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This volume is arranged in two sections, one covering papers on the Septuagint and the scrolls, the other papers on the Septuagint and other cognate writings. At the head of each section are two papers delivered by
76. I hasten to add that these explanations are not Tov's, nor are they attributable to anyone in particular. They simply reflect one sort of inference that could reasonably be drawn from any such situation.


78. Analogies with the manuscript discoveries at Qumran readily suggest themselves.
Since the discoveries in the caves at Qumran in the late forties and in the early fifties, the Old Greek of Isaiah (hereafter: LXX Isa) is no longer the only witness to the early history of the text of Isaiah. Among the large number of (fragments of) biblical texts the following Isaiah-texts have been found:
- 1QIsa⁵, a complete scroll, the only one among the biblical texts from Qumran; dating from the late second century BCE.
- 1QIsa⁶, preserved in a fragmentary state, with major parts from Isa 41 onwards; dating from the late first century BCE.
- 4QIsa⁷⁻⁸, fragments of about 17 scrolls;⁴ dating from the period 150 BCE - 70 CE.
- 5QIsa (5Q3), a tiny fragment, dating from the first century CE.²
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For 1QIsa and 1QIsa official editions are available, but up to the present the edition of the 4Q fragments has not yet appeared. Yet we know something about these fragments because P. W. Skehan has published a list of the contents of all the 4QIsa MSS, and F. J. Morrow, a student of his, has catalogued and analyzed all the variants of these MSS in his dissertation, entitled *The Text of Isaiah at Qumran*.

As is well known the above mentioned QIsa-texts are not the only texts with regard to the book of Isaiah found at Qumran. We also have parts of *pesharim* on several passages from Isaiah. The large number of biblical Isaiah texts, together with these *pesharim* and, furthermore, the many instances of citations from and allusions to passages from Isaiah, make it fully clear that this book was a favorite one at Qumran. For our subject, LXX Isa in relation to the QIsa-texts, we limit ourselves to the biblical texts from Qumran.

Both LXX Isa and the QIsa-texts go back to the period of c. 150 BCE until 70 CE. These texts are important witnesses to that early period of the history of the text of the Hebrew Bible, the period before c. 100 CE, i.e. before the proto-masoretic text dominates the scene. The period before 100, or maybe even before the first century CE, is characterised by the well known and much discussed variety and fluidity of biblical texts and text traditions. This applies also to our Isa-texts from that period: they too display a variety, as may be clear from the following characterizations.

LXX Isa and 1QIsa both reflect a free approach
towards their Vorlage, as appears from deviations and variant readings of a linguistic nature, as well as from contextual changes such as harmonizations. Both texts are also characterized by interpretative renderings or readings.

1Qlsa, on the other hand, is a text of quite a different type, reflecting a conservative attitude towards its Vorlage. Though paleographically younger than 1Qlsa, as far as its orthography is concerned 1Qlsa is much older. As a copy it belongs to the accurate type, and being very close to MT it can therefore be regarded as a pre-masoretic text.

The fragments of 4Q are to be seen as a third group: as a whole they offer a large number of variants, but these variants are, in general, rather insignificant. The 4Qlsa-texts hold a position somewhere between 1Qlsa and 1Qlsa, being closer to the (proto)-masoretic text than to 1Qlsa. According to Morrow the variants of 4Qlsa are due to 5 tendencies: (a) breakdown of Hebrew grammar and usage; (b) breakdown of Hebrew pronunciation; (c) substitution of more normal or current diction, including the interpretation of difficult or unusual words in terms of what is known; (d) a harmonizing tendency with regard to person; (e) influence of similar biblical passages on each other.

So one can discern three kinds of Isa-texts. As far as the Qlsa-texts are concerned, a threefold variety is attested in one and the same region, namely Judea. This means that these data cannot be accounted for by the theory of local text-types.
Though LXX Isa as well as Qlsa are indeed to be considered as early witnesses, as stated above, one should not forget two important differences between them: in contrast to Qlsa the Old Greek, as a translation, is not a text written in the language of the Hebrew Bible itself, and the Old Greek is not attested by any manuscript dating from the time when the original translation was presumably made. Because of these two aspects LXX Isa is in fact only an indirect witness to the early history of the text of Isaiah.

On the other hand, however, LXX Isa has the advantage of being a complete text. Though this is, quite exceptionally, also the case with 1Qlsa⁵, all other Qlsa-texts, as well as all remaining biblical texts from Qumran, have been preserved in only a fragmentary state.

After these introductory remarks we will now deal with our subject matter, LXX Isa in relation to Qlsa, from two points of view:
1. LXX Isa together with Qlsa against MT.
2. LXX Isa compared with Qlsa.

Because all these materials are witnesses to the earliest attested period of the text of Isaiah it is of course most important to look for "pre-masoretic" readings which are older than (proto-)MT. As we all know the number of variants offered by our texts, be it directly or, in the case of a translation, indirectly, is very large. However, for several reasons most of them
are of a secondary nature. A particular element which limits the value of alternative readings is the fact that they are not supported by all available witnesses.

It will be clear that variants shared by LXX Isa together with all QIsa-texts are of particular weight, the more so when 1QIsa\textsuperscript{b} joins in. However, these cases are very rare. By way of example we refer to three quite interesting cases which are found in the last verses of Isaiah 53:

53:11

\begin{verbatim}
MT ] רְאֵמָה אַלְרָה 1QIsa\textsuperscript{a}, 1QIsa\textsuperscript{b}, 4QIsa\textsuperscript{d}, LXX Isa
\end{verbatim}

53:12

\begin{verbatim}
MT ] 577חַלָּה 1QIsa\textsuperscript{a}, 1QIsa\textsuperscript{b}, 4QIsa\textsuperscript{d}, LXX Isa
\end{verbatim}

The fact that these variants are attested by all the early witnesses so far available for these verses strongly favours the assumption that they are to be seen as belonging to the pre-masoretic text of Isaiah. This is the more probable since 1QIsa\textsuperscript{b}, a conservative type of text, joins the other texts.

Cases of combined evidence from LXX Isa and the QIsa-texts versus MT are very rare indeed. Though the most important MS, 1QIsa\textsuperscript{b}, is only fragmentarily preserved, because of the nature of this MS one can safely assume that the rare cases of combined evidence point to a pre-masoretic text of Isaiah which is very close to (proto-)MT.
We will discuss now our second point, LXX Isa compared with the Qlsa-texts. As we have seen, the Qlsa-texts fall into three groups: 1QIsa\(^a\), 1QIsa\(^b\), and 4QIsa. What can be said about the relationship between LXX Isa and 1QIsa\(^a\), 1QIsa\(^b\), and 4QIsa respectively?

As far as the matter of recension is concerned, it has become clear that there is no particular connection between LXX Isa and any one of the three groups of Qlsa-texts.\(^1\) This holds not only for 1QIsa\(^b\) and 4QIsa,\(^2\) but also for the most interesting text, 1QIsa\(^a\). It should be stressed that not only do LXX Isa and 1QIsa\(^a\) deviate in many instances from MT but both are also mutually divergent in a large number of cases, whereas the number of common readings versus MT is relatively very small. In his valuable discussion of these agreements, J. Ziegler offers some suggestions with regard to the common readings: some were present in the Vorlage of LXX Isa, be it in the text, or in the margin, and others, in particular the lexical variants, were part of a scholarly tradition.\(^3\) As always, the difficulty is to know whether a variant reading is going back to a Vorlage, or is due to the method of the author (scribe or translator). In light of the overall character of our texts one is more inclined to ascribe agreements on word-level to a common practice of both authors rather than to their Vorlagen.

So, quite different from the state of affairs with regard to the books of Samuel and Jeremiah,
notable agreement between LXX Isa and even one (group of) QIsa-text(s), against MT, does not emerge from a comparison between these texts. This does not mean, however, that there is no relationship or connection at all. It is to be asked whether, on the basis of characteristics other than that of textual agreements, LXX Isa has something in common with any one of the QIsa-texts.

Apart from a few readings, it can be stated that 1QIsa and 4QIsa do not have any particular trait in common with LXX Isa, though it must be admitted that a comparison with 1QIsa, and even more with 4QIsa, is complicated by the fragmentary state of these Isa-texts. But, unlike 1QIsa and 4QIsa, it is 1QIsa which has something in common with LXX Isa. Both texts, dating from the same period, the second half of the second century BCE, differ markedly from MT, and both reflect a free approach towards their Vorlagen.

We will concentrate therefore, in the rest of our paper, on the question of the relationship between LXX Isa and 1QIsa.

In his lecture during the IOSOT-congress at Strasbourg in 1956, P. W. Skehan, dealing with the relationship between LXX Isa and 1QIsa, stated that 1QIsa "illustrates ... an exegetical process at work within the transmission of the text itself, in Hebrew." He referred to Ziegler's study, Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias, in which it is suggested that cases of borrowings from other books into the text of Isaiah, as well as cases of harmonizations within the book itself may already have been present in
the Vorlage of LXX Isa. Skehan applied this idea to 1QIsa\(^a\); LXX Isa and 1QIsa\(^a\) are, he then remarked, "mutually illustrative, because the cave 1 manuscript gives us, for the first time in Hebrew, the kind of glossed and reworked manuscript that the LXX prototype must have been."\(^{22}\) However, with regard to all this, determining which variants go back to the Vorlage and which are due to the author remains highly problematic.

Though the usual method of comparison on word-level is quite understandable for text-critical purposes, this approach is too limited with regard to LXX Isa and 1QIsa\(^a\), since these texts reflect a free approach. This means that an analysis of variant readings has to be carried out within the scope of the nature of each of these texts itself, before a comparison with the other text is made. In my opinion, though a lot of research has been done, further research is needed on LXX Isa and 1QIsa\(^a\), each in their own right, before an adequate comparison can be made.

It is commonly agreed that in these texts under discussion a free approach towards their Vorlage is visible. But what do we assume about the nature of a translation like LXX Isa when we speak of a "free approach," or of a "free translation?"

The distinction between a "literal" and "free" translation is a very old one indeed. In ancient times, scholars like Cicero and, like him, Jerome were well aware of these two types of translation: the literal one was characterised by the expression *verbum pro verbo*, and the free one by
sensus de sensu. Though very useful, these designations constitute but a broad distinction.

A free approach means, in fact, two things: (a) a free attitude towards the Vorlage, and (b) a free representation of it. A free rendering, first of all, concerns the language of the Vorlage in several respects (grammatical, syntactical, semantic, stylistic, and idiomatic). In case of a translation into Greek, the aim is to produce an adequate rendering in good Koine Greek. Further, a free approach may also have to do with the content of the Vorlage. In such a case the translator apparently feels free to deviate from his Vorlage (also) with respect to content, for some reason or other.

As for the characteristics of a free approach in the sense of a free translation, the following aspects or tendencies apply:
- the aim of writing good Koine Greek, both with respect to syntax and to idiom;
- inconsistency, or variety, of lexical choices; different word order as well;
- grammatical and contextual changes, such as harmonizations;
- that of adding or subtracting words or phrases.

As we know from past research, these aspects, and others as well, are typical of LXX Isa.

Today, we live in the era of the computer, the great advantage of which is that quantitatively as well as percentiley literalness can be measured in a more accurate way than ever before. Furthermore and importantly, it is now more readily possible to detect patterns on a
syntactical or stylistic level in Greek as part of the method of a translator. In relation to these matters we now have some interesting results from the well known CATTS project. However, in particular with regard to free translations, such as LXX Isa and LXX Job, these findings, though of a great help, have their limits. The conclusion, based on earlier research or on modern research by means of the computer, that the data justify the characterization of "free approach," leaves several questions unanswered. It is helpful and important to know that certain variants, pluses or minuses, are due to contextual changes, but the question remains open whether they are intentional or unintentional. It is also important to know that the lexical choices display a great measure of inconsistency, but the question whether they are pure guesses or deliberate choices, serving some (contextual) interpretation, remains open. Let us state it in this way: for what purpose or purposes did the author of LXX Isa, or mutatis mutandis the scribe of 1QIsa, use the "free approach"? In short, one wants to know more than simply whether the attitude of the translator towards his Vorlage was literal or free.

Instead of guessing whether a translator made a guess, or made his translation from intuition, or whether he harmonised rather mechanically or not, a more detailed analysis of a text such as LXX Isa is needed. As I have argued elsewhere, with regard to LXX Isa I prefer the following approach: each pericope should be analysed in detail, both on a linguistic level and on the level of
contents, including a comparison with MT. Thus one can attempt to determine whether, and to what extent, deviations in LXX Isa from MT are serving a particular interpretation of the actual context. If so, they provide us with little evidence that might go back to a different Vorlage.

Our choice for the pericope as the basis for closer research has to do with the scribal and reading practices of the ancient world. This aspect is particularly interesting with regard to 1QIsa. In this scroll the pericopes are clearly indicated by a nuanced system of text-division. As to 1QIsa I prefer also a more holistic, and less atomistic approach, by which I mean that there should be a close reading of a pericope, including an analysis of its syntax, its form and its contents, taking seriously its own variants, its own division and subdivision. In terms of antiquity, such a reading means in fact the reconstruction of the àνγγυνώς, the "reading aloud" of the text, which implies, particularly in the case of an unvocalised text, a first interpretation of it.

As an example I may refer to my analysis of LXX Isa 8:11-16 and 1QIsa 8:11-18. Both passages I have analysed in the way just mentioned. The conclusion was reached that each passage constitutes a coherent text in its own right, containing a form and content quite different from the other, and each one is different from MT as well. Deviations or variant-readings turned out to be part of a particular interpretation.

Let me give some examples:
- MT Isa 8:11 has the reading יִמְלָל נַעֲרֵי, "and YHWH
instructed me (not to go the way of this people)." LXX offers in its place the rendering ἀπετάθησα (presumably via the root ἀπέτασσομαι), "they disobey," and together with other deviations from MT this rendering makes perfect sense, though one quite different from that of MT: persons with power, leaders, do not obey the way of this people.
- In MT Isa 8:15 the verb ἁπλάω, "to stumble" is used. In LXX this verb has been rendered here by ἀπευπανθίζομαι. This equivalent for ἁπλάω does not occur in the rest of LXX Isa, nor in the other books of the LXX. In our pericope, however, this rendering makes perfect sense: the strong leaders shall become "powerless." A nice example of a lexical choice in view of the actual context in Greek (vs. 11).
- In 1QIsa", the text of 8:11 has the reading εἰρήνα, "He (YHWH) will cause us to turn away (from walking in the way of this people)." A close reading of our pericope, including this variant, reveals that this reading serves a particular interpretation of Isa 8:11ff.
- This pericope of 1QIsa" also contains an interesting case of text-division: within 8:12-13 (see col. VIII, l. 6) the scroll displays an interior subdivision marked by a blank space in the line. As a result, the words Τῷ τῶν ἀναστήσως are not part of vs. 13, as is the case in MT, but figure as the last words of vs. 12. Reading the text of 1QIsa" as it stands, an understanding of this text different from MT emerges. Our variant in vs. 11 and this subdivision create in the text of 1QIsa" "a strong emphasis on the group of the
prophet and his followers, standing as a group opposed to the people."

My conclusion is that in these, and other cases as well, the passages involved constitute a deliberate composition. This means that the authors are not to be regarded simply as dragoman-translators or copyists, but more likely as scribes and scholars. Or to put it in terms of antiquity; they are to be seen as "oratores," rather than "interpretes."

This conclusion may help us in finding an answer to our question concerning for what purpose the authors of LXX Isa and 1QIsa used the free approach. But again one wants to know more. For two further questions arise, namely, (a) why, for what purpose, did the authors produce their text as a deliberate composition, and (b) how did they produce their text.

The first question is a hermeneutical one; it has to do with the status of our texts, being prophetical books dating from the hellenistic period. As has been argued first of all by I. L. Seeligmann, LXX Isa contains passages which reflect an understanding of the prophecies of Isaiah as predictions of what happened in the time of the translator. This means that LXX Isa may be read and understood (i.e. decoded) as a collection of prophetical oracles like Daniel 11 or Book III of the Sibylline Oracles.

As I have argued elsewhere, 1QIsa also contains texts which reflect such an actualization of prophecy, an understanding of prophecies typical of the Qumran community as appears from the pesharim. In this respect 1QIsa 8:11 is a
most interesting case: the tenor of this verse, within the pericope to which it belongs, agrees with the use of this verse in other texts from Qumran. This text appears to be "an important text in the self-understanding of the Qumran covenanters." So the most natural conclusion is that 1QIsa\(^a\) 8:11ff reflects the attempt of legitimating the Qumran community on the basis of this passage.

Our second question, concerning how such a text was produced, has to do with the interpretation technique of the time. How was the Vorlage read and interpreted, and which exegetical devices were used? It will be clear that this question is of crucial importance for the matter of the Vorlage.

At the end of this paper I return to the relationship between LXX Isa and 1QIsa\(^a\), the texts on which we have concentrated our discussion. What do both texts have in common? Both texts are, in my view, "mutually illustrative," not only with regard to their free approach, but also in the way in which both authors have used this free approach. My tentative conclusion is, that they, as scribes and scholars, have made the effort to create new texts with a meaning of their own, presumably with the ultimate purpose not only to modernize the text linguistically, but also to actualize the prophecies of Isaiah.

Of course, further research has to be carried out, in order to get a better knowledge of both texts in their own right, and hence to be able to carry out a comparison between both as adequately as possible. But if we are on the right track, it would mean that both texts reflect some literary
activity of scribes resulting in updated texts of Isaiah, kinds of new editions of the book. It would also mean that the significance of their relationship lies not so much in their being the earliest witnesses to the text of Isaiah, but more in particular in their being kindred pieces of Jewish literature from the hellenistic era.

NOTES


2. See DJD III, 173. Beside these findings at Qumran, a very small fragment was found outside Qumran: Mur Isa, a fragment containing parts of Isa 1:4-14; see DJD II, 79-80.


4. It was announced at the Groningen congress in 1989 that this edition would be part of volume 9 of the DJD series: see E. Ulrich, RevQ 14 (1989-90) 227. However, at the Manchester congress Ulrich told me that meanwhile the decision has been taken not to publish the 4QIsa materials in volume 9.
5. See note 1.


7. See DJD III, 95-96; DJD V, 11-30.


11. Being such a tiny fragment 5Q3 is left out of consideration.


14. We need not enter the discussion about the origin of the QIsa-texts (whether they are written by the Qumran community, or by people outside Qumran): see E. Tov, "The Orthography and Language of the Hebrew Scrolls Found at Qumran and the Origin of these Scrolls," *Textus* 13 (1986) 31-57.

15. We leave aside here the question of whether these variants are real variants or "pseudo-variants", i.e. variants in the mind of the translator. For this term, see E. Tov, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (Jerusalem Biblical Studies 3; Jerusalem: Simor, 1981) 228-30.

17. Cf. D. Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament. 2. Isaïe, Jérémie, Lamentations* (OBO 50/2; Fribourg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986) 406. On the other hand, J. Koenig is of the opinion that the reading "יִלּוֹ" of 1QIsa is has been derived by the scribe of the scroll, via analogical interpretation, from Isa 9:1; see J. Koenig, *L'herméneutique analogique du Judaïsme antique d'après les témoins textuels d'Isaïe* (VTSup 33; Leiden: Brill, 1982) 274-83. For critical remarks, see my review-article in *BibOr* 43 (1986) col. 373.

18. See also the article by E. Tov in this volume.

19. 1QIsa is, in fact, close to (the Vorlage of) Kaige-Theodotion Isaiah.

20. On 4QIsa variants supported by LXX, see F. J. Morrow, *Text of Isaiah*, 182-84.


23. Ibid., p. 151.


27. See in particular J. Ziegler, Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias (Alttest. Abhandl. XII,3; Münster: Aschendorffschen Verlagsbuch-handlung, 1934).


29. A. van der Kooij, "Accident or Method? On 'Analogical' Interpretation in the Old Greek of Isaiah and in 1QIs," BibOr 43 (1986) cols 366-76.


36. A. van der Kooij, Die alten Textzeugen, 81-97.

37. G. J. Brooke, Exegesis at Qumran. 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context (JSOTSup 29; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985) 319.