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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

The greatest translation feat of the ancient world began in Egypt in the third century B.C. After adopting the Greek language, the Jewish community in Alexandria translated their ancient Hebrew writings into Greek. The project began with the translation of the Hebrew Torah. Over the following decades and centuries, the remainder of the Old Testament books followed suit. The translation style, also termed translation technique, varies from book to book. Those responsible for producing the Greek Pentateuch (largely writing in the vernacular Koine) generally followed a more source oriented approach; seeking to bring their readers to the Hebrew behind the Greek of their translations. In contrast, those who translated books such as Old Greek (OG) Proverbs and OG Job generally followed a more target oriented approach; catering to the target language and bringing the text to the reader. Greek Leviticus is typically described as one of the more literal translations


3Regarding the “Interlinear Paradigm” and the translation style of the Pentateuch, see Albert Pietersma and Benjamin Wright, eds., A New English Translation of the Septuagint (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 1, 43, 84, 107, 141; for studies on the nature of the Greek in the Pentateuch, see Adolf Deissmann, Bible Studies: Contributions, Chiefly from Papyri and Inscriptions, to the History of the Language, the Literature, and the Religion of Hellenistic Judaism and Primitive Christianity (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1901; originally German publications in 1895 and 1897); Lee, A Lexical Study; Trevor V. Evans, Verbal Syntax in the Greek Pentateuch: Natural Greek Usage and Hebrew Interference (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001); James K. Aitken, No Stone Unturned: Greek Inscriptions and Septuagint Vocabulary Critical Studies in Hebrew Bible 5 (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2014).

4As John Screnock states, “A ‘source oriented’ translation caters more to the source language and brings the audience to the text, whereas a ‘target oriented’ translation caters to the target language and bring the text to the audience, linguistically speaking.” John Screnock, Traductor
where Hebrew syntactic structure, lexeme order, and lexical choice are maintained.\textsuperscript{5} Though it was not initially one collection of writings, this body of Greek Old Testament literature would eventually be termed the “Septuagint” (LXX) in reference to the supposed seventy two translators of the Pentateuch.

Septuagint studies provides OT scholars with valuable information in the areas of philology, exegesis, and textual criticism.\textsuperscript{6} Emanuel Tov states it strongly, “the text-critical use of data in the LXX can proceed profitably only if the analysis of the translation technique of each individual translation unit is taken into account.”\textsuperscript{7} Translation technique (TT) is simply the collective name for all the various renderings used by a translator. To study it is to describe systematically the result of the work of the translator.\textsuperscript{8} This thesis will focus on three aspects of TT in LXX Leviticus (1) the treatment of the Hebrew verb qṭr, (2) the influence of cultural and religious ideologies and traditions upon the translator, and (3) Greek lexical choice.

**Goal and Summary**

In this thesis I investigate three features of Septuagint Leviticus’ Greek text in order to gain a better understanding of the translator, his world, and his text. In chapter 1, I analyze the translator’s treatment of the Hebrew verb qṭr. When dealing with the obligatory and non-obligatory constituents of the qṭr clause, the translator


periodically omitted representation of obligatory Hebrew constituents and replaced them with Greek equivalents of non obligatory Hebrew constituents. In chapter two, I argue that the translator of Leviticus had a curious relationship with the Hebrew lexeme *leḥem* "bread/food." When he perceived his Hebrew text to imply that God ate food, the translator either omitted or misrepresented *leḥem* in his translation. In the last chapter, I outline the reception history of δικαίωμα. When the translator chose δικαίωμα to represent ḫōq "statute," in LXX-Lev 25:18a, he was part of a tradition that would influence the meaning of δικαίωμα in subsequent Jewish and Christian Greek literature, and eventually the broader Greek world. In all three of these studies, the translator’s TT shows him to be somewhat dependent on, and possibly a part of, a group of Pentateuchal translators.
CHAPTER 2
LXX-LEVITICUS AND QṬR

The Hebrew verb qṭr (hereafter קטר) occurs 115 times in the Hebrew Bible,1 17 (usable) times in the non-Biblical Qumran literature,2 and twice in Ben Sira.3 Hebrew Leviticus contains the most occurrences of any book with 33.4 The translator of Greek Leviticus (hereafter LXX-Lev) generally opted for a word for word approach to translation technique (TT), and mostly followed the event structuring of קטר in his Vorlage.5 The focus of this chapter will be those instances where the translator deviates from his usual approach. More specifically, when dealing with the obligatory and non-obligatory constituents of the Hebrew clause, the translator periodically omits representation of obligatory Hebrew constituents


2Of the 31 occurrences, 17 were sufficiently clear (i.e. without damaged contexts) for the present study. Martin G. Abegg et al., The Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance, vol 1.2 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 654.


replacing them with Greek equivalents of non obligatory Hebrew constituents. The goal of this chapter is to analyze those occurrences which show deviation from the translator’s usual TT. To do so, I will present (1) a brief description of valency linguistic theory, (2) קַטֵּר in Hebrew Leviticus, and (3) LXX-Lev’s treatment of קַטֵּר.

Valency and Biblical Hebrew

The ability of words to combine with other words to form larger units may be termed valency. In the field of chemistry, the term valency describes the bond or bonds that an atom has or may have with one or more other atoms. Linguists have adopted and adapted the term valency (also termed complementation) to the study of language. The categories of classical grammar derive primarily from a case based study of languages which can be traced back to the Ancient Greeks. However, this case based system for the study of languages in the Proto-Indo-European family is not optimal for analyzing semitic languages. Valency as a system should be able (hypothetically) to analyze any language and, therefore, has major benefits over against classical approaches to grammar. While the study of valency may be applied to verbs, adjectives and nouns, this chapter is primarily interested in the verbal valency of קַטֵּר. More specifically, I use the valency of קַטֵּר to analyze the translation technique of LXX-Lev.

Valency Theory

In linguistic usage, as mentioned above, verbal valency refers to the quantitative and qualitative analysis of the syntactic elements that a verb requires or

6John A. Cook, “A Valency Dictionary of Biblical Hebrew” (unpublished), 1. I must thank Cook for sharing this work with myself via email.


permits combining with. The valency of קסם is represented, therefore, by both the number and type of arguments with which it may combine. In order to avoid the traditional grammatical categories, as much as possible, such as subject, object, adverb, prepositional phrase, etc. I have chosen to adopt a methodology which describes syntactic elements by both the syntactic category (complement vs. adjunct) and semantic role (agent, patient, theme etc.).

**Complements and adjuncts.** The valency approach developed by the Germans (in Germanistik) is one of the most systematic attempts to describe structuring patterns of verbs, adjective and nouns.

One of [valency’s] most important assets is that it has always devoted considerable attention to the distinctions between such elements whose occurrence is dependent on the presence of a particular valency carrier, i.e. the complements (Ergänzungen), and such elements whose occurrence in a clause is structurally independent of the presence of particular other words, i.e. the adjuncts or peripheral elements (Angaben). The distinction between complements and adjuncts takes the form of a gradient rather than that of two clearly distinct categories, it can be said that within valency frameworks what is to be considered a complement of a valency carrier is not left to intuition but based on a number of test criteria.

In this chapter, I employ the term “complement” for any obligatory clausal constituents (besides the verb). In traditional categories, these would usually include the subject and objects of the verb. One advantage of the valency approach, however, is its ability to track more than just transitivity. Valency analysis succeeds, where classical grammar fails, when for instance a locative adverb complement is always required by the verb. Another advantage to a valency approach is the ability to analyze null (non-overt) complements. Null complements are not phonologically

---


present in the clause but are syntactically present based on anaphora. This phenomenon will be termed “null anaphor” when the verb carries complements over from a previous clause earlier in the context. Non-overt complements may also be “implicit” (i.e., implied by the verb) where the complementation is determined by the verbal lexeme.\textsuperscript{12} As mentioned above, an advantage of the valency approach is its ability to track complements when, for example, a locative adverb (LC=location complement) is always required by the verb. An example of such an LC, in the present study, is חַגְדָּה (altar) which occurs overtly 88 percent of the time with קָטָר in Leviticus. In the remaining occurrences חַגְדָּה is implied by the verb or it occurs in a previous clause and is present in the syntax based on null anaphor.

In this chapter, I use the term “adjunct” for any non-obligatory clausal constituents. For the sake of clarity, I name each clausal constituent (obligatory and non obligatory), by combining both its syntactic function and semantic role.\textsuperscript{13} For instance, in the clause, “the man threw the ball to the dog” the complements “man,” “ball,” and “dog” each have a semantic role. The naming of these complements would be as follows: “The man” is the agent complement (AC), “the ball” is the patient complement (PC), and “the dog” is the recipient complement (RC). I might expand the clause with verbal adjuncts such as “quickly” (manner adjunct), “for him” (beneficiary adjunct) and so on. These categories will become clear as the study of קָטָר progresses.

The number of complements licensed by Hebrew verbs is most often one to three.\textsuperscript{14} The terms used to describe these complementation patterns are

\textsuperscript{12}Cook, “Valency Analysis,” 11.


\textsuperscript{14}Meteorological terms in Hebrew may either have an implied subject “it” and be monovalent, or they may be avalent.

Isa 33:19 And (it?) will hail when the forest falls down.
“monovalent,” “bivalent,” and “trivalent.” Note the examples:

1. Monovalent
   Isa 65:17 יִשְׂמָחוּ עֲבָדִי, behold, my servants shall rejoice.

2. Bivalent
   Isa 47:3 נָקָם אֶקָּח, I will take vengeance.

3. Trivalent
   Isa 27:4 מִי־יִתְּנֵנִי מָרִיתֵנִיּ שֶׁפֶר Who will give me thorns?

The focus of this chapter, as mentioned above, will be the instances where the Greek translator did not accurately represent the event structure of קטר. Lexica of Biblical Hebrew have traditionally focused on the event semantics of verbs but the structuring of the event language has been sorely neglected. It is to this that we now turn.

**Hebrew Leviticus and QTR**

The verb קטר occurs 33 times in Hebrew Leviticus. The Hiphil stem dominates with 32 occurrences with the other single occurrence being the Hophal stem. In Leviticus, Hiphil קטר is trivalent meaning that it always has three overt or non-overt complements (agent, patient, and location).

**Non-Overt Complements Illustrated**

Non-overt (“null”) complements are syntactically present (based on anaphora or implicitness) but without phonological representation. In Leviticus, Hiphil קטר takes a null anaphor agent complement 50 percent of the time and a null anaphor patient complement 38 percent of the time. In contrast, Hiphil קטר takes its locative complement הַמִּזְבֵּחַ as null 12 percent of the time (implicit 9 percent and anaphor 3 percent). The remaining 88 percent of the time, it is an overt LC. The

---

presence of non overt complements (in this case based on null anaphor) is demonstrated by comparing the instances that contain overt complements with those instances that do not. The following two example are illustrative. In the first, the order of overt complements is V-AC-PC-LC.

Leviticus 1:9

And the priest shall burn all of it on the altar, as a burnt offering, a food offering with a pleasing aroma to the LORD.

In Leviticus, Hiphil קטר first occurs in 1:9. All three complements of the trivalent Hiphil קטר are overt. In addition, adjuncts are present which allow us to (at least initially) classify them as non obligatory components of the clause. This example illustrates an (because one has to say an order) V-AC-PC-LC order where the 3ms agent complement (הַכֹּהֵן), the patient complement (הַכֹּל), and the locative complement (הַמִּזְבֵּחַ) are phonologically present (overt). The adjuncts are as follows: First, עֹלָה "whole burnt offering" (with the appositional semichut אִשֵּׁה רֵיחַ נִיחוֹחַ "a sweetly smelling fire offering") is a product of the verbal action. Second, the adjunct prepositional phrase (PP) לַֽיהוָה is the beneficiary of the verbal action. To complement this example I provide a minimalist example below. In this case, only the verb and LC are present but the agent and patient complements are syntactically present based on null anaphor but not phonologically present. The overt complement order in this case is V-LC.

Leviticus 1:13

And the priest shall offer all of it and (the priest) shall burn (it) on the altar

In this verse, four verses after the previous example, the priest (הַכֹּהֵן) is to
offer (הִקְרִיב). The patient complement refers anaphorically to "intestines and legs" from the previous clause. The next clause continues the same agent and patient complements syntactically but without presenting them phonologically ("null anaphor"). For the sake of illustration, the example might be marked as follows: "(null anaphor)."

The patient complement refers anaphorically to "intestines and legs" from the previous clause. The next clause continues the same agent and patient complements syntactically but without presenting them phonologically ("null anaphor"). For the sake of illustration, the example might be marked as follows: "(null anaphor)."

Lexica

Upon consulting the main authoritative Hebrew – English lexica, one finds that when the PC is carried over based on null anaphor (38 percent of the time) the lexica list the overt product adjuncts of כֹּרֶב as objects. The adjuncts mentioned in our example above (עליה "whole burnt offering" and אִשֵּׁה "a sweetly smelling fire offering") are included in the lexica as objects (complements) to the verb. In his forthcoming article, John Cook addresses this very issue:

Biblical Hebrew grammars and lexica have been largely confined to describing what overtly occurs in the text. However, as has been pointed out by some (e.g., Miller 2003), an adequate analysis of Biblical Hebrew argument structure requires attention to non-overt constituents. Non-overt complements have been of particular interest to valency studies, and various labels have been applied to the (non-)overt distinction, including obligatory versus optional complements (Herbst and Roe 1996) and primary and secondary complements (DeArmond and Hedberg 2003).
In the case of the Hiph of קֵסֶר, the PC often being null, the lexica confuse their readers by listing product adjuncts with the patient compliments of the verb. To illustrate this point, the lexica represent the semichut (construct phrase) אִשֶּׁה רֵיחַ נִיחֹחַ and both אִשֶּׁה רֵיחַ נִיחֹחַ as “obj.” As will be seen later on, if we only used the lexica, this adjunct and product confusion would not allow us to see the deviation by the translator in Leviticus 3:11 and 16. This issue will be addressed at the end of the next section, but for now, it is enough to realize that a fresh study of קֵסֶר, with a valency approach, ruled out the semichut נִיחֹחַ רֵיחַ אִשֶּׁה and both אִשֶּׁה רֵיחַ נִיחֹחַ as “obj.” The incorporation of valency theory in TT studies allows for a better understanding of the Hebrew parent text, and therefore, the translator’s TT.

LXX-Lev and QTR

The following section primarily focuses on the translator’s representation of the Hebrew syntax. More specifically, the focus will be on deviations from the syntactic structure of the translator’s Vorlage. The Samaritan Pentaeuch (SP), Dead Sea Scrolls (DSS), and LXX were read alongside the MT. Any seeming additions or different renderings by the LXX that were supported by a reading in either the SP or DSS (or both) were not counted as additions or mistakes by the Greek translator but assumed to be a part of his Vorlage.

Rendering QTR

When translating the Hebrew lexeme קֵסֶר, the Leviticus translator seems to have followed the lead of LXX-Exodus. The Exodus translator employed ἀναφέρω “offer (in sacrifice)” or ἐπιτίθημι “to put (upon)” in translating קֵסֶר when it took

---


19 Exod 29:13, 18, 25; 30:7a,b, 8, 20.
food offerings as PC. He also employed θυμιάω “burn so as to produce smoke”\textsuperscript{20} when קטר referred to burning incense. The Greek translator of Leviticus follows the LXX-Ex in 31 out of the 33 occurrences. In 19 occurrences, the Leviticus translator employed ἀναφέρω\textsuperscript{21} and in 12 occurrences ἐπιτεθημ.\textsuperscript{22} Lastly, the translator chose προσφέρω “offer” for Hiph קטר in LXX-Lev 2:11, and medio-passive ἐπιτελέω “performed” for Hoph קטר in LXX-Lev 6:22.

The Koine nature of the vocabulary is seen in the lexemes that the translator did not choose. Options, from Greek literature which may have been available to him in the 3rd c. B.C., that he did not select were: ἀτμίζω “smoke,” ἐκκαπνίζομαι "evaporate in smoke," καπνείω "turn into smoke," κνισόω “turn into fatty smoke, τύφω to “smoke.”\textsuperscript{23} The Greek translator of Leviticus followed the example of LXX-Exodus and interestingly the translator of Numbers follows suit.\textsuperscript{24}

\textbf{Rendering the Complements of O}\textbf{T\textit{R}}

When translating the complements of קטר, the translator’s word for word approach to TT is seen in his lexical choices.

The overt agent complements for קטר in Leviticus and the Greek translator’s renderings are as follows:

\begin{align*}
\text{בְנֵי־אַהֲרֹן} & \text{ὁ ιερεὺς} \\
\text{oυιοί Ααρων} & \text{ὁ ἱερεύς}\textsuperscript{25} \\
\text{הַכֹּהֵן} & \text{Μωσῆς}
\end{align*}


\textsuperscript{21} LXX-Lev. 2:16; 3:5, 11, 16; 4:10, 19, 26, 31; 6:15 (8), 35 (7:5); 7:21 (31); 8:16, 20, 21, 28; 9:10, 20; 16:25; 17:6. Liddell, Scott, and Jones, \textit{A Greek-English Lexicon}, 123.

\textsuperscript{22} LXX-Lev. 1:9, 13, 15, 17; 2:2, 9; 4:35; 5:12; 6:12 (5); 9:13, 14, 17.

\textsuperscript{23} Liddell, Scott, and Jones, \textit{A Greek-English Lexicon}, 271, 508, 876, 876, 965, 1838.

\textsuperscript{24} See LXX-Num. 5:26; 16:40 (17:5); 18:17.

\textsuperscript{25} In one occurrence the translation is plural. This may be due to the \textit{Vorlage} or TT.
The overt patient complements and the Greek translator’s renderings are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>אֶת־הַכֹּל</td>
<td>τὰ πάντα</td>
<td>all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מִגִּרְשָׂהּ</td>
<td>τὸ μνημόσυνον</td>
<td>memory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>עַל</td>
<td>αὐτῆς</td>
<td>of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כָּל־לְבֹנָתָהּ</td>
<td>τὸν λίβανον</td>
<td>all woods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֶת־כָּל־הָאַיִל</td>
<td>τὸν κριὸν</td>
<td>all cow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וְאֶת־הַכְּלָיֹת</td>
<td>τὸ στέαρ καὶ τοὺς νεφροὺς</td>
<td>all kidneys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֶת־הַחֵלֶב</td>
<td>τὸ στεῖρ καὶ τοὺς νεφροὺς</td>
<td>all meat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מִן־הַכָּבֵד</td>
<td>τὸν λίβανον</td>
<td>from all woods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מִן־הַחַטָּאת</td>
<td>τὸν στέαρ</td>
<td>from all meat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The overt location complements and the translator’s renderings are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>כְּלֵיל</td>
<td>ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον</td>
<td>upon the altar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וְאֶת־הַכְּלָיֹת</td>
<td>ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον</td>
<td>upon the altar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֶת־הַחֵלֶב</td>
<td>ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον</td>
<td>upon the altar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מִן־הַחַטָּאת</td>
<td>ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον</td>
<td>upon the altar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These lists show that when the verbal complements for Hiphil are overt, the translator renders them quite faithfully.

Rendering of the Adjuncts of QTR

The location adjuncts and the Greek translator’s renderings are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>בֵּית הַנָּה</td>
<td>ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον</td>
<td>upon the altar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לִבְּלִי</td>
<td>ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον</td>
<td>upon the altar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מִן־הַכָּבֵד</td>
<td>ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον</td>
<td>upon the altar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מִן־הַחַטָּאת</td>
<td>ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον</td>
<td>upon the altar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The product adjuncts that the translator renders in a formal equivalence style are as follows:

The product adjunct that the translator, on occasion, represents in a manner somewhat differently from his source text are as follows:

Beneficiary adjuncts:

Manner adjuncts:

Situation Adjunct:

\[26\]" represents the translator's deviation from his Vorlage in 3:11 and 16. I will address these instances later in this chapter.
When dealing with Hebrew adjuncts the translator fairly accurately represented the vocabulary of his source text. However, it seems that when it came to the syntax of the adjuncts he had less of a concern for a literal representation.

**Rendering the Order of Overt Complements of QTR**

In Hebrew Leviticus, קטר occurs as a trivalent Hiphil with agent (AC), patient (PC), and locative complements (LC). The translator accurately represents the clause order of the overt complements 70 percent of the time.\(^\text{27}\) In Hebrew Leviticus the overt constituent order for קטר is most often V-LC (x10) with the second and third most often being V-PC-AC-LC (x6) and V-AC-PC-LC (x5). The remaining combinations occur either 1 or 2 times each V-AC-PC, PC-V-LC, V-PC, V-PC-LC, PC-V, PC-V-LC, and V-LC-PC. The translator seems to have deviated from his Hebrew text 21 percent of the time (7 occurrences). The SP and DSS agree with the MT against the LXX in all the examples. The Greek representation in these 10 instances, therefore, should be seen as changes made by the Greek translator and as accurate representations of his Hebrew Vorlage. These occurrences are analyzed in the next section.\(^\text{28}\)

\(^\text{27}\)The Greek translator mostly represents the order of the Hebrew verb and its overt complements. The constituent orders that were accurately represented by the translator are: V-LC (x6), V-AC-PC-LC (x4), V-PC-AC-LC (x3), V-AC-LC (x2), V-AC-PC (x2), PC-V-LC (x2), V-PC (x2), V-PC-LC (x2), V-PC (x1), PC-V (x1), PC-V-LC (x1).

\(^\text{28}\)It could also be that אֶת־אַזְכָּרָתָה "its memorial portion" is a product adjunct to the verb (in this study I have treated it as a PC) and that the patient complement is being carried by the verb based on null anaphor. If so then the Greek translator is incorrect as he translates as the patient complement in the following occurrences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lev. 2:2</th>
<th>V-AC-LC</th>
<th>PC-V-LC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>and the priest shall burn this as its memorial portion on the altar, a food offering with a pleasing aroma to the LORD</td>
<td>καὶ ἐπιθήσει ὁ ἱερεὺς τὸ μνημόσυνον αὐτῆς ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον· θυσία, ὀσμή εὐωδίας τῷ κυρίῳ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lev. 5:12</th>
<th>V-LC</th>
<th>PC-V-LC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the priest shall lay its memorial portion on the altar; it is a sacrifice, an odor of fragrance to the Lord</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additions. In three instances the translator represented non-overt Hebrew complements in his translation. In 1:15, 2:9 and 8:28, Hiphil קטר takes its AC and PC based on null anaphor. The addition of ὁ ἱερεὺς by the translator in 1:15 and 2:9, as well as the additions of Μωυσῆς and αὐτά in 8:28 represent the non-overt Hebrew syntax.

Lev. 1:15  
MT  
V-LC  
V-AC-LC

and burn it on the altar

Lev. 2:9  
V-LC  
V-AC-LC

and burn this on the altar, a food offering with a pleasing aroma to the LORD

Lev 6:8 (LXX 15)  
V-LC  
V-LC-PC

and burn this as its memorial portion on the altar, a pleasing aroma to the LORD

Lev. 8:28  V-LC  V-PC-AC-LC  

וַיַּקְטֵר הַמִּזְבֵּחָה עַל־הָעֹלָה  καὶ ἀνήνεγκεν αὐτὰ Μωυσῆς ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον, ἐπὶ τὸ ὅλοκαύτωμα τῆς τελείωσεως  

and burned them on the altar with the burnt offering  and Μωυσῆς offered them up on the altar on the whole burnt offering of validation  

**Omission.** In the following example the translator omits any Greek representation of the Hebrew 3mp pronominal suffix.  

Lev. 4:10  V-PC-AC-LC  V-AC-LC  

הַכֹּהֵן וְהִקְטִירם הָעֹלָה מִזְבַּח עַל καὶ ἀνοίσει ὁ ἱερεὺς ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον τῆς καρπώσεως.  

and the priest shall burn them on the altar of burnt offering  And the priest shall offer on the altar of offering  

**Change of order.** In the following example the translator represents a different order of constituents in his transition than what was probably in his Vorlage.  

Lev. 4:35  V-AC-PC-LC  V-PC-AC-LC  

אֹתָם הַכֹּהֵן וְהִקְטִיר יְהוָה אִשֶּׁי הַמִּזְבֵּחָה καὶ ἐπιθήσει ὁ ἱερεὺς ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον ἐπὶ τὸ ὅλοκαύτωμα κυρίου  

and the priest shall burn it on the altar, on top of the LORD’s food offerings  and the priest shall lay it on the altar; on the whole burnt offering of the Lord.  

**Omission and misrepresentation.** I will devote the entire second chapter of this thesis to addressing the translator’s treatment of 3:11 and 16. For the moment it is important to observe that the patterns of Hebrew syntax represented by the Greek are anomalous. The translator represents what would be the product adjuncts of the Hiph of קטר as its PCs. As will be seen, the translator’s treatment of ketab in these two verses supports the notion that when he read "food offering" in his Vorlage, perceiving his Hebrew text to imply that God ate food, he
intentionally avoided conveying its meaning and implications.

Lev. 3:11  V-PC-AC-LC  
And the priest shall burn it on the altar as a food offering to the LORD

V-AC-LC-PC  
the priest shall make an offering on the altar, an odor of fragrance, an offering to the Lord

In reaction to the idea that YHWH receives the fat of the lamb as food, the Greek translator has omitted the 3ms object of the Hebrew verb and omitted לֶחֶם “food” in his translation.30 Additionally, he substitutes the accusative noun phrase ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας “odor of fragrance” for ἱερεὺς, making it the direct object of ἀναφέρω.31 Moreover, the translator renders ἁπλῶς “fire-offering,” with the cultic Greek term κάρπωμα “offering of fruits,” setting it in apposition to ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας.32 The Greek syntax represents unattested Hebrew syntax as ניחח ריח “fragrant aroma” is never the object of the verb καταρρέει nor does it occur alone as an adjunct of καταρρέει, it always modifies the head noun אשה in a semichut ניחח ריח אשה.33 Based on internal evidence it seems right to conclude that Hebrew syntax has betrayed the translator who used ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας “odor of fragrance” as the direct object of ἀναφέρω. While the Hebrew stresses that the fat of the lamb will be smoked up as food for YHWH, the Greek emphasizes that a sweet smell is what is lifted up—an offering.

30Another option for the object of ἀναφέρω would be an implied object, referring semantically to an antecedent. This option leaves ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας as an adverbial accusative and κάρπωμα as appositional to ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας. If this option is chosen to explain the syntax, it also betrays the hand of the translator because it would leave ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας as an adjunct modifier of the verb, which in every other case has been rendered εἰς ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας.


32Liddell, Scott, and Jones, A Greek-English Lexicon, 880.

33A study of the 42 occurrences of the phrase ניחח ריח in the Hebrew Bible shows the following: First, it never occurs as the object of קטר. Second, when it modifies קטר, it is most frequently prefixed with the preposition ל (and always translated by εἰς in Greek). Third, when it functions appositionally, it always follows the noun it modifies. And fourth, when it occurs in a copular phrase הוא is present.
And the priest shall burn them on the altar as a food offering with a pleasing aroma.

Similar to his actions in verse 11, the translator has avoided the notion that the fatty parts of a goat become food for YHWH. He does this by omitting both the Hebrew 3mp pronominal suffix, which is the object of the verb, and לֶחֶם אִשֶּׁה. Furthermore, he represents the product adjunct as with accusative κάρπωμα, making it the direct object of ἀναφέρω. Throughout LXX-Lev, the translator uses εἰς ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας to represent the verbal adjunct לֶחֶם אִשֶּׁה. However, in this passage, he has omitted εἰς, and set ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας in apposition to κάρπωμα. In similar fashion to 3:11, the translation emphasizes that YHWH receives something other than the “fat.” In this case it is a κάρπωμα, “offering,” an ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας, “odor of fragrance.”

In 3:11 and 16 the Greek text avoids the notion of YHWH consuming food, and emphasize that the cultic ritual is ultimately an “odor of fragrance” to YHWH.

Conclusion

LXX-Lev employs a word for word approach to translation technique. This was seen in the translator’s representation of the event structuring of Hiph כְּפָר. While most of the time he properly represented the Hebrew complements of Hiph כְּפָר, his treatment of its adjunct did not display the same level of concern. The

---

34 The LXX, Samaritan Pentateuch, and Samaritan Targum witness to a reading with this addition. These traditions often agree with regard to small additions throughout Leviticus (see 1:6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 15, etc.). It is important for the discussion of the syntax and semantics, so I have added it to help illustrate the reason for the divergence in the Greek.

35 Muraoka, A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint, 47; Wevers, Notes on the Greek Text of Leviticus, 39.

36 See n. 33 on p. 18 of this thesis.
translator followed Exodus’ Greek translator in his choice of Greek verbs for Hiph קטר (and was followed by LXX-Num). The valency analysis of קטר was an important tool for discovering and understanding the deviation by the Greek translator in Lev 3:11 and 16. When dealing with the complements and adjuncts of Hiph קטר the translator omitted representation of Hebrew complements replacing them with Greek equivalents of Hebrew adjuncts. It is to this deviation that we now turn.
CHAPTER 3
GOD’S LEḤEM IN LXX-LEVITICUS

The Greek translator of Leviticus had a curious relationship with the Hebrew lexeme leḥem (hereafter לֶחֶם) “bread/food.” When he perceived his Hebrew text to imply that God ate food, the translator either omitted or misrepresented לֶחֶם in his translation. I shall argue that in Leviticus 3:11, 16; 21:6, 8, 17, 21, 22; and 22:25, the translator most likely read לֶחֶם in his parent text and that he intentionally avoided conveying its meaning and implications.

When Hebrew Leviticus 3:11 stressed that the priest would burn (lit. “make smoke”) fat as food for God, the translator substituted ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας “odor of fragrance” for לֶחֶם. Thus, in the Greek translation the priest was to offer up _a sweet smell_ —an offering for God. Similarly, when the Hebrew text of 3:16a stressed that the priest would burn the fatty parts, with a sweet smell, as food for God, the translator omitted any lexical representation of לֶחֶם. Thus, in the translation, the priest was to offer up an _offering_ —a sweet smell. Lastly, in six instances where the Hebrew speaks of “God’s food” the translator used δῶρον “gift” to represent לֶחֶם (these cases will hereafter be termed DFL, “dōron for lehem”).

1 If לֶחֶם was in the Vorlage of the LXX, then the translator, who generally follows a quantitative approach to translation technique, acted out of character. Previous scholarship has

---

1 Lev 21:6, 8, 17, 21, 22; 22:25.

2 The Göttingen edition of Leviticus may reflect an early revision of the Old Greek text. One must bear in mind this possibility when attempting to characterize the translator. For this study, however, it is not a pressing concern since the study of the ancient witnesses includes pap4QLXXLev for LXX Lev 3:11. For further discussion of the “literalness” of the translator, see Anssi Voitila, “Leviticus,” in T and T Clark Companion to the Septuagint, ed. J. K. Aitken (London: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2015), 51, 53.
not adequately addressed this problem. This chapter will (1) survey previous scholarship, (2) analyze the internal and external evidence, (3) discuss the semantic range of לֶחֶם, and (4) suggest the possible influence of pagan cults and Jewish tradition upon the translator.

**Previous Scholarship**

As mentioned in the introduction to this thesis, scholars have long debated a starting point for analyzing translation technique. There exist, however, two predominant schools of thought; the “the textual” and the “exegetical” approaches. Adherents of the “textual approach” are quick to postulate alternate Vorlagen. They believe that the translators sought, albeit with errors, to transmit the text that was before their eyes into the target language without altering it. In contrast, adherents of the “exegetical approach” exhaust all possible explanations before postulating different Vorlagen. They believe that the translators were influenced by the exegetical practices of their time and applied midrashic exegetical techniques to the text. In their brief treatments of לֶחֶם in LXX-Lev, John William Wevers, Dirk Büchner, and Suzanne Daniel all seek exegetical explanations for the seeming deviation by the translator (exegetical approach). They, however, do not agree on the motivation for the translator’s actions. In contrast, Anssi Voitila postulates an alternate Vorlage (textual approach).

---


LXX-Leviticus

Wevers notes that the idea of a “food sacrifice,” (i.e., providing food for the deity), may have “smacked too much of pagan (Egyptian) practices.”\(^5\) Thus, the translator deviated from his parent text with what he felt to be a safe alternative. With respect to DFL, Wevers states that the translator “assiduously avoids the notion of the ‘bread of God’ as though God might be in need of food.”\(^6\)

Dirk Büchner disagrees with Wevers, regarding 3:11 and 3:16a, stating that “it is not convincing to suggest that the Lord cannot be regarded as partaking in the meal...or that G made the change out of reaction to Egyptian-Greek deities who partake in sacred meals.”\(^7\) Büchner believes that the translator felt uncomfortable by the directions to give YHWH the least attractive and inedible parts of the animal. He also wonders, with regard to 3:11, if the translator may have been influenced by the idea that deities could be fed through perfumed smoke. Büchner also notes that the translator generally selected Greek lexemes that represented ingredients used in the pagan first-fruits offering to the Greek gods.\(^8\) Thus, he concludes that the translator is not entirely separating the Israelite cult from those of the Greek pagans.

Regarding DFL, Büchner states that “the real reason for the change may lie in the fact that here the notion of food edible by humans is replaced with divine food. The way deities partake in the sacrificial meal is by way of the savory smoke. So perhaps it is indeed a kind of anti-anthropomorphism.”\(^9\)

---


\(^6\) Ibid., 334.


\(^8\) Büchner offers a list of Greek terms associated with κάρπωμα, the Greek first-fruit offering. Terms used in Leviticus aside from κάρπωμα are the "ὀσφύς (haunches with tail).... and the μηροί or μηρία (thighs or thigh bones) onto which a double layer of fat was laid (any of πιμελή, πίαρ, πίων, δημός, κνίση)." Ibid., 106.

\(^9\) Ibid.
Suzanne Daniel hypothesizes that the translator is harmonizing 3:11 and 3:16a with κάρπωμα ὀσμὴ εὐωδίας “it is an offering, an odor of fragrance” from 3:5. Büchner rightly rejects this view, stating that it does not explain the omission of “an important word like לֶחֶם.” Daniel is correct in noticing the harmonization, but it is certainly not the reason for the omission of לֶחֶם in both verses.

Anssi Voitila recommends that the translator may have had a different parent text in 3:11 and 3:16a. He also suggests, with regard to DFL, that the translator may have thought it was an “offering of some sort” or that his parent text read קָרְבָּן “offering, gift, sacrifice.”

**Exegesis or Alternate Vorlage?**

This section will cover the internal and external evidence, the meaning of לֶחֶם, and the translations of לֶחֶם in the Greek Old Testament. I will establish that לֶחֶם was in the translator’s Vorlage and that he intentionally avoided the notion of YHWH eating food.

**Leviticus 3:11 and 3:16a**

In this section, I cover the external and internal evidence for Lev 3:11 and 3:16a. The results of my analysis will confirm that אִשֶּׁה לֶחֶם “food of a fire-offering” was, most likely, the reading in the translator’s parent text.

**Extant witnesses.** The surviving textual evidence is analyzed below.

---


13Ibid.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>3:11</th>
<th>3:16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew MT (BHS)</td>
<td>אִשֶּׁה לֶחֶם</td>
<td>אִשֶּׁה לֶחֶם</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medieval Mss</td>
<td>אִשֶּׁה לֶחֶם</td>
<td>אִשֶּׁה לֶחֶם</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek LXX</td>
<td>ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας· κάρπωμα</td>
<td>3:16 ἄρτον πυρόν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revisers</td>
<td>130, 344 ἄρτον πυρόν</td>
<td>85 ἄρτον πυρόν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSS 4QLev b</td>
<td>[לֶחֶם אִשֶּׁה]</td>
<td>[לֶחֶם אִשֶּׁה]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>pabulum ignis</td>
<td>alimoniam ignis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syriac P</td>
<td>لَعْس مَعْصَى</td>
<td>لَعْس مَعْصَى</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Church Fathers</td>
<td>3:16 Hesychius of Jerusalem 818</td>
<td>ἄρτον πυρόν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


16 August Freiherrn von Gall, *Der Hebräische Pentateuch der Samaritaner* (Giessen, Germany: Alfred Töpelmann, 1914).


Concerning verse 11, the Samaritan tradition (SP and Sam{Tg}) accords with the reading of the MT, even thought the SP more frequently follows the LXX in Leviticus 1-4. Both variants were also present at Qumran (4Q{Lev}b and pap4QLXX{Lev}b). The ancient sources accord with the reading of the MT. The Greek revisers all correct toward the reading of the MT (s-group). The Hebrew source of Peshitta Leviticus was close to MT, but often relied on the LXX and possibly the Targum as a source of lexical information and exegesis. Early revisions in the LXX-Lev tradition, as well as preference for the MT tradition, both explain the absence of discrepancies in the Pehitta. The SP should be taken as an independent witness.

26. This retroversion from Greek is based on the translator's renderings throughout Leviticus. He stereotyped ὀσμή for ריח (Lev 1:9, 13, 17; 2:2, 9, 12; 3:5, 16; 4:31; 6:8, 14; 8:21, 28; 17:6; 23:13, 18; 26:31). Aside from Leviticus 26:31(θυσία), the translator represents ἱππότικα with ענודון (Lev 1:9, 13, 17; 2:2, 9, 12; 3:5, 16; 4:31; 6:8, 14; 8:21, 28; 17:6; 23:13, 18). He uses five terms to represent καρπωμα Lev. 2:9, 10, 11, 16; 3:3, 5, 9, 11, 14, 16; 6:10, 11; 7:5, 25, 30, 35; 8:21, 28; 10:12, 13, 15; 22:22, 27; 23:37; θυσία Lev. 1:9; 1:13, 17; 2:2, 3; 21:6, 21; 23:13, 23:18; 24:9; τὸ ὀλοκαύτωμα Lev. 4:35; 5:12; 23:8, 25, 27, 36(x2); πυρός Lev. 1:17; 3:5; πρόκειμαι Lev. 24:7.

25. These traditions often agree against the MT, with regard to small additions in the first five chapter of Leviticus (see 1:6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 15 etc.).

against the reading of the LXX.

Regarding verse 16a, the Samaritan tradition once more follows the MT, and the SP counts as an independent witness against the reading of the LXX. The ancient sources heavily favor the wording of the MT, which is also attested at Qumran (4QLev). Origen and the extant Greek revisers correct toward the reading of the MT (＊G, 376, M, s-group). The Peshitta reading supports the MT. This may be explained by early revisions in LXX-Lev and/or scribal preference for the MT tradition. The Old Latin is a daughter version of the LXX. In this case, it does not prove helpful, as it attests its own unique reading where extra “outside, beside” stands in the place of אשה לֶחֶם. The analysis of external evidence strongly suggests that the Vorlage of the MT, SP and LXX contained לֶחֶם אשה in 3:11 and 3:16a. The translator of the LXX omitted לֶחֶם in both verses, but the reading continued in the SP and MT traditions. The revisers eventually used a Hebrew text to correct the changes in the LXX. The external evidence establishes that לֶחֶם is original to the Hebrew parent text of LXX-Lev 3:11 and 3:16a.

Syntax and semantics. It is important to recognize that Hebrew, like any language, has its own patterns of syntax. In this section, I will show that the Greek syntax of 3:11 represents anomalous Hebrew syntax (in the Hebrew Bible as a whole). I will also argue that the deviation in 3:11 requires that we see the same implications for 3:16a.27 These observations are intended to reinforce the reading of לֶחֶם in the translator’s Vorlage, and to establish that he avoided the idea of God

---

Then the priest shall turn it into smoke on the altar, as food of a fire-offering for the LORD.

In verses 3:9 and 3:10, the Hebrew author has given directions for offering the חֵלֶב “fat” of a lamb. Verse 11 concisely restates this, adding that making “it” (the fat) smoke will be a אִשֶּׁה לֶחֶם “food of a fire-offering” לַיהוָה “for the Lord.” This sacrifice is offered up on the altar, and the act is performed to transform the fat of the lamb into food for YHWH’s benefit. The אִשֶּׁה לֶחֶם “food of a fire-offering” preserves an idiom common to ancient religions, where food is served to a god. The translator read the text in accordance with this idiom. It is possible, however, that the Hebrew author was using this idiom to reflect God’s desire for the fellowship and devotion of his worshippers and not a desire for sustenance.

In reaction to the idea that YHWH receives the fat of the lamb as food, the Greek translator has omitted the 3ms object of the Hebrew verb and omitted לֶחֶם “food” in his translation. Additionally, he substitutes the accusative noun phrase όσμήν εὐωδίας “odor of fragrance” for לֶחֶם, making it the direct object of ἀναφέρω. 

---

28 The Hebrew verb קטר, a waqatal, which in the Hiphil means “to offer/burn something,” takes a 3ms pronominal suffix as its object, which takes as its antecedent the בֵּן “fat” from v. 9. The prepositional phrase המזבחה “on the altar” is the location. The bound phrase אשה לֶחֶם “as a food offering,” an adjunct to the verb, is the product of the “offering it up,” namely, the end result of a transformation. The adjunct prepositional phrase ליהוה denotes YHWH as the beneficiary for whose benefit the action is performed.


30 Another option for the object of ἀναφέρω would be an implied object, referring semantically to an antecedent. This option leaves όσμήν εὐωδίας as an adverbial accusative and κάρπωμα as appositional to όσμήν εὐωδίας. If this option is chosen to explain the syntax, it also betrays the hand of the translator because it would leave όσμήν εὐωδίας as an adjunct modifier of the verb, which in every other case has been rendered εἰς όσμήν εὐωδίας.

Moreover, the translator renders אִשֶּׁה “fire-offering,” with the cultic Greek term κάρπωμα “offering of fruits,” setting it in apposition to ὀσμὴν ἐυωδίας.\(^{32}\) The notion that the Vorlage could have read instead is not supported by any extant manuscripts, when and are adjuncts of the pattern is always אִשֶּׁה ניחח ריח and ניחח ריח רוח ניחח in the Hebrew Bible.\(^{33}\) The Greek syntax represents impossible Hebrew syntax as ניחח רוח ניחח (“fragrant aroma”) is never a patient complement of the verb ניחח.\(^{34}\) It is consequently right to conclude that Hebrew syntax has betrayed the translator who used ὀσμὴν ἐυωδίας “odor of fragrance” as the direct object of ἀναφέρω.

Based on internal evidence, there is no alternate Vorlage here. Rather, the translator has shifted to creating syntax without guidance from a parent text. While the Hebrew stresses that the fat of the lamb will be smoked up as food for YHWH, the Greek emphasizes that a sweet smell is what is lifted up—an offering.

The idea of “eating or feeding” seems to be lost when the term לֶחֶם is omitted. I am somewhat hesitant to accept Büchner’s suggestion that the substitution of ὀσμὴν ἐυωδίας for לֶחֶם is based on the belief that YHWH feasts on the perfumed smoke. In contrast, I understand the omission to show that the translator avoided the notion that YHWH feeds at all. It seems best to conclude that he concealed his omission of לֶחֶם by using “sweet smell,” which was available from the context as he rendered כי ניחח רוח ניחח as κάρπωμα ὀσμὴν ἐυωδίας in 3:5 and כי ניחח רוח ניחח as κάρπωμα ὀσμὴν ἐυωδίας in 3:16a.


\(^{33}\) Exod 29:18, 25, 41; Lev 1:9, 13, 17; 2:2, 9, 12; 3:5, 16; 4:31; 6:8, 14; 8:21, 28; 17:6; 23:13, 18; 26:31; Num 15:3, 7, 10, 13-14, 24; 18:17; 28:2, 6, 8, 13, 24, 27; 29:2, 6, 8, 13, 36; Ezek 6:13; 16:19; 20:28, 41.

\(^{34}\) A study of the 42 occurrences of the phrase כי ניחח רוח in the Hebrew Bible shows the following: First, כי ניחח רוח never occurs as the object of כָּרְסָר. Second, when it modifies כָּרְסָר, it is most frequently prefixed with the preposition הִי (and always translated by εἰς in Greek). Third, when it functions appositionally, it always follows the noun it modifies. And fourth, when it occurs in a copular phrase אִשֶּׁה is present.
Then the priest shall turn these into smoke on the altar as food of a fire-offering, with a pleasing aroma [for the Lord].

And the priest shall offer on the altar an offering, an odor of fragrance to the Lord.

In 3:14-15, directives are given for offering up the fatty parts of a goat. Verse 3:16a is a concise restatement of the directives.\(^\text{36}\) In contrast with verse 3:11, however, the Hebrew adds that the priest will smoke “them” (the fatty parts) up, as a ניחוח ליהוה (“food of a fire-offering”), הלקח ניחוח (“for a pleasing aroma”), ליהוה (“for the Lord”). This offering is performed to transform the fat of the lamb into food, that has a sweet smell, for YHWH’s benefit.\(^\text{37}\)

Once again, as in verse 11, the translator has avoided the notion that the fatty parts of a goat become food for YHWH. He does this by omitting both the Hebrew 3mp pronominal suffix, which is the object of the verb, and ליהוה =/front of ליהוה.

Furthermore, he represents אשה לחם with accusative κάρπωμα, making it the direct object of ἀναφέρω.\(^\text{38}\) Throughout LXX-Lev, the translator uses εἰς ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας to represent the verbal adjunct πάντα τὸ στέαρ τῷ κυρίῳ “all the fat is the Lord’s.” Interestingly, both the NRSV and the NETS translators mark the clause as starting the next paragraph in their translators. This fits comfortably with the translator’s exegetical behavior but will not be discussed further in this chapter.

\(^\text{39}\) The second part of v. 16 in Hebrew reads בַּכְלָלֵיהּ ליהוה “all the fat is YHWH’s.” The Greek translator rendered this phrase idiomatically as πάν τὸ στέαρ τῷ κυρίῳ “all the fat is the Lord’s.” Interestingly, both the NRSV and the NETS translators mark the clause as starting the next paragraph in their translators. This fits comfortably with the translator’s exegetical behavior but will not be discussed further in this chapter.

Just as in 3:11, the Hebrew verb קטר is a Hiphil w“qatal, but here it takes a 3mp pronominal suffix as its object, which takes as its antecedent the varied types of “fat” from vv. 14 and 15. The adjunct bound phrase הלקח אשה לחם “as a food offering” is the product of the “offering it up,” namely, the end result of a transformation. The adjunct prepositional phrase ליהוה ניחוח “for a sweet smell” is the object of sensory input, the, stimulus. The adjunct prepositional phrase ליהוה denotes YHWH as the beneficiary, for whose benefit an action is performed.

\(^\text{37}\) Muraoka, A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint, 47. Wevers, Leviticus, 39.

\(^\text{38}\) See n. 33 on p. 29 of this thesis.
εὐωδίας, setting it in apposition to κάρπωμα. In similar fashion to 3:11, the translation emphasizes that YHWH receives something other than the “fat.” In this case it is a κάρπωμα, “offering,” an ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας, “odor of fragrance.”

The retroversion אִשֶּׁה רַחֵת is not witnessed by any of the early translations of 3:16, but this phrase does occur elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible. However, as in 3:11 the Greek represents unlikely Hebrew syntax, as a cursory study of the valency of Hiphil קַטֶר suggests that it never takes אִשֶּׁה “fire offering” as an object. In addition, the external evidence and the case for omission of לֶחֶם in 3:11 is strong. Thus, it should be assumed that the translator acted similarly here in 3:16a. He opted to create his own rendering without guidance from a parent text.

The argument against YHWH feasting on the savory smoke seems to become stronger in this section. The idea of portraying YHWH as eating through smoke is actually more explicit in the Hebrew and not the Greek. The Hebrew emphasizes that the fatty parts will be smoked up, as food for YHWH, with a pleasing aroma. In contrast, the Greek stresses that an offering is what is offered up—a sweet smell.

The translator’s Hebrew text most likely had לֶחֶם, for which he substituted ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας in 3:11, and which he omitted in 3:16a. The Greek texts avoid the

---

40The retroversion of 3:16a לַיהוָה ניחח ריח אישה המבשחתה והקטיר, is attested in 2:9b.

Leviticus 2:9b 

MT

הָקִסֵּר הַמִּזְבֵּחָה אֲשֶׁר רַחֵת לְיהוָה

and turn this into smoke on the altar, an offering

LXX

καὶ ἐπιθῆσεi ὁ ἱερεύς ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον κάρπωμα, ὀσμὴ εὐωδίας κυρίῳ.

by fire of pleasing odor to the Lord.

and the priest shall lay [it] on the altar; [it is an]

offering, an odor of fragrance to the Lord.

Supposing that the Vorlage of 3:16 is in fact the same text as MT 2:9b, one must note that the translator does not translate them in the same way. He seems to have no qualms when the Hebrew speaks of smoking up the memorial portion of the grain offering in 2:9. He uses ἐπιθῆσει “to put/lay,” instead of ἀναφέρω, “to offer up” and carries over the grain as an implied object. In addition, he renders the Hebrew אִשֶּׁה רַחֵת “a fire offering of a sweet smell,” with a nominative κάρπωμα “an offering,” with the nominative noun phrase ὀσμὴ εὐωδίας in apposition. This firsthand evidence, available from a study of the translator’s rendering of 2:9b illustrates what the translator did when he encountered the exact syntax represented by the retroversion of 3:16a. This could be attributed to the different contexts (i.e., gain versus fatty parts) or even stylistic variation.
notion of YHWH consuming food, and emphasize that the cultic ritual is ultimately an “odor of fragrance” to YHWH.

**Leviticus 21 and 22**

Regarding DFL, the evidence strongly suggests that the translator read לֶחֶם in his Hebrew text.\(^{41}\) He employed δῶρον for לֶחֶם stereotypically when it occurred in bound phrase לֶחֶם + pron. suffix “their/your/his God’s food.” His action avoided the semantic range of לֶחֶם and therefore the notion that God consumes food. I will (1) discuss the internal and external evidence, (2) rule out “gift” as part of the semantic range of לֶחֶם, and (3) study the Greek renderings of לֶחֶם in cultic contexts.

DFL. Chapter 21 emphasizes the purity of those who offer “God’s food.” Similarly, chapter 22 stresses the purity of the animals offered as “God’s food.” The internal and external evidence suggests that לֶחֶם is original in all six verses. I will also argue that the translator’s lexical choice of δῶρον (“gift”) was meant to avoid the idea of YHWH eating.

The Hebrew syntax in the contexts\(^ {42}\) of DFL prevented the translator from


\(^{42}\)Verse 21:6b has been placed in the main text of the chapter, for argument’s sake. The other five verses are listed here for further analysis by the reader.

**Leviticus 21:6a**

καὶ ἀγιάσει αὐτόν ὁ θεὸς τοῦ ἱερέως ὁ θεὸς αὐτοῦ.

Verse 21:6b has been placed in the main text of the chapter, for argument’s sake. The other five verses are listed here for further analysis by the reader.

**Leviticus 21:8a**

καὶ ἀγιάσει αὐτόν τὰ δῶρα κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ υμῶν οὗτος προσφέρει.

and you shall treat them as holy, since they offer the food of your God.

**Leviticus 21:17b**

οὐ προσελεύσεται προσφέρειν τὰ δῶρα τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτοῦ.

he may not approach to offer his God’s food.

**Leviticus 21:21b**

οὐ προσελεύσεται προσφέρειν τὰ δῶρα τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτοῦ.

he shall not approach to offer the gifts of his God.

**Leviticus 22:25**

οὐ προσελεύσεται προσφέρειν τὰ δῶρα τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτοῦ.

he shall not approach to offer the gifts of his God.
using “sweet smell,” as in 3:11, or omitting any representation of לֶחֶם, as in 3:16a.

When לֶחֶם appeared in the formula “bread of [x] God” (x being the variable pronoun), the translator rendered it as δῶρον “gift.” He sought to avoid the meaning of לֶחֶם and any of its implications. I have characterized this misrepresentation as “avoidance,” since the translator seeks to avoid the meaning of לֶחֶם and any of its implications.43

Leviticus 21:6b

“For they offer the LORD’s offerings by fire, the food of their God.

Verse 21:6b is significant, as it is the translator’s first rendering of לֶחֶם with δῶρον. It contains some of the same terms as 3:11 and 3:16a, most notably אִשֶּׁה and לֶחֶם.

These terms from chapter three may have triggered the translator to render “God’s food” with “God’s gift” in the rest of chapters 21 and 22.

Voitila strongly suggests that the translator’s source text contained קָרְבָּן “offering” in these instances.44 This is a valid suggestion, as δῶρον is the stereotypical rendering for קָרְבָּן in Leviticus.45 However, Voitila does not address the

43The term “avoidance” is implemented to describe a total break from the original lexical meaning, and any implication that it may have had. Since YHWH is the creator and sustainer of all things, the burden of proof is on those who would argue that “God’s gift” is an implication of “God’s food.” One would need to show that the Israelite cult viewed sacrifices as “gifts” from man to God.

44Voitila does not argue this point, per se. Rather he merely thinks it to be the most convincing option. Therefore, I have used “strongly suggests” to represent him accurately. Voitila, Leviticus, 53.

45Lev 1:2, 1:3, 10, 14; 2:1, 4, 5, 7, 12, 13; 3:1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 12; 4:23, 32; 5:11; 6:13; 7:13 14, 16,
external evidence himself. His suggestion of a different Vorlage is not compelling for three reasons: First, there is minimal external evidence for קָרְבָּן in the occurrences of DFL (the Targum, and one occurrence in the Samaritan Targum). Second, the ancient versions that witness קָרְבָּן are from exegetical traditions. I take this fact to mean that others in the Second-Temple period sought to avoid the idea of “God’s food.” Lastly, the Greek revisers corrected every occurrence of δῶρον to ἄρτος.

Voitila also suggests that if לֶחֶם and not קָרְבָּן was in the Vorlage of DFL, then the translator may have understood it to be similar to the grain offering that was not meant to be eaten by God. This is conjectural for three reasons: First of all, the trigger words אִשֶּׁה and לֶחֶם in 21:6b appear at the beginning of the DFL sequence. Thus, the translator might have associated “God’s food” with the ideas of chapter three. Second, Voitila does not offer criteria to determine how the translator differentiated between offerings eaten by God and those that were not. If the translator understood לֶחֶם in 3:11 and 3:16a to designate those offerings as eaten by God, then the same implication regarding לֶחֶם should be seen in DFL and not the reverse. And third, the semantic range of לֶחֶם, analyzed in the next section, does not include the idea of “gift.”

Büchner thinks that DFL is a kind of anti-anthropomorphism. He believes that the use of “gift” may signify a shift of the edible human food to divine food. His argument here is problematic as it rests on his conclusion from 3:11, that the


46 The Targum has קָרְבָּן in every occurrence and the Samaritan Targum only has it in verse 21:21.

47 See second apparatus in Wevers, Leviticus, 233-36 and 244.

48 I owe Anssi Voitila a debt of gratitude for his continued correspondence regarding this matter via e-mail June-July 2017.

49 Büchner, The SBL Commentary on the Septuagint, 117.
In the previous section, I argued against Büchner’s view and if I am correct, then his view here regarding a shift from solid human food to divine food is incorrect.

I have argued, in the instances of DFL, that the translator read לֶחֶם in his Hebrew text. In addition, I have concluded, along with Wevers, that the translator deviated from his parent text to avoid any implicatures of לֶחֶם.51

**Hebrew and cognates.** The results of a study of the 427 occurrences (296 biblical, 14 Ben Sira, 22 Judean Desert, 87 nonbiblical Qumran, and 8 Hebrew Inscriptions) of לֶחֶם are presented in a simplified chart below. I have outlined the semantic range based on the sum total of the contexts in which לֶחֶם occurs.52

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concrete</th>
<th>Abstract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Bread”</td>
<td>“Bread”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Flesh of bulls”</td>
<td>“Bread of prudence”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Tree with its fruit”</td>
<td>“Bread of adversity”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Food allowance”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most concrete meaning in Hebrew is “bread.” From this, all the other usages derive based on the level of abstractness. Nowhere in the 427 occurrences does לֶחֶם stand for “gift.”

The available cognates for לֶחֶם, listed in appendix I, up until 200 CE confirm the semantic range provided by the mass study above. They give weight to the idea that in Semitic languages לֶחֶם refers to the regular food of the country. For this reason, in Arabic it is “flesh,” and in seashore areas it can mean “fish.” Therefore,

---


52 A. Evan-Shoshan, *A New Concordance to the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1984); G. Lisowsky, *Konkordance zum Hebräischen Alten Testament* (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1958); Accordance modules were used for Ben Sira, Judean Desert Manuscripts, nonbiblical Qumran Manuscripts, and North West Hebrew Inscriptions.

in God’s house, it means “God’s food.” Marcus Jastrow lists “tribute, tax, salary” as an Aramaic meaning after 200 CE transferred by the use of לֶחֶם in certain contexts—namely, the Midrashic והלחם של מלכות, “that is (thou shalt partake of) the royal maintenance,” and the Talmudic יהלを使う משבח, “the tribute belonging to the altar.” The available evidence places these meanings more than four hundred years after the Aramaic of the translator’s day. It is most likely, therefore, that Aramaic and Post Biblical Hebrew did not cause interference in DFL.

In this section, I have ruled out the semantic range of Hebrew לֶחֶם as the reason for the translator’s lexical choice of δῶρον. This was done though an exhaustive study of the Hebrew occurrences of לֶחֶם and its cognates.

**Greek.** The Septuagint translators employed seventeen various Greek terms for لֶחֶם. In the cultic contexts, the translators made use of three terms which are the focus of this section.

δῶρον “loaf of wheat-bread” for לֶחֶם when it stands for:

1. Bread of the Presence/Showbread: Exod 25:30; 39:36; 40:23; Num 4:7; 1 Sam 21:7; 1 Kgs 7:48; 1 Chr 23:29; 2 Chr 4:19; Neh 10:34
2. Bread that is burnt: Lev 24:7; Ezek 44:7; Mal 1:7
3. Wave Offering: Exod 29:2, 23; Lev 8:26; 23:17, 18, 20
4. Peace Offering: Lev 7:13
5. Bread for Human Consumption: Exod 18:12; 29:32; 34 Lev 8:31, 32;

---


δῶρον “votive gift or offering to a god”\(^{59}\) for לֶחֶם when it stands for:

1. God’s Food: Lev 21:6, 8, 17, 21, 22; 22:25
2. Food Offering: Num 28:24

δόμα “gift; payment”\(^{60}\) for לֶחֶם when it stands for:

1. God’s Food: Num. 28:2

When speaking of physical bread, the lexeme of choice in the cultic context is ἄρτος “loaf of wheat-bread.” When לֶחֶם is part of a construction attributing the idea of “God’s food” to an offering, the translators use δῶρον “votive gift” or δόμα “gift.” The LXX-Lev translator cleverly chose δῶρον, which in the cultic context meant “votive gift or offering to a god.”\(^{61}\) His choice of pagan Greek cultic vocabulary allowed him to avoid the meaning and implications of לֶחֶם. The translator of Numbers (LXX-Num) acted in a similar manner to the translator of LXX-Lev. He avoided the notion of God eating by replacing לֶחֶם with δῶρον or δόμα.\(^{62}\)

The question “exegesis or alternate Vorlage?” gives us grounding to understand the translator of LXX-Lev. In all the occurrences, the ancient witnesses confirmed that לֶחֶם was in the parent text of the translator. In 3:11 and 3:16a the translator represented unlikely Hebrew syntax, and in chapters 21 and 22 he deviated from the semantic range of לֶחֶם. In each instance, the notion of God eating

\(^{59}\) Liddell, Scott, and Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 465.

\(^{60}\) Ibid., 444.

\(^{61}\) Ibid., 465.

\(^{62}\) Notice that Hebrew Num 28:2b and 28:24b contain many of the terms as Lev 3:11 and 3:16b. The Numbers translator treats them in almost exactly the same way as the Leviticus translator.

\[
\begin{align*}
28:2b & \quad \text{My offering, the food for my offerings by fire, my pleasing odor, you shall take care to offer to me at its appointed time.} \\
28:24b & \quad \text{the food of an offering by fire, a pleasing odor to the LORD as a gift, an offering as an odor of fragrance to the Lord}
\end{align*}
\]
triggered a deviation by the translator.

**Translator**

As shown above, the translator deviated from his *Vorlage* in order to avoid the idea of YHWH consuming food. In this section I will suggest that both, the surrounding religious context, and the beliefs of a Second Temple tradition may have motivated the translator's deviations.

**Religious Setting**

The Pentateuch was likely translated in Alexandria, during the 3rd century B.C.E. This was a time of religious diversity in Egypt, where both Greek and Egyptian cults existed side by side. Greek rulers followed both their own cults as well as those of the Egyptians. In this polytheistic system, with no one cult claiming exclusive truth, it was natural for persons to worship and trust different gods. In short, Alexandria was composed of a mixed religious populace.

Some scriptures speak against the idea of God eating food. In contrast, Greek and Egyptian cults had sacrifices that were meant to provide sustenance to the gods. This opposition may be the main driving force behind the translator's treatments of לֶחֶם. Francoise Dunand puts forward the idea that the religious system of Alexandria, though polytheistic, was able to incorporate monotheistic religions for

---


64The prominent Greek cults worshipped Zeus, Demeter, Dionysus, and Aphrodite, while the Egyptians worshiped the goddess Isis and the god Sarapis. Ibid., 254.

65Ibid.

66Psalm 50:12-13: “If I were hungry, I would not tell you, for the world and its fullness are mine. Do I eat the flesh of bulls or drink the blood of goats?”

67The Egyptian cult offering, termed “the Eye of Horus,” was meant to provide nourishment and help to preserve the life of the gods. Gertie Englund, “Offerings,” in *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Ancient Egypt*, ed. Donald B. Redford (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 564. In the Greek system the sacrifice was meant to give the deity his or her portion of the food which was burnt on the fire of the altar. Simon Hornblower and Antony Spawforth, eds., *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 3rd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 1344.
several centuries. She also believes that there was an important and protected Jewish community in Alexandria from the time of Ptolemy I (305 BCE). Dunand also thinks that the Alexandrian Jewish community did not have difficulties worshiping YHWH. Her historical reconstruction makes it plausible to suggest that the translator of LXX-Lev lived in a society that was at least periodically tolerant of YHWH as a deity. The translator’s use of pagan cultic terms, for instance δῶρον, may show a desire to capitalize on the “inclusivity” of the pagan cults. It is clear, however, in his treatment of לֶחֶם, that he seeks to differentiate YHWH from the other gods.

Tradition

Jan Joosten gives three criteria for the presence of tradition in the LXX: system, divergence, and multiple attestation. First, system: similar passages must be rendered in the same way. The translator’s treatment of לֶחֶם in both chapter three and DFL accord with this criterion. Second, divergence: the rendering must diverge from the plain meaning of the parent text. This was seen in chapter three where the syntax was changed and לֶחֶם omitted to avoid the notion that God received food. This was also seen in DFL, where the translator deviated from the semantic range of לֶחֶם. Third, multiple attestation: the interpretation is attested in

---

70 Büchner offers a list of Greek terms associated with κάρπωμα, the Greek first-fruit offering. Terms used in Leviticus aside from κάρπωμα are the ὀσφύς (haunches with tail). . . and the μηροί or μηρία (thighs or thigh bones) onto which a double layer of fat was laid (any of πιμελή, πίαρ, πίων, δημός, κνίση). Büchner, The SBL Commentary on the Septuagint, 106.
72 Ibid.
multiple ancient writings.\(^7^3\) Evidence for this criterion comes from the usages of δῶρον and δόμα by the translator of LXX-Num and from the Targums, the oral exegetical tradition of the synagogue, which rendered לֶחֶם as קָרְבָּן.

In this section I have suggested that the translator’s actions were in line with a Second-Temple tradition. I have also suggested that his treatment of לֶחֶם was to differentiate YHWH from the other gods. The beliefs of the cults and the views of Jewish tradition may have played a role in the translator’s treatments of לֶחֶם אֱלֹהָי “food of a fire-offering” and לֶחֶם אֱלֹהִים “God’s food.”

**Conclusion**

This chapter has argued that לֶחֶם was most likely in the translator’s Hebrew text, and that he omitted or replaced it to avoid conveying its meaning and implications. In addition, it suggested that although the translator may have been part of a Second-Temple tradition, interested in maintaining the exclusivity of YHWH, he portrayed the Israelite faith as similar to the cults by his choice of lexemes. The translator’s curious relationship with לֶחֶם shows that his concern was to suppress any notion that YHWH ate food like the other gods.

CHAPTER 4

ΔΙΚΑΙΩΜΑ: A CURIOUS CASE OF SEMANTIC BORROWING

This chapter focuses on the linguistic phenomenon of semantic borrowing, specifically, Greek words that took on new meaning based on their use by Greco-Jewish translators.¹ In this study the candidate for semantic borrowing will be δικαίωμα (*δικαί- + lengthened omicron + -μα(τ)-), where the suffix particularizes the meanings of δικαιόω.² Leviticus 25:18a reads אֶת־חֻקֹּתַי וַעֲשִׂיתֶם “you shall observe my hukkōt (statutes).” The LXX translator renders it καὶ ποιήσετε πάντα τὰ δικαίωμα τὰ μου “and you shall observe all my τὰ δικαιώματα.” Two peculiarities are evident when considering the diachronic use of this word: first, the verb and the noun do not exhibit semantic consistency. While δικαιόω conveys ideas related to “righting a wrong” (which brings to mind judicial decisions and actions), δικαίωμα may represent a meaning “statute, ordinance,” namely that which governs how members of a society are to behave:

δικαίῳ consider fair, justify, submit to justice, punish, condemn, deal justly, defend the rights of a widow, pass judgment, do justice.³
δικαίωμα I. right action, judgment; II. argument, justification, claim, rationale, righteous sayings, righteousness, judgment, cause, right, statute (?)


²R. S. P. Beekes and Lucien van Beek, Etymological Dictionary of Greek (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 334.

Second, while the use of δικαίωμα for “ordinance, statute” is prevalent in the Septuagint and the Jewish and Christian Greek literature that followed, this meaning does not evidence itself in papyri, inscriptions, or Greek literature (until the 3rd c. A.D.). In this chapter, I outline the reception history of δικαίωμα in order to account for these peculiarities and demonstrate the likelihood that the “statute, ordinance” arose from the Septuagint and influenced the meaning of the word in later literature. To do so, I will address (1) previous scholarship, (2) the etymology and reception history of δικαίωμα, and (3) the example of LXX Leviticus 25:18a.

### Previous Scholarship

The bifurcation regarding the meaning of δικαίωμα is apparent in LXX-Lev 25:18. The study of δικαίωμα in this chapter will reveal a fairly broad semantic range. This broad range can mostly be explained (aside from “statute, ordinance”) from the central meaning “something that one does, says, or thinks that makes right or that is right.” The context of LXX-Lev 25:18 pertains to rules and regulations for the sale of crops. If one attempts to translate δικαίωμα with a gloss such as “righting a wrong” (which shares minimal to no semantic overlap with ḫōq) the passage becomes difficult to understand. In the translation example below, I have attempted to illustrate the semantic issue that arises when one attempts to translate ḫōq “statute” based on the etymology of δικαίωμα and usage in papyri, inscriptions, and Greek literature (until the 3rd c. A.D.).

---

4 This list is the result of studying the 265 occurrences of δικαίωμα in inscriptions, papyri, Greek literature, the Septuagint, and Jewish and Christian Greek literature. See appendix 2 for definitions and the data behind these glosses.

5 The idea for this chapter arose from three factors: (1) a paper on -μα(τ)- ending nouns that I presented in Peter Gentry’s Hellenistic Greek seminar; (2) a discussion with Dirk Büchner in Robert Hiebert’s Septuagint course at Trinity Western University; and (3) sample articles for the forthcoming Historical and Theological Lexicon of the Septuagint.
Leviticus 25:18

MT

וַעֲשִׂיתֶם תִּשְׁמְרוּ וְאֶת־מִשְׁפָּטַי אֶת־חֻקֹּתַי וַעֲשִׂיתֶם לָבֶטַח עַל־הָאָרֶץ וִישַׁבְתֶם אֹתָם

You shall observe my statutes and faithfully keep my ordinances, so that you may live on the land securely.

LXX

καὶ ποιήσετε πάντα τὰ δικαιώματά μου καὶ πάσας τάς κρίσεις μου, καὶ φυλάξασθε καὶ ποιήσετε αὐτά, καὶ κατοικήσετε ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς γῆς πεποιθότες.

And you shall observe all my righting of wrongs(?) and all my judgments, and you shall guard yourselves and do them, and you shall dwell on the land feeling confident.

The context does not pertain to correcting injustices but rather to proper civil/religious regulations. The dominant usage in the Septuagint and the Jewish and Christian Greek literature that followed, which fits well here in LXX-LEV 25:18, is “statute, ordinance.” As mentioned above, this usage seems to go against the etymology of δικαίωμα and it is not attested in the papyri, inscriptions, or Greek literature (until the 3rd c. A.D.).

Emmanuel Tov argues that the usage “ ordinance, statute” for δικαίωμα was available to the translators of the LXX, and consequently does not represent a semantic loan. As evidence for his position, Tov cites a papyrus (P.Oxy. 8 1119.15, 3rd c. A.D.) and a Roman Historian (Dio Cassius, 3rd c. A.D.). He states that these sources “are later than the LXX, but are not found in the realm of its influence.” In other words, the translators’ use of δικαίωμα as “ ordinance, statute” was natural Greek in the third century B.C. This view is inadequate, however, as it does not

---

6The Hebrew is cited from the Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia, 4th ed., and the English translation is cited from the 2001 New Revised Standard Version. I modify both the Hebrew and English when necessary.


9Ibid.

10Ibid.
explain how a -μα(τ)- noun deviated from the general idea of its verbal stem.\textsuperscript{11}

Additionally, the sources that Tov cites do not support his argument. In opposition to Tov’s conclusions, Helene Cadell argues that the use of δικαίωμα in P.Oxy. 8 1119.15 refers not to “ordinances” but rather to the “privileges” granted by Hadrian to Antinoites.\textsuperscript{12} Moreover, Dio Cassius, writing five hundred plus years after the translation of the Pentateuch, explicitly discusses Christians and Jews in his writings.\textsuperscript{13} As proconsul of Africa and as a historian, Dio Cassius would have

\textsuperscript{11}The BDAG lexicon presents the data in a similar way to Tov. If one were to argue for Tov’s position, the best developmental pattern comes from the idea that δικαίωμα was used for the abstract idea “proper conduct” Nicolaus Historicus (3rd c. B.C.). The concept of “proper conduct” is similar to the idea of “right action/s” Aristotle Rhetorica 1359a25; 1373b1; 1373b21. This usage may have then become associated with the realm of civil law (i.e., “proper conduct within society”) and was then later used with verbs pertaining to enacting legal restrictions (διατάσσω in Dio Cassius). This theory would explain the usage in Dio Cassius (2nd/3rd c. A.D.) Historiae Romanae 36.40.2: 52.31.2.4-5; 55.13.7.4. This view based on the meaning “proper conduct” is cogent with Tov’s theory as it explains the rise of a meaning similar to “ordinance, statute” within the Greek speaking world without the influence of the Septuagint. This theory is highly theoretical and goes against the evidence presented in this chapter. For Nicolaus Historicus (3rd c. B.C.), see K. Müller, Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum 3 (Paris: Didot, 1841-1970). University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae: A Digital Library of Greek Literature,” Thesaurus Linguae Graecae Digital Library, accessed October 2017, http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0577:003:180076. For Aristotle, see W. D. Ross, Aristotelis ars Rhetorica (1964; repr., Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959). University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae: A Digital Library of Greek Literature,” accessed October 2017, http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0086:038:26442. Frederick William Danker, ed., A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. 3rd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001), 249.


\textsuperscript{13}In Historiae Romanae 70.3.1-2 he states that “Antoninus is admitted by all to have been noble and good, neither oppressive to the Christians nor severe to any of his other subjects; instead, he showed the Christians great respect and added to the honour in which Hadrian had been wont to hold them. For Eusebius Pamphili cites in his Ecclesiastical History a letter of Hadrian in which the emperor is seen to threaten terrible vengeance upon those who harm in any way or accuse the Christians and swears in the name of Hercules that punishment shall be meted out to them.” Dio Cassius, Earnest Cary, and Foster B. Herbert, Dio Cassius Roman History, Loeb Classical Library, the Text of Cassius Dio on LacusCurtius, accessed October 2017, http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Cassius_Dio/70*.html.


In book 37, chapters 15 through 19 are about the Jews. For example 37,16.5 “This was the course of events at that time in Palestine; for this is the name that has been given from of old to the whole country extending from Phoenicia to Egypt along the inner sea. They have also another name that they have acquired: the country has been named Judaea, and the people themselves Jews.” Cassius, Cary, and Herbert, accessed October 2017, http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/
certainly been in contact with the meaning “ordinance, statute” through interaction with Christian or Jewish communities and writings. What seems most plausible, in light of the evidence given the below, is that the translators of the Septuagint used δικαίωμα in a way that lead to the development of a new sense, which was then absorbed into the broader language over time.

Helene Cadell and Cameron Boyd-Taylor disagree with Tov. Specifically, before the translation of the Pentateuch, δικαίωμα did not mean “ordinance, statute.” Cadell attributes the dominant use of this meaning in the Septuagint to metonymy regarding the idea “rules of law.” She believes that the translators saw δικαίωμα as a figure of speech that incorporated different possible ideas from different sources. The word became a generic law term covering any form of legislation.

Boyd-Taylor argues that the use of δικαίωμα for “ordinance” in the Pentateuch trades “on the stock meaning … ‘amendment of a wrong.’” He postulates that the Genesis translator may have introduced the meaning for etymological reasons to translate ḫuqqā “statute” in Gen. 26:5. The Exodus translator then followed suit (starting with two occurrences of ḥōq “statute” in 15:25-26), using δικαίωμα to solve various problems of translation.

Another option is that Jewish circles may have already chosen to use δικαίωμα for “ordinance, statute,” as part of their technical religious/legal

\[\text{Texts/Cassius_Dio/37*.html.}\]


\[15\text{Cadell, “Vocabulaire de la Législation Ptolémaïque,” 218, 220.}\]

\[16\text{Ibid., 221.}\]

\[17\text{Boyd-Taylor, “Linguistic Register,” 165.}\]

\[18\text{Ibid.}\]
terminology. Jan Joosten states, “It makes little sense to think that Jews waited for the Septuagint to give them words for such central concepts as the Sabbath, circumcision, or the Jewish Law.”

Previous scholarship suggests, therefore, that “ordinance, statute” for δικαίωμα, could have been (1) an available use within the Greek speaking world (prior to the translation of the LXX), (2) part of a “grab bag” sort of range of meaning, (3) formed by the translators of the Septuagint as they traded on the meaning “amendment of a wrong,” or (4) formed by the Jewish community when they converted their religious/legal terminology into Greek. A detailed study of the etymology and usage of δικαίωμα will provide evidence towards ruling out the first view.

**Etymology and Usage of δικαίωμα**

The abundance of verbal nouns ending in -μα(τ) is characteristic of Hellenistic Greek from Aristotle onwards. The -μα(τ) suffix was greatly productive in the language of tragedy and Ionic prose developed by the Philosophers and remained prolific in the post-classical period. The close

---


20 As an aside, I speak fluent Croatian as a result of having lived in Croatia for a significant portion of my childhood. I am not aware of any Croatian word that is a very good translational equivalent of the English word *justification*, as used in the Reformation Christian religious sense. To convey its meaning one must either define it using other words or choose a somewhat similar word to use in its stead, which is a much more convenient option.

21 It is impossible to establish beyond doubt the reason/s for adopting δικαίωμα as “ordinance, statute.” What is possible, however, is “to inventory the kind of inputs that were available to the translators, and the constraints to which they had to bow.” See Joosten, “The Vocabulary of the Septuagint,” 6.


23 In Greek morphology, a suffix is the formative element that is added to the root/stem and stands between it and the ending. Herbert Weir Smyth and Gordon M. Messing, *Greek Grammar* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1984), 227.

24 Francisco Rodríguez Adrados, *A History of the Greek Language: From Its Origins to the*
connection to the verbal idea associated with the stem is evident throughout the history of the language. This close link is the reason that δικαίωμα is peculiar. There remain -μα(τ)- nouns of whose development we are not certain. While earlier Greek tended to use -μα(τ)- nouns as nomina actionis, which often became the names of objects, in the Koine period, -μα(τ)- nouns mostly indicated the result of an action and were only occasionally nomina actionis.

The most likely evolution of this word family starts with the Proto-Indo-European (PIE) *deik “to show” underlying the Greek δίκη “custom, right, judgement, justice, lawsuit, trial, punishment” (Iliad). The verb δικαίω is then denominative of δίκη, and the addition of -μα(τ)- to the verbal stem of δικαίω (*δικα- plus lengthened omicron) is the basis for the formation of δικαίωμα.

*deik → δίκη → δικαίω → δικαίωμα

In the fifth and fourth centuries B.C., the following meanings for δικαίω are

Present (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 169.

25 The less frequent -μα action nouns have been in competition with -ή and -σίς for instance ἐπίταγμα/ἐπιταγή, ἐνταλμα/ἐντολή, ἐπαύξημα/ἐπαυξή/ἔπαυξις. In Modern Greek this suffix has become synonymous with -μός and only a few of the words still maintain the result of an action significance. Leonard R. Palmer, The Greek Language (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1996), 252.

26 In Homeric examples, the use of -μα suffix is less restricted. First, some very old words have correspondents in other Indo-European languages, but remain isolated in Greek and cannot be interpreted as derivatives of verbs: αἷμα ‘blood’ (Homer), σώμα ‘body, dead body’ (Homer), σήμα ‘sign, prodigy, tomb’ (Homer). According to Plato's folk etymology σώμα was a derivative of σώζω. Some nouns whose etymology seems to be explained by comparative grammar, remain, from the Greek point of view, quite isolated. Words such as ἐρμα ‘support, prop’ and πείσμα "tether" may likely be related to πενθερός ‘father-in-law’, while λαίτμα ‘depth of the sea’ whose suffix has a τ enlargement should probably not be separated from λαιμός “throat.” Pierre Chantraine, La Formation Des Noms en Grec Ancien (Paris: C. Klincksieck, 1968), § 138; James Hope and Wilbert Francis Howard Moulton, Grammar of New Testament Greek, vol. 2, Accidence and Word-Formation, with an Appendix On Semitisms in the New Testament (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1929), 354.


29 Beekes and van Beek, Etymological Dictionary of Greek, 334.
attested: (1) “to consider fair,” (2) “justify,” (3) “submit to justice, punish, condemn,” (4) “deal justly, defend a right,” (5) “consider fair or convenient,” and (6) “pass judgement, give an interpretation, estimate.”

Since the -μα(τ)- suffix particularizes the meanings of δικαίωμα, the analysis of usage should yield result-of-action or action nouns that are in some way related to the above meanings. Notwithstanding, the etymology of δικαίωμα should be employed cautiously as word meaning comes primarily from usage and not from etymology. As a final point of emphasis: note the similarity between the idea of the verb and the idea of the noun in the following examples.

προστάσσω “to command” → πρόσταγμα “command”

κρίνω “to judge” → κρίμα “judgment”

These nouns, with similar meanings to “ordinance, statute,” particularize or limit the meaning of their verbal roots. Compare the previous nouns with the following pattern.

δικαίωμα “consider/set right” → δικαίωμα “ordinance (?), statute(?)”

What is not clear is how the dominant use of δικαίωμα, in the Septuagint and the Greek literature that followed it, naturally relates to its verbal stem. For civil laws are not the result of “setting right” (an idea relating to common law). Rather, civil

---


31Beekes and van Beek, Etymological Dictionary of Greek, 334.


33Beekes and van Beek, Etymological Dictionary of Greek, 1454, 780, 285-286; Liddell, Scott, and Jones, A Greek-English Lexicon, 1526, 995-96.
laws maintain civil order. The reception history (from antiquity to the Patristic Fathers) of δικαίωμα (265 occurrences) is presented in the following sections.34

Greek Literature from 5th c. B.C. to mid 3rd c. A.D.

Up until the early third century A.D., the noun δικαίωμα occurs 44 times in extant Greek literature. Most of the attestations are in historical and philosophical writings but δικαίωμα also appears in rhetorical, grammatical, oratorical, and religious works. In all these genres the word is always a result-of-action noun. If one rules out the late usage by Dio Cassius “ordinances,” then the most basic meaning for δικαίωμα, in Greek literature, seems to be “something that one does, says, or thinks that makes right or that is right.” The standard according to which the “something” is “right/just” may sometimes be explicit (i.e. the laws of the Greeks),35 easily deduced from context (i.e. laws of logic in argumentation),36 or harder to define. In some cases δικαίωμα is defined by contrast (i.e. δικαίωμα as opposed to ἀδίκημα),37 by comparison (i.e. the “action of δικαίωμα” in relation to “that which is δίκαιος”),38 or

34 Lampe’s lexicon was used for the Patristic Fathers. The remaining occurrences were analyzed within the larger context of each occurrence, when a larger context was available.


36 Aristotle, De Caelo 279b9 Aristotle’s uses δικαίωμα once in his philosophical treatise On the Heavens. Aristotle discusses whether or not the the world has existed from eternity past or whether it had a beginning. He begins by addressing the arguments of those who do not hold his view. For, his arguments will be more convincing if he first addresses the δικαιώματα of the words of those who dispute his views. The usage in this context conveys the idea of “arguments with the intention of being right” or “claims of being right.” P. Moraux, Du Ciel (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1965), 1-154. University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0086:005:55599.


38 Arist. Ethica Nicomachea 1135a.9 In his philosophical work on ethics Aristotle uses δικαίωμα three times in his discussion of his ideas of “Universals” and “Particulars.” He notes that before something is done, it is “unjust” but once it is done it is an “unjust action.” He applies this same idea to “just” and “just action” (δικαιόμα), which is a correction of injustice. I. Bywater, Aristotelis Ethica Nicomachea (1894; repr., Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962), 1-224. University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae: A Digital Library of Greek Literature,” accessed October 2017, http/
similarity (i.e. δικαίωμα “an argument/claim,” and λόγος “a reason”). Aristotle defines δικαίωμα as “the correction of an injustice,” and Chrysippus states that “δικαιώματα come from δικαιοσύνης.”

In historical writings, (1) Thucydides Historicus (5th c. B.C.) and Dionysius Halicarnassensis (1st c. B.C.) use δικαίωμα in the context of

---

39 Isoc. Archidamus 6.25.6 If the Spartans are willing to give up Messene then they must be willing to give up Lacedaemon because in both instances they use the same δικαίωμα and λόγος as the reasons for their possession of both lands. This occurrence probably conveys the sense of “arguments” or “reasons” (supporting right course of action). É. Brémond and G. Mathieu, Isocrate Discours, 2 vols. (repr. 1967; Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1938), 175-205, University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0086:010:190851.


42 Historiae 1.41.1 Thucydides uses δικαίωμα four times in his work the History of the Peloponnesian War. This is the first occurrence. It happens upon the lips of the Corinthians in 1.41.1, as they address the Athenians in an attempt to convince them to avoid joining forces with the Corcyraeans. In 1.40.2 they argue, “You cannot receive them justly” (δικαίως in line 3). The Corinthians seek to show that their arguments, “these δικαίωμα” (1.41.1), are in conformity with the τοὺς Ἑλλήνων νόμους (laws of the Greeks). This occurrence in 1.41.1 conveys the idea that the “δικαίωμα” are pleas for action that accord with what is just. Best understood as “arguments” or “points of justice.” Jones and Powell, Thucydidis historiae, University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017., http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0003:001:50049.


Antiquitates Romanae 3.10.4.2 In a context where Fufetius and the Albans are vying for the blessing of Tullius. The leader of the Albans argues that universal law, ancestry, and observance of customs are reasons why the Albans will never allow the city to be ruled by its own colony. The first point based on the “Universal Law” is represented by δικαίωμα. The second, based on racial possession of a city, is called “ἐτέρον δὲ τοιούτῳ” (in line 3), and the third argument, based on proper observance of customs by the citizens, is called "τελευταῖος μοι λόγος ἔστιν." K. Jacoby, Dionysii Halicarnasei antiquitatum Romanarum quae supersunt, 4 vols. (repr. 1967; Leipzig: Teubner, 1885-1905), University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0081:001:421463.

Antiquitates Romanae 3.11.3.4,11 Fufetius addresses the Alban’s arguments by conflating the first and second arguments into one, termed a δικαίωμα. Fufetius calls the Alban’s third point a δικαίωμα while the Alban leader called it a λόγος. This show the interchangeability of δικαίωμα with λόγος in some contexts. Jacoby, Dionysii Halicarnasei, University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0081:001:425003.

Antiquitates Romanae 3.12.1.3 Dionysius Halicarnassensis comments on the narrative and
argumentation/persuasion, as “a reason or proof offered to convince the mind,” (i.e. logical “claim,” “argument” or “point”). This usage is similar and possibly even interchangeable with λόγος “a reason.” (2) Thucydides attests the only use of δικαίωμα as a “principle that someone advocates”: δικαίωματι γὰρ οὐδετέρους ἑλλείπειν ἥγονται “as to a cause, they think that neither of the two is lacking one.”

(3) Thucydides and Dio Cassius Historicus (2/3rd c. A.D.) use δικαίωμα as “a defense offered for the correctness of a position”: οὐ γὰρ ἔργῳ ἕσον ὥσπερ τῷ δ. ἐστὶν “it is not equal in deed as it is in justification”; τοῦ καλοῦ δ. “honorable rationale”; and καίτοι ἐγώνε τοσοῦτον περιεῖναι τοῖς δ. τοῦ Πομπηίου νομίζω “and yet I think this case to be superior in justification.” (4) Nicolaus terms the “points/argument/claims” of both sides (Albans vs. Fufetius) δικαίωματα. Jacoby, Dionysii Halicarnaseni, University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0081:001:429994.

45Th.Historiae 5.97.1.1-6 The second usage by Thucydides, comes upon the lips of Athenian ambassadors to the Melians in 5.97.1. The ambassadors put forward the notion that their subjects see them as powerful when the Melian are their enemies so that if they were to accept Melian friendship they would be viewed as weak. The Melians ask if Athenian subjects view both those whom the Athenians have subdued and those who are not under Athenian rule as equal. The Athenians respond by saying that their subjects see those who are able to preserve their freedom as powerful and the others as those who are “not lacking in δικαίωμα.” The usage of δικαίωμα here fits with the idea of “pleas of right” even “pleas for just action” or “claim.” However, it seems to better to understand this occurrence as “a principle that someone advocates” namely “a cause.” Jones and J.E. Powell, Thucydidis Historiae, 2 vols., University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0003:001:768319.

46Th.Historiae 6.80.2.2 The last use by Thucydides comes as a second occurrence on the lips of Hermocrates as he continues to address the men of Camarina telling them that if they choose neutrality, inevitably leading to the destruction of one side. Then, the seeming “rightness” of the ideal is not equal to what will actually happen “in deed.” Jones and Powell, Thucydidis Historiae, University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0003:001:886288.

47Th.Historiae 6.79.2.4 The third usage by Thucydides, comes upon the lips of Hermocrates as he seeks to turn an assembly of Syracusians, Camararians, and Euphemians against the Athenians. Specifically addressing the men of Camarina, he tells them if they try to be in league with the Athenians then they are committing an egregious error. The Chalcidians would not help the Athenians restore the Leonties even though the Lenties were themselves Chalcidians! How much more should the Camarians avoid being in league with their enemy! The “beautiful ideal” of helping their own people here is represented by δικαίωμα. It could be “right idea.” Jones and Powell, Thucydidis Historiae, University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0003:001:885758.

Historicus (3rd c. B.C.), uses δικαίωμα as the abstract idea of “proper conduct”: τὰ τῆς φύσεως δ. “their righteous deeds of character.”

Halicarnassensis and Dio Cassius use δικαίωμα as “a demand or proof of a right”: ἔχεις δ. φέρειν “you have a claim to offer” and ἀλλ’ οὐδὲν γάρ δικαίωμα τῶν ὀπλῶν ἰσχυρότερόν ἐστι “for no claim is stronger than arms.”

(6) Dionysius also uses δικαίωμα as “an idea/word that seeks to make right”: in the context of seeking revenge, τὰ σκληρὰ καὶ ὑπέραυχα . . . δικαιώματα “cruel and overly proud judgments.”

(7) The idea “something due a person” occurs in Jewish Greek literature, papyri, and inscriptions. It does not, however, show up in extant Greek literature until the writings of Cassius Dio (2/3rd c. A.D.). He uses δικαίωμα with five different contextual meanings: (i.) based on ancestry; (ii.) based on social class/


49 D.H. Antiquitates Romanae 4.34.4.8 Tullius, speaking in the senatorial floor, addresses the issue of succession to the Kingship. He argues that those whom he is addressing do not have right of succession unless they can bring some unknown δικαίωμα “claim” to the kingship. Jacoby, Dionysii Halicarnasei, University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0081:001:0690759.

50 D.C. Historiae Romanae 61.1.1.9 Although Britannicus was Claudius’ legitimate heir by birth and Nero was adopted, Nero ultimately took power through removing Britannicus and his sisters, U. P. Boissevain, Cassii Dionis, University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0385:001:2187700.

51 D.H. Antiquitates Romanae 8.50.3.3 In a discussion where Venturia is entreats Marcus to forgive the nation, he speaks against the δικαίωμα “acts of vengeance” that were instituted by Marcus. Jacoby, Dionysii Halicarnasei, University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0081:001:425003.

52 D.H. Antiquitates Romanae 8.44.3.3. τὸ δ. τῆς ἔλευθερίας “the right of liberty” Brutus speaks to a multitude that agrees with his word and desire to take action. He encourages them to split up into their voting units and to vote to rid Rome of the tyrants (the Tarquini and their offspring). His belief is that those whom he is addressing justly deserve to be rid of the Tarquini. K. Jacoby, Dionysii Halicarnasei, University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0081:001:801443.
status,\textsuperscript{53} (iii.) legislated to cites, governors, citizens or foreign nationals;\textsuperscript{54} (iv.) based on entitlement (actual or imagined);\textsuperscript{55} and (v.) based on political agreements.\textsuperscript{56}

Lastly, are the examples in Dio Cassius (2/3 c. AD) which Tov puts forward as evidence for his position: (8) “laws or decrees put forward by a legislative body or


D.C.\textit{Historiae Romanae} 42.34.5.4, In an effort to gain Caesar’s favor, Cleopatra lays aside her δικαϊώματα and trusts the combination of her beauty and humility to win the day. Her tactics are a success. Boissevain, \textit{Cassii Dionis}, University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0385:001:783487.

D.C.\textit{Historiae Romanae} 52.2.6.4 The δικαϊώματα of parents who had three children could be, formerly by acts of the senate and now by the Emperor, granted to those who have less children. This would keep the parents from being penalized for having fewer children and give them many of the rewards offered to larger families. Boissevain, \textit{Cassii Dionis}, University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0385:001:1745016.

D.C.\textit{Historiae Romanae} 5.22.2.2 The “right” to seek vengeance. The tribunes who were not murdered by the populace took the deaths of the other tribunes as a δικαϊώμα for the vengeance. Boissevain, \textit{Cassii Dionis}, University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0385:001:76360.

D.C.\textit{Historiae Romanae} 5.22.2.2 The “right” to seek vengeance. The tribunes who were not murdered by the populace took the deaths of the other tribunes as a δικαϊώμα for the vengeance. Boissevain, \textit{Cassii Dionis}, University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0385:001:106339.

\textsuperscript{54}D.C.\textit{Historiae Romanae} 8.37.4.3-4 The people are emboldened to require more money from the creditors as though their success comes from a δικαϊώμα. In the context of settling debts between the people and nobles, the nobles are willing to give up and more than they had originally offered. This yielding by the creditors does not solve the issue rather than people are emboldened to require more as though their success comes from a δικαϊώμα. Boissevain, \textit{Cassii Dionis}, University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0385:001:76360.

\textsuperscript{55}D.C.\textit{Historiae Romanae} 11.43.10.6 Hanno must occupy the city by force as he does not have even the littlest δ. on his side. Claudius desires to meet with Hanno, who is occupying the city by force, but Hanno will not meet. Claudius becomes angry, therefore, stating that if Hanno had the smallest δικαϊώμα on his side he would not continue to occupy the city by force. Boissevain, \textit{Cassii Dionis}, University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0385:001:106339.
“ruler,” the first two occurrences of this meaning for τὰ δ. are issued by a legislative body. In D.C.Historiae Romanae 36.40.2.1 it is the praetors who issue τὰ δ. and not a single sovereign οὐ γάρ πω πάντα τὰ δ. τὰ περὶ τὰ συμβόλαια διετέτακτο “for the ordinances concerning contracts had not yet been issued.” The Senate, in 52.31.2.4, renders τὰ δ.τὰκ τῶν νόμων “ordinances in accordance with the law.” In the third occurrence in Dio Cassius’ writings, however; the τὰ δ. are issued by a ruler, Augustus διέταξε . τὰ δ., which citizens, former masters, and freed slaves would χράομαι “live under” 55.13.7.4. Tov says that Dio Cassius was outside the realm of the Septuagint’s influence and that these occurrences show the meaning “ordinance, statute” was available in the linguistic milieu of the Pentateuch translators. His position is not convincing since the meaning “ordinance, statute” is inconsistent with the usual pattern of -μα(τ)- noun derivation and is only attested five hundred plus years after the translation of the Pentateuch. The meaning “ordinance, statute” could have already absorbed into the broader language by the mid-third century and Dio Cassius mentions Christians and writes a few chapters discussing the Jews.

In philosophical literature: (1) Plato Philosophus (5th/4th c. B.C.) uses δικαίωμα as “an accusation of a wrong intended to make the situation right” τῶν δὲ ἄλλων δ. ἀφείσθω “let him be forgiven of the other charges.” (2) Aristotle (4th c.


58 D.C.Historiae Romanae 52.31.2.4-5 If the senate renders δικαιώματα in accordance with the laws then the δικαιώματα would be more easily accepted by the people. Boissevain, Cassii Dionis, University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0385:001:1570419.


60 Leges 684.e.2-3 Plato uses δικαίωμα in a dialogue between the characters Athenian and Clinias. The characters discuss the notions of justice (δίκαιος) and injustice (ἄδικος). Athenian outlines the laws that should be instituted to punish he gives a caveat for those who are mentally “mad” when they break the law; namely, that the person who breaks the law will pay back all the damages, but he is to be acquitted of the other δικαιώματα. The usage here conveys the idea of “charges” or “claims that show someone to be in the wrong. J. Burnet, Platonis opera, vol. 5 (1907; repr., Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967): St I16.24a-969d, University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0059:034:554458.
B.C.), in Rhetorica, uses δικαίωμα as “an action that is right/righteous,” but in Ethica Nicomachea, he defines it as “the correction of an injustice.” Actual use of “an action performed with the intention of writing a wrong” occurs in the writing of Chrysippus Stoicus (3rd c. B.C.), δικαιώματα δέ, τὰ ἀπὸ δικαιοσύνης “just actions are motivated by justice.” (4) In the context of a debate Aristotle uses δικαίωμα as “a defense offered for the correctness of a position”; he attempts to dispose the λόγων δικαίωματα of those who argue against his position. The title of Aristotle’s non extant work “Δικαιώματα of the Greek Cities,” may convey the idea “dues legislated to cites,” however, with scant context it is difficult to know.

In grammatical works, Herennius Philo (1st c. A.D.) and Ammonius

---


62 Ethica Nicomachea 1135a.9 In a discussion of his ideas of “universals” and “particulars” he notes that before something is done, it is “unjust” but once it is done it is an “unjust action.” He applies this same idea to “just” and “just action” (δικαίωμα), which is a correction of injustice. I. Bywater, Aristotelis ethica Nicomachea, University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0086:010:190851.


66 De diversis verborum significationibus N.122.4; V. Palmieri, Herennius Philo. De diversis
Grammaticus (1st/2nd c. A.D.)\textsuperscript{67} cite the above-mentioned work by Aristotle as “τοῖς Δικαϊώματα of the Cities.”\textsuperscript{68} Harpocratio (1st/2nd c. A.D.) cites it as “τοῖς Δικαϊώματα.”\textsuperscript{69} Julius Pollux (2nd c. A.D.) lists δικαϊώμα in a section on -μα ending nouns along with ρήγμα “breakage,” φράγμα “fence,” βάμμα “dye” etc.,\textsuperscript{70} but the usage is not clear.

In oratory writing, Isocrates (5th/4th c. A.D.) uses δικαϊώμα alongside λόγος to convey “a demand or proof of a right,” similar in purpose with, but not synonymous to λόγος “a reason.”\textsuperscript{71} In his writing on divination, Artemidorus Daldianus Onirocriticus (2nd c. B.C.) uses δικαϊώμα as a physical object “documents” ἀφεθέντι τῶν ἐγκλημάτων μηκέτι δεήσεσθαι τῶν δ. “the one forgiven of the charges will no longer need in be need of justificationary documents.”\textsuperscript{72} The next section will

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\bibitem{71} Isoc.\textit{Archidamus}.6.25.6 Against the custom in Sparta, Isocrates comes forward into a public place as a young man to offer counsel on a subject which he believes is being intentionally neglected by the elders; no one is speaking in a “manner worthy of the state” (Isoc 6.1, 2). Isocrates addresses the laxity with which the people are treating the lands that are rightfully theirs outside of Sparta. He argues that if they would fight to keep Sparta then they should be concerned to keep the land of Messene which is rightfully theirs. Both Lacedaemon (the city-state of which Sparta was the main settlement) and Messene are of equal importance, because they were both given to the Spartans by the sons of Heracles, Apollo directed the Spartans to inhabit them and the Spartans conquered the people who held it previously. His argument is that if the Spartans want to keep Lacedaemon then they must keep Messene. If they are willing to give up Messene, then they must be willing to give up Lacedaemon, because in both instances they use the same δικαϊώματα and λογίως as the reasons for their possession of both lands. The meaning is that of “arguments/claims” and “reasons” (supporting right course of action). É. Brémond and G. Mathieu, \textit{Isocrate. Discours}, vol. 2 (1938; repr., Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1967), 175-205, University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0010:016:9905.
\bibitem{72} Onirocriticon.5.10.2,5 line two and three read Ἐδοξέ τις φεύγων γραφήν δημοσίων
\end{thebibliography}
demonstrate that this usage by Artemidorus attests the dominant usage in the papyri. Usage in Greek literature yields a broad spectrum of contextually based meanings. If one removes Dio Cassius from the picture, all the meanings fit with the idea of “something that one does, says, or thinks that makes right or that is right.”

Papyri and Inscriptions from Antiquity to Mid 3rd c. A.D.

In the papyri, δικαίωμα occurs approximately 39 times. In the context of Egyptian legal proceedings it refers to a physical object, “(justificatory) documents.” Two of the oldest papyri (3rd c. B.C.) attest the meaning “documents of the trial”:

τόν τεθέντων δικαιωμάτων and τὰ δὲ δικαίωμα[μα] τα τη[ς] δίκης. In a letter

In summary, the usages attested in Greek literature are as follows: I. The result of a physical movement: (a.) an action that is right/righteous, (b.) an action performed with the intention of writing a wrong.

II. The result of thinking or speaking: (a.) a reason or proof offered to convince the mind (often similar to λόγος), (b.) a demand or proof of a right, (c.) a defense offered for the correctness of a position, (d.) idea/word that seeks to make right, (f.) a principle that someone advocates, (g.) something due a person: i. based on ancestry ii. based on social class/status iii. legislated to cities, governors, citizens or foreign nationals: iv. based on entitlement (actual or imagined) v. based on political agreements, (h.) ordinances.


P.Lille 1.29.25 (B.C. 299-200; Arsinoites, Egypt) In the context the examination of slaves by torture is prescribed if the documents of the trial do not provide enough information. Duke, “Papyri.info,” accessed October 2017, http://papyri.info/ddbdp/p.lille;1;29.

P.Hal 1.38 (B.C. 259 after; Apollonopolites, Egypt) The context concerns the court where

57
concerning the improper conduct of beekeepers, the author (Sostratos) desires "justificatory documents" so the trial may be conducted in his district (B.C. 241).77 In a letter (mid 3rd c. B.C.) concerning denied legal protection there is a discussion of ἀντίγραφα τῶν δικαιωμάτων "copies of the documents" and τὰ παρ’ ἐμοῦ δικαιώματα πάντα "all my documents."78 There are multiple occurrences (mid 3rd c. to mid 2nd c. B.C.) of τὰ πρὸς τὴν κατάστασιν δ. "the documents for the defense."79 τὰ δ. occurs twice in the text "The court of the Ten" (B.C. 226): γραπτὸν λόγον θ[ε]μένης καὶ τὰ δικ[α]ϊώματα βουλομ[ένης "reviewing the written plea and the documents of defense," and τὸ διάγραμμα ὃ κ[αὶ παρέδοτο] [ἐν] τοῖς δικαιώμ[ασιν, "the list which was also transmitted in the documents of defense."80 In a fragment of uncertain nature (3rd/2nd c. B.C.?) the word still seems to carry the idea of written documents: παραθέσθαι ἐν δικαίωμα "set forth in the documents."81 From the mid second-century B.C. to the mid second-century A.D. the physical object "documents" occurs in letters of complaint and in different legal

77 P.Cair. Zen. 3 59368.6 (B.C. 241; Memphis?) P.Cair. Zen. 3 59368 is a letter, concerning bee-hives and other matters, from Sostratos to Zenon and Xenophon. In it, Sostratos discusses sending justificatory documents so that the case may be tried in his own district. Duke, "Papyri.info," accessed October 2017, http://papyri.info/ddbdp/p.cair.zen;3;59368.


contexts: a ruling, hearing, and deposition. The same phrase “copy of a legal proof” occurs in the second century A.D. ἀντίγραφον δικαίωμάτων and in the third century A.D. ἀντίγραφον δικ(αώματος). Two mid second-century A.D. copies, of the same text, support the reading παρακεμένων/δικαίωμάτων “appended documents.” Also, in the late second-century A.D. it occurs in relation to matrimony τοῖς δι[καἱ]όμαι τοῦ γάμου “in the wedding documents.” In documents concerning the repayment of a loan and mortgage δικαίωμα means a “right” (A.D. 151).


88 Helene Cadell gives a careful explanation of the language of that text, explaining that τὰ δικαίωματα are the special privileges granted by Hadrian to Antinoites. Helene Cadell, “Vocabulaire de la Législation Ptolémique,” 220-21. In addition a summary of the context is on papyri.info: “A petition from two citizens of Antinopolis who had property at Oxyrhynchus, Theon and Arsinos, requesting the strategus of the Oxyrhynchite nome to notify the existing phylarch that they were exempt from nomination to municipal offices. Their rights had been established ten years before under an earlier strategus, and they give a narrative of the course of events, and enclose copies of official correspondence relating to their case.” Duke, “Papyri.info,” accessed October 2017, http://papyri.info/ddbdp/p.oxy;8;1119.

89 Multiple occurrences in the inscriptions were unusable as they were significantly devoid
Islands, the use in both, the oldest court context (end of 4th c. B.C.)\(^9\) and Lysimachus' address to the Samains (B.C. 300-290), means "arguments."\(^9\) In Patissia, Attica, τὰ δ. are prepared to bind someone in a suit.\(^9\) In an inscription from Ephesos, Asia Minor, a governor asks for a list of his τὰ δ. "privileges/rights."\(^9\) In Hermopolis Magna, Egypt, (A.D. 250), the speaker defends a rebuttal ἐν μεγίστῳ δικαίωματι "by means of a very great defense."\(^9\)

---


\(^{94}\) SPP 20 54.20 (A.D. 250; Hermoupolis Magna), Duke, "Papyri.info," accessed October
The evidence from papyri and inscriptions goes against Tov’s view, because, in the papyri, τὰ δικαίωματα never means “ordinance, statute.” Rather, the available data in Egypt and elsewhere attests δικαίωμα in legal contexts as mostly “documents,” and sometimes “arguments,” or “rights.”

Septuagint

**Statistical observations.** The noun δικαίωμα occurs 140 times in the LXX (9 of these are compositional Greek). It is found 42 times in the Pentateuch, mostly as τὰ δ. “statutes.” But only 14 of the occurrences are in Genesis through Numbers. By stark contrast, it occurs 28 times in Deuteronomy. Psalms contains the most occurrences of δικαίωμα in wisdom literature. Most of the historical books contain occurrences, with 1 Samuel attesting the most with 7. In the prophets it occurs most often in Ezekiel with 17 occurrences, 16 of which are the plural (τὰ) δ.

**Hebrew equivalents.** In the translated books the dominant use of δικαίωμα occurs with the word group ḥōq/ḥuqqâ "statute" (x71), and it is also


95 The occurrences in papyri and inscriptions attest the following meanings: I. The result of speaking or thinking: (a.) a reason or proof offered to convince the mind (often similar to λόγος), (b.) the quality of being righteous, (c.) something due a person: i. legislated to citizes, governors, citizens or foreign nationals; II. Physical object: (a.) documents.


98 Gen 26:5; Exod 15:25; 26; Lev 25:18; Num 27:11; 30:17; 31:21; 35:29; Deut 4:1, 5, 6, 8, 14, 40, 45; 5:1, 31; 6:1, 2, 17, 20, 24; 7:11; 8:11; 10:13; 11:1; 17:19; 26:16, 17; 27:10; 28:45; 30:10,
often used to translate mišpāṭ “judgement” (x38).⁹⁹ The idea “ordinance, statute” is also seen in the use of the δικαίωμα for piqqūd “precept” (x6),¹⁰⁰ derek “way” (x1),¹⁰¹ and taḥbulāh “guidance, direction, counsel” (x1).¹⁰² Four uses of δικαίωμα translate šēdāqāh “righteousness” (x4).¹⁰³ Three words which are translated by δικαίωμα do not share overlap with its semantic range: rīb “strife” (x1),¹⁰⁴ šūrā “shape, design” (x1),¹⁰⁵ and yārīb “adversary” (x1). The main driving force behind the semantic loan is the frequent use of δικαίωμα for ḥōq/huqqā “statute."

**Septuagint usage.** The results of an examination of all the instances of δικαίωμα in the Septuagint can be categorized as follows:¹⁰⁶ (1) “An action that is right/righteous”: Proverbs 2:8 ὁδοὺς δικαιωμάτων (similar to Nicolaus Historicus, 3rd c. B.C.).¹⁰⁷ (2) “An action performed with the intention of writing a wrong”: 1 Samuel 10:25 τὸ δ. τοῦ βασιλέως “the judgment of the king,” (similar to Aristotle, 4th c. B.C. and Chrysippus Stoicus, 3rd c. B.C.).¹⁰⁸ (3) The earliest extant usage, in all

---

99Exod 21:1; 9, 31; 24:3; Num 15:16; Deut 7:12; 33:10; 1 Sam 2:13; 8:3, 9, 11; 10:25; 27:11; 30:25; 1 Kgs 3:28; 8:45; 59(x2); Ezek 5:6 (x2), 7 (x2), 11:20; 18:9; 20:11, 13, 16, 18, 19, 21, 24, 25; 44:24; Mal 3:22 [24]; Prov 2:8; 8:20; 19:28; 2 Chr 6:35.

100Ps 19:9 [18.9]; 119:27 [118.27], 56, 93, 94, 141

101Job 34:27.

102Sir 32:16 (Geniza mss B, E, F).

1032 Sam 19:29; Bar 2:12, 17, 19.

104Jer 11:20.

105Ezek 43:11.

106The context of each occurrence was the main tool for understanding usage.

107Prov 2:8, ὁδοὺς δικαίωμάτων “the ways of righteous deeds.” Sir 32:16 δικαίωματα ώς φῶς ἔξαψουσιν “they will ignite righteous deeds like a lamp.” Bar 2:19 τὰ δικαίωματα τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν “the righteous deeds of our fathers.”

108Sam 8:9,11;10:25, τὸ δ. τοῦ βασιλέως “the judgment of the king” (see δικάζω in verse 6); 1 Kgs 3:28 τὸ ποιεῖν δικαίωμα “to bring about judgement”; 8:45 καὶ ποιήσεις τὸ δ. αὐτοῖς “you will execute judgement for them.”
Greek writings, of the nomen actionis “showing or declaring one to be in the right” occurs in Jeremiah 18:19 εἰσάκουσον τῆς φωνῆς τοῦ δ. μου “hear the sound of my vindication.” 109 (4) “A defense offered for the correctness of a position”: 1 Samuel 27:11 where David has a τὸ δικαίωμα “rationale” for killing all the men and women (similar to Thucydides Historicus, 5th c. B.C.). 110 (5) “Something spoken that is right/righteous” 4 Maccabees 18:6, the mother speaks τὰ δ. τοῖς τέκνοις. 111 (6) The earliest extant occurrences of “the quality of being righteous” are in Proverbs 8:20 and 19:28 καθυβρίζει δ. “he despises righteousness.” 112 (7) “A principle that someone advocates” Jeremiah 11:20 ὅτι πρὸς σὲ ἀπεκάλυψα τὸ δ. μου “since I have revealed my cause to you” (similar to Thucydides Historicus). 113 (8) The meaning “something due a person” occurs with three different nuances in the Septuagint (i) based on social class/status (earliest extant usage; 2 Samuel 19:29); (ii) legislated to cites, governors, citizens or foreign nationals (similar usage by Aristotle), Numbers 27:11; and (iii) based on religious or cultural requirements (only attested in the Septuagint), 1Samuel 2:13 and Ruth 4:7. 114

The dominant use, however is (9) “laws/decrees (or their stipulations) made by a sovereign,” which occurs 112 out of 140 times in the Septuagint. 115

109 Jer 18:19 εἰσάκουσον τῆς φωνῆς τοῦ δ. μου “hear the sound of my vindication.” Bar 2:17 Those in Hades will not give δόξαν καὶ δικαίωμα τῷ κυρίῳ “glory and justification to the Lord.”

110 1 Sam 27:11 David’s τὸ δικαίωμα “rationale” for killing all the men and women on his raids is so that “They must not bring word to Geth against us, saying, ‘This is what David does.” Pietersma, and Wright, A New English Translation of the Septuagint.

111 4 Macc 18:6 Ἐλεγεν δὲ ἡ μήτηρ τῶν ἑπτὰ παίδων καὶ ταῦτα τὰ δ. τοῖς τέκνοις “and the mother of seven boys also spoke these righteous words/sayings to her children.”


113 Jer 11:20 ὅτι πρὸς σὲ ἀπεκάλυψα τὸ δ. μου “since I have revealed my cause to you”; 1 Kings 8:59 τοῦ ποιεῖν τὸ δ. τοῦ δούλου σου καὶ τὸ δ. λαοῦ σου Ἰσραήλ “to bring about the cause(?) of your servant and the cause(?) of your people Israel.”

114 (i) 2 Sam 19:29 the δ. to address the king. (ii) Num 27:11 δ. κρίσεως, and 35:29 δ. κρίματος “right of judging/judgement”; (iii) 1 Sam 2:13 τὸ δ. τοῦ ιερέως παρὰ τοῦ λαοῦ, “the priest’s due (of food) from the people”; the right of inheritance exchange, Ruth 4:7.

115 Gen 26:5; Exod 15:25-26; 21:1, 9, 31; 24:3; Lev 25:18; Num 15:16; 30:17; 31:21; 36:13;
usage is often translated in English as “statutes.” Presumably, the first translation occurrence would have been Genesis 26:5.

Genesis 26:5  

LXX                      NETS

ἀνθ’ ἔν υπήκουσεν Ἀβραὰμ ὁ πατήρ σου  “since your father Abraam obeyed my
τῆς ἐμῆς φωνῆς καὶ ἐφύλαξεν τὰ voice and kept my ordinances and my
προστάγματά μου καὶ τὰς ἐντολὰς μου statutes and my
καὶ τὰ δικαιώματά μου καὶ τὰ precepts.”
nόμιμα μου.

tὰ δικαιώματα is in a word list, where each lexeme conveys a similar sense to the
others, all the while maintaining its own nuance. The words are connected by
conjunctive καὶ, making this entire list a compound object that the agent, Abraham
“kept” (φυλάσσω), hence the commonality shared by all. This type of compound
noun phrase, as patient complement to the verb, is common of usage in the
Pentateuch—31 out of 42 occurrence (with 25 in Deuteronomy). Thus, τὰ
dικαιώματα took on meaning from ḥōq/ḥuqqâ “statute.”

One or more of the following nouns is most often in a list with τὰ
δικαιώματα: νόμος “law,” κρίσις “judgment,” κρίμα “judgment,” ἐντολή “command,”
μαρτυρία “testimony,” and/or πρόσταγμα “commandment.” Positively, τὰ
dικαιώματα is often an object of διδάσκω “to teach,” φυλάσσω “to keep,” λαλέω “to
speak,” μανθάνω “to learn,” ποιέω “to do,” ἐντέλλω “to command,” ἀκούω “to hear,”
ἐκζητέω “to seek out,” πορεύομαι “to walk,” γράφω “to write,” ἀπαγγέλλω “to

116The Greek text comes from the critical edition of Genesis, by John William Wevers. The
English translations of the Greek are derived from Albert Pietersma, and Benjamin G. Wright, A New
English Translation of the Septuagint, with a few changes where I deemed appropriate. John William
Wevers, Genesis, Septuaginta, Band I (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974).

117Gen 26:5; Exod 15:25-26; Lev 25:18; Num 15:16; 36:13; Deut 4:1, 5-6, 8, 14, 40, 45; 5:1, 31; 6:1-2, 4, 17, 20; 7:11; 8:11; 10:13; 11:1; 17:19;
26:16-17; 27:10; 28:45; 30:10; 30:16; 33:10; Ruth 4:7; 1 Sam. 8:3; 30:25; 2 Sam 22:23; 1 Kgs 2:3; 2
Kgs 17:8,13, 19, 34, 37; 23:3; 2 Chr 19:10; 1 Macc 1:13, 49; 2:21, 40; 1 Esd 8:7; Ps 17:23; 18:9; 49:16;
88:32; 104:45; 118:5, 8, 12, 16, 23; 118:24; 118:26; 118:27; 118:33, 48; 118:54; 118:56, 64, 68, 71;
118:80; 118:83, 93, 94; 118:112; 118:117, 118, 124, 135, 141, 145, 155; 118:171; 147:8; Ode 14:36,
37, 38; Job 34:27; Sir 4:17; Hos 13:1; Mic 6:16 (not in Göttingen edition); Mal 3:24; Bar 2:12, 4:13;

Deut 4:1; 5:6, 8, 14, 40, 45; 5:1, 31; 6:1-2; 6:4; 6:17, 20, 24; 7:11-12; 8:11; 10:13; 11:1; 17:19;
26:16-17; 27:10; 28:45; 30:10; 30:16; 33:10; Ruth 4:7; 1 Sam. 8:3; 30:25; 2 Sam 22:23; 1 Kgs 2:3; 2
Kgs 17:8,13, 19, 34, 37; 23:3; 2 Chr 19:10; 1 Macc 1:13, 49; 2:21, 40; 1 Esd 8:7; Ps 17:23; 18:9; 49:16;
88:32; 104:45; 118:5, 8, 12, 16, 23; 118:24; 118:26; 118:27; 118:33, 48; 118:54; 118:56, 64, 68, 71;
118:80; 118:83, 93, 94; 118:112; 118:117, 118, 124, 135, 141, 145, 155; 118:171; 147:8; Ode 14:36,
37, 38; Job 34:27; Sir 4:17; Hos 13:1; Mic 6:16 (not in Göttingen edition); Mal 3:24; Bar 2:12, 4:13;
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announce,” διηγέομαι “to recite,” μελετάω “study,” and ἄδολεσχέω “meditate.” Negatively, the word is an object of ἐκκλίνω “to pervert,” καταλείπω “to leave,” ἀφίστημι “put away,” βεβηλόω “to violate,” and ἐπιλανθάνομαι “forget.” It is equated with νόμος in Numbers 15:16, but in 31:21 it is τὸ δ. τοῦ νόμου. In Deuteronomy, the Shema is summarized by τὰ δ. καὶ τὰ κρίματα (Deut 6:4); τὰ δ. are part of τὰς γεγραμμένας ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου (Deut 30:10), and τὰ δ. are shown to Jacob and τὸν νόμον to Israel (Deut 33:10). In 1 Esdras 8:7 ἐκ τῶν έντολῶν διδάξαι → τὰ δ. In the Psalms, τὰ δικαίωμα are εὐθεία (Ps 18:9), συμβουλία “advice or counsel given” (Ps 118:24), ψαλτός “sung of” for comfort during sojourning (Ps 118:54). In addition, one’s heart might become ἄμωμος “blameless” by means of the statutes (Ps 118:80), one may κλίνω “lean” his or her heart to do the statutes (Ps 118:112), and singing results from learning them (Ps 118:171).

**Greek Job 34:27.** The knowledge that δικαίωμα is most likely a semantic loan can shed light on the translation technique of the authors of the Greek Old Testament. Consider the example of OG Job 34:27. The translator of Job demonstrates extraordinary fluency in Greek and his choice of rare vocabulary (even Homeric) show him to be at, or at least aiming at, a high register of Greek. At the same time, he intentionally uses features of the Pentateuchal translation style, a literary tactic in compositional Jewish texts. Note his use of δικαίωμα.

---

118 Marieke Dhont, *Style and Context of Old Greek Job*, Journal for the Study of Judaism Supplement Series 183 (Leiden: Brill, 2018), 332; Claude E. Cox, “Job,” in *T and T Clark Companion to the Septuagint*, ed. J. K. Aitken (London: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2015), 385-400. His use of rare Greek vocabulary, all the way back to Homer, is evidence for his level of education and interest in Greek literature. This is a sampling from an unpublished list of vocabulary composed by Claude Cox. “OG Job 3.10b ἀπαλλάσσω Homeric (?); 9.8a ταῦτα in LXX (other is Sir 43.12) Homeric; 9.18a ἀναπνέω hapax in the LXX, 11x in the liiad; 9.30a ἀπολούω hapax in LXX; 9.33a εἴθε hapax in the LXX, Homeric; 10.1a κάμνω 2x in lob (other is 17.2); 3x outside lob in LXX, Homeric; 10.10b τυρός hapax; 17.2a λίσσομαι hapax.”

119 Dhont, *Old Greek Job*, 332.
because they turned aside from following him, and had no regard for any of his law and did not recognize his ordinances ways.

The translator most often uses ὁδός for derek but here he uses δικαίωμα. He also adds νόμος “law” for clarity to the somewhat ambiguous Hebrew. The sense of δικαίωματα in this case should be taken as “ordinances” and not “righteous ways” for two reasons. First, when desiring to convey the meaning “righteous ways” for derek as in OG Job 24:13, the translator used ὁδὸν δὲ δικαιοσύνης instead of δικαίωμα.122 Second, while the Hebrew parallelism is “turning from following God” and “not regarding his ways” the Greek is “turning from God’s law” and “not recognizing his ordinances.” The translator chose δικαίωμα as “ordinance, statute” in line with Jewish Greek tradition where his source text did not require it.123 The translator’s treatment of this verse is true to his style. While aiming at a higher register of Greek he intentionally incorporates a semantic loan that began with the Pentateuch.

Usage in the Septuagint reflects meanings from Greek literature, inscriptions, and papyri but also includes unique usages first attested in the Septuagint.124 Most noticeable and pertinent for this study is the prevalent use of

---


123 Jewish compositions in Greek often combine natural Greek usage with a particular usage of Greek that find its origins in features of Hebrew interference in the LXX but came to be used independently from a Hebrew source. Dhont, Old Greek Job, 81.

124 The meanings that occur in the Septuagint are as follows: I. The result of physical
δικαίωμα for “ordination, statute.” This borrowing seems to have occurred as the word most often translated ḫōq/ḥuqqâ “statute.”

**Greek Jewish Literature**

In Jewish Greek literature, δικαίωμα occurs 17 times, with the following meetings: (1) “An action that is right/righteous” in Josephus and Philo.\(^{125}\) (2) “The quality of being righteous,” a further attestation of the usage from Proverbs.\(^{126}\) (3) The meaning “something due a person” occurs with contextual nuances (i) based on ancestry, and (ii) legislated to foreign nationals.\(^{127}\) Almost half of the occurrence in Jewish Greek literature (8 out of 17) continue the meaning first attested in the Septuagint: (4) “laws/decrees (or their stipulations) made by a sovereign,” Levi 14:4 τοῖς τοῦ θεοῦ δ.; Judah 13:1 τοῦ ποιεῖν τὰ δ. κυρίου; *Paraleipomena Jeremiou* 6.23.6

---


οὐκ ἐφυλάξατε τὰ δ. μου. The meaning “documents” occurs once: J. Antiquitates Judaicae 17.130.4 τῶν ἀλλαχόθεν δ. “justificatory documents from elsewhere.”

The New Testament

In the New Testament, δικαίωμα occurs 10 times, with the following meanings: (1) “an action that is right/righteous” Romans 5:18, δι᾿ ἑνὸς δικαιώματος “through one man’s righteous act”; Revelation 15:4; 19:8. (2) “the Nomen Actionis of showing or declaring one to be in the right” Romans 5:16, in contrast with κατάκριμα “condemnation”; τὸ δὲ χάρισμα ἐκ πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων εἰς δικαίωμα “on the other hand, the free gift following many trespasses brings justification.” (3) Similar to the Septuagint and Jewish Greek Literature, the dominant use in the New Testament literature is “laws or decrees (or their stipulations)” Luke 1:6; Romans 128

---
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The Early Church

By the fifth century, there are over one thousand occurrences of δικαίωμα in the Church Fathers. According to Lampe’s Patristic Greek Lexicon the following eight meanings are attested in the early church: (1) “righteous act,” (2) “righteousness,” (3) “reason, justification (for an action),” (4) “proof, argument,” (5) “document (esp. of written argument or plea),” (6) “bond,” (7) “act of justice, judgement,” and similar to the Septuagint, Jewish Greek, and New Testament literature the dominant use is (8) “ordinance” (in general).

LXX Leviticus 25:18a

Cadell attributes the dominant use in the Pentateuch to metonymy regarding the idea “rules of law.” She believes that the translators saw δικαίωμα as a figure of speech that incorporated different possible ideas from different sources. The word became a generic law term covering any form of legislation. Cadell’s theory would adequately explain the usage in Leviticus 25:18.

130Cadell, “Vocabulaire de la Législation Ptolémaïque,” 218, 220.
131Ibid., 221.
MT

וַעֲשִׂיתֶם תִּשְׁמְרוּ וְאֶת־מִשְׁפָּטַי אֶת־חֻקֹּתַי וַעֲשִׂיתֶם לָבֶטַח עַל־הָאָרֶץ וִישַׁבְתֶ֥ם אֹתָם

LXX

καὶ ποιήσετε πάντα τὰ δικαίωματά μου καὶ πάσας τὰς κρίσεις μου, καὶ φυλάξασθε καὶ ποιήσετε αὐτὰ, καὶ κατοικήσετε ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς πεποιθότες.

You shall observe my statutes and faithfully keep my ordinances, so that you may live on the land securely.

And you shall observe all my statutes? and all my judgments, and you shall guard yourselves and do them, and you shall dwell on the land feeling confident.

Dirk Büchner also agrees with Cadell’s suggestion regarding δικαιώματα.\textsuperscript{133} As mentioned in the example of Gen 26:5 τὰ δικαίωματα is in part of a parallel word pair connected by conjunctive καὶ. The two words are a compound object that the agent, Abraham “kept” (φυλάσσω). This type of compound noun phrase, as patient complement to the verb, is common of usage in the Pentateuch.\textsuperscript{134} As a result τὰ δικαίωματα took on nuances from both parallelisms in the contexts where it occurred as a result of translating the underlying ἡοῶ/χουκά “statute.” Further research is warranted, however, as Cameron Boyd-Taylor states “A persuasive narrative is wanted, taking into account the larger picture of juridical usage in the Greek Pentateuch, and with reference to other instances of lexical innovation.”\textsuperscript{135}

\textbf{Conclusion}

The history of reception revealed a fairly broad semantic range for δικαιώμα in compositional usage. More importantly for this study, the evidence points to the meaning “ordinance, statute” as being a semantic loan, for three reasons: first, the verb and its -μα(τ)- noun do not exhibits semantic consistency (δικαίω “consider/make right” vs. δικαίωμα “statute, ordinance”). Second, the

\textsuperscript{133}In a class handout at Trinity Western University, May 2017, Dirk Büchner stated, “I am of the opinion that this is a wholly translation-specific rendering. Gk Leviticus chose vocabulary from a kind of ‘field-specific’ grab-bag to sound right but without conveying meaning.”

\textsuperscript{134}Gen 26:5; Exod 15:25-26; Lev 25:18; Num 15:16; 36:13; Deut 4:1, 5-6, 8, 14, 40, 45; 5:1, 31; 6:1-2, 4, 17, 20; 7:11; 8:11; 10:13; 11:1; 17:19; 26:16-17; 27:10; 28:45; 30:10, 16;

\textsuperscript{135}Cameron Boyd-Taylor, email correspondence, December 27, 2017.
study of 265 occurrences of δικαίωμα ruled out any attestations of “ordinance, statute” in papyri, inscriptions and Greek literature before, and during, the period when the Septuagint was translated. And third, the evidence supporting “statute, ordinance” in Greek literature, and therefore as a natural meaning in Greek, comes five hundred years after the translation of the Pentateuch. Also, regarding this third point, it is not clear why Tov believes the Historian Dio Cassius, who discusses Jews and Christians in his writings, to be outside the influence of the Septuagint. The Pentateuchal translators were in agreement with regards to using δικαίωμα as “ordinance, statute.” The rise of the use “ordinance, statute” started with the translators of Pentateuch who may have viewed δικαίωμα as figure of speech that incorporated different possible meanings from different sources conveying the general idea “rules of law.” The repetitive practice of using δικαίωμα to translate ḥōq/ḥuqqā “statute” and mišpāt “judgment” was the mechanism that contributed to the rise of the semantic loan. The frequency with which this usage occurs in the Septuagint and the literature that follows it has caused more than one lexicographer to overlook this semantic loan; the entries of some of the standard lexica should be reevaluated.
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

In this thesis I investigated three features of Septuagint Leviticus' Greek text as a means to better understand the translator, his world, and his text. In chapter 2, we saw that the valency of קטר was an important tool for discovering and understanding the deviation by the Greek translator in Leviticus 3:11 and 16. When dealing with the complements and adjuncts Hiph קטר, the translator omitted representation of Hebrew complements replacing them with Greek equivalents of Hebrew adjuncts. In chapter 3, we saw that, when the translator perceived his Hebrew text to imply that God ate food, he either omitted or misrepresented לֶחֶם in his translation. In the last chapter, we studied the history of δικαίωμα's usage up until the 3rd c. A.D. The translator chose δικαίωμα to represent ḫōq "statute," in LXX-Lev 25:18a, as part of a tradition that would influence the meaning of δικαίωμα in subsequent Jewish and Christian Greek literature and eventually the broader Greek world. In all three studies the translator seemed to be somewhat dependent on, and possibly a part of, a group of Pentateuchal translators.
APPENDIX 1

COGNATES

1. Ugaritic (14th-12th c. B.C.E.) - LḤM - bread, meal
2. Hebrew (11th c. B.C.E.→)
   a. Classical Hebrew (11th c. B.C.E.-1st c. C.E.) - לֶחֶם - bread, meal
      i. Hebrew Inscriptions (11th-6th c. B.C.E.) - לֶחֶם - bread, meal
      ii. Qumran Hebrew (2nd c. B.C.E.-1st c. C.E.) - לֶחֶם - bread, meal
   b. Middle Hebrew (2nd-3rd c. C.E.) - לֶחֶם - bread, meal
3. Samaritan (2nd c. B.C.E.) - lēm - bread, meal
4. Arabic (6th B.C.E.→) - laḥm - Meat
5. Punic (5th BC-6th AD) - לֶחֶם - bread
6. Ethiopic - lāhm, lāḥm - bull, cow
7. Aramaic2 - לֶחֶם - bread, food
   a. Old Aramaic (925 - 700 B.C.E.) - לֶחֶם - bread
   b. Imperial Aramaic - לֶחֶם - bread - 700 - 200 B.C.
      i. Biblical Aramaic3 - לֶחֶם - bread, food, feast
   c. Middle Aramaic (200 B.C.E. - 200 C.E.)
      i. Aramaic from Ancient Egypt4 - לֶחֶם - bread
      ii. Qumran Aramaic5 - לֶחֶמת - bread


52Q24 f4:5, 8, 9, 14, 15. Accordance Module. Qumran Non-Biblical Manuscripts.
d. Late Aramaic (200B.C.E. - 700C.E.)

i. Western

- Jewish Palestinian Aramaic - לַחֵם - bread
- Samaritan Aramaic - לָחֵי - bread, food
- Judean Aramaic - לַחֵם - bread, food
- Christian Palestinian Aramaic - LHM - bread, loaf of bread

ii. Eastern

- Jewish Babylonian Aramaic - לַחֵם - bread, food
- Talmudic Aramaic - לָחֵמָה, נָחָמָה - food, bread
  - Zebahim - food, bread (trans. ➔ tribute)
  - Meilah - food, bread (trans. ➔ tribute)
- Syriac - laḥmā - bread, meal, food
- Mandeans - lahma - bread, food
- Midrash⁶ (400-1500C.E.) - לַחֵם - food, bread
  - Ruth Rabbah (500-640C.E.) - food, bread (trans. ➔ tribute)

---

⁶Dates are somewhat uncertain; language is suggestive of several centuries later than the NT writings. Fitzmyer, A Wandering Aramaean, 86.
APPENDIX 2

CONTEXTUAL USAGE

δικαίωμα (descriptive lexical entry based on contextual usage)

Etymology: PIE *deik → δίκη → δικαιώ → δικαίωμα

I. The result of a physical movement
   a. an action that is right/righteous
      Contrasted with ἀδίκημα “intended wrong,” Arist.Rhetorica 1359a25; 1373b1; two types of δ.: toward individual or community Arist.Rhetorica 1373b21; Nic.Dam.Damascenus Fragmenta 95.17-18 τὰ τῆς φύσεως δ. “their righteous deeds of character (quoted in J.Antiq.17:108); LXX Prov. 2:8, ὁδοὺς δικαιωμάτων “the ways of righteous deeds”; LXX Sir. 32:16 δικαιώματα ὡς φῶς ἔξάψουσιν “they will ignite righteous deeds like a lamp”; LXX Bar. 2:19; Ph.De decalogo 109.2 τῶν πρὸς ἀνθρώποις δ.; Ph.Quaestiones in Genesim (frag.) 4.184.1; Rom 5:18, δι’ ἐνός δικαιώματος “through one man’s righteous act”; Rev 15:4 (unless “judgements”); 19:8.
   b. an action performed with the intention of righting a wrong
      In ethical discourse, Aristotle defines δ. as “a correction of an injustice” Arist.Ethica Nicomachea 1135a.9,12-13; Chry.Stoic 3.136.6-7 δικαιώματα δὲ, τὰ ἀπὸ δικαιοσύνης (also quoted in Ar.Did.Liber de philosophrum sectis 77.2.9-10); LXX 1 Kings 3:28 τοῦ ποιεῖν δικαίωμα “to bring about judgement”; 8:45 καὶ ποιήσεις τὸ δ. αὐτοῖς “you will execute judgement for them.”

II. Based on speaking or thinking
   a. a reason or proof offered to convince the mind (similar to λόγος):
      Arguments or points in conformity with the τοῦς Ἑλλήνων νόμους Th.Historiae 1.41.1 (cited in D.H.De Thucydidis idiomatibus 5.2-5); δ. is used interchangeably with λόγος D.H.Antiquitates Romanæ 3.10.4.2; 3.11.3.4,11; 3.12.1.3; SPP 20 54.20 ἐν[ν] μεγίστῳ δικαιώματι “by means of a very great defense”; Samos 127.13; IG XII,6 1:155.13; SEG 17:415.4
   b. the Nomen Actionis of showing or declaring one to be in the right
      LXX Jer. 18:19 εἰσάκουσον τῆς φωνῆς τοῦ δ. μου “hear the sound of my vindication”; LXX Bar. 2:17 Those in Hades will not
give δόξαν καὶ δικαιώμα τῷ κυρίῳ "glory and justification to the Lord"; Rom 5:16, in contrast with κατάκριμα "condemnation,” τὸ δὲ χάρισμα ἐκ πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων εἰς δικαιώμα "on the other hand, the free gift following many trespasses brings justification.”

c. a demand or proof of a right:
The same δ. and λόγους are used as justification for the possession of land in Isoc. Archidamus 6.25.6-7; D.H. Antiquitates Romanae 4.34.4.8 ἔχεις δ. φέρειν "you have a claim to offer"; D.C. Historiae Romanae 61.1.1.9 ἀλλ' οὐδὲν γὰρ δικαίωμα τῶν ὀπλῶν ἰσχυρότερον ἔστι "for no claim is stronger than arms."

d. a defense offered for the correctness of a position:
Th. Historiae 6.80.2.1-2, οὐ γὰρ ἔργω ἵσον ὀσπερ τῷ δ. ἔστην "it is not equal in deed as it is in justification";
Th. Historiae 6.79.2.4, τοῦ καλοῦ δ. “honorable rationale”;
David’s rationale for his actions LXX 1 Sam. 27:11; Aristotle attempts to disprove the λόγων δικαιώματα of those who argue against his position Arist. De Caelo 279b9; D.C. Historiae Romanae 41.32.4.1 καίτοι ἔγωγε τοσοῦτον περιείναι τοῖς δ. τοῦ Πομπηίου νομίζω “and yet I think this case to be superior in justification.”

e. something spoken that is right/righteous
LXX 4 Mac 18:6 Ἔλεγεν δὲ ἡ μήτηρ τῶν ἑπτὰ παιδῶν καὶ ταῦτα τά δ. τοῖς τέκνοις “and the mother of seven boys also spoke these righteous words/sayings to her children.”

f. the quality of being righteous (always singular)
LXX Prov. 8:20, ἀνὰ μέσον τρίβων δ. “in the center of paths of righteousness”; 19:28, καθυβρίζει δ. “he despises righteousness”; Apocalypsis Enochī 104.9.3, οὐ γὰρ εἰς δικαιώμα εἰσάげιν; “do not lead to righteousness”

g. idea/word that seeks to make right
Pl. Leges 684.e.2-3, τῶν δὲ ὀλλών δ. ἀφείσθω “let him be forgiven of the other charges”; In the context of seeking revenge τὰ σκληρὰ καὶ ὑπέραυχα . . . δικαιώματα “cruel and overly proud judgements” D.H. Antiquitates Romanae 8.50.3.3; LXX 1 Sam. 8:9,11; 10:25, τοῦ δ. τοῦ βασιλέως “the judgment of the king” (see δικαίωμα in verse 6).

h. a principle that someone advocates
Th. Historiae 5.97.1.1-6, Δικαιώματι γὰρ οὐδετέρους ἐλλείπειν ἠγούνται “as to a cause, they think that neither of the two is lacking one”; LXX Jer. 11:20 ἵτι πρός σὲ ἀπεκάλυψα τὸ δ. μου “since I have revealed my cause to you”; LXX 1 Kings 8:59 τοῦ ποιεῖν τὸ δ. τοῦ δούλου σου καὶ τὸ δ. λαοῦ σου Ισραήλ "to bring about the cause(?) of your servant and the cause(?) of your people Israel."
i. something due a person
   i. based on ancestry:
      D.H. *Antiquitates Romanae* 4.84.3.3 τὸ δ. τῆς ἑλευθερίας “the right of liberty”; J. *Antiquitates Judaicae* 17.228.2, τὰ δ. προετίθεται “putting forward his rights.”
   ii. based on social class/status:
      LXX 2 Sam. 19:29 the δ. to address the king; Clodius rejects his patrician rank and takes on the δ.(pl.) of the populace, D.C. *Historiae Romanae* 37.51.1.5; 38.12.2.1-2; In an effort to gain Caesar’s favor, Cleopatra lays aside her δ.(pl.) and trusts her beauty and perceived humility to win the day, D.C. *Historiae Romanae* 42.34.5.4; The selection of some to the office of council depended ἐπὶ τε τοῖς δικαιώμασι, D.C. *Historiae Romanae* 55.20.3.5 (unless “right actions”)
   iii. legislated to cites, governors, citizens or foreign nationals:
      Aristotle’s non extant work “The rights of the Greek Cities,” Arist. *Fragmenta varia* 8.46.n.1,2-3; LXX Num. 27:11 δ. κρίσεως, and 35:29 δ. κρίματος “right of judging/judgement”; The δ. of the Alexandrian Jews, J. *Antiquitates Judaicae* 19.285.3, *De bello Judaico* 7:111.1, and *Contra Apionem* 2.37.4; the δ. of parents who have three children, D.C. *Historiae Romanae* 55.2.6.4; D.C. *Historiae Romanae* 97.29; the δ. of married men D.C. *Historiae Romanae* 60.24.4.1; P.Lond. 2 360.8; SPP 22 43.31; P.Oxy. 8 1119.15; Ephesos 219.5
   iv. based on entitlement (actual or imagined):
      The people are emboldened to require more money from the creditors as though their success comes from a δ., D.C. *Historiae Romanae* 8.37.4.3-4; a δ. for seeking vengeance, D.C. *Historiae Romanae* 5.22.2.2
   v. based on political agreements:
      Hanno must occupy the city by force as he does not have even the littlest δ. on his side, D.C. *Historiae Romanae* 11.43.10.6
   vi. based on religious or cultural requirements:
      LXX 1Sam. 2:13 τὸ δ. τοῦ ἱερέως παρὰ τοῦ λαοῦ, “the priest’s due (of food) from the people”; the right of inheritance exchange, LXX Ruth 4:7.

j. laws or decrees (or their stipulations) made by a sovereign.

In the LXX it is most often listed with one or more of the following nouns: νόμος, κρίσις, κρίμα, ἐντολή, μαρτυρία, and/or πρόσταγμα. Positively, it is a verbal complement of διδάσκω, φυλάσσω, λαλέω, μανθάνω, ποιέω, ἐντέλλομαι, ἀκούω, ἐκζητέω, πορεύομαι, γράφω, ἀδολεσχέω and “meditate.” Negatively it is a verbal complement of ἐκκλίνω “to pervert,” καταλείπω “to leave,” ἀφίστημι “put away,” ἀπαγγέλλω “to violate,” and ἐπιλανθάνομαι “forget.” In an inscription it is a verbal
complement of συνετίζω “cause to understand,” and Dio Cassius uses it as a verbal complement of διατάσσω. Gen 26:5; Ex 15:25-26; 21:1, 9, 31; 24:3; Lev 25:18; equated with νόμος Num 15:16; 30:17; 31:21 τὸ δ. τοῦ νόμου; 36:13; Deut 4:1; 5-6, 8, 14, 40, 45; 5:1, 31; 6:1-2; the Shema is summarized by τὰ δ. and “judgments” 6:4; 6:17, 20, 24; 7:11-12; 8:11; 10:13; 11:1; 17:19; 26:16-17; 27:10; 28:45; they are part of τὰς γεγραμμένας ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου 30:10; 30:16; 33:10 τὰ δ. are shown to Jacob and τῶν νόμων to Israel; Ruth 4:7; 1Sam. 8:3; 30:25; 2Sam 22:23; 1 Kings 2:3; 2 Kings 17:8,13, 19, 34, 37; 23:3; 2 Chr 19:10; 1 Mac 1:13; 1 Mac 1:49; 2:21, 40; 1 Esdr 8:7 έκ τῶν ἐντολῶν διδάξαι → τὰ δ.; Psa 17:23; δ. are εὐθύς 18:9; 49:16; 88:32; 104:45; 118:5, 8, 12, 16, 23; they are συμβουλία “advice or counsel given” 118:24; 118:26; the ὁδὸν δικαιωμάτων “way of statutes” 118:27; 118:33, 48; the statutes are ψαλτός “sung of” for comfort during sojourning 118:54; 118:56, 64, 68, 71; one’s heart might become ἀμωμός “blameless” by means of the statutes 118:80; 118:83, 93, 94; one may κλίνω “lean” his or her heart to do the statutes 118:112; 118:117, 118, 124, 135, 141, 145, 155; singing results from learning the δ. 118:171; 147:8; Ode 14:36, 37, 38; Job 34:27; Sir 4:17; Hos 13:1; Mic 6:16 (not in Göttingen edition); Mal 3:24; Bar 2:12, 4:13; Ezek 5:6, 7; 11:20; 18:9; 20:11, 13, 16, 18, 19, 21, 24, 25, 36:27; 43:11; 44:24. Levi 14:4 (Testamenta XII Patriarcharum 3.14.4.5), τοῖς τοῦ θεοῦ δ.; Judah 13:1 (Testamenta XII Patriarcharum 4.13.1.3), τοῦ ποιεῖν τὰ δ. κυρίου; Paraleipomena Jeremiou 6.23.6 (long version, 4th Baruch 6.23), οὐκ ἐφυλάξατε τὰ δ. μου; Ph. Quod deterius potiori insidiari soleat 67.3 (Det. 67); 68.3 (Det. 68); Ph. Quis rerum divinarum heres sit. 8.6 (Her. 8); Ph. De congressu eruditionis gratia. 163.10 (Congr. 163); Ph. De somniis. 2.175.4; Luke 1:6; Rom 1:32; 2:26 τὰ δ. τοῦ νόμου; 8:14 τὸ δ. τοῦ νόμου; “ordinances” for proper worship and behavior, Heb 9:1,10; D.C. Historiae Romanae 52.31.2.4-5, τὰ δ. τὰ κύριον νόμων “the ordinances in accordance with the law”; D.C. Historiae Romanae 36.40.2.1, οὗ γὰρ πω πάντα τὰ δ. τὰ περὶ τὰ συμβόλαια διετέτακτο “for the proper conduct concerning contracts had not yet been set in order”; Augustus διέταξε → τὰ δ. which citizens, former masters, and freed slaves would χράομαι D.C. Historiae Romanae 55.13.7.4

III. Physical object
a. documents
Most often dealing with a legal plea/trial. P. Lille 1.29.25, τῶν τεθέντων δ.; P. Hal. 1.38 τὰ δὲ τη[ς] δικης. P. Cair. Zen. 3 59368.6; multiple occurrences of τὰ πρὸς τὴν κατάστασιν δ.
“the documents for the defense” P.Petr.3 25.52, BGU 6 1248.5, P.Erasm. 1.11.7, and SB 10 10254.13; SB 18 13256.8 ἀντίγραφα τῶν δ. “copies of the documents” and line 16 τὰ παρ’ ἐμοῦ δ. πάντα “all my documents”; P.Gurob 2.39 γράπ[τὸν λόγον θ[ε]μένης καὶ τὰ δ. βουλομ[ένης “reviewing the written plea and the documents of defense,“ and line 41 τὸ διάγραμμα ὃ κ[αὶ παρέδοτο] [ἐν τοῖς δ. “the list which was transmitted in the documents of defense”; P.Col.4 119.3 παραθέσθαι ἐν δικ[αίωματος “set forth in the documents”; P.Tor. Choach. 12.3.21, 23; 12.5.25; ]Antiquitates Judaicae 17.130.4 τῶν ἀλλαχόθεν δ. “justificatory documents from elsewhere”; P.vindob.Bosw.1.5; BGU 4 1033.7, 12; P.Yadin 1 15.12, 32; BGU 7 1654.1; P.Yadin 1 24.FrA.9; FrE.2; SB 20 14111.1; P.Fouad 1 13 παρακεμένω(ν)/δικαίωματον “appended documents”; P.Diog. 9.18 τοῖς δ[ικαίωμασι τοῦ γάμου “in the wedding documents”; BGU 4 1069 V ἀντίγραφον δικ(αίωματος) “copy of a legal proof”; IG III App. 94.8, 11-12 τὰ δικαίωματα prepared against someone in a suit; Artem.Onirocriticon 5.10.2.5 ἀφεθέντι τῶν ἐγκλημάτων μηκέτι δεήσεσθαι τῶν δ. “the one forgiven of the charges will no longer stand in need of justificatory documents.”


Deissmann, Adolf. *Bible Studies: Contributions, Chiefly from Papyri and Inscriptions, to the History of the Language, the Literature, and the Religion of Hellenistic Judaism and Primitive Christianity*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1901; originally German publications in 1895 and 1897.


This thesis investigates three features of Septuagint Leviticus’ Greek text as a means to better understand the translator, his world, and his text.

After an introductory chapter, chapter 2 shows that the valency of Hebrew verbs (in this instance קטר) is an important tool for the analysis of translation technique. In this case, discovering and understanding the deviations by Greek translators in Lev 3:11 and 16a.

Chapter 3 provides further analysis of Lev 3:11 and 16a arguing that the translator did most likely deviate from his Hebrew parent text based on religious reasons. When the translator perceived his Hebrew text to imply that God ate food, he either omitted or misrepresented לֶחֶם in his translation.

Chapter 4 studies the history of the usage of δικαίωμα. The translator chose δικαίωμα to represent ḫōq “statute,” in LXX-Lev 25:18a, as part of a tradition that would influence the meaning of δικαίωμα in subsequent Jewish and Christian Greek literature and eventually the broader Greek world.

In all three studies the translator seemed to be somewhat dependent on, and possibly a part of, a group of Pentateuchal translators.
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