Greek Isaiah 13:1-14:23:
Translation Technique and Literary Structure

Matthew James Albanese

Wolfson College

University of Oxford

Thesis and Abstracts Submitted in the
Faculty of Oriental Studies
For the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Trinity Term 2022

123,380 Words

Abstract

In this thesis, I pursue a translation technical analysis of the oracle against Babylon and her king in Greek Isaiah 13:1-14:23 from two distinct perspectives. First, in the vein of Septuagint translation technique, I survey specific examples from these two chapters and highlight their literary and stylistic features. Second, I explore these same chapters at the levels of literary macro- and micro-structure, highlighting the translator's awareness of the Hebrew text's own literary structure and his appropriation of such features into the Greek. In this analysis, I demonstrate that 'free' renderings in Greek Isaiah serve the purpose of explicating and heightening the literary and structural features latent in the Hebrew text. Thus, the constructed Greek text largely derived its coherence from the Hebrew text itself. Even though some features of Greek Isaiah arose without literary or structural motivations, the large number of translation features originating in the Hebrew text illustrates the literary and structural emphases with which the translator approached his work.

Table of Contents

Thesis Abstract *i*

Acknowledgements *iv*

Chapter 1 History of Greek Isaiah Research 1

2.1 Aims of the Thesis 1
2.2 History of Research Introduction 1
2.3 Survey of Greek Isaiah Research 3
1.4 Conclusion 12

Chapter 2 Assumptions, Methodology, and Scope of the Thesis 14

2.1 Introduction 14
2.2 Prolegomena 14
2.3 Literal and Free Translation Spectrum 16
2.4 Linguistic Methodology 19
2.5 The *Vorlage* of Greek Isaiah 21
2.6 Manuscripts, Textual Criticism, and Editions of Greek Isaiah 23
2.7 Literary Structure and the Septuagint 30
2.8 The Literary Structure of Isaiah 13:1-14:23 36
2.9 Interpretation and Meaning 52
2.10 The Structure of the Thesis 65

Chapter 3 Greek Isaiah 13:1-22: Translation Technique and Style 68

3.1 Introduction 68
3.2 Translation Technique and Style in Greek Isaiah 13:1-22 73
Example 1: Isaiah 13:1 73
Example 2: Isaiah 13:2 74
Example 3: Isaiah 13:3 77
Example 4: Isaiah 13:4-5 80
Example 5: Isaiah 13:8 84
Example 6: Isaiah 13:9 89
Example 7: Isaiah 13:10 91
Example 8: Isaiah 13:13-14 97
Example 9: Isaiah 13:16 98
Example 10: Isaiah 13:19 102
3.3 Conclusion 103

Chapter 4 Greek Isaiah 14:1-23: Translation Technique and Style 105

4.1 Introduction 105
4.2 Translation Technique and Style in Greek Isaiah 14:1-23 105

Example 11: Isaiah 14:1-3 105
Example 12: Isaiah 14:9 120
Example 13: Isaiah 14:11 123
Example 14: Isaiah 14:12 126
Example 15: Isaiah 14:13 130
Example 16: Isaiah 14:17 134
Example 17: Isaiah 14:19-20 136
4.3 Conclusion 141

Chapter 5 The Literary Micro-Structure of Greek Isaiah 13:1-14:23 142

6.1 Introduction 142
6.2 The Literary Micro-Structure of Isaiah 13:1-14:23 145
The Literary Structure of Isa 13:4-5 145
The Literary Structure of Isa 13:9-11 149
The Literary Structure of Isa 13:12-14 151
The Literary Structure of Isa 13:15-18 154
The Literary Structure of Isa 13:20-14:6 164
The Literary Micro-Structure of Isa 14:7-21 170
The Literary Micro-Structure of Isa 14:22-23: σπέρμα 191
6.3 Conclusion 194

Chapter 6 The Literary Macro-Structure of Greek Isaiah 13:1-14:23 195

5.1 Introduction 195
5.2 The Literary Macro-Structure of Isaiah 13:1-14:23: Parallels and Themes 195
5.3 Parallels of the Literary Macro-Structure 196
Literary Structure of the Hebrew Text 196
The Oracular Heading 198
The Thematic-Character Marker: Babylon 203
The Kingdom and the King 205
Emphasizing Babylon in the Second Person Plural 211
Temporal Referents 222
The Parallelism of Animals 224
Mirrored Characters 228
5.4 Themes of the Literary Macro-Structure 233
The Day of Yhwh 233
The Inhabited City-World as οἰκουμένη 237
The Desert City 240
Geographical Foundations 242
Prominence of Mountains 244
The Land of Yhwh in 14:1-2 and 14:20 246
5.5 Conclusion 250

Chapter 7 Conclusion 251

Appendices **255**

Appendix 1: The Exegetical Difficulty in Isaiah 13:2 255
Appendix 2: The Text Critical Problem of Isaiah 13:18a 266
Appendix 3: θρῆνος and מָשָׁל 276
Appendix 4: Isaiah 14:17 and the Problem of ἐπαγωγή 280
Appendix 5: Deviations from the Hebrew Text 292

Bibliography **299**

Thesis Abstract

In this thesis, I pursue a translation technical analysis of the oracle against Babylon and her king in Greek Isaiah 13:1-14:23 from two distinct perspectives. First, in the vein of Septuagint translation technique, I survey specific examples from these two chapters and highlight their literary and stylistic features. Second, I explore these same chapters at the level of the literary micro- and macro-structure, highlighting the translator's awareness of the Hebrew text's literary structure and his appropriation of such features into the Greek.

I demonstrate that 'free' renderings in Greek Isaiah serve the purpose of explicating and heightening the literary and structural features latent in the Hebrew text. Thus, the constructed Greek text largely derived its coherence from the Hebrew text itself. Even though some features of Greek Isaiah arose without literary or structural motivations, the large number of translation features originating in the Hebrew text illustrates the literary and structural emphases with which the translator approached his work.

Chapter 1 introduces the thesis by surveying the history of relevant Greek Isaiah research which has shaped the field with respect to Greek Isaiah's provenance, translation characteristics, literary features, and linguistic milieu. I build upon this previous translation technical research by pursuing an original investigation into the translator's interest to preserve the literary structure of the Hebrew text.

In chapter 2, I introduce the terminology and methods of Septuagint research wherein I treat a range of prolegomena: the spectrum of 'free' and 'literal' translations, linguistic methodology, questions pertaining to Greek Isaiah's *Vorlage*, manuscripts, textual criticism, and contemporary editions of Greek Isaiah, several facets of literary structure in the Septuagint, hermeneutical assumptions. I then outline in brief the global aims of the thesis chapter by chapter.

Chapter 3 contains methodological and theoretical discussion of recent treatments of literary, stylistic, and intertextual features in the Septuagint. I provide ten examples from Isa

13:1-22 which illustrate the translator's concern to capture his Hebrew text through 'free' renderings from the perspective of style and intertextuality.

Chapter 4 continues this thread of discussion by exploring seven examples from Isa 14:1-23. These examples display the same types of literary, stylistic, and intertextual features present in the previous chapter. In both of these chapters, I highlight the translator's concern to faithfully present his source text in a stylish and contextual way by inserting Greek literary features and intertextual allusions throughout.

The next two chapters treat the topic of literary micro- and macro-structure in the oracle against Babylon and her king. In chapter 5, I discuss features of the literary micro-structure in Isa 13:1-14:23. Here, I explore several instances where the translator of Greek Isaiah explicated and heightened features of the Hebrew text at the micro-level in order to strengthen their structural tenacity in the Greek. The translator arranged such micro-structures by supplying and repeating unique lexemes lacking in the Hebrew, by adjusting semantic referents, and by highlighting the discourse with well-placed markers. Even though these features may be formally absent in the Hebrew text, they are nonetheless thematically implicit. The translator of Greek Isaiah heightened such literary-micro structures in his work. In doing so, he created a text with more robust and forceful structure than the Hebrew source. I argue that the transfer of these literary micro-structures are both consonant with and evocative of what is latent in the Hebrew.

In chapter 6, I build upon chapter 5 and delineate features of the literary macro-structure of Isa 13:1-14:23 from two angles. First, I explore structural parallels between Isaiah 13 and 14 and conclude that the translator sought to incorporate macro-structural features into the Greek text despite his deviations from the Hebrew. I then explore themes embedded in the literary structure of the Hebrew and explain how the translator explicated and heightened them in the Greek. This avenue of explanation illustrates how Greek Isaiah was organized at the macro-level in order to preserve the implicit literary structure of the Hebrew text.

Following this structural analysis, I provide a brief conclusion in chapter 7 which summarizes my research in Isa 13:1-14:23. I also highlight the contribution my work makes to Greek Isaiah research and suggest potential avenues for further analysis on the topic of literary structure in the Septuagint. Several detailed appendices follow the conclusion, each of which

explores specific interpretive difficulties which were previously highlighted in the body of the thesis.

Acknowledgments

Many teachers throughout my life have shaped me in ways innumerable. I am thankful for them as God's gifts to instruct and guide me toward maturity in all my diverse interests. I first of all thank Desirée Ruhstrat, my violin and viola teacher, who believed in my desires and talents, who made me work harder than I ever had before, and who got me into a music conservatory I could only have dreamed of attending. Perhaps more than all my teachers, her instruction shaped me the most. And to Michael Strauss, my undergraduate viola teacher. I thank him for teaching me that musicality embodies the aim of technique. If you create something beautiful, you possess all the technique you need. By teaching me the world of music, they taught me to read rightly. And by reading texts polyphonically, I have better understood the musical patterns and structures therein. The immeasurable depths of musical meaning began when 'the morning stars sang together' at the creation of the world. And teachers like them enable the continual discovery of such meaning.

I also thank Dr. Peter Gentry who introduced me to the Septuagint and taught me to read Greek and Hebrew with precision and rigor. He shaped me profoundly both as a student and as a teacher. Because of him, my future students will not escape the grammatical hot seat. I will not forget his maxim: no morphology, no theology. I am also thankful for Dr. Jonathan Pennington, who opened up to me the worlds of typology, intertextuality, figural reading, and the history of interpretation. My posture toward the study of the sacred Scriptures is inescapably colored by his instruction and these approaches to reading. I thank him for his mentorship and friendship over the years.

I am also thankful to Professor Markus Bockmuehl for the opportunity to teach New Testament Greek for three years during my residency in Oxford. Even though I worked in Hebrew and Jewish Studies, I was always welcomed in New Testament seminars, colloquia, and the annual New Testament field trip. His was a warm and welcoming mentorship.

And to my academic mentors and thesis advisors in Oxford, who helped me build and revise my doctoral thesis over the years. Especially to Professor Hindy Najman, I am grateful for

your patience with my project, for reading and commenting on my chapters, and for your encouragement along the way. You have helped me in endless ways.

To my three fantastic and energetic sons, Nyjah Edwin, Emmett James, and Noah Shane. They are a great joy. And they both amaze me with their intelligence, creativity, and excitement.

I am most of all thankful to my sweet and lovely wife, Abbie Albanese. She has been a faithful companion and friend through dark valleys and joyful heights. She makes our house a home and is a gift from God beyond what I deserve or could imagine. To an excellent wife more precious than jewels, I love her dearly.

I dedicate this doctoral thesis to my father and mother, Donald and Suzanne Albanese. They have expressed tireless patience, kindness, support, and love toward their son's multiple and diverse interests. Their generosity enabled both my research in Oxford and the completion of my doctorate. I am thankful that God provided me with parents like them.

Ἰησαίας ὁ προφήτης ὁ μέγας καὶ πιστὸς ἐν ὁράσει αὐτοῦ.
ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις αὐτοῦ ἀνεπόδισεν ὁ ἥλιος καὶ προσέθηκεν ζωὴν βασιλεῖ.
πνεύματι μεγάλῳ εἶδεν τὰ ἔσχατα καὶ παρεκάλεσεν τοὺς πενθοῦντας ἐν Σιων.
ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος ὑπέδειξεν τὰ ἐσόμενα καὶ τὰ ἀπόκρυφα πρὶν ἢ παραγενέσθαι αὐτά.
Ben Sira 48:22-25

וְיֵרְדְּ מִיָּם עַד־יָם וּמִנָּהָר עַד־אַפְסֵי־אָרֶץ׃
Psalm 72:8

δεῖ γὰρ αὐτὸν βασιλεύειν ἄχρι οὗ θῇ πάντας τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ.
ἔσχατος ἐχθρὸς καταργεῖται ὁ θάνατος·
1 Corinthians 15:25-26

Chapter 1: Introduction and History of Research

Aims of the Thesis

This doctoral thesis explores the Septuagint version of Isaiah 13:1-14:23 with the aim to explain the translator's lexical and semantic understanding of his Hebrew text, to articulate his tendencies in transferring this content into Greek, and to delineate his attempt to preserve and explicate features of its literary structure. In short, it constitutes a study in translation technique and argues that specific features of the Hebrew literary structure shaped and influenced the translator's construction of his Greek text. The selection from Isaiah which I investigate in this thesis concerns the oracle against Babylon (13:1-22) and her king (14:1-23). These chapters have not yet been thoroughly investigated in Septuagint research, and as such provide fresh material for detailed inquiry. Further, these chapters permit investigation into unique features of its literary structure since they constitute a clear and distinct section within the prophetic discourse. Before introducing the assumptions, methodology, and scope of this thesis, I will survey the history of relevant Greek Isaiah research with the aim to situate my work within the ongoing discussion.

Below, I largely omit discussion of early Greek Isaiah research since it was typically concerned with questions either of Greek Isaiah's *Vorlage* or the 'free' or 'literal' character of the translation. Septuagint research has resolved these issues in significant ways. As such, I will only highlight research which has shaped more recent discussion on Greek Isaiah as it pertains to the translator's understanding of his Hebrew text, his translation technique and tendencies, and the Greek text's literary and structural qualities.

History of Research Introduction

I begin by surveying trends in Greek Isaiah research which are relevant to the topics pursued in this thesis, namely the related phenomena of translation technique, literary and thematic structure, stylistic Greek renderings, and translational coherence.[1] I start by interacting

[1]See the following chapter for definitions and explanations of technical terminology.

with the works of both Joseph Ziegler and Isac Seeligman from the first half of the 20th century and proceed through relevant figures in contemporary research.

The work of Isac Seeligmann in the mid-twentieth century represents something of a hinge in Greek Isaiah research.[2] Interest in Greek Isaiah before Isac Seeligmann was largely concerned with questions of textual history and the translator's *Vorlage*. As such, traditional text-critical questions dominated the discussion.[3] Pre-Seeligmann researchers also explored the translator's historical and political world(s) and their influence upon his work. But with Seeligmann and his successors, the translator's personality and ideology came to the fore. And even though socio-historical questions persisted after Seeligmann, his monolithic portrait of a translation with motivated 'free' renderings significantly influenced contemporary discussion. He advocated that the translator of Greek Isaiah sought to render the Hebrew text in such a way so as to make his source text more contemporary by actualizing the socio-political realities of his day into the translation itself.

Post-Seeligmann researchers refined his investigations and developed in more detail a conception of Geek Isaiah's literary features, its coherence *qua* translation, and precise descriptions of its translation-technical details. Contemporary Greek Isaiah research finds itself in *these* currents, sometimes trying to escape them. While questions of provenance and historical context are still discussed, they do not constitute the primary *locus* of interest. Below, I highlight the development of these research trends and outline some of the scholarly developments which followed Seeligmann's work. Thus, this survey enables readers to properly situate my own work among the scholarly insights of previous researchers.[4]

---

[2]See Seeligmann (2004). For summaries of Seeligmann's work, see relevant discussions in Jobes and Silva (2000), 94-97; Troxel (2008), 4-12; Cunha (2014), 10-14; Van der Vorm-Croughs (2014), 6-7.

[3]For early research on Greek Isaiah see Scholz (1880); Liebmann (1902): 209-86; Zillessen (1902): 238-63; Ottley (1904); Wutz (1925); Fischer (1930); Euler (1934).

[4]This survey reflects my own investigations while also following the contours of the following: Troxel (2008); Van der Vorm-Croughs (2014); Cunha (2014); Wagner (2013); Salvesen (2020).

Survey of Greek Isaiah Research

Joseph Ziegler's work on Greek Isaiah illustrates well the interests of pre-Seeligmann scholarship. However, it also perceptively anticipates many current observations regarding the translator's interest in theme and literary coherence. Ziegler's most significant contributions to the field are to be found in the Göttingen critical edition and in his summary of the translator's tendencies in *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias*.[5] Mirjam van der Vorm-Croughs summarizes Ziegler's detailed assessment:

> Ziegler devoted much attention to the pluses and minuses in Greek Isaiah. According to Ziegler, the majority of them are innovations of the translator himself. Pluses are often the result of the translator's aspirations towards explication and exegesis, while minuses are mostly meant to reduce redundancy in the Hebrew text.[6]

And on Ziegler's evaluation of the translator's approach, she states:

> He does not hesitate to omit words, to change the order within a clause, or to add his own explanation of it. Repeatedly, the translator is seized by a particular idea and then renders his text under the impact of it. Many times he is influenced by parallel passages elsewhere in Scripture.[7]

Ziegler's observations constitute a strong and lasting pillar in the field of Greek Isaiah research. As such, his description of translation features of Greek Isaiah are still cited in contemporary research.

Ziegler's insights have endured for nearly a century: the translator avoided strict adherence to his *Vorlage*, he paraphrased his Hebrew text, his lexical deviations are largely intentional, he juxtaposed ideas from thematically parallel passages.[8] As such, the translator's 'personality' may be discerned through a translation-technical analysis of the Hebrew and Greek texts. Ziegler recognized that Greek Isaiah is at the same time 'free' *and* closely bound to the Hebrew text. He denied the translator's strict adherence to his *Vorlage*. But he understood the

---

[5]Ziegler (1934); Ziegler (1983).

[6]Van der Vorm-Croughs (2014), 2.

[7]Van der Vorm-Croughs (2014), 5.

[8]Ziegler (1934), 135: "*Der Js. Übers. scheint überhaupt sein Buch sehr gut dem Inhalte nach im Gedächtnis gehabt zu haben; denn es begegnen viele Wiedergaben, die sich nur auf Grund der Exegese nach sinnverwandten Stellen erklären lassen . . . Gerade bei der Js-LXX darf irgendein Wort oder eine Wendung, die vom MT abweicht, nicht aus dem Zusammenhang genommen werden und für sich allein betrachtet worden, sondern muß nach dem ganzen Kontext der Stelle und ihren Parallelen gewertet werden*."

translator's tendency to explicate the meaning of the Hebrew through intentional deviation.[9] He conceives of this latter task as accomplished through the translator's deep awareness of literary context along with the lexical and literary parallels already extant in the Hebrew text. This resulted in a translation which explicated certain features of the Hebrew text more fully.[10] In sum, the translator of Greek Isaiah intentionality constructed a 'free' yet coherent literary product which also closely adhered to the meaning(s) of his Hebrew text. I mention these ideas here because they are glimpses into the main arguments of this thesis.

Isac Seeligmann sought to advance this discussion in his work, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah and Cognate Studies*, which was both comprehensive in scope and also formative for the next generation of scholars.[11] In general, Seeligmann emphasized the translator's identity, his cultural milieu, and the ideology informing his translation efforts. Greek Isaiah was "the work of a distinctly recognizable personality."[12] Even though his views on several issues in Greek Isaiah are largely obsolete, all researchers recognize him as a significant landmark in the field.

Seeligmann's great impact to Greek Isaiah research advanced the theory of actualization which proposes that the translator's socio-political experiences and expectations were encoded in his work. Of note, this proposal occupies an entire chapter of his monograph.[13] Regarding the theory, Seeligmann notes:

---

[9]Ziegler (1934), 22: "*Der Text, der der LXX vorlag, war (natürlich mit kleinen unbedeutenden Ausnahmen) identisch mit dem MT*."

[10]Ziegler (1934), iv. Ziegler contrasts his own approach to previous researchers who, "*oft ein Wort aus dem Zusammenhang reißen*."

[11]Seeligmann (2004), originally published in 1948. Jean Koenig (1982) advocated both a holistic literary intentionality behind Greek Isaiah and the translator's inclination to actualization. In this respect, he resembles Ziegler and Seeligmann. See page 32: "*Le niveau de connaissance des texts et donc de la langue . . . implique . . . que les changements ont été généralement determinés par d'autres motifs, d'ordre idéologique et plus spécialement religieux*." Koenig also anticipated several literary features in the translation which were developed in subsequent research. While I am sympathetic to Koenig's attention to literary intentionality, I do not ascribe to the actualization approach he advocated or to the holistic genius of the translator of Greek Isaiah.

[12]Seeligmann (2004), 128. Jobes & Silva (2000), 102, note that Seeligmann's work on Greek Isaiah constitutes "the most significant attempt to use the Septuagint as evidence of Jewish theology."

[13]Seeligmann (2004), 259-294.

> The Alexandrian translation of Isaiah is a source of historical knowledge of its time, by tracing in it allusions to contemporary events and manifestations of spiritual forces active in the Jewish-Hellenistic community of Alexandria.[14]

Thus, understanding the translator's tendencies enables one to recognize instances of actualization. Thus, the intersection between the translator's social identity and our knowledge of his ideology lies in the very phenomena of 'free' translational insertions: "our chief source of knowledge regarding the translator's opinions is surely the discrepancies found between his work and the (Masoretic) Hebrew text."[15] Deviations from the Hebrew did not serve the aim of literary coherence. Instead, they pointed to actualizing interpretations.

Seeligmann's approach to actualization is not wholly consistent, nor is it persuasive.[16] Along with several others involved in Greek Isaiah research, my thesis indirectly critiques the actualization proposal by illustrating that the majority of deviations in Greek Isaiah in fact serve literary, stylistic, and structural purposes. And since these types of stylistic features are predominant, appealing to the socio-political realities encoded the translation lacks *prima facie* warrant.

Following Seeligmann's approach in many respects, Arie van der Kooij's work entered into Greek Isaiah research in 1981 as the most methodologically mature reflection on translation technique.[17] While an advocate of actualization, he also attended closely to the translation as a stylish work in itself (i.e., coherence). This approach avoided atomistic analysis and instead captured the prophetic discourse holistically. Unlike Seeligmann, "the differences between MT and LXX cannot be taken as isolated renderings": they should be understood as "part of the

---

[14]Seeligmann (2004), 128.

[15]Seeligmann (2004), 129; Cunha (2014), 11: "Seeligmann believed that one can only find the translator's references to historical allusions or expressions of his beliefs in places where his translation was free."

[16]See criticisms in Troxel (2008), 4-19; de Sousa (2010), 1-19; Wagner (2013), 29-34; Van der Vorm-Croughs (2014), 6-11.

[17]Principally Van der Kooij (1981); more recent treatment occurs in Van der Kooij (1998); Van der Kooij (1997), 513-29. Per van der Kooij (1998), 15-19, his methodology explores linguistic, comparative, literary, and historical features of the translation through 1) comprehensive study of the MT, 2) investigation of Greek Isaiah, 3) the genre of Greek Isaiah, and 4) the Hebrew *Vorlage* behind the translation.

passage as a whole."[18] Van der Kooij recognized the translator's awareness of larger Isaianic themes. As such, he emphasized the translator's intention to construct a linguistic and literary unity which at the same time contains elements of contemporization or actualization. Thus, actualization grounds the coherent literary product of Greek Isaiah, not within the textual-literary world of the *Vorlage*, but instead in the socio-political realities of the translator's own era. Van der Kooij aimed to discover the rationale behind the Hebrew and Greek divergences and to uncover certain clues which suggested actualization.

Van der Kooij conceives of actualization as 'updated' prophecies which refer to then-contemporary events. It is the "reinterpretation of the temporal application of ancient prophecy."[19] As such, the text embeds the translator's own creativity. He notes:

> The ancient prophecies were considered to be a source of hope, which was based on a reading and interpretation of these prophecies as referring to events of the age in which the readers/interpreters were living.[20]

To demonstrate this, van der Kooij appeals to presumed similarities in Ben Sira, Tobit, Daniel, and Pesher Habakkuk, in which 'eschatological prophecies' were updated for contemporary audiences in order to "enhance the authority of the ancient prophecy."[21] However, Troxel and others have demonstrated that appeal to contemporaneous scribal tendencies are illegitimate on the grounds of false analogy.[22] Nonetheless, van der Kooij's balanced approach to the analysis of

---

[18]Van der Kooij (1998), 15.

[19]Van der Kooij (1998), 18.

[20]Van der Kooij (1998), 88. Penner rightly resists this impulse. See Penner (2020), 14-15: "[T]he differences between the Hebrew and Greek are explainable as mistakes or as updating with no change of reference" and "if G intended to convince his readers that the events prophesied had been fulfilled in his own day, he appears to have failed in his purpose." Such rejection of actualization is presently widespread. See the relevant sections in Troxel (2008); De Sousa (2010); Wagner (2013).

[21]Van der Kooij (1998), 93; Van der Kooij (1998), 188-89. For references, see Ben Sira 36:13-20; Tobit 14:3-5; Daniel 9:2ff; 1QpHab.

[22]See Troxel (2008), 162: "The latter [i.e., *pesharim*] are explicit in their alignment of the text with contemporaneous events, whereas we have to extrapolate from oblique statements in a translation to what the translator might have had in view." For example, the author of Pesher Habakkuk explains the contemporary meaning of the biblical prophet with the recurrent phrase פשרו על 'this refers to.'

Greek Isaiah's *Vorlage*, its translation style, and its literary coherence carries forward into contemporary Greek Isaiah research.[23]

Van der Kooij provides an example of actualization which is relevant to this thesis in his discussion of the downfall of Babylon's king in Isa 14:1-23. He sees this text not only as a prophetic reference to the king of Babylon, but as an intentional allusion by the Greek translator to "the death of the Seleucid king Antiochus IV Epiphanes."[24] And since actualization is evident to van der Kooij in Isa 23:1-18, supposed parallels between chapters 23 and 14 also suggest to him the presence of actualization within the oracle against the king of Babylon. The discussion in subsequent chapters will illustrate that the translator of Greek Isaiah in no way demonstrates a concern to link the character in Isaiah 14 with any non-textual character. Instead, the translator's concern to read the text in accordance with literary and structural features overrides any tendency to actualize the text.[25]

Ronald Troxel's 2008 monograph seeks to situate the translator of Greek Isaiah in the socio-religious milieu of ancient Judaism and to construct the translator's 'profile,' an aspect

---

[23]Baer (2001), 18, demonstrates a more refined assessment than that of van der Kooij. While the translator may convey some actualizing tendencies he is primarily concerned to "display his theological understanding of the text" through rhetorical and homiletical features. Baer (2001), 17, also diverges from Koenig's imbalanced approach to the translator's intentionality: "Mistakes and a not quite victorious struggle with the book's difficult Hebrew appear to lie at the root of many of the LXX deviations. These coexist, however, with theological concerns and exegetical practice that produced a work that can only be fully appreciated when allowed bona fide status as ancient Jewish biblical interpretation." The scenario of misunderstanding the Hebrew requires more nuance. Misreadings may merely stem from the possibilities allotted by an unpointed manuscript, confusing orthography, difficult poetic-semantic construals, or the Aramaic milieu of the translator. All of these may result in 'mistranslations,' but none of them is of necessity due to the translator's deficient understanding of the Hebrew language. Byun (2017) specifically explores the translator's linguistic and cognitive environment in order to demonstrate how translator's historical situation led him to 'misunderstand' his source text. The translator of Greek Isaiah understood Hebrew. But he knew it as a Greek and Aramaic speaker, somewhat removed from the Classical Hebrew of the book Isaiah. Thus, it is insufficient for translation technical analysis to approach Greek Isaiah as a product simply informed by the Hebrew text. We must also consider the multifaceted linguistic layers which influenced the translator's work.

[24]Van der Kooij (1998), 99. See also Seeligmann (2004), 84ff; Van der Kooij (1981), 35-43.

[25]For a thorough survey and evaluation of the actualization thesis in Greek Isaiah, see Salvesen (2020), 185-202.

which resonates with previous scholars. Thus, the question of translation technique is crucial to Troxel's project.[26] He articulates the translator's overall approach in the following way:

> His choices of conjunctions, his reformulations of sentences, and his interpretation of passages in the light of theologoumena he perceived essential to the book show that he was less concerned to bring his readers to the Hebrew text of Isaiah than to bring the book to them.[27]

These motivations produced a translation which embodies a coherent message, one designed to become an independent entity for its readers. In other words, despite the translator's freedom, he nonetheless conveyed the message of Hebrew Isaiah with remarkable accuracy. Thus, Troxel rejects actualization on the basis of insufficient evidence. Appeals to toponyms and characters such as Antiochus IV are superficial in nature, and cannot be defended in the face of rigorous linguistic and translation-technical analysis.[28]

Franklin Rodrigo de Sousa's monograph, *Eschatology and Messianism in LXX Isaiah 1-12*, contributes to previous Greek Isaiah research by navigating the poles of translation-literary coherence and what he calls 'pragmatic' readership. He emphasizes the translator's role as a 'pragmatic reader' instead of highlighting him as creatively constructing a coherent text. Thus, the theological or ideological interests of Greek Isaiah have been overemphasized. So, as a corrective, de Sousa emphasizes how features of literary coherence are mostly emergent from the Hebrew text: "these should not always be taken as a window into actualizing exegesis or theological *Tendenz*."[29] Theo van der Louw takes a similar perspective:

> Certain 'free renderings' are sometimes regarded as raw material for the historian, viz. as visible traces of the translator, in which his (midrashic or actualizing) exegesis shows. This is why certain types of 'free renderings' have become a focus of interest for scholars who try to reconstruct the historical background of

---

[26]Troxel spends a significant amount of time in his monograph addressing the identity of the translator as an Alexandrian scribe in the tradition of museum scribes. This proposal has received significant criticism from a number of scholars: Pietersma (2008); Van der Kooij (2009): 147-52; Baer (2010): 302; Ausloos (2010): 145.

[27]Troxel (2008), 132.

[28]For a important discussions regarding the topic of actualization with reference Isaiah 14, 2 Maccabees, and Antiochus Epiphanes, see Troxel (2008), 211-218; Gregory (2015), 87-103.

[29]De Sousa (2010), 8-9: "Unlike an original composition, a translation is bound to its source text" and "Even though there will be variations in the degree of attachment to the *Vorlage*, the LXX books in general seem to have at their heart the intent to reproduce or transmit the original Hebrew or Aramaic text into Greek in a way that is meaningful to their recipient."

> the Septuagint and the translator's Hellenistic and/or Jewish ideology. Yet this concern can easily miss the fact that free renderings are first of all *linguistic material*.[30]

Greek Isaiah is primarily a *translation*. Coherence surely exists. But it is not solely due to the translator's imagination.[31] The translation's structure, themes, and coherence are grounded primarily in his *Vorlage*. And its literary value is not imposed; it simply emerges.

John Lee's work on the translator's literary Greek helpfully nuances de Sousa's proposal by detailing the existence of high-register elements in the translation.[32] Such tendencies surely impose literary coherence onto the work, but not necessarily in a way foreign to the themes and structure of the *Vorlage*. Such expressions simply unveil the translator's reading strategies along with his motivation to create a sophisticated and coherent translation. Coupled with de Sousa's emphasis upon reading strategy, Lee's observations suggest that both pragmatism and intentionality are essential to the translator's approach.[33] To illustrate this, John Lee details the several linguistic and stylistic features in Greek Isaiah: chiasms, inversion of word order, insertion of alliteration, lexical repetition, tragic phrase, proverbial expression, literary or poetic vocabulary, new creations, particles, literary word choices.

Immensely helpful for Greek Isaiah research is Mirjam van der Vorm-Croughs' monograph, *The Old Greek of Isaiah: An Analysis of Its Pluses and Minuses*. In this volume she exhaustively evaluated and classified Greek Isaiah's divergences from its source text, offering various categories for the translator's pluses and minuses. Scholars often discuss Greek Isaiah's

---

[30]Van der Louw (2007), 9.

[31]One must be careful to avoid the fallacy of bifurcation here. Both tendencies may be present as they are not mutually exclusive. For a balanced articulation, see de Sousa (2010), 10-11: "It would not be surprising if the translator employed 'normal' reading strategies, which included an awareness of context, and allowed this awareness to inform his translational decisions at several points."

[32]See Lee (2014), 135-146.

[33]Cunha (2014), 45-46, helpfully notes how translational coherence strongly suggests the intentional construction of lexical, thematic, and structural elements from Hebrew to Greek. However, I suggest that literary 'tenacity' better describes the tendencies of the Greek Isaiah translator. I am specifically arguing that his task of coherence is intentionally governed in large part by his ties to the literary form and presentation of the Hebrew text itself.

additions, omissions, and deviations without qualifying their terminology. But van der Vorm-Croughs has supplied helpful criteria for evaluating such features.

Further, van der Vorm-Croughs also affirms the significance of literary coherence as a motivating factor in the translation.[34] She notes:

> By inserting explicating details, the translator may have wished to . . . make his text more *coherent* by extending internal links and references, for example by means of the addition of demonstratives or genitive pronouns. Sometimes the reverse may have been intended: the replacement of an implied subject by a noun, for instance, weakens the link to the earlier mention of this subject, and hence may mark the beginning of a new section.[35]

These observations overlap and correspond with those of John Lee mentioned above. Van der Vorm-Croughts largely views additions and omissions as "the product of the translator's purposeful interventions."[36] She notes how the translator borrows, explicates, reduces, and emphasizes rhetoric and literary influence. The translator of Greek Isaiah sought to be sensitive to literary and theological contexts. As such, her work is invaluable for my project as it provides a springboard for relevant examples in the arguments below.

Ross Wagner's work, *Reading the Sealed Book: Old Greek Isaiah and the Problem of Septuagint Hermeneutics*, focuses upon the hermeneutical phenomena encountered in the translation of Isaiah 1:1-31. As such, his research emphasizes the translation's resultant 'constitutive' character, a feature which embodies the translation's function, process, and product.[37] This includes the combination of all literary, textual, and linguistic features which made the translation possible.

In this theoretical task, Wagner appropriates from the theoretical work of Gideon Toury and Umberto Eco.[38] Toury's model considers translations as culturally embodied events

---

[34]See van der Vorm-Croughs (2014), 31-62; esp. 31, 39, 61-62, 63, 77, 80, 332.

[35]Van der Vorm-Croughs (2014), 61-62. On page 63 she states: "[The translator] may have used implication so as to strengthen the textual coherence. If, for instance, a proper name instead of being repeated, is replaced by a pronoun, this makes a stronger link to the clause in which the name itself is mentioned."

[36]Van der Vorm-Croughs (2014), 11.

[37]Wagner (2013).

[38]See Toury (1995); Eco (1976); Eco (1979); Eco (1984); Eco (1990). For a more detailed summary of Toury's *Descriptive Translation Studies*, see Wagner (2013), 6-28. For seminal application of DTS in Septuagint research, see van der Louw (2007), Boyd-Taylor (2011). Also, the theme of *BIOSCS* 39 (2006) is entirely devoted to

which occur in social contexts shaped by appropriate and inappropriate translational norms. Eco's model of the cultural encyclopedia envisions an interconnected semiotic system wherein meanings are situated amongst a web of other signs and their significations. Like an encyclopedia, the possibilities of meaning are innumerable. A culturally situated translator in effect bridges encyclopedic cultures.

Wagner's overall perspective on Greek Isaiah is that it constitutes a faithful representative of its source text, even amidst its many deviations from the Hebrew. He notes:

> The Greek translator . . . takes considerable pains to clarify the structure and cohesion of the discourse in Isaiah 1 through his strategic deployment of inferential particles and through his judicious use of stylistic devices such as parallelism, repetition, chiasm and *inclusio*.[39]

In other words, translational deviations do not obscure the Hebrew meaning. They are in fact consonant with the meaning of the source text. He makes the significant statement that, "the Greek translator does not so much inject 'foreign' ideas into Isaiah's vision as amplify, elaborate and interweave characteristically 'Isaian' themes into bold new patterns."[40] The translator explicates for listeners and readers "the logical development of the prophet's vision" in a "distinctively Greek accent."[41] Such statements about Greek Isaiah's 'constitutive' character are largely in concert with my own. And like the growing consensus of Greek Isaiah scholarship, Wagner emphasizes Greek Isaiah's unique interpretive coherence without excluding its firm relationship to its *Vorlage*.[42] In other words, the translation is both 'literal' and 'free' at the same time but in different ways.

---

the topic of the Septuagint and DTS. For a critique of Toury's model of DTS in Septuagint studies, see Gauthier (2014); Dhont (2018); Sperber & Wilson (1995). For a discussion of Umberto Eco's theories of the Model Reader and the Cultural Encyclopedia, see Wagner (2013), 36-63 along with the relevant methodological discussion in this thesis.

[39]Wagner (2013), 64. Consider also the examples in Lee (2014): 135-46.

[40]Wagner (2013), 236.

[41]Wagner (2013), 235-36.

[42]Wagner (2013), 233, admits that no features of actualization occur in Isa 1:1-31: "What we have not found, however, is compelling evidence to suggest that the Greek translator sought to 'actualize' OG Isaiah 1 for his audience by encoding his translation with specific references to contemporary historical events."

Conclusion

This historical survey highlights both the major players in contemporary Greek Isaiah research and also their indebtedness to the work of figures such as Joseph Ziegler and Isac Seeligmann. But it also illustrated progress in the field. Scholars have largely moved away from the actualizing thesis of Seeligmann and van der Kooij toward a more literary and stylistic approach to Greek Isaiah. Concerns about the *Vorlage* of Greek Isaiah have given way to interpretive and hermeneutical questions.

As the above survey illustrates, coherence and actualization are not necessarily mutually exclusive positions. Many scholars have held to both. However, given the thoroughgoing presence of literary features in the translation, actualization advocates bear the burden of proof if they are to persuasively establish their case. And at present, this case has not yet been successfully demonstrated.[43] In other words, since wide-ranging literary intention in Greek Isaiah can provide sufficient explanation for the divergences between Greek Isaiah and its *Vorlage*, we need not appeal to additional motivations behind such renderings.

This latter claim arises from the epistemic principle of parsimony, commonly referred to as Ockham's Razor.[44] In short, without positive and compelling reasons for the actualization thesis, we should refrain from accepting it. Such principles are also prominent in Septuagint research. As Anneli Aejemlaeus notes:

> [T]he simplest adequate explanation should be given precedence over more complicated ones. A deliberate change of the meaning out of an ideological motivation seems to me in many cases to be the more complicated explanation.[45]

Ronald Troxel elaborates on this idea:

> [O]nly if the translator can be shown to refer deliberately to people, countries, ethnic groups, circumstances, or events by deviating from his *Vorlage* is it legitimate to entertain the possibility that he sought to identify such entities as the 'true' referents of his Hebrew exemplar. More stringently, it must be shown that the

---

[43]For a recent survey and assessment of actualization proposals, see Salvesen (2020), 185-202.

[44]*Entia non sunt multiplicanda praeter necessitatem* 'entities are not to be multiplied beyond necessity.' See Blackburn (2008), 258. For fuller discussion of the 'Razor' in Ockham's metaphysics and epistemology, see Spade (2006), 100-117; Spade and Panaccio (2019).

[45]Aejmelaeus (2007), 312.

> translator did not arrive at a rendering by reasoning from the immediate or broader *literary* contexts, but that he fashioned it with an eye to circumstances or events in his day.[46]

In light of these epistemic constraints and the lack of positive support for actualization, demonstrating the translator's intentional literary and structural coherence effectively neutralizes claims of actualization. And by implication, the actualization thesis is rebutted. To restate the principle: since wide-ranging literary intention in Greek Isaiah can provide sufficient explanation for the divergences between Greek Isaiah and its *Vorlage*, we need not appeal to additional motivations behind such renderings. A more detailed treatment of perspective will be illustrated more fully in due course.

In the following chapters, I contribute to this discussion by further emphasizing the literary features in Greek Isaiah 13:1-14:23 in a way that illustrates that literary craft does not entail ideological imposition. In other words, literary features in Greek Isaiah are largely emergent. This in many ways complements and corrects some aspects of 'coherence' proponents. As I noted above, a better way to express the features of 'coherence' in Greek Isaiah can be conveyed by its literary 'tenacity.' The translator was surely concerned to create a coherent text. But its translational coherence does not arise at the expense of the features of its Hebrew *Vorlage*. Its coherence is not simply imposed. Instead, the translation's coherence is largely governed by its ties to the literary expressions and structures of the Hebrew text itself. This idea will be detailed in chapters 5 and 6 where I demonstrate the translator's concern to explicate the Hebrew text's literary structure even amidst translational deviation. This feature of the translator's work has been largely ignored in previous scholarship. But I hope that the ensuing discussion initiates interest in this aspect of Greek Isaiah.

[46]Troxel (2008), 164. Referenced in Salvesen (2020), 192n25, who also rejects actualization proposals in favor of "the simplest explanation" on page 201.

Chapter 2: Assumptions, Methodology, and Scope

"The LXX is far too important to be treated as a grab-bag for conjectures and for rewriting the MT."[1]

"Most of the elements of MT are reflected in the LXX, a fact too often overlooked."[2]

Introduction

To build upon the discussion of the history of Greek Isaiah research, the material in this chapter supplies the groundwork for the arguments I pursue in chapters 3 through 6. Here, I set forth my assumptions and methodology, along with the overall layout for the following chapters. I begin by defining central terminology for Septuagint research and translation-technical studies. I then survey the contours of the 'free' and 'literal' translation spectrum in the Greek Old Testament, and describe how Greek Isaiah fits within these parameters. In the three sections that follow, I explore several other foundational issues: linguistic method, Greek Isaiah's *Vorlage*, ancient manuscripts, textual criticism, and modern editions of Hebrew and Greek Isaiah. I then explore the concepts and features of literary structure both in the Septuagint more generally and with Greek Isaiah in particular. I conclude the chapter with a model of my hermeneutical approach for the thesis before presenting the structure, rationale, and aims for the work's main chapters.

Prolegomena

As is frequently mentioned in Septuagint studies, the term 'Septuagint' (LXX) itself is strangely problematic since it most properly refers to the original Greek translation of the Pentateuch. However, the term is also used to identify not only the corpus of the Hebrew Bible translated into Greek, but may also include Greek compositional literature labeled as 'apocrypha' or 'deuterocanonical.'[3] In light of these multiple referents, specialists have decided to label any

[1]Wevers (1986), 38.

[2]Tov (2015), 63.

[3]Fernándos Marcos (2000), 35-51; Williams, (2010), 169-80; Aitken (2015), 1-2; Dhont (2018), 1.

initial Greek version of the Hebrew Bible (HB) outside the Pentateuch with the moniker Old Greek (OG). And although the phrase 'Old Greek Isaiah' is the most accurate way to refer to the Greek version of Hebrew Isaiah which I explore in this thesis, I simply employ the term 'Greek Isaiah' in reference to the second century B.C. Greek translation of the book.[4] Furthermore, I will use the terms 'Septuagint' and 'LXX' interchangeably in this thesis to refer to the whole corpus of the Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible. Otherwise, the context of my discussions will clarify my terminology.

Questions pertaining to translation technique constitute the primary focus of this project, one defined by Anneli Aejmelaeus as an investigation into the Septuagint which uncovers "the relationship between the text of the translation and its *Vorlage*."[5] Research in translation technique occurs through a threefold process, moving from the reconstruction of a parent text to analysis of a translated text. And it concludes with a synthesis and appraisal of the linguistic and hermeneutical processes involved in the translation's creation.

This latter investigation inquires about the working methodology of the translator, what he knew about his source material, and what he was capable of creating for his target audience. This type of analysis is simply descriptive and does not offer prescriptive norms as to what he ought to have done. So, even though I employ the phrase 'translation technique' to describe the translator's work, the investigation may be better labelled 'translation tendencies.' The 'technique' employed by the translator was not altogether a conscious part of the translation process. It was also a byproduct of his multifaceted translation goals.[6]

---

[4]See Troxel (2008), 1-72; Ngunga & Schaper (2015), 457-58. Of note, other scholars identify the translator and his work as 'G.'

[5]Aejmelaeus (2007), 205-6; Sollamo (2016), 161-71, esp. 63: "Translation technique study presents three principal advantages: it makes it possible to treat the Septuagint as a translation, to evaluate the quality of Septuagint Greek, and to characterize the translations."

[6]See Dhont (2018), 19: "A translation is the result of a translator's conscious and unconscious approaches toward the source text. Consequently, it is often heterogeneous in character."

Literal and Free Translation Spectrum

Inquiry into translation technique demands an assessment of any one translator's overall tendencies. So, researchers typically conclude that translators followed either 'literal' or 'free' approaches to their source text. While these two ends of the translation spectrum are recognizably reductionistic, they function as a helpful heuristic device. 'Literal' translations generally follow their source texts word-for-word at the expense of larger semantic concerns. And 'free' translations typically paraphrase or expand linguistic material from their source texts at the expense of preserving the source's lexemes or its syntactical structures. In this respect, Greek Isaiah must be globally regarded as a 'free' translation.

However, as I detail in chapters 3 and 4, the use of 'literal' and 'free' to describe translations is only proper when we recognize that it does not describe the work as a whole, but specific features therein. A translation of any particular biblical book may contain both 'literal' and 'free' features, each occurring in different ways. Emanuel Tov's description of these characteristics is helpful at this juncture:

> The characterizations 'free'/'literal' refer to renderings of individual words, syntagmata, and clauses, and on the basis of such characterizations, a complete unit (book) may be dubbed a 'literal' or 'free' translation. The translator of such a unit is then described as someone who tried to be 'faithful' to the underlying Hebrew text or who let his imagination run freely while transferring the details of the source text into the target language. Between these two opposite approaches, many gradations and variations may be discerned, from extremely paraphrastic (to the extent that the wording of the parent text is hardly recognizable) to slavishly faithful.[7]

The following 4 examples display the spectrum of these 'literal' and 'free' renderings in the Septuagint corpus. First, Ecclesiastes 4:4 constitutes a strongly 'literal' rendering of the Hebrew text:

Eccl 4:4	וְרָאִיתִי אֲנִי אֶת־כָּל־עָמָל	καὶ εἶδον ἐγὼ σὺν πάντα τὸν μόχθον
	וְאֵת כָּל־כִּשְׁרוֹן הַמַּעֲשֶׂה	καὶ σὺν πᾶσαν ἀνδρείαν τοῦ ποιήματος,
	כִּי הִיא קִנְאַת־אִישׁ מֵרֵעֵהוּ	ὅτι αὐτὸ ζῆλος ἀνδρὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἑταίρου αὐτοῦ·
	גַּם־זֶה הֶבֶל וּרְעוּת רוּחַ׃	καί γε τοῦτο ματαιότης καὶ προαίρεσις πνεύματος.
	I saw all toil and all profit	*And I saw [with] all toil and [with] all manliness*
	from work, that it comes from	*of work, that it is the jealousy of a man [from] his*
	a man's envy of his neighbor;	*companion; this is also indeed vanity and the*
	this also is vanity and a striving of wind.	*inclination of wind.*

[7]Tov (2015), 20-21.

The Greek text follows the Hebrew in a hyper-literal way.[8] This is evidenced by strict adherence to word order and the idiosyncratic use of the preposition σύν 'with' to render the Hebrew object marker אֵת. Greek Leviticus 19:1-2 also represents a 'literal' approach to the source text. Yet, it contains more natural Greek syntactical patterns than those present in Greek Ecclesiastes:

Lev 19:1-2 וַיְדַבֵּר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה לֵּאמֹר	καὶ ἐλάλησεν κύριος πρὸς Μωυσῆν λέγων
דַּבֵּר אֶל־כָּל־עֲדַת בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל	Λάλησον τῇ συναγωγῇ τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ
וְאָמַרְתָּ אֲלֵיהֶם קְדֹשִׁים תִּהְיוּ	καὶ ἐρεῖς πρὸς αὐτούς Ἅγιοι ἔσεσθε,
כִּי קָדוֹשׁ אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם׃	ὅτι ἐγὼ ἅγιος, κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν.
And Yhwh spoke to Moses, saying, "Speak to all the congregation of the sons of Israel and say to them: 'You shall be holy, for I, Yhwh your God, am holy.'"	*And the Lord said to Moses, saying, "Speak to the gathering of the sons of Israel and say to them: 'You shall be holy, because I, the Lord your God, am holy.'"*

The Greek text follows the Hebrew in a very straightforward manner. And from the perspective that the MT faithfully preserves the *Vorlage* of Greek Leviticus, this passage contains only two points of divergence from its source text. First, the Hebrew כָּל is absent in the Greek phrase τῇ συναγωγῇ τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ. And second, the word order of the final line is reversed. The phrase קָדוֹשׁ אֲנִי has become ἐγὼ ἅγιος. Nonetheless, nearly every element of the source text occurs in the target text. The word-for-word pattern is easily detected.

The two examples above represent the 'literal' end of the translation spectrum well. But examples from Isaiah and Proverbs illustrate the dynamics of 'free' Septuagint renderings. Isaiah 9:9 displays these 'free' features from one perspective:

Isa 9:9[10] לְבֵנִים נָפָלוּ וְגָזִית נִבְנֶה	Πλίνθοι πεπτώκασιν, ἀλλὰ δεῦτε λαξεύσωμεν λίθους
שִׁקְמִים גֻּדָּעוּ וַאֲרָזִים נַחֲלִיף׃	καὶ ἐκκόψωμεν συκαμίνους καὶ κέδρους
—	<u>καὶ οἰκοδομήσωμεν ἑαυτοῖς πύργον</u>.
Bricks have fallen but we shall build with stones; the sycamores were cut down, but we will replace them with cedars.	*Bricks have fallen; but come, let us hew stones and let us cut down sycamores and cedars; <u>and let us build for ourselves a tower</u>.*

This example contains divergences in word order, lexical pluses and minuses, along with interpretive explications. But the final clause of the Greek lacks attestation in the Hebrew text. In

[8]Gentry (2016), 202-220, esp. 215-16. For an alternative perspective on Greek Ecclesiastes, Aitken (2005): 55-78.

fact, it is most likely an allusion to the tower of Babel story in the book of Genesis. Thus, the translator's freedom extends beyond lexical and syntactical variations from the Hebrew. It also includes references to other portions of the biblical corpus. Nonetheless, this intertextual and theological addition is faithful to the overall context of the Hebrew. Even though the translator significantly diverged from his source, it is at the same time faithful to that very text but at a level beyond the lexeme.[9] This illustrates how Greek Isaiah is both 'literal' and 'free'. An example from Proverbs 11:7a exhibits a different yet complementary perspective on the 'free' side of the translation spectrum:

Prov 11:7a	בְּמוֹת אָדָם רָשָׁע תֹּאבַד תִּקְוָה	τελευτήσαντος ἀνδρὸς δικαίου οὐκ ὄλλυται ἐλπίς,
	In the death of a wicked man, hope shall perish.	*When a righteous man dies, hope is not destroyed,*

The word order between the Hebrew and Greek here is nearly identical. And the overall meaning of the Greek is almost a complete parallel to the Hebrew. However, the translator accomplished this task in a thoroughly different way from his *Vorlage*. The Greek text contains the genitive absolute τελευτήσαντος ἀνδρὸς δικαίου to render the Hebrew prepositional phrase בְּמוֹת אָדָם רָשָׁע. And where the Hebrew contains the term 'evil,' the Greek text contains the term 'righteous.' The following negation οὐκ balances this semantic shift. But it demonstrates the liberties taken by the translator in his construction of this 'free' rendering of Proverbs. But all the while, the translation is generally 'literal' in capturing the meaning of the verse. This survey of examples supports James Barr's famous statement: "There are different ways of being literal and of being free, so that a translation can be literal and free at the same time but in different modes or on different levels."[10]

[9]See the description of Greek Isaiah's tendencies in Ngunga & Schaper (2015), 459-60: "[T]here are multiple motivations for the Isaiah translator's choice of lexemes. These include contextual sensitivity, lexical rearrangements due to a scarcity of suitable Greek equivalents to some Hebrew terms and an interest in producing a coherent text in good Koine Greek. . . . His choices also reveal his strategy in creating intertextual links within the overall literary unit, his dependence—in some cases—on an existing pattern laid down in the LXX-Pentateuch, and so on."

[10]Barr (1979), 294.

Linguistic Methodology

The linguistic analysis in this project has been influenced by two theoretical discussions. The first concerns that of verbal valency and the second, that of semantic roles. As Holmstedt and Screnock state: "A verb's valency is part of its lexical composition and refers to the number of arguments the verb requires in order to be semantically 'complete.'"[11] Thus, linguistic 'arguments' constitute necessary grammatical elements in a clause whereas 'adjuncts' are not essential to the core demands of the predicate. Even more precisely:

> Valency is the potential of a lexeme (a verb, noun, or adjective) to structure its syntactic environment by defining the number and the form of complements that may occur in a clause or, in the case of a noun or adjective, in a phrase. Valency is a property of every verbal lexeme.[12]

Generally, verbs may be monovalent if they require only one argument, bivalent if they require two, and trivalent if they require three. While I do not explicitly discuss valency in the course of this thesis, it undergirds the linguistic analysis presented herein.

Related to verbal valency is the second area of linguistic influence informed by argument structure and semantic roles. This influence occurs explicitly throughout the project. This linguistic approach is defined by Paul Kroeger as follows: "[A]rgument structure is a representation of the number and type of arguments associated with a particular predicate."[13] This leads to analysis of specific arguments by assigning them labels for their semantic roles in clauses. Kroeger also notes that analysis of predicate structure requires that we "assign participants to broad semantic or conceptual categories according to the role they play in the described event or situation."[14] In contrast to the traditional labels such as 'subject,' 'object,' and

---

[11]Holmstedt and Screnock (2015), 4. See also Crystal (2008), 507; Cook (2016), 53-86. For a concise definition of a linguistic 'argument,' see Kroeger (2005), 58: "Arguments are elements of a clause which have a close semantic relationship to their predicate. They are the participants which must be involved because of the very nature of the relation or activity named by the predicate, and without which the clause cannot express a 'complete thought.'" See also Noonan (2020), 89-90.

[12]Malessa (2013).

[13]Kroeger (2004), 9.

[14]Kroeger (2004), 9.

'indirect object,' this list of semantic roles enables high-resolution terminology regardless of a phrase's valency or argument structure.

Traditional labels identify where arguments occur in grammatical slots, but they do not always correspond with usage in a sentence. I employ several terms from the following list of semantic roles in this thesis since the clause and argument structure from Hebrew to Greek Isaiah often differs. This terminology helps to clarify the linguistic analysis of such translation phenomena. The inventory of semantic roles provided by Kroeger is as follows:

> AGENT: causer or initiator of events
> EXPERIENCER: animate entity which perceives a stimulus or registers a particular mental or emotional process or state
> RECIPIENT: animate entity which receives or acquires something
> BENEFICIARY: entity (usually animate) for whose benefit an action is performed
> INSTRUMENT: inanimate entity used by an agent to perform some action
> THEME: entity which undergoes a change of location or possession, or whose location is being specified
> PATIENT: entity which is acted upon, affected, or created; or of which a state or change of state is predicated
> STIMULUS: object of perception, cognition, or emotion; entity which is seen, heard, known, remembered, loved, hated, etc.
> LOCATION: spatial reference point of the event. The LOCATION role includes the sub-types SOURCE, GOAL, and PATH, which respectively describe the origin (or beginning-point), destination (or end-point), and pathway of a motion
> ACCOMPANIMENT (or COMITATIVE): entity which accompanies or is associated with the performance of an action.[15]

The significance of argument structure analysis is most evident in passive verbal transformations where the argument as 'subject' of a transitive verb may be displaced with an intransitive verb even though it still performs the same semantic role (e.g., Jane [AGENT] threw the ball to Bill [RECIPIENT] ›› The ball was thrown to Bill [RECIPIENT] by Jane [AGENT]).[16] By employing the term AGENT instead of 'subject', we can avoid vague grammatical referents.

Behind the presentation in chapters 3 through 6 lies thorough lexical and translation technical work for Isa 13:1-14:23. For nearly every term in the Hebrew text of Isaiah, I examined its occurrences in the Hebrew Bible and the Greek renderings in the Septuagint. This enabled me to assess the larger translation patterns of the Greek translators. I then examined Greek Isaiah's

---

[15]See Kroeger (2004), 9; Crystal (2008), 428.

[16]On passive transformation, see Kroeger (2004), 53-87.

own particular patterns and either compared or contrasted them with the results from the previous lexical and statistical analysis of the Septuagint. Much of Greek Isaiah contains translational divergences of maximally two or three words per verse. So, the selection of examples which I detail in the forthcoming chapters highlights the translation peculiarities of Greek Isaiah which exceed such minor deviations.[17]

The *Vorlage* of Greek Isaiah

The large majority of research on Greek Isaiah recognizes that the translator's *Vorlage* is nearly identical to the Hebrew text preserved in the Masoretic Text (MT).[18] And so it is commonplace in Greek Isaiah research to approach analysis of the translation in this fashion unless there is significant justification for supposing otherwise. As Wagner notes:

> While the *Vorlage* of OG Isaiah clearly was not identical with any surviving exemplar of the Masoretic text (𝔐), previous research has shown it to have been sufficiently close to permit one to utilize 𝔐 (and, more recently, 1QIsa[a]), as a starting point for an investigation of the translation's relationship to its source.[19]

This view is confirmed primarily by considering the relationship of the Greek text to the Hebrew after all relevant information from translation technique is covered, a position again observed by Wagner:

> In comparing the Old Greek to the Hebrew text (and variants) known via the manuscripts and versions, it often appears clear that the translation represents the consonantal text common to the principal witnesses 𝔐 and 1QIsa[a].[20]

And after the publication of Mirjam van der Vorm-Croughs' meticulous analysis of the differences between the Hebrew and Greek, it is definitively difficult to postulate an alternative Hebrew *Vorlage*.[21] She states: "Considered on the whole, it seems that only a minority of pluses

---

[17]I completed this work on the textual database provided by Accordance Bible Software, Version 12.3.6, Oaktree Software, 2019.

[18]For terminology related to the MT such as proto-MT and MT-like, see Tov (2012); Tov (2019), 31-52.

[19]Wagner (2013), 30n149.

[20]Wagner (2013), 48.

[21]Van der Vorm-Croughs (2014), 477-513.

and minuses in LXX Isaiah are due to a *Vorlage* differing from the MT."[22] Penner's analysis also supports this portrait of the plusses and minuses in Greek Isaiah: "The most significant *omissions* involve less than a verse."[23] And again: "The *additions* are even fewer. . . . None of the additions extends beyond a clause or short sentence."[24]

Furthermore, the evidence of Isaiah at Qumran also demonstrates the antiquity and presence of the Hebrew base text which was preserved in the MT.[25] As Seulgi Byun notes:

> The vast majority of the variants in 1QIsa[a] are orthographical or morphological in nature and do not offer more original readings than those of the MT. There are, however, a handful of textual variants of consequence, which have been noted by various scholars, but these are relatively few and far between.[26]

We can proceed with methodological confidence that the translator of Greek Isaiah was working with a Hebrew text nearly identical to the one we possess today in the MT. And given the amount of research confirming this position, those proposing a divergent *Vorlage* for Greek Isaiah from what is largely preserved in the MT, shoulder the burden of proof to demonstrate this methodological position.[27] Thus, in this project I rely upon the Hebrew texts of Isaiah contained in BHS and 1QIsa[a] along with the Greek text of Isaiah in the Göttingen critical edition.[28]

In addition to accessing Greek manuscripts from antiquity, we are also able to triangulate and compare our assessment of Greek Isaiah to other ancient witnesses, translations, and revisions. The principal sources in this endeavor include the Masoretic Hebrew manuscripts and the Isaiah scroll from from Qumran (1QIsa[a]).[29] Further, much significant material is also

---

[22]Van der Vorm-Croughs (2014), 518.

[23]Penner (2020), 7. He references Isa 2:22; 38:15; 40:7; 56:12.

[24]Penner (2020), 8. See Baer (2001), 16: "[M]ost divergences [are] limited to one to three words."

[25]Several scrolls from Qumran cave 4 contain portions of Isaiah. But only manuscripts from cave 1 contain Isaianic material relevant to this thesis: 1QIsa[a] and 1QIsa[b]. The latter of these manuscripts is extremely fragmentary and omits chapter 14 altogether. Thus, 1QIsa[a] constitutes the sole Qumran evidence which is discussed in this thesis. Kutzcher (1974); Tov (1997), 2:493; Tov (2012), 93-110; Byun (2015), 65-80.

[26]Byun (2015), 69. See also Longacre (2013): 17-50.

[27]For a thorough methodological treatment of *Vorlage*, see Troxel (2008), 73-85.

[28]Elliger & Rudolph (1997); Parry & Qimron (1999); Ziegler (1982); Ulrich & Flint (2010).

[29]The text from Qumran labeled 1QIsa[b] (1Q8) is fragmentary and largely unhelpful in this study. At most, the fragment for Isa 13:1-8 contains only 86 consonants in maximally 26 words. And this is an exceedingly

found in the later Greek revisions of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, which may be accessed in the second apparatus of Ziegler's edition. Last of all, in addition to the Hebrew and Greek witnesses, we may also utilize ancient non-Greek versions of Isaiah in Aramaic, Latin, Syriac. Such witnesses are be utilized in this thesis when appropriate in order to shed light on the discussion, especially as it contributes to our understanding of various modes of reading Hebrew Isaiah in antiquity.

Manuscripts, Textual Criticism, and Editions of Greek Isaiah

As is well known, no singular or definitive text of Greek Isaiah exists.[30] This is largely due to the fact that the translation *qua* manuscript which emerged from the translator's hand is materially no longer accessible. And even if it were, it would be difficult to demonstrate such a fact. As a result, the pristine form of the translation *qua* text is likewise inaccessible given the abundance of textual corruptions present in surviving manuscripts.[31] However, this does not entail that the text of Greek Isaiah is lost. We can reasonably assume that it is present, albeit imperfectly, in the manuscripts preserved from antiquity. Consider the state of manuscript attestation noted by van der Kooij:

> The text of Isa^{LXX} is extant in five uncial manuscripts (A, B, Q, S, and V), in numerous minuscule manuscripts, and in commentaries of the Greek fathers (Eusebius of Caesarea, Basil, John Chrysostom, Theodoret of Cyrrhus, and Cyril of Alexandria). It is indirectly attested through ancient translations (into OL, Coptic, and Syriac). The 'Alexandrian' text, whose primary witnesses are MSS A and Q, as well as Cyril,

---

generous count, including even partial consonants and unclear orthographic material. In all, the fragment contains only one complete clause in Isa 13:2—הרימו קול להם—a phrase in agreement with what is preserved in 1QIsa^{a} and in the Masoretic tradition.

[30]Here, 'text' is differentiated from 'manuscript,' the former being the literary-semantic witness accessed through the physical artifact of a manuscript. A text is *what* the manuscript preserves, and as such is usually older than the material itself. See Wasserman and Gurry (2017), 3-5, 21-25.

[31]These statements concerning a single manuscript would hold true even if a plurality of manuscript copies were produced together. Thus, the idea of a 'pristine manuscript' is largely a generalization since there would have been a close temporal proximity between manuscript production, revision, and editing as noted in Aitken (2020), 16: "Editing . . . was a natural part of the writing process such that writing and editing according to how it sounds to a Greek are all one and the same activity." See Aitken (2016), 269-293, for relevant details on ancient translation procedures in Egypt. See also Aitken (2014), 120-134. This topic is related to the question of the 'original text.' For discussion related to New Testament manuscripts, see Mitchell (2017), 287-308.

> probably 'best preserves the original ancient Sept[uagint] text.' This contrasts with the Hexaplaric (attested among others by MSS B and V as well as Eusebius) and the Lucianic or Antiochene recension (primarily represented by a number of minuscules as well as Theodoret). These two recensions are marked, among other things, by a text that has been improved in a number of places according to the Hebrew text.[32]

The diversity of textual material in these manuscripts preserves a large portion of what may be considered the 'original' text of Greek Isaiah. However, divergent readings demand that this 'original' text be recovered through manuscript analysis and the reasoned investigations of textual criticism.[33] Just like the creation and production of knowledge, a critical text is made. But this does not entail that it is made-up. Instead, the aim of this text-critical enterprise is to reconstruct the 'earliest attested text' present in reliable ancient witnesses by applying a consistent text-critical methodology.[34]

The primary edition of Greek Isaiah utilized in this project is found in Joseph Ziegler's text of *Isaias* in the Göttingen *Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum*.[35] As Greek Isaiah research widely acknowledges, Ziegler's edition provides the best reconstructed version of the 'original' text. This edition is of unique value because of its two textual apparatuses. The first apparatus details variant readings from the Greek manuscript history and the second includes readings from the revisions of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion. And because of Ziegler's work in this text-critical arena, his investigation into Greek Isaiah's textual history, and the editorial layout of the edition, research in Greek Isaiah may proceed with reasoned confidence in

---

[32]Van der Kooij (2019), 518; internal citation from Ziegler (1983), 25. See also Silva (2007), 823: "It is important to note that the earlier English translations of the LXX by Thomson and Brenton were based on editions of the Greek version that essentially reproduced the text of Codex Vaticanus. While this important manuscript preserves an excellent text for most books of the LXX, it is less trustworthy in the case of Esaias." For the full presentation of the manuscript evidence, see the *Einleitung* in Ziegler (1983), 7-118; Jellicoe (1993), 299-300.

[33]For a succinct overview of the rationale, purpose, means, and method(s) of textual criticism, see van der Kooij (2018), 579-590; Barthélemy (2013), 84-97. See also Tov (2012); Tov (2013); Tov (2015).

[34]For a statement related to the 'earliest attested text,' see Tov (2015), 3: [A]s a rule, textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible aims . . . only at that stage (or stages) of the composition(s) that is (are) attested in the textual evidence." See further discussion on the 'original' text in Tov (2012), 161-169; Barthélemy (2012), 137-141; Jobes & Silva (2015) 128-134. Tov (2012), 9: The original text constitutes "the written text or edition (or a number of consecutive editions) that contained some form of the finished literary product. This entity stood at the beginning of the textual transmission process." In this essay, Tov prefers the label 'determinative text.' I have chosen to utilize the term 'original' text in a qualified way despite the difficulty of precise definition.

[35]Ziegler (1983).

the formal reliability of its subject matter.[36] From this edition, we can conceptually access the history of Greek Isaiah's transmission despite its material intangibility.

In addition to consulting Ziegler's edition, I also made reference to Rahlfs-Hanhart throughout my research.[37] However, since little divergence exists between these two editions, I seldom reference Rahlfs-Hanhart. Nonetheless, I have compared them and highlight the differences as they are relevant. Silva's comments on the editions are apt:

> Ziegler's reconstructed text is very similar to that found in Rahlfs' *Septuaginta*. If we set aside differences that do not show up in an English translation (primarily Greek orthographic variants), we find approximately ninety places where the two editions differ, and many of these variations are relatively minor.[38]

Overall, I only diverge from Ziegler's edition in favor of Rahlfs-Hanhart in two places: Isa 13:3 and 14:13. The first of these is discussed in detail below while the latter is minor and only treated in passing.

Textual Difficulties in Greek Isaiah 13:1-14:23

Now, even though Ziegler's edition grants access to an overwhelmingly consistent textual tradition, some difficulties and uncertainties persist with his editorial decisions. We must keep in mind that methodological distance must be placed between addressing textual problems from the perspective of the Hebrew Bible in contrast to those in the Septuagint.[39] Even though the Septuagint is an important source for the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible, the discussion

---

[36]See Aitken (2015), 7: "The best critical editions are the volumes of the Göttingen Septuagint (produced by the Septuaginta-Unternehmen research centre in Göttingen), which contain an editor's restoration of the best readings and a full apparatus of manuscript evidence.

[37]Rahlfs-Hanhart (2006).

[38]Silva (2007), 823. See also Ngnunga & Schaper (2015), 456: "Rahlfs-Hanhart and Göttingen differ in a few places, and though many variations are relatively minor, close scrutiny of every case against its literary context is encouraged, as it could lead to significant results." Investigating the differences at Isa 13:3 below has proven valuable.

[39]For text-critical discussions in relation to the Hebrew text, see the extended discussions in Barthélemy (1986), 90-107, where he treats problems in Isa 13:2; 13:13; 13:22; 14:2; 14:4; 14;6; 14:12; 14:19; 14:21. Barthélemy (1986) 96-100, discussed the difficulty of MT מדהבה in Isa 14:4 at length and corrects the orthography of the lexeme to מרהבה. See also the concise discussion in de Waard (1997), 63. This proposal has been defended even further in two articles by Mizrahi (2013), both being published in the same year. See also Troxel (2022), 299: " מדהבה in Isa 14:4 likely reflects מרהבה, as read by 1QIsa[a] and implied by ἐπισπουδαστής.

here is interested in the Greek text itself and not with the reconstruction of the Hebrew *Vorlage*. Specific instances of this latter topic are addressed elsewhere in the thesis. With this in mind, Isa 13:3 in particular demands significant attention when addressing text-critical phenomena of the Babylon discourse. Although other text-critical problems occur in Isa 13:1-14:23, they are relatively minor and easier to resolve.[40] However, the features in 13:3 are problematic enough to address here for reasons delineated below.

Textual issues in Isa 13:3 become apparent as soon as we compare the editions of Ziegler and Rahlfs:[41]

13:3a	MT	אֲנִי צִוִּיתִי לִמְקֻדָּשַׁי גַּם קָרָאתִי
13:3a	Ziegler	ἐγὼ συντάσσω, καὶ ἁγιάζω αὐτούς· [ἡγιασμένοι εἰσί] καὶ ἐγὼ καλῶ αὐτούς·
13:3a	Rahlfs	ἐγὼ συντάσσω, καὶ ἐγὼ ἄγω αὐτούς· ἡγιασμένοι εἰσίν, καὶ ἐγὼ ἄγω αὐτούς·

In fact, three specific disparities occur between the phrases above, the first and last of which require detailed text-critical analysis. The bracketed phrase (i.e., [ἡγιασμένοι εἰσί]) in Ziegler's text simply indicates that he thinks the phrase should be omitted. Yet, as the ensuing discourse illustrates, no significant rationale exists for removing the phrase.

Before unfolding the textual history of this verse, a significant preliminary statement on Ziegler's edition is necessary. When Ziegler's edition is compared to the Hebrew text, it is

---

[40]For a minor issue in Isa 14:13, see the difference between Rahlfs' σὺ δὲ εἶπας ἐν τῇ διανοίᾳ σου and Ziegler's σὺ δὲ εἶπας τῇ διανοίᾳ σου. For readings in Isa 14:13 which are easily resolved, see differences between Rahlfs' ἐπάνω τῶν ἄστρων τοῦ οὐρανοῦ θήσω τὸν θρόνον μου and Ziegler's ἐπάνω τῶν ἄστρων τοῦ θεοῦ θήσω τὸν θρόνον μου. Rahlfs' reading is to be preferred over that of Ziegler for the following reasons: it deviates from the Hebrew text as the *lectio difficilior*, it creates a literary and thematic parallel with the wording of both 13:10 and 14:12, and it constitutes the majority reading as it is attested by A, B, S, and Q. Further, the phrase 'stars of heaven' occurs several times in the Hebrew and Greek Pentateuch, and as such may at this point convey a more biblical style. In contrast, the term θεοῦ is only preserved in Cyprian and Tyconius, and the phrase 'star(s) of God' is attested elsewhere only in Amos 5:26. Semantic similarity between אֵל and θεοῦ here is thus inconsequential to its antiquity. I elaborate on this topic in chapter 4. Greek Isaiah 14:21 has a slight textual disparity with the final term in the verse: Ziegler's πολέμων versus Rahlfs' πολέων. Ziegler's reading is to be preferred on the basis of widespread manuscript attestation and its status as a translational and semantic *lectio difficilior*.

[41]The problem is also apparent when consulting contemporary Septuagint publications. See NETS: 'It is I who instruct, and I lead them; [they have been consecrated,] and it is I who summon them'; BdA: '*Moi je les ranges, et je les sanctifie; [ils sont sanctifiés], et moi je les appelle*'; LXX.D: '*Ich gebe die Anweisungen, und ich heilige sie; [geheiligt sind sie,] und ich rufe sie*'. NETS follows Rahlfs' edition in the first portion of the verse, while others follow Ziegler's text in its entirety. LES follows the less reliable reading of B from Swete's edition: ἐγὼ συντάσσω, καὶ ἐγώ, αὐτούς rendered as 'I, even I, am appointing them.' Regarding the status of B, and a fact widely recognized, see Silva (2007), 823: "While this important manuscript [B] preserves an excellent text for most books of the LXX, it is less trustworthy in the case of Esaias."

admittedly preferable from a 'literal' perspective. However, for the first and final underlined divergences in the examples above—לְמִקַּדְּשָׁי with ἁγιάζω and קָרָאתִי with καλῶ—Ziegler inserts conjectural emendations. And as such, he labels them with *scripsi* in the first apparatus. However, these editorial decisions should immediately give us pause. They are nowhere attested in the Greek manuscript history. And since the present discussion precisely concerns this textual history, we must explore Ziegler's rationale for such emendation. In the end, I conclude that Ziegler is mistaken at this point. He privileges questions about translation technique over those of textual criticism, and as a result seems to import into the text-critical procedure his views about how the translator ought to have proceeded. Below, I outline the text-critical problem and explain the most likely 'original' text and the rationale behind Ziegler's evaluation.

External Textual Evidence

To begin I list the extant and most relevant textual and manuscript evidence for Isa 13:3. I then provide summative observations about this data to conclude my evaluation of this textual problem:

EVIDENCE

MT:	אֲנִי צִוִּיתִי לִמְקֻדָּשָׁי גַּם קָרָאתִי
1QIsa[a]:	אני צויתי למקדשי גמ קראתי
A:	ἐγὼ συντάσσω καὶ ἐγὼ αὐτούς· ἡγιασμένοι εἰσίν, καὶ ἐγὼ ἄγω αὐτούς
B:	ἐγὼ συντάσσω καὶ ἐγὼ αὐτούς (cf. O- and C-group)
S:	ἐγὼ συντάσσω καὶ ἐγὼ ἄγω αὐτούς· ἡγειασμένοι εἰσίν, καὶ ἐγὼ ἄγω αὐτούς
Q:	ἐγὼ συντάσσω καὶ ἐγὼ ἄγω αὐτούς· ἡγιασμένοι εἰσίν, καὶ ἐγὼ ἄγω αὐτούς
L:	ἐγὼ συντάσσω, ἡγιασμένοι εἰσίν καὶ ἐγὼ ἄγω αὐτούς
α΄σ΄θ΄	εγω ενετειλαμην (α΄ σ΄ θ΄ ενετ. 710)
	τοις ηγιασμενοις μου (α΄ εγω – ηγ. μου Chr.)
	καιγε εκαλεσα δυνατους (α΄ σ΄ δυν. 710 Eus.Tht.; οι λ΄ δυν Chr.) μου

EDITIONS

Rahlfs:	ἐγὼ συντάσσω, καὶ ἐγὼ ἄγω αὐτούς· ἡγιασμένοι εἰσίν, καὶ ἐγὼ ἄγω αὐτούς
Gött.	ἐγὼ συντάσσω, καὶ ἁγιάζω αὐτούς· [ἡγιασμένοι εἰσί] καὶ ἐγὼ καλῶ αὐτούς

RAHLFS' APPARATUS

|| και εγω αγω αυτους 1^0 > L
| αγω 1^0 > B* A^{*}: post εγω
| αυτους $1^0 \cap 2^0$ B*

Text-Critical Observations

The majority of manuscripts accord with the readings of A, S, and Q, a point admitted by Rahlfs, Ziegler, and Ottley.[42] Codex B is the outlier and resembles the shorter reading of the Hexaplaric witnesses attested in the O-, C-, and L-groups. These readings should be regarded as out of line with the 'original' as they contain readings due to errors of sight and are motivated by a concern to mirror the Hebrew text more 'literally.'[43] Nevertheless, even the reading of the L-group witnesses to some features of the majority by including ἡγιασμένοι εἰσί. And codex B also contains in its bottom margin the majority reading: ἐγὼ αὐτούς ἡγιασμένοι εἰσί καὶ ἐγὼ ἄγω.[44] These latter observations illustrate the widespread attestation of this longer reading. But they also show the potential difficulty it posed for ancient readers, most likely on the basis of its repetition.

The majority reading should likely be regarded as the *lectio difficilior* both at the level of translation and also on account of the perceived redundancy. But the reading also fits the oracular context and yet deviates from Hebrew text in such a way as to constitute a 'free' translation pattern so characteristic of Greek Isaiah. It largely captures in one way or another each element of the Hebrew text, with only slight variations or additions. This is another feature characteristic of Greek Isaiah's translation patterns.

The apparatus from Rahlfs' edition above nicely captures these textual phenomena, but it may miss a key step in the scribal process. It seems that two scribal errors of the eye are responsible for the shorter minority reading. As the scribe recorded the first instance of ἐγὼ ἄγω αὐτούς, he committed a periblepsis between εγω and αγω due to homoioteleuton and then proceeded to copy αὐτούς. Rahlfs does not explicate this step for us. He only notes the omission

---

[42]Rahlfs (2006), xlii, defines the marking A$^{\text{ᵻ}}$ as follows: "[O]nly the MSS. which we have cited and, at the most, not more than one minuscule which we have not mentioned have supported the reading in question." Thus, the majority of manuscripts contain the longer reading εγω αγω αυτους. Ziegler's apparatus confirms this assessment with the marking *rel.*(*iqui*) 'the remainders.'

[43]See Van der Kooij (2019), 518: "The 'Alexandrian' text, whose primary witnesses are MSS A and Q, as well as Cyril, probably 'best preserves the original ancient Sept[uagint] text.' This contrasts with the Hexaplaric (attested among others by MSS B and V as well as Eusebius) and the Lucianic or Antiochene recension (primarily represented by a number of minuscules as well as Theodoret). These two recensions are marked, among other things, by a text that has been improved in a number of places according to the Hebrew text."

[44]The script appears to be of a different hand.

of ἄγω. However, in the second step the scribe then committed haplography by associating the second αὐτούς with the first. This latter step is explicated in Rahlfs' apparatus. As a result the scribe omitted the entirety of ἄγω αὐτούς ἡγειασμένοι εἰσίν, καὶ ἐγὼ ἄγω from his work. Thus, the original reading ἐγὼ συντάσσω καὶ ἐγὼ ἄγω αὐτούς· ἡγειασμένοι εἰσίν, καὶ ἐγὼ ἄγω αὐτούς had become ἐγὼ συντάσσω καὶ ἐγὼ αὐτούς.

Text-Critical Evaluation

Ziegler's text not only deviates from the majority reading at Isa 13:3, but it largely ignores the minority reading as well. It seems that Ziegler emended the text based on an unwarranted assumption of how the translator of Greek Isaiah ought to have worked. With ἁγιάζω (*scripsi*), Ziegler assumed that phrase ἐγὼ ἄγω αὐτούς could not have been original on the presumed basis of its deviation from the Hebrew text. He may also have understood its perceived redundancy to disqualify its reliability. So, he sought to reconstruct the original Greek text on the basis of the Hebrew. And instead of accepting the extant participial phrase ἡγιασμένοι εἰσί as the translator's original rendering, he suggests removing it from the reading tradition in favor of an emendation. This is all the more peculiar in light of the semantic overlap between למקדשׁי and ἡγιασμένοι at this point. Assuming that something like ἁγιάζω was original, Ziegler sought to reconstruct the 'corrupted' phase ἐγω ἄγω toward ἁγιάζω. This explanation has some orthographic plausibility. But it does not seem to be the most text-critically sound decision in light of the discussion above.

Ziegler's second emendation replaces ἄγω with καλῶ. This 'literal' rendering more closely pairs the Greek to the Hebrew קראתי at both the semantic and morphological levels. Yet this decision is faulty for the same reasons as the previous emendation. The reading lacks manuscript attestation and it unjustifiably assumes a certain translation approach. The method employed is circular. As such it should be rejected in favor of the majority reading on the basis of a faulty assumption about Greek Isaiah's translation practice. As Ottley and Penner observe, the only reading which resembles καλῶ occurs outside the Greek tradition in Tyconius with *voco*.[45]

[45]Ottley (1904), 171-172 ; Penner (2020), 530.

In sum, Ziegler's explanation is unnecessarily complex and exposes his assumption about what the translator's working methods must have been. Like the minority witnesses, he doesn't seem to have thought the perceived redundancy of ἐγὼ ἄγω αὐτούς was original. But this impulse attributes a translation approach to Greek Isaiah which ought not be ascribed to him. Preferences for 'literal' readings reconstructed from the *Vorlage* are specious as they could be multiplied throughout the translation without end. Thus, I side with the comments of Silva that some of Ziegler's conjectural emendations are "reasonable, even brilliant, but not totally persuasive."[46]

The strength of Ziegler's emendation consists in its lexical-semantic overlap with the Hebrew text. However, given the strength of the majority reading alongside the 'free' translation patterns of Greek Isaiah, Ziegler's twofold emendation lacks both justification and warrant. As such, I deviate from his edition at this point in favor of the text as preserved in Rahlfs' edition.

Literary Structure and the Septuagint

Here I discuss the methodological warrant for investigating the topic of literary structure in Greek Isaiah. While discussion of structure in literature is vast and difficult, by 'literary structure' I simply refer to the way and manner the literature of Isaiah unfolds and develops beyond individual clauses and verses.[47] In light of the fact that "structure implies purpose," John Sailhamer notes:

> The most influential yet subtle feature of an author's work . . . is the overall framework within which he arranges his account. Some call this the literary context. Perhaps a more usable term would be *structure*. What this means is that each segment of a narrative always has an internal relationship to the other segments of that

[46]Silva (2007), 823. This assessment also applies to the position advocated by Ottley (1904), 171-172. His solution is more plausible than Ziegler's but succumbs to the same assumptions and lacks support in the manuscripts. Contrary to the translation of Ziegler's text in LXX.D (2011), the accompanying commentary prefers the majority of manuscript witnesses for the opening two contested phrases as attested in Rahlfs' edition: "*textkritisch zu bevorzugen ist die Lesart der meisten Hss*. καὶ ἐγὼ ἄγω αὐτούς· ἡγιασμένοι εἰσίν (=RA)" (2537). LXX.D also prefers the text of the final phrase as preserved in Rahlfs: "*textkritisch zu bevorzugen ist der von fast allen HSS. bezeugte* Text ἐγὼ ἄγω αὐτούς »*ich führe sie*« (=RA)" (2537). Even though the translation in LXX.D corresponds with Ziegler's text, their text-critical preferences line up with the majority reading.

[47]For discussions of rhetoric and literary structure in the Hebrew Bible, see Sternberg (1985); Meynet (1998); Dorsey (1999); Walsh (2001); Douglas (2007); Alter (2011); Meynet (2012); Gentry (2015); Rendsburg (2019).

> narrative and to the narrative viewed as a whole. When we speak of structure we are speaking of the total set of relationships within a narrative unit.[48]

Because the translator of Greek Isaiah would undoubtably have approached his Hebrew text as a coherent and unified entity, it is only fitting to regard it as such when investigating the translator's approach to the *Vorlage*.[49] And since a perceived cohesive structure would be the result of intentional literary creation, part of this project is to explore whether and how the translator of Greek Isaiah understood and appropriated from such structural features in the Hebrew Vorlage.

My interest in this question originated by noticing deviating lexical elements in Greek Isaiah which produced thematic and structural patterns within individual chapters and across larger spans of the translation. These examples seemed to illustrate the translator's awareness and explication of literary features beyond individual clauses. And they also suggest that the translator worked on a scale which took literary micro- and macro-structures into consideration.

The impetus for the project began with several features in Isaiah 2:1-22[21], where the translator of Greek Isaiah aptly captured the heading of 2:1 but twice supplied the prepositive plus καὶ νῦν at 2:5 and 2:10. This seems to be motivated by his intention to explicate or heighten discursive and structural features implicit within the discourse:[50]

Isa 2:1	הַדָּבָר אֲשֶׁר חָזָה יְשַׁעְיָהוּ בֶּן־אָמוֹץ	ὁ λόγος ὁ γενόμενος παρὰ κυρίου πρὸς Ησαίαν υἱὸν Αμως
Isa 2:5	בֵּית יַעֲקֹב לְכוּ	*καὶ νῦν* [+], ὁ οἶκος τοῦ Ιακωβ, δεῦτε
Isa 2:10	בּוֹא בַצּוּר	*καὶ νῦν* [+] εἰσέλθατε εἰς τὰς πέτρας

The twofold addition of καὶ νῦν at verses 5 and 10 creates a clear discursive-structural break in the Greek text. But it also seems to be motivated by thematic and structural features already present in the Hebrew. And as such, it heightens the literary features of the *Vorlage*.[51]

---

[48]Sailhamer (1992), 25.

[49]The approach taken in this project treats both Hebrew and Greek Isaiah as literary unities and thus does not consider appeals to their diachronic development. For recent work on the diachronic development and source history of Isaiah see the works by Stromberg (2011) and Lee (2018).

[50]Perhaps the heading at 2:1 is so marked and paralleled to Isa 1:1 that it did not require additional discourse-structural features.

[51]See de Sousa (2010), 21: "καὶ νῦν possibly indicates that, for the translator, v. 5 is the beginning of a new thought/syntactical unit, if not a new section. . . . [T]he LXX addition supports the text division at this point, as

For example, Isa 2:5 introduces a distinct thematically marked section with a topic shift through the use of the imperative לְכוּ / δεῦτε ‘come.’ Isaiah 2:10 in the Hebrew then reintroduces the injunction with two imperatives (e.g., בּוֹא as εἰσέλθατε; וְהִטָּמֵן as κρύπτεσθε). The imperative at 2:5 offers for Jacob hope of walking in the light of Yhwh. But the second set of imperatives at 2:10 foreshadow destruction. In light of these rhetorical-thematic features, we can understand the translator of Greek Isaiah’s twofold insertion of καὶ νῦν. He sought to highlight structural features present in the Hebrew text for his audience. This is especially significant given the few explicitly non-paired structural and discourse markers in the chapter.[52]

In addition to this, Greek Isaiah contains the clause terminal phrase ὅταν ἀναστῇ θραῦσαι τὴν γῆν in verse 10, which is unattested in the Hebrew text:[53]

Isa 2:10	בּוֹא בַצּוּר	καὶ νῦν εἰσέλθατε εἰς τὰς πέτρας
	Enter into the Rock;	*And now enter into the rocks;*
	וְהִטָּמֵן בֶּעָפָר מִפְּנֵי פַּחַד יְהוָה	καὶ κρύπτεσθε εἰς τὴν γῆν ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ φόβου κυρίου
	and Hide in the dust from before the terror of Yhwh;	*and hide in the earth from before the fear of the Lord,*
	וּמֵהֲדַר גְּאוֹנוֹ׃	καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς δόξης τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ
	and from his majestic splendor	*and from the glory of his strength*
	—	*ὅταν ἀναστῇ θραῦσαι τὴν γῆν* [+].
	—	*when he would arise to crush the earth* [+].

This is especially significant since the above addition from verse 2 occurs twice elsewhere in the same chapter, in both the Hebrew and Greek:

Isa 2:19	וּבָאוּ בִּמְעָרוֹת צֻרִים וּבִמְחִלּוֹת עָפָר	εἰσενέγκαντες εἰς τὰ σπήλαια καὶ εἰς τὰς σχισμὰς τῶν πετρῶν καὶ εἰς τὰς τρώγλας τῆς γῆς
	מִפְּנֵי פַּחַד יְהוָה וּמֵהֲדַר גְּאוֹנוֹ	ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ φόβου κυρίου καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς δόξης τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ,
	בְּקוּמוֹ לַעֲרֹץ הָאָרֶץ׃	*ὅταν ἀναστῇ θραῦσαι τὴν γῆν*.

---

also do, in particular, 1QIsa[a] and 4QIsa[b] (fragment 2) which have line breaks.”

[52]Isaiah 2:11 contains the only other instance of δέ in the chapter, but it most likely pairs with the Hebrew *waw*. This verse does open with the addition of postpositive γάρ, which connects verses 10 and 11 together in an exegetically and structurally sensitive way. Verse 7 similarly contains the addition of postpositive γάρ which serves a similar discursive role. These examples constitute the only instances of discourse features in the chapter.

[53]This additional phrase is without attestation in the ancient versions. And of note, the entire verse is omitted in 1QIsa[a].

Isa 2:21	מִפְּנֵי פַּחַד יְהוָה וּמֵהֲדַר גְּאוֹנוֹ	ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ φόβου κυρίου καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς δόξης τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ,
	בְּקוּמוֹ לַעֲרֹץ הָאָרֶץ׃	<u>ὅταν ἀναστῇ θραῦσαι τὴν γῆν</u>.

In addition to the highlighted parallels in the passages cited, each of these verses share related themes such as hiding in rocks to avoid the coming judgment of God. What seems to have occurred here is that the translator first of all recognized the thematic significance of Yhwh's judgment upon the land. And as such, he included the phase about Yhwh rising to terrify the earth at the beginning of the judgment discourse. This decision creates a more robust structural presentation which articulates more explicitly the thematic features implicit in the Hebrew text. Furthermore, the omission of verse 22 in the Greek text may also point to the translator's intention to present the literary structure stylistically with an *inclusio*.[54]

It seems clear then that verse 10 contains a translational plus which exists to explicate and heighten the literary structure and themes of the Hebrew text. This view is supported by the addition of καὶ νῦν as a discourse marker in light of the resumptive imperative at verse 10. And when we encounter the plus ὅταν ἀναστῇ θραῦσαι τὴν γῆν from verse 10 two more times at the end of the chapter also attested in the Hebrew text, it is difficult to see the identical plus in verse 10 as anything but expressive of intentional explication of thematic and structural elements from the Hebrew into the Greek. In other words, the translator is motivated by the thematic and structural features of the Hebrew text and seeks to incorporate them into his work.

In addition to this example, it is fitting to explain similar translation tendencies in the chapters relevant to this thesis. Thus, here I briefly introduce similar instances of both micro- and macro-structural elements present in the translator's work. These topics are treated in detail later

[54]After completing my own research on this topic, I was glad to have discovered the following comments of de Sousa (2010), 25-26: "It is readily noticeable that this section forms a coherent unit in Hebrew. Its contents as well as the text division indicators in manuscripts would have invited the translator to read the text with at least some 'assumption of coherence,' as cognitive linguists would express it. Even though the atomistic reading of verses was largely a feature of ancient exegesis, the fact that texts were *written* as discrete units makes it reasonable to assume that, at least to some degree, they were also read as such. The assumption of coherence, together with other expectations with regard to the functioning of a passage such as Isa 2:10-21, is the most likely explanation of the attempt to harmonize the refrains in the section. It is a quite natural move for an interpreter immersed in the Hebrew text to expect that the repeated refrains display a certain unity and for him to express this in his translation."

in this work. But they are significant at this point to establish the rationale of the project. To begin, Isaiah 13:12 and 13:14 illustrate the translator's concern to highlight the micro-structural features of his source text:

Isa 13:12a	אוֹקִיר אֱנוֹשׁ מִפָּז	καὶ ἔσονται οἱ καταλελειμμένοι ἔντιμοι μᾶλλον ἢ τὸ χρυσίον τὸ ἄπυρον,
	I will make men more rare than fine gold	*And those who have been left will be more valuable than unsmelted gold*
Isa 13:14a	וְהָיָה כִּצְבִי מֻדָּח וּכְצֹאן וְאֵין מְקַבֵּץ	καὶ ἔσονται οἱ καταλελειμμένοι ὡς δορκάδιον φεῦγον καὶ ὡς πρόβατον πλανώμενον, καὶ οὐκ ἔσται ὁ συνάγων,
	And [men] shall be like a scattered gazelle and like a flock with none to gather	*And those who have been left will be like a fleeing gazelle and like a wandering sheep, and there will be none who gathers*

The addition and duplication of the phrase ἔσονται οἱ καταλελειμμένοι in both of these verses suggests that the translator understood the structural unity of his Hebrew text and desired to explicate it in the translation. And this lexical and structural unity seems to revolve around a unified character between verses 12 and 14, since אֱנוֹשׁ is explicit in verse 12 and elided into וְהָיָה in verse 14.[55] The translator's choice of the participle οἱ καταλελειμμένοι for אֱנוֹשׁ likely reflects the understanding that a remnant of Babylon's militaristic forces would still remain either during or after her cosmic undoing. So, even though the Hebrew text does not contain explicit lexical or semantic material corresponding with these Greek phrases (e.g., פְּלֵיטָה, יֶתֶר, שְׁאֵרִית, etc.), the meaning of each Greek phrase can be understood as both originating from the literary context at one level and also as tying the literary structure together.[56]

Some other features substantiate the translator of Greek Isaiah's concern to explicate material relevant to the literary macro-structure of the book. Like the oracle against Babylon and her king in Isa 13:1-14:23, Isa 21:1-10 constitutes another oracle against Babylon. And while few lexical parallels exist between these two passages in the Hebrew, the translator supplied several lexical and thematic parallels between them. Two examples from Isaiah 21 illustrate this:

---

[55]These observations accord with the comments of Aejmelaeus (2005), 304: "A common strategy of translation is to complement the text with items that are not mentioned explicitly but are implicitly presupposed. The source of the filling in is normally the context or the general understanding of the text."

[56]For a full treatment of this micro-structure, see the relevant section in chapter 5. See also pages 52-54 for a discussion of explicit and implicit meaning.

Isa 13:17	הִנְנִי מֵעִיר עֲלֵיהֶם אֶת־מָדָי	ἰδοὺ ἐπεγείρω ὑμῖν τοὺς Μήδους
	Behold! I am arousing the Medes against them.	*Behold, I am raising the Medes against you!*
Isa 21:2	עֲלִי עֵילָם צוּרִי מָדָי	ἐπ᾽ ἐμοὶ οἱ Αιλαμῖται, καὶ οἱ πρέσβεις τῶν Περσῶν ἐπ᾽ ἐμὲ ἔρχονται
	Go up, O Elam! *Lay siege, O Media!*	*The Ailamites are upon me,* *and the elders of the Persians are coming upon me*
Isa 13:12	אוֹקִיר אֱנוֹשׁ מִפָּז	καὶ ἔσονται οἱ καταλελειμμένοι ἔντιμοι μᾶλλον ἢ
Isa 13:14	וְהָיָה כִּצְבִי מֻדָּח וּכְצֹאן וְאֵין מְקַבֵּץ	καὶ ἔσονται οἱ καταλελειμμένοι ὡς δορκάδιον φεῦγον
Isa 21:10	מְדֹשָׁתִי וּבֶן־גָּרְנִי אֲשֶׁר שָׁמַעְתִּי מֵאֵת יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל הִגַּדְתִּי לָכֶם׃	ἀκούσατε, οἱ καταλελειμμένοι καὶ οἱ ὀδυνώμενοι ἀκούσατε ἃ ἤκουσα παρὰ κυρίου σαβαωθ· ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Ισραηλ ἀνήγγειλεν ἡμῖν.
	O, my threshed and winnowed one, *what I heard from Yhwh of armies, the God of Israel, I declare to you.*	*Hear, those who have been left and are in pain;* *Hear what things I heard from the Lord Sabaoth;* *The God of Israel announced them to us.*

The significance of the second example is apparent given the previous discussion of literary micro-structure. Whereas the Hebrew text at Isa 21:10 contains the noun מְדֹשָׁה ‘trampled,’ Greek Isaiah features the plural participle οἱ καταλελειμμένοι. And although the translator may have explicated the agricultural imagery of the Hebrew text in his rendering, semantic and conceptual overlap between מְדֹשָׁה and καταλείπω is difficult to explain. Given the pattern of semantic overlap between καταλείπω in Greek Isaiah and the Hebrew text, at this point the translator was most likely motivated to include this Greek lexeme on account of parallels in the literary and thematic structure between Isa 13:12 and 13:14.[57]

The example at Isa 21:2 also confirms this structural connection. Although the rendering of צוּרִי ‘lay siege’ as οἱ πρέσβεις ‘elders’ most likely represents confusion of Hebrew roots, the use of Πέρσης to render מָדָי ‘Media’ suggests a connection with Isa 13:17:[58]

Isa 13:17	הִנְנִי מֵעִיר עֲלֵיהֶם אֶת־מָדָי	ἰδοὺ ἐπεγείρω ὑμῖν τοὺς Μήδους
	Behold! I am arousing the Medes against them.	*Behold, I am raising the Medes against you!*

[57]The translator of Greek Isaiah most frequently employs καταλείπω for יתר ‘to remain,’ עזב ‘to forsake,’ שאר ‘to remain,’ and שכח ‘to forget.’ Each of these Hebrew terms express similar semantic ranges to the Greek.

[58]See chapter 3 for the discussion of Hebrew confusion with צור in Isa 13:8.

Parallels between the Hebrew texts are apparent. Both verses occur in oracles against Babylon. And each instance mentions the Medes, a term only occurring in these two places in Isaiah. Although the translator rendered this Hebrew term accurately in Isa 13:17, the pairing of מָדַי with Πέρσης in 21:2 seems to create a macro-structural *inclusio*. The result is that, when we read the oracles against the nations in Greek Isaiah, we encounter the Medes in Isa 13:17 and the Persians in Isa 21:2. This word group is evocative both of the absorption of the Median empire into the Persian and also of the several pairings of this term in the Hebrew Bible.[59] In combination with the use of οἱ καταλελειμμένοι at Isa 21:10, the deviation at 21:2 likely suggests that the translator linked both Babylon oracles together with similar lexical items. In doing so, he explicated the implicit literary structure of the Hebrew text.

The Literary Structure of Isaiah 13:1-14:23

Although I discuss features of literary structure and related issues more deeply in later chapters, I here provide a brief outline of and rationale for the structural boundaries behind the research in this thesis. What occurs here constitutes prolegomena for the latter more detailed treatment. I begin with a discussion of the Hebrew text before proceeding to that of the Greek. I then survey insights to be gained from evaluating contemporary editions and translations, investigating ancient manuscripts, and then conclude with an overview of ancient commentators on aspects of literary structure in Greek Isaiah.

Hebrew Literary Structure of Isaiah 13:1-14:23

The structural analysis of the Hebrew text below relies primarily upon discourse markers and secondarily from thematic shifts in the discourse. Such a procedure is essential since 14:1-23 lacks discourse features which are otherwise present in 13:1-22. Here, I arrange the oracle against Babylon and her king from the Hebrew text as follows:[60]

---

[59]See Esth 1:3; 1:14; 1:18; 1:19; 10:2; Dan 5:28; 6:8; 6:12; 6:15; 10:1.

[60]From a macro-perspective, the whole of the Babylon oracle may be read in accord with a threefold thematic structure: Isa 13:1-22; 14:1-2; 14:3-23. Some ancient manuscripts also follow this arrangement.

A. Isaiah 13:1-22: The Kingdom of Babylon

I. Isa 13:1-8 Heading: Oracle of Babylon—The day of Yhwh: Pronounced
II. Isa 13:9-16 The day of Yhwh: Magnified
III. Isa 13:17-22 The day of Yhwh: Realized

B. Isaiah 14:1-23: The King of Babylon

I. Isa 14:1-2 Interlude: Israel Returns to the Land
II. Isa 14:3-6 Israel Taunts the King of Babylon
III. Isa 14:7-21 Response: Deceased Kings Taunt the King of Babylon
IV. Isa 14:22-23 The End of Babylon and her King

While a more detailed portrait of this structure occurs later in the thesis, here I summarize its most salient features. I organize chapter 13:1-22 around three discourse features: the heading at 13:1 and the discursive shifts at 13:9 and 13:17 marked by הִנֵּה. Other thematic signals aid in arranging micro-structural divisions. But the boundaries of the literary structure can be sufficiently demarcated through the features noted here.[61]

Chapter 14:1-23 largely omits explicit discourse features and is thus outlined thematically. Exceptions may occur with the temporal statement at 14:3 and the markers of closure in 14:22-23. I separate Isa 14:1-2 from what follows since it describes the restoration of Israel to her land with third person referent to Yhwh. The shift in theme and verbal agent distinguishes it as a distinct 'interlude' amidst the surrounding material. Isaiah 14:3-23 may be organized under a single heading with smaller subdivisions; it describes a holistic portrait of the fall of Babylon's king. However, the structure above emphasizes distinct thematic and character shifts in the discourse: Israel taunts the king in verses 3-6, deceased kings taunt the king in verses 7-21, Yhwh pronounces Babylon's full destruction in verses 22-23. I break the literary structure between verses 23 and 24 on the basis of both a thematic-character shift from Babylon to Assyria and also on account of the threefold statement [צְבָאוֹת] נְאֻם יְהוָה in verse 23 which marks closure.

This latter detail is significant on the basis of its discursive patterns in Isaiah. The phrase נְאֻם יְהוָה is frequent in the Hebrew Bible, but occurs only 25 times in Isaiah. Variations on נְאֻם יְהוָה occur 7 times in Isaiah where either צְבָאוֹת or a combination of צְבָאוֹת and אָדוֹן are added to the stock phrase.[62] Nevertheless, such lexical variation does not seem to alter the phrase's

[61]For a discussion of discourse in Isaiah, see Meier (1992), 242-272.

[62]See Isa 1:24; 3:15; 14:22; 14:23; 17:3; 19:4; 22:5. Fully aware of this variation, I nonetheless refer to

discursive effect: the phrase opens discourse, closes discourse, and occurs mid-discourse. However, statistical disparity colors this portrait. On 6 occasions the phrase opens discourse and in and in 5 instances it occurs in mid-discourse.[63] Yet, of particular significance for this discussion, the remaining 14 occurrences of נְאֻם יְהוָה conclude discourse.[64] While the precise function for some instances of נְאֻם יְהוָה in these examples from Isaiah may be be debated, the overarching pattern for this phrase places it at discursive closure.[65] Such observations correspond with Waltke and O'Connor's observation that the phrase נְאֻם יְהוָה is "almost always used as a closing formula in the prophets."[66]

In light of these observations from the Hebrew text, the threefold repetition of נְאֻם יְהוָה in Isa 14:22-23 constitutes a clear instance of discursive closure. Such repetition of this phrase is unequaled in the book. And when this discursive feature is combined with the thematic-character shift from Babylon to Assyria in verse 24, the structural break becomes all the more apparent.[67] In addition, the initial oath formula at 14:24 also signals a topical break: נִשְׁבַּע יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת לֵאמֹר אִם־לֹא כַּאֲשֶׁר דִּמִּיתִי כֵּן הָיָתָה. In all likelihood, the phrase נְאֻם יְהוָה at Isa 14:22-23 functions to close the literary structure of the oracle against Babylon and her king which began in Isa 13:1.

---

all instances with the simple phrase נְאֻם יְהוָה.

[63]On opening discourse, see Isa 1:24; 30:1; 41:14; 66:2; 66:17; 66:22. On mid-discourse, see Isa 43:10; 49:18; 52:5[x2]; 55:8. The occurrence of חַי־אָנִי נְאֻם־יְהוָה at 49:18 may not function as a discourse marker in the same way as נְאֻם יְהוָה does by itself.

[64]See Isa 3:15; 14:22-23[x3]; 17:3; 17:6; 19:4; 22:25; 31:9; 37:34; 43:12; 54:17; 56:8; 59:20. While some occurrences of נְאֻם יְהוָה are grammatically penultimate or antepenultimate, most instances occur in final clause position.

[65]On the rhetorical phenomenon of closure in Hebrew literature, see Rendsburg (2016), 280: "in a series of corresponding passages (typically four or more, though sometimes as few as three), the syntax or wording of the last one in the sequence is altered. This device alerts the reader that she has reached the end of the thought-unit." Many of these references are followed by *setumot* [ס] in the Masoretic interpretive tradition, attesting to the importance of this phrase for concluding structural and thematic units.

[66]Waltke and O'Connor (1990), 681. See also Williamson (2006), 123: "Although it [נְאֻם] most usually occurs in the Hebrew Bible at the close of a divine speech, this is by no means invariably so . . ."

[67]On Isa 14:24, see Robert Alter (2019), 670: "This is the beginning of a third distinct prophecy in this chapter, directed to the destruction of Assyria . . ."

Even though the most proximate and explicit structural heading occurs at 14:28, and while one is absent at 14:24, consideration of discourse markers, thematic breaks, and rhetorical features noted here support the analysis of the Hebrew text I propose.[68]

Literary Structure of Greek Isaiah 13:1-14:23

Like the analysis of the Hebrew text above, I also structure the Greek text around three major units:[69]

1. Isa 13:1-22 Oracle Against Babylon
2. Isa 14:1-2 Israel Restored
3. Isa 14:3-23 Taunt Against the King of Babylon

Similarly to the Hebrew discourse marker הִנֵּה, the Greek text of 13:1-22 is shaped around the discourse marker ἰδού. Yet, in contrast to the absence of discourse markers in the Hebrew structure of 14:1-23, the Greek text contains several additional particles. However, in the end these features do not impact the overall structure of the text. They simply strengthen its explication.

In light of this phenomena, it is possible to arrive at a more precise articulation of the Greek literary structure which is nearly identical to the Hebrew structural outlined above:

1. Isa 13:1-22 Vision Against Babylon
    - A. 13:1-8 Attack Upon Babylon
    - B. 13:9-16 Battle Against Babylon
    - C. 13:17-22 Destruction of Babylon

[68]See the following research for a survey of similar structural proposals. Oswalt (1986): 13:1-18 [1-5, 6-18]; 13:19-22; 14:1-23 [1-4a, 4b-21, 22-23, 24-27, 24-32]; Wildberger (1997): 13:1-14:2; 14:3-23; 14:24-27; 14:28-32; Seitz (1993): 13:1-22; 14:1-23; 14:24-32; Gray (1949): 13:1-14:23 [13:1; 13:2-22; 14:1-4a; 14:4b-21; 14:22-23(?); 14:24-27; 14:28-32; Roberts (2015): 13:1-22; 14:1-4a; 14:4b-2; 14:22-23; Smith (2007): 13:1-14:27 [13:1-16; 13:17-22; 14:1-2; 14:3-23; 14:24-27]; Grogan (2008): 13:1-14:23; 14:24-27; 14:28-32; Tull (2010): 13:1-22 [1-5, 6-8, 9-16, 17-22]; 14:1-32 [1-2, 3-23, 24-27, 28-32]; Motyer (1999): 13:1-14:27: [13:2-16; 13:17-22; 14:1-2; 14:3-23; 14:24-27]. Although some interpreters structure chapter 14 from verse 1 to verse 27, these outlines nonetheless structural outlines include a break after verse 23. The only exception is Watts (2005): 13:1; 13:2-22a; 13:22b-14:7; 14:8-21; 14:22-27.

[69]This larger literary structure is then met by two other ‘oracular’ structures: Assyria in 14:24-27 and Philistia (i.e., ἀλλόφυλοι) and 14:28-32. The overwhelming number of editions and translations of these passages agree with my analysis. See the chart below.

2. Isa 14:1-23 Taunt Against the King of Babylon
    A. 14:1-2 Interlude: Israel Restored
    B. 14:3-6 Israel Taunts the King of Babylon
    C. 14:7-21 Kings Taunt the King of Babylon
    D. 14:22-23 The Lord Destroys the King of Babylon

Apart from the oracular heading at 13:1, each structural unit in chapter 13 is marked by ἰδού. And like the Hebrew text, the structural breaks between between 14:1-2, 14:3-6, and 14:22-23 depend upon thematic features and shifts in character. However, multiple additions of the discourse marker δέ provide more robust warrant for an assessment of discursive unity in Isa 14:7-21.[70] Like the Hebrew, the only substantial deviations between the versions occur in micro-structural features. However, we must inquire into whether the structural boundaries for the Babylon discourse outlined here are defensible.

Perceiving the opening structural boundary at Isa 13:1 is straightforward as it contains a marked oracular heading and opens a series of oracles against nations. The eponymous heading creates a clear break with the preceding material at the level of grammar and theme. However, even though I posited 14:23 as the terminal boundary of this oracle in the Hebrew text, this view requires attention and a defense from the Greek text as well.

Since I structure the discourses against Babylon from Isa 13:1-14:23, I must examine the possibility that the structure extends to 14:27 and provide counter-arguments against it. A potentially strong piece of evidence in favor of this ‘expanded’ structure is that, when compared to 13:1 and 14:28, Isa 14:24-27 lacks an oracular heading which would formally separate it from the preceding discourse. As such, in contrast to 14:28-32, 14:24-27 would follow too ‘smoothly’ to constitute a distinct structural unit. In addition, Isa 14:24-27 shares several lexical and thematic elements with the preceding discourse, in both in the Hebrew and in the Greek. This would illustrate how such lexical and thematic solidarity between these passages is evidence of structural unity. Upon close examination, however, preference for this ‘expanded’ literary structure lacks persuasiveness from both a micro- and macro-perspective.

[70]Like myself, 1QIsa[a], BdA, and LXX.D recognize a structural break at 14:7.

To begin, formal discourse headings are not required for breaks in literary structure. Instead, such breaks function similarly to discourse markers, which simply explicate what is already be present implicitly in the text.[71] To determine whether a structural break occurs, we must survey the content of discourse in examining themes, characters, topics, lexemes, and rhetorical formulations.[72] When approached in this manner, we can see that Isa 14:24-27 is marked by several features which form a contrast to the preceding material. Verse 25 introduces Assyria as a new character among the topical shift from Babylon's destruction to the Lord's irreversible purpose. Further, several new terms are clustered together within this short span of verses—βούλη, βουλέυω, χείρ, ὑψηλός—effecting distinct lexical and thematic shifts. Babylon and her king are no longer in focus. Instead, Assyria receives the attention with features describing her demise. These details illustrate the micro-structural elements which form the structural boundaries between the Babylon discourse and the oath against Assyria.

From a macro-perspective, we may look to the oracles against the nations more broadly to highlight the possibility of structural breaks which lack explicit oracular headings. The relationship of the discourse of Cush in Isa 18:1-7 to its surrounding chapters is illustrative of this phenomenon. The Cush discourse sits amidst the oracles against Moab in 15:1-16:14, Damascus in 17:1-14, and Egypt in 19:1-24, the latter three of which are introduced by explicit headings.[73] Yet, while 18:1-7 lacks such a heading, there is no doubt that it addresses a different character and is marked with novel thematic emphases.[74] It contains its own structural unity on the basis of a thematic *inclusio* at the beginning and end of the chapter. Further, its geographical

---

[71]See discussion of discourse marker δέ in chapter 5.

[72]One significant piece of evidence against the inclusion of 14:24-27 into the Babylon discourse is the *inclusio* with בָּבֶל / βαβυλών / βαβυλωνία at 14:4 and 14:22[23]. See a survey of other relevant features in Rendsburg (2019).

[73]Paragraph markers in the Masoretic tradition signal breaks at 16:14; 17:6; 17:11; 17:14; 18:3; 18:7; 19:15. Some of these breaks are signaled by explicit oracular markers while others are thematic.

[74]Several ancient manuscripts explicate this structural feature with distinct paragraphs: 1QIsa^{a} פ; Aleppo פ; B19a פ; Sinaiticus; Alexandrinus. While Marchalianus and Vaticanus contain paratextual indications of a sense division, they nonetheless lack formal structural breaks at 18:1. With Vaticanus, however, this remains unsurprising due to its overall lack of explicit structural markings.

topic is far removed from the oracular locales which surround it. Such features support the proposal concerning the presence of a structural break at the Assyria discourse. However, a caveat concerning this break is needed.

The perspective outlined above does not entail that passages such as these lack literary connections to their surrounding material. The discourse against Assyria evidences clear parallels with earlier material, both in the Hebrew and Greek versions. Several elements from Isa 14:25—τοῦ ἀπολέσαι τοὺς Ἀσσυρίους ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς τῆς ἐμῆς καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ὀρέων μου—have parallels in the preceding Babylon discourse which arise from 'free' renderings of the Hebrew there. Like 14:25, Isa 14:13 and 14:19 all 'freely' emphasize mountains: καθιῶ ἐν ὄρει ὑψηλῷ ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρη τὰ ὑψηλὰ τὰ πρὸς βορρᾶν and σὺ δὲ ῥιφήσῃ ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν.[75] And when compared to Isa 14:25, 14:20 contains a strikingly similar 'free' rendering concerning 'land.' For example, 14:20 contains the first person singular pronominal referent τὴν γῆν μου in parallel to 14:25.

Further, the twofold mention of 'yoke' in Isa 14:5 deviates from the Hebrew semantics there, while the use of ὁ ζυγός also occurs 'literally' with lexical attestation in the Hebrew at 14:25:[76]

Isa 14:5	συνέτριψεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν ζυγὸν [מַטֵּה] τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν, τὸν ζυγὸν [שֵׁבֶט] τῶν ἀρχόντων·
Isa 14:25	ἀφαιρεθήσεται ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν ὁ ζυγὸς αὐτῶν [עֹל]

Last of all, double use of οἰκουμένη in Isa 14:26 resembles phrases in the Babylon oracle where the translator employs the same term while deviating from Hebrew semantics. However, such phenomena alone do not establish structural unity between Isa 14:24-27 and the discourse which precedes it.

The larger context of the oracles against the nations illustrates how such lexical and thematic material occurs even across explicit structural breaks. In the previous section introducing literary structure, I highlighted parallels between the Babylon discourses in chapters 13 and 21. Yet, these passages remain structurally distinct and distant. Nonetheless, they are thematically related in the Hebrew and are thus ripe for harmonious lexical alterations by the

[75]Twofold use of ὕψηλος in Isa 14:13 may also parallel 14:26-27.

[76]On Isa 14:5, see LXX.D (2011), 2541 : "*Der Übersetzer gleicht den Text an V.25 an, vgl. V.29*."

translator of Greek Isaiah. So, like lexical parallels between the Babylon and Assyria discourses just mentioned, the oracle against Philistia in the Greek text at 14:28-32 also shares similar lexical and thematic material with the preceding discourses:

14:29 כִּי נִשְׁבַּר שֵׁבֶט מַכֵּךְ	14:5 שָׁבַר יְהוָה מַטֵּה רְשָׁעִים שֵׁבֶט מֹשְׁלִים
συνετρίβη γὰρ ὁ ζυγὸς τοῦ παίοντος ὑμᾶς	συνέτριψεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν ζυγὸν τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν, τὸν ζυγὸν τῶν ἀρχόντων
	14:25 וְסָר מֵעֲלֵיהֶם עֻלּוֹ
	καὶ ἀφαιρεθήσεται ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν ὁ ζυγὸς αὐτῶν
14:30 וְהֵמַתִּי בָרָעָב שָׁרְשֵׁךְ וּשְׁאֵרִיתֵךְ יַהֲרֹג	14:22 וְהִכְרַתִּי לְבָבֶל שֵׁם וּשְׁאָר וְנִין וָנֶכֶד
ἀνελεῖ δὲ λιμῷ τὸ σπέρμα σου καὶ τὸ κατάλειμμά σου ἀνελεῖ	καὶ ἀπολῶ αὐτῶν ὄνομα καὶ κατάλειμμα καὶ σπέρμα

At some points, these translated phrases are motivated by Hebrew semantics. But instances of intentional semantic deviation from Hebrew lexemes in these examples strongly suggests that the translator intended to illustrate thematic and structural ties between structural breaks. In verses 14:29 and 14:5, the Hebrew semantics of neither שֵׁבֶט nor מַטֵּה can account for the translator's use of ὁ ζύγος. The choice seems to be motivated instead by 14:25, where עוֹל and ζύγος pair with clear semantic overlap.[77] The use of σπέρμα to render שֹׁרֶשׁ in 14:29 and 14:30 deviates from Greek Isaiah's typical use of ῥίζα.[78] Thus, it appears that the use of σπέρμα in 14:20 and 14:22 motivated identical lexical forms in the oracle against Philistia.

If phenomena such as these occur across the bounds of explicit structural units (e.g., between 14:28-32 and the previous oracular discourse), an implicit structural shift at 14:24-27 cannot be dismissed based on similar translation features. Instead, shift in themes, characters, and topic provide more essential signs for structural breaks. Formal oracular statements may heighten what is implicit in the discourse, but they should not be regarded as necessary markers for structural divisions.

Contemporary Septuagint Research

The portrait presented above is confirmed and complemented by several significant

[77]Like Isa 14:29, 14:6 also pairs מַכָּה with παίω.

[78]See Isa 5:24; 11:1; 11:10; 14:29; 14:30; 37:31; 53:2.

editions and translations of Greek Isaiah. The chart below outlines several approaches to the literary structure of Isa 13:1-14:23 which are signaled through paragraph markers, divisions, and headings in these editions. The sample set here contains a survey of Greek editions of Isaiah from Ziegler, Rahlfs, and Ottley. I also include structural layouts present in translations from NETS, LES, BdA, and LXX.D:[79]

Ziegler	**Rahlfs**	**Ottley**	**NETS**	**LES**	**BdA**	**LXX.D**
13:1	13:1	13:1	13:1	13:1	13:1	13:1
13:2-22	13:2-22	13:2-22	13:2-3	13:2-22	13:2-5	13:2-5
			13:4-5			
			13:6-22		13:6-11	13:6-16
					13:12-16	
					13:17-22	13:17-22
14:1-2	14:1-2	14:1-2	14:1-2	14:1-2	14:1-3	14:1-2
14:3-21	14:3-21	14:3-23	14:3-11	14:3-23	14:4-6	14:3-6
					14:7-15	14:7-11
			14:12-20a		14:16-21	14:12-17
			14:20b-21			14:18-21
14:22-27	[14:22-23]		14:22-23		14:22-23	14:22-23
	14:24-27	14:24-27	14:24-27	14:24-27	14:24-27	14:24-27
14:28-32	14:28-32	14:28-32	14:28-32	14:28-32	14:28-32	14:28-32

Several features of these structural arrangements are apparent. First, every source referenced here sees a structural break at Isa 13:22 even though it lacks an explicit discourse marker. Second, consensus exists with regard to the structural significance of Isa 14:1-2; only BdA expands its boundaries to verse 3. Third, every edition and translation above apart from Ziegler's contains a noticeable break between 14:23 and 14:24.[80] As Ottley notes in reference to 14:24-27: "The next four verses, with a sudden transition, deal with Assyria's fall."[81] The overarching structure which

[79]For a more detailed structure behind LES, see Penner (2020), 90-96; 529-546: 13:1; 13:2-5; 13:6-8; 13:9-11; 13:12-13; 13:14-16; 13:17-18; 13:19-22; 14:1-2; 14:3-4a; 14:4b-11; 14:12-19; 14:19-23; 14:24-27; 14:28-32. Penner's arrangement of the Greek text still places a break between 14:23 and 14:24.

[80]Although Rahlfs does not break the paragraph at verse 24, he separates the preceding material with an em-dash. See the comments in LXX.D (2011), 2543: "Der Übersetzer zieht das Ende von V.23^{MT} zum Folgenden und lässt die anschließende Schwureinleitung in V.24^{MT} aus."

[81]Ottley (1904-6), 181. On the same page: "This verse, in itself, might have stood in connection with what precedes." However, this refers to the formation of the Hebrew text and not to the canonical and contextual version.

I proposed earlier is not only justifiable from the Hebrew and Greek material, but is well accepted in contemporary Septuagint research.

Manuscripts of Isaiah 13:1-14:23

Some insight into the literary structure of the Babylon oracle and taunt can be gained by exploring structural features in ancient and medieval manuscripts. While such an investigation should not be considered as descriptive of authorial or translational intent, it may serve as a tool for evaluating the structural portrait presented here.

This investigation appropriates from insights in delimitation criticism which recognizes paragraphs and subsections, especially in Greek manuscripts, and labels them as *ekthesis* and *paragraphoi*. As Tov notes, *ekthesis* marks "new sections with an enlarged initial Greek letter protruding into the margin."[82] And the *paragraphos* is often "a horizontal stroke made in the margin of a manuscript to indicate some break between groups of clauses."[83] While *ekthesis* is most often attributed to original scribal activity, the *paragraphoi* are more often paratextual, marginal, and attributable to a later scribal hand. Such breaks may be understood respectively as 'major' and 'minor' divisions. The 'major' divisions are frequently marked by lacunae between paragraphs or lines, and are easily detectable in manuscripts. 'Minor' divisions are more difficult to detect, but are often signaled with smaller spaces between words or slight markings between lines and sentences. In the discussion below, I am primarily interested to display the more 'major' divisions (*ekthesis*) in the Greek manuscripts, as the details surrounding the *paragraphoi* are complex and not always clear.[84]

---

[82]Tov (2004). 151.

[83]Porter (2009), 183.

[84]As noted by Tov (2004), 151, such *paragraphoi* tend to be later insertions: "Since these *paragraphoi* were often indicated by users or later scribes, they do not necessarily reflect the practices of the first transcribers." See also Porter (2009), 183: "The Greek use of paragraphoi between lines to indicate breaks often is accompanied by the next line of text being written ekthetically and perhaps larger, as well as the preceding line being left with space or even blank." My investigation did not discover such clear relationships between the *paragraphoi* and the *ekthesis*. *Ekthesis* markings in Codex Alexandrinus illustrate the difficulty in systematizing their arrangement: 13:1; 13:4b; 13:6; 13:7; 13:12; 13:14; 13:17; 13:19; 14:1; 14:3; 14:7; 14:9; 14:12; 14:13; 14:15; 14:19; 14:20c; 14:22; 14:24; 14:26; 14:29a; 14:29c; 14:31; 15:1. Inconsistencies in this manuscript are also noted by Wagner (2014), 65-66n7: "Alexandrinus similarly makes generous use of *ekthesis* to mark sense divisions. Some of these are

Such analysis is comparable to traditional sense divisions in Hebrew manuscripts with the 'major' breaks marked by *petuchot* (פ) and the 'minor' breaks marked by *setumot* (ס). The Hebrew divisions are less cumbersome and will be presented as they occur in their respective witnesses. This analysis of Isa 13:1-14:23 includes the sense divisions from several Hebrew and Greek witnesses: 1QIsa[a], Leningrad Codex (B19a), Aleppo Codex, Codex Alexandrinus (A), Codex Sinaiaticus (S), Codex Vaticanus (B), Codex Marchalianus (Q):[85]

1QIsa[a]	**B19a**	**Aleppo**	**A**	**S**	**B**	**Q**
[פ]13:1	[פ]13:1	[ס]13:1	13:1	13:1	13:1	13:1
				13:6		
[ס]13:9						13:9
[פ]13:17				13:17		
						13:19
[ס]14:1			14:1			
[פ]14:3	[ס]14:3	[ס]14:3		14:3		
						14:4
[ס]14:7						
			14:9			14:9
			14:12	14:12		
[ס]14:13						14:13
[ס]14:16b						
[ס]14:18						
			14:19			
			14:20c			
[ס]14:22						
[ס]14:24	[פ]14:24	[ס]14:24			[14:24]	[14:24]
			14:26	14:26		
[פ]14:28	[פ]14:28	[פ]14:28		14:28	[14:28]	14:28
			14:29b			
			14:31	14:31		

In the Hebrew manuscripts, the sense divisions in 1QIsa[a] largely agree with my own structural

---

preceded by a partially blank line. In other cases the new section starts after a short gap in the middle of a line; the following line is then introduced with an *ekthetic* letter. Yet other instances of *ekthesis* are preceded by no blank space at all."

[85]For features and dates of these manuscripts, see relevant sections in Barthélemy (2012); Würthwein (2014). I also explored other Masoretic witnesses: Codex Cairensis (C), Codex Babylonicus Petropolitanus (V^P), Codex Sassoon 1053. These Masoretic codices are similarly arranged with slight variation. Codex Cairensis (C): 13:1; 14:3; 14:24; 14:28. Codex Babylonicus Petropolitanus (V^P): 13:1; 13:6; 14:3; 14:24; 14:28. Codex Sassoon 1053: 13:1; 14:3; 14:24; 14:28. However, due to similarities between these and both Aleppo and B19a, I do not present their structures in this chart. I place references with unclear or significant minor sense divisions in brackets: [—].

analysis. Even though formal markers of *setumot* and *petuchot* are absent in this scroll, it captures major and minor divisions with paragraph breaks (e.g., *petuchot*) and spacing within lines (e.g., *setumot*). Although Masoretic manuscripts lack many of the minor divisions found in the 1QIsa[a], this later tradition agrees substantially with its major structural features. The whole Hebrew tradition is in agreement at key junctures of the discourse: 13:1; 14:3; 14:24; 14:28. Greek manuscripts, however, do not exhibit this same level of uniformity and consistency.

The Greek manuscripts outlined above share many similarities with the sense divisions of the Hebrew manuscripts. The whole tradition understandably contains a structural break at 13:1. And occasionally two manuscripts will contain corresponding structural divisions. However, unlike the Hebrew witnesses, no two Greek manuscripts are entirely uniform in their structural agreements apart from the heading at 13:1.[86] Only A and Q divide the discourse at 14:9. And breaks at 14:12, 14:26, and 14:31 occur only in A and S, divisions which are more thematic than discursive. Even the clear structural and thematic break at 14:28 is only highlighted by S and Q.

Overall, the Greek manuscript tradition is inconsistent in its structural preservation of the Babylon oracle and discourse. And although such disparity in the Greek tradition is perplexing, it does not seem to negate the presence of a clear literary structure in the text of Greek Isaiah. The structures present in A and S are the most accurate from a linguistic and thematic perspective. But even these make an obscure division at 14:26 by dividing the oracle against Assyria in unexpected ways. It seems that the Greek tradition favored thematic breaks in the discourse while the Hebrew tradition follows *both* thematic and discursive features.[87] And for

[86]If we consider each *ekthesis* in A, more similarities between manuscripts might have been noted. But given its irregularities and lack of clarity regarding its sense divisions, the structural organization around major breaks above should be regarded as sufficient.

[87]Three peculiarities in the manuscripts outlined above are worth nothing. First of all, the analysis illustrates a large scale disregard for discourse marker pairing of הִנֵּה / ἰδού at 13:9 and 13:17 in the Hebrew and Greek manuscripts. Second, apart from the *setumot* at 14:7 1QIsa[a], the manuscripts attest a wholesale absence of a sense division at this juncture. Last of all, even though the Hebrew manuscripts uniformly contain a structural break at 14:24, Greek evidence is lacking at this point. B and Q contain minor structural divisions at 14:24 as is apparent through uniquely marked scribal spacing. But these do not constitute the major breaks I deem significant for ancient evidence of literary structure. Nonetheless, we should consider it noteworthy that the overwhelming tendency of

the purposes of this research, it is best to include both pieces of evidence as we consider features of its literary structure. To my mind, inconsistencies in the Greek manuscript tradition render it of little value for assessing the literary structure of Greek Isaiah. Such inconsistency makes it difficult to place much weight on their interpretive value. Instead, when considering the literary structure of Isa 13:1-14:23, it is preferable to work from both the linguistic and thematic material of the Babylon discourse while also considering the divisions present in contemporary editions and translations. However, to situate my proposal most fully, I conclude with an investigation into the perspectives of ancient commentators.

Ancient Interpreters on Isaiah 13:1-14:23

While little explicit discussion in ancient interpreters treats the literary structure of the Babylon discourse, some statements by early commentators illustrate their perspectives on this matter. Here I survey commentaries by Eusebius of Caesarea, Jerome, Cyril of Alexandria, and Theodoret of Cyrus in order to evaluate their structural approaches to the Babylon discourse. While these commentaries are clearly theologically oriented—"all of them seem to embody the two primary principles of biblical unity and diverse levels of meaning"[88]—their authors nonetheless provide valuable information given their emphases upon literal and historical interpretation, a feature often downplayed in popular conceptions of patristic exegesis.[89]

In Jerome's Isaiah commentary, it is clear that he views the tenfold oracles in chapter 13-23 as a literary unity. But more to the point for our specific passage, he alludes to a structural break after 14:23 where he states: "[Isaiah] returns to the present situation, that is, to Sennacherib king of the Assyrians . . . He joins things that are near with things that are coming much later in the future."[90] Here, Jerome demonstrates that the thematic and character shift with the mention of

---

modern editions and translations recognize a structural break at 14:24.

[88]Cassel (2006), 167.

[89]See van der Kooij (2006), 50: "Eusebius and Jerome share a literal and historical type of interpretation of Isaiah." Also noted in Hollerich (1999), cited in Salvesen (2015), 78. Such literal and historical interpretive tendencies are also present in Cyril and Theodoret.

[90]Scheck (2015), 238-39.

Sennacherib requires the designation 'return.' Jerome also notices that temporal differences are present between the Babylon and Assyrian referents. These temporal and referential features confirm that Jerome's structuring of the Babylon discourse is similar to my own.

Euesebius of Caesarea offers several more statements by way of structural features than Jerome. He opens his discussion of Isa 13:1, not only with statements about the macro-structure of all the national oracles, but with statements about the Babylon oracle in particular:

> After the Word brings to a close the prophecy concerning the one who proceeded 'from the root of Jesse' and after prophesying about all the things that happen at the coming of Christ, he commences another theme: against Babylon."[91]

These comments illustrate how Eusebius regarded the Babylon oracle as structurally distinct from Isaiah's opening chapters. But concerning the conclusion of the Babylon discourse, we encounter other statements which contrast Jerome's perspective.

Eusebius may have recognized a slight discursive shift at Isa 14:24. In discussing Isa 14:24-25, he notes that these verses are "added to what was said concerning the Babylonian ruler and concerning the city itself and the nation of the Assyrians. . . ."[92] Eusebius understood the reference to Babylon in chapter 13, not with imperial designation but simply as an Assyrian city. Thus, the whole discourse is threefold in its referent. This statement may express his view that 14:24-25 functions as a summative addendum with a slight thematic shift. But as his interpretation develops Eusebius seems to regard 14:26-27 as a more significant sense division.

Eusebius uniquely suggests that the Babylon discourse terminates with 14:25 as is evident in his statements concerning 14:26: "Up to this point the prophet has sketched out a word concerning Babylon, but now the prophecy returns again to the first theme . . ."[93] Although the thematic-structural break at this point is novel at the linguistic and thematic level, it does resemble some sense divisions in the Greek manuscripts surveyed above. But in the end, Eusebius seems to terminate the whole of the Babylon discourse with 14:27: "[The Word] . . . of

---

[91]Armstrong (2013), 71.

[92]Armstrong (2013), 79-80. The phrase 'and the nations of the Assyrians' (περὶ τε τοῦ Ἀσσυρίων ἔθνους) here separates this phrase from the two preceding terms, indicating that the list is threefold.

[93]Armstrong (2013), 80.

necessity calls these things to mind, just as at the beginning of the prophecy, so also at the end."[94]

Now, while these statements seem to identify Eusebius' structural arrangement from Isa 13:1-14:27, his views concerning the oracle against Philistia introduce another layer of complexity into the discussion. Although 14:28 contains a novel oracular heading, he regards it as a recapitulation of the Babylon oracle: "Making another start at sketching out the theme of the 'vision against Babylon,' the Word addresses the houses of those other tribes, whom the Hebrew text and the other Greek translations call Philistines."[95] Here, the new oracle continues what began in chapter 13 and suggests a novel conception of the literary structure from Isa 13:1-14:32. This latter perspective corresponds with my earlier comments concerning lexical and thematic overlap. Even though the Philistia oracle is structurally distinct from the Babylon discourse, it shares many lexemes and themes with that same material. The idiosyncrasies of Eusebius' structural interpretations render a precise declaration of his perspective difficult. However, it is clear that he does not see a structural break at 14:24. Instead, he extends thematic divisions to 14:26 and 14:28. Although my approach differs from his on this latter point, I am nonetheless in agreement with him regarding the overall literary unity of 13:1-14:32.

Uniquely, both Cyril of Alexandria and Theodoret of Cyrus conflated the characters of Babylon and Assyria.[96] Cyril links the phrase ὃν τρόπον εἴρηκα in 14:24 back to the Babylon discourse, indirectly suggesting thematic continuity.[97] Theodoret is more explicit concerning this thematic unity with the following statement: "This text shows that the prophet uses the names Assyrian and Babylonian to refer to the same people."[98] But in contrast to Eusebius, Theodoret's

---

[94]Armstrong (2013), 80.

[95]Armstrong (2013), 80.

[96]With reference to Guinot's work on Theodoret, Childs (2004), 142, notes how Theodoret mistook the historical referents in this passage for geographical ones: "Guinot expresses some doubts as to whether Theodoret has a clear historical understanding of the relation between Assyria and Babylon. He seems to see the shifting focus from one to the other more in geographical terms of different capitals rather than reflecting differing historical periods. In his handling of the transition from Babylon to Assyria in Isa. 14, Theodoret concludes that this is evidence for the same people being called by different names."

[97]See Hill (2008), 309.

[98]Isidore of Seville may also have conflated the characters of the Babylon discourse. See McKinion

interpretation expresses an awareness of a thematic shift at 14:24: "In this way he stops talking about Nebuchadnezzar and his descendants who had been deprived of the kingdom, and he turns to Sennacherib. For it was his army that besieged Jerusalem, whose ruins are famous to this day."[99] The recognition of this shift by Theodoret resembles the perspective of Jerome. But Theodoret's agreement with Eusebius' character conflation illustrates how, similar to the Greek manuscript tradition, divergent tendencies existed among ancient interpreters. Although these ancient readers shared an awareness of literary structure based on thematic shifts, they likely arrived at different perspectives on this structure due to more fundamental views on the discourse's character referents.

In sum, disagreements between ancient interpreters exist regarding the literary structure of the Babylon discourse, especially concerning the relationship of 14:24-27 to previous material. But this should not be surprising. Lack of formal discourse markers permit different approaches to the structure of the text. But these approaches appear to be twofold. Interpreters conclude either that the Babylon discourse terminates at 14:23 or that it continues through 14:27. Such diverse reading patterns resemble the multiple sense divisions in the manuscripts surveyed above. However, the ancient commentaries are more restrictive in conveying structure than the manuscripts. Nonetheless, in accord with the whole of this discussion, these ancient interpreters see an overarching structural unity in the Babylon discourse. And the frequent recognition of an explicit or implicit thematic shift at 14:24 supports the approach I take in this thesis.

Conclusion: The Literary Structure of Isaiah 13:1-14:23

The series of observations above elaborate upon the structural details and boundaries of the oracle against Babylon and her king at Isa 13:1-14:23. They illustrate how this literary structure is shaped around discourse makers and thematic material, a portrait to be perceived through both linguistic and literary analysis. Such an assessment confirms that the oracle against

---

(2004), 140: "He was addressing the entire world under the figure of Babylon."

[99]Wilken (2007), 174.

Babylon and her king begins with 13:1 and concludes at 14:23. As such, analysis of the material regarding Assyria and Philistia will largely be omitted from this thesis. These structural conclusions correspond with the majority of contemporary Septuagint research in printed editions and translations. Further, the ancient Hebrew manuscript tradition also affirms the structures proposed here. And while less agreement exists across Greek manuscripts, the structural outline I provide is nonetheless found in these witnesses.

We encounter some disagreement when observations from ancient interpreters are consulted. But on the whole, the structural portrait put forth in these prolegomena is supported not only from the Hebrew and Greek texts, but from the breadth of the interpretive tradition of Isaiah. Such literary, structural, thematic, and lexical overlap between these discursive and oracular units which follow the Babylon oracle is to be expected. It is widely recognized that the Babylon oracle is the heading for the entire oracular series following the heading of Isa 1:1. This is most clear in the Hebrew text. But it is also true of Greek Isaiah as well since he frequently demonstrates familiarity with the whole of the oracular discourse. In light of this, we have a solid basis for analyzing the literary structure of the oracle against Babylon and her king in Greek Isaiah 13:1-14:23.

Interpretation and Meaning

Approaching an Interpretive Model

Claims to literary knowledge assume a multifaceted framework which would enable the emergence and validity of such claims. As such, the conception of reading 'well' demands *a priori* perspectives on authors, their intentions, lexical semantics, the nature of texts, polysemy, etc. This conception of literary knowledge must also consider the role of the reader who constructively discovers a text's meaning(s) through active engagement with the semiotic play between explicit and implicit senses therein.[100] Further, describing the reader's role requires the

[100]Although questions of authorial intent are complex and nuanced, I think a qualified form of the idea can still be successfully maintained and defended. See Eco (1979); Eco (1990); Vanhoozer (1998). Eco (1979), 10, prefers the phrase 'textual strategy' to 'author,' since the latter is "textually manifested only (i) as a recognizable *style* or textual *idiolect* . . . (ii) as mere actantial roles . . . (iii) as an illocutionary signal." Since 'textual strategies' are only manifested as the works of authorial agents, it is still appropriate to appeal to 'authorial intent' in a qualified

additional concept of his or her posture toward the text and the contours of this reading practice. A reader must have the 'right sort of mind.'

Since this thesis explores the translator of Greek Isaiah's insight into the thematic and structural features of Isa 13:1-14:23, I outline here an interpretive model in terms of which such a proposal can be conceived. This section recognizes and elucidates two related points. With Tod Linafelt, we should concede first of all that literature is "not primarily about communicating information," but instead must recognize with Mark Gignilliat that literature "is loaded with semantic potential."[101] To frame this discussion, I proceed by defining my terminology, rehearsing conceptions of the cultural encyclopedia and 'model reader,' and qualifying this conception by proposing that the translator of Greek Isaiah articulated the semantic potential of his *Vorlage* by employing relational virtues in the practices of reading and re-reading. In the end, by attending closely to his work, we may also become apprenticed to the book of Isaiah, in both the Greek and the Hebrew.

Terminology: Explicit and Implicit Meaning

Throughout this thesis, I describe translational features with several designations. As I discussed earlier, lexemes may be rendered 'literally' or 'freely.' But these renderings may also transfer senses which are either explicit or implicit. Explicit senses relate closely to dictionary definitions or grammatical designations. However, Brown and Yule highlight a common epistemic error when dealing with an exclusively explicit sense: "We certainly rely on the syntactic structure and lexical items used in a linguistic message to arrive at an interpretation, but it is a mistake to think that we operate only with this literal input to our understanding."[102] Appeal to implicit meaning fills this gap. This implicit sense relates to broader thematic, structural, or encyclopedic senses. It is not expressed by the lexeme alone but rather with its

---

sense.

[101]Linafelt (2016), 8; Gignilliat (2019), 92.

[102]Brown and Yule (1983), 223. I take the phrase 'literal input' to indicate 'explicit' sense.

broader interaction with contextual, literary, or cultural realities. Detailing this point, de Sousa notes:

> [C]omprehension of meaning does not come simply from understanding the meaning of words and sentences, or solely on the literal decoding of linguistic structure. . . . [B]esides the linguistic knowledge necessary for understanding, one also draws from other cognitive factors, such as the assumption of coherence, the principles of analogy, local interpretation and general features of context, the regularities of discourse structure, and the regular features of information structure.[103]

It should be clear that both senses must interact with one another for literary meaning to emerge. As a caveat, it should also be stated that explicit meaning does not require 'literal' renderings. Nor does implicit meaning require a 'free' rendering.[104] Examples of such translation possibilities will be detailed in subsequent chapters. On this point, consider the helpful comments by Meir Sternberg:

> From the viewpoint of what is directly given in the language, the literary work consists of bits and fragments to be linked and pieced together in the process of reading: it establishes a system of gaps that must be filled in. This gap-filling ranges from simple linkages of elements, which the reader performs automatically, to intricate networks that are figured out consciously, laboriously, hesitantly, and with constant modifications in the light of additional information disclosed in later stages of the reading.[105]

Uncovering implicit meanings is thus an essential and inescapable requirement for the task of reading literature.

Gregory of Nazianzus provides a helpful illustration of the essential union between explicit (i.e., 'names') and implicit (i.e., 'things') meanings in *Theological Oration* 31 on the Holy Spirit:

> There really is a great deal of diversity inherent in names and things, so why are you so dreadfully servile to the letter, . . . following the syllables while you let the realities go? Supposing you mention 'twice five' or 'twice seven' and I infer from your words 'ten' or 'fourteen,' or suppose from your mentioning a 'rational, mortal animal' I draw the conclusion a 'man,' would you allege I was talking rubbish? How could I be? I am saying what you said. The words belong just as much to the man who infers the logical grounds for using them as they do to their actual user. In the examples I have just given I should be considering meanings rather than words, and so, in the same way, if I hit upon something meant, though not mentioned, or not stated in

---

[103]De Sousa (2010), 25. See Alter (2019), 76: "My own contention is that meaning in the Bible or in any literary text cannot be reduced to lexical values, that it involves the communication of affect and can never be separated from the nuanced connotation of words and their dynamic interaction as they are joined through sound, through syntax, and through poetic or narrative context."

[104]For detailed discussion, see Barr (1979).

[105]Sternberg (1987), 186.

> clear terms, by Scripture, I should not be put off by your quibbling charge about names—I should give expression to the meaning. This is how we shall make our stand against people whose views are only half right![106]

Here Gregory combats a simplistic emphasis upon words and urges his reader to press into the realities which those words signify, namely the "great diversity inherent in names and things." Missing inferential (i.e., implicit) readings results in being "dreadfully servile to the letter." To follow the syllables without recognizing their implications turns out to be only only half right, or half sensible (i.e, τοὺς ἐξ ἡμισείας εὐγνώμονας). This final phrase portrays the explicit and implicit senses as two halves of a whole, both of which are essential to grasp literary portraiture. As Peter Leithart notes: "Interpretation is all about tracing out the crucial missing elements that make the text mean what it does."[107] And while a spectrum of explicit-to-implicit literary understandings surely exists, the schema supplied here provides a general summary of what is more fully articulated in subsequent chapters. Below, I unfold a conception of how readers interact with and interpret literature, explain features of becoming the right kind of reader, and highlight how this model applies to the translator of Greek Isaiah in this project.

Assumptions, Encyclopedia, and Model Reader

As with with assumptions of all social engagement, texts also presume that their readers utilize certain conventions. Texts are in fact social products. And the successful reader is one who engages a text with the literary assumptions it requires. Such assumptions enable readers to recognize significant themes, literary structures, poetic features, irony, word play, etc. None of these features are explicitly identified as such in the text but are instead a part of the 'cultural encyclopedia' from which a text emerged. This cultural encyclopedia constitutes a model which represents "the totality of world knowledge and pragmatic processes" in terms of which a specific text is "a limited actualization of the encyclopedic possibilities."[108]

---

[106]Gregory of Nazianzus (2002), 135; Grégoire de Nazianze (2008), 320-323.

[107]Leithart (2009), 112.

[108]Huizenga (2009), 28.

In contrast to a dictionary model of meaning which proposes that "a language is a series of items explained by a concise definition, usually composed by a finite set of semantic universals, that cannot be further analyzed," an encyclopedic model of meaning is robustly associative and allows for semiotic play in conceptually innumerable ways.[109] Thus, this model enables us to conceptualize interpretation as "a complex strategy of interactions which also involves readers, along with their competence in language . . . not only a given language as a set of grammatical rules, but also the whole encyclopedia . . . the cultural conventions that that language has produced."[110] It is this encyclopedic model which helps us grasp the theoretical background of how the essential interaction between explicit and implicit features in texts exists. Words interact not only with other words, but with their relevant cultural worlds. Words inherently evoke cultural senses beyond lexical-definitional meaning.

Although the complexity of interpretive practice will always exceed comprehensive explanation, the encyclopedic model of literary knowledge illustrates how formal textual features invite readers to constructively engage with and discover a range of possible literary meanings. However, several questions naturally arise from this proposed encyclopedic model, specifically concerning the reader's role in the interpretive process. Eco notes that the emergence of meaning "does not lie in the text as an explicit linear linguistic manifestation; it is the result of a rather complex operation of textual inference."[111] This articulates well the statements above regarding the essential unity between explicit and implicit elements of the interpretive process. But the interpretive process will not tolerate just any reader. Instead, it requires a 'model reader.' And even further, Eco suggests that well-crafted actually texts create such readers: "A well-organized text on the one hand presupposes a model of competence coming, so to speak, from outside the text, but on the other hand works to build up, by merely textual means, such a competence."[112]

---

[109]Eco (1990), 144. For summarizes of cultural encyclopedia, see Huizenga (2009), 21-42; Wagner (2013), 37-45; Pennington (2017), 19-40.

[110]Eco (1992), 67-68.

[111]Eco (1979), 4.

[112]Eco (1979), 8.

And again: "You cannot use the text as you want, but only as the text wants you to use it."[113] As such, "certain interpretations are not contextually legitimated."[114]

Thus, the goal of reading is to become the 'model reader' demanded by the text, a reader who both engages with and is engaged by it so as to tease out its semantic possibilities. Thus, the 'model reader' is "one who sits at the juncture where the particular text connects with the cultural encyclopedia in the most coherent and economic way possible."[115] And since interaction between a reader and his or her cultural encyclopedia is an inescapable part of an embodied interpretive experience, the conceptual separation between explicit and implicit meaning is excluded from the process of reading and translation. From this, we can explore the process of becoming this 'model reader.'

Virtue, Reading, and Re-Reading

In significant ways, the translator of Greek Isaiah exhibits traits of a 'model reader.' As the ensuing chapters illustrate, the translator demonstrates a nuanced awareness of the lexemes, grammar, themes, and structures in Hebrew Isaiah. As a result, he explicated his *Vorlage* for the Greek reader in subtle and artful ways, engaging with both its explicit and implicit details. But this status of 'model reader' must be conceived of as a moment on the journey through the virtue-situated practices of the 'model re-reader.' Conceiving of the 'model reader' as a re-reader helps us understand the interpretive aims and processes behind the translator of Greek Isaiah's work. Further, it helps account for his close attention to and detailed explication of Isa 13:1-14:23 in its Isaianic and 'canonical' contexts.

I unfold this idea of the 'model re-reader' from two perspectives. I begin by borrowing concepts from Alasdair MacIntyre concerning practices and virtues. These concepts then constitute the groundwork for exercising the prolonged practices of reading and re-reading.

---

[113]Eco (1979), 9.

[114]Eco (1990), 42-43.

[115]Pennington (2017), 23.

This portrait allows a deeper conception of the translator's intricate work as one deeply attuned to the linguistic and literary features of the Hebrew text. Thus, his translation project permitted him to become a 'model reader' whose posture toward the text was in turn shaped by it. And insofar as he has understood and conveyed the 'grain of the text,' we are warranted in conceiving of him as a reliable and trustworthy Isaianic 'model reader.' As an implication of this warrant, we may apprentice under him in order to become model readers of both Hebrew and Greek Isaiah.

Alasdair MacIntyre: Virtue and Practices

Alasdair MacIntyre's masterful work *After Virtue* surveys the shift in ethical models from Aristotelian antiquity, through the Enlightenment, and to twentieth century. And in stern rejection of Enlightenment ethical conceptions, he revisits an Aristotelian-teleological model of ethics and reconsiders the topic of virtue in terms of apprenticed 'practice(s)' as "the arena in which the virtues are exhibited."[116] MacIntyre clarifies 'practice(s)' as follows:

> [A]ny coherent and complex form of socially established cooperative human activity through which goods internal to that form of activity are realized in the course of trying to achieve those standards of excellence which are appropriate to, and partially definitive of, that form of activity, with the result that human powers to achieve excellence, and human conceptions of the ends and goods involved, are systematically extended."[117]

Such practices include activities such as chess and architecture along with artistic practices of painting and music. And in our case, reading, re-reading, and translation. And as activities which require a breadth of skills, participants must play by the 'rules,' and thus engage in specific virtues as performance standards, minimally with justice, courage, and honesty.

But MacIntyre also includes humility and patience into this list of virtues as he understands practices to be embedded within the bounds of apprenticeship. In our case, we may understand the apprenticeship as persistent devotion to a text as to a craft. And in view of the inherent relationality of practices—"[v]irtues sustain the relationship required for practices"—

[116]MacIntyre (2007), 187.

[117]MacIntyre (2007), 191.

the *habitus* of a practitioner-apprentice must also exhibit care, concern, truthfulness, and trust in the pursuit of his activity's excellence.[118] MacIntyre notes:

> To enter into a practice is to enter into a relationship not only with its contemporary practitioners, but also with those who have preceded us in the practice, particularly those whose achievements extended the reach of the practice to its present point.[119]

Practitioners are playing a 'game' with specific social expectations, a game with standards of justice, courage, truthfulness, and trust. And the goods of practices engendered by these apprenticeship virtues may only be achieved by "subordinating ourselves within the practice in our relationship to other practitioners."[120] In this way, the apprenticeship model provides the frame for developing the right interpretive sensibilities.

MacIntyre's proposal overlaps with my conception of the translator of Greek Isaiah as concerned to artfully transfer thematic and structural elements of the Hebrew text for his Greek readership. We can surely identify the translator as having engaged in the apprenticed practice of careful reading. And this constitutes an arena informed by the apprenticeship virtues. As the thesis proceeds, it will become clear just how the translator of Greek Isaiah models such an approach. His attention both to the inner-Isaianic material and also to his broader canonical context marks him as a virtuous apprentice to his text and tradition. But beyond this view of virtuous reading practice, the literary intricacies of Greek Isaiah should be understood as the result of a more prolonged and reflective process of re-reading.

Becoming the Model Re-Reader

From this conception of the virtue-marked reading practice, I suggest here that the path toward the 'model reader' occurs specifically through habitual re-reading. The concept of 're-reader' has *prima facie* plausibility given the intertextual play within Greek Isaiah itself. The translator clearly had a deep and intimate knowledge of the book of Isaiah, which would not

---

[118]MacIntyre (2007), 221.

[119]MacIntyre (2007), 194.

[120]MacIntyre (2007), 191

have arisen from limited exposure to the literature. But this concept also has further support within the translator's socio-historical context. As other Greek Isaiah researchers have noted, the translator would have been a part of a larger interpretive community. Alison Salvesen notes:

> It also seems unlikely that the translator operated as a lone interpreter: many of the theological themes brought out in LXX Isaiah could have been due to a tradition of interpretation of the Hebrew book on which the translator built.[121]

Further, the translator's work could have been expressive of more than one interpretive community. Several options have been suggested by researchers. And are each has explanatory power in its own right: the Jewish synagogue, Jewish scribal and sagacious circles, the professional scribes of the museum.[122]

Franklin Rodrigo de Sousa comments upon the several dimensions of the translator's interpretive context:

> [The world of Hellenistic Judaism was] a complex setting where scribes, immersed in the biblical text, struggled with it, and tried to bring out its meaning within the influence of traditions and practices proper to their own heritage and of scholarly procedures that derived from the Alexandrian world which they inhabited.[123]

Even though we cannot speak with certainty about every area of influence upon the translator, his work evidences influence from a wide variety of interpretive circles, each of which would have embodied and transmitted to him a tradition of both reading and re-reading. As such, this translator as 're-reader' was "a complex figure, fluent in Greek . . . and familiar with Classical rhetoric, while also at home with biblical traditions and hermeneutical principles and procedures typical of Judaism."[124]

---

[121]Salvesen (2020), 200-201.

[122]See van der Kooij (1998), 112-123; Troxel (2008), 20-35; Aitken (2016), 269-293; de Sousa (2021), 245-258. In his discussion of communal elements behind the Greek Penteuch, Aitken (2021), 12, notes: "The suggestion that there was an oral tradition behind the translation can be illuminated by the consistency in translation choices. Agreement over how to translate key religious terms . . . implies decisions being made before the translation has been penned. Likewise, subtle translation choices . . . require thoughtful consideration and could not appear in more than once book by chance. . . . [T]his oral background is a natural development of the familiarity of any text within its community."

[123]De Sousa (2021), 248.

[124]De Sousa (2021), 248.

Through this more comprehensive process of re-reading, an interpreter achieves insight into a text and is thus shaped into the person the text 'wants' him to become. He is thus enabled to become a person with 'the right sort of mind.' Re-reading allows an interpreter to grasp a piece of literature as a whole. It allows him to "behave towards a book as we do towards a painting."[125] As Fred Sanders suggests:

> Whole new vistas of insight and enjoyment open up to the reader who returns to certain well-structured books, where there is a palpable frisson between intuiting the whole text at once and reclaiming the linear experience of another trip through it.[126]

Thus, re-readers are able to obtain a view of the whole apart from which the cohesion of the explicit particulars and implicit senses remains out of reach. And so, repeated exposure and contemplation toward a holistic grasp of a text grant interpreters an opportunity to link unstated thematic and structural features only *suggested* by explicit linguistic material.

Without proceeding toward this expansive interpretive vision, readers are bound to be 'dreadfully servile to the letter.' And mastery of such a process is particularly essential for understanding 'open' symbolic works such as those of the Hebrew prophets. Not only do symbolic works require their readers to recognize them as such. But it is only in re-reading that a cohesive meaning can emerge. As Sanders notes again:

> Rereading makes possible an interpretive interplay between the text's parts and its whole . . . Immersive mastery of a text opens up new interpretive possibilities in negotiating the whole-part dialectic, which is one of the main engines in the production of meaning for the reader.[127]

In the search for literary depth, which includes intentional structuring and thematic nuance, this task of re-reading enables interpreters to discern the literary abilities of an author (and the translator). This is due to the fact that "[s]tories and poems tend to withhold some of their favors

---

[125]Nabokov (1980), 3.

[126]Sanders (2016), 216.

[127]Sanders (2016), 215. Sanders quotes the suggestive statement of Brown (1950), 6: "There is nothing magical in reading. It is in re-reading that some magic may lie." See also Spacks (2011), 279: "Rereading has turned out to be rich in paradox. . . . What once you failed to notice jumps up to alarm or delight you."

for repeated visits."[128] But by accessing these implicit senses, readers may become the kinds of persons the text requires.

To illustrate this point, consider the passage in Patrick Rothfuss' novel, *The Name of the Wind*, where the narrator describes the mysterious Fae character, Bast, whose enigmatic identity has not yet been fully disclosed:

> In fairness, something ought to be said about Bast. At first glance, he looked to be an average, if attractive, young man. But there was something different about him. For instance, he wore soft black leather boots. At least, if you looked at him that's what you saw. But if you happened to catch a glimpse of him from the corner of your eye, and if he were standing in the right type of shadow, you might see something else entirely. And if you had the right sort of mind, the sort of mind that actually sees what it looks at, you might notice that his eyes were odd. If your mind had the rare talent of not being fooled by its own expectations, you might notice something else about them, something strange and wonderful.[129]

Only as Bast's character is revisited throughout the novel (i.e., re-read) are readers exposed to a proper 'vision' of his identity. They gain the 'right sort of mind.' And this mind is an essential element for the 'model reader,' who is to be formed through repeated exposure in his practice.

The applicability of this concept to this thesis is natural as Isaiah 13:1-14:23 similarly requires the 'right sort of mind' to grasp it. Through repeated exposure, readers learn that the darkened sun and the burnt-out moon of 13:10 are not in fact cosmic phenomena. Instead they are socio-political symbols for the dissolution of Babylon and her king as 13:17ff make clear. This imagery is cosmic only in a socio-political sense. But it is only through the practiced re-reading of the whole discourse that the mind of the reader 'actually sees what it looks at.' The Babylon discourse itself corrects the initial interpretation which is naturally 'fooled by its own expectations,' a reading informed simply with explicit linguistic material. It is the practice of re-reading that provides us with the rare talent to 'see something else entirely.'

Obtaining this mind through the process of re-reading is detailed by O'Keefe and Reno's description of the 'associative strategy.' This approach involves "the countless ways in

[128]Linafelt (2016), 8.

[129]Rothfuss (2008), 101.

which particular words, images, or phrases are joined together in our minds."[130] Elaborating upon this engagement, they state:

> What do such associations achieve? . . . It seems almost second nature for a reader to move from word to word, image to image, and in so doing construct and interpretation that does not 'explain' the text, but rather illuminates or organizes it. Just as the words of a crossword puzzle cross and, in crossing, provide decisive clues about what comes next, so the words and images or texts cross and lead the reader forward toward the construction of associations only latent and potential in the material at hand. This building up of crossing links is the basic goal of the associative strategy.[131]

The process of re-reading is the practice where interpreters organize texts and are agents in the construction of implicit literary realities. Or, re-reading is the locus where the associative strategy occurs. John Webster's comments regarding the nature of the intellect are helpful here as well: "By the intellect's operation we begin to assimilate a pattern, to generalize and compare, to abstract from sensible particulars: in short, to understand what something is."[132] The 'something' we understand is not simply what can be explained regarding lexemes and grammatical sequences. It is instead those themes and structures which the particulars suggest. And so, the 'model reader' is one who employs an associative strategy and whose intellect is engaged in the interpretive practices of reading and re-reading while employing the virtues of textual apprenticeship. These practices result in a constructed meaning which arises from explicit lexical material toward a mature and well-formed synthesis of a literary tableau: "An interpreter is one who 'acts out' the material before him so as to give it intelligible life."[133] And with Webster we can qualify this interpretive process as "certainly, an act of 'making' but not of 'making up'.[134]

---

[130]O'Keefe and Reno (2005), 48.

[131]O'Keefe and Reno (2005), 49. Relevant to Greek Isaiah research, they state: "[I]n antiquity, identifying such patterns was often viewed as a sign that a reader was on the right path," Ibid., 48.

[132]Webster (2016), 146.

[133]Steiner (1989), 7.

[134]Webster (2016), 146.

Conclusion

The discussion above offered a conceptual scheme for approaching Greek Isaiah as a work related to its Hebrew *Vorlage* at the explicit linguistic and implicit literary levels. By applying this model specifically to Greek Isaiah, we can recognize more fully the translator's practice in creating a nuanced and artful literary work. The translator's literary and cultural encyclopedic context constitutes the cognitive environment wherein his interpretive assumptions could actively engage with the book Isaiah. In turn, this provided an avenue for the translator of Greek Isaiah to embody the status of a 'model reader,' or even a 'model translator.' He performed and completed this task by employing the relational virtues of apprenticeship in the practices of reading and re-reading.

As detailed in subsequent chapters, the translator of Greek Isaiah attended closely to the explicit and implicit features of the Babylon discourse. And his renderings at the lexical, thematic, and structural levels demonstrate that these virtuous practices enabled him to perceive and understand many layers of textual meaning in the discourse. We will discover that he had the 'right sort of mind' for both interpreting his *Vorlage* and transferring its meaning to his readers.[135] We are thereby warranted in our practice of reading and re-reading his work in the same manner. In turn, we also must be become 'model readers' of Greek Isaiah by employing the relational virtues in the apprenticeship practices of reading and re-reading. This should enable us to become the kinds of interpreters who perceive the intelligibility of the literary object in the range of its explications an implications. As such, Greek Isaiah shapes its readers into 'model readers' of the translation. But by virtue of the translator's faithful explication of his *Vorlage*, the translation also forms its readership into 'model readers' of the Hebrew as well. The translator of Greek Isaiah encourages us in this task.

[135]See Appendix 5 for a discussion of whether the translator neglected to capture features of the Hebrew text in his translation.

The Structure of the Thesis

Beyond the previously detailed history of research and the present methodological introduction, the body of this thesis consists of 4 remaining chapters. These are intended to highlight examples from Greek Isaiah which are relevant to this thesis from three perspectives: translation technique and style, literary micro-structure, literary macro-structure. Each successive treatment builds upon the others, from minute details to a holistic perspective on the oracle against Babylon and her king.[136]

In chapters 3 and 4, I detail the translator's translation-technical and stylistic concerns which he employed in the construction of his work. These chapters build up a profile of the translator and his approach to his *Vorlage* at the level of the lexeme, the clause, and its semantics. Such analysis provides the bedrock for the ensuing thematic and structural concerns in chapters 5 and 6. We will see that the same tendencies which concern the translator at the level of the lexeme are significant for his work at the level of theme and literary structure.

Chapter 3 surveys 11 examples from Isaiah 13:1-22 where the translator of Greek Isaiah diverged from his Hebrew text in significant ways. Chapter 4 surveys 7 further examples from Isaiah 14:1-23 with the same aims as chapter 3. The translation divergences I discuss are dependent upon many factors. The translator often explicated his Hebrew text by adding lexemes not present in the parent text. He often rearranged syntax to unify the discourse. And he occasionally demonstrated a misunderstanding of his Hebrew text only to then stylistically reconfigure his translation in contextually sensitive ways. Further, Greek Isaiah contains many intertextual allusions with both inner-Isaianic references and also with connections to the Pentateuch. The examples in these two chapters provide a portrait of the translator as one who worked with his Hebrew text in order to explicate its meaning despite occasional

[136]The overall structure of this thesis follows the pattern laid out by Glenny (2009) on Septuagint Amos. He notes: "[P]art one focuses on the topic of translation technique in LXX-Amos, and part two is more oriented toward the theology oof LXX-Amos. See Glenny (2009), esp. 28.

misunderstandings and deviations. As Silva notes: "There can be no doubt that he struggled mightily to make sense of difficult passages . . ."[137]

Chapters 5 and 6 develop the verse-level translation technique discussion of the previous two chapters and illustrate that similar features also occur at larger structural levels. I begin with a discussion of literary micro-structures and conclude with a discussion of literary macro-structures. My aim here is to illustrate that the translator of Greek Isaiah did not only render his Hebrew text freely at the level of the lexemes or the clause without a broader perspective. Instead he approached his task with the intention to convey larger thematic and structural ideas. This corresponds with further observations from Silva: "[H]e is sensitive to the thrust of the book as a whole . . ."[138]

Building on the previous lexeme and clause-level analysis, chapter 5 investigates features of the literary micro-structure within the whole oracular discourse of Isaiah 13:1-14:23. I detail the construction of literary features beyond the level of the lexeme and clause, but within the confines of larger discourse units. This small-scale structural investigation focuses largely upon features such as lexical repetition, discourse markers which unify distinct portions of the Babylon oracle, and the translator's motivations behind and intentions for their inclusion.

Chapter 6 moves beyond the literary micro-structure with an interest in the whole literary macro-structure of Isaiah 13:1-14:23. Here, I demonstrate how the translator reworked features of the Hebrew text in order to highlight certain structural features within the oracle, such as *inclusio* and thematic and geographical parallels from the very Hebrew text from which he deviated. These macro-structural features concern Isaiah 13:1-14:23 as a holistic entity in contrast to the micro-structural discussion in the previous chapter.

While chapters 3 and 4 of this thesis supply Greek Isaiah researchers with translation technical analysis of chapters not yet fully explored in the field, chapters 5 and 6 introduce a a more nuanced approach for academic interest in Greek Isaiah. Beyond the translator's well-

---

[137]Silva (2007), 824.

[138]Silva (2007), 824.

understood aims of explication, implication, style, and intertextual allusion within the levels of the lexeme and the clause, I seek to demonstrate that the translator of Greek Isaiah constructed his text in light of the larger themes and literary structure of the Hebrew text. In other words, the translator of Greek Isaiah included the small-scale deviations into his work in the service of larger literary and structural goals.

In chapter 7, I conclude the discussion with a summary of the proposal presented in the body of the thesis and suggest further lines of research which would develop my own work presented here. Several appendices follow the conclusion of the thesis, each of which contains detailed discussion of significant lexical and interpretive *minutiae* which would have detracted too much from the main argument of the thesis.

Since work on Isaiah 13:1-14:23 has not specifically been treated in the field, this thesis provides the opportunity to place a previously unexamined text among the theories and perspectives of Greek Isaiah research. I anticipate fresh results that demonstrate both the translator's faithful reading of his *Vorlage* along with his desire to render the Hebrew into a coherent work that is sensitive to the literary features and structure of its parent text.

Chapter 3: Greek Isaiah 13:1-22:
Translation Technique and Style

Introduction

This chapter and the next survey several examples which highlight translation and stylistic features within Greek Isaiah 13:1-14:23. As Marieke Dhont notes: "style pertains to the way in which something is done or made."[1] This discussion differs from a strict study of rhetorical features although it occasionally includes references to them. Thus, the present chapter unpacks several examples from Isa 13:1-22 with regards to their relationship to the Hebrew *Vorlage* along with their respective construction into the Greek language. The next chapter treats material from Isa 14:1-23 with these same considerations in mind. The majority of these examples consist of single verses. But occasional examples contain clusters of verses which exhibit features relevant to the discussion of the translation style of the Septuagint.

Under this heading of Greek Isaiah's style, I treat elements in the translation which may be defined as both literary and intertextual features. Investigation into literary features is necessitated by the translator of Greek Isaiah's frequent and intentional lexical and semantic deviations from the Hebrew text. But even though the translation often contains accurate Greek renderings of specific Hebrew terms, the translator frequently deviated from strict pairings of the same terms elsewhere.[2] We must account for these inconsistencies. And since many of these lexical and semantic deviations appear to have been motivated by allusions to other portions of biblical literature, it is also necessary to investigate Greek Isaiah's intertextual features.[3] Much

---

[1]Dhont (2018), 3: "When it comes to written texts, style can be defined as the conscious or subconscious selection of a set of linguistic features from all the possibilities in a language."

[2]See Kozman (2019): 244-56, for a recent treatment of these stylistic-literary features. See also the treatment in Troxel (2008), 87-132, esp. 132: "[the translator] was less concerned to bring his readers to the Hebrew text of Isaiah than to bring the book to them."

[3]A much discussed example of intertextuality in Greek Isaiah occurs at Isa 9:9[10], where the Hebrew text לְבֵנִים נָפָלוּ וְגָזִית נִבְנֶה שִׁקְמִים גָּדָעוּ וַאֲרָזִים נַחֲלִיף is rendered as Πλίνθοι πεπτώκασιν, ἀλλὰ δεῦτε λαξεύσωμεν λίθους καὶ ἐκκόψωμεν συκαμίνους καὶ κέδρους καὶ οἰκοδομήσωμεν ἑαυτοῖς πύργον. The lexical deviation of the final phrase—καὶ οἰκοδομήσωμεν ἑαυτοῖς πύργον—contains language which strongly suggests influence from the Babel narrative in Gen 11:4: Δεῦτε οἰκοδομήσωμεν ἑαυτοῖς πόλιν καὶ πύργον. Van der Vorm-Croughs (2014), 363; Koenig (1982), 87-9, notes the antiquity of this thematic connection: "*Saint Jérôme déjà avait remarqué que l'interprétation de G en 9, 10 (= TM 9, 9) rappelait l'épisode fameux de la Tour de Babel (Gen 11, 1s.)*"; Troxel (2008), 147-48. On page 148, Troxel states: "It is evident, therefore, that in 9:9[10] . . . the translator looked to the story of the tower in

research has considered these stylistic and intertextual features in the Septuagint, but specific and detailed treatments of these issues in Greek Isa 13:1-14:23 do not yet exist.[4]

As I hinted at in the previous chapter, I follow Marieke Dhont's position that discussion of Septuagint translations as literal and free requires qualification.[5] She suggests that we place each respective term in inverted commas: 'literal' and 'free'. This designation entails that the renderings are not literal or free as such. Instead, they are 'literal' and 'free' with respect to certain elements in the Hebrew text.[6] While some translations may be 'free' with regards to lexical-semantic overlap or syntactic order, they may be 'literal' with regard to the overall meaning or sense of a verse. This may even apply to the literary context as a whole. I employ these descriptors within inverted commas in the ensuing discussion. And in the discussion below I detail the quality of literalness and freeness within each individual example.

Greek Isaiah is widely regarded as a stylistic translation given its features of lexical repetition, assonance, poetic vocabulary, and minimal interference from the Hebrew text. John Lee's analysis enables us to expand this list of stylistic features in Greek Isaiah to include the use of tragic phrases, proverbial expressions, literary and poetic vocabulary, new lexical creations, and particles.[7] And while the labels 'stylistic' and 'literary' have received some criticism, I continue to employ them in these chapters to describe "those elements of vocabulary, grammar,

---

Genesis for both phraseology and a means of casting whole verses."

[4]See the following research for discussion on intertextuality in the Septuagint: Hanhart (1990), 339-79; Van der Vorm Croughs (2001), 81-94; Theocharous (2014); Joosten (2016), 99-107; Ross (2017): 25-36.

[5]This is an old discussion in Septuagint studies represented well by the works of James Barr and Emanuel Tov. See Barr (1979); Tov (2015).

[6]See Dhont (2018), 34-46; Tov (2015), 20-21: "The characterizations 'free'/'literal' refer to renderings of individual words, syntagmata, and clauses, and on the basis of such characterizations, a complete unit (book) may be dubbed a 'literal' or 'free' translation. The translator of such a unit is then described as someone who tried to be 'faithful' to the underlying Hebrew text or who let his imagination run freely while transferring the details of the source text into the target language. Between these two opposite approaches, many gradations and variations may be discerned, from extremely paraphrastic (to the extent that the wording of the parent text is hardly recognizable) to slavishly faithful."

[7]Lee (2014): 135-46. On page 145, Lee states: "The person who made this translation seems . . . to have been focused on turning the text not just into meaningful Greek, but into *stylish* 'biblical' Greek, that is, Greek with a 'biblical' flavour on the pattern of the Pentateuch, but in a better style and on a higher level of Greek."

and syntax that are characteristic of literary or poetic texts rather than of documentary and administrative texts."[8]

With that said, in this chapter and in the next I investigate the translation technique of Greek Isaiah with an eye to those features which may be characterized as stylistic. Many of these features in the examples below occur through lexical repetition, a common feature in Hebrew narrative and poetry.[9] But on the nature of repetition as stylistic in Greek literature, Mirjam van der Vorm-Croughs supplies helpful comments:

> The frequent repetition of words is a characteristic feature of Biblical Hebrew literature. Repetition was also part of Greek theories about the ornamentation of a text, though to a lesser degree. Words could be repeated in order to draw attention to a passage and to imbue it with strength and pathos. . . . The LXX of Isaiah contains plenty examples of repetition, of which a significant number appears to have been invented or modified by the translator, through the addition of words or phrases.[10]

Typically, these stylistic examples of translation find their origin not in a 'literal' transmission of the Hebrew lexemes or syntax into the Greek, but in a heightened concern to present the Greek text as a literary entity in and of itself.[11] In what follows, I highlight ways that lexical repetition explicates and unifies the Hebrew source text. And I refer to these general translation tendencies as stylistic.

In tandem with the topic of style, features of intertextuality in Septuagint research have also gained attention. From one perspective, the term intertextuality is used in semiotics and

---

[8]Dhont (2018), 42. Dhont prefers to describe such texts as 'high register.' This designation is fine insofar as it goes. And I understand her concern. But I do not set these descriptive restrictions upon my own analysis. I mean the same thing when I employ 'stylistic', 'literary', and 'high register.' See the up-to-date treatment in John Lee (2018), 90-91. See also Aitken (2005): 55-78; Aitken (2014), 120-34.

[9]Sternberg (1987); Alter (2011); Rendsburg (2019).

[10]Van der Vorm-Croughs (2013), 221. Also see the discussion of repetition in Lausberg (1998), 274-98: "Repetition is for reinforcement, generally with emotional emphasis, but it is also exploited intellectually"; in contrast to the stylistic feature of lexical variation, Dines (2016), 379, notes: "The converse effect—repeating a significant word, or grammatical form, for emphasis—also figures in Greek rhetoric and is frequent in the Septuagint."

[11]As Dhont (2018), 323, states: "Formal representation of the Hebrew in terms of lexical consistency, word order, and qualitative representation no longer needed to be the translator's main concern." See also Dhont (2019): 404: "While some translators looked increasingly towards a Pentateuchal translation method with emphasis on interference, other Septuagint books, such as Isaiah, Proverbs, and Job, attest to a markedly different translation approach. These texts show more emphasis on idiomatic usage of the Greek language and oftentimes include literary vocabulary and rhetorical features that frequently appear in the Greek without reflecting such feature in the Hebrew. The translators' main concern was oftentimes not rendering the form of the source text, but rather its meaning."

cognitive linguistics in reference to epistemic processes involved in language use and interpretation.[12] But the term is also used in biblical studies in reference to citations, allusions, and echoes of biblical and other literatures.[13] Myrto Theocharous succinctly summarizes this avenue of intertextuality as "how one biblical text depends on another."[14] Intertextual connections may be detected in the Septuagint by first noticing intentional lexical and semantic deviations from the Hebrew *Vorlage*.[15] If the translator supplies Greek content which is thematically related to the source text but representative of linguistic features outside of it, we can propose an intertextual connection. In the case of Greek Isaiah, this intertextuality can occur within the book of Isaiah itself as inner-Isaianic intertextuality.[16] But it can also occur across the breadth of canonical literature, most frequently with the Pentateuch.[17]

What follows in this chapter expands upon the translation technique, literary style, and intertextual features of the oracle against Babylon in Isa 13:1-22. I treat 10 examples with an aim to highlight the diverse ways in which the translator of Greek Isaiah constructed his text. I

---

[12]Eco (1986); Huizenga (2009); Chandler (2017).

[13]Fishbane (1985); Hays (1989); Huizenga (2009); Emadi (2015): 8-23.

[14]Theocharous (2014), 1. See the helpful description in Rajak (2009), 225: "A high degree of intimacy with the substantial parts of a previously completed corpus of translations is implied."

[15]Dhont (2018): 178, provides a helpful methodological caveat: "The extent to which literary awareness is shown in a translation does not necessarily imply conscious choices on the part of the translator. When certain features in the Greek text do not reflect a feature of the Hebrew text, we can begin to speculate about their conscious use only when the rendering deviates from the Hebrew in a way that cannot be explained by a different reading of the Hebrew, by a parent text at odds with the MT or by other aspects of the translator's technique, such as standard lexical choices."

[16]See Wagner (2013), 233: "G frequently bumps up the 'volume' of such internal echoes and allusions. What is more, the Greek translator thickens the vast web of intra textual connections running between Isaiah's opening vision and later parts of the book by adding strands of his own."

[17]Theocharous (2014), 5, provides a helpful caveat for intertextual relationships: "What we are after . . . is not the author's clues and his intent but the translator's *idea* of the author's intent." See also Dhont (2019): 399-400: "Aside from being a source of intertextuality for subsequent translational and compositional activity, the LXX Pentateuch also became a model for the translation of subsequent books in different ways. It set the standard for the acceptability of the use of vernacular Koine to translate the Jewish Scriptures. It provided translators with a lexicon for standard Hebrew-Greek equivalences and for specific expressions. It also represented a model in terms of the translation approach, as the translation approaches of other LXX books are often explained as a development of the Pentateuchal translation approach"; Wagner (2013), 233: "At several points we encountered evidence of the translator's interest in forging links with a significant textual precursor, the Greek Pentateuch."

aim to show that he was a skillful reader who sought to produce accurate renderings of the Hebrew in a literary way for his Greek audience. What I illustrate in the examples below corresponds with Ross Wagner's observations about Isa 1:1-31:

> The Greek translator does not so much inject 'foreign' ideas into Isaiah's vision as amplify, elaborate and interweave characteristically 'Isaian' themes into bold new patterns. The voice of OG Isaiah is that of the Hebrew prophet. But he speaks with a distinctively Greek accent.[18]

Many of Greek Isaiah's renderings are straightforward. But the oracle against Babylon of Isa 13:1-22 contains several perplexing traits in the Greek which demand significant attention. Even more could be said than my discussion below addresses. But the examples in the following discussion seem to be the most significant, complex, and interesting avenues to explore noteworthy traits of Greek Isaiah's translation style.

Before describing specific examples from Isa 13:1-22, it is crucial both to compare and contrast my work with that of Mirjam van der Vorm-Croughs' monograph *The Old Greek of Isaiah*. Her work in that volume is thorough and precise. She details the translational and rhetorical features in significant detail. And I interact with it regularly throughout this thesis. But while she occasionally describes the rationale behind Greek Isaiah's renderings, the large majority of her research is descriptive.[19] This is no critique of her work, only a description of its aims. In contrast, my explanations develop her observations by describing the etiology of Greek Isaiah's stylistic decisions. And these decision often arose from the translator's concern for literary style and intertextual allusions. In the following examples, I illustrate these types of motivations through an explanation of the literary features in Isa 13:1-22.

[18]Wagner (2013), 236. Components of such features are elaborated in Lee (2014), 138-39; Van der Vorm-Croughs (2014), 177, 221-54.

[19]Van der Vorm-Croughs (2014), 299-454. While this section occasionally contains suggestions regarding translational motivations, much of the discussion is merely descriptive.

Translation Technique and Style in Greek Isaiah 13:1-22

Example 1: Isaiah 13:1

Greek Isaiah 13:1 contains a stylistic reworking of the corresponding Hebrew text in the vein of natural Greek usage. Despite syntactic changes, the translator did not significantly alter the denunciatory meaning of the oracle as a whole.[20] However, he augmented its presentation of this verse both by adjusting its word order and also by explicating its meaning through lexical addition:

13:1 מַשָּׂא בָּבֶל אֲשֶׁר חָזָה יְשַׁעְיָהוּ בֶּן־אָמוֹץ׃

The oracle of Babylon which Isaiah, the son of Amos, saw.

Ὅρασις, ἣν εἶδεν Ησαίας υἱὸς Αμως κατὰ Βαβυλῶνος.

A vision, which Isaiah, the son of Amos, saw against Babylon.

The first two lexical items of the Hebrew text are in fact represented by the first and last elements in the Greek. The phrase מַשָּׂא בָּבֶל was interrupted by the insertion of the relative pronoun ἥ. This pronoun in all likelihood represents the Hebrew relative particle אֲשֶׁר which opens the phrase. In effect, the phrase מַשָּׂא בָּבֶל has become *עַל בָּבֶל. . . מַשָּׂא אֲשֶׁר. In the Greek text, this is captured as Ὅρασις, ἣν . . . κατὰ Βαβυλῶνος.[21] The restructuring of this phrase is significant since it highlights the vision and the object of the oracle by placing each of these elements at the beginning and end of the verse. The translator has created something of an *inclusio* in his rendering by spreading out the theme of the verse from start to finish. This is a well-documented rhetorical and stylistic feature.[22] In addition to this divergence in word order, the Greek text contains another important stylistic feature.

Even though the entirety of the oracle in Isa 13:1-22 is one of impending judgment, the construct phrase מַשָּׂא בָּבֶל is interpretively malleable. It neglects to show the prophetic

---

[20] 1QIsa[a] משא בבל אשר חוזה ישעיה בן אמוץ; Targum מַטַל כָּס דִלוֹט לְאַשקָאָה יָת בָּבֶל דְאִתנַבִי יְשַׁעיָה בַר אָמוֹץ; Peshitta ܡܫܐ ܒܒܠ ܕܚܙܐ ܐܫܥܝܐ ܒܪ ܐܡܘܨ. ; Vulgate *onus Babylonis quod vidit Isaias filius Amos*; Aquila αρμα βαβυλωνιων; Symmachus and Theodotion λημμα βαβυλωνιων. Of the ancient witnesses, only Greek Isaiah and the Targum deviate from that preserved in the Masoretic tradition. Based on this external attestation, it is most likely that the Greek and Aramaic are 'free' in their renderings.

[21] See Wagner (2013), 67-70, for a discussion of these oracular introductions.

[22] See the treatment of rhetorical features in Dhont (2018), 191-94.

intention of doom since it neither denounces nor affirms Babylon. In this way it differs from the opening phrases at Isa 1:1 and 2:1 which describe the prophetic vision as עַל־יְהוּדָה וִירוּשָׁלָ͏ִם. At Isa 13:1, however, the translator has performed the interpretive task for his readers by supplying the denunciatory rendering κατὰ Βαβυλῶνος 'against Babylon.' This interpretive addition corresponds with the trajectory of the the chapter's oracle and directs the reader of the translation to grasp the solemnity of the discourse from the start.

In sum, the translator reorganized the initial Hebrew bound phrase and supplied the preposition κατά in order to explicate the ensuing prophetic judgment of the oracular heading.[23] These two translational adjustments exemplify the translator of Greek Isaiah's concern to explicate his source text stylistically while also conveying his nuanced interpretation.

Example 2: Isaiah 13:2

Typical of his translation style, Greek Isaiah generally follows the lexemes, word order, and syntactical layout of his Hebrew text in a traceable way. In this regard, the translator's work accords with 'normal' Septuagint translation patterns. Such a tendency is present in Isa 13:2, even though stark divergences from this pattern occur at the end of the verse:

13:2a	עַל הַר־נִשָּׂפָה שְׂאוּ־נֵס	Ἐπ᾽ ὄρους πεδινοῦ ἄρατε σημεῖον[24]
	Upon a bare mountain, lift up a standard;	*Upon a flat mountain, raise a sign;*
13:2b	הָרִימוּ קוֹל לָהֶם	ὑψώσατε τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῖς

[23]As I note in chapters 5 and 6, similar features occur elsewhere in Greek Isaiah. See Isa 1:1 and 2:1.

[24]The neuter adjective πεδινός is in gender agreement with the preceding noun ὄρος. And major Greek lexicons agree with the general glosses 'flat, level, plane.' See LSJ, 1352; BrillDAG, 1600; LEH, 476; GELS, 541; Bauer 790. Of the 22 occurrences of πεδινός, ή, όν in the Septuagint, the translators always employ the feminine form, rendering the feminine Hebrew noun שְׁפֵלָה in 13 instances, מִישׁוֹר on 4 occasions, and בִּקְעָה once. The widespread use of feminine πεδινή in these instances is due to both lexical and contextual factors. The feminine form ἡ πεδινή in Jer 48[31]:8 could function substantivally, modify an implied noun such as γῆ, or modify πόλις from the preceeding context. I find the latter to be the most persuasive on contextual grounds. Nonetheless, the instance of neuter πεδινόν in Isa 13:2 contains the sole deviation from feminine πεδινή in the Septuagint. Like the Old Greek, Symmachus captured שפה with added synonym ὁμαλός 'even, level' while Aquila employed the adjective γνοφώδης 'dark, gloomy.' This latter rendering suggests that Aquila did not read the consonantal form נשפה in accord with its verbal semantics from שפה, but instead understood it in terms of the nominal semantics related to the terms נָשֶׁף, *נִשְׁפָּה , or נִשְׁפָּא (Aramaic), each meaning 'twilight, darkness.' See HALOT, 730. Jerome reads the term similarly and employed the term *caligosus* 'dark.' Basil of Caesarea similarly records the otherwise unattested reading νεφώδης 'cloudy.'

	Raise a voice to them;	*Lift up the voice to them;*
13:2b′	—	μὴ φοβεῖσθε
	—	*Do not be afraid;*
13:2c	הָנִ֥יפוּ יָ֖ד	παρακαλεῖτε τῇ χειρί[25]
	Wave a hand	*Summon with the hand;*
13:2d	וְיָבֹ֖אוּ פִּתְחֵ֥י נְדִיבִֽים׃	Ἀνοίξατε, οἱ ἄρχοντες
	In order that they would enter the gates of the nobles.	*Open up, O rulers!*

This example contains several unexceptional translation features. At Isa 13:2a, the translator strictly followed the lexemes and word order of the Hebrew. At 13:2b, he did likewise albeit with the inclusion of the articular noun τὴν φωνήν in place of anarthrous קוֹל. Even the rendering at 13:2c, although it exhibits slight semantic divergence between נוף and παρακαλεῖν, follows the word order of the Hebrew and conveys its overall meaning.[26] However, two clauses in this verse demand further explanation: 13:2b′ and 13:2d.

The plus at 13:2b′ exemplifies the translator's freedom with regard to his source text. It is also noteworthy that the addition of the phrase μὴ φοβεῖσθε is absent from all other versions of Isaiah, including the evidence from Qumran. But this freedom is not wholly unconstrained. The origin of this plus seems best explained by appealing to an analogical intertext at Isa 40:9:

40:9a	עַל הַר־גָּבֹהַ עֲלִי־לָךְ מְבַשֶּׂרֶת צִיּוֹן	ἐπ᾽ ὄρος ὑψηλὸν ἀνάβηθι, ὁ εὐαγγελιζόμενος Ζιων·
40:9b	הָרִימִי בַכֹּחַ קוֹלֵךְ מְבַשֶּׂרֶת יְרוּשָׁלָ�ִם	ὕψωσον τῇ ἰσχύι τὴν φωνήν σου ὁ εὐαγγελιζόμενος Ιερουσαλημ·
40:9c	הָרִימִי	ὑψώσατε,
40:9d	אַל־תִּירָאִי	μὴ φοβεῖσθε·

[25]The term παρακαλέω is marked by a broad semantic range: 'call upon,' 'summon,' 'invite,' 'appeal to,' 'encourage,' 'entreat,' 'request.' See LSJ, 1311; BrillDAG, 1550; LEH, 464; GELS, 527; Bauer, 764. Lee (2018), 10: "The word is difficult to analyse lexically: the senses shade from one to another and it is often hard to decide which one is meant in a given context." See a comprehensive discussion in Lee (2018), 10-15. Modern translations of the Septuagint attest to this difficulty: NETS 'encourage them with your hand'; LES 'exhort with your hand'; BdA '*exhortez de la main*'; LXX.D '*fordert auf mit der (erhobenen) Hand*.' Overall, the Septuagint translators show interpretive sensitivity in their approach to נוף, evidenced by the diverse lexemes they employed. The Septuagint contains 11 different Greek terms which render the 34 instances of נוף in the Hebrew Bible: ἐπιβάλλω, ἀφορίζω, φέρω, ἀναφέρω, ἐπιφέρω, προσφέρω, ἐπιτίθημι, ἀφαιρέω, ἐπαίρω, ἀποδίδωμι, αἴρω, ἕλκω, παρακαλέω. And of interest for the discussion of Isa 13:2, παρακαλέω renders נוף only here and at Isa 10:32, two passages with recognized lexical and thematic parallels. This fact strongly suggests that the translator of Greek Isaiah was both sensitive to the context of his passage and also displayed his interpretive skill in his work.

[26]Regardless of the precise sense of παρακαλέω, it does not convey a precise semantic overlap with נוף. Instead, the rendering at Isa 13:2 should be considered as one of implication: waving a hand entails the summoning of the addressee.

40:9e אִמְרִי לְעָרֵי יְהוּדָה הִנֵּה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם׃ εἶπον ταῖς πόλεσιν Ιουδα Ἰδοὺ ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν.

The lexical connections between Isa 13:2 and 40:9 in the Hebrew are apparent upon comparison.[27] And the Hebrew to Greek renderings at 40:9 are nearly identical to those at 13:2. However, whereas Isa 40:9 occurs in a context of prophetic hope, the oracle of chapter 13 concerns apocalyptic destruction. So, the intertextual relationship between these passages appears to be one of contrast. Further, the intertextual impact of this lexical plus may evoke sarcasm, a feature which occurs several times in chapters 13 and 14. The translator likely recognized the lexical similarities between these passages in the Hebrew but then included the phrase μὴ φοβεῖσθε in a context of judgment.[28]

The lexical and thematic parallels between these two chapters in the Hebrew are remarkable. And the translator of Greek Isaiah apparently thought these connections played a mutually interpretive role for his work. He employed translational freedom based upon the lexical content of another passage in Isaiah. But this other text stands in a cataphoric relationship more than 25 chapters away from Isa 13:2. Without lexical justification in chapter 13's context, the translator supplied the lexical plus μὴ φοβεῖσθε from chapter 40 backwards into Isa 13:2. In other words, the translator read the former passage in light of the latter. This pattern of intertextual appropriation is significant since it occurs several times in this oracle against Babylon.

The final clause of Isa 13:2 also deserves comment since the Greek diverges from the Hebrew text in several ways. Apart from the omission of the clause-initial verb **בוא**, Greek Isaiah also reflects Hebrew consonants which diverge from the Masoretic tradition:

13:2d וְיָבֹאוּ פִּתְחֵי נְדִיבִים׃ Ἀνοίξατε, οἱ ἄρχοντες

Instead of capturing the post-verbal construct phrase in line with Hebrew semantics, the translator most likely read the bound member of the phrase as the plural imperative *פִּתְחוּ 'open up!' Given the orthographic similarities between *yod* and *waw*, this divergent reading is not

[27]This example has also been noted by others. See van der Vorm-Croughs (2014), 336.

[28]It is worth nothing that the insertion of μὴ φοβεῖσθε into Isa 13:2 does not obscure the overall meaning of the Hebrew. Instead, it colors the translation with inner-Isaianic awareness.In addition to the lexical parallels between Isa 13:2 and 40:9, we should also consider the repetition of παρακαλεῖν in Isa 40:1, 2, 11 as a motivation for thematic similarity.

surprising.[29] In light of this rendering, the translator would have understood the plural noun נְדִיבִים as the plural addressee of the imperative.

The translator's construction of this phrase seems to have arisen from a desire to create a coherent presentation of the Hebrew text before him. Granted that the translator read the bound member of the construct phrase as an imperative, the omission of בוא would have reduced the semantic confusion of having two verbs side by side.[30] The absence of a direct translation of בוא may also have arisen from a conflation of both verbs, since the translator may have decided to capture both בוא and פתח with the singular lexeme ἀνοίγω. Whatever etiology of this phrase we prefer, the translator's decision resulted in a series of five imperatives, each directed to the implied addressee: ἄρατε, ὑψώσατε, μὴ φοβεῖσθε, παρακαλεῖτε, ἀνοίξατε. The translator seems to explicate what is already in the text by heightening the features of the Hebrew even further in his translation. Greek Isaiah's concern to preserve this imperatival feature in this verse is significant since he tends to emphasize stylistic repetition in his work, whether it be lexical or morphological.[31]

Example 3: Isaiah 13:3

The translation features of Isa 13:3 are some of the most difficult to explain in the whole of the Babylon oracle. This verse contains several textual difficulties, clausal and syntactic alterations, and a number lexical additions. Some of these features may have arisen due to the translator's difficulty with the Hebrew text, while other features represent the translator's stylistic concerns:[32]

Isa 13:3a אֲנִי צִוִּיתִי לִמְקֻדָּשָׁי ἐγὼ συντάσσω καὶ ἐγὼ ἄγω αὐτούς·

[29]1QIsa[a] omits the clause-initial *waw* and preserves the third person singular verb—יבוא פתחי נדיבים—whereas the Masoretic text and 4QIsa[e] (4Q59) each contain the *waw* conjunctive attached to third person plural: ויבאו פתחי נדיבים. The reading in 4QIsa[a] (4Q55) likewise omits the clause-initial *waw*, but retains the plural יבאו as we see in MT and 4QIsa[e]. See the relevant discussions in Kutzcher, (1974).

[30]The omission of בוא may either be an oversight or an intentional minus.

[31]See Appendix 1 for a lengthy discussion of the interpretive difficulties in this verse.

[32]Recall text-critical discussion of Isa 13:3 in chapter 2. Although I opt for the reading presented in Rahlfs-Hanhart on text-critical grounds, I present Ziegler's text above since it remains the standard edition.

	I have commanded my holy ones	*I am ordering and am leading them;*
Isa 13:3a´	—	ἡγιασμένοι εἰσί
	—	*they have been consecrated*
Isa 13:3b	גַּם קָרָאתִי גִבּוֹרַי לְאַפִּי עַלִּיזֵי גַאֲוָתִי׃	καὶ ἐγὼ ἄγω αὐτούς·
	I even summoned . . .	*and I am leading them*
Isa 13:3b´	[גִּבּוֹרַי לְאַפִּי]	γίγαντες ἔρχονται πληρῶσαι τὸν θυμόν μου
	my mighty men for my anger	*Giants are coming to fulfill my anger,*
Isa 13:3b´´	[עַלִּיזֵי גַאֲוָתִי׃]	χαίροντες ἅμα καὶ ὑβρίζοντες.
	my proudly exulting ones.	*rejoicing and boasting together.*

Since several text-critical difficulties occur in Isa 13:3a, it is difficult to comment upon all of the translator's renderings there, especially concerning the phrase לִמְקֻדָּשָׁי. But apart from the opening two Hebrew terms in Isa 13:3b, the remaining material is clear enough to assess the emergence of the Greek text.

Unlike 13:3a, the readings at Isa 13:3b agree in the editions of both Ziegler and Rahlfs. But making sense of the Greek text's relationship to the Hebrew is not entirely straightforward:

13:3a.i	גִּבּוֹרַי	γίγαντες
13:3a.ii	—	ἔρχονται πληρῶσαι
13:3a.iii	לְאַפִּי	τὸν θυμόν μου
13:3a.iv	עַלִּיזֵי גַאֲוָתִי	χαίροντες ἅμα καί ὑβρίζοντες

Three distinct issues confront us as we seek to explain the origin of this Greek phrase. Most simply, we must consider the translator's rationale behind the use of γίγας 'giant' to render גִּבּוֹר 'mighty man.' Correspondence between these two terms occurs 17 times in the Old Testament. And while the term γίγας may be glossed as 'giant,' it may also convey the more mundane meaning 'mighty.' Interestingly the first pairings of these term in the biblical canon occur in Gen 6:8 and Gen 10:8-9.[33] The first of these passages describes the pre-diluvian characters in the story of the Nephilim. And the latter of these passages refers to the character of Nimrod in the genealogy of nations. And as we learn in Gen 10:10, Nimrod was a king over Babel. And given

[33]In some respects, this reading both contrasts and complements Porter and Pearson (1997), 541: "[A] conscious understanding on the part of the translator of the myths surrounding the giants, such as are found in the Enoch literature, Jubilees, and elsewhere. Furthermore, although the translation of 'mighty ones' is a possibility for γίγας, its setting in the milieu of Hellenistic Judaism, with its growing interest in the myths surrounding Genesis 6, as illustrated in the intertestamental literature, argues that the understanding of γίγας in all of these verses is probably related to this complex of thought."

the connection between Babel in Genesis and Babylon here in Isaiah, the influence of these texts upon the translator of Greek Isaiah seems likely.

Next, the inclusion of two additional verbs which are absent in the Hebrew—ἔρχομαι and πληρόω—demands explanation. Since the translator associated the opening of Isa 13:3b in the Hebrew—גַּם קָרָאתִי rendered as καὶ ἐγὼ καλῶ αὐτούς—as a distinct clause from the phrase beginning with גִּבּוֹרַי, he needed to supply verbal information for the second part of this verse. Otherwise, it would not have made sense syntactically. Thus, the addition of the verbal phrase ἔρχονται πληρῶσαι explicates what would be implied between גִּבּוֹרַי and לְאַפִּי. But the translator seems to have performed this verbal explication in light of the surrounding context.

The verb ἔρχομαι also occurs in 13:5 to describe the militaristic agents who come to execute Yhwh's wrath. So, the use of ἔρχομαι in 13:3 suggests that the translator was aware of the subsequent material in his explication of the terse phrase in 13:3. And even more subtly, the use of πληρόω seems to convey the implied meaning of the *lamed* in the phrase לְאַפִּי.[34] This would constitute a highly explicated rendering where the translator read verbal semantics out of a Hebrew preposition. In short, he interpreted this Hebrew phrase as a purpose clause which lacked an explicit predicate. As such, the translator sought to clarify the lack of a verb by adding one to the clause. The inclusion of ἔρχονται πληρῶσαι concisely accomplishes this in a contextually sensitive and stylistically well-formed way.

Last of all, we must explore the translator's expansion of the appositional bound phrase עַלִּיזֵי גַּאֲוָתִי into the pair of adverbial participles. Whereas the Hebrew text requires this phrase to function appositionally in relation to גִּבּוֹרַי, the translator might not have thought this possible given his different conception of the Hebrew syntax. Nonetheless, the stylistic result is clear. The phrase models a distinctly Greek idiom. Each member of the bound phrase was rendered as an adverbial participle, a non-existent feature Hebrew syntax. The bound member עַלִּיזֵי became χαίροντες and the free member גַּאֲוָתִי became ὑβρίζοντες.[35] Yet, since the Hebrew

[34]For the '*lamed* of purpose,' see *BHRG*, 350-51; *GBH*, 596.

[35]The verb עלז 'to exalt, triumph' occurs 16 times in the Hebrew Bible and is most often rendered with Greek terms sharing a similar semantic range. Jer 50[27]:11 contains the term κατακαυχάομαι 'to exalt, triumph over'; Zeph 3:14 contains κατατέρπω 'to delight greatly in'; Psa 28[27]:7 contains ἀναθάλλω 'to grow, bloom up'; Psa 108[107]:8 contains ὑψόω 'to lift up, raise high, exalt'; Psa 149:5 contains καυχάομαι 'to boast, glory'. Psalm

text joins these terms together in a construct phrase, it seems that the translator was reluctant to separate them. The inclusion of ἅμα καί between these two participle demonstrates that the translator read these terms together and sought to preserve this pairing.[36] The resultant translation consists of a larger adverbial phrase consisting of two participles joined by a coordinating καί and the adverb ἅμα, a thoroughly Greek construction. As the textual history of this verse illustrates, the translator of Greek Isaiah had difficulty working out the underlying structure of the Hebrew. But despite these setbacks, he still created a Greek text which explicated elements of the Hebrew in a stylistic way.[37] And if the participial construction ἡγιασμένοι εἰσί attested in Rahlfs' text is original to Greek Isaiah, these latter participles could serve as evidence for the translator's tendency to repeat morphologically similar items.[38]

Example 4: Isaiah 13:4-5

The Hebrew of Isaiah 13:4-5 contains at least three independent clauses where a cacophony of kingdoms is introduced (13:4a-4b), Yhwh musters a host for battle (13:4c), and Yhwh and his agents of wrath journey from the end of the cosmos. This militaristic gathering occurs for the purpose of geopolitical destruction:

13:4a	קוֹל הָמוֹן בָּהָרִים דְּמוּת עַם־רָב	φωνὴ ἐθνῶν πολλῶν ἐπὶ τῶν ὀρέων ὁμοία ἐθνῶν πολλῶν
	The sound of a multitude is on the mountains like a great people;	*A sound of many nations on the mountains like many nations;*
13:4b	קוֹל שְׁאוֹן מַמְלְכוֹת גּוֹיִם נֶאֱסָפִים׃	φωνὴ βασιλέων καὶ ἐθνῶν συνηγμένων
	The sound of an uproar of kingdoms, of nations gathered.	*A sound of kings and nations gathered together.*
13:4c	יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת מְפַקֵּד צְבָא מִלְחָמָה׃	κύριος σαβαωθ ἐντέταλται ἔθνει ὁπλομάχῳ

96[95]:12 contains the only other pairing of the root עלז with χαίρω in the Septuagint. The rendering of the root גאה here corresponds with the semantics of the Greek term ὑβρίζω and other terms related to the semantic domain of ὕβρις.

[36]Concerning the addition of ἅμα for the purpose of translational explication, cohesion, and clarity, van der Vorm-Croughs (2014), 41, states: "These words generally do not change the context of the sentence in which they are inserted, but have a purely intensifying function."

[37]See comments on Greek style in Ottley (1906), 2.171: "γίγαντες, ὑβρίζοντες, impart a colour to the language which scarcely suits the original." Added to this colorful language should be the use of χαίροντες.

[38]Later in this chapter I detail the translator's tendency to repeat Greek features.

	Yhwh of armies is mustering a host for battle;	*The Lord Sabaoth has commanded a heavily-armed nation*
13:5a	בָּאִים מֵאֶרֶץ מֶרְחָק מִקְצֵה הַשָּׁמָיִם *they are coming from a far land, from the end of the heavens;*	ἔρχεσθαι ἐκ γῆς πόρρωθεν ἀπ᾽ ἄκρου θεμελίου οὐρανοῦ *to come from a far away land, from the utmost foundation of heaven,*
13:5b	יְהוָה וּכְלֵי זַעְמוֹ לְחַבֵּל כָּל־הָאָרֶץ׃ *Yhwh and the instruments of his rage, to destroy all the land.*	κύριος καὶ οἱ ὁπλομάχοι αὐτοῦ, τοῦ καταφθεῖραι τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην. *The Lord and his heavily-armed ones, to destroy the whole inhabited world*.

The translator of Greek Isaiah structured this passage with notable differences, both in lexical details and syntactical arrangement. Instead of preserving the threefold clause structure of the Hebrew text, he reduced the passage into two clauses. Furthermore, the translator both conflated lexical elements and introduced others in order to produce a stylistic Greek presentation.

The Greek text of Isaiah 13:4a-b contains alternating renderings. Whereas several features of the Hebrew carry over into the translation—קוֹל as φωνή, בֶּהָרִים as ἐπὶ τῶν ὀρέων, דְּמוּת as ὁμοία—others are altered. The translator expanded upon the Hebrew text with one lexical substitution and one addition. The term הָמוֹן is typically paired with πλῆθος ‘multitude’ in the Septuagint. But the translator here employed the term πόλυς in combination with the lexical plus ἔθνος. Furthermore, he repeated this phrase at the end of the clause when rendering עַם־רָב. The result constitutes a lexically repetitive and thus stylistically elaborated translation since the opening and ending of this clause mirror one another. Further, the use of ἐθνῶν πολλῶν in 13:4a and ἐθνῶν συνηγμένων in 13:4b resembles the rhetorical feature of *epiphora*, where repetition occurs at the end of two different clauses. Interestingly, this repetitive feature occurs only where the translator deviated from the lexemes of the Hebrew. Such repetition should be regarded as the product of intentional stylistic aims.[39]

In contrast to this, Isaiah 13:4b exhibits features of a condensed translation where no Greek term apparently represents the Hebrew lexeme שְׁאוֹן ‘noise, roar.’[40] It is likely that the

[39]Consider Lee (2014): 138-39, where he regards repetition as a feature of Greek style; van der Vorm-Croughs (2014), 177: “In LXX Isaiah [repetition] often seems to have been employed for *stylistic* reasons . . . with the purpose of creating or ameliorating a parallelism.”

[40]Van der Vorm-Croughs explains the condensation of the phrase קול שאון ממלכות into φωνὴ βασιλέων as the reduction of synonymous words which were in a construct state conjunction. She also states that שאון may have been omitted so as to make the clause in which it appears more parallel to the preceding one: φωνὴ ἐθνῶν πολλῶν . .

translator of Greek Isaiah understood the meaning of this Hebrew term since he employed the Greek term κραυγή ‘shout’ for שְׁאוֹן at Isa 66:6.[41] But despite this omission, the translator proceeded to render the Hebrew with peculiar and repetitive vocabulary, supplying ἔθνος for the third time in verse 4.[42] The stylistic aims of his work here are apparent in the construction of repetition and parallelism.[43]

The twofold repetition of ὁπλομάχος ‘heavily armed’ in verses 4 and 5 constitutes a very clear stylistic rendering. First of all, the translator employed this term to render two distinct Hebrew phrases: צְבָא מִלְחָמָה and כְּלֵי זַעְמוֹ. And as I detail in chapter 5, the repetition of ὁπλομάχος indicates that the translator interpreted these two Hebrew phrases as having the same referent. Second, the choice of terminology is unique to Greek Isaiah. While the term ὁπλομάχος is fairly common in Attic and Hellenistic literature, Greek Isaiah contains the sole occurrences of this term in the Septuagint corpus.[44] And whereas more ‘literal’ lexical options would have been available to the translator, the use of this terminology illustrates how the translator applied a unique term in a stylistically repetitive way.[45]

. // φωνὴ βασιλέων καὶ ἐθνῶν συνηγμένων. See van der Vorm-Croughs (2014), 194 and 194n24.

[41]See Isa 5:14; 13:4; 17:12[x2]; 17:13; 24:8; 25:5; 66:6. Of its 8 occurrences in the book, Isa 66:6 constitutes the only explicit accurate rendering of שְׁאוֹן. Isaiah 17:2 contains the term ἠχέω ‘to sound, ring out’. But this seems to render the related Hebrew verb שׁאה ‘to rumble, roar’.

[42]See the discussion on literary macro-structure in chapter 5 regarding the translator’s use of βασιλεύς ‘king’ for מַמְלָכָה ‘kingdom.’

[43]The translator also transforms the series of קוֹל interjections into strings of genitives. See Gesenius (2006), §146b, where he notes that in these types of constructions, קוֹל functions as an exclamation. Interestingly, the translators of the Septuagint do not seem to take note of this grammatical principle. Regarding the lexical plus καί in Greek Isaiah, it is worth mentioning that 1QIsa[a], the Targum, the Peshitta, and the Vulgate each lack a coordinating conjunction at this point.

[44]LSJ, 1240 mentions the occurrence of this term in Polybius and Xenophon. A search of this lexeme in the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* online produces 7 occurrences prior to Greek Isaiah. All the authors referenced in TLG are considered Classical writers: Xenophon, Anaxadrides, Theophrastus, Chrysippus, Teles, Polybius. It seems that the use of ὁπλομάχος indicates higher literary style on the part of the translator. The Greek term may also signify a ‘teacher in armed combat.’ But this meaning does not fit the Isaianic context as well as the gloss noted above.

[45]For more literal renderings of these phrases, see Num 31:14 הַמִּצְבָא rendered as ἐκ τῆς παρατάξεως τοῦ πολέμου; 1 Chron 7:4 גְּדוּדֵי צָבָא מִלְחָמָה rendered as ἰσχυροὶ παρατάξασθαι εἰς πόλεμον; 1 Chron 7:11 יֹצְאֵי צָבָא לַמִּלְחָמָה rendered as ἐκπορευόμενοι δυνάμει τοῦ πολεμεῖν. The later Greek revisions all pair σκευή

At a different stylistic level, the translator's reordering of the Hebrew syntax occurs between 13:4c and 13:5a where he transformed the participial predicate (בָּאִים) of 13:5a into a infinitive of purpose (ἔρχεσθαι). He thereby connected the infinitive as a complement to the predicate of 13:4c (פקד / ἐντέλλω). This syntactical reordering resulted in a text which exhibits a different type of symmetry than what is present in the Hebrew. Whereas the Hebrew text follows something of a chiastic pattern between 13:4c and 13:5b—יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת מְפַקֵּד and יְהוָה . . . בָּאִים וּכְלֵי זַעְמוֹ—Greek Isaiah exhibits a paneled parallelism:

A [13:4c]	κύριος	A′ [13:5b]	κύριος
B [13:4c]	ἔθνει ὁπλαμάχῳ	B′ [13:5b]	οἱ ὁπλαμάχοι
C [13:5a]	ἔρχεσθαι	C′ [13:5b]	τοῦ καταφθεῖραι

It is unlikely that the translator read בָּאִים at 13:5a as an infinitive in parallel with לְחַבֵּל at 13:5b. And so, we should understand his use of the Greek infinitive ἔρχεσθαι to be stylistically motivated. This stylistic concern expresses itself in the translator's penchant for symmetry and repetition as the example of parallelism above demonstrates. And within this paneled parallelism, the translator seems to have employed the rhetorical feature of *mesodiplosis* to the rare term ὁπλαμάχος.[46] The translator of Greek Isaiah altered the syntactical arrangement of his Hebrew text by condensing the syntactic features of 13:4c-13:5b from two clauses into one. And paneled parallelism structured around the pattern *κύριος* + *ὁπλομάχος* + *infinitive* constitutes the resultant work.[47]

This example from Isa 13:4-5 illustrates the translator's syntactic reworking of his Hebrew material in order to produce a stylistically symmetrical text. To do this, the translator condensed and expanded Hebrew phrases, employed terminology unique within the Septuagint,

---

with כְּלֵי in 13:5.

[46]See Dhont (2018), 191-94: "repetition of a word at least one of which occurs in the middle of the colon."

[47]The Hebrew syntax of verse 5 renders the participial predicate in 13:5a (בָּאִים) while the subject of the clause occurs in 13:5b (יְהוָה וּכְלֵי זַעְמוֹ). The Greek text differs from this layout since יְהוָה / κύριος in 4c corresponds with יְהוָה / κύριος in 5b, the second instance being appositional to the first. In light of this appositional relationship, both nominative phrases function as the 'subject' of the predication in verse 4: מְפַקֵּד / ἐντέλλω.

and rearranged the syntax of his Hebrew text in order to create a more balanced presentation for his Greek readers.

Example 5: Isaiah 13:8

The translator's rendering of Isa 13:8 is less complex than examples 2 through 4. But the Hebrew-to-Greek differences and stylistic features still require explanation. This verse describes the recipients upon whom the day of Yhwh comes, a militaristic clash where one party thoroughly terrifies the other. Here, the translator reorganized the syntactical layout of the Hebrew and supplied several lexical pluses which functioned as interpretive glosses:

13:8a	וְנִבְהָלוּ	καὶ ταραχθήσονται οἱ πρέσβεις,
	And they will be dismayed;	*And the elders will be terrified*
13:8b	צִירִים וַחֲבָלִים יֹאחֵזוּן	καὶ ὠδῖνες αὐτοὺς ἕξουσιν
	pangs and agony shall seize them;	*and pangs will have them*
13:8c	כַּיּוֹלֵדָה יְחִילוּן	ὡς γυναικὸς τικτούσης·
	they shall writhe as a laboring woman;	*like a woman who gives birth;*
13:8d	אִישׁ אֶל־רֵעֵהוּ יִתְמָהוּ	καὶ συμφοράσουσιν ἕτερος πρὸς τὸν ἕτερον καὶ ἐκστήσονται,
	they shall be astounded, each with his neighbor;	*and they will wail, one to the other; and they will be amazed*
13:8e	פְּנֵי לְהָבִים פְּנֵיהֶם	καὶ τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτῶν ὡς φλὸξ μεταβαλοῦσιν.
	their faces shall be aflame.	*and they will change their face as a flame.*

In all likelihood, the Hebrew text of 13:8 requires the syntactical order as it is presented above. The grammatical subject of בהל in 13:8a is elided from the previous verse and both צִיר and חֶבֶל function as modifiers to the verb אחז in 13:8b.[48] Nevertheless, the translator conceived of these clauses differently by linking the initial noun צִיר 'pang' in 13:8b with the initial verb בהל 'to be dismayed' from 13:8a.[49] The Hebrew meaning of צִיר corresponded with the semantics of 'pangs'

[48]The verb בהל is never associated with childbirth pangs in the Hebrew Bible. And we also have inner-Isaianic associations of צִיר and אחז at 21:3: צִירִים אֶחָזוּנִי כְּצִירֵי יוֹלֵדָה rendered as καὶ ὠδῖνες ἔλαβόν με ὡς τὴν τίκτουσαν.

[49]It is well known that Septuagint translators often understood בהל in light of Aramaic semantics 'to be in haste.' As such they typically employed the verb σπουδάζω as we see at Isa 21:3 and Job 23:16. However, the translator of Greek Isaiah seems to have accurately transmitted the Hebrew semantics of this verb, either legitimately or by guesswork. It is possible that the translator was aware of both meanings even though only one of them was of Hebrew origin. If this is the case, the translator would have understood בהל 'to terrify' and בהל 'to be

at Isa 21:3 (e.g., ὠδῖν). But the translator also employed the term πρέσβυς ‘elder’ for the imperative צוּרִי at Isa 23:2.[50] This latter rendering can be explained by appealing to the homonym צִיר ‘messenger.’ And this seems to be how the translator rendered צִירִים not only at Isa 13:8 but also at Isa 57:9.[51] Theodotion also evidences this understanding with his choice of περίοχαι ‘the superiors.’ The translator accurately rendered חֵבֶל with ὠδίν, supplied the lexical plus αὐτούς to represent the implied grammatical object of אחז, and employed the future form of ἔχω for אחז. Further, the translator’s syntactical decision to read חֲבָלִים as the AGENT of the verb אחז accords with other pairings of these terms in the Hebrew Bible.[52] This evidence suggests that the translator was aware of the nuances in his Hebrew text and intentionally organized his translation in light of these features.

The translator concluded his arrangement of the Hebrew by rendering the prepositional phrase כַּיּוֹלֵדָה with the expanded Greek phrase ὡς γυναικὸς τικτούσης.[53] Whereas ὡς corresponds with the Hebrew preposition כְּ, and the participle יוֹלֵדָה matches the Greek participle τικτούσης, the translator supplied the lexical plus γυναικός. This pairing could function either as an attributive phrase or as a genitive absolute. This would diverge from the substantive meaning of this term in the Hebrew. Mirjam van der Vorm-Croughs also recognizes this feature and classifies it under the category of explication by the addition of a pleonastic noun.[54] I agree

---

in haste’ as homonyms of one another when in reality they shared unrelated linguistic origins. For a discussion of these features, see Joosten (2012), 25-36; Byun (2017); Loiseau (2016), esp. 69-71.

[50]In all likelihood, the translator read this latter term as II צִיר ‘messenger, envoy’ instead of as the noun III צִיר ‘pangs spasm’ or the verb I. צור ‘to lay siege’.

[51]See HALOT, 1015, 1024: ; I. צור ‘to lay siege’; II צִיר ‘messenger, envoy’; III צִיר ‘pangs spasm’. See Isa 13:8; 21:2; 57:9; 63:9. Isaiah 57:9 contains the phrase וַתְּשַׁלְּחִי צִירַיִךְ עַד־מֶרָחֹק rendered as καὶ ἀπέστειλας πρέσβεις ὑπὲρ τὰ ὅριά σου. Interestingly, each of these readings is lexically permissible. The question is whether they are semantically and exegetically appropriate. The consonantal differences between these nominal and verbals forms makes the semantic disparity understandable. See the brief discussion in Tov (2015), 87. Also Karrer and Kraus (2001), 2538: “*Der Übersetzer deutet* צירים *»Krämpfe« von* ציר *II. »Bote« (vgl. 18,2; 57,9) her und verknüpft das Wort mit dem voranstellenden Verb (diff. MT)*.”

[52]See Jer 13:21 הֲלוֹא חֲבָלִים יֹאחֶזוּךְ כְּמוֹ אֵשֶׁת לֵדָה and Jer 49:24 צָרָה וַחֲבָלִים אֲחָזַתָּה כַּיּוֹלֵדָה.

[53]The translator understood יְחִילוּן to introduce the following clause. This deviates from the Masoretic presentation. Nonetheless, the use of συμφοράζω ‘to wail’ illustrates the translator’s understanding of this verb.

[54]Van der Vorm-Croughs (2014), 59: “A peculiar detail of the translation style of LXX Isaiah is that Hebrew nouns—usually substantivated adjectives—are regularly represented by a semantically related *adjective* (or

with this assessment since the translator seems to have clarified what may have been perceived to be absent in the Hebrew text.

Following the addition of καί to this phrase, the translator began a new clause by pairing יְחִילוּן with συμφοράσουσιν.[55] And instead of the typical Septuagintal rendering of distributive אִישׁ with ἕκαστος, the translator chose to employ the less common ἕτερος.[56] The translator also supplied this same term for the semantically distinct term רֵעַ 'neighbor.' This captured the force of the Hebrew idiom 'a man to his neighbor' more clearly for Greek readers as 'one to another.' And since the translator organized the clause structure of his Hebrew text as described above, he was left with a verb dangling at the end of this phrase: תמה. In lieu of this, he supplied an additional καί and rendered the verb יִתְמָהוּ as ἐκστήσονται, which functions as its own independent clause.

The verb συμφοράζω in 13:8d should be discussed in brief due to its status as a *hapax legomenon* in the Septuagint. In context, this term develops a portrait of Babylonian turmoil, situated among a diverse series of Hebrew terms. By supplying different Greek lexemes for each Hebrew term in this apocalyptic tableau, the translator mirrored the Hebrew text's semantic contours. In sum, lexical repetition is lacking.[57] But in this variegated lexical list, the translator paired the rare term συμφοράζω 'to wail' with the Hebrew חיל 'to be in labor, writhe.'[58]

---

as a participle used as an adjective) plus an explicating, pleonastic *noun*. Although, strictly speaking, these nouns cannot be qualified as 'pluses'—as they actually form part of a translation at phrase level—these cases are still noteworthy enough to mention here." Interestingly, the translator did not explicate his text at Isa 23:1—צִירִים אֲחָזוּנִי כְּצִירֵי יוֹלֵדָה rendered as καὶ ὠδῖνες ἔλαβόν με ὡς τὴν τίκτουσαν—and at Isa 42:14—כַּיּוֹלֵדָה אֶפְעֶה rendered as ἐκαρτέρησα ὡς ἡ τίκτουσα.

[55]See the similar observation in Karrer and Kraus (2011), 1242: "*Im MT gehört das Verb zum voranstehenden Satz*."

[56]Concerning reciprocation, see Lee (2018), 218-22: "Greek has its own resources . . . the wonderful antique idiom ἕτερος τῷ ἑτέρῳ, with variations of case, etc." See also Silva (2007), 824.

[57]הֵילִילוּ as ὀλολύζετε; תִּרָפֶינָה as ἐκλυθήσεται; יִמַּס as δειλιάσει; וְנִבְהָלוּ as ταραχθήσονται; יֹאחֲזוּן > ἕξουσιν; יְחִילוּן as συμφοράσουσιν; יִתְמָהוּ as ἐκστήσονται.

[58]A range of lexicons gloss συμφοράζω similarly: LSJ, 1688 'bewail'; BrillDAG, 2014 'to lament'; GELS, 649 'to bewail'; LEH, 584 'to wail'; also Penner (2020), 513; συμφοράζω is a rare word, meaning bewail." The translator seems to have rendered חיל with a synecdoche. To bewail accompanies and conveys labor pains as a part of the whole.

However, apart from adding stylistic color to his translation, the translator's rationale for selecting this verb is not apparent.[59] The term συμφοράζω occurs only here in the Septuagint corpus and features infrequently in contemporary Greek literature.[60] Therefore, to elaborate upon Greek Isaiah's use of this term we should examine issues pertaining to etymology, literary register, and style.[61]

First of all, this verb's etymology is not apparent given extant lexicographical data. Presumably συμφοράζω 'lament, wail' would be semantically related to the noun συμφορά, glossed positively as 'event, circumstance' and negatively as 'mishap, misfortune.'[62] But this nominal lexeme lacks any straightforward semantic overlap with συμφοράζω. And lexicons instead relate the noun to συμφέρω 'to bring together.'[63] The Greek noun φορά 'impulse, passion' also seems to have an etymological connection to συμφοράζω as well. But again, semantic overlap between the verb and noun is not evident.[64] And when textual examples are reviewed, ideas of lamentation and wailing are also absent.[65]

---

[59]The most common words in the LXX within the semantic domain of 'weeping,' 'crying,' or 'groaning' are κλαίω and πενθέω. For a full listing, see Louw and Nida (1989), 304ff. Other Greek examples in the LXX from most to least frequent are listed here: θρηνέω, στενάζω, ὀλολύζω, ἀλαλύζω, δακρύω.

[60]LSJ, BrillDAG, and TLG record 12 occurrences in 6 different works: Orphica, *Fragmenta* 49.52; Demetrius, *Formae Epistolicae* 5.7; Philodemus, *On Death* 25.37; Crates Thebanus, *Epistulae* 26.10; Diogenis Sinopensis, *Epistulae* 39.1; Pseudo-Callisthenes' *Historia Alexandri Magni* γ.32.5; γ.19.43; 1.24.11; 1.32.4; 1.41.8; 2.15.11; 3.19.8. It is possible that the gloss 'to wail' for συμφοράζω is not the most accurate. Contextual parallels in Philodemus' *On Death* between μάταιος, κακοπαθ[ε]ία, and συμφοράζω may aid in redefining the verb in line with morphologically similar terms: συμφορά and φορά. See the etymological discussion below.

[61]Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion together employ the ὠδίνω for תמה, perhaps on account of the difficult or unknown meaning of συμφοράζω in this context.

[62]LSJ, 1688; BrillDAG, 2013; LEH, 584; GELS, 649. See Septuagint instances of συμφορά in Esth 16:5; 2 Macc 6:12, 16; 9:6; 14:14, 40; 4 Macc 3:21; Wis 14:21; 18:21. Examples from the Septuagint are globally negative. For some clarification about these semantic distinctions, see Verrall (1888).

[63]See LSJ, 1688; BrillDAG, 2013; GELS, 649; LEH, 584.

[64]See BrillDAG, 2300: "of pers. *force*, *impulse*, *passion*, *ardor*; irrational impulse; the force of madness; interest in something; full of force."

[65]See Plutarch, *Themistocles* 2.1: Ἔτι δὲ παῖς ὢν ὁμολογεῖται φορᾶς μεστὸς εἶναι, καὶ τῇ μὲν συνετός, τῇ δὲ προαιρέσει μεγαλοπράγμων καὶ πολιτικός. See a 2nd century C.E. example from the *Epistle to Diognetus* 9.1: μέχρι μὲν τοῦ πρόσθεν χρόνου εἴασεν ἡμᾶς ὡς ἐβουλόμεθα ἀτάκτοις φοραῖς φέρεσθαι, ἡδοναῖς καὶ ἐπιθυμίαις ἀπαγομένους. Note the parallel between φόρα and ἐπιθυμία.

Second, since some non-Septuagintal instances of συμφοράζω occur in literary texts, use of this verb in Greek Isaiah may signal the translator's concern for a higher literary register. This feature would correspond with other literary patterns in Greek Isaiah: poetic vocabulary, rare terminology, classical idiom, etc.[66] However, the small sample set of lexical evidence outside Greek Isaiah renders a definitive position on this matter a *desideratum*. Nonetheless, occurrences of συμφοράζω in the literary texts cited above do not exclude the possibility of a higher literary register. The lack of evidence simply demands suspended judgment in the matter.

Last of all, even though both the etymological and literary details of this verb are uncertain, the translator's use of συμφοράζω to create stylistic color is evident in verse 8.[67] This is suggested not only by the varied terminology in Isa 13:8, but also by the translator's deviation from his otherwise uniform rendering of חיל elsewhere in his work. Greek Isaiah always pairs חיל with ὠδίνω 'to have birth pains' or with ὠδίν 'pains of childbirth.'[68] This demonstrates the translator of Greek Isaiah's semantic knowledge of חיל. But given his pairing of ὠδίν with אחז earlier in the verse, these lexical differences illustrate the translator's concern for a stylistic variation in his work even when repetition was a viable option.[69]

In sum, the verb συμφοράζω features in several ancient Greek literary texts, but is also patently rare. We must note in addition that its etymological status is vague, it is difficult to pin down its exact literary register, and even its meaning is somewhat elusive. However, it seems clear that the translator of Greek Isaiah employed this term to convey a variegated lexical portrait which represented the diverse vocabulary of his Hebrew text. Thus, the verb συμφοράζω in Isa 13:8 contributes to the overall stylistic presentation which often characterizes the translator's

[66]See the examples in Lee (2014), 140-44.

[67]Regretfully, the Brill Etymological Dictionary of Greek does not explicitly treat this term.

[68]See Isa 23:4; 23:5; 26:17; 26:18; 45:10; 51:2; 54:1; 66:7; 66:8^{x2}. The revisers eploy the term ὠδίνω for חיל at 13:8. They may have either disagreed with the rendering συμφοράζω, or were unaware of its meaning.

[69]The pairing between אחז and ὠδίνω corresponds with the other Babylon oracle at Isa 21:3, where the translator supplied the nominal form ὠδιν for the same Hebrew term. On the viability of repetition in Greek Isaiah, see the threefold use of τέκνον in Isa 13:16-18.

work. This example further illustrates how the translator of Greek Isaiah intentionally shaped his translation to preserve the Hebrew text in a semantically and stylistically appropriate way.

The remainder of Isa 13:8 contains two additional elements and a change in word order. The clause initial καί is a plus to the Hebrew text. And the verbal plus at the end of the verse—μεταβάλλω—compensates for the lack of an explicit verb in the Hebrew text. However, instead of supplying ἔσται to represent the semantics of the Hebrew verbless clause, the translator supplied this additional verb in order to explicate the Hebrew semantics. The translation is 'literal,' but not at the level of the lexeme. It is 'literal' with reference to the phrase.

The transposition of lexemes in the phrase פְּנֵי לְהָבִים פְּנֵיהֶם into τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτῶν ὡς φλόξ constitutes the final point of Isa 13:8 to consider. The initial element of the Greek phrase—'their appearance'—captured the final element of the Hebrew: 'their faces.' This phrase functions as the THEME of the lexical plus μεταβάλλω.[70] And the translator rendered the predicate פְּנֵי לְהָבִים simply as a comparative phrase: ὡς φλόξ.[71] Again, while this rendering does not mirror the lexemes of the Hebrew text, it captures the semantics of this idiom.[72]

Example 6: Isaiah 13:9

Greek Isa 13:9 contains several examples illustrating the translator's concern to create a stylistic and symmetrical rendering of his Hebrew text. At verse 9, the Hebrew text re-introduces the theme of the 'day of Yhwh' and describes it as a destructive day of wrath. And the translator captures each of these elements in his transformation of the phrase:

13:9a	הִנֵּה יוֹם־יְהוָה בָּא אַכְזָרִי וְעֶבְרָה וַחֲרוֹן אָף	ἰδοὺ γὰρ ἡμέρα κυρίου ἀνίατος ἔρχεται θυμοῦ καὶ ὀργῆς
	Behold! The day of Yhwh is coming,	*For behold, an incurable day of the Lord is coming,*

[70]For a different perspective, see Ottley (1906), 173: "μεταβαλοῦσιν] Probably taking 'faces' as a verb, פנה sometimes meaning 'change,' remove . . ."As a counter, this interpretation is attested neither in Greek Isaiah nor in the remaining books of the LXX. See also Ziegler (1934), 141: "*Der Übersetzer las hier aus* פני *das Verbum* פָּנוּ *heraus*." Ziegler's proposal here is difficult to maintain for two reasons. First, the verb פנה never pairs with lexemes of the βαλ- stem in Greek Isaiah. Second, this pattern never occurs in the LXX corpus. Note the repetition in Theodotion: προσωπον φλογος το προσωπον αυτων. Theodotion omits the verbal plus μεταβάλλω.

[71]HALOT, 520 glosses this phrase as 'faces aflame, flushing'.

[72]The phrase ὡς φλόξ may correspond as a syntactic parallel with ὡς γυναικὸς τικτύσης in 13:8c since the explicit pairing of כְּ / ὡς is present only in the latter example.

	a cruel day, a day of wrath, and a day of burning anger,	*a day of anger and wrath*
13:9b	לָשׂוּם הָאָרֶץ לְשַׁמָּה	θεῖναι τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην ἔρημον
	in order to set the earth as a desolation;	*to set the whole inhabited world as a desert*
13:9c	וְחַטָּאֶיהָ יַשְׁמִיד מִמֶּנָּה׃	καὶ τοὺς ἁμαρτωλοὺς ἀπολέσαι ἐξ αὐτῆς.
	and he shall destroy its sinners from it.	*and to destroy sinners from it.*

The first point of stylistic transformation occurs in the shift of word order in 13:9a. Following the participle בָּא, the Hebrew text contains a string of adjectival and nominal complements: אַכְזָרִי וְעֶבְרָה וַחֲרוֹן אָף. Each of these terms in some way modifies the previous mention of the 'day of Yhwh.'[73] The Greek text also contains a string of terms which modify 'the day of the Lord,' but the translator altered the word order with an interesting effect.[74]

Whereas the Hebrew text contains each 'day of Yhwh' modifier after the participle, the translator placed the אַכְזָרִי / ἀνίατος pairing before the predicate בָּא / ἔρχεται. This shift in word order impacts the meaning of the Greek text in two significant ways. First, if ἀνίατος were placed after ἔρχεται, the adjective could have been read read attributively, substantively, or appositionally. But the proximity of ἀνίατος and ἡμέρα requires the former to modify the latter attributively: 'the incurable day of the Lord.' Second, the post-verbal string of genitives—θυμοῦ καὶ ὀργῆς—must now modify the pre-verbal noun ἡμέρα. The post-verbal placement of ἀνίατος could have demanded a substantive meaning modified by the two genitive nouns. But the translator's decision to shift the word order of the Hebrew text solidified the meaning of this phrase. In effect, the translator's stylistic decision to alter the word order of the Hebrew text

[73]I prefer the English translation in the example above, but commentators exhibit several different renderings. Gray (1949), 235: "Behold the day of Yahweh cometh, cruel with wrath and heat of anger." Gray notes: אכזרי is best taken as in apposition. to יהוה ים and ועברה as a case of *waw concomitantiae*"; Watts (2005), 192: "Behold the day of Yhwh (is) coming, cruel, overflowing, burning anger"; Oswalt (1986), 303: "Behold the day of the Lord comes, pitiless and overflowing with wrath"; Roberts (2015), 194: "Behold the day of Yahweh is coming, cruel, with wrath and burning anger"; Alter (2018), 664: "The LORD's day comes, ruthlessly, anger and smoldering wrath." Silva (2007), 834 understands the phrase similarly to me. See also the discussion in Penner (2020), 532.

[74]Some manuscripts do not preserve the word order contained in Ziegler's edition and are in line with the reading of the Hebrew text. See the Göttingen 1st apparatus: ἀνίατος ἔρχ. Ir.[lat] Tyc. Spec. Or.[lat] XI 101] tr. *O′′ L′′`*-46 *C* 239′ 403′ 449′ 534 Bas. Chr. Tht. Cypr. = 𝔐; om. ἀν Eus. Theodotion captures the threefold list of the Hebrew with μηνιδος και οργης και θυμου. The first term in the list μηνις occurs only twice in the Septuagint and is typical of a high literary register. See Aitken (2011), 95-126, esp. 119.

produced a clearer reading in the Greek than would have been possible if he had followed the order of his source text.

The second point concerns the double use of infinitives in the translation of 13:9b-c. The first infinitive θεῖναι in 13:9b has a morphological counterpart in the Hebrew text: לָשׂוּם. But the second infinitive ἀπολέσαι in 13:9c pairs with the *Hiph'il* finite verb יַשְׁמִיד. In line with patterned repetition seen elsewhere in Greek Isaiah, especially with infinitives (cf. 13:14), along with the translator's tendency to create symmetrical renderings of his Hebrew text, this double infinitive fits into the category of repetitive renderings. In sum, the translator created a clearer reading at verse 9a and he organized the remaining material around a morphologically repetitive pattern with infinitives. His concern for presenting the text stylistically goes hand in hand with his desire to explicate it accurately.

Example 7: Isaiah 13:10

Isaiah 13:10 unfolds the socio-political ramifications of the day of Yhwh's encounter with Babylon. The destruction of the land and its people mentioned in verse 9 is portrayed in cosmic perspective in verse 10. The heavenly host no longer shine, the sun is darkened, and the moon is no longer radiant:[75]

13:10a	כִּי־כוֹכְבֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם וּכְסִילֵיהֶם לֹא יָהֵלּוּ אוֹרָם *For the stars of the heavens and their constellations shall not shine their light;*	οἱ γὰρ ἀστέρες τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ Ὡρίων καὶ πᾶς ὁ κόσμος τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τὸ φῶς οὐ δώσουσι, *For the stars of heaven and Orion and all the ornament of heaven will not give light,*
13:10b	חָשַׁךְ הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ בְּצֵאתוֹ *the sun has darkened in its going out,*	καὶ σκοτισθήσεται τοῦ ἡλίου ἀνατέλλοντος, *and it will be darkened when the sun rises,*
13:10c	וְיָרֵחַ לֹא־יַגִּיהַ אוֹרוֹ׃ *and the moon shall not shine its light.*	καὶ ἡ σελήνη οὐ δώσει τὸ φῶς αὐτῆς. *and the moon will not give its light.*

The translator of Greek Isaiah picks up on each of these features of the Hebrew text with several, lexical, structural, and stylistic transformations. The most explicit of these occurs at 13:10a,

[75]On the characteristics of 'apocalyptic' literature, see Collins (1979): 1-20; Wright (1992), 280-98; Beale (1999), 37-43.

where the translator expanded the twofold referent of the Hebrew phrase into a threefold Greek referent.

Locating precise pairings between the Hebrew and Greek phrases in 13:10a is straightforward. But the origins of the Hebrew-to-Greek shifts are not entirely clear. This is evident in the following layout:

13:10a.i	כִּי־כוֹכְבֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם	οἱ γὰρ ἀστέρες τοῦ οὐρανοῦ
13:10a.ii	וּכְסִילֵיהֶם	καὶ Ὡρίων καὶ πᾶς ὁ κόσμος τοῦ οὐρανοῦ

The first phrase, labelled 13:10a.i, corresponds almost verbatim when comparing the Hebrew and the Greek. The only differences occur with the post-positive γάρ where the Hebrew has a line-initial כִּי. Additionally, the Greek contains the genitive singular τοῦ οὐρανοῦ where the Hebrew has the standard plural הַשָּׁמַיִם.[76] These renderings constitute standard Greek stylistic practice. But the following line is much more stylistically interesting.

As the examples above illustrate, the phrase at 13:10a.ii contains the sole Hebrew term כְּסִיל with an added pronominal suffix. But this single lexeme is paired with two distinct Greek terms: Ὡρίων and the phrase initiated by ὁ κόσμος. While one of these Greek items may be considered a repetitive or double rendering, I think it is more plausible to see this expanded phrase as an explication of the meaning of כְּסִילֵיהֶם. The Greek translator has not really added extra semantic material. Instead, he has explicated and developed a concept latent in the Hebrew with additional lexemes.[77]

As standard Hebrew lexicons note, the meaning of כְּסִיל refers to the constellation Orion.[78] This is precisely how Greek Isaiah renders the term in the example above. And this

[76]The book of Isaiah contains 32 instances of שָׁמַיִם. Apart from 2 occurrences, the translator of Greek Isaiah renders every instance of this term with the singular οὐρανός. See Isa 44:23 and 49:13 for instances of the plural οὐρανοί.

[77]Van der Vorm-Croughs (2014), 147, categorizes this example under the descriptive label ‘Double Translation’. Regarding 13:10, she states: “καὶ πᾶς ὁ κόσμος τοῦ οὐρανοῦ may have been supplemented to ὁ Ὡρίων in order to explain the *plural* of the Hebrew form וכסיליהם.” I arrived at my assessment independent of her, but I concur entirely. See also page 141, where she defines this as when “one segment of the Hebrew text is represented twice in a Greek translation.” Compare the shorter reading of Symmachus: τα αστρα αυτου.

[78]See HALOT, 489; BDB, 493; DCH, 4.444.

meaning is captured by at least one other Septuagint translator.[79] But as HALOT also notes, the plural form also refers to Orion and its constellations.[80] And this seems to be how the translator understood the term as he included the phrase πᾶς ὁ κόσμος τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. Since the semantic range of κόσμος in this context exceeds the simple meaning 'world, earth,'[81] here the Greek term most likely signifies something like 'organization,' 'adornment,' or 'the world of heaven.'[82] Thus, the whole Greek phrase employed here should be understood as a reference to what the sole Hebrew term signifies.

It seems then that this 'free' translation actually originated from a 'literal' rendering of the plural form of כְּסִיל. By listing out the constellations of the stars of the heavens in the phrase Ὠρίων καὶ πᾶς ὁ κόσμος τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, the translator has explicated the 'literal' meaning suggested by the Hebrew term כְּסִילֵיהֶם. This occurred even though he deviated from strict lexical pairing. Such a rendering is likely to have been motivated by the desire to explicate the implicit meaning of the Hebrew text in literary way.[83] In addition, the repetitive use of οὐρανός at the beginning and end of this phrase reinvokes the translator's pattern of lexical repetition. This constitutes another piece of stylistic motivation behind his renderings.

Further, when we consider similar renderings in the Pentateuch, it seems that the translator of Greek Isaiah created Isa 13:10 in light of other cosmologically significant passages. These are found principally in Genesis and Deuteronomy:

---

[79]See Job 38:31. The term כְּסִיל also occurs in Amos 5:8 and Job 9:9. However, the corresponding Greek in these latter passages do not contain Orion references.

[80]See HALOT, 489: "pl. 'Orions' meaning Orion and its constellations, especially Sirius, the hunter's hound."

[81]See Plato, *Timaeus*, 27a: ἀρχόμενον ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου γενέσεως; Aristotle, *On the Heavens*, 274a.27: ὁ περὶ ἡμᾶς κόσμος; ibid. 296a.33: ἡ δέ γε τοῦ κόσμου τάξις ἀΐδιός ἐστιν. LSJ, 985 and BrillDAG, 1165 note that the meaning 'world' as human habitation begins with New Testament literature. However, the books of 2 Maccabees and the Wisdom of Solomon contain several occurrences of κόσμος which may convey the sense of 'world' as human habitation. See 2 Macc 3:12; 8:18; Wis 2:24; 6:24; 9:3; 10:1; 13:2; 14:6; 16:17. See κόσμος 1.b in GELS, 409: "*the created world* 'most likely focused on humans,' 2M 3.12."

[82]Ottley (1904-6), 173: "κόσμος is properly the orderly array of the heavenly bodies." On the meaning of κόσμος in Gen 2:1, see Harl (1994), 98: "*l'universe lui-même*"; Wevers, (1993), 20: "order, good order, . . . arrangement."

[83]See Ottley (1904-6), 173: "Not in Heb.: probably a duplicate rendering or an explanation of *Chesilim*."

Gen 2:1 וַיְכֻלּוּ הַשָּׁמַיִם וְהָאָרֶץ וְכָל־צְבָאָם׃

καὶ συνετελέσθησαν ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ καὶ πᾶς ὁ κόσμος αὐτῶν.

Deut 4:19[84] וְרָאִיתָ אֶת־הַשָּׁמַשׁ וְאֶת־הַיָּרֵחַ וְאֶת־הַכּוֹכָבִים כֹּל צְבָא הַשָּׁמָיִם

καὶ ἰδὼν τὸν ἥλιον καὶ τὴν σελήνην καὶ τοὺς ἀστέρας καὶ πάντα τὸν κόσμον τοῦ οὐρανοῦ

Deut 17:3 וְלַשָּׁמֶשׁ אוֹ לַיָּרֵחַ אוֹ לְכָל־צְבָא הַשָּׁמַיִם אֲשֶׁר־צִוִּיתִי׃

τῷ ἡλίῳ ἢ τῇ σελήνῃ ἢ παντὶ τῶν ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ἃ οὐ προσέταξα.

In each of these examples, the phrase πᾶς ὁ κόσμος is in some way connected to the term ὁ οὐρανός. This takes place either in the immediate context as we see in Gen 2:1, or in a genitive construction as it occurs in the examples from Deuteronomy.[85] But even more significant than this is the way the Greek phrase is connected to the host of heaven (e.g., כָּל־צְבָא).

If the translator of Greek Isaiah made the literary and intertextual connection between πᾶς ὁ κόσμος τοῦ οὐρανοῦ in 13:10 and the passages from the Pentateuch, it seems very likely that the rationale for this move came from its connection with the heavenly host. This seems to have occurred even though the idea was absent from the Hebrew text of Isaiah.[86] This is significant because this 'host' terminology clearly refers to the stars in the Pentateuchal and prophetic contexts. Thus, it seems that the translator was motivated to expand the term כְּסִילֵיהֶם as he did, first of all because of its plural morphology, but also because it was obviously connected to the heavenly host. And this term for 'host' is rendered in similar passages as πᾶς ὁ κόσμος.[87] The translator complemented the cosmological picture of his source text by

---

[84]Interestingly, Deut 4:19 shares all the same cosmological terminology as Isa 13:10 in the Greek, but not in the Hebrew. It may be that the translator of Greek Isaiah was specifically motivated by Deut 4:19. In fact, LXX Deut 4:19 and Greek Isa 13:10 are the only places in the Septuagint where these phrases occur together.

[85]In addition to Isa 13:10 and Isa 24:21, the passages in these examples contain the only instances of κόσμος and οὐρανός together in the whole of the Septuagint. See Van der Vorm-Croughs (2014), 361: "וכסיליהם seems to have been rendered by both ὁ Ὡρίων and καὶ πᾶς ὁ κόσμος τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. The latter rendering might be based upon Gen 2:1. Also that verse speaks of 'all the ornament' of heaven. . . . Another option, proposed by Ziegler, is that the extra words have entered Isa 13:10 from Isa 24:21, although there the word כל / πᾶς is missing." For this latter option she makes reference to Ziegler (1934), 64.

[86]Ziegler (1934), 117, also considered the importance of this influence from the Pentateuch.

[87]Another 'apocalyptic' passage in the book of Isaiah renders this terminology in a similar way to Isa 13:10. It also corresponds to the linguistic patterns just mentioned from Genesis and Deuteronomy. See Isa 24:21 וְהָיָה בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא יִפְקֹד יְהוָה עַל־צְבָא הַמָּרוֹם בַּמָּרוֹם וְעַל־מַלְכֵי הָאֲדָמָה עַל־הָאֲדָמָה׃ rendered as καὶ ἐπάξει ὁ θεὸς ἐπὶ τὸν κόσμον τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τὴν χεῖρα καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς. Although the research and position in this section are my own, my proposal ends up being very similar to that found in Cunha (2014), 153.

transforming his Hebrew material in light of the presentation of cosmological features from Genesis and Deuteronomy. And this intertextual connection arose in order to explicate the overall sense of the Hebrew text in light of a larger canonical reading.

The second point of stylistic significance concerns the translator's rendering of Isa 13:10b. The Hebrew text contains a finite verb, followed by an articular noun, which is then modified by an infinitive construct signifying temporality. The Greek text, however, alters the syntax of this arrangement, and results in a phrase with a highly stylized portrayal of the Hebrew.

13:10b חָשַׁךְ הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ בְּצֵאתוֹ καὶ σκοτισθήσεται τοῦ ἡλίου ἀνατέλλοντος,

The translator rendered the Hebrew finite verb in a semantically appropriate way given the context. But he also altered the articular noun and the infinitive with much more Greek stylistic import. Even though he retained the article of the noun, he rendered it in the genitive case. And instead of supplying a temporal infinitive phrase, he captured the Hebrew infinitive with a Greek participle also in the genitive case.[88] This translation produced a genitive absolute which accurately captured the semantics of the Hebrew phrase but in a stylized Greek idiom. The verbal THEME of the Greek could either refer to the cosmos of the previous clause or to the rising sun in the genitive absolute phrase.[89] However, given the principle that grammatical subjects of genitive absolutes remain distinct from the subjects of the main clause, the former reading is preferable. Even though the translator deviated from the 'literal' rendering of Hebrew lexemes, he nonetheless produced a semantically 'literal' rendering of the source text for his Greek audience in a stylistic way.[90]

The final point of translational style is seen when examining features present in Isa 13:10a and 13:10c. Like the previous repetition of οὐρανός discussed above, here we see how the

[88]The use of the articular infinitive preceded by a preposition was a valid syntactical and translation option: *ἐν τῷ ἀνατελεῖν αὐτόν. Jonah 4:8 contains an example of this translation difference: וַיְהִי כְּזָרַח הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ rendered as καὶ ἐγένετο ἅμα τῷ ἀνατεῖλαι τὸν ἥλιον. The translator would have been familiar with this temporal pattern. So, the rendering here suggests stylistic intentionality on his part.

[89]For the recurrent use of the genitive absolute in the Septuagint, see Num 3:4: καὶ ἐτελεύτησεν Ναδαβ καὶ Αβιουδ ἔναντι κυρίου προσφερόντων αὐτῶν πῦρ ἀλλότριον ἔναντι κυρίου; cited in Joosten (2011), 13.

[90]This contrasts the more 'literal' renderings of Symmachus and Theodotion: ο ηλιος εν τη εξοδω αυτου.

translator arranged his text with a view to its symmetrical presentation through repetition. These features occur in the first and final clauses of our verse:

13:10a	כִּי־כוֹכְבֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם לֹא יָהֵלּוּ אוֹרָם	οἱ γὰρ ἀστέρες τοῦ οὐρανοῦ . . . τὸ φῶς οὐ δώσουσι
13:10c	וְיָרֵחַ לֹא־יַגִּיהַ אוֹרוֹ׃	καὶ ἡ σελήνη οὐ δώσει τὸ φῶς αὐτῆς.

The translator twice supplied the negated verb δίδωμι and its grammatical object φῶς for two different Hebrew verbs. While the use of φῶς corresponds with the double use of אוֹר in 10a and 10c, the translator's verbal choice did not accurately pair with the semantics of either Hebrew lexeme.[91] Furthermore, this example exhibits the rhetorical technique of *mesodiplosis*, or middle repetition. Even though the Hebrew noun אוֹר 'light' occurs twice in clause-terminal position, Greek Isaiah presented this material differently. The first use of φῶς is pre-verbal while the second is clause-terminal. This rhetorical feature constitutes a departure from the Hebrew word order in a stylistic way.[92]

Apart from this example, the first verb הלל 'to shine' and the second נגה 'to gleam' are never rendered with δίδωμι in the Septuagint. Moreover, these Hebrew verbs clearly convey the semantics of radiance. But the translator seems to have neglected to transfer this meaning for some other purpose. And based on the occurrence of נגה in Isa 9:1[2] accurately paired with λάμπω 'to shine,' we must consider the double verbal deviation in 13:10 as intentional.[93] And based on the translator's patterned structural and lexical repetitions and symmetries seen elsewhere in these examples, it seems appropriate to attribute such stylistic motivations to his work here. Even though he deviated from his source text in many ways, the translator supplied the pattern δίδωμι plus φῶς in a stylistic way by creating a structurally symmetrical repetition of negation, verb, and object.

---

[91] 1QIsa[a] attests a different verbal reading from MT at 13:10a: לוא יאירו אורם.

[92] For detailed discussion of rhetorical features see Dhont (2018), 191-94, and the literature cited therein.

[93] It is possible that the translator did not understand the meaning of the root הלל behind the verb יָהֵלּוּ in 13:10a. The use of the related term הֵילֵל in 14:12 may also have given him problems. But the context(s) of each of these passages is clear enough to provide the translator with ample evidence for legitimate semantic guesswork.

Example 8: Isaiah 13:13-14

The larger section of Isa 13:12-14 contains several features pertaining to Greek Isaiah's appropriation of the Hebrew text's literary structure. But since I treat such structural features in detail in chapter 5, I restrict the present discussion to the elements of style and translation symmetry in verses 13 and 14. From this angle, these verses contain two relevant pieces of information. The first of these concerns the relative clause in 13:13d while the second relates to the translator's use of Greek infinitives in place of Hebrew finite verbs in 13:14c-d:

13:13a	עַל־כֵּן שָׁמַיִם אַרְגִּיז	ὁ γὰρ οὐρανὸς θυμωθήσεται
	Therefore, I will cause the heavens to shake	*For the heavens will be enraged*
13:13b	וְתִרְעַשׁ הָאָרֶץ מִמְּקוֹמָהּ	καὶ ἡ γῆ σεισθήσεται ἐκ τῶν θεμελίων αὐτῆς
	and the earth will be shaken from its place	*and the earth will be shaken from its foundations*
13:13c	בְּעֶבְרַת יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת	διὰ θυμὸν ὀργῆς κυρίου σαβαωθ
	at the wrath of Yhwh of armies	*because of the wrathful anger of the Lord Sabaoth,*
13:13d	וּבְיוֹם חֲרוֹן אַפּוֹ׃	τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, ᾗ ἂν ἐπέλθῃ ὁ θυμὸς αὐτοῦ.
	and on the day of his burning anger;	*at the day on which his anger shall come.*
13:14a	וְהָיָה כִּצְבִי מֻדָּח	καὶ ἔσονται οἱ καταλελειμμένοι ὡς δορκάδιον φεῦγον
	and it shall be that, like a scattered gazelle	*And those who are left shall be like a fleeing fawn*
13:14b	וּכְצֹאן וְאֵין מְקַבֵּץ	καὶ ὡς πρόβατον πλανώμενον, καὶ οὐκ ἔσται ὁ συνάγων,
	and like a flock with none who gather,	*and like a forsaken flock, and there will be none gathering*
13:14c	אִישׁ אֶל־עַמּוֹ יִפְנוּ	ὥστε ἄνθρωπον εἰς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ἀποστραφῆναι
	each shall turn to his people	*so that a man may return to his people*
13:14d	וְאִישׁ אֶל־אַרְצוֹ יָנוּסוּ׃	καὶ ἄνθρωπον εἰς τὴν χώραν αὐτοῦ διῶξαι.
	and each shall flee to his own land.	*and that a man may hasten to his own country.*

The Greek relative clause in 13:13d transformed the Hebrew bound phrase בְּיוֹם חֲרוֹן אַפּוֹ, which functioned as a singular syntactic constituent, into a Greek phrase replete with several syntactical pieces. In place of the initial temporal בְּיוֹם, the translator omitted the preposition and supplied the dative of ἡμέρα. This Greek case conveys temporal semantics by itself. The translator then broke up this string of construct nouns with the insertion of a relative pronoun. This subordination then introduced the verbal addition of the subjunctive from ἐπέρχομαι preceded by ἄν. Last of all, the translator reorganized the phrase terminal אַף with the semantic role of verbal THEME and placed it as the grammatical subject of the verb. These features from 13:13d exemplify the translator's concern to present his Hebrew source in a stylistic way for his Greek audience. The construction here follows that of Greek idiom and not of Hebrew syntax. The reordering of the lexical and syntactical material also resembles the opening of the oracle in Isa

13:1. As such, this example from 13:13d contains such lexical and stylistic adjustments which are typical of compositional Greek and exceed the boundaries of more 'literal' Septuagintal renderings.[94]

The second point of interest in this example concerns the double use of infinitives at 13:14c-d. In each of these clauses, the Hebrew text contains clause-terminal finite verbs, the semantics of which generally correspond with the Greek pairings. However, the translator's decision to introduce the final two clauses of verse 14 with the result particle ὥστε demanded a rearrangement of morphology and syntax. The resultant construction contains the common Greek pattern of accusative noun functioning as the subject of an infinitive. Like the rendering at 13:13d, the translation style here models that which occurs in typical Greek compositions. What is also of interest is the double occurrence of this feature, which resembles the translator's pattern of repetition and symmetry. While much of the Greek renderings in this passage closely mirror the Hebrew text, the translator employed several features which deviated from the source text in a stylistic yet semantically accurate way.

Example 9: Isaiah 13:16

Isaiah 13:16 announces the particulars of the ensuing Babylonian devastation, one precipitated upon its homes and inhabitants. The dramatic nature of these events from the Hebrew text were rendered with equal intensity in the first two clauses of Greek Isaiah: רטשׁ paired with ῥάσσω and שׁסס paired with προνομεύω. But the third clause introduces a semantic disparity between the verbs שׁגל and ἔχω. At first glance, it appears that the translator simply toned down the meaning of the phrase. But further analysis unveils the likelihood of a subtle literary impulse at work:

13:16a	וְעֹלְלֵיהֶם יְרֻטָּשׁוּ לְעֵינֵיהֶם	καὶ τὰ τέκνα αὐτῶν ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν ῥάξουσι
	And their infants will be dashed in pieces before their eyes;	*And they will strike their children before them,*

[94]See the comment in Ziegler (1934), 141: "*Der Übers. hat hier 13,13 wohl nach 24,18 widergegeben*." Since chapters 13 and 24 both share 'apocalyptic' imagery, Ziegler's observation supports my proposal that the translator on a deep level understood the thematic and lexical relationships between passages read them in mutually interpretive ways.

13:16b	יִשַּׁסּוּ בָּתֵּיהֶם	καὶ τὰς οἰκίας αὐτῶν προνομεύσουσι
	their houses shall be plundered;	*and they will plunder their houses,*
13:16c	וּנְשֵׁיהֶם תִּשָּׁגַלְנָה׃	καὶ τὰς γυναῖκας αὐτῶν ἕξουσιν.
	and their wives shall be ravished.	*and they will have their women.*

The Hebrew text at 13:16c contains the verb שגל, whose transitive semantics convey 'to violate, sleep with' and whose passive semantics are more graphic, signifying 'to be ravished, raped.'[95] The latter meaning is clearly present in the example from 13:16c. And so in all likelihood the translator supplied a euphemism for the graphic Hebrew description by supplying the future form of the Greek verb ἔχω.[96] However, a closer look into this rendering illustrates an additional motive behind the decision. I contend that the translator worked from a twofold perspective with this verbal phrase. His rendering was motivated by both euphemism and intertextuality.

First, when we survey occurrences of שגל in the Hebrew Bible, we discover that each instance of this verb is accompanied with the *Qere* שכב 'to lie down.'[97] In all likelihood, this reading arose in opposition to the *Kethib* from a desire to convey such violent imagery

---

[95]See Zech 14:2 וְנִלְכְּדָה הָעִיר וְנָשַׁסּוּ הַבָּתִּים וְהַנָּשִׁים תִּשָּׁגַלְנָה rendered as καὶ ἁλώσεται ἡ πόλις, καὶ διαρπαγήσονται αἱ οἰκίαι, καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες μολυνθήσονται. The surrounding clauses of this verse should be noted as they contain the same ideas and lexemes as Isaiah 13:16. DCH, 8.265; HALOT, 1415, note how, unlike the supposed denominative from שֵׁגַל 'consort, queen' or the purported 'archaic' form from גלה 'uncover,' the etymological link to Akkadian *šagālu(m)* 'to confiscate, seize' is the only connection with explanatory power. This is confirmed by the context of Isa 13:16 which concerns neither 'uncovering' nor queens and consorts, but strongly suggests sexual misconduct. The use of שגל elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible also confirms this meaning (esp. Deut 28:30). In addition the Masoretic preference of the *Qere* illustrates its impropriety. The noun שֵׁגַל is never treated in such a manner. Both occurrences of the noun occur in royal context. See Psa 45:10 states נִצָּבָה שֵׁגַל לִימִינְךָ בְּכֶתֶם אוֹפִיר 'a queen stands at your right hand in gold of Ophir'; Neh 2:6 וְהַשֵּׁגַל יוֹשֶׁבֶת אֶצְלוֹ 'the queen was sitting next to him.' For a thorough discussion, see Feigin (1926): 46-69. The conjecture of שַׁגַל for שָׁלָל in Judges 5:30 is implausible given the external versional evidence. Each ancient version mirrors the MT: Greek as σκῦλον (A) and σκῦλα (B); Aramaic as בזז; Latin as *congero*; Syriac as ܟܢܫ. Further, unlike the destructive context of Isaiah 13:16, neither instance of שֵׁגַל in the Hebrew Bible is found in a similar narrative.

[96]If the translator wished to preserve something nearer the Hebrew meaning of שגל, he could have supplied several other Greek terms: ἁρπάζω, ὑβρίζω, φθείρω, μολύνω. The verb שגל only occurs 4 times in the Hebrew Bible: Deut 28:30; Isa 13:16; Jer 3:2; Zech 14:2. Apart from Deuteronomy and Isaiah, the Septuagint translators elsewhere supplied semantically related verbs. Jeremiah 3:2 contains the verb ἐκφύρω 'to defile' and Zech 14:2 contains μολύνω 'to stain, defile'. While these Greek renderings are less explicit than the Hebrew, they preserve in part what the Hebrew text entails.

[97]The *Qere* reads ישכבנה at Deut 28:30, תשכבנה at Isa 13:16, שכבת at Jer 3:2, and תשכבנה at Zech 14:2. This pattern is also present in the Greek revisions: Aquila συγκοιτάζω 'to lie with,' Symmachus παραχράομαι 'to misuse, abuse,' Theodotion ἔχω in the future middle-passive as σχεθησοονται.

euphemistically.[98] It was a "guide against obscenity."[99] Such a tendency to euphemize also occurs in 1QIsa[a] with תשכבנה, where the scribe employed the same form attested in the *Qere* reading from Isa 13:16.[100] And the Samaritan Pentateuch at Deut 28:30 (significant in the following paragraph) also deviates from שׁגל: וְאִישׁ אַחֵר יִשְׁגָּלֶנָּה becomes ואיש אחר ישכב עמה.[101] Based on this data, lexical and semantic deviation from שׁגל constitutes a widespread and longstanding tradition of euphemism away from its obscene connotations. This is evidenced by the many circumlocutions attested in the non-Greek versions.[102] However, the semantic divergence between שׁגל and Greek Isaiah's ἔχω hardly seems euphemistic. The semantic disparity is quite pronounced. What might explain such a seemingly erroneous rendering? I think this disparity may be adequately addressed by considering the lexical and intertextual influence from the Pentateuch.

While Septuagint translators generally convey the semantics of שׁגל as 'defile' or 'pollute,' the book of Deuteronomy contains a rendering of שׁגל which is nearly identical to Greek Isaiah. And in addition to this lexical-semantic overlap, both of these passages also share contextual and thematic similarities:[103]

Deut 28:30	אִשָּׁה תְּאָרֵשׂ וְאִישׁ אַחֵר יִשְׁגָּלֶנָּה	γυναικα λήμψῃ, καὶ ἀνὴρ ἕτερος <u>ἕξει</u> αὐτήν
Isa 13:16	וּנְשֵׁיהֶם תִּשָּׁגַלְנָה	καὶ τὰς γυναῖκας αὐτῶν <u>ἕξουσιν</u>

[98]I am not alone in this suggestion. See HALOT, 1415 "It is obviously an uncouth word, for which *Q* substitutes שׁכב"; DCH, 8.265 "Perhaps considered vulgar by the Masoretes"; Gesenius, 805 "The Masorites have in every instance substituted for this verb, which they regarded as obscene"; BDB, 993 "Mass. think the verb obscene"; Jastrow, 1522 "Changed by Massorah into שׁכב." Ibn Ezra briefly comments upon it: "It is read תשכבנה by euphemism." See also Wildberger (1997), 9; Watts (2005), 194.

[99]Gordis (1937), 86.

[100]Even though 1QIsa[a] preserved the *Qere* reading תשכבנה, it is unlikely that the translator encountered this verb in his *Vorlage*. Of its roughly 200 occurrences, the Septuagint translators never pair שׁכב with ἔχω. See the brief discussion in Tov (2015), 63.

[101]The versions also present more subtle meanings than that conveyed by שׁגל here.

[102]Aramaic contains שׁכב, Latin uses *violo*, and Syriac contains ܒܥܐ. Gordis (1937), 29-39, 86 states: "Where the text reads a word which might be too coarse when read in the Synagogue, the reader is enjoined to substitute one of milder force"; "The Q substitutes a less offensive term for the word in the text."

[103]The example from Deut 28:30 occurs within the list of covenant curses. And the litany of destructive events there closely resembles what is outlined in the oracle against Babylon.

The example from Deuteronomy indicates that covenant curses follow in the wake of Israel's disobedience with the result that wives will no longer belong to their husbands. Instead, they will be seized by other men: 'you shall betroth a wife, but another man shall ravish her.' Even though semantic overlap between שׁגל and ἔχω is lacking in this example (as it is in Isa 13:16), the verbal pairing between the Hebrew and Greek at Deut 28:20 is evident. And so, the dual factor of contextual resonance alongside the combination of this pairing in Isa 13:16c strongly suggests that the translator of Greek Isaiah was influenced by Greek Deuteronomy at this point.[104]

Thus, the twofold rationale behind Greek Isaiah's rendering has good explanatory power. Since the translator evidences knowledge of שׁגל's vulgar connotations by deviating from it, he would have first sought to supply a lexeme with a more subtle meaning.[105] In search of an appropriate expression, the translator had the option of either selecting a lexeme afresh or of finding one with literary precedent. Since the meaning of שׁגל shares no obvious semantic overlap with ἔχω, we may suppose that a literary precedent motivated his decision.[106] And in light of the lexical and thematic evidence from Deut 28:30, the translator likely mirrored the lexical pairings found there. Such a distinct lexical pairing seems to have set a translation precedent for an obscene Hebrew lexeme which was in turn received and appropriated by the translator of Greek Isaiah.

In sum, the translator of Greek Isaiah read his Hebrew text in light of Deuteronomy's similar expression, and then employed the LXX rendering of the same phrase in Deut 28:30 forwards into the book of Isaiah.[107] So, his departure from the 'literal' semantics of the Hebrew

---

[104]This observation is confirmed by Karrer and Kraus (2011), 2539: "*Diese Übs. von* שׁגל (*Qr.* שׁכב) *»beschlafen« weist auf Dtn 28,30 zurück*."

[105]Such euphemistic renderings may also be ascribed to the use of ἐκφύρω in Jer 3:2 and μολύνω in Zech 14:2. But the use of ἔχω for שׁגל is further removed semantically.

[106]Apart from Deut 28:30 and Isa 13:16, the Septuagint does not employ ἔχω in the future with reference to sexual misconduct.

[107]Consider the comments by Dhont (2019): 399-400: "Aside from being a source of intertextuality for subsequent translational and compositional activity, the LXX Pentateuch also became a model for the translation of subsequent books in different ways. It set the standard for the acceptability of the use of vernacular Koine to translate the Jewish Scriptures. It provided translators with a lexicon for standard Hebrew-Greek equivalences and for specific expressions. It also represented a model in terms of the translation approach, as the translation approaches of other LXX books are often explained as a development of the Pentateuchal translation approach."

text at Isa 13:16 actually serves a stylistic role to link the oracle against Babylon to the covenant curses of Deuteronomy while also capturing the longstanding exegetical tendency to euphemize the vulgar semantics of שגל. The affect of the translator's work has deflated the uncouth usage of שגל while simultaneously conveying its connotations to readers through this literary connection with LXX Deut 28:30.

Example 10: Isaiah 13:19

The translator's rendering of Isa 13:19 contains several features pertinent to the discussion of Greek Isaiah's translation technique, style, and literary structure. Here, I discuss in particular the Greek divergences from the Hebrew text at Isa 13:19b and highlight intertextual links with another passage from Deuteronomy:

13:19a	וְהָיְתָה בָבֶל צְבִי מַמְלָכוֹת תִּפְאֶרֶת גְּאוֹן כַּשְׂדִּים *And Babylon, the splendor of the kingdoms, the majestic glory of Chaldeans, shall be*	καὶ ἔσται Βαβυλών, ἡ καλεῖται ἔνδοξος ὑπὸ βασιλέως Χαλδαίων, *And Babylon, who is called glorious by the king of the Chaldeans, shall be*
13:19b	כְּמַהְפֵּכַת אֱלֹהִים אֶת־סְדֹם וְאֶת־עֲמֹרָה׃ *as when God overturned Sodom and Gomorrah.*	ὃν τρόπον κατέστρεψεν ὁ θεὸς Σοδομα καὶ Γομορρα· *like when God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah.*

As is clear from comparing the Hebrew and Greek texts, the translation at 13:19b follows the Hebrew text in a straightforward manner. Even though the semantic and syntactic roles differ in several respects between source and target text, each Greek element corresponds at some point with an element from the Hebrew. This may be seen in the following layout:

13:19b.i	כְּמַהְפֵּכַת	ὃν τρόπον κατέστρεψεν
13:19b.ii	אֱלֹהִים	ὁ θεός
13:19b.iii	אֶת־סְדֹם	Σοδομα
13:19b.iv	וְאֶת־עֲמֹרָה	καὶ Γομορρα

The initial Hebrew bound phrase contains the most divergence into Greek. The translator expanded the preposition, construct noun, and free noun into an idiomatic comparative phrase. This then couples with a finite verb and an explicit verbal AGENT. Nonetheless, these elements follow the overall semantics and word order of the Hebrew text. And the relationship between the final two Sodom and Gomorrah references is even more 'literal' than the opening examples.

What is of greater interest is the translator's decision to render the phrase in this specific manner, especially in light of his 'free' Greek construction at Isa 13:19a. I propose here that the translator supplied this rendering based upon influence from the book of Deuteronomy. The phrase in 13:19b is remarkably similar to what occurs in Deut 29:22:

Isa 13:19b	כְּמַהְפֵּכַת אֱלֹהִים אֶת־סְדֹם וְאֶת־עֲמֹרָה׃	ὃν τρόπον κατέστρεψεν ὁ θεὸς Σοδομα καὶ Γομορρα·
Deut 29:22[23]	כְּמַהְפֵּכַת סְדֹם וַעֲמֹרָה אַדְמָה וּצְבֹיִים	ὥσπερ κατεστράφη Σόδομα καὶ Γόμορρα, Ἀδαμὰ καὶ Σεβωίμ,
	אֲשֶׁר הָפַךְ יְהוָה בְּאַפּוֹ וּבַחֲמָתוֹ׃	ἃς κατέστρεψεν κύριος ἐν θυμῷ καὶ ὀργῇ.

The connection between the Hebrew phrases is unmistakable. And especially since the term מַהְפֵּכָה occurs so seldom in the Hebrew Bible, the thematic and intertextual connection between these Sodom and Gomorrah passages in Deuteronomy and Isaiah is strong.[108] As a result of these lexical and thematic links, the translator of Greek Isaiah may have also rendered 13:19b in a way that suggests an intertextual link with the Old Greek of Deuteronomy.[109] In addition to the Isaiah translator's recognition of this phrase, other Septuagint translators seem to have recognized this Hebrew connection as well. And in turn they also appropriated similar Greek renderings into their work.[110]

Conclusion

The preceding survey of 10 examples from Greek Isaiah 13:1-22 illustrated the translator's concern to render his Hebrew text stylistically through repetition, lexical change, and intertextual allusions. The large majority of these stylistic renderings occurred through significant divergence from the Hebrew text and intentional alterations in the Greek. But as I mentioned in the introduction to this chapter, recognizing these features demands a level of methodological constraint. As I stated there, Marieke Dhont provides some helpful limits:

---

[108]See Deut 29:22; Isa 1:7; Isa 13:19; Jer 49:18; Jer 50:40; Amos 4:11.

[109]Isaiah 1:7 renders the Hebrew term similarly, though it occurs with different referents: וּשְׁמָמָה כְּמַהְפֵּכַת זָרִים as καὶ ἠρήμωται κατεστραμμένη ὑπὸ λαῶν ἀλλοτρίων.

[110]See Jer 49:18[29:19] כְּמַהְפֵּכַתסְדֹם וַעֲמֹרָה וּשְׁכֵנֶיהָ rendered as ὥσπερ κατεστράφη Σόδομα καὶ Γόμορρα καὶ αἱ πάροικοι αὐτῆς; Jer 50[27]:40 כְּמַהְפֵּכַת אֱלֹהִים אֶת־סְדֹם וְאֶת־עֲמֹרָה וְאֶת־שְׁכֵנֶיהָ rendered as καθὼς κατέστρεψεν ὁ θεὸς Σόδομα καὶ Γόμορρα καὶ τὰς ὁμορούσας αὐταῖς; Amos 4:11 הָפַכְתִּי בָכֶם כְּמַהְפֵּכַת אֱלֹהִים אֶת־סְדֹם וְאֶת־עֲמֹרָה rendered as κατέστρεψα ὑμᾶς, καθὼς κατέστρεψεν ὁ θεὸς Σοδομα καὶ Γομορρα.

> When certain features in the Greek text do not reflect a feature of the Hebrew text, we can begin to speculate about their conscious use only when the rendering deviates from the Hebrew in a way that cannot be explained by a different reading of the Hebrew, by a parent text at odds with the MT or by other aspects of the translator's technique, such as standard lexical choices.[111]

The examples I unpacked above meet these standards for evaluating a translator's stylistic intentionality. Greek Isaiah exhibits concerns for style through pairing unique Greek lexemes to the Hebrew, through the repetition of terms, and through intertextual allusions both internal and external to the book of Isaiah. I continue this exploration of stylistic features in the next chapter where I treat several examples from Isa 14:1-23 from the same perspective. These ensuing examples illustrate similar features to what was presented here. But the oracle against the king of Babylon in chapter 14 also contains several stylistic tendencies which exceed those of chapter 13.

[111]Dhont (2018), 178.

Chapter 4: Greek Isaiah 14:1-23:
Translation Technique and Style

Introduction

This chapter continues the thread begun in chapter 3 concerning the translation technique and style of Greek Isaiah. The present discussion focuses on the features of Isa 14:1-23, wherein I detail the stylistic and intertextual traits of the Greek text through an analysis of its translation technique. I have organized the material from chapter 14 into 7 examples which support the position that the translator of Greek Isaiah sought to render his Hebrew *Vorlage* in an accurate yet stylistic way. Each of the following examples illustrates this proposal from several avenues.

Translation Technique and Style in Greek Isaiah 14:1-23

Example 11: Isaiah 14:1-3

Within the canonical form of the text, Isaiah 14:1-3 functions as an interlude between the oracle against Babylon and the lament of Babylon's king. It envisions Yhwh's future restoration of Israel and the exultation of Israel over her oppressors. The Hebrew text has many significant thematic parallels and intertextual links both within the book of Isaiah and with the larger canon of the Hebrew Bible. And even though the translator's rendering of Isa 14:1-3 is largely straightforward, the translator appears to have observed and included several of these thematic and intertextual connections into his work. Even though several points of argument are required to detail all of the literary features from Isa 14:1-3, I will treat the whole of verses 1 through 3 under a single heading. We will see that many of the features in these verses are thematically related.

Isaiah 14:1—Allusions to Exodus

This first example from Isa 14:1 introduces the future restoration of both Israel to her land and the sojourner who accompanies her. I will discuss two salient points from this verse, the

first in detail and the second only in passing as it receives fuller treatment later in this section. Each of these two features has significant implications for the translator's renderings as it relates to the topic of intertextuality. I begin with the rendering of הַגֵּר in 14:1d:

14:1a	כִּי יְרַחֵם יְהוָה אֶת־יַעֲקֹב	καὶ ἐλεήσει κύριος τὸν Ιακωβ
	For, Yhwh will have compassion on Jacob;	*And the Lord will have compassion upon Jacob*
14:1b	וּבָחַר עוֹד בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל	καὶ ἐκλέξεται ἔτι τὸν Ισραηλ,
	and he will again choose Israel;	*and he will again choose Israel,*
14:1c	וְהִנִּיחָם עַל־אַדְמָתָם	καὶ ἀναπαύσονται ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς αὐτῶν,
	and he will give them rest in their land;	*and they will rest upon their land,*
14:1d	וְנִלְוָה הַגֵּר עֲלֵיהֶם	καὶ ὁ γιώρας προστεθήσεται πρὸς αὐτοὺς
	and the sojourner will be joined to them;	*and the sojourner will be added to them*
14:1e	וְנִסְפְּחוּ עַל־בֵּית יַעֲקֹב׃	καὶ προστεθήσεται πρὸς τὸν οἶκον Ιακωβ,
	and they will be attached to the house of Jacob	*and he will be added to the house of Jacob.*

The noun גֵּר 'stranger, sojourner' is common in the Hebrew Bible, occurring over 80 times. And the Greek translators almost always capture its meaning accurately with lexemes such as πάροικος 'stranger' or προσήλυτος 'sojourner.'[1] But Greek Isaiah diverges from this pattern by rendering גֵּר with the rare term γιώρας at 14:1.[2] And since this example constitutes the sole

[1]Greek Job 31:32 contains the sole instance of the Greek term ξένος 'stranger' paired with גֵּר. For thorough discussion of the relationship of גֵּר, προσήλυτος, πάροικος, and γ(ε)ιώρας, see Moffitt and Butera (2013) and Thiessen (2013). These articles demonstrate that προσήλυτος in the Septuagint means 'sojourner' and not 'proselyte.' See also Lee (2018), 15-16. This latter sense bsecomes prominent only later in the history of the Greek language, and is likely influenced by גֵּר, גִּיּוֹר, and גִּיּוֹרָא 'convert' from Aramaic and Rabbinic Hebrew. See Ottley (1906), 175. It is clear that the Greek term γ(ε)ιώρας at Exod 12:19 and Isa 14:1 transliterates the Aramaic. In fact, Moffitt and Butera state on page 170: "In cases which the meaning of גר shades into 'convert,' the translators opt for the transliterated Aramaic word γειώρας." However, identifying the precise meaning of this lexeme is difficult since the Aramaic terms above still retain the older meaning 'sojourner.' See Jastrow (1950), 236, who includes 'stranger' as a meaning for גִּיּוֹר, גִּיּוֹרָא, citing *Tg. Onq*. Exod 23:9; *b. Qam*. 42a; *b. Yoma* 47a. See also *m. Šeb*. 10:9; *m. Ḥal*. 3:6; *m. Bik*. 1:4-5, cited in Moffitt and Butera (2013). And since the contexts of Isa 14:1 and Exod 12:19 lend themselves well to the meaning 'sojourner,' I have included this in the translation above. In both passages, Aquila and Symmachus employ the term προσήλυτος. And Theodotion concurs at Isa 14:1. But it is nonetheless difficult to determine whether they understood the term to mean 'sojourner' or 'convert' since both meanings for προσήλυτος were available to the revisors at this time. As such, a definitive position on their intended meaning is difficult to determine. Lexicons differ in their approach to the semantic range of γ(ε)ιώρας. See BrillDAG, 420: 'visitor, foreigner'; LEH, 117: 'sojourner' and 'proselyte'; GELS, 132: 'resident alien.' However, NETS, LEH, *BdA*, and LXX.D never translate the term as 'proselyte' or 'convert.' Contra Seeligmann (2004), 288-289, they gloss the term either as 'sojourner' or transliterate it as 'gioras.' See also the discussion in Le Boulluec and Sandevoir (1989), 51-52; 149.

[2]In all likelihood, the term is a transliteration of the Aramaic גִּיּוֹר 'sojourner'. See Jastrow (1950), 236: גִּיּוֹר, גִּיּוֹרָא 'stranger', 'proselyte'; Sokoloff (2009), 229: גיר 'to convert'; גיורא adj. 'foreign, alien', n. 'stranger foreigner'; Byun (2017), 115-16; Loiseau (2016), 21; Joosten (2016), 246-56, esp. 249. Speaking of Aramaic

occurrence of גֵּר in the book of Isaiah, it is difficult to detect any patterns within Greek Isaiah regarding the motivation for the translator's use of γιώρας 'sojourner.'[3]

Even though the book of Isaiah lacks any explicit clue to understanding the translational motivation for γιώρας, the book of Exodus supplies a helpful point of connection. While most occurrences of גֵּר in Exodus are rendered with πάροικος or προσήλυτος, a singular occurrence in the book attests terminology similar to that seen in in Isa 14:1:

Exod 12:19 וְנִכְרְתָה הַנֶּפֶשׁ הַהִוא מֵעֲדַת יִשְׂרָאֵל בַּגֵּר וּבְאֶזְרַח הָאָרֶץ
That person shall be cut off from the congregation of Israel, whether a sojourner or native of the land.
ἐξολεθρευθήσεται ἡ ψυχὴ ἐκείνη ἐκ συναγωγῆς Ἰσραήλ,
ἔν τε τοῖς γιώραις καὶ αὐτόχθοσιν τῆς τῆς·
That life shall be destroyed from the gathering of Israel, both among the sojourners and also among the natives of the land.

In a discussion of Passover stipulations, Exod 12:19 contains restrictions upon eating what is leavened with respect to strangers and natives of the land.[4] And this passage contains the only other usage of γιώρας in the Septuagint.[5] In all likelihood, the translator of Greek Isaiah was influenced by this rendering from Exodus and incorporated this rare gloss as an intertextual link.[6]

---

loanwords found only in the Septuagint or dependent writings, Joosten states: "These items are not representative of Hellenistic Greek. Nor are they transcriptions of Hebrew words. They can hardly be explained otherwise than by a reference to pre-existing speech habits among Greek-speaking Jews." See also the reference to Joosten's article on the possible Aramaic understanding of גֵּר here in Aitken (2014), 123: "Spoken Aramaic might well have influenced some idioms, being responsible for the morphology of some loan-words . . . γειώρας < Arm. *gywr'* (Heb. *gēr*)."

[3]Isaiah 54:15 contains three instances of the verb גור, but most likely with the meaning 'to attack.' However, the translator of Greek Isaiah seems to have understood the meaning as 'to sojourn" as he paired it with with προσήλυτος and προσέρχομαι. A translation of 'condensation' accounts for the omission of the third instance of גור. See van der Vorm-Croughs (2014), 209; 386.

[4]Compare Exodus 12:48-49 for similar Hebrew occurrences with divergent Greek renderings.

[5]A minor textual difference exists between the editions of Rahlfs and Wevers at this point. Rahlfs included the term γειώρας while Wevers supplied γιώρας as the example above attests.

[6]It is well-accepted that the Pentateuch served as a type of lexicon for later Septuagint translators. See Tov (1999), 183-94, esp. 188. Like myself, Tov sees the occurrence of γιώρας in Isa 14:1 as lexical connection to Exod 12:19. He does not, however, make a literary or intertextual argument about its use in Greek Isaiah. On page 191, Tov states: "There is no concrete evidence that the translators possessed either dictionaries or word lists. Thus, when attempting to determine the meaning of a word, they resorted to various sources of information. These ranged from exegetical traditions, the context, etymology, post-biblical Hebrew, the Aramaic language, to the translation of the Torah. The latter was often consulted when the translators encountered difficult Hebrew words which also occurred in the Torah . . ." See also Tov (1999), 165-94. For a rejoinder to this opinion, see Barr (2003), 523-43, esp.

Given the thematic parallels pertaining to the return from exile and the assemblage of a mixed multitude both in the immediate context of Isa 14:1 and also within the book of Exodus, the inclusion of the noun γιώρας in Isa 14:1 would function as an intertextual evocation of Exod 12:19.[7]

But this allusion to the book of Exodus may also have had another motivation, one within the book of Isaiah itself. Just as the noun גֵּר occurs rarely in Isaiah, so does its accompanying verb לוה 'to accompany, join oneself to.'[8] This verb occurs in only two places in the book of Isaiah: once in Isa 14:1 and twice Isa 56:1-7. And the themes and language of this latter passage are remarkably similar to the former. The context of Isa 56:1-7 concerns a coming salvation where foreigners and eunuchs are brought into the family of Yhwh:[9]

Isa 56:3	וְאַל־יֹאמַר בֶּן־הַנֵּכָר הַנִּלְוָה אֶל־יְהוָה	μὴ λεγέτω ὁ ἀλλογενὴς ὁ προσκείμενος πρὸς κύριον
	Let not the foreigner who has joined himself to Yhwh say	*Let not the foreigner who has been attached to the Lord say*
Isa 56:6	וּבְנֵי הַנֵּכָר הַנִּלְוִים עַל־יְהוָה	καὶ τοῖς ἀλλογενέσι τοῖς προσκειμένοις κυρίῳ
	And the foreigner who has joined himself to Yhwh	*And to the foreigners who are attached to the Lord*

Even though the verb לוה occurs in these verses with an obvious thematic parallel to Isa 14:1-3, the Greek translator did not create a parallel at this point.[10] However, it is crucial to point out this

---

527. Barr remarks: "No features of context or content have been adduced that might explain why the Isaiah translator, if he was consulting the LXX, avoided the massive majority of Pentateuchal renderings and just here adopted this highly unusual rendering, which is a Greek transliteration of the Hebrew term." At the time of Barr's writing, this may have been the case. But my explanation above seems to answer all the demands he requires. The translator of Greek Isaiah perceived the clear connections with the book of Exodus in Isa 14:1-3 and sought to convey this by employing the idiosyncratic term γιώρας. To complement Tov's position, see Yardney (2019): 157-77. Yardney mentions Barr's critique of Tov's position on גֵּר / γιώρας but does not suggest a solution.

[7]See Exod 12:38. See the brief comments in Rajak (2009), 140.

[8]The verb לוה occurs only 12 times in the Hebrew Bible and is rendered with a variety of Greek terms in the Septuagint: προστίθημι in Num 18:2, 4; Isa 14:1; Esth 9:27; πρόσκειμαι in Isa 56:3, 6; καταφεύγω in Jer 50[27]:5; Zech 2:15; συμπαραγίνομαι in Psa 83:9[82:8]; συμπρόειμι in Eccl 8:15; ἐπισυνάγω in Dan 11:34. The alternative homophone II לוה "to borrow, lend to" occurs twice in Isa 24:2 and is rendered by the Greek term δανίζω pass. 'to lend, borrow.'

[9]Isaiah 56:1—כִּי־קְרוֹבָה יְשׁוּעָתִי לָבוֹא—also contains language reminiscent of Isa 13:22—וְקָרוֹב לָבוֹא עִתָּהּ. And these passages contain the only instances in the book of Isaiah where קָרוֹב is followed by infinitival בוא. Interestingly, Greek Isaiah does not explicate the connection.

[10]It could be argued that the translator decided not to employ πρόσκειμαι in Isa 14:1 because he

lexical connection here since the subsequent verses in this example detail its thematic significance for our passage. Even though the connection with לוה is not explicated in the translation of Isa 14:1, its occurrence in chapters 14 and 56 does not seem to have gone unnoticed by the translator of Greek Isaiah.

Isaiah 14:2—Allusions to Creation, Exodus, and Isaiah

Analysis into Greek Isa 14:2 aids the previous discussion by adding evidence which evokes intertextual allusions both to the Pentateuch and to Isa 56:1-7. The whole of Isa 14:2 is cited below in full:

14:2a	וּלְקָחוּם עַמִּים	καὶ λήμψονται αὐτοὺς ἔθνη
	And the peoples shall take them;	*And the nations will take them*
14:2b	וְהֵבִיאוּם אֶל־מְקוֹמָם	καὶ εἰσάξουσιν εἰς τὸν τόπον αὐτῶν,
	and they shall bring them to their place;	*and they will bring them into their place,*
14:2c	וְהִתְנַחֲלוּם בֵּית־יִשְׂרָאֵל	καὶ κατακληρονομήσουσι καί πληθυνθήσονται
	and the house of Israel shall possess them	*and they will obtain an inheritance and they will be multiplied*
14:2c.i	עַל אַדְמַת יְהוָה לַעֲבָדִים וְלִשְׁפָחוֹת	ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς του θεοῦ εἰς δούλους καὶ δούλας·
	in the land of Yhwh as male servants and female servants;	*upon the land of God as male servants and female servants;*
14:2d	וְהָיוּ שֹׁבִים לְשֹׁבֵיהֶם	καὶ ἔσονται αἰχμάλωτοι οἱ αἰχμαλωτεύσαντες αὐτούς,
	And they will take captive those who were their captors;	*and those who captured them will be captured,*
14:2e	וְרָדוּ בְּנֹגְשֵׂיהֶם׃	κα κυριευθήσονται οἱ κυριεύσαντες αὐτῶν.
	and they shall rule over those who oppressed them.	*and those who ruled over them shall be ruled.*

In both the Hebrew and Greek examples above, clauses ‘a’ and ‘b’ describe Israel’s journey back to their own land by the hand of the peoples (i.e., ἔθνη). Then, clause ‘c’ in the Hebrew text

misunderstood the meaning of the verb ספח ‘to associate with, attach oneself to.’ It seems obvious that the translator understood the meaning of לוה as is evidenced by the semantic overlap in 14:1; 56:3; 56:6. Furthermore, the majority of Septuagint translators seem to have grasped its semantics: see Jer 50[27]:5 and Zeh 2:15 for divergent semantics. But given that no other Septuagint translator exhibits semantic overlap with the term ספח, it seems likely that the meaning of this term was forgotten: see 1 Sam 2:36; 1 Sam 26:19; Isa 14:1; Hab 2:15; Job 30:7. In light of this observation, the translator could have supplied προστίθημι at 14:1 as a more general term than πρόσκειμαι and thus as an appropriate guess based on context and the verbal parallel in the preceding clause.

describes Israel's own inheritance of said peoples. Clause 'c' in the Greek is not as explicit concerning the verbal AGENT. Clauses 'd' and 'e' in the Hebrew continue in this vein and contrast the positive portrayal of the opening clauses by describing Israel's future subjugation of their former captors. At this point again the Greek text is not as explicit as the Hebrew concerning the AGENT involved in the captivity process. Overall, the Greek text captures much of what is present in the Hebrew while also avoiding, at least explicitly, the shift in character referent from the 'peoples' to the 'house of Israel' in 14:2c. However, differences in the Greek text are exacerbated in particular at 14:2c by the translator's use of κατακληρονομέω in place of נחל, the lexical plus πληθυνθήσονται, and the precise contextual sense of εἰς δούλους καὶ δούλας. Due to these interpretive difficulties between the Hebrew and Greek, I provide a detailed discussion of these intricacies before discussing its literary and intertextual features.

At clauses 'a' and 'b,' the Hebrew text identifies the 'peoples' as the verbal AGENT and Jacob-Israel as the PATIENT of exilic return, conveyed by the third person plural pronominal suffix attached to each Hebrew verb. The Greek translator accurately captured this feature of the Hebrew text with the nominative plural ἔθνη for the 'peoples' and the accusative plural αὐτούς for 'Israel.' However, clause 'c' of the Hebrew text shifts the AGENT-PATIENT semantic roles. There, the house of Israel functions as the explicit grammatical subject and the peoples occupy the slot of grammatical object: 'and the house of Israel shall possess them'. This shift, however, does not occur explicitly in the Greek.

Since the translator omitted the phrase בֵּית־יִשְׂרָאֵל from his rendering of clause 'c,' the Greek text contains no explicit signal to indicate a shift in character. We may rightly assume then that the AGENT of clauses 'a' and 'b' continues to function as such for the following phrase. In other words, in contrast to the Hebrew, the Greek text continues the previous AGENT-PATIENT semantic relationship so that the nations (i.e., ἔθνη) would be placed in the slot of grammatical subject for both verbs in clause 'c': κατακληρονομέω and πληθύνω. This reading entails that the very nations who brought Israel back to their land would also be involved in the processes of inheriting and multiplying.[11] Since the Greek text itself provides no information signaling a shift

[11]A similar position is articulated by Ottley (1904-6), 175: "καὶ πληθυνθήσεται] An addition by the LXX. It seems best to keep ἔθνη as the subject of the verbs, in which case κατακληρονομήσουσιν is causal, 'shall

in character, and since the reading proposed here is not contextually incoherent, we have no grounds to posit a character shift at the beginning of clause 'c.'[12] This assessment recognizes Greek Isaiah's intentional divergence at this point not only from the Hebrew text, but from all other ancient versions.[13]

As the verse develops in the Greek, however, a new character is introduced into the passage: the former captors and rulers of Israel as οἱ αἰχμαλωτεύσαντες and οἱ κυριεύσαντες. These characters will in fact receive retribution for their own actions. They will be taken captive and subjugated. This shift deviates somewhat from the Hebrew text, which more straightforwardly identifies Israel as the agent who will capture and rule. But in the Greek, the passage more generally describes the fact that those who captured and ruled will undergo a similar fate (i.e., presumably over Israel as αὐτούς and αὐτῶν from earlier in the discourse).[14] Unlike the Hebrew, the Greek text focuses on the new characters.

This proposal raises potential objections that such an interpretation conveys a discursive rift in the scheme of exilic return. First of all, the verb κατακληρονομέω is regarded by Septuagint lexicons as conveying overtones of militaristic violence. This seems to contradict the nations as the flourishing heirs in God's land in this passage. Further, how does the character continuity fit with the Greek minuses and pluses throughout the passage? Last of all, if the nations inherit the land and multiply upon it, how could they be both heirs and servants as noted in clause 'c'? I address these questions by considering the meaning of κατακληρονομέω, by pursuing a thematic and intertextual analysis of the verbal addition πληθύνω, by examining the

---

make them to inherit.'"

[12]LXX.D agrees with my characterization of this verse by explicitly defining the AGENT of *empfangen* as *die Fölkerschaften*. See also Karrer and Kraus (2011), 2540: "*Der Übersetzer bezieht das Verb auf »die Völkerschaften«, die auf Gottes Land »Besitz erhalten«.*"

[13]1QIsa[a] בית ישראל; Symmachus οικος ισραηλ; Targum בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל; Peshitta ܒܝܬ ܐܝܣܪܝܠ; Vulgate *domus Israhel*.

[14]This is confirmed by the observation's of Penner (2019), 537: "The reversal of the captives and dominators was fulfilled when the Persians and Medes defeated the Assyrians/Babylonians."

significance of the phrase εἰς δούλους καὶ δούλας, and detailing what these features entail for the meaning of the passage.

Several issues surround an accurate understanding of κατακληρονομέω in this passage. Apart from discussion of either its 'violent' or 'peaceful' sense, it is not clear whether it should be regarded as causative with the pronoun αὐτούς elided from clause 'a,' or whether it should simply be considered transitive with the elision of τόπος from clause 'b.' However, due to the proximity of τόπος in clause 'b' along with the mention of land in clause 'd' with γῆ, I think that κατακληρονομέω is best regarded as transitive, paired with the object τόπος elided from clause 'b': 'The nations will inherit their place and they will multiply on the land of God.'[15]

Concerning the sense of κατακληρονομέω, Muraoka's comments are important to consider. He suggests that the terms related to κληρονόμος in the Septuagint often connote geographical possession which follows military engagement: "the word group κληρονόμος in the LXX often signifies . . . violent appropriation rather than peaceful transfer of property upon someone's natural death."[16] In fact, his category for the verb κατακληρονομέω puts forth this gloss.[17] Nonetheless, however often this sense occurs in the Septuagint, it does not seem applicable in Isa 14:2c since this phrase lacks contextual markers of violence.[18] Mention of oppression and rule does not occur until later in the verse, after a new character occurs. And while themes of oppression and rule may color the meaning of the whole passage after having read 14:2d-e, we should not import the meanings of the latter lexemes into former ones.[19]

---

[15]The etiology of the Greek clause from the Hebrew seems to demand a more causative understanding of κατακληρονομέω. But if we consider the Greek solely on its own terms, a simple transitive understanding is more coherent. Both meanings are possible, but I have selected the latter in this discussion for its thematic consistency. This term expresses a wide semantic range: to obtain as one's assured possession; to leave as an inheritance; to name/make as heir; to assign as a possession; to take possession/conquer; to dispossess; etc. See LSJ, 894; BrillDAG, 1056; LEH, 315; GELS, 372-73.

[16]GELS (2009), 400.

[17]See GELS, 372 'to take possession of, following a successful military operation; LEH, 315 'to size possession of [τι] (with violence).'

[18]Both LEH and GELS do not mention Isa 14:2 in their entries on κατακληρονομέω. This may suggest that they do not categorize the verse under this gloss.

[19]The ensuing discussion illustrates how inheritance, multiplication, and servants are expressive of

Isaiah 14:2c contains two features which suggest that the Greek translator sought to make thematic and intertextual connections with other portions of the Hebrew and Greek Old Testament. To begin, I address both the nominal minus and the verbal plus of the Greek text at 14:2c:[20]

14:2c.i	וְהִתְנַחֲלוּם	καὶ κατακληρονομήσουσι
14:2c.ii	בֵּית־יִשְׂרָאֵל	— [-]
14:2c.iiii	—	καὶ πληθυνθήσονται [+]

The omission of the noun phrase בֵּית־יִשְׂרָאֵל from this clause may have been due to the perceived redundancy it would have created in light of the preceding context:[21] the threefold occurrence of אֶת־יַעֲקֹב as τὸν Ιακωβ, בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל as τὸν Ισραηλ, עַל־בֵּית יַעֲקֹב as πρὸς τὸν οἶκον Ιακωβ.[22] However, I think a more persuasive option regards the omission of בֵּית־יִשְׂרָאֵל into the Greek as contextually and semantically appropriate since the translator most likely regarded this phrase as the grammatical object—in syntactical apposition to the third person masculine plural suffixed object pronoun ם—which was previously expressed in 14:2a as αὐτούς. In other words, what was redundant was not the title 'house of Israel,' but pronominal reference to this object. Thus, since the translator would have understood the 'house of Israel' as the grammatical object of נחל, the idea required no explication as it could be evoked through elision. The etiology of the Greek clause from the Hebrew requires a more causative understanding of κατακληρονομέω: 'They (ἔθνη) will cause Israel to inherit the place.' But if we consider the Greek solely on its own

---

'peaceful' connotations. It is noteworthy that each major Septuagint translation renders the verb contrary to suggestions of violence or military engagement: NETS 'they will obtain an inheritance'; LES 'they will inherit'; BdA '*Ils auront l'héritage*'; LXX.D '*und sie* (*die Völkerschaften*) *werden ihr Erbteil empfangen*'. I do think that the mention of oppression and rule in clauses 'd' and 'e' refers to militaristic subjugation. But since a character shift occurs there, it does not apply to the AGENT and THEME of clause 'c.'

[20]I do not consider the absence of the third person plural suffix ם- from 14:2c.i to be a minus since it is elided into 14:2c from either αὐτούς or τόπος in 14:2a-b.

[21]This perspective admittedly assumes that the translator of Greek Isaiah had before him the consonantal text בית ישראל as is preserved in the Masoretic tradition. However, this supposition has plenty of support through the witness of the ancient versions and in the overall consensus of Greek Isaiah research. Of note, the phrase בית ישראל occurs respectively in 1QIsa[a] as בית ישראל, Symmachus as οικος ισραηλ, the Targum as בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל, the Peshitta as ܒܝܬ ܐܝܣܪܐܝܠ, and the Vulgate as *domus Israhel*.

[22]See the viewpoints expressed in Seeligmann (2004), 174; Van der Vorm-Croughs (2014), 336-38.

terms, a simple transitive understanding is more adequate: 'They (ἔθνη) will inherit the place.' As I stated earlier, while both interpretive options have apt explanatory power, I think the latter meaning conveys the most coherent sense of the Greek text.

What is of further interest is the use of the additional verb πληθύνω. From a literary and theological perspective, the translator suggests that the events surrounding Israel's return from exile are marked by inheritance and abundance. And in many ways this scheme mirrors the creation mandate of Genesis and its re-appropriated use in the book of Exodus:

Gen 1:28 וַיְבָרֶךְ אֹתָם אֱלֹהִים וַיֹּאמֶר לָהֶם אֱלֹהִים פְּרוּ וּרְבוּ וּמִלְאוּ אֶת־הָאָרֶץ וְכִבְשֻׁהָ וּרְדוּ בִּדְגַת הַיָּם

And God blessed them and God said to them, "Be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth and subdue it and rule over the the fish of the sea"

καὶ ηὐλόγησεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς λέγων Αὐξάνεσθε καὶ <u>πληθύνεσθε</u> καὶ πληρώσατε τὴν γῆν καὶ κατακυριεύσατε αὐτῆς

and God blessed them saying, "Increase and multiply and fill the earth and rule over it"

Gen 47:27 וַיֵּשֶׁב יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם בְּאֶרֶץ גֹּשֶׁן וַיֵּאָחֲזוּ בָהּ וַיִּפְרוּ וַיִּרְבּוּ מְאֹד

And Israel dwelt in the land of Egypt, in the land of Goshen; and they possessed it; and they were fruitful; and they multiplied greatly.

κατῴκησεν δὲ Ισραηλ ἐν τῇ Αἰγύπτῳ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς Γεσεμ καὶ <u>ἐκληρονόμησαν</u> ἐπ᾽ αὐτῆς καὶ ηὐξήθησαν καὶ <u>ἐπληθύνθησαν</u> σφόδρα.[23]

Now Israel dwelt in Egypt, in the land of Goshen and they obtained an inheritance on it and they increased and they multiplied exceedingly.

Exod 1:7 וּבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל פָּרוּ וַיִּשְׁרְצוּ וַיִּרְבּוּ וַיַּעַצְמוּ בִּמְאֹד מְאֹד וַתִּמָּלֵא הָאָרֶץ אֹתָם׃

And the sons of Israel were fruitful and they increased and they grew and they became exceedingly strong and the earth was filled with them.

οἱ δὲ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ ηὐξήθησαν καὶ <u>ἐπληθύνθησαν</u> καὶ χυδαῖοι ἐγένοντο καὶ κατίσχυον σφόδρα σφόδρα· <u>ἐπλήθυνεν</u> δὲ ἡ γῆ αὐτούς.

Now the sons of Israel increased and multiplied and became numerous and became very very strong; and the land continually multiplied them.

Given the previous intertextual connection from Isa 14:1 between גּוּר / γιώρας and the book of Exodus, it seems likely that the addition of πληθύνω in 14:2 displays a similar thematic relationship. And insofar as the translator understood the description in Exodus as a literary development of the creation mandate in Genesis, the translator of Greek Isaiah seems to have read Isa 14:1-2 likewise in light of creation and exodus themes.[24]

---

[23]Note the lack of violent imagery associated with κληρονομέω here.

[24]This corresponds with the larger prophetic discourse in the book of Isaiah. Creation and exodus

Now, recalling the occurrence of the verb לוה in Isa 14:1 and Isa 56:1-7 discussed above, we should explore another parallel between these two chapters to establish the translator's concern in order to evoke biblical-theological themes. The translator's rendering of the phrase לַעֲבָדִים וְלִשְׁפָחוֹת as εἰς δούλους καὶ δούλας in 14:2c.i is relatively straightforward. The preposition εἰς captures the semantic force of the transformative *lamed*. And its singular occurrence also avoids the repetition of the preposition ל / εἰς which is present in the Hebrew. However, at Isa 56:6 the translator seems to have created a rendering which is parallel to the phrase in 14:2 while at the same time divergent from the precise lexical content in the latter chapter:

14:2c.i	עַל אַדְמַת יְהוָה לַעֲבָדִים וְלִשְׁפָחוֹת *in the land of Yhwh as male servants and female servants*	ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς του θεοῦ εἰς δούλους καὶ δούλας· *upon the land of God as male servants and female servants.*
56:6	וּבְנֵי הַנֵּכָר הַנִּלְוִים עַל־יְהוָה לְשָׁרְתוֹ וּלְאַהֲבָה אֶת־שֵׁם יְהוָה לִהְיוֹת לוֹ לַעֲבָדִים *And the foreigner who has joined himself to Yhwh to minister to him and to love the name of Yhwh; to become his servants.*	καὶ τοῖς ἀλλογενέσι τοῖς προσκειμένοις κυρίῳ δουλεύειν αὐτῷ καὶ ἀγαπᾷν τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου τοῦ εἶναι αὐτῷ εἰς δούλους [+] καὶ δούλας *And the foreigners who are attached to the Lord to serve him and to love the name of the Lord to become his male and female servants.*

In the same passage at Isa 56:6 where the the term לוה occurs, we also have the occurrence of the plural form of עֶבֶד. But instead of rendering this term in a strict fashion, the translator of Greek Isaiah inserted the longer εἰς δούλους καὶ δούλας. This Greek phrase does not originate from the Hebrew of Isa 56:6, but instead corresponds precisely with the Hebrew and Greek pairing of Isa 14:2.[25] And since the occurrences of δοῦλος and δούλη occur together only at these two *loci* in Greek Isaiah, the intentionality behind this rendering should be evident. We must also note that mention of servants in Isa 56:1-7 is positive. These servants are foreigners. And such foreigners will love Yhwh and minister to him. Thus, the translator must have read Isa 56:1-7 in light of Isa

---

themes are re-appropriated at several places to predict new exodus and new creation expectation. See Isa 11:12-16; 12:2-6; 51:9-11; 63:10-12; 65:17. See especially Ex 15:3 אִישׁ מִלְחָמָה as κύριος συντρίβων πολέμους and Isa 42:13 כְּאִישׁ מִלְחָמוֹת as κύριος . . . συντρίψει πόλεμον. Here, the translator modeled his divergent rendering after a clear allusion to the Song at the Sea in Exodus 15.

[25]Among the ancient versions, Greek Isaiah alone contains this reading at Isa 56:6.

14:1-2, then inserted the lexemes from Isa 14:2 into Isa 56:6, all due to his recognition that the language and themes of each passage provided mutually interpretive material for one another.[26]

This connection illustrates how the translator regarded both the positive nature of servanthood in Isa 14:2c and how he highlighted the contrast between the peoples of clauses 'a-c' and the captors and rulers described in clauses 'd-e.' Thus, given this portrait of peaceable relations between Israel and the peoples, we have thematic support for the position that the translator of Greek Isaiah preserved the ἔθνη-character as the verbal AGENT throughout Isa 14:2a-c in contrast to the presentation found in the Hebrew. Such a reconstruction from Hebrew to Greek must have been motivated by the aim to express the coherence of the parent text through the inner-Isaianic and biblical-theological themes of creation and exodus. The addition of πληθύνω into in this passage contributes to these emphases as well.

In light of both the surrounding context of exilic return and the nations as a preserved character-AGENT who enact inheritance as those already having been joined to Israel, the approach articulated here most fully accounts for the lexical and thematic material. The use of servant language (i.e., δοῦλος and δούλη) does not refer to harsh subjugation as do the verbs in clauses 'd' and 'e'. But based upon the translator's appropriation of this exact terminology in Isa 56:6, we should instead understand the positive outlook of the identical phraseology in 14:2c. The peoples bring Israel back to their land. And insofar as they are joined and attached to Israel, the peoples also will inherit the land and multiply on it as the Lord's male and female servants. In light of these facets of the Greek text, we have no contextual reason for supposing that κατακληρονομέω entails militaristic violence. And since the glosses provided by every major Greek lexicon contain 'peaceful' meanings for this verb, the viewpoint advocated here remains the strongest of the options surveyed.

The best interpretation of Greek Isaiah 14:1-2 must recognize its divergence from the

[26]See Van der Vorm-Croughs (2014), 338: "Another text in which foreigners who cling to the God of Israel and receive blessings are called 'male and female slaves' is LXX Isa 56:6. The 'female slaves' in this verse are absent in the Hebrew, which offers merely לעבדים. The translator may have added καὶ δούλας in harmonisation with 14:2, which would support the assumption that in 14:2, as in 56:6, the 'male and female slaves' are to be seen as the foreign people." Here, van der Vorm-Croughs is countering Seeligmann's proposal that it would have been considered too harsh for the people of Israel to rule over foreign peoples.

Hebrew in terms of character continuity, the omitted verbal AGENT, and the significant addition of πληθύνω. However, the contextual, thematic, and intertextual clues of the Greek text permit insight into the translator's own interpretive emphases, which envision the peoples who joined themselves to Israel in verse 1 as fruitful heirs and servants in the land of God.

At the level of style, it should be noted that the translator created a parallel with the Greek roots in 14:2d-e where no such a symmetry existed in the Hebrew. On top of this, it may also be plausible to connect his lexical choices here to the previous connection with Genesis and Exodus:

Isa 14:2d	וְהָיוּ שֹׁבִים לְשֹׁבֵיהֶם	καὶ ἔσονται αἰχμάλωτοι οἱ αἰχμαλωτεύσαντες αὐτούς,
Isa 14:2e	וְרָדוּ בְּנֹגְשֵׂיהֶם׃	καὶ κυριευθήσονται οἱ κυριεύσαντες αὐτῶν.

Whereas the translator at 14:2d supplied the same Greek root αἰχμαλωτ- to match the repetition of the same Hebrew root שׁבה, the following clause contains two instances of κυριέυω whereas the Hebrew text employs different verbs: רדה and נגשׂ.[27] These translation decisions seem to have occurred for two different reasons. The first concerns the stylistic repetition of Greek roots which, while absent in the Hebrew text, provided a symmetrical structure in the translation. Even though the verb נגשׂ nowhere else pairs with κυριεύω, these Greek semantics are not too far off from renderings of נגשׂ elsewhere in the Septuagint. And the repetition of verbal ideas in 14:2e nicely mirrors the pattern laid out by the Hebrew text from the previous clause. The translator may also have been motivated to include the verb κυριεύω here based on intertextual connection with רדה / κυριεύω in Gen 1:28 noted above. If the rationale for this lexical choice is accepted, it would strengthen the present argument concerning the thematic evocation of creation and exodus themes.

Isaiah 14:3—Harsh Service and the Exodus

The final verse to consider explains how God, in bringing Israel back to their land, will give them rest from pain, wrath, and slavery. Here, I present an argument which solidifies

[27]Consider the frequency of the term נגשׂ in Exodus to describe oppressive Egyptian taskmasters: Exod 3:7; 5:6; 5:10; 5:13; 5:14.

and concludes my position that the translator of Greek Isaiah was motivated by literary and intertextual connections with the book of Exodus in his renderings:

14:3a.i	וְהָיָה בְּיוֹם הָנִיחַ יְהוָה לְךָ	καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἀναπαύσει σε ὁ θεὸς
	And in the day when Yhwh gives you rest	*And it will be in that day that God will give you rest*
14:3a.ii	מֵעָצְבְּךָ וּמֵרַגְזֶךָ	ἐκ τῆς ὀδύνης καὶ τοῦ θυμοῦ σου
	from your pain and from your turmoil	*from your pain and displeasure*
14:3a.iii	וּמִן־הָעֲבֹדָה הַקָּשָׁה אֲשֶׁר עֻבַּד־בָּךְ׃	καὶ τῆς δουλείας τῆς σκληρᾶς, ἧς ἐδούλευσας αὐτοῖς.
	and from the hard service which was served by you	*and hard slavery with which you served them*

The occurrence of the phrase הָעֲבֹדָה הַקָּשָׁה ‘harsh slavery’ in 14:3a.iii contains unmistakable resonances with the book of Exodus. In fact, the phrase only occurs in the book of Exodus when describing the labor imposed upon Israel by Egypt, in reference to Israel’s Egyptian captivity in Deuteronomy, or in thematic development of this theme.[28] Each occurrence of this phrase is listed here:

Exod 1:14	וַיְמָרְרוּ אֶת־חַיֵּיהֶם בַּעֲבֹדָה קָשָׁה	καὶ κατωδύνων αὐτῶν τὴν ζωὴν ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις τοῖς σκληροῖς
Exod 6:9	מִקֹּצֶר רוּחַ וּמֵעֲבֹדָה קָשָׁה	ἀπὸ τῆς ὀλιγοψυχίας καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων τῶν σκληρῶν
Deut 26:6	וַיִּתְּנוּ עָלֵינוּ עֲבֹדָה קָשָׁה	καὶ ἐπέθηκαν ὑμῖν ἔργα σκληρά·
1 Kgs 12:4	מֵעֲבֹדַת אָבִיךָ הַקָּשָׁה	ἀπὸ τῆς δουλείας τοῦ πατρος σου τῆς σκληρᾶς
2 Chron 10:4	מֵעֲבֹדַת אָבִיךָ הַקָּשָׁה	ἀπὸ τῆς δουλείας τοῦ πατρός σου τῆς σκληρᾶς

Now, even though the Hebrew phrase unmistakably alludes to the Exodus narrative, the Greek translators of the Pentateuch supplied different renderings than what Greek Isaiah contains. Greek Isaiah’s use of δουλεία corresponds more with the Septuagint versions of Kings and Chronicles. But given that Greek Isaiah was likely translated before the Greek former prophets, the use of this Greek phrase would not have arisen from a parallel in the Greek versions. Nonetheless, the exodus associations with this phrase must have been a key feature in the construction of the discourse at this point.

[28]See Exod 1:14; Exod 6:9; Deut 26:6; 1 Kgs 12:4; 2 Chron 10:4. The occurrence of the phrases וְאַתָּה עַתָּה הָקֵל מֵעֲבֹדַת אָבִיךָ הַקָּשָׁה in 1 Kgs 12:4 and וְעַתָּה הָקֵל מֵעֲבֹדַת אָבִיךָ הַקָּשָׁה in 2 Chron 10:4 in reference to Solomon has polemical overtones since they intertextually accuse David’s descendant of ruling Israel as an Egyptian. For another type of this thematic appropriation, see the use of the phrase כְּגַן הַיָּרָק in Deut 11:10 and לִגַּן יָרָק in 1 Kgs 21:2 to describe Ahab’s reign as allusion to Egypt and its agriculture.

In all likelihood, the translator employed the term δουλεία here in connection to the related terminology in 14:2 and 14:3:

Isa 14:2c.i	עַל אַדְמַת יְהוָה לַעֲבָדִים וְלִשְׁפָחוֹת	ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς του θεοῦ εἰς δούλους καὶ δούλας·
Isa 14:3a.iii	וּמִן־הָעֲבֹדָה הַקָּשָׁה אֲשֶׁר עֻבַּד־בָּךְ׃	καὶ τῆς δουλείας τῆς σκληρᾶς, ἧς ἐδούλευσας αὐτοῖς.

The use of the δουλ- root twice in 14:2 and twice in 14:3 contributes to the translator's frequent strategy of symmetrical presentation. By employing these terms in this fashion, the translator rendered the Hebrew text in a semantically appropriate way while also presenting it as a well-structured, stylistic, and intertextual product for his Greek audience.[29]

Isaiah 14:1-3—Conclusion

The analysis of Isa 14:1-3 above illustrates how the translator of Greek Isaiah expressed two distinct features in his rendering of the Hebrew text on the basis of a significant intertextual connection. Each exhibits some relationship with the book of Exodus. The translator's decision to render גֵּר as γιώρας in Isa 14:1 attests to his use of the only occurrence of this term in the Septuagint at Exod 12:19 in the Greek Pentateuch. Given this connection to Exodus, the verbal plus πληθύνω likely recalls the creation mandate of Gen 1:28 and its thematic re-appropriation at Exod 1:7. And these connections are supported in the Hebrew text by the intertextual allusion to the book of Exodus wherein we encounter הָעֲבֹדָה הַקָּשָׁה 'harsh service' at Isa 14:3, a phrase only employed in the Hebrew Bible when referencing Israel's service to a Pharaoh-like tyrant.

Second, verses 1 and 2 exhibit clear parallels to Isa 56:1-7 which in turn influenced how the translator rendered the latter text in Greek. But this parallel may also have informed how the translator understood the meaning of Isa 14:1-3. The inclusion of the nations within Israel in their return from exile likely signified the mixed multitude of the new exodus for the translator of Greek Isaiah (cf. Exod 12:28). In Greek Isaiah, the nations are joined to an Israel which is made up of God's male and female servants. Third, though implicit, the translator may have been

[29]The repetition of the δουλ- root in these verses parallels and contrasts the translator's repetition of ἀναπαυ-. The thematic and theological significance of juxtaposing 'slavery' and 'rest' is striking. It is also reflective of major themes in the Bible, especially within the book of Exodus.

motivated to connect these passages together because of the thematic and theological thrust toward new creation and new exodus already present in the book of Isaiah.

These tendencies are recognized by Mirjam van der Vorm-Croughs in a similar, though less developed manner. However, her comments are helpful and worth citing:

> Besides elements from the immediate context, the translator has often introduced into his text elements from passages elsewhere in the book of Isaiah. This gave him a means to clarify and interpret difficult portions with the help of other, related passages, but also to create linkages to other sections in Isaiah, thus improving the unity of his translation.[30]

In this example from Isa 14:1-3, we did not encounter any "difficult portions" that would have required the translator of Greek Isaiah to look elsewhere in the book for assistance. In fact, the Hebrew in these verses is relatively straightforward. Despite the simplicity of the source text, however, the Greek translation is marked by lexical deviation at several points. Nonetheless, we encountered several "linkages to other sections of Isaiah" and beyond. These translation decisions perform a greater function than preserving the unity of the source text. They evoke the biblical story for those with ears to hear.[31] They are apparent to 'the right sort of mind.'

The stylistic, thematic, and theological-intertextual features of the Hebrew text of Isa 14:1-3 provided the translator with a lens in terms of which he rendered the text before him into Greek. Isaiah 14:1-3 was read within the intertextual matrices allotted to the translator most prominently by Isaiah 56:1-7 and by the book of Exodus.

Example 12: Isaiah 14:9

I refrain from mentioning all the features of Isa 14:9 in this section since I discuss this verse at length in chapter 5 under the heading 'lexical conflation.' In the present treatment I highlight two aspects from the Greek translator's rendering of clauses 'b' and 'c.' Each of these clauses underwent a variegated transformation from the Hebrew to the Greek:

---

[30]Van der Vorm-Croughs (2014), 333.

[31]See Lee (2014): 135-46. Recall his statement from the previous chapter: "The person who made this translation seems . . . to have been focused on turning the text not just into meaningful Greek, but into *stylish* 'biblical' Greek, that is, Greek with a 'biblical' flavour on the pattern of the Pentateuch, but in a better style and on a higher level of Greek."

14:9a	שְׁאוֹל מִתַּחַת רָגְזָה לְךָ לִקְרַאת בּוֹאֶךָ *Sheol trembles from below at you to greet your coming;*	ὁ ᾅδης κάτωθεν ἐπικράνθη συναντήσας σοι, *Hades was embittered from below upon meeting you,*
14:9b	עוֹרֵר לְךָ רְפָאִים כָּל־עַתּוּדֵי אָרֶץ *he rouses the shades for you, all the rulers of the earth;*	συνηγέρθησάν σοι πάντες οἱ γίγαντες οἱ ἄρξαντες τῆς γῆς *all the giants who ruled over the earth were raised up together to you,*
14:9c	הֵקִים מִכִּסְאוֹתָם כֹּל מַלְכֵי גוֹיִם׃ *he raised up from their thrones all the kings of the nations.*	οἱ ἐγείραντες ἐκ τῶν θρόνων αὐτῶν πάντας βασιλεῖς ἐθνῶν. *those who raised all the kings of the nations from their thrones.*

Verse 9b seems to preserve all the elements of the Hebrew text, but in a different lexical and syntactical layout than the source text conveys. The *Polel* masculine singular perfect עוֹרֵר is captured by the plural middle-passive verb συνηγέρθησαν, which is followed by the inseparable preposition לְךָ paired with σοι. The plural noun רְפָאִים corresponds with οἱ γίγαντες while the following phrase כָּל־עַתּוּדֵי אָרֶץ is broken up so that πάντες precedes οἱ γίγαντες and the participial rendering of עַתּוּדֵי אָרֶץ as οἱ ἄρξαντες τῆς γῆς occurs in clause-terminal position. Each of these lexical pairings can be discussed in detail. But I will limit myself to the peculiarities between the rendering of the verb עוֹרֵר and the noun רְפָאִים.

The translator's use of συνεγείρω for עור is natural given the semantic overlap between them. Pairing ἐγείρω and עור is common in the Septuagint. And from a stylistic perspective, the translator created repetition by employing the Greek stem at the openings of 14:9b and 14:9c. But the occurrence of this verb is significant for another reason. Whereas several commentators and translations understand שְׁאוֹל to be the AGENT of the perfect עוֹרֵר, the translator of Greek Isaiah sees things differently.[32] And this is fitting since שְׁאוֹל is always understood as a feminine noun when it functions as the AGENT of a verb in the book of Isaiah.[33] It

[32]See the renderings in the following commentaries: Kaiser (1974): "the Waste Land beneath is stirred up to meet you when you come; it rouses the shades to meet you"; Watts (2005): 'Sheol below is stirred up because of you, to meet your arrival. Waking ghosts because of you, all 'the rams' of the earth. Rousing from their thrones all the kings of the nations"; Oswalt (1986), 315: "Sheol beneath is in turmoil for you to greet your arrival; it rouses the shadowy ones for you, all the leaders of the earth"; Wildberger (1997), 41: "on your account the spirits of the dead roused up all the rulers of the earth." See Gesenius (2006), §145t, where he notes that often only a predicate in close proximity to feminine nouns will be conjugated as feminine.

[33]See Isa 5:14; 14:19; 38:18. However, Hos 13:14 contains a masculine second person singular pronoun in reference to Sheol. Also, Job 26:6 predicates the masculine singular adjective עָרוֹם to Sheol.

is very likely that the translator picked up upon this grammatical clue and refused to associate the grammatical subject of clause ‘a’ with the *Polel* verb in clause ‘b.’ But instead of understanding Yhwh to be the verbal AGENT as the grammar and context would seem to demand, the translator of Greek Isaiah gathered requisite grammatical material from the immediate context.[34] The translator then selected the term רְפָאִים rendered as οἱ γίγαντες to function as the THEME of the verb συνεγείρω, which was then captured in the plural.[35]

The term רְפָאִים occurs 14 times in the Hebrew Bible. But modern lexicons categorize its meaning under two headings: ‘departed spirits’ and ‘Rephaim.’[36] Mention of departed spirits occurs only 8 times in the Hebrew Bible and is rendered by γίγας ‘giant, mighty’ only at Isa 14:9 and Prov 21:16.[37] The presumable homonym רְפָאִים meaning ‘Rephaim’ pairs with γίγας 6 times even though ῥαφαΐν and τιτάν constitute its majority renderings.[38] The Greek term γίγας occurs nearly 40 times in the Septuagint. Apart from this sole pairing of γίγας and רְפָאִים in Greek Isaiah, the 4 other instances of this Greek term render גִּבּוֹר.[39]

Based on these statistics, it is likely that the Septuagint translators as a whole understood רְפָאִים to have a monolithic meaning instead of the twofold one offered by modern lexicographers. And given the translator’s renderings elsewhere in Greek Isaiah, he does not seem to evidence a firm grasp of this term’s Hebrew semantics. Instead, he followed the common pattern of Septuagint renderings and associated the Hebrew term with gigantesque figures. His rendering also makes sense given the immediate context, rendering רְפָאִים in light of the leaders,

---

[34]This position seems to be the most probable given the masculine singular referent which also parallels Yhwh as the subject in 13:17: הִנְנִי מֵעִיר עֲלֵיהֶם מָדָי.

[35]Even though the translator employed the plural verb συνηγέρθηαν instead of the singular, it is noteworthy that he preserved the masculine grammatical gender of the verb עוֹרֵר by pairing it with γίγας.

[36]רְפָאִים I. HALOT, 1275 ‘dead spirits’; DCH, 7.536 ‘the dead’; רְפָאִים II. HALOT, 1275 ‘Rephaim’; DCH, 7.536 ‘Rephaim,’ ancient inhabitants of Canaan and legendary race of giants.

[37]See Isa 14:9; 26:14; 26:19; Psa 88:10; Job 26:5; Prov 2:18; 9:18; 21:16. Septuagint translators also supply the terms γηγενής, ἰατρός, and ἀσεβής.

[38]See Gen 14:5; Josh 12:4; Josh 13:12; 1 Chron 11:15; 1 Chron 14:9; 1 Chron 20:4.

[39]See Isa 3:2; 13:3; 14:9; 49:24; 49:25.

kings, and thrones which occur later in verse 9. But the translator may also have connected this rendering with Isa 13:3, where he paired γίγας with גִּבּוֹר. The transformation of the final phrase into the Greek participle οἱ ἄρξαντες suggests that the translator saw both of the Hebrew nominal referents as equivalent while also seeking to avoid a simple appositional expression.

The final clause builds upon the translator's work in 14:9b by shifting the focus away from Sheol and toward the giants who ruled the earth. I supply clause 'c' here again for ease of reference:

14:9c הֵקִים מִכִּסְאוֹתָם כֹּל מַלְכֵי גוֹיִם׃ οἱ ἐγείραντες ἐκ τῶν θρόνων αὐτῶν πάντας βασιλεῖς ἐθνῶν.

Unlike the preservation of the Hebrew verb into the Greek at 14:9b, the translator here rendered the Hebrew singular finite verb הֵקִים into the Greek plural participle οἱ ἐγείραντες. This singular-to-plural shift models the translation of the previous clause. And the translator repeated the verbal idea of the previous phrase through repetition of the Greek stem. He also created an appositional phrase in contrast to the Hebrew which introduced a new clause. Nonetheless, the translator's rendering of the final phrase into the Greek accusative case preserved its function as the verbal PATIENT. In Isa 14:9, Greek Isaiah evidences a translator who was concerned to render the lexemes and syntax before him in a rigorous yet stylistic way. His translational deviations still capture the overall thrust of this enigmatic passage.

Example 13: Isaiah 14:11

My interest in Isa 14:11 only concerns the first clause of verse. And in this verse, I am only concerned with the Greek rendering of the final phrase. It seems that even though the translator would have been familiar with the Hebrew semantics of the phrase הֻמְיַת נְבָלֶיךָ, he deviated from its lexemes and syntax in several ways:

14:11a הוּרַד שְׁאוֹל גְּאוֹנֶךָ הֻמְיַת נְבָלֶיךָ κατέβη δὲ εἰς ᾅδου ἡ δόξα σου, ἡ πολλή σου εὐφροσύνη·
Your glory was brought down to Sheol, the sound of your harps. *Now your glory went down to Hades, your abundant rejoicing.*

The opening of this phrase is rendered both straightforwardly and stylistically. However, the origin of the appositional element הֻמְיַת נְבָלֶיךָ rendered as ἡ πολλή σου εὐφροσύνη is more

difficult to understand.[40] The use of the noun הֶמְיַת 'sound, music' is rare in the Hebrew Bible, but its meaning can easily be ascertained from its relationship to the verb המה 'to make a noise.' And the Isaiah translator elsewhere demonstrates familiarity with the verbal meaning.[41] The related noun הָמוֹן occurs several times in Isaiah and is rendered into Greek with the following terms: πλῆθος, μέγας, πολύς, πλοῦτος.[42] Now, this pairing of הָמוֹן with πολλή is significant since this Greek term also occurs as a rendering of הֶמְיָה in 14:11. And since המית (i.e., הֶמְיַת) could easily be confused with המון (i.e., הָמוֹן) given our orthographic evidence from Qumran, this pattern seems to account for the translator's attributive use of πολλή.[43]

The translator's rationale for rendering נֵבֶל 'harp' as εὐφροσύνη is more difficult to uncover. This is especially the case since the only other occurrence of this Hebrew term in Isaiah corresponds with an accurate Greek gloss:

Isa 5:12 וְהָיָה כִנּוֹר וָנֵבֶל תֹּף וְחָלִיל וָיַיִן מִשְׁתֵּיהֶם
There is a lyre and a harp, a tambourine and a flute, wine and their feasts
μετὰ γὰρ κιθάρας καὶ ψαλτηρίου καὶ τυμπάνων καὶ αὐλῶν τὸν οἶνον πίνουσι
For with the lyre and harp and drums and flutes they drink wine

In addition to this example, the translators of the greater Septuagint corpus are largely agreed in their renderings of נֵבֶל as a musical instrument.[44] And they render the term in several appropriate

---

[40]Ulrich and Flint note that 1QIsa[a] diverges from the Masoretic reading at this point with the phrase המות נבלתך 'the death of your corpse.' But this reading of the manuscript is not apparent, nor is it the most persuasive. See Ulrich and Flint (2010a), 24; Ulrich and Flint (2010b), 134. Nonetheless, this seems to be how the Latin read the phrase: *concidit cadaver*. And at least the first term of the Syriac captures this reading as well: ܡܚܐ ܡܘܬܐ. In the larger context of the chapter, this reading makes good sense. But the phrase is awkwardly placed in 14:11, especially in apposition to the noun גאונך. For similar readings of the Hebrew המית, see Symmachus' εθανατωθη and Theodotion's ο θανατος.

[41]See Isa 16:11; 17:12; 22:2; 51:15; 59:10-11.

[42]Note the pairing of הָמוֹן and ἐθνῶν πολλῶν in Isa 13:4.

[43]The logic of this orthographic confusion follows. The *he* and the *mem* in המית would have been understood correctly. But given the shape of *taw* in Qumran orthography, this single letter could have easily been understood to represent two letters: *waw* and *nun*. Remember, scribes were inconsistent in their use of medial and final letters. The *yod* would then have been read as the tittle on the *mem*. Even a cursory glance at 1QIsa[a] shows this explanation to be plausible. And the evidence from the pairings in Hebrew and Greek Isaiah strongly point in this direction. For an insightful statement, see Ottley (1906), 178: "πολλή suggests that LXX. interpreted המיה, as המון is often used, of multitude or abundance, rather than of musical sound."

[44]See See 1 Sam 10:5; 2 Sam 6:5; 1 Kgs 10:12; Isa 5:12; Isa 14:11; Amos 5:23; Amos 6:5; Psa 33:2; Psa

ways: ψαλτήριον, ὄργανον,[45] ψαλμός, κιθάρα. Even though some translational divergence occurs, it is clear that the translators understood the term's musical connotations. So given Greek Isaiah's correct rendering at 5:12, why would he have diverged from musical semantics in 14:11? It is difficult to say. But an analysis of the root εὐφραν- may aid the discussion.

Within Isa 14:1-32, the Greek translator employs the εὐφραν- root 4 times, twice as the verb εὐφραίνω and twice as the noun εὐφροσύνη:

Isa 14:7	כָּל־הָאָרֶץ פָּצְחוּ רִנָּה	πᾶσα ἡ γῆ βοᾷ μετ᾽ εὐφροσύνης
Isa 14:8	גַּם־בְּרוֹשִׁים שָׂמְחוּ לְךָ	καὶ τὰ ξύλα τοῦ Λιβάνου ηὐφράνθησαν ἐπὶ σοί
Isa 14:11	הוּרַד שְׁאוֹל גְּאוֹנֶךָ הֲמִיַּת נְבָלֶיךָ	κατέβη δὲ εἰς ᾅδου ἡ δόξα σου, ἡ πολλή σου εὐφροσύνη
Isa 14:29	אַל־תִּשְׂמְחִי פְלֶשֶׁת כֻּלֵּךְ׃	μὴ εὐφρανθείητε, πάντες οἱ ἀλλόφυλοι

Given the thematic repetition of rejoicing in the Hebrew text at 14:7; 14:8; and 14:29, it is possible that the translator sought to emphasize this contextual feature when the text before him proved difficult (i.e., 14:11). He most likely knew that the phrase הֲמִיַּת נְבָלֶיךָ demanded something signifying noise. And the appositional parallel with the גְּאוֹן / δόξα pairing from earlier in the verse also could have influenced him in this direction. But since all the occurrences of נֵבֶל in the Hebrew Bible also contain parallels to other musical instruments, he may not have understood the musical referent in Isa 14:11 given the absence of lexical parallels.

Even if the translator understood the reference to the harp, his rendering of הֲמִיַּת as πολύς would have made this phrase difficult to understand: 'your great harp.' This rendering would have been additionally difficult to grasp in light of this phrase's appositional relationship to the previous one. So, in an effort to explicate the difficult text before him, it seems that the translator sought out a relevant idea from the context of chapter 14. In this case, it proved to be the root εὐφραν- attested throughout this chapter. And this term fit both the immediate and larger contexts of the discourse. Thus, by selecting this Greek lexeme, the translator created a repetition which represented his stylistic renderings elsewhere in the oracle. Given this reading, the

57:9; 71:22; 81:3; 92:4; 108:3; 144:9; 150:3; Neh 12:27; 1 Chr 13:8; 1 Chr 15:16; 1 Chr 15:20; 1 Chr 15:28; 1 Chr 16:5; 1 Chr 25:1; 1 Chr 25:6; 2 Chr 5:12; 2 Chr 9:11; 2 Chr 20:28; 2 Chr 29:25.

[45]Only in Amos 5:23; 6:5.

translator of Greek Isaiah sought to preserve the literary thrust of his Hebrew text despite his lexical deviations from it.

Example 14: Isaiah 14:12

The present example addresses the translator of Greek Isaiah's approach to the final phrases from each clause in Isa 14:12. I will not discuss the openings of each phrase in this example since I treat them in greater detail in subsequent chapters. But we should note that even though the translator changed the second person singular referent of the Hebrew to the third person in his translation, he nonetheless captured the semantics of the clause. I now elaborate upon the final elements of each clause:

14:12a	אֵיךְ נָפַלְתָּ מִשָּׁמַיִם הֵילֵל בֶּן־שָׁחַר	πῶς ἐξέπεσεν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὁ ἑωσφόρος ὁ πρωὶ ἀνατέλλων;
	How you fell from heaven, O day star, son of the dawn!	*How the day star fell from heaven, the one who rises early;*
14:12b	נִגְדַּעְתָּ לָאָרֶץ חוֹלֵשׁ עַל־גּוֹיִם׃	συνετρίβη εἰς τὴν γῆν ὁ ἀποστέλλων πρὸς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη.
	You were struck down to the earth, you who laid the nations low.	*The one who sends to all the nations was crushed to the earth.*

Three pieces of linguistic data in these Greek renderings deserve attention as we consider the translator's approach in creating a stylistic Greek text. The first piece of data concerns the rendering of the noun הֵילֵל with ὁ ἑωσφόρος.[46] Next, I discuss the appositional phrase בֶּן־שָׁחַר and its pairing with the attributive participial phrase. The last point concerns the divergent lexical and semantic pairing between the participles חוֹלֵשׁ and ὁ ἀποστέλλων.

The term הֵילֵל in verse 12a is a *hapax legomenon* in the Hebrew Bible. But the translator's use of the term ὁ ἑωσφόρος may suggest that he appropriately understood the meaning of the Hebrew since both terms can be glossed as 'morning star,' whether referring to

[46]See the following articles for discussion regarding the interpretive complexities present within this section of prophetic discourse. Spronk (1998), 717-26; See also Heiser (2001): 354-69; Albani (2004), 62-86; Quick (2017): 1-20. See the references in Quick's article for this history of research on this passage. On page 11, Quick provides the following insightful comment: "Despite the prevalence of this interpretation of *hêlēl ben-šaḥar* in modern translations, the meaning 'Venus' is by no means the necessary or even the most obvious reading of the phrase."

the planet Venus or to the Sun itself.[47] The previous chapter contains the verb הלל at 13:10, where the translator rendered the phrase לֹא יָהֵלּוּ אוֹרָם as τὸ φῶς οὐ δώσουσι. While the Greek semantics of the example from chapter 14 capture the meaning of the Hebrew, it is difficult to know whether the translator understood the meaning of הלל 'to shine' in chapter 13 or whether he gathered its sense from context.[48]

Beyond this passage, the term ἑωσφόρος occurs 6 times in the whole of the Septuagint corpus.[49] In these occurrences, the pairing always relates to Hebrew terms signifying radiance and light. In 1 Sam 30:17, ἑωσφόρος translates נֶשֶׁף 'twilight.' And in Psa 110:3, the term מִשְׁחָר pairs with πρὸ ἑωσφόρου, speaking of the 'womb of the dawn.' This connection between ἑωσφόρος and שַׁחַר is then modeled several other times. Last of all, Job 11:17 joins ἑωσφόρος to the common בֹּקֶר which in most other contexts pairs with πρωί. Regardless of whether the translator knew the meaning of the noun הֵילֵל, his use of the term ἑωσφόρος is an accurate rendering of its meaning. And if the translator did not in fact understand the Hebrew, he was well aware of the lexemes in the surrounding context and supplied ἑωσφόρος as a fitting gloss.

The final element in 14:12a is simpler to describe since it seems that the translator most likely based his of understanding this phrase upon his familiarity with the meaning of בֶּן־שָׁחַר. The noun שַׁחַר 'dawn, morning' occurs over 20 times in the Hebrew Bible and is typically rendered by the Greek translators with the noun ὄρθρος 'dawn, early morning.'[50] In

---

[47]LSJ (1996), 725 ἑωσφόρος 'bringer of morn, the morning star'; Bauer (2000), 424 ἑωσφόρος, ου, ὁ 'morning star,' from ἕω, Attic form of Ionic ἠώ 'dawn, morning' and φέρω; Muraoka (2009), 312 1. 'the morning-star' 2. 'the time of appearance of the morning-star, dawn.' Compare this context with its occurrence in 2 Pet 2:19.

[48]The verb הלל also occurs at Job 29:3; 31:26; 41:10. Greek Job pairs two Greek terms with the Hebrew: αὐγέω 'to shine' from αὐγή 'light, rays' and ἐπιφαύσκω 'to arise, shine.' The translator of Greek Job seems to have understood the meaning of the Hebrew verb.

[49]See 1 Sam 30:17; Psa 110[11]:3; Job 3:9; 11:17; 38:12; 41:10; Isa 14:12. The *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* notes that this term occurs 9 times in pre-Septuagintal literature. In its few occurrences, it can be found in Homer, Plato, and Eudoxus of Cnidus. This may suggest that the translator employed it in lieu of his concern for 'high-literary' style.

[50]See Gen 19:15; 32:25; 32:27; Josh 6:15; Judg 19:25; 1 Sam 9:26; Isa 14:12; 58:8; Hos 6:3; 10:15; Joel 2:2; Amos 4:13; Jonah 4:7; Psa 22[21]:1; Psa 57[56]:9; Psa 108[9]:3; Psa 139[8]:9; Job 3:9; Job 38:12; Job 41:10;

only a few instances is the term translated differently. But each of these divergent pairings accurately captures the Hebrew semantics.[51] Since semantic knowledge of בֶּן־שַׁחַר is more well-attested by Septuagint translators than of הֵילֵל, it seems that this Hebrew phrase could have served as a starting point for the translator's construction of this final phrase in Isa 14:12a. But instead of pairing ὁ ἑωσφόρος with בֶּן־שַׁחַר, it seems that he paired it with הֵילֵל so that it could function as the head noun. And in turn, the translator employed the attributive phrase ὁ πρωὶ ἀνατέλλων to highlight the Hebrew semantics in a stylistic way which also conveyed the appositional element בֶּן־שַׁחַר from the *Vorlage*.[52]

The final salient point to discuss concerns the translator's transmission of the Hebrew participle חוֹלֵשׁ with the Greek participle ὁ ἀποστέλλων. The verb חלשׁ 'to defeat, be weakened' occurs only 3 times in the Hebrew Bible.[53] And in addition to an absence of Septuagintal pairing between חלשׁ and ἀποστέλλω, these terms also share no semantic overlap with one another. So, it seems that the translator of Greek Isaiah not only misunderstood this term, but he also supplied a Greek gloss which diverged significantly from the lexical parallels in the immediate context. And while the use of the participle ὁ ἀποστέλλων serves as a parallel both stylistically and phonologically with ὁ πρωὶ ἀνατέλλων in the previous line, the rationale behind this specific Greek lexeme is not immediately obvious. What could account for this feature?

Song 6:10; Neh 4:15.

[51]See πρωί in Gen 32:25; see πρόϊμος in Isa 58:8; ἑωθινός 'early, in the morning' in Jonah 4:7; Psa 22[21]:1; ἑωσφόρος in Job 41:10. Isaiah 14:12 diverges from this pattern with its idiosyncratic rendering ὁ πρωὶ ἀνατέλλων.

[52]Isaiah 58:8 also pairs the term שַׁחַר with πρόϊμος 'early,' a term related to πρωί: אָז יִבָּקַע כַּשַּׁחַר אוֹרֶךָ rendered as τότε ῥαγήσεται πρόιμον τὸ φῶς σου. Thus, the translator seems inclined to associate these these two concepts together in contrast to the majority trend in the Septuagint to link ἑωσφόρος with שַׁחַר. Regarding this phrase, Quick (2017), 13-14, adds: "The translation of the LXX as ἑωσφόρος ὁ πρωὶ ἀνατέλλων, 'bringer of the morn, who used to rise early in the morning,' perfectly fits an interpretation of the sun as the referent of *hêlēl ben-šaḥar*: surely more so than any star, it is the sun which portents the dawn." She agrees with my assessment that the Septuagint captures the thrust of the Hebrew text despite its lexical divergences.

[53]See Exod 17:13; Isa 14:12; Job 14:10. The noun חַלָּשׁ 'weakling' occurs only once at Joel 4:10. While HALOT divides the verb into two categories, BDB is most likely correct in organizing the term into only a singular category. The paucity of data makes precision difficult.

Given that the term חוֹלֵשׁ was misunderstood by the translator, the apparent disparity of these terms may be explained by an extension of a feature described by Emanuel Tov as the 'interchange of consonants.'[54] According to Tov's research and analysis, this interchange of consonants concerns "single letters or combinations of two letters, mainly because of their similar shape." But he then goes on to say that, "this focus thus excludes interchanges of letters or words because of other reasons, such as context, language, exegesis, and theology."[55] But it is precisely this exclusion which I hope to exploit here. In particular, it seems that the translator of Greek Isaiah fully understood the consonantal arrangement of the root חלשׁ. But given his ignorance of its meaning, he seems to have moved the consonants around in his mind to synthesize the root שׁלח.[56] And in light of the overwhelming majority of pairings between שׁלח and ἀποστέλλω in Greek Isaiah, this proposal has sufficient evidentiary and explanatory power.[57] This decision was likely motivated by a desire to preserve the thematic and contextual meaning of the passage in a stylistically appropriate way which also simultaneously attended to the details of the Hebrew text.[58]

---

[54]See Tov (1999), 301-11. See also Tov (2007), 459-82, which is indirectly related to this topic.

[55]Tov (1999), 302.

[56]See Ottley (1904), 119: "Apparently חולשׁ read as שׁלח"; Ottley (1906), 178: "Evidently here LXX. misread חולשׁ, participle of חלשׁ, 'discomfit,' 'weaken,' and took it from שׁלח, 'send,' transposing the letters"; Karrer and Kraus (2011), 2541: "*Der Übersetzer liest* שׁולח *statt* חולשׁ ›*der besiegt*‹"; van der Kooij (2019), 519. This phenomena also seems to occur in Mal 3:8-9 where the translator interpreted the root קבע 'to rob' as עקב 'to betray, hamper, hinder' and rendered it with πτερνίζω 'to strike at the heel, trip up, supplant.' See the discussion in Vianès (2011), 147-50: "*[L]e TM n'a pas* 'qb *mais* qb' *qui comporte les mêmes consonnes en ordre différent . . . En rendant* qb' *par* pternízō *le traducteur grec semble avoir voulu que l'on lise* 'qb. *cela ne suppose pas un* Vorlage *différente du TM mais est l'équivalent d'un* qerē *pour un* ketīv *difficile*." In addition to the plausibility of this scenario noted above, the Hebrew reading חלשׁ is evidenced in all the ancient witnesses, including 1QIsa[a] and Theodotion. However, this semantic and orthographic disparity could have resulted from several other factors. My position is that it was an intentional decision on the basis of Hebrew misunderstanding. However, it could also have been the result of a cognitive lapse of consonantal order, or simply an instance of periblepsis. On these latter two topics, see the discussion on the fruitfulness of cognitive science for textual criticism in Vroom (2016).

[57]In the Babylonian Talmud, *Shabbat* 23.3, the Rabbis interpret the phrase חוֹלֵשׁ עַל־גּוֹיִם 'you who defeated/laid low the nations' as 'you who cast lots over the nations.' This Rabbinic understanding likely derives from the Hebrew/Aramaic root חלק 'to have a share in.' See Neusner (2005), 149b.

[58]It should be noted that the translator did not provide a participial object for ἀποστέλλω. He could have supplied the noun τὸ φῶς to create a more explicit parallel with the preceding phrase. But this might have altered his strict observance of the *Vorlage*. Even though Greek Isaiah deviated from the Hebrew text at the lexical level, the

It seems that the use of ἀποστέλλω in 14:12b was motivated by several factors, each deriving from the Hebrew text in some way. The rendering was motivated by the consonantal interchange from חולֹש to שולֹח in accord with a modified portrayal of Tov's form of 'consonantal interchange.' The translator also sought to create a parallel with the participle in the previous line—ὁ πρωὶ ἀνατέλλων—by supplying one here: ὁ ἀποστέλλων. And these participles each exhibit phonological assonance with one another.

In sum, the translator approached the latter half of each clause in verse 12 with difficulty. And so, I provided a rationale above for his construction of this verse. Given his understanding of the phrase בֶּן־שַׁחַר in verse 12a, he supplied an accurate contextual guess for the preceding term הֵילֵל.[59] And in light of these decisions, he constructed his phrase in verse 12b by creating a grammatical and phonological parallel with his choice of the participle ὁ ἀποστέλλων.[60]

Example 15: Isaiah 14:13

In this discussion, I highlight a thematic parallel between Isa 14:13 and 37:24 which sheds light into the translator of Greek Isaiah's intertextual and stylistic approach to his renderings of the Hebrew text. This portion of the Babylon oracle from chapter 14 describes the king of Babylon's notorious attempt to gain a seat on God's heavenly throne. I begin by

---

translator sought in many ways to preserve the consonantal text. Interestingly, NETS supplies the participial object: "How is fallen from heaven the Day Star, which used to rise early in the morning! He has been crushed into the earth who used to send light to all the nations." Contrast *BdA*: "*Comment? Est-il tombé du ciel, l'astre de l'aurore, qui se lève au matin? Il s'est brisé à terre, celui qui envoyait des émissaires auprès de toutes les nations!*"

[59]Symmachus and Theodotion both reinterpret חלֹש in accordance with its Hebrew semantics, strongly suggesting that they understood the meaning of this verb. Symmachus renders the Hebrew with the term ο τιτρωσκων 'the one who wounds' which captures its transitive semantics. And Theodotion captures the intransitive meaning of the verb with the phrase ο ασθενειας παρεχων 'the one who shows weaknesses.'

[60]Lacking in this discussion is a treatment of the addition of πάντα to the phrase עַל־גּוֹיִם / πρὸς πάντα τὸ ἔθνη. This addition seems to motivated by other occurrences of either כֹּל + גּוֹיִם or כֹּל + מַלְכֵי גּוֹיִם in the chapter. See Isa 14:9c; 14:7; 14:29; 14:26. The Greek here likely constitutes a stylistic rendering in light of this repetition. See the comments by Van der Vorm-Croughs (2014), 321-22, regarding contextual anaphoric renderings.

describing the lexical features of 14:13 before developing its intertextual connection with the Greek of 37:24:

14:13a-b	וְאַתָּה אָמַרְתָּ בִלְבָבְךָ הַשָּׁמַיִם אֶעֱלֶה *But you said in your heart:* *"I shall go up to heaven;*	σὺ δὲ εἶπας τῇ διανοίᾳ σου εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀναβήσομαι, *But you said in your mind: "I will ascend into heaven,*
14:13c	מִמַּעַל לְכוֹכְבֵי־אֵל אָרִים כִּסְאִי *"I shall raise my throne above the stars of God;*	ἐπάνω τῶν ἄστρων τοῦ θεοῦ θήσω τὸν θρόνον μου[61] *I will set my throne above the stars of God,*
14:13d	וְאֵשֵׁב בְּהַר־מוֹעֵד בְּיַרְכְּתֵי צָפוֹן׃ *I shall dwell upon the mountain of testimony in the far corners of the north."*	καθιῶ ἐν ὄρει ὑψηλῷ ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρη τὰ ὑψηλὰ τὰ πρὸς βορρᾶν, *I will sit on a high mountain, upon the high mountains which are in the north."*

Isaiah 14:13 contains two pieces of significant data which require attention before the stylistic significance of this example can be detailed. First, I consider the initial prepositional phrase in 14:13d. The translator rendered the bound member of this phrase in a straightforward manner. The Hebrew and Greek pairings of בְּהַר with ἐν ὄρει follow normal semantic patterns. However, the translator's decision to render מוֹעֵד with ὑψηλός is peculiar to this passage.[62] Furthermore, the rendering of this term elsewhere in Greek Isaiah illustrates the translator's eclectic approach to this lexeme.[63] But the importance and frequency of this term in the Hebrew Bible make it difficult to propose that the translator was ignorant of its meaning. So we must look elsewhere to understand why he rendered it with ὑψηλός. Before considering an explanation for this lexical pairing, however, I must detail the second datum of interest in this clause.

---

[61]Slight disagreement exists between the editions of Rahlfs and Ziegler here. Rahlfs reads ἐπάνω τῶν ἄστρων *τοῦ οὐρανοῦ* whereas Ziegler reads τῶν ἄστρων *τοῦ θεοῦ*. The strength of Ziegler's text is its semantic correlation between the Greek and Hebrew. But the strength of Rahlfs' text is its external Greek evidence. The reading τοῦ οὐρανοῦ occurs in the major 4th and 5th century Greek codices, but Ziegler's reading is only found in Cyprian and Tyconius, likely following the MT. And since the translator of Greek Isaiah does not always follow his Hebrew text lexeme-by-lexeme, evidence for Ziegler's reading should not be considered reliable. On this point, Symmachus is recorded as preserving the reading in Rahlfs. Yet, 710 records the readings of Aquila and Theodotion as ισχυρου and Symmachus as θεου. See the full discussion in chapter 2.

[62]Ottley (1906), 197, suggests that מועד was read as מאד, and was thus paired with ὑψηλός. But מְאֹד always pairs with σφόδρα in Greek Isaiah. And ὑψηλός never pairs with מְאֹד elsewhere in the biblical corpus.

[63]Isaiah 1:14 contains ἑορτή 'festival' and 33:20 contains σωτήριον 'salvation.'

The second prepositional phrase in 14:13d stands in apposition to the first phrase in both the Hebrew and Greek. Even though this syntactical element was accurately carried over from the Hebrew, the translator's lexical renderings within this phrase are difficult to explain. The noun יְרֵכָה occurs 28 times in the Hebrew Bible and signifies either the 'rear' of a building or a 'far part' geographically. On the whole, it appears that the Septuagint translators understood the meaning of this term. And apart from this divergent pairing as τὰ ὄρη τὰ ὑψηλά in 14:13, the renderings in Greek Isaiah indicate that the translator was aware of the Hebrew term's meaning as well.[64] This semantic departure enabled these clauses at 14:13 to function as parallels with one another, a sign of the translator's stylistic motivations.[65] And the Greek rendering of the final term צָפוֹן 'north' with the idiomatic τὰ πρὸς βορρᾶν accurately transmitted the meaning of the Hebrew.[66] But there may be another reason why the translator supplied this repetitive sequence in his departure from the Hebrew.

I think we can discover the rationale behind the translator's renderings in 14:13d by examining a thematically related passage in Isa 37:24. This verse occurs in a context where Yhwh addresses Hezekiah through the prophet Isaiah concerning Sennacherib, the king of Assyria. This Assyrian king previously mocked the nation of Israel in language resembling Yhwh's own promises to Israel (cf. Isa 36:4-20). But now Yhwh repeats Sennacherib's speech in language similar to that present in Isa 14:13. The first clause of verse 24 is especially important at this point:

37:24a	אֲנִי עָלִיתִי מְרוֹם הָרִים יַרְכְּתֵי לְבָנוֹן *I went up to the heights of the mountains at the far corners*	ἐγὼ ἀνέβην εἰς ὕψος ὀρέων καὶ εἰς τὰ ἔσχατα τοῦ Λιβάνου *I went up to the height of the mountains and to the limits of Lebanon*

[64]Isaiah 14:15 contains θεμέλιον 'foundation' and 37:24 contains ἔσχατος 'end.'

[65]Van der Vorm-Croughs (2014), 239 recognizes this feature: "*Reduplicatio* [or, *anadiplosis*] is the repetition of the last member of a syntactic or metrical word group at the beginning of the immediately following syntactic or metrical word group. In LXX Isaiah fresh cases of this figure, generated by means of an addition, occur only sporadically." But she recognizes 14:13 as an example of this feature: "Also in 14:13 the similar items in *reduplicatio* are repeated in a different inflexion."

[66]The term צָפוֹן occurs over 140 times in the Hebrew Bible and is nearly always translated with βορρᾶς in the Septuagint. When this term occurs in the book of Isaiah, the translator always paired it with βορρᾶς. See Isa 14:13; 14:31; 41:25; 43:6; 49:12.

	of Lebanon;	
37:24b	וְאֶכְרֹת קוֹמַת אֲרָזָיו מִבְחַר בְּרֹשָׁיו *I cut down its tall cedars, its choice cypresses;*	καὶ ἔκοψα τὸ ὕψος τῆς κέδρου αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ κάλλος τῆς κυπαρίσσου *and I cut down the height of its cedar and the beauty of the cypress*
37:24c	וְאָבוֹא מְרוֹם קִצּוֹ יַעַר כַּרְמִלּוֹ׃ *I will come to its highest height, to its fertile forest.*	καὶ εἰσῆλθον εἰς ὕψος μέρους τοῦ δρυμοῦ *and I entered into the height of the forest region*

Two pieces of evidence substantiate this claim. First, at the level of Hebrew, this verse contains the only other occurrence of the noun יְרֵכָה in Isaiah apart from the discourse of Isa 14:12-15. And even though the translator rendered this term with ἔσχατος at 37:24a, its parallel with the previous prepositional phrase εἰς ὕψος ὀρέων suggests conceptual association between the referents. Additionally, this previous phrase εἰς ὕψος ὀρέων is remarkably similar to the language in Isa 14:13.[67] This leads to the next point, namely that this passage, along with Isa 14:13, contains the only combination of הַר and יְרֵכָה in the biblical corpus. So, given the double use of these terms in the Hebrew in combination with similar Greek renderings, it seems more than plausible that the translator inserted the more 'literal' renderings from 37:24 into his divergent pairings at 14:13. This resembles the insertion of the phrase μὴ φοβεῖσθε from Isa 40:9 into 13:2.

This connection may be strengthened further by considering additional contextual parallels between 37:24 and 14:8. The opening of the taunt against the king of Babylon describes the king as a woodcutter who formerly destroyed Lebanon's cedars:[68]

14:8a	גַּם־בְּרוֹשִׁים שָׂמְחוּ לְךָ אַרְזֵי לְבָנוֹן	καὶ τὰ ξύλα τοῦ Λιβάνου ηὐφράνθησαν ἐπὶ σοὶ καὶ ἡ κέδρος τοῦ Λιβάνου
14:8b	מֵאָז שָׁכַבְתָּ	ἀφ᾽ οὗ σὺ κεκοίμησαι,
14:8c	לֹא־יַעֲלֶה הַכֹּרֵת עָלֵינוּ׃	οὐκ ἀνέβη ὁ κόπτων ἡμᾶς.

This combination of woodcutting and the mention of Lebanon's trees is remarkably similar to the language of Isa 37:24 where Sennacherib claims to have gone up to Lebanon's mountains and lopped down its cedars and cypresses.[69] This language occurs in both the Hebrew and the Greek.

---

[67]Recall the double use of each noun ὄρος and ὕψος in Isa 14:13d: καθιῶ ἐν ὄρει ὑψηλῷ ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρη τὰ ὑψηλὰ τὰ πρὸς βορρᾶν.

[68]See Osborne (2018), 118-27. Osborne also notes these connections within the book of Isaiah along with the arboreal connections in Isa 10:33-34; 14:12 ;14:19.

[69]For research on specific arboreal themes which also connects these passages, see Austin (2019), 301-2.

Furthermore, these two texts contain the only pairings of such terminology in the book of Isaiah.[70] These observations suggest that the translator of Greek Isaiah made his connections between these two chapters based upon such linguistic and thematic features.

In sum, Greek Isaiah's construction of 14:13 was influenced not only by concerns for style attested in the repetition of Greek terms, but also by thematic and intertextual borrowing from Isa 37:24. The stylistic emphasis upon 'height' may be due to the translator's emphasis upon the king who sought to parallel the Most High (i.e., ὕψιστος). But the translator also seems to have understood the thematic parallels of royal hubris from both of these passages as well. And in an effort to convey this feature of arrogant rulership, the translator described the king of Babylon in the language which Yhwh employed for the king of Assyria. The first intertextual connection addressed in this chapter concerned the influence of Isa 14:1-3 upon the translator's rendering of Isa 56:1-7. There, the translator read his source text forward into a cataphorically related passage. But in Isa 14:13, the translator made an anaphoric intertextual connection where he read Isa 37:24 backwards into his rendering of Isa 14:13.[71]

Example 16: Isaiah 14:17

Greek Isaiah 14:17 contains several interesting features when read in its structural context. But since I elaborate upon these structural features in chapters 5 and 6, I limit the discussion here to two salient facets in verse 17c. The first treats the rendering of the noun phrase and the second concerns the placement of the verb:[72]

14:17a-b	שָׂם תֵּבֵל כַּמִּדְבָּר וְעָרָיו הָרָס	ὁ θεὶς τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην ἔρημον καὶ τὰς πόλεις καθεῖλε,

[70]Isaiah 41:19 contains a list of several trees in which the cedar and cypress are included. But this passage does not pair them together as they are in 14:8 and 37:24.

[71]Osborne (2018), 124, understands Isa 14:8-21 as I suggest Greek Isaiah has: "the passage points toward a comparison between arrogant foreign kings. The taunt over the king of Babylon . . . projected the same impending judgment as that which fell on the forest-chopping, city-leveling, arrogant king of Assyria." See also the extended discussion of Isa 36-39 in Van der Vorm-Croughs (2014), 305-19.

[72]On the syntax of this clause, see Gesenius (2006), §117o: "Sometimes the verb, on which an accusative of the object really depends, is contained only in sense in the verb which apparently governs, e.g. Is 14[17] אֲסִירָי לֹא־פָתַח בֵּיתָה *his prisoners he let not loose* nor sent them back *to their home*."

	Who set the world like the desert,	*The one who set the whole inhabited world as a desert and*
	and he destroyed its cities;	*he destroyed cities,*
14:17c	אֲסִירָיו לֹא־פָתַח בָּיְתָה׃	τοὺς ἐν ἐπαγωγῇ οὐκ ἔλυσε.
	he did not send home his prisoners.	*he did not release those in distress.*

The translator likely rendered the first noun of verse 17c freely as τοὺς ἐν ἐπαγωγῇ and condensed the remainder of the phrase into the verb λύω. His rendering is a bit peculiar since he clearly evidenced knowledge of these Hebrew terms elsewhere in his translation.[73] But the Greek resembles the translation pattern at Isa 10:4 where the Hebrew term אַסִּיר was paired with the phrase εἰς ἐπαγωγήν 'in distress.'[74] Thus, it is obvious that the translator knew the meaning of this common stem and merely adapted his translation to contextual demands. The use of ἐπαγωγή seems to be a gloss of implication. And its placement in this noun phrase indicates that the translator created a stylistic rendering of his Hebrew text alongside a possible intertextual allusion to the same term in Isa 10:4.[75] The translated phrase is typical idiomatic Greek, not a feature common in Hebrew literature.[76]

The decision to place the verb at the end of the line seems to have motivated the condensation of the noun phrase in its clause-initial position. I say this because the placement of the clause-terminal verb λύω reflects the position of the verb καθαιρέω in the previous clause.[77]

---

[73]Although Isa 14:17 contains the sole occurrence of אָסִיר in the book, the verb אסר 'to bind' occurs on three occasions: 22:2; 49:9; 61:1. Isaiah 22:2 contains מְקֻשָּׁת אֻסְרוּ כָּל־נִמְצָאַיִךְ rendered at καὶ οἱ ἁλόντες σκληρῶς δεδεμένοι εἰσί, employing the verb δέω 'to bind.' Isaiah 49:9 contains לֵאמֹר לָאֲסוּרִים צֵאוּ rendered as λέγοντα τοῖς ἐν δεσμοῖς Ἐξελθατε, supplying the nominal form δεσμός 'bond, fetter'. Isaiah 61:1 proves to be more difficult where the Hebrew text reads לִקְרֹא לִשְׁבוּיִם דְּרוֹר וְלַאֲסוּרִים פְּקַח־קוֹחַ and the Greek contains κηρύξαι αἰχμαλώτοις ἄφεσιν καὶ τυφλοῖς ἀνάβλεψιν. The final two terms in the Greek seem to be an addition. And so the translator may have conflated the rest of this clause into the Greek phrase κηρύξαι αἰχμαλώτοις ἄφεσιν, thus reading the Hebrew אסר at least in part as αἰχμάλωτος 'captive'. Regardless of how we understand this last phrase, the translator evidences a clear understanding of אסר's Hebrew meaning.

[74]The noun אַסִּיר occurs twice more in Isaiah. See 24:22 וְאֻסְּפוּ אֲסֻפָּה אַסִּיר עַל־בּוֹר rendered as καὶ συνάξουσιν καὶ ἀποκλείσουσιν εἰς ὀχύρωμα καὶ εἰς δεσμωτήριον; Isa 42:7 לְהוֹצִיא מִמַּסְגֵּר אַסִּיר rendered as ἐξαγαγεῖν ἐκ δεσμῶν δεδεμένους. Both of these Greek renderings illustrate the translator's awareness of אַסִּיר's Hebrew semantics.

[75]See Karrer and Kraus (2011), 2542: "Der Übersetzer übersetzt אסיר wie in 10,4, liest פתח pi. und übergeht ביתה."

[76]See Appendix 4 for an extended discussion of the semantics of ἐπαγωγή.

[77]The translator's use of λύω also reflects his understanding of the *Qal* stem פתח in the MT as a *Pi'el*.

Thus, the translator likely sought to create a paralleled syntactic arrangement between these two clauses. This pair of clause-terminal verbs reflects the translator's patterned concern for stylistic symmetry in his renderings which we have seen elsewhere.

Example 17: Isaiah 14:19-20

In line with the influence of Isa 37:24 upon Isa 14:13, I argue in a similar vein with respect to the translator's construction of Isa 14:19-20. And while several lexical items in the Greek accurately represent the semantics of the Hebrew in this passage, the majority of the Greek phrases here deviate so thoroughly from the source text that we could even posit different Hebrew readings behind the Greek.[78] However, given the translator's renderings at 14:13 to 'read backwards,' it seems worthwhile to consider the possible influence of other Isaianic passages upon this verse. I begin by detailing the difficulties between the Hebrew and the Greek of verse 19 and then proceed to highlight the influence of certain lexemes and phrases within Isa 34:1-12 and Isa 63:1-6 upon its construction:[79]

14:19a	וְאַתָּה הָשְׁלַכְתָּ מִקִּבְרְךָ כְּנֵצֶר נִתְעָב	σὺ δὲ ῥιφήσῃ ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν ὡς νεκρὸς ἐβδελυγμένος
	But you were cast out from your grave like a loathed branch	*But you will be cast out into the mountains like an abominable corpse*
14:19b	לְבוּשׁ הֲרֻגִים	μετὰ πολλῶν τεθνηκότων
	clothed with the slain,	*with many who have died,*
14:19c	מְטֹעֲנֵי חָרֶב[80]	ἐκκεκεντημένων μαχαίραις
	those pierced by the sword,	*those who have been pierced with swords,*

See HALOT, 987 pi. 1.a. 'to let loose'; 1.b. 'to untie'; 1.c. 'to undo'; 1.d. 'to liberate'.

[78]For another treatment of these difficulties with this passage, see Troxel (2008), 209-18. See also Seeligmann (2004), 172; Van der Vorm-Croughs (2014), 144. For text-critical discussion on the Hebrew text, see Barthélemy (1986), 104-105; de Waard (1997), 64-65.

[79]For a discussion of the peculiarities in this clause, see Osborne (2018), 125n35. See Jerome's comments in Scheck (2015), 313-14, where he discusses features of the Hebrew, Old Greek, Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion. Symmachus captures Isa 14:19 almost word-for-word with precise lexical and semantic overlap. Aquila's vocabulary differs slightly but captures the Hebrew text similarly.

[80]The verb ܩܛܠ 'to kill' for טען 'to pierce' in the Peshitta may indicate that the Syriac translator did not know the meaning of the Hebrew as it is a *hapax* in the Hebrew Bible. Nonetheless, the Syriac generally captures the sense from context.

14:19d	יוֹרְדֵי אֶל־אַבְנֵי־בוֹר	καταβαινόντων εἰς ᾅδου.
	those who go down to the stones of the pit,	*those who descend into Hades.*
14:19e	כְּפֶגֶר מוּבָס׃	ὃν τρόπον ἱμάτιον ἐν αἵματι πεφυρμένον οὐκ ἔσται καθαρόν
	like a trampled corpse.	*Like a garment which has been defiled with blood, he will not be clean.*

The only Greek clauses in the above examples which resemble the Hebrew semantics occur in 19a, 19c, and 19d. And even these clauses contain obscure renderings amidst the aforementioned 'literal' ones. The more difficult instances of clauses 'b' and 'd' house renderings whose origins are difficult when compared to the Hebrew.

At verse 19a, the well-known noun קֶבֶר 'grave' seems to pair with the phrase ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν 'in the mountains.' The latter half of verse 19a seems to be a better fit for the Hebrew at verse 19e.[81] But the rendering at verse 19e deviates from the source text in such a way that it seems as if the translator disregarded the Hebrew entirely. And verse 19d deviates from the Hebrew in a stylistic way by paralleling other phrases in chapter 14.[82]

In light of these features, scholars have suggested several avenues of inner-Isaianic influence. Seeligmann noted that the rendering ἐν αἵματι πεφυρμένον at 14:19f resembled Aquila's reading of Isa 9:4[5]: וְשִׂמְלָה מְגוֹלָלָה בְּדָמִים as και ιματισμος πεφυρμενος εν αιμασιν. He noted that this suggests "the possibility of a fragment which was inserted into the Septuagint after Aquila."[83] Mirjam van der Vorm-Croughs offers a more persuasive option for this data, suggesting that the Greek renderings in Isa 14:19-20 were influenced by Hebrew similarities found in Ezek 16:6 and 16:22.[84]

While these suggestions remain possible, I think a simpler explanation can be found within the book of Isaiah itself. Inner-Isaianic textual play should take methodological

---

[81]See Ottley (1904-1906), 180: "ὃν τρόπον ἱμάτιον must be כבגד for כפגר 'like a carcase.'" Also Ziegler (1934), 94-95.

[82]See my discussion of Isa 14:7-21 in chapter 5 on micro-literary structure.

[83]Seeligmann (2004), 157.

[84]Van der Vorm-Croughs (2014), 426-28. See also Ziegler (1934), 114; Karrer and Kraus (2011), 2542. See Ottley (1904-1906), 2.180, who attributes most of the deviations to orthographic confusion.

precedence when exploring the translator's tendencies. So, I suggest instead that the translator of Greek Isaiah appropriated the divergent material in Isa 14:19 from other thematically related passages, specifically Isa 34:1-12 and 63:1-6. I begin with with a discussion of the material from Isaiah 34.

When we consider the thematic and lexical material of the Babylon oracle in Isa 13:1-14:23, it becomes apparent that several of its features also occur in chapter 34. Both of these passages describe the mutual downfall of cosmic forces with the destruction of militaristic forces on earth, resulting in the slaughter of nations.[85] We encountered features of cosmological destruction in 13:10 and 14:12-15, the destruction of militaristic forces and families in 13:4-8, 13:11-18, and 14:21-23, and the mention of desert animals in 13:20-22 and 14:23. All of these features are also present in the larger context of Isa 34:1-17, which indicates that the translator himself saw these chapters as both parallel and mutually interpretive of one another. In other words, both passages are 'apocalyptic' in expression:[86]

Isa 34:3	וְחַלְלֵיהֶם יֻשְׁלָכוּ	οἱ δὲ τραυματίαι αὐτῶν ῥιφήσονται
	וּפִגְרֵיהֶם יַעֲלֶה בָאְשָׁם	καὶ οἱ νεκροί, καὶ ἀναβήσεται αὐτῶν ἡ ὀσμή,
	וְנָמַסּוּ הָרִים מִדָּמָם׃	καὶ βραχήσεται τὰ ὄρη ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτῶν.
	Their slain shall be cast out;	*Now their wounded and their dead will be cast out*
	their corpses shall go up, their stench;	*and their smell will go up*
	the mountains shall flow with blood.	*and the mountains will be drenched with their blood.*
Isa 34:4	וְנָמַקּוּ כָּל־צְבָא הַשָּׁמָיִם	—
	וְנָגֹלּוּ כַסֵּפֶר הַשָּׁמָיִם	καὶ ἑλιγήσεται ὁ οὐρανὸς ὡς βιβλίον
	וְכָל־צְבָאָם יִבּוֹל	καὶ πάντα τὰ ἄστρα πεσεῖται
	כִּנְבֹל עָלֶה מִגָּפֶן	ὡς φύλλα ἐξ ἀμπέλου
	וּכְנֹבֶלֶת מִתְּאֵנָה׃	καὶ ὡς πίπτει φύλλα ἀπὸ συκῆς
	All the host of heaven will rot away;	—
	and the heavens will roll up like a scroll;	*And the heaven will be rolled up like a book;*
	and all their host shall fall like the falling	*and all the stars will fall like leaves from a vine*

[85]Compare Isa 14:21a הָכִינוּ לְבָנָיו מַטְבֵּחַ בַּעֲוֹן אֲבוֹתָם rendered as ἑτοίμασον τὰ τέκνα σου σφαγῆναι ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις τοῦ πατρός σου with Yhwh's destruction of the cosmic host in Isa 34:2: נְתָנָם לַטֶּבַח rendered as καὶ παραδοῦναι αὐτοὺς εἰς σφαγήν. Furthermore, similar language occurs in the Hebrew text between Isa 14:21 בַּל־יָקֻמוּ and Isa 34:1 וְיֵרְשׁוּ אֶרֶץ וּמָלְאוּ פְּנֵי־תֵבֵל עָרִים תִּשְׁמַע הָאָרֶץ וּמְלֹאָהּ תֵּבֵל וְכָל־צֶאֱצָאֶיהָ. These linguistic connections likely encouraged the translator to make the other connections I suggest above.

[86]Anna Angelini draws connections between these chapters as I do. See Angelini (2016): 97-109; Angelini (2015): 33-43.

of a leaf from a vine and like the falling of a fig tree.

and as leaves fall from a fig tree.

In addition to the thematic similarities mentioned above, Isa 14:19 and 34:3-4 also contain interesting lexical parallels. Both of these texts contain the only instance of *Hoph'al* שׁלךְ in the book Isaiah.[87] And in each instance of this Hebrew verb, Greek Isaiah captured its semantics with the future middle-passive form of ῥίπτω. Furthermore, several of the deviant Greek lexemes from Isa 14:19 occur in chapter 34 as well: νεκρός, ὄρος, αἷμα.[88] Consider these examples side by side:

14:19a	σὺ δὲ ῥιφήσῃ ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν	34:3a	οἱ δὲ τραυματίαι αὐτῶν ῥιφήσονται
14:19b	ὡς νεκρὸς ἐβδελυγμένος	34:3b	καὶ οἱ νεκροί, καὶ ἀναβήσεται αὐτῶν ἡ ὀσμή
14:19f	ἱμάτιον ἐν αἵματι πεφυρμένον	34:3c	καὶ βραχήσεται τὰ ὄρη ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτῶν

These verses constitute the only places in all of Greek Isaiah where this series of lexemes occur together. So, given the thematic and lexical similarities between these passages, the case for the translator 'reading backwards' from chapter 34 into chapter 14 is quite strong.

Many of the translational oddities in Isa 14:19 can be understood merely as literary and thematic insertions from Isa 34:3-4. And since this type of translation was outlined earlier with reference to Isa 13:2 and 14:13, it should not surprise us that it occurs here. However, these literary connections from chapter 34 do not answer all the difficulties present in Isa 14:19, specifically those related to the 'garment' mentioned in verse 19e. But when we consider material from Isaiah 63, a clearer portrait of the translator's construction of verse 19 emerges.

Isaiah 63:1-6 describes Yhwh as a victorious warrior whose garments are stained with the blood of his enemies as he comes from Edom and Bozrah. He accomplishes salvation for his people in the day of vengeance and in the year of salvation. Verses 1-2 in particular are the most significant for the present discussion:

Isa 63:1	מִי־זֶה בָּא מֵאֱדוֹם	τίς οὗτος ὁ παραγινέμενος ἐξ Εδωμ,
	חֲמוּץ בְּגָדִים מִבָּצְרָה	ἐρύθημα ἱματίων ἐκ Βοσορ,

[87]See Lisowsky (1958), 1447.

[88]On the phrase ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν in Isa 14:19, Ziegler (1934), 114, suggests Ezek 31:16 as influential for the translator's construction. He also highlights a possible connection with Isa 34:3, yet he does not discuss its significance in detail. Isaiah 34:5-6 also contain two occurrences of חֶרֶב / μαχαίρα, a pairing found in Isa 14:19c. This is not significant in terms of lexical deviation, but illustrates the contextual parallels between these passages.

	זֶה הָדוּר בִּלְבוּשׁוֹ צֹעֶה בְּרֹב כֹּחוֹ	οὕτως ὡραῖος ἐν στολῇ, βίᾳ μετὰ ἰσψύος;
	אֲנִי מְדַבֵּר בִּצְדָקָה רַב לְהוֹשִׁיעַ׃	ἐγὼ διαλέγομαι δικαιοσύνην καὶ κρίσιν σωτηρίου.
Isa 63:2	מַדּוּעַ אָדֹם לִלְבוּשֶׁךָ	διὰ τί σου ἐρυθρὰ <u>τὰ ἱμάτια</u>
	וּבְגָדֶיךָ כְּדֹרֵךְ בְּגַת׃	καὶ τὰ ἐνδύματά σου ὡς ἀπὸ πατητοῦ ληνοῦ;

Two main features in these verses are significant for discussion of Isa 14:19: geography and clothing. Even though the Greek texts of Isa 14:19 and 63:1-2 contain the term ἱμάτιον, the occurrence of this shared lexeme does not by itself demonstrate inner-Isaianic borrowing. However, when we consider the geographical terms in Isa 63:1 and their literary significance, we can discover a thematic link between the two chapters.

In the Hebrew text, the mention of אֱדוֹם and בָּצְרָה is significant. These terms do not occur in Isa 14:19. But they *do* occur together in Isa 34:5-6. Recall that the latter passage shares clear thematic and lexical material with Isa 14:19. This is significant not only since the term בָּצְרָה occurs only in Isaiah chapters 34 and 63. It is also important because both chapters pair the terms together. They are the only Isaianic passages that do this. And so, Isaiah 34 is lexically, thematically, and geographically related to Isaiah 63. This is also seen in the occurrence of the phrase יוֹם נָקָם 'day of vengeance' at both Isa 34:8 and 63:4.[89] Thus, chapters 34 and 63 have an implicit lexical and thematic relationship in the Hebrew text.

It seems then that the translator of Greek Isaiah constructed Isa 14:19 in recognition of the thematic, lexical, and geographical relationships between Isaiah 34 and Isaiah 63 highlighted above. And as a result, he had warrant for supplying lexical material from Isaiah 63 (i.e., ἱμάτιον) into his construction of Isa 14:19 even though the Hebrew text lacked a direct thematic relationship.[90] Although the term ἱμάτιον occurs in Isa 14:19 but not in chapter 34, its occurrences in chapter 63 strongly suggest that the translator conflated these passages thematically in his mind and as such supplied material from chapter 63 into chapter 14. His 'reading backwards' went an additional level deeper. Thus, his approach is inter-literary as he

[89]The phrase only occurs elsewhere in Isa 61:2.

[90]Isaiah 63:3, 6 employs the term αἷμα for the rare Hebrew term נֵצַח 'juice, blood.' This rendering may have been a contextual guess or could have resulted from the influence of several occurrences of דָּם as αἷμα in Isaiah 34.

worked by inserting material from Isa 34:3-4 and Isaiah 63:1-6 anaphorically into his renderings of Isa 14:19.

Admittedly, all the difficulties in this section have not been resolved. But I contend that what has been argued here moves Greek Isaiah research a step forward both in clarifying the difficulties of this verse and in understanding the translator's thematic and stylistic concerns. At first glance, what may appear to have been deviation away from the lexemes and literary structure of the Hebrew text seems to have better explanatory power as the translator's aim toward literary and structural cohesion through intentional omissions and additions.

Conclusion

In continuity with the examples from Isa 13:1-22 in chapter 3, in this chapter I surveyed several examples from Isa 14:1-23 which detail the translator of Greek Isaiah's concern for stylistic and intertextual Greek renderings. In this discussion, I described the translator's unique word choices, his stylistic repetitions, and his practice of canonical and inner-Isaianic intertextuality. This survey of Greek Isaiah's translation technique showed that the translator was concerned to reproduce his Hebrew text in a stylistic yet faithful way. I opened chapter 3 with an appeal to Ross Wagner's description of Greek Isaiah's translation technique. And I repeat it here as a fitting conclusion to my discussion of the translation technique and style of Greek Isa 13:1-14:23:

> The Greek translator does not so much inject 'foreign' ideas into Isaiah's vision as amplify, elaborate and interweave characteristically 'Isaian' themes into bold new patterns. The voice of OG Isaiah is that of the Hebrew prophet. But he speaks with a distinctively Greek accent.[91]

The 'free' renderings in Greek Isaiah serve not as ideological insertions but as aids for faithful reading. And even when the translator might have struggled with his Hebrew text, his contextual guesses and conjectures always appear to serve the overall thrust of Isaiah's message in a literary and stylistic fashion. The following two chapters address these types of features from the larger perspective of literary structure.

[91]Wagner (2013), 236.

Chapter 5: The Literary Micro-Structure in Greek Isaiah 13:1-14:23

Introduction

In the previous 2 chapters I highlighted select stylistic and translation-technical aspects of Greek Isaiah 13:1-14:23. Here, I aim to move out from these oft-visited translation-technical aspects of the Septuagint to those of thematic and literary structure. Even though the question of literary structure in the Septuagint, and specifically in Greek Isaiah, receives some attention in current research, it is seldom discussed as a topic in its own right, especially as it relates to translation's firm relationship to the Hebrew text's own structure(s).[1] What I offer here aims to complement and develop any initial observations into Septuagint literary structure with a more systematic and wide-ranging treatment.[2] And insofar as this chapter and the next constitute the substance of my research thesis, they also offer the most novel contributions to Greek Isaiah research in this project.

The ensuing discussion regarding the literary structure of Greek Isaiah proceeds on two levels. First, in this chapter I discuss features of the translation's literary micro-structure. Such features may constitute structural clues which influence the translator's attempt to produce a coherent or robust Greek text. While this latter aspect of the literary structure is often relegated to discussion of translational style or deviation, I will illustrate here how such translation features

---

[1]For previous research which does recognize such features, see the comments on Isaiah 1:1-31 in Wagner (2014), 231: "Rhetorical figures such as isocolon, parallelism, chiasm, paronomasia and *inclusio* also foster cohesion and coherence at the discourse level. The Greek translator regularly preserves – and frequently augments – such features of the parent text. . . . [W]e observed G utilizing a wide variety of techniques to tighten the parallelism between adjacent clauses and sentences. We also witness him crafting small-scale chiastic structures and improving isocolon with minor additions and subtractions. Paranomasia is a recurring feature in Isaiah's opening vision, particularly in the Greek version. . . . Where the device of *inclusio* occurs in the source text, G faithfully reproduces it, adding enhancements of his own. As a result, this figure plays as significant a role in structuring the rhetoric of the Greek text as it does that of the Hebrew parent."

[2]For brief comments about Greek Isaiah and literary structure, see Troxel (2008), 291; Wagner (2013), 64, 235-247; Byun (2017), 61, 133. Regarding the literary structure of Greek Isaiah 1:1-31, see Wagner (2013), 64: "The Greek translator (G) takes considerable pains to clarify the structure and cohesion of the discourse in Isaiah 1 through his strategic deployment of inferential particles and through his judicious use of stylistic devices such as parallelism, repetition, chiasm and *inclusio*."

have structural significance.[3] Second, in chapter 6 I explore features of the translation's macro-structure. These include items such as discourse markers and themes delineating and reaching across whole chapters and smaller sections within them. While much research has recognized and discussed these translation features individually, seldom do scholars inquire into the rationale *behind* such deviations from the Hebrew text into Greek Isaiah. My arrangement of the micro- and macro- categories below contain several pieces of evidence in order to establish the plausibility of my overall proposal in this thesis.

Before proceeding with the details of this argument, I will reiterate and elaborate upon some methodological points from chapter 2. The preservation of the Hebrew literary structure in the Septuagint is a feature worth investigating, particularly for the so-called 'free' translators. The default mode for 'literal' translations consists in the immediate transfer of literary features of the parent text. Since Hebrew particles like כִּי and הִנֵּה would have near one-to-one counterparts in the Greek (e.g., γάρ and ἰδού), the nature of any select 'literal' passage would also evidence a one-to-one structural relationship from the Hebrew to the Greek. So, we should not be surprised to find that the structure of a strict translation like LXX Leviticus looks similar to the literary structure of its Hebrew source. Strict translation technique necessitates an implicit overlap in the structural traits of the translated literature.[4] And even if a 'literal' translator aimed specifically to preserve and transfer the literary structure of his *Vorlage* into Greek, researchers would be at

[3]For helpful treatments of coherence in Greek Isaiah, see Van der Kooij (1998), 17; Van der Kooij (1997), 513-29; Cunha (2014), 33-47. Since I am not content merely to detect and describe the coherence of the Greek text, I hope to explore its etiology and whether the deviating features of the Greek text are tied to the Hebrew source. For research which views the translator's approach similarly to my own, see De Sousa (2010), 8: "Unlike an original composition, a translation is bound to its source text," and "the LXX books in general seem to have at their heart the intent to reproduce or transmit the original Hebrew or Aramaic text into Greek in a way that is meaningful to their recipients."

[4]However, even books like the literally translated Greek Psalter at times privilege poetic structure over an isomorphic translation style. But this seems to be an exception in the Septuagint corpus. It is only made possible by deviating from a strict translation style toward a free one. Whenever the Greek Psalter would emphasize the literary structure of a passage, it would in the nature of the case appropriate a freer approach to the translation task. See Gauthier (2014), for the spectrum of translation techniques in the Greek Psalter. He characterizes the style of the Greek Psalter as iso-semantic.

pains to demonstrate this since the nature of 'literal' translation largely prohibits them from recognizing structural deviations between the Hebrew and Greek.[5]

But the characteristics of a free translation do not prima facie guarantee such structural overlap between source and target texts. Thus, the preservation of literary structure in free translations cannot be assumed a priori. Frequent pluses and minuses, and either stereotyped or varied lexical choice, render the transfer of literary structure from the Hebrew to Greek a possibility and one requiring elucidation. And when the literary structure of a free translation corresponds with its Hebrew source, we should be inclined to recognize its intentional transfer.

Oftentimes, the structure of the Greek books of Job and Proverbs look remarkably different from their Hebrew counterparts.[6] These Greek versions move beyond simple lexical and clause level additions and deletions. They even include and omit features from the Hebrew text at the level of the paragraph. Greek Isaiah also shares these translation features. It frequently deviates from the Hebrew text, though perhaps without the drastic addition and omission of paragraphs. Such deviations across these 'free' translations would presumably obscure the literary structure of the original Hebrew unless the translator sought to preserve it. The aim of this chapter and the following, thus seeks to investigate such structural features of a 'free' translation like Greek Isaiah.

In order to accomplish this, I will delineate the nuanced elements of Greek Isaiah's literary micro-structure. This micro-structure may be detected within and in between what I have delineated as the stanzas of the macro-structure. As the examples I provide below illustrate, just as the translator sought to capture the details of the literary macro-structure into the translation, the translator was also concerned to highlight the micro-structural details of his source text. These details include the repetition and explication of implicit themes from the Hebrew. They also include subtle linguistic deviation from the Hebrew which provide insight into how the

---

[5]For a discussion of how the transfer of literary structure may occur in 'literal' translations, see Joosten (2016), 99-107.

[6]For work on Greek Job, see Dhont (2018). For work on Greek Proverbs, see Gauthier, Kotzé, and Steyn (2016); Joosten (2016), 99-107.

translator pieced the whole oracle together. But in contrast to the structural phenomena to be discussed in the following chapter, what I present here takes place within smaller units of discourse. Hence, the designation 'micro'-structures.[7]

Greek features at the level of the micro-structure indicate that the translator was concerned to preserve the thematic and contextual details of the oracle which contribute to the structure of the oracular whole. In fact, it is often through divergence from the Hebrew text that we can perceive the translator's intention to portray the coherent literary structure of the very same Hebrew text. From the evidence presented here, it appears that the translator sought to explain the implicit meaning of the text by highlighting the unity of the oracle through translational deviation. And in combination with the following chapter on macro-structural features, the ensuing micro-structural discussion begins to illustrate how the translator of Greek Isaiah approached the task of transferring the structural features of his source text holistically. In the following pages, I explore 6 examples from the oracle against Babylon and her king from Isa 13:1-14:23 in order to highlight the micro-structural features selected by the translator.

The Literary Micro-Structure of Isaiah 13:1-14:23

The Literary Structure of Isa 13:4-5

The literary structure of the oracle's opening stanza contains imperatives in verses 2 and 6 and the action of the addressee(s) in verses 3-5:[8]

13:2 Imperative: Babylon as addressee
13:3 Yhwh commands his army
13:4 Presence of Yhwh's army
13:5 Yhwh and his army come
13:6 Imperative: Babylon as addressee

[7]This designation does not rule out the possibility that such micro-structural features impact the literary macro-structure of the text. It merely concerns itself with this avenue of translational activity. Concerning the macro-structural impact of these micro- features, I provide an explanation of this feature at the end of the penultimate section in this chapter.

[8]I have only arranged the literary structure chiastically for its heuristic value.

Here, I highlight two features of the translator's approach to verses 4 and 5 which demonstrate his concern both to preserve the structural integrity of the text and to highlight the unity of its thematic-character. He accomplishes this task through syntactic and lexical alteration from the Hebrew. And as a result of deviating from the Hebrew, he creates a heightened thematic portrayal of his *Vorlage*.

Isaiah 13:4-5 contains several interesting translational issues which cannot presently be discussed.[9] Nevertheless, two translational features in particular appear to preserve and heighten the unity of the passage:

13:4a	קוֹל הָמוֹן בֶּהָרִים דְּמוּת עַם־רָב	φωνὴ ἐθνῶν πολλῶν ἐπὶ τῶν ὀρέων ὁμοία ἐθνῶν πολλῶν
	A sound of a multitude is on the mountains like a great people	*A sound of many nations on the mountains like many nations*
13:4b	קוֹל שְׁאוֹן מַמְלְכוֹת גּוֹיִם נֶאֱסָפִים	φωνὴ βασιλέων καὶ ἐθνῶν συνηγμένων.
	A sound of the uproar of kingdoms, nations which have been gathered	*A sound of kings and nations which have been gathered together*
13:4c	יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת מְפַקֵּד צְבָא מִלְחָמָה	κύριος σαβαωθ ἐντέταλται ἔθνει <u>ὁπλομάχῳ</u>
	Yhwh of armies is preparing a host for war	*The Lord Sabaoth has commanded a heavily-armed nation*
13:5a	בָּאִים מֵאֶרֶץ מֶרְחָק מִקְצֵה הַשָּׁמָיִם	<u>ἔρχεσθαι</u> ἐκ γῆς πόρρωθεν ἀπ᾽ ἄκρου θεμελίου τοῦ οὐρανοῦ
	They are coming from a distant land, from the end of the heavens	*to come from a far away land, from the utmost foundation of heaven*
13:5b	יְהוָה וּכְלֵי זַעְמוֹ לְחַבֵּל כָּל־הָאָרֶץ	κύριος καὶ <u>οἱ ὁπλομάχοι αὐτοῦ</u>, τοῦ καταφθεῖραι τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην.
	Yhwh and the vessels of his anger to destroy all the land.	*The Lord and his heavily-armed ones, to destroy the whole inhabited world*

These structural features are seen in the double use of the adjective ὁπλαμάχος 'heavily armed' in verses 4c and 5b and also in the occurrence of the infinitive ἔρχεσθαι in 5a. Both of these Greek terms have no formal correspondence with the Hebrew text. Yet, they clearly originate from the Hebrew text and demonstrate the translator's desire to preserve a unified portion of the stanza.

First, the double use of ὁπλομάχος in the Greek text signifies a unity of character between the verses. This is a significant feature of Greek Isaiah at this point since the Hebrew

[9]Such issues in verse 4 include the use of the genitive string following φωνή to translate the קוֹל exclamation along with the reworked lexical items concerning nations and kings. Regarding verse 4, the use of the verb ἐντέλλω to translate פקד likely resembles Aramaic influence. See Loiseau (2016), 67-68.

text does not contain the formal lexical correspondence as we see in the Greek. The Hebrew text of verse 4 opens by describing the sound of a military presence. And the verse closes with the declaration that Yhwh himself is assembling these forces as a host of war: צְבָא מִלְחָמָה. Verse 5 then announces that this military force originated from a distant land and then identifies them as the instruments of Yhwh's rage: כְּלֵי זַעְמוֹ. While these two phrases in the Hebrew are related referentially and thematically, they share no formal lexical similarities. Nevertheless, the Greek translator has recognized the referential identity between the phrases. We know this because he associated them formally with identical lexical deviations.[10]

The translator's use of identical lexical items across these verses heightens and clarifies the implicit meaning of the Hebrew text. Whereas the Hebrew text of Isa 13:4-5 unites its characters only by context (i.e., implicitly), the Greek translator explicated the identity of this character by employing the term ὁπλομάχος:

צְבָא מִלְחָמָה	*a host for war*	ἔθνει ὁπλομάχῳ	*with an armed nation*
כְּלֵי זַעְמוֹ	*instruments of his wrath*	οἱ ὁπλομάχοι αὐτοῦ	*his armed men*

Identifying the characters formally results in a coherent and well-structured translation. However, this structural coherence is not foreign to the translator's Hebrew source. Rather, the translation embodies and explicates the structural coherence of the Hebrew. The translator's additions and alterations seem to be influenced by the very same Hebrew text he modifies. As we will see in the following point, what deviates from the Hebrew at the level of the lexeme heightens the coherence of the passage at the level of structure.

Second, the translator also portrayed the structural integrity of verses 4 and 5 with the use of the Greek infinitive ἔρχεσθαι in contrast to pairing the Hebrew participle בָּאִים with

---

[10]Interestingly, the translator deviated from the semantics of well-understood Hebrew terms.The noun צָבָא in verse 4 is translated several ways in Greek Isaiah: 13:4 as ἔθνος; 24:21 and 40:26 as κόσμος; 34:2 as ἀριθμός; 40:2 as ταπείνωσις; 45:12 as ἄστρον. The plural צְבָאוֹת is consistently transliterated as σαβαωθ throughout the translation. Each rendering of this term is contextual apart from the use of ταπείνωσις in 40:2. The noun מִלְחָמָה mostly occurs with the πολεμ- root: πόλεμος in 21:15; 22:2; 42:13; 42:25; πολεμέω in 2:4; 7:1; ἀντιπολεμέω in 41:12; πολεμιστής in 3:2; πολεμία 27:4. The translator uses μάχαιρα in 3:25. Isa 28:6; 30:32. Isa 36:5 seem to render the term periphrastically. The noun כְּלִי in verse 5 is variously rendered in the Greek: σκεύος in 10:28[29]; 39:2; 52:11; 54:16; 54:17; 65:4; ἐπιστολή in 18:2; βουλή in 32:7; κόσμος in 61:10. The term is thrice rendered idiomatically in 22:24 and as μετὰ ψαλμῶν in 66:20 for the phrase בִּכְלִי טָהוֹר. The noun זַעַם is rendered with the term ὀργή in 10:5; 10:25; 26:20 and 30:27.

another Greek finite verb (e.g., ἐντέλλω in verse 4).[11] This is seen principally in the relationship between the clauses in verses 4c and 5a. Whereas the grammar of the Hebrew text distinguishes verse 4c as a separate clause from 5a, the Greek translator joined them syntactically:

13:4c	יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת מְפַקֵּד צְבָא מִלְחָמָה	κύριος σαβαωθ ἐντέταλται ἔθνει ὁπλομάχῳ
13:5a	בָּאִים מֵאֶרֶץ מֶרְחָק מִקְצֵה הַשָּׁמָיִם	ἔρχεσθαι ἐκ γῆς πόρρωθεν ἀπ᾽ ἄκρου θεμελίου τοῦ οὐρανοῦ
13:5b	יְהוָה וּכְלֵי זַעְמוֹ לְחַבֵּל כָּל־הָאָרֶץ	κύριος καὶ οἱ ὁπλομάχοι αὐτοῦ, τοῦ καταφθεῖραι τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην.

In the Hebrew text above, verse 4c stands independently from 5a as a null-copula clause with the participle מְפַקֵּד. Likewise, verse 5 contains a syntactically independent null-copula clause with the participle בָּאִים. However, the translator joined these two phrases together by altering the participle בָּאִים into the infinitive ἔρχεσθαι.[12] Thus, the translator altered the semantic role of the previously independent THEME (יְהוָה וּכְלֵי זַעְמוֹ) from verse 5b into a verbal AGENT (κύριος καὶ οἱ ὁπλομάχοι αὐτοῦ) which functions as an appositional phrase to יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת in verse 4.

Less persuasively, two other readings may be possible at this point. First, the phrase κύριος καὶ οἱ ὁπλομάχοι αὐτοῦ could be understood to function as the THEME of an elided verb ἔρχονται: 'The Lord and armed men [are coming] to destroy . . .' This reading would explain the sudden resumption of the nominative case. But its weakness is the lack of an explicit verb. Second, the phrase κύριος καὶ οἱ ὁπλομάχοι αὐτοῦ could actually function as the nominative THEME of the infinitive ἔρχεσθαι because of the principle in Attic Greek that "[i]f the subject of the infinitive is the same as that of the main verb, . . . it will be in the nominative."[13] If this is what occurs here, the following translation would result: 'The Lord of Sabaoth has commanded that the Lord and his armed men should come to destroy . . .' Such a feature would also suggest a high literary-syntactical register. Now, while these two readings are possible, I think my position stated earlier is the most plausible.

---

[11]See Ottley (1906), 172: "Here ἔρχονται and the following infin. have no corresponding Heb., and it may be inferred that the version supplied them to give sense (or to paraphrase ל)."

[12]We have no evidence to propose an original infinitive in the translator's *Vorlage*. The Greek infinitive from ἔρχομαι only occurs with בוא in Isa 44:7; 47:13; 48:5; 66:7. And the infinitive never occurs with the participle as we see it here.

[13]See Morwood (2001), 155; CGCG, 587-588.

Admittedly, the syntax of the translation remains somewhat obscure. But the translator's intention is evident. He joined the characters and themes of verses 4 and 5 by reworking the syntax of the Hebrew. In conjunction with his double use of the noun ὁπλομάχος, the translator has effectively structured his Greek text in accordance with the thrust of his Hebrew source by connecting verses 4 and 5 with the Greek infinitive from ἔρχομαι. In this example, the translator deviated from the this passage's syntactical and structural features on the one hand while also highlighting its conceptual unity on the other.

The Literary Structure of Isa 13:9-11

Within the larger discourse unit of Isa 13:9-16, verses 9 through 11 constitute a micro-structural unit which details the destruction of heaven and earth. These verses emphasize such themes through an A-B-A´ chiastic arrangement. And the translator transferred this thematic pattern by virtue of a 'literal' approach to the source text. But he also heightened the A-A´ parallel with distinct lexical deviation from the Hebrew:[14]

Isa 13:9	הִנֵּה יוֹם־יְהוָה בָּא אַכְזָרִי וְעֶבְרָה חֲרוֹן אָף לָשׂוּם הָאָרֶץ לְשַׁמָּה וְחַטָּאֶיהָ יַשְׁמִיד מִמֶּנָּה׃	ἰδοῦ γὰρ ἡμέρα κυρίου ἀνίατος ἔρχεται θυμοῦ καὶ ὀργῆς θεῖναι <u>τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην</u> ἔρημον καὶ τοὺς ἁμαρτωλοὺς <u>ἀπολέσαι</u> ἐξ αὐτῆς.
	Behold! The day of Yhwh is coming, a cruel day, a day of wrath, and a day of burning anger, to set the land as a desolation; he shall destroy its sinners from it.	*For behold, an incurable day of the Lord is coming, a day of anger and wrath to set the whole inhabited as a wilderness and to destroy the sinners from it.*
Isa 13:10	כִּי־כוֹכְבֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם וּכְסִילֵיהֶם לֹא יָהֵלּוּ אוֹרָם חָשַׁךְ הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ בְּצֵאתוֹ וְיָרֵחַ לֹא־יַגִּיהַ אוֹרוֹ׃	οἱ γὰρ ἀστέρες τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ὁ Ὡρίων καὶ πᾶς ὁ κόσμος τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τὸ φῶς οὐ δώσουσι καὶ σκοτισθήσεται τοῦ ἡλίου ἀνατέλλοντος, καὶ ἡ σελήνη οὐ δώσει τὸ φῶς αὐτῆς.
	For the stars of heavens and their constellations shall not flash forth their light; the sun is darkened when it comes out and the moon shall not shine its light.	*For the stars of heaven and Orion and all the ornament of heaven will not give light and it will be darkened when the sun rises, and the moon will not give its light.*

[14]For a defense of my translation here, see the discussion in chapter 3.

Isa 13:11	וּפָקַדְתִּי עַל־תֵּבֵל רָעָה וְעַל־רְשָׁעִים עֲוֹנָם	καὶ ἐντελοῦμαι τῇ οἰκουμένῃ ὅλῃ κακὰ καὶ τοῖς ἀσβέσι τᾶς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν
	וְהִשְׁבַּתִּי גְּאוֹן זֵדִים	καὶ ἀπολῶ ὕβριν ἀνόμων,
	וְגַאֲוַת עָרִיצִים אַשְׁפִּיל׃	καὶ ὕβριν ὑπερηφάνων ταπεινώσω.
	And I will visit evil upon the inhabited world and their iniquities upon the wicked; and I will end the pride of the insolent; and I will abase the arrogance of the violent	*And I will command evils for the whole inhabited world and their sins for the ungodly and I will destroy the arrogance of the lawless and I will bring low the arrogance of the haughty.*

The thematic chiasm of heaven and earth is seen in the A-B-A´ structure of Isa 13:9-11 where verses 9 and 11 detail earthly portents and verse 10 describes heavenly ones. The anger of Yhwh in verse 9 comes to the earth in order to destroy both it and its inhabitants. And verse 11 develops this earthly destruction by detailing Yhwh's retribution upon the inhabited world and the concomitant cessation of human pride. Verse 10 clearly describes heavenly bodies of the cosmos. And taken together, these verses illustrate the commensurate fates of heaven and earth. As such, the chiastic structure of the Hebrew is apparent at this level.

But this structure in the Hebrew text is explicated by the translator as he supplied two identical lexemes in the A and A´ portions of this chiasm. The first lexical pairing occurs with the double use of ἡ οἰκουμένη ὅλη. Even though this phrase is declined differently in each of its instantiations, the uniformity of referent between verses 9 and 11 is unmistakable. And when we consider that the translator rendered two different Hebrew terms when constructing this phrase, the parallel becomes all the more significant. The translator seems to have recognized the chiasm in this literary micro-structure and explicated it by supplying identical terminology at its borders.

In addition to the double use of ἡ οἰκουμένη ὅλη, the translator also supplied the same verb to describe Yhwh's destructive activity in the A and A´ portions of chiasm: ἀπόλλυμι. In verse 9, the Greek text contains ἀπόλλυμι as a rendering of the Hebrew שׁמד. The semantic overlap between these two terms is close. But in verse 11, the translator supplied the same Greek term for the Hebrew verb שׁבת. And here, the semantic overlap between the two terms is not as evident. It seems instead that the use of these two Greek terms performs a structural function, joining this literary micro-structure together through lexical repetition. In combination with the lexical parallel created by ἡ οἰκουμένη ὅλη, the double use of ἀπόλλυμι resembles this structural mirror and strengthens the literary micro-structure through lexical repetition.

By supplying these deviating pairs of lexemes, the translator created a more tightly-knit literary structure for his Greek audience. But we can see that this structural fabric is latent in the Hebrew text. Greek Isaiah merely explicated it with more lexical force. The repetition of these two terms thus heightens the implicit structural features of the Hebrew text and illustrates how the translator was concerned to preserve these features of his source text even through lexical deviation.

The Literary Structure of Isa 13:12-14

A third piece of evidence supporting the view that the translator sought to preserve the literary structure of his Hebrew text is found between verses 12 and 14. Analyzing the context of the Hebrew text is methodologically crucial if we are to grasp the structural effect of the translator's work accurately:

Isa 13:9	הִנֵּה יוֹם־יְהוָה בָּא אַכְזָרִי וְעֵבְרָה וַחֲרוֹן אָף לָשׂוּם הָאָרֶץ לְשַׁמָּה וְחַטָּאֶיהָ יַשְׁמִיד מִמֶּנָּה׃ *Behold! The day of Yhwh is coming, a cruel day,* *a day of wrath, and a day of burning anger to make* *the land into desolation; he will destroy its sinners from it.*	A	Destruction of Earth
Isa 13:10	כִּי־כוֹכְבֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם וּכְסִילֵיהֶם לֹא יָהֵלּוּ אוֹרָם חָשַׁךְ הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ בְּצֵאתוֹ וְיָרֵחַ לֹא־יַגִּיהַ אוֹרוֹ׃ *For the stars of heavens and their constellations shall not* *flash forth their light; the sun is darkened when it comes* *out and the moon shall not shine its light.*	B	Destruction of Heaven
Isa 13:11	וּפָקַדְתִּי עַל־תֵּבֵל רָעָה וְעַל־רְשָׁעִים עֲוֹנָם וְהִשְׁבַּתִּי גְּאוֹן זֵדִים וְנַאֲוַת עָרִיצִים אַשְׁפִּיל׃ *And I will visit evil upon the inhabited world and their* *iniquities upon the wicked; I will cause the arrogance of* *the insolent to cease; I will lay low the pride of the ruthless.*	C	Destruction of Pride
Isa 13:12	אוֹקִיר אֱנוֹשׁ מִפָּז וְאָדָם מִכֶּתֶם אוֹפִיר׃ *I will make men more rare than fine gold and mankind* *more than the gold of Ophir.*	D	Destruction of Men
Isa 13:13	עַל־כֵּן שָׁמַיִם אַרְגִּיז וְתִרְעַשׁ הָאָרֶץ מִמְּקוֹמָהּ בְּעֶבְרַת יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת וּבְיוֹם חֲרוֹן אַפּוֹ׃ *Therefore, I will make the heavens tremble and the earth I will shake* *from its place because of the anger of Yhwh of armies on the*	A′/B′	Destruction Heaven and Earth

day of his fierce anger.

Isa 13:14	וְהָיָה כִּצְבִי מֻדָּח וּכְצֹאן וְאֵין מְקַבֵּץ	D′	Destruction of Men
	אִישׁ אֶל־עַמּוֹ יִפְנוּ וְאִישׁ אֶל־אַרְצוֹ יָנוּסוּ׃		
	And like a scattered gazelle and like a flock with none to gather,		
	each shall turn to his own people and each shall flee to his own land.		

As the second stanza in the oracle, these verses elaborate upon the approaching day of Yhwh. Verses 9, 10, and 13 employ the language of earthly and heavenly destruction to describe the cosmic scope of this day. Verses 11 and 12 interrupt this sequence by describing the destruction of pride and the men caught up and destroyed in the cosmic turmoil. Yet, verse 13 revisits the cosmic imagery from verses 9 and 10 just before verse 14 reintroduces the human element seen in verses 11 and 12.[15] The poetic shift in verse 13 reverts back to the themes of earlier verses whereas verse 14 shifts attention again toward the material in verses 11 and 12. While this stanza has clearly and intentionally placed themes, it does not communicate them linearly. Instead, it communicates them resumptively, in a type of poetic cycle.

This feature of the oracle is important when considering the translator's approach to this passage. It is fairly clear from the Hebrew text that the characters of verses 11, 12, and 14 are related to one another. But this relationship is not formal. It is only thematic. And the thematic-character referents of these verses are merely implicit in the Hebrew text. However, the translator of Greek Isaiah sought to explicate this theme-character of the Hebrew text by supplying two identical lexical additions:

Isa 13:12	אוֹקִיר אֱנוֹשׁ מִפָּז	καὶ ἔσονται <u>οἱ καταλελειμένοι</u> ἔντιμοι μᾶλλον ἢ τὸ χρυσίον τὸ ἄπυρον,
	וְאָדָם מִכֶּתֶם אוֹפִיר׃	καὶ ὁ ἄνθρωπος μᾶλλον ἔντιμος ἔσται ἢ ὁ λίθος ὁ ἐν Σουφιρ.
Isa 13:14	וְהָיָה כִּצְבִי מֻדָּח וּכְצֹאן וְאֵין מְקַבֵּץ	καὶ ἔσονται <u>οἱ καταλελειμμένοι</u> ὡς δορκάδιον φεῦγον καὶ ὡς πρόβατον πλανώμενον,[16] καὶ οὐκ ἔσται ὁ συνάγων,
	אִישׁ אֶל־עַמּוֹ יִפְנוּ וְאִישׁ אֶל־אַרְצוֹ יָנוּסוּ׃	ὥστε ἄνθρωπον εἰς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ἀποστραφῆναι καὶ

[15]This structural pattern is also evidenced by the repetition of key lexemes in verses 9 and 13. Isaiah 13:9a descries the day of Yhwh as אַכְזָרִי וְעֶבְרָה וַחֲרוֹן אָף rendered with the terminology ἀνίατος . . . θυμοῦ καὶ ὀργῆς. Isaiah 13:13b describes this event with nearly the same terminology: בְּעֶבְרַת יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת וּבְיוֹם חֲרוֹן אַפּוֹ rendered as διὰ θυμὸν ὀργῆς κυρίου σαβαωθ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, ᾗ ἂν ἐπέλθῃ ὁ θυμὸς αὐτοῦ. Thus, the thematic merism of heaven and earth in these verses is accompanied by lexical repetition to confirm the thematic parallel.

[16]The lexical plus πλανώμενον may have the stylistic effect of mirroring the previous phrase. See Karrer and Kraus (2011), 2539, who suggest influence from Jer 50[27]:17.

ἄνθρωπον εἰς τὴν χώραν αὐτοῦ διῶξαι

Apart from several other translational differences in these verses, the lexical addition of the participle οἱ καταλελειμμένοι reveals an interesting feature of the translator's approach.[17] First of all, the translator supplied an interpretive addition with the participle οἱ καταλελειμμένοι. In verse 12, the participle likely represents the Hebrew noun אֱנוֹשׁ whereas in verse 14 the participle is clearly an explanatory lexical addition.[18] Furthermore, in verse 12, this leads to a syntactical reworking of the phrase. The men as the objects of destruction are now presented as the remnant, or as those who may have been left behind in battle.

The addition of ἔσονται in 13:12 also demonstrates the micro-structural intentionality in this section. The use of the future form of εἰμί is justified by וְהָיָה in 13:14. But the opening of verse 12 lacks any verbal marker of this type. The identical phraseology in verses 12 and 14 at the verbal and participial level strengthens the translator's intentionality to create a unified literary structure in these verses.

Second, what is merely implicit in the Hebrew text—the identity of the characters between verses 12 and 14—was made explicit by the translator. The double use of the participle οἱ καταλελειμμένοι clarifies the identity of the oracle's character. And the translator explicitly associated what the Hebrew reader needed to intuit. The double use of this participle also emphasizes the tenacity of the literary structure, a coherence which is also present in the Hebrew. Since the thematic progression of this stanza is not linear, the structure of the Hebrew stanza

---

[17]This participle also occurs as a lexical plus in the other oracle against Babylon in Isa 21:10: מְדֻשָּׁתִי וּבֶן־גָּרְנִי אֲשֶׁר שָׁמַעְתִּי מֵאֵת יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל הִגַּדְתִּי לָכֶם׃ / ἀκούσατε, οἱ καταλελειμμένοι καὶ οἱ ὀδυνώμενοι, ἀκούσατε ἃ ἤκουσα παρὰ κυρίου σαβαωθ· ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Ισραηλ ἀνήγγειλεν ἡμῖν. This occurrence is very likely exegetically significant as it has ramifications for the literary macro-structure of the series of oracles against the nations. Among other features, this lexical element links two different denouncements of Babylon which are 8 chapters apart. The participle also deviates from the Hebrew semantics in favor of identical Greek terminology. As such, it demonstrates that the translator not only had a macro-perspective of the book. He also sought to connect topics and themes to relevant chapters through lexical deviation.

[18]Van der Vorm-Croughs (2014), 47, states: "In some other cases where in the Hebrew the subject is only represented in the grammatical person and number of the verb, the translator has made the subject explicit by way of the addition of (a noun phrase governed by) a substantive noun in the nominative. In general, this noun (phrase) derives from the immediate context. Its purpose is usually just to clarify the text, but sometimes it changes the reference to the person implied by the verb."

could possibly appear to be fragmented. However, the double use of the Greek participle illustrates both the translator's awareness of this stanza's thematic-structural unity and his desire to convey such structural integrity to his audience.

The Literary Structure of Isaiah 13:15-18

As I will detail in the following chapter on literary macro-structure, Hebrew Isa 13:1-22 exhibits clear shifts in the discourse at 13:9 and 13:17. Greek Isaiah also follows this overarching pattern of the Hebrew text. Each version marks its major discourse units with the particles הִנֵּה and ἰδού. In addition to these interjections, both versions also exhibit consistent characters and themes in their distinct sections. The literary coherence of chapter 13 exists on several levels of the discourse. And the chapter reads like a coherent narrative from beginning to end in character, theme, and development, in both Hebrew and Greek versions.

This is significance since, unlike the largely inevitable transfer of literary structure from 'literal' translations, the literary structure of this 'free' translation more clearly demonstrates the translator's intentionality.[19] In discussing the topic of literary style and register in the Greek Pentateuch, James Aitken makes the following, related point:

> A marker of higher education is the ability to vary style and expression according to the context or purpose of the document. The translation technique of regular equivalence and of adhering to the Hebrew word order, however, limits any opportunity to display such ability.[20]

Strict translation patterns do not exclude creative expression altogether. But they surely limit such expression. In reverse order then, we are also limited in recognizing creative and structural intentionality in 'literal' translations due to their strict portrayal of the features from the Hebrew. Even if a 'literal' translator intended to capture structural features of the Hebrew text, it would be more difficult to demonstrate this than it would be when analyzing the work of a 'free' translator. This follows since 'free' translation tendencies are not as constrained to the structure of the parent text as are those characteristic of 'literal' translation patterns.

---

[19]For further discussion of this perspective, see the discussion of Literary Structure and the Septuagint in chapter 2 along with the introductory comments earlier in this chapter.

[20]Aitken (2021), 18.

To understand this feature, we may survey the second literary section of the Hebrew text found in verses 9 through 16 where the prophet announces the day of Yhwh. Within this oracular setting, verses 9-11 and 13 unfold the cosmic scope of this day of judgment. On the other hand, verses 12 and 14-16 describe the terrifying slaughter which the recipients of Yhwh's anger will encounter. Yhwh's instruments of war ravage families and their homes. Nonetheless, these heavenly and earthly events should be understood together, as two sides of the same coin. The overlap of character and theme constitutes a piece of well-crafted literature.

Throughout this section, consistency exists between characters, pronominal referents, and verbal semantics. Yet, as verse 17 introduces a distinct literary unit, a new character is also introduced (i.e., the Medes) and the ensuing syntax follows accordingly. The Hebrew text demonstrates new movement in the literary structure at this point. A type of literary disjunction occurs, and the verbs and pronouns following the shift at verse 17 naturally correspond in character and theme.[21]

Even though the new literary section is marked formally and thematically, we should still read the passages as embedded within the same narrative trajectory. Each stanza uniquely contributes to the oracle as a whole. The mysterious INSTRUMENT of the day of Yhwh in the first two literary units is finally unveiled in the third stanza. The proleptic destruction of the earlier sections is now portrayed as a reality on the near horizon (cf. 13:22). This final literary section constitutes the oracle's *dénouement*. It is here that all the pieces come together. We now know that the entire oracle discusses the future destruction of Babylon by Median forces. And these forces form God's instrument of judgment.

The Greek text also models these literary features, albeit in a unique way. While the Hebrew text unequivocally associates verse 16 with verse 15, the Greek text slightly diverges from this pattern. Instead of maintaining thematic solidarity with verse 15, the Greek of verse 16 evokes features not encountered until verse 18. Thus, the Greek text appears at first glance to

[21]Consider the series of plural verbs in the active voice which begin in verse 17. The AGENT of these verbs corresponds with the newly introduced character (e.g., the Medes) and not the characters of the previous section.

break the constraints of the Hebrew literary structure and deviate away from it. However, as I hope to illustrate, this is not the whole story.

Rather than deviating wholly from the literary structure of the Hebrew text, the translator has in fact constructed a text which preserves the Hebrew structure in some ways while diverging from it in others. Thus, structural awareness and deviation seem to occur alongside one another. The translator does this by showing how distinct literary sections of the oracle exhibit solidarity of character and theme. The Greek text joins two sections of the Hebrew literary structure thematically all the while maintaining them as distinct entities. I hold that the translator of Greek Isaiah, at this point, emphasizes the literary tenacity of the Hebrew oracle by explicating what is implicit in the Hebrew text. Thus, the Greek of verse 16 seems to function as a literary lynch pin, joining each stanza together all the while remaining structurally distinct from the following stanza. In effect, the translator anticipated the final literary section by deviating from the previous one with his overlap of theme and character.

In the following discussion, I will demonstrate how Greek Isaiah both deviated away from the literary structure of the Hebrew text while also preserving it through its verbal, nominal, and pronominal features. Such features are realized more specifically in the 'in-between' elements of the second and third oracular stanzas. This occurs through the thematic interaction between the stanzas. I begin by discussing verbs in verse 16, first, in their relationship to verse 15, and second, in their relations to verses 17 and 18. Then, I consider the translator's uncharacteristic rendering of עֹלֵל in verse 16 with τέκνον. Last of all, I discuss the use of pronouns in these verses and their relationship to the literary structure. It is at this point where the emphases of my argument materialize. I conclude that the Greek rendering of verse 16 evidences an awareness of both the preceding and the subsequent literary sections of the passage. Through lexical and syntactic deviations from the Hebrew text, the translator heightened the literary structure of that very same Hebrew text. I supply the whole of the textual example here:

Isa 13:15a	כָּל־הַנִּמְצָא יִדָּקֵר	ὃς γὰρ ἐὰν ἁλῷ, ἡττηθήσεται,[22]
Isa 13:15b	וְכָל־הַנִּסְפֶּה יִפּוֹל בַּחָרֶב׃	καὶ οἵτινες συνηγμένοι εἰσί,
Isa 13:16a	וְעֹלְלֵיהֶם יְרֻטְּשׁוּ לְעֵינֵיהֶם	καὶ τὰ τέκνα αὐτῶν ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν ῥάξουσι
Isa 13:16b	יְשֻׁסּוּ בָּתֵּיהֶם	καὶ τὰς οἰκίας αὐτῶν προνομεύσουσι
Isa 13:16c	וּנְשֵׁיהֶם תִּשָּׁגַלְנָה׃	καὶ γυναῖκας αὐτῶν ἕξουσιν.
Isa 13:17a	הִנְנִי מֵעִיר עֲלֵיהֶם אֶת־מָדָי	ἰδοὺ ἐπεγείρω ὑμῖν τοὺς Μήδους
Isa 13:18a	וּקְשָׁתוֹת נְעָרִים תְּרַסַּשְׁנָה	τοξεύματα νεανίσκων συντρίψουσι
Isa 13:18b	וּפְרִי־בֶטֶן לֹא יְרַחֵמוּ	καὶ τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν οὐ μὴ ἐλεήσουσιν,
Isa 13:18c	עַל־בָּנִים לֹא־תָחוֹס עֵינָם׃	οὐδὲ ἐπὶ τοῖς τέκνοις οὐ φείσονται οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτῶν.

Translation and explanation of these textual features is provided in the discussion below.

Verbal Features of Verses 15 and 16

First of all, with specific attention to verbal semantics, I show how the translator created a contrast between verses 15 and 16 where the Hebrew has none. I proceed in two steps, first by highlighting features of the Hebrew text and then by emphasizing translational divergence in the Greek. Regarding the Hebrew text, verse 16 should be viewed as a clear continuation of verse 15:

Isa 13:15 כָּל־הַנִּמְצָא יִדָּקֵר וְכָל־הַנִּסְפֶּה יִפּוֹל בַּחָרֶב׃
All of those who are found shall be pierced through;
and all of those who are carried off shall fall by the sword.

Isa 13:16 וְעֹלְלֵיהֶם יְרֻטְּשׁוּ לְעֵינֵיהֶם יְשֻׁסּוּ בָּתֵּיהֶם וּנְשֵׁיהֶם תִּשָּׁגַלְנָה׃
Their infants shall be dashed to pieces before their eyes;
their houses shall be plundered; their wives shall be ravished.

These verses in the Hebrew are a part of the same section in the literary structure. They are also contextually and thematically uniform. Just as the fleeing warriors are massacred by the implied AGENT in verse 15, so also are the children, homes, and women objects of the destructive will of this same implied AGENT. These features are conveyed by the passive verbal semantics of the

[22]Note the Attic form ἡττάομαι ‘to be defeated’ here in place of the Hellenistic form ἡσσάομαι at Isa 13:15. On the shift from Attic -σσ- to Hellenistic -ττ-, see Thackeray (1909), 121-122; Moulton (1920), 107; BDF, 18; Lee (2014): 140-43. The reading εκκεντηθησεται is attested in the Greek revisers, and also occurs in several other manuscripts, most of which are dated late. Ottley suggests that the translator of Greek Isaiah read the Hebrew incorrectly. See Ottley (1906), 175: “The later Greek versions more literally ἐκκεντηθήσεται and so some Luc. cursives. Possibly the LXX. read ידקר wrongly as a passive (which, however, is not found) from דרך.” Ottley may be imprecise here. Isaiah 13:15 contains the only instance of *Niph’al* דקר. But the passive *Pu’al* stem of דקר occurs in Jer 37:10; 51:4; Lam 4:9.

pointed Hebrew text. And since no explicit character shift occurs, even the consonantal Hebrew text suggests a reading with a uniform passive voice.

Now, while the phrase יִפּוֹל בַּחָרֶב in verse 15 is not morphologically passive, it is semantically passive. And even though the consonantal forms throughout verse 16 might allow for either active or passive verbal semantics, the Masoretic pointing presents the most cohesive reading.[23] This is evident in both the seamless thematic connection between verses 15 and 16, and also in the lack of any indicators to suggest divergence in character, theme, or structure. Where these same verbs occur elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible, the active or passive semantics are clear from context. So, unless we have good reason to depart from the passive semantic shape of the literature at this point, the best reading of the consonantal text is that which conveys passive verbal semantics. The consonantal text might allow active morphology. But the literary presentation does not. And it is likely that the Greek translator would have known this. So, any deviation away from the passive verbal semantics of the Hebrew should be considered as intentional.

As such, it is fair to say that, in the examples above and below, the translator of Greek Isaiah deviated from the Hebrew structure here and instead created a literary and thematic contrast between verses 15 and 16. Whereas passive verbal semantics occur throughout both verses of the Hebrew text, the Greek text preserves the passive semantics in verse 15 while conveying active semantics in verse 16:[24]

Isa 13:15a	יִדָּקֵר	PATIENT *will be pierced*
	ἡττηθήσεται	PATIENT *will be defeated*
Isa 13:15b	יִפּוֹל בֶּחָרֶב	PATIENT *will fall by the sword*
	μαχαίρᾳ πεσοῦνται	PATIENT *will fall by the sword*

[23]Of note, the final phrase in verse 16 cannot be accurately read as semantically active in the Hebrew text since the consonantal form can only be analyzed either as an imperfect second or third person feminine plural. This requires that it pair with the plural feminine noun נְשֵׁיהֶם. As such, the verb must be regarded as a third person feminine plural. The feminine plural likewise occurs in all the ancient versions. And the Greek revisers each preserve the verbal semantics as middle-passive.

[24]For discussion on verbal valency, semantic roles, and argument structure, see Kroeger (2004); Cook (Unpublished); Screnock and Holmstedt (2015), 1-14. For a discussion of thematic emphases of the Greek voice, see See Aubrey (2016): 563-625.

Isa 13:16a	יְרֻטָּשׁוּ	PATIENT *will be dashed to pieces*
	ῥάξουσι	[AGENT] *will dash to the ground* PATIENT
Isa 13:16b	יְשֻׁסּוּ	PATIENT *will be plundered*
	προνομεύσουσι	[AGENT] *will plunder* PATIENT
Isa 13:16c	תִּשָּׁכַלְנָה	PATIENT *will be ravished*
	ἕξουσι	[AGENT] *will have* PATIENT

While the uniformity in voice is apparent in the Hebrew text of both verses, the Greek text evidences a contrast. Presumably, the identity of each implied agent persists across these verses, but the organization of semantic arguments in the Greek text of verse 16 changes. This change has the effect of shifting the action and thematic focus from the verbal PATIENT to the verbal AGENT. The translator highlighted a thematic character who had yet to be identified, whose identity was only to be disclosed in the ensuing section (i.e., the Medes in Isa 13:18). Thus, the verbal semantics of verse 16 anticipate the character and agency of the following verses.

The translation of verse 16 is not consonant with the second oracular stanza (i.e., 13:9-16), but instead anticipates the one that follows. In this way, the translator demonstrated not only how he understood the immediate coherence of each literary section but also how the larger coherence of the the oracle functions. In the mind of the translator, these two literary sections formed a coherent whole with accompanying thematic continuity. While this is implied by the Hebrew text, the translator explicated it by changing the verbal forms in verse 16. This observation leads to the next point in the discussion of verbal semantics.

The Greek verbal semantics in verse 16 correspond precisely with the features of verse 18, the latter of which is embedded in a distinct literary section of the oracle. As we saw above, each Hebrew verb in verse 16 corresponds with a Greek future active form. The same feature holds true for the verbs in verse 18:[25]

Isa 13:16a	יְרֻטָּשׁוּ	ῥάξουσι
Isa 13:16b	יְשֻׁסּוּ	προνομεύσουσι
Isa 13:16c	תִּשָּׁכַלְנָה	ἕξουσι
Isa 13:18a	תְּרַטַּשְׁנָה	συντρίψουσι
Isa 13:18b	לֹא יְרַחֵמוּ	οὐ μὴ ἐλεήσουσι
Isa 13:18c	לֹא תָחוּס עֵינָם	οὐ φείσονται [οἱ ὀφθαλμοί αὐτῶν]

[25]See Appendix 2 for discussion the textual and semantic difficulties in Isa 13:18.

This feature is justified, however, since the Hebrew text of verse 18 contextually situates these verbal forms. Verse 17 has provided an explicit character in its introduction of the Medes as the AGENT of Babylon's destruction. And the verbal semantics of verse 18 assume this newly introduced AGENT. Thus, it makes good sense to propose that the translator read verse 16 in light of the larger literary context. And more specifically, the translation of verse 16 reflects the semantics of the following stanza. Here, we begin to see Greek Isaiah's overlap in literary structure.

Nominal Features of Verses 16 and 18

Second, I present the translator's choice of nouns in verses 16 and 18 as clues into his awareness of the Hebrew text's literary structure. The translator's decision to render the Hebrew term עֹלֵל 'infant' as τέκνον 'child' in verse 16 does not quite correspond with Hebrew semantics.[26] In addition, the pairing of τέκνον with the Hebrew phrases פְּרִי־בֶטֶן[27] and עַל־בָּנִים[28] in verse 18 deviates, not only from the Hebrew semantics, but also from Greek Isaiah's general

[26]The term עוֹלֵל/עוֹלָל '(nursing) infant' occurs twenty times in the Hebrew Bible and corresponds with the Greek term νήπιος 'infant, child' in all but three instances. See 1 Sam 15:3; 22:19; 2 Kgs 8:12; Isa 13:16; Jer 6:11; 9:20; 44[51]:7; Hos 14:1; Joel 2:16; Mic 2:9; Nah 3:10; Psa 8:3; 17:4; 137:9; Job 3:16; Lam 1:5; 2:11, 19, 20; 4:4. Deviation occurs in Isa 13:16; Hos 14:1; Mic 2:9.

[27]The phrase פְּרִי־בֶטֶן is a standard expression for the offspring of a woman and is typically coupled with one of two Greek phrases: τὰ ἔκγονα τῆς κοιλίας or ἐκ καρποῦ τῆς κοιλίας. See Gen 30:2; Deut 7:13; 28:4, 11, 18, 53; 30:9; Isa 13:18; Mic 6:7; Psa 127[126]:3; 132[131]:11. The examples from Mic 6:7 and Psa 132[131]:11 describe the fruit of the womb as belonging to a man. Elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible, the noun בֶּטֶן is translated by γαστήρ, πλευρα 'side, rib', idiomatically as στόμα (cf. Ezek 3:3), ὠδίν, παλλακίς, οἰκία, ψυχή, καρδία, σπλαγχνόν, πρωτογενής. The noun פְּרִי is translated by κάρπιμος, ἐκφόριον, γένημα, freely as νοῦς in Isa 10:12, εὐλογία in Isa 27:9, σπέρμα in Isa 37:31, εὔσκιος in Jer 11:16, ἐκλεκτός in Ezek 19:12, καρποφόρος, and καρπίζομαι. Lam 2:20 contains an interesting example where פְּרִים alone is translated by καρπὸν κοιλίας αὐτῶν. See the discussion in Benjamin Austin*, Plant Metaphors in the Old Greek of Isaiah*, 105-7.

[28]The translator employs τέκνον in 13:18; 30:1; 39:7; 51:18; 54:1, 13; 60:19; 63:8; παιδίον in 38:19 and 66:8. Greek Isaiah largely renders בֵּן idiomatically: ἐν τόπῳ πίονι for בֶּן־שֶׁמֶן in 5:1; τοὺς ἀφ᾽ ἡλίου ἀνατολῶν for אֶת־בְּנֵי־קֶדֶם in 11:15 (cf. Gen 29:1); ἡ ὠδὶν for בָּנִים in 37:3; τὰ ἔκγονα τῆς κοιλίας αυτῆς for בֶּן־בִּטְנָה in 49:15; ἄνθρωπος for בְּנֵי אָדָם in 52:14; 52:6; ἀλλογενεῖς for בְּנֵי נֵכָר in 56:3, 6; 60:19; 61:5. In the whole of the Septuagint, translating בֵּן with one of these Greek terms is quite rare. Of the near 3,700 occurrences of בֵּן in the Hebrew Bible, fewer than three hundred occur with τέκνον in the Septuagint. And fewer than one hundred are paired with παιδίον.

translation patterns. Furthermore, the threefold occurrence of the term τέκνον is both stylistically noticeable and thematically unifying:

Isa 13:16a	עֹלְלֵיהֶם	τὰ τέκνα
Isa 13:18b	פְּרִי־בֶטֶן	τὰ τέκνα
Isa 13:18c	עַל־בָּנִים	ἐπὶ τοῖς τέκνοις

The word choice of the Greek instead seems to be generically constructed, since the repetition of τέκνον diverges from Greek Isaiah's typically diverse lexical usage. However, the translation choices here have created a unified character between these verses. Repetition of τέκνον in such close proximity suggests that each occurrence signifies an identical referent. This character connection may be present in the Hebrew text. But if so, it is only implicit. The translator has made the connection between these two portions of the literary structure explicit. By flattening the diverse descriptions of the Hebrew text with the Greek noun τέκνον, the translator has shown in effect that he understood the relationship between these distinct literary sections to be unified.

This piece of data, in connection with the previous discussion about verbal semantics, constitutes evidence of the translator's awareness of the Hebrew literary structure. The data also leads us to recognize the translator's intention to rework it. One could surely argue that the translator rendered the passage in this way because he was unaware of the Hebrew structure. He could have merely read the text according to his own literary impressions rather than by the context and the discourse markers of the parent text. But my final point seeks to rebut this potential objection. The translator was not only aware of the Hebrew literary structure, he also sought to communicate it in his translation.

Regarding the repetition of τέκνον here (and of ἀναπαύω in the following example) it could be suggested that the translator's patterned lexical repetition was due to 'laziness' on his part, or at least to some kind of 'efficient' approach to rendering his Hebrew text. However, I think this position, while initially suggestive, is not able to explain the range of features throughout the translation. Most substantially, it does not take into consideration the actual interpretive work behind such lexical repetition. We can all agree at this point that the translator of Greek Isaiah is not sloppy. This is recognizable not only in his careful construction of clauses at the stylistic level (cf. 13:10 and 13:15), but also in the intentionality behind repeated lexical

items across his chapters for the purpose of heightening thematic and literary structure. And while this may be suggestive of 'efficient' translation technique, this nonetheless highlights both his close attention to the Hebrew text along with his careful arrangement of a structurally robust translation. His lexical choices were still *conscious* lexical choices which need not have agreed with one another.

Perhaps the translation patterns of the Greek Psalter might fit the concept of 'laziness' or 'efficiency' as the whole of the work is marked by clear and patterned pairings between Hebrew and Greek terminology. But given the large-scale translational and semantic deviations and inconsistencies within Greek Isaiah, claims of laziness may beg the question as they have not dealt sufficiently with the lexical-semantic statistics of the translation. All of this goes to say that the preservation of thematic and structural features in the translator's *Vorlage* were of utmost concern to him. And claims to 'laziness' or 'efficiency' simply assume that mere lexical consistency indicates minimal cognitive effort. It has been my overall aim in this thesis to redirect this perspective.

Pronominal Features of Verses 16 through 18

For the final point in this argument, I propose that the translation of pronouns in verses 16 through 18 provides insight into the translator's structural intentions. Not only does the translator demonstrate that he is aware of the Hebrew literary structure, his pronominal renderings suggest that he is concerned to replicate it. Thus, the translator respected the literary structure of the Hebrew and arranged his text accordingly. Greek Isaiah did not overwrite the literary structure of the Hebrew text but emphasized it through literary reworking.

The second person plural pronouns in the Greek text of 13:17 and 13:18b are not attested in the Hebrew text. Their usage here seems to be intentional, especially given the proximity of several third person pronouns. And the contrast between these pronouns is apparent. The examples below illustrate the differences:[29]

[29]The third person plural pronouns in verse 16 each evoke the same referent. In this case, they refer to the children, homes, and women of the Babylonian warriors of Isa 13:15. The Hebrew and Greek texts correspond entirely at this point. In verse 17, however, the Hebrew text continues with the third person plural pronoun while the

Isa 13:16a$_1$	עֹלְלֵיהֶם	τὰ τέκνα αὐτῶν	Isa 13:17	עֲלֵיהֶם	ὑμῖν
Isa 13:16a$_2$	לְעֵינֵיהֶם	ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν	Isa 13:18b	פְּרִי־בֶטֶן	τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν
Isa 13:16b	בָּתֵּיהֶם	τὰς οἰκίας αὐτῶν	Isa 13:18c	עֵינָם	οἱ ὀφθαλμοί αὐτῶν
Isa 13:16c	נְשֵׁיהֶם	τὰς γυναῖκας αὐτῶν			

The second person plural pronouns in verses 17 and 18b deviate from the previous third person pronominal pattern. Thus, in combination with the הִנֵּה / ἰδού discourse marker in verse 17, these pronouns suggest that the translator was aware of the shift in discourse. Whereas the third person pronouns had referred to the verbal PATIENT up until verse 17 (i.e., Babylon), the translator now addresses Babylon with the second person pronoun. In turn, the third person pronoun is reserved for the new characters, the Medes (e.g., verse 18c). Thus, the phenomena of the pronouns in these examples re-situate the themes and characters of the previous literary section in to a new one.

I contend that the translator's use of the second person pronouns here serves a purpose to structure the literary oracle according to the Hebrew model. Principally, the pronouns serve to distinguish the final stanza of verses 17-22 from those preceding it. But they also balance the Greek semantic parallels in verses 16 and 18. Even though the translator affirmed the thematic similarities between these verses, he also desired to differentiate them. Verses 16 through 18 are united both by their verbal semantics and also by the repetition of τέκνον. But they are differentiated by the discourse marker and the shift in pronouns. By inserting these second person plural pronouns into his translation, the translator has in effect preserved the boundaries of the Hebrew text's literary structure.

The shift in person indicates that verse 17 signified a new section of discourse for the translator.[30] Yet, even though the section is distinct, in it the translator also maintained thematic

---

Greek deviates from this pattern. The translator employs the second person plural pronoun ὑμῖν while the Hebrew maintains third person usage with עֲלֵיהֶם. This Greek pronoun here specifically addresses Babylon and replaces the third person referents of the previous verses. The referent persists, but the manner of referentiality differs. And in verse 18b, the translator supplies the second person pronoun ὑμῶν as a lexical plus. Like the pronoun in verse 17, this term also replaces the previous third person referent. The Babylonians are now addressed in the second person while the Medes are referenced by the third person. The third person plural pronoun at the end of verse 18 confirms the character distinctions highlighted by the translator. It seems most plausible, then, that the translator's awareness of the thematic and literary shift is apparent by these features.

[30]This is evidenced by the shift to ὑμῖν in verse 17a and the addition of ὑμῶν in verse 18b. The only

and literary connections with the previous material. Nominal recursion of τέκνον establishes consistent characters across these distinct literary sections. In addition, the translator created a stereotyped presentation of the verbal AGENT, verbal valency, and the verbal PATIENT whereas the Hebrew text contains variety in its verbal semantics. All of these features serve the translator's goal to preserve and connect the literary structure of the Hebrew text even despite his deviating tendencies.

The Literary Micro-Structure of Isaiah 13:20-14:6

In this portion of the argument, I contend that the translator of Greek Isaiah transformed his source text at Isa 13:20-14:6 by supplying an eightfold repetition ἀναπαύω in place of the more diverse lexical material of the Hebrew. And although semantic overlap exists between some of the Hebrew and Greek lexemes in this passage, the translation patterns here convey a clear micro-structural unit which both deviates from and also highlights the unity of the oracle against the kingdom and the lament over the king. As we will see in the following chapter, such structural and thematic unity between Isaiah 13 and 14 is ubiquitous. But here, the translator deviated from the formal lexical and discourse strictures of 13:17-22, 14:1-3, and 14:1-6 in order to highlight other kinds of structural features through lexical repetition. However, this deviation from the Hebrew text resulted in a literary unit which bridges together the two sections of the Babylon oracle.[31] In deviating from formal elements of the Hebrew text, the translator heightens many of its thematic entailments.

To begin, I demonstrate how uniformity of Greek lexical selection with ἀναπαύω in Isa 13:20-14:6 occurs despite the diversity of Hebrew lexemes in this passage. Formally, the translator 'flattens' the diverse lexical presentation of the Hebrew by pairing four different Hebrew verbs throughout the passage with one Greek verb. However, the monolithic use of

---

other second person plural references in Isa 13:1-22 are found with the plural imperatives in 13:2 and 13:6.We must also remember that this verse (13:17) begins with the discourse marker הִנֵּה/ἰδού.

[31]This observation is also articulated in Penner (2020), 537, 539. On Isa 14:1: "Their 'rest' ἀναπαύσονται in the land recalls 13:20-21"; on Isa 14:6[7]: "The appearance of ἀναπαύω again in 14:7 recalls 13:20, 21 and 14:1."

ἀναπαύω throughout this section suggests that the translator of Greek Isaiah was intentional with his lexical choice. This is apparent both from lexical repetition of ἀναπαύω and also from the lack of precise semantic overlap between the Hebrew and Greek pairings. From this, we can put together a case for an intentionally formed micro-structural entity. The following examples set forth the relevant data:[32]

13:20d	וְרֹעִים לֹא־יַרְבִּצוּ שָׁם	οὐδὲ ποιμένες οὐ μὴ ἀναπαύσονται ἐν αὐτῇ
	Shepherds will not recline their flocks there	*Nor will shepherds rest in it*
13:21a	וְרָבְצוּ־שָׁם צִיִּים	καὶ ἀναπαύσονται ἐκεῖ θηρία
	Desert creatures will recline there	*Wild animals will rest there*
13:21c	וְשָׂכְנוּ שָׁם בְּנוֹת יַעֲנָה	καὶ ἀναπαύσονται ἐκεῖ σειρήνες
	Ostriches will dwell there	*And sirens will rest there*
14:1c	וְהִנִּיחָם עַל־אַדְמָתָם	καὶ ἀναπαύσονται ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς αὐτῶν
	He will give them rest in their land	*And they will rest upon their land*
14:3a	וְהָיָה בְּיוֹם הָנִיחַ יְהוָה לְךָ	καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἀναπαύσει σε ὁ θεός
	In the day when Yhwh gives you rest	*And it will be that God gives you rest on that day*
14:4c	אֵיךְ שָׁבַת נֹגֵשׂ	Πῶς ἀναπέπαυται ὁ ἀπαιτῶν
	How the oppressor ceased!	*How the exactor has come to an end*
14:4d	שָׁבְתָה מַדְהֵבָה	καὶ ἀναπέπαυται ὁ ἐπισπουδαστής
	How the onslaught ceased!	*And the taskmaster has come to an end!*
14:6d-7a	מֻרְדָּף בְּלִי חָשָׂךְ נָחָה שָׁקְטָה	ἢ οὐκ ἐφείσατο, ἀνεπαύσατο πεποιθώς
	Pursuit without ceasing; all the land is rested and quiet.	*Which he did not spare, being confident he rested.*[33]

[32]Most of the major translations of the Septuagint are semantically and contextually nuanced in their renderings of ἀναπαύω. However, BdA supplies the singular gloss *repos* throughout this section. Interestingly, this mirrors the Greek text's formal lexical presentation. NETS: 13.20 nor will shepherds rest in it; 13.21 but wild animals will rest there; there sirens will rest; 14.1 and they will rest on their own land; 14.3 God will give you rest from your pain; 14.4 How the exactor has ceased and the taskmaster has ceased!; 14.6 he rested confidently; LEH: 13.20 nor may shepherds rest in it; 13.21 and wild animals will rest there; and Sirens will rest there; 14.1 and they will rest in their land; 14.3 God will give you rest from your temper; 14.4 How has the demanding one stopped; and the taskmaster stopped; 14.6 He rested, trusting; BdA: 13.20 *et les pasteurs n'y trouveront pas un repos*; 13.21 e*t des bêtes y auront un repos*; *des sirènes y auront un repos*; 14.1 *et ils auront repos sur leur terre*; 14.3 *Dieu te donnera du repos après ta souffrance*; 14.4 *L'exacteur a-t-il trouvé un repos? Celui qui pressait à la tâche a-t-il trouvé un repos?;* 14.6 *il trouva un repos, confiant*; LXX.D: 13.20 *und Hirten werden nicht in ihm rasten*; 13.21 *vielmehr werden dort wilde Tiere rasten*; *und Sirenen werden dort rasten*; 14.1 *und sie werden sich auf ihrem Land niederlassen*; 14.3 *da wird Gott dich ausruhen lassen vom Schmerz*; 14.4 *Wie ist zur Ruhe gebracht, der Schulden einforderte, und zur Ruhe gebracht der Antreiber!*; 14.6 *kam er sich (Gott) fügend zur Ruhe*.

[33]For a helpful interpretive perspective, see Penner (2020), 538: "No new subject has been introduced, so the one resting would seem to be God." Identifying the precise lexical pairing at 14:7a is difficult. Here, I have paired the occurrence of ἀναπαύω with נוח. But it could equally be a rendering either of שׁקט 'to be peaceful, to be at rest', or a condensed rendering of both Hebrew terms.

As is evident from the examples above, the translator supplied the singular Greek lexeme ἀναπαύω in place of the diverse lexical content from the Hebrew text: רבץ, שׁכן, נוח, שׁבת. However, even though semantic deviation from the Hebrew to Greek does not occur with every rendering, the translation choices illustrated here resulted in a Greek text which is lexically uniform and largely tied to the Hebrew.[34] To illustrate the significance and intentionality of this lexical uniformity, I elaborate at length upon the semantics of the Hebrew lexemes rendered here as ἀναπαύω.

Lexicons of Classical and Septuagint Greek demonstrate the broad semantic range of ἀναπαύω, the potential glosses of which frequently overlap with the relevant Hebrew terms. The Greek verb occurs in active and middle-passive forms with relatively similar meanings, and each voice is attested in the examples above.[35] This wide semantic range and variability in voice may be a reason why the translator supplied this verb; it largely accounts for the meanings of the Hebrew terms. But as I detail below, precision in semantic overlap between ἀναπαύω and its Hebrew pairings varies enough here to demand attention.

The verb נוח ‘to rest’ occurs 14 times in Isaiah and is largely rendered with ἀναπαύω, ἀναπαύσις, or ἀνάπαυμα.[36] Septuagint translators other than Greek Isaiah also rendered נוח with a more diverse set of Greek terms.[37] Nonetheless, the whole of the Septuagint corpus pairs נוח with

---

[34]A similar pattern of heightening thematic elements of the Hebrew occurs elsewhere in Greek Isaiah. See the repetitions of ἐλπίς in chapter 28 and εὐφροσύνη in chapter 35.

[35]The semantic range for ἀναπαύω is laid out by BrillDAG, 147 as follows: A. *act* to make stop, check; to cause to halt, rest; to mitigate; to give peace, quiet, tranquility; to exempt, exclude; to rest; B. *mp* to cease, stop, rest; to be peaceful, find rest; to conclude; to halt, make a stop; to be exempt; to rest, sleep; to be uncultivated; of the dead, to rest, lie. See also LSJ, 115. For the Septuagint, GELS, 43-44 presents the meanings as follows: 1. to put an end to; 2. to give rest; 3. mid. a. to take rest, leave off working; b. to let up, decrease pressure (creditor, harsh taskmaster); c. to call the day; 4. mid. to stop moving and come to rest; 5. mid. to be or become free from agitation and worries; b. to be relieved of, freed from. See also LEH, 42. Each of these lexicons present the nominal form ἀνάπαυσις in similar fashion.

[36]See Isa 7:19; 11:2; 14:1; 14:7; 23:12; 25:10; 28:2; 28:12; 30:32; 46:7; 57:2; 63:14; 65:15. Infrequent divergence from נוח / ἀναπαυ- pattern in Isaiah includes use of ἐπιποθέω, τίθημι, ὁδηγέω, and καταλείπω.

[37]The full Septuagint corpus contains a wide spectrum of renderings: τίθημι, καθίζω, καταλιμπάνω, ἀφίημι, καταλείπω, ἀποτίθημι, καθίημι, ἐάω, καθίστημι, ἐπιτίθημι, ἀναπηδάω, κατακληρονομέω, ἐπιλανθάνομαι, ἐπαφίημι, ἐναφίημι, ἐμπίπλημι, παραδίδωμι, ἀνίημι,

-παύω frequently enough that we may recognize it to be a standard translation pattern.[38] This is undoubtedly due to the clear semantic overlap between the two verbs. Beyond the appropriate lexical-semantic pairing, the use of ἀναπαύω also conveys the overall sense of the immediate discourse.

The verb שׁבת is found 10 times in the Hebrew text of Isaiah and is most frequently translated with παύω or ἀναπαύω.[39] Septuagint translators outside Greek Isaiah also rendered this term similarly.[40] And even though several other Greek terms render שׁבת in the Septuagint corpus, such pairings are both semantically appropriate and contextually stylish.[41] While other lexical options existed for our translator's rendering of שׁבת, he supplied a semantically and contextually appropriate gloss.

Of special interest is the use of ἀπόλλυμι 'to destroy' for *Hiph'il* שׁבת 'to put an end to' at Isa 13:11, a rendering in relatively close textual proximity to the examples in 13:20-14:6, yet divergent in lexical choice. Contrary to a perspective that the translator was lazy, hurried, or unconcerned with semantic precision, rendering שׁבת with both ἀπόλλυμι and ἀναπαύω in the same discursive unit lends support to the claim that the translator of Greek Isaiah was intentional and contextually nuanced in his renderings. Even at this point, we can ascertain a more general

---

[38]See καταπαύω in Exod 10:14; 20:11; 33:14; Deut 3:20; 12:10; 25:19; Josh 1:13; 1:15; 3:13; 21:44; 22:4; 23:1; 2 Sam 21:10; Eccl 10:4; 1 Chron 23:25; 14:5; 14:6; 15:15; 20:30; ἀναπαύω in Exod 23:12; Deut 5:14; 2 Sam 7:11; 1 Kgs 5:18; Zech 6:8; Job 3:13; 3:17; 3:26; Prov 21:16; 29:17; Eccl 7:9; Lam 5:5; Esth 9:22; Dan 12:13; Neh 9:28; 1 Chron 22:9; 22:18; κατάπαυσις in Num 10:36[35]; ἐπαναπαύομαι in Num 11:25; 11:26; Judg 16:26; 2 Kgs 2:15. Even though the -παύω root occurs several times throughout the Septuagint's rendering of נוח, the dominant translation pattern remains with -μι verbs and -λείπω.

[39]See Isa 13:11; 14:4[x2]; 16:10; 17:3; 24:2; 24:8[x2]; 30:11; 33:8. To render שׁבת, the translator of Greek Isaiah elsewhere employed the verbs ἀπόλλυμι and ἀφαιρέω, supplied a periphrastic phrase at 17:3, and likely included παρακαλέω at 21:2.

[40]The translators employ καταπαύω at Gen 2:2; 2:3; 8:22; Exod 5:5; 34:21[x2]; 2 Kgs 23:5; 23:11; Lam 5:14; Neh 4:5; 6:3; 2 Chron 16:5; παύω at Exod 31:17; Deut 32:26; Jer 31[38]:36[37]; Prov 18:18; ἀναπαύω at Exod 23:12; Lev 25:2; διαπαύω at Lev 2:13.

[41]For example: ἀφανίζω 'to destroy, ruin'; σαββατίζω, ἀπόλλυμι, ἐκλείπω, ἀπαλλοτριόω, καταλύω, ἀποστρέφω, κατακαύμα, καταδυνατεύω, ἀνταναιρέω, ἡσυχάζω, καθίζω (incorrectly at Prov 22:10), αἴρω, ἐπιστρέφω. Greek Ezekiel often employs ἀποστρέφω.

intentionality behind the eightfold use of ἀναπαύω in Isa 13:20-14:6. The survey of the last two lexical pairings illustrate this position more fully.

Of the 10 times where either the verb רבץ or the noun רֶבֶץ occurs in the book of Isaiah, the Greek contains 7 pairings which are patterned around the root ἀναπαυ-.[42] Yet, even though semantic overlap exists between these Hebrew and Greek terms, this pattern diverges significantly from the full Septuagint corpus where -παύω infrequently pairs with רבץ.[43] It is clear that the Isaiah translator preferred this lexical and semantic pairing despite available and widespread alternatives. And given these statistics, the pairing of these verbs here is noteworthy. In light of this, we can begin to perceive how the translator opted for a semantically appropriate rendering which contributes to the unity of the literary micro-structure.

The verb שׁכן occurs 14 times in the book of Isaiah and is rendered into Greek primarily with two terms: seven instances of -οικέω and four occurrences of -παύω.[44] However, the full Septuagint corpus largely excludes the -παύω pairing, privileging -οικέω and -σκηνόω instead.[45] This disparity very likely results from the lack of precise semantic overlap between שׁכן and -παύω.[46] And even though the idea of 'dwelling' for שׁכן would more precisely correspond

---

[42]See Isa 11:6; 11:7; 13:20; 13:21; 14:30; 17:2; 27:10; 54:11; רֶבֶץ at 35:7; 65:10. See the pairing of רֶבֶץ and ἀναπαύσις in Isa 17:2 and 65:10.

[43]Only 4 occurrences of רבץ outside of Isaiah pair with stems related to παύω: Gen 29:2; 49:14; Ezek 34:14; 34:15. The verb רבץ occurs 30 times in the Hebrew Bible and is rendered more broadly in the larger Septuagint corpus: ἡσυχάζω; κοιμάομαι; ἔχω; πίπτω; συγκαθίζω; θάλπω; κολλάω; πηγή; ἑτοιμάζω; κοιτάζω; γίνομαι; ἐγκάθημαι; νέμω; κατασκηνόω.

[44]See Isa 8:18; 13:20; 13:21; 18:3; 26:19; 32:16; 33:5; 33:16; 34:11; 34:17; 57:15^{x2}; 65:9. The term is once omitted at Isa 33:24 and once rendered periphrastically at Isa 26:19: שֹׁכְנֵי עָפָר as οἱ ἐν τῇ γῇ.

[45]Outside Greek Isaiah, this pairing only occurs 6 times: Deut 33:12 as καταπαύω; Deut 33:20 as ἀναπαύω; Ezek 17:23^{x2} as ἀναπαύω; Ezek 31:13 as ἀναπαύω; Psa 55[54]:7 has καταπαύω. Some deviations from this pattern include the following pairings with שׁכן: καταβαίνω, ὁράω, ἐπικαλέω, ἐπισκιάζω, κτίζω, καταγίνομαι, ἵστημι, κατασκηνόω, στρατοπεδεύω, καταπαύω, πήγνυμι, καταλύω, ἀποκαθίστημι, ἐπικαθίζω, κοιμάω.

[46]In contrast to the Greek glosses listed earlier, the difference in the Hebrew meaning seems to rest in the idea of more permanent dwelling. HALOT, 1497-99 provides the following glosses for שׁכן: Qal. to settle; to reside; Pi. to cause to dwell; Hif. to cause to dwell. See also DCH, 8.356-60: Qal. to dwell, to live; Pi. to cause to dwell, make settle down; Hif. to cause to dwell, cause to live, cause to abide, cause to settle upon. In the entry for שׁכן, DCH, 357 1.b glosses the term 'live, abide, rest.' But the enduring sense communicated in the entry's biblical references do not necessarily correspond to the temporary meanings conveyed by ἀναπαύω.

with a term like κατοικέω, the translator nonetheless selected ἀναπαύω as his gloss. Thus, although the conceptual link between שׁכן and ἀναπαύω is understandable, the semantic possibilities of these two verbs allow for little overlap in accord with both the Classical and Septuagint Greek entries referenced above.

This is all the more striking in light of a different rendering of שׁכן earlier in the micro-structure, where the translator conveyed the absence of Babylonian inhabitants with οὐδὲ μὴ εἰσέρχομαι 'no one will enter in' in place of וְלֹא תִשְׁכֹּן. In contrast to something like a conveniently stereotypical use of ἀναπαύω, this kind of nuanced approach illustrates translational intentionality and in turn deliberate repetition of ἀναπαύω. In sum, the pairing of שׁכן and ἀναπαύω at Isa 13:20-14:6 constitutes the clearest lexical-semantic outlier in this analysis. This should strike us as significant given the translator's tendency for nuance and semantic precision. And if we consider how repetition of ἀναπαύω links Isa 13:20-14:6 together lexically, we are on sound footing for perceiving it as a significant feature in the construction of this passage's literary micro-structure.

A threefold portrait emerges from this analysis and also suggests that the translation choices served thematic and structural ends. First of all, the use of ἀναπαύω for נוח and שׁבת follows normal semantic expectation and likely accounts for the prominence of ἀναπαύω throughout the passage. The straightforward pairings here may have served as a semantic and thematic cornerstone as the translator conceived of his work. Semantic overlap between רבץ with ἀναπαύω is less precise as the full Septuagint corpus indicates. However, the paring of these two verbs can be defended in accord with the presentation in major lexicons. Yet, as I stated above, it is clear that the Isaiah translator preferred this lexical and semantic pairing despite available and widespread alternatives. The pairing of שׁכן and ἀναπαύω deviates from straightforward semantic overlap in a noticeable way. And as the most irregular semantic pairing in the discourse, another type of translational tendency likely motivated the translator's lexical decisions at this point.

Second, we may follow these disparities further by considering the lexical 'flattening' of this discourse in comparison to the diversity of Hebrew lexemes. Such lexical repetition is striking when reading the Greek text alone. But in combination with an analysis of both Hebrew verbal diversity and their lexical semantics, a search for an alternative to 'literal' translation

technique is wanting. As I stated earlier, I think these features are best explained by appealing to the translator's purposeful concern to preserve and highlight the literary and structural features which he perceived in the Hebrew text. In other words, the semantic and translational irregularities present in his work disclose his aims. The translated text conveys a literary cohesion by avoiding the Hebrew text's verbal diversity. And deviations from the Hebrew text serve as a bridge for maintaining the literary structure.[47]

Last of all, these literary and structural features can be better understood by considering the macro- and micro-structural features of the Babylon oracle. It seems that the translator's repetition of ἀναπαύω created a micro-structural unit which bridged the macro-structural entities of chapters 13 and 14. Even where a thematic shift occurs regarding the future redemption of Israel (e.g., 14:1-2), the translator nonetheless carried readers along by supplying the same lexical form. Through selective distribution of the lexeme ἀναπαύω, the translator sought to convey the overall structural and thematic unity of the passage. The Greek micro-structure opens with desert animals resting in desolate Babylon, followed by Israel resting in her land, and concluding with the king of Babylon 'resting' from wickedness. This is all the more ironic since Israel's rest in the land is contrasted by the king of Babylon's 'rest,' which derives from the Hebrew שׁבת. The play on both word and sense is significant. Through this seemingly 'flat' lexical choice, the translator captured and conveyed significant thematic and structural features from the Hebrew text for his Greek audience. Such decisions must have relied on much foresight and artful decisions based upon sensitivity to context, structure, and semantic play.[48]

The Literary Structure of Isaiah 14:7-21

In order to elaborate upon the issue of the literary micro-structure of Isa 14:7-21, I divide the present discussion into three smaller subsections. Each of these subsections deals with

[47]A stylistic element may also be present with repetition, compound verbs, and the combination of variation and repetition. See Dines (2016), 379-80.

[48]On the poetic style of Isa 14:4, see Penner (2020), 538: "G manages to include alliteration in Πῶς ἀναπέπαυται ὁ ἀπαιτῶν καὶ ἀναπέπαυται ὁ ἐπισπουδαστής."

separate issues which support my overall proposal that the translator is both aware of the literary structure of the Hebrew text and also appropriates from it for his Greek audience with the goal of explicating its thematic and structural features. Herein I elaborate upon the translation technical features which include emphasis upon the second person singular addressee, the thematic placement of Sheol and Hades, and the use of the discourse marker δέ. After developing these issues in the discussion below, we will be able to see more clearly how the translator, despite considerable divergences from the Hebrew text, has also preserved key thematic and structural features of the very same text. He does not always translate literally on the lexical level. At times his renderings are literal translations of structural features.

Highlighting the Second Person Singular

As I illustrate in the following chapter under the heading 'Emphasizing Babylon in the Second Person Plural,' the translator of Greek Isaiah is concerned both to preserve the second person plural references of the Hebrew text in Isa 13:1-22 and also to explicate them through lexical additions for his Greek readership. The evidence shows that the translation contains several additional references to the second person plural. These translation decisions resulted in a discourse where the overall unity of the addressee is emphasized and heightened in the Greek text. What is present and implicit in the Hebrew is explicated in the Greek. This structural heightening through translational addition occurs in each of the three subsections of Isa 13:1-22. And given the macro-structural scope of the ensuing discussion, I treat it under the larger heading of the literary macro-structure.

Now, even though chapter 14 contains similar emphases upon second person referents, the nature of the evidence to be treated in the present discussion differs somewhat from the examples in chapter 13. The features I wish to highlight in chapter 14 fall, not under the rubric of the literary macro-structure, but under that of its micro-structure. In accordance with the literary structure outlines I presented in chapter 2, I will primarily treat the data from Isa 14:7-21 'Kings Taunt the King of Babylon' here. In the opening verses of chapter 14, the translator

generally rendered the Hebrew text literally at the level of the lexeme. And so, no micro-structural motivations regarding second person forms can be detected there.[49]

Nonetheless, I have here listed all of the second person singular references to the king of Babylon in Isa 14:7-21 simply to illustrate how prominent they are in this section of discourse. Additionally, a complete survey of this feature will also aid analysis of the translator's deviations from and explications of the Hebrew. In turn, we may highlight the translator's explicative approach to this micro-structural feature. The discourse unit from Isa 14:7-21 follows:[50]

14:7	נָחָה שָׁקְטָה כָּל־הָאָרֶץ פָּצְחוּ רִנָּה	πᾶσα ἡ γῆ βοᾷ μετ᾽ εὐφροσύνης
	All the land rested and is quiet;	*All the earth shall cry out with rejoicing*
	they broke out with rejoicing.	
14:8a	גַּם־בְּרוֹשִׁים שָׂמְחוּ לָךְ	καὶ τὰ ξύλα τοῦ Λιβάνου ηὐφράνθησαν ἐπὶ σοί
	Even the cypresses rejoiced at you	*And the trees of Lebanon rejoiced at you*
14:8b	מֵאָז שָׁכַבְתָּ	ἀφ᾽ οὗ σὺ κεκοίμησαι
	From that time you lie down	*Since the time when you have fallen asleep*
14:9a	שְׁאוֹל מִתַּחַת רָגְזָה לְךָ לִקְרַאת בּוֹאֶךָ	ὁ ᾅδης κάτωθεν ἐπικράνθη συναντήσας σοι
	Sheol stirred up from beneath at you to	*Hades was embittered from beneath upon*
	greet your coming	*meeting you*
14:9b	עוֹרֵר לְךָ רְפָאִים	συνηγέρθησάν σοι πάντες οἱ γίγαντες
	He roused up the Rephaim for you	*All the giants rose up together at you*
14:10b	כֻּלָּם יַעֲנוּ וְיֹאמְרוּ אֵלֶיךָ	πάντες ἀποκριθήσονται καὶ ἐροῦσί σοι
	All of them shall answer and say to you	*All will answer and say to you*
14:10c	גַּם־אַתָּה חֻלֵּיתָ כָמוֹנוּ	καὶ σὺ ἐάλως ὥσπερ καὶ ἡμεῖς[51]
	Even you have become weak like us	*And you were caught just as we were*
14:10d	אֵלֵינוּ נִמְשָׁלְתָּ	ἐν ἡμῖν δὲ κατελογίσθης

[49]Even though several second person singular referents occur in earlier portions of this chapter (e.g., 14:1-2; 14:3-6), the features contained there do not exhibit the same types of characteristics attested in 14:7-21 such as deviation, addition, and conflation. The Hebrew text of Isa 14:3-4 contains six second person singular references, each of which refers to Israel. But these examples carry over the person referentiality into the Greek text and are not helpful for discussing translational deviation.

[50]Van der Vorm-Croughs (2014), 44, recognizes the prominence of some of these features. Under the heading 'the *addition* of a pronominal subject' she notes: "One way in which implied subjects in the Hebrew have regularly been made explicit in LXX Isaiah is by the addition of an independent pronoun. This occurs especially often in the near presence of another such pronoun, for instance with the purpose of focusing on a certain person by repeating strong reference to him, or, on the other hand, so as to accentuate the contrast between different groups."

[51]For the verb חלה 'to be sick,' Symmachus likely read חיל 'to tremble, writhe.' This would account for his use of the verb τρέω 'to be afraid of.'

	You have become like us	*And you were reckoned among us*
14:11a	הוּרַד שְׁאוֹל גְּאוֹנֶךָ הֶמְיַת נְבָלֶיךָ	κατέβη δὲ εἰς ᾅδου ἡ δόξα σου ἡ πολλή σου εὐφροσύνη
	Your pride was brought down to Sheol, the sound of your harps	*And your glory went down to Hades, your abundant rejoicing*
14:11b	תַּחְתֶּיךָ יֻצַּע רִמָּה	ὑποκάτω σου στρώσουσι σῆψιν
	Beneath you, maggots are laid as a bed	*Beneath you they will spread out decay*
14:11c	וּמְכַסֶּיךָ תּוֹלֵעָה	καὶ τὸ κατακάλυμμά σου σκώληξ
	and worms are your covering	*and your covering will be a worm*
14:12a	אֵיךְ נָפַלְתָּ מִשָּׁמַיִם הֵילֵל בֶּן־שָׁחַר	πῶς ἐξέπεσεν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὁ ἑωσφόρος ὁ πρωὶ ἀνατέλλων
	How you fell from heaven, O day star, son of the dawn	*How the day star fell from heaven, the one who rises early*
14:12b	נִגְדַּעְתָּ לָאָרֶץ חוֹלֵשׁ עַל־גּוֹיִם	συνετρίβη εἰς τὴν γῆν ὁ ἀποστέλλων πρὸς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη
	You were cut down to the earth, you who laid low the nations.	*He was crushed to the earth, the one who sent out to all the nations*
14:13a	וְאַתָּה אָמַרְתָּ בִלְבָבְךָ	σὺ δὲ εἶπας τῇ διανοίᾳ σου
	But you said in your heart	*But you said in your mind*
14:15	אַךְ אֶל־שְׁאוֹל תּוּרָד	νῦν δὲ εἰς ᾅδου καταβήσῃ
	Yet, you were brought down to Sheol	*But now you will go down to Hades*
14:16a-b	רֹאֶיךָ אֵלֶיךָ יַשְׁגִּיחוּ אֵלֶיךָ יִתְבּוֹנָנוּ	οἱ ἰδόντες σε θαυμάσουσιν ἐπὶ σοί καὶ ἐροῦσιν
	Those who look at you shall stare; they shall ponder at you	*Those who see you will marvel at you and say*
14:19a	וְאַתָּה הָשְׁלַכְתָּ מִקִּבְרְךָ	σὺ δὲ ῥιφήσῃ ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν
	But you were cast out from your grave	*But you will be thrown out on the mountains*
14:20a	לֹא־תֵחַד אִתָּם בִּקְבוּרָה	οὕτως οὐδὲ σὺ ἔσῃ καθαρός
	You shall not be joined with them in burial	*So neither will you be clean*
14:20b	כִּי־אַרְצְךָ שִׁחַתָּ	διότι τὴν γῆν μου ἀπώλεσας
	For you destroyed your land	*Because you destroyed my land*
14:20c	עַמְּךָ הָרָגְתָּ	καὶ τὸν λαόν μου ἀπέκτεινας
	You killed your people	*and you killed my people*
14:20d	לֹא־יִקָּרֵא לְעוֹלָם זֶרַע מְרֵעִים	οὐ μὴ μείνῃς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα χρόνον
	The seed of evildoers shall never be named	*You shall not remain forever*
14:21a	הָכִינוּ לְבָנָיו מַטְבֵּחַ בַּעֲוֹן אֲבוֹתָם	ἑτοίμασον τὰ τέκνα σου σφαγῆναι ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις τοῦ πατρός σου
	Prepare slaughter for his sons because of the iniquity of their fathers.	*Prepare your children to be slaughtered for the sins of your father.*

For the most part, the translator of Greek Isaiah transferred exactly what occurs in the Hebrew text regarding second person singular referents. This includes both verbal and pronominal referents. However, some divergences occur, either in the change of verbal person, the addition of lexical elements, or the conflation of second person referents. In total, I discuss two instances

of deviation from the second person singular (e.g., 14:12a; 14:12b), six lexical additions (e.g., 14:8b; 4:20a; 14:20d; 14:21a[x3]), and two examples where the translator conflates features from the Hebrew text (e.g., 14:9a; 14:16a-b). I treat each of these issues below in a systematic fashion.

Lexical Deviation

As the list of examples above illustrates, deviation from the second person singular referents in the Hebrew text occurs at 14:12a and 14:12b. In the midst of a long series of second person singular verbal and pronominal references, at verse 12 the translator twice deviated from this pattern by supplying third person singular verbs. For more convenient reference, I list each of these passages as I discuss them:[52]

Isa 14:12a	אֵיךְ נָפַלְתָּ מִשָּׁמַיִם הֵילֵל בֶּן־שָׁחַר	πῶς ἐξέπεσεν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὁ ἑωσφόρος ὁ ἀνατέλλων
Isa 14:12b	נִגְדַּעְתָּ לָאָרֶץ חוֹלֵשׁ עַל־גּוֹיִם	συνετρίβη εἰς τὴν γῆν ὁ ἀποστέλλων πρὸς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη

In terms of the rhetorical effect from the perspective of the Greek text alone, this is dramatic. But when we consider that the translator also deviated not only from his Hebrew text but also from a series of 29 second person singular referents, we should pause and think about his possible motivations. It most immediately serves as a climactic moment in the literary micro-structure.[53] The shift in verbal person also seems to function as a rhetorical highlighter.[54] But the verse also embodies a scenic shift from the underworld to the king of Babylon's desire to reside above the heavens. The shift from 'beneath' the earth to the downfall of the king to the earth is here marked by a noticeable shift in verbal person. And just as this shift is detected through a straightforward reading of the Greek text, a comparison of the Hebrew and the Greek reveals it all the more.

---

[52]These examples serve as potential defeaters to what I propose here. However, in combination with my ensuing discussion on discourse markers, the deviations from the second person forms in 14:12 appear to serve a structural role that highlights the cosmological significance of the king of Babylon's downfall.

[53]This portion of text contains the first instance of the threefold creation imagery in the oracle against Babylon and her king—heaven, earth, under the earth (i.e., Sheol). These themes only occur elsewhere in the oracle in part at 13:5 and 13:9-13. The rhetorical effect of including these themes seems to indicate that this verse is the center and climax of the prophetic discourse.

[54]As I discuss in a later discussion on discourse markers, this verse is surrounded by two instances of δέ. In combination with these discourse markers, the shift in verbal person to the third person singular seems to have both a rhetorical and structural effect.

Thus, deviation away from the second person singular in these instances serves a significant role in shaping the literary micro-structure.

Lexical Addition

Next, it is appropriate to discuss the Greek additions to the Hebrew material which emphasize the second person singular referents. Six examples illustrate this feature of the translator's approach. The first two concern the addition of pronouns:[55]

Isa 14:8b	מֵאָז שָׁכַבְתָּ	ἀφ᾽ οὗ σὺ κεκοίμησαι
Isa 14:20a	לֹא־תֻחַד אִתָּם בִּקְבוּרָה	οὕτως οὐδὲ σὺ ἔσῃ καθαρός

These examples contain strict renderings of the Hebrew verbal forms שָׁכַבְתָּ as κοίμησαι and תֻחַד as ἔσῃ at the level of verbal person and number. However, these two examples also evidence the addition of the pronoun σύ which is only implied by the Hebrew text.[56] And while the translator may have been influenced by stylistic concerns for his target audience, structural and contextual emphasis upon the second person singular forms suggest very strongly that these additions serve a structural and discursive function. The pronominal additions are unnecessary to convey the semantics of the Hebrew text. Thus, we can see that the translator emphasized this micro-structural phenomena by heightening the second person singular addressee.

Another type of Greek addition occurs which further supports my proposal about the literary micro-structure. This occurs, not through pronominal additions, but through the shift in verbal morphology away from the third person singular of the Hebrew text toward the second person singular of the Greek. The example below illustrates this clearly:

Isa 14:20d	לֹא־יִקָּרֵא לְעוֹלָם זֶרַע מְרֵעִים	οὐ μὴ μείνῃς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα χρόνον, σπέρμα πονηρόν

[55]Van der Vorm-Croughs (2014), 44, also recognizes the significance of these two verses. She provides the following comments on such pronominal features in this oracle: "In 14:8-21 . . . independent pronouns in the second person singular have been applied abundantly in the Greek. One can find seven instances of σου, five of σοι and an equal number of σύ. Of the latter, there are two that concern pluses [e.g., 14:8; 14:20]. . . . Maybe the repeated use of these pronouns was meant to highlight the pretentious greatness and the arrogance of the king."

[56]It seems that the translator read the opening of Isa 14:20a as *לֹא־תִהְיֶה 'you shall not be . . .'

The Hebrew text and its non-Greek versions all preserve the third person verbal form.[57] Greek Isaiah alone diverges toward the second person at this point by rendering the third person *Niph'al* יִקָּרֵא as the second person aorist subjunctive μείνῃς. This shift establishes my emphasis upon the translator's intention to heighten the second person singular referent throughout the literary micro-structure in Isa 14:7-21. The translator seems to have taken a holistic approach to the themes and structure of his Hebrew text.

Under the rubric of translational additions, one final example illustrates Hebrew deviation through both verbal and pronominal changes into the Greek. This example serves as a powerful thematic and structural signal, especially since it occurs at the end of the micro-literary section:

Isa 14:21a	הָכִינוּ לִבְנָיו מַטְבֵּחַ בַּעֲוֹן אֲבוֹתָם	ἑτοίμασον τὰ τέκνα σου σφαγῆναι ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις τοῦ πατρός σου

The Hebrew text contains a second person plural imperative with the term הָכִינוּ and two third person singular pronominal forms with the terms לִבְנָיו and אֲבוֹתָם. But in accordance with the structural patterns which the translator has employed throughout this section, he also supplied several second person singular forms of each of these terms: the singular imperative ἑτοίμασον for הָכִינוּ, the phrase τὰ τέκνα σου for לִבְנָיו, the phrase τοῦ πατρός σου for אֲבוֹתָם. Each of these examples exhibits lexical deviation away from the third person singular forms of the Hebrew text in favor of the second person singular. In combination with the previous emphases upon the second person singular throughout this literary micro-structure, this final example explicates the addressee through translational deviation and serves as the terminal element in the micro-structural discourse.

Lexical Conflation

In the final portion of this argument, I discuss Greek conflations of the second person singular referent. The nature of the deviations and additions discussed earlier seem to highlight

[57]See the third person plural in 1QIsa[a]: לוא יקראו לעולם; third person singular in the Aramaic: לָא יִתקְיִם לְעָלַם; third person singular in the Peshitta which appears to be influenced by the semantics of the Greek but not its morphology: ܠܐ ܢܬܩܝܡ ܠܥܠܡ; third person singular in the Vulgate: *non vocabitur in aeternum*.

the translator's concern to emphasize this discursive-referential feature. But conflations of second person singular forms may also stand as a defeater to this proposal. Only a single clear example of referential conflation occurs in the the examples listed above. I present it here for clarity:

Isa 14:9a שְׁאוֹל מִתַּחַת רָגְזָה לְךָ לִקְרַאת בּוֹאֶךָ ὁ ᾅδης κάτωθεν ἐπικράνθη συναντήσας σοι

This example seems to go against my contention that the translator highlighted the second person singular referent. If my proposal were true, why would the double occurrence of the second person singular in the Hebrew text—לְךָ and בּוֹאֶךָ—only produce a singular occurrence of the referent in the Greek text—σοι? Upon examination, however, this misgiving does not pose a serious problem.

Consideration of the translator's stylistic concerns suggests that the desire to avoid redundancy influenced the lexical conflation at this point. The hypothetical rendering of the phrase רָגְזָה לְךָ לִקְרַאת בּוֹאֶךָ as *ἐπικράνθη ἐπὶ σοὶ συναντήσας σοι is repetitive and awkward in Greek. And further, the conflation doesn't detract from the clear second person singular referent. Instead, it presents it in a literarily pleasing way. The alternative would have constituted a clunky presentation in an otherwise highly stylized translation.

Insofar as the Greek constitutes the translator's own understanding of the Hebrew, we may proceed in two steps. First, it is possible that the translator misunderstood the meaning of the Hebrew text at this point. This is suggested by comparing the Hebrew phrase בּוֹאֶךָ to the Greek συναντήσας σοι, the first of which speaks of the king of Babylon's approach to Hades and the latter of which speaks of Sheol's own approach. If the translator would have rendered the phrase according to the Hebrew sense, then the second person singular referent may have been preserved as in the following reconstruction: συναντῆσαι ἐν τῷ ἔρχεσθαι σε. However, the translation as we have it does not suggest such an understanding of the Hebrew.

It is also possible that the translator avoided rendering this Hebrew infinitive altogether. Misunderstanding of the Hebrew or perceived redundancy on the part of the translator may account for this possibility. So, given what the translator thought the Hebrew text meant, he thus created a Greek rendering that captured this idea in a stylistically appropriate and non-redundant way. However, I think the most persuasive approach to this phrase is that the translator

merely understood the Hebrew morphology and syntax differently than the Masoretic tradition presents it. It appears that the translator understood the final element of the phrase לִקְרַאת בּוֹאֶךָ to contain the participle בָּאֶךָ 'the one who comes to you' instead of a series of two infinitives as the Masoretes suggest. The translator then conflated the two Hebrew elements into one Greek lexeme. His use of συναντάω 'to meet' conforms to this reading quite well.

Thus, the Greek rendering appears to be a conflation given the difficulty of translating a perceived redundancy in the Hebrew text. The omission of one of the the second person singular forms from the Hebrew into the Greek doesn't detract from the larger thematic prominence of the second person singular. Rather, the conflation was most likely motivated by concerns related to style, misunderstanding, or a divergent reading. This translational conflation is only a potential defeater to my argument for the heightened prominence of the second person singular referent in this micro-structural section of the discourse. In all other cases, the translator preserved the second person singular feature in his text, but not at the expense of obscuring the Greek style for his target audience.[58]

In short, the second person singular form is present in the Hebrew text in reference to the king of Babylon. In some sense, this feature contrasts the previous discussion regarding the second person plural referent to the kingdom of Babylon in Isa 13:1-22. But while these portions of the oracle differ in many regards, the translator of Greek Isaiah seems to have preserved a macro-structural pattern between the chapters. He heightened and preserved the importance of the addressee in each respective context with second person forms. This emphasis upon the second person illustrates all the more how the translator of Greek Isaiah followed consistent translation patterns which heightened and explicated the literary themes and structures. Even though some of these translations deviated from the Hebrew text, they still preserved it at the larger level of literary structure. The result is a translation which is more emphatic and explicit at

[58]Another possible defeater for my positions exists. Isaiah 14:16a-b *preserves* lexical and semantic redundancy whereas this verse avoids it. To overthrow this potential objection, I contend that the respective redundancies of these two passages are altogether different. The repetition of the second person singular pronouns in verse 16 are each associated with different verbal ideas whereas the double use of the pronoun in verse 9 would have been linked with the same verbal idea. Thus, it was appropriate for the translator to make this decision in 14:16 where he preserved the second person singular referents without detracting from the overall sense of the passage.

the micro- and macro-structural levels regarding the king and kingdom of Babylon addressed in the second person.

Sheol, the Pit, and Hades

A second set of evidence demonstrates the translator of Greek Isaiah's concern to explicate the thematic and literary micro-structure of Isa 14:7-21 for his Greek audience. This evidence revolves around themes associated with the setting of Sheol. Here, I unpack the literary-structural unity evoked by the translator in four steps. The examples below provide the relevant thematic information for this discussion:

Isa 14:9	שְׁאוֹל מִתַּחַת רָגְזָה לְךָ	ὁ ᾅδης κάτωθεν ἐπικράνθη συναντήσας σοι
	Sheol stirred up from beneath at you	*Hades was embittered from below upon meeting you*
Isa 14:11	הוּרַד שְׁאוֹל גְּאוֹנֶךָ	κατέβη δὲ εἰς ᾅδου ἡ δόξα σου
	Your glory was brought down to Sheol	*Now your glory went down to Hades*
Isa 14:15a	אַךְ אֶל־שְׁאוֹל תּוּרָד	νῦν δὲ εἰς ᾅδου καταβήσῃ
	Yet you shall be brought down to Sheol	*But now you will go down to Hades*
Isa 14:15b	אֶל־יַרְכְּתֵי־בוֹר	καὶ εἰς τὰ θεμέλια τῆς γῆς
	To the farthest parts of the pit	*And to the foundations of the earth*
Isa 14:19e	יוֹרְדֵי אֶל־אַבְנֵי־בוֹר	μετὰ . . . καταβαινόντων εἰς ᾅδου
	Those who go down to the stones of the pit	*With . . . those who go down to Hades*

In the examples listed here, the three occurrences of שְׁאוֹל are paired with Greek ᾅδης (e.g., 14:9; 14:11; 14:15a). This is to be expected given the translation patterns in Greek Isaiah and in the remainder of the Septuagint. The noun שְׁאוֹל occurs roughly 66 times in the Hebrew Bible and is well-distributed through the whole of its corpus. The majority Greek term favored by the Septuagint translators is ᾅδης 'the netherworld.' Yet, occasional divergences from this pattern exist.[59] Nevertheless, the book of Isaiah itself contains 10 instances of שְׁאוֹל, each of which generally pairs the term with ᾅδης.[60]

Second, the example from 14:11 includes the addition of a preposition in the Greek text—εἰς ᾅδου—whereas this locative-adverbial meaning is merely implied in the Hebrew.

---

[59]See the use of θάνατος in 2 Sam 22:6 and Prov 23:14. Greek Ezek 32:21 contains the term 'pit, hole' in the phrase מְתוֹךְ שְׁאוֹל / ἐν βάθει βόθρου.

[60]See Isa 5:14; 7:11; 14:9; 14:11; 14:15; 28:15; 28:18; 38:10; 38:18; 57:9.

However, the verbal and nominal parallel between the Hebrew texts of 14:11 and 14:15a most likely points to the structural warrant for the Greek translator's rendering. Each of these Hebrew phrases contains a passive stem of the verb ירד and the locative function of שְׁאוֹל. Thus, it appears that the translator of Greek Isaiah picked up upon these lexical and thematic parallels and explicated the locative semantics of 14:11 in light of the lexical features from 14:15.

This third point is quite parenthetical to the present discussion. But it establishes the significance of the following point. The example in 14:15b is of interest because its language stands in parallel to 14:15a epexegetically: אֶל־יַרְכְּתֵי־בוֹר. Thus, Sheol in 14:15a is explicated as the farthest portion of the pit in 14:15b. Additionally, this phrase mirrors what was seen in 14:13c, both lexically and thematically.

Isa 14:13c	וְאֵשֵׁב בְּהַר־מוֹעֵד בְּיַרְכְּתֵי צָפוֹן	καθιῶ ἐν ὄρει ὑψηλῷ ἐπὶ τὸ ὄρη τὸ ὑψηλὰ τὰ πρὸς βορρᾶν
	I will dwell on the mountain of assembly, on the farthest part of north.	*I will sit on a high mountain, on the high mountains in the north.*
Isa 14:15	אַךְ אֶל־שְׁאוֹל תּוּרָד אֶל־יַרְכְּתֵי־בוֹר	νῦν δὲ εἰς ᾅδου καταβήσῃ καὶ εἰς τὰ θεμέλια τῆς γῆς
	Yet you shall be brought down to Sheol, to the farthest parts of the pit	*But now you will go down to Hades and to the foundations of the earth.*

The thematic similarity between these verses is really one of contrast. Whereas the king of Babylon wished to have his throne above God's stars and to dwell in the farthest mountain of the north, he has in actuality been thrown down to the farthest pit, namely Sheol. The lexical similarity between these verses, though lost in the Greek text, is very clear in the Hebrew. Each phrase contains the term יְרֵכָה 'far part' attached to the locale being discussed.[61] The use of θεμέλιον in verse 15 contains some semantic connection with the Hebrew. But the translator omitted a lexical pairing for the term in verse 13 and merely supplied the relative phrase τὰ πρὸς βορρᾶν. It is noteworthy that this takes place even though Greek Isaiah elsewhere evidenced a

[61]See the discussion of יְרֵכָה and θεμέλιον in chapter 5 for detailed lexical statistics.

clear understanding of the meaning of יְרֵכָה.[62] The significance of this point will now become apparent as we consider the features of 14:19.

The use of ᾅδης in 14:19e to render the Hebrew phrase אַבְנֵי־בוֹר 'pit' is curious since the translation of this highly common noun is strangely 'mistranslated' as ᾅδης.[63] But when we consider the thematic and structural features of this discourse, I believe we can put the translation pieces together quite nicely. As we saw in 14:15, the phrase אֶל־יַרְכְּתֵי־בוֹר is another way of saying שְׁאוֹל in this discursive section.[64] But the translator there rendered the former phrase differently due to a stylistic concern to avoid redundancy. However, the translator seems to have picked up on this feature of the text and capitalized upon it. The result is a discourse which expresses and explicates the implicit thematic and structural integrity of the Hebrew text into the Greek.

In verse 19, where the translator saw the phrase יוֹרְדֵי אֶל־אַבְנֵי־בוֹר, he supplied the Greek phrase καταβαινόντων εἰς ᾅδου.[65] Not only did the translator differ his rendering of the term בּוֹר in this phrase from what we saw above in verse 15, but the term ᾅδης clearly deviated from the semantics of the Hebrew. However, we should be able to recognize that the occurrence of the term ירד in combination with the prepositional phrase signifying Sheol here in verse 19 likely triggered the thematic and structural unity of the Hebrew text to the translator's mind. This

---

[62]Isaiah 37:24 contains the phrase אֲנִי עָלִיתִי מְרוֹם הָרִים יַרְכְּתֵי לְבָנוֹן rendered as ἐγὼ ἀνέβην εἰς ὕψος ὀρέων καὶ εἰς τὰ ἔσχατα τοῦ Λιβάνου. The translator's use of ἔσχατος strongly suggests that he correctly understood the Hebrew semantics of יְרֵכָה.

[63]The term בּוֹר 'pit' occurs 71 times in the Hebrew Bible and is most frequently rendered with λάκκος 'pit' by the Septuagint translators. This Hebrew noun occurs 6 times in Isaiah and is captured by the translator with various Greek terms: γή, ᾅδης, ὀχύρωμα, λάκκος. The renderings γή and ᾅδης are unique to Greek Isaiah. And only at Isa 14:15 do we encounter the use of γή, which seems to deviate from the Hebrew semantics. However, when combined with the term θεμέλιον (e.g., εἰς τὰ θεμέλια τῆς γῆς), the meaning is closely related to 'pit'.

[64]See Karrer and Kraus (2011), 2542: "*Wiedergabe von* אבני־בור »Steine der Grube« *in Anlehnung an V.15*."

[65]Van der Vorm-Croughs (2014), 501, suggests that the shorter reading of the Greek text may reflect a divergent *Vorlage*. But the reading of the Masoretic text is also attested in 1QIsa[a], the Targum, the Peshitta, and the Vulgate. The reading of 1QIsa[a] resembles what follows: יורדו א[ל] אבני בור. Nonetheless, despite the superscripted correction, it still preserves the Masoretic reading. Instead of a divergent *Vorlage*, the shorter reading in the Greek seems to accord with what I propose above.

led him him to explicate what was present already in the source text. Phrases remarkably similar to these occur throughout the discourse (e.g., 14:11; 14:13; 14:15). And the translator seems to have picked up on this pattern toward the end of the literary section so as to explicitly convey the structural unity of the discourse. Thus, the explication of the phrase אֶל־אַבְנֵי־בוֹר as εἰς ᾅδου serves a role to highlight the micro-structural unity of the Hebrew discourse and thus establish the literary tenacity of the Hebrew text more strongly.

In addition to the argument that the translator heightened the second person singular referents of the Hebrew text to explicate its literary structure, this portion of the micro-structural argument illustrates how Greek Isaiah preserved key micro-structural features which were significant in the discourse. Thematic emphasis in Greek Isaiah regarding Hades originated from the Hebrew text's presentation of Sheol and the pit. But the translator seems to have read these themes in light of their larger thematic and structural presentation. And the resultant translation constitutes a work concerned to preserve such features from the Hebrew text in a more robust and explicative manner. The features described above do not represent the parent text at the lexical level. But they do represent them at the level of the literary structure.

The use of εἰς ᾅδου as a deviation from the Hebrew signals that the translator sought to create coherence in the thematic and literary structure of this oracle. That the translator did not render the phrase אֶל־אַבְנֵי־בוֹר as πρὸς λίθους λακκοῦ illustrates that he had some other motivations and influences behind his work. And since the translation of 14:19e accords with the lexical and semantic patterns elsewhere in the literary micro-structure of 14:7-21, readers of the Greek text would see the whole of this unit as an intentionally structured unity. These features become even clearer as we consider the final portion of the argument in terms of the discursive significance of δέ.

The Structural Marker δέ in Isaiah 14:7-21

Isaiah 14:7-21 introduces an enigmatic literary setting where the prophet gives readers and hearers a glimpse into the goings-on in Sheol. The whole discourse of this micro-structural section is framed as the speech of the tree-kings introduced in 14:8. This speech, seemingly constituted as an outburst of joy, concerns both the cessation of the deceased king of

Babylon and also the astonishment at his mere humanity. And while the Hebrew text has its own structural features which are interesting in and of themselves, I am here concerned to outline Greek Isaiah's own approach to this royal 'taunt' against the king. In particular, I contend that the translator of Greek Isaiah intentionally employed the particle δέ in order to highlight specific structural features of the Hebrew text. The ensuing analysis of these features should lead us to conclude that, in combination with the two arguments made above, the translator explicated and heightened the features which were implicit in the literary micro-structure of his Hebrew *Vorlage*.

The discourse marker δέ examined here occurs five times in Greek Isaiah 14:7-21. But since δέ does not have a precise lexical equivalent in Hebrew, its patterned use here must be motivated by factors beyond strict lexical pairing. The motivating factors for this rendering are likely structural:

Isa 14:10	גַּם־אַתָּה חֻלֵּיתָ כָמֹונוּ אֵלֵינוּ נִמְשָׁלְתָּ	καὶ σὺ ἐάλως ὥσπερ καὶ ἡμεῖς, ἐν ἡμῖν δὲ κατελογίσθης
Isa 14:11	הוּרַד שְׁאֹול גְּאֹונֶךָ הֲמִית נְבָלֶיךָ	κατέβη δὲ εἰς ᾅδου ἡ δόξα σου, ἡ πολλή σου εὐφροσύνη
Isa 14:13	וְאַתָּה אָמַרְתָּ בִלְבָבְךָ הַשָּׁמַיִם אֶעֱלֶה	σὺ δὲ εἶπας τῇ διανοίᾳ σου Εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀναβήσομαι
Isa 14:15	אַךְ אֶל־שְׁאֹול תּוּרָד אֶל־יַרְכְּתֵי־בֹור	νῦν δὲ εἰς ᾅδου καταβήσῃ καὶ εἰς τὰ θεμέλια τῆς γῆς
Isa 14:19	וְאַתָּה הָשְׁלַכְתָּ מִקִּבְרְךָ כְּנֵצֶר נִתְעָב	σὺ δὲ ῥιφήσῃ ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν ὡς νεκρὸς ἐβδελυγμένος
Isa 14:20	לֹא־תֵחַד אִתָּם בִּקְבוּרָה	οὕτως οὐδὲ σὺ ἔσῃ καθαρός

These examples show that the particle δέ only rendered explicit Hebrew lexemes on two occasions: וְאַתָּה as σὺ δέ at 14:13 and 14:19. These renderings are semantically appropriate as the translator likely read the clause-initial *waw* with the adversative meaning 'but.'[66] However, such renderings are only semantically appropriate insofar as they emerge from the discursive context. Thus, by supplying this particle the translator unveiled his conception of the surrounding discourse. After all, δέ does not by itself convey an adversative sense.[67] Other Greek terms could

[66]See discussion on *waw* as a discourse marker in Van der Merwe, Naudé, and Kroeze (2017), 418-26.

[67]For other features of δέ, see the helpful discussions in Robertson (1934), 1183-1186; Smyth (1984), §2834-2838; Turner (2019), 331-332. On the non-contrastive use of δέ, see Smyth §2836: "Copulative δέ marks transition, and is the ordinary particle used in connecting successive clauses or sentences which add something new or different, but not opposed, to what precedes . . . Copulative δέ is common in marking *continuation* . . . when a new phase of a narrative is developed . . . where attention is called to a new point or person . . ."

have been similarly employed to this end (e.g., καί or ἀλλά).[68] As Fresch notes: "[T]he motivation to use δέ is based . . . on the translator's conception of the movement and structure of the discourse."[69] Yet, without such an awareness or conception of the discursive structure of Isa 14:7-21, the use of δέ would not have been legitimately employed at the level of semantic transfer.

But in contrast to the occurrences of ו and δέ at 14:13 and 14:19, the other instances of δέ (and οὐδέ) in 14:10; 14:11; 14:15; 14:20 lack such pairing with the Hebrew text. Instead, they constitute discursively-informed lexical additions which emerge from the implicit structure of the *Vorlage*. Such additions may be understood within my overall proposal that Greek Isaiah's deviations are based on the implicit phenomena of the Hebrew text. In these instance then, the translator explicated implicit features of the Hebrew discourse structure for his Greek audience.

From here, I proceed in two steps. First, I summarize the research of Christopher Fresch on discourse markers and their use in the Septuagint. Fresch analyzed these discourse features primarily in the Old Greek Twelve Prophets, but his linguistic research is nonetheless relevant for Greek Isaiah research. After this summary, I examine the data from Isa 14:7-21 afresh in order to clarify the translator's rationale for supplying δέ to construct this literary micro-structure.

On Discourse Markers

It should go without much explanation that language, discourse, and meaning are complex phonological, written, and cognitive phenomena. And so, in an effort to clarify discursive complexity, speakers and writers employ various aids along the way to mark out discursive and structural shifts. Discourse markers are one of these tools which "aid readers in the comprehension task, thereby facilitating successful communication."[70] And relevant to the

---

[68]See the section 'Choice Implies Meaning' in Runge (2010), 5-7.

[69]Fresch (2021), 81.

[70]Fresch (2015), 1. In Classical and Hellenistic Greek, the following particles constitute the most frequent discourse markers: δέ, εἰ/ἐὰν μή, ἀλλά, ἀλλ᾽ ἤ, μέν, καί, οὖν, διὰ τοῦτο, γάρ. See also Runge (2010); Levinsohn (2000).

Septuagint, discourse markers enable translators to breach 'literal' renderings in order to capture the meaning of the Hebrew more fully. Thus, it is possible to render the source text 'freely' at the lexical level while at the same time rendering it 'literally' at the level of discourse and structure.

As the authors of *CGCG* note: "[W]hen people hear or read a text, they intuitively look for relationships between the individual sentences: they look for textual coherence."[71] As such, readers are able to sufficiently infer the meaning of a discourse without the presence of discourse markers. But including these markers reduces a reader's cognitive effort as they construct a coherent portrait of textual meaning. "[I]t is a way for the speaker/writer to make interpreting the text easier for the addressee."[72] As such, these markers serve as "linguistic road signs . . . alerting [readers] to what is coming, and providing them with instructions on how to proceed."[73] Thus, the translator's explication of the Hebrew text's thematic and structural features with the discourse marker δέ unveils his own structural conception of Isa 14:7-21. This is due to the fact that δέ is "intrinsically tied to context and the flow of the discourse."[74] And by constructing the Greek text in this discursive fashion, the translator of Greek Isaiah created a more coherent or robust structural presentation for his readers.

Discourse Marker δέ

Fresch's linguistic analysis and judgment moves beyond what is typically offered by Greek grammarians who regard δέ largely as an 'adversative particle.'[75] Instead, he illustrates how several examples from the Hellenistic papyri contain instances of δέ which in no way correspond to its 'adversative' sense. And while the particle δέ clearly has an adversative meaning in some contexts, this description alone does not accurately capture the multiple

---

[71]CGCG (2019), 657. On textual coherence, see the extended discussion in von Siebenthal (2019), 569-636.

[72]CGCG (2019), 657.

[73]Fresch (2015), 4.

[74]Fresch (2015), 17.

[75]*BDF* (1961), §447; Porter (1999), 208; Funk (2013), §632; *et al*. as noted by Fresch (2015), 28-29. See the nuanced presentation in Turner (2019), 331-332.

instances of δέ in the Greek of the Hellenistic literature of this period. As such, the meaning of δέ must be contextually derived rather than being pulled from the particle itself.[76] So then, how might δέ function?

As *CGCG* notes, "[Δ]έ indicates a shift to a new, distinct, text segment, often with a change of topic . . . to connect clauses and/or sentences."[77] As such, it frequently occurs at significant literary 'seams' which highlight referent switches, topic changes, or thematic shifts. Δέ "signals distinct information units at macro- and micro-levels."[78] Thus, δέ is employed for structural purposes in order to organize and highlight specific discursive units, such as scenes, speeches, or subtopics within the larger framework of a text's literary structure. And as we will see, the patterned use of δέ in the examples from Isa 14:7-21 highlights distinct elements of this passage's literary structure. And the very occurrence of these particles, then, suggests that the translator sought to convey something relevant from the literary structure of the Hebrew text.

Δέ in Isaiah 14:7-21

We can now assess more fully the relationship between δέ and the literary structure of Isa 14:7-21, specifically as it relates to features of context, literary 'seams', and the introduction of 'novel' information. I again supply relevant examples from Isa 14:7-21:

Isa 14:10	גַּם־אַתָּה חֻלֵּיתָ כָמוֹנוּ אֵלֵינוּ נִמְשָׁלְתָּ	καὶ σὺ ἐάλως ὥσπερ καὶ ἡμεῖς, ἐν ἡμῖν δὲ κατελογίσθης
Isa 14:11	הוּרַד שְׁאוֹל גְּאוֹנֶךָ הֲמִיַּת נְבָלֶיךָ	κατέβη δὲ εἰς ᾅδου ἡ δόξα σου, ἡ πολλή σου εὐφροσύνη
Isa 14:13	וְאַתָּה אָמַרְתָּ בִלְבָבְךָ הַשָּׁמַיִם אֶעֱלֶה	σὺ δὲ εἶπας τῇ διανοίᾳ σου Εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀναβήσομαι
Isa 14:15	אַךְ אֶל־שְׁאוֹל תּוּרָד אֶל־יַרְכְּתֵי־בוֹר	νῦν δὲ εἰς ᾅδου καταβήσῃ καὶ εἰς τὰ θεμέλια τῆς γῆς
Isa 14:19	וְאַתָּה הָשְׁלַכְתָּ מִקִּבְרְךָ כְּנֵצֶר נִתְעָב	σὺ δὲ ῥιφήσῃ ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν ὡς νεκρὸς ἐβδελυγμένος
Isa 14:20	לֹא־תֵחַד אִתָּם בִּקְבוּרָה	οὕτως οὐδὲ σὺ ἔσῃ καθαρός

The Hebrew text here exhibits an implicit literary structure, evident from the double occurrence of וְאַתָּה at 14:13 and 14:19 and the exclamation אֵיךְ at 14:15 (cf. 14:12 below). Not only did the

[76]See van der Vorm-Croughs (2014), 88: "In most cases . . . δέ has been added so as to make explicit the relation of one sentence to the previous one. . . . [W]ith regularity it is utilised in a continuative way, in order to express the continuation of a thought."

[77]CGCG (2019), 671.

[78]Fresch (2021), 81.

translator supply δέ in these instances, he included the particle elsewhere even without lexical injunction from the Hebrew text.

At Isa 14:10, δέ is inserted between the prepositional phrase and the verb: אֵלֵינוּ נִמְשָׁלְתָּ rendered as ἐν ὑμῖν δὲ κατελογίσθης. At 14:11, the particle occurs between the verb and the subject Sheol: הוּרַד שְׁאוֹל גְּאוֹנֶךָ rendered as κατέβη δὲ εἰς ᾅδου ἡ δόξα σου. Isaiah 14:15 contains δέ in between the pairing אַךְ / νῦν and the prepositional phrase: אַךְ אֶל־שְׁאוֹל תּוּרָד rendered as νῦν δὲ εἰς ᾅδου καταβήσῃ.[79] And at 14:20, the phrase οὕτως οὐδέ replaces the negation לֹא, therefore joining verse 20 to the preceding section, both of which are likely distinct in the Hebrew. The use of these particles obviously serves an interpretive and structural function. But their rationale is not immediately obvious. A few brief observations are in order.

It is noteworthy that the addition of these discourse particles begins with the reported speech of Sheol's inhabitants. The use of δέ beginning with verse 10 highlights a structurally novel discourse which is markedly distinct from the preceding royal taunt. The use of the particle again in 14:13 corresponds with this speech function as well. Shifting toward a new speaker, the king of Babylon here deliberates within his *Umwelt* about how he would ascend to God's heavenly realm.[80]

Second, as the remaining examples illustrate, the use of the particle δέ corresponds with the use of the second person singular referents noted throughout the literary micro-structure of Isa 14:7-21. The use of δέ and οὐδέ in these instances highlights the already explicated second person singular features of the Greek text. These discourse markers draw attention specifically to the king of Babylon by emphasizing the new thematic prominence of his downfall.

---

[79]Given the placement of νῦν in first position at Isa 14:15, we should assume that it and not δέ renders the Hebrew particle אַךְ.

[80]Consider the statements on discourse markers by Aijmer (2013), 5: "Their ability to project a new stage in the discourse (a new activity, speech act, or text) is an important aspect of metalinguistic indicators. They therefore have a crucial role in controlling and changing the progress of the discourse." These observations correspond precisely with what we see in the examples above.

Last of all, we should note how sparingly the particle δέ is employed in this literary micro-structure from 14:7-21.[81] Even though δέ occurs in 14:10 and 14:13 to signal the new substructural discourse, while at the same time highlighting the second person singular referents in the final four examples, the translator did not overdo its usage by supplying discourse markers at every conceivable speech juncture or by highlighting each second person singular referent. Instead, he appears to have carefully placed the discourse marker δέ at key thematic points which introduce speech-units regarding the destruction of the king of Babylon.

Sparse use of the particle may be grasped more easily by presenting the discourse of Isa 14:7-21 as follows:

> [7]πᾶσα ἡ γῆ βοᾷ μετ᾽ εὐφροσύνης, [8]καὶ τὰ ξύλα τοῦ Λιβάνου ηὐφράνθησαν ἐπὶ σοὶ καὶ ἡ κέδρος τοῦ Λιβάνου Ἀφ᾽ οὗ σὺ κεκοίμησαι, οὐκ ἀνέβη ὁ κόπτων ἡμᾶς. [9]ὁ ᾅδης κάτωθεν ἐπικράνθη συναντήσας σοι, συνηγέρθησάν σοι πάντες οἱ γίγαντες οἱ ἄρξαντες τῆς γῆς οἱ ἐγείραντες ἐκ τῶν θρόνων αὐτῶν πάντας βασιλεῖς ἐθνῶν. [10]πάντες ἀποκριθήσονται καὶ ἐροῦσί σοι Καὶ σὺ ἐάλως ὥσπερ καὶ ἡμεῖς, ἐν ἡμῖν **δὲ** κατελογίσθης. [11]κατέβη **δὲ** εἰς ᾅδου ἡ δόξα σου, ἡ πολλή σου εὐφροσύνη· ὑποκάτω σου στρώσουσι σῆψιν, καὶ τὸ κατακάλυμμά σου σκώληξ. [12]*πῶς ἐξέπεσεν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὁ ἑωσφόρος ὁ πρωὶ ἀνατέλλων; συνετρίβη εἰς τὴν γῆν ὁ ἀποστέλλων πρὸς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη.* [13]σὺ **δὲ** εἶπας τῇ διανοίᾳ σου Εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀναβήσομαι, ἐπάνω τῶν ἄστρων τοῦ θεοῦ θήσω τὸν θρόνον μου, καθιῶ ἐν ὄρει ὑψηλῷ ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρη τὰ ὑψηλὰ τὰ πρὸς βορρᾶν, [14]ἀναβήσομαι ἐπάνω τῶν νεφελῶν, ἔσομαι ὅμοιος τῷ ὑψίστῳ. [15]νῦν **δὲ** εἰς ᾅδου καταβήσῃ καὶ εἰς τὰ θεμέλια τῆς γῆς. [16]οἱ ἰδόντες σε θαυμάσουσιν ἐπὶ σοὶ καὶ ἐροῦσιν Οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὁ παροξύνων τὴν γῆν, σείων βασιλεῖς; [17]ὁ θεὶς τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην ἔρημον καὶ τὰς πόλεις καθεῖλε, τοὺς ἐν ἐπαγωγῇ οὐκ ἔλυσε. [18]πάντες οἱ βασιλεῖς τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐκοιμήθησαν ἐν τιμῇ, ἄνθρωπος ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ· [19]σὺ **δὲ** ῥιφήσῃ ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν ὡς νεκρὸς ἐβδελυγμένος μετὰ πολλῶν τεθνηκότων ἐκκεκεντημένων μαχαίραις καταβαινόντων εἰς ᾅδου. ὃν τρόπον ἱμάτιον ἐν αἵματι πεφυρμένον οὐκ ἔσται καθαρόν, [20]οὕτως ***οὐδὲ*** σὺ ἔσῃ καθαρός, διότι τὴν γῆν μου ἀπώλεσας καὶ τὸν λαόν μου ἀπέκτεινας· οὐ μὴ μείνῃς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα χρόνον, σπέρμα πονηρόν. [21]ἑτοίμασον τὰ τέκνα σου σφαγῆναι ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις τοῦ πατρός σου, ἵνα μὴ ἀναστῶσι καὶ τὴν γῆν κληρονομήσωσι καὶ ἐμπλήσωσι τὴν γῆν πόλεων.

This selection illustrates the ability of δέ to clearly structure the discourse. This discourse marker stands at several key junctures. Verses 10 and 13 each introduce new sections of either speech or reported speech. The use of δέ at verse 11 introduces a significant shift in topic where it describes the first instance of Babylon's descent to Sheol-Hades. The force of δέ here cannot be adversative since it merely furthers the discourse trajectory. The tree-kings of Sheol merely recognize that the king of Babylon descended to the pit.

[81]Of note, δέ is nowhere employed in Isa 13:1-22.

The next occurrence of δέ in verse 13 moves readers away from the discourse of the tree-kings and introduces the *Umwelt* of the king of Babylon. Similar to the use of δέ at verse 10, the particle here both introduces a new segment of speech and shifts the overall discourse to the subsequent internal dialogue. A clear change of focus and theme is evident.[82] Then, the use of δέ at verse 15 moves readers away from the inner speech-world of the king back to that of the tree-kings from verse 10. Here, the speakers again describe the descent of the king to Sheol-Hades (cf. 14:11). The examples below show how this parallel is warranted from the thematic and literary structure of the Hebrew text:

Isa 14:11	הוּרַד שְׁאוֹל גְּאוֹנֶךָ	κατέβη δὲ εἰς ᾅδου ἡ δόξα σου
Isa 14:15	אַךְ אֶל־שְׁאוֹל תּוּרָד	νῦν δὲ εἰς ᾅδου καταβήσῃ

The recurrence of both passive verbs from ירד along with the repetition of the locative שְׁאוֹל in both phrases render it very likely that such lexical and thematic parallels contributed to the translator's double use of δέ. Overall, there is a strong case for the translator's intention to selectively include this discourse marker both to introduce new sections of speech and also to highlight thematic parallels regarding the downfall of the king of Babylon.[83]

This intentional structuring is last of all confirmed by the use of οὐδέ at Isa 14:20. Whereas the structural relationship between verse 20 and the preceding material in the Hebrew text must be inferred, Greek Isaiah explicates this discursive unity with the particles οὕτως οὐδέ at the beginning of the verse. Such thematic and discursive unity between 14:20 and the preceding material is evident in the Hebrew text through repeated use of second person singular forms. However, the Greek plus οὕτως οὐδέ more clearly highlights the implicit relationship

[82]If the particle is rendered adversatively, it is merely a contextual epiphenomena and not one strictly derived from the lexeme itself.

[83]This trend, however, seems to go against what we see in verse 16. Given the shift in theme in 14:16, the absence of the discourse marker seems curious. According to the pattern of discursive speech followed by description of royal downfall, we would expect 14:16 to begin as follows: οἱ *δὲ ἰδόντες σε θαυμάσουσιν ἐπὶ σοί. But even though this verse introduces a new topic within the discourse, it does not introduce new speakers. The entities involved in marveling at the king of Babylon are those mentioned earlier in the oracle. And the thematic-character pattern we see in Isa 14:16-19 quite closely follows what occurred in 14:9-11 where the kings in Sheol address the king of Babylon through a speech discourse. Insofar as 14:19 contrasts the speech of these tree-kings in Sheol, the translator continues the pattern he established earlier and supplied the discourse marker δέ to render the Hebrew וְאַתָּה. This translational move has lexical, contextual, and patterned discursive warrant.

between verse 20 and the preceding material and makes the resolution of the discourse more obvious to readers.

Even though the discourse marker δέ has lexical warrant from the Hebrew וְאַתָּה in 14:13 and 14:19, its use throughout Isa 14:7-21 is structurally and thematically significant in two ways. It heightens the ideas of speech and that of the king of Babylon's downfall. Verse 20 expands the impact of this downfall to the king's very descendants. All this strongly suggests that the translator of Greek Isaiah picked up these structural features from the Hebrew text and highlighted them by selectively employing the particle δέ. Thus, the patterned use of this particle without explicit Hebrew pairing illustrates that it emerged as a result of the translator's assessment of the literary and structural discourse and in turn "provides a structure to the text in conventional Greek idiom that mirrors . . . the structure of the Hebrew."[84]

The above analysis demonstrates how the translator of Greek Isaiah employed the discourse marker δέ to emphasize thematic, contextual, and structural features which were simply implicit in the Hebrew. Nonetheless, by unpacking these elements of the literary micro-structure in Isa 14:7-21, we can appreciate the translator's concern to explicate and heighten the structural features of the Babylon discourse for his Greek audience. In addition to this exploration, the two other micro-structural phenomena surveyed in this section—that of the second person singular and the theme of Sheol—support my proposal for the translator's approach to his Hebrew text.

Summary of the Literary Structure of Isaiah 14:7-21

The literary micro-structure of Greek Isaiah 14:7-21 highlights and explicates the Hebrew text in three ways. It emphasizes the second person singular referent, heightens the thematic prominence to the themes surrounding Sheol and Hades, and explicates the structure of the discourse by his intentional use of the discourse marker δέ. Given the above observations and analysis, we can perceive the translator's intention to preserve and heighten the Hebrew text and the level of its literary micro-structure. Through lexical and thematic deviation, the translator

[84]Fresch (2015), 52.

made his work more structurally robust than the Hebrew. Nevertheless, the very motivations for such deviations are to be found within the Hebrew text itself.

Furthermore, these literary micro-structural phenomena have implications for the literary macro-structure of the Babylon discourse. By emphasizing the second person singular in 14:7-21, the translator has effectively unified chapters 13 and 14 with respect to the aforementioned emphasis upon the second person plural forms in Isa 13:1-22. Chapter 13 emphasizes the kingdom of Babylon with the second person plural while chapter 14 emphasizes the king of Babylon with the second person singular. The Greek text heightens these thematic-character referents through additions and alterations to the Hebrew text, resulting in a literary macro-structure which emphasizes the central themes and characters of the discourse while also strengthening the addressee through translational deviation.

Literary Structure of Isa 14:22-23: σπέρμα

A final point to discuss concerns the double use of σπέρμα in the final section of chapter 14. And although this terminology was discussed in the previous chapter with regards to the literary macro-structure, its repetition also serves a micro-structural purpose. Consider the examples listed here:

Isa 14:20	לֹא־תֵחַד אִתָּם בִּקְבוּרָה כִּי־אַרְצְךָ שִׁחַתָּ עַמְּךָ הָרָגְתָּ לֹא־יִקָּרֵא לְעוֹלָם זֶרַע מְרֵעִים׃ *You shall not be joined with them in burial for you destroyed your land; you killed your people; the seed of evildoers shall no longer be named.*	οὕτως οὐδὲ σὺ ἔσῃ καθαρός διότι τὴν γῆν μου ἀπώλεσας καὶ τὸν λαόν μου ἀπέκτεινας οὐ μὴ μείνῃς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα χρόνον, <u>σπέρμα</u> πονηρόν. *So neither will you be clean because you destroyed my land and you killed my people; you will not remain forever, O evil seed.*
Isa 14:22[85]	וְקַמְתִּי עֲלֵיהֶם נְאֻם יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת וְהִכְרַתִּי לְבָבֶל שֵׁם וּשְׁאָר וְנִין וָנֶכֶד נְאֻם־יְהוָה׃ *"And I will rise against them," says Yhwh of armies, "and I will cut off*	καὶ ἐπαναστήσομαι αὐτοῖς λέγει κύριος σαβαωθ, καὶ ἀπολῶ αὐτῶν ὄνομα καὶ κατάλειμμα καὶ <u>σπέρμα·</u> τάδε λέγει κύριος. *And I will rise up against them," says the Lord Sabaoth, "and I will destroy their name, remnant, and seed." Thus*

[85]Concerning the omission of the term Babylon in the Greek, see the discussion in chapter 6 on the structural significance of Babylon as a thematic-character marker.

from Babylon name, remnant, offspring, and posterity," declares Yhwh. *says the Lord.*

The lexical doubling of this Greek term resembles the features discussed above in 13:4-5 and 13:12-14. As I will discuss in chapter 6, these two verses represent two distinct sections of the literary structure in the Hebrew text. The same follows for their Greek renderings.[86] But despite these structural differences, the translator appropriately captured the unity and continuity of characters between these distinct structural units by supplying two instances of σπέρμα. This rendering has a unifying effect of theme and character upon the Greek readership. And whereas the first use of σπέρμα in verse 20 for זֶרַע is lexically justified, the use of σπέρμα in verse 22 conflates the terms נִין וָנֶכֶד.[87]

The semantic relationships between זֶרַע, נִין, and נֶכֶד are close enough to justify use of the lexeme σπέρμα in these instances. But the Hebrew lexical forms are obviously very different. And since it is very unlikely that the translator knew the meanings of either terms נִין or נֶכֶד, he would have most likely needed to infer their meanings from context.[88]

While I think the Hebrew text itself implies a continuity of character, this is not evident from the lexical items themselves. But the Greek text explicated this character continuity by twice supplying the σπέρμα lexeme. Thus, Greek Isaiah attests to a literary structure which heightens the emphasis of the Hebrew text through this lexical peculiarity. And so, the translator most likely supplied a contextual guess which corresponded to the larger context. And this

[86]The shift from the second person singular of 14:7-21 to the first person singular of 14:22-23 in the Greek text renders this structural break evident.

[87]Van der Vorm-Croughs (2014), 188, classifies this condensation as "the reduction of synonymous elements in coordination."

[88]See Gen 21:23, where the LXX renders the Hebrew phrase אִם־תִּשְׁקֹר לִי וּלְנִינִי וּלְנֶכְדִּי as μὴ ἀδικήσειν με μηδὲ τὸ σπέρμα μου μηδὲ τὸ ὄνομά μου. The use of ἐπίγνωστος at Job 18:19 is difficult to explicate and may indicate that the translator did not understand the Hebrew terminology before him. These verses constitute the only places where the lexemes נִין and נֶכֶד occur, and always paired together. For a defense and explication of the principle of contextual guessing, see Tov (1999), 203-18, esp. 213: "Reliance on parallelism is a form of contextual translation . . . a stable means of determining the meaning of words, but the decision whether or not to turn to parallelism remains subjective and the recognition of different types of parallelism requires different renderings."

lexical guess in fact created a more robust thematic and structural connection in the Greek text which affirms that which is nonetheless implicit in the Hebrew.

In addition to the structural influences within the oracle against Babylon and her king, the subsequent oracle against Philistia in Isa 14:28-32 may also contribute to the translator's lexical choices evidenced in 14:20-22. The examples here illustrate this nicely:

Isa 14:29	כִּי־מִשֹּׁרֶשׁ נָחָשׁ יֵצֵא צֶפַע	ἐκ γὰρ σπέρματος ὄφεων ἐξελεύσεται ἔκγονα ἀσπίδων
	For from the root of a serpent an adder shall come forth	*For from the seed of snakes the offspring of asps will come forth*
Isa 14:30	וְהֵמַתִּי בָרָעָב שָׁרָשֵׁךְ וּשְׁאֵרִיתֵךְ יַהֲרֹג	ἀνελεῖ δὲ λιμῷ τὸ σπέρμα σου καὶ τὸ κατάλειμμά σου ἀνελεῖ
	But I will put your root to death with famine; and it will kill your remnant.	*Now he will wipe out your seed with famine and he will wipe out your remnant.*

While these examples fall outside the discourse addressed to Babylon and the king, they illustrate that the translator may have extended the lexical and thematic elements of the literary macro-structure from 13:1-14:23 beyond these borders. The translator's decision to render each occurrence of the Hebrew term שֹׁרֶשׁ 'root' with the noun σπέρμα in these two verses is unique not only within Greek Isaiah but in the whole of the Septuagint.[89] The use of this Greek term signals a lexical parallel to the Greek renderings in 14:20-22.

Although the use of κατάλειμμα at 14:30 has lexical warrant from the Hebrew text, it likewise parallels its previous occurrence in 14:22. Thus, these examples from the oracle of Philistia may have influenced the translator's renderings within the Babylon oracle. But it seems more persuasive to see them as influenced by the previous material. In combination with κατάλειμμα at 14:22, the double use of σπέρμα in 14:20-22 created a set of characters in the Greek text which seems to have structurally influenced the translator in the remainder of his task.

[89]Throughout the corpus of the Greek Old Testament, the translators are almost uniform in rendering the term שֹׁרֶשׁ with ῥίζα. For examples in Greek Isaiah, see 5:24; 11:1; 11:10; 37:31; 53:2.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I discussed the question of whether the translator of Greek Isaiah appropriated elements from the literary micro-structure of the Hebrew text in Isa 13:1-14:23. In the previous pages, I affirmed that such features were present and pervasive in his work through an analysis of six distinct micro-structural units. I analyzed 1) the parallel terminology and syntactic unity of 13:4-5; 2) the structural unity created by lexical additions in 13:12-14; 3) the translator's awareness of overlap in the literary macro-structure through micro-structural details in 13:15-18; 4) the linkage of distinct oracular units through deviating lexical choices in 13:20-14:7; 5) the fine lexical, thematic, and discursive details supplied in 14:7-21; 6) the micro-structural unity created by uniform lexical choices in 14:20-22.

In this analysis, I concluded that a major motivation for the translator's activity is found in his concern to appropriate from and to preserve the Hebrew literary structure despite his deviations from it at the lexical level. Even though the translator of Greek Isaiah is considered to be 'free' in his approach, this designation for the most part seems to apply only lexical choices. When we consider the topics discussed in this chapter, we can see that 'free' renderings at the lexical level often serve the purpose of preserving 'literal' features at the level of the literary structure. When the discussion in this chapter is combined with the following, a strong case can be made that the translator of Greek Isaiah sought to preserve several features from both the literary micro- and macro-structures of the Hebrew text. And so, I now turn to the topic of literary macro-structure in Greek Isaiah 13:1-14:23.

Chapter 6: The Literary Macro-Structure of Greek Isaiah 13:1-14:23

Introduction

To complement the previous discussion on literary micro-structure, this chapter highlights and defends the translator of Greek Isaiah's understanding and appropriation of the literary macro-structure of the Hebrew text of Isa 13:1-14:23. Little research on Greek Isaiah has investigated this topic of literary macro-structure. And even less attention has been paid to the structural components of the Hebrew text which informed the translator's decisions. In light of this, this chapter aims to contribute to an area of Greek Isaiah research which has been left underdeveloped in my estimation.[1] As I mentioned in the preceding chapter, this section on literary macro-structure includes discussion on translation features such as discourse markers and themes delineating and reaching across whole chapters and smaller sections within them.

In this chapter on literary macro-structure, I demonstrate how the translator of Greek Isaiah understood and structured the Hebrew text despite his deviations from the Hebrew source. And I conclude that the literary transfer of structural features from the Hebrew text into the Greek suggests that the translator was concerned to preserve in various ways the literary macro-structure of his source text.

The Literary Macro-Structure of Isaiah 13:1-14:23: Parallels and Themes

I organize this discussion of the literary macro-structure into two sections. The first of these presents the macro-structural details of Isa 13:1-14:23 in terms of its structural parallels, whether they be lexical or thematic. These parallels occur in select locations throughout the discourse, typically in distinct structural places forming an *inclusio* or mirrors between chapters 13 and 14. The second section concerns specific thematic elements of the macro-structure and how these themes materialize throughout the prophetic discourse. Whereas the first section

[1]See chapter 5 for resources on literary structure in Greek Isaiah.

presents features of the literary structure as pillars, the second section presents these features as the interlaced construction within the larger literary structure.

In this first section concerning structural parallels, I highlight 7 separate features which the translator of Greek Isaiah employed to organize the macro-structure of these chapters: 1) the oracular heading, 2) the structural *inclusio* of the theme-character Babylon, 3) the use of kingdom terminology, 4) the heightened use of second person plural form in the kingdom oracle, 5) temporal referents, 6) animal references, 7) mirrored characters between the chapters.[2] The translator's approach to these literary features indicates that he was concerned to preserve the literary structure of Isa 13:1-14:23 by transferring the structural and thematic clues of the Hebrew text to his translation. Although slight disparities between the Hebrew and Greek occur with respect to the macro-literary structure, the translator has largely followed the cues of his source text. In fact, it seems that he seeks to explain further the implicit meaning of the text by highlighting the unity of the oracles against Babylon and her king through his altered renderings.

Parallels of the Literary Macro-Structure

Literary Structure of the Hebrew Text

As we recall from the introduction, Isa 13:1-22 can be understood to exhibit a threefold literary structure in the Hebrew while Isa 14:1-23 is fourfold in its organization:

1. Isa 13:1-22 Vision Against Babylon
    - A. 13:1-8 Attack Upon Babylon
    - B. 13:9-16 Battle Against Babylon
    - C. 13:17-22 Destruction of Babylon
2. Isa 14:1-23 Taunt Against the King of Babylon
    - A. 14:1-2 Interlude: Israel Restored
    - B. 14:3-6 Israel Taunts the King of Babylon
    - C. 14:7-21 Kings Taunt the King of Babylon
    - D. 14:22-23 The Lord Destroys the King of Babylon

[2]Even though the chapter arrangement expressed in the MT postdates the production of Greek Isaiah, the topic shift between 13:1-22 and 14:1-23 legitimates the division I propose here. Furthermore, the features within Greek Isaiah itself suggest that the translator recognized this topic switch.

For reference, I structure chapter 13 around the use of הִנֵּה / ἰδού at 13:9 and 13:17. In the Hebrew, the term הִנֵּה functions as discourse marker of *mirativity*, a feature which creates surprise and points to a newsworthy event or situation. As *BHRG* states:

> Since most instances of the particle in the Hebrew Bible reflect the evaluation of the speaker(s) concerning the newsworthiness of an imminent action, event or the information conveyed in a clause or clauses, it is classified in this grammar as a deictic particle that predominantly functions as a 'discourse marker.'[3]

The translator's pairing with ἰδού functions similarly.[4] When these chapters are read together, the whole of the Babylon oracle can also be understood in accordance with the threefold macro-pattern as illustrated here:

A.	Isa 13:1-22	Oracle Against the Kingdom of Babylon
B.	Isa 14:1-2	Interlude: Israel Returns to the Land
C.	Isa 14:3-23	Taunt Against the King of Babylon

These outlines are significant because they shape the ensuing discussion by illustrating the holistic thrust of Babylon's demise in these oracles. In the Hebrew text, the end of the kingdom of Babylon mirrors the end of the king of Babylon. In other words, the fate of the kingdom and the fate of the king go hand in hand. And much of what is presented in terms of the Greek appropriation of this structure concerns heightening the elements of these destruction motifs.

Emphasis upon parallels in the macro-structure suggests that readers should view Isa 13:1-14:23 as a literary whole. And the features I highlight in the Greek text demonstrate that the translator of Greek Isaiah organized his text as such. Thus, the Greek readership is guided to read according to these literary macro-structural patterns because of the translator's distinctive concern to alter the components of the Hebrew text in this direction. But the readers aren't illegitimately forced into these readings. The following discussion demonstrates that the translator was justified in his re-structuring of the discourse. And such re-structuring is grounded in the literary themes and structure of the Hebrew text itself. I here present evidence to support the following seven parallels in the literary macro-structure mentioned above.

---

[3]See *BHRG*[2] (2017), 407-418; esp. §40.22; also Miller-Naudé and Van der Merwe (2011): 53-81.

[4]See Bauer (2000), 468, where the ἰδού is defined as a 'prompter of attention'.

The Oracular Heading

The oracular heading of Isa 13:1 is a major structural feature. It grabs our attention in a manner akin to a discourse marker:[5]

Isa 13:1 מַשָּׂא בָּבֶל אֲשֶׁר חָזָה יְשַׁעְיָהוּ בֶּן־אָמוֹץ׃
An oracle of Babylon which Isaiah, the son of Amos, saw
Ὅρασις, ἣν εἶδεν Ησαίας υἱὸς Αμως κατὰ Βαβυλῶνος
An oracle, which Isaiah, the son of Amos, saw against Babylon

As a highlighting feature of the discourse, the heading both marks the end of the previous literary section and initiates a new discursive section. Also, the oracular statement likely serves as a heading not only for chapter 13, but for the taunt against the king of Babylon in chapter 14 as well.[6]

Furthermore, I contend that this heading not only initiates the discourse of chapters 13 and 14, but also subordinates the whole section that follows (i.e., 14:24-23:18). This heading against Babylon serves as the heading for the whole series of oracles against the nations. This feature can be seen in two ways. First, the heading of 13:1 is reminiscent of two expanded oracles earlier in the book, both in form and in function (cf. 1:1; 2:1). Second, the heading of 13:1 holds a unique thematic and structural position among the nine subsequent headings in the oracles against the nations.[7] I will thus examine the significance of this heading for its immediate context in light of the material which both precedes and follows it.

The unique structural placement of the heading in 13:1 is apparent when we consider the larger structure of the book of Isaiah up to this point. Both Isa 1:1 and 2:1 contain formally

---

[5]On the chapter headings in Greek Isaiah, see Van der Louw (2007), 155-160; Wagner (2013), 64-70. On the related issue of literary structure and delimitation criticism in Greek Isaiah, see De Sousa (2010), 19-26. For discussion of the Hebrew text, see Williamson (2006), 12-21.

[6]See Williamson (2006), 163: "Although 13:1 stands at the start of the oracles against the nations, its immediate reference is to chs 13-14." See also Watts (2005), 190.

[7]Researchers differ somewhat on the limits the oracles against the nations in Isaiah. For the organization of the oracles within chapters 13-23, see Gray (1949), 232; Oswalt (1986), 60-63; Kilian (1994); Zapff (1995), 14; Wildberger (1997), 1-2. For the organization of the oracles within chapters 13-27, see Motyer (1993), 131-34; Blenkinsopp (2000), 271-73; Watts (2005), 223-29; Gentry (2015), 227-53. For a recent collection of research on theses oracles in the Hebrew Bible, see Holt, Kim, and Mein (2014).

similar headings which introduce and delineate the ensuing discursive material.[8] And these headings earlier in Isaiah also align with the form and function of the oracular heading of Isa 13:1:

Isa 1:1 חֲזוֹן יְשַׁעְיָהוּ בֶן־אָמוֹץ אֲשֶׁר חָזָה עַל־יְהוּדָה וִירוּשָׁלָם
בִּימֵי עֻזִּיָּהוּ יוֹתָם אָחָז יְחִזְקִיָּהוּ מַלְכֵי יְהוּדָה׃
Ὅρασις, ἣν εἶδεν Ησαίας υἱὸς Αμος, ἣν εἶδε κατὰ τῆς Ιουδαίας καὶ κατὰ Ιερουσαλημ
ἐν βασιλείᾳ Οζίου καὶ Ιωαθαμ καὶ Αχαζ καὶ Εζεκίου, οἳ ἐβασίλευσαν τῆς Ιουδαίας.

Isa 2:1 הַדָּבָר אֲשֶׁר חָזָה יְשַׁעְיָהוּ בֶן־אָמוֹץ עַל־יְהוּדָה וִירוּשָׁלָם׃
Ὁ λόγος ὁ γενόμενος παρὰ κυρίου πρὸς Ησαίαν υἱὸν Αμως
περὶ τῆς Ιουδαίας καὶ περὶ Ιερουσαλημ.

Isa 13:1 מַשָּׂא בָּבֶל אֲשֶׁר חָזָה יְשַׁעְיָהוּ בֶּן־אָמוֹץ׃
Ὅρασις, ἣν εἶδεν Ησαίας υἱὸς Αμως κατὰ Βαβυλῶνος

Each of these examples constitutes a chapter heading which contains the name of the prophet, his lineage, the medium of revelation (i.e., vision, word, oracle), the use of the verb חזה to describe the transfer of revelation, and the subject matter of the ensuing discussion (i.e., Judah, Jerusalem, Babylon). These headings are clues within the Hebrew text to its own literary layout and logic. They function as distinct structural markers which embed and subordinate their subsequent material. And the translator perceived these features and carried them into his translation as well.[9]

[8]Wagner (2013), 60-68, commenting on Isa 1:1, states: "The significance of these subtle transformations comes fully into view only retrospectively. Considered in light of the distinctive themes that emerge from the translator's handling of the chapter as a whole, they combine to highlight the political dimension of Isaiah's prophetic activity and to focus the searchlight of Isaiah's prophetic critique squarely on those charged with the task of ruling God's people."

[9]The Greek text of each verse contains slight deviations from the Hebrew, supplying stylistic-interpretive additions to the syntax. This occurs in two ways. First, the translator expanded the syntax of the Hebrew with the additional relative clauses and attributive phrases. Second, the translator interpretively rendered the Hebrew preposition עַל 'about' in 1:1 and 2:1 in ways respective to their ensuing context: κατά in 1:1 and περί in 2:1. The translator likewise supplied both an additional relative clause and also the correct interpretive preposition κατά in 13:1. These decisions were well suited to the context in which they occur and indicate that the translator was interested to frame his work in an exegetically informed way. Regarding Isa 1:1, see Wagner (2013), 70: "a slight transformation of the superscription correlates with a discernible emphasis in the Greek version of Isaiah's inaugural vision."

The significance of the expanded oracular heading in Isa 13:1 can be seen by comparing it with the nine subsequent national oracles. In both the Hebrew and Greek texts, these examples do not bear the same thematic or structural weight as the heading in 13:1:[10]

Isa 14:28	הָיָה הַמַּשָּׂא הַזֶּה	ἐγενήθη τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο[11]
Isa 15:1	מַשָּׂא מוֹאָב	τὸ ῥῆμα τὸ κατὰ τῆς Μωαβίτιδος
Isa 17:1	מַשָּׂא דַּמָּשֶׂק	τὸ ῥῆμα τὸ κατὰ Δαμασκοῦ
Isa 19:1	מַשָּׂא מִצְרָיִם	ὅρασις Αἰγύπτου
Isa 21:1	מַשָּׂא מִדְבַּר־יָם	τὸ ὅραμα τῆς ἐρήμου
Isa 21:11	מַשָּׂא דוּמָה	τὸ ὅραμα τῆς Ιδουμαίας
Isa 21:13	מַשָּׂא בַּעְרָב	—[12]
Isa 22:1	מַשָּׂא גֵּיא חִזָּיּוֹן	τὸ ὅραμα τῆς φάραγγος Σιων
Isa 23:1	מַשָּׂא צֹר	τὸ ὅραμα Τύρου

In Hebrew, these oracular headings differ significantly from the more elaborate headings in 1:1; 2:1; 13:1. Whereas the elaborate headings contain several thematic details, each heading apart from Isa 14:28 in these examples above merely follows the concise formula **מַשָּׂא** + *X*. It is likely that the structural significance of these shortened formulae is lessened and thus, they are subordinated to the main heading in 13:1. Such structural distinctions are evident in the Hebrew text itself.[13]

In the Greek, the translator largely rendered each of these oracular statements without deviation from the Hebrew text. He simply supplied a corresponding Greek term to the noun

---

[10]Some 'semi-oracular' statements, which do not share the **מַשָּׂא** / ῥῆμα-ὅρασις pattern, occur in Isa 14:4 and 21:2. See **מָשָׁל** / θρῆνος in Isa 14:4; **חָזוּת** / τὸ ὅραμα in 21:2. Several 'oracular' patterns occur outside the oracles against the nations: **מַשָּׂא** / ἡ ὅρασις in 30:6; **לֶרְאִים** / καὶ τοῖς τὰ ὁράματα ὁρῶσι in 30:10; **וְהָיוּ דֵרָאוֹן** / καὶ ἔσονται εἰς ὅρασιν in 66:24. See **וְכֹבֶד מַשָּׂאָה שְׂפָתָיו מָלְאוּ זַעַם** / μετὰ δόξης τὸ λόγιον τῶν χειλέων αὐτοῦ in 30:6 for misunderstanding on the part of the translator.

[11]The full phrase in 14:28 reads **בִּשְׁנַת־מוֹת הַמֶּלֶךְ אָחָז הָיָה הַמַּשָּׂא הַזֶּה** / τοῦ ἔτους, οὗ ἀπέθανεν Αχαζ ὁ βασιλεύς, ἐγενήθη τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο. The length of this phrase may not be indicative of an oracular parallel resembling 1:1; 2:1; 13:1. Instead, it may resemble the other 'obituary' statement in Isa 6:1: **בִּשְׁנַת־מוֹת הַמֶּלֶךְ עֻזִּיָּהוּ** / καὶ ἐγένετο τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ, οὗ ἀπέθανεν Οζίας ὁ βασιλεύς.

[12]The originality of this textual minus is uncertain. The textual history preserves the phrase with widespread attestation in several late manuscripts. The Greek revisers also include the phrase. Yet, its absence in the major uncials seems to entail that it is the more difficult reading, and thus, original to the Old Greek.

[13]The unity of these ten headings has been recognized at least as far back as Eusebius and Jerome. See Armstrong (2013), 71; Scheck (2015), 226-227

מַשָּׂא—ῥῆμα, ὅρασις, or ὅραμα—and followed it with a term or phrase in the genitive case.[14] As such, these examples largely do not offer the interpretive additions evidenced by the major Isaianic structural headings. Isaiah 15:1 and 17:1 constitute the only examples with deviation. And here it is slight. The addition of the Greek preposition κατά merely stresses the latent negative element of each oracle. While the preposition forms an interpretive and stylistic addition, it does not by itself signal a major structural break.

Additionally, none of these Greek oracles contain the reworked syntax attested in the major structural headings of 1:1; 2:1; 13:1. This lack of stylistic manipulation suggests that the translator regarded these headings as less structurally significant than the major headings of the book. The components of the major headings—the prophet, his vision, the verb חזה, and the medium of revelation—are all absent in these minor headings listed above. Thus, in both the Hebrew and Greek versions, these oracles do not seem to have the thematic or structural prominence of those headings in 1:1; 2:1; 13:1.

The beginning of the final oracular section in Isa 14:1-23 shares some parallels with the opening of the Babylon oracle in Isa 13:1. The use of the Babylon referent at 14:4 (עַל־מֶלֶךְ בָּבֶל) leads readers to recall the mention of Babylon at the beginning and end of chapter 13. In addition to this, the instructions to Israel in Isa 14:4 to lift up a taunt (וְנָשָׂאתָ הַמָּשָׁל הַזֶּה) also resemble the opening oracular announcement:[15]

Isa 13:1	מַשָּׂא בָּבֶל אֲשֶׁר חָזָה יְשַׁעְיָהוּ בֶּן־אָמוֹץ	ὅρασις, ἣν εἶδεν Ησαίας υἱὸς Αμως κατὰ Βαβυλῶνος
	And oracle of Babylon which Isaiah, the son of Amos, saw	*A vision, which Isaiah, the son of Amos, saw against Babylon*
Isa 14:4	וְנָשָׂאתָ הַמָּשָׁל הַזֶּה עַל־מֶלֶךְ בָּבֶל	καὶ λήμψῃ τὸν θρῆνον τοῦτον ἐπὶ τὸν βασιλέα Βαβυλῶνος
	And you shall take up this taunt against the king of Babylon	*And you will take up this lament against the king of Babylon*

[14]Van der Louw (2007), 158, for differences in Greek oracular terms; see also Dogniez (2010): 243.

[15]Compare 14:4 with the list of oracular statements throughout Isaiah at 13:1; 14:28; 15:1; 17:1; 19:1; 21:1; 21:11; 21:13; 22:1; 23:1. The 'oracular' statement of 14:4 resembles this list enough to be grouped among them. But it also differs in the oracular formula so that we should regard it as a subset of the oracle introduced in 13:1. Watts (2005) makes similar observations in the respective section.

The use of the verb נשׂא in Isa 14:4 should trigger our literary-structural memory and transport us back to the initial oracular statement of 13:1. The relationship between מַשָּׂא and the verb נשׂא is apparent.[16] And a survey of biblical literature shows a frequent pairing of these terms.[17] On this basis, the 'heading' in 14:4 should be situated among the other oracular headings within the book.

However, the lexical shift from מַשָּׂא to מָשָׁל could also be due to the heightened nature of this portion of the oracle. The discourse against the king of Babylon in chapter 14 has moved from the mere מַשָּׂא 'oracle' of chapter 13 and is now presented as a מָשָׁל 'taunt'. This taunt, then, may function as a detailed and narrowed oracle against the individuated king within the kingdom. The translator's perception of these thematic and structural features could also explain why he employed the unique term θρῆνος 'lament' for מָשָׁל when it is typically rendered with παραβολή.[18] The patterned oracular features from earlier in the discussion—the prophet, his vision, the verb חזה, and the medium of revelation—seem to have been transformed in the taunt against the king of Babylon. In light of this scheme, Israel takes the role of the prophet who lifts up a taunt against the king of Babylon in a mocking and sardonic series of judgment oracles.[19]

This feature at 14:4 seems to function as a new type of oracular heading against a new character in the discourse. Instead of the oracle against the kingdom of Babylon as in chapter 13, we now hear about Israel lifting up a lament as an oracle against the individual king of Babylon. This specific connection does not seem to have influenced the translator's work, but it was surely in his purview since he sees and renders the two chapters as a coherent literary unit. The ensuing discussion of the micro- and macro-structural features of 13:1-14:23 illustrate this in greater

---

[16]HALOT, 640 explicitly states that מַשָּׂא is from נָשָׂא קוֹל 'to raise one's voice, make a statement'.

[17]See 2 Kings 9:25 וַיהוָה נָשָׂא עָלָיו אֶת־הַמַּשָּׂא הַזֶּה. A possible reason that Hebrew Isaiah contains this phraseology instead of the term מַשָּׂא could be to maintain Isa 13:1-14:23 as a unified oracle. Gray (1949), 247, also suggests this root connection between the verb and the noun.

[18]The noun מָשָׁל 'saying, proverb' occurs 39 times in the Hebrew Bible and is most frequently translated with the term παραβολή in the Septuagint. This verse in Isaiah constitutes the only place throughout the Septuagint where the term θρῆνος 'dirge, lamentation' is employed. The interpretive element of the translator is clearly at work here.

[19]See Appendix 3 for an extended discussion on the semantic details of מָשָׁל and θρῆνος.

detail.

The Thematic-Character Marker: Babylon

The oracle against Babylon is also structured around well-placed thematic-character markers which both introduce and conclude chapters 13 and 14. The explicit mention of Babylon at the beginning and end of each chapter of the Hebrew text constitutes a literary *inclusio* which signals the structural importance of this feature.[20] This thematic marker appears in four select phrases:

Isa 13:1	מַשָּׂא בָּבֶל	Ὅρασις . . . κατὰ Βαβυλῶνος
	An oracle of Babylon	*A vision . . . against Babylon*
Isa 13:19	וְהָיְתָה בָּבֶל	καὶ ἔσται Βαβυλών
	And Babylon shall be	*And Babylon shall be*
Isa 14:4	וְנָשָׂאתָ הַמָּשָׁל הַזֶּה עַל־מֶלֶךְ בָּבֶל	καὶ λήμψῃ τὸν θρῆνον τοῦτον ἐπὶ τὸν βασιλέα Βαβυλῶνος
	And you shall take up this taunt against the king of Babylon	*And you shall take up this lament against the king of Babylon*
Isa 14:22	וְהִכְרַתִּי לְבָבֶל שֵׁם וּשְׁאָר וְנִין וָנֶכֶד	—[21]
	And I will cut off from Babylon name, remnant, descendants, and posterity	—

Chapter 13 explicitly contains mention of Babylon in the first and final stanza of the oracle: an introduction and an *inclusio*. Following a brief interlude in Isa 14:1-3, chapter 14 contains another Babylonian denouncement, this time against its king. Just like chapter 13, the mention of Babylon occurs at the beginning and the end of the taunt of chapter 14.

The Greek translator captured this introduction-*inclusio* structure quite precisely. He rendered the Hebrew term בָּבֶל as βαβυλών in each translated instance. However, he altered the phraseology of Isa 14:22 by omitting the mention of Babylon in his translation. The examples below illustrate this omission; he merely replaces the Hebrew term with a Greek pronoun:

Isa 14:22	וְקַמְתִּי עֲלֵיהֶם נְאֻם יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת	καὶ ἐπαναστήσομαι αὐτοῖς, λέγει κύριος σαβαωθ

[20]Similar features occur elsewhere in biblical poetry. See Psalm 8:2, 10, where the phrase יְהוָה אֲדֹנֵינוּ מָה־אַדִּיר שִׁמְךָ בְּכָל־הָאָרֶץ occurs at the beginning and end of the poem as a thematic structuring device. On the inclusio and the framing inclusio, see Walsh (2001), 47, 57-59. See also Douglas (2007).

[21]The Greek translator makes no mention of Babylon in this verse: ἀπολῶ αὐτῶν ὄνομα καὶ κατάλειμμα καὶ σπέρμα. However, in 14:23 the translator alters the Hebrew text and adds the term βαβυλωνία.

	וְהִכְרַתִּי לְבָבֶל שֵׁם וּשְׁאָר וְנִין וָנֶכֶד נְאֻם־יְהוָה׃	καὶ ἀπολῶ αὐτῶν ὄνομα καὶ κατάλειμμα καὶ σπέρμα τάδε λέγει κύριος.
	And I will rise up against them, declares Yhwh of armies; and I will cut off from Babylon name, remnant, descendants, and posterity, declares Yhwh.	*And I will rise up against them, says the Lord Sabaoth, and I will destroy their name and remnant and seed; thus says the Lord.*
Isa 14:23	וְשַׂמְתִּיהָ לְמוֹרַשׁ קִפֹּד וְאַגְמֵי־מָיִם	καὶ θήσω τὴν Βαβυλωνίαν[22] ἔρημον ὥστε κατοικεῖν ἐχίνους, καὶ ἔσται εἰς οὐδέν·
	וְטֵאטֵאתִיהָ בְּמַטְאֲטֵא הַשְׁמֵד	καὶ θήσω αὐτὴν πηλοῦ βάραθρον εἰς ἀπώλειαν
	And I will set her and her pools of water as a habitation of the hedgehog; and I will sweep her with the broom of destruction	*And I will set Babylonia as a wilderness so that hedgehogs would inhabit her; and it will become nothing; and I will set her as a pit of clay for destruction.*

Nonetheless, instead of including the Babylonian place name in verse 22, the translator added the term to his work in verse 23. The Greek term αὐτῶν in verse 22 seems to represent the phrase לְבָבֶל, a divergence which merely replaced the Hebrew term without any interpretive emphasis.[23] Lexical replacement also occurs in verse 23 where the term τὴν Βαβυλωνίαν substitutes for the third person feminine singular pronominal suffix הָ-. This translational alteration evokes the same semantic referent as the verbal suffix but includes the explicit character Babylon omitted in the previous verse.[24]

---

[22]Whereas 13:1; 13:19; 14:4 contain the Greek term Βαβυλών, possibly expressive of the municipality, 14:23 contains the regional term Βαβυλωνία 'Babylonia.' See instances of βαβυλωνία at Isa 11:11 as an addition and at 39:1 as an alteration of בָּבֶל. These different Greek terms may be functionally synonymous, but the putative shift from locale to region may convey the translator's exegetical understanding of the oracle. On the use of this term in the Greek Old Testament, along with the putative relationship between Isaiah and Daniel, see Van der Kooij (2008), 465-470, esp. 466.

[23]See van der Vorm-Croughs (2014), 80, who identifies this example as an *implication* by omission: "Implication is only now and then achieved by way of an omission. In other places it is done through the *substitution* of words, in particular of a noun by a pronoun." Her description of this feature as substitution is more fitting than that of implication. Under this category, she also includes examples from Isa 52:9 and 63:6. Troxel (2008), 147n53, more helpfully analyzes this phrase by linking verses 22 and 23 together.

[24]Van der Vorm-Croughs (2014), 60-61, categorizes this feature as *explication* without the occurrence of a plus: "Explication can be achieved not alone by means of an addition, but also by replacing words, especially by substituting a pronoun for a noun." See. 1QIsa[a] ושמתי which omits the pronominal suffix. Although I agree with van der Vorm-Croughs' category, she does not mention the possible literary or structural features which may have influenced the alterations in verses 22 and 23

Despite the lexical-semantic differences between the term βαβυλών and βαβυλωνία, the translator makes an effort to preserve the introduction-*inclusio* structure of the Hebrew text by including the explicit Babylonian referent in verse 23. And even though the rationale for the shift of the character Babylon from the Hebrew text of verse 22 to the Greek text of verse 23 is somewhat perplexing, the referents are more or less preserved. And granted that all the versions of verses 22 and 23, except the Old Greek, correspond with the Hebrew text, it is fitting to see this Greek deviation as an intentional translational reordering.[25]

It must be admitted that the translator was concerned to preserve important structural features of the text despite his free tendencies. The Greek text would have made semantic and contextual sense without the insertion of βαβυλωνία in verse 23. Yet, the translator thought it reasonable to include the place name, a decision which preserved the literary structure of the Hebrew text. Translational deviation by the translator of Greek Isaiah does not skew the larger picture of the Hebrew text. Instead, the translator is concerned to preserve the literary macro-structure of his source by preserving subtle *inclusio* signals.[26]

The result of this translational departure from the Hebrew *inclusio* creates a more concrete conclusion to the whole of the oracle against Babylon and her king in the Greek text. Seeing this phenomenon as an intentional structuring feature is justified by the evidence above and the examples yet to be surveyed will clearly warrant this conclusion.

The Kingdom and the King

In this section, I argue that the translator's understanding and formation of the literary structure sheds light upon a thorny translation issue in chapters 13 and 14. This translation issue

---

[25]1QIsa[a] contains the phrase לבבל but the final *lamed* is nearly illegible in the manuscript. The base of the consonant has somehow been removed. It also appears that the scribe of 1QIsa[a] sought to write over an older text at this point.

[26]See Wagner (2013), 30: "G clearly aims at producing a translation with a high degree of acceptability at the textual and literary levels. He fosters cohesion in the translated text with his adept use of Greek particles and through careful cultivation of simple but highly effective stylistic devices such as parallelism, chiasm and *inclusio*. Utilizing techniques such as the strategic repetition of key words and phrases, he enhances the thematic coherence of the text. Evidence for G's attention to the 'literary' quality of his translation can be found in the multiplication of intratextual linkages within the book of Isaiah as well as in the creation of new intertextual and cultural allusions."

concerns the idiosyncratic rendering of the term מַמְלָכָה ‘kingdom’ with the Greek noun βασιλεύς ‘king’ in three verses:

Isa 13:4	קוֹל שְׁאוֹן מַמְלְכוֹת גּוֹיִם נֶאֱסָפִים	φωνὴ βασιλέων καὶ ἐθνῶν συνηγμένων
	A sound of the roar of kingdoms, of nations who have been gathered	*A voice of kings and nations who have been gathered together*
Isa 13:19	וְהָיְתָה בָבֶל צְבִי מַמְלָכוֹת	καὶ ἔσται Βαβυλών, ἡ καλεῖται ἔνδοξος ὑπὸ βασιλέως Χαλδαίων
	And Babylon, the beauty of of the kingdoms, shall be	*And Babylon shall be, who is called glorious by the king of the Chaldeans*
Isa 14:16	הֲזֶה הָאִישׁ מַרְגִּיז הָאָרֶץ מַרְעִישׁ מַמְלָכוֹת׃	Οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὁ παροξύνων τὴν γῆν, σείων βασιλεῖς;
	Is this the man who made the earth to tremble, who caused kingdoms to quake?	*Is this the man who troubles the earth, who shakes kings?*

The semantic difference between the Hebrew and Greek terms is apparent. Even corrections in the versions, revisions, and Greek manuscripts attest to this semantic disparity.[27] In what follows, I approach the shift from ‘kingdom’ to ‘king’ from two perspectives. First, I discuss the translation technical side of this term in Greek Isaiah. Second, I argue that the translator was motivated by the literary structure of chapters 13 and 14 when rendering the term in this way.

The term מַמְלָכָה occurs 116 times in the Hebrew Bible and 14 times in the book of Isaiah.[28] *HALOT* organizes the semantic range of this noun into three meaningful glosses: 1) ‘dominion, kingdom’; 2) ‘kingship, royal sovereignty’; 3) ‘king’.[29] In the book of Isaiah, this term always corresponds with ‘kingdom’ semantics. The Greek translator also shows awareness of this corporate meaning since he employs the term βασιλεία ‘kingdom’ in many places:[30]

---

[27]Along with Symmachus, several Greek manuscripts contain the reading των βασιλειων, which would correspond more precisely with מָמְלָכָה. However, not only are these readings late, the major uncial codices all contain the reading βασιλέως. The Targum reads מַלְכוּ ‘kingdom,’ the Latin reads *regnum* ‘kingdom,’ and the Syriac reads ܡܠܟܘܬܐ ‘kingdom.’ 1QIsa[a] contains the reading ממלכת whereas 1QIsa[b] contains the reading ממלכתו. The orthographical difference is semantically inconsequential.

[28]See Isa 9:6; 10:10; 13:4, 19; 14:16; 17:3; 19:2(x2); 23:11, 17; 37:16, 20; 47:5; 60:12.

[29]The references for the third gloss, ‘king’, do not of necessity demand this reading: 1 Sam 10:18; 1 Kgs 10:20; 2 Chron 9:19; 12:8; Lam 2:2; Jer 1:15; 25:26; Psa 68:33; 79:6; 102:23; 135:11. Nevertheless, the book of Isaiah never employs מַמְלָכָה with the meaning ‘king’. HALOT (1994), 595 provides a fourth category labelled ‘theologically’, which offers no semantic information not already present in the previous categories. *BDB* more helpfully categorizes the term: 1. ‘kingdom, realm’; 2. ‘sovereignty, dominion’; 3. ‘reign’.

[30]Correspondence between מַמְלָכָה and βασιλεία occurs in Isa 9:6; 17:3; 23:17; 37:16, 20; 47:5. The

Isa 9:6	עַל־כִּסֵּא דָוִד וְעַל־מַמְלַכְתּוֹ
	ἐπὶ τὸν θρόνον Δαυιδ καὶ <u>τὴν βασιλείαν</u> αὐτοῦ
Isa 37:20	וְיֵדְעוּ כָל־מַמְלְכוֹת הָאָרֶץ כִּי־אַתָּה יְהוָה לְבַדֶּךָ
	ἵνα γνῷ πᾶσα <u>βασιλεία</u> τῆς γῆς ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ θεὸς μόνος

However, as we saw in Isa 13:4; 13:19; 14:16 above, the translator deviated from the corporate meaning in favor of the individual meaning of βασιλεύς 'king.' This shift in semantic reference also occurs in other chapters:[31]

Isa 23:11	יָדוֹ נָטָה עַל־הַיָּם הִרְגִּיז מַמְלָכוֹת
	ἡ δὲ χείρ σου οὐκέτι ἰσχύει κατὰ θάλασσαν, ἡ παροξύνουσα <u>βασιλεῖς</u>

Such examples illustrate how the translator understood and employed the מַמְלָכָה / βασιλεία pairing, but also departed from it in favor of the מַמְלָכָה / βασιλεύς rendering. The translator's rationale for this deviation may or may not be systematic. And each example must be investigated individually. I will offer such a rationale for the examples in Isa 13:4 and 13:19 below and conclude that the decision to render מַמְלָכָה with βασιλεύς in our verse should be considered to have arisen intentionally.[32] Insight into the translator's rationale for this rendering may be perceived by looking more broadly at his understanding of royal themes.

The related root מלך occurs 81 times in the book of Isaiah and is translated by 8 Greek terms.[33] The large majority of occurrences evidence semantic overlap between the languages: e.g., the verb מלך becomes βασιλεύω, the noun מֶלֶךְ becomes βασιλεύς. Deviations

---

term βασιλεία 'kingdom' occurs 9 times in Greek Isaiah and translates מַמְלָכָה on six occasions and מְלוּכָה once in 62:3. Isa 62:3 contains מְלוּכָה. The additional two occurrences appear to be interpretive additions to explicate the Hebrew text. See בִּימֵי עֻזִּיָּהוּ as ἐν βασιλείᾳ Οζίου in Isa 1:1; יֶחֱת אֶפְרַיִם מֵעָם as ἐκλείψει ἡ βασιλεία Εφραιμ ἀπὸ λαοῦ in 7:8.

[31]See Karrer and Kraus (2011), 2542: "*Könige: Wiedergabe von* ממלכות *»Königreiche« wie in 23,11, vgl. 13,2*." The translator deviates from the semantics of the Hebrew here even when elsewhere in the same chapter he preserves them. See the expected rendering of אֶת־כָּל־מַמְלְכוֹת as πάσαις ταῖς βασιλείαις only a few verses later in 23:17. See also Isa 60:12 : כִּי־הַגּוֹי וְהַמַּמְלָכָה אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יַעַבְדוּךְ יאבדו וְהַגּוֹיִם חָרֹב יֶחֱרָבוּ / τὰ γὰρ ἔθνη καὶ οἱ βασιλεῖς οἵτινες οὐ δουλεύσουσίν σοι, ἀπολοῦνται, καὶ τὰ ἔθνη ἐρημίᾳ ἐρημωθήσονται.

[32]Apart from this lexical pairing in Greek Isaiah, these two terms only correspond in translations that are likely to have followed the Isaiah translator chronologically. See Muraoka (2002), *i-xxi*; Theocharous (2014).

[33]This root occurs as the verb מלך and the nouns מֶלֶךְ, מַמְלָכָה, and מְלוּכָה. Corresponding Greek terms include ἀρχή, ἄρχων, βασιλεία, βασιλεύς, βασιλεύω, and νόμος.

from this pattern are mostly explanatory or stylistic.[34] However, the noun מַמְלָכָה presents us with some difficulty as we have briefly surveyed above. On 6 occasions, the Hebrew term מַמְלָכָה 'kingdom' is correctly translated with the noun βασιλεία 'kingdom.'[35] But in 5 places, the translator pairs מַמְלָכָה with the term βασιλεύς 'king.'[36] These deviations occur 3 times in the oracle(s) against Babylon, and twice elsewhere. Interestingly, each of these latter passages contains language and imagery redolent of that found in Isa 13:1-14:23.[37]

The use of the singular βασιλεύς 'king' to represent the plural of מַמְלָכָה 'kingdom' may be understood in one of three ways. First, we may attribute the disparity to a mistranslation from the similar root מלך. However, the translator's awareness of the lexical differences between מֶלֶךְ and מַמְלָכָה is evident from even a cursory reading of the translation.[38] Second, instead of reading the word מַמְלָכָה as 'kingdom,' the translator could have understood it in accordance with its rarely attested meaning 'king.' However, the paucity of data supporting this reading in the Hebrew Bible renders this appeal somewhat specious. In addition, none of the major lexicons supply this meaning for מָמְלָכָה in Isa 13:19.[39] In my analysis, no passages noted by *HALOT* with

---

[34]See Isa 1:1 as stylistic explanation: מַלְכֵי יְהוּדָה > οἳ ἐβασίλευσαν τῆς Ιουδαίας; Isa 36:1 לַמֶּלֶךְ חִזְקִיָּהוּ > βασιλεύοντος Εζεκίου. The translator employs a genitive absolute for stylistic variation in Isa 37:13: אַיֵּה מֶלֶךְ־חֲמָת > ποῦ εἰσιν οἱ βασιλεῖς Εμαθ καὶ Αρφαδ; καὶ πόλεως Σεπφαριμ, Αναγ, Ουγαυα. The threefold usage of מֶלֶךְ is likely stylistically condensed by the singular occurrence of βασιλεύς.

[35]See Isa 9:6; 17:3; 23:17; 37:16, 20; 47:5. The translation in 37:16 corresponds with the imperial terminology employed in chapters 13 and 14: מַמְלְכוֹת הָאָרֶץ > βασιλείας τῆς οἰκουμένης.

[36]See Isa 13:4, 19; 14:16; 23:11; 60:12. In Isa 19:2 the translator twice employs νόμος for מַמְלָכָה. He also supplies χώρα or ἀρχή in Isa 10:10.

[37]On similarities between chapters 14 and 23, see Van der Kooij (1998), 64-65: "Both chapters . . . show an interesting agreement; both are about a powerful position which has come to an end, the difference being that in ch. 23 it is a position of power of the *sea*, and in ch. 14 over the *earth*." Interestingly, David Baer's study on Isa 56-66 does not mention the semantic disparity between מַמְלָכָה and βασιλεύς at Isa 60:12. See Baer (2001).

[38]It may be conceivable that the deviation from ממלכה > βασιλεύς arose due to the translator's lack of care. From this perspective, the translation did not arise from misunderstanding, but merely from sloppy work. However, given the careful reworking of 13:19a discussed in chapter 3, I think this approach is unlikely.

[39]See BDB, 575; HALOT, 595; DCH, 5.331. Of note, BDB does not recognize the gloss 'king.' The following commentaries rightly posit the gloss 'kingdom(s)' for מַמְלָכָה without mention of other semantic possibilities: Gray (1949), 243; Oswalt (1986), 308-309; Wildberger (1997), 5, 29-30; Young (2001), 421, 427; Childs (2001), 118; Watts (2005), 199; House (2019), 389.

this gloss demand such a lexical designation. Further, the book of Isaiah nowhere attests this gloss. Third, the reading may be literary and exegetical in terms of its placement in the literary structure of the Babylon oracle. This approach is more difficult to establish, but I think more fruitful and descriptive of the translator's intentions.[40]

I propose that the translation choice is intentional with the motivation to thematically join chapters 13 and 14 through the character of the king of Babylon.[41] While the Hebrew text of chapter 13 denounces the 'kingdom' of Babylon and chapter 14 the 'king' of Babylon, the Greek text appears to unite these chapters around the individual king. Thus, the Greek text of chapter 13 anticipates the discourse of chapter 14 and embeds the royal character of the latter within itself.[42] This translation decision creates a hermeneutical guide for readers of the Greek text, resulting in an explicitly unified Babylonian oracle through patterned lexical occurrences. The judgment upon the kingdom of Babylon in the Hebrew text of chapter 13 is envisioned by the translator as the result of a single individual, the arrogant king of Babylon.[43] While this structural feature is implicit in the Hebrew text, it has become heightened in the Greek.

This portrait of the individual king is apparent from several texts. Though several examples could be supplied, two verses are offered here:[44]

Isa 14:4	וְנָשָׂאתָ הַמָּשָׁל הַזֶּה עַל־מֶלֶךְ בָּבֶל
	καὶ λήμψῃ τὸν θρῆνον τοῦτον ἐπὶ <u>τὸν βασιλέα</u> βαβυλῶνος
Isa 14:16	הֲזֶה הָאִישׁ מַרְגִּיז הָאָרֶץ מַרְעִישׁ מַמְלָכוֹת׃
	Οὗτος <u>ὁ ἄνθρωπος</u> ὁ παροξύνων τὴν γῆν, σείων βασιλεῖς;[45]

[40]A variant source text behind the Greek may also explain this deviation. But several methodological difficulties arise if we grant this position. See Van der Vorm-Croughs (2014), 477-513.

[41]See Motyer (1993), 146: "The whole section ([14:]3-23) on the downfall of the king matches that on the downfall of the city (13:17-22) in the overall structure of the passage."

[42]This observation also applies to Isa 13:4 and 14:6 where foreign kingdoms are viewed as kings. Corporate identity is individuated by its representative.

[43]The translator may also have been inclined to shift the Hebrew semantics because of the heading in Isa 1:1 where the prophet's vision concerns both kingdoms and kings.

[44]I explore in detail the translator's emphasis upon this character portrayed in the second person singular in the following chapter.

[45]This language of shaking (e.g., παροξύνω) also occurs in Isa 23:11 and is recognized by Van der Kooij

These examples contrast those of Isa 13:4 and 13:19 above where the Hebrew explicitly identified its addressee as a kingdom. Chapter 14, on the other hand, unequivocally highlights an individual (e.g., מֶלֶךְ בָּבֶל in 14:4; זֶה הָאִישׁ in 14:16). In addition to the use of pronouns, suffixes, and verbs in the singular throughout the immediate context of chapter 14 (esp. vv. 8-20), verses 4 and 16 cited above contain explicit references to the singular 'king' and 'man' of Babylon. Furthermore, emphasis upon the individual king in 14:16 is coupled with the formal shift from מַמְלָכָה 'kingdom' to βασιλεύς 'king' by the translator.[46]

These features suggest that the translator intended to convey an individualized understanding of the kingdom of Babylon. The Greek version does not indicate that the king of Babylon caused kingdoms to shake as noted by the Hebrew text, but that the king shakes other 'kings.'[47] This phrase resembles that found in Isa 13:4 where the voice of 'kings' approaches Babylon. Emphasis upon the individual king in chapter 14 likely produced the rationale for anticipating the 'king' over the 'kingdom' in the Greek text of chapter 13. By anticipating the ensuing emphasis upon the individual king in chapter 14, the translator offers a hermeneutical guide for his readers which preserves the literary unity of these two chapters.[48] And this translational move strengthens the literary tie which is already implicit in the Hebrew text.[49]

Last of all, the translator likely gained the impulse to emphasize kings over kingdoms from other characters in the discourse of chapter 14. These characters occur at the beginning and

---

(1998), 64.

[46]Note the similarities between this verse and Isa 13:4.

[47]See also Isa 14:9 חֵקִים מִכִּסְאוֹתָם כֹּל מַלְכֵי גוֹיִם > οἱ ἐγείραντες ἐκ τῶν θρόνων αὐτῶν πάντας βασιλεῖς ἐθνῶν; 14:18 כָּל־מַלְכֵי גוֹיִם כֻּלָּם שָׁכְבוּ בְכָבוֹד > πάντες οἱ βασιλεῖς τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐκοιμήθησαν ἐν τιμῇ.

[48]See the comment referenced above by Williamson (2006), 163: "Although 13:1 stands at the start of the oracles against the nations, its immediate reference is to chs 13-14."

[49]As I noted in chapter 1, this suggestion of literary 'tenacity' or 'intentionality' differs from those who propose 'coherence' as a model for reading Greek Isaiah. The translator is surely concerned to create a coherent text, but I am specifically arguing that his task of coherence is governed in large part by his ties to the literary form and presentation of the Hebrew text itself.

end of the section of discourse from 14:7-20 and are represented by the rulers of the earth and the kings of the nations:

Isa 14:9b	עוֹרֵר לְךָ֙ רְפָאִ֔ים כָּל־עַתּוּדֵ֖י אָ֑רֶץ	συνηγέρθησάν σοι πάντες οἱ γίγαντες οἱ ἄρξαντες τῆς γῆς
	He raises up the Rephaim at you, all the leaders of the earth	*All the giants who rule the earth were raised together at you*
Isa 14:9c	הֵקִ֖ים מִכִּסְאוֹתָ֑ם כֹּ֖ל מַלְכֵ֥י גּוֹיִֽם	οἱ ἐγείραντες ἐκ τῶν θρόνων αὐτῶν πάντας βασιλεῖς ἐθνῶν
	He raises from their thrones all the kings of the nations	*Those who roused all the kings of the nations from their thrones*
Isa 14:16	הֲזֶ֣ה הָאִ֗ישׁ מַרְגִּ֤יז הָאָ֙רֶץ֙ מַרְעִ֣ישׁ מַמְלָכֽוֹת	οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὁ παροξύνων τὴν γῆν, σείων βασιλεῖς;
	Is this the man who made the earth tremble, who cause kingdoms to shake?	*Is this the man who troubles the earth, who shakes kings?*
Isa 14:18	כָּל־מַלְכֵ֣י גּוֹיִ֔ם כֻּלָּ֖ם שָׁכְבוּ֙ בְּכָב֔וֹד	πάντες οἱ βασιλεῖς τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐκοιμήθησαν ἐν τιμῇ
	All the kings of the nations, all of them sleep in glory.	*All the kings of the nations fell asleep in honor*

In addition to the emphasis upon the individual king of Babylon in chapter 14, the rulers of the earth and the kings of the nations are also given thematic prominence. Given the oracular unity of these two chapters alongside the lexical deviations from מַמְלָכָה to βασιλεύς mentioned above, we should take note of this overarching thematic and structural feature.[50] The prominence of individuated kings and their interaction with the king of Babylon surely functions as a lexical and structural influence upon the translator's decision throughout the oracle. The translator seems to have altered his Greek renderings regarding kingdoms and kings in light of this implicit thrust in the whole oracle against Babylon.

Emphasizing Babylon in the Second Person Plural[51]

Here, I investigate imperatival and other second person forms of the Hebrew oracle as important thematic-structural markers in chapter 13. I hope to illustrate that the translator was

[50]Compare the Greek renderings of 13:2e—Ἀνοίξατε, οἱ ἄρχοντες—and 14:9b: οἱ ἄρχοντες τῆς γῆς. The translator's rendering of מַלְאֲכֵי־גוֹי 'messengers of a nation' as βασιλεῖς ἐθνῶν 'kings of the nations' in Isa 14:32 may also add weight to these 'royal' emphases.

[51]I include this section under 'parallels' because it mirrors the emphasis upon the second person singular discussed in the previous chapter. Further, even though I only describe features present within chapter 13 here, I subsume this discussion under the heading of literary macro-structure since it pertains to the whole of the chapter.

motivated by these second person forms in order to heighten the thematic structure of his translation. I proceed in this discussion by investigating the opening plural imperatives of the oracle as addressed to the veiled character (i.e., Babylon) who remains the focus of the discourse until the end of the chapter. These imperatival forms occur in verses 2 and 6:[52]

Isa 13:2 עַל הַר־נִשָּׂפָה שְׂאוּ־נֵס הָרִימוּ קוֹל לָהֶם הָנִיפוּ יָד

Upon a windswept mountain, raise a banner! Lift up a voice to them! Wave a hand!

Isa 13:6a הֵילִילוּ כִּי קָרוֹב יוֹם יְהוָה

Wail, for the day of Yhwh is near!

The four plural imperatives in these verses constitute the only second person plural referents in the Hebrew oracle. And so, second person forms in this oracle distinctly refer to the addressee mentioned here. In this case, it signals the kingdom of Babylon.

The remainder of the oracle moves away from referring to Babylon with second person forms and instead employs third person forms when referring to this kingdom-character:

Isa 13:8b אִישׁ אֶל־רֵעֵהוּ יִתְמָהוּ פְּנֵי לְהָבִים פְּנֵיהֶם׃

Each shall be horrified before his neighbor; their faces shall be the faces aflame.[53]

Isa 13:17a הִנְנִי מֵעִיר עֲלֵיהֶם אֶת־מָדָי

Behold, I am raising up the Medes against them (i.e., men, women, children of Babylon).

Whereas the second person forms in verses 2 and 6 refer solely to Babylon, the third person forms within the oracle embody a variety of referents. Some of these third person forms refer to Babylon, but the relationship is not exclusive as it was with second person forms.[54] Nonetheless, the context is relatively clear regarding the character-identity of each third person referent. In

---

[52]For a defense of my interpretation of the addressee of these imperatives, see the detailed discussion in Appendix 1.

[53]Hebrew lexicons agree on the broad semantic range of תמה. See HALOT, 1744-45 with 'to be astonished, amazed' and 'to freeze with fear, be horrified, stare at'; DCH, 8.639 'to be astounded, amazed, stupefied' and 'to look in astonishment, look aghast, marvel'; BDB, 1069 'to be astonished, dumbfounded, look in astonishment at.' The nominal form is similar semantically: תְּמָהוֹן 'confusion, bewilderment, panic.' Of note, the Septuagint translators all demonstrate sufficient knowledge of this term. I consider the gloss supplied above to be the most accurate in the context.

[54]In verses 3-5, the third person referent signifies a foreign invading military (i.e., the Medes). Isaiah 13:7-8 employs several third person forms to refer back to the initial second person addressee (i.e., Babylon). Isaiah 13:9-10 and 13 employ third person forms in reference to the day of Yhwh and its accompanying geo-cosmological upheaval. Verses 11-12 and 14-20 all refer to Babylon with third person forms. First person forms occur 9 times, in verses 3, 11-13, and 17. God constitutes the first person referent for each of these forms.

verse 2, the interaction between characters is formally distinguished: Babylon is addressed with the second person form, the Medes are addressed with the third person form. As the oracle develops, the formal character distinction fades and only contextual factors determine the identity of third person referents. The translator of Greek Isaiah alters this picture somewhat.

Examining the second and third person forms in Greek Isaiah reveals a uniformity of referents otherwise absent in the Hebrew text. The Greek translator altered the formal presentation of the Hebrew by re-employing second person plural forms to identify Babylon. The translator included both lexical addition and alteration with the result that a recapitulated Babylon would be signified by second person plural forms.[55] These differences create a subtle, yet recognizable, structuring feature in the discourse. The following phrases illustrate such features:

Isa 13:2a	שְׂאוּ־נֵס	ἄρατε σημεῖον
Isa 13:2b[56]	הָרִימוּ קוֹל לָהֶם	ὑψώσατε τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῖς
Isa 13:2b´	—	[+] μὴ φοβεῖσθε[57]
Isa 13:2c	הָנִיפוּ יָד	παρακαλεῖτε τῇ χειρί
Isa 13:2d[58]	וְיָבֹאוּ פִּתְחֵי נְדִיבִים	Ἀνοίξατε, οἱ ἄρχοντες
Isa 13:6	הֵילִילוּ כִּי קָרוֹב יוֹם יְהוָה	ὀλολύζετε, ἐγγὺς γὰρ ἡ ἡμέρα κυρίου
Isa 13:17	הִנְנִי מֵעִיר עֲלֵיהֶם אֶת־מָדָי	ἰδοὺ ἐπεγείρω ὑμῖν τοὺς Μήδους[59]
Isa 13:18b[60]	וּפְרִי־בֶטֶן לֹא יְרַחֵמוּ	καὶ τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν

[55]While the present discussion is only concerned with the formal preservation of character in the oracle, I argue below that these lexical differences also serve an important structuring role.

[56]Note the distinction in verbal voice between the second and third person characters.

[57]See the use of this phrase in Isa 35:4; 40:9 and the lexical-thematic similarities between these passages. Van der Vorm-Croughs (2014), 336, 356: "the influence of chapters further on in the book is so substantial that one can hardly escape the conclusion that the translator has indeed utilised subsequent parts of his translation in earlier sections." My discussion of literary style in the previous chapter treats this issue more fully.

[58]The Greek text omits the third person form and does not preserve the second and third person interaction. Van der Vorm-Croughs (2014), 263, 393, categorizes this feature as an *ellipsis*: "the omission of a word (often a verb) which can easily be understood in the context."

[59]Like the Greek, the Syriac also contains the second person plural suffix ـحلمحه. This from likely arose from an interaction with the Greek tradition and not from an independent Hebrew witness. See Weitzmann (2005), 78-79: "There is no difficulty . . . in supposing that P's translators made sporadic use of LXX, alongside a Hebrew text as their main source." Also noted in Wagner, *Reading the Sealed Book*, 70n19.

[60]In accordance with he Hebrew text, the translator re-employs the third person forms in 13:18c: עַל־בָּנִים

Repetition of the plural imperatives in verse 2 is exegetically significant for Hebrew text. As we saw above, verse 2 contains three plural imperatives addressed to Babylon and verse 6 invokes the same form again. Yet, whereas the Hebrew text is content to employ these forms only in the opening of the oracle, the Greek text is concerned to add more second person forms to this extant pattern.

In the examples above, the Greek text diverges from the Hebrew in several places. However, it should be noted first of all that the Greek also preserves some important features of its source. Every single imperative from the Hebrew is transferred into the Greek: שְׂאוּ / ἄρατε, הָרִימוּ / ὕψώσατε, הָנִיפוּ / παρακαλεῖτε. In addition, 13:2b preserves the character distinction between the second and third person plural forms (e.g., הָרִימוּ / ὑψώσατε and לָהֶם / αὐτοῖς). Nonetheless, the differences between the Hebrew and Greek texts are significant and worth pointing out.

First of all, 13:2b´ contains the additional Greek phrase μὴ φοβεῖσθε. While this phrase is absent in the Hebrew text, this term continues the imperatival series of verse 2 and accords with other Isaianic passages.[61] The coupling of related themes and terminology in these later passages likely encouraged the translator to make the association. The translator's imperatival addition also resulted in a heightened series of second person forms, emphasizing the role of the addressee in the oracle. The force of imperatival command is multiplied.

Second, the series of plural imperatives grows with the reworked phrase in the Greek text of Isa 13:2d. Here, the verb וְיָבֹאוּ is omitted and the bound member of the phrase פִּתְחֵי נְדִיבִים 'the gates of the nobles' is rendered with the imperative פִּתְחוּ 'open up!' The plural addressee in the reworked phrase is semantically equivalent to the previous imperatival referents, but here it takes on the semantic role of EXPERIENCER-AGENT in the vocative case (i.e., οἱ ἄρχοντες). This

---

לֹא־תָחוּס עֵינָם / οὐδὲ ἐπὶ τοῖς τέκνοις οὐ φείσονται οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτῶν. It is difficult to escape the intentional character distinctions highlighted by the translator.

[61]Similar imperatival strings occur in Isa 35:4; 40:9. See Van der Vorm-Croughs (2014), 336: "the translator has often introduced into his text elements from passages elsewhere in the book of Isaiah. This gave him a means to clarify and interpret difficult portions with the help of other, related passages, but also to create linkages to other sections in Isaiah, thus improving the unity of his translation."

translation may have arisen intentionally, or due to ignorance, mistake, or a manuscript containing פתחו instead of the construct noun פתחי.[62] Regardless of the reading's etiology, the translator clearly emphasized the imperatival series when other options would have been available.[63] Thus, the Greek text contains a heightened emphasis upon the character addressed by these second person plural forms.

These first two pieces of evidence demonstrate how the translator, early in the oracle, was concerned to alter his Hebrew text through addition to emphasize the addressee of the second person plural form(s). These same features of alteration and addition occur later in the oracle as well. Yet, whereas the first two deviations accorded with the surrounding imperatival series, the additions and alterations toward the second person forms later in the chapter cannot appeal to similar forms in the immediate context. Instead, it is plausible that they occur under the influence of the oracle's opening lines.

This leads to the third point, that the translator re-introduced the second person referent in 13:17 after an absence of second person forms in the oracle's second stanza. In verse 17, readers finally discover the enigmatic identities of both the imperatival addressee of verse 2 along with the identity of God's instrument of destruction. Yet, while the Hebrew text unveils both of these identities with third person forms, the Greek text formally distinguishes these characters. The Hebrew text indicates that God will raise up the Medes against Babylon with the third person form עֲלֵיהֶם 'against them' while the translator captured the phrase with the second person form ὑμῖν 'against you.'

The patterned preservation and explicit articulation of the second person referents in these chapters is heightened further with the second person plural form ὑμῖν in the Greek text instead of the third person plural Hebrew form. This suggests that the translator sought formal

---

[62]Concerning potential confusion between *yod* and *waw* in this passage, see the discussion of Qumran orthography on page 73.

[63]The translator could just as easily rendered the phrase as פָּתְחוּ נְדִיבִים* 'the nobles opened.' In conjunction with the preceding verb in the Hebrew text וַיָּבֹאוּ, this reading may even be expected. Compare the similar phraseology in Isa 26:2: פִּתְחוּ שְׁעָרִים וְיָבֹא גוֹי־צַדִּיק שֹׁמֵר אֱמֻנִים / ἀνοίξατε πύλας, εἰσελθάτω λαὸς φυλάσσων δικαιοσύνην καὶ φυλάσσων ἀλήθειαν.

unity between the beginning and end of the oracle. And thus, he was concerned to preserve its structural and thematic coherence.[64] The translator specifically re-invoked the second person plural form to refer to Babylon even though this form was only attested in the opening stanza. Although this feature is implicit in the Hebrew text, the translator explicated what was assumed by heightening the literary structure of his translation. In conjunction with the following point, this lexical alteration strongly indicates that the translator intentionally preserved the character and structure of the text by employing the second person form.

Last of all, the phrase from 13:18b listed above further substantiates the translator's emphasis upon the second person plural addressee. Whereas the Hebrew phrase פְּרִי־בֶטֶן lacks any pronominal referent, the Greek text contains the phrase τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν where the second person plural pronoun is a translational plus. In the immediate context of the Hebrew, this phrase refers to the inhabitants of Babylon who will be plundered by the Medes. Verses 15 through 16 make this clear with a series of parallel phrases. The addition of the Greek pronoun in verse 18b explicates and emphasizes the identity of its accompanying noun. And by employing this second person pronoun, the translator also linked this phrase referentially with the second person forms present elsewhere in the chapter.

The Greek additions and alterations toward second person plural forms described above indicate that the translator of Greek Isaiah was concerned to highlight the thematic and structural integrity of the Hebrew text. Yet, his concern for coherence and structural integrity does not appear to be motivated by an ideology imposed upon the Hebrew text. Instead, it derived from the formal, structural, and literary clues of the Hebrew text itself. Given the span of literature over which these second person plural forms operate, it is fitting to situate these observations in terms of the translator's concern to explicate and heighten features within the literary macro-structure.

[64]As I discuss in the following section of the chapter, it is unlikely that the Hebrew text contained the second person plural form. The entire literary thrust of the immediate context emphasizes this character with the third person plural form. Verse 17 merely continues this trend.

Imperativization and Personalization in Greek Isaiah

Before advancing the discussion of macro-structural phenomena in Greek Isaiah, I here situate the translator's imperatival emphasis within recent academic discussion. My observations about Greek Isaiah's appropriation of the Hebrew literary structure resonate in many ways with the work of David A. Baer.[65] While viewing many aspects of the translator's ability as deficient, Baer also recognizes that the translator evidences a robust theological understanding of the book of Isaiah: "a *tendency* on the part of the translator to display his theological understanding of the text."[66] Baer's work is relevant for the present discussion because of the emphasis he places upon Greek Isaiah's rhetorical and homiletical motivations. He labels these translational motivations as *imperativization* and *personalization*.[67] These labels explain both the translator's "frequent recurrence to imperatival forms of Greek verbs" and also his "substitution of first- and second-person grammatical forms for third-person forms."[68]

Baer sees imperativization as a widespread phenomenon in Greek Isaiah, occurring nearly one hundred times in the translation. He deems instances of imperativization as either authorized, semi-authorized, or unauthorized, based on the level of justification provided by the Hebrew text.[69] Yet, he concedes that most instances of translational imperative-making are in

---

[65]See chapters 2 and 3 in Baer (2001).

[66]Baer (2001), 17-18: "Mistakes and a not quite victorious struggle with the book's difficult Hebrew appear to lie at the root of many of the LXX deviations. These coexist, however, with theological concerns and exegetical practice that produce a work that can only be fully appreciated when allowed *bona fide* status as ancient Jewish biblical interpretation." I affirm this eclectic view of the translator.

[67]Baer (2001), 25: "[the translator] is moved by homiletical intentions towards proclamation of the book's essential message—as he perceives this to be—to his own community." On page 59, Baer notes that imperativization occurs nearly 100 times in Greek Isaiah while personalization occurs roughly 200 times.

[68]Baer (2001), 28, 53. Seeligmann (2004), 57, 109, makes observations resembling imperativization in 21:7-10 and personalization in Isa 21:2. David Baer also makes note of these passages from Seeligmann's work.

[69]Authorized imperatives describe alternative vocalizations of the extant consonantal text. Semi-authorized imperatives reflect consonantal and vocalic divergence from the MT. Unauthorized imperatives lack any imperatival basis or correspondence in the Hebrew text. Regarding such imperativizations, he states on page 34: "There are numerous brief exclamations and homiletical exhortations scattered throughout LXX Isaiah that appear to be contributions of the translator with no underlying Hebrew to explain them." These categories are heuristically valuable, but do not seem to account for the intricacies of reading and translating manuscripts. See Isa 13:2 where the MT contains פִּתְחִי in construct but the translation reads *פִּתְחוּ as an imperative. This latter form could actually be

some way textually warranted: "imperativizations that lack any precedent in the Hebrew text are rare."[70]

A helpful example of imperativization in Greek Isaiah occurs in Isa 26:9. Here, the translator decided to imperativize the text despite the possibility of rendering the text otherwise:

Isa 26:9b כִּי כַאֲשֶׁר מִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ לָאָרֶץ צֶדֶק לָמְדוּ יֹשְׁבֵי תֵבֵל׃

For when your judgments are in the land, the inhabitants of the land shall learn righteousness.

διότι φῶς τὰ προστάγματά σου ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. δικαιοσύνην μάθε<u>τε</u>, οἱ ἐνοικοῦντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.

For your ordinances are a light upon the earth. Learn righteousness, O inhabitants of the land!

Despite the reconfiguration of the first line of this example, the translator here has read the third person plural Hebrew verb לָמְדוּ as the plural imperative לִמְדוּ. Baer classifies this translation as an authorized imperativization. Even though the imperatival rendering deviates somewhat from the flow of the passage, it has formal justification in the consonantal Hebrew text.[71]

The second feature which Baer highlights is that of personalization. This feature describes Greek Isaiah's tendency to prefer first and second person forms instead of the third person forms of the Hebrew text. The translator likely performed these changes out of a desire to make his translation relevant for his contemporary audience (i.e., contemporization). Baer notes that, "the translator is persuaded that his text speaks as much to and about 'you' and 'us' (i.e., his audience, sometimes including himself) as it does to and about his forebears in ancient Israel."[72]

---

what the translator saw even though the construct noun would have been the the syntactically preferable reading.

[70]Baer (2001), 42. On the same page, he states in a footnote that, "this is as one would expect given that this translator's 'freedom' does not cut him loose from his parent text." In an example on this page from Isa 58:7, which Baer classifies as semi-authorized, he notes: "The LXX is not entirely creative here, for the translator is merely making explicit an imperatival intent that is already implicit in the Hebrew text."

[71]Isaiah 21:7 contains another example of this tendency: וְהִקְשִׁיב קֶשֶׁב רַב־קָשֶׁב / ἀκρόα<u>σαι</u> ἀκρόασιν πολλήν. When given the choice between rendering the verb as perfect or an imperative, the translator tends toward imperatival representation of his source text.

[72]Baer (2001), 53.

Some examples from Baer's research demonstrate this personalizing phenomena. The Greek text of Isa 1:4 illustrates how the translator transformed the Hebrew verbs so as to address his target audience:[73]

Isa 1:4c עָזְבוּ אֶת־יְהוָה נִאֲצוּ אֶת־קְדוֹשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל
They forsook Yhwh; they rejected the holy one of Israel.
ἐγκατελίπετε τὸν κύριον καὶ παρωργίσατε τὸν ἅγιον τοῦ Ισραηλ
You forsook the Lord and you angered the holy one of Israel.

The third person plural verbs עָזְבוּ 'they forsook' and נִאֲצוּ 'they rejected' are transformed into the second person plural forms ἐγκατελίπετε 'you forsook' and παρωργίσατε 'you angered.' Yet, this shift may be justified. As Baer notes: "sometimes this 'personalization' is an explicit clarification of an implicit second-person referent that appears already in the Hebrew text."[74] The translator appears to read the initial הוֹי interjection of the verse into the verbal features in the clause listed above.[75] Given this context, this change toward personalization may be motivated and thus justified by the Hebrew text.

An example from Isa 14:21 demonstrates how this personalization feature impacts more than verbal morphology:[76]

Isa 14:21 הָכִינוּ לְבָנָיו מַטְבֵּחַ בַּעֲוֹן אֲבוֹתָם
Prepare slaughter for his sons because of the iniquity of their fathers!
ἑτοίμασον τὰ τέκνα σου σφαγῆναι ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις τοῦ πατρός σου
Prepare your children to be slaughtered for the sins of your father!

The translator here captured the plural Hebrew imperative in his Greek text with the singular form. But he alters, and thus personalizes, the third person descriptions of לְבָנָיו 'for his sons' and אֲבוֹתָם 'their fathers' into the second person with the phrases τὰ τέκνα σου 'your children' and τοῦ πατρός σου 'your father.' In this oracle against the king of Babylon, Baer aptly describes this

[73]Baer (2001), 57; Wagner (2013), 80-81; Van der Louw (2007), 243-247.

[74]Baer (2001), 57. For a potential motivational factor for these renderings, compare the imperatival forms of Isa 1:2 in the Hebrew and Greek texts. For a helpful discussion of this text, see Van der Louw (2007), 167-172; Wagner (2013), 80-84.

[75]Isaiah 1:4a reads הוֹי גּוֹי חֹטֵא עַם כָּבֶד עָוֹן / οὐαί ἔθνος ἁμαρτωλόν, λαὸς πλήρης ἁμαρτιῶν.

[76]Baer (2001), 57. The pronominal emphasis of this verse may also correspond with my perception of the second person plural function in Isa 13:17-18. I return to this example in significant detail in the next chapter.

phenomenon: “occasionally, the fury of the text is turned not against the listening or reading faithful, but against foreign evil-doers themselves, as though they were present to hear their doom declared.”[77] This final example of personalization is relevant for our present discussion concerning the literary structure of the oracle against Babylon in chapter 13.

Baer’s analysis of imperativization and personalization in Greek Isaiah aids my own research in two significant ways.. First, as I elaborate above, the translator not only captured the imperatival series of forms in 13:2 but added to it with the phrase μὴ φοβεῖσθε and heightened its force with the transformation of פִּתְחֵי נְדִיבִים into ἀνοίξατε, οἱ ἄρχοντες. This seems to follow Greek Isaiah’s trend toward imperativization. Second, alteration toward and addition of second person pronouns ὑμῖν and ὑμῶν in 13:17-18 also shares some features with the personalization trend in Greek Isaiah. In these verses, Babylon is not addressed in the third person, but referred to directly with second person forms. Both of these pieces of evidence seem to resonate with the categories laid out by Baer. However, I do not think his categories fully explain the features of chapter 13. In fact, applying these categories to the evidence above without nuance may actually obfuscate the translator’s actual rationale for employing such imperatival and personalized forms.

Concord between Baer’s categories and the examples presented above from chapter 13 seems somewhat superficial since any correspondence between them proves to be accidental. Regarding imperativization in Isa 13:2, Baer’s categories do not account for the likely intertextual insertion of μὴ φοβεῖσθε nor the legitimacy of reading the Hebrew phrase פִּתְחֵי נְדִיבִים with the imperatival form פִּתְחוּ.[78] The translator clearly expresses a penchant for imperatives in verse 2. But this inclination is entirely consonant with the imperatival pattern of the Hebrew text. The increase in imperative forms better corresponds with the translator’s tendency to highlight and heighten his Hebrew text, rather than with a mere emphasis upon imperativization. Apart from the intertextual addition of μή φοβεῖσθε, the translation is entirely

[77]Baer (2001), 57.

[78]This latter point is especially relevant given the close orthographic relationship between *yod* and *waw* at Qumran. See Kutzcher (1974); Qimron (2008); Reymond (2014).

explainable as an accurate rendering of its Hebrew source. Furthermore, as I noted above, this intertextual allusion seems also to originate from texts which contain similar imperatival strings.[79] The translator's presumable tendency toward imperativization, then, may simply be the outworking of his tendency to explicate and heighten what is already implied by the Hebrew.

Further, the category of personalization does not seem to match the data of chapter 13 well. While the addition of the second person pronouns in Isa 13:17-18 are clearly addressed to a personal character (i.e., 'you' and 'your') as opposed to an impersonal one (i.e., Babylon), the translator does not seem to be motivated only by the desire to personalize his text. The paucity of any other such personalizing forms in the oracle should make this clear. Instead, the translator adjusted his text for two structural reasons. First, as I mentioned above, the shift toward the second person pronominal forms in 13:17-18 re-invokes the opening series of imperatives and thus brings the character Babylon to the forefront. These pronouns have a resumptive function in the oracle. Second, these pronominal forms are placed at a key juncture in the oracle's macro-structure. Resuming the character of Babylon here illustrates the translator's concern to preserve and emphasize the larger literary macro-structure of the oracle.

Baer's labels of imperativization and personalization only loosely apply to the literary features of Isa 13:1-22. As such, these categories don't seem to explain why such features are present in the oracle. My analysis above suggests that the concern both to imperativize and personalize is not an ideological imposition upon the text. Instead, the features which seem to correspond with Baer's imperativization and personalization proposal emerge from the Hebrew text itself. The imperatival addition and alteration in 13:2b´ is thoroughly consonant with the immediate Hebrew context. And the personalized second person pronouns in 13:17-18 are also influenced by the opening of the oracle. And even though Baer states that, "the translator has exhortation on his mind, and is going to practise it by hook or by crook,"[80] these two features in Isaiah 13 are not merely ideological or contemporizing. They arise instead from what appears to

[79]See the series of imperatives in Isa 35:3-4 and 40:9-10.

[80]Baer (2001), 34.

be a deep familiarity with the Hebrew text. In effect, they create a thematically and structurally robust translation which preserves and heightens the literary structure of the Hebrew source.[81]

Temporal Referents

We can see the larger structural parallel between Isa 13:1-14:23 confirmed by the translator's use of temporal markers which refer to the future. Whereas the connection is present in the Hebrew text by implication, the lexical features of Greek Isaiah explicate this parallel. This connection between the end of chapters 13 and 14 is presented below to illustrate this point:[82]

Isa 13:20a	לֹא־תֵשֵׁב לָנֶ֣צַח וְלֹא תִשְׁכֹּ֔ן עַד־דּוֹר וָדוֹר
	It will not be inhabited forever; and it will not be lived in for generations.
	οὐ κατοικηθήσεται <u>εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα χρόνον</u>, οὐδὲ μὴ εἰσέλθωσιν εἰς αὐτὴν διὰ πολλῶν γενεῶν
	It will not be inhabited forever, nor will they enter into it for many generations.
Isa 13:22c-d	וְקָר֥וֹב לָבֹ֖וא עִתָּ֑הּ וְיָמֶ֖יהָ לֹ֥א יִמָּשֵׁכוּ
	Its time is near in coming; and its days shall not delay.
	ταχὺ ἔρχεται καὶ <u>οὐ χρονιεῖ</u>
	It is coming quickly and it will not delay.
Isa 14:20d	לֹא־יִקָּרֵ֥א לְעוֹלָ֖ם זֶ֥רַע מְרֵעִֽים
	The seed of evildoers shall not be named forever.
	οὐ μὴ μείνῃς <u>εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα χρόνον</u>, σπέρμα πονηρόν
	You shall not abide forever, O evil seed.

The translator of Greek Isaiah employed the phrase εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα χρόνον for two different Hebrew phrases in these examples: לָנֶ֣צַח and לְעוֹלָ֖ם. He also supplies the verb χρονίζω to render a temporal idea at 13:22. Noticeably, each of these occurrences shares the χρόν- root. In the Greek text alone, this temporal feature suggests thematic uniformity. But the lexical pattern also suggests structural uniformity since the lexemes are tied to the overarching temporal themes of the Hebrew text. Thus, the translator of Greek Isaiah appears to have explicated the temporal

[81]On the heightening function of personalization, see Baer (2001), 59: "[O]ur translator brings to his task a heightened dramatic sense, a contemporizing style, and a truly homiletic intention."

[82]For alternative proposals regarding the temporal phrases here, see Van der Vorm-Croughs (2014), 446-47.

themes by supplying two uniform phrases—εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα χρόνον—and also by including the verb χρονίζω.[83] Exploring some lexical statistics will provide some clarity to this portrayal.

The Hebrew term נֶצַח 'forever' occurs six times in the book of Isaiah.[84] And the renderings of this term in Greek Isaiah largely correspond with this temporal understanding.[85] The translator nearly always employs the phrase εἰς χρόνον or εἰς αἰῶνα for this term, albeit with slight additions or alterations.[86] So, this rendering appears to be straightforward and normative of Greek Isaiah's translation patterns.

The phrase עוֹלָם functions similarly in Isaiah, occurring forty-six times in the book. The translator of Greek Isaiah nearly always pairs this term with αἰών, almost to the exclusion of rendering it with any other lexeme.[87] But on four occasions, the term עוֹלָם is rendered with the full phrase εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα χρόνον:

Isa 9:6	מֵעַתָּה וְעַד־עוֹלָם	ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν καὶ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα χρόνον
Isa 14:20	לֹא־יִקָּרֵא לְעוֹלָם זֶרַע מְרֵעִים	οὐ μὴ μείνῃς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα χρόνον, σπέρμα πονηρόν
Isa 34:10	לַיְלָה וְיוֹמָם לֹא תִכְבֶּה לְעוֹלָם	νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας καὶ οὐ σβεσθήσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα χρόνον
Isa 34:17	עַד־עוֹלָם יִירָשׁוּהָ	εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα χρόνον κληρονομήσετε

These rarer renderings of עוֹלָם do not seem to exhibit any overarching thematic pattern. However, the usage of this Greek phrase in Isa 34:10 and 34:17 suggests that thematic influence exists between these two sections of discourse (e.g., 13:1-14:23 and 34:1-17).[88] These thematic

[83]The use of χρονίζω for מִשֹּׁךְ is unique at this point in Greek Isaiah. The translator has accommodated the rendering here at 13:22 to the temporal context. Whether the translator understood the meaning of this Hebrew term is questionable. But it is nonetheless significant that he employed this temporal expression which accords with the lexemes in the immediate context.

[84]See Isa 13:20; 25:8; 28:28; 33:20; 34:10; 57:16.

[85]The use of ἰσχύω at 25:8 is likely a thematic rendering.

[86]Such alterations include the addition of the article in the phrase εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα at 28:28; διὰ παντός at 57:16.

[87]Isaiah 42:14 contains the adverbial rendering ἀεί. This rendering is stylistically and contextually fitting. In Isa 63:16 and 63:19, the translator supplies the phrase ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς. This also constitutes a contextually sensitive rendering.

[88]These parallels received detailed treatment in the subsequent sections of this chapter.

parallels have also been noted by several other researchers.[89] Thus, given what I take to be the lexical and thematic influence of chapter 34 upon the Babylon oracle in chapters 13 and 14, it would not be not surprising to see lexical and thematic influence here as well with regards to temporal imagery.

But this observation does not explain the motivational origins for the phrase εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα χρόνον from עוֹלָם. Nor does it explain the use of the same Greek phrase at Isa 9:6. But it does demonstrate its thematic and structural significance in the Greek text of Isa 13:1-14:23. Repetition of these temporal lexemes at significant structural boundaries in the Babylon oracle strongly suggest translational intentionality. And patterned lexical correlation between the Babylon oracle and features from 34:1-17 also suggests a level of influence.

When readers of the Greek text encounter this phrase, it signals an identical referent in their cognitive framework. And this referent in such short discursive space suggests thematic and structural intentionality. When we compare the Greek text to the Hebrew, we can detect how the translation maintains a uniform temporal referent even though the Hebrew text differs in its lexical choices. Thus, Greek Isaiah seems to contain these phrases at key junctures of the discourse, with the result of emphasizing that discourse's structural bounds. And in all likelihood, given the prominence of these types of patterns in Greek Isaiah, the renderings in these passages were intentionally aimed to create coherent thematic and structural uniformity.

The Parallelism of Animals

The ending of the Hebrew text of chapter 14 in many ways parallels the themes and characters found in the end of chapter 13. Specifically, the list of animals inhabiting the desolate city of Babylon in 13:20-22 corresponds with the קִפֹּד 'hedgehog, owl' who also inhabits denuded Babylon in 14:23:[90]

[89]See Angelini (2015): 33-43, and the references cited therein.

[90]The list of several other animals in 13:20-22 makes this connection even more sure. Isaiah 13:21-22 contains a list of six desert-dwelling animals who inhabit the former city of Babylon. Interestingly, the term קִפֹּד does not occur in the examples from chapter 13. Isaiah 34:8-15 also contains the trope of animals inhabiting destroyed cities. As it will become clear, the translator of Greek Isaiah is aware of these parallels and capitalizes upon the lexical parallels between the chapters in his translation. See Angelini (2016): 97-109; Angelini (2015):

Isa 13:22	וְתַנִּים בְּהֵיכְלֵי עֹנֶג	καὶ νοσσοποιήσουσιν ἐχῖνοι ἐν τοῖς οἴκοις αὐτῶν
	And jackals in pleasant palaces	*And hedgehogs will make nets in their houses*
Isa 14:23	וְשַׂמְתִּיהָ לְמוֹרַשׁ קִפֹּד	καὶ θήσω τὴν Βαβυλωνίαν ἔρημον ὥστε κατοικεῖν ἐχίνους
	And I will make it a dwelling for the hedgehog	*And I will set Babylonia as a wilderness so that hedgehogs will inhabit it.*

Even though the connection between these two passages is thematically present in the Hebrew text, it is not lexically explicit. The term תַּן does not occur in the concluding section of chapter 14. And the term קִפֹּד does not occur in the ending of chapter 13. The connection is signaled by the implicit recursion of themes from 13:20-22 into 14:22-23.[91]

But what is noteworthy is that the translator of Greek Isaiah seems to have picked up on this implicit connection. And in turn, he has altered his translation to highlight it. This is seen in the explication of the animal parallel by employing the same Greek term ἐχῖνος for two different Hebrew terms: תַּן in 13:22 and קִפֹּד in 14:23. The Greek term ἐχῖνος occurs five times in the Septuagint, each time being paired with קִפֹּד apart from the example in 13:22.[92] Further, it is telling that the term תַּן 'jackal' stands behind several different Greek terms in the translation of Isaiah. These patterns hold for the larger corpus of the Septuagint translators.[93]

33-43; Aitken (2015): 21-34.

[91]In addition to parallel animals, these thematic parallels also include the destruction of land and the erasure of inhabitants. See the following section labelled 'mirrored characters' for a full explication of these themes. The parallels between themes and characters here are also confirmed by similar features in Isa 34:8-15.

[92]The majority of these occurrences are found in Greek Isaiah. See Isa 13:22; 14:23; 34:11; 34:15; Zeph 2:14. The example from Isa 34:15 pairs ἐχῖνος with the Hebrew term קִפֹּז instead of קִפֹּד. But the difference between these terms is not semantic but phonetic, the former exhibiting a voiced inter-dental aspirant for the final consonant ז while the latter exhibits a voiced inter-dental stop in the final consonant ד. Whether these two terms are referentially equivalent in the Hebrew text is difficult to determine since the former is a *hapax legomena*. Nevertheless, the translator of Greek Isaiah conveyed these two terms as referentially synonymous.

[93]The noun תַּן 'jackal' occurs fourteen times in the Hebrew Bible: Isa 13:22; 34:13; 35:7; 43:20; Jer 9:10; 10:22; 14:6; 49:33; 51:37; Mic 1:8; Mal 1:3; Psa 44[43]:20; Job 30:29; Lam 4:3. Apart from the sole pairing of תַּן with ἐχῖνος in Isa 13:22, the Greek translators supply the following terms to render this Hebrew noun: σειρήν, ὄρνεον, δράκων, στρουθός, δόμα, κάκωσις. Interestingly, three of these renderings are ornithological. It is my view that the translators of the Septuagint show no evidence of understanding this Hebrew term. Where it is glossed with an animal referent, these meanings can be deduced from context. My explanation of influence from literary structure in this section is as follows. The translator knew these terms were related thematically, referentially, and structurally. But he didn't know the exact meaning of the term in 13:22 while he understood more accurately the term in 14:23.

We can see that these lexical choices in 13:22 and 14:23 demonstrate an element of intentional thematic and structural selection by investigating these statistics further. Examples from Isa 34:11 and 34:15 illustrate how the translator of Greek Isaiah twice employed ἐχῖνος to render קִפֹּד:

Isa 34:11	וְיִרְשׁוּהָ קָאַת וְקִפּוֹד . . . יִשְׁכְּנוּ־בָהּ	καὶ κατοικήσουσιν ἐν αὐτῇ ὄρνεα καὶ ἐχῖνοι
	The hawk and the hedgehog shall possess it . . . they shall dwell in it	*And birds and hedgehogs will dwell in it*
Isa 34:15	שָׁמָּה קִנְּנָה קִפּוֹז	ἐκεῖ ἐνόσσευσεν ἐχῖνος
	There the owl nests	*There the hedgehog nested*

As these example indicate, the pairing of קִפֹּד and ἐχῖνος is statistically normative for Greek Isaiah. And this is even more significant when we consider that these illustrations above largely constitute the sole occurrences of these terms in the Hebrew and Greek corpus.[94] Taken as a whole, this pairing appears to be normative.

However, the pairing of תַּן and ἐχῖνος at 13:22 suggests that this rendering is not so monolithic. To counter this disparity, I suggest that the translator at this point breaks his semantic-translation pattern with תַּן in order to create a parallel in the literary structure. Examples from renderings of תַּן elsewhere in Isaiah provide a springboard for my hypothesis:

Isa 34:13	וְהָיְתָה נְוֵה תַּנִּים חָצִיר לִבְנוֹת יַעֲנָה	καὶ ἔσται ἔπαυλις σειρήνων καὶ αὐλὴ στρουθῶν
Isa 35:7	בִּנְוֵה תַנִּים רִבְצָהּ חָצִיר לְקָנֶה וָגֹמֶא	ἐκεῖ εὐφροσύνη ὀρνέων, ἔπαυλις καλάμου καὶ ἕλη.
Isa 43:20	תְּכַבְּדֵנִי חַיַּת הַשָּׂדֶה תַּנִּים וּבְנוֹת יַעֲנָה	εὐλογήσει με τὰ θηρία τοῦ ἀγροῦ, σειρῆνες . . .

In line with the statistics detailed in the footnotes above, the examples here demonstrate that the translator of Greek Isaiah favored ornithological terminology when rendering the Hebrew term תַּן. And the Greek translators as a whole evidence similar semantic tendencies.[95] Given that the overall pattern in the Septuagint corpus favors the pairing of תַּן with a variety of animal referents beside ἐχῖνος, the pairing of these two terms at 13:22 was most likely motivated by a literary and

---

He then identified these terms together and placed the term ἐχῖνος at the end of each chapter.

[94]Greek Zephaniah 2:14 also contains ἐχῖνος for קִפֹּד. This non-Isaianic rendering supports the position that this lexical pairing is standard. This holds even if the translator of the Twelve was influenced by Greek Isaiah.

[95]This holds true for renderings of תַּן even outside of Greek Isaiah. See Jer 10:22; 49:33; Job 30:29.

structural intention. And this intentional pairing fits well with the view that the translator sought to connect the themes and characters at the level of the literary macro-structure.

In combination with its literary and structural parallels, the thematic and lexical proximity of 13:22 and 14:23 suggests that the translator sought to explicate this structural parallel by doubly employing the term ἐχῖνος. Given the translator's likely misunderstanding of the term תַּן, he would have sought to gloss the term from a contextually relevant example. The thematic and structural nearness of 14:23 to this passage provided such a gloss with the pairing of קִפֹּד and ἐχῖνος. And given the association of these terms in Isa 34:11-15, the decision to supply ἐχῖνος for תַּן at 13:22 constitutes a decision which has thematic and structural impact upon readers. This translation decision requires that readers associate the themes and characters of 13:20-22; 14:22-23; and 34:11-15 together. Thus, the deviation at this point in Greek Isaiah impacts the structural presentation of the text which resulted in a heightened unity and coherence of the literary structure.

The effect of the lexical choice at 13:22 and 14:23 entails that such lexical repetition points readers to the initial usage and suggests that the translator intentionally shaped the structure of the latter discourse to parallel the former.[96] Even though the actual cognitive-translation process probably began with the rendering of 14:23 informing 13:22, for readers of Greek Isaiah, the structural signal is linear from chapter 13 to chapter 14. All that matters in this instance is the resultant Greek text. Its literary structure, though lexically deviating in some ways from the Hebrew text, actually preserves the overall structure of the Hebrew source. Inconsistent translation patterns with the use of ἐχῖνος in 13:22 and 14:23 demonstrate that the translator sought to create a coherent structural cue in his work, one which originated in the literary structure which is implicit in the Hebrew.

[96]To my mind, the translator of Greek Isaiah actually constructs the former example to mirror the latter. The terminology of the Greek in 14:23 more closely matches the Hebrew there than it does for what is found in 13:22. This construction seems to illustrate that the translator did not proceed through his work systematically or linearly. Instead, he likely knew the layout of the book first, translated specific 'key' passages or selected appropriate terminology for them, and only then proceeded to complete the translation work elsewhere.

Mirrored Characters

Here, I highlight how the translator of Greek Isaiah conveyed the solidarity of characters across his macro-structural organization of Isa 13:1-14:23. The way he read his text at the lexical level gives us insight into how he understood the structural relationship between these chapters. When we compare the lexical designations of characters from chapter 13 with what is found in chapter 14, we discover several lexical parallels. And since these parallels are also present in the Hebrew text in one way or another, we should take note of this feature since the Greek lexemes often deviate significantly from the underlying Hebrew source.

First, I begin with examples of the translator's approach to the themes and characters of the Hebrew text of chapter 13. These examples demonstrate both the translator's typical and idiosyncratic Greek lexical choices for select Hebrew terms. Such lexical decisions will prove to be important as we investigate the details of chapter 14:

Isa 13:12	אוֹקִיר אֱנוֹשׁ מִפָּז *I will make men more rare than fine gold*	καὶ ἔσονται <u>οἱ καταλελειμμένοι</u> ἔντιμοι μᾶλλον ἢ τὸ χρυσίον *And those who remain will be more valued than pure gold*
Isa 13:14	וְהָיָה כִּצְבִי מֻדָּח *And he shall be like a frightened gazelle*	καὶ ἔσονται <u>οἱ καταλελειμμένοι</u> ὡς δορκάδιον φεῦγον *And those who remain will be like a fleeing gazelle*
Isa 13:15	וְכָל־הַנִּסְפֶּה יִפּוֹל בֶּחָרֶב *And all who are caught shall fall by the sword*	καὶ οἵτινες συνηγμένοι εἰσί, <u>μαχαίρᾳ</u> <u>πεσοῦνται</u> *And those who have been gathered shall fall by the sword*
Isa 13:16a	וְעֹלְלֵיהֶם יְרֻטָּשׁוּ לְעֵינֵיהֶם *And their children shall be dashed in pieces before their eyes*	καὶ <u>τὰ τέκνα</u> αὐτῶν ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν ῥάξουσι *And they will strike down their children before them*
Isa 13:18b	וּפְרִי־בֶטֶן לֹא יְרַחֵמוּ[97] *They will not have compassion upon the fruit of the womb;*	καὶ <u>τὰ τέκνα</u> ὑμῶν οὐ μὴ ἐλεήσουσιν *And they will not have mercy upon your children;*
Isa 13:18c	עַל־בָּנִים לֹא־תָחוּס עֵינָם *their eyes will not pity children*	οὐδὲ ἐπὶ <u>τοῖς τέκνοις</u> οὐ φείσονται οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτῶν *nor will their eyes spare the children*

[97]The Hebrew text of 13:18a also contains these themes—וּקְשָׁתוֹת נְעָרִים תְּרַטַּשְׁנָה—yet the translator rendered the noun נַעַר with νεανίσκος instead of τέκνον. This shift is likely accounted for by a concern for stylistic variation. However, the threefold repetition of τέκνον in verses 16a and 18b-c seems to suggest that something other than lexical variation was a concern within Greek Isaiah.

As I discuss in a related section on the literary micro-structure of Isa 13:12-18 in the previous chapter, the characters in the Hebrew text of Isa 13:12 and 13:14 are also those mentioned in verse 15 after the brief change in topic at verse 14. This consistency in character is implicit in the Hebrew but is explicated by the translator's use of the phrase οἱ καταλελειμμένοι to mark the verbal subject in 13:12 and 13:14. The men of Babylon who remain after battle in the day of Yhwh will be found. They themselves will fall by the sword: יִפּוֹל בֶּחָרֶב rendered as μαχαίρᾳ πεσοῦνται.

Verses 16 through 18 detail how the family members of these men will participate in a similar fate. The Hebrew text describes how destruction will fall upon the children, houses, and women of these warriors. We should take note of the use of τέκνον in these passages since it conveys a structural purpose which bridges distinct sections of the Hebrew literary structure. For the present purpose, we only need to note how frequently the use of τέκνον occurs since the singular Greek term renders three different Hebrew elements: עוֹלֵל, פְּרִי־בֶטֶן, בֵּן. This translational uniformity is striking, especially since τέκνον does not constitute a precise gloss in any of these instances. Additionally, the resumption of this Greek term in chapter 14 reinvokes the same phenomena that we see here in the destruction men and their progeny. We will examine these occurrences in due course.

The day of Yhwh in these verses from chapter 13 provides a glimpse into the corporate destruction of Babylonian society. Men, women, and children all perish in this event. But the prominence of familial terminology not only colors chapter 13, but also the circumstances within chapter 14. Apart from the thematic use of women, all of these themes occur again in chapter 14 with a literary twist. Instead of referring to corporate Babylon, chapter 14 applies these themes to the individual king of Babylon, the representative of the kingdom. The king, his land, and his descendants will all be destroyed. Such themes are uniform and paralleled in both chapters of the Hebrew text. Yet, while these themes are not as explicit in the Hebrew text of chapter 14, they are nevertheless present though occasional lexical pairs and implicit connections. Nonetheless, the translator of Greek Isaiah seems to have noticed these parallels and sought to heighten the thematic and structural connections between the two passages.

The end of chapter 14 contains a recapitulation of many if not all of these themes from chapter 13 mentioned above. They are both lexically and implicitly present in the Hebrew text and are made more explicit by the Greek translation. The examples presented here should be compared with those provided earlier:

Isa 14:12a	אֵיךְ נָפַלְתָּ מִשָּׁמַיִם	πῶς ἐξέπεσεν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ
Isa 14:12b	נִגְדַּעְתָּ לָאָרֶץ	συνετρίβη εἰς τὴν γῆν
Isa 14:19b	לְבוּשׁ הֲרֻגִים מְטֹעֲנֵי חָרֶב	μετὰ πολλῶν τεθνηκότων ἐκκεκεντημένων μαχαίραις
Isa 14:20d	לֹא־יִקָּרֵא לְעוֹלָם זֶרַע מְרֵעִים	οὐ μὴ μείνῃς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα χρόνον, σπέρμα πονηρόν
Isa 14:21a	הָכִינוּ לְבָנָיו מַטְבֵּחַ בַּעֲוֹן אֲבוֹתָם	ἑτοίμασον τὰ τέκνα σου σφαγῆναι ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις τοῦ πατρός
Isa 14:22b	וְהִכְרַתִּי לְבָבֶל שֵׁם וּשְׁאָר וְנִין וָנֶכֶד	καὶ ἀπολῶ αὐτῶν ὄνομα καὶ κατάλειμμα καὶ σπέρμα

The first two examples from 14:12 contain typical lexical parings with each of the Hebrew terms. So, at one level these renderings are not all that interesting. But when viewed in the macro-structural matrix, they suggest that the translator heightened the parallels implicit in the Hebrew.

Just as the men of Babylon fell (**נפל** / πίπτω) by the sword and their children were dashed (**רטשׁ** / συντρίβω) in chapter 13,[98] similarly did the king of Babylon fall (**נפל** / ἐκπίπτω) from heaven and get chopped down (**גדע**) and crushed (συντρίβω) to the earth in chapter 14.[99] What appears to be implicit artistic parallelism in both lexeme and sense in the Hebrew text is heightened specifically by the lexical choices of the Greek. These parallels can be detected by considering the examples in proximity to one another:

Isa 13:15	וְכָל־הַנִּסְפֶּה יִפּוֹל בֶּחָרֶב	καὶ οἵτινες συνηγμένοι εἰσί, μαχαίρᾳ πεσοῦνται
Isa 13:18	וּקְשָׁתוֹת נְעָרִים תְּרַטַּשְׁנָה	τοξεύματα νενίσκων συντρίψουσι
Isa 14:12a	אֵיךְ נָפַלְתָּ מִשָּׁמַיִם	πῶς ἐξέπεσεν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ
Isa 14:12b	נִגְדַּעְתָּ לָאָרֶץ	συνετρίβη εἰς τὴν γῆν

Again, this thematic connection is already present in the Hebrew text. And while the Hebrew connection is subtle, it is thematically and structurally important. The fate of the king of Babylon is identical to the fate of the nation, and vice versa. Whatever happens to the corporate body-politic also happens to its head. And even though the Hebrew lexemes differ somewhat in form,

---

[98]For the same Hebrew verb **רטשׁ** 'to dash,' the translator employed two different Greek verbs. In 13:16, he supplied ῥάσσω 'to strike,' and in 13:18 he supplied συντρίβω.

[99]The use of ἐκπίπτω in 14:12a is really just a stylistic rendering of the Hebrew **נפל** plus the **מִן** preposition from the phrase **אֵיךְ נָפַלְתָּ מִשָּׁמַיִם**. See Appendix 2 for a discussion of the syntactical difficulties in 13:18.

the translator picked up on this literary and structural parallel and shaped his text to express it.[100] The Greek lexical choices make the parallel of theme and character more explicit than the Hebrew. The terminology itself signals this literary and structural relationship. The remainder of the examples demonstrate this further.

The same point can be further substantiated with an example of Isa 14:19b. The use of the phrase מְטֹעֲנֵי חָרֶב 'those pierced by the sword' rendered as ἐκκεκεντημένων μαχαίραις 'those pierced by swords' lexically and thematically resembles the statement in 13:15 regarding the men who fall by the sword:

Isa 13:15	וְכָל־הַנִּסְפֶּה יִפּוֹל בֶּחָרֶב	καὶ οἵτινες συνηγμένοι εἰσί, μαχαίρᾳ πεσοῦνται
Isa 14:19b	לְבוּשׁ הֲרֻגִים מְטֹעֲנֵי חָרֶב	μετὰ πολλῶν τεθνηκότων ἐκκεκεντημένων μαχαίραις

The king of Babylon in 14:19 will meet a fate shared by those men in chapter 13 who fled from battle but who were then found and destroyed. And even though the lexical similarities of this chapter are merely the result of accurate semantic pairing between Hebrew and Greek, the character association is important to recognize.

The conclusion of the oracle against the king of Babylon in chapter 14 contains references to all the previously highlighted terms. I again supply the relevant examples:

Isa 14:20d	לֹא־יִקָּרֵא לְעוֹלָם זֶרַע מְרֵעִים	οὐ μὴ μείνῃς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα χρόνον, σπέρμα πονηρόν
Isa 14:21a	הָכִינוּ לְבָנָיו מַטְבֵּחַ בַּעֲוֹן אֲבוֹתָם	ἑτοίμασον τὰ τέκνα σου σφαγῆναι ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις τοῦ πατρός
Isa 14:22b	וְהִכְרַתִּי לְבָבֶל שֵׁם וּשְׁאָר וְנִין וָנֶכֶד	καὶ ἀπολῶ αὐτῶν ὄνομα καὶ κατάλειμμα καὶ σπέρμα

And beyond this, the translator not only transferred over the terminology of sword, child, and remnant (e.g., μαχαίρα, τέκνον, κατάλειμμα), he also seems to have explicated and heightened the genealogical references with the double use of σπέρμα.[101] I explain each of these features in detail below.

The use of κατάλειμμα in 14:22b accurately renders the Hebrew term שְׁאָר. But it also resumes the idea of οἱ καταλελειμμένοι from the Greek text of 13:12 and 13:14. In fact, granted

[100]Isaiah 13:6 contains the noun συντριβή to render שֹׁד in the phrase כְּשֹׁד מִשַּׁדַּי יָבוֹא. The translator rendered this phrase as καὶ συντριβὴ παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ἥξει. While it is not essential to my argument here, the use of συντριβή here could also support the proposal for an intentional construction of the literary macro-structure.

[101]We must remember that the choice to employ τέκνον in Isa 13:16-18 is semantically imprecise and statistically unlikely.

that the translator recognized the thematic and character parallels between chapters 13 and 14, it is likely that the remnant terminology here influenced his renderings in chapter 13. Whereas the character parallel remains implicit in both chapters of the Hebrew text, the translation explicates this remnant idea in both places with the same terminology. In effect, the translator has thematically and referentially paired these characters together, creating more robust literary structure as a result. The remnant of Babylon and the genealogical remnant of the king share a similar fate.[102] Again, the downfall of the king of Babylon mirrors the destruction of the kingdom. This takes place through the clues within the Hebrew text. But it also occurs due to the translator's deviation from the specific lexemes in order to emphasize what is implicit.[103]

Last of all, we encounter the terminology of father, child, and seed in 14:20-22. These semantics are present in the Hebrew text (e.g., אָב, בֵּן, זֶרַע) and also in the Greek (e.g., πατήρ, τέκνον, σπέρμα). But this familial language is also unmistakably reminiscent of that found in 13:15-18 where we encounter fathers and their children. First of all, the features of 14:21a suggest that this connection occurs not only in the Hebrew but also in the Greek text:

Isa 14:21a הָכִינוּ לְבָנָיו מַטְבֵּחָה בַּעֲוֹן אֲבוֹתָם ἑτοίμασον τὰ τέκνα σου σφαγῆναι ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις τοῦ πατρός

As I noted in the previous micro-structural chapter, where I dealt with these verses in detail, the use of τέκνον to render the Hebrew term בֵּן is atypical in the Septuagint. In the whole of the Greek Old Testament, fewer than three hundred of the roughly 3,700 instances of בֵּן are paired with τέκνον. This amounts to an estimated pairing of eight percent.

But beyond these statistics, this feature occurs several times in 13:15-18 where τέκνον renders all three terms עוֹלֵל, פְּרִי־בֶטֶן, and בֵּן.[104] The reuse of the Greek term in chapter 14

[102]The double use of ἀπόλλυμι in 13:9 and 13:11 may support this position.

[103]The direction of influence upon the translator does not essentially matter at this point. But if my above hypothesis of structural influence is correct, the theme-character of the οἱ καταλελειμμένοι in 13:12 and 13:14 would be proleptic and influenced by the content of the following chapter since καταλείμμα corresponds with the semantics of שְׁאָר. This is difficult to prove, but not unexpected in the translator's work. He seems to perform similar moves elsewhere.

[104]See Isa 13:16a; 13:18b; 13:18c. As I demonstrate in the next chapter, this singular rendering for all three Hebrew referents is unique and statistically in the minority. The term עוֹלֵל and the phrase פְּרִי־בֶטֶן occur with τέκνον only here.

follows the same pattern it did in 13:15-18. There, it marked off a distinct literary unit. And the repetition of the term in this final section of the oracle against the king draws readers to make the relevant associations between the characters of each chapter. The children of the kingdom of Babylon mirror the children of the king of Babylon. While this feature is implicitly present in the Hebrew text, the Greek text makes it all the more apparent through lexical explication.

Themes of the Literary Macro-Structure

In contrast to the previous section of literary parallels, here I present evidence for recurrent themes in the literary macro-structure of Isa 13:1-14:23. These samples of evidence contrast the structural emphasis found in the previous list of examples. Those former samples of data functioned as structural pillars. But these thematic examples function more as the literary rebar that supports the platforms in between the pillars. In what follows, I highlight five themes in the literary macro-structure: 1) the day of Yhwh, 2) the inhabited city-world as οἰκουμένη, 3) the importance of the desert as ἔρημος, 4) the geography of foundations as θεμέλιον, 5) the prominence of mountains, 6) the land of Yhwh.

In conjunction with the previous structural parallels, these thematic features further demonstrate that the translator of Greek Isaiah created a coherent literary-structural whole in the Greek text even when he deviated from the Hebrew source. Even though lexical or syntactical deviation occurs throughout these examples, the overall translation accords with thematic and structural indicators found within the Hebrew text.

The Day of Yhwh

As we have already seen from the analysis of the Hebrew literary structure mentioned earlier in this chapter, the day of Yhwh is a central structuring device for Isa 13:1-22. This thematic device also plays a prominent role when we consider chapters 13 and 14 together. The imagery of the ‘day of Yhwh’ is prominent in chapter 13, but then disappears in the opening interlude of chapter 14. But as the scene shifts from the interlude concerning Israel in 14:1-2

toward the taunt against the king of Babylon in 14:3, we encounter again the mention of the 'day of Yhwh.'[105] The examples below detail this theme:[106]

Isa 13:6	הֵילִילוּ כִּי קָרוֹב יוֹם יְהוָה	ὀλολύζετε, ἐγγὺς γὰρ ἡ ἡμέρα κυρίου
	Wail! For the day of Yhwh is near!	*Wail, for the day of the Lord is near!*
Isa 13:9	הִנֵּה יוֹם־יְהוָה בָּא	ἰδοὺ γὰρ ἡμέρα κυρίου ἀνίατος ἔρχεται
	Behold, the day of Yhwh comes.	*For behold, the incurable day of the Lord is coming*
Isa 13:13	וּבְיוֹם חֲרוֹן אַפּוֹ	τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, ᾗ ἂν ἐπέλθῃ ὁ θυμὸς αὐτοῦ
	In the day of his fierce anger	*on the day on which his anger shall come*
Isa 13:22	וְקָרוֹב לָבוֹא עִתָּהּ וְיָמֶיהָ לֹא יִמָּשֵׁכוּ	ταχὺ ἔρχεται καὶ οὐ χρονιεῖ
	Its time is near coming and its days shall not be prolonged	*It comes quickly and it will not delay*
Isa 14:3	וְהָיָה בְּיוֹם הָנִיחַ יְהוָה לְךָ	καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἀναπαύσει σε ὁ θεός
	On the day when Yhwh gives you rest	*And it will be on that day, God will give you rest*
Isa 14:4b	וְאָמַרְתָּ	καὶ ἐρεῖς ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ
	And you shall say	*And you will say in that day*

The full phrase יוֹם יְהוָה / ἡ ἡμέρα κυρίου occurs only at 13:16 and 13:9 with minor variations in each Hebrew and Greek passage. And we can see that this phrase is resumed more concisely as the chapter proceeds. Verse 13 contains the temporal phrase בְּיוֹם / τῇ ἡμέρᾳ which is most appropriately associated with the double 'day of Yhwh' referents earlier in the chapter. In addition to this, verse 22 refers to the 'time' (עֵת) and 'days' (יוֹם) of Babylon's destruction as imminent and sure.[107] Given the contextual prominence of the 'day of Yhwh' in this chapter, these temporal referents are most naturally referring to this 'day.' Thus, each instance of this temporal referent denotes the period of time that the Medes approach, defeat, and leave desolate the kingdom of Babylon (cf. 13:17).

---

[105]Consider again the combined literary structure of chapters 13 and 14:

A. Isa 13:1-22 Oracle of Babylon
B. Isa 14:1-2 Interlude about Israel
A′. Isa 14:1-23 Taunt of the King of Babylon.

[106]At the literary and theological level, it is interesting that on the 'day' of the king of Babylon's demise, Israel announces *shabbat* since the oppressor has ceased (cf. 14:4-5).

[107]Interestingly, Greek Isaiah omits any explicit references to the 'day' when rendering these phrases. But his use of temporal semantics (e.g., χρονίζω) continues this chronological scheme in some respect.

Then, after the interlude at Isa 14:1-2, the Hebrew text resumes its denouncement of Babylon, this time against its king. In 14:3, we encounter the term 'day' in the temporal phrase וְהָיָה בְּיוֹם הָנִיחַ יְהוָה לְךָ. In the context of the Hebrew text, this phrase most likely alludes to the statement in 14:1c where God causes Israel to rest in the land:[108]

Isa 14:1c	וְהִנִּיחָם עַל־אַדְמָתָם	καὶ <u>ἀναπαύσονται</u> ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς αὐτῶν
Isa 14:3a	וְהָיָה בְּיוֹם הָנִיחַ יְהוָה לְךָ	καὶ ἔσται <u>ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ</u> <u>ἀναπαύσει</u> σε ὁ θεός

But while the verbal referent of 'rest' in 14:3 connects its themes to 14:1, the temporal phrase בְּיוֹם is referentially less clear. Does this phrase refer to the former 'day of Yhwh'? Or, does it refer to the more proximate event of Israel's return? While both readings of the Hebrew are possible, the Greek text clarifies this exegetical openness by inserting the far demonstrative pronoun ἐκεῖνος. This term undoubtedly refers readers back to the 'day of Yhwh' in chapter 13.[109]

But the two referents of the 'day of Yhwh' need not be opposed since both themes are present in 14:3. It appears that the translator understood the Hebrew text at this point to signify two realities: בְּיוֹם refers to the fourfold 'day of Yhwh' in 13:1-22 and also to Israel's return in 14:1-2. And this is in my estimation precisely what the Hebrew text means; the temporal event of 'the day of Yhwh' is multifaceted. Here, the 'day of Yhwh' refers to a two-sided event, one where Babylon is destroyed and the other where Israel returns from exile.[110] The translator seems to have picked up on this pattern and emphasized the close association of these themes by employing the Greek far demonstrative pronoun ἐκεῖνος.[111]

Thus, the translator has inserted the demonstrative pronoun with the effect of bridging the literary-structural gap which was interrupted by the oracular interlude in Isa 14:1-2. And by adding the pronoun ἐκεῖνος at 14:3, the translator demonstrated that he was not only aware of the

---

[108]See Kaiser (1974), 26; Watts (2005), 262; Roberts (2015), 203.

[109]The use of a near demonstrative οὗτος would have maintained the ambiguity which the Hebrew text allows. But the translator interprets the text for us with the far demonstrative and thus joins the two chapters together conceptually.

[110]See Hiers (1992), 2:82-83; Barker (2012), 132-143.

[111]The translator of Greek Isaiah rarely renders the term יוֹם without the pronoun הַהוּא as ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ. See Isa 10:17-18; 14:3, 14:4; 30:25; 38:13.

cohesive literary structure of the Hebrew text, but that he also sought to present this literary structure even amidst deviation from the Hebrew text itself.[112]

To press this point further, we must consider the occurrence of another temporal referent in Isa 14:4. Similar to the previous example, the evidence from this verse strengthens the case that the translator sought to explicate the literary structure of the Hebrew text through deviating features in the Greek:

Isa 14:3	וְהָיָה בְּיוֹם הָנִיחַ יְהוָה לְךָ	καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἀναπαύσει σε ὁ θεός
Isa 14:4b	וְאָמָרְתָּ אֵיךְ שָׁבַת נֹגֵשׂ	καὶ ἐρεῖς ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ Πῶς ἀναπέπαυται ὁ ἀπαιτῶν

Isaiah 14:4 contains another translational addition which heightens the temporal referent of the discourse. But in contrast to the example of 14:3, the translator here inserted the entire phrase ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ where the Hebrew text contains no temporal referent at all.[113]

The insertion of this whole phrase strengthens the case that the translator intentionally connected the temporal referent of chapter 14 with the references mentioned in chapter 13. This translational deviation—from וְאָמָרְתָּ to καὶ ἐρεῖς ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ—turns out to have no lexical justification in its Hebrew source. Thus, the translator is lexically 'free' in his translation approach at this point. However, at the level of literary structure, it is quite 'literal.' The translator's lexical deviation actually strengthens the overall coherence of the Hebrew text's literary structure. Such coherence is present in the Hebrew text, but it is emphasized and heightened in the Greek though intentional additions.

The 'day of Yhwh' occurs when Babylon is destroyed in Isa 13:1-22. But it is also the day when Israel both rests from oppression and raises up a taunt to the king of Babylon in Isa 14:3-4. The translator conveyed this thematic-structure parallel by emphasizing the 'day of Yhwh' in 14:3-4 even when such explicit lexical items are absent in the Hebrew text. As I illustrated above, these translational deviations make the most sense when we understand that the

---

[112]Van der Vorm-Croughs (2014), 450, takes note of the lexical addition ἐκεῖνος under the heading of 'assimilation to fixed biblical phrases' but does not highlight the structural purpose it plays here.

[113]Van der Vorm-Croughs (2014), 322, likewise notes this addition and indicates that it exists due to anaphoric translation, or contextual harmonization and exegesis in Greek Isaiah. Just like my previous observation about her work, van der Vorm-Croughs is correct but not comprehensive in her evaluation. The structural intentionality of these lexical additions is a point she neglects to notice.

translator sought to convey the structural integrity of the passage before him by explicating what is thematically and structurally implicit in the Hebrew text. The resultant translation is a text with heightened emphases, one 'more coherent' than its *Vorlage*, yet all the while conveying that source text's very own internal patterns.

The Inhabited City-World as οἰκουμένη

We can also see paralleled settings of the inhabited city-world, or the οἰκουμένη, in the larger literary structure of Isa 13:1-14:23. To begin, we need to see how the Hebrew text conveys various senses of the locative-setting with relatively few lexemes:

Isa 13:5a	בָּאִים מֵאֶרֶץ מֶרְחָק מִקְצֵה הַשָּׁמָיִם	ἔρχεσθαι ἐκ τῆς πόρρωθεν ἀπ᾽ ἄκρου θεμελίου τοῦ οὐρανοῦ
	They come from a distant land, from the end of the heavens.	*to come from a far land, from the high foundation of heaven*
Isa 13:5b	לְחַבֵּל כָּל־הָאָרֶץ	τοῦ καταφθεῖραι τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην
	to destroy all the earth	*to destroy the whole inhabited world*
Isa 13:13b	וְתִרְעַשׁ הָאָרֶץ מִמְּקוֹמָהּ	ἡ γῆ σεισθήσεται ἐκ τῶν θεμελίων αὐτῆς
	And the earth shall shake from its place	*And the earth will be shaken from its foundations*
Isa 13:14d	וְאִישׁ אֶל־אַרְצוֹ יָנוּסוּ	καὶ ἄνθρωπον εἰς τὴν χώραν αὐτοῦ διῶξαι
	And each shall flee to his own land	*and a man shall flee to his own country*

In these examples, the Hebrew term אֶרֶץ conveys minimally three distinct senses. In 13:5a, the term signifies a geographical region distinct from the telic destination conveyed by the term in 13:5b. The term in 13:13b may convey the same sense at 13:5b, but it may also signify something more expansive, especially in light of the verse's own heaven and earth parallelism.[114] The occurrence of אֶרֶץ in 13:14 conveys a narrower locative sense than the others as it most likely refers to a section within a larger geographical space which is associated with a distinct people.[115]

In the oracular context, each of these land references concerns the arrival of the Medes against the kingdom of Babylon. And so, the senses I have attributed to אֶרֶץ above reflect this literary setting. Thus, it is fair to say that the translator of Greek Isaiah picked up on these

[114]The whole relevant portion of the text reads: עַל־כֵּן שָׁמַיִם אַרְגִּיז וְתִרְעַשׁ הָאָרֶץ מִמְּקוֹמָהּ׃

[115]The parallel phrase at 13:14c confirms this analysis: אִישׁ אֶל־עַמּוֹ יִפְנוּ.

semantic nuances to a large degree.[116] This sampling above demonstrates that the Hebrew text itself expresses various meanings for the Hebrew term אֶרֶץ even within a relatively short section of discourse. And the translator also understood these semantic nuances and explicated them with divergent Greek lexemes: γῆ, οἰκουμένη, χώρα.[117]

With that said, it is apposite to move toward the macro-structural implications of the geographical setting in the Hebrew and Greek texts. The following examples illustrate how the translator of Greek Isaiah was aware of the location-setting referents in the Hebrew text of this oracle and sought to convey this structural intentionality in his translation:[118]

Isa 13:5	לְחַבֵּל כָּל־הָאָרֶץ	τοῦ καταφθεῖραι τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην
Isa 13:9	לָשׂוּם הָאָרֶץ לְשַׁמָּה	θεῖναι τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην ἔρημον
Isa 13:11	וּפָקַדְתִּי עַל־תֵּבֵל רָעָה	καὶ ἐντελοῦμαι τῇ οἰκουμένῃ ὅλῃ κακά
Isa 14:17	שָׂם תֵּבֵל כַּמִּדְבָּר	ὁ θεὶς τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην ἔρημον

The consistent use of the term οἰκουμένη in these verses suggests that the translator of Greek Isaiah sought to convey lexical, thematic, and geographical continuity across chapters 13 and 14. Regardless of whether the Hebrew text actually suggests such monolithic referents is beside the point. As the varied geographical renderings in the examples above illustrated earlier, the translator was not bound to render his Hebrew text with such uniform terminology. But the repetition of οἰκουμένη here suggests that the translator saw such unity of referent in these examples. The meaning of οἰκουμένη in these verses should be understood as 'the inhabited

[116]Regardless of whether we agree with the translator's understanding and interpretation of these distinct senses, we should still recognize that he was himself aware of the semantic differences present in the discourse.

[117]For other instances of אֶרֶץ in the Babylon oracle, see Isa 14:7; 14:9; 14:12; 14:16; 14:20; 14:21. All of these occurrences correspond with the Greek term γῆ. Isaiah 14:21 contains תֵּבֵל paired with γῆ and the use of מָקוֹם in 13:13 and 14:2 may also demonstrate these Greek and Hebrew nuances. Just as the term אֶרֶץ has many semantic referents in the discourse, so do other terms like תֵּבֵל and מָקוֹם. For תֵּבֵל, see Isa 13:11; 14:17; 14:21. For מָקוֹם, see 13:13 and 14:2.

[118]LXX.D, 2542 also takes note of this lexical repetition.

world.'[119] And I contend that the repetition of this Greek term suggests that we read the same referent across the examples.

Thus, the translator has perceived a pattern in the Hebrew text where human political establishments are at some level destroyed. And in specific instances he chose to render the Hebrew text with the Greek term οἰκουμένη. This translational decision created a text with more explicit lexical unity than the Hebrew even though this same Hebrew text implicitly required these interpretive and semantic distinctions. Thus, the reader of the Greek text is compelled to associate each instance of οἰκουμένη with the same socio-political referent.

One additional feature which further substantiates this connection is the use of the adjective ὅλος in the examples under consideration. Here, we can see both the exegetical and literary-structural approach of the translator:[120]

Isa 13:5	לְחַבֵּל כָּל־הָאָרֶץ	τοῦ καταφθεῖραι τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην
Isa 13:9	לָשׂוּם הָאָרֶץ לְשַׁמָּה	θεῖναι τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην ἔρημον
Isa 13:11	וּפָקַדְתִּי עַל־תֵּבֵל רָעָה	καὶ ἐντελοῦμαι τῇ οἰκουμένῃ ὅλῃ κακά
Isa 14:17	שָׂם תֵּבֵל כַּמִּדְבָּר	ὁ θεὶς τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην ἔρημον

Isaiah 13:5 constitutes the only example above which lexically supports the inclusion of the adjective ὅλος from the Hebrew. Thus, the rendering οἰκουμένη ὅλη and its morphological variations throughout the remainder of these examples exhibit clear lexical deviation from the Hebrew text.[121] However, this deviation serves as another structural marker to the already firm

---

[119]Here I supply the general gloss 'inhabited world' for οἰκουμένη. This meaning fits well in the oracle and accurately conveys the semantics of both תֵּבֵל and אֶרֶץ in context. GELS, 487 helpful clarifies this sense: "as against ἔρημος." This is also the primary sense of οἰκοουμένη in Philo and Josephus. Of note, even before οἰκουμένη comes to mean 'Roman Empire' in the first centuries B.C. and A.D., the term does in fact refer to the world of Greek politics: πᾶσ' ἡ οἰκουμένη 'the Greek world' in Demosthenes, *De Corona* 18.48. See LSJ, 1205; BrillDAG, 1431. For the meaning 'Roman Empire,' see Bauer, 699; Lampe 944.

[120]Van der Vorm-Croughs (2014), 42-43, states: "Each time that ὅλος is a plus, it is joined to γῆ or οἰκουμένη. . . . Presumably ὅλος was added in assimilation to the fixed expression כל־הארץ which recurs repeatedly throughout the book of Isaiah, particularly in passages dealing with God's judgment of the world. The LXX renders this phrase οἰκουμένη ὅλη or πᾶσα ἡ γῆ. See 6:3; 10:14, 23; 12:5; 13:5; 14:26; 25:8; 28:22; 37:11 (LXX); and 37:18 (LXX)." This pattern within Greek Isaiah is significant. But van der Vorm-Croughs' observations do not not account for the literary structural implications of the examples treated here.

[121]The combination of οἰκουμένη and ὅλος occurs eight times in Greek Isaiah: 10:14; 10:23; 13:5; 13:9; 13:11; 14:17; 14:26; 37:18. Only the examples in chapters 13 and 14 evidence the addition of ὅλος into the phrase. Thus, this feature appears to be unique to these chapters alone in Greek Isaiah. Apart from these examples

structural point made by the repetitive use of οἰκουμένη discussed above. Readers cannot help but associate all of these references together since the fourfold occurrence of οἰκουμένη joined with ὅλος is unmistakable.

The addition of ὅλος to the structural mix highlights the unity of this thematic section and further coheres the structural integrity of the chapter. This feature illustrates how the translator both understood each chapter of the oracle against Babylon to refer to the same socio-political realties and also how he heightened this coherence through lexical deviation from the Hebrew.[122]

The Desert City

Another less extensive, but nevertheless present, thematic connection is found in the description of the destroyed city as a wilderness.[123] In the Hebrew text, this desolation is expressed with two different lexemes: שַׁמָּה and מִדְבָּר. But the structural significance of the Greek text occurs when recognizing its uniform selection of Greek lexemes:

Isa 13:9	לָשׂוּם הָאָרֶץ לְשַׁמָּה	θεῖναι τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην ἔρημον
	To set the whole earth for destruction	*To set the whole inhabited world as a wilderness*
Isa 14:17	שָׂם תֵּבֵל כַּמִּדְבָּר	ὁ θεὶς τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην ἔρημον
	Who set the inhabited world as a wilderness	*The one who set the whole inhabited world as a wilderness*
Isa 14:23	וְשַׂמְתִּיהָ לְמוֹרַשׁ קִפֹּד	καὶ θήσω τὴν Βαβυλωνίαν ἔρημον ὥστε κατοικεῖν ἐχίνους
	And I will set her as a habitation for the hedgehog	*And I will set Babylonia as a wilderness so that hedgehogs inhabit it*

concerning οἰκουμένη (x7), the adjective ὅλος functions as an addition in one other case with the noun אֶרֶץ / γῆ in Isa 9:18[19]: בְּעֶבְרַת יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת נֶעְתָּם אָרֶץ rendered as διὰ θυμὸν ὀργῆς κυρίου συγκέκαυται ἡ γῆ ὅλη. Since deviation at this point is fairly rare, these patterns strongly suggest intentionality behind the addition of this term.

[122]Another example from Isa 14:26 contains this feature outside the immediate purview of this thesis: זֹאת הָעֵצָה הַיְעוּצָה עַל־כָּל־הָאָרֶץ וְזֹאת הַיָּד הַנְּטוּיָה עַל־כָּל־הַגּוֹיִם׃ rendered as αὕτη ἡ βουλή, ἣν βεβούλευται κύριος ἐπὶ τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην καὶ αὕτη ἡ χεὶρ ἡ ὑψηλὴ ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς οἰκουμένης. This example contains very similar Hebrew deviations like those discussed above.

[123]See thematic parallels at Isa 34;11; 35:1[x2]; 35:2; 35:6.

The conquered land is modified in 13:9 with the term שַׁמָּה ‘desolation’. The translator’s use of the term ἔρημος is understandable, but not entirely appropriate at the semantic level.[124] Nevertheless, this rendering is consistent with the overall patterns of Greek Isaiah.[125] Isaiah 14:17 contains the term מִדְבָּר ‘desert’ rendered more accurately with the same term. So, according to the standards set by the translator, both renderings are expected and normative.

Even though an implicit thematic connection between these two verses exists in the Hebrew text, the heightened thematic and structural uniformity of the Greek text is evident.[126] The translator’s double use of ἔρημος aids in explicating this structural clue. But the coherence is also heightened by the combination of οἰκουμένη and ὅλος in the phrase I mentioned in the previous section. The lexical and semantic parallels are impossible to miss. And these thematic connections are implicit in the Hebrew text since the desolate fate of Babylon in 13:9 structurally parallels the king of Babylon’s very own actions in 14:7.[127]

This case is strengthened as we consider the last example in the above selection. Isaiah 14:23 contains no mention of שַׁמָּה or of מִדְבָּר. Yet, the translator includes the term ἔρημος in his rendering to serve as a syntactical complement to the predicate τὴν Βαβυλωνίαν. Again, the theme of destruction is implicit in the Hebrew text but is not expressed explicitly. The translator’s preference for the lexeme ἔρημος occurs here and continues the thematic and structural coherence of chapters 13 and 14 in a manner similar to what has already been discussed in this chapter. This final deviation from the Hebrew text heightens the implicit themes and structure of the Hebrew text with the result of creating a more coherent and robust presentation of the Hebrew discourse into the Greek. Thus, this lexical addition heightens the

[124]The majority renderings of שַׁמָּה in the Septuagint are ἀφανισμός ‘destruction’ and ἄβατος ‘desolate.’

[125]Of the three instances of שַׁמָּה in Hebrew Isaiah, all are paired with the Greek term ἔρημος. See Isa 5:9; 13:9; 24:12.

[126]The terminology in the two verses is identical in the Greek and nearly so in the Hebrew.

[127]These two verses exhibit thematic irony when considered together. Inasmuch as the king of Babylon turned the inhabited world into a wilderness (14:17), through Median hegemony, Yhwh makes the land of Babylon a desolation (13:9).

thematic and structural prominence of the 'desert' in the oracle against Babylon in a way consonant with the patterns of the Hebrew text.

This implicit structural phenomena is also present at other levels. Isaiah 14:21-23 is thematically related to 14:17 since each selection mentions the inhabited world (תֵּבֵל) and cities (עִיר). And as I mentioned above in the section on mirrored characters, the mention of desert animals and the destruction of the king's descendants may invoke the implicit desert theme. So, in addition to thematic and structural connections with 13:9 and 14:17, warrant for desert themes in these examples may also have arisen from the scene of desolation in 13:20-22. While the term מִדְבָּר is nowhere found in 13:20-22, the idea is everywhere present given both the genealogical destruction in the immediate context and also the list of desert animals mentioned there. Additionally, the connection between the desert animals of 13:20-22 and 34:8-15 discussed above may also have triggered these desert themes in the translator's mind.[128] Thus, emphasis upon Babylon as a forsaken desert has thematic warrant from related passages in the broader literary macro-structure.

Geographical Foundations

Another small set of examples which confirms the translator's overall concern to preserve structural coherence occurs with the use of the Greek term θεμέλιον. Like the examples above, these lexical occurrences further illustrate how a singular term repeated throughout a discourse can function as a thematic and structural lynchpin. The literary effect upon the reader is one of coherence and unity of theme:

Isa 13:5	בָּאִים מֵאֶרֶץ מֶרְחָק מִקְצֵה הַשָּׁמָיִם *They are coming from a distant land, from the end of the heavens*	ἔρχεσθαι ἐκ γῆς πόρρωθεν ἀπ᾽ ἄκρου θεμελίου τοῦ οὐρανοῦ *To come from a far land, from the high foundation of heaven*
Isa 13:13	וְתִרְעַשׁ הָאָרֶץ מִמְּקוֹמָהּ *And the land shall shake from its place*	ἡ γῆ σεισθήσεται ἐκ τῶν θεμελίων αὐτῆς *The land will be shaken from its foundations*
Isa 14:15	אֶל־יַרְכְּתֵי־בוֹר	καὶ εἰς τὰ θεμέλια τῆς γῆς

[128]Isaiah 34-35 contain several implicit and explicit references to the desert. Since we know that this text impacted the translator's renderings in 13:20-22, it is just as plausible for them to have influenced him in chapter 14 as well. See Angelini (2015): 33-43.

To the farthest parts of the pit *And into the foundations of the earth*

The term θεμέλιον is employed in Greek Isaiah several times without an overarching pattern of Hebrew correspondence.[129] But throughout Isaiah this term most frequently corresponds with the Hebrew root יסד 'to found.' Yet, we see none of these occurrences in the examples above. Furthermore, in these examples no detectable patterns occur between θεμέλιον and corresponding Hebrew pairs. Θεμέλιον in these examples renders three different Hebrew terms: מִקְצֵה 'end,' מָקוֹם 'place,' יְרֵכָה 'farthest part.'[130] This phenomena suggests that some type of literary intention informed these decisions. We must ask, then, whether this feature is justified by the literary structure.

The translator does not seem to have any thematic motives for employing this term in the structural context. And unlike the thematic prominence of the 'desert' in the previous discussion, the thematic importance of 'foundation' does not have the same type of discursive prominence. However, the translator seems to recognize that each verse presented above speaks in some way about geographical or spatial boundaries. And so his choice to emphasize each of these expressions with θεμέλιον shows that this element of the text had some discursive significance to his mind.[131] The effect is a macro-structural lexical unity conveyed through mentioning geographical foundations through the singular lexeme θεμέλιον. This takes place in spite of the fact that the use of θεμέλιον diverges from the Hebrew lexical sense(s) in the oracle.

This example does not have much explanatory power on its own. But as part of the overall thrust of this chapter, it appears to correspond with the translator's thematic and macro-structural concerns of unity and coherence. So, given the conceptual, thematic, and structural

---

[129]See Isa 13:5; 13:13; 14:15; 24:18; 25:2; 28:16^{x2}; 40:21; 44:23; 54:11; 58:12.

[130]The noun יְרֵכָה occurs 28 times in the Hebrew Bible and signifies either the 'rear' of a building or a 'far part' geographically. On the whole, it appears that the Septuagint translators understood the semantics of this term, rendering it in the following ways: παρατείνω, ὀπίσω, μηρός, ἐσώτερος, ἄκρος, βάθος, χωρίζω, προΐστημι, κοῖλος, πλεῦρον, κλίτος, ἔσχατος. The use of ἔσχατος dominates the Hebrew and Greek pairings throughout the Septuagint. The translation of בְּיַרְכְּתֵי צָפוֹן as ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρη τὰ ὑψηλὰ τὰ πρὸς βορρᾶν in 14:13 deviates from the semantics of the Hebrew. But this rendering supplies a meaning that is structurally and semantically pleasing.

[131]See van der Vorm-Croughs (2014), 37n24: "In all likelihood, the translator has borrowed θεμέλιος from verse 13. . . . Compare further τὰ θεμέλια τῆς γῆς in LXX Isa 14:15; 24:18; and 40:21."

parallels of chapters 13:1-14:23, the divergent use of θεμέλιον as a structural marker has some lexical explanatory power.

Furthermore, it is worth nothing that the terminological uniformity of θεμέλιον may have gained its prominence in light of the heaven and earth merism found in chapter 13. I provide the previously mentioned examples here for convenience:

Isa 13:5	בָּאִים מֵאֶרֶץ מֶרְחָק מִקְצֵה הַשָּׁמָיִם	ἔρχεσθαι ἐκ γῆς πόρρωθεν ἀπ᾽ ἄκρου θεμελίου τοῦ οὐρανοῦ
Isa 13:13	וְתִרְעַשׁ הָאָרֶץ מִמְּקוֹמָהּ	ἡ γῆ σεισθήσεται ἐκ τῶν θεμελίων αὐτῆς

Each verse listed here contains in its larger context references to the earth and the heavens. Yet, the translator of Greek Isaiah only supplied the term θεμέλιον in each of these verses to refer to one aspect of this merism. Just as verse 5 contains the heaven and earth merism, so does verse 13. And each of these heaven and earth merisms include θεμέλιον in the Greek text. Thus, the double use of this term in these verses appears to be motivated by structural features associated with the heaven and earth merism.

And so, while verses 5 and 13 each contain instances of the heaven and earth theme, the same heaven and earth theme is captured at a larger scale by the double use of the term θεμέλιον in 14:13-15. It is likely, then, that the translator picked up on the double occurrence of θεμέλιον with the heaven and earth merism from chapter 13. And then, he explicated this reference to the geographical foundations at 14:15 in light of the heaven and earth pairing.

Prominence of Mountains

Another suggestive example of intentional deviation for the purpose of heightening the thematic and literary unity occurs with mention of mountains. At three places in the Babylon oracle of 13:1-14:23, the Hebrew text mentions the mountain locale with corresponding Greek renderings. But in one place, the Greek text includes the term ὄρος with no corresponding Hebrew term. The examples below illustrate this feature:

Isa 13:2	עַל הַר־נִשָּׂפָה שְׂאוּ־נֵס	ἐπ᾽ ὄρους πεδινοῦ ἄρατε σημεῖον[132]
	Upon a windswept mountain, raise a signal!	*Upon a flat mountain, raise a sign!*

[132]See chapter 3 for a discussion on πεδινός.

Isa 13:4	קוֹל הָמוֹן בֶּהָרִים דְּמוּת עַם־רָב *A voice of a multitude on the mountains is like a great people*	φωνὴ ἐθνῶν πολλῶν ἐπὶ τῶν ὀρέων ὁμοία ἐθνῶν πολλῶν *A sound of many nations on the mountains is like many nations*
Isa 14:13	וְאֵשֵׁב בְּהַר־מוֹעֵד בְּיַרְכְּתֵי צָפוֹן *And I shall sit upon the mountain of assembly at the far parts of the north*	καθιῶ ἐν ὄρει ὑψηλῷ ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρη τὸ ὑψηλὰ τὰ πρὸς βορρᾶν *I will sit on a high mountain at the high regions in the north*
Isa 14:19	וְאַתָּה הָשְׁלַכְתָּ מִקִּבְרְךָ כְּנֵצֶר נִתְעָב *But you were thrown from your grave like a rotten branch*	σὺ δὲ ῥιφήσῃ ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν ὡς νεκρὸς ἐβδελυγμένος *Now you will be thrown among the mountains as a despised corpse*

Isaiah 13:2 and 13:4 set the scene of the ensuing battle upon mountains with the pairing of הַר and ὄρος. The example from 14:13 follows suit as the king of Babylon envisions his mountain dwelling among the the stars of God, on the mount of assembly. However, at 14:19 the translator supplied the term ὄρος without any lexical basis in the Hebrew text.

Deviation from the Hebrew term קֶבֶר 'grave' in this example appears to be intentional since the Hebrew and Greek pairings elsewhere in Isaiah share legitimate semantic overlap.[133] And since all the ancient witnesses of Isaiah agree with the reading of the Masoretic tradition here, we have no evidentiary reason to suppose that the translator possessed a divergent Hebrew reading at this point. Thus, the use of ὄρος in this instance is most likely an intentional deviation. And given the prominence of mountain settings in this oracle, this deviation creates a further structural emphasis upon its thematic importance.

An additional piece of structural evidence occurs just outside of the oracle against Babylon. But it may also indicate that the translator was concerned to emphasize the thematic elements already present in his Hebrew text so as to create a more robust and coherent literary presentation:[134]

---

[133]See Isa 22:16^{x2}; 53:9; 65:4. In these examples, the translator employs μνημεῖον, μνῆμα, ταφή. The semantic correspondences throughout the rest of the Septuagint attest to this understanding. Thus, the use of ὄρος at 14:19 is unique in the whole of the Septuagint.

[134]The use of mountain imagery in Isa 34:3-4 very likely also influenced these lexical choices at Isa 14:19. It is instructive to compare all of Isa 14:19 with Isa 34:3: וְחַלְלֵיהֶם יֻשְׁלָכוּ וּפִגְרֵיהֶם יַעֲלֶה בָאְשָׁם וְנָמַסּוּ הָרִים מִדָּמָם׃ rendered as οἱ δὲ τραυματίαι αὐτῶν ῥιφήσονται καὶ οἱ νεκροί, καὶ ἀναβήσεται αὐτῶν ἡ ὀσμή, καὶ βραχήσεται τὰ ὄρη ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτῶν. The present argument complements the discussion of Isa 34:3-4's influence upon Isa 14:19 unfolded in chapter 4.

Isa 14:25	לִשְׁבֹּר אַשּׁוּר בְּאַרְצִי וְעַל־הָרַי אֲבוּסֶנּוּ	τοῦ ἀπολέσαι τοὺς Ἀσσυρίους ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς τῆς ἐμῆς καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ὀρέων μου

In addition to the thematic and structural importance of mountain settings in the Babylon oracle, the statements against Assyria in Isa 14:24-27 also contain mountain references. These connections should not be overlooked. Themes within the larger literary structure seem to have influenced the translator of Greek Isaiah at this point. The presence of these features accounts for his deviation from such common words like קֶבֶר. In light of the several pieces of evidence already covered, we can see how the translator sought to incorporate elements from the themes from within the Hebrew literary structure to heighten the structural unity and coherence of his translation.[135] The geographical place of imperial destruction in all these instances occurs upon mountains. And so, it was fitting for the translator to emphasize this point at 14:19. Thus, translational deviation at the lexical level serves the purpose of heightening what is present in the Hebrew text at the structural level.

The Land of Yhwh in 14:1-2 and 14:20

This section concludes the discussion of the literary macro-structure in Hebrew and Greek Isaiah. Here, I seek to demonstrate how the translator appropriated from the thematic emphasis upon Yhwh's land at the beginning of chapter 14 and how he then altered the text at the end of the chapter in order to create a literary *inclusio*. This *inclusio* has been discussed earlier in this chapter. But here, I show how an additional translation feature contributes to its construction. This aspect of the translator's work resulted is a more robust and heightened literary structure which is reflective of the Hebrew text even while deviating from its particular lexemes.

First of all, the opening and conclusion of the oracle in chapter 14 is marked by the mention of land. More specifically, mention of land concerns the place to which Israel shall return. But this locale is also designated to be Yhwh's land. This latter point is significant and is seen in the examples below

Isa 14:1	כִּי יְרַחֵם יְהוָה אֶת־יַעֲקֹב	καὶ ἐλεήσει κύριος τὸν Ιακωβ
	וּבָחַר עוֹד בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל	καὶ ἐκλέξεται ἔτι τὸν Ισραηλ,

[135]I elaborate on a similar feature from the oracle against Assyria in the next section of this chapter.

	וְהִנִּיחָם עַל־אַדְמָתָם	καὶ ἀναπαύσονται ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς αὐτῶν,
	וְנִלְוָה הַגֵּר עֲלֵיהֶם	καὶ ὁ γιώρας[136] προστεθήσεται πρὸς αὐτοὺς
	וְנִסְפְּחוּ עַל־בֵּית יַעֲקֹב׃	καὶ προστεθήσεται πρὸς τὸν οἶκον Ιακωβ,
	For Yhwh will have mercy on Jacob; he will choose Israel again; he will cause them to rest on their land; the sojourner shall be joined to them; they shall be attached to the house of Jacob;	*And the Lord will have mercy upon Jacob, and he will again choose Israel, and they will rest upon their land, and the sojourner will be added to them, and he will be added to the house of Jacob.*
Isa 14:2	וּלְקָחוּם עַמִּים	καὶ λήμψονται αὐτοὺς ἔθνη
	וְהֵבִיאוּם אֶל־מְקוֹמָם	καὶ εἰσάξουσιν εἰς τὸν τόπον αὐτῶν,
	וְהִתְנַחֲלוּם בֵּית־יִשְׂרָאֵל	καὶ κατακληρονομήσουσιν καὶ πληθυνθήσονται
	עַל אַדְמַת יְהוָה לַעֲבָדִים וְלִשְׁפָחוֹת	ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς δούλους καὶ δούλας·
	וְהָיוּ שֹׁבִים לְשֹׁבֵיהֶם	καὶ ἔσονται αἰχμάλωτοι οἱ αἰχμαλωτεύσαντες αὐτούς,
	וְרָדוּ בְּנֹגְשֵׂיהֶם׃	καὶ κυριευθήσονται οἱ κυριεύσαντες αὐτῶν.
	the nations shall take them and bring them to their place, and the house of Israel shall possess them upon the land of Yhwh as male and female servants, and they shall capture those who captured them and they shall rule over those oppressed them.	*And the nations will take them and bring them into their place, and they will inherit it and be multiplied upon the land of God as male and female servants; and those who captured them shall be captured, and those who ruled over them shall be ruled over.*

In these examples, the Hebrew text identifies the locale under investigation in three ways: עַל־אַדְמָתָם in 14:1, אֶל־מְקוֹמָם in 14:2, עַל אַדְמַת יְהוָה in 14:2. Contextually, each of these references parallel one another: Israel's land and place is also Yhwh's land. The translator of Greek Isaiah merely picks up this connection by rendering each of these examples straightforwardly: γῆ pairs with אֲדָמָה and τόπος pairs with מָקוֹם.

These observations become significant as we examine a structural parallel in Isa 14:20-21 which describes the final destruction of the king of Babylon. As we have seen before, Israel's return corresponds with Babylon's demise. In this passage we see several references to land which in part evoke this parallel:

Isa 14:20	לֹא־תֵחַד אִתָּם בִּקְבוּרָה	οὕτως οὐδὲ σὺ ἔσῃ καθαρός,
	כִּי־אַרְצְךָ שִׁחַתָּ עַמְּךָ הָרָגְתָּ	διότι τὴν γῆν μου ἀπώλεσας καὶ τὸν λαόν μου ἐπέκτεινας·

[136]See the treatment of γιώρας in chapter 4.

	לֹא־יִקָּרֵא לְעוֹלָם זֶרַע מְרֵעִים׃ *You shall not be united with them in burial, for you destroyed your land and you killed your people; the seed of wickedness shall not be named forever.*	οὐ μὴ μείνῃς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα χρόνον, σπέρμα πονηρόν. *So, neither will you be clean, because you destroyed my land and you killed my people; you will not abide forever, O evil seed.*
Isa 14:21	הָכִינוּ לְבָנָיו מַטְבֵּחַ בַּעֲוֹן אֲבוֹתָם בַּל־יָקֻמוּ וְיָרְשׁוּ אָרֶץ וּמָלְאוּ פְנֵי־תֵבֵל עָרִים׃ *Prepare slaughter for his sons because of the iniquity of their fathers lest they would arise and inherit the land and they fill the face of the earth with cities.*	ἑτοίμασον τὰ τέκνα σου σφαγῆναι ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις τοῦ πατρός σου, ἵνα μὴ ἀναστῶσιν καὶ <u>τὴν γῆν</u> κληρονομήσωσιν καὶ ἐμπλήσωσι <u>τὴν γῆν</u> πόλεων. *Prepare your children to be slaughtered for the sins of your father in order that they may not arise and inherit the land and fill the earth with cities.*

Granting the structural significance of the land parallel, we must take note of the Greek text. The translator rendered the land reference straightforwardly into his work just as he did in 14:1-2. But his deviations from the Hebrew at 14:20 follow the thrust of the chapter's opening. Here, the translator deviated from the specific morphology of the Hebrew and altered its second person pronominal referents. Whereas the Hebrew text mentions אַרְצְךָ 'your land' and עַמְּךָ 'your people' with reference to the second person singular, the translator instead captured the first person singular referent with τὴν γῆν μου 'my land' and τὸν λαόν μου 'my people.' This shift toward the first person singular seems to deviate from both the Hebrew lexeme and also from the context since Yhwh is not specifically identified as the speaker.[137] But the first person deviation in the Greek also serves to link readers back to the opening of the chapter where the land mentioned specifically belonged to Yhwh.

This deviation corresponds with the overarching pattern I have sought to illustrate regarding Greek Isaiah's macro-structural motivations. The translator has created a text which heightens the thematic and literary structural patterns of the Hebrew text even when he himself deviated from strict lexical renderings. Translational deviations in instances such as these

[137]We do not encounter the shift to the first person singular until 14:22, but the translator seems to read 14:20 in light of this latter discursive shift. Using this type of proleptic feature would not be unattested for the translator's own work. Further, that Yhwh is speaking here is suggested by the material from 14:24-25 in following oracle against Assyria. I discuss this evidence below.

demonstrate the translator's concern to emphasize what was already present in the Hebrew, but also his concern to explicate it through divergence. Thus, these features suggest that the translator of Greek Isaiah viewed the work before him in a holistic fashion as he sought to communicate its larger thematic and structural features.

The Hebrew and Greek evidence from Isa 14:25 is also of interest for this discussion. Even though this passage remains outside the scope of the Babylon oracle, its proximity to this discourse makes it relevant to the previous thematic and structural survey. I present the data here:[138]

Isa 14:25	לְשָׁבֹר אַשּׁוּר	τοῦ ἀπολέσαι τοὺς Ἀσσυρίους
	בְּאַרְצִי וְעַל־הָרַי אֲבוּסֶנּוּ	ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς τῆς ἐμῆς καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ὀρέων μου,
	וְסָר מֵעֲלֵיהֶם עֻלּוֹ	καὶ ἔσονται εἰς καταπάτημα καὶ ἀφαιρεθήσεται ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν ὁ ζυγὸς αὐτῶν
	וְסֻבֶּלּוֹ מֵעַל שִׁכְמוֹ יָסוּר׃	καὶ κῦδος αὐτῶν ἀπὸ τῶν ὤμων ἀφαιρεθήσεται.

The double occurrence of the first person singular suffix in the Hebrew terms אֶרֶץ and הַר may also have influenced the translator's renderings at 14:20. Here, no deviation from the first person singular pronoun occurs. The phrase בְּאַרְצִי is rendered as ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς τῆς ἐμῆς which emphasized the first person already present in the Hebrew. And the phrase וְעַל־הָרַי likewise stands behind the Greek ἀπὸ τῶν ὀρέων μου. Just like the opening verses of chapter 14, the translator here rendered the text straightforwardly. But in doing so, he captured the first person singular emphasis upon the land as Yhwh's own possession. And references to the land of Yhwh from this verse alongside that of the opening chapter suggest that the first person singular pronominal deviations in 14:20 were influenced by features such as these.

This evidence from 14:25 confirms the translator's overall tendency to appropriate from the literary structure and context when he deviated from the Hebrew text. The translator was not conceptually bound to contemporary verse divisions. Thus, it is likely that the translator picked up on both of these references to Yhwh's land and rendered his Greek text accordingly at 14:20. And the deviations at 14:20 likely illustrate the translator's awareness of larger contextual and structural features of the Hebrew text. He sought to capitalize upon these features in the construction of a more coherent and robust literary structure. And influence of 14:25 upon the

[138]Mention of burden and yoke in the Hebrew text is reminiscent of the slavery themes in Isa 14:1-3.

oracle against Babylon shows how even larger themes in the book of Isaiah influenced the translator. He does not divide up the book like we do, but instead views it as a coherent literary whole and alters the text to heighten what he thinks is thematically and structurally relevant.

Conclusion

I have argued in this chapter that the translator of Greek Isaiah freely appropriated features from the literary macro-structure of Isa 13:1-14:23 in order to create a more robust and coherent presentation of his *Vorlage*'s own literary structure. I argued for this position by presenting examples relevant to structural and thematic parallels in the Hebrew text. Then I illustrated how the translator of Greek Isaiah heightened such features through lexical deviation from his source text. But instead of such deviations obscuring the meaning of the Hebrew text, they in fact strengthen features of the literary macro-structure situated therein.

Chapter 7: Conclusion

In this thesis, I pursued a translation technical analysis of the oracle against Babylon and her king in Greek Isaiah 13:1-14:23 from two distinct perspectives. I began by surveying select examples from these two chapters and highlighting their literary and stylistic features. Then I explored these same chapters at the level of the literary micro- and macro-structure, highlighting the translator's awareness of the Hebrew text's literary structure and his appropriation of these features into the Greek. The latter of these perspectives largely constitutes an original contribution to the field of Greek Isaiah research.

Throughout this analysis, I demonstrated that 'free' renderings in Greek Isaiah often serve the purpose of explicating and heightening the literary and structural features implicit in the Hebrew text. Instead of constructing features of a coherent translation which was ideologically independent from the source text, as we see with the 'actualization' thesis, the translator of Greek Isaiah derived translational coherence in large part from the Hebrew text itself. And even though some features of Greek Isaiah arose without literary or structural motivations, such as divergences in clause structure from Hebrew to Greek, lexical and semantic misunderstanding influenced by interference from post-Biblical Hebrew and Aramaic, and alternative construals of consonantal orthography, the abundance of translation features originating from the Hebrew text itself illustrates the literary and structural emphases with which the translator approached his work.

Chapter 1 began the thesis by surveying the history of relevant Greek Isaiah research which has shaped the field with respect to Greek Isaiah's provenance, translation characteristics, literary features, and linguistic milieu. In this thesis, I built upon this previous translation technical research by pursuing an original investigation into the translator's interest to preserve the literary structure of the Hebrew text. In chapter 2, I introduced the terminology and methods of Septuagint research wherein I discussed a range of prolegomena: the spectrum of 'free' and 'literal' translations, linguistic methodology, questions pertaining to Greek Isaiah's *Vorlage*, manuscripts, textual criticism, and contemporary editions of Greek Isaiah, several facets of

literary structure in the Septuagint, hermeneutical assumptions. I then outlined in brief the global aims of the thesis chapter by chapter.

Chapter 3 began with a methodological and theoretical discussion of recent treatments of literary, stylistic, and intertextual features in the Septuagint. Then I provided 10 examples from Isa 13:1-22 which illustrated the translator's concern to capture his Hebrew text through 'free' renderings from the perspective of style and intertextuality. Chapter 4 continued this thread of discussion by exploring 7 examples from Isa 14:1-23. These examples display the same types of literary, stylistic, and intertextual features present in the previous chapter. In both of these chapters, I highlighted the translator's concern to faithfully present his source text in a stylish and contextual way by including Greek literary features and intertextual allusions throughout his work.

The next two chapters treated the issue of literary structure from the perspectives of its micro- and macro-structural details. In chapter 5, I discussed features of the literary micro-structure in Isa 13:1-14:23. Here, I explored 7 instances where the translator of Greek Isaiah explicated and heightened features of the Hebrew text at the micro-level in order to strengthen its structural tenacity in the Greek. The translator developed such micro-structures by supplying and repeating unique lexemes lacking in the Hebrew, by adjusting semantic referents, and by highlighting the discourse with well-placed markers. Even though these translational features were formally absent in the Hebrew text, they were nonetheless literarily implicit. As such, the translator of Greek Isaiah heightened these implicit literary-micro structures. In doing so, he created a text containing a more robust and explicit structure than his source text. But all the while the translation is consonant and evocative of what is latent in the Hebrew.

In chapter 6, I delineated features of the literary macro-structure of Isa 13:1-14:23 from two angles. First, I explored structural parallels between Isaiah 13 and 14 and concluded that the translator sought to incorporate macro-structural features into the Greek text despite his deviations from the Hebrew. I then explored themes embedded in the literary structure of the Hebrew and explained how the translator explicated and heightened them in the Greek. These explications illustrated how Greek Isaiah was structured at the macro-level in order to preserve the implicit literary structure of the Hebrew text.

This thesis has implications for previous and future Greek Isaiah research. Regarding previous research, my analysis and proposal further rebuts the actualization thesis advocated by Isac Seeligmann and Arie van der Kooij. And while I did not aim to thoroughly refute this position, my analysis demonstrates that the translator was globally concerned to construct his text in light of literary, intertextual, and structural features. This is especially relevant since proponents of actualization have appealed to Isa 14:12-15 as an encoded reference to Antiochus IV Epiphanes. But since such literary, intertextual, and structural features sufficiently explain the phenomena in Greek Isaiah at this point, we need not appeal to external socio-political events which may have informed the translation process, especially since positive evidence for actualization is wanting. The epistemic rationale for this position was first outlined in chapter 1.

While the discussion of translation technique in chapters 3 and 4 explored new material in the history of Greek Isaiah research, investigation into the structural features of the Septuagint in chapters 5 and 6 introduced a more nuanced approach for academic interest in Greek Isaiah. In that sense, this project was exploratory and sought to assess whether such features could be discovered in Greek Isaiah. This initial step of uncovering structural patterns in the Septuagint and in Greek Isaiah should proceed and develop more methodological constraints as future researchers pursue this question.

Much work still needs to be completed on several Isaianic literary structures if my thesis proposal is to be accepted as an accurate description of the translator's holistic approach. The oracle against Moab in Isa 15:1-16:14, the antithetical destruction and renewal passages in Isa 34:1-35:10, and the long narrative of Isa 36:1-39:8 would each provide meaningful avenues of research to confirm and clarify the approach of this doctoral thesis. Each of these examples are well-structured in the Hebrew and constitute manageable test cases to develop a method for investigating features of literary structure in Greek Isaiah. I hope that future researchers will assess elements of this project and verify, falsify, refine, and modify my approach in order to construct a clearer picture of Greek Isaiah's translation features.

The literary structural proposal of this thesis demands more from Greek Isaiah research. It requires that we attend to the translator's textual work beyond the level of the lexeme

and the clause. We must instead read at the levels of the literary structure and of the whole text. It sets forth the challenge to read Isaiah as the translator himself did, with the ‘right sort of mind.’

Appendix 1:
The Exegetical Difficulty in Isaiah 13:2

To further defend my proposal in the body of this thesis, I provide here a defense for my interpretation of Isa 13:2. Several difficulties in this verse require attention, especially in light of my divergence from the majority of interpreters. However, understandings of this verse are so varied that even a well-defended minority position should be permitted a hearing. To set forth my interpretive proposal, I first highlight the difficulties in the Hebrew and Greek versions of Isa 13:2, and then engage with a range of ancient and contemporary interpreters. I conclude with my own proposal, where I revisit the meaning of the Hebrew text and explain the Greek plus at Isa 13:2b´.

The Hebrew text of Isaiah 13:2 at minimum contains two significant difficulties. And when we consider the Greek, a third interpretive variable emerges. The overarching interpretive questions to answer for this verse concern the identities of both the imperatival addressee and that of the RECIPIENT of the imperatival actions. Relevant material is supplied here:

Isa 13:2a	עַל הַר־נָשָׂפָה שְׂאוּ־נֵס	ἐπ᾽ ὄρους πεδινοῦ ἄρατε σημεῖον
	Upon a bare mountain, lift up a standard;	*Upon a flat mountain, raise a sign;*
Isa 13:2b	הָרִימוּ קוֹל לָהֶם	ὑψώσατε τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῖς
	Lift up a voice to them!	*Lift up the voice to them;*
Isa 13:2b´	—	[+] μὴ φοβεῖσθε
	—	*Do not be afraid;*
Isa 13:2c	הָנִיפוּ יָד	παρακαλεῖτε τῇ χειρί
	Wave a hand	*Summon with the hand;*
Isa 13:2d	וְיָבֹאוּ פִּתְחֵי נְדִיבִים	Ἀνοίξατε, οἱ ἄρχοντες[1]
	so that they would enter the gates of the nobles.	*Open up, O rulers!*

In this passage, no addressee is explicitly identified; it is simply assumed. Likewise, the identity of the imperatival RECIPIENT is also enigmatic.[2] Childs agrees: "Those executing the divine

[1]The Greek text omits the third person plural form and does not preserve the second and third person interaction in this verse. See Barthélemy (1986), 90-92; van der Vorm-Croughs (2014), 263, 393, who categorizes this feature as an *ellipsis*: "the omission of a word (often a verb) which can easily be understood in the context."

[2]Difficulty identifying the characters is also present in the Greek text. See Penner (2020), 529: "The announcement of Lord Sabaoth's coming wrath in 13:2 is presented in vivid imagery, full of sights and sounds. It begins with a series of imperatives, leaving the reader wondering who is being addressed." See also page 530: "The second imperative to raise the voice to 'them' still does not identify any of addressees: who is being commanded,

judgment and those receiving it are undefined as yet."[3] The ensuing discussion seeks to clarify this interpretive difficulty in the Hebrew text before addressing the idiosyncratic feature in the Greek text at 13:2b´.[4]

History of Interpretation Overview

In this section, I survey the strengths and weaknesses of several ancient and contemporary interpreters. Regarding the initial summons to raise a signal, Eusebius situates the passage in terms of God's address to angels: "[God] commands the angels at attention to raise a signal on a mountain in the plain" and "[God] commands the angels around him to open the doors."[5] Jerome likewise recognizes the difficulty: "It is commanded either to angels or any servants that the captivity of Babylon is declared to be coming by God's command and by the raised hand of messengers."[6] Kilian reads the phrase in this manner as well: "*In [2f] werden wohl Herolde des himmlischen Hofstaates beauftragt, die Krieger (Jahwes) zusammenzurufen*."[7] And Watts' interpretation follows suit, noting that chapter 13 "sets the scene in the Heavenly Council."[8]

However, while prophetic visionary experiences are occasionally set within in the divine council in an explicit way (cf. Isa 6:1-13), the Babylon oracle is silent about such matters.

---

and who is supposed to hear those voices. Nor is it immediately clear whether μὴ φοβεῖσθε, παρακαλεῖσθε is addressed to the same people as ἄρατε and ὑψώσατε, or to αὐτοῖς. . . . With οἱ ἄρχοντες, an addressee is finally specified, but again it is not clear whether they are the addressees of ἄρατε and ὑψώσατε or those referred to by αὐτοῖς."

[3]Childs (2001), 124. See also Zapff (1995), 33: "*In Jes 5,26 ist es Jahwe selbst, der das Zeichen aufstellt . . ., während in Jes 13,2 Jahwe lediglich nicht näher Bezeichnete dazu aufruft, das Zeichen zu errichten*."

[4]The discussion here represents investigation into the following works: Gray (1949); Young (1965); Erlandsson (1970); Kaiser (1974); Kilian (1994); Zapff (1995); Wildberger (1997); Blenkinsopp (2000); Childs (2001); Motyer (2003); Watts (2005); Tull (2010); Armstrong (2013); Scheck (2015); Alter (2019); House (2019); Penner (2020).

[5]Armstrong (2013), 72-73.

[6]Scheck (2015), 228.

[7]Kilian (1994), 96.

[8]Watts (2005), 195.

Instead, just like the widely recognized paralleled visions at Isa 1:1 and 2:1, the oracular vision here is portrayed simply as a discourse without any reference to an heavenly court. Thus, the absence of any lexical or thematic reference to such a setting simply begs the question in its assertion.

Among the interpreters of Isa 13:2 I explored, Wildberger provided the most thorough discussion on this passage. As such, he serves as a helpful springboard for understanding the difficulties in verse 2. He identifies the imperatival addresses as "messengers or heralds" who are "to go out among the peoples of the world to cause them to come near, to be his helpers in the battle . . ."[9] Now while Wildberger refrains from specifically identifying the implicit addressee, he clearly distinguishes between this character and the imperatival RECIPIENT.[10] Thus, a distinction exists between the 'messengers' and the 'helpers in the battle,' the latter of whom he identifies as the Medes: "the consecrated ones," "Yahweh's מקדשׁים," "they are his גבורים," and "they are his **עליזי** נאותי"; "[H]is warriors are referred to in v. 2a only as להם (to them)."[11] Thus, the imperatival addressee cannot be the attacking enemy since the they themselves encourage such warriors. And Wildberger clearly identifies the unstated RECIPIENT in verse 2 with the Median characters involved in the remainder of the chapter. I am in full agreement with these latter characterizations.

However, despite the exegetical precision of these statements, I am not persuaded of Wildberger's overall proposal for Isa 13:2. His identification of the addressee as heralds, servants, or prophets seems to be as vague as the interpretations mentioned earlier. And I don't find his discussion about the phrase פִּתְחֵי נְדִיבִים at all persuasive. Wildberger dissociates the phrase פִּתְחֵי נְדִיבִים 'gates of the nobles' from a reference to Babylon in favor of an appeal to a Median military camp:

---

[9]Wildberger (1997), 18.

[10]Likewise Jerome: "It is commanded either to angels or any servants that the captivity of Babylon is declared to be coming by God's command and by the raised hand of messengers"; "It is not surprising if he calls the Medes sanctified for the overthrow of Babylon. . . . about whom he testifies quite openly in what follows." See Scheck (2015), 228.

[11]Wildberger (1997), 18-19.

> [I]t can hardly already be referring to an entry into Babylon. And it makes no sense at this point, where there is such hesitation even to mention Babylon by name, that its gates would be identified as those of the nobles or princes.[12]

Instead, he suggests that נדיבים means 'freely willing ones' who inhabit a military encampment and "make themselves available when Yahweh summons them to do his bidding."[13] And again on the phrase פִּתְחֵי נְדִיבִים:

> [It] must refer to something like the entrance into the camp, the place where all the troops bivouac, so that one would have to imagine that those who were freely willing would have to go through some gateway, understanding that whoever passed through this entrance would be declaring himself ready to go into battle.[14]

In response to the first comment regarding the absence of a Babylonian referent in verse 2, we must simply note that Babylon has in fact been mentioned by name in 13:1 and will again be mentioned in 13:19, 14:4, and 14:22. And since Babylon is the topic throughout the discourse of 13:1-14:23, it is entirely plausible to identify 'the gates of the nobles' with this Babylonian referent. Furthermore, even though many interpreters rightly identify the Medes as the imperatival RECIPIENT throughout this verse, this Median character is not explicitly identified until verse 17.[15] Wildberger even admits to this latter feature: "One ought not to be put off by the fact that the Medes, or some other people, are not mentioned by name, since 5:26-20, which is very similar to this passage, does not identify the enemy either."[16] Why would this latter reading regarding the Medes be permissible while the former concerning Babylon excluded?

---

[12]Wildberger (1997), 19. See also Watts (2005), 196: "The *gates* may well be the entrance to the camp. By entering the *nobles* swear allegiance and participation in the campaign."

[13]Wildberger (1997), 19. On the same page he provides a defense for this position: "One must interpret נדיבים in the sense which it is used in Judg. 5:2, 9: these are the 'freely willing ones,' who make themselves available when Yahweh summons them to do his bidding." Likewise Watts (2005), 196: "*The gates of nobles*: נדיבים 'nobles' reflects the Song of Deborah (Judg 5:2, 9) where another form of the root describes 'volunteers' for battle." Aquila seems to capture the phrases similarly with εισελθετωσαν ανοιγματα εκουσιαζομενων 'let them enter the doors of the volunteers.'

[14]Wildberger (1997), 19. On the same page, Wildberger admits the difficulty of his proposal: "This interpretation causes problems with the meaning of פתחי."

[15]See Gray (1949), 238. Wildberger's comments on verse 3 also contend for a Median referent. See Wildberger (1997), 20: "Just as, according to 10:5, the Assyrians are the 'rod of anger,' so in this case it is the Medes who are Yahweh's tool."

[16]Wildberger (1997), 18-19.

In addition, the well-recognized links between Isa 13:1 and the visions beginning in Isa 1:1 and 2:1 also lend support to my criticisms of Wildberger's proposal. These earlier visions contain headings which mention Judah and Jerusalem, yet they are hardly mentioned elsewhere in the discourse. Nonetheless, we would be mistaken in missing the larger scope of such headings.

In light of Wildberger's earlier characterization of לָהֶם as referring to a Median RECIPIENT, this proposal seems unnecessarily redundant. If he advocates for a Median referent, why in the context would these warriors be summoned into their own camp instead of being sent out to destroy? We should instead regard the statements of verse 2 in a complementary way to those in 13:3-5: Yhwh summons his host *for battle*. As House notes: "Wildberger may also miss the increasingly specific nature of the directions given the invading troops. The goal is to enter a specific city."[17]

Furthermore, why couldn't the entrance of the camp be identified with the camp of Babylon's army? And apart from the brief mention of the same root נדב in the book of Judges with the meaning 'freely,' Wildberger does not provide evidence against the meaning of נְדִיבִים as 'nobles.' On the whole, his argument engages in special pleading and does not consider the widespread interpretation of this phrase in antiquity.[18] In light of these criticisms of the interpretations above, I now summarize my understanding of the Hebrew text before providing an explanation of the seemingly disruptive Greek plus μὴ φοβεῖσθε in Isa 13:2b′.

Interpretive Counter Proposal

In light of the interpretive disagreements above, I present an approach which aims to resolve the difficulties in Isa 13:2 outlined above. I propose that the identity of this verse's addressee emerges as we consider the identity of the THEME in the final volitive phrase וְיָבֹאוּ

[17]House (2019), 377.

[18]The ancient versions correspond with the Hebrew meaning proposed here: Greek ἄρχων 'ruler'; Aramaic נדב 'to donate; to be devoted to'; Syriac ܢܕܒ 'to rule'; Latin *dux* 'leader.' Aquila's rendering in Codex Q may deviate from this portrait: εισελθετωσαν ανοιγματα εκουσιαζομενων.

פִּתְחֵי נְדִיבִים.[19] And as I noted above, the character of Babylon is the most plausible candidate given both the immediate and broader Isaianic contexts. I will proceed from there and defend that view in due course.

Since the third person plural referent in the phrase 'they enter' expresses the aim of the earlier plural imperatives, the earlier forms should not be understood to have the same addressee-referent as the latter. This is confirmed by the distinction between the third person plural referent of לָהֶם and the second person plural imperatives. It is also substantiated by the strong contextual relationship between the third person plural referents in the pronoun לָהֶם and the verbal phrase וְיָבֹאוּ. The difference in grammatical person-referent makes all the difference. As such, interpreters must clarify these character distinctions. And as mentioned above, the themes and overall context of the Babylon oracle strongly push readers to identify the Medes as both the RECIPIENT of the imperatival address and also as the AGENT of 'entrance.'

Verse 3 continues this Median characterization by identifying them as Yhwh's consecrated agent of destruction.[20] As such, the Median military agents are responsible for the chapter-wide cosmic havoc. And since 13:3 continues the earlier discourse from verse 2, it is only natural to see the Median forces attacking Babylon as that THEME referenced in the volitive phrase above. As Young succinctly notes: "The meeting place is designated as 'the doors of the noble ones,' the Babylonians or Chaldeans at whose gates the soldiers will gather and into which as victors they will enter."[21]

The question to consider at this point concerns the identity of the imperatival

---

[19]The Hebrew syntax [modal form] + [*waw* conjunctive + *yiqtol*] expresses volitive force. See Ross (2001), 153; GBH (2009), 352-357; BHRG (2017), 197-198. Despite slight semantic variation, Aquila (εισελθετωσαν) and Symmachus (εξελθετωσαν) both preserve this syntactical understanding with third person plural hortatory subjunctive.

[20]On this connection between verses 2 and 3, see Childs (2001), 124: "[T]here is a perceptive resonance in v. 3 with the summoning of mighty men to execute the divine anger." With regards to the continuity and gradual unfolding of the characters in verses 2-3, see Erlandsson (1970), 114: "It emerges from v.3 that it is Yahweh himself (**אני**) who is speaking and giving orders for his warriors to come together. Who these mobilized warriors are . . . is not said. At first they are only referred to as 'them' (v.2) and it is only gradually in a very condensed description that 'them' acquires a more palpable significance." Concerning the lifting of the voice 'to them' and the 'they' who enter the nobles' gates, see Alter (2019), 663: "'They' are the troops of the army invading Babylon."

[21]Young (1965), 416.

addressee. This addressee *must* be distinct from the Medes since it is this character who in fact invites the Medes to 'enter the gates' by lifting a banner, raising a voice, and summoning with the hand. And in considering the whole discourse of chapter 13, it is appropriate to identify this addressee as Babylon. It is in fact the only argument which can be supported by both text and context.

As I noted above, the entirety of the oracular discourse concerns Babylon. So it should not be surprising that from the outset it would also be addressed to her. A similar kind of address occurs in the oracle to Philistia in Isa 14:28-32. There, the city and its gates are commanded to wail with terminology resembling the Babylon oracle of the previous chapter.[22] Both oracles are addressed to their respective cities. And both concern future political turmoil. And even though the title Philistia is present the latter discourse while reference to Babylon is formally absent, the remaining lexical, thematic, and structural parallels between these oracles illustrate that national oracles are in fact addressed to these very nations. Unless alternative lexical or thematic elements in a passage direct readers to a different perspective, this should be the *prima facie* understanding of such a discourse.

This address to Babylon as the initiator of her own demise would further parallel the inverted sarcasm present in chapter 14. Just as the king of Babylon has both an ironic taunt hurled at him before the deceased tree-kings rejoice with singing, it would be wholly consistent to portray the kingdom of Babylon in Isa 13:2 as the initiator of her own downfall. And given the dearth of persuasive alternatives to the characterization of the imperatival addressees—divine council or Median forces—the Babylonian addressee remains the most plausible and coherent reading of the passage.

In the end, it is the only proposal that has lexical, thematic, and structural support in light of the Babylon discourse as a whole. In what follows, I propose that the translator of Greek Isaiah read his Hebrew text in accord with the above interpretation. And the plus μὴ φοβεῖσθε in 13:2b′ serves to heighten features of this reading in line with larger thematic and structural parallels in Isaiah.

---

[22]See הֵילִילוּ in 13:6 and הֵילִילִי in 14:31.

Interpreting the Greek Plus at Isaiah 13:2b´

We must now ask whether the translator of Greek Isaiah understood and rendered the passage similarly to my proposal for the Hebrew text above. This comes to the forefront in light of the Greek plus μὴ φοβεῖσθε at Isa 13:2b´, an addition which seems to disrupt the character-consistency for which I previously argued. If Babylon constitutes the imperatival addressee in the series of Greek imperatives, as the initiators of their own destruction, why would they also be instructed not to fear? Why shouldn't the Babylonian addressee be afraid of such cosmic and socio-political upheaval? In response to this difficulty, I still maintain the consistent identity of Babylon as imperatival addressee in 13:2. However, to understand the Greek plus μὴ φοβεῖσθε in this way, we must consider the larger thematic and intertextual patterns so frequent Greek Isaiah.[23]

I first assess the influence of well-recognized Isaianic parallels upon Isa 13:2. Most often referenced are its lexical and thematic parallels in 40:9 and 5:26-30.[24] However, I offer here an alternative perspective which derives from Isa 10:26-30 and proves to be more thematically and structurally related to the Babylon discourse.[25] This latter appeal helps to clarify the Greek plus μὴ φοβεῖσθε which initially appears to disrupt my approach. As a result we will be able to see how the use of this Greek phrase in fact serves to unify these passages at the thematic and structural level.

The language and themes of Isa 40:9 bear striking resemblance to those in Isa 13:2—mountains, voices, fear, encouragement—each of which is rendered with similar Greek terms. And further, the translator's lexical choices in 13:2 are remarkably similar to those in 40:9. Isaiah

[23]On this tendency in Greek Isaiah, see van der Vorm-Croughs (2014), 356: "[T]he number of pluses and minuses in LXX Isaiah that reveal the influence of chapters further on in the book is so substantial that one an hardly escape the conclusion that the translator has indeed utilized subsequent parts of his translation in earlier sections."

[24]See Ottley (1904), 2.171.

[25]Isaiah research more broadly has recognized the thematic similarities between chapters 10 and 13, but to my knowledge no appeal has been made to the relevance of these two passages for understanding the Greek plus μὴ φοβεῖσθε at 13:2b´. Wildberger notes parallels between Isa 13:2 and Isa 10:27b-32, which continues the discourse from and is thematically consonant with the present focus on Isa 10:24-26. See Wildberger (1997), 19; Karrer and Kraus (2011), 2537.

5:26-30 contains similar examples which resemble the Babylon discourse. This latter text unfolds Israel's impending destruction through a series of prophetic woes. And the final woe in 5:22-30 contains nearly identical language to that in the Babylon oracle as well: raising a signal, the ends of the earth, speedy arrival, arrows and bows, 'that day,' darkness, light. However, while these two references may illustrate Greek Isaiah's tendency of literary interplay, they don't seem to illuminate the use of μὴ φοβεῖσθε in 13:2b′ in any significant way. From this, I propose that a frequently neglected parallel from Isa 10:24-27 aids this discussion and clarifies the Greek plus under investigation.[26]

Like Isa 13:1-14:23, Isa 10:24-27 constitutes another prophetic statement of concerning national destruction. And as I illustrate in the structural prolegomena in chapter 4 of this thesis, connections between these two chapters were likely based on the portrayal of Babylon and Assyria undergoing parallel fates. As such, lexical and thematic parallels between the chapters are unsurprising, and even expected. To illustrate the abundance of these lexical and thematic parallels, I cite the Hebrew and Greek text of 10:24-27 below:[27]

10:24	לָכֵן כֹּה־אָמַר אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה צְבָאוֹת	Διὰ τοῦτο τάδε λέγει κύριος σαβαωθ
	So, thus says the Lord, Yhwh of armies:	*Therefore this is what the Lord Sabaoth says:*
	אַל־תִּירָא עַמִּי יֹשֵׁב צִיּוֹן מֵאַשּׁוּר בַּשֵּׁבֶט יַכֶּכָּה	Μὴ φοβοῦ, ὁ λαός μου οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐν Σιων, ἀπὸ Ἀσσυρίων, ὅτι ἐν ῥάβδῳ πατάξει σε·
	Do not fear, my people who inhabit Zion, the Assyrians who shall strike you with the rod	*Do not be afraid, my people who dwell in Zion*, of *of the Assyrians, because he will strike you with a rod*,
	וּמַטֵּהוּ יִשָּׂא־עָלֶיךָ בְּדֶרֶךְ מִצְרָיִם׃	πληγὴν[28] γὰρ ἐγὼ ἐπάγω ἐπὶ σὲ τοῦ ἰδεῖν ὁδὸν Αἰγύπτου.
	and who shall lift up a staff against you	*for I myself am bringing upon you a blow in order*

[26]See van der Vorm-Croughs (2014), 336. She relates Isa 13:2 to 35:4 and 40:9, but does not include reference to Isa 10:24-27.

[27]For examples of similar lexical parallels with chapter 1 beyond those found in Isa 13:2, see 13:17 הִנְנִי מֵעִיר עֲלֵיהֶם אֶת־מָדָי as ἰδοὺ ἐπεγείρω ὑμῖν τοὺς Μήδους; 14:4 וְאָמָרְתָּ as καὶ ἐρεῖς ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ; 14:5 שָׁבַר יְהוָה מַטֵּה רְשָׁעִים שֵׁבֶט מֹשְׁלִים as συνέτριψεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν ζυγὸν τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν, τὸν ζυγὸν τῶν ἀρχόντων; 14:6 מַכֵּה עַמִּים בְּעֶבְרָה מַכַּת בִּלְתִּי סָרָה רֹדֶה בָאַף גּוֹיִם as πατάξας ἔθνος θυμῷ πληγῇ ἀνιάτῳ, παίων ἔθνος πληγὸν θυμοῦ; 14:25 וְסָר מֵעֲלֵיהֶם עֻלּוֹ as ἀφαιρεθήσεται ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν ὁ ζυγὸς αὐτῶν; 14:26 זֹאת הָעֵצָה הַיְעוּצָה עַל־כָּל־הָאָרֶץ as αὕτη ἡ βουλὴ ἣν βεβούλευται κύριος ἐπὶ τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην; 14:29 כִּי נִשְׁבַּר שֵׁבֶט מַכֵּךְ as συνετρίβη γὰρ ζυγὸς τοῦ παίοντος ὑμᾶς. Compare also Isa 10:32 יְנֹפֵף יָדוֹ as τῇ χειρὶ παρακαλεῖτε to Isa 13:2 הָנִיפוּ יָד as παρακαλεῖτε τῇ χειρί.

[28]Muraoka suggests that that dominant sense of πληγή in the Septuagint is 'blow, injury sustained or caused.' See GELS, 562-563; LEH, 497; CGL, 2.1141.

	as on the road of Egypt.	*to see the way of Egypt.*
10:25	כִּי־עוֹד מְעַט מִזְעָר וְכָלָה זַעַם	ἔτι γὰρ μικρὸν καὶ παύσεται ἡ ὀργή,
	For in a little while, fury shall cease.	*For in a little while the anger also will cease.*
	וְאַפִּי עַל־תַּבְלִיתָם׃	ὁ δὲ θυμός μου ἐπὶ τὴν βουλὴν αὐτῶν·
	my anger shall be toward their destruction.	*but my wrath shall be upon their counsel.*
10:26	וְעוֹרֵר עָלָיו יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת שׁוֹט	καὶ ἐπεγερεῖ ὁ θεὸς ἐπ᾽ αὐτοὺς
	כְּמַכַּת מִדְיָן בְּצוּר עוֹרֵב	κατὰ τὴν πληγὴν τὴν Μαδιαμ ἐν τόπῳ θλίψεως,
	And Yhwh of armies shall wield a whip against them like the striking of Midian at the rock of Oreb.	*God will rise up upon them like the blow at Midian, in the place of affliction.*
	וּמַטֵּהוּ עַל־הַיָּם	καὶ ὁ θυμὸς αὐτοῦ τῇ ὁδῷ τῇ κατὰ θάλασσαν
	And his staff shall be over the sea,	*His wrath shall be in the way around the sea,*
	וְנָשָׂאוֹ בְּדֶרֶךְ מִצְרָיִם׃	εἰς τὴν ὁδὸν τὴν κατ᾽ Αἴγυπτον.
	and he will raise it as on the road to Egypt.	*on the path which is around Egypt.*
10:27	וְהָיָה בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא יָסוּר סִבְלוֹ מֵעַל שִׁכְמֶךָ	καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἀφαιρεθήσεται ὁ φόβος αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ σοῦ
	On that day his burden shall depart from your shoulder;	*In that day, fear of him will be taken away from you;*
	וְעֻלּוֹ מֵעַל צַוָּארֶךָ	καὶ ὁ ζυγὸς αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὤμου σου,
	his yoke shall depart from your neck;	*his yoke will be removed from your shoulder*
	וְחֻבַּל עֹל מִפְּנֵי־שָׁמֶן׃	καὶ καταφθαρήσεται ὁ ζυγὸς ἀπὸ τῶν ὤμων ὑμῶν.
	the yoke shall be broken because of oil.	*the yoke will will be destroyed from your shoulder.*

What the examples from these two chapters illustrate is that the translator of Greek Isaiah was interested in wide-ranging interpretive overlap. He felt at liberty to employ similar Greek vocabulary between thematically related passages even though the Hebrew lexical-semantics did not always correspond with choice translation choices. In light of such tendencies, we should not be surprised to discover the influence of Isa 10:24-27 upon the Greek plus μὴ φοβεῖσθε in Isa 13:2 since these connections provide sufficient epistemic and literary warrant for such an insertion.

From here, I propose that the Greek plus μὴ φοβεῖσθε in Isa 13:2 functions similarly to the senses of אַל־תִּירָא and μὴ φοβοῦ within Isa 10:24. The injunction אַל־תִּירָא in 10:24 is clearly addressed to Israel even though she awaits her own imminent destruction. Yet, instead of proposing a shift in character, the injunction must be understood in terms of the divine purpose behind the ensuing cataclysm.[29] The appeal to not fear is thus placed in a narrative structure

[29]Psalm 46:1-12 is a prime example of such a paradox. Because of Yhwh's rule, the EXPERIENCER refrains from fear, even in the midst of the 'apocalyptic' events outlined in verses 2-3: the ensuing terror of failing land, shaking and trembling mountains, the roaring and foaming waters giving way. Verses 6 through 10 confirm the

which foresees the eventual end and thwarting of the military onslaught.[30] With this perspective in mind we can apply a similar narrative framework when interpreting μὴ φοβεῖσθε in Isa 13:2.

But when we view μὴ φοβεῖσθε in Isa 13:2, its meaning conveys a more sarcastic tone which is largely absent in 10:24. Such sarcasm is already evident in 13:2 and follows through the rest of the discourse. Here, the imperatival invitation initiates Babylon's full destruction. Unlike Israel, Babylon will meet her end. This proposal should not be surprising since the Babylon discourse is replete with sardonic irony: men will undergo the pangs of birth like women in labor; the royal star of Babylon and his political constellations will cease to shine; the haughty and proud will lay low; people will become more sparse than rare gold; the tree-kings of Sheol rejoice and mock the deceased king of Babylon.

Insofar as injunctions not to fear are permissible within patently fearful scenarios (e.g., Isa 10:24-27), this proposal for Isa 13:2 has *prima facie* plausibility. And given the strength of the consistent imperatival addressee noted above, this proposal is also the most likely given its discursive simplicity. Thus, it appears that translator emphasized the second person plural with μὴ φοβεῖσθε and then clarified the addressee at the end of the verse with οἱ ἄρχοντες. In the discursive context, this most certainly refers to Babylon given that its only other occurrence features in direct address to Babylon in 14:5. We should not seek a more complex explanation for the identity of these characters when a singular identity sufficiently explains the data.

In sum, the features of this text outlined in this discussion correspond with the overall themes and structure of the larger Babylon discourse. Further, they ultimately heighten the literary impulses of the Hebrew text. Thus, the Greek plus μὴ φοβεῖσθε provides further evidence of the translator's concern to explicate such literary elements for his Greek readership and audience.

---

socio-political dimensions of these 'apocalyptic' themes with mention of nations, kingdoms, wars, bow, and chariot.

[30]See Penner (2020), 520: "Eusebius gave the reason they should not be frightened: although the Assyrians will strike with a rod, it is only for a little while."

Appendix 2:
The Text Critical Problem of Isaiah 13:18a

As I indicated in chapter 3, the first phrase of Isa 13:18 contains a difficult textual-syntactic problem. The pointed Hebrew text contains a verb preceded by two nouns, each of which plays a clear and distinct syntactic role. But the consonantal form of the text could be read in several other ways. And since this doubly-fronted nominal feature appears to be rare in the Hebrew Bible, we should not be surprised to find significantly divergent readings in the versions. But each of these versions themselves contain interpretive idiosyncrasies which require detailed attention.

To address this problem, I proceed in several steps. First, I present the major extant readings for Isa 13:18a and explain them grammatically on their own terms. Then, for all but two, I seek to eliminate their renderings of the consonantal Hebrew text as syntactically imprecise; only the Aramaic and the Syriac accurately render the Hebrew text at the grammatical level. Following this, I provide a rationale for Greek Isaiah's deviation from the Hebrew text which emphasizes its placement in the surrounding literary context. Even though Greek Isaiah does not evidence the most syntactically precise understanding of Hebrew grammar at Isa 13:18a, it nevertheless preserves a robust reading which illustrates the translator's awareness of larger literary and structural features. Last of all, I set forth a proposal for the most plausible reading of the consonantal Hebrew text in light of this section's text-history discussion.

Textual Witnesses

MT:	וּקְשָׁתוֹת נְעָרִים תְּרַטַּשְׁנָה	*and the bows, they shall shatter the youths*
1QIsa[a]:	וקשתות נערים תרטשנה	*and the bows, they shall shatter the youths*
LXX:[31]	τοξεύματα νεανίσκων συντρίψουσι	*they shall shatter the arrows of the youths*
Aramaic:	וְקֶשְׁתָתְהוֹן עוּלֵימִין יְבַזְעָן	*and their bows, they will split open young men*
Syriac:	ܩܫܬ̈ܐ ܕܥܠܡ̈ܐ ܢܬܟܫܠ	*the bows of the youths shall be shattered*
Latin:	sed sagittis parvulos interficiant	*but with arrows, they will kill the small children*

[31]The Göttingen apparatus contains two alternative readings: συντριψωσι(ν) *II* 534; ριψουσιν 93. However, they are inconsequential for the present argument.

The examples above do not require that their divergences be treated in a strictly text-critical framework; each version clearly emerges from the consonantal Hebrew text. Instead, this textual problem is syntactic in nature and requires investigation in the internal evidence. Of note, the versions agree little regarding the 'proper' interpretation of this phrase. The Masoretic tradition and the Aramaic Targum constitute the only traditions that agree in their reading. Here, I discuss each of the syntactic features in the above examples before evaluating them.

The Masoretic Text presents the consonantal form קשתות as an absolute noun with the pointing קְשָׁתוֹת 'bows.'[32] As such, it must function as the AGENT of the active *Pi'el* verb תְּרַטַּשְׁנָה 'to shatter': both terms agree in person, number, and gender. If it were not for this subject-verb agreement, the phrase could be conceived of differently. However, from this noun-verb morphology the noun נְעָרִים 'youths' must function as the verbal PATIENT. Thus, the nouns preceding the verb should each be considered as fronted to the main clause. The consonants of 1QIsa[a] are in full accord with the Masoretic tradition.

In contrast, the Septuagint reads the first two nouns of the Hebrew text as a bound phrase. This reading produces the genitive string τοξεύματα νεανίσκων 'arrows of the youths,' which functions as the verbal PATIENT of συντρίβω 'to shatter.'[33] And since the Greek text omits an explicit AGENT for transitive συντρίβω, it must be supplied from context. Here, the Medes from the previous verse are the only viable candidate.[34] The discussion below surveys the difficulties associated with this reading.

---

[32]The morphology קְשָׁתוֹת would convey the sense of the plural construct.

[33]See the body of the thesis for discussion of the change from קֶשֶׁת 'bow' to τόξευμα 'arrow,' where I propose that the translator reversed the synecdoche of the Hebrew text.

[34]Wildberger (1997), 9, misreads this phrase: "The Gk reads: τοξεύματα νεανισκῶν συντρίψουσιν (bows of the young men will be shattered), and thus reads the construct form קְשָׁתוֹת (bows of) . . . which has caused some commentators to point תרטשנה as a *pu'al* instead of a *pi'el*." Likewise, *HALOT*, 1223, mistakenly renders the Greek as passive. The future active form of the Greek verb renders both analyses incorrect. Watts (2005), 194, follows the rendering of Greek Isaiah. For a viewpoint similar to my own, see Gray (1949), 243: "The order . . . is unusual, but not unknown. . . . The vb. being 3rd *fem*. pl. נערים cannot be the subj., nor can the subj. be either indef., or the Medes. קשתות must be the subj., if the text be correct . . ."

Like the Masoretic tradition, the Aramaic Targum also reads the initial two nouns of the Hebrew text as separate syntactic entities. It recognizes them as doubly-fronted nouns to the main clause. The first noun קַשְׁתָתְהוֹן 'their bows' contains an additional pronominal suffix, but nonetheless functions as the verbal AGENT. In turn, the second noun עוּלֵימִין 'young men' functions as the PATIENT of the bi-valent verb בזע 'to split open.' The third person feminine plural verb accords with the initial feminine plural noun.

However, like the Greek, the Syriac Peshitta reads the first two Hebrew nouns as a single syntactic entity, joining them with the construct particle: ܩܫܬܗ ܕܥܠܡܐ 'the bows of the youths.' However, whereas the Greek text contains an active verb, the Syriac attests the passive *Ethpe'el* stem of ܒܙܥ 'to be broken, shattered.' This entails that the Peshitta translator read the Hebrew verb תרטשנה as a *Pu'al* in contrast to the *Pi'el* reading of the Masoretic text. Thus, the Syriac translator situated the initial construct phrase as the verbal PATIENT. And the construct phrase agrees with the verb in person, number, and gender.

The Latin Vulgate contains another unique reading. Jerome distinguished the first two nouns syntactically and understood the initial noun as a verbal INSTRUMENT; as such he employed the term *sagitta* 'arrow' in the ablative case.[35] He captured the second Hebrew noun with in accusative case, designating it as the verbal PATIENT of the active verb *interficio* 'to kill, destroy.' Like the Septuagint, the Latin text also demands an implied verbal agent. This raises several interpretive problems which are addressed below.

Even though each version surveyed here derives from the same consonantal Hebrew text, each likewise appropriates the text differently. While some interpretive patterns occur in more than one version, none of the translations are identical. I now evaluate the readings described above and conclude that, while each reading may potentially explain the Hebrew phrase in isolation, several of them do not properly convey the overall thrust of the Hebrew within its own literary setting.

[35]The Vulgate reading accords with Symmachus: τοξοις παιδια προσρηξουσιν 'with bows, they shall shatter the children.'

Syntactic Evaluation

Here, I demonstrate that only the readings in the Masoretic tradition, the Targum, and the Peshitta capture the semantic and literary constraints of the Hebrew consonantal text. These constraints include both the grammar of the clause and literary material surrounding verse 18a. The Greek Septuagint and the Latin Vulgate, on the other hand, while at points capturing potentially accurate readings of the Hebrew, abstract it from its literary context and, thus, read it imprecisely.[36]

In contrast to the Masoretic reading, Greek Isaiah captured the Hebrew bound phrase קַשְׁתוֹת נְעָרִים with a nominative and genitive pairing: τοξεύματα νεανίσκων. This isolated reading is grammatically and somewhat contextually appropriate. However, it creates a semantic disparity between the Hebrew and the Greek. At this point, the translator had the option to read the verb תרטשנה either as the active *Pi'el* stem תְּרַטַּשְׁנָה or as the passive *Pu'al* stem תְּרֻטַּשְׁנָה. But since he rendered the Hebrew verb with the future active form συντρίψουσι, it appears that he read the Hebrew according to *Pi'el* semantics. In addition, since the Greek verb συντρίβω functions according to transitive, or bi-valent, semantics in verse 18a, the preceding genitive phrase τοξεύματα νεανίσκων must function as the verbal PATIENT.[37] Thus, the verb requires an implied agent since the text contains no explicit noun to fill this slot. The difficulty with the translator's approach lies here. Because the Hebrew verb is feminine plural, the implied agent of the Hebrew verb must also be grammatically feminine.[38]

As noted above, the only viable candidate for the implied AGENT of συντρίβω in the immediate context is the Medes mentioned in verse 17. This is also the clear intention of the translator, who included a series of third person plural verbs in Isa 13:16-18 with which the

[36]I argue below in more detail that the Greek deviation was very likely intentional with the aim to emphasize other literary features present in the Hebrew.

[37]The narrative and literary context strongly contradicts the possibility that the phrase 'the arrows of the youths' functions as the verbal AGENT.

[38]The Greek and Latin both contain this difficulty since they render the Hebrew verb actively, transitively, and with an implied agent. The Syriac translator avoided this problem by capturing the verb according to the passive semantics of the *Pu'al* stem.

Medes consistently function as the verbal AGENT or EXPERIENCER. However, from the perspective of the Hebrew text, the 'accuracy' of this reading is problematic for two related reasons. First, the Hebrew text requires the implied AGENT to be feminine plural, but the noun מָדַי never functions as such. Second, explicit pairing between מָדַי and verbs in the immediate context always occurs with masculine plural verbs. I elaborate on these positions below.

First, if the feminine plural verb תרטשנה in verse 18a demanded the noun מָדַי from the preceding verse to be its implied AGENT, this would be the only case in the Hebrew Bible where מָדַי is explicitly paired with a feminine plural verb. But this appears to be the way the translator captured his Hebrew text. The oracle against Babylon in Jer 51[28]:28 contains the only potential evidence for such a pattern:[39]

Jer 51[28]:28	קַדְּשׁוּ עָלֶיהָ גּוֹיִם אֶת־מַלְכֵי מָדַי	*Prepare nations against her, the kings of the Medes,*
	אֶת־פַּחוֹתֶיהָ וְאֶת־כָּל־סְגָנֶיהָ	*her governors and her officials*
	וְאֵת כָּל־אֶרֶץ מֶמְשַׁלְתּוֹ׃[40]	*and all the land of its dominion.*

While feminine referents here are attributed to מָדַי, they are never in direct agreement with the verb. Furthermore, since the feminine pronouns in this verse are always singular, their referent should also be designated as singular. Last of all, the final noun of the phrase מֶמְשַׁלְתּוֹ 'its dominion' contains the third person masculine singular pronominal suffix, but presumably refers to the same referent as the previous feminine suffixes. The disparity between gendered pronouns here renders it unlikely that the noun מָדַי is to be regarded as implicitly feminine, let alone plural. Instead, these feminine pronominal suffixes may simply function as a circumlocution for identifying cities as feminine.[41]

---

[39]For instances of מָדַי in the Hebrew Bible, see 2 Kgs 17:6; 18:11; Isa 13:17; Isa 21:2; Jer 25:25[32:11]; 51[28]:11; 51[28]:28; Esth 1:3, 14, 18, 19; Esth 10:2; [Arm] Dan 5:28; 6:1, 9, 13, 16; 8:20; 9:1; 11:1; Ezra 6:2.

[40]The third person masculine singular pronoun cannot refer back to the feminine noun אֶרֶץ. It must refer either to Media itself or to its governors and officials. The latter option is more widely attested in the Hebrew Bible. See 1 Kgs 9:19; 2 Kgs 20:13; Isa 22:21; 39:2; Psa 103:22; 114:2; 145:13; Dan 11:5; 2 Chron 32:9. The Old Greek reads καὶ πάσης τῆς γῆς without any pronominal referent.

[41]A similar phenomena seems likely in Isa 21:2b, which identifies מָדַי as a feminine singular noun by pairing it with a feminine singular imperative: צוּרִי מָדַי 'Lay siege, O Media!' See also Isa 21:2a, which contains the phrase עֲלִי עֵילָם 'Go up, O Elam!' with the feminine singular imperative. However, עֵילָם is elsewhere regarded as masculine: Isa 22:6; Jer 49:35, 36, 37. See Ezek 32:24 for reference with a feminine singular pronoun.

Second, the verbal pattern of the immediate context evidences concern for strict subject-verb agreement. This is evident in the way that מָדַי repeatedly pairs with masculine plural verbs from verses 16 through 18. Conversely, verbs marked for feminine gender in this literary context always pair with feminine nouns:[42]

13:16a	third masculine plural	יְרֻטָּשׁוּ	masculine plural	עֹלְלֵיהֶם
13:16b	third masculine plural	יִשַּׁסּוּ	masculine plural	בָּתֵּיהֶם
13:16c	third feminine plural	תִּשָּׁגַלְנָה	feminine plural	נְשֵׁיהֶם
13:17b	third masculine plural	יַחְשְׁבוּ	*implied* masculine plural	מָדַי
13:17c	third masculine plural	יַחְפְּצוּ	*implied* masculine noun	מָדַי
13:18a	third feminine plural	תרטשנה	feminine plural	קְשָׁתוֹת
13:18b	third masculine plural	יְרַחֲמוּ	*implied* masculine plural	מָדַי
13:18c	third feminine singular	תָּחוּס	feminine singular	עֵינָם

In this context, wherever masculine plural verbs occur, masculine nouns accord with with them. Conversely, the same goes for the feminine plural noun-verb pairings in 13:16c and 13:18c. Thus, the Hebrew text displays patterned noun-verb agreement which establishes a precedent that would be contradicted if an implied masculine AGENT (e.g., מָדַי) would be paired with a feminine verb (e.g., תְּרַטַּשְׁנָה). Thus, the morphological and syntactical constraints of the Hebrew text disallow the Medes to function as the AGENT of the feminine plural verb תרטשנה. And so, we can agree that the Greek translation deviates from the Hebrew syntax and its contextual constraints at this point.[43]

The rationale behind the translator's deviation however has not yet been addressed. But we know that it cannot reflect the meaning of the Hebrew phrase. Either the translator was ignorant of the Hebrew grammar here or he intentionally constructed his text for some literary end. The latter option is much more likely given Greek Isaiah's overall translational features. Nonetheless, an iso-morphic representation of the Hebrew could not have been in view. I will discuss the possible influences which may have motivated the translator in due course.

The strength of the Masoretic Text and the Aramaic Targum rests in their ability to

[42]I include my syntactic proposal for 13:18a here and defend the position below.

[43]The point made here renders the revision by Symmachus and the Latin Vulgate incorrect by implication since their translations require a *feminine* implied subject and inconsistent use of subject-verb agreement by the Hebrew text.

capture the grammatical and contextual features of Isa 13:18a. In both of these text-traditions, the feminine plural verb pairs with an explicit feminine plural AGENT. This is something both the Greek and Latin version fail to do. The difficulty with preferring the readings found in the Hebrew and the Aramaic, however, seems to consist in the phenomenon of the doubly fronted nouns.[44] Even though this reading makes sense semantically and contextually, it may have been perceived as rhetorically amiss. Such obscure rhetoric may explain why such deviation occurs in the versions; the translators would have sought to capture a presumably more 'precise' reading.

Like the other Semitic versions, the Syriac Peshitta also preserves a reading which makes semantic and contextual sense. This can be seen principally by its rendering of the Hebrew verb in the passive voice in the *Ethpe'el* stem as ܬܬܒܪܝ:

13:18a ܩܫܝܬܐ ܕܒܚܘܪܐ ܬܬܒܪܝ
the bows of the youths shall be shattered

And while the Syriac verb maintains the person, number, and gender of the Hebrew verb, the shift to the passive voice in the Syriac enables the construct phrase ܩܫܝܬܐ ܕܒܚܘܪܐ 'the bows of the youths' to function in the verb's subject slot. It appears, then, that the translator of the Peshitta understood the Hebrew verb תרטשנה in light of the semantics demanded by the *Pu'al* stem. This verbal shift to the passive enabled the Syriac translator to resolve the grammatical and contextual difficulties for which the Greek and Latin translations failed to account.

The Greek Translator's Rationale

As I argued above, it is apparent that Isa 13:18a in the Greek does not reflect the grammatical demands of the Hebrew text. Reading the initial Hebrew nouns as a bound phrase requires either a passive verb or the presence of an implicit verbal AGENT. However, even though the Greek translator opted for the former, he breached the morphological and syntactic restrictions of Hebrew with regards to noun-verb gender agreement. However, given the translator's patterned understanding of contextual subject-verb pairing, we should regard his translation of this phrase as an intentional deviation. As such, the translator of Greek Isaiah knew

[44]For a thorough discussion of marginal constructions (i.e., fronting), see Holmstedt (2014), 109-156.

an accurate avenue of rendering the phrase before him. He merely decided not to take this route. Here, I propose a simple model which explains how the translator reworked Isa 13:18a and briefly investigates why he constructed the translation in this manner.

That the translator of Greek Isaiah intentionally deviated from the Hebrew syntax is evident both in his verbal choices and in the resultant literary structure. I simply wish to highlight the result of this deviation by detailing significant literary features of the immediate context. This list contains all the verbs from verses 16 through 18 and notes their morphological and syntactical traits:

13:16a	ῥάξουσι	3rd person plural	bi-valent active
13:16b	προνομεύσουσι	3rd person plural	bi-valent active
13:16c	ἕξουσι	3rd person plural	bi-valent active
13:17a	ἐπεγείρω	1st person singular	tri-valent active
13:17b	λογίζονται	3rd person plural	bi-valent middle-passive [subject-focused]
13:17c	ἔχουσιν	3rd person plural	bi-valent active
13:18a	συντρίψουσι	3rd person plural	bi-valent active
13:18b	ἐλεήσουσι	3rd person plural	bi-valent active
13:18c	φείσονται[45]	3rd person plural	bi-valent active

Whereas the Hebrew text of verse 16 almost exclusively favors passive verbal semantics in connection with the preceding material,[46] the translator organized his Greek verbs exclusively with the active verbal semantics. This shift toward active verbal voice resulted in a uniform verbal presentation across the literary structure with recognizable rhetorical significance. As such, the Greek verbs consistently occur in the active voice with Median agency. And the translator's intentional deviation from the Hebrew text at 13:18a contributes to this uniformity. Thus, it seems that the translator of Greek Isaiah intentionally deviated from the syntactic constraints of the Hebrew text (perhaps due to interpretive difficulty) with the aim to heighten the thematic and structural elements already present in the Hebrew text.

Greek Isaiah embodies a re-situated Hebrew text, one both cognizant of and divergent from its Hebrew source. It is not a translation which fully captures the grammatical demands of

[45]The plural noun οἱ ὀφθαλμοί, and not the Medes, is the explicit AGENT of this verb.

[46]See the relevant discussion on passive verbal semantics in chapter 6.

the Hebrew. But it nonetheless exhibits awareness of its literary features by heightening their structural significance. The Greek text is deceptively simple but at the same time incredibly nuanced. What at first seems to be an 'inaccurate' rendering of the Hebrew text is in fact one which unveils a robust literary and structural grasp of the oracle. As such, the translator intends us to read the text as unified in theme, agent, and literary structure.

The Meaning of the Hebrew Text

Variation among the versions likely arose on account of the perceived rhetorical difficulty rooted in the doubly-fronted nouns. While the reading offered by the Masoretic-Targumic traditions is semantically and contextually valid, it may have appeared obscure to its interpreters. As such, it was avoided in the Greek, Syriac, and Latin. But as I illustrated above, the Syriac tradition did preserve a valid reading of the consonantal Hebrew text. From this, how might we decide which reading is intended by the Hebrew? I hold that attention to thematic and literary contexts allow us to resolve this question by affirming that the Masoretic-Targumic traditions accurately convey the meaning of the Hebrew.[47]

Thematic parallels between Isa 13:16 and 13:18 are fairly clear. Verse 16 describes the family and mentions infants, houses, and wives. Verse 18 continues this thread with a threefold description of youths, the fruit of the womb, and children. The following examples illustrate this pattern:

13:16a	ועלליהם ירטשׁו	'children, infants'
13:16b	ישסו בתיהם	'houses'
13:16c	ונשיהם תשגלנה	'wives'
13:18a	וקשׁתות נערים תרטשׁנה	'boys, youths'
13:18b	ופרי־בטן לא ירחמו	'fruit of the womb'
13:18c	על־בנים לא־תחוס	'children, sons'

Regardless of the Hebrew verbal pointing, each of these phrases demands that the familial characters function as the verbal PATIENT. However, the Syriac version shifts this emphasis: ܩܫܝܗܘܢ ܕܥܠܝܡܐ ܢܬܟܫܪ, 'the bows of the youths will be smashed.' Instead of maintaining the familial theme

[47]For other brief treatments of this issue, see Wildberger (1991), 9-29; Oswalt (1986), 304-309.

throughout the passage, the the syntax of the Syriac requires an inconsistent character shift. The verbal PATIENT here does not resonate with the pattered familial theme of the discourse. Instead, military instruments occupy the this character role. This change of theme introduces a disjunction into the discourse which suggests that it is foreign to the literary trajectory of the passage.

The Masoretic-Targumic reading seems to preserve the *lectio difficilior* of the Hebrew grammar. A reading which maintains the doubly-fronted nouns has the appearance of rhetorical infelicity.[48] However, this reading is still grammatically, semantically, and contextually coherent. In addition, it preserves the thematic emphasis upon the familial concepts as the verbal PATIENT in the literary structure. On the other hand, the reading offered by the Syriac seems to preserve the *lectio difficilior* on literary grounds. Like the Masoretic-Targumic tradition, it also contains a grammatically, semantically, and contextually coherent reading. But the divergence it creates seems to introduce an interruption which distracts from the discourse's emphasis. So, while each reading embodies its own version of a *lectio difficilior*, I propose that the difficulty of the Syriac is ultimately more disruptive than the Masoretic-Targumic reading. Thus, the *lectiones difficiliores* are not equal between the two versions. Ultimately, the Masoretic-Targumic tradition preserves a reading that, while rhetorically unusual, preserves the literary cohesion of the discourse.

[48]See Williamson (2020), 229-236.

Appendix 3:
θρῆνος and מָשָׁל

By examining the semantic range of the root מׇשַׁל, we can see that I מׇשַׁל ‘to formulate an expression, be like’ is clearly related to the noun מָשָׁל ‘parable, saying.’ This noun occurs in the example from Isaiah 14:3 above and is rightly understood with the more infrequent and sardonic meaning ‘taunt, jest,’ a gloss suggested both by HALOT and DCH.[49] Now, while the term מָשָׁל in Isa 14:4 is rendered into Greek with θρῆνος ‘lament,’ this example contains the sole instance of this Hebrew-to-Greek pairing in the Old Testament. And of further interest, this pairing both departs from the semantic range of the Hebrew term and deviates from the tendencies of other Septuagint translators. Here, I investigate this disparity in translation patterns and aim to elucidate the lexical and semantic dimensions of this *prima facie* oddity.

Of the 39 occurrences of מָשָׁל in the Hebrew Bible, an overwhelming set of this lexeme is paired in the Septuagint with παραβολή.[50] While this pairing fits well in the contexts where it occurs, some translators included it in ways appearing out of place:

Psa 78[77]:2	אֶפְתְּחָה בְמָשָׁל פִּי אַבִּיעָה חִידוֹת מִנִּי־קֶדֶם׃
	I shall open my mouth in <u>a parable</u> . . .
	ἀνοίξω ἐν παραβολαῖς τὸ στόμα μου, φθέγξομαι προβλήματα ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς
	I will open my mouth <u>in parables</u> . . .
Jer 24:9	וּנְתַתִּים . . . לְחֶרְפָּה וּלְמָשָׁל לְשִׁנְינָה וְלִקְלָלָה
	I will make them . . . a reproach, <u>a byword</u>, a taunt, and a curse
	καὶ δώσω αὐτοὺς . . . εἰς ὀνειδισμὸν καὶ <u>εἰς παραβολὴν</u> καὶ εἰς μῖσος καὶ εἰς κατάραν
	I will set them . . . as a disgrace and as <u>a parable</u> and as hated and as a curse

[49]See HALOT, 648; DCH, 5.538. See Wildberger (1997), 50: “The word actually means ‘likening, comparison’ . . . it can be used as a neutral term, ‘saying, proverb,’ but can also be used in the special, technical sense of a ‘mocking saying.’”; also, “mocking song.” Alternatively, the verbal meaning of II מׇשַׁל ‘to rule, take dominion’ (HALOT, 596), corresponds semantically with the nouns מִמְשָׁל ‘dominion, ruler’ and מֶמְשָׁלָה ‘dominion, military strength,’ along with the less frequent II מֹשֶׁל ‘dominion.” See also the comment of Chilton (1987), 33: “Babylon is the butt of a taunt against the broken strength of its sinful mastery.”

[50]The majority of deviations from this pattern accord semantically with the Hebrew, either as προοίμιον ‘poem, parable,’ παροιμία ‘proverb,’ or ἴσος ‘equal to.’ See Job 13:12; 27:1; 29:1; Prov 1:1; 26:7. For deviation from this pattern, see παιδεία in Prov 25:1, δουλεία in Prov 26:9, and ἀφανισμός in 1 Kings 9:7. The two latter renderings are likely contextual in their origin. It is noteworthy, however, that each instance of παραβολή in the Septuagint pairs with מָשָׁל. In Rahlfs (2006), Eccl 1:17 παραβολή translates הוֹלֵלוֹת ‘madness.’ But the Göttingen edition by Gentry (2019) contains the reading παραφορά ‘distraction.’

The examples above each pair παραβολή with מָשָׁל. But only Psa 78:2 allows for this lexical pairing in context. The example from Jer 24:9 simply evidences a stereotypical translation which obscures the meaning of the phrase from Hebrew into Greek. And despite attempts by both Classical and Septuagint Greek lexicons to gloss παραβολή with the meaning 'taunt,' 'mocking speech,' or 'by-word,' such a proposal does not reflect the literary examples cited therein.[51] In light of this lexical and semantic data, we must now consider the significance of the pairing of מָשָׁל and θρῆνος in Greek Isaiah.[52]

In the translated books of the Septuagint, the term θρῆνος occurs 22 times and is consistently glossed as 'dirge,' 'lament[ation],' wailing.'[53] Apart from the idiosyncratic rendering of מָשָׁל with θρῆνος at Isa 14:4, every other instance of this Greek term pairs with one of three Hebrew terms: קין 'to sing a funeral song,' קִינָה 'funeral song, dirge,' נְהִי 'lamentation.'[54] This is not surprising since each of these Hebrew lexemes shares adequate semantic overlap with the Greek term. What is surprising, however, is the divergence attested in Greek Isaiah.[55] How can this be explained?

I think this translational divergence can be explained by an appeal to the oracular context. That is, the translator of Greek Isaiah did not render the Hebrew text with a 'literal'

---

[51]LSJ, 1305 and BrillDAG, 1543 outline glosses corresponding to παραβολή similarly: 'juxtaposing,' 'throwing against,' 'deviation,' mathematical 'division,' and 'legal deposit,' none of which suggest that a meaning like 'taunt' exists in Classical literature. Under the heading of 'throwing against,' BrillDAG also supplies the gloss 'injury' for Jer 24:9. LSJ likewise provides the entry 'by-word, proverb.' Yet, these glosses only cite the Septuagint itself. See GELS, 524-25, which also supplies the meanings 'mocking or hurting speech.' In contrast, LEH, 461 rightly states that such meanings should be regarded as stereotyped.

[52]Both Wis 5:4 and Tob 3:4 contain the phrase παραβολὴν ὀνειδισμοῦ 'proverb of insult' with negative connotations. However, since παραβολή does not convey this negative meaning of itself, it appears that the addition of ὀνειδισμός in the phrase generates the 'sardonic' sense.

[53]See LSJ, 805; BrillDAG, 950; LEH, 278; GELS, 332. Lamentations 1:1 contains θρῆνος but lacks a Hebrew counterpart.

[54]Interestingly, even though Mic 2:4 and Hab 2:6 employ מָשָׁל as 'taunt' as is attested in Isa 14:4, the translator of the Twelve rendered the Hebrew with παραβολή instead of θρῆνος. Some Septuagint translators evidence word play and repetition with the θρην- stem. See 2 Sam 1:17; Ezek 27:32; Mic 2:4.

[55]This idiosyncrasy is highlighted further when considering the breadth of ancient witnesses: α΄σ΄θ΄ παραβολή; Targ. מְתַל; Lat. *parabola*; Pesh. ܡܬܠܐ.

lexeme, but instead with a 'free' one that would in turn clarify the royal denouncement. In other words, including παραβολή would have deviated from the overall sense of the discourse whereas θρῆνος functions to preserve the song against the deceased king.[56] And since songs and laments over fallen kings in the Hebrew Bible are often expressed with קין, קִינָה, and נְהִי—frequently rendered as θρῆνος—the discourse of Isa 14:4-23 can likewise be regarded as expressing a similar trope.[57]

This rationale may be further understood by considering parallels to the 'taunt-lament' in Isa 14:4-23 elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible. The discourse in Isaiah is patently about a dead king, his short-lived rule, and his dramatic downfall. And since such a trope is often portrayed throughout the Hebrew Bible with the term קִינָה, it would have been appropriate here for the translator to regard the Isaianic oracle as related to these other passages.[58] Two important royal laments in the Hebrew Bible stand out to support this idea: the lament over Saul in 2 Sam 1:17-27 and the lament over the king of Tyre in Ezek 26:1-28:19. As Wildberger notes: "[O]ne should compare this [song] with the song of David, in which he laments the death of Saul and Jonathan (2 Sam. 1:19, 25, 27)."[59] The oracle(s) against Tyre in Ezek 26:1-28:19 constitutes another clear thematic parallel to Isa 14:4-23 since it portrays a proud king who sought a divine seat, but was subsequently thrown down as a mere mortal and destroyed by the sword.

Each of these famous laments contains relevant lexemes—notably קין and קִינָה—and share significant thematic ideas such as the rule over nations and the subsequent fall from glory. Thus, it was fitting for the translator of Greek Isaiah to supply a term related to royal laments in his interpretation of the discourse. And even though the rendering at Isa 14:4 deviates from the 'literal' semantics of מָשָׁל, the Greek lexeme portrays the subsequent discourse in an accurate

---

[56]See the comments of Ottley (1906), 176: "Heb. word *māhsāl* generally means a parable or parallel, and hence sometimes a 'taunt-song.' The poem which follows bears, by irony, the form of an elegy, which seems the justification of the LXX.'s rendering, found here only . . ."

[57]See רנן, פצח, and שׂמח in Isa 14:7-8.

[58]See the brief discussion in Penner (2020), 538.

[59]Wildberger (1997), 50.

way with a 'biblical' flavor. Thus, this passage further illustrates the aims of my thesis, namely that what may be perceived in Greek Isaiah as a 'free' rendering with regard to the lexeme is in fact 'literal' at the level of theme and literary structure.

In sum, even though παραβολή was a standard way of capturing the semantics of מָשָׁל in Septuagint literature, the translator of Greek Isaiah likely saw this term to be inappropriately suited to the discourse against the king of Babylon.[60] So instead, he provided one which deviated from the 'literal' meaning of the Hebrew lexeme in order preserve the literary themes and structure before him. And since θρῆνος was the most common way to express royal lament terminology from the Hebrew Bible to the Septuagint, it seems only natural for the translator of Greek Isaiah to have supplied this common term when he associated Isa 14:4-23 with these related discourses. Through this decision, the translator displayed both his interpretive sensibilities and his concerns to portray the literary thrust of the Hebrew text in its biblical-theological framework.

[60]It it is not clear whether or not the sardonic meaning of מָשָׁל 'taunt' was known to the Septuagint translators. Nonetheless, the translator of Greek Isaiah correctly observed contextual meaning and supplied an appropriate and oft-employed Greek term associated with 'lament.'

Appendix 4:
Isaiah 14:17 and the Problem of ἐπαγωγή

As I discussed at length in the body of this thesis, Greek Isaiah 14:17 contains several interesting features when read in its structural context. But since I elaborated upon these structural features in chapters 5 and 6 in detail, I limit the discussion here to three salient facets in verse 17c which prove to be difficult. The first treats the rendering of the noun phrase τοὺς ἐν ἐπαγωγῇ, the second concerns the placement of the verb λύω, and the third explores the meaning of the difficult phrase ἐν ἐπαγωγή:[61]

14:17a-b	שָׂם תֵּבֵל כַּמִּדְבָּר וְעָרָיו הָרָס	ὁ θεὶς τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην ἔρημον καὶ τὰς πόλεις καθεῖλε,
	Who set the world like the desert,	*The one who set the whole inhabited world as a desert and*
	and he destroyed its cities;	*he destroyed cities,*
14:17c	אֲסִירָיו לֹא־פָתַח בֵּיתָה׃	τοὺς ἐν ἐπαγωγῇ οὐκ ἔλυσε.
	he did not send home his prisoners.	*he did not release those in distress.*

First, the translator likely rendered the first noun of verse 17c freely as τοὺς ἐν ἐπαγωγῇ and condensed the remainder of the phrase into the verb λύω. His rendering is a bit peculiar since he clearly evidenced knowledge of these Hebrew terms elsewhere in his translation.[62] But the Greek resembles the translation pattern at Isa 10:4 where the Hebrew terms אַסִּיר and הֲרוּגִים were similarly condensed into the phrase εἰς ἐπαγωγήν. This latter point is detailed below.

Second, the decision to place the verb at the end of the line seems to have motivated

---

[61]On the Hebrew syntax of this clause, see Gesenius (2006), §117o: "Sometimes the verb, on which an accusative of the object really depends, is contained only in sense in the verb which apparently governs, e.g. Is 14[17] אֲסִירָי לֹא־פָתַח בֵּיתָהּ *his prisoners he let not lose* nor sent them back *to their home*."

[62]Although Isa 14:17 contains the sole occurrence of אָסִיר without the *dagesh* in the book of Isaiah, the noun אַסִּיר with the *dagesh* occurs twice more in Isaiah. See 24:22 וְאֻסְּפוּ אֱסֹף אַסִּיר עַל־בּוֹר rendered as καὶ συνάξουσιν καὶ ἀποκλείσουσιν εἰς ὀχύρωμα καὶ εἰς δεσμωτήριον; Isa 42:7 לְהוֹצִיא מִמַּסְגֵּר אַסִּיר rendered as ἐξαγαγεῖν ἐκ δεσμῶν δεδεμένους. Both of these Greek renderings illustrate the translator's awareness of אַסִּיר's Hebrew semantics. The verb אסר 'to bind' also occurs on three occasions: 22:2; 49:9; 61:1. Isaiah 22:2 contains מְקֻשֶּׁת אֶסָּרוּ כָּל־נִמְצָאַיִךְ rendered at καὶ οἱ ἁλόντες σκληρῶς δεδεμένοι εἰσί, employing the verb δέω 'to bind'. Isaiah 49:9 contains לֵאמֹר לָאֲסוּרִים צֵאוּ rendered as λέγοντα τοῖς ἐν δεσμοῖς Ἐξελθατε, supplying the nominal form δεσμός 'bond, fetter'. Isaiah 61:1 proves to be more difficult where the Hebrew text reads לִקְרֹא לִשְׁבוּיִם דְּרוֹר וְלַאֲסוּרִים פְּקַח־קוֹחַ and the Greek contains κηρύξαι αἰχμαλώτοις ἄφεσιν καὶ τυφλοῖς ἀνάβλεψιν. The final two terms in the Greek here seem to be an addition. And so the translator may have conflated the rest of this clause into the Greek phrase κηρύξαι αἰχμαλώτοις ἄφεσιν, thus reading the Hebrew אסר at least in part as αἰχμάλωτος 'captive'. Regardless of how we understand this last phrase, the translator evidences a clear understanding of אסר's Hebrew meaning.

the condensation of the noun phrase in its clause-initial position. I say this because the placement of the clause-terminal verb λύω reflects the position of the verb καθαιρέω in the previous clause.[63] From this perspective then, the translator likely sought to create a paralleled syntactic arrangement between these two clauses. This pair of clause-terminal verbs reflects the translator's patterned concern for stylistic symmetry in his renderings which we have seen elsewhere. The result is a balanced clause structure. Last of all, given the general semantic breadth of ἐπαγωγή in Greek literature generally and its infrequency in the Septuagint, extended comment upon this term is essential at this point to fully grasp the construction of verse 17c.

The Semantic Problem of ἐπαγωγή

The translator's use of ἐπαγωγή in 14:17c demands close attention. As I stated above, the Greek phrase τοὺς ἐν ἐπαγωγῇ here contains elements which are formally absent in the Hebrew text. And the rationale behind this rendering cannot be fully grasped without first settling a second issue. That is, the broad semantic range of ἐπαγωγή must be delineated in order to understand its meaning here. This task is especially significant since major reference works and translations disagree on this noun's meaning. Consider the contemporary reception of this phrase:[64]

---

[63]The translator's use of λύω also reflects his understanding of the *Qal* stem פתח in the MT as a *Pi'el*. See HALOT, 987 pi. 1.a. 'to let loose'; 1.b. 'to untie'; 1.c. 'to undo'; 1.d. 'to liberate'. See See Karrer and Kraus (2011), 2542: "*Der Übersetzer übersetzt* אסיר *wie in 10,4, liest* פתח *pi. und übergeht* ביתה."

[64]On an ostensible text-critical problem between ἐπαγωγή and ἀπαγωγή, see Walters (1973), 129-30: "In Isaiah ἐπαγωγή, which is preferred by Rahlfs and Ziegler in 10:4, and by all editors in 14:17, would make sense in itself. Yet only ἀπαγωγή tallies with the Hebrew אָסִיר. . . . So we must write εἰς ἀπαγωγήν 10:4 with BQLC, τοὺς ἐν ἀπαγωγῇ 14:17 with VQ^{mg}L and others." Admittedly, if ἀπαγωγή were the correct reading, 'captivity' would surely be the correct gloss. We see this in 1 Esdr 8:24 where ἀπαγωγή pairs strictly with Aramaic אֱסוּר from Ezra 7:26; pairings with ἐπαγωγή are only attested in late manuscripts. However, apart from the relatively late manuscript attestation of ἀπαγωγή in Greek Isaiah (and in LXX Deuteronomy), Walters' approach begs the lexical and semantic question by assuming that the translator of Greek Isaiah sought to produce a strict rendering of the Hebrew. And beyond the external evidence, the reading ἐπαγωγή constitutes a *lectio difficilior* which also makes sense in the literary context. Walters also suggests the reading ἀπαγωγή at Deut 32:36. Concerning this latter view, Wevers (1995), 529, states: "This seems to me to be a case of special pleading." See additional comments in Ottley (1904-6), 26, 179.

Isa 14:17: אֲסִירָיו לֹא־פָתַח בֵּיתָה
τοὺς ἐν ἐπαγωγῇ οὐκ ἔλυσε
NETS: [he] has not released those who are in misery[65]
LES: he did not release those under attack[66]
BdA: *il n'a pas affranchi les prisonniers*
LXX.D: *erlöste die im Elend nicht*

Apart from *BdA*, each gloss for ἐπαγωγή here corresponds with examples from standard lexicons as 'misery,' 'distress,' or 'attack.' And the caveat in the footnote of NETS is telling of the phrase's difficulty. So, since disparity exists in these renderings, it is worth pursuing a clearer portrait of this term's meaning.[67]

These diverse renderings may be understood from two perspectives. First of all, Greek Isaiah preserves neither the formal nor the semantic content of the Hebrew text. In place of a Hebrew noun, the Greek contains a relative phrase. And instead of bringing over the meaning 'prisoners,' he supplies a gloss of implication in one of two ways, either as 'misery, distress' or as 'captivity, exile.'[68] Nonetheless, a precise semantic fit between ἐπαγωγή and the Hebrew text is elusive at this point. Thus, the question of the meaning of ἐπαγωγή, as the second and more fundamental *desiderata* before us, occupies the majority of the following discussion.

Greek lexicons of the Classical and Hellenistic worlds are in concert with their diverse portrait of ἐπαγωγή. LSJ, BrillDAG, and CGL are in agreement about this term's broad semantic range. Depending upon context, the term can denote 'introduction,' 'help, aid,' 'calling forth,' 'allurement,' 'invasion, assault,' 'marching in a column,' 'incantation, conjuring,' or

---

[65]In Silva (2007), 836, footnotes the rendering: "Possibly *captivity*."

[66]See Penner (2020), 541: "The reappearance of ἐπαγωγῆ recalls 10:4; ἐπαγωγή generally means bringing in, so can be used for enticement, but in this military context, an 'attack' would probably be understood, as in Polybius 10.23.7." Even though I disagree with Penner's translation at Isa 10:4, his decision coincides with instances in Greek literature recorded in relevant lexicons and the nominal etymology.

[67]The reading in Greek Isaiah is unique in antiquity. See 1QIsa[a] אסיריו לוא פתח ביתה; A´ Σ´ Θ´ τους δεσιους αυτου μη απολυσας εις οικιαν; Targum לַאֲסִירוֹהִי לָא פְתַח תַרעָא; Peshitta ܠܐ ܦܬܚ ܒܝܬܗ; Vulgate *vinctis eius non aperuit carcerem*.

[68]So, we are left with three options for pairing the Greek phrase τοὺς ἐν ἐπαγωγῇ to the Hebrew. The translator could have rendered either Hebrew noun—אֲסִירָיו or בֵּיתָה—while omitting the other. Or, he could have condensed both Hebrew nouns into the single Greek phrase.

'inductive reasoning.' The first two of these lexicons also supply two additional glosses which are unique to the Septuagint: 'captivity, imprisonment' and 'misery, distress':

LSJ, 603	7. *leading away into captivity*, *captivity*, LXX *Is*. 14.17; generally, *distress*, *misery*, ib. *Si*. 23.14 (pl.), cf. Hsch.[69]
BrillDAG, 733	5. misery, misfortune (analog.) (Sirach 23.11)
	6. captivity, imprisonment (later extension) Isa 10.4

These lexical entries from LSJ and BrillDAG are noteworthy since they are exclusive to Septuagint usage.[70] However, such meanings should evoke caution since they may in fact align more with the Hebrew text than accepted Greek meanings.[71] Much research has highlighted this caveat about LSJ.[72] And since it is difficult to make sense out of the Septuagint examples with typical Classical Greek glosses, we should proceed with some suspicion regarding the accuracy of these lexical entries.

To shape this semantic portrait further, it is also profitable to examine the semantic presentation of ἐπαγωγή in standard Septuagint lexicons. These works significantly narrow the sense of the term in the corpus:[73]

---

[69]LSJ locates ἐπαγωγή in Sir 23:14, which is found only in Swete's edition. In contrast to this, all citations provided here accord with the editions of both Rahlfs and Ziegler, which locate ἐπαγωγή in Sir 23:11.

[70]References to the Septuagint are largely absent in CGL.

[71]Under ἀπαγωγή in GELS, 63, Muraoka provides the gloss preceded by an asterisk: **carrying off to prison*. This marking indicates that "the word is not attested earlier than the Septuagint" (*xiii*, *xxii*). This note confirms the suspicions above concerning glosses exclusive to the Septuagint and unwarranted textual emendations. Even though ἀπαγωγή is absent from printed Septuagint editions, Muraoka includes such references to this term where they otherwise do not occur.

[72]See Caird (1968), 454: "Anyone who tries to read the LXX with the help of LSJ soon becomes aware of a similar lack of linguistic method. The admirable principles which have governed the compilation of the Lexicon as a whole are all too often neglected in the Septuagintal entries, and no systematic consideration has been given to the problems raised by the fact that the LXX is for the most part a translation of a semitic text"; Lee (1983), 8: "LSJ includes a large amount of LXX material, but as is mostly well known, is often in error. A particular fault is its tendency to equate the LXX word with the Hebrew it translates when there is no good reason to do so"; 44: "LSJ's material, in particular, must be used with caution in any study of LXX vocabulary"; ibid: "[I]t is essential for students of the LXX not to regard LSJ's collection as final."

[73]Also see Lampe (1969), 506: 1. introduction; application (of remedies); 2. bringing in, addition; what follows; 3. bringing up of enemies against; attack, onset; persecutions, afflictions.

LEH, 219 *distress*, *misery*
GELS, 257 *calamity*

These lexicons recognize not only that the majority of Classical meanings do not apply to ἐπαγωγή in the Septuagint, but they also exclude ‘captivity’ as a possible gloss. This is significant as we analyze ἐπαγωγή in the Septuagint.[74]

As we will see, the meanings provided by these Septuagint lexicons may be consistently applied in every instance of ἐπαγωγή in the Septuagint to be discussed below. And none of the examples from the Septuagint require the gloss ‘captivity’ as was suggested by the Classical Greek lexicons.[75] In fact, employing this gloss would often not make any sense in context. So, to assume that it must convey this sense in Greek Isaiah 14:17 ends up begging the semantic question on the basis of what we think the Hebrew requires.

To bolster this position further, Greek Isaiah itself provides some patterns against which we may compare the supposed meaning ‘captivity, exile’ with ἐπαγωγή. In comparing instances of captivity terminology in the book, we can perceive the translator’s pattern of employing a precise and unequivocal Greek lexeme (e.g., αἰχμαλω-). This pattern stands in contrast to the more vague semantics of ἐπαγωγή.[76] From the span of ‘captivity, exile’ terminology in Isaiah, here I present two illustrative examples of this phenomenon, each evidencing a different Hebrew verb:[77]

Isa 5:13 לָכֵן גָּלָה עַמִּי מִבְּלִי־דָעַת

[74]Etymologically, the meaning ‘captivity’ is *prima facie* implausible for the term ἐπαγωγή. Such a sense is more fitting with the prefix ἀπ- as we see with ἀπαγωγή ‘leading away, captivity’ in LSJ, 174 and BrillDAG, 221. This is confirmed in Polybius who often employs ἐπαγωγή with the sense of entrance ‘into’ and not captivity ‘away from.’ As we will see, the latter rendering ‘captivity, exile’ for ἐπαγωγή is unattested in Greek literature.

[75]Two instances of ἐπαγωγή in extant papyri also provide no evidence for the meaning ‘captivity.’ See BGU 8.1855 (TM 4934; 64-44 B.C.): [μ]ετ᾽ ἐπαγωγῆς τοῦ ἀρχεφόδου ‘with the cooperation of the police-chief’; jur.pap.36_1 (TM 70352; 88 B.C.): κα[ὶ] τὸ ὕδωρ παρὰ ὀγδόην ἡμέρας τὸ ἥμισυ καὶ [τῆς] [ἐ]παγωγῆς νυκτὸς τὸ ἥμισυ. See full text in Ellis H. Minns. “Parchments of the Parthian Period from Avroman,” in *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 35 (1915): 28. Josephus employs the term 5 times in Antiquities. See Ant. 17:97; 17:340; 18:7; 18:60; 19:193. Each instance accords with Classical semantics, and instances in 18:7 and 19:193 may convey the meanings attested in Septuagint lexicons. The term never occurs in Philo.

[76]These semantic patterns also correspond with the full corpus of the Hebrew Bible and Septuagint.

[77]For the broad spectrum of data, see Isa 5:13; 14:2; 20:4; 23:1; 45:13; 46:2; 49:24; 49:25; 52:2; 61:1. For each of these examples, the Greek translator employed the stem αἰχμαλω- to convey exile or captivity. Of

τοίνυν αἰχμάλωτος ὁ λαός μου ἐγενήθη διὰ τὸ μὴ εἰδέναι αὐτοὺς τὸν κύριον

Isa 14:2 וְהָיוּ שֹׁבִים לְשֹׁבֵיהֶם וְרָדוּ בְּנֹגְשֵׂיהֶם

καὶ ἔσονται αἰχμάλωτοι οἱ αἰχμαλωτεύσαντες αὐτούς . . .

From these two examples, we see the translator's tendency to employ the stem αἰχμαλω- for the standard Hebrew 'captivity, exile' lexemes שׁבה and גלה. Thus, Greek Isaiah illustrates that the translator had sufficient and patterned lexical options to express these ideas. And from this basis, in addition to the overriding patterns of the larger Septuagint corpus, we should be suspicious of any attempt to gloss ἐπαγωγή 'captivity' or 'exile' as LSJ and BrillDAG suggest.

Furthermore, the second example above from Isa 14:2 above is of particular significance since it not only contains explicit language of captivity, but it also occurs within the same chapter as the example from Isa 14:17 under discussion. That the translator supplied a term other than αἰχμαλω- in verse 17 strongly suggests that he did not in fact wish to convey ideas of 'captivity.' As a result, we should investigate the requisite sources and reference materials in order to gain a clearer understanding of the translator's use of this term.

Examples of ἐπαγωγή in the Septuagint

Although the term ἐπαγωγή occurs only 3 times in translated Septuagint books, Sirach features the term 9 times and the Psalms of Solomon contain it once.[78] The examples from Sirach evidence the clearest and most helpful semantic portrait of this term. As such, it provides the best place to initiate analysis. Incidentally, this work is relatively contemporaneous with

---

significance is the condensed rendering αἰχμαλωσία for שְׁבִי and גָּלוּת in Isa 20:4.

[78]See Deut 32:36; Isa 10:3-4; 14:17; Sir 2:2; 3:28; 5:8; 10:13; 23:11; 25:14[x2]; 38:19; 40:9; Psa. Sol. 2:22. The term also occurs in Odes 2:36 which reproduces Deut 32:36. Psalms of Solomon is not a translated text, but the meaning fits with either 'attack' or 'misery': Ἱκάνωσον, κύριε, τοῦ βαρύνεσθαι χεῖρά σου ἐπὶ Ιερουσαλημ ἐν ἐπαγωγῇ ἐθνῶν 'May it be enough, O Lord, namely your hand weighing heavy upon Jerusalem in the invasion-misery of the nations.' The term also occurs in the Testament of Levi 3:2: ἐν αὐτῷ εἰσι πάντα τὰ πνεύματα τῶν ἐπαγωγῶν εἰς ἐκδίκησιν τῶν ἀνόμων 'for in [the day of judgement of God] are all the spirits of calamities for vengeance of the lawless.' The use of ἐπαγωγή in these texts supports my semantic proposal.

Greek Isaiah and provides a valuable springboard to assess the semantics of ἐπαγωγή.[79] Each example from Sirach below contains the Hebrew lexical pair in brackets:[80]

Sir 3:28[81] ἐπαγωγῇ [מכה] ὑπερηφάνου οὐκ ἔστιν ἴασις
For the misery of the arrogant there is no healing

Sir 5:8 οὐδὲν γὰρ ὠφελήσει σε ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐπαγωγῆς [עברה]
For it will not be of benefit in a day of distress

Sir 10:13 διὰ τοῦτο παρεδόξασεν κύριος τὰς ἐπαγωγὰς [נגע]
Because of this, the Lord appointed the miseries

Sir 23:11 πλησθησεται γὰρ ἐπαγωγῶν [נגע] ὁ οἶκος αὐτοῦ
For his house will be filled with miseries

Sir 40:9 ἐπαγωγαί [שד], λιμὸς καὶ σύντριμμα καὶ μάστιξ
calamities, famine and ruin and scourge

In addition to the footnoted examples, the references sampled here are especially important since they permit insight into the translator's understanding of ἐπαγωγή from the perspective of the Hebrew.[82] And in contrast to the examples from other translated Septuagint books, which are less

[79]The textual histories of Ben Sira and Sirach are notoriously difficult and the influence of one tradition or translation upon another is not always clear. On the topic of textual history, see Yadin (1965); Pancratius (1997); Wright (2014), 90-109; Wright (2015), 410-424; Askin (2018); Ueberschaer (2019), 397-414; Salvesen (2021), 385-402. In light of these textual difficulties, it could have been possible for ἐπαγωγή not only to have rendered the noted Hebrew terms above, but also for a later Hebrew scribe to create his manuscript under the semantic influence and force of ἐπαγωγή in the Greek tradition. Nonetheless, if this scenario had taken place, it would still support my proposal in favor of semantic overlap between ἐπαγωγή and glosses of 'calamity, misery, distress.' This kind of 'back-translation' would only indicate that a scribe understood the meaning ἐπαγωγή in accordance with my 'calamity' semantics. And the lack of 'captivity' semantics is telling.

[80]Examples not provided here lack Hebrew counterparts. I provide translations which I consider to be the most precise from either NETS or LES. Each remaining example from Sir 2:2; 23:11; 25:14; 38:19 is consistent with the meaning 'misery, distress, calamity,' but lacks a Hebrew counterpart. Sirach 25:14 is the most difficult passage to translate, and the meaning of ἐπαγωγή could mean 'attack.' Nonetheless, this meaning is entirely within the semantic range of the Greek term. Brenton (1851) contains mixed renderings: 'captivity' at Isa 14:17; 10:4; 'hostile invasion' at Deut 32.36; terms related to 'captivity' for each instance of ἐπαγωγή in Sirach.

[81]The Hebrew orthography is difficult at this point due to a potential erasure. Nonetheless, the initial consonants מ and כ are present.

[82]Manuscript A preserves the readings from 3:28; 5:8; 10:13. Manuscript B preserves the reading from 40:9. Manuscript C preserves the reading from 23:11. The Hebrew and Greek texts diverge with regards to the verbal phrase at 23:11. But the following material מביתו הנגע is in all likelihood captured by ἐπαγωγῶν ὁ οἶκος αὐτοῦ. Manuscripts from Masada preserve only small fragments from chapters 39:27-44:1 with a *lacuna* where 40:9 belongs. Manuscripts from Qumran (11Q5 and 2Q18) do not contain textual material relevant to this discussion. Manuscripts D, E, F likewise lack any relevant textual material. For images and transcriptions of Ben Sira manuscripts, see https://www.bensira.org/navigator.php.

strict in their rendering, each example from Sirach here exhibits a one-to-one pairing between the Hebrew and the Greek. Each Hebrew term bracketed in the examples above—עברה, נגע, שׁד מכה,—expresses ideas of destruction, calamity, injury, or abuse.

So, in contrast to the more creative pairing(s) in Greek Isaiah, we know from Sirach-Ben Sira that ἐπαγωγή conveyed the meanings of various Hebrew terms which express calamity, destruction, or injury.[83] This point establishes the semantic prominence of 'calamity, misery' in the 2nd century B.C. as a gloss for ἐπαγωγή. And Sirach's use of ἐπαγωγή also corresponds with the suggested glosses in LEH and GELS. To delineate this point further, two other examples of ἐπαγωγή are treated before returning to discussion of Isa 14:17.

The first examines the use of ἐπαγωγή in LXX Deut 32:36. This occurrence illustrates how the term is a lexical plus and, as such, its meaning cannot be gathered from the Hebrew lexemes themselves. It must be obtained from context and Greek usage more generally:

Deut 32:36	כִּי יִרְאֶה כִּי־אָזְלַת יָד וְאֶפֶס עָצוּר וְעָזוּב
	εἶδεν γὰρ παραλελυμένους αὐτοὺς καὶ ἐκλελοιπότας ἐν ἐπαγωγῇ καὶ παρειμένους
NETS:	For he saw them paralyzed, both failed under attack and enfeebled
LES:	For he saw them exhausted and failing, in misery and weakened
BdA:	*Car il les a vus défaits, abandonnés en détresse et délaissés*
LXX.D:	*und ohnmächtig in der Not und erschlafft*

Based on the Hebrew-to-Greek pairings here, we may reasonably conclude that the term ἐκλελοιπότας (i.e., ἐκλείπω 'to forsake') renders the *Qal* Passive of עצר 'to hold back.' This is confirmed by the subsequent *Qal* passive of עזב 'to free' paired with παρειμένους (i.e., παρίημι 'to neglect').[84] And so, the phrase ἐν ἐπαγωγῇ constitutes a lexical plus to the Hebrew of the MT. As such it reflects the translator's interpretation of this verse, but does not demand the idiosyncratic gloss 'captivity' for ἐπαγωγή. Instead, the meaning 'distress, misery' or 'attack' for

[83]Walters (1973), 129, grants as much.

[84]I understand the specific Hebrew-Greek pairings as follows: כִּי־אָזְלַת יָד with παραλελυμένους [αὐτοὺς]; וְאֶפֶס עָצוּר with καὶ ἐκλελοιπότας; ἐν ἐπαγωγῇ as a plus; וְעָזוּב with παρειμένους. Wevers (1995), 529 understands the pairings differently. However, to confirm the status of ἐν ἐπαγωγῇ as a plus, see also SamP. ואפס עצוב ועזוב; Pesh. ܘܠܝܬ ܕܫܒܩ ܘܫܒܝܩ ܠܐ ܐܝܬ; Targ. יְהוֹן מְטַלְטְלִין וּשְׁבִיקִין; Vulg. *defecerint residuique consumpti sint*. The phrase עָצוּר וְעָזוּב appears to mean something like 'bond and free.' HALOT glosses it as 'kept back and let free.' See instances of similar pairings in 1 Kgs 14:10; 21[20]:21; 2 Kgs 9:8; 14:26.

ἐν ἐπαγωγῇ aptly captures the sense of the passage, a point confirmed in LEH and GELS. Additionally, each translation listed above conveys ἐπαγωγή with this sense. For the reasons listed here, this example, combined with those from Sirach mentioned earlier, supports meanings like 'distress' over those signifying captivity.[85]

To conclude the discussion, I example the two examples of ἐπαγωγή in Greek Isaiah require attention. I aim to show not only that 'misery, distress, *et al.*' is an appropriate gloss in the passages below, but that we have no substantial reason for rendering ἐπαγωγή as 'captivity.' This is confirmed from several avenues: lexical semantics, Greek usage detailed in lexicons, contemporary Septuagint translations. Each example is provided here:

Isa 10:3-4[86]	וְאָנָה תַּעַזְבוּ כְּבוֹדְכֶם׃
	בְּלִתִּי כָרַע תַּחַת אַסִּיר וְתַחַת הֲרוּגִים יִפֹּלוּ
	καὶ ποῦ καταλείψετε τὴν δόξαν ὑμῶν τοῦ μὴ ἐμπεσεῖν εἰς ἐπαγωγήν;
LES:	*And where will you abandon your riches not to fall into captivity?*
NETS:	*And where will you leave your glory so as not to fall into misery?*[87]
BdA:	*Et où laisserez-vous votre gloire pour ne pas tomber en captivité?*
LXX.D:	*Und wo werdet ihr eure Herrlichkeit zurücklassen, damit sie nicht ins Elend stürzt?*

Piecing together the Hebrew and Greek at this juncture is difficult since some lexical elements of the Hebrew are absent in the Greek. A disparity first of all lies between the sole Greek infinitival phrase—τοῦ μὴ ἐμπεσεῖν εἰς ἐπαγωγήν—and the pair of Hebrew verbs—**כרע** and **נפל**. And even though the **נפל** and -πίπτω pair more frequently in Greek Isaiah, the Greek term occasionally corresponds with **כרע**. Semantic overlap is also conceivable with both. In addition, the Hebrew contains two prepositional phrases—**תַּחַת אַסִּיר** and **וְתַחַת הֲרוּגִים**—whereas the Greek contains one—εἰς ἐπαγωγήν. This rendering could be explained either as the omission of the latter phrase, or as the condensation of both Hebrew phrases into the singular Greek expression. Nonetheless, the Greek rendering here must be one of implication as I noted above.

---

[85]In reference to Caird (1968-69), see Harl (1992), 338: "*selon Caird, il a le sense général de «détresse» et non le sense particulier de «captivité» (LSJ)*."

[86]Note that Greek Isaiah contains different verse divisions than the Masoretic presentation.

[87]In Silva (2007), 832, footnotes the rendering: "Possibly *captivity*."

In light of these patterns, we would thus be unjustified in supplying the meaning 'captivity' since it is nowhere else attested in Greek literature and neither is it required by the Hebrew or Greek lexemes in this text. The use of the gloss 'captivity' may to some extent make sense of the passage. But employing it would beg the semantic question without providing evidence for this term as a legitimate gloss.[88] Thus, the only warranted rendering is found in NETS and LXX.D; the presentations of LES and *BdA* are mistaken in my view.

Keeping this gamut of details in perspective, we may now revisit the lexical problem of ἐπαγωγή in Isa 14:17. I present the data again for convenience:

Isa 14:17:	אֲסִירָיו לֹא־פָתַח בֵּיתָה
	τοὺς ἐν ἐπαγωγῇ οὐκ ἔλυσε
NETS:	[he] has not released those who are in misery
LES:	he did not release those under attack[89]
BdA:	*il n'a pas affranchi les prisonniers*
LXX.D:	*erlöste die im Elend nicht*

Among these translations, it is noteworthy that the idea of 'captivity' or 'prisoners' is only present in *BdA*. This gloss deviates from other translation patterns as it seems to capture the semantics of Hebrew אָסִיר rather than Greek ἐπαγωγή.[90] However, this goes against the majority view of the translations above. And since the rendering '*les prisonniers*' occurs neither in published translations nor in Greek lexicons, it should not significantly influence the present investigation. This gloss seems to arise from translational convenience instead of sound lexical method. Contrary to this, we can see that the major Septuagint translations avoid the gloss 'captivity' in place of ἐπαγωγή. And even though Silva's translation in NETS contains a footnote

[88]Contra Ottley (1906), 179: "The usual rendering of ἐπαγωγή, 'calamity' . . . does not seem applicable to either place in Isaiah: and the idea of leading (captive) appears better suited." As I note above, this statement begs the lexical and semantic question by supposing that the individual Hebrew term must have directly informed the translator's decision.

[89]See the relevant comments in the reference to Penner (2020) noted above.

[90]Contrast this rendering with ἐπαγωγή as *détresse* in Deut 32:36. This gloss in Isa 14:17 is significant since it deviates from the lexicological method which informs the translation principles of *BdA*. See Harl (2001): 181-82: "The goal of 'La Bible d'Alexandrie' is to offer as exact a translation of the Greek text of the LXX as possible."

with an alternative suggestion, the lexical arguments presented above lend no support to such a position.

Conclusion

The preceding discussion detailed the various difficulties surrounding ἐπαγωγή in the Septuagint. First of all, the noun expresses a unique meaning in the Septuagint when compared with other Greek literature. And while ἐπαγωγή exhibits a wide semantic range in Classical Greek, LSJ and BrillDAG propose the meanings 'misery' and 'captivity' solely to Septuagint occurrences. And while the latter meaning 'captivity' for ἐπαγωγή is not clear from the Septuagint examples, the meaning 'misery, calamity' has strong evidence in its favor. Not only do the major Septuagint lexicons designate 'misery, calamity' as the only possible meaning for ἐπαγωγή, the Hebrew-Greek pairings in Sirach make this gloss all the more likely, where the translator employed ἐπαγωγή with its 'Septuagintal' meaning by strictly pairing it with related Hebrew terms: מכה, עברה, נגע, שׁד. And since the use of ἐπαγωγή in LXX Deuteronomy and Greek Isaiah cannot be paired with any specific Hebrew term, it is difficult to argue against the only clearly attested meaning in favor of an unattested 'captivity.'[91] Last of all, given the lack of contextual and literary attestation for ἐπαγωγή as 'captivity,' we have good reason to reject this meaning and supply 'misery, calamity' for each instance in the Septuagint. Such a proposal confirms the presentations in LEH and GELS while regarding LSJ and BrillDAG as mistaken in their approach at this point.[92]

It seems clear, then, that the translator of Greek Isaiah knew the meaning of the term ἐπαγωγή and simply adapted his translation to the contextual demands of the Hebrew text (but

[91]See Caird (1968), 473. After identifying 'trouble' as an appropriate gloss for ἐπαγωγή, he states: "In view of the well-established tendency of the translator of Isaiah to depart from the sense of the Hebrew almost at whim, there is no need to look for a more precise meaning for the word in the two passages in which he uses it." Contrast this with Ottley (1904), 26: "B's reading seems to be right, ἀπαγωγήν perhaps being preferable here to ἐπαγωγήν, which may have come in from xiv. 17." In contrast to this, I think it is more plausible that 10:4 influenced 14:17.

[92]For a robust critique of BrillDAG, see Lee (2017).

not its strict semantics). The Greek usage appears to be used as a gloss of implication, which condenses the Hebrew nouns אָסִיר and בַּיִת into the relative clause τοὺς ἐν ἐπαγωγῇ. In turn, this describes the prisoners as 'those in distress.' This condensation of semantic implication is similar to what occurs in Deut 32:36 and Isa 10:4, and the use of a noun phrase here suggests the translator's concern for a stylistic rendering of his Hebrew. And such a rendering would permit the reorganization of the word order from Hebrew to Greek as is attested in Isa 14:17.

Appendix 5:
Deviations from the Hebrew Text

In this appendix I briefly explore topics related to the boundaries of the translator of Greek Isaiah's interpretive approach. I examine, on the one hand, whether the translator read and interpreted Isaiah beyond the strictures of his Hebrew text. Did he insert a surplus of Greek material into his work which had no explicit or implicit attestation in the Hebrew text? On the other hand, I investigate whether the translator 'failed' to capture significant themes or structures within the parameters of the Hebrew text. Did he 'miss' anything of significance? I aim in this appendix, then, to clarify my perspective on the translator's own abilities and practices within his Second Temple interpretive milieu.

Locating a surplus of 'free' translation material in Greek Isaiah which is not attached to the Hebrew text in some way is difficult given the translator's overall 'literal' tendencies. This is not to say that the translation is 'literal' in the traditional sense of the term, with consistent lexical-semantic and word-for-word renderings. Rather, the translator was concerned to produce a 'free' translation that was nonetheless intimately connected to the words and ideas of the Hebrew source. In other words, the nature of the translator's approach largely restricted the emergence of significant 'surplus' of Greek material beyond the strictures of the Hebrew. This arises from the fact that Greek Isaiah is in fact a *translation*.[93] As van der Louw notes: "[F]ree renderings are first of all *linguistic material*."[94] The translator was concerned to render both the explicit and implicit sense(s) of his Hebrew text to his Greek audience.

Unlike the translation tendencies of Old Greek Proverbs and Old Greek Job which contain significant and recognizable Greek additions and omissions when compared to the

[93]See Troxel (2008), 132: "[The translator] was less concerned to bring his readers to the Hebrew text of Isaiah than to bring the book to them." See also Wagner (2013), 236: "The Greek translator does not so much inject 'foreign' ideas into Isaiah's vision as amplify, elaborate and interweave characteristically 'Isaian' themes into bold new patterns. The voice of OG Isaiah is that of the Hebrew prophet. But he speaks with a distinctively Greek accent."

[94]Van der Louw (2007), 9.

Masoretic Text, Greek Isaiah is closely tied to the Hebrew.[95] Greek Isaiah's 'freeness' is marked by varied and intentional lexical choice, heightened poetic and discourse features, along with Pentateuchal and inner-Isaianic allusions. Such an approach permitted freedom in the translator's work while also enabling close 'literal' adherence to the Hebrew text. Thus, since so little material is added or omitted in the Greek, it is difficult to posit a non-explication rationale behind Greek Isaiah's plusses and minuses. The simplest explanation seems to be that the translator aimed at explicating the sense(s) of the Hebrew with varied emphases. This is not to deny the presence of Greek surplus, but instead to emphasize the consistency with which the translator adheres to the Hebrew text. As Silva notes: "What may have been going on in [the translator's] mind . . . is an intriguing question, but we would be wrong to infer that he was unconcerned about being faithful to the text."[96] This details of this perspective are detailed throughout chapters 3-6 in this research project.

With that said, an alternative possibility remains, namely that the translator might have 'failed' to transfer elements of the Hebrew text into the Greek. This is surely a possibility, but it also raises significant yet difficult methodological questions. Since the translator of Greek Isaiah proceeds with a 'literal' approach, it is difficult within the contours of Isa 13:1-14:23 itself to detect significant thematic or structural deviations. However, the question of whether the translator might have 'failed' in thematic and structural connections still an important matter. And it is one which may prove important beyond the boundaries of Isa 13:1-14:23. Below I detail what I consider to be some 'failed' connections at the level of Isaiah's literary macro-structure.

Given the range of semantic, thematic, and structural possibilities in interpreting biblical literature and beyond, it should go without saying that the translator of Greek Isaiah had other legitimate avenues before him for capturing the meaning(s) of Hebrew Isaiah. As such, 'failure' to capture the range of interpretive possibilities is inevitable since this is simply a resultant and necessary feature of translation itself. Even the most 'faithful' and 'accurate'

---

[95]See the discussions of Greek Job and Greek Proverbs in Aitken (2015); Salvesen and Law (2021).

[96]Silva (2007) 824.

translations must still choose sides in favor of one or another lexical, semantic, or structural nuance. Nonetheless, in the following discussion I will highlight two passages relevant to the question of 'failed' thematic and structural connections. Given his fluency in the macro-themes and structures of Isaiah, I argue that the translator of Greek Isaiah 'failed' to read the oracle against Babylon and her king in light of significant parallels in Isa 47:10 and Isa 60:1-3, 19-20.

As I illustrated in the body of the research thesis, the translator of Greek Isaiah displays an awareness and heightening of macro-structural features between Isaiah 13 and 21. This is relevant because both passages serve as oracles against Babylon, and the translator went out of his way to highlight their similarity by employing similar yet unnecessary lexemes (e.g., οἱ καταλελειμμένοι). In addition to chapter 21, Isaiah 47:1-15 serves as another passage which denounces Babylon. But this latter passage does not seem to have influenced the translator's work in Isa 13:1-14:23 and vice versa. This is significant since both passages are thematically parallel in their denouncement of Babylon as a royal figure who both spoke boastful words in the heart and also sought identification with God. Yet, as is evident in the references below, no significant lexical overlap occurs between these passages in the Greek text:

Isaiah 14:13	וְאַתָּה אָמַרְתָּ בִלְבָבְךָ	σὺ δὲ εἶπας τῇ διανοίᾳ σου[97]
	הַשָּׁמַיִם אֶעֱלֶה	εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀναβήσομαι,
	מִמַּעַל לְכוֹכְבֵי־אֵל אָרִים כִּסְאִי	ἐπάνω τῶν ἄστρων τοῦ θεοῦ θήσω τὸν θρόνον μου
	וְאֵשֵׁב בְּהַר־מוֹעֵד בְּיַרְכְּתֵי צָפוֹן׃	καθιῶ ἐν ὄρει ὑψηλῷ ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρη τὰ ὑψηλὰ τὰ πρὸς βορρᾶν,
Isaiah 14:14	אֶעֱלֶה עַל־בָּמֳתֵי עָב	ἀναβήσομαι ἐπάνω τῶν νεφελῶν,
	אֲדַמֶּה לְעֶלְיוֹן׃	ἔσομαι ὅμοιος τῷ ὑψίστῳ.
Isaiah 47:10	וַתִּבְטְחִי בְרָעָתֵךְ	τῇ ἐλπίδι τῆς πονηρίας σου.
	אָמַרְתְּ אֵין רֹאָנִי	σὺ γὰρ εἶπας Ἐγώ εἰμι, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἑτέρα·
	חָכְמָתֵךְ וְדַעְתֵּךְ הִיא שׁוֹבְבָתֶךְ	γνῶθι ὅτι ἡ σύνεσις τούτων καὶ ἡ πονηρία σου ἔσται σοι αἰσχύνη.
	וַתֹּאמְרִי בְלִבֵּךְ אֲנִי וְאַפְסִי עוֹד׃	καὶ εἶπας τῇ καρδίᾳ σου Ἐγώ εἰμι, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἑτέρα.

The only similarity between the passages is found in the rendering of Isa 14:13 as σὺ δὲ εἶπας τῇ διανοίᾳ σου and Isa 47:10 εἶπας τῇ καρδίᾳ σου. Yet, these translations simply correspond to the lexical-semantics of their Hebrew counterparts. What is more significant is the lexical and semantic deviation from the Hebrew text in Isa 47:10 where the translator repeated the phrase

[97]Codex Sinaiticus contains the reading τῇ καρδίᾳ σου in 'agreement' with τῇ καρδίᾳ σου in Isa 47:10. However, since both of these readings are strict renderings of the Hebrew text, their agreement is insignificant.

ἐγώ εἰμι, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἑτέρα despite the lack of a Hebrew counterpart in the first occurrence. If this kind of deviation would also have occurred in the thematically related section in Isa 14:13-14, we would have good reason to posit intentional thematic and structural connections on the part of the translator. The same goes for the inverse. If something resembling the 'free' rendering καθιῶ ἐν ὄρει ὑψηλῷ ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρη τὰ ὑψηλὰ τὰ πρὸς βορρᾶν from Isa 14:13 occurred in chapter 47, we would likewise have evidence for intentional thematic connections between the passages. However, since none of these lexical patterns can be observed between these thematically related passages, it seems that the translator of Greek Isaiah 'failed' to explicate such parallels between them.

The second example covers select verses from Isaiah 60:1-22 which describe the future restoration of the divinely radiant city of God. In this chapter, cosmic-astral imagery occurs in order to highlight the new order in which the light of God overcomes and replaces the old luminaries. As such, Isa 60:1-3, 19-20 resembles Isa 13:10 in remarkable ways, both lexically and thematically. Each passage describes the fall of an old order by employing cosmic terminology related to 'light,' 'darkness,' 'sun,' and 'moon.' And the latter passage mentions the arrival of a new creation order outshining the old. This can be seen in the following examples:

Isaiah 13:10	כִּי־כוֹכְבֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם	οἱ γὰρ ἀστέρες τοῦ οὐρανοῦ
	וּכְסִילֵיהֶם לֹא יָהֵלּוּ אוֹרָם	καὶ ὁ Ὡρίων καὶ πᾶς ὁ κόσμος τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τὸ φῶς οὐ δώσουσι,
	חָשַׁךְ הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ בְּצֵאתוֹ	καὶ σκοτισθήσεται τοῦ ἡλίου ἀνατέλλοντος
	וְיָרֵחַ לֹא־יַגִּיהַ אוֹרוֹ	καὶ ἡ σελήνη οὐ δώσει τὸ φῶς αὐτῆς.
Isaiah 60:1	קוּמִי אוֹרִי כִּי בָא אוֹרֵךְ	Φωτίζου φωτίζου, Ιεροουσαλημ, ἥκει γὰρ σου τὸ φῶς
	וּכְבוֹד יְהוָה עָלַיִךְ זָרָח׃	καὶ ἡ δόξα κυρίου ἐπὶ σὲ ἀνατέταλκεν.
Isaiah 60:2	כִּי־הִנֵּה הַחֹשֶׁךְ יְכַסֶּה־אֶרֶץ וַעֲרָפֶל לְאֻמִּים	ἰδοὺ σκότος καὶ γνόφος καλύψει γῆν ἐπ᾽ ἔθνη·
	וְעָלַיִךְ יִזְרַח יְהוָה	ἐπὶ δὲ σὲ φανήσεται κύριος
	וּכְבוֹדוֹ עָלַיִךְ יֵרָאֶה׃	καὶ ἡ δόξα αὐτοῦ επὶ σὲ ὀφθήσεται.
Isaiah 60:3	וְהָלְכוּ גוֹיִם לְאוֹרֵךְ	καὶ πορεύσονται βασιλεῖς τῷ φωτί σου
	וּמְלָכִים לְנֹגַהּ זַרְחֵךְ׃	καὶ ἔθνη τῇ λαμπρότητί σου.
Isaiah 60:19	לֹא־יִהְיֶה־לָּךְ עוֹד הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ לְאוֹר יוֹמָם	καὶ οὐκ ἔσται σοι ὁ ἥλιος εἰς φῶς ἡμέρας
	וּלְנֹגַהּ הַיָּרֵחַ לֹא־יָאִיר לָךְ	οὐδὲ ἀνατολὴ σελήνης φωτιεῖ σοι τὴν νύκτα,
	וְהָיָה־לָּךְ יְהוָה לְאוֹר עוֹלָם	ἀλλ᾽ ἔσται σοι κύριος φῶς αἰώνιον
	וֵאלֹהַיִךְ לְתִפְאַרְתֵּךְ׃	καὶ ὁ θεὸς δόξα σου.
Isaiah 60:20	לֹא־יָבוֹא עוֹד שִׁמְשֵׁךְ	οὐ γὰρ δώσεται ἡ ἥλιός σοι

וְיַרֵחֵךְ לֹא יֵאָסֵף	καὶ ἡ σελήνη σοι οὐκ ἐκλείψει·
כִּי יְהוָה יִהְיֶה־לָּךְ לְאוֹר עוֹלָם	ἔσται γὰρ κύριός σοι φῶς αἰώνιον
וְשָׁלְמוּ יְמֵי אֶבְלֵךְ׃	καὶ ἀναπληρωθήσονται αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ πένθους σου.

The large majority of the renderings above are straightforward as the translator of Greek Isaiah rendered his Hebrew text in a 'literal' manner. Such strict renderings can be seen with the following patterns between the chapters: σελήνη renders יָרֵחַ, φῶς and φωτίζω render אוֹר and אור, σκότος and σκοτίζω render חֹשֶׁךְ and חשׁך, ἥλιος renders שֶׁמֶשׁ, ἀνατέλλω renders ירח. These 'literal' renderings, then, also entail that any lexical parallels between the chapters are superficial when these terms are in question. Although with these terms we have clear lexical agreement-patterns between chapters 13 and 60, they bear no significance because they simply represent standard lexical-semantic transfer. If we can explain the Greek translation on the basis of lexical or semantic possibilities in the Hebrew text itself, there is no need to appeal to intertextual, thematic, or structural features outside of the passage in consideration.[98] Even if the translator connected these passages in his mind, the reader would have no way of recognizing any intentionality behind the product.

However, some lexical deviation does occur in Isa 60:19, where the translator idiomatically rendered the phrase לְנֹגַהּ הַיָּרֵחַ with ἀνατολή σελήνης while the nearly identical phrase לְנֹגַהּ זָרְחֵךְ in Isa 60:3 was captured with τῇ λαμπρότητί σου. This could have been a potential source for inner-Isaianic borrowing and a sign of translational intentionality had one or both of these phrases been inserted into Isa 13:10. Similar to Isa 47:10 above, such idiomatic renderings would have been ripe material for lexical transfer between these chapters. However, since such phrases are not shared between chapters 13 and 60, we have no basis to affirm intentional thematic or structural connections. In other words, the translator 'failed' to make significant and relevant inner-Isaianic allusions. The lack of such features does not mean that the translator was unaware of these parallels. It simply means that he did not seek to explicate them into his translation at this point.[99]

[98]See the discussion on the principle of parsimony on page 12.

[99]See the discussions in chapters 3-6 of this thesis for an explanation of such macro-structural and inner Isaianic borrowing.

It is difficult to say exactly why the translator chose to incorporate some thematic, structural, and intertextual connections and allusions into his work while avoiding others. Again, we can recognize the significance of Silva's observation: "What may have been going on in [the translator's] mind . . . is an intriguing question, but we would be wrong to infer that he was unconcerned about being faithful to the text."[100] Detailed exploration into the socio-cultural backgrounds for such readings patterns-traditions is beyond the scope of this project. But some concluding observations might help create methodological boundaries for evaluating the topic.

We must recognize that the translator of Greek Isaiah had many ways to be 'faithful' in the explication of his source text at the levels of both theme and structure. He could have read and interpreted his Hebrew text 'with the grain' and with 'the right sort of mind' in several legitimate ways. But certain reading practices surely governed and constrained his translation patterns. We know that the translator was concerned to stay close to the Hebrew text despite occasional 'free' renderings. Further, we know he sought to read his Hebrew text before him in light of the whole context of Isaiah. As Silva states:

> There can be no doubt that he struggled mightily to make sense of difficult passages, and that even when he seems to go beyond the text, he is sensitive to the thrust of the book as a whole and seeks to come up with teachings that are up-building.[101]

In other words, the Hebrew text at the micro- and macro-levels for the most part governed the translator's interpretive program. The other end of the interpretive spectrum could be characterized as Targumic. This would have been a legitimate approach, but it does not accurately characterize the translator's work or what he sought to accomplish.

What seems to have motivated the translator of Greek Isaiah instead was a tight connection to the words of the Hebrew. However, the translator did feel at liberty to include intertextual features from other parts of the Hebrew Bible, especially the Pentateuch.[102] And of great significance, these intertextual references often originate from thematically significant

---

[100]Silva (2007) 824.

[101]Silva (2007), 824.

[102]Wagner (2013), 233: "At several points we encountered evidence of the translator's interest in forging links with a significant textual precursor, the Greek Pentateuch."

portions of the Pentateuch which pair with relevant Isaianic themes. Such intertextual borrowings include references to the narrative of Babel's downfall, exile from land, the creation mandate, and its application to the return from exile as a new exodus.

Reading in such a sensitive manner to the patterns of the text is expressive of what it means to have 'the right sort of mind.' But it also seems then that the translator fits right into the scriptural and interpretive inheritance of Second Temple Judaism's approach too biblical literature, with its range of rigid interpretation to that of free interpretive plurality. It is within this context that the translator of Greek Isaiah comes to us as a mediating figure between the 'literal' interpretive patterns of the Greek Pentateuch and *kaige* to the 'free' interpretations attested in Greek Job, Greek Proverbs, the Jewish texts of the Judean Desert, and the later Targumim.[103]

[103]See Ulrich (1999); Tov (2012); Teeter (2014); Ulrich (2015); Aitken (2021); Dhont (2021).

Bibliography

Accordance Bible Software. Version 12.3.6. Oaktree Software, 2019.

Aejmelaeus, Anneli. *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators.* Leuven: Peeters, 2007

Aejmelaeus, Anneli. "What We Talk About When We Talk About Translation Technique (1998)," in *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators.* Leuven: Peeters, 2007. Pages 205-222.

Aejmelaeus, Anneli. "Levels of Interpretation: Tracing the Trail of the Septuagint Translators (2005)," in *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators.* Leuven: Peeters, 2007. Pages 295-312.

Aijmer, Karin. *Understanding Pragmatic Markers: A Variational Pragmatic Approach*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2013.

Aitken, James. "Rhetoric and Poetry in Greek Ecclesiastes," *BIOSCS* 38 (2005): 55-78.

Aitken, James. "The Literary Attainment of the Translator of Greek Sirach," in *The Texts and Versions of the Book of Ben Sira: Transmission and Interpretation*. Edited by Jean-Sébastien Rey and Jan Joosten. Leiden: Brill, 2011. Pages 95-126.

Aitken, James. "Language of the Septuagint and Jewish-Greek Identity," in *The Jewish-Greek Tradition and the Byzantine Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014. Pages 120-134.

Aitken, James, ed. *The T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint*. London: T&T Clark, 2015.

Aitken, James and Lorenzo Cuppi. "Proverbs," in *The T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint*. Edited by James Aitken. London: T&T Clark, 2015. Pages 341-355.

Aitken, James. "Why is the Giraffe Kosher? Exoticism in Dietary Laws of the Second Temple Period," *Biblische Notizen* 164.1 (2015): 21-34.

Aitken, James. "The Septuagint and Egyptian Translation Methods," in *XV Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Munich 2013*. Edited by Kraus, van der Meer, and Meiser. Atlanta: SBL, 2016. Pages 269-293.

Aitken, James. "The Origins and Social Context of the Septuagint," in *T&T Clark Handbook of Septuagint Research*. Edited by William A. Ross and W. Edward Glenny. London: T&T Clark, 2021. Pages 9-20

Albanese, Matthew. “The Linguistic Milieu of Septuagint Isaiah”: Seulgi L. Byun, *The Influence of Post-Biblical Hebrew and Aramaic on the Translator of Septuagint Isaiah* (Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2017), in *The Expository Times* 129/1 (2017): 47-48.

Albani, Mattias. “The Downfall of Helel, the Son of Dawn Aspects of Royal Ideology in Isa 14:12-13,” in *The Fall of the Angels*. Edited by Christoph Auffarth and Loren Stuckenbruck. Leiden: Brill, 2004. Pages 62-86.

Alter, Robert. *The Art of Biblical Narrative.* New York: Basic Books, 2011.

Alter, Robert. *The Hebrew Bible: A Translation with Commentary*. New York: Norton, 2018.

Alter, Robert. *The Art of Bible Translation*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2019.

Angelini, Anna. “Biblical Translations and Cross-Cultural Communication: A Focus on the Animal Imagery,” *Semitica et Classica* 8 (2015): 33-43.

Angelini, Anna. “Ruins, Zion and the Animal Imagery in the Septuagint of Isaiah 34,” *JSCS* 49 (2016): 97-109.

Aristotle. *On the Heavens*. Translated by W. K. C. Guthrie. Loeb Classical Library 338. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1939.

Armstrong, Jonathan J., trans. *Commentary on Isaiah: Eusebius of Caesarea*. Ancient Christian Texts. Edited by Joel C. Elowsky. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2013.

Askin, Lindsey. *Scribal Culture in Ben Sira*. SJSJ 184. Leiden: Brill, 2018.

Aubrey, Rachel. “Motivated Categories, Middle Voice, and Passive Morphology,” in *The Greek Verb Revisited: A Fresh Approach for Biblical Exegesis*. Edited by Steven E. Runge and Christopher J. Fresch. Bellinghma, WA: Lexham Press, 2016. Pages 523-625.

Austin, Benjamin. *Plant Metaphors in the Old Greek of Isaiah*. Atlanta: SBL, 2019.

Baer, David A. “Review of Ronald L. Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation: The Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah*.” *VT* 60 (2010): 302.

Baer, David A. *When We All Go Home: Translation and Theology in LXX Isaiah 56-66*. JSOTSup 318. The Hebrew Bible and Its Versions 1. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2001.

Baer, David A. “It's All About Us!: Nationalistic Exegesis in the Greek Isaiah (Chapters 1-12),” in *As Those Who are Taught: The Reception of Isaiah from the LXX to the SBL*, eds. Claire M. McGinnis and Patricia K. Tull. Symposium Series 27. Atlanta, GA: SBL, 2006. Pages 29-48.

Barker, J.D. “The Day of the Lord,” in *Dictionary of the Old Testament Prophets*. Edited by Mark J. Boda and J. Gordon McConville. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2012. Pages 132-143.

Barr, James. *The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979.

Barr, James. “Did the Greek Pentateuch Really Serve as a Dictionary for the Translation of the Later Books?” in *Hamlet on a Hill: Semitic and Greek Studies Presented to Professor T. Muraoka on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*. Edited by M. F. J. Baasten and W. T. van Peursen. Leuven: Peeters, 2003. Pages 523-543.

Barthélemy, Dominique. *Critique textuelle de l’Ancien Testament: 2. Isaïe, Jérémie, Lamentations*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986.

Bauer, Walter. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Third Edition. Revised and Edited by Frederick Danker. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000. [Bauer]

Beale, G. K. *The Book of Revelation: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.

Beentjes, Pancratius C. *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew: A Text Edition of All Extant Hebrew Manuscripts and A Synopsis of All Parallel Hebrew Ben Sira Texts*. VTSup 68. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Blass, Friedrich and Albert Debrunner. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Edited and Translated by Robert Funk. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961. [*BDF*]

Blenkinsopp, Joseph. *Isaiah 1-39*. New York: Doubleday, 2000.

Bockmuehl, Markus. *Seeing the Word: Refocusing New Testament Study*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006.

Bons, Eberhard and Jan Joosten, eds. *Handbook of the Septuagint: The Language of the Septuagint*. Volume 3. München: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2016.

Le Boulluec, Alain and Pierre Sandevoir. *La Bible d'Alexandrie: L'Exode*. Paris: Cerf, 1989.

Le Boulluec, Alain and Philippe Le Moigne. *Vision que Vit Isaïe*. La Bible d'Alexandrie. Paris: Cerf, 2014.

Boyd-Taylor, Cameron. *Reading Between the Lines: The Interlinear Paradigm for Septuagint Studies*. Biblical Tools and Studies 8. Leuven: Peeters, 2011.

Brenton, Sir Lancelot C. L. *The Septuagint in English*. London: Samuel Bagster & Sons, 1851.

Brock, Sebastian, ed. *The Old Testament in Syriac According to the Peshitta Version: Isaiah*. Leiden: Brill, 1993.

Brockington, Leonard. "The Greek Translator of Isaiah and His Interest in ΔΟΞΑ," *ZAW* 66 (1954): 23-32.

Brown, Francis, Samuel Driver, Charles Briggs. *The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1997. [BDB]

Brown, E. K. *Rhythm in the Novel*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1950.

Brown, Gillian and George Yule. *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Broyles, Craig C. and Craig A. Evans, eds. *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition*. Vol. 1. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Broyles, Craig C. and Craig A. Evans, eds. *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition*. Vol. 2. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Byun, Seulgi L. "The Biblical Texts of Isaiah at Qumran," in *Bind Up the Testimony: Explorations in the Genesis of the Book of Isaiah*. Edited by Daniel I. Block and Richard L. Schultz. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2015. Pages 65-80.

Byun, Seulgi L. *The Influence of Post-Biblical Hebrew and Aramaic on the Translator of Septuagint Isaiah*. London: T&T Clark, 2017.

Caird, George B. "Towards a Lexicon of the Septuagint I," in *The Journal of Theological Studies* 19 (1968): 455-475.

Caird, George B. "Towards a Lexicon of the Septuagint II," in *The Journal of Theological Studies* 20 (1969): 21-40.

Cassel, J. David. “Patristic Interpretation of Isaiah,” in *As Those Who are Taught: The Reception of Isaiah from the LXX to the SBL*. Edited by Clair McGinnis and Patricia Tull. Symposium Series 27. Atlanta, GA: SBL, 2006. Pages 145-170.

Chandler, Daniel. *Semiotics: The Basics*. London: Routledge, 2017.

Childs, Brevard S. *Isaiah: A Commentary*. Louisville, KY: John Knox, 2001.

Childs, Brevard S. *The Struggle to Understand Isaiah as Christian Scripture*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2004.

Chilton, Bruce D. *The Isaiah Targum: Introduction, Translation, Apparatus and Notes*. The Aramaic Bible. Volume II. Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1987.

Clines, David, ed. *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*. 8 Volumes. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993-2011.

Collins, John. “Introduction: Towards the Morphology of a Genre,” *Semeia* 14 (1979): 1-20.

Cook, Edward. *Dictionary of Qumran Aramaic*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2015.

Cook, John A. “Valency: The Intersection of Syntax and Semantics,” in *Contemporary Examinations of Classical Languages (Hebrew, Aramaic, Syriac, and Greek): Valency, Lexicography, Grammar, and Manuscripts*. Perspectives on Linguistics and Ancient Languages 8 (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2016), 53-66.

Cook, Paul M. *A Sign and a Wonder: The Redactional Formation of Isaiah 18-20* (Leiden: Brill, 2011).

Cox, Claude E. “Job,” in *The T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint*. Edited by James Aitken. London: T&T Clark, 2015. Pages 385-400.

Crystal, David. *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. 6th Edition. Oxford: Blackwell, 2008.

Cunha, Wilson de Angelo. *LXX Isaiah 24:1-26:6 as Interpretation and Translation: A Methodological Discussion*. SCS 62. Atlanta, GA: SBL, 2014.

Dhont, Marieke. *Style and Context of Old Greek Job*. Leiden: Brill, 2018.

Dhont, Marieke. “Towards a Comprehensive Explanation for the Stylistic Diversity of the Septuagint Corpus,” *Vetus Testamentum* 69 (2019): 388-407.

Dhont, Marieke. “Septuagint Translation Technique and Jewish Hellenistic Exegesis,” in *T&T Clark Handbook of Septuagint Research*. Edited by William A. Ross and W. Edward Glenny. London: T&T Clark, 2021. Pages 21-33.

Diggle, James, *et al.* eds. *The Cambridge Greek Lexicon*. Volume I: A-I. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021. [CGL]

Diggle, James, *et al.* eds. *The Cambridge Greek Lexicon*. Volume II: K-Ω. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021. [CGL]

Dines, Jennifer Mr. *The Septuagint*. London: T&T Clark, 2004.

Dines, Jennifer. “Stylistic Features of the Septuagint,” in *Handbook of the Septuagint: The Language of the Septuagint*. Volume 3. Edited by Eberhard Bons and Jan Joosten. München: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2016. Pages 375-385.

Dogniez, Cécile and Marguerite Harl. *La Bible d’Alexandrie: Le Deutéronome*. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1992.

Dogniez, Cécile. “L’indépendance du Traducteur Grec d’Isaïe,” in *Isaiah in Context*. Leiden: Brill, 2010. Pages 229-246.

Dorsey, David A. *The Literary Structure of the Old Testament: A Commentary on Genesis-Malachi*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1999.

Douglas, Mary. *Thinking in Circles: An Essay on Ring Composition*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2007.

Elliger, K. and W. Rudolph, eds. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. 5th Edition. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1997.

Emadi, Samuel. “Intertextuality in New Testament Scholarship: Significance, Criteria, and the Art of Intertextual Reading,” *Currents in Biblical Research* 14.1 (2015): 8-23.

van Emde Boas, Evert, Albert Rijksbaron, Luuk Huitink, and Mathieu de Bakker. *The Cambridge Grammar of Classical Greek*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019. [CGCG]

Eco, Umberto. *A Theory of Semiotics*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1976.

Eco, Umberto. *The Role of the Reader*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1979.

Eco, Umberto. *Semiotics and the Philosophy of Language*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1984.

Eco, Umberto. *The Limits of Interpretation.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1990.

Eco, Umberto. *Interpretation and Overinterpretation*. Edited by Stefan Collini. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Eco, Umberto. *Mouse or Rat?: Translation as Negotiation*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2004.

Erlandsson, Seth. *The Burden of Babylon: A Study of Isaiah 13:2-14:23*. Coniectanea Biblica. Old Testament Series 4. Lund: Gleerup, 1970.

Euler, Karl F. *Die Verkündigung vom leidenden Gottesknecth aus Jes 53 in der Griechischen Bible*. BWANT 66. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1934.

Falls, Thomas B., trans. *St. Justin Martyr: Dialogue with Trypho*. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2003.

Feigin, Samuel. "Word Studies," in *The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures* 43.1 (1926): 44-53.

Fernández Marcos, Natalio. *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Version of the Bible*. Translated by Wilfred G. E. Watson. Atlanta: SBL, 2000.

Fishbane, Michael. *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985.

Fischer, Johann. *In welcher Schrift lag das Buch Isaias den LXX vor?* Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1930.

Fresch, Christopher. *Discourse Markers in the Septuagint and Early Koine Greek with Special Reference to the Twelve*. Ph.D Dissertation. University of Cambridge, 2015.

Fresch, Christopher. "The Septuagint and Discourse Grammar," in *T&T Clark Handbook of Septuagint Research*. Edited by William A. Ross and W. Edward Glenny. London: T&T Clark, 2021. Pages 79-92.

Funk, Robert W. *A Beginning-Intermediate Grammar of Hellenistic Greek*. Third Edition. Salem, OR: Polebridge, 2013.

Gallagher, Edmon L. and John D. Meade. *The Biblical Canon Lists from Early Christianity: Texts and Analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.

Gauthier, Randall X. *Psalms 38 and 145 of the Old Greek Version*. VTSup 166. Leiden: Brill, 2014.

Gauthier, Randall X., Gideon R. Kotzé, and Gert J. Steyn, eds. *Septuagint, Sages, and Scripture: Studies in Honour of Johann Cook*. VTSup 172. Leiden: Brill, 2016.

Gentry, Peter J. "The Septuagint and the Text of the Old Testament," in *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 16.2 (2006): 193-218.

Gentry, Peter J. "The Text of the Old Testament," in *The Journal of the Evangelical Theology Society* 52.1 (2009): 19-45.

Gentry, Peter J. "The Literary Macrostructures of the Book of Isaiah and Authorial Intent," in *Bind Up the Testimony: Explorations in the Genesis of the Book of Isaiah*. Edited by Daniel Block and Richard Schultz. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2015. Pages 227-253.

Gentry, Peter J., "New Ultra-Literal Translation Techniques in Kaige-Theodotian and Aquila," in *Handbook of the Septuagint: The Language of the Septuagint*. Volume 3. Edited by Eberhard Bons and Jan Joosten. München: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2016. Pages 202-220.

Gentry, Peter J., ed. *Ecclesiastes*. Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum 11.2 Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2019.

Gesenius, Wilhelm. *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*. Edited by E. Kautzsch. Translated by A. E. Cowley. Mineola, NY: Dover, 2006.

Gignilliat, Mark S. *Reading Scripture Canonically: Theological Instincts for Old Testament Interpretation*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2019.

Glenny, Edward. *Finding Meaning in the Text: Translation Technique and Theology in the Septuagint of Amos*. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

Gordis, Robert. *The Biblical Text in the Making: A Study of the Kethib-Qere*. Philadelphia, PA: Jewish Publications Society, 1937.

Gray, George Buchanan. *Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Isaiah I-XXXIX*. London: T&T Clark, 1949.

Gregory, Bradley "Isaiah 14 (LXX) as Narrative Template for Antiochus IV in 2 Maccabees 9," in *Journal of Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 48 (2015): 87-103.

Guinot, Jean-Noël, ed. *Théodoret de Cyr: Sommentair sur Isaïe*. Tome 2. Sources Chrétiennes. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1982.

Graves, Michael, trans. *Commentary on Jeremiah: Jerome*. Ancient Christian Texts. Edited by Christopher A. Hall. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2011.

Grogan, Geoffrey W. "Isaiah," in *Proverbs-Isaiah.* The Expositor's Bible Commentary 6. Edited by Tremper Longman III and David E. Garland. Revised Edition. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2008: 435-863.

Hanhart, Robert. "Die Septuaginta als Interpretation und Aktualisierung," in *The Bible and the Ancient World: Isaac Leo Seeligmann Volume*, ed. Alexander Rofé and Yair Zakovitch. Jerusalem: E. Rubinstein, 1983.

Hanhart, Robert. "The Translation of the Septuagint in Light of Earlier Tradition and Subsequent Influences," in *Septuagint, Scrolls, and Cognate Writings*, SBLSCS 33 (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1990), 339-79.

Harl, Marguerite. *La Bible d'Alexandrie: La Genèse*. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1994.

Harl, Marguerite. "The Bible d'Alexandrie 1. The Translation Principles," in *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*, ed. B. A. Taylor. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 51. Atlanta, GA: SBL, 2001. Pages 181-197.

Hatch, Edwin and Henry Redpath. *A Concordance to the Septuagint: And the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (Including the Apocryphal Books)*. 2nd Edition. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1998.

Hays, Richard. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.

Hiers, Richard H. "Day of the Lord," in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. New York: Doubleday, 1992. Pages 82-85.

Heiser, Michael. "The Mythological Provenance of Isa. XIV 12-15: A Reconsideration of the Ugaritic Material," *Vetus Testamentum* 51 (2001): 354-69.

Hendel, Ronald and Jan Joosten. *How Old is the Hebrew Bible: A Linguistic, Textual, and Historical Study*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2018.

Hill, Robert Charles, trans. *Cyril of Alexandria: Commentary on Isaiah.* Volume 1: Chapters 1-14. Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox, 2008.

Robert D. Holmstedt, Robert D. "Critical at the Margins: Edge Constituents in Biblical Hebrew," in *KUSATU* 17 (2014): 109-156.

Holmstedt, Robert D. and John Screnock. *Esther: A Handbook on the Hebrew Text*. BHHB. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2015.

Holt, Else K., Hyun Chul Paul Kim, Andrew Mein, eds. *Concerning the Nations: Essays on the Oracles against the Nations in Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel*. London: Bloomsbury, 2014.

de Hoop, Raymond, Marjo C.A. Korpel, and Stanley E. Porder, eds. *The Impact of Unit Delimitation on Exegesis*. Pericope 7. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

House, Paul R. *Isaiah. Volume 1: Chapters 1-27*. Ross-shire, Scotland: Mentor, 2019.

Huizenga, Leroy. *New Isaac: Tradition and Intertextuality in the Gospel of Matthew*. Leiden, Brill, 2009.

Jastrow, Marcus. *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature*. New York: Pardes, 1950.

Jellicoe, Syndey. *The Septuagint and Modern Study*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1993.

Joüon, P. and T. Muraoka. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebew*. 2nd Edition. Rome: Gregorian & Biblical Press, 2009. [GBH]

Karen Jobes and Moisés Silva. *Invitation to the Septuagint*. 2nd Edition. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015.

Joosten, Jan. "The Aramaic Background of the Seventy: Language, Culture and History," *BIOSCS* 43 (2010): 53-72.

Joosten, Jan. "Rhetorical Ornamentation in the Septuagint: The Case of Grammatical Variation," in *Et Sapienter et Eloquenter: Studies on Rhetorical and Stylistic Features of the Septuagint*. Edited by Eberhard Bons and Thomas Kraus. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011. Pages 11-22.

Joosten, Jan. *Collected Studies on the Septuagint: From Language to Interpretation and Beyond*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.

Joosten, Jan. “Septuagint Greek and the Jewish Sociolect in Egypt,” in *Handbook of the Septuagint: The Language of the Septuagint.* Volume 3. Edited by Eberhard Bons and Jan Joosten. München: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2016. Pages 246-256.

Joosten, Jan. “The Relation of the Septuagint of Proverbs to the Septuagint of Psalms” in *Septuagint, Sages, and Scripture: Studies in Honour of Johann Cook*. Edited by Randall X. Gauthier, Gideon R. Kotzé, Gert J. Steyn. VTSup 172. Leiden: Brill, 2016. Pages 99-107.

Kaiser, Otto. *Isaiah 13-39: A Commentary.* Philadelphia, PA: Westminster, 1974.

Karrer, Martin and Wolfgang Kraus. *Septuaginta Deutsch: Das griechische Alte Testament in deutscher Übersetzung*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2009. [LXX.D]

Karrer, Martin and Wolfgang Kraus. *Septuaginta Deutsch: Erläuterungen und Kommentare*. Band II: Psalmen bis Daniel. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2011.

Kraus, Wolfgang and Siegfried Kreuzer, eds. *Die Septuaginta: Text, Wirkung, Rezeption*. 4. *Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch* (*LXX.D*). *Wuppertal, 19-.-22. Juli 2012*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 361. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.

Khan, Geoffrey, ed. *Encyclopedia of Hebrew Language and Linguistics*. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

Khan, Geoffrey. *The Tiberian Pronunciation Tradition of Biblical Hebrew*. Volume 1. Cambridge Semitic Languages and Cultures. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020.

Kilian, Rudolf. *Jesja II: 13-39*. Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1994.

Koehler, Ludwig and Walter Baumgartner. *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Leiden: Brill, 1994. [HALOT]

Koenig, Jean. *L'Herméneutique analogique du Judaïsme antique*. VTSup 33. Leiden: Brill, 1982.

van der Kooij, Arie. *Die alten Textzeugen des Jesajabuches*. Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 35. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981.

van der Kooij, Arie. “Isaiah in the Septuagint.” In *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition*. Vol. 2. Eds. Craig C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans. Leiden: Brill, 1997. Pages 513-529.

van der Kooij, Arie. *The Oracle of Tyre: The Septuagint of Isaiah 23 as Version and Vision*. VTSup 71. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

van der Kooij, Arie. "Interpretation of the Book of Isaiah in the Septuagint and in Other Ancient Versions," in *As Those Who are Taught: The Reception of Isaiah from the LXX to the SBL*. Edited by Clair McGinnis and Patricia Tull. Symposium Series 27. Atlanta, GA: SBL, 2006. Pages 49-68.

van der Kooij, Arie. "Isaiah and Daniel in the Septuagint," in *Florilegium Lovaniense: Studies in Septuagint and Textual Criticism in Honor of Florentino García Martínez*. Edited by H. Ausloos, B. Lemmelijn, and M. Vervenne. Leuven: Peeters, 2008.

van der Kooij, Arie. "Textual Criticism," in *The Oxford Handbook of Biblical Studies*. Edited by Judith M. Lieu and J. W. Rogerson. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008. Pages 579-590.

van der Kooij, Arie. "To Settle and to Dwell: On Lexical Variation in the Old Greek of Isaiah," in *In the Footsteps of Sherlock Holmes: Studies in the Biblical Text in Honour of Anneli Aejmelaeus*. Edited by Kristin De Troyer, T. Michael Law, and Marketta Liljeström. Leuven: Peeters, 2014.

van der Kooij, Arie. Review of Seulgi L. Byun, *The Influence of Post-biblical Hebrew and Aramaic on the Translator of Septuagint Isaiah*, RBL November, 2017.

van der Kooij, Arie. "Esaias/Isaias/Isaiah," in *Introduction to the Septuagint*. Edited by Siegfried Kreuzer. Translated by David A. Brenner and Peter Altmann. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2019. Pages 515-527.

Kozman, Rony. "There is No 'Fear' in 'the Fear of the LORD': Translating יראה as εὐσέβεια in Old Greek Isaiah," *ZAW* 131.2 (2019): 244-56.

Kreuzer, Siegfried, ed. *Introduction to the Septuagint*. Translated by David A. Brenner and Peter Altmann. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2019.

Kroeger, Paul R. *Analyzing Syntax: A Lexical-Functional Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Kroeger, Paul R. *Analyzing Grammar: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Kutzcher, E. Y. *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll*. STDJ 6. Leiden: Brill, 1974.

Lampe, G. W. H., Ed. *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969.

Lausberg, Heinrich. *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric: A Foundation for Literary Study*. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

Law, Timothy Michael and Alison Salvesen, eds. *Greek Scripture and the Rabbis*. Leuven: Peeters, 2012.

Leithart, Peter J. *Deep Exegesis: The Mystery of Reading Scripture*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2009.

Leithart, Peter J. *Theopolitan Reading*. West Monroe, LA: Athanasius, 2020.

Liebmann, Ernst. "Der Text zu Jesaja 24-27," *ZAW* 22 (1902): 209-86.

Lieu, Judith M. and J. W. Rogerson, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Biblical Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Linafelt, Tod. *The Hebrew Bible as Literature: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.

Lisowsky, Gerhard. *Konkordanz zum Hebräischen Alten Testament*. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1958.

Lee, John. *A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch*. SCS 14. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983.

Lee, John. "The Literary Greek of Septuagint Isaiah." *Semitica et Classica* Vol. 7 (2014): 135-46.

Lee, John. "The Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek: New Clothes for an Old Emperor," in *Novum Testamentum* (2017): 415-435.

Lee, John. *The Greek of the Pentateuch: Grinfield Lectures on the Septuagint 2011-2012*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018.

Lee, Jongkyung, *A Redactional Study of the Book of Isaiah 13-23*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018.

Levinsohn, Stephen H. *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek: A Coursebook on the Information Structure of New Testament Greek*. 2nd Edition. Dallas, TX: SIL International, 2000.

Lewis, Charlton and Charles Short. *A Latin Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984.

Liddell, Henry George and Robert Scott. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Ninth Edition. Revised. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Loiseau, Anne-Françoise. *L'influence de l'araméen sur les traducteurs de la LXX principalement, ainsi que sur les scribes de la Vorlage de la LXX*. Atlanta: SBL, 2016.

Longacre, Drew. "Developmental Stage, Scribal Lapse, or Physical Defect? 1QIsa[a]'s Damaged Exemplar for Isaiah Chapters 34-66," *Dead Sea Discoveries* 20/1 (2013): 17-50.

Longman, Tremper III and David E. Garland, eds. *Proverbs-Isaiah.* The Expositor's Bible Commentary 6. Revised Edition. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2008.

Louw, Johannes and Eugene Nida, eds. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains*. 2nd Edition. New York: United Bible Societies, 1989.

van der Louw, Theo A. W. *Transformations in the Septuagint: Towards an Interaction of Septuagint Studies and Translation Studies*. CBET 47. Leuven: Peeters, 2007

Lust, Johan. "A Septuagint Christ Preceding Jesus Christ? Messianism in the Septuagint Exemplified in Isa 7,10-17." In *Messianism and the Septuagint: Collected Essays*. Ed. Johan Lust. Leuven: Peeters, 2004. Pages 211-226.

Lust, Johan, Erik Eynikel, and Katrin Hauspie. *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. Rev. Ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2003. [LEH]

MacIntyre, Alasdair. *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory*. Third Edition. South Bend, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2007.

Malessa, Michael. "Valency," in *Encyclopedia of Hebrew Language and Linguistics*. Edited by Geoffrey Khan. Leiden: Brill, 2013. Consulted online on 09 April 2021 <http://ezproxy-prd.bodleian.ox.ac.uk:2197/10.1163/2212-4241_ehll_EHLL_COM_00000508>

Marcovich, Miroslav, ed. *Iustini Martyris: Dialogus Cum Tryphone*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1997.

McGinnis, Clair and Patricia Tull. *As Those Who are Taught: The Reception of Isaiah from the LXX to the SBL*. Symposium Series 27. Atlanta, GA: SBL, 2006.

McKinion, Steven A., ed. *Isaiah 1-39*. Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2004.

Meier, Samuel A. *Speaking of Speaking: Marking Direct Discourse in the Hebrew Bible*. VTSup 46. Leiden: Brill, 1992.

van der Merwe, Christo, Jacobus Naudé, and Jan Kroeze. *A Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar*. 2nd Edition. London: Bloomsbury, 2017. [BHRG]

Meynet, Roland. *Rhetorical Analysis: An Introduction to Biblical Rhetoric*. JSOTSup 256. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.

Meynet, Roland. *Treatise on Biblical Rhetoric*. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Migne, J. P., ed. *Cyril of Alexandria: Commentarius in Isaiam Prophetam*. Patrologiae cursus completus: Series graeca. Paris, 1859.

Miller-Naudé, Cynthia L. and C. H. J. van der Merwe. "הִנֵּה and Mirativity in Biblical Hebrew," *Hebrew Studies* 52 (2011): 53-81.

Minns, Ellis H. "Parchments of the Parthian Period from Avroman," in *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 35 (1915): 22-65.

Mitchell, Timothy N. "What are the NT Autographs? An Examination of the Doctrine of Inspiration and Inerrancy in Light of Greco-Roman Publication," in *JETS* 59.2 (2017): 297-308.

Mizrahi, Noam. "The Linguistic History of מדהבה: From Textual Corruption to Lexical Innovation," *Revue de Qumran* 26.1 (2013): 93-116.

Mizrahi, Noam. "The Textual History and Literary Background of Isa 14,4*," in *ZAW* 125(3) (2013): 433-447.

Moffitt, David M. and C. Jacob Butera. "P.Duk. inv. 727r: New Evidence for the Meaning and Provenance of the Word Προσήλυτος," in *JBL* 132, no.1 (2013): 159-178.

Montanari, Franco, ed. *The Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek*. Leiden: Brill, 2015. [BrillDAG]

Morwood, James. *The Oxford Grammar of Classical Greek*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Motyer, J. Alec. *The Prophecy of Isaiah: An Introduction & Commentary*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1993.

Motyer, J. Alec. *Isaiah*. Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1999.

Moulton, James. *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*. Volume 2. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1920.

Muraoka, Takamitsu. "Introduction Aux Douze Petits Prophètes," in *La Bible D'Alexandrie: Les Douze Prophètes—Osée*. Edited by Eberhard Bons, Jan Joosten, and Stephan Kessler. Paris: Cerf, 2002.

Muraoka, Takamitsu. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. Louvain: Peeters, 2009. [GELS]

Nabokov, Vladimir. *Lectures on Literature*. New York: Harcourt, 1980.

Najman, Hindy. "Ethical Reading: The Transformation of the Text and the Self," in *The Journal of Theological Studies* 68.2 (2017): 507-529.

Gregory of Nazianzus. *On God and Christ: The Five Theological Orations and Two Letters to Cledonius*. Popular Patristics Series. Edited by John Behr. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press. 2002.

Grégoire de Nazianze. *Discours 27-31 (Discours Théologiques): Introduction, Texte Critique, Traduction et Notes*. Edited by Paul Gallay. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2008.

das Neves, Joaquim. *A Teologia da Tradução Grega dos Setenta no Livro de Isaías*. Lisbon: Universidade Católica Portuguesa, 1973.

Jacob Neusner, *The Babylonian Talmud: A Translation and Commentary*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2005.

Ngunga, Abi T. and Joachim Schaper. "Isaiah," in *The T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint*. Edited by James Aitken. London: T&T Clark, 2015. Pages 456-468.

Noonan, Benjamin J. *Advances in the Study of Biblical Hebrew and Aramaic: New Insights for Reading the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2020.

O'Keefe, John J. and R. R. Reno. *Sanctified Vision: An Introduction to Early Christian Interpretation of the Bible*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005.

Olley, John. *"Righteousness" in the Septuagint of Isaiah: A Contextual Study*. SBLSCS 8. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1979.

Osborne, William. *Trees and Kings: A Comparative Analysis of Tree Imagery in Israel's Prophetic Tradition and the Ancient Near East*. Bulletin for Biblical Research Supplement 18. University Park, PA: Eisenbrauns, 2018.

Oswalt, John. *The Book of Isaiah: Chapters 1-39*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1986.

Ottley, Richard R. *The Book of Isaiah According to the Septuagint*, 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1904-6.

Parry, Donald W. and Elisha Qimron. *The Great Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa[a]): A New Edition*. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Penner, Ken, ed. *The Lexham English Septuagint*. Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2019.

Penner, Ken. *Isaiah*. Septuagint Commentary Series (Leiden: Brill, 2020). Pre-published Edition.

Pennington, Jonathan. *The Sermon on the Mount and Human Flourishing: A Theological Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2017.

Pietersma, Albert and Benjamin Wright, eds. *A New English Translation of the Septuagint: And the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included Under that Title*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007. [NETS]

Pietersma, Albert. "A Panel Presentation on Ronald Troxel's *LXX-Isaiah*," http://homes.chass.utoronto.ca/~pietersm/Troxel'sLXX-Isaiah(2008).pdf, (2008):1-18.

Porter, Stanley E. and Brook W. R. Pearson. "Isaiah Through Greek Eyes: The Septuagint of Isaiah," in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition*. Vol. 2. Edited by Craig C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans. Leiden: Brill, 1997. Pages 531-546.

Porter, Stanley E. *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*. Second Edition. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.

Porter, Stanley E. "Pericope Markers and the Paragraph: Textual and Linguistic Implications," in *The Impact of Unit Delimitation on Exegesis*. Pericope 7. Edited by Raymond de Hoop, Marjo C.A. Korpel, and Stanley E. Porder. Leiden: Brill, 2009. Pages 175-195.

Provan, Iain and Mark J. Boda, eds. *Let us Go up to Zion: Essays in Honour of H. G. M. Williamson on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*. VTSup 153. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Qimron, Elisha. *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2008.

Quick, Laura. "*Hêlēl ben-Šaḥar* and the Chthonic Sun: A New Suggestion for the Mythological Background of Isa 14:12-15," *Vetus Testamentum* 68 (2017): 1-20.

Rahlfs, Alfred and Robert Hanhart, eds. *Septuaginta, id est Vetus Testamentum Graece*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006.

Rajak, Tessa. *Translation & Survival: The Greek Bible of the Ancient Jewish Diaspora*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Reimer, David J. "On Triplets in a Trio of Prophets," in *Let us Go up to Zion: Essays in Honour of H. G. M. Williamson on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*. VTSup 153 Edited by Iain Provan and Mark J. Boda. Leiden: Brill, 2012. Pages 203-217.

Rendsburg, Gary. "Marking Closure," in *Vetus Testamentum* 66 (2016): 280-303.

Rendsburg, Gary. *How the Bible is Written*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2019.

Rey, Jean-Sébastien and Jan Joosten. *The Texts and Versions of the Book of Ben Sira: Transmission and Interpretation*. SJSJ 150. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

Reymond, Eric. *Qumran Hebrew: An Overview of Orthography, Phonology, and Morphology*. Atlanta, GA: SBL, 2014.

Roberts, J. J. M. *First Isaiah: A Commentary*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2015.

Robertson, A. T. *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*. Nashville: Broadman, 1934.

Rothfuss, Patrick J. *The Name of the Wind*. New York: DAW Books, 2008

Rosenthal, Franz. *A Grammar of Biblical Aramaic*. 6th Edition. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 1995.

Ross, Allen P. *Introducing Biblical Hebrew*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2001.

Ross, William A. "Style and Familiarity in Judges 19,7 (Old Greek): Establishing Dependence Within the Septuagint," *Biblica* 98.1 (2017): 25-36.

Ross, William A. and W. Edward Glenny, eds. *T&T Clark Handbook of Septuagint Research*. London: T&T Clark, 2021.

Runge, Steven E. *Discourse Grammar of the Greek New Testament: A Practical Introduction for Teaching and Exegesis.* Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2010.

Sailhamer, John H. *The Pentateuch as Narrative: A Biblical-Theological Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992.

Salvesen, Alison. "The 'Three' in early Christian commentary: The case of the 'Song of the Vineyard' (Isaiah 5:1-7)," in *JSCS* 48 (2015): 72-85.

Salvesen, Alison. "LXX Isaiah as Prophecy? Supposed Historical Allusions in LXX Isaiah," in *Imperial Visions: The Prophet and the Book of Isaiah in an Age of Empires*. Edited by Reinhard Kratz and Joachim Schaper. FRLANT 277. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2020. Pages 185-202.

Salvesen, Alison and Timothy Michael Law, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of the Septuagint*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021.

Salvesen, Alison. "Deuterocanonical and Apocryphal Books," in *The Oxford Handbook of the Septuagint*. Edited by Alison G. Salvesen and Timothy Michael Law. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021. Pp. 385-402.

Sanders, Fred. *The Triune God*. New Studies in Dogmatics. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2016.

Schaper, Joachim. "Messianism in the LXX of Isaiah and Messianic Intertextuality in the Greek Bible." In *The Septuagint and Messianism*. Ed. M. A. Knibb. Leuven: Peeters, 2006. Pates 371-380.

Scheck, Thomas P., trans. *St. Jerome: Commentary on Isaiah*. Ancient Christian Writers: The Works of the Fathers in Translation. Mahwah, NJ: The Newman Press 2015.

Schleusner. J. Fr. *Novus Thesaurus Philologico-Criticus, sive Lexicon in LXX*. Londini, 1829.

Scholz, Anton. *Die alexandrinische Übersetzung des Buches Jesias*. Würzburg: Woerl, 1880.

Screnock, John. *Traductor Scriptor: The Old Greek Translation of Exodus 1-14 as Scribal Activity*. Leiden: Brill, 2017.

Seeligmann, Isac Leo. *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah and Cognate Studies*. Edited by Robert Hanhart and Hermann Spieckermann. FAT 40. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.

Seitz, Christopher R. *Isaiah 1-39*. Interpretation. Louisville, KY: John Knox, 1993.

von Siebenthal, Heinrich. *Ancient Greek Grammar for the Study of the New Testament*. Oxford: Peter Lang, 2019.

Silva, Moisés. *Biblical Words and Their Meaning: An Introduction to Lexical Semantics*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1994.

Silva, Moisés. "Esaias: To the Reader," in *A New English Translation of the Septuagint: And the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included Under that Title*. Edited by Albert Pietersma and Benjamin Wright. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007. Pages 823-825.

Smith, Gary V. *Isaiah 1-39*. The New American Commentary 15A. Nashville, TN: B&H, 2007.

Smith, J. Payne, ed. *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 1999.

Smyth, Herbert Wier. *Greek Grammar*. Revised by Gordon M. Messing. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1984.

Sokoloff, Michael. *A Dictionary of Judean Aramaic*. Bar Ilan: Bar Ilan University Press, 2003.

Sokoloff, Michael. *A Syriac Lexicon*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2009.

Sollamo, Raija. "The Study of Translation Technique," in *Handbook of the Septuagint: The Language of the Septuagint*. Volume 3. Edited by Eberhard Bons and Jan Joosten. München: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2016. Pages 161-171.

de Sousa, Franklin Rodrigo. *Eschatology and Messianism in LXX Isaiah 1-12*. London: T&T Clark, 2010.

de Sousa, Franklin Rodrigo. "Problems and Perspectives on the Study of Messianism in LXX Isaiah," in *The Old Greek of Isaiah: Issues and Perspectives*. Leuven: Peeters, 2010.

de Sousa, Franklin Rodrigo. "Isaiah," in *The Oxford Handbook of the Septuagint*. Edited by Alison G. Salvesen and Timothy Michael Law. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021. Pages 245-258.

Spacks, Patricia Meyer. *On Rereading*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap, 2011.

Spade, Paul Vincent, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Ockham*. Edited by Paul Vincent Spade. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Spade, Paul Vincent. “Ockham’s Nominalist Metaphysics: Some Main Themes,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Ockham*. Edited by Paul Vincent Spade. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999. Pages 100-117.

Spade, Paul Vincent and Claude Panaccio. “William of Ockham,” in *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy.* Edited by Edward N. Zalta. Spring, 2019: https:/plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2019/entries/ockham/

Sperber, Alexander, ed. *The Bible in Aramaic: The Latter Prophets According to Targum Jonathan.* Volume 3. Leiden: Brill, 1963.

Sperber, Dan and Dierdre Wilson. *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. 2nd Edition. Oxford: Blackwell, 1995.

Spronk, Klass. “Down with Hêlēl!: The Assumed Mythological Background of Isa. 14:12,” in *‘Und Mose schrieb dises Lied auf’: Studien zum Alten Testament und zum Alten Orient*. Edited by Manfried Dietrich and Ingo Kottsieper. Münster: Verlag, 1998. Pages 717-726.

Steiner, George. *Real Presences*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1989.

Sternberg, Meir. *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1985.

Stromberg, Jacob. *An Introduction to the Study of Isaiah*. London: T&T Clark, 2011.

Stromberg, Jacob. *Isaiah After Exile: The Author of Third Isaiah as Reader and Redactor of the Book*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Swete, Henry B. *The Old Testament in Greek According to the Septuagint: Hosea - 4 Maccabees*. Volume 3. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1894.

Swete, Henry B. *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Thackeray, Henry John. *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek: According to the Septuagint*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909.

Theocharous, Myrto. *Lexical Dependence and Intertextual Allusion in the Septuagint of the Twelve Prophets*. London: T&T Clark, 2014.

Thesaurus Linguae Graecae Digital Library. Edited by Maria C. Pantelia. University of California, Irvine. [TLG]

Thiessen, Matthew. “Revisiting the προσήλυτος in ‘the LXX’,” in *JBL* 132, no.2 (2013): 333-350.

Toury, Gideon. *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. BTL 4. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1995.

Tov, Emanuel. “The Text of Isaiah at Qumran,” in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition*. Edited by Craig C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans. VTSup 70. Leiden: Brill, 1997. Pages 491-511.

Tov, Emanuel. *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint*. VTSup 72. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Tov, Emanuel. “Theologically Motivated Exegesis Embedded in the Septuagint,” in *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint*. VTSup 72. Leiden: Brill, 1999. Pages 257-269.

Tov, Emanuel. “Interchanges of Consonants Between the Masoretic Text and the Vorlage of the Septuagint,” in *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint*. Leiden: Brill, 1999. Pages 301-311.

Tov, Emanuel. “The Impact of the Septuagint Translation of the Torah on the Translation of the Other Books,” in *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint*. VTSup 72. Leiden: Brill, 1999. Pages 183-194.

Tov, Emanuel. “The Background of the Sense Divisions in the Biblical Texts,” in *Delimitation Criticism: A New Tool in Biblical Scholarship*. Edited by Marjo C. A. Korpel and Josef M. Oesch. Assen: Van Gorcum, 2001. Pages 312-350.

Tov, Emanuel. *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 54. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

Tov, Emanuel. “Biliteral Exegesis of Hebrew Roots in the Septuagint?,” in *Reflection and Refraction: Studies in Biblical Historiography in Honour of A. Graeme Auld*, eds. Robert Rezetko, Timothy H. Lim and W. Brian Aucker. Leiden: Brill, 2007. Pages 459-482.

Tov, Emanuel. *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. 3rd Edition. Revised and Expanded. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2012.

Tov, Emanuel. “Post-Modern Textual Criticism?,” in *Greek Scripture and the Rabbis*. Edited by Timothy Michael Law and Alison Salvesen. Leuven: Peeters, 2012. Pages 1-18.

Tov, Emanuel. *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*, rev. 3rd ed. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2015.

Tov, Emanuel. "'Proto-Masoretic,' 'Pre-Masoretic,' 'Semi-Masoretic,' and 'Masoretic': A Study in Terminology and Textual Theory," in *Textual Developments: Collected Essays Volume 4*. VTSupp 181. Leiden: Brill, 2019. Pages 195-213.

Troxel, Ronald. "What's in a Name: Contemporization and Toponymns in LXX-Isa," in *Seeking out the Wisdom of the Ancients: Essays to Honor Michael A. Fox on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, eds. by Ronald L. Troxel, Kevin G. Friebel, and Dennis R. Magary. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2005.

Troxel, Ronald. *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation: The Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Troxel, Ronald. "Writing Commentary on the Life of a Text," *Vetus Testamentum* 67 (2017): 105-128.

Troxel, Ronald. *Commentary on the Old Greek and Peshitta of Isaiah 1-25*. Text-Critical Studies 13. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2022.

Tull, Patricia K. *Isaiah 1-39*. Smyth & Helwys Bible Commentary. Macon, GA: Smith & Helwys, 2010.

Turner, Nigel. *Moulton's Grammar of New Testament Greek. Volume 3: Syntax*. London: T&T Clark, 2019.

Ueberschaer, Frank. "Sophia Sirach / Ekklesiasticus / The Wisdom of Jesus Son of Sirach," in *Introduction to the Septuagint*. Edited by Siegfried Kreuzer. Translated by David A. Brenner and Peter Altmann. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2019. Pages 397-414.

Ulrich, Eugene. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.

Ulrich, Eugene and Peter Flint. *Qumran Cave 1: II: The Isaiah Scrolls, Part 1: Plates and Transcriptions*. DJD 32. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010. [2010a]

Ulrich, Eugene and Peter Flint. *Qumran Cave 1: II: The Isaiah Scrolls, Part 2: Introductions, Commentary, and Textual Variants*. DJD 32. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010. [2010b]

Ulrich, Eugene. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Developmental Composition of the Bible*. Leiden: Brill, 2015.

Vanhoozer, Kevin J. *Is There a Meaning in This Text?: The Bible, the Rader, and the Morality of Literary Knowledge*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1998.

Verrall, A. W. "The Diversity and Usage in Prose and Poetry Illustrated by the Word συμφορά," in *The Classical Review* 2.5 (1888): 148-149.

Vianès, Laurence. *La Bible d'Alexandrie: Malachie*. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2011.

van der Vorm-Croughs, Mirjam. "Intertextuality in the Septuagint: The Case of Isaiah 19," *BIOSCS* 34 (2001), 81-94.

van der Vorm-Croughs, Mirjam. *The Old Greek of Isaiah: An Analysis of Its Pluses and Minuses*. Atlanta, GA: SBL, 2014.

Vroom, Jonathan. "A Cognitive Approach to Copying Errors: Haplography and Textual Transmission of the Hebrew Bible." *JSOT* 40.3 (2016): 259-279.

de Waard, Jan. *A Handbook on Isaiah*. Textual Criticism and the Translator. Edited by Harold P. Scanlin. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1997.

Wagner, J. Ross. *Reading the Sealed Book: Old Greek Isaiah and the Problem of Septuagint Hermeneutics*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.

Walsh, Jerome T. *Style & Structure in Biblical Hebrew Narrative*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2001.

Walters, Peter. *The Text of the Septuagint: Its Corruptions and their Emendations*. Edited by D. W. Gooding. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.

Waltke, Bruce K. and M. P. O'Connor. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrans, 1990.

Wasserman, Tommy and Peter J. Gurry. *A New Approach to Textual Criticism: An Introduction to the Coherence-Based Genealogical Method*. Resources for Biblical Study 80. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2017.

Watts, John. *Word Biblical Commentary: Isaiah 1-33*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 2005.

Weber, Robert and Roger Gryson. *Biblia Sacra Vulgatam*. 5th Edition. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007.

Webster, John. *God Without Measure: Working Papers in Christian Theology. Volume II: Virtue and Intellect*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2016.

Weitzmann, Michael. *The Syriac Version of the Old Testament*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Wevers, John William. "An Apologia for Septuagint Studies," *BIOSCS* 18 (1986): 16-38.

Wevers, John William. *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus*. SCS 30. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1990.

Wevers, John William. *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis*. SCS 35. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1993.

Wevers, John William. *Notes on the Greek Text of Deuteronomy*. SCS 39. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1995.

Wildberger, Hans. *Isaiah 13-27: A Continental Commentary*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1997.

Williams, Peter J. "The Bible, the Septuagint, and the Apocrypha: A Consideration of their Singularity," in *Studies in the Text and Versions of the Hebrew Bible in Honour of Robert Gordon*. Edited by Geoffrey Khan and Diana Lipton. Leiden: Brill, 2010. Pages 169-180.

Williamson, Hugh. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Isaiah 1-27: Commentary on Isaiah 1-5* vol. 1. London: T&T Clark, 2006.

Williamson, Hugh. "Isaiah 13:18," in *Vetus Testamentum* 70 (2020): 229-236.

Wilken, Robert Louis, ed., trans. *Isaiah: Interpreted by Early Christian and Medieval Commentators*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2007.

Wright, Benjamin. "Sirach: To the Reader," in *A New English Translation of the Septuagint: And the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included Under that Title*. Edited by Albert Pietersma and Benjamin Wright. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007. Pages 715-719.

Wright, Benjamin. “Preliminary Thoughts about Preparing the Text of Ben Sira for a Commentary,” in *Die Septuaginta: Text, Wirkung, Rezeption*. 4. *Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch* (*LXX.D*). *Wuppertal, 19-.-22. Juli 2012*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 361. Edited by Wolfgang Kraus and Siegfried Kreuzer. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014. Pages 89-109.

Wright, Benjamin. “Sirach (Ecclesiasticus),” in *The T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint*. Edited by James Aitken. London: T&T Clark, 2015. Pages 410-424.

Wright, N. T. *The New Testament and the People of God*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.

Würthwein, Ernst. *The Text of the Old Testament: An Introduction to the Biblia Hebraica*. 3rd Edition. Translated by Erroll F. Rhodes. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2014.

Yadin, Yigael. *The Ben Sira Scroll from Masada: With Introduction, Emendations and Commentary*. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1965.

Yardney, Sarah. “The Use of Glossaries by the Translators of the Septuagint,” *Textus* 28 (2019): 157-77.

Young, Edward J. *The Book of Isaiah*. Volume 1: Chapters 1-18. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1965.

Zapff, Burkard. *Schriftgelehrte Prophetie—Jes 13 und die Komposition des Jesajabuches*. Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1995.

Ziegler, Joseph. *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias*. Münster: Aschendorffschen Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1934.

Ziegler, Joseph. *Eusebius Werke*. *Band 9: Der Jesajakommentar*. Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1975.

Ziegler, Joseph, ed. *Isaias*. Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum 14. 3rd Edition. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983.

Zillessen, Alfred. “Bermerkungen zur alexandrinischen Übersetzung des Jesaja (c. 40-66),” *ZAW* 22 (1902): 238-63.