

is clear: a fixed rent ($1\frac{2}{4}$ sack per aroura), whatever profit the lessee made of the land. Probably it was a long-term lease, which could be inherited or bought. Complete ownership, however, it never became; the lessee was restricted in his rights, the land remained the property of the state. In many instances the possessor was also bound to perform particular services to the state, e.g. military service — in which case he may not have had the right of sale or inheritance. Possibly, the former position had developed from the latter. The 'servants' of the state were obliged to pay only a small part of their harvest to the authorities, over and above the services they performed. Under particular circumstances the duty to perform these services seem to have disappeared during the Ramesside Period. For the data of the Wilbour Papyrus this had no consequences, since the income of the state from the fields remained the same.

From these pages it appears that Stuchevsky considers 'taxes' as including 'landrent', although he does not state so explicitly. Indeed, the distinction appears to be immaterial, and is not made in most Early States.

In accordance with Gardiner,³⁵⁾ Stuchevsky believes that the holders of the plots of the apportioning paragraphs were called *nmhw*, their fields *ihw nmh*, which seems to correspond with ἰδούκτητος γῆ. Discussing the evidence for this category of the population he refers to the Pap. Valençay I,³⁶⁾ where they are recorded as paying gold to the treasury of Pharaoh (vs. 2-3), as against the *ihwtyw* on khato-land who simply deliver their harvest to the state. He also quotes the Haremhab Decree in which *nmhw* are protected in order to enable them to deliver their *hiri* and to fulfil their *bikw*. The *nmhw*, also called *nmhw n ps ts* (Will of Naunakhte I, 2, 1,³⁷⁾ were registered (*sphr*; see the Adoption Papyrus).³⁸⁾ Nominally their land belonged to Pharaoh, as clearly appears from the donation stelae from the Third Intermediate Period representing the king as the donor (only one, stela Cairo JE 36159,³⁹⁾ explicitly mentions a *nmhw*). Other occurrences of the *nmhw* are to be found in the stela of Sheshonq⁴⁰⁾ and the larger Dakhleh stela.⁴¹⁾

Most explicit in this matter is the well-known Will of Ewerot,⁴²⁾ where the sale of fields which were not fully owned by the *nmhw* sellers is recorded. Since it is Amun who is speaking, and the fields are to be separated (*wi3*) from the land of the Amun temple and of Pharaoh, it is clear that the plots were not completely private property; perhaps even not after the sale.

At the end of the chapter the author stresses that nowhere in New Kingdom sources there is any indication of the existence of communal land. Whether that is due to our documentation is uncertain. A little may be known about quasi-communities on state land, for example, from the

names of settlements (*whyt*) compounded with private names occurring in the Wilbour Papyrus, or also from toponyms composed of the word 'hill' (*ibdt*) plus a private name. It is in these settlements that the state cultivators as well as the conditional possessors of land may have dwelled. Perhaps the phrase *rmf 3w n dmit* in the Inscription of Mes⁴³⁾ refers to the original organization of cultivators.

The subject of the final chapter (IV) is the khato-land of Pharaoh. Stuchevsky's point of departure — correctly, in my opinion — is that all land recorded in the Wilbour Papyrus is state property, temple fields included. Temples merely constituted a special branch of the state organization. A minority of the plots mentioned in Text A did not belong to temples, but to 'Landing Places of Pharaoh', the Harem, the Treasury of Pharaoh, etc. To these special categories should also be reckoned the *minē*- and khato-land of Pharaoh (only occurring in the non-apportioning paragraphs of Text A). The difference between these two is obscure. Stuchevsky connects the term *mint* with the word *mint* that, according to *Wb.* II, 42, 13, indicates an "Art Gewässer", suggesting that it was originally an area covered by water, hence possibly a piece of land for which good inundation, created by order of Pharaoh, was typical. *H3-t3*, originally "1000 square cubits" (= 10 arouras), discussed in an earlier study of Stuchevsky (in Russian),⁴⁴⁾ should indicate a piece of land of this size which was reclaimed by a single member of a group of reclaimers, by order of the king. The development of its meaning is: a plot of 10 arouras > royal land; a sequence not dissimilar to that of the word *mint*. This, however, does not explain their administrative meaning in the Ramesside Period.

For that Stuchevsky analyses Text B of the Wilbour Papyrus, which is a record of khato-land. It differs from Text A by the numerous additions and alterations made (in red ink) after it was written. Most of the plots were, as in Text A, on temple land, which only means that they were controlled by temple administrations responsible for the payment of taxes to the state. Contrary to Gardiner's opinion, Stuchevsky argues that 'khato-land of Pharaoh *hr ihwt Pr-3*' (this occurs 50 times!) were not royal property, that was handed over to temples, but which was only placed under the administrative control of a neighbouring institution. It is a parallel of what is found in Text A, in the Posh-A and -B entries.

Once more quoting the Turin Taxation Papyrus⁴⁵⁾ and Pap. Valençay I,⁴⁶⁾ the author argues that the khato-fields, as with the plots in Text A, were tilled, some by state cultivators, others by private possessors. The large numbers of sacks (e.g. 700, but also 1000 or even 3000) noted in the first lines of the paragraphs indicate the totals for which the pertinent administration was responsible (the 'sowing-order'). Mostly these numbers bear no relation to those of the arouras that follow (see, e.g., § 11), which means that the 'sowing-order' also related to other plots, not recorded here. In a few instances correspondence between

³⁵⁾ *Wilbour II*, p. 206.

³⁶⁾ See note 16.

³⁷⁾ Pap. Asmolean Museum 1945.97. See now Allam, *Hier. Ostraka und Papyri* (note 34), p. 268-274.

³⁸⁾ Pap. Ashmolean Museum 1945.96. See Allam, *op. cit.*, p. 258-267.

³⁹⁾ See Meeks, in *State and Temple Economy* (= *Or. Lovan. Anal.* 6, Leuven, 1979), p. 667, Nr. 22.7.25.

⁴⁰⁾ See Blackman, *JEA* 27 (1941), p. 83-95.

⁴¹⁾ See Gardiner, *JEA* 19 (1933), p. 19-30.

⁴²⁾ See Legrain, *ZAS* 35 (1897), p. 13ff.

⁴³⁾ Gardiner, *The Inscription of Mes* (Leipzig, 1905). For a recent edition of the text, see Gaballa, *The Memphite Tomb-Chapel of Mose* (Warminster, 1977), pl. 58-63.

⁴⁴⁾ *Zavisimoe naselenie drevnego Egipta* (1966).

⁴⁵⁾ See note 20.

⁴⁶⁾ See note 16.

the order and the numbers was achieved after alterations. In §18 the total is 1000 sacks,⁴⁷⁾ but the number of arouras in the entries is 464½; at the end, a number of 200 arouras is entered in red, what at a rate of 5 sacks per aroura indeed gives 1000 sacks. Most of the figures, however, remain obscure, though certainly the alterations and additions reflect recent changes in the apportioning of the plots, both between temples and in the sphere of private possessions.

Some alterations suggest that land, previously in the hands of possessors, was now tilled by state cultivators (e.g., 11, 24-27). Although henceforth placed in another category, it remained khato-land of Pharaoh,⁴⁸⁾ the difference being merely the system of exploitation.

Some entries contain the phrase (in red, hence a later addition): *m ihwty N* (N being a soldier). They indicate that the *ihwty* here was not the actual cultivator but the possessor. The formula *m prt n N*, 'sown with grain of N', or, perhaps, 'sown for N' (by the administration) also shows that part of the fields were at the disposition of private individuals.

The summary (p. 227) states: 1) the khato-land of Pharaoh was created by organized reclamation; 2) in the Ramesside Period, it was state-owned land, entrusted, for administrative reasons, to temples and state institutions; 3) it was cultivated according to the two existing systems: either as large domains tilled by state cultivators, or in smaller units tilled by private possessors or under the responsibility of them. In many instances the plots went over from one category to the other.

At the very end of his work Stuchevsky devotes attention to the question posed by Gardiner: does the Wilbour Papyrus deal with taxes paid to the Crown or with rents contributory to the temples. Stuchevsky's answer is that temple and state cannot be separated, the temple granaries being simply dependences of the State Granary. Egyptologists studying the late Ramesside Period have generally exaggerated the state-temple antithesis, mainly on account of an erroneous interpretation of the relief of the high-priest Amenhotep. The accompanying text⁴⁹⁾ proves that Amenhotep was a loyal servant of his king, well rewarded for his services — amongst which were the filling of the granaries both of the Amun temple and of Pharaoh.

So much for Stuchevsky's valuable contribution to Egypt's economic history. As indicated above, not all problems posed to us by the Wilbour Papyrus and other account papyri from the Ramesside Period have been solved by him. The main importance of his study lies in his careful distinction between three categories of *ihwtyw*: 'agents of the fisc', actual workers on the fields, and possessors of land, either under obligation for particular services or, at least, restricted in their ownership, the Pharaoh nominally remaining the ultimate owner.

The second major achievement of this book is the argument brought forward that the plots of the non-apportioning paragraphs were liable to a tax of 30% of the harvest — a harvest which, for administrative reasons, was reckoned to be standardized at 5 sacks per aroura of *k3yt* land —

whilst 70% was returned to the workers themselves. From the apportioning domains the temples and other institutions received a considerably lower percentage of the yield.

Apart from these main points many details are dealt with, not all mentioned above — though some may be of value for the explanation of particular texts. Whatever the final opinion of Egyptology on these minutiae, it seems to me that Stuchevsky has presented a remarkable contribution to our, as yet, defective knowledge concerning agricultural economy and administration during the XXth Dynasty.

Leiden, October 1985

JAC. J. JANSSEN

* * *

Accident or Method? On "Analogical" Interpretation in the Old Greek of Isaiah and in 1QIs^a

There are many and sometimes striking differences between the Old Greek of Isaiah (LXX Is) and the Masoretic text of this book (MT Is) and between the complete Isaiah scroll from Qumran (1QIs^a) and MT Is as well. Various explanations have been given for them: a different Hebrew Vorlage, a faulty knowledge of Hebrew, guesses, mechanical errors, an attempt to write good Koine Greek viz. adaptations to later Hebrew, exegesis. A recent contribution to the discussion of how to explain the differences is the study of Jean Koenig, entitled: *L'herméneutique analogique du Judaïsme antique d'après les témoins textuels d'Isaïe*¹⁾. It is his main thesis that most of the differences or variant readings are not to be seen as accidental ones, but as intentional ones, being the result of ancient methods of interpretation. "Il apparaissait ... qu'en dehors du cas des accidents, le gros de ces variantes illustre une herméneutique ancienne ..."²⁾.

The concern of Koenig is with one of the ancient methods, namely with what he calls «herméneutique analogique» (analogical interpretation). This method is of two types: (a) borrowings of words and phrases from another biblical passage in or outside the book of Isaiah, and (b) the introduction of alternative forms and meanings through such devices as metathesis and (assumed) homonymy. He deals with both types by giving examples of them, first from LXX Is, and then from 1QIs^a. In this review-article I will make some comments on the study of Koenig.

LXX Isaiah

As to the first type of analogical interpretation (borrowings from elsewhere) scholars like A. Zillesen³⁾ and J. Ziegler⁴⁾ have noted many examples of it in LXX Is, but

¹⁾ Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, Vol. 33. Leiden, Brill, 1982, xviii + 450 p., f 140,-. ISBN 90 04 06762 0. Hereafter cited as HA.

²⁾ HA, xi.

³⁾ Zillesen, "Bemerkungen zur alexandrinischen Übersetzung des Jesaja (c. 40-66)", ZAW 22 (1902), 238-263.

⁴⁾ Ziegler, *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaïas* (Alttest. Abhandl. XII,3), Münster 1934.

⁴⁷⁾ For this example, see *Wilbour II*, p. 183.

⁴⁸⁾ This contrary to Helck, *Verwaltung* (p. 129-130), who suggests that the land returned to the Crown.

⁴⁹⁾ Published by Helck, *MIO* 4 (1956), p. 161-178.

according to Koenig they did not explain them in the right way. In his view an explanation in terms of "accidental influence" does not do full justice to the data. It would be more appropriate, so Koenig argues, to understand cases of borrowings as the result of a particular method, used by the translator⁵). (In line with this Koenig prefers the term "emprunt (scripturaire)" to the more neutral or passive word "influence".)

The central question here is: how do we know that differences between LXX Is and MT Is which seem to be the result of influence from other passages (in or outside Isaiah) are the outcome of an exegetical method such as analogical interpretation? With regard to this question Koenig points to some general conditions such as a great knowledge of the books of the Bible on the part of the translator, and to "garanties de méthode" such as an authoritative status of the books of the Bible, and some relationship with later methods of interpretation used by the Rabbis⁶). However, as Koenig admits, these general conditions do not prove the "method" of analogical interpretation. The crucial proof, as he puts it, is that this type of interpretation serves the purpose of the translator, namely the actualization of the prophecies of Isaiah. As for this aspect he refers to the study of I. L. Seeligmann⁷), and points to the book of Daniel and to the interpretation of prophecies in texts from Qumran⁸). He states it thus: "Les modifications oraculaires décelables dans G Is livrent donc la preuve cruciale de l'application au livre d'Is d'une hermeneutique méthodique"⁹).

Let us deal, at some length, with an example of his approach in order to discuss his method of analysis. An important example of the first type of analogical interpretation for Koenig is LXX Is 9,10 (MT Is 9,9), which he discusses in his chapter "La Tour de Babel dans l'Isaïe grec et le schisme Samaritain" (pp. 87-103). His concern is here with the plus in the Old Greek at the end of the verse: και οικοδομησωμεν εαυτοις πύργον. The context (vs 8-9), he assumes, describes the plan of the inhabitants of Samaria to restore and to fortify the city of Samaria. The plus in vs 9 he considers to be borrowed from LXX Gen 11,4¹⁰). In support of this he points to "analogical" relations between the two passages (thematic, lexical, and stylistic¹¹). He then claims that the translator, as a consequence of the use of words from Gen. 11, has used the second verb in vs 10 (בנה) for οικοδομησωμεν, and that the fourth verb (ηλιη) underlies the Greek λαξευσωμεν¹²). The equivalence between ηλιη and λαξευσωμεν he regards as a possible one via the homonym of ηλη in Hebrew and Aramaic with the meaning "to cut"¹³). He further discusses other differences between MT and LXX vs 10 (δευτε; εαυτοις) and vs 11 (ράξει and διασκεδάσει), and

considers them all to be the result of conscious borrowings from Gen. 11¹⁴). Finally, Koenig points to other passages in LXX Is (10,9 and 11,11) which show influence from Gen 11¹⁵).

After having discussed these aspects of the analogical relationship between LXX Is 9 and LXX Gen. 11 he comes to the "crucial" question of the actualization. Koenig is of the opinion that the words borrowed from LXX Gen. 11 serve a specific actualization of the passage in Is 9. His argument runs as follows: "Du temps de G ce que la mention de Samarie évoquait nécessairement dans l'esprit d'un juif, qu'il fût palestinien ou membre de la diaspora, c'était le schisme samaritain"¹⁶). With the theme of the building of the Tower of Babel the translator describes and condemns the "heresy" of the Samaritans¹⁷).

The way Koenig deals with the plus of LXX Is 9,10 raises some comments. The question of the function and of the meaning of the plus is of course a good one, but to answer this question on the basis of an assumed relationship with LXX Gen 11,4 only is to be criticized. One misses a systematic study of the plus in its own actual context (LXX Is 9,8-13), including a detailed examination of the relationship of this context with the Hebrew text (MT, 1QIs¹⁸).

In order to overcome the fragmentary character of the approach of Koenig, to my mind, a method of analysis on several levels should be carried out. In view of the scribal and reading practices of the ancient world I prefer the *pericope* to single words or single verses as startingpoint of such a method of analysis¹⁸). By a method of analysis on several levels I mean the following¹⁹):

(1) the first level is that of the *text of the LXX version*: a critical judgment of the text of the version has to be made in order to know which text actually is the text of the version.

(2) the level of *word-word relations*: the level of comparison between MT and LXX, including the evidence of Qumran-scrolls. Variant readings, pluses and minuses in LXX Is. (e.g. 9,8-13) have to be noted. Uncertainties as to the Hebrew text have to be described and studied (such as the crux of רצו רצו in 9,10), without formulating a final judgment (see below).

(3) the level of *grammar and semantics*: as for the grammatical aspect this level concerns the question of how the translator has rendered Hebrew forms and sentences. In LXX Is 9,8-13 vs 10 is an interesting case of a syntactical difference between LXX and the Hebrew text (MT and 1QIs¹⁸). In such a case it is important to know whether the "free" translation is but an attempt to write good Koine with the same semantic content as in Hebrew or not. Here the aspect of semantics comes in: how did the

⁵) See HA, 4-10.

⁶) HA, 30-37.

⁷) Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah. A Discussion of its Problems* (MVEOL 9), Leiden 1948, 4.

⁸) HA, 44f.

⁹) HA, 47.

¹⁰) On the agreement between both passages, see also Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 63.109, Seeligmann, *Version*, 47, and *The Hebrew University Bible: The Book of Isaiah, Part I-II*, Jerusalem 1975, ad loc.

¹¹) HA, 89-91.

¹²) HA, 92.

¹³) HA, 92-97.

¹⁴) HA, 97-99.

¹⁵) Is, 99f. See also Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 69, and Seeligmann, *Version*, 47.

¹⁶) HA, 101.

¹⁷) HA, 102.

¹⁸) On the scribal and reading practices, see J. M. Oesch, *Petucha und Setuma. Untersuchungen zu einer überlieferten Gliederung im hebräischen Text des A.T.* (OBO 27), Freiburg/Göttingen 1979; W. G. Rutherford, *A Chapter in the History of Annotation, being Scholia Aristophanica*, Vol. III, London 1905, 168.

¹⁹) For the description of the levels of analysis, see also my "The Septuagint and the Exegesis of the Bible" (forthcoming).

translator interpret his Vorlage semantically? Study of this asks also for a dealing with the meaning of the Greek text on its own²⁰). It has further to be examined whether the Greek text (pericope) is a coherent and meaningful whole, or not. Study of the meaning of a Greek text, such as LXX Is 9,8-13, has to do with lexical aspects of Greek words, which asks for word studies in LXX Is as a whole and also outside LXX Is in comparable contexts. For this level the observations on the style of the translator, made by J. Ziegler in his study *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias*²¹), are also to be taken into consideration.

As we have noted above Koenig is of the opinion that the building of the tower refers to the restoration and fortification of the city of Samaria. However, how do we know this? A difficulty is that the name "Samareia" may be the name of that city, but it can also be used for the region. And what does it mean that the Greek text (vs. 11) speaks of the mountain of Sion? Questions such as these make it clear that study of lexical aspects and of the coherence of the Greek text of Is 9,8-13 is an essential part of the method of analysis.

(4) the level of *the context of LXX Is as a whole*: this level is in fact already involved in the previous one (as to semantics and lexical aspects). The importance of this level has been pointed out by Ziegler²²). Apart from the matter of semantics the study of the context of LXX Is has to do with matters such as: the question of whether certain word equivalents in a particular passage are typical of LXX Is or not, and the study of related passages in LXX Is. As for the pericope of LXX Is 9,8-13, dealing with Ephraim and Samaria, related passages such as ch. 7; 8,1-10; 28,1-4 should be studied. The same applies, for instance, to the motif of the tower building. Koenig mentions LXX Is 10,9, but he does not pay attention to LXX Is 5,2.

(5) the level of *actualization*: in line with Seeligmann Koenig is of the opinion that LXX Is contains exegesis of the type of actualization in the sense of fulfilment-interpretation of prophecies (cf. Qumran)²³). For him this question is of crucial importance, but it must be said, his dealing with this aspect with regard to LXX Is 9,10 (and also with regard to other passages of LXX Is he discusses in his book) is insufficient.

The level of actualization requires a good knowledge of the history of the Hellenistic period, and of the literature, biblical and non-biblical, Jewish and non-Jewish, of this period. As we have seen, Koenig argues that a Jew of the time of LXX Is associates the name of "Samaria" directly and necessarily with the Samaritan schism. But

this is quite improbable, for a contemporaneous text, Sirach 50,26 (Greek text), distinguishes clearly between between "the inhabitants of the mountain of Samaria" (οἱ καθήμενοι ἐν ὄρει Σαμαρείας) and "the ... people that dwells in Shechem" (ὁ λαὸς ... ὁ κατοικοῦν ἐν Σικκμοῖς).

More important for the level of actualization, of course, is the question of whether the Greek text itself contains an element which points into that direction. With regard to this, the most interesting feature in LXX Is 9,8-13 is the mention of "Syria" (Συρίαν) and of "the Greeks" (τοὺς Ἑλληνας) in vs 12²⁴). Due to his insufficient treatment of the context of vs 9 Koenig does not pay attention to this feature of vs 12.

In my view, study on all these levels, including aspects of translation technique and of interpretation techniques, has to be carried out in order to be able to give an answer to the question of the function and the meaning of the plus in LXX Is 9,10. The matter of the background of the plus can then be dealt with.

Study on all these levels is, I think, also necessary with regard to a more definite judgment of the question of different readings in the Hebrew Vorlage of LXX Is. Hence the remark, made in connection with the second level, of not yet formulating a final judgment, if ever possible, from study on that level.

In the next part of his book (pp. 107-198) Koenig deals with examples of the second type of analogical interpretation: the introduction of alternative forms and meanings through such devices as different vocalizations, interchange of consonants because of graphic or phonetic similarity, metathesis, etymological exegesis, and (assumed) homonymy. It is asked again whether these alternative forms and meanings in LXX Is are to be considered as mechanical errors or as part of a particular exegetical method. Koenig discusses the following passages of LXX Is: 3,8; 8,11-16; 26,9; 32,1-10; 34,1+41,1+43,4,9; 40,26+41,20+43,15+45,18. We will make some comments on two of them: 8,11-16 (pp. 117-135) and 32,1-10 (pp. 142-160).

The passage of 8,11-16 in LXX Is differs widely from MT (and 1QIs^a). In vs 11 persons (leaders) are introduced, who in vs 16 are accused of preventing study and knowledge of the Law. Vs 15 (διὰ τοῦτο ...) contains a prophecy of doom on them. Koenig takes over the opinion of Seeligmann that "the translator in 8,11-16 condemned an existing anti-dogmatic movement in his environment"²⁵). This means, so Koenig remarks, that this passage had "une valeur oraculaire"²⁶) for the translator. He then tries to find out through which devices the translator came to his rendering of certain Hebrew words. So, for example, the rendering πεποιθώς (vs 14; in vs 12 the same root has been rendered differently) of מַעֲרֹכִים he explains via רחץ in Aramaic (with phonetic similarity of ח-ע, and with metathesis); the double negation in vs 14 results from ל interpreted as לא (by abbreviation); and τοῦ μὴ μαθεῖν for בלמדִי (vs 16) presupposes the interpretation of בלמדִי by worddivision (בל + למד).

La

²⁰) For this aspect, comp. T. Muraoka, "Hosea IV in the Septuagint Version", *AJBI* 9 (1983), 24-64, and id., "On Septuagint Lexicography and Patristics", *JThSt* n.s. 35 (1984), 441.

²¹) See note 4 above.

²²) Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 135: "Der Js-Übers. scheint überhaupt sein Buch sehr gut dem Inhalte nach im Gedächtnis gehabt zu haben; denn es begegnen viele Wiedergaben, die sich nur auf Grund der Exegese nach sinnverwandten Stellen erklären lassen. Gerade bei der Js-LXX darf irgendein Wort oder eine Wendung die vom MT abweicht, nicht aus dem Zusammenhang genommen werden und für sich allein betrachtet werden, sondern muss nach dem ganzen Kontext der Stelle und ihren Parallelen gewertet werden ...".

²³) See also J. C. M. das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega dos Setenta no Livro de Isaias (Cap. 24 de Isaias)*, Lisboa 1973; A. van der Kooij, *Die alten Textzeugen des Jesajabuches. Ein Beitrag zur Textgeschichte des A.T.* (OBO 35), Freiburg/Göttingen 1981, 22ff.

²⁴) On these renderings in vs 12, see Seeligmann, *Version*, 81; M. Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus* (WUNT 10), 2., durchgesehene und ergänzte Aufl., Tübingen 1973, 61.

²⁵) See Seeligmann, *Version*, 106.

²⁶) HA, 121.

The passage of LXX Is 8,11-16 is indeed an interesting example of the relationship between specific renderings of Hebrew words and the overall composition of the text in Greek. However, the treatment of Koenig (and also of Seeligmann) is too fragmentary to be conclusive. Closer study of the question of the Vorlage, of the word-word relations, and of the meaning and content of the Greek text as a whole is necessary, including proper attention to passages which are related to that of 8,11-16 (comp. LXX Is 28; 30,9-11).

LXX Is 32,1-10 Koenig describes as a "nid de variations par herméneutique analogique"²⁷). In contrast to LXX Is 8,11-16 he merely offers a summing up of his explanations of word-word relations. His treatment of 32,1-10 lacks the "crucial proof" that the supposed cases of analogical interpretation are to be considered as part of a method, as intentional, for he does not pay the proper attention to the contents of the Greek passage as a whole. Moreover his explanations of some word-word relations are hardly convincing. In 32,2 he relates MT כצל סלע (IQIs^a: בצל) to the Greek verb φανήσεται, and explains it via the root סלל, but this is very improbable²⁸). In 32,8 he explains גריבות — גרבות via גרבות — גרבות which is rather speculative. It is further not clear why the passage of vs 1-10 has been chosen instead of the pericope 32,1-8 (+31,9!) in LXX Is. The relationship between MT and LXX Is 32,1-8(10) is a complicated one, and asks therefore for a fuller analysis on the several levels referred to above²⁹).

Accident (error) or Method, that is the question. Variant-readings in LXX Is, which are not going back to a different Vorlage, are they "accidentelle" or "méthodique"? LXX Is scholars like R. R. Ottley³⁰) and J. Fischer³¹) tended to look at them as mechanical errors ("Verlesungen", misreadings); L. Priejs³²) on the other hand stressed the other possibility: the translator was using exegetical methods (such as the *al-tigre* technique). Ziegler, Seeligmann, and recently E. Tov³³) hold a more nuanced view. Besides the matter of analysis of the Greek in relation to the Hebrew an important question is how the translators are looked upon: as mechanically working persons (like dragomans) or as scholars, who were using certain exegetical techniques of their time. For making a choice between the two possibilities (accident or method of exegesis) Koenig introduces his "crucial proof": variant-readings in LXX Is are intentional, if they serve the actualization of the prophecies aimed at by the translator. I agree with this, but the problem of the study of Koenig is: how to prove (as far as possible) the crucial proof. For this reason I have

described tentatively a method of analysis on several levels (see above).

The complete Isaiah-scroll: IQIs^a

As examples of the first type of analogical interpretation Koenig discusses variant-readings in IQIs^a 1,7,15; 14,2; 20,6; 26,8; 30,6; 34,4+51,6; 52,8; 53,11; 62,10 (pp. 218-289). It is his intention "de montrer que les emprunts scripturaires déjà remarqués par Skehan, puis par Kutscher, ne sont pas, comme l'ont cru ces auteurs, des intrusions empiriques, sans autre signification historique qu'une dégradation de la tradition textuelle hébraïque, mais illustrent l'application d'une méthode qui faisait autorité"³⁴). He is of the opinion that all his examples are cases of a "clarification littéraire" and of a "édification religieuse"³⁵). By this he means that they are cases of conscious borrowings which serve a particular interpretation of the text.

Let us look at some of the examples more closely. IQIs^a (hereafter Q^a) 1,15 has a plus in comparison with MT: אצבעותיכם במאן, and it is generally assumed that this plus has been derived from Is 59,3. In proof of this Koenig points to the fact that the preposition ב in the plus is still there. He regards this plus as something more than "une simple harmonisation littéraire"³⁶). The author of the text (scroll?) should have added it in order to prevent the possibility of "disculper" (vindication) (for the fingers are the factual organs of doing something).

The plus of Q^a 1,15 may be more than just an accidental harmonization³⁷) with 59,3, but Koenig's interpretation of the plus seems to me too speculative. It is quite possible that the author wanted to harmonize 1,15 with 59,3 simply because both passages are related to each other (comp. מלאך דמים ידכם in MT 1,15, and כפיכם גאלו בדם in MT 59,3), in order to strengthen the coherence of the text of Isaiah as a whole. For the rest, it is to be noted that Koenig does not deal with the orthographic differences between the plus in 1,15 and the same words in Q^a 59,3.

In Is 30,6 Q^a has the plus וציה after צרה, and reads מים instead of MT מהם. Koenig suggests that both readings are borrowed from Deut. 8,15 and Ps. 63,2. The reason of these borrowings should have been their connection with the desert motif which is so well-known from other Qumran texts. He assumes that the text of Q^a 30,6 refers to the common possessions of the Qumran-community in the desert. The end of vs 6 (... על עמ) he translates as follows: "à cause d'un peuple qui n'est pas utile"³⁸), and the words בהמות המדבר he renders with "quand le Négueb ... est en rumeur"³⁹) (via the root המה). "Cette rumeur ... c'était l'afflux des nouveaux adeptes qui venaient se joindre à la communauté de Qumran et ... y déposer leurs biens"⁴⁰).

This interpretation of Q^a 30,6 raises some comments. First, the borrowing from Deut. 8,15 and Ps. 63,2 is far from certain, because it is easier to assume that related

²⁷) HA, 142.

²⁸) See Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 142; L. Laberge, *La Septante d'Isaïe 28-33. Étude de tradition textuelle*. Ottawa 1978, 80f.; HUB Isaiah, *ad loc.* The verb φανήσεται is to be seen as a plus in LXX Is, which is meant as a contrast to the verb κρυβήσεται in vs 2^a.

²⁹) As for the level of word-word relations with respect to this passage, see in particular Laberge, *Septante*, 80-85.

³⁰) Ottley, *The Book of Isaiah according to the Septuagint (Codex Alexandrinus)*. Vol. 1, Cambridge 1909.

³¹) Fischer, *In welcher Schrift lag das Buch Isaias den LXX vor?* (BZAW 56), Giessen 1930.

³²) Priejs, *Jüdische Tradition in der Septuaginta*. Leiden 1948.

³³) Tov, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*. Jerusalem 1981 (comp. pp. 229ff.). See also I. L. Seeligmann, "Voraussetzungen der Midraschexegese", in: *Congress Volume Copenhagen 1953* (Suppl. VT 1), Leiden 1953, 150-181.

³⁴) HA, 289.

³⁵) HA, 290.

³⁶) HA, 224.

³⁷) Tov regards this case as an example of unconscious harmonization; see his "The Nature and Background of Harmonizations in Biblical Manuscripts", *JSOT* 31 (1985), 11.

³⁸) HA, 244.

³⁹) HA, 244.

⁴⁰) HA, 244.

texts within the book of Isaiah have played an "influential" role (see ציה in 35,1; 41,18 and 53,2; and see ואין מים in 50,2 and 1,30 (Q^a!)⁴¹). Some interest in the desert-motif may have been an important reason, but the question is: how do we know that the author of Q^a wanted to create, by means of the borrowings, a text which should refer to the possessions of the Qumran-community in the desert? Apart from the far-fetched translation of בהמות the main difficulty of the treatment of Koenig is that he isolates 30,6 from its immediate context (30,7-11) too much. Within this pericope the words עַם לֹא יִדְעִילוּ in vs 6 do refer to Egypt in vs 7, and this means that these words are not to be interpreted as referring to the wicked known from the Qumrantexts, as Koenig assumes⁴²). This makes clear that a contextual interpretation of a text is needed first, before one tries to determine the aspect of actualization of a pericope in Q^a (on this aspect see also below).

Koenig discusses also the famous variant (plus) of Q^a 53,11: אור (after the word ויראה)⁴³). He is of the opinion that this plus has been derived from Is 9,1. (This implies that אור in 53,11 constitutes a secondary element which was not part of the more original text. Koenig argues for this on pp. 276-282.) The "light" in 53,11 should be a symbol for "Law" (comp. "the light of the nations" in 42,6 and 49,6)⁴⁴).

On the way Koenig treats the plus in Q^a 53,11 I will make the following remarks:

- It remains a difficult question to know whether the plus in 53,11 is a secondary element in the history of this text, or not, because not only Q^a and LXX Is, but also 1QIs^b and 4QIs^d⁴⁵ have this reading! It means that all most ancient textual witnesses of Isaiah (2nd-1st cent. B.C.) attest a text with the reading אור.
- Even if this word is to be seen as a secondary reading, then it is to be asked whether this plus has been borrowed from Is 9,1. Koenig adduces no strong arguments in favour of this assumption; he even makes it less probable by stating that the meaning of אור "light" in 53,11 is that of אור in 42,6 and 49,6 (and not that of אור in 9,1).
- A discussion of 53,11 within its immediate context, Q^a 53,9-12, including the other variant-readings in this passage, is missed.
- The same applies to a discussion of 53,11 in the light of contemporary and related texts such as Daniel 11,33 and 12,3, and IQS 4,6-8.

His examples of the second type of analogical interpretation in Q^a are the following cases: 1,8; 5,11; 5,24; 6,10; 8,11; 14,32; 25,1; 29,16+45,9; 42,4; 52,14; 51,5; 48,11 (pp. 295-376). In my view some of these examples are interesting ones (1,8; 25,1; 42,14), some of them are convincing ones (6,10; 8,11), but some I find too speculative (5,24; 29,16 and 45,9).

Koenig often disagrees with E.Y. Kutscher as to the character of variant-readings. Kutscher has dealt with Q^a variants mainly on a linguistic level⁴⁶), not so much on

a exegetical level, while Koenig strongly stresses the exegetical nature of variants. For Koenig Kutscher seems to be his major opponent. It must be pointed out, however, that Koenig's plea for regarding particular readings of Q^a as exegetical ones, is not new. His interpretation of Q^a 6,10, for example, has been put forward already by W.H. Brownlee as early as 1964⁴⁷). It is a pity that Koenig apparently did not consult the literature on "exegesis in Q^a", which appeared in the years after 1960.

Just as is the case with his treatment of examples of scriptural borrowings the way in which Koenig deals with his examples of "word-analogy" is in most cases fragmentary. A fuller discussion of several aspects is required in order to minimize the element of speculation. Comparable with the method of analysis of LXX Is described above, as to 1QIs^a I would suggest the following approach:

(1) the level of *palaeography*: the first thing to be done is to determine which is the actual reading of Q^a. So, for instance, the variant-reading in Q^a 8,11 is not יסירני, but יסירני⁴⁸).

(2) the level of *word-word relations*: on the basis of a comparison between MT and Q^a (and LXX Is) the differences have to be noted.

(3) the *linguistic* level: this is the level of analysis of variant-readings, in the first place, as to the aspects of orthography, grammar including syntax (see espec. the study of Kutscher), and in the second place, as to the lexical aspect, not only of the variant-readings as such, but also of their actual context in Q^a.

(4) the level of *the division of the text (pericopes)*: the aspect of textdivision in Q^a is to my mind of major importance for the determination of the immediate context of particular readings in the scroll. As we have seen, Koenig does not pay attention to this aspect; in consequence he isolates the verses with variants too much. The textdivision in Q^a informs us about the pericope in which particular readings have their place and function. As has been pointed out by J.M. Oesch in his important study *Petucha und Setuma*⁴⁹) the division of the Hebrew text into paragraphs with line-spaces (with a system of sub-division) is a *sense-division* ("Sinneinteilung") of the text. He further makes clear that textdivision was part of the scribal practices in the ancient world. I would add to this that the textdivision, carried out by the scribes, was of great help for the reading aloud (the ἀνάγνωσις) of the text⁵⁰). Thus textdivision as sense-division offers a clue for the actual context of variants, and it is therefore important to examine in which way a pericope was read and interpreted.

⁴⁷) Brownlee, *The Meaning of the Qumran Scrolls for the Bible, with Special Attention to the Book of Isaiah*. Oxford 1964, 186f. See also my *Die alten Textzeugen*, 84f.; J. Hoegenhaven, "The First Isaiah Scroll from Qumran (1QIs^a) and the Massoretic Text. Some Reflections with Special Regard to Isaiah 1-12", *JSOT* 28 (1984), 29; C.A. Evans, "1QIsaiah^a and the Absence of Prophetic Critique at Qumran", *RQ* 44 (1984), 537-542.

⁴⁸) For improved readings, see Kutscher, *Language*, and HUB Isaiah.

⁴⁹) See note 18 above (on Q^a, see pp. 198-248 in the study of Oesch). See also his "Textgliederung im A. T. und in den Qumranhandschriften", *Henoch* 5 (1983), 289-321; Y. Maori, "The Tradition of *Pisqa'ot* in Ancient Hebrew MSS: the Isaiah Texts and Commentaries from Qumran", *Textus* 10 (1982), [1]-[50].

⁵⁰) See the study of Rutherford, mentioned in note 18 above. For the term ἀνάγνωσις see also Prologue Ben Sira, 10, and the Letter of Aristeas, 305.

⁴¹) See my *Die alten Textzeugen*, 104.

⁴²) HA, 244.

⁴³) HA, 274-283.

⁴⁴) HA, 282.

⁴⁵) See F. Morrow, *The Text of Isaiah at Qumran*. Michigan 1973, 143.

⁴⁶) Kutscher, *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa^a)* (STDJ 6), Leiden 1974.

(5) the level of the *context of Q^a as a whole*: this concerns the matter of relations between texts and pericopes within Q^a. Here the question of harmonization within Q^a is to be mentioned: cases of harmonization — are they purely of a mechanical nature, or are they intentional and do they attest an important relationship between texts (verses) and pericopes?

(6) the level of *actualization*: it has been put forward above (see sub LXX Isaiah) that for this level a good knowledge of the history of the Hellenistic period, and of the literature of this period, both Jewish and non-Jewish, is required. As for Q^a the most important contemporaneous literature is, of course, that of the Qumran-community, in particular the *pesharim*. They show us how (as to method and content) prophecies were read and interpreted⁵¹). From them we know that prophecies were interpreted on the level of actualization in the sense of the so-called fulfilment-interpretation. Thus the milieu of Q^a points clearly into the direction of this type of actualization. The question is, of course, whether Q^a itself does contain elements of this interpretation. How do we know that a particular variant-reading reflects such an interpretation? After having studied this reading on the levels of analysis mentioned above I think the best way to deal with this question is to find out whether other texts of Qumran shed some light on a reading in Q^a viz. on a particular theme or passage in Q^a. An interesting example is the text of Q^a 8,11 with its reading סיררו. 4QFlor offers a "sectarian" interpretation of Is 8,11 which presupposes the reading of Q^a⁵²). I, therefore, agree with Koenig that Q^a 8,11 may reflect an interpretation which is meant as a legitimization of the Qumran-community⁵³). However, Q^a has also to be studied within its own context (8,11-15.16-18), in order to examine whether this interpretation makes sense in the whole pericope, or not⁵⁴).

Study on these levels will also be of much importance with regard to the question of the text of the Vorlage of Q^a. It further may help us in finding an answer to the questions of the status of the scribe of Q^a (was he but a copist, or was he a scholar who was authorised to explain sacred texts?), and of the status of Q^a (copy of an existing texttradition⁵⁵), or "une vulgarisation compétante"⁵⁶), as Koenig puts it?).

The "analogical" methods

Finally, I will make some remarks on the last part of the book of Koenig, entitled "Les origines des méthodes analogiques et leur portée pour la critique" (pp. 379-427). As to the origins of the method of scriptural borrowings he points to the exilic and post-exilic period: in his view this method was used already in the redaction-process of

the sacred books⁵⁷). He then discusses the origins of the method of word-analogy. It is his opinion that this method has its roots in the culture of ancient Mesopotamia with its scribal system of "des signes plurivalentes"⁵⁸). Lexicographical "plurivalence" in lists he regards as a basis of "une plurivalence plus large, du type assonantique"⁵⁹).

The question of the origins of exegetical techniques is as such a useful and interesting one. The interpretative technique of word-analogy is well-known indeed from Mesopotamia (and from elsewhere as well), although there is no clear connection with what Koenig calls «la plurivalence des signes"⁶⁰). But, instead of dealing with the origins of the analogical methods, I think, it would be more useful to discuss the matter of these methods in connection with exegetical techniques of the period of LXX Is and Q^a itself. Koenig, on the one hand, relates the analogical methods to techniques of the later period (that of rabbinic interpretation; see the first part of his book), while, on the other hand, he goes back to ancient Mesopotamia in search of the origins of one of these methods. So one misses a discussion of his methods within the framework of the wider cultural context of the time in which both texts, LXX Is and Q^a, were written. Here I think in particular of the exegetical science of Alexandria⁶¹), and of methods of exegesis at Qumran⁶²). As for the term "analogical", as used and chosen by Koenig, it is interesting to see that the Alexandrian scholars also knew of "analogia" (analogical word-analysis), although they used it in a more limited sense⁶³).

In sum, the study of J. Koenig is a stimulating one, containing important observations⁶⁴) and discussions, but is, in my view, to be criticised as far as his method of analysis is concerned.

Bilthoven, January 1986

ARIE VAN DER KOOLJ

* * *

⁵⁷) HA, 379-383.

⁵⁸) See HA, 384.

⁵⁹) HA, 388. On pp. 390-404 he gives some examples; that of Gen. 6,1-4 (pp. 396-403) is hardly convincing.

⁶⁰) See J. Krecher, "Kommentare", RIA VI, 188-191. For corresponding interpretative techniques between ancient Mesopotamia and ancient Judaism, see J.H. Tigay, "An Early Technique of Aggadic Exegesis", in: *History, Historiography and Interpretation. Studies in Biblical and Cuneiform Literatures*. H. Tadmor and M. Weinfeld (eds), Jerusalem 1984, 169-189.

⁶¹) See R. Pfeiffer, *Geschichte der Klassischen Philologie. Von den Anfängen bis zum Ende des Hellenismus*. München 1978, 114-285; P.M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*. Vol. I, Oxford 1972, 447-479.

⁶²) See H. Gabrion, "L'interprétation de l'Écriture dans la littérature de Qumran", in: *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt II*, Bd. 19,1. Hrg. von W. Haase. Berlin/New York 1979, 779-848; P.M. Horgan, *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretation of Biblical Books*, Washington 1979; D. Dimant, "Qumran Sectarian Literature", in: *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period. Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus* (Compendium Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum, Section II). M.E. Stone (ed.), Assen/Philadelphia 1984, 503-514 ("Biblical Interpretation"); Brooke, *Exegesis* (note 52).

⁶³) See Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, Vol. I, 463: "the principle of Analogy ... or regularity, as applied to declension and conjugation". With regard to the LXX see in particular: D. Weissert, "Alexandrian Analogical Word-Analysis and Septuagint Translation Techniques", *Textus* 8 (1973), 31-44.

⁶⁴) See, for example, his chapter on LXX Is 40,26+41,20+43,15+45,18 (HA, 173-193).

⁵¹) For literature, see note 62 below.

⁵²) See now G.J. Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran. 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context* (JSOT Suppl. Series 29), Sheffield 1985 (on the restoration of the quotation of Is 8,11, see p. 116).

⁵³) Cf. my *Die alten Textzeugen*, 86.

⁵⁴) The same criticism applies to my treatment of Q^a 8,11 (*Die alten Textzeugen*, 86).

⁵⁵) Be it a copy of the archaic (and accurate) type like 1QIs^b, or be it a copy of the fluid type like the 4QIs fragments.

⁵⁶) HA, 208. This could be the type of text which is similar to that of the text of Chronicles in its relation to Samuel-Kings: a "new" text (for this type, see also my *Die alten Textzeugen*, 117).

Ornamental Micrography in Medieval Hebrew Manuscripts*

Under an impressive cover⁽¹⁾ which heralds the very subject of the book, the reader will find two independent papers, one in French by C. Sirat (pp. 17-37), the other in English by L. Avrin (pp. 43-63), a French translation by the first author of a short Hebrew medieval text (pp. 39-42), and, very clumsily placed at the beginning of the volume, the lengthy French "abrége" (pp. 9-15) of L. Avrin's contribution which should follow the text it summarizes. The whole is supplemented by a glossary (pp. 65-67), two pages of acknowledgements (pp. 69-70)²⁾, a rather uncritical³⁾ bibliography (p. 68) for L. Avrin's paper, a list of captions to the plates (pp. 73-80)⁴⁾ and what constitutes the bulk of the volume, 118 plates in black and white of a regrettably poor quality.

Let us first dispose of a point common to both contributions: the quite unnecessary and somewhat surprising rejection of the term "calligram" (French: calligramme) to designate motives outlined with lines of microscopic

Hebrew writing and the abusive and confusing use deliberately made of the word "micrography". The scruples shown by both authors to use the word "calligram" are nowadays quite out of place, the more so as the term "micrography" cannot actually mean anything else than microscopic writing — but it is a very useful word with this precise meaning — and is unable to convey the least idea of ornamental pattern or motives. On the contrary the two Greek words which have been united in the original French "calligramme" do in fact convey the idea of beauty attached to something written in whichever way it has been achieved. That the term has been coined by the poet G. Apollinaire, for his own poetical, visual and typographical games, the aim of which, i.e. to achieve the synthesis between concept and form by filling with the lines of the poem a shape akin to its main subject, seems generally to have been foreign to Jewish "micrographers", cannot weigh on the fact that for decades now, the word has been in use for every decorative shape or pattern, ancient⁵⁾ or modern, whether outlined or filled up by means of writing⁶⁾. So its use is perfectly justified for Jewish decorative micrography which in our opinion it much better befits than the rather clumsy, naive and at times even ugly motives designed by Apollinaire, which on the whole largely betrayed his ambitious project.

The main interest of C. Sirat's paper is in the numerous and lengthy quotations (nearly half of her article is made up of them) of always interesting and more than once beautiful texts about Hebrew script and letters. She has gathered this kind of anthology in order to support a confrontation of the two Jewish trends of thought about script, the philosophical trend, partly inherited from the Greek and the mystical trend which endowed the letters of the alphabet with mystical properties. In C. Sirat's opinion, the last conception, the truly genuine Jewish one, finds its illustration in what she calls "micrography", i.e. in micrographic lines of text arranged in decorative patterns where the meaning gives way to the full creative powers of the letters themselves.

First one has to point out that the choice of microscopic script was quite independent of any mystical preoccupation but obeyed to an obviously practical purpose. When it became the custom to copy in the codex, along the biblical text, the critical apparatus of the *masora*, only by using minute writing could the scribe succeed in copying, in the limited space of the margins, both *masorae*, the *masora parva* in the vertical margins and the intercolumnar spaces, the *masora magna* in the horizontal margins. Now of these two *masorae* the more important for the accurate reading of the text, its "necessary grammar", was the *masora parva*. And this very *masora* is never written in ornamental shapes⁷⁾. Quite contrary to C. Sirat's assumption, this would imply that the medieval Jewish copyists did in fact think that in this case the written text could

* This study is a review article of Colette Sirat, *La lettre hébraïque et sa signification* and of Leila Avrin, *Micrography as Art*. Paris, Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique — Jerusalem, The Israel Museum, Department of Judaica, 1981 (80 p., 118 pl.) = *Études de paléographie hébraïque*.

¹⁾ On the frontcover, on the black background appears in light grey (i.e. in the reversed relation of the original, black letters on the clear parchment) a circular micrographic motive, borrowed from Paris, B.N. ms. hébr. 5, fol 117r (see pl. 52) on which are surimpressed the first two letters of the initial word of Psalm I, אֲשֶׁר (happy), continued on the back cover. Was it by chance or on purpose that these two letters have thus been isolated so as to form the word אֵשׁ (fire) and convey the idea of the fire in which the divine voice took the shape of letters (see, p. 24)?

²⁾ The alphabetical order and the lack of any appreciation about the selected works leave the reader wholly unaware of the progress of the knowledge of the subject (a question which has completely been overlooked by L. Avrin in her paper) or of the respective importance and particular object of each work. For instance one should like to know that the first item, by L. Avrin, is a thoroughly critical review of the third by S. Ferber. Moreover the criterion for the selection is not clear: one wonders at the mention of B. Narkiss, "The Relation between the Author, Scribe, Massorator ...", where only a short paragraph deals cursorily with the subject, and at the omission of the splendid album by D. Gunzburg and V. Stasof, *L'ornement hébreu*, Berlin, 1905, the first publication to reveal to cultivated people and scholars of the West, the beauty and richness of micrographic decoration in Hebrew manuscripts from the Near East.

³⁾ Several errors also appear in the acknowledgements: the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana is not in Rome but in the City of Vatican; the Library of Balliol College in Oxford is quite independent, as all College Libraries, of the Bodleian Library and has its own Keeper; the John Rylands Library is University Library.

⁴⁾ Corrections have to be made to one plate and in the captions of some other plates: on plate 15, the upper motive is out of place as it does not belong to the Leningrad Ms. II B 116, but to Ms. I 92, an *Ashkenazi* manuscript, very likely from the end of the 13th century (see D. Gunzburg and V. Stasof, *op. cit.*, *supra* n. 2, fig. 14, 15, 16). For plate 37, the shelfmark is in fact No. 19, for plate 55, 61, 68-70, 72, it is Cod. Urbin. ebr. 1. For plate 62, 63 and 65 it is MCF2-1, MCF2-3, MCF2-7 and the folios for plates 62 and 65 are 42 r and 86 v. Errors concerning datation or geographical origin, in captions for plates 23, 24, 29, 42, 71, should be corrected accordingly to the indications we give further on about the manuscripts that they reproduce. Finally, one wonders about the meaning of the note entitled "Drôleries", p. 80, as obviously none of the pages indicated corresponds to the texts printed in this volume. For the Berlin manuscripts, the Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Orientabteilung, only is to be mentioned as the manuscripts kept in Marburg (cf. Caption to pl. 53) and Tübingen after the last war had already been brought back to West Berlin around 1970.

⁵⁾ L. Avrin assumes (p. 43) that the ancient Greek call their own calligrams *technopaegnia*. But she has misunderstood Pauly whom she refers to. The Greek word, used by the Latin poet Ausonius as a title for a poem, did not imply any visual but a pure intellectual game. Only the Modern did make use of it for designating the figured poems of late Antiquity.

⁶⁾ See *Tresor de la langue française*, V, Paris, 1977, p. 47.

⁷⁾ At the most, in *Ashkenazi* codices, some of its letters, the *lamed*, have been elongated and sparingly decorated.