

Collected Essays

EBERHARD BONS, RALPH BRUCKER, and JAN JOOSTEN (eds.), *The Reception of Septuagint Words in Jewish-Hellenistic and Christian Literature* (WUNT 2/367; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014). Pp. viii + 213. Paper \$119.

This volume is a collection of essays by scholars currently producing the *Historical and Theological Lexicon of the Septuagint (HTLS)*, the first volume of which is nearing completion. *HTLS* provides “historical studies of Septuagint words, retracing their usage from early Greek authors, over Koine Greek and the Septuagint (LXX) translation itself, into Jewish-Hellenistic and early Christian literature” (p. v). To that extent, this collection of essays aims to help develop a methodology for answering the various questions raised by the goals of *HTLS*, such as those related to semantic development of words in the LXX and beyond, NT adoption of LXX terminology, lexical obsolescence, and so on. The essays included are as follows, with a brief summary.

In “A Sample Article: ᾄδω,” Ralph Brucker provides a sample from *HTLS*, surveying in six sections the use of ᾄδω (“to sing”) in Greek literature, papyri and inscriptions, the LXX, Jewish literature in Greek, and early Christian literature. He discusses its subjects, objects, related forms (e.g., the traditional gloss “flute” for αὐλός is, he states, “clearly wrong” [p. 2]) and various alternative meanings. The verb appears often particularly in the LXX Psalter and other cultic contexts, strictly as a human action. Full of textual citations for each point, often with English translations, Brucker’s sample article gives a clear view of the scope of coverage intended in *HTLS*.

In “Kämpfen, Mühsal und Elend in der Septuaginta: Die von ΑΕΘΛ-/ΑΘΛ- abgeleitete Wortgruppe,” Christoph Kugelmeier discusses the root ἀθλ- and its use in the LXX. The word group is associated with a characteristic aspect of pagan Greek life, namely ἀγών (“struggle” or “contest”). Kugelmeier argues that the root initially referred to a “prize,” then developed the extended meaning “struggle for things difficult to acquire,” and became common within the sports culture of Greek life (p. 20). In the LXX, only Maccabees, with its strong Hellenistic influence, employs the ἀθλ- group in this latter sense (e.g., 4 Macc 9:8), and it is later taken up in the NT (e.g., 2 Tim 4:7) and by Philo (e.g., *Somn.* 1.251), often metaphorically.

In “The Notion of *Anathema* in Ancient Jewish Literature Written in Greek,” Katell Berthelot shows that in Greek sources ἀνάθημα were types of decorative offerings, not sacrifices. In turn, ἀνατίθημι means “to consecrate” or “to dedicate irrevocably” (pp. 37, 40). It is occasionally used of land or humans reserved for the benefit of a god. In the LXX ἀνάθη/εμα translates only *hērem*. In many cases, then, ἀνάθημα is used as a “semantic neologism” to refer to what is abominable to God and must be destroyed (p. 46), a use later adopted and expanded in the NT. Later Jewish authors, however, used ἀνάθημα with its standard Greek meaning, likely considering the LXX use of the word to be incorrect.

In “The Noun βοηθός as a Divine Title,” Eberhard Bons discusses how, although calling God a “helper” (βοηθός) is common in early Christianity, the concept is sparse in the NT. In Classical sources βοηθός occasionally refers to divine military helpers, but not in prayers. In documentary evidence, βοηθός perhaps refers not to a god (cf. *Urkunden der Ptolemäerzeit [ältere Funde]* [ed. U. Wilcken; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1927–34] 1.52.8-9) but often to a human *assistant*, usually someone in a position of power. In the LXX, God, not a human, is usually the βοηθός, especially in the Psalter, where God is also metaphorically a rock (*šûr*). The LXX translators likely chose βοηθός because it expresses “the idea of dependency” (p. 66).

In “Die Bedeutung von διαθήκη im Hebräerbrief,” Wolfgang Kraus examines the meaning of διαθήκη, specifically in Hebrews, and in light of other proposals by Knut Backhaus, Manuel Vogel, and Sebastian Fuhrmann. The author of Hebrews uses διαθήκη mostly in the “Christological midsection” of the book, sometimes citing the LXX (p. 72). After walking through the various uses of the word, Kraus concludes that, in 9:16, διαθήκη is used in its normal Greek legal sense, not a federal one. The new and better διαθήκη serves to ground Jesus’ high priesthood and the fulfillment of the forgiveness that he brings about (cf. Ps 109[110]:4; Jeremiah 38[31]). This argument was not meant polemically but was later used that way against Jews.

In “The Use of δόξα in Paul and John as Shaped by the Septuagint,” Jörg Frey considers how the LXX usage of δόξα is adopted in the NT (p. 87). In nonbiblical Greek δόξα means “opinion,” “judgment,” or “repute.” The last sense is markedly favored and developed in the LXX, likely due to its initial employment in the Pentateuch and then Isaiah. Whereas Jewish authors such as Philo use δόξα according to its standard Greek meaning (“opinion”) rather than that of the LXX (“glory,” “radiance”), the NT largely adopts and develops the LXX usage. Paul often uses δόξα to refer to God’s glory in Christ, while, for the author of John, δόξα primarily describes Christ and is connected with his death and exaltation.

In “Mixed Blessings: The Biblical Notion of Blessing in the Works of Philo and Flavius Josephus,” Jan Joosten examines how the LXX translation affected the Greek target language. The Classical sense of εὐλογέω, “praise,” “speak well of,” appears mostly in political contexts. In the LXX, εὐλογέω is occasionally used this way (e.g., Prov 31:30) but is often used of God in religious discourse, as in some contemporaneous inscriptions. The use of εὐλογέω in the LXX, however, is new, meaning “bless,” with God as the subject and creatures as its object, typically rendering Hebrew *bārāk*. Joosten surmises that this use arose in the language of prayer even prior to the translation of Genesis (p. 108 n. 8). Philo

further develops the verb through Hellenistic philosophical categories, while Josephus employs the Classical sense.

In “The Use of ὁμόνοια and Related Terms in the Septuagint and in Christian Literature of the First Three Centuries,” Emanuela Prinzivalli shows that ὁμόνοια referred primarily to *concord*, especially civic concord, in Classical and Hellenistic sources. Appearing just seven times in the LXX, ὁμόνοια is used more generically but, together with Jewish literature, emphasizes “civic ὁμόνοια” as vital to human existence in conjunction with God’s just law (p. 121). The early Christian author of *1 Clement*, Ignatius of Antioch, Origen, and others later “readapted” ὁμόνοια, along with similar terms like φιλαδελφία, to express “feelings of union meant to unite members of a church” (p. 127).

In “La Septante dans quelques *testimonia* non canoniques des origines chrétiennes,” Enrico Norelli undertakes a study of the process of the production of noncanonical texts (*testimonia agrapha*) and their relation to the LXX. These texts cite Israel’s prophetic Scriptures in tandem with comments about their fulfillment in Jesus’ life and work. The *testimonia* contain many variant LXX readings, although these often seem to be changes created in the production of the *testimonia* themselves. Norelli concentrates on three texts from *1 Clement* at some length (8.2-3; 26.2; and 29.3) to determine their process and purpose of composition. The essay concludes with an exploration of the *Apocryphon of Ezekiel* in relation to *1 Clem.* 8.2-3, which Norelli denies as a potential source text.

In “Eine Grammatik der Septuaginta und des Neuen Testaments: Methodische Überlegungen zu Grenzen und Möglichkeiten,” Thomas Kraus addresses the question of the legitimacy and theoretical complexities of producing a grammar of the LXX and the NT. He first outlines various shortcomings in works that have thus far appeared, such as that by H. St. J. Thackeray, then raises further doubts about whether NT grammars can sufficiently describe the diversity of that corpus within the broader development of Greek. Though the Greek Bible has a chimera-like unity, the presence of “translation Greek” (*Übersetzungsgriechisch*) complicates the theoretical task of a unified grammar. Kraus then investigates the historical development of ἐν + dative alongside the Hebrew instrumental *bē-*, concluding that a connection between the two is indisputable (p. 177).

In the final essay, “Outlook,” James K. Aitken discusses “general areas of consideration” for inquiries such as those in this volume (p. 183). These include a discussion of the LXX in the history of Greek and its treatment in modern lexicons, the question of register in the LXX, and the value of inscriptional evidence. He closes with useful comments on the reception of LXX words and cautions that later interpretation and chronology must not prevent us from understanding Greek words in context on their own terms.

Sketching the far-reaching importance of close investigation of LXX vocabulary, the essays in this volume are an excellent glimpse of the many insights that *HTLS* will provide. Space does not permit critical interaction with the contributions here. Suffice it to say that it will be precisely such critical interaction—with, for example, the methodologies employed, words worth investigation, conclusions reached, and so on—that will drive this important field forward. This volume will therefore be of interest to scholars of the NT, Koine Greek, Second Temple Judaism, and early Christianity, among others, and will, one hopes, spur interest among students.

Ross William, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, CB1 2AX, United Kingdom