



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

LXX Isaiah 24:1-26:6 as interpretation and translation : a methodological discussion

Angelo Cunha, W. de

Citation

Angelo Cunha, W. de. (2012, March 15). *LXX Isaiah 24:1-26:6 as interpretation and translation : a methodological discussion*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/18588>

Version: Corrected Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/18588>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/18588> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

Author: Angelo Cunha, Wilson de

Title: LXX Isaiah 24:1-26:6 as interpretation and translation : a methodological discussion

Issue Date: 2012-03-15

CHAPTER 1 - INTRODUCTION

This chapter introduces the history of research on LXX Isa and discusses the research questions, methodology, contribution, and scope of the present work. The review of monographs and works dealing specifically with LXX Isa will inform the reader of its main developments since its very inception to the present time. It also offers a good background to the research questions that will occupy the present inquiry.

In its initial stage, research on LXX Isa focused mostly on its *Vorlage* and assumed that a very different Hebrew text from MT once lay behind the Greek. After almost a decade, scholars started to show a more cautious approach to the textual-critical use of LXX Isa, calling attention to the personality of the translator. Since then this phrase has been used extensively has acquired two main emphasis. In its initial stage, the “personality of the translator” referred to translation style, which was seen as rather free. In a later period, the same expression would denote not only translation style but also the translator’s theology. What follows below is an attempt to present those developments.

Following the review of the research history, this chapter turns to the research questions and methodology that will be the main topic of this monograph. Justification as to why LXX Isa 24:1-26:6 was chosen as the corpus to illustrate a methodological discussion of LXX Isa will then follow.

THE CONTOURS OF LXX ISA’S RESEARCH HISTORY

LXX Isa and Its Vorlage

The very first monograph on LXX Isa was A. Scholz’s *Die alexandrinische Uebersetzung des Buches Jesaias*.¹ In this work, Scholz strongly argued that the translator’s *Vorlage* was in fact different from

¹ A. Scholz, *Die alexandrinische Uebersetzung des Buches Jesaias* (Würzburg, Druck von Leo Woerl, 1880).

the Hebrew text preserved in MT. It was full of errors because of the way it was produced, namely, through dictation. Scholz postulated that, while one person read the Hebrew aloud, another wrote it down. An unclear diction led the recorder to insert Hebrew words with similar sounds onto his copied text. For Scholz, this model of production accounted for what he viewed as several errors in LXX Isa. Conversely, the translator was not responsible for those errors as he worked with great care and could not have possibly made so many mistakes. Consequently, Scholz viewed an unclear diction, due to similarities between certain Hebrew consonants, as the main cause for the errors found in the Greek translation.²

To give a few examples from LXX Isa 24:1-26:6, Scholz claimed that ἡσχύνθησαν “they were ashamed” (Isa 24:9) for MT’s בִּשְׁרֵי “with the song” reflects a Hebrew *Vorlage* that mistakenly read יִבְשׁוּ “they were ashamed.” יִבְשׁוּ/בִּשְׁרֵי’s similar sounds produced the reading יִבְשׁוּ in the translator’s *Vorlage*, who then rendered it with ἡσχύνθησαν. Scholz also claimed that certain Hebrew consonants of similar shapes, such as *rêš* and *dālet*, *wāw* and *yôd*, caused some mistakes. For instance, πτωχός “poor” in Isa 25:3 is in place of MT’s עָז “strong.” For Scholz, the translator’s *Vorlage* read עָנִי “poor,” which was an error that resulted from the similarities of the consonants *zayin* and *nûn*.³ In no way did Scholz consider that the translator himself may have been responsible for those differences. Instead, they were already in the translator’s *Vorlage*, which for him varied from MT.

Scholz’s different *Vorlage* hypothesis did not receive wide acceptance and was rejected in the early stages of LXX Isa’s research.⁴

² Scholz, *Jesaias*, 15-16.

³ Scholz, *Jesaias*, 29, 30.

⁴ In a few cases, however, a few scholars used the hypothesis of a different *Vorlage* to account for some of LXX Isa’s departure from the Hebrew. See e.g., H. W. Sheppard, “ΤΟΥ ΣΙΑΩΑΜ - הַשְׁלִיחַ Isa. viii 6,” *JTS* 16 (1915): 414-416; A. Vaccari, “ΠΤΟΛΙΣ ΑΣΕΔΕΚ IS. 19, 18,” *Bib* 2 (1921), 353-356; P. Katz, “Notes on the Septuagint,” *JTS* 47 (1946), 30-33; A. Vaccari, “Parole Rovesciate e Critiche Errate nella Bibbia Ebraica” in *Studi Orientalistici in Onore di Giorgio Levi Della Vida* (Pubblicazioni Dell’Istituto Per L’Oriente 54;

Beginning with E. Liebmann, the focus shifted from the text behind the Greek to the translator in front of his *Vorlage*. The following questions became important: first, what was the style of the translation? Second, what was the level of the translator's knowledge of the Hebrew language? And, third, did the translator leave traces of his ideology in his translation?

LXX Isa and the Personality of the Translator: Translation Style

In 1902, Liebmann began a series of articles devoted to a text-critical discussion of MT Isa 24-27 by comparing it with its ancient witnesses. His main contribution was his plea that the "personality of the translator(s)" should be taken into account before using their translation(s) for text critical purposes. By this, he meant that a careful study of each translation's style must precede any proposals for a different Hebrew *Vorlage* behind them.⁵

Focusing mainly on LXX Isa, Liebmann was interested in the following three questions: first, how well did the translator know the Hebrew language? Second, what was the style of his translation? And, third, does the translator betray an influence from his worldview?⁶ As for the translator's familiarity with Hebrew, Liebmann concluded that the translator's lexical and grammatical knowledge was good. Although the translator had some difficulties with the tenses of some Hebrew verbs, his familiarity with the Hebrew language was still commendable.⁷

As for the translation style, Liebmann paid attention to questions of "additions" and "omissions," sentence composition, differences in the

Roma: Istituto Per L'Oriente, 1956), 2:553-566; the critical apparatus of the BHS.

⁵ cf. E. Liebmann, "Der Text zu Jesaia 24-27," ZAW 22 (1902), 6, 7.

⁶ cf. Liebmann, "Der Text," 26.

⁷ cf. Liebmann, "Der Text," 28, 39. For a detailed discussion, cf. pp. 27-39. In the same year, H. B. Swete (*An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* [Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2003; reprint of 1902 edition], 315-316), expressed a completely different view of the Isa translator, when he stated that "the Psalms and more especially the Book of Isaiah shew obvious signs of incompetence."

number of verbal forms, the conjunction *καί*, the definite article, pronominal suffixes, and the use of prepositions. He concluded that LXX Isa does not carry any weight for textual criticism concerning sentence composition, the differences in the number of verbal forms, and additions. Contrarily, LXX Isa may have some text-critical value in its use of certain Greek words, certain uses of *καί*, the definite article, pronominal suffixes and prepositions.⁸

Finally, Liebmann pointed to a few cases where the translator's "dogmatic views" were responsible for some of LXX Isa's divergences from the Hebrew. The translator's usage of *διὰ* "on account of" for תחת "under" in Isa 24:5 and ὅτι ἡμάρτοσαν "they sinned" for וישמו "they became guilty" in Isa 24:6 all point to the translator's ideology. The more so as, in Liebmann's view, ἀφανίζω "to destroy" could have been used to translate וישמו.⁹

The year of 1902 saw another important publication. In his "Bemerkungen zur alexandrinischen Übersetzung des Jesaja (c. 40-66),"¹⁰ Zillessen tried to show that related phraseology in MT Isa 40-66 is the reason behind many of LXX Isa's departures. He argued the translator borrowed phrases from elsewhere in the book for his translation of certain verses. In these cases, LXX Isa would have no bearing in MT's corrections.¹¹ Zillessen proposed that LXX Isa carried out two types of corrections in light of related phrases in Isa 40-66. The first type was some sort of improvement of the Hebrew and some examples are Isa 40:5 (cp. 52:10); 41:6 (cp. 41:5); 42:1 (cp. 45:4); 46:11 (cp. 48:15); 48:16 (cp. 45:19). The second were cases where the Greek reworked, altered, even replaced the Hebrew due to related phraseology. Some examples of this type are 41:28 (cp. 63:5); 42:4 (cp. 11:2; 51:5); 44:23 (cp. 52:9); 45:8 (cp. 44:23; 49:13). Moreover, Zillessen also identified seven cases outside Isa 40-66 that influenced translations in LXX Isa 40-66. Of these seven, three come from outside the book of Isa (cf. Exo 17:6 [cp. Isa 48:21]; Amos 9:14 [cp. Isa 45:13]; Ps 37:6 [cp. Isa

⁸ cf. Liebmann, "Der Text," 45.

⁹ cf. Liebmann, "Der Text," 49.

¹⁰ A. Zillessen, "Bemerkungen zur alexandrinischen Übersetzung des Jesaja (c. 40-66)" ZAW 22 (1902): 238-263.

¹¹ cf. Zillessen, "Bemerkungen," 240.

51:5]). The others come from the book of Isa itself (cf. 42:4 [cp. 11:2]; 45:9 [cp. 28:24; 29:16]; 61: 7 [cp. 35:10]).¹²

Zillessen also discussed whether the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the translator or the translator himself was the source of the differences in LXX Isa 40-66. He claimed that in a few cases the Hebrew seemed to be the source that motivated the changes; in most cases, however, the source of the change was found in the translation itself. Still much indebted to viewing LXX Isa's value for textual-criticism, Zillessen conjectured whether a precursor form of the *Vorlage*, supplied, for instance, with interlinear parallel sentences, was behind the translator's changes.¹³ Later on, Ziegler would pick up on Zillessen's conjecture of "interlinear parallel sentences" to develop his theory of glosses in the margin of the translator's *Vorlage*.¹⁴

In 1904, R. R. Ottley also addressed the differences between the MT and LXX. Contrary to Scholz's previous research, Ottley discarded the idea that a different *Vorlage* once lay behind the Greek. Instead, he argued LXX Isa's divergences originated with the translator's faulty knowledge of the Hebrew language.¹⁵ Although he conjectured the translator may have used an illegible manuscript, he saw the translator's imperfect knowledge of the Hebrew as the main cause for LXX Isa's departures.¹⁶ For instance, Ottley claimed that "often we can see the

¹² cf. Zillessen, "Bemerkungen," 261.

¹³ cf. Ibid.

¹⁴ J. Koenig, *L'herméneutique analogique du judaïsme antique d'après les témoins textuels d'Isaïe* (VTSup 33; Leiden: Brill, 1982), 24.

¹⁵ R. R. Ottley, *The Book of Isaiah According to the Septuagint (Codex Alexandrinus)* (London: C. J. Clay and Sons, 1904-1906), 1:49: "in Isaiah I find it hard to see that the LXX gives any proof at all (unless in a few isolated exceptions) of an older or superior Hebrew text; because the translators seem to have been so constantly mistaken in reading their Hebrew, or unable to translate it, as to deprive their witness of all authority."

¹⁶ Ottley, *Isaiah*, 1:50: "The failures of the translator (or translators) in reading his original may have been largely justified by illegibility of MSS., and very likely by abbreviations also; the actual script may have been very difficult. But over and above all this, it seems as if his knowledge of Hebrew was imperfect; and if this was so, he may have thought that he saw before him not

translator losing his clue, and going gradually astray,” citing LXX Isa 24:23 is one example. He suggested *τακήσεται* “it will melt, dissolve” (Isa 24:23a) resulted from the translator’s faulty rendering of *בושה* “it will be ashamed” with *πесείτται* “it will fall” in the parallel clause of Isa 24:23b.¹⁷ Differences explained as mistakes, misreading or guessing abound in Ottley’s work.¹⁸

Four years before Ziegler’s monumental work, J. Fischer devoted attention to the *Vorlage* behind LXX Isa. Against F. Wutz, whose work argued the LXX translators worked from a H text that had been transcribed into Greek, Fischer argued that the *Vorlage* behind LXX Isa was a consonantal Hebrew text.¹⁹ Noticing that the characteristic feature of LXX Isa is its shorter text when compared to MT,²⁰ Fischer discussed the question of how to account for this phenomenon. He then paid great attention to the style of the translation. Basically, he offered four explanations: minuses in the Greek text itself; translator’s intentional minuses; translator’s contraction of words or phrases; gaps in the translator’s *Vorlage*. Although Fischer argued that a gap in the translator’s *Vorlage* should not be denied, he strongly emphasized that, in general, the differences between LXX Isa’s *Vorlage* and MT were not that significant and that their nature was clear. By this, he meant that a different *Vorlage* is mostly not the reason for LXX Isa’s divergence from the Hebrew. Instead, the translator should be taken as responsible for the differences between LXX Isa and MT.²¹ To prove his point, Fischer proceeded to a discussion of translation style.

Fischer argued the method of translation was not a word for word rendition but, rather, a free translation. The aim of the translator was to bring the meaning of his text into Greek. Fischer also argued that

merely something different from reality, but something such as no skilled Hebrew writer would have written.”

¹⁷ cf. Ottley, *Isaiah*, 1:50; 2:224.

¹⁸ cf. e.g., Ottley, *Isaiah*, 2:222, 225. In vol. 1:51, Ottley characterized the “mistakes and misreadings” in LXX Isa as “so numerous.”

¹⁹ J. Fischer, *In welcher Schrift lag das Buch Isaias den LXX vor?* (BZAW 56; Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1930), III.

²⁰ cf. Fischer, *In welcher Schrift*, 6.

²¹ cf. Fischer, *In welcher Schrift*, 8.

in places where his *Vorlage* was easy to translate, the translation was more literal. Contrarily, the translation was freer in places where the *Vorlage* was difficult to render. In those places, the translator struggled to make the meaning of his text clear, making use of the context to clarify it. For example, Fischer pointed to Isa 33:18, where the translator read אֲתֵּי הַמִּגְדָּלִים “the towers” as אֵת הַמִּגְדָּלִים “the ones being caused to be great” and, in the light of the context, rendered it with τὸς τρεφόμενους “the ones being caused to grow up.”²²

Furthermore, Fischer stressed that a free translation style characterizes LXX Isa.²³ In Isa 10:26, for example, ἐν τόπῳ θλίψεως “in the place of affliction” renders בצור עורב. For him, the translator interpreted the image of “raven” (עורב) as a cipher for unhappiness. A free translation style included also free exegesis as in the rendition of שרשך “your root” with τὸ σπέρμα σου “your seed” (Isa 14:30). The elimination of anthropomorphism was another aspect of LXX Isa’s free translation style. Fischer explained אל גבור פלא יועץ אל גבור with μεγάλης βουλῆς ἄγγελος (Isa 9:5) as due, perhaps, to the translator’s ignoring גבור. Finally, he argued the translation is filled with many additions to clarify the Hebrew.²⁴

Moreover, Fischer argued the translator deliberately exchanged, added or omitted certain consonants in his *Vorlage*. For instance, the rendition of נוֹאֲלוּ “they acted foolishly” with ἐξέλιπον “they fell” (Isa 19:13) reflects the verbal form נִלְאוּ “they grew weary.” In this case, the translator omitted the consonant *waw* to produce the meaning “they fell.” There are also other places where the translator added (cf. 24:14; 25:2-3; 26:17-18; 27:1), omitted (cf. 25:11; 26:9) or changed the order of a consonant, especially when it had the same shape as ד and ר.²⁵

²² cf. Fischer, *In welcher Schrift*, 9, 10.

²³ With Fischer, the view of the translation style as free had considerably changed from Swete’s 1902 (cf. *An Introduction*, 324) claim that the LXX Isa translation was so literal as to render “entire sentences” as “unintelligible.”

²⁴ cf. Fischer, *In welcher Schrift*, 11.

²⁵ Fischer, *In welcher Schrift*, 10-11.

Fischer also argued the translator frequently used his knowledge of Aramaic for his translation. He gave several examples confirming this feature.²⁶ He claimed that the translator was an expert in the Aramaic language, being his living language, and that he had a better control of it than of Hebrew.²⁷

After Fischer, J. Ziegler published, in 1934, his groundbreaking monograph on LXX Isa.²⁸ In this study, Ziegler addressed the fundamental question of the relation between MT and LXX Isa. For him, it essentially entailed two alternatives: first, the translator had an identical *Vorlage* to MT; or, second, the translator's source-text markedly diverged from MT.²⁹

In doing so, Ziegler proposed, together with Liebmann and Fischer, that an evaluation of LXX Isa's relation to MT must pay attention to the translation style. In this respect, he discussed at length, among other things, matters such as minuses and pluses, the translator's handling of comparisons, his use of related phraseology throughout the translation, and the translator's lexical choices vis-à-vis his Alexandrian background. He categorically argued that a free translation style characterizes LXX Isa and that this translation has much in common with LXX Job/Prov and the *targumim*.³⁰ Rather than a word for word translation, Ziegler viewed the translator as someone who paid attention to the context during the production of his translation.

A case in point is the translator's handling of difficult Hebrew words, for which he reached to the context for help. For instance, the noun $\eta\psi$ "dawn, crepuscule" was rendered as $\tau\delta\ \acute{o}\psi\epsilon$ "late in the day, in

²⁶ cf. Fischer, *In welcher Schrift*, 9. Later, A. van der Kooij (*Die alten Textzeugen des Jesajabuches: ein Beitrag zur Textgeschichte des Alten Testaments* [OBO 35; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981], 69) would doubt Fischer's claim that the translator utilized his Aramaic knowledge "very often."

²⁷ cf. Fischer, *In welcher Schrift*, 10.

²⁸ J. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias* (ATA 12/3: Münster: 1934).

²⁹ cf. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 1.

³⁰ cf. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 7.

the evening” because of τὸ πρωί “in the morning” at the beginning of the verse (Isa 5:11). Similarly, ἡ ψυχὴ was used for the difficult ἡψν to create a parallel with ἡ καρδία at the beginning of the verse (Isa 21:4).³¹ Thus, the translator did not produce his work mechanically. He, rather, paid careful attention to both the immediate and broader contexts of a given passage.

In his discussion of LXX’s minuses, Ziegler argued that for the most part they originated with the translator himself, who intentionally and unintentionally left words out of his translation. Most importantly, Ziegler claimed that the translator did not feel restricted to his *Vorlage* in a strict way and that he was not producing a literal word for word translation.³² In fact, Ziegler assumed that the translator’s *Vorlage* was identical to MT, excepting a few cases.³³

In his discussion of “Gegenseitige Beeinflussung sinnverwandter Stellen in der Js-LXX,” Ziegler advanced his main thesis that the translator had a sufficiently good general knowledge of the book of Isa as a whole and that the exegesis of several related phrases may clarify several divergences. The reason is that many of the Greek’s differences from MT originated with the translator’s technique of rendering one passage in the light of another in the book. In his own words:

³¹ cf. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 9. For more examples, cf. pp. 9-12.

³² cf. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 46-47: “Hier erhebt sich die Frage: Hat die LXX bereits in ihrer Vorlage die betreffenden Versteile und Worte nicht gelesen? Wie oben bemerkt worden ist, hat Fischer richtig erkannt, daß LXX-Vorlage und MT sich nicht weit voneinander entfernen; doch besteht kein Zweifel, daß in unserem MT manche Versteile und glossenartige Bemerkungen stehen, die LXX noch nicht gelesen hat. Jedoch geht bei dem größten Teil des Minus die Ursache auf den Übers. selbst zurück; er hat oftmals Satzteile und Worte absichtlich und unabsichtlich ausgelassen... Der Js-Übers. fühlte sich nicht streng an seine Vorlage gebunden und hatte auch keineswegs die Absicht, wörtlich und genau, Wort für Wort zu übersetzen; deshalb hat er einfach schwierige, seltene Wörter ausgelassen, manche Sätze verkürzt und zusammengezogen.” For a recent, systematic study of LXX Isa’s minus and pluses, confirming Ziegler’s conclusions above, cf. M. van der Vorm-Croughs, *The Old Greek of Isaiah: An Analysis of its Pluses and Minuses* (Ph.D. diss.; Universiteit Leiden, 2010).

³³ cf. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 22.

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; erst so läßt sich manche Differenz der LXX gegenüber dem MT erklären.³⁴

Ziegler devoted about forty pages to a discussion of LXX Isa 1-66, pointing to cases where the translation of one passage was influenced by another. With the programmatic statement above, he advanced LXX Isa's research significantly by highlighting that the translator made use of his knowledge of the content of the whole book for his rendition of particular passages.

In the last chapter of his book, "Der alexandrinisch-ägyptische Hintergrund der Js-LXX," Ziegler argued that LXX Isa must also be studied in the context of the Alexandrian-Egyptian world. For him, the translator attempted to produce a translation that would be comprehensible to Alexandrian Jews and, in doing so, resorted to the lexicon of his homeland. LXX Isa, thus, acquired a new meaning in Greek clothes. This implied, so argued Ziegler, that a proper understanding of LXX Isa requires an acquaintance with the cultural world of the translator.³⁵ For instance, in the light of papyri documents, Ziegler argued that ἀνίημι in LXX Isa 27:10 means "to abandon" as the same verb appears in P. Tebt. I 72, 36, dating from the second cent. B.C.E., with this meaning: γῆν ἀνιέναι εἰς νομάς "to abandon the land as pasturage."³⁶ This example and others point to the importance of comparing LXX Isa with contemporary papyri texts.³⁷

³⁴ Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 135.

³⁵ cf. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 175-177.

³⁶ cf. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 180.

³⁷ For recent research on the cultural context of LXX Isa in the light of contemporary papyri literature, cf. M. N. van der Meer, "Trendy Translations in the Septuagint of Isaiah: A Study of the Vocabulary of the Greek Isaiah 3,18-23

LXX Isa and the Personality of the Translator: The Translator's Theology

The year of 1934 also witnessed to an influential shift of focus in LXX Isa research with K. F. Euler's study of LXX Isa 53. The value of Euler's work consists in its methodology. Rather than being interested in LXX Isa 53 as a translational text, Euler focused on it as a text in its own right. Instead of taking LXX Isa 53 as a text that reflects faithfully the ideology of its *Vorlage*, Euler wanted to study LXX Isa 53 as a text that communicates its own ideas. He thus made a distinction between LXX Isa as a translational text and as a text in its own right. In the latter capacity, Euler viewed LXX Isa as reflecting the translator's particular beliefs. As he put it:

Wenn im ersten Teil der Arbeit eine Übersetzung und Erklärung des LXX-Textes von Jes 53 gegeben wird, so ist der eben bezeichnete Gesichtspunkt bestimmend gewesen, den LXX-Text als selbständigen Text zu betrachten und nicht als einen Übersetzungstext, der die Gedanken des hebräischen Textes nur wortgetreu wiedergäbe. Der Text als übersetzter Text bleibt unberücksichtigt; hier ist er selbständiger Text, der bestimmte und verständliche Aussagen macht.³⁸

in the Light of Contemporary Sources," in *Die Septuaginta – Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 20. - 23. Juli 2006* (WUNT 219; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 581-596; idem, "Papyrological Perspectives on the Septuagint of Isaiah," in *The Old Greek of Isaiah: Issues and Perspectives. Papers read at the Conference on the Septuagint of Isaiah, held in Leiden 10-11 April 2008* (eds. A. van der Kooij and M. N. van der Meer; CBET 55; Leuven: Peeters, 2010), 107-133; idem, "Visions from Memphis and Leontopolis: The Phenomenon of the Vision Reports in the Greek Isaiah in the light of Contemporary Accounts from Hellenistic Egypt," in *Isaiah in Context: Studies in Honour of Arie van der Kooij on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (eds. M. N. van der Meer et al., VTSup 138; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 281-316.

³⁸ K. F. Euler, *Die Verkündigung vom leidenden Gottesknecht aus Jes 53 in der Griechischen Bibel* (BWA[N]T 66; Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1934), 2.

Euler claimed further that LXX Isa 53 as a text in its own right carries an ideology of its own, independent from its H *Vorlage*:

Es war ja verschiedentlich schon betont worden, daß der LXX-Text, obwohl er ein übersetzter Text ist, durchaus selbständig ist in seinem Gedankeninhalt... Denn die Übersetzung kann beeinflußt sein von einem schon vorherrschenden Glauben hinsichtlich des Ebed, der in den Kreisen, aus denen die LXX stammt, beheimatet ist. Ebenso wie Targum und rabbinische Literatur in dieser Hinsicht eine bestimmte Meinung vertreten, könnten ja auch die LXX-Übersetzer eine solche haben, die sie durch ihre Übersetzung zum Ausdruck bringen.³⁹

Euler's work represented a major shift in emphasis on LXX Isa studies. Rather than studying LXX Isa as a translation, focusing on translation style as had so often been done before the year of 1934, Euler argued it should be studied as a text in its own right that may carry its own independent ideology. After Euler's publication, one notices in retrospect that scholars began to be more and more interested not only on translation style but much more LXX Isa's ideology.

In 1948, I. L. Seeligmann published his "The Septuagint Version of Isaiah: A Discussion of Its Problems." This work, which would become his *opus magnum*, has rightly been deemed "the most significant attempt to use the Septuagint as evidence of Jewish theology."⁴⁰ Seeligmann characterized LXX Isa as a work that reflected the translator's personal views and his surrounding context:

The translation of Isaiah is characterized in numerous places not only by a fairly considerable independence of the Hebrew text, but also by the fact that it evinces an equally marked influence from the surrounding cultural atmosphere, as well as expressing the author's personal views. This translation, in fact, is almost the only one among

³⁹ Euler, *Die Verkündigung*, 10.

⁴⁰ cf. K. H. Jobes and M. Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Book House, 2000), 102.

the various parts of the Septuagint which repeatedly reflects contemporaneous history.⁴¹

Seeligmann would see reflected in LXX Isa events from the Maccabean period, other “contemporaneous and parallel political developments in the territories bordering on Palestine,” the history of Ptolemaic Egypt, as well as events of the broader Hellenistic history.⁴² Pertaining to the Maccabean period, he discovered allusions to Antiochus IV Epiphanes (cf. Isa 14:18-20), Onias III (cf. Isa 8:8), Jewish emigration to Egypt (cf. Isa 10:24), a Philistinian fleet that Jews used for trading voyages (cf. Isa 11:14), anti-Jewish movements in Phoenician cities during the Maccabean wars and reference to 2nd century B.C.E expansion of the Nabatean state (cf. Isa 15:7ff).⁴³ On the history of Ptolemaic Egypt, he found mentioning of the situation of Ptolemaic Egypt after Antiochus Epiphanes’ campaigns (cf. Isa 22:5) and of Ethiopian support for Egyptian rebels against the Ptolemeans (cf. Isa 20:5).⁴⁴ As for the broader Hellenistic history, Seeligmann saw in the phrase “ships of Carthage” in LXX Isa 23 a reference to Carthage’s attempt to become an agrarian state after the destruction of its shipping and trade.⁴⁵ For him, therefore, LXX Isa was full of references to its historical period. This was a phenomenon that could only be explained from the perspective of contemporization.⁴⁶

It is important to point out that Seeligmann believed that one can only find the translator’s references to historical allusions or expressions

⁴¹ I. L. Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah. A Discussion of Its Problems* (MVEOL 9; Leiden: Brill, 1948), 4. Reprinted in I. L. Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah and Cognates Studies* (ed. R. Hanhart and H. Spieckermann; FAT 40; Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2004). See also pp. 79, 82 and idem, “Problemen en perspectieven in het moderne Septuaginta-onderzoek,” *JEOL* 6-8 (1939-1942), 390b-390e. For an English translation of this article, cf. “Problems and Perspectives in Modern Septuagint Research,” *Text* 15 (1990): 169-232.

⁴² cf. Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, 89, 90.

⁴³ cf. Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, 83-89. See also idem, “Problemen,” 390d-390e.

⁴⁴ cf. Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, 89-90.

⁴⁵ cf. Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, 91.

⁴⁶ cf. Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, 79.

of his beliefs in places where his translation was free. Talking about LXX Isa's departures from its Hebrew source, Seeligmann claimed that

they [= inconsistencies] also entitle us to try, on our part, to discover, in isolated, free renderings, certain historical allusions or expressions of the translator's own views and ideas; also in those places where these insertions appear to constitute an element alien to the main context.⁴⁷

Seeligmann argued that the translator had an atomistic approach to his *Vorlage*. Much like "a... feature in the most ancient Jewish exegesis," that he introduced interpretations of words or phrases into his translation without paying attention to the immediate context. For that reason, Seeligmann found it unlikely "to discover logical connexions in any chapter or part of a chapter in our Septuagint-text."⁴⁸ This last statement, as it will be seen below, is at odds with his claim that both literal and free translations reflect the translator's ideology.

Seeligmann further elaborated on the "personal views" of LXX Isa's author in the last chapter of his dissertation, entitled "the Translation as a Document of Jewish-Alexandrian Theology." He discussed the methodology that must be used in writing a history of "Jewish-Alexandrian theology." For him, the sources of the translator's religious notions can be found both in the Bible itself and in Jewish traditions of the time as well as in the Hellenistic worldview.⁴⁹ Therefore, both literal and free renderings are important sources of the translator's

⁴⁷ Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, 41. However, Seeligmann viewed literal translations as important as free ones for the reconstruction of the translator's "religious notions." As he put it on p. 95, "passages that were translated literally in a given book of the Septuagint, are of equal importance as free paraphrases: both represent fragments of the religious notions of the translator concerned."

⁴⁸ cf. Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, 41.

⁴⁹ cf. Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, 95: "The sources of information at our disposal are insufficient for the writing of a history of Jewish-Alexandrian theology. We may say, however, that although its content is for the most part derived from the Bible, it also contains later elements which have their origin partly in popular Jewish traditions that grew outside, and simultaneously with, the Bible and gradually became authoritative, and partly in conscious or unconscious borrowing from the Hellenistic thought-world."

theology as “both represent fragments of the religious notions of the translator concerned.”⁵⁰ However, Seeligmann decided to focus only on those places where the translation differed ideologically from its source text. He did not intend to write a history of the religious notions of the translator, which included a study of both literal and free renderings, but “to indicate the differences between those embodied in the translation and in the original.”⁵¹ Different from his predecessors, he used the term “personality of the translator” to designate a study not only of translation technique, as it had been so usual until his day, but also of the translator’s theological concepts.⁵²

In his discussion of the translator’s theological notions, Seeligmann focused on the translator’s ideas about God, Torah, and Israel, which form “the nuclear idea of every Jewish-theological conception.”⁵³ He found nuances of the translator’s views on God in the epithets he used, such as the more usual κύριος for אלהים/יהוה instead of the less frequent δεσπότης; the use of δίκαιος, δικαιοσύνη, and ἔλεος; and the non-translation of צור as an epithet for God to avoid any hint at approving stone worshipping.⁵⁴ Terms as εὐσεβής, εὐσέβεια, δικαιοσύνη, ἔνδοξος, νόμος, ἀνομέω and cognate, all function as windows into the translator’s religious ideas about virtuosity and Torah.⁵⁵ Seeligmann also

⁵⁰ Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, 95.

⁵¹ Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, 95.

⁵² cf. Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, 96: “the personality of the translator and his spiritual background.” In light of Seeligmann’s discussion on pp. 95-96, “spiritual background” stands for the religious concepts of the translator. At the conclusion of chapter 4, on p. 120, Seeligmann refers to the “translator’s personality or... mental images.”

⁵³ Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, 96. See also idem, “Problemen, 389: “De beschrijving van de theologie der vertalers zal - zooals die van iedere Joodsche theologie - gegroepeerd moeten worden, om de begrippen: God, Israël - hierbij ook Messiaansche idee als nationale verlossingskracht - en Thorah.”

⁵⁴ cf. Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, 97-103. See also idem, “Problemen,” 390a: “Dat de vaak voorkomende metafoor van God als Rots of Steen op geen enkele plaats letterlijk wordt vertaald wortelt misschien ten deele in het apologetische streven ook den schijn van instemming met steenvereering te ontgaan.”

⁵⁵ cf. Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, 103-109.

found ample evidence for the translator's view of prophecy as "the revelation of an age-old plan" that is "bound to be fulfilled."⁵⁶

Further, Seeligmann argued the translator had a particular view of exile and diaspora that differed from the Hebrew. Whereas the latter views the exile as a consequence of God's just punishment, the translator views it as the result of "an injustice visited on Israel because of the superior might of other peoples."⁵⁷ Exile as an injustice and oppression coupled with a "yearning for national deliverance"⁵⁸ shaped the translator's work. LXX Isa consistently uses the term *ἀδικέω* "in regard to the oppressors to whom the Jewish people are subjected" for several Hebrew terms.⁵⁹ The diaspora feeling can also be seen in the "veneration of national symbols" like Zion and Jerusalem and in the "constant yearning for liberation."⁶⁰ The use of *σωτηρία*, *σώζω*, *σωτήριον* for different Hebrew lexemes indicated that the translator viewed their meaning as primarily of "liberation from a powerful political enemy," "escape from a great political disaster," and "deliverance from exile."⁶¹ Seeligmann further noted that the concepts of *σώζω* and cognates occur "in close connexion with one of the most notable thoughts in Isaiah's preaching, *i.e.* the proclamation of the return of the Remnant of Israel"⁶² (cf. the parallel occurrence of *σώζω*/cognates and *κατάλειμμα/καταλείπω* in Isa 10:20, 22; 37:32). The translator further identified the "Remnant of the people of Israel with the Jewish diaspora in Hellenistic Egypt" and also in Mesopotamia (cf. Isa 11:16; 19:24-25).⁶³ Because the translation of Isa betrays unique ideas that differ from MT, Seeligmann argued that a study of the "personality of the translator" involved not only translation style but also the translator's theology. And the ideology of the translator would indeed become the general focus of later works.

⁵⁶ cf. Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, 109-110.

⁵⁷ Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, 111.

⁵⁸ Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, 116.

⁵⁹ cf. Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, 111 and also p. 112.

⁶⁰ Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, 113.

⁶¹ Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, 114.

⁶² Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, 115.

⁶³ cf. Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, 116, 117.

In 1951, L. H. Brockington published an important article that dealt with the translator's interest in the theme of $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$. This term appears 68x in LXX Isa but translates כבוד only 28x. The high frequency of $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$ is striking in comparison with other LXX books that translate the *Tanach*. There $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$ occurs 270x and translates כבוד 180x. The difference in statistics is of 2/3 for LXX books and 7/17 for LXX Isa. Brockington argued that $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$ had a theological significance for the translator and that it "was associated, directly or indirectly, with God's redemptive work among men."⁶⁴ Substantiation for Brockington's claim of the soteriological meaning of $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$ can be found in places where the translator introduced it where his *Vorlage* referred to "salvation" (cf. e.g., Isa 12:2; 44:23). The opposite also proves Brockington's point. In Isa 40:5; 60:1-7, for instance, the translator introduced $\sigma\omega\tau\eta\rho\iota\alpha$ as his *Vorlage* referred to "glory."⁶⁵ Brockington saw the "individuality of the translator" in his increased use of $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$ as a concept denoting salvation.⁶⁶

Following, J. Coste published an article on LXX Isa 25:1-5, in which he made important methodological points. He approached LXX Isa 25:1-5 as a "translational" text, as a literary unit, as a text expressing certain beliefs, and as a text that functions as a channel for revelation.⁶⁷ As a translation, he concluded that LXX Isa 25:1-5 showed itself "comme un échec presque complet."⁶⁸ Contrarily, when studied in its own right,⁶⁹ LXX Isa 25:1-5 presented itself as an ordered and coherent text. He further concluded that LXX Isa 25:1-5, as a literary and conceptual text, shows that an active interpretive plan was already at work even before its translation had started. This interpretive plan reflected the translator's personal piety and faith.⁷⁰

⁶⁴ L. H. Brockington, "The Greek Translator of Isaiah and His Interest in $\Delta\text{O}\Xi\text{A}$," *VT* 1/1 (1951), 26.

⁶⁵ For details, cf. Brockington, " $\Delta\text{O}\Xi\text{A}$," 30-32.

⁶⁶ cf. Brockington, " $\Delta\text{O}\Xi\text{A}$," 31.

⁶⁷ cf. J. Coste, "Le texte grec d'Isaïe XXV, 1-5," *RB* 61 (1954), 37.

⁶⁸ Coste, "Le texte grec," 50.

⁶⁹ A similar approach had already been advanced for LXX Isa 52:13-53:12, see the discussion above of Euler, *Die Verkündigung*.

⁷⁰ cf. Coste, "Le texte grec," 51.

As a text that expresses the translator's "personal piety and faith," Coste characterized LXX Isa 25:1-5 as a messianic thanksgiving song that celebrates the destruction of the wicked and the deliverance of the Israelites, who will recognize the Lord in Zion.⁷¹ In his lexical analysis, he claimed the themes of poverty and deliverance, on one hand, and expectation and messianic gift, on the other, are the themes of LXX Isa 25:1-5. As such, he viewed it as the "song of the poor," which reflects a spiritual movement in Judaism that brought the concepts of poverty and humility to the fore of its religious faith.⁷² For Coste, therefore, LXX Isa 25:1-5, as a text in its own, betrayed the translator's ideology.

After Coste, the Portuguese scholar J. C. M. das Neves sought to recover the theology of the translator in his study of LXX Isa 24.⁷³ He approached this text in three levels. The first discussed the exegesis and theology of MT Isa 24; the second paid attention to "philological differences" between MT and LXX; and the third discussed the exegesis and theology of LXX Isa 24.⁷⁴

Das Neves understood that the translator's religious conceptions determined his translation and the text as a literary unit. On the level of translation, das Neves noted that the translator sometimes read the Hebrew in slightly different ways from MT/1QIsa^a. Note, for instance, ὁ λαός ὁ πτωχός "the poor people" for יְעַם יְעַם "the strong people," reflecting a reading of MT as עַם יְעַם. This and many other examples suggested to das Neves that the Isa translator was well acquainted with the Hebrew language and manipulated it to express his religious beliefs.⁷⁵

The level of the literary unit concerns, for das Neves, the translator's reading method. For him, "re-readings" and "actualizations"

⁷¹ cf. Coste, "Le texte grec," 51.

⁷² cf. Coste, "Le texte grec," 59-60.

⁷³ J. C. M. das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega dos Setenta no Livro de Isaías (Cap. 24 de Isaías)* (Lisbon: Universidade Católica Portuguesa, 1973).

⁷⁴ cf. das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 265.

⁷⁵ cf. das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 266. For more examples, see pp. 265-266.

are essential for the Isa translator. The former consists in reading the Hebrew in a different way from the original. The latter in finding the fulfillment of former prophecies in the events of the translator's time.⁷⁶ These two methods combined are used to express the translator's religious views about two contemporary Jewish groups: the pro and contra hellenization.⁷⁷

The core of LXX Isa 24's theology is the existence of two opposite groups in the translator's time, one supporting Antiochus Epiphanes' policies in Jerusalem and another resisting them. Das Neves expressed this clearly:

Em todo o text, como se vê, perpassa sempre a mesma mentalidade de *atualização*, tendo por base as duas facções de judeus: os ímpios que se aliam aos inimigos na sua política e os fiéis ao jahvismo, prontos a sofrer com amor e com alegria e até mesmo a morrer *com morte de fogo* (Is. 9, 3-5; p. 232 s), o que nos indica tratar-se de espírito originado numa facção religiosa.⁷⁸

Das Neves identified several themes related to the group faithful to Yahweh. This group is found in dispersion in Egypt (cf. LXX Isa 18: 2, 7; 25:5; 27:12; 33:17; 41:9a, 2, 5; 45:22; 49:6; 52:10; 62:11) and is expecting its redemption (cf. LXX Isa 33:13; 41:1; 45:16, 22; 48:20; 49:1, 6; 51:5; 52:10; 60:9; 62:11). He further pointed out that this group in dispersion is sometimes referred to as the ones "left, spared" (cf. LXX Isa 4:2; 10:17, 11:10; 21; 19; 13:12; 20:6; 28:5, 6-28), the "poor" (cf. LXX Isa 25:1-5) and the "humiliated" (cf. LXX Isa 26:3). Related to the "poor" are concepts such as "joy" (εὐφροσύνη), glory (δόξα), and

⁷⁶ cf. das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 268. For das Neves' more detailed discussion of actualization in comparison with Dan and the *pesharim*, see idem, "A Teologia dos Setenta no Livro de Isaias," *Itinerarium* 43 (1964), 26-28.

⁷⁷ cf. das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 268, 269.

⁷⁸ das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 269. See also his "A Teologia dos Setenta," 19, 21.

righteousness (δικαιοσύνη). The “spared-poor-humiliated” group shares an eschatological hope for the messianic Jerusalem.⁷⁹

Contrarily, the party of unfaithful Jews is denominated by terms like πλούσιος/πλοῦτος, with the exception of LXX Isa 32:18; 33:20; ἁμαρτωλός, a concept that is more emphasized in the LXX than in MT; ἄρχοντες,⁸⁰ who are in fact referred to with the term ἁμαρτωλός above; βουλή/μάταια as the expression of political aspects devised by the ἄρχοντες; ἔθνη, although this term can also refer to the faithful people of God; and the present Jerusalem in its situation of impiety.⁸¹ It is necessary to note that das Neves is not saying that the terms above in all their occurrences in LXX Isa always refer to either the faithful or the unfaithful group. Instead, he noted that these terms seem to be associated with one or the other group at several places in LXX Isa.

In his analysis of LXX Isa 24, das Neves arrived at the following important conclusions: first, he noted that there are substantial differences between MT and LXX. He argued that it is not possible to explain these differences as errors of a paleographical nature only, such

⁷⁹ cf. das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 269-274. For a more detailed discussion of das Neves' view of the “remnant” in LXX Isa, see idem, “Isaías 7,14 no Texto Massorético e no Texto Grego: A obra de Joachim Becker,” *Didaskalia* 2 (1972), 106. Here das Neves summarized the theology of the “remnant” in LXX Isa as follows: 1. While MT speaks of the rest of “trees” or of the people in general terms, LXX refer to the “remnant” as a religious concept, as the faithful and pious class among the people. It also applies daily metaphors as agriculture, for instance, in a personal way and with reference to the “remnant” of Israel; 2. The “remnant” in LXX Isa is characterized as “poor” and “small” (cf. LXX Isa 24:6); 3. Whenever MT refers to the “remnant” as a specific class and in religious terms, the Greek tends to emphasize those references; 4. The “remnant” relates to the people in diaspora in Egypt that will return with gladness to Zion after their redemption; and, 5. This “remnant” suffers injustice by the wicked class of the people; however, those injustices are considered to be from God, who uses them to purify, sanctify, preparing them for future messianic happiness.

⁸⁰ For a more in depth discussion of ἄρχοντες in LXX Isa, see F. Raurell, “‘Archontes’ en la Interpretació Midràshica d’Is-LXX” *Revista Catalana de Teologia* 1 (1976), 315-374.

⁸¹ cf. das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 274-275.

as confusion of consonants, omissions, dittography, etc. Contrarily, he found in those differences the “personality of the translator.” He also noted that the Greek text, when studied in its own, presents its own well-defined thought. This “well-defined thought” can only be extracted by paying careful attention to the smallest particularities of the text. The differences between MT and LXX originate in the translator’s religious views rather than in a faulty understanding of the Hebrew text.⁸² LXX Isa is, thus, a theological interpretation of the Hebrew, made necessary by the historical and religious actualizations of that period.⁸³

Another important article that highlighted aspects of the social and political environment of LXX Isa was one Frederic Raurell published in 1976 entitled “‘Archontes’ en la interpretació midràshica d’Is-LXX.”⁸⁴ He called attention to the social background of Palestinian Jews in the 2nd century B.C.E., who lived under the oppressive control of Antiochus IV Epiphanes. He interpreted ἄρχοντες (Isa 3:4, 14; 14:5) as designating leaders of the Jewish community in Jerusalem favoring Antiochus IV’s policy of hellenization. Specifically, the ἄρχοντες were economic oppressors of the poor (πτωχός) who inflicting harsh taxes (cf. ἀπαιτῶν in Isa 3:12; 14:4).⁸⁵ The reason for harsh taxation was war

⁸² cf. das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 265. On p. 43, das Neves claimed that the differences between the Hebrew and the Greek can be found in the “mentalidade teológica do nosso tradutor.” The reason is that LXX Isa is more an interpretation than a translation.

⁸³ cf. das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 278. For a critical review of das Neves, see Raurell, “La teologia de Is-LXX en un studio reciente,” *Estudios Franciscanos* 76 (1975), 409-421.

⁸⁴ cf. Raurell, “‘Archontes,’” 315-374.

⁸⁵ For the theme of economic exploitation in LXX Isa, cf. R. L. Troxel, “Economic Plunder as a Leitmotif in LXX-Isaiah,” *Bib* 83 (2002), 375-391; idem, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation: The Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah* (JSJSup 124; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 201-209. In his article “Economic Plunder,” Troxel identified the harsh taxation under the Seleucids as the background of the motif of “economic plunder” in LXX Isa, as is clear from his statement on p. 390: “This leitmotif accords with the broad consensus that LXX-Isa was translated in the second quarter of the second century B.C.E., when Seleucid domination of Jerusalem and Judea was being thrown off. The level of taxes under the Hellenists had become repressive, making relief from Seleucid taxation a significant consequence of the revolt.

indemnities that Antiochus IV had to pay to the Romans.⁸⁶ Thus, the translator's employment of the term ἄρχοντες reflected his oppressive socio-political situation under Antiochus IV's control of Jerusalem.

In 1979, J. W. Olley made an important contribution to LXX Isa studies. The purpose of his monograph was to study how the translator understood passages in which the root דָּרַשׁ occurs as well as the "intended meaning of δικαιοσύνη and related words."⁸⁷ With such a study, Olley tried to discuss the question of the extent to which the translator's use of δικαιοσύνη and its cognates can be characterized as Jewish Greek.⁸⁸ Specifically, he sought to investigate why the translator "used certain words and what meaning he saw in those words in their context."⁸⁹ He assumed that

the translators believed that the words and structures they used were at least reasonably capable of conveying the meaning they saw in the original, allowing for individual theological views and linguistic abilities. This does not mean that they necessarily agreed with the meaning they saw.⁹⁰

Olley called for a contextual study of δικαιοσύνη and cognates in their LXX literary contexts. He warned that "one cannot assume that, because a particular Hebrew word is 'usually' rendered by a particular Greek word, therefore there is considerable semantic overlap." Further, he claimed that "unusual" renderings must be analyzed in their literary

That seems a likely explanation for the translator's preoccupation with economic plunder as the supreme crime of the people's rulers, with removal of such oppression constituting a signal feature of divine deliverance."

⁸⁶ cf. Raurell, "'Archontes,'" 365: "Les elevades indemnitzacions de guerra que els selèucides havien de pagar als romans les hagueren de pagar els pobres súbdits jueus. Per aquestes mateixes raons econòmiques els selèucides intentaren apoderar-se dels tresors del temple. Aquest intent sembla que fracassà al principi; tanmateix, el 175, Antíoc IV Epifanés va depositar el sumo sacerdot legítim i vengué dues vegades el càrrec als dos millor licitadors."

⁸⁷ J. W. Olley, *'Righteousness' in the Septuagint of Isaiah: A Contextual Study* (SBLSCS; Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1979), 1.

⁸⁸ cf. Olley, *'Righteousness'*, 1.

⁸⁹ Olley, *'Righteousness'*, 11.

⁹⁰ Olley, *'Righteousness'*, 5.

context, under the assumption “that the translator intended his reading to make sense.”⁹¹

Olley concluded that “while the fact that he [the translator] uses *δικαιο*-words is due to קדצ in MT, this is not simply a case of ‘automatic response translation’ since no instance has been found where this leads to a meaning unrecognizable on the basis of secular Greek usage.”⁹² Even though Olley conceded that some “meanings do however undergo slight semantic expansion due to their usage within a Jewish theological framework,”⁹³ they do not constitute “‘Jewish Greek’ but rather Greek words with some new associations added due to the Jewish context.”⁹⁴

Finally, Olley uncovered a “consistent picture of some aspects of the translator’s theology and technique” in the latter’s “linguistic preferences.”⁹⁵ He pointed out that the translator, while following the precedent in the Pentateuch in his use of ἀσεβής for ψר, he also employs “ἀσεβής for other roots when reference is to Israel’s enemies” and as a description of its oppressors.⁹⁶ On the other hand, the translator usually reserves ἀνομ-words as a reference to Israel and “more generally to wrongdoing and wrongdoers.”⁹⁷ Finally, ἀδικ-words are employed to describe actions of oppression either by “Israel’s leaders” or by others “who have attacked and oppressed Israel (cf. Isa 10:20; 21:3; 23:12; 25:3f; 51:23; 65:25).”⁹⁸

Olley summarized the translator’s theology as follows: first, because “acts of oppression by rulers and judges and attacks on other nations are, as in secular Greek understanding, ‘unjust,’” the translator employs ἀδικ-words. Ἀσεβ-words would not be appropriate in those contexts. Second, given the oppressor’s nature as “wrongdoers” and “their failure to serve the Lord,” the translator employs ἀσεβ-words to

⁹¹ Olley, *‘Righteousness’*, 125.

⁹² Olley, *‘Righteousness’*, 125.

⁹³ Olley, *‘Righteousness’*, 125-126.

⁹⁴ Olley, *‘Righteousness’*, 126.

⁹⁵ Olley, *‘Righteousness’*, 122.

⁹⁶ Olley, *‘Righteousness’*, 122.

⁹⁷ Olley, *‘Righteousness’*, 122.

⁹⁸ Olley, *‘Righteousness’*, 122.

describe them as they are most appropriate for those contexts. And, third, the translator reserves ἀνομ-words to refer to “Israel’s disobedience of the law of God.”⁹⁹ Detecting the translator’s theology in his careful contextual study of the translator’s linguistic preferences, Olley advanced the translator’s theology as the reason for some of his lexical choices.

In 1981, A. van der Kooij engaged in an important discussion of the proper methodological use of the ancient versions (LXX, 1QIsa^a, 1QIsa^b, θ¹, α¹, σ¹, Targ., Pesh., and Vulg.) for the textual criticism of MT Isa. He argued that a study of the textual witnesses in their own milieu must precede any text-critical work.¹⁰⁰ In his analysis of LXX Isa, van der Kooij focused on passages where fulfillment-interpretation played an important role, intending to provide a better understanding of the character of LXX Isa, its translator and his background.¹⁰¹ Much like his predecessors, he paid attention to the translator’s theology and his historical background while speaking of the “character of LXX Isa.”

Van der Kooij identified several cases of fulfillment-interpretation in LXX Isa. He argued the translator often interpreted references to the “king” of Assyria or Babylon as a cipher for the Seleucid kings Antiochus III/IV (cf. Isa 8:7; 10:9, 10; 14:19-20, 22-27).¹⁰² He further identified two steps in the translator’s reworking of Isa 22:5-11. For him, the differences between MT and LXX Isa 22:5-11 reflect events occurring in Jerusalem around 167 B.C.E. At the same time, some of the divergences in that same passage were due to the translator’s allusions to reparations that had been previously carried out

⁹⁹ Olley, *‘Righteousness’*, 123.

¹⁰⁰ A. van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 1: “Dabei kann es aber schon aus Raumgründen nicht die Absicht sein, die Textzeugen des Jesajabusches umfassend zu behandeln. Es soll vielmehr versucht werden diejenige Aspekte zu beleuchten, die für die textkritische Auswertung der Textzeugen wichtig sein, wie: Gründe und Ursachen textlicher Unterschiede zwischen den Textzeugen und dem masoretischen Text (MT), den Ort der Textzeugen innerhalb der Textgeschichte und das Milieu, in dem sie entstanden sein.”

¹⁰¹ cf. van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 34.

¹⁰² cf. van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 34-43.

under the high priest Simon (c. 200 B.C.E.).¹⁰³ Likewise, LXX Isa 8:8's departures find their cause in the translator, who interpreted it as a reference to Antiochus IV's deposition of Onias III as the high priest in Jerusalem.¹⁰⁴ The phrase *πόλις-ασεδεα* for עיר ההרס (Isa 19:18) was used to legitimize the temple in Leontopolis, making useless any assertions that עיר הצדק or עיר הסרח were in the translator's *Vorlage*.¹⁰⁵ Finally, van der Kooij also identified a negative reference to Menelaus and a positive one to Alcimus in LXX Isa 22:16-18, 20-25 respectively.¹⁰⁶

Van der Kooij's work contributed greatly to a discussion of the translator's identity. For him, the translator must be seen as a member of

¹⁰³ cf. van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 49: "die Unterschiede zwischen MT (= meistens Q^a) und LXX Jes 22,5-11 finden ihre beste Erklärung durch die Annahme, dass der Übersetzer in diesen Versen auf Ereignisse in Jerusalem im Jahr 167 v.Chr. und auf Wiederherstellungsarbeiten zur Zeit des Hohenpriesters Simon anspielt."

¹⁰⁴ cf. van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 52. Van der Kooij has changed his view that LXX Isa 8:8 referred to the time of the translator, asserting that it instead refers to the time of Isaiah, cf. van der Kooij, "LXX-Isaiah 8:9 and the Issue of Fulfilment-Interpretation," *Adamantius* 13 (2007), 23; idem, "The Septuagint of Isaiah and the Mode of Reading Prophecies in Early Judaism" in *Septuaginta - Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten: Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 20.-23. Julie 2006* (ed. Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus; WUNT 219; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 602.

¹⁰⁵ cf. van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 55. See also idem, "The Old Greek of Isaiah 19:16-25: Translation and Interpretation" in *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognates Studies: Jerusalem 1986* (ed. Claude E. Cox; SBLSCS 23; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 136-137. Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, 68, had advanced that the translator's *Vorlage* attested to עיר הצדק. Vaccari, "ΠΟΛΙΣ ΑΣΕΔΕΚ," 356; "Parole Rovesciate," 560, 562-564 had argued that הסרח was in the translator's *Vorlage*. The translator then read הסרח as הסדח by changing the ר into a ד. He then transcribed הסדח with *ασεδεα*. Vaccari pointed out that the use of *α* for *ח* is common with several examples. Recently Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 170-171 resorted to Vaccari's explanation to argue against van der Kooij's proposal that the translator used *πόλις-ασεδεα* to legitimize the Leontopolis temple. Against Vaccari, however, it must be noted that there is no textual evidence that the translator's *Vorlage* read הסרח, cf. 1QIsa^a/4QIsa^b: עיר ההרס.

¹⁰⁶ cf. van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 59, 60.

the Oniad priesthood circles in Jerusalem, as a scribe, and as a priest. Van der Kooij argued that the translator advocated for the legitimacy of the Leontopolis temple with his rendering πόλις-ασεδεκ in LXX Isa 19:18. The translator's divergent rendering τοῦ ἰδεῖν ὁδὸν Αἰγύπτου/ בְּדֶרֶךְ מִצְרַיִם in Isa 10:24 indicates he approved of Onias IV's escape to Egypt by occasion of Antiochus IV's oppression of Jerusalem in 167 B.C.E. This piece of evidence led van der Kooij to view Onias IV as the author of LXX Isa.¹⁰⁷ Whereas LXX Isa's provenance is in Leontopolis, the translator's is Jerusalem. The Jerusalem provenance of the translator implied he was acquainted with traditions and events there.¹⁰⁸

Van der Kooij also viewed the translator as a scribe based on his translation method ("Art und Weise").¹⁰⁹ The translator's borrowing from the Torah and the Prophets shows that he was well acquainted with those books. Likewise, his intra-harmonization with passages from H Isa also points to his solid knowledge of that book.¹¹⁰ Van der Kooij also found evidence that the translator viewed himself as a scribe in his unique use of γραμματικός for ספר in LXX Isa 33:18. He argued the translator compared himself to the Alexandrian γραμματικοί, who were occupied with philological and etymological matters, as well as with the reading and interpretation of literary texts. Like them, the translator was equally engaged in the reading and interpretation of H Isa.¹¹¹

¹⁰⁷ cf. van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 331.

¹⁰⁸ cf. van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 60-61.

¹⁰⁹ cf. van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 62: "Die Art und Weise, mit der der Übersetzer mit dem Text des Jesajabuches umgeht, macht deutlich, dass er ein *Schriftgelehrter* war" (italics his). For van der Kooij's more detailed discussion of the translator as a scribe, cf. his *The Oracle of Tyre: The Septuagint of Isaiah 23 as Version and Vision* (VTSup 71; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 112-123; idem, "Perspectives on the Study of the Septuagint: Who are the Translators?" in *Perspectives in the Study of the Old Testament and Early Judaism* (ed. F. G. Martínez and E. Noort; VTSup 73; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 219-224.

¹¹⁰ cf. van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 62-63.

¹¹¹ cf. van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 63. It is interesting to note that van der Kooij does not make much of γραμματικός in LXX Isa 33:18 in his later publications, cf. his passing notes in *The Oracle*, 115; "Perspectives on the Study of the Septuagint," 221. Accepting van der Kooij's view of the translator as a γραμματικός, Troxel (cf. *LXX-Isaiah, passim*) advanced that LXX Isa should be studied in light of the γραμματικοί's work in Alexandria. In short, he

Finally, van der Kooij also considered the translator to be a priest. He found evidence for his view in the advocacy for the Oniad Leontopolis temple in LXX Isa 19:18 and the addition of ἱερεῖς in Isa 40:2.¹¹² As a priest, the translator read Isa from the perspective of fulfillment-interpretation and found in the 2nd B.C.E. the fulfillment of Isaianic announcements.¹¹³ The translator's reading mode was based in his belief that the last days (cf. τὰ ἐπερχόμενα/τὰ ἔσχατα in LXX Isa 41:22; 44:7; 45:11; 46:10) of Isa had started. In this sense, the translator of Isa may be compared to the authors of Dan and certain Qumran documents. Although LXX Isa was produced in Egypt, the link between Leontopolis and Qumran is found in the Jerusalemite background of the translator.¹¹⁴ The translator's bent to fulfillment-interpretation was also based on his view of Isa as a vision (cf. ἰσῆ/ὄρασις in Isa 1:1 and ἰσῆ/ὄραμα in Isa 22:1).¹¹⁵

Picking up on the research developed by Zillessen and Ziegler, which showed that the translator borrowed phraseology from elsewhere in Isa or outside it, J. Koenig devoted a full fledged discussion of borrowings in LXX Isa. He rejected Ottley's claim that the translator introduced the wording of a particular passage into another

proposed the translator, like the γραμματικοί, was only concerned with linguistic and contextual interpretation. Only very rarely was the translator involved in fulfillment-interpretation. Although Troxel denied van der Kooij's opinion that the translator's use of γραμματικός is self-referential, he proceeded to construct a view of the translator that by and large resembles van der Kooij's scribal model, cf. D. A. Baer, review of R. L. Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation: The Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah*, VT 60 (2010), 302.

¹¹² cf. van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 64-65.

¹¹³ cf. cf. van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 95-96, 330-331.

¹¹⁴ cf. van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 64. In his *LXX-Isaiah*, 20, Troxel criticized van der Kooij for comparing LXX Isa with the *pesharim* on the basis that the former was produced in Egypt and the latter in Palestine. However, Troxel did not discuss van der Kooij's view of the translator's Palestinian origin, which would allow for a fruitful comparison of LXX Isa with documents from Qumran.

¹¹⁵ cf. van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 64.

unconsciously, accidentally and unintentionally.¹¹⁶ Rather, for him, the translator consciously borrowed phraseology from elsewhere due to an ideological or historical reason.¹¹⁷

For instance, Koenig argued that the plus *καὶ οἰκοδομήσωμεν ἑαυτοῖς πύργον* in Isa 9:9 reflects the historical milieu of the Samaritan schism in the translator's time. He argued the plus above originated with a borrowing from Gen 11:3-4. This borrowing reflects the translator's systematic analogical reading of his Scriptures prompted by the occurrence of *נבנה* and *לבנים* in Gen 11:3,4 and Isa 9:9.¹¹⁸ Thus, Koenig viewed the changes in LXX Isa 9:9 as rooted in the historical motif of the Samaritan schism.¹¹⁹

Koenig further argued that the original circumstances of the Isaianic prophecy in Isa 9:11 were lost in the eyes of the translator. He pointed out that

depuis le VIIIe siècle, les oracles d'Is, comme ceux des autres prophètes, avaient acquis une omnivalence temporelle qui permettait d'en tirer des enseignements applicables à des époques autres que celle de leur origine.

Consequently, the mention of Samaria in the Hebrew Isa evoked in the translator's mind, as a Jew, the Samaritan schism.¹²⁰

Koenig also discussed what he termed the "religious conditions" that favored the use of "analogical hermeneutics." Although Hellenistic

¹¹⁶ cf. Koenig, *L'herméneutique*, 6-8.

¹¹⁷ cf. Koenig, *L'herméneutique*, 102: "L'herméneutique ouvre la voie de la solution historique. Elle avertit que la transformation méthodique du texte, étant donné les teneurs, doit nécessairement être en rapport avec un motif idéologique d'envergure."

¹¹⁸ cf. Koenig, *L'herméneutique*, 90.

¹¹⁹ cf. Koenig, *L'herméneutique*, 101.

¹²⁰ cf. Koenig, *L'herméneutique*, 101: "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*" (italics his).

influence on the production of the LXX is undeniable,¹²¹ Koenig pointed out that the weight of the religious tradition of Judaism and its mode of thinking is also paramount. He noted that the sacralization of the prophetic writings consisted in their use of earlier prophetic oracles that would be applicable to contemporary and even future events. For him, the same process took place in the sacralization of the LXX, sacralization which would have profited greatly from an “analogical hermeneutic” method of reading the Scripture.¹²²

Like the prophetic writings’ application of earlier prophecies to a later period, Koenig observed that LXX Isa applied the H to its contemporary history. The translator used “Carthage” for “Tarsis” in Isa 23:1, 10; saw the “Assyrians” in the Hebrew as a cipher for the “Syrians” in the Seleucid period; interpreted the Philistines as a reference to Palestinian coastal Greek cities in the translator’s time, etc. He noted that all these typological changes attest to an actualizing. He even compared LXX Isa’s reading-mode with the *pesharim*, claiming that

l’adaptation grecque d’Is est l’une des manifestations qui illustrent un grand courant de spéculation oraculaire sur les Écrits traditionnels d’Israël. Le livre de Daniel et divers écrits de Qumrân, en premier lieu le Habaquq, en sont d’autres témoins.¹²³

For Koenig, thus, the translator’s theology or historical milieu can be detected in his recourse to Scriptural borrowings.

In 1998, van der Kooij produced a monograph on LXX Isa 23 focusing his attention its coherence as a text in its own right. He approached LXX Isa 23 as a text in two levels: first, in comparison with MT and then in its own right. As a text in its own right, van der Kooij probed whether LXX Isa 23 presents a coherent message or whether “significant renderings and passages in the LXX text make sense in relation to each other.”¹²⁴ Furthermore, he also focused on whether LXX

¹²¹ cf. Koenig, *L’herméneutique*, 33, 49.

¹²² Koenig, *L’herméneutique*, 33-35.

¹²³ Koenig, *L’herméneutique*, 45.

¹²⁴ cf. van der Kooij, *The Oracle*, 75. He had already raised the issue of coherence in his earlier publications, cf. idem, “Die Septuaginta Jesajas als

Isa 23 “not only constitutes, as a translation, a transformation from the linguistic point of view, but also a transformation in the sense of reinterpretation of the temporal application of an ancient prophecy.” The question for him was the translator’s hermeneutics: “did the translator aim at producing a version of an ancient prophecy which would make sense as an oracle at his time?”¹²⁵

At the end of his study, van der Kooij concluded as follows:

The Greek text in its own right turns out to be a coherent text to a large extent, syntactically, stylistically and semantically. Significant renderings and passages appear to be related to each other. It points to a translator who aimed at producing a meaningful text. The main difference between MT and LXX, on the level of contents, has to do with the presence and contextual function of “Carthage” in the Greek text. In contrast to MT which is about a destruction of Tyre, LXX refers to a destruction of Carthage with its serious consequences for Tyre.¹²⁶

Following his investigation of LXX Isa 23 as a text in its own right, van der Kooij addressed the question as to why this text differs from its Hebrew counterpart as far as its content is concerned. For him, the answer is in the translator’s reading mode. In short, the translator read Isa 23 from the perspective of fulfillment interpretation, interpreting “the ‘signs’ of his time on the basis of ancestral, prophetic books, in our case the book of Isaiah, in order to help his people survive in hard times and to give them, at least the pious ones, hope for the future.”¹²⁷ Van der Kooij further pointed to the historical-political events that form the background for LXX Isa 23:

Dokument Jüdischer Exegese. - Einige Notizen zu LXX - Jes. 7” in *Übersetzung und Deutung* (Nijkerk, Holland: Uitgeverij G. F. Callenbach: 1977), 93, 99; idem, *Textzeugen*, 33-34.

¹²⁵ van der Kooij, *The Oracle*, 18.

¹²⁶ van der Kooij, *The Oracle*, 87.

¹²⁷ van der Kooij, *The Oracle*, 109. See also idem, “Zur Theologie des Jesajabuches in der Septuaginta,” in *Theologische Probleme der Septuaginta und der hellenistischen Hermeneutik* (ed. H. G. Reventlow; VWGTh 11; Gütersloher: Kaiser, 1997), 16.

- the destruction of Carthage, which the Romans brought about in 146 B.C.E.;
- the Parthian invasion of Babylonia, which was “presumably understood as a sign of the nearby breakdown of the Seleucid empire;”
- Tyre’s involvement, “in some way or another, in the Hellenization of the city and temple of Jerusalem.”¹²⁸

Finally, van der Kooij further situated LXX Isa’s reading mode in the context of other Jewish and non-Jewish writings of the 2nd century B.C.E. In general lines, he highlighted two main aspects involved in the reading of prophecies in that period. First, prophecy was seen as a prediction that had not yet been fulfilled; and, second, the interpretation of prophecies was restricted “to persons of the highest scholarly level of the time.” As he put it:

In short, in the Hellenistic period the mode of reading prophecies as predictions about the recent past, the present and the near future of the reader/interpreter was the prevailing one. The corresponding interpretation of prophecies was a matter of wisdom and scholarship of a specific nature, an ability which was thought to be the privilege of wise men of the highest level within the society of the time.¹²⁹

Another important study appeared in 1999, which focused on an exegetical and theological study of Isa’s so-called “servant songs.” Important for our purposes was E. R. Ekblad Jr.’s evaluations of the causes of the divergences between MT and LXX of Isa 42:1-8; 49:1-9a; 50:4-11; 52:13-53:12. He claimed that most of the divergences found in the LXX were evidence of “a coherent theology and consistent exegetical

¹²⁸ van der Kooij, *The Oracle*, 109.

¹²⁹ van der Kooij, *The Oracle*, 93. See also his “Theologie,” 15: “Es liegen mehrere Texte vor, die darauf hinweisen, daß schriftgelehrte Juden zur Entstehungszeit der LXX die Prophezeiungen Jesajas als Vorhersagen lasen und deuteten, genauso wie es später der Fall ist im Neue Testament, Targum Jonatan zu den Propheten und in der frühchristlichen Exegese” and “Ferner spiegeln Stellen wie Sirach 36,14f. und Tobit 14,5 nicht nur ein lebendiges Interesse an den prophetischen Weissagungen und Erwartungen wider, sonder machen zugleich klar, daß man die Prophezeiungen auf die (nahe) Zukunft bezogen verstand.”

method.”¹³⁰ He urged caution in using the LXX Isa’s variant readings to reconstruct the translator’s *Vorlage*. Rather, he called for an evaluation of those divergences in the light of the whole book of Isa “because the LXX’s word choice is determined by contextual and intertextual exegesis.” More importantly, Ekblad concluded that

the selection of a given word in the LXX is often determined by its semantic rapport... with other words in other texts which the translator saw as linked for the purpose of clarifying meaning. Scripture is used to interpret and clarify Scripture.¹³¹

As recent as 2008, R. L. Troxel published his *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation: the Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah*, a monograph that in his opinion “lays the foundation for a new view of the translator’s work.”¹³² The purpose was to challenge what the author describes as a consensus that has lasted for the past fifty years:

The sketch of the translator of Isaiah promoted by many scholars over the past fifty years (that he deliberately infused his translation with the beliefs and issues of his day) is... based on undisciplined associations between unique phraseology in the book and significant events known from the second century B.C.E.¹³³

To reevaluate this *status quo*, Troxel argued that it is necessary to take other aspects into consideration:

In order to reevaluate this portrayal, however, we must consider how translation was conceived in the Hellenistic era, how ancient scholars (especially those in the Alexandrian Museum) studied and used revered texts, and how to determine if a distinctive Greek locution is based on a reading in the translator’s *Vorlage* at variance with the one in MT, or

¹³⁰ E. R. Ekblad Jr., *Isaiah’s Servant Poems according to the Septuagint: An Exegetical and Theological Study* (CBET 23; Leuven: Peeters, 1999), 268.

¹³¹ Ekblad Jr., *Isaiah’s Servant Poems*, 268.

¹³² Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, ix.

¹³³ Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, ix.

even whether we have sufficient evidence to draw a conclusion in every case.¹³⁴

The first chapter, “The Translator of Isaiah,” discussed the translator’s identity. This question relates to how the translator approached his work.¹³⁵ Troxel justified this quest with Ziegler’s observation that LXX Isa, in contrast to other LXX books, brings with it the particular imprint of the translator. In other words, the personality of the translator has to be taken into account in evaluations of the relation between LXX Isa with MT Isa. Because the translator often infuses “Isaiah’s oracles with meaning that cannot always be justified linguistically from his source text,” the question of his identity becomes important. Troxel claimed that “it is not enough to call him a translator, because he seems to have gone beyond simply offering a translation.”¹³⁶

Troxel advanced that the translator must be seen against the model of the *γραμματικοί* in Alexandria. He rejected van der Kooij’s comparison of LXX Isa’s translator with scribes “that produced the *pesharim*,” claiming that “this association with a type of literature found only in *eretz Israel* raises the question in what the (sic) sense the translator was an Alexandrian.”¹³⁷ Rather, Troxel proposed that the translator must be viewed as an “Alexandrian.” He found support for his view on the translator’s use of *γραμματικοί* for ספר in LXX Isa 33:18, the only place where *γραμματικός* renders ספר in the LXX. After a brief description of the history of the term *γραμματικοί* in the Hellenistic period and how the latter were expelled from Egypt under Euergetes II after 145 B.C.E., Troxel argued LXX Isa 33:18 reflects the translator’s contemporaneous history around 145 B.C.E.:

In this light, while the translation of ספר by *γραμματικοί* in Isa 33:18 may simply be a register of the translator’s esteem for the grammarians, it seems more likely that his rendering of those verses expressed his dismay at the absence of *γραμματικοί* as pillars of Alexandrian society after 145 B.C.E. It is difficult to identify a more likely explanation for

¹³⁴ Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, ix.

¹³⁵ cf. Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 1.

¹³⁶ Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 2.

¹³⁷ Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 20. See also p. 162.

why, in this passage alone, he elected the use of *γραμματικοί*. In fact, the translation of *ἕρῳ* by *οἱ συμβουλευόντες* might be equally explicable as reflecting the wholesale dispatching of many who had remained loyal to Philometer's widow.¹³⁸

Troxel viewed two aspects of the Isa translator that likened him to the *γραμματικοί* in Alexandria. The first is the translator's linguistic interpretation (chapter 4), especially his use of etymological exegesis.¹³⁹ The second is the translator's recourse to "contextual interpretation" (chapter 5). "Contextual interpretation" involves an intertextual interpretation of Isa based not only on the immediate or larger context of a given passage but also on the context of the translator's social-political milieu.¹⁴⁰

Despite the recognition that the translator interpreted Isa in light of his "socio-political milieu," Troxel turned to a criticism of "contemporization." The basis for his criticism of "contemporization" was his view of the translator as an Alexandrian as opposed to considering him an "*ein Schriftgelehrter*" as van der Kooij had previously advanced. Although Troxel did not make the dichotomy above clear, it becomes apparent in his discussions of "fulfillment-interpretation" in chapters 6-7. The main difference between Troxel's and van der Kooij's point of view is that, for van der Kooij, the translator "considered himself inspired to interpret the ancient oracles as presaging events in his own day."¹⁴¹ Contrarily, Troxel proposed that the translator should be taken in light of the Alexandrian *γραμματικοί*, who were engaged only with linguistic and contextual interpretation.

For Troxel, the basic issue is how to detect aspects of "contemporization" in LXX Isa: "the issue is defining what sorts of textual markers are sufficient to conclude that the translator deliberately alluded to events in his world as the 'true' referent of the prophet's oracle."¹⁴² A comparison with the *pesharim* proves inadequate:

¹³⁸ Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 24.

¹³⁹ cf. Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 107, 132.

¹⁴⁰ cf. Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 134.

¹⁴¹ Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 19. See also p. 3.

¹⁴² Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 162.

The problem of comparing the supposed *Erfüllungsinterpretation* of the translator with the *pesharim* is that the latter are explicit in their alignment of the text with contemporaneous events, whereas we have to extrapolate from oblique statements in a translation to what the translator might have had in view, which raises the thorny issue of intention. When we are dealing with a work whose substance is derived from its Hebrew exemplar, how can we ascertain what mental process created what we perceive as a historical allusion?¹⁴³

Troxel characterized his approach as “minimalist.” Historical references in the translation can only be postulated if a divergence was not based in the immediate or broader literary contexts. As he put it:

Embracing this principle requires a minimalist approach: only if the translator can be shown to refer deliberately to people, countries, ethnic groups, circumstances, or events by deviating from his *Vorlage* is it legitimate to entertain the possibility that he sought to identify such entities as the “true” referents of his Hebrew exemplar. More stringently, it must be shown that the translator did not arrive at a rendering by reasoning from the immediate or broader literary contexts, but that he fashioned it with an eye to circumstances or events in his day.¹⁴⁴

It is important to register here scholars’ responses to Troxel’s claims. The most detailed replies came from A. Pietersma and van der Kooij. In his “A Panel Presentation on Ronald Troxel’s *LXX-Isaiah*,” Pietersma addressed, among other things, Troxel’s interpretation of LXX Isa 33:18, a central passage for Troxel. Pietersma considered Troxel’s reading of LXX Isa 33:18 to be “a good example of what I deem to be undisciplined interpretation of a translated text.”¹⁴⁵ His main criticisms were threefold. First, he argued that Troxel completely ignored the

¹⁴³ Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 162.

¹⁴⁴ cf. Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 164. See also pp. 166-167.

¹⁴⁵ A. Pietersma, “A Panel Presentation on Ronald Troxel’s *LXX-Isaiah*,” (Cited April 18, 2011. Online: <http://homes.chass.utoronto.ca/~pietersm/Ronald%20Troxel's%20LXX-Isaiah.pdf>), 2.

context of Isa 33:18. He did not address the relation between vv. 18-19 with 17, 20: “how does the negativity of vv. 18-19 relate to the positive attitude expressed in vv. 17 and 20?”¹⁴⁶ Pietersma further argued, quoting Troxel’s own words, that

it is difficult to see ‘how the translator went about forming it [the passage] into a literary unity - unless one take Isa 33:18 in complete isolation from its immediate context. And, for some reason, that is precisely what Troxel does, while at the same time making the entire book of LXX-Isaiah its new context.’¹⁴⁷

Second, he further pointed out that Troxel based his interpretation of LXX Isa 33:18 on “*circumstantial* evidence.”¹⁴⁸ By “*circumstantial* evidence,” he meant Troxel’s importation into the text of his view of οἱ γραμματικοί as denoting the literati at the Alexandrian museum. For Pietersma, the evidence of the γραμματικοί in the Alexandrian museum is irrelevant because translation was not among the “various genres of Greek literature” studied at the Museum. As Troxel recognized that LXX Isa is a translation, his use of the evidence from the Alexandrian museum is unsuitable for LXX Isa’s study.¹⁴⁹

And, third, Pietersma accused Troxel’s treatment of LXX Isa 33:18 of being “contradictory” and, echoing Troxel’s words, “undisciplined.” In arguing that οἱ γραμματικοί reflects events around 145 B.C.E. when the literati of the Museum were expelled from Alexandria, Troxel used contemporization, an aspect he had heavily criticized in his book. Consequently, Pietersma opined:

What seems contradictory is that, on the one hand, Troxel questions “contemporization” in LXX-Isaiah, while, on the other hand, he introduces it in grand style. To me this is not disciplined or principled interpretation of a translated text.¹⁵⁰

¹⁴⁶ Pietersma, “A Panel Presentation,” 17.

¹⁴⁷ Pietersma, “A Panel Presentation,” 17-18.

¹⁴⁸ Pietersma, “A Panel Presentation,” 13 (italics his).

¹⁴⁹ cf. Pietersma, “A Panel Presentation,” 8.

¹⁵⁰ Pietersma, “A Panel Presentation,” 18. See also J. L. W. Schaper, review of R. L. Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation: the*

Van der Kooij's reception of Troxel's book was cordially mixed as it accepted some aspects while rejecting others. He saw Troxel's call for seeing the translator as a *γραμματικός* as positive insofar as it takes "the wider cultural context" of LXX Isa into account.¹⁵¹ He additionally pointed out that LXX Isa and the *γραμματικοί* practiced what is termed "etymological exegesis," a similarity that Troxel missed. In a footnote, van der Kooij rejected Troxel's interpretation of Isa 33:18 "as reflecting the dismay of the translator" in view of the absence of the *γραμματικοί* after 145 B.C.E. as "unlikely in view of the immediate context of LXX Isa 33."¹⁵² Van der Kooij further noted that "contextual interpretation," which is one of the aspects Troxel advanced as new in LXX Isa studies, is actually "not that new." Other scholars, such as Ziegler, had already discussed it.¹⁵³

In general terms, van der Kooij criticized Troxel's approach as not detailed enough. In Troxel's discussion of the phrases "the country above Babylon" and "where the tower was built" (LXX Isa 10:9), van der Kooij missed a more detailed explanation. He deemed inadequate Troxel's view that the "country above Babylon" was a sufficient translation of "as Karchemish" in MT. Although Troxel rightly detected a link with Gen 11 in the phrase "where the tower was built," van der Kooij similarly missed a discussion of the reason for the translator's use of that phrase in LXX Isa 10:9 in relation to Chalanne, and not Babel as in Gen 11. Troxel's insufficient treatment of LXX Isa 10:9 led van der Kooij to conclude that "the text as it stands should be analyzed in more detail" and that "since the motif of 'tower building' is found in a number of texts of the time... it would be more interesting to study the text in a

Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah, JSOT 33.5 (2009), 58, who similarly deemed Troxel's "associations" as no more "disciplined" "than, say, those of I. L. Seeligmann."

¹⁵¹ cf. van der Kooij, review of R. L. Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation: the Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah*, BIOSCS 42 (2009), 148, 152.

¹⁵² van der Kooij, review of R. L. Troxel, 148, n. 1.

¹⁵³ cf. van der Kooij, review of R. L. Troxel, 148. In addition to Ziegler, the present historical review shows that Zillessen, Fischer, and Koenig had already gone over the issue of "contextual interpretation."

wider perspective.”¹⁵⁴ The same criticism van der Kooij applied to Troxel’s treatment of LXX Isa 10:8.¹⁵⁵ Troxel’s test case study of LXX Isa 28 on the level of its literary structure equally lacked in detail. For van der Kooij, it was “rather global.”¹⁵⁶

Van der Kooij also addressed Troxel’s criticism of “fulfillment-interpretation.” First, he pointed out that “fulfillment-interpretation” “is not a matter of particular vocabulary and toponyms,”¹⁵⁷ as Troxel insinuated in his full treatment of the phrase ἐν (ταῖς) ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις and toponyms in chapter six of his book.

Second, van der Kooij highlighted that the “crucial question” in dealing with “fulfillment-interpretation” is hermeneutical in nature, namely, how the “oracles” of Isa “were read and understood by the translator.”¹⁵⁸ He deemed as “extremely unlikely” that Isa was read as referring to the time of the Assyrians and Babylonians, as our historical-critical method postulates. Instead, the “cultural context of LXX Isaiah” indicates that “ancient prophecies were envisaged as trustworthy predictions... and that scholars who were authorized to do so applied ancient prophecies, or visions, to their own time.”¹⁵⁹ He faulted Troxel for not paying attention to this cultural context and noted that Troxel referred only to the *pesharim*.¹⁶⁰

¹⁵⁴ van der Kooij, review of R. L. Troxel, 149.

¹⁵⁵ van der Kooij, review of R. L. Troxel, 149-150.

¹⁵⁶ van der Kooij, review of R. L. Troxel, 150. Troxel seemed to be aware that his treatment of LXX Isa 28 was not as detail as it should have been. Note his concluding statement (*LXX-Isaiah*, 286): “even if a full treatment of each verse in this unit might identify *additional* nuances...” (italics mine).

¹⁵⁷ van der Kooij, review of R. L. Troxel, 150.

¹⁵⁸ van der Kooij, review of R. L. Troxel, 150.

¹⁵⁹ van der Kooij, review of R. L. Troxel, 151.

¹⁶⁰ cf. van der Kooij, review of R. L. Troxel, 151. As our review thus far has shown, Troxel failed to note that van der Kooij has compared LXX Isa not only with the *pesharim*, as Troxel suggested in his book, but with Jewish and non-Jewish sources and both from inside and outside Palestine. See van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 60-65; idem, *The Oracle*, 88-94, and, most recently, idem, “The Old Greek of Isaiah and Other Prophecies Published in Ptolemaic Egypt,” in *Die Septuaginta – Texte, Theologien, Einflüsse. 2. Internationale Fachtagung*

Finally, van der Kooij reminded Troxel that a simple discussion of “words or phrases, whether arrived on the basis of a given context or not, are too small a basis for the issue of actualization.”¹⁶¹ Instead, it is important to discuss, first, how the translator produced particular renderings; second, a given chapter must be analyzed from the point of view of its contents, paying attention to every aspect of transformation as well as thematic links with other passages in LXX Isa. And, third, the question of actualization can only be addressed after the first two aspects were taken into account.¹⁶²

As it can be seen from the review thus far, a shift from the translator’s *Vorlage* to the translator himself has occurred in the study of LXX Isa. Scholars disagree, however, on the most fitting way to approach it and how to explain its divergences from MT. This disagreement forms a good background for the discussion that follows below.

PRELIMINARY QUESTIONS

That “every translation is an interpretation” is commonplace cannot be denied. J. Barr, however, has pointed out “that in the context of ancient biblical translation, this remark is a highly misleading truism.” He argued that the “process of translation” “may involve” two different types of interpretation, “so different as hardly to deserve to be called by the same name.” Whereas the first type of interpretation is a “basic/semantic comprehension of the meaning of the text,” the other “lies on a higher level” as “it begins only after these basic linguistic elements have been identified.”¹⁶³ The present work uses the word “interpretation” in its “higher level” denotation.

veranstaltet von *Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D)*, Wuppertal 23. - 27.7.2008 (eds. W. Kraus and M. Karrer; WUNT 252; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 72-84.

¹⁶¹ van der Kooij, review of R. L. Troxel, 151.

¹⁶² cf. van der Kooij, review of R. L. Troxel, 152.

¹⁶³ J. Barr, *The Typology of Literalism in ancient biblical translations* (NAWG 15; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979), 290-291.

In contradistinction to previous works,¹⁶⁴ the term “interpretation” deliberately precedes “translation” in the title. The reason is the present’s work’s assumption that interpretation on a “higher level” foregoes the process of translation. The assumption, or the point being argued, is that the translator of Isa already had an understanding - on a higher level - of the book he was about to translate before he started its translation. Although it is true that interpretation on a higher level logically presupposes lower level reading, it is not clear that the translator started the process of translation based only on his understanding on a basic level. Rather, it is more likely that the translator, after interpreting on a basic level, acquired an understanding of the passage(s)/book on a higher level before the translation process started. Consequently, interpretation on a higher level not only anteceded but also governed and shaped the process of translation. And although interpretation is rightly described as containing two levels, a basic and a higher one, it is very likely that they went hand in hand and mutually informed one another while the Isa translator read his Hebrew *Vorlage*. If it can be reasonably demonstrated that interpretation on a higher level forwent the process of translation, it stands to reason that any explanations of the process of translation can only be carried out after a study of the translation as a product.

The view that the product of a translation shaped its process is not new for both the fields of Translation and LXX Isa studies. G. Toury argued for the interrelatedness of function, process, and product-oriented approaches. Whereas function concerns the position a translation occupies in the culture in which it is or will be embedded, process has to do with “the process through which a translated text is derived from its original.” The text-linguistic makeup of the translation, the relationships which tie it to its source-text, and its shifts from it constitute the concern of a product-oriented approach. Toury argued that all these three aspects “are not just ‘related’... but... form one complex whole whose

¹⁶⁴ cf. e.g., Baer, *When We All Go Home: Translation and Theology in LXX Isaiah 56-66* (JSOTSup; The Hebrew Bible and Its Versions 1; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001); Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation*.

constitutive parts are hardly separable from one another for purposes other than methodical.”¹⁶⁵

Toury explained the relationship between function, product, and process-oriented approaches as follows: “the (prospective) systemic position & function of a translation determines its appropriate surface realization (= textual linguistic make-up),” which in turn “governs the strategies whereby a target text (or parts thereof) is derived from its original, and hence the relationships which hold them together.”¹⁶⁶ For him, to understand “the intricacies of translational phenomena,” it is of paramount importance to study the “interdependencies” between a function, process, and product-oriented approach.¹⁶⁷

The reason is that the function of a translation, prospective or not, in a given culture is a “governing factor in the very make-up of the product, in terms of underlying models, linguistic representations, or both.” Even the retaining of certain features of the source-text in the target-text signals not to their inherent importance but the importance the producer of the target-text assigned to them. In turn, the prospective function of the translation together with its linguistic make-up (product) “inevitably also govern the strategies which are resorted to during the production of the text in question, and hence the translation process as such.”¹⁶⁸ Toury’s remarks are highly important for the field of LXX Isa studies. The claim that the function and the product of a translation “govern the strategies” which the translator employs in the process of his translation is a good reminder that a proper explanation for the process of

¹⁶⁵ G. Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond* (BTL 4; Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1995), 11.

¹⁶⁶ Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies*, 13. The quotation reproduces the concepts Toury presents in the format of a chart.

¹⁶⁷ Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies*, 11. He also spoke of “function, process, and product oriented approaches” as being not only related but forming “one complex whole whose constitutive parts are hardly separable from one another for purposes other than methodical.” See also C. Boyd-Taylor, review of A. Aejmelaeus, *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays*, *BIOSCS* 42 (2009), 126, who called for a more target-oriented approach to LXX studies, denying the translators were “determined principally by linguistic facts.”

¹⁶⁸ Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies*, 13.

LXX Isa translation presupposes a firm understanding of it as a product. Because the translation as a product is the only window to the translator's interpretation (on a higher level) of his *Vorlage*, it seems reasonable to ground explanations for how particular readings arose on the results of the analysis of the translation as a product.

Another aspect needing emphasis here is Toury's claim that the retaining of certain features from the source-text in the target-text does not signal to their inherent importance but to the importance the translator assigned to them. This claim has a paramount implication for the study of what is normally termed "literal" translations in LXX Isa. As it was seen in the review of the history of research above, some scholars have argued the translator's ideology can only be found in his "free renderings." This minimalist approach seems to presuppose that the translator decided to keep aspects of his source-text because of their inherent importance. However, it is important to note that the translator may have retained certain features of his *Vorlage* intact in his translation because of their importance to him, to his intentions, and to his interpretation, on a higher level, of his source-text. As such, the claim that the translator's ideology or intentions can only be found in his deviations is highly problematic. As it will be argued in the course of this work, both "literal" and "free" renderings taken together should be seen as expressive to the translator's higher level interpretation of his *Vorlage*.

Some scholars in the field of LXX Isa studies have long applied similar concepts in their research. A prime example is A. van der Kooij's study of LXX Isa 23. He first approached it as a text, which entailed two interrelated aspects: in comparison with MT (source-text) and in its own right (target-text). This approach is similar to Toury's product-oriented. After analyzing LXX Isa 23 in its own right, van der Kooij went on to discuss why LXX Isa 23 was produced the way it was (function), finishing with remarks on how the translator produced his translation (process).¹⁶⁹ Van der Kooij's logic was similar to Toury's: it is only possible to understand the process of a translation after a study of the translation as a product.

¹⁶⁹ cf. van der Kooij, *The Oracle*, 48, 88, 110. For details on this work, see our discussion above.

Furthermore, that the translator had a higher level interpretive plan before he started his work is not a new idea in the field of LXX Isa studies. In his influential work, Ziegler claimed that the translator of Isa “scheint überhaupt sein Buch sehr gut dem Inhalte nach im Gedächtnis gehabt zu haben.”¹⁷⁰ In his also important contribution, Coste argued that the translator had an interpretative strategy in mind before he started his translation of LXX Isa 25:1-5.¹⁷¹

The present work stands firm on that tradition. It will pursue two main questions:

First, where should the translator’s “higher level” interpretations be found? Should they be found only in his “free” renderings? Or should they be found in a combination of both “free” and “literal” translations?¹⁷²

Second, do the “literal” and “free” renderings of the sections that compose LXX Isa 24:1-26:6 cohere with each other?¹⁷³ In other words, is the final product of LXX Isa 24:1-26:6 to be seen as a meaningful literary coherent unit? Another ancillary question would be whether LXX Isa 24:1-26:6 possibly as a coherent text would shed light on the translation process of those chapters. Although this question falls outside the scope of the present work, occasionally the issue of the translation process will be addressed.

¹⁷⁰ Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 135. See the discussion of this work on the history of research above.

¹⁷¹ cf. Coste, “Le texte grec,” 51.

¹⁷² For a discussion of the difficulty implied in the terms “literal” and “free” in relation to LXX studies, cf. J. Barr, *The Typology of Literalism*, 279-325 and the more recent contribution by T. A. W. van der Louw, *Transformations in the Septuagint: Towards an Interaction of Septuagint Studies and Translation Studies* (CBET 47; Leuven: Peeters, 2007), *passim*. For a helpful definition of “free” and “literal” translations, cf. E. Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (2nd ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), 125: “The more a translation unit uses fixed equivalents, the more it is considered literal, and the less that such equivalents are found in it, the freer it is considered.”

¹⁷³ For a discussion of the scope of LXX Isa 24:1-26:6, see discussion below.

What follows is a critique of approaches that limit themselves to the process of the translation without paying attention to the translation as a product. A common characteristic of approaches that start with the process of translation is their atomistic nature. As it will be seen below, with a few exceptions, they usually pay attention to words or phrases and hardly discuss the translation on broader levels, such as verses, paragraphs, chapters, and book. Their working assumption seems to be that translation immediately followed interpretation on its basic level.

PROBLEMATIC ASSUMPTIONS

Low Level Interpretation to Translation Equals Emergency Solution

Interpretation as an emergency solution assumes the translator did not understand the meaning of his Hebrew *Vorlage*.¹⁷⁴ It is claimed that when faced with a difficult text, the translator panicked and “looked for an emergency exit.”¹⁷⁵ It is equally claimed that most cases judged to be theological exegesis are actually examples of “emergency solutions” the translator employed due to his misunderstandings and guessing.¹⁷⁶

A text cited as an example of the translator’s perplexity in face of a difficult Hebrew text is Isa 9:5(6)d: ויקרא שמו פלא יועץ אל גבור ויקרא שמו פלא יועץ אל גבור / και καλεῖται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ μεγάλης βουλήs ἄγγελος ἐγὼ

¹⁷⁴ In the field of LXX Isa studies, it is sometimes assumed that the translator’s knowledge of Hebrew was weak under the impression that that assumption is “generally agreed” among specialists on LXX Isa. See e.g., Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 83 n. 57, 84 n. 67. Troxel dismissed van der Kooij’s argument that the translator was trained in reading the Hebrew aloud. With Seeligmann, he argued that the translator’s knowledge of Hebrew was more “a product of theoretical study rather than of living experience” (the phrase under quotation comes from Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, 49). Even if it were true that the translator’s knowledge of Hebrew was more a product of the theoretical study, it is hard to see how that would prevent him from learning how to read the Hebrew aloud.

¹⁷⁵ A. Aejmelaeus, “Levels of Interpretation: Tracing the Trail of the Septuagint Translators,” in *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays* (CBET 50; Leuven: Peeters, 2007), 310.

¹⁷⁶ cf. Aejmelaeus, “Levels of Interpretation,” 309.

γὰρ ἄξω εἰρήνην ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄρχοντας εἰρήνην καὶ ὑγίειαν αὐτοῖς. It has been claimed that the translator's interpretation of this passage "is built around a few items that have been analyzed in an incorrect way."¹⁷⁷ First, the Greek genitival construction μεγάλης βουλής "is impossible on the basis of the Hebrew" because "Hebrew cannot express a genitive preceding its main word;" second, ἄξω "is based on a false analysis of the Hebrew 'Father';" that is, the translator analyzed אבִי as אבִי א "I will cause to come." Third, עַד was read as a preposition and it was translated with ἐπί; fourth, singular רַשׁ was "turned to plural 'rulers'" (ἄρχοντας). Fifth, ἄγγελος corresponds to אֱלֹהִים; and, finally, there is the threefold translation of שָׁלוֹם.¹⁷⁸ This brief analysis led one scholar to conclude that "the syntactic structure of the Greek text is based on mere guessing. The translator simply panicked and looked for an 'emergency exit'."¹⁷⁹

However, it is maintained that "the difficulty of the source and the ignorance of the translator give way to contemporary theological or ideological convictions." In this case, the ideology is the wish that the rulers of all nations will receive peace. The case of Isa 9:5 is not to be considered an interpretation but as a rewriting of the source text, a rewriting that still gives rise to the translator's ideology.¹⁸⁰

The principle underlying the approach exemplified is that *if it looks like a mistaken, then it must have been a mistake*. The belief is that explanations as mistakes are simpler and, therefore, should receive the priority. The contrary applies to explanations that resort to ideology. Note the following circular reasoning:

It is here as important as ever to adhere to the old rule that the simplest adequate explanation should be given precedence over more complicated ones. A deliberate change of the meaning out of an

¹⁷⁷ Aejmelaeus, "Levels of Interpretation," 309.

¹⁷⁸ cf. Aejmelaeus, "Levels of Interpretation," 309.

¹⁷⁹ Aejmelaeus, "Levels of Interpretation," 309-310.

¹⁸⁰ cf. Aejmelaeus, "Levels of Interpretation," 310. Similarly, Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, 96, also maintained that the translator betrayed his theology in mistaken interpretations due to his lack of understanding of the Hebrew.

ideological motivation seems to me in many cases to be the more complicated explanation.¹⁸¹

The question is, of course, whether explanations from the point of view of “translation style” are in fact the simplest, given Aejmelaeus’ recognition that all LXX translators “had a theological or religious motivation for their work.”¹⁸²

Aejmelaeus’ explanations of Isa 9:5 as the result of guessing give an important opportunity to discuss approaches that solely focus on “translation style.” Such an approach is highly limited. First, it is usually atomistic in that it pays attention to single words or phrases to the expense of the broader literary context. For instance, Aejmelaeus offers no comments on the translator’s use of the conjunction $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ and on the transition to divine speech that $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\omega}$ signals.¹⁸³ No attention is, thus, devoted to the role words and phrases play in their own literary context.

Second, the approach paradoxically lacks in detailed analysis and it can be characterized as methodologically one-sided. By not discussing the function of $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\omega} \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho \acute{\alpha}\xi\omega$, Aejmelaeus’ approach missed an important clue to understanding the translator’s interpretation.¹⁸⁴ Aejmelaeus’ approach, besides focusing solely on the translation process without paying attention to the translation as a product, takes for granted that the translation should be “literal.” The definition of “literal” is highly problematic. Does “literal” equate to the modern exegete’s

¹⁸¹ Aejmelaeus, “Levels of Interpretation,” 312.

¹⁸² Aejmelaeus, “What We Talk about when We Talk about Translation Technique,” in *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays* (CBET 50; Leuven: Peeters, 2007), 218. See also the criticisms in C. Boyd-Taylor, review of A. Aejmelaeus, *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays*, *BIOSCS* 42 (2009), 125.

¹⁸³ For a recent discussion of these issues, cf. Troxel, “BOYAH and BOYAEYEIN in LXX Isaiah,” in *The Old Greek of Isaiah: Issues and Perspectives* (ed. A. van der Kooij and M. N. van der Meer; CBET 55; Leuven: Peeters, 2010), 160.

¹⁸⁴ For a more fruitful discussion of Isa 9:6, cf. van der Kooij, “Wie heißt der Messias?” 157-163; R. Hanhart, *Studien zur Septuaginta und zum hellenistischen Judentum* (ed. R. G. Kratz; FAT 24; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 95-133.

interpretation of the Hebrew? Is it possible that the translator's divergent interpretations could also be seen as "literal," at least from his perspective?

And, third, the approach can also be characterized as anachronistic. The question is how to determine whether the translator's reading of Isa 9:5 was the result of mistake or not. Most importantly, if one wants to call it a "mistake," then the question would be: "mistake" in whose eyes? Perhaps, in the "eyes" of the modern exegete, who reads Isa 9:5 differently from the translator's. But could one still say that the translator made a mistake? And, how should one determine whether a particular reading is a mistake? The proposal of this dissertation is that a reading can only be deemed a "mistake" if it can be determined that it does not fit in its own literary context in the Greek. If it can, then the likelihood is that it was not a mistake.

Higher Level Interpretation Found Only in Free Translations

A common assumption among some specialists is that the translator's ideology is only found in his "free" renderings. Although Seeligmann had argued the translator's religious notions can be found in literal and free renderings as "both represent fragments of the religious notions of the translator concerned,"¹⁸⁵ he decided to focus only on those places where the translation differed ideologically from its source text. He did not intend to write a history of the religious notions of the translator, which included a study of both literal and free renderings, but

¹⁸⁵ Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, 95: "This implies that, for such a cross-section, passages that were translated literally in a given book of the Septuagint, are of equal importance as free paraphrases: both represent fragments of the religious notions of the translator concerned." For a seemingly contradictory view, cf. p. 41: "If we look at the mentality behind these inconsistencies in this light, we shall, on the one hand, feel sceptical towards the probability of their being particularly ingenious and particularly purposeful efforts to discover logical connexions in any chapter or part of a chapter in our Septuagint-text, but, on the other hand, they also entitle us to try, on our part, *to discover, in isolated, free renderings, certain historical allusions or expressions of the translator's own views and ideas*" (italics ours).

“to indicate the differences between those embodied in the translation and in the original.”¹⁸⁶

Recently, Troxel offered a different position from Seeligmann in claiming that the translator’s ideology can only be found in “free” renderings. For him, because “what a *translator* offers is bound... to what his source text says,” “as long as a translator renders his source text ‘literally,’ we have no way of perceiving his exegesis.”¹⁸⁷ Differently, “exegetical” interpretations can only be found where the translator departed from his presumed *Vorlage* “to the degree it suggests the translator substituted a phrase or a clause for what lay in his *Vorlage*.”¹⁸⁸ And, as it is reasonable to assume that the translator’s insertions were dictated by his understanding of the context, his exegesis is found in his “contextual interpretations.”¹⁸⁹

In Troxel’s monograph, one gets the impression that “literal” equals “linguistic interpretation,” whereas “free” stands for “exegetical, contextual interpretation.” However, a sharp distinction between “linguistic” and “exegetical” interpretations is unsustainable. For instance, Troxel discussed the translator’s interpretation of passages “in the light of theologoumena” elsewhere in the book under the heading “linguistic interpretation in LXX-Isaiah.”¹⁹⁰ This is, however, hardly a matter of “linguistic interpretation.” For instance, Troxel pointed to the translator’s equalization of *δόξα* with salvation as is clear from LXX Isa 40:5: יהוה כבוד וראו כל־בשר יחדו *καὶ ὀφθήσεται ἡ δόξα κυρίου καὶ ὄψεται πᾶσα σὰρξ τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ*.¹⁹¹ The difficulty of terming the translator’s use of *δόξα* and salvation as part of “linguistic” interpretation is clearly seen in Troxel’s conclusion that “the translator’s exploitation of the themes of *δόξα* and salvation are good examples of ‘theological exegesis’...”¹⁹² Even if it is true that those themes are “essential elements

¹⁸⁶ Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, 95.

¹⁸⁷ Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 133 (Italics his).

¹⁸⁸ Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 134.

¹⁸⁹ Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 134.

¹⁹⁰ cf. Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 128-132.

¹⁹¹ cf. Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 130.

¹⁹² Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 131-132.

of the book of the translator,”¹⁹³ the translator’s decision to employ them in his rendition of certain passages cannot be a matter of linguistics only. Rather, the translator had to make a deliberate and intentional decision to introduce those themes in a particular passage, in a move that goes way beyond simply “linguistic” interpretation.

Another problem with the claim that the translator’s exegesis can only be found in his “free” translations is that it tends to dissect the very text the translator produced as a unit. As seen above, Troxel offered a valuable discussion of the translator’s use of prepositions “to clarify the relationship between clauses.” The translator’s linking of clauses through conjunctions implies that he aimed at producing a well-knit text, which was composed of “free” and “literal” translations. If the translator considered that his “free” renderings went along with his more “literal” ones, it is a mistake to assume that his “exegesis” is only found in “free” renderings. As it will be argued in this dissertation, the translator’s exegesis is found in the final form of the text he produced, which happens to include both “free” and “literal” translations.

Troxel’s claim that the translator’s ideology can only be found in “free” renderings to the exclusion of “literal” ones raises an important question: Is the translator’s ideology to be found only in “free” renderings or can they also be found in “literal” translations? More specifically, could the translator’s juxtaposition of “free” and “literal” translations reflect his ideology?

Higher Level Interpretation and Low Level Ones are Incoherent

As it was mentioned above, albeit Seeligmann viewed “free translations” as important as “literal renditions” for the reconstruction of the translator’s theology,¹⁹⁴ he also claimed that the translator’s own views or historical allusions can be found in free renderings. And not only in “free renderings” in general but “especially in those places where

¹⁹³ Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 132.

¹⁹⁴ cf. Seeligmann, *The The Septuagint Version*, 95: “This implies that, for such a cross-section, passages that were translated literally in a given book of the Septuagint, are of equal importance as free paraphrases: both represent fragments of the religious notions of the translator concerned.”

these insertions appear to constitute an element alien to the main context.”¹⁹⁵ He did not believe “free renderings” cohered with the translator’s more “literal translations:”

If we look at the mentality behind the inconsistencies in this light, we shall... feel skeptical towards the probability of their being particularly ingenious and particularly purposeful efforts to discover logical connexions in any chapter or part of a chapter in our Septuagint-text.¹⁹⁶

Different from Seeligmann, Coste showed that the “free renderings” of LXX Isa 25:1-5 cohered well with its “literal translations.” After discussing LXX Isa 25:1-5 in comparison with MT,¹⁹⁷ Coste concluded that it showed itself, as a translational text, “comme un échec presque complet.” Contrarily, when analyzed as a literary unit in its own right, LXX Isa 25:1-5 is “une composition ordonnée et cohérent.”¹⁹⁸ Coste further concluded that LXX Isa 25:1-5, as a literary and conceptual text, shows that an active interpretive plan was already at work even before its translation had started. Finally, Coste argued that this interpretive plan reflected the translator’s personal piety and faith.¹⁹⁹ Das Neves and van der Kooij reached similar conclusions in their studies of LXX Isa 24; 23 respectively.²⁰⁰

The divergence of opinions as to whether LXX Isa’s “free” translations cohere with its “literal” renditions offer an excellent opportunity to ask the question: do the “free” translations in LXX Isa 24:1-26:6 cohere with its “literal” ones? In other words, does LXX Isa 24:1-26:6 make any sense without recourse to its Hebrew *Vorlage*? One

¹⁹⁵ Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, 41.

¹⁹⁶ Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, 41. See also J. Barr, *The Typology*, 281: “the tendency of many early translators was... to combine the two approaches [literal and free] in a quite inconsequential way.”

¹⁹⁷ cf. Coste, “Le texte grec,” 37-45.

¹⁹⁸ Coste, “Le texte grec,” 50.

¹⁹⁹ cf. Coste, “Le texte grec,” 51.

²⁰⁰ cf. das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 265; van der Kooij, *The Oracle*, 87. On p. 43, das Neves claimed that the differences between the Hebrew and the Greek find their origin in the “mentalidade teológica do nosso tradutor.” The reason is that LXX Isa is more an interpretation than a translation.

specialist remarked: “Nevertheless, that translator [LXX Isa] seems to have viewed his task differently than those of the Torah. While he often follows their more literal tendencies, he frequently also stands closer to the style of translation we find in Proverbs and Job. The question is how to account for this peculiar mix.”²⁰¹ In my view, the question is not so much to account for how “literal” and “free” renderings came to be but whether those two types of translations make sense in their own literal contexts.

Contextual Interpretation versus Interpretation on a Higher Level

In his criticisms of “fulfillment-interpretation,” Troxel postulated a principle to detect whether a particular divergence in the G reflects the translator’s contemporaneous history or not. For him, historical references in LXX Isa can only be found if a divergence was not based in the immediate or broader literary contexts. As he put it:

Embracing this principle requires a minimalist approach: only if the translator can be shown to refer deliberately to people, countries, ethnic groups, circumstances, or events by deviating from his *Vorlage* is it legitimate to entertain the possibility that he sought to identify such entities as the “true” referents of his Hebrew exemplar. More stringently, it must be shown that the translator did not arrive at a rendering by reasoning from the immediate or broader literary contexts, but that he fashioned it with an eye to circumstances or events in his day.²⁰²

The principle seems to be based on the assumption that the translator, when faced with a difficult Hebrew text, resorts to phraseology from elsewhere:

Additionally, the fact that deviations from the MT recur in several passages may mean nothing more than that the translator followed similar paths in trying to rescue verses he found inscrutable, as evidenced by “stop-gap” words like ἤττ᾽ἄσθαι.²⁰³

²⁰¹ Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 75.

²⁰² Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 164. See also pp. 166-167.

²⁰³ Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 166.

The problem with the approach above is its assumption that the translator resorted to words/phraseology from elsewhere in his *Vorlage* due to their inherent importance. However, Toury has remarked that a translator retains aspects of his source-text because of the importance he assigned to them.²⁰⁴ In this light, it is important to ask the question as to why the translator of Isa decided to use words/phraseology from elsewhere for his translation of certain passages. Was it because of their “inherent importance” or because of the importance he assigned to them? If the second option is correct, then it will become clear that even the use of word/phraseology from elsewhere in the *Vorlage* may betray the translator’s ideology simply because he found them important for his higher level interpretation of his source-text.

Furthermore, the fact that a reading may have been based on the immediate or broader context does not exclude the issue of intention. In this sense, van der Kooij’s critique of Troxel is relevant. He reminded Troxel that a simple discussion of “words or phrases, whether arrived on the basis of a given context or not, are too small a basis for the issue of actualization.”²⁰⁵ I would add they are equally too narrow for detecting “interpretation on a higher level.”

METHODOLOGY

In the attempt to detect higher level interpretation in the translation of LXX Isa 24:1-26:6, the present study will approach it from two interrelated perspectives. First, part 1 will compare LXX Isa 24:1-26:6 with MT. The focus lies in describing, not evaluating, the translator’s translation style or *Übersetzungsweise*.²⁰⁶ One important aspect is the discovery of unusual lexical choices. Unusual is defined here in the light of the Isa translator’s profile. The question is: why did the translator choose a particular Greek term for his rendition of a certain

²⁰⁴ cf. the discussion above and Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies*, 13.

²⁰⁵ van der Kooij, review of R. L. Troxel, 151.

²⁰⁶ For the study of “translation style” as descriptive, cf. van der Kooij, *The Oracle*, 16. For a similar position in relation to LXX studies outside LXX Isa, cf. Aejmelaeus, *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators*, 205-206.

Hebrew word?²⁰⁷ Put differently, when faced with a choice between two or more Greek lexemes for a single Hebrew term, what led the translator to choose one lexeme over the other? (cf. Olley). Part 1 will questions concerning the translator's lexical choices, whereas part 2 will attempt to answer them.

Part 1 will not attempt to judge whether the translator's *Vorlage* was identical to unvocalized MT or not. It rather takes MT tentatively as the likely *Vorlage* behind the Greek. D. De Crom pointed out to the similarity between LXX and Descriptive Translation Studies in relation to the provisional status of the source-text in translation studies: "both DTS and translation technique work with *assumed* source texts, meaning that the nature and extent of ST-TT relations are not given but have to be discovered during textual study." Whereas the provisional status of the ST is an axiomatic formulation in DTS, De Crom pointed out that in LXX studies that provisional status is "a practical consequence of the textual uncertainty of both ST and TT."²⁰⁸ As such, unpointed MT will be tentatively taken as the likely source-text of LXX Isa. When there is a divergence between Qumran Isa scrolls and MT, part 1 will discuss that divergence. The assumption is that one cannot make decisions concerning LXX Isa's *Vorlage* without understanding its profile. One can only make textual decisions based on a translation after being acquainted with its style. For that reason, part 2 will, when necessary, discuss the issue of the translator's *Vorlage*.

Second, part 2 will analyze LXX Isa 24:1-26:6 as a text in its own right. Two aspects will be the focus here: first, to what extent do "free" renderings found in the composing sections of LXX Isa 24:1-26:6 cohere with its "literal" translations? Can LXX Isa 24:1-26:6 be seen as a coherent text? In other words, "To what extent can one make sense of the Greek text without recourse to the Hebrew?"²⁰⁹

²⁰⁷ cf. Olley, 'Righteousness,' 11.

²⁰⁸ D. De Crom, "The LXX Text of Canticles: a Descriptive Study in Hebrew-Greek Translation" (Ph.D. diss., Katholieke Universiteit Leuven OE Literatuurwetenschap: Tekst en Interpretatie, 2009), xxxix.

²⁰⁹ De Crom, "The LXX Text of Canticles," xxxvii.

And, second, as a text in its own right, how does LXX Isa 24:1-26:6 compare ideologically with MT? As discussed above, some scholars claim the translator's ideology can only be found in "free" renderings. While it is true that one must start with "free" translations, it will be argued in the course of this work that the translator's ideology, in the sense of how he interpreted the Hebrew on a higher level, is to be found in the final product of his translation. This final product is composed of "free" and "literal" renderings.

Another important goal would be to explain the process behind the translation in an attempt to reconstruct what went "in the translator's mind" while he was producing his work. Even though this step falls outside the scope of the present work, occasionally part 2 will discuss cases which previous scholarship explained as a different *Vorlage*, mistakes, or "influence" by phraseology from elsewhere. A more systematic discussion of the translation process will remain a *desideratum* for future research.

CONTRIBUTION

LXX Isa's research history is a basic attempt to provide an explanation for the divergences between the H and the G. As the historical overview above shows, scholars have proposed many varied reasons for LXX Isa's departures from the H. A different H *Vorlage*, translator's deficient knowledge of H, poor orthographic quality of the translator's H manuscript, translator's reading errors of similar H consonants, changes in the transmission of LXX Isa, the translator's theology and bent to fulfillment interpretation, linguistic necessity of the target language, and etc., were all advanced as possible candidates to account for the differences between the translation and its source text. Given the amount of divergent opinions, there is a clear need for a firmer and helpful methodological meter from which to judge a particular divergence in LXX Isa.

One important parameter will be whether the literary sections composing LXX Isa 24:1-26:6 can be seen as a coherent text. Coherence will provide a firmer framework to evaluate the nature of LXX Isa's divergences from the H. The presence of coherence in a given passage in the G will suggest that the translator intentionally read his *Vorlage* in a

different way from, say, Aquila and our modern interpretation of the H. The presence of coherence would also indicate the translator had an interpretation on a higher level in mind before he even started his translation. Coherence would also open the doors to a more fruitful search for the discovery of the translator's milieu in his translation. Similarly, the lack of coherence would suggest that LXX Isa's divergences from the H have an accidental nature. As such, explanations like translator's errors, different *Vorlage*, and the like would seem more convincing.

The search for the LXX Isa's coherence presupposes a methodological approach that focuses not only on describing the process of the translation but on the translation as a product. In fact, the methodological contribution of the present work is to call for a study of the Greek in its own right before delving into discussions of how the translator went about producing his translation. It will be argued that the process of the translator can be properly assessed only after the acquisition of a solid understanding of the translation as a product.

As it is clear from the historical overview above, scholars have made considerable progress in studying LXX Isa as a text in its own right in opposition to studying it in relation to its H *Vorlage* (textual-criticism) or simply as a translation. However, there still remains much to be done in the study of LXX Isa as a "document in" and "of itself." Not too long ago, scholars complained about the lack of work on LXX Isa in its own right: "there have, of course, been many large strides forward in the study of the LXX, but the LXX remains valuable to most scholars primarily as a witness to its *Vorlage*, and not as a document in and of itself."²¹⁰ This statement remains true today. In taking LXX Isa 24:1-26:6 as a text in its own right and commenting on it in detail, the present work hopes to be a step forward in filling in this gap.

²¹⁰ S. E. Porter and B. W. R. Pearson, "Isaiah through Greek Eyes: The Septuagint of Isaiah," in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition* (ed. C. C. Broyles and C. A. Evans; VTSup 70/2; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 531.

SCOPE

One commentator has correctly remarked on MT Isa 24-27 that “few sections within the book of Isaiah have called forth such a wide measure of scholarly disagreement on their analysis and interpretation as have these four chapters.” One of the major problems of this literary section is the issue of whether it has any “structural coherence.” Basically, scholars have debated the issue of how to relate what appears to be “eschatological prophecy” (Isa 24:1-23; 26:6-27:13) with “liturgical songs” (Isa 25:1-5; 26:1-6).²¹¹ The lack of agreement on the coherence of Isa 24-27 offers an interesting opportunity to see what became of those chapters in LXX Isa 24-27.

As it will be seen in the course of this dissertation, LXX Isa 24:1-26:6 forms a literary unit that revolves around the theme of “cities” and the “ungodly” (cf. 24:10, 12; 25:2-3; 26:1, 5-6). There is a contrast between the “fortified cities” (cf. πόλεις ὀχυράς in 25:2; 26:5) and the “fortified city” (cf. πόλις ὀχυρά in 26:1). In addition, there is a reference to the “city of the ungodly” (cf. τῶν ἀσεβῶν πόλις in 25:2b), the “cities of the wronged men” (cf. πόλεις ἀνθρώπων ἀδικουμένων in 25:3), and to “every city/cities” (πᾶσα πόλις/πόλεις in 24:10, 12).²¹² Even though Isa 27:3 mentions a “strong, besieged city” (πόλις ἰσχυρά πόλις πολιορκουμένη), Isa 27 has been left out of consideration for practical reasons. The problems that chapter presents both in the H and in the G would deserve a monograph solely dedicated to it. LXX Isa 26:5-6’s mention of πόλεις ὀχυράς form a nice *inclusio* around the theme of

²¹¹ cf. B. S. Childs, *Isaiah* (OTL; Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001), 171-172.

²¹² For a discussion of the identity of these cities, cf. van der Kooij, “The Cities of Isaiah 24-27 According to the Vulgate, Targum and the Septuagint,” in *Studies in Isaiah 24-27: The Isaiah Workshop - De Jesaja Werkplaats* (OtSt 43; ed. H. J. Bosman, et al., Leiden: Brill, 2000), 191-196; idem, “Interpretation of the Book of Isaiah in the Septuagint and in Other Ancient Versions,” in “As Those Who Are Taught:” *The Interpretation of Isaiah from the LXX to the SBL* (SBLSymS 27; ed. C. M. McGinnis and P. K. Tull; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), 62-66.

“cities” that had started in LXX Isa 24:10, 12. As such, the present dissertation will focus on LXX Isa 24:1-26:6.

Another reason for choosing LXX Isa 24:1-26:6 as the object of the present inquiry is the lack of attention previous works on these chapters have devoted to the theme of “cities” and their relation to the “(un)godly.” As seen in the history of research above, neither Liebmann’s text-critical interest in LXX Isa 24-27 nor Coste’s or das Neves’ theological approach have dealt with the “cities” and “(un)godly” motif in LXX Isa 24:1-26:6. Apart from a couple of brief articles on the “cities,”²¹³ there are no other systematic studies of these important themes in LXX Isa 24:1-26:6. The present dissertation hopes to fill in this gap.

Finally, a deeper understanding of how the Isa translator read H Isa 24:1-26:6 is important for modern interpreters of MT. As is well-known, MT Isa 24-27 has received considerable attention in the past hundred years.²¹⁴ In contrast, little attention has been devoted to LXX Isa 24-27. With the exception of Liebmann’s study of its translation technique, Coste’s treatment of LXX Isa 25:1-5 and das Neves of LXX Isa 24 remain the few treatment of LXX Isa 24-27 in a more detailed way. It is important for those working on H Isa 24-27 to know how its first interpreter, the translator of Isa, read it. It is possible that modern students may gain some light from LXX Isa in solving difficult problems in the interpretation of the H.²¹⁵ The present study of LXX Isa 24:1-26:6

²¹³ cf. van der Kooij, “The Cities of Isaiah 24-27,” 191-196; idem, “Interpretation of the Book of Isaiah,” 62-66.

²¹⁴ For recent studies on Isa 24-27, see e.g., R. Scholl, *Die Elenden in Gottes Thronrat: Stilistisch-kompositorische Untersuchungen zu Jesaja 24-27* (BZAW, 274; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 2000); B. Doyle, *The Apocalypse of Isaiah Metaphorically Speaking: A Study of the Use, Function and Significance of Metaphors In Isaiah 24-27* (BETL 151; University Press/Uitgeverij Peeters, Leuven, 2000); H. J. Todd, *Intertextuality in Isaiah 24-27: The Reuse and Evocation of Earlier Texts and Traditions* (FAT 2/16; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006).

²¹⁵ For an example of an attempt to gain some light from the LXX for the interpretation of MT Isa 24:14-16, cf. W. de Angelo Cunha, “A Brief Discussion of MT Isaiah 24,14-16,” *Bib* 90/4 (2009), 530-544.

58 Isa 24:1-26:6 as Interpretation and Translation

hopes to give the student of the H a thorough understanding of how that text was first interpreted in the second century B.C.E.