

# Historiographic Tendencies in the Septuagint

Historiographic tendencies in the Septuagint are embedded in the general tendencies of Jewish Literature in the Second Temple period. There are also, however, analogous tendencies within Greek historiography and Hellenistic philology on Homer. Some methodological remarks will clarify the limitations of our approach.

## 1. On Method

At the beginning, some annotations on method are necessary.

1. There are only a few theoretical remarks on writing history in ancient Jewish sources.<sup>1</sup> We have only implicit, sometimes ambiguous indications.

2. The majority of the portions of the Septuagint that deal with Israel's history consists of translated texts, not original compositions. A translator does not provide a treatise on history *per se*; he can only reflect what is present in his *Vorlage*. The freedom to shape tradition is more restricted, for example, than the freedom of the Chronicler when re-writing the books of Samuel and Kings.

3. The character of translation varies. Some translations are oriented towards the target language, whereas other translations are more faithful to their *Vorlage*, even at the level of representing individual graphemes.<sup>2</sup>

4. Presupposed Hebrew Readings of the Septuagint are sometimes close to readings in Qumran or in the Samaritan Pentateuch.<sup>3</sup> In many cases, the Septuagint did not initiate but simply attests a developing tradition. It seems correct to assume a milieu of Hebrew- and Aramaic-speaking scribes<sup>4</sup> who were responsible for most of the changes whereas the translators felt obliged to represent their source text.

5. The secondary character of the Septuagint text-form is by no means always obvious especially with regard to the historical books.<sup>5</sup> In many

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Jesus Sirach, prologue, on translation; 2Macc 2:19–32, on shortening; Josephus, *JW*, prol.; *Ant.*, prol. *Against Apion*, prol.

<sup>2</sup> KREUZER, "Textverständnis."

<sup>3</sup> In Exod 13:4<sup>SP</sup>, the syntagma "at this day" is deleted in order to avoid a contradiction to Deut 16:1 (Israel left Egypt during nighttime). In Exod 20:18<sup>SP</sup>, the phrasing "all the people saw ... the voice..." is avoided: It is not possible to "see" a voice.

<sup>4</sup> VAN DER KOOIJ, "Zum Verhältnis von Textkritik und Literarkritik," 198–200.

<sup>5</sup> On 3Kingdoms, cf. MEISER, "Basileion III."

cases, the lively scholarly debate demonstrates that arguments can be inverted.

## 2. Tendencies of Historiography in Early Jewish Literature

Even in the earliest sources, Jewish authors retold history according to their own theological perspective. As a sample corpus for the study of the subject, I will deal with Chronicles, the book of Tobit and the work of Demetrius the historian. Although the last of these already presupposes the Septuagint, it is useful to consider the tendencies of Greek historiography with regard to both its motivation and style.

For Greek historiographers, different motivations are decisive for their approach. Herodotus intended to preserve the memory of the remarkable deeds of Greeks and Barbarians.<sup>6</sup> The aim of Thucydides was not mere pleasure reading, but to be of use to anyone who wanted to recognize the past in order to anticipate the future, which unfolds according to consistent human nature.<sup>7</sup> Xenophon's *Agésilaios* is a protreptic work meant to enshrine the virtue of the hero.<sup>8</sup> Duris of Samos did not intend to enrich history with falsehood but sought to make reality more understandable by imitating human self-presentation.<sup>9</sup> Polybius intended to teach those who were curious<sup>10</sup> how to deal better with present circumstances.<sup>11</sup>

The book of Chronicles has limited analogy to Thucydides with regard to its protreptic aim and also to Herodotus with regard to its theological convictions.<sup>12</sup>

With regard to the way they present history, it seems misguided to compare Chronicles with Herodotus or Thucydides. The latter two offer their views without association with any source texts, and their intention is to present history as it really happened. Herodotus reflects – to mention examples only from the first book of his *History* – on his literary style<sup>13</sup> as

---

<sup>6</sup> Herodotus, 1:1, LCL:2.

<sup>7</sup> Thucydides, 1:22.4, LCL 108:38–40.

<sup>8</sup> Xenophon, *Agésilaios* 1:1.1, LCL 183:60.

<sup>9</sup> LENDLE, *Einführung*, 187.

<sup>10</sup> Polybius, 2:56.10–13, LCL 128:376–378.

<sup>11</sup> Polybius, 9:25.2, LCL 159:56.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. MEISTER, *Geschichtsschreibung*, 38: Herodotus's theological convictions are comparable to the archaic convictions of Sophocles whereas we do not find influences of sophistic thinking and its rationalism.

<sup>13</sup> He mentions cataphoric (1:106.2; 148.1; 185.1) and anaphoric (1:130.3) references; he marks the finishing of a paragraph (1:92.4) or a digression (1:140.3). Sometimes he marks his decision what to present (1:177.1; 192.1; 194.1). Sometimes he presents distinct versions side by side (1:1.1–1:45.3; 27.2; 95.1).

well as his dependence upon eyewitnesses<sup>14</sup> and the varying degree of certainty regarding their accuracy.<sup>15</sup> Thucydides, who is more critical, discusses the judicious use of sources, historical analogy, and examination of archeological and topographical conditions.<sup>16</sup>

Remarks of this kind are of course absent from the translated parts of the Septuagint. There are, however, observable tendencies that are analogous to the tendencies in ancient philology on Homer, beginning in the third century BCE.<sup>17</sup> Homeric Philologists had to deal with a text that was not concerned with contemporary history. Their intention was to remove historical errors and any internal inconsistencies from Homer since they considered it a work of poetic value.<sup>18</sup>

The book of Tobit is by no means a historiographical work. Yet it nevertheless contains tendencies comparable to those in Jewish historiography, especially Torah-orientation<sup>19</sup> and intertextuality.<sup>20</sup>

The Chronicler<sup>21</sup> occasionally uses more precise characterizations of texts,<sup>22</sup> offers pluses that agree with other biblical texts<sup>23</sup> or terminological references<sup>24</sup> He also fills gaps,<sup>25</sup> gives names to anonymous figures,<sup>26</sup> adds

<sup>14</sup> Herodotus, 1:34.8; 82.8; 94.2; 180.3.

<sup>15</sup> Herodotus sometimes refers to knowledge based on experience (1:105.3; 131.1; 140.1, 2; 170.1; 171.2; 196.1), sometimes to plausible history (1:145.1; 172.1; 214.5), and sometimes to mere presupposition (1:57.1; 97.2; 172.1). Occasionally he notes his distance (1:153.1; 187.5; 201.1) or explicit skepticism (1:75.6; 182.1) of a tradition known to him.

<sup>16</sup> MEISTER, *Geschichtsschreibung*, 50.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. already LIEBERMAN, *Hellenism*, 37.

<sup>18</sup> Of course, ancient philology on Homer covers many more topics, cf. pp. 5–10 in this Volume.

<sup>19</sup> Tobit is living “according to the Law of Moses” (Tob 6:13<sup>LXX</sup>, 8:1<sup>LXX.S</sup>).

<sup>20</sup> We should note references to Gen 12–50, but also to the book of Job.

<sup>21</sup> Concerning the comparison between the books of Samuel/Kings and the Chronicler cf. KALIMI, *Geschichtsschreibung*.

<sup>22</sup> 2Kgs 22:16 characterizes Deuteronomy in general (“all words of this Law”) as announcement of disaster, but this is true only for texts like Deut 28:15–68. Therefore, the Chronicler switches in 2Chr 34:24 to “all the curses”.

<sup>23</sup> 1Chr 11:23 adds elements of Sam 17:4, 7 to the presupposed text 2Sam 23:21.

<sup>24</sup> According to 1Kgs 9:25, Solomon makes offerings three times a year. 2Chr 8:12 adds the reference to the festivals mentioned in Deut 16:16: Only there the phrase “three times a year” is used with regard to the offerings (KALIMI, *Geschichtsschreibung*, 60–61).

<sup>25</sup> 1Chr 11:5a explicitly mentions the subject of the remark: “Here you do not come in” of 2Sam 5:6b. Further, cf. 1Chr 21:15 and 2Sam 24:16

<sup>26</sup> In 1Sam 16:6–13; 17:12, only the first three brothers of David are mentioned by name. But 2Chr 2:13–15 offers seven names. 2Chr 23:1 adds the names of the military leaders who made a conspiracy against Athaliah, in comparison to 2Kgs 11:4 (KALIMI, *Geschichtsschreibung*, 70; he offers further examples of such secondary naming in early Jewish literature).

place names,<sup>27</sup> and offers cataphoric and anaphoric<sup>28</sup> references. Sometimes, however, the opposite is true: He is willing to omit superfluous names<sup>29</sup> and details.<sup>30</sup>

Other modifications are part of his specifically theological strategy. He omits ideas that do not agree with his own convictions. Legitimate continuity involves only the southern kingdom.<sup>31</sup> He almost completely omits the history of the northern kingdom.<sup>32</sup> On the other hand, he inserts elements, especially from Deuteronomy, to present some characters as living in accordance with the Torah<sup>33</sup> and others as living contrary to God's commands.<sup>34</sup> Divine justice is realized in history by the so-called *Tun-Ergehen-Zusammenhang*. Examples are well-known. Jehoram of Judah is oppressed by the Philistines and the Arabs, but also by an incurable disease that he contracted because he had forsaken God (2Chr 21:11–20).<sup>35</sup> Similarly, the army of Joash was delivered into the hand of Aram because he abandoned the Lord (2Chr 24:24).<sup>36</sup> On the other hand, the cities of Judah were never conquered thanks to the piety of Hezekiah (2Chr 32:1 diff 2Kgs 18:13). The long-term kingship of Manasseh was possible because of his repentance (2Chr 33:12).

The Jewish historian Demetrius explains how it was possible for Jacob to have had twelve children within eight years.<sup>37</sup> Another focus of his work is the length of the distinct periods of Israel's history from Adam until the beginning of the captivity in Egypt.<sup>38</sup> Further, he deals with theological

---

<sup>27</sup> Based on Jer 46:2, the Chronicler adds the name Carchemish in 2Chr 35:20 for the battle mentioned in 2Kgs 23:29 though the two references, 2Kgs 23:29 and Jer 46:2, refer to distinct events (KALIMI, *Geschichtsschreibung*, 76).

<sup>28</sup> 1Chr 18:8 (similarly 2Sam 8:8<sup>LXX</sup>) states that Solomon used the spoils from David's battle against the Philistines for the construction of the temple in Jerusalem. On the other hand, 2Chr 13:1, differing from the Hebrew equivalent 1Kgs 6:1 explicitly refers to the epiphany of God at the threshing-floor of Araunah.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. 2Chr 32:21 with 2Kgs 19:37.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. 1Chr 21:4 with 2Sam 24:5–7.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. 2Chr 13:4–12. This text is a plus in comparison to 1Kgs 15:1–8.

<sup>32</sup> Luke-Acts is shaped by a similar concept. The continuity of gentile Christians with the beginnings in Jerusalem is guaranteed only by the twelve apostles and Paul. We cannot be sure, however, whether analogy or genealogy is the model to explain this parallel.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. KALIMI, *Geschichtsschreibung*, 115–143.

<sup>34</sup> The terms שאל and דרר of Deut 18:9–12 are decisive for interpreting the premature death of Saul owing to his inquiry of the medium (1Chr 10:13, referring to 1Sam 28) and the temporal disaster for Manasseh by his acting as medium (2Chr 33:6).

<sup>35</sup> This text is a plus; cf. 2Kgs 8:16–22.

<sup>36</sup> Similarly, 2Chr 25:20 gives reason for the defeat of Amaziah of Judah against Joash.

<sup>37</sup> Eusebius of Caesarea, *Praep. Ev.* 9:21.3–5, GCS 43/1:508–509.

<sup>38</sup> Eusebius of Caesarea, *Praep. Ev.* 9:21.18, GCS 43/1:511.

and historical problems of Moses's marriage to Zipporah of Midian.<sup>39</sup> Another subject of his work is the internal consistency of the Book of Exodus. How was it possible that the Israelites had weapons with them when they had planned to leave the land only for three days? His answer: They used the weapons of the drowned Egyptians.<sup>40</sup>

Summarizing some aspects of the Jewish literature of the second century BCE., we can state the following: Jewish authors refer to Israel's history parenetically when addressing Jewish readers but apologetically when addressing a non-Jewish audience. A series of examples illustrates God's creating glory within Israel (Sir 44:2), the saving activity of God's wisdom (Sap 10:1–21; cf. Sap 9:18) and the faithfulness of true Israelites (1Macc 2:51–60).<sup>41</sup> Within apocalypticism, the divine announcement of the future also concerns the present; in practical terms, this notion functions as the establishment of faithfulness to God of Israel and to his commandments. Authors like the Samaritan Anonymus, Eupolemos, Ps.-Hecataios II., Cleomedes Malchas, and Artapanos illustrate Israel's antiquity and its superiority in comparison with the surrounding non-Jewish culture.

### 3. Historiographic Tendencies in the Septuagint

Historiographic tendencies in the Septuagint are comparable with tendencies within ancient Homeric scholarship. One of its axioms has been that the text to be established as a critical edition should be coherent, conform to real life, poetically valuable, and free from mistakes.<sup>42</sup> Within the Septuagint, we find the tendency to avoid internal discrepancies or correct the presentation of how an event unfolded, whereas we do not see efforts to correct biblical texts by means of external sources on ancient history. Both theologically motivated changes concerning the notion of God and idealization of certain characters are consistent with the Hellenistic philological approach to statements categorized as erroneous, which were subject to text-critical emendation. The category of ἀπρεπές traces back to the category of πρεπές<sup>43</sup> within philosophical debates.

---

<sup>39</sup> How can Moses marry Zipporah without contradicting to his own law (Deut 7:5)? He recognized her offspring from Abraham from her name. But how it is possible that he married her though he lived in the sixth generation after Abraham, she in the seventh? Demetrius refers on the distinct age of Abraham during Isaac's birth (Eusebius of Caesarea, *Praep. Ev.* 9:29.1–3, GCS 43/1:528).

<sup>40</sup> Eusebius of Caesarea, *Praep. Ev.* 9:29.16 fine, GCS 43/1:538.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. Diogenes Laertios 2:11, LCL:140 on the reception of Homer.

<sup>42</sup> DÖRRIE, "Zur Methodik antiker Exegese," 129.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. Cicero, *Nat. de.* 3:64, LCL 268:346; Dio Chrysostom, *Or.* 12.52, LCL:56–58; Plutarch, *Is.* 78,383a, LCL:184; cf. Xenophanes, *Frgm.* 1 (ed. Diehls and Kranz, 127).

### 3.1. Detail-oriented Modifications

Homeric philologists criticize ill-suited<sup>44</sup> or literarily odd<sup>45</sup> phrases, but also anachronisms<sup>46</sup> or (apparent) mistakes, for example, concerning zoology.<sup>47</sup>

Analogous corrections in the Septuagint are indirectly part of this study. The Bible as a reliable source of historical knowledge must be free from mistakes even in irrelevant details. There was, however, no consistent approach to such corrections, perhaps in order to avoid introducing illegitimate changes into the text, which became authoritative.<sup>48</sup> Part of this detail-oriented modification is the distinction in rendering the *plurale tantum* אֱלֹהִים with θεός or θεοί<sup>49</sup>, according to the specific context.

Gen 7:2–3 reports God’s command concerning how many animals Noah should take into the ark. In the Masoretic text, the distinction between unclean and clean animals concerns only land animals but not birds. Yet according to Lev 11:13–19 and Deut 20:25 some bird species are also unclean. Therefore, Gen 7:3<sup>LXX</sup> adds an appropriate distinction. It is not possible for God to contradict himself.

In 1Sam 1:23<sup>MT</sup>, it is not clear whether Hannah’s words or God’s words will be fulfilled. 4Q51 i 5 and 1Sam 1:23<sup>LXX</sup> attest a more nuanced version: It is God’s word that will be fulfilled. The Qumran parallel is a witness to scribal corrections also appearing in non-Hellenistic Judaism.

According to Jer 26:2<sup>MT</sup>, the prophet should address “the cities of Judah” within the temple court. But it is impossible for cities to be situated inside the temple. Therefore, the Septuagint translator omits the word “cities” in Jer 33:2<sup>LXX</sup>.<sup>50</sup> Biblical metaphorical style would not justify a literary rendering in this case.

---

<sup>44</sup> According to Aristarch of Samothrace, the term δαΐς in *Il.* 1:5 is ill-suited; it refers to regularly meals of human beings and is not applicable to the meals of the primitive ancestors or of wild beasts. PFEIFFER, *Geschichte der klassischen Philologie*, 146, points to peripatetic studies on pre-history as a background for Aristarch’s critique.

<sup>45</sup> Zenodot rejects *Il.* 15:64–76 due to its lack of precision; these verses remind him of Euripides. Cf. VAN THIEL, „Der Homertext in Alexandria,” 23.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. WILSON, “Griechische Philologie im Altertum,” 97.

<sup>47</sup> For examples, see PFEIFFER, *Geschichte der klassischen Philologie*, 150, 260.

<sup>48</sup> I cannot deal here with the new debate on the canonicity of the text that became the Bible; cf. MAIER, “Zur Frage des biblischen Kanons.”

<sup>49</sup> Cf., e.g. Exod 22:28; Ruth 1:15. In other cases, the translators chose solutions that do not deal with the uniqueness of the God of Israel.

<sup>50</sup> Jerome, in *Ier.* 5:36.3, CCSL 74:253.

### 3.2. Avoiding Internal Discrepancies

Within Homeric philology, Zenodot rejected (the usual term is ἀθετέω) some passages that were inconsistent with others in Homer. He did not delete them but rather categorized them as inauthentic.<sup>51</sup> Aristophanes of Byzantium (ca. 265–190 or ca. 257–180) was more cautious in making such judgments. He re-integrated many passages that had been rejected by Zenodot but also excluded other passages owing to what he considered their poor style.

These kinds of evaluations were impossible for the translators and transmitters of texts that became authoritative within Judaism and Christianity. They had to use other strategies.

Gen 2:2<sup>MT</sup> places the completion of creation in the seventh day, but Gen 2:2<sup>LXX/SP</sup> (similarly Jub 2:16, 25) place it at the sixth day to avoid any contradiction to the Sabbath commandment. Again, it was seen as impossible that God should contradict his own commands. The parallelism between the Septuagint, the Book of Jubilees and the Samaritan Pentateuch proves once more the existence of such tendencies in non-Hellenistic Judaism.

In Gen 22:2, the word יחיד (“only one”) in the description of Isaac is rendered by ἀγαπητός (“beloved”), perhaps due to the birth of Ishmael.<sup>52</sup> According to John William Wevers, however, the terms “the single one” and “the beloved one” were synonyms at this time; therefore, this rendering is not a distinct example of exegesis.<sup>53</sup>

The tale of Moses’s call in Exod 3 includes the phrase “mountain of God” (Exod 3:1<sup>MT</sup>). The translator omitted the reference to God. “The shorter text is fitting, since God has not yet appeared to Moses; it is thus premature to designate it as mountain of God”.<sup>54</sup>

The tale of Saul’s rejection includes the remark “Samuel did not see Saul again until the day of his death” (1Sam 15:35). In 1Sam 19:24<sup>MT</sup>, however, it is said that Saul “stripped off his clothes, and he too fell into a frenzy before Samuel.” 1Kgdms 19:24 corrects: “he fell into a frenzy before them” (the company of the prophets), in order to avoid any discrepancy with 1Sam 15:35.<sup>55</sup>

Within the discussion of the “ark of covenant”, 2Sam 6:14<sup>MT</sup> says that David danced before the ark of the Lord with music instruments. Instru-

---

<sup>51</sup> PFEIFFER, *Geschichte der klassischen Philologie*, 282. This kind of judgment has been abandoned owing to insights into the character of such traditions.

<sup>52</sup> SPEISER, *Genesis*, 163.

<sup>53</sup> WEVERS, *Genesis*, 316.

<sup>54</sup> WEVERS, *Exodus*, 25.

<sup>55</sup> LESTIENNE, *Premier Livre des Règnes*, 322.

ments are typically used for music but not for dance; therefore, the translator changed the phrasing.<sup>56</sup>

Other passages are more disputed, e.g. the number of those born to Jacob (70 according to Gen 46:27<sup>MT</sup>; 75 according to Gen 46:27<sup>LXX</sup>). The number 75 reappears in Exod 1:5 but not in Deut 10:22. Barthélemy considers the number 75 to be original,<sup>57</sup> Günther Stemberger supposes that this number arose in the Hebrew tradition,<sup>58</sup> whereas Jürgen Ebach favors the theory of translator exegesis: He added the five people mentioned in Gen 46:20 (the offspring of the succeeding generations).<sup>59</sup>

### 3.3. Historical Corrections

Historical corrections are based on the study of biblical texts, not on information independent of the biblical tradition. These corrections are mostly driven by the desire to avoid inner-biblical discrepancies. This tendency, however, appears in relation to more than just historical matters. Therefore, I have collected the following historical corrections in a separate section.

The conquering of the holy land, the exile under the Assyrians and Babylonians, and the post-exilic history are all subjects that should be presented without internal discrepancies.

In Gen 35:12<sup>LXX</sup>, the translator added a plus (σολ ἕσται) to avoid a discrepancy between the perfect σολ δέδωκα and the conquest that had not yet taken place from the internal perspective of the Genesis narrative.<sup>60</sup> In Num 26:16, the translator added δέ in order to distinguish between the generations that died in Canaan and those that died wandering in the wilderness.<sup>61</sup>

Josh 13:2 includes a list of territories not yet conquered and Josh 13:13 a list of nations not driven out by Israel. In both cases, the translator adds the plus χαναναϊος. Perhaps he had V. 3 in mind<sup>62</sup> or Josh 15:63; 16:10; 17:12–13, 16; Jgs 1:19–35.<sup>63</sup> Canaanites are still inhabiting some territories; they have not yet been conquered.<sup>64</sup>

<sup>56</sup> He did not omit, however, the scenery of a dancing king (cf. 2Reg 6:20–21).

<sup>57</sup> BARTHÉLEMY “Les Tiquané Sophérim,” 106–107.

<sup>58</sup> STEMBERGER, “Stephanusrede,” 233f. DURHAM, *Exodus*, 2, refers to 4QEx<sup>a</sup>.

<sup>59</sup> EBACH, *Genesis 37–50*, 437 (Lit!). The “nine” offspring of Joseph in V. 27a arose from the difference between 75 and 66 (Gen 46:26). Cf. also WEVERS, *Genesis*, 786.

<sup>60</sup> Cf. SCHAPER, “Exodos,” 223, referring to EVANS, *Verbal Syntax*, 148. Similarly, WEVERS, *Numbers*, 463, argued in the same way in his comment on Num 27:12, concerning the rendering ἐγὼ δίδωμι (present) of יתת (perfect).

<sup>61</sup> RÖSEL/SCHLUND, “Arithmoi/Numeri,” 497.

<sup>62</sup> BOLING, *Joshua*, 333.

<sup>63</sup> BUTLER, *Joshua*, 145.

<sup>64</sup> DEN HERTOOG, “Jesus/Josue,” 638.

Amos 6:9<sup>LXX</sup> (or its Hebrew Vorlage<sup>65</sup>) includes a plus (καὶ λειφθήσονται οἱ καταλοιποί) that diminishes the threat of disaster. This phrase may have been motivated by Israel's post-exilic history: It is impossible that Amos would have been ignorant of the turn after the exile.<sup>66</sup>

In Papyrus 967, the order of Dan 7; 8 is re-arranged so that the visions sent to the prophet during Belsazar's lifetime come before the tale of Belsazar's death (Dan 5:30).<sup>67</sup> In the same codex, the marriage between Cleopatra – the daughter of Antiochus III – and Ptolemaeus V Epiphanes is described in Dan 11:17 as arranged “in order to destroy him” (MT: to destroy her). In fact, Antiochus III did not intend to destroy his own daughter but rather to influence the Ptolemaic king.<sup>68</sup> This is one of the few examples of correction according to a non-biblical tradition.

The appearance of what could be a correction tendency in a reading is not always the best explanation of how the reading came about. According to Josh 5:6, the Israelites who were born in the wilderness were not circumcised. But the different text-forms vary in the stated duration of this period. Josh 5:6<sup>MT</sup> reads “40 years” while Josh 5:6<sup>LXX</sup> reads “42 years.” It may be that the translator may have combined Num 10:11 (the departure from Sinai in the second year, in the second month, on the twentieth day of the month) with Num 14:33–34 (forty years of wandering).<sup>69</sup> There are, however, other possible explanations of the additional καὶ δύο. It may be – or presuppose – a doublet (שנה ושנים instead of שנה) that arose either by mere mechanical repetition<sup>70</sup> or as a product of the intention to represent each element of a corrupt source text.<sup>71</sup> Many researchers ascribe this change to the translation process;<sup>72</sup> in my point of view, however, a correction within the Hebrew scribal milieu is possible as well. In general, we should avoid hasty conclusions.<sup>73</sup>

<sup>65</sup> WOLFF, *Dodekapropheton 2: Joel und Amos*, 3.

<sup>66</sup> Cf. SCHAT/DAFNI, “Amos,” 2355.

<sup>67</sup> Cf. KREUZER, “Papyrus 967,” 75f.

<sup>68</sup> NEEF, “Daniel,” 3044.

<sup>69</sup> MOATTI-FINE, *Jésus (Josué)*, 118.

<sup>70</sup> HOLMES, *Joshua*, 30; BOLING, *Joshua*, 184. Cf. also TOV, “Midrash-Type Exegesis in the Septuagint of Joshua,” 158.

<sup>71</sup> On the phenomenon of double translation in the book of Joshua cf. DEN HERTOOG, *Studien zur griechischen Übersetzung des Buches Josua*, 82ff.

<sup>72</sup> BUTLER, *Joshua*, 55; RÖSEL, “Die Septuaginta-Version des Josuabuches,” 206; SIEGERT, *Einleitung*, 295. VAN DER MEER, *Formation and Reformulation*, 356 does not exclude a changing already within Hebrew tradition. Nevertheless, he favors an alteration introduced in the translation process. The main arguments are the lot of changings and the chronographic interests by authors like Demetrius and Eupolemus.

<sup>73</sup> The same is true concerning the place of the assembly mentioned in Joh 24:1 (cf. DEN HERTOOG, “Jesus/Josue,” 654). In Jdgs 10:8, the phrase “in that year, 18 years” is surprising. Cod. B offers καίρως. We can interpret this reading either as a correction or an

### 3.4. Intertextual Harmonizations

Sometimes new connections appear concerning salvation history. The term *αἰβωτός* connects the tale of the flood in Gen 6–8 (Hebrew: תבה)<sup>74</sup> with the tale of the ark in 1Sam 6 (Hebrew: ארון). The tale of the call of Joshua in Num 27 includes in V. 12 the command, “Go up this mountain of the Abarim range, and see the land that I have given to the Israelites.” Yet Num 27:12<sup>LXX</sup> reads as follows: “Go up into the mountain that is on the other side (of this Mount Nabau), and see the land Chanaan, which I am giving to the sons of Israel for a possession.” The plusses *Χανααν* and *ἐν κατασχέσει* enhance a connection to God’s promise in Gen 17:8 (*καὶ δώσω πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν Χανααν εἰς κατάσχεσιν αἰώνιον*).<sup>75</sup> The same term is applied to both the worm that attacked Jonah’s plant (Jonah 4:7; Hebrew: תולעת) and the worm that made the manna go bad (Exod 16:20; Hebrew: תולע).<sup>76</sup> The graphical similarity between *תולע* and *תולעת* suggests that a correction had already arisen in a Hebrew milieu. In Isa 11:1, the terms *ῥάβδος* (only here for חטב) and *ἄνθος* are reminiscent of Num 17:23. The figure announced in Isa 11 is a high-priestly character.<sup>77</sup> 2Reg 24:25 includes a hint of Salomon’s expansion of the altar.

Sometimes other details are of interest. 2Reg 14:27 offers a cataphoric reference to the fate of Abessalom’s daughter. The Greek text of 1Kgdms 10:1, however, is heavily disputed. In the present form, this text includes a connection to 1Sam 9:16–17 and to Exod 3 that is missing in the Hebrew tradition. Is the Septuagintal plus the product of exegesis in translation,<sup>78</sup> or is the minus of the Masoretic text the result of omission due to homoioteleuton?<sup>79</sup>

### 3.5. Actualizations

Actualizations imply anachronism, which has parallels not in historiography but in Alexandrian philology. Corrections to Homer were made, “whenever it was not in conformity with the manners of the court of the Ptolemies or the customs of certain Greeks.”<sup>80</sup>

---

inner-Hebrew development: שנה would have been altered to *ען* (*καιρός* is a common rendering of this term).

<sup>74</sup> That the translator of Exodus rendered תבה not with *αἰβωτός* but *θῖβις* is not the result of salvation-historical factors, but rather owing to his notion of the scenery. For this term, we also have archeological references. Cf. LE BOULLUEC/SANDEVOIR, *L’Exode*, 80.

<sup>75</sup> RÖSEL/SCHLUND, “Arithmoi/Numeri,” 500.

<sup>76</sup> HECKEL, “Jonas,” 2404.

<sup>77</sup> VAN DER KOOIJ/WILK, “Esaias,” 2534.

<sup>78</sup> TSUMURA, *First Samuel*, 282; LESTIENNE, *Premier Livre des Règnes*, 210.

<sup>79</sup> MCCARTER, *I Samuel*, 171.

<sup>80</sup> LIEBERMAN, *Hellenism*, 37.

In the Septuagint, topographical and ethnic terms were actualized owing to contemporary interests.<sup>81</sup> We observe tendencies not only to modernize the terminology of administration,<sup>82</sup> but also of loyalty to the ruling Ptolemies<sup>83</sup> and to harmonization with Ptolemaic law.<sup>84</sup> These tendencies do not exclude others that entail dissociation from the Egyptian context<sup>85</sup> or from Hellenistic religious practice in general.<sup>86</sup> Sometimes there appears to be an attempt to locate the ancestral history in general in Egypt<sup>87</sup> or to empha-

---

<sup>81</sup> The term ארם is often rendered by Σύρια (Gen 33:20; 2Reg 8:5 etc.), ארם נהרם or פרו by Μεσσοποτάμια (Gen 24:40; 28:2,5), the term פלשתים by ἀλλόφυλοι (1Kgds 4:1 etc.).

<sup>82</sup> For example: In Exod 3:16; Num 22:4; Josh 23:2, the term γερουσία is used designating the Israelites. In Num 1:20, δῆμος is the rendering of משפטים. In Lev 19:16; Deut 28:32, the term ἔθνος for “Israel” is an application of constitutional terminology. The rendering ἡγουμένος for גידן uses a title for the leading priest that is common in Egyptian papyri. ὑπομνηματογράφος (1Chr 18:15; Isa 36:3, 22) is the title of a leading officer in the Ptolemaic court.

<sup>83</sup> Exod 22:28<sup>LXX</sup> is an admonition to loyalty. Blasphemy against foreign deities is forbidden (the translator interprets אלהים as plural); cf. Philo, Vit Mos II 205. The translator of Lev 11:5 avoids the rendering of נפש (hare) by λαγώς in order to avoid any allusion to the name of Lagos, father of Ptolemaeus I. The translator of Deuteronomy avoids the term βασιλεύς in Deut 17:15 (BICKERMAN, *Jews*, 108), and the term θρόνος in Deut 17:18 (POLA, *Deuteronomium* 17–20, 571). This tendency of loyalty, however, is missing in the Septuagint of the Twelve Prophets, cf. DOGNIEZ, “‘Lost in Translation’,” 195. Cf. further, SELEZNEV, “Replacing תלם with ἀρχων in the LXX,” 313, who names an anti-monarchic tendency within Israel responsible for the rendering of תלם within (parts of) the Septuagint.

<sup>84</sup> The Translator of Deuteronomy interprets Deut 21:10 not as “you take them [i.e., the enemies] captive” but “you take as plunder their booty”; cf. Wevers, *Deuteronomy*, 339. Slave trade was an exclusive royal right. Deut 12:11, 26 offers the term ἐπιδέκατον, perhaps in connection with the secular tax called δέκατον.

<sup>85</sup> Isa 19:5 offers the rendering Λαός μου ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ for עמי מצרים in order to avoid the concept of “Egypt” as “my people”. The Ibis is listed among unclean birds (Lev 11:17; cf. GÖRG, “Die Septuaginta im Kontext spätägyptischer Kultur,” 118f. In Isa 65:11, δαίμων and τύχη render the names of the deities Gad and Meni of the Hebrew text. Agathos Daimon, combined with Agathe Tyche, was venerated as benevolent deity in Alexandria. Concerning the reading תי Baal in Jer 2:8, Andreas Vonach suggests an allusion to the Isis-cult (VONACH, “Jeremias,” 2739).

<sup>86</sup> In the third and second century BCE, astartes or pile-oracles were obsolete. Instead of that, the translator of Deut 7:5 refers to the “holy groves” (ἄλση), the translator of 1Sam 15:23 to bird signs. The translation of Deut 23:18 includes an addition prohibiting the participation in non-Jewish mystery cults (TILLY, *Einführung*, 78). Dan 1:20<sup>MT</sup> compares the princes of Judah with magicians and enchanters. Instead of this, in P967 “sophists and philologists” are named, in LXX “sophists and philosophers.” The princes of Judah by no means are comparable to magicians!

<sup>87</sup> RÖSEL, *Übersetzung*, 241.

size the importance of a Jewish presence for the non-Jewish populace.<sup>88</sup> With regard to some prophetic books, scholars debate possible tendencies of actualization towards contemporary history. Arie van der Kooij identifies the high-priest Simon (he died 134 BCE) as the king mentioned in Zech 9:9f.<sup>89</sup> Thomas Pola connects the reading *Ιουδας* in Zech 14:14 (instead of *Ιουδα*) to Judas Maccabaeus.<sup>90</sup>

Such tendencies are visible also in certain details that are theologically irrelevant.<sup>91</sup> The translator of Num 1:24–25 rearranges the order of the tribes of Israel to align with Gen 35:22–26. Similarly, he changes Num 26 in some details out of a concern for coherence with Gen 46.<sup>92</sup> Within the book of Numbers, there are different traditions concerning the age when Levites begin their service in the tent of witness (30 years according to Num 4:3, 23, 30<sup>MT</sup> vs. 25 years according to Num 8:24). Num 4:3, 23, 30<sup>LXX</sup> offers the reading “25 years”.

As for chronological changes, it was not historical knowledge derived from other sources that was decisive, but rather various ideas modified according to different necessities. In comparison to the Masoretic Text of Genesis, the Septuagint offers longer periods: In the Septuagint, “the time from creation to the flood ... is 2242 years in Gen over against 1656 years in MT and 1307 years in Sam” (i.e. the Samaritan Pentateuch).<sup>93</sup> There is, however, no consensus within scholarship concerning what motivated this difference. According to Martin Rösel, the translator intended to align the completion of temple construction with the 5000<sup>th</sup> year after the creation of the world.<sup>94</sup> According to Gordon Wenham and Folker Siegert, the decisive factor was proving priority over to Egypt’s offspring.<sup>95</sup> Exod 12:40 has a plus *καὶ ἐν γῆ Χανααν*, which envelops the period since the events reported in Gen 12. This plus may have been introduced in order to avoid the chronological problem that 430 years<sup>96</sup> is too long for only the four

---

<sup>88</sup> Joseph marries Aseneth, the daughter of an Egyptian priest in On (Gen 46:20<sup>MT</sup>). In the Septuagint, the name of the city is rendered *Ἡλίου Πόλις*. This referring to an important city at Hellenistic times indirectly emphasizes Joseph’s glory.

<sup>89</sup> VAN DER KOOIJ, “The Septuagint of Zechariah,” 53–64, referring on Hos 3:5; Am 9:11–12; Tob 13:13; 14, 5–6; 1Macc 14:4–15, 36.

<sup>90</sup> POLA, “Von Juda zu Judas,” 576. Some manuscripts (V A-Q’-198-233’-407-449’-534’-86<sup>c</sup> Cyr) include also the article.

<sup>91</sup> Cf. DORIVAL, *Les Nombres*, 42–43.

<sup>92</sup> Cf. WEVERS, *Numbers*, 435–439.

<sup>93</sup> WEVERS, *Genesis*, 68; cf. also HUGHES, *Secrets of the Times*.

<sup>94</sup> RÖSEL, *Übersetzung*, 135–144 (including discussion on other proposals).

<sup>95</sup> WENHAM, *Genesis 1–15*, 130; SIEGERT, *Zwischen Hebräischer Bibel und Altem Testament*, 296.

<sup>96</sup> The discrepancy between the 400 years according to Gen 15:13 and the 430 years according to Exod 12:40<sup>MT</sup> is another problem. In his *Quaestiones in Genesim*, Philo does not address this issue (we would expect a remark after *Qu. Gen.* 3:12). According to

generations mentioned in Exod 6:16–20.<sup>97</sup> There is another possibility, however: the translator or a scribe within Hebrew tradition was ashamed by the sheer length of Israel’s stay in Egypt.<sup>98</sup> 1Kgs/3Reg 6:1 offers different readings concerning the date of the temple’s construction after the exodus (MT: 480 years; LXX: 440 years). The Masoretic reading states the symbolic number 12 x 40<sup>99</sup> times whereas the Septuagint reading can be understood as harmonization with 1Chr 5:29–34<sup>100</sup>: 40 years of priesthood are granted for every one of the 11 generations mentioned.<sup>101</sup>

### 3.6. Theological Tendencies

A study on historiography in the Septuagint must include the issue of theological tendencies. Despite the increasing tendency to emphasize God’s transcendence,<sup>102</sup> God’s activity in human history is a foundational notion within ancient Judaism.

#### 3.6.1. God is Good

Plato’s basic thesis<sup>103</sup> is paramount within Greek philosophical theology and yet also converges with analogous insights in the Old Testament.

Of course, this recognition does not imply a general tendency to deal with texts that do not cohere with Plato’s thesis. In Isa 45:7<sup>LXX</sup> and Jer 11:4<sup>LXX</sup>, for example, the ambiguity in God’s action is not clarified. In other texts, the translation includes alterations. According to Exod 4:24, it is not God himself but his angel who is responsible for attacking Moses.<sup>104</sup> In Exod 15:3<sup>LXX</sup> and Isa 42:13<sup>LXX</sup>, God is praised for “shattering wars”,

---

KREUZER, “430 Jahre,” 207, the period of Joseph’s ministry in Egypt is estimated as a period with-out oppression.

<sup>97</sup> DURHAM, *Exodus* 172; WEVERS, *Exodus*, 190; KREUZER, “Zur Priorität und Auslegungsgeschichte von Exodus 12,40 MT,” 254. WALTER, *Fragmente jüdisch-hellenistischer Exegeten*, 289), offers another explanation: Exod 12:40 has a minus. The Vorlage perhaps mentioned only the children of Israel.

<sup>98</sup> SIEGERT, *Zwischen Hebräischer Bibel und Altem Testament*, 296f.

<sup>99</sup> WELLHAUSEN, *Composition*, 265; MULDER, *1 Kings*, 231.

<sup>100</sup> Zadok I is priest during David’s reign (2Sam 8:17; 1Chr 27:17).

<sup>101</sup> MONTGOMERY/GEHMAN, *Kings*, 143; WISEMAN, *1 and 2 Kings*, 104; COGAN, *1 Kings*, 236.

<sup>102</sup> Such tendencies are also sometimes present within Alexandrian scholarship on Homer. Zenodot rejected *Il.* 3:423–427 (Aphrodite’s help) and *Il.* 4:88 (Athene “searched for” Pandaros). Cf. PFEIFFER, *Geschichte* 146, VAN THIEL, “Homertext,” 13, 22.

<sup>103</sup> Plato, *Rep.* II 379c, LCL 237:184.

<sup>104</sup> On the history of the interpretation of Exod 4:24–26, see my study “The Impact of Reception History for the Research of Septuagint” (in this Volume pp. 413–414).

not for being a warrior, but that does not entail pacifism.<sup>105</sup> Other texts where such tendencies are debated are Gen 4:7;<sup>106</sup> Num 15:36;<sup>107</sup> 1Kgdms 6:19;<sup>108</sup> Isa 63:3;<sup>109</sup> Jer 19:9.<sup>110</sup> Sometimes, however, the history of textual transmission is uncertain. According to Jer 21:7<sup>LXX</sup> it is God who will not spare Israel, but according to Jer 21:7<sup>MT</sup> it is the king of Babylon. Perhaps the Masoretic text is avoiding the notion of God's cruelty,<sup>111</sup> but the Septuagint reading could be a secondary harmonization with Jer 13:14.

God is good, and there is no need for him to feel remorse over his actions. The Hebrew verb נחם is semantically ambiguous. It can mean "to repent" or "to be comforted." When God is the subject of this verb, the typical rendering μετανοέω is in most cases replaced by παρακέκλημαι. The translators sometimes<sup>112</sup> chose the latter to avoid discrepancy with 1Sam 15:29 (God "is not a mortal that he should change his mind").<sup>113</sup> In other cases, the idea of God changing his mind goes unchallenged. Instead, God is distanced from administering punishment and associated with benevolent activity. From a reader's perspective, this emphasis points to the effects of humans turning away either from evil (Jer 18:8) or good (Jer 18:10). God's positive reaction to humans turning away from evil encourages human beings in their moral progress, whereas God's negative reaction warns human beings to not turn away from the good.

### 3.6.2. Stylizing Human Beings

#### 3.6.2.1. Reducing Misbehavior

In Exod 32:5, the term for altar, מזבח, is rendered by θυσιαστήριον, a neologism referring to legitimate altars, not by βωμός, a term used in many

<sup>105</sup> God brings a conclusion to the wars with his victory; cf. Judith 16:2; cf. BONS, "The Lord is the One Who Crushes Wars'," 164.

<sup>106</sup> WEVERS, *Genesis*, 55, supposes a misreading (לנתח instead of לפתח). According to RÖSEL, *Übersetzung*, 105, however, διαρέω never is used as a translation of נתח.

<sup>107</sup> ויח is omitted, perhaps avoiding an explicit connection between God's command to Moses and the death of the sinner (RÖSEL/SCHLUND, "Arithmoi/Numeri," 469).

<sup>108</sup> Cf. my study "The Septuagint of Samuel and the Targum Jonathan," in this volume p. 74.

<sup>109</sup> Jes 63:3<sup>LXX</sup> avoids the notion of the "clothes of God, sparkled with blood".

<sup>110</sup> Jer 19:9<sup>MT</sup> reads והאכלתהם את-בשר בנייהם ("I will give them the flesh of their sons to eat"). In the Septuagint, it is reduced to και ἔδονται τὰς σάρκας τῶν υἱῶν αὐτῶν ("they will eat the flesh of their sons"), but also in 4Q72: אכלו (וי) = "they shall eat."

<sup>111</sup> STIPP, "Zur aktuellen Diskussion," 652.

<sup>112</sup> Gen 6:6<sup>LXX</sup>; 1Chr 21:15<sup>LXX</sup>; 1Kgdms 15:11; Jer 20:16<sup>LXX</sup>; Jer 49:10<sup>LXX</sup>. – The translator of Am 7:5 read the consonants נחם as imperative. He interpreted the text as the prophet's plea for God's repentance, not as statement of God's real action.

<sup>113</sup> We should not, however, over-emphasize the difference between the two verbs. Ancient commentators felt obliged to explain this difficulty, cf. Origen, *Hom. Jer.* 18.6, SC 238:198–204, Theodoret of Cyrus, *Qu. Gen.* 52, OECT:110.

cases for illegitimate altars. The translator thereby avoided portraying the first high priest Aaron as sinful.<sup>114</sup>

Jer 17:1–14<sup>MT</sup> has no parallel in the Septuagint. Since the text strongly emphasizes the sin of Judah, it is at least debatable whether or not the translator – or a scribe within the Hebrew transmission – omitted this embarrassing passage.<sup>115</sup>

Reports mentioning the wrath of Israel’s elites are an obstacle for any self-portrait of Judaism as a philosophical way of life. Therefore, Moses’s harsh reaction to Dathan’s and Abiram’s rebuke (Num 16:12–14) in Num 16:15 is reduced to indignance.<sup>116</sup> Similarly, the proper state for communicating with God for Samuel,<sup>117</sup> David,<sup>118</sup> and Jonah is not wrathfulness but being disheartened.<sup>119</sup>

Both drunkenness and sexual activity before marriage were regarded as immoral within ancient Judaism. In the report of Ruth’s night-time encounter with Boas (Ruth 3:7), the verbs וישת (“and he drunk”) and ותשכב (“she laid down”) are omitted, either by the translator or by a Hebrew scribe. The reader should not be led to think that Boas was drunk or that Ruth planned to have sexual intercourse with him.<sup>120</sup>

2Kgs 2:23 describes young children jeering at Elisha. The prophet then curses the forty-two children, and two bears rip them apart. The Antiochene text or its Hebrew Vorlage offers the plus *καὶ ἐλίθαιζον αὐτόν*, added in order to excuse the prophet’s harsh reaction.

### 3.6.2.2. Conformity with the Torah

Within the Old Testament, 2Kgs 14:6; 23:25 and 2Chr 7:17 are seminal. Along these lines, the translators manifest their Torah-orientation insofar as they also portray other figures or characters in a positive light, similar to Sirach.<sup>121</sup> The report of Amram’s marriage with Iochabed (Exod 6:20) is modified: Iochabed is not Amram’s aunt, but the “daughter of his Father’s brother,” i.e. his cousin. The translator wished to avoid any violation of Lev 20:20.<sup>122</sup> The obedience of the patriarchs to the Torah before the reve-

<sup>114</sup> TOV, “Theologically Motivated Exegesis,” 263–264.

<sup>115</sup> FISCHER, “Zum Text des Jeremiabuches,” 324.

<sup>116</sup> The mention of Moses’s humility (Lev 12:3<sup>MT</sup>)/meekness (Lev 12:3<sup>LXX</sup>) is telling.

<sup>117</sup> 1Kgms 15:11.

<sup>118</sup> 2Reg 6:8; 1Chr 13:11. Another explanation, however, would be inner-Greek error (*ἀθυμέω* instead of *θυμώω*).

<sup>119</sup> Cf. HECKEL, “Jona,” referring to PERKINS, “The Septuagint of Jonah,” 45.

<sup>120</sup> BONS, “Die Septuaginta-Version des Buches Ruth,” 214–215.

<sup>121</sup> Cf. Sir 46:11; 49:1–3. Concerning analogies between the Chronicles and the book of Sirach cf. ROSE, “David im Lob der Väter (Sir 47,1–11),” 369.

<sup>122</sup> SCHMIDT, *Exodus*, 294. The translator of Num 26:59<sup>LXX</sup>, however, does not follow this example.

lation of the Torah was part of the portrayal of Israel's history in both the Septuagint and early Judaism in general.<sup>123</sup>

Within the conflict described in Num 16, Moses states that he did not take "any donkey from them, and I have not harmed one of them" (Num 16:15). Whereas the MT in the first part of this statement only mentions the donkey, the Septuagint expands: "I have not taken what was desired from any one of them." This change is an example of idealizing the portrayal of the figure of Moses.<sup>124</sup>

Elkanah's and Hanna's offering according to 1Sam 1:21 is modified by a plus: they offer "all the tithes of the land", in conformity with Lev 27:30. The vow of 1Kgdms 3:11 in the Septuagint and in 4Q51 includes a plus ("and he will drink no wine"); this rendering portrays Samuel as a Nazirite according to the terms in Num 6:5. According to 2Reg 6:14, David's clothing is "a distinguishing garment", not the garment of a priest. Similarly, 2Reg 8:18<sup>LXX</sup> portrays David's sons not as priests but rather as "chiefs of the court", which also occurs in 1Chr 18:17.

### 3.6.3. Negatively Stylizing Characters

In certain renderings of the events of "Israel in the wilderness", sometimes the behavior of the people is characterized not only as quarrel but as strife (Num 20:13).<sup>125</sup> According to Num 16:13; 21:5, the people begin to think that Moses's real intention is to kill them in the wilderness. Additionally, Moses's and Aaron's transgression is emphasized (Num 27:14<sup>LXX</sup>). The sons of Eli violate the *καθῆκον* (1Kgdms 2:16 in a plus to 1Sam 2:16). They are also a negative example with regard to the standards of Greek education that may have existed in certain parts of ancient Judaism. The seven prophets who are Jeremiah's opponents are named pseudo-prophets.<sup>126</sup> For similar reasons, Ananias is not named a "prophet" in Jer 35:12, 15, 17<sup>LXX</sup> (diff. Jer 28:12, 15, 17<sup>MT</sup>).<sup>127</sup>

<sup>123</sup> SCHAPER/WEBER, "Exodos," 286, referring on LE DEAUT, "La Septante, un Targum?," 174 n. 135.

<sup>124</sup> Cf. bMeg 9b.

<sup>125</sup> WEVERS, *Numbers*, 328. In my view, the translator understood מריבה as connected with ריב, "strife".

<sup>126</sup> Jer 33:7; 35:1<sup>LXX</sup> diff. Jer 26:7; 28:1<sup>MT</sup>; cf. Jerome, in Jer. 5:38.2; 5:56.2, CCSL 74:255.269. Cf. my study 'Prophecy and Pseudo-Prophecy' (pp. 532–558 in this volume).

<sup>127</sup> Jerome, in Jer. 5:61.2, CCSL 74:272–273.

## 4. The Septuagint and Luke-Acts

### 4.1. *Remarks on Method*

With regard to method, we must consider the ways in which the Septuagint and Luke-Acts are comparable.

1. Possible source texts of Acts (as texts) are unavailable.
2. The author of Acts was unable to examine the Septuagint alongside its Hebrew source texts. The literary and theological tendencies discussed here were therefore not accessible.
3. Israel's Bible was part of the author's literary and theological context and concept. He was able to imitate the style of the Septuagint.<sup>128</sup> However, this does not necessarily indicate whether genealogy (textually-based tradition received by the author of Acts) or analogy (linguistic imitation by the author of Acts) is the best framework for explaining the parallel phenomena in both Luke and the Septuagint.
4. There may also have been other sources behind Luke's historiography. It is a given, however, that biblical literature is especially influential when biblical themes are involved.

### 4.2. *Avoiding Discrepancies*

Due to challenges of method (see 4.1.), we cannot decide where and why the author of Acts made historical corrections.<sup>129</sup> What we can see, however, is that he was not interested in correcting discrepancies in every case when integrating traditions: none of the figures mentioned in Acts 10:1–11:18 has Luke 24:47 in mind.<sup>130</sup>

### 4.3. *Intratextual Harmonizations*

Sometimes Luke harmonizes sayings of the Bible or sayings of Jesus in his presentation. The singular *νεφελή* in the quotation of Dan 7:13 in Luke 21:27 could be an intra-textual harmonization to Luke 9:34<sup>131</sup> or Acts 1:9, 11, where Jesus's ascension in a cloud is the counterpart to his expected return. Within Luke 7:18–23 (part of the Q-tradition), the author inserted Luke 7:21 in order to demonstrate that the announcements Isa 29:18; 35:5–6 had truly been fulfilled in Jesus's life and work. In Luke 21:12, the author harmonized his Vorlage Mark 13:9 according to his record of early church history. Anticipating Acts 5:19, he inserted the term *φύλακται*; fur-

<sup>128</sup> Cf. Luke 1:5, further Luke 1:63: *ἔγραψεν λέγων*.

<sup>129</sup> In his Gospel (Luke 3:1, 19; 9:7), the author corrects Mark's characterization of Herod Antipas: He was not "king" (Mark 6:14), but "tetrarch".

<sup>130</sup> Only for this reason are we able to characterize Acts 10:1–11:18 as traditional.

<sup>131</sup> WIEFEL, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, 354 n. 3.

thermore, he reverses the order of ἡγεμόνες and βασιλεῖς in light of Acts 21:12–16. The quotation of Joel in Acts 2:17–21 involves two pluses: 1. καὶ προφητεῶσιν (V. 18) is inserted, perhaps reflecting Num 11:27–29 or anticipating Acts 19:6: The Holy Spirit is at work in women and men (cf. Joel 3:2). 2. The term *σημεῖα* is inserted in light of Acts 2:22, 43; 5:12; 6:8.

#### 4.4. *Tendencies of Actualizing*

The tendency to actualize the names of nations is absent due to the temporal proximity with the reported events. Administrative terminology is actualized not with regard to the political realm but rather to ecclesiastical structures. According to the author of Acts, Paul is active within a circle of congregations lead by elders – in the original Pauline letters, the term *πρεσβύτεροι* is absent. Due to contemporary concerns, Luke emphasizes the political loyalty of Christians to the Roman Empire. His records of situations of conflict with Jewish authorities in Acts 4; 5 are transparent also for conflicts with non-Jewish authorities.<sup>132</sup>

#### 4.5. *Theological Actualizing*

##### 4.5.1. *Reducing Misbehavior*

Within Luke-Acts there is a well-known and often criticized tendency to eliminate<sup>133</sup> or minimize<sup>134</sup> inner-Christian conflict and to reduce the misbehavior of the disciples.<sup>135</sup> With regard to the results of this study, however, Luke's mode of presentation perhaps is more understandable.

##### 4.5.2. *Conformity to the Torah*

In the Septuagint, the tendency to present figures or characters after Moses in a positive light – specifically as observant of the Torah – is motivated by the interests of ethical admonition. Within Acts, we can compare Acts 15:21, 28–29: Gentile Christians really should observe the Apostolic decree to ensure a minimum of cultic purity. Respect for Jewish sentiments may also be responsible for Timothy's circumcision – there is no proof that Paul really circumcised him. Sometimes the author of Luke-Acts emphasizes the observance of Torah for apologetic reasons.<sup>136</sup> In my view, there is no influence from biblical models in this regard.

<sup>132</sup> Acts 5:29, 41 are applicable on both Jewish or non-Jewish authorities.

<sup>133</sup> Cf. Acts 18:1–17 on the one side, the *Vivace furioso* 2Cor 10–13 on the other.

<sup>134</sup> Cf. Acts 6:1–7; 15:36–41.

<sup>135</sup> Mark 8:32–3; 14:50 have no parallel in Luke's Gospel.

<sup>136</sup> Luke characterizes the parents of Jesus as obedient to the Torah (Luke 2:24), just as he does with Paul (Acts 23:5). The Jesus movement did not intend to be antagonistic towards Jewish practice and belief. Luke inserts an episode with Herod Antipas into the

### 4.5.3. Negative Characterizing

Luke reinforced the negative characterization of non-believing Jews with regard to their actions taken against Jesus,<sup>137</sup> Stephen,<sup>138</sup> and Paul<sup>139</sup>, probably due to apologetic reasons concerning the portrayal of the Roman Empire<sup>140</sup> and the failing mission attempts among Jews. Similarly, he enhances the portrait of Judas by mentioning the influence of Satan (Luke 22:3).<sup>141</sup> From the perspective of reception-history, a reader of Chronicles may not have seen any problems in Luke's strategy.

It is also possible that Acts 12:20–23 could be explained by this tendency; Josephus's tale (*Ant.* 19:343–350) is not a counter-argument. Distinct traditions are recorded by Josephus and Luke, but both from the point of view of biblical monotheism.<sup>142</sup>

## Bibliography

### Sources

*Cicero, De natura Deorum*, with an English Translation by H. Rackham, in *Cicero*, in twenty-eight Volumes, Vol. XIX (Cambridge [MA]: Harvard University Press/London: William Heinemann, 1979), 1–396.

*Dio Chrysostom*, with an English translation by H. Lamar Crosby, in five Volumes, Vol. II, LCL (London: William Heinemann/Cambridge [MA]: Harvard University Press, 1951).

*Diogenes Laertius*, with an English translation by R. D. Hicks, in two Volumes, Vol. I, LCL (London: William Heinemann/Cambridge [MA]: Harvard University Press, 1959).

Plato, *The Republic*, Volume I, Book I–V, with an English translation by Paul Shorey, in *Plato*, in twelve Volumes, Vol. V/1, LCL 273 (London: William Heinemann/Cambridge [MA]: Harvard University, 1969).

---

story of Jesus's passion, perhaps to demonstrate Jesus's innocence as proven by two independent witnesses (cf. Deut 19:15<sup>LXX</sup>).

<sup>137</sup> Cf. Luke 23:1–25.

<sup>138</sup> The Jewish Sanhedrin was not allowed to put someone to death (cf. Jn 18:31 etc.). It was Luke who transformed the violent action against Stephen into a regular process.

<sup>139</sup> In his missionary activities, the Lukan Paul always begins to preach in the synagogue; after being expelled from the synagogue, he also preaches to Gentiles. This pattern is apologetically motivated: it is not Paul but his Jewish opponents who are responsible for the conflict.

<sup>140</sup> Cf. STEGEMANN, *Zwischen Synagoge und Obrigkeit*; MEISER, "Lukas und die römische Staatsmacht;" YODER, *Representatives of Roman Rule*.

<sup>141</sup> The influence of Satan does not imply that Judas would not be responsible for his actions; cf. Luke 22:6 (καὶ ἐξωμολόγησεν); Acts 5:9 (συνεφωνήθη ὑμῖν); TestDan 4:7; TestNapht 8:6.

<sup>142</sup> I am grateful to Jenny Pulido and William Ross for improving my English style.

- Polybius*, with an English Translation by W. R. Paton, in six Volumes, Vol. I, LCL 128 (Cambridge [MA]: Harvard University Press/London: William Heinemann, 1975).
- Plutarch, *De Iside et Osiride*, in *Plutarch, Moralia*, with an English translation by Frank Cole Babbitt, in Fourteen Volumes, Vol. V (London: William Heinemann/Cambridge [MA]: Harvard University Press, 1936), 1–191.
- Thucydides*, with an English translation by Charles Forster Smith, in four volumes I, History of the Peloponnesian War Books I and II (Cambridge [MA]: Harvard University Press/London: William Heinemann, 1969).
- Xenophanes, *Fragments*, in: *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker. Griechisch und Deutsch*, ed. Hermann Diels, 5<sup>th</sup> edition ed. Walther Kranz, Vol. I (Berlin: Weidmann, 1934), 113–139.
- Xenophon, *Agesilaos*, in *Xenophon*, in seven Volumes, Vol. VII, Scripta Minora, by E. C. Marchant and G. W. Bowersock, LCL 183 (Cambridge [MA]: Harvard University Press/London: William Heinemann, 1971), 59–131.
- Eusebius of Caesarea, *Praeparatio evangelica*, ed. Karl Mras, GCS 43/1 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1954), 2<sup>nd</sup> edition ed. Édouard des Places (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1982).
- Jerome, *Commentarii in Ieremiam*, cura et studio Siegfried Reiter, CCSL 74 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1960).
- Origène, *Homélie sur Jérémie*, Tome 2: Homélie XII–XX et Homélie latines, traduction par Pierre Husson/Pierre Nautin, édition, introduction et notes par Pierre Nautin, SC 238 (Paris: Cerf, 1977).
- Origène, *Homélie sur Jérémie*, Vol. 2: Homélie XII–XX et Homélie latines, traduction par Pierre Husson/Pierre Nautin, édition, introduction et notes par Pierre Nautin, SC 238 (Paris: Cerf, 1977).
- Theodoret, *The Questions on the Octateuch*, Vol. 1, On Genesis and Exodus, ed. John F. Petruccione, LEC 1 (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 2007).

### Secondary Literature

- BARTHELEMY, DOMINIQUE, “Les Tiquané Sophérim et la critique textuelle de l’Ancien Testament,” in ID., *Études d’histoire du texte de l’Ancien Testament*, OBO 21 (Fribourg/Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978), 91–110.
- BICKERMAN, ELIAS J., *The Jews in the Greek Age* (Cambridge [MA]/London: Harvard University Press, 1988).
- BOLING, ROBERT G., *Joshua. A New Translation with Notes and Commentary*. Introduction by G. E. Wright, AncB 6 (Garden City/New York: Doubleday, 1982).
- BONS, EBERHARD, “‘The Lord is the One Who Crushes Wars.’ A Fresh Look at the Septuagint Translation of Exod 15:3,” in *Die Septuaginta – Geschichte, Wirkung, Relevanz*, eds. Martin Meiser et al., WUNT 405 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018), 158–167.
- , “Die Septuaginta-Version des Buches Ruth,” *BZ* 42 (1998): 202–224.
- BUTLER, TRENT C., *Joshua*, WBC 7 (Waco: Word Books, 1983).
- COGAN, MORDECHAI, *1 Kings. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AncB 10 (New York et al.: Doubleday, 2000).
- DEN HERTOEG, CORNELIS, “Jesus/Josue/Das Buch Josua,” *LXX.E*, 605–656.
- , *Studien zur griechischen Übersetzung des Buches Josua* (Ph.D. Giessen 1996).
- DOGNIEZ, CÉCILE, “‘Lost in Translation’: La désignation des chefs dans le Dodeka-prophète,” *JSJ* 39 (2008): 192–210.

- DORIVAL, GILLES, *Les Nombres. Traduction du texte grec de la Septante, Introduction et Notes*, BdA 4 (Paris: Cerf 1994).
- DÖRRIE, HEINRICH, "Zur Methodik antiker Exegese," *ZNW* 65 (1974): 121–138.
- DURHAM, JOHN I., *Exodus*, WBC 3 (Waco: Word Books, 1987).
- EBACH, JÜRGEN, *Genesis 37–50*, HThK (Freiburg: Herder 2007).
- EVANS, TREVOR V., *Verbal Syntax in the Greek Pentateuch: Natural Greek Usage and Hebrew Interference* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).
- FISCHER, GEORG, "Zum Text des Jeremiabuches," *Bib* 78 (1997): 305–328.
- GÖRG, MANFRED, "Die Septuaginta im Kontext spätägyptischer Kultur. Beispiele lokaler Inspiration bei der Übersetzungsarbeit am Pentateuch," in *Im Brennpunkt: Die Septuaginta. Studien zur Entstehung und Bedeutung der Griechischen Bibel*, Bd. 1, eds. Heinz-Josef Fabry and Ulrich Offerhaus, BWANT 153 (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2001), 115–130.
- HECKEL, THEODOR K., "Jonas/Jona," *LXX.E*, 2394–2404.
- HOLMES, SAMUEL, *Joshua. The Hebrew and Greek Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1914).
- HUGHES, JEREMY, *Secrets of the Times. Myth and History in Biblical Chronology*, JSOT.SS 66 (Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 1990).
- KALIMI, ISAAC, *Zur Geschichtsschreibung des Chronisten. Literarisch-historiographische Abweichungen der Chronik von ihren Paralleltexten in den Samuel- und Königsbüchern*, BZAW 226 (Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 1995).
- KREUZER, SIEGFRIED, "430 Jahre, 400 Jahre oder 4 Generationen – Zu den Zeitangaben über den Ägyptenaufenthalt der 'Israeliten'," *ZAW* 98 (1986): 199–210.
- , "Papyrus 967. Bemerkungen zu seiner buchtechnischen, textgeschichtlichen und kanongeschichtlichen Bedeutung," in *Die Septuaginta – Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten*, eds. Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus, WUNT 219 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 64–82.
- , "Zur Priorität und Auslegungsgeschichte von Exodus 12,40 MT. Die chronologische Interpretation des Ägyptenaufenthalts in der jüdischen, samaritanischen und alexandrinischen Exegese," *ZAW* 103 (1991): 252–258.
- , "Das frühjüdische Textverständnis und die Septuaginta-Versionen der Samuelbücher. Ein Beitrag zur textgeschichtlichen und übersetzungstechnischen Bewertung des Antiochenischen Textes und der Kaige-Rezension an Hand von 2Sam 15,1–12," in *La Septante en Allemagne et en France/Septuaginta Deutsch und Bible d'Alexandrie*, eds. Wolfgang Kraus and Olivier Munnich, OBO 238 (Fribourg: Academic Press/Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009), 3–28.
- LE BOULLUEC, ALAIN/SANDEVOIR, PIERRE, *L'Exode. Traduction du texte grec de la Septante. Introduction et notes*, BdA 2 (Paris: Cerf, 1989).
- LE DÉAUT, ROGER, "La Septante, un Targum?," in *Études sur le Judaïsme hellénistique. Congrès de Strasbourg (1983)*, eds. Raymond Kuntzmann and Jacques Schlosser (Paris: Cerf, 1984), 147–195.
- LENDLE, OTTO, *Einführung in die griechische Geschichtsschreibung von Hekataios bis Zosimos* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1992).
- LESTIENNE, MICHEL, *Premier Livre des Règnes*, BdA 9.1 (Paris: Cerf, 1997).
- LIEBERMAN, SAUL, *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1962).
- MAIER, JOHANN, "Zur Frage des biblischen Kanons im Frühjudentum im Licht der Qumrantexte," *JBTh* 3 (1988): 135–146.
- MCCARTER, P. KYLE, *I Samuel. A New Translation with Introduction, Notes and Commentary*, AncB 8 (Garden City/New York: Doubleday, 1980).

- MEISER, MARTIN, “Basileion III/Das dritte Buch der Königtümer/Das erste Buch der Könige,” in *Einleitung in die Septuaginta*, ed. Siegfried Kreuzer, LXX.H 1 (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2016), 232–240.
- , “Lukas und die römische Staatsmacht,” in *Zwischen den Reichen: Neues Testament und Römische Herrschaft. Vorträge auf der Ersten Konferenz der European Association for Biblical Studies*, eds. Michael Labahn and Jürgen Zangenberg, TANZ 36 (Tübingen/Basel: Francke, 2002), 175–193.
- MEISTER, KLAUS, *Die griechische Geschichtsschreibung. Von den Anfängen bis zum Ende des Hellenismus* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1990).
- MOATTI-FINE, JACQUELINE, *Jésus (Josué). Traduction du texte grec de la Septante. Introduction et notes*, BdA 6 (Paris: Cerf, 1996).
- MONTGOMERY, JAMES A./GEHMAN, HENRY S., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Kings*, ICC 20 (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1951).
- MULDER, MARTIN JAN, *1 Kings*, HCOT (Leuven: Peeters, 1998).
- NEEF, HEINZ DIETER, “Daniel/Das Buch Daniel,” *LXX.E*, 3016–3051.
- PERKINS, LARRY, “The Septuagint of Jonah: Aspects of Literary Analysis Applied to Biblical Translation,” *BIOSCS* 20 (1987): 43–53.
- PFEIFFER, RUDOLF, *Geschichte der klassischen Philologie. Von den Anfängen bis zum Ende des Hellenismus* (Hamburg-Reinbek: Rowohlt, 1970).
- POLA, THOMAS, “Deuteronomium 17–20,” *Septuaginta Deutsch. Erläuterungen und Kommentare zum Griechischen Alten Testament*, eds. Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2011), 570–576.
- , “Von Juda zu Judas. Das theologische Proprium von Sach 14,12–21 LXX,” in *Die Septuaginta – Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten*, eds. Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus, WUNT 219 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 572–580.
- ROSE, MARTIN, “David im Lob der Väter (Sir 47,1–11). Ein ‘Spiel’ mit Manuskripten,” in *Nächstenliebe und Gottesfurcht. Beiträge aus alttestamentlicher, semitistischer und altorientalistischer Wissenschaft für Hans-Peter Mathys zum 65. Geburtstag*, eds. Hanna Jenni and Markus Saur, AOAT 439 (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2016), 351–373.
- RÖSEL, MARTIN, “Die Septuaginta-Version des Josuabuches,” in *Im Brennpunkt: Die Septuaginta. Studien zur Entstehung und Bedeutung der Griechischen Bibel*, Vol. 1, eds. Heinz-Josef Fabry and Ulrich Offerhaus, BWANT 153 (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2001), 197–211.
- , *Übersetzung als Vollendung der Auslegung. Studien zur Genesis-Septuaginta*, BZAW 223 (Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 1994).
- RÖSEL, MARTIN/SCHLUND, CHRISTINE, “Arithmoi/Numeri/Das vierte Buch Mose,” *LXX.E*, 431–522.
- SCHAPER, JOACHIM/WEBER, EKKEHARD, “Exodos/Exodus/Das zweite Buch Mose,” *LXX.E*, 258–324.
- SCHART, AARON/DAFNI, EVANGELIA G., “Amos,” *LXX.E*, 2339–2361.
- SCHMIDT, WERNER HUGO, *Exodus. 1. Teilband Exodus 1–6*, BK AT II/1 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988).
- SELEZNEV, MIKHAIL, “Replacing תַּלְמֵי with ἀρχων in the LXX: Self-Censorship or Inner Development of the Jewish Tradition?,” in *Die Septuaginta – Themen, Manuskripte, Wirkungen*, eds. Eberhard Bons et al. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020), 302–314.
- SIEBERT, FOLKER, *Zwischen Hebräischer Bibel und Altem Testament. Eine Einführung in die Septuaginta*, MJSt 9 (Münster: LIT, 2001).
- SPEISER, EPHRAIM AVIGDOR, *Genesis*, AncB 1 (Garden City/New York: Doubleday, 1964).

- STEGEMANN, WOLFGANG, *Zwischen Synagoge und Obrigkeit. Zur historischen Situation der lukanischen Christen*, FRLANT 152 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1991).
- STEMBERGER, GÜNTHER, "Die Stephanusrede (Apg 7) und die jüdische Tradition," in ID., *Studien zum rabbinischen Judentum*, SBAB 10 (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk 1990), 229–250.
- STIPP, HERMANN-JOSEF, "Zur aktuellen Diskussion um das Verhältnis der Textformen des Jeremiabuches," in *Die Septuaginta – Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten*, eds. Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus, WUNT 219 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 630–653.
- TILLY, MICHAEL, *Einführung in die Septuaginta* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2005).
- TOV, EMANUEL, "Midrash-Type Exegesis in the Septuagint of Joshua," in ID., *The Greek and Hebrew Bible. Collected Essays on the Septuagint*, VTSup 72 (Leiden: Brill/Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1999), 153–163.
- , "Theologically Motivated Exegesis Embedded in the Septuagint," in ID., *The Greek and Hebrew Bible*, 257–269.
- TSUMURA, DAVID TOSHIO, *The First Book of Samuel*, NICOT (Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans 2007).
- VAN DER KOOIJ, ARIE, "The Septuagint of Zechariah as Witness to an Early Interpretation of the Book," in *The Book of Zechariah and its Influence*, ed. Christopher M. Tuckett (Aldershot/Burlington: Ashgate, 2003), 53–64.
- , "Zum Verhältnis von Textkritik und Literarkritik: Überlegungen anhand einiger Beispiele," in *Congress Volume Cambridge 1995*, ed. John A. Emerton, VTSup 66 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 185–202.
- VAN DER KOOIJ, ARIE/WILK, FLORIAN, "Esaias/Isaias/Das Buch Jesaja (Erläuterungen zu Kapitel 1–39)," *LXX.E*, 2484–2607.
- VAN DER MEER, MICHAËL N., *Formation and Reformulation. The Redaction of the Book of Joshua in the Light of the Oldest Textual Witnesses*, VTSup 102 (Leiden: Brill, 2004).
- VAN THIEL, HELMUT, "Der Homertext in Alexandria," *ZPE* 115 (1997): 13–36.
- VONACH, ANDREAS, "Jeremias/Jeremias/Jeremia," *LXX.E*, 2696–2814.
- WALTER, NIKOLAUS, *Fragmente jüdisch-hellenistischer Exegeten: Aristobulos, Deme-trios, Aristetas*, JSHRZ III,4 (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, <sup>2</sup>1980), 257–302.
- WELLHAUSEN, JULIUS, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments* (Berlin: Weidmann, <sup>3</sup>1899).
- WENHAM, GORDON J., *Genesis 1–15*, WBC 1 (Waco: Word Books, 1987).
- WEVERS, JOHN WILLIAM, *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis*, SBL.SCS 35 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993).
- , *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus*, SBL.SCS 30 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990).
- , *Notes on the Greek Text of Numbers*, SBL.SCS 46 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998).
- WIEFEL, WOLFGANG, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, ThHK NT 3 (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1987).
- WILSON, NORMAN, "Griechische Philologie im Altertum," in *Einleitung in die griechische Philologie*, ed. Heinz-Günther Nesselrath (Stuttgart/Leipzig: Teubner, 1997), 87–103.
- WISEMAN, DONALD J., *1 and 2 Kings*, The Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1993).
- WOLFF, HANS WALTER, *Dodekapropheten 2: Joel und Amos*, BK AT XIV/2 (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, <sup>2</sup>1975).
- YODER, JOSHUA, *Representatives of Roman Rule: Roman Provincial Governors in Luke-Acts*, BZNW 209 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2014).