Chapter 1.
INTRODUCTION

In recent decades the inquiry into the Greek translation of Isaiah has gained in popularity. Whereas in the course of the previous two centuries studies were only sporadically dedicated to this translation, more lately quite a number of publications on the Greek Isaiah have appeared. Apparently, the study of this document has an increasing attraction for scholars. This is not surprising, though, as the LXX of Isaiah provides an exceedingly fascinating and rich source for examination. The multifaceted nature of the translation offers ample opportunity for scholars to choose different aspects of the work to analyse and illuminate. One of the first to be responsible for the growing interest in the Greek Isaiah was Joseph Ziegler. In addition to composing a critical edition\(^1\), he also wrote a comprehensive work on the character of the translation, *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias* (1934).\(^2\) In that work Ziegler presents a compilation of the differences between the Masoretic and the Septuagint text of Isaiah. One of the conclusions he draws, is that the Septuagint of Isaiah can be characterised as a rather free translation. Its text bears the personal stamp of the translator, who sometimes omitted words which he did not understand, or added words favoured by him. Moreover, the translator of Isaiah occasionally appears to have imbued his translation with his own ideas and thoughts, shaping the text to his own preferences.\(^3\) This observation of Ziegler concerning the special character of the LXX of Isaiah is one of the main principles on which later Septuagint scholars have based their investigation. In his *Untersuchungen*, Ziegler has devoted much attention to the pluses and minuses in the Greek Isaiah. According to Ziegler, the majority of them are innovations of the translator himself. Pluses are often the result of the translator’s aspirations towards explication and exegesis, while minuses are mostly meant to reduce redundancy in the Hebrew text; they usually dispense with synonymous words or phrases in Hebrew. While Ziegler’s discussion of pluses and minuses is extremely valuable for the study of the Greek Isaiah, his work can be seen as somewhat random and incomplete. Since Ziegler, investigations have been made into a wide variety of other aspects of the translation, but up to now we still lack a more systematic analysis of pluses and minuses in the Septuagint of Isaiah, notwithstanding that such an analysis may well be helpful in establishing general tendencies displayed in the translation and the main techniques used by the translator in rendering his Hebrew text. This lacuna has stirred up the motivation to dedicate this study to investigating the pluses and minuses in the Greek translation of Isaiah. Do they indeed betray certain translation tendencies of the translator, or do they indicate that he had a Vorlage in front of him which differed from the Masoretic text?

But before I reach that intricate issue, I shall first discuss a number of previous works on the Greek Isaiah that have been of importance for the present study, as well as some publications that have focused on the pluses and minuses in other books of the Septuagint. Moreover,
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2 Joseph Ziegler, *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias* (ATA XII,3; Münster: Aschendorff, 1934).

before the examination of LXX Isaiah’s pluses and minuses can be undertaken, I shall have to clarify what exactly I mean when speaking of “pluses” and “minuses.”

1.1 A brief survey of studies on the Septuagint of Isaiah

One of the earliest modern works that has been published on the Septuagint of Isaiah is *Die Alexandrinische Uebersetzung des Buches Jesaias* (1880) by Anton Scholz.4 In this paper Scholz specifically considers the origins of the Isaiah translation. He believes that its Alexandrian author tried to render the Hebrew into Greek word by word, with an admirably profound knowledge of the Hebrew text. Only in such a way can one clarify why the Greek version of Isaiah achieved such a great authority within the Jewish community. This could, in Scholz’ eyes, never have happened if the translation had been freer.5 Arguing from that principle, Scholz seeks to explain LXX Isaiah’s deviations from the Masoretic text in the first place as having a bearing on the translator’s Hebrew Vorlage. This Vorlage would have contained many scribal mistakes, particularly due to its transmission by means of dictation, which was accomplished by scribes who interchanged similar sounding letters, who altered words, added and omitted elements, and permitted themselves all kinds of freedoms. Only now and then are differences between the two versions, in Scholz’ opinion, to be traced back to the translator himself, especially when the Hebrew text was unclear because of corruption or on account of metaphorical language that was incomprehensible to the Alexandrian readers.6

A somewhat remarkable conclusion that Scholz reaches in the course of his work, is that, even though both the Hebrew and Greek versions do indeed comprise a significant number of additions, they hardly contain any omissions. That is to say, elements which are present in the MT but absent in the Septuagint, should in Scholz’ view by definition be perceived as additions to the MT, while elements which are present in the LXX but not in the MT, have to be taken as additions to the LXX. Scholz explains these additions as “Randglossen,” adopted into the text by later scribes. His denial of the existence of omissions in the LXX Scholz bases on the assumption that it was unthinkable in Antiquity that someone would leave out albeit just one word from Holy Scripture.7

A quite different approach was advocated by Richard R. Ottley. In the introduction to his work *The Book of Isaiah according to the Septuagint* (1909)8 he writes:

> 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 … Seldom, if ever, is its reading intrinsically preferable to the M.T.9
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Hence, contrary to Scholz, Ottley is of the opinion that the differences between the MT and the LXX of Isaiah in most cases have to be ascribed to the translator rather than to a deviating Hebrew parent text. Besides, Ottley thinks that the Isaiah translator has had a deficient rather than a profound knowledge of the Hebrew. This the translator betrays by his constant confusion of letters, mistakes in word divisions, and the way in which he disregards the grammatical functions of words, loses the thread of the text, and takes refuge in “stop-gap rendering.” As an important explanation for the failures of the translator Ottley offers the illegibility of the Hebrew manuscripts with their frequent use of abbreviations.\(^{10}\)

Like Ottley, Johann Fischer also maintains that the Isaiah translator was lacking in competence as regards the Hebrew language. In his work *In welcher Schrift lag das Buch Isaias den LXX vor? Eine textkritische Studie* (1930),\(^ {11}\) Fischer notices that in places where the Hebrew is easy to comprehend, the translation accords with the MT, but when it becomes more complicated, the translator has often changed his text and occasionally resorted to conjecture. Still, Fischer also allows for the possibility that deviations from the MT are sometimes caused by the deliberate interventions of the translator: The translator has dealt freely with his text; he did not aim at an exact word by word translation, but rather attempted to express the meaning of his text. This free way of rendering, together with the translator’s supposed lack of knowledge of the Hebrew, Fischer assumes to account for the majority of LXX Isaiah’s variants. Differences in Vorlage, by contrast, have caused only a minority of them, the Hebrew Vorlage of LXX Isaiah being practically identical to that of the MT.\(^ {12}\)

Fischer mentions several phenomena that he regards to be typical for the Greek Isaiah. These are, for instance, *Doppelübersetzungen* (which he takes to be the work of later editors), clarifying additions, the transposition of consonants (e.g. הָנָּה becomes הָנָה), the mutual influence of related texts, haplography and dittography at the beginning and end of words, and inner Greek corruptions.\(^ {13}\) But the most striking aspect that he thinks typifies the LXX of Isaiah is the fact that this translation very frequently displays a *Defizit* in comparison to the MT. As a clarification for these (mostly small) minuses he offers several options:

- The translator has accidentally skipped part of the text.
- Intentional omissions by the translator, especially when he did not grasp an expression, or when something in his eyes did not fit well in the context.
- The drawing together of textual elements by the translator, who thus wanted to offer a shortened version of the text.
- Something was already missing in the Vorlage of the LXX.

Fischer concludes by positing that in most cases LXX Isaiah’s *Defizit* is merely apparent, and not evidence of a more original reading.\(^ {14}\)

The scholar who was next in line, and who left his predecessors somewhat in his shadow, is Joseph Ziegler. I have already lingered on his major work—*Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias* (1934)—earlier in this introduction, and will do here some more. In the
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Untersuchungen Ziegler criticises the method of isolating a word from its surrounding and then comparing it to its Greek equivalent. He prefers to give consideration to the context in which a word occurs—to parallel and related places—and to elucidate the translation from that perspective. Ziegler means that the Septuagint of Isaiah distinguishes itself from other translations in that it bears the personal stamp of the translator. The Isaiah translator often tends to give a free rendering of the Hebrew. When he has trouble in understanding the text, he does not hesitate to omit words, to change the order within a clause, or to add his own explanation of it. Repeatedly, the translator is seized by a particular idea and then renders his text under the impact of it. Many times he is influenced by parallel passages elsewhere in Scripture. He further reveals a preference for certain expressions, which he applies in his translation whenever it suits his purposes. Yet, Ziegler emphasises, not all differences between the LXX and the MT of Isaiah can be ascribed to this liberal attitude of the translator. Some of the interpreting additions and variants may already have been extant in his Hebrew Vorlage in the form of glosses—scribal notations in the margin of manuscripts.

In the Untersuchungen two chapters are assigned to the occurrence of pluses and minuses in the Greek Isaiah. As it concerns minuses, Ziegler regards some of them as glosse-like remarks that the translator has not yet read in his Vorlage, but the preponderance he thinks to be accounted for by intentional or unintentional omissions on the part of the translator himself. Unintentional omissions—often embodying larger minuses—have occurred through a mistake, made by either the Hebrew scribe, or the Greek translator, or a later Greek editor. Intentional omissions are largely due to nonchalance or to a lack of understanding of the translator, who regularly left out difficult or rare Hebrew words. Furthermore, minuses often appear where one finds two (or more) identical or synonymous elements in the Hebrew text. The translator may have removed either of them because he conceived the text as redundant, or because he could not think of a Greek synonym.

Also regarding LXX Isaiah’s pluses Ziegler stresses the uncertainty of their origin: this may have been the Hebrew Vorlage of the LXX, the Greek translator, or a later Greek editor. Nevertheless, most pluses betray, according to the scholar, the exegetical and explicating aspirations of the translator himself.

All in all, Ziegler distinguishes the following categories of pluses in LXX Isaiah:

- Doppelübersetzungen: These only rarely go back to the “Ur-LXX”; usually they have been added by later readers.
- πας (appears approximately forty times as a plus): This word has generally been inserted by the translator himself, in particular when the same word is attested in the surrounding text, e.g. in a parallel verse.
- λέγων or ἐρω: These expressions are most commonly additions by the translator.
- Auxiliary verbs.

15 Ziegler, Untersuchungen, iv.
16 Ziegler, Untersuchungen, 7–8.
17 Ziegler, Untersuchungen, 103, 134–135.
18 Ziegler, Untersuchungen, 13.
19 Today scholars question the idea of glosses in Hebrew manuscripts. One of the main reasons for this is that the Dead Sea Scrolls, which at the time when Ziegler was writing his Untersuchungen had not yet been discovered, do not provide any evidence of such marginal notes.
20 Ziegler, Untersuchungen, 46–56.
- Pleonastic additions or similar explicating renderings: The insertion of a noun in the genitive, or of an adjective or a common noun, e.g. ἀνθρώπος; these are usually supplied by the translator.
- The translator’s insertion of a subject or an object in order to make the text more explicit (sometimes the extra text may already have been present in the Hebrew manuscript as an exegetical marginal gloss).

After Ziegler’s *Untersuchungen*, another influential publication that appeared on the Greek Isaiah was Isac L. Seeligmann’s *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah. A Discussion of its Problems* (1948). In this pioneering study, Seeligmann argues that the Septuagint of Isaiah is not only characterised by a considerable measure of independence vis-à-vis the Hebrew text, but that it also stands out by the influence it reveals of the cultural and political-historic context in which it was composed. The text hides a translator who believed that the period in which he lived, was the time for the fulfilment of ancient prophecies. The Alexandrian translator tried to revive the text of Isaiah and to contemporise it by incorporating in it the religious concepts of the Jewish Hellenistic times in which he lived. This intriguing facet of the Greek Isaiah which Seeligmann has brought to the fore was later on elaborated by, among others, Robert Hanhart, Jean Koenig, and Arie van der Kooij.

Yet, even though van der Kooij in his works has paid much attention to the phenomenon of actualisation within the Greek Isaiah, in his opinion this is only one of the various aspects on which an examination of this translation should focus. In several of his studies van der Kooij has emphasised that an atomistic approach to the Septuagint of Isaiah ought to be avoided: The differences between the LXX and the MT should not be investigated merely on word or verse level, but rather in the light of their own context in the Greek, especially their immediate context—the pericope or chapter in which they occur. In view of this, van der Kooij wants to promote a “contextual approach” to the Greek Isaiah. In *The Oracle of Tyre* (1998) he introduces a method that fits such a course, involving an analysis of the LXX in four steps: Firstly, the investigation of the Masoretic text on a grammatical, stylistic, and

23 Seeligmann, *Septuagint Version*, 3–4; 76–120.
26 Also das Neves has written on this subject: see J. C. M. das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega dos Setenta no Livro de Isaías* (Lisbon: Universidade Católica Portuguesa, 1973).
28 See the preceding footnote.
semantic level. Secondly, the comparison of the Greek with the Hebrew, followed by a study of the LXX on its own, which is directed at contextual questions, such as: Which function and meaning do particular LXX renderings have in their own context? Are they related to each other? Does the Greek in itself form a coherent text? The third step is to analyse the LXX passage according to its genre. In LXX Isaiah this is especially useful as it concerns prophetic texts. These prompt discussion as to whether the translator has tried to reinterpret those texts in order to apply them to his own time. This is where we arrive at the topic of actualisation. The fourth and final step has bearing on the Hebrew source text behind the Greek translation, and on the question of how the translator has read and interpreted this text. With respect to this issue, van der Kooij follows the line that the Vorlage of LXX Isaiah was probably not very different from the MT.

A somewhat controversial, and—not only for that reason—also very fascinating work, is L’herméneutique analogique du Judaïsme antique d’après les témoins textuels d’Isaïe, written by Jean Koenig in 1982. Koenig in this monograph polemicises against the “explication empiriste” of the Greek Isaiah of which he accuses his predecessors, especially Ziegler and Ottley. Those scholars too often in his view explained LXX Isaiah’s deviations from the Hebrew as the product of the translator’s ignorance or subjectivity. This especially relates to the way in which they approach the phenomenon of “analogy” in the translation. By the term “analogy” Koenig seeks to indicate the adoption of elements from elsewhere in Scripture (“analogie scripturaire”) on the one hand, and cases in which the translator has intentionally read Hebrew words in a variant way—for example by means of metathesis or homonomy (“analogie verbale formelle”) on the other. Even if Ziegler and Ottley did recognise some instances of analogy, they failed, in Koenig’s eyes, to identify the method that was hidden behind it. On these grounds, Koenig wants to replace the empirical exegesis of his predecessors by his own “herméneutique analogique et méthodique,” which presupposes an authoritative norm to underlie cases of analogy. Analogy was not employed just randomly in the translation, but with precision and subtlety. This implies, as Koenig argues, that the technique was the outcome of scholarly investigation, bound to the religious principles of contemporary Judaism. The purpose of its application was to create a text that would be edifying for the religious community. Within Hellenistic Judaism a particular hermeneutics existed that legitimated and authorised the phenomenon of analogy in religious texts. It did not only impact on the Septuagint of Isaiah, but also, inter alia, on the Great Isaiah Scroll from Qumran, in which plenty examples of analogy can also be found. In later Rabbinical texts this hermeneutical method of analogy has been applied even more extensively, Koenig contends.

While Koenig now and then runs the risk of clarifying LXX Isaiah’s variants in a somewhat speculative way, his approach is directly opposed to the rather careful evaluation of Moshe Goshen-Gottstein. His analysis of LXX Isaiah is included in the text edition of the book of Isaiah that forms part of The Hebrew University Bible of which Goshen-Gottstein is one of
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29 van der Kooij, Oracle of Tyre, 15–19.
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the editors. In the critical apparatus to this text Goshen-Gottstein pays much consideration to the comparison of the MT with the LXX of Isaiah. He offers comments on many of the pluses, minuses and variants of the latter, which he most often perceives as being the result of a translation technique or a translational mistake. Some examples of categories he offers in order to classify pluses and minuses are “condensed rendering,” the influence of other texts (from inside or outside of Isaiah), double reading or rendering, dittography, haplography, homoeoteleuton, exegesis, expanded rendering, inner Greek changes, a lack of lexicographical knowledge, a tendency to level cases of parallelism, reduction of repetitions, reformulation, and simplification. In his discussion of the differences, Goshen-Gottstein tries hard to avoid conjectural explanations, regularly rejecting creative explanations of not obvious Greek equivalents. In this he may sometimes go slightly too far, in my view, as it seems clear that an associative, midrashic way of rendering the Hebrew was typical of the Isaiah translator.

This midrashic component of the Greek Isaiah is regularly pointed out by David A. Baer. In his monograph When We All Go Home (2001) Baer puts forward that LXX Isaiah chapters 56–66 are marked by theological Tendenz and homiletical motivation. Several of the tendencies that he recognises in the translation are “personalization,” which refers to the translator’s inclination to “personalise” his text by turning third-person references into first- and second-person statements; “imperativization”—indicating the fact that declarative statements are regularly turned into commands; the translator’s amelioration of theologically or ideologically offensive passages, and his display of a nationalistic bias in favour of the Jews and Jerusalem. However, even when diverging from his source text, the translator still remains close to the details of his Hebrew Vorlage: He ”seldom strays from his Hebrew text for more than two or three words,” and there is almost always some concrete textual feature that has authorised or facilitated the translator’s manoeuvre. In this, the translator reveals an affinity with the midrashic tradition.

To this topic of the freedom versus conservatism of LXX Isaiah which Baer touches upon, we will return later on in this chapter.

Another study from the same year which I have regularly consulted, is “Le Livre d’Ésaïe dans la Septante. Ecdotique, stylistique, linguistique ou esquisse d’une poétique de la Septante,” which forms the PhD dissertation of the French scholar Philippe Le Moigne. This work has
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unfortunately not been published yet. It contains much valuable and detailed information on a number of particles in the Greek Isaiah, and on LXX Isaiah’s use of the figure of chiasmus.

The most recent work that has been written on the Isaiah translation is *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation. The Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah* (2008), by Ronald L. Troxel. In it Troxel seeks to present a counterview to the dominant idea of recent decades that the free translation style of LXX Isaiah reveals the translator’s conviction that Isaiah’s oracles were being fulfilled in his own days. According to Troxel, there is no basis to classify the translator’s work under the rubric of Erfüllingsinterpretation. His way of translating is rather determined by another interest, namely his concern to convey the sense of the Isaianic text to his Greek readers. For this purpose he used whatever devices were at his disposal, such as the interpretation of words in the light of others occurring later on in the context, his supply of a word or phrase to complete the meaning he finds implied, his insertion of an expression based on a parallel in the nearby context, his choice of contextually appropriate equivalents based on etymological interpretations; his inclination to plug in stop-gap words, selecting a word that best fitted his understanding of the context, and his willingness to interpret words and phrases in the light of the broader context, as well as to borrow formulations from elsewhere in the book or from outside it. Also his reformulations of sentences are intended to give his readers a better insight into the message of the Isaianic text. Still, such manoeuvres should according to Troxel merely be understood as “ad hoc attempts to make sense of the text for the reader”, they do no reveal any method of the translator. Some of the devices mentioned, such as etymological reasoning, and the rendering of Scriptural passages in the light of other, related ones—even though they were also applied in contemporary Jewish literature—make Troxel assume that the translator was influenced by the work of Aristarchus and other γραµµατικοί in the Alexandrian Museum: “Just as Aristarchus practiced interpretation of Homer by Homer … so the Isaiah translator found a sure guide to meaning by looking to other passages inside and outside Isaiah that contained similar words, phrases, or themes.”

According to Troxel it is very likely that the Isaiah translator was influenced by these scholars, since their work was probably familiar to any intellectual Alexandrian. Although I think that Troxel is right in underlining the Isaiah translator’s large-scale use of certain interpretative devices with the purpose of bringing the message of Isaiah closer to his readers, I do not believe that his employing such means excludes the possibility that at times this message in the translator’s eyes contained elements that were of a special importance for his own time and community. His application of linguistic and contextual or intertextual exegesis may well have gone hand in hand with a certain interest in contemporisation.

When surveying the various works that have been written over the last two centuries concentrating on the Greek Isaiah (although I have been unable to deal with many of them here), I have found that two things stand out for me. In the first place, in the investigation of

43 Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation*, 228.
44 Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation*, 291.
45 One of these is Ekblad’s useful study on the Septuagint version of Isaiah’s Servant Poems, in which the author tries to determine the specific exegesis and underlying theology of these chapters. See Eugene R. Ekblad Jr.,
LXX Isaiah throughout the years one can observe a shift: While in the earlier period differences between the Hebrew and Greek were quite often ascribed to the translator’s supposed *incompetence* (by e.g. Ottley, Fischer, Ziegler, and Seeligmann), in the course of the decades scholars became more and more aware of the deliberate approach and scrutiny of the translator. As a consequence, the majority of LXX Isaiah’s variants came to be conceived of as the product of the translator’s purposeful interventions. While a scholar such as Koenig went quite far in this direction, others, such as Goshen-Gottstein, Baer, and Troxel took a more moderate position.

A second observation is that in works on LXX Isaiah certain patterns that appear to typify the translation recur again and again, having been noticed by successive authors. These are, for instance, the translator’s penchant for borrowing elements from other passages in Scripture, his inclination towards making his text more explicit, his reduction of synonymous or identical elements, and his homiletical interest and midrashic-like way of interpreting the Hebrew. Also in the present work these translational patterns will be treated, as they provide a significant clarification of many of the translation’s pluses and minuses as well. Yet, other typical habits of the Isaiah translator seem to have been somewhat neglected in previous studies. One of these is the translator’s stylistic or literary inspiration. Although while taking a closer look at the style and rhetoric of the Isaiah translation, one can do nothing else but appreciate the way in which the translator has dealt with the rhetorical aspect of his work, it has regularly been denied that the LXX translator was even concerned with this side of his translation. One of the few scholars who has given due credit to the stylistic efforts of the Isaiah translator is the already mentioned Philippe Le Moigne. Because the translator of Isaiah has been underestimated in this respect, the present work will pay special consideration to this topic of stylistics, and attempt to throw more light on how it may have influenced the translation, even if my inquiry, also as regards this subject, has to be restricted to the cases of plus and minus.

1.2 A survey of studies on pluses and minuses in the Septuagint

Despite the fact that other works focusing on the pluses and minuses in the Greek Isaiah have not been published yet, there are some studies which discuss pluses and minuses in sections elsewhere in the Septuagint. An early example of such a study is George B. Gray’s article “The Additions in the Ancient Greek Version of Job,” dating from 1920. In it Gray divides the pluses in the LXX translation of Job into two groups: Firstly, small pluses, composed of a word or two or a clause, of which some according to the author may already have been present in the underlying Hebrew manuscript of the LXX, while others were probably added by the translator himself. In addition to these small pluses, LXX Job contains two larger ones, in 2:9 and at the end of the book. These Gray supposes to have been inserted by a later editor of the translation, since they differ in vocabulary from the surrounding text.

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


More than a half century later, in 1984, the work *Additions or Omissions in the Books of Samuel. The Significant Pluses and Minuses in the Massoretic, LXX and Qumran Texts* appeared, written by Stephen Pisano. This book deals with the “significant”—that is larger—pluses and minuses in the Greek version of Samuel, which can be encountered in this translation in substantial numbers. Usually they are formed by major parts of verses, but also by an entire verse, or even more than one. The main point that Pisano infers after inquiring into these pluses, is that the Masoretic version of Samuel generally reflects a more original text form than the LXX: pluses and minuses in LXX Samuel are quite often the result of later literary activity on the part of the translator or the editor of the Hebrew Vorlage. In some cases they are the outcome of translational mistakes, but more often of deliberate modification. The LXX translator or the Hebrew editor from time to time inserted elements for “expansionist” motives, or shortened their text so as to produce a smoother or more unified narrative. Strikingly often LXX Samuel displays pluses that can be explained in a “haplografic” way. Those pluses contain identical or similar words at the beginning and end of the phrases or sentences of which they consist, suggesting that their omission in other manuscripts may be the result of a haplogenetic error, although in reality the extra text is an expansion accomplished by a later editor or by the LXX translator, who was thus trying to make his insertions fit more smoothly into the text. Also the “CATTS-project” under the guidance of Robert A. Kraft and Emanuel Tov has made the pluses and minuses of the Septuagint into one of its targets of investigation. This especially pertains to the work that this project has produced under the title *The Minuses of the Septuagint. The Pentateuch*. This extremely scrupulous study, edited by Frank Polak and Galen Marquis, gives a comprehensive listing of all minuses in the Pentateuch. They are classified on the basis of different levels, such as the linguistic unit they form, and their syntactic and stylistic functions. Also minuses that possibly have a translational or scribal background have been grouped together, as well as ones that are paralleled in other Hebrew texts.

In their analysis of minuses the authors are inevitably faced with all kinds of complexities related to the definition of a “minus.” Polak and Marquis regard a minus as

… an element of the biblical text present in the MT that is not represented in the LXX, in a constellation indicating a possible shorter reading of the Hebrew source text. On the other hand, if
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there is a reasonable justification for deciding that the responsibility for the shorter Greek text lies solely with the translator, we are dealing with a reduced rendering, rather than with a minus.\(^{53}\)

Hence, Polak and Marquis opt to speak of a “minus” only if the absence of a Greek equivalent is probably caused by a deviating Hebrew *Vorlage*, and not when this is most likely the translator’s own achievement. Notwithstanding this, missing elements that according to the authors have their roots in translational practices, still receive a discussion in their work, being assigned to specific categories, and in this way included among “the Minuses of the Septuagint.” This inconsistency illustrates the complex nature of analysing pluses and minuses in ancient translations.

Polak and Marquis have offered an pleasingly systematic and (virtually) complete list of the minuses in the Greek translation of the Pentateuch. Yet, their method of identifying and registering minuses cannot readily be applied to every other book of the Septuagint. This has to do with the different character of the various Greek translations: The Septuagint of the Pentateuch—like for instance the LXX of the Psalms, Chronicles and part of Samuel-Kings—affords a quite literal translation of the Hebrew text, making it relatively easier to catalogue all pluses and minuses of this document. The translation of other Biblical writings, such as the Book of Isaiah, on the contrary, is characterised by a large number of sections which render the supposed underlying Hebrew in a fairly free way. As a result, it is sometimes rather doubtful what exactly are the “pluses” and “minuses” in a specific unit, or whether it is even useful to employ these terms in some contexts (we will continue on this subject further on in this chapter). On these grounds, as far as the LXX of Isaiah is concerned, it is not a realistic aim to try to offer an entirely complete list of its pluses and minuses.

1.3 How to establish pluses and minuses in a translation

1.3.1 Defining “plus” and “minus”; “addition” and “omission”

The terms “plus” and “minus” easily give rise to confusion. This makes it necessary to include in this introduction a short reflection on their meaning.

In the present study a “plus” denotes a textual element (consisting of one or more words) which is present in the LXX but does not have a counterpart in the Masoretic text. A “minus,” on the contrary, is an element attested in the MT which is not represented in the LXX. This terminology is meant to be neutral, not conveying any implication about the origin of the textual element under consideration. Hence, it does not indicate whether the cause of this extra or missing part of the text lies either in the translation process or in the underlying Hebrew text of the translation. This accords with the way in which the categories “plus” and “minus” are used, for instance, in Tov’s handbook *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint*.\(^{54}\)

Some other works, though, reckon among “pluses” and “minuses” only those components of the translation that probably have to be attributed to a *Vorlage* that was at variance with the MT.\(^{55}\)
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\(^{55}\) E.g. Tov, *Computerized Data Base*, 51: “It should immediately be added that not all plus and minus elements of the LXX are indicated as pluses and minuses. Many of these plus and minus elements are considered as
A similar confusion exists around the terms “addition” and “omission.” Especially in earlier works on the Septuagint these have occasionally been employed to indicate extra or missing text in the translation without the purpose of claiming anything as the cause, so leaving open the possibility that this is due to a different Vorlage.\textsuperscript{56} However, nowadays “addition” and “omission” are mostly used in their literal sense, that is, designating quantitative deviations from the MT that are most likely accounted for by the translator himself. Also in the present study I will label text as an “addition” or an “omission” solely if assuming that a translational move is at stake.

1.3.2 Segmentation of the source text

Before one can try to identify pluses and minuses in a translation, it has first to be clear which choice the translator has made in the segmentation of his source text.\textsuperscript{57} In other words, one has to establish on which linguistic level he has realised his translation.\textsuperscript{58} A translator may choose as segments on which he bases his rendition paragraphs, sentences, clauses, phrases, words, or even morphemes. If, for instance, he works at word level, this entails that every word in the source text is represented by a related word in the translation. Still, in practice it hardly ever happens that a translator in his work remains faithful to one and the same translation level. Often, for example in the case of a passage that is hard to translate, he may opt to switch to another—e.g. clause instead of word—level.

In a translation pluses and minuses occur when there is a “quantitative divergence from the original.”\textsuperscript{59} This means that one can speak of a “minus” if one segment in the translation is not reflected in the source text, and of a plus if there is one segment extra in the translation as compared to the source text. When the segments in a specific part or place of the translation include phrases, this can mean that e.g. one word in the source text corresponds to more than one word in the translation, without there being any mention of a plus (for instance, the rendering of לאלהי by γυναικ/υς τικτο/σης in Isa 13:8), or, that two or more words in the Vorlage are the equivalent of only one word in the translation without the occurrence of a minus (e.g., אסתר אћתא in Isa 37:2), namely if on those occasions the word(s) in the translation constitute(s) one and the same syntactical phrase, which clearly matches one phrase in the source text.
This method of establishing pluses and minuses in a translation conveys a quantitative approach to the text, which does not always coincide with a semantic approach: If one content element in the translation is extra or lacking as compared to the source text, it does not always form a “plus” or a “minus.” This pertains for instance to cases where the source text has been made more explicit or implicit in the translation, in the light of which the translation contains more, or respectively less, information, yet without displaying an additional or missing syntactical unit. The following instances can illustrate such a situation:

1:31 καὶ κατακαυθήσονται οἱ ἄνωμοι καὶ οἱ ἀμαρτωλοὶ ἄμα

“Those two” has been glossed in the translation as “the lawless and the sinners,” which does not form a real plus.

35:2 καὶ ο λαὸς μου ὁφεται τὴν δόξαν κυρίου

In the LXX the text has been made more implicit by the rendering of ἀναλοιχισθῆναι as συντρ.

a. Translation at word level

The translator of LXX Isaiah has mainly rendered his text at word level: most commonly one word in the Hebrew is mirrored by one word in the Greek. “Word” should not be taken in the sense of a graphical word—i.e. a series of letters between two empty spaces—but as a functional word, that is, the smallest linguistic unit that by itself has a meaning and a grammatical function, or, in technical terms, “a lexeme together with all its inflectional affixes.” Functional words do sometimes not accord with graphical words, for instance, in the case of the so-called “clitics”—words that are immediately connected to other words on which they are dependent for their realisation. Hebrew instances of these are the article ה, the pronominal suffixes, the conjunction ו and the prepositions ב, ב and ב, which formally count as (functional) words.

In parts of the text which are translated at word level pluses and minuses are simply those words in the translation that are extra as compared to the source text, respectively those words in the source text of which an equivalent fails in the translation. One example of a passage in LXX Isaiah that has almost entirely been translated at word level, is afforded by Isa 1:3:

MT Isa 1:3 יידוע שור חכמה חמוד反應 בעם בעם ישראלי לא יידוע עם לא התובן

---


61 Bosman and Sikkel, “Reading Authors and Reading Documents,” 115.

In the synopsis below, the n-dash indicates a minus, while pluses have been underlined:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>לְּמָּשׁ</td>
<td>ἐγνὼ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בֹּשֶּׁׁ</td>
<td>βοῦς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>תָּנוּ</td>
<td>τὸν κτησάµενον (–)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>קָאָּ נ</td>
<td>καὶ οὐς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בָּאָּ ס</td>
<td>τὴν φάτνην</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בָּלָּ ל</td>
<td>τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοῦ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יִשֶרָאֵל</td>
<td>Ἰσραὴλ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(–)</td>
<td>δὲ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(–)</td>
<td>μὲ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(–)</td>
<td>οὐκ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יִדֶר</td>
<td>ἐγνὼ,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(–)</td>
<td>καὶ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נֶעֶר</td>
<td>ὁ λαὸς (–)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(–)</td>
<td>μὲ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(–)</td>
<td>οὐ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מְנֻנֶת</td>
<td>συνήκεν.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Translation at phrase level

Very frequently the translator switches from a translation at word level to a translation at phrase level, which means that one phrase in the Hebrew is reflected by one phrase in the Greek. As discussed earlier, this may entail that something that in Hebrew is expressed by means of only one word, in Greek is formulated using two or more words, or vice versa. There can be multiple reasons for such a difference in the number of words forming a phrase, both semantic and grammatical. From a semantic perspective, the translator may employ more words for denoting the same entity simply because his language requires more words for conveying this idea. Also when he renders a Hebrew word in a variant way this sometimes causes a deviation in the number of words used (e.g. שביתת becomes οἱ ἄνουμοι καὶ οἱ ἁμαρτωλοί in Isa 1:31). An example of a grammatical reason is that the Hebrew sometimes has a preposition where the Greek uses a declension (e.g. שְׁלַמֵר becomes Σαµαρεία in Isa 10:11); another one is that in Greek a verb is regularly followed by a preposition where in Hebrew it is not (e.g. παύσασθε ἀπὸ corresponds to停下 in Isa 1:16).

Besides in the case where equivalent phrases have a different number of words, one can also speak of a rendering at phrase level when the translation utilises a grammatical category other than the source language, which changes the internal word structure. An illustration is provided by the Hebrew method of qualifying a thing or a person by means of a genitive

---

The article has been left out of consideration.
construction (e.g., מָרֵע in Isa 1:4), whereas the Greek commonly uses an adjective for that purpose (στέρμα τοιμήρον).64

Some additional examples of a translation at phrase level are the following:

3:13  עָמָר לְדִי עָמוֹם  kai στήσει εἰς κρίσιν τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ
he stands to judge the peoples  and he will make his people stand to judge them

8:8  φύσις κατὰ γνώμην  kai ἔσται ἡ παρεμβολὴ αὐτοῦ ὡστε πληρῶσαι
and its outspread wings will fill ...  and his camp will be such as to fill ...

35:6  οὐκ εἶσεν ἡ γλῶσσα  kai τραν τραν τραν τραν
the tongue of the speechless shall sing for joy  and the tongue of stammerers shall be clear

35:6  ἐν ἠρώτησι  ἐν οἴνῳ διψώσα  in the wilderness  in a thirsty land

In some situations it is hard to ascertain whether the translation is either at word or phrase level, which can also make it complicated to determine whether or not there is a plus or minus at stake. This can be exemplified by the rendering of לְדִי as ποδ/ν in Isa 1:6. On the one hand, one could perceive this as a translation at phrase level, positing that in this word combination כ ("sole") does not offer extra information, but only specifies that on this occasion לְדִי denotes a “foot” rather than a “leg” (which is the alternative meaning of לְדִי).65

Yet, in favour of the assumption that לְדִי as ποδ/ν in Isa 1:6 is a translation at word level—with כ being a minus—one can argue that it was not really necessary for the translator to omit an equivalent for כ: He could have reproduced לְדִי in a more literal way by το ἐκχύνον τοῦ ποδός, as has also happened in Deut 11:24; 28:35,56,65; Josh 1:3; and 2 Sam/2 Kgdms 14:25.

As a consequence of this often vague distinction between translation at word or phrase level, I have to admit that in the present study I have not always been as faithful to this demarcation as I may here have led the reader to expect. At times I discuss “pluses” and “minuses” that may in fact rather form part of a translation at phrase level, sometimes also because they can offer an interesting insight into a certain translation pattern of LXX Isaiah. On such occasions, I have however usually tried to indicate and explain my own aberration.66

64 The phenomenon that a Hebrew genitivus qualitatis corresponds to an adjective in the Greek, has parallels in the Peshitta; see Wido Th. van Peursen, Language and Interpretation in the Syriac Text of Ben Sira. A Comparative Linguistic and Literary Study (MPIL 16; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 194–195.


66 See especially sections 4.7 and 9.1.
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Assur destined her for wild animals this too has been made desolate (left) without the Assyrians 67

37:34 (etc.) נאנייהו τά δέ λέγει κύριος.
(This is) the revelation of the Lord These things says the Lord

Translation at clause level does not occur so often in the LXX of Isaiah. This may seem odd for a translation that has regularly been characterised as “free.” However, in the next paragraph we will see that our own idea of a “free” translation, namely translation at clause level—or paraphrase—, entails something different from the free style of rendering of the Isaiah translator. This observation is in line with what James Barr has remarked in his much-acclaimed treatise, The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations, which is that the modern ideal of a free translation—“the idea that one should take a complete sentence or even a longer complex, picture to oneself the meaning of this entirety, and then restate this in a new language in words having no necessary detailed links with the words of the original”—scarcely existed in Antiquity. 68

d. Rearrangement

The free style of rendering that the Isaiah translator has applied in his translation with regularity, and at which I have hinted in the preceding section, pertains to a particular method, which, even if it is far from a straightforward word-for-word (or phrase-for-phrase) translation, does not involve paraphrase either. In this way of translating most separate Hebrew words or phrases do have a counterpart in the Greek, but these are semantically and/or grammatically often different from their Hebrew source, and also the way in which they are joined together into one sentence, deviates from the Vorlage, resulting in a text that not only has a different syntax but also a different content as compared to the original one. In the present study I shall call this method—by lack of a better term—“rearrangement.” 69

Passages in LXX Isaiah that have been rearranged often display the following features:

- The translator has made a selection from the words of his Vorlage: some he does render, others not; with the chosen words he composes a new sentence.
- Besides omitting, the translator may also add words if this suits the internal structure of the new sentence or its content. Sometimes one word in the source text has received two counterparts in the translation (“double translation”), 70 or two synonymous expressions have been reduced to one (“condensation”). 71
- In rearranged sentences the translator has frequently rendered words not in a literal or faithful way but in an associative way, that is: with the help of expressions that are related to the original only indirectly, through a semantic or formal link. Those expressions may

67 NETS translates by “this too has been made desolate by the Assyrians.” For the translation with “… left without the Assyrians,” see van der Kooij, Oracle of Tyre, 66–67.
68 Barr, Typology of Literalism, 281.
69 Goshen-Gottstein speaks of “reformulation” (HUB Isa, passim); I prefer not to use this term, because it may suggest paraphrase. Troxel calls texts that are rendered in a similar way “non-translations” (Troxel, LXX-Isaiah as Translation, 134).
70 Cf. chapter 2.
71 Cf. chapter 3.
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belong to another grammatical category (e.g. a verb becomes a noun), or have an entirely different connotation from the original words. In LXX Isaiah especially formal association occurs abundantly (particularly in rearranged texts, but also beyond). This kind of association means that an expression in the translation, even if it does not form a *semantic* equivalent of a word in the source text, when reconstructed into the Hebrew, it does resemble the original word as regards its *form*, for instance through the replacement of one letter by another, similar, one (e.g., in Isa 44:14 “cedar” has generated κύριος via מִשְׁמֶרֶת, or through the application of metathesis.72 In the past, the origin of such alternative readings has often been sought in an error of the translator or in a different Vorlage. Yet, in a large number of these cases the translator has probably read words in a different way on purpose. Such a deliberate, creative dealing with the form of words has its roots in Jewish hermeneutics. In this the idea prevailed that words in Scripture do not solely have a literal meaning, but also a derivative one, based on formal similarities.73 An outcome of this same way of interpreting Biblical texts can be found in the midrashic method of *al tiqre*. This method facilitates the reading of a large number of words from Scripture in a different manner, e.g. through a change in the vocalisation of the original word, the transposition of its consonants, or the replacement of one consonant by another one that is formally or phonetically related to it. Such manoeuvres were not made by the rabbis because they rejected the accepted or literal reading, but because they held the opinion that a text could contain various meanings. The reading of the *al tiqre* often supported their interpretation of the halakha or the aggadah.74 The hypothesis that also the translators of the Septuagint made use of similar midrashic procedures has been defended by e.g. Zacharias Frankel, Leo Prijs, van der Kooij, Roger Le Déaut, and Tov.75

- In rearranged texts the translator has not always preserved the Hebrew sentence division; he has often made divisions where they are not attested in the MT (though it is not always clear if he has done this intentionally or not), or he has drawn two clauses of his Vorlage together into one.
- Neither has he consistently maintained the word order of his parent text (although mostly he has).

---

72 Hundreds of examples of this kind can be found in LXX Isaiah. Only a few of them can be given here: See e.g. 2:6 שְׁבֵֽעָן (MT: שְׁבֵעָן—“east”)/ כָּזֶֽה (MT: כָּזֶֽה—“ancient times”); 8:15 רָע (MT: imp. רָע—“wrap up”)/ הָעֲבָרָה (MT: הָעֲבָרָה—“uncover,” “reveal”)/ אָמַּר (MT: אָמַּר—“like night”)/ בַּיָּת (MT: בַּיָּת—“entire”); 11:1 הָעֵד (MT: הָעֵד—“like a father”).

73 See e.g. the rabbinical principle mentioned above—“One biblical verse or expression is susceptible of many (different) interpretations” (Sanhedrin 34a) (translation from Max Kadushin, *The Rabbinic Mind* [New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1952], 104).


Rearranged passages at times seem to have been created with the purpose of imbuing certain ideas into the text, for instance ideological or theological ones. Rearrangement could provide the translator with a means to, on the one hand, stay close to his Vorlage (at least, from a formal perspective), and so to respect the Hebrew text, but on the other hand, where it comes to the message, to deviate from the text and to be able to incorporate in it his own thoughts. In such a way, this method could authorise the translator’s ideological, theological, or actualising interpretation of the text. Yet, rearrangement has also been applied for other, more “internal” reasons, for instance in order to make a connection with Biblical passages elsewhere, or for stylistic motives.

The way of translating I have just tried to expose has been described by Barr decades ago. In his aforementioned treatise he notes that in ancient Greek Bible translations one often encounters a translation method in which

the lexical elements are … taken fairly literally and rendered with common or easily understandable equivalences. But the syntactic structure of the Greek sentence is a quite free composition of the translator.

Barr further remarks that it is not unusual in Greek translations from the Hebrew that the translation is on the one hand ‘literal’—in the sense that it offers an “one-for-one representation” of the Hebrew elements by Greek ones—but at the same time “free,” because the translator in rendering those separate elements allowed himself great liberties. According to Barr many translators in Antiquity were neither consistently literal nor consistently free in their way of translating but combined these two approaches in a rather inconsequential way. This image that Barr depicts of ancient Bible translations fits the Septuagint of Isaiah quite well. Also in this translation literal and free rendition are often closely and intricately intertwined.

To make this rather technical exposition somewhat more concrete, let me now offer a few illustrations of rearranged texts in LXX Isaiah:

**Isa 3:10**

MT Isa 3:10

Tell the innocent how fortunate they are

LXX Isa 3:10 εἴποντες Δῆσωμεν τὸν δίκαιον, ὡτι δύσχρηστος ἡμῖν ἔστιν saying, “Let us bind the just, for he is a nuisance to us.”

The words or phrases of this verse can be aligned in a synopsis in the following way. At the right a proposal is made for the manner in which the Hebrew and Greek may match:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>אמריה</td>
<td>εἴποντες</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>דעון</td>
<td>Δῆσωμεν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>זדיק</td>
<td>τὸν δίκαιον</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

76 See chapter 8.
77 See chapter 7.
78 Barr, *Typology of Literalism*, 323.
80 This point is also repeatedly emphasised by Baer. See Baer, *When We All Go Home*, e.g. 15–16, 22, 119, 278.
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The Greek word δύσχρηστος seems to have received a double translation in the LXX as both εἰπόντες and Δήσωµεν. The latter is an associative rendering, echoing the Hebrew imperative דָּרְשֵׁה (“bind!”). The relation between דָּרְשֵׁה and δύσχρηστος is somewhat obscure; maybe the translator has opted for a Greek adjective meaning “nuisance” because it forms an antonym to דָּרְשֵׁה.81

Isa 5:13

MT Isa 5:13

καὶ πλῆθος ἔγενηθη νεκρῶν διὰ λιμῶν καὶ δίψαν ὑδάτως.

LXX Isa 5:13

καὶ πλῆθος ἔγενηθη νεκρῶν διὰ λιμῶν καὶ δίψαν ὑδάτως.

The translator has reused the Hebrew expressions καὶ πλῆθος, νεκρῶν, διὰ λιμῶν, and δίψαν, but equipped them with other syntactical functions. He may have reproduced with καὶ πλῆθος through a link of the root πλῆθος—“to be heavy” with the idea of a multitude. He has vocalised as μῖρος (“death ones”) rather than as μῖρος (“men”) such as the MT exhibits. Besides, he has supplied ἔγενηθη and ὑδάτως, and omitted τὸν θρόνον and ὁμονόμως. The latter noun means “multitude,” parallel to πλῆθος. It is possible that he has interpreted καὶ πλῆθος and πλῆθος in the same sense, and collapsed these two expressions together into καὶ πλῆθος.

Isa 16:3

MT Isa 16:3

grant justice; make your shade like night at the height of noon; hide the outcasts, do not betray the fugitive;

LXX Isa 16:3

πλείονα βουλεύου, ποίει τε σκέπην πένθους αὐτῇ διὰ παντός· ἐν μεσημβρινῆ σκοτίᾳ φεύγουσιν, ἔξεστησαν, μὴ ἀπαχθῆσθαι.

... take further counsel, and make for her a shelter for mourning for all time. They flee in darkness at noon, they were astonished; do not be taken away.

81 For a discussion of the rendering of this verse, cf. Scholz, Alexandrinische Uebersetzung, 31; Fischer, In Welcher Schrift, 19; Otley, Book of Isaiah, 2:117; Ziegler, Untersuchungen, 61; Tov, Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint, 138–139; Troxel, LXX-Isaiah as Translation, 93.
In this quite complex translation, most Greek words still seem to hide a link to the Hebrew. 

πλείονα βουλεύου ("take further counsel") might render πληθύνεια, in which ποίει reflects πλήθος, and σκέπην translates πλήθος (with omission of the suffix). διά παντός echoes πληθύνεια, read as πληθύνεια ("entirely") instead of as πληθή ("like night"). The appearance of πένθους ("mourning") is striking. A word with a similar sense cannot be found in the Hebrew version. Probably it is an addition, just like αὐτῇ (although, alternatively one could connect πένθους αὐτῇ to πληθύνεια, which would have been linked to πληθύνεια or πληθύνεια = "to mourn"), while αὐτῇ would be based on its final two consonants πληθύνεια.

The source of ἐν μεσημβρίνῃ is plain, as this phrase forms a fairly literal rendering of νυμφή τοῦ Κριστοῦ. The succeeding noun—σκοτία—is probably related to κότιον; compare for this link Dan 2:22 where "hidden things" (אַרְבּוֹן) are called "dark things" (καὶ σκοτεινά) in the LXX.

The verb φεύγουσιν ("they will flee") in all probability renders φεύγουσιν ("the banished ones"), while ἕξεστησαν ("they were astonished") represents ἔξω ("fugitive"), interpreted as a form of ἔξω, which in Aramaic can denote "to be confused." μὴ ἀπασχοληθῆς ("do not be taken away"), at last, comes from לִשְׁנֵיהֶם, read as though it were a Hif. form of לָשׁוֹן ("to take into exile") rather than a Pi. form of the same root meaning "to betray."

However uncertain one remains about the exact moves the translator has made, his achievement is a Greek text with a different syntax and sentence division, the content of which is almost independent from the Hebrew.

1.3.3 The limits of a quantitative approach

The reason why I have paid so much attention to the subject of rearrangement in LXX Isaiah is so as to expose the problem that in passages, which have been rendered according to this method, the identification of pluses and minuses is usually quite complicated. In rearranged sentences it is often unclear how the source text and translation exactly relate to each other. The connection between segments in the Hebrew and Greek is often merely indirect and hence difficult to ascertain, which makes it hard to find out whether and where the text contains pluses and minuses. What is more, elements have in many cases been added or omitted by the translator just because this suited the syntax and/or logic of his newly created sentence. Such kind of additions and omissions cannot always be detached from their context.

82 For the translation of σκέπην, cf. Gen 19:8; Judg 9:15; Ps 17(16):8; 36(35):8; 63(62):8; 91(90):1; 121(120):5; Isa 25:4; 49:2; Ezek 31:12,17; Hos 4:13; and 14:8.
and clarified on their own. Most do not have a function in themselves, but are purely related
to and dependent on the new sentence that has been formed.\textsuperscript{83} One could even query whether
those elements can still be defined as cases of “plus” and “minus.” For these reasons, doubtful
“pluses” and “minuses” forming part of rearranged sentences will mostly be excluded from
my discussion of the pluses and minuses in the Greek Isaiah. Nonetheless, there are also
pluses and minuses in rearranged texts that can be explained separately. See e.g. ὀδύρωσις in
5:13 above, which explicates “thirst” and of which an equivalent could likewise be imagined
to stand in the Hebrew text. Most of such pluses and minuses in rearrangements which can be
classified among the “regular” categories of pluses and minuses that LXX Isaiah displays, will
receive treatment in the present study.

The complication mentioned above confronts us with the limits of a quantitative approach.
The “unsystematic” way of rendering and the elusiveness that feature in certain parts of the
Isaiah translation make it often extremely complicated to ascertain which elements can be
identified as pluses and minuses; or, they even make it impossible to speak of LXX Isaiah’s
pluses and minuses in an unambiguous manner. Here also lies the reason why the present
study cannot offer a complete list of “pluses and minuses” in the Septuagint of Isaiah, let
alone that for all those cases an explanation could be provided. This work merely seeks to
afford a large collection of examples illustrating certain translation processes, patterns, and
tendencies that seem to characterise the Greek Isaiah and that have given rise to the
occurrence of pluses and minuses in the translation. Additionally, this research highlights the
truth we are faced with when searching for extra or missing elements in the translation,
namely that a rather extensive amount of the Greek text of Isaiah does not lend itself to a
systematic, quantitative approach, but asks of us a more creative and intuitive way of looking
at this intriguing translation.

1.4 Vorlage or translator?

One question that turns up each time that pluses and minuses in the Septuagint are subjected
to an examination is whether they have been caused by an underlying Hebrew manuscript at
variance with the MT, or by the translator himself who has added or omitted elements to or
from his text. Septuagint scholars have approached this issue in different ways. On the one
side, there are those who hold the opinion that prior to establishing the source of a variant to
be a different Vorlage, one should be able to exclude the possibility that the plus or minus was
the translator’s own accomplishment. So, first one has to check whether or not the deviation
may have come into being by a mistake of the translator (or copyist), a certain translation
 technique that he has applied, or perhaps a specific interpretation he wanted to incorporate
into his text, and only if these options seem implausible, may one postulate that the plus or
minus was already present in the translator’s Hebrew manuscript. Scholars who take this
position, are, inter alia, John W. Wevers, Staffan Olofsson and Tov.\textsuperscript{84} On the opposite side

\textsuperscript{83} For examples, see ἡμῖν ἔστιν in 3:10; ἐγγυνήθη, Ἰωάννης, and θεός in 5:13; and שׁוֹשַׁנָּה in 16:3 above.
\textsuperscript{84} John W. Wevers, “The Use of Versions for Text Criticism. The Septuagint,” in La Septuaginta en la
investigación contemporánea (V Congreso de la IOSCS) (ed. Natalio Fernández Marcos; Textos y estudios
“Cardenal Cisneros” 34; Madrid: Instituto “Arias Montano,” 1985), 20–21; Staffan Olofsson, \textit{The LXX Version}. 
are the ones who contend that the explanation for a plus or a minus first has to be looked for in a different Hebrew Vorlage. One of them is Anneli Aejmelaeus who reasons as follows:

Now, knowing that the translators considered the text they translated to be authoritative Scripture and, on the other hand, that most of them, after all, were fairly literal, it would seem to be a good rule of thumb to start with the assumption that larger divergences from the MT mainly come from the Vorlage, and only exceptionally and with imperative reasons to attribute them to the translator.\(^8^5\)

A balanced way of dealing with this question, as most of these scholars (including Aejmelaeus) themselves acknowledge, is to study and evaluate each and every individual case of plus or minus on its own, only after a thorough analysis has been made of the translation character of the work in which it is found. When a translation turns out to be quite literal, this may be an argument to seek the origin of its pluses and minuses in the first place in a different Vorlage. When, on the contrary, it appears rather free, one may first try to identify the extra or missing elements as innovations of the translator. Since the Septuagint of Isaiah clearly belongs to the second group—that of “free” translations—this gives rise to the presumption that the preponderance of its pluses and minuses may stem from the translator himself.\(^8^6\) This is in line with the outcome of the present study, which seems to indicate that most of LXX Isaiah’s pluses and minuses fit within one of the several categories I have found of translation techniques that have been applied frequently in this translation, for which reason it is not necessary to attribute them to a Hebrew text differing from the MT. However, this surely does not imply that I exclude the alternative, i.e. that any one of them might actually still be the result of a different Vorlage. All pluses and minuses which have been labelled under a particular flag in this work should be considered as possibly—and not necessarily—explicable in the way suggested.

1.5 An outline of this study and a discussion of the method of analysis

A categorisation of the pluses and minuses of the Greek Isaiah can give a more objective and precise insight into the way in which the translator has dealt with his Hebrew text. In view of this fact, I have attempted to classify LXX Isaiah’s extra and missing elements, the results of which are shown in this study. In doing this, I have sought to elaborate on the classification of pluses and minuses Ziegler has made, though also to complement and enhance his work.

---


\(^8^6\) Eugene Ulrich also maintains that one should first take into consideration whether the Hebrew parent text of the LXX may have been different from the MT before one decides to deal with an intervention of the Isaiah translator; see e.g. Eugene Ulrich, “Light from 1QIsa* on the Translation Technique of the Old Greek Translator of Isaiah,” in Scriptur in Transition. Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo (ed. Anssi Voitila and Jutta Jokiranta; ISJSup 126; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 197–198.
where necessary. In this way, I have arrived at eleven categories to account for the large majority of the pluses and minuses to be found in the Greek Isaiah. Each one of these groups will be discussed in one of the next eleven chapters. After a number of chapters describing translational techniques and tendencies—such as double translation, condensation, explicitation, the amelioration of rhetorical figures, and the adoption of elements from elsewhere in Scripture—one chapter will follow on pluses and minuses that may have come into being through an error of the translator, succeeded by one on extra and missing elements that might have a different Vorlage underlying. In the latter section also a comparison between the cases of plus and minus in LXX Isaiah and the Isaiah Scroll from Qumran will be included.

Thus, the structure of this study can be expressed in a scheme as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pluses and minuses possibly caused by the translator</th>
<th>chapters 2–11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>translation techniques</td>
<td>chapters 2–10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>translation mistakes</td>
<td>chapter 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluses and minuses possibly caused by a different Vorlage</td>
<td>chapter 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When examining the pluses and minuses of LXX Isaiah, one is confronted with an extensive amount of material. This has forced me to limit my discussion of each separate case. On account of this, the analysis may occasionally run the risk of appearing somewhat superficial, especially as compared to some other publications on LXX Isaiah that in a very detailed and elaborate way have examined one or two passages of the Isaiah translation. However, the concise style of the present study is the consequence of my choice to treat as large as possible a number of instances of plus and minus in the Greek Isaiah rather than only a selective few.

A second restriction of this study is that it will mainly attempt to discover which translational tendencies or patterns are disclosed by the Greek translation. The processes leading to pluses and minuses which will be described, will include linguistic and stylistic aspects (i.e. cases in which elements have been added or omitted for the sake of a proper use of the Greek language), literary aspects (additions and omissions meant to embellish the Greek text), translation technical aspects (e.g. the avoidance of redundancy), and contextual and intertextual exegesis and harmonisation. However, it will leave aside a thorough content analysis of the translation, and will thus not try to answer the question as to why the translator may have applied such a specific way of translating from the perspective of the message and content of the wider discourse. Similarly, this study will only sparingly continue into the possible deeper theological, ideological, or actualising motives behind the moves of the translator.

Besides translational patterns, this work will—as mentioned—also pay attention to the relation between the Greek Isaiah and its possible Hebrew Vorlage, and try to find out which

---

87 For several reasons I have chosen not to treat pluses and minuses in two separate parts of this study. In the first place, because this would have resulted in undesirable duplications. That is, some of the techniques discussed (e.g. anaphoric translation) involve both pluses and minuses, and, in case of a separation into pluses and minuses, would have to be dealt with and explained twice. Secondly, when pluses and minuses arising from the same technique are listed in different sections, this makes it more difficult for the reader to obtain a complete picture of the application of such a technique. A third, more practical, consideration has been that a separate discussion of pluses and minuses would produce some very small chapters, as certain techniques involve almost only pluses and just a few minuses (e.g. the creation or improvement of rhetorical figures).
pluses and minuses may have been the result of the translator’s use of a different Hebrew text. But also as concerns this topic, restrictions of room have stopped me from elaborating every detail. The *Vorlage*-issue is treated only globally throughout and at the end of every chapter, and besides that, in a separate chapter (see ch. 12).

*Text editions used*

The Greek text of Isaiah I have employed for this study reflects the critical edition of Ziegler, unless indicated otherwise. Also for the other books of the Septuagint I have used the Göttingen editions for as far as these are already available. The English translation of the Greek comes from *NETS*, except for some occasional changes, which I have indicated in the footnotes. Hebrew citations derive from *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*, while the English translation of the Hebrew generally follows the *New Revised Standard Version*. 