebrew exegesis and comparison of biblical passages (in this case Leviticus and Proverbs). Certainly, it has been usual to take the resemblances between other Septuagint books and rabbinic citations as evidence of shared textual traditions (Vorlagen).[56]

A second explanation for correspondences between the Septuagint and rabbinic sources is that they can easily be accounted for by recourse to continuing 'tradition'. It is likely that at times Septuagint Proverbs does serve as witness to traditions known from later, such as the evil inclination (Prov 2:11, 17) or the developing, if not fully realised, tradition of the fence around the Torah (Prov 28:4; cf. Aristeas 139; Aboth 1:1; NumRab 10:8).[57] At the same time parallels between the Septuagint and rabbinic literature have usually been taken as early evidence for Jewish exegetical traditions.[58] This is often a reasonable supposition, and for most cases we do not wish to suggest an alternative hypothesis. However, to suggest that whenever there is a correspondence it derives from a shared if unspecified tradition is merely a hypothesis, especially where there is no evidence beyond the two texts compared. The proposal advanced here is that some of the rabbinic readings might derive from familiarity with the Septuagint text, whether consulted directly or remembered orally. As a hypothesis it has as much validity as the idea of shared traditions, and indeed might be stronger if it can be shown that Septuagint texts were still in use amongst some rabbis. One justification for this position is that there was knowledge of the Septuagint in the same time period, judging from the evidence of Justinian and the use made in inscriptions. Hence, the first half of this paper has aimed at showing that there was some continuing use of the Sep-

---

[55] See A. Samely, Rabbinic interpretation of scripture in the Mishnah (Oxford, 2002), who compares this sort of feature to a metalinguistic (almost philological) analogy of the gezerah shawah type.

[56] See, in particular, D. Büchner, 'Jewish commentaries and the Septuagint', Journal of Jewish Studies 48 (1997), 250–61; 'On the relationship between "Mekilta de Rabbi Ishmael" and Septuagint Exodus 12–23', in B. Taylor (ed.), IX Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Cambridge 1995 (SBL Septuagint and Cognate Studies, 45; Atlanta, 1997), 403–420.

[57] See in particular, J. Cook, 'The law of Moses in Septuagint Proverbs', VT 49 (1999), 448–61; 'Towards the dating of the tradition "the Torah as surrounding fence"', JNSL 24 (1998), 25–34; 'The origin of the tradition of the יצר הטוב and יצר הרע', JSJ 38 (2007), 80–91.

[58] Z. Frankel, Über den Einfluss der palästinischen Exegese auf die alexandrinische Hermeneutik (Leipzig, 1851); L. Prijs, Jüdische Tradition in der Septuaginta: Die grammatikalische Terminologie des Abraham ibn Ezra (Hildesheim, 1987); J. Schaper, Eschatology in the Greek Psalter (Tübingen, 1995).

tuagint at the very time that the rabbis were writing. To establish this further, some comments on the social context are in order.

Social context

The use of Greek in Palestine as well as in the Mediterranean is well attested in late antiquity.[59] More than half of the inscriptions found in Palestine are in Greek, and approximately one third of those are from synagogues.[60] One may presume that people would understand enough Greek to listen to a biblical translation in view of the production of the translations of Aquila and Symmachus in the second century.[61] Knowledge or study of Greek by the rabbis is frequently referred to in the sources,[62] some rabbis even preferring Greek for discussion. The question is whether those comfortable in Greek or even better in Greek than Hebrew or Aramaic would use Greek translations or whether religious sensibility would encourage them to use Hebrew.

Smelik has gathered the evidence of rabbinic use of Greek translations, and shown how a monolingual Greek reading prevailed in Greek-speaking areas (e.g., tMeg. 3:13; mMeg. 1:8; GenRab 36:8).[63] The Jews of Caesarea recited the shema in Greek and most likely also read the Torah in Greek (jSot. 7:1 (21b)). Gradually the dominance of Hebrew as the holy language changed practice, but the traditions of Greek versions seem to have been strong for some time. The repeated discussions and tension in rabbinic lit-

---

[59] For studies on this question, see, inter alia, K. Treu, 'Die Bedeutung des Griechischen für die Juden im römischen Reich', Kairos (1973), 123–33; Sevenster, Do you know Greek?; G. Mussies, 'Greek in Palestine and the diaspora' in S. Safrai et al. (eds), The Jewish people in the first century: historical geography, political history, social, cultural and religious life and institutions (Assen, 1988), 1040–64; B. Spolsky, 'Jewish multilingualism in the 1st century: an essay in historical sociolinguistics', in J. A. Fishman (ed.), Readings in the sociology of Jewish languages (Leiden, 1985), 35–50; J. C. Poirier, 'The linguistic situation in Jewish Palestine in late antiquity', Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism 4 (2007), 55–134, esp. 110–25.

[60] See L. E. Levine, The ancient synagogue: the first thousand years (New Haven and London, 2000), 591–93, on the various forms of Jewish worship; and, J. M. Watt, 'Language Pragmatism in a Multilingual Religious Community," in B. Olsson and M. Zetterholm (eds), The ancient synagogue from its origins until 200 C.E.: papers presented at an international conference at Lund University, October 14–17, 2001 (Stockholm, 2003), 284–92, who considers cultural and sociological reasons for the accommodation of Greek.

[61] As noted by W. Smelik, 'Code-switching: the public reading of the Bible in Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek', in L. Morenz and S. Schorch (eds), Was ist ein Text? – Ägyptologische, altorientalistische und alttestamentliche Perspektiven (Berlin, 2007), 142.

[62] A. D. Tropper, Wisdom, politics, and historiography: Tractate Avot in the context of the Graeco-Roman Near East (Oxford, 2004), 127–31.

[63] Smelik, 'Code-switching', 141–7.

erature over the use of Greek represents the reality that Greek was regularly used. One story that has been discussed recently by two scholars will suffice to illustrate the issue.[64] In mMeg 2:1 a discussion focuses on the validity of hearing the reading of Esther in Greek if the person only knows Greek, and the necessity of hearing it in Hebrew if that language is intelligible, representing the increasing tension over the use of Greek in the synagogue. The Tosefta (tMeg 2:5) recalls the tale of R. Meir's visit to Asia Minor where he is said not 'to find a megillah written in Hebrew'. Presumably, since the tale is set in Asia Minor, it was in a Greek-speaking area, and rather than there being no scroll at all (otherwise they could not have celebrated Purim) there probably was a Greek one. The story is repeated in Genesis Rabbah 36:8, using it as an explanation of the law on reading from a written text:

We are not allowed to say any portion of Holy Writ by heart, but must always read it from the Scroll. Thus when Rabbi Meier was once in Asia on Purim, and was unable to find a copy of the book of Esther, he wrote the book out from memory (as he knew it by heart), and then made another copy from which he read to the congregation.

The story does suggest that Greek versions alone would have been used in synagogues in Greek-speaking areas. Burns proposes that a practical concession to the demands of a Jewish audience was exceptionally invested in the Purim ritual: 'Greek Esther remained a viable Jewish ritual text while the rest of the Septuagint was neglected as such'.[65] It is not clear, however, why the same situation could not apply to other Septuagint books in Greek-speaking synagogues. For the story also reminds us of some pragmatic considerations. The production of scrolls was a costly and time-consuming task, and if it were for a community that did not understand the Hebrew, then investment in a Hebrew scroll was not necessarily worthwhile. Even if a Hebrew version existed in some places it would have eventually worn out and would have required being replaced or simply neglected. We cannot know whether the version of Aquila or the Septuagint was the one used, but similar pragmatic concerns might guide us. If a community was already using the Septuagint and were told of a new version by Aquila, unless the rabbis had absolute control over a geographically diverse range of synagogues, there would have been financial considerations in not using the new version. Furthermore, if that version was not intelligible without being used in coordination with the Hebrew, then it

---

[64] Smelik, 'Code-switching', 146–6; J. Burns, 'The special Purim and the reception of the Book of Esther in the Hellenistic and early Roman eras', Journal for the Study of Judaism 37 (2006), 26–32.

[65] Burns, 'The special Purim', 30.

would not necessarily have been adopted by a synagogue where only Greek was read.[66]

Identifying rabbinic use of the Septuagint

The inscriptions, being for the most part in Greek, have provided a context in which to place the rabbinic evidence. Since the rabbinic evidence is in Hebrew, and given the complex textual history of Proverbs, some comments need to be made on how to identify the use of a Greek version within a Hebrew text, even though we have noted possible Jewish use of Greek versions in the period. Rabbinic knowledge of Greek has been well-demonstrated by Lieberman,[67] and we need not enter here into that discussion or the rabbinic attitudes to the LXX. Nevertheless, it seems likely that some rabbinic texts might be more prone to using Greek versions than others, dependent on the time period and provenance of the tractate. Thus, focus here is on some of the earlier rabbinic texts and those most likely from Palestine or even Greece, according to some suggestions. Mishnah Aboth in particular has been seen within a Graeco-Roman context,[68] and contains many Greek words and possible puns in Greek.

Similarity between a rabbinic interpretation and a Greek version on an exegetical level could be explained in many ways. It is possible that they are both drawing on the same tradition, rather than one on the other, or that they are following the same Vorlage or the same reading tradition of an identical Hebrew text. It is equally possible, though, that in the minds of the rabbinic compilers was the Greek translation, through which their interpretation was distilled, but that they wrote down the authoritative Hebrew text. Examples of this we will consider below. Even if they seem to be following the Greek, if there is no extant version of Aquila or the other 'recensions', it is not possible to be certain whether they had a different reading or not. On a positive note, if an interpretation is dependent on a Greek meaning that is not found in the Hebrew or on a pun in Greek, there is the likelihood that a Greek source lies behind the interpretation. The use of a Greek loan-word might also imply dependency, although this is not beyond doubt. The three examples presented here illustrate these possibilities. One will consider an interpretation that might derive directly from the translation of the Septuagint as an interpretation of the Hebrew. The second will consider an interpretation that seems to be based on the meaning

---

[66] Alexander, 'How did the Rabbis learn Hebrew', 83–4, suggests that the features of Aquila only make sense if it is used as a crib for students to understand the Hebrew, rather than as a free-standing translation.

[67] S. Lieberman, Greek in Jewish Palestine: studies in the life and manners of Jewish Palestine in the II–IV centuries C.E. (New York, 1942).

[68] Tropper, Wisdom.

of the Greek in contrast to the Hebrew. The third example will be a loan-word in Hebrew from the Greek word attested in the Septuagint.

Interpretation from Greek wording

The first example is a quotation in the Mishnah of Prov 10:7, the text so frequently appearing in inscriptional epitaphs. mYoma 3:9–11 discusses those who acted properly and improperly in the Temple. Mishnayoth 9 and 10 speak of those whose memory is remembered for praise (לשבח), and 11 recalls those who acted improperly. The structure is informative:[69]

3:9

… ועשאן בן גמלא של זהב, והיו מזכירין אותו לשבח

   … ben Gamla made some of gold, and they used to remember him for praise

3:10

…נקנור נשו נסים לדלתותיו והיו מזכירין אותו לשבח

   … Miracles befell the gates of Nicanor (cf. tos.Yoma 2:4) and they used to remember him for praise

The section is concluded with the quotation of Prov 10:7:

mYoma 3:11

ואלו לגנאי[...] על נאמר הראשונים "זכר צדיק לברכה " ועל אלו נאמר "רשעים ושם ירקב"

   But these [were remembered] for disgrace […] Of the first it is said, 'The memory of the righteous is for a blessing', and of these [second group] it is said, 'But the name of the wicked shall rot' (Prov 10:7).

In the structure of the Mishnah, the quotation of Prov 10:7a is the biblical justification for remembering for praise (לשבח) those that acted properly. The righteous are to be praised since their memory is to be for a blessing. Those that acted improperly are to be remembered for disgrace, which is explained by a quotation of Prov 10:7b. It seems that the phrase in mish-nayoth 9 and 10 'and they used to remember him for praise' (והיו מזכירין אותו לשבח) is an interpretation of the Proverbs phrase 'the memory of the righteous is for a blessing' (זֵכֶר צַדִּיק לִבְרָכָה). In that case, לשבח as an explanation of לִבְרָכָה is the same understanding as the LXX version of this verse: μετ' ἐγκωμίων.

   On such a reading, the framer of these mishnayoth has an understanding of Prov 10:7 that derives from the LXX translation, or at the minimum is aware of an interpretation that is found in the LXX (but that is marginally reductive). This is not as surprising as it perhaps sounds, given the frequency of this verse in Jewish epitaph inscriptions, including the reading as attested in the Septuagint rather than that from Aquila. This is a notable example, since if the interpretation is correct, it is one of the few cases

---

where we have different readings in Aquila and the LXX and where we see the rabbis following the interpretation of the Septuagint. That we do not have examples in inscriptions from Palestine, the centre of early rabbinic activity, might weaken the usefulness of such evidence, but it does at least show that in Jewish circles at the time of the rabbinic movement both the versions of Aquila and the LXX were known. It is possible that this verse was known in oral tradition as a set phrase, frequent as it is in epitaphs, and that the framer of the mishnayoth was therefore making the association in his head. It is equally possible that he was familiar with the Septuagint text and interpreted the Hebrew on the basis of his reading of the Greek.

Interpretation based on Greek semantics

In Aboth 4:1 four types of character are defined (the wise, the strong, the rich and the honourable) in order to demonstrate the virtues of wisdom, self-control, contentment and courtesy. Each virtue is supported by a proof-text that might be later additions to the original sayings, but which nonetheless are well suited to the types described.

Ben Zoma says:
    Who is the wise one? He who learns from all men, as it says, "I have acquired understanding from all my teachers" (Psalms 119:99).
    Who is the mighty one? He who conquers his inclination, as it says, "slowness to anger is better than a mighty person, [and he who rules his spirit than one who conquers a city.]" (Prov 16:32). (איזה הוא גיבור-הכובש את יצרו, שנאמר "טוב ארך אפיים, מגיבור")
    Who is the rich one? He who is happy with his lot, as it says, "When you eat [from] the work of your hands, you will be happy, and it will be well with you" (Psalms 128:2). "You will be happy" in this world, and "it will be well with you" in the world to come.
    Who is honored? He who honors the created beings, as it says, "For, those who honour Me, I will honour; and those who despise me will be held in little esteem" (1 Samuel 2:30).

The quotation from Prov 16:32 contains its own internal pun indicating that one who rules his spirit is better than one who captures (and thereby would rule) a city (וּמֹשֵׁל בְּרוּחוֹ מִלֹּכֵד עִיר). This is explained in the mishnah as referring to 'one who conquers his inclination' (הכובש את יצרו) and can be seen as a possible interpretation of the Hebrew. However, when looking at the Greek, this sense seems to be much clearer.

Prov 16:32
LXX: κρείσσων ἀνὴρ μακρόθυμος ἰσχυροῦ
        ὁ δὲ κρατῶν ὀργῆς κρείσσων καταλαμβανομένου πόλιν

ὁ δὲ κρατῶν ὀργῆς recalls the Platonic virtue of control over the passion, the verb κρατέω having a stronger sense of mastery. The strength of the Hebrew verb כבש (as opposed to the MT מֹשֵׁל) is implied in the Greek

κρατέω and the topic of control of the passions seems to be clearer in the Greek too.

The relationship between the biblical quotations in the mishnah and the maxims is uncertain, and it could be that the biblical passages were added later as justification.[70] Nevertheless, their selection even later still requires some understanding of the meaning of the passage. The lemmata and commentary in rabbinic literature often witness to different text bases, which might account for correspondences between Septuagint and rabbinic text types. In transmission the quotations tend to be harmonized towards the authoritative text, and Büchner suggests the same applies to the Mekhilta where the lemmata were inserted or brought into line with MT at a later stage.[71] In Philo, too, Walters found that the lemmata were the LXX whilst the commentary sections represented aberrant texts.[72] Hence, it is possible to cite a biblical verse whilst having in mind a different text, or, comparably in the case considered here, a verse in a different language that leads to a different understanding of the verse.

Greek loan-words in Hebrew

The case of reminiscences of the Septuagint in rabbinic literature might be made especially for the appearance of Greek loan-words that are the same as those in the Septuagint. A good example is that of Prov 1:5:

MT: יִשְׁמַע חָכָם וְיוֹסֶף לֶקַח וְנָבוֹן תַּחְבֻּלוֹת יִקְנֶה:
NRSV: let the wise also hear and gain in learning,
          and the discerning acquire skill
LXX: τῶνδε γὰρ ἀκούσας σοφὸς σοφώτερος ἔσται,
          ὁ δὲ νοήμων κυβέρνησιν κτήσεται
Targum: יקנה: מדברנותא וסוכלתנא מנדעא ויוסף חכימא ישמע
Peshitta: ܢܩܢܐ ܡܕܒܪܢܘܬܐ ܣܘܟܠܬܢܐ ܡܢܕܥܐ ܘܢܘܣܦ ܚܟܝܡܐ ܢܫܡܥ

תַּחְבֻּלָה could be derived from חבל 'to bind' or derivative of חֹבֵל 'sailor', a noun attested in Jonah 1:6. In the context of Proverbs, it might denote guidance of a state, but more likely it is guidance from God. The LXX translation κυβέρνησις denotes steering or piloting (e.g., Plato Rep. 488b) and came to be used metaphorically of government, as early as Pindar and

---

[70] P. M. Walters, Philo's Bible: the aberrant text of Bible quotations in some Philonic writings and its place in the textual history of the Greek Bible (Cambridge, 1950), 4. D. Patte, Early Jewish hermeneutic in Palestine (Dissertation series, 22; Missoula, Montana, 1975), 98, suggests the verses were added retroactively since they were interpreted in the light of oral law.

[71] D. L. Büchner, 'Exegetical variants in the LXX of Exodus. An evaluation', Journal of Northwest Semitic languages 22 (1996), 36.

[72] Walters, Philo's Bible; cf. G. E. Howard, 'The aberrant text of Philo's quotations reconsidered', HUCA 54 (1973), 197–209.

much loved by Plutarch. In the other appearances of תַּחְבֻּלָה in Proverbs (11:14; 12:5; 24:6)[73] it is also rendered by κυβέρνησις. 'The Three' in Proverbs all seem to render it in a similar way to the LXX, but paying attention to the plural form of the noun.[74] The Hebrew word only occurs elsewhere in the bible at Job 37:12, where the LXX merely transliterates it (θεεβουλαθω), but Symmachus also translates it by κυβέρνησις and Aquila provides a synonym οἰάκωσις 'guiding' (from the noun οἴαξ; cf. 4Macc. 7:3).[75] The targum (מדברנותא in all instances) and Peshitta provide a translation denoting 'administration', which is significant since they do not seem to have influenced in their word choice the traditions that we consider here.[76]

Leviticus Rabbah 21:5 is the first case in an explanation of Lev. 16:3 ('With this shall Aaron come into the Holy Place'). The verse is explicated in a word play by reference to Prov 24:6, and the first interpretation given by R. Nathan and R. Aḥa in the name of R. Simon is that the guidance (תחבלות) is to perform religious acts to counteract bundles of transgressions (חבילות). The second interpretation also aims to explain the word in Proverbs:

R. Joḥanan expounded the text as applying to the art of the helmsman (קיברניטין). For R. Joḥanan said: A man should always be like a helmsman (קיברניט), on the look-out for the performance of a religious act …[77]

LevRab 21:5, in the name of R. Joḥanan, takes the word in Proverbs to be a helmsman who is always on the watch on a religious life. Strikingly it uses the Greek loan-word from κυβέρνησις, and, as we have already seen, this word is the one used in the Septuagint, but not extant in the daughter versions. Pesikta rabbati 47:20 also used the loan-word to translate the Hebrew of Prov 24:6,[78] such that it might be a common rendering.[79] Nevertheless, it derives from the Septuagint, whichever source used it first. LevRab is undoubtedly Palestinian, containing features of Galilean Ara-

---

[73] Although the Hebrew word also appears in Prov 20:18, there is a lacuna in the Greek at this point.

[74] Field, Origenis, II, 311, 332: gubernationes. The evidence is derived from the Syro-Hexapla. In two cases Theodotion takes it in a cognitive sense: ἀνοησία (Prov 11:14, with Hebrew negative), ἐννόημα (12:5; Field, Origenis, II, 334).

[75] Field, Origenis, II, 68.

[76] This is the targumic rendering at Prov 1:5; 11:14 and 20:18.

[77] The orthography given here is that of the MS British Library Add. 27,169. Variation in manuscripts on the plene spelling of the word.

[78] Text and manuscript variants in Rivka Ulmer, Pesiqta Rabbati: a synoptic edition of Pesiqta Rabbati based upon all extant manuscripts and the Editio Princeps (Atlanta, 1997), 1040.

[79] See too Pesikta ahare 176a.

maic and many Greek words beyond this one example, confirming the possibility that it came from an environment in which Greek was used.[80]

The Targum of Proverbs

Further work is needed on the targum of Proverbs, especially as no critical edition exists. There are some eight manuscripts known,[81] but they have not been collated. Lagarde's edition was based on the published Rabbinic Bible, and the only other edition is that of MS Zamora.[82] It is therefore, difficult at this stage to identify subtle textual relations without establishing the textual history. Kaminka has noted many parallels between Greek Proverbs and the targum, but this leads him to the unlikely conclusion that the targum was written in the third century BCE and that each version derives from the same Hebrew text-type.[83] It has, however, been recognised for some time that the targum of Proverbs is dependent on the Peshitta,[84] and Weitzman has recently confirmed that the number and character of parallels between the two versions indicate literary dependence.[85] Indeed, the targum sometimes agrees with Peshitta in following the LXX over MT.[86] The dependence is especially evident in the linguistic mixture of Jewish Aramaic with Syriac in the targum, suggesting the reworking of an older text, while the purer Syriac of the Peshitta suggests that it is the parent text. Although some are cautious about how a Jewish translator would consult a Christian Syriac text,[87] it seems possible that, for the megilloth

---

[80] G. Stemberger, Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash, 2nd edition (Edinburgh, 1996), 291.

[81] L. Díez Merino, Targum de Proverbios. Edición príncipe del Ms. Villa-Amil no.5 de Alfonso de Zamora (Bibliotheca Hispana Bíblica, 11; Madrid, 1984), 137–42.

[82] P. de Lagarde, Prophetae Chaldaice; Hagiographia Chaldaice (Leipzig, 1872–1873). The Zamora MS has been published as Díez Merino, Targum de Proverbios.

[83] A. Kaminka, 'Seputaginta und Targum zu Proverbia', HUCA 8–9 (1931–1932), 169–91.

[84] The proposal goes back as far as Nöldeke and Melammed. For a history of scholarship and survey of issues on the question see R. J. Owens, 'The relationship between the Targum and Peshitta texts of the book of Proverbs: status quaestionis', in Targum Studies, vol. 2: Targum and Peshitta. Edited by P. V. M. Flesher (Atlanta, 1998), 195–207.

[85] M. P. Weitzman, The Syriac version of the Old Testament: an introduction (Cambridge, 1999), 109–10.

[86] Weitzman, Introduction, 110 (on Prov 7:22).

[87] E.g., D. M. Stec, 'The recent English translation of the targumim to Jobs, Proverbs and Qohelet: A review', JSS (1994), 163; J. F. Healey, 'The Targum of Proverbs', in The Aramaic Bible, 15 (Edinburgh, 1991), 9.

that might have only been for private rather than liturgical use, a translator was happy to consult any source available.[88]

Given the strong dependence of the targum on Peshitta, any correspondence between the LXX and targum must be compared to the Peshitta, which might have been the source of the Septuagint reading. As much was the opinion of Nöldeke, since he could not imagine the targumist consulting a translation that Judaism had already dissociated itself from.[89] Kaminka's list of examples deserves greater scrutiny, but since most scholars agree that the Peshitta of Proverbs is consulting the Septuagint directly, it is most often the Peshitta that is the source for such readings in the targum.[90] One example will suffice to indicate the difficulties and also the uncertainty without a critical edition of the targum. Prov 2:17 reads in the versions:

MT: אֶל־הֶיָה וְאֶת־בְּרִית נְעוּרֶיהָ אַלּוּף הַעֹזֶבֶת שָׁכֵחָה:
NRSV: who forsakes the partner of her youth
and forgets her sacred covenant
LXX: υἱέ, μή σε καταλάβῃ κακὴ βουλὴ ἡ ἀπολείπουσα διδασκαλίαν νεότητος καὶ διαθήκην θείαν ἐπιλελησμένη
Lagarde דאלההא וקיימא א[ה]דטליות מרביינא טעת: דשבקא
Peshitta: ܢܒܚܐ ܡܢܒܚܘܬ ܗܢܒܝܗܘܢ ܡܐ ܡܒܘܐ ܟ ܐܒܠܐ

The Septuagint has interpreted the Hebrew אַלּוּף as διδασκαλία 'teaching', having taken the word either as אַלּוּף II denoting a 'chief' (e.g., Gen 36:15; Exod 15:15), from which the translator derived a teacher (but rendering it by an abstract noun), or more likely as cognate to אלף piel 'to teach'. Indeed, in two passages elsewhere in Hebrew (Jer 3:4; 13:21) the noun might denote 'teacher', and it has been argued that the designation 'teacher' fits Prov 2:16 as well.[91] Both the targum in Lagarde's edition and the Peshitta read it as a person, namely a 'teacher'. The Zamora manuscript of the targum, however, like the LXX, reads an abstract noun 'teaching' (מרביתא). The orthographic difference between the two targum readings is minor and could be an inner-targum corruption, but it is striking that the text has been corrected to the same reading as the Septuagint. It is possible that either an editor corrected the already existing targumic reading to-

---

[88] See the explanation of Weitzman, Introduction, 110. Of course, if the Peshitta was originally Jewish as Weitzman believes, then this would have been easier, but it is not an essential prerequisite.

[89] Th. Nöldeke, 'Das Targum zu den Sprüchen von der Peschita abhängig', in A. Merx (ed.), Archiv für wissenschaftliche Erforschung des Alten Testaments 2 (1871), 248.

[90] Owens, 'The targum', 205, merely concludes that some targum readings agree with the LXX, without elaborating or clarifying whether these are unique between the two versions.

[91] W. McKane, Proverbs: A new approach (London, 1970), 286; Waltke, The Book of Proverbs, chapters 1–15, 122–23.

wards the Septuagint (producing ms Zamora), or the targum was corrected away from the Septuagint towards the Peshitta (the Lagarde version). In either case, we may suggest that the Septuagint might have influenced a targumic reading.[92]

It seems to have been established by scholars that the targum of Proverbs was dependent on the Peshitta, but that Septuagint readings are also present within it. The extent of such readings has not yet been determined, and cannot be without further textual work and editing of the various versions of Proverbs. If influence from the Septuagint could be identified, it might provide an insight into the workings of a rabbinic school. What is striking is the willingness among some scholars to accept that the targumist might have consulted the Peshitta, but equally striking is the opposition from some, who maintain that this could not be possible owing to their own presuppositions of attitudes to texts and relations between communities. If it is conceivable, however, that the targumist consulted a Syriac version in the possession of Christians, it is also conceivable that in Palestine or Syria a targumist with a working knowledge of Greek might have consulted a Septuagint text, which after all might still have been in use in some Jewish communities.

Conclusions

The book of Proverbs was a fruitful source for maxims and popular wisdom, and was naturally cited by Jews in antiquity. The citation and use of the Greek version was gradual and not until the first century AD, as testified by the New Testament, Ps-Phocylides and the Wisdom of Solomon, did it leave its mark on Jewish literature. In Greek-speaking contexts it continued to be known, at least in the form of the maxim from Prov 10:7, into late antiquity. The inscriptions show that not only Aquila's version but also the Septuagint version was used in the western communities.[93]

As scholarship on rabbinic literature has increasingly drawn attention to the Greek context of some rabbinic literature, both in its conceptual framing and its use of the Greek language,[94] there is evidence too from rabbinic

---

[92] The history of Zamora's text is itself complex and we do not know how much he might have modified it himself. Only further investigation will resolve some of these questions.

[93] Continuing textual diversity of the Psalms is suggested by A. Salvesen, 'Psalm 135(136).25 in a Jewish Greek inscription from Nicea', in G. A. Khan (ed.), Semitic studies in honour of Edward Ullendorf (Leiden, 2005), 219.

[94] E.g., B. L. Visotzky, 'Midrash, Christian exegesis, and Hellenistic hermeneutic', in C. Bakhos (ed.), Current trends in the study of Midrash (Leiden, 2006), 111–31.

literature of the use of Greek versions in Jewish communities in late antiquity. Therefore, that some rabbinic interpretations might derive from the Septuagint is as strong a hypothesis as supposing a common tradition of interpretation. We have sought here to suggest some possible examples of internal evidence for rabbinic use of the Septuagint, but much further investigation is needed with this in mind. The targum too, undoubtedly influenced by the Peshitta, deserves further consideration as to how far there are correspondences with the Septuagint and whether these correspondences might derive from actual consultation of the Septuagint.

How might we conceive of the rabbis' working method if the Septuagint lies behind any of their interpretations? We need not necessarily presume that they were always consulting the Septuagint, but that some were familiar with it from hearing it in the synagogue and no doubt from reading it. The accessibility of sources meant that in some locations they might only hear the Septuagint or might have it alone to consult, given that writings were scarce.[95] With familiarity with the Greek text it might naturally be in their minds even when writing or consulting the Hebrew, consequently their interpretations would be informed by it.[96]

---

[95] According to the version of the story in tMeg 2:5 R. Meir was looking for a biblical text to consult to determine the calendar rather than for liturgical use.

[96] D. S. Blondheim, 'Échos du judéo-hellénisme (étude sur l'influence de la Septante et d'Aquila sur les versions néo-grecques des Juifs)', Revue des Études Juives 78 (1924), 1–2, suggested that there were continuing oral Greek traditions passing on the translations. The oral nature of some of these traditions certainly needs to be recognized.

The Cultural History of the Ancient Bible Versions:
The Case of Lamentations

by

Philip S. Alexander

Introduction

The ancient versions of the Hebrew Bible have been subjected to an immense amount of scholarly scrutiny over the centuries, but much of this has been confined to a very narrow range of questions. Interest has been overwhelmingly textual and philological, focused, on the one hand, on their internal textual history, with a view primarily to recovering their original form, and, on the other, on their relationship to the Masoretic Hebrew text, and the light they can throw on its textual history and language, particularly its vocabulary. Less attention has been paid to them as cultural artefacts in their own right, or to the light they may throw on wider historical and religious issues. Why were they made? Why were they made when they were made and not at another time? Why do they have the particular style and character that they have? Who made or sponsored them and for what purpose? What function did they serve within the communities to which they were directed? What might they tell us about their translators'/ sponsors'/ reading communities' attitudes towards Scripture in general and the biblical book which they render in particular? What relationship do they bear to each other? Here I am thinking not just of a narrow textual relationship, such as the derivation of the Vetus Latina or the Coptic versions from the Septuagint, or the use of the Septuagint by the Peshitta translators, but of broader comparative historical questions such as why a Greek version of a given biblical book should have existed before an Aramaic version was felt necessary.

Behind the neglect of these questions I detect assumptions that need to be exposed and challenged. Hidden here is, surely, an implication that rendering any part of the Hebrew Bible into a foreign language was an obvious and natural thing to do. There is nothing remarkable about it, and so the questions I have raised are rather forced and pointless. But this involves projecting back too casually into antiquity the conditions of book

production and consumption of our own world. The fact is that to translate any part of the Hebrew Bible, however small, into a foreign language, involved a substantial outlay of time, effort and resources. It was unlikely to have been lightly undertaken, with no specific purpose in view. Translation is a demanding, unforgiving art which lays cruelly bare the translator's understanding of a text. As any teacher of languages knows, there is no better way to discover how well students know a foreign text than to get them to translate it into their own language. Unlike their modern counterparts who can draw on dictionaries and grammars, as well as, possibly, earlier versions and exegesis of the text, not to mention a well-articulated discipline of translation-theory, ancient translators had few aids, and before they began, and at every step on the way, they had to make very basic decisions. Their choices are historically revealing.

There is also, I would suggest, another assumption that has inhibited us from asking broader cultural and historical questions about the ancient versions of the Hebrew Bible, and it is that translation has been seen, particularly by Jewish scholarship, as playing a marginal and very minor role in the history of Judaism. After all, as everyone knows, since late antiquity Jews have publicly read and privately studied their Bible in Hebrew. Translations are for women and children, and in terms of their exegesis they are heavily dependent on the great rabbinic Bible commentaries. In the hierarchy of literary values that has prevailed within the traditional Jewish world, Targum comes a very distant third to Midrash and Talmud, of use for illuminating from time to time a difficult word in Tanakh, but for little else. Against this attitude, the integrity and independence of the Targum, and of the other ancient versions, needs to be vigorously asserted. Translation, as I have argued elsewhere, is a more widespread and significant phenomenon in the history of Judaism, even in medieval and modern times, than has often been supposed.[1] The integrity and originality of the ancient versions has to be respected, and questions as to their historical and cultural significance must be squarely and rigorously addressed.[2]

I shall try in this short essay to illustrate these points with reference to the ancient versions of Lamentations that were done directly from the He-

---

[1] P. S. Alexander, 'Notes on some targums of the Targum of the Song of Songs', in P. V. M. Flesher (ed.), Targum and Scripture: studies in Aramaic translations and interpretation in memory of Ernest G. Clarke (Leiden, 2002), 159–74.

[2] I am not suggesting that cultural questions have been totally ignored, though in the past they have been posed in a rather unimaginative way. In recent years there are signs that a cultural approach is becoming more common. This is well illustrated by the important project on the Greek Bible in the Graeco-Roman World, directed by Tessa Rajak of the University of Reading, and by her Grinfield Lectures on the Septuagint at Oxford.

brew.[3] The particular character of this biblical book makes it suitable for our present purposes. It is short, so can be studied in some depth. Its Hebrew poses numerous problems which are diagnostic of the knowledge and skills of the translator, and it has an obvious Sitz im Leben within Jewish religious life, namely the commemoration of the fall of Jerusalem and the destruction of the Temple, which came to be associated with the Ninth of Av. Attempting to write the cultural history of the ancient Bible versions is inevitably a speculative enterprise, but I hope to show that, if done in a disciplined and responsible way, it can be instructive, and can clarify not only their origin, setting, and inter-relationship, but wider issues as well.

The Greek Translations

I begin with the Greek versions of Lamentations, since all the evidence indicates that they are the earliest translations we now have.[4] Lamentations in the great Septuagint manuscripts belongs, as Barthélemy demonstrated, to the so-called kaige recension, the chief characteristic of which, beside its tell-tale rendering of Hebrew (ve-)gam by the somewhat unusual Greek conjunction kaige (see Lam 1:8; 2:9; 3:8; 4:3, 15, 21), are its extreme literalness and its fidelity to the Masoretic form of the Hebrew text.[5] The Sep-

---

[3] Including the cultural history of versions not translated directly from the Hebrew (e.g. the daughter versions of the Septuagint such as the Vetus Latina and the Coptic) would have unduly extended the present essay, but the approach is applicable to them as well.

[4] The Peshitta Lamentations may be equally early, but the evidence is very tenuous: see below.

[5] D. Barthélemy, Les devanciers d'Aquila (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 10; Leiden, 1963), 33. Peter J. Gentry lists nine markers of the kaige recension, five of which apply to Lamentations. Of these five only three 'provide strong support that the Greek Lamentations belongs to the kaige tradition.' He cautiously concludes: 'It is clear that some relationship exists between Greek Lamentations and other texts of the kaige tradition, but it is not systematic' (Gentry, 'Lamentations', in A. Pietersma and B. G. Wright [eds], A new English translation of the Septuagint [New York, 2007], 934). Isabelle Assan-Dhôte, on the basis of a fuller study, is more emphatic: 'Le texte de la LXX ancienne, attesté par le Vaticanus et les manuscrits qui lui sont apparentés, révèle des procédés de traduction – littéralisme, systématisation des équivalences lexicales, exégèse analogique – qui permettent d'identifier le traducteur comme appartenant au groupe kaigé-Thédotion.' Her discovery that some of Greek Lamentations lexical choices have a Theodotionic complexion is interesting, but need not further concern us here. See Assan-Dhôte in I. Assan-Dhôte and J. Moatti-Fine, Baruch, Lamentations, Lettre de Jérémie (La Bible d'Alexandrie 25.2; Paris, 2005), 151–59. See also her doctoral dissertation, Université de Paris-Sorbonne, 1996, 'La version grecque des Lamentations de Jérémie', 55–62. I have not seen K. J. Youngblood, 'Translation technique in the Greek Lamentations' (PhD dissertation, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2004). For the Greek text

tuagint of Lamentations could hardly be more different from the Septuagint of Jeremiah, which diverges substantially from the Masoretic text, and, even where it coincides, is generally freer in its translational technique. Though Lamentations is often found in the Greek manuscripts copied alongside Jeremiah, it clearly did not emerge from the same milieu, nor, probably, does it belong to the same time. In the case of some other books of the Hebrew Bible, the kaige recension represents a revision of an Old Greek translation, a major aim of which was to bring it into closer conformity to the Masoretic text-type. In the case of Lamentations, however, careful analysis of the Greek manuscripts fails to disclose any evidence for an older text: the kaige version appears to represent the first translation. This suggests that Lamentations was first done into Greek relatively late. The kaige versions were not produced all at once: we are dealing with a 'school' or group of translators, or a tradition of translation, and for this reason we should not expect absolute consistency of rendering. The earliest attested examples are dated to the late first century BCE,[6] but kaige versions may have gone on being produced down to the second century CE, when their literalism was picked up and carried to extremes by Aquila.

Let us now ask ourselves an obvious historical question. If the Greek version of Lamentations does indeed belong to this period, precisely when within it was it most likely to have been made? The answer surely is, 'After 70'. Lamentations mourns the destruction of the First Temple, and was probably intended from the outset as a collection of poems to be recited to commemorate that event. Interest in the destruction of the First Temple revived strongly after the destruction of the Second, and Lamentations was pressed into service to commemorate that as well. The question of the commemoration of the fall of the First Temple in Second Temple times is complex. Though Zech 8:18–19 calls for the abolition of four fasts associated with the debacle of 587, the Qumran Scrolls prove that the book of Lamentations continued to be copied and read during the Second Temple period (3Q3 [3QLam]; 4Q111 [4QLam]; 5Q6 [5QLam^a]; 5Q57 [5QLam^b]). The fall of the First Temple offered abiding theological lessons about fidelity to the Covenant, and could have still been memorialized by particularly pious Jews, or by priests, or by groups like the Qumran Yahad, which rejected the Second Temple, and may have held that the Temple had never

---

of Lamentations, I have used J. Ziegler, Ieremias Baruch, Threni, Epistula Ieremiae (Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum auctoritate Societas Litterarum Gottingensis editum XV; Göttingen, 1957).

[6] This is Peter Parsons' preferred date for the Nahal Hever Minor Prophets scroll (8QHevXIIgr): see Parsons, 'The scripts and their date', in Emanuel Tov (ed.), The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever (8QHevXIIgr) (DJD 8; Oxford, 1990), 19–26. Barthélemy dated it to the first century CE.

really been restored after the Babylonian exile, and was still, so to speak, 'in ruins' (cf. 4Q179 [4QapocrLamA]; 4Q501 [4QapocrLamB]). But it seems highly unlikely that such commemoration was prominent, or would have meant much to the majority of Jews, either in Palestine or in the Diaspora, who could visit in Jerusalem a flourishing Temple, which, after Herod's refurbishment, counted as one of the architectural wonders of the world. In other words, unless the impetus was purely literary or antiquarian (possibilities which cannot, of course, be ruled out), there was little incentive to translate Lamentations into Greek during Second Temple times.

The fall of the Second Temple, however, undoubtedly came as a massive blow to Jews worldwide, both emotionally and theologically, and we know of a number of writings (2 Baruch, 4 Ezra, Paraleipomena Jeremiou), all composed within seventy years of the event, which attempted in various ways to address the catastrophe.[7] It makes good sense, surely, to place the Greek rendering of Lamentations in the same time-frame. But Greek Lamentations differs from these other texts in a number of ways. Most obviously it is liturgical in content (liturgy was its function, as I suggested,

---

[7] It should be borne in mind that the significance of the destruction of the Temple was highly contentious: Christians argued that it was punishment for the crucifixion, and clear evidence for Israel's final rejection. On Jewish responses to the catastrophe in general, see H. J. Schoeps, Die Tempelzerstörung des Jahres 70 in der jüdischen Religionsgeschichte (Coniectanea Neotestamentica 6; Uppsala, 1942); C. Thoma, 'Die Zerstörung des jerusalemischen Tempels im Jahre 70 n. Chr. Geistig-religiöse Bedeutung für Judentum und Christentum nach den Aussagen jüdischer und christlicher Primärliteratur' (Diss. Phil.; Wien, 1966); J. Neusner, 'Judaism in a time of crisis: four responses to the destruction of the Second Temple', Judaism 21 (1972), 313–27; M. E. Stone, 'Reactions to the destruction of the Second Temple', JSJ 12 (1981), 195–204; M. Goodman, 'Diaspora reactions to the destruction of the Temple', in J. D. G. Dunn (ed.), The parting of the ways A.D. 70 to 135 (Tübingen, 1992), 27–38; K. Schmid, 'Die Zerstörung Jerusalems und seines Tempels as Heilsparadox. Zur Zusammenführung von Geschichtstheologie und Anthropologie im Vierten Esrabuch', in J. Hahn (ed.), Zerstörungen des Jerusalemer Tempels (Tübingen, 2002), 183–206. Specifically on rabbinic responses, see S. J. D. Cohen, 'The destruction: from Scripture to midrash', Prooftexts 2 (1982), 18–39; R. Goldenberg, 'Early rabbinic explanations of the destruction of Jerusalem', JJS 33 (1982), 517–25; M. Kister, 'Legends of the destruction of the Second Temple in Avot De-Rabbi Nathan', Tarbiz 67 (1997–78), 483–529 [Hebrew]; G. Stemberger, 'Reaktionen auf die Tempelzerstörung in der rabbinischen Literatur', in Hahn (ed.), Zerstörungen des Jerusalemer Tempels, 207–36. Specifically on Christian responses, see S. G. F. Brandon, The fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church: a study of the effects of the Jewish overthrow on Christianity (2nd ed.; London, 1968); Lloyd Gaston, No stone on another: studies in the significance of the fall of Jerusalem in the Synoptic Gospels (Leiden, 1970); S. Lücking, 'Die Zerstörung des Tempels 70 n. Chr. als Krisenerfahrung der frühen Christen', in Hahn (ed.), Zerstörungen des Jerusalemer Tempels, 140–65; G. Gelardini, 'Hebrews, an ancient synagogue homily for Tisha Be-Av: its function, its basis, its theological interpretation', in Gelardini (ed.), Hebrews, contemporary methods – new insights (Biblical Interpretation Series 75; Leiden, 2005), 122ff.

right from the outset), so it was probably intended to be used in Greek-speaking synagogues on the day (whenever that might have been) on which they mourned the loss of the two Temples. We have evidence that it was, indeed, so used from the Didascalia Apostolorum 21[8] and the Apostolic Constitutions 5.20. The other texts are more in the nature of theological treatises. Although 2 Baruch, and to a lesser extent Paraleipomena Jeremiou, contain notable qinot, which could have and, indeed, may have been recited liturgically, and there is some evidence that prose-texts such as these were used to commemorate the fall of Jerusalem (see below), they are clearly not intended as liturgy, and it seems unlikely that they would have been publicly read on the fast. They may have been meant as edifying private reading.

Isabelle Assan-Dhôte argues that several translations in the Septuagint Lamentations allude to the Roman destruction of Jerusalem.[9] Her key witness is 2:8, where she detects a subtle 'réactualisation' of the text to make it refer to the events of 70. The Hebrew runs:

'The Lord was determined (hašab) to destroy
   the wall of the daughter of Zion;
he stretched out the line;
   he did not turn back his hand from overwhelming;
he caused rampart and wall (ḥel ve-ḥomah) to lament;
   they languished together.'

The Greek translates:

'The Lord returned (epestrepsen) to destroy
   the wall of the daughter of Zion;
he stretched out the measure;
   he did not turn back his hand from trampling down[10];
the outer wall (proteichisma) mourned;
   the (main) wall (teichos) became weak along with it.'

If Assan-Dhôte is right that epestrepsen tou diaphtheirai in effect means, 'The Lord came back a second time to destroy', then there is a clear reference to the second destruction of Jerusalem – by the Romans (on 70 as a second destruction see Josephus, War 6.435; Mishnah Taᶜanit 4.6; Tosefta

---

[8] Ed. A. Vööbus, The Didascalia Apostolorum in Syriac (CSCO 407; Louvain, 1979), 2: 217 = V 20, 6–8 in the ed. of F. X. Funk, Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum (Paderborn, 1905), 1: 295–6.

[9] Assan-Dhôte, Lamentations, 168–74, 221–22.

[10] Reading katapatēmatos rather than katapontismatos, which makes no sense, though accepted by both Assan-Dhôte ('de ce qui a été englouti dans les flots'!) and Gentry ('from drowning'). The idea that the holy city and its Temple were desecrated by the 'trampling' of the Gentiles is widespread in the literature of the destruction. Katapatēma can actually mean 'profanation': see J. Lust, E. Eynikel and K. Hauspie, A Greek – English lexicon of the Septuagint (Stuttgart, 1996), 2. 241.

Ta^canit 3.9; Babylonian Talmud Ta^canit 29a). She further argues that the careful nuancing of the Hebrew *ḥel ve-ḥomah* into proteichisma and teichos is meant to recall the Roman breeching of two successive walls during the siege of Jerusalem – two separate events spaced out in time (Josephus, War 5.302–31), the first commemorated by the fast of the Seventeenth of Tammuz, the second by the fast of the Ninth of Av. She finds other allusions to the Roman destruction of Jerusalem in 2:7, 2:18 and 3:5. She concludes: 'L'ensemble de ces divergences entre la traduction grecque des Lamentations et le TM constitue comme un faisceau d'arguments permettant de supposer que la traduction des Lamentations en grec a put être exécutée au lendemain de la destruction de Jérusalem par les Romains en 70. Cette réactualisation, dont ni les leçons d'Aquila, ni les fragments de Qumrân existant pour les passages en question ne portent la trace, paraît bien faire référence à la catastrophe récente, présente dans l'esprit du traducteur au point de lui faire proposer aux lecteurs de la version grecque des Lamentations une nouvelle lecture du texte, «lamentations pour la deuxième fois»'.[11] The argument is subtle and falls somewhat short of proof, but the renderings are suggestive and certainly resonate more loudly in a post-70 context.

A second question now presents itself. Who at this time would have been interested in sponsoring such a Greek rendering of Lamentations, and why? That it came from Palestine is highly likely. The kaige recension seems to have been Palestinian in origin, and surely only there, at this period, could the Hebrew scholarship have been found to cope with the linguistic difficulties of such a text. The choice of sponsors is limited: it is between the nascent rabbinic movement and whatever remnant of the priesthood managed to re-assert its leadership in the political confusion following the loss of the Temple. I would suggest that there are good reasons for linking Greek Lamentations specifically with the Rabbinate, and seeing it as part of its growing outreach to the Greek-speaking Diaspora.[12] The kaige recension was not rabbinic in origin: it is attested too early for that to be plausible. But a number of features of it would have made it congenial to the Rabbinate. It presupposes the form of the Hebrew text (the

---

[11] Assan-Dhôte, Lamentations, 173.

[12] I am not trying to revive here Barthélemy's theory linking the kaige recension specifically with the school of Hillel (Les devanciers, 271). I would not be nearly as confident as he was that we can reconstruct a Hillelite, or even an Aqivan, school of exegesis. His whole handling of the rabbinic evidence is deeply problematic, and, besides, his dating of 8QHevXIIgr is probably too late. For an assessment of Barthélemy's ideas, see L. J. Greenspoon, 'Recensions, revisions, rabbinics: D. Barthélemy and early developments in the Greek traditions', Textus 15 (1990), 153–67.

Masoretic) which the Rabbis adopted and promoted.[13] Its literalism would also have been appealing, since implicit in it is the notion of the primacy of the Hebrew, a cardinal doctrine of rabbinic Judaism.

One of the most momentous developments in the history of the early rabbinic movement was its ability to project its authority outside Palestine. Its success among Jews in the Aramaic-speaking east is well recorded in the Babylonian Talmud. Its progress in the Greek-speaking west, however, is much less well documented, but that it scored some notable victories there as well – in the teeth of fierce Christian competition – can be in no doubt, for by the Byzantine era we have clear evidence in the Greek-speaking world of rabbinically-orientated synagogues. How was this 'conversion' of the Greek-speaking Diaspora achieved? We do not know for sure, but it seems probable that two factors played a part. First, the Palestinian Rabbinate promoted Greek versions of the Bible to replace the Septuagint, which was to them now textually and theologically dubious, and had, anyway, been appropriated by the Church,[14] and to present a more rabbinically acceptable understanding of Scripture. But, second, in keeping with their doctrine of the primacy of the Hebrew text (in its Masoretic form), they encouraged the public reading of the Scriptures in Hebrew in the Greek-speaking synagogues.

The latter proposal had profound implications. Greek synagogues that wished to adopt it had to acquire Hebrew scrolls, and to learn how to read them in public. Up to this point in time there is no reason to think that Scripture was read in any language other than Greek in Greek-speaking synagogues. An obvious source from which to acquire both Hebrew scrolls and the skills necessary to read them was the Palestinian Rabbinate, which stood to gain thereby influence and authority in the Diaspora. The version of Aquila, which was unquestionably produced under rabbinic auspices in the early part of the second century CE, was, I have argued elsewhere, constructed precisely to help Greek-speakers learn Hebrew. This explains its extreme literalness.[15] It is possible also that the transliteration column of Origen's Hexapla originated as some sort of teaching-aid designed to

---

[13] See P. S. Alexander, 'Why no textual criticism in rabbinic literature? Remarks on the textual culture of the Rabbis', in G. J. Brooke (ed.), Jewish ways of reading the Bible (Oxford, 2000), 175–91.

[14] For rabbinic attitudes towards the Septuagint, see G. Veltri, Eine Tora für den König Talmai: Untersuchungen zum Überlieferungsverständnis in der jüdisch-hellenistischen und rabbinischen Literatur (Tübingen, 1994). For Christian attitudes, see M. Møller, The first Bible of the church: a plea for the Septuagint (Sheffield, 1996); M. Hengel, The Septuagint as Christian Scripture: its prehistory and the problem of its canon (Edinburgh, 2002).

[15] P. S. Alexander, 'How did the Rabbis learn Hebrew?', in W. Horbury (ed.), Hebrew study from Ezra to Ben Yehuda (Edinburgh, 1999), 71–89.

enable Greek-speaking Jews to read unvocalised Hebrew scrolls correctly. If the Greek Lamentations was indeed produced under rabbinic auspices in Palestine, it would make sense to link it to the Palestinian Rabbinate's broader strategy to extend its authority into the Greek Diaspora. It would then be the first in a series of three versions of this particular biblical book sponsored by the Rabbinate, the second and third being Aquila and Symmachus, fragments of both of which have been preserved.[16] If the rabbinic tradition that Aquila was produced in the school of Rabbi Aqiva is sound (and I can see no good reason to doubt it), then it should probably be dated to the late 120s or early 130s. Symmachus, the rabbinic character of whose version was plausibly argued by Alison Salvesen, is probably to be dated to around 200 and associated with Caesarea Maritima.[17] The Septuagint Lamentations must be earlier than Aquila, and be dated, as I have already suggested, to the late first or early second century CE.

There may have been other reasons why the Palestinian Rabbinate was keen to sponsor a Greek translation of Lamentations. The kaige versions testify to the growing authority of the Masoretic text-type, and the growing acceptance of the concept of the primacy of the Hebrew. They were intended to correct the perceived inadequacies of the Old Greek with regard to its base-text and its over-free style of translation. Implicit in the project was a rejection of the doctrine of the inspiration of the Old Greek, and an early assertion of the principle of the Hebraica veritas, which was to be taken up, with momentous consequences, by Christian scholars, such as

---

[16] See Ziegler's apparatus for the fragments, and further F. Field, Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt (Oxford, 1867–75), 2: 743–61. Origen, Selecta in Threnos (ed. Klostermann, GCS, 3: 236), appears to state that no edition of Aquila and Theodotion for Lamentations exists, only of Symmachus and the Septuagint. This is puzzling, since later in his commentary (at 4:20) he himself quotes from Aquila alongside Symmachus, and a considerable number of other unquestionably Aquilan renderings have been preserved. It is possible Origen's text should be translated "an edition of Aquila and Theodotion of Lamentations is not quoted (pheretai; sc. in the Hexapla), only of Symmachus and the Seventy", though why he should have omitted Aquila, when he had access to his version, would remain a puzzle. No remnants of Theodotion survive, though Assan-Dhôte shows that some of the lexical choices in the Septuagint Lamentations are Theodotionic (see n. 5); the identity of that version, and of its shadowy author, are notoriously elusive.

[17] A. Salvesen, Symmachus in the Pentateuch (Journal of Semitic Studies Monographs 5; Manchester, 1991). See my review of this in JJS 43 (1992), 145–7, where I suggest that Salvesen's very tentative conclusions can be affirmed more confidently. Caesarea Maritima, with its Greek-speaking Jewish population, was probably at the early period the Palestinian Rabbanite's window on the Greek-speaking Diaspora, and, indeed, one wonders whether Symmachus might not have been the meturgeman of the Greek synagogue there. Early rabbinic attitudes towards the town are a kind of barometer of the Rabbinate's attitude towards the Greek Diaspora. For recent work on the later Greek versions, see Salvesen (ed.), Origen's Hexapla and fragments (Tübingen, 1998).

Origen[18] and Jerome. In the case of Lamentations, however, as I have already noted, there was no Old Greek translation to correct. The kaige version was the first attempt at a translation. Was its purpose simply to provide Greek-speaking Jews with appropriate liturgy to commemorate the destructions of Jerusalem and its Temple? That was almost certainly a factor, but other considerations may also have played a part. This possibility comes to the fore when we put the Greek Lamentations in the same time-frame as 2 Baruch, 4 Ezra and Paraleipomena Jeremiou, and read it against these works.

The comparison with 2 Baruch is particularly interesting. 2 Baruch originated in Hebrew in Palestine in the late first or early second century, but was then, probably quite quickly, translated into Greek. The Greek was later rendered into Syriac, and it is this Syriac version which now alone preserves the text in its entirety: the Hebrew has totally disappeared, and only fragments of the Greek survive (P.Oxy. 403 = 12:1–13:2; 13:11–14:3).[19] One interesting feature of 2 Baruch is its lack of allusion to Lamentations. This is strange. It is hardly credible that a learned Jewish author, writing in Palestine about the destruction of the First Temple in the aftermath of the destruction of the Second would not have known Lamentations. But if he did, why does his work not show signs of the influence of this biblical book? The lack of allusion is felt most keenly in the dirges embedded in the work. These are totally different in style, and arguably in theology, from the qinot of Lamentations. The contrast is sharpened by a comparison with the one significant qinah in Paraleipomena Jeremiou (4:6–9, called a thrēnos in the text), which does seem to echo Lamenta-

---

[18] Nicholas de Lange is certainly right to say that Origen did not fully recognise the primacy of the Hebrew over the Greek versions, and continued to uphold the Alexandrian doctrine of the inspiration of the Septuagint (Origen and the Jews: studies in Jewish-Christian relations in third-century Palestine [Cambridge, 1976], 50–51), but the whole enterprise of the Hexapla is surely predicated on the assumption that the extant texts of the Septuagint are corrupt and have to be corrected from the Hebrew. To the extent that Origen held the view that the Hebrew text in his day was more reliable than the Greek, and the latter needed to be revised in the light of the former, he inaugurated a process which ended in Jerome abandoning the Septuagint as unredeemable and going back to the Hebrew original.

[19] R. H. Charles, The Apocalypse of Baruch translated from the Syriac (London, 1896); P.-M. Bogaert, Apocalypse de Baruch (2 vols, Sources Chrétiennes; Paris, 1969); F. Zimmermann, 'Textual observations on the Apocalypse of Baruch', JTS 40 (1939), 151–6; Zimmermann, 'Translation and mistranslation in the Apocalypse of Baruch', in M. Ben-Horin et al. (eds), Studies and essays in honour of Avraham A. Neuman (Leiden, 1962), 580–7. R. Nir's attempt to argue that 2 Baruch is Christian (The destruction of Jerusalem and the idea of redemption in the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch [Atlanta, 2003]) fails to persuade. See the review by L. I. Lied in JSS 50/2 (2005), 403–5, for some telling criticisms.

tions.[20] It has long been recognized that the author of this work borrowed from 2 Baruch, but I would argue that, crucially, he borrowed from Lamentations as well. The absence of allusion to Lamentations in the threnody of 2 Baruch contrasts even more strikingly with the later synagogue piyyutim for the Ninth of Av, which find it difficult to break free from the poetic spell of the biblical book.

The most instructive of the 2 Baruch qinot for our present purposes, found at 10:6–19, opens, 'Happy is the man who was never born,/ Or the child who died at birth./ But woe to us who are alive,/ For we have seen the sorrows of Zion,/ And the fate of Jerusalem.' The poet continues by calling on the 'sirens of the sea', the 'Liliths of the desert', and 'the demons and jackals of the forests' to lament with him. The lament ends by invoking divine vengeance on Babylon for what she has done to Zion, but its core is a long and elaborate call on animate and inanimate nature to cease functioning, now that the Temple has been destroyed. This may be more than a literary trope. Behind it may lie the idea that the Temple is the omphalos or axis of the world, the guarantor of cosmic order. Once it has gone the world must inevitably revert to primaeval chaos. What I miss here is any sense of sin and repentance, which are themes of Lamentations. Apart from a fleeting reference to the false stewardship of the priests, there is no acknowledgement that Israel may have brought the disaster on herself by violating the terms of the Covenant. The latter was the Rabbis' view of the catastrophe, and they found it clearly expressed in Lamentations. Might the Rabbinate have sponsored the Greek version of Lamentations to try and counter what it saw as inadequate theologies of catastrophe being promoted by apocalyptic works such as 2 Baruch?

There is a little piece of evidence that gives credence this hypothesis. It is the curious intertextuality between the Qinah of 2 Bar 10:6–19 and the views of certain ascetics criticized in Tosefta Sotah 15:8–15. The Tosefta passage contains an important discussion of how in the Rabbis' opinion the destruction of the Temple should be mourned. The burden of its message is that excessive mourning should be avoided: not to mourn at all is impossible, but mourning too much is equally wrong. Two of the protagonists of the rabbinic view are Rabbis Ishmael and Joshua, second generation Tannaim who flourished in the early second century, at the very time when 2 Baruch was composed. Their opponents are described as 'ascetics' (perušim): they were probably members of the movement known elsewhere as 'Mourners for Zion' ('Avelei Tziyyon), about whom I will have more to say below. Rabbi Ishmael accuses the ascetics of advocating such extremes of abstinence that they risk destroying the world, and bringing life to an end.

---

[20] See J. Herzer, 4 Baruch (Paraleipomena Jeremiou), translated with an introduction and notes (Atlanta, 2005), 76–8, and passim.

He exclaims: 'Since you are uprooting the Torah from our midst, let us make a decree that the world should be desolate – that no one should marry a wife and produce children, or have a week of celebration for his son, until the seed of Abraham die out of its own accord!'[21] But this is precisely what 2 Baruch, on the face of it, advocates: 'You, heavens, withhold your dew,/ And do not open the storehouses of rain./ You, sun, withhold the radiance of your rays,/ And you, moon, hide the brightness of your light;/ For why should any light be seen,/ When the light of Zion is darkened?/ You, bridegrooms, do not enter the bridal chamber,/ And let not the virgins crown themselves with garlands./ You, married women, pray not for children,/ For the barren shall greatly rejoice,/ Those without sons shall be glad,/ But those who have sons shall be in anguish./ For why should they bear children in pain,/ Only to bury them with tears?/ Or why, again, should men have sons,/ Or why should their offspring any longer be given a name,/ When this mother [Zion] is desolate,/ And her sons are led away as captives?' (10:11–16). It is probably a mistake to dismiss this as mere rhetoric: there may well have been Mourners for Zion who advocated abstention from procreation in the wake of the fall of the Temple.

Rabbi Joshua, like Rabbi Ishmael, also employs essentially a reductio ad absurdum approach, by challenging the ascetics with the unacceptable implications of their actions. He asks them why they abstain from meat and wine. They reply: 'Shall we eat meat, when every day a continual burnt offering [of meat] was offered on the altar, and now is no more? … Shall we drink wine, when every day wine was poured out as a drink offering on the altar, and now is no more?' Well, then, he retorts, you should also abstain from drinking water and eating bread, figs and grapes, since these were also involved in the Temple cult! Compare this with 2 Bar 10:9–10, 'You farmers, sow not again./ You, earth, why do you yield your crops at harvest?/ Keep to yourself your pleasant produce./ And you, vine, why do you still give your wine?/ For it will never again be offered in Zion,/ Nor will your firstfruits again be offered.' 2 Baruch's exhortation to cease talking of human beauty, and its call on the virgins to burn their finery, finds an echo at Tosefta Sotah 15:14, which allows women to wear their finery, provided they leave out some small item 'as a memorial to Jerusalem'. The echoes are even stronger in Tosefta Sotah 15:8–10, where a series of 'decrees' is quoted forbidding brides to wear crowns, or ride in palanquins or use perfumes, such as foliatum. Who issued these 'decrees' is unclear. The

---

[21] I have used here J. Neusner's translation (The Tosefta: translated from the Hebrew with a new introduction [Peabody, Mass., 2002], 1: 893), but the Hebrew is problematic. Crucially the Erfurt ms reads 'let us make a decree that Israel should be desolate.' See the discussion of the textual problems in S. Lieberman, Tosefta Kifshutah: 8. Seder Nashim (New York, 1972), 772–4.

impression given is that it was not the Rabbinate, since the Rabbinate seems bent on moderating them as far as it can. The prohibition of foliatum is, indeed, attributed to Rabbi Judah ben Bava, who was, like Ishmael and Joshua, a second generation Tanna, but even this ruling (which was hardly in itself harsh) was rejected by the Sages. The possibility that these 'decrees' emanated from the priesthood, which may have been represented strongly in the ranks of the Mourners for Zion, should not be discounted. Indeed, there is much to be said for seeing 2 Baruch as of priestly origin.[22]

The Peshitta

The Syriac version of Lamentations was made direct from the Hebrew, but its translator's knowledge of the original language was barely adequate to cope with the problems he faced.[23] He seems to be guessing quite a lot, though his guesses are usually so intelligent and so appropriate to the context that the ordinary reader would have gained the impression that he was dealing with a clear and accurate translation. His version is certainly far more intelligible, though strictly speaking less accurate, than the Septuagint. Curiously, there are questions about his grasp not only of Hebrew, but of Syriac as well. His vocabulary seems impoverished, and he is content to render different synonymous Hebrew words, even in the same verse, by the

---

[22] My analysis of the Septuagint of Lamentations is based on the original form of the text as attested in Vaticanus, Sinaiticus, a number of minuscules, the Vetus Latina and certain other text-witnesses. It is clear, however, that this text, in Lamentations as in other Biblical books, was subjected to a Lucianic or Antiochian revision. The origins and function of this revision, which is attested in the quotations in Theodoret's commentary on Lamentations, need not detain us here. Suffice to say that it attests continuing interest in this biblical book. Assan-Dhôte claims that the Lucianic recension in Lamentations 'présente de nombreux accords d'interprétation avec le Targum des Lamentations, les deux textes s'appuyant manifestement sur les traditions orales exégétiques communes du texte biblique. … Cette recension atteste vraisemblablement un texte employé dans la liturgie juive: elle rejoint souvent le Targum dans les considérations polémiques et théologiques' (Assan-Dhôte, Lamentations, 149; further I. Assan-Dhôte, 'Le texte antiochien du livre des Lamentations: tradition écrite, traditions orales', in G. Dorival and O. Munnich (eds), Selon les Septante: trente études sur la Bible grecque des Septante: en hommage à Marguerite Harl (Paris, 1995), 187–206. With regard to the alleged parallels with the Targum it should be borne in mind that the Antiochian revision of Lamentations was extant already in the early fifth century, and almost certainly considerably earlier. The Targum cannot be dated that early (see below).

[23] I have used the Syriac text printed in B. Albrektson, Studies in the text and theology of the Book of Lamentations (Lund, 1963). Albrektson's analysis of Peshitta Lamentations and its relationship to the other ancient versions is the fullest and most thorough done to date.

same Syriac word.[24] As a result his version is stylistically rather poor, which would have reduced its liturgical effectiveness, if it was ever so used.

The relationship of the Peshitta to the other ancient versions helps to contextualize it. First, there is no evidence that its translator consulted the Septuagint. There are places where the Septuagint has correctly understood a hapax legomenon, or a difficult piece of Hebrew, but the Peshitta has not. If the Peshitta translator had known the Septuagint of this book, its influence would surely have been more apparent, as it is in the Peshitta of some other books of the Hebrew Bible.[25] Nor did he know the Targum.[26] There is probably, as we shall see, a very simple explanation for this: the Targum was not composed till centuries later. But there may be more to it than meets the eye. The lack of correlation between the two versions cuts both ways: not only does the Peshitta not know the Targum, but the Targum does not know the Peshitta. The Targumist went to the trouble of making an Aramaic version of Lamentations, without knowing – or if he knew – without caring, that an Aramaic version already existed, which could have saved him some trouble.[27]

All this makes good sense if we accept Michael Weitzman's theory that the Peshitta descends from a Jewish version of the Hebrew Bible made in Edessa around 200 CE. The translator and his community were non-

---

[24] Albrektson, Studies, 211.

[25] Albrektson, Studies, 212.

[26] There is no basis for Albrektson's suggestion (Studies, 212) that: 'The question of P[eshitta]'s relation to T[argum Lamentations] cannot be put so simply or in the same manner as the question of P's possible dependence on LXX, as T is later than P. The problem must rather be whether P could have been influenced by an earlier stage of a targumic tradition, which later reached its full development in T. Certain peculiarities in P might possibly indicate this. Its clearly marked effort to explain and elucidate and its tendency to establish the interpretation through the addition of particles could point towards a targum as the background of the translation. No definite conclusions can however be drawn from the material in Lam. There are no striking agreements between P and T, which usually reflects MT and indeed often contains a literal translation of it.' The simple fact is that there is not a shred of evidence that Peshitta Lamentations points to the existence of an Ur-Targum Lamentations, or, conversely, that Targum Lamentations knew Peshitta Lamentations.

[27] We have one clear case, viz. Proverbs, where the Targum is based on the Peshitta. See the discussion in J. F. Healey, The Targum of Proverbs (The Aramaic Bible 15; Edinburgh, 1991), 7–10. Healey expresses difficulty in believing that 'the Jewish Targumist used a Christian Syriac text', and pronounces 'slightly bizarre' the notion that 'Tg is a radical reworking of S or a similar Christian Syriac text in the light of the MT'. But there is a growing consensus that the Christian and Jewish communities interacted throughout late antiquity more closely than has often been supposed, and the picture changes dramatically if Syriac Proverbs was in origin actually a Jewish version which originated in a non-rabbinic milieu. See the next note.

rabbinic, and this basically explains the significant lack of correlation between his translation and rabbinic tradition. This community, or a sizable
part of it, converted to Christianity and introduced its translation of the Old
Testament to the Syriac-speaking Church.[28] It would certainly make sense
to see Peshitta Lamentations specifically as the work of a Jewish translator, aimed at enriching the Jewish community's liturgy for commemorating
the fall of Jerusalem. Indeed, one wonders whether Syriac Lamentations
might not be particularly early: the closer one brings it to 70 the more
sense such a translation would make. The reason for its lack of correlation
with the Greek may, then, not be that the Greek was produced in rabbinic
circles with which the Edessan Syriac translator had little or no contact,
but that the Peshitta was produced even before the Greek, or so close to it
in time that the possibility of the Greek influencing it was greatly reduced.

There is a tantalising piece of evidence that may suggest that Syriac-
speaking synagogues commemorated the fall of Jerusalem. Pierre Bogaert
has drawn attention to the curious fact that the Ambrosian ms B.21 Inf.
contains a small collection of texts in Syriac (2 Baruch, 4 Ezra and
Josephus, War 6) which have all to do with the fall of Jerusalem, and he
suggests that this collection was assembled with a view to the commemoration of that event. His preference is for a Jewish-Christian origin, but
might it not have been produced, like the original Syriac version of the Tanakh, in Edessa some time in the second century by the Jewish community,
from whom it then passed over into the Syriac Church?[29] This would point
to that community's interest in the destruction, and increase the likelihood
that it also made a version of Lamentations.

---

[28] M. P. Weitzman, The Syriac version of the Old Testament: an introduction (Cambridge, 1999), 206–62; Weitzman, From Judaism to Christianity: studies in the Hebrew
and Syriac Bibles, ed. A. Rapoport-Albert and G. Greenberg (Journal of Semitic Studies
Supplements 8; Oxford, 1999), 3–30 and passim. Weitzman was not the first to make this
proposal. A similar idea was mooted by F. C. Burkitt in his famous St. Margaret's Lectures for 1904: see his Early Eastern Christianity (reprint, Piscataway, NJ, 2004), 70–6.

[29] Bogaert, Apocalypse de Baruch, 1: 161–2. Bogaert expresses himself with characteristic caution: 'L'hypothèse la plus vraisemblable peut se formuler ainsi. Une communauté juive, ou plus probable judéo-chrétienne perpétuant un usage juif, a utilisée ces trois
écrits avant la conquête de l'Islam. Et elle a dû le faire en référence à la prise de Jérusalem. Il se peut que, plus tard, une communauté chrétienne – et non plus judéo-chrétienne
– ait héritée de cet usage.' Ephrem wrote a short set of scholia on Lamentations which
suggests that the book was of some interest in the Syriac Church. See T. J. Lamy, Sancti
Ephraem Syri Hymni et Sermones (Malines, 1886), 2: 215–28.

The Vulgate

Chronologically the next version to claim our attention is Jerome's Latin, which he produced in Bethlehem sometime between 390 and 406 as part of his great revision of the Vetus Latina.[30] Though he clearly translated Lamentations direct from the Hebrew, he also kept an eye on the Septuagint, the influence of which can be detected at various points. Some Vulgate manuscripts even include a Latin rendering of the Septuagint preface to the book, and the Septuagint played an important role in his christological rendering of 4:20 (on which more below). One of the most intriguing features of this Latin version is surely its lack of correlation with the Targum. Jerome himself tells us that he had Jewish teachers[31] and their assistance would have been invaluable in Lamentations, the Hebrew of which poses, as I have already noted, many linguistic problems. If a Targum of the book was extant, it is hard to see why they would not have known it. We need not suppose that Jerome himself would have had access directly to a written copy of the Targum, which in his day would have circulated primarily in oral form, or, if he did possess a copy, that his Aramaic would have been good enough to make much use of it. However, given the Targum's role in Jewish liturgy and education,[32] the Jewish learning of his Jewish informants would have had to have been very low indeed for them not to have known it.

It is possible to detect the influence of Jewish exegesis on some of Jerome's renderings, but the correlation often seems to be with the Midrash rather than the Targum. So his striking translation of the Hebrew mišbatteha by sabbata at 1:7 (viderunt eam hostes et deriserunt sabbata eius) involves a kind of 'al tiqrei attested in the Midrash (Lamentations Rabba 1:7 §34). The Targum, however, and indeed the Septuagint, are

---

[30] For the text I have used R. Weber, Biblia Sacra iuxta Vulgatam Versionem (4th ed. prepared by Roger Gryson; Stuttgart, 1994).

[31] See, e.g., Epistula 84.3.2, and the Prologues to Job and Tobit; further, G. Bardy, 'Saint Jérôme et ses maîtres hébreux', RB 46 (1934), 145–64; H. Marti, Übersetzer der Augustin-Zeit (Studia et Testimonia Antiqua 14; München, 1974), 31–3. It is astonishing how few scholars have recognized that the Targum would have been a godsend to Jerome, so that it makes sense to explore his indebtedness to Jewish exegesis in his day specifically in terms of the correlations between the Vulgate and the Targum. A. Kamesar, Jerome, Greek scholarship, and the Hebrew Bible: a study of the Quaestiones in Genesim (Oxford, 1993), 176–91, barely mentions the Targum, but it features regularly in C. T. R. Hayward's notes in his Jerome's Hebrew Questions on Genesis (Oxford, 1995).

[32] On the role of the Targum in Jewish primary education, see P. S. Alexander, 'How did the Rabbis learn Hebrew?', in W. Horbury (ed.), Hebrew study from Ezra to Ben Yehuda (Edinburgh, 1999), 71–89.

quite different. So too his rendering of the problematic ya^{c}ib at 2:1 by ob-
texit caligine suggests he understood the verb here as a denominative of
^{c}ab, 'cloud', again an interpretation attested in the Midrash (Lamentations
Rabba 2:1 §1). The Septuagint's egnoph$\bar{o}$sen (a neologism?) may reflect
the same interpretation, but the Targum is completely different, and puz-
zlingly takes the verb to mean 'loathe, abominate'.[33] The lack of correla-
tion between the Vulgate and the Targum, then, may be more significant
than at first sight we might think. It hints that still in Jerome's day no Tar-
gum of the book of Lamentations was extant that could have offered a
convenient summary of the Jewish understanding of how to translate the
book.

There is one other feature of Jerome's Latin version which may help to
contextualize it culturally. It is the fact that it is notably stylish. Indeed it is
by far the most stylish of all the ancient versions. Jerome was conscious of
the need to achieve euph$\bar{o}$nia, proprietas et elegantia in the target lan-
guage (without, of course, sacrificing accuracy), particularly when one is
translating a text which may have a public use, such as the Psalms (see
Epistula 106.54.55), but he seems to have taken particular pains over Lam-
entations, as he himself notes in his Prologue to Jeremiah (et civitatis suae
ruinas quadruplici planxit [Hieremias] alphabeto, quod nos mensurae
metri versibusque reddidimus). It functions well liturgically – the number
of fine musical settings it has inspired is remarkable – and one wonders if
Jerome may have had a liturgical role for it in mind from the start.

The liturgical use of Lamentations 5 (the so-called Oratio Jeremiae)
was widespread within the Church both in the east and the west, and effec-
tively the whole book was incorporated in the west into the Holy Week
rituals, as a proper reading for Tenebrae on Maundy Thursday, Good Fri-
day and Holy Saturday. It is very hard to say how far back this practice of
linking Lamentations liturgically to Passion Week goes. Some would say
no earlier than the seventh century, when the Gallican rite, with which his-
torically it is most closely associated, seems to have crystallized.[34] How-
ever, the exegetical connection between the Passion and Lamentations is
much older than that. It was effected through a particular understanding of
the Septuagint translation of 4:20, which in Christian copies ran: 'The
spirit of our face, Christ the Lord, was caught in their destructions/ corrup-

---

[33] It would probably have been within the parameters of Hebrew grammar as under-
stood by our Targumist for him to have taken √^{c}wb here as a by-form of √t^{c}b, on the
grounds that both roots share two radicals. The qal sense of both roots would be 'to be
loathsome', and the causative (hif./pi.), 'to regard as loathsome, abhor' (BDB 1073b). It
should be borne in mind that the fundamental concept of the tri-radical root was not un-
derstood by Hebrew grammarians till the middle ages.

[34] So, e.g., E. A. Matter, 'The Lamentations Commentaries of Hrabanus Maurus and
Paschasius Radbertus', Traditio 38 (1982), 138–9.

tions, of whom we said, "In his shade we will live among the nations".'[35] It was inevitable that Christians should see here a reference to the atoning death of Christ, and Jerome, ignoring the Hebrew, and presumably the advice of his Jewish teachers, rendered accordingly: Spiritus oris nostri Christus Dominus captus est in peccatis nostris, cui diximus: In umbra tua vivemus in gentibus.

The Christian reading of Lamentations is complex. One approach was to see the book as foreshadowing the sufferings of Christ. Verses such as 1:12, 'Is it nothing to you, all you who pass by? Behold and see if there is any sorrow like my sorrow, which was brought upon me, which the Lord inflicted on the day of his fierce anger', inevitably resonate in a certain way in the Christian mind. And many a Christian preacher has heard the voice of Christ in the cries of the suffering geber of chapter 3. But these seem to be relatively late homiletic developments. The earliest approach was to link the book to the fall of the Second Temple as well as to the first (a move common also in Jewish exegesis), and to see it as a terrible witness to the sufferings that befell Israel for spurning her Messiah. The idea that the destruction of the Second Temple was punishment for the Jews' rejection of Jesus is very old, as old as Matt 23:37–39 and Luke 13:31–35, in which, surely, distant echoes of the language of Lamentations can be heard. This made Lamentations an appropriate Christian reading for Holy Week. Not only was its sombre tone highly suitable to the occasion, but it held up the Jews as a solemn warning to all those who would reject the Crucified.[36] Jerome's translation certainly came to be used liturgically, and it served this purpose well, but it is not impossible that he crafted it as he did with some liturgical purpose in mind. Whatever his intention, he has certainly aggressively appropriated the book for Christian ends.

---

[35] Rahlfs suggests that the Greek text originally had christos kuriou, which is clearly what the Hebrew mešiah YHWH means, but that kuriou was written in abbreviated form as ku, which could stand for either kurios or kuriou (A. Rahlfs, Septuaginta [6th ed.; Stuttgart, nd], 2: 764). Christian scribes found the urge to adopt the first possibility irresistible. Lam 4:20 was an important testimonium in the Church from as early as the second century. See J. Daniélou, 'Christos Kurios, une texte des Lamentations dans le recueil des Testimonia', Revue des Sciences Religieuses 39 (1951), 338–52; Daniélou, Études d'exégèse judéo-chrétienne (Paris, 1966), 76–95; O. Skarsaune, The proof from prophecy: a study in Justin Martyr's proof-text tradition – text-type, provenance, theological profile (Leiden, 1987), 162, 451.

[36] And, of course, it prepared the ground for the Reproaches (Improperia) hurled at the Jews on Good Friday.

The Targum

I have analysed the Targum of Lamentations at length elsewhere, and will confine myself here to making a few points relevant to the present discussion.[37] From its content, language and relationship to Midrash, it is very probable that the Targum was composed in the Galilee in the late fifth or early sixth century CE. Unlike many other Targums it was rabbinic in origin. That is to say, whoever composed it belonged to the rabbinic movement, and was concerned to promote through it specifically rabbinic values (note, for example, its reference to the importance of the study of the Mishnah at 2:19[38]). It may well have been issued under rabbinic auspices as a Targum to be publicly recited with the public reading of Lamentations in Hebrew on the Ninth of Av. This is certainly the role envisaged for it in Soferim 18:4, though the practice of publicly reading Lamentations with a Targum, if it was ever widespread, did not survive into the middle ages, let alone into more recent times.

Seen in the context of our tradition-history of the versions, Targum Lamentations raises some obvious questions. Why was it produced so late? If we are right, the Palestinian Rabbinate by around 200 CE had sponsored no fewer than three Greek versions of Lamentations. Why did it wait almost three hundred years before sponsoring an Aramaic Targum of the same book? One possible explanation immediately comes to mind. The situation of the Greek-speaking and the Aramaic-speaking synagogues was not the same, at least initially. The former read Scripture in Greek, the latter in Hebrew. If there was no Greek version of Lamentations then the book would simply not be read, but if there was no Aramaic version Lamentations would still have been read – in Hebrew. Barthélemy, followed by Le Déaut, misunderstood the situation. He assumed that the Greek version was intended from the outset as a sort of Greek Targum, and this suggested

---

[37] P. S. Alexander, The Targum of Lamentations: translated, with a critical introduction, apparatus, and notes (The Aramaic Bible 17B; Collegeville, Minnesota, 2008). The Yemenite recension of Targum Lamentations has been edited by A. van der Heide, The Yemenite tradition of the Targum of Lamentations: critical text and analysis of the variant readings (Leiden, 1981), and the western recension by J. José Alarcón Sainz, 'Edición Critica del Targum de Lamentationes segun la Tradución Textual Occidental' (Doctoral Thesis; Universidad Complutense de Madrid, 1991; Collección Tesis Doctorales, Nº 89/91, Editorial de la Universidad Complutense de Madrid: Madrid, 1991).

[38] 'Arise, Congregation of Israel, that dwells in exile, engage in [the study of] the Mishnah in the night (for the Shekhinah of the Lord dwells before you), and the words of the Torah at the beginning of the morning watch. Shed like water the pride of your heart, and turn in repentance, and pray in the synagogue before the face of the Lord. Raise to him your hands in prayer, for the life of your young men who are parched by hunger at the head of every market-place.'

to him that the Hebrew was already being read in the Aramaic-speaking synagogues of Palestine with Targum.[39] But this is questionable on two counts: first, there is no evidence that Greek synagogues were reading the Bible in Hebrew at this early date, and second, there is no way our current Targum of Lamentations can be as early as the second century. The possibility cannot be ruled out that there may have been an old Palestinian Targum that predated our current Targum Lamentations. Tantalisingly we find embedded at a few places in the Midrashim Aramaic renderings of words and phrases from Lamentations which do not agree with our current Targum.[40] I do not think, however, that these can be taken as evidence of an older Targum, the absence of which is corroborated, as we saw, by the lack of correlation between the Peshitta and the Vulgate, on the one hand, and the Targum, on the other. It is clear from the Midrash that there was a lively tradition of popular preaching in Aramaic about the fall of Jerusalem and the destruction of the Temple. I suspect that the Aramaic fragments of Lamentations in the Midrash are ad hoc translations by the darshanim, presumably done before the present Targum was in circulation.

The Greek-speaking synagogues had Lamentations in Greek, and the Aramaic-speaking synagogues had it in Hebrew: both, then, had Lamentations. But why did the need suddenly arise to accompany the Hebrew Lamentations with a rabbinic Targum? The answer probably lies in the fact that the question of the destruction and restoration of the Temple had become once again a contested issue, to the extent that the Rabbinate felt it had to take a stand and publish its views. This it did by imposing its own reading on the book of Lamentations through a Targum. There is an intriguing symmetry here. I suggested earlier that the Septuagint Lamentations may have been sponsored by the Palestinian Rabbinate, at least in part, to counter the theology of catastrophe propounded by apocalyptic works such as 2 Baruch. Similar considerations may have called into being the Aramaic Targum almost 400 years later. The fifth century marks the beginning of the apocalyptic revival in Judaism. Jews, and indeed Christians and Pagans as well, in the Near East, became once more engrossed in the end of the world. For Jews this was inevitably bound up with messianism, and the restoration of the Temple, longing for which would have been

---

[39] Barthélemy, Les devanciers, 159; R. Le Déaut, Introduction à la littérature targumique (Première partie; Rome, 1966), 143.

[40] E.g. in Lamentations Rabba 2:8 §12, ḥel ve-ḥomah is rendered šura ubar šura, but the Targum has maqqefana vešura. See above on the Septuagint translation of this phrase. Lamentations Rabba 3:65 §9 gives two Aramaic renderings of the Hebrew meginnat leb, which it attributes to two different teachers, viz., tebirut libba and ᶜazizut libba. The Targum agrees with the former. Mediaeval commentators, such a the Leqaḥ Tob, from time to time give their own, "off-the-cuff", Aramaic renderings, which do not agree with the Targum.

acute at the time when its destruction was mourned. But ever since the de-
bacle of Bar Kokhba the Palestinian Rabbinate had been wary of political
messianism, and had done its utmost to dampen and side-line messianic
expectation within the communities where it held sway. In the fifth cen-
tury, however, possibly because popular pressure could no longer be re-
sisted, it seems to have decided to change tack. It finally embraced messi-
anism, but gave it a distinctively rabbinic stamp.[41] The Targum of Lamen-
tations, with its rabbinic reading of the catastrophies of 587 and 70, can be
seen as part of this broader trend.

The growing rabbinic interest in the fall of Jerusalem is reflected also in
Lamentations Rabba, which belongs to roughly the same period as the Tar-
gum. Lamentations Rabba is a rich work, which engages with the biblical
book at a profound level. It is fundamentally a Beit Midrash text, but as its
Proems with their abundant aggadot show, as well as its sections in Gali-
lean Aramaic, it drew heavily on popular preaching associated with the
Ninth of Av. Its relationship to the Targum is complex. There are many
overlaps, but it would be simplistic to see the Targum as having drawn di-
rectly on the Midrash, or vice versa. Even in the overlaps, each work usu-
ally nuances the tradition in subtle but significant ways. There can be little
doubt, however, that both emanate from a similar rabbinic milieu at
roughly the same time, and are concerned to expound a distinctively rab-
binic doctrine of catastrophe.[42]

Paul Mandel has argued that the so-called 'Sefardi' text of Lamenta-
tions Rabba goes back to a recension of the work produced in Babylonia in
the early Islamic era.[43] I have argued that a significant recension of Tar-
gum Lamentations, now preserved in the Yemenite manuscripts, was also

---

[41] See P. S. Alexander, 'The Rabbis and Messianism', in M. Bockmuehl and J. Carle-
ton-Paget (eds), Redemption and resistance: the Messianic hopes of Jews and Christians
in antiquity (London, 2007), 227–44.

[42] The Midrash is somewhat earlier in date. It does not cite any authorities later than
the late fourth century CE, and originated probably in the early fifth. The Targum dates,
as I noted earlier, from the late fifth or early sixth century.

[43] P. D. Mandel, 'Midrash Lamentations Rabbati: prolegomenon, and a critical edition
to the Third Parasha' (2 vols; PhD dissertation, Hebrew University Jerusalem, 1997)
[Hebrew]. See the summary of this in Mandel, 'Between Byzantium and Islam: the
transmission of a Jewish book in the Byzantine and Early Islamic periods', in Y. Elman
and I. Gershoni (eds), Transmitting Jewish traditions: orality, textuality, and cultural
diffusion (New Haven and London, 2000), 74–106. The Sefardi recension, which actually
circulated in north Africa and in the Yemen (in the abbreviated form found in Pirqei
Tišᶜah be'Av), as well as in Spain, was first identified by A. Marx in a review of Buber's
Midrasch Echah Rabbati in Orientalische Literaturzeitung 5/7 (1902), 293–6. He con-
trasted it with the "Ashkenazi" recension, which circulated in Germany, northern France,
Italy and Provence.

produced in Babylonia at the same period.[44] The characteristics of this Babylonian recension of the Targum are: (1) An extensive recasting of the original Galilean Aramaic into the more standard Aramaic of the Onqelos-Jonathan Targum. The Aramaic is not, indeed, the local Babylonian Jewish Aramaic of the Babylonian Talmud, but this is easily explained. Targums Onqelos and Jonathan, though originating in Palestine, were well known in Babylonia, and became the 'official' Aramaic versions there. Though it was not their own vernacular, this dialect of Aramaic was well understood by the Babylonians: it defined the sort of Aramaic they expected to find in a Targum.[45] (2) The expansions of the original western Targum were shortened to bring the text into closer conformity with the original Hebrew, though care was taken not to alter the rabbinic emphasis of the western text (note how the crucial reference to the Mishnah at 2:19, though embedded in an expansion, is retained). It is tempting to see the Babylonian recensions of the Targum and of the Midrash on Lamentations as linked in some way. Both required a considerable investment of effort, and were presumably not lightly undertaken. This suggests that in the Babylonian communities interest in the fall of Jerusalem was still high, and the understanding of that event still, in some way, contentious.

Sa⁽adya

The final version of Lamentations translated directly from the Hebrew which we will consider is Saadya's.[46] This keeps close to the original and lacks the aggadic expansions of the Targum. However, there are hints that

---

[44] Alexander, Targum Lamentations, Introduction 1 and 2.

[45] The literary normativeness of this dialect is shown by its surprising use in the Aramaic incantation bowls. This usage does not mean that the dialect was a current vernacular in Babylonia when the bowls were written, or even that it originated there, but rather that, through the circulation of western Targums in Babylonia, and their acceptance as authoritative, this form of Aramaic had achieved high, if not sacred, status. Targum Onqelos is occasionally quoted in the incantation bowls, which proves that the bowl-writers knew it. See C. Müller-Kessler, 'The earliest evidence for Targum Onqelos from Babylonia and the question of its dialect and origin', Journal for the Aramaic Bible 3 (2001), 181–98.

[46] I have used the text of Sa⁽adya conveniently printed in Y. Qafiḥ, Ḥamesh Megillot: Shir ha-Shirim, Rut, Qohelet, Ester, ⁽im peirušim ⁽attiqim (Jerusalem, 1962), 331–53. I have also consulted the Arabic versions of Lamentations in the Yemenite manuscripts British Library, Or 1476 and Or. 2375. The textual transmission of the so-called Sa⁽adya version of the Tanakh is seriously under-researched, and so doubts always arise whether the version attributed to him in any given biblical book is actually his. I have assumed in the case of Lamentations that the attribution is correct, because I can see no good reason to question it.

Sa͑adya knew the Targum (his contemporizing rendering of the Hebrew 'Daughter of Zion' by 'Congregation of Zion' probably follows it), and indeed his whole enterprise of translating the Bible into Arabic, which was now, presumably, the vernacular of most Jews, can be seen as an exercise in renewing the Targum. If this is the case, then it helps us to date the Babylonian recension of Targum Lamentations. Sa͑adya's Tafsir was composed in the first half of the tenth century. The Babylonian recension of the Targum (and, indeed, of Lamentations Rabba, which, I suggested, is linked to it) should be dated somewhat earlier – probably to the eighth or seventh century.

I have argued in this essay for the cardinal principle that interest in a biblical book such as Lamentations should not be seen as casual. The expenditure of time and effort needed to translate it and comment on it shows that it was deemed relevant to religious life, and may hint that its interpretation was contested. Sa͑adya suggests an historical context for this continuing rabbinic interest in Lamentations, namely, the fierce struggle which rabbinic Judaism was waging against Karaism – a struggle in which Sa͑adya was a leading champion of the Rabbanite cause. Mourning for Zion was a key feature of Karaite spirituality, and Lamentations seemed to have played a central role in their liturgy.[47] The best evidence for this comes from slightly later than the time of Sa͑adya and largely from the writings of the Karaite community in Jerusalem who called themselves, among other things, the 'Mourners for Zion'.[48] But the tradition of Mourning for Zion predates the rise of Karaism and goes back to the late first or early second century CE. Indeed, it is probably Mourners for Zion who are

---

[47] See especially the commentary on Lamentations by Sa͑adya's doughty Karaite critic, the author of The wars of the Lord, Salmon ben Yeroham, ed. S. Feuerstein, Der Commentar des Karäres Salmon ben Yerucham zu d. Klageliedern. Zum ersten Male nach der Pariser Handscrhrift edirt, mit einer Einleitung und Anmerkungen versehen (Inaugural-Dissertation, University of Bern; Cracow, 1898). Further: L. Marwick, 'Studies in Salmon ben Yeruham', JQR n.s. 34 (1943/44), 313–20, 475–80; H. Ben-Shammai, 'Poetic works and lamentations of Karaite Mourners for Zion: structure and contents', in S. Elizur et al. (eds), Kenesset-Ezra: Literature and life in the synagogue, studies presented to Ezra Fleischer (Jerusalem, 1994), 191–234 [Hebrew].

[48] The Hebrew phrase 'Avelei Tziyyon, taken from Isa 61:3, is, of course, ambiguous and can mean either 'Mourners for Zion' or 'Mourners in Zion'. The Karaite community in Jerusalem was both. For an overview of it, see M. Gil, A history of Palestine 634–1099 (Cambridge, 1992), 617–22; D. Frank, 'The mourners for Zion ca. 950–1000', in M. Sæbø (ed.), Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: the history of its interpretation I.2, the Middle Ages (Göttingen, 2000), 119–23; Y. Erder, 'The Mourners of Zion: the Karaites in Jerusalem in the tenth and eleventh centuries', in M. Polliack (ed.), Karaite Judaism: a guide to its history and literary sources (Leiden, 2003), 213–35; Erder, The Karaite Mourners of Zion and the Qumran scrolls (Tel Aviv, 2004) [Hebrew].

in view in Tosefta Sotah 15:8–15, discussed above.[49] Sa‘adya, though he ended his life in Baghdad, and may have produced his Tafsir there, came from the west, and was well acquainted with developments in the Land of Israel. The Karaites were excellent propagandists, and close cultural contacts were maintained between the Jewish communities in the east and the west. Besides there were Karaites in the east, where, in fact, Karaism had originated. A continuous tradition of rigorously ascetic Mourning for Zion, promoted by groups outside the rabbinic movement, may well have been a major factor in keeping interest in Lamentations alive, and in impressing on the Rabbinate the need to assert its understanding of the book, and, more generally, of the destruction and restoration of the Temple.[50]

Conclusion

I readily admit that much of the argument in this essay is speculative, and would need a great deal of highly detailed work to substantiate it, but I hope I have said enough to illustrate my basic thesis that writing the cultural history of the ancient Bible versions is a useful exercise, and to indicate some of the principles we should apply in approaching this task. We should start from the premise that ancient Bible versions were seldom, if ever, produced for purely literary or antiquarian reasons. They were usually intended to serve a definite purpose. This means that we should ask not only when and where they were made, but by whom and with what end in view. To answer these questions we should set the versions in the widest possible religious context of their time of origin, and compare and contrast them, as appropriate, with other works from the same period. We should avoid treating them in isolation, but put the translations of the same book on a trajectory, and compare them with each other. Interesting questions,

---

[49] See Alexander, Targum Lamentations, Introduction 7.2; further, M. A. Fishbane, The exegetical imagination: on Jewish thought and theology (Cambridge, Mass., 1998).

[50] It has to be said that, because it is generally so literal, there does not seem to be anything obviously rabbinic, or anti-Karaite, about Sa‘adya's version of Lamentations, and if one were to find it unattributed in a manuscript one would be at a loss to classify it as rabbinic. But the politics of Bible translation are complex, and simply who made a version can be important. In conditions of conflict sects can be reluctant to trust translations, however innocuous in themselves, whose provenance they would regard as tainted. Sa‘adya may have deemed it advisable, and indeed necessary, to provide Rabbanite communities with a version of Lamentations that had impeccable Rabbanite credentials. For the rival Karaite tradition of Bible translation and commentary, see M. Polliack, The Karaite tradition of Arabic Bible translation (Leiden, 1997); D. Frank, Search Scripture well: Karaite exegetes and the origins of the Jewish Bible commentary in the Islamic East (Leiden, 2004).

as I have tried to show, can be generated not only by their relationship, but also by their lack of relationship with each other. We should avoid generalization, and proceed biblical book by biblical book, because the intrinsic character of each book is a fundamental factor in its cultural history. In the case of Lamentations the fact that it commemorates the fall of Jerusalem, and had an obvious liturgical function, is an important key to unlock the history of its translation. But the conclusions we reached for Lamentations do not necessarily apply to the rest of the Hebrew Bible. If the ancient Bible versions are treated not only as textual and philological resources, but also as cultural artefacts, and interrogated with strictly cultural and historical questions, they can throw light on each other's origin and setting, on the inter-relation of the communities that produced them, and on the inner development of those communities' religious life.

The Relationship of LXX and the Three in Exodus 1–24 to the Readings of F[b]

by

Alison Salvesen

The medieval marginal readings in the fifth-century uncial F (Codex Ambrosianus), known collectively as F[b], are glosses to the Septuagint text of F and cover Gen 31:15–Josh 12:12. For the most part they are anonymous. They include many readings which undoubtedly belong to the period of later Greek, and some of them additionally appear in the Constantinople Pentateuch. Several scholars have studied the glosses of F[b], including in recent years Cameron Boyd-Taylor, John Wevers and his team of editors at Göttingen,[1] and most notably Natalio Fernández Marcos. In preparing an edition of the Hexaplaric fragments to the Book of Exodus as part of the international Hexapla Project, I have noted the same phenomenon in F[b] as others have done, namely the existence of apparent affinities between certain readings in F[b] and earlier Greek biblical tradition.[2] In this paper I will examine more closely the nature of F[b] readings in Exodus and whether any of them could be related to named and known revisions. The study, such as it is, is limited to what I have covered so far in my work on Exodus, in other words up to chapter 25.

Natalio Fernández Marcos has made the intriguing suggestion that the glosses come from a single, medieval Jewish version.[3] Does a sample of the F[b] material in Exodus fit the hypothesis that many if not all of the

---

[1] J. W. Wevers with U. Quast, Exodus, Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum, Vol. II, 1 (Göttingen, 1991), 43–44.

[2] E.g. N. Fernández Marcos, The Septuagint in Context. Introduction to the Greek Versions of the Bible (Leiden, 2000); English translation of Introducción a las versiones griegas de la Biblia (Textos y estudios "Cardinal Cisneros", 23; 2d ed.; Madrid, 1998), 175–76 (= 183, Introducción): 'the author of these corrections is definitely working within the tradition of the Jewish versions, and there is remarkable agreement with the vocabulary of the Greek text of the Constantinople Pentateuch even though it represents a less developed stage of the language.'

[3] 'Although the glosses remain anonymous, in a passage from Genesis, F[b] identifies its author as τὸ ἰουδαϊκόν [Gen. 47.31]', Fernández Marcos, Septuagint in Context, 176 (= 182–3, Introducción).

glosses[4] have been taken from a single medieval Jewish Greek translation, or do they seem to be a chance assortment of different readings from different versions, some known and some unknown, some with possible Hexaplaric links and others independent of Origen, some transmitted principally by Jews and others by Christians?

I have attempted to sort an array of different readings into categories, though many could belong to more than one. It should be borne in mind that the scribe who inserted the glosses in F and the translator(s) of the version(s) from which the glosses originated are unlikely to have been the same people. The point is that the scribe who was responsible for adding the glosses was providing possible alternatives to the LXX Greek text of the codex, without necessarily knowing or caring how either the glosses or the text glossed related to the Hebrew. However, in seeking the origins of the version(s) reflected in F[b], we must assess their relationship to the Hebrew as well as the type of Greek they represent.

1. Standardization of terms found in LXX tradition?

Some readings from F[b] indicate a kind of continuity with LXX tradition in terms of vocabulary or the standardization of a term found more commonly elsewhere in LXX. Do these arise from an independent version (perhaps a full revision of LXX) from which the corrector (= F[b]) has provided annotations to the text of F? Or are they from several separate versions? Or from individual corrective glosses? Why are they so rarely attributed?

Exod 18:23
HT   וְצִוְּךָ
LXX   κατισχύσει
?   προσέταξέ σε Witness: F[b]

The LXX rendering here is not a close translation of the Hebrew, though in the context of Jethro's advice to Moses ('if you do this thing, God will strengthen you') it makes sense. In the LXX Pentateuch προστάσσειν and συντάσσειν are very common equivalents for צוה, but ἐντέλλειν is the commonest of all, and is Aquila's preferred rendering also. Thus F[b]'s προσέταξε may be either an independent standardization of what is a

---

[4] It is not quite clear whether Fernández Marcos sees all the glosses as originating from this single source (as suggested by his remarks in The Septuagint in Context cited above), or only the majority of them: see his article 'El Pentateuco griego de Constantinopla' in Erytheia 6:2 (1985), 185–203, esp. 199 note 47, 'de éste último que corrigió todo el manuscrito proceden también la mayoría de las lecturas marginales (F[b]) tomadas, en mi opinión, de una supuesta versión judía.'

more common rendering of the Hebrew verb in LXX, or it could even be the work of Symmachus, who has this equivalent in Ps 39:2; 67:29.

Exod 16:25
HT   בַּשָּׂדֶה
LXX   πεδίῳ
?   ἀγρῷ   Wit: F^b

LXX translators like both ἀγρός and πεδίον for שדה in the Pentateuch. Moreover, ἀγρός is too common in the Three for it to be assigned to a particular source.

Exod 24:14
HT   יִגַּשׁ
LXX   προσπορευέσθωσαν
?   προσεγγισ[άτω] Wit: F^b

Possibly Aquilanic, but the equivalence προσεγγίζειν/נגשׁ is also very common in LXX generally.

2. Aquila and his legacy

a) 'Aquilanic' readings in F^b?

In some places in F^b there are readings which, if not derived directly from Aquila, bear all the hallmarks of his translational approach and have affinities with his vocabulary.[5] When readings are the same in character to Aq. elsewhere for the same equivalent, should we assume dependence, and therefore attribute the reading to Aq., or do we put it down to mere influence on translational style – for instance, the adoption of his methods and lexicon by a later translator or school of translators? The former possibility seems more likely, in that Aq. had already produced a complete and very consistent translation. Furthermore, the fact that so many readings in F^b are anonymous does not mean that they cannot possibly originate from an earlier translator. Aquila's version is so easily identified that we can be reasonably certain that what looks like Aquila is Aquila. Whether these readings of his were principally transmitted by Jews or by Christians, however, remains to be determined.

Exod 17:2
HT   וַיָּרֶב
LXX   ἐλοιδορεῖτο

---

[5] A recognised phenomenon. 'Zumeist beschränkt sich F^b auf die Uberlieferung von α′-Lesarten', Wevers, Exodus, 43, cf. Fernández Marcos, Septuagint in Context, 175–6 (= 183, Introducción).

?   ἐδικάσθη   Wit: Fᵇ

δικάζειν/ריב is not a common equivalent in LXX, but it is a standard
equivalent in Aq.

Exod 21:18
HT   יְרִיבֻן
LXX   λοιδορῶνται
σ′   διαμάχωνται
Wit: Text: M 58 25-52'-57-313'-414'-422-500-550' 85'-130-344 18
        Attribution: σ′ M 85'-344 18; absc 321; s nom 58 52'-313'-552 130; α′ 25-57-
414'-422-500-550
?   δικάζονται Wit: Fb

Here the context is a physical fight between two men, yet we find the
δικάζειν/ריב equivalence. It is even more likely that this comes from Aq.
because it represents a purely etymological translation in this context:
unlike ריב, δικάζειν always has a juridical sense. As for the other reading,
διαμάχωνται, there are 19 witnesses to it, out of which only four testify
to Sym. as its origin, while eight attribute the reading to Aquila. However,
διαμάχεσθαι is not associated with Aquila elsewhere.

Exod 20:9, cf. 13:5
HT   תעבד
LXX   ἐργᾷ
?   δουλεύσεις Wit: Fᵇ

A standardization of the rendering found also in Aquila's version passim,
even when it means 'worship'.

Exod 22:17 (16)
HT   יִשְׁקֹל
LXX   ἀποτείσει
?   σταθμίσει Wit: Fᵇ

The rendering of LXX is somewhat loose. σταθμίζειν is found for שׁקל in
Aquila fragments (Job 31:6; Isa 33:18; 55:2). LXX apparently only uses
the form σταθμάω.

Exod 21:18
HT   אִישׁ
LXX   τις
?   ἀνήρ Wit: Fᵇ

אִישׁ can be used in the sense 'someone', or distributively 'each' when re-
peated. Rendering it as ἀνήρ regardless of context is associated with both
the 'Kaige' revision and Aq., but here the sense is acceptable: 'if two men
rail at each other and a man strikes his neighbour...' So this example is
ambiguous.

Exod 14:16
HT   וּבְקָעֵהוּ
LXX   ῥῆξον
?   σχίσον Wit: F^b

Describing the parting of the Red Sea. Cf. Aq. in Ps 77(78):15; Isa 59:5; 63:12; Ezek 13:13 for בקע.

Exod 19:9
HT   בְּעַב
LXX   στύλῳ
?   πάχωμα Wit: F^b

The form πάχωμα **is not attested before the Byzantine period,[6] but** πάχος **occurs in Aq. (as also LXX) several times as the standard equivalent for** עב**, so there may be some connection between F^b's reading and Aq. Significantly,** ἐν παχώματα **appears in a biblical gloss in Hebrew script to** במעבה **in the Cairo Genizah material.[7]**

Exod 16:20
HT   וַיָּרֻם
LXX   ἐξέζεσεν
?   συνέσηψεν Wit: F^b

The verb συσσήπω **is attested in the active and passive forms in Greek from Aristotle onwards, though it is not used in LXX Greek. However, we could compare Aq.** σῆψις **(or an alternative reading** σήπη, **cf. LXX Sir 19:3) for** רִמָּה **in Job 17:14.**

   There are many other anonymous readings in F^b that are from Aq. directly or connected with his rendering in some way, e.g. Exod 14:21 ἀπηλιώτη (קָדִים) **and** εἰς χέρσον (לְחָרָבָה), α' εἰς χέρσον, **cf. also Aq. in Exod 14:16); 14:25** μετὰ βαρύτητος (בִּכְבֵדֻת).

b) Cases where Field or Wevers links an anonymous F^b reading with an attributed reading from Aquila

As is the case with anonymous readings in other mss, both Field and the Göttingen edition sometimes associate unattributed lemmata in F^b with a named reading from Aquila. This seems entirely reasonable.

Exod 15:5
HT   תְּהֹמֹת
LXX   πόντῳ (πόντος F^b 376 57^{mg} 85^{mg} -344^{mg})
α'σ'θ'   ἄβυσσοι **(retroversion from Syriac)**

---

[6] See E. Trapp, Lexikon zur byzantinischen Gräzität, besonders des 9.–12. Jahrhunderts (Vienna, 1993 –), VI:1250, giving various meanings.
[7] N. R. M. de Lange, Greek Jewish texts from the Cairo Genizah (Tübingen, 1996), 162.5, on 1 Kings 7:46.

Attr: α′σ′θ′ Syh^L; s nom F^b
Wit: Syh^L ܬܗܘܡܐ; F^b Var: ἄβυσσος F^b

The practice of Field and the Göttingen edition has been to combine sets of anonymous readings with attributed readings, indicating that the editors believe that the readings come from the same source.[8] Every editor will differ on which readings can be combined. For instance, this reading ἄβυσσοι (retroverted from the Syrohexapla) is attributed jointly to Aq., Sym. and Th. in Syh (ed. Lagarde). The Göttingen editors have associated the reading of F^b, ἄβυσσος, with it. The rendering is a fairly obvious one and could theoretically have arisen spontaneously apart from the Three. However, the singular form may have been influenced by the singular verb ἐκάλυψεν and the LXX variant πόντος: πόντος is in fact what F^b supplies as a correction in the text of F. So the editorial decision seems justified. LXX uses ἄβυσσος in Gen 1:2, Deut 8:7 for תהום etc., so all the later versions are stereotyping or correcting the equivalence to a key LXX usage.

Exod 14:21
HT   לֶחָרָבָה
LXX   ξηράν
α′   εἰς χέρσον
Wit: Text: F^b M 135 57-550' 85'-344
         Attr: M 85-344
Var: Text: εἰς] absc 321
         Attrib: s nom F^b 135 57-550': nom absc 321

Wevers' edition attributes the anonymous reading in F^b to Aq., and adds F^b to the witnesses to Aquila's reading.

Exod 13:18
HT   וַחֲמֻשִׁים עָלוּ בְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם
LXX   πέμπτη δὲ γενεᾷ ἀνέβησαν οἱ υἱοὶ Ισραηλ ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου
α′   καὶ ἐνωπλισμένοι ἀνέβησαν υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ ἀπὸ γῆς Αἰγύπτου
Wit: Text: full lemma Hier Ep XXXVI 12; καὶ ἐνωπλισμένοι F^b M 707 57'-C''^{commDiod} 85'-344-730^{commDiod} 18^{comm} 646^{commDiod}
         Attr: Hier M C''^{commDiod} 730^{commDiod} 18^{comm} 646^{commDiod}
Var: Text: καί] > F^b M C'' 730 646; ἐνωπλισμένοι] ἐνωπλισαμ. ed.; -σαμενοι 18; καθωπ. 707 57' 85'-344
         Attrib: + σ′ 57' 85'-344; absc 707 321; s nom F^b

The Göttingen edition attributes the anonymous reading in F^b to Aq. and adds F^b to witnesses to Aq.'s reading. This involves a two word reading καὶ ἐνωπλισμένοι in F^b, which matches the beginning of a much longer lemma from Jerome that he attributes to Aq. Given the support for the at-

---

[8] F. Field, Origenis Hexaplorum Fragmenta quae supersunt. 2 vols. (Oxford, 1875); Wevers, Exodus.

tribution to Aq. in manuscript M and the catena tradition, it would be difficult to argue that ἐνωπλισμένοι in F[b] arose spontaneously from a Jewish midrashic interpretation of חֲמֻשִׁים. It is far more likely that it originated with the long lemma attributed to Aq.

As for the alternative joint attribution to Aq. and Sym. together, that is theoretically possible for ἐνωπλισμένοι alone, but certainly not for the entire lemma, as the lack of definite articles is typical of Aq., not Sym. Moreover, Sym. has a separately attested reading, ὁπλῖται (LXX uses ἐνοπλίζω in Num 31:5; 32:17, 27, 29, but for חלץ.)

Other possible features connecting some readings in F[b] with Aq. include the following:

1. φωτίζειν: At Exod 4:12 for HT וְהוֹרֵיתִיךָ, LXX καὶ συμβιβάσω σε, F[b] has the anonymous reading καὶ φωτίσω σε. This is independently attributed to Aq. by the named reading φωτίσω σε attested in several other mss belonging mainly to the catena tradition. Compare also the anonymous marginal reading ἐφώτισεν in mss 85' at Exod 15:25, corresponding to וַיּוֹרֵהוּ and LXX ἔδειξεν.

Of course, φωτίζειν is found in OG for אור in Hiph., and in later or revised parts of the LXX corpus for ירה Hiph. However, Aq. in particular stereotypes φωτίζειν as the rendering of ירה Hiph, (sometimes following Theod.).[9]

In contrast, Sym. uses either δηλοῦν (Gen 46:28; Job 12:7) or ὑποδεικνοῦν (most other occurrences[10]) for ירה Hiph. However, compare the treatment of φαίνειν/לְהָאִיר in the next example.

2. περιπατεῖν. For הלך, e.g. at Exod 13:21 for לְהָאִיר לָהֶם לָלֶכֶת יוֹמָם וָלָיְלָה, F[b] has the anonymous reading τοῦ φωτίσαι αὐτοὺς τοῦ περιπατεῖν ἡμέραν καὶ νύκταν. This stands in contrast to the asterised addition τοῦ φαίνειν αὐτοῖς ὁδεύειν ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτός attributed jointly to Sym. and Th. in the Syrohexapla and also attested in the main text of some Origenic LXX MSS.

While LXX uses περιπατεῖν only for the Hithpa. of הלך, Aq. employs it for the Qal and Piel in addition. However, it is not in itself a sure indica-

---

[9] Gen 46:28; Exod 24:12; Deut 17:10; 33:10; Pss 24(25):8, 12; 26(27):11 (also Theod.); 44(45):5; 85(86):11; 118(119):33; Prov 4:4; Job 12:7 + Theod.; Mic 3:11 + Theod. (Syriac); Isa 2:3 + Theod. See also de Lange, Greek Jewish Texts, 163.12.

[10] E.g. Isa 2:3; Pss 24(25):8, 12; 26(27):11; 44(45):5; 85(86):11; 118(119):33.

tor of Aq., since Sym. is also fond of using the verb for Qal, Piel and Hith-
pael.[11]

3. ῥεῖθρον appears anonymously in F[b] at Exod 1:22; 2:3,52; 4:9;
7:20,21,24,25; 8:3,5,11, all for יְאֹר. The same word occurs in Aq.'s
renderings at Exod 7:19, 24; Job 28:10 (pl.)[12], Isa 33:21 (pl.), Jer 26(46):8.

4. διεσχίσθησαν τὰ ὕδατα in F[b] at Exod 14:21 for וַיִּבָּקְעוּ הַמָּיִם, and note
the literalistic use of the pl. noun and verb for הַמָּיִם. Cf. Aq. Ps. 140(141):7
διασχίζοντι for בקע.

3. F[b] and the Three

Where other manuscripts preserve attributed readings that correspond to an
unattributed one in F[b], it is interesting to compare them. The results of
such comparisons can either indicate a direct relationship between that F[b]
reading and one or more of the Three, or show that the F[b] reading is com-
pletely independent of the Three.

a) Readings related to those of the Three

Exod 18:11
HT   אֲשֶׁר זָדוּ
LXX   ὅτι ἐπέθεντο
οἱ λ′   ὅτι ὑπερηφανεύσαντο
Wit: Text: full lemma 58; ὅτι > F[b] M 707 57-413 85-130-321
           Attrib: M 58 707 85-130
Var: Attrib: s nom F[b] 57 321; ο′ 413; οἱ λ′ 58

Cf.:

α′   ὅτι ἐν τῷ ῥήματι ᾧ ὑπερηφανεύσαντο ἐπ᾽ αὐτούς Wit: 344 (+ σ′ 108 Syh)
σ′   ὅτι ὑπερηφανεύσαντο κατ᾽ αὐτῶν Wit: 344
θ′   ὅτι ὑπερηφανεύσαντο ἐπ᾽ αὐτούς Wit: 344

The verb ὑπερηφανεύσαντο is found in precisely this form in the three
separated readings of the Three attested in other sources. So the amalgama-
tion of the partial reading ὅτι ὑπερηφανεύσαντο, common to all Three,
under the umbrella term οἱ λοιποί, is accurate here. Aq. and Sym. in par-

---

[11] E.g. Ps 37(38):7 Piel; 41(42):10 Qal; 72(73):9 Qal; 81:5 Hithpa; Ecc 10:6 Qal.
However, on the whole Sym. seems to prefer ἀναστρέφομαι for הלך in Qal and
ὁδεύειν for the Hitpa. There are also combined readings of the Three using περιπατεῖν
for Qal in Prov 28:6 (Qal), and Isa 59:9 (Piel).
[12] Sym. uses the same word here, but in the context of a very different reading.

ticular use the noun ὑπερηφανία elsewhere, whereas LXX tends to limit it for rendering the root גאה (but see the example below, Exod 18:21).

However, F^b records the same reading without any attribution. This may suggest that some other of its anonymous readings could represent the work of one of the Three or a combination of two or more of them.

Exod 18:21
HT   בֶצַע
LXX   ὑπερηφανίαν
οἱ λ′   πλεονεξίαν
Wit: Text: F^b M 58-376 C⁻⁷⁷-57'-422 108-85-130-321 18 Syh
        Attrib: M 130-321
Var: Attrib: α′ σ′ θ′ Syh; s nom F^b 58-376 C⁻⁷⁷-57'-422 108-85 18
Syh: ܡܥܠܒܢܘܬܐ

Again we have a reading that is anonymous in the majority of witnesses including F^b, and we only know that it could be a shared reading of the Three through the attribution in Syh (α′ σ′ θ′) and Greek manuscripts M 130 321 (οἱ λ′). If the same reading had appeared in F^b alone, we would not have suspected that it was common to more than one reviser of the Three. πλεονεξία is a frequent rendering in the Three for בֶצַע.

Exod 18:22
HT   הַגָּדֹ֣ל
LXX   τὸ ὑπέρογκον[13]
οἱ λ′   τὸ μέγα
Wit: Text: full lemma 58 57' 85' | μέγα F^b M
        Attrib: M 85'
Var: Attrib: οι ολοι 57; οἱ ο′ 413; s nom F^b 85

F^b has another unattributed reading corresponding to one assigned jointly to the Three in other manuscripts. Note that in Exod 18:26 below LXX has the same Greek word as here, ὑπέρογκον, for another Hebrew equivalent. It is no doubt for reasons of consistency and greater faithfulness to the Hebrew text that the Three have corrected the renderings in both verses.

Exod 18:26
HT   הַקָּשֶׁ֖ה
LXX   ὑπέρογκον
α′ σ′   σκληρόν[14]
Wit: Text: F^b M 57' 85-130-321
        Attrib: 57' 85-130
Var: Attrib: + θ′ M; s nom F^b; absc 321

This anonymous reading in F^b corresponds to one attributed to Aq. and Sym. in some Greek manuscripts.

---

[13] LXX ms 458 reads τὸ ὑπέρογκον μέγα.
[14] It should be noted that the note in M reads, 'α′σ′θ′ σκληρόν δυσχερές'.

Exod 18:26
HT   הַקָּשֶׁה
LXX   ὑπέρογκον
θ′   δυσχερές
Wit: Text: M 57' 85-130
          Attrib: 57' 85
Var: Attrib: s nom M 130

Following on from the example just above, note that F[b] does not include
the reading that is attributed to Theod. in manuscripts 57' and 85. Theod.
rarely if ever appears as a separate source for a reading in F[b], either
anonymously or with attribution, except when implicitly included in a
group (οἱ λ′, οἱ γ′ etc.). Is this significant or not?

Exod 19:12
HT   וְהִגְבַּלְתָּ
LXX   ἀφοριεῖς
οἱ λ′   ὁριοθετήσεις
Wit: Text: F[b] M 58-707 57' 85'-130-344 18
          Attrib: M 344
Var: Text: ὁροθετήσεις F[b] 58-707 18; ὁρηοθετήσις 130
          Attrib: οἱ ο′ F[b]; s nom 58-707 57' 85'-130 18

F[b] attributes its reading to ο′, i.e. the Seventy, against the witness of M and
344, which assign it to 'The Rest'. The word ὁριοθετεῖν appears to be
one of Aquila's neologisms: see Deut 19:14; Zech 9:2, for the root גבל.
Note the following example below, in contrast, where we have the same
Hebrew verb but F[b] glosses with a different equivalent:

Exod 19:23
HT   הַגְבֵּל
LXX   Ἀφόρισαι
?   σὺ μέρισαι Wit: F[b]

σὺ μέρισαι cannot originate from Aq., since he uses μερίζειν only for
חלק, as does LXX on the whole.

Exod 16:14
HT   וַתַּעַל שִׁכְבַת הַטָּל
LXX   –
α′   καὶ ἀνέβαινε τὸ κοίμημα τῆς δρόσου
Wit: Text and Attrib: F[b] Syh[L] ܘܣܠܩ ܡܕܡܟܐ ܕܛܠܐ
Var: κοίμ[ημα] F[b]

Here F[b] provides an explicit attribution to Aq. which is verified by the Sy-
rohexapla (Lagarde's edition). (Syh[L] also has separate readings for Sym.
and Theod.)

Exod 16:14
HT   דַּק מְחֻסְפָּס דַּק כַּכְּפֹ ר

LXX   λεπτὸν ὡσεὶ κόριον λευκὸν ὡσεὶ πάγος
σ'   λεπτὸν ἀνασυρόμενον λεπτὸν ὡσεὶ πάχνη **(retroversion from Syriac)**
Wit: Syh^L ܪܩܝܩܐ ܡܬܓܪܕ ܐܝܟ ܚܠܒܐ ܪܩܝܩܐ
?   λεπτὸν ἀνασυρόμενον λεπτὸν <ὡσεὶ> πάχνη
Wit: **lemma F^b** | λεπτὸν ὡσεὶ πάχνη **343** | πάχνη M 57-73 127 85'
Var: ὡσεί] > F^b; πάχνη ind ad κόριον 85': πάχνον 321

Field identified this Syrohexaplaric reading of Sym. with the anonymous Greek one in F^b, and other mss seem to attest to parts of the same reading, without attribution. So F^b appears to have a reading originating from Sym.

Exod 16:22
HT   לֶחֶם מִשְׁנֶה
LXX   τὰ δέοντα διπλᾶ
σ'   ἄρτον διπλοῦν
Wit: F^{b2} Syh^L ܠܚܡܐ ܥܦܝܦܐ
Var: Attrib: s nom F^{b2}
?   ἄρτους διπλοῦς
Wit: F^{b1}

The reading in the singular form that is found in F^{b2} for this verse corresponds to one attributed to Sym. in Syh.

b) Readings independent of the Three

These are readings which do not coincide with readings attributed to the Three in the same place. Their origin is therefore unknown.

Exod 19:13
HT   בִּמְשֹׁךְ הַיֹּבֵל הֵמָּה יַעֲלוּ בָהָר
LXX   ὅταν αἱ φωναὶ καὶ αἱ σάλπιγγες καὶ ἡ νεφέλη ἀπέλθῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρους, ἐκεῖνοι ἀναβήσονται ἐπὶ τὸ ὄρος.
α'   ἐν ἑλκυσμῷ τοῦ παραφέροντος αὐτοὶ ἀναβήσονται ἐν ὄρει
Wit: **full lemma 344;** ἐν ἑλκυσμῷ τοῦ παραφέροντος **(retroverted from Syh^L** ܒܢܓܕܐ ܕܗܘ ܕܡܥܒܪ**)**
σ'   ὅταν ἀφελκύσθη ὁ ἀλαλαγμὸς αὐτοὶ ἀναβαινέτωσαν εἰς τὸ ὄρος
Wit: **full lemma 344;** ὅταν ἀφελκύσθη ὁ ἀλαλαγμός **(retroverted from Syh^L** ܐܡܬܝ, ܕܢܬܓܪ ܩܥܬܐ**)**
Var: Text: ἀλαλαγμός] σαλπιγμος 344
θ'   ἐν τῇ ἀπελεύσει τοῦ ἰωβὴλ αὐτοὶ ἀναβήσονται εἰς τὸ ὄρος
Wit: **full lemma 108 344;** ἐν τῇ ἀπελεύσει τοῦ ἰωβήλ **(retroverted from Syh^L** ܒܡܐܙܠܬܐ ܕܝܘܒܠ**)**
Var: Attrib: s nom 108
?   ὅταν φωνήσῃ ἰουβήλ
Wit: F^b (cod [ἰουβ]ήλ)

Φωνεῖν **occurs for seven different roots in LXX, as well as in non-translated sections (1 Chr 15:16; Isa 8:19; 19:3; 29:4; Ps 113:15(115:7); 1 Ezr 4:41, 5:58, Tob BA 5:9; 4 Macc 15:21; 3 Macc 1:23; Jer 17:11), but never for** מִשְׁךְ**. However, there is a similar phrase in Amos 3:6,** εἰ

φωνήσει σάλπιγξ ἐν πόλει, though the Hebrew underlying it differs from that of Exod 19:13. Compare also 1 Macc 9:12 ἐφώνουν ταῖς σάλπιγξι. Since the reading in F^b here is contextual rather than literal, influences from other parts of LXX are possible. Also, ὅταν resembles LXX and Sym. in this verse rather than the very literal rendering of the infinitive construct by the dative on the part of Theod. and Aq.

Exod 20:25
HT   כִּי חַרְבְּךָ הֵנַפְתָּ עָלֶיהָ
LXX   τὸ γὰρ ἐγχειρίδιόν σου ἐπιβέβληκας ἐπ' αὐτό
α′   ὅτι μάχαιράν σου ἐξῆρας ἐπ' αὐτό
σ′   τὴν γὰρ μάχαιράν σου ἐκίνησας ἐπ' αὐτό
θ′   ὅτι τὴν ῥομφαίαν σου ἐπιβέβληκας ἐπ' αὐτό
?   ...ξίφος... (F^b)

ξίφος is found in LXX Josh 10:28,30,32,35,37,39; 11:11,12,14; Ezek 16:40; 23:47 for חרב.[15] So the reading in F^b may represent a standardization of a certain equivalence in LXX, but it is apparently unconnected to the Three.

Exod 21:7
HT   וְכִי־יִמְכֹּר אִישׁ אֶת־בִּתּוֹ לְאָמָה לֹא תֵצֵא כְּצֵאת הָעֲבָדִים׃
LXX   ἐὰν δέ τις ἀποδῶται τὴν ἑαυτοῦ θυγατέρα οἰκέτιν, οὐκ ἀπελεύσεται ὥσπερ ἀποτρέχουσιν αἱ δοῦλαι.
α′   και ὅταν πωλήσῃ ἀνὴρ τὴν θυγατέρα αὐτοῦ εἰς οἰκέτιν οὐκ ἐξελεύσεται ὡς ἔξοδος τῶν δούλων
?   ἐὰν τις πωλήσῃ τὴν θυγατέρα αὐτοῦ ... οἰκέτιδα Wit: F^b
σ′   .... οὐ προελεύσεται προέλευσιν δουλικήν
θ′   .... οὐκ ἐλεύσεται ὥσπερ ἐκπορεύονται οἱ δοῦλοι

ἀποδίδομαι 'sell, trade', is used widely in the LXX Pentateuch for מכר, whereas πωλέω occurs only once there for מכר (see the next verse, LXX Exod 21:8), and twice for שבר.[16] So are Aq. (cf. Gen 25:31) and F^b standardising in order to maintain consistency of wording with the next passage? Yet F^b and Aq. do not present the same reading: is it possible that F^b reproduces the first part of the reading of Th. or of Sym., or an independent tradition?

Exod 22.6 (5)
HT   שַׁלֵּם יְשַׁלֵּם
LXX   ἀποτείσει
σ′ θ′   pr ἀποτινύων
?   ἀποδώσει   Wit: F^b. F^c deletes.

---

[15] de Lange, *Jewish Greek Texts*, 210.66, notes the use of τὴν μάχαιραν for חרב in a gloss to Ezek 21:16, an equivalence found also in Sym. for this passage.
[16] See T. Muraoka, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint, chiefly of the Pentateuch and the Twelve Prophets* (Leuven, 2002), 53a, 500b.

ἀποτίνειν is very common for the Piel of שלם in LXX Exodus, Leviticus, and Kingdoms. The form ἀποτιννύειν is less frequent in LXX. The verb ἀποδίδοναι has a wider semantic range, and is common in LXX for several Hebrew verbs.[17] In the LXX Pentateuch it only represents the Piel of שלם in Deut 7:10 (bis), and is more frequent in Psalms and Ecclesiastes in this equivalence. Both verbs ἀποδίδοναι and ἀποτίνειν occur in Aq. and Sym. for the Piel of שלם. So the source of Fb's gloss here is unclear, though since we know it cannot be from Sym. or Theod., and there is no recorded reading for Aq., it is just possible that it derives from the latter reviser.

Exod 23:21

HT	כִּי לֹא יִשָּׂא לְפִשְׁעֲכֶם
LXX	οὐ γὰρ μὴ ὑποστείληταί σε
σ′	οὐκ ἀφήσει παράπτωμα ὑμῶν Wit: Procop
?	…συγχωρή[σει]… Wit: Fb

συγχωρέω is apparently unattested in the readings of the Three and appears in LXX Greek only in 2 Maccabees[18] and Daniel LXX Bel. In those passages it has the sense of permitting, granting, allowing, or agreeing. However, in the context of Exod 23:21 it seems to refer to divine forgiveness, a meaning apparently not found until the Patristic period.[19] It is also clear that the reading presented by Fb has nothing to do with that of Sym. and does not resemble the style of Aquila in terms of translation technique.

Exod 17:16

HT	כִּי־יָד עַל־כֵּס יָהּ מִלְחָמָה לַיהוָה
LXX	ὅτι ἐν χειρὶ κρυφαίᾳ πολεμεῖ κύριος
?	ὅτι ἡ δύναμις ἐπὶ θρόνον ἄχραντον πόλεμος τοῦ κυρίου Wit: Fb
οἱ γ′	…κυρίου… Wit: Syh[txt] ܘܡܪܝܐ

LXX: 'because the Lord fights with a hidden hand'; Fb 'because the power upon the immaculate throne, the battle of the Lord'. If we accept that the triple jointly attributed reading in Syh renders יָהּ as κυρίου, the very different anonymous translation in Fb does not have anything to do with the Three. On the other hand, the word ἄχραντος 'pure, unadulterated' does appear one other time in Greek biblical tradition, in Sym. to Lam 4:7 (ἄχραντοι for זַכּוּ), and also, appropriately, in Josephus's description of

---

[17] See Muraoka, Greek-English Lexicon, 52b–53a, 62 a–b.

[18] 2 Macc 4:9; 11:15, 18, 24, 35, cf. 2:31.

[19] G. W. H. Lampe, A Patristic Greek Lexicon (Oxford, 1961–68). E.g. συγχώρησις τοῦ Αδάμ in The Life of Adam and Eve, 37:6, refers to the (divine) pardon granted to Adam (J. Tromp, The Life of Adam and Eve in Greek: a Critical Edition [Leiden, 2005], 56), though the date of even the Greek form of the work, let alone a putative Semitic original, remains uncertain.

the Holy of Holies in Jerusalem.[20] So given the free translation style of the anonymous reading it is just possible that ἄχραντον derives from Sym., but in that case the reading of οἱ γ′ would have to be explained differently.

Exod 19:22

HT	יִפְרֹץ
LXX	ἀπαλλάξῃ
α′	διακόψῃ Wit: M 57′-78-550′ 85′-130 Syh ܒܩܦ
σ′	διαφθείρῃ Wit: M 57-78-413-550′ 85′-130 Syh ܢܚܒܠ
θ′	ܢܟܐܒ Wit: Syh
?	παρακλάσθη Wit: F^b

Although κλᾶν is very common in Greek, and also generates a wide range of compound verbs such as ἀνακλᾶν, ἐπικλᾶν, ἐκκλᾶν, the verb παρακλᾶν is much less widely attested and Trapp's Lexicon places it in the Byzantine period.[21] Also, the reading of F^b has nothing to do with the Three, whose readings for this Hebrew word are all separately attested.

4. Readings of F^b independent of the Three and LXX but hard to categorise

Exod 21:8

HT	וְהֶפְדָּהּ
LXX	ἀπολυτρώσει
?	ἐλευθερώσει Wit: F^b

The only other place ἀπολυτροῦν occurs in LXX is Zech 3:1; the simplex is the more common form. ἐλευθεροῦν only occurs three times in LXX, in non-translated parts (Prov 25:10a, 2 Macc 1:27; 2:22), but is found in the New Testament and Christian literature. It is not attested for any of the Three.

Exod 21:18

HT	בְּאֶגְרֹף
LXX	πυγμῇ
?	γρόνθ[ω] Wit: F^b

---

[20] ἔκειτο δὲ οὐδὲν ὅλως ἐν αὐτῷ, ἄβατον δὲ καὶ ἄχραντον καὶ ἀθέατον ἦν πᾶσιν, ἁγίου δὲ ἅγιον ἐκαλεῖτο (BJ V.219.4). 'In this there was nothing at all. It was inaccessible, undefiled, and unseen by anyone, and it was called the Holy of Holies.'

[21] E. Trapp, Lexikon zur byzantinischen Gräzität (Vienna: 1993–), IV: 1213 'παρακλάω **abbrechen** ... παρακεκλασμένος **geborsten, verwittert** ... παρκλάουσ′ **ablenken**'.

For γρόνθος LSJ gives the definition 'fist' in the context of combat, from classical times onwards, but the word does not appear in LXX.[22] γρόνθος is found in Aq. to Judg 3:16 for גמד (see Field ad loc.), Sym. Isa 58:4 (though the style of the two word reading is more that of Aq.). Interestingly, Hesychius glosses πυγμή with γρόνθος, which would seem to indicate that the latter term had superseded the former by his day (probably fifth century CE).

Exod 22:4 (3)
HT   מִשּׁ֖וֹר עַד־חֲמֹ֑ור
LXX   (ἀπό) τε (ὄνου)
θ′   μόσχου καί
?   βοὸς <καί> Wit: F[b]

Here Theod. and the reading of F[b] supply a minus in LXX. Both μόσχος and βοῦς are common equivalents for שור in LXX.

Exod 23:19
HT   לֹֽא־תְבַשֵּׁ֥ל גְּדִ֖י בַּחֲלֵ֥ב אִמֹּֽו
LXX   οὐχ ἑψήσεις ἄρνα ἐν γάλακτι μητρὸς αὐτοῦ
σ′   οὐ σκευάσεις ἔριφον διὰ γάλακτος μητρὸς αὐτοῦ
?   ἐρίφιον Wit: F[b]

The form ἐρίφιον, which occurs in Tob 2:13, is listed as a possible neologism in LEH.[23] It is also found in the Gospels, notably in the parable of the Sheep and the Goats. This latter instance gives rise to a large proportion of the hundred occurrences in the current TLG corpus, since it generated much patristic comment and allusion. The word also occurs in Athenaeus and Galen, who span the second century CE. In the eleventh-century work Etymologicum Gudianum it is the gloss for ἔριφος.

Exod 21:22
HT   וְנָגְפ֡וּ
LXX   πατάξωσιν
?   ὠθήσουσιν Wit: F[b]

LXX uses ὠθεῖν for various Hebrew equivalents, and Sym. and Theod. each employ it once, but the commonest choices in LXX for נגף are παίειν and πταίειν.

Exod 22:6 (5)
HT   גָּדִ֜ישׁ
LXX   ἅλωνα
?   θιμωνία Wit: F[b]

---

[22] H. G. Liddell, R. Scott, H.S. Jones and R. McKenzie, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford, 1940), I.361a.

[23] J. Lust, E. Eynikel, and K. Hauspie, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint. Revised Edition* (Stuttgart, 2003), 243a.

LXX uses θημωνία in Exod 8:14(10) for חֹ֫מֶר, Zeph 2:9 without a clear equivalent, Cant 7:3 for ערמה. It appears in OG Job 5:26 (+ ἅλωνος under the obelus) for גָּדִישׁ (where the catena tradition notes that Theod. has σωρός). Aq. and Theod. employ θημωνία for גָּדִישׁ in Job 21:32 (the asterized addition in the LXX addition has σωρός).

Exod 22:6 (5)
HT   הַשָּׂדֶה
LXX   πεδίον
?   χωρίον Wit: F[b]

LXX only uses χωρίον for כרם, and in 2 and 4 Maccabees. However, in the sense of 'piece of land, field' (as in this context of fire burning someone's property) the word is found in papyri, Josephus and the New Testament.

Exod 22:29 (28)
HT   לֹא תְאַחֵר
LXX   οὐ καθυστερήσεις
?   οὐ βραδύνεις Wit: F[b]
Var: + δοῦναι cod

The following word looks like a gloss. LXX Gen 43:10 uses βραδύνειν for התמהמה; and note Deut 7:10 and Isa 46:13 where it occurs for לֹא תְאַחֵר. Aq. also employs βραδύνειν for אחר in Piel (Ps 126(127):2 and Hab 2:3). Perhaps therefore F[b]'s reading reflects a kind of standardisation process, or is related in some way to Aq.[24]

Exod 23:15
HT   הָאָבִיב
LXX   τῶν νέων
?   τῶν πρωΐμων Wit: F[b]

πρωΐμα is not found in LXX, but is Classical in origin (Xenophon, Aristotle). It is used by Aq., but for מורה and מקשרות.

Exod 23:27
HT   וְהַמֹּתִי
LXX   καὶ ἐκστήσω
?   καὶ πατάξω Wit: F[b]

Not from Aquila, who uses φαγεδαινίζειν for המם. LXX uses πατάσσειν often for Hiph. נכה. Sym. also likes to use πατάσσειν, but for a variety of roots.

Exod 24:15
HT   וַיְכַס

---

[24] καὶ βραδύνουσιν appears in a gloss in Hebrew characters, but relates to יחלו in Exod 32:11 (de Lange, Greek Jewish Texts, 186.188).

LXX   ἐκάλυψεν
?   ἐσκίασεν Wit: F^b

Σκιάζω is not used in LXX for כסה. Therefore F^b's reading is either con-
textual (the cloud overshadowed, rather than covered, the mountain when
Moses went up), or the translator 'read' the verb as ויסך, from סכך, since
LXX does occasionally use σκιάζω.[25]

Exod 16:23
HT   אפ֫תּ
LXX   πέσσητε
?   ζυμώσητε Wit: F^{b 1}
?   ὀπτήσετε Wit: F^{b 2}

πέσσειν is standard in LXX for אפה. Neither ζυμοῦν nor ὀπτᾶν is used
by Aq. for אפה (he employs πέσσειν in Gen 40:5, and Hos 7:6), so we can
exclude his version as the source of either reading. ζυμοῦν really refers to
the process of leavening, as in LXX Exod 12:34,39; Lev 6:17 (10); 23:17;
Hos 7:4, where passive forms are used to represent חמץ.

5. F^b = Constantinople Pentateuch

Fernández Marcos notes that of the 488 marginal readings of F^b in Exodus,
100 are shared with the Constantinople Pentateuch.[26] Wevers' edition notes
such cases in the second apparatus. Not all of them appear to be particu-
larly late in terms of style or lexicon. Here are some examples.

Exod 16:15
HT   מָן הוּא
LXX   Τί ἐστιν τοῦτο
?   μὰν αὐτόν Wit: F^b, = ConstPent.

The reading given by F^b understands the Hebrew as a statement, rather
than a question.

Exod 16:23
HT   תְּבַשֵּׁלוּ
LXX   ἕψητε
?   μαγειρεύσητε Wit: F^b, = ConstPent.

---

[25] Exod 38:8 (37.9), 1 Chron 28:18; Job 40:17 (22 MT יסכהו). A Cairo Geniza text
gives a gloss to 1 Kings 8:7 ויסכו, καὶ συνσκιάσειν, and compares סוככים (Exod. 25:20;
37:9): de Lange, Greek Jewish Texts, 162.9–10, who also observes that Aq. regularly
uses συσκιασμός for סכה. (This same equivalent occurs anonymously in F^b at Exod
13:20: another link to Aq.?)

[26] Septuagint in Context, 176 (= 183, Introducción), following Wevers, Exodus, 43–
44.

μαγειρεύειν occurs in LXX Lam 2:21 and Sym. Ps 36:14, both for טבח, and related nouns in LXX Ezekiel ch. 46 for בשל, but is not otherwise attested for the Three and LXX.

Exod 16:36
HT   הָאֵיפָה הוּא
LXX   τῶν τριῶν μέτρων ἦν
?   τοῦ μοδίου ἦν Wit: F^b, = ConstPent.

μέτρον is found for איפה in LXX Deut 25:14,15; Proverbs (1), Zechariah (5), Ezekiel (5), while we find οιφι for איפה in LXX Numbers, Judges, Ruth, I Kingdoms, Ezek. The mistranslation πέμμα ('cooked food, cake') occurs in Ezekiel chs. 45 and 46. μόδιος is a loan word from Latin, and is found in the New Testament (the 'bushel' of Matt 5:15 etc.) as well as later literature.

Exod 16:18
HT   אִישׁ לְפִי־אָכְלֽוֹ
LXX   ἕκαστος εἰς τοὺς καθήκοντας παρ' ἑαυτῷ
?   κατὰ φαγεῖν αὐτοῦ Wit: F^b, = ConstPent.

Not Aquilanic, if we compare the similar Hebrew of Exod 16:16, where Syh alone preserves Aq. and Theod.:

Exod 16:16
HT   אִישׁ לְפִי־אָכְלֽוֹ
LXX   ἕκαστος εἰς τοὺς καθήκοντας
α'   ἀνὴρ εἰς στόμα βρωσέως αὐτοῦ (retroverted from Syh ܐܢܫ ܠܦܘܡܐ
ܕܡܐܟܘܠܬܗ ܕܝܠܗ)
σ'   ἕκαστος κατὰ/πρὸς λόγον τῆς βρώσεως αὐτοῦ (retroverted from Syh ܟܠ ܚܕ
ܐܝܟ ܠܚܡ ܡܐܟܘܠܬܐ ܕܝܠܗ)
Wit: lemma Syh; εἰς λόγον τῆς βρώσεως αὐτοῦ **Procop**[27]
θ'   ἀνὴρ εἰς τὴν βρῶσιν αὐτοῦ (retroverted from Syh ܐܢܫ ܠܡܐܟܘܠܬܐ ܕܝܠܗ)

All in all, it seems that F^b's κατὰ φαγεῖν αὐτοῦ does not derive from Aq., Sym., or Theod.

Exod 16:31
HT   כְּזֶרַע גַּד
LXX   σπέρμα κορίου
?   κολιάνδρου Wit: F^b, = ConstPent.
τὸ ἰουδ' κοριανδροκόκκου Wit: F^b
Var: κολ. cod

---

[27] Ceriani, cited in Field, believes that the Procopius reading could equally belong to v.18. However, it may be a contamination from LXX (or even from Aq. or Theod.), and in this case the Greek Procopius reading and the Syriac reading could be combined to restore Sym.'s version here.

F^b has two different readings here. κολίανδρος, **equivalent to** κόριον, **seems to be used from the third or fourth century CE.** κοριανδρόκοκκον **does not appear in the current TLG corpus, Trapp or Kriaras.**[28]

Exod 16:21
HT   וְנָמָס
LXX   ἐτήκετο
?   ἀνελύετο **Wit: F^b**
Var: ἐλύετο F^{b2}, **= ConstPent.**

ἀναλύεσθαι **does not occur at all in the translated portions of LXX, and apparently not in the Three either. However, the simplex (see F^{b2}) is found in LXX, though not for** מסס**. In this particular context, the melting of the manna in the sun, the closest sense for** ἀναλύεσθαι **and** λύεσθαι **is that found in medical literature to describe the dissolving of substances.**

Exod 21:6
HT   בַּמַּרְצֵעַ
LXX   ὀπητίῳ
?   τρυπητηρίῳ **Wit: F^b, = ConstPent.**

The verb τρυπάω **is found in LXX as the rendering of the verb of the same root** רצע **in this very verse.**[29] ὀπήτιον, **'little awl', is a neologism according to LEH, and is also used in the parallel passage in Deut 15:17 for** מַרְצֵעַ**. While** τρυπητῆρ **occurs in Philo Mechanicus (third century BCE), the diminutive form** τρυπητήριον **is not found elsewhere at this period. It is evidently an etymological rendering of** מַרְצֵעַ **based on the LXX's rendering of the verb** רצע **in Exod 21:6. Yet if that is the case, there is no reason why the form** τρυπητῆρ **should not have been used, unless perhaps it was superseded by** τρυπητήριον**, or the diminutive form was felt to be more appropriate for a tool to pierce something as small as an earlobe. The use of a nominal form related to the noun in this verse may reflect the interest in standardisation shown by Aq. or Theod., though it is hard to be certain.**

Exod 22:16 (15)
HT   מָהֹר
LXX   φερνῇ
?   προικί **Wit: F^b, = ConstPent.**

The context is what a man who seduces a virgin should give to her father, and the Hebrew noun is usually rendered 'bride-price'. However, as Le Boulluec and Sandevoir note, φερνή **has the wrong connotation here as it**

---

[28] **E. Kriaras, Lexicon of Medieval Greek Demotic Literature 1100–1669** (Λεξικό της μεσαιωνικής ελληνικής δημώδους γραμματείας 1100–1669) **(Thessalonica: 1968–).**

[29] **It also occurs for** נקב **in LXX Hag 1:6, Job 40:26.**

refers to a gift given to the future son-in-law, even though here the seducer is paying compensation to the girl's father.[30] προίξ in post-Classical Greek appears to be more or less synonymous, since it is often used by grammarians as a gloss for the earlier term. However, in some legal documents it refers to a gift made by the husband to make up the dowry (προσφορά) given by the bride's family.[31]

Note that προίξ represents two different Hebrew words in F[b] Exod (see below, for שלוחים), and so it is conceivable that the readings come from two different sources, particularly since the occurrence in the sing. in Exod 18:2 is separately attested in 108 (and neither reading for 18:2 appears in ConstPent.).

Exod 18:2

HT	אַחַר שִׁלּוּחֶיהָ
LXX	μετὰ τὴν ἄφεσιν αὐτῆς
α′ θ′	μετὰ ἐξαποστολὰς αὐτῆς
σ′	= o′
?	μετὰ τὴν προῖκα **Wit: full lemma F**[b1]	προῖκα **108**
?	μετὰ τὰς προῖκας **Wit: F**[b2]

The reference is to Zipporah's 'sending away', when she would presumably have received her marriage portion. The rendering of the Hebrew preserved in F[b] here is contextual, not literal as in Aq. and Theod., and is similar to a Hebrew-Greek gloss to the very same passage in the Cairo Geniza, προικίον.[32]

Exod 24:6

HT	בָּאַגָּנֹת
LXX	εἰς κρατῆρας
?	εἰς τὰς λεκά[νας] **Wit: F**[b]**, = ConstPent.**

λεκάνη **is also found in LXX Jdgs A and B 5:25; 6:38 for a different Heb. word.**

Exod 24:8

HT	וַיִּזְרֹק
LXX	κατεσκέδασεν
?	ἐράντ[ισεν] **Wit: F**[b]**, = ConstPent.**

κατασκεδάννυμι **is a hapax in LXX. Much more common are** ῥαίνειν **and** προσχεῖν**, especially in Leviticus.** ῥαντίζειν **is also found in LXX**

---

[30] A. Boulluec and P. Sandevoir, La Bible d'Alexandrie II. L'Exode (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1989), 228.

[31] See the discussion and examples of προίξ used in Greek marriage documents from Nahal Hever (Jewish, 128 CE) and Dura Europos (Greco-Roman, 232 CE) given by J. Evans Grubbs, Women and the Law in the Roman Empire: a source book on marriage, divorce and widowhood (London and New York, 2002), 122–134.

[32] de Lange, Greek Jewish Texts, 106.13.

Lev 6:27(20), 4 Kgds 9:33, but for נזה, and in Ps 50(51):9 for חטא. Aq. uses it in Lev 8:11, and there are joint readings in Isa 52:15; 63:3. Given that the LXX reading here refers to scattering rather than sprinkling (with blood), it is unsurprising that the word was revised later, but it cannot be ascertained who the reviser was, though Aq. remains a possibility.

Exod 19:16
HT   קֹלֹת
LXX φωναί
?   βρονταί Wit: F^b, = ConstPent.

Note that the anonymous reading is less literal than that of LXX. βροντή is found in LXX and the Three, but for רעם. However, it also appears in a Hebrew-Greek gloss to Ezek 10:5, for קול.

6. Late/unusual F^b readings

Certain readings in F^b are so clearly later than Koine Greek that they are unattributable to any of the named versions, and instead have affinities with the later Jewish Greek tradition, the Constantinople Pentateuch in particular, as noted by many scholars already. Sometimes they occur in places where there are no alternative attributions, but it is clear that the vocabulary they employ is very different from that of Aq., Sym., Theod., ὁ Σύρος, ὁ Ἑβραῖος or any of the others. (The lexicographical comments below are far from definitive, and merely serve to indicate which items are likely to reflect a date later than that of the Three.)

ἁπλικεύειν or ἁπληκεύειν 'encamp' (< Lat. applicare [castra]) is found in John Malalas (sixth century).[33] In F^b forms of this verb gloss στρατοπεδεύειν and παρεμβάλλειν (both for חנה) in Exod 13:20, 14:2, 9. At Exod 19:2, ἡπλίκευσαν occurs for LXX παρενέβαλεν (וַיִּסְעוּ), as in ConstPent. The verb is also attested in an anonymous reading in ms 56 to Exod 14:9.

καρούχα, καρούχιον (< Lat. carruca, 'chariot or carriage'), Exod 14:6 (καρούχας F^{b1}, καρούχην F^{b2} = ConstPent), 14:7 (καρούχια F^b = ConstPent) for LXX ἅρματα (= רכב).[34] The form καρούχα is not particularly late as it appears in Sym. to Isa 66:20 for פרדים,[35] and around the same time in the Martyrdom of Polycarp. Καρούχιον seems to date from the eighth century (Trapp), and Kriaras notes that it is also found in

---

[33] Trapp, Lexikon, I.159.

[34] In fact Hesychius glosses ἅρμα with ὄχημα and καροῦχα.

[35] Eusebius, Comm. in Isaiam, 2.58 line 94: ἀντὶ δὲ τοῦ·ἐν λαμπήναις ἡμιόνων μετὰ σκιαδίων, ὁ Σύμμαχος ἐφ' ἵπποις καὶ ἐν ἅρμασι καὶ ἐν λεκτίσι καὶ ἐν καρούχαις καὶ ἐν φορείοις ἡρμήνευσε.

the eighth century (Trapp), and Kriaras notes that it is also found in ConstPent at Gen 41:43, Exod 15:19 and Deut 20:1.

παλλικάρια probably here 'young warrior',[36] the gloss of F^b at Exod 14:7; 15:4 for LXX τριστάτας (שָׁלִשָׁ), cf. ConstPent. Trapp gives references to Byzantine legal sources, and it also appears in the seventh-century Chronicon Paschale,[37] the late poetic version of the Alexander Romance, and the Chronicon Moreae, and on up to the present day. It may also be the reading of a Hebrew-Greek gloss, possibly to הנערים in Exod 14:24,[38] and Kriaras notes its use for נעריו in ConstPent to Gen 22:3, 5.

φαρία 'horses, cavalry', cf. φάρας from Semitic פרש? (Sophocles). The reading appears in F^b to Exod 14:9 LXX ἱππεῖς, HT וּפָרָשָׁיו, and for the same equivalents at Exod 14:17, 23, 26, 28; 15:19. The word belongs to the Byzantine period. Cf. also ConstPent.

φοσσάτον in the sense of 'army' < Lat. fossatum. The entry in Lampe suggests the development of the word from 'ditch' > 'entrenched camp' > 'army'. The late fourth/early fifth century writers John Chrysostom and Theodoret both cite the word, but as a borrowing. Theodoret uses it as a word for 'ditch', but Chrysostom in the sense of 'camp'.[39] Φοσσάτον appears in F^b readings at Exod 14:4 for στρατιά (חַיִל), and at Exod 14:20,24; 16:13 for LXX παρεμβολή (מַחֲנֶה). All four occurrences of φοσσάτον are also found in ConstPent. In Genesis F^b also has the combination φοσσάτον φοσσατεύσει ... φοσσατεύσει at Gen 49:19 for LXX πειρατήριον πειρατεύσει ... πειρατεύσει, גְּדוּד יְגוּדֶנּוּ ... יָגֻד. The verbal

---

[36] See the range of senses current in the medieval period in Kriaras. For the older period, LSJ gives the definition 'page', based on the occurrence in the Oxyrhynchus Papyri.

[37] Page 717 lines 15, 18, 20: καὶ μηδενὸς τῶν ἐχθρῶν σύνεγγυς τοῦ τείχους φανέντος, ἐξῆλθαν στρατιῶται μετὰ παλλικαρίων καὶ πολιτῶν, ὀφείλοντες ὡς ἀπὸ δέκα μιλίων θερίσαι ὀλίγα γεννήματα, καὶ συνέβη ἀπαντηθῆναι αὐτοῖς τοὺς ἐχθροὺς καὶ ἔνθεν κἀκεῖθέν τινας διαπεσεῖν, συσχεθῆναι δὲ καί τινας ἐκ τῶν παλλικαρίων, τῶν στρατιωτῶν καὶ τῶν πολιτῶν τῶν ἐξελθόντων σὺν αὐτοῖς. εἰ μὴ γὰρ συνέβη τοὺς στρατιώτας περισπασθῆναι εἰς τὸ ἐκδικῆσαι τὰ ἴδια παλλικάρια καὶ τοὺς πολίτας, ἱκανοὶ ἐφονεύοντο ἐκ τῶν ἐχθρῶν κατ᾽ ἐκείνην τὴν ἡμέραν.

[38] de Lange, Greek Jewish Texts, 118.17.

[39] Theodoret gives it as the Latin equivalent of τάφρος (N. Fernández Marcos and J.R. Busto Saiz, eds., Theodoreti Cyrensis Quaestiones in Reges et Paralipomena (Madrid, 1984), Quaest. 1 Regn. ΝΑ΄, 44 line 20: Τὴν δὲ <<ἀματτάραν>> ἐν τῇ τῶν Ἑβραϊκῶν ὀνομάτων ἑρμηνείᾳ οὕτως εὗρον κειμένην, παρὰ μὲν τοῖς Ἕλλησι τάφρον, παρὰ δὲ Ῥωμαίοις φοσσάτον, παρὰ δὲ τῷ Σύρῳ σκοπόν, εἰς ὃν οἱ γυμναζόμενοι τὰ βέλη πέμπειν εἰώθασι. Chrysostom uses it in his 23rd Homily on Ephesians (Migne PG 62, 168 line 20): Ὥστε εἴ τις οἶδεν ὅτι ὁ παρὼν βίος ὁδός τίς ἐστι καὶ στρατεία, καὶ ὡς ἂν εἴποι τις τὸ λεγόμενον παρ᾽ αὐτοῖς φωσσάτον, οὐ ζητήσει οἰκοδομὰς λαμπράς. Τίς γάρ, εἰπέ μοι, κἂν σφόδρα εὔπορος ᾖ, αἱρήσεται ἐπὶ τοῦ λεγομένου φωσσάτου οἰκοδομεῖν οἰκίας λαμπράς; Various different spellings of the word exist.

form in its various spellings (e.g. φοσσατεύειν) is only found in sources from the eighth century.

στόρνυμι in the sense 'saddle a horse' (rather than lay out a bed) is apparently not found before the second century CE.[40] ἔστρωσεν is the reading of F^{b1} and ConstPent at Exod 14:6 for LXX ἔζευξεν (וַיֶּאְס ר), while F^{b2} has a more literal rendering of the Hebrew verb, ἔδησεν.

Exod 21:10
HT   וְעֹ נָתָהּ
LXX   τὴν ὁμιλίαν
?   ὀρδινίαν Wit: F^b

A Latin-based loan. Trapp lists different forms and senses, all of which are late (dating from the ninth century). The meaning 'portion; property' comes closest to the context here.[41]

Exod 16:16, 22
HT   עֹ מֶר :הָעֹ מֶר
LXX   γομορ
?   δεκάλιτρον Wit: F^b

In Palladius, the term refers to ten obols' worth of bread.

Exod 16:30
HT   וַיִּשְׁבְּתוּ
LXX   καὶ ἐσαββάτισεν
?   ἤργησεν Wit: F^b

Note the replacement of the Semitism of LXX with a native Greek word, used in 2 Macc 5:25 for keeping the Sabbath. Elsewhere in LXX (all in late books) ἀργεῖν is used as the equivalent of בטל.

Exod 16:31
HT   כְּצַפִּיחִת בִּדְבָשׁ
LXX   ὡς ἐγκρὶς ἐν μέλιτι
?   ...] ἐγκρίδιον μετὰ μέλιτος Wit: F^b
τὸ ἰουδ΄ ὡς μέλι ἄκαπνον Wit: F^b
Var: ἄκαπ[νον] cod

Another place where F^b provides two different readings. If this second reading is correctly recorded, it refers to honey obtained without smoking out the bees. It is found in Ps-Galen in precisely this context, μέλι

---

[40] See the Protevangelium of James, §35 line 15, Καὶ ἔστρωσεν τὸν ὄνον καὶ ἐκάθισεν αὐτήν. Hesychius glosses ἐπέσαξεν (LXX Gen. 22:3, Abraham saddling his donkey) with ἔστρωσεν.

[41] It may also occur in a Hebrew-Greek gloss to 1 Kings 6:36, but in the more fundamental sense of 'order' (de Lange, Greek Jewish Texts, 158.1).

ἄκαπνον ὑλιστόν.[42] **Eusebius says that Symmachus uses the word for a type of wood in Isa 41:19.**[43]

Conclusion

The foregoing examples are illustrative of the range of types of readings in F[b]. Though it is certainly true that many of them, especially those found later in the Constantinople Pentateuch or explicitly attributed to τὸ ἰουδαϊκόν, are without a doubt fragments of one or more medieval Jewish translations into Greek, many others are rooted in older LXX translational approaches or in the revisional layers of the first and second centuries of the Common Era, and several have an affinity with Aquila.[44]

Two main hypotheses could be used to explain what is going on in this rather random selection out of the 488 F[b] readings in Exodus. The first is that, as Natalio Fernández Marcos has suggested, a medieval scribe with access to a late Jewish Greek version of the Bible (perhaps to be identified with the attribution τὸ ἰουδαϊκόν attached to some of the marginal notes) added a selection of its readings to the margins of ms F. If this is in fact the case, the examples in this paper demonstrate that this late Jewish version would vary enormously in terms of lexicon, consistency of translational approach and influences. Thus some material has obvious and attested affinities with Hexaplaric notations, while other readings appear unaligned, even if they are not always very late in terms of language. Given the conservative nature of biblical translation, such a spectrum of renderings is hardly impossible within a single version: note that several examples in section 5 above demonstrate that the sixteenth century Constantinople Pentateuch shares several readings with F[b] which could also be at home in one of the older versions.

A second possibility is that F[b] represents a ragbag collection of readings, from different versions and from different periods, some associated with the Hexapla and others having entered from outside the scope of Christian transmission. The annotator may have had access to a variety of

---

[42] De remediis parabilibus libri iii. Vol. 14, 557 line 15. The adjective is found in a different context in Theophrastus, fourth to third century BCE.

[43] Comm. in Isaiam, Book 2 section 20 line 137. The reading of Sym., ἄκαπνον ξύλον, is also found in ms 86, and corresponds to עֵץ.

[44] Cf. Fernández Marcos, 'El Pentateuco griego de Constantinopla',199: 'una colación sistemática de las lecturas marginales del ms. A 147 Infr. de la Ambrosiana de Milán, según el aparato de la edición de Brooke-McLean con el texto de Septuaginta, Aquila, Símaco, Teodoción y el neogriego de Constantinopla me permitió constatar cómo esta versión judía medieval, τὸ ἰουδαϊκόν, se inserta en una línea de traducción que conduce a la Pentateuco de Constantinopla'.

material, either garnered by him directly from other manuscripts or from other collections. Greek biblical material in Greek characters was in the public, Greek-speaking domain, and it was possible for both Jews and Christians to use it. However, only a Jewish scholar (or Jewish convert to Christianity) learned in both Hebrew and Greek would have been able to assess how satisfactorily the glosses represented the meaning of the Hebrew text as it was currently understood.

The evidence of the glosses in the Cairo Geniza material clearly demonstrates that readings linked to Aquila and even Symmachus did circulate independently of the Hexapla, in a Jewish milieu, into the Byzantine period and beyond. Yet given the overlap of some of the F^b readings with Hexaplaric ones known from Christian witnesses, it seems unlikely that absolutely all of them derive from a single, purely Jewish source. We are unable to rule out the possibility that some of them entered the margin of F from Christian sources, since F remains at base a Christian manuscript of the LXX. A case in point would be the reading at Exod 14:27, εἰς τὸ ἀρχαίον αὐτῆς, explicitly attributed to Sym. by F^b but also by the LXX manuscripts M 707 57 85 344.

Thus it is entirely plausible that while the scribe of F^b drew on the postulated independent late Jewish version, he also incorporated older Hexaplaric traditions dependent on Christian transmission. Unfortunately for modern scholars, he failed, for whatever reason, to provide regular attributions, so making it difficult if not impossible to disentangle the various strands. In the end, only an in-depth study of all the F^b notes from Genesis 31 to Joshua 12 offers any chance of resolving the issue.

Biblical Quotations in the Greek Jewish Inscriptions of the Diaspora

by

Silvia Cappelletti

Since Deissmann's studies on Scripture and epigraphy in 1905,[1] the presence of biblical quotations in inscriptions (both Christian and Jewish) has been a problem for scholars. Unlike the Christian context, Jewish evidence is extremely scarce. In the present study I shall consider the presence of biblical quotations in Jewish inscriptions written in Greek, to trace a literary presence and, when possible, to try to understand what version of the Greek Bible was in use. I shall take into consideration not only inscriptions with a complete – or almost perfect – quotation, but also imperfect or partial quotations. I do not aim at providing a complete catalogue of the Jewish inscriptions with biblical passages. Instead, in analysing selected texts, I want to discuss questions arising from the quotations, in an attempt to see the spread and the use of Septuagint in the Diaspora from the second century CE to late antiquity. Such a broad geographic and chronological scope is both allowed and strongly suggested by the scarcity of evidence, which prevents us from doing more accurate research on a specific area or period.

I. Perfect quotations

Unlike the Christian environment, the Jews quoted a limited number of passages – in funerary contexts only Prov 10:7, 'the memory of the just

---

[1] A. Deissmann, 'Verkannte Bibelzitate in syrischen und mesopotamischen Inschriften', Philologus 64 (1905), 475–8; A. Deissmann, Licht vom Osten (Tübingen, 1923), 400–2. Cf. the studies of E. Böhl ('Alte christliche Inschriften nach den Text der Septuaginta', Theologische Studien und Kritiken 1881, 692–713), E. Nestle ('Die alten christlichen Inschriften nach dem Text der Septuaginta', Theologischen Studien und Kritiken 1883, 153–4), A. J. Delattre ('Les citations bibliques dans l'epigraphie africaine', in Compte rendu du IIIe congrès scientifique international des catholiques. Bruxelles 3–8 septembre 1984 (Bruxelles 1895), 210–212), and for the Latin Bible J. Gensichen, De Scripturae sacrae vestigiis in inscriptionibus latinis Chistianis (Geifswald, 1910), 5.

man with praise.'[2] As far as the exact (or almost exact) quotation of the passage is concerned, the evidence comes only from Rome. But we have to point out that the use by and large of this passage in a funerary context and in Greek epigraphy cannot be considered typical of the Roman community: as we shall see, partial or imprecise quotations or quotations in Latin and Hebrew are attested in other centres of the Diaspora, and could be considered a funerary habit.

The first inscription, JIWE II, 112, was found in the catacomb of Monteverde, a funerary area near Via Portuense, now lost. The stone, a blue-grey marble plaque, is kept in the Jewish epigraphic collection of the Vatican Museums (Lapidario ebraico ex-Lateranense). Most of the Roman Jewish inscriptions, including those discussed in this paper, though found in different archaeological contexts, can be dated only roughly to the third to fourth century CE, because of difficulties in dating the context of the finds and because of the poor quality of the texts themselves, which makes any palaeographic study particularly hard.[3]

ἐνθάδε κῖτε | Μακεδόνις | ὁ Αἴβρεος Κεσαρεὺς | τῆς Παλεστίνης | υἱὸς Ἀλεξάνδρου· || μνία δικαίου εἰς | εὐλογίαν· ἐν ἰρή|νῃ ἡ κοίμισί[ς] σου.

This text is remarkable for several reasons: first of all, for mentioning the birthplace of the deceased (Caesarea in Palestine)[4] and for the use of the term Ἑβραῖος instead of Ἰουδαῖος (with a few phonetic adjustments), a peculiar use on which much has been written.[5]

---

[2] **Prov 10:7:** ‏זכר צדיק לברכה‎.

[3] S. Cappelletti, The Jewish community of Rome (Leiden, 2006), 179–191. H. J. Leon dates the catacombs to the I BCE–III CE and the inscriptions to the II–III CE (H. J. Leon, The Jews of Ancient Rome, [Peabody, 1995²], 87, 89, 91–2); H. Solin ('Juden und Syrer in westlichen Teil der römischen Welt. Eine ethnisch-demographische Studie mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der sprachlichen Zustände', ANRW II, 29.2 [1983], 587–789, 656, 684, 694, nr. 235, 701, 718 nr. 287), D. Noy (JIWE II, 3–5; 177–8) and L. Rutgers (The hidden heritage of Diaspora Judaism [Leiden 1998], 57), date the inscriptions to the III/IV century.

[4] Other inscriptions from Rome with the mention of the birthplace: JIWE II, 459 τοῦ Κεσαρέως (of Palestine, Mauritania or Asia Minor), JIWE II, 503 Ἀχαιάς (probably from Achaia), JIWE II, 238 ἀπὸ Ἀκουλείας (from Aquileia), JIWE II, 515 τοῦ Κατανέου (from Catania), JIWE II, 560 Ῥώμης (from Rome, inscription of unknown provenance), JIWE II, 183, ll. 2–3 Ἰουδέα ἀπὸ | Λαδικίας (from Laodicea in Phrygia or in Syria), JIWE II, 60, Σεφωρηνός (from Sepphoris), JIWE II, 508 Θαβρακενός (from Thabraca), JIWE II, 561 Τιβερεύς (from Tiberias), JIWE II, 113 Τριπολίτης (from Tripoli in Syria, Asia Minor or Libya). On this point see C. Vismara, "Orientali a Roma: nota sull'origine geografica degli Ebrei nelle testimonianze di età imperiale", DArch 5 (1987), 119–121.

[5] Roman Jewish inscriptions with the mention of Ἑβραῖος: JIWE II, 559, 44, 108, 561. Α συναγωγὴ τῶν Ἑβραίων in JIWE II, 2, 33, 578, 579. Epigraphic evidence of Ἰουδαῖος/Iudaeus at Rome: JIWE II, 567, 233, 183, 489, 584 (ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαισμῷ).

The quotation in ll. 6–7 reads: μνία δικαίου εἰς | εὐλογίαν. The interchange of diphthong ει with ι, to express the long /i/ sound, is well attested in epigraphic and papyrological evidence of this period.[6] The text of Prov 10:7 agrees with the version of Aquila. According to Origen's Hexapla,[7] Aquila translated צדיק with δικαίου and לברכה with εἰς εὐλογίαν.[8] With regard to Aquila's translation of the first term, זכר, 'memory', we have no other evidence in the remaining fragments. It is difficult to infer what term Aquila would have used. According to Turner, μνεία does not occur in Aquila's lexicon, which in the remaining fragments uses μνημόσυνον[9] or μνήμη[10] as the Septuagint does, though this latter version shows greater lexical variety.[11] As far as the Septuagint is concerned, μνεία is quite a rare term.[12] The translation of 'memory' (זכר)

Ἰσδραηλίτης is attested only once, in JIWE II, 489. On the problems concerning these terms in inscriptions see R. Kraemer, 'On the meaning of the term "Jew" in Greco-Roman inscriptions', HTR 82 (1989), 35–53; M. Williams, 'The Meaning and Function of Ἰουδαῖος in Graeco-Roman Inscriptions', ZPE 116 (1997), 249–262; P. van der Horst, Ancient Jewish epitaphs (Kampen, 1991), 79; J. van Henten, 'A Jewish epitaph in a literary Text: 4 Macc. 17:18–10', in Studies in early Jewish epigraphy, J. W. van Henten and P. W. van der Horst, eds. (Leiden 1994), 52. See also G. Harvey, The true Israel (Leiden 1996), 104–147 (in particular 145–146), D. Goodblatt, 'From Judaeans to Israel: names of Jewish States in antiquity', JSJ 29 (1998), 1–36; S. Cohen, The beginnings of Jewishness (Leiden, 2007), 69–106.

[6] F. Gignac, A grammar of the Greek papyri of the Roman and Byzantine periods (Milan, 1976), vol. 1 (Phonology), 189–190. This shift could mark the identification of the diphthong /ei/ with the simple vowel /i/.

[7] F. Field, Origenis Hexaplorum Fragmenta quae supersunt (Oxford, 1875; repr., Hildesheim, 1964), vol. 2, 329.

[8] The version of Aquila uses the term εὐλογία as a translation of ברכה also in Deut 11:27; Job 29:13; Isa 44:3 and Ezek 34:26 (N. Turner, An index to Aquila (Oxford, 1966), 100 and 268).

[9] Ps 29(30):5; Isa 26:14.

[10] Ps 6:6.

[11] μνήμη, μνεία and μνημόσυνον for זכרון or זכר, μνῆμα and μνημεῖον for קבר, μνημόσυνον for זכרון. E. Hatch and H. Redpath, A concordance to the Septuagint and other Greek versions of the Old Testament including the Apocryphal Books (Oxford, 1897; repr., Graz, 1975), vol. 2, 932–3; J. Lust et al., eds., A Greek–English lexicon of the Septuagint (Stuttgart, 2003), 405–6; T. Muraoka, A Greek-English lexicon of the Septuagint: chiefly of the Pentateuch and the Twelve prophets (Louvain, 2002), 378; J. F. Schleusner, Novus thesaurus philologico-criticus, sive Lexicon in 70 et reliquos interpretes Graecos ac scriptores apocryphos Veteris Testamenti (2nd ed.; Glasgow, 1822; repr., Turnhout, 1994), 471. The current translation of memory (זכר) in the Septuagint Book of Proverbs is μνήμη (Prov 1:12 and Prov 10:7): μνημόσυνον does not belong to its vocabulary.

[12] Deut 7:18; Job 14:13; Ps 110(111):4; Wis 5:14; Zech 13:2; Isa 23:16; 26:8; 32:10; Jer 38(31):20; Bar 4:27; Dan 5:5; Ezek 21:32; 25:10; 4 Macc 17:8. Μνεία, remembrance, can stand for being able to call back into memory (for instance Zech 13:2; Ezek

in the Septuagint version of Proverbs is μνήμη (Prov 1:12 and Prov 10:7); μνημόσυνον and μνεία do not belong to its vocabulary. We should remark that μνεία, though infrequent in the Septuagint, belongs to the lexicon of the New Testament with the meaning of remembrance, mention in prayer,[13] and is attested in the Greek language of the Roman and Byzantine periods, as well as in the Patristic literature.[14] As van der Horst points out,[15] this text shows the success of this translation in replacing the Septuagint version in the common usage of the Roman community.

JIWE II, 276, comes from Vigna Randanini catacomb, a burial area near via Appia, where it is still probably kept.

ἐνθάδε κεῖτε Ἀμάχις | ὁ καὶ Πρῖμος. μνήμη | δικαίου ἰς εὐλογίαν | οὐ ἀληθῆ τὰ ἐνκώ|μια. ἐν ἰρήνη {νη} || κοίμισίς σου. | (menorah)

It is an interesting inscription that possibly merges two different versions, that of Aquila and that of the Septuagint. The true quotation is in ll. 2–3 and is accurately cited from Aquila. Ἰς for εἰς is due to the same phonetic phenomenon mentioned for the previous inscription. The second part of the clause uses language that does not belong to Aquila and seems to be inspired by the Septuagint.[16] In this latter version, ἐγκώμιον is used only twice, namely in Prov 10:7 and Esth 2:23.[17] In both the passages, the term stands for ברכה. Conversely, it is attested in what we have of Aquila in two places in Isaiah (Isa 12:2 and 51:3) as a translation of זמרה, 'song'.[18] How

---

21:32; 25:10), and then the act of mentioning, of remembering (Isa 32:10; Deut 7:18; Ps 110(111):4), but it can mean also the object of memory (Isa 28:8; Wis 5:14). See Muraoka, Greek-English lexicon, 378.

[13] As remembrance of somebody: 1 Thess 3:6; 2 Tim 1:3; as mention in prayer: Rom 1:9; 1 Thess 1:2; Phlm 4; Eph 1:16, Phil 1:3. F. W. Danker, A Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament and other early Christian literature (3rd. ed. rev. by F. W. Danker; Chicago, 2000), 654.

[14] G. Lampe, A patristic Greek lexicon (Oxford, 1987), 452: 1 Clem. 56.1; C. Laod. Can. 51; Gr. Nyss., Encomia in Stephanum, 2 (M. 46.733A), Socr., Hist. Eccl., 7.25.2; Eus. Al., Sermo I (M. 86.324.A).

[15] van der Horst, Jewish epitaphs, 37.

[16] LXX Prov 10:7: μνήμη δικαίων μετ᾽ ἐγκωμίων.

[17] Esth 2:23: ὑπὲρ τῆς εὐνοίας Μαρδοχαίου ἐν ἐγκωμίῳ.

[18] And in Ps 146(147):1 כי טוב זמרה. Aquila translates the clause as ἀγαθὸν ἐγκώμιον (Field, Origenis Hexaplorum, vol. 2, 302). The Septuagint translates זמרה as αἴνεσις (Isa 12:2 and 51:3). In Ps 146(147):1, the Septuagint translates זמרה as αἰνεῖτε, still in the same semantic field. These passages apart, the term זמרה is attested only in Exod 15:2; Pss 81:3; 98:5; 118:14 and Amos 5:23. Barth distinguishes between its use in the absolute state (Isa 51:3; Amos 5:23; Ps 81:3; Ps 98:5), with the meaning of laudatory ode to God, and its use in the construct state (Exod 15:2; Isa 12:2; Ps 118:14) with the meaning of force, divine protection (C. Barth, s.v. זמר zmr, in Grande lessico dell'Antico Testamento, A. Catastini and and R. Contini, eds. (Brescia, 2002), vol. 2, 642–650 (translated from G. Botterweck et al., eds. Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten

to translate ll. 3–4? If εὐλογία and ἐγκώμιον are not to be considered
synonymous, the passage could be translated 'the memory of the just man
for a blessing, whose eulogies are true', as Noy does.[19] However, in such a
translation ἐγκώμιον does not stand for a blessing but for a laudatory ode,
the same semantic field as Aquila. Should we suppose that this part too is
inspired by Aquila's lexicon? It is hard to say. Ἐγκώμια as a plural noun
is attested only in the Septuagint, in Prov 10:7.[20] Notwithstanding the
meaning this term possibly has in the inscription, we could tentatively
suggest that this line, though not a true quotation of the Septuagint, is in-
spired by the language of this translation, and specifically by the passage
of Proverbs itself. Consequently, in my opinion, what the inscription at-
tests is not a true fusion of two versions of the same passage,[21] but the quo-
tation of the passage according to Aquila, and the memory of a term used
in the same passage by the Septuagint, a term that, as already stressed, is
peculiar to Proverbs, but that is not unknown to the lexicon of Aquila. This
evidence could suggest that, even when Aquila's version was in use, the
Septuagint still circulated and a peculiar term could be known by heart.

Again from Rome, and again from a funerary context, we have JIWE II,
588, an inscription on a gold-glass of small dimensions (6.3 x 5.8 cm) re-
producing a temple-like building, a menorah and lamps with flames. To the
left of the central position are three amphorae, while to the right are two
palm trees with huts against their trunks. Notwithstanding the location of
the find – De Rossi found this object in 1882, in the Christian catacomb of
Ss. Pietro and Marcellino, on Via Casilina[22] – it is unanimously considered
Jewish. Its date is debated, and ranges between the third and sixth century,
although the use of Greek in the inscription suggests an earlier third to
fourth century date.[23] The inscription, in gold lettering on a pale blue, says:

Around picture of temple and menorah: οἶκος ἰρή|[νη]ς. Λα|βὲ εὐλογία.
Around outside: [- - μετὰ τῶν] σῶ[ν] πάντων.

The first clause, 'house of peace', is actually not a biblical quotation. It is
also reported on an inscription from the upper catacomb of Villa Torlonia

Testament (Stuttgart, 1970–1977), vol. 2, 604–612). The Septuagint Book of Psalms is
apparently unaware of these differences and translates the root זמר with ψαλλ–, with a
clear reference to the sound of string instruments. זמרה as αἴνεσις is to be considered a
peculiarity of the Septuagint Isaiah. In what we have of Aquila, זמרה is translated as
μελῳδία (Ps 80:3, Field, Origenis Hexaplorum, vol. 2, 232), a term that Symmachus
translates as ᾠδή (but in Ps 117:14 αἴνεσις).

[19] JIWE II, 276, 240.
[20] In Esth 2:23 it is used as a singular noun.
[21] Contra van der Horst, Jewish epitaphs, 37.
[22] J. B. De Rossi, Verre représentant le Temple de Jérusalem (Genoa, 1883).
[23] J. Leveen, The Hebrew Bible in art (London, 1944; repr., New York, 1974), 17.

at Rome, written in charcoal on tiles closing a loculus of gallery A5.[24] This inscription dates from the third to fourth century CE. Noy sees a similarity with a fragmentary inscription from a catacomb of Beth She'arim, likewise dated to the third to fourth century: τόπος τῆς εἰρήνης, 'place of the peace.'[25] The text describes the burial place.

Because this phraseology does not fit any biblical description of the Temple, usually mentioned as οἶκος θεοῦ or οἶκος κυρίου, it has been supposed that it was a reference to the grave connected to the gold-glass.[26] However, the production of a gold-glass for funerary use is attested only once, in a gold-glass of unknown provenance but of Roman context, sold before 1951 and now lost, which has a clear funerary inscription.[27] Noy is well aware of the lack of decisive evidence, but nevertheless distinguishes between the iconography of the object, interpreted as the Temple, and the phrase 'house of peace', supposed to refer to the tomb.[28] Conversely, some who have been party to the scholarly debate make a link between the iconography and the inscription. The building at the centre is interpreted as the Temple and the inscription is supposed to be a non-biblical reference to the Temple.[29]

With regard to the second clause, εὐλογία could stand for εὐλογίαν: the loss of the ending ν is not actually a misspelling, for it is a tendency attested in papyri of this period.[30] The phrase has been considered a quotation from 1 Kgdms 25:27 or from 4 Kgdms 5:15.[31] In these passages, the benediction refers to a gift, an object or goods, as in Gen 33:11 where εὐλογίας is synonymous with the term δῶρα, used a few lines above.[32]

---

[24] JIWE II, 513: ὖκος εἰρήνης· Κερδῶν μετὰ εὐλογίας | ἐν ἰρή|νη.

[25] BS II, 30 (CIJ II, 1040).

[26] E.g. E. Goodenough, Jewish symbols in the Greco-Roman period, (New York, 1953), vol. II, 473.

[27] JIWE II, 596: ἐνθάδε κεῖνται | Ἀναστασία μήτηρ καὶ | Ἀσθὴρ θυγάτηρ· ἐν [εἰ]ρήνη ἡ κοίμησεις | αὐτῶν. ἀμ[ή]ν. | שלום.

[28] JIWE II, 473.

[29] Since the first editor, De Rossi, Verre, 14–15; Frey, CIJ I, 515: «est sans doute le Temple de Jérusalem représenté»; H. Leclerq, 'Verre', DACL XV.2 (1953), 2973, plate 11220; E. Revel-Neher, L'arche de l'alliance dans l'art juif et chrétien (Paris, 1982), 107–8; A. St Clair, 'God's house of peace in paradise: the Feast of Tabernacles on a Jewish gold-glass', JJA 11 (1985), 6–15.

[30] Gignac, A grammar of the Greek papyri, vol. I, 111–4 and E. Mayser, Grammatik der Griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit (Berlin and Leipzig, 1934), vol. I.1, 169–170.

[31] 1 Kgdms 25:27: καὶ νῦν λαβὲ τὴν εὐλογίαν ταύτην, ἣν ἐνήνοχεν ἡ δούλη σου τῷ κυρίῳ μου. 4 Kgdms 5:15: καὶ νῦν λαβὲ τὴν εὐλογίαν παρὰ τοῦ δούλου σου.

[32] Gen 33:10–11: εἰ εὕρηκα χάριν ἐναντίον σου, δέξαι τὰ δῶρα διὰ τῶν ἐμῶν χειρῶν... λαβὲ τὰς εὐλογίας μου, ἃς ἤνεγκά σοι.

Conversely, λαμβάνειν εὐλογίαν (לקח ברכה), is attested twice in Genesis and in Ps 23(24):5[33]. In these passages, εὐλογία stands again for benediction.

The interpretation of the inscription depends on a debated point, namely the use of the gold-glasses, and the reason why they were walled up in the galleries of Jewish catacombs, often near funerary inscriptions. It raises questions about the function of the gold-glasses as intact objects (those found in catacombs are fragments of larger glass vessels) and as 'funerary' objects. This inscription, written as decoration of a gold-glass, could be tentatively referred to the original use of the object, possibly a non-funerary use. Thus, it has been supposed that it was related to the benedictions pronounced before the meal, a hotly debated reading that depends on the interpretation of the iconography itself.[34]

Outside Rome, one of the most precise quotations from the Greek Bible has been found in Nikaia, Bithynia (Iznik). The stone was probably part of the front column of an aedicula inside a synagogue, as suggested by the quality of the material (Proconnese marble) and by the inscribed text, often used in benedictions. It could date from the fourth to sixth century.[35] The

---

[33] Gen 27:35, 37 (the blessing of Jacob and Esau) and Ps 23(24):5 (οὗτος λήμψεται εὐλογίαν παρὰ κυρίου).

[34] De Rossi, Verre, 17–18; H. W. Beyer and H. Lietzmann, Die Jüdische Katakombe der Villa Torlonia in Rom. Studien zur spätantiken Kunstgeschichte 4, Jüdische Denkmäler, I (Berlin-Leipzig, 1930), 23 and H. Beyer, s.v. εὐλογία, in F. Montagnini and G. Scarpat, eds., Grande Lessico del Nuovo Testamento, (Brescia, 1965–1992), vol. II, 1170 nr. 31 (It. ed. G. Kittel et al., eds., Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament, (Stuttgart, 1933–1979), vol. II, 758). Frey took it to signify 'accept a blessed object'. Noy translated the clause as 'accept a blessing', but in commenting on the text noted the importance of the references to the books of Kingdoms whose meaning was 'accept the gift'. On gold-glasses see J. Engemann, 'Bemerkungen zur römischen Gläsern mit Goldfoliendekor', JAC 11–12 (1968–9), 7–25; L. Rutgers, The Jews in late ancient Rome (Leiden, 1995), 81–5; L. Rutgers, The hidden heritage of Diaspora Judaism (Leiden, 1998), 68–9.

[35] Schneider published the stone in 1943. With the cooperation of J. Keil, he could recognise the first inscription as Jewish, and read: [ὁ] διδοὺς ἀγ[α]|[θ]ὸν τῖ πάσι σ|αρκί, ὅτι εἰ[ς] | ἐῶνα ἔλεο[ς] | αὐτοῦ. He considered the inscription as a quotation of Ps 135:25 according to the Septuagint, and dated it to the second century CE (A.M. Schneider, Die römischen und byzantinischen Denkmäler von Iznik-Nicaea. Istanbuler Forschungen 16 (Berlin, 1943), 36, no. 68, republished by S. Sahin, Katalog der antiken Inschriften des Museums von Iznik (Nikaia). Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien 9 (Bonn, 1979), 295b, nr. 615). In 1996 Fine and Rutgers re-edited the stone and dated it to the fourth to sixth century on the grounds of a stylistic analysis of the menorah. They read ἄρτον instead of ἀγαθὸν in ll. 1–2 and suggested that this quotation echoed later Greek translators, such as Symmachus and Aquila (S. Fine and L. V. Rutgers, 'New light on Judaism in Asia Minor during late antiquity: two recently identified inscribed Menorahs', JSQ 3 (1996), 1–23). In 1998, A. Pralong published a study of the

text of the inscription was reedited in 2001 by Zuckerman, to whom I refer.

Διδοὺς ἄρ|[τ]ον τῖ πάσι σ|αρκί, ὅτι εἰ[ς] | ἐῶνα ἔλεο[ς] | αὐτοῦ

It is the only epigraphic mention of Ps 135:25, a passage that the Septuagint translates as ὁ διδοὺς τροφὴν πάσῃ σαρκί, ὅτι εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ. The lettering of some words depends on a phonetic rendering of the vowels. Thus, in τῖ πάσι "ι" is the phonetic transcription of η, the ending of the singular feminine dative of the first declension, while the interchange of ε and the diphthong αι of the word ἐῶνα is quite a common phenomenon in the Roman period, which indicates the identification of the short diphthong /ai/ with the simple vowel /e/.[36] Since the first publication, scholars have debated the version of the Bible underlying this quotation. According to Field's edition of the Hexapla,[37] Origen, in quoting the very beginning of the passage, mentions the Septuagint and adds two similar versions, with the words: ἄλλος· ὃς δίδωσιν ἄρτον. ἄλλος· διδοὺς ἄρτον, which is actually the version of the inscription. Field identifies the first quotation as Aquila, and the second as Symmachus. Zuckerman shares this opinion, noting that, although Origen does not preserve the rest of the verse, εἰς αἰῶνα (without an article) turns out to be Symmachus' regular way of translating לעולם, 'forever'. He concludes that the Iznik inscription was the 'first empirical proof of the use of Symmachus' translation of the Bible in a Jewish, arguably synagogal, context.'[38] However, Aquila too uses the same expression, as some scholars have remarked.[39] Differently from the Septuagint that adds the article (εἰς τὸν

Christian iconography of the stone, and dated it to the fourth century. Pralong's detailed photos allowed new studies of the Jewish inscription too (A. Pralong, 'A propos d'un bloc de marbre d'Iznik', in ΕΥΨΥΧΙΑ. Mélanges offerts à Hélène Ahrweiler (Byzantina Sorbonensia 16), M. Balard, ed., (Paris, 1998), vol. 2, 603–9 and plates I, III, IV and V.). In 2001 C. Zuckerman re-edited the text and emended the previous readings of l.1. He agreed with Fine/Rutgers' reading of ἄρτον but remarked that there was no room for a masculine article before διδούς, as previously supposed (C. Zuckerman, 'Psalm 135:25 in Symmachus' translation on a Jewish inscription from Nicaea (Iznik)', SCI 20 (2001), 105–111). Ameling, who published the inscription in IJO, accepted his reading (W. Ameling, Inscriptiones Judaicae Orientis. II. Kleinasien. Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum 101 (Tübingen, 2004), nr.153, 321–324). Notwithstanding a different interpretation of the biblical passage itself, Salvesen too welcomed the reading of Zuckerman ('Psalm 135(136):25 in a Jewish Greek inscription from Nicaea', in Semitic studies in honour of Edward Ullendorff, G. Kahn, ed., (Leiden, 2005), 212–221)

[36] Gignac, A grammar of the Greek papyri, vol. 1, 235

[37] Field, Origenis Hexaplorum, vol.2, 290b and n.8.

[38] Zuckerman, Psalm 135:25, 111

[39] van der Horst (Jewish Epitaphs, 37–38) wonders whether this quotation – like other imperfect quotations – has to be considered as a conscious harmonization of two versions

αἰῶνα), Symmachus translates לעולם as εἰς αἰῶνα (without the article)[40] or, less frequently, as δι᾽ αἰῶνος.[41] However, εἰς αἰῶνα turns out to be Aquila's regular way of translating לעולם, a translation that is modelled on the form of the Hebrew expression.[42] In 2005 Salvesen analysed certain stylistic peculiarities of the epigraphic fragment.[43] She concluded that the stone possibly quoted (or echoed) Aquila's version of the passage and noted the use of this version, not that of Symmachus, among the Jewish communities of Asia Minor in late antiquity.

II. Imperfect quotations

It is much more difficult to envisage the source of texts where biblical passages are roughly quoted, or which echo Scripture in a partial or inaccurate way. How should we regard a text that is couched in biblical language but is not a true quotation? Moreover, how should we classify texts that quote a passage, but with meaningful inaccuracies, or that put the passage into a clause, modifying its structure, or shaping it ad sensum? Can we deduce information on the Bible from such texts? To answer these questions, let us return to Prov 10:7.

JIWE II, 307 comes from the catacomb of Vigna Randanini at Rome, where it is still kept.[44] It is a marble plaque divided into three fragments.

---

or a free rendering, an allusion, a quotation by heart of a Biblical passage. Ameling (IJO,II, 324) cites Zuckerman, whose reading he uses, but is not completely convinced by his interpretation that, conversely, Felle welcomes (A. Felle, Biblia epigraphica: la Sacra Scrittura nella documentazione epigrafica dell'orbis Christianus antiquus (III–VIII secolo), (Bari, 2006), App. B, 616).

[40] Pss 29(30):7; 30(31):2; 36(37):27; 44(45):18; 48(49):12; 88(89:)29, 53; 118(119):98; 144(145):2.

[41] Pss 29:13; 40(41):13; 88(89):37. According to Shenker, the few cases of εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα could depend on a possible influence of the language of the Septuagint. A. Schenker, Hexaplarische Psalmenbruchstücke. Die hexaplarischen Psalmenfragmente der Handschriften Vaticanus graecus 752 und Canonicianus graecus 62. Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 8 (Freiburg/Göttingen, 1975), 291–2; J. R. Busto Saiz, La traducción de Símmaco en el libro de los Salmos (Madrid 1985), 184. Salvesen, 'Psalm 135(136):25', 219–220.

[42] Pss 29(30):7, 30; 30(31):2; 48 (49):9, 12; 88(89):28, 37, 53. K. Hyvärinen, Die Übersetzung von Aquila. Coniectanea Biblica Old Testament Series (Lund, 1977), 47 and 93.

[43] Namely the use of the present participle without an article or relative pronoun to translate נתן, the rendering of לכל בשר and of חסדו without an article – this latter typical of Aquila – and again εἰς αἰῶνα. Salvesen, 'Psalm 135(136):25', 212–221.

[44] Noy, JIWE II, 261. On the meaning of νομοδιδάσκαλος see also T. Rajak, 'The Jewish community and its boundary', in The Jews among Pagans and Christians in the Roman Empire, J. Lieu et al., eds., (London and New York, 1992), 14–5.

[....]τῳ νομωδ[ιδασ]|[κάλῳ·] μνήμη δικαίο[υ] σ[ὺ]ν | ἐνκωμίῳ· vac. | ἐν ἰρήνῃ κοίμισίς σου.

The clause in lines 2–3 is based on the Septuagint version (μνήμη δικαίων μετ᾽ ἐγκωμίων), quite faithfully cited. As has been remarked, the use of ἐγκώμιον to translate the Hebrew ברכה, and generally the use of εγκωμ- in place of ευλογ- to translate the Hebrew root ברך, belongs to the lexicon of the Septuagint book of Proverbs, and contributes to mark the Hellenistic character of its language.[45] Although this quotation is clearly inspired by the Septuagint passage, it differs from this version in two significant details. Firstly, in the inscription σύν replaces μετά. The use of this preposition is not directly inspired either by the Hebrew or by the Septuagint text, but depends on a linguistic trend attested in koiné Greek.[46] Secondly, the inscription uses the singular instead of the plural form in two places, both for δίκαιος in l.2 and for ἐγκώμιον in l.3. This is far more interesting, because it apparently echoes the Hebrew text, which uses the singular, as Aquila's version does. What can we deduce? Though the lexicon and the word-order of this inscription are clearly inspired by the Septuagint, the passage is not an exact quotation, since it differs on a peculiarity of the Septuagint text.

Again on Prov 10:7. IJO I, Cre3 is a funerary inscription found at Kastelli Kissamou, in the isle of Crete, dated to the fourth to fifth century CE.

Σοφία Γορτυνί|α πρεσβυτέρα | κὲ ἀρχισυναγω|γίσσα Κισάμου ἔν|θα. Μνήμη δικέας | ἰς ἐῶνα. ἀμήν.

This inscription, remarkable for the titles the woman holds,[47] is also interesting from our point of view. The sentence in ll. 5–6 recalls the biblical passage, but with a significant difference. Again, we have to allow for the usual phonetic adjustments: ε for αι and ι for ει. Thus, the text should be read as μνήμη δικαίας εἰς αἰῶνα. The first part of the sentence is a quotation of Proverbs, but it is hard to say from which version. As we have

[45] J. Cook, 'Hellenistic influence in the Septuagint Book of Proverbs', in VII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies. Leuven 1989, C. Cox, ed., (Atlanta, 1991), 341–353; id. 'The Septuagint Proverbs as a Jewish-Hellenistic document', in VIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies. Paris 1992, L. Greekspoon and O. Munnich, eds., (Atlanta, 1995), 349–365.

[46] F. Blass and A. Debrunner, Grammatica del greco del Nuovo Testamento, (Brescia 1982), 293–4 and 298–9 (It. ed. G. Pisi, ed., of F.Blass-A. Debrunner, Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch, F. Rehkopf, ed., (Göttingen, 1976), 14th ed.); Mayser, Grammatik der Griechischen Papyri, II.2, 398–401; G. Cooper, Attic Greek prose syntax (Ann Arbor, 1998), II, 1158–1160 and 1190–4.

[47] See P. van der Horst, 'The Jews of ancient Crete', JJS 39/2 (1988), 183–201.

already seen, the use of the singular for translating צדיק (or צדיקה), could recall Aquila's version, rather than the Septuagint. L.6 contains the formula εἰς αἰῶνα. ἀμήν. In the first part of the line, לעולם is again translated without an article, as in Aquila and, less frequently, in Symmachus. The first editor, Bandy,[48] saw in this text a possible quotation from the Septuagint. In my opinion, on the contrary, this inscription does not actually quote a biblical passage, but uses biblical language, possibly inspired by the phraseology of Aquila's version – not that of the Septuagint – to construct a sentence that merges the beginning of a biblical passage and a very common biblical formula.

III.

Evidence for the use of biblical quotations in epigraphy by Jews is extremely rare. In an area such as Egypt, where the Jewish presence was certainly well established, no evidence of clear quotations has been found. As far as Egypt is concerned, this could be due to the scarce use of epigraphy outside the Leontopolite nome, and to the peculiarities of the epigraphic evidence from this area. However, in late antiquity new communities were founded in Italy, Gallia and Hispania. Rome apart, the main epigraphic languages in Western Diaspora were Latin and (from the fifth century on) Hebrew, but in the third to fourth century Greek was still in use, with a frequency that varied with the geographical context. In Italy, for instance, neither the communities of Northern Italy nor the Jews of Venosa (as attested in the first stage of development of their catacombs) offer any evidence at all of inscriptions written in Greek and quoting biblical passages.

These brief notes concerning the locations of the finds could be taken as a starting point for further investigation of two different aspects: the spread of the Greek Bible in the Diaspora, and a better understanding of the cultural and religious patterns of the Diaspora communities themselves.

The few exact quotations cited in the inscriptions (some of which have been analysed in this paper) clearly attest to the use and spread of different Greek translations, from the Septuagint to (probably) Aquila. The most interesting case is that of Rome, with three inscriptions which quote the same passage in different versions. Though inaccurate, JIWE II 307 is strongly inspired by the Septuagint, and is not influenced – either in language or in syntax – by the other versions. The same is true for JIWE II, 112, which is almost an exact quotation from Aquila. JIWE II, 276, on the contrary, quotes Aquila, but in some lexical choices it attests to a deep

---

[48] A. Bandy, 'Early Christian inscriptions of Crete', Hesperia 32/2 (1963), 228–9.

knowledge of the Septuagint, still circulating. As already remarked, the imprecise dating of the Roman inscriptions does not help us understand if and when Aquila replaced the Septuagint in the synagogue service and in the daily life of the community.

Another point concerns the use of Scripture, when introduced in the text as an imprecise quotation or as a pale memory echoed in the linguistic fabric. Let us return to Prov 10:7. The occurrence of this passage in different contexts and periods attests to the spread of a funerary habit in the whole Mediterranean Diaspora.[49] However, if we consider the quality of the quoted text, the inaccuracies noted in the Greek inscriptions are attested in Latin inscriptions too, and in Hebrew texts. In considering JIWE II, 307, we stressed that while the Septuagint chooses the plural δικαίων for צדיק, the inscription uses the singular δίκαιος. JIWE I, 120[50], a bilingual Greek/Hebrew inscription from Taranto, dated to the seventh to eighth century, quotes on ll. 7–9: memoria iustorum ad be[nedictionem]. P. van der Horst briefly comments on this text and recalls the plural used in the Septuagint.[51] But this fact is interesting even from our point of view, because it cannot be considered a quotation of the Latin Bible, which translates it as Memoria iusti cum laudibus. The second part of the clause (ad benedictionem) follows the Hebrew text (with a translation which recalls that of Aquila). The first part (memoria iustorum) quotes the passage as freely as the inscriptions in Greek, but, apparently, with a greater awareness: the Hebrew passage is quoted in l.6, and צדיק is given correctly in the singular.[52] The same phenomenon is attested in another inscription from Taranto, also dated to the seventh to eighth century, JIWE I, 133, in Hebrew: זכר צדיקים לברכה. Here too, the just man becomes the just men.

---

[49] Noy (vol. I, 157) remarks the importance of Prov 10:7 in Jewish ancient and medieval epigraphy and in rabbinic thought. R. Isaac cites this passage to support his statement: 'Whoever mentions the name of the righteous man and does not say a blessing for him violates a religious duty of commission' (Gen. Rab. XLIX, 1 on Gen 17:17–19).

[50] JIWE I; 120: (A) hic requiescit benememorio An|atoli filio Iusti qui vixit annos | XXXX. Sit pax in requie eius. | (menorah)

(B)אור זרוע לצדיק ולישר[י־לב] שמחה | נזכר זדיק לברכה אנתולי |

memoria ius|torum ad be|[nedictionem]

Inscriptions A and B are carved on opposite faces of a parallelepiped stone.

[51] van der Horst, Jewish Epitaphs, 38

[52] A nun is carved before זכר. As Noy pointed out, this could be a mistake for וזכר due to an inaccuracy of the drafter or of the first editor, F. Lenormant, whose reading is the basis of subsequent editions of the stone. The line, even if unemended, is written in correct Hebrew and could be translated as 'The memory of the just man is remembered' or 'We shall remember the memory of the just man' (Noy, I, 154–7). It should be noted that the biblical verse does not begin with a waw.

What can be deduced? In the opinion of some scholars,[53] with reference to a Christian context and to correct quotations, the presence of a biblical passage is connected to the authoritative value that a quotation has in an epigraphic text. This aspect, that could mark the social, cultural or religious identity of the deceased, is strengthened when the quotation is chosen from Scripture. The same point might be made regarding the Jewish environment as well. But it cannot be applied to the epigraphic evidence as a whole. With regard to inscriptions with inaccurate quotations, this process depends on the links the writer creates between the quoted passage and the text of the inscription. Translations such as memoria iustorum or μνήμη δικαίων (or the use of צדיקים) in inscriptions dedicated to only one person could indicate a collective value underlying the Hebrew term, but does not actually create a textual link between the quotation and the body of the inscription. As for perfect quotations, this kind of imperfect quotations are juxtaposed with the text of the inscription in a paratactic way and have mainly a formulary function.[54]

The point changes when the biblical passage is modified according to the context, as in JIWE II, 307, or where it is but a linguistic substratum. In the inscription from Crete, the memory of the biblical passage is fading; sometimes, the original text can hardly be recognised. With differences and peculiarities that depend on the evidence, these inscriptions attest to the familiarity the Jews of the Diaspora had with the Bible, whose lexicon is used in writing the inscriptions, merged and inserted in the eulogy of the deceased. I wonder whether these inaccuracies could also attest to the presence of local variants to the text of the Bible, which the surviving versions do not record. As shown in commenting on the inscription from Iznik, a lexical study of this kind of evidence turns out to be valuable in an attempt to reconstruct the biblical text and the history of its subsequent translations.

There is still an unsolved problem. Why did the Jews barely quote the Bible in their inscriptions? In the scholarly debates on the criteria that could be applied to establish the Jewishness of a document – resumed recently in the introductions to the corpus of Jewish inscriptions from the Eastern Mediterranean[55] – the presence of a biblical quotation is not con-

---

[53] F. M. Young, Biblical exegesis and the formation of Christian culture, (Cambridge 1977), 100–103; Felle, Biblia Epigraphica, 439–443.

[54] Felle, Biblia epigraphica, 18–9 and 439.

[55] As van der Horst has pointed out, the presence of only one criterion is not enough to establish whether an inscription (or a papyrus) is Jewish or not (Jewish Epitaphs, 16–17). J. B. Frey, Corpus Inscriptionum Iudaicarum, (Roma 1936–1952), vol. I, XII; V. Tcherikover – A. Fuks, eds., Corpus Papyrorum Iudaicarum (Cambridge Mass., 1957–1964), vol. I, XVII–XX; D. Noy, JIWE I, IX–X; D. Noy et al., Inscriptiones Iudaicae Orientis, Eastern Europe, (Tübingen 2004), V–VI; Walter Ameling, ed., Inscriptiones

sidered a matter of primary importance. The Jewish character of an inscription is established by reference to symbolism and iconography, the presence of terms which could certainly refer to the synagogue or to a Jewish religious milieu, the occurrence of typical Jewish formulae or the use of the Hebrew language. The numeric irrelevance of biblical quotations in Jewish epigraphy supports this methodology, and, in my opinion, opens the way to further studies on the channels used by Jews to mark their religious belonging. We have to conclude that in the Diaspora of the Roman period, the Jews did not use the Bible in an epigraphic context to define and assess their cultural and ethnic identity.

Iudaicae Orientis. Kleinasien (Tübingen 2004), 5–21; D. Noy and H. Bloedhorn, Inscriptiones Iudaicae Orientis. Syria and Cyprus (Tübingen 2004), 5.

The Septuagint in Disgrace: Some Notes on the Stories on Ptolemy in Rabbinic and Medieval Judaism[*]

by

Giuseppe Veltri

Introduction

The Greek translation of the Torah, the so-called Septuagint, was, according to ancient Christian sources, the bone of contention between the Church fathers and the rabbis. Christian authors report the belief that the Septuagint was divinely inspired: God inspired Moses to write down the Torah on Mt. Sinai; in a similar way, seventy-two or seventy translators, assembled near the library of Alexandria, provided a perfect reproduction of the Hebrew text.[1] Rabbinic Judaism mentions only some Hebrew "translations" or texts of the "Torah for the King Ptolemy" (Talmai in Hebrew) and a story on the "translations", transmitted by Babylonian sources. In the post-talmudic tractates Sefer Torah and Soferim we have the earliest attestation of direct criticism against the Septuagint. In the following, I shall analyse the talmudic stories on the Septuagint and the medieval sources and try to ascertain their source and context.

---

[*] This contribution is based on my studies on the traditions and the legend of the Septuagint in Rabbinic and Medieval Judaism. Many of the sources and the arguments are to be found in my book Eine Tora für den König Talmai (Tübingen, 1994). On the stories of the Septuagint in Middle Ages see my earlier studies: 'Tolomeo Filadelfo, emulo di Pisistrato. Alcune note su leggende antiche di biblioteche, edizioni e traduzioni', Laurentianum 32 (1991), 146–166; 'Der Fasttag in Erinnerung an die Entstehung der Septuaginta und die Megillat Taanit Batra', Frankfurter Judaistische Beiträge 19 (1991–1992), 63–71; 'Die Entstehung der LXX in der jüdisch-mittelalterlichen Historiographie. Rezeption des Josephus und Einfluß christlicher Quellen', Laurentianum 33 (1992), 89–116.

[1] Sources of the legend and commentary now in G. Veltri, Libraries, translations, and "canonic" texts: the Septuagint, Aquila, and Ben Sira in Jewish and Christian tradition (Leiden and Boston, 2006); see especially the first chapter for the Jewish-Hellenistic and Christian Sources. In 2006 David J. Wasserstein published his father's posthumous work Abraham Wasserstein, The legend of the Septuagint: from classical antiquity to today (Cambridge, 2006).

Talmudic stories and post-talmudic developments

Babylonian rabbinic authorities show some familiarity with the legend of the Septuagint in the story of the translation in Bavli Megillah 9a–b (see also Soferim 1:7):[2]

The permission of our teachers to write in Greek is extended only to the Pentateuch because of the events with the King Ptolemy. It is taught there: It so came to pass that King Ptolemy summoned seventy-two Elders and put them in seventy-two houses without communicating to them why he had summoned them. He went to everyone separately, saying to them: write out for me the Torah of Moses, our teacher. The Holy one, blessed be He, granted knowledge to the heart of every one and they agreed with each other in their judgement. They wrote for him: (here the changed verses follow).

The number and the separation of the Elders, the houses (or cells) and the intervention of God to inspire either the "writing" or the translation of the Pentateuch, the royal attempt to avoid an agreement of the elders/ translators, are all basic elements in the Christian version of the legend of the Septuagint. Although this tradition is transmitted as baraita (implying a Mishnah-like Palestinian origin), there is no doubt that it is a product of Babylonian academies, for no Palestinian source before the Babylonian Talmud is concerned with the story of the seventy-two or seventy. They speak only of "changes for King Ptolemy/Talmai" in the form of lists or individual verses, but no mention is made of the circumstances of the translation. I suppose that Babylonian teachers read the legend of the Septuagint in the edition of Epiphanius of Salamis, the only patristic source which collected all the elements the rabbis needed with the notable exception of the number, because Epiphanius speaks of 36 and not of 72 cells. That the Babylonian Rabbis privileged the number 72 is fully understandable because of the gematria of the Hebrew name of Greece: Yawwan, yud+waw+waw+nun, 10+6+6+50=72. Epiphanius is of the opinion that divine "inspiration" produced the agreement among the translators in making changes in the text, precisely the changes of the Babylonian teachers. At any rate, a Christian influence on the Gemara is undeniable.

   The sources examined so far are either positive or neutral in regard to the evaluation of the circumstances of the translation of the Torah into Greek. However, there are two other rabbinic sources which are definitely negative in judging the process of translation of the Septuagint and its aftermath. We read in the minor talmudic tractate Soferim 1:7:

The text of the Torah must not be written in (Old) Hebrew or in Aramaic, or in Median or Greek. The Scripture (ktav) in every language and every writing may only be recited if it was written in Assyrian script.

---

[2] Soferim is a later tractate which depends on talmudic material existing at the time of the writer; see G. Veltri, Eine Tora für den König Talmai (Tübingen, 1994), 236–9.

It came to pass that five elders wrote the Torah for the King Ptolemy. This day was as ominous for Israel as the day when the golden calf was made. For the Torah could not be adequately translated.

Once again it happened that the King Ptolemy summoned seventy-two Elders and put them in seventy-two houses without communicating to them why he had summoned them. He went to everyone separately, saying to them: write out for me the Torah of Moses, our teacher. The Holy one, blessed be He, granted knowledge to the heart of every one and they agreed with each other in their judgement. Each person wrote a Torah for him in which they changed thirteen passages (here the changed verses follow).

A very similar tradition is transmitted in Sefer Torah 1:6:

The text of the scroll of the Torah must not be written in (old) Hebrew, or in Elamitic, or in Median, or Greek. Seventy elders wrote the whole Torah in Greek for king Ptolemy and that day was as ominous for Israel as the day when the Israelites made the golden calf. For the Torah could not be adequately translated. They changed thirteen passages (here the changed verses follow).

There is no doubt that Soferim, Sefer Torah and Bavli Megillah follow the same tradition, only the accents are different, although they seem to speak of two different translations. The negative aspects of translating are emphasised only by the Soferim (first translation) and Sefer Torah. The Babylonian Talmud is openly positive in following the halakhah of the Mishnah, which permits the Greek letters (and language).

The story of the two translations reported by tractate Soferim has occupied the attention of Jewish scholars since the Renaissance. According to the Italian humanist Azariah de' Rossi, the negative report refers to the translation of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion.[3] Abraham Geiger was of the opinion that the editor of Soferim was confused and fused the positive report of the Babylonian Talmud with the negative story of Sefer Torah.[4] Joel Müller, the editor of Massekhet Soferim, considers both translations as referring to one and the same translation; however, the negative report on the Torah of the five translators goes back in his opinion to a later period under the negative influence of Megillat Taʿanit Batra (see below).[5] Manuel Joël distinguishes between a first translation of the seventy-two and that of the five translators at the time of Trajan or Hadrian, as

---

[3] Azariah de' Rossi, Sefer Meʾor ʿEnayim, D. Cassel, ed., 3 vols. (Vilnius, 1864–1866, reprint Jerusalem, 1970), ch. 8, vol. 1:136. Translation in J. Weinberg, tr., Azariah de' Rossi, The light of the eyes (New Haven and London, 2001), 172.

[4] A. Geiger, Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel in ihrer Abhängigkeit von der innern Entwickelung des Judenthums (Breslau, 1857), 419–420 and 441. According to Z. Frankel, the report of the five translators is fictitious: see his Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta (Leipzig, 1841), 61, note k.

[5] J. Müller, ed., Masechet Sopherim. Der Tractat der Schreiber, eine Einleitung in das Studium der althebräischen Graphik, der Masora und der altjüdischen Liturgie, nach Handschriften herausgegeben und kommentiert (Leipzig, 1878), 12.

the first was considered a danger for Israel equal to that provoked by the episode of the golden calf.[6]

The thesis of a translation made by five translators had no lasting influence in modern scholarship, because the number five can be explained on the basis of other considerations: a mistake in the manuscript (Berliner),[7] an indirect or direct reference to the five books of the Torah (Frankel, Graetz, Aptowitzer, Hadas),[8] or as an allusion to the fifth column of the Hexapla of Origen (Joël).[9]

The number of translators[10] oscillates in Jewish and Christian sources between seventy (Sefer Torah and Soferim, manuscript Halberstamm), seventy-two (Bavli Megillah 9a–b), and five (Sefer Torah, Soferim and Avot de-Rabbi Natan, ed. B 37). The number seventy-two goes back to the so-called letter or report of Aristeas to an unknown, more likely fictitious, Philocrates.[11] An explanation for Aristeas's report is surely the number of the tribes, while Josephus gives seventy beside the traditional seventy-two. I think that gematria may also have played a role (see above). The number seventy refers to the elders of Exodus. The number five can also be explained on the basis of the following reasons: influence of Avot de-Rabbi Natan (version B, 37), provided that this does not depend on the same source; allusion to the "five Elders" in Mishnah Eruvim 3:4, Bavli Rosh Ha-Shanah 15a and Tosefta Shevi'it 4:21;[12] and finally a reference to the tradition of the five sages charged by Moses to restore the Bible after its destruction/fire (4 Ezra 14), a very intriguing reference if we suppose that

[6] M. Joël, Blicke in die Religionsgeschichte zu Anfang des zweiten christlichen Jahrhunderts, vol. 1 (Breslau, 1880), 3.

[7] A. Berliner, Targum Onkelos. Einleitung und Register (Frankfurt a.M., 1884), 79.

[8] Z. Frankel, Über den Einfluß der palästinischen Exegese auf die alexandrinische Hermeneuthik (Leipzig, 1851), 228–231; H. Graetz, Geschichte der Juden von den ältesten Zeiten bis auf die Gegenwart, vol. 3/2 (fifth edition; Leipzig, 1906), 579; A. Aptowitzer, 'Die rabbinischen Berichte über die Entstehung der Septuaginta', Ha-Kedem 2 (1908), 120; M. Hadas, Aristeas to Philocrates (New York, 1951), 81.

[9] Joël, Blicke in die Religionsgeschichte, vol. 1:4.

[10] The number of translators was also discussed in Jewish-Hellenistic and Christian literature. See M. Steinschneider, 'Die kanonische Zahl der muhammedanischen Secten und die Symbolik der Zahl 70–73, aus jüdischen und muhammedanisch Quellen nachgewiesen', Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft 4 (1850), 145–170; id. 'Nachtrag', Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft 57 (1903), 474–507; B. M. Metzger, 'Seventy or seventy-two disciples', New Testament Studies 6 (1959–60), 319–321; G. Dorival, 'La Bible de la Septante: 70 ou 72 traducteurs?', in Tradition of the text: studies offered to D. Barthélemy in celebration of his seventieth birthday, ed. G. J. Norton, S. Pisano (Fribourg, Göttingen, 1991), 45–62.

[11] On bibliography about the sources of the legend see above; further see also Aristeas to Philocrates, ed. Moses Hadas (New York, 1951); Lettera di Aristea a Filocrate, ed. Francesca Calabi (Milano, 1995).

[12] See Berliner, Targum Okelos, vol. 2: 78, note 2.

the legend of Ezra influenced the legend of the Septuagint.[13] The number five is, in my opinion, not a historical reference to a new translation different from the Torah for King Ptolemy, but only a literary clue to distinguishing two different traditions, one negative and the other positive.

The only constant in every report on the "Septuagint" is the information about the aim of the translation: for Ptolemy according to rabbinic sources, for the royal library of Alexandria according to Jewish-Hellenistic and Christian literature. In Jewish-Hellenistic tradition the king plays a role as a patron and lover of Jewish wisdom, while in the Christian tradition he emerges rather as an unwilling initiator of the Christian religion. In the Jewish tradition, in the main Palestinian in origin, King Ptolemy is neither the initiator nor the mentor/patron, but the addressee of the Torah, and that is an intriguing peculiarity. For the tradition of a Torah for the king is not new in rabbinic sources, but refers to Deuteronomy 17:18: "When he takes the throne of his kingdom, he is to write for himself on a scroll a copy of this law, taken from that of the priests, who are Levites". Katav lo (so the Masoretic text) can mean either that he should write it for himself or that someone else should write it out for him.[14] That is also the explanation of Yerushalmi Sanhedrin 2:4 (20c): "they wrote for him (means) in his name." According to Sifre Devarim, the priests correct the copy of the king, while the above quoted Yerushalmi Sanhedrin 2:4 (20c) adds that the Sanhedrin should correct the copy on the basis of the scroll of the Temple court. In this context, it is obvious that the text of Deuteronomy 17:18 is read in a different way: instead of mishneh torah, they understand meshanneh torah ("he changes the Torah") or even meshunnah torah ("an altered Torah"). And this tradition is also present in rabbinic tradition as expression of a change of the Torah (perhaps in the messianic era), a possible reference to the change of the Torah beginning in Ezra's time.[15]

If interpreted in terms of this logic, the rabbinic interpretation of the Septuagint as Torah for King Ptolemy suggests a deconstruction of meaning in the history of hermeneutics: the high value of this translation lies in its nature as a written (ketav) alteration of the Torah of Moses, an alteration implemented by the Priests or by the Sanhedrin. This is only the copy for royal needs. Of course, in this view the Septuagint cannot be a liturgical and didactical document: it is solely a Torah for the king's use, so that he may learn from it.

Returning to the relation of Sefer Torah and Soferim (first report) to the mishnaic and talmudic halakhah, we have to stress that both tractates

---

[13] See my book, Libraries, translations, and 'canonic' texts, chap. 1.3.

[14] See M. A. Friedman, "ve-khatevu lo, 'ose lo ktav", Sinai 84 (1979), 177–79.

[15] See Yerushalmi Megillah 11 (71b); Tosefta Sanhedrin 4:7–8; Bavli Sanhedrin 21b–22a.

should be dated after the talmudic period, because they prohibit what the Talmud allows, via the literary distortion of the meaning taken from the Talmud. Neither Soferim nor Sefer Torah distinguishes clearly between writing and language, and they confuse the halakah they are quoting. The redactor of Soferim affirms that it is not allowed to write in Old ʿIvrit, Median and Greek. If one has written in other languages, he could recite from them in the liturgy only if written in Assyrian script (ashshurit).

What is the aim of this halakhah, the script or the language? The question is not pointless: from the time of the Mishnah until at least Maimonides a very lively discussion took place on whether other alphabets were suitable for liturgy.[16] In the Middle Ages, the opinion gained acceptance that in the time of the Mishnah, first only the Greek alphabet was allowed (though not the language); later it was replaced by the Assyrian square characters.[17] The disharmony between the premise (no other alphabet is permitted) and the conclusion (reading in other languages) is also confirmed by the sentence "The Scripture (ktav) in every language and every form of writing may be recited only if it was written (ketuvah) in Assyrian script". The feminine ketuvah is a small but precious reference to the fact that the redactor of the tractate of the scribe is quoting from earlier texts: the expression "only if it was written (ketuvah!) in Assyrian writing" originates from the reading of the Megillat Ester, which according to the Mishnah (Megillah 2:1; cf. Bavli Shabbat 115a; Bavli Megillah 18a) has to be written in Assyrian characters and recited in the Hebrew language. The redactor of Soferim deconstructs the original context and applies and extends a ban on other scripts for the Megillah to the Torah, without specifying whether he opts for Assyrian characters or for the language. This confusion proves that he collects texts without much interest in really understanding them.

The distortion of earlier halakhot can also be observed in the case of Sefer Torah if the redactors maintain: "Seventy elders wrote (katevu) the whole Torah in Greek for the king Ptolemy and that day was as ominous for Israel as the day when the Israelites made the golden calf. For the Torah could not be adequately translated (tirgem)". The sentence she-loʾ hayetah ha-torah yekholah le-targem kol ṣorkhah is a quotation from Yerushalmi Megillah 1:11 (71c) with the omission of ella yevanit ("with the exception of Greek)". In the Talmud Yerushalmi, the halakhah states that only the Greek language is suitable for the translation (as targum),

---

[16] See Maimonides, Hilkot Tefillin 1:19, in Mishneh Torah: the book of adoration, ed. M. Hyamson (Jerusalem, 1965), 121a.

[17] See the fragment published by E. N. Adler in Jewish Quarterly Review 9 (1897), 669–716 and Rabbi Meʾiri, Beyt ha-beḥira ʿal masekhet megillah, ed. Moses Hersler (Jerusalem, 1967–1968), 35–36.

while the redactor of Sefer Torah omits the language and extrapolates an absolute ban on all languages from this sentence. The comparison with the golden calf is also a quotation from earlier rabbinic traditions, namely from the Talmud Yerushalmi Shabbat 1:4 (3c) and Bavli Shabbat 17a, where the comparison to the execrable day refers to the (historical?) dispute between the schools of the Hillelites and Shammaites, which ended in violence. The golden calf here symbolises the division between two rabbinic schools and the consequences of that division.

It is not clear what the redactor of Sefer Torah was aiming at when comparing the Septuagintal translation to the golden calf. But if we think that according to Pesiqta Rabbati § 5 (see below), the written Torah is an example of a discussion between the nations of the world which translated the Torah and read it in Greek, and Israel, we can perhaps conclude that what is important here is the claim to possession of the written Torah. However, there too the texts are not clear enough to spell out the object of the controversy: the written or the oral Torah, the text (ketav) or the liturgical, didactic translation (targum)? In any event, the negative stories and reports on the Septuagint should be placed in a later post-talmudic period when a revival of Hebrew took place accompanied by dangers to one's identity because of Christian or Gnostic adoption of the Jewish Torah.

The oft-quoted Midrash in the context of the adoption of the Septuagint is Pesikta Rabbati § 5 (ed. Friedman, 14b):

Rabbi Judah, pupil of Rabbi Shalom said: Moses prayed [God] to have the Mishnah in writing. The Holy one, blessed be He, predicted that in the future the nations of the world would translate the Torah and recite it in Greek and make it known: 'They (the Jews) are not Israel.' The Holy one, blessed be He, said to him: "Oh Moses: one day the nations will say: 'We are the sons of God'. Israel will answer: 'We are the sons of God'. And this will hold the scales even.

The Holy one, blessed be He, said to the nations: "Why do you claim that you are my sons? I know only that my son is the one who owns my secrets" (word in Greek: mis/erin). The nations answer him: 'What are your secrets'? He says to him: 'The Mishnah'.

The message of the Midrash is unambiguous: The Mishnah constitutes the discrimen, the only difference, between Israel and the nations of the world. The historical circumstances in which this tradition should be placed remain unclear. The common opinion views this text in relation to the so-called Jewish-Christian controversy because of the Christian claim to be the verus Israel.[18] Some scholars even see in this text a discrediting of the

---

[18] G. F. Moore, Judaism in the first centuries of the Christian era, 3 vols. (Cambridge, Ma., 1927–30), vol. 2:68, footnote 6; D. Barthélemy, 'L'Ancien Testament a mûri à Alexandrie', Theologische Zeitschrift 21 (1965), 364–365; repr. in Études d'histoire du texte de l'Ancien Testament (Fribourg and Göttingen, 1978), 133–134; see further J. Bergmann, Jüdische Apologetik (Berlin, 1908), 61; E. E. Urbach, 'Halakha we-nevu'a',

Greek Torah.[19] I cannot recognize any blame or reproof of the Septuagint here. On the contrary, look first at the liturgical terminology of the text: the nations of the world would translate (in the meaning of targum)[20] and recite the text in Greek. Qara' and tirgem are Jewish liturgical technical terms for the synagogue service (see Mishnah Megilla 4). Second, after the appropriation of the written Torah by the nations of the world, the scales are even. This means that the claim of the nations is upheld to base their right in the giving of the Torah. But that is not enough. Only the Mishnah as secret doctrine[21] authorized the Jewish people to be named "son of God." If here we recall what was stated with reference to Hilarius – according to whom the seventy are "authorities" because they possess a particular hidden doctrine in addition to the written law (praeter scientiam legis) and incorporated in the written text – we can fully understand the focus of the Midrash. Moreover, the attempts to canonize the Septuagint as a synolon (the whole) of oral and written Torah do not give them, "the Gentile", the right to consider themselves sons of God, because the specific difference lies in the Mishnah, transmitted orally.

To conclude this first part. Although recent studies try to offer a different vision of the "negative" attitude toward the Septuagint in old rabbinic texts by dating Sefer Torah and Soferim in 3th century,[22] I would like to emphasize that both of them cannot be other than post-Amoraic because they confused the material of the preceding tradition. We do not have any evidence of an Amoraic verdict against the translators and their product.

Tarbiz 18 (1946–1947), 6–7, footnote 50; id. The sages: their concepts and beliefs (Jerusalem, 1975), 305–306; M. Simon, Verus Israel. Étude sur les relations entre Chrétiens et Juifs dans l'empire romain (135–425), (2nd edition; Paris, 1964), 225; L. Baeck, 'Haggadah and Christian doctrine', Hebrew Union College Annual 23/1 (1950–1951), 557–558; M. Simon, 'La Bible dans les premières controverses entre Juifs et Chrétiens', in Le monde grec ancien et la Bible, ed. Claude Mondésert (Paris, 1985), 111; but cf. J. Maier, Jüdische Auseinandersetzung mit Christentum in der Antike (Darmstadt, 1982), 184–185.

[19] So N. de Lange: 'It is the purpose of such apologetic to discredit the Greek version of the Bible at the same time as bestowing a spurious respectability on the rabbinic traditions. The Rabbis persistently deprecated the translation of the Bible into Greek;' Origen and the Jews, 50.

[20] On the difference between likhtov bilshon and letargem see my book Libraries, translations, and 'canonic' texts, chap. 3.

[21] Talmud Yerushalmi Pea 2:6 (17a/43–50) and Talmud Yerushalmi Hagiga 1:8 (76d/17–24). On this terminology, see G. A. Wewers, Geheimnis und Geheimhaltung im rabbinischen Judentum (Berlin and New York, 1975), 87–90.

[22] The study of M. Simon-Shoshan, 'The task of the translators: the Rabbis, the Septuagint, and the cultural politics of translation', Prooftexts 27 (2007), 1–39, offers only a summary of old opinions based on already known texts. The Amoraic, or even Tannatic, origin of Sefer Torah and Soferim is only claimed, but not proved. I basically miss the discussion of ketav and letargem.

In addition to this, the Rabbis contextualized the literary motif "Torah for King Talmai" in a favourable exegetical tradition making the king into a special talmid, as a later Midrash states: "This is one of the passages which the Elders of Israel changed for king Ptolemy. They wrote for him: Elohim bara' bereshit ("God created in the beginning"). For he [the King] did not have enough knowledge to reflect on the Midrash of the Torah (Leqaḥ Ṭov to Gen 1:1)."

Almost no scholar has noted that the "changes for the king" is nothing but a rabbinic paradigm to be referred to the "changed Torah for the king" (mishneh Torah) of Deuteronomistic tradition and the main question in the evaluation of the Septuagint is the written character of the translation. The written translation could be interpreted as a substitute for the Hebrew original. And that was the real problem.

Medieval reception and the Megillat Taʿanit Batra

Two opposite tendencies run through the Middle Ages: praise and contempt for the undertaking of the Septuagint. The positive attitude to the Greek Torah originates from Hellenistic Jewish (Josephus) as well from Christian sources.[23]

Praises for the translation of the Greek Torah are present in the Byzantine world. The anonymous translator or adaptator of Josephus in the Sefer Yosippon,[24] records the event of the translation without adding any negative connotation. Its Arabic and Ethiopic versions, in a short summary of episode,[25] also show no negative attitude. Besides the Yosippon reception there is also a more direct reading of Josephus in the thirteenth century, as we have it in the Sefer ha-Zikhronot of Elʿazar b. Asher ha-Levi (thirteenth-fourteenth century), or the so-called Chronicle of Jerachmeel (MS Bodley, Neubauer and Cowley 2797), partly published by A. Neubauer and M. Gaster[26] and recently by E. Yassif.[27] Of interest is the fact that the Chronicle

---

[23] On this part, see also the work of Wasserstein, quoted above.

[24] There is a lot of literature on the topic, see my Gegenwart der Tradition (Leiden, 2002), 122 ff. On the edition of Yosippon, Saskia Dönitz (Freie Universität, Berlin) is preparing her PhD.

[25] J. Wellhausen, Der arabische Josippus, in Abhandlungen der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaft zu Göttingen, vol. 1 (Berlin, 1897); Des Josef ben Gorion (Yosippon) Geschichte der Juden, Zēna Āihŭd, ed. M. Kamil (Hamburg and New York, 1937).

[26] A. Neubauer, Mediaeval Jewish chronicles, vol. 2 (Oxford, 1895) and M. Gaster, 'The unknown Aramaic original of Theodotion's additions to the Book of Daniel', in idem, Studies and Texts, vol. 3 (New York, 1928), 16. Translation and commentary in vol. 1, 42 (39–68).

also transmits some "histories" of the Hebrew translations which are probably translated from Christian catenae in a Latin version, as I have tried to show elsewhere.[28]

Also subordinate to the Christian tradition are the Karaite notices on the Septuagint. As Abū Yūsuf Ya'qub al-Qirqisānī puts it:

They[29] surpass the Christians in nonsense and falsehood, for the Christians rely in many of their teachings on nonsense and obstinacy for they recognize and admit the truth of the Jewish religion and at the same time renounce it. When it became clear to them that alterations and changes had been introduced into the translations of our books, impudence led them to claim Syriac as the primaeval language. Cyprian and his like are the authorities for this. Many of them argue that no alteration or change has been introduced into the translation because King Ptolemy, having assembled seventy elders of the Jews, divided them up and placed every pair in a separate place and then he ordered them to translate for him the twenty-four books; which they did, and when their translations were compared, no difference was found between them. This is what they call the Edition of the Seventy. The Rabbanites confirm this story, giving the king in question the name of "Talmai", but claim that the great and glorious Creator dictated to them so that they wrote the same thing; but they changed ten things in the Scripture, and wrote them not as they are in the original.[30]

In his report on the Septuagint, Qirqisani probably follows Epiphanius (and not Cyprian!) by reading the Syriac version of his De Mensuris and Ponderibus,[31] a text which was also well received among Muslim sources.[32]

A first negative notice on the LXX is transmitted by Abraham Ibn Daud in his Divre Malkhe Yisrael Ba-Bayit ha-Sheni[33] where we also find a mixture of Christian and Jewish sources. The story of the Septuagint transla-

---

[27] Sefer ha-Zikhronot hu' Divrey ha-Yamim le-*Yeraḥ*me'el, ed. Eli Yassif (Tel Aviv, 2001).

[28] Veltri, Gegenwart der Tradition, 132–8. These traditions show just how deep the knowledge of Christian sources was among Jews in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.

[29] The Rabbanites.

[30] A. Harkavy, 'Remarks of the Qaraite Abū Yūsuf Ya'qub al-Qirqisānī on the Jewish sects' (in Russian), Memoirs of the Oriental Department of the Imperial Russian Archeological Society 8 (1894), 247–78. New edition by L. Nemoy, Kit*ā*b al-Anw*ā*r wal-Mar*ā*qib. Code of Caraite Law by Ya'qub al-Qirqis*ā*ni, vol. 1 (New York, 1939), 37–8; English translation in L. Nemoy, 'Al-Qirqisānī's account of the Jewish sects and Christianity', Hebrew Union College Annual 7 (1930), 358–359. The quoted English translation is by W. Lockwood, in B. Chiesa and W. Lockwood, Ya'q*ū*b al-Qirqis*ā*n*ī* on Jewish sects and Christianity (Frankfurt, 1984), 130–1.

[31] J. E. Dean, ed., Epiphanius' treatise on weights and measures: the Syriac version (Chicago, 1935). See also D. J. Bruns, 'Syrische Nachrichten von den griechischen Übersetzungen aus Manuscripten gesammlet', 14 (1784), 39–59.

[32] See G. Vajda, 'La version des LXX dans la littérature musulmane', Revue des Études Juives 89 (1929–1930), 65–70; see Wasterstein, The legend, 174 ff.

[33] Amsterdam 1710–1711, 50a–b.

tion in the cells, the precise agreement in the translated text, the miracle and finally the changes in the texts are rabbinic and Christian. The literary aim of the story, however, is Christian. Ibn Daud writes:

(Talmai) looked for an argument against Israel and for a pretext in their teaching to expel them from society.

Yet his plan did not work out. The translation was a success and the translators were praised and honoured at the king's court, according to Ibn Daud following the story of Josephus-Yosippon.

The motif of fear against the king is present already in the report of Latin Church father Jerome[34]. However, the first to speak of a pretext is the Arabic writer Muhammad Ibn Ahmad Al-Birūni, who may also be the source of Ibn Daud:

The Jews, however, give quite a different account, viz., that they made the translation under compulsion and that they yielded to the king's demand only from fear of violence and maltreatment and not before having agreed upon inverting and confounding the text of the book.[35]

Al-Birūni refers to a negative tradition, i.e. that the traduction was a product of compulsion. No source of the Tannaitic and Amoraic period reports compulsive measures of king Talmai/Ptolemy looking for a pretext. The origin of the tradition of a "compulsion" may once more be Epiphanius of Salamis, who, according to the Greek-Syriac version, mentions a letter of Ptolemy to the rulers ("principibus") of Jerusalem[36] asking for the prophetic books on God and the creation of the world: "sine invidia et dolo mittite mihi". An indirect threat and compulsion cannot be overlooked.

Al-Birūni is also a very important testimony because he also transmits a list of Jewish fasts. Under Tevet he writes:

5. First appearance of darkness. Ptolemy, the king of the Greeks, had asked them for the Torah, compelled them to translate it into Greek, and deposited it in his treasury. They [the Jews] maintain that this is the version of the Seventy. In consequence darkness spread over the world during three days and nights.
8. A fast-day, the last of the three Dark Days, so called for the reason just mentioned.[37]

---

[34] Prologus in Pentateuchum, Patrologia Latina 28, 121 (see also Biblia sacra iuxta Vulgatam versionem. ed. Weber, 1975, 3–4) 'Iudaei prudenti factum dicunt esse consilio, ne Ptolomeus, unius dei cultor, etiam apud Hebraeos duplicem divinitatem deprehenderet, quos maximi idcirco faciebat, quia in Platonis dogma cadere videbantur.'

[35] English translation by C. E. Sachau, ed., The chronology of ancient nations (London, 1879), 23–24; Arabic text in Chronologie orientalischer Völker von Albêrūnī, ed. C. E. Sachau (Leipzig, 1878).

[36] I am quoting from the Latin version in van M. Esbroeck, 'Une forme inédite de la lettre du roi Ptolémée pour la traduction des LXX', Biblica 57 (1976), 542–49, here 547.

[37] C. E. Sachau, ed., The chronology, 272.

Al-Birūni is reading the so called Additions to the Scroll of the Fasts (Megillat Taʿanit Batra) which – with the exception the rabbinic tractates Soferim and Sefer Tora – is the only gaonic source with a very negative attitude to the Septuagint. We read in it:

On the eighth of Tevet the Torah was translated into Greek at the time of King Ptolemy. For three days, darkness descended upon the world.[38]

I do not intend to go into details on the complicated origins of this gaonic tractate,[39] which some scholars have antedated – as is usual for this genre – to the first centuries CE. I would like only to point to the fact that the manuscript transmission on the fast offers no option of a pre-gaonic period. Even the date 8 Tevet is not certain: some manuscripts transmit the date of the fast as 7 Tevet;[40] for the Sefer Orḥot Ḥayyim the date is the first of Tevet.[41] In the Sefer Kol Bo §63 there is no special day. The earliest text is a piyyut of the eighth century, attributed to R. Pinḥas ben Yaʿaqov ha-Cohen, which reads: צום כתב תורה יוונית בשמונה בו.[42] No mention is made of the darkness, while the Genizah fragment T-S H1l.32, published by M. Zulay,[43] commented: תורה יוונית נכתבה חשכו לכוכביו כוכבי נפשו.[44]

Alongside very positive or at least neutral traditions on the Septuagint, a negative vision of the event of the translation on the Septuagint has also been transmitted, however there is no proof that it was in the mainstream before the liturgy of Tevet[45] fomented or expanded criticism against the Greek Torah. The three days of darkness unequivocally refers to the Exodus tradition (Exodus 10:21–3) and its Midrashic developments, according to which the darkness was used by God to dispose of those Israelites who

---

[38] On the scroll, see S. Z. Leiman, 'The scroll of fasts: the ninth of Teveth', Jewish Quarterly Review 74 (1983), 174–95. On the text of the scroll, see H. Lichtenstein, 'Die Fastenrolle: eine Untersuchung zur jüdisch-hellenistischen Geschichte', Hebrew Union College Annual 8–9 (1931–1932), 318–51.

[39] Se now on it S. Elizur, Wherefore have we fasted? Megilat Taanit Batra and similar lists of fasts (in Hebrew) (Jerusalem, 2007); on the fast of 8 Tevet, pp. 197–199.

[40] MS Bodley, Opp. Add. fol., 55 (Neubauer 2421), fol. 69; Neubauer, Mediaeval Jewish chronicles, 24 and VII–VIII.

[41] Sefer Orhot Hayyim, vol. 1 (Jerusalem, 1956), 214.

[42] A. Marmorstein, 'Qiddush Yerahim de-Rabbi Pinhas', in ha-Zopheh le-Hokhmat Israel 5 (1921), 249; new edition in S. Elizur, ed., The liturgical poems of Rabbi Pinhas ha-Cohen (in Hebrew) (Jerusalem, 2004), 715.

[43] Sinai 28 (1950–1951), 167.

[44] See also MS Vatican 360; see also L. J. Weinberger, Hebrew Union College Annual 34 (1968), 10 and the piyyut of Yosef ben Shmuel (ca. 1040), 'The Fast of Tebeth', translated by N. Davis in Jewish Quartely Review 11 (1899), 409–10.

[45] There is no evidence that such a fast was observed at all. Yet, the list of fasts is very popular from the eighth–ninth century until the Arbaʿa Ṭurim and onwards.

refused to leave Egypt.[46] If we follow this tradition, we can understand the fast of Tevet as a reproach to the Jews of Egypt, the great diaspora, who abandoned the Hebrew traditions and embraced Greek culture and customs.

Yet Alexandria of Egypt was a pale idea in Jewish memory when the first Jewish poets of the rabbinic period composed the first piyyutim which have been transmitted to us. Other troubles and compulsions were on the agenda of the Christian ruling power. In Byzantine times, Justinian prohibited reading and commenting on the Torah (by sermon or targum) in Hebrew or Aramaic.[47] It is not by chance that the first negative attitude to the Septuagint is not in the Midrashic exegesis, but liturgical texts or those with liturgical connections (such as Soferim, Sefer Torah or the piyyutim). R. Yehudai Gaon, contemporaneous to the author or collector of the Megillat Ta'anit Batra, reports Byzantine prohibition of studying and teaching the Torah:

We have heard that the evil government prescribed that the Torah cannot be read and translated. Thus, the sages of that generation decided to read and translate the whole of Psalm 20, Isaiah 6,3 and Ezekiel 3,12 (Qedushah).[48]

We do not have enough evidence to ascertain whether a change in the liturgy (piyyut instead of sermon) took place on the basis of a new historical situation.[49] It is certain, however, that the negative attitude to the experience of the Septuagint was accompanied by the revival of the Hebrew language and the beginning of liturgical poetry. The darkness of Tevet shelters the seeds of a new creativity.

---

[46] Sources of the legend in L. Ginzberg, The legends of the Jews (Philadelphia, 1969), vol. 2, 345; vol. 5, 431–432.

[47] G. Veltri, 'Die Novelle 146 Perì Hebraion: Das Verbot des Targumvortrags in Justinians Politik', in Die Septuaginta zwischen Judentum und Christentum, ed. M. Hengel and A. M. Schwemer (Tübingen, 1994), 116–130; now also in Veltri, Gegenwart der Tradition, 104–19.

[48] S. Halberstamm, ed., 'Shte tshuvot 'im hearot', Jeschurun 6 (1868), 126–7; see J. Mann, 'Changes in the divine service of the Synagogue due to religious persecution', Hebrew Union College Annual 4 (1927), 268, note 54.

[49] On this aspect see S. Libermann, 'Ḥazanut Yannai', Sinai 4 (1939), 225 ff. H. Shirman, 'Hebrew liturgical poetry and Christian hymnology', Jewish Quarterly Review 44 (1953–1954), 141 ff.; Z. M. Rabinowitz, The liturgical poems of Rabbi Yannai according to the triennal cycle of the Pentateuch, vol. 1 (in Hebrew) (Jerusalem, 1985), 14 ff; E. Fleischer, 'Studies in the problem relating to the liturgical function of the types of early Piyyut" (in Hebrew), Tarbiz 40 (1970–1971), 41–63.

The Medieval Setting

The Jewish Communities of the Byzantine World from the Tenth to the Mid-Fifteenth Century: Some Aspects of Their Evolution

by

David Jacoby

Byzantium witnessed repeated changes in its boundaries from the tenth century to its fall in the mid-fifteenth century. Not surprisingly, the loss or recovery of territories experienced by the empire affected the fate of the Romaniote Jewish communities, exclusively or overwhelmingly composed of Greek speakers sharing a distinctive religious culture. These communities exhibited various common features and it is fitting, therefore, to examine their evolution in a long-term perspective, regardless of whether they remained continuously under Byzantine domination or were temporarily or definitively subjected to foreign rule. This is especially warranted for the investigation of scholarly life and intellectual activities in these communities. The title of this paper, therefore, refers to the Byzantine world rather than to the Byzantine empire within its political boundaries.

Joshua Starr has assembled fairly rich and varied evidence regarding Romaniote Jews until the Fourth Crusade, which ended in 1204, to which Zvi Ankori has added important information by focusing on the Karaites. Steven Bowman has covered the following period until the fall of Byzantium.[1] Starr relied entirely, and Bowman almost exclusively upon published sources. Their works remain extremely valuable, yet require numerous additions, corrections, and new interpretations of primary sources. However, it is not the aim of this paper to present a revised survey of individual Jewish communities of the Byzantine world. Rather, while taking into consideration new sources and new approaches, it focuses on three issues: the main features of these communities, some basic trends in their evolution, with due regard for chronological and regional variations, and the relation between that evolution and the broader context in which it occurred.

---

[1] J. Starr, The Jews in the Byzantine Empire, 641–1204 (Texte und Forschungen zur byzantinisch-neugriechische Philologie 30; Athens, 1939); Z. Ankori, Karaites in Byzantium: the formative years, 970–1100 (New York and Jerusalem, 1959); S. B. Bowman, The Jews of Byzantium, 1204–1453 (Tuscaloosa, Ala., 1985).

The sources bearing on the Jews of the Byzantine world are sporadic. They nevertheless yield precious information ranging from facts to rumours, as for instance in times of messianic excitement during the First Crusade and in the Peloponnesus around 1257,[2] and from evidence regarding individuals to the life of communities and the operation of the latter's institutions. Jewish and Byzantine sources provide the bulk of information until the mid-thirteenth century. From that time onward the volume of documentation increases substantially with the addition of western sources, especially notarial deeds, many still unpublished, referring to Jews in the remaining Byzantine territories and in former Byzantine lands under Latin rule. Most Romaniote communities are nevertheless poorly documented. Many of them are so far attested only once, while the sources regarding others are fragmentary and present substantial chronological gaps. This is even the case with the communities of Constantinople and Thessalonica, the best illustrated Jewish settlements in Byzantium. Moreover, the existence of several communities is only revealed indirectly by isolated literary or documentary sources or funerary inscriptions referring to a single resident, whether craftsman, merchant, scholar or scribe. It is a safe guess that such information implies the existence of a larger Jewish group in the same locality. This is clearly the case with respect to women, who did not live on their own. Once inserted within their proper Byzantine context, these sources may be highly instructive regarding communities, migration, and cultural life.

The identification and dating of manuscripts in a distinctive 'Byzantine' Hebrew script, thanks to advances in the investigation of Hebrew palaeography, codicology and calligraphy, add precious evidence regarding Jewish communities in the Byzantine world for the second half of the period covered by this paper.[3] Dated or datable colophons appearing in these manuscripts, whether original works or copies, offer information about the circulation of books and scribes and, more generally, about individual communities and connections between them. Individuals sometimes transcribed biblical, talmudic, liturgical, legal, philosophical or other texts for their own use. Thus Shmuel son of Eliahu ha-Cohen copied in 1307/1308 a work of grammar and lexicons for himself in Syros, one of the Cyclades islands (Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hunt. 128).[4] However, the work was

---

[2] Starr, Jews in the Byzantine Empire, 203–206, 208–209, nos. 153–154; for the second instance, see below, n. 49.

[3] See M. M. Beit-Arié, Hebrew manuscripts of East and West: towards a comparative codicology (London, 1993). The data has been assembled by the Hebrew Palaeography Project of the Israel Academy of Sciences, Jerusalem.

[4] See A. Neubauer, Catalogue of the Hebrew manuscripts in the Bodleian Library and in the college libraries of Oxford (Oxford, 1886), cols. 521–2, no. 1467.

generally performed by professional scribes and, therefore, implies the presence of wealthy patrons belonging to the social, economic and intellectual elite of the local community, as well as their financial backing or that of communal institutions. In 1329 Adoniyah son of Abba Kalomiti completed in Thessalonike the copy of a Hebrew commentary to the Guide of the Perplexed by Maimonides.[5] Apparently being the son of a leader of the Jewish community in Negroponte must have facilitated his access to the owner of the manuscript.[6] A Jew from Toledo calling himself 'the Spaniard' was a wandering professional scribe, moving from one place to another to find employment. He worked in Negroponte in 1401, in Thessalonica in the summer of 1403, in Modon in the winter of 1404, in Thebes in 1415, with a visit in the same year to Philippopolis.[7] In some copies he stated that he made them for his personal use, yet in view of his mobility it seems likely that he envisaged selling them.

Scholarly activity and institutions of learning such as permanent schools presumably attached to synagogues, as in Thebes and Thessalonica in the 1130s, also offer indirect evidence regarding the social structure and institutions of Jewish communities, since their operation primarily depended upon local financial support.[8] Such support is well illustrated by Benjamin of Tudela for Provence and by the documents of the Genizah for Egypt. It may be safely assumed for Byzantium, although no such evidence has surfaced so far. The size of the community and the financial means it could muster determined to a large extent the scope and intensity of its cultural life.

Individual Greek names and toponymic surnames provide important indications regarding linguistic and cultural orientations, yet supply only limited data regarding Jewish mobility in the Byzantine world or beyond its boundaries. Since they were inherited, they reveal neither the identity of the individual who migrated, nor the timing or itinerary of his or her movements unless further evidence in that respect is available. Moreover, individual movement does not necessarily reflect migration trends, which involve large numbers of people over a lengthy period.

The Jewish communities were widely dispersed throughout the Byzantine world. They were overwhelmingly urban, although some of their

---

[5] The colophons are translated by Bowman, Jews of Byzantium, 252, no. 47.

[6] On this scribe and the Kalomiti family, see D. Jacoby, 'Foreigners and the urban economy in Thessalonike, c. 1150 – c. 1430', Dumbarton Oaks Papers, 57 (2003), 124–125.

[7] Translation of the colophon of 1403 and note on the scribe in Bowman, Jews of Byzantium, 296, no. 108.

[8] On permanent schools in Thebes and Thessalonica, see N. de Lange, 'Jewish education in the Byzantine Empire in the twelfth century', in G. Abramson and T. Parfitt, eds., Jewish education and learning (Chur, 1994), 116–118.

members residing in small towns may have engaged in rural activities, whether on their own or by relying on a dependent or hired workforce. In the period covered here many communities were positioned along major waterways and land routes in localities enjoying brisk economic activity or in major political and administrative centres. For instance, Benjamin of Tudela around 1160 and sources of the thirteenth century refer to the communities encountered along the Via Egnatia joining Dyrrachion (modern Durazzo) on the Adriatic to Constantinople.[9] Other communities, presumably the smallest, were situated in less favourable locations. Unfortunately, quantitative data regarding the communities are rather scarce, and their nature has been the subject of diverging interpretations. Such is the case of the figures recorded by Benjamin of Tudela, who crossed the Byzantine empire between mid-1161 and mid-1163.[10] These are assessments in round figures, the large ones clearly referring to individuals as for Thebes, Thessalonica, and Constantinople.

Jewish rural settlements and Jews engaging in agricultural and pastoral activities are not documented in the Byzantine world to the same extent as urban communities. Still, they were presumably more numerous than it would seem at first glance. According to the chronicle known as Megillath Ahima'as, in the second half of the ninth century Jewish villagers, clearly farmers, travelled in their wagons to spend the Sabbath in Venosa, a locality of Byzantine Apulia in Italy.[11] Around 1160 Benjamin of Tudela noted that two hundred Jews living in Krisa, a small port on the northern shore of the Gulf of Corinth in the vicinity of Delphoi, 'sow and reap on their own plots and lands' and that they 'camp apart', in other words, reside in a segregated neighbourhood. It is noteworthy that this fairly large community was headed by three individuals and thus had a communal organization, like urban Jewish communities.[12] Benjamin bypassed another Jewish rural community in the vicinity of Thessalonica, because it was not situated along his itinerary like Krisa. Some twelfth- and thirteenth-century sources refer to Jewish rural settlements in the region of Dyrrachion and in Thrace, and various toponyms in a number of Aegean islands seem to suggest the existence of villages exclusively inhabited by Jews or with a decisive Jew-

---

[9] Bowman, The Jews of Byzantium, 61–62.

[10] For this dating, see D. Jacoby, 'Benjamin of Tudela and his 'Book of Travels'', in K. Herbers und F. Schmieder, eds., Venedig im Schnittpunkt der Kulturen. Aussen- und Innensichten europäischer und nicht-europäischer Reisender im Vergleich (= Venezia incrocio di culture. A confronto le percezioni dall' interno e dall' esterno di viaggiatori europei e non) (Roma, 2008), in press.

[11] B. Klar, ed., Megillath Ahimaats (= The Chronicle of Ahimaats) (Jerusalem, 1974), 16 (Hebrew). See also Starr, Jews in the Byzantine Empire, 27–28, no. 22.

[12] M. N. Adler, ed., The itinerary of Benjamin of Tudela (London, 1907), Hebrew text, 12 (= English trans., 10).

ish majority, presumably after the Fourth Crusade.[13] It is rather doubtful that these rural settlements made any contribution to Jewish culture in the Byzantine world.

Some Jews, like other urban residents, owned or held land without necessarily pursuing themselves agricultural or pastoral activities. Thus, for instance, in the early tenth century the wealthy Amittai II had a vineyard near Oria in Apulia.[14] Jews must have been eager to obtain rural land and manpower. Both direct and indirect involvement in agricultural and pastoral production were clearly related to the existence of the internal Jewish economic network handling the production, transportation, supply and consumption of foodstuffs and wine governed by religious prescriptions. This network was exclusively geared toward Jewish customers.[15]

The extensive geographic distribution of the Jewish communities in the Byzantine world accounts for the complex communication web connecting them. Their size (mostly small), social composition, and economic profile fluctuated continuously as a result of evolving political and economic conditions and the high degree of Jewish mobility in the Byzantine world, as well as across the empire's political and cultural boundaries. Except for short periods of persecutions, the Jews enjoyed both within and outside the empire the status of a tolerated minority. On the whole there were no political, religious or cultural impediments to their mobility, which exceeded by far that of other ethnic or religious groups in frequency and geographic range. It was stimulated by a conjunction of factors, some of them of political, economic and legal nature specific to the Jews. Jewish migration was essentially an inter-urban phenomenon, in view of the overwhelmingly urban character of Jewish society. It is well known that city dwellers are more prone to move than peasants.

In the period covered here Romaniote Jews spoke vernacular Greek in everyday life. Its use is attested by Jews from Constantinople explaining a Greek loan-word in the Talmud to Rav Hai, head of a talmudic academy in Arabic-speaking Iraq in the first half of the eleventh century, by Rabbanite and Karaite glosses and commentaries to biblical texts, Passover Haggadoth, as well as by Greek terms appearing in Rabbanite legal documents and

---

[13] For details, see D. Jacoby, 'The Jews in the Byzantine economy, seventh to mid-fifteenth century', in R. Bonfil, O. Ir-Shai, G. Stroumsa, R. Talgam, eds., The Jews of Byzantium: a cultural history, in press.

[14] Klar, Megillath Ahimaats, 29. For further evidence, see previous note.

[15] D. Jacoby, 'The Jews in Byzantium and the Eastern Mediterranean: economic activities from the thirteenth to the mid-fifteenth century', in M. Toch und E. Müller-Luckner, eds., Wirtschaftsgeschichte der mittelalterlichen Juden: Fragen und Einschätzungen (Munich, 2008), in press; Jacoby, 'Jews in the Byzantine economy'.

in commercial letters exchanged between Jews.[16] On the other hand, He-
brew established itself as the language of Jewish liturgy and written culture
in the Byzantine world from the ninth and, in any event, from the tenth
century, beginning in the communities of southern Italy. Hebrew facili-
tated communication and transactions between Byzantine Jews and others
originating or residing in different cultural milieus.[17] The translation of
Karaite traditional literature from Arabic into Hebrew initiated by Tobias
son of Moses in the eleventh century illustrates a fairly rapid process of
Karaite acculturation in the Byzantine empire, yet may also have been
partly prompted by Byzantine Rabbanites joining the Karaite congregation
and by the urge to convince others to act likewise.[18] The brotherhood of
Jewish scholarship, which throve on Hebrew, was particular to men.[19]
Women lacked similar bonds and, therefore, were far less inclined to aban-
don their social and cultural milieu and to integrate within an alien envi-
ronment of Arabic-speaking Jews. Israel ben Nathan offers a case in point.
His wife, whom he married in Constantinople, refused to follow him to
Jerusalem around 1050 and, therefore, he divorced her before his depar-
ture.[20]

---

[16] Starr, Jews in the Byzantine Empire, 180–181; de Lange, 'Jewish education', 119;
N. de Lange, 'Jewish use of Greek in the Middle Ages: evidence from Passover Haggad-
oth from the Cairo Genizah', Jewish Quarterly Review, 96 (2006), 490–497; N. de Lange
'Hebrews, Greeks or Romans? Jewish culture and identity in Byzantium', in D. C.
Smythe, ed., Strangers to themselves: the Byzantine outsider (Papers from the Thirty-
second Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, University of Sussex, Brighton, March
1998; Aldershot, 2000), 113, quoting the criticism of Rabbanite legal documents by the
twelfth-century Karaite Judah Hadassi; my review of N. de Lange, Greek Jewish texts
from the Cairo Genizah (Tübingen, 1996), in Byzantinische Zeitschrift, 91 (1998), 110–
112.

[17] N. de Lange, 'The Hebrew language in the European Diaspora', in B. Isaac, A. Op-
penheimer, eds., Studies on the Jewish Diaspora in the Hellenistic and Roman periods
(Tel Aviv, 1996), 109–137; de Lange, 'Hebrews, Greeks or Romans?', 111–113.

[18] On the translation programme, see Z. Ankori, Karaites, passim; also N. de Lange,
'Can we speak of Jewish orthodoxy in Byzantium?', in A. Louth and A. Casiday, eds.,
Byzantine orthodoxies (Papers from the Thirty-sixth Spring Symposium of Byzantine
Studies, University of Durham, 23–25 March 2002; Aldershot, 2006), 174–176, on the
Karaite acquaintance with Rabbanite writings and shared aspects of everyday life.

[19] N. de Lange, 'Hebrew scholarship in Byzantium', in N. de Lange, ed., Hebrew
scholarship and the medieval world (Cambridge, 2001), 23–37.

[20] See D. Jacoby, 'The Jews of Constantinople and their demographic hinterland', in
C. Mango and G. Dagron, eds., Constantinople and its hinterland (Papers from the
Twenty-Seventh Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Oxford, April 1993; Alder-
shot, 1995), 224–225, repr. in D. Jacoby, Byzantium, Latin Romania and the Mediterra-
nean (Aldershot, 2001), no. IV; also S. D. Goitein, A Mediterranean society: the Jewish
communities of the Arab world as portrayed in the documents of the Cairo Geniza
(Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1967–1993), III, 177, and V, 439.

Jewish mobility was also enhanced by ties uniting scattered members of the same families, by the tightly-knit internal organization of the communities, essential for the collective survival of their members' religious and ethnic identity, and by their social and economic support of needy individuals, scholars, captives to be ransomed, refugees, immigrants, pilgrims and proselytes, who could expect to be taken care of upon their arrival.[21] Interestingly, in an undated twelfth-century letter an Egyptian Jewess praised the Byzantine Jews for ransoming their relatives.[22] The network connecting individual Rabbanite and Karaite congregations, respectively, both within and outside the Byzantine world, had a strong impact upon the channelling and directions of Jewish mobility. The extensive links between them fostered a constant flow of visitors, scholars, scribes, messengers carrying official and private correspondence and queries addressed to renowned masters, as well as the stream of those eager to study under the latter's guidance. It also furthered the movement of merchants supplying ritually prepared foodstuffs and wine. These travellers occasionally acted as agents of cultural transfers.

Four periods in particular warrant our attention, in view of their impact upon the Jewish communities of the Byzantine world: from the Byzantine reconquista of the 960s and 970s, which achieved the recovery of Crete, Cyprus, and extensive territories in Asia Minor and Syria, until the second decade of the eleventh century, a period in which the empire attained under Basil II its major expansion since the reign of Justinian I; the second half of the eleventh century, which witnessed the Seljuq advance in Asia Minor; the period following the Fourth Crusade, with the temporary loss of Constantinople to the Latins (1204–1261) and the territorial disintegration of the empire; finally, the fourteenth century, in which the Turkish emirates were established in Asia Minor and the Ottomans consolidated their rule in the Balkans and Asia Minor.

The Byzantine recovery of Crete in 961 is reflected by an undated Genizah letter sent by Moshe Agura from Rhodes to his relatives, who had emigrated and presumably lived in Egypt. Agura refers to a violent change of power in Crete, after which he left for Rhodes where his brother-in-law was temporarily living or trading. Agura complains about Rhodes, 'for this island too, is evil in every respect'. Joshua Holo, who edited and com-

---

[21] The medieval communal organization in the Mediterranean region is best documented for Egypt by the sources of the Genizah: Goitein, A Mediterranean Society, I, 327, 329–330; II, 55, 79, 91–143, 153–154, 169–170, 306–308; V, 36. Ransoming of Egyptian Jews brought as slaves to Constantinople, in an undated letter: S. Assaf, Mekoroth u-mechkarim be-toldoth Yisrael (= Sources and studies in the history of Israel) (Jerusalem, 1945), 145, n. 12.

[22] Translation by Starr, Jews in the Byzantine Empire, 214, no. 162.

mented upon the letter, claims that it illustrates the hardships as well as the
legal and economic discrimination suffered by the Jews of Byzantium
around the mid-tenth century.[23] This interpretation is totally unwarranted.
In fact, the letter reflects local conditions. The population of Crete, includ-
ing the remaining Christians, did not assist the Byzantine forces in the re-
conquest of the island by Nikephoros Phokas, and there is good reason to
believe that such was also the attitude of the Jews. The Byzantine recovery
was followed by widespread looting, destruction, and presumably also con-
fiscations of property in Chandax, the main urban centre of Crete, later
called Candia by the Latins.[24] Some of that property had presumably be-
longed to the state or to ecclesiastical institutions before the Arab con-
quest. Muslims and Jews undoubtedly suffered more than Christians from
the Byzantine recovery of Crete. It is likely that these local conditions in-
duced Agura to leave the island. As for his complaint about Rhodes, it re-
flects the disappointment and impatience of a newcomer unable to inte-
grate rapidly within the local economy. It should be noted that despite his
complaints, Agura did not intend to leave the island, unless the relatives to
whom he addressed his letter assured him that they enjoyed better condi-
tions. Moreover, he did not even hint at the possible emigration of his
brother-in-law and the latter's wife, whom he had brought to Rhodes. It
follows that the problems Agura encountered in Crete and Rhodes were of
a personal and economic nature and do not reflect a deterioration of Jewish
condition in the empire.

   The Byzantine expansion of the 960s and 970s in Asia Minor and Syria
under Nikephoros II Phokas and John I Tzimiskes had more general reper-
cussions. Large numbers of Syrians, Armenians and Jews arrived in Asia
Minor, a process that continued in the eleventh century.[25] A more direct
incentive to Jewish migration appeared after 1009, when the Fatimid Ca-
liph al-Hakim initiated a new policy directed against Jews and Christians.
Many of them emigrated from Fatimid territory to Antioch, Laodikeia, and
other Byzantine cities. The unstable conditions in Syria and the prospects
of security in the empire were the primary factors that generated the popu-
lation movement into Byzantine Asia Minor. In addition, the westward
movement of Armenians and Jews in that region reached Constantinople
from the early eleventh century. This movement appears to have been re-

   [23] J. Holo, 'A Genizah letter from Rhodes evidently concerning the Byzantine recon-
quest of Crete', Journal of Near Eastern Studies, 59 (2000), 1–12.
   [24] F. A. Farello, 'Niceforo Foca e la riconquista di Creta', Medioevo Greco, 1 (2001),
155–159.
   [25] G. Dagron, 'Minorités ethniques et religieuses dans l'Orient byzantin à la fin du Xe
et au XIe siècle: l'immigration syrienne', Travaux et Mémoires, 6 (1976), 177–216, repr.
in G. Dagron, La Romanité chrétienne en Orient. Héritages et mutations (London, 1984),
no. X. On the Jews, see next note.

lated to the economic expansion enjoyed in that period by the empire and especially by its capital. The influx of 'many aliens, Armenians and Arabs and Jews' was held responsible for the severe riots that erupted in Constantinople in 1044. Consequently, Emperor Constantine IX ordered the expulsion of those among them who had settled in the city in the preceding thirty years. It is highly doubtful that all those targeted by the expulsion decree of 1044 actually left Constantinople. Moreover, there is even evidence that Jews continued to settle in the city shortly after that date.[26]

It is apparently in the framework of these demographic developments that the Karaites established their first congregations in the Byzantine empire. The one in Constantinople appears to have already existed around the year 1000. The congregation in Attaleia/Antalya, along the southern shore of Asia Minor, is documented in 1028.[27] A ketubbah or marriage contract drafted in 1022 at Mastaura, a small town located on a tributary of the Maeander river in Lydia, reveals another aspect of the population movement from Fatimid territory. Some features of the contract suggest that the Jews living at Mastaura in the early eleventh century, or some of them at least, had come from Palestine or Syria. However, by 1022 the families of the bride and the bridegroom, as well as those of the witnesses appear to have been fully immersed in their Greek milieu. Several names and a dozen Greek appellations for movable objects appearing in the marriage contract illustrate a process of acculturation extending over two or three generations at most.[28]

The Seljuq advance in Asia Minor following the battle of Mantzikert in 1071 generated a massive westward exodus toward Constantinople and the Aegean islands.[29] Jews participated in that movement, as illustrated by the letter of an Egyptian Jew written around 1089. Before 1071 he had been living for some time in eastern Asia Minor, yet after the Seljuq victory he fled with his family and eventually settled in Thessalonica.[30] It is possible that Jewish migration from Asia Minor in that period partly explains the increase in the number of Jews residing in the island of Chios, which ap-

---

[26] Jacoby, 'Jews of Constantinople', 223–225.

[27] Jacoby, 'Jews of Constantinople', 225.

[28] D. Jacoby, 'What do we learn about Byzantine Asia Minor from the documents of the Cairo Genizah?', in N. Oikonomides and S. Vryonis, eds., *Η Βυζαντινή Μικρά Ασία (6ος–12ος αι.)* [Byzantine Asia Minor (6th–12th cent.)] (Athens, 1998), 84–87, repr. in Jacoby, Byzantium, no. I.

[29] S. Vryonis, The decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the process of Islamization from the eleventh through the fifteenth century (Berkeley, 1971), 110–171.

[30] Translation and commentary of his letter by Goitein, A Mediterranean Society, V, 438–443. There is no evidence that this Jew resided for some time in Constantinople, as suggested ibid., I, 58.

parently rose from fifteen families in 1049 to four hundred individuals
more than a century later, a figure mentioned by Benjamin of Tudela.[31]

The Fourth Crusade, which ended with the Latin conquest of Constan-
tinople in 1204, was a watershed. It was followed by the territorial disinte-
gration of the Byzantine empire, the Latin occupation of extensive Byzan-
tine territories, and the establishment of a fairly large number of new po-
litical entities, a process that extended over several decades.[32] Latin
immigrants settled in major and small ports as well as in new political and
administrative centres, and Latin lords competed to further economic activ-
ity in their respective territories. The extensive geographic distribution of
the Latin settlers resulted in some significant shifts in the economic func-
tions of cities and in the course of trade routes in the eastern Mediterra-
nean. In addition, the new seats of local lords and their dependents created
new centres of consumption.[33] The conjunction of these developments ap-
pears to have generated a broader diffusion of Jews in the Byzantine world
on the one hand, and their greater concentration in specific cities witness-
ing brisk economy activity, on the other. In addition, the intensification of
trade and shipping, the privileges enjoyed by Venice and Genoa in Byzan-
tium, and the favourable conditions existing in their respective territories
of the eastern Mediterranean furthered the emergence of new currents of
Jewish migration.

The Jews of Constantinople were the first to be affected by the Fourth
Crusade. Their compact neighbourhood in the suburb of Pera or Galata,
north of the Golden Horn, attested in the early 1160s by Benjamin of
Tudela, was set on fire by the crusaders in 1203.[34] Some Jews who sur-
vived the catastrophe, among them silk workers, left the suburb and settled
in the new Greek state established in Asia Minor, later known as the em-
pire of Nicaea. Others resettled in Constantinople proper. Nicholas of

---

[31] On the problems raised by these figures, see N. Oikonomides, 'The Jews of Chios
(1049): a group of Excusati', in B. Arbel, ed., Intercultural contacts in the Medieval
Mediterranean: studies in honour of David Jacoby (London, 1996) (= Mediterranean
Historical Review, 10/1–2 (1995), 218–225.

[32] Overview in D. Jacoby, 'Byzantium after the Fourth Crusade: The Latin Empire of
Constantinople and the Frankish states in Greece', in J. Shepard, ed., The Cambridge
history of the Byzantine Empire (Cambridge, 2008), in press.

[33] See D. Jacoby, 'Changing economic patterns in Latin Romania: the impact of the
West', in A. E. Laiou and R. P. Mottahedeh, eds., The Crusades from the perspective of
Byzantium and the Muslim world (Washington, D. C., 2001), 197–233, repr. in D.
Jacoby, Commercial exchange across the Mediterranean: Byzantium, the Crusader Le-
vant, Egypt and Italy (Aldershot, 2005), no. IX.

[34] Incidentally, Benjamin uses 'Pera', the appellation coined by the Latins for the ur-
ban region in which the Jewish neighbourhood was located. The Greek-speaking local
Jews would have called it Galata. On the two names, see A. Failler, 'Retour à Péra par Ta
Pikridiou et Diplokionion', Revue des Études Byzantines, 58 (2000), 194–198.

Otranto, a monk from southern Italy who stayed in the city from 1205 to 1207, encountered there Rabbanite and Karaite Jews, yet fails to specify where they resided and whether all of them were concentrated within a specific urban area, which seems likely. It is clear, however, that in the reign of Michael VIII all the Jews lived in a segregated neighbourhood enclosed by a wall erected between 1261 and 1282 in the area of Vlanga, north of the port of Kontoskalion situated along the southern shore of the city. They included tanners. The emperor may have encouraged Jewish immigration in the framework of his policy aiming at the repopulation of the city and the boosting of its economy.[35]

The extensive privileges granted by Michael VIII to Genoa and Venice, respectively in 1261 and 1268, the virtual exterritorial status enjoyed by their respective quarters in Constantinople, and the policy implemented by the two maritime cities resulted in the establishment of two additional Jewish communities in the city, one Genoese and the other Venetian. These favourable conditions, the growing economic activity in the quarters of Venice and Genoa and the increasing commercial exchanges between their respective outposts in the Mediterranean and the Black Sea also stimulated Jewish migration to Constantinople throughout the Palaiologan period. Economic and fiscal considerations induced both maritime powers to grant their protection to Byzantine subjects and to foreigners, including Jews. The grant of Venetian or Genoese nationality extended the exemption from Byzantine taxation and jurisdiction enjoyed by the citizens of the two powers to their naturalized Jews, to the benefit of these powers and the employers of Jewish workers.[36] Some time before 1319 Venetian Jewish craftsmen were exercising jointly with Byzantine Jews the tanning of hides. These were imported from the Black Sea by Venetian merchants and entrepreneurs, who re-exported them with added value after tanning, in both cases free of Byzantine taxes. Emperor Andronicus II complained that numerous Venetian Jewish workers were in fact imperial subjects from the

---

[35] D. Jacoby, 'The Jewish community of Constantinople from the Komnenan to the Palaiologan period', Vizantijskij Vremennik, 55/2 (80) (1998), 36–40, and on Nicholas of Otranto, ibid., 37–38, repr. in Jacoby, Byzantium, no. V.

[36] On this policy, see D. Jacoby, 'Les Vénitiens naturalisés dans l'Empire byzantin: un aspect de l'expansion de Venise en Romanie du XIIIᵉ au milieu du XVᵉ siècle', Travaux et Mémoires, 8 (1981), 217–235, repr. in D. Jacoby, Studies on the Crusader states and on Venetian expansion (Northampton, 1989), no. IX; D. Jacoby, 'Les Génois dans l'Empire byzantin: citoyens, sujets et protégés (1261–1453)', La Storia dei Genovesi, 9 (1989), 245–284, repr. in D. Jacoby, Trade, commodities and shipping in the Medieval Mediterranean (Aldershot, 1997), no. III.

provinces who, after settling in the city, had obtained Venetian status there.[37]

A Venetian judicial document of 1343 refers to the Jewish neighbourhood of Cafacalea within the Venetian quarter.[38] The local Jewish community was at first composed of former imperial subjects, as noted above. Over time it was reinforced by Romaniote Jews from Venetian Crete and other Aegean islands, as well as by Catalan Jews who had temporarily resided in Candia, the capital of Crete.[39] Mordekhai Khomatiano (1402–1482?), scion of a Romaniote family of Constantinople and author of works on astronomy and grammar, biblical commentaries, and piyyutim or liturgical poems, was apparently a Venetian Jew.[40] In the early fifteenth century the Venetian authorities intervened in the internal affairs of the local Jewish community, dislodged the Jewish oligarchy from its privileged position, and imposed their own regulations regarding the management of communal affairs.[41]

The Jewish community of the Genoese quarter of Pera also resided in a specific neighbourhood, the Contratta Judeorum. It attracted immigrants from various regions. Romaniote Jews, some from Chios, under Genoese rule from 1346 onward, are attested in 1389. Their relatives and other Jews from Chios appear in several notarial deeds, in the account book of the Venetian merchant Giacomo Badoer, who resided in Constantinople from 1436 to 1440, and in a verdict of the Venetian bailo in the city, Marino Soranzo, issued in 1443.[42] A western Jew of unknown origin, a Catalan

---

[37] D. Jacoby, 'Les quartiers juifs de Constantinople à l'époque byzantine', Byzantion, 37 (1967), 196–214, repr. in D. Jacoby, Société et démographie à Byzance et en Romanie latine (London, 1975), no. II; D. Jacoby, 'Venice and the Venetian Jews in the Eastern Mediterranean', in G. Cozzi, ed., Gli Ebrei e Venezia (secoli XIV–XVIII) (Milano, 1987), 38–39, repr. in Jacoby, Studies, no. X.

[38] Ed. by Jacoby, 'Les quartiers juifs de Constantinople', 221–223, doc I. Cafacalea is also attested in 1339: Ch. Gaspares, ed., Franciscus de Cruce, νοτάριος στον Χάνδακα, 1338–1339 (Istituto ellenico di studi bizantini e postbizantini di Venezia, Graecolatinitas nostra, Fonti I; Venezia, 1999), 170–171, no. 224.

[39] Jacoby, 'Les quartiers juifs de Constantinople', 205–214 and 221–223, doc. I; D. Jacoby, 'Les Juifs vénitiens de Constantinople et leur communauté du XIIIe au XVe siècle', Revue des études juives, 131 (1972), 397–410, repr. in D. Jacoby, Recherches sur la Méditerranée orientale du XIIe au XVe siècle. Peuples, sociétés, économies (London, 1979), no. XII. A Venetian Jew bearing a Greek surname, attested in 1350, appears to have come from Crete: M. Balard, A. E. Laiou, C. Otten-Froux, Les Italiens à Byzance (Byzantina Sorbonensia, 6; Paris, 1987), 125–126, no. 27.

[40] On this scholar see Bowman, Jews of Byzantium, 149 and n. 68. His status is suggested by Anastasi Comathiano, attested in 1424, apparently a relative, who was a Venetian Jew: see Jacoby, 'Les quartiers juifs de Constantinople', 225.

[41] Jacoby, 'Les Juifs vénitiens de Constantinople', 401–406.

[42] Jacoby, 'The Jews in Byzantium and the Eastern Mediterranean'. Badoer traded with thirty Jews during his stay in Constantinople, as recorded in his account book: U.

Jew, and others bearing Arabic names also lived in Pera in 1390–1391. Catalan Jews and others with Arabic names also appear later in the account book of Giacomo Badoer.[43]

As a result of the developments examined above, the Jews of the Palaiologan era (1261–1453) were divided between three distinct Jewish communities, one in the imperial section of the city and another in each of the respective quarters of Venice and Genoa, instead of being concentrated within a single urban area as before 1204. Each community was subjected to a different jurisdiction and, like the Venetian one, the Byzantine and Genoese communities presumably had their own communal institutions. It is unclear whether the Karaites were included in all three communities. The three communities lived side by side until the fall of Constantinople to the Ottomans in 1453. This was a feature particular to Constantinople, not found elsewhere in the Byzantine world. Contacts and economic cooperation between Jews belonging to the three 'national' communities are well documented from the early fourteenth to the mid-fifteenth century, and were clearly the norm.[44]

The rise of new political and economic centres after the Fourth Crusade clearly affected the patterns of Jewish migration and settlement. A Jewish community existed in the ninth century in the Anatolian city of Nicaea.[45] A Hebrew epitaph found there has been tentatively assigned to the twelfth or thirteenth century, although the dating is not secure.[46] In any event, Jews apparently lived in Nicaea when Jewish silk workers from Constantinople settled there shortly after the fall of this city and around the time Nicaea became the capital of the newly established Byzantine entity in Asia Minor. Their settlement was possibly encouraged by Theodore I Laskaris, the first ruler of that state. The local silk industry was still operating in 1290, and its activity presumably continued until the city's fall to the Ottomans

Dorini e T. Bertelè, eds., Il libro dei conti di Giacomo Badoer (Costantinopoli, 1436–1440) (Il Nuovo Ramusio, III; Roma, 1956).

[43] Jacoby, 'Les quartiers juifs de Constantinople', 215–216; M. Balard, La Romanie génoise (XIIe – début du XVe siècle) (Rome, 1978), I, 277–279, 350. Contrary to the latter there was no continuity between the pre-1204 Jewish quarter and the contratta Judeorum in Pera. For the names, see Jacoby, 'The Jews of Constantinople', 229–230, and Jacoby, 'The Jews in the Byzantine economy'.

[44] Jacoby, 'The Jews in the Byzantine economy'.

[45] W. Ameling, Inscriptiones Judaicae Orientis, II, Kleinasien (Tübingen, 2004), 321. Translation in Starr, The Jews in the Byzantine Empire, 119–122, no. 54.

[46] A. M. Schneider, Die römischen und byzantinischen Denkmäler von Iznik-Nicaea (Istanbuler Forschungen, Band 16; Berlin, 1943), 36–37, nos. 69–70.

in 1331.[47] Whether Jews were involved in its silk manufacture until then remains an open question.

Three cities in the Peloponnesus also attracted Jewish settlers after the Fourth Crusade. In the early thirteenth century Andravida became the main residence of the princely court, Latin knights and commoners of Frankish Morea and a sizeable consumption centre.[48] As revealed by a Genizah fragment, the Jewish community in Andravida headed by three Jewish leaders experienced messianic excitement by 1257.[49] Chiarenza was founded around the mid-thirteenth century at a short distance from Andra- vida and rapidly became the major port of Frankish Morea.[50] Considering the Jewish settlement pattern of that period, we may safely assume that Jews settled in Chiarenza shortly afterwards, although none is attested there until the early fourteenth century. In 1372 a Jew from Candia, Crete, resided in the city, whether temporarily or permanently.[51] Chiarenza ap- parently began to decline in the late fourteenth century. According to an estimate made in 1391 for Amadeo of Savoy, who aspired to become prince of Frankish Morea, there were only about 300 households or be- tween 1,200 and 1,500 inhabitants in the city, including Jews.[52] In 1430 a Catalan pirate captured and deported the Jews remaining in the city.[53]

Mistra, west of Sparta in the Peloponnesus, was also a new city. It de- veloped after 1262 under Byzantine rule, and served as administrative capital of the so-called Byzantine despotate of Morea from 1348 until its fall to the Ottomans in 1460. Many members of the province's elite gath- ered around the despot's court.[54] The numerous churches and their frescoes illustrate the wealth of the court and Mistra's role as a centre of luxury

---

[47] D. Jacoby, 'The Jews and the silk industry of Constantinople', in D. Jacoby, Byzan- tium, Latin Romania and the Mediterranean (Aldershot, 2001), no. XI, 18–19.

[48] D. Jacoby, 'Italian migration and settlement in Latin Greece: the impact on the economy', in H. E. Mayer [und] E. Müller-Luckner, eds., Die Kreuzfahrerstaaten als multikulturelle Gesellschaft. Einwanderer und Minderheiten im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert (Schriften des Historischen Kollegs, Kolloquien 37; München, 1997), 105, repr. in Jacoby, Byzantium, no. IX.

[49] Bowman, Jews of Byzantium, 224–226, no. 21, and see ibid., 79–81, 100.

[50] On the evolution of Chiarenza, see Jacoby, 'Italian Migration', 105–106, and A. Tzavara, Clarentza, une ville de la Morée latine, XIIIe–XVe siècles (Institut hellénique d'études byzantines et post-byzantines de Venise, Tommaso Flanghini 3), Venise, 2008, and for the city's foundation ibid., 26–29 and 192, n. 770.

[51] Ibid., 195–196.

[52] Jacoby, 'Italian Migration', 106.

[53] Bowman, Jews of Byzantium, 308, no. 127. Contrary to Bowman, ibid., 85, they were clearly permanent residents of Chiarenza.

[54] D. A. Zakythinos, Le despotat grec de Morée, éd. revue et augmentée par Chryssa Maltézou, (London, 1975), I, esp. 94–96, 211–216.

consumption.[55] It is unclear when Jews first settled in Mistra. In 1387 Moshe Pangalo, a Romaniote Jew, referred to the local Jewish community in his copy of the treatise Sha'are Tsedek, composed by the thirteenth-century Jewish Catalan author Jonah son of Abraham Gerondi, among the strong opponents of Maimonides' philosophical works.[56] The presence of this treatise in Mistra illustrates the circulation of Jewish books across the Mediterranean.

In 1207 Venice conquered Chandax, called Candia by the Latins, the main port of Crete, and extended its rule over the island in the following years. Candia became the administrative capital of Crete, a function it retained until its fall to the Ottomans in 1669. By the late thirteenth century the city had also developed into a thriving trading centre inserted within one of the major waterways of the eastern Mediterranean connecting Venice to the Levant and Egypt, as well as within the regional maritime network of the Aegean extending to Constantinople.[57] A well-structured Jewish community already existed in the city at the time of the Venetian conquest. In the following period it became one of the major Jewish settlements of the Byzantine world.[58] Its growth and that of additional Cretan communities was closely linked to the economic prosperity of Crete, the involvement of Jews in the tanning of local and imported hides, local retail, wholesale and regional maritime trade, and money-lending. Indeed, Cretan Jews acted as entrepreneurs promoting the production of large volumes of kosher cheese and wine and supplied them to Jewish communities in a vast region extending from Venice and its hinterland in the west to Alexandria in the east and the Black Sea to the northeast.[59] Its Jewish community is especially well documented, thanks to the survival of its communal ordinances known as 'Taqqanoth Qandyah', drafted in He-

---

[55] On this last aspect, see D. Jacoby, 'Late Byzantium between the Mediterranean and Asia: trade and material culture', in S. T. Brooks, ed., Byzantium: faith and power (1261–1557): perspectives on late Byzantine art and culture. The Metropolitan Museum of Art Symposia (New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art; New Haven, and London: Yale University Press, 2007), 32–36.

[56] Bowman, Jews of Byzantium, 291, no. 100, and ibid., 81–82.

[57] Overview in D. Jacoby, 'Creta e Venezia nel contesto economico del Mediterraneo orientale sino alla metà del Quattrocento', in G. Ortalli, ed., Venezia e Creta (Atti del Convegno internazionale di studi, Iraklion-Chanià, 30 settembre – 5 ottobre 1997; Venezia, 1998), 73–106, repr. in D. Jacoby, Commercial exchange across the Mediterranean: Byzantium, the Crusader Levant, Egypt and Italy (Aldershot, 2005), no. VII.

[58] D. Jacoby, 'Venice and the Venetian Jews', 37, 41–45, 51–53. J. Starr, 'Jewish life in Crete under the Rule of Venice', Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research, 12 (1942), 59–114, paved the way for the study of Cretan Jewry in Venetian Crete, yet is now partly superseded by more recent publications using new archival sources and providing a different approach.

[59] Jacoby, 'The Jews in Byzantium and the Eastern Mediterranean'.

brew,[60] and numerous Venetian official and private documents, many still unpublished.

Situated at the juncture of major sea routes, Candia attracted numerous Jewish immigrants from various regions of the Byzantine world, Spain, and other countries in the West, as well as from the Levant from the thirteenth to the sixteenth century. Oriental Jews from Damascus appear in Candia in the late fourteenth century, next to one called Yerushalmi and another named Abbas.[61] Their encounter in Candia and the continuous contact between the Jewish communal leaders and scholars of Crete with their counterparts in other regions made substantial contributions to the thriving cultural life of the Candiote community, partly attested by numerous manuscripts preserved in the Vatican library.[62]

The city of Euripos on the island of Euboea, both called Negroponte by the Latins, offers yet another illustration of the close link between economic development following the Fourth Crusade and the evolution of the local Jewish community. The city had already served as port of call and trading station along the waterway linking Italy to Constantinople when Benjamin of Tudela encountered the local Jewish community around 1161. Negroponte was conquered by the Latins in 1205, a Venetian outpost was established in the city in 1211, and by 1256 it had become a compact quarter along the sea shore enjoying an exterritorial status. The city of Negroponte was divided between Venice and the main feudal lords of Euboea, yet Venice was the dominant economic and political force there. With the additional help of tax exemptions Venice turned it into the main regional warehouse, transit port, and transshipment station of the western Aegean, handling local, regional and trans-Mediterranean trade.[63]

The progressive consolidation of Venice's position in the city of Negroponte was also reflected within the local Jewish community. Like the

---

[60] E. S. Artom and M. D. Cassuto, eds., Taqqanoth Qandyah we-Zihronoteha (Statuta Judaeorum Candiae eorumque memorabilia) (Jerusalem, 1943).

[61] Examples in D. Jacoby, 'Quelques aspects de la vie juive en Crète dans la première moitié du XVᵉ siècle', Actes du Troisième Congrès international d'études crétoises (Rethymnon, 1971), II (Athens, 1974), 109–111, repr. in Jacoby, Recherches, no. X; D. Jacoby, 'Rof'im ve-khirurgim yehudi'im be-Kretim takhat shilton Venetsia' (= 'Jewish physicians and surgeons in Crete under Venetian rule'), in M. Ben-Sasson, R. Bonfil, J. R. Hacker, eds., Culture and society in Medieval Jewry: studies dedicated to the memory of Haim Hillel Ben-Sasson (Jerusalem, 1989), 431–444.

[62] See Starr and Cassuto, 'Jewish life in Crete', 105–114, for a first approach to the topic.

[63] D. Jacoby, 'La consolidation de la domination de Venise dans la ville de Négrepont (1205–1390): un aspect de sa politique coloniale', in Ch. A. Maltezou e P. Schreiner, eds., Bisanzio, Venezia e il mondo franco-greco (XIII–XV secolo) (Atti del Colloquio Internazionale organizzato nel centenario della nascita di Raymond-Joseph Loenertz o. p., Venezia, 1 – 2 dicembre 2000; Venice, 2002), 151–187.

Latins and the Greeks, the Jews were divided into two groups, subjects of Venice on the one hand, those of the feudal lords, on the other. As in Constantinople, Venice conducted a policy of naturalization in the island, first attested in 1268, and fiscal considerations prompted it to extend its authority over the Jewish subjects of the feudal lords. The lively economic activity in Negroponte afforded ample opportunities for Jewish involvement in entrepreneurship, credit operations, and participation in regional and long-distance trans-Mediterranean trade. Some Jews of Negroponte possibly acting as entrepreneurs were heavily involved in the concentration of raw silk from Euboea and neighbouring territories and in its supply to the expanding silk industry of Venice. From the late thirteenth century a growing number of Jews considered it advantageous to obtain Venetian status. All the Jews of Negroponte became Venetian subjects before the extension of Venetian rule over the entire city and over the whole of Euboea in 1390. The increase in Jewish taxes some time before 1414 and the extension of t he Jewish neighbourhood in the city of Negroponte in 1440 seem to imply a sustained growth in the number of Jews. However, this number dwindled rapidly in the following years and had seriously decreased by 1452 as a result of emigration to Ottoman territories. Moreover, the two additional Jewish communities of Euboea, at Karystos and Oreos, had ceased to exist.[64]

Following the Fourth Crusade Thessalonica became in 1204 the capital of the Latin kingdom bearing that name, whose brief existence ended in 1224. It is doubtful that this function had any impact on the local Jewish community in that short period.[65] The monk Nicholas of Otranto, already mentioned earlier, conducted religious disputations with Rabbanite and Karaite Jews of Thessalonike in 1205, 1207, or in both these years.[66] The will of the Greek monk Matthaios Perdikares, drafted in 1240, refers to the Jewish neighbourhood, which implies the continuity of Jewish residential concentration in a specific urban area.[67] It is impossible to determine,

---

[64] D. Jacoby, 'The demographic evolution of Euboea under Latin rule, 1205–1470', in J. Chrysostomides, Ch. Dendrinos, J. Harris, eds., The Greek islands and the sea. Proceedings of the First International Colloquium held at the Hellenic Institute, Royal Holloway, University of London, 21–22 September 2001 (Camberley, Surrey, 2004), 159–169.

[65] On which see Jacoby, 'Foreigners and the urban economy in Thessalonike', 92–94. On the Jews of Thessalonica in the twelfth century, see ibid., 123–124.

[66] Jacoby, 'The Jewish community of Constantinople', 37–38.

[67] See the will and commentary in P. Lemerle, A. Guillou, N. Svoronos, D. Papachryssanthou, eds., Actes de Lavra, II. De 1204 à 1328 (Archives de l'Athos, VII; Paris, 1977), 1–4. R. Janin, La géographie ecclésiastique de l'Empire byzantin. Première partie: Le siège de Constantinople et le patriarcat oecuménique, III: Les églises et les monastères (Paris, 1969), 488, par. 6, followed by V. Kidonopoulos, Bauten in Konstan-

though likely, that there was continuity in this respect in the following 180 years or so and that the neighbourhood was identical with the one gutted by fire some time before 1420, which was situated to the northeast of the church of the Forty Martyrs, thus slightly to the north of the leophoros and about the middle of the latter's east-west course through the city, which approximately corresponded to the present Egnatia Street.[68] Thessalonica remained the second most important city of Byzantium until its final fall to the Ottomans in 1430, yet lost its function as major transit station linking Constantinople to the West within the trans-Mediterranean trading system as early as the second half of the thirteenth century. It is impossible to determine whether the subsequent economic contraction, also due to political developments in the fourteenth century, affected the local Jewish community, since there is not a single piece of evidence regarding the occupations of its members from 1204 to around 1455. The local Romaniote community is documented until that time, when its members were forcibly transferred to Istanbul by the Ottoman authorities.[69]

A few cities of the eastern Mediterranean region became major political, administrative and economic centres as a result of political, military and territorial developments in the fourteenth and fifteenth century. These cities too attracted Jewish settlers. Such was the case of Chios, occupied by the Genoese in 1346 and remaining under their rule until 1566. Chios exported the island's mastic, a costly resinous substance much in demand. In addition, the port of Chios served as transit station for alum produced at Phocea, at a short distance on the coast of Asia Minor. Alum, a mineral substance, was widely used in the western textile and leather industries. More generally, Chios filled a pivotal role in the Genoese network of maritime trade in the eastern Mediterranean.[70] There is good reason to believe that Jews continuously resided in Chios after Benjamin of Tudela's visit in the early 1160s. A scholar by the name of Eliahu living in Chios in 1362, who owned a commentary composed by a Jew of Constantinople, offers the first testimony to their presence in the island under renewed Genoese

---

tinopel 1204–1328 (Mainzer Veröffentlichungen zur Byzantinistik, hrg. von Günter Prinzing, 1) (Wiesbaden, 1994), 95–96, mistakenly assumed that the will referred to Constantinople.

[68] On the fire, see N. Oikonomidès, ed., Actes de Dionysiou, Archives de l'Athos, IV (Paris, 1968), 112, no. 19, lines 8–11: τῆς παλαιᾶς πυρικαύστου Ἑβραΐδος; for the proposed location, see ibid., 111–112.

[69] Jacoby, 'Foreigners and the urban economy in Thessalonike', 123–129. On the economic decline of the city, see ibid., 95–113, 130–131.

[70] Balard, La Romanie génoise, passim. On Chios in the alum trade, see also D. Jacoby, 'Production et commerce de l'alun oriental en Méditerranée, XIᵉ–XVᵉ siècles', in Ph. Borgard, J.-P. Brun et M. Picon, eds., L'alun de Méditerranée (Collection du Centre Jean Bérard, 23; Naples/Aix-en-Provence, 2005), 234, 236–237, 245, 248–250, 253–254.

rule.[71] Their numbers must have markedly increased in the following dec-
ades, although some Jews left Chios for Constantinople.[72] Genoese notarial
deeds offer fairly abundant evidence about them from 1394 onward. They
were well integrated in the local economy and engaged in numerous crafts,
as well as in local and regional trade.[73] The fairly sizeable and prosperous
Jewish community was protected by the Genoese rulers, in view of its im-
portance as a source of fiscal revenue.[74] It resided alongside the Genoese
in a quarter included within the kastron or fortified section of the city,
whereas the Greeks lived outside that section. Like Candia, Chios attracted
western Jews, to whom I shall return later.

The Turkish conquests and the subsequent establishment of emirates in
western Asia Minor, as well as the Ottoman occupation of Byzantine land
in that region and in the Balkans resulted in the creation of new political
and economic centres benefiting from population concentration and eco-
nomic growth. These developments furthered the growth of various Ro-
maniote communities. Around 1045 Jews resided in Ephesos, on the west-
ern coast of Asia Minor.[75] Nothing is known about them until the four-
teenth century. There is nevertheless reason to believe that Jews
continuously resided in Ephesos and that their numbers were reinforced
after the Turkish conquest of 1304. The city, later known as Theologo, be-
came the capital of the emirate of Aydin and a cosmopolitan trading centre
by the second half of the fourteenth century.[76] However, its economic ex-
pansion must have begun earlier, as implied by its important function in
the slave trade, attested by Matthew, metropolitan of Ephesos, who pre-
sumably arrived in the city in 1339. Matthew complained that there were
many Greek slaves in Jewish houses.[77] Greek clearly facilitated communi-

---

[71] Yehuda b. Moses Moskoni, Hakdamah le-Eben ha-Ezer; Otsar Tov, ed. Abraham
Berliner (Berlin, 1878), 7; translation in Bowman, The Jews of Byzantium, 283, no. 87.

[72] See above, n. 43.

[73] Jacoby, 'The Jews in Byzantium and the Eastern Mediterranean', and Jacoby, 'The
Jews in the Byzantine economy'.

[74] D. Jacoby, 'Ha-Yehudim be-Chios takhath shilton Genua (1346–1566)' (= 'The
Jews of Chios under Genoese rule (1346–1566)'), Zion, 26 (1960/61), 180–197, with
English summary; Balard, La Romanie génoise, I, 279–283.

[75] Starr, Jews in the Byzantine Empire, 30, 48, 196–7,

[76] On this city and its hinterland at that time, see E. A. Zachariadou, Trade and cru-
sade: Venetian Crete and the Emirates of Menteshe and Aydin (1300–1415) (Library of
the Hellenic Institute of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Studies, No. 11; Venice, 1983),
125–129.

[77] D. Reinsch, ed., Die Briefe des Matthaios von Ephesos im Codex Vindobonensis
Theol. Gr. 174 (Berlin, 1974), 178, lines 126–128; translation, not entirely accurate, by
Vryonis, The decline of Medieval Hellenism, 264. The dating is not entirely secure: see P.
Lemerle, L'émirat d'Aydin, Byzance et l'Occident. Recherches sur 'la geste d'Umur
Pacha' (Paris, 1957), 32–33.

cation between masters and slaves. A Jewish physician was attached to the court of Aydin in 1331/32.[78]

Two cities under Ottoman rule apparently also attracted Jewish settlers. Bursa in northwestern Asia Minor served as Ottoman capital from 1326 to 1402. Adrianople was conquered by Sultan Murad I in 1376/77 and succeeded Bursa in that role from 1402 to 1453. The function of the two cities as government centres and seats of the sultans' court under Mehmed I (1413–1421) and Murad II (1421–1451) promoted their development into major markets in land trade and luxury consumption. A colophon of 1377 illustrates the existence of a Jewish community in Bursa, headed by Shlomo ha-Nasi, son of Jesse ha-Nasi of Trnovo (Bulgaria).[79] He was thus a fairly recent settler in Bursa. Four different scribal hands reflect the presence of Romaniote Jews belonging to the Karaite congregation in Adrianople in 1335/36, before the Ottoman conquest.[80] A bill of sale from 1389 provides further evidence in that respect.[81] In 1438 a Jewish merchant residing in the city bought western woollens in Constantinople.[82]

After conquering Constantinople in 1453 Sultan Mehmed II implemented a policy aimed at increasing the city's population by the forcible transfer of inhabitants from other cities. This policy put an abrupt end to the existence of several Romaniote communities. All the Jews of Bursa, Adrianople and several other cities were deported in 1455.[83] A similar measure affected the entire Jewish population of Thessalonica around that time. No Jews resided in this city in the following decades, as illustrated by Ottoman population censuses carried out from 1478 to 1490. The Jewish presence in Thessalonica was renewed when Sepharadic and Ashkenazi Jews settled in the city.[84] Romaniote Jews who had left Euboea before 1459 for unknown locations in Ottoman territory were also resettled in Istanbul. In that year and again in 1462 Venice requested Sultan Mehmed II to allow their return, to no avail. These Jews were possibly the origin of the community of Agriboz, attested by Ottoman fiscal records of the seventeenth century, although it is also possible that this community was established following the Ottoman conquest of Negroponte in 1470.[85]

Though far from complete, the preceding survey of Jewish communities points to some basic trends of Jewish mobility within the Byzantine world.

---

[78] Ibn Battuta, Travels in Asia and Africa, 1325–1354, tr. H. A. R. Gibb, (Cambridge, 1958–1994), II, 442.

[79] Bowman, Jews of Byzantium, 91, n. 115.

[80] Bowman, Jews of Byzantium, 263–264, no. 56.

[81] Bowman, Jews of Byzantium, 232, no. 26*, commentary, and 292, no. 100*.

[82] Dorini e Bertelè, Il libro dei conti di Giacomo Badoer, 511, line 11.

[83] Bowman, Jews of Byzantium, 91 and 325, no. 149.

[84] Jacoby, 'Foreigners and the urban economy in Thessalonike', 127–128.

[85] Jacoby, 'Les quartiers juifs de Constantinople', 216, 220.

Before the Fourth Crusade military events resulting in territorial losses in Asia Minor led to the withdrawal of Byzantine populations toward the Aegean and Constantinople. On the other hand, economic factors generated a more varied and complex web of migration, the full reconstruction of which is impossible in the absence of adequate evidence. Nevertheless it is clear that Constantinople was the focus of migration from the entire Byzantine world, the immigrants hoping to find a slot of their own in the vast economy of the city. On a smaller scale, the development of specific economic branches in provincial cities created employment, like the silk industry sponsored by local entrepreneurs in Thebes in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. It is likely that the first Jewish silk workers establishing themselves in that city and in Thessalonica came from other Byzantine sites, such as Constantinople, where Jewish silk workers are already attested in the tenth century. The same presumably occurred, partly at least, following the deportation of the Jewish silk workers from Thebes to Palermo in 1147, ordered by King Roger II of Sicily.[86] Another wave of professional migration, noted earlier, followed the Latin conquest of Constantinople in 1204, when Jewish silk workers left the city to join the silk industry in the Greek state of Nicaea.[87]

New patterns of internal migration within the Byzantine world emerged after 1204. Although Constantinople still attracted numerous immigrants, it ceased to be the main focus of migration. The consolidation of Venetian and Genoese presence in Constantinople and in the Aegean region, the intensive economic activity of the two maritime powers, and the favourable legal status and privileges enjoyed by their respective citizens and subjects attracted Jews, Latins and Greeks alike. These factors stimulated migration between their respective colonies and outposts along the waterways connecting them. Thus lively business relations existed between the Jews of Candia and Constantinople, which included consignments of kosher cheese and wine being sent from Crete, while Jews living in the Jewish neighbourhood of the Venetian quarter in the Byzantine capital sent hides to tanners in Candia.[88] The Cretan Jews settling in Constantinople in the fourteenth century appear to have been more numerous than the Jews of the empire's capital moving to Candia. Similarly, as noted earlier, Jews from Genoese Chios established themselves in the Genoese quarter of Constantinople located in Pera. The commercial connections between Venetian Crete and Negroponte were also intense, and Jews from the latter

---

[86] D. Jacoby, 'Silk in Western Byzantium before the Fourth Crusade', Byzantinische Zeitschrift, 84/85 (1991/1992), 452–500, repr. in Jacoby, Trade, no. VII; Jacoby, 'The Jews and the silk industry of Constantinople', 1–20.

[87] See above, n. 47.

[88] Gaspares, Franciscus de Cruce, 170–171, no. 224.

island settled in Candia, among them Yecuda de Medego, whose extensive business transactions are documented from 1360 to 1381.[89] Yet Jewish migration did not always follow this pattern. Around 1300 the sons of Moses Galimidi emigrated from Negroponte to Corinth, Thebes, Andros, Salona, Sparta and Constantinople, while Daniel of Negroponte established himself in the Black Sea port of Tana, where he traded in 1359.[90] The complex web of specific professional mobility between Jewish communities is well illustrated by the Jewish scribe from Toledo, active in the Aegean region in the early fifteenth century.[91]

As elsewhere, there seems to have been a correlation between brisk economic activity, Jewish cultural life, and learning institutions in the Romaniote communities. In the 1160s Benjamin of Tudela mentions scholars in Thebes, Halmyros, Besaina, a small locality on the way from Halmyros to Thessalonica, in the latter city, and in Constantinople.[92] Isaiah of Trani, a native of Apulia (1200–before 1260), well acquainted with the writings of Romaniote scholars, refers to Greek scholars in Thebes and Siponto.[93] This is not to say that small communities lacked cultural activity. [94]

Important shifts in the nature, orientation and channelling of external Jewish migration into the Byzantine world took place after the Fourth Crusade. Until then most Jews arriving from foreign lands, especially in Constantinople, hailed from the eastern provinces of the empire and from eastern Islamic countries. Among them was a Syrian Jew who served as interpreter at the imperial court, whom the Arab traveller Ibn Battuta

---

[89] Jacoby, 'The demographic evolution of Euboea', 165.

[90] According to a Hebrew letter published by C. Bernheimer, 'Document relatif aux Juifs de Négrepont', Revue des Études Juives, 65 (1913), 224–228; translated with commentary by Bowman, Jews of Byzantium, 234–240, no. 30, but for the dating see D. Jacoby, 'Silk in Medieval Andros', in E. Chrysos and E. Zachariadou, eds, Captain and Scholar. Papers in Memory of D. I. Polemis (Andros, 2008), in press. For Tana, see previous note.

[91] See above, n. 7.

[92] Bowman, Jews of Byzantium, 75, 99. On Besaina, called Bissina by Benjamin, see J. Koder und F. Hild, Hellas und Thessalia (Tabula Imperii Byzantini, 1 = Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Denkschriften, 125. Band; Wien, 1976), 134–135.

[93] S. Schechter, 'Notes on Hebrew MSS. in the University Library of Cambridge', Jewish Quarterly Review, 4 (1892), 90–101, 94.

[94] On late eleventh- and twelfth-century Jewish scholars in Constantinople, Thessalonica, Thebes, Candia, and other localities, some of which are unknown, see also de Lange, 'Jewish education', 121–126. On copies of works of Abraham ibn Ezra made in various localities of the Byzantine world, see N. de Lange, 'Abraham Ibn Ezra and Byzantium', in F. Díaz Esteban, ed., Abraham Ibn Ezra y su tiempo. Abraham Ibn Ezra and his Age (Actas del Simposio Internacional. Proceedings of the International Symposium, Madrid, Tudela. Toledo, 1–8 febrero 1989; Madrid, 1990), 9–12.

encountered in Constantinople in 1331/32. Jews bearing Arabic names appear in the city in the first half of the fifteenth century, and Oriental Jews also settled in Candia.[95] These cases illustrate the continuation of the population influx from the Islamic East, the volume of which seems to have substantially diminished from the thirteenth century on.

The novel element in Jewish migration into the Byzantine world was the ever-growing arrival of Jews hailing from the central and western Mediterranean, as well as from other western regions.[96] Candia, a major maritime junction and economic centre, with its large Jewish community, was the first major destination of the immigrants. Jews fleeing the late thirteenth-century persecutions in the Kingdom of Naples were followed by others from several regions. The broad diversity of migration currents reaching Candia is well reflected by three Jewish associates, all living in the city, who sold honey in 1339. They or their forefathers had arrived from Messina in Sicily, Tripoli in North Africa, and Catalonia respectively.[97] The surnames Theotonicus, Todescho, de Alemania and Ashkenazi, documented in Candia from the second half of the fourteenth century on, all point to Germany, and Sarfati to northern France. A Catalan Jew attested in 1343 in Constantinople among Romaniote Jews had clearly passed through Candia. The flow of Catalan Jews substantially increased after the anti-Jewish riots of 1391 in Barcelona. Surnames such as Sepharadi, Spagnolo, Bonsinior, Astruc attest to their presence in Candia and Constantinople. Immigrants from Majorca are also attested in Candia.[98] The account book of the Venetian merchant Giacomo Badoer, compiled in Constantinople in the 1430s, and Venetian documents refer to Jews called Baron, Barona, Signorin, Saporta and Verga.[99] The names Fogiano, Lacave, Astruc, Benno and Galiano, documented in Genoese Chios between 1417 and 1456, illustrate immigration from southern Italy and Catalonia.[100]

Despite the growing numbers of Spanish immigrants, Greek-speaking Romaniote Jews remained the dominant group in the Jewish communities of the Byzantine world, both in numbers and as a cultural factor. Significantly, not a single Sepharadic congregation is to be found in these communities before the massive arrival of Jews expelled from Spain in 1492. Two factors account for the absence of such congregations. The arrivals of immigrants in specific communities were thinly spread over many years,

---

[95] See above, n. 61.

[96] I believe that this picture is not just the outcome of a shift in documentation resulting from the absence of relevant sources from the Genizah since the thirteenth century and the massive addition of western sources.

[97] Gaspares, Franciscus de Cruce, 165–166, no. 216.

[98] Jacoby, 'Quelques aspects de la vie juive en Crète', 110–111.

[99] See above, n. 44.

[100] See above, n. 43.

rather than concentrated within short periods as in the late fifteenth century. As a result, their numbers in a single community at any given time were never sufficient for them to establish separate congregations. These circumstances, the social pressure exerted by the Romaniote Jews, and economic imperatives prevented the immigrants from maintaining their distinct cultural identity, whether individually or collectively, and prompted them to integrate within the existing communities.

The acculturation of the Jewish immigrants to the Romaniote milieu is illustrated in various ways. The acquisition of vernacular Greek, at least at a rudimentary level, was a prerequisite for communication with local Jews and participation in the economic life of the Byzantine world. Well beyond linguistic skills, marital connections to local families ensured a firmer integration within the local community, as illustrated in Candia. In 1415 the son of Salomon Spagnolo wedded Erini, a woman bearing a Greek name. In 1432 Anastasia, member of a local family, appears as widow of Moshe Delmedigo, whose family hailed from Germany despite his Italian surname. Khrusoli Katalan, mentioned from 1450 to 1453 in the communal ordinances of Candia, was clearly the son of a mixed marriage. His first name was derived from Greek chrysos, while his toponymic surname reveals the origin of his family from Catalonia.[101]

The assimilation of immigrants to the Romaniote milieu is also illustrated by Hebrew manuscripts. Newly arrived scribes used the style to which they were accustomed, an Italian script in the Cretan cities of Canea and Candia, respectively in 1382 and 1400, a Spanish one by the scribe from Toledo, as well as in Candia in 1395, 1396 and 1399/1400, although surprisingly the latter scribe was the son of Moshe ha-Yerushalmi. By contrast, scribes belonging to the second or later generations of immigrants hailing from Spain, Provence, or other countries used the Byzantine Hebrew script. Several such cases may be cited: Abraham son of Leon, attested in Candia in 1374/75, one bearing the surname Yerushalmi, and another called Ashkenazi in unknown locations, respectively in 1429 and 1453, and finally, Grazian and ha-Sepharadi in Rhodes, respectively in 1426 and 1453.[102] However, several late manuscripts display a fusion of Byzantine and Sepharadi script elements.[103]

The forceful transfer of Romaniote communities from the Ottoman provinces to Constantinople/Istanbul, except those of the Peloponnesus, made possible the survival of their congregations and traditions in the city

---

[101] Jacoby, 'Quelques aspects de la vie juive en Crète', 111–112.

[102] I rely here on the data bank mentioned above, n. 3.

[103] S. Reif, 'Some changing trends in the Jewish literary expression of the Byzantine world', in C. Holmes and J. Waring, eds., Literacy, education and manuscript transmission in Byzantium and beyond (Leiden, Boston and Köln, 2002), 105.

long after the demise of the Byzantine empire, despite the dominant posi-
tion acquired by the Sepharadic immigrants and their descendants after
1492.[104] These entirely replaced the Romaniotes in the provincial cities
from which they had been deported. On the other hand, the Romaniote
communities existing outside the boundaries of the Ottoman empire after
1470, as in Candia and Corfu, survived under Venetian rule. This is partly
illustrated by Elijah Kapsali of Candia (1490–1555), who reports the read-
ing of a Greek translation of the Book of Jonah in the synagogues of these
two cities on Yom Kippur.[105]

---

[104] On the Romaniote congregations in Istanbul, see Bowman, Jews of Byzantium,
189–192.

[105] Bowman, Jews of Byzantium, 166 and n. 125.

Byzantium and Byzantines in the Cairo Genizah:
New and Old Sources

by

Ben Outhwaite

Presented below are nine letters that were either written by Byzantine Jews living in Egypt, addressed to Jews living in Byzantine territories, or sent from Constantinople itself.[1] The letters were all discovered in Cambridge University Library's Taylor-Schechter Genizah Collection, the vast hoard of medieval Jewish manuscripts recovered from the storeroom (genizah) of the Ben Ezra Synagogue in Fusṭāṭ, Old Cairo, at the end of the nineteenth century by the Cambridge scholar Solomon Schechter.[2] The Genizah Collection has long been appreciated as an invaluable source of material on the medieval Mediterranean, and a number of documents relating to Byzantine Jewry have been unearthed.[3] In the present paper, I wish to add to this number by presenting nine letters that all share a Byzantine context.

Of the letters, some have previously been edited or translated (rarely both), as detailed below, but not in all cases were their Byzantine connections known or made clear. So it is with the letter by the Byzantine scholar Yeḥi'el b. Elyaqim (T-S 13J20.3), whom one of the earliest historians to work on the Genizah, Jacob Mann, misidentified as a native of Aleppo.[4]

---

[1] I am grateful for the valuable comments I received following the presentation of an earlier version of this paper, particularly Professor Nicholas de Lange, and for the remarks of my colleagues in the Genizah Research Unit, Dr Esther-Miriam Wagner, Professor Stefan Reif, Dr Friedrich Niessen and Dr Avihai Shivtiel.

[2] For a useful introduction to the Genizah see S. C. Reif, A Jewish archive from Old Cairo: the history of Cambridge University's Genizah Collection (Richmond, Surrey, 2000).

[3] See for instance the list published in N. R. M. de Lange, 'Greek and Byzantine fragments in the Cairo Genizah', Bulletin of Judaeo-Greek Studies 5 (1989), 13–17 or his monograph, Greek Jewish texts from the Cairo Genizah (Tübingen, 1996). The latter contains only a small number of documentary (as opposed to literary) texts, however.

[4] J. Mann, The Jews in Egypt and Palestine under the Fatimid caliphs: a contribution to their political and communal history, based chiefly on Genizah material hitherto unpublished, and a second supplement to "The Jews in Egypt and in Palestine under the Fatimid caliphs" (New York, 1970 [1920–2]), vol. ii, 301–3.

Similarly, I bring together four letters that testify to the presence of a Byzantine scribe in Egypt, plying his trade as a petitioner on behalf of the poor (T-S 12.237; T-S NS 325.184; T-S 13J13.16; T-S 8J16.29). Other documents relevant to the Byzantine world have attracted only passing mentions in footnotes, such as the resident of Constantinople Abū ʿAlī's magnificent telling-off of his father-in-law (T-S Misc.35.8), and others still, such as the Greek-speaking Abraham's greetings to his son-in-law (T-S 6J4.1) or the same Yeḥiʾel b. Elyaqim's note requesting help (T-S AS 142.126), have not previously been published in any form.

A letter to Seleucia

Probably dating from towards the beginning of the Classical Genizah Period (mid-10th c. to mid-13th c.) and written in Egypt, the first document is a letter (Cambridge University Library T-S 12.179) addressed to a Jew living in Seleucia (modern Silifke), on the southern coast of Byzantine Asia Minor. It was written by an Egyptian Jew, known only as Saʿd, to his son-in-law, a certain Aaron the Ḥaver ('Member of the Academy').[5] For reasons unknown – perhaps he was a trader – Aaron had departed Egypt, leaving behind his wife and children. Saʿd remained in touch with him by letter until he received a report of Aaron's death at the hands of an unnamed 'enemy' (Pirates? The Byzantine army or navy? There were many dangers for Mediterranean travellers). This letter is the first written by Saʿd after receiving the news from Aaron himself, that he was in fact alive and well.

Unfailingly polite, and suitably thankful to hear of Aaron's good health, Saʿd nevertheless takes his son-in-law to task for his lengthy absence – 23 years! – from his wife and children, and his lack of interest in their welfare. Despite his chastising tone, Saʿad clearly hoped to tempt his daughter's husband home with the implication that all was forgiven. Under Jewish law the two were still married, since Aaron had evidently not divorced his wife and given her a geṭ, a bill of divorce, without which she would remain an ʿaguna, a 'living widow'. With Aaron living under Byzantine sovereignty, there were no effective legal measures, such as the threat of excommunication, that could either compel him to divorce his wife or force his return; Saʿd thus falls back upon diplomacy.

After encouraging Aaron to show greater concern for his family, Saʿd answers the specific questions that his son-in-law posed in his previous letter, on the state of the Nile and the price of bread: 'You said: "Inform

---

[5] חבר (ḥaver), was one of the highest titles granted by the Palestinian Yeshivah; see E. Bareket, Fustat on the Nile: the Jewish elite in medieval Egypt (Leiden, 1999), 32–6.

me about the water". The Nile has already flooded and is at peace. As for
the [price of] bread: twelve pounds for a silver [dirham]'. Clearly eco-
nomic concerns played a significant role in either Aaron's original deci-
sion to abscond or in his reluctance to return from Seleucia. Such inquiries
from abroad concerning 'the water' and the price of bread are not unusual.
A letter from the mid-eleventh century, T-S 10J19.16, written by 'Eli ha-
Kohen b. Ezekiel, asks the addressee, 'Eli ha-Kohen b. Ḥayyim, to tell him
the 'size of the water […] and the price', i.e., the depth of the Nile and the
price of wheat or bread (r. 8).[6] A healthy water-level in the Nile was essen-
tial to life in Egypt. Each year it was necessary for the Nile to flood suffi-
ciently to irrigate the surrounding farmland and ensure a healthy wheat
crop; insufficient or excessive flooding could have terrible consequences,
and there were a number of serious famines in the eleventh century that
resulted from the Nile's failure to flood properly (Gil 2004: 161). Saʿd's
reply is that the Nile has flooded but 'is at peace', i.e., that it has subsided
fully, ensuring a good harvest. With such words did he hope to tempt his
daughter's husband back home.

Seleucia is mentioned rarely in Genizah documents, but further evi-
dence for Jews living there is preserved in a twelfth-century letter, T-S
13J21.17, sent by a Jewish doctor from Seleucia, to his in-laws, bragging
about his wealth, house and possessions, and encouraging his relatives to
emigrate from Egypt to Byzantium.[7] Clearly, Seleucia was not inhospitable
to Jews in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, and Saʿd's errant son-in-law
was weighing carefully the conditions back in Egypt before making a deci-
sion to return.

The letter is undated, but its approximate age can be estimated. The
very square script and the use of vellum as writing material suggest an
early date. Paper rapidly replaced parchment as an everyday writing mate-
rial in Egypt following the Fāṭimid conquest (marriage contracts and other
legal documents, as well as sacred texts, continued to be written on vellum,
however), and it is rare to find Egyptian or Syro-Palestinian letter-writers
using parchment much beyond the end of the tenth century.[8] The fact that
the letter is written in Hebrew and Aramaic, rather than Arabic, also sug-
gests a comparatively early date, since Judaeo-Arabic became the domi-

---

[6] Edited in M. Gil, Palestine during the first Muslim period (634–1099) (Hebrew; Tel
Aviv, 1983), vol. iii, 78–80.

[7] Translated in S. D. Goitein, 'A letter from Seleucia (Cilicia)', Speculum 39 (1964),
298–303.

[8] In North Africa and Byzantium itself, parchment remained a more popular medium
for longer, in part because of the paucity of paper and, in North Africa at least, due to the
plentiful availability of sheep skins. On the spread of paper-making in general see J.
Bloom, Paper before print: the history and impact of paper in the Islamic world (New
Haven and London, 2001).

nant language for correspondence from the middle of the eleventh century onwards. Thus a good estimate for the letter's date would be late tenth to early eleventh century.

Cambridge University Library T-S 12.179

Vellum; 276×200;[9] **Egypt; 10th–11th c.**[10]
Recto

1 בשמ׳ רחמ׳

2 שלום רב לאהבי תורתיך ואין למו מכשול

3 שלום טב מריבונא טבא דמיטוביה מטיב לעלמיה ושלומות

4 כנהרים כלם יחולו על ראש כב׳ ג׳ קדש׳ מר׳ ור׳ אהרן החבר

5 וכל הנלוים אצלו ישאו שלום ממני ומאנשי מ[קו]מי מיודעי [ומאת]

6 קרובי גם אלהינו יקבץ נפוצות יהודה וישראל לעלות אל היכל

7 קדשו לחזות בנועם יי ולבקר בהיכלו

8   שא שלום ממני אני סעד ואודיעך כי נפש[י] כספה

9 לראות את פניך ולחזות את כבודך לא הק׳ב׳ה׳ יול]

10 והעול יחסכני מהלוך אליך והמקום בר׳ הוא בוחן לב[ות?

11 קודשא בריך הוא יראיני פניך ב[ק]רוב [

12 ולא התעכבתי שאכתוב לך בכל שעה אלא שמענו כי נ[פלת ביד?]

13 האויב ונצטערתי על אותו דבר ואחר כן שמעתי כ[י] את[ה]

14 בחיים כתבתי זה הכתב ואני בבקשה ממך שתשיבני

15 ותודיעני מה אתה עליו וכל צורך שיש לך ושלומך ואני

16 ואנשי ביתי בשלום ואין בלבי דבר יכאיביני אלא ר[ַחַק]

17 ממני ואודיעך שאשתך בצער גדול עם היל[דים]

18 שלך והנחתה זה שלש ועשרים שנה ולא נכספתה לראו[תם]

19 למה תעשה כה לאשתך ובניך ודע מה תעשה

20 בילדים שלך ואמרת הודיעוני בשביל המים כבר שט[ף]

21 נילוס והשלים והלחם שנים עשר רטל בכסף וגן י׳

22 ארץ מצרים ואמרתה כי אתה חולה המ׳ב׳ה׳ י[תן ל]ך

23 רפואה שלימה וע[ן

Right-hand margin

<div dir="rtl">

1 ש[

2 בת שתי[

3 אחרת שא שלום

4 ממני סעד

5 ומבתך

6 ושלום

7 ומאשתך

8 וב

</div>

Verso

<div dir="rtl">

1 יגיע זה הכתב אל סלוכיה אל כב׳   ממני סעד

2 מר׳ ור׳ אהרן החבר אל בית   חותנך

3 שבתי אצל הכניסה

</div>

Notes on the transcription: [ ] indicates a lacuna in the text; < > indicates text written above the line.

Translation of T-S 12.179

Recto

1. In your name, O Merciful One.

2. 'Great peace have those that love your Law; nothing can make them stumble' (Pss 119:165).

3. Good greetings[11] from the good Lord who, from his goodness, spreads good upon the world and blessings

4. like rivers. May all of them whirl about the head of the honourable, great, holy, our master and teacher[12] Aaron the Ḥaver[13]

5. and all who are connected with him. May they accept greetings from me and from the people around me, from my friends [and from]

6. my relatives. May our God also bring together the scattered people of Judah and Israel, to lead them up to the temple

7. of His holiness, 'to gaze upon the delightfulness of the Lord and to contemplate His temple' (Pss 27:4)

8. Accept greetings from me, Saʻd,[14] and I am letting you know that my soul longs

9. to see your face and to gaze upon your honour. May the Holy One,

---

[11] A Hebraism intrudes into Saʻd's Aramaic blessing in line 2, שָׁלוֹם instead of Aramaic שְׁלָם.

[12] כבוד גדולת קדושת מרינו ורבינו כב׳ ג׳ קדש׳ מר׳ ור׳ is; these polite terms of address are usually abbreviated in Genizah letters.

[13] חבר, ḥaver, 'member of the Academy', was a senior title bestowed by the Palestinian Yeshivah. Saʻd's son-in-law was someone of importance.

[14] סעד, Saʻd, is an Arabic name (meaning 'good fortune', 'lucky star'); the more common (among Jews), Hebraised version is סעדיה, Saʻadiah.

blessed be He,[15] not […]

10. And the yoke prevents me from going to you. And the Lord, blessed[16] be He, tests hearts.

11. May the Holy One, blessed be He, let me soon look upon your face. […]

12. I would not have ceased my constant writing to you except we heard that [you had been killed by]

13. the enemy. And I was sad about this news. But subsequently I have heard that you are

14. alive [and so] I have written this letter. I implore you to reply to me

15. and let me know what you are up to[17] and whether you have any needs and how you are. And I

16. and the members of my household are well: my heart is free from all cares except that caused by your distance

17. from me. And I am informing you that your wife suffers great distress with your children.

18. You've abandoned [them] these past twenty-three years and have shown no desire to see them.

19. Why do you act in this way towards your wife and your sons? You should consider what to do[18] about

20. your children. You said: 'Inform me about the water'.

21. The Nile has already flooded and is at peace. As for the [price of] bread: twelve pounds for a silver [dirham]. And a garden of the Lord is

22. the land of Egypt.[19] And you said that you were ill. The Lord, blessed be He, grant you a complete recovery and […]

Margin

1. […]
2. daughter […]
3. another. Greetings
4. from me, Saʿd
5. and from your daughter.
6. And greetings.

---

[15] הק׳ב׳ה׳ is the usual abbreviation for הקדוש ברוך הוא.

[16] ברוך is בר׳.

[17] 'What you are up to'; this is a straightforward calque of the Arabic expression ما انت عليه, mā anta ʿalayhi.

[18] 'You should consider what to do' is a biblical idiom taken from Judg 18:14.

[19] 'And a garden of the Lord is the land of Egypt' is inspired by Gen 13:10 כגן יי כארץ מצרים, 'like the garden of the Lord, like the land of Egypt'. Saʿd is referring to the succesful Nile inundation having ensured the fertility of Egypt's fields.

7. And from your wife
8. and…[20]

Verso
1. Let this letter reach Seleucia, to the honourable
2. master and teacher Aaron the Ḥaver, to the house of
3. Shabbetay[21] by the synagogue.[22]
1a. From me, Saʿd,
2a. your father-in-law.

A former slave writes from Constantinople

The following letter, T-S Misc.35.8, is a mirror image of the previous one. It was sent from Byzantium by one Abū ʿAlī to his father-in-law, Joseph al-Baghdādī ('the man from Baghdad'). The shoe is on the other foot in this relationship, since it is the son-in-law who is reprimanding the father for what he regards as his abominable behaviour towards the married couple.[23]

 Abū ʿAlī was not a native of Byzantium, as his Arabic kunya (honorific epithet) indicates, and he describes both he and his wife as 'exiled from our land' (r. 6). They met and married after being captured and sold into slavery in Byzantium.[24] They were evidently redeemed by the local Jewish community, and now live freely in Constantinople, although it is their great wish to return home to Egypt and finally pay their respects to Joseph. Joseph, however, was unhappy at his daughter marrying without his permission, far from home. After ignoring the couple's many letters, he instead contacted a local Jew, R. Elijah (a popular Byzantine Jewish name), enclosing a geṭ, a divorce deed, for his son-in-law to sign and thereby free

---

[20] Here the letter breaks off mid-word, suggesting that it was never finished.

[21] Shabbetay was probably a local, since the name was popular among Byzantine Jews; see N. de Lange, 'Jewish sources', in M. Whitby, ed., Byzantines and Crusaders in non-Greek sources (Oxford, 2007), 367.

[22] כניסה, 'synagogue', derived from Arabic كنيسة, kanīsa, 'church; synagogue', is frequently found in Hebrew documents from the Genizah as a synonym of Hebrew בית הכנסת.

[23] This letter is mentioned briefly in S. Assaf, Texts and studies in Jewish history (Hebrew; Jerusalem, 1946), 145 note 12, under its former classmark of T-S Loan 8, but it has neither been edited nor translated.

[24] Not an unusual occurrence in the eleventh–twelfth centuries, when there was considerable piracy in the eastern Mediterranean. There are a number of Genizah documents that give firsthand accounts of the sale of Byzantine Jews in the Egyptian port of Alexandria, see. Mann, Jews in Egypt and Palestine, vol. i, 87–92.

Joseph's daughter from what he regarded as an unsatisfactory marriage. By
the time that Joseph's deed arrived, Abū ʿAlī's wife had already borne
several sons, who had died, and a daughter, who was married to a Kohen.
Abū ʿAlī was appalled at Joseph's demand that he should divorce his wife
after they have already raised a family together, and threatened to publicly
embarrass him by showing his correspondence to the 'judges and leading
members of the community' (r. 24). Instead, Abū ʿAlī asks Joseph to meet
his representative, a man called Samuel, whom he has dispatched to Egypt
to bring back his share of an inheritance. There is more than a slight odour
of blackmail in Abū ʿAlī's suggestions to his father-in-law.

Although the name Abū ʿAlī is a common one in the Genizah world,
another text, the well-known letter of a Jewish physician from Seleucia,
T-S 13J21.17, refers to an Abū ʿAlī that can only be our current corre-
spondent: פאמא חאל אבו אלחסן בן בנת כאלי פקד כתבת יי כתב אנה תופי פי בית אבו
[ני]עלי צהר אלחבר אלבגדאדי אלזלבא, 'You ask about Abu'l-Ḥasan, the son of
the daughter of my paternal uncle. I have already written in ten letters that
he died in Constantinople in the house of Abū ʿAlī, the son-in-law of the
Ḥaver al-Baghdādī, the pancake maker' (T-S 13J21.17 v. 4–6).[25] If Joseph
were a ḥaver, 'member of the Yeshivah', an important title in public life,
then that would further explain his wish to divorce his daughter from a
comparative nobody and find a more advantageous match for her. The
physician's letter was written in 1137, so a date in the first half of the
twelfth century for Abū ʿAlī's letter seems reasonable.

A number of codicological observations can be made about the letter. It
is written on oriental laid paper: the Byzantines are not thought to have had
a native paper-making industry, and, prior to the second half of the twelfth
century, they imported their paper from Arab lands.[26] The handwriting is a
Byzantine type, which is squarer than the contemporary Egyptian style.
Whereas letters from Egypt usually leave a considerable margin along the
top and right-hand side of the leaf, this letter utilises the full width and
length, and, unlike Egyptian letters, the text on verso is not inverted in re-
lation to recto. Moreover, the entire letter, bar the names, is written in He-
brew. How to explain this, given that Abū ʿAlī hailed from an Arab land,
probably Egypt? The simplest explanation is that he employed a Byzantine
scribe to write his letter, who naturally wrote it in the language all Jews
had in common, Hebrew. The orthography of Constantinople, קושטנדינא (r.
3, v.7; Kustandina), with a d, reflects the vernacular Greek pronunciation,

rather than that of an Arabic-speaker.[27] There is a spelling mistake in the one word in Judaeo-Arabic in the address, אלבוגדאדי (v. 8), with Hebrew waw (u/o) for the Arabic a vowel.[28] There is also a potential case of the confusion of two sibilants, a typical Greek-speaker's mistake when writing Hebrew, in ירוסת, 'inheritance' (r. 16), though this is correctly written elsewhere in the letter (v. 2).[29] An alternative explanation is that Abū ʿAlī was sold into slavery while very young and had spent most of his life in Constantinople, picking up the local handwriting and pronunciation, and forgetting his Arabic.

Cambridge University Library T-S Misc.35.8

Paper; 157 × 140; Constantinople; 12th c.
Recto

1 לכבוד אדוני ומרי ומחותני מ׳ יוסף אלבגדאדי מני חתנך אבו ע[לי
2 דע אדוני כי כשבגזר הגוזר להראותנו צרות רבות נתננו ביד שובינו
3 והביאוני עם כמה אנשים ונשים ונמכרנו הנה בקוסטנדינא ופדאונו
4 בעזרת הבורא וחסדיו הורבו עלינו ולא תמנו על כי לא כלו רח[מ]יו וגם
5 אחרי כן בימים מעטים הכרנו אני לבתך והיא איתי ו[ב]כינו [כ]מה על כי
6 גלינו מארצנו ונפרדנו מאתכם והשתדלו מאנשי א[ ] יא (?) וכגזירת
7 האומר ניזדווגנו וחס עלינו האל וריחם אותנו בבנים ובבת ˙ הבנים הלכו
8 לבית מועד והבת נשארה לנו ונשאת על בחור כהן ויפה בכל ˙ וגם תקווה
9 יש לנו עוד אולי נזכה להשתחוותכם ˙ ועתה היה בדעתנו לבוא בעזרת
10 האל ומפני חולאים אשר מצאתנו ואבדה הפרוטה ממנו מבלי ימצא לנו
11 הוצאת מרגוע על כן חדלנו ˙ ואי שמ׳ מאז ועד עתה כמה אגרות הודענוך
12 ואפ[י]לו לתשובת שלום לא קיבלנו ממך והייתכן כזה עליך או היוכש[ר לך]
13 ואד[ר]בא המררתני בגט אשר כתבת ˙ חלף הטובה רעה ˙ וילכו ה[ ]
14 יעבירו ועתה נראה ונבין אך הפעם עם זה שמואל אם אתה חס ומרחם
15 עלינו [ויי]חשב עלינו מה שתעשה כי מכתובתנו ריחמתנו וגם שתרוץ
16 בכל חכמתך על זה שמואל איפיטרופא שעשיתי לקחת מן ירוסת אבותיי
17 כי׳ דינ׳ שלמקום אולי שיביאם לנו להיות הוצאה לבואנו אליכם ˙ והנה
18 כותב לך דע ו'הבן מן עבדך וחתנך כי על פי כתבתיך אשתקד שתתקן לי
19 [כ]תובת אשתי בתך עשירה יחידתי על כן הוקשה לך הדבר לעשות
20 וכתבת לר׳ אליה שאפטור לבתך בגט כשהיא עם בת ובן וחתן ˙ אם רציית

---

[27] Arabic-speaking Jews write variants on אלקסטנטינינה (sometimes with velarisation of the sibilant, אלקצטנטיניה), reflecting the Arabic القسطنطينية (al-Qusṭanṭīnīya).

[28] Reflecting the lowering of the pronunciation of a in the environment of the velar غ. It is correctly written אלבגדאדי, however, in the first line of the letter.

[29] Since Greek possesses only one sibilant phoneme /s/ (σ), which is realised somewhere between Hebrew /s/ (ס) and /š/ (שׁ).

21 אתה א' אני כמה וכמה הייתי רוצה שאפטרנה מקודם ולאחרי זכרנו אלהינו
22 לנטעים היאך לא חסת לנפשך ולא יראת מן שבגדו נשמת רוחך וגם זו
23 תדע תדע אם לא הייתי מרחם על נפשי ואל נפשות אשר עמי הייתי לוקח את
24 אגרותיך ובא [לה]ודיעה (?) לדיינים ולחשובי הקהל ֗ אבל חסד] [חדלתי גם על
25 כי החלתי ו[נ]יתרוקנתי ושמא לא אנוח עד שאבוא ובתך [ל]א הייתה רוצה
26 שתקבל גט ממני והייתה בוכה וא֗ מֶרֶת לחשובי הקהל הֵאָך אקבל
27 גט ואניח את ילדיי וחתני וגם הם האשימוך בדבר שעשית ֗

Verso

1 ייושתקו וילכו הרעות ל֗ [כם ועתה אם תרצה שתנחמני כתוב
2 לי בדיקדוק מה נשאר לי מיירושת אבותיי בבירור ועל ידי מי הם
3 מושמים ותשתדל אולי לאיפיטרופיא שמניתי אולי שיביא לי י֗ דיני'
4 שיהיו לנו הוצאה ובעזרת האל נבוא ונשתחוה לכם ובעד אחותיי תדעני
5 אם הן בחיים ונזכה להשתחוותכם ומשתחווים לכפות רגליך בתי וחתני והנולד
6 אם יזכה ושלומך ושלום אחיי אחי אשתי עם הגברת חמותי יירב לעד [...]
7 תובל אגרת אבונ] [י בן אבולמאני   מן קוסטנדינא
8 אלי כבו' מ' ור' יוסף אלבוגדאדי   במצרים לשלום
9   תתבשר

Translation of T-S Misc.35.8

1. To the honourable, my lord and my master, my father-in-law, Mar[30] Jo-
seph the Baghdadi, from me,[31] your son-in-law Abū ʻAlī.
2. Know, my lord, that when He who makes decrees decreed that we
should experience many trials, He gave us into the hand of our captors
3. who brought us with a number of men and women, and sold us here in
Constantinople. But we were ransomed
4. with the Creator's help, and the abundance of his kindness was upon us,
and we didn't meet our end, because there is no end to His mercy. And
also,
5. afterwards, a few days later, we became acquainted, I to your daughter
and she to me, and we shed many tears together because
6. we had been exiled from our land and separated from you all. And some
of the people of [   ]ia[32] made great efforts, and, in accordance with the
decree

---

[30] מ׳ is מר, 'master', used as a general male title, Mr.
[31] מני is a 'poetic' form of ממני or מן, found in Biblical Hebrew, and common in
Byzantine Hebrew letters it seems. T-S AS 152.17 is a scrap of vellum containing a short
note in a crude square script. The signatories, two women with the Greek names Irini and
Kali (showing the vernacular Greek shift to i) sign off with the same form: ומני אירינ
וקלי
אחותה, 'from Irini and Kali, her sister' (r. 16–17).
[32] Staining unfortunately obscures the toponym; it may read כותיא[ ]אוש, but it is very
difficult to make out under the stain.

7. of He who proclaims, we were joined together.[33] And God showed us compassion and mercy, by providing us with sons and a daughter. The sons departed

8. for the House of Meeting,[34] but we were left with the daughter, and she is betrothed to a young man, a Kohen, fair in all respects. And

9. we still entertain the hope that perhaps we shall succeed in presenting ourselves to bow down before you. And now, we had it in mind to come, with

10. God's help, but because of various sicknesses which found us and because the last penny disappeared from our hands without our finding

11. even enough for ease, we gave up. And, O heavens, since then and up to now we've kept you informed through many letters,

12. but we haven't received from you even a word of greeting in response. Can such a thing be possible with you? Or is it fitting [for you?]

13. But on the contrary you have embittered me with the divorce deed which you wrote. Instead of good, evil. And the [ ] will go

14. and cause it to pass. And now let us consider and attend only this once to this Samuel. If you have compassion and mercy

15. upon us, then let him consider what you should do for us, because of our marriage deed you should show me compassion,[35] and you should even speed

16. with all your wisdom to meet this Samuel, a representative I appointed to collect from my forefathers' inheritance

17. about 10 dinars 'of the place',[36] that perhaps he might bring them to us to cover the cost of our coming to you. And now

18. [I am] writing to you: know and understand from your servant and your son-in-law that since I wrote to you last year that you should prepare for me

19. the marriage deed of my wife, your daughter, 'Ashira,[37] my only one, therefore it must have been a difficult thing for you to do,

---

[33] ניזדווגנו, 'we were married, joined together', from the root זוג, is not a common verb in this context. See the discussion below, on T-S 6J4.1, for more on this root.

[34] They died.

[35] Although the reading is clear, the correct sense is difficult to determine. Literally it is 'and because of our marriage deed, you have shown me compassion', but I think the writer is implying that, because of the ties of marriage that bind them (however reluctant), he deserves more assistance from his father-in-law in securing what remains of his inheritance.

[36] By which he must mean Egyptian dinars. It was common to specify the type of dinar required, given the wide variety in circulation and their differing value; see S. D. Goitein, A Mediterranean society: the Jewish communities of the Arab world as portrayed in the documents of the Cairo Geniza; economic foundations (vol. 1) (Berkeley, 1967), 234–6.

20. [for] you wrote to R. Elijah that I should divorce her with a divorce deed when she was with a daughter and a son and a son-in-law! If you desire

21. this, my lord, then how much more do I wish that I could have divorced her right at the beginning. After our God blessed us

22. with offspring, how could you not show compassion for your own flesh and not fear the one whose very garment is the breath of your life?! This you should also

23. know: if I had no care for myself and for those souls that are with me, I would have taken

24. your letters and gone and shown them to the judges and to the leading members of the community. However, out of kindness I forbore and also because

25. I became sick and drained, and perhaps I should not rest until I have come [to you]. And your daughter didn't want

26. to accept a divorce deed from me, and she cried out and said to the leading members of the community 'How can I accept

27. a divorce deed and leave behind my children and my son-in-law?!' And they too accorded you blame for what you did.

Verso

1. They shall be silent, and the evil deeds shall go to […]. And now, if you wish to console me,

2. write to me in detail what remains for me from my forefathers' inheritance, clearly and according to those

3. responsible. And maybe you should make an effort with the representative that I appointed, that perhaps he might bring me 10 dinars

4. that would serve us for expenses, and by the help of God, we shall come and bow down before you. And concerning my sisters, let me know

5. if they are alive and well. And may we be allowed to bow down before you, bowing down to the soles of your feet, my daughter, my son-in-law and the baby – if He grants it. And may your wellbeing, and the wellbeing of my brothers, the brothers of my wife, along with the lady, my mother-in-law, increase forever. […][38]

6. May the letter of Abū ʿAlī b. Abuʾl-Maʿānī from Constantinople be carried

---

[37] This could be an Arabic or a Hebrew name. Jewish women in Egypt were normally given Arabic names; see S. D. Goitein, A Mediterranean society: the Jewish communities of the Arab world as portrayed in the documents of the Cairo Geniza; the family (vol. 3) (Berkeley, 1978), 315.

[38] There is an acronym, as is common at the end of letters, but I cannot decipher it.

7. to the honourable master and teacher Joseph the Baghdadi in Egypt,[39] with glad tidings.

Greetings from home

Although the following damaged letter consists of little more than a long list of greetings, the names it preserves are an interesting mix of Arabic and Greek, testifying once again to the links between the Jewish Byzantine and Jewish Arab worlds.

The letter is from Abraham to his son-in-law Elijah. Letters from Egyptian Jews rarely mention the names of female relatives, following the etiquette of the Islamic world, but Abraham is not from an Arab land and so happily mentions a number of female relatives in the course of his short letter. These include a lady with a Greek name, Mersini (showing the Greek-speaker's orthography of שׁ for *sigma*) and Abraham's daughter אתוכלי, the pronunciation of which is unclear (perhaps Atokali?), but may be derived from the names Anticleia or Autocleia. Other Greek names in the letter are Arini and Leon, and Abraham's other son-in-law, Kalev (Caleb), bears a distinctively Byzantine Hebrew name.[40]

Two women mentioned in the letter bear Arabic names, indicating that they are from Egypt or another Arab land. Abraham's son-in-law, Elijah, has a sister called Sitt al-Rūmī, 'Lady of the man from Rūm' and Leon, a relative or friend (it isn't clear which), is married to Sitt al-Bayt, 'Lady of the House'. Abraham doesn't know how to write Arabic (or Judaeo-Arabic) and spells the names in a decidedly non-standard manner, שטירומי (r. 2) and שטילבית (r. 7). In both cases he runs what are two separate words together, uses שׁ instead of the expected ס, and ט instead of ת. Moreover, he ignores classical Arabic orthography by writing Sitt al-Rūmī as it is pronounced, with the *lam* of the definite article assimilated to the following letter, *sitt ar-rūmī*, rather than as it should properly be written, with the definite article preserved, סת אלרומי. He could not betray his ignorance of Arabic and his own Greek-speaking background more discernibly.

In terms of vocabulary, one item stands out quite distinctly. Whenever Abraham refers to a man's wife he does not use the ordinary Hebrew word אשה, 'woman; wife' (in construct, אשת, 'wife of') but the much more unusual word זוגה (*zuga*, in construct זוגת, 'wife of'). Were this letter from an Egyptian Jew, this usage could easily be explained as the influence of the common Arabic word for wife, زوجة (*zauja*), but Arabic influence seems extremely unlikely. This predilection for the root זוג is not limited

---

[39] מצרים may denote, in particular, Fusṭāṭ.
[40] de Lange, 'Jewish sources', 367.

to this letter, however, since in T-S Misc.35.8, above, Abū ʿAlī described how he married his wife by using the same, rare root, ניזדוווגנו (*nizdav-vagnu*), 'we got married'. Thus two Greek-speakers appear to favour זוג, and it may well be that the influence of their vernacular is the cause. Greek σύζυγος (*syzygos*) is 'spouse', and there is a certain degree of homophony with זוגה, enough probably to cause it to become their favoured term for 'spouse' when they wrote Hebrew.[41]

Aside from these linguistic matters, there is little information preserved in the letter. There is mention of the grape harvest, and of the rise of a river. This might, as in the letter to Seleucia, be a reference to the flooding of the Nile.

Cambridge University Library T-S 6J4.1

Paper; 100×136; place unknown; 11–12th c. (?)
Recto

1 [ת רבות וברכות עצומות לחתני מ׳ אליה ולבתי אתוכלי

2 [אביך ואמך ואחיך אליה ואחותך שטירומי וזקנה ומן

3 [ך [ ]בת אחותך דעו אנו לחיים ובוטחים לאל וגם אתם לחיים

4 [שלום היה רוצה אחיך לבוא אצלכם ובשביל הבציר לא בא

5 [לא היה אדם שתכתוב לנו כתב אם הציל האל לזוגתך לשלום

6 [אם יבוא אדם אל הנה שגרו לנו כתב בשביל שלומכם ורב שלום

7 [מ׳ אריני ומ׳ לאון וזוגתו שטילבית ומ׳ כלב חתנינו וזוגתו

8 [רב שלום לזוגתו לבן אחי אליה ולבניו ודע הוא

9 [אֵי יש לו ב׳ חדשים וחיצי ובזמן שיעלה הנהר

10 [ן החוב שיש לו חוצה ויבוא אצלכם ורוב שלום

11 [תי וזוגתו מֶרְשִׁינִי ובנו שמריה ואשביעכם אם

12 [...]

Verso

1 תובל האיגרת למ׳ אליה אחמד עיני אביך אברהם [...]

1. [...] great [wellbeing] and mighty blessings to our son-in-law Mar[42] Elijah and to our daughter ʼTWKLY

2. [...] your father and mother and your brother Elijah and your sister Sitt al-Rūmī, and her father,[43] and from

---

3. […] your […] your niece. Know that we are alive and well and trusting in God and also that you are alive and well

4. […] well. Your brother wanted to come to you, but because of the harvest he didn't come.

5. […] wasn't anyone, that you write us a letter [to tell us] if God has kept your wife well

6. […] if someone should come here, send us a letter telling us how you are, and many greetings

7. [from] Mar Arini, and Mar Leon and his wife Sitt al-Bayt, and Mar Kalev,[44] our son-in-law, and his wife

8. […] many greetings to his wife, to my nephew Elijah, and to his sons. And know that he […]

9. […] that he has two and a half months, and when the river rises

10. […] the debt that he has outside (?), and he will come to you. Many greetings

11. […] my […] and his wife Mersini and his son Shemariah, and I shall make you swear that you will not

12. […]

Verso

1. May this letter be carried to Mar Elijah, delight[45] of my[46] eyes, from me, your father Abraham […][47]

---

[43] זקנה, 'her old man', is as ambiguous in Hebrew as it is in English. Nevertheless, it must refer to an elderly male relative.

[44] Arini and Leon are two names from Greek; Kalev (Caleb) is a Hebrew name, but one very popular among Byzantine Jews; see de Lange, 'Jewish sources', 367.

[45] אחמד, 'delight', with prosthetic alef. Is this a case of Arabic influence? Holo explains prosthetic alef as representative of Arabic phonology in the letter that he published from Rhodes, T-S NS 324.1 r. 10, but given the clear Greek-speaking background of the present writer it seems extremely unlikely here; J. Holo, 'A Genizah letter from Rhodes evidently concerning the Byzantine reconquest of Crete', Journal of Near Eastern Studies 59 (2000), 1–12. Possibly prosthetic alef is indicative instead of Abraham's inability to pronounce the Hebrew ח correctly, though he retains it in the orthography, perhaps pronouncing the word as amed or emed. Thus אח is essentially a digraph for an initial vowel.

[46] 'My eyes', עיני, makes more sense, though you could read the second yod as a waw, 'his eye'.

[47] Abraham's second name is only partially preserved, vocalised with Tiberian signs. Unfortunately, not enough is extant to read it properly. There is Arabic script around the address, added later by someone who picked up this scrap and used it to practise writing the ordinal numbers in Arabic.

A Byzantine scribe in Egypt

The following letters requesting charity were all written by the same scribe, who hailed originally from Byzantium. Although he had little or no Arabic when he wrote these letters (as can be seen from the mistakes he makes whenever Arabic words occur), his considerable ability in Hebrew ensured that his time was occupied petitioning on behalf of the poor. At least one of those on whose behalf he wrote was of a similar background, marked by his name Moschus (Greek, Μόσχος), and it may well be that he acted as a representative for those immigrant Jews from the Byzantine territories who found themselves in Fusṭāṭ in a state of destitution.

Letters appealing for charity – begging letters or 'Schnorrerbriefe' – are commonplace in the Genizah thanks to the combination of a large indigent community and charitably-minded individuals and institutions to which they could turn. A great many of these letters are written in Hebrew, rather than Judaeo-Arabic, and reflect the words of the foreign poor in the Genizah world, who were forced to turn to the local community for support.[48] A significant proportion of these penniless immigrants were from the Byzantine Empire, particularly towards the end of the eleventh and at the beginning of the twelfth century, when first the Seljuks and then the Crusaders prompted the flight of Jews from Asia-Minor.[49] Others came not as refugees, but as captives, victims of Mediterranean piracy, and would be brought to Alexandria where it was well known that the Jewish community would do all in its power to find the money to ransom them.[50] Such were the numbers of Byzantine Jews dependent upon charity, that some alms lists have separate sections headed אלרום, 'the Rūm' ('the Romans'), as those from Byzantium were designated, which contain dozens of names.[51]

Of the four letters, only one is unambiguously written on behalf of a Jew from Byzantine lands, a blind man called Moschus (T-S 12.237). The others were written on behalf of an elderly woman from the Maghreb (T-S NS 325.184), an unnamed woman with a disfiguring disease (T-S 13J13.16) and an unnamed blind man (T-S 8J16.29). Two of them are addressed to named individuals: a charitable administrator called 'Eli ha-Kohen b. Ḥayyim and his son Ephraim (T-S 8J16.29), and the head of the Jewish communities in Egypt, the Nasi ('prince') David b. Daniel (T-S

---

[48] On the foreign poor in the Genizah see M. Cohen, Poverty and Charity in the Jewish community of medieval Egypt (Princeton and Oxford, 2005), 72–108.

[49] Cohen, Poverty and Charity, 84–5.

[50] Cohen, Poverty and Charity, 111–4.

[51] For instance T-S K15.15, translated in M. Cohen, The voice of the poor in the Middle Ages: an anthology of documents from the Cairo Genizah (Princeton and Oxford, 2005), 124–9.

13J13.16). The others address 'the holy community', presumably the local
Fusṭāṭ community. On the basis of the leaders mentioned, the letters can be
dated to around 1090.

The similar phraseology and handwriting shared by all four letters show
that they are the product of the same scribe.[52] That he was a Byzantine is
evident not only from the handwriting, which is of a Byzantine type, but
also because all four letters share the same scribal traits of beginning the
text from the top of the page and writing across the full width of the page,
a feature that is rare in Egyptian or Syro-Palestinian texts of the eleventh-
twelfth centuries but which matches the layout found in other letters writ-
ten by Byzantine Jewish scribes.[53] Furthermore, a few linguistic peculiari-
ties single him out as being from a Greek-speaking background. The letter
on behalf of the unnamed blind man, T-S 8J16.29, employs an odd tempo-
ral expression, ויש לי שנה לא אכלתי בשר, 'and for a year I haven't eaten
meat' (r. 5–6), which is not typical Hebrew syntax (one would prefer ושנה
לא אכלתי) but exactly how one would express this in vernacular Greek, ἔχω
ἔνα χρόνο να φάω.[54] An idiosyncratic יש occurs similarly in the letter on
behalf of blind Moschus, T-S 12.237, כי לא יש לי אדם, 'for I have no one' (r.
19), where Hebrew would properly employ the negative אין. Similar uses
of the particle יש as a copula may be found in other Hebrew letters by
Greek-speaking Jews.[55]

Further pointers to the scribe's foreignness lie in the orthography of
place-names referred to in the letters. In T-S 8J16.29 he spells Alexandria

---

[52] Some examples of similar phraseology: T-S 8J16.29 describes 'Eli ha-Parnas ('the
charitable administrator') as הצדיק התם הישר, 'the righteous, the pure, the upright' (r. 3);
T-S 12.237 addresses the community as החסידים הצדיקים הישרים התמימים, 'the pious, the
righteous, the upright, the pure' (r. 4); T-S 13J13.16 uses slightly different phrasing to
address David b. Daniel, the recipient, but goes on to refer to his ancestors as הצדיקים
והחסידים והתמימים, 'the righteous, and the pious, and the pure' (r. 18–19); the references to
presenting a supplication: T-S 8J16.29, עבדך מפיל תחינתו, 'your servant presents his sup-
plication' (r. 8–9); T-S 12.237, אפיל תחינתי, 'I shall present my supplication' (r. 13); T-S
13J13.16, אני מפלת תחינתי, 'I am presenting my supplication' (r. 10); the inclusion of the
biblical plea from Psalms 74:21, ואל ישוב דך נכלם, 'do not let the oppressed return in
shame', which is found verbatim in T-S 12.237 (r. 14) and T-S 8J16.29 (r. 15–16), and in
modified form in T-S 13J13.16 (r. 22) and T-S NS 325.184 (r. 9–10); the use of יסגא,
'may it increase', in the closing blessing formulas of all four letters (T-S 8J16.29 r. 18;
T-S 12.237 r. 22; T-S 13J13.16 r. 25; T-S NS 325.184 r. 14)).

[53] For instance T-S Misc.35.8, edited above, or the letter written by a Byzantine scribe
for the Egyptian lady Maliḥa, T-S 13J1.4, edited by Mann, Jews in Egypt and Palestine,
vol. ii, 306–7.

[54] I am grateful to Prof. Nicholas de Lange for pointing the Greek parallel out to me.

[55] For instance T-S NS 324.1, a Hebrew letter from Rhodes edited in Holo, 'Genizah
letter', 1–12: לא יש, 'is not' (r. 10); ואם יש המקום טוב, 'and if the place is good' (r. 19); or
T-S 8J19.33, edited in de Lange, Greek Jewish texts, 17–19, האל גדול יש, 'God is great' (r.
12).

as אקסדריאה (r. 11), with ק instead of the expected כ. Alexandria, الاسكندرية (al-Iskandarīya) in Arabic, is usually rendered אסכנדריה, אלאסכנדריה, אלאכסנדריה or אכסנדריה in Hebrew script (Golb 1974: 117), but Greek has only a single phoneme /k/ (Gk. κ), for both, hence, the confusion.[56] A further lack of familiarity with Arabic orthography is shown by the scribe in writing Cairo as two words, אל כהרי (T-S 13J13.16 r. 21). The usual spelling in Hebrew script is אלקאהרה (al-Qāhira), with the definite article prefixed to its noun, mirroring the Arabic spelling, القاهرة. Thus he substitutes כ for ק, again, and does not employ the usual Arabic orthography of א for long a. The final yod reflects the contemporary pronunciation with 'imāla (inclination of a>e), and thus the scribe is recording what he heard, unaware of the correct written form. In the letter for 'Azūzā, although he writes אל[כ]בירה, 'the old', correctly (T-S NS 325.189 r. 4), his spelling of the feminine gentilic, מגרביאה, 'the woman from the Maghreb' (r. 4), is an odd hybrid of formal Arabic spelling מגרביה and popular Judaeo-Arabic orthography, מגרביא.[57] The writer of these letters was clearly educated; his Hebrew and knowledge of the biblical sources is excellent, but he shows an ignorance of Arabic that marks him out as a foreigner from the Rūm.

Cambridge University Library T-S 8J16.29

Paper; 18.8×13.2; Egypt; c. 1090.[58]
Recto

<div dir="rtl">

1 לכבוד גדולת קדושת הדרת נזר ועטרת

2 אל מרנא ורבנא עלי הפרנס הנאמן החכם והנבון

3 הצדיק התם הישר שעשה עמי טובות הרבה

4 מיום בואי ואני עבדו הסגי נהור אתענה

5 בכל שיני וחמישי ויש לי שנה לא אכלתי

6 בשר ואני מתפלל לך ולחמודך ר' אפרים

7 יומם ולילה שיזכיך האל לראות לו בנים

8 זכרים מחלציו ולשמוח בה[ם] אמן עבדך

</div>

[56] Another good example is preserved in T-S 8J19.33, edited in de Lange, Greek Jewish texts, 17–19, where a Greek speaker spells Alexandria אלקשנטריאן (r. 14).

[57] On Judaeo-Arabic orthography of the feminine nisba, see E.-M. Wagner, 'A linguistic analysis of Judaeo-Arabic letters from the Cairo Genizah' (unpublished PhD. dissertation; Cambridge, 2007), 49. The greatest influence on the spelling here, though, is probably Hebrew orthography.

[58] The letter has been edited before, by A. Scheiber, 'Beggars' letters from the Geniza' in M. Zohori and A. Tartakover, eds, Hagut Ivrit be-'eyropah (Tel Aviv 1969) 266, republished in his Geniza Studies, (Hildesheim, 1981), Hebrew section, 78–9, and translated in Cohen, Voice of the poor, 98–9. The current edition and translation are my own.

9 מפיל תחינתו לפני יי ולפניך לעשות עמי

10 חסד לעשות [לי פ]סיקה כי אשתי ונעריי

11 עולים מן אקסדריאה וכתבו לי כי אין להם

12 שכר הספינה ותעשה עמי חסד גם

13 בפעם הזה ותיטיב חסדך עמי האחרון

14 מן הראשון ותגזר אומר ויקם לך ועל דרכיך

15 נגה אור ואל תרף ידך מעבדך ואל

16 ישוב דך נכלם ואלהי ישראל יתן לך שיבה

17 טובה ואחרית טוב ותבלה בטוב ימיך

18 ושנותיך בנעימים ושלומך יסגא לעד

19 אמן

Translation of T-S 8J16.29

Recto

1. To the honourable, great, holy, glorious crown and diadem,

2. to our master and our teacher 'Eli the Parnas, the Trustee,[59] the wise and the discerning,

3. the righteous, the pure, the upright man who has done me many favours

4. since my arrival. I, his blind servant,[60] fast

5. every Monday and Thursday,[61] and it has been a year[62] since I last ate

6. meat. I pray for you and for your son, R. Efraim,

7. day and night that God may grant you the opportunity to see

8. male children from his loins and to delight in them. Amen.[63] Your servant

9. presents his supplication before the Lord and before you to act kindly with me

---

[59] The parnasim were responsible for the charitable activities of the community, overseeing the social services and administering the communal properties from which revenue was derived. Ne'eman, 'trustee' (short for ne'eman bet din, 'trustee of the court'), was a similar title given to respected members of the community; see S. Goitein, A Mediterranean society: the Jewish communities of the Arab world as portrayed in the documents of the Cairo Geniza; the community (vol. 2) (Berkeley, 1971), 77–81.

[60] הסגי נהור, lit. 'the one great of light/eyesight', is a Babylonian Aramaic-derived euphemism for blindness. The unusual use of the definite article -ה on the construct (סגי) rather than the genitive (נהור) is a common feature of Medieval Hebrew; see Ch. Rabin, The development of the syntax of post-biblical Hebrew (Leiden, 2000), 88.

[61] Those days when the Torah is read in the synagogue are traditional days for fasting (though only during the daylight hours). Particularly pious individuals could choose to fast every Monday and Thursday; no doubt the poor man's poverty aided his piety in this respect.

[62] The syntax of ויש לי שנה shows Greek influence, as noted above.

[63] The scribe uses אמן in all four of his letters in the same way, as a transitional marker to signal the end of the preface and the start of the business of the letter, and to end the letter.

10. by holding a collection[64] for me since my wife and my children,

11. who are due to come up from Alexandria, have written to me to say that they lack

12. the cost of the boat ride. So do me a kindness also

13. this time[65] too 'and this last kindness shall be greater

14. than the first' (Ruth 3:10) 'and decide on a matter, and it will be established for you, and

15. light will shine on your ways' (Job 22:28). Do not neglect your servant.[66] 'Do not

16. let the oppressed return in shame' (Pss 74:21). And the God of Israel give you

17. a good old age and a good end, and may you spend your days in prosperity

18. and your years in delight. May your wellbeing increase forever.

19. Amen.

Cambridge University Library T-S 12.237

Paper; 22.4×17.5; Egypt; c. 1090.
Recto

1 אשרי שומרי משפט עושה צדקה בכל עת

2 פיזר נתן לאביונים צדקתו עומדת לעד קרנו תרום בכבוד

3 לכבוד גדולת קדושת ישישת יקרת הדרת פארת (?) ועטרת כותרת

4 לכל קהל הקודש הזה החסידים הצדיקים הישרים התמימים

5 החרדים אל דבר יי ֗ ישמרם אל׳ הפ[ו]ריח [   ]

6 עליכם מקרא דכת׳ יסף יי (!) עליכם ככם אלף פעמי[ם וי]ברך אתכם

7 כאשר דבר לכם ויצילכם מכל צרה וצוקה אמן ֗ [   ] יש[או] שלום

8 מאדון השלום ומן עבדכם מוֹסְקוֹ הדל המ[ק]וֹל[ק]ל העני ואב[ןיו]ן

9 רש ואיש תככים ועיוור שלא אוכל לראות שיטיבכם האל׳ ותעשו

10 עמי צדקה והאל׳ יחשב לכם לצדקה ֗ כי יהיו עמי ארבעה נפשות

11 וימותו מן ה[רע]ב ולמען יי ונפשכם אל תשיבני ריקם מלפניכם

12 כי ביי בט[חת]י ובכם ובאתי לפניכם כצפור בפח ואל תניחוני

13 עלוב ואנו[ך (?) וה]נה אפיל תחינתי לפני יי ולפניכם לרחמוני לחזק

14 ידיי כמ[נ]הגכם הטוב ואל ישוב דך ניכלם מכם ֗ וזה חסדכם

15 אשר [תע]שו עמי ישלם יי פעולתכם והיה שכרכם שלם מעם יי

16 [אל]הי [ישראל (?)] [ו]יברככם וירבכם ויתן לכם את ברכת אברהם

---

[64] Pesiqa, a public appeal for funds; see Goitein, Mediterranean society, 106–107 and Cohen, Poverty and Charity, 220–4.

[65] בפעם הזה is not a grammatical error (masculine demonstrative with feminine noun), since it exhibits this concord in the Bible, Judg 16:28.

[66] A phrase adapted from Josh 10:6.

17 [לכ]ם ולזרעכם ׳ ויצילכם מכל צרה ו[צוקה] ומבכייה וזע[ק]ה
18 [מלך ו[י]היו [ ] ולמ[ ]
19 [ ]כם [ו]אל תעלימו עינכם ממני כי לא יש לי אדם בעולם
20 [ש]י[חנינ]י (?)[](?) אלא אתם לבדכם ותזכו לחזות בנועם יי) ולבקר
21 בהיכלו ויקיים עליכם [מ]קרא דכת׳ [כי] עין בע[י]ן יראו בשוב
22 [יי ציון] יגל יעקב וישמח ישראל ושלומכם יסגא וכבודכ[ם]
23 יגדל [ו]לא ידל ולעד יתגדל אמן סלה

Verso

1 מוסקוס

Translation of T-S 12.237

Recto

1. 'Happy are those who observe justice, who do righteousness at all times'
(Pss 106:3).
2. 'They have distributed freely, they have given to the poor; their right-
eousness endures forever; their horn is exalted in honour' (Pss 112:9).
3. To the honourable, great, holy, venerable, dear, splendid, glorious[67] dia-
dem and crown;
4. to this holy community, who are pious, righteous, upright and pure,
5. who tremble at the word of the Lord – may God preserve them – who
flourish […]
6. about whom it was written in the Bible (Deut 1:11): 'May the Lord in-
crease you a thousand times more and bless you,
7. as he has promised you!' And may he save you from every distress and
anguish. Amen. Greetings
8. from the Lord of Peace and from your servant Mosqo,[68] who is poor,
cursed, wretched, penniless,
9. impoverished, 'an injured man' (Prov 29:13) and blind, so that I cannot
see. May God be good to you and may you perform
10. for me an act of charity and God shall reckon it to you as a righteous
act. For there are four souls with me,

---

[67] The text appears to read פארת, which may be a mistake for תפארת, 'glory', or a
deliberate neologism.

[68] That this unusual name would have been unfamiliar to the intended recipients is
demonstrated by the scribe vocalising it with Tiberian vowel signs. It reads Mosqo here
(in the oblique case, showing loss of the final sibilant), on verso it is written (without
vowels), Mosqos (in the nominative, preserving final s). The Greek name is Moschos
(Μόσχος), attested in another Genizah letter, T-S 8J19.33, as מוֹשְׁכּוֹ (v. 1), also with eli-
sion of final s; see de Lange Greek Jewish texts, 17–19. Our scribe again shows no dis-
tinction between ק and כ.

11. and they will die of hunger. For the sake of the Lord and your own sakes, do not send me away from you empty-handed,

12. for I trust in the Lord and in you. I have come before you like a bird in a trap; do not leave me

13. humiliated and [embittered (?).] I shall present my supplication before the Lord and before you, to show me pity[69], to strengthen

14. my hands, according to your good custom. 'Do not let the oppressed return in shame' (Pss 74:21). And for this kindness of yours

15. that you will do for me, may the Lord repay you, and may your reward be complete from the Lord,

16. God of [Israel]. May He bless you and multiply you and give you Abraham's blessing –

17. to you and your descendants. And may He save you from all trials and [tribulations], and from weeping and distress.

18. […] king. And may they be […]

19. […] you. [And] do not hide your eyes from me, because I have no one[70] in the world

20. to favour me except for you alone. May you merit looking upon the delight of the Lord and visiting

21. His temple, and may He fulfill for you the verse: '[For] plainly they will see the return of

22. [the Lord to Zion]' (Isa 52:8). 'Jacob will rejoice; Israel will be glad' (Pss 14:7; 53:7). May your wellbeing increase and may your honour

23. accrue, and may it not diminish, but grow greater forever. Amen Sela.

Verso
1. Mosqos

Cambridge University Library T-S 13J13.16

Paper; 26.3×18.31; Egypt; c. 1090.[71]
Recto

<div dir="rtl">

1. יענך יי ביום צרה ישגבך שם אלהי יעקב

2. ישלח עזרך מקודש ומציון יסעדך

3. יחוס על דל ואביון ונפשות אביונים יושיע

</div>

---

[69] Although ink spots obscure the reading, it appears to read לרחמוני, an odd form. Although one would expect an infinitive construct, it could be understood as a neologism, an -on suffix noun, 'for my pity'.

[70] The use of לא יש instead of אין suggests Greek influence, as noted above.

[71] The letter has been previously translated in Cohen, Voice of the poor, 52–3. The current edition and translation are my own.

4. לכבוד גדולת קדושת הדרת נזר ועטרת ושם טוב מלמעלה
5. למרינו ורבינו אדונינו דוד הנשיא הגדול ראש גליות כל ישראל
6. ישמרהו אלהינו ויחייהו אדונינו וינצרהו יוצרינו ויזכהו האל
7. לראות לו בנים זכרים מחלציו למלאות מקומו ומקום אבותיו
8. הצדיקים ויאריך ימיו ושנותיו בנעימים אמן
9. אמתך הענייה העלובה העגומה האנונה הדאוגה המסוכנת
10. מעונותיי אני מפלת תחינתי [לפני יי ו]לפניך שתקשיב דברי
11. אמתך כי רבות אנחותיי ול[ב]י [דוי] כי אני לבדי אין לי לא
12. איש ולא בן ולא בת ולא אח ולא אחות ומתנודדת כצפור בודד
13. על גג . וכשרבו פשעיי ועונותיי נסתכנתי בחוטמי ויצאה
14. המכה הזאת ונרקב ונאכל מקום פני והולך החולי וקשה
15. ולא אוכל לעשות מלאכה ואני בעירום ובצמא ובחוסר
16. כל ואין לאל ידי ואין אדם משגיח עלי אפילו אם אמות
17. ועתה מתנפלת לפני יי ולפני אדוני שתרחמני כחסדך
18. ותעשה עמי למען יי ולמען זכות אבותיך הצדיקים
19. והחסידים והתמימים ות[גז]ר אומר ויקם לך ועל דרכיך
20. אור ויצוה אדוני לעשות [פס]יקה בכל מקום שיחפוץ אדונינו
21. או אל כהרי או אל מדינה ואמצא חנינה ומרגוע מיי וממך
22. ואל ישיבני אדוני ריק[ם ... ונ]כלמת מלפניו ואהיה מתפללת
23. על [יי] ועל שמך הנעים [והטוב (?)]() ואל שדי [י]ברך אותך ויפרך
24. וירבך והיית לקהל עמים ויתן לך את ברכת אברהם לך
25. ולזרעך אתך ושלומך יסגא ו[יר]בה וכב[ודך י]גדל
26. ועל כל יתגדל לע[ד]י עד ו[לנצח נצחים אמן

Translation of T-S 13J13.16

Recto

1. 'The Lord answer you in the day of trouble! The name of the God of Jacob protect you!' (Pss 20:2).

2. 'May He send you help from the sanctuary, and give you support from Zion' (Pss 20:3).

3. 'He has pity on the weak and the needy, and saves the lives of the needy' (Pss 72:13).

4. To the honourable, great and holy, glorious crown and diadem, a good name from above.

5. To our master and teacher, our lord David the Great Prince, Head of all Israel in Exile,

6. may our God keep him and our Lord[72] preserve him and our Creator protect him, and may God allow him

---

[72] Cohen, *Voice of the poor*, 53–4 translates this 'and grant long life to our lord', avoiding the problem of אדונינו referring to God. Nevertheless, אדונינו must here be the subject of the verb.

7. to see male offspring from his loins, to take his place and the place of his righteous ancestors.

8. May He extend his days and his years in delight. Amen.

9. Your poor maidservant – pathetic, grief-stricken, wretched, worried and impoverished

10. by my sins – I hereby present my supplication [before the Lord and] before you, that you may pay heed to the words of

11. your maidservant, 'because my sighs are many and my heart is [faint]' (Lam 1:22), for I am all alone: I have neither

12. husband, nor son, nor daughter, nor brother, nor sister. I am 'like a lonely bird

13. on a rooftop' (Pss 102:8). As my sins and my transgressions increased, I developed a serious affliction upon my nose,

14. and the infection spread, and it festered and my[73] face was eaten away. This disease is worsening,

15. and I cannot perform any work. I am naked, thirsty, and I lack

16. everything. I am powerless. There is no one to take care of me, even if I were to die.

17. Now then, [I] throw myself down before the Lord and before my lord, that you might show pity to me, according to your kindness,

18. and take action for me, for the sake of the Lord and the sake of the merit of your righteous,

19. pious and pure ancestors. 'You will decide on a matter, and it will be established for you, and light [will shine] on your ways' (Job 22:28).[74]

20. And may my lord order a charitable collection in any place that our lord desires,

21. either in Cairo or the city,[75] that I may find compassion and respite from the Lord and from you.

22. And let my lord not send me back empty-handed […] and humiliated from him. I shall be praying

23. to[76] the Lord for your pleasant and good name. And may God Almighty bless you, make you fruitful

24. and multiply you, so that you become a congregation of nations, and may He give Abraham's blessing to you

---

[73] The scribe slipped for a moment and wrote פניה, 'her face', before correcting himself.

[74] The scribe missed out נגה from the quotation.

[75] The 'city' is presumably Fusṭāṭ, where the scribe was probably based. Perhaps this could this be further evidence of his Byzantine origins, since the Byzantine capital, Constantinople, was often referred to simply as 'the City' by Greek-speakers.

[76] The use of על for an expected אל is slightly unusual, though there is ample biblical precedent for this interchange.

25. and to your descendants with you. And may your wellbeing increase and grow, and may your honour accrue
26. and become greater than all others',[77] forever and for all eternity. Amen.

Cambridge University Library T-S NS 325.184

Paper; 120×115; Egypt; c. 1090.[78]
Recto

<div dir="rtl">

1 לכבוד גדולת קדושת הדרת נזר ועטרת

2 לכל קהל הקודש החסידים [ה]צדיקים החכמים

3 והנבונים משמים [אלהינו יש]מרם לחיי עד

4 אמן. אמתכם עזוזא אל[כ]בירה <מגריביאה> החלושה

5 שואלת מיי׳ ומכם לע[ש]ות ע[מי [חס]ד אלהים

6 כי אני ערומ[ה] [ו]אכלני [ה]ו[ר]ב בי[ום] וקרח

7 בלילה ו[תדר שנתי (?) ו]אין לי כסו[ת   ]לה

8 ו[ה]מות [ואשא]ל אני מן ה[שמים שתע]שו

9 עמי חס[ד ותפ]תחו ידיכם עלי[י וא]ל אשו[ב]

10 ריקם מכם כי על [יי׳] השלכ[תי י]הבי

11 ועליכם ואל תעלימו עיניכם ממני

12 ואלהי ישראל יצילכם מכל צרה ויענכם

13 ביום צרה וישלח ברכה במעשי

14 ידיכם ושלומכם יסגא לעד אמן

</div>

Translation of T-S NS 325.184

Recto

1. To the honourable, great, holy, glorious crown and diadem
2. to all of the holy community, who are pious, righteous, wise
3. and have understanding from Heaven – our God preserve them eternally.
4. Amen. Your maidservant 'Azuza the old, weak westerner
5. requests from the Lord and from you to show me God's kindness
6. because I am [naked] and the [heat] consumes me by [day] and the cold
7. by night and [my sleep flees.[79] And] I have no covering […]
8. Death [… and I request] from [Heaven that you show]

---

[77] The phrase is derived from Dan 11:36 'and magnify himself above every god'.

[78] Edited in A. Scheiber, Geniza Studies (Hildesheim; New York, 1981), 76, 81–2 (Hebrew section), but not translated. The current edition differs from Scheiber's only at two points: r. 7 Scheiber reconstructs כסות [במה אשכב], but this is impossible given that the line ends לה[...]; similarly, in the hole in r. 8 he reconstructs ו[ה]מות [עלה בחלוני ואשא]ל, for which there is just not enough space available.

[79] Adapted from Gen 31:40.

9. me kindness and that you open your hands to me [that] I might not come back

10. from you empty-handed, for on the [Lord] have I cast my burden[80]

11. and on you. Do not hide your eyes from me.

12. May the God of Israel save you from all trouble, and may He answer you

13. in a day of trouble.[81] And may he send a blessing through

14. the deeds of your hands. May your wellbeing increase forever. Amen.

Yeḥi'el b. Elyaqim, scholar from Byzantium

Documents written by the scholar Yeḥi'el b. Elyaqim were first brought to light by one of the earliest historians to work on Genizah texts, Jacob Mann. Mann published a letter from the Cambridge Genizah Collection, T-S 13J20.3, sent by Yeḥi'el to a friend, Yefet, reporting that he had arrived safely in Minyat Ziftā (in the Nile Delta) and then proceeding to give instructions to Yefet and, through him, Yeḥi'el's own wife, how to raise his two sons in his absence.[82] Yeḥi'el signed off his letter with יחיאל ברבי אליקים הצו״ם, which Mann slightly (but significantly!) misread as Yeḥi'el birabbi Elyaqim ha-Ṣovi (הצובי), taking the last element as a gentilic, 'the man from Aleppo'. Hence the myth of an Aleppan scholar Yeḥi'el was born.[83] In his 1985 book, The Jews of Byzantium, however, Steven Bowman suggested that Yeḥi'el was perhaps the brother of Hillel b. Elyaqim, the Byzantine author of a commentary on the Sifra.[84] Mordechai A. Friedman, in his article on a responsum on the reshut written by Yeḥi'el, stated Yeḥi'el's Byzantine origins clearly and pointed out that Mann had misread his motto (marked as an acronym with a supralinear line) for a gentilic, and that it should be read הצו״ם, an acronym for Isaiah 33:15 הלך צדקות ודובר מישרים, 'he who walks righteously and speaks uprightly'.[85]

---

[80] Adapted from Pss 55:23.

[81] Adapted from Pss 20:2.

[82] The letter is edited, but not translated, in Mann, Jews in Egypt and Palestine, vol. ii, 301–3.

[83] And repeated many times, even as recently as Cohen, Voice of the poor, 56–7: 'The recommendation is endorsed on the back by the judge Yeḥi'el b. Eliakim of Aleppo'. He correctly recognises, however, that the Hebrew characters following his father's name are an acronym and not a gentilic adjective, and suggests הצור ירחם, 'may the Rock (God) have mercy'.

[84] S. B. Bowman, The Jews of Byzantium 1204–1453, (Alabama, 1985), 218–9.

[85] Friedman, 'R. Yeḥi'el b. Elyakim's responsum permitting the reshut', in E. Fleischer, M. A. Friedman and J. A. Kraemer (eds), Mas'at Moshe: studies in Jewish and Islamic culture presented to Moshe Gil ((Jerusalem, 1998), 328–67, and particularly 338

It is in fact clear from the first letter published by Mann that Yeḥi'el was not a native of an Arab land. His handwriting is utterly unlike that of his contemporaries in Egypt, since he is still writing in a square script, long after the adoption of a more cursive Hebrew script in Egypt. A number of features that are clearly Byzantine stand out, including long, thin, curved descenders, and the old-fashioned alef. The simple fact that, at the beginning of the thirteenth century, he wrote a letter entirely in Hebrew is also clear evidence of his European origins, since by that time – and for over a hundred years before – Judaeo-Arabic had been the language of correspondence for the Jews of Islam. A few linguistic peculiarities in his letter draw attention to his ignorance of Arabic. The Egyptian port of al-Maqs (المقس) is transcribed by him as מכס (T-S 13J20.3 r. 4), rather than מקס (or even אלמקס) – showing the typical Greek-speaker's confusion of ק and כ; similarly, Minyat Zifta (منية زفتا, מניה זפתא) in Hebrew script, appears in his letter in a very odd spelling (and as a single word), מנהזפת (r. 4). To cap it all, he possesses a combination of two names rare or unknown in Egypt, Yeḥi'el and Elyaqim, pointing strongly to his being an immigrant.[86]

Yeḥi'el's letter deals with various issues including his family, debts he owes and the charitable obligations upon him, but he takes particular care to ensure that his wife make their eldest son, Elyaqim, practice the correct blessings, 'to say the ha-Moṣi' blessing and the blessing over wine, water and washing' (r. 12–13). This echoes the concerns of another Byzantine, Elijah b. Kalev b. Leon, who wrote a letter to the Egyptian Nagid Samuel b. Ḥananiah. In that letter, written sometime in the 1140s while Elijah was making his way through Egypt, he bemoans the dearth of learning among the Egyptian Jews, 'they remain unwashed of their filth! Men of learning are as animals in their eyes. The Law and the statutes are worthless in their eyes… how can they set their minds to eating their bread without saying a prayer!'.[87] Yeḥi'el's particular concern that his wife lead his son properly in the most common blessings suggests that he held a similar opinion of

---

note 41. In general, the use of a motto ('alāma in Arabic) is common in Genizah documents, where it is a custom probably derived from the Islamic world. The Jerusalem Ga'on, Solomon b. Judah, had an official motto, ישע רב, 'great salvation', with which he closed his communications (e.g., T-S 13J26.1 r. 25 and v. 2), but he also sometimes surrounded his name with tiny letters, spelling out a personal motto, ואנכי תולעת ולא איש, 'and I am a worm, not a man', a phrase from Pss 22:7 (T-S 20.178 r. 40).

[86] The name Elyaqim is rarely found outside Byzantium, see de Lange, 'Jewish sources', 367.

[87] T-S 10J9.14 r. 9–10, 12: ומצואתם לא רוחצו ואנשי החכמות בעיניהם כבהמות והתעודה והחוקים זולין בעיניהם ... ואיך ליתן לבם לוכל לחמם בלא תפלה. The whole letter is edited in Mann, Jews in Egypt and Palestine, vol. ii, 288–9, with quite a number of minor misreadings, and it is partially translated in J. Starr, The Jews in the Byzantine Empire (Athens, 1939), 220.

the state of knowledge and religious observance among the local Jewish community, when compared to his own upbringing in Byzantium.

Cambridge University Library T-S 13J20.3

Paper; 24.9×16.6; Egypt; 1211–38.[88]
Recto

1 תבואתך טובה ורחבה ונסבה בך ובנחלתך ובכל נפשות ביתך רעי
2 אשר כנפשי מר׳ ור׳ יפת המלמד תכון בארץ ושאננת מפחד רעה
3 אמרתי <אגלה> את אזנך את כל ההוה באותו שבוע אשר נסענו ברביעי בשבת
4 הפליגה ספינתנו מן מכס וביום חמישי באנו אל מחוז מנהזפת בשלום
5 כלנו ברוח נכון באין סער בים ואין מכלים דבר אך מצאתי עולם הפוך
6 ואנשי המקום מבוקשים משרי מסים אשר עליהם יוקשים כצפרים
7 האחוזות בפח ואני נבוך בארץ עד ישקיף וירא יי משמים ˙ וקולי שמעה
8 כחסדך הט אזנך לאמרי פי שאל נא את שלום ביתי ומה תגיד להם
9 שחולה אהבתם אני ואחרי דברי לא ישנו ולאט לי לנער לאליקים נהלהו
10 לאטו בקריאתו והרגילהו לקרות מארבע מא הפאות מלמעלה
11 ומלמטה כאשר אהבתי ואל יבטל עם הנערים והרגילהו לברך את
12 הברכות שהוא יודע וצוה את אמו ליטול ידיו ולברך המוציא וברכת
13 היין והמים ונטילה אשר חנכנו אותו לפי דרכו והזהירם על בני הקטן
14 לבלתי הניח אותו להיידות בחצר פן יקראנו אסון מן הסתיו ומקור
15 הזמן ופן תפול עליו לבנה מן הקיר כי יקרו לי וילדי שעשועים המה ואף כי
16 עניים אנחנו לא קצרה יד יי מהושיע ואותם הכספים אשר לויתי מאותו עני
17 נהלני בחסדך עד אשר אבוא אל [אר]צנו ואם ראיתו כי הוא נחפז ללכת הנה
18 צויתי את שיך אל אסמאעיל אלטולאטולי להלות לי וקבל בסבר פנים יפות
19 וקח ממנו שיעור החוב ותן לו ואני ידעתי כי יהיה חיבוץ לשם חילוק לחם העניים
20 ועטנים ואם תוכל ענוותך תרבני וחלקתו שבועים שנים או שלשה ואם יקשה
21 בעיניך יתלה עולי באחרים עד ידעו כי איש היה בתוכם וסוכת שלום פרוס
22 על האח הנחמד כלי יקר שפתי דעת מר׳ ורב׳ התלמיד בן אלדיין הוא וכל בית
23 אביו ובניו בקרב שנים יחיו ולבי עליהם עד אשלם אשר נדרתי עליהם
24 בקריאתם ואותו הנער אבו אלביאן ש׳ץ׳ הקריבהו אליך ודברת אליו
25 כי לא עזבתיהו ממיעוט מתנתו כי מצותו עלי והוא יתום ואין עזר לו
26 ובשובי בשלום אשלים מלאכתו בחסדי בוראי ועשה והצליח ודודיו
27 אלשיך סמואל רשיד ואחיו ר׳ יהושע תרום קרנם בכבוד ושלום כל
28 אוהבינו ירבה ישליו אהליהם ובטוחות למו יחיאל ברבי אליקים ה׳צ׳ו׳מ׳

Verso

1 והזקן אלשיך אבי אלפרג שואל בשלום ביתו והקטון בן בתו ומצוה עליו
2 ובשלום הכל שלם הוא אתנו כלנו חיים

Translation of T-S 13J20.3

Recto

1. 'May goodness come' (Job 22:21) to you and yours and to all the members of your household, [a goodness] 'that widens and turns ever upward' (Ezek 41:7). My friend

2. who is like my soul, our master and teacher[89] Yefet the Teacher – may you be established in the land and be at ease from dread of evil.[90]

3. 'I thought that I would uncover your ear' (Ruth 4:4) with all that has happened[91] this last week that I have been travelling. On the fourth day of the week

4. my ship set sail from Maks (al-Maqs) and on the fifth day we arrived safely at the town of Minyat Ziftā.

5. All our spirits were high, there having been no storms at sea 'and no lack of anything' (Judg 18:7). However, I found a world turned upside down.

6. The men of the place are hunted by the tax officials, who lay snares for them like birds

7. caught in a trap. And I am entangled in the land, 'until the Lord from Heaven looks down and sees' (Lam 3:50). Now, 'hear my voice

8. in your kindness' (Pss 119:149). Turn your ear to the words of my mouth.[92] Ask after the welfare of my household. And what should you say to them

9. but that I am sick with love for them,[93] and 'after I spoke they did not speak again' (Job 29:22). And deal gently for my sake with the young man

---

[89] מר׳ ור׳ is either מרנא ורבנא (Aramaic titles) or מרנו ורבנו (Hebrew titles), 'our master and teacher'.

[90] ושאננת מפחד רעה, 'may you be at ease from dread of evil', is drawn from Prov 1:33 ושאנן מפחד רעה, 'and he will be at ease without dread of evil'.

[91] ההוה is an Aramaizing form of הָיָה, with the definite article. The article functions as a relativizer (syntactically identical to the relative -שׁ on a finite verb). This construction has its roots in BH (for instance, ההלכוא, 'who had come', Josh 10:24) but is still rare in post-biblical Hebrew; see B. Outhwaite, 'Karaite epistolary Hebrew: the letters of Toviyyah ben Moshe', in G. Khan (ed.), Exegesis and grammar in medieval Karaite texts, (Oxford, 2001), 203–4.

[92] הט אזנך לאמרי פי, 'turn your ear to the words of my mouth', is adapted from Prov 4:20.

[93] שחולה אהבתם אני, 'that I am sick with love for them', is adapted from Song of Songs 2:5.

Elyaqim;[94] lead him on

10. slowly in his reading and accustom him to reading from all four sides, from above

11. and below, as I desire.[95] Do not let him idle away his time with other boys. Accustom him to say

12. the blessings that he knows and tell his mother to wash his hands and to say the ha-Moṣi' blessing and the blessing

13. over wine, water and washing, in which we have instructed him, in his own way. And warn them to beware of

14. letting my youngest son toddle about[96] in the courtyard,[97] 'in case harm should befall him' (Gen 42:4) because of the winter and the cold

15. of the season, and in case a brick should fall off the roof onto him. For they are precious to me and are my darling children. And even though

16. we are poor, the Lord's hand is not too short to save us. And as for the money I borrowed from that poor man,

17. lead me on in your kindness until I come back to our land. And if you see that he is in a hurry to leave, then

18. I requested Shaykh Ismā'īl al-Ṭūlāṭūli to make me a loan and he gladly agreed.

19. So take from him the amount of the debt and give it to [the creditor]. I know that there will be a bit of a scramble[98] at the distribution to the poor of bread

---

[94] ולאט לי לנער לאליקים, 'and deal gently for my sake with the young man Elyaqim', is drawn from David's words about his son Absalom in 2 Sam 18:5.

[95] לקרות מארבע הפאות, 'to reading from all four sides'; being able to read a book upside down or from the sides would mean that his son could share a single book with other children and still follow the lesson. Goitein writes that, in his day, one could still meet members of the Yemenite Jewish community who had had the same skills instilled in them, being able to 'read a text turned upside down with the same fluency as right side up'; see Goitein, Mediterranean society, vol. 2, , 181.

[96] להידדות, 'toddle about'. Both a pi'el, 'to lead slowly', and a hitpa'el, 'to walk slowly/deliberately', of the דדה are found in the Bible; see F. Brown, S. Driver and C. Briggs, eds, A Hebrew-English lexicon to the Old Testament (Oxford, 1906), 186b. Post-biblically, the pi'el is used of leading children, Mishnah Shabbat 18:2 אשה מדדה את בנה, 'a woman may walk her child', and the hitpa'el of birds hopping about, Babylonian Talmud Bava Batra 23b אין מדדה יותר מנ', '[a bird] can hop no more than 50 [cubits].

[97] בחצר, 'in the courtyard'; this is the central, unroofed court possessed by most Egyptian houses of sufficient size, further described in Goitein, Mediterranean society, vol. 4, 63 and E. W. Lane, Cairo Fifty Years Ago, ed. S. Lane-Poole (London, 1896), 29–31. [98] Mann read חיבוץ as חיבוט and glossed it as '"beating out"; here in the meaning of a crush'; Mann, Jews in Egypt and Palestine, vol.ii, 302 n. 4. In fact, it should be read with final צ but the root חבץ has a similar meaning of 'to beat [milk], to make pulp, scramble' (Jastrow 1950: i 420–421).

20. and olives (?),[99] but if you can, your care will make me great. And his share is two or three weeks'. And if it is too hard

21. in your eyes, let my yoke rest on others, so that they know that a man was among them.[100] Spread a booth of peace

22. over the delightful brother – 'a precious vessel are the lips of knowledge' (Proverbs 20:15) – our master and teacher, the student, son of the judge[101] – may he, all of his

23. father's household and all of his sons live in the midst of years. They are in my thoughts until I pay what I vowed concerning them

24. at their appeal. And as for the boy Abu-'l-Bayān – his Rock preserve him[102] – bring him close to you and tell him

25. that I have not abandoned him because of the meagerness of his gift, but that I [still] have an obligation to him. He is an orphan and has no one to help him.

26. And when I return safely, I shall complete his work, with the kindness of my Creator. May he prosper in what he does. And as for his uncles,

27. the Shaykh Samawāl Rashīd and his brother R. Joshua, may their horn be raised in honour. And may the wellbeing of all

28. our friends increase; may their tents be at rest and may they be secure![103] Yeḥi'el son of the scholar Elyaqim, 'he who walks righteously and speaks uprightly' (Isaiah 33:15).

Verso
1. And the elder, Shaykh Abu'l-Faraj, asks afer the wellbeing of his household and of the little one, the son of his daughter, and he gives some instructions concerning him. Everything is fine here with us; we are all alive.

It is not known how Yeḥi'el b. Elyaqim first arrived in Egypt. In the responsum edited by Friedman, Yeḥi'el states (in his typical biblicising style), 'And when God caused me to wander from my father's house' (Gen

---

[99] בחילוק לחם העניים ועטנים, 'at the distribution to the poor of bread and olives'. In place of the last word Mann read ועשנים and suggested amending it to ועדשים, 'lentils'; see Mann, Jews in Egypt and Palestine, vol. ii, 302 n. 5. Reading עטנים, 'preserved olives', is a possibility, but it is not a common word.

[100] A play on Ezek 2:5 and 33:33, וידעו כי נביא היה בתוכם, 'and they will know that there has been a prophet among them'.

[101] אלדיין is an arabicised version of הדיין, 'the judge'.

[102] שמרהו צורהו or even שמרו צורו = ש׳ צ׳ or some combination of both. This common blessing may be found in many different forms.

[103] ישליו אהליהם ובטוחות למו, 'may their tents be at rest and may they be secure', is drawn from Job 12:6 ישליו אהלים לשדדים ובטוחות למרגיזי אל, 'the tents of robbers are at peace, and those who provoke God are secure'.

20:13), I chose to sojourn in Egypt' (the second phrase echoing Gen 12:10). Did he come willingly, or as a refugee or a captive of pirates? Although we have quite a number of legal documents signed by Yeḥi'el, there is nothing to shed further light on his early history. Recently, however, I came across the following tiny note, written on a small scrap of Egyptian paper, addressing a certain Moses the Judge and signed by Yeḥi'el 'the least of Israel' b. Elyaqim. It is clearly in his handwriting, but the signature does not bear his distinctive הצו״ם motto, suggesting that this is an earlier piece of writing. It is probably the earliest document by him that so far has turned in the Genizah, and, tantalisingly, it alludes to his arrival by ship 'against his will' in an unnamed town, presumably in Egypt. Could it mean that he, like so many Byzantine Jews there, was transported to Egypt a victim of war or piracy?

Cambridge University Library T-S AS 142.126

Paper; 89×166; Egypt (?); early 13th c.
Recto

<div dir="rtl">

1 תשואות חן חן לאבן החן יושב על המשפט

2 מרנ׳ ורב׳ משה הדיין בית דין יפר[הו] משאת

3 שלומים מאתי אוהבך עתה באתי עיר

4 קצה גבולך דורש שלומך וטובתך כל ימי

5 לעולם וברב בשת וכלמה הפילוני עתותי

6 ברעת הזמן ולא אוכל להמלט והספינה

7 הביאותנו הנה על כרחנו ואלים אמר לבהלנו

8 עד ישקיף וירא יי׳ משמים צמ״ה (?)

9   יחיאל קטן ישראל בירבי אליקים

</div>

Translation of T-S AS 142.126

Recto
1. 'Cries of grace, grace' (Zech 4:7) to the stone of grace, 'who sits in judgement' (Isa 28:6),
2. our master and our teacher[104] Moses the Judge, Bet Din[105], may he be made fruitful, gifts
3. of wellbeing from me, your friend. Now, I have arrived at 'a town
4. on the edge of your territory' (Num 20:16), wishing you peace and prosperity

---

[104] מר׳ ור׳ is either מרנא ורבנא (Aramaic titles) or מרנו ורבנו (Hebrew titles).

[105] Short for אב בית דין (Av Bet Din), 'Head of the Court', a senior member of the Jewish community.

5. forever, and in great shame and disgrace my times have cast me down
6. into the current evil 'and I cannot flee' (Gen 19:19) and a ship
7. brought us here against our will. And God has commanded us to hurry[106]
8. 'until the Lord from heaven looks down and sees' (Lam 3:50). […][107]
9. Yeḥi'el, the least of Israel, son of the scholar Elyaqim

Conclusion

Byzantine Jewish documents, though never numerous, are a persistent presence in the Genizah. Aside from containing clearly Greek names or themes, they stand out through a combination of their distinctive handwriting, the unusual layout of the text and the use of Hebrew over Arabic. Further distinguishing features can be gleaned from the texts presented above: there is a preference for the bare title מר, 'Master', over 'our master and our teacher', מרנו ורבנו or מרנא ורבנא, commonly found in Genizah letters. מני also occurs frequently in these texts as an epistolary version of ממני or מן,[108] and yet it is quite uncommon in the wider Genizah correspondence. The consonants ס/שׁ and כ/ק interchange, under the influence of the Greek vernacular, and, under similar influence, ישׁ is occasionally employed as a copula. Ignorance of the correct form of written Arabic is shown in the unusual orthography of personal names and toponyms when they occur. When taken together these features all point strongly to a Byzantine Greek origin for the writer of a letter.

What further information may be gleaned from these texts? The letters themselves are parochial in their outlook. Fathers chastise their daughters' husbands and sons their wives' fathers. Greetings are exchanged, family news is swapped. Alms are sought. The writers of these letters do not touch upon the wider events of their day, but upon matters of immediate relevance to them and their friends and relations. Their is no mention of geopolitics, but of the price of bread, the difficulties of a journey or the state of the Nile; they present a ground-level view of their world and era, a window upon everyday Jewish life around the medieval Mediterranean, one of the great advantages of the texts discarded in the Cairo Genizah.

The letters, though differing widely in their place of composition, their tone, their purpose and their subject matter, all point to one significant fact: that there existed extensive links at the level of the individual between the Byzantine and oriental (that is to say, Arab-Islamic) Jewish

---

[106] Adapted from 2 Chr 35:21.

[107] There is an acronym or abbreviation here, of which only מ is completely clear.

[108] Though not unknown in Egyptian or Syro-Palestinian letters, it does occur more frequently in the Byzantine correspondence

worlds. They show that Byzantine Jews married Jews from Arab lands, and vice versa, that Egyptian Jews took up residence in Byzantium, and, probably in much greater numbers, that Byzantine Jews found themselves citizens, willing or otherwise, of the Fāṭimid Empire. Despite the physical barrier of the Mediterranean Sea, and the imperial boundaries of the Byzantine and Fāṭimid territories, communications continued between ordinary Jews across the geographical and political divide.

Cambridge University Library T-S 12.179, r

Cambridge University Library T-S Misc.35.8, r

Ben Outhwaite

Cambridge University Library T-S 6J4.1, r

16

יענך יי ביום צרה ,ישגבך שם אלהי יעקב.
ישלח עזרך מקודש ומציון יסעדך.
נחום על דל ואביון ולעשות אבונים ישיע.

לכבוד גדולת קדושת הדרת נזר ועטרת ושם טוב מלמעלה
למריע ורבנ אדוננו דוד הנשיא הגדול ראש גלות כל ישראל
ושמרהו אלהיע ויחייהו ⋅ די ⋅ ט ⋅ ויפארהו יוצרהו ויזכהנהו
והיאות לו בעם זכדים מחליצו למלאות מ⋅ריו ויזכהו אבותי
הצדיקים ויאריך ימיו ושעתו בנעימים אמן

אמהך העניה העלובה העגומה שאענה הדאונה המסוכנת
מצעועתיי אנ מפלת תחיכי ⋅ לתעך שתקשיבדברו
אמהך כי דבות אנחנתיי ⋅⋅⋅יד וו ⋅ כי אנו לבדיאין לו לא
איש ולא בן ולא בת לא אח ולא אחות ומת עדהת כצפור בודך
על גג. וכאשר ⋅ פשעניו ועינעתיי נסתכנתי בחוטאני ויצאנה
המכה הזאת ונרקב ונאכל מקום פעך והולך החול וקשה
ולא אוכל לעשות מלוכה ואנו בעירוס ובימא ובחוסר
כל ואין לא ידי ואין אדם משגיח עלי אפילו אס אמנת
ועתה מתנפלת לפני יי ולפני אדונ שתרחמני כחסדך
ותעשה עמי למען ⋅ ולמענזכות אבותיך הצדיקים
והחסידים ותתמימים והייר אומר ויד⋅ ך ועל דרכיך
אור ויצוה אדונ לעשות ⋅ קה בכל מקום שיחפץ חנע
אנו כהדריאן ל מדינה וימצא חניה ומדוע מי⋅ ⋅מיך
ואנו מישיבני אדונ רית בלמת מל⋅ענו ואהיה מתפלל
עלם ועל שמך הנעני⋅ ⋅⋅ ⋅ שדי צדך אותך ויתרך
וירבך ונהיית לקהל עמדס וייקו ך אתבדכבך א ברהל ⋅⋅
ולזרעך אתך ושלומך יסגאו יבה וכה. גדל ך
ויגל כל יתגדל לנו לנצח נעתחיס אמן

Cambridge University Library T-S AS 142.126, r

Testimonies and Influences

Sefer Yosippon and the Greek Bible

by

Saskia Dönitz

The following article presents some reflections on the reception of Sefer
Yosippon (Book of Yosippon) in medieval Hebrew literature.[1] One of the
crucial differences between the Hebrew Bible and the Septuagint consists
of the additional texts in the Greek Bible, called in Hebrew ספרים חיצוניים
('external books'). Some of the biblical books were completed by chapters,
e.g. Esther and Daniel. On the other hand, entire new books entered the
canon of the Greek Bible which had not been part of the Hebrew Biblical
tradition, e.g. 1–2 Maccabees, 1 Esdras, Wisdom of Solomon, Judith, and
others. As will presently be shown, some of these texts found their way
(back) into the Hebrew-Aramaic tradition via a medieval Hebrew para-
phrase of the works of Flavius Josephus, the book called Sefer Yosippon.
In this article I will investigate the special features of the additions in the
Greek Bible woven into the text of Sefer Yosippon. I will argue that the
broad reception of Sefer Yosippon in Jewish literary society in Byzantium
as well as in Ashkenaz and Sefarad is grounded to a large extent in texts
stemming originally from the Greek Bible.[2]

   Sefer Yosippon was probably written in the ninth to tenth century in
southern Italy. During this period the area was still under Byzantine rule,
although Latin influence was also felt in its culture and literature. The
anonymous redactor of Sefer Yosippon reworked some of the apocryphal
texts of the Septuagint, Flavius Josephus's Antiquitates and the Bellum
Judaicum into a well written historiographical description of the history of
the Jewish people from the Babylonian Exile to the destruction of the Sec-

---

[1] Text: D. Flusser, The Josippon [Josephus Gorionides]: Edited with Introduction,
Commentary and Notes (Jerusalem, 1980–1). The reception history of Sefer Yosippon has
not yet been analyzed thoroughly. The perception of the Sefer Yosippon in medieval Jew-
ish literature was the subject of my Ph.D. thesis under the supervision of Prof. Dr. Peter
Schäfer at the Freie Universität Berlin.

[2] There is an ongoing discussion about the question which of the books found in the
Greek Bible had a Hebrew source. My point is that the reception of some of these exter-
nal books in medieval Hebrew literature is based on Sefer Yosippon. The redactor of Se-
fer Yosippon used the Greek or the Latin Bible as his source, not a Hebrew 'original' of
these books.

ond Temple. Since Flavius Josephus in his introduction to the Bellum Judaicum mentions having written an Aramaic version of his work, the medieval Sefer Yosippon was identified with this Aramaic original written by Josephus himself. The attribution to the Hellenistic Jewish historian contributed to the diffusion and authority of Sefer Yosippon, which was read among Jews in Palestine, Byzantium, Ashkenaz, France and Spain.

The textual history as well as the question of date, provenance and literary character of Sefer Yosippon was first analyzed extensively by David Flusser.[3] He published an eclectic edition which to his mind came close to the Urfassung of Sefer Yosippon, accompanied by a second volume dedicated to the discussion of the origin and dating of this text. In my research on the transmission and the reception of the Sefer Yosippon I have examined the manuscripts known to us today, and I discovered that there must have been an earlier redaction of the text that is transmitted in fragments of the Cairo Genizah (eleventh century) and in one Italian manuscript (MS Vatican Urbinati Ebr. 52; Italian, fifteenth century). This redaction differs in several respects from the one printed in Flusser's edition. Flusser included a part containing some of the additions to the Book of Daniel in his edition, but this section is not part of the text represented by the Cairo Genizah. Therefore, one can assume that the additions to Daniel are a later interpolation into Sefer Yosippon. I will return to this interpolation at a later stage.

Soon after its compilation the book won fame in Italy and the Near East,[4] and later also in Ashkenaz, France, Spain and Byzantium. It was treated as an 'open text' and underwent several stages of rewriting and revision which resulted in three redactions.[5] Considering the number of manuscripts and the many textual variations that were produced during the centuries of the text's transmission, it can be maintained that Sefer Yosippon was one of the most widespread texts in Jewish medieval society. This is corroborated by the large number of quotations of the book.[6]

---

[3] Flusser, Josippon, vol. 2.

[4] It was translated into Judeo-Arabic very soon after the completion of the work: S. Sela, 'The Book of Josippon and its parallel versions in Arabic and Judeo-Arabic', (3 vols.; Ph.D. diss., Tel Aviv, 1991).

[5] Flusser edited a text that represents a version of redaction A. Redaction B was edited by D. Günzburg, ספר יוסיפון כפי דפוס מנטובה קודם רם לפ״ק מהדורת דויד בן נפתלי גינצבורג (Berdichev, 1913).The third redaction was edited by H. Hominer, Josiphon of Joseph Ben Gorion ha-Cohen: Reprinted according to the complete Edition of Venice 5304 (1544) with Supplements from the Mantua Edition 5238–5240 (1478–80) and the Constantinople Edition 5270 (1510) (Jerusalem, 1967).

[6] A. A. Neuman, 'Josippon: History and Pietism', in Alexander Marx jubilee volume: on the occasion of his seventieth birthday, S. Lieberman and A. Marx, eds., (New York, 1950), 637–667, especially 666f.

Let me return to the content of Sefer Yosippon. The book's main sources are the Latin translations of Josephus's works, i.e. Ps-Hegesippus's De Excidio Hierosolymitano and Rufinus's translation of the Antiquitates.[7] Moreover, the redactor of Sefer Yosippon probably also had a copy of the Greek and the Latin Bible at hand. The first third of Sefer Yosippon is actually a reworking of some of the additions found in the Greek Bible. The chapter on Esther and Mordecai consists of some of the additions to the Greek Bible only.[8] Sefer Yosippon, chapters 11 to 28, is a reworking of 1–2 Maccabees.[9] Finally, a later interpolation on Jesus also comprises a version of the Susannah story from the Septuagint.[10] We thus see that the author of Sefer Yosippon reveals a tendency to supplement the biblical narrative of the history of the Jews. Interestingly enough, his sources are the Greek or Latin Bible, transmitted mostly by Christians. It seems as though the redactor of Sefer Yosippon felt the necessity to reintegrate these sources into medieval Jewish Hebrew literature.

Later redactors shared this aim. In redaction B of Sefer Yosippon an interpolation comprises the stories of Daniel and Bel and Daniel and Tannin as well as Daniel in the lion's den.[11] In the following chapter, Sefer Yosippon tells the story of the competition of the three guardsmen, in a composite narrative derived from Josephus's Antiquitates and 1 Esdras.[12] We see that a later redactor felt a lack in the story of Daniel and added some of the additions to the Greek Bible to the text of Sefer Yosippon.

In the following part I will discuss the special characteristics of the various parts of Sefer Yosippon deriving from 1–2 Maccabees and the additions to the books of Esther and Daniel in the Greek Bible. Furthermore, I will draw attention to the reception of these motifs in medieval Hebrew literature.

The books of the Maccabees

Chapters 11–26 of Sefer Yosippon are a retelling of the events associated with the revolt of the Maccabees, taken from 1–2 Maccabees. The two versions in the Greek Bible were merged by the author or redactor of Sefer

---

[7] V. Ussani, Hegesippi qui dicitur historiae libri V (Leipzig, 1932). Rufinus's translation is only available in Gelenius's edition; S. Gelenius, ed., Antiquitates Iudaicae. Flavii Josephi Antiquitatum Judaicarum libri XX (Basel, 1534).

[8] Flusser, Josippon, vol. 1, chapter 9.

[9] Flusser, Josippon, vol. 1, chapter 11–27.

[10] See Appendix 5.2 in Flusser, Josippon, vol. 1, 442–4.

[11] Flusser, Josippon, vol. 1, chapter 4–5.

[12] Flusser, Josippon, vol. 1, chapter 6.

Yosippon into a chronological narrative, actually creating a fairly modern synopsis of the events. He also integrated the martyrs' stories from 2 Maccabees 6 and 7. The martyrdom of the mother and her seven sons was already transmitted in rabbinic texts (b Git 57b; EkhR 15.1).[13] It became one of the most famous literary motifs during the Middle Ages not only among Jewish, but also among Christian and Muslim authors.[14] Like his source, the redactor of Sefer Yosippon located the story in the persecutions under Antiochus IV Epiphanes in the second century BCE, while the rabbinic and medieval versions do not refer explicitly to a specific ruler, but talk about a Caesar (קיסר), probably a Roman emperor. This means that in rabbinic literature the story of the mother and her seven sons was combined with the rabbinic martyrs' stories belonging to the Roman period. Sefer Yosippon returns the story to its original historical context. Hence it can be proved that Sefer Yosippon was the source that was used by Joseph ben Solomon of Carcassonne (eleventh century, southern France) when he cited the story of the mother and her seven sons in a piyyut for Hanukkah, and not one of the rabbinic writings.[15] I shall point out some special features of the story of the Maccabees in Sefer Yosippon to show the way the redactor reworked his sources.

The redactor of Sefer Yosippon identified Eleazar the Priest, who suffered martyrdom during the persecution undertaken by Antiochus IV Epiphanes, with one of the leaders of the group of sages who were sent to Egypt in response to Ptolemy's request to translate the Torah into Greek. This serves as an explanation for the fact that in the plot of Sefer Yosippon the story of the translation of the Septuagint is located in the time of the Seleucid king Antiochus IV Epiphanes, more precisely between the chapter on the Heliodorus affair and the chapter on the beginnings of the persecu-

---

[13] G. D. Cohen, 'The Story of Hannah and her Seven Sons in Hebrew Literature', in Mordecai M. Kaplan Jubilee Volume, M. Davis, ed., (Jerusalem, 1953), 109–122; R. Doran, 'The Martyr: A Synoptic View of the Mother and her Seven Sons', in Ideal Figures in Judaism, J. J. Collins, ed., (Chicago, 1980), 189–221; E. Baumgarten and R. Kushelevsky, 'From "The Mother and Her Sons" to "The Mother of the Sons" in Medieval Ashkenaz', Zion 71 (2006), 301–342.

[14] D. Joslyn-Siemiatkoski, 'The Maccabean Martyrs in medieval Christianity and Judaism' (Ph.D. diss., Boston, 2005); G. Rouwhorst, 'The Cult of the Seven Maccabean Brothers and their Mother in Christian Tradition', in Saints and Models in Judaism and Christianity, M. Poorthuis and J.J. Schwartz, eds., (Leiden, 2004), 182–204; L. V. Rutgers, 'The Importance of Scripture in the Conflict between Jews and Christians: The Example of Antioch', in The Use of Sacred Books in the Ancient World, L. V. Rutgers, ed., (Louvain, 1992), 287–303.

[15] I. Davidson, אוצר השירה והפיוט מומן חתימת כתבי הקודש עד ראשית תקופת ההשכלה (New York, 1970), 1651א; S. I. Baer, סדר עבודת ישראל (Rödelheim, 1848 (reprint Jerusalem 1937)), 629–633.

tions under Antiochus.[16] The identification of Eleazar the translator and Eleazar the martyr was later cited by the Coptic author Abu Shakir ibn al-Sana' al-Rahib (thirteenth century) as well as by Jirjis al-Makin ibn al-'Amid from the Arabic translation of Sefer Yosippon.[17]

According to Sefer Yosippon Antiochus IV Epiphanes commanded his military leader, Philippus, to kill everyone 'who calls himself a Jew' (מחה וכל אשר יזכיר שמו יהודי תהרגוהו [...] תמחו),[18] a motif that appears neither in the Books of the Maccabees nor in Josephus.[19] The same command is quoted in the Hanukkah piyyut אין צור חלף by Solomon ha-Bavli (tenth century, Italy), by Rashi in his commentary on Dan 11:17 (eleventh century, Ashkenaz) and in the Hanukkah Midrashim.[20] One cannot be sure if Sefer Yosippon or the Talmud was the source of the quotations except in the case of Rashi, who names the book explicitly.

The death of the wicked Greek king was described by the redactor of Sefer Yosippon in a special way. Illnesses befall the king, and he dies in terrible pain. Gershom Me'or ha-Gola refers to the death of the Greek king in his Seliha אתה מקדם אלהינו in the same way as it is described in Sefer Yosippon.[21] Rashi also quoted this story in his commentary on Judg 11:39 and 12:7 (both tenth-eleventh century, Ashkenaz). These quotations demonstrate that from the tenth century on Sefer Yosippon was a common source for the events connected to Hanukkah and the Maccabees among Jewish sages in of medieval Europe.[22]

In the early redaction A of Sefer Yosippon the mother of the seven sons is not named. The name Hannah is given to her in the later redaction B which was probably copied and disseminated in Sefarad (Spain).[23] Abraham Ibn Daud, Maimonides and Israel ben Joseph Al-Nakawa knew the

---

[16] Flusser, Josippon, chapter 11–13. For a discussion on the story of the translation of the Septuagint in Sefer Yosippon see A. Wasserstein; D. Wasserstein, The Legend of the Septuagint: From Classical Antiquity to Today (Cambridge, 2007), 192–216; G. Veltri, Gegenwart der Tradition: Studien zur jüdischen Literatur und Kulturgeschichte (Leiden, 2002), 122–143.

[17] Wasserstein and Wasserstein, The Legend of the Septuagint, 160–164.

[18] Chapter 16, lines 3ff. in Flusser's edition.

[19] But compare b RH 18b.

[20] E. Fleischer, The Poems of Shelomo Ha-Bavli: Critical edition with introduction and commentary (Jerusalem, 1973), 243–248; Davidson, א3079.

[21] Davidson, א8824; A. M. Habermann (ed.), גרשום מאור הגולה סליחות ופזמונים (Jerusalem, 1943/44), 21.

[22] The other authoritative source was the Scroll of Antiochus, a reworking of 1 Maccabees and rabbinic sources. The essential differences are that the Scroll of Antiochus does not contain the stories of martyrdom. Moreover, the hero is named Johanan and not Judah.

[23] Sefer Yosippon, Mantua 1480, 24.

mother by that name.[24] The rabbinic and medieval versions call her Miriam
(bat Tanhum). It is clear that the chapter on the death of the mother and her
seven sons in Sefer Yosippon relies heavily on the description in 2 Macca-
bees 7. At the same time the redactor integrates some new motifs into the
story which became crucial for the later understanding of martyrdom in
Jewish medieval society in Ashkenaz, e.g. the great light in the afterworld
promised for those who are ready to die for qiddush ha-shem (sanctifica-
tion of the name of God). This motif was also used by the authors of the
Hebrew chronicles of the First Crusade.[25]

The subsequent events of the rebellion of Mattathias and his sons as
well as the wars of Judah the Maccabee were not in the focus of the me-
dieval Hebrew authors. There are no citations of these chapters from Sefer
Yosippon. Nevertheless, the literary creativity of the redactor of the book is
shown by his reworking of the sources. When Judah was appointed mili-
tary leader of the Jews by his father Mattathias, the redactor of Sefer
Yosippon decided to bestow a special position on him. He wrote that Mat-
tathias anointed him and thus made him 'anointed (for the) war' (משוח
מלחמה), the rabbinic term for a priest in war.[26] This term occurs in Sefer
Yosippon mainly when the Greek text designates Judah as 'the Maccabee'
(ὁ Μακκαβαῖος).[27] It seems as if the redactor decided that משוח מלחמה
was the correct translation of this term. It is equally used in Yerahmeel's
version of Seder Olam, in the Hanukkah Midrashim[28] and in a fragmentary
Hebrew translation of 1 Maccabees 1–4 and 6–9.[29] The translation is part
of an Ashkenazi manuscript. We have seen that in Ashkenaz and France in
the tenth and eleventh century there was a special interest in the events of
the time of the Maccabees, so it is possible that this translation was made

---

[24] Cohen, 'The Story of Hannah and her Seven Sons', 118f.

[25] E. Haverkamp, Hebräische Berichte über die Judenverfolgungen während des Er-
sten Kreuzzugs (Hannover, 2005), 286f., 324f., 362f., 370f., 376f., 436f., 442f., 458f.,
476f.; see also R. Chazan, God, Humanity and History: The Hebrew First Crusade Nar-
ratives (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London, 2000), 194–202; S. Shepkaru, Jewish Mar-
tyrs in the Pagan and Christian Worlds (New York, 2006), 117–125.

[26] M Sot 8,1; b Sot 43a; b Yom 72b–73b; Sifra Zaw 5; y Yom 1,1 (38d); y Meg 11,10
(72a).

[27] 1 Macc 3:1; 1 Macc 5:24; 2 Macc 10:35; 2 Macc 11:15; 2 Macc 12:19f. The
Hebrew מכבי was derived from מקבת which is translated as 'hammer', see Judg 4:21; I
Kgs 6:7; Isa 44:12; Jer 10:4.

[28] E. Yassif, The Book of Memory: that is The Chronicles of Yerahme'el (Tel Aviv,
2001), 372, 374; D.S. Löwinger, יהודית שושנה נוסחאות חדשות מוזען לאור על פי כתב יד שבכודפסט
(Budapest, 1940), 16.

[29] D. Chwolson, 'שריד ופליט', Qobetz al Yad 7 (1896/97), 3–14; MS Paris, BnF, hébr.
326, Ashkenaz, 13/14th century, fols. 159v–168v. Flusser argued that this translation
inspired the author of Sefer Yosippon, but nothing prevents us from saying that it also
could have been vice versa.

in Ashkenaz in the eleventh century. The rise of these narratives on the time of the Maccabees points to a need to fill the gaps in the history of the Jewish people that the author of Sefer Yosippon served successfully by re-integrating texts about the Maccabees stemming from the Septuagint.

The redactor of Sefer Yosippon also used the stories of the wars of the Maccabees to praise the Romans. Chapter 21 talks about the covenant be-tween Judah the Maccabee and the Romans.[30] To show the power of the Romans, who in the opinion of the redactor are the fourth empire of Daniel's vision, he introduced a section that talks about the wars between Hannibal and Scipio. He probably drew on a source that is based on Livy.[31] The wars of the Romans against Carthage were also mentioned by Josephus in Antiquities 12,414 in connection with the covenant between Judah and the Romans. It seems therefore that the redactor of Sefer Yosip-pon used this remark in Josephus as a starting-point to integrate more in-formation about Roman history.[32] The story of the Maccabees in Sefer Yosippon represents therefore an example of the reworking of the sources by the redactor(s) and of their intentions. On the one hand, the redactor wants to reintegrate the stories of the Maccabees, the one about the martyrs as well as the one about the warriors, into Jewish historiography. On the other hand, we perceive a clear intention to add more information on Ro-man history.

Esther

The chapter on Esther in Sefer Yosippon is exclusively concerned with the so-called additions to the canonical book.[33] It starts with the plot of the two eunuchs against Artaxerxes. This is followed by the dream of Mordecai, the prayers of Mordecai and Esther with changes in the wording, and, fi-nally, the story of Esther's reception at the court of Artaxerxes and the sal-vation of the Jewish people from Haman's murderous plans.[34] Added to these parts is an introduction which recalls the hostility between Mordecai

---

[30] 1 Macc 8:22–20.

[31] Flusser, Josippon, vol. 1, chapter 21, note to line 9.

[32] Chapter 2 of Sefer Yosippon consists of the early history of Rome, its foundation, the early kings and the invention of the Roman senate.

[33] Flusser, Josippon, vol. 1, chapter 9.

[34] The order of the additions is changed in relation to the biblical order: in the Bible the dream comes first and after that the discovery of the plot.

and Haman and their ancestors Saul and Agag, the king of the Amale-
kites.[35]

The deviations in the wording between Sefer Yosippon and the additions
to Esther are most obvious in the prayers of Esther and Mordecai. Morde-
cai's prayer is longer than in the additions. The redactor of Sefer Yosippon
enhanced the tendency already found in the prayer which talks about God
singling out Israel as the chosen people and therefore stretching out a help-
ing hand. But it is the misdeeds and the sins of Israel that brought them
exile and captivity.[36] The prayer of Esther in Sefer Yosippon is also ex-
tended by a paragraph telling the deeds of salvation that God sent Israel,
such as the Exodus. Again the sins of the fathers are said to have brought
exile and captivity to the Jewish people. On the other hand, God will not
let his people down.[37]

The changes in wording refer to the similar situation of the Jews in the
time of Esther and Mordecai and in the time of the redactor of Sefer Yosip-
pon. They emphasize that Israel lives in exile because of the sins of the
fathers, but that God will lead his people to salvation and the messianic
days. The story of Esther and Mordecai relates to the main subjects of sur-
vival in conditions of exile and rescue from calamity which are character-
istic of Second Temple literature. The central theme is the confrontation
between Israel and the nations in its multiple facets.[38]

As with the story of the Maccabees, the chapter on Esther in Sefer
Yosippon is also often referred to in medieval Hebrew literature.[39] In con-
trast to the section on the Maccabees where isolated motifs were quoted,
the additions to the book of Esther in Sefer Yosippon were sometimes ex-
cerpted as a whole. Esther Rabbah on 4:17 and 5:1 quotes the dream, the
prayers and Esther's visit to Artaxerxes in a shortened version. Since it is
assumed that this part of Esther Rabbah was probably composed in the
eleventh century, it is possible that the author took these texts from Sefer
Yosippon.[40] The same choice of texts is found in Aaron ben Hayyim ha-
Kohen's commentary to the piyyut תמימים כרשו (thirteenth century,

---

[35] 1 Sam 15:1–35; Esth 2:5; 3:1; 9:24; see also Midr Agg Shmot 17,16; Midr Agg
Bamidbar 1,15; Leqah Tov on Gen 49:27; Yalq Shim on Judges § 50, Mahzor Vitry §
249; 2 Targ Esth 4,13; PRE, chapter 49.

[36] Flusser, Josippon, vol. 1, chapter 9, lines 42–50. The references to the sins of Israel
and the mighty enemies who are rejoicing over Israel's fall are actually part of the prayer
of Esther in the additions to the Bible; see Esth 14:6–10 (Vulgate).

[37] Flusser, Josippon, vol. 1, chapter 9, lines 66–75.

[38] E. Yassif, The Hebrew folktale: history, genre, meaning (Bloomington, 1999), 40–
43.

[39] Tobias ben Eliezer; Esther Rabba II; Immanuel of Rome; Joseph Ibn Kaspi; Ger-
sonides.

[40] G. Stemberger, Einleitung in Talmud und Midrasch (Munich, 1992), 312f.

France). Immanuel of Rome quotes the whole chapter from Sefer Yosippon except the dream in his commentary on Esther (thirteenth century, Italy).[41] Finally, there are eight manuscripts (mostly Bible codices from Italy and Ashkenaz) which transmit a text called חלום מורדכי in Aramaic, consisting of Mordecai's dream and the prayers of Mordecai and Esther.[42] In my view, this text is translated from Sefer Yosippon, although its source is not indicated.

The study of the Jewish reception of the additions to Esther shows that they were very often extracted from Sefer Yosippon and circulated independently. In contrast to the stories of the Maccabees, the book of Esther, including the additions, did not gain as much interest among Christian authors. The Jews, on the other hand, wrote several Targumim and many commentaries on the book of Esther, thereby enhancing the importance of Purim.[43] By translating the additions to Esther into Hebrew literature the redactor of Sefer Yosippon contributed in a way to the midrashic literature on Esther. This is the reason for the many quotations from this chapter of Sefer Yosippon. The question of how to cope with the conditions of exile and existence in the Diaspora, within an ongoing confrontation between the Jews and the Nations, which is dealt with both in the canonical book of Esther and in the Greek additions, belonged to the stories shaping Jewish collective memory and forming Jewish self-identity, especially after the destruction of the Second Temple.

Daniel

Chapters 3–5 in Sefer Yosippon tell the story of Belshazzar's desecration of the Holy Vessels, his death and the reign of Cyrus and Darius.[44] The leading figure is the biblical hero Daniel. Only in later manuscripts of Sefer Yosippon, presumably in redaction B, are the stories of Daniel in the Lion's den, Daniel and Bel and Tannin and the competition of the three guardsmen associated with the chapters on Daniel.[45] The author of this interpolation freely combined motives from the additions to the Book of Daniel in the Greek Bible and 1 Esdras, thereby producing a retelling of

---

[41] B. Walfish, Esther in Medieval Garb: Jewish Interpretation of the Book of Esther in the Middle Ages (Albany, 1993), 43–44.

[42] A. Jellinek, ed., בית המדרש (Leipzig, 1855; repr., Jerusalem, 1967), vol. IV, 1–8.

[43] D. Börner-Klein; E. Hollender, Die Midraschim zu Ester (Leiden, 2000).

[44] A. A. Neuman, 'Josippon and the Apocrypha', JQR 43 (1952/53), 1–26.

[45] The first manuscript containing these parts is MS Oxford Heb. 11 (Neubauer 2979, Ashkenaz, fourteenth century): see Yassif, The Book of Memory, 254–265. It is also found in MS Vatican ebr. 408 (Italy, fifteenth century), fols. 7v–15v.

Daniel's deeds at the court of Darius and Darius's promise to Zerubbabel to let the Jewish people return to Jerusalem and rebuild the Temple. The interpolation serves as the story that gives the reason for Darius's promise: it is the gift given by the king to Zerubbabel after the latter won the contest of the three guardsmen. In redaction A all of this is missing; instead, the rebuilding of the Temple is a result of the king's comprehension of the story of Belshazzar and his acceptance of the power of the God of Israel.

In contrast to the broad reception of the chapters on the Maccabees and on Esther in Sefer Yosippon, the additions to the book of Daniel did not receive as much attention among Jews. The reason may be that these texts were only interpolated in a later redaction of Sefer Yosippon. Therefore, neither Rashi nor other exegetes of the Bible knew them. The silence in the reception history of Sefer Yosippon with regard to those additions to Daniel is another argument against Flusser's thesis that these texts were present in the original text of Sefer Yosippon and erased later.[46] The fact that they are found neither in the early manuscripts of Sefer Yosippon from the Cairo Genizah, nor in the Judeo-Arabic translation or in the other manuscripts of redaction A also suggests these texts were added at a later stage in the transmission of Sefer Yosippon.[47]

Since these texts are only found in a copy of Sefer Yosippon made by Yerahmeel (twelfth century, Italy), it can be assumed that he was the redactor who interpolated the additions to Daniel into Sefer Yosippon.[48] This is corroborated by the fact that Yerahmeel's collection of texts also contains translations of the Aramaic parts of Daniel into Hebrew as well as translations of the additions to Daniel into Hebrew and Aramaic which are not part of Sefer Yosippon.[49] Besides Daniel and Tannin and Daniel in the lion's den, he also translated the Song of the three children and the story of Susannah.[50] In the introduction to the text of the Song in Yerahmeel there is a Hebrew passage stating that these texts were translated by Todos (= Theodotion) and that they are not found in the 24 Books of the Hebrew Bible. In the same passage it is said that the texts were also translated by

---

[46] Flusser, Josippon, vol. 1, note on chapter 3, line 58; vol. 2, 47f.

[47] Compare e.g. D. Flusser, Josippon: The Original Version MS Jerusalem 8" 41280 and supplements (Jerusalem, 1978), fol. 4r–5r.

[48] Yerahmeel's collection of texts including the Sefer Yosippon survived only in a later compilation written by Eleazar ben Asher ha-Levi in Ashkenaz around 1325 called Sefer ha-Zikhronot (Book of Memories), see Yassif, The Book of Memory.

[49] Yassif, The Book of Memory, 231–250.

[50] The story of Susannah in a Judaized form is integrated into Sefer Yosippon by another redactor; see note 9.

Symmachus and Akilas (סימכוס ועקילס).[51] Here we note that in the twelfth century there still exists an inkling of the knowledge that there are additional parts of the text of the Hebrew Bible and that they were translated by several Jewish and Christian authors.[52]

Conclusion

To summarize: 1–2 Maccabees and the additions to Esther were reintroduced into medieval Hebrew literature via Sefer Yosippon. Moreover, a later copyist of Sefer Yosippon also decided to insert the additions to the book of Daniel together with some parts of 1 Esdras. These chapters of Sefer Yosippon represent an effort to supply material from the Hellenistic-Jewish period missing in rabbinic and medieval Hebrew literature, drawing – remarkably – on the Greek Bible, with its Christian connotations.

The reception of these parts of Sefer Yosippon in medieval Hebrew literature was extensive. Bible exegetes, liturgical poets and authors of narrative texts read the chapters on Esther and Mordecai's salvation of the Jewish people and the victory of the Maccabees against the wicked Greek king Antiochus and used them in their own texts. The chapter on Esther was extracted from Sefer Yosippon and inserted into Hebrew Bible manuscripts as a supplement to the scroll of Esther, in the way the so-called additions had been appended to the canonical book of Esther in the Vulgate.

The stories about persecution and salvation as well as martyrdom belong to genres originating in the Second Temple period. Transmitted into the middle ages they became part of the foundation of Jewish society's historical consciousness and identity, a foundation that was laid down by the Greek-speaking Jews during the Hellenistic age and transmitted by Byzantine Jews via Sefer Yosippon into Ashkenaz, France and Spain.

The additions to the Book of Daniel were not quoted from Sefer Yosippon, because this chapter in Sefer Yosippon itself is a later interpolation. Nevertheless, medieval Hebrew authors were interested in them, e.g.

---

[51] Yassif, The Book of Memory, 243. The later revisions of the Septuagint are also mentioned in the copy of Seder Olam that was integrated by Yerahmeel into the Sefer ha-Zikhronot; see Yassif, The Book of Memory, 382; Veltri, Gegenwart der Tradition, 134ff.

[52] Comparing the interpolation and its sources there are not so many grave deviations in Sefer Yosippon. Since the story of Daniel in the lion's den is told in the additions as well as in Dan 6, the redactor of the interpolations uses both versions of it. The number of the lions is ten instead of seven; see Flusser, Josippon, vol. 1, chapter 4, line 80. Daniel calms the lions with a song; see Flusser, Josippon, vol. 1, chapter 4, lines 86–88. In the competition of the three guardsmen the redactor changed the order of the mighty items from wine-king-woman to king-wine-woman; see Flusser, Josippon, vol. 1, chapter 6, lines 57–61.

Yerahmeel ben Solomon, who translated them into Aramaic and mentioned that the text goes back to a certain Todos. This raises the question which source was used by the Jewish author of Sefer Yosippon. According to Flusser the anonymous author used a Latin translation of the Bible.[53] Although a comprehensive comparison of the texts still remains to be done, a first check on some literary motifs has shown that if it was a Latin version it could have been a mixture of the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina.[54] If, against Flusser's argument, it was a Greek text, some of the wording of Sefer Yosippon hints at a mixture of Theodotion and the Septuagint.[55] But since I am not an expert on this subject, this analysis should be left for future research.

---

[53] Flusser, Josippon, vol. 2, 132–140.

[54] This can be shown by the fact that the prayer of Esther in the Vetus Latina has the motif of Esther calling herself an orphan; see P. Sabatier, Bibliorum Sacrorum Latiane Versiones Antiquae seu Vetus Italica (Paris, 1751), 809; compare Flusser, Josippon, vol. 1, chapter 9 line 63. Flusser thought that this might be a hint that the redactor knew the story of Joseph and Aseneth; see D. Flusser, 'Joseph and Asenath: A Hellenistic-Jewish Novel', Dappim le-mehqar ba-sifrut 2 (1985), 73–81, especially 78.

[55] Compare especially the story of Daniel and Bel. While the sealing of the place fits the version of Theodotion, the fact that the priests are not killed corresponds with the Septuagint; see Flusser, Josippon, vol. 1, chapter 5 lines 21–32 and cf. O. Munnich, J. Ziegler, D. Fraenkel, et al., Susanna, Daniel, Bel et Draco: Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum (Göttingen, 1999), 396–401.

The Greek Bible used by the Jews in the dialogues Contra Iudaeos (fourth-tenth centuries CE)[1]

by

Patrick Andrist

In all the periods of the Byzantine empire, literary dialogues Contra Iudaeos were written in Greek by Christian authors.[2] These texts have the reputation of being very conservative, borrowing arguments, biblical quotations and, sometimes, larger portions of text from each other, so that one wonders whether there is any chance of finding any valuable information in them about the Jews of their time and, furthermore, about the Bible they used. And indeed, if all these literary dialogues were conceived on Mt Athos by monks who had always lived there, and if all these monks had read or heard was orthodox liturgy, standard Christian biblical texts and writings Contra Iudaeos produced in similar conditions, there would be little chance of finding any genuine Jewish biblical tradition in these works.

In order to evaluate any information from Christian literary dialogues relating to the Jewish Bible, one must first remember a few points about the transmission of the Greek Bible and convince oneself that there is at least some theoretical possibility of finding such material in these Christian texts. One must then also ponder how genuine Jewish Greek biblical material can be distinguished from Christian Greek biblical material. This is the first part of this article.

Next, 'external' aspects, such as references to Jewish Bibles, polemics against Aquila and questions about the deuterocanonical books are presented. The last three sections exemplify the kinds of biblical variants at-

[2] For a recent and fresh introduction to polemics Contra Iudaeos, see V. Déroche, 'Forms and functions of anti-Jewish polemics: polymorphy, polysemy', to be published in Proceedings of the conference 'Christians and Jews in Byzantium: Images and Cultural Dynamics', Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 21–24 May 2006 (ed. G. Stroumsa).

tributed to the Jews. This overview is not a thorough catalogue of all relevant instances, and it does not address questions concerning Jewish interpretations of the Bible.

Surprisingly enough, genuine Jewish biblical material can sometimes be found, though very infrequently, in Greek dialogues Contra Iudaeos from the first six centuries of the Byzantine empire.

A. Methodological issues about the production, circulation and possible use of the Jewish Greek Bible

1. Jewish translations and Christian Bibles

Between the third and the first century BCE, the books of the Jewish Bible were progressively translated into Greek; the result of this long-lasting work is generally called the Septuagint.[3] This first Greek Bible is clearly a Jewish work. Starting with the first century CE, it was also received by the Christian communities as their Bible, and became the first part of the Christian Bible. In the Christian world, the Septuagint underwent several recensions and revisions (the most famous of them being by Origen in the third century).

Christians acquired the Septuagint in various ways, including the fact that the first generation of Christians was, by far, mostly made of Jewish people; if some of them owned biblical books in Greek, there is no reason why they would not keep on using them and making copies from them.

---

[3] Technically, the name Septuagint applies only to the Greek translation of the Pentateuch made at the time of Ptolemy II. However, following common practice, it designates here the whole Greek Bible that was available before the Christian era, then variously used, augmented and revised by Christians. For a discussion of the date of the Septuagint and various theories about its origin see G. Dorival, 'L'histoire de la Septante dans le Judaïsme antique,' in La Bible Grecque des Septante (ed. M. Harl, G. Dorival and O. Munnich; Paris, 1988), 39–82; N. Fernández Marcos, The Septuagint in context: introduction to the Greek versions of the Bible (trans. Wilfred G. E. Watson; Leiden, Boston, Köln, 2000), 53–86; with a discussion of the Jewish Greek canon, M. Hengel (with R. Deines), 'Die Septuaginta als "christliche Schriftensammlung", ihre Vorgeschichte und das Problem ihres Kanons,' in Die Septuaginta zwischen Judentum und Christentum (ed. Martin Hengel; Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 72; Tübingen, 1994), 182–284. On the critical editions of the Septuaginta books and their making, P.-M. Bogaert (and partially B. Botte), 'Septante et versions grecques,' Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible 12 (1993): 536–692. When relevant, the CPG and CPL number of the ancient Greek and Latin works are given: CPG number from M. Geerard and J. Noret, Clavis Patrum Graecorum (6 vols.; Corpus Christianorum; Turnhout, 1974–2003); CPL number from E. Dekkers and A. Gaar, Clavis patrum Latinorum (Corpus Christianorum; Turnhout, 1995).

This is also true for any later Christian converts from Judaism. Besides, one does not know how far the copying of the Greek Bible was controlled by Jewish authorities, and how easy it was for anyone to acquire those books. Finally, when persecution of the Jewish communities started to spread, from the end of the fourth century onwards, it sometimes happened that Bibles in the synagogues were not fully destroyed, but confiscated, as the story of the sack of the synagogue of Minorca clearly shows.[4]

Taking for granted that the Greek language remained alive among the Romaniotes throughout the Byzantine period and, at least to the eighth century, was also an important written language,[5] one wonders how long the Septuagint was also transmitted in those Jewish circles. It is commonly accepted that the Jews totally abandoned the Septuagint from the second century,[6] but was it so everywhere? Did it totally stop being transmitted in Jewish circles until the sixteenth century? One must be careful not to generalise from the attitude of some major Jewish circles to all the Jewish communities.

On the one hand, several factors played a role in weakening the interest in the Septuagint in Jewish communities.

Firstly, even before the Christian era, the Septuagint underwent criticism because of its discrepancies with the authoritative Hebrew text of the time. Some decades later, Christian apologetics and protreptical writings started making increasing use of the Septuagint, as these texts tried to

---

[4] Severus Minoricensis, Epistula de conversione Iudaeorum apud Minorcam insulam meritis sanctis Stephani facta (CPL 576), 13.13, ed. S. Bradbury (with Engl. trans.; Oxford Early Christian Texts; Oxford, 1996), 80–125, 94; J. Amengual i Batle, Els orígens del Cristianisme a les Balears i el seu desenvulupament fins a l'època musulmana (2 vols.; Palma de Mallorca, 1992), 2:12–64. The text does not say which language the stolen sacred books were written in.

[5] E.g. V. Colorni, 'L'uso del Greco nella liturgia del giudaismo ellenistico e la novella 164 di Giustiniano,' Annali di storia del diritto 8 (1964): 19–80 (repr. in Judaica minora: Saggi sulla Storia dell'Ebraismo Italiano dall'Antiquita all'Età Moderna, ed. V. Colorni; Milano, 1983); N. R. M. de Lange, 'Sem et Japhet. Les Juifs et la langue grecque,' Pardès 12 (1990; trans. J.-C. Attias), 90–107; N. R. M. de Lange, Greek Jewish texts from the Cairo Genizah (Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum 51; Tübingen, 1996); S. Reif, 'Some changing trends in the Jewish literary expression of the Byzantine world,' in Literacy, education and manuscript transmission in Byzantium and beyond (ed. C. Holmes and J. Waring; The medieval Mediterranean 42; Leiden, 2002), 81–110, 84, 97–100, 103, 105–106. J. Niehoff-Panagiotidis, 'Byzantinische Lebenswelt und rabbinische Hermeneutik: die griechischen Juden in der Kairoer Genizah,' Byzantion 74 (2004): 51–109.

[6] For example, following D. Barthélemy, G. Dorival, 'L'élimination de la Septante dans les années 90–130,' in 'L'achèvement de la Septante dans le judaïsme. De la faveur au rejet,' in La Bible grecque des Septante (ed. M. Harl, G. Dorival and O. Munnich; Initiations au christianisme ancien; Paris, 1988), 119–125, 122–124. See also the quote from Origen, below.

show that the First Testament's prophecies had been fulfilled by Jesus of Nazareth and his followers. These 'demonstrations' sometimes took advantage of peculiarities of the translations, which either depended on a different underlying Hebrew text, or were interpretative or free translations of the standard Hebrew text.

Very soon, again even before Christian era, the Septuagint or part of it was revised.[7] Eventually new translators built on these revisions to produce new Greek Bibles (at least, competing translations of most of its books) that could potentially replace the Septuagint. Theodotion, Symmachus and Aquila are the best known of these new translators, but Aquila's version seems to have been particularly well accepted within Jewish communities. Sources witness also to other translations or revisions.[8]

How many such revisions existed? How extensive and influential were they? How successful were the revisions and new translations against the 'original' translations? These questions still need to be answered. Besides, a recent suggestion that Aquila's translation was not written against the Septuagint but performed the function of a Greek targum[9] makes one think of a possible parallel and peaceful transmission of both versions within 'official' Judaism: the Septuagint as a text for liturgical use and Aquila's version as a support for exegetical use. In any case, for some time, all or most of these different 'forms' of the biblical text must have been used and copied synchronically.

It is very important to note that some of these non-Septuagint Jewish Greek translations were known and used in some Christian circles. For example, Origen's Hexapla cited the readings of Theodotion, Symmachus and Aquila; the Hexapla are probably the indirect source of most of what is known today from Christian documents about Aquila's readings.

Another factor in the weakening of the Septuagint (and of all the Greek translations), is the growing use of Hebrew as a liturgical language.[10]

---

[7] See the discussions of the proto-Lucianic and Theodotionic revisions, in Fernandéz Marcos, The Septuagint, 148–153, 232–236.

[8] N. Fernandéz Marcos, 'Jewish versions into mediaeval and modern Greek,' in The Septuagint, 174–187.

[9] G. Veltri, 'Der griechische Targum Aquila,' ch. V in Gegenwart der Tradition. Studien zur jüdischen Literatur und Kulturgeschichte (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 69; Leiden, Boston, Köln, 2002), 75–103; G. Veltri, 'The targumim of Aquila and Onkelos: canonical substitution,' ch. 3.3 in Libraries, translations, and 'canonic' texts: the Septuagint, Aquila and Ben Sira in the Jewish and Christian traditions (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 109; Leiden and Boston, 2006), 163–189.

[10] N. R. M. de Lange, 'A Thousand Years of Hebrew in Byzantium,' in Hebrew study form Ezra to Ben-Yehuda (ed. W. Horbury; Edinburgh, 1999), 147–161; N. R. M. de Lange, 'The Hebrew language in the European Diaspora,' in Studies on the Jewish

However, even if many Jews stopped using the Greek Bible, there is no reason to believe that all the Jews totally rejected it everywhere and to exclude a priori that the Septuagint and other Greek versions kept on being copied privately or in some Jewish communities. Rather, the sources tend to testify to an ongoing tradition of the Greek biblical texts and an ongoing interest for a Greek Bible throughout the Byzantine empire, even if clear witnesses to the use of it are scanty.[11] In any case, it would be also a methodological mistake to deduce, from the scarcity of information, that the copying and the use of the Septuagint within Jewish Communities was totally abandoned as soon as the Christians also used it as holy Scripture.

2. Novella 146 of Justinian

After the fourth century, the most often mentioned, and disputed, external witness to the use of the Greek Bible in Jewish circles is Novella 146 of Justinian, dated 8 February 553.[12] In this decree, Justinian allowed the Jews to use both the Septuagint and Aquila's version in the synagogues, but forbade the use of the oral law. According to a recent study by Giuseppe Veltri, Justinian invented an argument inside the Jewish communities, in order to interfere in their practices and forbid the use of the oral tradition, as a measure within his broader policy of converting the Jews to Christianity;[13] as a result, according to Veltri, one should no longer give credit to what is said in the Novella about the use of the Septuagint and Aquila in the synagogues: it is just a 'scenario' made up by Justinian and his advisers on the basis of a much older reality.

This interpretation of Novella 146 is far from being fully convincing. Did Justinian really need to fake a dispute inside the Jewish community if

---

Diaspora in the Hellenistic and Roman periods (Tel Aviv, 1996), 111–137. N. R. M. de Lange, 'Sem et Japhet,' 96–98.

[11] N. R. M. de Lange, 'The Jews of Byzantium and the Greek Bible: outline of the problems and suggestions for future research,' in Rashi 1040–1990. Hommage à Ephraïm E. Urbach (ed. G. Sed-Rajna; Paris, 1993), 203–210; Fernandéz Marcos, 'Jewish versions'; N. R. M. de Lange, 'La tradition des "révisions juives" au Moyen Âge. Les fragments hébraïques de la Geniza du Caire' in κατὰ τοὺς ο'. Selon les Septante. Trente études sur la Bible grecque des Septante. En hommage à Marguerite Harl (ed. G. Dorival and O. Munnich; Paris, 1995), 133–143. Since those publications, other witnesses have surfaced. For a recent example, see N. Tchernetska, J. Olszowy-Schlanger and N. R. M. de Lange, 'An early Hebrew-Greek Biblical glossary from the Cairo Genizah,' Revue des études juives 166 (2007): 91–128.

[12] For literature on this Novella, see de Lange, 'The Hebrew language,' 132–135.

[13] G. Veltri, 'Die Novelle 146 περὶ Ἑβραίων. Das Verbot des Targumvortrags in Justinians Politik,' in Die Septuaginta zwischen Judentum und Christentum (ed. M. Hengel and A. M. Schwemer; Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 71; Tübingen, 1994), 116–130; new edition with minor changes, 'Justinians Novelle 146 Peri Hebraion,' ch. VI in Gegenwart, 104–119.

he wanted to interfere in its affairs? Could Justinian and his advisors be so unaware of the reality of the synagogues that they promulgated this law without knowing that Greek Bibles were no longer used in synagogues? Is there any other instance where the emperor justified himself in such a way while making a law? One may well be convinced by Veltri's suggestions about the goal of Justinian's rule, without following his arguments about the mise en scène of his law-making.

As a result, one may still see Novella 146 as echoing a situation where the Septuagint was used in the synagogues.[14]

3. The story of Cosmas the lawyer

Another indirect witness from the sixth century is the story reported in a well-known text in John Moschos's Pratum Spirituale. As discussed below, this text also provides us with an interesting model for the production of literary works Contra Iudaeos:

'Concerning this master Cosmas the lawyer, many people told us many things; some one thing, others another. But most people told us a great deal. We shall write down what we saw with our own eyes and what we have carefully examined, for the benefit of those who chance to read it. He was a humble man, merciful, continent, a virgin, serene, cool-tempered, friendly, hospitable, and kind to the poor. This wondrous man greatly benefited us, not only by letting us see him and by teaching us, but also because he had more books than anybody else in Alexandria and would willingly supply them to those who wished. Yet he was a man of no possessions. Throughout his house there was nothing to be seen but books, a bed and a table. Any man could go in and ask for what would benefit him and read it. Each day I would go in to him and I never entered without finding him either reading or writing against the Jews. It was his fervent desire to convert the Hebrews to the truth. For this reason he would often send me to some Hebrews to discuss some point of Scripture with them (ἵνα ἀπὸ Γραφῆς αὐτοῖς διαλεχθῶ), for he would not readily leave the house himself.'[15]

---

[14] Incidentally, it is sometimes argued that the Novella was perceived by some Christians as a concession to the Jews, against the Septuagint, and prompted a climate of polemics against Aquila, that would be echoed in such works as the Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila (see further below); see R. G. Robertson, 'The Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila: a critical text, introduction to the manuscript evidence, and an inquiry into the sources and literary relationship' (Ph.D. diss., Harvard, 1986), 372–383. This suggestion of Robertson has been widely accepted in the research field. The Anonymus Declerck has also been connected with this Novella; see José H. Declerck, Anonymus dialogus com Iudaeis saeculis ut videtur sexti (Corpus Christianorum, Series Graeca 30, 1994), xlviii–xlix; see also below.

[15] Iohannes Moschus, Pratum Spirituale (CPG 7376), ed. J.-B. Cotelier, Ecclesiae Graecae Monumenta 2 (Paris, 1681), repr. in Patrologia Graeca (ed. J.-P. Migne), 87.3:2852–3112; trans. by J. Wortley, The spiritual meadow (Cistercian Studies Series 139; Kalamazoo, Michigan, 1992); ch. 172 (PG 87.3:3040C–3041A; trans. 141–142). On the story of Cosmas see V. Déroche, 'La polémique anti-judaïque au VIème et au VIIème

There is no reason not to consider this story as a fair witness about Cosmas and John Moschos. It is no cliché, and it does not match any narrative pattern in John Moschos. Without giving a priori credit to every detail, it can be used as a relevant historical text.

The text clearly states that John Moschos used to discuss with Jews 'from' the Scriptures. In which language did these debates take place? Surely not in Hebrew or Aramaic, since it would imply that John Moschos knew it fairly well. It must then be in the common vernacular language of Alexandria, and Greek is the only reasonable answer. So, in the sixth century, some Jewish people were using the Bible in Greek in discussion with their Christian opponents. Was the Jewish party quoting the Greek Bible according to a specific translator, an oral tradition, or translating it on the spot, because they knew the Hebrew text only? This last option does not make much sense.

To debate effectively with John Moschos about the First Testament, the Jews had to be able to lean on one of their stabilised Greek traditions. It is not clear, however, whether this tradition was all or partially oral, or relayed by written books, whatever they might be: Greek Bibles used in synagogues, private Bibles, non-biblical books containing excerpts from the Bible, such as Testimonia books or polemics Contra Christianos.

Which Greek text would be reflected in this tradition? Even though Cosmas has been thought of as a possible author of several preserved dialogues, and these dialogues mainly used the Septuagint as the Biblical text of both opponents, it is not possible to deduce that this version was also the standard text of the challenged Jews.

Besides, John Moschos provides here a possible contrastive model for the production of works Contra Iudaeos. In a direct link with real debates Cosmas was interested in writing texts Contra Iudaeos;[16] according to John Moschos, these texts aimed at converting the Jews and were not mere exercises, or intra-Christian propaganda. Two underlying source types can be pointed out:

Firstly it is stressed that Cosmas was reading books Contra Iudaeos. Even though it does not explicitly say he was copying from those texts, the literary link is obvious and Cosmas was necessarily influenced by his read-

siècle. Un mémento inédit, les Képhalaia,' Travaux et Mémoires 11 (1991), 275–311, 285–286; L. L. Lahey, 'Jewish Biblical interpretation and genuine Jewish-Christian debate in The Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila,' Journal of Jewish Studies 51 (2000): 281–296.

[16] For a discussion of the production of Christian anti-Jewish texts in a context of social conflicts between both communities in the fourth and the fifth century see P. Andrist, 'Le Dialogue d'Athanase et Zachée. Etude des sources et du contexte littéraire' (Ph.D Diss., University of Geneva, 2001: http:// www.unige.ch/ cyberdocuments/ theses2001/ AndristP/these.pdf), 451–484.

ings. In one sense, these Christian books represent intra-Christian material and tradition.

Secondly, and more interestingly, Cosmas also wanted to test his arguments on contemporary Jews, and used to send John Moschos to debate with them. What John would bring back to Cosmas, and what Cosmas would use from that in his writings can also be considered an indirect contemporary Jewish oral source.[17]

Thirdly one should not exclude the possibility that Cosmas, in his apparently large private library, also possessed Jewish books he could use in his writings. But this potential third source is not explicitly mentioned.

Cosmas was clearly composing literary works which were definitely not faithful transcriptions of real debates with the Jews. Surprisingly, in spite of this fact, his texts potentially contained some genuine Jewish material. Of course, the extent and the nature of this material is not clear: it could be underlying arguments, that are not clearly stated, or large quotations, including Biblical quotations; there is a large range of possibilities and one also wonders how faithfully this possible material was transmitted.

Even though this pattern of production should not be blindly applied to all texts Contra Iudaeos, or even all dialogues Contra Iudaeos, it forces one to admit that there is a theoretical possibility of finding genuine Jewish material in such Christian works.

4. Recognising a Jewish Greek Bible and Jewish Greek variants

The Cosmas story shows how a Christian author can potentially present his readers with both Christian and Jewish kinds of material together, in a contrastive way. Seen more globally, there are at least three basic ways this could happen:

1) If a Christian author consciously puts in the mouth of his Jewish character biblical text taken from a Jewish source. This can be a written source (a Jewish Bible, Jewish books with biblical material), or an oral source (opponents in discussions or debates, converted Jews). The possibility of a written source is to be seriously taken into account, when one considers how much a Jewish author like Philo of Alexandria was read in later Christian circles. The possibility of an oral source is also to be taken seriously, when one recalls the story of John Moschos;

2) If the author is a converted Jew, who quotes lessons he learned before he became a Christian;

---

[17] Incidentally, this could be also a good explanation for the origin of genuine Jewish Biblical interpretation and some Hebrew and Aramaic words in the Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila (about this text, see a note below). See the discussion in Lahey, 'Jewish', and L. L. Lahey, 'Hebrew and Aramaic in the Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila,' in Hebrew study, 106–121, 118–121.

3) If the author uses a Christian source, either a written (treatises Contra Iudaeos, Erotapokriseis) or an oral source (a learned colleague), that discriminates between Jewish and Christian variants. In the effectively preserved written text there are very few places where a Jewish variant is designated as such; some examples are presented below.

The central question, however, is how to distinguish an authentic Jewish Septuagint reading from its authentic Christian Septuagint diverging counterpart.

On the one hand, the situation seems hopeless. If the Christian's First Testament is originally a Jewish Greek Bible, and if Christians kept on acquiring Jewish Greek Bibles at later times, it follows that any potentially typical Jewish biblical feature or variant could also be found in a Christian Bible or in Christian texts quoting from the Bible. The same is true about the various versions of the new translators, since their texts were also extant in some Christian circles.

On the other hand, it sometimes happens that Christian texts, such as polemical dialogues, set up one or several Jewish character(s) arguing with one Christian character about the content of the Greek Bible (and not only about the interpretation of it). In such cases one naturally wonders whether the Jew is defending an authentic Jewish variant.

In other cases, discrepancies in the Greek biblical texts sometimes appear while comparing biblical quotations by the Christian character with biblical quotations by the Jewish character. These occurrences are not frequent, but when identified, they are also natural places where one wonders whether they offer some genuine information about the Jewish Greek Bible.

If one admits, as a working hypothesis, that Septuagint manuscripts were still copied in Jewish communities after the second century, one must expect that this Jewish text would be (virtually) free from typical variants from Christian revisions of the Bible. So, when the variants quoted by a Jewish character match the text that is critically established today, against a diverging Christian quotation, there is some chance that this text is Jewish. However, if there is no Christian quote to compare it against, nothing can be deduced, because many 'correct' variants also circulated among Christians.

Of course, a Jewish text would also evolve and typical Jewish variants would circulate. As a result, when one finds an otherwise unattested variant cited by a Jewish character, one must ask oneself if one is not dealing in reality with a Jewish variant. The probabilities for such an origin are higher when the Christian character quotes the same text with another variant (see above) and/or the text betrays some Aquilanic or rabbinic influence.

These meagre possibilities are explored below, after presenting some
'external' features of the Jewish Bible as pictured in polemical dialogues.
This is not a very successful journey, but not a total failure either.

B. External questions: references to the Bible;
polemics against Aquila; the diverging canon

1. An awareness of Jewish Bibles

Unsurprisingly, it was common knowledge among Christian authors that
the Jews owned Bibles and that some of them had a good knowledge of
them. There is an interesting example in the Trophaea Damasci (Troph.
Dam.):[18] the Christian character asks his Jewish opponents to get the Book
of Daniel from the Synagogue;[19] when the book is here, the Jews use it,
then the monk takes it 'and opens it at the tenth vision of Daniel and reads'
from Daniel 9.[20] For the current enquiry, it is interesting to ask, what lan-
guage, from the author's perspective, this Book of Daniel was supposed to
be written in.

The Troph. Dam. is a Greek dialogue, that is explicitly held in Greek.[21]
As a result, all the biblical quotations are in Greek too. According to the
literary setting the Jews are reading from the Bible and not translating
from it, and a very large audience from various beliefs – not just a learned

---

[18] Trophaea Damasci (CPG 7797), ed. G. Bardy, 'Les Trophées de Damas.
Controverse judéo-chrétienne du VIIe siècle,' Patrologia Orientalis 15 (1920), 172–292,
189–284. On this text, Déroche, 'La polémique,' 280; I. Aulisa and C. Schiano, Dialogo
di Papisco e Filone giudei con un monaco. Testo, traduzione e commento (Quaderni di
Vetera Christianorum 30; Bari, 2005), passim, in particular 310–321, 328–339; review by
P. Andrist, forthcoming in Byzantinische Zeitschrift. This text, which mentions the Ar-
abs, has been dated to the seventh century.

[19] Troph. Dam. (3.6.4), 3.7.8–9, 4.2.1–2 (ed. Bardy 247, 253, 262). A similar feature
appears in the related Dialogica Anastasiana (Dial. Anast., CPG 7796; on this name,
Andrist, review of Aulisa, Schiano; ed. Aulisa, Schiano, Dialogo, 181–210), 7.10–11,
(ed. Aulisa, Schiano 187). Interestingly, Augustine relates the story of a bishop who was
forced by his congregation to ask the Jews about the Hebrew reading in Jonah; from the
answer of the Jews, Jerome concludes the latter did not know Hebrew, or lied (manifes-
tum est eos aut Hebraeas litteras ignorare aut... voluisse mentiri); Augustine, Ep. 71.5,
75.21–22 (ed. A. Goldbacher, S. Aureli Augustini Hipponiensis episcopi epistulae; pars 1,
Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 34, 1895), 253, 320–323; = Jerome, Ep.
104.5, 112.21–22 (ed. Isidorus Hilberg, Sancti Eusebii Hieronymi epistulae; pars 2, Cor-
pus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 55, 1912), 241, 391–393.

[20] Troph. Dam. 4.3.1 (ed. Bardy 263).

[21] At the beginning of the second day, the text says that the Jews ask their question in
Greek (Troph. Dam. 2.1.1; ed. Bardy 215; "καὶ γλώττῃ ἑλληνίδι, ἐρωτῶσιν
τοιάδε").

Christian scholar – understands the quotations. This is naturally not proof that, in reality, there were Greek Bibles in the synagogues of the time, but this is how the unknown Christian author presents it. The fact that the quoted Daniel text is Theodotionic is not surprising; most probably it was the standard text for the Christian author,[22] who naturally 'projected' it onto the Bible of the Jewish opponent.

Also in the Dialogue of Gregentius and Herban (Dial. GH),[23] the discussion and the biblical quotations are clearly supposed to be in Greek, as Herban laments:

Dial. GH A.44–45 (ed. Berger 454): 'It was bad that our fathers consented to translate the books of Israel into the elaborated language of the Greeks, so that you employ them to shut us up.'

2. Defending the Septuagint

Even before the period under scrutiny, Justin[24] made a case that the Rabbis rejected the Septuagint, suppressed some verses from the Bible, and kept in the Synagogues unrevised copies of the text.[25] No matter whether Justin's statements are correct or not, this text witnesses to a Christian belief, or awareness, that Jewish Bibles were undergoing revision in the second century.

In a later time, the author of the Dialogue of Timotheus and Aquila (Dial. TA)[26] not only thought that the Jews distorted the Scriptures, but he also felt that the Jews accused the Christians of doing so.

---

[22] Fernández Marcos, The Septuagint, 143–145.

[23] Ps. Gregentius, Disputatio cum Herbano iudaeo (CPG 7009), ed. A. Berger, Life and works of Saint Gregentios, Archbishop of Taphar, Millenium-Studien zu Kultur und Geschichte des ersten Jahrtausends n. Chr. – Millennium Studies in the culture and history of the first millenium C.E. 7; Berlin, New York, 2006), 500–803. The text is attributed a date in the tenth century, cf. Berger, Life, 100–109.

[24] Iustinus Martyr, Dialogus cum Tryphone iudaeo (CPG 1076), ed. P. Bobichon, Justin Martyr. Dialogue avec Tryphon. Édition critique, traduction, commentaire (2 vols.; Paradosis 47; Fribourg, 2003), 1:184–562.

[25] Iustinus, Dialogue, 71–72, ed. Bobichon 378–380. See the commentary of Bobichon, Justin, 2:767–770.

[26] Dialogus Timothei et Aquilae (CPG 7794). The text circulated in various recensions:

a) The versio longior (Dial. TA-long.) was edited by Robertson, The Dialogue, i–cxxix; his text was very usefully published by W. Varner, Ancient Jewish-Christian dialogues: Athanasius and Zacchaeus, Simon and Theophilus, Timothy and Aquila: Introductions, Texts and Translations (Studies in the Bible and early Christianity 58, Lewiston (NY), Queenston (Ontario), 2005), 140–280, without the critical apparatus, but with a translation.

b) A new edtion of the versio brevior (Dial. TA-brev.) was prepared by L. L. Lahey, 'The Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila: critical text and English translation of the short

Dial. TA-long. 39.1–5 (ed. Robertson and trans. Varner in Varner 226–227; cf. Dial. TA-brev. 22.2, ed. Lahey 172–173):

39.1–3. 'The Jew said: You Christians have again distorted the scriptures as you wished! For you have made many points from the books you have brought forth, but these are not contained in the Hebrew but in the Greek only… Have you Christians truly desired to distort the scriptures?

39.4–5. The Christian said: Unawares you have well asked, truly and accurately, about the plot that took place by Aquila the translator against the divine scriptures. Or rather you have brought up the harm unto himself having distorted the divine scriptures and translated them so badly as it seemed good to him. For this Aquila, because he desired to hide the testimonies about the Messiah, learned thoroughly the Hebrew letters and language in the fortieth year of his life, and then distorted the scriptures!'

Dial. TA-long. 40.20 (ed. Robertson and trans. Varner in Varner 234–235):

'The Christian said: … So whenever you find something, whether in the Hebrew (for even there he removed it) or in the Greek that covers up the testimonies to the Messiah, know that such was the scheme of Aquila.'

Interestingly, for the Christian author, the Bible of the Jewish character was primarily a Hebrew one, even though the latter was supposed to know the Greek one too. The Christian character argues that his Jewish opponent was in contact with a Greek Bible influenced by Aquila. However, when the author puts a quotation in the mouth of the Jewish character (whose name is also Aquila, which cannot be unintentional) it is not the version of Aquila but the Septuagint. Such is also the case with the other dialogues. In this section, the author tells the story of the miraculous translation of the 72 translators.[27] This story is frequently found in the apologetical and the

---

recension with an introduction including a source-critical study' (Ph.D. diss., Cambridge, 2000), 106–186 (publication forthcoming).

c) For other possible versions of this text, P. Andrist, 'Un témoin oublié du Dialogue de Timothée et Aquila et des Anastasiana antiiudaica (Sinaiticus gr. 399),' Byzantion 75 (2005), 9–24, below, this important manuscript is abbreviated 'S'; P. Andrist, 'Trois témoins athonites mal connus des Anastasiana antiiudaica (et du Dialogus Timothei et Aquilae): Lavra Κ 113; Vatopedi 555; Karakallou 60 – Essai sur la tradition des Anastasiana antiiudaica, notamment du Dialogus Papisci et Philonis cum monacho,' Byzantion 76 (2006): 402–422.

d) For a summarised presentation of the current debates and important works of N. Nilson, J. Pastis and L. Lahey, see Varner, Ancient, 4–8, 135–138. The text and its preserved versions are variously attributed a date in to the fifth or the sixth century and, due to the polemics against Aquila, sometimes put in relation with the Novella 146. About the circulation of this text, see P. Andrist, 'Physionomy of Greek manuscript books contra Iudaeos in the Byzantine era, a preliminary survey' to be published in the Proceedings of the Conference 'Christians and Jews in Byzantium, Images and Cultural Dynamics', Jerusalem, 21–24 May 2006 (ed. G. Stroumsa; forthcoming).

[27] The polemics against Aquila covers all of chapters 39–40. On earlier polemics against Aquila, see now also Veltri, Libraries, 163–168.

Contra Iudaeos literature, and is also related in Jewish sources,[28] but it is otherwise not explicitly told in the polemical dialogues.

Another noticeable feature of the Dial. TA lies in its mentioning other Greek translations of the Bible, hidden in wine jars (Dial. TA-long. 3.9–10, quoted below).

Aquila is also attacked in the Anonymus Declerck (Anon. Decl.)[29] as having distorted some Scriptures.[30] The author uses expressions like 'your Aquila' or 'Aquila that is much liked by the Jews'.[31] However, these remarks could be influenced by a Christian tradition, whose success could be due to a famous statement of Origen that the Greek Jews prefer Aquila.[32] Notably, in the Anonymus Declerck the polemic against Aquila is not sharp, even though the Jewish character is also challenged by the Christian character to answer his question by using the version of Aquila.[33] In fact, the author's attitude is to demonstrate that the 'Christian truth' can be proved whatever version is used. This is probably why he also sometimes presents variants from Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion.[34]

Incidentally, Aquila is also mentioned once in a polemical dialogue Contra Iudaeos in the Slavonic Vita Constantini.[35]

---

[28] G. M. Vian, 'Le versioni greche della Scrittura nella polemica tra giudei e cristiani,' in La Bibbia nella polemica antiebraica (Annali di storia dell'esegesi 14/1; Bologna, 1997), 39–54; Veltri, Libraries, 138–141, Fernández Marcos, The Septuagint, 35–52.

[29] Anonymus Declerck = Anonymus dialogus cum iudaeis (CPG 7803), ed. Declerck, Anonymus, 1–111.

[30] Anon. Decl. V.353–369 (ed. Declerck 44).

[31] Anon. Decl. V.359, IX.253 (ed. Declerck 44, 86).

[32] Origenes, Epistula ad Iulium Africanum de historia Susannae (CPG 1494) 4 (2), ed. N. R. M. de Lange (Sources Chrétiennes 302; Paris, 1983) 526: 'Οὕτω γὰρ Ἀκύλας δουλεύων τῇ Ἑβραϊκῇ λέξει ἐκδέδωκεν εἰπών· φιλοτιμότερον πεπιστευμένος παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις ἡρμηνευκέναι τὴν Γραφήν· ᾧ μάλιστα εἰώθασι οἱ ἀγνοοῦντες τὴν Ἑβραίων διάλεκτον χρῆσθαι, ὡς πάντων μᾶλλον ἐπιτετευγμένῳ.' It would be a methodological mistake to consider the testimony of Origen, that certainly reflects the situation in Cesarea in the middle of the third century, as necessarily reflecting the stance of all the Jewish communities in all the Byzantine empire from the third century on.

[33] Anon. Decl. V.366–369 (ed. Declerck 44). An echo with the Novella 146 of Justinian is probable, no matter what the final interpretation of this law is, since several other features of the Anon. Decl. also point to the second half of the sixth century (Declerck, Anonymus, xlii–li). The link with the Novella is discussed on p. xlviii–xlix. This Dialogue is the only known witness for the Aquilanic translation of Is. 8.3.

[34] Declerck, Anonymus, xxviii, xxxiii–xxxiv, xlviii–xlix.

[35] Vita Constantini Thessalonicensis (=Cyrilli) 9, ed. A. Vaillant, Textes vieux-slaves (2 vols.; Textes publiés par l'Institut d'Études slaves 8; Paris, 1968; ed. 1:1–40; trans. 2:1–25); 1:16 (2:11).

3. The Canon

From the polemical dialogues, can we learn which books were contained in
the Jewish Greek Bible? (About their order not enough is currently known,
and so this question cannot be addressed here.)

It is common knowledge that the Christian Greek canon of the First Tes-
tament contains books that are not in the Hebrew canon, such as Tobit or
the Wisdom of Solomon. How these books came to be inserted into the
Septuagint is not our concern. The question is rather whether any of the
polemical dialogues betrays an awareness of any discrepancy between the
Jewish Hebrew and the Christian Greek Canon. Some examples of the data
from the dialogues are presented below.

a) The book list in the Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila

In the Dial. TA, the Christian character gives a list of the books of the First
Testament and points out the 'apocryphal books' (ἀπόκρυφα βιβλία =
deuterocanonical). The Jewish character does not contradict him. Here are
the relevant quotations (see also above):

Dial. TA-long. 3.7–18 (ed. Robertson and trans. Varner in Varner 142–145, emphasis
mine):

3.7. 'The Jew said: From what books do you wish to do this debate with me?

3.8. The Christian said: I mentioned this to you because there are also some other
apocryphal books.

3.9–10. For there are the ones that are in the Divine Covenant, which also the Hebrew
translators translated, and Aquila, and Symmachus and Theodotion. Two other versions
were also found hidden[36] in wine jars. One was in Jericho and the other was in Nicopolis,
which is Emmaus. Who the translators were we do not know, for they were found in the
days of the destruction of Judea that took place under Vespasian.[37]

3.11–16. These, then, are the divinely inspired books, both among Christians and
among Hebrews. The first is the Book of Genesis. The second is Exodus. The third is
Leviticus. The fourth is Numbers. These are the ones dictated through the mouth of God
and written by the hand of Moses. And the fifth is the Book of Deuteronomy, not dictated
through the mouth of God but was the law given a second time (δευτερονομηθέν)
through Moses. (Therefore, it was not placed in the aron, that is, the Ark of the Cove-
nant). This is the Mosaic Pentateuch. The sixth is Joshua, son of Nun. The seventh is the
Judges along with Ruth. The eighth book is the 'Things that are left,' first and second.
Ninth is the Book of Kingdoms, first and second. Tenth is the third and fourth Book of
Kingdoms. Eleventh is Job. Twelfth is the Psalter of David. Thirteenth is the Proverbs of
Solomon. Fourteenth is Ecclesiastes along with the Canticles. Fifteenth is the Twelve
Prophets, then Isaiah, Jeremiah. And again, Ezekiel, then Daniel and again, Esdras, twen-
tieth.

---

[36] The versio brevior (Dial. TA-brev. 6.3; ed. Lahey 110–111), which merely speaks
of something 'hidden', is best understood by presupposing a text close to the versio
longior.

[37] The versio brevior (Dial. TA-brev. 6.3; ed. Lahey 112–113) adds 'I reject these'.

3.17. The twenty first is the book of Judith. Twenty second is Esther. For Tobit and the Wisdom of Solomon and the Wisdom of Jesus Son of Sirach, the 72 translators handed down to us as apocryphal books.

3.18. These twenty two books are the inspired and canonical ones. There are twenty seven, but are numbered as twenty two, because five of them are doubled. And they are numbered according to the letters of the Hebrew alphabet, and all the rest of them belong to the apocrypha.'

Here is the last part of this statement in the versio brevior (TA-brev. 6.4, ed. Lahey 112–113):

'Timothy says: …But the God-inspired books are these which are honoured among Hebrews and Christians: First Genesis… Ezra, Judith, Esther, Tobit.'

In the versio longior the book of Judith is included among the authoritative books, while Tobit and the two books of wisdom are excluded.[38] In the versio brevior the latter two books are not mentioned, while Judith and Tobit are included in the list without any particular comment. However, as far as one knows, there was no debate among the Jews in the Byzantine period about Judith or Tobit, which were clearly not considered scriptural.

Does this list teach us anything about the Byzantine Jewish Greek Bible? Probably not. Instead, the lists teach us something about what the author of the Dial. TA[39] knew about the Jewish canon of his time. Probably whoever was responsible for the versio longior (or his source) was aware of differences between the Jewish and the Christian canon, but his knowledge was not entirely accurate.

There is no such list in the other preserved polemical dialogues of the time.

b) Some examples about the book of Baruch

In the Dialogue of Athanasius and Zacchaeus (Dial. AZ),[40] the characters disagree about the author of the book of Baruch:

---

[38] Later in the text, the Christian character quotes from apocryphal books, for example from the Wisdom of Solomon or the Book of Sirah, see Dial. TA-long. 10.30–31, 24.6 (ed. Robertson in Varner 162, 194); incidentally, in the Dial. TA-long. 9.12–13 (ed. Robertson in Varner 156), Aquila rejects an explanation of Timothy, because it derives from the Testament of Solomon.

[39] And/or the author of his sources, and/or the copyist, and/or whoever was responsible for the various versions.

[40] Ps. Athanasius Alexandrinus, Dialogus Athanasii et Zacchaei (CPG 2301), ed. Andrist, Le Dialogue, 27–61 (improved publication forthcoming in the Corpus Christianorum); older ed., F. C. Conybeare, The Dialogues of Athanasius and Zacchaeus and of Timothy and Aquila (Anecdota Oxoniensia, Classical Series, Part VIII, Oxford, 1898), 1–64, reprinted, with a translation, by Varner, Ancient, 22–84. The text is attributed a date at the end of the fourth century, see P. Andrist, Les protagonistes égyptiens du débat apollinariste. Le Dialogue d'Athanase et Zachée et les dialogues pseudoathanasiens –

Dial. AZ 24–25 (ed. Andrist 34; trans. Varner 35, with slight modifications here):

24. 'Zacchaeus said: And the wisdom of God – was she seen upon earth?

Athanasius said: And why should this be strange? Hear Jeremiah speaking: "This is our God; no other can be compared to him! He found the whole way to knowledge… Afterward he appeared upon earth and lived among men" (Bar 3:35–38).

25. Zacchaeus said: That was not written in Jeremiah!

Athanasius said: Read the Epistle of Baruch so that you will know and believe that it was so written.

Zacchaeus said: I know that it is written in that epistle, but it was not written in Jeremiah.

Athanasius: Jeremiah along with Baruch and the Lamentations and the Epistle are written in one book. And the four of these books are named "Jeremiah".'

As there is a parallel text in the Dial. TA-long., one may assume that this story comes from a common source, provisionally named TAZ:[41]

Dial. TA-long 10.5–10 (ed. Robertson and trans. Varner in Varner 158–161; not quoted in Dial. TA-brev.):

'The Christian said: … (10.5) And concerning his incarnation, the same Jeremiah said, "This is our God, no other shall be compared to him. He searched out all the way of knowledge. And he gave to Jacob his servant and to Israel his beloved, and after these things he was seen on earth and dwelt among men" (Bar 3:36–38)…

10.7. The Jew said: The things that you just said are not written in Jeremiah!

10.8. The Christian said: They are in the epistle of Baruch.

10.9. The Jew said: This is so.

10.10. The Christian said: But the epistle of Baruch, and the Lamentations of Jeremiah, and his prophecy are generally designated as one book.'

TAZ is necessarily earlier than the Dial. AZ, which was most probably composed at the end of the fourth century. As there is no clear terminus post quem, it is not impossible that the underlying work dates from before the Byzantine period. However, the author of the common source, or someone deeper in the source chain, was aware that the Jews (or at least the Jews he knew of) did not have Baruch in their canon. What happened at the beginning of this chain? Was the author of this first source referring to the Hebrew canon, or to a Jewish Greek Canon? How did he get this piece of information? Even though it is difficult to answer these questions, this discussion tells us something about the Jewish Greek Bible in the source TAZ, and also about the awareness of such a question by both the authors of the Dial. AZ and the Dial. TA.

In other places, the Jewish character is sometimes portrayed quoting from deuterocanonical books. This is for example the case in Dial. GH,

---

intertextualité et polémique religieuse en Egypte vers la fin du IVe siècle, Recherches Augustiniennes 34 (2005), 63–141, 92–93, 121.

[41] On this source, Andrist, Le Dialogue, 179–184; see also Lahey, The Dialogue, 75–80.

where the Jewish character quotes from Bar 4:4 under the name of Jeremiah.[42]

Dial. GH Γ.629–631 (ed. Berger 636–637): 'Herban: … and we are intimate friends of God according to what has been said by Jeremiah: 'We are blessed, he says, Israel, for the things pleasing to God are known to us' (Bar 4:4), and not, as it appears clearly, to the nations'.

Similarly, in Troph. Dam. 1.2.3 (ed. Bardy 196) the Jewish character quotes from Bar 3:36. In the Doctrina Iacobi (Doctr. Iac.)[43] Baruch is used un-problematically by Jacob, the pro-Christian Jewish character, but there is a reaction from Joustos when he uses the Wisdom of Solomon or the agraphon of Mt 27:3.[44]

All these cases are better explained by admitting that these authors were not aware of any problem with the book of Baruch than by assuming an underlying Greek Jewish canon. The authors were disconnected from the reality of their time and these quotations do not increase our knowledge about the Greek Bible of the Jews in the Byzantine Empire.

C. Parallel quotations

The following examples illustrate various cases where a biblical reference is quoted by both the Jewish and the Christian characters with noticeable variants in the same text. Only quotations with several words and no obvious paraphrastic renderings are considered here.

In reality, there is not much material to be compared, for several reasons: firstly, the Jewish character usually quotes a much smaller number of biblical verses than his Christian opponent and a good number of them are not common with the latter's quotations. Secondly, when they do quote the

---

[42] See also Dial. GH Δ.34 (ed. Berger 660), where Herban pretends quoting from Sirach but in reality cites Isaiah (it is generally admitted, that this type of errors are more frequent when an author deals with Testimonia [to be put in italics?]); Dial. GH Δ.111 (ed. Berger 666) where Herban quotes from Bar 4:3.

[43] Doctrina Iacobi nuper baptizati (CPG 7793), ed. V. Déroche, Travaux et Mémoires 11 (1991), 70–219; commentary by G. Dagron and V. Déroche, Travaux et Mémoires 11 (1991), 230–273. Their dating of the text about 640, as suggested by the text itself, a few years after the forced baptism of the Jews by Heraclius in 632, is accepted here as the best explanation for the context of its production. For another interpretation, P. Speck, 'Die Doctrina Iacobi nuper Baptizati', in P. Speck, Varia VI, Beiträge zum Thema Byzantinische Feindseligkeit gegen die Juden im frühen siebten Jahrhundert (ποικιλα βυζαντινα 15; Bonn, 1997), 267–439.

[44] Doctr. Iac. 4.4.35–41 about Wisd 5:4–6, Doctr. Iac. 5.10.10 about Wisd 4:19, Doctr. Iac. 5.14.8 about the agraphon of Jeremiah from Mt 27:9 (ed. Déroche 179, 199, 205).

same text, they normally quote it without significant variants, even when the common text bears major textual peculiarities when compared to the standard biblical text(s). This feature tends to demonstrate that most of the time the Christian author was not making a difference between the Bibles of his Jewish and his Christian characters. Finally, there are also divergent quotations that are difficult to interpret.

The amount of comparable material varies greatly in the various texts. In the Dial. TA, for example, once allusions, paraphrases, unclear or small quotations are excluded, only 4–5 parallel biblical passages can be used. However, in other texts, when the characters discuss at length the interpretation of some verses, they often both quote the same verse. As a result, there are about 23 usable parallels quotations in the Dial. AZ and about 30 usable parallel quotations in the Dial. GH.

Four cases of diverging parallel quotations are presented below.

Case C.1: Is 53:3b

a) MT:[45] '… he was a man of sorrows (אִישׁ מַכְאֹבוֹת) and acquainted with grief…'

b) LXX[46] (ed. Ziegler 321): '… he was a man in suffering (ἄνθρωπος ἐν πληγῇ ὤν), and acquainted with the bearing of sickness…'

d) Dial. AZ 39 (ed. Andrist 38; Athanasius, the Christian character) = LXX.

c) Dial. AZ 40 (ed. Andrist 39; Zacchaeus): '… he was a man in honour (ἄνθρωπος ἐν τιμῇ ὤν), and acquainted with the bearing of sickness…'

All the Greek witnesses of the Dial. AZ have this variant, but it is not reported among the witnesses of Is 53:3. Could it be of Jewish origin? Or is it rather influenced by the following Psalm?

e) Ps 48:13, 21 LXX[47] (ed. Rahlfs 159, 160; =Ps 49 MT): '… a man in honour (ἄνθρωπος ἐν τιμῇ ὤν) understands not…'

When one knows how important the Psalms were in the Christian liturgy, on a daily basis, one may reasonably think that the author, his source, or an early copyist confused the texts. A definite answer is difficult to give, but, unless parallels are found in Jewish literature of the time, it is difficult to argue that the author deliberately put a Jewish variant into the mouth of Zacchaeus.

Case C.2: Is 7:14

a) MT: '…behold, the virgin shall conceive (הָרָה) and bear a Son…'

b) LXX (ed. Ziegler 147): '…behold, the virgin shall have (ἕξει) in the womb, and shall bring forth a son…'

---

[45] Meaningful variants in witnesses are mentioned in the commentary.

[46] Ed. J. Ziegler, Isaias (3d ed.; Septuaginta 14; Göttingen, 1983).

[47] Ed. A. Rahlfs, Psalmi cum Odis (Septuaginta 10; Göttingen, 1931).

c) Dial. TA-long. 8.5, 18.10, 26.6, 34.14 (ed. Robertson in Varner 156, 180, 196, 216; the Christian): = LXX. – Also in the manuscript S of the Dial. TA.

d) Dial. TA-long. 18.6 (ed. Robertson in Varner 180; the Jew): '…behold, the virgin shall be taken (λήψεται) in the womb, and shall bring forth a son…' – Also in S; well attested in the Origenic, Lucianic and in the chains witnesses of Is 7:14.

e) Dial. TA-brev. 17.6 (ed. Lahey 156; corresponding with TA-long. 18.10; Timothy): '…behold, the virgin shall be taken (λήψεται) in the womb, and shall bring forth a son…'

Considering the versio longior one is tempted to see ἕξει as a Christian variant, attested four times, and λήψεται as a Jewish variant, even though the versio brevior gives the Christian character the variant λήψεται. However, even if the difference also exists in the original form of the Dialogue, one does not see how the common λήψεται could be considered as a Jewish variant solely on this basis.

Case C.3: Is 10:17

a) MT: 'And the light of Israel shall be for a fire,
and his Holy One for a flame (וּקְדוֹשׁוֹ לְלֶהָבָה):
and it shall burn (וּבָעֲרָה)
and devour his thorns and his briers in one day (וְאָכְלָה שִׁיתוֹ וּשְׁמִירוֹ בְּיוֹם אֶחָד).'

b) LXX (ed. Ziegler 162): 'And the light of Israel shall be for (εἰς) a fire,
and he shall sanctify him with burning fire (καὶ ἁγιάσει αὐτὸν ἐν πυρὶ καιομένῳ)
and it shall devour the wood as grass (…ὡσεὶ χόρτον τὴν ὕλην).'

The Hebrew and Greek agree in the first part of the quotation; then the LXX introduces the idea of a sanctification through fire that corresponds with the Hebrew second and third parts; in the final parts, they diverge on 3 points: what is devoured; the Greek makes a comparison between wood and grass; the Hebrew mentions 'the day'.

c) Dial. GH Γ.160–163,165–166 (ed. Berger 604); Gregentios, the Christian character): 'And the light of Israel shall be like (ὡς) a fire,
and he shall sanctify him with a burning flame (ἐν φλογὶ καιομένη)
and it shall burn (καὶ φλέξει)
and it shall devour the wood as grass.'

In the second part, the Greek text of the Christian character keeps the idea of the sanctification but 'with a burning flame'; this recalls the 'flame' of the MT and is a frequent variant in the Fathers and in the LXX manuscripts, particularly in the Lucianic tradition. Like the Hebrew and the Lucianic tradition, 'it shall burn' is read. The end corresponds with the LXX. One gets the feeling of a mixture of features from the MT and the LXX.

d) Dial. GH Γ.90–91 (ed. Berger 598; Herban):
'And in the last day (τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ), the light of Israel shall be like a fire,

and God shall sanctify him with a burning flame,
and it shall burn
and it shall devour the wood as grass.'

In general, the Greek text cited by the Jewish character matches the main features of the Greek text by the Christian character. As the author might be using here a lost commentary of Isaiah,[48] there is a very good chance that he would get the Greek text from this source rather than from his Bible or out of memory. As a result, one tends to believe this possible commentary was based on a Lucianic text type.

However, one notes two differences between Gregentios and Herban's quotations: at the beginning, Herban adds 'in the last days'; then he clearly insists that God himself shall sanctify him. No other Greek witnesses of Is 10:17 are reported containing these variants. Where do they come from?

Firstly, the idea of the 'the days' is found in the Hebrew, at the end of the verse, and later in the Greek, on verse 20. More importantly, Herban, in the context, says that the prophecy is yet to be accomplished. The phrase 'in the last day' can be understood as an explanation and not a formal quotation, and the English translator rightly did not write it in italic characters. The word 'God' plays the same role: God himself will sanctify Israel.

As the differences can be satisfactorily explained by the context and the chances that the author added genuine Jewish variants to his commentary source are very low, it is not possible to consider these two variants as witnessing to a Jewish Bible text type.

Case C.4: Is 11:12

a) MT: 'He shall set up a banner for the nations, and shall assemble the outcasts (נִדְחֵי) of Israel...'

b) LXX (ed. Ziegler 167): 'And he shall lift up a sign for the nations, and he shall gather the lost ones (τοὺς ἀπολομένους) of Israel…'

c) Dial. GH B.665, 689 (ed. Berger 546, 548; Gregentios): 'And he shall lift up a sign for the nations, and he shall gather the rejected ones (τοὺς ἀπωσμένους) of Israel…'

d) Dial. GH B.648 (ed. Berger 546; Herban): 'And he shall lift up a sign for the nations, and he shall gather those who perish (τοὺς ἀπολλυμένους) of Israel…'

Both the Jewish and the Christian characters diverge from the standard LXX text and they also diverge from one another. Besides, manuscripts of the Dial. GH themselves diverge concerning the Herban and Gregentios text. In five manuscripts, Herban speaks of 'the rejected ones', like Gregentios. Also several manuscripts of B.689 give Gregentios the variant 'those who perish'. Gregentios's variant is not reported among other LXX witnesses. It is quoted twice the same way, and this can hardly be seen as

---

[48] Berger, Life, 127.

happening by chance. It could be an influence of the MT, which it is closer to. But it recalls also the following text, from a similar context:

e) Mic 4:7,[49] LXX (ed. Ziegler 215): 'And I will make her that was bruised a remnant, and her that was rejected (τὴν ἀπωσμένην) a mighty nation…'

Paradoxically, as the Christian character presents a variant close to the MT, the Jewish characters variant is attested in some Bible manuscripts and in the Catenae. One would like again to know which reading was in the Isaiah commentary used by the author. Does Herban's variant match this commentary, and Gregentios's variant derive twice from Micah? Or, was Gregentios's variant copied twice from the lost commentary and the Herban one quoted by heart? More importantly, would anyone argue that the Christian author consciously put a MT variant in the mouth of the Christian character and left a frequent LXX variant in the mouth of the Jewish character, in a place where it does not play much a role in the discussion? Here again it is hard to recognise a Jewish variant in Herban's quotation.

As the four examples illustrate, divergent parallel quotations are not easy to interpret. We have so far not found any such place where we could honestly convince ourselves that we might be in the presence of some genuine reading from a Jewish Greek Bible.

D. Peculiar readings

In non-paralleled biblical quotations by the Hebrew character, one observes a whole range of phenomena, from standard quotations to strange variants.

Case D.1: Is 11:11

a) MT: '…from Egypt, and from Pathros, and from Cush, and from Elam, and from Shinar, and from Hamath, and from the islands of the sea.'

b) LXX (ed. Ziegler 167): '…from Egypt, and from the country of Babylon, and from Ethiopia, and from the Elamites, and from the rising of the sun, and out of Arabia.'

c) Dial. GH B.646 (ed. Berger 546; Herban): '…from Egypt, from Babylon and Ethiopia, from the Elamites and from the rising sun, and out of Arabia and from the islands of the sea.'

Herban's text mixes features from the Hebrew and the Greek. This is similar to the case C.3 above, where the quotations by the two characters presented the same feature. As these variants are also found in Lucianic

---

[49] Ed. J. Ziegler, Duodecim prophetae (3d ed.; Septuaginta 13; Göttingen, 1984).

manuscripts, one feels again that such would be the text type of the possibly underlying Christian commentary.

Case D.2: Mic 5:2 (=5:1 in ed. Rahlfs)

a) MT: 'But you, Bethlehem Ephrathah, though you are little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of you shall come forth to me the one to be a ruler in Israel, whose goings forth are from of old, from everlasting.'

b) LXX (ed. Ziegler 217): close to the MT. Small variants include 'house of Ephrathah' at the beginning.

c) Troph. Dam. 1.4.7 (ed. Bardy 204; the Jew): 'But you, Bethlehem, house of Ephrathah, though you are little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of you shall come forth to me a leader, who will shepherd my people Israel.'

This variant is simply explained by New Testament influence:

d) Mt 2:6:[50] 'But you, Bethlehem, in the land of Judah, are not the least among the rulers of Judah; for out of you shall come a leader, who will shepherd my people Israel.'

This is part of an ironical situation, where the Jews is pictured as knowing very well one prophecy considered major by the Christians. However, it is interesting that only the third major variant from Matthews's text is quoted by the Jews, while the first two ones are omitted. No other Greek witness of Mic 5:2 is reported containing this text. Rather than a Jewish variant, the text may reflects that the Christian author of the Trophaea was somewhat aware that the Matthew quotation was problematic.

Case D.3: Is 44:14–17

a) MT: 'He cuts down cedars for himself, and takes the cypress and the oak; he secures it for himself among the trees of the forest. He plants a pine, and the rain nourishes it. (15) Then it shall be for a man to burn, for he will take some of it and warm himself; yes, he kindles it and bakes bread; indeed he makes a god and worships it; he makes it a carved image, and falls down to it. (16) He burns half of it in the fire; with this half he eats meat; he roasts a roast, and is satisfied. He even warms himself and says, "Ah! I am warm, I have seen the fire." (17) And the rest of it he makes into a god, his carved image. He falls down before it and worships it, prays to it and says, "Deliver me, for you are my god!" '

b) LXX (ed. Ziegler 287–288): 'He cuts wood out of the forest, which the Lord planted, even a pine tree, and the rain made it grow, (15) that it might be for men to burn: and having taken part of it he warms himself; yea, they burn part of it, and bake loaves thereon; and of the rest they make for themselves gods, and they worship them. (16) Half thereof he burns in the fire, and with half of it he bakes loaves on the coals; and having roasted flesh on it he eats, and is satisfied, and having warmed himself he says, "I am comfortable, for I have warmed myself, and have seen the fire". (17) And the rest he makes a graven god, and worships, and prays, saying, "Deliver me; for thou art my God".'

---

[50] Ed. "Nestle Aland", Novum Testamentum Graece (27th ed.; Stuttgart, 1993).

c) Troph. Dam. 3.6.1 (ed. Bardy 245; the Jew): 'Since you are quoting Isaiah back and forth… He says about you the gentiles: "I am the Lord who makes to grow all the trees of the field. But you, you cut a tree; half of it you give to the fire; the other half you tread down with your feet; with the last half (!) you make an image and you worship it".'

The Jews in Troph. Dam. clearly refer to Isaiah, but no verse of Isaiah has such a text, literally. As the editor already saw, Is 44:14–17 is the only place in Isaiah that would substantially correspond with the quoted text, and one recognises some elements from the Septuagint. However, there is no reason to consider it a Jewish variant rather than a convenient summary.

Case D.4: a composite quotation

a) Dial. TA-long. 37.2 (ed. Robertson in Varner 222; the Jew): 'The Lord God said: "Whoever breaks this my covenant will certainly die, for he has broken my covenant".' Minor difference in S. Not found in the versio brevior.

'Whoever breaks this my covenant' (ὃς ἂν διασκεδάσει τὴν διαθήκην μου ταύτην):

Curses on whoever breaks the covenant are found in several places in the First Testament, but never with this expression. There is one sentence in the LXX where a punishment is promised to whoever breaks the covenant, with comparable vocabulary, in Lev 26:15; however it is constructed with the infinitive mood (ὥστε διασκεδάσαι τὴν διαθήκην μου) and the punishment is not a death penalty here. Overall, the same expression with other moods or tenses occurs 12 times in the Septuagint.

'will certainly die' (θανάτῳ ἀποθανεῖται):

The death penalty occurs frequently in the First Testament, sometimes linked to the idea of breaking the covenant (see Lev 26:27; Prov 2:17) but the expressions are very different. Formally, the expression θανάτῳ ἀποθανεῖται occurs three times, in different contexts (Judges 21:5; 1Reg.LXX=1Sam.MT 14:39, 2Reg.LXX=2Sam.MT 12:14). Similar expressions with other moods or tenses are frequent. This second verse recalls somewhat another quote in the Dial. TA.

1Reg (=1Sam) 14:39 LXX[51] (ed. Rahlfs, Hanhart 528): 'if answer should be against my son Jonathan, he shall surely die'.

'for he has broken my covenant' (ὅτι τὴν διαθήκην μου διεσκέδασεν).

A parallel expression occurs at the end of the circumcision commandment:

Gen 17:14 LXX[52] (ed. Wevers 179): 'And the uncircumcised male, who shall not be circumcised in the flesh of his foreskin on the eighth day, that soul shall be utterly de-

---

[51] Ed. A. Rahlfs, Septuaginta (2d ed. by Robert Hanhart; Stuttgart, 2006).
[52] Ed. J. W. Wevers, Genesis (Septuaginta 1; Göttingen, 1974).

stroyed (ἐξολεθρευθήσεται) from its family, for he has broken my covenant (ὅτι τὴν διαθήκην μου διεσκέδασεν).

Overall the sentence recalls common expressions in the Torah that say, 'Whoever does this and that shall die' (see Ex 21:11–17; Lev 20:11–12 etc.). As a result, Dial. TA 37.2 can be seen as a composite quotation based on a common First Testament sentence structure.

'Whoever': general structure.
'breaks this my covenant': adapted frequent expression, see in particular Lev 26:15.
'will certainly die': other adapted frequent expressions, see above.
'for he has broken my covenant': from Gen 17:14.

Nothing makes one think here of a Jewish Biblical quote. More probably, the author, or someone in his sources, faked a Biblical verse.

Case D.5: agrapha

Sometimes one faces quotations which do not seem to come from the Bible. For example:

Troph. Dam. 2.8.2 (ed. Bardy 234; a priest of Jerusalem): 'You won, but "it is not good for the winner to wage a war", says God.'
Dial. GH B.414–415 (ed. Berger 528; Herban): 'Behold, does Moses not also say, "Perish you that do not hold up the law for their help".'

Where do these pseudo-verses come from? It is difficult to say. In polemical dialogues composite Scriptures and agrapha are not peculiar to the Jewish characters. Although they are fairly frequent in the literature Contra Iudaeos, they are also found in many other texts.[53] This is why one is very reluctant to recognise any Jewish biblical element in them.

E. Discussed Biblical variants

Seldom, the Jewish and the Christian characters disagree not only on the interpretation of a verse, but also on its content, as the following examples illustrate.

Case E.1: Is 7:14 in the Anon. Decl. V.263

a) MT: '… behold, the young woman (הָעַלְמָה) shall conceive and bear a Son…'
b) LXX (ed. Ziegler 147): '… behold, the virgin (παρθένος) shall have in the womb, and shall bring forth a son…'

---

[53]See for example A. Resch, Agrapha, Aussercanonische Schriftfragmente (Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur 30, 2/2, 1906). This list must now be completed by many new items to be found in publications about specific works.

c) Anon. Decl. 5.263 (ed. Declerck 41; the Jew): 'Our manuscripts do not have: "Behold the virgin" (παρθένος), but "Behold the young woman" (νεᾶνις). This is also the rendering of the Hebrew, of Aquila and of Symmacus.'

In this text, the sentence makes more sense if the author assumes the Jewish character uses a Septuagint. Unsurprisingly, the Christian character defends a LXX variant while his Jewish opponent defends Aquila's variant.

However, one cannot draw any conclusion from this exchange, because it is a cliché in Christian literature that the Jews rendered Is 7:14 with 'νεᾶνις'.[54] Was there ever a Septuagint manuscript with such a reading? The apparatus criticus of the current Göttingen edition of the Septuagint does not mention any.

Case E.2: Gen. 19:24 in Dial. AZ 15

a) MT: 'Then the Lord rained brimstone and fire on Sodom and Gomorrah, from the Lord out of the heavens.'

b) LXX: 'And the Lord rained on Sodom and Gomorrha brimstone and fire from the Lord out of heaven.' – A series of manuscripts read 'And the Lord God…'

c) Dial. AZ 15 (ed. Andrist 31; trans. Varner 29, with slight differences)

'Athanasius said: The scripture also says: "And the Lord God rained on Sodom and Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the Lord out of heaven. And he overthrew these cities, and all the surrounding country". Then from what Lord did the Lord God rain brimstone and fire on Sodom and Gomorrah?

Zacchaeus said: It does not say that "The Lord God rained" but "The Lord rained".'

Athanasius: Many more of the copies (τὰ πλείονα τῶν ἀντιγράφων) have: "Lord God". Let us grant that "God" is not added…'

The verse is quoted in the parallel passage in the Dial. TA (TA-long. 6.9), and later in the debate (Dial. TA-long. 28.44). No manuscript of this text adds 'God' at this place, and this variant is not discussed by the characters. It could be a peculiarity of the author of the Dial. AZ.

More interestingly, both variants are transmitted in the manuscripts of the Septuagint, and the variant defended by the Jewish character is today considered the ancient one. As explained above this kind of situation is fitting for an intra-Jewish transmission of the Bible. However, we cannot reach any sound conclusion again, because, contrary to what Athanasius claims, most of the manuscripts do not read 'God' at this place, and it is not possible to think that all these manuscripts are Jewish. Besides, it is difficult to deduce what was in the source TAZ here. According to a possible scenario, TAZ could be without 'God' here (see Dial. TA) and the fairly learned author of the Dial. AZ himself added the discussion.

---

[54] For testimonies in early Christian litterature, see Bobichon, Justin, 2:702 n. 18. In other polemical dialogues, see Dial. AZ 32a, Dial. TA-long. 34.14–15, Dial. TA-brev. 17, Troph. Dam. 1.5.3 etc.

Case E.3: Ps 118:27 MT = 117:27 LXX, in the Troph. Dam. and the Dial. Anast.[55]

a) MT: 'God is the Lord, and he has given us light (וַיָּאֶר-לָנוּ).'

The apparatus criticus of the BHS says that one manuscript, the Peshitta, the Targum and the Old Latin omit the copula, so that one should perhaps read יָאֶר.[56] This would allow us to read the jussive mood: 'Let the Lord God appear to us' or 'May the Lord God shine upon us' (like Driver). Incidentally, this could be an influence of the frequent blessing 'The Lord make His face shine…' (Num 6:25; Ps 67:2; 80:4, 8, 20; 119:13 etc.).

b) LXX (ed. Ziegler 287): 'God is the Lord, and he has appeared (ἐπέφανεν ἡμῖν) to us'.
c) Troph. Dam. 1.6.1 (ed. Bardy 208):
'The Christian: … God is the Lord, and he has appeared (ἐπέφανεν) to us.
The Jew: "He will appear to us (ἐπιφανεῖ)", he says, and not, "he has appeared"…'

The variant 'He will appear' is not mentioned in the apparatus of the Septuagint, or in the Bodmer manuscript of the Psalm. It does not seem to be known to the Christian Fathers either.

d) Dial. Anast. 8 (ed. Aulisa, Schiano 188):
'The Christian: …God is the Lord, and he has appeared to us (ἐπέφανεν).
The Jews started to shout, "Let him appear to us (ἐπιφάνηθι)", he says. It is something future (μελλητικόν ἐστιν).'[57] – Among the oldest witnesses of the Dial. Anast, manuscript D omits 'Let him appear to us'.

The variant 'Let him appear to us (ἐπιφάνηθι)' is not mentioned either in the apparatus of the Septuagint or in the Bodmer manuscript of the Psalm. It does not seem to be known to the Christian Fathers either. However, it strikingly matches the jussive variant of the Hebrew. This can hardly be fortuitous and it is difficult to believe that the author or his source invented it.

We have a strong impression here of authentic Jewish Greek Biblical material. Did someone, maybe in the seventh century, argue with a Jew

---

[55] I thank Thomas Römer, Alessandra Lukinovich and Shifra Sznol for their precious inputs while studying this variant.

[56] D. Barthélemy, Psaumes (Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament 4, =Orbis biblicus et Orientalis 50, 4; ed. S. D. Ryan and A. Schenker; Fribourg, 2005), 775–776; G. R. Driver, 'Ps 118:27 חגירוסא,' Textus 7 (1969): 130–31, Driver states than another Hebrew manuscript supports the jussive mode, even though it includes the copula; H.-J. Kraus, Psalmen 60–150, vol. 2 of Psalmen (6th ed.; Biblischer Kommentar. Altes Testament 15.2; Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1989), 977; K. Seybold, Die Psalmen (Handbuch zum Alten Testament 1/15; Tübingen, 1996), 458. Latin version, without a copula, published by P. Sabatier, Bibliorum Sacrorum Latinae versiones antiquae, seu vetus Italica et caeterae quaecunque in codicibus mss.... (3 vols.; Reims, 1743; repr. Turnhout, 1987), 2:231.

[57] Aulisa, Schiano, Dialogo, 236.

about Psalm 117, and learn that his opponent was reading that verse with a difference in the word? Or did a converted Jew remember the reading of the Psalm as he used to know it? It is obviously impossible to answer these questions, but the first option seems to be more probable. Thus, if this lesson was transmitted through a direct contact between a Christian and a Jew, it can hardly be argued that they discussed in Hebrew; the Jew would have given the Greek translation ἐπιφάνηθι. Unfortunately, it is not possible to know if he made the translation for the occasion, or if this was the rendering of his Greek Bible, the Septuagint or another translation.

Besides Troph. Dam. and Dial. Anast. are parallel texts here. However, their different renderings of the reaction of the Jewish character about Ps 118:27 does not shed light on which text has to be given priority. If the author of the Troph. Dam. had before his eyes the Dial. Anast. or a common source with a similar text, he might have interpreted μελλητικόν grammatically and 'established' the variant ἐπιφανεῖ on this basis. On the other hand, one might also think of an original 'He will appear to us. It is something future', that was then modified, upon some unassessable Jewish influence, to 'Let him appear to us. It is something future'.

Conclusion

As already mentioned several times, it is not easy to identify authentic Jewish material in polemical dialogues with any certainty. The difficulties are not just methodological, as many technical obstacles also hinder progress: critical editions of many books of the Greek Bible and of many dialogues are still lacking. The manuscript tradition of several dialogues is poor; as the copyists tended to normalise the Biblical quotations according to their authoritative text, many peculiar features of these quotations are probably lost. The dating of the dialogues and the analysis of their sources is often unsatisfactory too. Finally it was in the apologists' best interest to conceal the differences between the Hebrew and the Greek texts, since such differences would weaken the strength of their biblical arguments.

As expected, the harvest is meagre. Most of the time in polemical dialogues Contra Iudaeos the Bible of the Jewish characters matches the Christian Bible of the author. The surprise is that, in spite of this fact and of the many technical difficulties, the basket of the researcher is not totally empty: very rarely we have found some material that can reasonably be considered to have a good chance of genuinely reflecting a Jewish biblical text of the time, even possibly a Jewish Greek Bible.

The last examples presented above show that the most interesting results are reached when a peculiarity in the Greek biblical text can be paral-

leled with a non-standard Hebrew one. The lack of tools, however, makes it difficult to find those parallels. As one remembers that agrapha are also found sometimes in Jewish literature,[58] a pluridisciplinary systematic comparison of the Greek and the Hebrew (and Aramaic, Latin, Syriac, Coptic etc.) non-standard biblical material in ancient texts could potentially yield very fruitful results. One would not be surprised if such work resulted in discovering much parallel material, and not only among quotations attributed to Jewish characters in polemical literary dialogues. One would then face the questions anew: could a Jewish Greek or a Jewish Hebrew biblical tradition be the source of much of this data? It is, of course, not possible to tell in advance how much one would learn from these studies about the spread of the Jewish Greek Bible or the influence of Jewish 'non-standard' biblical Greek or even Hebrew traditions among Christian authors, particularly on early sources. However, the potentially rich harvest of such a fascinating project makes it urgent for someone to undertake it.

---

[58] N. R. M. de Lange, 'A fragment of Byzantine anti-Christian polemic', Journal of Jewish Studies 41 (1990), 92–100, 97, at the end of a quotation from Jer 31:33. Composite and agrapha are also found in texts like the Sefer Yosippon, as I learned from a stimulating discussion with Saskia Dönitz (see also her contribution in this volume).

The Use of the Greek Bible in Some Byzantine Jewish Glosses on Solomon's Building Campaign

by

T. M. Law

Introduction

Late antique and medieval sources indicate that the Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible produced by Aquila continued to be read in Jewish circles from the time of Aquila into the Byzantine period. Jerome notes in his commentary on Ezekiel that in his own day Aquila was still being read and used by the Jews.[1] Jerome's contemporary Augustine also noted this fondness for Aquila.[2] Not much later, in 553, Justinian issued his decree that the Jews were free to read the Holy Scriptures in Greek in the synagogues, so that those who hear may understand. The Greek they are to read, however, is that of the Septuagint, which is preferred chiefly because of the miracle of its production. Justinian declares that the Jews should not be denied the right to use the other versions and therefore licentiam concedimus etiam Aquilae versione utendi.[3] According to Natalio Fernández Marcos, the destiny of Aquila's version was linked with the use of Greek in the East up to the Arab invasion.[4]

Thanks to the finds of the Cairo Genizah we have at our disposal a treasury of manuscripts, not least those of Greek Bible texts. P. Kahle's words in 1959 are memorable and worth quoting:

When in the course of the last century the Cairo Genizah was rediscovered, the men in charge of the Synagogue to which it belonged made the surprising discovery that there were some queer people in the world who were attracted by the old material, who were

---

[1] Comm. in Ez. 3:5
[2] De Civitate Dei 15:23: Aquila, autem, quem interpretem Iudaei ceteris anteponunt…
[3] Justinian, Novella 146. See the translation of the novella in P. E. Kahle, The Cairo Genizah, 2nd ed., (Oxford, 1959), 315–7.
[4] N. Fernández Marcos, The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Versions of the Bible (Leiden, 2000), 112–3.

willing to pay considerable sums of money for these scraps of dirty parchment and paper, and that even famous universities were keenly interested in the matter.[5]

We can certainly thank this famous university in Cambridge for their interest in the matter, which is part of the reason we are able to study these fragments today.

In 1897, F. C. Burkitt published the first fragments from the Cairo collection thought to be from the version of Aquila.[6] The fragments, produced between the end of the fifth and beginning of the sixth centuries, contained 1 Kgs 20:7–17 and 2 Kgs 23:11–27, and were apparently part of a text made for the synagogue.[7] In 1900, C. Taylor published several more palimpsests from the Genizah collection.[8] Among them was a fragment also believed to be from Aquila's translation of Pss 90:17–103:17. Taylor dated this text to the latter part of the fifth century and noted the similarity of the script to the script of the fragments published by Burkitt.[9] Though the manuscripts were in different hands, the scribes were certainly contemporaries. In this same publication, Taylor published a Hexapla fragment of Ps 22(21 LXX) with the columns of Aquila, Symmachus, and the LXX. In the second half of the twentieth century, H. P. Rüger discovered majuscule Greek glosses to the Hebrew text of Prov 17:16–19:13, which he believed were organized in an interlinear format by a reader who knew Aquila.[10] Finally, in 1980 N. de Lange published several glosses that are related to Aquila's translation of Malachi and Job.[11]

This is a short summary of the discovery of Aquila among the finds of the Cairo Genizah collection, but it is a history with an open ending. As we will see below, there are more readings still veiled in the Cairo collection that may be related to Aquila; moreover, the possibility remains that some vestiges of Symmachus' version were also in use – or at least still known – in Byzantine Judaism.

---

[5] Kahle, The Cairo Geniza, 4–5.

[6] F. C. Burkitt, Fragments of the Books of Kings According to the Translation of Aquila (Cambridge, 1897). For a very detailed analysis of the Greek scripts in these and other Genizah palimpsests, cf. N. Tchernetska, 'Greek Oriental palimpsests in Cambridge: problems and prospects,' in Literacy, Education and Manuscript Transmission in Byzantium and Beyond, C. Holmes and J. Waring eds. (Leiden, 2002), 243–56, esp. 244–251. By studying these scripts, Tchernetska is able to evaluate the strength of the previous scholars' proposals for the dating and provenance of such fragments.

[7] Burkitt, Fragments, 10.

[8] C. Taylor, Hebrew-Greek Cairo Genizah Palimpsests (Cambridge, 1900).

[9] Taylor, Hebrew-Greek Cairo Genizah Palimpsests, 53.

[10] H. P. Rüger, 'Vier Aquila-Glossen in einem hebräischen Proverbien-Fragment aus der Kairo-Geniza', ZNW 50.3–4 (1959), 275–7.

[11] N. R. M. de Lange, 'Some New Fragments of Aquila on Malachi and Job?', VT 30 (1980), 291–5.

I have chosen to concentrate on what could be called a glossary. The fragment T-S K24.14 contains Greek glosses in Hebrew characters from 1 Kgs 6:20–8:37, preserving a portion of what may have been a text on the entire book of 1 Kings. While we may not be sure of the original scope of this text, we know the special vocabulary of Solomon's building campaign was of sufficient difficulty to require glossing. Thus, this glossary represents an effort to utilize various Greek sources for the explanation of technical vocabulary. The procedure of the glossator is to list the Hebrew lemma, offer a Greek translation, and at times refer to other places in the Bible which illustrate his gloss. The fragment has been published with comments by de Lange, first in the festschrift for E. I. J. Rosenthal,[12] and updated later in his Greek Jewish Texts from the Cairo Genizah.[13]

Our task is to see what, if any, relationships to other extant Greek texts emerge from the glosses, while keeping a sharp eye open for readings that might be associated with, or derivative of the version of Aquila. Because there have been a number of fragments preserved in the Cairo collection believed to be from Aquila's version, we may find some link between these glosses on 1 Kings and the translation of Aquila. And yet we must be careful because we are not dealing with continuous texts, but glosses which, even if they match the style and lexicon of Aquila, might nonetheless stem from other sources

I. Some Special Problems

Throughout the study, we will work from recto to verso on the two leaves that are extant, but concentrate most of our efforts on those examples where the gloss can be identified in the textual history of the Greek Bible. The reference for each reading will indicate 'r' for recto or 'v' for verso, followed by the line number(s) in de Lange's edition. For the sake of comparison, I also add the reading from MT that is being explained by the gloss. The G1K (Glosses on 1 Kings) lines will contain first the Hebrew and then the Greek and English transcriptions and translations offered by de Lange. Then, I list readings from other Greek versions that will be relevant to the investigation, including some from my critical edition of Hexaplaric fragments on 1 Kings (3 Kingdoms) that is currently in pro-

---

[12] De Lange, 'Two Genizah Fragments in Hebrew and Greek', in Interpreting the Hebrew Bible: Essays in honour of E. I. J. Rosenthal, J. A. Emerton and S. C. Reif, eds. (Cambridge, 1982), 75–83.

[13] De Lange, Greek Jewish Texts from the Cairo Genizah (Tübingen, 1996), 155–63.

gress (indicated by the initials TML).[14] Finally, I will make some philological comments and place these fragments in the text history of the Greek Bible. References to 'LXX' indicate a shared reading by the three major recensions of the books of Kings, Codex Vaticanus (B), the Hexaplaric recension (O = Codex Alexandrinus [A] + 247), and the Antiochene recension (Ant).[15]

Before investigating the most relevant examples of interaction between known Greek texts and this glossary, I would like to note examples that demonstrate the difficulty of the text with which we are working. These cases exhibit the difficulty of reading a Greek Jewish manuscript in Hebrew characters and the challenges for the transcription and interpretation of such a text. Fortunately, I am not the only one puzzled by the following examples.[16]

1r 8–10

MT   (6:31) הָאַיִל מְזוּזוֹת חֲמִשִׁית

G1K   הָאַיִל טוֹאִישְׁקִירוֹפִּימָן טוֹפִּישׁוֹמָן פִּישׁוֹן טוֹאִשְׁקִירוֹמָן

"האיל: τὸ ἰσκιρόπιμαν τὸ πίσσωμαν πισον τὸ ἰσκέρωμαν."

The Greek of G1K is difficult, as is the Hebrew: אַיִל was rendered 'lintel' by Qimhi; 'doorpost' by Rashi; 'threshold' by Gersonides;[17] 'pilaster' by Burney with the following מְזוּזוֹת as a gloss on אַיִל;[18] 'portal' by Montgomery and Gehmen with אַיִל as a gloss on מְזוּזוֹת;[19] 'upper projection' by Gray;[20] and 'jamb' by Cogan.[21] LXX omits אַיִל, probably because it is superfluous with the following מְזוּזוֹת. The glossator of G1K does set out to explain the meaning of this enigmatic word, but unfortunately his solution leaves us with its own enigma.

This is a hornet's nest. We know that Aquila uses a similar word ἐσκιρρωμένον (σκιρροῦσθαι) for עֲקַלָּתוֹן in Isa 27:1, but the word appears to be absent from the remainder of the Greek LXX tradition. De

---

[14] In the LXX, 1–2 Samuel = 1–2 Kingdoms; 1–2 Kings = 3–4 Kingdoms. To avoid possible confusion, I will only refer to Samuel and Kings rather than alternate between Samuel-Kings and Kingdoms, the latter usually reserved for the LXX books.

[15] References to 'Ant' follow the critical edition of N. Fernández Marcos and J. R. Busto Saiz, El Texto Antioqueno de la Biblia Griega, vols. I–III (Madrid, 1989–96).

[16] De Lange, Greek Jewish Texts, 157 and 160.

[17] See M. Cogan, I Kings: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary (New York, 2001), 246.

[18] C. F. Burney, Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Book of Kings (Oxford, 1903), 77.

[19] J. A. Montgomery, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Kings (H. S. Gehmen, ed.; Edinburgh, 1951), 157, 159–160.

[20] J. Gray, I and II Kings (London, 1964), 163.

[21] Cogan, I Kings, 246.

Lange offers several solutions for how this lemma could be read,[22] so this
problem need not detain us here.

   2r 5–6[23]
   MT   וַיַּעַשׂ אֶת־הַמְּכֹנוֹת (7:27)
   G1K   ויעש את המכונות טאיפותימטא ואת כנו פולורון
   "and he made המכונות: τὰ ὑποθέματα, (cf.) and its כן (Exod 30:28, etc.),
   ?πουλλουρον."

The first part of this gloss will be dealt with below. Here, we are con-
cerned with the very difficult reference to Exod 30:28. The Greek transla-
tion in G1K for the Hebrew כַּן is difficult to make out. One may suggest
emending de Lange's πουλλούρον to πολλούρον, reading the first waw
of the G1K gloss as holem-waw, rather than as shureq. This πολλούρον
might have come from πολύρροος ('much-flowing stream'). The word
occurs in the form closest to our gloss in Julius Pollux's Onomasticon of
the second century CE where he has πολλύρους. In addition to these
orthographical notes, we may note that the reading fits the context of Exo-
dus 30 where, when we compare with v. 18, we see that the bronze כַּן, or
'stand', was to be placed between the tent of meeting and the altar, and it
was to have water placed in it, with which Aaron and his sons would wash
their hands and feet. While these orthographical and intertextual notes may
make better sense of the gloss, the pronunciation of πολύ- was polí- at
this time; thus, this interpretation is admittedly tentative, and we may be
no closer to a better understanding than before.

   2v 7–8
   MT   וְהַמְזַמְּרוֹת וְהַכַּפּוֹת וְהַמִּזְרָקוֹת וְהַמַּחְתּוֹת (7:50)
   G1K   הַמְזַמְּרוֹת טַקְלִידִיא וְהַפְּתָחוֹת קִיטַאֲנִיקְטִירִיא
   המזמרות והפתחות (7:50): τὰ κλειδιά καὶ τὰ ἀνοικτήρια

De Lange does not see this lemma in the Hebrew text of 1 Kings, but it is
simply an adaptation of a longer lemma in which the glossator misreads
the second element, also committing metathesis in the process. The G1K
lemma reads הַמְזַמְּרוֹת וְהַפְּתָחוֹת, omitting וְהַכַּפּוֹת וְהַמִּזְרָקוֹת, which occurs in
between in MT. In G1K, however, וְהַפְּתָחוֹת is read instead of וְהַמַּחְתּוֹת, a
simple mistake of reading a פ for מ. On this reading, then, the Greek
ἀνοικτήρια makes perfect sense. The reading in MT is 'snuffers, basins,
incense spoons, and censers (fire pans?)' and the Hebrew of G1K reads
'snuffers and openers'. The most common meaning of κλειδίον is 'key',
so that the Greek rendition in G1K would be 'the keys and the openers'. It
may be that the concern of G1K was only to translate the second word
(וְהַפְּתָחוֹת), and to do so by offering two Greek possibilities: τὰ κλειδιά

---

[22] De Lange, *Greek Jewish Texts*, 157.
[23] See the discussion of the first part of this verse below.

καὶ τὰ ἀνοικτήρια. Nonetheless, there is a better explanation. There are at least two places where κλειδίον occurs with a different meaning. In Hero Mechanicus's Spiritalia Pneumatica 1.24, and in P.Oxy.2146.7, κλειδίον is used like a stopcock which plugs a pipe to cease the flow of liquid. Semantically then, the G1K reading τὰ κλειδιά fits this same meaning, and could also be an acceptable translation for מַזְמֵרָה, "snuffer."

II. The Glosses of T-S K24.14

1 recto

1r 4–5
MT (6:21) וַיְעַבֵּר בְּרַתִּיקוֹת זָהָב
G1K ויעבר ויחבר קיכמינאשׁין
ויחבר כמו אֶינְקֲתוֹלוֹשׁשׂ קרְפּיאָה
ויעבר = (6:21) ויחבר, καὶ χαμίνασιν,
cf. ויחבר (Exodus 36:10): ἐνκαθολώσας καρφία.
TML⁜καὶ περιεπίλησε Σαλομῶν τὸν οἶκον ἔνδοθεν χρυσίῳ ἀποκλείστῳ, καὶ παρήγαγεν ἐν καθηλώμασιν χρυσίου✓ κατὰ πρόσωπον τοῦ δαβείρ (6:21)

De Lange already noted that though χαμίνασιν is not attested anywhere else, it may be related to χάμος, a 'muzzle' or 'halter', and therefore might refer to something that binds. The glossator explains the meaning of וַיְעַבֵּר, equating it to the meaning of ויחבר. The phrase in Hebrew (עַבְּרְיַו בְּרַתִּיקוֹת זָהָב) is, in itself, difficult enough. The only occurrence of עבר Pi. ("to pass") in the Hebrew Bible is here. The best translation seems to be, "and he drew gold chains in front of the inner sanctuary." The text is not fully descriptive, but according to the parallel in 2 Chr 3:14 the chains might be holding up a curtain. This seems to be the meaning that our G1K gloss is conveying by relating עבר to חבר.

The glossator refers to the use of וַיְחַבֵּר in Exod 36:10 and explains the meaning with ἐνκαθολώσας καρφία. This rendering for Exod 36:10 is not found anywhere else in the textual tradition of the Greek Exodus. The participle may be related to ἐγκαθηλώσας, "having nailed in."[24] Interestingly, here at 1 Kgs 6:21, we have an asterisked addition to the Old Greek (OG), where a long line contains ἐν καθηλώμασιν. One may wonder if the glossator used this prepositional phrase from 1 Kgs 6:21, usually taken to mean "an overlaying", and transformed it to represent verbally the idea from his Exod 36:10 reference.

1r 7–8
MT (6:29) וְאֵת כָּל־קִיר וֹת הַבַּיִת מֵסַב קָלַע פִּתּוּחֵי מִקְלְעוֹת כְּרוּבִים
G1K קלע שְׁטרִימֶן טוֹרְנַפְּשִׁישׁ כלום פְּרֵי קִירֵימֶן

---

[24] Cf. Ezek 7:23: καθήλωσιν (σ' θ').

קלע (6:29): στρίμμαν τόρνευσις, i.e. πῆρε κιρεμμαν

Aquila has διατετορευμένα **for** מִקְלַעַת **at 1 Kgs 6:18, but** τόρνευσις **and its related words are also attested in LXX for** קלע **(Exod 25:18, 31, 36; Jer 10:9[5 MT]; and 1 Kgs 10:22). In fact, in Exod 25:18 the OG has** τορευτά **and Aquila has** ἐλατούς**. Thus, it appears that this meaning in our G1K fragment was common in the Greek Bible, and not peculiar to Aquila. Symmachus also uses this word in Exod 25:33 for the carving of almond trees in the Tabernacle account.[25] In each context, the meaning is "carved in relief."[26] It has the nuance of turning, and is often used in contexts of handiwork: a** τορνευτής **is a "turner"; a** τόρευμα **is a "relief work"; a** τορευτής **"an embosser"; and a** τορευτικός **is "one who is skilled in embossing."**

The other issue in this lemma from G1K is the meaning of πῆρε κιρεμμαν**. In my judgment, it is possible to see this as related to** περικείρω**, "to shear all around."[27] This is usually meant with reference to hair, but in Aelian's Historical Miscellany the Stoic writer used it metaphorically with regard to city walls when he juxtaposed Alexander's cutting his hair (**ἀπέκειρε**) in imitation of Achilles (Ill. 23.141) with his destruction (**περικείρας**) of the acropolis of Ecbatana.[28] This same meaning would fit well in the context of cutting into stone here in 1 Kings.**

> **1r 8**
> MT (6:29) וְתִמֹּרֹת
> G1K וְתִימֹּרוֹת קַיאִיפִּינִיקֵשֻׁשׁ
> מרתיתו (6:29): καὶ οἱ φοινίκεσας
> B φοίνικες (6:29)
> O φοίνικας (also, 6:32 O)

This reading is particularly interesting, and here we follow de Lange's suggestion that the G1K reading is actually an amalgamation that represents the uncertainty in the manuscript tradition. Thus, φοινίκεσας **should actually be read** φοίνικες/ας**. The OG, attested by B 243 and 501, has the nominative ending, while the remainder of the Greek tradition and the Ethiopic (against B) has the accusative.**

> **1r 10–11**
> MT (6:34) גְּלִילִים

---

[25] **Symmachus:** ἐντετορνευμένοι ἀμύγδαλα 'carved in relief (with) almond trees'. **I thank Alison Salvesen for bringing this to my attention.**

[26] **Jer 10:5(9 LXX): 'forged in relief'?**

[27] **cf. Jer 9:25; 25(32 LXX):23.**

[28] **Varia Historia, 7.8.8.:** ἀπέκειρε δὲ καὶ τοὺς πλοκάμους τοὺς ἑαυτοῦ, Ὁμηρικὸν πάθος δρῶν καὶ μιμούμενος τὸν Ἀχιλλέα τὸν ἐκείνου. βιαιότερον δὲ καὶ θερμότερον ἐκείνου ἔδρασεν οὗτος, τὴν τῶν Ἐκβατάνων ἀκρόπολιν περικείρας.

גְּלוֹלִים שְׁטְרוּגִּילָא כמו אבן גלל G1K
גלולים (6:34): στρογγύλα, cf. a rolling (גלל) stone.

The gloss is provided for the Hebrew גָּלִיל, "cylinder, rod." The meaning of στρογγύλος is "round" and it is uncertain whether this was given as a natural definition for גָּלִיל (a cylinder is of course round), or if the definition was taken from the normal equivalent for στρογγύλος in the Greek Bible, עָגֹל. If the latter, the glossator was creating this meaning for גָּלִיל from עָגֹל.

The term στρογγύλος is used only three times in the LXX, all to translate עָגֹל: 1 Kgs 7:23(10 LXX), 35(21 LXX); and 2 Chr 4:2. Aquila maintains this same equivalence in two places: 1 Sam 26:5 (α′σ′), and Ezek 1:7. Moreover, this reading occurs in several Hexaplaric witnesses. It is attested by the majority of the Greek witnesses along with Arm Boh Sah and OL in 1 Sam 17:20; by 121[b] and Arm in 1 Sam 19:16, where 108 also attributes στρογγύλωμα to Symmachus; and by O and Arm in 1 Kgs 7:31 (2x). This accounts for nine occurrences, though we have only one reading where our sources tell us that the reading belongs uniquely to Aquila. It is possible that Symmachus kept his predecessor's rendering in 1 Sam 26:5, but in any case, Aquila's reading would have been more original. We should not forget the possibility that Aquila influenced the LXX textual tradition, and that a word unique to him found its way into the LXX. At the very least, we can see that there are 6 clear cases out of the 9 where some version from the Hexapla influenced the Greek textual history.

As for those three cases where the reading occurs in B, often assumed to be the OG, we note the following: in 1 Kgs 7:23(10 LXX), the reading is also found in 106 107 236 242 247; the second reading from B, 1 Kgs 7:35(21 LXX), is also attested in 107* and Ant; and finally, the reading in 2 Chr 4:2 is also found in Ant. All of these witnesses that agree with the three cases of στρογγύλος in B are witnesses that often preserve Hexaplaric material. Thus, this reading appears to be Hexaplaric, and has more than likely influenced the Greek tradition, even B which is often (wrongly) assumed to be free from Hexaplaric influence.

1r 11–12
(6:35) מִיֻשָּׁר עַל־הַמְּחֻקֶּה MT
מִיוּשֵׁר אֹ רְתוֹן כַּטַּטוֹ אִיגּוֹלַמַּן אִישׁוֹן G1K
מיושר (6:35): ὀρθὸν κατὰ τὸ ἐγγόλαμμαν ἴσον
O καὶ ἐνκολαπτὰ ἐπ᾽ αὐτῶν ἐνκεκολαμμένα χερουβεὶν (6:32)
= וְקָלַע עֲלֵיהֶם מִקְלְעוֹת כְּרוּבִים.

The definition for the lemma given by the glossator is "straight over the carving evenly." This is the meaning of the Hebrew text, but the use of ἐγκόλαμμα for מְחֻקֶּה is not attested in the LXX. There is only one case of ἐγκόλαμμα, and it is the equivalent for פִּתּוּחַ in Exod 39:6 (36:13 LXX).

Also, פָּתוּחַ is translated by ἐκκολαπτός in 1 Kgs 6:29(28 LXX).[29] Cf. G1K 1v 1–2 (6:36): כרותות: ἦταν κομμένα κόπτοντα ὑπὸ τῆς ὀρδινιᾶς ('they were cut, cutting according to order').

1 verso

1v 8–9
MT (7:9) מְגֹרָרוֹת בַּמְּגֵרָה
G1K מְגוֹרָרֹת בַּמְּגֵרָה פְּרְיאוֹנִיזָמֵינִי̈ש אִיפְרְיאוֹנִין
(7:9) מגוררת במגרה: πριονισμένες ἐπριόνιν
LXX κεκολαμμένα ἐκ διαστήματος (7:46)
TML α΄ πεπρισμένων ἐν πριστῆρι, σ΄ πεπρισμένων πρίονι

The attribution to Aquila is found in 554 for the reading that is attributed to Symmachus in 243 and Syh[mg]. This raises the question of the authenticity of this Symmachus reading. It appears more Aquilanic, but the slight change could indicate Symmachus's adaptation of his predecessor's reading.

This participle is found only here in the Hebrew Bible. It is related to מְגֵרָה which is itself derived from גרר ('to drag'). The meaning of the noun מְגֵרָה is difficult to discern. The translation of this participial phrase may be 'sawing with a saw', but we have no record of saws being used in stonework. This lack of evidence is not proof in itself, but it should caution the interpreter against proposing easy solutions. Cogan suggests that since the root is גרר it must have been some tool that was dragged across the face of a stone to make it smooth. He translates, 'smoothed with a smoothing tool'. LXX translates the participle with a pf. pass. form of κολάπτω ('to carve') and follows with ἐκ διαστήματος (lit. 'carved in a radius'?).[30]

Aquila and Symmachus have the pf. pass. of πρίω ('to saw'). The former's translation has a prepositional phrase like MT, and a nominal root that is identical to the verb root, a common practice of Aquila. We also note that the only other two places where πρίων occurs in the Greek tradition are in Ant, often a repository of Hexaplaric readings, and in both instances it is placed in the same construction we find in Aquila. The first is 2 Sam 12:31 (Ant): διέπρισεν ἐν πρίοσι for וַיָּשֶׂם בַּמְּגֵרָה;[31] and the second 1 Chr 20:3 (Ant): ἐνέπρισεν ἐν πρίοσι for וַיָּשַׂר בַּמְּגֵרָה.

Symmachus's participle is followed by a dative of the same root ("sawn with a saw"). This is similar to Aquila's method, at least by using the same

---

[29] In our case at 1r 7–8 (above), τόρνευσις was being employed for קלע.

[30] It would also be possible to translate 'carved with distinction' if a point is being made about its style. Cf. H. G. Liddell, R. Scott, and H. S. Jones, A Greek-English Lexicon (ninth edition with revised supplement; Oxford, 1996), 413.

[31] Cf. VL (L$_{91-95}$): secaverunt illos in serra.

root twice.[32] As we mentioned above, this appears to be an imitation of the style of Aquila by Symmachus. We are still not completely sure how much Symmachus used Aquila. It is worthy of note that 554 actually attributes the Symmachus reading to Aquila. If it is in fact Symmachus, he drops the preposition, which Aquila used to represent formally the Hebrew, and simply allows the Greek case system to make the instrumental nuance clear. As for our G1K fragment, we tentatively agree with de Lange that the glossator seems to be conflating the two readings of Aquila and Symmachus.[33]

1v 10–11
MT (7:9) מְגֵרָרוֹת בַּמְּגֵרָה
G1K ודא אֵינְרוּפְנוֹן וּדְרִישָׁתוֹ שִׁירְמֵינֵשׁ קֵיאֵינְרוּקְנוֹן אַבְטוּ
"**Alternatively:** ἐν ϱούκανον, **and its explanation is** συϱμένες καὶ ἐν ϱούκανον αὐτοῦ."
LXX κεκολαμμένα ἐκ διαστήματος (7:46)
TMLαʹ πεπϱισμένων ἐν πϱιστῆϱι
σʹ πεπϱισμένων πϱίονι

This is an alternative to the interpretation above. The translation is 'drawn also in its plane.' Earlier, de Lange noted 'συϱμένες reflects the derivation of מגורת and מגרה from גרר, "to draw, pull".'[34] He also connected ϱούκανον ("a plane") to ϱουκάνι, which is itself connected to the Latin runcina.

The verb σύϱω appears in LXX at Deut 32:24; 2 Sam 17:13; Isa 3:16; 28:2; 30:28; 4 Mac 6:1; and Jer 46(26 LXX):22, but never for גרר. On the other hand, we do have a record of Aquila using συϱούσα for מִתְגֹּרֵר at Jer 30(37 LXX):23.[35] It is possible that this is simply a gloss using a Greek expression that was known, and does not reflect a Greek version.

1v 11–12
MT (7:9) וּמִמַּסָּד עַד־הַטְּפָחוֹת
G1K וּמִמַּסָּד עַד־הַטְּפָח ׄת קֵיאַפּוֹטוֹתֵימֵילִיאוֹמֶן אֵיאוֹשׁ טַפַּלַשְׁטָא
 וממסד עד־הטפחות (7:9): καὶ ἀπὸ τὸ θεμέλιωμαν ἕως τὰ παλαιστά
LXX ἕως τῶν γεισῶν (7:46)
TMLαʹ (ἕως) τῶν παλαιστωμάτων, σʹ τῶν ἀπαρτισμάτων

The translation of the G1K lemma is 'and from the foundation to the spans'. The word θεμέλιωμαν is strange, but is close to θεμέλιον. This is the translation of מַסָּד, which occurs only here in the Hebrew Bible. The Three use θεμέλιον for יָסַד at Prov 10:25 (αʹσʹθʹ) and θεμέλιος for מוֹסָד

---

[32] See similar constructions in LXX Amos 1:3 and Sus-Th 59.
[33] De Lange, Greek Jewish Texts, 158.
[34] De Lange, Greek Jewish Texts, 158.
[35] The problem here is that the reading for Aquila is a retroversion from the Syh, so the possibility that Aquila's reading was not from συϱϱεῖν remains open.

at Isa 28:16 ($\alpha'\sigma'\theta'$) and Jer 31:37 (38:35 LXX) (α'); but closer to our fragment here is Aquila's use of $\theta\epsilon\mu\epsilon\lambda\iota\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma$ for יְסוּדָה at Ps 87(86 LXX):1. Even in the light of this evidence from Aquila, we must admit that $\theta\epsilon\mu\epsilon\lambda\iota$- roots occur throughout the LXX when some form of יסד lies behind it.

A more direct link with Aquila can be found in $\tau\grave{\alpha}$ $\pi\alpha\lambda\alpha\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}$, 'hand breadth', because this reading is attested for Aquila in our verse here. He uses it several times elsewhere: for טֶ פַּח in Lam 2:20 and Ezek 43:13 ($\alpha'\sigma'$); for טֶפַח at 1 Kgs 7:9 (46 LXX); and in a verbal form $\pi\alpha\lambda\alpha\iota\sigma\tilde{\upsilon}\nu$ for טִפַּחְתִּי at Lam 2:22. The LXX also happens to prefer $\pi\alpha\lambda\alpha\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}$ or $\pi\alpha\lambda\alpha\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\varsigma$, and it is found twice in Ant; thus again, while our G1K fragment finds its parallel in an attested Aquila fragment, this word appears to be common in the Greek Bible.

> 1v 13–14
> MT (7:16) כֹּ תָר ת
> G1K כְּרֻותֹת פֶּרִיקֶפָלִידִיאָ
> כתרת (7:16): $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\kappa\epsilon\phi\alpha\lambda\acute{\iota}\delta\iota\alpha$
> LXX $\epsilon\pi\iota\theta\acute{\epsilon}\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$ (7:4)
> TML$\alpha'\sigma'$ $\kappa\epsilon\phi\alpha\lambda\acute{\iota}\delta\epsilon\varsigma$

We now have the reading of Aquila: $\kappa\epsilon\phi\alpha\lambda\acute{\iota}\delta\epsilon\varsigma$.[36] Aquila has $\kappa\epsilon\phi\alpha\lambda\acute{\iota}\delta\epsilon\varsigma$ in 7:20(9 LXX), where the OL reads capita. Cf. 2v 2–3 below.

2 recto

> 2r 1–3
> MT (7:17) שְׂבָכִים מַעֲשֵׂה שְׂבָכָה
> G1K שְׂבָכָה קִיקְנֹופָדֹושֵׁשׁ וְהֹוא כְּמֹו שְׂבָכָה יִתְהַלֵּךְ וְהֹוא פֹודֹובְרֹוכָא כלום פֵּיזֹובֹולֹון
> "שבכה (7:17): $\kappa\upsilon\kappa\nu o\pi\acute{\alpha}\delta\omega\tau o\nu$ $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\gamma o\nu$, $\kappa\upsilon\kappa\nu o\pi\acute{\alpha}\delta\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma$, which is like he walks שבכה (Job 18:8), which is $\pi o\delta\acute{o}\beta\rho o\chi\alpha$, i.e. $\pi\epsilon\zeta\acute{o}\beta o\lambda o\nu$."

The Hebrew portion of the fragment does not include the whole phrase from MT, but the Greek portion is no doubt a translation of מַעֲשֵׂה שְׂבָכִים שְׂבָכָה.[37] Based on technique alone, the translation fits the character of Aquila. Cf. also 2v 3–4 below.

There may also be lexical parallels with Aquila. In Jer 52:22 and 23, Aquila has $\kappa\rho o\kappa\upsilon\phi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omega\tau o\varsigma$ for שְׂבָכָה and Symmachus also has this reading in v. 22. Field suggested that Aquila invented a new verbal form $\kappa\rho o\kappa\upsilon\phi\alpha\nu\tau\acute{o}\omega$, from $\kappa\rho o\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\phi\alpha\nu\tau o\varsigma$ ('woven' or 'network'), and from this new verb, the form $\kappa\rho o\kappa\upsilon\phi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omega\tau o\varsigma$.[38] The word used by Aquila in the Jeremiah passage is still different; yet on closer inspection, one can see

---

[36] Codex M attributes the reading to both Aquila and Symmachus.

[37] De Lange, Greek Jewish Texts, 159.

[38] F. Field, Origenis hexaplorum quae supersunt, sive veterum interpretum Graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum fragmenta (Oxford, 1875), II: 739.

that some of the differences are at points where there are similar phonemes: the Jeremiah lexeme has φ where the G1K lexeme has π, and τ where our Cairo fragment has δ. These are phonological ambiguities that arise from Greek texts written in Hebrew script. Granted, these differences alone are not sufficient, but they may be helpful, for determining the meaning of κυκνοπάδωτος. The context makes perfect sense if we read κροκύφαντος in the G1K line. The Hebrew can be translated as 'lattices, lattice work…', with מַעֲשֵׂה שְׂבָכָה glossing שְׂבָכִים; thus Cogan.[39] This is the meaning of κροκύφαντος.

The remainder of the gloss is a reference to Job 18:8, and should be read: 'which is like "he walks upon a snare (i.e., a net)."' The two Greek words are probably 'snare'.[40]

2r 3
MT (7:23) עָגֹ̇ל
G1K עָגוּל שְׁטְרוֹגִּילוֹן
עגול: στρογγύλον
LXX στρογγύλον (7:10)

Cf. 1r 10–11 above. On this occasion, our fragment is in agreement with the LXX. Also found in the Greek textual history are στρογγύλων (106 107), στρογγύλην (Ant 247), στρογγύλο (242), and στρογγύλω (236).

2r 3–4
MT בְּיִצְקָתוֹ (7:24)
G1K ביציקתו אָבְטוּ אֵינָאִיפִּיכִּישִׁין
ביציקתו (7:24): ἐν ἰπίχυσιν αὐτοῦ

The translation of בְּיִצְקָתוֹ ('when it was cast') in G1K is 'in its pouring'. De Lange's suggestion that ἰπίχυσις is only distinguished from ἐπίχυσις because of regional pronunciation is reasonable (cf. also 2v 11, 12),[41] and N. Fernández Marcos recognized the same phenomenon in the Constantinople Pentateuch.[42] Aquila also uses ἐπίχυσις for צוּקָה in Prov 1:27. Thus, it is possible that this reading reflects a known reading of Aquila, especially since there is no other Greek testimony for ἐπίχυσις here.

2r 4–5
MT (7:26) אַלְפַּיִם בַּת יָכִיל
G1K אלפים בת יכיל דְּישְׁכִילִיאָ בּוּטִיאָ אֵיכוֹרִין
יכיל בת אלפים (7:26): δισχίλια βουτία ἐχώρειν
Ο   δισχιλίους χοεῖς χωροῦντα

[39] Cogan, I Kings, 262.
[40] De Lange, Greek Jewish Texts, 159.
[41] De Lange, Greek Jewish Texts, 160.
[42] Fernánez Marcos, The Septuagint in Context, 181–2.

The translation given for the Hebrew in G1K is: 'it held two thousand casks.' Though absent in B, a similar reading occurs in the Hexaplaric recension along with several other witness: δισχιλίους χοεῖς χωροῦντα (O 127[sub +] 158 Arm).[43] βουτία is rendered according to the likeness in sound with the Hebrew בת. This is similar to 7:38, where the Hebrew text has בַּת, which is translated by Symmachus as βάτους. Symmachus's βάτους is to be distinguished from the βάτος that occurs in Exod 3:2, 3, 4; Deut 33:16; and Job 31:40: the latter is a bramble, or bush, but our reading is a phonetic assimilation to the Hebrew. This happens in LXX for בַּת only at II Esdras 7:22 (2x); the other eight times where בַּת is rendered phonetically are divided up among Aquila (3x), Symmachus (3x), and Theodotion (2x).

In 1 Kgs 7:38, which is very close to this verse, Symmachus's βάτους is matched by an anonymous reading in 243 and Masius's Syh text. This anonymous reading is assigned to Aquila by Field. In my preliminary draft of the critical text of the Hexaplaric fragments of 1 Kings, I see no reason to change Field's suggestion. The distinguishing mark that sets off the anonymous (Aquilanic?) reading from Symmachus is the last clause: τεσσαράκοντα βάτους ὑπερέφερεν λουτήρ (Symmachus has τεσσαράκοντα βάτους χωροῦντας τὸν λουτῆρα). Aquila uses the verb ὑποφέρειν for כול Hi. at Jer 6:11, and כול Pilp. at Jer 20:9. Aquila also uses λουτήρ for כִּיוֹר at 1 Sam 2:14. These evidences are by no means overwhelming proof; they do show, however, while Aquila may be the source of βουτία, it is safer to attribute the reading more generally to the Greek tradition influenced by the Hexapla.

2r 5–6
MT ‏(7:27)‏ וַיַּעַשׂ אֶת־הַמְּכֹנוֹת
G1K ‏ויעש את המכונות טָאִיפּוֹתְיָמָטָא ואת כַּנּוֹ פולורון‏
"and he made המכונות: τὰ ὑποθέματα, (cf.) and its כן (Exodus 30:28, etc.), ?πουλλουρον."
LXXδέκα μεχωνὼθ (7:14)
TMLα' ὑποθέματα, σ' βάσεις

The Hebrew here was mystifying to the ancient interpreters. Much of the Greek tradition followed a methodology of transliteration, while others attempted to translate. The Hebrew is usually understood to be some sort of base.[44] This is how both Aquila and Symmachus understood the Hebrew, but the entire Greek textual tradition otherwise follows B. For the

---

[43] Καὶ ἐποίησεν δέκα χυτροκαύλους χαλκοῦς τεσσαράκοντα χοεῖς χωροῦντα τὸν χυτρόκαυλον τὸν ἕνα μετρήσει·

[44] See also de Lange, Greek Jewish Texts, 160.

G1K reading, then, we can certainly attribute the τὰ ὑποθέματα directly to Aquila.[45]

2r 8
MT אוֹפַנֵּי (7:30)
G1K אוֹפַנֵּי טְרוֹכִיאָ
τρόχια :אופני

The Greek τροχός ('wheel') is the translation for אוֹפַן at 30 places in LXX, and not a few places in Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion.[46] This is simply a common word in the Greek Bible. But the word in G1K is τρόχια ('wheel track' or 'rut'), which never occurs in the LXX for אוֹפַן, and only seven times for מַעְגָּל ('track' or 'path').[47] The translation of מַעְגָּל with τρόχια, however, probably would not have been used by Aquila. This is because, as we have already seen, Aquila maintains lexical consistency in his Greek to mirror that of the Hebrew; he used στρογγύλος and the like for עגל, so it would be more unlikely, though not impossible, for him to use τρόχια for מַעְגָּל. In 1 Sam 17:20, for instance, Aquila has στρογγύλος for מַעְגָּל.[48] The G1K reading, then, is not peculiar to Aquila.

2r 9
MT וְחִשֻּׁרֵיהֶם (7:33)
G1K וְחִישׁוּרֵיהֶם אַבְטוֹן קִיבְרֶגְמַטא
וחישוריהם (7:33): καὶ βρέγματα αὐτῶν

The Hebrew is translated as 'hubs'. De Lange guesses the meaning of the Greek ('and their ?drippings'[49]) based on reading the Hebrew root חשר as related to the Aramaic חֲשַׁר, a term used in several places in Talmud Yerushalmi with the sense 'to sift' or 'to spread'. From this, the meaning 'to drip' may be derived. He may be right, especially if we see the βρέγματα of G1K as related to βρέχω. LEH counts seven uses of βρέχω with the meaning in the LXX 'to drench (with tears)' or 'to rain'. More importantly, Aquila and Symmachus use βρέχω in Amos 4:7. However, all of these uses are translations of מָטָר, which is neither in our MT lemma nor in our G1K text. It appears, then, this was a gloss that used a word common in Greek Bible texts and connected it, as de Lange suggested, to חשר.

---

[45] See above for the discussion of the last part of the lemma.

[46] E.g. α´ τροχός = אוֹפַן Exod 14:25; Ezek 1:16 (α´θ´), 21 (⸓α´θ´).

[47] It is used also at Prov 4:27, for which MT has no equivalent.

[48] Though, in 243 there is a scholion that attributes to Aquila and Symmachus several different readings. Procopius provides the reading we give here, and we deem it more certain.

[49] De Lange, Greek Jewish Texts, 160.

2r 12

כְּמַעַר־אִישׁ (7:36) MT

אַנְיִירְמָן אוֹשׁ כְּמָעֶר אנדְּרוֹשׁ G1K

כמער :ὡς ἀνάγυρμαν ἀνδρός.

The glossator was perhaps bewildered as much as modern commentators who attempt to explain כְּמַעַר. De Lange admitted to the difficulty of not only the Hebrew, but also the Greek of the G1K gloss. Thus, he suggested that ἀνάγυρεμα ('quest') was the 'most obvious' meaning,[50] even though it did not fit the context. Another possibility is that our word is derived from ἀνεγείρω ('to erect'), so could mean 'stature'.[51] As far as meaning is concerned, this certainly accords well with the phrase as a whole, and could have been used to explain that some of the carvings were like the stature of a man. But this still seems a bit unsettling. Perhaps I could add a suggestion: we might read ἀνάγυρμαν as related to ἀνάγυρις, which is the name of a plant attested in a Hellenistic writer in the first century CE, Dioscorides (3.157). The suggestion is perhaps a bit bold when comparing this meaning to what we have been considering. But when set into the context of the verse, it makes sense: the verse is describing the fine carving detail on the sides of the bases.

The Hebrew writer explains that the detail was created by carving כְּרוּבִים אֲרָיוֹת וְתִמֹרֹת כְּמַעַר־אִישׁ וְלֹיוֹת סָבִיב. Several commentators suggest reading מֵעַבַר־אִישׁ (cf. v. 30), for which expression O has ἀπὸ πέραν ἀνδρός. It seems most reasonable to read MT with the emendation מֵעַבַר־אִישׁ, though our G1K glossator seems to have read MT as it is. This is the same text the writer of 4QKgs read when he produced ממער, confusing the כ with a מ, an interchange also noted in 1QIsaᵃ.[52] Thus, the line in MT v. 36 might read: 'cherubim, lions, and palm trees at each end and additions all around.' It is still unclear what the glossator was making of MT. Nonetheless, our proposal to read ἀνάγυρις would render: 'cherubim, lions, and palm trees like a laburnum, each also with additions all around.' Without this suggestion, I remain baffled.

The distributive use of ἀνήρ for אִישׁ in καίγε was famously noted by D. Barthélemy,[53] but it is unclear in this lemma whether or not the glossator is using ἀνήρ in this sense. In any case, we know that ἀνήρ was the translation of choice for both καίγε and Aquila.[54]

---

[50] De Lange, Greek Jewish Texts, 160.

[51] De Lange, Greek Jewish Texts, 160.

[52] מאפס MT/ כאפס 1QIsaᵃ, Isa 40:17.

[53] D. Barthélemy, Les Devanciers d'Aquila: Première publication intégrale du texte des fragments du Dodécaprophéton: trouvés dans le désert de Juda, précédée d'une étude sur les traductions et recensions grecques de la Bible réalisées au premier siècle de notre ère sous l'influence du rabbinat palestinien (Leiden, 1963), 48–54.

[54] See K. Hyvärinen, Die Übersetzung von Aquila (Uppsala, 1977), 39.

2r 13–14
MT כְּמֵעַר־אִישׁ (7:36)
G1K כָּמֵעַר אוֹשׁ אַשְׁקִימוֹשִׁינִין כמו למען הביט על מְעוֹרֵיהֶם
"(Alternatively:) כמער: ὡς ἀσχημοσύνην. Cf. That you may look at their מעורים
(Hab. 2:15)."

De Lange's translation of this alternative is 'like the private parts'. The
passage that is cited, Hab 2:15 (LXX), has σπήλαιον ('cave') for מְעוֹר
('nakedness'). De Lange notes that in the Hab 2:15 passage that is cited
here, Symmachus has ἀσχημοσύνη ('shame'; Aquila: γυμνωσιν). Most
interestingly, ἀσχημοσύνη is also found in the Greek Minor Prophets
Scroll at Hab 2:15, suggesting that Symmachus followed καίγε here. In
Exod 20:26 the LXX translates עֶרְוָה with ἀσχημοσύνη, further linking
the Greek rendering to this Hebrew root.

2 verso

2v 2–3
MT הַכֹּתָרֹת (7:41)
G1K הכותרות קַיכורנִיאָה טוֹנְפֵּרִיקִיפַלִידִיאוֹן כלום גֵרנִיאָה חלולה קוּפוֹטִי
"הכותרות: καὶ χούρνια τῶν περικεφαλιδίων, i.e. γούρνια, hollow, κουφωτοί."

For περικεφαλιδίων, cf. also 1v 13–14. The meaning may be 'around the
top of the capital'. De Lange suggests that χούρνια might be explained by
γούρνια, which may be related to the medieval γούρνα (a drinking
trough).[55] This fits the context well, and does make sense out of the com-
pound produced by attaching περί to κεφαλιδίων. Ant also has four in-
stances of περικεφαλαία: for כּוֹבַע at 1 Sam 17:5 and 2 Chr 26:14;
for קוֹבַע at 1 Sam 17:38; and one occurrence without a Hebrew equivalent
at 1 Sam 17:49. The final word κουφωτοί means 'hollow', which is the
glossator's Greek equivalent for חֲלוּלָה.

2v 3–4
MT וְהַשְּׂבָכוֹת (7:41)
G1K וְהַשְּׂבָכוֹת טַקִיקְנוֹפָדוֹטָא מעשה שרשרות
"והשבכות (7:41): τὰ κυκνοπάδωτα, chain work (cf. 7:17)."

Cf. 2r 1.

2v 8–9
MT הָאֵתָנִים (8:2)
G1K טוֹנְדִינָמוֹמָטוֹן האיתנים
האיתנים (8:2): τῶν δυναμωμάτων
LXX ἐν μηνὶ Αθαμείν (8:2)
TML σ′ (ἐν μηνὶ) τῷ ἀρχαίῳ

---

55 De Lange, Greek Jewish Texts, 161.

The G1K Greek reading can be translated 'of the mighty ones' or 'of the powers'.[56] What must have been an obscure noun to the ancient translators is now clear to us. We now know that this is a Phoenician month name. Also in 6:1 and 38 are זִו and בּוּל, respectively.[57] These Phoenician names of months appear only here in the entire Hebrew Bible, and according to U. Cassuto they must have come into the ancient Israelite record of the Temple building through the contacts made with Phoenician construction workers.[58] Each of these three Phoenician names is followed by the Israelite month number. In our case here at 8:2, this would translate, 'which is the seventh month'.

LXX simply transliterates. Symmachus translates with ἀρχαῖος, which usually means 'original, ancient, old'. Perhaps while thinking of the adj. אֵיתָן, which refers to permanence and endurance, Symmachus offered an exegetical rendering. If this is what Symmachus had in mind, his reading would not be built upon the usual nuance of ἀρχαῖος ('the original month'). Instead, Symmachus would be extending the semantic range of ἀρχαῖος to encompass the shades of meaning provided by אֵיתָן. This extension seems to be the same thing the G1K glossator was doing, and his choice is semantically close to Symmachus. Thus, Symmachus' rendering has to do with permanence or endurance, and the G1K rendering with might or power.[59]

2v 9
MT   (8:7) וַיָּסֹ֫כּוּ
G1K ויסכו קינשקיאשין כמו סוככים
ויסכו: καὶ συνσκιάσειν, cf. סוככים (Ex. 25:20; 37:9).

Similar to this Greek reading are those found in Aquila: συσκιασμός for סֻכָּה in Lev 23:42; Deut 31:10; 1 Kgs 20(21 LXX):12, 16; Ps 31(30 LXX):21, 60(59 LXX):8; Amos 5:26; and Isa 1:8; and סֹ֫ךְ Ps 27(26 LXX):5. However, the OG has similar renderings. One finds συσκιάζω, '(over)shadow', at Exod 25:20, where σκεπάζοντες, σκέποντες, and συσκιάζοντες are all attributed to Aquila by different sources; at Num 4:5, where Aquila has τοῦ παρατανυσμοῦ; and at Hos 4:13, where MT, and thus Aquila, omits. In three places, one finds συσκίος ('shady'): at 1

---

[56] De Lange, Greek Jewish Texts, 162.

[57] Cf. Cogan, I Kings, 236, 247, and 278. The appearance of these month names in the Hebrew Bible is unique to 1 Kgs 6 and 8. Both בּוּל and אֶתָנִים are attested in Phoenician inscriptions. See M. E. Cohen, The Cultic Calendars of the Ancient Near East (Bethesda, MD, 1993), 384–5. The other term, זִו, could be an abbreviation, as suggested in K. Kitchen, The Reliability of the Old Testament (Grand Rapids, MI, 2003), 527 n81.

[58] U. Cassuto, Biblical and Oriental Studies, vol. 2 (Jerusalem, 1975), 223–4, n. 44 and 45.

[59] Aquila's use of δυν- roots are restricted to אביר, גבר, חיל, יכל, and צבא.

Kgs 14:23; at Ezek 6:13, where Aquila has τερεβίνθου ἰθαρά; and at Cant 1:16, where Aquila has εὐθαλής. It appears that all we can say is that this is a common rendering in the Greek tradition, but we cannot firmly attribute the reading to any one revision or translation. The strongest case might be made for the OG, since the glossator is pointing his readers to Exod 25:20, where συσκιάζοντες appears.

2v 10
MT בֵּית זְבֻל (8:13)
G1K בֵּית זְבוּל אִיקוֹן אִיקִיטִירִיאוּ
בֵית זבול :οἶκον οἰκητηρίου
B – (8:13)
TML{α'} οἶκον κατοικητηρίου

The Hebrew can be translated 'exalted house'. The reading οἶκον κατοικητηρίου may be attributed to Aquila with a high level of certainty. This reading occurs anonymously in O M Z(uid) 71 127(sub ※) 158 Arm Boh. The translation of the entire line appears to resemble the style of Aquila: ※τότε εἶπεν Σαλωμών· κύριος εἶπεν τοῦ σκηνῶσαι ἐν γνόφῳ. οἰκοδομῶν ᾠκοδόμησα οἶκον κατοικητηρίου σοι, ἕδρασμα τῇ καθέδρᾳ σου αἰῶνας ✓. I would suggest the lemma in G1K is an adaptation of this reading.

2v 12–13
MT תוֹרֵם (8:36)
G1K תוֹרֵם פוֹטִישִׁישׁ אַבְטִי
תורם (8:36): φωτίσεις αὐτή

Aquila frequently translates ירה Hi. with φωτίζω. But this translation also makes it way into LXX tradition. The question is whether or not Aquila is responsible for those cases where the LXX translates as such. The influence of the Three upon later LXX textual tradition is something that has not been taken seriously by scholars up to now, and may well explain the use of φωτίζω for ירה Hi. in the LXX.

2v 13–14
MT שִׁדָּפוֹן (8:37)
G1K שִׁדָּפוֹן קַפְשׁוֹן כְּמוֹ שְׁדוּפוֹת קדים
שדפון (8:37): καύσων, cf. blighted (שְׁדֵפוֹת) by the east wind (Gen 41:23).

B has ἐμπυρισμός here, but G1K renders שִׁדָּפוֹן with καύσων, 'scorching heat'. One finds this same equivalent at Gen 41:6, where Aquila uses καύσων for שדופות. The Greek καύσων is also used in the LXX, but never for שִׁדָּפוֹן. However, we can suggest that this reading could have come directly from Aquila on the basis of a reading found in Barhebraeus Commentary on Kings. In 8:37, Barhebraeus translates 'plague and blight'. But he quotes an anonymous Greek source: 'Greek: blight and burning

wind.'[60] This reading does not occur anywhere else in the Greek manuscript tradition, but is known by Barhebraeus to have been from a Greek version. Barhebraeus frequently quoted the Hexaplaric version; thus, Aquila may be the source for this reading in G1K.

2v 14
MT יֵרָקוֹן (8:37)
G1K לַכְנִיאַשְׁמוֹשׁ יֵרָקוֹן
ירקון (8:37): λαχανιασμός

De Lange notes that Kriaras gives the meaning 'hot breath' to λαχανιασμός,[61] but this meaning does not suit the context, unless it is meant to stand for some humid, odorous, unpleasant thing. The Hebrew can be rendered 'mildew', as some English versions translate. The sense of mildew is close to de Lange's suggestion that we read 'green rot'.[62]

Aquila uses λάχανον ("green herbage") for יֶרֶק at Gen 1:30.[63] Also in the LXX we find λάχανον for יֶרֶק or יָרָק at Gen 9:3, 1 Kgs 20(21 LXX):2 (2x), Ps 37(36 LXX):2, and Prov 15:17. For our G1K fragment here, we can suggest the probability that this word originated in Aquila's version. It is characteristic of Aquila to maintain lexical consistency and if need be to create neologisms for the sake of uniformity. Because we know he used λάχανον for ירק, it is perfectly Aquilanic that he should use λαχανιασμός, or perhaps the already present λαχανισμός, for יֵרָקוֹן. The ending -ιασμός hints that this word was developed from λαχανίζω ('to be at grass' or 'to become green').[64] Fernández Marcos has reminded us that Aquila often creates nouns with the suffix -μός;[65] thus, we conclude it is probable that this reading can be traced to Aquila's version.[66]

[60] ܟܘܬܪܐ ܘܥܩܒܬܐ ܗܘ ܒܥܡܝܢܐ ܐܗܘ ܕܐܝܟ ܐܘܪ̈ܬܐ ܘ ܐܘ ܐܘܡܘܬ̈ܐ ܘܗܘܡܪܐ. See the new critical edition: A. Sauma, Gregory Bar-Hebraeus's Commentary on the Book of Kings from his Storehouse of Mysteries: A Critical Edition with an English Translation, Introduction and Notes (Uppsala, 2003).

[61] De Lange, Greek Jewish Texts, 163.

[62] De Lange, Greek Jewish Texts, 163.

[63] Cf. 2 Kgs 4:39 where Theodoret mentions the existence of the reading ἄγρια λάχανα for אֹרֹת: Fernández Marcos and J. R. Busto Saiz, Theodoreti Cyrensis Quaestiones in Reges et Paralipomena: editio critica (Madrid, 1984).

[64] Cf. F. Blass, et al., eds. (=BDF), A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature (Chicago, 1961), §109.

[65] N. Fernández Marcos, Septuagint in Context, 117.

[66] See A. Salvesen, Symmachus in the Pentateuch (Manchester, 1991), 212 for the readings of Aquila and Symmachus at Deut 28:22 where they are translating יֵרָקוֹן.

Conclusion

This study has attempted to place the glosses of G1K within the textual history of the Greek Bible to see if it is possible to assign these readings to known Greek Bible versions and recensions. We saw a number of glosses that are clearly examples of words frequently used in the Greek Bible, and so may not represent any one version. In fact, some were so common they probably represent ad hoc translations, without having a genesis in a particular text.[67] Others we felt more confident to link to the version of Aquila. But this raises other questions. Should we see some copy of the actual version of Aquila behind these glosses? In connection with Rüger's finds of a similar work on Proverbs, de Lange thinks that while this possibility cannot be ruled out, it is more likely that these testify to a living tradition based on Aquila.[68] Should we see these Aquilanic glosses as a practice of mimicry by the glossator, having a root in Aquila, but also part of a translational tendency that could have been more far reaching than we know about? I do not see why this should not be possible. It might require a bit more modesty on our part when attaching the name 'Aquila' to everything that bears similar marks to the fragments we have already decided are Aquila. Instead, this could have been a style that had already become well known in Jewish circles. This may explain why some words in our glosses and in others appear to be Aquilanic but have a slight change in some vocable or affix, or may even reflect developments in Medieval Greek. In this, we would agree again with de Lange, who notes that we should not jump to the conclusion that these words were simply taken from the version of Aquila, but we should rather see this as a tradition based on Aquila.[69]

This is precisely the type of caution I would wish to leave us with after looking at these glosses. While we may not be able to see Aquila underlying every Greek gloss, what we have seen is that in contrast to using one Greek version, as might have been the case in Christian Churches (e.g., the Antiochene LXX text in Antioch), the Jews of Byzantium had a remarkable wealth of Greek Bible texts. Aquila, and possibly Symmachus and Theodotion were only part of this treasure. What is more impressive is that this richness manifests itself within each of these works from Byzantine Jewry, such that each of the glossaries and commentaries from this period

---

[67] See also de Lange, 'Hebrew/Greek Manuscripts: Some Notes', JJS 46 (1995), 263.

[68] See, for example, de Lange, 'The Jews of Byzantium and the Greek Bible: Outline of the Problems and Suggestions for Future Research', in G. Sed-Rajna (ed.), Rashi 1040–1998. Hommage à Ephraïm E. Urbach (Paris, 1993), 203–10, esp. 206–7.

[69] De Lange, 'The Jews of Byzantium', 208.

draws on not one but many Greek Bible versions.[70] This richness seems to me the most important conclusion of a study that has attempted to look at the relationship of these glosses to the textual history of the Greek Bible.

Finally, even with the cautions just mentioned, as we think about Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, we can see from this material that these versions were appreciated for more than their place in the Hexapla. Indeed, they had a life of their own outside of the Hexapla. This is easy to forget when we think of the Three in connection with Origen's work in the third century. It is as if we recognize their genesis and their relationship to other translational trends like καίγε, and then conclude that their chief destiny was their inclusion in the Hexapla. I hope this study adds to the weight of evidence we already have that shows that the so-called Hexaplaric versions, and particularly Aquila, had a life of their own independent of Hexaplaric, that is Christian, tradition.

[70] See also N. de Lange, 'Hebrew-Greek Genizah Fragments and their Bearing on the Culture of Byzantine Jewry', in D. Assaf (ed.), Proceedings of the Ninth World Congress of Jewish Studies (Jerusalem, 1986), 39–46.

Manuscript Studies

The Book of Canticles in Codex Graecus Venetus 7

by

Dries De Crom*

The Greek translation of the five Books of Moses, Proverbs, Ruth, Canticles, Ecclesiastes, Lamentations and Daniel contained in codex Graecus Venetus 7 (GrVen), commonly assigned to the fourteenth century and of uncertain authorship,[1] has gained itself a reputation for the peculiar type of Greek it exhibits. The translator has managed to reconstruct a highly refined form of Attic Greek, incorporating numerous elements from Homeric and tragic vocabulary, morphology and syntax. In this way he has taken his text well beyond the limits of Atticist Greek in an attempt to imbue it with literary distinction and a highly archaizing sound. Of course, this also makes his language entirely artificial and unrelated to the demotic Greek that he must have used in his everyday life. In fact, the Greek of GrVen does not represent any natural stage in the evolution of the language, combining as it does elements from roughly two thousand years of written Greek into a single literary idiom. The underlying assumption may well have been that only the language employed in the ancient masterpieces of

[1] Edition: O. Gebhardt, ed., Graecus Venetus. Pentateuchi Proverbiorum Ruth Cantici Ecclesiastae Threnorum Danielis Versio Graeca. Ex uno bibliothecae S. Marci Venetae codice nunc primum uno volumine comprehensam atque apparatu critico et philologico instructam (Leipzig, 1875). In addition to the introductory notes to this edition, see H. Swete, An introduction to the Old Testament in Greek (2nd ed.; Cambridge, 1902), 56–8; D. Blondheim, 'Échos du judéo-hellénisme: étude sur l'influence de la Septante et d'Aquila sur les versions néo-grecques des Juifs', REJ 78 (1924), 1–14 (= D. Blondheim, Les parlers judéo-romans et la Vetus Latina. Étude sur les rapports entre les traductions bibliques en langue romane des Juifs au moyen âge et les anciennes versions, [Paris, 1925], 157–170); C. Aslanov, 'La place du Venetus Graecus dans l'histoire des traductions grecques de la Bible', Revue de Philologie de Littérature et d'Histoire anciennes, 3e série, 73 (1999), 155–174; N. Fernández Marcos, The Septuagint in context: introduction to the Greek versions of the Bible (Leiden, 2000); translation of Introducción a las versiones griegas de la Biblia (Textos y estudios "Cardinal Cisneros" 23; 2nd ed.; Madrid, 1998), 178–9 (= 185–6, Introducción). On the question of the authorship of this version, see the postscript.

Greek literature is dignified enough to articulate the elevated character of
the Hebrew Bible and its language.[2]

The main purpose of this study is to address the relation between the
Greek book of Canticles as found in this intriguing manuscript and its
LXX counterpart. Both the linguistic make-up of GrVen and the interpreta-
tion of particular passages clearly mark a departure from the LXX transla-
tion of Canticles, sometimes in favour of other ancient Jewish versions,
notably those of Aquila and Symmachus. At the same time the medieval
translation seems unable to escape the influence of LXX, a text that was
known and used throughout the Byzantine world.

1. Linguistic and literary profile of GrVen Canticles

Although my purpose does not allow for an expanded overview of the
various Atticist tendencies and poetical elements in the language of GrVen
Canticles, some characteristics of the Greek text itself are worthy of note.
The first few lines (1:2–4) may serve as a brief illustration of its singular
linguistic character.

2 φιλήσειέ με πρὸς φιλήματος στόματος αὐτοῦ·
κρείττους γὰρ οἱ σοὶ ἔρωτες οἴνου
3 τῇ ὀδμῇ τὰ μύρα σου χρηστά,
μύρον κενωθήσῃ τοὔνομά σοι·
διὸ κόραι ἠγάπησάν σε.
4 ἕλκε με κατόπιν σου, δραμούμεθα.
ἤγαγέ με ὁ βασιλεὺς τοῖς ταμιείοις ἑαυτοῦ.
ἀγαλλιάσομεν χαιρήσομέν τ' ἐν σοί,
μνησθησόμεθα τῶν ἐρώτων σου μᾶλλον οἴνου·
εὐθύτητες ἠγάπησάν σε.

One notes the revival of ancient words and variant spellings (ὀδμῇ, διὸ,
κόραι), the crasis in τοὔνομα, the use of the comparative genitive instead
of a preposition, poetical τε without καί, the use of the locative dative,
and the rare use of χαίρω with ἐν (cf. Soph., Trach. 1119). The transla-
tion is interspersed throughout with words and forms that are taken directly
from Homeric and tragic literature, e.g. κεχόλωνται (1:5), στέ-
ψει/ἔστεψε (3:11), ἤρτηται (4:4) and ὄμμασιν (8:10). There even ap-
pear to be a few traces of Doric Greek in the book of Canticles, even

---

[2] Aslanov, 'La place du Venetus Graecus', 170–171.

though the Doric dialect in GrVen is generally assumed to have been re-
served for rendering the Aramaic portions of Daniel.[3]

One of the salient linguistic features of the translation is the reintroduc-
tion of the optative, a verbal form that had long since become obsolete.
The translator often seems to have used it in a basically correct and quite
natural way, for instance in indirect questions (7:13 θεασώμεθα εἴπερ
ἀνθήσειεν ἡ ἄμπελος) and as a rendering of the jussive (1:2; cf. supra).
However, it is also habitually used to render a simple yiqtol, perhaps in an
attempt to convey some of the modal value this Hebrew verb form often
seems to have. This leads to some very awkward occurrences of the opta-
tive that seem to defy categorization in terms of classical usage, e.g.
ἐδραξάμην αὐτὸν καὶ οὐκ ἐάσαιμι αὐτόν (3:4 MT ארפנו LXX
ἀφήσω).[4]

Furthermore, the translator has made the interesting choice of reviving
the ancient word pair ἐραστής – ἐρώμενος to replace the Hebrew term of
endearment דודי (passim). In classical civilization the ἐραστής was tradi-
tionally the 'lover', the active male who pursued the favours of the passive
ἐρώμενος or ἐρωμένη, the 'beloved'. In GrVen Canticles it is unclear
whether the translator intended to make any such distinction. It would
seem that he simply used ἐρώμενος in the first half of the text, reserving
ἐραστής for the latter half with the exception of 2:16 (ὁ ἐραστής μου
ἐμοί), no doubt to harmonize this half-verse with its several repetitions.
On the other hand, it is possible that the translator wished initially to stress
the girl's unfulfilled longing for her beloved (ἐρώμενος), whereas chap-
ters 5–7 attribute a more active role to her male lover (ἐραστής) and

---

[3] See Fernández Marcos, The Septuagint in context, 179 (= 185, Introducción). Doric
elements in the translation of Canticles include the hapax legomenon καρίον (4:11; 5:1),
διδυματόκος (4:2; 6:6), and the use of σηκόω ('weigh, balance') in a pastoral sense
('close the animal pen') that is otherwise only attested in Doric Greek (compare 1:7 πῶς
ποιμανεῖς, πῶς σηκώσεις ἐν μεσημβρίᾳ to Hesychius, Lexicon s.v. σάκωσε).

[4] Another example (Exod 15:1) is analysed more thoroughly by Aslanov, 'La place du
Venetus Graecus', 170–171. Concerning the example of the optative in 1:2 (cf. supra), in
medieval and later Greek the semantic range of the aorist stem of φιλέω was indeed
restricted to 'to kiss', although the present was still used occasionally as a synonym for
ἀγαπάω (cf. 1:7). See J. Barr, 'Words for love in Biblical Greek', in L. Hurst and N.
Wright, eds, The glory of Christ in the New Testament: studies in Christology in memory
of George Bradford Caird (Oxford, 1987), 5–7; R. Joly, Le vocabulaire chrétien de
l'amour est-il original? Φιλεῖν et ἀγαπᾶν dans le grec antique (Bruxelles, 1968), 30–
35. The strange use of the aorist of φιλέω for 'to love' in ὃν ἐφίλησεν ἡ ψυχή μου
(3:4) may have been inadvertent: the translator was obviously aiming for variety in the
same formula ('whom my soul loves') by alternating φιλέω, which he used correctly in
the present (1:7), with ἀγαπάω, in the aorist to render a Hebrew qatal (3:1.3). The sub-
sequent return to φιλέω (3:4) would then have been influenced by the immediately pre-
ceding aorist tense.

stress the joys of love fulfilled – again with the exception of 2:16. If this is indeed the case, it may well be that the translator understood the book of Canticles as an evolving narration of love.

Table 1: ἐρώμενος and ἐραστής in GrVen Canticles

1:13	ἐρώμενος	5:8	ἐραστής
1:14	ἐρώμενος	5:9	ἐραστής
1:16	ἐρώμενος	5:10	ἐραστής
2:3	ἐρώμενος	5:16	ἐραστής
2:8	ἐρώμενος	6:1	ἐραστής
2:10	ἐρώμενος	6:2	ἐραστής
2:16	ἐραστής	6:3	ἐραστής
2:17	ἐρώμενος	7:11	ἐραστής
5:4	ἐραστής	7:12	ἐραστής
5:5	ἐραστής	7:14	ἐραστής
5:6	ἐραστής		

Finally, the artificial character of the language employed by the translator is also evident from the large number of hapax legomena, most of which we must assume are neologisms coined by the translator himself.

ἀγαθέω (4:10) 'to be good' cf. ἀγαθόω, ἀγαθύνω
ἀκροτριχίς (7:6) 'curl of hair' cf. θρίξ
ἀπυρόχρυσος (5:11.15) 'gold untouched by fire (i.e. unblemished)' cf. ἄπυρος
ἀρωματιστής (5:13) 'perfume vendor'
ἰσότμητος (4:2) 'cleanly shaven' or 'shaven in like manner'
καλυκόω (6:11; 7:13) 'to blossom' cf. κάλυξ
καρίον (4:11; 5:1) = κηρίον with Doric vocalization
λιθοταξία (1:10) 'stone setting'
προβόστρυχος (4:3) 'curl of hair (on the forehead)' cf. βόστρυχος
προκόμη (5:11) 'hair (on the forehead)' cf. προκόμιον
προτριχίς (5:2) 'forelock' cf. θρίξ
προχαιτίς (6:7) 'loose hair (on the forehead)'
ῥάντιστρον (7:3) 'bowl-shaped vessel' cf. ῥαντίζω[5]
χαιτίς (4:1) 'loose, flowing hair' cf. χαίτη

It is striking that the translator quite often chooses to create a neologism when faced with a Hebrew hapax legomenon.[6] This is the case with λιθο-ταξία (1:10), προτριχίς (5:2), προκόμη (5:11), ἀρωματιστής (5:13)

[5] Compare the etymology of ῥαντιστήριον, which is preserved in the commentary on 1 Kings in the Cairo Genizah; see N. de Lange, Greek Jewish texts from the Cairo Genizah (Tübingen, 1996), 136–137.

[6] A study of some of the MT hapax legomena and their treatment in LXX is provided by H. Ausloos and B. Lemmelijn, 'Rendering love: hapax legomena and the characterisation of the translation technique of Song of Songs', in: H. Ausloos et al., eds, Translating a translation: the Septuagint and its modern translations in the context of Early Judaism (Leuven, 2008), 43–61.

and ῥάντιστρον (7:3). Furthermore, when the Greek text has χαιτίς (4:1), προβόστρυχος (4:3), ἀπυρόχρυσος (5:11.15) and προχαιτίς (6:7) the Hebrew text does not strictly speaking present a hapax legomenon, but does feature a lexeme that is rare and hard to interpret. Even in the creation of new lexical items the translator aims for variety, opting for a different neologism at each occurrence of MT צמה (4:1.3; 6:7). This would indicate that the translator had a twofold aim of faithfully rendering the meaning and style of the Hebrew text, including the unfamiliar ring of certain rare words, while at the same time improving the style of the Greek text with a learned vocabulary.

2. The language of GrVen Canticles and the LXX

It will not come as a surprise that over 70 per cent of the verses in GrVen Canticles exhibit at least some formal correspondence to the ancient LXX translation of the same book, with some verses being identical apart from minor stylistic improvements (e.g. the dual number in 4:5 τὼ δύο μαστώ σου ὡς δύο νεβρὼ διδύμω δορκάδος τὼ νεμωμένω ἐν κρίνοις). This is no doubt due to both translations' very literal approach towards their respective source texts,[7] and is of disappointingly little value in determining the level of dependence of one on the other.

Altogether more compelling are those instances where GrVen has not followed the example set by LXX. Indeed, some of the most idiosyncratic features of the ancient Greek translation have been abandoned in favour of other lexical choices. The LXX translation makes use of two remarkable neologisms of its own, viz. ἀδελφιδός for דוד (passim) and κυπρίζω/κυπρισμός for the problematic סמדר (2:13.15; 7:13). Both would have fitted nicely into the list of neologisms given earlier: ἀδελφιδός relates to the common word ἀδελφιδοῦς as χαιτίς does to χαίτη, and κυπρίζω seems to be a denominative (cf. κύπρος) comparable to καλυκόω. Since both words are so closely tied to the Greek text of Canticles as to not appear outside LXX Canticles itself and the exegetical tradition derived from it, it is all the more striking that the GrVen translator has retained neither. The term of endearment דודי is variously rendered by ἐρώμενος and ἐραστής (cf. supra), while סמדר is identified as a noun in all instances and systematically rendered with the accusative ὄμφακα. Admittedly, the lat-

---

[7] The GrVen translation formally corresponds with MT in every detail, whereas the LXX version has some significant pluses and minuses. On the relation of LXX and MT Canticles, see the notes to Dirksen's edition of Canticles in Biblia Hebraica quinta editione cum apparatu critico novis curis elaborato. General Introduction and Megilloth (Stuttgart, 2004), 10*–11*.

ter equivalent also has the virtue of being closer to the probable meaning of MT.[8]

Although it seems right to say that GrVen Canticles clearly sets itself apart from the LXX by replacing two of its most tell-tale equivalences, the matter is slightly more complicated than that. There are a number of expressions or particular usages in GrVen that are otherwise only found in the LXX and dependent writings; some of these are nearly as exclusive to LXX Canticles as ἀδελφιδός or κυπρίζω. Obviously these instances, some of which are enumerated below, confirm the assumption that the translator was at home in the style and diction of the LXX. More importantly though, they also indicate that he could not (or would not) avoid all LXX influence on his own translation. Incidentally, it also means that he was not averse to words that were strongly reminiscent of their Christian context,[9] as will be evident from some of the examples below.

a. ἀγαλλιάσομεν (1:4)

In contrast to its parent ἀγάλλω/-ομαι this LXX neologism is hardly ever used outside LXX, NT and the writings of the Church Fathers. Its only occurrence outside a biblical context seems to be in a list of rare verbs in Aelius Herodianus's De orthographia (second century CE).[10] Thus, it is not part of the poetical vocabulary from which the translator draws so heavily, but belongs to a markedly Septuagintal and Christian vocabulary.

b. ξὺν στίγμασι τοῦ ἀργύρου (1:11)

The LXX translator used the very same equivalent to render the Hebrew hapax legomenon נקדות, its only occurrence in the Greek OT. While at the time of the LXX it was not used very widely (for a comparable context see Diodorus 35, 2, 36), in the fourteenth-century Byzantine world it must have had a definite Christian ring about it.

---

[8] See Y. Zakovitch, Das Hohelied (Freiburg, 2004), 152 and the parallels indicated there.

[9] The existence of a shared religious vocabulary among Jews and Christians in the Byzantine era is mentioned by N. de Lange, 'Hebraism and Hellenism: the case of Byzantine Jewry', Poetics Today 19 (1998), 138. Another example of a phrase with definite parallels in Christian literature, which the translator does not actively avoid, is τῆς κυησάσης με (3:4). Although the verb κύω/κυέω is not particularly prominent in biblical Greek, the feminine participle aorist has become a more or less standard reference to the Holy Virgin in Christian hymns (e.g. Analecta Hymnica Graeca 1, 1, 9, 39; 1, 5, 9, 40).

[10] See A. Lentz, ed., Herodiani Technici Reliquiae (Leipzig, 1868; repr., Hildesheim, 1965), 462. On the status of the verb as a neologism and its possible link with Hebrew גיל, see J. Barr, 'Doubts about homoeophony in the Septuagint', Textus 12 (1985), 66–69.

c. κυκλώσω ἐν τῇ πόλει **(3:2; cf. 3:3; 5:7)**

In this case it is not so much the verb itself as the way in which it is used that is strongly reminiscent of the LXX. The verb κυκλόω is normally used transitively in the sense of 'to encircle something, to surround something'. The intransitive use is restricted to the middle and passive voices, and even then it is largely restricted to poetry (e.g. Eur., Phoen. 1126). In the LXX, however, the active voice is allowed with precisely this intransitive meaning 'to go around, to move around in circles' in a small but significant number of instances, among them Cant 3:2.3; 5:7.[11] The GrVen translator seems to have retained this half-verse without much regard for its non-classical verbal syntax.

d. ἐκαρδίωσας **(4:9)**

This is another word that was popular in the LXX and later Christian literature. It probably originated as an equivalent for Hebrew לבב, although it seems to have evolved independently as a denominative verb in Nic., Alex. 581 (third-second century BCE), where it is used as a metrical variation for καρδιαλγέω.

There are a number of additional similarities between both versions of Canticles that are somewhat less cogent. Some of them could also be argued to stem from both versions being literal translations of the Hebrew text, notably the non-classical use of the preposition ἐν (6:11 ἰδεῖν ἐν τοῖς δένδρεσι) and the typical translation of an infinitive absolute with a finite verb (8:7 περιοράσει περιοραθήσεται). Nevertheless they are strongly reminiscent of the style of the LXX. A few other instances attest to words and usages that featured prominently in the LXX but became much more widespread afterwards, so that their occurrence in GrVen Canticles cannot be put down to the influence of the LXX alone (2:12 φθάνω in the sense of 'to arrive'; 4:1 ὤρθρισαν).

As far as Canticles is concerned, then, I would be inclined to say that the GrVen translator did deliberately depart from the ancient LXX translation in a significant way, but was nevertheless heavily influenced by it in a number of passages.

3. An advanced stage of textual exegesis

Nevertheless, the translator has achieved more than a mere stylistic updating of the LXX text: his text was intended as a stand-alone translation, not

---

[11] Outside LXX Canticles it is found in 2 Kgdms 24:6; 4 Kgdms 11:8; Eccl 1:6 (ter); 7:25; 12:5; Ps 26:6; Jer 52:7; α' θ' 1 Kgdms 22:18; θ' Isa 28:2.

as a rewriting or retranslation. Consequently, the differences between the two versions run deeper than the linguistic level. Compared to the LXX version of the book of Canticles the GrVen translation appears to reflect a more advanced stage of exegesis and grammatical understanding of the text.[12] Returning to the opening verses, cited earlier, one will note that GrVen reads ἔρωτες (1:2 and passim) for MT דדיך rather than the controversial μαστοί of LXX. In the following verse MT תורק is interpreted as a pu'al yiqtol second feminine singular (1:3 κενωθήσῃ) whereas LXX has ἐκκενωθέν. In verse 1:4, however, GrVen and LXX share the interpretation of משרים as a noun, not an adverb (LXX εὐθύτης, GrVen εὐθύτητες).

Another interesting example includes verse 2:1, which conveys the popular image of the 'rose of Sharon' (ῥόδον τοῦ σάρωνος) over against LXX ἄνθος τοῦ πεδίου. The translator has also differentiated between the use of אהבה with and without the article, interpreting the former as a reference to the female character (2:7; 3:5 τὴν φιλοῦσαν). Exactly the same interpretations are regularly put forward in modern commentaries on Canticles.

Some instances of translation betray the influence of specific rabbinic exegesis, notably from the Sefer Hašorašim of David Kimchi[13] and Rashi's commentary on the book of Canticles. This is evident already from the title verse, which reads ᾠδὴ τῶν ᾠδῶν τῶν τοῦ σελομῶντος (1:1). The distribution of articles precludes any other interpretation than "a song from the songs that are Solomon's", which is precisely how Kimchi interpreted this verse.[14] More evidence of rabbinical exegesis is to be found in the various translations of מבעד לצמתך (4:1.3; 6:7). Although the noun צמה probably refers to a veil of some kind, it is here rendered variously as χαιτίς, προβόστρυχος, προχαιτίς ('curl, lock of hair'), in agreement with the explanations of both Rashi and Kimchi.[15] Another instance where GrVen relies on rabbinical exegesis is 3:10 τὸ κατάστρωμα αὐτοῦ

---

[12] According to Aslanov, 'La place du Venetus Graecus', 161 the translator devotes more attention to the morphological analysis of individual words than to syntactical analysis. The examples given here seem to confirm this hypothesis, although occasionally GrVen disagrees with LXX on sentence segmentation (different sentence division in 7:14) and text structure as well (for instance the change of grammatical subject in 8:13 ἡ καθεζομένη vs. LXX ὁ καθήμενος).

[13] Fernández Marcos, The Septuagint in context, 179 (= 185, Introducción).

[14] M. Pope, Song of Songs: a new translation with introduction and commentary (Garden City, NY, 1977), 294.

[15] P. Stoop-van Paridon, The Song of Songs: a philological analysis of the Hebrew book שיר השירים (Leuven, 2005), 179–180. On the interpretational difficulties connected with the noun צמה, see R. Ceulemans and D. De Crom, 'Greek renderings of the Hebrew lexeme צמה in Canticles and Isaiah', VT 57 (2007), 511–523.

χρυσοῦ, concurring with Kimchi's interpretation of the stem רפד (cf. MT Cant 3:10 רפידה) as 'to spread, to extend'.[16] As Gebhardt shows in his edition, the positively intriguing reference to the pagan goddess Hecate (7:3 ἑκάτης) relies on Kimchi's identification of MT הסהר with the moon, rather than on a Verschreibung of εἱρκτῆς.[17] The same holds true for φθεγγόμενος in verse 7:10 where instead of a simple misreading of דבר for MT דבב we are to suppose Rashi's interpretation of the latter stem as 'to cause to speak'.[18]

Another peculiar interpretation that stands firmly in the Jewish exegetical tradition is the identification of the final element in שלהבתיה (8:6) as an abbreviation of the divine name. The translator has rendered it with τοῦ ὀντωτοῦ, his preferred equivalent for the tetragrammaton and one of the most persistent features of this Greek version.

Nevertheless, there is no reason to assume that the translator has allegorized his translation beyond the scope of the source text. His sole intent has been to render the Hebrew text as faithfully as possible into his own eclectic idiom. The translation is susceptible of allegorical interpretation just as much as its Hebrew Vorlage is, but it does not seem to presuppose such an interpretation. Even when the translator is relying on rabbinic exegesis, he does so only to understand his Vorlage on the basic morphological and grammatical level.

4. The Three in GrVen Canticles

The continued knowledge and use of ancient Greek Bible translations by Jews from antiquity to the Byzantine era has left its mark on the translations contained in this remarkable codex, and the book of Canticles is no exception. There are some striking parallels between the present translation and some of the readings ascribed to Symmachus and Aquila.[19] As these parallels range from quasi-literal citations to distant resemblances, there is no clear line to draw in the translator's use of these versions: GrVen Canticles is not simply a translation according to Symmachus or Aquila, just as it is not simply a reworking of the LXX. This eclectic use of ancient Jewish versions seems to fit in with the idea that (remnants of)

---

[16] P. Joüon, Le Cantique des Cantiques. Commentaire philologique et exégétique (Paris: Beauchesne, 1909), 188.

[17] Gebhardt, Graecus Venetus, ad Cant 7,3: 'pro luna deam lunarem substituit'.

[18] Cf. Zakovitch, Das Hohelied, 254 and his translation on p. 250.

[19] I have consulted the remaining fragments of these versions as collected by F. Field, Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt sive veterum interpretum Graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum fragmenta, 2 vols, (Oxford: Clarendon, 1875).

non-LXX Greek versions were transmitted in Jewish circles throughout late antiquity and the Middle Ages right down to the Constantinople Penta- teuch (1547), in writing and/or orally.[20] This tradition relied heavily on Aquila, it would appear, but drew from the other ancient versions as well. The translator of GrVen evidently had the opportunity to avail himself of it in the course of his work.

As far as readings attributed exclusively to Symmachus are concerned, there are seven passages in GrVen Canticles that are very similar to what is known of this ancient version.

1. συλλάβετε ἡμῖν (2:15) = σ' vs. LXX πιάσατε ἡμῖν
2. οἱ φύλακες (3:3) = σ' vs. LXX οἱ τηροῦντες
3. ὑακίνθου (5:14) = σ' vs. LXX θαρσις
4. τῶν ἀμνάδων (6:6) = σ' vs. LXX τῶν κεκαρμένων
5. κολυμβήθρα ἐν ἐσεβῶνι (7:5) σ' κολυμβῆθραι vs. LXX λίμναι ἐν Εσε- βων
6. ἡδὶ ἡ ἡλικία σου (7:8) σ' αὕτη ἡλικία σου vs. LXX τοῦτο μέγεθός σου
7. ὑπὸ τῇ μηλέᾳ (8:5) σ' ὑπὸ τὴν μηλέαν vs. LXX ὑπὸ μῆλον

The second example is indicative of the common approach of Symmachus and the GrVen translator. Since both were concerned with writing idio- matic Greek,[21] the replacement of the Hebrew participle שמרים with the corresponding Greek noun seems only natural. Whether the GrVen transla- tor arrived at this equivalence independently of Symmachus or not is im- possible to tell. The same is true of the seventh example. The third, fourth and sixth[22] examples, however, seem to give positive proof of Sym- machean influence on GrVen Canticles, owing to their unusual vocabulary.

For the sake of completeness one should take note of some passages where the GrVen text seems to echo a reading that is shared by Symma- chus and Aquila. In these instances it is especially difficult to establish the precise relations between the different versions. Again, none of them un- ambiguously spells out the GrVen translator's dependence on his ancient predecessors.

1. ἐν ταῖς δορκάσιν ἢ ἐν ταῖς ἐλάφοις τοῦ ἀγροῦ (2:7; 3:5) α' σ' ε' ἐν δορ- κάσιν ἢ ἐν ἐλάφοις τῆς χώρας vs. LXX ἐν δυνάμεσι καὶ ἐν ἰσχύσεσι τοῦ ἀγροῦ

---

[20] See N. de Lange, 'La tradition des "révisions juives" au moyen âge. Les fragments hébraiques de la Geniza du Caire', in G. Dorival and O. Munnich, eds, Κατὰ τοὺς Ο΄. Selon les Septante. Trente études sur la Bible grecque des Septante en hommage à Mar- guerite Harl (Paris, 1995), 133–143, and N. de Lange, 'The Jews of Byzantium and the Greek Bible: outline of the problems and suggestions for future research', in G. Sed- Rajna, ed., Rashi 1040–1990. Hommage à Ephraïm E. Urbach (Paris, 1993), 203–210.

[21] See for instance Aslanov, 'La place du Venetus Graecus', 167.

[22] For this use of ἡλικία 'size, stature, degree of growth', see a.o. Plato, Euthyd. 271b; Luke 19:3. MT קומה is translated in the same way in σ' ο' Ezek 13:18.

2.   γρηγορεῖ (5:2) = α' σ' vs. LXX ἀγρυπνεῖ
3.   πρασία (5:13) = α' σ' vs. LXX φιάλαι
4.   πρασιάς (6:2 [= LXX 6:1]) = α' σ' vs. LXX φιάλας
5.   καὶ ἤνεσαν (6:9 [= LXX 6:8]) α' σ' καὶ ἐπήνεσαν vs. LXX καὶ αἰνέσουσιν

The influence of Aquila runs deeper than a few verbal resemblances, though. His version seems to have been altogether more formative for both the textual form and the interpretation of GrVen Canticles. For instance, the translator did not continue the LXX equivalence of רעיתי with ἡ πλη-σίον μου (1:9 and passim), which had probably been taken up from LXX Psalms (e.g. Ps 34:14 MT כרע־כאח LXX ὡς πλησίον ὡς ἀδελφόν) but was perhaps not entirely suitable for use in an amorous context. Instead GrVen reads φίλη μου/μοι, as did Aquila.

A good example of how Aquila's version influenced the interpretation of particular passages is the identification of the Hebrew hapax legomenon לתלפיות (4:4) that was merely transcribed as θαλπιώθ in the LXX. Here, the GrVen translator seems to have quoted Aquila directly by translating εἰς ἐπάλξεις ('into battlements').

The influence of Aquila has left more elusive traces in verse 1:6 μηδαμῶς ὁρᾶτέ με, ὅτι εἰμὶ κατάκορος, which one would translate at first sight as 'do not look upon me, for I am insatiable'. This obviously suits neither the context nor the Hebrew text, which has the diminutive שחרחרת ('blackish, swarthy'; LXX μεμελανωμένη). True enough, both κατάκορος and its synonym κατακορής are used quite frequently to indicate the dark or deep shade of colours in such expressions as κατακό-ρως μέλας or ἐρύθημα κατακορές (cf. LSJ s.v. κατάκορος; s.v. κα-τακορής). However, in this type of expressions κατάκορος is always used adverbially, being a secondary qualification of the colour in question and never indicating the colour itself. Its independent and adjectival usage to refer to a dark hue in GrVen Canticles is very peculiar indeed. In point of fact, there are only two clear parallels to be found, and these are both readings attributed to Aquila (Gen 49:12 MT חכלילי LXX χαροποιοί α' κατάκοροι; Prov 23:29 MT חכללות LXX πέλειοι α' κατάκοροι).[23]

---

[23] I will not go into the possible etymological distinction between κατάκορος 'black, dark' (κατα + *κορ- 'black', cf. κόραξ) and κατάκορος 'immoderate' (κατα + κόρος 'satiety', cf. κορέννυμι), which is presupposed by both Gebhardt (note to Cant 1:6 in his edition) and Field, Origenis Hexaplorum, 1:71. Suffice to say that neither P. Chan-traine, Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque. Histoire des mots, 2 vols (Paris, 1968–1980) nor H. Frisk, Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch, 3 vols (Heidelberg, 1970) mentions a stem *κορ- 'black', identifying the common element in κόραξ, κορώνη, κορωνίς and corvus as an onomatopoeia instead. Since the original usage of κατάκορος in the context of colours was adverbial, it stands to reason that it originated from κατάκορος 'immoderate' (cf. κατακόρως μέλας 'immoderately black', i.e. sati-ated with black colour). Thus, the secondary shift to κατάκορος 'black, dark', which is,

As a final link between Graecus Venetus Canticles and Aquila I would like to recall the neologism καλυκόω 'to blossom' (6:11; 7:13), which strangely enough seems to be presupposed in the rather obscure noun κα-λύκωσις 'budding flower' (cf. LSJRevSup s.v καλύκωσις) that is used twice by Aquila to render the only two occurrences of MT חבצלת (Cant 2:1; Is 35:1). Although there have been several more derivations from κάλυξ 'flower-cup' (e.g. καλύκιον, καλυκίζω, καλυκῶπις), these are all derived from the stem καλυκ-, not καλυκο- as in Aquila and GrVen Canticles.

These last two examples indicate that Aquila's influence surpasses the boundaries of single verses and readings. His version seems to have subtly influenced the translator's idiom, resulting in what we might call an 'Aquilanic residue' in the language of the translation as a whole.

5. Conclusion

By way of conclusion I would like to restate the main findings of this paper. By adopting the elevated language of ancient Greek poetry the GrVen translator has constructed a highly artificial idiom with distinct literary aspirations, owing to his linguistic ingenuity and singular vocabulary. With regard to the book of Canticles, the translation is intended as more than a stylistic reworking of the LXX version. On the linguistic level, the translation is symbolically set apart from LXX Canticles by abandoning some of its most innovating linguistic features, but it cannot avoid its influence in less conspicuous cases. On the exegetical level, GrVen reflects an advanced level of textual understanding and reveals clear traces of the exegesis of Rashi and David Kimchi. The ancient Jewish versions have also left their mark on the translation. While the GrVen translator and Symmachus may have found each other through their common approach towards the target language, it is Aquila who takes pride of place. His version has not only left a definite mark on the translation and interpretation of individual passages, but has also contributed more subtly to the singular character of the vocabulary of GrVen Canticles as a whole.

---

as a far as we know, attested to only in the codex Graecus Venetus 7 and Aquila, does not necessitate an etymological bifurcation.

Postscript: the authorship of the Graecus Venetus translation

The question of authorship of the GrVen translation cannot be adequately addressed in a study as limited in scope as the present one, but this does seem to be the occasion to highlight one of the most significant and mystifying features of the manuscript, namely the apparent blend of Christian and Jewish elements that seems to pervade it on the codicological, palaeographical and textual levels.

This insight into the twofold nature of GrVen is of course not new: it was duly considered in Cardinal Mercati's identification of Simon Atumanus, a fourteenth-century Christian studax, as its author.[24] Mercati stressed the improbability, at least in that day and age, of two different people possessing the exceptional levels of mastery of both Greek and Hebrew that are exhibited by the GrVen translator and ascribed to Atumanus. Indeed, the very same Atumanus is also credited with a translation of the gospels from Greek into Hebrew. Moreover, Mercati's short biographical note implies that the very same prelate of Thebes harboured plans to prepare a brand new trilingual edition of the Holy Book (Hebrew, Greek and Latin). Could this obviously gifted individual and the mysterious GrVen translator be one and the same?

Aslanov accepted Mercati's proposal, but apparently did not consider it a sufficient explanation for some of the translation's overtly Jewish characteristics.[25] He argued that Atumanus might have been a Jewish convert, thus explaining the striking Jewish character of the translation. In this he relied first and foremost on the archbishop's peculiar name, which would certainly seem to imply something of the sort.

Though far from being the only speculation on the identity of the GrVen translator,[26] the 'Mercati-Aslanov hypothesis' (if one may call it such) does offer an explanation for the surprising combination of Christian and Jewish elements referred to earlier.

Codex Graecus Venetus 7 has received very little detailed attention since Mercati, and the issue of authorship has largely been left untouched. This postscript is not intended to add anything substantially new to the discussion, but rather to stress the need, for any and all future research on the

---

[24] See G. Mercati, Se la versione dall'ebraico del codice Veneto Greco VII sia di Simone Atumano arcivescovo di Tebe. Ricerca storica con notizie e documenti sulla vita dell'Atumano (Roma, 1916).

[25] Aslanov, 'La place du Venetus Graecus', 156–158.

[26] In his preface to Gebhardt's edition, for instance, Delitzsch ascribed the translation to one Elissaeus, a Byzantine Jew known from other sources (Gebhardt, Graecus Venetus, xi). Gebhardt himself assigned the translation to a Karaite milieu (Gebhardt, Graecus Venetus, lxv–lxix). See Mercati, Se la versione, 9, for other authors' views on the matter.

matter, to account for the hybrid nature of the manuscript and the translation contained within it. For this purpose, a brief overview of the various Christian and Jewish characteristics that need to be taken into account should prove useful.

In the first category I would like to mention the limited amount of textual material that, at least as far as the book of Canticles is concerned, comes from a distinctively Christian background. It would be interesting to scan the other biblical books in the codex for similar occurrences, in order to evaluate correctly the evidentiary value of what may perhaps turn out to be a substrate of Christian terms.

Other elements that point towards the author coming from a Christian background were already indicated by Mercati. Basing himself on the rather unpractised book hand found in the first part of the codex (up to f. 81^r), he typified the author's writing skills as Latin, i.e. in the style of the western Christian world. Then there is the undoubtedly Christian salutation Ave M(ari)a, added tachygraphically to the upper margin of every page of ff. 1–81^r. These details are all the more significant when one realizes that this particular part of the codex is considered to be the translator's autograph, so that the translator himself is to be held accountable for both the Latin book hand and the Ave Maria.

The elements that stem from the Jewish tradition are altogether more noticeable than their Christian counterparts. The influence of rabbinic sources and ancient Jewish versions on the GrVen translations has long been noted. In respect of the book of Canticles, I have pointed out the importance of rabbinic exegesis, especially Kimchi's Sefer Hašorašim, for the translation, as well as various traces of Symmachus and Aquila. Concerning the latter, both the extent and nature of these traces confirm their Jewish provenance – in other words, whereas a single direct quotation of a reading attributed to Aquila (e.g. 4:4 εἰς ἐπάλξεις) could equally well have been taken from a Christian source, multiple 'Aquilanic' linguistic peculiarities (e.g. 1:6 κατάκορος) surely could not.

Furthermore there is the matter of the pages being ordered from right to left, presupposing the Hebrew reading direction even in Greek.[27] The combination of all of these elements at first sight makes the codex and the translations contained in it appear more Jewish than Christian. According to Aslanov's judgement,[28] 'cette version ne peut avoir été l'œuvre que d'un Juif'.

Nonetheless it is clear that future research into the authorship of the GrVen translations will have to accommodate both the Christian and Jew-

---

[27] Cf. Bessarion's bibliographical note ἄρχεται ἀπὸ τοῦ τέλους τοῦ βιβλίου κατὰ Ἰουδαίους (quoted from Gebhardt, Graecus Venetus, xvii [n. 1]).
[28] Aslanov, 'La place du Venetus Graecus', 158.

ish influences indicated here. Short of proclaiming the translation to be the result of a combined Jewish-Christian effort, a tempting alternative but one lacking actual evidence in the absence of a more thorough textual and contextual study, Aslanov's modification of Mercati's hypothesis seems to be the only theory to meet this demand.

Greek Sources of the Complutensian Polyglot

by

Natalio Fernández Marcos

In his 2003 Grinfield Lectures on The Study of the Septuagint in Early Modern Europe Scott Mandelbrote deals, among other interesting issues, with the text of the Alcalá or Complutensian Polyglot, the earliest printed text of the Septuagint, completed the tenth of July 1517. He drew attention to the impact of the arrival of Codex Alexandrinus in England in 1627 and its use as one of the main authorities for the London Polyglot (1653–1657), whose editor, Brian Walton, was especially critical of the text of the Complutensian Polyglot and the precise age of the manuscripts on which it was based.[1] Indeed, Walton's judgement is highly negative; he maintains that the Greek text of the Alcalá Polyglot is very far from the genuine Septuagint. It is a compilation of several different texts with Hexaplaric additions and even Greek commentaries in an attempt to relate it to the Hebrew text printed in the parallel column.[2] He backs up his statement with some examples taken from the first chapter of the book of Job.

Since then the vexed problem of the Greek manuscripts used by the Complutensian philologists has been dealt with by different scholars, including myself. However, I think it is worthwhile taking another look at

---

[1] S. Mandelbrote, 'The Grinfield Lectures 2003–2004', BJGS 33 (Winter 2003–2004), 37. Codex Alexandrinus was presented to King Charles I as a New Year's gift in 1627. Walton was the first to designate the manuscript as Codex Alexandrinus. On the origin of this manuscript see S. McKendrick, 'The Codex Alexandrinus or the danger of being a named manuscript', in The Bible as book: the transmission of the Greek Text, S. McKendrick and O. O'Sullivan, eds. (London, 2003), 1–16.

[2] 'Nova enim et mixta est haec Versio, partim ex Septuaginta, partim ex Origenis additamentis ex Theodotione, partim ex Aquilae, Symmachi, aliorumque Interpretum, imo & Commentatorum Graecorum verbis consarcinata, ut hoc modo textui Hebraeo per columnas aptius responderet,' B. Walton, Prolegomena (De versionibus Graecis) to the Biblia Polyglotta (London, 1657), 64. Likewise in the Praefatio B2 Walton deals with the new contributions of the London Polyglot and among them he mentions the publication of the Septuagint according to the Sixtine edition of 1587 and Codex Alexandrinus when it disagrees from Vaticanus, 'rejecta illa Complutensium, quam secuti sunt in Regiis et Parisianis, ut omnium quae hodie extant maxime mixta et interpolata, et quae a genuina τῶν ο′ omnium longissime distat.'

the question in the light of new evidence which has recently been pub-
lished in the context of Septuagint textual criticism.

It is well known that Cardinal Jiménez de Cisneros, in the Preface to the
reader that precedes the edition of the texts, praises the Greek manuscripts
sent by Pope Leo X from the Vatican Library and used for the Polyglot, as
very old and pure ('vetustissima simul et emendatissima'). He mentions, in
addition, other sources: a copy from a very correct manuscript belonging to
the legacy of Cardinal Bessarion, sent by the Venetian Senate; together
with other manuscripts which were the fruit of a long and costly search for
a large number of corrected codices.[3]

Cisneros's statement must be interpreted in the context of the Renais-
sance, indulging in some rhetorical bias, and the state of Biblical studies at
that time. But the basic reliability of the information transmitted is not in
doubt. In the nineteenth century, Vercellone discovered in the Vatican Li-
brary the proceedings of an inventory of the library of Leo X which were
drawn up in 1518; he edited this inventory and described the codices lent
to Spain for the preparation of the Complutensian Bible, adding that they
had been returned to the library.[4] These are Vaticanus Graecus 330 (= 108
of Rahlfs's Catalogue) and Vaticanus Graecus 346 (= 248 of Rahlfs's
Catalogue).[5] The former contains the Octateuch, 1–4 Kingdoms, 1–2
Paralipomena, 1–2 Ezra, Judith, Esther (Septuagint and Alpha-text) and
Tobit (incomplete), while the latter contains Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song
of Songs, Job, Wisdom, Ben Sira (with the second Prologue), 1–2 Ezra,
Esther, Tobit and Judith. It must be emphasized that ms 330 has many
Hexaplaric notes and Arabic glosses as well as some Greek scholia to 2
Kingdoms. Ms 346 is full of Hexaplaric notes in the margins without any
sigla indicating their attribution. As we shall see below, these circum-
stances may explain some singular readings of the Complutensian at the
beginning of the the book of Job.

As far as the copy sent by the Venetian Senate is concerned, we have no
other information than the words of Cisneros in the aforementioned Pref-

---

[3] 'Quod autem ad Graecam scripturam attinet: illud te non latere volumus: non vul-
garia seu temere oblata exemplaria fuisse huic nostrae impressioni archetypa: sed vetus-
tissima simul et emendatissima: quae sanctissimus Dominus noster Leo Decimus Pon-
tifex Maximus coeptis nostris aspirans ex ipsa apostolica Bibliotheca ad nos misit: tantae
integritatis: ut nisi eis plena fides adhibeatur: nulli reliqui esse videantur: quibus merito
sit adhibenda. Quibus etiam adiunximus alia non pauca: quorum partem ex Bessarionis
castigatissimo codice summa diligentia transcriptam Illustris Venetorum Senatus ad nos
misit: partem ipsi magnis laboribus et expensis undique conquisivimus: ut copia emenda-
torum codicum abunde supesset,' Prologus ad Lectorem, III of the Alcalá Polyglot.

[4] C. Vercellone, Dissertazioni accademiche (Rome, 1864), 409.

[5] A. Rahlfs, Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften des Alten Testaments (Berlin,
1914).

ace. There is no evidence of the loan in the Marcian Library of Venice. Delitzsch, in a visit to the library, examined the Greek mss that had belonged to cardinal Bessarion in order to find out which of them served as the base of the Spanish copy. He arrived at the conclusion that ms 68 (= Gr.V) is the best candidate, the one most deserving of the adjective castigatissimus of Cisneros's Preface. He also verified that the Complutensis fills the lacunae of Vat. 330 from a copy of ms 68; he insists, however, that these two manuscripts are not the only sources.[6] A partial copy including Judges, Ruth, 1–4 Kingdoms, 1–2 Paralipomena, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, 1–2 Ezra, Esther (according to ο′ and with the Greek Suppplements pace Rahlfs[7]), Wisdom, Judith, Tobit, 1–3 Maccabees of ms 68, a complete Bible[8] including the New Testament, was preserved until the Spanish civil war (1936–1939) in the library of the Complutensian University of Madrid, as part of the ancient collection of the Colegio de San Ildefonso of Alcalá founded by Cisneros. It was consulted by Samuel P. Tregelles, the editor of the New Testament, in 1860, and in 1886 Delitzsch published its text for the Song of Deborah (Judges 5) and David's elegy (2 Sam 1:19–26) from a facsimile copy sent by the librarian Pascual de Gayangos.[9] (I shall say a few words about the fate of this manuscript, 442 of Rahlfs's Catalogue, and its present state of preservation at the end of this article.) The other manuscript from the same collection of Alcalá and used basically for the edition of the Psalms by the Complutensian philologists is a Psalter of the fourteenth or fifteenth century (Number 23 of Villa-Amil's Catalogue = 1670 of Rahlfs's Catalogue).[10]

For the time being, we shall leave to one side the problem of the Greek manuscripts used for the text of the New Testament, which has still not been answered satisfactorily and also requires further study.[11] As far as the text of the Old Testament is concerned, it is clear that Delitzsch's studies led to a positive appreciation of the Complutensian Polyglot as a textual

---

[6] F. Delitzsch, Fortgesetzte Studien zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Complutensischen Polyglotte (Leipzig, 1886), 26.

[7] Rahlfs (Verzeichnis, 124) remarks: 'Esther (la partie qui existe dans l'hébreu)', obviously taking this information from Graux's catalogue. See, however, N. Fernández Marcos, 'Un manuscrito complutense redivivo. Ms. griego 442 = Villa-Amil 22,' Sefarad 65 (2005), 65–83.

[8] The order of the books is the same as in ms 68. However, we can only speculate on the omission in the copy of the Pentateuch, Joshua, the Prophets, Job, Psalms and Sira. The ms has 1–3 Maccabees only like its copy.

[9] Delitzsch, Fortgesetzte Studien, 13–18.

[10] Delitzsch, Fortgesetzte Studien, 28–9.

[11] See the interesting contribution of J. A. L. Lee, 'Dimitrios Doukas and the accentuation of the New Testament text of the Complutensian Polyglot', NT 47 (2005), 250–90.

witness. This process of re-evaluation of the Complutensian Greek text has continued with growing interest up to the present time.

Closely related to the problem of the manuscripts used by the Complutensian collaborators is the use they made of such witnesses – in other words, whether they respected the readings of the manuscripts or whether they corrected them in order to accommodate the Greek text to the Hebrew or the Vulgate printed in parallel columns. The opinion of scholars on this issue ranges from the strongly negative stance of A. Masius, B. Walton and R. Simon to the more balanced opinions of F. Delitzsch, P. de Lagarde and J. Ziegler, who held the Complutensian Greek text in great esteem. One thing seems clear: it is time to forgo broad generalizations and to undertake a thorough study of individual books in order to advance towards the clarification of this vexed question. For example, the critical edition of the book of Job by J. Ziegler has indirectly shed light on the Complutensian Greek text of this book. As in the rest of the Wisdom books, the Alcalá Polyglot basically follows ms 248 lent by Leo X. But for the first ten chapters (we recall that the first chapter of Job constituted the core of Walton's criticism) they took the readings of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion which were in the margin of this manuscript, and sometimes whole sentences, I suppose because these readings were closer to the Hebrew. But it can be verified that in the rest of the book, chapters 11–42, only five marginal readings of ms 248 were introduced into the Complutensian text.[12] In defence of the editors it should be remembered that these marginal Hexaplaric readings lacked the sigla indicating attribution.[13] It can be deduced that at times closeness to the Hebrew or to the Vulgate was the criterion for the restoration of the Greek. This is certainly not a sound principle according to modern textual criticism of the Septuagint, but was the kind of philology commonly practised in the Renaissance.[14] The European humanists, like Origen and Jerome, thought that the Greek translation was made from the same Hebrew text as that transmitted by the Masoretes, a text which had been preserved unaltered throughout the centuries. They

---

[12] O'Connell thinks that the different procedures in the editing of Job are due to two different editors, one of them more interventive than the other, not to tiredness of the editor after chapter 10 as Ziegler thought: see S. O'Connell, From most ancient sources: the nature and text–critical use of the Greek Old Testament text of the Complutensian Polyglot Bible (OBO 215; Fribourg and Göttingen, 2006), 133.

[13] J. Ziegler, Septuaginta. XI, 4 Iob (Göttingen, 1982), 56–58, and Delitzsch, Fortgesetzte Studien, 12: 'Die Verschmelzung solcher Marginallesarten mit dem Septuagintatext war freilich unkritisch, entschuldigt sich aber dadurch, dass sie im codex nicht mit ΑΣΘ bezeichnet sind.' Delitzsch insists that most of the peculiar readings of the Complutensian are not retroversions but rely on the witness of the manuscripts.

[14] 'Und in der That, welchem andern Kriterium hätten sie bei ihrem beschränkten handschriftlichen Apparat folgen sollen?,' Delitzsch, Fortgesetzte Studien, 27.

had no inkling of the different Hebrew texts that the Qumran documents have brought to light and, consequently, the possibility of a different Hebrew *Vorlage* in the hand of the translators. Consequently, in the Preface to Pope Leo X, Cardinal Cisneros points to the originals as the ultimate criterion for authenticity in the translated texts, 'ita ut librorum Veteris Testamenti synceritas ex Hebraica veritate: Novi autem ex Graecis exemplaribus examinetur.'[15]

But we should not think that recourse to the original source as the arbiter of Greek readings was used as the supreme principle or in a systematic way. This device has been detected in a few cases, where the editors prefer the Greek reading closest to the original Hebrew, be it in the body of the manuscripts or in their margins. Yet, in Jeremiah, the Complutensian editors, aware of the differences which exist between the Hebrew and the Greek texts, maintain the Septuagint tradition as valid in its own right, warning in the preface to this book that the Greek text must be respected without trying to correct it towards the Hebrew, because the truth of both should be maintained.[16] This is a surprisingly modern warning, and one confirmed by some of the Qumran Jeremiah fragments (4QJer[b,d]) that support the Septuagint short text edition. And on the text of Reigns O'Connell states: 'The editors saw LXX as a separate entity and consequently the Greek text as requiring internal criticism. This consideration, frequently in tension with that of faithfulness to their primary source and to the Hebrew, explains the number of stylistic modifications and the overall pragmatic approach to the text.'[17]

It is not only the new critical editions of the Göttingen series which have helped to illuminate the Complutensian text. Further studies, especially on the books of Reigns and the Twelve Prophets, have led to the conclusion that each book has to be subjected to a thorough analysis, since the results are differently nuanced according to the most recent studies.[18] In what follows, I do not pretend to offer a global or final solution to this

---

[15] Prologus, col. 1.

[16] 'Haec interpretatio hieronymi est. Si quid in ea novi erit: secundum hebraeos codices exploretur. Alia est Septuaginta interpretum ecclesiis usitata. Quae quamvis nonnulli aliter habeat quam in hebraeis codicibus invenitur: tamen utraque, id est secundum septuaginta: et secundum hebraeam, apostolica autoritate firmata est: non errore neque reprehensione superiori: sed certo consilio septuaginta nonnulli aliter dixisse vel contexuisse intelliguntur. Quod ideo praemonemus ne quisquam alteram ex altera velit emendare. Quod singulorum in suo genere veritas observanda est,' Preface to the Book of Jeremiah.

[17] O'Connell, From most ancient sources, 111.

[18] See N. Fernández Marcos, 'El texto griego de la Biblia Políglota Complutense', in N. Fernández Marcos and E. Fernández Tejero, Biblia y Humanismo. Textos, talantes y controversias del siglo XVI español (Madrid, 1997), 221–24.

complex problem, but only to mention in passing a few recent and partial studies that have added to the esteem of the Complutensian Greek text among textual critics of the Septuagint over the last sixty years.

In a study devoted to the Twelve Prophets, I pointed out that every publication of a new witness had contributed to reducing the number of singular readings of the Alcalá Polyglot, readings too often attributed to arbitrary corrections of the editors.[19] The main problem of the Complutensian Greek text of the Twelve, 'die noch unerledigte Frage' in Delitzsch's words,[20] found a partial answer in Ziegler's study. He demonstrated that a good number of readings of the Complutensian Polyglot considered to be unique were shared by Codex Washingtonianus (W) (of the third century AD but only published in 1927),[21] the marginal readings of ms 86, the Coptic versions and, especially, the Old Latin. However, he ended his article with ambiguous conclusions: on the one hand he recognizes that the Complutensis transmits very ancient readings which are lacking in the known manuscripts; the editors had at their disposal 'eine Vorlage, die ganz altertümliche Lesarten überlieferte, die heute in den uns bekannten Handschriften fehlen.'[22] On the other hand, he mentions frequent retroversions from Latin into Greek without deciding whether these interventions were made by the editors or were taken from Greek manuscripts already influenced by Latin readings. Another eminent scholar of Septuagint studies, John W. Wevers, was not satisfied with Ziegler's solution, and stated in a critical review that the Complutensian text of the Dodekapropheton continues to be an interesting enigma.[23]

With the publication of the critical editions of the Greek Pentateuch in the Göttingen series it has been confirmed that the Complutensian editors

---

[19] 'Todo nuevo testimonio, como se demostró con motivo de la publicación del Codex Washingtonianus (W) en 1927, ha contribuido a reducir el número de lecturas exclusivas de la Complutense, muchas de las cuales se atribuían hasta entonces a correcciones arbitrarias de los editores,' N. Fernández Marcos, 'El texto griego de la Complutense en Doce Profetas', Sefarad 39 (1979), 6. The same could be said of the publication of the Dodekapropheton Scroll from Nahal Hever.

[20] Delitzsch, Fortgesetzte Studien, 53.

[21] See Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften des Alten Testaments von Alfred Rahlfs. Bd. I,1 Die Überlieferung bis zum VIII. Jahrhundert, bearbeitet von Detlef Fraenkel (Göttingen, 2004), 387–89.

[22] J. Ziegler, 'Der griechische Dodekapropheton–Text der Complutenser Polyglotte', Bib 25 (1944), 309.

[23] 'Ihr Text bleibt ein interessantes Rätzel ... Die Compl. Polyglotte enthält auch eine Reihe von nirgendswo bezeugten Sonderlesarten ... Es fragt sich, ob nicht der Text von einer anderen griech. Übersetzung beeinflusst sein könnte; denn absichtliche Revision, wie sie Ziegler vermutet, ohne die Zugrundelegung irgendwelcher Hss. ist auch keine zufriedenstellende Lösung,' see J. W. Wevers, 'Septuaginta Forschungen', TR 22 (1954), 105.

had ms 108, sent from Rome, as their main source for volume 1. However, they also had recourse to other manuscripts. Moreover, further studies have shown that somewhere after Exod 15 and before Exod 25 the primary source changes to a manuscript of the f-group of Wevers' edition.[24] Scholars had not been aware of this change of primary source. Therefore the Göttingen editions misrepresent Complutensian because they attempt to present Complutensian on the basis of 108.[25] This verification supports Cisneros's statement when he alludes, in the preface to the reader, to other manuscripts he has purchased with much effort and large sums of money. In the second volume a significant unevenness in editorial approach can be perceived. In Joshua there is a change of primary source from an ms of the f-group which is no longer known (not ms 56 as another promiment scholar M. L. Margolis thought) to ms 108 again at the end of the book.[26] Therefore, it is at least surprising that Margolis, in a study of the Complutensian text of Joshua, recently published for the first time by L. Greenspoon, expresses a very critical judgement on the editors of the Alcalá Polyglot. He attributes to retroversion by the editors from Latin into 'Spanish Greek' all the readings that do not agree with mss 108 or 56 of Rahlfs's catalogue, even when the reading can be found in other known Greek manuscripts.[27] His argument cannot be sustained in the light of recent research. As O'Connell states: 'There is only the slightest trace of what Margolis termed "Spanish Greek" – Greek resulting from editorial retroversions. ... The misplaced identification [of ms 56] leads him [Margolis] to see much more editorial activity in Complutensian than there actually was and to identify certain readings as "Spanish Greek" when in fact they were to be found in what may be termed the f-type source. The term "Spanish Greek" is unfortunate because it leads to overgeneralisation in the evaluation of Complutensian readings which are not found elsewhere.'[28]

---

[24] O'Connell, From most ancient sources, 19 and 35: 'The first volume of Compl is edited with considerable care and fidelity to all the texts involved.'

[25] For instance, "the editor or editors of Leviticus may not be accused of constructing the text. There is some slight stylistic modification but otherwise all the readings in the Greek column are attested in the two mss. at the editors' disposition," see O'Connell, From most ancient sources, 28. Even the most recent edition by U. Quast, Septuaginta. IV, 3 Ruth (Göttingen, 2006), 14, states: 'Compl. wird notiert, wenn ihre Lesart von 108 abweicht.'

[26] O'Connell, From most ancient sources, 75.

[27] L. Greenspoon, 'Max L. Margolis on the Complutensian text of Joshua', BIOSCS 12 (1979), 43–56.

[28] O'Connell, From most ancient sources, 75 and 78, and O'Connell continues: 'Although there are retroversions and errors in Compl, they are not as frequent as Margolis maintains; they are to be attributed more to the characteristics of the source mss than to editorial intervention or negligence.'

In a perspicacious study D. Barthélemy called the attention of scholars to a singular phenomenon of the Greek Ezekiel: the close connection between the Complutensis and the most ancient witness of this book, Papyrus 967, in the description of the temple. Pap 967 belongs to the end of the second or the beginning of the third century AD. In this part of the book (Ez 40:42–46:24) there are 215 readings of the papyrus which are not supported in the manuscripts of Ziegler's apparatus. Interestingly, 130 of these readings agree exactly with the text of the Complutensian Polyglot. It would have been difficult to give credit to the antiquity of these Complutensian singular readings had they not been confirmed by the discovery and publication of a new witness such as Pap 967. Barthélemy is convinced that the editors of the Alcalá Polyglot had a manuscript at their disposal, albeit fragmentary, which has now disappeared but which belonged to a textual family clearly different from that of Codex Vaticanus that embraces more or less the rest of the textual tradition. He recalls the high esteem of Lagarde towards the Complutensian text, laments that the Alcalá Polyglot was not collated in the first volumes of the Göttingen series, and concludes: 'La Complutensis se confirme donc, de plus en plus clairement, comme un témoin textuel de haute valeur, quoique énigmatique; et Robert Hanhart a eu parfaitement raison de lui faire place, à partir de 1960, dans la Septante de Göttingen.'[29]

Finally, in his edition of 2 Ezra R. Hanhart is more cautious with regard to the singular text of the Complutensis. As a result of Barthélemy's article, he says, those readings in agreement with the Masoretic text which are lacking in the Lucianic recension represented by ms 108 should be subjected to a new analysis. Hanhart concludes that no certain conclusion can be reached regarding the use of manuscripts which are now lost or the reconstruction of the text by the editors. Nevertheless, he observes that the eclectic use of mss has led the editors to choose the reading of 108 which is closer to the MT, as can be proven in the utilization of the Lucianic doublets, taking the part of the doublet which is closer to the Hebrew.[30]

Another intriguing connection between the Complutensis and the extant manuscripts was found during the preparation of the critical edition of Exodus. It has been analyzed by the editor, J. W. Wevers, and a research scholar of the Septuaginta-Unternehmen, D. Fraenkel, in separate contribu-

---

[29] D. Barthélemy, 'Les relations de la Complutensis avec le papyrus 967 pour Éz 40,42 à 46,24', in Studien zur Septuaginta – Robert Hanhart zu Ehren. Aus Anlass seines 65 Geburtstages, D. Fraenkel, U. Quast and J. W. Wevers, eds. (MSU 20; Göttingen, 1990), 261. For more details see D. Barthélemy, Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament. Tome 3. Ézéchiel, Daniel et les 12 Prophètes. (OBO 50/3; Fribourg and Göttingen, 1992), CXXV–CXLIV.

[30] R. Hanhart, Septuaginta. Vol. VIII/2 Esdrae Liber II (Göttingen, 1993), 25.

tions. In the Ambrosian library of Milan there is an important uncial manuscript of the fifth century AD (S. P. 51, formerly A.147 inf.), F according to Rahlfs's Catalogue.[31] In the Middle Age this codex was systematically repaired by an instaurator. The instaurator has also corrected the codex. These and later corrections have been designed as F[b] in Wevers's edition[32]. A later corrector completed the omissions of the manuscript using a Vorlage that is in an order and textual form closer to the Hebrew than the Greek Exodus. This current text of the later corrector or suppletor is called F[h] in Wevers's edition. Interestingly enough, the text of this medieval Jewish corrector agrees with the Septuagint column of the Complutensian Polyglot. As a matter of fact, F[h] and Complutensis agree with the Hexaplaric witnesses in the outline and distribution of the text but not in the textual form of the completed text, where both witnesses go their own way against the Hexaplaric recension. Only one conclusion can be drawn: that both witnesses follow a common textual tradition. Of early printed editions only the Complutensian offers a text similar to that of F[h] in this part of Exodus. This means that the editor knew either the manuscript F itself with its medieval corrections or the Jewish tradition on which these corrections are based.[33] The Brooke-McLean edition published this text for Ex 36:8–39:43 (according to the Hebrew = pp. 408–36 of Wevers' edition) in an Appendix to Exodus, taking the text of ms G of the Hexaplaric recension as the basis. F[h] was included in the apparatus, but under the siglum F[b]. According to Wevers, this Second Tabernacle Account of F[h] is a revised text also based on the Greek Exodus and not a new rendering of the Masoretic Text. It is a revision based on the Hebrew, not unlike that of Origen's Hexapla, but with many more corrections towards MT. On several occasions, both the Complutensis and F[h] support the same variant, indeed the same sentence.[34] I cite Wevers' words: 'Close scrutiny reveals

---

[31] Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften. Bd. I,1 Die Überlieferung bis zum VIII. Jahrhundert, bearbeitet von Detlef Fraenkel, 229–31. As indicated in an early record on the flyleaf, it was imported from Macedonia (ex Macedonia Corcyram advecta) and bought by cardinal Borromaeus for the Ambrosian Library.

[32] 'In Mittelalter ist der Codex von einem Instaurator durchgängig nachgezogen worden. Dieser Instaurator hat die Hs. auch korrigiert. Seine und spätere Korrekturen werden in der Ausgabe mit F[b] bezeichnet,' see J. W. Wevers, Septuaginta. II, 1 Exodus (Göttingen, 1991), 7.

[33] See Wevers, Exodus, 7–8; D. Fraenkel, 'Die Quellen der asterisierten Zusätze im zweiten Tabernakelbericht Ex 35–40*', in Studien zur Septuaginta, D. Fraenkel, U. Quast and J. W. Wevers, eds., 144–45 and 174–84. In fact, several of these corrections also agree with the translation into modern Greek published in 1547 in Hebrew script as a column of the Constantinople Polyglot Pentateuch: see N. Fernández Marcos, Introducción a las versiones griegas de la Biblia. 2nd edition revised and augmented (Madrid, 1998), 183–89.

[34] See J. W. Wevers, Septuaginta. II, 1 Exodus (Göttingen, 1991), 408–11.

that Complutensian's support is stronger for the base text than for the readings which constitute revisions towards MT. This must mean that one of the sources of Complutensian must have shared in its stemmata a parent text which also lay in the textual ancestry of F^h. That source is not one of the extant identified sources of Complutensian for the Pentateuch, viz. ms 108 and some of the f mss, but one no longer extant.'[35]

Although most of these marginal glosses are anonymous, in the notes to Gen 47:31 and Exod 16:31 the readings of F^b are attributed to τὸ ιουδ′ (= τὸ ιουδαικόν). In fact, these readings follow the tradition of the ancient Jewish versions, particularly Aquila (cf. Exod 6:3; 15:1,11; Num 23:19; 24:4; 25:6), and very often agree with the lexicon of the Greek column in the Constantinople Pentateuch of 1547.[36]

Some comments on this chain of evidence seem appropriate. First of all, it is recognized that the Complutensian collaborators made use of other sources no longer extant beside those commonly accepted for the Pentateuch, ms 108 and one of the f- group.[37] These conclusions confirm the statement of Cardinal Cisneros in the preface to the reader 'ut copia emendatorum codicum abunde supesset.' Secondly, the base text followed in the Second Tabernacle Account of Exodus forms part of a Jewish tradition connected with the ancient Jewish versions of the Bible, especially Aquila, a tradition which is also reflected in the Greek column of the Jewish Constantinople Pentateuch of 1547. We lack proof of the actual link used by the Complutensian editors, but all the evidence leads to the conclusion that contacts between Cardinal Cisneros and these manuscripts from North Italy, corrected by Jewish hands, was not only possible but quite plausible. The migration of Greek manuscripts from Constantinople to Italy even before 1453 is well attested.[38] The main collection of the Marcian Library in

---

[35] J. W. Wevers, 'A secondary text in Codex Ambrosianus of the Greek Exodus', in Philologia Sacra. Biblische und patristische Studien für Hermann J. Frede und Walter Thiele zu ihrem siebzigsten Geburtstag. Band I, R. Gryson, ed. (Freiburg, 1993), 48. O'Connell recognizes that 'there is a relationship between F^h and Compl only in the texts where the main text fails. Compl borrows from F^h and not vice versa,' see O'Connell, From most ancient sources, 53, n. 48. There is significant unevenness in the editing of the Second Tabernacle Account. Like Fraenkel, O'Connell accepts that it is a product of the Hellenists of Alcalá, but he admits in this narrative the influence of the Vulgate on the shape of the Greek column: see O'Connell, From most ancient sources, 72–73.

[36] Fernández Marcos, Introducción a las versiones griegas, 182–83, and N. Fernández Marcos, 'El Pentateuco griego de Constantinopla', Erytheia 6 (1985), 198–99. Of the 488 readings that F^b preserves in the book of Exodus, it shares 100 with the Constantinople Pentateuch: see Wevers, Septuaginta. II, 1 Exodus, 43–44.

[37] The following mss belong to this group in the Pentateuch: 53, 56, 129, 246 and 664.

[38] J. Signes Codoñer, 'Translatio studiorum: la emigración bizantina a Europa Occidental en las décadas finales del Imperio (1353–1453)', in Constantinopla 1453. Mitos y realidades, P. Bádenas de la Peña and I. Pérez Martín, eds. (Nueva Roma 19; Madrid,

Venice came from the legacy of Cardinal Bessarion. Cultural contacts be-
tween Spain and Venice, Milan, Rome and other cities of Italy were fre-
quent in the fifteenth-sixteenth centuries. Some of the Complutensian col-
laborators such as Alfonso de Zamora or Pablo Coronel were conversos
who had access to Hebrew manuscripts and Jewish exegetical traditions.
Moreover, the Cretan Demetrio Ducas was called by Cisneros to collabo-
rate in the edition of the Greek text of the Complutensis when he was in
Italy working on the publication of Greek texts for Aldus Manuzius in
Venice.[39] Hernán Núñez de Guzmán (also known as Pinciano and Comen-
dador griego), the other collaborator in the edition of the Greek text, was
twice in Italy (probably in Bologna before and after 1499), where he pur-
chased several Greek manuscripts.[40] Nebrija himself had studied ten years
in Italy.

The philological criteria of the Renaissance for the edition of translated
texts were well established in the Preface of the Complutensian Polyglot:
when the witnesses disagree the truth relies on the originals, the Hebrew
text for the Old Testament and the Greek text for the New. It is not surpris-
ing that, given these criteria of textual criticism, the Complutensian phi-
lologists gave priority to the manuscripts and readings which supported the
Masoretic Text. To this end they sometimes even preferred marginal read-
ings, whether they belonged to the Hexapla as in the ten first chapters of
Job or to para-Hexaplaric notes and texts as in the late part of Exodus. As
Delitzsch stated, what other criterion could they have followed at the time?
They thought that the ancient Greek translators had before them the same
textus receptus, which had remained unaltered since the time of the trans-
lation.

The latest study of the Complutensian Greek text, by S. O'Connell, re-
veals that one can hardly speak of one text of the Alcalá Polyglot: 'The
Greek column is an eclectic text constructed by a number of editors who
worked semi-independently.'[41] These editors apply different procedures.
They usually follow a main manuscript as the base which they correct with

---

2003), 189–246. In connection with the Council of Florence (1438/39) Signes states
('Translatio studiorum', 232): 'Muchos eruditos griegos trajeron desde Bizancio manus-
critos de autores antiguos que difundieron entre sus colegas humanistas, presentes en las
sesiones conciliares.'

[39] J. López Rueda, Helenistas españoles del siglo XVI (Madrid, 1973), 20.

[40] J. Signes Codoñer, C. Codoñer Merino and A. Domingo Malvadi, Biblioteca y epis-
tolario de Hernán Núñez de Guzmán (El Pinciano). Una aproximación al humanismo
español del siglo XVI. Nueva Roma 14 (Madrid, 2001), 7–12.

[41] O'Connell, From most ancient sources, 166. However, the number of editors should
not be exaggerated. We know only three or at most four editors for the Greek column:
Demetrio Ducas, Hernán Núñez (or Pinciano, a disciple of Nebrija) and López de Zúñiga.
Perhaps they were helped by Juan de Vergara.

readings of another manuscript. But the manuscript chosen as the base may change from book to book, from one part of the Bible to another. This may explain in some way the enigma of the Complutensis.

O'Connell slightly modifies Fraenkel's conclusions on Exodus 35–40. The Greek column bears traces of two hands, one non-interventive and the other quite interventive. The incorporation of marginal glosses is a significant feature of the Complutensian text, but there is no convincing evidence of spontaneous retroversion from MT or Vulgate. The editor made an effort to find textual sources for all the readings in the Second Tabernacle Account.[42]

Concerning the work of the Hellenists of Alcalá in the second volume O'Connell concludes that they 'executed their task with noteworthy seriousness: the evaluation of their work must strive to avoid facile and simplistic solutions.'[43]

As far as Ezekiel is concerned Barthélemy's conclusions are confirmed. The sounding of other chapters shows that there is a relationship, albeit hidden, with Pap 967 for some passages where 967 is still extant. There is an increase of unique Complutensian readings in the first ten chapters of Ezekiel, a section for which 967 is not extant. These unique readings are to be attributed more to the characteristics of the lost primary source than to the interventions of a particular editor.[44]

If we pay attention to the shape of the text it must be said that the Vulgate was used as a guide in establishing the text. The Vulgate does not always influence the Complutensian text, but it is a constant factor in the editing. The Masoretic text is of lesser influence. It is significant in longer texts that it is the Vulgate which acts as a guide in interpreting the Hebrew. In Ezekiel, a very clear influence of Jerome's commentary is evident in the final chapters. O'Connell concludes his important monograph with the following assertions:

It is possible to distinguish contrasting techniques and tendencies throughout the Greek column: in the degree of Vg use; in the use or non-use of MT; in the incorporation of marginal glosses; in the use of Jerome's commentary; in the style of combining source mss and in differing stylistic and orthographic criteria. It must, however, be stated that the stylistic modification is quite restrained. There is no question of the editors changing to have a more elegant text. Their modification is aimed at restoring what had become corrupt or was lost. They were people of their time and Complutensian testifies to their expertise within their time.

---

[42] O'Connell, From most ancient sources, 37–73.

[43] O'Connell, From most ancient sources, 103.

[44] O'Connell. From most ancient sources, 163: 'The most significant result of the investigation of Ezek 42c was that many of the unique Compl readings, rather than being supposed retroversions were in fact pre-Hexaplaric readings of very high quality ... The specific Compl readings show that the editor had access to a ms no longer extant.'

The practical effect of this is to show the editorial activity of the Complutensian Hellenists in a much calmer light, especially that the amount of borrowing from the secondary source is comparatively limited as is the number of readings attributable to spontaneous editorial intervention.[45]

Behind all the efforts of the editors lies the most important component of all: the manuscripts which the editors used. It is the manuscripts which give the fundamental colour to the Greek column. It is still valid to maintain that the text-critical value of this text lies in the value of its sources.

As we have shown above, for the first volume, the Pentateuch, and the second, Joshua–2 Chronicles, the main sources of the Greek column were ms 108 and a second manuscript of the f-group. But for Judges and the following books the editors had at their disposal a third manuscript, a partial copy of ms 68 sent to Alcalá by the Venetian Senate. It is ms 116-Z-36 (22 of Villa-Amil, 442 of Rahlfs).[46] A printed text of this manuscript for Judges 5, the Song of Deborah, and 2 Sam 1:19–26, David's elegy over Saul and Jonathan, was published by Delitzsch from a copy sent by Pascual de Gayangos, the librarian of the Madrid University.[47] O'Connell describes the use of this manuscript made by the Complutensian philologists with the following words: 'However, with the appearance of ms 442 for Judges, the editors had available to them a ms which was much closer to ms 108. The sudden switch to ms 442 then becomes more understandable: in Judges the close relationship between mss 108 and 442, while not members of the same ms group, offered the editors a more stable path in establishing the Greek column and provided a sense of security as to where the LXX lay.'[48]

My interest in this manuscript goes back to my postgraduate studies at the Complutensian University of Madrid. A document signed by the director of the Complutensian Library on the fifth of June 1973 informed that ms 22 (= 442) with other Hebrew and Latin Bibles were not accesible to researchers since they had to be restored. My interest increased when in the Göttingen edition of 1 Ezra, in the description of the available manuscripts, R. Hanhart stated of 442: 'Die Hs. ist laut Mitteilung der Bibliothek vom 24.10.1969 im spanischen Bürgerkrieg verbrannt.'[49]

---

[45] O'Connell, From most ancient sources, 168.

[46] J. Villa–Amil y Castro, Catálogo de los mss. Existentes en la Biblioteca del noviciado de la Universidad Central (procedentes de la antigua de Alcalá). Parte I: Códices (Madrid, 1878) 5–6.

[47] Delitzsch, Fortgesetzte Studien, 13–17.

[48] O'Connell, From most ancient sources, 86. Actually, in Judges ms 108 belongs to the Hexaplaric group and ms 442 to the group MNhyb$_2$ of Brooke–McLean, although ms 442 was not collated by Brooke–McLean.

[49] R. Hanhart, Septuaginta. Vol. VIII/1 Esdrae Liber I (Göttingen, 1974), 14. Information repeated in specialists' publications until now: see U. Quast, Septuaginta IV, 3 Ruth,

My joy was still greater when I was able to verify two years ago that ms 22 was not completely lost but only damaged, that it had been partially restored, even digitized, and that I could have in my hands the extant folios and fragments of the manuscript that had been presumed burnt. In a separate publication I have made known and described the contents and remnants of the restored manuscript.[50]

10, and O'Connell, From most ancient sources, 82: 'While the ms has been rendered unreadable by the ravages of the Spanish Civil War ...'

[50] Fernández Marcos, 'Un manuscrito complutense redivivo', see note 7.

List of Contributors

JAMES K. AITKEN is Academic Director of the Centre for the Study of Jewish-Christian Relations, Cambridge.

PHILIP ALEXANDER is Professor of Post-Biblical Jewish Literature and Co-Director of the Centre for Jewish Studies in the University of Manchester.

PATRICK ANDRIST is Conservator of the Bongarsiana and Swiss National Science Foundation, Burgerbibliothek Bern.

CAMERON BOYD-TAYLOR is a Research Associate in the Faculty of Divinity, University of Cambridge.

SILVIA CAPPELLETTI is a Research Assistant in Roman History, Department of Antiquities, University of Milan, Italy.

DRIES DE CROM is a Research Assistant in the Centre for Septuagint Studies and Textual Criticism, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven.

NICHOLAS DE LANGE is Professor of Hebrew and Jewish Studies in the University of Cambridge and a fellow of Wolfson College, Cambridge.

SASKIA DÖNITZ is a Research Assistant of the Byzantinisch-Neugriechisches Seminar, Freie Universität, Berlin.

NATALIO FERNÁNDEZ MARCOS is a Research Professor in the Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas (CSIC), Madrid.

WILLIAM HORBURY is Professor of Jewish and Early Christian Studies in the University of Cambridge, a Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, and a Fellow of the British Academy.

DAVID JACOBY is Emeritus Professor of History in the Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

JULIA G. KRIVORUCHKO is a Research Associate in the Faculty of Divinity, University of Cambridge.

TIMOTHY MICHAEL LAW is a doctoral student in the Oriental Institute, University of Oxford.

BEN OUTHWAITE is Head of the Taylor-Schechter Genizah Research Unit, Cambridge University Library.

ALISON SALVESEN is University Research Lecturer in the Oriental Institute, Oxford University, Polonsky Fellow in Jewish Bible Versions, Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies, and Supernumerary Fellow in Oriental Studies, Mansfield College.

GIUSEPPE VELTRI is Professor of Jewish Studies in the Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg and Director of the Leopold-Zunz-Zentrum zur Erforschung des europäischen Judentums.

Index of Biblical References

Index of Greek Words

Index of Manuscripts

Index of Modern Authors

Index of Subjects