

Copyright © 2018 Joel Richard Bell

All rights reserved. The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary has permission to reproduce and disseminate this document in any form by any means for purposes chosen by the Seminary, including, without limitation, preservation or instruction.

STUDIES IN SEPTUAGINT LEVITICUS:
LINGUISTICS, TRADITION, AND LEXICAL CHOICE

A Thesis
Presented to
the Faculty of
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Theology

by
Joel Richard Bell
May 2018

APPROVAL SHEET

STUDIES IN SEPTUAGINT LEVITICUS:
LINGUISTICS, TRADITION, AND LEXICAL CHOICE

Joel Richard Bell

Read and Approved by:

Peter J. Gentry

Peter J. Gentry (Chair)

Date 10 JULY, 2018

For Katie Bell, my greatest earthly treasure

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	vi
PREFACE	ix
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. LXX LEVITICUS AND <i>QṬR</i>	4
Valency and Biblical Hebrew	5
Valency Theory	5
Hebrew Leviticus and <i>QṬR</i>	8
Non-Overt Complements Illustrated	8
Lexica	10
LXX Leviticus and <i>QṬR</i>	11
Rendering <i>QṬR</i>	12
Rendering the Complements of <i>QṬR</i>	12
Rendering the Adjuncts of <i>QṬR</i>	13
Rendering the Order of the Overt Complements of <i>QṬR</i>	15
Conclusion	20
3. GOD'S <i>LEḤEM</i> IN LXX LEVITICUS	21
Previous Scholarship	22
Exegesis or Alternate <i>Vorlage</i> ?	24
Leviticus 3:11 and 16a	24
Leviticus 21 and 22	32

Chapter	Page
Translator	38
Social Setting.....	38
Tradition.....	39
Conclusion	40
4. ΔΙΚΑΙΩΜΑ: A CURIOUS CASE OF SEMANTIC BORROWING.....	41
Previous Scholarship	42
Etymology and Usage of δικαίωμα	46
Greek Literature from 5th c. B.C. to mid 3rd c. A.D	49
Papyri and Inscriptions	56
Septuagint.....	60
Greek Jewish Literature.....	66
New Testament	67
Early Church.....	68
LXX Leviticus 25:18a.....	68
Conclusion	69
5. CONCLUSION.....	71
Appendix	
1. COGNATES.....	72
2. CONTEXTUAL USAGE	74
BIBLIOGRAPHY	79

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Authors

Ar.Did.	Arius Didymus Doxographus	i B.C.
Arist.	Aristoteles Philosophus.....	iv B.C.
Artem.	Artemidorus Daldianus Onirocriticus.....	ii A.D.
Chry.	Chrysippus Stoicus.....	iii B.C.
D.C.	Dio Cassius Historicus.....	ii/iii A.D.
D.H.	Dionysius Halicarnassensis.....	i B.C.
Isoc.	Isocrates Orator	v/iv B.C.
J.	Josephus Historicus.....	i A.D.
Nic.Dam.	Nicolaus Damascenus Historicus.....	i B.C.
Ph.	Philo Byblius Historicus.....	i. A.D./i. B.C.
Pl.	Plato Philosophus.....	v/iv B.C.
Th.	Thucydides Historicus	v B.C.

Papyri and Inscriptions

BGU	<i>Aegyptische Urkunden aus den Königlichen (later Staatlichen) Museen zu Berlin, Griechische Urkunden.</i> Berlin, 1863–.
Ephesos	McCabe, Donald F. <i>Ephesos Inscriptions. Texts and List.</i> “The Princeton Project on the Inscriptions of Anatolia,” The Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, 1991.
IG	<i>Inscriptiones Graecae.</i> Berlin, 1873–.
JWE 2	Noy, David. <i>Jewish Inscriptions of Western Europe.</i> Vol. 2. The City of Rome. Cambridge, 1995.

- Lefebvre, IGChrEg. Lefebvre, Gustave. *Recueil des inscriptions grecques-chrétiennes d'Égypte*. "Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale du Caire, Mémoires publiés par les membres," Paris, 1907.
- P.Cair. Zen. *Zenon Papyri, Catalogue général des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire*, ed. C. C. Edgar. Cairo, 1925–40.
- P.Col. *Columbia Papyri*. IV. Ed. W. L. Westermann, C. W. Keyes, and H. Liebesny; New York, 1940.
- P.Diog. *Les archives de Marcus Lucretius Diogenes et textes apparentés*, ed. P. Schubert. Bonn, 1990. (Pap. Texte Abh. XXXIX).
- P.Enteux. AppD ENTEΥΞEΙΣ: *Requêtes et plaintes adressées au Roi d'Égypte au IIIe siècle avant J.-C.*, ed. O. Guéraud. Cairo, 1931—32. (Publ. Soc. Fouad I).
- P.Erasm. *Papyri in the Collection of the Erasmus University (Rotterdam)*. I, ed. P. J. Sijpesteijn and Ph. A. Verdult. Brussels 1986.
- P.Fouad *Les Papyrus Fouad I*, ed. A. Bataille, O. Guéraud, P. Jouguet, N. Lewis, H. Marrou, J. Scherer and W. G. Waddell. Cairo, 1939. (Publ. Soc. Fouad III).
- P.Gurob *Greek Papyri from Gurob*, ed. J. G. Smyly. Dublin, 1921. (Royal Irish Academy, Cunningham Memoirs 12).
- P.Hal. *Dikaiomata: Auszüge aus alexandrinischen Gesetzen und Verordnungen in einem Papyrus des Philologischen Seminars der Universität Halle (Pap.Hal. 1) mit einem Anhang weiterer Papyri derselben Sammlung*, ed. by the Graeca Halensis. Berlin, 1913.
- P.Hamb. *Griechische Papyrusurkunden der Hamburger Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek*. I (in 3 parts), ed. P.M. Meyer. Leipzig-Berlin, 1911—1924. Pt. I, nos. 1—23; pt. II, nos. 24—56; pt. III, nos. 57—117.
- P.Lille *Papyrus grecs* (Institut Papyrologique de l'Université de Lille). I, ed. P. Jouguet, P. Collart, J. Lesquier and M. Xoual in 4 fasc., 1907, 1908, 1923 and 1928.
- P.Lond. *Greek Papyri in the British Museum*. London. I, ed. F. G. Kenyon. 1893. Nos. 1—138.
- P.Oxy. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. Published by the Egypt Exploration Society in Graeco-Roman Memoirs. London, 1898–.

- P.Petr. *The Flinders Petrie Papyri*. 3 vols.; Royal Irish Academy, Cunningham Memoirs; Dublin, 1891-1905.
- P.Tviiiiviiior. Choach. *Il Processo di Hermias e altri documenti dell'archivio dei choachiti, papiri greche demotici conservati a Torino e in altre collezioni d'Italia*, ed. P. W. Pestman. Turin, 1992. (Mus. Tor. VI).
- P.vindob.Bosw. *Einige Wiener Papyri*, ed. E. Boswinkel. Leiden, 1942. (Pap. Lugd. Bat. II).
- P.Yadin *The Documents from the Bar Kochba Period in the Cave of Letters. I, Greek Papyri*, ed. N. Lewis. Jerusalem, 1989.
- Samos McCabe, Donald F. *Samos Inscriptions. Texts and List*. «The Princeton Project on the Inscriptions of Anatolia», The Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, 1986.
- SB *Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden aus Aegypten*. Begun by F. Preisigke in 1915, continued by F. Bilabel, E. Kiessling, and H.-A. Rupprecht.
- SEG *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*. Vols. 12-25, ed. Arthur G. Woodhead. Leiden, 1955-1971.
- SPP SPP = Stud.Pal = *Studien zur Palaeographie und Papyruskunde*, ed. C. Wessely. Leipzig, 1901-1924.

Reference Works

- BDB Francis Brown, Samuel R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament with an Appendix Containing the Biblical Aramaic, Based on the Lexicon of William Gesenius*. 4th ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1959.
- BDAG 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.
- DCH David J. A Clines, *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.
- HALOT Ludwig Koehler, Walter Baumgartner, Johann J. Stamm. *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. 5 vols. Translated and edited under supervision of M. E. J. Richardson. Leiden: Brill, 1994–2000.

PREFACE

I am greatly indebted to my parents, Dr. Richard and Mrs. Beverly Bell. The encouragement and financial support we received from them was instrumental in my success during the ThM. I must thank Dr. Peter Gentry for his friendship as well as his guidance in the world of biblical scholarship. I have gleaned much wisdom from him, in his classes, his office, and even at the movies! I must thank Brian Davidson, Jonathan Kiel, Matthew Albanese, Joseph Habib, and Will Ross, from whom I received guidance and feedback at different points during the writing of this thesis. I am grateful for their friendships and their encouragement during the ThM. Without them I would not be the Christian man nor the scholar that I am today. Of course my sweet wife, Katie Bell, is most of all (on this earth) to be thanked. She faithfully stood by me in thick and thin, working a full time teaching position to keep us afloat. Ultimately, however, I am most indebted to my Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, whose grace is continually working in me. I am grateful that he has not left me to my own devices.

Joel Bell

Louisville, Kentucky

May 2018

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The greatest translation feat of the ancient world began in Egypt in the third century B.C.¹ After adopting the Greek language, the Jewish community in Alexandria translated their ancient Hebrew writings into Greek.² 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.³ 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.⁴ Greek Leviticus is typically described as one of the more literal translations

¹John A. L. Lee, *A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch*, Septuagint and Cognate Studies 14 (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983).

²Jan Joosten, "The Vocabulary of the Septuagint and Its Historical Context," in *Septuagint Vocabulary. Pre-History, Usage, Reception*, ed. E. Bons and J. Joosten, Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 58 (Atlanta: SBL, 2011), 2-3.

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 Srenock 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 Srenock, *Traductor*

where Hebrew syntactic structure, lexeme order, and lexical choice are maintained.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.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.”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.⁸ This thesis will focus on three aspects of TT in LXX Leviticus (1) the treatment of the Hebrew verb *qtr*, (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 *qtr*. When dealing with the obligatory and non-obligatory constituents of the *qtr* clause, the translator

Scriptor, Supplements to the Vetus Testamentum 174 (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 27.

⁵Jennifer Dines, *The Septuagint* (repr, London: T&T Clark, 2005), 15. Armin Lange and Emanuel Tov, eds., *Textual History of the Bible: The Hebrew Bible*, vol. 1B, *Pentateuch, Former and Latter Prophets* (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 142.

⁶Anneli Aejmelaeus, “What Can We Know about the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Septuagint?” *Zeitschrift Für Die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 99, no. 1 (1987), 58; Karen H. Jobes and Moisés Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015), 156-57.

⁷Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 3rd ed. (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012), 18.

⁸Anneli Aejmelaeus, “Translation Technique and the Intention of the Translator,” in *VII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Leuven, 1989*, ed. Claude E. Cox (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1991), 24.

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 *lehem* “bread/food.” When he perceived his Hebrew text to imply that God ate food, the translator either omitted or misrepresented *lehem* in his translation. In the last chapter, I outline the reception history of δικαίωμα. When the translator chose δικαίωμα to represent *hōq* “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 *QTR*

The Hebrew verb *qtr* (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

¹Exod 29:13, 18, 25; 30:7-8, 20; 40:27; Lev 1:9, 13, 15, 17; 2:2, 9, 11, 16; 3:5, 11, 16; 4:10, 19, 26, 31, 35; 5:12; 6:5, 8, 15; 7:5, 31; 8:16, 20-21, 28; 9:10, 13-14, 17, 20; 16:25; 17:6; Num 5:26; 17:5; 18:17; 1 Sam 2:15-16, 28; 1 Kgs 3:3; 9:25; 11:8; 12:33-13:2; 22:44; 2 Kgs 12:4; 14:4; 15:4, 35; 16:4, 13, 15; 17:11; 18:4; 22:17; 23:5, 8; Is 65:3, 7; Jer 1:16; 7:9; 11:12-13, 17; 18:15; 19:4, 13; 32:29; 33:18; 44:3, 5, 8, 15, 17-19, 21, 23, 25; 48:35; Hos 2:15; 4:13; 11:2; Amos 4:5; Hab 1:16; Song 3:6; 1 Chr 6:34; 23:13; 2 Chr 2:3, 5; 13:11; 25:14; 26:16, 18-19; 28:3-4, 25; 29:7, 11; 32:12; 34:25. A. Evan-Shoshan, *A New Concordance to the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1984), 1015-16; G. Lisowsky, *Konkordanz zum Hebraischen Alten Testament* (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1958), 1256-57. I have taken מקטר in Mal 1:11, as a frozen Hophal participial form. Thus I listed it as a noun along with *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*, Brown, Driver, and Briggs' *Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*, the *Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*, and Lisowsky's *Konkordanz*.

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.

³Ben Sira 45:14 and 16. Ben-Hayyim Zeev, and Akademyah la-lashon ha-'Ivrit (Jerusalem) ספר בן סירא : המקור, קונקורדנציה וניתוח אוצר המלים (Jerusalem: ha-Akademyah la-lashon ha-'Ivrit, 1973), 267.

⁴Lev 1:9, 13, 15, 17; 2:2, 9, 11, 16; 3:5, 11, 16; 4:10, 19, 26, 31, 35; 5:12; 6:5, 8, 15; 7:5, 31; 8:16, 20-21, 28; 9:10, 13-14, 17, 20; 16:25; 17:6.

⁵The Göttingen edition of Leviticus may reflect an early revision of the Old Greek text. For a discussion of the text of the Göttingen edition as well as 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), 47-53.

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) קטר in Hebrew Leviticus, and (3) LXX-Lev's treatment of קטר.

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.⁶ Linguists have adopted and adapted the term valency (also termed complementation) to the study of language.⁷ The categories of classical grammar derive primarily from a case based study of languages which can be traced back to the Ancient Greeks.⁸ 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 קטר. More specifically, I use the valency of קטר 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.

⁷Thomas Herbst, *A Valency Dictionary of English : A Corpus-Based Analysis of the Complementation Patterns of English Verbs, Nouns, and Adjectives Topics in English Linguistics* 40 (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2004), introduction.

⁸Andre Malchukov and Andrew Spencer, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Case* (New York: Oxford Press, 2009), 13.

permits combining with.⁹ The valency of קטר is represented, therefore, by both the number and type of arguments with which it may combine.¹⁰ 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.¹¹

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

⁹John A. Cook, “Valency Analysis of Biblical Hebrew Verbs and the Challenge of Non-Overt Complements” (unpublished ms), 1. I must thank Cook for sharing this work with myself via email; Thomas Herbst and Katrin Götz-Votteler, *Valency: Theoretical, Descriptive and Cognitive Issues Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs* 187 (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2007), 19.

¹⁰Cook, “Valency Analysis,” 1.

¹¹Herbst and Götz-Votteler, *Valency*, 15.

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.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 **הַמִּזְבֵּחַ** (altar) which occurs overtly 88 percent of the time with **קטר** in Leviticus. In the remaining occurrences **הַמִּזְבֵּחַ** 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.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 **קטר** progresses.

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

¹²Cook, “Valency Analysis,” 11.

¹³Paul R. Kroeger, *Analyzing Syntax: A Lexical-functional Approach* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 9.

¹⁴Meteorological terms in Hebrew may either have an implied subject “it” and be monovalent, or they may be aivalent.

Isa 33:19 **וּבְרֵד בְּרֵדַת הַיָּעַר** And (it?) will hail when the forest falls down.

“monovalent,” “bivalent,” and “trivalent.” Note the examples:

1. Monovalent

Isa 65:17 הִנֵּה עֲבָדַי יִשְׂמְחוּ behold, my servants shall rejoice.

2. Bivalent

Isa 47:3 נָקַם אֶקַח I will take vengeance.

3. Trivalent

Isa 27:4 מִי־יִתְּנֵנִי שָׁמִיר 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.¹⁵ 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

¹⁵Cook, “A Valency Dictionary,” 1.

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

וְהִקְטִיר הַכֹּהֵן אֶת־הַכֹּל הַמִּזְבֵּחַ And the priest shall burn all of it on the
עֲלֵה altar, as a burnt offering,
אִשָּׁה רִיח־נִיחֹחַ a food offering with a pleasing aroma
לַיהוָה 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 (הכהן), the patient complement (הכל), and the locative complement (המזבח) are phonologically present (overt). The adjuncts are as follows: First, עֲלֵה “whole burnt offering” (with the appositional *semichut* אִשָּׁה רִיח־נִיחֹחַ “a sweetly smelling fire offering”) is a product of the verbal action. Second, the adjunct prepositional phrase (PP) לַיהוָה 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

וְהִקְרִיב הַכֹּהֵן אֶת־הַכֹּל And the priest shall offer all of it
וְהִקְטִיר הַמִּזְבֵּחַ and (the priest) shall burn (it) on the altar

In this verse, four verses after the previous example, the priest (הכהן) is to

offer (הקריב) all of it (אֶת־הַכֹּל). The patient complement refers anaphorically to הקָרֵב והַכְרָעִים “intestines and legs” from the previous clause. The next clause continues the same agent and patient complements syntactically but without presenting them phonologically והַקָּטִיר הַמְזֻבָּח (“null anaphor”). For the sake of illustration, the example might be marked as follows והַקָּטִיר ∅ ∅ הַמְזֻבָּח “and (the priest) shall burn (it) on the altar.” From these two examples in 1:9 and 13, we may conclude that the trivalent hiphil קטר may take its agent and patient complements through null anaphor and that אִשָּׁה רִיח־גִּיחוּחַ and עֹלָה are non obligatory components of the clause (adjuncts) in 1:9.

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 קטר as objects. The adjuncts mentioned in our example above (עֹלָה “whole burnt offering” and אִשָּׁה רִיח־גִּיחוּחַ “a sweetly smelling fire offering”) are included in the lexica as objects (complements) to the verb.¹⁶ 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).¹⁷

¹⁶BDB (p. 883) acc. חֶלֶב Lev 17:6, אִשָּׁה Lev 2:11, ראש Lev 8:20, אֶזְבָּח Lev 2:16, חֶלְבֵי הַשְּׁלָמִים Lev 6:5, place is מְזֻבָּח על Lev 4:10, המְזֻבָּח, המְזֻבָּח acc. Lev 6:8. HALOT (vol. 3, p. 1095-6) 1. of the official cult: עֹלָה Lev 1:9, 13, 15, 17; 4:10; 6:5; 8:20f; 9:13f; מְנַחָה Lev 6:8; 9:17; אֶזְבָּח Lev 22:9, 16, 68; חֶלֶב (חֶטְאָת) Lev 2:11, 16; 3:11; 7:5; 8:21, 28; אִשָּׁה רִיח־גִּיחוּחַ לִי/אִשָּׁה Lev 1:9, 13, 17, 3:5, 16; חֶלֶב (חֶטְאָת) Lev 4:19, 26, 31, 35; 8:16; 9:10; 16:25; סֵלֶת (לֶחְטָאָת) Lev 5:12; מִצּוֹת (אִשָּׁה) Lev 3:16; 9:20; 17:6; חֶלֶב (זָבַח) Lev 7:31; cf. Lv 3:11 (לֶחֶם). DCH (Vol. 7, p. 243-4) Object: אֵיל ram Lev 8:21, עוֹף bird Lv 1:17, ראש head Lev 8:20; 9:10; שׁוֹק thigh Lev 8:28, כַּרְע leg Lv 9:14, נֶחֱת piece Lv 8:20, פָּדֵר Lv 8:20, חֶלֶב Lev 3:16; 4:10, 19, 26, 31, 35; 6:5; 7:5, 31; 8:16, 28; 9:10, 20; 16:25; 17:6; יִתְרָת Lev 3:16; 4:10; 7:5; 8:16, 28; 9:10, כְּלִיָּה Lv 3:16; 4:10; 7:5; 8:16, 28; 9:10, קָרֵב Lev 9:14, אֵלִיָּה Lev 7:5; 8:28, לֶחֶם bread Lev 3:11, 16, שָׂאֵר Lev 2:11, רָקִיק Lev 8:28, חֶלֶה Lev 8:28, 28, דָּבֵשׁ Lev 2:11, קָרְבָּן Lev 1:15; 3:5, 11, מְנַחָה Lev 9:17, אִשָּׁה Lev 1:9; 2:2, 9, 11, 16; 3:5; 7:5, עֹלָה Lev 1:9; 9:10, אֶזְבָּח Lev 2:2, 9, 16; 5:12, 68, רִיחַ Lev 6:8, כֹּל Lev 1:9, 13; 8:28.

¹⁷Cook, “Valency Analysis,” 1.

In the case of the Hiph of קטר, 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) אִשָּׁה רִיחַ and both אִשָּׁה and רִיחַ גִּיחַח 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 קטר, with a valency approach, ruled out the *semichut* אִשָּׁה רִיחַ גִּיחַח and both אִשָּׁה and רִיחַ גִּיחַח 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 Pentateuch (SP), Dead Sea Scrolls (DSS), and LXX were read alongside the MT.¹⁸ 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 קטר, 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)”¹⁹ in translating קטר when it took

¹⁸August Freiherrn von Gall, *Der Hebräische Pentateuch der Samaritaner* (Giessen, Germany: Alfred Töpelmann, 1914); Eugene Ulrich, *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls: Transcriptions and Textual Variants* (Leiden: Brill, 2010); K. Elliger and W. Rudolph, eds., *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*, 4th ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1997); John William Wevers, ed., *Leviticus, Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum Band II, 2* (Göttingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986).

¹⁹Exod 29:13, 18, 25; 30:7a,b, 8, 20.

food offerings as PC. He also employed θυμιάω “burn so as to produce smoke”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 ἀναφέρω²¹ and in 12 occurrences ἐπιτίθημι.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, τυφω to “smoke.”²³ The Greek translator of Leviticus followed the example of LXX-Exodus and interestingly the translator of Numbers follows suit.²⁴

Rendering the Complements of *QTR*

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:

בְּנִי־אֶהְיֶה יֵרֵאֵץ מֹשֶׁה	οἱ υἱοὶ Ἀαρὼν οἱ ἱερεῖς Μωσσοῦς	הַכֹּהֵן ὁ ἱερεὺς ²⁵
-------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	------------------------------------

²⁰H. G. Liddell, R. Scott, and H. Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 9th ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 809.

²¹LXX-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, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 123.

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

²³Liddell, Scott, and Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 271, 508, 876, 876, 965, 1838.

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

²⁵In one occurrence the translation is plural. This may be due to the *Vorlage* or TT.

The overt patient complements and the Greek translator's renderings are as follows:

אֶת־הַכֹּל	τὰ πάντα	אֶת־כָּל־הָאֵיל	ὅλον τὸν κριὸν
מִגְרָשָׁהּ וּמִשְׁמֶנֶהּ כָּל־לִבְנָתָהּ	τὸ μνημόσυνον αὐτῆς ἀπὸ τῶν χίδρων σὺν τῷ ἐλαίῳ καὶ πάντα τὸν λίβανον	אֶת־הַחֶלֶב וְאֶת־הַבֶּזֶד מִן־הַחֶמֶץ וְאֶת־הַחֶמֶץ	τὸ στέαρ καὶ τοὺς νεφροὺς καὶ τὸν λοβὸν τοῦ ἥπατος τοῦ περὶ τῆς ἀμαρτίας
אֶת־הַחֶמֶץ	τὸ στέαρ τὸ περὶ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν	אֶת־הָרֶאשׁ וְאֶת־הַחֶמֶץ וְאֶת־הַחֶמֶץ	τὴν κεφαλὴν καὶ τὰ μέλη καὶ τὸ στέαρ
כָּל־יָל	ἅπαν	הַחֶלֶבִים	τὰ στέατα
אֶת־כָּל־הַחֶלֶב	τὸ πᾶν στέαρ αὐτοῦ	הַחֶלֶב	τὸ στέαρ
חֶלְבֵי הַשְּׁלָמִים	τὸ στέαρ τοῦ σωτηρίου	ס or ו	a form of αὐτός
אֶת־הַחֶלֶב	τὸ στέαρ	אֶת־הַחֶמֶץ	τὸ μνημόσυνον αὐτῆς

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

x24	הַמִּזְבֵּחַ	ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον (one occurrence adds τῶν ὀλοκαυτωμάτων)	עַל מִזְבֵּחַ הָעֹלָה	ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον τῆς καρπώσεως
x2	עַל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ	ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον	עָלָיָהּ	ἐπ' αὐτὸ

These lists show that when the verbal complements for Hiphil קטר 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:

עַל־הָעֵצִים אֲשֶׁר עַל־הָאֵשׁ	ἐπὶ τὰ ξύλα τὰ ἐπὶ τοῦ πυρός
עַל אֲשֵׁי יְהוָה	ἐπὶ τὸ ὀλοκαύτωμα κυρίου
עַל אֲשֵׁי יְהוָה	treated as a genitive modifier of LC
עַל־הָעֹלָה	ἐπὶ τὸ ὀλοκαύτωμα τῆς τελειώσεως

עַל־הָעֵלָה ἐπὶ τὸ ὀλοκαύτωμα

The product adjuncts that the translator renders in a formal equivalence style are as follows:

עַל־הָעֵלָה אֲשֶׁר עַל־הָעֵצִים אֲשֶׁר עַל־הָאֵשׁ ἐπὶ τὰ ὀλοκαυτώματα ἐπὶ τὰ ξύλα τὰ ἐπὶ τοῦ πυρός

לְרִיחַ נִיחֹחַ εἰς ὄσμην εὐωδίας

אֲשֶׁה רִיחַ נִיחֹחַ κάρπωμα ὄσμην εὐωδίας

אֲשֶׁה κάρπωμα

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

אֲשֶׁה i.e. changed to an infinitive καρπῶσαι.

אֲשֶׁה רִיחַ נִיחֹחַ i.e. treated as a copular phrase.

עַל־הָאֵשׁ רִיחַ־נִיחֹחַ i.e. represented with a copular phrase.

לְחַם אֲשֶׁה κάρπωμα (?)²⁶

לְחַם אֲשֶׁה ὄσμην εὐωδίας· κάρπωμα (?)

Beneficiary adjuncts:

לְיְהוָה τῷ κυρίῳ

לְיְהוָה κυρίῳ

Manner adjuncts:

כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה אֶת־מֹשֶׁה ὄν τρόπον ἐνετείλατο κύριος τῷ Μωσῆ

כְּחֶלֶב זָבַח הַשְּׁלָמִים ὥσπερ τὸ στέαρ θυσίας σωτηρίου

Situation Adjunct:

מִלִּבְדַּעַלְת הַבְּקָרָה χωρὶς τοῦ ὀλοκαυτώματος τοῦ πρωינוῦ

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 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.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.²⁸

²⁷The 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-LC-PC (x2), V-PC-LC (x1), PC-V (x1), PC-V-LC (x1).

²⁸It could also be that את־אִזְכָּרְתָּהּ “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 את־אִזְכָּרְתָּהּ as the patient complement in the following occurrences.

Lev. 2:2	V-AC-LC	וְהִקְטִיר הַכֹּהֵן אֶת־אִזְכָּרְתָּהּ הַמִּזְבֵּחַ אֲשֶׁה רִיחַ נְיָחַח לַיהוָה	V-AC-PC-LC	καὶ ἐπιθήσει ὁ ἱερεὺς τὸ μνημόσυτον αὐτῆς ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον· θυσία, ὄσμη εὐωδίας τῷ κυρίῳ
		and the priest shall burn this as its memorial portion on the altar, a food offering with a pleasing aroma to the LORD		the priest shall lay its memorial portion on the altar; it is a sacrifice, an odor of fragrance to the Lord
Lev. 5:12	V-LC		PC-V-LC	

Additions. In three instances the translator represented non-overt Hebrew complements in his translation.²⁹ 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 Μωσση̄ς and αὐτά in 8:28 represent the non-overt Hebrew syntax.

Lev. 1:15	MT V-LC	וְהִקְטִיר הַמִּזְבֵּחַ וְהִקְטִיר הַמִּזְבֵּחַ	LXX V-AC-LC καὶ ἐπιθήσει ὁ ἱερεὺς ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον
		and burn it on the altar	And <u>the priest</u> shall place it on the altar
Lev. 2:9	V-LC	וְהִקְטִיר הַמִּזְבֵּחַ אִשָּׁה רֵיחַ נִיחֹחַ לַיהוָה	V-AC-LC καὶ ἐπιθήσει ὁ ἱερεὺς ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον· κάρπωμα, ὄσμη εὐωδίας κυρίῳ.
		and burn this on the altar, a food offering with a pleasing aroma to the LORD	and <u>the priest</u> shall lay it on the altar; it is an offering, an odor of fragrance to the Lord
<hr/>			
		וְקִמַץ הַכֹּהֵן מִמֶּנָּה מְלֹא קִמְצוֹ אֶת־אֲזִכָּרְתָּהּ וְהִקְטִיר הַמִּזְבֵּחַ עַל אֲשֵׁי יְהוָה	αὶ δραξάμενος ὁ ἱερεὺς ἀπ’ αὐτῆς πλήρη τὴν δράκα, τὸ μνημόσυνον αὐτῆς ἐπιθήσει ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον τῶν ὀλοκαυτωμάτων κυρίῳ
		and burn this on the altar, on the LORD’s food offerings	the priest shall lay its memorial portion on the altar on the whole burnt offerings to the Lord.
Lev 6:8 (LXX 15)	V-LC	וְהִקְטִיר הַמִּזְבֵּחַ [אִשָּׁה] רֵיחַ נִיחֹחַ אֲזִכָּרְתָּהּ לַיהוָה	V-LC-PC καὶ ἀνοίσει ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον κάρπωμα ὄσμη εὐωδίας, τὸ μνημόσυνον αὐτῆς τῷ κυρίῳ
		and burn this as its memorial portion on the altar, a pleasing aroma to the LORD	and he shall offer its memorial portion on the altar: an offering, an odor of fragrance to the Lord

²⁹The Hebrew is cited from the 4th ed. of *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*, and the English translation is cited from the New Revised Standard Version. I modify both the Hebrew and English when necessary. Karl Elliger and Wilhelm Rudolph, eds., *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*, 4th ed.; Michael D. Coogan, Marc Z. Brettler, and Carol Newsom, eds., *The New Oxford Annotated Bible with Apocrypha: New Revised Standard Version*, rev. ed. (Garden City, NY: Oxford University Press, 2010). The Greek texts come from the critical edition of *Leviticus*, by John William Wevers. The English translations of the Greek are derived from the 2007 *New English Translation of the Septuagint*. I modify the English translation when necessary. John William Wevers, *Leviticus*; Pietersma and Wright, *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*.

Lev. 8:28	V-LC	V-PC-AC-LC
	וַיִּקְטֹר הַמִּזְבֵּחַ עַל-הָעֹלָה	καὶ ἀνήνεγκεν αὐτὰ Μωυσῆς ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον, ἐπὶ τὸ ὄλοκαύτωμα τῆς τελειώσεως
and burned them on the altar with the burnt offering		and <u>Moyses</u> offered <u>them</u> 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
	וְהִקְטִירָם הַכֹּהֵן עַל מִזְבֵּחַ הָעֹלָה	καὶ ἀνοίσει ὁ ἱερεὺς ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον τῆς καρπώσεως.
and the priest shall burn <u>them</u> 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
	וְהִקְטִיר הַכֹּהֵן אֹתָם הַמִּזְבֵּחַ עַל אֲשֵׁי יְהוָה	καὶ ἐπιθήσει <u>αὐτὸ ὁ ἱερεὺς</u> ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον ἐπὶ τὸ ὄλοκαύτωμα 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 קטר in these two verses supports the notion that when he read אֲשֵׁה לַיהוָה "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

V-AC-LC-PC

וְהִקְטִירוּ הַכֹּהֵן הַמִּזְבֵּחַ לְחֶם אֵשָׁה לַיהוָה ἀνοίσει ὁ ἱερεὺς ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον
ὄσμην εὐωδίας· κάρπωμα κυρίου.

And the priest shall burn it on the altar
as a food offering to the LORD

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 חֶם “food” in his translation.³⁰ Additionally, he substitutes the accusative noun phrase ὄσμην εὐωδίας “odor of fragrance” for חֶם, making it the direct object of ἀναφέρω.³¹ Moreover, the translator renders אֵשָׁה “fire-offering,” with the cultic Greek term κάρπωμα “offering of fruits,” setting it in apposition to ὄσμην εὐωδίας.³² The Greek syntax represents unattested Hebrew syntax as רִיחַ נִיחֹחַ “fragrant aroma” is never the object of the verb קטר nor does it occur alone as an adjunct of קטר, it always modifies the head noun אֵשָׁה in a semichut רִיחַ נִיחֹחַ אֵשָׁה.³³ Based on internal evidence it seems right to conclude that Hebrew syntax has betrayed the translator who used ὄσμην 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 ὄσμην εὐωδίας as an adverbial accusative and κάρπωμα as appositional to ὄσμην εὐωδίας. If this option is chosen to explain the syntax, it also betrays the hand of the translator because it would leave ὄσμην εὐωδίας as an adjunct modifier of the verb, which in every other case has been rendered εἰς ὄσμην εὐωδίας.

³¹T. Muraoka, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*, rev. ed (Louvain: Peeters, 2010), 47; John William Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Leviticus* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1997), 29.

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

³³A study of the 42 occurrences of the phrase רִיחַ נִיחֹחַ 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 אֵשָׁה is present.

וְהִקְטִירָם הַכֹּהֵן הַמְזַבֵּחַ καὶ ἀνοίσει ὁ ἱερεὺς ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον
³⁴לְחֶם אֵשָׁה לְרִיחַ נִיחֹחַ [לִיהוּה] κάρπωμα, ὄσμην εὐωδίας τῷ κυρίῳ

And the priest shall burn them on the altar as a food offering with a pleasing aroma

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

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 ׁהָלֵךְ of ׁשָׂה. Furthermore, he represents the product adjunct ׁשָׂה with accusative κάρπωμα, making it the direct object of ἀναφέρω.³⁵ Throughout LXX-Lev, the translator uses εἰς ὄσμην εὐωδίας to represent the verbal adjunct ׁהָלֵךְ נִיחֹחַ.³⁶ However, in this passage, he has omitted εἰς, and set ὄσμην 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 ὄσμην 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 קטר. While most of the time he properly represented the Hebrew complements of Hiph קטר, his treatment of its adjunct did not display the same level of concern. The

³⁴The 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.

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

³⁶See 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 *LEHEM* IN LXX-LEVITICUS

The Greek translator of Leviticus had a curious relationship with the Hebrew lexeme *lehem* (hereafter ׀׀׀) “bread/food.” When he perceived his Hebrew text to imply that God ate food, the translator either omitted or misrepresented ׀׀׀ 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 ׀׀׀ 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 ׀׀׀. 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 ׀׀׀. 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 ׀׀׀ (these cases will hereafter be termed DFL, “*dōron* for *lehem*”).¹ If ׀׀׀ was in the *Vorlage* of the LXX, then the translator, who generally follows a quantitative approach to translation technique, acted out of character.² Previous scholarship has

¹Lev 21:6, 8, 17, 21, 22; 22:25.

²The 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 מִן־לְבַיִת , 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.³ 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.⁴ In their brief treatments of מִן־לְבַיִת 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).

³Arie Van der Kooij, *The Oracle of Tyre: The Septuagint of Isaiah 23 as Version and Vision*, Supplements to the Vetus Testamentum 71 (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 8; Eugene Ulrich, “Light from 1QIsaA on the Translation Technique of the Old Greek Translator of Isaiah,” in *Scripture in Translation: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo*, ed. Anssi Voitila and Jutta Jokiranta (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 197-98.

⁴W. Edward Glenny, *Finding Meaning in the Text: Translation Technique and Theology in the Septuagint of Amos* (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 6-8; David A. Baer, *When We All Go Home: Translation and Theology in LXX Isaiah 56-66*, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series, vol. 318, Hebrew Bible and Its Versions, vol. 1 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 16; Van der Kooij, *The Oracle of Tyre*, 4-8 and 186. Both Robert Hiebert and Kristin De Troyer expressed their positions in course lectures (2017).

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

⁵John William Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Leviticus* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1997), 29.

⁶Ibid., 334.

⁷Dirk Büchner, ed., *The SBL Commentary on the Septuagint: An Introduction*, Septuagint and Cognate Studies 67 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2016), 117.

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

⁹Ibid.

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 3:5.¹⁰ Büchner rightly rejects this view, stating that it does not explain the omission of “an important word like *לְחֵם*.”¹¹ Daniel is correct in noticing the harmonization, but it is certainly not the reason for the omission of *לְחֵם* in both verses.

Anssi Voitila recommends that the translator may have had a different parent text in 3:11 and 3:16a.¹² 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.”¹³

Exegesis or Alternate *Vorlage*?

This section will cover the internal and external evidence, the meaning of *לְחֵם*, and the translations of *לְחֵם* in the Greek Old Testament. I will establish that *לְחֵם* 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 *לְחֵם אֵשׁה* “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.

¹⁰Suzanne Daniel, *Le Vocabulaire du Culte dans la Septante* (Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck, 1966), 136.

¹¹Büchner, *The SBL Commentary on the Septuagint*, 117.

¹²Voitila, “Leviticus,” 53.

¹³*Ibid.*

Hebrew		Greek ²⁰	
MT (BHS) ¹⁴ and Medieval Mss ¹⁵		Septuagint Manuscripts	
3:11	לֶחֶם אֵשָׁה	3:11 LXX	ὄσμὴν εὐωδίας· κάρπωμα
3:16	לֶחֶם אֵשָׁה	3:16 LXX	[---] κάρπωμα
		376	ἄρτον κάρπωμα
		G	[*ἄρτον] κάρπωμα
SP ¹⁶		Revisers	
3:11	לחם אשה	3:11	130, 344 ἄρτον πυρόν
3:16	לחם אשה	85	ἄρτον πυρρόν
DSS ¹⁷		3:16	M'(M + 416), 130, 321, 344
3:11	4QLev ^b [לחם אשה]		ἄρτον πυρόν
3:16	4QLev ^b לחם [לחם]	85	ἄρτον πυρρόν
		M'	ἄρτον προσφοράν
Aramaic		DSS ²¹	
Tg ¹⁸		3:11	pap4QLXXLev ^b
3:11	לחם קורבנא		οσμ]ηγ[ευωδιας καρπωμα]
3:16	לחם קורבנא	Latin	
Sam ^{Aram}		V ²²	
3:11	לחם קרבן	3:11	<i>pabulum ignis</i>
3:16	לחם קרבן	3:16	<i>alimoniam ignis</i>
Syriac		OL ²³	
p ¹⁹		3:16	extra
3:11	לסג מסוכב	Early Church Fathers	
3:16	לסג מסוכב	3:16	Hesychius of Jerusalem 818
			ἄρτον πυρόν

¹⁴Karl Elliger and Wilhelm Rudolph, eds., *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*, 4th ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1997).

¹⁵Giovanni Bernardo De Rossi, *Variae lectiones Veteris Testamenti librorum, ex immensa manuscriptorum editorumque codicum congerie haustae et ad Samaritanum textum, ad vetustissimas versiones, ad accuratiores sacrae criticae fontes ac leges examinatae* (Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1969); Benjamin Kennicott, *Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum, cum variis lectionibus* (Oxford: E. Typographeo Clarendoniano, 1776).

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

¹⁷Eugene Ulrich, *Qumrân cave 4, VII* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 180.

¹⁸Alexander Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic, Based on Old Manuscripts and Printed Texts* (Leiden: Brill, 1959).

¹⁹Peshitta Institute, *The Old Testament in Syriac According to the Peshitta Version Part I Fasc. 2. Leviticus; Numbers; Deuteronomy; Part II, Fasc. 1b. Joshua* (Leiden: Brill, 1991).

Vorlagen:

3:11	לחם אשה	MT, Kenn., De-Rossi, 4QLev ^b , SP, s-group (85, 130, 344), Sam ^{Tg} , T, P, V, ^{Lat} Hes 818
	²⁴ ריח ניחח אשה	LXX, pap4QLXXLev ^b
3:16a	לחם אשה	MT, Kenn., De-Rossi, 4QLev ^b , SP, *G, 376, M', s-group (85, 130, 321, 344), Sam ^{Aram} , T, P, V
	אשה ----	LXX
	חוג	OL

Concerning verse 11, the Samaritan tradition (SP and Sam^{Tg}) accords with the reading of the MT, even though the SP more frequently follows the LXX in Leviticus 1-4.²⁵ Both variants were also present at Qumran (4QLev^b and pap4QLXXLev^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.²⁶ Early revisions in the LXX-Lev tradition, as well as preference for the MT tradition, both explain the absence of discrepancies in the Peshitta. The SP should be taken as an independent witness

²⁰Wevers, *Leviticus*.

²¹Patrick W. Skehan et al., *Qumran Cave 4: Palaeo-Hebrew and Greek Biblical Manuscripts IV* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992), 170.

²²Francis Aidan Gasquet, *Biblia Sacra iuxta latinam vulgatam versionem ad codicum fidem* (Rome: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1926).

²³Pierre Sabatier, Vincent de La Rue, and Réginaud Florentain, *Bibliorum Sacrorum Latinæ versiones antiquæ, seu vetus Italica, et cæteræ quæcunque in codicibus mss. & antiquorum libris reperiri potuerunt: quæ cum Vulgata Latina, & cum textu Græco comparantur* (Remis, France: Apud Reginaldum Florentain, 1743).

²⁴This retroversion from Greek is based on the translator's renderings throughout Leviticus. He stereotyped ὄσμη 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 ניחח with εὐωδία (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 אשה; κάρπωμα 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.

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

²⁶David J. Lane, *The Peshitta of Leviticus* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 97; Emanuel Tov, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*, 3rd ed. (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2015), 152.

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^b). 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 לְהַם אֱשֶׁה. The analysis of external evidence strongly suggests that the *Vorlage* of the MT, SP and LXX contained אֱשֶׁה לְהַם, in 3:11 and 3:16a. The translator of the LXX omitted לְהַם 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 אֱשֶׁה לְהַם 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 לְהַם in the translator's *Vorlage*, and to establish that he avoided the idea of God

²⁷The Hebrew is cited from *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*, 4th ed., and the English translation is cited from the New Revised Standard Version. I modify both the Hebrew and English when necessary. Karl Elliger and Wilhelm Rudolph, eds., *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*, 4th ed.; Michael D. Coogan, Marc Z. Brettler, and Carol Newsom, eds., *The New Oxford Annotated Bible with Apocrypha: New Revised Standard Version*, rev. ed., ed. Michael D. Coogan, Marc Z. Brettler, and Carol Newsom (Garden City, NY: Oxford University Press, 2010). The Greek texts come from the critical edition of Leviticus, by John William Wevers. The English translations of the Greek are derived from the 2007 *New English Translation of the Septuagint*. I modify the English translation when necessary. Wevers, *Leviticus*; Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright. *A New English Translation of the Septuagint: And the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included Under That Title* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007).

consuming food.

Leviticus 3:11

MT

וְהִקְטִירוּ הַכֹּהֵן הַמִּזְבֵּחַ
לְחֶם אֵשָׁה לַיהוָה

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

LXX

ἀνοίσει ὁ ἱερεὺς ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον
ὄσμῆν εὐωδίας· κάρπωμα κυρίῳ.

the priest shall make an offering on the altar, an odor of fragrance, an offering to 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 לְחֶם אֵשָׁה “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.²⁸ The לְחֶם אֵשָׁה “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.²⁹

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 לְחֶם “food” in his translation.³⁰ Additionally, he substitutes the accusative noun phrase ὄσμῆν εὐωδίας “odor of fragrance” for לְחֶם, making it the direct object of ἀναφέρω.³¹

²⁸The Hebrew verb קטר, a *wəqatal*, which in the Hiphil means “to offer/burn something,” takes a 3ms pronominal suffix as its object, which takes as its antecedent the חֵלֶב “fat” from v. 9. The prepositional phrase הַמִּזְבֵּחַ “on the altar” is the location. The bound phrase לְחֶם אֵשָׁה “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 לַיהוָה denotes YHWH as the beneficiary for whose benefit the action is performed.

²⁹Baruch A. Levine, *Leviticus: Va-Yikra: the Traditional Hebrew Text with the New Jps Translation* (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 2003), 17.

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

³¹T. Muraoka, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*, rev. ed. (Louvain: Peeters, 2010), 47; Wevers, *Leviticus*, 29.

Moreover, the translator renders אֲשֶׁה “fire-offering,” with the cultic Greek term κάρπωμα “offering of fruits,” setting it in apposition to ὄσμῃν εὐωδίας.³² The notion that the *Vorlage* could have read רִיחַ נִיחַח אֲשֶׁה is not supported by any extant manuscripts, when אֲשֶׁה and נִיחַח רִיחַ are adjuncts of קָטַר the pattern is always אֲשֶׁה נִיחַח רִיחַ in the Hebrew Bible.³³ The Greek syntax represents impossible Hebrew syntax as רִיחַ נִיחַח (“fragrant aroma”) is never a patient complement of the verb קָטַר.³⁴ It is consequently right to conclude that Hebrew syntax has betrayed the translator who used ὄσμῃν εὐωδίας “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 ὄσμῃν εὐωδίας 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 רִיחַ נִיחַח אֲשֶׁה as κάρπωμα ὄσμῃν εὐωδίας in 3:5 and אֲשֶׁה לֶחֶם as κάρπωμα ὄσμῃν εὐωδίας in 3:16a.

³²H. G. Liddell, R. Scott, and H. Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 9th ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 880.

³³Exod 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.

³⁴A study of the 42 occurrences of the phrase רִיחַ נִיחַח in the Hebrew Bible shows the following: First, רִיחַ נִיחַח never occurs as the object of קָטַר. Second, when it modifies קָטַר, 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 הוּא is present.

Leviticus 3:16a

MT+SP

LXX

וְהִקְטִירָם הַכֹּהֵן הַמִּזְבֵּחַ
לְחֶם אֶשָׁה לְרִיחַ נִיחֹחַ [לַיהוָה]³⁵

καὶ ἀνοίσει ὁ ἱερεὺς ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον
κάρπωμα, ὄσμῃν εὐωδίας τῷ κυρίῳ.

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.³⁶ In contrast with verse 3:11, however, the Hebrew adds that the priest will smoke “them” (the fatty parts) up, as a לְחֶם אֶשָׁה (“food of a fire-offering”), לְרִיחַ נִיחֹחַ (“for a pleasing aroma”), לַיהוָה (“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.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 לְחֶם אֶשָׁה. Furthermore, he represents אֶשָׁה with accusative κάρπωμα, making it the direct object of ἀναφέρω.³⁸ Throughout LXX-Lev, the translator uses εἰς ὄσμῃν εὐωδίας to represent the verbal adjunct לְרִיחַ נִיחֹחַ.³⁹ However, in this passage, he uses ὄσμῃν

³⁵The LXX, Samaritan Pentateuch, and Samaritan Targum witness to a reading with this addition. These traditions often agree, in Lev 1-5, with regard to small additions (see 1:6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 15, etc.). It is important for the discussion of the syntax and semantics, so it has been added to help illustrate the reason for the divergence in the Greek.

³⁶The second part of v. 16 in Hebrew reads בְּכֹל־חֵלֶב לַיהוָה, “all the fat is YHWH’s.” The Greek translator rendered this phrase idiomatically as πᾶν 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.

³⁷Just as in 3:11, the Hebrew verb קָטַר is a Hiphil w^oqatal, 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 לְחֶם אֶשָׁה “as a food offering” is the product of the “offering it up,” namely, the end result of a transformation. The adjunct prepositional phrase לְרִיחַ נִיחֹחַ “for a sweet smell” is the object of sensory input, the stimulus. The adjunct prepositional phrase לַיהוָה denotes YHWH as the beneficiary, for whose benefit an action is performed.

³⁸Muraoka, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*, 47. Wevers, *Leviticus*, 39.

³⁹See 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 ὄσμην εὐωδίας, “odor of fragrance.”

The retroversion אֵשׁ רֵיחַ נִיחַח is not witnessed by any of the early translations of 3:16, but this phrase does occur elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible.⁴⁰ However, as in 3:11 the Greek represents unlikely Hebrew syntax, as a cursory study of the valency of Hiphil קטר suggests that it never takes אֵשׁ “fire offering” as an object. In addition, the external evidence and the case for omission of קָטַר 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 קָטַר, for which he substituted ὄσμην εὐωδίας in 3:11, and which he omitted in 3:16a. The Greek texts avoid the

⁴⁰The retroversion of 3:16a ליהוה ריח ניחח המזבחה אשה ריח ניחח, is attested in 2:9b.

Leviticus 2:9b	MT	LXX
	וְהִקְטִיר הַמִּזְבֵּחַ אֵשׁ רֵיחַ נִיחַח לַיהוָה	καὶ ἐπιθήσει ὁ ἱερεὺς ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον· κάρπωμα, ὄσμην εὐωδίας κυρίῳ.
	and turn this into smoke on the altar, an offering 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 ἐπιθήσει “to put/lay,” instead of ἀναφέρω, “to offer up” and carries over the grain as an implied object. In addition, he renders the Hebrew אֵשׁ רֵיחַ נִיחַח “a fire offering of a sweet smell,” with a nominative κάρπωμα “an offering,” with the nominative noun phrase ὄσμην 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 מִנְחָה in his Hebrew text.⁴¹ He employed $\delta\omega\rho\omicron\nu$ for מִנְחָה stereotypically when it occurred in bound phrase מִנְחָה לַיהוָה +pron. suffix “their/your/his God’s food.” His action avoided the semantic range of מִנְחָה 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 מִנְחָה , and (3) study the Greek renderings of מִנְחָה 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 מִנְחָה is original in all six verses. I will also argue that the translator’s lexical choice of $\delta\omega\rho\omicron\nu$ (“gift”) was meant to avoid the idea of YHWH eating.

The Hebrew syntax in the contexts⁴² of DFL prevented the translator from

⁴¹DFL, “dōron for lehem.” Lev 21:6, 8, 17, 21, 22; 22:25.

⁴²Verse 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.

21:8a	וְקִדְשֵׁתוּ בִּי־אֶת־לֶחֶם אֱלֹהֶיךָ הוּא מִקְרִיב	καὶ ἁγιάσει αὐτόν· τὰ δῶρα κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ ὑμῶν οὗτος προσφέρει·
	and you shall treat them as holy, since they offer <u>the food of your God.</u>	and he will sanctify him—it is he that offers <u>the gifts of the Lord your God</u>
21:17b	לֹא יִקְרַב לְהִקְרִיב לֶחֶם אֱלֹהֵינוּ:	οὐ προσελεύσεται προσφέρειν τὰ δῶρα τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτοῦ.
	he may not approach to offer <u>his God’s food.</u>	he shall not approach to offer <u>the gifts of his God.</u>
21:21b	אֵת לֶחֶם אֱלֹהֵינוּ לֹא יִגַּשׁ לְהִקְרִיב:	τὰ δῶρα τοῦ θεοῦ οὐ προσελεύσεται προσενεγκεῖν.
	he shall not come near to offer <u>the food of his God.</u>	he shall not come near to offer <u>the gifts of God.</u>

using “sweet smell,” as in 3:11, or omitting any representation of **לְחֶמֶת**, as in 3:16a. When **לְחֶמֶת** 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 **לְחֶמֶת** and any of its implications. I have characterized this misrepresentation as “avoidance,” since the translator seeks to avoid the meaning of **לְחֶמֶת** and any of its implications.⁴³

Leviticus 21:6b

<p>כִּי אֶת־אֲשֵׁי יְהוָה לְחֶמֶת אֱלֹהֵיהֶם הֵם מְקַרְבִּים</p> <p>For they offer the LORD’s offerings by fire, the <u>food of their God</u>.</p>	<p>τὰς γὰρ θυσίας κυρίου δῶρα τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτῶν αὐτοὶ προσφέρουσιν</p> <p>For it is they that offer the sacrifices of the Lord, as <u>gifts of their God</u></p>
--	---

Verse 21:6b is significant, as it is the translator’s first rendering of **לְחֶמֶת** with δῶρον. It contains some of the same terms as 3:11 and 3:16a, most notably **אֲשֵׁי** and **לְחֶמֶת**. 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 **קָרְבָן** “offering” in these instances.⁴⁴ This is a valid suggestion, as δῶρον is the stereotypical rendering for **קָרְבָן** in Leviticus.⁴⁵ However, Voitila does not address the

<p>21:22b לְחֶמֶת אֱלֹהֵי מִקְדָּשֵׁי הַקְּדוֹשִׁים וּמִן־הַקְּדוֹשִׁים יֵאָכַל:</p> <p>He may eat <u>the food of his God</u>, of the most holy as well as of the holy.</p>	<p>τὰ δῶρα τοῦ θεοῦ τὰ ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἁγίων φάγεται·</p> <p>He shall eat <u>the gifts of God</u>, the holy of holies, and of the holy things.</p>
<p>22:25a וּמִיַּד בֶּן־נֹכֵר לֹא תִקְרִיבוּ אֶת־לְחֶמֶת אֱלֹהֵיכֶם מִכֶּל־אֲלֵהָ</p> <p>neither shall you offer any of these [animals] gotten from a foreigner as <u>your God’s food</u>.</p>	<p>καὶ ἐκ χειρὸς ἀλλογενοῦς οὐ προσοίσετε τὰ δῶρα τοῦ θεοῦ ὑμῶν ἀπὸ πάντων τούτων</p> <p>And from an alien’s hand you shall not offer any of these [animals] as <u>gifts to your God</u></p>

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).⁴⁶ 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.⁴⁷

Voitila also suggests that if לָחֵם 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.⁴⁸ This is conjectural for three reasons: First of all, the trigger words אִשָּׁה and לָחֵם 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 לָחֵם in 3:11 and 3:16a to designate those offerings as eaten by God, then the same implication regarding לָחֵם should be seen in DFL and not the reverse. And third, the semantic range of לָחֵם, 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.⁴⁹ His argument here is problematic as it rests on his conclusion from 3:11, that the

29, 38; 9:7, 15; 17:4; 22:18; 22:27; 23:14; 27:9.

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

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

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

⁴⁹Büchner, *The SBL Commentary on the Septuagint*, 117.

“immortal gods feed on the superior food of perfumed smoke.”⁵⁰ 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

Concrete	→	Abstract ⁵³
“Bread”		“Bread of prudence”
“Food”		“Bread of adversity”
“ <u>Flesh</u> of bulls”		
“Tree with its <u>fruit</u> ”		
“Food allowance”		

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,

⁵⁰Büchner, *The SBL Commentary on the Septuagint*, 117.

⁵¹Wevers, *Leviticus*, 334.

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

⁵³Isa 30:20; Sir 15:3. Pancratius C. Beentjes, *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew: A Text Edition of All Extant Hebrew Manuscripts and a Synopsis of All Parallel Hebrew Ben Sira Texts* (New York: Brill Academic, 1997), 44; see 1 Kgs 11:18; Neh 5:14, 18 for the concrete usage “food allowance.”

in God’s house, it means “God’s food.”⁵⁴ Marcus Jastrow lists “tribute, tax, salary” as an Aramaic meaning after 200 CE transferred by the use of מִן־הַלֶּחֶם in certain contexts—namely, the Midrashic $\text{לֶחֶם שֶׁל מַלְכוּת}$, “that is (thou shalt partake of) the royal maintenance,” and the Talmudic $\text{לֶחֶם שֶׁל מִזְבֵּחַ}$, “the tribute belonging to the altar.”⁵⁵ 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 in this section, I have ruled out the semantic range of Hebrew מִן־הַלֶּחֶם as the reason for the translator’s lexical choice of $\delta\omega\rho\nu$. This was done though an exhaustive study of the Hebrew occurrences of מִן־הַלֶּחֶם and its cognates.

Greek. The Septuagint translators employed seventeen various Greek terms for מִן־הַלֶּחֶם .⁵⁶ In the cultic contexts, the translators made use of three terms which are the focus of this section.⁵⁷

$\alpha\rho\tau\omicron\varsigma$ “loaf of wheat-bread”⁵⁸ for מִן־הַלֶּחֶם 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;

⁵⁴N. H. Snaith, *Leviticus and Numbers*, New Century Bible Based on the Revised Standard Version (London: Oliphants, 1977), 36.

⁵⁵Marcus Jastrow, *Dictionary of the Targumim, Talmud Bavli, Talmud Yerushalmi, and Midrashic Literature* (New York: Pardes, 1950), 704.

⁵⁶T. Muraoka, *A Greek-Hebrew/Aramaic Two-Way Index to the Septuagint* (Louvain: Peeters Publishers, 2010), 241.

⁵⁷Cultic occurrences of מִן־הַלֶּחֶם Gen 14:18; Exod 18:12; 23:25; 25:30; 29:2, 23, 32, 34; 34:28; 35:13; 39:36; 40:23; Lev 7:13; 8:26, 31, 32; 21:6, 8, 17, 21, 22; 22:7, 11, 13, 25; 23:14, 17, 18, 20, 24:7; Num 4:7, 28:2, 24; Judg 13:16; 1 Sam 2:36, 10:3, 21:5, 21:7; 1 Kgs 7:48; 2 Kgs 4:42; Ezek 16:19, 44:7; Hos 9:4; Mal 1:7; Neh 10:34; 1 Chr 23:29; 2 Chr 4:19, 13:11. Note that in Exod 35:13 and Lev 3:11, 16 the LXX has not represented the Hebrew.

⁵⁸Liddell, Scott, and Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 9th ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 250.

22:7; 1 Sam. 2:36; 10:3; 21:5; Ezek 16:19; Hos 9:4

δῶρον “votive gift or offering to a god”⁵⁹ for עֹלָה 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 עֹלָה 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 עֹלָה 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 עֹלָה. 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 עֹלָה 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 עֹלָה 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 עֹלָה. In each instance, the notion of God eating

⁵⁹Liddell, Scott, and Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 465.

⁶⁰Ibid., 444.

⁶¹Ibid., 465.

⁶²Notice 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.

28:2b	אֶת־קֹרְבַנִי לְחֵמִי לְאִשֵּׁי רֵיחַ נִיחֹחַי תִּשְׁמְרוּ לְהַקְרִיב לִי בְמוֹעֲדוֹ	Τὰ δῶρά μου δόματά μου καρπώματά μου εἰς ὄσμῆν εὐωδίας διατηρήσετε προσφέρειν ἔμοι ἐν ταῖς ἑορταῖς μου.
My offering, <u>the food</u> for my offerings by fire, my pleasing odor; you shall take care to offer to me at its appointed time.		My gifts, <u>my presents</u> , my offerings as an odor of fragrance you shall take heed to offer to me at my feasts.
28:24b	לְחֵם אִשָּׁה רֵיחַ־נִיחֹחַ לַיהוָה	δῶρον κάρπωμα εἰς ὄσμῆν εὐωδίας κυρίῳ
<u>the food</u> of an offering by fire, a pleasing odor to the LORD		<u>as a gift</u> , an offering as an odor of fragrance to the Lord

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.⁶³ 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.⁶⁴ 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.⁶⁵

Some scriptures speak against the idea of God eating food.⁶⁶ In contrast, Greek and Egyptian cults had sacrifices that were meant to provide sustenance to the gods.⁶⁷ This opposition may be the main driving force behind the translator's treatments of אֱכָל . Francoise Dunand puts forward the idea that the religious system of Alexandria, though polytheistic, was able to incorporate monotheistic religions for

⁶³Francoise Dunand, "The Religious System at Alexandria," in *A Companion to Greek Religion*, ed. Daniel Ogden (Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), 262.

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

⁶⁵*Ibid.*

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 worshipping YHWH.⁶⁸ 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.⁶⁹ The translator's use of pagan cultic terms, for instance δῶρον, may show a desire to capitalize on the the "inclusivity" of the pagan cults.⁷⁰ It is clear, however, in his treatment of אֲנִי, 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.⁷¹ First, system: similar passages must be rendered in the same way.⁷² The translator's treatment of אֲנִי 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 אֲנִי omitted to avoid the notion that God received food. This was also seen in DFL, where the translator deviated from the semantic range of אֲנִי. Third, multiple attestation: the interpretation is attested in

⁶⁸Dunand, "The Religious System at Alexandria," 261.

⁶⁹Barbara Watterson, *Gods of Ancient Egypt* (Stroud, England: Sutton, 1996), 20; Robert A. Armour, *Gods and Myths of Ancient Egypt* (Cairo: American University in Cairo, 1986), 18.

⁷⁰Büchner offers a list of Greek terms associated with κάρπωμα, the Greek first-fruit offering. Terms used in Leviticus aside from κάρπωμα are the "ὄσφυς (haunches with tail). . . and the μηροί or μηρία (thighs or thigh bones) onto which a double layer of fat was laid (any of πιμελή, πῖαρ, πίων, δημός, κνίσση)." Büchner, *The SBL Commentary on the Septuagint*, 106.

⁷¹Jan Joosten, "Divergent Cultic Practices in the Septuagint: The 'shoulder' (βραχιῶν) of the Priest," *Journal of Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 48 (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2015), 31.

⁷²Ibid.

multiple ancient writings.⁷³ 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 קֶרֶבֶן.

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 אִשָּׁה "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.

⁷³Joosten, "Divergent Cultic Practices in the Septuagint," 31.

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 (*δικαι- + lengthened omicron + -μα(τ)-), where the suffix particularizes the meanings of δικαίω.² Leviticus 25:18a reads יתקנה־תִּשְׁמְרוּ “you shall observe my *huqqôṭ* (statutes).” The LXX translator renders it καὶ ποιήσετε πάντα τὰ δικαίωματά μου “and you shall observe all my τὰ δικαίωματά.” Two peculiarities are evident when considering the diachronic use of this word: first, the verb and the noun do not exhibit semantic consistency. While δικαίω 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:

δικαίω	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, <i>statute</i> (?),

¹T. Muraoka, “Septuagintal Lexicography: Some General Issues,” in *Melbourne Symposium on Septuagint Lexicography*, Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series, no. 28 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990), 37; Cameron Boyd-Taylor, “Calque-culations—Loan Words and the Lexicon,” *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 38, ed. Bernard A. Taylor (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2005), 81.

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

³Francisco Rodriguez Adrados, gen. ed., *Diccionario Griego-Español*, vol. 5 (Madrid: CSIC, 1997), 1092.

ordinance (?); III. documents.⁴

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.⁵

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 *hōq*) 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 *hōq* “statute” based on the etymology of δικαίωμα and usage in papyri, inscriptions, and Greek literature (until the 3rd c. A.D.).

⁴This 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.

⁵The 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*.

וְעִשְׂתֶּם אֶת־חֻקֹּתַי וְאֶת־מִשְׁפָּטַי תִּשְׁמְרוּ וְעִשְׂתֶּם
אֹתָם וַיִּשְׁבְּתֶם עַל־הָאָרֶץ לְבִטָּח

καὶ ποιήσετε πάντα τὰ δικαιώματά μου
καὶ πάσας τὰς κρίσεις μου, καὶ
φυλάξασθε καὶ ποιήσετε αὐτά, 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 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.⁸ 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.).⁹ He states that these sources “are later than the LXX, but are not found in the realm of its influence.”¹⁰ 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.

⁷The Greek text comes from the critical edition of Leviticus, by John William Wevers. The English translations of the Greek are derived from the 2007 *New English Translation of the Septuagint*. I modify the English translation when necessary.

⁸Emmanuel Tov, “Greek words and Hebrew meanings,” in T. Muraoka, *Melbourne Symposium on Septuagint Lexicography*, Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series, no. 28 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990), 89-90.

⁹Ibid.

¹⁰Ibid.

explain how a -μα(τ)- noun deviated from the general idea of its verbal stem.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.¹² Moreover, Dio Cassius, writing five hundred plus years after the translation of the Pentateuch, explicitly discusses Christians and Jews in his writings.¹³ As proconsul of Africa and as a historian, Dio Cassius would have

¹¹The 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* 36.40.2.1; 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, 1841-1870). 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.

¹²Helene Cadell gives a careful explanation of the language of that text, explaining that τὰ δικαίωματὰ are the special privileges granted by Hadrian to Antinoites. See Helene Cadell, "Vocabulaire de la Législation Ptolémaïque Problème du Sens de Dikaiōma Dans le Pentateuque," in *Katá Tous O': Selon Les Septante: Trente Études Sur La Bible Grecque Des Septante En Hommage A Marguerite Harl*, ed. Gilles Dorival and Olivier Munnich (Paris: Cerf, 1995), 220-21.

¹³In *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 *The Text of Cassius Dio on Lacus Curtius*, accessed October 2017, http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Cassius_Dio/70*.html.

In book 73,4.6-7 "The tradition is that she greatly favoured the Christians and rendered them many kindnesses, inasmuch as she could do anything with Commodus." Cassius, Cary, and Herbert, *Dio Cassius Roman History*, accessed October 2017, http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Cassius_Dio/73*.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 led 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.”¹⁴ Cadell attributes the dominant use of this meaning in the Septuagint to metonymy regarding the idea “rules of law.”¹⁵ 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.¹⁶

Boyd-Taylor argues that the use of δικαίωμα for “ordinance” in the Pentateuch trades “on the stock meaning ... ‘amendment of a wrong.’”¹⁷ He postulates that the Genesis translator may have introduced the meaning for etymological reasons to translate *huqqâ* “statute” in Gen. 26:5. The Exodus translator then followed suit (starting with two occurrences of *hōq* “statute” in 15:25-26), using δικαίωμα to solve various problems of translation.¹⁸

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

Texts/Cassius_Dio/37*.html.

¹⁴Cadell, “Vocabulaire de la Législation Ptolémaïque,” 220; Cameron Boyd-Taylor, “Linguistic Register and Septuagint Lexicography,” in *Biblical Greek Language and Lexicography: Essays in Honor of Frederick W. Danker*, ed. Bernard A Taylor (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans), 164-66.

¹⁵Cadell, “Vocabulaire de la Législation Ptolémaïque,” 218, 220.

¹⁶*Ibid.*, 221.

¹⁷Boyd-Taylor, “Linguistic Register,” 165.

¹⁸*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.”¹⁹

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.²⁰ A detailed study of the etymology and usage of δικαίωμα will provide evidence towards ruling out the first view.²¹

Etymology and Usage of δικαίωμα

The abundance of verbal nouns ending in -μα(τ)- is characteristic of Hellenistic Greek from Aristotle onwards.²² The -μα(τ)- suffix²³ was greatly productive in the language of tragedy and Ionic prose developed by the Philosophers²⁴ and remained prolific in the post-classical period. The close

¹⁹It should be noted that Joosten does not specifically address δικαίωμα. Joosten, “The Vocabulary of the Septuagint and Its Historical Context,” in *Septuagint Vocabulary: Pre-history, Usage, Reception*, ed. Eberhard Bons and Jan Joosten, Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 58 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011), 5-6.

²⁰As 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.

²¹It 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.

²²F. C. Conybeare and St. George Stock, *A Grammar of Septuagint Greek* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing Company, 1980), §9.

²³In 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.

²⁴Francisco 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.²⁵ This close link is the reason that δικαίωμα is peculiar. There remain -μα(τ)- nouns of whose development we are not certain.²⁶ While earlier Greek tended to use -μα(τ)- nouns as *nomina actionis*, which often became the names of objects,²⁷ in the Koine period, -μα(τ)- nouns mostly indicated the result of an action and were only occasionally *nomina actionis*.²⁸

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 (*δικαι- plus lengthened omicron) is the basis for the formation of δικαίωμα.²⁹

**deik* → δίκη → δικαίω → δικαίωμα

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

Present (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 169.

²⁵The less frequent -μα action nouns have been in competition with -ή and -σις for instance ἐπίταγμα/ἐπιταγή, ἐνταλμα/ἐντολή, ἐπαύξημα/ἐπαύξη/ἐπαύξις. 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.

²⁶In 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: αίμα ‘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 έρμα ‘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.

²⁷Carl Darling Buck, *Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1933), 221; Hope and Moulton, *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, 355; Joseph Wright, *Comparative Grammar of the Greek Language* (London: H. Frowde, 1912.), 131.

²⁸Helmut Rix, *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen: Laut- u. Formenlehre* (Darmstadt, Germany: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1976), 94; Buck, *Comparative Grammar*, 221; Hope and Moulton, *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, 2: 355; Wright, *Comparative Grammar*, 131.

²⁹Beekes 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.”³⁰ Since the -μα(τ)- suffix particularizes the meanings of δικαίωω,³¹ 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.³² 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”³³

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.

δικαίωω “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

³⁰I. with acc. (1) “consider fair” Herodotus Historicus (9.93) 5th c. B.C.; (2) “justify” Pindarus Lyricus (*Fragmenta* 169a.3) 5th c. B.C.; (3) “submit to justice, punish, condemn” Herodotus Historicus (1.100); (4) “deal justly, defend the rights of a widow,” Aristoteles Philosophus (*Ethica Nicomachea* 1136a22) 4th c. B.C.; II. with inf. “consider fair or convenient,” Herodotus Historicus (6.82, 1.89, 2.172, 3.118), Thucydides Historicus (2.41) 5th c. B.C.; III. abs. “pass judgment, give an interpretation, estimate,” Herodotus Historicus 9.42, Thucydides Historicus 4.122. Adrados, *Diccionario Griego-Español*, vol. 5, 1092.

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

³²James Barr, *Semantics of Biblical Language* (London: Oxford University Press, 1961).

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

³⁴Lampe’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.

³⁵Th.*Historiae* 1.41.1 H. S. Jones and J. E. Powell, *Thucydides Historiae*, 2 vols., University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae: A Digital Library of Greek Literature,” *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*, accessed October 2017, <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0003:001:50049>.

³⁶Arist.*De Caelo*.279b9 Aristotle’s uses δικαίωμα once in his philosophical treatise *On the Heavens*. Aristotle discusses whether or not 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 δικαίωματα 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>.

³⁷Arist.*Rhetorica* 1359a25 Aristotle puts forward topics that an orator must be ready to discuss. W. D. Ross, *Aristotelis ars Rhetorica* (1959; repr., Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964), 1-191. University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0086:038:26442>.

³⁸Arist.*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” (δικαίωμα), 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. δικάϊωμα “an argument/claim,” and λόγος “a reason”).³⁹ Aristotle defines δικάϊωμα as “the correction of an injustice,”⁴⁰ and Chrysippus states that “δικαιώματα come from δικαιοσύνης.”⁴¹

In historical writings, (1) Thucydides Historicus (5th c. B.C.)⁴² and Dionysius Halicarnassensis (1st c. B.C.)⁴³ use δικάϊωμα in the context of

/stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0086:010:190851.

³⁹Isoc.*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 δικαιώματα and λόγους 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?0010:016:9905>.

⁴⁰*Ethica Nicomachea*.1135a.13 I. Bywater, *Aristotelis Ethica Nicomachea*, University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017 <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0086:010:190851>.

⁴¹Acts of self control come from soundness of mind and just actions are fueled by δικαιοσύνης (justice). J. von Arnim, *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta*, vol. 3 (Leipzig: Teubner, 1903), 136.

⁴²*Historiae* 1.41.1 Thucydides uses δικάϊωμα 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 δικαιώματα” (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 “δικαιώματα” are pleas for action that accord with what is just. Best understood as “arguments” or “points of justice.” Jones and Powell, *Thucydides historiae*, University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017., <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0003:001:50049>.

⁴³*De Thucydidis idiomatibus* 5.2-5 This usage of δικάϊωμα by Dionysius is in a quote of the Corinthians to the Athenians from a papyrus. Possibly from Thucydides Historicus 1.41.1. L. Radermacher and H. Usener, *Dionysii Halicarnasei quae exstant*, vol. 5 (1899; repr., Leipzig: Teubner, 1965), 421-438, University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0081:011:6172>.

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 δικάϊωμα. The second, based on racial possession of a city, is called “ἕτερον δὲ τοιόνδε” (in line 3), and the third argument, based on proper observance of customs by the citizens, is called “τελευταῖός μοι λόγος ἐστίν.” 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 δικάϊωμα. Fufetius calls the Alban’s third point a δικάϊωμα while the Alban leader called it a λόγος. This show the interchangeability of δικάϊωμα with λόγος in some contexts. Jacoby, *Dionysii Halicarnasei*, University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/ris/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”: Δικαιώματι γὰρ οὐδετέρους ἐλλείπειν ἠγοῦνται “as to a cause, they think that neither of the two is lacking one.”⁴⁴ (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 ἔργω ἴσον ὥσπερ τῷ δ. ἐστὶν “it is not equal in deed as it is in justification”;⁴⁵ τοῦ καλοῦ δ. “honorable rationale”;⁴⁶ and καίτοι ἔγωγε τοσοῦτον περιεῖναι τοῖς δ. τοῦ Πομπηίου νομίζω “and yet I think this case to be superior in justification.”⁴⁷ (4) Nicolaus

terms the “points/argument/claims” of both sides (Albans vs. Fufetius) δικαίωματα. Jacoby, *Dionysii Halicarnasei*, University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0081:001:429994>.

⁴⁴Th.*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 Δικαιώματι.” 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, *Thucydides historiae*, 2 vols., University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0003:001:768319>.

⁴⁵Th.*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, *Thucydides historiae*, University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0003:001:886288>.

⁴⁶Th.*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, Camarians, and Euphemusians 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 Leonties 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, *Thucydides Historiae*, University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0003:001:885758>.

⁴⁷D.C.*Historiae Romanae* 41.32.4.1 The δικαίωματα of the speaker are greater than Pompey’s so much so that he challenged Pompey to a judicial trial. U. P. Boissevain, *Cassii Dionis Cocceiani historiarum Romanarum quae supersunt*, 3 vols. (1895-1901; repr., Berlin: Weidmann, 1955), University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0385:001:695027>.

Historicus (3rd c. B.C.), uses δικαίωμα as the abstract idea of “proper conduct”: τὰ τῆς φύσεως δ. “their righteous deeds of character.”⁴⁸ (5) Dionysius Halicarnassensis and Dio Cassius use δικαίωμα as “a demand or proof of a right”: ἔχεις δ. φέρειν “you have a claim to offer”⁴⁹ and ἀλλ’ οὐδὲν γὰρ δικαίωμα τῶν ὀπλῶν ἰσχυρότερόν ἐστι “for no claim is stronger than arms.”⁵⁰ (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.”⁵¹ (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;⁵² (ii.) based on social class/

⁴⁸*Damascenus Fragmenta* 95.17-18 “Right actions” of character or outward appearance, depending on how one takes φύσις. K. Müller, *Fragmenta historicorum Graecorum* 3 (Paris: Didot, 1841-1870), 348-464, University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0577:003:180076>.

⁴⁹D.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?0081:001:690759>.

⁵⁰D.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>.

⁵¹D.H.*Antiquitates Romanae* 8.50.3.3 In a discussion where Venturia is entreating Marcus to forgive the nation, he speaks against the δικαιώματα “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>.

⁵²D.H.*Antiquitates Romanae* 4.84.3.3. τὸ δ. τῆς ἐλευθερίας “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;⁵³ (iii.) legislated to cives, governors, citizens or foreign nationals;⁵⁴ (iv.) based on entitlement (actual or imagined);⁵⁵ and (v.) based on political agreements.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

⁵³D.C.*Historiae Romanae* 37.51.1.5, In anger Clodius rejects his patrician rank and takes on the δικαιώματα of the populace. U.P. Boissevain, *Cassii Dionis*, University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0385:001:390992>

D.C.*Historiae Romanae* 38.12.2.1.1-2, Caesar has Clodius transferred to the δικαιώματα of the populace and then appoints him tribune. Boissevain, *Cassii Dionis*, University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0385:001:422139>.

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

D.C.*Historiae Romanae* 55.20.3.5 The selection of some to the office of council depended ἐπί τε τοῖς δικαιώμασι, (unless “right actions” or “claims”). Boissevain, *Cassii Dionis*, University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0385:001:2007066>.

⁵⁴D.C.*Historiae Romanae* 55.2.6.4 The δικαιώματα 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, *Cassii Dionis*, University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0385:001:1745016>.

D.C.*Historiae Romanae* 97.29 The δικαιώματα of parents. Boissevain, *Cassii Dionis*, University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0385:010:180101>.

D.C.*Historiae Romanae* 60.24.4.1 The δικαιώματα of married men. Boissevain, *Cassii Dionis*, University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0385:001:2153350>.

⁵⁵D.C.*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 δικαίωμα. 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 δικαίωμα. Boissevain, *Cassii Dionis*, University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0385:001:76360>.

D.C.*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 δικαίωμα for the vengeance. Boissevain, *Cassii Dionis*, University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0385:001:38442>.

⁵⁶D.C.*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 δικαίωμα on his side he would not continue to occupy the city by force. Boissevain, *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 36.40.2.1⁵⁷ 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 52.31.2.4,5, renders τὰ δ.τάκ τῶν νόμων “ordinances in accordance with the law.”⁵⁸ 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” 55.13.7.4.⁵⁹ 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.”⁶⁰ (2) Aristotle (4th c.

⁵⁷Boissevain, *Cassii Dionis*, University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0385:001:299807>.

⁵⁸D.C.Historiae Romanae 52.31.2.4-5 If the senate renders δικαίωματα in accordance with the laws then the δικαίωματα 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>.

⁵⁹Boissevain, *Cassii Dionis*, University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0385:001:1778563>.

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 (δικαίος) 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 “δικαιωμάτων.” 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 II.624a-969d, University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0059:034:554458>.

B.C.), in *Rhetorica*,⁶¹ uses δικαίωμα as “an action that is right/righteous,” but in *Ethica Nicomachea*, he defines it as “the correction of an injustice.”⁶² (3) 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.”⁶³ (4) In the context of a debate Aristotle uses δικαίωμα as “a defense offered for the correctness of a position”; he attempts to disprove the λόγων δικαιώματα of those who argue against his position.⁶⁴ The title of Aristotle’s non extant work “Δικαιώματα of the Greek Cities,” may convey the idea “dues legislated to cities,” however, with scant context it is difficult to know.⁶⁵

In grammatical works, Herennius Philo (1st c. A.D.)⁶⁶ and Ammonius

⁶¹Arist.*Rhetorica*1359a25 contrasted with ἀδίκημα “intended wrong,” P. Moraux, Aristote. *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>

Arist.*Rhetorica* 1373b1 Aristotle discusses the difference between unjust and just actions. W.D. Ross, *Aristotelis ars rhetorica*, (1959; repr., Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964), 1-191, University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0086:038:100442>.

Arist.*Rhetorica* 1373b21 Aristotle distinguished between unjust and just actions which are done against an individual or a community. W.D. Ross, *Aristotelis ars rhetorica*, (repr. 1964; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959), 1-191, University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0086:038:100442>.

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>.

⁶³Chry.*Stoic* 3.136.6,7 Acts of self control come from soundness of mind and just actions are fueled by δικαιοσύνης (justice). J. von Arnim, *Stoicorum veterum fragmenta*, vol. 3, 136. Arius Didymus (1st c. B.C.), quotes Chrysippus, *Ar.Did.Liber de philosophum sectis* 77.2.9-10 This is the exact phrasing as Chry.*Stoic* 3.136.6,7 written two centuries earlier. Acts of self control come from soundness of mind and right actions, which come from δικαιοσύνης (righteousness). F.W.A. Mullach, *Fragmenta philosophorum Graecorum*, vol. 2, (Paris: Didot, 1867), 53-101, University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0529:002:78469>.

⁶⁴Arist.*De Caelo*.279b9 Aristotle’s arguments will be more convincing if he first addresses the δικαιώματα of the words/reasons of those who dispute his views. P. Moraux, *Aristote. Du ciel*, University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0086:005:55599>.

⁶⁵Arist.*Fragmenta varia* 8.46.n.1,2-3. V. Rose, *Aristotelis qui ferebantur librorum fragmenta*, (repr. 1967; Leipzig: Teubner, 1886), 23-425, University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0086:051:615947>.

⁶⁶*De diversis verborum significationibus* N.122.4; V. Palmieri, *Herennius Philo. De diversis*

Grammaticus (1st/2nd c. A.D.)⁶⁷ cite the above-mentioned work by Aristotle as “τοῖς Δικαιώματα of the Cities.”⁶⁸ Harpocration (1st/2nd c. A.D.) cites it as “τοῖς Δικαιώματα.”⁶⁹ Julius Pollux (2nd c. A.D.) lists δικαίωμα in a section on -μα ending nouns along with ῥῆγμα “breakage,” φράγμα “fence,” βάμμα “dye” etc.,⁷⁰ but the usage is not clear.

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

verborum significationibus, (Naples: M. D'Auria, 1988), 125-231, University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?1416:001:47517>.

⁶⁷*Fragmenta varia* 8.46.614.4-5 (De adfinium vocabulorum differentia) K. Nickau, *Ammonii qui dicitur liber de adfinium vocabulorum differentia*, (Leipzig: Teubner, 1966), University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0708:001:90108>.

⁶⁸V. Rose, *Aristotelis qui ferebantur librorum fragmenta*, University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0086:051:615947>.

⁶⁹*Fragmenta varia* 8.46.612.2 Rose, *Aristotelis qui ferebantur librorum fragmenta*. University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0086:051:615947>.

⁷⁰*Onomasticon*.6.183.5, E. Bethe, *Pollucis Onomasticon*, 2 vols., Lexicographi Graeci 9.1-9.2 (Leipzig: Teubner, 1900-1931), University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0542:001:614944>.

⁷¹Isoc.*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 δικαίωμα and λόγους 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, *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>.

⁷²*Onirocriticon*.5.10.2,5 line two and three read “Ἐδοξέ τις φεύγων γραφήν δημοσίων

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.⁷³ 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.⁷⁴ 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”: τῶν τεθέντων δικαιωμάτων⁷⁵ and τὰ δὲ δικαίω[μα]τα τη[ς] δίκης.⁷⁶ In a letter

ἀδικημάτων [τὰ γράμματα καὶ] τὰ δικαίωμα ἀπολωλεκέναι. R.A. Pack, *Artemidori Daldiani Onirocriticon Libri V* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1963), University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0553:001:466307>.

⁷³In 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, cites, governors, citizens or foreign nationals: iv. based on entitlement (actual or imagined) v. based on political agreements, (h.) ordinances.

⁷⁴Multiple occurrences in the papyri were unusable as they were significantly devoid of context and surrounding data, or the reconstruction of δικαίωμα was too hypothetical (including one variant reading). For papyri see: P.Eras. 1 11.7 (B.C. 150, May 13), The Duke Collaboratory for Classics Computing & the Institute for the Study of the Ancient World, “Papyri.info,” *papyri.info*, accessed October 2017, <http://papyri.info/ddbdp/p.erasm;1;11>. P.Hamb. 1 31 a.line 9 (A.D. 126-138; Egypt - Arsinoites), Duke, “Papyri.info,” accessed October 2017, <http://papyri.info/ddbdp/p.hamb;1;31a>. BGU 1 265.17 (A.D. 148, Apr 26 after; Egypt), Duke, “Papyri.info,” accessed October 2017, <http://papyri.info/ddbdp/chr.wilck;;459>. BGU 3 780 (c.A.D. 154-9 Arsinoite, Egypt), Duke, “Papyri.info,” accessed October 2017, <http://papyri.info/ddbdp/bgu;3;780>. SB 6 9339.26, Duke, “Papyri.info,” accessed October 2017, <http://papyri.info/ddbdp/p.bacch;;21>. BGU 3 847.8 (A.D. 182-183; Egypt), Duke, “Papyri.info,” accessed October 2017, <http://papyri.info/ddbdp/chr.wilck;;460>. BGU 3 847 (A.D. 182-183; Egypt), Duke, “Papyri.info,” accessed October 2017, <http://papyri.info/ddbdp/chr.wilck;;460>. P.Enteux. AppD.5 (B.C. 234-233; or 237-236; Arsinoite?), Duke, “Papyri.info,” accessed October 2017, <http://papyri.info/ddbdp/p.enteux;;AppD>. P.Yadin 1 20 (Variant δικέωμ), Duke, “Papyri.info,” accessed October 2017, <http://papyri.info/ddbdp/p.babatha;;20>.

⁷⁵P.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>.

⁷⁶P.Hal 1.38 (B.C. 259 after; Apollonopolites, Egypt) The context concerns the court where

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): γραπ[τ]ὸν λόγον θ[ε]μένης καὶ τὰ δικ[α]ιώματα βουλομ[έ]νης “reviewing the written plea and the documents of defense,” and τὸ διάγραμμα ὃ κ[αὶ] παρέδοτο] [έν] τοῖς δικαιώμα[σιν], “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 δικα[ιώμασι] “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

judges preside over trials in which true and false testimonies occur. Duke, “Papyri.info,” accessed October 2017, <http://papyri.info/ddbdp/p.hal;1>.

⁷⁷P.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.cairzen;3;59368>.

⁷⁸A petition for legal protection. SB 18 13256.8,16 (B.C. 230-221 or 268-246; Arsinoites), Duke, “Papyri.info,” accessed October 2017, <http://papyri.info/ddbdp/sb;18;13256>.

⁷⁹See P.Petr.3 25.52 (B.C. 228 ? Arsinoite?), where the context concerns legal documents. Duke, “Papyri.info,” accessed October 2017, <http://papyri.info/ddbdp/chr.mitt;30>. BGU 6 1248.5 (B.C. 137 ; unknown origin), Court context. Accusation of crime. Report of the Court of First Instance to the President of the Court of First Instance. Duke, “Papyri.info,” accessed October 2017, <http://papyri.info/ddbdp/bgu;6;1248>. P.Erasm. 1 11.7 (May 13, 150 B.C.) Order from the Chrematistai to Apollonis. Duke, “Papyri.info,” accessed October 2017, <http://papyri.info/ddbdp/p.erasm;1;11> and SB 10 10254.line 13 = SB 8 9678 (B.C. 145-116; Arsinoites) (titled “Judgement/sentence/verdict”) *Abschriften amtlicher Schreiben*. Duke, “Papyri.info,” accessed October 2017, <http://papyri.info/ddbdp/sb;10;10254>.

⁸⁰P.Gurob 2.39,41 (B.C. 226; Korkodilopolis [Arsinoites], Egypt) Court of the Ten. Duke, “Papyri.info,” accessed October 2017, <http://papyri.info/ddbdp/p.gur;2dupl>.

⁸¹P.Col.4 119.3 (B.C. 299-200? or 200-175?). Fragment of uncertain nature. Duke, “Papyri.info,” accessed October 2017, <http://papyri.info/ddbdp/p.col;4;119>.

contexts: a ruling, hearing, and deposition.⁸² The same phrase “copy of a legal proof” occurs in the second century A.D. ἀντίγραφ(ον) δικαιωμάτων⁸³ and in the third century A.D. ἀντίγραφον δικ(αιώματος).⁸⁴ Two mid second-century A.D. copies, of the same text, support the reading παρακειμένω(ν)/δικαιωμάτων “appended documents.”⁸⁵ Also, in the late second-century A.D. it occurs in relation to matrimony τοῖς δι[κai]ώμασι τοῦ γάμου “in the wedding documents.”⁸⁶ In documents concerning the repayment of a loan and mortgage δικαίωμα means a “right” (A.D. 151).⁸⁷ Similar, in P.Oxy. 8 1119.15 (253 A.D.), δικαίωμα means “privileges” granted by Hadrian to Antinoites.⁸⁸

In inscriptions, δικαίωμα occurs approximately 15 times.⁸⁹ On the Aegean

⁸²I assume some association of the idea “justificatory document” but was not able to clarify so “documents” is what I have identified them as. P. Tor. Choach. 12.3.21,23; 5.25 (B.C. 117, Dec 11; Thebes); P.vindob.Bosw.1.5 (A.D. 87; Arsinoite), Complaint from priests. Duke, “Papyri.info,” accessed October 2017, <http://papyri.info/ddbdp/p.vind.bosw;;1>. BGU 4 1033.lines 7&12 (A.D. 117 after; unknown origin). The context is a trial or a hearing. Duke, “Papyri.info,” October 2017, <http://papyri.info/ddbdp/bgu;4;1033>. P.Yadin 1 15.12,32 (A.D. 125, Oct. 11? Oct 12?; Maoza, Arabia) is a deposition. Duke, “Papyri.info,” accessed October 2017, <http://papyri.info/ddbdp/p.babatha;;15>. BGU 7 1654.1 (A.D. 133 after. Egypt). Duke, “Papyri.info,” accessed October 2017, <http://papyri.info/ddbdp/bgu;7;1654>. P.Yadin 1 24.FrA.line 9; FrE line 2 (A.D. 130?; Maoza, Arabia.), Duke, “Papyri.info,” accessed October 2017, <http://papyri.info/ddbdp/p.babatha;;24>.

⁸³SB 20 14111.1 (A.D. 161 Jun after; Egypt). Duke, “Papyri.info,” accessed October 2017, <http://papyri.info/ddbdp/sb;20;14111>.

⁸⁴BGU 4 1069 V line 2 (June-August(?), ca. A.D. 245 Arsinoites). Duke, “Papyri.info,” accessed October 2017, <http://papyri.info/ddbdp/bgu;4;1069>.

⁸⁵SB 6 9339.26 (A.D. 178 Bacchias; Arsinoite, Egypt) Duke, “Papyri.info,” accessed October 2017, <http://papyri.info/ddbdp/p.bacch;;21>; P.Fouad 1 13 (A.D. 178, Bacchias; Arsinoite, Egypt). Duke, “Papyri.info,” accessed October 2017, <http://papyri.info/ddbdp/p.bacch;;22>.

⁸⁶P.Diog. 9.18 (A.D. 186-210? Philadelpheia?, Egypt?) Duke, “Papyri.info,” accessed October 2017, <http://papyri.info/ddbdp/p.diog;;9>.

⁸⁷SPP 22 43,31 (A.D. 151, March 17; Egypt). Duke, “Papyri.info,” accessed October 2017, <http://papyri.info/ddbdp/stud.pal;22;43dupl>. P.Lond. 2 360.8 (A.D. 151, March 17; Egypt). Duke, “Papyri.info,” accessed October 2017, <http://papyri.info/ddbdp/p.lond;2;360dupl>.

⁸⁸Helene Cadell gives a careful explanation of the language of that text, explaining that τὰ δικαιώματά are the special privileges granted by Hadrian to Antinoites. Helene Cadell, “Vocabulaire de la Législation Ptolémaïque,” 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>.

⁸⁹Multiple 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.)⁹⁰ and Lysimachus' address to the Samians (B.C. 300-290), means "arguments."⁹¹ In Patissia, Attica, τὰ δ. are prepared to bind someone in a suit.⁹² In an inscription from Ephesos, Asia Minor, a governor asks for a list of his τὰ δ. "privileges/rights."⁹³ In Hermopolis Magna, Egypt, (A.D. 250), the speaker defends a rebuttal ἐ[ν] μεγίστῳ δικαίωματι "by means of a very great defense."⁹⁴

of context and/or surrounding data, or the reconstruction of δικαίωμα was too hypothetical, see: Ephesos 429 (IEph 590.8; Ephesos, Asia Minor), The Packard Humanities Institute (Project Centers: Cornell University and Ohio State University), "Searchable Greek Inscriptions A Scholarly Tool in Progress The Packard Humanities Institute," accessed October 2017, <http://epigraphy.packhum.org/text/248140?hs=80-89>. IG II² 1355.13 (Attica), The Packard Humanities Institute, "Searchable Greek Inscriptions", accessed October 2017, <http://epigraphy.packhum.org/text/3571?hs=567-577>. Ephesos 3780 (IEph 2125; Ephesos) Fragment of grant of burial rights (no name and no date; found at Ephesos), The Packard Humanities Institute, "Searchable Greek Inscriptions," accessed October 2017, <http://epigraphy.packhum.org/text/251524?hs=107-118>. Ephesos 429 (IEph 590.8), The Packard Humanities Institute, "Searchable Greek Inscriptions," accessed October 2017, <http://epigraphy.packhum.org/text/248140?hs=80-89>. Ephesos 3116 (IEph 4207), The Packard Humanities Institute, "Searchable Greek Inscriptions," accessed October 2017, <http://inscriptions.packhum.org/text/250853?hs=177-188>. SEG 34:1334 (Lycaonia, Asia Minor), The Packard Humanities Institute, "Searchable Greek Inscriptions," accessed October 2017, <http://epigraphy.packhum.org/text/275789?hs=250-260>. Two inscription were Christian and therefore not included as they attest readings from the Judeo-Christian Greek tradition: Lefebvre, IGChrEg 237.12,13 (Sohāg — Monastery of Amba Shenūdi, Nubia and Cyrenaica, Egypt) it occurs in a Christian prayer as "statutes." This occurrence is both, similar to those found in the Septuagint as τὰ δικαίωματα occurs as the object of διδάσκω and different as it also occurs as the object of συνερίζω "cause to understand." The Packard Humanities Institute, "Searchable Greek Inscriptions," accessed October 2017, <http://epigraphy.packhum.org/text/217300?hs=1294-1302%2C1367-1375%2C1435-1443>. In a Sicily, Italy (3rd/4th c. A.D.), a Christian inscription reads: ἀσύκριτον ἐν δικαίωματί σου "surpassing in your righteousness." JIWE 2 25 (3rd/4th c. AD; Sicily, Italy), The Packard Humanities Institute, "Searchable Greek Inscriptions," accessed October 2017, <http://epigraphy.packhum.org/text/178179?hs=330-339>.

⁹⁰SEG 17:415.4 (end 4th c. BC; Aegean Islands), The Packard Humanities Institute, "Searchable Greek Inscriptions," accessed October 2017, <http://epigraphy.packhum.org/text/322605?hs=716-725>.

⁹¹The context is a dispute between the Prienes, who possessed a valuable and fertile portion of land on the mainland, and the Samians, who tended to extend their land over into that of the Prienes (B.C. 300-290). The word probably means "arguments" when the people of Priene proved their immemorial possession of certain territory. Extant in two inscriptions: Samos 127.line 13 (Aegean Islands), The Packard Humanities Institute, "Searchable Greek Inscriptions", accessed October 2017, <http://epigraphy.packhum.org/text/254292?hs=1143-1152> and IG XII,6 1:155.line 13 (B.C. 283/2; Aegean Islands), The Packard Humanities Institute, "Searchable Greek Inscriptions," accessed October 2017, <http://epigraphy.packhum.org/text/343917?hs=1142-1151>.

⁹²IG III App. 94.8,11-12, The Packard Humanities Institute, "Searchable Greek Inscriptions," accessed October 2017, <http://epigraphy.packhum.org/text/234447?hs=362-371%2C487-4989>.

⁹³Ephesos 219.5 (IEph 217) Letter of governor asking for a list of his privileges. The Packard Humanities Institute, "Searchable Greek Inscriptions," accessed October 2017, <http://epigraphy.packhum.org/text/247926?hs=350-359>.

⁹⁴SPP 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 δικαιώματα 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."⁹⁵

Septuagint

Statistical observations. The noun δικαίωμα occurs 140 times⁹⁶ in the LXX (9 of these are compositional Greek).⁹⁷ 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),⁹⁸ and it is also

2017, <http://papyri.info/ddbdp/stud.pal;20;54>.

⁹⁵The 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 citizens, governors, citizens or foreign nationals; II. Physical object: (a.) documents.

⁹⁶Gen 26:5; Exod 15:25-26; 21:1, 9, 31; 24:3; Lev 25:18; Num 15:16; 27:11; 30:17; 31:21; 35:29; 36:13; Deut 4:1, 5-6, 8, 14, 40, 45; 5:1, 31; 6:1-2, 4, 17, 20, 24; 7:11-12; 8:11; 10:13; 11:1; 17:19; 26:16-17; 27:10; 28:45; 30:10, 16; 33:10; Ruth 4:7; 1 Sam 2:13; 8:3, 9, 11; 10:25; 27:11; 30:25; 2 Sam 19:29; 22:23; 1 Kgs 2:3; 3:28; 8:45, 59; 2 Kgs 17:8, 13, 19, 34, 37; 23:3; 2 Chr 6:35; 19:10; 1 Esdr 8:7; 1 Macc 1:13, 49; 2:21, 40; 4 Macc 18:6; Psa 17:23; 18:9; 49:16; 88:32; 104:45; 118:5, 8, 12, 16, 23-24, 26-27, 33, 48, 54, 56, 64, 68, 71, 80, 83, 93-94, 112, 117-118, 124, 135, 141, 145, 155, 171; 147:8; Ode 14:36-38; Prov 2:8; 8:20; 19:28; Job 34:27; Sir 4:17; 32:16; Hos 13:1; Mic 6:16; Mal 3:24; Jer 11:20; 18:19; Bar 2:12, 17, 19; 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. The occurrences in Num 36:13; Deut 6:4 [3]; Hos 13:1; Ruth 4:7; Psa 119:24; and Sir 4:17 are uncertain.

⁹⁷Compositional texts include: 1 Esdr 8:7; 1 Mac 1:13, 49; 2:21, 40; 4 Mac 18:6; and Ode 14:36, 37, 38. Edwin Hatch, and Henry A. Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament* (Including the Apocryphal Books), 2 vols. (Oxford, 1897-1906. Baker Reprint, 1983), 334-35; *The Revised Catss Hebrew/Greek Parallel Text*. Edited by Tov, Emanuel and Frank Polak. (*Accordance electronic ed.* Altamonte Springs: OakTree Software, 2008).

⁹⁸Gen 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 *mišpāt* “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 *tahbulāh* “guidance, direction, counsel” (x1).¹⁰² Four uses of δικαίωμα translate *šedāqāh* “righteousness”(x4).¹⁰³ Three words which are translated by δικαίωμα do not share overlap with its semantic range: *rīb* “strife” (x1),¹⁰⁴ *šûrâ* “shape, design” (x1),¹⁰⁵ and *yārīb* “adversary” (x1). The main driving force behind the semantic loan is the frequent use of δικαίωμα for *hōq/huqqâ* “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 δικαιομάτων (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

16; 1 Kgs 2:3; 2 Kgs 17:8, 13, 19, 34, 37; 23:3; 2 Sam 22:23; Ezek 36:27; Mic 6:16; Ps 18:23 [17.23]; 50:16 [49.16]; 89:32 [88.32]; 105:45 [104.45]; 119:5 [118.5], 8, 12, 16, 23, 26, 33, 48, 54, 64, 68, 71, 80, 83, 112, 117, 118, 124, 135, 145, 155, 171; 147:19 [8]; 2 Chr 19:10; 1 Esdr 8:7 [e7.10].

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 δικαιομάτων “the ways of righteous deeds.” Sir 32:16 δικαίωμα ὡς φῶς ἐξάψουσιν “they will ignite righteous deeds like a lamp.” Bar 2:19 τὰ δικαίωμα τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν “the righteous deeds of our fathers.”

¹⁰⁸1 Sam 8:9,11;10:25, τὸ δ. τοῦ βασιλέως “the judgment of the king” (see δικάζω in verse 6); 1 Kgs 3:28 τοῦ 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 cities, 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), 1 Samuel 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 This

¹⁰⁹Jer 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.”

¹¹⁰1 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*.

¹¹¹4 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.”

¹¹²Prov 8:20, ἀνά μέσον τρίβων δ. “in the center of paths of righteousness”; 19:28, καθυβρίζει δ. “he despises righteousness.”

¹¹³Jer 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 Ἰσραηλ “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 ἱερέως παρὰ τοῦ λαοῦ, “the priest’s due (of food) from the people”; the right of inheritance exchange, Ruth 4:7.

¹¹⁵Gen 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

<p>ἀνθ' ὧν ὑπήκουσεν Ἀβραὰμ ὁ πατήρ σου τῆς ἐμῆς φωνῆς, καὶ ἐφύλαξεν τὰ προστάγματα μου καὶ τὰς ἐντολάς μου καὶ τὰ <u>δικαιώματά</u> μου καὶ τὰ νόμιμά μου.</p>	<p>“since your father Abraam obeyed my voice and kept my ordinances and my commandments and my <u>statutes</u> and my precepts.”</p>
---	--

τὰ δικαιώματά is in a word list, where each lexeme conveys a similar sense to the others, all the while maintaining its own nuance.¹¹⁶ The words are connected by conjunctive καί, 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).¹¹⁷ Thus, τὰ δικαιώματα took on meaning from *hōq/huqqā* “statute.”

One or more of the following nouns is most often in a list with τὰ δικαιώματά: νόμος “law,” κρίσις “judgment,” κρίμα “judgment,” ἐντολή “command,” μαρτυρία “testimony,” and/or πρόσταγμα “commandment.” Positively, τὰ δικαιώματά 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

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; Ezek 5:6, 7; 11:20; 18:9; 20:11, 13, 16, 18, 19, 21, 24, 25; 36:27; 43:11; 44:24.

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, 16;

announce,” δηγέομαι “to recite,” μελετάω “study,” and άδολεσχέω “meditate.” Negatively, the word is an object of έκκλίνω “to pervert,” καταλείπω “to leave,” άφίστημι “put away,” βεβηλόω “to violate,” and έπιλανθάνομαι “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 έν 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 έκ τῶν έντολῶν διδάξει → τὰ δ. In the Psalms, τὰ δικαιώματα are εύθεϊα (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 άμωμος “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.¹¹⁸ At the same time, he intentionally uses features of the Pentateuchal translation style, a literary tactic in compositional Jewish texts.¹¹⁹ Note his use of δικαίωμα.

¹¹⁸Marieke 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 άπαλλάσσω Homeric (?); 9.8a τανύω in LXX (other is Sir 43.12) Homeric; 9.18a άναπνέω hapax in the LXX, 11x in the Iliad; 9.30a άπολούω hapax in LXX; 9.33a εΐθε hapax in the LXX, Homeric; 10.1a κάμνω 2x in Iob (other is 17.2); 3x outside Iob in LXX, Homeric; 10.10b τυρός hapax; 17.2a λίσσομαι hapax.”

¹¹⁹Dhont, *Old Greek Job*, 332.

¹²¹אֲשֶׁר עָלְבָן סָרוּ מֵאַחֲרָיו וְכַל־דַּרְכָּיו לֹא הִשְׁכִּילוּ־וְדֵי אֲשֶׁר עָלְבָן סָרוּ מֵאַחֲרָיו וְכַל־דַּרְכָּיו לֹא הִשְׁכִּילוּ־וְדֵי ὅτι ἐξέκλιναν ἐκ νόμου θεοῦ, δικαιώματα δὲ αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἐπέγνωσαν

because they turned aside from following because they turned aside from God's 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 δικαιώματα 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

¹²⁰The Greek text comes from the critical edition of Job by Ziegler. The English translations of the Greek are derived from the 2007 *New English Translation of the Septuagint*. I modify the English translation when necessary. Joseph Ziegler, *Job. Septuaginta, Band XI, 4* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982).

¹²¹Cited from Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia, 4th ed., and the English translation is cited from the New Revised Standard Version.

¹²²ἡ ὁδός Job 4:6; 12:24; 17:9; 19:12; 21:14; 22:28; 23:10, 11; 24:4; 24:13 (ὁδὸν δὲ δικαιοσύνης); 28:23; 31:7; 38:25; ἀνάπαυμα “rest” 3:23; ὑπὸ πάντων 6:18; ἀσεβής 8:19; λαλέω 13:15; ἔργον 34:21; 36:23; δικαίωμα 34:27; γῆ 38:19; πόθεν 38:24; πλάσμα 40:19.

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.

¹²⁴The meanings that occur in the Septuagint are as follows: I. The result of physical

δικαίωμα for “ordinance, statute.” This borrowing seems to have occurred as the word most often translated *hōq/huqqâ* “statute.”

Greek Jewish Literature

In Jewish Greek literature, δικαίωμα occurs 17 times, with the following meanings: (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

movement: a. an action that is right/righteous; b. an action performed with the intention of righting a wrong; II. Based on speaking or thinking a. the Nomen Actionis of showing or declaring one to be in the right; b. a defense offered for the correctness of a position; c. something spoken that is right/righteous; d. the quality of being righteous (always singular); e. a principle that someone advocates; f. something due a person, i. based on social class/status, ii. legislated to cities, governors, citizens or foreign nationals, iii. based on religious or cultural requirements; g. laws or decrees (or their stipulations) made by a sovereign (mostly pl.).

¹²⁵J.*Antiq.*17.108 (quoting Nic.Dam.Damascenus Fragmenta 95.17-18), B. Niese, *Flavii Iosephi opera*, vols. 1-4 (1887-1890; repr., Berlin: Weidmann, 1955), University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0526:001:2125238>; Ph.*De decalogo* 109.2 τῶν πρὸς ἀνθρώπους δ., L. Cohn, *Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt*, vol. 4 (1902; repr., Berlin: De Gruyter, 1962), 269-307, University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0018:023:43169>; Ph.*Quaestiones in Genesim* (frag.) 4.184.1; F. Petit, *Quaestiones in Genesim et in Exodum. Fragmenta Graeca*, Les oeuvres de Philon d’Alexandrie 33 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1978), University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0018:034:61564>.

¹²⁶*Apocalypsis Enochi* 104.9.3, οὐ γὰρ εἰς δικαίωμα εἰσάγ[ουσιν]; M. Black, *Apocalypsis Henochi Graece, Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece* 3 (Leiden: Brill, 1970), 19-44, University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?1463:001:58572>.

¹²⁷(i.) based on ancestry: J.*Antiq.* 17.228.2, τὰ δ. προετίθει “putting forward his rights.” B. Niese, *Flavii Iosephi opera*, vols 1-4 (1887-1890; repr., Berlin: Weidmann, 1955), University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0526:001:2167223>.

(ii.) legislated to cities, governors, citizens or foreign nationals: The δ. of the Alexandrian Jews, J.*Antiq.*19.285.3, *De bello Judaico* 7:111.1, and *Contra Apionem* (= *De Iudaeorum vetustate*) 2.37.4; B. Niese, *Flavii Iosephi opera*, University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0526:001:2428977>; <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0526:004:948576>; and <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0526:003:106673>.

οὐκ ἐφυλάξατε τὰ δ. μου.¹²⁸ 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’ ἐνὸς 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 *Levi* 14:4 (Testamenta XII Patriarcharum 3.14.4.5), τοῖς τοῦ θεοῦ δ.; M. de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text* (Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece 1.2. Leiden: Brill, 1978), University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?1700:002:35814>.

Judah 13:1 (Testamenta XII Patriarcharum 4.13.1.3), τοῦ ποιεῖν τὰ δ. κυρίου; M. de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?1700:002:54545>.

Paraleipomena Jeremioi 6.23.6 (long version, 4th Baruch 6.23), οὐκ ἐφυλάξατε τὰ δ. μου; R.A. Kraft and A.-E. Purinton, *Texts and Translations 1*. Pseudepigrapha Series 1 (Missoula, Montana: Society of Biblical Literature, 1972), University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?1772:001:17989>.

Ph.*Quod deterius potiori insidiari soleat* 67.3 (Det. 67); L. Cohn, *Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt*, vol. 1 (1896; repr. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1962), University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0018:005:34454>.

Ph.*Quod deterius potiori insidiari soleat* 68.3 (Det. 68); Cohn, *Philonis Alexandrini*, University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0018:005:34700>.

Ph.*Quis rerum divinarum heres sit*. 8.6 (Her. 8); P. Wendland, *Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt*, vol. 3 (1898; repr. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1962), University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0018:015:1883>.

Ph.*De congressu eruditionis gratia*. 163.10 (Congr. 163), Wendland, *Philonis Alexandrini*, University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2017, <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0018:016:6499>.

Ph.*De somniis*. 2.175.4; Wendland, *Philonis Alexandrini*, 204-306, University of California, “Thesaurus Linguae Graecae,” accessed October 2107, <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0018:019:165688>.

1:32; 2:26 τὰ δ. τοῦ νόμου; 8:14 τὸ δ. τοῦ νόμου; Hebrews 9:1, 10.

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).¹²⁹

LXX Leviticus 25:18a

Cadell attributes the dominant use in the Pentateuch to metonymy regarding the idea "rules of law."¹³⁰ 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.¹³¹ Cadell's theory would adequately explain the usage in Leviticus 25:18.¹³²

¹²⁹G. W. H. Lampe, ed., *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford: Oxford Press, 1961), 371.

¹³⁰Cadell, "Vocabulaire de la Législation Ptolémaïque," 218, 220.

¹³¹*Ibid.*, 221.

¹³²The 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. The Greek text comes from the critical edition of Leviticus, by John William Wevers. The English translations of the Greek are derived from the 2007 *New English Translation of the Septuagint*. I modify the English translation when necessary.

MT

LXX

וְעָשִׂיתֶם אֶת־קִדְוָתַי וְאֶת־מִשְׁפָּטַי תִּשְׁמְרוּ וְעָשִׂיתֶם
אֹתָם וְיִשְׁבְּתֶם עַל־הָאָרֶץ לְבָטָח

καὶ ποιήσετε πάντα τὰ δικαιώματά μου
καὶ πάσας τὰς κρίσεις μου, καὶ
φυλάξασθε καὶ ποιήσετε αὐτά, 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.¹³³ As mentioned in the example of Gen 26:5 τὰ δικαιώματα is in part of a parallel word pair connected by conjunctive καί. 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.¹³⁴ As a result τὰ δικαιώματά took on nuances from both parallelisms in the contexts where it occurred as a result of translating the underlying *hōq/huqqâ* “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.”¹³⁵

Conclusion

The history of reception revealed a fairly broad semantic range for δικαίωμα 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 exhibit semantic consistency (δικαιόω “consider/make right” vs. δικαίωμα “statute, ordinance”). Second, the

¹³³In 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.”

¹³⁴Gen 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;

¹³⁵Cameron 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/ḥuqqâ* “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 לָקַח 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 ḥōq "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

COGNATES¹

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

¹This list was compiled using Michael Sokoloff, *A Syriac Lexicon: A Translation from the Latin: Correction, Expansion, and Update of C. Brockelmann's Lexicon Syriacum* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2009); Sokoloff, *A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic of the Byzantine Period*, 2nd ed. (Ramat Gan, Israel: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003); Sokoloff, *A Dictionary of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic of the Talmudic and Geonic Periods* (Ramat Gan, Israel.: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 2003); Abraham Ṭal, *A Dictionary of Samaritan Aramaic*, 2 vols. (Leiden: Brill Academic Pub, 2000); Bezalel Porten and Jerome A. Lund, *Aramaic Documents from Egypt: A Key-Word-in-Context Concordance* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2002); Wilhelm Gesenius, Rudolf Meyer, and Herbert Donner, *Hebräisches Und Aramäisches Handwörterbuch Über Das Alte Testament*, 18th ed. (Berlin: Springer, 2013); Michael Sokoloff, *A Dictionary of Judean Aramaic* (Ramat-Gan: Bar Ilan University Press, 2003); Sokoloff, *A Dictionary of Christian Palestinian Aramaic* (Leuven: Peeters Publishers, 2014).

²Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *A Wandering Aramaean: Collected Aramaic Essays*, SBL Monograph Series (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1979), 60-62.

³E. Vogt, *Lexicon of Biblical Aramaic: Clarified by Ancient Documents*, Subsidia Biblica 42, trans. Joseph A. Fitzmyer (Rome: Gregorian & Biblical Press, 2011), 193.

⁴Bezalel Porten, ed., *Textbook of Aramaic Documents from Ancient Egypt* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1999).

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 - לחם, לחמא - bread
- Samaritan Aramaic - לחים - bread, food
- Judean Aramaic - לחם - bread, food
- Christian Palestinian Aramaic - *LḤM* - bread, loaf of bread

ii. Eastern

- Jewish Babylonian Aramaic - לחמא - bread, food
- Talmudic Aramaic - לחם, נהמא - food, bread
 - Zebahim- food, bread (trnsf. → tribute)
 - Meilah- food, bread (trnsf. → tribute)
- Syriac - *lahmā* - bread, meal, food
- Mandaean - *lahma* - bread, food
- Midrash⁶ (400-1500C.E.) - לחם - food, bread
 - Ruth Rabbah (500-640C.E.) - food, bread (trnsf. → 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 → δικαιόω → 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 δικαιομάτων “the ways of righteous deeds”; LXX *Sir.* 32:16 δικαίωματα ὡς φῶς ἐξάψουσιν “they will ignite righteous deeds like a lamp”; LXX *Bar.* 2:19; *Ph.De decalogo* 109.2 τῶν πρὸς ἀνθρώπους *δ.*; *Ph.Quaestiones in Genesim (frag.)* 4.184.1; *Rom* 5:18, δι’ ἐνὸς δικαιομάτου “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 δικαίωματα δέ, τὰ ἀπὸ δικαιοσύνης (also quoted in *Ar.Did.Liber de philosophum 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 τοὺς 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 Romanae* 3.10.4.2; 3.11.3.4,11; 3.12.1.3; *SPP* 20 54.20 ἐ[ν] μεγίστῳ δικαιομάτι “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 δικαίωμα τῷ κυρίῳ “glory and justification to the Lord”; Rom 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.”

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 ὄπλων ἰσχυρότερόν ἐστι “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 ἔργῳ ἴσον ὥσπερ τῷ δ. ἐστὶν “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 περιεῖναι 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 Ἐλεγεν δὲ ἡ μήτηρ τῶν ἑπτὰ παιδῶν καὶ ταῦτα τὰ 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 τριβῶν δ. “in the center of paths of righteousness”; 19:28, καθυβρίζει δ. “he despises righteousness”; *Apocalypsis Enochi* 104.9.3, οὐ γὰρ εἰς δικαίωμα εἰσάγ[ουσιν]; “do not lead to righteousness”

g. idea/word that seeks to make right

Pl.*Leges* 684.e.2-3, τῶν δὲ ἄλλων 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, τὸ δ. τοῦ βασιλέως “the judgment of the king” (see δικάζω in verse 6).

h. a principle that someone advocates

Th.*Historiae* 5.97.1.1-6, Δικαιώματι γὰρ οὐδετέρους ἐλλείπειν ἡγοῦνται “as to a cause, they think that neither of the two is lacking one”; LXX Jer. 11:20 ὅτι πρὸς 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 Ἰσραὴλ “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 ἐλευθερίας “the right of liberty”; J.*Antiquitates Judaicae* 17.228.2, τὰ δ. προετίθει “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; 38.12.2.1.1-2; 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 cities, 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, ἀπαγγέλλω, διηγέομαι “to recite,” μελετάω “study,” ἀδολεσχεύω and “meditate.” Negatively it is a verbal complement of ἐκκλίνω “to pervert,” καταλείπω “to leave,” ἀφίστημι “put away,” βεβηλόω “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 τὸν νόμον 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 ἐκ 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 δικαιομάτων “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 ἄμωμος “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.τάκ τῶν νόμων “the ordinances in accordance with the law”; *D.C.Historiae Romanae* 36.40.2.1, οὐ γάρ 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 δ. τη[ς] δίκης; 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 αντίγραφα τῶν δ. “copies of the documents” and line 16 τὰ παρ’ ἐμοῦ δ. πάντα “all my documents”; P.Gurob 2.39 [γραπ]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] [έν] τοῖς δ. “the list which was transmitted in the documents of defense”; P.Col.4 119.3 παραθέσθαι ἐν δικα[ιώμασι “set forth in the documents”; P.Tor. Choach. 12.3.21, 23; 12.5.25; J.*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 παρακειμένω(ν)/δικαιωμάτων “appended documents”; P.Diog. 9.18 τοῖς δι[και]ώμασι τοῦ γάμου “in the wedding documents”; BGU 4 1069 V αντίγραφον δικ(αιώματος) “copy of a legal proof”; IG III App. 94.8, 11-12 τὰ δικαιώματα 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.”

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abegg, Martin G., James E. Bowley, Edward M. Cook, Emanuel Tov, and Eugene Ulrich. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance*. Vol. 1.2. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Adrados, Francisco Rodriguez, gen. ed. *Diccionario Griego-Español*. Vol. 5. Madrid, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1997.
- _____. *A History of the Greek Language: From Its Origins to the Present*. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Aejmelaeus, Anneli. "Function and Interpretation of כִּי in Biblical Hebrew." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 105, no. 2 (1986): 193-209.
- _____. *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays*. Rev. ed. Dudley, MA: Peeters, 2007.
- _____. "Participium Coniunctum as a Criterion of Translation Technique." *Vetus Testamentum* 32, no. 4 (1982): 385-93.
- _____. "Translation Technique and the Intention of the Translator." In *VII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Leuven, 1989*, edited by Claude E. Cox., 23-36. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1991.
- _____. "What Can We Know about the Hebrew Vorlage of the Septuagint?" *Zeitschrift Für Die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 99, no. 1 (1987): 58-89.
- Aitken, James K. *No Stone Unturned: Greek Inscriptions and Septuagint Vocabulary*. Critical Studies in Hebrew Bible 5. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2014.
- _____, ed. *The T and T Clark Companion to the Septuagint*. Bloomsbury Companions. London: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2015.
- Baer, David A. *When We All Go Home: Translation and Theology in LXX Isaiah 56-66*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 318. Hebrew Bible and Its Versions. Vol. 1. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- Barr, James. *Semantics of Biblical Language*. London: Oxford University Press, 1961.
- _____. *The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations*. Mitteilungen Des Septuaginta-Unternehmens 15. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979.
- Beekes, R. S. P., and Lucien van Beek. *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

- Beentjes, Pancratius C. *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew: A Text Edition of All Extant Hebrew Manuscripts and a Synopsis of All Parallel Hebrew Ben Sira Texts*. New York: Brill, 1997.
- Ben-Hayyim Zeev, and Akademyah la-lashon ha-'Ivrit (Jerusalem) : ספר בן סירא : המקור, קונקורדנציה וניתוח אוצר המלים. Jerusalem: ha-Akademyah la-lashon ha-'Ivrit, 1973.
- Bergsma, John Sietze. *The Jubilee from Leviticus to Qumran: A History of Interpretation*. Boston: Brill, 2007.
- Bethe, E. Pollucis *Onomasticon*. 2 vols. Lexicographi Graeci 9.1-9.2. Leipzig: Teubner, 1900-1931. Accessed October 2017. <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0542:001:614944>.
- Black, M. *Apocalypsis Henochi Graece*. Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece 3. Leiden: Brill, 1970. Accessed October 2017. <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?1463:001:58572>.
- Blake, Barry J. *Case*. 2nd ed. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Boisacq, Émile. *Dictionnaire Étymologique De La Langue Grecque*. 4th ed. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1950.
- Boissevain, U. P. *Cassii Dionis Cocceiani Historiarum Romanarum Quae Supersunt*. 3 vols. 1895-1901. Reprint, Berlin: Weidmann, 1955. Accessed October 2017. <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0385:001:695027>.
- Boyd-Taylor, Cameron. "Calque-culations—Loan Words and the Lexicon." *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 38 (2005): 79-99.
- _____. "Lingusitic Register." In *Biblical Greek Language and Lexicography: Essays in Honor of Frederick W. Danker*, edited by Bernard A Taylor, 149-66. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2004.
- Brémond, É., and G. Mathieu, *Isocrate. Discours*. Vol. 2. 1938. Reprint, Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1967. Accessed October 2017. <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0010:016:9905>.
- Brown, Francis, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs., eds. *Hebrew & English Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Translated by Edward Robinson. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980.
- Büchner, Dirk, ed. *The SBL Commentary on the Septuagint: An Introduction*. Atlanta: SBL, 2016.
- Buck, Carl Darling. *Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1933.
- _____. *A Dictionary of Selected Synonyms in the Principal Indo-European Languages: A Contribution to the History of Ideas*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1949.

- Buck, Carl Darling, and Walter Petersen. *A Reverse Index of Greek Nouns and Adjectives, Arranged by Terminations with Brief Historical Introduction*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1945.
- Burnet, J. *Platonis Opera*. Vol. 5. 1907. Reprint, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967. Accessed October 2017. <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0059:034:554458>.
- Bywater, I. *Aristotelis Ethica Nicomachea*. 1894. Reprint, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962. Accessed October 2017. <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0086:010:190851>.
- Cadell, Helene "Vocabulaire de la Législation Ptolémaïque Problème du Sens de *Dikaiôma* Dans le Pentateuque." In *Katá Tous O': Selon Les Septante: Trente Études Sur La Bible Grecque Des Septante En Hommage À Marguerite Harl*, edited by Gilles Dorival, and Olivier Munnich, 207-221. Paris: Cerf, 1995.
- Caragounis, Chrys C. *The Development of Greek and the New Testament: Morphology, Syntax, Phonology, and Textual Transmission*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.
- Chantraine, Pierre. *La Formation Des Noms en Grec Ancien*. Paris: C. Klincksieck, 1968.
- Chantraine, Pierre, Jean Taillardat, Alain Blanc, et al. *Dictionnaire Étymologique de la Langue Grecque: Histoire des Mots*. Paris: Klincksieck, 2009.
- Christidēs, A.-Ph, M. Arapopoulou, and Maria Chritē. *A History of Ancient Greek: From the Beginnings to Late Antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Clackson, James. *Indo-European Linguistics: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Clines, David J. A. *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.
- Cohn, L. *Philonis Alexandrini Opera Quae Supersunt*. Vol. 1. Berlin: Reimer, 1896. Reprint, Berlin: De Gruyter, 1962. Accessed October 2017. <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0018:005:34454>.
- _____. *Philonis Alexandrini Opera Quae Supersunt*. Vol. 4. Berlin: Reimer, 1902. Reprint, Berlin: De Gruyter, 1962. Accessed October 2017. <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0018:023:43169>.
- Conybeare, F. C., and St. George Stock. *A Grammar of Septuagint Greek*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing Company, 1980.
- Coogan, Michael D., Marc Z. Brettler, and Carol Newsom, eds. *The New Oxford Annotated Bible with Apocrypha: New Revised Standard Version*. Rev. ed. Garden City, NY: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Cox, Claude E., ed. *VII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Leuven, 1989*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1991.

- _____. "Job." In *T and T Clark Companion to the Septuagint*, edited by J. K. Aitken, 385-400. London: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2015.
- Crown, Alan D. *Samaritan Scribes and Manuscripts*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001.
- Crystal, David. *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. 6th ed. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2008.
- Daniel, Suzanne. *Le Vocabulaire du Culte dans la Septante*. Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck, 1966.
- Danker, Frederick William, ed. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001.
- de Jonge, M. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text. Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece 1.2*. Leiden: Brill, 1978. Accessed October 2017. <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?1700:002:35814>.
- De Rossi, Giovanni Bernardo. *Variae lectiones Veteris Testamenti librorum, ex immensa manuscriptorum editorumque codicum congerie haustae et ad Samaritanum textum, ad vetustissimas versiones, ad accuratiores sacrae criticae fontes ac leges examinatae*. Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1969.
- 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.
- Dhont, M. *Style and Context of Old Greek Job*. Journal for the Study of Judaism Supplement Series 183. Leiden: Brill, 2018.
- Dines, Jennifer M. *The Septuagint*. Edited by Michael A. Knibb. New York: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Dotan, Aron, ed. *[torah Nevi'im U-Khetuvim] =: Biblia Hebraica Leningradensia: Prepared According to the Vocalization, Accents, and Masora of Aaron Ben Moses Ben Asher in the Leningrad Codex*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2001.
- The Duke Collaboratory for Classics Computing & the Institute for the Study of the Ancient World. "Papyri.info." *papyri.info*. Accessed October 2017. <http://papyri.info/>.
- Dunand, Françoise. "The Religious System at Alexandria." In *A Companion to Greek Religion*, edited by Daniel Ogden, 253-63. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.
- Elliger, Karl, and Wilhelm Rudolph, eds. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. 4th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1997.
- Englund, Gertie. *Offerings*. In *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Ancient Egypt*, edited by Donald B. Redford, 564-69. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.

- Evans, Trevor V. *Verbal Syntax in the Greek Pentateuch: Natural Greek Usage and Hebrew Interference*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Gall, August Freiherrn von. *Der Hebräische Pentateuch der Samaritaner*. Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1914.
- Gasquet, Francis Aidan. *Biblia Sacra Iuxta Latinam Vulgatam Versionem ad Codicum Fidem*. Rome: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1926.
- Gesenius, Wilhelm, Rudolf Meyer, and Herbert Donner. *Hebräisches Und Aramäisches Handwörterbuch Über Das Alte Testament*. 18. ed. Berlin: Springer, 2013.
- Giannakis, Georgios K., and Vít Bubeník. *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics*. Leiden: Brill, 2014.
- Glenny, W. Edward. *Finding Meaning in the Text: Translation Technique and Theology in the Septuagint of Amos*. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Good, Roger. *The Septuagint's Translation of the Hebrew Verbal System in Chronicles*. Supplements to the Vetus Testamentum. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Goodrich, Chauncey A., and Caspar Frederic Hachenberg. *Elements of Greek Grammar*. Hartford, CT: Oliver D. Cooke & Co, 1828.
- Hasselbrook, David S. *Studies in New Testament Lexicography: Advancing Toward a Full Diachronic Approach with the Greek Language*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.
- Hatch, Edwin, and Henry A. Redpath. *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (Including the Apocryphal Books)*. 2 vols. Oxford, 1897-1906. Reprint, Grand Rapids: Baker, 1983.
- Herbst, Thomas. *A Valency Dictionary of English: A Corpus-Based Analysis of the Complementatation Patterns of English Verbs, Nouns, and Adjectives*. Topics in English Linguistics 40. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2004.
- Herbst, Thomas, and Katrin Götz-Votteler, eds. *Valency: Theoretical, Descriptive and Cognitive Issues*. Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs 187. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2007.
- Hiebert, Robert J. V. *"Translation Is Required": The Septuagint in Retrospect and Prospect*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010.
- Hjelm, Ingrid. *The Samaritans and Early Judaism: A Literary Analysis*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- Hornblower, Simon, and Antony Spawforth, eds. *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Huber, Karl. *Untersuchungen über den Sprachcharakter des Griechischen Leviticus*. Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1916.

- Jacoby, K. *Dionysii Halicarnasei Antiquitatum Romanarum quae Supersunt*, 4 vols. 1899. Reprint, Leipzig: Teubner, 1967. Accessed October 2017. <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0081:001:421463>.
- Jannaris, Antonius N. *An Historical Greek Grammar, Chiefly of the Attic Dialect As Written and Spoken from Classical Antiquity Down to the Present Time, Founded Upon the Ancient Texts, Inscriptions, Papyri and Present Popular Greek*. London: Macmillan Co, 1897.
- Jastrow, Marcus. *Dictionary of the Targumim, Talmud Bavli, Talmud Yerushalmi and Midrashic Literature*. New York: Pardes, 1950.
- Jobs, Karen H., and Moisés Silva. *Invitation to the Septuagint*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids, Baker Academic, 2015.
- Jones, H. S. and J. E. Powell. *Thucydidis Historiae*. 2 vols. 1942. Reprint, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967-1970. Accessed October 2017. <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0003:001:50049>.
- Joosten, Jan. "Divergent Cultic Practices in the Septuagint: The 'shoulder' (βραχίων) of the Priest." *The Journal of Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 48 (2015): 27-38.
- _____. "The Vocabulary of the Septuagint and Its Historical Context." In *Septuagint Vocabulary: Pre-history, Usage, Reception*, edited by Eberhard Bons and Jan Joosten, 1-12. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 58. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011.
- Kennicott, Benjamin. *Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum, cum Variis Lectionibus*. Oxford: E. Typographeo Clarendoniano, 1776.
- Kloekhorst, Alwin. *Etymology of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Koehler, Ludwig, Walter Baumgartner, and Johann J. Stamm. *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. 5 vols. Translated and edited under supervision of M. E. J. Richardson. Leiden: Brill, 1994-2000.
- Kraft, R. A., and A.-E. Purinton, *Texts and Translations 1. Pseudepigrapha Series 1*, Missoula, MT: Society of Biblical Literature, 1972. Accessed October 2017. <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?1772:001:17989>.
- Kraus, Wolfgang, and R. Glenn Wooden, eds. *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.
- Kreuzer, Siegfried. *The Bible in Greek: Translation, Transmission, and Theology of the Septuagint*. Septuagint and Cognate Studies. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015.
- Kroeger, Paul R. *Analyzing Grammar: An Introduction*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- _____. *Analyzing Syntax: A Lexical-functional Approach*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

- Kühner, Raphael, B. B. Edwards, and Samuel H. Taylor. *Grammar of the Greek Language, for the Use of High Schools and Colleges*. Andover, MA: Allen, Morrill and Wardwell, 1844.
- Lampe, G. W. H., ed. *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*. Oxford: Oxford Press, 1961.
- Lane, David J. *The Peshitta of Leviticus*. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Lange, Armin, and Emanuel Tov, eds. *Textual History of the Bible: The Hebrew Bible*. Vol. 1B, *Pentateuch, Former and Latter Prophets*. Leiden: Brill, 2017.
- Lee, John A. L. *A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch*. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 14. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983.
- Levin, Beth, and Malka Rappaport Hovav. *Argument Realization*. Research Surveys in Linguistics. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Levine, Baruch A. *Leviticus: Va-Yikra: the Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation*. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 2003.
- Liddell, Henry G., Robert Scott, and Henry S. Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon*. 9th rev. ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.
- Lieber, Rochelle. *Deconstructing Morphology: Word Formation in Syntactic Theory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Lisowsky, Gerhard. *Konkordanz Zum Hebräischen Alten Testament*. 3rd ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelges., 2009.
- Louw, Theo A. W. van der. *Transformations in the Septuagint: Towards an Interaction of Septuagint Studies and Translation Studies*. Leuven: Peters, 2007.
- Lowy, S. *The Principles of Samaritan Bible Exegesis*. Leiden: Brill, 1977.
- Malchukov, Andrej, and Andrew Spencer, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of CASE*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Maltby, Robert. *A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies*. Leeds: Cairns, 1991.
- Martinez, F. Garcia, and M. Vervenne, eds. *Interpreting Translation: Studies On the LXX and Ezekiel in Honour of Johan Lust*. Leuven: Peeters Publishers, 2005.
- Matthews, P. H. *Morphology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Mayser, E. *Grammatik der Griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit, Laut- und Wortlehre*. Leipzig: B. T. Teubner, 1906.
- Meillet, A., and J. Vendryes. *Traité de Grammaire Comparée des Langues Classiques*. Paris: H. Champion, 1953.
- Moulton, James Hope, and Wilbert Francis Howard. *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.

- Moraux, P. *Du Ciel*, Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1965. Accessed October 2017. <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0086:005:55599>.
- Mullach, F. W. A. *Fragmenta Philosophorum Graecorum*, Vol. 2. Paris: Didot, 1867. Accessed October 2017. <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0529:002:78469>.
- Müller, K. *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum* 3, Paris: Didot, 1841-1870. Accessed October 2017. <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0577:003:180076>.
- Muraoka, T. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. Rev. ed. Louvain: Peeters, 2010.
- _____. *A Greek-Hebrew/Aramaic Two-Way Index to the Septuagint*. Louvain: Peeters Publishers, 2010.
- _____. "Septuagintal Lexicography: Some General Issues," 17-47. In T. Muraoka, *Melbourne Symposium on Septuagint Lexicography*, Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series, no. 28. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.
- Nickau, K. *Ammonii qui Dicitur Liber de Adfinium Vocabulorum Differentia*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1966. Accessed October 2017. <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0708:001:90108>.
- Niese, B. *Flavii Iosephi Opera*, Vols. 1-4, Reprint, 1955. Berlin: Weidmann, 1887-1890. Accessed October 2017. <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0526:001:2125238>.
- Pack, R.A. *Artemidori Daldiani Onirocriticon Libri V*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1963. Accessed October 2017. <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0553:001:466307>.
- The Packard Humanities Institute* (Project Centers: Cornell University and Ohio State University). "Searchable Greek Inscriptions A Scholarly Tool in Progress The Packard Humanities Institute." Accessed October 2017. <http://epigraphy.packhum.org/>.
- Palmer, Leonard R. *The Greek Language*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1996.
- Palmieri, V. *Herennius Philo. De diversis verborum significationibus* Naples: M. D'Auria, 1988. Accessed October 2017. <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?1416:001:47517>.
- Peile, John. *An Introduction to Greek and Latin Etymology*. London: Macmillan, 1872.
- Peshitta Institute. *The Old Testament in Syriac According to the Peshitta Version Part I Fasc. 2. Leviticus; Numbers; Deuteronomy; Part II, Fasc. 1b. Joshua*. Leiden: Brill, 1991.
- Petit, F. *Quaestiones in Genesim et in Exodum. Fragmenta Graeca. (Les oeuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie 33.)* Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1978. Accessed October 2017. <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0018:034:61564>.

- Pietersma, Albert, and Benjamin G. Wright. *A New English Translation of the Septuagint: And the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included Under That Title*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Porten, Bezalel, and Ada Yardeni, eds. *Textbook of Aramaic Documents from Ancient Egypt*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1999.
- Radermacher, L. and H. Usener, *Dionysii Halicarnasei quae Exstant*. Vol. 5. Reprint, 1965. Leipzig: Teubner, 1899. Accessed October 2017. <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0081:011:6172>.
- Rix, Helmut. *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen: Laut- u. Formenlehre*. Darmstadt, Germany: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1976.
- Robertson, A. T. *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*, 4th ed. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1934.
- Rose, V. *Aristotelis qui Ferebantur Librorum Fragmenta*, 1886. Reprint, Leipzig: Teubner, 1967. Accessed October 2017. <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0086:051:615947>.
- Ross, W.D. *Aristotelis ars Rhetorica*. 1959. Reprint, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964. Accessed October 2017. <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0086:038:26442>.
- Sabatier, Pierre, Vincent de La Rue, and Réginaud Florentain. *Bibliorum Sacrorum Latinæ versiones antiquæ, seu vetus Italica, et cæteræ quæcunque in codicibus mss. & antiquorum libris reperiri potuerunt: quæ cum Vulgata Latina, & cum textu Græco comparantur*. Remis, France: Apud Reginaldum Florentain, 1743.
- Schweizer, E. *Grammatik der Pergamenischen Inschriften, Beiträge zur Laut- und Flexions- ehre der Gemeingriechischen Sprache*. Berlin: Weidmann, 1898.
- Schwyzler, Eduard, Demetrius J. Georgacas, and Karl Brugmann. *Griechische Grammatik: auf der Grundlage von Karl Grugmanns Griechischer Grammatik*. München: C.H. Beck, 1939.
- Screnock, John. *Traductor Scriptor, Supplements to the Vetus Testamentum 174*. Leiden: Brill, 2017.
- Shoshan, Abraham Even, ed. *New Concordance of the Old Testament*. Jerusalem: Kuperard, 1990.
- Sihler, Andrew L. *New Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Skehan, Patrick W., Eugene Ulrich, Judith E. Sanderson, and P. J. Parsons. *Qumran Cave 4. Palæo-Hebrew and Greek Biblical Manuscripts IV*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.
- Smyth, Herbert Weir, and Gordon M. Messing. *Greek Grammar*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1984.

- Snaith, N. H. *Leviticus and Numbers*. New Century Bible Based on the Revised Standard Version. London: Oliphants, 1977.
- Sokoloff, Michael. *A Dictionary of Christian Palestinian Aramaic*. Leuven: Peeters Publishers, 2014.
- _____. *A Dictionary of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic of the Talmudic and Geonic Periods*. Ramat Gan, Israel: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 2003.
- _____. *A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic of the Byzantine Period*, 2nd ed. Ramat Gan, Israel: The Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 2003.
- _____. *A Dictionary of Judean Aramaic*. Ramat Gan, Israel: Bar Ilan University Press, 2003.
- _____. *A Syriac Lexicon: A Translation from the Latin: Correction, Expansion, and Update of C. Brockelmann's Lexicon Syriacum*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2009.
- Sollamo, Raija, and Seppo Sipilä, eds. *Helsinki Perspectives On the Translation Technique of the Septuagint: Proceedings of the IOSCS Congress in Helsinki 1999 (Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society, 82)*. Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001.
- Sperber, Alexander. *The Bible in Aramaic, Based on Old Manuscripts and Printed Texts*. Leiden: Brill, 1959.
- Stehle, Matthias, and Herbert Zimmermann. *Greek Word-Building*. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press for the Society of Biblical Literature, 1976.
- Stevens, Gerald L. *New Testament Greek*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1994.
- Taylor, Bernard A., ed. *IX Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Cambridge, 1995*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997.
- Tjen, Anwar. *On Conditionals in the Greek Pentateuch: A Study of Translation Syntax (The Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies)*. Reprint, New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2012.
- Tov, Emanuel. "Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings." In *Melbourne Symposium on Septuagint Lexicography*. Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series, no. 28, edited by T. Muraoka, 83-125. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.
- _____. *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*. 3rd ed. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2015.
- _____. *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. 3rd ed. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012.
- Tov, Emanuel, and Frank Polak, eds. *The Revised Catss Hebrew/Greek Parallel Text*. Accordance Electronic ed. Altamonte Springs, FL: OakTree Software, 2008.

- Thayer, Bill, ed. *The Text of Cassius Dio on Lacus Curtius*. Accessed October 2017. <http://penelope.uchicago.edu>.
- Tribulato, Olga. *Ancient Greek Verb-Initial Compounds: Their Diachronic Development Within the Greek Compound System*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2015.
- Ulrich, Eugene. *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls: Transcriptions and Textual Variants*. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- _____. "Light from 1QIsaA on the Translation Technique of the Old Greek Translator of Isaiah." In *Scripture in Translation: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Raija Sallamo*, edited by Anssi Voitila and Jute Jokiranta, 193-204. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- _____. *Qumrân cave 4. VII*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.
- University of California. "Thesaurus Linguae Graecae: A Digital Library of Greek Literature." *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*. Accessed October 2017. <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu>.
- Vaan, Michiel Arnoud Cor de. *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the Other Italic Languages*. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Valpy, F. E. J. *The Fundamental Words of the Greek Language, Adapted to the Memory of the Student by Means of Derivations and Derivatives, Passages from the Classical Writers, and Other Associations*. London: Printed for G.B. Whittaker, 1826.
- Van der Kooij, Arie. *The Oracle of Tyre: The Septuagint of Isaiah 23 as Version and Vision*. Supplements for the Vetus Testamentum 71. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Vogt, Ernst. *Lexicon of Biblical Aramaic: Clarified by Ancient Documents (Subsidia Biblica, vol. 42)*. Translated by Joseph A. Fitzmyer. Rome: Gregorian & Biblical Press, 2011.
- Voitila, Anssi. "Leviticus." In *T and T Clark Companion to the Septuagint*, edited by J. K. Aitken, 43-57. London: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2015.
- von Arnim, J. *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta*. Vol. 3. Leipzig: Teubner, 1903.
- Waltke, Bruce K. and M. O'Connor. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
- Wendland, P. *Philonis Alexandrini Opera Quae Supersunt*. Vol. 3. Berlin: Reimer, 1898. Reprint, Berlin: De Gruyter, 1962. Accessed October 2017. <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/Cite?0018:015:1883>.
- Wevers, John William. *Genesis. Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum, Band I*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974.
- _____. *Leviticus. Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum, Band II, 2*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986.

_____. *Notes on the Greek Text of Leviticus*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997.

Wright, Joseph. *Comparative Grammar of the Greek Language*. London: H. Frowde, 1912.

Ziegler, Joseph. *Job. Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum, Band XI, 4*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982.

ABSTRACT

STUDIES IN SEPTUAGINT LEVITICUS: LINGUISTICS, TRADITION, AND LEXICAL CHOICE

Joel Richard Bell, Th.M.
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2018
Chair: Dr. Peter J. Gentry

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 לָחַם in his translation.

Chapter 4 studies the history of the usage of δικαίωμα. The translator chose δικαίωμα to represent *ḥōq* "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.

VITA

Joel Richard Bell

EDUCATIONAL

B.S., Furman University, 2008

M.Div., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2016

ORGANIZATIONAL

Evangelical Theological Society

Society of Biblical Literature