

THEOLOGY AND IDENTITY OF THE EGYPTIAN  
JEWISH DIASPORA IN SEPTUAGINT OF ISAIAH

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

KEUNJOO KIM

FACULTY OF THEOLOGY  
AND  
WOLFSON COLLEGE

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD  
JULY 2009

## Table of Contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT .....	vii
ABSTRACTS .....	viii
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.1. A Review of Septuagint-Isaiah Studies .....	1
1.1.1. Two trends in the Septuagint study .....	2
1.1.2. Septuagint as an ancient witness to the MT .....	2
1.1.3. Septuagint in its own right .....	7
1.1.4. Septuagint in its own context .....	10
1.2. Methodology and Purpose of the Study .....	19
CHAPTER 2 EGYPT TEXTS IN LXX-IS: IDENTITY .....	25
2.1. 10:20-27 .....	25
2.1.1. Context of MT .....	25
2.1.2. Comparison of two versions .....	26
2.1.2.1. 10:20 .....	26
2.1.2.2. 10:21 .....	28
2.1.2.3. 10:22 .....	29
2.1.2.4. 10:23 .....	32
2.1.2.5. 10:24 .....	34
2.1.2.6. 10:25 .....	37
2.1.2.7. 10:26 .....	37
2.1.2.8. 10:27 .....	39
2.1.3. The Septuagintal text as it stands .....	41
2.1.3.1. Verses 20-21 .....	42
2.1.3.2. Verses 24-27 .....	44
2.1.3.3. Historical implication: “Assyria” and the separation .....	47
2.1.4. The identity of the diaspora: their theology .....	51
2.2. 11:10-16 .....	54
2.2.1. Context of MT .....	54
2.2.2. Comparison of two versions .....	55
2.2.2.1. 11:10 .....	55
2.2.2.2. 11:11 .....	56
2.2.2.3. 11:12 .....	58
2.2.2.4. 11:13 .....	59
2.2.2.5. 11:14 .....	59
2.2.2.6. 11:15 .....	61

2.2.2.7. 11:16 .....	63
2.2.3. The Septuagintal text .....	63
2.2.3.1. The structure of chapter 11 in LXX-Is .....	63
2.2.3.2. Verse 10: God's salvation .....	65
2.2.3.3. Verses 11-12: "Assyrians" and the restoration of the remnant .....	66
2.2.3.4. Verse 15: The River Nile .....	67
2.2.3.5. Comparison between verse 11 and verse 16 .....	68
2.2.3.6. Relation to chapter 12 .....	70
2.2.4. Conclusion .....	70
2.3. 19:16-25 .....	71
2.3.1. Context of MT .....	71
2.3.2. Comparison of two versions .....	73
2.3.2.1. 19:16 .....	73
2.3.2.2. 19:17 .....	75
2.3.2.3. 19:18 .....	76
2.3.2.4. 19:19 .....	83
2.3.2.5. 19:20 .....	83
2.3.2.6. 19:21 .....	85
2.3.2.7. 19:22 .....	86
2.3.2.8. 19:23 .....	86
2.3.2.9. 19:24 .....	88
2.3.2.10. 19:25 .....	90
2.3.3. The Septuagintal text .....	91
2.3.3.1. The land of the Jews .....	91
2.3.3.2. "The City of Asedek" and "Mother-City" .....	92
2.3.3.3. The subject of verse 20 .....	96
2.3.3.4. Israel, Egypt and the Assyrians: the Jews in Egypt .....	97
2.3.4. Theology of 19:16-25 in LXX-Is .....	100
2.3.4.1. The City of Righteousness .....	100
2.3.4.2. The expectation of human saviour like Moses .....	102
2.3.4.3. The blessed Jews in the land of Egypt: "my people, my inheritance" ..	103
2.3.4.4. Date of translation .....	105
2.4. 27:12-13 .....	105
2.4.1. Context of MT .....	105
2.4.2. Comparison of two versions .....	105
2.4.2.1. 27:12 .....	106
2.4.2.2. 27:13 .....	109

2.4.3. The Septuagintal text .....	110
2.4.3.1. “The canals of the River” .....	110
2.4.3.2. “In the land of the Assyrians” and “in Egypt” .....	110
2.4.4. Theology of 27:12-13 in LXX-Is: The restoration of the Egyptian Jews ...	113
2.5. Summary .....	114
CHAPTER 3 EGYPT TEXTS IN LXX-IS: VIEW ON EPGYT .....	116
3.1. 20:1-6 .....	116
3.1.1. Context of MT .....	116
3.1.2. Comparison of two versions .....	117
3.1.2.1. 20:1 .....	117
3.1.2.2. 20:2 .....	117
3.1.2.3. 20:3 .....	118
3.1.2.4. 20:4 .....	119
3.1.2.5. 20:5 .....	120
3.1.2.6. 20:6 .....	122
3.1.3. The Septuagintal text .....	124
3.1.3.1 Verse 5 .....	124
3.1.3.2. Verse 6 .....	127
3.1.4. Theology of 20:1-6 in LXX-Is: “How shall we be saved?” .....	128
3.2. 30:1-7 .....	129
3.2.1. Context of MT .....	129
3.2.2. Comparison of two versions .....	129
3.2.2.1. 30:1 .....	129
3.2.2.2. 30:2 .....	131
3.2.2.3. 30:3 .....	132
3.2.2.4. 30:4 .....	133
3.2.2.5. 30:5 .....	134
3.2.2.6. 30:6 .....	135
3.2.2.7. 30:7 .....	136
3.2.3. The Septuagintal text .....	137
3.2.3.1. Egypt: “A nation which will not benefit” .....	138
3.2.3.2. Μάτην or μάταιος .....	139
3.2.3.3. Verse 7: Declaration for the Jews in Egypt .....	140
3.2.4. Theology of 30:1-7 in LXX-Is .....	141
3.3. 31:1-3 .....	142
3.3.1. Context of MT .....	142
3.3.2. Comparison of two versions .....	143

3.3.2.1. 31:1 .....	143
3.3.2.2. 31:2 .....	144
3.3.2.3. 31:3 .....	145
3.3.3. The Septuagintal text and its theology .....	147
3.3.3.1. Verse 1: “Trust in whom” .....	147
3.3.3.2. Verse 2: Their vain hope .....	147
3.3.3.3. Verse 3: Egypt .....	148
3.4. 19:1-15 .....	149
3.4.1. Context of MT .....	149
3.4.2. Comparison of two versions .....	149
3.4.2.1. 19:1 .....	149
3.4.2.2. 19:2 .....	150
3.4.2.3. 19:3 .....	152
3.4.2.4. 19:4 .....	153
3.4.2.5. 19:5 .....	154
3.4.2.6. 19:6 .....	155
3.4.2.7. 19:7 .....	157
3.4.2.8. 19:8 .....	158
3.4.2.9. 19:9 .....	159
3.4.2.10. 19:10 .....	160
3.4.2.11. 19:11 .....	160
3.4.2.12. 19:12 .....	161
3.4.2.13. 19:13 .....	161
3.4.2.14. 19:14 .....	162
3.4.2.15. 19:15 .....	163
3.4.3. The Septuagintal text .....	163
3.4.3.1. Polemic against the idol worship of the Egyptians .....	164
3.4.3.2. Emphasis on disaster for Egypt .....	164
3.4.4. Theology of 19:1-15 in LXX-Is .....	165
3.4.4.1. Condemnation against the idolatry of the Egyptians .....	165
3.4.4.2. Emphasis on the negative aspect of Egypt .....	166
3.5. Summary .....	166
CHAPTER 4 THE TEMPLE OF ONIAS .....	168
4.1. The Oniads and the Temple of Onias .....	168
4.1.1. Problems .....	169
4.1.2. The Temple of Onias .....	172
4.2. The Function of the Temple .....	175

4.2.1. Why Heliopolis? .....	177
4.2.2. The reference to the Temple .....	180
4.2.3. The Zadokite Onias .....	183
4.2.4. Its relationship with the Temple of Jerusalem .....	189
4.3. Priests in Egypt .....	191
4.3.1. Identifying Jewish priests in Egypt: 40:2 in LXX-Is .....	192
4.3.2. Judgment against the present Jerusalemite priests .....	198
4.3.2.1. Is 3:16-26 .....	198
4.3.2.2. Is 43:28: The problem of the ruling class of Judah .....	200
4.3.3. Expectations of a new temple and priests .....	207
4.3.3.1. Is 66:3 .....	207
4.3.3.2. "Holy": Is 30:19; 44:28; 33:5 .....	208
4.3.4. Rebuilding the temple .....	210
4.3.5. Favourable attitude towards foreign rulers .....	212
4.4. Summary .....	217
CHAPTER 5 HELLENISTIC JEWISH LITERATURE .....	220
5.1. Introduction: Metropolis and Identity .....	220
5.2. Heliopolis and Jewish Residence .....	224
5.3. <i>Joseph and Aseneth</i> .....	227
5.3.1. <i>Aseneth and the Temple of Onias</i> .....	229
5.3.2. Identity .....	232
5.3.3. Attitude towards foreign kings .....	237
5.4. <i>Third Sibylline Oracles</i> .....	240
5.4.1. "The king from the sun" and Philometor .....	240
5.4.2. <i>3Sib</i> and LXX-Is .....	246
5.5. <i>Third Book of Maccabees</i> .....	249
5.5.1. Identity of the Jews in Egypt .....	249
5.5.2. Attitude towards the Ptolemaic dynasty .....	255
5.5.3. Relation to LXX-Is .....	260
5.6. <i>Letter of Aristeas</i> .....	262
5.6.1. Attitude towards the Greek king .....	262
5.6.2. Legitimacy by Jerusalem and the Greek king .....	267
5.7. Summary .....	270
CHAPTER 6 CONCLUSION .....	272
BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	277

## **Acknowledgement**

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor Dr. Alison G. Salvesen whose help, stimulating suggestions and warm encouragement helped me in all the time of research for and writing of this thesis. I also want to thank Myung-sung Church, Doorae Institute, Bundang Central Presbyterian Church, and Eunkwang Church for their financial support. Especially, I would like to give my special thanks to my wife Sunhee and two lovely daughters, Grace and Jenny.

I dedicate this thesis to the Reverend Sinam Song who stimulated me to study the Word of God in the Old Testament.

# **Theology and Identity of the Egyptian Jewish diaspora in Septuagint of Isaiah**

Short Abstract

Keunjoo Kim

Wolfson College and Faculty of Theology

Doctor of Philosophy; Trinity 2008

Abstract

The Old Greek version of the *Book of Isaiah* (hereafter LXX-Is) should be studied not only as a translation but also as an interpretation reflecting the theology of the translator or translator's community in Egypt. 'Free' translation in LXX-Is usually appears not to originate from any misunderstanding of the probable Hebrew Vorlage or from a different Vorlage, but deliberately and consciously. Also it is important that these Greek renderings should be dealt with in a broader context, not merely verse by verse; because the Septuagint seems to have been regarded as a religious text in itself, circulating among Jews in Egypt. The most conspicuous theme in Septuagint Isaiah is a bold declaration concerning their identity. According to this, the Jewish diaspora in Egypt is the true remnant, and their residence in Egypt should be regarded as due to God's initiative, thus "Eisodos" instead of "Exodus" is emphasized. Such ideas may be understood as displaying an apologetic concern of the Jewish diaspora to defend their continued residence in Egypt, whereas the Bible states firmly that Jews are not to go down there. Judgments against Egypt appear more strongly than MT, and this is another expression of their identity. LXX-Is supplies a bold translation in 19:18: a temple in Egypt, called the 'city of righteousness'. The writings of Josephus testify to the existence of the Temple of Onias in Heliopolis under the reign of Ptolemy Philometor who apparently showed great favour towards the Jews. The temple's significance should be considered as more than a temporary shrine for local Jewish mercenaries. Rather, it aimed to be a new Jerusalem under a lawful Zadokite priest. In addition to this, LXX-Is shares some interesting and distinctive ideas with Hellenistic Jewish literature, including views on priests and sacrifice, and an attitude towards foreign kings shared by Hellenistic Jewish literature of the period. To conclude, through comparing with MT and investigating LXX-Is as it stands, this work shows that LXX-Is is not just a translation but a Hellenistic Jewish document reflecting a particular theology of at least some Jews in Egypt. LXX-Is is shown to have its place within Jewish Hellenistic literature.

# Chapter 1 Introduction

## 1.1. A review of Septuagint-Isaiah studies

In biblical studies in the modern period, the Septuagint<sup>1</sup> was primary evidence among ancient witnesses for study of the Masoretic Text. If there was some difficulty in MT, first of all, one consulted the Septuagint, and from the latter part of the twentieth century, the Qumran biblical manuscripts. In recent times, however, we would say that Septuagint study has entered a new phase. The Septuagint has come to be treated not only as supplementary evidence to illuminate the more authoritative text, but as a religious text in its own right, bearing its own meanings and theological messages. Since the post-exilic period, Hebrew had been losing its hold as a vernacular language and the Septuagint was arguably the text both for the Jews in Egypt and probably in other parts of the Greek-speaking Diaspora, since it was written in Koine Greek and accessible to later Jewish generations who did not know the Hebrew language well. It also functioned as the supreme sacred text for the newly emerged Greek-speaking Christian world. While today biblical scholars read the Septuagint along with the Hebrew original, Jewish and Christian communities in those centuries would read the Septuagint without any consultation of the MT and it probably formed a fundamental part of their religious life. With this in mind, we cannot too much emphasize the importance of attending to the meaning and value of the Septuagint in its own right.

---

<sup>1</sup> The term “Septuagint or LXX” can be understood variously. The basic and original referent of the name is the Pentateuch translated into Greek during the third century BCE, with the *Letter of Aristeas* as propaganda document. In this thesis the term will be used to indicate the entire Greek Bible, including the apocryphal books. See K.H. Jobes and M. Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2000), 30-33. For the explanation of the number “seventy”, see H.M. Orlinsky, “The Septuagint and its Hebrew Text”, in W.D. Davies and L. Finkelstein (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Judaism* (vol. II; Cambridge University Press, 1989), 537-540.

### 1.1.1. Two trends in the Septuagint study

Muraoka summarizes two trends in the study of the Septuagint: Reader-oriented and translator-oriented approaches.<sup>2</sup> According to him, the former contains studies of the Septuagint *in its own right*, including Septuagint commentary, lexicon, etc. The Septuagint is said to embody the oldest exegesis of the Hebrew Bible. The latter, however, concerns Septuagint in relation to its Semitic original, establishing characteristics and translation techniques or identifying agreements and disagreements between Septuagint and its Semitic Vorlage, and tracing the evolution of the latter in relation to the standard text of the Jewish Bible. In this area, Septuagint study still throws light on the meaning of Hebrew/Aramaic words and forms in the Bible.<sup>3</sup>

In line with Muraoka's summary, we will survey the previous history of study on the Book of Isaiah in Greek (hereafter, LXX-Is) according to the above two categories.

### 1.1.2. Septuagint as an ancient witness to the MT

Many studies, falling into Muraoka's second category, have appeared. In fact, it could be said that the first stage of Septuagint Isaiah study started from this point of view, including the studies of A. Scholz,<sup>4</sup> R.R. Ottley<sup>5</sup> and J. Ziegler.<sup>6</sup> These concentrated on the divergences between LXX and MT. To explain the differences

---

<sup>2</sup> T. Muraoka, "The Semantics of the LXX and its Role in Clarifying Ancient Hebrew Semantics", in T. Muraoka (ed.), *Studies in Ancient Hebrew Semantics* (AbrNSup 4; 1995), 136-7; also idem, "On Septuagint Lexicography and Patristics", *JTS* 35 (1984), 441.

<sup>3</sup> Muraoka's two trends are expressed by M. Harl in terms of "amont" ('upstream') and "aval" ('downstream'). The former concerns how the translation refers to the original Hebrew, while the latter focuses upon what the translator produces, detached from its original. See M. Harl, "Traduire la Septante en français: pourquoi et comment?" in *La langue de Japhet. Quinze études sur la Septante et le grec des Chrétiens* (Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1992), 33, and more recently, "La Bible d'Alexandrie dans les débats actuels sur la Septante" in Y. Goldman and C. Uehlinger (eds.), *La double transmission du texte biblique: Études d'histoire du texte offertes en hommage à Adrian Schenker* (OBO 179; Fribourg: Editions Universitaires; Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001), 3.

<sup>4</sup> *Die alexandrinische Uebersetzung des Buches Jesaias* (Würzburg: Leo Woerl, 1880).

<sup>5</sup> *The Book of Isaiah according to the LXX (Codex A)*, 2 vols (London, 1904).

<sup>6</sup> *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias* (Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen 12/3; Münster, 1934).

between them, some suggestions were made<sup>7</sup>: 1. Different or faulty Vorlage (Scholz, E. Liebmann), 2. Faulty knowledge of the Hebrew language (Ottley) or misreadings of translator(s) (Ottley, J. Fischer), 3. influence of Aramaic (Fischer), 4. attempts to produce good Koine Greek (Ziegler, Seeligmann), 5. predilection for a free and paraphrasing translation (Fischer, Ziegler, Seeligmann). Recently, in his research on Is 23:1-14 P. Flint divided the differences between LXX and MT into three categories: a. literal and semantically accurate; b. non-literal, but semantically adequate; c. non-literal and semantically inadequate.<sup>8</sup> In addition to these he included the possibility of a different Vorlage. Ultimately, he explains most differences by two techniques (literal and semantically adequate, non-literal but semantically adequate) and variations in the Vorlage.<sup>9</sup> More concrete and complex studies about “translation technique” have been done within a linguistic framework (for example, the “Finnish” or “Scandinavian” scholars).<sup>10</sup> An explanation involving translation technique,<sup>11</sup> basically, should be

---

<sup>7</sup> Arie van der Kooij, “A short commentary on some verses of the Old Greek of Isaiah 23”, *BIOSCS* 15 (1982), 36. See J. Fischer, *In Welcher Schrift lag das Buch Isaias den LXX vor? Eine textkritische Studie* (BZAW 56; Giessen, 1930); E. Liebmann, “Der Text zu Jesaja 24-27”, *ZAW* 22 (1902), 1-56; C. Rabin, “The Translation Process and the Character of the Septuagint”, *Textus* 6 (1968), 1-26.

<sup>8</sup> “The Septuagint Version of Isaiah 23:1-14 and the Masoretic Text”, *BIOSCS* 21 (1988), 35-54. In addition, Schweitzer proposes much more detailed eight categories in analysing the presentation of mythological elements in Isaiah, as follows: transliteration, translation while keeping the mythological concepts within the Hebrew/ancient Near Eastern context, translation with equivalent concepts in a Hellenistic framework, translation with an eye toward “actualizing exegesis”, emendation of ideas perceived as “offensive” or “outdated”, deletion of elements not understood, mistranslation with “incorrect” words either because of a lack of knowledge or for some other reason, accurate following of a Hebrew text that has a different reading or one that does not unambiguously require a mythological reading. S.J. Schweitzer, “Mythology in the Old Greek of Isaiah: The Technique of Translation” *CBQ* 66 (2004), 219.

<sup>9</sup> Flint, “Septuagint”, 37-45.

<sup>10</sup> A. Aejmelaeus, *Parataxis in the Septuagint. A Study of the Rendering of the Hebrew Coordinate Clauses in the Greek Pentateuch* (Helsinki: Suomalaisen Tiedeakatemia, 1982); idem, “Participium coniunctum as a criterion of translation technique”, *VT* 32 (1982), 385-393; idem, “What can we know about the Hebrew Vorlage of the Septuagint?”, *ZAW* 99 (1987), 58-65; idem, “Translation Technique and the Intention of the Translator” in C.E. Cox (ed.), *VII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991), 23-36; idem, “What We Talk about When We Talk about Translation Technique” in B.A. Taylor (ed.), *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Oslo, 1998* (Atlanta: SBL, 2001), 531-552; S. Olofsson, *The LXX Version. A Guide to the Translation Technique of the Septuagint* (CB OTS 30; Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell International, 1990); idem, *God is my Rock. A Study of Translation Technique and Theological Exegesis in the Septuagint* (CB OTS 31; Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell International, 1990); I. Soisalon-Soininen, *Die Infinitive in der Septuaginta* (Helsinki: Suomalaisen Tiedeakatemia, 1965); R. Sollamo, *Renderings of Hebrew Semiprepositions in the Septuagint* (AASF DHL 19; Helsinki: Suomalaisen

preferred to that of a different Vorlage and that of an intentional modification.<sup>12</sup> These studies are certainly helpful and necessary, and can provide a foundation for further considerations,<sup>13</sup> but are often characterized by a lack of historical and theological interest. They focus upon the translators and their techniques, but seem to fail to notice that LXX was the religious canon for the Jewish community in the Hellenistic period, of which the translators form part. However, there appears, these days, a growing tendency to trace “theological interpretation” based on “solid translation-technical groundwork”.<sup>14</sup>

One more important element that the above viewpoint is likely to overlook is the effect of the Septuagint as it stands. For example, some Greek renderings seem to witness to a different Vorlage or result from the translator’s mistaken understanding, etc. But sometimes it is much more compelling to assume a deliberate choice by the translator. The assumption that divergences are due to a variant Vorlage behind LXX is too sweeping and prevents further discussion of other possibilities, and in fact, lacks external evidence, e.g. in the Qumran Isaiah scrolls. Considering, for instance, a change in the Greek text that cannot be explained by three categories in the translation

---

Tiedeakademia, 1970); idem, *Repetition of the Possessive Pronouns in the Septuagint* (SCS 40; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995); Cf., J. Schaper, *Eschatology in the Greek Psalter* (WUNT 276; Tübingen: Mohr, 1995), 16. For linguistic and language-oriented research, see E. R. Ekblad Jr., *Isaiah’s Servant Poems According to the Septuagint: An Exegetical and Theological Study* (Peeters, 1999), 18-20.

<sup>11</sup> Instead, some scholars prefer the term “Übersetzungsweise” because “translation technique” implies a kind of systematic theory of translation. See Aejmaelus, “Translation Technique”, 25-27; R.L. Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation: The Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah* (JSJSup 124; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2008), 74f. So, Aejmaelus suggests defining “translation technique” “as simply designating the relationship between the text of the translation and its *Vorlage*”. See Aejmaelus, “What We Talk about”, 532.

<sup>12</sup> M. P. Weitzman, “Hebrew and Syriac Texts of the Book of Job”, in M.P. Weitzman, *From Judaism to Christianity: Studies in the Hebrew and Syriac Bibles* (ed. by A. Rapoport-Albert and G. Greenburg; Oxford, 1999), 130-131. In this respect, the point that translators are not authors is repeatedly emphasized by scholars. See J. Lust, “Messianism in Ezekiel in Hebrew and in Greek” in J. Lust, *Messianism and the Septuagint* (BETL 178; Leuven University Press, 2004), 189-191.

<sup>13</sup> E. Tov, “The Original Shape of the Biblical Text”, in J.A. Emerton (ed.), *Congress Volume Leuven 1989* (VTSup 43; Leiden, 1991), 348.

<sup>14</sup> Aejmaelus, “What We Talk About”, 548. She is convinced that “chasm between linguistic study and the more theologically oriented study of the Septuagint is really not that wide”, and gives some useful questions for establishing the theology of the translator (549).

technique suggested by Flint, if then one concludes that the change could be from a different Vorlage, such a conclusion leaves no room for any other possibility.<sup>15</sup>

While some words or phrases may either originate from translational choice or from a different Vorlage, the result of these possible changes is to produce a significantly different message for the reader community. That is, the effect of the small differences might go beyond the sum of the parts. And this effect may have had a special meaning for the implied audience, the Jewish diaspora who lived in Egypt. It is this sort of effect that we should pay attention to. First and foremost, careful consideration should be taken at the level of the translator's work. Basically, to discern the translator's intention and theology involves investigating how the Greek relates to the Hebrew. But when the level of the assumed reader is considered, another "theology" of the Septuagint may be possible,<sup>16</sup> for the reader would not have consulted the Hebrew Vorlage, unlike the translators. This means that confusion between the intention of the translator and understanding of readers can happen when we read the Septuagint. So-called "intertextuality" seems to be involved at both levels,<sup>17</sup> and in many cases we wonder whether the translator did intend parallelism, chiasm, and intertextuality, etc. It may be appropriate to consider those inter-relationships among biblical books, partly, at the level of reader response.<sup>18</sup> After all, the two levels of

---

<sup>15</sup> For example, Troxel mentions 48:17 in LXX-Is as an example to attest a different Vorlage in *LXX-Isaiah*, 75-76. The different reading in LXX-Is from MT is seen in 1QIs<sup>a</sup>, as he points out. Another example in 33:1, too is attested in Qumran (78-79). Therefore, if we cannot find evidence among the extant manuscripts and versions, to use "variant Vorlage" should be carried with extreme caution.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Sollamo points out that the term "Septuagint" indicates "the Greek translation only", without including the Vorlage. See R. Sollamo, "Messianism and the 'Branch of David'" in M.A. Knibb (ed.), *The Septuagint and Messianism* (Leuven University Press, 2006), 358.

<sup>17</sup> For "intertextuality", see Schaper, "Messianic Intertextuality in the Greek Bible" in M.A. Knibb (ed.), *The Septuagint and Messianism* (Leuven University Press, 2006), 371-380, though he does not pay attention to the two levels; M. Crougths, "Intertextuality in the Septuagint: The Case of Isaiah 19", *BIOSCS* 34 (2001), 81-94.

<sup>18</sup> D. Baer, *When We All Go Home: Translation and Theology in LXX Isaiah 56-66* (JSOTS 318; Sheffield, 2001), 85-86, admits that he does not restrict his treatment "to those ameliorations that are necessarily *conscious* translational acts" (his italics) because unconscious changes can "produce a text that mitigates potential scandal", and practically, it is "impossible to determine the extent to which an

understanding should be considered with as much caution as possible. As Muraoka points out, “the intention of the translator as understood by the reader(s) of his translation and how the former understood the text in the source language should not be confused”.<sup>19</sup> To go back to the original work of the translator is beset with many difficulties including the possibility of different Hebrew traditions, possible editing after the first “original” translation, etc. It means that to speak of a “theology of the translator” is far from straightforward, though still the effort to distinguish what the translator did is worthwhile.<sup>20</sup>

Actually, the question that we should ask in relation to the Septuagint is: Why did the translator choose – in Flint’s term –, “non-literal but semantically adequate” expressions, even though the translator could find more literal ones. “It is in cases where the provision of an interpretational element is optional, rather than required, that we are best able to discern the individual interests and concerns of a particular translator”.<sup>21</sup>

Through elaborate discussions of translation technique, we are liable to err in our evaluation of ancient Jewish translators through our modern attitudes and ways of thinking. As Seeligmann and others observe, the translator of Septuagint Isaiah interpreted the given text within some Jewish traditional interpretative method, rather than working with some new principle of translation.

Van der Kooij’s comment, therefore, is worth heeding: “Too often translations like

---

ameliorative reading is a conscious act”. Throughout his book, he examines the translator, but the aforementioned shows that the two levels are considered together, probably undistinguishably.

<sup>19</sup> Muraoka, “Lexicography”, 447f.

<sup>20</sup> Aejmelaeus makes a similar point concerning how one ascertains the “intention” of the translator : “The Greek text of the Septuagint ... should be interpreted as such according to the meaning and rules of the Greek and according to the probable understanding of an original native speaker. It should neither be interpreted according to the Hebrew original nor according to the assumed intention of the translator”. See Aejmelaeus, “Translation Technique”, 33f.

<sup>21</sup> S. Brock, “Translating the Old Testament”, in D.A. Carson and H.G.M. Williamson (eds.), *It is written: Scripture Citing Scripture. Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars, SSF*. (Cambridge, 1988), 88.

the LXX Isa as well as other books in the LXX are criticized on the basis of *our* philological criteria and from *our* exegetical view of the Hebrew text” (his italics).<sup>22</sup>

### 1.1.3. Septuagint in its own right

The Septuagint text should be evaluated in its own right, not as a mere supplementary tool for identification of the underlying Hebrew text. This view corresponds to the more practical reason for the translation: The Septuagint served the internal need of the Hellenized Jewish community in Egypt where they had very little knowledge of Hebrew. The Jews in Egypt looked at and used the Septuagint with no recourse to a Hebrew text. This leads us to take seriously any change in Septuagint as a significant one for the translator, a member of that Diaspora in Egypt. Some divergences could be interpreted as intentional. When we gather these intentional changes altogether, we may outline the theological perspective of the translator. And semantically possible renderings may indicate the intention of the translator, too. In this case, the Septuagint would be of more than limited value as a textual witness for MT.

To study the theology of LXX-Is in its own right, therefore, is a pressing task in LXX research.<sup>23</sup> Seeligmann has left an unrivalled contribution in this area. The translator, Seeligmann suggests,<sup>24</sup> had the “notion that the period in which he lived was to be time for the fulfillment of ancient prophecies”, and he put his efforts into contemporizing the old biblical text and reviving it by imbuing it with the religious

---

<sup>22</sup> “Isaiah 23”, 46.

<sup>23</sup> Marcos, *Septuagint*, 305ff.

<sup>24</sup> I.L. Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah and Cognate Studies* (ed. Robert Hanhart and Hermann Spieckermann; Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 128. Originally, Seeligmann’s book *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah. A Discussion of Its Problems* was published in Leiden, 1948. Recently, this book was reprinted in 2004 as mentioned above, including his two other articles. Citations hereafter are from this recent version.

conceptions of a new age. According to him, this realization enables us to take the difference between the original and the translation as a basis for an attempt to reconstruct the complex of theological ideas behind the translation. Therefore, understanding the theology of the translator in Seeligmann means understanding the contemporary historical situation as far as is possible and interpreting any significant changes in LXX-Is in the light of the historical background. While Ottley thought, according to Seeligmann, that the translator misconceived the original at so many places that we ought to give up the idea of using it as a basis for the reconstruction of the actual Hebrew text of the period, Seeligmann criticizes him in that his analysis could never give us a complete picture of the principles and methods governing the translator's work.<sup>25</sup> He also commented that Ziegler had not discussed problems of a historical or religio-historical nature.<sup>26</sup> He concludes that it was within Jewish exegetical tradition, especially Midrash, that LXX-Is must be investigated and understood.<sup>27</sup> He explains that "Midrash aims at attributing to the text a contemporaneous application, i.e. to show that the ancient word also refers to the period of those who later endeavour to interpret it".<sup>28</sup> He also adds that this effort to modernize old prophecies takes a concrete form in times of "crisis and persecution" such as the desecration of the Jerusalem temple by Antiochus Epiphanes.<sup>29</sup> In the light of his explanation, even though rabbinic midrashic works appeared after the first century CE, we agree that LXX-Is is one of the earliest works using Jewish midrashic method.<sup>30</sup> In fact, this contemporizing interpretation of biblical texts is also found in

---

<sup>25</sup> Seeligmann, 131.

<sup>26</sup> Seeligmann, 132-133.

<sup>27</sup> Seeligmann, 294.

<sup>28</sup> Seeligmann, 239.

<sup>29</sup> Seeligmann, 239.

<sup>30</sup> For Seeligmann, "every branch of Jewish literature succeeding the Bible sees itself in one way or

the *pesher* of the Qumran community,<sup>31</sup> which seems to belong to a roughly similar period to that of the translation of Isaiah. Through his remarkable study, Seeligmann suggests the translator's view was that the Jewish Diaspora in Egypt is identified with the remnants of Israel; "the remnant will greatly increase in numbers; they will rejoice in the contemplation of God, be reunited and regain their former exalted position".<sup>32</sup> Furthermore, he suggests that Onias, who was driven out by Jason, and built the temple in Heliopolis, was behind this translation.<sup>33</sup> He thinks that the temple in Heliopolis might be regarded "as an intermediary station through which the Palestinian tradition and Biblical interpretation found their way to the Jewish milieu in Alexandria, and, more particularly, to the Alexandrian translation of Isaiah".<sup>34</sup>

---

another as a commentary or a lawful continuation of the Bible. This applies most particularly to the entire Talmud literature, which knows no truth that is not yet extant in the Bible. Every religious conviction, every practical wisdom should be retrieved there". See Seeligmann, 107. Midrash as a religious activity searching for the present significance of the Biblical text, can be seen already in some passages in the Bible itself (e.g. Gen 22:14; titles in the book of Psalms) and in the New Testament. Also see the explanation and bibliography in H.L. Strack and G. Stemberger, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash* (trans. by M. Bockmuehl; T & T Clark, 1991), 254-262. Also midrashic elements in LXX are noted by D.W. Gooding. According to him, some of them can be traced back to the original translation, and others from later revision. See "On the use of the LXX for Dating Midrashic Elements in the Targums", *JTS* 25 (1974), 1-11; idem, *Relics of Ancient Exegesis: A Study of the Miscellanies in 3 Reigns 2* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976). The oldest midrashic exegesis is arguably seen in an ancient Midrash preserved in all extant rituals for Passover evening. See Louis Finkelstein, "The Oldest Midrash: Pre-Rabbinic Ideals and Teachings in the Passover Haggadah", *HTR* 31 (1938), 291-317. In explaining Jacob's move to Egypt, this Midrash interprets "my father, a wandering (רַבֵּי) Aramaean" in Deut 26:5 as "an Aramaean destroyed (רַבֵּי) my father". See Finkelstein's translation, 295-298. This Midrash, according to Finkelstein, dates back to the first half of the second century BCE, before the Maccabean period, and was written by a High priest, probably Simon the Just. This indicates that this midrashic interpretation appeared from the third century BCE, much earlier than the Talmudic literature. See the commentary on 10:20-26 in the following chapter. For standard examples of midrashic translation in LXX, see E. Tov, "Septuagint", in M.J. Mulder (ed.), *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (Assen/Maastricht: Van Gorcum, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988), 177f. David Baer's study on LXX Isaiah 56-66 also concludes the translator was "an early exponent of the type of Jewish interpretative traditions that are seen in more developed form in the Targumim, Midrashim and Talmudim". See *When We*, 22,279.

<sup>31</sup> Recently, S. Berrin suggested a clear definition of *pesher*, according to categories of form, content, method and motive, as follows: "a form of biblical interpretation peculiar to Qumran, in which biblical poetic/prophetic texts are applied to postbiblical historical/eschatological settings through various literacy techniques in order to substantiate a theological conviction pertaining to divine reward and punishment". See S. Berrin, "Qumran Pesharim" in M. Henze (ed.), *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2005), 110-133. Also see Johann Maier, "Early Jewish Biblical Interpretation in the Qumran literature" in Magne Sæbø (ed.), *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation* (vol.1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 108-129.

<sup>32</sup> Seeligmann, 288.

<sup>33</sup> Seeligmann, 242-244.

<sup>34</sup> Seeligmann, 244-245.

#### 1.1.4. Septuagint in its own context

Since Seeligmann, terms such as ‘contemporizing’ or ‘actualization’ or ‘fulfillment-interpretation’ have become primary ways of understanding the theology and thought of LXX-Is.<sup>35</sup> But post-Seeligmann scholars go further in that they consider LXX-Is a coherent work on its own, while Seeligmann tried to discover, in isolated, free renderings, certain historical allusions or expressions of the translator’s own views and ideas.<sup>36</sup> In fact, this idea was already expressed by a German scholar in his book of 1934: “obwohl ein übersetzter Text, durchaus selbständig ist in seinem Gedankengehalt. ... es ist der Beweis anzutreten, daß der Text trotz der Schwierigkeiten ein sinnvolles Ganzes ist”.<sup>37</sup> But it was Arie van der Kooij, a Dutch scholar, who made a significant contribution to the study of LXX-Is.<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup> J.C.M. das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega dos Setenta no Livro de Isaías (Cap. 24 de Isaías)* (Lisboa, 1973); J. Koenig, *L'herméneutique analogique du Judaïsme antique d'après les témoins textuels d'Isaïe* (SVT 33; Leiden: Brill, 1982); R. Hanhart, “Die Septuaginta als Interpretation und Aktualisierung, Jesaja 9:1 (8:23)-7(6)”, in A. Rofe and Y. Zakovitch (eds.), *Isac Leo Seeligmann Volume. Essays on the Bible and the Ancient World* (vol. III; Jerusalem, 1983), 331-346; For the works by A. van der Kooij, see below; D. Baer, *When We*; S.E. Porter and Brook W.R. Pearson, “Isaiah through Greek Eyes: The Septuagint of Isaiah”, in C.C. Broyles and C.A. Evans (eds.), *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah* (vol. 2; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 532-546; Florian Wilk, “Vision wider Judäa und wider Jerusalem (Jes 1 LXX): Zur Eigenart der Septuaginta-Version des Jesajabuches”, in W. Kraus and Karl-Wilhelm Niebuhr (eds.), *Frühjudentum und Neues Testament im Horizont Biblischer Theologie* (WUNT 1/162; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 15-35, etc. For a review on this “actualization” interpretation line, see Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 4-19, even though the conclusion of his book is that “there is no basis to view the translator’s work under the rubric of *Erfüllungsinterpretation*” (287, his italics). See below.

<sup>36</sup> Seeligmann, 41.

<sup>37</sup> K.F. Euler, *Die Verkündigung vom leidenden Gottesknecht aus Jes. 53 in der griechischen Bible*. Quotation from Seeligmann, 133.

<sup>38</sup> *Die Altentextzeugen des Jesajabuches* (OBO 35; Göttingen; Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981); “A short commentary on some verses of the Old Greek of Isaiah 23”, *BIOSCS* 15 (1982), 36-50; “Accident or method: On “analogical” interpretation in the Old Greek of Isaiah and in 1QIs<sup>a</sup>”, *BO* 43 (1986), 366-375; “The Old Greek of Isaiah 19:16-25: Translation and Interpretation,” in *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* (Jerusalem 1986; SBLSCS 23; 1987), 127-166; “The Septuagint of Isaiah: Translation and Interpretation”, in J. Vermeylen (ed.), *Le livre d'Isaïe (The Book of Isaiah)* (Leuven, 1989), 127-133; “The Old Greek of Isaiah in relation to the Qumran texts of Isaiah: some general comments”, in G.J. Brooke and B. Lindars (eds.), *Septuagint, scrolls and cognate writings* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 195-213; “Isaiah in the Septuagint”, in C.C. Broyles and C.A. Evans (eds.), *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretative tradition* (Vol. 2; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 513-29; “Zur Theologie des Jesajabuches in der Septuaginta” in H.G. Reventlow (ed.), *Theologische Probleme der Septuaginta und der hellenistischen Hermeneutik* (VWGT 11; Gütersloh: Ch. Kaiser, 1997), 9-25.; “The Servant of the Lord: A Particular Group of Jews in Egypt According to the Old Greek of Isaiah. Some Comments on LXX Isa 49,1-6 and Related Passages”, in J. van Ruiten and M. Vervenne (eds.), *Studies in the Book of Isaiah* (Leuven University Press, 1997), 383-396; *The Oracle of Tyre. The*

His article about the method of Septuagint study in 1986 made some comments on the study of Koenig,<sup>39</sup> who tried to do a specific actualization through his ‘analogical interpretation’. Van der Kooij criticizes him for the fragmentary character of the method. According to van der Kooij, Koenig did not consider a systematic study of change in its own actual context.<sup>40</sup> For more comprehensive and systematic analysis of the Septuagint, he suggests a method of analysis on several levels as follows:<sup>41</sup> 1. The level of the text of the LXX version, 2. the level of word-word relations (comparison between MT and LXX, including Qumran), 3. the level of grammar and semantics (how did the translator render Hebrew forms and sentences and how did he interpret his Vorlage semantically? It also demands a treatment of the meaning of the Greek text on its own – its internal coherence), 4. the level of the context of LXX-Is as a whole (comparison with other related passages in LXX-Is), 5. the level of actualization. Like Seeligmann, he also regards variant readings as intentional, to serve the actualization of the prophecies aimed at by the translator.<sup>42</sup> But, as we can see in his method above, an examination should be carried out not at word level alone, but at the level of its own larger context in Greek. For him, the crucial matter is to see whether specific readings in the Greek text cohere with each other, i.e. whether they make sense as part of the

---

*Septuagint of Isaiah XXIII as Version and Vision* (Leiden: Brill, 1998); “The Cities of Isaiah 24-27 according to the Vulgate, Targum and Septuagint”, in H. Jan Bosman, H. van Grol, et al. (eds.), *Studies in Isaiah 24-27* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 183-198; “‘Coming’ Things and ‘Last’ Things: Isaianic Terminology as understood in the Wisdom of Ben Sira and in the Septuagint of Isaiah” in F. Postma, K. Spronk and E. Talstra (eds.), *The New Things. Eschatology in Old Testament Prophecy. Festschrift for Henk Leene* (Maastricht: Uitgeverij Shaker Publishing, 2002), 135-140; “The Septuagint of Isaiah and the Hebrew Text of Isaiah 2:22 and 36:7” in P.W. Flint, E. Tov and J.C. VanderKam (eds.), *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, and the Septuagint Presented to Eugene Ulrich* (SVT 101; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2006), 387-383; “Interpretation of the Book of Isaiah in the Septuagint and in Other Ancient Versions” in C.M. McGinnis and P.K. Tull (eds.), *As Those Who Are Taught: The Interpretation of Isaiah from the LXX to the SBL* (SBLSS 27; Atlanta: SBL, 2006), 49-68.

<sup>39</sup> Koenig, *L’herméneutique analogique du judaïsme antique d’après les témoins textuels d’Isaïe*.

<sup>40</sup> Cf. van der Kooij, “Accident or method”.

<sup>41</sup> Van der Kooij, “Accident or method”, 368-9.

<sup>42</sup> Van der Kooij, “Accident or method”, 371.

Greek text as it stands.<sup>43</sup> He examined many Isaiah texts in Greek using this method: 8:11-16,<sup>44</sup> 19:16-25,<sup>45</sup> chapter 23,<sup>46</sup> 49:1-6,<sup>47</sup> etc.

David Baer takes a similar approach.<sup>48</sup> The reason he chose chapter 56–66 as a whole for his investigation is because he took van der Kooij's claim seriously.<sup>49</sup> LXX-Is, he thinks, contains mistakes and sometimes fails to comprehend difficult Hebrew but it coexists with theological concerns and exegetical practices. And this "liberty" on the part of the translator does not make him an "existential lone cowboy".<sup>50</sup> Rather, he is a representative of wider Jewish interpretative tradition,<sup>51</sup> already commented on in relation to Seeligmann above. And he says the translator's own ideology is accessible to careful analysis of his technique.<sup>52</sup> His main claim to identifying the translator's technique is that the translator had a homiletical motivation.<sup>53</sup> Thus he demonstrates in his book that the translator's tendency consists of interpreting many imperative forms and personal pronouns in the texts (in his terms, 'imperativization' and 'personalization': for him, LXX-Is is a 'preached text'), ameliorating the source text's least circumspect statements about God, and toning down and otherwise altering sexual, cultic, and other potentially awkward language,<sup>54</sup> and finally moving the text in

---

<sup>43</sup> Van der Kooij, "Isaiah in the Septuagint", 520.

<sup>44</sup> Van der Kooij, "Isaiah in the Septuagint". Recently, J. Ross Wagner criticized van der Kooij's study of this text, for "he has not pressed this contextual approach nearly far enough in his actual interpretation of this particular text". See J. R. Wagner, "Identifying "Updated" Prophecies in Old Greek (OG) Isaiah: Isaiah 8:11-16 as a Test Case", *JBL* 126 (2007), 251-269.

<sup>45</sup> Van der Kooij, "19:16-25".

<sup>46</sup> Van der Kooij, "Isaiah 23"; *Oracle of Tyre*.

<sup>47</sup> Van der Kooij, "Servant".

<sup>48</sup> *When We*; idem, "'It's All About Us!' Nationalistic Exegesis in the Greek Isaiah" in C.M. McGinnis and P.K. Tull (eds.), *As Those Who Are Taught*, 29-47.

<sup>49</sup> Baer, *When We*, 12-13.

<sup>50</sup> Baer, *When We*, 16.

<sup>51</sup> Baer, *When We*, 16

<sup>52</sup> Baer, *When We*, 17.

<sup>53</sup> Baer, *When We*, 17

<sup>54</sup> This tendency in the Septuagint-Isaiah was pointed out by J. Lust, too: "The Septuagint offers an interpretative translation in which the offensive character of the saying disappears ... in its renderings the guiding inspiration was probably a theological one. The translator could not accept the idea of Jahweh as a

a nationalistic direction that also reflects the Diaspora situation of the translator and his community. His careful analysis demonstrates that the translator is a preacher with homiletical purpose. While Seeligman focuses upon content, Baer tries to demonstrate the preached character of LXX-Is by examining the book's style. His own method is similar to that of van der Kooij: lexical and semantic analysis, grammatical and syntactical analysis, and finally, description of the purpose and meaning of the Greek text.<sup>55</sup> Regrettably, however, Baer did not approach the text as a whole, although he chose 56–66 as the text to study. Like earlier scholars, he also only paid attention to individual verses in 56–66 and we cannot find any study of a larger section as a whole in his book.<sup>56</sup>

E.R. Ekblad Jr. also made a contribution in this area.<sup>57</sup> Though he does not tackle the historical milieu, his approach is an exegetical and theological study of the Septuagint in its own right, based on larger sections, not upon isolated verses.<sup>58</sup> First of all, he focuses upon the differences between the LXX and the MT as “features of one final form of text”.<sup>59</sup> For him, differences due to “inner-translational factors such as linguistic, contextual, theological and midrashic elements inherent in the translation process from Hebrew to Greek” are not related to the Vorlage, but have “exegetical explanations”.<sup>60</sup> Furthermore, he seeks to understand how each difference may express the unique interpretation of the meaning of the Servant Poems in the larger context of Isaiah 1–66, “rather than assuming that textual variants are due to differences in the

---

God causing evil in an ‘immoral way’. This is easily understandable against the cultural background. ...in the intertestamental period”. See “Messianism in the Septuagint: Isaiah 8:23b-9:6 (9:1-7)”, in J. Krasovec (ed.), *The Interpretation of the Bible: the International Symposium in Slovenia* (Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 147-163. Cf., Porter and Pearson, 538-9.

<sup>55</sup> Baer, *When We*, 19-22.

<sup>56</sup> This is also seen in his recent article, “All About Us”.

<sup>57</sup> Ekblad, *Isaiah's Servant Poems According to the Septuagint*.

<sup>58</sup> This focus upon larger literary unit is also seen in recent scholars such as Wagner, Troxel, etc.

<sup>59</sup> Ekblad, 22.

<sup>60</sup> Ekblad, 24.

underlying Hebrew Vorlage, ignorance of Hebrew or the translator's error".<sup>61</sup> It means that his study deals with the level of the text, or the reader community, not the level of the translator, in order to build a "theology" of a given Septuagint text.<sup>62</sup>

One more thing to be noted in the work of the above three scholars (Seeligmann, van der Kooij and Baer) is their stress on the Hellenistic milieu which influenced the translation. On analyzing Is 8:11-16, Seeligmann claimed that the translation was done by the Jewish Diaspora in Alexandria who had a particular theological tendency. But van der Kooij thinks that the text seems more likely to refer to Jerusalem and Judah as the scene of particular tensions within the Judaism of the time.<sup>63</sup> So this translation, he suggests, was made by Jewish scholars who fled from Jerusalem and took refuge in Egypt at a time when traditional Judaism was being threatened. Accordingly, he gives a quite remarkably concrete account of the historical background: many texts, including LXX Is 11:16, 19:18f,25, refer to the flight of Onias IV and his followers to Egypt in the sixties of the second century BCE, so he suggests that the translation was made by the followers of the Temple of Onias, and this translation was done in Leontopolis, not in Alexandria.<sup>64</sup> Baer also emphasizes the position of the translator in the Hellenistic Diaspora, although he does not give any detail about the historical background.

Septuagint Isaiah makes quite explicit efforts to relate the given Hebrew text to the situation surrounding the translator's community. For example, LXX 11:16: "And there will be a highway for the remnant of my people *in Egypt*, and it will be for Israel as the day when they came out of Egypt". Compared with MT ("And there will be a highway

---

<sup>61</sup> Ekblad, 30.

<sup>62</sup> His concern is clearly shown in the frequent appearance of "the reader" throughout his book.

<sup>63</sup> Van der Kooij, "Isaiah in the Septuagint", 528.

<sup>64</sup> Van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 60-62; "Servant", 394-396. This localization of the translation of Isaiah is already suggested in the middle of nineteenth century by Z. Frankel, *Historisch-kritische Studien zu der Septuaginta* (Leipzig, 1841), 40.

for the remnant of his people who will be left *from Assyria, ...*”), it seems quite clear that the translator changed the text into one referring to the Egyptian diaspora. In addition the fact that the LXX has “my people” instead of “his people” should be also regarded as significant.<sup>65</sup> Compared with MT 54:8 (“In *overflowing* wrath for a moment I hid my face from you, but with everlasting love I will have compassion on you, says the LORD, your Redeemer”, *NRSV*), LXX reads differently: “In *a little* wrath I turned away my face from you; but with everlasting mercy will I have compassion upon you, says the Lord that delivers you”. As shown in italics for both versions, LXX changes “overflowing wrath” of MT into “a little wrath” and the parallel seems much better in LXX (“a little wrath ... everlasting mercy”) than in MT.<sup>66</sup> What could this change mean to the Diaspora who had left their country, whether driven out by force or whether they had moved spontaneously, for example for economic reasons? Therefore, it seems clear that in the text of LXX-Is, there are many dimensions to be explored: to decipher what the original Hebrew text meant, to explain what the original meaning indicated in the eyes of the translator's period, and lastly, to interpret what the original text assured for the Jewish community in Egypt (*Bewahrung, Aktualisierung* and *Interpretation* respectively in Hanhart’s terminology).<sup>67</sup>

While we consider these translational aspects of LXX-Is, it is essential to understand the historical background and to place the text in its specific period, as far as possible. This necessitates comparative research into other Jewish-Greek literature around this period. However, relating a certain religious text to a certain, specific

---

<sup>65</sup> For more detailed study on the text, see 2.2.

<sup>66</sup> We may think it arises from a different Vorlage or faulty reading. But there is a certain tendency, differing from that of MT, to minimize God’s wrath against Israel and to favorably describe God’s action towards Israel in vv.6,10,16 in LXX Is. In this light, the change in 54:8 along with other ones in that chapter is likely to be deliberate.

<sup>67</sup> R. Hanhart, “Die Bedeutung der Septuaginta für die Definition des ‘Hellenistischen Judentums’”, in J.A. Emerton (ed.), *Congress Volume. Jerusalem 1986* (VTS 40; Leiden, 1988), 71. He deals with the three categories of the translation concerning political, cultural, and religious legitimation.

period is problematic. The basic authoritative character of religious texts, the Bible in particular, has existed and will exist because the texts find application in all the generations to come. In this respect, the statement that the translator reckoned the prophecy fulfilled in his day should be carefully evaluated. As a matter of fact, several recent works of Septuagint scholarship on Isaiah argue that there is little evidence to prove “actualization” in the chosen texts of LXX-Is.<sup>68</sup> The works of R.L. Troxel can be singled out in this respect.<sup>69</sup> According to him, the translator was influenced by the γραμματικοί and the *gymnasion* in the Alexandrian Museum, unlike Palestinian Jewish scribes who produced the *pesharim*.<sup>70</sup> Troxel denies any systematic theory of translation so he prefers the term *Übersetzungsweise*.<sup>71</sup> In evaluating LXX, he regards two factors as critical: a different Vorlage and intertextuality. So, his main critique of the so-called “contemporization” of Seeligmann and van der Kooij is that: most readings considered to be “contemporizing” are either due to a textual variant in the Hebrew, or consideration of the immediate or broader contexts.<sup>72</sup> He argues that “only if the translator can be shown to refer deliberately to people, countries, ethnic groups, circumstances, or event by deviating from his Vorlage is it legitimate to entertain the possibility that he sought to identify such entities as the ‘true’ referents of this Hebrew

---

<sup>68</sup> Flint, “Septuagint”, 35-54; Wagner, “Identifying”, 251-269. Schweitzer also demonstrates that there is no evidence of “actualization” translation for mythological elements, though he does not mean to oppose van der Kooij.

<sup>69</sup> R. L. Troxel, “ΕΣΧΑΤΟΣ and Eschatology in LXX-Isaiah”, *BIOSCS* 25 (1992), 18-27; “Exegesis and theology in the LXX: Isaiah v 26-30”, *VT* 43 (1993), 102-111; “Isaiah 7,14-16 Through the Eyes of the Septuagint”, *ETL* 79 (2003), 1-22; “What’s in a Name? Contemporization and Toponyms in LXX-Isa”, in R.L. Troxel, K.G. Friebel, and D.R. Magary (eds.), *Seeking Out the Wisdom of the Ancients: Essays Offered to Honor Michael V Fox on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2005), 327-44; *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation: The Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah*.

<sup>70</sup> Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 20-72.

<sup>71</sup> Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 59-72, 73-74.

<sup>72</sup> Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 133-172. In fact, his book aims at criticizing “the prevailing” “contemporizing” interpretation on LXX-Is (iv).

exemplar”.<sup>73</sup> His book is well structured,<sup>74</sup> and emphasizes how cautious one should be in speaking of ‘contemporizing translation’, and how one must pay attention to the literary context. He does this by demonstrating many examples of intertextuality. In this respect, it seems that Troxel walks with the Finnish scholars. To summarize, the familiarity with the practices of Alexandrian γραμματικοί, and the use of intertextuality as an interpretative ploy in other Jewish compositions of the Hellenistic era, are both basic abilities of the translator.<sup>75</sup>

A few things, however, need to be commented on: first of all, for Troxel, “context” seems to refer only to a literary one, but not to the historical and political context. Historical background is employed merely to depict the influence of Alexandrian intellectual tradition over the translator. Troxel does not care about what the translator as a Jew would feel in Hellenistic Egypt, and he does not consider what influence turbulence in Palestine would have on the Jews. It does not seem reasonable that influence should be confined to the intellectual milieu alone. Secondly, he shows throughout his works that many different readings in LXX-Is are explained by intertextual influence, mainly from LXX-Pentateuch. But to indicate that a reading was influenced by a verse in LXX-Pentateuch is insufficient. The fact that the translator used expressions from, for example, the *Book of Exodus*, — if the connection with Exodus is not found in the supposed Vorlage — could demonstrate that the translator made a theological choice to link his contemporary situation with the past deliverance/judgment in the *Book of Exodus*. For these two reasons, Troxel has nothing to say concerning a “theology” of the translator, even though it must be true that

---

<sup>73</sup> Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 164.

<sup>74</sup> Translator, his intellectual background, examination of Vorlage, linguistic interpretation, contextual interpretation, concrete examples, and conclusion.

<sup>75</sup> Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 151. The similar tendency to criticize “actualized interpretation” by emphasizing a wider context of the translator’s is also suggested in Wagner, “Identifying”, 251-269.

“theological interest and motivation is present” in LXX.<sup>76</sup>

To conclude, to identify how the translator saw fulfillment in LXX is, theoretically, an essential task. Every reader of the Bible in every period would feel that they were living in the days or on the verge of the days to which the text refers and implies.<sup>77</sup> If a reader or a translator did not find any text which was being fulfilled in his day, why would he read it? While Troxel argues that the reason the translator “felt forced into decisions that strike us as odd for a translator” was his concern “to bring an *understanding* of Isaiah to his Greek readers (his italics),”<sup>78</sup> it still evokes a question of what such an “understanding of Isaiah” was like. As we saw above, which “understanding of Isaiah” would make the translator change “for the remnant of his people who will be left from Assyria (לְשֵׁאֵר עַמּוֹ אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁאַר מֵאַשּׁוּר)” into “for the remnant of my people in Egypt (τῶ καταλειφθέντι μου λαῶ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ)” in 11:16? If Troxel is right in negating the existence of “actualization”, the translator should have changed “from Assyria” in 11:16 into a new, contemporary name to indicate the region in the period of the translator. But he changed the name into “in Egypt”. How else can we explain this without using the term “fulfillment”?<sup>79</sup> Troxel cursorily treats this change in 11:16 as one caused by a variant Vorlage, without explaining his reason.<sup>80</sup> This would be quite an easy solution, by the cure-all criterion of “a different Vorlage”, which tends to be used when scholars are reluctant to accept any theological or deliberate change in LXX, even though there remains no witness. It seems highly

---

<sup>76</sup> Aejmelaesus, “What We Talk About”, 548.

<sup>77</sup> Van der Kooij, “‘Coming’ Things”, 140; Baer, “All About Us”, 47, concludes his article: “No doubt the translator considered that the Vorlage insisted—as the Diaspora community might have presumed—that when the prophet Isaiah spoke, he spoke ‘about us’”. Cf. also the attitude of the author of the *Habakkuk peshet* from Qumran. For the author, every word in Habakkuk indicated to the events happened in the author’s days.

<sup>78</sup> Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 288.

<sup>79</sup> See 2.2. It was this “fulfillment” interpretation to which Jesus referred, saying “Today this scripture is fulfilled in your ears”, when he read verses in the Book of Isaiah (Luke 4:17-21).

<sup>80</sup> See “Name?”, 328; *LXX-Isaiah*, 189.

unlikely to derive from a different Vorlage, considered within the context of 11:11-16. In fact, his explanation just moves the problem back to the Vorlage's own variant interpretation. It should be pointed out that a variant Hebrew Vorlage produces theological problems of its own, if those variants are faithfully reflected by LXX-Is, and these problems may also serve for and form 'theology of the translator'.

## 1.2. Methodology and Purpose of the study

Based on the above critical review of the history of research on LXX-Is, investigating the theology and significance of LXX-Is is a two fold task. Firstly, in chapter 2 and chapter 3, we will deal with the text in LXX-Is as a translation of a given Hebrew Vorlage, resembling MT. We need to identify the Hebrew Vorlage of this Greek translation and compare both with Qumran manuscripts. Methodologically, any interpretative or theological decision regarding the character of the translation should be preceded by a careful lexical, grammatical and semantic study. We should listen carefully to Aejmelaeus' advice: "... the scholar who wishes to attribute deliberate changes ... to the translator is under the obligation to prove his thesis with weighty arguments and also to show why the divergences cannot have originated with the Vorlage".<sup>81</sup> At the same time, it must be borne in mind that the theory of a different Vorlage may not explain every divergence, as mentioned above.<sup>82</sup> At this stage, a detailed comparison with the Hebrew text is needed. As suggested by Muraoka's comment quoted at the start of this introduction, this stage of the work can contribute

---

<sup>81</sup> A. Aejmelaeus, "What can we know about the Hebrew Vorlage of the Septuagint?", *ZAW* 99 (1987), 71.

<sup>82</sup> Using the same argument of Aejmelaeus: "the scholar who wishes to attribute deliberate changes to a Vorlage is" also "under the obligation to prove his thesis", by comparing possible extant versions, and showing why the reading survived only in the Vorlage of LXX and turns up in no other version or manuscript.

to clarifying the meanings of some obscure Hebrew words and expressions.

The main focus, however, will be on the analysis of the Septuagint text itself. Biblical texts have many meanings, including the “original” or earliest one. Through the ages, the text has been understood, interpreted and applied to its own period and reader community. As the first translation of the Hebrew Bible, the Septuagint was the one that had a remarkable significance for its audience, who would have had linguistic ability only in Greek. In essence, the translation was made presumably because the Jewish community in Egypt needed it, and therefore, it should not “bring the reader to the text, but the text to its reader”.<sup>83</sup> This point leads us to consider the work as a coherent whole in its context,<sup>84</sup> and this requires an examination of larger sections, rather than just a few isolated verses. This does not deny the necessity of dealing with isolated verses, but it strongly suggests that consideration of a larger context should be essential for understanding the Septuagint in the way that the community in its own period did. The question of how much context we should examine may be problematic. Recently, Ross Wagner suggests three dimensions of the “context”: 1. to extend the boundaries of the immediate context, 2. to look at a larger literary unit, e.g. chs. 1-12 or ultimately the whole book, 3. to consider the translator’s use of parallel passages.<sup>85</sup> Practically speaking, the first and the third contexts should be considered, while the

---

<sup>83</sup> Mogens Müller, “The Septuagint as the Bible of the New Testament Church. Some Reflections”, *SJOT* 7 (1993), 203; cf. Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 101; cf. Literal translations (“*verbum e verbo*”) for legal documents seek the reverse, i.e. to bring the reader to the original. See S. Brock, “The Phenomenon of the Septuagint” in M.A. Beek, et al. (eds.), *The Witness of Tradition* (OS 17; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1972), 17, 28; idem, “Aspects of Translation Technique in Antiquity”, *GRBS* 20 (1979), 73. Brock, “Aspects”, 73, suggests that to choose either *verbum e verbo* approach or *sensus de sensu* approach, the most important factors among them are: the nature of the text he is translating, the relative prestige of the two languages concerned and the extent to which the source language is still widely known.

<sup>84</sup> In this respect, the present work is in contrast to the *New English Translation of the Septuagint* (hereafter *NETS*), which adopts the metaphor “interlinear” to point to “a deeper linguistic relationship of dependence and subservience”. Also *NETS* presupposes “a Greek translation which aimed at bringing the Greek reader to the Hebrew original rather than bringing the Hebrew original to the Greek reader”. See A. Pietersma and B.G. Wright (eds.), *A New English Translation of the Septuagint* (Oxford University Press, 2007), xiv.

<sup>85</sup> “Identifying”, 266-267.

second category of context ideally needs an exhaustive study of the whole book of Isaiah, a life-long task. We will pay attention to this level as required, as well as the first and the third. To conclude, our method of dealing with texts in LXX-Is will be as follows:<sup>86</sup>

1. Fixing the texts: first of all the context of the Masoretic text (MT) will be considered. There will be the least text-critical amendment of MT.
2. Comparison between two versions: Is there any difference between them? How can we explain the difference?
3. What does the LXX text as it stands mean?: how does the difference function in the LXX as it stands?
4. Theology of the diaspora: what does this text by the translator tell of the theology of the Egyptian diaspora? What does the text imply historically?

It would be too vast a task to investigate the whole of Isaiah. For convenience and significance, we will limit ourselves principally to the texts where Egypt, the place of residence of the Egyptian Jews, is explicitly mentioned. By focusing on these “Egyptian texts” in LXX-Is, we hope that this study reveals what the translator thought of Egypt, and how the translator or the reader community would interpret their residence in Egypt. In other words, the present study aims at offering comprehensive views on Egypt in LXX-Is.

Secondly, we will deal with the historical implications of our discussion. The translation was not carried out in a vacuum in time and space. We will try to identify what situation lies behind LXX-Is. The result will be compared with the wider historical and cultural context. On the supposition that the translation was made in Egypt, our research into the historical background considers both the situation from which the Egyptian Diaspora departed, and the situation in Egypt where they lived. On the one

---

<sup>86</sup> This method is based on van der Kooij’s explanation, which is reflected in others such as Porter and Pearson, Baer and Ekblad, as we saw above. Troxel uses three stages to examine the differences between MT and LXX: variants in the Vorlage, translation method, and exposition. But he thinks that there are changes not to be explained by these three, which is due to linguistic and theological exegesis by the translator. See “Exegesis and Theology”, 102-111. Other works to emphasize theological concern of the translator include: L.H. Brockington, “The Greek Translator of Isaiah and His Interest in ΔΟΞΑ”, *VT* 1 (1951), 23-32; J. Lust, “The Demonic Character of Jahweh and the Septuagint of Isaiah”, *Bijdragen* 40 (1979), 2-14; Olofsson, *God is my Rock*.

hand, on the Jewish side a question arises: how could they justify their departure from Palestine and residence in Egypt in the face of so many biblical passages forbidding Israel from going down to Egypt?<sup>87</sup> This is a question involving their identity and self-perception. And concerning Hellenistic Egypt: how could the Jewish Diaspora tolerate Hellenistic culture in idolatrous and polytheistic Egypt? In essence, every Jewish work produced during this period should be an “identity document” in that they try to explain or legitimize Jewish residence in Egypt. In connection with this, a comparison of LXX-Is with other Jewish literature is necessary, in order to ascertain where LXX-Is is located within wider Hellenistic Jewish literature. This approach is “certainly an important advance in the fields both of the LXX and of Jewish studies”.<sup>88</sup> The theological points and historical conclusions which we will find through the analysis of LXX-Is will be perspectives for investigating the literature. In so doing, it will be demonstrated that LXX-Is also belongs to the literature in which the Egyptian Jews tried to express their identity as God’s people, as well as other Jewish Greek literature during those periods.

This historical research will be carried out in chapter 4 and chapter 5. In chapter 4, in particular, we will deal with the temple of Onias, which will become prominent in the textual analysis. It seems that the temple of Onias was intended as a new Zion, which LXX-Is identifies as “a city of righteousness”, not just a shrine for local Jewish mercenaries. Another topic in the chapter concerns priests in Egypt. Our textual and historical studies on the temple of Onias lead to a consideration of the attitude of LXX-Is towards priests and temples. The examination of the topic will show that LXX-Is

---

<sup>87</sup> Recently, these “intriguing” questions are also raised by Sarah Pearce, who tries to answer these by examining Philo, an Alexandrian Jew. See S.J. Pearce, *The Land of the Body: Studies in Philo’s Representation of Egypt* (WUNT 208; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007).

<sup>88</sup> J. Aitken, “Book Notes: Baer David A., *When We All Go Home*”, *Bulletin of Judaeo-Greek Studies* 30 (2002), 17.

rejects the priests in Jerusalem and expects new priests and the building of a new temple. This includes the favourable attitude expressed in LXX-Is towards a certain foreign ruler who will build the new temple.

The subsequent chapter 5 surveys Hellenistic Jewish literature, and examines the views of the selected works regarding Jewish identity in Egypt, the temple, and foreign rulers. The discussion demonstrates that LXX-Is belongs with Hellenistic Jewish literature, having similarities and differences with these non-translated works.

As for literature written by Jews in Palestine and Egypt in the Hellenistic period, it is extensive and diverse. Usually, scholarly books on the Second Temple period mention the Septuagint as the source or cornerstone of Jewish Hellenistic literary production, but do not deal with the actual contents of the Septuagint as literature reflecting Jewish thought and theology of the Hellenistic period.<sup>89</sup> Books written in Greek from the beginning are dealt with as such but ones written in Hebrew are not used for the purpose. It is partly because those books are translated. Recently, scholars have emphasized the significance of the Septuagint as Hellenistic Jewish literature.<sup>90</sup> I

---

<sup>89</sup> P.M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (Oxford, 1972), 689-690; V. Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews* (translated by S. Applebaum; Atheneum/New York, 1970), 348; M. Hengel's masterpiece, *Judaism and Hellenism* (London: SCM Press, 1974) does not have a category for the LXX, even though he mentions the Hellenizing tendency of some texts in LXX, such as Prov 8:22-31 (162-3); It seems that it is only Elias J. Bickerman who has dealt with this aspect of LXX-Torah in detail. See *The Jews in the Greek Age* (Cambridge/London: Harvard University Press, 1988), 101-116; Grabbe does not deal with LXX as a document of Hellenistic Judaism proper, but lists and summarises it quite briefly under "Historical Problems and Studies" in the chapter "Alexander, the Diadochi, and the Ptolemies". Some books such as Qohelet, Ben Sira, Tobit, 1-3 Maccabees, and Judith, purporting to have been written in this period, are dealt with separately. L.L. Grabbe, *Judaism from Cyrus to Hadrian* (London: SCM Press, 1992); E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* (revised and edited by G. Vermes, F. Millar, M. Goodman; A New English Version, vol.3 part 1; Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark, 1986), 474-493; S.J.D. Cohen mentions the translation briefly, in *From the Maccabees to the Mishnah* (second edition; Louisville/London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2006), 200-201; L.H. Schiffman does deal with the Septuagint under the category of "The Literature of the Hellenistic Diaspora" in *From Text to Tradition. A History of Second Temple and Rabbinic Judaism* (Hoboken: Ktav Publishing House, 1991), 91-94.

<sup>90</sup> Already Seeligmann, 94ff, characterized the translation of Isaiah as "a document of Jewish-Alexandrian Theology". Older but still influential, J. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias* (Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen 12/3; Münster, 1934); Also Hanhart, "Bedeutung", 67-80; Porter and Pearson, 531-546; Tessa Rajak, Sarah Pearce, James Aitken and Jeniffer Dines (eds.), *Jewish Perspectives on Hellenistic Rulers* (Hellenistic Culture and Society 50; Berkeley/London: University of California Press, 2007), which is a production of an international colloquium in 2003 titled "Representations of Hellenistic Kingship" organized by the research project "The Greek Bible in the

hope that the present work will contribute to the statement that Septuagint Isaiah is part of Hellenistic Jewish literature proper. It is a translation, and at the same time it is a work of Jewish literature reflecting a certain theology and thought, partly in order to legitimize Jewish residence in Hellenistic Egypt.

---

Graeco-Roman World". This project "aims to provide a major new appraisal of the place of the Greek Bible as a source for understanding how Greek-speaking Jews were influenced by and interpreted the political, social, and intellectual cultures of their Hellenistic worlds" (see "Preface" in the abovementioned book). See part three of this book on the Septuagint, in particular. Some scholars, however, emphasized the Jewish element in LXX: R. Marcus, "Jewish and Greek Elements in the LXX" in *Louis Ginzberg: Jubilee Volume on the Occasion of his seventieth birthday* (English section; New York: The American Academy for Jewish Research, 1945), 227-245; L. Prijs, *Jüdische Tradition in der Septuaginta* (Leiden: Brill, 1948).

## Chapter 2 Egypt Texts in LXX-Is: Identity

Chapter 2 and 3 will deal with Egypt texts in LXX-Is. Through these two chapters, we will compare MT and LXX in detail to show how we can explain changes in LXX. Furthermore, as we said before, we will focus upon the Septuagintal text as it stands to find what the Greek text meant to the translator and his community. The final aim of this work is to establish the message or ‘theology’ of LXX-Is.

### 2.1. 10:20-27

#### 2.1.1. Context of MT

10:20-27, in which Egypt is explicitly mentioned in vv. 24, 26, should be dealt with, narrowly within the frame of 10:5-34, and broadly within chapter 9:7 (9:8 LXX) - chapter 12 about the response to the attack by Assyria.

In the MT, chapters 9:7-12:6 constitute a section clearly marked off from the former chapters (6-9:7), which tell the story from the perspective of Isaiah of Jerusalem himself (the so-called ‘Isaiah memoir’), and the following (ch. 13ff), which is called the oracles to the nations. The contents of this section flow thus: Judgment against arrogant Israel (9:8-10:4),<sup>1</sup> judgment against arrogant Assyria (10:5-19), salvation oracles for the remnant of Israel (10:20-27), the attack by the Assyrian king and his defeat by YHWH (10:28-34), salvation promises concerning the peaceful kingdom (11:1-9), oracles for the remnant of Israel (11:10-16), a song of thanksgiving (12:1-6).

Within the wide context of chs. 9-12, 10:20-27 connects the salvation oracle in 9:1-7 with the similar oracles in chs. 11-12. And within the narrow context of 10:5-34, 10:20-27 connects the judgment oracle in 10:5-19 with Assyria’s defeat in 10:28-34.

---

<sup>1</sup> This part has a repeated refrain: “For all this, his anger has not turned away; his hand is stretched out still”, which unites this section. For this reason, the section could be connected with 5:25-30. cf. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1-12*, 224-5.

Thus 10:20-27 contains judgment oracle (vv.20-23) and salvation oracle (vv.24-27).

## 2.1.2. Comparison of two versions

### 2.1.2.1. 10:20

וְהָיָה בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא לְאִיּוֹסִיף עוֹד      καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ οὐκέτι προστεθήσεται  
שְׂאֵר יִשְׂרָאֵל וּפְלִיטַת בֵּית־יַעֲקֹב      τὸ καταλειφθῆν Ἰσραηλ καὶ οἱ σωθέντες τοῦ Ἰακωβ  
לְהִשָּׁעַן עַל־מִכְהוֹ      οὐκέτι μὴ πεποιθότες ὧσιν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀδικήσαντας αὐτούς  
וְנִשְׁעַן עַל־יְהוָה קְדוֹשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּאֱמֶת:      ἀλλὰ ἔσονται πεποιθότες ἐπὶ τὸν θεὸν τὸν ἅγιον τοῦ Ἰσραηλ τῇ ἀληθείᾳ

MT: And it shall come to pass in that day, the remnant of Israel and the escaped of **the house of** Jacob shall no more continue to lean on the one who smote him, but they shall lean on YHWH the Holy One of Israel, in truth.

LXX: And it shall come to pass in that day, the remnant of Israel shall be no more added to, and the saved of Jacob shall **no more** trust in those who did wrong to them, but they shall trust in the God the Holy One of Israel, with truth.

1QIs<sup>a</sup>: ונשען אל־יהוה instead of יעקב.<sup>2</sup> It has אל for על thus "... ונשען אל־יהוה".

In two other cases (30:12; 31:1), the verb שֶׁעַן comes with עַל in 1QIs<sup>a</sup> as well as MT so the present אֵל in Qumran seems to be caused by a possible mistake. LXX rendered those three cases consistently using πεποιθότες ἐπί. LXX has no equivalent for the Hebrew בֵּית. "The remnant of Israel" seems more suitably paired with "the saved of Jacob" of the LXX than with "the escaped of the house of Jacob" of the MT. So the translator is likely to have omitted "house" in keeping with his succinct Greek style, rather than in order to retain a strict parallelism. If he had wanted to maintain parallelism, he would have written οἱ σωθέντες Ἰακωβ.<sup>3</sup>

Contrary to the MT which has one לֹא־עוֹד, the LXX has two; οὐκέτι and οὐκέτι μῆ. This seems to be due to the translator's different understanding of the MT. The verse in the MT consists of two main verbs: לֹא יוֹסִיף ... לְהִשָּׁעַן. But in the LXX, the verbal

---

<sup>2</sup> This orthography of the name is consistent in 1QIs<sup>a</sup> (41 occurrences). The so-called "Scriptio Plena" using *waw* or *yod*, is a conspicuous and consistent technique throughout the scroll.

<sup>3</sup> The translation of בֵּית יַעֲקֹב in 2:5-6 shows a good example of parallelism being maintained: it was translated as ὁ οἶκος τοῦ Ἰακωβ (2:5), τὸν οἶκον τοῦ Ἰσραηλ (2:6). It seems that the translator inconsistently used the definite article for translating בֵּית יַעֲקֹב: ὁ οἶκος Ἰακωβ (8:14; 48:1), ὁ οἶκος τοῦ Ἰακωβ (2:5; 10:20-without οἶκος), τὸν οἶκον τοῦ Ἰσραηλ (2:6). Like MT-Is 10:20, Psalm 114:1 (LXX 113:1) has the same parallelism: "Israel" and "the house of Jacob", which was translated with no change in LXX.

structure has been changed: οὐκέτι προστεθήσεται (future indicative 3<sup>rd</sup> singular), οὐκέτι μὴ πεποιθότες ὄσιν (present subjunctive 3<sup>rd</sup> plural), ἔσονται πεποιθότες (future indicative 3<sup>rd</sup> plural). That is, by changing the infinitive, which should have been read together with the preceding לֹא יִסֵּיךָ, into a finite subjunctive verb plus participle, the translator may need one more οὐκέτι μὴ for a smooth understanding. The technique in which the Qal or Hiphil form of יָסַי with an infinitive verb (“continue, proceed + to ... or ... again”) is translated as ‘προστίθημι+ infinitive’ is a very literal rendering of the Semitic idiom.<sup>4</sup> This technique of translation of the Hebrew phrase is strictly observed throughout the LXX.<sup>5</sup> In cases where the mechanical translation is not kept, at least, the same meaning is necessarily reflected.<sup>6</sup> This situation applies to LXX-Is, too.<sup>7</sup> Therefore, it is unlikely that this use in LXX-Is 10:20 results from either misunderstanding or ignorance of the verb.<sup>8</sup> But the meaning of this verse including this peculiar usage of the verb should be considered within the context of LXX-Is

<sup>4</sup> ‘προστίθημι+ infinitive’ phrase is used only five times in the Greek ‘deutero-canonical’ books: Tob 14:2; 1Mac 9:1,72; 10:88; Sirach 18:5.

<sup>5</sup> Among the translations outside Isaiah, the Hiphil form of יָסַי is mainly rendered by the Greek verb προστίθημι in the active or passive. Examples used in the active (altogether 48 times): Pentateuch (15 times); Joshua-2Kings (12 times); 1Ch-Esther (5 times); Psalms (3 times); Jeremiah-Malachi (12 times). Examples in passive (altogether 35 times): Pentateuch (10 times); Joshua-2Kings (16 times); elsewhere (9 times). Qal form of יָסַי is also rendered in active or passive form of προστίθημι; examples in active: Nu 32:15; Lev 26:18; Deut 20:8; Judg 8:28, 13:21; examples in passive: Gen 8:12, 38:26; Deut 5:25; 1Sam 7:13, 15:35, 27:4; 2Sam 2:28; 2Kings 6:23. When we use statistics of word use, we should be aware the note of J. Barr: “Note that statistics of word use ... , especially when involving largish numbers, are approximate rather than exact: there are often differences between manuscripts and other factors”, though these do not make “much difference to the actual argument”. See J.Barr, “Did the Greek Pentateuch really serve as a dictionary” in M.F.J. Baasten and W.Th. van Peursen (eds.), *Hamlet on a Hill: Semitic and Greek Studies Presented to Professor T. Muraoka on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (Peeters: Leuven, 2003), 527.

<sup>6</sup> Gen 8:10, 37:5; Ex 10:29; Nu 22:26; 1Sam 3:6; 2Sam 2:22, 3:34; Is 24:20; Jer 38:12 (MT 31:12).

<sup>7</sup> 7:10, 8:5, 11:11, 23:12, 29:14, 47:1, 52:1. All of this usage of the verb יָסַי is strictly translated as προστίθημι + infinitive, excluding Is 24:20, in which הִקֵּי יָסִי־אֶל־ is rendered as οὐ μὴ δύναιται ἀναστῆναι quite suitably.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Ottley, 2:163. In connection with this, it seems worth considering 37:31 in LXX-Is. LXX-Is has ἔσονται instead of προσθήσει for הִסִּי in MT: “And those who were left *shall be* in Judea ...”. 19:30, which has the exactly same words in MT, in LXX-2Kings has προσθήσει for this, which may imply that the remnant shall be added. 1QIs<sup>a</sup> in Is 37:31 seems to read it as from “יָסִי”, so “the escapees of the house of Judah will gather ...”. This shows the difficulty of interpreting the first half of this verse which has only one verb הִסִּי. While modern English translations (*KJV*, *NRSV*, etc) generally interpret the verb in an adverbial sense (‘again’), it seems more suitable that the first half is a sentence which consists of subject, verb and object and that, therefore the verb means “add” (*BDB*, 414).

generally, which will be dealt with later.

What the LXX says in this verse is: the remnant of Israel shall be no more added to and they shall trust in God. In addition, the middle part expressed in the present subjunctive emphasizes that they shall never more trust in others (cf. 17:8).<sup>9</sup>

LXX-Is has “those who did wrong to them” instead of “the one who smote him” in the MT. According to the context, “the one” and “him” in the MT refer respectively to “Assyria” and “the remnant of Israel”, which are in many cases expressed by singular pronouns, though these should be considered, in fact, as plural in meaning, an understanding which seems also to be reflected in the LXX translation. What is notable is that the LXX expresses the attack of Assyria against them by the verb ἀδικέω. According to Seeligmann’s study on this verb in LXX-Is, the suffering of Israel’s being attacked and exiled is caused by the injustice of foreign countries, including Assyria.<sup>10</sup>

#### 2.1.2.2. 10:21

שָׂאֵר יָשׁוּב שְׂאֵר יַעֲקֹב אֶל-אֱלֹהֵי גְבוּרָה: καὶ ἔσται τὸ καταλειφθῆναι τοῦ Ἰακωβ ἐπὶ θεὸν ἰσχύοντα

MT: **The remnant**, the remnant of Jacob shall **return** to the Mighty God.

LXX: **And** the remnant of Jacob shall (trust) on the mighty God.

1QIs<sup>a</sup>=MT but יַעֲקֹב (see verse 10).

שָׂאֵר יָשׁוּב which does not appear in LXX-Is might have been omitted in the translator’s *Vorlage* because of parablepsis.

The LXX begins this verse with καὶ ἔσται. As we saw in the above, it seems that the *Vorlage* had שְׂאֵר יַעֲקֹב as the beginning phrase of this verse. Thus, the translator could understand this verse which lacked a verb as connected with the verbal frame of the previous verse, that is, ἔσσονται πεποιθότες ἐπὶ ~.<sup>11</sup> Presumably καὶ ἔσται was added for

---

<sup>9</sup> The construction of οὐ μὴ with the subjunctive can denote an emphatic denial. H.W. Smyth, *Greek Grammar* (rev. Gordon M. Messing; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1984), §1804; cf. Ottley, 1:37.

<sup>10</sup> Seeligmann, 280-1. He rightly points out that this interpretation of the LXX concerning the diaspora (cf. 3Mac 6:3; Is 23:12) was distinguished from the classic prophetic views which regarded it as God’s punishment; cf. Baer, *When We*, 28 n. 3

<sup>11</sup> Moisés Silva rendered this verse literally: "And what remains of Iakob will be to the mighty God", as Ottley, 2:163, does. See his translation of LXX-Is in *NETS*.

this reason.

For the reason we have seen above, the preposition לַ was translated as ἐπί, which was usually used for על.

### 2.1.2.3. 10:22

כִּי אִם־יִהְיֶה עַמֶּךָ יִשְׂרָאֵל כְּחֹל הַיָּם      καὶ ἂν γένηται ὁ λαὸς Ἰσραηλ ὡς ἡ ἄμμος τῆς θαλάσσης  
שָׂאֵר יָשׁוּב בָּ      τὸ κατάλειμμα σωθήσεται

כְּלִיֹּן קְרוּן שׁוֹטֵף צָדָקָה:      λόγον γὰρ συντελών καὶ συντέμων ἐν δικαιοσύνη

MT: For though **your** people Israel will be like the sand of the sea, the remnant **among them** will return. Destruction is determined, righteousness **is overflowing**.

LXX: And though the people of Israel become like the sand of the sea, the remnant will be saved. **For** He finishes and cuts short **the reckoning**<sup>12</sup> in righteousness,

1QIs<sup>a</sup> =MT but כִּי for כִּי.<sup>13</sup>

Instead of “your people Israel” in the MT, LXX-Is has just “the people of Israel”.

“You” in the MT seems to indicate the prophet on many occasions. There appear phrases in which prophets call the people of Israel “my people” (Is 3:12, 22:4, 26:20, 32:13,18, 53:8 and especially in Jeremiah). In these examples, prophets identify themselves with God, that is, prophets say something as if they were speaking on behalf of God himself. Therefore, God calling Israel “your (the prophet’s) people” has a common thread with God calling them “my people”. It seems that the translator distinguished “the people of Israel” from the remnant. In v.24, God addresses the people in Zion, calling them “my people” and they are told not to be afraid. From this, we can naturally infer that “my people” refers to “the remnant” and so does “your people”. Presumably for this reason, the translator omits the genitive pronoun σου. Though the people of Israel should suffer afflictions, his people among them (i.e. the remnant), not all of them, will be saved. And in here, we can also understand why the

---

<sup>12</sup> Cf. *NETS*.

<sup>13</sup> The appending of ‘Aleph’ to כִּי is one of the orthographic characteristics of Qumran scrolls: e.g. 1:2,20; 8:4; 35:6; 55:10; 65:6. But less frequently כִּי appears, too, including in the following two verses (5:7; 11:23,25; 22:1,9,13,16; 26:3,4,5; 33:5, etc). It might show this scroll was copied by at least two different copyists.

LXX omits “among them”. It is because “the remnant” already includes the meaning “among them” in it. The translator simplifies the sentence by omitting unnecessary words, a typical tendency found throughout LXX-Is.<sup>14</sup>

The LXX inserts γάρ between the first half and the second.<sup>15</sup> This word was added by the translator to explain the correlation between the two halves, so can be called “explanatory γάρ”, which may be considered a technique of the translator.

Λόγον seems to be also added in the LXX.<sup>16</sup> Some scholars, including Fischer, thought it was from מלה or מליין,<sup>17</sup> instead of כלה or כליין. As we find from Qumran scrolls, sometimes it is hard to distinguish מ from כ. Admitting the possibility of misreading like this, we need to have a look at other related passages:

10:22	כליין חרוץ	λόγον ... συντελών και συντέμων
10:23	כלה ונחרצה	λόγον συντετμημένον
28:22	כלה ונחרצה	διότι συντετελεσμένα και συντετμημένα πράγματα
cf. Dan 5:27		συντέμνεται και συντετέλεσται (no equivalent in MT)
Dan 11:36	עד-כלה ... נחרצה	ἕως ἂν συντελεσθῆ ... συντέλεια

10:23 seems to support Fischer’s view that λόγον came from מלה or מליין but 28:22 indicates otherwise: in 10:23 and 28:22 the Hebrew phrases are identical and 10:22, basically, has the same words. When we take account of the fact that the verb חרוץ is always used with כלה in Isaiah (10:22, 23, 28:22), it seems unlikely that the translator misread כלה or כליין as מלה or מליין. 11:36 in LXX-Daniel shows כלה and נחרצה are closely connected. And, though there is no equivalent in MT, 5:27 in LXX-Daniel shows that the very phrase consisting of two Greek verbs (συντέλω and συντέμνω) may have become a sort of idiom, indicating God’s rapid and determined action, as the equivalent

<sup>14</sup> On the tendency, see also van der Kooij, *Oracle of Tyre*, 9.

<sup>15</sup> This particle was used 184 times in LXX-Is, which is remarkably frequent comparing with the frequency in LXX-Jer (2), LXX-Ez (3) or 12 Prophets of LXX (4). Over half of the occurrences in Isaiah (93 times) were added without any equivalent Hebrew words. Other statistics showing the significance of this word, see Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 92.

<sup>16</sup> Ottley, 2:163: “otiose noun”.

<sup>17</sup> J. Fischer, *In welcher Schrift lag das Buch Isaias den LXX vor?* (Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1930), 26-27; Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 283-285.



if not, he changes the expression into a more specific, clear and concrete one.<sup>23</sup> Therefore, it is likely that “overflowing of righteousness” in this verse is translated simply as “in righteousness”.

יָשׁוּב appears as σωθήσεται. Though we cannot definitely exclude a slim possibility that the translator misread יָשׁוּב as יִשְׁע or the Vorlage could have יִשְׁע, it seems much more plausible that the translator used it to convey his theological view.<sup>24</sup> This suggestion is confirmed by another example in 52:8, in which LXX-Is has “when the Lord shall have mercy on Zion ἃν ἐλέησῃ κύριος τὴν Σιων” instead of “when YHWH shall return to Zion צִיּוֹן יְהוָה בְּשׁוּב”. In this verse, LXX-Is changed “return” into “have mercy on”, which should be regarded as the interpretation of the translator concerning the meaning of “the Lord’s return to Zion”.<sup>25</sup>

#### 2.1.2.4. 10:23

כִּי כִלָּה וְנִחַרְצָה      ὅτι λόγον συντεταμημένον  
 אֲדַנִּי יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת עֲשֵׂה בְקִרְבִּי כָּל־הָאָרֶץ:      ποιήσει ὁ θεὸς ἐν τῇ οἰκουμένῃ ὅλη

MT: For **the Lord YHWH of hosts** will make **a full end**, as determined, in the midst of all the earth.

LXX: For God will make a shortened **reckoning** in the whole world.

1QIs<sup>a</sup>: אֲדוּנִי for אֲדַנִּי<sup>26</sup>; עוֹשֵׂה for עֲשֵׂה<sup>27</sup>, elsewhere the same with MT. Qumran Isaiah scroll tends to prefer the “Scriptio Plena” in many words.

4QIs<sup>c</sup>: עוֹשֵׂה for עֲשֵׂה.

In the Greek Bible, יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת is rendered generally as κύριος παντοκράτωρ or

<sup>23</sup> For example, the rock of Israel – God of Israel (30:29), the descent of his arm – the anger of his arms (30:30), “the hand of YHWH, which he is waving against it” – “the hands of the Lord, which he shall lay on them” (19:16), etc.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. Rom 9:27. But Ottley, 2:163, concludes this that “σωθήσεται explains ‘shall return’”, which is a meaningless, circular conclusion, for he understands a Septuagintal verse with the meaning of a Hebrew verse. The meaning of the Greek term should be understood within the context of LXX. Similarly, Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 123, suggests that this σωθήσεται expands the semantics of יָשׁוּב. But it should be noted that LXX omits the concept of “return”, which is evident in MT. See below.

<sup>25</sup> This kind of theological translation can be also found in 14:32: “For the Lord has founded Zion and by him the poor of the people *shall be saved* (σωθήσονται for יִהְיוּ ‘shall find refuge’ in MT)”.

<sup>26</sup> E.g. 3:17,18; 29:13; 36:8,9,12; 40:10; 56:8; 65:15. In 6:11; 7:14; 8:7; 9:7; 21:16; 28:16, 1QIs<sup>a</sup> has יְהוָה for אֲדַנִּי in MT. In some cases, this Qumran scroll writes אֲדַנִּי as the Qere over the Kethib יהוה: 3:15; 8:7; 28:16; 65:13, etc.

<sup>27</sup> 5:5; 17:7; 22:11; 29:16; 43:19, etc.

κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων but LXX-Is peculiarly transliterates it as κύριος σαβαωθ.<sup>28</sup> For example, צבאות appears 82 times in MT-Jer but σαβαωθ is used only once for that word (MT-Jer 46:10 = LXX-Jer 26:10). It means the transliteration of the Hebrew word could surely be considered a characteristic of the translator of LXX-Is. Of 61 occurrences of יהוה צבאות in MT-Is, σαβαωθ is used 48 times.<sup>29</sup> And even where there is no צבאות, σαβαωθ appears five times.<sup>30</sup> When we consider all these, even though the Hebrew word is not reflected at all in some places,<sup>31</sup> it seems quite probable that the phrase ὁ θεός in the present verse of LXX-Is came from the Vorlage, that is, the Vorlage might not have had יהוה צבאות but only יהוה.<sup>32</sup>

This verse has also λόγον, to which the passive participle of συντέμνω refers. We can see it as being likewise added to clarify the verb.

כל הארץ בקרב is translated just ἐν τῇ οἰκουμένη ὅλη. LXX renders בקרב according to the context, so ἐπι (5:8; 6:12; 7:22), ἐν (10:23; 19:24; 24:13), ἐν μεσῶ (5:25).<sup>33</sup> Ἡ οἰκουμένη means the inhabited world, which is the place where peoples, nations and kingdoms reside (14:26; 23:17; 34:1; 37:16; 62:4), and which can be desolate because of God's judgment against sin (13:5,9; 14:17, 24:1, 37:18). God's purpose is upon this (14:26). As 10:23 also tells of God's purpose and action against the world, the translator's choice of this Greek word instead of the more general γῆ or χώρα for Hebrew ארץ is quite suitable.

<sup>28</sup> Of 63 occurrences in the whole Greek Bible, it appears 53 times in LXX-Is.

<sup>29</sup> 42 times in chapters 1-39; 6 times in chapters 40-66.

<sup>30</sup> 5:25; 7:7; 22:17; 23:11; 45:14.

<sup>31</sup> 3:15; 8:13; 9:12,18; 10:23,26; 14:23,27; 19:17,18,20; 22:14; 24:23; 31:5.

<sup>32</sup> The fact that יהוה צבאות in 44:6 was rendered θεός σαβαωθ could support this view. The apparatus in 10:23 of BHS mentions that there are 2 Hebrew manuscripts having only “ארני”, which, too, supports our suggestion. In some places in LXX-Is, ארני is translated as ὁ θεός (3:17, 9:16). Therefore it does not seem plausible that ὁ θεός cannot have been the original reading.

<sup>33</sup> On this semi-preposition, see R. Sollamo, *Renderings of Hebrew semiprepositions in the Septuagint* (Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1970), 235-248.

### 2.1.2.5. 10:24

לִכְן כִּה־אָמַר אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה צְבָאוֹת    διὰ τοῦτο τάδε λέγει κύριος σαβαωθ  
 אֶל־תִּירָא עַמִּי יִשָּׁב צִיּוֹן מֵאֲשׁוּר    μὴ φοβοῦ ὁ λαός μου οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐν Σιών ἀπὸ Ἀσσυρίων  
 בַּשִּׁבֵּט יִכָּכֶה    ὅτι ἐν ῥάβδῳ πατάξει σε  
 וּמִטְהוֹ יִשְׂאֵל־עֲלֶיךָ בְּדֶרֶךְ מִצְרָיִם:    πληγὴν γὰρ ἐγὼ ἐπάγω ἐπὶ σὲ τοῦ ἰδεῖν ὁδὸν Αἰγύπτου

MT: Therefore thus says the Lord **YHWH** of hosts, “Do not be afraid, my people who dwell (in) Zion, of Assyria. He shall smite you with the staff and he shall lift up **his** rod against you, as the manner of Egypt.

LXX: Therefore thus says the Lord Sabaoth, “Do not be afraid, my people who dwell **in** Zion, of Assyrians, **because** with a staff he shall smite you. Because I myself bring a blow upon you in order to see the way of Egypt.

1QIs<sup>a</sup>: אֲדֹנָי for אֲדֹנָי (see verse 23); יִשָּׁב for יִשָּׁב. It has מִשְׁבֵּט for בַּשִּׁבֵּט, which has no evidence in other versions and manuscripts. And it has וּמִטְהוֹ for וּמִטְהוֹ, while in 10:26 וּמִטְהוֹ appears in 1QIs<sup>a</sup>, too. Probably, ה could be omitted by writing error.

4QIs<sup>c</sup>: כֹּה for כִּה, which is regularly spelled as Scripto Plene in 4QIs<sup>a</sup>, too.<sup>34</sup>

In almost every place in MT-Is where אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה appears, LXX-Is has just κύριος<sup>35</sup> or θεός in a few cases,<sup>36</sup> while 1QIs<sup>a</sup> has two readings: אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה<sup>37</sup> and simply יְהוִה.<sup>38</sup>

There is no equivalent to ὅτι in the Masoretic version. This word connects ἀπὸ Ἀσσυρίων (“of Assyria”) with ἐν ῥάβδῳ πατάξει σε (“with a staff he shall smite you”), while, in the MT, the latter (בַּשִּׁבֵּט יִכָּכֶה, “with the staff he shall smite you”) begins the second half of the verse and is connected with v.24bβ (“and he shall lift his rod upon ...”). By this added ὅτι, the structure of the present verse was significantly changed, which will be dealt with later. It is also worthwhile to note that the LXX has ἐγὼ in the second half. It goes without saying that the insertion of a personal pronoun as a subject denotes a special emphasis. Though some manuscripts do not have this pronoun,<sup>39</sup> most LXX manuscripts have ἐπάγω (אֲשָׁא)<sup>40</sup> instead of יִשָּׁא of MT. This change might have come from a Vorlage having אֲשָׁא, but the combination of ἐγὼ and ἐπάγω seems to

<sup>34</sup> E. Ulrich, F.M. Cross, R.E. Fuller, J.E. Sanderson, P.W. Skehan and E. Tov, *Qumran Cave 4* (DJD XV; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 46.

<sup>35</sup> 7:7; 22:5,12,15; 28:16,22; 30:15; 40:10; 48:16; 49:22; 50:4,5,9; 52:4; 56:8; 61:1,11; 65:15. These two words of the MT-Is are ignored in 3:15 and 22:14 of the LXX-Is.

<sup>36</sup> See verse 23.

<sup>37</sup> 7:7; 10:23,24; 22:12,14,15; 25:8; 40:10; 48:16; 50:4,9.

<sup>38</sup> 3:15; 28:16,22; 30:15; 50:5; 52:4; 61:1,11; 65:13.

<sup>39</sup> A, O, C, etc.: ‘hebraising tendency’.

<sup>40</sup> Or אֲבִיא, as Ottley, 2:164, suggests.

suggest an intentional change of the translator. At least, the present text on its own shows how the Greek verse would be understood by contemporary Jews.

One of the most basic and essential differences between the MT and the LXX is where the second half of the verse starts. The added element ὅτι shows that the translator understood v.24bα in the MT as the phrase which modifies ἀπὸ Ἀσσυρίων (מַאֲשׁוּר). Therefore, while the MT starts the second half of the verse from “with the staff ~”, the LXX starts from וּמַטְהוֹ ~, that is, πληγῆν γὰρ ~. In connection with this, it is notable that the LXX interprets the copulative וְ in וּמַטְהוֹ as γὰρ, which definitely came from the translator. For the translator the second half seemed to give the reason why God said not to be afraid. Another important change of this verse in LXX-Is concerns the subject of the second half: the subject of the MT is an Assyrian king (אֲשׁוּרִי), but that of the LXX is God Himself (ἐπάγω).

The insertion of ἐγω, which has no equivalent in the MT, makes us consider this change of the verb intentional. After all, it is highly probable that the translator wanted to say by these changes that it was God Himself who had brought about the present situation. We cannot discern how the omission of a third person- pronominal suffix in וּמַטְהוֹ could have happened. It may have been left out unintentionally or it may be from a different Vorlage. Presumably, deliberate omission is possible because the third person pronominal suffix does not fit with ἐγω or ἐπάγω. Be that as it may, it seems clear that this omission as it stands tends to emphasize the action of God: even a staff which was stretched toward Israel was God’s staff, not an Assyrian king’s!

We can see another prominent interpretation of the translator in the final clause of the present verse: τοῦ ἰδεῖν ὁδὸν Αἰγύπτου. It is quite clear what the second half in this verse of the MT means: An Assyrian king shall attack and oppress Israel, as the Egyptians did when the Israelites stayed in Egypt. So the final clause, בְּדֶרֶךְ מִצְרַיִם

means “after the manner of Egypt” (*KJV*), substantially “as the Egyptians did” (*RSV*).<sup>41</sup> It refers to what happened in Egypt. But the translator seems to understand it differently:

Is 10:24	בדרך מצרים	τοῦ ἰδεῖν ὁδόν Αἰγύπτου
Is 10:26	בדרך מצרים	εἰς τὴν ὁδόν τῆς κατ’ Αἴγυπτον
Am 4:10	בדרך מצרים	ἐν ὁδῷ Αἰγύπτου

The Hebrew preposition כִּי can be used to denote “according to (a model)” in examples such as Gen 1:26; 5:1,3; Ex 25:40, including these three verses above.<sup>42</sup> In these, translators of the Septuagint rendered the preposition as κατά, instead of a literal rendering ἐν. However, among the examples which belong to the same category, these three above show a different translation. In addition to this, the Hebrew word כִּי means “manner, custom, way” in some cases (Gen 19:31, 31:35, Is 10:24,26, Am 4:10).<sup>43</sup> In Gen 19:31 and 31:35, the LXX reflects this meaning of each verse suitably.<sup>44</sup> Furthermore, εἰς τὴν ὁδόν τῆς κατ’ Αἴγυπτον in 10:26 for the same Hebrew phrase בדרך מצרים indicates how the translator understood this phrase. Taking the above usages into account, the following conclusion seems clear: What is in common with Is 10:24 and 10:26<sup>45</sup> is that the translation of these verses understood the Hebrew phrase merely geographically.<sup>46</sup> 10:26 in LXX clarifies further this geographical reading, so it seems that the translator specifies “the way of Egypt” in 10:24: “the way downward to

---

<sup>41</sup> ‘as did the Egyptians’ (*JPS*); Many commentaries have the same or similar translations: ‘according to the manner of Egypt’ (Cheyne; Wildberger; Gray; Oswalt), ‘as the Egyptians did’ (Blenkinsopp; Childs; Jensen; Kaiser; Sawyer). Only Watts, *Isaiah 1-33*, 157, understands this phrase geographically, following LXX: “in the Way of Egypt”.

<sup>42</sup> *BDB*, 90.

<sup>43</sup> *BDB*, 203.

<sup>44</sup> Gen 19:31 כִּי-הֵאָרֵץ → ὡς καθήκει πάση τῇ γῆ; Gen 31:35 כִּי-דָרַךְ נָשִׁים → ὅτι τὸ κατ’ ἔθισμόν τῶν γυναικῶν.

<sup>45</sup> Amos 4:10 could also be included in this category, just as in LXX-Is 8:23, but I exclude this verse because it has a possibility of being rendered literally.

<sup>46</sup> Compare ὁδόν θαλάσσης of 8:23 in LXX-Is understood geographically. But Ekblad, 224f, sees 10:24 as denoting ‘way of life’ and 10:26 as a physical road.

Egypt”.<sup>47</sup>

2.1.2.6. 10:25

כִּי־עוֹד מְעַט מִזַּעַר זְעִי גָאֵר מִיִּכְרוֹן

וְכִלְיָהּ זָעַם וְאִפִּי עַל־תְּהַלְיָתָם: καὶ παύσεται ἡ ὀργή ὁ δὲ θυμὸς μου ἐπὶ τὴν βουλήν αὐτῶν

MT: For yet a **very** little while, and indignation shall cease and my anger shall be towards their destruction.

LXX: Because yet a little while and the wrath shall cease, but my anger shall be against their counsel.

1QIs<sup>a</sup>=MT.

The LXX rendered מְעַט מִזַּעַר as simply μικρόν (cf. 29:17), an abbreviating technique which can be seen throughout LXX-Is.

תְּהַלְיָהּ is a hapax legomena.<sup>48</sup> Some Hebrew manuscripts have תְּהַלְיָהּ (‘end, completeness’).<sup>49</sup> The uncertainty over the meaning may have caused the translator to change it into ‘βούλη’, which sounds similar to the difficult Hebrew word.<sup>50</sup> At the same time human ‘council’ is understood negatively throughout LXX-Is,<sup>51</sup> being clearly contrasted with God’s counsel.<sup>52</sup>

2.1.2.7. 10:26

וְעוֹרֵר עָלָיו יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת שׁוֹט καὶ ἐπεγερεῖ ὁ θεὸς ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς

כְּמַכַּת מִדָּוָן בְּצוֹר עוֹרֵב κατὰ τὴν πληγὴν τὴν Μαδιαμ ἐν τόπῳ θλίψεως

וּמִשְׁהוֹ עַל־הֵם וְנִשְׂאוּ καὶ ὁ θυμὸς αὐτοῦ τῆ ὁδῶ τῆ κατὰ θάλασσαν

בְּדַרְךְ מִצְרַיִם: εἰς τὴν ὁδὸν τὴν κατ’ Αἴγυπτου

<sup>47</sup> cf. van der Kooij, “Servant”, 390-1.

<sup>48</sup> On this Hebrew word and its translation, see D. Barthélemy, *Critique Textuelle de L’ancien Testament. 2. Isaïe, Jérémie, Lamentatikon*s (OBO 50/2; Fribourg: Éditions Universitaires/ Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986), 75-77.

<sup>49</sup> Or different division is suggested: יָהֵם (or תְּהַלְיָהּ) אִפִּי עַל־תְּהַלְיָהּ (‘my wrath over the whole earth comes to an end’ or ‘my wrath shall be utterly completed’). See Kaiser; Oswalt; Wildberger against Gray; Blenkinsopp.

<sup>50</sup> This translation technique can be called ‘Homeophony’. According to Caird, “For the most part homeophony appears to have been a brave and often ingenious attempt to make plausible sense of an otherwise unintelligible text”. G.B. Caird, “Homeophony in the Septuagint”, in W. D. Davies, R. Hamerton-Kelly and R. Scroggs (eds.), *Jews, Greeks and Christians: Religious Cultures in Late Antiquity. Essays in honour of William David Davies* (Leiden: Brill, 1976), 88; cf. James Barr is sceptical about the existence of this ‘Homeophony’ translation. See J. Barr, “Doubts about Homoeophony in the Setpuagint”, *Textus* 12 (1985), 1-77.

<sup>51</sup> 3:9; 7:5,7; 8:10; 10:25; 19:3,11; 28:8; 29:15; 30:1; 31:6; 32:7; 36:5; 44:25; 47:13; 55:7.

<sup>52</sup> 4:2; 5:19; 9:6; 11:2; 14:26; 19:17; 25:1,7; 46:10; 55:8. According to 9:6 in LXX-Is, the name of a child to save Israel is “A messenger of Great Council μεγάλης βουλῆς ἄγγελος”. On the significance of βούλη in LXX-Is, see van der Kooij, “Theologie des Jesajabuches”,<sup>16</sup>; Schaper, “Messianic Intertextuality”, 374f; Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 267f.

MT: And YHWH **of hosts** shall wield **a scourge** against him as a blow of Midian at the rock of Oreb, and his rod shall be upon the sea **and he shall lift it** as the manner of Egypt.

LXX: And God shall rise up against them according to the blow of Midian in the place of affliction, and his anger shall be **by the way** down to the sea, to the way down to Egypt.

1QIs<sup>a</sup>=MT except ויעיר as Hiphil of the verb for ויעיר as Polel.<sup>53</sup>

This verse is one of a few passages which have no equivalent of the Hebrew word **צבאות**.<sup>54</sup> As we saw in the above, the Vorlage probably had no **צבאות**. **שׁוֹט** is used 11 times throughout the whole OT<sup>55</sup> and it is rendered by translators of the LXX as μάστιξ, excluding Job 9:23 and all of three Isaianic passages. In LXX-Is 28:15 and 28:18, this Hebrew word is translated as καταγίς. This could come from an intentional omission out of ignorance or the translator might have decided that the meaning was included in the following πληγή.

The LXX has nothing which matches **נשאו**. It is probable that the translation of **נשאו** as θυμός αὐτοῦ, as we will see shortly below, leads the translator to omit **נשאו**. Perhaps it could be neatly rendered implicitly in the preposition εἰς. Τῇ ὁδοῦ τῇ κατὰ θάλασσαν in the LXX seems to render **על דרך הים**. **דרך** could have been in the Vorlage as Ziegler speculated from 8:23<sup>56</sup> or it could be inserted by the translator who was aware of 8:23.

The translator writes αὐτούς instead of the singular pronoun in the MT. It matches well the previous third personal plural pronoun αὐτῶν in the end of verse 25.

**בצור עורב** reminds us of the event that happened in the time of Gideon (Judg 7:25). This specific information must have been very difficult for the translator and the contemporary community to understand. Perhaps the translator regarded **בצור** as **בצר**

---

<sup>53</sup> Interestingly, 1QIs<sup>a</sup> writes **יעיר** of MT as **ויעיר** twice in 50:4.

<sup>54</sup> See v. 23 in the above.

<sup>55</sup> 1Ki 12:11,14=2Ch 10:11,14; Job 5:21, 9:23; Pr 26 :3 ; Is 10 :26, 28:15,18; Na 3:2.

<sup>56</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 64.

and עֹרֵב as something from ערב IV ('be arid or sterile').<sup>57</sup> From this we may infer the Greek phrase ἐν τόπῳ θλίψεως.<sup>58</sup> Or, the present Greek phrase may come from paraphrasing due to the difficulty in understanding עֹרֵב.

The noun מַטֵּה appears 8 times in Isaiah but the translator of Isaiah rendered it variously: the basic meaning 'rod' is reflected three times as ῥάβδος (9:3, 10:15, 28:27), but in the rest of the occurrences it is rendered with concrete meanings which the contexts need,<sup>59</sup> which seems consistent with the general technique of the translator. In this verse, too, θυμός arises from the contextual translation technique of the translator.<sup>60</sup>

As we saw above, מַצְרִים דֶּרֶךְ in 10:24 and 26 denotes a geographical road. In v.26, two paragraphs in the MT are incorporated into one in the LXX with some addition and omission: ὁ θυμός αὐτοῦ τῆ ὁδῶ τῆ κατὰ θάλασσαν εἰς τὴν ὁδὸν τὴν κατ' Αἴγυπτον. Now this phrase refers very clearly to a particular road: *Via Maris*.

#### 2.1.2.8. 10:27

וְהָיָה בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא	καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ
וְסֹר סִבְלוֹ מֵעַל שִׁכְמוֹךָ	ἀφαιρεθήσεται ὁ φόβος αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ σοῦ
וְעֵלֹ מֵעַל צְוֵארֶךָ	καὶ ὁ ζυγὸς αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὤμου σου
וְחָבַל עַל מַפְנֵי-שִׁמּוֹן	καὶ καταφθαρήσεται ὁ ζυγὸς ἀπὸ τῶν ὤμων ὑμῶν

MT: And it shall come to pass in that day, his burden shall be removed from your shoulder and his yoke from your neck, and a yoke shall be broken because of oil.

LXX: And it shall be in that day, his fear shall be removed from you and his yoke from your shoulder, and the yoke shall be destroyed from your shoulders.

1QIs<sup>a</sup>: עול for על in our fourth line. Elsewhere it is identical with MT.

4QIs<sup>c</sup>: it does not have והוא; Yodh is inserted in the right above of סור, which seems to be done by the copyist; סבולו for סבולו.

<sup>57</sup> BDB, 787. Among words derived from this root, עֹרֵב ('desert-plateau, steppe') and עֹרְבָה ('desert-plain, steppe') involve a location.

<sup>58</sup> On the injection of τόπος, see Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 116.

<sup>59</sup> 10:5 ὄργη, 10:24 πλῆγή, 14:5 ζυγόν. In 30:32, furthermore, the word seems to be rendered as ἐλίς. We can see the same situation for the word שִׁבְטָה, which is used together with מַטֵּה many times and seems to have an identical meaning. שִׁבְטָה is also rendered contextually: ῥάβδος (9:3, 10:5,24, 28:27), λόγος (11:4), ζυγόν (14:5,29), πλῆγή (30:31).

<sup>60</sup> Also Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 228 n. 117.

The translator matches סבלו with ὁ φόβος αὐτοῦ and מעל שכמך with ἀπὸ σοῦ, so when we reconstruct a possible Hebrew text according to the LXX, v.27aβ seems to be יסור פחדו מעליך. Fischer suggested that φόβος was a broken form of φόρος<sup>61</sup> which means ‘tribute, or paying tribute’. Considered with the expression in Gen 49:15 of the LXX,<sup>62</sup> his suggestion seems plausible but there is no textual evidence for this reading.<sup>63</sup> We already know the translator changes abstract and symbolic words into concrete and practical ones. In line with this method of translation, “rod” could represent sometimes “anger” or sometimes “plague”. In the same manner, the translator would render “burden” which Assyria had laid upon the Israelites as “fear” of Assyria. This change seems to naturally lead to the subsequent change of “from your shoulder” into “from you”. Presumably, this paraphrasing could also be understood as one of the techniques of the translator.<sup>64</sup>

The apparatus of the BHS suggests that יְחַבֵּל be changed into יְחַבֵּל and the Atnach of the present verse be moved under this, making the rest of the verse, with some changes,<sup>65</sup> connected with the following verses. But there is no supporting evidence. Most of all, the Septuagint and Qumran Isaiah Scrolls do not support this. Even though the Septuagint paraphrases a Hebrew text similar to the MT, it does not ignore the Hebrew text utterly. It is clear that the translator preserves the order, the structure, etc., as well as he can. The present Masoretic verse consists of an introductory formula, a sentence with a verb, a sentence without a verb, and a sentence with a verb, which is strictly maintained in the LXX. Moreover, the second “yoke” without “his” well attests

---

<sup>61</sup> Fischer, *Schrift*, 12; Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 16.

<sup>62</sup> ὑπεθηκεν τὸν ὄμωσιν αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ ποιεῖν (לְסַבֵּל) καὶ ἐγενήθη ἀνήρ γεωργός.

<sup>63</sup> The Greek word never appears in LXX-Is. Only in 46:1 of LXX, the similar word φορτίον (‘burden’) is used for מִשָּׂא.

<sup>64</sup> Cf. Ottley, 2:165: “there is nothing more than a looseness not uncommon in the LXX’s rendering”.

<sup>65</sup> על מפני־שמך → עלה מפני רמון (‘he arrived in front of Rimmon’).

that the Vorlage had just על not עלו (that is, two-letter word not three-letter),<sup>66</sup> which might have caused a confusion such as עֲלָה. Therefore, the Septuagint supports the traditional reading of the MT. Though we should be very careful when we use the Septuagint for textual criticism because of its free translation, there is still room for us to utilize the LXX for that purpose.

It is very difficult to know where “your shoulder” in the LXX came from, while the Masoretic text has “your neck צוֹאֲרֵךְ”. It could be from the Vorlage or it could be from the influence of שִׁכְמוֹךְ in the end of v.27aβ. Furthermore, the translator expands 27aγ (“his yoke from your shoulder”) into 27b with plural: “the yoke shall be destroyed from your (pl.) shoulders”. It does not seem plausible to trace it back from a change of שִׁמּוֹן into שִׁכְמוֹךְ.<sup>67</sup> As we saw in the change of צוֹאֲרֵךְ into ἀπὸ τοῦ ὤμου σου, it is likely that this was caused deliberately by the translator.

### 2.1.3. The Septuagintal text as it stands

In contrast to the previous section from 10:5 to 10:19, oracles towards Assyria, the present section from v.20 clearly shows that the main concern is changed into a speech towards Israel. It is uncertain whether v.27 in MT is connected with the previous section beginning from v.20 or with the following verses.<sup>68</sup> According to BHS, this verse is set out in stanzas so it is part of the following verses up to v.34. But in the Septuagint, this verse clearly belongs to the preceding verses. Firstly, it has no difficult phrase such as “because of the oil מִפְּנֵי-שִׁמּוֹן” and therefore, the content of this verse is

---

<sup>66</sup> Contrary to Blenkinsopp.

<sup>67</sup> But Ottley, 2:165, suggests the resemblance between שִׁמּוֹן and שִׁכְמוֹךְ, “more especially in some scripts near the time when the LXX was made”.

<sup>68</sup> Many commentators see the section as going up to v.27a, and the last phrase in v.27 מִפְּנֵי-שִׁמּוֹן begins a new verse, by changing into שִׁמְרוֹן (Childs; Gray; Wildberger), רִמּוֹן (Sawyer; Jensen), פְּנֵי יִשְׁמֹן (Watts), or blank (Blenkinsopp). For Sweeney, however, v. 26 is the last verse of the section.

definitely connected with the preceding ones. Secondly, “his fear ὁ φόβος αὐτοῦ” reminds us of v.24 “Do not be afraid μὴ φοβοῦ” so it makes v.27 a conclusion of the previous section. Therefore, in LXX-Is, vv.20-27 forms a section clearly distinguished from the previous and the following verses.

#### 2.1.3.1. Verses 20-21

Vv.20-21 is closely connected together. These verses consist of four sentences:

- The remnant of Israel shall be no more added to;
- The saved of Jacob shall no more trust in those who did wrong to them;
- They shall trust in God the Holy one of Israel with truth;
- The remnant of Jacob shall trust in the mighty God.

The first two are arrayed in chiasmic structure: Verb – Subject – Subject – Verb (A-B-B'-A') and they are negative sentences, while the last two are positive ones (A-A-B-B). Subjects in the first and last sentences are “the remnants”, and subjects in the second and the third ones are “the saved” (A-B-B-A). In addition, the first and the last sentences have singular verbs, but the second and the third plural verbs (A-B-B-A). The Septuagintal array in the first two is much more remarkable, considering that the first two are one sentence in the MT, in which we cannot find any conspicuous structure. All of these observations show that these two verses are inseparably connected, and are the result of deliberate literary and theological choices. As was dealt with earlier, שאר ישוב in v.21 could be omitted through parablepsis, but the verse as it stands clearly contributes to the well-connected structure of these two verses.

It does not seem clear what the first sentence with the verb προστίθῃμι means. The literal meaning ‘the remnant of Israel shall no more increase’ seems so awkward compared with other verses in LXX-Is, for example, 6:12 speaking of the increase of the

remnant, even though the nuance differs slightly.<sup>69</sup> Presumably, the context makes it more natural that the verb is being used as a kind of auxiliary verb meaning ‘again, repetition’, so “(they) shall not repeat (to trust ...)”. In this kind of usage, the verb should be used with *To-infinitive* as was seen in the above explanation of verse 20.<sup>70</sup> If the translator had done so, the text would follow the meaning of the MT. But he did not do so, and with this, including his making one sentence into two, we can see signs of deliberate intention on his part. Vv.20-21 in LXX has another significant verbal phrase: εἰμί + ποιηθέντες. The perfect participle form of ποιέω appears many times in LXX-Is.<sup>71</sup> Especially, the usage where this form is connected with the verb εἰμί is seen 17 times, while this usage is used only three times outside LXX-Is.<sup>72</sup> Therefore we can surely say that this usage is also one of the translation techniques of LXX-Is employed to reflect its own ideas.<sup>73</sup> What is important for the translator is whom they trust in, and this point becomes a crucial factor to evaluate and define the existence of the Diaspora in Egypt.

Finally, we can summarize in one sentence what this Septuagintal verse says: “The remnant shall trust only in the God of Israel”. While the present MT text has two equally significant verbs (שׁוּב, שׁעַן) and expresses the repentance of Israel, LXX-Is makes MT simple and demonstrates clearly that the primary agenda is in whom they

---

<sup>69</sup> καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα μακρυνεῖ ὁ θεὸς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ οἱ καταλειφθέντες πληθυνθήσονται ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς (“And after this God shall remove the men far away and the remnants shall be multiplied on the earth”). The translator rendered the Hebrew הַעֲזוּבִים as οἱ καταλειφθέντες. Even though the same expression is used to refer to the remnant positively, this Greek phrase in this verse could be understood to refer to ‘those who are left’ through judgment, according to the context. But Baer interprets this as a positive reference to the remnant in “About Us”, 36-38, which seems hard to agree with. The Greek verb and the phrase are used in positive sense in many verses, indeed. But there are still verses where they imply judgment, for example, 10:19 in LXX: καὶ οἱ καταλειφθέντες ἀπ’ αὐτῶν ἔσονται ἀριθμὸς καὶ παιδίον γράψει αὐτούς. Therefore, much caution is needed in dealing with the phrase, when he says “the negative and abstract concept of ‘abandonment’ has been supplanted by a positive, concrete, and plural concept with strong remnant connotations” (38).

<sup>70</sup> See 1.1.2.1.

<sup>71</sup> It appears 27 times in LXX-Is out of total 64 times throughout the Septuagint.

<sup>72</sup> 2Sa 22:3; Pr 3:5; Je 31:11 (MT 48 :11).

<sup>73</sup> Also see van der Kooij, “Isaiah in the Septuagint”, 525; cf. Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 269.

shall trust.

In addition, vv.20-21 tells that “the remnant of Israel” is identical to “the saved of Jacob”<sup>74</sup> and “the remnant of Jacob”. This relation can be seen again in v.22: “the remnant shall be saved”. In other words, the remnant is the saved. The rest of v.22 and v.23 only shows that the work of God shall be swift and determined for the remnant. Though the Masoretic text indicates the determined destruction, the translator changes it into God’s determination for the remnant.<sup>75</sup>

### 2.1.3.2. Verses 24-27

Now we expect what and how God will do His work for the people in the following vv.24-27. God addresses his people, and therefore they appear in the second personal pronoun up to v.27. The starting word is “Do not be afraid” (v.24) and one of the final sayings is “his fear shall be taken away” (v.27). There are two reasons, each introduced by γάρ, to explain why they do not have to be afraid. The first reason is that the blow the dwellers in Zion are struck will be caused by God Himself and that the purpose for this affliction is in order to see the way to Egypt (24). The subject of “τοῦ ἰδεῖν” could be God or “you” and according to the context, “you” would be more appropriate.<sup>76</sup> Now it is time to think about the meaning of the phrase “τοῦ ἰδεῖν ὁδὸν Αἰγύπτου”, which seems very important for understanding the present text of LXX-Is. In MT-Deut 17:16 God forbids Israel to go down to Egypt to get horses: “you shall never return that way (בְּדֶרֶךְ הַיָּם) again”. Furthermore, Deut 28:68 gives us “to see the way to Egypt”:

MT: And YHWH shall bring you back *in ships to Egypt by the way that I promised you that you should never see it again* (מִצְרַיִם בְּאֵנִיֹּת בְּדֶרֶךְ אֲשֶׁר אָמַרְתִּי ..

---

<sup>74</sup> In 4:2 of LXX-Is, “the saved of Israel פְּלִיטַת יִשְׂרָאֵל” is rendered by “the remnant of Israel τὸ καταλειφθέν τοῦ Ἰσραήλ”.

<sup>75</sup> Also Baer, “About Us”, 39-40.

<sup>76</sup> Sir Lancelot C.L. Brenton also translates the phrase as “that you may see the way of Egypt”. *The Septuagint with Apocrypha: Greek and English* (London: Samuel Bagster & Sons, 1851; repr., 3rd ed. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 1990). Seeligmann, 243, has the same translation: “... in order that you may see the way to Egypt”.

לֵךְ לְאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם; and you shall ...

LXX: And the Lord shall bring you back to *Egypt in ships and by the way of which I said, 'you shall not see it again'* (εἰς Αἴγυπτον ἐν πλοίοις καὶ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ἣν εἶπα οὐ προσθήσεσθε ἕτι ἰδεῖν αὐτήν); and you shall ...

What we clearly see in this verse of Deuteronomy is that ‘to see the way ... to Egypt’ means to go down to Egypt.<sup>77</sup> If it is right, we can apply this for v.24 in LXX-Is: God Himself will bring a blow upon you that you may go down to Egypt. While to go down to Egypt in Deuteronomy and elsewhere such as Ho 8:13, 9:3, is a punishment for apostate Israel, it indicates a promise of God’s guidance in LXX-Is. This matches the encouraging saying “Do not be afraid”, otherwise we would not be able to explain why God encourages Israel not to be afraid, and what function the added “γάρ” and “ἐγώ” have.<sup>78</sup>

The second reason not to fear is that this affliction shall not be for long, which seems to match v.22f, and that God’s anger shall be directed away from them to Assyria (25). V.26 elaborates the latter aspect of the second reason. According to this, God’s anger shall be on the way to Egypt for the protection of Israel who is going down to Egypt. On that day, the yoke which is on the shoulder of Israel shall be removed (27). Therefore, the affliction that Israel has to suffer is according to God’s will and Assyria’s attack on Israel shall cause Israel to see the way to Egypt, i.e. to go down to Egypt. Though Assyria shall oppress Israel, Israel shall see the way to Egypt because God’s anger will be on the way to Egypt to protect Israel. Finally, the yoke of Assyria shall be removed as Israel settles down in Egypt.

At the same time, vv.24-27 has some points of contact with the previous verses, vv.20-23. First of all, the starting formula of v.24 “therefore thus says the Lord

---

<sup>77</sup> In Ex 14:13, too, ‘to see the Egyptians’ refers to return to Egypt.

<sup>78</sup> Seeligmann, 242-44, also rightly suggested that 10:24 in LXX echoed “the idea of a Jewish emigration from Palestine to Egypt” but his suggestion should have been supplemented with full consideration of the Septuagintal text as it stands.

Sabaoth” connects vv.20-23 with vv.24-27. Secondly, the salvation oracle in vv. 20-23 matches “do not be afraid” saying in vv.24ff. Thirdly, the mention that God will do his work so swiftly and determinedly in v. 22f is reflected in v. 25.

If we can say the section vv.20-23 is about abstract principles, the other section 24-27 could be regarded as their concrete application in history. According to this, it is quite likely that the salvation of the remnant refers to their escape to Egypt. In other words, their refuge to Egypt is not humiliating defeat nor unfaithful betrayal towards YHWH, which can be seen in Jeremiah (Jer 2:18,36, 24:8-10, 42:10-22, 43:1-13, 44:1-30), but a plan from God Himself. In ancient times, the God who protected and led Israel out of Egypt shall lead them into Egypt under His protection. In MT, two instances of *בְּדֶרֶךְ מִרְצִיָּם* play an important role in indicating two contrasting functions of Egypt: the first means “as the Egyptians did” to refer to the oppression of Egypt and the second “as God did in Egypt” to refer to God’s action against Egypt. But in the Septuagint, by changing both into a geographical sense, the translator makes this section a proof-text for “*Eis-odos*” (*into* Egypt).

In connection with this, we should point out the translator’s rendering of *שׂאֵר יְשׁוּב*. This Hebrew phrase plays a very significant and symbolic role in MT-Is<sup>79</sup> but it is not the case in LXX-Is. The symbolic name is rendered as *ὁ καταλειφθεὶς Ἰασουβ* very oddly in 7:3, thus the meaning of “return” disappears and only the meaning of “remnant” survives, and is even omitted in 10:21. In 10:22, it is translated into *τὸ κατάλειμμα ... σωθήσεται*. That is, any implication of “returning” to Judah is totally eliminated, which is quite remarkable because “returning to God” is always clearly and literally translated in LXX-Is (19:22; 31:6; 44:22; 55:7). And “returning to their country” of the Assyrian

---

<sup>79</sup> See, for example, Blenkinsopp; Childs; especially Wildberger, etc.

army is also literally rendered (37:7,8,34,37, etc.).

Thus it is plausible to conclude that for the Jews in Egypt, God's salvation is not "returning to Judah" but "entering Egypt".

### 2.1.3.3. Historical implication: "Assyria" and the separation

This unique emphasis upon "entering Egypt" in our present Septuagint text hints at a certain historical situation. Mentioned earlier, the text encourages Israelites to leave Judah and to go down to Egypt, faced with the Assyrians' "staff", which God Himself will bring. What did that mean to the translator and his contemporary readers? It is time to think about "Assyria" in LXX-Is.

On this, Seeligmann indicated many similarities between the book of Daniel and Isaianic passages,<sup>80</sup> suggesting:

The Seleucid king Antiochus Epiphanes – who held himself king of Asia, Assyria and Babylon – when he conquered Jerusalem and became oppressors of the Jews, was identified with the ancient kings of Assyria and Babylon against whom classical prophecies were aimed.<sup>81</sup>

Among many examples to support his argument, he pointed out Is 14:19-20 as "the strongest argument".<sup>82</sup> In these verses speaking of the king of Babylon, it is prophesied about the king that

וְאַתָּה הַשְּׁלֵכֶת מִקְבְּרֶךָ...  
לֹא־תִחַד אִתָּם בַּקְּבוּרָה כִּי־אֲרָצֶךָ שַׁחַת עָמְךָ הִרְגִּיתָ לֹא־יִקְרָא לְעוֹלָם זֶרַע מְרַעִים

But the Septuagint has something very different:

σὺ δὲ ῥιφήσῃ ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν ...  
οὕτως οὐδὲ σὺ ἔσῃ καθαρὸς διότι τὴν γῆν μου ἀπόλεσας καὶ τὸν λαόν μου ἀπέκτεινας  
οὐ μὴ μείνῃς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα χρόνον σπέρμα πονηρόν

Seeligmann notes the similarity with 2 Mac 9:28, which says of Antiochus Epiphanes: ὁ μὲν οὖν ἀνδροφόνος καὶ βλάσφημος τὰ χεῖριστα παθῶν ὡς ἑτέρους διέθηκεν ἐπὶ ξένης ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν οἰκτίστῳ μὲν κατέστρεψεν τὸν βίον ("So the murderer and blasphemer, having endured the more intense suffering, such as he had inflicted on

<sup>80</sup> Seeligmann, 239-242.

<sup>81</sup> Seeligmann, 79.

<sup>82</sup> Seeligmann, 79-80 n.135.

others, came to the end of his life by a most pitiable fate, among the mountains in a strange land” *NRSV*). The phrase ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν indicates to Seeligmann that 14:19 in LXX-Is implies the death of Antiochus. Van der Kooij questions the connection between *2 Mac* and LXX-Is, because *2 Mac* is younger than LXX-Is, so he thinks *2 Mac* borrowed the expression from LXX-Is.<sup>83</sup> But this cannot explain how the rendering in LXX-Is happened. Troxel tries to explain the rendering in LXX-Is by attributing it to the translator’s “periphrastic style”.<sup>84</sup> However, the crux of the rendering is why ‘mountains’ appears, and Troxel passes it by simply mentioning “mountains are frequently designated as the scene of battle”.<sup>85</sup> Moreover, Troxel argues that there is no pathos concerning the death of a king as seen in *2Mac* 9:28, but the verse in LXX-Is portrays a common death like that of soldiers dead in the midst of war. However, 14:18-20 in LXX-Is does contrast the death of the king with other honourable deaths of kings. This is in accord with the expression οἰκτίστῳ μόρῳ in *2Mac* 9:28. 14:20 in LXX-Is gives the reason why the king had to face the miserable death: διότι τὴν γῆν μου ἀπώλεσας καὶ τὸν λαόν μου ἀπέκτεινας (“because you destroyed *my* land, and killed *my* people ...”), while MT has “... כִּי־אַרְצְךָ שָׁחַתָּ עַמְּךָ הָרַגְתָּ” (“because you destroyed *your* land, you slaughtered *your* people ...”). Troxel pays no attention to the changes of the two pronominal suffixes here. Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, 1QIs<sup>a</sup>, and Targum have the same reading with MT. The easiest way to explain this would be to attribute this to a variant, unattested in other witnesses. If it is not the case, then it seems that the translator changed them. If this is right, it is highly likely that the translator understood this verse as a reference to the death of Antiochus IV. At least, the contemporary

---

<sup>83</sup> *Textzeugen*, 40.

<sup>84</sup> Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 216f.

<sup>85</sup> Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 217.

readers would understand the given Greek text so. Therefore the death “in the mountains” may indicate a tradition concerning the death of Antiochus, preserved also in *2 Mac*.

According to LXX, the conquests of the Assyrian army seem the central event in explaining the existence of the Jewish Diaspora. This idea naturally leads us to think that the name ‘Assyrians’ should be understood symbolically.<sup>86</sup> Which empire can we imagine as big and powerful as Assyria? Two empires are possibilities: Persia<sup>87</sup> and the Hellenistic empires since Alexander the Great, especially, the Ptolemaic dynasty in Egypt and the Seleucid dynasty in Syria. According to 10:5f, Assyria (LXX: “Assyrians”) is the rod of God’s wrath. Since the Persian empire never acted as an invader or destroyer of Israel, ‘Assyrians’ cannot refer even symbolically to Persia. The Seleucid rulers would be a better candidate for the ‘Assyrians’ of LXX-Is.<sup>88</sup> The similarity between ‘Assyria’ Ἀσσοῦρ and ‘Syria Συρία’ provides another support for this.<sup>89</sup> In fact, it was Babylon that usually had symbolic value as a stereotyped description of a foreign, evil ruler against the Israelites or God’s people.<sup>90</sup> But examples are often found where ‘Assyria’ is used for that purpose (cf. Neh 9:32). Of note among them is Ezra 6:22:<sup>91</sup> “With joy they celebrated the festival of unleavened bread seven days; for the LORD had made them joyful, and had turned the heart of *the king of Assyria* to them, so that he aided them in the work on the house of God, the God of Israel” (NRSV: my italics). It

---

<sup>86</sup> Kaiser, *Isaiah 1-12*, 244: “Assyria has become a code name for world power”. For this, he gives instances such as 10:5ff; 14:24ff; 30:28ff; 31:4ff.

<sup>87</sup> Gray, *Isaiah I-XXVII*, 226, thinks it may refer to the Persian Empire.

<sup>88</sup> Kaiser, *Isaiah 13-39*, 109f, thinks even MT had the Seleucids in mind in this “Assyria”. Also Duhm; Marti; Procksch; Blenkinsopp. However, as Wildberger, *Isaiah 13-27*, 279, criticizes, there seems no adequate reason for this late dating for MT-Is.

<sup>89</sup> In Jer 35:11 (LXX 42:11), LXX has ἀπὸ προσώπου τῆς δυνάμεως τῶν Ἀσσυρίων (“because of the force of the Assyrians”) for מִפְּנֵי חֵיל אֲרָם (“because of the army of Aram”) of MT. The Septuagintal reading seems to come from a misreading the Greek “Syrians”, an equivalent of אֲרָם, as “Assyrians”. Similar errors are found in some manuscripts of Nu 24:22 and Is 17:3.

<sup>90</sup> Williamson, *Ezra, Nehemiah*, 85. He mentions 1 Pet 5:13; Rev 14:8; 18:2, etc, as examples.

<sup>91</sup> For the discussion of this verse, see Williamson, *Ezra, Nehemiah*, 85f.

must be that “the king of Assyria” indicates Darius, the king of Persia,<sup>92</sup> even though here his role is a benign one. This technique is well attested in the *Book of Judith*, where Nebuchadnezzar is depicted as the king of the Assyrians, with Nineveh as capital (Judith 1:1,11; 2:1; 4:1), and his general Holofernes appears as a general-in-chief of the Assyrian army (Judith 2:4; 5:1; 6:1). Through those anachronistic mentions of ‘Nebuchadnezzar’ and ‘Assyria’, this Book exhorts the contemporary readers to resist the enemies of their faith and freedom.<sup>93</sup> If the *Book of Judith* was written in the Maccabean period,<sup>94</sup> ‘Assyria’ in this book may be a cipher for Syria.

Therefore, with Seeligmann, we conclude that “Assyria” in LXX-Is would be understood as referring to the Seleucids,<sup>95</sup> especially, the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, when threats and aggression against Judah reached their highest point by the trampling of the Jerusalem Temple.<sup>96</sup>

When we turn to our present text, then, it seems evident that the verses tell of the separation or departure from Judah of the Jews in times of persecution by Antiochus. Another important feature of the above analysis lies in its implication for the date of the translation. Already Seeligmann pointed out that LXX-Is reflected “the idea of a Jewish emigration from Palestine to Egypt to escape the religious persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes”, through his observation that LXX-Is “replaces, on more than one occasion, the Assyrian king of the Hebrew text by the action of Antiochus Epiphanes”.<sup>97</sup> The

---

<sup>92</sup> According to Kaiser, *Isaiah 1-12*, 268, this could be an indication that the author lived in the early Hellenistic period.

<sup>93</sup> Schürer, 217. Many scholars suggested that the book was occasioned by the campaigns against the Jews of Artaxerxes Ochus (359-338 BCE) because ‘Holofernes’ and ‘Bagoas’, who participated in the campaigns of Artaxerxes against Egypt, appeared in the book. Then, the *Book of Judith* can be seen as a quasi fictional narrative that gives some lessons for contemporary readers using those past events as a motif. On similarities and differences between the book and the historical event, see Schürer, 217f.

<sup>94</sup> Otzen, 132-35.

<sup>95</sup> Also van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 39; idem, “Cities of Isaiah 24-27”, 183-98, 196.

<sup>96</sup> Against Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 188-199, 209-234.

<sup>97</sup> Seeligmann, 243.

rendering of *ועפּוּ בַכְּתָף פְּלִשְׁתִּים* into *καὶ μετασθήσονται ἐν πλοίοις ἀλλοφύλων* (Is 11:14), according to Seeligmann, reflects the historical situation when Simon took hold of Palestinian coastal cities before 140 BCE (1Mac 10:74089; 11:61-62).<sup>98</sup> Therefore, he suggests that LXX-Is was translated about 140 BCE. Our analysis so far also goes with this suggestion that the translation was done after the desecration of Antiochus, and it will be further substantiated through our subsequent analysis of the texts.

#### 2.1.4. The Identity of the Diaspora: their theology

##### 1. The remnant is the people who came down to Egypt.

“The remnant” in the MT cannot be specified. The term *שְׂאֵר יְשׁוּב* appears in 7:3 and twice in our present section. The setting in chapter 7 is God’s message by Isaiah to Ahaz who was trembling in face of the threat of the Syro-Ephramite coalition. Shear-yashub who accompanied Isaiah represents the promise of salvation as well as an admonition to keep faith.<sup>99</sup> This double sense of the phrase matches well Isaiah’s advice to stand firm in faith (7:9) and the saying that only the remnant will return among Israel though the Israelites are as many as the sand of the sea (10:22). Therefore ‘the remnant’ in MT-Is is the unspecified people who will survive the disaster. But it is not the case with the Septuagint. As we saw in the above, vv. 20-23 is closely connected with vv. 24-27. The former part tells the remnant who will be saved and the latter part tells the purpose of the affliction. According to vv. 24-27 in LXX-Is, the purpose of the affliction is to lead Israel into Egypt. When we consider the Septuagint as it stands, it is plausible that the remnant who will be saved indicates the people who will flee to Egypt. In other words, the Jewish diaspora in Egypt is the remnant, the saved of Jacob. The

---

<sup>98</sup> Seeligmann, 245.

<sup>99</sup> The uncharacteristic word order, according to Wildberger, suggests that phrase be interpreted as “*only a remnant will return*”. *Isaiah 1-12*, 296-7.

present text reveals their identity as the remnant of Israel.

## 2. The remnant in Egypt was caused by God's plan.

In view of so many negative references in the Old Testament to going down to Egypt,<sup>100</sup> this Septuagintal interpretation is very significant. Their existence in Egypt is due to God Himself. The confession of 25:5 in LXX-Is says the same theme: “ὡς ἄνθρωποι ὀλιγόψυχοι διψῶντες ἐν Σιων ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπων ἀσεβῶν οἷς ἡμεῖς παρέδωκα (we are) as fainthearted and thirsty men in Zion from *ungodly men to whom you delivered us*”.<sup>101</sup> In ancient times, as the *Exodus* had been accomplished according to God's guidance, so *Eisodus* was the result of God's providence. This motif is confirmed further by references to “Ex-Judah” (48:1; 65:9)<sup>102</sup> or “Ex-Jerusalem”.<sup>103</sup>

It might be said that the translator renders the given Hebrew text in a midrashic way. Exactly the same interpretation is seen in an ancient Midrash preserved in Passover Haggadah.<sup>104</sup> According to this, Jacob's move into Egypt was caused by the persecution of Laban the Aramaean,<sup>105</sup> and was compelled by the word of God. Furthermore, “Aram” can be understood to indicate the Seleucid kings. Therefore, our text goes in the same track with Jewish midrashic exegesis, for interpreting their situation in Egypt.<sup>106</sup>

## 3. The remnant in Egypt shall trust in the God of Israel, not in Assyria nor in others.

---

<sup>100</sup> Gen 26:2; Deut 17:16; Jer 2:18,36, 24:8-10, 42:10-22, 43:1-13, 44:1-30; Ezek 29:6; Ho 7:11, 9:6, 12:1; Some passages in Old Testament declare the returning to Egypt as God's punishment (Deut 28:68; Ho 8:13; 9:3).

<sup>101</sup> Ottley, 2:226, points that *παρέδωκα* is a favourite word.

<sup>102</sup> See 4.4.4.

<sup>103</sup> Ekblad, 167-168, demonstrates that LXX-Is urges the people to leave Jerusalem (in contrast to the MT's Babylon) in 52:9-12.

<sup>104</sup> Finkelstein, 291-317.

<sup>105</sup> The Midrash interprets “אֲרָמִי אֲבִיר אָבִי” (“my father, a wandering Aramaean”) in Deut 26:5 as “אֲרָמִי אָבִיר אֲבִיר” thus “an Aramaean destroyed my father”. Living under the Ptolemaic rulers, who fought against the Seleucids, the compiler of this Midrash might hesitate “to identify the ancestor of the Jews as an Aramaean”, and this could lead to the midrashic interpretation. See Finkelstein, 299-304. This tendency is also seen in the translator of Deuteronomy 26:5: *Συρίαν ἀπέβαλεν ὁ πατήρ μου* “My father rejected Syria”.

<sup>106</sup> On LXX-Is as Jewish midrashic exegesis, see “Introduction”; Seeligmann, 238-240, 293f.

We already saw that vv. 20-21 were tightly connected, and that the supreme emphasis was given to the verbal phrase ‘εἰμί + πεποιθότες’.<sup>107</sup> This emphasis and the fact that this phrase appears very frequently in LXX-Is have surely something to do with the message about “to see the way to Egypt”. The translator rendered rather abstract verbs into this verbal phrase. For him, ‘to look to (שעה)’ God means ‘to trust in’ God (17:7,8, 31:1, 32:3<sup>108</sup>); and ‘to wait for’ (קוה, 8:17, 33:2), ‘to hang upon’ (תלה, 22:24), ‘to take delight in’ (ענג, 58:14) and ‘to lean upon’ (שען, 10:20), including ‘to trust in’ (בטח, 12:2, 36:4,6, 37:10) and ‘expectation or hope’ (נבט, 20:5,6), are rendered by this phrase. Even in 8:14, the translator seems to have put in a confessional formula: *καὶ ἐὰν ἐπ’ αὐτῷ πεποιθῶς ᾗς* (the italicized phrase appears only in LXX: “if you shall trust in him”) *ἔσται σοι εἰς ἀγίασμα*.<sup>109</sup>

It seems clear that whom the remnants trust in was a fairly important question for the community of the translator. One of the main reasons that God tells his people not go down to Egypt in the Old Testament is their reliance upon Egypt, not upon YHWH (e.g. Jer 2:18; Ez 29:6,7; Ho 7:11). It is quite likely that the frequent occurrences and emphasis of the phrase in LXX-Is show us that the translator also knew of the aforementioned tendency in the references to going down to Egypt. It seems that the translator submits a strong defense for Jewish residence in Egypt.

Van der Kooij sees 10:24 in LXX-Is as referring to the flight of Onias and his followers to Egypt.<sup>110</sup> This crucial point should be considered with following

---

<sup>107</sup> Cf. van der Kooij, “Isaiah in the Septuagint”, 525.

<sup>108</sup> תשענה (שעה) in MT would be better read as תשענה (שעה, ‘be blinded, smeared over’). But the translator seems to have read as Kethib, and with this he changed the verse into a confessional formula:

MT: ... וְלֹא תִשְׁעֶנָּה עֵינֶי רְאִים ... *And the eyes that see will not be blinded ...*

LXX: καὶ οὐκέτι ἔσονται πεποιθότες ἐπ’ ἀνθρώποις *And they will not trust in men, ...*

<sup>109</sup> On this verse, confer van der Kooij, “Isaiah in the Septuagint”, 525.

<sup>110</sup> van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 39; “Servant”, 395-6.

examinations of other important texts concerning Egypt.

## 2.2. 11:10-16 my people who are left over in Egypt

### 2.2.1. Context of MT

11:1-9 concerns the prediction about an ideal future ruler<sup>111</sup> and the peaceable kingdom. This ideal ruler is called “the shoot from the root of Jesse”.

This section is full of metaphorical expressions indicating his work and his peaceable kingdom. It, therefore, is very difficult to find any historical and concrete mention or allusion, except the name “Jesse”, in this section. But 11:11-16, by contrast, is full of concrete references. That is, while the first part of chapter 11 is very figurative and metaphorical, the second part is very concrete and historical.

V.10 with the introduction formula **ביום ההוא** is nearly unanimously said to be a later addition.<sup>112</sup> Whatever the case, this verse as it stands functions as the connecting element of the two parts.<sup>113</sup> Its motif is “the root of Jesse” which is the leading theme of the first part. And “the root of Jesse” will stand as a standard (**נס**) for the nations, which appears again in verse 12 of the second part. Therefore the verse begins a new part at the same time it finishes the previous part. So we will include this in this section.

### 2.2.2. Comparison of two versions

#### 2.2.2.1. 11:10

וְהָיָה בְּיוֹם הַהוּא	καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ
שָׂרֵשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲשֶׁר עֲמֹד לְגַם עַמּוּת	ἡ ῥίζα τοῦ Ἰεσσαὶ καὶ ὁ ἀνιστάμενος ἄρχειν ἐθνῶν
אֱלֹהֵי גוֹיִם יִדְרָשׁוּ	ἐπ’ αὐτῷ ἔθνη ἑλλιοῦσι
וְהָיְתָה מְנַחְתּוֹ כְּבוֹד:	καὶ ἔσται ἡ ἀνάπαυσις αὐτοῦ τιμὴ

<sup>111</sup> Blenkinsopp; Childs; Kaiser; Wildberger, etc.

<sup>112</sup> Cheyne; Clements; Jensen; Kaiser; Sweeney; Wildberger, etc.

<sup>113</sup> Childs; Clements; Kaiser; Oswalt.

MT: And in that day it shall be the root of Jesse, who stands as a standard of the peoples; unto him, nations will seek, and his resting-place will be glorious.

LXX: And in that day it shall be the root of Jesse and the one who rises up to rule nations; in him, nations will hope, and his resting-place will be honour.

1QIs<sup>a</sup>: ידרשו for ידרשו; מנוחתו for מנוחתו; נוֹאִים for נוֹיִם<sup>114</sup>; and it has והיה (or could be והיא) for והיתה in MT. Qumran seems to consider כבוד as a subject.

4QIs<sup>c</sup>: ידרשו for ידרשו.

There is no minus or plus between MT and LXX but some alterations. While MT uses two words (גזע, שרש) to indicate “root” in 11:1,10, LXX uses ρίζα as the equivalent for both of them, which makes the LXX-text consistent.

Changing אֲשֶׁר into καί, the translator introduces the role of the person called “the root of Jesse”. לֵנֶס is rendered as ἄρχεῖν. It is hard to explain where this rendering came from, especially as the word is rendered literally in v.12, but possible only to surmise that the translator reckoned ‘a standard for nations’ signified ‘to rule nations’ according to his translation technique of ‘turning metaphor into concrete expressions’.<sup>115</sup>

To render the verb דרש as the Greek verb ἐλπίζω is odd. For the Hebrew verb is usually rendered as variants of ζητέω in Isaiah.<sup>116</sup> Especially, there is no case where the Greek verb is used as a rendering of דרש outside Isaiah. The present translation accordingly is probably influenced by 42:4 and 51:5, where it is said that the Gentiles (ἔθνη) shall hope in God. We will return to this later.

#### 2.2.2.2. 11:11

וְהָיָה בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא יוֹסִיף אֲדֹנָי וְהָיָה לְקִנּוּת אֶת־שָׂאֵר עַמּוֹ אֲשֶׁר יִשְׂאֵר מֵאֲשׁוּר וּמִמִּצְרָיִם וּמִפְתָּרוֹס וּמִכּוּז וּמִעֵילָם וּמִשְׁנַעַר וּמִחֲמַת וּמֵאֵי הַיָּם: καὶ ἔσται τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκεῖνη προσθήσει κύριος τοῦ δεῖξαι τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ τοῦ ζηλωσαι τὸ καταλειφθῆν ὑπόλοιπον τοῦ λαοῦ ὃ ἂν καταλειφθῆ ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀσσυρίων καὶ ἀπὸ Αἰγύπτου καὶ Βαβυλωνίας καὶ Αἰθιοπίας καὶ ἀπὸ Αἰλαμιτῶν καὶ ἀπὸ ἡλίου ἀνατολῶν καὶ ἐξ Ἀραβίας

MT: And it shall come to pass in that day, the Lord will set a second time his

<sup>114</sup> 1QIs<sup>a</sup>, consistently, use נוי as a singular type (1:4; 49:7; 55:5, etc.) and נוֹאִים as a plural one (2:2,4; 29:7,8; 66:18, etc.).

<sup>115</sup> See 2.1.2.3; cf. Stone sees allusion to 11:10 in LXX-Is in Mark 10:42b. See C.F. Stone, “Allusion to Isaiah 11.10 LXX in Mark 10.42b”, *NTS* 48 (2002), 71-83.

<sup>116</sup> 55:6; 58:2; 65:10. ἐκζητέω – 1:17; 8:19; 9:12; 16:5; 31:1; elsewhere, 62:12 (ἐπιζητέω); 19:3 (ἐπερωτάω).

hand to get the remnant of **his** people which will be left from Assyria and from Egypt and **from** Pathros and **from** Cush and from Elam and from Shinar and from Hamath **and from the islands of the sea**.

LXX: And it shall come to pass, the Lord will show again his hand to be zealous for the **remaining** remnant of the people, whoever will be left from the Assyrians and from Egypt and Babylon and Ethiopia and from Elamites and from the rising of the sun<sup>117</sup> and out of Arabia.

1QIs<sup>a</sup>: orthographic writing – אֲדוּנִי. Elsewhere 1QIs<sup>a</sup> = MT.

According to Wildberger, שְׁנִית looks superfluous since the Hebrew verb יָסַף means “again” when it is followed by an infinitive verb.<sup>118</sup> The Septuagintal reading τοῦ δειξάου also seems to show the existence of a Hebrew verb here. BHS suggests reading שְׁנִית with reference to the Arabic *sanija* (‘it is high’), which Wildberger criticizes because there is no evidence for a Hebrew word שְׁנִית with this meaning. So he suggests that MT should be emended to read יָסַף שְׁנִית (‘raise high his hand’) based on 49:22.<sup>119</sup> Since 49:22 deals with YHWH’s raising hand and lifting up a standard for nations which are also seen in 11:11 and 11:12, the suggestion seems highly probable. But the problem still remains because it is hard to explain how LXX arrived at this rendering “to show” from “raise (hand)” in MT. Whatever the case, it is quite likely that there was a verb in this place, at least in the Vorlage of LXX-Is.

In the second line, LXX has only “people” instead of “his people” in MT. The sentence in MT around that phrase is exactly the same as verse 16 in MT, while the corresponding parts of LXX are quite different. This seems significant, and we will return to it later.

LXX omits ἀπό twice in 11bβ but the nouns are still rendered as genitive, which shows the translator expected the reader to assume the force of the preposition.

---

<sup>117</sup> ἀπὸ ἡλίου ἀνατολῶν, which seems an equivalent of שְׁנִית, refers to “from the east” (Is 9:11; 41:25; 45:6; 59:19). Or the Greek phrase could be a rendering of מִן־מִזְמַר from מִזְמַר “sun, heat” (Is 24:23; 30:26). Then, it is possible to think that the translator might put the two Hebrew words (שְׁנִית, מִזְמַר) together.

<sup>118</sup> Wildberger; cf. Gray.

<sup>119</sup> Also Clements; Kaiser; Watts; H.G.M. Williamson, “Isaiah XI 11-16 and the Redaction of Isaiah I-XII” in J.A. Emerton (ed.), *Congress Volume. Paris 1992* (Leiden/New York/Köln: E.J. Brill, 1995), 343, and for alternatives, see 355-357. cf. Barthélemy, 83f. Oswalt questions how the simple reading שְׁנִית was changed into the difficult reading שְׁנִית.

Greek ὑπόλοιπον seems redundant. It may arise from some confusion due to the repetition of similar sounds and letters. Or it may have been added to emphasize the surviving remnant.

LXX seems to read קנה as קנא, which is seen again in 11:13, thus τοῦ ζηλώσαι for לְקַנּוֹת.<sup>120</sup> With this rendering, LXX shows God's concern for his people more vividly and emotionally.<sup>121</sup>

The final phrase וּמֵאֵי הַיָּם seems to be omitted in LXX. Some scholars think it is a later addition to complete the list of the lands where the Jews were dwelling.<sup>122</sup> The same phrase is used to indicate a place afar in 24:15. Probably, its absence in LXX could come from the Vorlage. Or it may be omitted due to the intention to list the nations conquered by the Assyrian army. The lists of the nations and peoples in the two different versions of the present verse are quite different from each other, as follows.

- The order and number:

Assyria – Egypt – Pathros – Cush – Elam – Shinar – Hamath – Coast islands  
(MT)

Assyria – Egypt – Babylon – Ethiopia – Elam – the rising of the sun – Arabia  
(LXX)

- LXX rendered some names as peoples: the Assyrians, Elamites.<sup>123</sup>

- Only “the Assyrians” has a definite article in LXX.

10:9 in LXX gives us a clue to solving the difficulties of the present verse. 10:9 shows the power of the Assyrian army by listing the nations conquered by them. Interestingly, כַּרְכַּמִּישׁ is rendered as Βαβυλών and חֲמַת as Ἀραβία. That is, Babylon and Arabia are mentioned together as the nations conquered by the Assyrian army. “Pathros”, which refers to ‘Upper Egypt’ (Jer 44:1,15; Ez 30:14), seems not to be

---

<sup>120</sup> Cf. Tov explains this as an example of “etymological exegesis”. See , E. Tov, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (revised and enlarged second ed.; JBS 8; Jerusalem: Simor LTD., 1997), 177.

<sup>121</sup> See God's zeal towards Israel: Ez 39:25; Joel 2:18; Zec 1:14, etc.

<sup>122</sup> For example, Clements; Kaiser; Wildberger.

<sup>123</sup> LXX-Is always renders עֵילָם as the plural noun “the Elamites” (21:2; 22:6).

reflected in the present verse of LXX but replaced by “Babylon”.<sup>124</sup> The translator might have thought the mention of “Egypt (and Ethiopia)” would be inclusive enough to refer to the whole region of Egypt, making ‘Pathros’ redundant. Presumably it shows the translator’s familiarity with Egypt. When we also take into account that Egypt, Ethiopia and Elamites were all conquered by the Assyrian army or served them,<sup>125</sup> it is likely that the list in 11:11 of LXX-Is indicates the nations and peoples who were besieged by the Assyrian army. The fact that only “the Assyrians” has a definite article in LXX, too, may support this suggestion.

### 2.2.2.3. 11:12

וְנָשָׂא נִסִּים לְגוֹיִם	καὶ ἀρεῖ σημεῖον εἰς τὰ ἔθνη
וְאַסְפֵּי נְדָחֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל	καὶ συναΐξει τοὺς ἀπολομένους Ἰσραηλ
וְנִפְצוֹת יְהוּדָה יִקְבֹּץ	καὶ τοὺς διεσπαρμένους Ἰουδα συναΐξει
מֵאַרְבַּע כְּנָפוֹת הָאָרֶץ	ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων πτερύγων τῆς γῆς

MT: And he will raise a standard for the nations, and he will assemble the outcasts of Israel, and the dispersed of Judah he will gather from the four corners of the earth.

LXX: And he will raise a sign for the nations, and he will gather the lost of Israel, and the scattered of Judah he will gather, from the four corners of the earth.

1QIs<sup>a</sup>: וְנָשָׂא לְגוֹיִם for לְגוֹיִם (see 11:10); Qumran has מִכְּנָפוֹת for כְּנָפוֹת. 4QIs<sup>a</sup> has מֵאַרְבַּע כְּנָפוֹת like MT.

This is a very literally translated verse. LXX renders two Hebrew verbs (אָסַף, קָבַץ) as the same Greek (συναΐγω), which makes the parallelism in this verse more prominent than MT: “gather – the lost of Israel – the scattered of Judah – gather (a-b-b’-a)”.<sup>126</sup>

### 2.2.2.4. 11:13

וְסָרָה קְנֵאת אֲפֹרִים	καὶ ἀφαιρεθήσεται ὁ ζῆλος Ἐφραιμ
וְצָרְרֵי יְהוּדָה יִפְרְתוּ	καὶ οἱ ἐχθροὶ Ἰουδα ἀπολοῦνται
אֲפֹרִים לֹא יִקְנֵא אֶת־יְהוּדָה	Ἐφραιμ οὐ ζηλώσει Ἰουδα
וְיְהוּדָה לֹא יִצָּר אֶת־אֲפֹרִים	καὶ Ἰουδας οὐ θλίψει Ἐφραιμ

<sup>124</sup> Cf. Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 147.

<sup>125</sup> Egypt: 19:22-23, on Egypt and Ethiopia: esp. 20:1-6, Elamites: 21:1; 22:6.

<sup>126</sup> In Is 27:13, there appears the same technique. In this verse, הַגְּבֻרִים and הַנְּדָחִים are translated as οἱ ἀπολόμενοι, which also seems to make the parallelism prominent. Cf. J.S. Croatto, “The ‘Nations’ in the Salvific Oracles of Isaiah”, *VT* 55 (2005), 158-159, notices the parallelism in 11:12 and argues that “nations”, paralleled with “from the four corners of the earth”, refers to the regions of Jewish Diaspora.



LXX does not reflect two pronominal suffixes of MT in this verse, which happens often in LXX-Is.<sup>134</sup> LXX reads ימה with the following sentence, which seems to introduce another *καί* to connect it with בני־קדם. And in 14b, the translator seems to render the Hebrew sentence according to what the text means, not literally in later Greek versions such as Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion.<sup>135</sup>

The translator adds *πρῶτος* twice in the latter part of the verse. There is no obvious reason for this, unless the translator wished to refer to a certain historical situation unknown to us, concerning Moab and Ammon in his day.<sup>136</sup>

בכתף פלשתים is rendered as ἐν πλοίοις ἀλλοφύλων. A transliterated form Φυλιστιμ of פלשתים appears only in a few books,<sup>137</sup> and throughout the whole Septuagint ἀλλόφυλοι is its usual equivalent. For the translator, “the shoulder of Philistines”, which means in MT Shephelah<sup>138</sup> or coastal plain,<sup>139</sup> is reckoned to mean “the ships of foreigners”, which is also a characteristic rendering of the translator.<sup>140</sup>

The structure of MT text is changed in LXX by reading ימה (‘to the sea’, that is ‘to the west’) as an object of the following sentence but the whole meaning that this verse delivers is hardly changed in LXX.

---

<sup>134</sup> For example, 5:14,23,28, 6:2, 6:5, 6:10, etc.

<sup>135</sup> Aquila: ἰδουμαια και μωαβ αποστολη χειρος αυτων; Symmachus: εδωμ και μωαβ εκτασις χειρος αυτων; Theodotion: ἰδουμαια και μωαβ εκ[σ]τασις χειρος αυτων (my italics).

<sup>136</sup> Cf. 1 Mac 5:6 tells that Judas Maccabeus attacked “the children of Ammon”.

<sup>137</sup> E.g. Gen 10:14; Ex 13:17; Josh 13:2,3,5; Judg 10:6,7,11; 1Mac: 3:24; Sirach: 46:18; 50:26. It seems that in the early period of the translation process of the Septuagint Φυλιστιμ was preferred, and ἀλλόφυλοι prevailed, as time went further. In Isaiah, the Hebrew word appears three times and is rendered ἀλλόφυλοι (2:6; 11:14) except 9:11, where it is translated into Ἕλλην, a contemporized rendering.

<sup>138</sup> Gray; Oswalt.

<sup>139</sup> Cheyne; Clements; Jensen; cf. Brueggemann: “the backs of the Philistines”.

<sup>140</sup> i.e. “turning metaphors into concrete expressions”. See 2.1.3.2. But Seeligmann, 245-246, suggests that ἀλλόφυλοι refers to those who were not of Jewish birth, even though they had to be converted for the Jewish customs including the circumcision, during the Maccabaen rule.

### 2.2.2.6. 11:15

וְהַחֲרִים יְהוָה אֶת לְשׁוֹן יַם־מִצְרַיִם      καὶ ἐρημώσει κύριος τὴν θάλασσαν Αἰγύπτου  
 וְהִנִּיף יָדוֹ עַל־הַנְּהָר בְּעִים רוּחוֹ      καὶ ἐπιβαλεῖ τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸν ποταμὸν πνεύματι βιαίῳ  
 וְהָפְהוּ לְשַׁבְעָה נַחְלִים      καὶ πατάξει ἑπτὰ φάραγγας  
 וְהָרַיָּךְ בְּנַעְלִים:      ὥστε διαπορεύεσθαι αὐτὸν ἐν ὑποδήμασι

MT: And YHWH will destroy **the tongue** of the sea of Egypt and he will wave his hand over the river with his scorching wind, and he will smite it **into** seven streams and he will render it able to be trodden in sandals.

LXX: And the Lord will make desolate the sea of Egypt and he will lay his hand upon the river with a strong wind and he will smite seven ravines in order to pass through **it** in sandals.

1QIs<sup>a</sup>: לשבעה for לשיבוע; בעים רוחו for בעים רוח; ידיו for ידיו.

LXX seems to read החריב as החריב, because the latter is always rendered as ἐρημόομαι in LXX-Is.<sup>141</sup> When we take into account that there are some references to God drying up the sea (החריב ים),<sup>142</sup> we conjecture that the original reading was החריב as is reflected in LXX.<sup>143</sup> Peshitta (*wenahreb*) and Vulgate (*et desolabit*) support this view as well as Targum (וייבש), which has different consonants but the same meaning.

LXX does not reflect לשון. It could come from his technique of simplifying or from his ignorance of ‘the tongue of the sea’,<sup>144</sup> which seems to refer to the tongue-shaped Red Sea, probably the Gulf of Suez.<sup>145</sup> In translating the phrase הניף ידו על, LXX renders the verb not literally but contextually, thus ἐπιβαλεῖ τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἐπί.<sup>146</sup>

בעים רוחו is difficult to understand.<sup>147</sup> Interestingly, LXX renders it as πνεύματι βιαίῳ (“with a strong wind”). The “strong” (βίαιος) wind dried up the Red Sea in the time of the Exodus (Ex 14:21). In this way, the reference to the river in Assyria of MT is changed into the one in Egypt in LXX. In addition, LXX does not reflect the pronominal

<sup>141</sup> 34:10; 37:18,25; 44:27; 49:17; 50:2 (ἐξερημόομαι); 51:10; 60:12. For other examples, see Tov, *Text-Critical Use*, 137.

<sup>142</sup> Is 50:2; 51:10; Jer 51:36 (LXX 28:36).

<sup>143</sup> This is a widely proposed emendation by scholars, including Blenkinsopp; Clements, Gray, Kaiser, Oswalt, Watts, and Wildberger. Also see Williamson, *Book Called Isaiah*, 126. But see Barthélemy, 85f.

<sup>144</sup> See Is 50:2 and 51:10. In LXX-Joshua, the phrase is rendered as λοφιά τῆς θαλάσσης; 15:5, 18:19.

<sup>145</sup> Blenkinsopp; Cheyne; Oswalt; Watts; Wildberger.

<sup>146</sup> Cf. 5:25. See the explanation of 19:16.

<sup>147</sup> See Wildberger, *Isaiah 1-12*, 488.

suffix. 1QIs<sup>a</sup> does not have it, either. Then the septuagintal reading could have come from the Vorlage.

In *והכהו לשבעה נחלים*, the translator seems to ignore the preposition *ל*. While in MT God smites the river *into* seven streams, that is, many small and thin streams,<sup>148</sup> to make it possible to go through in sandals (that is, ‘on foot’), in LXX he smites seven ravines for the same purpose. We find a good clue to explain what “the seven ravines” meant, in Abraham’s story in *Genesis Apocryphon* 19:11-13: “... to [enter] the land of Egypt ... I [crossed] the seven heads of this river (*שבעת ראשי נהרא*)... and entered ... the land of Egypt”. The River Nile is introduced as having seven branches here. According to MT, the present phrase *נהר* concerns the River Euphrates<sup>149</sup> but LXX, remarkably, still concerns the River Nile.<sup>150</sup>

LXX has *αὐτόν* as an object of the verb *διαπορεύομαι*, which frequently happens in LXX-Is.<sup>151</sup>

#### 2.2.2.7. 11:16

<i>וְהָיְתָה מְסָלָה לְשָׂאֵר עַמּוֹ</i>	<i>καὶ ἔσται δίοδος τῷ καταλειφθέντι μου λαῶ</i>
<i>אֲשֶׁר יִשְׂאָר מֵאַשּׁוּר</i>	<i>ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ</i>
<i>כַּאֲשֶׁר הָיְתָה לְיִשְׂרָאֵל</i>	<i>καὶ ἔσται τῷ Ἰσραηλ</i>
<i>בְּיוֹם עָלְתוּ מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם:</i>	<i>ὡς ἡ ἡμέρα ὅτε ἐξῆλθεν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου</i>

MT: And a highway shall be for the remnant of his people **who will be left** from Assyria, as it was for Israel when they came up out of the land of Egypt.

LXX: And a passage shall be for my people who are left over in Egypt and it shall be for Israel, as the day when they came forth out of the land of Egypt.

1QIsa<sup>a</sup>: *והייתה* for *והייתה* twice<sup>152</sup>; *עלות* for *עלתו*.

*אשר ישאר מאשור* is rendered as just *ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ* in LXX. It should be regarded as

<sup>148</sup> Cf. Kaiser, *Isaiah 1-12*, 268: “... seven (i.e. an indeterminate number) ...”.

<sup>149</sup> Blenkinsopp; Cheyne; Kaiser; Sweeney; Wildberger, etc. “Nahar” could refer to just “(the) river”, but comparing with vv. 11 and 16, we should think that “Nahar” in the present verse of MT surely indicates the river Euphrates.

<sup>150</sup> Some manuscripts such as Co, Syp, add “*ἐν αἰγυπτῳ*”, probably to clarify this point. This tendency is also found in 28:5 of some manuscripts: “*τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἔσται κύριος σαβαωθ ὁ στέφανος τῆς ἐλπίδος ὁ πλακεὶς τῆς δόξης τῷ καταλειφθέντι μου λαῶ (ἐν αἰγυπτῳ in B<sup>c</sup>, C, 301, etc.)*”.

<sup>151</sup> 1:3; 3:7; 5:13; 12:2; 32:11, etc.

<sup>152</sup> 1QIs<sup>a</sup> uses, mainly *והייתה* as a 3rd person singular perfect verb of Qal: e.g. 11:16; 19:17; 29:2; but *הייתה* in 9:4; 13:19.

an intentional rendering, the reason for which will be discussed shortly.

LXX uses δίοδος for מַסְלָה.<sup>153</sup> Interestingly, LXX has “my people” instead of “his people” in MT, which could be from misreading of י/ו. But when we take into account that all extant Septuagint manuscripts of this verse preserve “my”, this Septuagintal reading seems to be intentional.

In the case of v.16b, LXX changes it into future tense by rendering כִּאֲשֶׁר as καί, which leads us to consider “Israel” as a synonym for “the remnant in Egypt”.

Judged by ὡς ἡ ἡμέρα in LXX, the Vorlage might have כִּי, while 1QIs<sup>a</sup> also has the same word as MT.

### 2.2.3. The Septuagintal text

#### 2.2.3.1. The structure of chapter 11 in LXX

11:10 and 11:11 have the introductory formula καὶ ἔσται (ἐν) τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκεῖνῃ which demarcates two sections of chapter 11. Ἡ ῥίζα τοῦ Ἰεσσαί in v.1 and v.10 functions as an inclusio to turn 11:1-10 into a coherent section. At the same time, the phrase “to rule the nations” in v.10 leads us to take the verse in connection with the following verses (for example, 11:14f) thus 11:10-16. The mention of “the remnant” in v.11 and v.16 also makes 11:11-16 a self-contained section. It seems sensible to conclude that v.10 functions as the hinge of chapter 11.

11:1-9 is full of metaphors and figurative expressions but there is no nation nor any historical event mentioned, while 11:11-16 deals with nations and events. While 11:1-9 concerns something abstract, 11:11-16 does something concrete and historical. While

---

<sup>153</sup> The Hebrew word is used 8 times in MT-Is, for which LXX-Is rendered as mainly δός (7:3; 19:23; 33:8; 36:2; 59:7; 62:10), twice τρίβος (40:3; 49:11) and once δίοδος in the present verse. Interestingly, the same Greek word is used to indicate “a passage in the water” in Thucydides, *Historiae*, 2.102.4: οὐδ’ ἔχουσαι εὐθείας διόδους τοῦ ὕδατος ἐς τὸ πέλαγος. Then, the present statement in Is 11:16 of LXX could show that it has something to do with the Exodus event, especially the passage between two divided waters.

the first part of chapter 11 imagines the ideal peaceable kingdom, the latter part of chapter 11 embodies it in the history.

V.16 begins with *καὶ ἔσται*, which functions as an opening formula as in v.10 and 11. Then, chapter 11 begins with “a shoot from Jesse’s root” and ends with “a passage for the remnant of my people in Egypt”. Therefore it can be considered as the conclusion of the present chapter as well as the culmination of 11:11-16. In other words, the mission of the messianic figure called “a shoot from Jesse’s root” is connected with the remnant in Egypt.

Quite remarkably, these two parts of chapter 11 are chiasmatically structured, a relationship which is not seen in MT<sup>154</sup>:

- |                         |                                  |
|-------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1. ἐξέρχομαι            |                                  |
| 4. πατάσσω .. πνεύματι  |                                  |
| 9. ἀπόλλυμι             |                                  |
|                         | 10. καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ |
|                         | 11. καὶ ἔσται τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ    |
|                         | 12. ἀπόλλυμι                     |
| 15. πνεύματι .. πατάσσω |                                  |
| 16. ἐξέρχομαι           |                                  |

This clearly demonstrates why the Septuagintal text needs to be dealt with in its own right, and why we should deal with the whole section of LXX, not with separate verses. And furthermore, 11:1-9 should be considered with the following vv.11-16, not isolated.<sup>155</sup>

Now it is time to see the second part in detail as LXX-Is stands.

#### 2.2.3.2. Verse 10: God’s salvation

As was explained in 11:10 above, the statement “nations will hope in you” with the

---

<sup>154</sup> L. Alonso-Schökel has pointed out to the correspondence between two sections in Chapter 11 of MT: the “Spirit of Yahweh” in v.2 and the “hand of Yahweh” in vv.11 and 15; the just government of the Messiah in vv.3-5 and the military successes of Judah against its enemies in v.14; the peace among the animals in vv.6f; and the reconciliation of Ephraim and Judah in v.13. Cited from Wildberger, *Isaiah 1-12*, 489. Originally, L.Alonso-Schökel, “Las poemas a la paz”, *Estudios Biblicos* 18 (1959), 168.

<sup>155</sup> Cf. Sollamo deals with 11:1-5 as being “more isolated in its context”, so concludes that the Septuagintal reading does not reveal any significant difference from MT. See Sollamo, “Messianism”, 366: “He merely translated the Hebrew Vorlage and left the interpretation to his readers”. However, as is shown above, the translator did not “merely” translate the Vorlage.

rendering of שרר as ἐλπίζω seems to come from 42:4 and 51:5:

42:4 καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ ἔθνη ἐλπιούσιν וְלִתְרוּתוֹ אֵימִים יִיחַלוּ<sup>156</sup>  
51:5 ... καὶ εἰς τὸν βραχίονά μου ἔθνη ἐλπιούσιν ἐμὲ νῆσοι ὑπομενοῦσιν καὶ εἰς τὸν  
βραχίονά μου ἐλπιούσιν וְיִחַלוּ וְאֶל־זֶרְעִי יִקְוּ אֵימִים אֵלַי וְיִפְטְמוּ אֵלַי ...  
cf. 26:8 ἡ γὰρ ὁδὸς κυρίου κρίσις ἠλπίσαμεν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι σου καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ μνείᾳ  
אַף אַרְחַ מְשַׁפְּטֵנָּהּ יְהוָה קְוִינָּה לְשִׁמְךָ וְלִזְכָּרְךָ תְּאַוֶּת־נַפְּשׁ:<sup>157</sup>

Is 42:4 belongs to the so-called “songs of the servant”, whose mission is stated as being to set judgement on the earth.<sup>158</sup> One of the results of his mission is the content that “nations will hope in him” according to LXX. “A shoot from Jesse’s root” is identified as “the servant of the Lord” here in 11:10 in LXX. This point can be further asserted in 51:5 with relation to 53:1 and 52:10. Taking into account the two verses, 53:1, which is also said to deal with “the servant of the Lord”, and 52:10, we agree with Ekblad’s suggestion that “the arm of the Lord appears to be identified as the servant himself”:<sup>159</sup>

53:1 ... and to whom has *the arm of the Lord been revealed?* ... καὶ ὁ βραχίον  
κυρίου τίνι ἀπεκαλύφθη  
52:10 And the Lord will *reveal his holy arm* in the sight of all the nations and all  
the ends of the earth will see the salvation from God καὶ ἀποκαλύψει κύριος τὸν  
βραχίονα αὐτοῦ τὸν ἅγιον ἐνώπιον πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν καὶ ὄψονται πάντα τὰ ἄκρα τῆς  
γῆς τὴν σωτηρίαν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ

Then, 51:5 means the same thing as 11:10. We may thus conclude that the theme “nations will hope in God or in God’s name” is intimately connected with God’s salvific action by his servant.<sup>160</sup>

### 2.2.3.3. Vv.11-12: “Assyrians” and the restoration of the remnant

The nations of the list have something to do with Assyria, as shown above. Then the verses would mean the Jewish diaspora was scattered during some international tumult around the Assyrian conquests.

<sup>156</sup> On this verse in LXX, see Ekblad, 67-70; Ottley, 2:307; Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 140-1.

<sup>157</sup> The Greek text arose from a different punctuation and understanding of order of MT.

<sup>158</sup> Ekblad, 80.

<sup>159</sup> Ekblad, 197.

<sup>160</sup> A similar theme is found in LXX-Gen 49:10, a mention about the coming Messianic figure: οὐκ ἐκλείψει ἄρχων ἐξ Ιουδα καὶ ἠγούμενος ἐκ τῶν μηρῶν αὐτοῦ ἕως ἂν ἔλθῃ τὰ ἀποκείμενα αὐτῷ καὶ αὐτὸς προσδοκία ἐθνῶν (cf. MT: וְלֹא יִקְהַת עַמִּים: (לְאַיִסּוֹר שְׂבַט מְיֹהוּדָה וּמְחַקֵּק מִבֵּין רִגְלָיו עַד־כִּי־בֹא שִׁילָה וְלֹא יִקְהַת עַמִּים)).

Unfortunately we do not know how this dispersion went on in the time of Assyria. Though some passages in the Old Testament refer to this exile of the Northern Kingdom (2 Ki 17:6,23ff) and hope for their return (Jer 31), little is known to us concerning the Judean exile of this period. Next, why did the translator regard the list as being concerned with Assyria? As we have already dealt with in the previous section concerning “Assyria” in chapter 10, we can conclude that the image of a Babylonian king or an Assyrian king in LXX-Is would remind readers of a contemporary tyrannical foreign king such as Antiochus Epiphanes of the Seleucids.

Then, 11:11 in LXX-Is tells of the zeal of God towards the Jewish Diaspora, “the remaining remnant of the people τὸ καταλειφθὲν ὑπόλοιπον τοῦ λαοῦ”, everywhere in the Hellenistic period. In v.12, they will be gathered “from the four corners of the earth ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων περὺγων τῆς γῆς”. According to 24:16, wonderful things are known “from the ends of the earth” (ἀπὸ τῶν περὺγων τῆς γῆς). Though what the wonderful things are is unclear from the text, we find it has something to do with “the remnants on the earth”:

14 they will cry aloud, *but the remnants on the earth will rejoice together in the glory of the LORD* [οἱ δὲ καταλειφθέντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς εὐφρανθήσονται ἅμα τῇ δόξῃ κυρίου; הָיָה בְּנֶאֱמָרָם], ... 15 therefore the glory of the LORD will be in the isles of the sea, ... 16 O LORD God of Israel, *from the ends of the earth we have heard wonderful things, hope to the godly* [ἀπὸ τῶν περὺγων τῆς γῆς τέρατα ἠκούσαμεν ἐλπίς τῶ εὐσεβεί; מִכְּכֹף הָאָרֶץ זְמַרְתָּ שְׂמֵעַנּוּ צְבָי לְצַדִּיק ...] (24:14-16)

Interestingly, LXX makes clear what the subject in v.14 is: “those left on the earth”, contrary to an indefinite one of MT.<sup>161</sup> The context from v.14 to v.16 in LXX also leads one to think that “the godly” in v.16 refers to the same group. Next, we can see what the “wonderful things” in 24:16 indicate: The hope for God’s intervention on behalf of the remnant.<sup>162</sup> According to 11:11-12 and 24:14-16, in that day, God will gather the

<sup>161</sup> Ottley, 2:222; Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 59f. Ziegler adds 13:12,14; 37:31, where subjects are made clearer by the expression “those who are left”.

<sup>162</sup> See also 43:5ff; 49:22; 60:4,22. cf. Kaiser, *Isaiah 1-12*, 265; Williamson, *The Book Called Isaiah*,

remnant of people, the godly, from the four ends of the earth, and they will rejoice together in God's glory. This expectation is embodied in the unusual rendering of צַבִּי as ἐλπίζ in 24:16. In contrast to this, in 28:14-19 of LXX, God will rise up against those "rulers of this people in Jerusalem" who made a covenant with Hades and made falsehood their "hope" (cf. מַחֲסָה in MT), which is declared an "evil hope" (ἐλπίς ποιηρὰ for רַק־זוּעָה) in v.19.<sup>163</sup> Indeed, there is hope for the godly. In v.12, other names for the Diaspora appear: "the outcast of Israel" and "the scattered of Judah".

#### 2.2.3.4. Verse 15: The River Nile

11:15 in LXX concerns only the River Nile, while MT deals with two rivers, Nile and Euphrates. In MT, the River Nile and the River Euphrates are inserted to indicate the remnants from both regions – Egypt and Mesopotamia. The translator of LXX, however, changed them to refer only to the Nile by two means: firstly, the omission of the preposition ל in לַשֶּׁבַע, which turns a symbolic mention ("into seven") into a topographical name referring to the streams of the Nile; secondly, the translation of בַּעִים into βιαίω, which reminds of an event in the time of the Exodus in Egypt.

In Ex 14:21, Moses stretched forth his hand over the sea (ἐξέτεινεν Μωυσῆς τὴν χεῖρα ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν) according to God's command (Ex 14:16) and God drove back the sea with a strong south wind (ἐν ἀνέμῳ νότῳ βιαίω)<sup>164</sup> so that the seabed became dry and the sea divided in two so that the Israelites could cross over. In the present verse, God Himself will make desolate the sea and stretch his hand over the River Nile. Therefore we can conclude that the essential motif of Is 11:15 must have come from this Exodus text to show God's miraculous action on his people's behalf. God's care for "his

---

125ff.

<sup>163</sup> Ottley, 1:50, points out that ἐλπίζ is a favourite term of the translator, and suggests a possibility that the translator read רַק־זוּעָה or קַי רַעָה (2:242). For a plausible explanation for this, see Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 263f.

<sup>164</sup> cf. MT: בְּרוּחַ קְדִים עוֹה "with a strong east wind"

people” will be more evident in the following verse in LXX.

#### 2.2.3.5. Comparison between v.11 and v.16

First of all, let us bring out the structure of v.16:

A passage shall be for the remnant of my people in Egypt,  
It shall be for Israel,  
→ As the day when they came out of Egypt.

“The remnant of my people in Egypt” is paralleled by “Israel”, differently from MT, where “Israel” indicates ‘Israel’ in the time of the Exodus. According to LXX, the remnant in Egypt is Israel proper.

The last statement “as the day when they came out of Egypt” shows clearly what the prototype of the restoration in this section is: it is the Exodus.

V.16 in LXX significantly differs from MT, where there appears the same phrase in v.11. The changes that we find between two verses are worthy of careful consideration, especially because it seems that LXX seldom changes the Hebrew Vorlage in the present section:<sup>165</sup>

v.11: MT אֲשֶׁר-שָׂאֵר עִמּוֹ אֲשֶׁר יִשְׂאֵר מֵאֲשׁוּר (וממצררים)

LXX τὸ καταλειφθὲν ὑπόλοιπον τοῦ λαοῦ ὃ ἂν καταλειφθῆ ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀσσυρίων (καὶ ἀπὸ Αἰγύπτου)

v.16: MT לְשֵׂאֵר עִמּוֹ אֲשֶׁר יִשְׂאֵר מֵאֲשׁוּר

LXX τῶ καταλειφθέντι μου λαῶ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ

1. MT readings in both verses are unmistakable in both written form and pronunciation. Presumably, the translator also could not have missed the repetition of the similar sounds: [*she’ar ‘ammo ‘asher yissh’aer me’ashur*].<sup>166</sup> It thus helps us decide that the appearance of “Egypt” here in LXX does not arise from any misreading or a different Vorlage. Also the translator of LXX does not appear concerned to preserve those conspicuous characteristics in MT.

2. LXX has “my” instead of “his” in MT. Needless to say, this use of the first person

---

<sup>165</sup> As we find in our studies on 11:10-16 so far, this section can be said to be a very literal translation.

<sup>166</sup> Gray, *Isaiah I-XVII*, 228: “This persistent alliteration may have been intended; there is nothing like it in Isaiah”.

possessive pronoun expresses God’s strong bond with the people and his firm decision to lead them out. There is no first person element in chapter 11 except v.9 and v.16. This change gives us the impression that chapter 12 is more or less connected with the present chapter, as a kind of response. To add one more, LXX-Is does not have “his” in v.11 so just “the remaining remnant of the people which will be left from Assyria and from Egypt ...”, while in v.16 LXX-Is has “*my* people who are left over in Egypt ...”. It appears that the remnant in regions beginning with Assyria is clearly contrasted with the remnant in Egypt.

3. V.11 in LXX renders the original sentence as carefully as it could and v.16 makes it clear and concise. According to this, it is “the remnant of my people in Egypt” in v.16 that the seemingly verbose explanation of v.11 deals with. The rendering of מן as ἐν also serves for the same purpose. The translator did not make any mistake in rendering מן as ἀπό or ἐκ in v.11 but he has an unexpected ἐν in v.16, which should be considered an intentional change. It seems to suggest that what is important is not “from” Egypt but “in” Egypt.

To sum up, contrary to MT which is mainly about the return of the diaspora from Assyria, LXX emphasizes the Egyptian Jewish diaspora, which is expressed as “the remnant of my people in Egypt”. 28:5 in LXX-Is is another example where the diaspora is called as “my people”:

LXX: τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἔσται κύριος σαβαωθ ὁ στέφανος τῆς ἐλπίδος ὁ πλακεὶς τῆς δόξης τῷ καταλειφθέντι μου λαῷ  
 MT: בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא יִהְיֶה יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת לְעִטְמַת צְבִי וְלְצִפּוֹרֶת הַפְּאֶרֶה לְשֵׁךְ עַמּוֹ

The translator changes “his” into “my” again with the same phrase “the remnant”, thus “In that day, the Lord of Sabaoth will be the crown of the hope, the braid of the glory, for the remnant of my people”. The correspondence of 11:16 and 28:5 clearly

demonstrates the identity of the Jewish diaspora.<sup>167</sup> The promise given to “the remnant of my people in Egypt”, then, is that God will be their hope and glory.

#### 2.2.3.6. Relation to chapter 12

As we saw in the above, LXX has a first-person pronoun (“my people”) instead of the third-person one in MT (“his people”) in v.16. This change makes the verse more affectionate and impressive. And this change matches the first-person pronoun (“my holy mountain”) in 11:9.

Furthermore, these personal endings, which express God’s love and salvation towards the remnants of Israel, give light to understanding the subsequent chapter 12, which praises God beginning with “I will bless you ...”. That is, chapter 12 should be understood as a thanksgiving song of the remnant who is expecting God’s promise and blessing.

#### 2.2.4. Conclusion

A general and frequent theme in the Hebrew Bible that God will gather the Jewish diaspora outside Palestine appears also in the present text. But with some significant changes, the translator of LXX-Is moves the focus from “remnant moving out of Assyria and Egypt, etc.” into “remnant in Egypt”. According to the translator, “my people who are left over in Egypt” is Israel proper and God will show them his great salvific action as he did in the first Exodus. Interestingly, while MT clearly gives the impression that God will lead Israel out of Egypt and out of Assyria, LXX makes it rather ambiguous because the translator changes the preposition  $\text{מִן}$  into  $\text{ἐν}$  in v.16. It is the Jewish

---

<sup>167</sup> 43:21 of LXX begins with “my people”, while MT simply has “people”. Interestingly, LXX seems to render  $\text{צִוֵּי}$  (‘to form’) as  $\text{περιποιέομαι}$  (‘to preserve, keep alive’) thus “my people whom I preserved to tell my praises”. It is quite likely that this rendering implies some relationship between ‘my people’ and ‘living as diaspora’. Cf. “the captives of my people ( $\text{τὴν αἰχμαλωσίαν τοῦ λαοῦ μου}$ )” in 45:13.

diaspora in Egypt that the translator considers to be his first and foremost concern. Perhaps the return to Palestine would be a secondary task or could be part of God's great action which would be for the benefit of the Jews in Egypt. The first person possessive pronominal ending attached to the diaspora reflects this concern, and at the same time self-esteem of the Diaspora, full of assurance. Considering that chapter 11 is tightly inter-connected, we have to read the present section with the preceding 11:1-10: thus, "a root from Jesse" or a certain messianic figure has something to do with the Jewish people in Egypt. Therefore the present text in LXX argues for the status and promise for the Jewish diaspora in Egypt: As God promised, God will deliver them, even during times of hardship such as the violent outrage of Antiochus Epiphanes. As God did in the first Exodus, God will show his salvation and glory toward Israel, the people who are left over in Egypt.

## 2.3. 19:16-25

### 2.3.1. Context of MT

19:16-25 is located among chapters 18-20 which deal with oracles concerning the region of Egypt, including Cush. Presumably, the reason that these are gathered together here is because of the fact that all of these texts mention Egypt. Among them, 19:16-25 is clearly demarcated from 19:1-15 because of the formula **ביום ההוא** in vv.16, 18, 19, 21, 23, 24. This phrase is used to introduce the oracles concerning the future of Egypt, and appears with the imperfect tense of **היה**. According to this, vv.16-25 is divided into five subsections: 16-17; 18; 19-22<sup>168</sup>; 23; 24-25.<sup>169</sup> As Childs points out,<sup>170</sup>

---

<sup>168</sup> Verse 21 has, also, the phrase but it does not have 'היה', which makes this verse to be included in vv. 19-22.

<sup>169</sup> Also Brueggemann; Oswalt; Sweeney; Wildberger. Also A. Deissler, "Der Volk und land überschreitende Gottesbund der Endzeit nach Jes 19, 16-25" in F. Hahn, F.-L. Hossfeld, H. Jorissen and A. Neuwirth (eds.), *Zion: Ort der Begegnung* (BBB 90; Athenäum-Hain-Hanstein; 1993), 8f; H. Hagelia, "A

vv.16-17 stands apart from the other four in that this oracle is essentially a judgment oracle. It is likely that the expression *עצת יהוה צבאות אשר-הוא יוען עליי* in v.17 is intended to be read together with v.12, which has *בוה-יהוה יוען צבאות על-מצרים*, to show the result of the oracle in 19:1-15. Then, vv.16-17 function as a connector between 19:18-25 and 19:1-15.

This section in MT concerns the Egyptians, their suffering, their deliverance, and their worship of YHWH. Conclusively, YHWH announces that Egypt is “my people” in v.25, the only occurrence in MT where “my people” is used to refer to a foreign nation by God.<sup>171</sup>

### 2.3.2. Comparison of two versions

#### 2.3.2.1. 19:16

ביום ההוא יהיה מצרים כנשים	τῆ δὲ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἔσονται οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι ὡς γυναῖκες
וחרדו ופחדו	ἐν φόβῳ καὶ ἐν τρόμῳ
מפני תנופת יד-יהוה צבאות	ἀπὸ προσώπου τῆς χειρὸς κυρίου σαβαωθ
אשר-הוא מניף עליו:	ἢ αὐτὸς ἐπιβαλεῖ αὐτοῖς

MT: **In** that day the Egyptians shall be like women and they shall tremble and fear because of **the waving of** the hand of YHWH of hosts, which he waves over it.

LXX: **But** on that day, the Egyptians shall be like women in fear and trembling because of the hand of the Lord Sabaoth, which he shall lay upon them.

1QIs<sup>a</sup>: הוא for ההוא in MT and 4QIs<sup>b</sup>; this has מניף ידו עליה<sup>172</sup> for מניף עליו; plural reading ופחדו וחרדו for ופחדו וחרדו in MT, 1QIs<sup>b</sup> and 4QIs<sup>b</sup>.

Generally, *ביום ההוא* is rendered as ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ throughout the Old

Crescendo of Universalism. An Exegesis of Isa 19:16-25”, *SEÁ* 70 (2005), 74f; F. Sedlmeier, “Israel-‘ein Segen inmitten der Erde’. Das JHWH-Volk in der Spannung zwischen radikalem Dialog und Identitätsverlust nach Jes 19,16-25” in J. Frühwald-König, F.R. Prostmeier and R. Zwick (eds.), *Steht nicht geschrieben? Studien zur Bibel und ihrer Wirkungsgeschichte* (FS für Georg Schmuttermayr; Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 2001), 93f. Watts includes vv.16-17 into vv.1-15.

<sup>170</sup> Childs, *Isaiah*, 144.

<sup>171</sup> “Diese biblische, d.h. kanonische Aussage ist formal und inhaltlich der Gipfelpunkt aller prophetischen Aussagen über einen universellen Heilshorizont”. See Deissler, 7; also see J.F.A. Sawyer, “Blessed be my people Egypt (Is 19:25)” in J.D. Martin and P.R. Davies (eds.), *A Word in Season* (JSOTSup 42; Sheffield Academic Press, 1986), 57-71. The phrase “my people” appears 158 times when YHWH calls Israel, mainly in the Latter Prophets (107 times). When it is used in the Pentateuch, it appears only in the *Book of Exodus*. Lohfink demonstrates that the idea יהוה עם is based on covenant between YHWH and Israel. See 2.3.4.3 below. N. Lohfink, “Beobachtungen zur Geschichte des Ausdrucks יהוה עם” in H.W. Wolff (ed.), *Probleme Biblischer Theologie* (FS von Rad; München: C. Kaiser, 1971), 275-305.

<sup>172</sup> The copyist of the Qumran scroll added ה upon מניף.

Testament.<sup>173</sup> But in LXX-Is the phrase is often (18 times among 45 occurrences) translated without ἐν.<sup>174</sup> Remarkably, the translator renders this phrase in nearly every case of chapter 19 with no ἐν. The only exception is the one in v. 21, which does not start with it, and does not have the verb הִיָּה. It seems reasonable to say that the translator gives special consistency to this section, 19:16-25.

The reason LXX has only “because of the hand” instead of “because of the waving (תְּנוּפֶת) of the hand” in MT can be explained by the technique of the translator, found elsewhere in LXX-Is, which made the text more concrete. In Is 10:32 and 13:2, “waving hand” means “beckoning with a hand” to the translator. Also the translator renders ‘God waves his hand on ..’ as ‘God put his hand on ...’ in Is 11:15 and 19:16.

In the beginning of this verse, LXX has δέ. In comparison with the occurrences of this particle in Ezekiel (36 times) and in Jeremiah (26 times), LXX-Is uses it remarkably frequently. This may arise from a tendency of the translator to explain and connect the relationship of given Hebrew sentences.<sup>175</sup> Generally, it is used to introduce a contrast with the previous sentence (for example, Is 1:2; 32:8, etc.), and in some cases, to connect sentences and phrases (for example, Is 30:1; 17:7, etc.). But this does not seem quite the case in the present verse. In the verse, this particle seems to function as a marker to indicate a change of phase or to draw attention to a new topic. It is also seen in other examples in which δέ is added into the same formula: 4:2 (בִּיּוֹם הַהוּא, τῆ δὲ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκέλυθη) and 38:1 (בִּימֵי הַהֵם, ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ καιρῷ), in which the

---

<sup>173</sup> This ‘Dative of Time’ does not accompany a preposition but when the attribute is a pronoun, generally ἐν is added. See Smyth, §§ 1540-42.

<sup>174</sup> 2:20; 4:2; 11:11; 17:7,9; 19:16,18,19,23,24; 22:8; 25:9; 26:1; 27:1,2; 28:5; 30:23; 31:7. In three verses, the Hebrew phrase is not reflected at all in LXX (4:1; 20:6; 24:21).

<sup>175</sup> This element appears quite frequently in such books as Genesis (750 times), Job (740 times), Proverbs (563 times), and in Greek-original books such as 2 Maccabees (462 times) and Wisdom of Solomon (142 times). These numbers are counted by *Bible Windows* (version 4.52). It is a very similar situation with γάρ. See 10:24. Van der Kooij, “19:16-25”, 130, thinks this plus of δέ suggests some relationship between v.16 and the preceding verses.

added particle indicates a new prophecy or event.<sup>176</sup>

The translator renders the term **מִצְרַיִם** as a plural word denoting the Egyptians, or a singular one denoting Egypt, the name of the region, depending on the context to which it belongs.<sup>177</sup>

1QIs<sup>a</sup> has plural verbs **וַחֲרָדוּ וַפָּחְדוּ** instead of singular **וַחֲרָד וַפָּחַד** in MT, with which 1QIs<sup>b</sup> and 4QIs<sup>b</sup> have the same reading. The reading in 1QIs<sup>a</sup> appears more suited to the context, taking **מִצְרַיִם** as collective, thus plural. It seems that the Vorlage of LXX has the same consonantal text as MT, for it is likely that *ἐν φόβῳ καὶ ἐν τρόμῳ* is a slick Greek-style translation of MT-reading or could be the result of understanding the consonants as nouns such as **וַיִּחְרָדְךָ (ה) וַפָּחַד**.<sup>178</sup>

In MT's **עָלִיו מִנִּיף הוּא**, LXX renders the verb not literally but contextually, so *αὐτὸς ἐπιβαλεῖ αὐτοῖς*, which is different from 1QIs<sup>a</sup>'s **וְדִי עָלִיו מִנִּיף הוּא**. “*Επιβάλλειν τὴν χεῖρά ἐπι ...*” is used as an idiom indicating ‘someone, mainly God, punishes or smites someone else’ throughout LXX.<sup>179</sup> In particular, Ex 7:4 says that the Lord will lay his hand upon Egypt, and after that the Egyptians will know the Lord (Ex 7:5; cf. Is 19:21). We will deal with this passage later.

### 2.3.2.2. 19:17

<b>וְהָיְתָה אֲדָמַת יְהוּדָה</b>	καὶ ἔσται ἡ χώρα τῶν Ἰουδαίων
<b>לְמִצְרַיִם לְחָנָא</b>	τοῖς Αἰγυπτίοις εἰς φόβητρον
<b>כֹּל אֲשֶׁר יִזְכֵּר אֶתְּךָ אֱלֹהֵי יִפְחָד</b>	πᾶς ὃς ἐὰν ὀνομάσῃ αὐτὴν αὐτοῖς φοβηθήσονται
<b>מִפְנֵי עֲצַת יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת אֲשֶׁר־הוּא יוֹעֵץ עָלָיו:</b>	διὰ τὴν βουλὴν ἣν βεβούλευται κύριος ἐπ' αὐτήν

<sup>176</sup> We have to admit that it is also possible to think that it arises from reading **כ** as **ו**.

<sup>177</sup> The Hebrew word appears 51 times in MT; of them, it is rendered as a singular word (*Αἰγύπτος*) 31 times, as a plural word (*Αἰγύπτους*) 12 times, and as a plural word with a corresponding plural verb 7 times. Only in 27:12 the word is translated into totally different Greek word (*Ῥινοκοροῦρα*). See 2.4.2.1.

<sup>178</sup> In Is 10:29 as well, LXX reads **וַיִּחְרָדְךָ**, a verbal form, as a nominal form **וַיִּחְרָדְךָ** so, *φόβος*. Crougths, 92-93, argues that the rendering of the present verse was influenced by 2:25 and 11:25 in LXX-Deut, which have the pair “*τρόμος καὶ φόβος*”, an equivalent of **וִירָאָה/מִוִּרְאָה וַפָּחַד**. From this, she suggests further that the translator of Isaiah had a Hebrew Vorlage of Deuteronomy (93-94). It is possible, but her argument needs to explain whether the rendering came from a nominal reading, as seen in 10:29 in LXX-Is.

<sup>179</sup> Gen 22:12; Ex 7:4; 2 Sam 18:12; Esther 6:2; Ps 80:15 [MT 81:15]; in Isaiah – 5:25, 11:14,15, 25:11.

MT: And the land of Judah shall become to Egypt a reeling; whoever shall remind them of it, they shall be afraid because of the counsel of YHWH of **hosts** which he is devising against it.

LXX: And the land of the Jews shall become to the Egyptians a terror; whoever names it to them, they shall be afraid because of the counsel which the Lord has devised against it.

1QIs<sup>a</sup>: להונה ליהוה for להגא<sup>180</sup>; orthographic differences איהה, כול.

4QIs<sup>b</sup>: מפיני עזת יהוה צבאות for מפני תנופת יד יהוה צבאות, which seems to be mistakenly copied from the same phrase in v. 16.

צבאות יהוה represented by κύριος σαβαωθ is a unique rendering of the translator. It is peculiar that he does not reflect צבאות three times in a row (vv.17,18,20) in this section 19:16-25.<sup>181</sup>

This verse of MT is paralleled by v.16, especially in the second half, while LXX does not preserve that parallel. מפני is rendered ἀπὸ προσώπου (v.16) and δία (v.17) respectively,<sup>182</sup> and above all, the sentence of the second half in LXX seems more streamlined. It is quite likely that, in his rendering of v.17bβ, the translator kept 19:12 (τί βεβούλευται κύριος σαβαωθ ἐπ’ Αἴγυπτον) in mind in two points: the use of the preposition ἐπί, and the perfect form βεβούλευται. With this, it is suggested that the final αὐτήν denotes “Egypt”, like in 19:12, against van der Kooij, who sees its referent as ἡ χώρα τῶν Ιουδαίων.<sup>183</sup> Even though it would seem to refer to ‘the land of the Jews’, contrary to “Egypt” of MT, in the context of the present verse, attention should be paid to the point that this verse has many things in common with 19:12. In addition, chapter 19 does not say anything concerning “the land of Judah” at all. Furthermore, when the verb βουλεύομαι is used with the preposition ἐπί, the object of ἐπί is something to be

---

<sup>180</sup> This interchange between נ and ה is easily seen in Qumran. Judging from the inserted *waw* in Qumran, this spelling seems to have come from phonetic mistake during dictation.

<sup>181</sup> Cf. S. Talmon, “Aspects of the Textual Transmission of the Bible in the Light of Qumran Manuscripts”, *Textus* 4 (1964), 102.

<sup>182</sup> The renderings of מפני in LXX-Is are ἀπὸ προσώπου (e.g. 7:16; 19:1,16; 57:1), ἀπό (e.g. 10:27; 30:11; 63:19), δία (e.g. 19:17,20; 21:15\*4), ὑπό (7:2), τὸ πρόσωπον (51:13). See Sollamo, *Renderings*, 81-94. According to her, 81, ἀπὸ προσώπου is the most common rendering of מפני in the LXX, which is also discernible in LXX-Is.

<sup>183</sup> Van der Kooij, “19:16-25”, 133.

destroyed or be threatened.<sup>184</sup> Therefore, “the land of Judah” does not seem appropriate for an object of ἐπί. Our view is supported by the next verse which deals with things in “Egypt”.

### 2.3.2.3. 19:18

בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא יִהְיֶה חֲמֵשׁ עָרִים בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם	τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ἔσονται πέντε πόλεις ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ
מְדַבְּרוֹת שְׂפַת כְּנָעַן	λαλοῦσαι τῆς γλώσσης τῆς Χανανίτιδι
וְנֹשְׁבֹת לַיהוָה צְבָאוֹת	καὶ ὀμνύουσαι τῷ ὀνόματι κυρίου
עִיר הַהָרָס יֵאמָר לְאַחַת:	πόλις-ασεδεκ κληθήσεται ἢ μία πόλις

MT: **In** that day, there shall be five<sup>185</sup> cities in **the land of** Egypt, speaking the language of Canaan and swearing by YHWH of **hosts**; One shall be called “the city of Destruction”.

LXX: On that day, there shall be five cities in Egypt speaking the Canaanite language and swearing by **the name of** the Lord; One **city** shall be called “the city Asedek”.

1QIs<sup>a</sup>: very significantly חרס for הרס, also in 4QIs<sup>b</sup>.<sup>186</sup>

On the absence of ἐν in the beginning, see v.16. בארץ מצרים is rendered as ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ with no equivalent of ארץ. It could be just a loose translation technique (cf. 27:13).

LXX makes the meaning of the MT phrase “swear by YHWH” clearer by adding “by the name of (τῷ ὀνόματι)”. It seems that the translator had Is 48:1 in mind: הנשבעים יהוה - οἱ ὀμνύοντες τῷ ὀνόματι κυρίου. It could be explained to avoid anthropomorphism by adding a “buffer”.<sup>187</sup> This connection with 48:1 might also explain the point that LXX does not reflect צבאות of MT. The added πόλις in the end of this verse makes the sentence clearer.

One of the most remarkable translations in LXX-Is is “the city of righteousness” (ασεδεκ, a transliterated form of הצדק) for MT’s “the city of destruction”. Many ancient

<sup>184</sup> Is 14:26; 23:8; Jer 49:20 [LXX 30:14], 30 [LXX 25]; 50:45 [LXX 27:45].

<sup>185</sup> As a round number, related to Egypt in particular (Gen 43:34; 45:22; 47:2), see Deissler, 15; differently from this, as five cities having a common fate, see Sedlmeier, 95f.

<sup>186</sup> In 1QIs<sup>a</sup>, ה is written, clearly distinguishably from ח in its writing style throughout the scroll. In the end of the same verse, אַחַת shows this clearly.

<sup>187</sup> Fritsch, 167.

versions bear witness to the reading “the city of the sun”, that is עיר החרס<sup>188</sup>:

Qumran-1QIsa<sup>a</sup>, 4QIsa<sup>b</sup>: עיר החרס

Symmachus: civitas ηλιου

Targum: בית שמש דעתידא למחרב<sup>189</sup>

Vulgate: civitas Solis

Cf. Aquila and Theodotion: αρες<sup>190</sup>

First of all, the reading preserved in MT does not match the positive tone concerning Egypt in vv.18-25.<sup>191</sup> The reading of Targum shows that “the city of destruction” may arise from an interpretation.<sup>192</sup>

Seeligmann is in favor of the theory of the originality of the tradition in the Septuagint.<sup>193</sup> According to him, LXX had the original reading and in the Hebrew text a gloss עיר החרס was inserted, “purporting to declare that it was Heliopolis which was being hinted at, which ousted the original הצדק עיר”. In a later generation, he suggests, when the temple at Heliopolis was branded as an illegitimate competitor of Jerusalem, עיר החרס must have been changed into the “ominous term” עיר ההרס.<sup>194</sup> He doubts the

---

<sup>188</sup> This must have been meant a Hebrew expression of the Greek city Heliopolis, which was known as On (אֹן), Gen 41:45,50; 46:20) or Awen (אָוֵן, Ezek 30:17). Beth Shemesh, a literal rendering, is found in Jer 43:13. In all cases, LXX renders them as Heliopolis. In addition, LXX has one more appearance of Heliopolis: in Ex 1:11 there were three places where the Israelites had to do forced labour, and one of them was Heliopolis. See 5.2.

<sup>189</sup> This reflects both two readings: החרס and ההרס. See van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 180.

<sup>190</sup> *Aquila* and *Theodotion* have αρες, which could be from either הרס or חרס. But since *Aquila's* translation technique avoids usually transliteration even in place names (e.g. οἴκου ἡλιου for בית-שמש in MT-Jer 43:13), we can assume he would have rendered it as a clear Greek word if he kept הרס in mind, which must have been a well-known word. Therefore, it is likely that the vorlage of *Aquila's* translation also has עיר ההרס. In contrast, *Theodotion* tends to like transliteration. Cf. LXX transliterates החרס in Ju 2:9; 8:13 as αρες.

<sup>191</sup> Cf. Cheyne, *Isaiah*, 120, supports “the city of destruction” by interpreting it as “city of the breaking down of idolatrous altars”. Interestingly, Israelit-Groll suggests that Isaiah chose the rare Hebrew הרס instead of שמש, because of its phonetic similarity to הרס, as a sarcasm. And she thinks the name referred to El-Amarna, the home of Egyptian monotheism. See S. Israelit-Groll, “The Egyptian Background to Isaiah 19.18” in M. Lubetski, C. Gottlieb and S. Keller (eds.), *Boundaries of the Ancient Near Eastern World. A Tribute to Cyrus H. Gordon* (JSOTSup 273; Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 302. But her understanding, basically, does not match the context of 19:16-25.

<sup>192</sup> The Babylonian Talmud in around 5th or 6th century CE also reflects this Targumic thought. *bMenahot*, 110a - While the text in this Talmud introduces the reading עיר הרס, it tries to give an explanation why “the sun” is meant here using the reading of the Aramaic Targum: “What is meant by the city of Heres (עיר הרס)? – As R. Joseph rendered it in Aramaic: the city of Beth Shemesh [the Sun], which is destined to destruction (בית שמש דעתיד למיחרב), will be said to be one of them. But whence do we know that Heres (חרס) signifies the sun? For it is written, Who commandeth the sun and it riseth not”.

<sup>193</sup> Seeligmann, 220; cf. Gray has the same opinion for the original reading. See Gray, *Isaiah*, 335-337.

<sup>194</sup> Seeligmann, 220.

possibility that עיר החרם was original because it is hard to explain why “the singular version החרם should have been replaced by the ordinary term הצדק” and why the translator used a transliterated form rather than a Greek name to legitimate a sanctuary in Egypt. But it is hard to explain how עיר הצדק was replaced by עיר החרם, added as a gloss. And we do not have any extant material to reflect עיר הצדק but the Septuagint. Then it seems that the reading “the city of the sun”, which is attested in most ancient textual evidence, is the likely original one.

Another solution is recently suggested by Troxel.<sup>195</sup> For him, the Septuagintal reading transliterates הסרה. He explains the reason for the scribal change החרם into הסרה as arising from the desire to obliterate intimations of solar worship, seen in the same change between Judg 2:9 and Josh 19:50.<sup>196</sup> This reading, Troxel suggests, resulted in Ασδεκ with the misreading ה into ד and transliterating ה as κ. However I am unable to find a case in which the final ה is transliterated as κ.<sup>197</sup> In a very few cases the last ה is rendered into χ (Gen 10:11,26). In addition, the last ה is usually represented by χ,<sup>198</sup> and the last ק into κ.<sup>199</sup> Thus, the name of the High Priest צדוק is always transliterated containing three consonants σ, δ and κ in LXX.<sup>200</sup> Therefore, it seems appropriate to regard Ασδεκ as a transliteration of הצדק.

However, the possibility that the Vorlage had הצדק or even הסרה should not be excluded. The safest approach in this very vexed question seems to be the minimalist

---

<sup>195</sup> Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 169-171.

<sup>196</sup> A. Vaccari holds the same opinion concerning the consonants. See “πολις Ασδεκ – Isaia xix,18”, *Bib* 2 (1921), 353-356.

<sup>197</sup> E.g. Gen 5:21ff; Ex 6:21; Nu 26:20; Jos 15:34,53; 1Sa 12:11ff; 1Ch 1:3,24; 2Ch 14:8; Ps 42:1[LXX 41:1]. Usually, final ה is ignored (e.g. Gen 5:21; 6:8). Even the final ה in Josh 19:50 which Troxel suggests is transliterated into χ.

<sup>198</sup> E.g. Gen 4:17,18; Jos 21:25; 2Sa 8:17; 1Ch 1:32,33.

<sup>199</sup> E.g. Gen 17:19; Jud 1:5,6,7; 1Ch 1:28,32,36.

<sup>200</sup> צדקיהו – Σεδεκια (1Ki 22:24; 1Ch 3:15; Jer 21:1; 32:1, etc); צדוק – Σαδωκ (2Sa 15:24; 1Ki 1:8; 2Ki 15:33; 1Ch 5:34; 16:39; 2Ch 31:10; Neh 3:4, etc) or Σαδδουκ (Ezra 7:2; Neh 3:29; 13:13; Eze 40:46; 43:19; 44:15; 48:11); מלכי-צדק – Μελχισεδεκ (Gen 14:18; Ps 110:4; cf. Heb 5:6; 6:20, etc).

position. There is no other witness reading הצדק or הסרח except LXX, and other major witnesses reflect החרס. This החרס may also explain the other variants in LXX, MT and Targum. So to take החרס as the original reading seems more likely than other possibilities.

Another piece of evidence supporting החרס is found in Josephus' works. According to Josephus,<sup>201</sup> it was because of the prophecy of Isaiah that Onias who fled from Palestine to Egypt built a temple in the nome of Heliopolis. Considering Josephus' negative attitude towards the Temple of Onias, his mention that the Temple was built according to the prophecy of Isaiah in the nome of Heliopolis should be considered seriously (this will be dealt with later).<sup>202</sup> Therefore we conclude that the text of Isaiah which Onias referred to had the reading "the city of the sun" indicating Heliopolis. Onias built the temple "in a place so unclean and full of sacred animals",<sup>203</sup> because of the prophecy in Isaiah.

Secondly, the fact that many Greek versions, even Aquila, have transliterated forms of Hebrew words here harmonizes well with the mention of the Canaanite language in this verse.<sup>204</sup> Troxel still questions why this important term הצדק is transliterated.<sup>205</sup> Once again, it seems plausible that the reason for transliteration is the phrase in the present verse, "speaking Canaanite", which is a better solution than Troxel's suggestion concerning the hypothetical form הסרח in the Vorlage.<sup>206</sup> It seems that the translator

---

<sup>201</sup> *Ant.* 13.64; also see *B.J.* 7.426ff.

<sup>202</sup> See 4.2.1.

<sup>203</sup> *Ant.* 13.70.

<sup>204</sup> Van der Kooij, "Accident or method", 137.

<sup>205</sup> Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 169-171. If Troxel changes the Vorlage of the translator as seen above, then he has to answer why *Aquila* and *Theodotion* also transliterate like  $\alpha\rho\epsilon\varsigma$ . That is, to transliterate in this verse is a problem not confined to LXX-Is. In fact, the preference to transliterate "Hebrew names of towns and countries above the Hellenistic nomenclature" is observed by Seeligmann, 232; Troxel also notes this tendency, in "Name", 329.

<sup>206</sup> Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 171.

wanted to show that a city in Egypt is called by a “Canaanite” name. Considering the fact that Hebrew theophoric names were still used in Egypt during the second century,<sup>207</sup> Jews in Egypt must have known some important Hebrew words, as the descendants of the peoples who have lived abroad still remember some words and phrases of their mother tongue today. Throughout LXX, names containing צדק are always transliterated using three consonants (σ, δ, κ).<sup>208</sup> Therefore, it seems that the transliterated name Ασεδεκ might have reminded the Jews in Egypt of “Zadok”, as there were Zadokite priests in the Temple in Egypt.<sup>209</sup> The suggestion by Deissler that “speaking Canaanite” indicates that Hebrew cultic terms were used<sup>210</sup> can contribute to our argument, for the name “Zadok” would belong to the cultic arena. The Septuagint Exodus preserves the Egyptian name “On” (1:11) of Heliopolis, which might also have reminded the Jews in Egypt of “the land of Onias”.<sup>211</sup> Therefore, the fact that two names - On and Asedek - have sounds related to the Zadokite priest Onias does not seem coincidence.<sup>212</sup> One more reason for the transliteration is the connection with 1:26. The translator would know that עיר הזרקס, the Hebrew reading he had, indicated Heliopolis where the Temple of Onias stood. By rendering this explicit name as πολίς Ασεδεκ, which means “the city of righteousness”, he would be able to achieve two goals, namely to keep the aural reminiscence of “Zadok” and “Canaanite language”, and at the same time to link the phrase with the mention עיר הצדק in 1:26. Perhaps the Vorlage of

---

<sup>207</sup> For example, the list of the translators in the *Letter of Aristeas* (47-51) shows that Greek names and Hebrew names were used together. One of the names of the translators in the *Letter of Aristeas* is a “Sedekiah (Σεδεκια)” (49). Admittedly, using Hebrew names does not necessarily mean that the Jews in Egypt knew the meaning of their names. However the fact that they still insisted on using those Hebrew names in the midst of Hellenization seems to lead us to presuppose that they knew what their Hebrew names signified, just as today people usually have some awareness of what their names mean.

<sup>208</sup> See n. 200 above.

<sup>209</sup> See below and chapter 4.

<sup>210</sup> Deissler, 15.

<sup>211</sup> See 5.2.

<sup>212</sup> Driver also implies this: G.R. Driver, *The Judaean Scrolls: The Problem and a Solution* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1965), 227f.

LXX-Is had עיר הצדק as a gloss, seemingly added to connect the possible original reading עיר החרם with 1:26, in contrast to Seeligmann as we saw above. It seems easier and more reasonable to explain how the original עיר החרם with a gloss עיר הצדק was rendered into πολίς Ασεδεκ and changed into עיר ההרם, rather than to explain how the original עיר הצדק with a gloss עיר החרם was changed into πολίς Ασεδεκ and עיר ההרם. This connection with 1:26 may provide the reason why the translator did not make use of a more direct term in the rendering of 19:18, if he intended to indicate the Temple of Onias in Heliopolis, as suggested by Murray.<sup>213</sup> A future ideal city will be called “city of righteousness” according to 1:21-28. The rendering πολίς Ασεδεκ in 19:18, then, is identified with the ideal city. Therefore, LXX-Is identifies the Temple of Onias in Heliopolis as the city of righteousness, leading by Zadokite priests. We will deal with this theme further in the next section. The suggestion by Monsengwo-Pasinya<sup>214</sup> that the translator probably wanted to avoid giving the same name to the Egyptian city as Jerusalem, by rendering πόλις δικαιοσύνη in 1:26 in LXX, does not seem correct: this suggestion presupposes that the Egyptian Jews of the period did not know any Hebrew word at all, contrary to common sense.

To conclude, עיר החרם seems to have been an original reading<sup>215</sup> and it must have been in the Vorlage of the Septuagint. Therefore πολίς Ασεδεκ is a very deliberate

---

<sup>213</sup> O. Murray, “Aristeas and Ptolemaic Kingship”, *JTS* 18(1967), 365. See below.

<sup>214</sup> L. Monsengwo-Pasinya, “Isaïe XIX 16-25 et universalisme dans la LXX” in J.A. Emerton (ed.), *Congress Volume Salamanca 1983* (VTSup 36; Leiden: Brill, 1985), 201.

<sup>215</sup> This seems the scholarly consensus, including Auvray; Blenkinsopp; Brueggemann; Clements; Jensen; Oswalt; Sweeney; Watts; Wildberger. Also Barthélemy, 149f; Sedlmeier, 91 n.7; van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 588; Hagelia, 79f; J.G. Bunge, *Untersuchungen zur Makkabäerbuch* (Bonn: Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Druck, 1971), 589-593, thinks that LXX-Is had a favorable attitude towards the Temple of Onias, while Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Hosea had a hostile attitude, judging from the use of the Hebrew On. For this, see 5.2; F.H.W. Gesenius, *Philologisch-kritischer und historischer Commentar über den Jesaia* (2 Teile in 3; Leipzig, 1821), 634. A possibility that Arabic *haris* (‘of the Lion’) lies behind to refer to the temple at Leontopolis is pointed by Duhm, *Jesaja*, 145; Ottley, 2:201; Sedlmeier, 91 n.7. Sawyer suggests the reference to Leontopolis may be found in the reading of Codex Sinaiticus πόλις ἁσέδ ἡλίου, since “*asad* is the normal Arabic word for ‘lion’”. See Sawyer, “Blessed”, 63.



verse (7:6; 16:3; 61:9; 66:17; but fully in 5:2; 6:5; 24:13; 41:18), a similar case to בקרב.<sup>221</sup> It seems difficult to find certain coherent principles in these usages. It could be an attempt to make more eloquent, non-Hebraistic Greek style.

In this verse, LXX adopts θυσιαστήριον as an equivalent for מזבח. As is pointed out by scholars,<sup>222</sup> LXX-Is uses this Greek word in a positive sense,<sup>223</sup> while βωμός is used to indicate idol worship or a Gentile cult (17:8; 27:9; and 15:2; 16:12 for במה). According to this, this usage in v.19 means that this altar in Egypt is a legitimate one,<sup>224</sup> as legitimate as the Jerusalem temple.

### 2.3.2.5. 19:20

וְהָיָה לְאוֹת וּלְעֵד לַיהוָה צְבָאוֹת	καὶ ἔσται εἰς σημεῖον εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα κυρίου
בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם	ἐν χώρᾳ Αἰγύπτου,
כִּי־יִצְעֲקוּ אֶל־יְהוָה מִפְּנֵי לְחָצִים	ὅτι κεκράξονται πρὸς κύριον διὰ τοὺς θλίβοντας αὐτούς,
וַיִּשְׁלַח לָהֶם	καὶ ἀποστελεῖ αὐτοῖς κύριος ἄνθρωπον,
מוֹשִׁיעַ וְרֹב וְהַצִּילֵם:	ὃς σώσει αὐτούς, κρίνων σώσει αὐτούς

MT: And it shall be a sign **and** a witness<sup>225</sup> to YHWH **of hosts** in the land of Egypt, for they will cry unto YHWH because of oppressors and he shall send them a saviour **and** defender<sup>226</sup> and he will deliver them.

LXX: And it shall be a sign forever to the Lord in the land of Egypt, for they will cry unto the Lord because of those who oppress **them**, and **the Lord** will send them **a man** who will deliver **them**; judging he will deliver them.

1QIs<sup>a</sup>: והיה for והיה; orthographic לוחצים; ושלח, waw consecutive perfect for וישלח in MT and 4QIs<sup>b</sup>; וירד, waw consecutive perfect for ורב.

With the reading לְעֵד as לְעֵד, the conjunction *waw* in front of לְעֵד seems to have been omitted, and εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα appears in LXX.<sup>227</sup> On the absence of an equivalent of

251-266.

<sup>221</sup> See the explanation of verse 10:23.

<sup>222</sup> Van der Kooij, “19:16-25”, 137-8; E. Tov, “The Septuagint”, in M.J. Mulder (ed.), *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (Assen/Maastricht: Van Gorcum, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988), 176. See 4.4.4.

<sup>223</sup> 6:6; 56:7; 60:7 – in all three the Greek word refers to the Jerusalem temple.

<sup>224</sup> Van der Kooij, “19:16-25”, 138. Interestingly, in 36:7, the only possible example where θυσιαστήριον may be used with negative connotations is not reflected in major ancient manuscripts, but is seen only in later recensions and Catena-group (V, L, C, etc.).

<sup>225</sup> Cf. לְעֵד וּלְעֵד as hendiadys thus “ein zuverlässiges Zeichen”. See H.A. Brongers, “Merismus, Synekdoche und Hendiadys in der bible-hebräischen Sprache”, *OtSt* 14 (1965), 109f.

<sup>226</sup> MT reads it as a participle, followed by versions (T, S, V), Oswalt, and Watts. But many scholars, including Gray, Kaiser, Kissane, Wildberger, read it as a perfect consecutive.

<sup>227</sup> Conversely, Prov 12:19 and Mi 7:18 read לְעֵד as לְעֵד.

צבאות, see 19:17. Changing participles into verbal sentences, LXX-Is puts in the objects of verbs which are not seen in MT: לחצים -- τὸς θλίβοντας αὐτούς; מושיע -- ἄνθρωπον, ὃς σώσει αὐτούς. There are many examples where pronouns are inserted to make the meaning clear in LXX-Is.<sup>228</sup> Especially, when Hebrew participles are rendered as Greek future or present verbs or as noun as in this verse, this sort of insertion of suitable pronouns happens frequently (for example, 1:15; 3:7,12, etc.). Similar to this, LXX-Is puts in κυρίως, which is not seen in MT, to make clear that the one who acts is the Lord Himself (8:10; 9:3; 14:17; 14:26; 27:4; 34:16; 44:14; 57:21; 63:9), which explains the insertion of κυρίως in our text.

LXX seems to read וְרָב (a substantive) as וְרָבִי (as a participle) so κρίνων<sup>229</sup> even though LXX did not reflect *waw*. 1QIs<sup>a</sup> reads this as וירד (“and he will go down), which suggests this tradition recognizes that one man is involved here, not two men.<sup>230</sup>

An unusual rendering ἄνθρωπον, ὃς σώσει αὐτούς for the Hebrew participle מושיע seems to come from avoiding a possible misunderstanding that could have been caused if it had been rendered as a Greek participle (for example, ὁ σώζων or σωτήρ),<sup>231</sup> because these possible renderings are always used to indicate God in LXX-Is (ὁ σώζων: 43:3,11, 60:16; σωτήρ: 45:15,21). Of course, the rendering would have put it into the accusative, thus τὸν σώζοντα (like in Ps 55:9[LXX 54:9]), which would have differentiated it from the subject God. However, LXX seems keen to distinguish sharply between the role of

<sup>228</sup> E.g. 1:3,13,15,16,20; 5:13; 30 :31, etc.

<sup>229</sup> But, with van der Kooij, “19:16-25”, 140, the rendering of LXX could be from the reading it as ‘*waw* consecutive perfect’, which is often rendered as participle as a translation technique of the translator when the perfect comes closely connected with a following verb. See Aejmelaeus, “Participium coniunctum”, 385-393, especially 389ff.

<sup>230</sup> Also R. Hayward, “The Jewish Temple at Leontopolis: A Reconstruction”, *JJS* 33 (1982), 441.

<sup>231</sup> Van der Kooij, “19:16-25”, 141f.; Schaper, “Messianic Intertextuality”, 377-378, suggests that this rendering is likely to have been influenced by Nu 24:7,17, and thus reflects “Septuagintal intertextuality”. The relationship of the verses in Numbers and Isaiah was originally suggested by W. Horbury, *Messianism among Jews and Christians: Twelve Biblical and Historical Studies* (London/New York: T&T Clark, 2003), 144-150, shows that the verse in Numbers saying “a man” was interpreted as a messianic oracle by Philo, Targum, Testament of Judah, Testament of Naphtali.

God and that of the mere human he sends. By introducing ἄνθρωπον, LXX makes it clear that a man is involved here.

#### 2.3.2.6. 19:21

וְנִדְעָ יְהוָה לְמִצְרַיִם      καὶ γνωστὸς ἔσται κύριος τοῖς Αἰγυπτίοις,  
וְיָדְעוּ מִצְרַיִם אֶת־יְהוָה בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא      καὶ γνώσονται οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι τὸν κύριον ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ  
וְעָבְדוּ זָבַח וּמִנְחָה      καὶ ποιήσουσι θυσίας  
וְנִדְרֵיהֶם יִשְׁלְמוּ:      καὶ εὔξονται εὐχὰς τῷ κυρίῳ καὶ ἀποδώσουσι

MT: And YHWH shall be known to the Egyptians and the Egyptians will know YHWH in that day, and they will serve with sacrifice **and grain offering** and they will vow a vow to YHWH and they will fulfill.

LXX: And the Lord shall be known to the Egyptians, and the Egyptians will know the Lord in that day and they will offer sacrifice and they will vow a vow to the Lord and they will pay (them).<sup>232</sup>

1QIs<sup>a</sup>=MT.

LXX renders זָבַח וּמִנְחָה as θυσία. In LXX-Is, מִנְחָה is rendered as θυσία (57:6; 66:20), δῶρον (39:1; 66:20) or σμίδαλις (1:13; 66:3).<sup>233</sup> זָבַח is always translated as θυσία in LXX-Is.<sup>234</sup> Accordingly it seems that this rendering in 19:21 is caused by a translation technique of simplification by omitting duplicated words or phrases.<sup>235</sup>

The case in which the verb עָבַד is used with מִנְחָה or זָבַח appears only in Isaiah (19:21 and 43:23), which seems to have been influenced by the Aramaic verb עָבַד (*do, make* = Heb. עָשָׂה).<sup>236</sup> The expression ποιέω θυσία is found in some places in LXX and the *Letter of Aristeas*.<sup>237</sup>

#### 2.3.2.7. 19:22

וְנָגַף יְהוָה אֶת־מִצְרַיִם      καὶ πατάξει κύριος τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους  
נֶגַף וְרָפְּוּא      πληγῆ μεγάλη καὶ ἰάσεται αὐτοὺς ἰάσει,  
וְשָׁבוּ עַד־יְהוָה      καὶ ἐπιστραφήσονται πρὸς κύριον,  
וְנִעְתַּר לָהֶם וּרְפָאָם:      καὶ εἰσακούσεται αὐτῶν καὶ ἰάσεται αὐτούς

<sup>232</sup> Silva's translation in *NETS*: "repay them".

<sup>233</sup> Actually מִנְחָה in 43:23; 57:6; 66:20 means "grain offering", which is rendered as θυσία or even not reflected (43:23).

<sup>234</sup> 1:11; 19:21; 34:6; 43:23,24; 56:7; 57:7.

<sup>235</sup> See 2.1.2.3.

<sup>236</sup> Van der Kooij, "19:16-25", 143; cf. Gray and Wildberger, as a technical term.

<sup>237</sup> Van der Kooij, "19:16-25", 143.

MT: And YHWH will smite the Egyptians, smite but also heal again<sup>238</sup>, and they will return to YHWH and he will hear them and he will heal them.

LXX: And the Lord will smite the Egyptians with a **great** plague and **he will heal them** with a healing, and they will return to the Lord and he will hear them and he will heal them.

1QIs<sup>a</sup>: ונרפוי, Niphal waw consecutive perfect, for רפוי in MT, so “they shall be healed”.

Μεγάλη seems to be added to reflect the grammatical force of infinitive absolute used after a finite verb having the same root.<sup>239</sup> This infinitive absolute is often rendered as a dative noun,<sup>240</sup> which leads one to consider the rendering of רפוי as *ιάσει*.<sup>241</sup> *Ἰάσεται αὐτούς* can be explained as a paraphrase for clarification.

### 2.3.2.8. 19:23

בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא תְהִיָּה מִסְלָה מִמִּצְרַיִם אֶשְׂרָה  
וּבְאֶשְׂרָה מִמִּצְרַיִם וּמִצְרַיִם בְּאֶשְׂרָה  
וְעִבְדוּ מִצְרַיִם אֶת־אֲשֹׁרֵי  
τῆ ἡμέρα ἐκείνη ἔσται ὁδὸς Αἰγύπτου πρὸς Ἀσσυρίους,  
καὶ εἰσελεύσονται Ἀσσύριοι εἰς Αἴγυπτον  
καὶ Αἰγύπτιοι πορεύσονται πρὸς Ἀσσυρίους  
καὶ δουλεύουσιν οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι τοῖς Ἀσσυρίοις

MT: **In** that day there shall be a highway **from** Egypt towards Assyria and Assyria will come into Egypt and Egypt into Assyria, and Egypt shall serve **with**<sup>242</sup> Assyria.

LXX: That day there shall be a way of Egypt towards Assyrians, and Assyrians will come into Egypt and Egyptians **will go** towards Assyrians, and the Egyptians shall serve the Assyrians.<sup>243</sup>

1QIs<sup>a</sup>: no מצרים in the last sentence so “they shall serve Assyria”.

On the absence of ἐν, see v.16. Ὀδὸς Αἰγύπτου in LXX, which has no equivalent of מן, generally means “the way to Egypt”<sup>244</sup> in contrast with the Masoretic “the highway from Egypt (to Assyria)”. LXX has one more verb in the third line: πορεύομαι. While MT uses the verb בוא for two sentences, LXX adopts different verbs respectively (εἰσερχομαι, πορεύομαι). This change seems to originate with the translator, not with the Vorlage. This clearly shows the speaker or translator was located in Egypt.

On the translation of מצרים, see Is 19:16. The Hebrew word אשור is nearly always

<sup>238</sup> cf. *GKC* §113s.

<sup>239</sup> cf. *GKC* §113r.

<sup>240</sup> Nu 11:15; Jer 22:10; in LXX-Is, see 6:9.

<sup>241</sup> cf. van der Kooij, “19:16-25”, 144f., thinks its rendering as αὐτούς *ιάσει*.

<sup>242</sup> We read אה as את, which seems more suitable for the context.

<sup>243</sup> Silva makes the point clearer: “and the Egyptians will be subject to the Assyrians” (*NETS*).

<sup>244</sup> Van der Kooij, “19:16-25”, 146. See Is 10:24,26, and especially, Jer 2:18 (cf. Am 4:10).

rendered as a plural noun in LXX-Is (42 times), except in 11:16<sup>245</sup> and 31:8,<sup>246</sup> which can be considered to denote ‘Assyrian people’. It could denote the people in Mesopotamia or outside there, or even Syria.<sup>247</sup> The Hebrew אֲשׁוּר is reflected as an accusative marker in LXX.<sup>248</sup> As Baer points out, attention should be paid to some cases where this change is “not simply the result of confusion with regard to אֲשׁוּר, but rather a piece of targum-like theological exegesis”.<sup>249</sup> In the present verse, the LXX rendering has its own meaning, which will be dealt with later.

### 2.3.2.9. 19:24

בְּיוֹם הַהוּא יִהְיֶה יִשְׂרָאֵל שְׁלִישִׁיהָ    τῆ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἔσται Ἰσραὴλ τρίτος  
 לְמִצְרַיִם וּלְאַשּׁוּר    ἐν τοῖς Ἀσσυρίοις καὶ ἐν τοῖς Αἰγυπτίοις  
 בְּרִכָּה בְּקֶרֶב הָאָרֶץ:    εὐλογημένος ἐν τῇ γῆ

MT: **In** that day Israel will be a third to Egypt and to Assyria, a blessing in **the midst of** the land,  
 LXX: That day Israel will be third among the Assyrians and among the Egyptians, blessed in the land,  
 1QIs<sup>a</sup>=MT.

On the Greek rendering of בְּקֶרֶב הָאָרֶץ, see Is 10:23. This phrase appears 12 times throughout the Hebrew Bible<sup>250</sup> and, in Isaiah, it is used 6 times.<sup>251</sup> It is rendered as ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς or ἐν τῇ γῆ. Van der Kooij seems to distinguish the meanings of these two thus: “on the earth” and “in the (given) country”.<sup>252</sup> According to him, this phrase in 19:24 is to be translated by “on the earth”.<sup>253</sup> But his argument may go too far. Interestingly, this phrase is translated as ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς in the first three cases in Isaiah and

<sup>245</sup> LXX has ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ instead of מִצְרַיִם in MT.

<sup>246</sup> אֲשׁוּר is rendered as Ἀσσοῦρ.

<sup>247</sup> Van der Kooij, “19:16-25”, 146.

<sup>248</sup> Also in 45:9; 53:9; 57:15; 63:11. See Baer, *When We*, 154, 215.

<sup>249</sup> Baer, *When We*, 154f; cf. Gray, *Isaiah I-XXVII*, 341, points out, from the context, it would be evident that “a subjection of Egypt to Assyria is incompatible with entire outlook of the verses”. In that case, the Septuagintal text should be regarded intentional. Cf. Cheyne thinks this rendering “thoughtless”. See Ottley, 2:202.

<sup>250</sup> Gen 45:6; 48:16; Ex 8:18; Deut 4:5; 19:10; Ps 74:12 (LXX 73:12).

<sup>251</sup> 5:8; 6:12; 7:22; 10:23; 19:24; 24:13.

<sup>252</sup> Van der Kooij, “19:16-25”, 149.

<sup>253</sup> Van der Kooij, “19:16-25”, 149f.

as ἐν τῇ (γῆ) in the next three cases. Furthermore, בקרב is consistently rendered as phrases with ἐν after 10:23.<sup>254</sup> It means those translations would result from a translation technique for stylistic reasons, not from any significant interpretive intention. Moreover, in the present verse, the preposition ἐν is preferred because of the parallelism with the preceding phrase ἐν τοῖς Ἀσσυρίοις καὶ ἐν τοῖς Αἰγυπτίοις. This stylistic preference to ἐν can be seen in 10:23 and 24:13.<sup>255</sup> With the appearance of ἐν χώρᾳ Αἰγυπτίων (Αἰγύπτου) in vv.19-20, it is quite possible to see that ἡ γῆ refers to the land of Egypt.

The Hebrew preposition ל is rendered as ἐν. In MT, Israel, Egypt and Assyria are treated as nations, and the preposition ל denotes the relationship of these nations. It seems that של־ישיה does not mean ‘ranking or order’, which we judge by the context of vv.24-25, and thus the translation: “a third” (*NJB, Tanakh, etc.*). Those three nations are equal and on a par so the following translation is quite plausible: “Israel will be a third partner with Egypt and with Assyria”.<sup>256</sup>

But the Greek equivalent τρίτος would be regarded as denoting “rank”.<sup>257</sup> And LXX renders the names of two nations as plural nouns denoting people with the preposition ἐν, which lets us regard “Israel” as denoting Israelite people as well. As in other examples, Dan (Theodotion) 5:7 and Sirach 45:23, in which τρίτος is used, ‘third’ clearly presupposes the other two. Then, ‘the other two’ in the present verse must be “the Assyrians” and “the Egyptians”. Strikingly, LXX arrays this ולְאַשּׁוּר וְלְמִצְרַיִם in a reverse

---

<sup>254</sup> 10:23; 12:6; 19:1,3,24; 24:13; 63:11. Before 10:23, בקרב is generally rendered as a phrase with ἐπι- only one exception is 5:25 (ἐν μέσῳ).

<sup>255</sup> In 10:23, ἐν is paralleled with ἐν δικαιοσύνη in the preceding verse. In 24:13 as well, ἐν is paralleled with the following ἐν μέσῳ τῶν ἔθνων.

<sup>256</sup> *Tanakh*, Blenkinsopp, Oswalt, Wildberger, etc.

<sup>257</sup> Van der Kooij, “19:16-25”, 148-150, thinks this word denotes “rank and high position”. He, thus, understands the phrase in this verse as “Israel shall be in a high position”. But this does not seem kind of a term denoting a general ‘high position’, for it presupposes the preceding two.

order, thus: ἐν τοῖς Ἀσσυρίοις καὶ ἐν τοῖς Αἰγυπτίοις. When we keep two things in mind that, firstly, Assyria invaded Egypt and that, secondly, the present verse has something to do with ‘rank’, the Septuagintal order seems to indicate a power ranking in Egypt under the invasion of Assyria (first Assyrians, second Egyptians and third Israelites),<sup>258</sup> which means the reverse order would be the result of the translator’s deliberate intention. This reversal of order has also something to do with stylistic concern. It is mentioned in the explanation of Monsengwo-Pasinya, who saw that vv.24-25 has a chiasmatic parallelism<sup>259</sup>:

Israel (a) - In Assyrians (b) - In Egyptians (c) - Blessed (d) - Blessed (d’) - In Egypt (c’) - In Assyrians (b’) - Israel (a’)

The reverse of the order in LXX, therefore, could be from a stylistic intention to preserve this chiasm.

LXX renders the noun ברכה as a passive participle εὐλογημένος, which is again seen in v.25. Probably the rendering of LXX is caused by the intention to connect v.24 to v.25.

#### 2.3.2.10. 19:25

אֲשֶׁר בִּרְכוּ יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת לְאָמֹר    ἦν εὐλόγησεν κύριος σαβαωθ λέγων  
 בְּרוּךְ עַמִּי מִצִּלְמוֹת וּמַעֲשֵׂה יְדֵי אֲשֶׁר    εὐλογημένος ὁ λαός μου ὁ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ ὁ ἐν Ἀσσυρίοις  
 וְנַחֲלָתִי יִשְׂרָאֵל:    καὶ ἡ κληρονομία μου Ἰσραηλ

MT: Whom YHWH of hosts shall bless him (them), saying, “Blessed be my people Egypt and **my handiwork** Assyria and my inheritance Israel.

LXX: Which the Lord of Sabaoth shall bless, saying, “Blessed be my people **who are in** Egypt and **who are among** Assyrians and my inheritance Israel.

1QIs<sup>a</sup> has the same consonantal text with MT except orthographic לאמור.

“מַעֲשֵׂה יְדֵי” my handiwork” is not reflected in LXX. This Hebrew phrase is also seen in 1QIs<sup>a</sup> and probably 4QIs<sup>b</sup>, and is reflected in nearly all the versions and translations. מַעֲשֵׂה appears frequently in MT-Is, and in almost every case it is rendered literally in

---

<sup>258</sup> Or it could reflect some tensions between the other inhabitants of Egypt and the Jews in Egypt. See Baer, *When We*, 216.

<sup>259</sup> Monsengwo-Pasinya, 204.

LXX.<sup>260</sup> Furthermore, the expression “one’s handiwork ... **יד-מעשה**” in MT-Is is always suitably rendered in LXX, positively denoting God’s work and negatively man-made idols.<sup>261</sup> Therefore in the case of the present verse, it should be regarded as being a clue to the intentional omission of the translator.

Ὁ ἐν appears twice in LXX, which is explicable as only a translator’s addition to make some effect to the text irrespective of the Vorlage. It makes the two proper nouns modify “my people” thus “my people in Egypt and in Assyrians”.

LXX translates **אשר ברכו** as ἦν εὐλόγησεν, which is normal Greek style. The referent of ἦν seems to be ἡ γῆ in the preceding verse. Again, **אשור** is rendered as a plural noun denoting people, contrasted with the preceding “Egypt” for the country name.

### 2.3.3. The Septuagintal text

As in MT, τῆ ἡμέρα ἐκείνῃ in 19:16 in LXX-Is distinguishes 19:16-25 from the preceding 19:1-15. Furthermore, differently from MT, σαβαωθ functions as an inclusio to demarcate this section, appearing only in v.16 and v.25, while it appears in vv.16,17,18,20,25 in MT. But this does not mean this section has nothing to do with the preceding one. The inserted δέ suggests some relationship between two sections.<sup>262</sup> The similarity between v.12 and v.17 also connects those two. Therefore it is important to recognize from the present section, what is discontinuous and what is continuous with the preceding one.

---

<sup>260</sup> Even in chapter 19, the word appears twice (19:14,15). The only one case in which it is not reflected is Is 41:29, which verse is totally paraphrased in LXX.

<sup>261</sup> God’s work: 5:12; 29:23; 64:7; men-made idols: 2:8; 17:8; 37:19. In other words, this phrase indicates God’s good work if its subject is God and it indicates idols if the subject is human. We can understand why the translator rendered the Hebrew **יד-מעשה** as τὰ ἔργα τῶν πόνων αὐτῶν (the works of their labours) in Is 65:22. It is because this phrase could cause confusion if it would be translated literally with a human-subject.

<sup>262</sup> On δέ, see 19:16.

### 2.3.3.1. The land of the Jews

V.16 has continuity with 19:1-15, telling of the judgment and fear of the Egyptians. A new topic is introduced in v.17: “the land of the Jews”. ארמת יהודה and its Greek rendering ἡ χώρα τῶν Ἰουδαίων are found only in 19:17.<sup>263</sup> According to van der Kooij, χώρα is used, in many times, in the political sense, denoting “the official territory of a given people”, so he thinks that ἡ χώρα τῶν Ἰουδαίων means the official territory of the Jews.<sup>264</sup> But what does it refer to? There is no example at all in which γῆ or χώρα appear with the plural Ἰουδαῖοι throughout LXX. This makes us hesitate to conclude that the phrase should be understood like ones such as χώρα Αἰγυπτίων, χώρα Ἀσσυρίων. Otherwise we may think that some place in Egypt where the Jews dwelled was intended. Interestingly, Josephus reports that a group lived in Egypt, called οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι οἱ τὴν Ὀνίου λεγομένην χώραν κατοικοῦντες (the Jews who inhabited the district called by Onias).<sup>265</sup> This shows us a reality that a region outside Israel could be considered as ἡ χώρα (Ἰουδαίων). This is confirmed by the observation of the present text. According to v.17, “the land of the Jews” will be a source of fear for the Egyptians and they will be afraid of the land and the counsel which the Lord devised against Egypt. When we take into consideration that five cities in the land of Egypt speaking the language of Canaan are mentioned after v.17, it seems that “the land of the Jews” in v.17 indicates these five cities in Egypt, especially “the city of Asedek”. Therefore we suggest that this “land of the Jews” refers to a region where the Jews had lived in Egypt.

### 2.3.3.2. “The City of Asedek” and “Mother-city”

Let us, then, focus on the Jewish region in Egypt. Surprisingly, one of the cities was

---

<sup>263</sup> For referring to “the land of Judah”, ארץ יהודה is the usual expression, with its Greek equivalent γῆ Ἰουδα (Deut 34:2; 1Sa 22:5; 2Ki 23:24; 1Ch 6:40; Jer 31:23; Am 7:12, etc.), including an example in Is 26:1.

<sup>264</sup> “19:16-25”, 133-4., which is also seen in examples such as Is 10:10; Dan 4:18, etc.

<sup>265</sup> *Ant.* 14.131.

called “the city of Asedek”, that is “the city of Righteousness”.<sup>266</sup> MT and Targum reflect negative views of that temple in Heliopolis,<sup>267</sup> and this attitude is also reflected in Jer 43:13 [LXX-Jer 50:13].<sup>268</sup>

The fact that this unique expression “the city of righteousness” appears in 1:26 urges to consider the present section of chapter 19 in connection with 1:21-28.<sup>269</sup> 1:26 is connected with the preceding phrases (1:21-25) that God will cleanse the dirt and sin of Israel. After this cleansing by God, Judah and Jerusalem will be called “the city of righteousness, the faithful city”(1:26). But Septuagint reads differently from MT in some points.

Firstly, when we look at v.24, LXX has “the mighty ones of Israel οἱ ἰσχύουτες Ἰσραηλ” instead of MT’s “the Mighty one of Israel אֲבִיר יִשְׂרָאֵל”,<sup>270</sup> that is, LXX reads the title of God as a title for the authorities. And the word “Woe οὐαί” is connected with this phrase, so the result is “Woe to the mighty ones of Israel”.<sup>271</sup> As Seeligmann finds, the translator renders “the rather unusual epithet for God to be a qualification for a class of persons clothed with power among people of Israel”.<sup>272</sup>

Secondly, while MT uses metaphors to describe God’s cleaning action in v.25, LXX renders using very concrete ones:

---

<sup>266</sup> See 19:18.

<sup>267</sup> Sawyer, “Blessed”, 62.

<sup>268</sup> Also probably in Ezek 30:17: “νεανίσκοι ἡλίου πόλεως καὶ Βουβάστου ἐν μαχαίρα πεσοῦνται ...”

<sup>269</sup> In MT, 1:21-26 is demarcated from vv.27-28. See Childs; Williamson. But, in v.27 of LXX-Is, LXX has γάρ, which connects v.27-8 to the preceding verses. It means 1:21-28 in LXX should be dealt with a section.

<sup>270</sup> The Vorlage of LXX could have “אֲבִירֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל”, in which final Yodh could have been added by dittography, for “אֲבִיר” with “יַעֲקֹב” is always used as God’s title in MT and it is generally reflected so in LXX (Gen 49:24 – δυνατός Ἰακωβ; Ps 132:2,5, Is 60:16 – θεός Ἰσραηλ; but in Is 49:26 (ἰσχύς Ἰακωβ) it does not refer to the deity). Targum also reads “... תְּקִיפֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל”. Cf. Fritsch, 161f; Baer, *When We*, 113; Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 95 n.45.

<sup>271</sup> Cf. 5:22 in LXX. Williamson, *Isaiah 1-5*, 123. On 5:22-23, see 4.4.2.2.

<sup>272</sup> Seeligmann, 271.

וְאֶשְׂיֵבָה יָדַי עָלֶיךָ 1:25 καὶ ἐπάξω τὴν χεῖρά μου ἐπὶ σέ  
 וְאֶצְרֶךָ כְּבַר סִינַיִךְ καὶ πυρώσω σε εἰς καθαρὸν τοὺς δὲ ἀπειθοῦντας ἀπολέσω  
 וְאֶסְיֶרְהָ כָּל-בְּרִיּוֹתֶיךָ: καὶ ἀφελῶ πάντα ἀνόμους ἀπὸ σοῦ  
 καὶ πάντα ὑπερηφάνους ταπεινώσω

MT: And I will turn my hand against you, and I will purge your dross with lye<sup>273</sup> and I will take away all your tin.

LXX: And I will bring my hand upon you and I will purge you completely, **but I will destroy** the rebellious ones and I will take away all of the lawless ones from you **and I will bring all the haughty ones low**.

It would be difficult to explain where this Septuagintal version came from.<sup>274</sup> But it is quite enough to note that remarkably, LXX delivers a very specific picture to its readers concerning God's purifying deeds. According to LXX, God will achieve his purpose of purifying Zion by punishing the following people: the rebellious, the lawless, the haughty.<sup>275</sup> In v.23, the princes of Zion "are rebellious ἀπειθοῦσι". Accordingly, we see a mutually related picture of some specific groups in LXX: 'rebellious princes' (v.23) – 'the mighty ones of Israel' (v.24) – '(I will destroy) the rebellious ones' (v.25). It may mean that God's purging action is against the rebellious leaders of Jerusalem.<sup>276</sup> This is also shown in the reference to God restoring 'the judges and counsellors' in v.26. In this respect, 'the lawless ones' and 'the haughty ones', including 'the lawless ones οἱ ἄνομοι', 'the sinners οἱ ἁμαρτωλοί' and 'those who forsake the Lord οἱ ἐγκαταλείποντες τὸν κύριον' in v.28, may be regarded as titles denoting leaders of Jerusalem.

Thirdly, LXX has more in v. 26 than MT so πόλις δικαιοσύνη μητρόπολις πιστὴ **Σιων**. The word μητρόπολις should be understood in connection with v.21. In v.21, LXX reads "faithful city **Zion** πόλις πιστὴ **Σιων**" instead of just "faithful city קרייה נאמנה" in MT.<sup>277</sup> Μητρόπολις denotes a central city, in terms of administration (=capital city) or in terms

<sup>273</sup> Literally, "as the lye". On 'lye' or 'alkali' as a flux, see Wildberger; Williamson.

<sup>274</sup> See Williamson, *Isaiah 1-5*, 125.

<sup>275</sup> Also Baer, "About Us", 32-33, who adds the similar tendency in *Targum Jonathan*.

<sup>276</sup> Also Olley, *Righteousness*, 67; similarly, Seeligmann, 105-106.

<sup>277</sup> Williamson, *Isaiah 1-5*, 120f, rightly suggests that this "Zion" in LXX may have been made by the translator himself "without any Hebrew Vorlage", while Troxel, "Name", 328-9, considers it due to a scribe because "there is no reason to attribute it to the translator". However, there is the reason: to connect v.21 with v.26, as Williamson and Ottley, 2:108, suggests.

of tradition.<sup>278</sup> In both aspects, Jerusalem is a metropolis of the Jewish nation.<sup>279</sup> Especially, Josephus and Philo refer to Jerusalem as a metropolis because of the sanctuary.<sup>280</sup> In Philo, this word is used as a metaphor indicating something central, original and essential.<sup>281</sup> Μητρόπολις in LXX is added to emphasize the restoration of the original, ideal and pure Zion, with another added word “Zion”. Compared to MT which does not clarify what “faithful city” refers to, LXX’s introduction of two references to Zion in v.21 and in v.26 makes clear what is being dealt with in the present section: the reformation of Zion – the corruption of Zion and the restoration of Zion. As Zion became a harlot and was full of sin, God will judge Zion by punishing her leaders, and cleanse the city. Now the cleansed city will be called “faithful mother-city Zion”, which means the new Zion will play a central role. The phrase “the city of righteousness, the faithful mother-city Zion” includes their ideal, their vision and the restoration of Israel.

MT: the faithful city (21) ----	the city of righteousness, the faithful city(26)
	↑
	God's cleansing
LXX: the faithful city Zion(21) -----	the city of righteousness, the faithful mother-city Zion(26)
	↑
	God's cleansing

Regarding MT, the text is limited to the contents concerning Judah and Jerusalem.

But in LXX, the text lets us imagine a new, ideal Zion after the failure of historic Zion.

In summary, God will judge the authorities of Israel and eliminate them. After this

<sup>278</sup> As ‘capital city’: Josh 14:15; 15:13; 21:11, and as ‘old traditional city’: 2Sam 20:19. In Josephus we find many examples where this word refers to the capital city of a nation, e.g. *Ant.* 4.82; 7.123,129; 10.269; 11.159,340; 12.119; *Vita*, 372; *B.J.* 3.29, etc.

<sup>279</sup> This word μητρόπολις would be a nickname for Zion in the Diaspora community. Zion is the object of intense affection and adoration (for example, Ps 137; 136 in LXX). It is well known that "and of Zion וְלִצִּיּוֹן" in MT-Ps 87:5 is translated as "Zion is mother μητηρ Σιων" in LXX-Ps 86:5. Seeligmann, 284; H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 60-150* (tr. by H.C.Oswald; Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1989), 184-186. In *Conf.* 77f, *Spec. Leg.* 281, Philo compares the relationship between Jerusalem and the Diaspora to that between a “mother-city (μητρόπολις)” and its “colony (ἀποικία)”.

<sup>280</sup> *Ant.* 3.245: “... εἰς ἐκείνην τὴν πόλιν, ἣν διὰ τὸν ναὸν μητρόπολιν ἔξουσιν ...”; *Flacc.* 46: “... μητρόπολιν μὲν τὴν ἱερόπολιν ἠγοῦμενοι, καθ’ ἣν ἴδρυται ὁ τοῦ ὑψίστου θεοῦ νεὼς ἄγιος, ...”. Cf. *B.J.* 2.400.

<sup>281</sup> *Conf.* 78; *Fug.* 94; *Som.* 1.41,181.

judgment, the city will be called the city of righteousness, the faithful mother-city Zion.<sup>282</sup> 19:18 in LXX-Is pronounces that a city in Egypt will be called “the city of righteousness”, which would definitely have reminded the readers of the same expression in 1:26 to show the ideal, symbolic city.<sup>283</sup> Interestingly, LXX reads וְשָׁבַיָּהּ in v.27 as וְשָׁבַיָּהּ: “For her captives (ἡ ἀίχμαλωσία αὐτῆς) shall be saved with judgment and with mercy”. It means that the Septuagint as it stands, regardless of whether this phrase in 1:27 arises from an unintentional reading of a different vocalization or an intentional translation, concerns the captive people of Zion, i.e., the Diaspora.<sup>284</sup> Therefore, it seems further evident that “the city of Asedek” in 19:16-25 concerning the Jewish Diaspora in Egypt should be understood with “the city of righteousness, a faithful mother city Zion” in 1:21-28.<sup>285</sup> The connection of Zion with ‘righteousness’ is also seen in 33:5: ἐνεπλήσθη Σιων κρίσεως καὶ δικαιοσύνης “Zion is filled with judgement and righteousness”.

According to 1:21-28 in LXX-Is, Zion, “the city of Righteousness”, is promised to appear after God’s purification, which means mainly the total change of the ruling class in Jerusalem.<sup>286</sup> It does not necessarily mean that the city in Egypt replaces Jerusalem, but it demonstrates that the city in Egypt has the same importance and significance as Jerusalem. Historically speaking, this is nothing but the proclamation of the legitimacy

---

<sup>282</sup> Baer, *When We*, 279, notes “Zion-centred sentiment” in LXX-Is. In particular, he finds the tendency to elevate the stature of Zion in 64:9 [10 in LXX-Is], which reads “the city of your Holy one has become desolate ...” to keep Zion undefiled, instead of the plural Hebrew reading to indicate the desolation of Jerusalem and Zion (... מְדִבְרָהּ הָיְיָ קִרְבָּהּ וְשָׁבַיָּהּ). See, *When We*, 225.

<sup>283</sup> Van der Kooij, “Accident or Method?”, 136-37. This connection between 19:18 and 1:26 and its interpretation as the assertion of legitimacy by the Jews in Egypt is already observed by Gesenius, *Jesaja*, 635, where other scholars with the same view are enumerated: Prideaux, Kennicott, J.D. Michaelis, Rosenmüller, etc.

<sup>284</sup> Also Seeligmann, 113-114; Baer, “About Us”, 41-42.

<sup>285</sup> Also Sedlmeier, 91 n.7.

<sup>286</sup> On this subject, see 4.3.

of the temple in Egypt.<sup>287</sup>

### 2.3.3.3. The subject of verse 20

Vv.19-20 tell of the religious life of the Jewish Diaspora in Egypt. The problem in these verses is to whom “they” in v.20 refers. Van der Kooij concludes that it is “the Egyptians” in the light of vv.21-22.<sup>288</sup> For clarifying this problem, we need to pay attention to “the land of Egypt” in v.20. The translator renders בתוך ארץ מצרים as ἐν χώρᾳ Αἰγυπτίων in v.19 but בארץ מצרים as ἐν χώρᾳ Αἰγύπτου in v.20. Why does the translator use that singular noun in v.20? Does it indicate an arbitrary translation?<sup>289</sup> It is difficult to give a reasonable explanation but the effect of the renderings is evident: if the translator had rendered it consistently, the resulting text would have caused readers to think that “Egyptians” were the subject of the ὅτι–clause, as assumed like καὶ ἔσται εἰς σημεῖον εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα κυρίῳ ἐν χώρᾳ Αἰγυπτίων ὅτι κεκραζόνται πρὸς κύριον .... One more thing should be included: the similarity of these verses to the Exodus narrative.<sup>290</sup> When the God of Israel displays his mighty deeds against the Egyptians, they will know (γνώσονται) that he is the Lord (Ex 7:5; 14:4,18), as in Is 19:21. God will bring a plague (πλήγη) upon the Egyptians (Ex 11:1), as in Is 19:22. Because of the oppression of the Egyptians (οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι θλίβουσιν αὐτούς),<sup>291</sup> God sent (ἀποστέλλω) a man, Moses (Ex 3:9-10), as in Is 19:20. Moses judged (κρίνω) Israel (Ex 18:13) as well as saved them, as in Is 19:20. Therefore, the subject of the ὅτι–clause should be ‘the Jews in five cities or in the city of Asedek’. So, it is highly likely that v.20 tells of the deliverance of the Jewish Diaspora in Egypt as in the time of the first Exodus.

---

<sup>287</sup> Van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 55.

<sup>288</sup> Van der Kooij, “19:16-25”, 141; also Monsengwo-Pasinya, 202.

<sup>289</sup> Baer, *When We*, 215 n. 44.

<sup>290</sup> See Blenkinsopp; Wildberger.

<sup>291</sup> On the significance of the Greek θλίβω indicating “Egypt”, see Pearce, *Land of the Body*, 82-84.

Through the salvation which will be performed for the land of the Jews, God will be known to the Egyptians. Vv.21-22 tell of the conversion of the Egyptians: God will judge by means of a great plague and they will turn to God with God's healing. They will give offerings to God and they will be heard by God.

#### 2.3.3.4. Israel, Egypt, and the Assyrians: the Jews in Egypt

Interestingly, in 19:23, LXX renders the Hebrew word מַצְרַיִם as Αἰγύπτος, Αἰγύπτιοι.

Then,

MT : Assyria – will come – in Egypt ; Egypt – (will come) – in Assyria,  
LXX : Assyrians – will come – into Egypt ; Egyptians – will go – towards Assyrians.

The first 'Egypt' in MT is rendered as a singular noun, which generally denotes the country or land.<sup>292</sup> It is not *in Assyria* but *towards Assyrians* that the Egyptians will go, while it is not *towards Egyptians* but *into Egypt* that the Assyrians will go according to LXX. That is, LXX depicts something inner-Egyptian. What we can imagine from this is that the Assyrians had entered the land of Egypt and the Egyptians had to approach the place where the Assyrians were encamped in Egypt. This fits the next sentence in v.23 well: "The Egyptians will serve the Assyrians". The Assyrian conquest of Egypt corresponds with v.22 and chapter 20.

Three peoples are dealt with in 19:24 of LXX, while three countries are involved in MT.<sup>293</sup> Therefore, "Israel" in this verse should be understood as indicating "the Jews", especially the Jews in Egypt (cf. 19:17). While it is ambiguous what the referent of בְּרַכָּה is in MT,<sup>294</sup> it is quite clear in LXX: the referent of εὐλογημένος (masculine singular) is "Israel". V.25 begins with a relative pronoun which refers to the final word of v.24 thus:

---

<sup>292</sup> On the meanings of each, see Is 19:16 and n.175. The point that LXX clearly distinguishes the usages of those singular and plural expressions can be also seen in the rendering of מַצְרַיִם מִסֵּלַח as ὁδὸς Αἰγύπτος in the same verse.

<sup>293</sup> See 19:24.

<sup>294</sup> The Hebrew word is a feminine singular form so it could be Israel or each of three nations. See Cheyne; Wildberger.

“the Lord of Sabaoth has blessed the land”. The context so far lets us recognize that “the land” here refers to the land of Egypt.

According to this, the Jews will be third because the Assyrians will have dominion over the Egyptians, and the Jews are foreigners in Egypt, but the Jews will be “blessed” in the “blessed” land, Egypt.

The definite articles with ἐν which are added in the latter part of 19:25 connect the following phrases with “my people ὁ λαός μου”. And “my people” parallels “my inheritance”. Thus:

Blessed be	my people	Israel
	among Egypt	
	among Assyrians	
	my inheritance	

As van der Kooij and Baer point out,<sup>295</sup> only one people is involved in this verse in LXX, which is more clearly expressed in TJ, contrary to MT, in which three nations are involved. “My people” and “my inheritance” modify “Israel”. When we find that “my people” and “my inheritance” are in parallel, we come to the conclusion that “my inheritance Israel” is substantially identical with “my people Israel”.

As for “my people in Egypt and among Assyrians”, does this indicate the Diaspora in Egypt and in Assyria? 19:16-25 tells of something domestic in the land of Egypt. The reason the Assyrians are mentioned here, too, is because of their conquest of Egypt. As we saw above, v.23 depicts the coming to Egypt of the Assyrians and the Assyrian camp in Egypt hereafter. The statement in v.24 that Israel will be third, too, presupposes that those three people were in the same area, Egypt. We have already seen “Israel” in v.24 denotes the Jews in Egypt. Taking the above into consideration, we conclude that “my people among Assyrians” also refers to the Jews in camps of Assyrians in Egypt.<sup>296</sup>

---

<sup>295</sup> Van der Kooij, “19:16-25”, 151-155; Baer, *When We*, 217.

<sup>296</sup> Also van der Kooij, “19:16-25”, 155.

Therefore, the people who will be blessed by the Lord are the Jews in Egypt. The above argument is confirmed by the following chiastic structure in vv.24-25:

Israel --- blessed --- the land --- the land --- blessed --- Israel  
 → a – b – c – c' – b' – a'

In this chiasm, paralleled phrases are generally deemed identical. As the first “Israel” denotes “the Jews in Egypt”, the last “Israel” should be the same. So it does to “the land”. To conclude, 19:24-25 pronounces that the Jews in Egypt will be blessed by the Lord, and because of them the land of Egypt where the Jews dwell will be blessed.<sup>297</sup>

Now let us turn to the first question: in which aspect is the present section continuous with 19:1-15? And in which aspect is it discontinuous? 19:16-25 bears continuity with 19:1-15 in telling the defeat and disaster of Egypt, which the Lord has devised against it (cf. 19:12,17). They will not turn to God until they are stricken and subdued (cf. vv.21-23). The present section has discontinuity with the preceding one because it deals with the Jews. The land of the Jews will be a surprise to the Egyptians (cf. 19:17). In the land of Egypt, there will be a lawful altar acceptable to God, who will send a man, a saviour (cf. 19:18-19). The Jews in Egypt will be blessed, called my people and my inheritance (cf. 19:24-25).

### 2.3.4. The Theology of 19:16-25 in LXX

#### 2.3.4.1. The city of Righteousness

According to LXX-Is, there will be a lawful altar in Egypt and there will be cities for

---

<sup>297</sup> Monsengwo-Pasinya, 204, argues, based on the chiastic parallelism in vv.24-25, that the corresponding parts mean the same thing, so the verses 24-25 do not exclude the Assyrians and the Egyptians from the divine blessing. Further, he suggests that the LXX preserves universalism, as seen in MT. However, he does not consider carefully the expressions “in the Egyptians”, “in the Assyrians”, “in Egypt” and “in the Assyrians”, three plural forms of which indicate people and the singular one of which indicates the region. But Monsengwo-Pasinya renders them in v.25 into singular nouns: “... Béni soit mon peuple qui est en Egypte et en Assyrie ainsi qu’ Israël mon héritage” (205). Also, he does not pay attention to the added preposition ἐν in v. 25 at all. If we do not take into account the changes, in fact, we read the same text with the present MT. In that case, his conclusion that this LXX verses reveal “un salut universel de Dieu”, preparing for a way to the New Testament (207), would be not surprising.

the Jews who worship the Lord. One of them will be called “the City of Asedek”. This phrase is intended to keep “the city of Righteousness” in Is 1:26 in mind and is connected with “Zion” and “mother-city”.

The failure of Israel, the failure of Jerusalem was caused by the corruption of the political and religious leaders. Now the Lord has judged them and through this, Zion will be cleansed and restored. The translator pronounces this cleansed Zion the city of Righteousness, which also appears as one of five cities in Egypt. We have already seen the original form of “the city of Asedek” was “Heliopolis”. After all, it seems that the translator wishes to show the biblical legitimacy of the Heliopolitan temple, that is the Temple of Onias.<sup>298</sup>

The point that a place/human in Egypt is called “mother-city” is also seen in 16:16 in *Joseph and Aseneth*.<sup>299</sup> When we remember that Aseneth is the daughter of a Heliopolitan priest, this connection between Heliopolis and ‘mother-city’ seems very significant.<sup>300</sup> Whenever this work was written, it shows a certain tendency to interpret the Heliopolitan temple as a new Zion and a new Jerusalem.

While Philo, an Alexandrian Jew in the first century CE, regards Jerusalem as the “metropolis”, the translator of LXX-Is in the second century BCE proclaims the city in Egypt to be the “metropolis”. We find that the translator and reader-community of the Septuagint regard this city as a central place where the new administration of God will come to fruition. Certainly, it would be both surprising and extraordinary for the Jews to be able to consider a place outside Jerusalem to be a “city of Righteousness and mother-city”.

---

<sup>298</sup> Also Barthélemy, 149f ; van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 55; Sedlmeier, 91 n.7; Sawyer, “Blessed”, 63.

<sup>299</sup> For further discussion, see 5.3.

<sup>300</sup> See chapter 4 and 5.

When would be a likely period in which to locate this proclamation? 1:21-28 tells of a certain corruption of Zion caused by the ruling class in Jerusalem. 19:18 shows the existence of a Jewish temple in Heliopolis and furthermore, a tendency to legitimize it. Therefore the most likely historical background would be the desecration of the Jerusalem temple by Antiochus Epiphanes. As the Seleucids gained control of Palestine since around 200, after many wars between the Seleucids and the Ptolemies,<sup>301</sup> peoples in the pro-Seleucid party held power over Jerusalem. The fact that the Zadokite priest Onias III had to depart from Jerusalem due to the power struggle is a striking example. When Jason bought the high priesthood by giving money to Antiochus, it brought about an important change: “whereas till now the post had been hereditary ..., the high priesthood became a normal official post and the high priest a Seleucid royal official utterly dependent on the king’s favor”.<sup>302</sup> The Zadokite priesthood came to an end and the Seleucid king took everything in Jerusalem under his control. His dominion of, and contempt for, Jerusalem reached its zenith when he trampled the temple after he failed to gain control of Egypt. This made Jerusalem become an “abode of aliens”.<sup>303</sup> A strong affirmation of a Jewish temple in Egypt, therefore, could be a reaction to this series of disastrous events against during the mid-second century BCE.<sup>304</sup>

#### 2.3.4.2. The Expectation of a human saviour like Moses

There are some statements that a temple would be built by a man who was a Jew in

---

<sup>301</sup> H. Heinen, “The Syro-Egyptian Wars and the new kingdoms of Asia Minor”, in F.W. Walbank, A.E. Astin, M.W. Frederiksen and R.M. Ogilvie (eds.), *The Cambridge Ancient History* (Vol. VII, part I; 2nd; Cambridge University Press: 1984), 142-412.

<sup>302</sup> Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization*, 160-1.

<sup>303</sup> 1Mac 1:35-38. See Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization*, 189.

<sup>304</sup> For further study see chapter 4.

Josephus' works.<sup>305</sup> Generally, these words have been considered to come from 19:18-19. But, frankly, we cannot find any allusion to "a man" in those verses, either in LXX and or MT. Rather, that mention seems to have come from 19:20 in LXX: "and the Lord will send them *a man* who will save them". If it is correct, it means this man who would act as a saviour and judge, was the promised builder of the temple in the land of Egypt.

As we saw above, v.20 has many links with the Exodus narrative.<sup>306</sup> It means the Jews in Egypt expected an amazing salvific act by the Lord God as in the Exodus. As God sent Moses to deliver Israel in Egypt, so the same God would send a man who will save and judge the Jews in Egypt. The tradition that Josephus preserved concerning the man who was to build a temple in Egypt could reflect the development of those expectations found in LXX-Is.

The above discussion leads us to suggest the man involved could be Onias, the last Zadokite priest,<sup>307</sup> who fled to Egypt and built the temple in the nome of Heliopolis. Or this expectation of a "saviour" could instead refer to a Ptolemaic king, especially Philometor who accepted the Jews into "the land of Onias", which will be dealt with later compared with the role of Cyrus in MT-Is (44:28).<sup>308</sup>

#### 2.3.4.3. The blessed Jews in the land of Egypt: "my people, my inheritance"

It goes without saying that there are many negative statements in the Hebrew condemning "going down to Egypt" and "dwelling in Egypt".<sup>309</sup> A prime example among them would be those of the prophet Jeremiah. According to him, those who go

---

<sup>305</sup> *B.J.* 7.432; *Ant.* 13.64. See 19:18.

<sup>306</sup> See 2.3.3.3.

<sup>307</sup> On the significance of Onias as a Zadokite priest, see our discussion in chapter 4 and Hayward, "Jewish Temple", 441-443.

<sup>308</sup> See 4.3.4. and 4.3.5.

<sup>309</sup> See 2.1.4.

down Egypt and dwell there will die by the sword and famine and they will not see Palestine any more (Jer 42:15-17). In particular, in Jer 43:13, the pillars (מצבות, στῦλοι) in Beth-Shemesh (בית שמש = Heliopolis) are said to be broken. Even if the pillars expressed in plural form refer to Egyptian religious objects, it seems clear that this text reflects a certain negative judgment concerning Heliopolis.

Faced with the above condemnation, the present Septuagintal text strongly argues that the Jews in Egypt and their religious activity are legitimate and blessed by the Lord. The Jews in Egypt will be blessed in that land. The Jews will be called “my people” and “my inheritance”.

Here we see further evidence showing the relationship of the present text with the Exodus narrative: “my people”. The theological importance and significance of this phrase is well illustrated in Hosea: “and he said, ‘Call his name Lo-Ammi (לֹא־עַמִּי, Οὐ λαός μου), for you will not be my people and I will not be your God” (Ho 1:9; cf. 2:3[2:1]). This phrase indicates the intimate and covenantal relationship between God and Israel. Interestingly, its usage in the Pentateuch as a title used by YHWH for Israel, appears only in the *Book of Exodus*.<sup>310</sup> Furthermore, when it is used in the *Book of Exodus*, it appears nearly always in the context of the Exodus.<sup>311</sup> It means Israel becomes the people of YHWH through the experience of the Exodus, as attested in Ex 3:7-10 (*KJV*):

“7 And the LORD said, I have surely seen the affliction of *my people which are in Egypt* (עַמִּי אֲשֶׁר בְּמִצְרַיִם, τοῦ λαοῦ μου τοῦ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ = ‘my people in Egypt’), and have heard their cry by reason of their taskmasters; for I know their sorrows. ... 9 ... and I have also seen the oppression wherewith *the Egyptians oppress them* (מִצְרַיִם לֹחֲצִים אֹתָם, οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι θλίβουσιν αὐτούς). 10 Come now therefore, and *I will send thee* (אֲשַׁלְּחֶךָ, ἀποστείλω σε) unto Pharaoh, that thou mayest bring forth my people the children of Israel out of Egypt”.

The resemblances between this text and 19:20 in LXX-Is are prominent. Notable

---

<sup>310</sup> See 2.3.1.

<sup>311</sup> Ex 3:7,10; 5:1; 7:4,16; 8:1 (MT and LXX 7:26),20,21,22,23 (MT and LXX 8:16,17,18,19); 9:1,13,17; 10:3,4; 12:31; 22:25 (MT and LXX 22:24). The only exception where it is used with no relation to Exodus is Ex 22:25.

among them, is the expression “my people which are in Egypt” in Ex 3:7. The Greek translation is exactly the same as the one in 19:25, while there is a great difference between them in MT. It, therefore, seems quite reasonable to see that the translation in 19:25 intended to recall 3:7 in LXX-Ex and to make the Jews in Egypt correspond to Israel in Egypt in the time of Exodus.

“ Η κληρονομία μου my inheritance” also denotes Israel in many cases,<sup>312</sup> especially in cases where λαός and κληρονομία appear together<sup>313</sup>: “When the most High divided to the nations their inheritance ... for the portion of YHWH is *his people*, Jacob the lot of *his inheritance*” (Deut 32:8-9). Thus, 19:25 in LXX announces the Jews in Egypt to be “Israel”.

The Exodus is the starting point where Israel takes on its identity as a nation and God’s people. Now LXX-Is declares the Jews in Egypt to be his people and his inheritance, the blessed one and new Israel who will experience God’s amazing saving acts. “The net effect is to tilt the nationalist/universalist balance” of the text in favor of particularism”,<sup>314</sup>

#### 2.3.4.4. Date of translation

According to our discussion, the Hebrew text of Isaiah available to Onias contained the reading “the city of the sun”, otherwise we cannot easily explain why he insisted on building a temple in the Heliopolitan nome. If he had had a Greek version of Isaiah containing the phrase “the city of Asedek”, there would be no hint in his text of Isaiah concerning the place where a temple would be built by a Jew. Therefore he must have read a Hebrew text with the reading of “city of the sun”, and he chose the place because

---

<sup>312</sup> 2Ki 21:14; Is 47:6; Jer 12:7,8,9, etc.

<sup>313</sup> Deut 32:9; 1Ki 8:51; Ps 28:9 (LXX 27:9); Joel 2:17; Mi 7:14, etc.

<sup>314</sup> Baer, “About Us”, 30; contrary to Monsengwo-Pasinya.

of the biblical prophecy. It suggests that the translation of LXX-Is was carried out after the Temple of Onias was built.

## 2.4. 27:12-13

### 2.4.1. Context of MT

The present text belongs to the larger context of chapters 24-27, the so-called ‘Isaiah Apocalypse’, which has long been recognized as a distinct unit.<sup>315</sup> On its apocalyptic nature and date, there is still discussion,<sup>316</sup> with which we will not deal here. Amid the prophetic announcement of YHWH’s blessing and the positive result for Israel (chs. 25-27),<sup>317</sup> 27:12-13 shows the most concrete picture of the future: the return of Israel to Zion. By this, 27:12-13 distinguishes itself from the previous verses.

### 2.4.2. Comparison of two versions

27:12-13 is very remarkable in that this part corresponds closely – word for word - to MT, while 27:1-11 has many pluses and significant alterations and paraphrasings.

#### 2.4.2.1. 27:12

וְהָיָה בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא	καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκεῖνη
יַחֲבֹט יְהוָה מִשִּׁבְלַת הַנָּהָר	συμφράξει κύριος ἀπὸ τῆς διώρυγος τοῦ ποταμοῦ
עַד-נַחַל מִצְרַיִם	ἕως Πινοκορούρων
וְאַתֶּם תִּלְקְטוּ לְאַחַד אַחַד בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל:	ὑμεῖς δὲ συναγάγετε τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ ἕνα ἕνα

MT: And in that day, YHWH will thresh from the channels<sup>318</sup> of the River to the

<sup>315</sup> Sweeney, 312.

<sup>316</sup> Cf. W.R. Millar, *Isaiah 24-27 and the Origin of Apocalyptic* (Harvard Semitic Monographs 11; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1976); Wildberger, *Isaiah 13-27*, 447-451.

<sup>317</sup> Sweeney, 312.

<sup>318</sup> The apparatus in MT suggests to read “שִׁבְלַת מִהַנָּהָר” (an ear of grain from the River). Actually, this suggestion seems to fit well the idea of harvest in the verse, which is followed by Blenkinsopp; Watts; similarly Kaiser; Wildberger. But we accept MT as it stands with Gray; Oswalt, for there is no textual evidence for the suggestion among versions. Actually, MT has another image about ‘flow, stream’, seen in parallelism between הַנָּהָר מִשִּׁבְלַת and עַד-נַחַל מִצְרַיִם, as pointed by J.J.M. Roberts, “Double Entendre in First Isaiah”, *CBQ* 54 (1992), 40. Roberts argues that this ‘double entendre’ is not a coincidence but intended. This was already noticed by Cheyne, 162.

wadi of Egypt, and you will be gathered one by one, O children of Israel.  
 LXX: And in that day, the Lord will fence in from the canal of the river to Rhinocorura, but you,<sup>319</sup> gather the children of Israel one by one.  
 1QIs<sup>a</sup>: orthographic difference יהבוט; משבל for משהבל; אהמה for אהם.<sup>320</sup>

The first alteration of LXX is the change of חבט into συμφράσσω. The Hebrew verb is used in connection with harvesting in the present verse (and in Is 28:27).<sup>321</sup> It may be due to a mistaken transcription of συτταράσσω, which appears in S. Or συμφράσσω may arise through the possible effort of the translator to make sense of συτταράσσω. Or it may arise from reading חבט as חבש ('bind', 'imprison').<sup>322</sup> Alternatively, it is likely that LXX paraphrases the MT reading.<sup>323</sup> Whatever the case, the Greek verb here concerns the place to be put aside to let someone dwell there.

שבֹּלֶת הנהר is rendered as δῶρυξ τοῦ ποταμοῦ. When שבֹּלֶת indicates 'flow, stream', there are two examples where it is rendered as καταίγίς (Ps 69:3,16 – LXX 68:3,16). Generally, δῶρυξ is an equivalent of יֵאֵר (Ex 7:19; 8:1, Is 33:21).<sup>324</sup> Considering the examples in the *Book of Exodus* and in *Sirach*, the Greek word δῶρυξ undoubtedly refers to the irrigation system in Egypt,<sup>325</sup> while the MT phrase indicates channels of the River Euphrates. The translator renders the Hebrew term as a term familiar to those who have dwelled in Egypt.<sup>326</sup>

Another interesting change in LXX-Is, showing the inner-Egyptian-viewpoint of the translator's, is the mention of Rhinocorura. Its Hebrew equivalent נחל מצרים refers

---

<sup>319</sup> Baer, *When We*, 223, thinks this "you" indicates "Gentile couriers who accompany Jewish returnees to eschatological Zion". It seems to me overinterpretation which has no ground to support it. It seems better to leave it unspecified as in MT.

<sup>320</sup> In every occurrence of 1QIs<sup>a</sup>.

<sup>321</sup> Blenkinsopp; Kaiser. Ottley, 2:236, wonders that συτταράξει might be the word in the present verse.

<sup>322</sup> Baer, *When We*, 223.

<sup>323</sup> Baer: "a demetaphorizing clarification of the metaphor".

<sup>324</sup> Besides, for נחל in Je 38:9 (LXX 31:9) and in Greek only, Sirach 24:30,31.

<sup>325</sup> Also Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 190f. : "Für die Verteilung des Wassers sind wichtig die Kanäle; in der Js-LXX werden sie 19:6; 27:12; 33:21 mit ihrem gebräuchlichen Namen δῶρυξ genannt. ... Unter δῶρυξ ist zunächst der künstlich angelegte Kanal zu verstehen".

<sup>326</sup> Cf. Liebmann, 27; Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 175-6.

to the Brook of Egypt (Nu 34:5; Josh 15:4,47; 1Ki 8:65<sup>327</sup>), which is considered the borderline between Canaan and Egypt,<sup>328</sup> and is used for the southernmost limit of the ideal Israel. In the Hebrew Bible, we often find that the phrase “from the Brook of Egypt to the River Euphrates” is used to indicate the territory of the Davidic kingdom (2Ki 24:7; cf. Gen 15:18).<sup>329</sup> Gaza is often used in the same way (e.g. 1Ki 4:21-24).<sup>330</sup> For this reason, Na’aman suggests that “the Brook of Egypt” referred to Naxal Besor, only slightly south of Gaza, contrary to the widely accepted opinion that “the Brook of Egypt” is modern Wadi el-‘Arish.<sup>331</sup> The main thing upon which the latter popular opinion is based is the rendering of נַחַל מִצְרַיִם as “Rhinocorura” in LXX-Is 27:12, which was the border town between Egypt and Syria in Hellenistic times,<sup>332</sup> the northernmost limit of Egypt. Diodorus (1<sup>st</sup> century BCE) and Strabo (1<sup>st</sup> century BCE- 1<sup>st</sup> century CE) report an interesting aetiological story of Rhinocorura.<sup>333</sup> According to them, the city was founded as the place where a king of the Kushite dynasty let the rebellious people dwell in isolation so that they would not plot any rebellion. They were sent to a place “in the edge of the desert” (ἐν τοῖς ἐσχάτοις τῆς ἐρήμου),<sup>334</sup> with their noses cut off, from which, it was said, the name ῥινοκόλουρα – ‘nose-clipped’<sup>335</sup> - originated. We will not deal with the reliability of the story here. It is enough to note that the story shows that

---

<sup>327</sup> Cf. in Gen 15:18 נַחַל מִצְרַיִם. In these six examples, Greek equivalents of נַחַל or נָהָר are ποταμός, χεῖμαρρος or φάραγξ.

<sup>328</sup> Kaiser; Wildberger, etc.

<sup>329</sup> Wildberger, *Isaiah 13-27*, 599.

<sup>330</sup> N. Na’aman, “The Brook of Egypt and Assyrian policy on the border of Egypt”, *Tel Aviv* 6 (1979), 76. cf. Gen 10:19; Jos 10:41; Jud 6:4.

<sup>331</sup> Na’aman, 74-77.

<sup>332</sup> Diodorus, 1.60.6.; cf. Seeligmann, 236; Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 203.

<sup>333</sup> Diodorus, 1.60.5ff.; Strabo, *Geography*, 16.2.31

<sup>334</sup> Diodorus, 1.60.5.

<sup>335</sup> ῥινοκόλουρα, which matches the above explained aetiology, appears in Diodorus, 1.60.5; Strabo, 16.1.12; 16.2.31; 16.4.24 but in a manuscript of Strabo ῥινοκόρουρα is seen, as in LXX-Is and other Greek literature (*Ant.* 13.396; Eusebius, *Onomasticon*, 148, etc.).

the city symbolizes a place on the utmost periphery of Egypt.<sup>336</sup>

There is a possibility that the Brook of Egypt differs from Rhinocorura in LXX.<sup>337</sup> But the significant point is that the translator identified the Hebrew name with the Greek one. By using that Greek name, the translator contemporises his Hebrew text.<sup>338</sup> Furthermore, it is highly likely that he tries to convey some effect or impression to the readers by that name: God will surely take care of even those isolated and deserted places.<sup>339</sup>

Lastly, the translator renders an imperfect verb (יִקְרָא) with an imperative one (συναγάγετε).<sup>340</sup> This may reflect a tendency on the part of the translator to employ the text for homiletic purposes, which Baer terms ‘Imperativization’.<sup>341</sup> With this change, the vocative “Children of Israel” becomes the objective of the verb and the subject “you” becomes the vocative.

#### 2.4.2.2. 27:13

וְהָיָה בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא	καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ
יִתְקַע בְּשׁוֹפָר גְּדוּלָה	σαλπιούσιν τῇ σάλπιγγι τῇ μεγάλῃ
וּבָאוּ הַאֲבִרִים בְּאֶרֶץ אַשּׁוּר	καὶ ἦξουσιν οἱ ἀπολόμενοι ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ τῶν Ἀσσυρίων

---

<sup>336</sup> Diodorus, 1.60.6, adds more about the city, which also supports this point: Αὕτη ... πάντων σχεδὸν τῶν πρὸς ἀνθρωπίνην δίαιταν ἀνηκόντων ἐστερηται (“This city ... is lacking in nearly everything which is necessary for human living”).

<sup>337</sup> See Na’aman’s aforementioned article. If “The Brook of Egypt” indicated Wadi el-‘Arish and was the actual border between Canaan and Egypt, we would expect some signs of pre-Hellenistic occupation here. But, according to Na’aman, 78 and 80-83, it was around Naxal Besor, Raphia and Gaza where those expected things were excavated. If then, “the Brook of Egypt” would indicate a different place from Rhinocorura (Wadi el-‘Arish), as Na’aman argues.

<sup>338</sup> Seeligmann, 236.

<sup>339</sup> Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 191, understands this as a natural naming by the translator. But the name does not give just a modern name but implies more. See above and 2.4.3.1 below.

<sup>340</sup> Cf. Liebmann, 48.

<sup>341</sup> Baer, *When We*, 23-52. Since there are some examples where imperatives were changed into other verbal forms, Baer’s argument should be more cautious. He admits the existence of this kind of example but he dismisses dealing with them seriously because they are far less frequent and even accidental. *When We*, 34, 38. It would be a mistake to draw too strong a conclusion from these less frequent usages, but it would equally be wrong to ignore them as being random finds of small significance. For example, in 6:10, the translator changes imperatives of MT into indicatives, which seems to stem from the purpose to explain why the Israelites were faced with so terrible a situation. Then, we find that the so-called ‘imperativization’ would be just one of many tools for the translator’s homiletic or educational purpose. It suggests that we need a larger category to explain the inclusion of all of them.

וְהַנְדָּחִים בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם      καὶ οἱ ἀπολόμενοι ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ  
וְהַשְׁתַּחֲוִי לַיהוָה      καὶ προσκυνήσουσιν τῷ κυρίῳ  
בְּהַר הַקֹּדֶשׁ בִּירוּשָׁלַם:      ἐπὶ τὸ ὄρος τὸ ἅγιον ἐν Ἱερουσαλημ

MT: And in that day, a big horn will be blown and those who were lost in the land of Assyria and those who were outcast in **the land of** Egypt will come and they will worship YHWH in the holy mountain at Jerusalem.

LXX: And in that day they will blow with a big trumpet, and those who were lost in the land of the Assyrians and those who were lost in Egypt will come and they will worship<sup>342</sup> the Lord on the holy mountain at Jerusalem.

1QIs<sup>a</sup>: orthographic difference אִיבָדִים; וְהַשְׁתַּחֲוִי for וְהַשְׁתַּחֲוִי.

LXX has only “in Egypt” instead of “in the land of Egypt” in MT. It may arise from the translator’s technique of simplification.<sup>343</sup> But this does not seem to be the case. In the present verse, MT text is set in strict parallelism but LXX does not follow it:

הַנְדָּחִים בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם	הַאֲבָדִים בְּאֶרֶץ אַשּׁוּר
οἱ ἀπολόμενοι ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ	οἱ ἀπολόμενοι ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ τῶν Ἀσσυρίων

The above comparison shows that it is reasonable to consider the renderings of LXX intentional.

LXX changes a passive singular verb of MT (יִתְקַע) into an active plural one (σαλπιοῦσιν), which makes the text more smooth and natural.<sup>344</sup> While MT uses two parallel verbs (נָדַח, אָבַד), LXX renders them as the same Greek verb (ἀπόλλυμι) to make it clear and consistent, which is also seen in many other places in LXX-Is.<sup>345</sup>

### 2.4.3. The Septuagintal text

#### 2.4.3.1. “The canals of the River”

As we saw above, the phrase seems to be associated with the River Nile, not with the River Euphrates. Especially, in LXX-Is 19:6, αἱ διώρυγες τοῦ ποταμοῦ refers to “the canals of the River Nile” in its context.<sup>346</sup> Then, does this phrase in the present verse also refer to the Nile, contrary to the MT?

<sup>342</sup> Cf. “(they will) do obeisance” in *NETS* for προσκυνήσουσιν.

<sup>343</sup> See 2.1.2.3.

<sup>344</sup> Similarly, 1:20; 6:7, etc.

<sup>345</sup> See 2.2.2.3.

<sup>346</sup> See 3.4.2.6.

Our answer is affirmative. To be sure, the phrase in MT indicates the River Euphrates, and the equivalent Greek phrase “the canals of the river” could refer to the Euphrates or the Nile. But it is quite likely that the context reveals that the Nile is concerned here. Let us see two verses in *Sirach*: “As for me, I was like *a canal from a river*, like *a water channel* into a garden (κάγω ὡς διώρυξ ἀπὸ ποταμοῦ καὶ ὡς ὑδραγωγὸς ἐξήλθον εἰς παράδεισον). I said, ‘I will water my garden and drench my flowerbeds’. And lo, *my canal became a river, and my river a sea* (ἡ διώρυξ εἰς ποταμόν καὶ ὁ ποταμός μου ἐγένετο εἰς θάλασσαν)” (24:30-31 NRSV; my italics). Two Greek words διώρυξ and ὑδραγωγὸς in these verses are used to indicate ‘canals’ in Egypt in some papyri.<sup>347</sup> Likewise, the phrase in LXX-Is would have the same effect. The phrase seems to indicate the canals of the River Nile.<sup>348</sup>

#### 2.4.3.2. “In the land of the Assyrians” and “in Egypt”

As we already dealt with in Is 19:16-25, the Hebrew אַשּׁוּרִים is consistently rendered as a plural noun οἱ Ἀσσυριοὶ in LXX except in 31:8. Likewise in 19:25, 27:13 concerns those who have something to do with “Egypt” and “the Assyrians”. It is quite plausible that 27:13 could be understood in conjunction with 19:25. As we have already established in discussions about 19:16-25, “the Jews among the Assyrians” seems to refer to the Jews among the Assyrian camp in Egypt. “Those who were lost in the land of the Assyrians” in the present verse, too, can refer to those who were in Assyrian camps in Egypt or any region where the Assyrians had dominion, rather than in the mainland of Assyria. The inner-Egyptian viewpoint in 27:12 as well as in 19:16-25 also supports this argument. It is worth dealing with Rhinocorura again here.

---

<sup>347</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 191.

<sup>348</sup> There would have been canals on the Lower Euphrates, near Babylon, but whether Egyptians Jews would have known this is unlikely.

We find a subtle but significant difference between “the Brook of Egypt” in MT and Rhinocorura in LXX. With the change of nuance in the aforementioned “the canals of the River”, the rendering Rhinocorura shows the standpoint of the translator. Since Rhinocorura was under the Egyptian administration system even in the Roman period,<sup>349</sup> this place cannot be considered to be the southern end of Canaan, paired with “the River Euphrates”. Rather it seems quite natural to be paired with “the River Nile” so “from the canals of Nile to Rhinocorura” as we have in LXX. While the Brook of Egypt means the southernmost limit of Canaan, Rhinocorura means the northernmost limit of Egypt. While MT describes the ideal scope between the River Euphrates and the Brook of Egypt, LXX deals with the region of Egypt between the River Nile and Rhinocorura.

Interestingly, according to 1Ch4:39-41, some Israelites belonging to the tribe of Simeon attacked Gedor, and destroyed the Meunim, and dwelt there “to this day”, since the time of Hezekiah. The “Meunim” are known as the people of Ham in 1Ch 4:40. In MT the place concerned is called Gedor, which seems to be a place east of Keilah. This is rendered as Gerar in LXX-1Ch 4:39. This change could be caused by slight difference between Gedor and Gerar (גדר/גרר). When, however, we take into account that Gedor (גדר) is exactly rendered thus in other places (4:4,18; 12:8), it is more likely that the change from Gedor into Gerar is significant. This could be a reflection of the existence of Israelites during the Hellenistic period at Gerar, the place around the border between Judah and Egypt. Jewish residence in this region as narrated in the first *Book of Chronicles* may have some relationship to Hezekiah’s attack on Philistia as far as Gaza (2Ki 18:8). Or it could have happened during Assyria’s campaigns against

---

<sup>349</sup> A.H.M. Jones, *The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces* (second edition, Oxford, 1983), 342f.

Palestine and the border of Egypt. An inscription belonging to the time of Tiglath-Pileser III mentions that tribute by an Arab ruler and by “Siruati the Me’unite below Egypt” was given to the king.<sup>350</sup> The regions had been an Assyrian sphere of influence since Tiglath-Pileser III,<sup>351</sup> and it was argued that Assyria settled the people from other countries in these regions.<sup>352</sup> The move of the tribe of Simeon to those regions could be explained by that international tumult. Whatever the case, it is likely that the text in 1Ch tells of Israelite existence after the exile. In the light of this, it may be that “the Brook of Egypt” rendered as “Rhinocorura”, implies something else: the power of the Assyrians, and Jewish residence.

This can be further supported by the observation of vv.12-13 in LXX. In MT, the boundaries in v.12 (from the Euphrates to the wadi of Egypt) are given as places where the children of Israel are scattered, and they are confirmed in v.13 as “the land of Assyria” and “the land of Egypt”. In other words, the places in the two verses are linked. And in LXX, we should also expect that the place names appearing in the two verses be linked:

ἡ διώρυξ τοῦ ποταμοῦ (A) ῥινοκοροῦρα (B)  
 (οἱ ἀπολόμενοι) ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ τῶν Ἀσσυρίων (B´) (οἱ ἀπολόμενοι) ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ (A´)

In LXX, A and A´ refer to Egypt. Therefore, Rhinocorura (B) should be linked with “the land of the Assyrians” (B´), and thus the two Greek verses has a chiastic structure such as A-B-B´-A´.

According to this, 27:12-13 in LXX concerns the restoration of the Jewish Diaspora in central area of Egypt and in even remote areas of Egypt.

---

<sup>350</sup> Na’aman, 69.

<sup>351</sup> ANET, 282 (A.L.Oppenheim’s translation). Cf. A.K. Grayson, “Assyria: Tiglath Pileser III to Sargon II (744-705 BCE)” in J.Boardman, I.E.S. Edwards, E.Sollberger and N.G.L.Hammond (eds.), *The Cambridge Ancient History* (Vol. III-2; Cambridge University Press, 1992), 89.

<sup>352</sup> Na’aman, 71; Grayson, 89.

#### 2.4.4. Theology of 27:12-13 in LXX-Is: The Restoration of the Egyptian Jews

How do we understand the phrase “from the canals of the river to Rhinocorura”?

While “the canals of the river” is a symbol of the abundant, fertile and cultivated areas of Egypt, “Rhinocorura” exemplifies the peripheral region and the influence of Assyrian power. It has already been established that “the Assyrians” in LXX may be considered a cipher for the contemporary Seleucid empire.<sup>353</sup> Then, “those who were lost in the land of the Assyrians” would refer to the Jews who had suffered and been outcast under the power of the Seleucid dynasty. It seems that Rhinocorura, too, symbolizes their power and influence.

The Hebrew word נִדְּחִים, which is translated as οἱ ἀπολόμενοι, indicates the Jewish Diaspora (Is 11:12; 56:8). According to 27:12, they will be gathered, which is a mark of God’s salvation, as in 56:8:

Says the Lord, who gathers the dispersed of Israel, “I will gather upon him a congregation” (εἶπεν κύριος ὁ συνάγων τοὺς διεσπαρμένους Ἰσραηλ ὅτι συναξῶ ἐπ’ αὐτὸν συναγωγῆν).<sup>354</sup>

Conversely, the point that there is no one to gather the group means that they were judged and had no hope for their future (Is 13:14). God will gather his lost people from the heart of Egypt to the deserted place, the place of suffering.

According to 56:6-7, re-gathered Israel will worship by giving sacrifices. This could be a clue to understanding “you” in 27:12. In 40:2 in LXX, God commands the priests to comfort Israel: “Speak, you priests, to the heart of Jerusalem; Comfort her ...”.<sup>355</sup> The theme of ‘to gather Israel’ appears in 40:10, too. Then, it seems to give a conjecture about the present verse: the command to gather the children of Israel would be given to

---

<sup>353</sup> See 2.1.3.3.

<sup>354</sup> Cf. Ekblad, 107 and 280, conjectures a gathering in the synagogue because of συναγωγῆ in 56:8. In fact, however, it seems more significant that 56:7 has the expression ὁ οἶκος τῆς προσευχῆς, as well as in 60:7, for the synagogues in Egypt are usually called *proseuche*. See 4.4.1.; cf. Seeligmann, 289; but van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 62, points out that the expression in both verses and 1Mac 7:37 refer to the Temple of Jerusalem.

<sup>355</sup> See 4.3.

priests.

“The remnant” is those who went down to Egypt according to 10:20-27 in LXX. They went to Egypt through God’s plan. The present study shows it is hoped in LXX that there will be an “Eis-odos”, contrary to the widely known “Ex-odos”. The “Eisodos” was caused by the Assyrians, which should be understood to refer to the Syrian Seleucid dynasty in LXX. As a matter of fact, there had been wars between the Seleucids and the Ptolemies to occupy the whole Coele-Syria including Palestine since the first war in 274 BCE, until Antiochus III finally gained control of the region 200 BCE after the fifth war.<sup>356</sup>

## 2.5. Summary

In 11:10-16, contrary to MT which is mainly about the return of the diaspora from Assyria, Egypt and elsewhere, LXX emphasizes the point that the Jews exist in Egypt, which is clearly shown in the phrase of 11:16, “my people who are left over in Egypt”, and the absence of **ישׁוּב שׂאֵר** in 10:20-27. “Exodus” is used as a model but for legitimizing “eis-odos” i.e. “into Egypt” in LXX-Is, seen in 10:20-27 and 11:10-16.

19:25 in LXX proclaims that the Jews in Egypt are blessed by God and they are called “my people”. There will be a Jewish temple in Egypt, and this will be called “the city of righteousness”, which appears also in 1:26. According to our analysis, the temple in Heliopolis in Egypt is seen as a new metropolis, new Zion. Finally, God will gather all the Israelites in Egypt from the Nile to Rhinocorura, a remote border town, as seen in 27:12-13 in LXX.

These texts above show that the Jewish diaspora in Egypt is the remnant guided by

---

<sup>356</sup> See Heinen, 412-442.

God, and their temple in Egypt “the city of righteousness” is a new Zion. Strictly speaking, our argument does not exclude the idea that Jerusalem has pre-eminence for the Jewish diaspora. Their residence in Egypt and the temple in Egypt should be understood as “a new Zion”, not “the new Zion”. Therefore, our interpretation fits those statements which show that Jerusalem is admired, such as the last half of 27:13: “And they will worship the Lord on the holy mountain at Jerusalem”.

These texts in LXX-Is strongly and effectively assert the identity of the diaspora. Their declaration as the pious remnant of God will be followed by showing their trust on God alone, not on Egypt or any other nations, in the next chapter.

## Chapter 3. The Egypt Texts in LXX-Is: View on Egypt

### 3.1. 20:1-6

#### 3.1.2. Context of MT

This chapter in MT is based on the concrete historical fact that the Assyrian army attacked Ashdod, which is well known from Sargon II's annals.<sup>1</sup> When Yamani of Ashdod rebelled against Assyria, Sargon ordered his troops to Philistia in 712. The Assyrian army besieged the city and transported its population and Yamani, who fled to Egypt, was sent to Assyria as a gesture of good will by Shabako, pharaoh of the 25<sup>th</sup> dynasty.<sup>2</sup> This victory indicated that Assyrian power over Philistia was consolidated, and it functioned to intimidate Egypt. The Assyrian siege of the city would have caused considerable shock and fear to the countries nearby, including Judah and Egypt. Based on this event, Isaiah's symbolic action in the present text is primarily understood as a sign of what will happen to Egypt and Cush. In this respect, this chapter is related to chapter 19.<sup>3</sup> However, since Egypt was not involved in hostilities with Assyria during this period (around 712 BCE), this "demonstration against Egyptian alliance would make a better fit with the circumstances of the rebellion leading to the punitive campaign of Sennacherib against Judah and Egypt a few years later", as Blenkinsopp suggests.<sup>4</sup> But Isaiah's symbolic action served as a warning to Judah, which was relying upon Egypt as an ally, "not to participate in political revolt against Assyria".<sup>5</sup> This is expressed in v.5: "They shall be dismayed and be ashamed of Cush their hope, and of

---

<sup>1</sup> ANET, 286-7.

<sup>2</sup> Grayson, 89; T.G.H. James, "Egypt: 25 and 26 dynasties" in *The Cambridge Ancient History* (vol.III-2), 692.

<sup>3</sup> Childs, *Isaiah*, 142. Sweeney interprets this chapter as the "legitimation for prophecy concerning Egypt" in chapter 19. See his commentary, 264ff.

<sup>4</sup> Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 1-39*, 322.

<sup>5</sup> Childs; also Wildberger; but Sweeney thinks that "Isaiah's action condemns Egypt for its failure to support Ashdod in the very revolt that Egypt fermented". His idea that this chapter, with chapter 19, should be understood as a Josianic diatribe against Egypt, is used to support his argument. This seems circular reasoning.

Egypt their glory”. Judah and Jerusalem thought Egypt was their “תפארתה” glory” but God is their real glory (Is 60:19), and then Israel shall be God’s glory (Is 46:13). Even if the subject of v.5 is not clearly indicated, it should be understood to refer to those countries who relied on Egypt as their ally, primarily Judah.<sup>6</sup>

### 3.1.3. Comparison of two versions

#### 3.1.3.1. 20:1

בשנת בא תרתן אשדוד	τοῦ ἔτους οὗ εἰσηλθε Ταναθαν εἰς Ἄζωτον
בשלח אתו סרגון מלך אשור	ἡνίκα ἀπεστάλη ὑπὸ Σαρναν βασιλέως Ἀσσυρίων
וילחם באשדוד וילכדה:	καὶ ἐπολέμησε τὴν Ἄζωτον καὶ κατελάβετο αὐτήν

MT: In the year Tartan came to Ashdod, when Sargon the king of Assyria sent him, and he fought against Ashdod and captured it.

LXX: In the year in which Tanathan came to Azotos, when he was sent by Sarnan the king of the Assyrians, and he fought against Azotos and captured it.

1QIs<sup>a</sup>: תרתן for תרתן; orthographic איתו; it seems to have סראון, probably caused by a copying error; וילכדה for וילכדה, probably a copying error of וילכידה?

4QIs<sup>b</sup>=MT.

The active infinitive phrase of MT בשלח אתו is rendered as a passive sentence in

LXX: ἡνίκα ἀπεστάλη ὑπο. This change of the verb שלח appears, too, in 6:6 and 37:21, which can be understood to emphasize the agency of the one who sent.

#### 3.1.3.2. 20:2

בעת ההיא דבר יהוה	τότε ἐλάλησε κύριος
ביד ישעיהו בן-אמוץ לאמר	πρὸς Ησαϊαν λέγων
לך ופתחת השק מעל מותניך	πορεύου καὶ ἄφελε τὸν σάκκον ἀπὸ τῆς ὀσφύος σου
ונעלה תחליץ מעל רגליך ויעש כן	καὶ τὰ σανδάλιά σου ὑπόλυσαι ἀπὸ τῶν ποδῶν σου καὶ ἐποίησεν οὕτως
הלך ערום ויחף: ס	πορευόμενος γυμνὸς καὶ ἀνυπόδετος

MT: At that time YHWH spoke by the hand of Isaiah, **son of Amoz**, saying, “Go and loose the sackcloth from your loins and take your sandal<sup>7</sup> off your feet”, and he did so, walking naked and barefoot.

LXX: Then the Lord spoke to Isaiah, saying, “Go and take the sackcloth off your loins and remove your sandals from your feet”. And he did so, walking naked and barefoot.

<sup>6</sup> 36:6 seems to reflect this warning against Judah in the mouth of Rabsaqeh: “Behold, you trusted in this broken reed of a staff, Egypt, ... (על-מצרים) ... (הנה בטהת על-משענת הקנה הרצוץ הזה על-מצרים) ...”.

<sup>7</sup> It seems reasonable that the MT reading נעלה should be corrected to נעליך as in 1QIs<sup>a</sup>, Aquila, Symmachus, Peshitta, Targum, Vulgate and LXX. There are some cases in which the singular form is still used in MT: Deut 29:4, 1Ki 2:5 and especially Jos 5:15, in which cases LXX renders them as singular.

1QIs<sup>a</sup>: ישעיה for ישעיהו<sup>8</sup>; orthographic לאמור and הלוך; plural נעליך for singular נעלך in MT<sup>9</sup>; תחליץ for תחליץ, a copying error of תחליץ?  
 4QIs<sup>a</sup>: ערם (also in 20:4 of 4QIs<sup>f</sup>) contrary to plene writings in 1QIs<sup>a</sup>.  
 4QIs<sup>b</sup>: ישעיה like 1QIs<sup>a</sup> (see above).

בעת ההיא is translated into ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ or ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ throughout LXX.<sup>10</sup> Therefore τότε as its rendering in the present verse is unique. בן־אמוץ is not seen in LXX. This omission happens only in 2Ch 26:22 and in the present verse out of all 13 occurrences. LXX renders ביד ישעיהו as just πρὸς.<sup>11</sup> Generally, the main equivalent of the Hebrew phrase when it appears with the verbs רבר and צוה, is “ἐν χειρὶ ~”,<sup>12</sup> but πρὸς is used in a few cases,<sup>13</sup> as in the present verse. With the omission of בן־אמוץ, the renderings τότε and πρὸς make the present verse quite simple and concise, compared with MT.

### 3.1.3.3. 20:3

וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה	καὶ εἶπεν κύριος
כַּאֲשֶׁר הִלְךְ עַבְדִּי יִשְׁעִיָּהוּ עָרֹם וְיָחֵף	ὅτι τρόποι πεπόρευται Ησαίας ὁ παῖς μου γυμνὸς καὶ ἀνυπόδητος
שְׁלֹשׁ שָׁנִים אֹת וּמוֹפֵת	τρία ἔτη ἔσται σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα
עַל־מִצְרַיִם וְעַל־כּוּשׁ:	τοῖς Αἰγυπτίοις καὶ Αἰθίοψιν

MT: And YHWH said, “As my servant Isaiah walked naked and barefoot for three years<sup>14</sup> as a sign and portent upon Egypt and **upon** Cush,

LXX: And the Lord said, “As my servant Isaiah has walked naked and barefoot for three years<sup>15</sup> - it **shall be** signs and portents to the Egyptians and Ethiopians, 1QIs<sup>a</sup>: orthographic ויאמר ושלוש but ומפת.

LXX renders על־מצרים ועל־כוש as simply τοῖς Αἰγυπτίοις καὶ Αἰθίοψιν. That LXX

<sup>8</sup> In MT, the longer form of the prophet’s name is always used but this first scroll of Qumran prefers the shorter form, found in the same verse of 4QIs<sup>b</sup>. In the first scroll, the longer form is used only twice (1:1; 38:21) out of 16 occurrences. In 39:3 of 1QIs<sup>b</sup> and 4QIs<sup>b</sup> the longer form is used.

<sup>9</sup> The Qumran reading fits the context better. Cf. Is 5:27; 11:5.

<sup>10</sup> ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ: e.g. Jud 4:4; 1Ki 11:29; Is 18:7; Jer 4:11; Am 5:13; Mi 3:4; ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ: e.g. Jos 6:26; Zep 1:12. In Jer 31:1, it is rendered as ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ ἐκείνῳ. There are many cases where the Kethib form בעת ההיא is preserved, all of which are translated into ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ: e.g. Gen 21:22; Deut 4:14; Jos 5:2; Is 39:1.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Tov, *Text-Critical Use*, 157; Barthélemy, 151.

<sup>12</sup> E.g. Nu 17:5; 1Ki 8:53,56; Jer 37:2; 2Ch 10:15. In Ex 9:35 of LXX, ביד יהוה ביד־משה is rendered as ἐλάλησεν κύριος τῷ Μωϋσῆ, while in some cases this ביד is translated into διὰ χειρὸς (e.g. Lev 10:11; Josh 20:2).

<sup>13</sup> 1Ki 16:12; Ho 12:11.

<sup>14</sup> “Accusative of duration”: *GKC* §118k.

<sup>15</sup> The usage of accusative for time or duration. See Smyth, §1582-3.

uses only one definite article may be a typical translation technique to make AB+AC into A(B+C), which is seen also in v.4.

LXX has ἔσται. In MT, the verse is connected with the next verse by using ... כאשר כן .... But LXX understands the present verse as self-contained, having a protasis (ὄν τρόπον ~) and an apodosis (ἔσται ~). The *athnach* under ויחף should perhaps be moved under שנים in MT, as the apparatus of BHS suggests.<sup>16</sup>

Instead of singular nouns אֹתָהּ וּמוֹפְתָהּ, LXX has plural σημεία καὶ τέρατα. The same rendering is seen in LXX-Deut 28:46, where curses will be “signs and portents” to the people who will not obey the word of YHWH. The Hebrew phrase in the plural form (אֹתוֹת וּמוֹפְתִים) is used with reference to the Exodus. Sometimes only one of the two nouns is used in MT but LXX renders them as two-noun phrase.<sup>17</sup> Therefore, it seems that the Greek plural phrase (σημεία καὶ τέρατα) was, basically, considered a formula, indicating God’s action against Egypt and Pharaoh and His deliverance of Israel in Egypt.<sup>18</sup> The rendering in the present verse also seems to reflect it.

#### 3.1.3.4. 20:4

כִּן יִנְהַג מֶלֶךְ־אֲשׁוּר אֶת־שָׂבִי מִצְרַיִם    ὅτι οὕτως ἄξει βασιλεὺς Ἀσσυρίων τὴν αἰχμαλωσίαν  
 וְאֶת־גְּלוֹת כּוֹשׁ נְעָרִים וְזָקְנִים    Αἰγύπτου καὶ Αἰθιοπίων νεανίσκους καὶ πρεσβύτας  
 עֲרוֹם וְיָחַף    γυμνούς καὶ ἀνυποδέτους  
 וְחֲשׂוֹפֵי שֵׁת עֲרוֹת מִצְרַיִם    ἀνακακαλυμμένους τὴν αἰσχύνην Αἰγύπτου

MT: So shall the king of Assyria lead away the captives of Egypt and **the exiles of Cush**, young and old, naked and barefoot, **and** with **buttocks bared**<sup>19</sup>, to the shame of Egypt!

LXX: **For** thus the king of Assyrians shall lead the captives of Egypt and Ethiopians, young and old, naked and barefoot, with the shame of Egypt

<sup>16</sup> Wildberger; Gray; Watts distinguishes between logical centre (BHS) and metrical centre (MT). But Cheyne and Oswald follow MT, and Oswald points that it is ambiguous how long Isaiah continued the symbolic action.

<sup>17</sup> מוֹפְתָהּ: Ex 7:9; 11:9,10; אֹתָהּ: Deut 11:3.

<sup>18</sup> Ex 7:3,9; 11:9,10; Deut 4:34; 6:22; 7:19; 11:3; 26:8; 29:2; 34:11; Ps 78:43 (LXX 77:43); 105:27 (104:27); 135:9 (134:9); Jer 32:20,21 (39:20,21); Baruch 2:11.

<sup>19</sup> We read וְחֲשׂוֹפֵי as וְחֲשׂוֹפֵי with the apparatus of BHS and most commentaries (Blenkinsopp, Gray, Kaiser, Wildberger, etc.). Cf. GKC §87g, explains this as “a singular with the formative syllable ‘\_’, or more probably as a construct state with the original termination *ay*”.



1QIs<sup>a</sup>: ויבושו, imperfect with waw, for ובשו, waw-consecutive perfect<sup>23</sup>; מבתחם, from verb בטה, for מבטם in MT from the verb נבט; מן־מצרים for ומצרים.<sup>24</sup>

The absence of the first “and” in LXX can be explained by *Participium Coniunctum*, which will be dealt with below. MT has מן־מצרים but LXX reads the part as οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι, which seems a form without “and of (מן-)”. When we consider that 1QIs<sup>a</sup> and Targum have ומצרים, it is plausible that the Vorlage of LXX had ומצרים like the versions and the translator happened to omit the Hebrew alphabet מ due to haplography. Or this could have happened already in the Hebrew Vorlage. The copulative ו seems to be reflected in γάρ.

The finite Hebrew verb וחתו is rendered as the Greek participle ἡττηθέντες, which is a Greek style translation technique, so called *Participium Coniunctum*, to render coordinate clauses connected with ו.<sup>25</sup> The use of ἡττάομαι for the Hebrew verb appears almost only in LXX-Is.<sup>26</sup> The Hebrew verb, then, which seems somewhat abstractive and emotional, is transformed into a rather concrete and historical verb. The Hebrew phrase וחתו ובשו appears in 37:27 where it is used to indicate the dismay and shame of nations in the face of Assyrian power, as in the present verse. However, in LXX-Is we cannot find any connection between the two verses because this phrase in 37:27 in LXX is rendered using only one Greek verb ἐξηράνθησαν “they withered”.

The first sentence in LXX has a clear subject “the Egyptians”, compared to the ambiguous “they” in MT. In MT, it seems that “they” was intended to refer to Judah and Jerusalem who relied upon Egypt (cf. 30:1ff; 31:1ff; 36:9f).<sup>27</sup> If this verse did not

---

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Wildberger.

<sup>24</sup> As a matter of fact, throughout MT-Is, מן־מצרים instead of ומצרים, is consistently used except in this verse.

<sup>25</sup> Aejmelaeus, “Participium Coniunctum”, 389. According to I. Soisalon-Soininen, *Die Infinitive in der Septuaginta* (Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1965), 177, this ‘Participium Coniunctum’ appears 25 times in LXX-Is.

<sup>26</sup> Three times in 8:9; 30:31; 31:4,9; 51:7 and LXX-Jer 31:1 (MT 48:1) outside Isaiah. ἐκλείπω is used in LXX-Is 7:8; 51:6, while διασκαδάζω in LXX-Is 51:6.

<sup>27</sup> Brueggemann; Kaiser; Watts.

have any connection with or implication for Judah, it would be very difficult to see why this section was included here. “The Egyptians” in LXX, however, excludes the ambiguity, and shows the *inner-Egypt* viewpoint of the translator. For him, it was the Egyptians who would be ashamed. The fact that the translator had “the Egyptians” as the subject shows us that he wanted to make it clearly understood as such.<sup>28</sup>

LXX seems to paraphrase MT: “their expectation” → “in whom they trusted”; “their glory” → “they were glory to them”. In particular, the rendering ἦσαν πεποιθότες, suggests that the translator read מבטח as מבטחם,<sup>29</sup> in the next verse as well.<sup>30</sup> That the motif “shame-trust” using the same Greek words in the present verse is also found in 42:17 and 31:13 in LXX-Jer (MT 48:13), which has בוש - בטח, serves to support this.

The possibility that the second οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι is read as a subject of the last line thus “for the Egyptians were glory to them”, seems to be excluded, because of the context and meaning. “The Egyptians were the glory of the Ethiopian” does not make sense once the translator decides to make “the Egyptians” the subject of the first half of the present verse, in contrast to MT.<sup>31</sup>

### 3.1.3.6. 20:6

וְאָמַר יִשָּׁב הָאֵץ הַזֶּה בְּיוֹם הַהוּא	καὶ ἐροῦσιν οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐν τῇ γῆσῳ ταύτῃ
הַנְּהַרְכָּה מִבָּטְנוֹ אֲשֶׁר־נָסְנוּ שָׁם לְעִזְרָהּ	ἰδοὺ ἡμεῖς ἡμεν πεποιθότες τοῦ φυγεῖν εἰς αὐτοὺς εἰς βοήθειαν
לְהַנְצִיל מִפְּנֵי מֶלֶךְ אֲשׁוּר	οἱ οὐκ ἐδύναντο σωθῆναι ἀπὸ βασιλέως Ἀσσυρίων
וְאֵין נִמְלֵט אֲנַחְנוּ: ס	καὶ Πῶς ἡμεῖς σωθησόμεθα

MT: And the inhabitants of this coastland shall say **in that day**, “Behold, **such** is our hope to where we fled<sup>32</sup> for help and for deliverance from the king of

<sup>28</sup> Contrary to Ottley, 2:203: “The LXX have lost the syntax and with it the meaning”.

<sup>29</sup> 1QIs<sup>a</sup> and Targum reflect this septuagintal reading. But Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 269.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. 32:18: “... ובמשכנות מבטחים ...” → “... καὶ ἐνοικήσει πεποιθώς ...”. In this verse, too, the translator paraphrases the noun-sentence in Hebrew, as in 20:5 above.

<sup>31</sup> The reading of other textual variants such as B, S, and L seems to reflect the literal meaning of a Hebrew text like MT: ... οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι οἱ ἦσαν αὐτοῖς δόξα (L: ~ εἰς δόξαν). But these readings cannot go with the Greek renderings of the first half as we see above.

<sup>32</sup> 1QIs<sup>a</sup> reads this as נסמך, which makes good sense, with reference to 36:6 “... Egypt, ... when one leans on it (איש עליו), and it will go into his hand and pierce ...”. But as Wildberger, *Isaiah 13-27*, 286, points out, the verb סמך in this sense needs the preposition על in all occurrences of MT. Also see *BDB*,

Assyria; then, how shall we escape?”

LXX: And the inhabitants in this island shall say, “Behold, we trusted to flee for help to those, who were not able to be saved from the king of Assyrians. And, how shall we be saved?”

1QIs<sup>a</sup>: orthographic יושב האיא, נסנו נסמך; האיא, יושב. Qumran reads here the verb סמך for נס in MT.<sup>33</sup>

LXX has no equivalent for **ההוא** ביום.<sup>34</sup> Of 45 occurrences in MT, such omission happens only three times (4:1; 20:6; 24:21). The first sentence of LXX consists of a plural subject and a plural verb, while these are singular in MT. “The inhabitants in (this) island” is found in 23:2,6,<sup>35</sup> where the expression indicates the peoples on the coast of Philistia.<sup>36</sup> It seems that the present verse is harmonized with the others.<sup>37</sup> But what this phrase refers to in the context of this Septuagintal section, will be dealt with later. The following sentence in the present verse of MT is conspicuously paraphrased in LXX. The sense that MT tries to deliver in this verse is: the failure of Egypt, to which they fled for help and deliverance from Assyria. The text of LXX reflects more clearly what MT says. The rendering of **להנצל מפני מלך אשור** as οἱ οὐκ ἐδύναντο σωθῆναι ἀπὸ βασιλέως Ἀσσυρίων resembles midrashic interpretation, as seen in Targum.<sup>38</sup> There is the possibility that the translator misread **להנצל** as **לֹא הִנְצֵל**, as Ottley suggests.<sup>39</sup> When we take these into account together with the fact that the translator paraphrases **שָׁמָע** as εἰς αὐτοὺς to clarify the reference of the verb φύγω, it seems more plausible to regard the present verse as a theological paraphrase by the translator – in which the insertion of

---

701f; Barthélemy, 152. When we find an example (Is 36:6) where the verb **נס** is used with **לעזרה** as in the present verse, we accept the reading of MT. LXX also reflects this reading.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. Watts; Wildberger.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. S has the phrase.

<sup>35</sup> Especially, 23:6 in LXX-Is: οἱ ἐνοικοῦντες ἐν τῇ γῆσιν ταύτῃ for **אֲשֶׁר בְּיַד** in MT.

<sup>36</sup> Van der Kooij, *Oracle of Tyre*, 52-53, 78. But he thinks the expression in 23:6 points to Carthage (57, 79). On a critique by Troxel, see *LXX-Isaiah*, 194-199.

<sup>37</sup> Generally, the plural form **אֲשֶׁר** is used and rendered as γῆσιν throughout Isaiah, thus indicates coastal region near a sea (24:15; 42:10), isles afar (e.g. 40:15; 60:9), or peoples thereof (e.g. 49:1; 66:19, where the word is paralleled with ἔθνη).

<sup>38</sup> Targum: “And the inhabitants of this island ... for help to be delivered from before the king of Assyria? *Hitherto they have not delivered themselves* (לֹא שִׁיבֵנו) (עַד כִּדְן נִפְשֵׁנוּן לֹא שִׁיבֵנו), and how shall we be delivered?” (Stenning’s translation).

<sup>39</sup> Ottley, 2:203.

σωθῆναι intends to connect it to σωθησόμεθα in the following sentence -, rather than as the result of a different Vorlage.<sup>40</sup> Another element contributing to LXX's paraphrase is the elimination of כה from MT, which is otherwise usually reflected in οὕτως or τὰδε.

Two Hebrew verbs (נצל, מלט) are both rendered as σῶζω. נצל appears 22 times in Isaiah and its usual equivalents are ῥύομαι and ἐξαίρω.<sup>41</sup> When we bear in mind that the rendering σῶζω is used in only 3 occurrences (19:20; 20:6; 38:6), it is likely that the rendering of נצל as σῶζω in the present verse arose from the translator's intention to create a parallel with the rendering מלט as σῶζω.<sup>42</sup>

### 3.1.4. The Septuagintal text

#### 3.1.4.1. Verse 5

The structure of MT in v.5 is remarkably different in LXX. It seems too simple to be mistaken:

They will be dismayed, and ashamed of Cush their expectation,  
of Egypt their glory.

But LXX has instead:

“The Egyptians, being defeated, will be ashamed of the Ethiopians, in whom the Egyptians trusted, because they were glory to them”.

Interestingly, LXX has “the Egyptians” twice as subject, while MT has no reference to “the Egyptians” at all. However the reading came about, the Septuagintal reading as it stands emphasises “the Egyptians”. What LXX says is that the Egyptians relied upon the Ethiopians because the Ethiopians were their glory and they will be ashamed of the Ethiopians, for the Ethiopians will not help the Egyptians against the Assyrians. Now

---

<sup>40</sup> In fact, there are many examples where LXX-Is gives a different meaning from MT by adding negative particles: e.g. 8:14; 27:3; 31:8; 54:4, etc.

<sup>41</sup> Interestingly, ῥύομαι as an equivalent of נצל appears in chapters 1-39 (e.g. 36:14; 37:12) and ἐξαίρω is used mainly after chapter 40 (e.g. 31:5; 42:22; 44:17,20; 47:14; 57:13). As for the cases where ῥύομαι appears after chapter 40, the Greek word is used for mostly נאל (e.g. 48:17,20; 49:7; 59:20; this Greek verb is never used as a rendering of נאל in chapters 1-39), in a few cases שש (49:25,26; 63:5) and פדרת (50:2).

<sup>42</sup> See 2.2.2.3.

the translator changes the relationship of alliance between Judah and Egypt into a relationship between Egyptians and Ethiopians. His treatment may be based on the historical fact that the Cushites – the Ethiopians - reigned over the whole of Egypt during the 25<sup>th</sup> dynasty (747-664 BCE)<sup>43</sup> and they showed themselves as the representative of Egypt. This Jewish notion of the surpassing power of the Ethiopians over the Egyptians may be traceable in some materials, one of which is Josephus' explanation of Moses' Cushite wife.<sup>44</sup> In this story, Moses serves as a kind of deliverer of Egypt in the face of the Ethiopians' sweeping power. The rendering in this verse of LXX-Is may reflect a memory of this traditional power relation between two nations in Egypt.<sup>45</sup> Or, as Seeligmann suggests,<sup>46</sup> LXX-Is could point out the support which Ethiopia had given to Egyptian rebels against the Ptolemaic kings. From 206 BCE to 186 BCE, a series of rebellions arose in Upper Egypt, and an Egyptian named Hurgonaphor (or Harmachis) drove the Greeks out of Thebes and became king.<sup>47</sup> It is suggested that the independent Ethiopian kings may have given aid to the Egyptian rebels.<sup>48</sup> After 180 BCE, it seems that Ptolemaic control over Theban region reestablished.<sup>49</sup> Nothing can be clearer concerning the situation, but it may be helpful to understand the rendering in LXX-Is.

---

<sup>43</sup> James, 683-701; A. Spalinger, "Third Intermediate-Saite Period (Dyn. 21-26)" in *ABD*, 2: 358-360.

<sup>44</sup> Artapanus, 27.7 on the Ethiopians' attack against Egypt; Pseudo-Eupolemus, 9.17.9: "Chus was the ancestor of the Ethiopians and the brother of Mitsraim, the ancestor of the Egyptians"; Josephus, *Ant.* 2.238-53. As a matter of fact, this story in Josephus explains how Moses married a Cushite woman (cf. Nu 12:1). Tessa Rajak, "Moses in Ethiopia: Legend and Literature", *JJS* 29 (1978), 121-22, suggests that this story about Moses and Ethiopia was familiar to the Jews in Alexandria.

<sup>45</sup> It seems difficult to find a hint to the contemporary situation of the translator between Egypt and "Ethiopia". See P.L. Shinnie, "The Nilotic Sudan and Ethiopia, c. 660 BCE to c. AD 600" in J.D. Fage (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Africa* (Vol.2; Cambridge University Press, 1978), 210-271.

<sup>46</sup> Seeligmann, 250.

<sup>47</sup> Shinnie, 228; E. Turner, "Ptolemaic Egypt", in F.W. Walbank, A.E. Astin, M.W. Frederiksen and R.M. Ogilvie (eds.), *The Cambridge Ancient History* (Vol. VII-part I; 2<sup>nd</sup> edition; Cambridge University Press 1984), 162f.

<sup>48</sup> Shinnie, 228.

<sup>49</sup> Shinnie, 228.

The above observation shows us how the target readership of the Hebrew, the Jews of Palestine, has been transferred in LXX to the Jews of Egypt. MT shows readers in Palestine how stupid the people who relied upon Egypt had been, while LXX does the same for readers in Egypt using an example within Egypt itself. As is seen in the commentary on 10:20f, the Greek phrase εἰμί + πεποιθότες plays a very important role in LXX-Is.<sup>50</sup> This phrase is very frequently used in LXX-Is. The question of whom a certain community trusts in determines its situation and identity according to LXX-Is. The translator judges Egypt by the same criteria. This is also attested by the Greek rendering of תפארתם: “because they were glory to them”. This sentence explains why the Egyptians trusted in the Ethiopians, according to LXX: because the Ethiopians were glory to the Egyptians. The statement seems to imply that it is God who should be their glory, as can be seen in 12:2; 60:19,21, etc. According to Brockington, glory and salvation are closely associated in LXX-Is.<sup>51</sup> For example, in 40:5,

MT “And the glory of YHWH shall be revealed and all flesh shall see together, for the mouth of YHWH has spoken” וְנִגְלָה כְבוֹד יְהוָה וְרָאוּ כָל-בָּשָׂר יַחְדָּו כִּי פִי יְהוָה דִּבֶּר  
 LXX “And the glory of Lord shall be seen and all flesh shall see the salvation of God for the Lord has spoken” καὶ ὁφθήσεται ἡ δόξα κυρίου καὶ ὄψεται πᾶσα σὰρξ τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ ὅτι κύριος ἐλάλησεν

The Septuagintal verse shows that “the glory of Lord” is identified with “the salvation of God” which is added by the translator as the object of the verb “see” (cf. 38:11; 52:10).<sup>52</sup> Therefore, in conjunction with the use of εἰμί + πεποιθότες, the rendering תפארת as δόξα shows that the translator is dealing with the problem of the salvation of Egypt here. In this respect, it would be quite natural for the verb σώζω to be used twice in the following verse.

---

<sup>50</sup> See 2.1.3.1.

<sup>51</sup> L.H. Brockington, “Greek Translator”, 30-31; idem, “LXX and Targum”, *ZAW* 66 (1954), 80.

<sup>52</sup> Seeligmann, 285-286, as avoiding literal anthropomorphic expression; cf. Tov, *Text-Critical Use*, 48-50; on the connection with 52:10, see Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 130f, 137.

### 3.1.4.2. Verse 6

V.6 in MT consists of three sentences: the inhabitants in this island will say in that day; Behold, such is our hope to which we fled for help and for deliverance from the king of Assyria; How shall we escape?

As seen in v.5, MT is concerned with Philistine cities and especially Judah, trusting in Egypt and Cush against Assyria.<sup>53</sup> But LXX changes this background into an inner-Egyptian one, so LXX is concerned with the Egyptians trusting in the Ethiopians against Assyria. Therefore, it seems plausible that “the inhabitants in this island” refers to “the Egyptians”.<sup>54</sup> Interestingly, the Greek word νῆσος sometimes refers to “land flooded by the Nile”.<sup>55</sup> Then, it is possible that the translator and the readers related the Greek term to “the people in the region flooded by the Nile” i.e. “the Egyptians”. In addition, the same phrase εἰμί + πεποιθότες is used in v.5 and v.6. In v.5, it is stated that the Egyptians trusted in the Ethiopians. In v.6, it is stated that we (the inhabitants in this island) trusted to flee to them for help”. It would be natural to regard this “we” in v.6 as “the Egyptians” in v.5. At least, it may be suggested that the Septuagintal reading is intended to be understood thus.

As we saw before, LXX divided the second sentence into two: Behold, we trusted to flee to them for help; who could not be saved from the king of the Assyrians. While MT highlights the statements about the shortcomings of Egypt in vv.4-5 by using כה מבטננו, LXX-Is gives a more lucid sense by eliminating כה. In fact, this verse is full of important theological terms (‘trust’, ‘flee to’, ‘help’ and ‘save’) and by these means the translator

---

<sup>53</sup> Brueggemann; Cheyne; Gray; Jensen; Watts; Wildberger; but Oswalt doubts that Judah was included.

<sup>54</sup> Also see Theodoret of Cyrus’ comment in Manley, 318.

<sup>55</sup> As *LSJ* shows, in *The Hibeh Papyri*, 1.90.7, which is assumed to belong to around 230 BCE, νῆσος is used to indicate a region in Oxyrhynchus nome. Theodoret of Cyrus explains: “He calls Egypt an ‘island’ because the river plays the part of a sea and surrounds it with its channels”. See Manley, 318. For the term to denote a peninsula, see van der Kooij, *Oracle of Tyre*, 79.

judged the situation definitively: they trusted in the Ethiopians to flee for help, and the Ethiopians could not save them from Assyria. While MT implicitly speaks of Egypt's inability to help, LXX does so explicitly. Arguably LXX has a much more negative view of trusting in other nation for help than MT.

To sum up, in vv.5-6, LXX has lengthy paraphrased sentences. It seems that the translator wanted to explain what had been going on through the use of examples within Egypt. In other words, it is likely that the Septuagintal text arises from a certain didactic motive. These verses inform the readers in whom we should trust in and who should be our glory – this is associated with salvation -, using a concrete historical example consisting of Egyptians and Ethiopians, which would be very familiar to the Jews in Egypt. After all, these two verses are telling readers in Egypt whence comes the salvation.

### 3.1.5. Theology of the Septuagint: “How shall we be saved?”

The translator tells the readers about the problem of how we will be saved, using as a concrete example of the situation between Egypt and Ethiopia. The powerful Ethiopians could not save the Egyptians who fled to them for help. They were not helpful. In this respect, LXX has a more negative view than MT concerning reliance on Egypt. We might consider this their response against many statements depicting going down to Egypt as infidelity and apostasy. This will be further demonstrated by other related texts in LXX-Is.

There are only three cases where נצל is translated into σώζω in LXX-Is, as seen above. Another case in 38:6 may suggest the answer of the translator to the question “how shall we be saved”:

καὶ ἐκ χειρὸς βασιλέως Ἀσσυρίων σώσω σε (וּמִכַּף מֶלֶךְ-אֲשׁוּר אֲצִילֶךָ) καὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς

πόλεως ταύτης ὑπερασπιῶ “And from the hand of the king of Assyrians I will save you, and I will shield this city”.<sup>56</sup>

## 3.2. 30:1-7

### 3.2.1. Context of MT

Although the superscription **נבא בהמוח נגב** appears in v.6, vv.6-7 should be understood in connection with vv.1-5. This is apparent in two ways: Firstly, both parts speak about Egypt (vv.2-3 and v.7), and secondly, both of them describe Egypt as an unhelpful nation using the same phrase “**עם לא־יועילו**” (v.5 and v.6). 30:8-33 deals with the description of those rebellious people seen in v.1 and the outcome of the situation<sup>57</sup> but the section does not have a direct relationship with Egypt. Therefore, we limit ourselves here to 30:1-7.<sup>58</sup>

Conflicts between Assyria and Egypt may form the background to the Hebrew text. During the Assyrian campaign, Judah took a pro-Egyptian policy against Assyria. Among the actions resulting from the policy would be the appeals for help from Egypt as shown in the present text and others (31:1-3; indirectly 28:14-15,18-22, etc.).<sup>59</sup>

### 3.2.2. Comparison of two versions

#### 3.2.2.1. 30:1

הוּי בְּנִים סוֹרְרִים נְאֻם־יְהוָה	οὐαὶ τέκνα ἀποστάται, τάδε λέγει κύριος,
לַעֲשׂוֹת עֲצָה וְלֹא מִנִּי	ἐποιήσατε βουλήν οὐ δι’ ἐμοῦ
וְלִנְסֹךְ מִסֶּכֶה וְלֹא רוּחִי	καὶ συνθήκας οὐ διὰ τοῦ πνεύματός μου
לְמַעַן סָפוֹת חַטָּאת עַל־חַטָּאת:	προσθεῖναι ἁμαρτίας ἐφ’ ἁμαρτίας,

MT: Woe to the rebellious children, says YHWH, who make a counsel **but** not

<sup>56</sup> In MT, “this city (העיר הזאת)” appears twice but it seems that the translator omits first one to make simple and clear.

<sup>57</sup> Sweeney, 386-389.

<sup>58</sup> Also Beuken; Cheyne.

<sup>59</sup> Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 1-39*, 411.

from me, and **who make** an alliance<sup>60</sup> **but** not my spirit, adding<sup>61</sup> sin upon sin, LXX: Woe to the rebellious children, **thus** says the Lord, you made a plan not through me, and pacts not **through** my spirit, adding sins upon sins, 1QIs<sup>a</sup>: orthographic נאם<sup>62</sup> and לויא; ממי; for מני<sup>63</sup>.

נאם־יהוה formula appears 25 times in Isaiah. Interestingly and remarkably, this formula is always rendered as τὰδε λέγει κύριος, except once in 14:22, in chapters 1-39,<sup>64</sup> as in other prophetic literature, while it is always rendered as λέγει κύριος, except twice in 52:5, in chapters 40-66.<sup>65</sup> Therefore, the fact that LXX has τὰδε in the present verse is consistent with the technique of the translator.<sup>66</sup>

There is no Greek equivalent for לנסך. The translator might have known what לנסך meant here,<sup>67</sup> and rendered the phrase as (ποιέω) συνθήκας ('make pacts'),<sup>68</sup> a phrase widely used in Greek literature to express a treaty between two countries.<sup>69</sup> Compared to its frequent appearance in Greek literature, there are only three cases in LXX where this phrase appears: Is 28:15, 30:1, Dan 11:4 and 11:17. The examples where

<sup>60</sup> נסך מוסכה indicates here 'pouring out a libation' in making a covenant, thus 'making an alliance' (NJB, NRSV; Watts; Wildberger). But Beuken; Blenkinsopp. Cheyne and BDB, 651, suggest 'weave a web', which, after all, may connote the action of making alliances. For Dahood's suggestion to take עצה as עץ with an accusative ending, paralleled with the understanding of לנסך מוסכה as 'casting a molten image', see M. Dahood, "Accusative 'ēsāh, 'wood' in Isaiah 30,1b", *Bib* 50 (1969), 57-58; W.H. Irwin, *Isaiah 28-33: Translation with Philological Notes* (BO 30; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1977), 72.

<sup>61</sup> Following the BHS apparatus and other versions (LXX, Peshitta, Targum, Vulgate), ספוח is read as ספח, an infinitive of סף, likewise in Nu 32:14; Deut 29:18, though Oswalt, Watts and Wildberger argue the reading in MT should be understood as Qal infinitive of סף based on Nu 32:14. See *GKC* §69 h1.

<sup>62</sup> In 1QIs<sup>a</sup>, נאם appears twice (1:24; 41:14), while, elsewhere, נאם is used (e.g. 3:15; 19:4; 31:9; 54:17).

<sup>63</sup> In 22:4, too, 1QIs<sup>a</sup> writes ממי for מני in MT: "tendency to normalize" (Irwin, 73). ממי in Is 29:13 of MT is seen in 1QIs<sup>a</sup> as well.

<sup>64</sup> 1:24; 3:15; 14:22,23; 17:3,6; 19:4; 22:25; 30:1; 31:9; 37:34. In 3:15 and 14:23, this Hebrew formula seems to be reflected in the following verses, respectively 3:16 and 14:24.

<sup>65</sup> 41:14; 43:10; 43:12; 49:18; 52:5; 54:17; 55:8; 66:2; 66:22. In 56:8 and 66:17, this formula is translated using εἶπεν instead of λέγει and in 59:20, it is not reflected.

<sup>66</sup> Interestingly, οὕτως λέγει κύριος is overwhelmingly preferred as a rendering for אמר יהוה after chapter 40 in LXX-Is (21 out of 26 occurrences). This phenomenon is never seen in other prophetic literature. Therefore, we conclude it is a unique translational feature of LXX-Is. At the same time, it might be used as evidence of two translators for LXX-Is. See M.S. Hurwitz, "The LXX of Isaiah 36-9 in Relation to that of 1-35, 40-66", *HUCA* 28 (1957), 80-83; also G.B. Gray, "The Greek version of Isaiah: is it the work of a single translator?", *JTS* 12 (1911), 290-293.

<sup>67</sup> Ottley, 2:252; But Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 266.

<sup>68</sup> In Is 40:19, too, the Hebrew verb לנסך is rendered as the verb ποιέω.

<sup>69</sup> For example: Aristophanes, *Pax*, 1065; Diodorus Siculus, *Bibliotheca historica*, 5.6.4; 12.26.3; 14.3.2; Polybius, *Historiae*, 1.16.9; 2.12.3; 7.4.2.; Xenophon, *Hellenica*, 2.2.12; 7.1.2; 5.3.26; *Ant.* 6.230; 16.270; *B.J.* 4.382; Herodotus, *Historiae*, 6.42.1, etc. In these all cases, the verb ποιέω is in the middle voice.

the active form of ποιέω is used in this phrase are rare throughout extant Greek literature.<sup>70</sup> Therefore, it can be said that the usage of LXX-Is is unique and the translator no doubt borrowed this phrase from 28:15, where the phrase is an equivalent of כרת ברית.

LXX does not reflect two adversative uses of וְ.<sup>71</sup> LXX adds the preposition διὰ in οὐ διὰ τοῦ πνεύματός μου for לֹא רוּחִי, perhaps from a desire to create a parallel with the previous οὐ δι' ἐμοῦ.

The MT in this verse is characterized by infinitive clauses, describing why the people are called “rebellious children”. But LXX does not reflect this framing: the only main verb in the Lord’s saying in LXX is ποιέω, while the last infinitive סַפַּס remains as an infinitive (προσθεῖναι). It is quite likely that the translator paraphrased the meaning of the given Hebrew text according to his understanding. In addition, by changing the third person of the Hebrew into a second person (ἐποιήσατε), the text is rendered more intense and direct.

Singular nouns about “sin” are sometimes translated as a plural noun αἱ ἁμαρτίαι in LXX-Is (5:18; 6:7; 13:11; 14:21; 53:6; 64:6) as in the present verse.

### 3.2.2.2. 30:2

וְהָלְכִים לְרַדְתַּם מִצְרַיִם וְפִי לֹא שָׁאַלְנִי  
 לְעֹז בְּמַעֲוֹ פַרְעֹה  
 וְלְחֹסוֹת בְּצֶל מִצְרַיִם: οἱ πορευόμενοι καταβῆναι εἰς Αἴγυπτον, ἐμὲ δὲ οὐκ  
 ἐπηρώτησαν τοῦ βοηθηθῆναι ὑπὸ Φαραῶ  
 καὶ σκεπασθῆναι ὑπὸ Αἰγυπτίων.

MT: who walk to go down to Egypt - but they did not ask my mouth -, to take refuge in **the protection of** Pharaoh, and to seek refuge in **the shadow of** Egypt.

LXX: who walk to go down to Egypt - but they did not ask me -, to be helped by Pharaoh and to be protected by Egyptians.

1QIs<sup>a</sup>: orthographic ההולכים, לוא and פרעוה.

לְעֹז בְּמַעֲוֹ is translated by τοῦ βοηθηθῆναι, an apparent paraphrase. In 17:10 and

<sup>70</sup> For example, in Isocrates’ writings which have dozens of appearances of the phrase, the case where the active form of the verb is only one: *In Callimachum*, 68.

<sup>71</sup> Generally, καὶ οὐ(κ) is followed by finite verb. Καὶ οὐ + phrase as in the present verse belongs to very rare cases, e.g. Nu 12:8.

25:4, מְעוּז is rendered as βοηθός as in the present verse. Likewise, the rendering of לחסות בצל as σκεπασθηγαι belongs to the same technique, “etymological reasoning”,<sup>72</sup> using a verb derived from a noun which has the same root, for the equivalent of צל is often σκέπη,<sup>73</sup> thus

βοηθός (מְעוּז) – βοηθηθηγαι (לְעוּז בְּמְעוּז)  
 σκέπη (צֶל) – σκεπασθηγαι (לְחַסוֹת בְּצֶל).

LXX changes “my mouth” in MT into “me”. This may relate more to the translator’s tendency to concretize, rather than an avoidance of anthropomorphism, since “the mouth” of YHWH still appears in LXX-Is (11:4- even “his lips”; 24:3; 25:8; 45:23; 48:3; 55:11; 58:14).

The verb חסה appears three times in Isaiah (14:32; 30:2; 57:13), and LXX renders the verb differently, rather theologically in the other two cases.<sup>74</sup> In the present verse, too, the Hebrew verb is translated by a more concrete Greek verb.<sup>75</sup>

### 3.2.2.3. 30:3

וְהָיָה לְכֶם מְעוּז פְּרֵעָה לְבָשָׂת וְהִחְסוּת בְּצֶל־מִצְרַיִם לְכַלְמָה: ἔσται γὰρ ὑμῖν ἡ σκέπη Φαραω εἰς αἰσχύνην καὶ τοῖς πεποιθόσιν ἐπ’ Αἴγυπτον ὄνειδος.

MT: Therefore the protection of Pharaoh will be to you, shame, and the refuge into the shadow of Egypt will be insult.

LXX: For the protection of Pharaoh will be to you, shame, and to those who trusted in Egypt, disgrace.

1QIs<sup>a</sup>: לכמה for לְכַלְמָה,<sup>76</sup> which seems to have happened from parablepsis (two Lamed and another לַכּ in the same verse).

While the verse in MT is well paralleled (the protection of Pharaoh → shame; the refuge into the shadow of Egypt → insult), the translator of LXX paraphrases it,

<sup>72</sup> Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 112.

<sup>73</sup> E.g. Gen 19:8; Ez 31:17; Ho 14:8 and Is 4:6; 25:4.

<sup>74</sup> In 14:32, “וְבָהּ יִחְסוּ עַנְיֵי עַמּוֹ” And the poor of his people *will find refuge in her* (=Zion) is translated by “καὶ δι’ αὐτοῦ σωθήσονται οἱ ταπεινοὶ τοῦ λαοῦ And by him (=God) the lowly of the people *will be saved*”, and in 57:13, “בִּי יִנְחַל־אָרֶץ” And whoever *take refuge in me* will inherit the land” by “οἱ δὲ ἀντεχόμενοί μου κτήσονται γῆν But whoever *hold me firm* will possess the land”.

<sup>75</sup> For a possible implied meaning in LXX by choosing this Greek word, see below.

<sup>76</sup> לכמה is an alternative writing for לַכּ in 1QIs<sup>a</sup> (e.g. 36:14; 62:6), while it retains לַכּ in some verses of the former chapters of Isaiah (e.g. 7:14; 31:7). This longer suffix with ה is a characteristic of writing in 1QIs<sup>a</sup> and more in 4QIs<sup>c</sup>.

explaining the metaphor of “refuge in the shadow” as “to trust in”. The latter is a very important concept, found frequently throughout LXX-Is.<sup>77</sup> In addition, LXX seems to have read החסות as החסות, the plural participle form of חסה. As a result of these renderings, “the protection of Pharaoh (ἡ σκέπη Φαραω)” becomes the keyword of the present verse as the only subject in the Greek text.

#### 3.2.2.4. 30:4

כִּי־הָיוּ בָצֵעַן שָׂרְיוֹ וּמַלְאָכָיו חָנֹס יַגִּיעוּ: ὅτι εἰσὶν ἐν Τάνει ἀρχηγοὶ ἄγγελοι ποιηροί

MT: For **his** princes are in Zoan and **his** messengers arrive at Hanes.<sup>78</sup>

LXX: For there are in Tanis princes, **evil** messengers.

1QIs<sup>a</sup>=MT.

In LXX, “evil messengers” appears in the place of “messengers” of MT. It is difficult to see why LXX has the additional adjective. It may have arisen from a misreading of חנס as חמס or less likely חנף.<sup>79</sup> Since this Hebrew word חנס seems to be also as μάτην from חָנַם in following phrase, we may have a doublet.<sup>80</sup> However, this would assume a double misreading. Alternatively, ποιηροί in LXX may be the result of an Aramaic understanding of the difficult word באיש in v.5 (cf. Ezra 4:12). The reading of 1QIs<sup>a</sup> in verse 5, כלה באש, seems to support this. If then, the possible reading of the Vorlage of LXX would be as following:

חנם יגעו כלה באיש על-עם ... “(messengers) in vain they labour, all are evil, towards a nation”

LXX does not reflect the pronominal suffixes in MT; thus “princes, messengers” instead of “his princes, his messengers”. This may be intentional. In MT, the referent of “his” in this text appears to be the Pharaoh of Egypt, compared with the reference to “princes in Zoan” in 19:11,13.<sup>81</sup> On the other hand what may be envisaged is the

<sup>77</sup> See 2.1.3.1.

<sup>78</sup> It seems that Sweeney, 399, regards “Hanes” as “On” i.e. Heliopolis, which is hard to accept.

<sup>79</sup> Fischer, *Schrift*, 47; Ottley, 2:252.

<sup>80</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 69.

<sup>81</sup> Irwin, 74f. So Kaiser thinks the mention of Zoan and Hanes (Heracleopolis Magna) shows the northern front line of the Ethiopian dynasty in the time of Shabako; also A. Kuschke, “Zu Jes 30:1-5”, *ZAW*

political relationship between Judah and Egypt against Assyria, and the referent of “his” is to the embassy sent by Hezekiah to Egypt.<sup>82</sup> However, if we preserve the consonants of MT, “his princes” ought to refer to “the princes of Pharaoh” according to the context. But in LXX, this is not the case. “The princes, messengers” seem clearly to refer to those who were sent to Egypt for help by the Israelites, confirmed by the following phrase “in vain they labour”.

חננס יגיעו, the last two words in MT seems to be rendered as μάτην κοπιάσουσι in the next verse,<sup>83</sup> perhaps the result of a misreading of Hebrew words or from a variant<sup>84</sup>: μάτην for חננס (MT: חננס) and κοπιάω for יגיעו<sup>85</sup> (MT: Hiphil of נגע).

### 3.2.2.5. 30:5

כָּל הַבְּאִישׁ עַל־עַם לֹא־יִוְעִילוּ לָמוֹ (μάτην κοπιάσουσι) πρὸς λαόν, ὃς οὐκ ὠφελήσει αὐτοὺς  
 לֹא לְעֹזֵר וְלֹא לְהוֹעִיל οὐτε εἰς βοήθειαν οὐτε εἰς ὠφέλειαν,  
 כִּי לְבִשְׁת׃ וְגַם־לְחַרְפָּה: ס ἀλλὰ εἰς αἰσχύνην καὶ ὄνειδος.

MT: **All stank**<sup>86</sup> towards a people, which will not profit them, not for help and not for profit, but for shame and even for disgrace.

LXX: (**In vain they labour**) towards a people, who will not profit them, neither for help nor for profit, but for shame and disgrace.

1QIs<sup>a</sup>: כלה באש for כל הבאיש (see the footnote below); orthographic לוא and להועיל for חועיל; לעזרה;

On “in vain they labour”, see above. And LXX appears not to represent the first phrase “כל הבאיש”, which would be rendered in v.4 of LXX.

23 (1952), 194-195. Beuken suggests this phrase should refer to “the princes of Pharaoh” and at the same time, the two embassies, from Egypt and from Judah, would meet in this border territory.

<sup>82</sup> For example, Cheyne; Sweeney; Sawyer; Blenkinsopp.

<sup>83</sup> “To labour in vain (κοπιάω + μάτην/ κενός)” appears not a few times: Job 2:9; 20:18; 39:16; Ps 127:1 (LXX 126:1); Is 49:4; 65:23.

<sup>84</sup> Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 189.

<sup>85</sup> After chapter 40, κοπιάω is used as an equivalent of mostly יגע (40:28,30,31; 43:22; 45:14; 47:15; 49:4; 57:10; 63:13; 65:23) and sometimes other Hebrew verbs (כשל: 63:13; עיף: 46:1; לאה: 47:13).

<sup>86</sup> According to Kethib of MT: כל הבאיש. Contrary to most commentaries (Beuken; Blenkinsopp “disillusioned”; Irwin; Oswalt; Wildberger, etc.) and some Hebrew manuscripts which go with Qere הביש, we support the Kethib (also Watts) because 1QIs<sup>a</sup> (כלה באש) preserves באש and also LXX may reflect it in ποιησοί. One advantage of this reading would be the consistent translation of the subsequent phrase יעילו לא על-עם לא (“towards a people”) in v.5 as well as v.6, otherwise we would have rendered them – exactly the same phrase - differently as in most commentaries and modern translations. For discussion concerning this, see J.A. Emerton, “A Textual Problem in Isaiah xxx. 5”, *JTS* 32 (1981), 125-128; idem, “A Further Note on Isaiah xxx. 5”, *JTS* 33 (1982), 161. He is in favour of keeping the Qumran reading but with different vowels thus באש/באש כלה (‘everyone will be ashamed’).

### 3.2.2.6. 30:6

מִשָּׂא בְּהִמּוֹת נִגְבַּ	ἢ ὄρασις τῶν τετραπόδων τῶν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ.
בְּאַרְיֵן צְרָה וְצוֹקָה	ἐν τῇ θλίψει καὶ τῇ στενοχωρίᾳ,
לְבִיא וְלִישׁ מִהֶם	λέων καὶ σκύμνος λέοντος ἐκεῖθεν
אִפְעָה וְשֶׂרֶף מְעוֹפֵף	καὶ ἀσπίδες καὶ ἔκγονα ἀσπίδων πετομένων
יִשְׂאוּ עַל-פְּתָח עִירִים חֵילָהֶם	οἱ ἔφερον ἐπ' ὄνων τὸν πλοῦτον αὐτῶν
וְעַל-דִּבְשָׁת גַּמְלִים אוֹצְרָתָם	καὶ καμήλων
עַל-עַם לֹא יוֹעִילוּ:	πρὸς ἔθνος ὃ οὐκ ὠφελήσει

αὐτοὺς εἰς βοήθειαν, ἀλλὰ εἰς αἰσχύνην καὶ ὄνειδος

MT: An oracle against the beasts of Negeb. In **the land of** trouble and distress, of the lioness and the roaring<sup>87</sup> lion, of the viper and the flying serpent, they will carry their riches on **the backs of** donkeys, and **their treasures on the humps of** camels toward a nation which will not profit (them).<sup>88</sup>

LXX: The oracle of the beasts<sup>89</sup> in the desert.<sup>90</sup> In the trouble and the distress, lion and lion's whelp there and asps and the young of flying asps, they carried their riches on donkeys and camels, towards a nation which will not profit **them for help, but for shame and disgrace.**

1QIs<sup>a</sup>: has וְצִיָּה between וְצוֹקָה and צְרָה, probably influenced from a likely idiomatic phrase צִיָּה אֲרֵץ in Is 41:18; 53:29; מִים וְאֵין מִים for מִהֶם, from a possible presupposed view on wilderness seen in such as Deut 8:15?; singular verb יִשָּׂא for plural יִשְׂאוּ; חֵילִם for חֵילִים; orthographic לֹא יוֹעִילוּ.

The apparatus of *HUB* suggests that probably, γῆ, equivalent to אֲרֵץ, was changed into τῆ, a possible error within the textual tradition of the version.

LXX has “on donkeys” instead of “on the backs of donkeys” in MT, representing a

<sup>87</sup> We read מִהֶם of MT as מִהֶם, which is a participle of הִמָּם. When we take into account the parallel structure of v.6bβ where two names for a lion (לְבִיא וְלִישׁ) are the counterpart of two names for a snake (אִפְעָה וְשֶׂרֶף), it seems quite natural that מִהֶם should be the counterpart of a participle מְעוֹפֵף. Also Brueggemann; Oswalt; *NEB*; *pace* Beuken, Cheyne. Other suggestions: נִהָם (‘growling’) - Duhm, Kaiser, Kissane, Watts, and Wildberger; הִמָּה (‘roaring’) - Blenkinsopp; בָּהֶם (‘among them’) - K.-D. Schunck, “Jes 30:6-8 und die Deutung der Rahab im Alten Testament”, *ZAW* 78 (1966), 50f; וְלִישֵׁם הֶם, enclitic ‘mem’ and a participle of הִים thus ‘roaring’ - Irwin, 76f. Except Schunck, all emendations agree on the meaning and the parallelism with מְעוֹפֵף.

<sup>88</sup> Sweeney, 400, suggests a different translation of the last phrase: “they carry/rely on a people that does not profit”, which does not seem persuasive.

<sup>89</sup> Literally, “four-footed animal”. This Greek word is one of renderings of Hebrew בְּהֵמָה: Gen 1:24; 34:23; Ex 8:13,14; Lev 7:21; Job 12:7, etc.

<sup>90</sup> נִגְבַּ is rendered in three ways throughout LXX: southwest (λίψ: Gen 20:1; Deut 1:7, etc.) or south (νότος: Nu 13:29; 1Ch 9:24, etc.), desert (ἔρημος: Gen 12:9; Nu 13:17; Deut 34:3, etc.) and place name (Ναγεβ: Jos 10:40; 11:16, etc.). Interestingly, in chapter 11 of Daniel in LXX, this Hebrew word is translated into Αἴγυπτος (Dan 11:5,6,9,11,14,15,25,29,40). In some manuscripts of LXX, including S, there is no heading. This might suggest that this heading was added here in a later period by the editor who arranged the unit 13-23 having similar headings. Cf. Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 1-39*, 413.

<sup>91</sup> Also in e.g. Ps 63:2; Jer 2:16; Eze 19:13; Ho 2:5; Jo 2:20; cf. Wildberger; Talmon, “Aspects”, 113, suggests וְצִיָּה as a “lector difficilior”.

simplification on the part of the translator, as elsewhere in LXX-Is. The similar technique of avoiding repetition, shortens another long MT-phrase “and their treasures on the humps of camels” into “and camels”.

LXX has more at the end, which definitely arises from repetition of the phrase in v.5. Since first, *λαός* is changed into *ἔθνος* and accordingly the following relative pronoun *ὃς* into *ὃ*, and secondly, *εἰς ὠφέλειαν* is not repeated and accordingly the adverb *οὔτε* does not appear, this addition at the end of the present verse should be regarded as an intentional one, not the result of dittography. However, we have to admit the possibility that the Vorlage of LXX may have read something like *לִמְנוּ לַעֲזֹר וּלְבִשְׁתָּ וּלְחַרְפָּה*.

### 3.2.2.7. 30:7

וּמִצְרַיִם הַבֵּל וְרִיק יַעֲזְרוּ Αἰγύπτιοι μάταια καὶ κενὰ ὠφελήσουσιν ὑμᾶς  
 לְכֵן קָרָאתִי לְיֹאֵת רַהַב הֵם שָׁבֹת: ἀπάγγειλον αὐτοῖς ὅτι ματαία ἡ παράκλησις ὑμῶν αὐτῇ  
 MT: **And** Egypt will help in vain and empty.<sup>92</sup> **Therefore** I have called this, “Rahab who sits still”.<sup>93</sup>  
 LXX: The Egyptians will benefit **you** in vain and with emptiness; Tell them, “This consolation of yours is vain”.  
 1QIs<sup>a</sup>: orthographic לְיֹאֵת for לְיֹאֵת; seems to have רַהַב for הֵם רַהַב. At least this scroll has one word here.

LXX has a pronoun *ὑμᾶς* in the place of *לְכֵן* in MT. Interestingly, 1QIs<sup>a</sup> text leaves a traces of the firstly written *לְכֵם* having been corrected into *לְכֵן* afterwards.<sup>94</sup> So the Vorlage of LXX may have had *לְכֵם*.<sup>95</sup>

LXX does not have an equivalent of the initial *waw* of MT. It seems that the

<sup>92</sup> *וְרִיק הַבֵּל* seems a hendiadys meaning “Nichtigkeit”, as suggested by Brongers, 107.

<sup>93</sup> Hebrew: *רַהַב הֵם שָׁבֹת*. This is a very famous crux among the Hebrew Bible. The present MT reading seems to be contradicted in the number, even though the meaning makes sense. While older scholars tried to emend the consonants, modern scholars tend to keep the given consonantal phrase. It seems that the most important point to keep in mind in this puzzling phrase is that there is a contrast in meaning between *רַהַב* and *שָׁבֹת*, when we pay our attention to the whole text from verse 1 to verse 7. *הֵם* can be used collectively, as Cheyne suggests, and *שָׁבֹת* seems to be dealt with separately to the first two words because Qumran scroll and LXX have a separate *שָׁבֹת*, even though these two ancient versions have in common that they show confusions dealing with the first two words. See Blenkinsopp; Irwin; Barthélemy; Schunck; Wildberger.

<sup>94</sup> Or the editor might have tried to correct medial ‘Nun’ into a final ‘Nun’.

<sup>95</sup> Also in Fischer, *Schrift*, 47; Ottley, 2:253.

translator read יעזרו as יעילו<sup>96</sup> with לכם as its object and if so, according to his understanding the *Athnah* should be under לכם.

A possible explanation for the latter part of the verse in LXX is that שבת is reflected in the following verse as καθίσσας. Rahab, an assumed sea monster, appears in Is 51:9 as well, but likewise in this verse LXX does not render the word, which shows that it must have been a puzzling word to the translator.<sup>97</sup> Presumably, he was unaware of a mythical creature called ‘Rahab’.<sup>98</sup>

### 3.2.3. The Septuagintal text

As in MT, vv.6-7 in the Septuagintal text should also be read together with vv.1-5. As for this, LXX goes further than MT: firstly, mentions of Egypt are seen in both parts (vv.3,4 and v.7), and secondly, αἰσχύνη and ὄνειδος are repeated in both parts (vv.3,5 and v.6). Thirdly, words meaning “vain” appear in both parts (v.5 and v.7). Lastly, ‘no profit of Egypt to Judah’ appears more repeatedly than MT by reading יעזרו as יעילו in v.7 (vv.5-7). The importance of these repeated phrases lies in the point that they point to the message that the text wants to deliver. In a wider context, the present section telling of “rebellious children” is contrasted with the preceding paragraph 29:22-24. According to 29:22 in LXX, Jacob will never be ashamed, and this “Jacob” is those whom God separated from Abraham.<sup>99</sup> This motif of separation is also typical of LXX-Is.<sup>100</sup>

---

<sup>96</sup> Words having עזר as its stem were never be rendered into ὠφελέω or ὠφέλεια throughout LXX. In LXX-Is, its equivalent words are always βοηθέω or βοήθεια (30:5; 41:6,10,13,14; 44:2; 49:8; 50:7,9; 63:5). Fischer, *Schrift*, 74, enumerates many cases where ל is read as ר and vice versa in LXX-Is: ל in ר: 1:13; 5:30; 16:9; 18:6; 23:8; 60:7; ר in ל: 28:22; 28:28. The present verse should be added in the catalog of ל in ר.

<sup>97</sup> Or, as Ottley, 2:253, suggests, it may be related to the rendering ματαιότης for רהבים in Ps 40:5 (LXX 39:5).

<sup>98</sup> Schweitzer, 224; cf. Peshitta: “vain is this your confidence” (Ottley’s translation).

<sup>99</sup> Comparing with MT (“Thus says YHWH, who redeemed [פרדה] Abraham, concerning Jacob ...), LXX seems to understand “Jacob” as the object of אשׁר clause thus “Therefore thus says the Lord, concerning Jacob, whom he separated from Abraham ...”.

### 3.2.3.1. Egypt: “A nation which will not benefit”

We have seen many examples where the translator applied the principle of simplification by omitting any repeated or unnecessary phrase and pronouns in his rendering. Such cases of omission result from the translation technique of the translator, not from any difference in the Vorlage which lay in front of the translator. In our present text, there are cases of the same principle in vv.1,2,6.

Therefore, it is quite extraordinary to find the longer phrase in v.6: “towards a nation who will not profit them for help, but for shame and disgrace”. What effect does this Septuagintal text have? It seems clear that there is a strong emphasis on the idea that the action of going down to Egypt for help would be absolutely in vain, and Egypt would never benefit Judah, but only prove to be shame<sup>101</sup> and disgrace.<sup>102</sup>

In connection to this, it is worthwhile considering the Greek verb σκεπάζω for כִּסֶּה in 30:2. In LXX-Exodus, the verb is used to denote God’s action in the Passover: when God sees the blood, he ‘will protect (σκεπάσω for כִּסֶּה)’ the Israelites (Ex 12:13,27). Interestingly, LXX-Is has a tendency to use this Greek word more frequently than expected.<sup>103</sup> According to an Isaianic verse in LXX, God will ‘protect’ his people “under (ὑπό)” the shadow of his hand (51:16). However, 30:2 shows what the problem is: they do not want ‘to be protected under, i.e. by’ God or God’s hand (cf. Is 49:2 in LXX) but ‘to be protected by Egyptians (σκεπασθήναι ὑπὸ Αἰγυπτίων)’. Thus the contrast implied in LXX-Is is brought out by the choice of σκεπάζω: in the time of the Exodus, the Israelites were ‘protected’ by YHWH, but now they wanted to be ‘protected’ by, ironically, the

---

<sup>100</sup> See our discussion on “Priests in Egypt” in the next chapter.

<sup>101</sup> For the significance of the Greek word *αἰσχύνη*, see Ekblad, 143.

<sup>102</sup> cf. In Is 44:9-10 in LXX, those who form an idol according to their own desire which will not benefit them, are in vain and will be put to shame (... πάντες μάταιοι [from יהוה] οἱ ποιούντες τὰ καταθύμια αὐτῶν ἃ οὐκ ὠφελήσει αὐτούς ἀλλὰ αἰσχυνθήσονται πάντες οἱ πλάσσοντες θεὸν καὶ γλύφοντες ἀνωφελῆ).

<sup>103</sup> 4:5 (הַפָּה); 28:15 (רַתַּר); 30:2 (הַכַּח); 49:2 (רַתַּר); 51:16 (רַתַּח).

Egyptians from whom they had departed! This is also seen in v.3, where the translator makes clear that “the protection (literally, ‘covering’) of Pharaoh” is placed in parallel “to trust in the Ethiopians” by rendering תַּחֲסוּת as τοῖς πεποιθόσιν. What is at stake is under whose covering they are.

### 3.2.3.2. Μάτην or μάταιος

These words appear more frequently in LXX-Is (22 out of 106 times) than in any other book.<sup>104</sup> Also in LXX-Is, there are many more cases than in any other Septuagintal books where the translator used μάτην or μάταιος to produce a text at variance to what we find in MT.<sup>105</sup>

Idols are in vain for salvation (2:20; 41:29) and so are the idol-makers (44:9). Likewise, those who trust in any other than God will be in vain (28:17; 30:15; 59:4). While this “vanity” is mostly related to idols after chapter 40, it seems to refer to something concrete, for example, human strength or a foreign country, especially Egypt before chapter 40. Their strength will be in vain (30:15; 33:11). And Egypt is vain for help (30:7) and God will rise up against their vain hope (31:2). So their labour will be in vain (30:5; 49:4). Counsels to find comfort other than from God are all in vain (28:29). Accordingly, these words are regularly used as a value judgment against certain negative actions by Judah or the Jews in LXX-Is.

### 3.2.3.3. Verse 7: Declaration for the Jews in Egypt

In order to clarify v.7, attention should first be given to “you” in v.3: “For the protection of Pharaoh will be to you shame and to those who trusted in Egypt disgrace”.

---

<sup>104</sup> For the Greek words, according to *HR*, five Hebrew words are their equivalents in LXX-Is: אֵין (31:2; 32:6; 41:29), חבל (30:7), רֵיק (29:8), שׁוּא (1:13; 30:28), תהו (44:9; 45:19; 49:4; 59:4). We need some corrections for this: as we saw in the above, it seems that we should regard μάτην as an equivalent of חנם in 30:5. And in 41:29, the equivalent of μάτην should be not אֵין but תהו, unlike *HR*.

<sup>105</sup> 2:20; 22:1; 27:3; 28:17,29; 29:13; 30:5; 30:7; 30:15×2; 33:11.

The frequent use of a perfect form of the verb *πέιθω* is another characteristic feature of LXX-Is.<sup>106</sup> For the translator, this term is used to judge individuals, his community and country. According to him, one should trust in the Lord, not in humans or in another nation or in idols (10:20; 17:7-8; 31:1; 42:17; 50:10; 58:14, etc.).<sup>107</sup>

Therefore, the focus of the Septuagintal rendering in v.3 seems to identify the addressees who would have shame and disgrace as “those who trusted in Egypt”, and they are probably the same as those directly in v.1 as “you”. In other words, the woe-saying of the present text is directed at “you” who made a counsel without God, went down to Egypt without asking God and trusted in Egypt rather than God.

However, the referent of “you” in v.7 may differ. We have seen that vv.6-7 play a role as a concluding section for vv.1-7. In contrast to MT which commences with *waw* (ו) in v.7, LXX does not reflect this. The effect by this rendering seems clear: the beginning without *καί* renders the first sentence an assured conclusion – “Egypt will benefit you utterly in vain!”. Therefore v.7 is a conclusion, while verse 6 presents a summary of vv.1-5. Furthermore, the second person in v.1 (*ἐποιήσατε*) and in v.7 (*ὕμῶς*) seems to function as an ‘inclusio’ for the present text. So it is quite likely that the last verse, v.7, is regarded as a concluding declaration.

Once v.1 is understood as an announcement of judgment against those who tried to help themselves by trusting Egypt without asking God, v.7 should be taken as a declaration concerning Egypt and an admonition to the addressee using a unique imperative, “tell them”. Therefore, this “you” in v.7 seems to be addressed to the Jewish readers of the LXX-Is or the Jewish community in Egypt to which the translator

---

<sup>106</sup> See 2.1.3.1.

<sup>107</sup> While, after chapter 40, the main object to trust in is idols, it concerns trusting men or other nations before chapter 40. cf. the discussion on ‘vanity’ above.

belonged. The imperative to the community or to a priest<sup>108</sup> is to tell Egypt; nevertheless, this imperative surely concerns not Egypt but the Jews themselves. In substance the text offers counsel, by declaring that “this consolation of Egypt is in vain”, which is seen again in 28:29: βουλεύσασθε ὑψώσατε ματαίαν παράκλησιν “take counsel, exalt vain comfort”.<sup>109</sup>

### 3.2.4. Theology of 30:1-7 in LXX-Is

In arguing that one should not trust in Egypt, the text in LXX is much stronger than MT. This is confirmed by much evidence such as “evil messengers” in v.4, “in vain they labour” in v.5, a long addition in v.6 and a surprising rewording in v.7, etc.

Why did the translator give such a strong message? Throughout the Bible Egypt was a forbidden place for Jewish residence. For the Jews in Egypt, this tendency would seem a threat to the foundation of their community. In the face of such a threat, they would produce arguments to defend and establish their identity on the one hand, and they would announce, on the other, they did not trust in Egypt, just as in the present text. An allusion to the Exodus in v.2 is pertinent to this argument. In LXX-Ex 12:13 and 12:27, the verb σκεπάζω is used for the Hebrew verb פָּטַף thus “(God) will protect you” instead of “(God) will pass over you” in MT. The translator of Exodus regarded God’s passing-over during the night in Egypt as God’s protection. So 12:27 in LXX-Ex says: ἐσκέπασεν τοὺς οἴκους τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ “he protected the houses of the sons of Israel in Egypt”. In the light of this reference, the use of the same verb in 30:2 may suggest that they are seeking to be protected by Egypt, not by God who protected

---

<sup>108</sup> The verb ἀπάγγειλον is a singular imperative, so it seems to be addressed to a priest as a leader of the community, or to the community collectively. See 4.3.

<sup>109</sup> Or “take counsel; lift up a vain appeal” (*NETS*). It seems that the inexplicable rendering βουλεύσασθε ὑψώσατε ματαίαν παράκλησιν in 28:29 in LXX is connected to the following chapter 29. In 29:13 in LXX, ‘the vain worship’ of people is mentioned and this seems to be related to “counsel” in 29:15 in LXX.

them at the time of the Exodus! According to 28:15, they are trying to be protected by falsehood, by making treaties (ἐποιήσαμεν ... συνθήκας) with death. But the protection (σκέπη) of Egypt will be shame to them (30:3). Quite the contrary, the translator seems to proclaim that God will protect them in Egypt, as in 4:5, 49:2 and 51:16. Therefore, the historical background of LXX-Is may be a period when there was an issue with Jewish residence in Egypt, as may be suggested in the *Letter of Aristeas*.<sup>110</sup>

### 3.3. 31:1-3

#### 3.3.1. Context of MT

In a wider context, chapters 28-33 belong together, which have the characteristic exclamation הוי (28:1; 29:1,15; 30:1; 31:1; 33:1). This section concerns the judgment and deliverance of Jerusalem. Among them, the beginning of chapter 31 (“Woe to those who go down to Egypt for help”) is closely connected with 30:1-2: “Woe to the rebellious children” who went down to Egypt for help. The present passage deals with the reliance on the Egyptians for aid to Israel against the threat of the Assyrian Empire, as a judgment upon Judah, as was the case with 30:1-7.<sup>111</sup>

#### 3.3.2. Comparison of two versions

##### 3.3.2.1. 31:1

הוי הירדמים מצרים לעזרה	Οὐαὶ οἱ καταβαίνοντες εἰς Αἴγυπτον ἐπὶ βοήθειαν,
על-סוסים ישענו	οἱ ἐφ' ἵπποις πεποιθότες
ויבטחו על-רכב כו רב	καὶ ἐφ' ἄρμασιν, ἔστιν γὰρ πολλὰ,
ועל פֿרשים כִּי-עֲצֵמוּ מֵאֵד	καὶ ἐφ' ἵπποις, πλῆθος σφόδρα,

<sup>110</sup> Cf. R. Sollamo, “The Letter of Aristeas and the Origin of the Septuagint” in B.A. Taylor (ed.), *X Congress of IOSCS; Oslo, 1988* (SBL: Atlanta, 2002), 329-342; See chapter 5.

<sup>111</sup> G.C.I. Wong demonstrates that trusting Egypt was opposed by Isaiah because it represented “a human effort to avoid or counter the divine intention of bringing judgment upon Jerusalem” with focus on v.2, not because Egypt represented human strength and power *per se*. See “Isaiah’s Opposition to Egypt in Isaiah XXXI 1-3”, *VT* 46 (1996), 392-401.

וְלֹא שָׁעוּ עַל־קְרוֹשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל    καὶ οὐκ ἦσαν πεποιθότες ἐπὶ τὸν ἅγιον τοῦ Ἰσραηλ  
 וְאֵת־יְהוָה לֹא דָרְשׁוּ:    καὶ τὸν θεὸν οὐκ ἐξεζήτησαν.

MT: Woe to those who go down to Egypt for help, they rely upon horses, and **they trust**<sup>112</sup> in chariotry for they are many, and in horses **for** they are very numerous,<sup>113</sup> and they have not regarded the Holy One of Israel, and they have not sought YHWH.

LXX: Woe to those who go down to Egypt for help, they trust in horses and in chariots for they are many, and in horses, a great multitude, and they would not<sup>114</sup> trust in the Holy One of Israel, and they did not seek God.

1QIsa: orthographic היורדים מאדה, and לוא(ו); רכב<sup>115</sup> for רכב.

LXX does not reflect יבטחו. The Hebrew verb בטח is usually rendered as a perfect form of πέλιω throughout LXX-Is. It is possible that the translator avoided the repetition of verbs with similar meaning (שען and בטח as πεποιθότες) by omitting the second verb בטח, or that he combined both Hebrew verbs in one Greek word.<sup>116</sup>

The second כי is not rendered in LXX. Presumably, the rendering of כיעצמו מאד would be ἔστιν γὰρ πλῆθος σφόδρα. The translator may have avoided repetition by rendering πλῆθος σφόδρα.

פרשים is rendered either “horses” or “horsemen” in LXX-Is, as in MT.<sup>117</sup> πλῆθος σφόδρα is used to refer to vast numbers of animals or humans in LXX.<sup>118</sup>

By rendering three different verbs (שען, בטח and שעה) as πεποιθα, the translator simplifies the text.<sup>119</sup>

<sup>112</sup> Literally, “they have trusted”. But in this case, as the preceding verb (ישענו) is imperfect which is used to refer to the present, this verb would be better understood as referring to the present action. See *GKC* §111t.

<sup>113</sup> פרשים can mean ‘horses’ and ‘horsemen’, as we see in *BDB*, 832. We choose “horses”. Worthy of note, this plural noun is paralleled with a singular רכב. With Irwin, 109 (‘span horses’); Kaiser (‘Gespanne’); Wildberger, and contrary to most commentaries and translations, it seems that this “refers to the teams that are hitched to them”, i.e. a chariot to which two horses are tied. The phrase צמד פרשים “a pair of פרשים” in 21:7,9 may confirm this. Thus, we translate כיעצמו מאד as “they are very numerous” with Irwin, Kaiser, Kissane, Oswalt and especially Wildberger, who points out that this phrase is paralleled with רב.

<sup>114</sup> “Imperfect of Resistance or Refusal”. According to Smyth, §1896, “with a negative, the imperfect often denotes resistance or refusal”. See 30:9,15; 42:24.

<sup>115</sup> Cf. Targum: רהיכיא.

<sup>116</sup> Cf. Is 30:12 in LXX-Is.

<sup>117</sup> “Horse”: 21:9; 22:6; “horsemen” i.e. “riders”: 21:7; 22:7; 36:9.

<sup>118</sup> E.g. Nu 32:1; 1Ki 7:32; 2Ch 11:12; Eze 47:10; Zec 14:14; Judith 7:2,4,18.

<sup>119</sup> Cf. Otley, 2:260, and Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 112, suggest that the translator regards שעו as conjugation

### 3.3.2.2. 31:2

וְגַם־הוּא חָכֵם וַיָּבֵא רָע      καὶ αὐτὸς σοφὸς, ἤγειν ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς κακὰ,  
 וְאֵת־דְּבָרָיו לֹא הִסִּיר      καὶ ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ οὐ μὴ ἀθετηθῆ,  
 וְקָם עַל־בַּיִת מְרָעִים      καὶ ἐπαναστήσεται ἐπ’ οἴκους ἀνθρώπων ποιηρῶν  
 וְעַל־עֲזָרָת פְּעֻלֵי אֱוֹן;      καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν ἐλπίδα αὐτῶν τὴν ματαΐαν,

MT: But he **also** is wise **and** has brought<sup>120</sup> disaster, and he has not taken back his words and he will rise against the house of those who do evil, and against the help of those who work iniquity.

LXX: But he, being wise, has brought<sup>121</sup> troubles **upon them**, and his word will never be set aside, and he will rise up against the houses of evil men and against their vain hope.

1QIs<sup>a</sup>: וַיְבִיא for וַיָּבֵא<sup>122</sup>; seems to have אָסִיר, first person imperfect, for הִסִּיר, third person perfect; orthographic לֹא and פְּעֻלֵי.

The translator appears not to put any weight on גַּם throughout LXX-Is. In particular he does not render it at all when it occurs with the copula *waw*, as in the present verse.<sup>123</sup> LXX does not have an equivalent of *waw* in וַיָּבֵא of MT, which the Vorlage must have had. It seems that the translator creates a single clause (ἤγειν) out of the two Hebrew ones.

LXX has an explicit object of the verb ἤγειν: ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς. There are many cases where pronouns are inserted into LXX to clarify the meaning<sup>124</sup> as in the present verse. The active sentence “he has not taken back his words” is changed into a passive one: “his word shall not be rejected”. But at least it seems evident that the change is not the result of any difference in the Vorlage, because the latter would not have אָסִיר but יֹסֵר instead of MT הִסִּיר. Therefore the change no doubt results from the translator’s desire<sup>125</sup> to give emphasis to “the word of God”.

---

of שֶׁעַן, as happened in 17:7-8.

<sup>120</sup> On aspects of the verbs in this verse, see Beuken; Kaiser; Oswalt; Sweeney; Wildberger; Wong, 396-399.

<sup>121</sup> LXX deals with God’s judgment as being repeated by using an imperfect tense here. Another case where the translator renders a *waw*-consecutive imperfect as an imperfect is seen in 51:13.

<sup>122</sup> This Qumran reading is apparently imperfect form with a copulative *waw* instead of *waw*-consecutive imperfect of MT. Considering a paralleled perfect verb הִסִּיר, we retain the reading of MT. See Wildberger.

<sup>123</sup> 5:2; 7:20; 21:12; 28:7; 30:5; 40:24; 45:16.

<sup>124</sup> E.g. 3:12,13; 6:13; 30:31; 33:14.

<sup>125</sup> This kind of change (passive → active or active → passive) is found many times in LXX-Is: for

Another interesting change of LXX is in the last line: “against their vain hope” for “against the help of those who work iniquity” of MT. The use of ἐλπίς as a rendering of עזרה,<sup>126</sup> and μάταιος as a rendering of און<sup>127</sup> also appears very rarely. Presumably, this paraphrase arises from the translator’s desire to deliver what he considered to be the message of the Hebrew clearly and effectively.

### 3.3.2.3. 31:3

וּמִצְרַיִם אָדָם וְלֹא־אֱלֹהִים אֵיγύπτιον, ἄνθρωπον καὶ οὐ θεόν,  
 וְסוֹסֵיהֶם בָּשָׂר וְלֹא־רוּחַ ἵππων σάρκας, καὶ οὐκ ἔστι βοήθεια·  
 וַיִּהְיֶה וַיִּטֵּה יְדוֹ ה' וַיִּטֵּה יְדוֹ ὁ δὲ κύριος ἐπάξει τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἐπ' αὐτούς  
 וְכָשַׁל עֲזָרָה וְכָשַׁל עֲזָרָה καὶ κοπιήσουσιν οἱ βοηθοῦντες  
 וְנָפְלוּ עִזָּרָה וְנָפְלוּ עִזָּרָה καὶ ἅμα πάντες ἀπολοῦνται.

MT: **And** Egypt is human and not God,<sup>128</sup> **and their** horses are flesh and not spirit, and YHWH will stretch out his hand, and the one who helps will stumble **and the one who is helped will fall**, and all of them will perish together.

LXX: Egyptian, human and not God, the flesh of horses, and there is no help; then the Lord will bring his hand **upon them**, and those who help will be weary, and all will perish together.

1QIs<sup>a</sup>: orthographic לויא and וסוסייהמה; has no waw so ידחו.

There is no equivalent element in LXX for two *waws* of MT, thus “Egyptian” for “And Egypt ...” and “the flesh of horses” for “and ... horses”. For this and the omission of αὐτῶν, see below. עזר ונפל עזר is rendered as καὶ κοπιήσουσιν οἱ βοηθοῦντες, which seems to reflect only the first two words. It may be the result of an omission in the Vorlage, or through *homoioteleuton* from the repetition of עזר.<sup>129</sup>

LXX has more: “... his hand *upon them*”, an addition often found in LXX to make

example, 1:20; 5:24; 6:6,7; 20:1; 37:21.

<sup>126</sup> Only once here. עזרה appears four times in MT-Is and it is rendered as βοήθεια (20:6; 31:1) or βοηθέω (10:3). ἐλπίς is a rendering of such Hebrew words as צבי (24:16; 28:4,5), קי (28:10,13,17), מחסה (28:15), חיות (28:18), זועה (28:19), בטח (32:9,10, 47:10).

<sup>127</sup> Ho 6:8 and two verses in Is 31:2; 32:6. cf. Is 41:29 – μάτην for און. On this word, see our work on “μάτην or μάταιος” in the explanation of ch. 30.

<sup>128</sup> Interestingly, Targum has רב (presumably, in the meaning of ‘prince’; cf. 30:4) instead of אֱלֹהִים. According to Wildberger, it happens because “the author of that text thought that the idea that the Egyptians could be ‘god’ was too daring even to utter”. He thinks the possibility of the same motive in rendering וְלֹא־רוּחַ as καὶ οὐκ ἔστι βοήθεια. But see below.

<sup>129</sup> Cf. Duhm.

meanings clear, as mentioned in relation to the previous verse. LXX does not reflect the first beginning *waw*. No doubt because the translator understood וּמִצְרַיִם as connected to the last ἐπί in the previous verse, and thus in apposition to “their vain hope τὴν ἐλπίδα αὐτῶν τὴν ματαίαν”. For this reason the translator rendered מִצְרַיִם as an accusative form Αἰγύπτιον. The rendering as accusative forms continues to the next line: ἵππων σάρκας (“the flesh of horses”). By the same token as above, the copula *waw* seems to be omitted in LXX. Considering the renderings of other Greek versions (σ’: καὶ ἵπποι αὐτῶν σάρξ; α’, θ’: καὶ οἱ ἵπποι αὐτῶν σάρκες), this Septuagintal reading without καί and even αὐτῶν is quite unique. The best way to explain it would be to regard the present LXX reading as due to a desire for clarify in meaning: thus, “their vain hope” is identified as “Egyptian”, a human, and also as “the flesh of horses”.

The rendering of רַחַח as βοήθεια makes sense in the light of the rendering of רַחֵם by the same Greek word in Esther 4:14. Alternatively, because this hypothetical רַחֵם is rarely used,<sup>130</sup> we may accept Ziegler’s suggestion that this rendering of רַחַח was probably a “Verdeutlichung” of the Hebrew Vorlage, influenced by other passages, esp. 30:5,32; 31:1f,3b.<sup>131</sup> His suggestion makes sense, for in many cases the translator changes רַחַח into suitable words according to the context.<sup>132</sup>

The translator renders כַּשָׁל as κοπιᾶω, cf. Is 5:27.

---

<sup>130</sup> In the meaning of ‘respite, relief’ only in Esther (from רַחַח, ‘respite, relief’ in Ex 8:11); ‘space or interval’ Gen 32:17 (from רַחֵם, ‘be wide, spacious’). In Ex 8:11, the Hebrew word is translated by ἀνάψυξις. We may guess that the rendering of LXX-Esther was influenced by the present verse of LXX-Is.

<sup>131</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 148.

<sup>132</sup> For example, ἄνεμος (‘wind’: 17:13; 41:16; 57:13; 64:5[LXX 64:6]); λόγος (32:2); πνοή (38:16); νοῦς (40:13); ψυχὴ (42:1); ὀργή (59:19); ἡσυχίος (‘quiet’: 66:2), etc.

### 3.3.3. The Septuagintal text and its theology

#### 3.3.3.1. Verse 1: “Trust in whom”

When we take the verbal forms used in verse 1 into account, the structure of the verse is as follows:

Those who go down to Egypt: participle of καταβαίνω  
Those who trust in horses and chariot: participle of πείθω

They did not trust in the Holy One of Israel: imperfect of εἰμί (πεποιθότες)  
They did not seek the God: aorist of ἐκζητέω

The first part consisting of participles and affirmative sentences is in sharp contrast with the second part consisting of finite verbs and negative sentences. This Septuagintal text shows much more clearly what Israel trusted and whom Israel did not trust.<sup>133</sup> Here we have another thematic word of LXX-Is: (εἰμί) πεποιθθα.<sup>134</sup> In the present text, three Hebrew verbs (שָׁעָה, בָּטַח and שָׁעָה) are rendered as the perfect participle form of πείθω, so LXX demonstrates a clearer and more contrasting picture of Israel than MT.

#### 3.3.3.2. Verse 2: Their vain hope

V.2 in LXX differs from MT in two ways. Firstly, the emphasis on “the word of God” is noted. The present verse consists of four καί sentences as follows:

καὶ ... ἦγεν ἐπὶ	and ... he has brought upon
καὶ ... ἀθετηθῆ	and ... it will never be set aside
καὶ ... ἐπαναστήσεται ἐπὶ	and ... he will rise up against
καὶ ... ἐπὶ	and ... (he will rise up) against

For these sentences three active verbs could have been used but the translator changed the second active sentence (“he has not taken back his words”) into a passive one (“his word will not be set aside”). The second, passive, sentence betrays the possible Vorlage and breaks the unity, considering the voice as well as the existence of

---

<sup>133</sup> Cf. Wong points that “it is not so much the kind of trust that is contrasted, but the object or direction of that trust” in four verbs in 31:1 in MT-Is. See Wong, 392. This point seems to be much clearer in LXX.

<sup>134</sup> See 2.1.3.1.

ἐπί and the subjects of each sentence. The only plausible effect of this change would be the emphasis on the subject of the second, passive sentence: “his word” i.e. the Word of God. A similar example where “the word of God” became more evident in LXX than MT is also seen in 45:23:

MT: ... בְּי נִשְׁבַּעְתִּי יְצֵי נִפְי צְדָקָה דְבַר וְלֹא יָשׁוּב By myself I have sworn, from my mouth has gone out righteousness, a word, and it will not return ...

LXX: κατ' ἑμαυτοῦ ὁμνύω Ἡ μὴν ἐξελεύσεται ἐκ τοῦ στόματός μου δικαιοσύνη οἱ λόγοι μου οὐκ ἀποστραφήσονται... By myself I swear, surely from my mouth the righteousness has gone out, my words will not turn back ...

Secondly, the translator paraphrases the last phrase “against their vain hope”. As we said before, it would be difficult and merely speculation to explain the change in the last phrase. But what is evident is that LXX-Is judges those who do evil and go down to Egypt and it announces that their hope would be in vain by using his characteristic term μάταιος. Therefore, there is a striking contrast between the above two observations: the unchangeable word of God and the vain hope of Israel.

### 3.3.3.3. Verse 3: Egypt

As noted above, the initial words in v.3 in MT are rendered as a series of accusative nouns, which should be connected with ἐπαναστήσεται ἐπί (“he will rise up against ~”) of the previous verse. And Αἰγύπτιον without the repetition of ἐπί is in apposition to “(their vain) hope” in v.2 thus: “their vain hope, Egyptian”. To conclude, LXX-Is proclaims more clearly that Egypt is a vain hope, than the implicit reading of MT-Is. To support this strong statement concerning the inefficacy of Egypt, the translator goes further: “Egyptian,... the flesh of horses”. While MT speaks of the horses of Egypt, LXX announces directly that Egypt is, actually, horseflesh, not to be trusted and not to be hoped in.

### 3.4. 19:1-15

#### 3.4.1. Context of MT

The part from chapter 13 to 23 is known as “the oracles toward the nations”. These oracles are mainly about judgments which God has prepared against the nations.

Chapter 19 is an oracle toward Egypt, and is mainly one of judgment. But from v.16, the tone becomes more positive. 19:16-25 deals with the future salvation of Egypt. This universal salvation for Egypt reaches its climax in verse 25: YHWH calls Egypt “his people”. Therefore, it seems quite natural to separate 19:1-15 from 19:16-25, as most commentaries do.

#### 3.4.2. Comparison of two versions

##### 3.4.2.1. 19:1

מִשָּׂא מִצְרַיִם	ὄρασις Αἰγύπτου.
הִנֵּה יְהוָה רֹכֵב עַל-עָב קָל	ἰδοὺ κύριος κάθηται ἐπὶ νεφέλης κούφης
וּבָא מִצְרַיִם	καὶ ἥξει εἰς Αἴγυπτον,
וְנָעוּ אֱלִילֵי מִצְרַיִם מִפְּנֵי	καὶ σεισθήσεται τὰ χειροποίητα Αἰγύπτου ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ,
וְלִבָּב מִצְרַיִם יִמָּס בְּקִרְבּוֹ:	καὶ ἡ καρδία αὐτῶν ἠττηθήσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς.

MT: An oracle concerning Egypt. Behold, YHWH rides on a swift cloud and comes to Egypt, and the idols of Egypt tremble before him, and the heart of Egypt melts in its midst.

LXX: A vision concerning Egypt. Behold, the Lord sits on a swift cloud and will come to Egypt, and the handmade (idols) of Egypt will be shaken before him, and their heart will be defeated within them.

1QIs<sup>a</sup> =MT but orthographic רוכב.

The first verse seems to be rendered quite literally. However, LXX adopts κάθημαι for רכב. There is a tendency in LXX-Is to translate the Hebrew word as ἀναβάτης when it refers to a human riding on horse or chariot.<sup>135</sup> Therefore, the rendering of the present verse may reflect an attempt to avoid anthropomorphism,<sup>136</sup> while the present Greek

---

<sup>135</sup> 21:7,9; 22:6; 30:16; 36:8,9. In other books of Old Testament, ἐπιβαίνω is most frequently used for its equivalent, for example, Gen 24:61; Lev 15:9; 2Sa 19:27; Zec 9:9, etc.

<sup>136</sup> Cf. in 2Sa 22:11, the Hebrew verb is rendered into ἐπικαθίζω, to describe the same picture, while in another same verse, Ps 18:11(17:11 in LXX), it is rendered into ἐπιβαίνω.

word is used to refer to God's sitting elsewhere in Isaiah (6:1; 37:16). This tendency to avoid anthropomorphism can be seen in the rendering בוא into ἤκω.<sup>137</sup>

אליים is translated by τὰ χεῖροποίητα, which is found in other Isaianic verses.<sup>138</sup>

Lastly, there is one more point to consider in LXX: ἠττάομαι. This Greek word appears only 17 times throughout LXX but 13 times in LXX-Is.<sup>139</sup> In many cases in LXX-Is, it is used as an equivalent of חתח. When one consider that this Hebrew word is usually rendered as πτοόομαι,<sup>140</sup> the frequent use of ἠττάομαι for it in LXX-Is should be regarded as one of the characteristics of LXX-Is, as Ziegler and others point out.<sup>141</sup>

### 3.4.2.2. 19:2

וּסְכַסְכְּתֵי מִצְרַיִם בְּמִצְרַיִם וְנִלְחֲמוּ אִישׁ בְּאָחָיו וְאִישׁ בְּרֵעֵהוּ עִיר בְּעִיר מִמְלָכָה בְּמִמְלָכָה: καὶ ἐπεγεροθήσονται Αἰγύπτιοι ἐπ' Αἰγυπτίους, καὶ πολεμήσει ἄνθρωπος τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἄνθρωπος τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ, πόλις ἐπὶ πόλιν καὶ νομὸς ἐπὶ νομόν.

MT: And I will spur on Egypt against Egypt, and they will wage war, one against his brother and one against his friend, a city against a city, a kingdom against a kingdom.

LXX: And Egyptians will be stirred up against Egyptians, and one will wage war against his brother and one against his neighbour, a city against a city and a nomos against a nomos.

1QIs<sup>a</sup>=MT.

4QIs<sup>b</sup>: [י]סכסכתי<sup>142</sup>; מצרים for במצרים; which could be caused from the following במצרים.

This verse is also rendered quite literally. But LXX begins with the third person verb (καὶ ἐπεγεροθήσονται), compared with the first person verbal form (וסכסכתי) of MT

<sup>137</sup> Baer, *When We*, 121.

<sup>138</sup> 2:18; 10:11; 16:12; 21:9; 31:7; 46:6. This Hebrew word is often rendered as βδέλυγμα (2:8,20) and once θεός (19:3). In 10:10, it is wrongly regarded as a hiphil imperative of ילל ('howl') thus ὀλολύξατε. Outside Isaiah, εἶδωλον (Lev 19:4; 1Ch 16:26; Ps 97:7 [LXX 96:7]); δαιμόνιον (Ps 96:5). On a possibility of the rendering in the present verse being influenced by 2:8 in LXX-Is and 26:1,30 in LXX-Lev, see Croughs, 82-83.

<sup>139</sup> חתח: 8:9 (3 times); 20:5; 30:31; 31:4,9; 51:7; דקר: 13:15; בגד: 33:1; רשע: 54:17 and מסס: 19:1.

<sup>140</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 197: e.g. Jer 1:17; 8:9; 17:18, etc.

<sup>141</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 197. According to him, this Greek word is a "technical term" used in a judicial court, for "the Alexandrian Greek readers". So the first meaning of the word is "to win a lawsuit". Therefore, he mentions this word as evidence for the suggestion that LXX-Is has an Alexandrian-Egypt background; Ottley calls it a "stop-gap rendering", see Ottley, 50; cf. "slot word" in Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 78-79. On the possibility of a homoeophonic translation, see Barr, "Doubts", 44-46.

<sup>142</sup> Cf. the copyist of 1QIs<sup>a</sup> adds "kaph" supralinearly between first "samech" and second "samech".

whose referent is God. It is difficult to explain how it came about – from a different Vorlage, for example, וסכסכה,<sup>143</sup> or to avoid anthropomorphism?<sup>144</sup> Whatever its origin, this Septuagintal reading reads more easily, in accordance with the preceding and following third person plural verbs in vv.1-2. In 9:10, the same verb יִסְכַּסְכוּ is rendered as διασκεδάσει, which shows the translator could not have clearly understood the Hebrew word, and thus gave a translation according to the context.<sup>145</sup>

מִצְרַיִם is translated here as a plural noun, “Egyptians”. The translator seems to have had freedom to render the Hebrew word according to his understanding of the context. Usually, the plural noun is used to indicate the Egyptian people, and a singular noun to indicate the nation itself.<sup>146</sup>

Interestingly, LXX-Is translates מִמְלַכָּה into νομός. It is well known that Egypt is divided into “nomoi”.<sup>147</sup> With Ottley and Ziegler,<sup>148</sup> we regard this rendering as revealing the Egyptian background of the translator, and reflecting his attempt to update the given text.

### 3.4.2.3. 19:3

וְנִבְקָה רִוַח־מִצְרַיִם בְּקֶרְבּוֹ וְעֲצָתוֹ אֲבַלֵּעַ וְדַרְשׁוּ אֱלֹהֵי־לֵילִים וְאֱלֹהֵי־אֲטִים וְאֱלֹהֵי־חַבּוֹת וְאֱלֹהֵי־דַעְנִים: καὶ παραχθήσεται τὸ πνεῦμα τῶν Αἰγυπτίων ἐν αὐτοῖς, καὶ τὴν βουλὴν αὐτῶν διασκεδάσω, καὶ ἐπερωτήσουσι τοὺς θεοὺς αὐτῶν καὶ τὰ ἀγάλματα αὐτῶν καὶ τοὺς ἐκ τῆς γῆς φωνοῦντας καὶ τοὺς ἐγγαστριμύθους.  
 MT: And the spirit of Egypt will be laid waste in her midst, and I will confuse her counsel and they will seek idols and charmers<sup>149</sup> and the familiar spirits and

<sup>143</sup> 4QIs<sup>b</sup> has וסכת. The final ה is often read as ח in LXX-Is, according to Fischer, *Schrift*, 70. If this is the case here, we could have מִצְרַיִם וסכסכה, which can be rendered as the present LXX reading.

<sup>144</sup> Fritsch, 168.

<sup>145</sup> Crougns, 84, also admits this possibility, but she gives more weight to the mutual influence between 9:10 and 19:2-3. However, she does not pay due attention to the change of the person and number of the present verse.

<sup>146</sup> See 2.3.2.1.

<sup>147</sup> Herodotus, *Historiae*, 2.165: κατὰ γὰρ δὴ νομοὺς Αἴγυπτος ἅπασα διαραίρηται.

<sup>148</sup> Ottley, 2:198; Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 192. Also in Seeligmann, 235f. This kind of translation is found in 27:12 concerning “Rhinocorura”. See 2.4.2.1.

<sup>149</sup> The Hebrew אֲטִים seems to indicate the ones who deal with ghosts. It seems to be related to an Akkadian word ‘etimmu’, which means ‘the ghost of a dead person’. See *HAL*, 36; *AHW*, 263; Wildberger.

ventriloquists.<sup>150</sup>

LXX: And the spirit of the Egyptians will be troubled in them, and I will reject their counsel, and they will ask **their** gods and **their** images and those who speak out of the earth and ventriloquists.<sup>151</sup>

1QIs<sup>a</sup>=MT.

LXX has two possessive pronouns which are not found in MT. Concerning four objects which the Egyptians would make enquiry of, LXX inserts the pronouns for the first two nouns, which indicate idols – inanimate things -, and does not do so for the last two nouns, which refer to humans. Therefore, it seems that the two pronouns are added by the translator to make it clear and for emphasis.

The Hebrew verb בקק is rendered here by παράσσω, which is unexpectedly frequently used in LXX-Is (11 times),<sup>152</sup> and in many cases including the present verse, reflects the turbulence of nations by some action of YHWH.<sup>153</sup> The rendering of אבִּלֵעַ by διασκεδάσω must be an *ad sensum* translation. Usually, the Hebrew verb is rendered καταπίνω,<sup>154</sup> but here it seems that the preceding עֲצָתוֹ influenced the translator: διασκεδάσω with βουλή is used as an idiom to indicate ‘to scatter, thus reject a plan or device’.<sup>155</sup>

The Hebrew word אֲטִימ must have been difficult to understand for the translator. He translated it into τὰ ἀγάλματα, which could be retroverted to אֲלִימ according to Fischer.<sup>156</sup> LXX rendered אֲטִימ of MT as τοὺς ἐκ τῆς γῆς φωνοῦντας. This seems to be

---

Probably, they are muttering quietly calling ghosts.

<sup>150</sup> אֲטִימ usually appears together with יִדְעֵנִי (e.g. Deut 18:11; 1Sa 28:3,9; 2Ki 23:24; Is 8:19). These have also something to do with the spirit of a dead person. Is 29:4 and 1Sa 28:3 show that these appear to be followed by “out of the earth” (מֵאֲרֶץ or מֵאֲרֶץ), which seems to refer to a kind of ventriloquism.

<sup>151</sup> Codex Sinaiticus and some other witnesses add καὶ τοὺς γνώστας in the end, which appears together with τοὺς ἐγγαστριμύθους in 2Sa 28:3,9; 2Ch 35:19. Presumably, this addition came from the influence of other verses including this Greek phrase, which showed it had something to do with the root יִדְעֵנִי.

<sup>152</sup> 3:12; 8:12; 13:8; 14:31; 17:12; 19:3; 24:14,19; 30:28; 51:15; 64:1. In every case, this Greek reflects different Hebrew verbs.

<sup>153</sup> Is 13:8; 14:31; 17:12; 24:19; 30:28; 64:1.

<sup>154</sup> Is 9:15; 25:8; 28:4; 49:19; outside in Isaiah, e.g. Ex 7:12; Deut 11:6; 2Sa 17:16; Ho 8:8; Hab 1:13.

<sup>155</sup> E.g. 2Sa 17:14; Ezra 4:5; Ps 33:10[LXX 32:10]; Is 8:10.

<sup>156</sup> *Schrift*, 34; cf. R. Hayward, “Observations on Idols in Septuagint Pentateuch” in S.C. Barton (ed.), *Idolatry: False Worship in the Bible, Early Judaism and Christianity* (London/New York: T&T Clark, 2007), 41f, 51f.

influenced by Is 29:4 and its Greek rendering (כַּאֲרִיב מֵאֲרִיץ – ὡς οἱ φωνοῦντες ἐκ τῆς γῆς).<sup>157</sup>

#### 3.4.2.4. 19:4

וְסִפְרֹתַי אֶת-מִצְרַיִם בְּיַד אֲדֹנָיִם קָשָׁה וּמֶלֶךְ עוֹ יִמְשֵׁל-בָּם וְנֹאֵם הָאֲדֹנָן יְהוָה זְבָאוֹת. καὶ παραδώσω Αἴγυπτον εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπων κυρίων σκληρῶν, καὶ βασιλεῖς σκληροὶ κυριεύσουσιν αὐτῶν. τάδε λέγει κύριος σαβαωθ.

MT: And I will hand over Egypt into the hand of a cruel lord,<sup>158</sup> and a fierce king will rule over them, says **the Lord** YHWH of host.

LXX: And I will deliver Egypt into the hands of **men**, of hard lords, and hard kings will reign over them; **thus** says the Lord Sabaoth.

1QIs<sup>a</sup>: orthographic אֲדֹנָיִם and נֹאֵם.<sup>159</sup>

LXX has κύριος σαβαωθ in the place of הָאֲדֹנָן יְהוָה זְבָאוֹת. Considering the cases where the Hebrew words are exactly reflected as ὁ δεσπότης κύριος σαβαωθ, such as in 1:24; 3:1; 10:33, it is difficult to decide whether the translator overlooked הָאֲדֹנָן, or the word was not in the Vorlage at all, as well as in 10:16.

It is hard to explain why LXX put “of men”(ἀνθρώπων) in the Greek version: perhaps to emphasise that κυρίων here refers to human beings, not divine. On the rendering of נֹאֵם-יְהוָה, see 3.2.2.1.

LXX renders two Hebrew adjectives (קָשָׁה, עוֹ) by the same Greek one (σκληρός). It may indicate that the translator understood ‘cruel lord’ and ‘fierce king’ of MT as referring to the same people. A rarely used verb סָכַר is paired with παραδίδωμι, which seems to reflect סָכַר<sup>160</sup> or מָנַן (Gen 14:20). In addition, LXX changes the singular forms of MT (יָד, אֲדֹנָיִם קָשָׁה, עוֹ, מֶלֶךְ and יִמְשֵׁל) into plural forms (χεῖρας, κυρίων σκληρῶν, βασιλεῖς σκληροί and κυριεύσουσιν) according to the context, consistently.

---

<sup>157</sup> This rendering is also seen in Is 8:19: וְאֵל-הַאֲבוֹת וְאֵל-הַיְדֻדִים ... → ζητήσατε τοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς φωνοῦντας καὶ τοὺς ἐγγαστριμύθους. Ekblad connects this with the Greek reading “from the earth” in 41:24. See Ekblad, 43-44; Schweitzer, 223-224, points out the LXX’s retention of the mythological context in this verse.

<sup>158</sup> A singular adjective modifies a seemingly plural noun which is usually called *pluralis excellentiae* or *majestatis*. See GKC §124i; §132k; JM §148a; Gray, etc.

<sup>159</sup> See 3.2.2.1.

<sup>160</sup> E.g. Deut 23:16; 1Sa 30:15; Ps 78:48[LXX 77:48].

### 3.4.2.5. 19:5

וְנִשְׁתַּחֲמָוּ מִיַּם הַיָּם וְיִבֶשׂ וְנִהָר יִחָרֵב וְיִבֶשׂ: καὶ πίονται οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι ὕδωρ τὸ παρὰ θάλασσαν,  
וְנִהָר יִחָרֵב וְיִבֶשׂ: ὁ δὲ ποταμὸς ἐκλείψει καὶ ξηραυνθήσεται.

MT: And the waters will be dried up from the sea, and the river will be dried up and parched.

LXX: And the Egyptians will drink the water which is by the sea, but the river will fail and be dried up.

1QIs<sup>a</sup>: יחרגב יחרב for יחרב, which could come from a misreading of יחרוב?

Πίονται would appear to come from the reading נִשְׁתַּחֲמָוּ, Niphal of נִשְׁתַּחֲמָה as יִשְׁתַּחֲמָה, Qal of שִׁתַּחֲמָה.<sup>161</sup> Because of this, it seems that the translator thought the subject of the verb was “the Egyptians”. Furthermore, this understanding seems to let him choose the adversative δέ for the simple *waw* in MT. The expression τὸ παρὰ θάλασσαν seems another peculiar rendering. Usually, παρά with genitive is used to translate מִן but in this verse the Greek preposition is used with an accusative noun, thus “the water (which is) by the sea” instead of “the water from the sea”.

The Hebrew verb חָרַב is nearly always rendered as ἐρημόω in LXX-Is.<sup>162</sup> The last verb יִבֶשׂ finds its usual equivalent ξηραίνω in LXX-Is<sup>163</sup> and especially in 44:27, the two Hebrew verbs appear together and are rendered by ἐρημόω and ξηραίνω respectively. Then, the translator’s choice of the Greek verb ἐκλείπω for חָרַב is not typical. This Greek verb seems to have more significance in LXX-Is than its Hebrew equivalent חָרַב does in MT-Is. On the one hand, the Greek verb mainly among chapters 1-39 of LXX-Is indicates the miserable result of God’s judgment,<sup>164</sup> and on the other hand, it indicates God’s unfailing faithfulness towards his people after chapter 40 in LXX-Is.<sup>165</sup> In the present verse, the use of this verb contributes to depicting the disastrous result on

---

<sup>161</sup> Ottley, 2:198; van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 68.

<sup>162</sup> 34:10; 37:18,25; 44:27; 49:17; 50:2 (ἐξηρημόω); 51:10; 60:12. In 42:15, the first half including the verb is not reflected in major LXX manuscripts. On 19:6, see below.

<sup>163</sup> 19:5,7; 27:11; 40:7,24; 42:15; 44:27. In 37:27; 44:11; 50:2, LXX-Is understands forms from יִבֶשׂ, which are actually from בִּישׁ and בִּישׁ.

<sup>164</sup> 7:8; 15:6; 21:16; 29:20; 38:14; 53:3.

<sup>165</sup> 51:6; 54:10; 55:13; 56:5; 58:11; 59:21; 60:20.

Egypt.

3.4.2.6. 19:6

וְהֶאֱזַנְיָחוּ נְהָרוֹת      καὶ ἐκλείψουσιν οἱ ποταμοὶ  
דְּלָלוּ וְחָרְבוּ      καὶ αἱ διώρυγες τοῦ ποταμοῦ, καὶ ξηρανθήσεται  
יְאֵרֵי מְצֻרֹת      πᾶσα συναγωγή ὕδατος  
קִנְיָהּ וְסוּף קַמְלוֹ:      καὶ ἐν παντὶ ἔλει καλάμου καὶ παπύρου·

MT: And the rivers will become foul,<sup>166</sup> the brooks of Egypt diminish<sup>167</sup> and are dried up, reed and rush decay.

LXX: And the rivers and the canals of the river will fail, and **every** reservoir of the water will be dried up **and in every** marsh of reed and papyrus.

1QIs<sup>a</sup>: וְהֶאֱזַנְיָחוּ for וְהֶאֱזַנְיָחוּ;<sup>168</sup> וְהֶאֱזַנְיָחוּ for נְהָרוֹת; וְדָלְלוּ for דְּלָלוּ, also וְקַמְלוֹ for just קַמְלוֹ.<sup>169</sup>

The Hebrew verb זָנָה is a hapax legomenon in this sense.<sup>170</sup> A similar subject (“the rivers”) to the preceding verse (“the river”) is used again in the present verse, and verbs having similar meanings appear again in the present verse as well as in the preceding one (דָּלַל, יָבַשׁ, חָרַב). Presumably, this would lead the translator to render הֶאֱזַנְיָחוּ as ἐκλείψουσιν. Or considering that ἐκλείπω is used as an equivalent for דָּלַל in LXX-Is (17:4; 38:14), it is also possible that the difficult word הֶאֱזַנְיָחוּ might be overlooked. Interestingly, in the first half of the present verse of MT, there are three verbs (זָנָה, דָּלַל, חָרַב) but LXX has only two (ἐκλείπω, ξηραίνω), which have already appeared in the preceding verse. Probably, the translator tried to reflect what the verse was saying, *ad sensum* translation, rather than an attempt to render literally.

The unparalleled αἱ διώρυγες τοῦ ποταμοῦ seems to be an addition of the translator. Ποταμός and διώρυξ often occur together with the following ἕλος,<sup>171</sup> indicating every place where water is kept. In particular in Ex 7:19, too, these three are used to indicate that

---

<sup>166</sup> For the prosthetic Aleph in Hiphil form of זָנָה, see *GKC* §53g and 53p; Watts; Wildberger; Oswalt; but Gray. 1QIs<sup>a</sup> has וְהֶאֱזַנְיָחוּ, which is a usual Hiphil form.

<sup>167</sup> Cf. Gray.

<sup>168</sup> See the footnote above.

<sup>169</sup> The scribe of this first Qumran scroll seems to keep the so called ‘*waw* consecutive perfect’ by prefixing *waw* strictly.

<sup>170</sup> זָנָה I means ‘reject’, ‘spurn’.

<sup>171</sup> Ex 7:19; 8:1; ποταμός and διώρυξ: Is 33:21.

the whole watery area of Egypt will be turned into blood. Therefore “the canals of Egypt” seems to be inserted here by the translator to allude to the plague in the Exodus story.<sup>172</sup> According to this, as in the time of the Exodus, every area of water in the whole of Egypt will be dried up. Lexicographically, it demonstrates that the translator of LXX-Is depends upon LXX-Ex.<sup>173</sup>

The rendering *πάσα συναγωγὴ ὕδατος* seems a term of the translator for **יֵאֲרֵי מִצְרַיִם**, probably influenced by the rendering of the similar phrase **כָּל-יֵאֲרֵי מִצְרַיִם** in 37:25.<sup>174</sup> Another peculiar rendering of the translator can be seen in the final phrase of the present verse: *ἐν παντὶ ἔλει καλάμου καὶ παπύρου*. Considering the counterpart of MT (קנה וסוף קמלו), the equivalent of *ἐν παντὶ ἔλει* would be קמלו, which is, unexpectedly, confirmed by another case in 33:9 where ἔλος is chosen for קמל.<sup>175</sup> Since there are some cases where ל is misread as ה,<sup>176</sup> the translator may have misread קמל as קמה (‘grain’).<sup>177</sup> And the affixed- *waw* seems to be rendered with the following verse – the initial *καί* in v.8. Nevertheless, there are still problems: where did *καὶ ἐν παντί* come from? It seems that it is only possible to conjecture: as the plague to turn water into

<sup>172</sup> For comment on the inner Egyptian point of view of *διῶρυξ*, see 2.4.2.1.

<sup>173</sup> For the argument that the Greek Pentateuch was used, by translators of other biblical books, as a lexical guide, see E. Tov, “The Impact of the LXX Translation of the Pentateuch on the Translation of Other Books” in P. Casetti, O. Keel and A. Schenker (eds.), *Mélanges D. Barthélemy. Études bibliques offertes à l’occasion de son 60e anniversaire* (OBO 38; Friburg, 1981), 577-592; J. Lust, “The Vocabulary of LXX Ezekiel and its Dependence upon the Pentateuch” in M. Vervenne and J. Lust (eds.), *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic Literature* (FS C.H.W. Brekelmans; BETL 133; Leuven, 1997), 529-546. This feature was already noticed by H.J. Thackeray, “Translators”, 578-585. J. Barr questions this consensus, asking that negative evidence should be fully considered. But even in his article, it emerges that LXX-Is uses the Greek Pentateuch as a sort of “dictionary”. Barr, “Pentateuch”, 523-543; Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 105f, also advises caution. However this intertextuality is a major method for Troxel to establish his understanding of the translator (chapter five in particular). Crougths, 86-87, uses the term “intertextuality” for the connection between the Exodus and the present verse in LXX-Is.

<sup>174</sup> Also Ottley, 2:199; **מִצְרַיִם** is used in poetry to indicate Egypt which translators of the Septuagint could not understand properly: **יֵאֲרֵי מִצְרַיִם** 2Ki 19:24 (MT=Is 37:25 but in Greek *ποταμοὶ περιοχῆς*); **מִצְרַיִם** Mi 7:12 (*αἱ ὀχύρα*). Usually, **מִצְרַיִם** is rendered into *περιοχῆ* throughout the LXX, which is a suitable equivalent of **מִצְרַיִם** and thus could be from the confusion between **מִצְרַיִם** and **מִצְרַיִם**. Thackeray points out that the translator is dependent upon the Greek-Pentateuch. See Thackeray, “Translators”, 583; Crougths, 85 n. 7, suggests that 37:25 is influenced by 19:6, which seems hard to agree.

<sup>175</sup> In 33:9, did the Vorlage have **גְּמָה**, as Ottley, 2:271, guesses?

<sup>176</sup> See Fischer, *Schrift*, 72.

<sup>177</sup> In Is 37:27, **קְמָה** is suggested as one of the destructive results by God’s intervention.

blood in Exodus affects the whole of Egypt (cf. Ex 7:19), the translator wanted to emphasize the overwhelming result on all of Egypt, which could lead him to make additions like *πάσα* (συναγωγή ὕδατος) and *ἐν παντί* (ἐλεει καλάμου καὶ παπύρου).

### 3.4.2.7. 19:7

עָרוֹת עַל-יְאֹר עַל-פִּי יְאֹר    καὶ τὸ ἄχι τὸ χλωρόν πᾶν τὸ κύκλω τοῦ ποταμοῦ

וְכָל כְּזֵרַע יְאֹר    καὶ πᾶν τὸ σπειρόμενον διὰ τοῦ ποταμοῦ

וְאֵינָנוּ: יִבֶּשׁ נַרְף וְנִרְף    ξηρανθήσεται ἀνεμόφθορον.

MT: Reeds **by the river**, by the mouth of the river<sup>178</sup>; and everything which is sown by the river will wither, be driven away<sup>179</sup> **and be no more**.

LXX: **And all** the green plant round the river and all the things which are sown through the river will be dried up and blasted with the wind.

1QIs<sup>a</sup>: orthographic כּוּל יִבֶּשׁ; וְנִרְף; וְנִרְף for נַרְף<sup>180</sup>; וְאֵינָנוּ for וְאֵינָנוּ בוּ.

1QIs<sup>b</sup>: orthographic יֵאֵר.

The first *καί* could come from the affixed *waw* in the last word of the previous verse, as above. And the first *πᾶν* in LXX may result from the intention to emphasise the overwhelming effect on Egypt, as seen in the previous verse. *עַל יְאֹר* could be in MT by dittography, as *BHS* suggests.<sup>181</sup> But the rendering of LXX *πᾶν τὸ κύκλω τοῦ ποταμοῦ* (all round the river) might include ‘by the river’ and ‘by the mouth of the river’.<sup>182</sup> And *κύκλω τοῦ ποταμοῦ* appears in Ex 7:24 to describe the plague in Egypt, which also calls to mind the plagues in the time of the Exodus.<sup>183</sup>

*עָרוֹת* in MT is dealt with as ‘reeds’, which has something to do with the Egyptian word *ṛ* (reed) or *ṛt* (a stem of a plant).<sup>184</sup> It seems that the Septuagintal equivalent *τὸ ἄχι τὸ χλωρόν* supports this. LXX adopts an unusual Greek word *ἀνεμόφθορος* for *נַרְף*, which is used to express the severity of the seven bad years in Egypt in Genesis

<sup>178</sup> On the influence of the Egyptian language to signify “the Nile”, see Israelit-Groll, 300f.

<sup>179</sup> But A. Guillaume, “A Note on Isaiah XIX 7”, *JTS* 14 (1963), 383, argues the meaning “be desiccated” for *נַרְף*, which is followed by H. Marlow, “The Lament over the River Nile-Isaiah xix 5-10 in Its Wider Context”, *VT* 57 (2007), 239.

<sup>180</sup> See on the explanation of 1QIs<sup>a</sup> on 19:6.

<sup>181</sup> Gray; Wildberger, etc.

<sup>182</sup> Cf. A. Niccacci, “Isaiah XVIII-XX from an Egyptological Perspective”, *VT* 48 (1998), 228.

<sup>183</sup> Cf. Crougns, 88.

<sup>184</sup> See *HAL*; Oswalt; Wildberger; but Gray points to a textual corruption. Niccacci, 228, shows that there are many words transliterated from Egyptian ones in the present chapter, including this one.

(41:6,7,23,24,27). This demonstrates that LXX-Gen, as well as LXX-Ex above, influenced LXX-Is.<sup>185</sup> It seems to be used here to remind, quite intentionally, of the disaster on Egypt.<sup>186</sup>

The final phrase in MT וַאֲיִנוּ seems not to be reflected in LXX. The Vorlage might not have the phrase, an omission caused by haplography (that is, because of similarity with וַאֲנִי in the next verse)<sup>187</sup> or the translator might judge that it is redundant. It means that at least the Vorlage of LXX cannot have had the reading of 1QIs<sup>a</sup> (וַאֲיִן בּוֹ).

#### 3.4.2.8. 19:8

וַאֲנִי תְּרִינִים וְאֶבְלוּ καὶ στενάξουσιν οἱ ἄλεις, καὶ στενάξουσιν  
 כָּל־מְשֻׁלְכֵי בִּיאֹר חֲקָה πάντες οἱ βάλλοντες ἄγκιστρον εἰς τὸν ποταμόν,  
 וּפְרָשֵׁי מִכְמַרְת עַל־פְּנֵי־מַיִם אֲמַלְלוּ: καὶ οἱ βάλλοντες σαγήνας καὶ οἱ ἀμφιβολεῖς πενήσουσι.

MT: And the fishermen will lament and all who cast hook in the river will mourn, and those who spread net on the water will languish.

LXX: And the fishermen will groan, and all who cast hook into the river will groan, and those who cast net and the anglers will mourn.<sup>188</sup>

1QIs<sup>a</sup>: seemingly misspelled הַרְיִינִים for הַרְיִינִים.<sup>189</sup> 4QIs<sup>b</sup> has הַרְיִינִים like MT.

1QIs<sup>b</sup>: orthographic בִּיאֹר.

In the place of “on the water” in MT, LXX has “and the anglers”. Καὶ οἱ ἀμφιβολεῖς is peculiar and hard to explain.<sup>190</sup> Be that as it may, the text of LXX is arrayed in chiasm (fishermen-those who cast hook-those who cast net-anglers) and this text seems to emphasise their groaning over the disastrous result upon Egypt. LXX-Is often adopts the same Greek word for different Hebrew words of similar meaning to simplify<sup>191</sup>: thus στείνω for אָנָה and אָבַל; βάλλω for שָׁלַךְ and פָּרַשׁ.

<sup>185</sup> Also Crougths, 87-89.

<sup>186</sup> Seeligmann, 188f.

<sup>187</sup> Also Gray.

<sup>188</sup> For the rendering of אֲמַלְלוּ, see Crougths, 89-90.

<sup>189</sup> In Job 40:31, LXX has ἀλιέων for דָּגִים in MT. Presumably, this rendering came from a possible misreading or misspelling of דָּגִים.

<sup>190</sup> Seeligmann, 43, mentions this Greek word as a token of “a big vocabulary” which the translator had.

<sup>191</sup> See 2.2.2.3.

### 3.4.2.9. 19:9

וּבִשּׁוּ עֲבָדֵי פִשְׁתִּים שְׂרִיקוֹת וְאֲרָגִים חֹרִי: καὶ αἰσχύνη λήμψεται τοὺς ἐργαζομένους τὸ λίνον τὸ σχιστόν  
καὶ τοὺς ἐργαζομένους τὴν βύσσον,

MT: And those who work in fine flax will be ashamed, those who comb<sup>192</sup> and those who weave will turn pale.

LXX: And shame will take those who work in fine flax and those who work in fine linen.

1QIs<sup>a</sup>: orthographic ובשו (=4QIs<sup>b</sup>), עוברי, אורגים, חורו (=4QIs<sup>b</sup>: ‘they will be pale’) for חורי.

LXX seems to paraphrase the verb בוש as a noun αἰσχύνη<sup>193</sup> with λαμβάνω.

Compared with MT, we see this Greek reading gives more weight to emphasising the calamity upon Egypt. And as in the preceding verse, LXX-Is takes one Greek verb (ἐργάζομαι) to render two different Hebrew verbs (עבר, ארג), to simplify and make it interrelated.

We read חורו like 1QIs<sup>a</sup> and 4QIs<sup>b</sup>, rather than חורי in MT.<sup>194</sup> In Is 29:22, this word, as a verb, is used with בוש, which makes more sense with the present verse. At the same time, with this reading, the present verse starts with a verb and ends with a verb, as in vv.5,6,8.

### 3.4.2.10. 19:10

וְהָיוּ שְׂתִתִּיה מְדַכְּאִים וְהָיוּ שְׂתִתִּיה מְדַכְּאִים καὶ ἔσσονται οἱ διαζόμενοι αὐτὰ ἐν ὀδύνη,  
כָּל-עֹשֵׂי שֶׁכֶר אֲנַמֵּי-נַפְשׁ: καὶ πάντες οἱ τὸν ζῆθον ποιοῦντες λυπηθήσονται καὶ τὰς ψυχὰς ποιέσουσι.

MT: And its weavers<sup>195</sup> will be dismayed; every worker for wages will be grieved in soul.

LXX: And those who weave it will be in pain, **and** all those who make beer will **be grieved and** pained in souls.

1QIs<sup>a</sup>: שותתיה for שותתיה (=4QIs<sup>b</sup>; MT=1QIs<sup>b</sup>), which seems to understand as a derivative of שתה (‘drink’)<sup>196</sup>; orthographic עושי.

<sup>192</sup> Following *BHS* apparatus, Blenkinsopp, Gray, Watts and Wildberger, we read as שְׂרִיקוֹת. To read like this also suits on the metre of this verse (3+3). For example, *NRSV*: “The workers in flax will be in despair, and the carders and those at the loom will grow pale”. But Chenye and Oswalt favour MT.

<sup>193</sup> For the significance of the Greek word, see Ekblad, 143.

<sup>194</sup> Blenkinsopp; Gray; Kaiser; Wildberger. Also Barthélemy, 138f. But Cheyne, Oswalt and Watts follow MT.

<sup>195</sup> From Coptic *štit* (‘weaver’) with *BHS*, and also Aramaic שתה (‘weave’). In Judg 16:13 of Targum, מושתית is used in the place of מסכת. For this, see Blenkinsopp; Gray; Watts; Wildberger; Barthélemy, 140f. LXX seems to support this. But see Tov, *Text-Critical Use*, 112.; Marlow, 240, using *BDB* (‘foundation’), suggests “nobles” as pillar of society; also Chenye and Oswalt: “its pillars”.

<sup>196</sup> Tov, *Text-Critical Use*, 111-112.

How the Greek verb λυπέω came into the LXX text is not certain. The verb is used as an equivalent of קנף in LXX-Is 8:21 and 57:12 twice but elsewhere (15:2; 32:11 and the present verse). We might suggest that the verb refers to the result of God's judgment on peoples, and for that reason it was chosen in the present verse and other places. Lastly, LXX reads שכר as שָׁכַר thus ζῦτος (= ζῦθος).

### 3.4.2.11. 19:11

אֲדָ-אֱוִלִים שְׂרֵי זָעַן καὶ μωροὶ ἔσονται οἱ ἄρχοντες Τάνεως·  
 חֲכָמֵי יַעֲצֵי פִרְעֹה עֲצָה נִבְעָרָה οἱ σοφοὶ σύμβουλοι τοῦ βασιλέως, ἡ βουλὴ αὐτῶν μωραυνθήσεται.  
 אִיךְ הָאֲמָרוּ אֶל-פִּרְעֹה πῶς ἐρεῖτε τῷ βασιλεῖ

בְּ-חֲכָמִים אֲנִי בְּ-מַלְכֵי-קִדְמָה Υἱοὶ συνετῶν ἡμεῖς, υἱοὶ βασιλέων τῶν ἐξ ἀρχῆς;

MT: Surely, the princes of Zoan are fools; the wisest counsellors of Pharaoh,<sup>197</sup> counsel is stupid<sup>198</sup>; how will you say to Pharaoh, 'I am the son of the wise, the son of the ancient kings'?

LXX: And the princes of Tanis **shall be** fools; the wise counsellors of the king, **their** counsel will become foolish. How will you say to the king, 'we are the sons of the intelligent, the sons of the kings from old'?

1QIs<sup>a</sup>: orthographic הכמיה, יועציו and פרעוה; חמים for חכמים, in which *kaph* seems to be carelessly omitted by the copyist.

פִּרְעֹה is rendered as ὁ βασιλεύς twice in this verse, and outside this verse it is nearly always transliterated (Φαραω) throughout the whole LXX,<sup>199</sup> including LXX-Is (30:2,3; 36:6). Two Hebrew words אֱוִלִים and נִבְעָרָה are rendered into the Greek words having the same root, μωροὶ and μωραυνθήσεται, which makes the Greek text chiastic. And there are a couple of changes in LXX to make more reasonable: use of plural pronoun (ἡμεῖς for אֲנִי) and the insertion of pronoun ("their" counsel).

<sup>197</sup> The superlative usage. See *GKC* §133h. But Dahood thinks the Qumran reading reflects the original one indicating the third person feminine singular suffix, thus "her wise men". See M. Dahood, "Isaiah 19,11 *hkmy* and 1QIs<sup>a</sup> *hkmyh*", *Biblica* 56 (1975), 420.

<sup>198</sup> On the structure of the second line, see Gray; Oswalt; Watts; Wildberger.

<sup>199</sup> The word appears 274 times in the Rahlfs-Septuagint, and except the following places it is always transliterated. In Jer 44:30 (LXX-Jer 51:30) the title might be omitted because of the subsequent similar name חפרע. In Jer 47:1 the second half including the word seems not to have been in the Vorlage of Jeremiah-translator and in Eze 30:24 it seems difficult to explain the septuagintal rendering. In Gen 41:34 it seems not to be reflected because of the contextual change of LXX-Gen and in Gen 46:5 the word is replaced with "Joseph" according to the theological context.

### 3.4.2.12. 19:12

אִים אֲפֹא חֲקֻמֶיךָ    ποῦ εἶσι νῦν οἱ σοφοί σου;

וַיְגִידוּ נָא לְךָ וַיִּדְעוּ    καὶ ἀναγγειλάτωσάν σοι καὶ εἰπάτωσαν

מִהֲיַעַן יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת עַל-מִצְרַיִם:    τί βεβούλευται κύριος σαβαωθ ἐπ' Αἴγυπτον.

MT: Then, where are your wise men? And please let them tell you, and let them know what YHWH of hosts has purposed on Egypt.

LXX: Now, where are your wise men? And let them tell you and say, 'what did the Lord of Sabaoth purpose concerning Egypt?'

1QIs<sup>a</sup>=MT.

The first line in our LXX-Is shows a very literal rendering of MT. See ποῦ εἶσι for אִים וַיִּדְעוּ ("and let them know") does not fit easily the preceding וַיְגִידוּ, which could fit הָעֵה (e.g. Is 41:22,23,26). Probably the translator might perceive it, which could be reflected in the rendering καὶ εἰπάτωσαν.

### 3.4.2.13. 19:13

נֹאֲלֵי שָׂרֵי צֹעַן    ἐξέλιπον οἱ ἄρχοντες Τάνεως,

נִשְׂאוּ שָׂרֵי נֹף    καὶ ὑψώθησαν οἱ ἄρχοντες Μέμφεως,

וַהֲתַעְנוּ אֶת-מִצְרַיִם פֶּנֶת שְׂבֻטֶיהָ:    καὶ πλανήσουσιν Αἴγυπτον κατὰ φυλάς.

MT: The princes of Zoan have become foolish, the princes of Noph have been beguiled, **the cornerstones**<sup>200</sup> **of her** tribes have led Egypt astray.

LXX: The rulers of Tanis have failed, and the rulers of Memphis were exalted, and they shall lead Egypt astray **according to** tribes.

1QIs<sup>a</sup>: נֹאֲלֵי for נִשְׂאוּ.

The verb נִשְׂאוּ is rarely used in MT,<sup>201</sup> which could make translators render it according to its context.<sup>202</sup> The word which the translator chose was the Greek verb ἐκλείπω.<sup>203</sup> This verb is already used in v.5 and v.6 to indicate natural disaster upon Egypt by God's judgment. By using the same verb, the translator delivers the overall disaster upon nature and rulers of Egypt.

The rendering ὑψώθησαν must be caused by the reading נִשְׂאוּ for נִשְׂאוּ.<sup>204</sup> This Septuagintal reading ("... were exalted") seems not to fit the context. Nevertheless, he

<sup>200</sup> Also Blenkinsopp; Cheyne; Oswalt; cf. "chiefs" (Gray, Watts); "princes" (Kaiser); "(territorial) leadership" (Wildberger).

<sup>201</sup> 4 times: Nu 12:11; Is 19:13; Je 5:4; 50:36.

<sup>202</sup> Nu 12:11: נֹאֲלֵי → ἡγνοήσαμεν; Je 5:4: נֹאֲלֵי → οὐκ ἔδυνασθησαν; Je 50:36: וַיִּנְאֲלוּ → παραλυθήσονται.

<sup>203</sup> See 3.4.2.5.

<sup>204</sup> Also Ottley, 2:200.

translated it literally as he understood it. Yet the indications are that this verse reveals a certain change of power from Tanis to Memphis. According to this, whoever rules Egypt, the leaders lead Egypt astray.<sup>205</sup> The Hebrew word פנה means ‘corner(stone)’ thus in the present verse ‘chief’ of ‘ruler’.<sup>206</sup> In Isaiah, it appears in 28:16 and is rendered as ἀκρογωνιαίος.<sup>207</sup> In the present verse, the construct form פנת might be understood as a form from פנים, thus κατά.

#### 3.4.2.14. 19:14

יהוה מסך בקרבה רוח עושים    κύριος γὰρ ἐκέρασεν αὐτοῖς πνεῦμα πλανήσεως,  
 והתעו את-מצרים בכל-מעשהו    καὶ ἐπλάνησαν Αἴγυπτον ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ἔργοις αὐτῶν,  
 כהתעות שבור בקיאו:    ὡς πλανᾶται ὁ μεθύων καὶ ὁ ἐμῶν ἅμα.

MT: YHWH mixed within her a spirit of distortion, and they lead Egypt astray in all their works, as a drunken man staggers in his vomit.

LXX: **For** the Lord mixed for them a spirit of error, and they led Egypt astray in all their works, as the one who is drunken and the one who vomits **together** go astray.

1QIs<sup>a</sup>: orthographic בכול; copyst adds the preposition *beth* supralinearly in בקיאו, which makes Qumran agree with MT.

4QIs<sup>b</sup>: מסך for נסך. Cf. רמא in Targum.

The first γάρ is typically found in LXX-Is, which is inserted by the translator to help understanding.<sup>208</sup> LXX-Is renders בקיאו into ὁ ἐμῶν, which could agree with the reading of 1QIs<sup>a</sup> without the supralinearly added ‘beth’. So probably, the Vorlage of LXX could have this reading. The last ἅμα is added in LXX-Is, probably to emphasise<sup>209</sup> that the two of them go astray.

#### 3.4.2.15. 19:15

ולא יהיה למצרים מעשה    καὶ οὐκ ἔσται τοῖς Αἰγυπτίοις ἔργον,  
 אשר יעשה ראש וזנב כפה ואגמון:    ὃ ποιήσει κεφαλὴν καὶ οὐράν ἀρχὴν καὶ τέλος.  
 MT: And there will be no work for Egypt, which head and tail, branch and rush may do.  
 LXX: And there will be no work for the Egyptians, which will make head and tail,

<sup>205</sup> On use and statistics of the Greek word πλανᾶω, see Ekblad, 223.

<sup>206</sup> e.g. Ju 20:2; 1Sa 14:8; Zec 10:4.

<sup>207</sup> Seeligmann, 184, suggests that this Greek word reveals the translator’s “big vocabulary”.

<sup>208</sup> See 2.3.2.1.

<sup>209</sup> 3:16, 11:7 (twice), 24:14, 13:3, 46:10, etc.; Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 183.

beginning<sup>210</sup> and end.  
1QIs<sup>a</sup>: orthographic לִיא and אִנְמָן (also in 9:13).

In many verses, LXX renders מִצְרַיִם into, sometimes a name of the region thus Αἰγύπτος, sometimes a name of the people thus οἱ Αἰγυπτίοι.<sup>211</sup> The metaphor “branch and rush” is rendered into a concrete expression “beginning and end”.<sup>212</sup>

### 3.4.3. The Septuagintal text

In this section, the translator generally gives a literal rendering. And as we saw, there are some expressions to indicate that this translation was carried out in an Egyptian milieu. Basically, the Greek text reflects what the Hebrew text delivers. This section in MT announces that YHWH will come against Egypt, and because of his coming there will be wars among them, and natural disasters. And it is declared that their wise counsellors will be useless, but they will know the counsel of YHWH on Egypt. Following the same line, LXX-Is gives much more emphasis to the content concerning failures and disasters of Egypt by making many changes.

#### 3.4.3.1. Polemic against the idol-worship of the Egyptians

LXX-Is has two added third personal possessive pronouns in v.3: “they will ask *their* gods and *their* images ...”. These clearly deliver the impression that the Egyptians ask their idols in vain, because they do not know that the disasters upon them are done by YHWH. The added “their” to reveal the futility of the Egyptians is seen also in v.11: “And the princes of Tanis shall be fools; the wise counselors of the king, *their* counsel will become foolish. How will you say to the king, ‘we are the sons of the intelligent, the sons of the kings from old?’”. While “their” counsel will become foolish, God’s counsel

---

<sup>210</sup> כִּפְהַ is suggested to indicate the title of Egyptian commoner by Israelit-Groll, 301.

<sup>211</sup> See 2.3.2.1.

<sup>212</sup> Cf. in 9:13, the same expression is translated into “great and small” (μέγαν καὶ μικρόν), which is a translation technique to turn metaphor into a concrete expression. Also, Swete, 329; cf. Crougths, 91-92. As an example of “Synekdoche”, see Brongers, 108.

concerning Egypt will be fulfilled (19:12). Though we agree with Ekblad’s statement that “counsellors can often be read as synonymous with idols”,<sup>213</sup> these counsellors in v.11 could be identified with the people in v.3. They enquire of their idols, but YHWH will deliver them into the hand of “hard lords”(v.4). So by this addition of the translator, the Septuagintal verse demonstrates the stupidity of the counsel of the Egyptians and the futility of their idol-worship more clearly than MT.<sup>214</sup>

### 3.4.3.2. Emphasis on disaster for Egypt

Disasters for Egypt are more emphasised in LXX-Is. Compared with MT in describing aspects concerning dryness of rivers using many verbs, LXX-Is adopts only two verbs (ἐκλείπω, ξηραίνω). This gives a clear and concise image of the terrible situation. As the whole watery area of Egypt (ποταμός, διώρυξ, ἔλος) turned into blood in the time of the Exodus (Ex 7:19; 8:1), now the same area will be dried up. This is not a local disaster. It will affect the whole of Egypt, and this is effectively emphasised by the addition of two “παῖς” in v.6. In addition, in v.5, the translator adds “the Egyptians” as a subject. According to this, the Egyptians will drink water, but every watery area will be dried up, which, arguably, recalls a scene from the Exodus story (Ex 7:20-24).<sup>215</sup> Also the expression κύκλω τοῦ ποταμου performs the same function. Another element reminiscent of the disaster for Egypt is the use of ἀνεμόφθορος, as we saw above.

The rendering וְשָׁרֵי into καὶ αἰσχύνη λήμψεται in v.9 also gives greater emphasis than MT. In v.13, LXX seems to have misread the Vorlage or had a different one, but LXX as it stands still makes sense. It demonstrates that either exalted Memphis or failed Tanis are of no use to lead Egypt into the right way. So we can conclude that the

---

<sup>213</sup> Ekblad, 41-44.

<sup>214</sup> On the underlying importance of Egypt as the place of idols discerned by translators of the Pentateuch, see Hayward, “Observations”, 50-52, 55-57.

<sup>215</sup> Also Crouchs, 85.

Septuagintal text in 19:1-15 delivers judgment on Egypt in a more emphatic way to depict disasters.

#### 3.4.4. Theology of 19:1-15 in LXX-Is

##### 3.4.4.1. Condemnation against the idolatry of the Egyptians

Strong condemnation of the idol worship of the Egyptians is a prevailing topic of Hellenistic Jewish literature.<sup>216</sup> This functions in two ways. On the one hand, most Jewish religious customs and their mode of life had to face much contempt and scorn from the Gentile side, but their strong stance against idols was highly rated by Greek writers.<sup>217</sup> In this respect, the anti-idolatry of Hellenistic Jewish literature may function as an instrument for propaganda promoting Jewish superiority. On the other hand, this condemnation of Egyptian idolatry is another expression of their legitimization for their residence in Egypt: they live in Egypt, yet they do not follow the Egyptian way, but condemn it strongly. Therefore, our discussion demonstrates that LXX-Is follows the same line as Hellenistic Jewish literature in asserting the legitimacy of Jewish residence in Egypt.

##### 3.4.4.2. Emphasis on the negative aspect of Egypt

LXX-Is is much more determined than MT to describe disasters for Egypt. Any Egyptian, high or low, is useless to protect them from the counsel of the Lord of Sabaoth. Judgment by the Lord will affect the whole area of Egypt. This emphasis in LXX-Is could be understood from the point of view of the Jewish diaspora in Egypt, as

---

<sup>216</sup> Collins, *Between*, 163. We find this topic in many verses of the literature in this period: for example, *Letter of Aristeas*, 138; *Sap. Sal.* 11:15; 13:14; 15:18-19; Philo, *Deca.* 76-80; *Vita.* 2.161-62,169,270; *Contempl.* 8-9; *Ebr.* 95; *Leg. ad Gaium* 139,163; *3 Sib.* 75,79; Josephus, *AgAp.* 1.254, 2.81. The main factor of Aseneth's penitence is her previous idol worship: *Joseph and Aseneth* 11.7-9,16; 12.5,9,12; 13.11, etc.

<sup>217</sup> Strabo, Isocrates, Plutarch, etc; cf. Bar-Kochva, 98; the mention of Hecataeus in Diod. I.83.1. According to Collins, *Between*, 158, "there had been a growing tendency towards monotheism in Greek philosophy since the fifth century B.C.E."

we have already said in our discussion on 20:1-6, 30:1-7 and 31:1-3.

### 3.5. Summary

The first three texts (20:1-6; 30:1-7; 31:1-3) all speak about Egypt, especially, the inefficacy of Egypt for any deliverance of Israel. And the last text 19:1-15 announces that Egypt shall be under inevitable judgment from the Lord. The passages in LXX have a feature in common: they are much clearer, stronger and more explicit than MT in announcing that Egypt is useless for the deliverance of Israel, or for their own destiny. For this, the translator paraphrases MT as in 20:5-6, adds some phrases as in 30:4; 19:3,7, repeats the argument as in 30:6, and omits some material as in 31:3. The efforts to get help from Egypt will be in vain and turn into shame and disgrace (30:1-6); As a matter of fact, shame will take Egypt (19:9); Egypt could not save them from the king of Assyrians (20:1-6); because an Egyptian is a human, not God, and is the flesh of horses (31:1-3); there shall be no work for the Egyptians (19:15).

The above-mentioned alteration of LXX-Is leads us to ponder some further questions. Firstly, this cannot be simple coincidence, because of its consistent tendency. Then, we need to think about why this sort of assertion was made. Possibly, we could assume a situation in which the Egyptian Jews had to face the challenge of many negative assertions against themselves. It is also plausible that these modifications came from a certain educational need for the reader community who settled in Egypt.

Therefore, these texts in LXX complement those Greek texts which declare that Jewish residence in Egypt was led by God, about which we dealt in 10:20-27; 11:10-16; 19:16-25 and 27:12-13. They live in Egypt according to God's providence as happened in Joseph's case, not because of disbelief or disobedience towards God's promises. Notwithstanding many warnings on trusting in Egypt for help, they are proclaiming

implicitly that they will never trust in Egypt because that help is utterly in vain. Their view of Egypt is another element in the formation of Jewish identity in Egypt. Furthermore, our analysis so far shows that LXX-Is was translated around mid-Second century BCE, after the foundation of the Temple of Onias.

## Chapter 4 The Temple of Onias

Our discussion so far suggests that the Temple of Onias lies behind LXX-Is, 19:16-25 in particular. Religious texts are basically written generally and universally so that their message is applicable to all ages and situations. It does not mean that those texts lose any concrete and particular meaning for a particular community in a specific period. Readers of the texts find that the texts indicate their own situation, the words and sayings in them being fulfilled or realized in their days. That is why they read ancient texts in the contemporary period, far removed from the time in which the texts were originally written. As for LXX-Is, it seems that the translator believes that the prophecy of Isaiah has been realized in his own day, in the middle of the second century BCE. This Isaiah text already prophesies that a temple will be built in Egypt, and be called “the city of Righteousness” (1:26 and 19:18 in LXX). Therefore the existence of the Temple of Onias means that the words of God prophesied have been actualized and fulfilled! In this chapter the Temple of Onias will be examined. When was this Temple built and by whom? What did the Jews in the Land of Onias see in the Temple?

### 4.1. The Oniads and the Temple of Onias

Concerning the Oniads and the Temple, there are some uncertainties in the primary sources which have given rise to many inconsistent theories. The major points of debate are: 1. The genealogy of the Oniads, 2. Who built the temple?, and, 3. What were the function and influence of the temple, and its relationship with the Jerusalem Temple?

The genealogy of the Oniads is as follows: Onias I (in the time of Alexander the Great) – Simon I – Onias II – Simon II – Onias III – Onias IV. There is a debate over

which of the two Simons is Simon the Just (Sirach 50:1-21).<sup>1</sup> After Simon I, his brother Eleazar, and next Manasseh, uncle of Eleazar, succeeded to the High Priesthood. It is somewhat unusual that Onias IV was given the same name as his father. Papponymy is a custom whereby a grandson is named after his grandfather, and according to B.E. Scolnic,<sup>2</sup> this practice became more frequent in the second half of the first millennium BCE.<sup>3</sup> Therefore, the use of an identical name for father and son is not common among the Jews, though a few exceptional examples are attested.<sup>4</sup> It is possible that Onias IV received the name after his father Onias III died. The other possible explanation is that the name Onias might be a kind of official title.<sup>5</sup> Josephus tells us that Menelaus was called Onias after Onias III died, and he seized the High Priesthood.<sup>6</sup>

Compared with the first problem, the second and the third ones have more complexity and significance.

#### 4.1.1. Problems

Who built the temple, Onias III or Onias IV? There are few references to this subject. We have to depend mainly on Josephus, *2Mac* and some rabbinic literature. But rabbinic literature is superficial, generalized, much later, and biased. Therefore our major source would be Josephus' works.

Basically, the two references in Josephus contradict each other, and also the narrative in *2Mac*. According to *B.J.* 1.33; 7.423-432, Onias III fled to Egypt after

---

<sup>1</sup> See J. VanderKan, "Simon the Just: Simon I or Simon II?", in D.P. Wright, D.N. Freedman, A. Hurvitz (eds.), *Pomegranates and golden bells : studies in biblical, Jewish, and Near Eastern ritual, law, and literature in honor of Jacob Milgrom* (Wiona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1995), ; U. Rappaport, "Onias", *ABD*, V, 23-24; "Onias" in *EncyJud*, 12: 1402-4.

<sup>2</sup> *Chronology and Papponymy: A List of the Judean High Priests of the Persian Period* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999), 34-5.

<sup>3</sup> Also in Maria Brutti, *The Development of the High Priesthood during the pre-Hasmonean Period* (VTSup 108; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2006), 115.

<sup>4</sup> cf., Schürer, 145, n.32.

<sup>5</sup> Scolnic, 271.

<sup>6</sup> *Ant.* 12.237-239,383; 20.235f.

seeing the desecration of the Temple of Jerusalem (168 BCE) by Antiochus Epiphanes (175-163 BCE). He sought permission for and built another shrine in Egypt to attract the Jews in Jerusalem. Seeligmann follows this view, and Hayward bases his arguments on the statements in *B.J.*, though without explicitly referring to the issue.<sup>7</sup> Parente has many reasons to adopt this theory,<sup>8</sup> also Keil,<sup>9</sup> and recently, Taylor.<sup>10</sup>

But in *Antiquities*,<sup>11</sup> Onias IV built the temple. And 2Mac 4:32-38 agrees with *Antiquities*. *Antiquities* was written eighteen years after the *B.J.* The explanation in *Antiquities* has more details than in *B.J.* Josephus omitted the parts that he had already explained in his *B.J.*; he added some concerning the person who built the temple, but omitted to say what the temple was like.<sup>12</sup> The brief reference to its later history in *Against Apion*, 2.49-56, which was the last to be written among the three of them, seems to follow the story-line after the explanations in *Antiquities*, even though it is far from clear. And the statements of the author of 2Mac on the death of Onias III at Daphne (2Mac 4:34), which is deemed to have been written within two generations after his death, cannot be disregarded.<sup>13</sup> Considering the positive and laudatory tone towards Onias III on the part of the author of 2Mac, this detail about Daphne does not fit 2Mac well, because the place was famous for the adoration of the god Apollo.<sup>14</sup> Right after reporting his death, the author enumerates condolences from the Jews, the Greeks,

---

<sup>7</sup> On other scholars and works, see E.S. Gruen, "The Origins and Objectives of Onias' Temple", *Scripta Classica Israelica* 16 (1997), 49. Among the earliest scholars, Friedrich Baethgen, "Siebenzehn makkabäische Psalmen nach Theodor von Mopsuestia", *ZAW* 6 (1886), 280-282.

<sup>8</sup> F. Parente, "Onias III's Death and the Foundation of the Temple of Leontopolis" in F. Parente and J. Sievers (eds.), *Josephus and the History of the Graeco-Roman Period. Essays in Memory of Morton Smith* (Leiden/New York/Köln: E.J. Brill, 1994), 69-98.

<sup>9</sup> V. Keil, "Onias III – Märtyrer oder Tempelgründer?", *ZAW* 97 (1985), 221-233.

<sup>10</sup> J.E. Taylor, "A Second Temple in Egypt: The Evidence for the Zadokite Temple of Onias", *JSJ* 29 (1998), 297-320.

<sup>11</sup> 12.387-388; 13.62-73, 285; 20.235-237.

<sup>12</sup> *Ant.* 13.72; R. Eisler, *The Messiah Jesus and John the Baptist* (London, 1931), 125; Schürer, 145 n.32.

<sup>13</sup> Gruen, "Origins", 49.

<sup>14</sup> That the High priest Onias III fled to the place could be regarded as being enticed, as in H.A. Redpath, "Mythological Terms in the LXX", *ATJ* 9 (1905), 43.

and even the king Antiochus Epiphanes, in 4:35-37, and adds the end of Andronicus, who killed Onias III, offering the following verdict:

“Inflamed with anger, he immediately stripped off the purple robe from Andronicus, tore off his clothes, and led him around the whole city to that very place where he had committed the outrage against Onias, and there he dispatched the bloodthirsty fellow. *The Lord thus repaid him with the punishment he deserved*” (2Mac 4:38 in NRSV, my italics).

Furthermore, Onias III appears with the prophet Jeremiah in a dream of Judah Maccabaeus to encourage him (2Mac 15:12-16). Therefore, it seems inappropriate to see the reference to Daphne as an indication of a defiled or “not orthodox” priest.<sup>15</sup> The very point that the mention of Daphne could cause misunderstandings as above leads us to think that the account of his flight to and his death at Daphne is reliable.<sup>16</sup> If Onias died in Daphne, it means that he could not have experienced the desecration of the Jerusalem Temple by Antiochus in 168 BCE.<sup>17</sup>

Therefore, the explanation in *Antiquities* seems better, as many scholars think (Tcherikover, Fraser, Ben-Sasson, Bickerman, *EncyJud.*, Schiffman, Schürer, van der Kooij, Gruen, recently VanderKam<sup>18</sup> and Capponi<sup>19</sup>), and it seems to be connected with the credibility of 2Mac.<sup>20</sup> But there are still many things to be clarified, and evidence

---

<sup>15</sup> Contrary to M. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism* (vol.2; London: SCM Press, 1974), 183, n.132. Tcherikover admits that the place was famous for the god Apollo, but with the evidence that there was also a Jewish synagogue there, he suggests “the flight of a Jewish High priest to a synagogue” because “the synagogues also enjoyed the right of asylum”. Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization*, 469, n. 39.

<sup>16</sup> So Gruen, “Origins”, 50, points out the sober and restrained writing on the death in 2 Mac 4:34, which means to him that the author does not embellish what happened.

<sup>17</sup> However, it should be admitted that the historicity around Onias’ death is still debatable. See J.A. Goldstein, *II Maccabees* (AB 41A; New York: Doubleday, 1983), 196-197, 238-239.

<sup>18</sup> J.C. VanderKam, *From Joshua to Caiaphas: High Priests after the Exile* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2004), 220-221.

<sup>19</sup> L. Capponi, *Il tempio di Leontopoli in Egitto* (Pisa: Edizioni ETS, 2007).

<sup>20</sup> Brutti, 308, gives credibility on 2 Mac and denies that the Temple was founded by Onias III, but she does not agree with a view of Onias IV as a founder. She tends to think a third figure belonged to a collateral branch of the Oniads, like Puech’s suggestion, who argues that the founder of the Temple in Leontopolis was “Onias son of Simon, the prostates that occupied an important position in the temple, whose uncle Menelaus had been high priest”, because it seems unthinkable that a legitimate heir of the Oniads had found a temple thus schismatizing the centrality of Jerusalem Temple. See É. Puech, “Le grand prêtre Simon (III) fils d’Onias III, le Maître de Justice?” in B. Kollmann, W. Reinbold, and A. Stendel (eds.), *Antikes Judentum und Frühes Christentum* (Fs. H. Stegemann; Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 1999), 137-158 re-quoted from Brutti, 213-214. Rainbow also doubts whether “Onias IV” existed at all, and suggests some other person, not a son of Onias III. P.A. Rainbow, “The Last Oniad and the Teacher of Righteousness”, *JJS* 48 (1997), 30-52. Another interesting suggestion by Capponi is that Onias III was

that is contradictory concerning this topic.<sup>21</sup> In particular, we should be more careful when we consider that there are many malicious reports about Onias and the temple in *Antiquities*, which could serve the purpose of degrading the religious value of the Temple.<sup>22</sup> Therefore, it should be kept in mind that to follow the view in *Antiquities* about the founder of the temple does not mean that all explanations about the temple in *B.J.* should be rejected,<sup>23</sup> and also, the identity of the founder does not impair the significance of the Temple.<sup>24</sup> On fixing the date of Onias III's death, Taylor says: "Since the dating of this period is so difficult, it may be better to concentrate rather on a sequential narrative rather than the actual dates as such".<sup>25</sup> One more thing to consider: Josephus preserves letters between Onias IV and the Ptolemies in *Ant.* 13.65-68; 70-71. In the first letter, Onias reveals his services for the dynasty:

"Many and great are the services which I have rendered you in the course of the war, with the help of God, when I was in Coele-Syria and Phoenicia ..." (*Ant.* 13.65).

It is quite likely that this quotation indicates what his father, Onias III, did for the Ptolemies, not Onias IV.<sup>26</sup> This demonstrates that the record of Onias III could be muddled with that of Onias IV, which makes for even greater confusion.

#### 4.1.2. The Temple of Onias

In this situation, the best method is to consider what is most evident and clear.

murdered by the Hasmonean to take charge of the high priesthood. 2Mac, according to her, is the result to convince the public that the Hasmonians are innocent of the death. See Capponi, *Il tempio*, 47-49, 58-59.

<sup>21</sup> Some scholars note the gap between 4:6 and 4:7 in 2 Mac. They think that some material, reporting that Onias III fled to Egypt and built the temple, was deleted by a certain Palestinian editor of the book to avoid the idea that the honourable Onias III built it outside Jerusalem. See Seeligmann, 253; Parente, "Onias III's Death", 82. The view of Theodore of Mopsuestia that Onias III, abhorred by Jason and Hellenistic reformers in Jerusalem, left for Egypt and built the temple, is often used for the suggestion. Baethgen, 276-277, introduces Theodore's view in commenting on Ps 55; Gruen, "Origins", 49-50 and n.17; Parente, "Onias III's Death", 76. The weakness of this view lies in "the possibility of proving the existence of the supposed gap", as Brutti, 216, points out.

<sup>22</sup> Taylor, 308.

<sup>23</sup> cf. Taylor, 309.

<sup>24</sup> As VanderKam points out, this inconsistency of Josephus' statements and no mention of Onias IV in 1 and 2 Maccabees demonstrate that "more was happening in Judea than 1 and 2 Maccabees report". VanderKam, *From Joshua*, 219.

<sup>25</sup> Taylor, 302.

<sup>26</sup> See Gruen, "Origins", 59; Taylor, 306.

First of all, it seems reliable that Onias the Zadokite built a temple in Heliopolis in Egypt, with the favour given by the Ptolemies. Secondly, the background of this temple was the turbulent situation in Judaea. Josephus describes Onias' motive as impure and foul, in order "to rival the Jews at Jerusalem" to cause indignation, and "to attract the multitude to the temple",<sup>27</sup> or even out of a personal desire to get "eternal fame and glory".<sup>28</sup> His judgment is clearly subjective and malicious based on his view on the temple. Critically reading Josephus' works, we can find the probable actual reasons for the foundation of a new temple in Egypt. He mentions that Onias fled to Egypt after Antiochus Epiphanes marched against Jerusalem and despoiled the temple,<sup>29</sup> through the guidance of Menelaus.<sup>30</sup> The temple was plundered, the sacrifices were forbidden, and the Jews were compelled to revere the gods of the Syrians. This situation was not changed by the death of Antiochus. Already, Jason became High priest through bribery,<sup>31</sup> and Alcimus, a non-Zadokite, became High priest after Menelaus<sup>32</sup> who also took the position wrongfully.<sup>33</sup> And the Seleucid kings (Epiphanes, Eupator, Demetrius) stood behind all these successive changes. Probably, this is why Onias IV moved into Egypt, because he saw "that Judaea was being ravaged by the Macedonians

---

<sup>27</sup> *B.J.* 7.431.

<sup>28</sup> *Ant.* 13.62.

<sup>29</sup> *B.J.* 1.32-33.

<sup>30</sup> W. Tarn, *Hellenistic Civilization* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed. rev. by G.T. Griffith; London: Edward Arnold Ltd, 1952), 215.

<sup>31</sup> The fact that Jason became High priest by bribery brought about the change in the High priesthood, as Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization*, 160-161, points out: "Whereas till now the post had been hereditary and the king had been in the habit of only granting or withholding his ratification in respect of the new candidate-henceforth the candidate paid the king the price of the position, so that in consequence the High Priesthood became a normal official post and the High Priest a Seleucid royal official utterly dependent of the king's favor".

<sup>32</sup> According to Josephus, *Ant.* 12.237-239, Onias III, Jason and Menelaus are the sons of Simon. Sacchi conjectures out Josephus' motive: "He tried to save the legitimacy of the Jerusalem priesthood, at least up until the Hasmonean high priests". See Paolo Sacchi, *The History of the Second Temple Period* (JSOTSup 285; Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 223.

<sup>33</sup> Jason and Menelaus are all reported to have given up Jewish religious customs and accepted Hellenistic ways (Jason: 2 Mac 4:9-13; Menelaus: *Ant.* 12.240.). Alcimus was allied to Demetrius, against Judas Maccabaeus. Interestingly, these three all, reportedly, had miserable deaths because of their wrongdoings. See *Ant.* 12.413 (Jason); 12.385 (Menelaus); 12.413 (Alcimus).

and their kings”.<sup>34</sup> When we take into consideration the similarities and differences between the narratives in Josephus, it is clear that the temple in Egypt, whoever the founder was, was built as a consequence of turbulence, including the desecration of the Temple caused by the Seleucid rulers and the high priests.<sup>35</sup> For this reason, Onias was welcomed by Ptolemy Philometor, who struggled to rule over Coele-Syria against the Seleucids.

Thirdly, it also seems evident that the location of the temple in Egypt was decided according to the prophecy of Isaiah. Josephus mentions this Biblical prophet in *B.J.* as well as *Ant*, even through the mouth of the foreign king.<sup>36</sup>

Lastly, the Temple of Onias resembles the Temple of Jerusalem. In one passage, Josephus denies the resemblance of the two,<sup>37</sup> but in others, it is clear that Onias built it to resemble the Jerusalem Temple.<sup>38</sup>

To conclude, it is quite appropriate that the temple in Egypt is called “the Temple of Onias”.

To date the foundation of the Temple of Onias is no more than supposition. Taking into account the motive for the building, the date should be after the desecration of the Jerusalem Temple (168 BCE). In 145 BCE, Euergetes II became king after a power struggle with Cleopatra, who was aided by the people of the land of Onias.<sup>39</sup> This year could be the *terminus ad quem*. Thinking narrowly, we consider the year 164 BCE as significant, for the foundation of another temple could be based on the defiled

---

<sup>34</sup> *Ant.* 13.62.

<sup>35</sup> In terms of the motive for the foundation of a new temple outside Jerusalem, certainly Onias III would be the person to build it. In this respect, some scholars suggest that the change from Onias III as the founder to his son was motivated by an attempt to “delegitimize the temple”. See Parente, “Onias III’s Death”, 83 n. 11.

<sup>36</sup> Rabbinical literature also preserves the name of Isaiah. See below.

<sup>37</sup> *B.J.* 7.427.

<sup>38</sup> ὁμοίως: *B.J.* 1.33; *Ant.* 12.388; 13.67; and παραπλήσιος: *Ant.* 20.236.

<sup>39</sup> *AqAp.* 2.49-52.

condition of the Jerusalem Temple. Then, between 168 and 164 might be the year for the Temple of Onias to be founded,<sup>40</sup> though a later date, for example, around the assumption of the High Priesthood by Jonathan, should not be excluded.<sup>41</sup> One more source for the date is a letter from Herodes to Onias written in 164 BCE.<sup>42</sup> The fact that this letter is not merely polite but contains a quite unusual formula of greeting which could be used to someone who has a very high rank in court, is matched with the important role of the Oniads during the reign of Philometor and afterwards.<sup>43</sup> It means that Onias IV will already have been in Egypt before 164 BCE. Therefore, it seems probable that the date of the foundation of the temple of Onias IV was between 168 and 164. But, whether or not the letter was sent to Onias remains elusive, because the manuscript shows clearly only one or two letters of his name, which could be interpreted differently.<sup>44</sup> It means that this letter could not form a significant evidence for dating the Temple of Onias.

## 4.2. The Function of the Temple

What was the function of the temple? About this, to date, the claim of Tcherikover,<sup>45</sup> denying that the temple could have had more meaning than a local shrine for a military force, seems central.<sup>46</sup> His evidence is: 1. It was built in

---

<sup>40</sup> Also the mention of the efficacy of sacrifices in this Temple in the Mishnah might imply that the Temple was founded between 168-164 BCE. See Parente, "Onias III's Death", 81-82; VanderKam, *From Joshua*, 218.

<sup>41</sup> For example, Capponi, *Il tempio*, 39-59, suggests around 150 BCE, after Jonathan became High Priest. What is important could be the motive to building a new temple. Interestingly, Capponi suggests that the story that the temple was built during the persecution was probably spread by the Oniads in Egypt, to be more acceptable and legitimate in the eyes of Jerusalem (58).

<sup>42</sup> *CPJud*, III:132.

<sup>43</sup> *CPJud*, I:245.

<sup>44</sup> Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization*, 498, doubts the reconstruction of the letter, which is changed from his first opinion in *CPJud*, I:245-6. Also A. Kasher, *The Jews in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt: The Struggle for Equal Rights* (Tübingen: J.C.B.Mohr, 1985), 60-61.

<sup>45</sup> *Hellenistic Civilization*, 277-281.

<sup>46</sup> Also J.M. Modrzejewski, *The Jews of Egypt: From Rameses II to Emperor Hadrian* (Edinburgh: T

Leontopolis not in Alexandria nor Memphis, 2. Most Jewish literature is silent about the temple, 3. The place was not suitable for the temple, as is shown by the words of Philometor, 4. Onias was a warrior, and the temple was internally bound up with the military colony at Leontopolis, rather than being a religious center for the entire Jewish Diaspora.

But a careful consideration of sources can take us to the opposite conclusion.<sup>47</sup> It seems that the first and the third points of Tcherikover belong to the same category concerning the place. First of all, the last point is not persuasive at all. The people in the land of Onias were famous for their military ability, but that does not affect the significance of their Temple. The Israelites after the Exodus could be classified as ‘soldiers’: the numbers of them are counted according to the number of **כָּל־יִצְחָק צָבָא** (‘everyone able to go to war’) (Nu 1:3,20; 26:2, etc.). The Israelites in the period of Judges are also regarded as potential soldiers. This consideration for the Israelites in the Wilderness and in the period of Judges has nothing to do with the character of their shrines. The shrine at Shiloh was aimed at all Israelites (Jer 7:12), and the shrines at Bethel and Dan were intended to represent all the people in Northern kingdom (1Ki 12:25-33). That the people of Onias are soldiers, therefore, says nothing about the significance of the Temple. In fact, to build a ‘temple’ alike to Jerusalem just for local soldiers would be harder than to build a temple intended for all the Jews in Egypt, like the tabernacle, and shrines.

Now let us examine the other two points. The major one seems why Onias built the temple in Leontopolis. There were many Jews in Alexandria in the Ptolemaic period.<sup>48</sup>

---

& T Clark, 1995), 128. cf. Collins, *Between*, 71.

<sup>47</sup> There are a number of scholars who consider the significance of the Temple: Hayward, Steckoll, Taylor, Gruen, Bohak, Capponi, etc.

<sup>48</sup> Fraser, 1:84. See above.

Why did Onias not build a temple in such a city where Jews lived so densely, if he wished to attract the Jews, as Josephus supposes? For a possible explanation, we need to examine the accounts of Josephus carefully. Before referring to the works of Josephus, there is one thing to be mentioned. Like many contemporary Jews, Josephus had a firm ‘single-temple policy’<sup>49</sup>:

“Let there be one holy city in that place in the land of Canaan, that is fairest and most famous for its excellence, a city which God shall choose for himself by prophetic oracle. And let there be one temple therein, and one altar of stones, .... In no other city let there be either altar or temple; for God is one and the Hebrew race is one”.<sup>50</sup>

It is accordingly understandable how he would regard the temple of Onias.<sup>51</sup> His view is likely to be reflected in a negative description of the temple, and therefore conversely, any positive mention of it can be regarded as being reliable.

#### 4.2.1. Why Heliopolis?<sup>52</sup>

When we consider the words of Philometor in Josephus<sup>53</sup> concerning whether the place is suitable for the worship of God, and his favor to the Jews, we can guess that Philometor would readily permit it even if Onias asked for a site in Alexandria.<sup>54</sup> According to *Against Apion* (2.49-56), Philometor and his wife *had committed* (ἐπίστευσαν) their whole kingdom to the Jews. In contrast to Onias who wanted to build a temple on the ruins of a stronghold once dedicated to an Egyptian goddess, the

---

<sup>49</sup> Bohak, “Theopolis: A Single-Temple Policy and Its Singular Ramifications”, *JJS* 50 (1999), 3.

<sup>50</sup> *Ant.* 4.200f.

<sup>51</sup> His negative view of other temples is also revealed in his peculiar explanation on the renouncement of the Samaritans faced with the threat of Antiochus Epiphanes. According to Josephus, they gave up their traditional belief, and pronounced their temple at mount Gerizim to be called that of “Zeus Hellenius”. See *Ant.* 12.258-261.

<sup>52</sup> Some connection between Heliopolis and a Jewish temple is attested in a few fragments of Greek literature in Egypt during Hellenistic period: Artapanus, *frag.* 2.23.4, in C.R. Holladay, *Fragments From Hellenistic Jewish Authors* (Chico: Scholars Press, 1983), 206-7; *AgAp.* 2.10; Besides them, there are many references locating figures in the Hebrew Bible in Heliopolis. Heliopolis as a settled area of Joseph and Jacob’s family, Artapanus, 2.23.3; as Abraham’s dwelling place, Pseudo-Eupolemus, *frag.* 1.6-8 in Holladay, 173-5; Moses as a Heliopolitan priest, Manetho in *AgAp.*, 1.237-8. See our discussion in 5.2. in the next chapter on this subject.

<sup>53</sup> *Ant.* 13.70.

<sup>54</sup> Cf. Gruen, “Origins”, 69, n.103, suggests that the Ptolemy would prefer a Jewish centre to be built remote from Alexandria, which is a simple conjecture without any evidence.

Ptolemies seem to be much more scrupulous,<sup>55</sup> as revealed in their reply to Onias:

King Ptolemy and Queen Cleopatra to Onias, greeting. We have read your petition asking that it be permitted you to cleanse the ruined temple in Leontopolis in the nome of Heliopolis, called Bubastis-in-the-Fields. We wonder, therefore, whether it will be pleasing to God that a temple be built in a place so wild and full of sacred animals. But since you say that the prophet Isaiah foretold this long ago, we grant your request if this is to be in accordance with the Law, so that we may not seem to have sinned against God in any way (*Ant.* 13.69-71).

It is likely that this letter reflects the negative views of certain Jews towards the Temple.<sup>56</sup> Also, we can perceive that Josephus wanted to exempt the Ptolemies from any responsibility for a temple built outside Jerusalem. However, regardless of the real motive of this letter in Josephus, it demonstrates why Onias insisted on building the temple there. The only reason that Onias wanted to build in that place, and the ‘scrupulous’ king permitted it, according to Josephus, is the prophecy of Isaiah.

Surprisingly, most scholars, as far as I am aware, do not pay much attention to the content of the prophecy,<sup>57</sup> while they perceive that the prophecy of Isaiah influenced Onias to build the Temple at Heliopolis. What was the content of the prophecy of Isaiah that Onias bore in mind? Josephus informs us of it as follows: “This temple should be built by a man that was a Jew in Egypt”<sup>58</sup>; “A temple to the Most High God was surely to be built in Egypt by a Jew”<sup>59</sup>; “There shall be an altar in Egypt to the Lord God” and “and many other such things did he prophesy concerning this place”.<sup>60</sup> It is likely that the first and second passages refer to Is 19:18 and the third in *Antiquities* refers to Is

---

<sup>55</sup> Modrzejewski, *Jews*, 127.

<sup>56</sup> Taylor, 306, suggests that “such flattery of the Ptolemies would seem to derive from people in pro-Jerusalem Alexandrian Jewish circles who would have sought to pour scorn on the alternative temple in Egypt without wishing to condemn the Ptolemies for permitting its construction”. The same motive of defending Ptolemaic rulers is also seen in other Hellenistic Jewish literature. For this, see 4.3.5 and chapter 5.

<sup>57</sup> Hayward, “Jewish Temple”, 440, notes this in a passing sentence; Capponi emphasizes that the prophecy of Isaiah originally referred to the Elephantine temple, but Onias utilized the prophecy to legitimize his temple. See Capponi, *Il tempio*, 67-69. cf. Sweeney and Wildberger also suggest that 19:18 indicated Elephantine, but it seems that this understanding does not fit “the city of the sun”, which undoubtedly refers to Heliopolis. However, Capponi’s mention on Onias’ use reflects exactly how the translator read Isaiah, namely as an actualized prophecy in his days.

<sup>58</sup> *B.J.* 7.432.

<sup>59</sup> *Ant.* 13.64.

<sup>60</sup> *Ant.* 13.68.

19:19.<sup>61</sup> The second one in *Antiquities* seems to combine the first and the third. Attention needs to be paid to two points. Firstly, the approach to the text seems similar to that of the Septuagint, which we have already examined in chapter 2. Is 19:16-25 in MT is a message concerning Egypt and the Egyptian people, but LXX-Is changes it as the reference to the Jews in Egypt. Onias, according to Josephus, shares the interpretive direction of LXX-Is. Secondly, it is noticeable that Josephus mentioned the place ‘Heliopolis’ repeatedly,<sup>62</sup> which seems to indicate that the name Heliopolis was preferred, in connection with the prophecy of Isaiah. The last passage also confirms the point: “and many other such things did he prophesy *concerning this place* [my italics]”. As a matter of fact, there is no mention about the place except “in the land of Egypt” and “the city of the sun” in Is 19:18-19. It seems accordingly clear that the text that Onias had read had the reading “the city of the Sun”, while the present MT writes “the city of destruction” in Is 19:18. However, if Josephus’ Isaiah had the same reading with Onias’ Hebrew Isaiah, he would have noticed it. So probably, Josephus might have read LXX-Is “city of righteousness”.

So we can see why Onias built the temple “in a place so wild and full of sacred animals”.<sup>63</sup> It is not because the temple was only for a military colony, but it is because of the prophecy of Isaiah. It seems that Onias intended the fulfillment of that prophecy.<sup>64</sup> The name “Heliopolis” is also implied in his arrangement to place a lamp symbolizing the ‘sun’, which we will return to.<sup>65</sup> One more thing to add: Josephus

---

<sup>61</sup> Hayward, “Jewish Temple”, 441, suggests that the mention of “by a Jew” implies 19:20 in LXX-Is.

<sup>62</sup> See 2.3.2.3.

<sup>63</sup> *Ant.* 13.70.

<sup>64</sup> For this reason, Kovelman points that Onias’ interpretation looks like the Egyptian version of *pesher*. See A. Kovelman, *Between Alexandria and Jerusalem: The Dynamic of Jewish and Hellenistic Culture* (BRLJ 21; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2005), 120.

<sup>65</sup> See 4.2.3 below. On the present location of the ancient place for the temple of Onias, see Taylor, 313-320.

himself wrote Onias' motive to build a temple in Egypt:

“... When I (Onias) came with the Jews to Leontopolis in the nome of Heliopolis and to other places where our nation is settled; and I found that most of them have temples, contrary to what is proper (καὶ πλείστους εὐρών παρά τὸ καθήκον ἔχοντας ἱερά), and that for this reason they are ill-disposed toward one another, as is also the case with the Egyptians because of the multitude of their temples and their varying opinions about the forms of worship ...”.<sup>66</sup>

According to the context, “most of them” in the second line seems to refer to the Jews settled in many places in Egypt. What, then, Onias found, would be not many Jewish temples, but Jewish customs observed in local Jewish communities.<sup>67</sup> Thus, it might be suggested that the motive to build a Jewish temple in Egypt was to keep religious customs according to the appropriate Jewish laws with the legitimate Zadokite priest.<sup>68</sup>

#### 4.2.2. The reference to the Temple

When Tcherikover mentions the silence of most Jewish literature, for example Philo, about the temple, he omits the most important Jewish literature in this Hellenistic era: Septuagint Isaiah. 19:18-19 in LXX-Is seems to reflect the importance and symbolic significance of the temple. According to LXX-Is, the temple in Heliopolis is the symbol of God's restoration, and the city will be called ‘the City of Righteousness’, the name applied to Zion (Is 1:26 in LXX). And the references in Talmudic literature to the temple of Onias<sup>69</sup> and their connection of the temple with Is 19:18-19 demonstrate that they argue against a convincing view, namely that the temple of Onias is the fulfillment of the prophecy of Isaiah. The fact that these rabbinic references dealt with the efficacy of sacrifices at the temple of Onias also reflects that Jews in Egypt brought

---

<sup>66</sup> *Ant.* 13.66.

<sup>67</sup> Contra R. Marcus in LCL and following the translation of Livia Capponi, “Martyrs and Apostates: 3 Maccabees and the Temple of Leontopolis” *Henoah* 29 (2007), 301.

<sup>68</sup> Capponi, “Martyrs”, 300-301.

<sup>69</sup> *mMen* 13:10; *yYoma* 6:3; *bMeg* 10a; *bAZ* 52b; *bMen* 109a-110a. That rabbis admit the existence of the Temple of Onias could be interpreted to show that this Temple was just a local shrine (Modrzejewski), or to show that the Temple did not break the Laws (Gruen). Whatever the case, the intention of Onias cannot be judged by these later Rabbis.

their offerings to the temple. And Josephus also connects the temple at Leontopolis with Is 19:18-19, and says that Onias knew the text. LXX-Is, rabbinic literature, and the works of Josephus reflect the significance of the temple. It can also be said that the silence of other Jews such as Philo has nothing to do directly with the intention of Onias and his people concerning the purpose of this temple. When Collins said that “... apart from Aristeas and Philo... in the literature of Egyptian Judaism which has come down to us, the [Jerusalem] temple receives very little attention”,<sup>70</sup> we cannot present this as evidence to prove that the Jerusalem temple had lost any significance for the Egyptian Jewry. The same logic should be applied to the temple of Onias. We have more to say about Philo, whose view on the temple is very clear:

“The highest, and in the truest sense the holy, temple of God is, as we must believe, the whole universe, having for its sanctuary the most sacred part of all existence, ... But he [Moses] provided that there should not be temples built either in many places or many in the same place, for he judged that since God is one, there should be also only one Temple. Further he does not consent to those who wish to perform the rites in their houses, but bids them rise up from the ends of the earth and come to this temple. ...”.<sup>71</sup>

In the eyes of Philo, who held this resolute view of the single temple, the temple of Onias would not have been acceptable at all. The silence of Philo on the Leontopolis temple, therefore, can be regarded as being intentional.<sup>72</sup>

It is notable that in *B.J.* 7.421, Caesar [Vespasian] ordered Lupus to demolish the Jewish Temple in the region called “Onias”, “being afraid that they [Jews] should get together again and persuade some others to join with them”. According to *B.J.* 7.434, the Temple area is regarded as a “sacred place” (τέμενος) and there are still people who come there to worship God. It shows the influence of that temple in the sight of gentiles,

---

<sup>70</sup> *Sibylline Oracles*, 49.

<sup>71</sup> *Spec. Leg.* 1.66-68.

<sup>72</sup> Interestingly, the argument that Philo was influenced by “Roman thinking” is regarded as problematic, because he does not mention Roman writers. See Pearce, *Land of the Body*, xxv-xxvi. Can “silence” be effective and reliable evidence? What makes us decide whether a work is done under a certain influence? Explicit mention or latent meaning?

and reflects the symbolic power of that temple, in the eyes of a conquering Roman emperor. Smallwood also notices this passage in Josephus, but based on her conclusion that the temple served only the local Jews, she concludes that the point that “the demolition of the sanctuary at Leontopolis was regarded as a safeguard against further trouble is far from clear”.<sup>73</sup> This is an absurd conclusion. Vespasian’s action against a supposedly local shrine does not make sense.<sup>74</sup> Even Smallwood points out that Vespasian could have been aware of the Temple during his stay in Alexandria.

There is other Hellenistic Jewish literature which shows the existence of the Temple of Onias. *Joseph and Aseneth* is a literary representation of the Temple and the Jews in Egypt, which we will deal with later.<sup>75</sup> Another literary work which alludes to the Temple is the *Fifth Sibylline Oracle*. In lines 493-503, the Sibyl declares and prophesies that “a fair temple of the true God” will be built, and it shall be “a great and holy temple in Egypt”. To this temple, people shall bring their sacrifices and “God shall grant a life without decay”. It might indicate the Temple of Onias, or “simply be elaborating upon Is 19:19”.<sup>76</sup> We cannot go further but it is quite certain that there was a tradition about and expectation of the holy temple in Egypt.

Holladay mentions some passages in *2 Mac* such as 1:1-9; 1:10-29 “as attempts to realign the loyalty of Egyptian Jews away from Leontopolis towards the Jerusalem temple”.<sup>77</sup> This understanding of *2 Mac* is found in many scholarly opinions.<sup>78</sup> But basically, this work does not mention the Temple in Leontopolis. On the contrary, it

---

<sup>73</sup> E. Mary Smallwood, *The Jews under Roman Rule* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1976), 367-368.

<sup>74</sup> Rainbow, 35.

<sup>75</sup> See chapter 5.

<sup>76</sup> Gruen, “Origins”, 68 n. 102; Collins, *Sibylline Oracles*, 93-94; Capponi, “Martyrs”, 301.

<sup>77</sup> Holladay, 230; Jellicoe argues that the *Letter of Aristeas* was directing against Leontopolis “with its temple and priesthood and rival version of Torah”. S. Jellicoe, “The Occasion and Purpose of the Letter of Aristeas: A Re-examination”, *NTS* 13 (1965-1966), 144-150.

<sup>78</sup> See bibliography in Collins, *Between*, 80-81 nn. 86-88; Gruen, “Origins”, 64, n.85. On our understanding concerning *2 Mac*, see 4.1.1. above.

does glorify Onias III: the “unbroken peace” of Jerusalem was due to the piety and hatred of wickedness of the High priest Onias III (3:1); Antiochus wept at his death because of his “moderation and good conduct (σωφροσύνη καὶ πολλή εὐταξία, 4:37)”; the Jews and the Greeks together shared their hatred of the crime (4:36), etc. When we consider these, it is inappropriate to regard *2 Mac* as a work containing implicit polemic against the Temple of Onias,<sup>79</sup> even though it has a strong faith in the Temple of Jerusalem and a hope of the restoration of the Jews outside (e.g. 1:29 “plant thy people again in thy holy place”).

Recently, Capponi has argued that *Testament of Job* reflects the Temple of Onias.<sup>80</sup> So Onias IV is expressed in Job, who suffers and goes into exile, becomes prosperous but loses everything. First of all, as Onias IV is permitted to purify the unclean, full of idols, Leontopolis, by Philometor, so Job is permitted to purify the shrine by God, and both of them are persecuted because of their struggle against paganism. According to her, the people of the Temple of Onias could re-utilize the biblical Job narrative to legitimize the Leontopolitan Temple. However, the *Book of Job* itself arouses various imaginations. The problem of theodicy arises everywhere and everytime, so this kind of work can be read against various circumstances, including Leontopolis.<sup>81</sup> It does not seem to be appropriate to pinpoint the historical background with just a thematic factor.

#### 4.2.3. The Zadokite Onias

In one place, Josephus mentions Onias’ intention with negative attitude; “... he had a mind to contend with the Jews at Jerusalem, and could not forget the indignation he

---

<sup>79</sup> Collins, *Between*, 82. Against Murray, 366-368.

<sup>80</sup> Capponi, *Il tempio*, 76-78.

<sup>81</sup> Cf. Collins, *Between*, 246.

had for being banished thence. Accordingly, he thought that by building this temple he should draw away a number from them to himself”.<sup>82</sup> But another explanation of Josephus gives a different picture of Onias’ intention:

... he determined to send to King Ptolemy and Queen Cleopatra and request of them authority to build a temple in Egypt similar to that at Jerusalem, and to appoint Levites and priests of his own race.<sup>83</sup>

His intention is to build a temple and to appoint Levites and priests “of his own race (ἐκ τοῦ ἰδίου γένους)”. The word γένος has many meanings. But considering the statements in *Ant.* 12.387; 20.235,<sup>84</sup> he apparently wanted to appoint priests from his “family”, that is, the Zadokites.<sup>85</sup> First of all, Onias was “the last legitimate Zadokite priest”.<sup>86</sup> Furthermore, Josephus reports that Onias asked the Ptolemies to make him High Priest.<sup>87</sup> When Eupator had Menelaus put to death, Josephus reports,<sup>88</sup> the king gave the High Priesthood to Alcimus, by the advice of Lysias “to transfer the office from this house to another”, probably intending to weaken the power and influence of priests. Therefore, the Temple of Onias is the one built by the Zadokite priest, contrary to the Temple of Jerusalem served by non Zadokite priests.<sup>89</sup>

---

<sup>82</sup> *B.J.* 7.431. In fact, Josephus’ calumny against the intention of Onias seems unfair, taking account of the favorable attitude towards Hasmonean Alexander Jannaeus of Ananias, son of Onias IV. See below.

<sup>83</sup> *Ant.* 13.63.

<sup>84</sup> 12.387: “Then Onias, the son of the high priest, ... seeing that the king had slain his uncle Menelaus and had given the high priesthood to Alcimus, *although he was not of the family of high priests, because he had been persuaded by Lysias to transfer the office from this house to another* (οὐκ ὄντι τῆς τῶν ἀρχιερέων γενεᾶς ἀλλ’ ὑπὸ Λυσίου πεισθεὶς μεταθεῖναι τὴν τιμὴν ἀπὸ ταύτης τῆς οἰκίας εἰς ἕτερον οἶκον), fled to Ptolemy, the king of Egypt”; 20.235: “The aforesaid Antiochus and his general Lysias were the first to depose anyone from the high priesthood. This they did in the case of Onias, surnamed Menelaus; for they put him to death at Beroea, excluded his son from the succession, *and appointed as high priest Jacimus, who was of Aaron’s line but not of the same family as Onias* (καθιστᾶσιν Ἰάκιμον ἀρχιερέα γένους μὲν τοῦ Ἀαρῶνος οὐκ ὄντα δὲ τῆς οἰκίας ταύτης)”. The γενεά or γένος is paralleled with οἰκία.

<sup>85</sup> Also in *Ant.* 13.73.

<sup>86</sup> Sacchi, 229. Recently, Schofield and VanderKam question the consensus that “the Hasmoneans were not Zadokites”, and conclude that “we have considerable reason to believe that the Hasmoneans were a Zadokite family and no evidence to the contrary”. See A. Schofield and J.C. VanderKam, “Were the Hasmoneans Zadokites”, *JBL* 124 (2005), 73-87. The point that the Hasmoneans were not rejected because they were not Zadokites seems worthy of note, but their argument that the Hasmoneans were Zadokites is based on only the verses in 1 Mac (2:1-2 for mention of Joiarib, 54 for mention of Phinehas), which could be from a possible “propaganda” from the Hasmoneans, as they admit.

<sup>87</sup> *Ant.* 20.236. Contrary to Gruen, “Origins”, 69, n.105.

<sup>88</sup> *Ant.* 12.387.

<sup>89</sup> The positive assessment of Jerusalem and its Zadokite priests is also seen in Ben Sira. See R.

It has been noted that Josephus' *B.J.*, curiously, begins with a comment on the temple of Onias, and ends with the same comment.<sup>90</sup> Examining Josephus' reference to the 343 years that the temple of Onias existed,<sup>91</sup> Eisler eccentrically suggested that this figure consisted of  $7 \times 7 \times 7$  so "he[Josephus] regarded the destruction of both temples as the just punishment of God for the transgression of the Deuteronomic law prohibiting the setting up of a rival sanctuary".<sup>92</sup> Chronologically the period that Josephus gives is wrong,<sup>93</sup> but the question whether it corresponds to the truth is much less important than the meaning which it gives to the temple. As Gruen pointed out,<sup>94</sup> a theory trying to reduce the significance of the temple fails to account for the symbolic endurance of the temple. While the temple was abolished on the eve of the seventh Jubilee of its existence according to the principle of Talmudic literature,<sup>95</sup> the temple existed during 7 jubilees ("heptajubilees"), in the counting method in the *Book of Jubilees*.<sup>96</sup> The former may imply that the temple of Onias was destroyed on the verge of perfection because the temple should be, in the eyes of Palestinian Jews, a kind of violation of the Law. But according to the method in the *Book of Jubilees*, the temple existed for 7 jubilees, so it is accordingly clear that this has another connotation. In many passages of the Hebrew Bible, the number 7 is regarded as being correlated with Divinity.<sup>97</sup> 'Sevenfold' also connotes a greater meaning than its face value.<sup>98</sup>

---

Hayward, "The New Jerusalem in the Wisdom of Jesus Ben Sira", *SJOT* 6 (1992), 123-138.

<sup>90</sup> Hayward, "Jewish Temple", 431; Eisler, 123-125.

<sup>91</sup> *B.J.* 7.436.

<sup>92</sup> Eisler, 124.

<sup>93</sup> If we follow the number, then, the temple would be founded in 270 BCE, which could not match the statements of even Josephus himself. Some scholars, therefore, emend the number, e.g. as 243. cf. Gruen, "Origins", 56.

<sup>94</sup> "Origins", 59.

<sup>95</sup> A. Schalit, "Onias, Temple of" *Encyclopedia Judaica*, vol. 12, 1404-5.

<sup>96</sup> S. Safrai, "Jubilee in the Second Temple Period" *Encyclopedia Judaica*, vol. 14, 581-2.

<sup>97</sup> Gn 2:3, Ex 37:23, Lev 23:16, 2 Ki 5:10, etc.

<sup>98</sup> Gn 4:15, Ps 79:12, Pr 6:31, Dn 3:19, etc.

Considering the explanation that the Jerusalem Temple was destroyed 3430 years (343×10) after creation in the calculation according to the *Book of Jubilees*,<sup>99</sup> it seems clear that this number '343' must have had theological significance. In connection to this, the Damascus document in Qumran, also known as "Zadokite document", points out that the covenanters of the community should follow the calendar suggested in the *Book of Jubilees* (CD xvi.1-4), which may contribute to the connection of the number 343 with "Zadokite".

On the day when YHWH will restore the Exile of his people, in Targum Jonathan-Isaiah 30:26, the sun's light shall give light 343 times.<sup>100</sup> This "343 times" light of the sun appears also in Targum Judg 5:31, which announces that the righteous (צדיקים)<sup>101</sup> will shine in the splendour of God's glory 343 times more.<sup>102</sup> Smelik demonstrates that this motif of 'turning the righteous into sevenfold light' (also seen in 2 Sam 23:4 in Targum<sup>103</sup>), well known to Hellenistic Judaism, was closely related with astral symbolism of immortality,<sup>104</sup> and that this belief of the righteous shining sevenfold contains "the eschatological union with God as light".<sup>105</sup> According to Hayward,<sup>106</sup> Onias was concerned with this interpretation, and it resulted in putting a lamp in his

---

<sup>99</sup> J. Maier, "Religious Beliefs, Qumran Sect" in L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam (eds.), *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (vol.2; Oxford University Press, 2000), 754. He explains that the Zadokites developed chronographic system based on the solar-oriented calendar, seen in the *Book of Jubilees*, corresponding to the law from the mouth of God. Namely, to keep the solar calendar, to the Qumran community, goes together with the strict observance of the Laws (1QH XX 9). On this, see G. Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (Penguin Books, 1998), 77-81.

<sup>100</sup> Hayward, "Jewish Temple", 436.

<sup>101</sup> Some manuscripts of Targum of Judge include צדיקים to clarify the meaning of this verse. W.F. Smelik, *The Targum of Judges* (OS 36; Leiden/New York/ Köln: E.J. Brill, 1995), 482.

<sup>102</sup> W.F. Smelik, "On Mystical Transformation of the Righteous into Light in Judaism" *JSJ* 26 (1995), 133-134.

<sup>103</sup> In the verse of 2 Samuel, "the righteous" seems to be added in the Targumic version because of the same motif.

<sup>104</sup> Smelik, "Transformation", 122-144.

<sup>105</sup> Smelik, *Targum*, 482. This motif appears in many rabbinic literature and New Testament, for example, Matt 13:43; 17:2; 2 Cor 3:18, etc. See Smelik, *Targum*, 483-484, and nn.886-893.

<sup>106</sup> "Jewish Temple", 436.

temple,<sup>107</sup> which symbolically represented the power of the renewed sun,<sup>108</sup> instead of the candlestick with seven branches in Jerusalem Temple.

Meanwhile, the *Book of Jubilees* (1:29), which was written in the second century BCE,<sup>109</sup> shows that there would be two changes on the day of final renewal. The one is that “the sanctuary of the Lord shall be made in Jerusalem on Mount Zion”, and the other is that “all the luminaries be renewed for healing and for peace and for blessing for all the elect of Israel”,<sup>110</sup> so two changes concern the sanctuary and the luminary. When we compare them with the action of Onias that he built a temple according to the word of the prophet and he put a lamp symbolizing the sun in his temple, it is apparent that the temple might have a special connotation beyond that of a local shrine.<sup>111</sup>

In addition, Hayward’s study provides useful insights into the importance of the temple.<sup>112</sup> He suggests that like the Qumran community, Leontopolis belongs to the Zadokite movement that rejected the Jerusalem temple.<sup>113</sup> He argues that the temple of Onias aimed to be the new Jerusalem using the explanation of the temple in *B.J.*

---

<sup>107</sup> Philo also, *Vita Mosis*, 2.102-103, mentions that the central light of the seven branches in menorah symbolizes the sun.

<sup>108</sup> But on the possibility to be influenced by the solar worship in Egypt, in Heliopolis in particular, see Capponi, *Il tempio*, 66-67.

<sup>109</sup> R.H. Charles, *Book of Jubilee*, lviii-lxvi; Schürer, 312f.

<sup>110</sup> Hayward, “Jewish Temple”, 436f.

<sup>111</sup> Bunge, 573-594, also gives the same weight on the temple through the research on the relevant passages in the Bible and Josephus: “Soviel wurde jedenfalls auch aus den vorhergehenden Darstellungen bereits deutlich, daß der jüdische Tempel von Leontopolis sowohl als politisches wie als geistiges Zentrum eine bedeutende Rolle gespielt haben muß”.

<sup>112</sup> Hayward, “Jewish Temple”, 430-443.

<sup>113</sup> Also see Hayward, “New Jerusalem”, 135f. On the Qumran community, see Vermes, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 26-90; On the similarities between two movements, see S.H. Steckoll, “The Qumran Sect in Relation to the Temple of Leontopolis”, *RQ* 6 (1967), 55-69, suggests that priests in the Temple of Onias moved to the Qumran community. However, Vermes, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 63 n.1, 146, draws attention to a passage in 4Q266 fr.5 II 6-9 saying that priests who have retreated among the Gentiles are disqualified. Even the sacrifice of the Gentiles is considered idolatry (*MMT B=4Q395* 8-9); see R.H. Eisenman and M. Wise, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered* (Shaftesbury/Rockport/Brisbane: Element, 1992), 185-186. On the identification of Onias III with the Teacher of Righteousness, see M.A. Knibb, “Teacher of Righteousness” in L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam (eds.), *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (vol.2; Oxford University Press, 2000), 918-921. “Teacher of Righteousness (מוריה הצדיק)” probably means that the “Teacher” was a scion of Zadokites, as H. Eshel thinks, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Hasmonean State* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans/ Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi Press, 2008), 33.

According to him, the tower-temple symbolism and the height of the tower show that Onias intended to build the new, symbolic temple.<sup>114</sup>

Basically, two communities (Qumran and the Land of Onias) have in common that they started after the desecration of the Temple of Jerusalem,<sup>115</sup> they occupied a place apart,<sup>116</sup> they both claim to represent the true Israel and the remnant,<sup>117</sup> and they are led by Zadokite priests.<sup>118</sup> But considering that the “wicked priest” tends to be identified with the Hasmonean ruler-priests,<sup>119</sup> the Qumran community seems to have had a negative attitude towards the Hasmoneans<sup>120</sup> which seems to be related with a

---

<sup>114</sup> Josephus emphasized that the Temple of Onias was not like the Temple of Solomon, to seemingly degrade the Temple in Egypt, but the point became prominent as a feature of a new future temple in the *Book of Tobit*: “God will have mercy on them, and bring them again into their land, where they shall build a Temple, but not like to the first, until the time of that age be fulfilled...” (14:4). See Hayward, “New Jerusalem”, 124f. According to Hayward, the *Book of Tobit* hopes a “new Jerusalem”.

<sup>115</sup> *CD* I 12-II 1; *1QpHab* VIII 9-13; IX 4-6, 8-12; especially XII 2-9: “... And as for that which He said, *Because of the blood of the city and the violence done to the land*: interpreted, *the city* is Jerusalem where the Wicked Priest committed abominable deeds and defiled the Temple of God. ...” (XII 6-9, translation by G. Vermes); *1QH* XII 7-12, etc.

<sup>116</sup> In the Qumran community, “the Council of the Community” is equated with the temple, so it is called “a House of Holiness for Israel” and “a House of Perfection and Truth in Israel” (*1QS* VIII 5-14); also “the Temple of God” (*1QpHab* XII 3-9). In the commentary to *Is* 54:11, the foundations with sapphires of New Jerusalem are interpreted to refer to the priests and the Council of the Community (*4Q164* 1-4).

<sup>117</sup> Nickelsburg demonstrates that the community has a polarized view of self-identification, thus they are “the group as the sole and exclusive arena for salvation”, and those who do not belong to them are “cut off from God’s favor and bound for damnation”. G.W.E. Nickelsburg, “Polarized Self-Identification in the Qumran Texts” in F.G. Martínez and M Popović (eds.), *Defining Identities: We, You, and the Other in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the fifth Meeting of the IOQS in Groningen* (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2008), 23-31. Actually, he points out (29), this “polemical polarizing self-identification” is a usual human behavior, not restricted to religious groups. On the dualism, a characteristic of the content of Qumran *pesher*, see Berrin, 117-120 and nn.21-22.

<sup>118</sup> Vermes, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 42. In *CD* IV 4, the priest in *Ezek* 44:15 is understood as “the converters of Israel who departed from the land of Judah, and those who joined them”. This motif of “Ex-Judah” corresponds to LXX-*Is*, for example 48:1.

<sup>119</sup> Vermes, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 60-62; T.H. Lim, “Wicked Priest”, *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, (vol.2), 973-976; I.M. Gafni, “Hasmoneans”, *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (vol.1), 329-333. Another expression referring to an anti-figure, “furious young lion” is suggested to indicate Alexander Jannaeus by Vermes, *Complete Dead Sea Scrolls*, 62. Lust suggests that LXX-Ezekiel also condemns Jonathan as wicked leader in 21:30-31. See J. Lust, “Messianism in LXX-Ezekiel” in M.A. Knibb (ed.), *The Septuagint and Messianism* (Leuven University Press, 2006), 419.

<sup>120</sup> Also VanderKam, *Introduction*, 165; Contrary to J. Liver, “The ‘Sons of Zadok the Priests’ in the Dead Sea Sect”, *RQ* 6 (1967), 27-29. According to *Damascus Document*, God’s wrath will be poured upon the “princes of Judah” (*CD* 8:3; cf. *CD* B 19:15-16). But “all who acted wickedly against Judah in the days of its chastenings” will be punished” (*CD* B 20:25b-27). See A.L.A. Hogeterp, “Eschatological Identities in the Damascus Document” in Martínez and Popović (eds.), *Defining Identities: We, You, and the Other in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the fifth Meeting of the IOQS in Groningen* (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2008), 125-126.

hope for a New Jerusalem with lawful high priesthood.<sup>121</sup> Recently, Hanan Eshel has demonstrated by analyzing the Qumran documents that the community “had no sympathy for the Hasmonean rulers, who had usurped the high priesthood”.<sup>122</sup>

#### 4.2.4. Its relationship with the Temple of Jerusalem

The Temple of Onias, as we saw, has greater significance than a local shrine for Jews in a military settlement. Does this mean that this Temple broke ties with Jerusalem and its Temple? This question is related to the essence of the Temple of Onias. Does this temple in Egypt deny or abolish the Jerusalem Temple?

First of all, we should remember how much Onias III is praised in *2 Mac*. If the people of the Land of Onias had contended with and opposed Jerusalem, those favourable descriptions would not bear recording.

Secondly, Josephus reports events that happened to the people in the land of Onias after the foundation of the Temple. When Cleopatra III was considering attacking Judea under the Hasmonean king Alexander Jannaeus, a certain Ananias gave the opposite advice, and counselled her not to do any wrong to Jannaeus, otherwise she would commit injustice, saying:

For I would have you know that an injustice done to this man will make all us Jews your enemies.<sup>123</sup>

This Ananias is introduced as son “of the Onias who had built the temple in the nome of Heliopolis, which was similar to the one at Jerusalem”.<sup>124</sup> If Josephus’ report

---

<sup>121</sup> On “the New Jerusalem” documents, see F.G. Martínez, “New Jerusalem”, *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, (vol.2), 606-610.

<sup>122</sup> Eshel, *Dead Sea Scrolls and the Hasmonean State*. According to him, the Qumran community labeled Jonathan as the “Wicked Priest”, his nephew John Hyrcanus as the “Man of Belial”, and Alexander Jannaeus as the “Lion of Wrath”. He points that there are a couple of documents revealing favourable attitude towards the Hasmoneans: *Pesher on Isaiah A (4QpIsa<sup>a</sup>)*, 4Q448. The former, a pesher on Is 10:24-34, he interprets, is against Ptolemy Lathyrus being about to attack Jerusalem. Eshel regards the latter as a non-sectarian one. See Eshel, 91-100, 101-115.

<sup>123</sup> *Ant.* 13.354. Capponi, “Martyrs”, 304, points out that 3 Mac 7:9 reveals the same ideology with Annanias’ saying.

<sup>124</sup> *Ant.* 13.285. In a subsequent section, Josephus cites Strabo, speaking of the faithfulness of “the Jews of the district named for Onias”. *Ant.* 13.287.

is credible, it clearly demonstrates the solidarity that the people in the Temple of Onias felt towards Jerusalem and its High priest.<sup>125</sup>

Another report by Josephus<sup>126</sup> on the Jews in the land of Onias is also related to the above. When Antipater made a drive into Palestine, towards Egypt where Caesar was fighting, the Jews dwelling in the district of Onias suddenly prevented the army of Antipater from going over to Caesar. But when Antipater showed them the letter of Hyrcanus the High Priest of Jerusalem urging people “to be friendly to Caesar and receive his army hospitably and furnish it with all things necessary”,<sup>127</sup> the Jews in the land of Onias were persuaded and followed immediately. This episode may demonstrate the faithful loyalty of the Jews in the land of Onias to the High Priest of Jerusalem.

The above reports, however, could reflect Josephus’ possible motive to indicate that even the people in the land of Onias respected Jerusalem and its High Priest, as is described in the *Letter of Aristeas*. So it is hard to find what the people in the land exactly said, but it is likely to reflect a reality that the people in the land had been on good terms with Jerusalem.

This good relationship with Jerusalem may have reflected the pride of the Jews in the land of Onias. And it can be surmised that a total denial of the Temple of Jerusalem might have not been taught among the Jews in the Land of Onias, so it seems that the Temple of Onias did not intend to break the connection with Jerusalem and the Temple,

---

<sup>125</sup> The view of Collins, *Between*, 71f and Capponi, “Martyrs”, 300, that the original ill feeling between Onias IV and the Hasmoneans had apparently been dissipated by the next generation is based on result. The flight of Onias IV into Egypt and the Maccabean revolt have response to the turbulence caused by Antiochus Epiphanes in common (*B.J.* 1.32-33; *Ant.* 12.387; 13.62f). See Onias’ words in *B.J.* 7.425, saying “the Jews would thus be still more embittered against Antiochus, who had sacked their temple at Jerusalem”. There is no negative reference by Onias toward the Hasmoneans in Josephus and books of Maccabees, contrary to their assumption and van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 73.

<sup>126</sup> *Ant.* 14.127-132.

<sup>127</sup> *Ant.* 14.131.

probably unlike Qumran. The Temple in Egypt does not exist only by denial of or hostility to the Temple in Jerusalem.<sup>128</sup> The Temple in Jerusalem was desecrated and so was the high priesthood. Onias built another Temple in Heliopolis. It seems to be apparently “schismatic yet neither illegitimate nor idolatrous”,<sup>129</sup> because it was built in accord with the prophecy of Isaiah, and was full of symbolic vessels. And its legitimacy is reflected in firstly LXX-Is, and Hellenistic Jewish literature around this period – *Joseph and Aseneth*, the *Third Sibylline Oracles*, and probably *Third Book of Maccabees* -, which will be dealt with in the next chapter. In LXX-Is, the Temple in Egypt is declared πόλις Ασεδεκ, reminiscent of the name “Zadok”, and it is declared also “faithful Metropolis Zion” (1:26 in LXX-Is), which seems to have been still meaningful after the restoration of the Jerusalem Temple by the Hasmoneans. The Temple of Onias had its own *raison d’être*.

As was mentioned in chapter 2 and in the beginning of this chapter, the Temple of Onias lies behind LXX-Is. The above observation on the Temple leads to question how LXX-Is deals with topics such as priests and temple.

### 4.3. Priests in Egypt

“Comfort, O comfort my people” (Is 40:1) is the famous beginning of the section called Deutero Isaiah. Contrary to the consistent tone of judgment up to chapter 39, chapters after 40 announce good news full of consolation and joy.

LXX-Is makes clear to whom this command of God is addressed by a remarkable addition in the following verse: “Speak, priests,<sup>130</sup> to the heart of Jerusalem ... ἱερεῖς

---

<sup>128</sup> Also Capponi, *Il tempio*, 39-42, 163-166.

<sup>129</sup> Capponi, “Martyrs”, 305.

<sup>130</sup> Contrary to LXX, Targum renders this verse as a command to a prophet, using וְאֶתְנַבֵּא. It is argued that originally, the verse was addressed to a council of heavenly beings, but this mythological aspect was

λαλήσατε εἰς τὴν καρδίαν Ἱερουσαλημ ...”. How can we explain the Septuagintal reading? What kind of reality does the Greek text reflect? What does LXX-Is reveal about Jewish priests in Egypt during the Hellenistic period?

#### 4.3.1. Identifying Jewish priests in Egypt: Is 40:2

This peculiar insertion of “priests” is seen also in Am 3:12 in LXX.<sup>131</sup> Ziegler points out that during those days priests also performed in part the office of prophets.<sup>132</sup> According to him, it seems that the present verse is a command to priests to tell the Israelites about the coming restoration. But since there is no trace of this in the other versions,<sup>133</sup> it is likely to be an addition by the translator.<sup>134</sup> Therefore it would not be too far off the mark to say that this addition should be explained as reflecting the contemporary situation of the translator. What did “priests” have to do with the Jewish Diaspora in Egypt?

There are some documents which tell of the immigration into Egypt of the Jews after the destruction of Jerusalem. According to Jeremiah 41:16; 43:6-7, many Israelites moved to Tahpanhes in Egypt, Johanan son of Kareah, all the leaders of the forces and all the rest of the people – soldiers, women, children, and eunuchs. However, there is no mention of priests, while among those who were taken captive to Babylon and returned, there are many reports of priests (for example, Ezra 2:61f,70; 3:8; 6:16;

---

unacceptable to the translator. See Schweitzer, 226.

<sup>131</sup> In Amos, the Greek ἱερεῖς seems to come from a transliteration of the difficult Hebrew word עֲרֹשׁ, rather than having any significant intention.

<sup>132</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 71.

<sup>133</sup> It does not appear in later witnesses such as Q, *oI*, 22, 48, 96, Eusebius and Jerome, etc., which seems a revision according to MT.

<sup>134</sup> It does not seem likely that there could have been a Hebrew Vorlage having הַכֹּהֲנִים, contrary to a suggestion of a possibility from the suffix כֹּ- by Ottley, 2:297. Command to ‘priests’ does not match the message and content of Deutero Isaiah. Actually, Goldingay and Payne enumerates possible ‘comforters’ in this verse: the author, the speaker, ‘you’ in the expression ‘your God’, God, ‘my people’, the comforters, and the audience. They suppose that the reading “priests” in LXX could come from in the light of Deut 20:1-4; Mal 1:6; 2:7; 3:1, which does not seem persuasive. See, Goldingay and Payne, 63-64.

7:7. etc). The first document which tells of the existence of Jewish priests in Egypt would be the Elephantine papyri. Porten suggests that the temple in Elephantine was established by Jewish priests who fled from Manasseh's paganization.<sup>135</sup> Though we cannot disregard the significance of the documents from the Elephantine community, including the temple,<sup>136</sup> we have to see it as an exceptional case. Their influence was limited to their own period and we cannot find any other trace of it in a later period.

The next report of Jewish priests in Egypt is found in the explanation given by Hecataeus of Abdera<sup>137</sup>, who was a Greek writer and a contemporary of Soter. According to passages purporting to be written by him,<sup>138</sup> after Ptolemy son of Lagus, later known as Soter (323-282 BCE), seized Syria at the battle of Gaza (312 BCE), many Jews, when they heard of his "gentleness and humanity (ἡπιότης καὶ φιλανθρωπία)<sup>139</sup>", went along with him even to Egypt. Among them was the High Priest Hezekiah, a sixty-six year old man of great dignity. A reference to this peaceful and voluntary move to Egypt can also be seen in the *Antiquities* of Josephus.<sup>140</sup> This view seems not to be compelling. Even though a foreign king were famous for his "gentleness", it is difficult to agree that a Jewish High Priest, having a good reputation, would leave the Temple of Jerusalem, and readily follow the foreign king to a foreign land, "despite the explicit biblical prohibition and warnings not to emigrate to Egypt".<sup>141</sup> Also Josephus writes

---

<sup>135</sup> B. Porten, "The Jews in Egypt", in W.D. Davies and L. Finkelstein (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Judaism* (vol. 1; Cambridge University Press, 1984), 385f.

<sup>136</sup> On the community, see Modrzejewski, *Jews*, 21-44.

<sup>137</sup> On the reliability of the works of "Pseudo"-Hecataeus, see Holladay, *Fragments*, vol. I, 280-290; for an exhaustive study, B. Bar-Kochva, *Pseudo-Hecataeus 'On the Jews': Legitimizing the Jewish Diaspora* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996). He argues that the works were written by a native of the Jewish Egyptian Diaspora to legitimize Jewish residence in Egypt. Be that as it may, it is widely accepted that authentic passages of the gentile Hecataeus lie before Josephus, as Stern points out. See Stern, I: 24.

<sup>138</sup> apud *AgAp.* 1.186ff.

<sup>139</sup> Each of these two words is usually used to indicate the virtues of kings: 2Mac 14:9; 3Mac 3:15; Esther 3:13.

<sup>140</sup> *Ant.* 12.9.

<sup>141</sup> Bar-Kochva, 79.

that Onias the First became a High Priest after Jaddus when Alexander died.<sup>142</sup> The fact that no High Priest named Hezekiah can be seen in the lists of the Jerusalem High Priests of Josephus,<sup>143</sup> while the *Tolida*, the Samaritan list of High Priests, places two High Priests named Hezekiah in this era, made Scolnic suggest that Hezekiah was a Samaritan High Priest.<sup>144</sup> Furthermore, when we take into account that the Jews received the evaluation from Hecataeus that they were “unsociable and showed hatred to foreigners (ἀπανθρωπία και μισοξενία)”,<sup>145</sup> it seems awkward that the Jews would welcome Ptolemy Soter because of his “humanity (φιλανθρωπία)”. The so-called Hezekiah coins, one of the main items of evidence that is used for the reliability of Hezekiah story,<sup>146</sup> also seem not to be persuasive in silencing other objections,<sup>147</sup> especially after later findings of those coins enabled the second word on the coin to be read HPHH, i.e. YHZKYH HPHH ‘Hezekiah the governor’.<sup>148</sup> We do not need to dwell further on his argument.<sup>149</sup> For us, it is enough to perceive that this tradition contained in the work of Josephus has difficulties. First and foremost, it would not make sense that a Jewish High Priest permanently moved to a country where there was no Jewish temple. Therefore, we find much more plausibility in Hengel’s suggestion<sup>150</sup> that this

---

<sup>142</sup> *Ant.* 11.346.

<sup>143</sup> Note Josephus’ pride in his rendering of the line of high priests: “I have also endeavored to preserve the record of the line of the high priests who have served during a space of two thousand years. ... without error, ...” (*Ant.* 20.261)

<sup>144</sup> Scolnic, 261-265.

<sup>145</sup> *Diodorus*, 40.3.4. This part preserved in *Diodorus Siculus* is undoubtedly considered as a genuine work of the Greek writer Hecataeus of Abdera.

<sup>146</sup> Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization*, 425f. n. 46; Stern, I:40; Schürer, 673; H. Hegermann, “The Diaspora in the Hellenistic Age”, in W.D. Davies and L. Finkelstein (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Judaism* (vol. 2: The Hellenistic Age. Cambridge University Press, 1989), 131.

<sup>147</sup> Bar-Kochva, 85-87.

<sup>148</sup> L.Y. Rahmani, “Silver Coins of the Fourth Century B.C. from Tel Gamma”, *IEJ* 21 (1971), 158-60; on this, see D. Rooke, *Zadok’s Heirs. The Role and Development of the High Priesthood in Ancient Israel* (Oxford University Press, 2000), 226-229.

<sup>149</sup> For more debate on this topic, Bar-Kochva, 71-91; Collins, *Between*, 65f.

<sup>150</sup> M. Hengel, “The political and social history of Palestine from Alexander to Antioch III (333-187 B.C.E.)”, in W.D. Davies and L. Finkelstein (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Judaism* (vol. 2: The Hellenistic Age. Cambridge University Press, 1989), 50. His idea was originally from Willrich’s

story contains clear allusions to the High Priest Onias IV settling in Leontopolis with a welcome by a Ptolemaic king. Furthermore, the suggestion of Bar-Kochva seems plausible that this Hezekiah story was transformed by an Egyptian Jew in order to legitimize Jewish residence in Egypt as the cooperation between the Jewish High Priest and the Ptolemaic king, as is reported in the *Letter of Aristeas*. The furthest this story can be utilized is that it could refer to a few Jews - maybe with a Hezekiah as their leader -, supporters of Ptolemy, who voluntarily moved into Egypt,<sup>151</sup> because Palestine and Egypt actually belonged to the same dynasty in the third century BCE.

The other tradition, furthermore, claims that the Jewish people were forcibly taken captive to Egypt under Ptolemy Soter, contrary to the story by Hecataeus on the peaceful move into Egypt of the Jews. Firstly, Agatharchides,<sup>152</sup> a Greek historian, whose work is also preserved in the writings of Josephus, ridiculed the behaviour of Jewish people who, “through superstition” about working on the Sabbath day, “submitted to be under a *hard master* (χαλεπὸν δεσπότην)”. Josephus also writes that the Ptolemaic king seized Jerusalem by deceit and treachery, and when he had gained it, he reigned over it in a cruel manner.<sup>153</sup> Though Josephus adds that the king changed his attitude toward the Jews after he knew the faithfulness of the Jews and he gave the Jews the same privilege as Macedonians,<sup>154</sup> it is evident, at least, that there was bitter and intolerable suffering during the period of captivity. Secondly, we can corroborate this with the mention of the *Letter of Aristeas* that explains the brutal and harsh

---

interpretation. H. Willrich, *Juden und Griechen vor der makkabäischen Erhebung* (Göttingen, 1895), 32, 80-82. cf. Bar-Kochva, 90f.

<sup>151</sup> Hegermann, 131-2. The fact that the *Letter of Aristeas*, which contains favourable attitude towards Ptolemaic dynasty, kept silence about any good relations between Ptolemy I and the Jews, is remarkable. Cf., Bar-Kochva, 78-81.

<sup>152</sup> *Ant.* 12.5-6.

<sup>153</sup> *Ant.* 12.4.

<sup>154</sup> *Ant.* 12.8.

manner of Egyptian soldiers towards the Jewish people. In 15-16 in the *Letter of Aristeas*, the Jews are described as “those who are held fast in miseries”, “those who are held in bondage”. The account depicts the event under Soter as “.. he [Soter], after overrunning the whole of Coele-Syria and Phoenicia, assisted by good fortune and his own prowess, transplanted some and made prisoners of others, terrorizing and reducing the whole country to submission. ... the remaining mass, those who were too old or too young for service[i.e. military], and the women as well, he reduced to bondage, not of his own free will, but rather compelled thereto by the soldiers (12-14)”. When we consider the sympathetic attitude of the author of the *Letter of Aristeas* towards the Ptolemies, in which the misery was caused not by Soter but his soldiers, this depiction in the *Letter of Aristeas* of the event during Soter’s reign seems to be highly reliable.<sup>155</sup> Many Jews, excluding young and healthy men, became slaves. In the reign of Philadelphus, it is said that they numbered over a hundred thousand, and the Jews who had come to Egypt before him received the benefit of being freed from bondage.<sup>156</sup> Regardless of the reliability of the purported decree of the Ptolemaic king, the *Letter of Aristeas* seems to reflect two facts: firstly, there existed many Jewish slaves in a certain early period of the Ptolemaic dynasty, and the author of the *Letter of Aristeas* regards the origin of the slaves as the campaign of Soter. Secondly, it shows that there were few slaves during the time it was written. Nevertheless the fact that there exists a text describing their liberation should be accepted as evidence for the severity of their condition in this period. Usually dismissed by earlier scholars, the

---

<sup>155</sup> Note the explanation of Bar-Kochva, 76: “One cannot imagine that an author who so admired the Ptolemaic dynasty and strove to prove its favorable attitude toward the Jews would have included in this book a story about their deportation and enslavement unless the event was indeed deeply rooted in the memory of his contemporaries”.

<sup>156</sup> *Letter of Aristeas*, 19-20.

explanation in the *Letter of Aristeas* is widely believed to be true these days.<sup>157</sup> Lastly, Appian of Alexandria in the second century CE wrote down in his *Syriacus* that “Pompey destroyed Jerusalem as Ptolemy the first king of Egypt *had* formerly *done* (καθηγήκει).”<sup>158</sup> According to this source using the verb καθάρω,<sup>159</sup> the conquest of Jerusalem by Soter was never peaceful.

The above discussion about the move into Egypt in the beginning of the Ptolemaic period shows clearly that the so-called peaceful migration under a Jewish high priest cannot be trustworthy. Therefore, Hecataeus’ report on Hezekiah, a high priest, cannot be considered as a reliable document showing the existence of Jewish priests in Egypt. This discussion leads us to the only possible explanation for their existence in Egypt: a Jewish move into Egypt in the reign of Philometor with a Zadokite priest Onias. The later rabbinic sources’ reluctant attitude towards this temple,<sup>160</sup> and Josephus’ record<sup>161</sup> show that sacrifices had been performed in the temple. Onias must have exercised political and religious leadership within the community and this seems to have been continued through the days of his sons, as we saw.<sup>162</sup> Therefore, events around Onias and the temple in Leontopolis preserved in Josephus and rabbinic literature are the only extant sources in which Jewish priests<sup>163</sup> played a certain role in Egyptian Jewish communities. Synagogues also seems to have functioned as communal religious places for prayer and assembly for the Jews in Egypt,<sup>164</sup> but it seems that

---

<sup>157</sup> Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization*, 272-4; Hengel, “Political”, 51, 100; Hegermann, 133-4.

<sup>158</sup> 50.252, in Stern, II:179.

<sup>159</sup> This verb means “put down by force/destroy, etc” which could not be understood to depict a peaceful occupation, as is shown also in Is 14:17; 22:10; 49:17.

<sup>160</sup> *yYoma* 6:3; *bMeg* 10a; *bAZ* 52b; *bMen* 109a-110a.

<sup>161</sup> *B.J.* 7.435.

<sup>162</sup> *Ant.* 13.287. See above.

<sup>163</sup> *Ant.* 13.63 and *B.J.* 430, shows there were a number of priests in the Temple.

<sup>164</sup> The term “proseuche” is used mainly in the Diaspora, especially in Hellenistic Egypt (cf. 56:7 and 60:7 in LXX-Is), a word corresponding to a synagogue in the land of Judah. For the terminology, see H. Bloedhorn and G. Hüttenmeister, “The Synagogue” in *Cambridge History of Judaism* (vol.III), 268-270;

priests did not play any role in the synagogal system, though the extant evidences are extremely rare.<sup>165</sup>

According to 40:2 in LXX-Is, it is “priests” who are commanded to speak to and comfort God’s people.<sup>166</sup> Now we find the most appropriate place for Jewish priests in Egypt: the Temple of Onias. After all, 40:2 in LXX-Is reflects a priest-centered community in Egypt. The Jews live in a foreign land but God will comfort them. God will comfort them through his messengers – priests, especially Zadokite priests.

This emphasis on priests in LXX-Is is consistently found throughout the book, which is reflected in both ways - as a negative judgment of priests in Jerusalem and a positive description concerning new priests and another temple to be built.

#### 4.3.2. Judgment against the present Jerusalemite priests

##### 4.3.2.1. Is 3:16-26

In this section, God announces the judgment against “the daughters of Zion”. From the preceding verses, it is clear that “the daughters of Zion” means Israel and that this announcement of the coming judgment is to them, especially the leaders of Israel: καὶ

---

But, R. Hachlili, “The Origin of the Synagogue: a Re-Assessment” *JSJ* 28 (1997), 37-40, points out a couple of opposite evidences; An inscription from Schedia in third century BCE is regarded as the earliest existence of synagogues in Egypt. On the Jewish synagogues in Egypt and related literature, see J.G. Griffiths, “Egypt and the Rise of Synagogue”, *JTS* 38 (1987), 1-15; Hachlili, 34-47; Fraser, I:84,282; II:164, 441; J.G. Griffiths, “The legacy of Egypt in Judaism”, in *Cambridge History of Judaism* (vol.III), 1028-1036, suggests that the first function of synagogues in Egypt might be religious worship, as dedications and designations show. And in time, he argues (1033), many functions were developed including those of prayer-house, public assembly room, school, and place of asylum. Cohen suggests the distinctions between temple and synagogue: firstly, synagogues were not inherently sacred, and secondly, the cult of the temple was sacrifice, while that of synagogues is prayer and assembly. The third distinction is personnel, he points out. The sacrificial cult was carried out by the priests, but the synagogue was a lay institution. See S.J.D. Cohen, “The Temple and the synagogue” in *Cambridge History of Judaism* (vol.III), 301-307.

<sup>165</sup> Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization*, 303; Based on the extant sources from first century AD, we cannot find any evidence to show that priests had a significant role here. In a dedication of a synagogue in Xenephyris, certain Theodorus and Achillion are written as “leaders (προστάται)” of the synagogue. See *CPJud*, 1441. The leadership of synagogues could be priests. But the extant materials show that this happened only in Jerusalem, where the temple was. See Lee Levine, “Synagogue Leadership: the Case of the Archisynagogue” in M. Goodman (ed.), *Jews in a Graeco-Roman World* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 211; cf. Schiffman, 87.

<sup>166</sup> In 49:13 in LXX, this comfort is addressed to “the lowly of his people”, while MT has only “his people”.

ταπεινώσει ὁ θεὸς ἀρχούσας θυγατέρας Σιών “And the God will make low the rulers, the daughters of Zion ...” (v.17), while the Hebrew קֶדְקֶד seems to indicate physical head.<sup>167</sup> Ziegler compares with other lists in the Bible (Ex 35:22-28; Nu 31:50; Ezek 16:10-13; Judg 10:4) and papyri, and concludes that those lists may have influenced the translator.<sup>168</sup> Van der Kooij has his opinion: the things in the list indicate a dowry.<sup>169</sup> Of note among the things in the list is that three materials in 3:23 of LXX – ὑάκινθος, κόκκινος, βύσσος - and πορφύρα in 3:21, which are essential things for priestly garments (Ex 25:4; 2Ch 2:13, etc.) or the Tabernacle (36:8, etc.),<sup>170</sup> are not found in jewelry lists in papyri of the Hellenistic and Roman periods.<sup>171</sup> The Hebrew counterparts in Ex 25:4 are תכלת, ארגמן, שני, חולעת and שש, one of which does not appear in the list of Isaiah 3:16-26 in MT at all.<sup>172</sup> Therefore, the renderings of LXX should be considered as very peculiar. Two or three of them are often used to indicate something valuable or someone of nobility.<sup>173</sup> But among those valuables, the most important one would be

---

<sup>167</sup> Otteley, 2:119; Baer, “About Us”, 39; van der Kooij, “Interpretation”, 53; cf. Williamson, *Isaiah 1-5*, 276.

<sup>168</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 203-211.

<sup>169</sup> Van der Kooij, “Interpretation”, 52-53. Comparing marriage contracts and related texts of papyri, he suggests that the list, having the same order (precious ornaments/objects - garments) with those materials, “has been formulated as list of objects that made up a dowry”. On the ornaments in papyri in Graeco-Roman period, see Simona Russo, *I gioielli nei papiri di età greco-romana* (Florence: Istituto Papirologico, 1999). But the order is already in MT, and probably in the Vorlage. Moreover, the order in detail differs from that in LXX-Is: among the ornaments in the lists of Russo’s book, ἐνώτιον (v.20), κάθεμα (v.19), περιδέξιον (v.20), δακτύλιος (v.20), μηνίσκος (v.18) respectively appear in 3:18-20 of LXX-Is in a different order.

<sup>170</sup> In addition to these main materials, ἐμπλόκιον, κόσμυβος, περιδέξιον and δακτύλιος are also usually used for priestly things. ἐμπλόκιον: Ex 35:22; 36:22 (MT 39:15), 24, 25; Nu 31:50; κόσμυβος: Ex 28:39; περιδέξιον: Ex 35:22; Nu 31:50; δακτύλιος: Ex 25:12; Nu 31:50.

<sup>171</sup> Only ὑάκινθος is mentioned among precious stones in Russo, *I gioiella nei papiri*, 267.

<sup>172</sup> It is well known that the LXX translators do not pay careful attention to consistency in detail, in rendering the names of precious stones, metals, etc., in particular. C. Rabin, “Character of the Septuagint”, 24. On differences of the account of priestly vestments between MT-Ex and LXX-Ex, see A.H. Finn, “The Tabernacle Chapters”, *JTS* 16 (1914-15), 449-482; D.W. Gooding, *The Account of the Tabernacle. Translation and Textual Problems of the Greek Exodus* (Cambridge University Press, 1959), 83-85; A. le Boulluec and P. Sandevor, *La Bible d’Alexandrie. L’Exode* (Cerf: Paris, 1989), 61-70.

<sup>173</sup> Est 1:6; Pr 31:22; Jer 10:9; Lam 4:5; Ez 16:10; 27:7; 1Esdras 3:6; 1Mac 4:23; Judith 10:21; TestJob 6:14, 15; 25:7, 8; *B.J.* 5.212; *De somniis*. 2.57; *Joseph and Aseneth* 2:15, etc. See G. Bohak, *Joseph and Aseneth and the Jewish Temple in Heliopolis* (SBLEJL 10; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 11; M. Haran, “Priesthood, Temple, Divine Service: Some Observations on Institutions and Practices of Worship”, *HAR* 7 (1983), 121-35. See 5.3.

the Tabernacle and priestly garments. So these four appear in Josephus to indicate the priestly garments,<sup>174</sup> or tabernacle.<sup>175</sup>

Especially, Philo tries to explain why these four materials are chosen:<sup>176</sup>

In choosing the materials for the woven work, he selected as the best out of a vast number possible four, as equal in number to the elements-earth, water, air, fire-out of which the world was made, and with a definite relation to those elements: the byssus, or bright white, coming from the earth, purple from the water while dark red is like the air, which is naturally black, and scarlet like fire, since both are bright red. For it was necessary that in framing a temple of man's making, dedicated to the Father and Ruler of All, he should take substances like those with which that Ruler made the All.

Therefore, it seems highly likely that the four materials symbolize the priesthood, and the high priesthood in particular.<sup>177</sup> Accordingly, the present section contains a judgment against the priests, possibly the high priests in Jerusalem. God will take away their glorious and noble garments and ornaments and He will put on them dust instead of a sweet smell, rope instead of a belt, baldness instead of glorious ornaments of head and sackcloth instead of a scarlet tunic (3:24 in LXX).

#### 4.3.2.2. Is 43:28: The problem of the ruling class of Judah

MT: וְאַחֲלַל שָׂרֵי קֹדֶשׁ וְאַתְנֶה לְחֶרֶם יַעֲקֹב וְיִשְׂרָאֵל לְגִדּוּפִים

LXX: καὶ ἐμίαιναν οἱ ἄρχοντες τὰ ἁγία μου καὶ ἔδωκα ἀπολέσαι Ἰακωβ καὶ Ἰσραὴλ εἰς ὀνειδισμόν

The latter part of the verse in LXX is translated very literally, while in the first part this is not the case at all:

MT: “And *I defiled the princes of the sanctuary*, and I put Jacob to the ban and Israel reviling”.

LXX: “And *the rulers defiled my sanctuary*, and I gave Jacob to destroy and Israel into reproach”.

---

<sup>174</sup> *B.J.* 5.212-214, 232.

<sup>175</sup> *Ant.* 3.183.

<sup>176</sup> *Vita*, 2.88. Also see Philo's interpretation of priestly vesture in 2.117-135. On Jewish symbolic interpretation of the vestments, and Jerome as its culmination, see R. Hayward, “St Jerome and the Meaning of the High-priestly Vestments” in W. Horbury (ed.), *Hebrew Study from Ezra to Ben-Yehuda* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999), 90-105, esp. 98-99. But there seems to remain some discrepancy between Philo and Jerome, because Philo uses Greek terms, while Jerome seems to consult Hebrew version by turning aside from LXX. For example, for Philo, βύσσος (for שֵׁשׁ) symbolizes the earth, but for Jerome, כַּתְנֵת signifies it.

<sup>177</sup> Rooke, 16f.

Compared with MT, what LXX as it stands<sup>178</sup> – regardless of whether this reading came from any confusion of the position of ‘yodh’ or from a different Vorlage, or a deliberate change by the translator as Ziegler suggests<sup>179</sup> - delivers to its readers is two-fold: 1. God’s sanctuary was defiled, 2. it is the rulers who defiled the sanctuary.<sup>180</sup>

It is evident that “my sanctuary” indicates the Temple of Jerusalem. Interestingly, “to defile the sanctuary” appears in 1Mac 1:46 (... καὶ μιᾶναι ἅγιασμα ...). Antiochus Epiphanes, who experienced frustration in his ambition to win over Egypt because of the intervention of Rome, returned to Syria, and on his way, he stopped at Jerusalem and even marched into the Temple. Furthermore, it was Menelaus who guided Antiochus to do that (2Mac 5:15). This Menelaus is reported in 2Mac 4:33-34 as being responsible for the assassination of Onias III. Then, the picture which LXX sketches in the present Isaianic verse seems clear: the rulers such as Menelaus defiled God’s sanctuary in Jerusalem.

This is confirmed by a brief consideration of “rulers”. After the Persian period, it is widely accepted that the ruling class of Judea was priests.<sup>181</sup> Judea was a very small but well-established community and was united around the Temple.<sup>182</sup> As a result of this, the high priest was the main authority for the Jews, at least within Jewish communities. Of course, the official supreme ruler was a governor sent by the Persian empire, but his authority derived from outside, while that of the high priests came from inside, the Jews themselves.<sup>183</sup> David Goodblatt demonstrates that high priests were the supreme

---

<sup>178</sup> It reflects a reading such as “... ויחללו השרים קדשי ...”. Cf. *NEB* seems to follow LXX-reading: “and your princes profaned my sanctuary ...”. On discussion of the verse, see Barthélemy, 320-322.

<sup>179</sup> *Untersuchungen*, 154f.

<sup>180</sup> The same reversal is also seen in 47:6. See Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 155; Barthélemy, 320.

<sup>181</sup> Rooke, 1-4, enumerates how many scholars have agreed with this idea since Wellhausen.

<sup>182</sup> M. Goodman, *The Ruling Class of Judaea* (Cambridge, 1987), 29.

<sup>183</sup> D. Goodblatt, *The Monarchic Principle* (Tübingen: J.C.B.Mohr, 1994), 7.

authority over the Jews during the Second Temple period.<sup>184</sup> According to him, this priestly monarchic leadership is confirmed theoretically and practically.<sup>185</sup> His position on the priestly supremacy reflects the scholarly consensus for the period. Recently, Deborah Rooke has argued that high priests did not exercise any power over civil administration but acted as leaders only in cultic affairs.<sup>186</sup> From the priest in the so-called ‘priestly document’ to the king-high priest in the Hasmonean dynasty, she deals with probably all the extant sources, and concludes that “high priesthood does not appear in the sources as an office which bestowed *ex officio* civil leadership prerogatives; rather, the basic function of the high priest was as a cultic figure”.<sup>187</sup> According to her, the main figure for civil leadership was usually the governor or king.<sup>188</sup>

Though her arguments are solid in many points, concerning the problem of leadership of the Jews, it seems that she has missed some points. First and foremost, it seems that she did not distinguish kinds or origins of authority: authority from within the community and from outside. With Goodblatt, it seems that the problem of leadership during the Second Temple period should deal with the native authority within the Jewish community. In many cases, Rooke points out that the civil authority was governors, not high priests.<sup>189</sup> Governors surely had political power but they were Persian officials, even if they were of Jewish descent, and their authority did not come from within. So the discussion of the leadership excludes this kind of authority from

---

<sup>184</sup> *Monarchic Principle*. In his work, “monarchy” does not mean something to be related to kingship but refers to the “purely etymological” meaning: “the rule of one person” (3).

<sup>185</sup> In his *Monarchic Principle*, chapter 1 deals with the practical examples of priestly monarchy in Jewish history after Persian period, while chapter 2 tells of its theoretical origin.

<sup>186</sup> Rooke, *Zadok’s Heirs*.

<sup>187</sup> Rooke, 328.

<sup>188</sup> To Rooke, Melchizedek is “priest by virtue of being king, not king by virtue of being priest” (103), who was dealt with as a model of Hasmonean kings by Goodblatt, 52-55.

<sup>189</sup> Rooke, 174 (Nehemiah); 182 (Bagohi); 226ff (Hezekiah), etc.

outside, but for Rooke the authority from outside was suggested as a solution in many cases. Furthermore, she places much weight on whether one could exercise ‘civil administration’. Under Persian empire and under Ptolemaic and Seleucid control, that the ‘civil administration’ was carried out by officials sent by the empires is beyond question. Who exercises civil administration does not shed any light on the question of the leadership of the Jewish community.

Secondly, her emphasis on civil authority makes her overlook many significant references to a symbolic representation of high priests. For example, when Heliodorus, an official of the Seleucid king, visited Jerusalem, he was welcomed by Onias the high priest (2Mac 3:9). Why did the high priest, instead of someone else, welcome a Persian official? A similar scene is seen in the story in Josephus in which Alexander was welcomed by Yaddua the high priest.<sup>190</sup> To discuss the historicity of the story is not our business. But these two scenes clearly picture a certain aspect of Jewish society where the high priest is the representative of the nation. However we cannot find any quotation of the verse in 2Mac in the work of Rooke.<sup>191</sup> Recently Gardner has demonstrated by examining the motif of “euergetism” in 2Mac that Onias III, high priest, was called “the benefactor of the city” (ὁ εὐεργέτης τῆς πόλεως, 2Mac 2:2), which indicates duties possibly about cultic status, but also conveys “the sense of political and administrative contribution” seen in the use of ἀγορανομία (2Mac 3:4).<sup>192</sup>

To conclude, during the Second Temple period, it seems that priests were the native ruling class. In Schürer’s word, “the high priests of the pre-Maccabean as well as

---

<sup>190</sup> *Ant.* 11.329ff.

<sup>191</sup> It is surprising that she does not refute the arguments of D.Goodblatt, who provides some of the most exhaustive research on the subject, except twice (*Zadok’s Heirs*, 262 and 263), where she quotes him to show she shares his opinion that the theory of the so-called “gerousia (council)” of the Jews is purely speculative, and in using one passage of Ben Sira.

<sup>192</sup> G. Gardner, “Jewish Leadership and Hellenistic Benefaction in the Second Century B.C.E.” *JBL* 126 (2007), 329-332.

the Hasmonean age were not merely priests but also princes”.<sup>193</sup> And our argument is supported by another recent work by J.C. VanderKam, who demonstrates that till the Hasmonean period, high priests exercise civil responsibility also (Persian period and Hasmonean period), or at least they appear as the head of the Jewish society with no firm evidence of a Jewish or foreign governor alongside them (early Hellenistic period).<sup>194</sup>

Therefore, when we find the expression such as “rulers” in LXX-Is, it is likely that the expression refers to the ruling class, mainly priests. As a matter of fact, 43:27 in LXX-Is already claims that “their rulers” (οἱ ἄρχοντες αὐτῶν for מְלִיצִי) transgressed against God. The Septuagintal text consistently declares that “rulers” transgressed YHWH and defiled his holy place. At least, the readers and the translator of the time would understand “rulers” as priests. This thought seems to correspond with the above observation about Menelaus. Severe attack against the priests of the Temple of Jerusalem is also seen in Zeph 3:4: οἱ προφῆται αὐτῆς πνευματοφόροι ἄνδρες καταφρονηταὶ οἱ ἱερεῖς αὐτῆς βεβηλοῦσιν τὰ ἅγια καὶ ἀσεβοῦσιν νόμον “Her prophets are those who have a spirit of human, and scornful men, her priests profaned the sanctuary and transgressed the law”.

Furthermore, it is worth considering 3:10-12 in LXX-Is. According to 3:12 in LXX-Is, “those who pronounce blessing lead you astray” (=9:15 in LXX-Is). This comes from a (mis)understanding of מְאַשְׁרֵי into οἱ μακαρίζοντες ὑμᾶς, a variant form of אֲשֵׁר (‘happiness’, ‘blessing’). But the Septuagint as it stands suggests that the exactors and the extortioners, i.e. the leaders, led the people astray. As we saw before, the “leader” should be understood to refer to priests in the Second temple period. Moreover, the

---

<sup>193</sup> Schürer, 227.

<sup>194</sup> VanderKam, *From Joshua*.

function of pronouncing blessing on others belongs to priests in particular (Nu 6:23). Therefore, 3:12 and 9:15 accuse those who bless (i.e. priests) of having led the people astray. Interestingly, 3:10 in LXX differs from MT quite a lot:

MT: אָמְרוּ צְדִיק כִּי־טוֹב כִּי־פָרִי מִעֲלֵי־הֵם יֵאָכְלוּ<sup>195</sup>  
 LXX: εἰπόντες δῆσωμεν τὸν δίκαιον ὅτι δύσχρηστος ἡμῖν ἐστι τοίνυν τὰ γενήματα τῶν ἔργων αὐτῶν φάγονται “Saying, ‘let us bind the righteous, that he is burdensome to us’, therefore they will eat the fruits of their works”

It is hard to believe that the translator changes the given text so much. He adds “δήσωμεν” and changes טוב into δύσχρηστος,<sup>196</sup> a word not used other than here and in 2:12 of *Wisdom of Solomon*.<sup>197</sup> And this is the content of their evil counsel in 3:9 in LXX-Is, which also differs from MT:

MT: ... אִי לְנַפְשָׁם כִּי־נִמְלוּ לָהֶם רָעָה ...  
 LXX: ... οὐαί τῇ ψυχῇ αὐτῶν διότι βεβούλευνται βουλὴν πονηρὰν καθ’ ἑαυτῶν

According to the Septuagint, therefore, the leaders of the people have devised evil counsel to bind the righteous one, because his existence was burdensome to them. We suggest that the above verses demonstrate that the priestly leaders in Jerusalem are accused of leading the people astray, and of having done evil against the righteous in particular. Who could “the righteous” (צַדִּיק, ὁ δίκαιος) refer to? The translator seems to refer, by his rendering vv.9-12, to Onias III, who was killed.<sup>198</sup> In particular, he was a Zadokite (צַדִּיק) priest.

A similar motif is found in 5:22-23 in LXX-Is, too. As we already saw in chapter 2, there is a condemnation of “the mighty ones” in Jerusalem in 1:24 in LXX-Is.<sup>199</sup> The same thought is also seen in 5:22 in LXX-Is, where “the mighty ones” are condemned. In the following verse, they are described as “those who justify the ungodly for a bribe,

<sup>195</sup> Williamson, *Isaiah 1-5*, 255f, suggests the initial word should be read אֲשֶׁר־י “blessed”.

<sup>196</sup> Tov, *Text-Critical Use*, 138-139, 168-171, explains that אָמְרוּ seems to be read twice, אָמְרוּ and אָסְרוּ, respectively thus εἰπόντες and δῆσωμεν, which would need further deviation δύσχρηστος; This double translation is also noticed by Ottley, 2:117; Seeligmann, 166, 211 n.38; Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 61; cf. Williamson, *Isaiah 1-5*, 256f.

<sup>197</sup> On the similar passages in *Wisdom of Solomon* and LXX-Is, see Ottley, 2:117f.

<sup>198</sup> Among Christian authors, it was understood to refer to James the Lord’s brother. Seeligmann, 166.

<sup>199</sup> See 2.3.3.2.

and take away the righteousness of the righteous (οἱ δίκαιοι ἄρουντες τὸν ἀσεβῆ ἕνεκεν δώρων καὶ τὸ δίκαιον τοῦ δικαίου ἄρουντες),<sup>200</sup> which may fit with Onias III's replacement in the High priesthood by Jason and Menelaus, by the power of bribery. The singular “the righteous”, contrasted with the plural in MT (צַדִּיקִים),<sup>201</sup> might even be intended by the translator to allude to the Zadokite Onias.

To conclude, it is clear what LXX-Is asserts here: the ruling class - the priests in charge of the Temple of Jerusalem defiled it.<sup>202</sup> Naturally, this would provide the reason to build another undefiled temple by undefiled priests.

Now, the problem lies in the ruling class who defiled the temple. 1:21ff should be understood in this light. LXX renders “the mighty one of Israel” (1:24), which is an epithet of God, as “Woe to the mighty ones of Israel”, that is, a judgment announced against the ruling class in Israel.<sup>203</sup> Furthermore, LXX has more in the following verse: τοὺς δὲ ἀπειθοῦντας ἀπολέσω which has no counterpart in MT. While MT in v.25 tells of something abstract, using metaphor, LXX speaks quite bluntly, and makes it clear that this verse still deals with the ruling class by using the same verb ἀπειθέω as in v.23. V.26 is about the famous “city of righteousness, mother-city Zion”. After all, LXX shows that the restoration or purification of Zion is related with changing or punishing the ruling class.

---

<sup>200</sup> Cf. Olley, *‘Righteousness’*, 43-46; on patristic interpretations of the verse, Muraoka, “Lexicography”, 443f.

<sup>201</sup> But Williamson, *Isaiah 1-5*, 388, suggests that the reading in MT should be emended to the singular צַדִּיק with Lowth, Duhm, Procksch, etc.

<sup>202</sup> The same judgment against the ruling class in Jerusalem is also found in 28:14-22. In MT, the passage functions as a warning, but in LXX, it announces judgment. In particular, compare v.22. Elsewhere rulers are judged: 5:22; 26:15; 43:4,9, etc. The same thought is seen in *1QpHab* XII 8-10. See Steckoll, 57-8. Presumably, defilement of the Jerusalem Temple by Jerusalem priests would be the starting point of the Qumran community and the Jews of Onias. See 4.2.3. in the above.

<sup>203</sup> In Is 22:3 too, this parallel of “rulers” and “the mighty” appears. In this verse, once again, it is difficult to explain how “the mighty” came in LXX.

### 4.3.3. Expectations of a new temple and priests

While there are some negative references to priests and temple in LXX-Is as we saw above, it is also clear that LXX-Is does not assert the abolition of priesthood or temple. LXX-Is even seems to emphasize the importance of sacrifice and cult positively, as is shown in some passages.

#### 4.3.3.1. Is 66:3

MT: ... שׁוֹחֵט הַשּׁוֹר מִכֶּה-אִישׁ זֹבֵחַ הַשֶּׁה עֵרַף כְּלָב ...

“Whoever slaughters an ox is like one who kills a human being; whoever sacrifices a lamb, like one who breaks a dog's neck ...” (NRSV).

LXX: ὁ δὲ ἄνομος ὁ θύων μοι μόσχον ὡς ὁ ἀποκτένων κύνα ...

“But the lawless one who sacrifices a calf to me is like one who kills a dog ...”.

This verse in MT is famous for its strong critique of sacrifice.<sup>204</sup> Remarkably, the Septuagint version of this verse has more at the beginning: ὁ δὲ ἄνομος “but the lawless one”. Scholz’s argument that this came from reading שׁוֹחֵט as חֹטֵא,<sup>205</sup> does not seem compelling at all. Ziegler thinks it might be a simple addition to show more clearly how illegal the actions in v.3 are.<sup>206</sup> This does not seem compelling, either. In many cases “the lawless” in LXX-Is denotes a certain group of people who forsake the Lord and defile Jerusalem by their evil deeds.<sup>207</sup> “The lawless” is often used with “the ungodly” (13:11; 33:14; 55:7) in LXX-Is, which is a counterpart of “the godly”, an important phrase to denote the ideal group of people in LXX-Is. In the present verse, therefore, it seems that we have to imagine the translator drawing a line between the sacrifice of the lawless and that of the godly. The translator makes the strong attitude of MT true of only “the lawless”, leaving any essential challenge to sacrifice untouched.

33:14 seems to have in common with this understanding: while MT says “The

---

<sup>204</sup> Claus Westermann says, quoting Mulenburg, “Such a condemnation of legitimate sacrifice goes far beyond any other critical statements about it in the whole Old Testament”. *Isaiah 40-66* (SCM Press, 1969), 413.

<sup>205</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 80.

<sup>206</sup> Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 80; also Ottley, 2:384: “it is perhaps more probably inserted to ease the abrupt transition of the Heb[rew]”.

<sup>207</sup> 1:4,25,28,31; 3:11; 9:16; 13:11; 29:20; 33:14; 57:13, etc.

sinners (חַטָּאִים) in Zion are afraid (פָּחַדוּ)”, LXX has “The lawless ones (οἱ ἄνομοι) in Zion have departed (ἀπέστησαν)”.<sup>208</sup> The Septuagintal verse speaks of a certain separation in Zion. A certain group of people, called “the lawless ones” who ruined sacrifice, were separated from Zion. Now Zion has been cleansed, and sacrifice will be effective. Once again, this notion of separation and cleansing is found in 1:21-26, which was dealt with in chapter 2. And LXX-Is tells of the separation by God in 29:22.<sup>209</sup> Therefore, there are peoples who were separated from Zion because of their lawlessness, while there are peoples whom God separated from Abraham. After this cleansing, Zion will be changed. The next verses deal with this point.

#### 4.3.3.2. “Holy”: Is 30:19; 44:28; 33:5

30:19 shows a significant difference between two versions:

MT: ... כִּי־עַם בְּצִיּוֹן יֵשֶׁב בִּירוּשָׁלַם בְּכֹ לֹא־תִבְכֶּה ...

“For the people in Zion, the dweller in Jerusalem, you shall never weep ...”

LXX: διότι λαὸς ἅγιος ἐν Σιων οἰκήσει καὶ Ἱερουσαλημ κλαυθμῶ ἔκλαυσεν ...

“For a holy people will live in Zion, and Jerusalem wept bitterly ...”

The change arises from omitting אֶל in LXX, which results in the separated fates of Zion and Jerusalem. Jerusalem is used to indicate the historical city in Palestine<sup>210</sup> so judgment was announced against it, in chapters 1-39.<sup>211</sup> However, “Zion” is used to indicate the symbolic and ideal state of Jerusalem, so no condemnation is made of Zion even in chapters 1-39.<sup>212</sup> There are some cases in which Zion and Jerusalem appear together. In these cases, they are mainly used to show the future restoration and

---

<sup>208</sup> Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 115, 122, explains, in terms of “finessing”, that the Greek equivalent suits the Hebrew verb well in the sense, “stand aloof, recoil from fear, horror, etc” from *LSJ*. He suggests this with the rendering ἐντραπήτωσαν of פָּחַדוּ in 44:11 as examples to show semantic sophistication of the translator. Indeed ἐντρέπω has the sense ‘feel reverence’, and is used in Ex 10:3. But throughout LXX-Is (10 times), as well as in LXX-Pentateuch (21 times), ἀφίστημι depicts always a certain separation, distance or departure.

<sup>209</sup> See 3.2.

<sup>210</sup> 1:1; 2:1; 7:1; 8:14; 22:21; 28:14, etc.

<sup>211</sup> 3:1,8; 5:3; 10:10,11; 22:10; 28:14; 30:19 (only in LXX), etc.

<sup>212</sup> 1:26; 10:24; 12:6; 30:19; 31:9; 32:2; 34:8; 35:10, etc.

glorious state (of the remnants).<sup>213</sup> There are some contradictory mentions of Jerusalem, as in 32:13f and 33:20 in LXX. In both of them, πόλις πλουσία appears,<sup>214</sup> and shows that both are dealing with the same city and refer to Jerusalem. But the former announces that the city will be deserted, while the latter affirms that Jerusalem will not be shaken at all. The latter should be interpreted as a new, ideal Jerusalem in future, as we find in the usage of “Zion”. Therefore, “Jerusalem” may mean the historical city which was ruined by God’s judgment, or a future ideal Zion.

In the present 30:19, the omission of אֲל could be a mistake of the translator’s, or it could arise from an intentional change. The fact that the Septuagint has more – “holy” - to modify “Zion” gives credence to the possibility of this intentional change. As it stands, this Septuagintal verse does make sense, when we consider the different usages of Zion and Jerusalem. And according to this, the people in Zion are “holy”.

The addition of “holy” is seen in 44:28, too. MT goes “... who says to Jerusalem, ‘it shall be built’, and to the temple, ‘you shall be founded’”. In LXX, it goes as “... who says to Jerusalem, it shall be built<sup>215</sup> and I will found my holy house”. Comparing to MT, we should point out that the Septuagint delivers a stronger interest on the part of God towards the temple than MT, by using a first person sentence and “my”. Interestingly, the addition of “holy” is also seen in 33:5: ἅγιος ὁ θεὸς ὁ κατοικῶν ἐν ὑψηλοῖς ἐνεπλήσθη Σιων κρίσεως καὶ δικαιοσύνης for MT’s נִשְׁבַּח יְהוָה כִּי שָׁכַן מְרוֹם מִלֵּא צִיּוֹן מִשְׁפַּט וְצֶדֶק לֵאמֹר. In this, God who dwells on high is holy (also in 57:15).<sup>216</sup>

<sup>213</sup> 2:3; 4:3,4; 10:12; 24:23; 33:20; 37:32, etc.

<sup>214</sup> In 32:13, קְרִיַת עֲלִיזָה (‘jubilant city’) is rendered as πόλις πλουσία and in 33:20, נוֹה שְׁאֲנִי (a quiet or secure abode) is translated into πόλις πλουσία.

<sup>215</sup> Cf. 25:2 in LXX: τῶν ἀσεβῶν πόλις εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα οὐ μὴ οἰκοδομηθῆ “The city of the ungodly shall not be built forever”. In this verse and 44:28, Jerusalem lies contrasted with “the city of the ungodly”.

<sup>216</sup> Olley, *‘Righteousness’*, 79-80, demonstrates, by analyzing the context, that “uprightness” of Zion will be filled after God’s defeating enemies of Zion, which implies that the new situation will come after delivering up the enemies of Zion; On a liturgical allusion of 33:5 and 57:15, Seeligmann, 267-268.

After all, these three verses show that “holy God” will build his “holy house”- a temple for the “holy people” in Zion. To those who had already experienced the desecration of the Second Temple, these verses would mean that another ideal “holy” temple would be built.

#### 4.3.4. Rebuilding the temple

As we saw above, Is 30:19 shows that the translator stands at the meeting point of a hopeful future and a disastrous past. This is also seen in some other passages. The next verse is 35:10:

וּפְדוּנוּ יְהוָה יִשְׁבֹּן	καὶ συνηγμένοι διὰ κύριον ἀποστραφήσονται
וּבְאוּ צִיּוֹן בְּרִנָּה	καὶ ἤξουσιν εἰς Σιών μετ’ εὐφροσύνης
וּשְׂמֵחַת עוֹלָם עַל־רֵאשִׁים	καὶ εὐφροσύνη αἰώνιος ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς αὐτῶν ἐπὶ γὰρ κεφαλῆς
אֲוֹתוֹן	αὐτῶν
וְנָסוּ יְגוֹן וְאַנְחָה:	ἀίνεσις καὶ ἀγαλλίαμα καὶ εὐφροσύνη καταλήμψεται αὐτούς
	ἀπέδρα ὀδύνη καὶ λύπη καὶ στεναγμός

While MT mentions two kinds of joy to take and two kinds of sorrow to flee away, LXX enumerates three kinds for each.<sup>217</sup> In LXX, joy to take is expressed in the future tense, while sorrow to flee away is in the aorist. While MT speaks of something to come, LXX stands in the middle of two events: sorrow has passed and joy will come. On the whole, the Septuagintal rendering gives much more emphasis to this verse than the Hebrew version.

In 63:18, while MT says “Your holy people possessed (ירשו) for a little while, (but) our adversaries have trampled down your sanctuary”, LXX is closely connected with the preceding verse<sup>218</sup>: “(... Return for the sake of your servants, for the sake of the tribes of

<sup>217</sup> Ottley, 2:280; Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 70-71, suggests there lies an effort to enrich the given Hebrew text by the translator for the lengthened phrase.

<sup>218</sup> This connection is evident when we see that the translator use the words having the same root (κληρονομία, κληρονομέω) for different Hebrew words (ירש, נהלה).

your inheritance) so that we may inherit (κληρονομήσωμεν) your holy mountain in a little, while our adversaries trampled your sanctuary”. The change of person and the tense of verbs effect a contemporization of the text.<sup>219</sup> LXX shows what happened in the past<sup>220</sup> and at the moment, and further it shows what the hope will be: inheriting the holy mountain.<sup>221</sup> This verse as well as 35:10, shows the standpoint of the translator: between the defiled sanctuary and the new future to come. In addition, 65:9 shows to whom this “we” refers: “We” who will inherit the holy mountain are the “seed” whom God will lead out of Jacob and Judah (ἐξάξω τὸ ἐξ Ιακωβ σπέρμα καὶ τὸ ἐξ Ιουδα καὶ κληρονομήσει τὸ ὄρος τὸ ἅγιόν μου). Significantly, the verb ἐξάγω is used typically to express the Exodus event. God will bring the Israelites, his people, “out of Judah”. Now we see “Ex-Judah” instead of “Exodus” from Egypt,<sup>222</sup> in which we see the motif of separation.<sup>223</sup>

With relation to the above discussion of a new undefiled temple, it is worthwhile considering 36:7. The verse is about Sennacherib’s speech against Jerusalem and Hezekiah: there is a large lacuna in LXX, while 1QIs<sup>a</sup> has the reading of MT.

<p>וְכִי־תֹאמַר אֵלַי אֱלֹהֵינוּ בְטַחְנוּ  הַלֹּא־הוּא אֲשֶׁר הִסִּיר הַזְּקֵנִהוּ  אֶת־בְּמֹתָיו וְאֶת־מִזְבְּחֹתָיו  וַיֹּאמֶר לַיהוָה וְלִירוּשָׁלַם  לִפְנֵי הַמִּזְבֵּחַ הַזֶּה תִּשְׁתַּחֲוּ:</p>	<p>εἰ δὲ λέγετε ἐπὶ κύριον τὸν θεὸν ἡμῶν  πεποιθήαμεν</p>
--	---

A parallel verse 2Ki 18:22 in LXX goes:

καὶ ὅτι εἶπας πρὸς με ἐπὶ κύριον θεὸν πεποιθήαμεν οὐχὶ αὐτὸς οὗτος οὐ ἄπέστησεν  
Εἰς κείνας τὰ ὑψηλὰ αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰ θυσιαστήρια αὐτοῦ καὶ εἶπεν τῷ Ιουδα καὶ τῇ

<sup>219</sup> Seeligmann, 285.

<sup>220</sup> In this respect, van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 57-58, suggests that 22:18 with 63:18b seems to indicate the desecration in 167 BCE.

<sup>221</sup> Baer, *When We*, 76-77.

<sup>222</sup> The same expression “Ex-Judah” is also seen in 48:1 in LXX-Is. They are “maintaining the name of holy city” (48:2 in LXX-Is). See 2.1.4.

<sup>223</sup> 29:22 in LXX-Is.

Ιερουσαλημ ἐνώπιον τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου τούτου προσκυνήσετε ἐν Ιερουσαλημ.<sup>224</sup>

There seems to be only two ways of explaining this Isaianic verse in LXX<sup>225</sup>: an intentional omission or a different Vorlage.<sup>226</sup> This short text of LXX-Is is significant in that the omitted part speaks about the removal of local shrines and the centralization of worship into Jerusalem by Hezekiah. Even if the verse in LXX-Is arises from a different Vorlage, it is still of significance in that there existed this kind of Hebrew version without a mention of Hezekiah's reformation. Presumably, the most natural reason for this short text would be a certain discomfort concerning the centralization, because they already had "an altar" in Egypt.<sup>227</sup> The Jews in Egypt had a temple, seemingly contrary to the centralization policy of Hezekiah, and we might say that they did not want Hezekiah to be recorded as a king who abolished temples and shrines other than the Jerusalem Temple.

It is noticeable that the translators of the Pentateuch distinguished between a lawful altar to YHWH and a pagan altar. Thus they render the former as θυσιαστήριον and the latter as βωμός.<sup>228</sup> This is confirmed in LXX-Is as well.<sup>229</sup> Is 19:19 in LXX-Is announces that there shall be an altar, i.e. θυσιαστήριον, in Egypt. But according to the context, "altars" in 36:7 should indicate 'altars for gods' thus βωμοί. Presumably, the translator of LXX-Is was confused as to how to render the Hebrew מִזְבְּחֵי.

---

<sup>224</sup> MT version of the verse is nearly the same as the Isaianic verse except a couple of differences: תִּמְנִיחֶנּוּ instead of תִּמְנִיחֶנּוּ and בִּירֵשֶׁלַיִם in the end. Interestingly, the first half of 2Ki 18:22 in LXX seems to be a rendering of the first half of Is 36:7 in Hebrew.

<sup>225</sup> Only later versions and recensions have the same wording with MT, for example, V, oII, L, Bo, Fa, etc.

<sup>226</sup> Cf. Baer, *When We*, 194; For arguments concerning the original reading, see van der Kooij, "Isaiah 2:22 and 36:7", 382-383.

<sup>227</sup> Van der Kooij also suggests this, in *Textzeugen*, 55; "Isa 2:22 and 36:7", 384.

<sup>228</sup> See 2.3.2.4.

<sup>229</sup> θυσιαστήριον: 6:6; 19:9; 56:7; 60:7; βωμός: 17:8; 27:9.

#### 4.3.5. Favourable attitude towards foreign rulers

The theme concerning the foundation of a new, undefiled temple is seen throughout LXX-Is. Rooke shows that temple building was usually a royal responsibility in the Ancient Near Eastern context, by using Laato's work,<sup>230</sup> which demonstrates that temple building is always shown as a project undertaken by a king, and the building itself was thought to guarantee the royal dynasty's establishment and well-being.<sup>231</sup> Because temple building is mainly the responsibility of kings, and Judaea and Egypt are ruled by foreign kings in the eyes of the Jews, it leads us to the problem of the Jewish attitude towards foreign rulers. In fact, a favorable attitude towards rulers is seen in most Jewish literature of the period.<sup>232</sup> It has been noted that the Septuagint translators were said to have made many "intentional" changes for the sake of the Ptolemies.<sup>233</sup> E.J. Bickerman points out examples to show this tendency, and one of them concerns the rendering of מֶלֶךְ.<sup>234</sup> This might be applied to LXX-Is, too. Distressed and hungry, one will eventually curse his king and his God, according to Is 8:21 in MT, which is rendered as follows:

... καὶ κακῶς ἐρεῖτε τὸν ἄρχοντα καὶ τὰ παταχρα<sup>235</sup>... for MT וּבְאַלְהֵי וּבְמַלְכּוֹ וּבְאֱלֹהֵי יְהוָה

When we consider that אֱלֹהֵי referring to YHWH in MT is rendered as τὰ παταχρα indicating foreign idols, it is evident that the ἄρχων was regarded as referring to a king

---

<sup>230</sup> Rooke, 142.

<sup>231</sup> Antti Laato, "Zachariah 4,6b-10a and the Akkadian Royal Building Inscriptions", *ZAW* 106 (1994), 53-69.

<sup>232</sup> For this, see Rajak, *Jewish Perspectives*.

<sup>233</sup> E. J. Bickerman, "The Septuagint as a Translation", *PAAJR* 28 (1959), 30; idem, *Jews*, 108. This tendency was observed by Rabbis, and by Jerome, too. A comprehensive study on this subject, G. Veltri, *Eine Tora für den König Talmi. Untersuchungen zum Übersetzungsverständnis in der jüdisch-hellenistischen und rabbinischen Literatur* (TSAJ 41; Tübingen, 1994), and critique to the book by E. Tov, "Eine Tora für den König Talmi", in E. Tov, *The Greek and Hebrew Bible. Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (VTSup 72; Leiden/Boston/Köln: Brill, 1999), 75-82. See S. Pearce, "Translating for Ptolemy: Patriotism and Politics in the Greek Pentateuch?" in *Jewish Perspective*, 168.

<sup>234</sup> Bickerman, *Jews*, 108. Pearce examines Bickerman's evidence, and suggests that his idea is one of the possible explanations of the verses involved, resting on "uncertain" foundations. See "Translating", 165-184.

<sup>235</sup> This Greek seems to a transliteration for an Aramaic פִּתְכָרָא ('idol'; cf. Is 37:38), which is seen in Targum. Seeligmann, 36, 137, 194; Troxel, "Name", 340.

by the translator.<sup>236</sup> Presumably, the rendering ὁ ἄρχων, compared with the reading βασιλεύς of α', σ', θ', arises from the purpose of avoiding the impression that a Ptolemaic king is alluded here. This would demonstrate the prudent attitude of the Jews in Egypt towards Ptolemaic kings,<sup>237</sup> and it might be a response to charges that “the Jews are disobedient to the king and disturb the public peace”.<sup>238</sup>

And more positive attitude can be seen from the following two verses, even though they seem implicit:

32:1 MT הָן לְצַדִּיק יִמְלֹךְ-מֶלֶךְ וְלִשְׂרָיִם לְמִשְׁפָּט יִשְׁרוּ  
LXX ἰδοὺ γὰρ βασιλεὺς δίκαιος βασιλεύσει καὶ ἄρχοντες μετὰ κρίσεως ἄρξουσιν

There have been many suggestions about the identity of the “king” here.<sup>239</sup>

Interestingly, LXX adopts the expression “just king”, which emphasizes the character of the king as just, while MT expresses the function or purpose of his rule,<sup>240</sup> reflected in εἰς δικαιοσύνην in α', σ' and θ', and contrary to “in righteousness” in modern translations of the Bible.<sup>241</sup> This theme of the “just king” appears again in 45:13:

45:13 MT ... אֲנֹכִי הָעִירְתִּיהוּ בְצַדִּיק וְכָל-דְּרָכָיו אִישׁר הוּא יִבְנֶנּה עִירֵי וְנִלְוֹתֵי יִשְׁלַח  
LXX ἐγὼ ἤγειρα αὐτὸν μετὰ δικαιοσύνης βασιλέα καὶ πᾶσαι αἱ ὁδοὶ αὐτοῦ εὐθείαι οὐ  
τος οἰκοδομήσει τὴν πόλιν μου καὶ τὴν αἰχμαλωσίαν τοῦ λαοῦ μου ἐπιστρέψει ...

<sup>236</sup> Troxel, “Name”, 340.

<sup>237</sup> Similar understanding seems to stand behind 10:8 in LXX, where the translator renders the arrogant saying of the Assyrian king (כִּי יֵאמֹר הֲלֹא שְׂרִי יִהְיֶה מְלָכִים) into praises of peoples to the king with calling him ἄρχων (καὶ ἐὰν εἴπωσιν αὐτῷ σὺ μόνος εἶ ἄρχων), seemingly out of a decision not to address the Assyrian king as “you alone are a king”. Subsequent calling the king of Assyria as ἄρχων in 10:12 can be explained in the same logic. Except three occurrences (8:21; 10:8,12), βασιλεύς and its derivatives are always used as equivalents of מֶלֶךְ in LXX-Is. In addition, Kovelman, 131, suggests that the rendering of מֶלֶךְ into ἄρχων in Deut 17:18 was done by the same motive.

<sup>238</sup> E. Gabba, “The growth of anti-Judaism or the Greek attitude towards Jews”, in W.D. Davies, L. Finkelstein (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Judaism* (vol. 2: The Hellenistic Age; Cambridge University Press, 1989), 640f. This is also seen in an apologetic concern of a Jewish rabbi Manasseh ben Israel in the seventeenth century arguing that “neither kingdom nor kings ... are cursed here [Jewish daily prayer] ... without any malice to the present government. ... After this manner, to avoid scandal, did the 72 interpreters, who coming in Leviticus to unclean beasts, in the place of Arnebeth, which signifies the hare, they put δασύποδα, that is rough foot; leaving the name and keeping the sense (*Vindiciae Judaeorum*, 3.2-3.3; my italics)”. Quoted in Pearce, “Translating”, 179. Interestingly, פִּרְעֹה in 19:11 is rendered as βασιλεύς twice. See 3.4.2.11.

<sup>239</sup> A useful survey for this topic is seen in P.D. Wegner, *An Examination of Kingship and Messianic Expectation in Isaiah 1-35* (Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 1992).

<sup>240</sup> Olley, ‘Righteousness’, 103; Troxel, “Isaiah 7,14-16”, 20.

<sup>241</sup> J.W. Olley, “Notes on Isaiah xxxii 1, xlv 19,23 and lxiii 1”, *VT* 33 (1983), 447-449.

In comparison with MT, LXX has more: “king (βασιλέα),”<sup>242</sup> which addition relates this verse to 32:1. In LXX-Is, “king” appears always specified.<sup>243</sup> The only two cases of an unspecified singular form of “king” are 32:1 and 45:13, in which the word “king” pairs with “just (or righteous)”. That is, these two verses are peculiar in grammatical form as well as theme. So, it is quite plausible to see that “king” in both verses refers to the same person. In 45:13 of MT, the king should indicate Cyrus, and as a matter of fact, Cyrus is called “Messiah” (45:1). The significance to be drawn from the title ascribed to a foreign king is that “the agent of the anticipated restoration will not be an Israelite or Davidic king”.<sup>244</sup> Therefore, presumably, we may conclude that these two verses in LXX-Is give the readers the impression that the same foreign individual is concerned here: the “just king” will appear through God’s agency and he will judge and rule with justice, and build God’s city.

What would the Jews in Egypt think of this Persian king “Cyrus”? Taking into consideration that Cyrus allowed them to rebuild the Jerusalem Temple - God's abode - ,<sup>245</sup> we can find an analogy in Philometor's role in building the Temple of Onias in Egypt.<sup>246</sup>

Josephus reports that Onias asked Philometor, a Ptolemaic king, to allow him to build a Jewish temple on Egyptian soil. It is likely that Onias would have had in mind

---

<sup>242</sup> Cf. Seeligmann, 146.

<sup>243</sup> Βασιλεύς is used to indicate kings of Judah (6:1; 14:28; chapter 36) and of northern kingdom (7:1,16; 8:6), kings of Assyria (7:17,20; 8:4; 20:1,4,6; 36:2,4,8, etc.), of Babylon (13:4,19; 14:4,16), of Egypt (19:11; 36:6), of Tyre (23:15; 34:12) and kings of nations (14:9,18,32; 23:11; 24:21; 41:2; 45:1; 49:17,23; 51:4; 52:15; 60:3,10,11,12,16; 62:2). In chapters 40-66, it indicates God Himself (6:5; 33:17,22; 41:21; 44:6). According to Williamson, “in those parts of the book that are widely agreed to come from the exilic period or later, God’s kingship comes strongly to the fore, while conversely human kingship disappears completely from view”. See H.G.M. Williamson, “The Messianic Texts in Isaiah 1-39”, in J. Day (ed.), *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East* (JSOTSS 270; Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 238f. In cases where it is used for Israel, it indicates a specified figure (for example, 6:1 Uzziah; 14:28 Achaz, etc.), usually in singular form.

<sup>244</sup> Williamson, “Messianic Texts”, 239.

<sup>245</sup> Interestingly, Cyrus is called “righteousness” in 42:1.

<sup>246</sup> As the future ideal king will be called “just king” in LXX-Is, Philadelphus, a Ptolemaic king was called “just king” by the Jews in the *Letter of Aristeas*, 46.



towards Philometor for permission to build a Jewish temple on Egyptian soil:

δέομαι συγχωρησαί μοι τὸ ἀδέσποτον ἀνακαθάραντι ἱερὸν καὶ συμπεπτωκὸς οἰκοδομησαί ναὸν τῷ μεγίστῳ θεῷ καθ' ὁμοίωσιν τοῦ ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις αὐτοῖς μέτροις ὑπὲρ σοῦ καὶ τῆς σῆς γυναικὸς καὶ τῶν τέκνων... (my italics).<sup>251</sup>

The above quotation includes all basic elements of synagogal dedication: ὑπὲρ, mentioning the royal family<sup>252</sup> and God to whom the building is dedicated. It means that two manifestations – temple and synagogue - of Jewish religion during the Hellenistic period in Egypt were built for sacrifice and prayer in honour of Ptolemaic kings, and aspects of Jewish religious life were closely connected with those kings. We will examine this factor through Hellenistic Jewish literature later.

Our observation so far leads us to suggest that the Temple of Onias aimed to be another temple in place of the Jerusalem Temple, desecrated by Antiochus. It seems that we can confirm that Cyrus, who allowed the Jews to build the temple, was a precedent, for Philometor, for the contemporary Jews in Egypt who wanted to build another temple.

#### 4.4. Summary

To conclude, the Jews in Egypt had to defend themselves on two fronts: the Hellenic side, and Palestine. While the former is connected to the anti-Judaic feeling, the latter is associated with the Hebrew biblical prohibitions concerning emigration to Egypt. The erection of a temple where they lived, outside Jerusalem, along with other important theological claims seen in LXX-Is, should be considered one of the most audacious efforts to make their residence hold significance beyond a transitory sojourn. In addition, maintaining a good relationship with the ruling dynasty also seems to

---

<sup>251</sup> *Ant.* 13:67.

<sup>252</sup> To mention the royal family is an expression of respect or deference. The letter of Eleazar to Philadelphus also commences with similar expressions about the royal family. See *Letter of Aristeas*, 41.

defend the possible anti-Jewish attacks.

The temple of Onias was not just a local shrine, or at least, was not intended to be so at its foundation. The temple was built in the nome of Heliopolis, in accordance with the prophecy of Isaiah. The person who built it was one of the last Zadokite priests, and the temple was erected with conscious resemblance to the Jerusalem temple after the latter had been desecrated. In Palestine, there was no Zadokite priesthood any more after Jason, but the Zadokite tradition continued to exist in the Jewish temple in Egypt. This explanation does not mean that Onias intended to establish a rival sanctuary, as a basis for defiance or schism. Taking account of the subsequent positive attitude on the part of dwellers in the land of Onias towards Jerusalem, it does not seem plausible that the temple was intended to deny the temple of Jerusalem in the long term, even though the Temple of Onias, if it was built before 164 BCE, functioned as the only proper temple during the turbulent period after the desecration of the Jerusalem Temple.

The perspective of Josephus and Philo on the Temple of Jerusalem is in line with the statements in Deuteronomy (12:5-7, 11-14, 17-18); there should be only one Temple in Jerusalem. But this assertion should not detract from the significance of the temple of Onias. In the midst of the One Temple ideology, Onias and his people built a new temple for the Jews in Egypt. His work, according to Josephus, was carried out on the basis of his interpretation of the prophecy of Isaiah. In this regard the temple can be seen as a response of the Jewish Diaspora to their life in Egypt. This pursuit of a new Jerusalem<sup>253</sup> based on their interpretation of the given biblical text, an interpretation which is reflected in LXX-Is, should be carefully evaluated rather than reduced to the building of a purely local shrine. But we also have to keep in mind that “a new

---

<sup>253</sup> Taylor also, 310, evaluates the temple as “an attempt to ensure that God was properly worshipped in accordance with the cultic prescriptions of Torah in a kind of new Jerusalem, now situated in Egypt”.

Jerusalem” does not exclude the temple of Jerusalem. In this respect, this temple in Egypt seems to differ from the Qumran movement.

As can be seen in the preceding discussions, Tcherikover did not consider LXX-Is as evidence for the importance of the Leontopolis Temple.

The point that LXX-Is is connected with the temple of Onias is further confirmed by our examination of the passages concerning priests and temple in LXX-Is. LXX-Is consistently condemns the ruling class, presumably the priests in Jerusalem, but reveals the expectation of a new temple in Zion, which should be interpreted symbolically. LXX-Is reflects the reality that the Jerusalem temple was trampled on and defiled, and the hope that those who dwell outside Judah will inherit the holy temple. And Cyrus, here, seems to function as a role-model for Philometor. As Cyrus permitted the returned remnant to build the Second Temple in Jerusalem, a new “just king” will allow those in Zion to build a new temple. This favourable attitude towards foreign kings is prominent in LXX-Is by way of the case of Cyrus, and is also a feature of Hellenistic Jewish literature which we will deal with in the following chapter.

The messages and theology of LXX-Is are not isolated. To establish their identity as Jews living in Egypt, outside Palestine, would have been one of the most compelling tasks of the Jewish communities in Egypt. This topic will be examined next, through other Hellenistic Jewish literature.

## Chapter 5 Hellenistic Jewish Literature

### 5.1. Introduction: Metropolis and identity

The Temple of Onias was built in Leontopolis, in the nome of Heliopolis. Presumably the exact location of the temple was Leontopolis, but it was known to be located in Heliopolis, a wider administrative district.

During the Hellenistic period, as many Diaspora Jews could not live in Judea or Jerusalem any more, the notion of “God dwelling<sup>1</sup> in the Temple in Jerusalem” was too local for them. As Schwartz points out,<sup>2</sup> the idea of the heavenly habitation of God or spiritual understandings of the Temple or the city of God, such as Philo’s,<sup>3</sup> emerged in this period. Schwartz quotes Kasher to show that Jerusalem was the “metropolis” of the Jews, but a look at Philo’s thought leads us in the other direction: for the Jews in Egypt, the place where they immigrated and lived is another “fatherland”, substituting for the original “metropolis” Jerusalem.

Jerusalem still remained “metropolis (μητρόπολις)” to the Jews in Egypt but they had another “fatherland (πατρίς)”. Kasher explains<sup>4</sup> Philo’s view that “Jews settled in the cities of the Diaspora as ‘immigrants’, and their settlements were ‘colonists (ἀποικία)’<sup>5</sup> of the metropolis (μητρόπολις) of Jerusalem”. In doing so, he regards

---

<sup>1</sup> Κατοικέω. According to D.R. Schwartz, *Studies in the Jewish Background of Christianity* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1992), 120, this verb indicates an intimate and permanent relation to a place of residence.

<sup>2</sup> D.R. Schwartz, “Temple or City: What did Hellenistic Jews See in Jerusalem?”, in M. Poorthuis and C. Safrai (eds.), *The Centrality of Jerusalem: Historical Perspectives* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1996), 117-120.

<sup>3</sup> *De somniis* 2.246-254: especially, “Now the city of God is called in the Hebrew Jerusalem and its name when translated is ‘vision of peace’. Therefore do not seek for the city of the Existent among the regions of the earth, since it is not wrought of wood or stone, but in a soul, in which there is no warring whose sight is keen, which has set before it as its aim to live in contemplation and peace” (250, translated by F.H. Colson in *LCL*).

<sup>4</sup> Kasher, 236.

<sup>5</sup> Kasher introduces a good definition of ἀποικία articulated in *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, I, 2852: “Die griechische Colonie ... ist ein Niederlassung von Griechen in fremden Lande, die ein selbständiges Staatwesen, eine Politie bildet, *unabhängig von der Mutterstadt* und eine neues Bürgerrecht begründet” (my italics). See Kasher, 237, n.18. ἀποικία is used to render גּוֹלָה in the Septuagint (2Ki 24:15; Ezr 6:19; Je 29:1). In chapter 29, Jeremiah sends a letter to the “elders of ἀποικία” to encourage them to settle there in Babylon. The term fits the context well in that settling is emphasized. See J.M. Modrzejewski, “How to be a Greek and Yet a Jew in Hellenistic Alexandria” in S.J.D. Cohen and E.S.

“fatherland” as “second homeland”, as a homeland “only in the political sense”.<sup>6</sup> For Philo, however, “colonists” differed from sojourners (from the verb παροικέω), who were mere visitors and who would return to their own region shortly, and from those who were expelled from their land because of their sin.<sup>7</sup> Colonists are voluntary immigrants who are trying to find a place to live in. Accordingly,

“When men found a colony, the land which receives them becomes their native land (πατρίς) instead of the mother-city (ἀντὶ τῆς μητροπόλεως), but to a traveller abroad the land which sent him forth is still the mother to whom also he yearns to return”.<sup>8</sup>

Many places outside Jerusalem, including Egypt, are the “fatherland (πατρίς)” for the Diaspora Jews:

“For so populous are the Jews that no one country can hold them, and therefore they settle in Europe and Asia both in the islands and on the mainland, and while they hold the Holy City where stands the sacred Temple of the most high God to be their *mother city*, yet those which are theirs by inheritance from their fathers, grandfathers, and ancestors even farther back, are in each case accounted by them to be their *fatherland* in which they *were born and reared ...*”<sup>9</sup> (my italics)

They do not live in Egypt as sojourners but inhabitants (παροικέω vis-à-vis κατοικέω), which is also reflected in the mention of their residence in Egypt before the Exodus in LXX-Ex 12:40: ἡ δὲ κατοίκησις τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ ἦν κατώκησαν ἐν γῆ Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ ἐν γῆ Χανααν.... The above consideration is likely to demonstrate that “fatherland” is not inferior or second to “mother city”, but those two terms are equally compatible. Recently, Sarah Pearce effectively demonstrates that Philo did not intend to emphasize ‘the centrality of Jerusalem’ or Jerusalem as ‘true homeland’ in his mention of “mother-city”,<sup>10</sup> rather “the μητρόπολις is mentioned in order to introduce the colonies on which Philo focuses attention” according to the context of his two works (*In Flaccum, Legatio*

---

Frerichs (eds.), *Diasporas in Antiquity* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993), 68.

<sup>6</sup> Kasher, 238.

<sup>7</sup> *Conf. Ling.* 76f.

<sup>8</sup> *Conf. Ling.* 78.

<sup>9</sup> *In Flaccum*, 46.

<sup>10</sup> S. Pearce, “Jerusalem as ‘Mother-City’ in the Writings of Philo of Alexandria”, in J.M.G. Barclay (ed.), *Negotiating Diaspora: Jewish Strategies in the Roman Empire* (London/New York: T&T Clark International, 2004), 9-36.

*ad Gaium*).<sup>11</sup> For Philo, she argues, “Alexandria is always the centre; there is never any thought of looking elsewhere for refuge”.<sup>12</sup> Her conclusion, thus, is that “there is no tension between the notion of Jerusalem as mother-city and Alexandria as home”.<sup>13</sup>

This view of Egypt as their “fatherland where they were reared (ἐτράφησαν)” is not only found in Philo’s works. A tombstone inscription found in Tell-el Yehoudieh, purportedly the ancient Leontopolis, shows their understanding of their town.<sup>14</sup> For the question of country (πατρίς) and birth, the inscription says, “Arsinoe, daughter of Aline and Theodosios. The famous land of Onias reared me”.<sup>15</sup> For her, “the land of Onias”, undoubtedly the region inhabited by Jews around Heliopolis, was the “fatherland”. The Greek for “rear” is τροφός, which usually means a nurse.<sup>16</sup> In other words, “the Land of Onias” was to her a “fatherland” like a “mother”, which is quite remarkable compared to other literature. As already noted, the “city of righteousness” in Egypt is called “metropolis” (Is 1:26 and 19:18 in LXX). The above suggests that Jews in Egypt during the Hellenistic period did not think of themselves as “the exile (גלות)”. Following the conclusions in the preceding chapters regarding their identity in Egypt, we might say that their residence in Egypt was not considered temporary or transient, and it was the place where they lived that was called “fatherland” or even “mothercity”, rather than Jerusalem in Palestine. It is additionally worthy of note that Philo later described the situation of the Jews in Alexandria, caused by Flaccus’ edict and subsequent actions, as “hearthless and homeless, outcasts and exiles from their own

---

<sup>11</sup> Pearce, “Jerusalem”, 32.

<sup>12</sup> Pearce, “Jerusalem”, 23. Philo’s strong sense of attachment to his home city, Alexandria, is dealt with in Pearce’s another article, “Belonging and Not Belonging: Local Perspectives in Philo of Alexandria” in S. Jones and S. Pearce (eds.), *Jewish Local Patriotism and Self-Identification in the Graeco-Roman Period* (JSPSup 31; Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 97-105.

<sup>13</sup> Pearce, “Jerusalem”, 36.

<sup>14</sup> Kasher, 127f.

<sup>15</sup> *CPJud*, 3: 1530.

<sup>16</sup> Gen 35:8; 2Ki 11:2; Is 49:23; and in New Testament, 1Th 2:7.

houses”,<sup>17</sup> and that for Philo and the Jews in his writings, Flaccus’ removal “gives *hope for the restoration of the home* they have lost in the troubles” (my italics).<sup>18</sup> While the italicized expression indicates ‘return to the land of Judah’ in the Bible, for the Jews in Egypt like Philo, the expression means their safe and peaceful settlement on the Egyptian soil.<sup>19</sup>

For Seeligmann, the use of ἀδικέω in LXX-Is reflects “the psychology of Galuth”.<sup>20</sup> According to him, the Jews would have felt that they were oppressed but unjustly, without a cause.

In the translator’s conception of world, the oppressors (ἀσεβείς ποιηροί) have, as their opposite, the victims, who are called not only ἀδικούμενοι but also ἀθυμήσαντες, ὀλιγόψυχοι, διψῶντες and πτωχοί, whilst their city is called ταπεινή. ... a hypersensitive pusillanimity and vulnerable inferiority complex are characteristic of the Galuth psychology of the Hellenistic diaspora.<sup>21</sup>

But this kind of self identity, in which they considered themselves weak or even inferior, would hardly strengthen the existence of any community. Use of such a mentality does not fit the concept of “metropolis” or even “fatherland”. Rather, it seems fair to say that the special emphasis on the Greek verb arose from a certain apologetic concern: that is, to emphasize that their suffering and residence in Egypt did not arise from judgment occasioned by their sins. Therefore, once again, the Jews in Egypt in this period are unlikely to have regarded themselves as “the exile”.<sup>22</sup>

Regarding “Hellenistic Jewish literature”, it is viewed as an apologetic response to the polemics of the Gentiles and, furthermore, it is argued that there was a positive

---

<sup>17</sup> *Legat.* 123.

<sup>18</sup> Pearce, *Land of the Body*, 15.

<sup>19</sup> Even Philo, *Spec. Leg.* 1.68, expresses that pilgrimage to Jerusalem should “bring himself to leave his country and friends and kinsfolk and sojourn in a strange land”, which indicates Jerusalem. On Philo’s view on Jerusalem, see Pearce, *Land of the Body*, 16-17.

<sup>20</sup> Seeligmann, 28off.

<sup>21</sup> Seeligmann, 112.

<sup>22</sup> Also Collins, *Between*, 3.

“missionary” motive for proselytizing.<sup>23</sup> Central to this Jewish identity in Egypt is “remaining Jewish but without rejecting Hellenistic culture”.<sup>24</sup> This can be expressed in a different way: to maintain Jewish life according to their Laws, and to maintain good relations with the Greeks.<sup>25</sup> As was demonstrated earlier, LXX-Is gives the Jews in Egypt reasons why they are living in Egypt. The translation encourages them to trust God and not to rely on Egypt, since they are the remnant, rather than exile. And it provides them with the Temple outside Jerusalem as a new Zion and “mother-city”. LXX-Is demonstrates that the Jews in Egypt are able to live in Egypt offering proper worship to their God, regardless of many warnings not to go down to Egypt. And for the Jewish community resident in Egypt, another essential element is the relationship with the ruling foreign dynasty. We have already dealt with the view of LXX-Is, which depicts the foreign king as a “just king”. Now it is time to deal with Hellenistic Jewish literature and how much it has in common with LXX-Is by focusing on the above discussion – their view of their identity and their attitude towards Ptolemaic rulers.

## 5.2. Heliopolis and Jewish residence

The relationship of Heliopolis with the Jewish Temple is widely attested in other literature. Much literature, both Jewish and non-Jewish, in Egypt during the Hellenistic period attests to a temple of the Jews and Jewish residence in Heliopolis. Presumably, the importance of the Greek city is related to the marriage of Joseph with Aseneth, a daughter of a Heliopolitan priest.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> M. Goodman dismisses the notion of Jewish proselytizing in *Mission and Conversion: Proselytizing in the Religious History of the Roman Empire* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1994). J. Barclay questions this, dealing with the meaning of “apologetics” and the possible readers of “apologetic literature”, in “Apologetics”, 129-148; also see Collins, *Between*, 14-16.

<sup>24</sup> Collins, *Between*, 3; Modrzejewski, *Jews*, 56-65.

<sup>25</sup> See Collins, *Between*, 6-13; Gabba, 614-656.

<sup>26</sup> Gen 41:45,50; 46:20; Jub 40:10; 44:24; T.Jos. 18:3.

According to Pseudo-Eupolemus,<sup>27</sup> who is deemed to belong to the first half of the second century BCE in a Syrian-Palestine setting,<sup>28</sup> Abraham went to Egypt because of famine and he lived in Heliopolis with the Egyptian priests, while *Genesis* of the Hebrew Bible does not give any specific name to the location, and *Genesis Apocryphon* 19:25 locates him in Zoan (Tanis). This means that the connection of the patriarch with Heliopolis was well known even among Palestinian authors. The connection of Heliopolis with ancient figures of the Hebrew Bible is seen elsewhere in Artapanus, frag. 2.3 (Jacob's family and Joseph); frag. 3.8 (Moses)<sup>29</sup>; even in Manetho, an Egyptian historian in the third century BCE (Moses as a Heliopolitan priest).<sup>30</sup>

This tradition goes further when we see Artapanus, an Egyptian Jew around the second century BCE.<sup>31</sup> According to him, Joseph and Jacob's family settled in Heliopolis. Moreover, it is said that these Jews built temples in Atos<sup>32</sup> and in Heliopolis!<sup>33</sup> It is quite certain that this story was influenced by the existence of the Temple of Onias in Heliopolis.<sup>34</sup> And it gives the Temple an origin with Joseph in ancient times. According to Artapanus, the Jewish temple in Egypt is a symbol of the developed and cultured Jews. It is no coincidence that Abraham, reportedly, taught the Egyptian priests in Heliopolis many new things including astrology,<sup>35</sup> and Joseph built

---

<sup>27</sup> Frag. 1, 6-8, in Holladay, 173-5.

<sup>28</sup> Holladay, 157-160; Schürer, 560.

<sup>29</sup> The troops which Moses leads are called "the Heliopolitans", which is reminiscent of the army of Onias in the time of the Ptolemies. Artapanus, frag. 3.8 in Holladay, 211.

<sup>30</sup> According to him quoted in Josephus, *AgAp.* 1.237-8, Moses who was a leader of the so-called Exodus was originally a priest of Heliopolis and his real name was Osarsiph, after the Egyptian god Osiris. When we substitute the prefix Osr, which means Osiris, for another prefix Jah/Jo meaning YHWH, we obtain the name 'Joseph'. In this respect, his mention of Moses seems to arise from confusion with Joseph.

<sup>31</sup> His ethnic identity and date are still debated. But the opinion that he was a Jew has met with broad scholarly consensus. See Holladay, 189.

<sup>32</sup> Scholars try to identify this name with biblical "Pithom". See Holladay, 230.

<sup>33</sup> Frag. 2. 4, in Holladay, 207.

<sup>34</sup> Holladay, 230; E. Koskeniemi, "Greeks, Egyptians and Jews in the Fragments of Artapanus", *JSP* 13 (2002), 27.

<sup>35</sup> Pseudo-Eupolemus, frag. 1.8.

a temple in the same city. Presumably, the comment of Herodotus, a Greek historian of the fifth century BCE, that the priests of Heliopolis “are said to be the most learned of the Egyptians”, was well known.<sup>36</sup>

Another allusion to the Jewish temple in Heliopolis can be seen in Apion's statement:

Moses, ... in Egypt, was a native of Heliopolis, who, being pledged to the customs of his country, *erected prayer-houses* (προσευχὰς ἀνῆγεν), open to the air, in the various precincts of the city, all facing eastwards.<sup>37</sup>

The phrase προσευχὰς ἀνῆγεν could be interpreted as “he offered prayers” as Whiston does. Either interpretation demonstrates that Heliopolis had a profound connection to the Jewish cult. Presumably, this “prayer house” in Heliopolis could also be a reflection of the contemporary temple of Onias.

Interestingly, LXX-Exodus tells that there were three cities, not the two cities in MT, for the Israelites in Egypt to build: Πιθωμ καὶ Ραμεσση καὶ Ων ἣ ἐστὶν Ἡλίου πόλις (Pithom, Rameses, and On, which is Heliopolis)”. The addition “On” appears in LXX-Jer, too. In 50:13 in LXX-Jer (43:13 in MT), “the land of Egypt” is rendered as “On”:

MT: ... מִצְרַיִם בְּאֶרֶץ שֶׁמֶשׁ בֵּית מִצְבָּח  
LXX: καὶ συντρίψει τοὺς στύλους ἡλίου πόλεως τοὺς ἐν Ων ...

It shows that the translator of Jeremiah knew that Beth-Shemesh i.e. Heliopolis was called On. Therefore connecting this with Ex 1:11, we find that the name “On” is not Hebrew but a Hebrew transliteration of the Egyptian name IWNW,<sup>38</sup> which means ‘pillar’. Considering that the Jewish residential place around the Temple was called “the land of Onias”, or more precisely “the land called Onias”,<sup>39</sup> the similarity between the

---

<sup>36</sup> Herodotus, II.3, and 160; cf. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 90.

<sup>37</sup> Josephus, *AgAp.* 2.10.

<sup>38</sup> Transliterated “On” as used in the other places of Septuagint refers to a place in Palestine. See Ho 4:15; 5:8; 10:5,8; 12:5; Am 1:5.

<sup>39</sup> Josephus, *Ant.* 13.287: οἱ ἐκ τῆς Ὀνίου γενόμενοι Ἰουδαῖοι; 14.131: οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι οἱ τὴν Ὀνίου χώραν λεγομένην κατοικοῦντες; *B.J.* 1:190: οἱ τὴν Ὀνίου προσαγορευομένην χώραν κατέχοντες.

two words is notable (IWNW versus ONIOU).<sup>40</sup> There is a prophecy that there will be a pillar in Egypt (Is 19:19). In contrast, 30:17 in Ezekiel reads the Egyptian name as: 𐤀𐤍𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍 (‘wickedness’, ‘idol’), implying an equation with the shrine of Bethel (cf. Ho 10:5,8). This word-play reveals the contemptuous attitude of Palestinian Jews towards Heliopolis and its Temple.

To conclude, there is some Hellenistic Jewish literature demonstrating the connection between the Temple of Onias and the Jews in Heliopolis. According to it, the Jewish temple in Egypt reveals the superiority of the Jewish people, and this is not a new phenomenon but is rooted in ancient tradition. Contrary to Palestinian interpretation, Jewish residence in Heliopolis was a matter for pride to them. This is reflected in a novel, *Joseph and Aseneth*.

### 5.3. *Joseph and Aseneth*

There is still much controversy concerning the date, author and provenance of this wonderful love story.<sup>41</sup> As this kind of story is usually transmitted over a long period, many changes, additions and minuses are possible. Furthermore, there are lots of important text groups for this story.<sup>42</sup> Each manuscript seems to have numerous

---

<sup>40</sup> One might think that this similarity “could have been considered a divine confirmation of the rightness of the location”. See Taylor, 315.

<sup>41</sup> For surveys of the history of research, see R.D. Chesnutt, *From Death to Life: Conversion in Joseph and Aseneth* (JSPSup 16; Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 20-93; E.M.Humphrey, *Joseph and Aseneth* (Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 17-79; Recently, S.R. Johnson, *Historical Fictions and Hellenistic Jewish Identity: Third Maccabees in Its Cultural Context* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004), 108 n. 50; P.D. Ahearne-Kroll, *Joseph and Aseneth and Jewish Identity in Greco-Roman Egypt* (Dissertation; University of Chicago, 2005), 14-87, 143-175.

<sup>42</sup> All versions of the story fall into four text groups: a, b, c and d. On this textual grouping, see C. Burchard, “Joseph and Aseneth”, in J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, vol.2, 178-181. While Philonenko prefers d-group, a shorter version, Burchard prefers b-group, a longer version, which has been the prevailing choice in the present scholarly debate. See M. Philonenko, *Joseph et Aséneth: Introduction, Texte Critique, Traduction et Notes* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1968). The shorter version based on d-group is translated into English by David Cook in H.F.D. Sparks (eds.), *The Apocryphal Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984), 465-503. Recently, Burchard produced a new, updated research on the subject and he still prefers to the longer text. C. Burchard, *Joseph und Aseneth* (assisted by Carsten Burfeind and Uta Barbara Fink; PVTG 5; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2003), 46; idem, “The Text of *Joseph and Aseneth* Reconsidered”, *JSP* 14 (2005), 83-96. Nearly all the scholarly works on *Joseph and Aseneth*

idiosyncrasies. What this implies is that it is hard to fix the date and the original version of the story. The last editions may belong to a particular period but the core of the story may date back still further.<sup>43</sup> As Ahearne-Kroll recently points out, “searching for the *Urtext* for the tradition may not be the most helpful solution for making sense of the textual witnesses”.<sup>44</sup>

One of the aims of this novel is generally accepted to be an explanation of how pious Joseph as a Jew could marry a pagan woman, a daughter of a pagan priest in Heliopolis.<sup>45</sup> When we take into account the outright rejection of this kind of intermarriage in the *Book of Jubilees*,<sup>46</sup> and the intentional change in the *Pseudo-Jonathan Targum* to Genesis 41:45, which identified Aseneth as a daughter of Dinah, who was reared by the wife of Potiphar, prince of Tanis,<sup>47</sup> *Joseph and Aseneth* suggests more reasonable and possible alternatives for their readers and contemporaries. It also contrasts with the prohibition on intermarriage stated by Philo, who also lived in a Hellenistic milieu.<sup>48</sup> When he refers in negative tones to a mixed mob of people born of

---

since 1980 have been based on Burchard's text. We use his translation based on the longer version b-group in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, vol.2, 202-247. Recently, however, re-consideration of Philonenko's shorter text is taken by two scholars: Angela Standhartinger, *Das Frauenbild im Judentum der Hellenistischen Zeit: Ein Beitrag anhand von 'Joseph und Aseneth'* (AGJU 26; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995), and especially, very challenging, Ross Kraemer, *When Aseneth met Joseph* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998). On the history of research on the editions of text and its critiques till 2003, see Burchard, “Text of *Joseph and Aseneth*”, 83-96. A recent dissertation on this story deals with the textual discussion, and takes the two together focusing the basic narrative, genre, and imagery which the two share, but arrives at the similar conclusion on date, provenance, etc., against Kraemer. See Ahearne-Kroll, 14-87.

<sup>43</sup> J.J. Collins, “Joseph and Aseneth: Jewish or Christian?”, *JSP* 14 (2005), 100-101.

<sup>44</sup> Ahearne-Kroll, 15; Similarly, R.D. Chesnutt, “Perceptions of Oil in Early Judaism and the Meal Formula in *Joseph and Aseneth*”, *JSP* 14 (2005), 114 n.5.

<sup>45</sup> Manuscript B seems to be aware of this problem, and thus introduces her father Pentephres as “first man in Heliopolis” (1:5,12).

<sup>46</sup> Jub 30:7 (translated by R.H.Charles): “And if there is any man who wishes in Israel to give his daughter or his sister to any man who is of the seed of the Gentiles he shall surely die, and they shall stone him with stone because he hath wrought shame in Israel; and they shall burn the woman with fire, because she has dishonoured the name of the house of her father, and she shall be rooted out of Israel” and also in 22:20; 25:9; 30:10,11,13.

<sup>47</sup> On rabbinic answers for this marriage, see V. Aptowitz, “Aseneth, the Wife of Joseph: A Haggadic Literary-Historical Study”, *HUCA* 1 (1924), 258.

<sup>48</sup> *Spec. Leg.* 3:29: “... do not enter into the partnership of marriage with a member of a foreign nation ...”. Also Josephus, *Ant.* 8.191, tells that this intermarriage of Solomon broke the Laws of Moses.

marriages between Hebrew men and Egyptian women in the time of the Exodus,<sup>49</sup> we can see that the same judgment could be applied to the marriage between Joseph and Aseneth. This marriage faces condemnation from normative Judaism as much as Jewish residence in Egypt does. In this respect, both *Joseph and Aseneth* and other Jewish Hellenistic literature, including LXX-Is, are aimed at providing a justification for a certain *modus vivendi* and particular identity, for the Jews in Egypt.<sup>50</sup> In this section we will investigate how this novel treats the problem of identity. Basically, we agree with Modrzejewski<sup>51</sup> that the story aims to promote two goals at the same time, namely peaceful coexistence with Gentiles and preservation of communal identity and traditions. It achieves this through the motif of marriage after Aseneth's conversion.<sup>52</sup>

### 5.3.1. Aseneth and the Temple of Onias

This story, and the figure of Aseneth in particular, is full of symbols, which can be understood in several ways. In the first chapters, the detailed description of her room draws attention from the main story line of the love story, and leads us to ask what significance this part has. The description of her bed is worthy of note:

“The bed was laid with gold-woven *purple* stuff, interwoven with *violet, purple, and white* (my italics)” (2:8, my italics).

Interestingly, the bed in Aseneth's chamber consists of three materials associated with the priesthood.<sup>53</sup> As was mentioned earlier,<sup>54</sup> four materials (ὑάκινθος, κόκκινος, βύσσος, πορφύρα) are essential things for the priestly garments or the Tabernacle; only

---

<sup>49</sup> *Moses*, 1.147.

<sup>50</sup> Also R.D. Chesnutt, “The Social Setting and Purpose of Joseph and Aseneth”, *JSP* 2 (1988), 35-43, who emphasizes that no missionary impulse is reflected in the story.

<sup>51</sup> Modrzejewski, *Jews*, 71f. See above.

<sup>52</sup> Also Collins, “Joseph and Aseneth”, 102-104. He pays due attention to this “intermarriage”, which has been a focal point for scholars to decide that the work was written by a Jew, contrary to Kraemer.

<sup>53</sup> Cf. A. Lieber, “I Set a Table before You: The Jewish Eschatological Character of Aseneth's conversion meal”, *JSP* 14 (2004), 67.

<sup>54</sup> See 4.4.2.1.

κόκκλιος is absent from the bed clothes.<sup>55</sup> Furthermore, two or three of them often indicate priestly garments (2 Ch 2:6, Sir 45:10). In particular, in Maccabees and elsewhere, “purple (πορφύρα)” is frequently used to symbolize priesthood.<sup>56</sup> Though most things in her room were rejected after her penitence including food and wine which Aseneth wanted to bring for the angel, the bed remains unchanged. When she asked the angel to sit on the bed, she said that “this bed is pure and undefiled” (15:14).<sup>57</sup> Then the angel sat there, judging from the context. When we take into account the rigid attitude concerning association with Gentiles,<sup>58</sup> the fact that the angel sat on the bed of Aseneth means the bed is “pure” and clean from the point of view of Jewish law, as she said. Thus the bed seems to hold significance in connection with the Jewish priestly cultus. This imagery is used again to refer to the new status of Aseneth after her penitence:

“... And bees rose from the cells of that comb, ... and the bees were white as snow, and their wings like *purple* and like *violet* and like *scarlet* (stuff) and like *gold-woven linen* cloaks, and golden diadems (were) on their heads ...” (16:17-18, my italics)

The bees from a honeycomb are “the most telling clue” for G. Bohak to base his theory that Aseneth symbolizes the Temple of Onias.<sup>59</sup> The bees are white as snow, and their wings like purple and like violet and like scarlet and like gold-woven fine linen garments. The bees also wear golden diadems. He sees the bees as priests. The bees fly

---

<sup>55</sup> The exception κόκκλιος of depicting Aseneth’s bed might be caused by a possible association of the material with prostitution, for example seen in Rahab’s red thread (Josh 2:18).

<sup>56</sup> 1Mac 10:62,64; 14:43,44; 2Mac 4:38; 3Sib. 657-58.

<sup>57</sup> It is stated that no man or woman ever sat on the bed apart from Aseneth, which might mean that the bed is naturally pure. This seems what Aseneth means in her saying. But still the bed could be regarded impure because Aseneth, rejected to kiss by Joseph because of being “foreign”, used to sit on there. It means that the reason of the purity of the bed should be sought elsewhere.

<sup>58</sup> Joseph never ate with the Egyptians (7:1) and he did not kiss Aseneth because she blessed idols and ate abominable food (8:5). On “kiss” as a “ritual of identity formation motif”, see Michael Penn, “Identity Transformation and Authorial Identification in Joseph and Aseneth”, *JSP* 13 (2002), 171-183. On the character of “food” in the story, see Lieber, 63-77.

<sup>59</sup> Bohak, *Joseph and Aseneth*. Interpretations for this honeycomb are suggested by so many scholars. Compare bibliography and critiques by A.E. Portier-Young, “Sweet Mercy Metropolis: Interpreting Aseneth’s Honeycomb”, *JSP* 14 (2005), 141-147 and n.24 in 141. Recently, Bohak’s argument is supported by Capponi, *Il tempio*, 72-74; idem, “Martyrs”, 302.

out from the honeycomb and encircle Aseneth and finally make a new honeycomb in her mouth. For Bohak, this indicates that some Jewish priests built a new temple around Aseneth, i.e. her place Heliopolis.

But his argument is based on the *b*-group reconstructed by Burchard, and in other text traditions, only three of the four materials appear.<sup>60</sup> If this “most telling clue” fails to appear in many important manuscripts, including manuscript A, which is, according to Burchard,<sup>61</sup> the most exhaustive and complete, his claim may be weakened. As Collins points out, “the allegory of the bees is so subtle that we must wonder whether the author intended it or whether anyone would have perceived it”.<sup>62</sup> Admittedly, any conclusion drawn about the bees could be considered tentative.<sup>63</sup> Nevertheless, it seems clear that three or four materials used in this story are items usually associated with the priesthood. To refer to valuable things, “gold and silver” would be enough.<sup>64</sup> Bohak may well be correct in suggesting that textgroup *b* might be composed by Heliopolitan Oniads. Bohak gives more evidence to show that the book was written by an Oniad writer: there is a positive attitude towards Pharaoh, the patriarchs are soldiers, Levi’s role is stressed, there is internecine conflict, Jewish priests observe ritual purity, the books shows familiarity with Egyptian/Heliopolitan theology, and Ioakim is mentioned.<sup>65</sup>

One more piece of evidence for this relationship between the Temple and the story can be added: the sun imagery for Joseph. In 5:4-5, Joseph’s first appearance is

---

<sup>60</sup> In Brooks’ translation based on *a*-group, purple, crimson and scarlet appear. E.W. Brooks, *Joseph and Aseneth* (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1918), 53; and Kraemer’s translation based on shorter recension (*d*-group) by Philonenko, purple, the color of hyacinth and golden thread appear. Kraemer, *When Aseneth met Joseph*, 263-279.

<sup>61</sup> C. Burchard, *Joseph und Aseneth* (JSHRZ II/4; Gütersloh Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1983), 583.

<sup>62</sup> Collins, *Between*, 107.

<sup>63</sup> Chesnutt, “Social Setting”, 35; But Attridge recommends Bohak’s theory as a “serious working hypothesis”. See the book review of H.W. Attridge, *CBQ* 60 (1998), 555-557.

<sup>64</sup> In *Joseph and Aseneth*, “gold and silver” is used so: 2:4; 7:4; 10:13, etc.

<sup>65</sup> Bohak, *Joseph and Aseneth*, 41-62.

described magnificently. Joseph in his chariot is wrapped in a purple linen robe, with a golden crown on his head with twelve precious stones. Aseneth is struck with admiration and says, “The sun from heaven has come to us on its chariot” (6:2). Kraemer compares this with the description of the imagery of Helios on his chariot, which leads her to decide that this novel is a product of the third or the fourth century CE, at the earliest. As Sivan points out, “olive branch” is related to Noah’s ark (Gen 8:11),<sup>66</sup> which we will deal with later. But the motif of “twelve stones” is definitely connected with priesthood (Ex 28:17-21). The core motif “sun” needs explanation. As we saw in the preceding chapter, this “sun” motif is expressed in the lamp without a lampstand in the Temple of Onias.<sup>67</sup> Therefore, the description of Joseph, using sun imagery and twelve stones, can be understood as an allusion to the Temple. Brooke also contributes to this conclusion, who points out that the sunlike figure appears also in the Qumran documents and others, for example, 4Q541 and Sirach 50:7, to indicate priestly activity.<sup>68</sup> After her penitential experience, Aseneth goes to meet Joseph again. And at that time, her face is like the sun and a rising morning star (18:9).<sup>69</sup> So the imagery of the sun is used for both Joseph and Aseneth, and this may indicate the Temple.

### 5.3.2. Identity

The penitence of Aseneth plays a major role in this story.<sup>70</sup> Only spiritual

---

<sup>66</sup> Hagith Sivan, “Review: Ross Shepard Kraemer, *When Aseneth Met Joseph. A late Antique Tale of the Biblical Patriarch and his Egyptian Wife Reconsidered*”, *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 1998. 12.02.

<sup>67</sup> Josephus, *B.J.* 7.429; Hayward, “Jewish Temple”, 434-437. See chapter 4.

<sup>68</sup> 4Q541 frag. 9.i.2-5: “... His word is like a word of the heavens, and his teaching conforms to the will of God. His eternal sun will shine; and its fire will burn in all the corners of the earth. And on the darkness it will shine; then the darkness will disappear [fr]om the earth and the cloud from the dry land” (translation of G.J. Brooke); in Sirach 50:7, Simon the Oniad is compared to the shining sun. See G.J. Brooke, “Men and Women as Angels in *Joseph and Aseneth*”, *JSP* 14 (2005), 164-167.

<sup>69</sup> The image of “morning star” is also used to praise Simon the Oniad high priest in Sirach 50:6

<sup>70</sup> M. Hubbard, “Honey for Aseneth: Interpreting a Religious Symbol”, *JSP* 16 (1997), 99.

penitence by prayer is necessary. No laws are given to her. As Howard Kee points out,<sup>71</sup> circumcision and baptism are absent from the document. The standards of proselytism are not observed, or are not important.<sup>72</sup> What is central is the epiphanic experience of the God of Light, whose presence illumines the believers and transforms each individual, so that he (Joseph) or she (Aseneth), whether of Jewish or pagan origin, shares in the divine life. In this story, the experience of God in a foreign land is more important. Though they are in Egypt, they are able to meet the God of Light. Even a proselytised Egyptian woman perceives the divine revelation! This story shows Egypt as a place of divine epiphany. It contains a positive re-interpretation of the land of Egypt where they have to live. In other words, the fact that they are living in Egypt may de-emphasize the concept of the geographical centrality of Jerusalem. A full experience of the divine is possible even in Egypt.

Aseneth is a representative of paganism through her depiction as the goddess Neith.<sup>73</sup> Her rooms are full of Egyptian gods made of gold and silver and she worships all those and performs sacrifices (2:3). Interestingly, this may be compared with Josephus' explanation of Heliopolis. Many times Josephus informs us that the place where Onias planned to build a temple was full of idols.<sup>74</sup> This insight into the relationship between the novel and the temple of Onias can be developed further. The angel proclaims Aseneth's change<sup>75</sup>:

“And your name shall no longer be called Aseneth, but your name shall be *City of*

---

<sup>71</sup> H. Kee, “The Socio-Cultural Setting of Joseph and Aseneth”, *NTS* 29 (1983), 410.

<sup>72</sup> Cf. Chesnutt, *From Death*, 155-165, points out, against Kee, that this story features a female convert, and the requirement for proselytism pertains only to males, so the silence of reference to sacrifice, immersion and circumcision does not “provide any grounds for a differentiation between Aseneth's conversion and Jewish proselytism”. Conversional ritual, he argues, was not fixed yet. *From Death*, 165 n. 42.

<sup>73</sup> Schürer, 548. Her name means ‘belonging to Neith’. Cf. M. Philonenko, “Joseph and Aseneth” in *EncyJud* (vol. 10; Jerusalem: Keter Publishing House, 1971), 223.

<sup>74</sup> *Ant.* 13.62-72.

<sup>75</sup> On widely attested ancient practices of ‘name-change’ at religious conversion, G.H.R. Horsley, “Name Change as an Indication of Conversion in Antiquity”, *Numen* 34 (1987), 1-17.

*Refuge* (πόλις καταφυγῆς),<sup>76</sup> because *in you many nations will take refuge with the Lord God, the Most High, and under your wings many peoples trusting in the Lord God will be sheltered*, and behind your walls will be guarded those who attach themselves to the Most High God in the name of Repentance. For Repentance is in the heavens, and exceedingly beautiful and good daughter of the Most High” (15:7, my italics)

That Aseneth will be the “City of Refuge” means that many nations will flee to her to find shelter in the Lord God.<sup>77</sup> Though Aseneth is an Egyptian woman, many nations will come to her to take refuge and they will trust in the Lord God. This thought is not unfamiliar in LXX-Is:

54:15 in MT: הן גור יגור אִפְס מֵאוֹתַי מִי־גַר אֶתְךָ עָלֶיךָ יפול  
 LXX: ἰδοὺ προσήλυτοι προσελεύσονται σοι δι’ ἐμοῦ καὶ ἐπὶ σὲ καταφεύξονται  
 “Behold, proselytes will come to you through me and they will take refuge in you”

While גור II (‘to stir up’ or ‘to quarrel’) is used here, the translator thought it derived from גור I (‘to sojourn’). Furthermore, the rendering προσέρχομαι for גור is seen in LXX-Pentateuch (Ex 12:48,49; Lev 19:33; Nu 9:14), in which the nominal form is used with the verb together, as in the present verse. That this verse in LXX-Is is surely aware of the “refuge city” in the Pentateuch is evident: in Nu 35:15, these refuge cities are not only for the Israelites but also for the “proselyte (προσήλυτος)”, a term that the translator of LXX-Nu chooses for גר.<sup>78</sup> This rendering lies in our present Isaianic verse in that proselytes will come to take refuge there. Therefore, we can say that the

<sup>76</sup> For efforts to explain this name-change in Hebrew or Aramaic, see Chesnutt, *From Death*, 70. For Chesnutt, this is further evidence to show that “the Greek *Joseph and Aseneth* has a strongly Semitic flavor”.

<sup>77</sup> The name occurs three times: 15:6; 17:6; 19:5.

<sup>78</sup> Portier-Young, 136. The Greek is an equivalent of גר throughout LXX. The postbiblical meaning to indicate ‘convert to Judaism’ is, arguably, not included in the LXX, because of Ex 22:20; 23:9, etc., in which the Israelites in Egypt are called προσήλυτοι. See Tov, “The Septuagint”, 175; T. Muraoka, “The Semantics of the LXX and its Role in Clarifying Ancient Hebrew Semantics” in *Studies in Ancient Hebrew Semantics* (AbrNSup 4; 1995), 26. Especially, Muraoka introduces Philo’s view on “proselytes”: τούτους δὲ καλεῖ προσηλύτους ἀπὸ τοῦ προσεληλυθέναι καινῇ καὶ φιλοθέῳ πολιτείᾳ... (“these last he calls ‘proselytes’ or newly joined, because they have joined the new and godly commonwealth, ...”) (*Spec. Leg.* 1.51; translation in *LCL*). So he thinks that Philo seems to be the first to use the noun as such. But Ex 12:48 seems to reveal that the translator of Exodus already perceives the connotation of the Greek word as ‘converts’:

MT: ... וְכִי־יִגְוֹר אֶתְךָ גַר וְעַשָּׂה פֶסַח לַיהוָה ...

LXX: ἔαν δέ τις προσέλθῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς προσήλυτος ποιῆσαι τὸ πασχα κυρίῳ ...

LXX has the same structure with Philo’s definition: προσήλυτος, the verb προσέρχομαι, and targeted action, which indicates that there appears two concepts of προσήλυτος in LXX (Muraoka regards this Exodus passage as showing “a rare glimpse into this process of word creation at work”). 54:15 in LXX-Is follows almost the same wording in Ex 12:48 in LXX. Two findings are there: the translator of Isaiah confers the translation of Exodus, and “proselyte” here seems to refer to “those who come to Jewish belief”.

translator in this verse follows the usage of the Greek Pentateuch.<sup>79</sup> The second half of the verse is difficult to explain, but what the present verse speaks is clear. Interestingly, chapter 54 addresses a woman from v.1, in both MT and LXX.<sup>80</sup> God left her for a while but will have compassion on her (54:7). In particular, v.6 in LXX says the opposite of MT concerning the woman:

MT: For the LORD has called you like a wife forsaken and grieved in spirit, like the wife of a man's youth when she is cast off, says your God (NRSV).

LXX: The Lord has *not* called you like a woman deserted and faint-hearted, *nor* a woman like hated from youth, says your God.

This woman seems to refer to Zion (cf. chapter 52) in MT and LXX. As we saw above, “Zion” refers to the community in Egypt, and the Temple of Onias. The rendering of v.14 seems to support our point further: “You *shall be built* (οἰκοδομηθήσῃ) in righteousness” for “you shall be established (תְּכֹנֶנִי) in righteousness” in MT. This is the only case where the Hebrew verb כִּוַּן is rendered as ‘build’ throughout the whole of LXX. In other words, MT declares that Zion will be made firm or established in God’s righteousness,<sup>81</sup> but LXX-Is declares that Zion will be built in righteousness. The last word “righteousness” in Hebrew reminds us and probably, the translator, of the Zadokite Onias, and of the “city of righteousness” (Is 1:26; 19:18).

After this declaration, v.15 follows. Strangers will come to you, Zion, the city built in righteousness. And they will take refuge in Zion. Therefore, we find that functionally, Aseneth as the “city of Refuge” corresponds to Zion built in righteousness. This is also seen in 55:5 in LXX:

55:5 in MT: הֵן גוֹי לֹא-תִדְעַתְּ תִקְרָא וְגוֹי לֹא-יִדְעוּךָ אֱלֹהֶיךָ יְרוּצוּ לְמַעַן יִהְיֶה אֱלֹהֶיךָ וְלִקְרוֹשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל כִּי פִאֲרֹךְ

LXX: ἔθνη ἃ οὐκ ᾔδεισάν σε ἐπικαλέσονται σε καὶ λαοὶ οἳ οὐκ ἐπίστανταί σε ἐπὶ σὲ καταφεύξονται ἕνεκεν τοῦ θεοῦ σου τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰσραὴλ ὅτι ἐδόξασέν σε

“Nations which do not know you will call upon you, and peoples who are not

<sup>79</sup> On the dependence of LXX-Is on LXX-Pentateuch, see 3.4.2.6 n.173.

<sup>80</sup> In MT, imperatives in the second feminine singular are used in vv.1-2,4, and the second personal pronominal suffix appears consistently in nearly all verses.

<sup>81</sup> “Righteousness” in the Second Isaiah usually indicates the salvation of God, e.g. 42:6; 45:13; 51:1,5,8, etc.

acquainted with you will take refuge in you because of your God, the Holy One of Israel, for he glorified you”

The difference between MT and LXX is due to LXX’s rendering of ייג as καταφεύγω.

What LXX says is that nations will take refuge in you because of God, which is seen in our passage in *Joseph and Aseneth*. By this rendering, 54:15 and 55:5 convey the same message as *Joseph and Aseneth*.<sup>82</sup> That is, Aseneth will play the role of Zion for the Diaspora.<sup>83</sup>

One more thing to note is the mention of Noah’s flood in 54:9. This is the only place where Noah’s flood is mentioned outside the *Book of Genesis*. As we saw above, Joseph holds an olive branch in his first appearance to Aseneth (5:5). One explanation of this motif in *Joseph and Aseneth* is a connection to LXX-Is at this place. Furthermore, it may be relevant that in *Testament of Levi* 8:8, an olive branch is used in relation to the priesthood.

The angel commands Aseneth to take off her black tunic, sackcloth and ashes, and to put on a new robe (14:12). Aseneth, who had been groaning and weeping bitterly before, is filled with joy and happiness. Ashes on her head turn into a golden crown (18:5):

“So that to those who mourn for Zion be given glory instead of ashes, oil of joy who mourn, a garment of glory instead of a spirit of weariness. They will be called the generations of righteousness, a plant of the Lord for glory” (Is 61:3 in LXX).<sup>84</sup>

More notable is another blessing of the Angel on Aseneth:

“And you shall be like a walled *mother-city* of all who take refuge with the name of the Lord God, the king of ages (16:16, my italics)”.<sup>85</sup>

As we already dealt with, this notion “mother-city (μητρόπολις)” is a special term to

---

<sup>82</sup> Cf. Zec 2:15: καὶ καταφεύξονται ἔθνη πολλὰ ἐπὶ τὸν κύριον ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ... This verse is slightly different to the other two verses. It concerns “the Lord”, not Israel or the Jews: “many nations shall flee for refuge to the Lord in that day”, contrary to MT’s “many nations shall be joined to the Lord in that day”. Therefore, the only verses that deal with ‘Israel as Refuge’ are LXX Is 54:15 and 55:5.

<sup>83</sup> Portier-Young, 137-138, which enumerates Biblical passages that Zion will be the refuge: Jer 50:4-5 (LXX 27:4-5); Zec 2:15; Ps 58:17-18 in LXX; 143:2, including Is 54:15; 55:5.

<sup>84</sup> M. Silva’s translation in *NETS*.

<sup>85</sup> This verse appears only in the longer text in Burchard, and not in Philonenko’s text. The fact that manuscripts containing this verse are written in Greek may indicate that this text was circulated in Egypt.

indicate Jerusalem.<sup>86</sup> This term is used in Is 1:26 in LXX to refer to the “city of righteousness”, and it is used for the changed state of Aseneth here. Therefore, a new Jerusalem appears in Egypt! Once again, we find that LXX-Is is closely related to *Joseph and Aseneth*. Therefore, Aseneth symbolizes a new mother-city Zion in Egypt,<sup>87</sup> i.e. the Temple of Onias according to Is 1:26 and 19:18 in LXX-Is. In addition, as Philonenko observes,<sup>88</sup> Philo connects the two important terms when he deals with “city of refuge” in Nu 35<sup>89</sup>:

Such are the reasons for the perpetrators of unintentional homicide taking refuge only in the cities of the Tabernacle attendants. We must next say what those cities are, and why they are six in number. It would seem, then, that the chiefest and surest and best mother-city something more than just a city, is the Divine Word, and that to take refuge first in it is supremely advantageous (*De Fuga*. 94).

In Philo, ‘mother-city’ is the supreme one, symbolizing divine word, among six refuge cities, which helps us to understand the combination of the two names given to Aseneth, in the period not far from *Joseph and Aseneth* and LXX-Is.

### 5.3.3. Attitude towards foreign kings

The idea of Jewish help and support for an Egyptian king is also seen in *Joseph and Aseneth*. Throughout this novel, the relationship between the Jews and the Pharaoh is portrayed as very good.<sup>90</sup> Barclay doubts this and registers Pharaoh as

---

<sup>86</sup> See 2.3.

<sup>87</sup> The image of “re-new” is frequent in *Joseph and Aseneth*. Hubbard, 97-110, shows that “honey” symbolizes ‘a new creation’ in comparison with the *Epistle of Barnabas*; On an idealization of the community of God into a city through the female figure, see E.M. Humphrey, *The Ladies and the Cities: Transformation and Apocalyptic Identity in Josepha and Aseneth, 4 Ezra, the Apocalypse and the Shepherd of Hermas* (JSPSup 17; Sheffield Academic Press, 1995); U. Fischer, *Eschatologie und Jenseitserwartung im hellenistischen Diasporajudentum* (BZNW 44; Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1978), 115-123, argues that Aseneth is not only “vor allem von der Gottesstadt schlechthin, Zion-Jerusalem” (Burchard’s term), but also “genauer noch von dem himmlischen Jerusalem der Heilzeit” (115; his underline). As he points out, this motif of “city-woman” plays a central role in the *Book of Revelation*, as seen in Rev 21:2,9ff; Also see P. Söllner, *Jerusalem, die hochgebaute Stadt. Eschatologisches und Himmlisches Jerusalem im Frühjudentum und im frühen Christentum* (TANZ 25; Tübingen/Basel: Francke Verlag, 1998), 122.

<sup>88</sup> Philonenko, *Joseph et Aséneth*, 183.

<sup>89</sup> *De Fuga*. 86-118.

<sup>90</sup> Collins, *Between*, 109.

“peripheral”.<sup>91</sup> He argues that all the positive actions of Pharaoh were just needed for “the dynamic of the story”. But if we say that the role of Pharaoh is ‘peripheral’, then we would have to say that all characters but Joseph and Aseneth in the story should be regarded as ‘peripheral’. And Levi’s wise prophetic ability, Benjamin’s brave fight and Simeon’s shrewdness, etc. would have to be ascribed as being due to “the dynamic of the story”. It does not seem an appropriate way of analyzing the story. Pharaoh recognizes Joseph’s God, and proclaims a blessing for Joseph and Aseneth in the name of the God of Joseph (21:2-7; cf. 3:4; 4:7). These examples cannot be regarded as simply ‘peripheral’. A more solid example for this argument is seen in the following statement:

“I will go tomorrow to Pharaoh the king, because *he is like a father* to me and appointed me chief of the whole land of Egypt” (20:9, my italics).

The idea that Pharaoh is a father to Joseph appears again in the mouth of Pharaoh’s firstborn son (24:14). Interestingly, Levi, who helped Aseneth when she was in danger of being killed by the king’s rebelling son, also tried to forge a relationship with the king, by saving the life of the son of the Pharaoh (29:4). Considering that the nature of the relationship is defined by Joseph, “God’s firstborn”,<sup>92</sup> and Levi, “a prophet of the Most High” (22:13), it seems that this expression should be taken seriously. One case of such a bond in the Hebrew Bible is seen in 2Sam 7:14, where God will be a father to David’s son.<sup>93</sup> The covenant between God and Israel is often expressed as a “father-son” relationship (Ex 4:22; Je 3:19; Ho 11:1; Ps 89:26, etc). Therefore, we may conclude that references to this bond in *Joseph and Aseneth* reflect a special covenantal relationship between the Jews represented by Joseph and Levi, and Pharaoh.

---

<sup>91</sup> J.G.M. Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander to Trajan* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1996), 210.

<sup>92</sup> 18:11. cf. 6:3,5; 13:13; 21:4. For this title, see Burchard, “Joseph and Aseneth”, 191f.

<sup>93</sup> Cf. 1Ch 28:6-God and Solomon.

There are expressions that renounce and judge the idols and gods of the Egyptian kingdom in *Joseph and Aseneth* (8:6; 10:12; 11:3-14, 16-18; 12:5, etc.). As is also the case in much Jewish literature during the Hellenistic period in Egypt, there is a tendency to distinguish Egypt from her religious beliefs throughout *Joseph and Aseneth* as well.

To conclude, it is not a coincidence that *Joseph and Aseneth* ends with the elevation of Joseph as an Egyptian pharaoh and as a father figure to the Egyptians. This story demonstrates that the Jews in Egypt are living with God and their residence in Egypt is not transient nor a result of sins. Aseneth, an icon of the Egyptian Jews, symbolizes the newly built Temple. Aseneth was not allowed to kiss Joseph because she was a “strange woman (γυνή ἀλλότρια)” (8:5), but after the conversion she was not any more a foreigner but “a daughter of the Most High” (21:5),<sup>94</sup> and Joseph kissed her, which gives her the spirit of life, wisdom and truth (19:3).<sup>95</sup> As a matter of fact, the author of *Joseph and Aseneth* already depicts Aseneth acting chastely, and emphasizes her virginity (7:8), which makes Joseph “rejoice exceedingly with great joy” and call her “sister”, even before her conversion. Evidently the author approves of virtuous people regardless of ethnicity. Furthermore, she is compared with Hebrew matriarchs, Sarah, Rebecca and Rachel, not with Egyptian women, in her appearance (1:5). This story argues that it is not ethnic problem but the religious one that matters.<sup>96</sup> Likewise, Leontopolis was an Egyptian place and was full of idols but is changed into a new mother-city Zion. This Aseneth will be called the “city of refuge” and “mother-city”.

---

<sup>94</sup> Hubbard, 106.

<sup>95</sup> Penn, 176.

<sup>96</sup> Collins, “Joseph and Aseneth”, 106. He cites 8:5, where Joseph explains why he is not allowed to kiss Aseneth. Though he calls her “foreign” but it becomes clear that “foreign” is not a problem of ethnicity. “Foreign” should be paraphrased in religious term as clearly seen in 8:5. The tendency to stress religious value rather than ethnicity, according to Collins, is quite typical of Hellenistic Judaism.

Surprisingly, the function of those two significant words in the story have not been fully investigated by scholars. Joseph, representing the Egyptian Jews,<sup>97</sup> and Aseneth, symbolizing the Temple of Onias, are prosperous in Egypt. These Jews in Egypt show their loyalty towards the Egyptian pharaoh, demonstrated by Joseph's calling him a father. They may suffer persecution but will finally prevail. God will change the sorrows and mourning of the Jews into a glorious restoration in Egypt.<sup>98</sup> In addition, it seems clear that this work aims at the Jews themselves, not towards the Gentiles for any "missionary propaganda" promoting proselytism.<sup>99</sup>

#### 5.4. *Third Sibylline Oracles*

The close relationship between the Jews in Egypt and the ruling dynasty, which is seen in LXX-Is (32:1; 45:13 in particular) and *Joseph and Aseneth*, is further emphasized in the *Third Sibylline Oracles* (hereafter, *3Sib*).<sup>100</sup>

##### 5.4.1. "The king from the sun" and Philometor

The first step in examining the work in relation to the present study is to summarize the main points in the suggestions of J.J. Collins, who carried out exhaustive research on *3Sib*,<sup>101</sup> as follows:

---

<sup>97</sup> Actually, the piety of Joseph is consistently emphasized throughout the story, though it is not dealt with in my work. It is the first meeting with Joseph that Aseneth found her miserable situation resulted in her dramatic conversion. On the passive but important role of Joseph, see S. Docherty, "Joseph and Aseneth: Rewritten Bible or Narrative Expansion?", *JSJ* 35 (2004), 38; Burchard, "Joseph and Aseneth", 182; but a different evaluation on Joseph, R.C. Douglas, "Liminality and Conversion in Joseph and Aseneth", *JSP* 3 (1988), 35-36.

<sup>98</sup> Lieber, 68-77, explores the motif of the eschatological meal of "the righteous ones" (הַצְדִּיקִים) through Philo and rabbinic literature compared with the conversion meal of Aseneth with the angel. This motif might also be significant when it is considered with the Temple of Onias the Zadokite.

<sup>99</sup> Contrary to G.W.E. Nickelsburg, "Stories of Biblical and Post-Biblical Times" in M.E. Stone (ed.), *Jewish writings of the second temple period : Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran, sectarian writings, Philo, Josephus* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1984), 33-88. Also see Docherty, 32-33.

<sup>100</sup> The most recent comprehensive research on this book should be R. Buitenwerf, *Book III of the Sibylline Oracles and Its Social Setting* (SVTP 17; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2003). A fully comprehensive history of research from sixteenth century to the present days is dealt with in Part One, 5-134. According to him, the work was written by a Jew sometime between 80 and 40 BCE in the Roman province of Asia.

<sup>101</sup> His suggestions are found mainly in three works: *The Sibylline Oracles of Egyptian Judaism*,

1. The seventh king refers to a Ptolemaic king, identified as “a king from the sun”.
2. The fact that the Jews are supposed to be strong during this king’s reign would seem to indicate Ptolemy Philometor who welcomed the Jews and allowed them to build their Temple in Leontopolis.
3. Since 3*Sib* does not have any explicit reference to the Leontopolis Temple, it is likely that the document was written before the Temple was built, approximately 160-150 BCE.

All the points he suggested have been in accord with many scholars,<sup>102</sup> but also faced serious objections and critiques from other scholars working in this area.<sup>103</sup> E.S. Gruen is one of the most recent critics. First of all, Gruen objects to fixing the date and the provenance of the work. According to him, 3*Sib* contains various prophecies which stem from different periods. It has some statements alluding to events which happened during the first century BCE.<sup>104</sup> The only way of fixing the date in the second century or earlier, would be to remove the problematic texts as ‘secondary’, he argues. In addition to this, if we accept this procedure, the date of composition would be narrowed down. If an apocalyptic writing made sense only within a very narrow time span, according to him, it could not retain its relevance in later periods.<sup>105</sup>

Gruen additionally raised a question about the interpretation of the ‘seventh king’.<sup>106</sup> According to him, there was no custom or principle of enumerating kings in the ancient world, including Egypt. Moreover, Egypt did not destroy the Roman empire at any stage of history, let alone during the time of Philometor, contrary to the prophecy, so he suggests that we should understand the number seven as an ideal or

---

(SBLDS 13, Montana, 1972); “The Sibylline Oracles, Book 3” in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: vol. I.*, ed. by J.H. Charlesworth, London, 1983, 354-380; *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora*.

<sup>102</sup> For example, H.W. Parke, *Sibyls and Sibylline Prophecy in Classical Antiquity* (ed. by E.C. McGing; London/New York: Routledge, 1988), 6; Söllner, 114-5; T.H. Tobin, “Philo and the Sibyl: Interpreting Philo’s Eschatology”, *The Studia Philonica Annual* 9 (1997), 87-89; J.R. Bartlett, *Jews in the Hellenistic World: Josephus, Aristaeus, The Sibylline Oracles, Eupolemus* (Cambridge University Press, 1985), 37-38, 42-49, 54-55; cf. L.R. Ubigli, “Sibyllinen”, *TRE* 31 (1999), 240-245.

<sup>103</sup> For example, Barclay, *Jews*, 216-228; E.S. Gruen, *Heritage and Hellenism* (University of California Press, 1998), 268-291; J.D. Gauger, *Sibyllinische Weissagungen* (Artemis & Winkler, 1998), 440-451.

<sup>104</sup> Gruen, *Heritage*, 271.

<sup>105</sup> E.S. Gruen, “Jews, Greeks, and Romans in the Third Sibylline Oracle” in M. Goodman (ed.), *Jews in a Graeco-Roman World* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 17-21.

<sup>106</sup> I will use Collins’ translation on 3*Sib* in *OTP*, unless otherwise stated.

mystical one. For him this kind of mystical or symbolic understanding is the right way to understand ‘apocalyptic literature’. He thinks that any effort to fix the date and place could harm the very essence of ‘apocalyptic literature’.

Gruen’s critiques seem reasonable. Nevertheless, there still remain some questions that Gruen does not answer: why does the Sibyl deal with “an Egyptian king, Greek by race” (3.193)? What would it mean to the Jews, if it had nothing to do with the Ptolemaic dynasty and the Egyptian Jews? Judging from many verses that praise the Jews (194-195; 213-230; 237-264; 573-599), the likely readership was Jewish communities in Egypt. What did the oracle mean by the expression that during the reign of the king the Jews would be strong?

Therefore, though Collins’ arguments have some defects, his following statement still seems to hold true: “The main historical interest of this oracle lies in its attestation of a Jewish community that could hail a Ptolemaic king as a savior figure or Messiah”.<sup>107</sup>

In the *3Sib*, the term “a king” appears many times. Our task is how to distinguish them.<sup>108</sup> First of all, the reference in 285-290 seems to imply Cyrus because his reign is connected with the exile of the Jews and the rebuilding of the Temple.<sup>109</sup> The Oracles say that he will be sent by the heavenly God. Another reference to a king being sent by the will of God is seen in 652: “And then God will send *a king from the sun* who will stop the entire earth from evil war (my italics)”. Kings of the Israelites are not described in this way. In fact, we find similar expressions only in Isaiah 41:2-4,25 in LXX and MT: “Who raised righteousness from the rising (of the sun) ... and shall give their swords

---

<sup>107</sup> Collins, *OTP*, 356.

<sup>108</sup> There are two cases in which God Himself is called as “a (great) king”: 3.55 and 3.617. “A king from Asia” in 611ff surely indicates a different king who will attack and overthrow Egypt. Generally, this is considered a reference to Antiochus Epiphanes, which Gruen does not agree with. Gruen, *Heritage*, 274-5.

<sup>109</sup> Also Buitenwerf, 207.

into the earth and throw out their bows as sticks ... but I have raised him from north and from the rising of the sun ...". In the *Book of Isaiah*, the one from the sun implies Cyrus. Collins shows that "a king from the sun" is used in some Egyptian documents to refer to an Egyptian king.<sup>110</sup> Thus the "king from the sun" may be a foreign, Egyptian king. The messianic king in 285-290 seems to be transferred to the king in 652 through the medium of Cyrus.<sup>111</sup>

The verses before 652 tell of terrible wars and desolation over the whole world. Interestingly, there is another reference to a king who comes after a great disaster and catastrophe: "... a sword will pass through your midst and scattering and death and famine will lay hold of you in the seventh generation of the kings, *and then you will rest* (καὶ τότε παύση)" (316-318). In these verses, "you" indicates the Egyptians.<sup>112</sup> Thus it seems that the time of the seventh king in Egypt will be the time of rest and peace. This idea about "the seventh king of Egypt" appears in 608, too.<sup>113</sup> According to 606-609, in the reign of the seventh king, people will cast their idols away out of shame. We see that the reign of the seventh king has something to do with the denunciation of idol-worship, which seems to be a theme particularly emphasized throughout *3Sib*.<sup>114</sup>

Along with the above observation, it is highly likely that another reference to an Egyptian king in 193 indicates the same king of Egypt in 609: "... every kind of deceit

---

<sup>110</sup> Collins, *Sibylline Oracles*, 40ff. Even though, as Gruen points out, the Potter's Oracle, which Collins mainly uses as supporting evidence, derives from the Egyptian nationalistic movement, the fact that the same expression is seen in a document referring to an Egyptian king would be significant and helpful in identifying "the king from the sun" in *3Sib*.

<sup>111</sup> Tobin, 90; Also Nolland argues that the section 265-94 belongs to the early Maccabean period: J. Nolland, "Sib. Or. III. 265-94, An Early Maccabean Messianic Oracle", *JTS* 30 (1979), 158-166. If he is correct, then the Jews of the time in Egypt would expect a king to rebuild a temple, which was accomplished by Philometor.

<sup>112</sup> See 314 in *3Sib*.

<sup>113</sup> On the identification of the king in 652 and 608, see Schürer, 636 n.211.

<sup>114</sup> Nolland considers emphasis on the idolatry as the cause of punishment, with a hope of a messianic figure to restore the eschatological temple, as an indicator that *3 Sib*, 265-94 in particular, was written in the early Maccabaen period.

will be found among them *until the seventh reign, when a king of Egypt, who will be of the Greeks, will rule* (ἄχρι πρὸς ἑβδομάτην βασιληίδα, ἧς βασιλεύσει Αἰγύπτου βασιλεύς, ὃς ἀφ’ Ἑλλήνων γένος ἔσται.)” (191-193). This detailed depiction of the seventh king of Egypt does not allow the reader to think of any other than a Ptolemaic king. Thus, we can conclude that 3*Sib* concerns a Ptolemaic king, during whose reign idolatry will cease, and all suffering, wars and disasters will stop, and the Jews will be strong and the Temple will be built. According to 194, at that time, the people of God will “again” be strong. The reason why “again” is used here would be the allusion in 167: “the house of Solomon will rule first of all”. After the house of Solomon, many other kingdoms will hold power but in the time of the seventh reign of an Egyptian king, the people of God, i.e. the house of Solomon, will again be strong. What we find here is that the seventh period of the Ptolemaic dynasty is connected with the strengthening of the Jews in that place, probably with the result of the newly rebuilt temple.<sup>115</sup>

Recently, Buitenwerf questions identification of “the seventh king” with a Ptolemaic king, and argues that the passages mentioning it (162-195; 314-318; 601-623) “function as indications of the date of an important event in the future”.<sup>116</sup> But the identification does not solely depend upon “(the) seventh king” but with other points: during his reign, the Jews will prosper; and the king who is an Egyptian king, Greek by race, will build the Temple. Buitenwerf does not explain our aforementioned questions why these three concrete expressions appear together. But yet, it would not be easy to conclude that this Ptolemaic king indicates Philometor and that the work was written

---

<sup>115</sup> Interestingly, 3*Sib* concerns only Solomon among Israelites’ kings, while David is not mentioned at all. This must be due to the fact that the Oracles display a deep concern with the Temple (286-94; 564-67; 657-79; 715-18, etc.) and Solomon is the founder of the Temple. Therefore, we may speculate that the strengthening of the Jews would signify to contemporary Jewish readers of these Oracles, in reality, the building of a new temple, as happened after the first exile to Babylon (cf. 286-290). Also Nolland, 161-165.

<sup>116</sup> Buitenwerf, 126-129.

during his reign or some time earlier, because there are many phrases which do not belong to the reign of this king.<sup>117</sup> With Gruen, Buitenwerf and other scholars, we have to admit that there are many symbolic and mystical expressions in *3Sib*, to which the number “seven” might belong. Therefore, the safest way would be to take the minimum from the texts. And the minimum we take from *3Sib* is that the document reflects a *memory* of the events in the reign of Philometor, during which the Jews and the Ptolemaic kings were on good terms. Expressions in *3Sib* such as those expressing a favourable opinion of a Ptolemaic king are not explicable outside the context of the prosperity and power the Jews enjoyed during the reign of Ptolemy Philometor. Gruen argues that there is no evidence for enumerating kings. He appears to be right for the official records of the periods, but it seems that he overlooks a fundamental feature of ordinary life. *3Sib* was not the official royal record or anything like that. It would have been circulated among ordinary people, rather than among the governing class.<sup>118</sup> When they read about “a seventh king” in this kind of literature with an apocalyptic bent, they would not rely upon any royal, official record but they would merely count the number of kings who had reigned so far. The likely response of readers in dealing with this number has nothing to do with any ancient official counting method about kings.

As in the case of many apocalyptic writings, this work also does not have concrete and specific expressions, but is full of symbolic ones. Nevertheless, if any concrete expressions survive, then they should be noted: they are references to a Greek king of

---

<sup>117</sup> Gauger, 441, points out “hatred against Rome”; For other historical events alluded to in the book, Buitenwerf, 127; On the composite character of the work, J. Geffcken, *Komposition und Entstehungszeit der Oracular Sibyllina* (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1902), 1-17; on a concise summary of scholarly opinions about the character of the *3Sib*, Gruen, “Jews”, 16 n.1.

<sup>118</sup> Barclay, *Jews*, 223-224; cf. Tobin, 91-92, suggests that the authors came from “the educated of Egyptian Jew”, and the work appealed to well educated Jews, but the appeal was not only to educated Jews but also popular among the far larger lower classes of the Jews in Egypt.

Egypt who will bring good things to the Jews, and rebuild the Temple. If the work was written in the early period of Philometor's reign, this work reflects the expectation of the Jews when they witnessed the king's welcome to the land of Onias. And if the work was written during the first century BCE or after, it may show the idealized hope of the Jews projected onto the figure of Philometor. We certainly do not find any explicit mention of the Temple of Onias in *3Sib*, even though there are many positive references to the Temple of Solomon. It does not mean that this work was written before the existence of the Temple of Onias, as Collins assumes. For the author of *3Sib*, the Temple of Solomon was the most important symbol of Jewish identity:

“Evil shall come to the godly men, who dwell around the great temple of Solomon, and who are the descendants of righteous men” (113-115).

Therefore, the Sibyl does not mention the Second Temple by Zerubbabel, which, of course, should not be interpreted as evidence that this work was written before the temple's rebuilding.

So, we do not know whether *3Sib* was written around the time of Philometor but we can tell that a memory of Philometor's reign lies behind the mention of the seventh Egyptian king, who will build the Temple.<sup>119</sup>

#### 5.4.2. *3Sib* and LXX-Is

The point that *3Sib* reflects the relation between Philometor and the Jews of Onias can be further supported by the argument that *3Sib* has many things in common with the Greek Isaiah, in that LXX-Is demonstrates strong support for the Temple of Onias.

One of the main themes of *3Sib* is a strongly critical attitude towards idolatry (8-45; 275-85; 545-55; 601-7; 763-4). In contrast, the Jews are praised for not being idolaters (218-30; 575-90). Therefore, if the Jews were to be punished, it was because they worshipped idols (265-79). According to the Sibyl, the supreme reason that one

---

<sup>119</sup> Also VanderKam, *Introduction*, 707-712.

should stop worshipping idols is that God is the creator of all things (esp. 8-35).

This strong judgment against idolatry can be seen in Isaiah, too, e.g, 2:8-9; 40:18-21; 42:17; 44:9-11, etc. And we noted earlier that 19:1-15 takes a decisive stand against idolatry,<sup>120</sup> a stance that is commonly seen in Hellenistic Jewish literature of this period.<sup>121</sup> Of note is the fact that one of the main arguments against idolatry in Isaiah is also based on the idea of God the Creator (40:21-26).<sup>122</sup>

One more thing to add in relation to the above argument: the Sibyl tries to emphasize the authority of her prophecy by mentioning “the former (τὰ πρότερα)” and “the latter (τὰ δ’ ἔσχατα)” things that she prophesied. This is exactly what LXX-Is does to show that God is the only true God: “Your judgment comes near, says the Lord, ... declare to you what shall come to pass or tell what were *the former* (τὰ πρότερα), ... and we shall know what are *the latter* (τὰ ἔσχατα) and future things” (Is 41:21-22).

Interestingly, we have further evidence that the ‘Sibyl’ read from and was influenced by LXX-Is. In the reign of the seventh king of Egypt, mortals would cast away the idols they had worshipped and hide them in clefts of rocks: “χειροποίητα ... ἃ ῥίψουσιν βροτοὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν σχισμαῖς πετρῶν κατακρύψαντες ...” (607). Similarly LXX-Is 2:18-19 says that “And they shall hide all handmade idols and having carried ... into the clefts of the rocks ... (καὶ τὰ χειροποίητα πάντα κατακρύψουσιν, εἰσενέγκαντες ... εἰς τὰς σχισμὰς τῶν πετρῶν)”, while MT-Is 2:18-19 says that humans shall hide themselves in the clefts of the rocks, not the idols (“And the idols shall disappear, and men shall come into the holes of the rocks ... **וְהָאֱלִילִים כָּלִיל יִחַלְף וּבָאוּ בְּמַעְרוֹת צְרִים**).<sup>123</sup> This change arises from

---

<sup>120</sup> See 3.4.

<sup>121</sup> See 3.4.4.1 on this motif; Nolland, 165-166.

<sup>122</sup> Contrary to Gruen, *Heritage*, 284, who thinks that this critique of idolatry indicates a possible provenance for the Oracles somewhere outside Egypt, the idolatry controversy can serve to show a certain relationship with Isaiah texts in 3 *Sib*. As we have seen, the theme of anti-idolatry is an important feature of Hellenistic Jewish literature connected with Egypt, including LXX-Is.

<sup>123</sup> Qumran reads as MT.

the rendering of בוא as εἰσφέρω. Almost the same phrase appears in v.10 and v.21, and LXX uses εἰσερχόμαι to render בוא of these verses. It may indicate that the rendering in LXX-Is 2:19 was not due to any misunderstanding or a different Vorlage. It is clear that LXX-Is 2:19 had a unique rendering, which was adopted in 3Sib.<sup>124</sup>

We, therefore, can conclude that the Sibylline text followed and was influenced by the text and imagery of LXX-Is.

We may also add the peaceful world of LXX-Is as a parallel to the coming order envisaged by 3Sib. 767ff offers an eschatological vision of a kingdom of the Sibyl, as the work nears the end. In that time, people will bring incense and gifts to the house of the great God (772f). Peace and joy will be theirs (780-787). The most noticeable feature of this eschatological kingdom is the depiction in 788-795:

Wolves and lambs will eat grass together in the mountains.  
Leopards will feed together with kids.  
Roving bears will spend the night with calves.  
The flesh-eating lion will eat husks at the manger  
Like an ox, and mere infant children will lead them  
With ropes. For he will make the beasts on earth harmless.  
Serpents and asps will sleep with babies  
And will not harm them, for the hand of God will be upon them.

This Sibylline version includes everything in LXX Isaiah.<sup>125</sup> In fact, this is an expanded version of Isaianic phrases in 11:6-8. Therefore, we can say that 3Sib makes the Isaianic vision of the day its own in terms of the eschatological kingdom.

To conclude, there is much in common between the Greek Isaiah and 3Sib, which should be considered as far from being coincidental. Of course, 3Sib uses many quotations from other books of the Hebrew Bible, but its use of Isaiah seems to preponderate. So it is likely that either 3Sib was influenced by LXX Isaiah, or the two

---

<sup>124</sup> Also V. Nikiprowetzky, *La Troisième Sibylle* (Paris: Mouton, 1970), 208; Gruen, "Jews", 22. Gruen denies the connection between a Ptolemaic reign and 3Sib, and suggests to consider a possible influence from Isaiah, but from our analysis, this suggested connection with Isaiah could serve that 3Sib reflects the memory of the Jewish experience in the time of Philometor.

<sup>125</sup> The image of "feeding together" is repeated in LXX-Is and 3Sib.

works share the same theological viewpoint.

*3Sib* reflects a close link between a Ptolemaic king and the Jews, including the foundation of a new temple, on which was already dealt with earlier.<sup>126</sup> Taking into account the historical background, the reign of Philometor and the flight of Onias into Egypt would fit best. It does not mean the work was written in this period, however. The work reflects the historical reality of the period.<sup>127</sup> The close affinity between *3Sib* and LXX-Is suggests the possibility that the two belonged to the same tradition. Thus it seems that a positive Jewish stance towards the Temple built by “the seventh king” or Philometor, was not confined to LXX Isaiah. As Söllner points out, therefore, “das Motiv der Rückkehr der Diaspora nach Jerusalem” plays no role in *3Sib*,<sup>128</sup> similar to LXX-Is and *Joseph and Aseneth*.

Next, we will deal with the *Third Book of Maccabees*, which also, in our opinion, presents a positive view towards Jewish priesthood in Egypt.

## 5.5. *Third Book of Maccabees*

### 5.5.1. Identity of the Jews in Egypt

Josephus and the *Third Book of Maccabees* (hereafter *3Mac*) report a huge persecution in Egypt upon the Jews who are doomed to be trampled by drunken elephants during the Ptolemaic period. As Barclay said, “both Josephus and *3 Mac* connect the event to a Jewish festival, and it is easy to conceive how similar but not identical legends could be passed down in the Jewish community”.<sup>129</sup> According to the majority scholarly opinion, the story preserved in Josephus is likely to have greater

---

<sup>126</sup> See 4.4.5.

<sup>127</sup> Bartlett, 48-49.

<sup>128</sup> Söllner, 124.

<sup>129</sup> Barclay, *Jews*, 194.

historical probability.<sup>130</sup> We will not get involved with this discussion, but will focus on the significant point of what the author of *3Mac* was trying to express by the framework in which Ptolemy IV Philopator appears as the persecutor of the Jews. The theme of *3Mac* is, basically, the glorious and miraculous victory which “Almighty God Most High” gave the Jews in the face of the huge persecution by the impious king without a proper reason, and the celebration of a festival.

But a closer look into the composition of *3Mac* reveals many interesting points.<sup>131</sup> First of all, what is the function of the first scene in Jerusalem? As Williams states, “it is curious that an etiological document concerning a festival celebrated by Egyptian Jews records so much action taking place outside Egypt”.<sup>132</sup> The story does not begin with the event in Egypt, but with Philopator’s victory at the battle of Raphia and his subsequent visit to the Jerusalem Temple. What halted his audacious and impious effort to enter into the Holy of Holies in the Temple was God’s miraculous deed after the prayer of Simon the high priest. The story so far seems to function, basically, as a prelude and background to explain why the king was so enraged, before the main storyline about the huge persecution that befell the whole Jewish community throughout Egypt.<sup>133</sup> But as Williams puts it, “Philopator’s desire that Alexandrian Jews worship Dionysius and their refusal to do so would be enough to bring in the elephant story and the attempted execution of the Egyptian Jews”.<sup>134</sup> Therefore, the

---

<sup>130</sup> See for reference, Gruen, *Heritage*, 228, especially, footnote 164; Also see 4.1.

<sup>131</sup> This composition of *3Mac* is usually expressed as the connection of “wholly legendary traditions alongside reliable historical sources”. F. Parente, “The Third Book of Maccabees as Ideological Document and Historical Source” *Heno* 10 (1988), 159. On sources used in *3Mac* and comparison, see J. Tromp, “The Formation of the Third Book of Maccabees”, *Heno* 17 (1995), 315-324; also Capponi, “Martyrs”, 293.

<sup>132</sup> D. Williams, “3 Maccabees: A Defense of Diaspora Judaism?”, *JSP* 13 (1995), 21. The view to see *3Mac* as an aetiological document to justify a feast of the Egyptian Jews was suggested by E. Bickerman in *Paulys Realencyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft* (XIV; Stuttgart, 1928), 797-800. See Parente, “Third Book of Maccabees”, 158.

<sup>133</sup> Also Tromp, “Formation”, 325.

<sup>134</sup> Williams, 21. Recent scholars tend to emphasize the significance of the Dionysius cult in *3Mac*: J.R.C. Cousland, “Dionysius Theomachos? Echoes of the Bacchae in 3 Maccabees”, *Bib* 82 (2001), 539-

first part should be granted an alternative significance, otherwise it would be redundant.

What takes up the substantial portion of this part is the prayer of Simon the High Priest. Focusing on this prayer, we notice that the first part has a quite simple structure: an unreasonable persecution by an impious king – a prayer of a (high) priest – God’s miraculous intervention. What is significant is that exactly the same structure is found in the main story in Egypt, where the prayer of Eleazar plays a main role. Therefore, it suggests that the ‘Jerusalem part’ functions as an example for the other prayer in Egypt. Then, it can be argued that even though the first part set in Jerusalem is relatively short, it plays a critical role in that it prepares the reader’s understanding for the events in Egypt. Considering that God’s glorious salvation is really a consequence of the prayers of Simon and Eleazar, it seems that the emphasis of this miracle story is on not God’s salvific action itself so much as the efficacy of the prayers of priests, which are both given an extensive introduction (2:2-20; 6:1-15).<sup>135</sup>

Further confirmation is found in the fact that both prayers have exactly the same structure:

The appeal to God: 2:2-3; 6:2-3  
The enumeration of occasions in the past when God brought about deliverance:  
2:4-12; 6:4-8  
The present imminent disaster: 2:13-14; 6:9  
Asking God for deliverance, so that the enemies may not boast and despise God:  
2:15-20; 6:10-15.

In answer to their prayers, God rescues his chosen place and his people. When we consider that the king neither repented nor perceived anything about God after the event at the Temple of Jerusalem, the significance of the first part seems to lie in providing the above framework for the latter part. And in the second part, according to

---

548; N. Hacham, “3 Maccabees: An Anti-Dionysian Polemic” in Jo-Ann Brant, C.W. Hedrick, and C. Shea (eds.), *Ancient Fiction: The Matrix of Early Christian and Jewish Narrative* (SBL Symposium Series 32; SBL Atlanta, 2005), 167-183.

<sup>135</sup> Contrary to V. Tcherikover, “The Third Book of Maccabees as Historical Source of Augustus’ time”, *ScrHie* 7 (1961), 9. He regards two prayers as having “no significance of their own”.

this structure, the Jews in Egypt play a role corresponding to that of the Jerusalem Temple in the first part. In other words, the Jews in Egypt are viewed as if they had taken on the significance of the Temple.<sup>136</sup> Another version of this story is preserved in Josephus but his account does not contain the passage concerning the Jerusalem Temple. In the version in *3Mac*, however, the aforementioned structure seems to demonstrate that the section centred on the Jerusalem Temple functions, ironically, to emphasize the identity of the Jews in Egypt. Though scholars tend to agree that *3Mac* shows a strong affinity with, and high esteem towards the Jerusalem Temple,<sup>137</sup> it seems that they overlook the significance of the two prayers. In contrast to our own view, Barclay concludes that it “displays the wider loyalties of the Egyptian Jews” towards the Jerusalem Temple, and “the similarities between the prayers of the Jerusalem priest Simon and the Egyptian priest Eleazar also indicate the theological unity of the two communities”.<sup>138</sup> The two prayers look similar and have points in common. But still, there remains a very significant difference between them: the miracle in Jerusalem occurred to the very person of the king but it could not change the king at all; rather, it only provoked him into strong antagonism against all Jews, while the miracle in Egypt changed the king with the result that he did good to the Jews, a

---

<sup>136</sup> Interestingly, the prayer of Simon the high priest has a more restricted view of the Temple adding some comments: 2:9 “You ... chose this city and sanctified this place for your name, *though you have no need of anything*”; 2:15-16 “*For your dwelling is the heaven of heavens, unapproachable by human being, but ... you sanctified this place*” (NRSV, my italics).

<sup>137</sup> In connection with this tendency to emphasize the loyalty towards Jerusalem of the Egyptian Jews, *3Mac* 2:31 has been understood to express some apostates to abhor the price to maintain “the piety of the city” i.e. Jerusalem: ἔτιοι μὲν οὖν ἐπιπολαίως τὰς τῆς πόλεως εὐσεβείας ἐπιβάθρα στυγούντες ..., as in, for example, Schwartz, “Temple or City”, 115-116. Tromp argues that this interpretation is out of the context, and the passage should be translated as “Some of them, who had a merely shallow aversion from using the city’s religion as a stepping-stone, ...”, with Alexandria as the referent of “the city”. According to him, this verse attests that there were some Jews who apparently abhorred to follow the Alexandrian religion but readily gave up their Jewish customs to get favour of the Ptolemaic king. And there is no evidence in this verse to show that Jerusalem takes par excellence of Judaism, and that the Jews in Egypt considers Jerusalem as homeland to follow and keep her piety, and furthermore, their life in Egypt as exile. J. Tromp, “Not Enough: ΕΠΙΠΟΛΑΙΩΣ in 3 Maccabees 2:31”, *JSJ* 30 (1999), 412-417. N.C. Croy, *3 Maccabees* (Septuagint Commentary Series; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2006), 62, also seems to understand the passage to indicate Jerusalem, even though he has a similar interpretation of the adverb ἐπιπολαίως.

<sup>138</sup> Barclay, *Jews*, 198.

point which has been long neglected from deserved attention by scholars so far.

The point is clearer when we remember the similar story about a Gentile who robbed the Temple in 2Mac 3:13-40 where Heliodorus experienced God's intervention, and changed his mind and the king's mind as well.<sup>139</sup> Thus there was no celebration for the deliverance in Jerusalem and in fact there was no apparent response from the Jerusalemites, in contrast to the reaction of the Jews in Egypt.<sup>140</sup> I would therefore argue, contrary to Barclay, that the Jerusalem section should be dealt with as a prelude or background for the following main part, in which is accomplished the full meaning of God's intervention. There is some truth in the statement about the Egyptian Jews' loyalty towards Jerusalem but it should not be emphasized too much. The main focus of the story lies in the Egyptian part and the emphasis of their identity through God's action and the transformation of the king.

One more argument to be noted: De Silva deals with the events including the prayers in 3Mac in comparison with the one in 2Mac 3:1-10:9.<sup>141</sup> His conclusion is that "3Mac was composed as a sort of parallel saga for Egyptian Judaism".<sup>142</sup> But such a comparison does not cast any light on the significant difference between the two separate events in 3Mac, which should be dealt with separately. The 'Jerusalem Temple' event in 3Mac is not explicitly connected to the Egyptian Jews, though Ptolemy's bad experience (being barred from the Temple by divine power) seems to have turned him against the Jews in Egypt, but it offers a pattern by which the

---

<sup>139</sup> In fact, this motif (persecution by foreign kings – God's miraculous intervention – kings are changed and give glory to God of Israel) is frequently repeated through the Hebrew Bible such as Dan 3:1-30; 6:1-27; the *Book of Esther*, etc.

<sup>140</sup> Williams, 25f, states another difference between two events: while God's help only came in the final moment of the terrible event in Jerusalem temple, the divine help came immediately and repeatedly in the event in Egypt.

<sup>141</sup> De Silva, *Introducing the Apocrypha. Message, Context, and Significance* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic, 2002), 311f.

<sup>142</sup> De Silva, 311. Tromp, too, compares 3Mac with 2Mac and suggests that the author of 3Mac is directly and literally using 2Mac. See "Formation", 318-322.

‘Elephant’ event of the Egyptian Jews is to be interpreted.

In connection with this, Eleazar’s prayer points out that the Jews in Egypt are the people of God<sup>143</sup> (6:3 “the children of the sainted Jacob”, “a people of your consecrated portion”; 6:13 “the nation of Jacob”<sup>144</sup>), which is often emphasized in LXX-Is.<sup>145</sup> Therefore, it seems quite likely that the story shows how the Jews in Egypt were significant theologically, even though they lived in a foreign land. Presumably, this would be the reason why Eleazar’s prayer does not contain any petition for returning to Palestine.<sup>146</sup> It may be confirmed by the expression ἀποικία in 6:10 in Eleazar’s prayer. As we argued earlier, this word implies a permanent residence abroad, not just sojourning for a short time.<sup>147</sup> In contrast, there is the motif of ‘returning home’ in 3Mac which refers to ‘returning’ to where they have lived in Egypt, “unharmd, free, and overjoyed”<sup>148</sup> (7:8,20). This is quite in contrast with a prayer of a Jew in Babylon:

“O Lord... Gather together our scattered people, set free those who are slaves among the Gentiles ... *Plant your people in your holy place, as Moses promised*” (2Mac 1:24-28 in NRSV, my italics).

Therefore, we can conclude that 3Mac emphasises the identity of the Jewish diaspora in Egypt by using this traditional legend with the particular framework which we see in both the Jerusalem section and the Egypt section.

In addition, there are some motifs in common with the Exodus story, which have been seldom noticed by scholars: the Israelites left Egypt with many riches given by the

---

<sup>143</sup> As Croy, xviii, points out, in this book God is almost exclusively concerned with the Jews, and Croy suggests that its climax is the praise of God as “the deliverer of Israel” (7:23).

<sup>144</sup> Ἰακωβ γένος. To emphasize the whole Jews, “the nation (τὸ ἔθνος)” is used in 3Mac 1:11; 2:27,33, while usually the plural form of the noun is used to indicate “the Gentile”.

<sup>145</sup> Another connection with LXX-Is is the use of the word ἀδίκως. Eleazar’s prayer says their living in Egypt is ‘unjustly’ perishing (... ἐν ξένη γῆ ξέρον ἀδίκως ἀπολλύμενοι, 6:3), a theme which is typical of the understanding of the Jewish diaspora shown in LXX-Is. On the Greek word of the present verse in 3Mac and LXX-Is, see Seeligmann, 111ff.

<sup>146</sup> Cf. Collins, *Between*, 130.

<sup>147</sup> In Philo’s view: *Conf. Ling.* 76f. See Kasher, 236f. See 5.1.

<sup>148</sup> “The author describes the physical, political, and emotional condition of the Jews upon their departure” in Croy, 118.

Egyptians – the Jews left Alexandria with the great favor of the Greek king; the Israelites proceeded to mount Sinai where they received the Law inscribed on stones through Moses – the Jews proceeded to Ptolemais where they inscribed this salvation on a pillar; the Israelites kept festivals celebrating their salvation – the Jews did the same thing, instituting a festival. The most significant difference between them is that there is no hint of a motif of a return to Palestine in *3Mac*. Therefore, as in LXX-Is,<sup>149</sup> the Exodus tradition is used differently in *3Mac*: In the *Book of Exodus*, the tradition is used to glorify their return to the promised land, but in *3Mac*, it is used to demonstrate the identity and glory of the Jews in Egypt, which seems to be similar to the use of Exodus story in the *Letter of Aristeas*.<sup>150</sup>

#### 5.5.2. Attitude towards the Ptolemaic dynasty

Another important point of the story is the consistent confirmation of loyalty towards the Ptolemaic dynasty: “The Jews kept maintaining *goodwill and unswerving loyalty* (εὐνοια καὶ πίστις ἀδιάστροφος) toward the dynasty” (3:3).<sup>151</sup> Even the king knew this: “the Jews who ... have shown *complete, firm loyalty* (ὀλοσχερῆς βέβαιος πίστις) to my ancestors” (5:31), which is reaffirmed by the king after he experiences the miracle in 6:25-6. Judging from these repetitive expressions about Jewish loyalty, one of the intentions of this story must be to show that the Jews were very faithful subjects to the foreign kings ruling over them.<sup>152</sup> The problem is that the author of *3Mac* uses terms that leave us in no doubt concerning his judgment of the king’s actions. Because of this,

---

<sup>149</sup> See 3.4.2.

<sup>150</sup> See below.

<sup>151</sup> In fact, the sentence is paralleled and closely connected with the Jewish food rite in 3:4. ‘loyalty toward foreign kings of the country where they live’ and ‘the observance of Jewish laws’ are suggested as representing the ideal existence of the Jews who live outside Palestine. They thought they could do it but as often happened, this way of life triggered Gentile antagonism toward the Jews. See Gabba, 614-656.

<sup>152</sup> H. Anderson, “3 Maccabees” in J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (Vol. II; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1985), 512.

Barclay thinks that “the author’s world is structured by the binary contrast of ‘Jews’ and ‘Gentiles’, whose relationship is chiefly defined by hostility”,<sup>153</sup> while many other scholars conclude that the main point to be emphasized here is concord, not antagonism.<sup>154</sup>

The typical method of those who perceive a favorable attitude on the part of the Jews towards some categories of outsider, is to distinguish “the Greeks” from “the Gentiles”: so, goodwill toward and from the Greeks, and enmity with the Gentiles.<sup>155</sup> In the following verses the author tries to exculpate the Greeks from the antagonistic attitude of people of “other races” toward the Jews:

Nevertheless those of other races paid no heed to their good service to their nation, which was common talk among all; instead they gossiped about the differences in worship and foods, alleging that these people were loyal neither to the king nor to his authorities, but were hostile and greatly opposed to his government. So they attached no ordinary reproach to them. The Greeks in the city, though wronged in no way, when they saw an unexpected tumult around these people and the crowds that suddenly were forming, were not strong enough to help them, for they lived under tyranny. They did try to console them, being grieved at the situation and expected that matters would change... and already some of their neighbors and friends and business associates had taken some of them aside privately and were pledging to protect them and to exert more earnest efforts for their assistance. (NRSV 3:6-10)

However, the work does not look that simple. There are no further references to these kind and generous “Greeks” in *3Mac*. But it seems that all nations, including the friends of the king and the king himself, united to threaten the Jews. Therefore, we suggest that the reference to the reasonable “Greeks” in 3:8-10 is a literary and idealistic representation of how “the Greeks” should be. Furthermore, the use of the term “the Greeks” in *3Mac* is probably a rhetorical device to associate the Jews with

---

<sup>153</sup> Barclay, *Jews*, 197; also Tcherikover, “Third Book of Maccabees”, 20-21. According to Barclay, therefore, *3Mac* and the *Letter of Aristeas* represent two sharply contrasting views towards Ptolemaic kings. Also in M.Hadas, “Aristeas and III Maccabees”, *HTR* 42 (1949), 175-84; De Silva, 307f. S. Tracy shows an interesting assumption that Aristeas is an answer to and a correction of *3Mac* because “the normal course of thought was from the less to the more enlightened”. See S. Tracy, “III Maccabees and Pseudo-Aristeas”, *Yale Classical Studies* 1 (1928), 241-252. But M. Hadas suggests the reverse: *The Third and Fourth Books of Maccabees* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1953), 9-10. Johnson is reluctant to follow either, *Historical Fictions*, 141 n. 48; also Anderson, 516; Croy, xvi.

<sup>154</sup> Gruen, *Heritage*, 233; Collins, *Between*, 128.

<sup>155</sup> Collins, *Between*, 126-129. He thinks a similar trait can be seen in Philo. Cf. Barclay, *Jews*, 196f.

“the Greeks”, a use that is actually reserved for a class of people known to be friendly and civilised, as Barclay suggests.<sup>156</sup>

There are also several places where the Gentiles are represented as a kind of “enemy”. In some occurrences, the Greek king and the Greeks seem to be called “enemy”:

1. In the prayer of Simon the High Priest, he mentions their present suffering as follows:

“See now, O holy king, that because of our many and great sins we are crushed with suffering, *subjected to our enemies* (ὕπετάγημεν τοῖς ἐχθροῖς ἡμῶν), and overtaken by helplessness” (2:13, *NRSV*).

The italicized “our enemies” must refer to the Hellenistic kingdom of the Ptolemaic dynasty, including Philopator.

2. 6:10 in Eleazar’s prayer asks God to rescue them from the hand of the “enemy”, which must also refer to Philopator or the dynasty.

3. And in 6:15, the “enemies” should not exclude “the Greek”: “Let it be shown to all the Gentiles that you are with us, O Lord, and have not turned your face from us; but just as you have said, ‘Not even when they were in the land of their enemies did I neglect them’, so accomplish it, O Lord” (*NRSV*). Moreover, in this verse, “the Gentiles” and “(their) enemies” are in parallel to refer to the same identity. The Jews in Egypt came there not because of the “Egyptians” or other peoples but because of the “Greeks”. And the land is not the land of the Egyptians but of the Greeks since the Hellenistic period.

Then, Barclay’s suggestion that there are two conflicting classes reflected in ‘Jews’ and ‘Gentiles’ appears likely.<sup>157</sup>

But there is one thing that Barclay fails to notice: though the author calls them the “enemy”, the Jews themselves in the story do not reveal any hatred or try to take revenge on them, even after the Jews receive the king’s favour. The Jews often considered the king as an “enemy”, but after the rumor about a possible persecution was circulated among them, they continued to maintain goodwill toward the dynasty (3:3). Soldiers who came to seize the Jews are called “their enemies” (4:4) but no resistance and no grudge against them is found. The author reports the existence of

---

<sup>156</sup> Barclay, *Jews*, 196f.

<sup>157</sup> In 5:13, the Jews implored God to save themselves from “the arrogant Gentiles”. It goes without saying that the king is meant to be included in this expression, and also in 6:13,15. In this respect, the view of Emmet and Anderson that the author of *3Mac* intended, to some extent, a non-Jewish audience should be rejected. C.W. Emmet, “The Third Book of Maccabees” in R.H. Charles (ed.), *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English* (vol. 1; Oxford University Press, 1913), 158; Anderson, 513. There are many offensive statements against non-Jews, which include not only ‘the Gentiles’ but also ‘the Greeks’. Cf. Williams, 18f.

“the inveterate enmity that had long ago been in their (the Gentiles’) minds” (4:1) but the Jews do not try to take revenge on the Gentiles. The Jews only try to get permission from the king to punish their own people who betray their faith (7:10).<sup>158</sup> So, *3Mac* is quite different from Esther which has a very similar structure to *3Mac*: in Esther, the celebration of a festival culminates in destroying the Gentiles who had been against the Jews.<sup>159</sup>

Therefore, Barclay’s view that *3Mac* reveals a hostile relationship between the Jews and the Gentiles should be evaluated as oversimplified. There was conflict but the concern of the author did not lie in advocating a solution to the conflict by vengeance. This can be confirmed in his defence of the king.

*3Mac* is full of expressions defining the wrongdoing of the king.<sup>160</sup> However, some device to exculpate the king is also seen in the story. Firstly, it was reportedly because of someone’s thoughtless (ἀπρονοήτως) word that the king was provoked to enter the Holy of Holies (1:14). Seeing the elephants turn against his peoples, the king blamed “his Friend” and made it clear who was responsible for this whole matter (6:22-28).

This is repeated in his letter on behalf of the Jews:

“Certain of our friends, frequently urging us with malicious intent, persuaded us to gather together the Jews of the kingdom in a body and to punish them with barbarous penalties as traitors: for they declared that our government would never be firmly established until this was accomplished, because of ill-will that these people had toward all nations. They also led them out with harsh treatment as slaves, or rather as traitors, and, girding themselves with a cruelty more savage

---

<sup>158</sup> The statement that there were over three hundred apostates (7:15) may indicate that some Jews in Egypt inclined towards Dionysius cult, which may suggest that an anti-Dionysian polemic is one of the purposes of *3 Mac*. See Hacham, “3 Maccabees”, 180-182; cf. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, I:202; II:135 n.611.

<sup>159</sup> This is pointed out also in N. Hacham, “3 Maccabees and Esther: Parallels, Intertextuality, and Diaspora Identity”, *JBL* 126 (2007), 782-783, with many other differences between them. E.J. Bickerman, “Notes on the Greek Book of Esther”, *PAAJR* 20 (1951), 129-130, explains that Greek Esther and *3Mac* have in common in that the Jews and their enemies are trying to do away with each other. However, the significant difference should be noted: the “enemy” in Esther is the Gentiles, while in *3Mac*, they are apostates, that is, other Jews.

<sup>160</sup> For example, “an impious and profane man, puffed up in his audacity and power” (2:2); “audacious and profane man” (2:4); “tyranny” (3:8); “arrogant Gentiles” (5:13), etc. Even Tcherikover, “Third Book of Maccabees”, 21, expresses that “the author of III Macc. apart from hating the gentiles in general, hated the King in particular”, and he compares the king with “noble” Philadephus in the *Letter of Aristeas*.

than that of Scythian custom, they tried without any inquiry or examination to put them to death” (7:3-5 *NRSV*)

What can we say about this? Would it be wrong to say that the author did not want to leave any impression that the king was responsible for the whole disaster?<sup>161</sup>

Interestingly, the Gentiles who died in this event were only the “friends” who were supposedly the cause of it, to the exclusion of the apostate Jews. From this, we may say that *3Mac* has a milder attitude toward the Gentiles than Esther in *MT*.<sup>162</sup> This may reflect something of their historical situation, or show an idealization of the relationship.<sup>163</sup>

To conclude, the author does not want to make any antagonism conspicuous.<sup>164</sup> Certainly he knows of the existence of “anti-Judaism” as well as “anti-Gentilism” there.<sup>165</sup> Rather, it seems that he tries to play down any antagonism between the Jews and the other people, including the Greeks. And the focus of the author in understanding this disaster is directed towards the Jewish community, away from any hostility of other peoples.

Presumably, for the Jews in the period of the author, how to live together with other, often aggressive neighbours would be a burning question. In terms of their existence, the more urgent matter would be the punishment of apostate Jews, not of the Gentiles. And the problem of apostasy is directly linked with that of identity.

---

<sup>161</sup> In this respect, Parente’s view, “Third Book of Maccabees”, 169, that negative depiction of Ptolemaic king in *3Mac* “must depend on a systematic and polemical reversal of the king’s character as it emerges from *Aristeas*” should be rejected as partial and limited.

<sup>162</sup> On the similarities between Greek Esther and *3 Mac*, see Hadas, *Maccabees*, 6-8; Parente, “Third Book of Maccabees”, 168-169; Modrzejewski, *Jews*, 147; Bickerman, “Notes”, 128-129; Johnson, *Historical Fictions*, 137 and nn. 33,35; Anderson, 515; Croy, xi-xii, xvi; and most comprehensibly, Hacham, “3 Maccabees and Esther”, 765-785, who argues direct literary dependence by showing the linguistic parallels between Greek Esther and *3Mac*, rather than focusing thematic and structural parallels of the scholarly works so far. Furthermore, he, 783-784, argues that Greek Esther follows the view in *3Mac* in dealing with Jewish-Gentile relations in the Diaspora, differently from Hebrew Esther.

<sup>163</sup> Hadas, *Maccabees*, 24: “III Maccabees may be regarded as a sort of corrective to the attitude of the Hebrew Esther”.

<sup>164</sup> Certainly, it is possible that the reality was full of tension and enmity. The real life, however, is one thing, and what is depicted and demonstrated in *3Mac* is another.

<sup>165</sup> De Silva, 315-19.

They lived in a foreign land (6:10), but they thought they could maintain their communal life by keeping the Jewish rites according to the Law<sup>166</sup> while at the same time serving foreign kings with loyalty; however, the Gentiles were not so easily persuaded. To maintain this way of life, what *3Mac* suggests is that God is with them and will do everything for them, as he has done in Jerusalem. Therefore, the main purpose of this story would be to encourage the Jews in Egypt not to commit apostasy,<sup>167</sup> but to keep their Jewish religious customs along with their belief that they are the people of God and that God is with them, and to keep serving foreign kings with goodwill and loyalty, and with emphasis on their peaceful co-existence with the Gentiles,<sup>168</sup> even though undeserved persecution might come upon them; because God could change the king himself who acts badly against the Jews.

### 5.5.3. Relation to LXX-Isaiah

*3Mac* reflects an idealized Jewish identity in Egypt. God provided his great power to save them following their prayers, represented by Eleazar's prayer. Even in front of the holy Jerusalem Temple, divine intervention could not change the impious king. He, however, was changed after experiencing 'the elephant event' and gave his proper homage toward the God of the Jews (7:6-9). This shows what a great thing God did for the Jews in Egypt and it reflects their identity and pride.<sup>169</sup> Indeed, they are reportedly "the children of the sainted Jacob" (6:3). This stance is seen also throughout LXX-Is.

---

<sup>166</sup> Also Parente, "Third Book of Maccabees", 180.

<sup>167</sup> Capponi, "Martyrs", 293, 303; J.R.C. Cousland, "Reversal, Recidivism and Reward in 3 Maccabees: Structure and Purpose" *JSJ* 34 (2003), 48-50.

<sup>168</sup> Also Hacham, "3 Maccabees and Esther", 783-784; S. Johnson, "Third Maccabees: Historical Fictions and the Shaping of Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Period" in Jo-Ann Brant, C.W. Hedrick, and C. Shea (eds.), *Ancient Fiction: The Matrix of Early Christian and Jewish Narrative* (SBLSymS 32; SBL Atlanta, 2005), 185-197; Croy, xix.

<sup>169</sup> De Silva, 304: "the work also gives poignant expression to the conviction that Diaspora Jews are no less connected with the fate and fortunes of the Jerusalem temple than are their Palestinian sisters and brothers and no further removed from God's favor and help".

Given that they had settled in the land to which the Bible warned them not to return, their status as God's righteous people must have been a major issue. And as we saw above, the use of the Exodus story is similar in LXX-Is and *3Mac*. Both works comment upon Jewish identity in Egypt. In relation to this, Williams holds the interesting opinion that *3Mac* should be viewed as a defence of Diaspora Jews towards a Palestinian Jewish readership.<sup>170</sup> It would be difficult to prove the existence of any conspicuous offensive attitude of Palestinian Jews towards Egyptian Jews and any explicit conflict between them.<sup>171</sup> However, it does seem clear that *3Mac* presents them as God's consecrated portion in Egypt (6:3). Based on our analysis of the two prayers above, we suggest that *3Mac* be considered as an "encouragement", towards the Egyptian Jews, rather than "defence", which might be aimed at Palestinian Jews.<sup>172</sup>

In addition, there is one more thing worth mentioning. The priest who prayed for the Jerusalem Temple was Simon. Interestingly, as Philip Alexander points out, he was an Oniad, Zadokite priest and "his name had been immortalized by the great panegyric in ch. 50 of Ben Sira, a Greek version of which became available in Egypt in the late second century CE".<sup>173</sup> According to our analysis, in the 'Jerusalem-section' which is introduced to emphasize the significance of God's deliverance of the Jews in Egypt, the fact that the influential person was Simon the Just, the very ancestor of Onias IV who fled into Egypt does not seem mere coincidence. It is possible that the counterpart of Simon in *3Mac*, Eleazar, may be one of the Oniad priests in the Land of Onias.<sup>174</sup>

---

<sup>170</sup> Williams, 17-29.

<sup>171</sup> Cf. De Silva, 311.

<sup>172</sup> Also in Capponi, "Martyrs", 302; Cousland, "Reversal", 39-51; more comprehensive discussion on this subject with the same conclusion, Johnson, *Historical Fictions*, 169-181; but contrary to Williams, 29: "the targeted audience may, in fact, have been Palestinian Jews".

<sup>173</sup> Philip Alexander, "3 Maccabees, Hanukkah and Purim", in A.Rapoport-Albert and G.Greenberg, (ed), *Biblical Hebrew, Biblical Texts: Essays in Memory of Micheal P. Weitzman* (JSOTSup 333; Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 338; Anderson, 518.

<sup>174</sup> In this regard, it would be significant that the story in *3Mac* deals with the whole Jewish community

Because *3Mac* introduces him as “famous among the priests of the country” (6:1), and because of the possibility of the existence of Jewish priests in Egypt as was dealt with above,<sup>175</sup> the most reasonable – in fact, the only probable – background would be the Temple of Leontopolis.<sup>176</sup> Furthermore, according to *3Mac* 7:13-16 depicting their joyful departure from Alexandria, “*their priests* and the whole multitude departed with joy, shouting Hallelujah ... and *departed from the city*” (my italics), which suggests that the priests were based outside Alexandria. Therefore, with Alexander, we agree that *3Mac* reflects religious pride of local Egyptian Jews.<sup>177</sup>

Lastly, we have to examine one of the most important documents in this period, the *Letter of Aristeas*.

## 5.6. *Letter of Aristeas*

### 5.6.1. Attitude towards the Greek king

The *Letter of Aristeas* (hereafter *Letter*) is widely known as an important document to explain the origin of the “Septuagint” in its original narrow, sense, i.e. the Greek Pentateuch. But oddly enough, there are relatively few verses to explain the process of translation proper (9-51; 301-22).<sup>178</sup> We can identify two main sections of this work – the Jerusalem section and the Alexandrian section. The former tells of the high priesthood and Jerusalem. This part shows the superiority of the Jewish high priesthood, ideally portrayed, and praises the magnificent beauty of Jerusalem,

---

in Egypt, not only the Jews in Alexandria, as the version preserved in Josephus.

<sup>175</sup> See 4.3.1.

<sup>176</sup> Also in Anderson, 526; Capponi, “Martyrs”, 303.

<sup>177</sup> Alexander, “3 Maccabees”, 518; Anderson, 339.

<sup>178</sup> We use the translation of M. Hadas, *Aristeas to Philocrates (Letter of Aristeas)* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1951), 91-227. On the ‘digressions’, see Hadas, *Aristeas to Philocrates*, 47-50, 54-59; Recently, S. Honigmann, *The Septuagint and Homeric Scholarship in Alexandria* (London/New York: Routledge, 2003); D. De Crom, “The *Letter of Aristeas* and the Authority of the Septuagint”, *JSP* 17 (2008), 142-144.

depicted also as an ideal Greek polis.<sup>179</sup> In the depiction of Jerusalem, we cannot find any hint of a Jewish king or other political leaders except the High Priest Eleazar.<sup>180</sup> There is no allusion to the political turbulence in Judah or to the substitution of the Zadokite priesthood by the Hasmonean priesthood. The High Priest Eleazar appears as the one who is in charge of Judah and Jerusalem, and Jerusalem is seen as a city of the priests. This is in harmony with the statements of Hecataeus of Abdera on Jerusalem since Moses.<sup>181</sup> With Honigmann,<sup>182</sup> we can see that this kind of understanding of Jerusalem would prevail among contemporaries. And it could be said that the ideal form of Jerusalem and Judah would be a priestly society, as is actually seen in Leviticus and Ezekiel. The *Letter* shows this contemporary view coloured with a more idealized description concerning things in the Temple. This ideal description of Jerusalem is connected to another ideal portrait of the Ptolemaic king in the 'Alexandrian section'; thus a noble high priest in Jerusalem and a wise and just Greek king in Alexandria. The high status of the Jewish religion and its priests and sages is indicated by the motif of the Greek king showing respect towards them<sup>183</sup>. It is also shown in the long explanation of the gifts sent to Judah and the long dialogue between the king and 72 Jewish translators. And the Greek king is deeply involved in every aspect of the *Letter*.<sup>184</sup> It seems that this is what the author chose for his apology for Jewish

---

<sup>179</sup> Honigmann, *Septuagint*, 23f, points out that the depiction of Jerusalem in the *Letter* directly follows Aristotle's depiction of the ideal polis.

<sup>180</sup> Silence about Jewish kings and warnings against tyranny (122, 289) might reflect anti-Maccabaen tendency of Alexandrian Jewish community in the *Letter*, as Capponi points out, *Il tempio*, 85-89.

<sup>181</sup> Diodorus, 40.3.5: "... the Jews never have a king, and authority over the people is regularly vested in whichever priest is regarded as superior to his colleagues in wisdom and virtue..." (F.R.Walton's translation in Stern, I:28).

<sup>182</sup> Honigmann, *Septuagint*, 24.

<sup>183</sup> Schürer, 679.

<sup>184</sup> Fraser, 1:698-701. Practically, it would be impossible to undertake this large enterprise to translate the Pentateuch without any patronage from Ptolemaic kings. See the significance of King's patronage for the work, T. Rajak, "The King and the Translation: Power and Culture in Ptolemaic Alexandria" *Henoch* 29 (2007), 255-257.

residence in Egypt. The king is utilized as a touchstone to reveal the superiority of the Jews and the translation in Egypt, which will eventually legitimize Jewish presence in Egypt.

First of all, there are many expressions depicting the Greek king in positive terms. The Ptolemaic king, Philadelphus, is described as a liberator of the Jews who were deported into Egypt as slaves (20). He admits that the Jews were unreasonably tyrannized and gives an order that they should be freed immediately (24). Furthermore, he gives a detailed decree to confirm the adequate execution of the order (27). As we saw in *3Mac*, the tendency to exculpate the seemingly harsh actions of a Greek king is introduced here, too. The author excuses the seemingly terrible treatment of Ptolemy Soter, the son of Lagos, towards the captured and transported Jews by explaining that his action was due to pressure from his soldiers (14). This is also seen in the king's decree in 23: "For it is our belief that these persons were made prisoner contrary to the will of our father and to propriety, and that it was to military recklessness that the despoliation of their country and the removal of the Jews themselves to Egypt was due".

Therefore the author of the *Letter* praises the king as righteous and pious (24, 46). The two virtues are introduced, according to the *Letter*, as the principles laid down by Moses (131). So the *Letter* gives the king the highest honour possible. Other evidence shows that this honour accorded to the king is not just a temporary and flattering speech: in the long dialogue consisting of questions and answers between the king and the translators, the Jewish translators recommend many virtues which kings should be equipped with. Among them, those repeatedly emphasized are the importance of justice (or righteousness) and piety.<sup>185</sup> And the *Letter* reports that the king was very pleased to

---

<sup>185</sup> Justice (or righteousness, δικαιοσύνη, δίκαιος):209; 212; 259; 280; 281; 291f; piety (εὐσέβεια): 215; 229; 233. Justice in particular, is the most important virtue and achievement for the subjects and the king.

hear that. It leads us to conclude that the portrait of the king described in the *Letter* seems to be not just a foreign good king but a king conformed to Jewish ideals as far as possible.<sup>186</sup> K. Whitelam shows that this concept of the “Just King” forms an important part of royal ideology not only in Mesopotamia but throughout the ancient Near East in general.<sup>187</sup> Throughout the Hebrew Bible, the concept centres on the Jewish understanding of kingship.<sup>188</sup> According to this, “the ideal of the king’s judicial functions is evident in the concept of justice as the basis of the royal throne (Pro 16:12; 20:28; Ps 122:5) ... the very throne of Yahweh is based on His justice” (Ps 89:15; 97:2).<sup>189</sup> Subsequently Whitelam shows that the failure to experience this ideal king in the real history of Israel led the ideal to be projected onto the messianic figure in the coming future (e.g. Is 16:5; 32:1; Jer 23:5-6). So it seems that the expression “just king” as ascribed to a Ptolemaic king by the Jews is no accident.

To add to this image of a just and pious king there is his cautious and respectful attitude towards the whole enterprise of the translation. First of all, his attitude is well illustrated in the lengthy explanation of the gifts which were sent to Jerusalem (51-82). Among them, the section concerning the table is conspicuous. Originally he wants to make it “up to colossal dimensions” (52) but he changes his mind because he wishes the table to be placed and used in the Jerusalem Temple: “it would afford him far greater satisfaction if the *appropriate* ministrations were *duly* performed by the *proper*

---

See Murray, 353; on the importance of piety in the framework of the *Letter*, Honigmann, *Septuagint*, 61; De Crom, 154-158.

<sup>186</sup> The explanation of the cleanness of animals may also be compared with the concept of “justice” because “unclean” animals “oppress” others and should be considered “injustice” (146-148). See Kovelman, 107-108.

<sup>187</sup> K.W. Whitelam, *The Just King: Monarchical Judicial Authority in Ancient Israel* (JSOTSup 12, Sheffield: JSOT Press), 1979.

<sup>188</sup> Beuken, 210.

<sup>189</sup> Whitelam, 31.

ministers upon the furniture which he had provided” (54, my italics).<sup>190</sup> His concern about ‘being appropriate or proper’ seems to presuppose a concern to do what was appropriate once he was informed about correct procedure (53). Hadas and Honigmann argue that the explanation of the gifts in the *Letter* belongs to a Hellenistic literary genre ‘*ecphrasis* (‘description’)’ to give the readers more pleasure by adding ‘variety’.<sup>191</sup> According to Honigmann, the explanation of the king’s motif about the size of the table is an unusual element for the genre. She concludes that “the description is thus dominated by a hint of piety which prevails here over the conventional motives belonging to the genre of *ecphrasis*”.<sup>192</sup> Such sensitive concern shown by a foreign but pious king towards the Jewish cult is seen in Josephus, where Philometor wondered whether Leontopolis, unclean and full of sacred animals, was an appropriate place to build a temple for God.<sup>193</sup>

Seen in 174f, the immediate reception given by the king for the men sent from Jerusalem also shows his cordial and special treatment of the Jewish translators. Finally, the king marveled at the intellect of the lawgiver when the law was read out for him, and ordered that great care should be taken of the books (312-17).

To conclude, the image of the foreign king in this work is substantially one of the ideal pious and just Jewish king. Rather than merely having a foreign king praising Jewish laws, this work seems to present a respected foreign ruler who finds many superior qualities in everything concerning the Jews and pays them due homage.<sup>194</sup>

---

<sup>190</sup> The Greek verb adopted here for ‘appropriate’ or ‘proper’ is καθήκω, which is used to especially refer to the whole burnt offering offered on the altar by a priest in Lev 5:10; 9:16.

<sup>191</sup> Hadas, *Aristeas*, 47-48; Honigmann, *Septuagint*, 14-25, in which she tries to explain the function of four long digressions in the Letter: the description of the gifts (51b-83a); the journey to Jerusalem (83b-120); the apology for the law by the High Priest Eleazar (128-71); and the symposium (187-300).

<sup>192</sup> Honigmann, *Septuagint*, 20.

<sup>193</sup> *Ant*, 13.70.

<sup>194</sup> Cf. V. Tcherikover, “The Ideology of the Letter of Aristeas”, *HTR* 51 (1958), 68-70, demonstrates that one of the aims of the Letter is to impress its Jewish readers the idea that “no abyss separates Judaism

This image of the “just king” is also seen in LXX-Is, as examined earlier.<sup>195</sup>

### 5.6.2. Legitimacy by Jerusalem and the Greek king

The Jews in Egypt have the Greek Torah, acknowledged by the honourable high priest in Jerusalem, and they have the pious and righteous king in Egypt. The king knows to appreciate the Jewish laws and to pay appropriate homage to Jewish priests and elders. Recently, Scholars note similarities between the Exodus story and the *Letter*, liberation from slavery, the building of the Tabernacle, and the giving of Torah.<sup>196</sup> Transforming the biblical Exodus story into a “new foundation story”,<sup>197</sup> the author of the *Letter*, Hacham argues, aims at proposing “a religious justification for the residence of Jews in Egypt”.<sup>198</sup> While LXX-Is tries to achieve the same result by actualizing the given Hebrew text, the *Letter* does so by introducing the ideal Jerusalem and the ideal Greek king presenting Torah.<sup>199</sup> Therefore, the *Letter* is a document to establish the legitimacy of Jewish residence in Egypt, just as in LXX-Is.<sup>200</sup> Common characteristics as an identity document of the Jews in Egypt is also shown in their attitude towards Greek rulers. In addition, it should be noted that the Exodus motif here is used not for ‘leaving Egypt’ but for ‘remaining in Egypt’ in both of them.<sup>201</sup>

One thing should be commented on: as one of the most important differences

---

from Hellenism”.

<sup>195</sup> See 4.3.

<sup>196</sup> N. Hacham, “The Letter of Aristeas: A New Exodus Story?” *JSJ* 36 (2005), 1-20; Kovelman, 101-134. This feature was already observed by H.M. Orlinsky, “Septuagint as Holy Writ and the Philosophy of the Translators”, *HUCA* 46 (1975), 89-114.

<sup>197</sup> Hacham, “Letter”, 14.

<sup>198</sup> Hacham, “Letter”, 1.

<sup>199</sup> “The Ptolemaic king ... is a latter-day Moses by virtue of his central role in the giving of the Law”. Hacham, “Letter”, 12. On this idealized portrait of Jerusalem and High priest, we might agree with Murray, 366, that “he had never been there, and had no reason to think his readers would have been there either”; also see Tcherikover, “Ideology”, 77-78.

<sup>200</sup> Some scholars suggest that the *Letter* was an apologetic response against Palestinian Judaism, but others think that it reflects a debate within the Alexandrian Jewish community. See Sollamo, “Letter”, 337-342.

<sup>201</sup> See 5.5. above; also Hacham, “Letter”, 8.

between the Exodus story and the *Letter*,<sup>202</sup> we should point out the role of the freed people. In the biblical Exodus story, these freed Israelites leave Egypt and receive the Torah, before settling in the land of Canaan. But in the *Letter*, those freed Jews settle in Egypt and we do not find any further trace of them. Scholarly opinion agrees that this work was written in Alexandria, but we do not discover whether Alexandrian Jewish people played any part in any of the events described in the *Letter*. To liberate the Jewish slaves is an action aimed at obtaining the favour of the Jews in Jerusalem. All the translators are Jerusalemites, sent by the high priest in Jerusalem. Those who receive the most lavish praises from the pious Greek king are the Jerusalemite elders, not the Jews in Egypt.<sup>203</sup> The Jews in Egypt appear in the last scene to give a “great ovation” to the translation (308). Another role of theirs is to pronounce that any revision against the translation done by the Jerusalemite elders, should be banned. The purpose seems to be to resist later revisions,<sup>204</sup> which might be carried out by the Jews in Egypt, as well as the Jews in the land of Judah. Therefore, the Jews in Egypt, except the pseudo-narrator Aristeas, do not take any significant position for the whole process

---

<sup>202</sup> Hacham, “Letter”, 8-11, also enumerates many differences between them: destination of the liberated people, the character of the Egyptian king, the king’s attitude towards the Jews, how to get property, and Jewish attitude towards the Egyptians.

<sup>203</sup> Hadas, *Aristeas*, 172 n. 184, suggests that all or most “the elders” would be priests, judging from a verse in the *Letter*: “... He [Philadelphus] ... called upon Elisha, the eldest of the priests who had come down with us, to offer a prayer ...” (184). Following this, Orlinsky, “Septuagint”,<sup>101</sup>, raises a possibility of the mention of priests in 310 to another reference to Jerusalem priests, while Hadas, *Aristeas*, 221 n 310, considers them as Alexandrian priests: “When the rolls had been read the priests and the elders of the translators and some of the corporate body and the leaders of the people rose up and said, ‘Inasmuch as the translation has been well and piously made and is in every respect accurate, it is right that it should remain in its present form and that no revision of any sort take place’”. Recently, De Crom, 144-145, demonstrates that the speech of the High priest in Jerusalem (128-171) takes a central position with the framework of the *Letter*.

<sup>204</sup> It is argued that another motive of the *Letter* is to nullify later revisional efforts towards the Septuagint. Some dissatisfaction with LXX can be traced in the prologue of Ben Sira already. So the *Letter* might have been written to elevate the status and authority of the LXX over other possible revisions. Interestingly, Jellicoe argues that the *Letter* was directed against Leontopolis, and sees the *Letter* as rejection against an earlier version of a Greek Torah, which is hard to be proved. See S. Jellicoe, “The Occasion and Purpose of the Letter of Aristeas: A Re-examination”, *NTS* 13 (1965-1966), 144-150. For a critique of this, see Sollamo, “Letter”, 336-337; some scholars definitely refute the existence of earlier translations of Torah, G. Howard, “*The Letter of Aristeas* and Diaspora Judaism”, *JTS* 22 (1971), 337-348; D.W. Gooding, “Aristeas and Septuagint Origins: A Review of Recent Studies”, *VT* 13 (1963), 357-379; but Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 44-46.

of the translation apart from approving it. All the authority derives from the Jews in Jerusalem and the Ptolemaic king, from outside Egypt including Alexandria. In such a letter, it seems natural, could not be odd or strange at all, that we cannot find any mention of or allusion to the Temple of Onias. And its silence should not be used as evidence that this work opposed the Temple in Egypt,<sup>205</sup> because the *Letter* is a document supporting the legitimacy of Jewish residence in Egypt only through the approval of Jerusalem<sup>206</sup> and the enlightened Greek king.<sup>207</sup> On this point, the *Letter* differs from LXX-Is, *Joseph and Aseneth* and *3Mac*. The latter three also have a positive attitude towards the Egyptian rulers, but their life in Egypt is justified by their pious belief and loyalty to God. As Sollamo suggests,<sup>208</sup> the two groups could reflect a debate within the Jews in Egypt to establish their identity.

## 5.7. Summary

According to some Hellenistic Jewish writers such as Artapanus and pseudo-Eupolemus, the Jewish temple in Egypt reveals the superiority of the Jewish people, and this is not a new phenomenon but is rooted in ancient tradition. Contrary to Biblical passages against going down to Egypt, the Jewish community in Heliopolis was a self-confident one. *Joseph and Aseneth* is an artistic and literary reconstruction of the proud Temple of Onias. *Aseneth*, an icon of the Egyptian Jews, symbolizes the newly

---

<sup>205</sup> For example, Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization*, 278, uses the *Letter's* silence to argue that the Temple of Onias was just a local shrine for Jewish military colonists there. He mentions there *3Mac*, too, but the work demonstrates, as we saw, many affinities with LXX-Is and takes a Jewish priest in Egypt as significant. Also Smallwood, 367-8; Jellicoe, "Occasion". See our discussion above.

<sup>206</sup> On the *Letter* to give a full emphasis on Jerusalem, the Temple, its High priest and its religious service, see Tcherikover, "Ideology", 77-79. Cf. Howard argues that the *Letter* was "an apology of Diaspora Judaism in the face of charges brought against it by Palestinian Judaism". See Howard, 337-348.

<sup>207</sup> Cf. De Crom, 144-154, argues that the authority of the *Letter* is endowed through two paradigm: one is from Alexandrian paradigm centering upon the text itself, and the other is from Jewish paradigm, with "community-centred authority". His argument is agreeable on the whole, but one point should be addressed: the "community" he mentions is based on Jerusalem priests, not on Alexandrian Jewry.

<sup>208</sup> Sollamo, "Letter", 329-342.

built Temple. Her life was full of idols but is changed into a new mother-city. This Aseneth will be called the “city of refuge” and “mother-city”. Compared with this, *3Mac* demonstrates that God is with the Jews in Egypt, mainly outside Alexandria, and will do everything for them, as he has done in Jerusalem. Therefore, the main purpose of this story is to encourage the Jews in Egypt to keep their Jewish religious customs along with their belief that they are the people of God, and to keep serving foreign kings with goodwill and loyalty, with emphasis on their peaceful co-existence with the Gentiles, even though unexpected persecution might come upon them. The counterpart of Simon in *3Mac*, Eleazar, may be one of the Oniad priests in the Land of Onias.

*3Sib* hints that there was (at least ideally) a close relationship between a Ptolemaic king and the Jews, as a saviour of the Jews. Considering the historical background, the reign of Philometor and the flight of Onias into Egypt would fit best. And the *Letter* is a document to establish the legitimacy of Jewish residence in Egypt, exactly as in LXX-Is. The image of the foreign king in this work is one of a pious and just Jewish king. But the *Letter* is a document for the legitimacy of the Egyptian Jewish Diaspora only by means of the authority of Jerusalem and the enlightened Greek king.

Also, it should be noted that the Exodus motif is used not for ‘leaving Egypt’ but for ‘remaining in Egypt’ in *3Mac*, *Letter* and LXX-Is.

To conclude, LXX-Is has much in common with other Hellenistic Jewish literature. This similarity might be due to the fact that the authors lived in Egypt, not in Jerusalem. Faced with warnings from the Bible not to go down to Egypt, the Jews in Egypt would ask themselves how they could justify their residence there. The favourable attitude towards the Ptolemaic rulers is consistently found in Hellenistic Jewish literature. The efforts to establish the identity for their life in Egypt can be compared with the

existence of Joseph in Egypt.<sup>209</sup> He was a pious and faithful person committed to God, even in time of trouble and adversity. At the same time, he was a loyal servant of Egyptian masters, including Pharaoh. Therefore, the fact that Heliopolis becomes the place for a new Temple, and that the city is repeatedly mentioned in Hellenistic Jewish literature is no coincidence. After all, old biblical traditions such as the Exodus were utilized in those works as contemporization and actualization for the Jews in Egypt, as it was also done in LXX-Is.

---

<sup>209</sup> On the similarity between Joseph and the Jews in Egypt, see Dov Gera, *Judaea and Mediterranean Politics 219 to 161 B.C.E.* (Leiden, New York: Brill, 1998), 57-58.

## Chapter 6 Conclusion

The Old Greek version of the *Book of Isaiah* (LXX-Is) should be studied not only as a translation but also as an interpretation reflecting the theology of the translator or translator's community in Egypt. In general LXX-Is was translated literally but there are many instances where it does not render the most obvious sense of the Hebrew in either formal or dynamic terms. Such 'free' translation usually appears not to originate from any misunderstanding of a Hebrew Vorlage or from a different Vorlage, but deliberately and consciously. Also it is very important that these Greek renderings should be dealt with in a broader context, not merely verse by verse; because the Septuagint seems to have been regarded as a religious text in itself, circulating among Jews in Egypt, without being compared with a Hebrew text of Isaiah. It is in this consideration of a larger section and context that semantically possible renderings take on a different import to that of the Hebrew Vorlage. For example, ἐξέρχομαι is used for נִצַּח in 11:1 and עָלָה in 11:16, and each rendering is semantically justified.<sup>1</sup> But the same Greek verb for two different Hebrew verbs forms a chiasmic structure in chapter 11, and this chiasm is confirmed further with other similar Greek words in parallel throughout the chapter.<sup>2</sup> The effect of this chiasm is not only at the aesthetic level, but also in the more substantial understanding of the chapter in LXX-Is. Accordingly, it seems that the translator suggests that the chapter should be understood as a coherent section, and the promise to David (v.1) is connected with the remnant of Jewish Diaspora in Egypt (v.16). Thus semantically possible renderings as well as intentional changes may indicate the theological tendencies of the translator. In addition to this, even a different

---

<sup>1</sup> ἐξέρχομαι is mainly used for נִצַּח (over 500 times), and matches עָלָה 4 times (Ex 1:10; Jos 18:11; 19:10; Is 11:16).

<sup>2</sup> See 2.2.3.1.

Vorlage could influence the translator: for example, the important term **ישׁוּב שְׂאֵר יִשְׂרָאֵל** is not found in LXX, and perhaps came about by dittography in the Vorlage. Whatever the reason, the translator does not pay any attention to the term throughout LXX-Is.<sup>3</sup> It suggests that even a variant should not be ignored when we consider the theology of LXX-Is.

The most conspicuous theme in LXX-Is is a bold declaration concerning their identity. According to this, the Jewish diaspora in Egypt is the very remnant which is repeatedly mentioned throughout Isaiah, and their residence in Egypt should be regarded as due to God's initiative. This emphasis on Jewish residence in Egypt leads the translator to ignore a theological term **ישׁוּב שְׂאֵר יִשְׂרָאֵל** in 10:21-22 in LXX, and to place stress upon "Jews in Egypt" (11:16; 19:25). In many places "Exodus" is used as an important motif to show God's salvific deeds for the Jews in LXX as well as in MT. But the translator goes one step further: for him, the "Exodus" functions as a paradigm for "Eisodos", i.e. "into Egypt". As God led the Israelites out of Egypt in ancient days, so the same God will lead the Jews into Egypt (10:20-27; 11:10-16; cf. 48:1; 65:9). Such ideas may be understood as displaying an apologetic concern of the Jewish diaspora to defend their continued residence in Egypt, corresponding to the ambivalence of the Bible concerning Egypt:

1. positive attitude towards Egypt: "Do not be afraid to go down to Egypt" (Gen 46:3), as a haven for the hungry (Gen 12:10ff, 26:1f, 42-46), as an opportunity for the rejected and expelled (Joseph; Hadad the Edomite I Ki 11:14-25; Jeroboam I Ki 11:40; prophet Urijah Jer 26:20-24), Egypt's worship to God (Ps 68:31, Is 18:7, 19:16-25, Zep 3:10).
2. negative attitude towards Egypt: "Do not go down to Egypt" (Gen 26:2, Deut 17:16), the warnings of prophets against those who were willing to escape to Egypt (Is 30:1-7, 31:1-3, Jer 2:18,36, 24:8-10, 42:10-22, 43:1-13, 44:1-30, Ezek 29:6, Ho 7:11, 9:6, 12:1), the declaration of judgment of God against Egypt (Is 19:1-15, 20:1-6, Jer 25:15-26, 46:1-25, Ezek 29-32).<sup>4</sup>

At the same time the translator seems to manifest a certain educational purpose in

---

<sup>3</sup> See 2.1.2.2. and 2.1.4.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Porten, 372.

teaching the Jews themselves in Egypt, as Baer implies in his term “homiletical motivation”. In this respect, even the theme of God’s gathering of the dispersed Israelites from Egypt to Euphrates is changed into that of the Jews dispersed within Egypt, from the river Nile to Rhinocorura (27:12-13). That is, the words in Hebrew Vorlage were contemporized and actualized for the Jewish Diaspora in Egypt.

Arguments for the identity of the life in Egypt are expressed in another way, as dealt with in chapter 3: to affirm strongly that Egypt is useless for any help and deliverance (20:1-6; 30:1-7; 31:1-3). The translator evidently announces to Egypt: “your consolation is vain!” (30:7 in LXX).

In particular, LXX-Is supplies a bold theological translation in 19:18: there will be a temple at a place in Egypt, which will be called the ‘city of righteousness’, instead of the arguably original reading ‘city of the sun’. According to this Septuagintal reading, the place of the temple to be founded in Egypt will be another ‘metropolis’ (1:21-26 in LXX). The writings of Josephus testify to the existence of the Temple of Onias in Leontopolis in around the middle of the second century under the reign of Ptolemy Philometor who showed great favour towards the Jews. This observation leads us to consider the temple’s significance as more than a temporary shrine for local Jewish mercenaries. Consideration of what LXX Isaiah and other Jewish sources say about the temple may indicate that the purpose of the Leontopolis temple was to form a new Jerusalem under a Zadokite priest who could not be found in Palestine anymore. This conclusion does not indicate that the Jews in the Land of Onias intended to usurp the Jerusalem Temple. The favourable attitude of the Jews in Egypt towards Jerusalem and its High Priest seems to support their esteem to Jerusalem, and this is clearly in contrast to the unfavourable, biased attitude of the Palestinian Jews towards the Egyptian Jews seen in admittedly later Talmudic literature. D.R. Schwartz pointed out

two important factors that influenced the Jews in the Diaspora:

First of all, the notion of God living in a specific place elsewhere, and of the only legitimate Jewish cult being limited to that specific place, was one which no exilic community could live with for long. ... the second consideration had everything to do with Hellenism in particular: the more Jews of the Hellenistic Diaspora became used to thinking of things, as the Greeks did, ... in terms of unseen logos which makes things what they are, the less it made sense for them to attach sacredness to a specific visible place.<sup>5</sup>

The Temple of Onias and LXX-Is may be suggested as typical examples to demonstrate the above analysis.<sup>6</sup> It seems that the Jews of the Temple of Onias were getting to know that temples could co-exist, and further, a temple is not bound to a place, which is, as a matter of fact, an originally biblical idea (e.g. 2Sam 7:6-7; Is 66:1).

Considering the relationship of LXX-Is with the Temple of Onias, it is understandable that LXX-Is consistently condemns the ruling class, presumably the priests in Jerusalem, but reveals the expectation of a new temple in Zion, which should be interpreted symbolically. LXX-Is shows that the Temple in Jerusalem was defiled, so a new temple will be built by a figure called a “just king” (32:1; 45:13).

This affirmation of the identity of the Jewish residence in Egypt, imbued with expectation of a new temple, is found in *Joseph and Aseneth* and *Third Sibylline Oracles*. In fact, strong expression of identity and favourable attitude towards a foreign ruling dynasty are also seen in other Hellenistic Jewish literature, *Third Book of Maccabees* and the *Letter of Aristeas*, as well as the aforementioned two works, even though there is, to a certain degree, difference in emphasis among them. This analysis demonstrates that these writings have some common elements in their theological ideas which reflect the experience of Jewish residence in Egypt in this broad period of the second century BCE.

---

<sup>5</sup> Schwartz, “Temple or City”, 117f.

<sup>6</sup> In fact, Ex 12:40 in LXX uses the verb κατοικέω to depict Jewish existence in Canaan as well as in Egypt.

To conclude, what the present work argues has been made clear: LXX-Is is not just a translation. It belongs to the historical period and its own situation. The translator tries to deliver accurately the sense of the Hebrew text, but at the same time with factors (misreading, different Vorlage, intentional choice of words, etc.), LXX-Is declares something different from MT. LXX-Is in its own right functions mainly as an “identity-document” for the Jewish Diaspora in Egypt. These messages found in LXX-Is correspond to the ones in Hellenistic Jewish literature of the second century BCE. Therefore, we can conclude that LXX-Is is a theological document of Jewish identity in Hellenistic Egypt.

There still remains much to be done further. First and foremost, a comprehensive study on the whole of LXX-Is should be done. In the present work, some selected sections were dealt with, but certainly, this work should be complemented by a study on larger context, i.e. the whole of LXX-Is.

## Bibliography

\* Abbreviated names of works, series and journals below and in the thesis are according to P.H. Alexander, et al. (eds.), *The SBL Handbook of Style. For Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Early Christian Studies* (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., 1999).

### Isaiah Commentaries

- Auvray, P., *Isaïe 1-39*. Paris, 1972.
- Baltzer, K., *Deutero-Isaiah: A Commentary on Isaiah 40-55*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001.
- Beuken, W.A.M., *Jesaja 1-12*. HThKAT. Freiburg, 2003; *Isaiah II: Volume 2 / Isaiah 28-39*. Translated by Brian Doyle. Leuven: Peeters, 2000.
- Blenkinsopp, J., *Isaiah 1-39: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. The Anchor Bible 19. Doubleday, 2000.
- Cheyne, T.K., *The Book of the Prophet Isaiah*. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. London: Kegan Paul, 1886.
- Childs, B.S., *Isaiah*. OTL. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001.
- Clements, R.E., *Isaiah 1-39*. NBC. Grand Rapids, 1980.
- Gesenius, F.H.W.m., *Philologisch-kritischer und historischer Commentar über den Jesaia*. 2 Teile in 3; Leipzig, 1821.
- Goldingay, J. and Payne D., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Isaiah 40-55*. vol.I. ICC. London/New York: T & T Clark, 2006.
- Gray, G.B., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Isaiah I-XXVII*. ICC. Edinburgh, 1912.
- Jensen, J., *Isaiah 1-39*. Old Testament Message 8. Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1984.
- Kaiser, Otto., *Isaiah 1-12: A Commentary*. OTL. Second edition: completely rewritten. SCM Press, 1983.
- Kaiser, O., *Isaiah 13-39: A Commentary*. OTL. SCM Press, 1974.
- Kissane, E.J., *The Book of Isaiah, Translated from a Critically Revised Hebrew Text with Commentary*. I-XXXIX. Dublin, 1941.
- Oswalt, J.N., *The Book of Isaiah Chapters 1-39*. NICOT. Grand Rapids, 1986.
- Sawyer, J.F.A., *Isaiah*. 2 vols. The Daily Study Bible Series. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1984-1986.
- Skinner, J., *The Book of the Prophet Isaiah: Chapters I-XXXIX*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1915.
- Sweeney, M., *Isaiah 1-39 with an Introduction to Prophetic Literature*. FOTL 16. Grand Rapids, 1996.
- Watts, J.D., *Isaiah 1-33, 34-66*. WBC 24-25. Waco: Word Books, 1985-87.
- Westermann, C., *Isaiah 40-66: A Commentary*. OTL. SCM Press, 1969.
- Whybray, R.N., *Isaiah 40-66*. NBC. Grand Rapids, 1975.
- Wildberger, H., *Isaiah 1-12, 13-27, 28-39*. 3 vols. Translated by T.H.Trapp. Continental Commentaries. Minneapolis, 1991-2002.
- Williamson, H.G.M., *Isaiah 1-5*. vol.1 of A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Isaiah 1-27. ICC. T & T Clark, 2006.

### Other works

- Aejmelaeus, A., "Participium coniunctum as a criterion of translation technique", *VT* 32 (1982), 385-393.
- , *Parataxis in the Septuagint. A Study of the Rendering of the Hebrew Coordinate Clauses in the Greek Pentateuch*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Tiedeakatemia, 1982.
- , "What can we know about the Hebrew Vorlage of the Septuagint?", *ZAW* 99 (1987), 58-89.
- , "Translation Technique and the Intention of the Translator" in C.E. Cox (ed.), *VII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991, 23-36.
- , "What We Talk about When We Talk about Translation Technique" in B.A. Taylor (ed.), *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Oslo*,

1998. Atlanta: SBL, 2001, 531-552.
- Ahearne-Kroll, P.D., *Joseph and Aseneth and Jewish Identity in Greco-Roman Egypt*. Dissertation; University of Chicago, 2005.
- Alexander, Philip S., "Retelling the Old Testament" in D.A. Carson and H.G.M. Williamson (eds.), *It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988, 99-120.
- , "3 Maccabees, Hanukkah and Purim", in A. Rapoport-Albert and G. Greenberg, (eds.), *Biblical Hebrew, Biblical Texts: Essays in Memory of Micheal P. Weitzman*. JSOTSup 333. Sheffield Academic Press, 2001, 321-339.
- Anderson, H., "3 Maccabees", in J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Vol. II. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1985, 509-29.
- Aptowitzer, V., "Aseneth, the Wife of Joseph: A Haggadic Literary-Historical Study", *HUCA* 1 (1924), 239-306.
- Baer, David A., *When We All Go Home: Translation and Theology in LXX Isaiah 56-66*. JSOTSup 318. Sheffield, 2001.
- , "'It's All About Us!' Nationalistic Exegesis in the Greek Isaiah" in C.M. McGinnis and P.K. Tull (eds.), *As Those Who Are Taught: The Interpretation of Isaiah from the LXX to the SBL*. SBLSymS 27; Atlanta: SBL, 2006, 29-47.
- Barclay, J.M.G., *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander to Trajan*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1996.
- , "Apologetics in the Jewish Diaspora" in J.R. Bartlett (ed.), *Jews in the Hellenistic and Roman Cities*. London and New York: Routledge, 2002, 129-148.
- Bar-Kochva, B., *Pseudo-Hecataeus 'On the Jews': Legitimizing the Jewish Diaspora*. Berkley: University of California Press, 1996.
- Barr, James, *The typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979.
- , "Doubts about Homoeophony in the Setpuagint", *Textus* 12 (1985), 1-77.
- , "Did the Greek Pentateuch really serve as a dictionary?" in M.F.J. Baasten and W.Th. van Peursen (eds.), *Hamlet on a Hill: Semitic and Greek Studies Presented to Professor T. Muraoka on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*. Peeters: Leuven, 2003, 523-543.
- Barthélemy, D., *Critique Textuelle de L'ancien Testament. 2. Isaïe, Jérémie, Lamentatikon*. OBO 50/2. Fribourg: Éditions Universitaires/ Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986.
- Bartlett, J.R., *Jews in the Hellenistic World: Josephus, Aristaeus, The Sibylline Oracles, Eupolemus*. Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Ben-Sasson, H.H. (ed.), *A History of the Jewish People*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1976.
- Berrin, S., "Qumran Pesharim" in M. Henze (ed.), *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran*. Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature. Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2005, 110-133.
- Bickerman, E.J., "Notes on the Greek Book of Esther", *PAAJR* 20 (1951), 101-133.
- , "The Septuagint as a Translation", *PAAJR* 28 (1959), 1-39.
- , *The Jews in the Greek Age*. Cambridge/London: Harvard University Press, 1988.
- Bloedhorn, H. and Hüttenmeister, G., "The Synagogue" in W. Horbury, W.D. Davies, and J. Sturdy (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Judaism*. vol. 3: The early Roman Period. Cambridge University Press, 1999, 267-297.
- Bohak, G., "CPJ III, 520: The Egyptian Reaction to Onias' Temple", *JSJ* 26 (1995), 32-41.
- , *Joseph and Aseneth and the Jewish Temple in Heliopolis*. SBLEJL 10. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.
- , "Theopolis: A Single-Temple Policy and Its Singular Ramifications", *JJS* 50 (1999), 3-16.
- Bosshard-Nepustil, E., *Rezeptionen von Jesaja 1-39 im Zwölfprophetenbuch*. OBO 154. Freiburg, Göttingen, 1977, 35-36, 119-25.
- Boulluec, A. le and Sandevour, P., *La Bible d'Alexandrie. L'Exode*. Cerf: Paris, 1989.
- Brenton, Sir Lancelot C.L. *The Septuagint with Apocrypha: Greek and English*. London: Samuel Bagster & Sons, 1851. Repr., 3rd ed. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1990.
- Brock, S.P., Fritsch, C.T., and Jellicoe, S.A. (eds.), *A Classified bibliography of the Septuagint*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973.
- Brock, S.P., "The Phenomenon of the Septuagint" in M.A. Beek, et al. (eds.), *The Witness of Tradition: Papers read at the Joint British-Dutch Old Testament Conference held at Woudschoten, 1970*. Oudtestamentische Studiën 17. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1972, 11-36.

- , “Aspects of Translation Technique in Antiquity”, *GRBS* 20 (1979), 69-87.
- , “Translating the Old Testament”, in D.A. Carson and H.G.M. Williamson (eds.), *It is written: Scripture Citing Scripture. Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars*, SSF. Cambridge, 1988.
- Brockington, L.H., “The Greek Translator of Isaiah and His Interest in ΔΟΞΑ”, *VT* 1 (1951), 23-32.
- , “LXX and Targum”, *ZAW* 66 (1954), 80-86.
- Brongers, H.A., “Merismus, Synekdoche und Hendiadys in der bibel-hebräischen Sprache”, *OtSt* 14 (1965), 100-114.
- Brooke, George J., “Men and Women as Angels in *Joseph and Aseneth*”, *JSP* 14 (2005), 159-177.
- Bruce, F.F., *Israel and the Nations*. The Paternoster Press, 1969.
- Brutti, M., *The Development of the High Priesthood during the pre-Hasmonean Period*. VTSup 108; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2006.
- Buitenwerf, R., *Book III of the Sibylline Oracles and Its Social Setting*. SVTP 17. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2003.
- Bunge, J.G., *Untersuchungen zur Makkabäerbuch: Quellenkritische, literarische, chronologische und historische Untersuchungen zum zweiten Makkabäerbuch als Quelle syrisch-palästinensischer Geschichte im 2. Jh. v. Chr.* Bonn: Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Druck, 1971.
- Burchard, C., *Joseph und Aseneth*. JSHRZ II/4. Gütersloh Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1983.
- , *Joseph und Aseneth*. Assisted by Carsten Burfeind and Uta Barbara Fink. PVTG 5. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2003.
- , “The Text of *Joseph and Aseneth* Reconsidered”, *JSP* 14 (2005), 83-96.
- Caird, George B. “Homoeophony in the Septuagint”, in R. Hamerton-Kelly and R. Scroggs (eds.), *Jews, Greeks and Christians: Religious Cultures in Late Antiquity. Essays in honour of William David Davies*. Leiden: Brill, 1976, 74-88.
- Capponi, L., *Il tempio di Leontopoli in Egitto: Identità politica e religiosa dei Giudei di Onia (c. 150 a.C. – 73 d.C.)*. Pubblicazioni della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia Dell’università di Pavia 118. Pisa: Edizioni ETS, 2007.
- , “Martyrs and Apostates: 3 Maccabees and the Temple of Leontopolis”, *Henoch* 29 (2007), 288-306.
- Charlesworth, J.H. (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 vols., London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1983, 1985.
- Chesnutt, Randal D., “The Social Setting and Purpose of *Joseph and Aseneth*”, *JSP* 2 (1988), 21-48.
- , *From Death to Life: Conversion in Joseph and Aseneth*. JSPSS 16. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- , “Perceptions of Oil in Early Judaism and the Meal Formula in *Joseph and Aseneth*”, *JSP* 14 (2005), 113-132.
- Cheyne, T.K., “The Nineteenth Chapter of Isaiah”, *ZAW* 13, 1893, 125-28.
- Cohen, S.J.D., “The Temple and the synagogue” in W. Horbury, W.D. Davies, and J. Sturdy (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Judaism*. vol. 3: The early Roman Period. Cambridge University Press, 1999, 298-325.
- , *From the Maccabees to the Mishnah*. Second edition. Louisville/London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2006.
- Collins, J.J. *The Sibylline Oracles of Egyptian Judaism*. SBLDS 13. Montana, 1972.
- , *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora*. 2nd ed., Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- , “Joseph and Aseneth: Jewish or Christian?”, *JSP* 14 (2005), 97-112.
- Cook, J., “Were the Persons Responsible for the Septuagint Translators and/or Scribes and/or Editors?”, *JNSL* 21 (1995), 45-58.
- Cousland, J.R.C., “Dionysius *Theomachos*? Echoes of the *Bacchae* in 3 Maccabees”, *Biblica* 82 (2001), 539-548.
- , “Reversal, Recidivism and Reward in 3 Maccabees: Structure and Purpose”, *JSJ* 34 (2003), 39-51.
- Croatto, J.S., “The ‘nations’ in the Salvific Oracles of Isaiah”, *VT* 55 (2005), 143-161.
- Crom, Dries De, “The Letter of Aristeas and the Authority of the Septuagint”, *JSP* 17 (2008), 141-160.
- Croughs, M., “Intertextuality in the Septuagint: The Case of Isaiah 19”, *BIOSCS* 34 (2001), 81-94.

- Croy, N.C., *3 Maccabees*. Septuagint Commentary Series. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2006.
- Dahood, M., "Accusative 'ēsāh, 'wood' in Isaiah 30,1b", *Biblica* 50 (1969), 57-58.
- \_\_\_, "Isaiah 19,11 *hkmy* and 1QIs<sup>a</sup> *hkmyh*", *Biblica* 56 (1975), 420.
- Davies, G.I., "The Destiny of the Nations in the Book of Isaiah", in J. Vermeulen (ed.), *Le livre d'Isaïe (The Book of Isaiah)*. Leuven, 1989, 93-120.
- Deissler, "Der Volk und land überschreitende Gottesbund der Endzeit nach Jes 19, 16-25" in F. Hahn, F.-L. Hossfeld, H. Jorissen and A. Neuwirth (eds.), *Zion: Ort der Begegnung*. Bonner Biblische Beiträge 90. Athenäum-Hain-Hanstein; 1993, 7-18.
- Delekat, L., "Die Peschitta zu Jesaja zwischen Targum und Septuaginta", *Biblica* 38 (1957), 185-199.
- \_\_\_, "Ein Septuagintatargum". *VT* 8 (1958), 225-52.
- DeSilva, D.A., *Introducing the Apocrypha. Message, Context, and Significance*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic, 2002.
- Docherty, Susan, "Joseph and Aseneth: Rewritten Bible or Narrative Expansion?", *JSJ* 35 (2004), 27-48.
- Dogniez, C., *Bibliography of the Septuagint (1970-1993)*. Leiden/New York, E.J. Brill, 1995.
- Douglas, R.C., "Liminality and Conversion in Joseph and Aseneth", *JSP* 3 (1988), 31-42.
- Driver, G.R., *The Judaean Scrolls: The Problem and a Solution*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1965.
- Editor, "Onias" in *Encyclopaedia Judaica*. Vol. 12. 1971, 1402-4.
- Eisenman, Robert H. and Wise, Michael, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered*. Shaftesbury/Rockport/Brisbane: Element, 1992.
- Eisler, R. *The Messiah Jesus and John the Baptist*. London, 1931.
- Ekblad, E.R., *Isaiah's Servant Poems According to the Septuagint*. Leuven: Peeters, 1999.
- Emerton, J.A., "A Textual Problem in Isaiah xxx. 5", *JTS* 32 (1981), 125-128.
- \_\_\_, "A Further Note on Isaiah xxx. 5", *JTS* 33 (1982), 161.
- Emmet, C.W., "The Third Book of Maccabees" in R.H. Charles (ed.), *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English*, vol. 1, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1913, 155-73.
- Eshel, H., *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Hasmonean State*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans/ Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi Press, 2008.
- Euler, K.F., *Die Verkündigung vom leidenden Gottesknecht aus Jes. 53 in der Griechischen Bibel*. BWANT 4/14. Leipzig, 1934.
- Feldman, L.H., "Josephus", in W. Horbury, W.D. Davies and J. Sturdy (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Judaism*. vol. 3: The early Roman Period. Cambridge University Press, 1999, 901-921.
- Finkelstein, L., "The Oldest Midrash: Pre-Rabbinic Ideals and Teachings in the Passover Haggadah", *HTR* 31 (1938), 291-317.
- Finn, A.H., "The Tabernacle Chapters", *JTS* 16 (1914-15), 449-482.
- Fischer, J., *In welcher Schrift lag das Buch Isaias den LXX vor?* Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1930.
- Fischer, U., *Eschatologie und Jenseitserwartung im hellenistischen Diasporajudentum*. BZNW 44. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1978.
- Flint, Peter W., "The Septuagint Version of Isaiah 23:1-14 and the Masoretic Text", *BIOSCS* 21 (1988), 35-54.
- \_\_\_, "The Isaiah Scrolls from the Judean Desert", in C.C. Broyles and C.A. Evans (eds.), *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah*. vol. 2. Brill, 1997, 481-489.
- Fraenkel, D., Quast, U., Wevers, J.W., *Studien zur Septuaginta – Robert Hanhart zu ehren*. MSU 20. Göttingen; Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990.
- Frankel, Z., *Historisch-kritische Studien zu der Septuaginta*. Leipzig, 1841.
- Fraser, P.M., *Ptolemaic Alexandria*. vol. I, II, III. Oxford, 1972.
- Fritsch, C.T., "The Concept of God in the Greek Translation of Isaiah", in J.M. Myers, O. Reimherr and H.N. Bream (eds.), *Biblical Studies in Memory of H.C. Alleman*. Locust Valley: J.J. Augustin, 1960, 155-169.
- Gabba, E., "The growth of anti-Judaism or the Greek attitude towards Jews", in W.D. Davies, L. Finkelstein (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Judaism*. vol. 2: The Hellenistic Age. Cambridge University Press, 1989, 614-656.
- Gafni, I., "Alexandrians in Jerusalem", *Encyclopedia Judaica*. vol. 1, 590.
- \_\_\_, *Land, Center and Diaspora. Jewish Constructs in Late Antiquity*. JSPSup 21. Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.

- , “Hasmoneans” in L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam (eds.), *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. vol.1. Oxford University Press, 2000, 329-333.
- Gardner, G., “Jewish Leadership and Hellenistic Benefaction in the Second Century B.C.E.” *JBL* 126 (2007), 327-343.
- Gauger, J.D., *Sibyllinische Weissagungen*. Artemis & Winkler, 1998.
- Geffcken, J., *Komposition und Entstehungszeit der Oracular Sibyllina*. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1902.
- Gesenius, Friedrich Heinrich Wilhelm, *Philologisch-kritischer und historischer Commentar über den Jesaja*. 2 Teile in 3. Leipzig, 1821.
- , edited and enlarged by Kautzsch, E. and revised by Cowley, A.E., *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910.
- Goodblatt, D., *Monarchic Principle: Studies in Jewish Self-Government in Antiquity*. Tübingen: J.C.B.Mohr, 1994.
- Gooding, D.W., *The Account of the Tabernacle. Translation and Textual Problems of the Greek Exodus*. Cambridge University Press, 1959.
- , “Aristeas and Septuagint Origins: A Review of Recent Studies”, *VT* 13 (1963), 357-379.
- , “On the use of the LXX for Dating Midrashic Elements in the Targums”, *JTS* 25 (1974), 1-11.
- , *Relics of Ancient Exegesis: A Study of the Miscellanies in 3 Reigns 2*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.
- Goodman, M., *The Ruling Class of Judaea*. Cambridge, 1987.
- , *Mission and Conversion: Proselytizing in the Religious History of the Roman Empire*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994.
- Gordon, R.P., “Terra Sancta and the Territorial Doctrine of the Targum to the Prophets.” 119-31 in J.A. Emerton and S.C. Reif (eds.), *Interpreting the Hebrew Bible: essays in honour of E.I.J. Rosenthal*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- (ed.), “The place is too small for us”: *the Israelite prophets in recent scholarship*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1995.
- Grabbe, L.L., *Judaism from Cyrus to Hadrian*. London: SCM Press, 1992.
- Gray, G.B., “The Greek version of Isaiah: is it the work of a single translator?”, *JTS* 12 (1911), 286-93.
- Grayson, A.K. “Assyria: Tiglath Pileser III to Sargon II (744-705 BC)” in J.Boardman, I.E.S. Edwards, E.Sollberger and N.G.L.Hammond (eds.), *The Cambridge Ancient History: vol.III-2*. Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Griffiths, J.G., “Egypt and the Rise of Synagogue”, *JTS* 38 (1987), 1-15.
- , “The legacy of Egypt in Judaism”, in W. Horbury, W.D. Davies, and J. Sturdy (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Judaism*. vol. 3: The early Roman Period. Cambridge University Press, 1999, 1025-1051.
- Gruen, E.S., “The Origins and Objectives of Onias' Temple”, *Scripta Classica Israelica* 16 (1997), 47-70.
- , *Heritage and Hellenism*. University of California Press, 1998.
- , “Jews, Greeks, and Romans in the Third Sibylline Oracle” in M. Goodman (ed.), *Jews in a Graeco-Roman World*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998, 15-36.
- Guillaume, A., “A Note on Isaiah XIX 7”, *JTS* 14 (1963), 382-383.
- Hacham, Noah, “The Letter of Aristeas: A New Exodus Story?”, *JSJ* 36 (2005), 1-20.
- , “3 Maccabees: An Anti-Dionysian Polemic” in Jo-Ann Brant, C.W. Hedrick, and C. Shea (eds.), *Ancient Fiction: The Matrix of Early Christian and Jewish Narrative*. SBLSymS 32. SBL Atlanta, 2005, 167-183.
- , “3 Maccabees and Esther: Parallels, Intertextuality, and Diaspora Identity”, *JBL* 126 (2007), 765-785.
- Hachlili, R., “The Origin of the Synagogue: a Re-Assessment”, *JSJ* 28 (1997), 34-47.
- Hadas, M., “Aristeas and III Maccabees”, *HTR* 42 (1949), 175-84.
- , *Aristeas to Philocrates*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951.
- , *The Third and Fourth Books of Maccabees*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1953.
- Hagelia, H., “A Crescendo of Universalism. An Exegesis of Isa 19:16-25”, *SEÅ* 70 (2005), 73-88.
- Hanhart, R., “Zum Wesen der makedonisch-hellenistischen Zeit Israels”, in J. Schreiner (ed.), *Wort, Lied und Gottesspruch. Beiträge Zur Septuaginta. Festschrift für Joseph Ziegler*. Würzburg, 1972, 49-58.
- , “Die Septuaginta als Interpretation und Aktualisierung, Jesaja 9:1 (8:23)-7(6)”, in A. Rofe and Y. Zakovitch (eds.), *Isac Leo Seeligmann Volume. Essays on the Bible and the*

- \_\_\_\_\_, *Ancient World*. vol. III. Jerusalem, 1983, 331-346.
- \_\_\_\_\_, “Die Bedeutung der Septuaginta für die Definition des ‘hellenistischen Judentums’”, in J.A. Emerton (ed.), *Congress Volume. Jerusalem 1986*. VTSup 40. Leiden, 1988, 67-80.
- Haran, M., “Priesthood, Temple, Divine Service: Some Observations on Institutions and Practices of Worship”, *HAR* 7 (1983), 121-35.
- Harl, “Traduire la Septante en français: pourquoi et comment?” in *La langue de Japhet. Quinze études sur la Septante et le grec des Chrétiens*. Cerf: Paris, 1992, 33-42.
- \_\_\_\_\_, “La Bible d’Alexandrie dans les débats actuels sur la Septante” in Y. Goldman and C. Uehlinger (eds.), *La double transmission du texte biblique: Études d’histoire du texte offertes en hommage à Adrian Schenker*. OBO 179. Fribourg: Editions Universitaires; Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001), 7-24.
- Hayes, J.H. and Irvine, S.A., *Isaiah, The Eighth-Century Prophet: His Times and His Preaching*. Nashville, 1987, 257-71.
- Hayward, R., “The Jewish Temple at Leontopolis: A Reconstruction”, *JJS* 33 (1982), 429-43.
- \_\_\_\_\_, “The New Jerusalem in the Wisdom of Jesus Ben Sira”, *SJOT* 6 (1992), 123-138.
- \_\_\_\_\_, “St Jerome and the Meaning of the High-priestly Vestments” in W. Horbury (ed.), *Hebrew Study from Ezra to Ben-Yehuda* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999), 90-105.
- \_\_\_\_\_, “Observations on Idols in Septuagint Pentateuch” in S.C. Barton (ed.), *Idolatry: False Worship in the Bible, Early Judaism and Christianity* (London/New York: T&T Clark, 2007, 40-57.
- Hegermann, H., “The Diaspora in the Hellenistic Age”, in W.D. Davies and L. Finkelstein (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Judaism*. vol. 2: The Hellenistic Age. Cambridge University Press, 1989, 115-166.
- Heinen, H., “The Syro-Egyptian Wars and the new kingdoms of Asia Minor”, in F.W. Walbank, A.E. Astin, M.W. Frederiksen and R.M. Ogilvie (eds.), *The Cambridge Ancient History*. vol. VII, part I: The Hellenistic World, 2<sup>nd</sup>. 1984, 412-442.
- Hengel, M., *Judaism and Hellenism*. London: SCM Press, 1974.
- \_\_\_\_\_, “The political and social history of Palestine from Alexander to Antioch III (333-187 B.C.E.)”, in W.D. Davies and L. Finkelstein (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Judaism*. vol. 2: The Hellenistic Age. Cambridge University Press, 1989, 35-78.
- \_\_\_\_\_, “The interpenetration of Judaism and Hellenism in the pre-Maccabean period”, in W.D. Davies and L. Finkelstein (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Judaism*. vol. 2: The Hellenistic Age. Cambridge University Press, 1989, 167-228.
- Höffken, P., “Bemerkungen zu Jesaja 31,1-3”, *ZAW* 112 (2000), 230-38.
- Hogeterp, A.L.A., “Eschatological Identities in the Damascus Document” in F.G. Martínez and M Popović (eds.), *Defining Identities: We, You, and the Other in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the fifth Meeting of the IOQS in Groningen*. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2008, 111-130.
- Holladay, C.R., *Fragments From Hellenistic Jewish Authors*. 2 vols. Chico: Scholars Press, 1983.
- Honigman, S., “Politeuma and Ethnicity in Ptolemaic Egypt”, *Ancient Society* 33 (2003), 61-102.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Septuagint and Homeric Scholarship in Alexandria*. London/New York: Routledge, 2003.
- Horbury, W. and Noy, D. (eds.), *Jewish Inscriptions of Graeco-Roman Egypt*. Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Horbury, W., *Messianism among Jews and Christians: Twelve Biblical and Historical Studies*. London/New York: T&T Clark, 2003.
- Horsley, G.H.R., “Name Change as an Indication of Conversion in Antiquity”, *Numen* 34 (1987), 1-17.
- Howard, G., “The Letter of Aristeas and Diaspora Judaism”, *JTS* 22 (1971), 337-348.
- Hubbard, M., “Honey for Aseneth: Interpreting a Religious Symbol”, *JSP* 8 (1997), 97-110.
- Humphrey, E.M., *The Ladies and the Cities: Transformation and Apocalyptic Identity in Joseph and Aseneth, 4 Ezra, the Apocalypse and the Shepherd of Hermas*. JSPSup 17. Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Joseph and Aseneth*. Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- Hurwitz, M.S., “The LXX of Isaiah 36-9 in Relation to that of 1-35, 40-66”, *HUCA* 28 (1957), 75-83.
- Inowlocki, S., “reviews: *When Aseneth met Joseph* by Ross Shepard Kraemer (Oxford University Press, 1998)”, *JJS* 50 (1999), 334-5.
- Irwin, W.H., *Isaiah 28-33: Translation with Philological Notes*. Biblica et Orientalia 30. Rome:

- Biblical Institute Press, 1977.
- Israelit-Groll, S., "The Egyptian Background to Isaiah 19.18" in M. Lubetski, C. Gottlieb and S. Keller (eds.), *Boundaries of the Ancient Near Eastern World. A Tribute to Cyrus H. Gordon*. JSOTSup 273. Sheffield Academic Press, 1998, 300-303.
- James, T.G.H. "Egypt: 25 and 26 dynasties", in J. Boardman, I.E.S. Edwards, E. Sollberger and N.G.L. Hammond (eds.), *The Cambridge Ancient History*. Vol.III-2. Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Jellicoe, S., "The Hesychian Recension Reconsidered", *JBL* 82 (1963), 409-18.
- , "The Occasion and Purpose of the Letter of Aristeas: A Re-examination", *NTS* 13 (1965-1966), 144-150.
- , *The Septuagint and Modern Study*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968.
- Jenkins, A.K., "The Development of the Isaiah Tradition in Isaiah 13-23", in J. Vermeulen (ed.), *Le livre d'Isaïe (The Book of Isaiah)*. Leuven, 1989, 237-251.
- Jobs, K.H. and Silva, M., *Invitation to the Septuagint*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2000.
- Johnson, S.R., *Historical Fictions and Hellenistic Jewish Identity: Third Maccabees in Its Cultural Context*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004.
- , "Third Maccabees: Historical Fictions and the Shaping of Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Period" in Jo-Ann Brant, C.W. Hedrick, and C. Shea (eds.), *Ancient Fiction: The Matrix of Early Christian and Jewish Narrative*. SBLSymS 32. SBL Atlanta, 2005, 185-197.
- Jones, A.H.M., *The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces*. second edition. Oxford, 1983.
- Kasher, Aryeh, *The Jews in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt: The Struggle for Equal Rights*. Tübingen: J.C.B.Mohr, 1985.
- Kee, H.C., "The Socio-Cultural Setting of Joseph and Aseneth", *NTS* 29 (1983), 394-413.
- Keil, "Onias III – Märtyrer oder Tempelgründer?", *ZAW* 97 (1985), 221-233.
- Kim, Hyun Chul Paul, "An Intertextual Reading of 'A Bruised Reed' and 'A Dim Wick' in Isaiah 42:3", *JSOT* 83 (1999), 113-124.
- Klijn, A.F.J., "The Letter of Aristeas and the Greek Translation of the Pentateuch in Egypt", *NTS* 11 (1964-65), 154-58.
- Knibb, M.A., "Teacher of Righteousness" in L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam (eds.), *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. vol.2. Oxford University Press, 2000, 918-921.
- Konkel, A.H., "The Sources of the Story of Hezekiah in the Book of Isaiah", *VT* 43 (1993), 462-482.
- Van der Kooij, Arie, *Die Altentextzeugen des Jesajabuches*. OBO 35. Göttingen; Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981.
- , "A short commentary on some verses of the Old Greek of Isaiah 23", *BIOSCS* 15 (1982), 36-50.
- , "Accident or method: On "analogical" interpretation in the Old Greek of Isaiah and in 1QIs<sup>a</sup>", *BO* 43 (1986), 366-375.
- , "The Old Greek of Isaiah 19:16-25: Translation and Interpretation," in C. Cox (ed.), *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*. Jerusalem 1986. SBLSCS 23. 1987, 127-166.
- , "The Septuagint of Isaiah: Translation and Interpretation", in J. Vermeulen (ed.), *Le livre d'Isaïe (The Book of Isaiah)*. Leuven, 1989, 127-133.
- , "The Old Greek of Isaiah in relation to the Qumran texts of Isaiah: some general comments", in G.J. Brooke and B. Lindars (eds.), *Septuagint, scrolls and cognate writings*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992, 195-213.
- , "Isaiah in the Septuagint", in Craig C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans (eds.), *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah*. Vol. 2. Leiden: Brill, 1997, 513-29.
- , "Zur Theologie des Jesajabuches in der Septuaginta" in H.G. Reventlow (ed.), *Theologische Probleme der Septuaginta und der hellenistischen Hermeneutik*. Veröffentlichungen der Wissenschaftliche Gesellschaft für Theologie 11. Gütersloh: Ch. Kaiser, 1997, 9-25.
- , "The Servant of the Lord: A Particular Group of Jews in Egypt According to the Old Greek of Isaiah. Some Comments on LXX Isa 49,1-6 and Related Passages", in J.van Ruiten and M. Vervenne (eds.), *Studies in the Book of Isaiah*. Leuven University Press, 1997, 383-396.
- , *The Oracle of Tyre. The Septuagint of Isaiah XXIII as Version and Vision*. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- , "The Cities of Isaiah 24-27 according to the Vulgate, Targum and Septuagint", in H. Jan Bosman, H. van Grol, et al. (eds.), *Studies in Isaiah 24-27*. Leiden: Brill, 2000, 183-198.
- , "'Coming' Things and 'Last' Things: Isaianic Terminology as understood in the Wisdom of

- Ben Sira and in the Septuagint of Isaiah” in F. Postma, K. Spronk and E. Talstra (eds.), *The New Things. Eschatology in Old Testament Prophecy. Festschrift for Henk Leene*. Maastricht: Uitgeverij Shaker Publishing, 2002, 135-140.
- \_\_\_, “The Septuagint of Isaiah and the Hebrew Text of Isaiah 2:22 and 36:7” in P.W. Flint, E. Tov and J.C. VanderKam (eds.), *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, and the Septuagint Presented to Eugene Ulrich*. VTSup 101. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2006, 387-383.
- \_\_\_, “Interpretation of the Book of Isaiah in the Septuagint and in Other Ancient Versions” in C.M. McGinnis and P.K. Tull (eds.), *“As Those Who Are Taught”: The Interpretation of Isaiah from the LXX to the SBL*. SBLSS 27; Atlanta: SBL, 2006, 49-68.
- Koskenniemi, E., “Greeks, Egyptians and Jews in the Fragments of Artapanus”, *JSP* 13 (2002), 17-31.
- Kovelman, A., *Between Alexandria and Jerusalem: The Dynamic of Jewish and Hellenistic Culture*. The Brill Reference Library of Judaism 21. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2005.
- Kraemer, R.S., (ed.), *Maenads, Martyrs, Matrons, Monastics*, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988.
- \_\_\_, *Her Share of the Blessings: Women’s Religion among Pagans, Jews, and Christians in the Greco-Roman World*. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- \_\_\_, *When Aseneth Met Joseph*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Kuschke, A., “Zu Jes 30:1-5”, *ZAW* 23 (1952), 194-195.
- Kutscher, E.Y., *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (1QIs<sup>a</sup>)*. Leiden: Brill, 1974.
- Laato, A., “Zachariah 4,6b-10a and the Akkadian Royal Building Inscriptions”, *ZAW* 106 (1994), 53-69.
- Levine, L., “Synagogue Leadership: the Case of the Archisynagogue” in M. Goodman (ed.), *Jews in a Graeco-Roman World*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998, 195-213.
- Lieber, A., “I Set a Table before You: The Jewish Eschatological Character of Aseneth’s conversion meal”, *JSP* 14 (2004), 63-77.
- Liebmann, E., “Der Text zu Jesaja 24-27”, *ZAW* 22 (1902), 1-56.
- Lim, T.H., “Wicked Priest” in L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam (eds.), *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. vol.2. Oxford University Press, 2000, 973-976.
- Liver, J., “The ‘Sons of Zadok the Priests’ in the Dead Sea Sect”, *RQ* 6 (1967), 3-30.
- Lohfink, N., “Beobachtungen zur Geschichte des Ausdrucks יְהוָה יֵצֵא”, in H.W. Wolff (ed.), *Probleme biblischer Theologie: Festschrift G. von Rad*. München: C. Kaiser, 1971, 275-305.
- Lust, J., “The Vocabulary of LXX Ezekiel and its Dependence upon the Pentateuch” in M. Vervenne and J. Lust (eds.), *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic Literature*. FS. C.H.W. Brekelmans; BETL 133; Leuven, 1997, 529-546.
- \_\_\_, “Messianism in the Septuagint: Isaiah 8:23b-9:6 (9:1-7)”, in J. Krasovec (ed.), *The Interpretation of the Bible: the International Symposium in Slovenia*. Sheffield Academic Press, 1998, 147-163.
- \_\_\_, “Messianism in Ezekiel in Hebrew and in Greek” in J. Lust, *Messianism and the Septuagint*. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 178. Leuven University Press, 2004, 189-200.
- \_\_\_, “Messianism in LXX-Ezekiel” in M.A. Knibb (ed.), *The Septuagint and Messianism*. Leuven University Press, 2006, 417-430.
- Maier, J., “Early Jewish Biblical Interpretation in the Qumran literature” in Magne Sæbø (ed.), *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation*. Vol.1: From the Beginning to the Middle age (Until 1300); Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996, 108-129.
- \_\_\_, “Religious Beliefs, Qumran Sect” in L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam (eds.), *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. vol.2. Oxford University Press, 2000, 753-757.
- Manley, J., *Isaiah Through the Ages*. Menlo Park: Monastery Books, 1995.
- Marcos, N.F., tr. by Watson, W.G.E., *The Septuagint in Context. Introduction to the Greek Version of the Bible*. Leiden/New York/Köln: E. J. Brill, 2000.
- Marcus, R., “Jewish and Greek Elements in the LXX” in *Louis Ginzberg: Jubilee Volume on the Occasion of his seventieth birthday*. English section. New York: The American Academy for Jewish Research, 1945, 227-245.
- Marlow, H., “The Lament over the River Nile-Isaiah xix 5-10 in Its Wider Context”, *VT* 57

- (2007), 229-242.
- Martínez, F.G., "New Jerusalem", in L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam (eds.), *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. vol.2. Oxford University Press, 2000, 606-610.
- McDonald, M.D., *The Prophetic Oracles Concerning Egypt in the Old Testament*. unpublished PhD diss., Baylor University, 1978.
- Millar, W.R., *Isaiah 24-27 and the Origin of Apocalyptic*. HSM 11. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1976.
- Modrzejewski, J.M., "How To Be a Greek and Yet a Jew in Hellenistic Alexandria" in S.J.D. Cohen and E.S. Frerichs (eds.), *Diasporas in Antiquity*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993. 65-92.
- \_\_\_, *The Jews of Egypt: From Rameses II to Emperor Hadrian*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1995.
- Monsengwo-Pasinya, L. "Isaie XIX 16-25 et universalisme dans la LXX" in J.A. Emerton (ed.), *Congress Volume Salamanca 1983*. VTSup 36. Leiden: Brill, 1985, 192-207.
- Müller, M., "The Septuagint as the Bible of the New Testament Church: Some Reflections", *SJOT* 7 (1993), 194-207.
- \_\_\_, *The First Bible of the Church: A Plea for the Septuagint*. Sheffield, 1996.
- Müller, von Karlheinz, "Die Rabbinischen Nachrichten über die Anfänge der Septuaginta", in J. Schreiner (ed.), *Wort, Lied und Gottesspruch. Beiträge Zur Septuaginta. Festschrift für Joseph Ziegler*. Würzburg, 1972, 73-93.
- Muraoka, T., "On Septuagint Lexicography and Patristics", *JTS* 35 (1984), 441-448.
- \_\_\_, "The Semantics of the LXX and its Role in Clarifying Ancient Hebrew Semantics", in T. Muraoka (ed.), *Studies in Ancient Hebrew Semantics*. AbrNSup 4 (1995), 19-32.
- \_\_\_, "Septuagint" in J.F.A. Sawyer and J.M.Y. Simpson (eds.), *Concise Encyclopedia of Language and Religion*. Elsevier, 2001.
- Murray, O., "Aristeas and Ptolemaic Kingship", *JTS* 18 (1967), 337-371.
- Na'aman, N., "The Brook of Egypt and Assyrian policy on the border of Egypt", *Tel Aviv* 6 (1979), 68-90.
- Niccacci, A. "Isaiah XVIII-XX From an Egyptological Perspective", *VT* 48 (1998), 214-238.
- Nickelsburg, G.W.E., "Stories of Biblical and Post-Biblical Times" in M.E. Stone (ed.), *Jewish writings of the second temple period : Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran, sectarian writings, Philo, Josephus* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1984), 33-88.
- \_\_\_, "Polarized Self-Identification in the Qumran Texts" in F.G. Martínez and M Popović (eds.), *Defining Identities: We, You, and the Other in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the fifth Meeting of the IOQS in Groningen*. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2008, 23-31.
- Nikiprowetzky, V., *La Troisième Sibylle*. Paris: Mouton, 1970.
- Nolland, N., "Sib. Or. III. 265-94, An Early Maccabean Messianic Oracle", *JTS* 30 (1979), 158-166.
- Olley, J.W., *"Righteousness" in the Septuagint of Isaiah: A Contextual Study*. Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series 8. Scholars Press, 1979.
- \_\_\_, "Notes on Isaiah xxxii 1, xlv 19,23 and lxiii 1", *VT* 33 (1983), 446-453.
- Olofsson, S., *The LXX Version. A Guide to the Translation Technique of the Septuagint*. CB OTS 30. Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell International, 1990.
- \_\_\_, *God is my Rock. A Study of Translation Technique and Theological Exegesis in the Septuagint*. CB OTS 31. Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell International, 1990.
- \_\_\_, "Consistency as a Translation Technique", *SJOT* 6 (1992), 14-30.
- Orlinsky, H.M., "The Treatment of Anthropomorphisms and Anthropopathisms in the LXX of Isaiah", *HUCA* 27 (1956), 193-200.
- \_\_\_, "Septuagint as Holy Writ and the Philosophy of the Translators", *HUCA* 46 (1975), 89-114.
- \_\_\_, "The Septuagint and its Hebrew Text", in W.D. Davies and L. Finkelstein (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Judaism*. vol. 2: The Hellenistic Age. Cambridge University Press, 1989, 534-562.
- Ottley, R.R., *The Book of Isaiah according to the LXX (Codex A)*. 2 vols, London, 1904.
- Otzen, B., *Tobit and Judith*. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.
- Parente, F., "The Third Book of Maccabees as Ideological Document and Historical Source", *Henoch* 10 (1988), 143-181.
- \_\_\_, "Onias III's Death and the Foundation of the Temple of Leontopolis" in F. Parente and J. Sievers (eds.), *Josephus and the History of the Graeco-Roman Period. Essays in Memory of Morton Smith*. Leiden/New York/Köln: E.J. Brill, 1994, 69-98.
- Parke, H.W., *Sibyls and Sibylline Prophecy in Classical Antiquity*. Edited by B.C. McGing.

- London/New York: Routledge, 1988.
- Pearce, S., "Belonging and Not Belonging: Local Perspectives in Philo of Alexandria" in S. Jones and S. Pearce (eds.), *Jewish Local Patriotism and Self-Identification in the Graeco-Roman Period*. JSPSS 31. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998, 79-105.
- , "Jerusalem as 'Mother-City' in the Writings of Philo of Alexandria", in J.M.G. Barclay (ed.), *Negotiating Diaspora: Jewish Strategies in the Roman Empire*. London/New York: T&T Clark International, 2004, 9-36.
- , "Translating for Ptolemy: Patriotism and Politics in the Greek Pentateuch?" in T. Rajak, S. Pearce, J. Aitken, and J. Dines, (eds.), *Jewish Perspectives on Hellenistic Rulers*. Hellenistic Culture and Society 50; Berkeley/London: University of California Press, 2007, 165-189.
- , *The Land of the Body: Studies in Philo's Representation of Egypt*. WUNT 208. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.
- Pearson, B.W.R., "Resurrection and the Judgement of the Titans: ἡ γῆ τῶν ἀσεβῶν in LXX Isaiah 26.19" in S.E. Porter, M.A. Hayes and D. Tombs (eds.), *Resurrection*. JSNTSup 186. Sheffield Academic Press, 1999, 33-51.
- Pelletier, A., "Josephus, the Letter of Aristeas, and the Septuagint", in L.H. Feldman and G. Hata (eds.), *Josephus, the bible, and the history*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1989, 97-115.
- Penn, M., "Identity Transformation and Authorial Identification in Joseph and Aseneth", *JSP* 13 (2002), 171-183.
- Philonenko, M., *Joseph et Aséneth: Introduction, Texte Critique, Traduction et Notes*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1968.
- , "Joseph and Aseneth" in *Encyclopaedia Judaica*. Vol. 10. 1971, 223-224.
- Pisano, S., "Egypt in the Septuagint text of Hosea", in G.J. Norton and S. Pisano (eds.), *Tradition of the text: studies offered to Dominique Barthelemy in celebration of his 70th birthday*. Freiburg: Universitätsverlag, 1991.
- Pietersma, A. and Wright, B.G., (eds.), *A New English translation of the Septuagint*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Porten, B. "The Jews in Egypt", in W.D. Davies and L. Finkelstein (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Judaism*. vol. 1: Introduction: The Persian Period. Cambridge University Press, 1984, 372-400.
- Porter, S.E. and Brook, W.R. Pearson, "Isaiah through Greek Eyes: The Septuagint of Isaiah", in C.C. Broyles and C.A. Evans (eds.), *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah*. vol. 2. Brill, 1997, 532-546.
- Portier-Young, A.E., "Sweet Mercy Metropolis: Interpreting Aseneth's Honeycomb", *JSP* 14 (2005), 133-156.
- Prijs, L., *Jüdische Tradition in der Septuaginta*. Leiden: Brill, 1948.
- Pucci Ben Zeev, M., "The Reliability of Josephus Flavius: The Case of Hecataeus' and Manetho's Accounts of Jews and Judaism: Fifteen Years of Contemporary Research (1974-1990)", *JSJ* 24 (1993), 215-34.
- Rabin, C., "The Translation Process and the Character of the Septuagint", *Textus* 6 (1968), 1-26.
- Rainbow, P.A., "The Last Oniad and the Teacher of Righteousness", *JJS* 48 (1997), 30-52.
- Rajak, T., "Moses in Ethiopia: Legend and Literature", *JJS* 29 (1978), 111-122.
- , Pearce, S., Aitken, J., and Dines, J. (eds.), *Jewish Perspectives on Hellenistic Rulers*. Hellenistic Culture and Society 50; Berkeley/London: University of California Press, 2007.
- , "The King and the Translation: Power and Culture in Ptolemaic Alexandria", *Henoah* 29 (2007), 241-257.
- Rappaport, U., "Onias", *ABD*, V, 23-24.
- Redpath, H.A. "Mythological Terms in the LXX", *ATJ* 9 (1905), 34-45.
- Reimer, D.J., "Book of the month: Isaiah by Brevard S. Childs", *ExpTim* 113, 2 (2001), 51-54.
- Roberts, J.J.M., "Double Entendre in First Isaiah", *CBQ* 54 (1992), 39-48.
- Rofé, A., "The Onset of Sects in Postexilic Judaism: Neglected Evidence from the Septuagint, Trito-Isaiah, Ben-Sira, and Malachi", in J. Neusner, E.S. Frerichs, P. Borgen and R. Horsley (eds.), *The Social World of Formative Christianity and Judaism*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988, 39-49.
- Rooke, D., *Zadok's Heirs. The Role and Development of the High Priesthood in Ancient Israel*. Oxford University Press, 2000.

- Russo, S., *I gioielli nei papiri di età greco-romana*. Florence: Istituto Papirologico, 1999.
- Sacci, P., *The History of the Second Temple Period*. JSOTSup 285; Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- Safrai, S., "Jubilee in the Second Temple Period", *Encyclopedia Judaica*, vol. 14, 578-82.
- Safrai, C., "The Centrality of Jerusalem: a Retrospect", in M. Poorthuis and C. Safrai (eds.), *The Centrality of Jerusalem: Historical Perspectives*. Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1996, 216-228.
- Sawyer, J.F.A. "Blessed be my people Egypt (Is 19:25)", in J.D. Martin and P.R. Davies (eds.), *A Word in Season. Essays in Honour of William McKane*. JSOTSup 42. Sheffield Academic Press, 1986, 57-71.
- , *The Fifth Gospel*. Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- , "The Gospel according to Isaiah", *ExpTim* 113, 2(2001), 39-43.
- Schalit, A., "Onias, Temple of" in *Encyclopaedia Judaica*. Vol. 12. 1971, 1404-5.
- Schaper, Joachim. *Eschatology in the Greek Psalter*. WUNT 276. Tübingen: Mohr, 1995.
- , "Messianic Intertextuality in the Greek Bible" in M.A. Knibb (ed.), *The Septuagint and Messianism*. Leuven University Press, 2006, 371-380.
- Schiffman, L.H., *From Text to Tradition. A History of Second Temple and Rabbinic Judaism*. Hoboken: Ktav Publishing House, 1991.
- Schofield, A. and J.C. VanderKam, "Were the Hasmoneans Zadokites", *JBL* 124 (2005), 73-87.
- Scholz, A. *Die alexandrinische Uebersetzung des Buches Jesaias*. Würzburg: Leo Woerl, 1880.
- Schunck, K.-D., "Jes 30:6-8 und die Deutung der Rahab im Alten Testament", *ZAW* 78 (1966), 48-56.
- Schürer, E., revised and edited by Vermes, G., Millar, F., Goodman, M., *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ. A New English Version*, vol.3 part 1, Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark, 1986.
- Schwartz, D.R., *Studies in the Jewish Background of Christianity*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1992.
- , "Temple of City: What did Hellenistic Jews See in Jerusalem?", in M. Poorthuis and C. Safrai (eds.), *The Centrality of Jerusalem: Historical Perspectives*. Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1996, 114-127.
- Schweitzer, S.J., "Mythology in the Old Greek of Isaiah: The Technique of Translation", *CBQ* 66 (2004), 214-230.
- Scolnic, B.E., *Chronology and Papyronymy: A List of the Judean High Priests of the Persian Period*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999.
- Sedlmeier, F., "Israel-'ein Segen inmitten der Erde'. Das JHWH-Volk in der Spannung zwischen radikalem Dialog und Identitätsverlust nach Jes 19,16-25" in J. Frühwald-König, F.R. Prostmeier and R. Zwick (eds.), *Steht nicht geschrieben? Studien zur Bibel und ihrer Wirkungsgeschichte*. FS für Georg Schmuttermayr. Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 2001, 89-108.
- Seeligmann, I.L. *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah and Cognate Studies*. FAT 40. Edited by Robert Hanhart and Hermann Spieckermann. Mohr Siebeck, 2004.
- Shinnie, P.L., "The Nilotic Sudan and Ethiopia, c. 660 BC to c. AD 600" in J.D. Fage (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Africa*. Vol.2. Cambridge University Press, 1978, 210-271.
- Sivan, H., "Review: Ross Shepard Kraemer, When Aseneth Met Joseph. A late Antique Tale of the Biblical Patriarch and his Egyptian Wife Reconsidered", *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 1998. 12.02.
- Smallwood, E.M. *The Jews under Roman Rule*. Leiden: E.J.Brill, 1976.
- Smelik, W.F., "On Mystical Transformation of the Righteous into Light in Judaism", *JSJ* 26 (1995), 122-144.
- , *The Targum of Judges*. OtSt 36. Leiden/New York/ Köln: E.J. Brill, 1995.
- Smyth, Herbert W. *Greek Grammar*. Revised by Gordon M. Messing. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1984.
- Soisalon-Soininen, I., *Die Infinitive in der Septuaginta*. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1965.
- Sollamo, Raija, *Renderings of Hebrew semiprepositions in the Septuagint*. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1970.
- , "The Letter of Aristeas and the Origin of the Septuagint", in B.A. Taylor (ed.), *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Oslo, 1988*. Atlanta: SBL, 2002, 329-342.
- , "Messianism and the 'Branch of David': Isaiah 11,1-5 and Genesis 49,8-12" in M.A. Knibb (ed.), *The Septuagint and Messianism*. Leuven University Press, 2006, 357-370.

- Söllner, P., *Jerusalem, die hochgebaute Stadt. Eschatologisches und Himmlisches Jerusalem im Frühjudentum und im frühen Christentum. Texte und Arbeiten zum neutestamentlichen Zeitalter 25*. Tübingen/Basel: Francke Verlag, 1998.
- Spalinger, A., "Third Intermediate-Saite Period (Dyn. 21-26)" in *ABD II*: 358-360.
- Spottorno, V., "Some Remarks on Josephus Biblical Text for 1-2 Kings", *VI congress of the IOSCS, Abbreviated titles 1987*, 277-85.
- Stähelin, Felix, "Elephantine und Leontopolis", *ZAW* 28 (1908), 180-2.
- Standhartinger, Angela, *Das Frauenbild im Judentum der Hellenistischen Zeit: Ein Beitrag anhand von 'Joseph und Aseneth'*. AGJU 26. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995.
- Steckoll, S.H., "The Qumran Sect in Relation to the Temple of Leontopolis", *Revue de Qumran* 6 (1967), 55-69.
- Stern, M. ed., *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*. Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, volume 1 (from Herodotus to Plutarch), 1976, volume 2 (from Tacitus to Simplicius), 1980, volume 3 (Appendixes and Indexes), 1984.
- Stone, C.F., "Allusion to Isaiah 11.10 LXX in Mark 10.42b", *NTS* 48 (2002), 71-83.
- Strack, H.L. and Stemberger, G., *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*. Translated by M. Bockmuehl. T & T Clark, 1991.
- Swete, H.B. *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*. 2<sup>nd</sup>. revised by Richard Rusden Ottley; with an appendix containing the Letter of Aristeas edited by H. St J. Thackeray. Cambridge, 1914.
- Talmon, S., "A Case of faulty harmonization", *VT* 5 (1955), 206-8.
- \_\_\_, "Aspects of the Textual Transmission of the Bible in the Light of Qumran Manuscripts", *Textus* 4 (1964), 95-132.
- Tarn, T., *Hellenistic Civilization*. Third edition revised by G.T. Griffith. London: Edward Arnold Ltd, 1952.
- Taylor, J.E., "A Second Temple in Egypt: The Evidence for the Zadokite Temple of Onias", *JSJ* 29 (1998), 297-321.
- Tcherikover, V., *The Jews in Egypt: In the Hellenistic-Roman Age in the Light of the Papyri*. Jerusalem, The Hebrew University Press, 1945.
- \_\_\_, "The Ideology of the Letter of Aristeas", *HTR* 51 (1958), 59-85.
- \_\_\_, "The Third Book of Maccabees as Historical Source of Augustus' time", *ScrHier* 7 (1961), 1-26.
- \_\_\_, Fuks, A., Stern, M. (eds.), *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum*. 3 vols. Jerusalem, Cambridge, Mass., 1957-64.
- \_\_\_, "Alexandria, Ancient Period", *Encyclopedia Judaica*, vol. 1, 1971, 589-591.
- \_\_\_, *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews*. Translated by S. Applebaum. Atheneum and New York, 1974.
- Thackeray, H.St J., "The Greek Translators of the Prophetic Books", *JTS* 4 (1903), 578-585.
- \_\_\_, *The Letter of Aristeas: translated*, London, 1917.
- \_\_\_, *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship. A Study in Origins*. 2nd ed., Oxford University Press, 1923.
- \_\_\_, *Josephus: The Man and the Historian*. New York, 1967, 75-100.
- Tobin, T.H., "Philo and the Sibyl: Interpreting Philo's Eschatology", *The Studia Philonica Annual* 9 (1997), 84-103.
- Tov, E., "The Use of Concordances in the Reconstruction of the Vorlage of the LXX", *CBQ* 40 (1978), 29-36.
- \_\_\_, "The Impact of the LXX translation of the Pentateuch on the Translation of the Other Books", in P. Cassetti (ed.), *Melanges Dominique Barthelemy*. OBO 38. Freiburg/Göttingen, 1981, 577-92.
- \_\_\_, "The Septuagint", in M.J. Mulder (ed.), *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*. Assen/Maastricht: Van Gorcum, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988, 161-188.
- \_\_\_, "The Original Shape of the Biblical Text", in J.A. Emerton (ed.), *Congress Volume Leuven 1989*. VTSup 43. Leiden, 1991.
- \_\_\_, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*. Revised and enlarged second edition. JBS 8. Jerusalem: Simor LTD., 1997.
- \_\_\_, "The Text of Isaiah at Qumran", in C.C. Broyles and C.A. Evans (eds.), *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah*. vol. 2. Brill, 1997, 492-511.
- Tracy, S., "III Maccabees and Pseudo-Aristeas", *Yale Classical Studies* 1 (1928), 241-252.

- Tromp, J., "The Formation of the Third Book of Maccabees", *Henoch* 17 (1995), 311-28.
- \_\_\_, "Not Enough: ΕΠΙΠΟΛΑΙΩΣ in 3 Maccabees 2:31", *JSJ* 30 (1999), 412-417.
- Troxel, R.L., "ΕΣΧΑΤΟΣ and Eschatology in LXX-Isaiah", *BIOSCS* 25 (1992), 18-27.
- \_\_\_, "Exegesis and theology in the LXX: Isaiah v 26-30", *VT* 43 (1993), 102-111.
- \_\_\_, "Isaiah 7,14-16 through the eyes of the Septuagint", *ETL* 79 (2003), 1-22.
- \_\_\_, "What's in a Name? Contemporization and Toponyms in LXX-Isa", in R.L. Troxel, K.G. Friebel, and D.R. Magary (eds.), *Seeking Out the Wisdom of the Ancients: Essays Offered to Honor Michael V Fox on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2005, 327-44.
- \_\_\_, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation: The Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah*. JSJSup 124. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2008.
- Turner, E., "Ptolemaic Egypt", in F.W. Walbank, A.E. Astin, M.W. Frederiksen and R.M. Ogilvie (eds.), *The Cambridge Ancient History*. vol. VII, part I: The Hellenistic World. 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1984, 118-174.
- Ubigli, L.R., "Sibyllinen", *TRE* 31 (1999), 240-245.
- Ulrich, E., "An Index to the contents of the Isaiah Manuscripts from the Judean Desert", in C.C. Broyles and C.A. Evans (eds.), *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah*. vol. 2. Brill, 1997, 477-480.
- \_\_\_, "Josephus' Biblical Text for the Books of Samuel", in L.H. Feldman and G. Hata (eds.), *Josephus, The Bible, and History*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1989, 81-96.
- Ulrich, E., Cross, F.M., Fuller, R.E., Sanderson, J.E., Skehan, P.W. and Tov, E., *Qumran Cave 4*. DJD XV; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.
- Vaccari, A., "πολίς Ασεδεκ – Isaia xix,18", *Biblica* 2 (1921), 353-356.
- VanderKam, J., "Simon the Just: Simon I or Simon II?", in D.P. Wright, D.N. Freedman and A. Hurvitz (eds.), *Pomegranates and golden bells : studies in biblical, Jewish, and Near Eastern ritual, law, and literature in honor of Jacob Milgrom*. Wiona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1995.
- \_\_\_, *An Introduction to Early Judaism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001.
- \_\_\_, *From Joshua to Caiaphas: High Priests after the Exile*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2004.
- Vermes, G., *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism*. Studia Post-Biblica 4. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1973.
- \_\_\_, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. Penguin Books, 1998.
- Waard, J. de, "'Homophony" in the Septuagint", *Bib* 62 (1981), 551-561.
- Wagner, J. Ross, "Identifying "Updated" Prophecies in Old Greek (OG) Isaiah: Isaiah 8:11-16 as a Test Case", *JBL* 126 (2007), 251-269.
- Walter, N., "Jewish-Greek literature of the Greek period", in W.D. Davies and L. Finkelstein (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Judaism*. vol. 2: The Hellenistic Age. Cambridge University Press, 1989, 385-408.
- Watts, J.W. and House, Paul R., *Forming Prophetic Literature: Essays on Isaiah and the Twelve in Honor of John D. W. Watts*. Sheffield, 1996.
- Weitzman, M.P., "Hebrew and Syriac Texts of the Book of Job", in M.P. Weitzman, *From Judaism to Christianity: Studies in the Hebrew and Syriac Bibles*. Edited by A. Rapoport-Albert and G. Greenburg; Oxford, 1999.
- Wever, J.W., "Proto-Septuagint Studies", in W.S. McCullough (ed.), *The Seed of Wisdoms: Essays in honour of T. J. Meek*. Toronto, 1964, 58-77.
- \_\_\_, "Barthelemy and Proto-Septuagint Studies", *BIOSCS* 21 (1988), 23-34.
- Whiston, W., *Josephus: the Complete Works*, Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1998.
- Whitehorne, J., "Ptolemy", *ABD*, V, 541-544.
- Whitelam, K.W., *The Just King: Monarchical Judicial Authority in Ancient Israel*. JSOTSup 12. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1979.
- Williams, D., "3 Maccabees: A Defense of Diaspora Judaism?", *JSP* 13 (1995), 17-29.
- Williamson, H.G.M., *Ezra, Nehemiah*. Waco: Word Books, 1985.
- \_\_\_, "Isaiah 1:11 and the Septuagint of Isaiah", in A.G. Auld (ed.), *Understanding poets and prophets*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993, 401-412.
- \_\_\_, *The Book Called Isaiah*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.
- \_\_\_, "Isaiah XI 11-16 and the Redaction of Isaiah I-XII" in J.A. Emerton (ed.), *Congress Volume. Paris 1992*. Leiden/New York/Köln: E.J. Brill, 1995, 343-357.
- \_\_\_, "The Messianic Texts in Isaiah 1-39", in J. Day (ed.), *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East*. JSOTSup 270. Sheffield Academic Press, 1998, 238-270.

- Wong, G.C.I., "Isaiah's Opposition to Egypt in Is 31:1-3", *VT* 46 (1996), 392-401.
- Ziegler, J., *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias*. Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen 12/3. Münster, 1934.
- , "Die Vorlage der Isaias-Septuaginta (LXX) und die erste Isaias-Rolle von Qumran (I Q Is.a)", *JBL* 78 (1959), 34-59.