CHAPTER ONE

THE RABBINIC TRADITION CONCERNING THE 'ALTERATIONS'
INSERTED INTO THE GREEK TRANSLATION OF THE TORAH AND
THEIR RELATION TO THE ORIGINAL TEXT
OF THE SEPTUAGINT

Various passages within rabbinic literature cite a series of alterations which were inserted into the Greek translation of the Torah. In these passages a list of 10 (11), 13, 15, or 18 (16) such alterations appears along with a brief account of the circumstances under which they were inserted in the translation. The background of this rabbinic tradition is examined here, as well as its importance for LXX studies. Special attention is given to the implications of the exact wording of the list for our understanding of the original form of the LXX.

1. *The sources*

The principal sources for the rabbinic tradition are: *b. Meg.* 9a; *y. Meg.* 1, 1, 4., p. 72a; *Mek.* Exod 12, 40; *Midr. Hagadol* Exod 4, 20; *Abot de-R. Nat.* version B, chapter 37; *Soph.* 1. 7; *Yal. Shim.* Gen 3; *Midr. Tan.* Exod para 22. Additional sources are listed in Higger, *Soferim*, 101.

2. *The list*

The various sources list a different number of alterations and at times explicitly state the number at the head of the list. Thus *Abot de-R. Nat.* and *Midr. Tan.* Exod paragraph 22 mentions 10 alterations (al-though the lists include 11 or 14 instances) and *Midr. Hagadol* on Exod 4:20 and Deut 4:19 mentions 18 alterations (the list in Exodus includes only 16 alterations). Other lists do not indicate any number at the head of their lists: *b. Meg.* 9a; *Mek.* Exod 12:40; *Yal. Shim.* Gen, paragraph 3.
    It would be natural to assume that the shortest list (10 or 11 alterations) reflects the original formulation of the rabbinic tradition,

expanded by the longer lists; however, the list and the story associated with it developed not only by expansion but also by abridgment.

The sources mentioning 13 or 15 alterations are the most widespread and presumably reflect the central tradition. The difference between these two traditions lies in the inclusion or exclusion of passages *10* and *11*. Attention should be drawn to the fact that the list with 16 alterations (*Midr. Hagadol* Exod 4:20) came about as a result of the addition of biblical passages similar to those originally in the list, and that list is therefore secondary. Among the other traditions, 10 or 18 alterations are mentioned in the headings of the list (though the lists themselves contain some other figure); it would appear that these figures have been influenced by other lists of 10 items in the context (*Abot de-R. Nat.* ibid.; *Abot* chapter 5, 1–9) and in the same way by the list of 18 emendations of the scribes in the Hebrew text of the Bible, which, too, is known from rabbinic literature.[1] Tendencies toward expansion and abridgment are also noticeable in the items comprising the list themselves, both regarding the biblical citations and their explanations. This problem is particularly acute in light of the fact that certain citations reflect more than one alteration (see notes 28, 29).

In view of these considerations it is impossible to determine with certainty which among the above-mentioned lists is the original or the nearest to it. The lists in *b. Meg.*, *y. Meg.* and *Mek.* are the most ancient among the sources, but we lack proven criteria in order to evaluate the differences between these sources themselves. Furthermore, each list itself is transmitted in various forms, both in manuscripts and printed editions, so it is hard to determine their original form, if that existed at all. There were also mutual influences between the various lists, at least at the level of individual manuscripts.

The relationship between the different sources was described in general terms by Frankel, Friedmann, Geiger, Aptowitzer, and Müller.[2] Before Aptowitzer it was generally believed that the relatively short *baraita* (13 passages) in *y. Meg.* (and similarly the list in *Mek.*) reflects a more original form than the other sources, but Aptowitzer considered the *baraita* in *b. Meg.* earlier. These two opinions are supported by different arguments (see Aptowitzer, "Berichte" 3 [1910] 102 ff.);

---

[1] See *Mek.* Exod 15:7, *Sifre* Num 10:35 *et al.* For an analysis, see Geiger, *Urschrift*, 231–261; B. Keller, "Fragment d'un traité d'exégèse massorétique," *Textus* 5 (1966) 60–84; W.E. Barnes, "Ancient Corrections in the Text of the O.T.," *JTS* 1 (1900) 379–414; W. McKane, "Observations on the Tikkûnê Sôp^erîm," *Festschrift Eugene A. Nida* (The Hague/Paris 1974) 53–77.

[2] Frankel, *Vorstudien;* Friedmann, *Onkelos;* Geiger, *Urtext;* Aptowitzer, "Berichte"; Müller, "Nachrichten."

evidently the main problem is the inclusion or exclusion of passages *10* and *11*. In *b. Meg.* these passages are included in the list, while in *y. Meg.* and in *Mek.* they are lacking. Judging by their contents, these passages belong in the list, but it is hard to determine if they also appeared at the earliest stage of its development.[3] Even if these passages were added to the list only at a later stage, the discussion will turn out to be profitable if it is based on the longest of the ancient lists. To that end, the 15 passages included in the list of *b. Meg.* 9a are cited below according to their sequence in the Talmud, quoted from the Vilna edition, and accompanied by variants from MS München (quoted from R. Rabinowitz, דקדוקי סופרים, 8 [München 1877]) and other sources.[4]

*y. Meg.* 1, 1, 4., p. 71b

*Mek.* Exod 12:40 according to H.S. Horowitz-Rabin (2d ed.; Jerusalem 1960)

*Midr. Hagadol* Exod 12:40 according to M. Margoliouth (Jerusalem 1967)

*Abot de-R. Nat.*, version B, chapter 37 according to S. Schechter (Vienna 1887)

*Soph.* 1.7 according to Higger, *Soferim*; individual manuscripts are here quoted as '*Soph.*, mss'

*Yal. Shim.* Gen, paragraph 3 according to the edition of the Rav Kook Institute (Jerusalem 1973)

*Midr. Tan.* Exod paragraph 22

1.    אלהים ברא בראשית (Gen 1:1)

2.    אעשה אדם בצלם ובדמות (Gen 1:26)

ובדמות] *Abot de-R. Nat.*: ודמות. *Soph.* pr.: ויאמר אליהם. *Midr. Hagadol* Exod adds: ויברא אלהים את האדם בצלם ובדמות (Gen 1:27).

3.    ויכל ביום הששי וישבות ביום השביעי (Gen 2:2)

*y. Meg.* and *Soph.*: ויכל בששי וישב(ו)ת בשביעי. In most traditions (except for *Midr. Hagadol* Exod) אלהים of MT is lacking. In *y. Meg.*, *Mek.*, *Midr.*

---

[3] Regarding this detail, is the list of the *Yerushalmi* earlier since the problematic passages are not found there; or perhaps were they omitted from the list in the *Yerushalmi* because they were problematic? Similarly, passage *15* appears in its present place in *b. Meg.* out of the verse order and should thus be considered an addition. On the other hand, it appears in *y. Meg.* in its proper place according to the order of the passages. It is hard to determine whether it was inserted here later or whether this was its original place.

[4] A perusal of the various manuscripts of these sources reveals that the many variant readings listed below as variants between the different lists appear also as variants within the tradition of *b. Meg.* (and also in other traditions, e.g., Higger, *Soferim*). The manuscripts of *b. Meg.* are not listed below. For example, if for passage *4*, it is written according to our principles, that the words ולא כתבו בראם are lacking in manuscript M of *b. Meg.* it should be pointed out that they are actually lacking in all the major manuscripts.

*Hagadol* Exod and *Tan.*, passages *3* and *4* are cited in inverted order. In *Abot de-R. Nat.* this passage is lacking.

4. (Gen 5:2) זכר ונקבה בראו ולא כתבו בראם

ונקבה] *y. Meg.*: ונקביו; *Mek., Midr. Hagadol* Exod, *Yal. Shim.* and *Soph.*: ונקוביו (thus also Gen Rab. 8:11).

בראו] *Mek.* and *Soph.*: בראם; *Midr. Hagadol* Exod: ברא אותו (the full text is: זכר ונקוביו ברא אותו זכר ונקוביו בראו).

ולא כתבו בראם] lacking in manuscript M of *b. Meg., y. Meg., Mek., Abot de-R. Nat., Soph.* and *Yal. Shim.*

5. (Gen 11:7) הבה ארדה ואבלה שם שפתם

ואבלה שם שפתם] lacking in *y. Meg.* and *Abot de-R. Nat.*

6. (Gen 18:12) ותצחק שרה בקרוביה

*y. Meg., Mek.,* and *Soph.* add: לאמר.

7. (Gen 49:6) כי באפם הרגו שור וברצונם עקרו אבוס

שור] manuscripts of *Mek.* and *Soph.*: איש

8. (Exod 4:20) ויקח משה את אשתו ואת בניו וירכיבם על נושא בני אדם

ויקח בניו] missing in *Abot de-R. Nat.*

נושא בני אדם] manuscript M of *b. Meg., Mek., Midr. Hagadol* Exod. *Abot de-R. Nat.* and *Soph.*: נושא(י) אדם.

נשא] *y. Meg.* and *Yal. Shim.*: נושאי.

9. ומושב בני ישראל אשר ישבו במצרים ובשאר ארצות שלשים שנה וארבע מאות שנה (Exod 12:40)

במצרים] *Soph.*: בארץ מצרים;

ובשאר ארצות] *y. Meg.*: ובכל הארצות; *Midr. Hagadol* Exod: ובשאר הארצות; *Mek.*: ובארץ כנע ובארץ ג(ו)ש, so also *Tan.* in inverted order; *Soph.*: ובארץ כנע; mss of *Soph.*: ובארץ כנע ובארץ מצרים.

10. (Exod 24:5) וישלח זאטוטי בני ישראל

זאטוטי] *Midr. Hagadol* Exod: זעטוטי; *Yal. Shim.*: זטוטי. The entire passage is lacking in *y. Meg., Abot de-R. Nat.* and *Soph.*

11. (Exod 24:11) ואל זאטוטי בני ישראל לא שלח ידו

זאטוטי] *Midr. Hagadol* Exod: זעטוטי; *Yal. Shim.*: זטוטי. The entire passage is lacking in *y. Meg., Mek., Abot de-R. Nat.* and *Soph.*

12. (Num 16:15) לא חמד אחד מהם נשאתי

חמד] *Mek.*: חמור. *Tan.* lacks the entire passage.

13. (Deut 4:19) אשר חלק ה' אלהיך אותם להאיר לכל עמים

להאיר] *Abot de-R. Nat.* adds: בהם. *y. Meg., Abot de-R. Nat., Soph.* and *Tan.* add: תחת (כל) השמים.

14. (Deut 17:3) וילך ויעבד אלהים אחרים אשר לא צויתי לעבדם

וילך-אחרים] lacking in *y. Meg., Mek., Midr. Hagadol* Exod and Tan.; ms M of *b. Meg.* and *Yal. Shim.* omit אלהים אחרים.

ולשמש או לירח או לכל צבא השמים אשר לא צויתי לעובדם .*Soph*: [וילך לעבדם
.ולכתבו לו אשר לא צויתי לאומות לעבדם .*Mek*:

לאומות לעבדם (לעבד ֔) :Exod *Midr. Hagadol* and ,.*Mek* ,.*Meg* .*y* [לעבדם

15.   וכתבו לו צעירת הרגלים ולא כתבו את הארנבת (Lev 11:6 (5); Deut
14:7; the continuation of the passage is quoted below).

וכתבו—הארנבת] *y. Meg.*: ואת הארנבת את צעירת הרגלים; *Mek.*, *Soph.* and *Yal.*
*Shim.*: (ו)את צעירת הרגלים). In *y. Meg.* and *Soph.* this passage comes after
passage *9*; in *Abot de-R. Nat.* it comes after passage *12*.

3. *The circumstances under which the alterations were inserted in the LXX*

The circumstances under which the alterations were inserted in the LXX
are described in the introduction to the list, whether in brief or in detail,
and the name King Ptolemy, 'for' whom the translators 'wrote' their
translation, is mentioned in all the descriptions.
The short descriptions speak only of 'writing,' as in *Mek.* ('and this is one
of the things they wrote for King Ptolemy. Similarly they wrote him ...')
or of an 'alteration' as in *y. Meg.*: 'thirteen details were changed by the
sages for King Ptolemy; they wrote for him ...'.

The longer descriptions relate the story of the writing of the LXX
known also from other sources, both Hebrew and Greek,[5] although the
differences in outlook and emphasis between the rabbinic account and
the other sources are considerable—see Aptowitzer, "Berichte" 3 (1910) 4
ff. *B. Meg.* relates the following account: 'It has been taught, the story
goes that King Ptolemy assembled seventy-two elders and lodged them
in seventy-two rooms without disclosing to them the reason for
assembling them, and he went into each one individually and ordered
them "write me the Torah of your Teacher Moses." The Holy One,
blessed be He, put wisdom in the heart of each one so that they agreed
with one accord and wrote for him ...' (at this place follows the list of
alterations).

This account describes the circumstances under which the Greek
translation of the Torah was prepared, and if not all the details of this
story are mentioned in every single source, it is often alluded to in such
phrases as 'they wrote for Ptolemy.' Furthermore, *Midr. Hagadol* Exod
4:20 says explicitly: 'this is one of the eighteen details which our Rabbis
changed in the Torah in Greek.' Significantly, in *Soph.* 1:7 this story is
mentioned together with another one which speaks explicitly about the

---

[5] See P. Wendland, *Aristeae ad Philocratem Epistula cum ceteris de origine versionis LXX
interpretum testimoniis* (Lipsiae 1900); H.St.J. Thackeray, *The Letter of Aristeas, Translated with
an Appendix of Ancient Evidence on the Origin of the Septuagint* (London 1918).

circumstances in which the LXX was produced ('Thus goes the story about five elders who wrote the Torah for King Ptolemy in Greek etc.'; after it comes the story under consideration here beginning with the words 'Another story about King Ptolemy ...').

4. *Writing or alteration?*

A few traditions speak of the 'writing' of the above-listed passages, while others speak of the 'change' from the Torah (see above). It would seem that even if it is not stated explicitly that the sages/elders/our Rabbis inserted alterations, such a claim is inherent in the very formulation of the list. First, all the passages mentioned in the list differ from MT. Second, for two passages the content of what the translators wrote is explicitly stated instead of other details: *4* 'male and female he created him' and they did not write 'he created them' (Gen 5:2; the final three words are lacking in many sources); *15* and they wrote for him צעירת רגלים and they did not write ארנבת (Lev 11:6 [5], Deut 14:7; the various traditions differ, but all of them refer to both expressions in one form or another).

Thus, the story preserved in rabbinic literature records the alterations from the Torah inserted by the translators. It was only natural that people should soon recognize the existence of differences between the Hebrew and Greek Pentateuch. The latter, too, was 'Jewish' at its source, even though the Jews distanced themselves from it at a later date. Furthermore, it was also natural that every difference between the Hebrew Torah—being in the language in which the words were originally written—and the Greek Pentateuch should be thought of as an alteration in the Greek. The real background of the aforementioned differences between the Hebrew and the Greek Pentateuch is dealt with below. Apparently, some of these differences do indeed stem from alteration, but others, probably the majority, stem from *Hebrew* variants, from translation technique and from an incorrect under-standing of certain translation equivalents in the LXX. All the same, the differences mentioned in the list as 'alterations' are described as such here, because this is how rabbinic tradition understood them. Christian tradition also took similar differences between the 'Jewish' and 'Greek' (from their viewpoint: Christian) Bible to be alterations, but in the opposite direction: a few Church Fathers claimed the LXX reflects the true form of

God's words, and that it was the Jews who had falsified them in their Bible.[6]

5. *The original language of the passages mentioned in the list*

The list contains a number of altered passages, inserted by the translators and differing from the Torah—thus according to rabbinic tradition—and it can indeed be verified that all the passages differ from MT. Therefore the passages listed in Hebrew refer to the Greek translation of the Torah, which is quoted in the list in Hebrew retroversion. Interestingly enough, a few researchers hold to the opinion, for reasons which will be treated later, that these are not citations from a Greek translation at all, but rather alterations on the Hebrew level.[7] This opinion does not appear likely, however, in view of the fact that the introduction to the list explicitly refers to a Greek translation. In addition to this, from some details in the list it also emerges that the citations come from a Greek translation:

1. Five of the passages are identical to passages in the LXX (*3*, *8*, *10*, *11*, *12*, *15*), with another one (*9*) being close to it.

2. The supposition that the list goes back to Greek words that were translated here into Hebrew is well substantiated by passage *15*. There it is said that the translators wrote צעירת רגלים (young-footed) 'and they did not write ארנבת (hare) since Ptolemy's wife's name was 'hare,' that he might not say 'the Jews have mocked me by putting my wife's name in the Torah' (*b. Meg.*). In fact, the people did not nickname Ptolemy's wife (actually his mother) ארנבת, but instead used a Greek equivalent (λαγωός). Therefore, if ארנבת refers to λαγωός, the phrase צעירת רגלים points to nothing else than a Greek word of equivalent value. Indeed, it is possible to identify the Greek word behind צעירת רגלים: the Greek equivalent for ארנבת in the LXX of Lev 11:6 (5) and Deut 14:7 is δασίποδα, whose meaning is 'hairy-footed' (שעירת רגלים). Undeniably this is the phrase צעירת רגלים in the words of the sages, presented thus by a phonetic interchange of צ/שׂ.[8] Furthermore, the equation of רגלים שעירת

---

[6] See, for example, Justin Martyr, *Dialogue with Trypho*, 3.1; P. Benoit, "L'Inspiration des LXX d'après les Pères," *Mélanges H. de Lubac*, I (Paris 1963) 169–187.

[7] Frankel, *Vorstudien*, 31; Friedman, 23 ff.; Talmon, "Scrolls," 26. Aptowitzer, "Berichte" 2 (1909) 7 ff., rejects this view.

[8] Cf., e.g. Num 16:30 ופצתה as against the reading of the SP פשתה; 2 Sam 8:3 להשיב as against להציב in 1 Chr 18:3. See also שיחקו in the *baraita* itself and cf. for this issue A. Bendavid, *Biblical Hebrew and Mishnaic Hebrew* 2 (Tel-Aviv 1971) 441 (Hebrew). The identification of צעירת רגלים with שעירת רגלים was first made by G. Tychsen, *Tentamen de variis codicum hebraicorum ... generibus* (Rostock 1772) 52. Tychsen also discusses the rabbinic tradition.

with δασύποδα appears reasonable in light of what is known about the use of compound words in the LXX and about the translation of these words in Hebrew and Aramaic: many pairs of two or more Hebrew words are translated in the LXX by compound words of the type כבד לשוﹾ - βραδύγλωσσος (Exod 4:10)—see Tov, "Compound Words."* Alternatively, compound Greek words were many times translated by a phrase of two Hebrew or Aramaic words, as can be recognized for instance in the Syro-Hexapla.[9] Moreover, the translation of δασύποδα in rabbinic literature needs to be seen in the light of the LXX vocabulary in which πούς generally reflects רגל and δασύς reflects שעיר as in Gen 27:11 (cf. also Gen 25:25; 2 Kgs 1:8).

3. The assumption that the passages mentioned in the list reflect Greek and not Hebrew words emerges also from passage *12*: חמד mentioned there reflects ἐπιθύμημα in the LXX (MT: חמור). Within the LXX the root חמד is generally translated by ἐπιθυμ-, and so חמד is translated in Isa 32:12 by ἐπιθύμημα. Therefore the reconstructed process חמד (the conjectural origin of the LXX) = ἐπιθύμημα = חמד (= the rabbinic list) points to a translation process.

4. Ostensibly, the change of word order in passage *1* (בראשית ברא אלהים) and the expressions *8* בני אדם (י)נושא = ὑποζύγια and *7* אבוס = σιτευτός (see below) can only be understood by the assumption that these are translations from Greek.

## 6. *The list of alterations and the original text of the LXX*

In the past, when scholars observed that the list contains passages which agree with the LXX, they shirked from applying this description to the entire list, since the majority of its details go against the transmitted text of the LXX. A comparison of the passages with the LXX shows that nine passages in the list differ from the LXX, while five agree with it (*3*, *8*, *10* , *12*, *15*), with one passage being close (*9*).

If the preceding analysis is correct, it is difficult to avoid the unusual assumption that the nine passages which do not agree with the transmitted text of the LXX reflect another textual form of that translation. This other text of the LXX evidently contained the original text of the translation which differs from the transmitted form in all the other manuscripts. This assumption is strengthened by what is known about the textual development of the translation during the first centuries of its existence. This question is now briefly considered.[10]

---

[9] E.g. Exod 4:10: חניר קלא ניר ובציר - ἰσχνόφωνος καὶ βραδύγλωσσος - כבד פה וכבד לשוﹾ לשנא; *passim* in the LXX: קשה ערף - σκληροτράχηλος - קשא קדלא.

[10] See further, Tov, *TCU,* 10–15.

It is reasonable to hypothesize with P.A. de Lagarde, *Proverbien*, 1–4, that the manuscripts of most, if not all, Septuagintal books, reflect in one form or another the first formulation of the LXX, which we may denote for the purpose of discussion as 'the original translation.' This original translation was not preserved in its pure form for an extended period because from the beginning of its dissemination in different scrolls, the textual transmission split off into several secondary traditions. In the pre-Christian period and the first century CE various types of corrections were then entered into individual scrolls of every one of the Septuagintal books. As a result of these corrections, as far as one can tell, there were no two identical or nearly identical scrolls in existence for any book of the LXX.[11] In contrast to this situation, by the second and third century CE, a recognizable unity had come about in the textual tradition of the LXX which later disappeared under the influence of the revisions of Origen and Lucian.

For the present discussion it is important to know which types of alterations were inserted in the textual witnesses of the LXX. The evidence shows that many alterations were inserted in early witnesses which brought the LXX into conformity with the Hebrew Bible. Some revisions were inserted in the forerunners of the translation units now found in the canon of the LXX,[12] while others are reflected in individual manuscripts, such as manuscripts AFM in Exodus-Deuteronomy.[13] Furthermore, even if in a certain detail all manuscripts of the LXX agree with MT, there is no certainty that the original translator indeed produced this rendering, because the original rendering may have been corrected in accordance with MT. This assumption received support from 4QLXXLev[a],[14] which sometimes reflects a text which is probably original, while the transmitted text of the LXX was probably corrected toward the standard vocabulary of the LXX and/or MT.[15]

---

[11] This point was emphasized by E.J. Bickerman, "Some Notes on the Transmission of the Septuagint," *A. Marx Jubilee Volume* (New York 1950) 149–178.

[12] This situation is recognizable, for example, in the 'LXX' of the following books: parts of Samuel and Kings, Daniel, Ruth, Ecclesiastes, Canticles.

[13] D.W. Gooding, *Recensions of the Septuagint Pentateuch* (Tyndale Lecture 1954; London 1955).

[14] See the discussion of P.W. Skehan, "The Qumrân MSS. and Textual Criticism," *VTSup* 4 (1957) 155–160 and of E. Ulrich in *DJD* IX, 161 ff.

[15] The alternative view, according to which the scroll reflects an early revision towards a freer rendering of MT, is not borne out by the evidence.

In view of this situation, it is suggested here that the passages mentioned in the list of alterations reflect the original text of the LXX, while the archetype of all the known manuscripts was corrected.[16]

As for the frequency of the presumed corrections of the original text of the LXX, the assumption that two-thirds of the passages in the list were emended in the archetype of Septuagint manuscripts is not illustrative of the frequency of such changes, which must have been less frequent.[17]

We now turn to the ten passages differing from the transmitted text of the LXX; their original form will be reconstructed on the basis of the rabbinic tradition. The discussion includes passage *9*, which agrees with the LXX to a limited extent.

The tentative retroversions from the Hebrew of the list to the Greek of the LXX are based primarily on the vocabulary of Hebrew-Greek equivalents which served the translators. These reconstructions encounter the same methodological difficulties as do retroversions in the reverse direction. The degree of reliability of the reconstruction depends on the degree of exactness in the translation. It should therefore be emphasized that the Hebrew translation in the list of Greek passages appears to be exact. This exactitude is recognizable in the literal translation of the two elements of δασύποδα (*15*) by רגלים = רגלים שעירת צעירת (see below) and in the translation from the Greek (possibly: τοῦ λατρεύειν αὐτοῖς) reflected in לעבדם (*14*)—such a reading is indeed reflected in a Hebrew source (*Siphre* Deut 19:19). It seems that only in one biblical passage is a Greek word presented by a free translation: אדם בני (י)נושא = ὑποζύγια (*8*). If this description proves correct and the Hebrew translation in the list is indeed literal, our reconstruction stands on a firm basis. In fact, the very nature of the list demands that the translation incorporated in it be exact, since the list purports to faithfully represent the differences between the Torah and the LXX.

We now present a tentative reconstruction of the original text of those passages in the list which differ from the transmitted text of the LXX, accompanied by remarks on the retroversions. The transmitted text of the LXX is recorded first, followed by the text of the LXX reconstructed from the rabbinic tradition. These passages have now been analyzed in detail by G. Veltri, *Eine Tora für den König Talmai—Untersuchungen zum Übersetzungsverständnis in der jüdisch-hellenis-tischen und rabbinischen*

---

[16] Absolute originality cannot be proven. In our view, the passages in the list reflect a text which is more original than the ones in the known manuscripts of the LXX.

[17] We are faced with a list of differences or changes, which are not characteristic of the general condition of the text.

*Literatur* (TSAJ 41; Tübingen 1994). The focus of this detailed study differs from our study and in a way the two studies complement one another. See also Tov, "Review of Veltri."*

| 1. | Gen 1:1 LXX | ἐν ἀρχῇ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός |
|---|---|---|
| | = MT | בראשית ברא אלהים |
| | LXX-reconstr. | ὁ θεὸς ἐποίησεν ἐν ἀρχῇ |
| | = rabb. list | אלהים ברא בראשית |

| 2. | Gen 1:26 LXX | ποιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον κατʼ εἰκόνα ἡμετέραν καὶ καθʼ ὁμοίωσιν |
|---|---|---|
| | = MT | נעשה אדם בצלמנו כדמותנו |
| | LXX-reconstr. | ποιήσω ἄνθρωπον κατʼ εἰκόνα καὶ καθʼ ὁμοίωσιν |
| | = rabb. list | אעשה אדם בצלם ובדמות |

One of the two differences between the LXX (= MT) and the reconstructed LXX (= rabb. list) concerns the person of the verb (see below). The reconstruction does not relate to prepositions in the list: ב...ב (MT כ...ב; LXX apparently כ...כ), because this type of difference cannot be reconstructed for the LXX. The other difference between MT (= LXX) and the retroverted LXX is based on a reliable tradition.

| 4. | Gen 5:2 LXX | ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς |
|---|---|---|
| | = MT | זכר ונקבה בראם |
| | LXX-reconstr. | ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτόν |
| | = rabb. list | זכר ונקבה בראו |

The reconstruction is based on the text of *b. Meg.* See also n. 29.

| 5. | Gen 11:7 LXX | δεῦτε καὶ καταβάντες συγχέωμεν ἐκεῖ αὐτῶν τὴν γλῶσσαν |
|---|---|---|
| | = MT | הבה נרדה ונבלה שם שפתם |
| | LXX-reconstr. | δεῦτε καὶ καταβάς συγχέω... |
| | = rabb. list | הבה ארדה ואבלה שם שפתם |

| 6. | Gen 18:12 LXX | ἐγέλασεν δὲ Σαρρα ἐν ἑαυτῇ |
|---|---|---|
| | = MT | ותצחק שרה בקרבה |
| | LXX-reconstr.(?) | ἐγέλασεν δὲ Σαρρα ἐν/πρὸς/ἐπὶ τοῖς/τοὺς ἔγγιστα αὐτῆς |
| | = rabb. list | ותצחק שרה בקרוביה |

The difference between the reading of MT (= LXX) and that of the list (בקרוביה) may be explained as follows:

1. If בקרוביה in the list refers to people standing near Sarah (see the early commentators on the rabbinic list) or to her relatives, the meaning

of the passage is that Sarah laughs at these people. In this case the original text of the LXX may be reconstructed as above.

2. Most modern interpreters hold that the difference between the passage quoted in the list and MT does not bear on the quoted words, but rather on the continuation of the biblical passage. Indeed, in the continuation of the sentence, the LXX (οὔπω μὲν μοι γέγονεν ἕως τοῦ νῦν) differs in three details from MT (אחרי בלתי היתה לי עֶדְנָה:אחרי) is not represented in the translation. Instead of בְלֹתִי the translator read בִּלְתִּי, and instead of עֶדְנָה he read עֲדֶנָה (= עד הנה).

3. Possibly the two words differ solely in their pattern (בקרבה/בקרוביה), their meanings being identical—cf. the transcription of בְּקֶרֶב by βεκορβ in the second column of the Hexapla in Ps 36(35):2 and notice similar phonetic shifts in mishnaic Hebrew.[18] Also the MT of Isaiah and 1QIsaᵃ differ in many instances as to noun patterns[19] and such differences are also to be assumed at the base of the relationship between MT and the transcriptions in the second column of the Hexapla.[20] But even if בקרוביה reflects a different pattern of the word in MT, the original translation should probably be understood as 'people standing nearby' or 'relatives.'

7.   Gen 49:6 LXX    ὅτι ἐν τῷ θυμῷ αὐτῶν ἀπέκτειναν ἀνθρώπους καὶ
                   ἐν τῇ ἐπιθυμίᾳ αὐτῶν ἐνευροκόπησαν ταῦρον
                   (ταυρούς manuscripts 458 340...)
       = MT        כי באפם הרגו איש וברצנם עקרו שור
       LXX-reconstr.    ... ἐνευροκόπησαν σιτευτόν ...
       rabb. list    (כי באפם הרגו שור וברצונם) עקרו אבוס

The point of departure of the reconstruction is אבוס[21] (אָבוּס = fattened = σιτευτός) which appears in all sources of the list (in most of the lists שור comes in the first hemistich, while in some of them איש appears as in MT [see n. 30]). An examination of the translation equivalents of the LXX shows that אבוס in the list may reflect σιτευτός which in the LXX also translates שור (that is, אבוס in the list = σιτευτός in the recon-structed LXX = שור in the Bible). This assumption is based on the following equivalents: Judg 6:25 פר השור - τὸν μόσχον τὸν σιτευτόν according to

---

[18] See G. Mercati, *Psalterii Hexapli Reliquiae* (Roma 1958).

[19] See Kutscher, *Language*, 396–398.

[20] See E. Brønno, *Studien über Hebräische Morephologie und Vocalismus, auf Grundlage der Mercatischen Fragmente der zweiten Kolumne der Hexapla des Origenes* (Leipzig 1943); Z. Ben-Hayyim, *Studies in the Traditions of the Hebrew Language* (Madrid/Barcelona 1954); A. Sperber, *A Historical Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (Leiden 1966).

[21] The vocalization of the Adler manuscript (אָבוס), like the orthography of manuscript Columbia X 893 – T 141 (איבוס), is apparently secondary.

manuscript A (cf. the text of B: τὸν μόσχον τὸν ταῦρον); 1 Kgs 5:3 אבוסים...
צא ‎" - πρόβατα ... σιτευτά; Prov 15:17 ... משור אבוס - ... ὑπὲρ βοῦν σιτευτόν.[22]

9. Exod 12:40 LXX ἡ δὲ κατοίκησις τῶν υἱῶν Ισραηλ ἣν κατῴκησαν
ἐν γῆ Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ ἐν γῆ Χανααν ἔτη
τετρακόσια τριάκοντα

MT ומושב בני ישראל אשר ישבו במצרים שלשים שנה וארבע מאות שנה

reconstr. (a) ἐν (γῆ) Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ (ἐν) ταῖς καταλοίπαις χώραις (τῶν χώρων)
= rabb. list במצרים ובשאר ארצות

reconstr. (b) ἐν (γῆ) Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν ταῖς χώραις
= list in *y. Meg.* במצרים ובכל הארצות

reconstr. (c) ἐν (γῆ) Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ ἐν ταῖς χώραις ταῖς ἑτέραις

reconstr. (d) ἐν γῆ Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ ἐν Χανααν καὶ ἐν γῆ Γεσεμ

Reconstructions a–c are founded on the assumption that the translation in the list is exact. Whether the majority reading ובשאר is more original than ובכל הארצות in *y. Meg.* cannot be determined. Both readings could have stemmed from ἑτέραις in reconstruction c. It should be observed that שאר ארצות does not occur in the Bible and the absence of the article in ארצות points to mishnaic Hebrew (against this, manuscript Columbia X 893 – T 141 of *b. Meg.* reads ושאר כל הארצות).

Reconstruction d is based on the assumption that the Hebrew translation in the list is free. The Greek text may then be reconstructed according to the LXX of the passage, according to the reading in *Mek.* (וש ‎ במצרים ובארץ כנע‎" ובארץ; thus also *Tan.* with inverted word order), and according to the SP *ad loc.* (בארץ כנע‎" ובארץ מצרים).

11. Exod 24:11 LXX καὶ τῶν ἐπιλέκτων τοῦ Ισραηλ οὐ διεφώνησεν οὐδὲ εἷς

MT ואל אצילי בני ישראל לא שלח ידו

LXX-reconstr. ... τῶν νεανίσκων / τῶν ἐλαττουμένων ...
= rabb. list ... זאטוטי (בני ישראל)

Passage *10* is treated above together with Exod 24:5 similar to the present passage. Since זעטוט-זאטוט is attested in Hebrew and Aramaic as 'small,' it probably goes back to νεανίσκοι in the LXX of v. 5. In accordance with passage *11*, this word probably appeared in the LXX of our passage, but here the problems are more involved than in v. 5.

---

[22] Attributed to Aquila and Theodotion; a similar translation is handed down as ε‎'.

From a linguistic viewpoint it is possible that the Greek translator would translate אצילי with a Greek word which would be retroverted in the list as זאטוט. Certainly the root אצל, which is related to the preposition אצל, appears both in the sense of 'to lack' (Sir 42:21) and in the sense of 'to set aside' (Gen 27:36; Num 11:17). From this it can be conjectured that the original equivalent of אצילי was ἐλαττουμένων, cf. Sir 42:21 נוסף[ ולא נאצל [לא - οὕτω προσετέθη οὔτε ἠλαττώθη לא נוסף[] is retroverted according to the LXX there, and support is now forthcoming for this retroversion from MasSir, which reads ([ולא נאצל] לא נאסף). Consequently the following process is reconstructed: אצילי in the Bible = ἐλαττουμένων in the reconstructed LXX = זאטוטי in the list. But it is also possible that νεανίσκοι appeared here, as in v. 5, if the translator identified בני ישראל אצילי (v. 11) with נערי בני ישראל (v. 5).

The original equivalent of אצילי cannot be reconstructed easily because the construction of the verse differs entirely in its Greek translation. Actually, אצילי is represented twice: (1) ἐπιλέκτων (chosen ones) reflecting the accepted interpretation of אצילי, and (2) it is also concealed behind διεφώνησεν: the Greek translation of ואל אצילי בני ישראל לא שלח ידו should be understood as 'and from the chosen of Israel not one was lacking.'[23] Because the root אצל means 'to lack,' διεφώνησεν somehow reflects אצל (rather than לא שלח ידו or a Hebrew variant). Alternatively, the translation may express tendentious exegesis, as elsewhere in the immediate context.[24] To reconstruct an individual detail in the verse is all the more abstruse.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 13. | Deut 4:19 LXX | ἃ ἀπένειμεν κύριος ὁ θεός σου αὐτὰ πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν τοῖς ὑποκάτω τοῦ οὐρανοῦ |
| | MT | אשר חלק ה' אלהיך אתם לכל העמים תחת כל השמים |
| | LXX-reconstr. | ... αὐτὰ + τοῦ φωτίζεσθει + πᾶσιν ἔθνεσιν |
| | rabb. list | + להאיר. |

The equivalent האיר - φωτίζεσθαι also occurs in Num 8:2; Ps 13(12): 3.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 14. | Deut 17:3 LXX | καὶ ἀπελθόντες λατρεύσωσιν θεοῖς ἑτέροις .. ἃ οὐ προσέταξα (-ξε(ν) BG...; = σοί FMV...) |
| | MT | וילך ויעבד אלהים אחרים ... אשר לא צויתי |
| | LXX-reconstr. | ... ἑτέροις + τοῦ λατρεύειν αὐτοῖς ... |
| | rabb. list | + לעבדם |

---

[23] See the similar use of the verb διαφωνέω in LXX Num 31:49: ולא נפקד ממנו איש - καὶ οὐ διαπεφώνηκεν ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν οὐδὲ εἷς; Josh 23:14: לא נפל דבר אחד - οὐ διεφώνησεν ἐξ αὐτῶν; see also 1 Sam 30:19; 1 Kgs 8:56.

[24] See especially v. 10: ויראו את אלהי ישראל - καὶ εἶδον τὸν τόπον οὗ εἱστήκει (ἐκεῖ) ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Ισραηλ and v. 11: ויחזו את האלהים - καὶ ὤφθησαν ἐν τῷ τόπῳ τοῦ θεοῦ, for which cf. Ch.T. Fritsch, *The Anti-anthropomorphisms of the Greek Pentateuch* (Princeton 1943) 45.

The equivalent עבד - λατρεύειν occurs among other places in Deut 28:14; Judg 2:19.

See also below on the earlier formulation of the LXX to passage *15*.

### 7. *The background of the differences between MT and the LXX*

The lists in rabbinic literature speak of alterations inserted in the translation, but this notion may now be abandoned.[25] The differences between the Torah and the LXX derive from: (a) translations deviating from MT based on Hebrew variants; (b) translations deviating from MT arising either from Hebrew variants or from exegesis; (c) exegetical translations; (d) Greek equivalents which were misinterpreted by the rabbinic tradition as differences between the LXX and the Torah.

The contents of lists of this type are largely a matter of chance, as is also the case with the list of the 'emendations of the scribes' (see n. 1). This list does not purport to represent the most conspicuous alterations and indeed anyone will easily find much more far-reaching differences between the LXX and MT, as for instance in the order of chapters and subject matter at the end of Exodus. What the passages in the list have in common is that they pertain to some central issues. These differences could easily be reinterpreted as alterations (like the 'emendations of the scribes').

### a. *Translations deviating from MT based on Hebrew variants*

The following passages most likely reflect Hebrew variants:

> 12.    Num 16:15 MT    לא חמור אחד מהם  נשאתי
>        LXX-reconstr.    לא  חמד אחד מהם נשאתי = list

Possibly the reading חמד was created when a copyist or translator replaced חמור with חמוד.[26] Cf. Gen 49:14 חמר גרם - τὸ καλὸν ἐπεθύμησεν = חמ(ו)ד גרסה (cf. similar linguistic exegesis in the LXX of Ps 119 (118):20 נרסה - ἐπεπόθησεν)[27] and Isa 27:2 כרם חמר - ἀμπελὼν καλός ἐπιθύμημα ...

---

[25] Some analyses of the differences between the rabbinic tradition and MT, like the traditional interpretations of the rabbinic tradition, presuppose that all the variants discussed reflect changes made by the translators. See, e.g., Geiger, *Urschrift*, 282–287; A. Kahana, הספרים החיצונים 2 (Tel Aviv 1960) 16–17; M.H. Segal מבוא המקרא 4 (Jerusalem 1960) 928–930.

[26] According to rabbinic tradition, both here and in passage *8* (Exod 4:20) the translation does not list חמור in relation to Moses, but this situation does not support the assumption that any bias is evident in the translation.

[27] It is difficult to assume that this interchange was tendentious; it is more probable that it derived from difficulties in identifying the rare word גרם (cf. also LXX of 2 Kgs 9:13).

MT apparently reflects the original intention of the text: Moses emphasized that he has not even taken for himself a small thing such as an ass. His words are similar to those of Samuel just before his death: וחמור מי לקחתי (1 Sam 12:3 MT LXX).

13.   Deut 4:19 MT    לכל העמים    אשר חלק ה׳ אלהיך
       LXX-reconstr.    ״     ״     ״ + להאיר ״    ״    ״    ״    = rabb. list

The added להאיר is also reflected in *Midr. Hagadol* to this verse (see also Rashi). This word evidently testifies to a tendentious early variant: one is not permitted to worship stars: the host of heaven are given only 'to shine.'

14.   Deut 17:3 MT    וילך ויעבד אלהים אחרים ... אשר לא צויתי
       LXX-reconstr.    לעבדם + ״    ״    ״    ״    ״    ״    ״
       = rabb. list

The additional לעבדם may reflect an early variant echoed in *Siphre* 148 on Deut 19:19. Cf. also Deut 28:14 ללכת אחרי אלהים אחרים לעבדם.
   The addition is occasioned by linguistic considerations because אשר לא צויתי has a certain syntactical oddness about it and begs, as it were, to be completed. The additional word is taken from the context (לעבדם ויעבד אלהים אחרים אשר לא צויתי +); early commentators added the same word.

b. *Translations deviating from MT arising either from Hebrew variants or from exegesis*

In certain categories of translation technique it is difficult to determine whether a specific difference between MT and an ancient version attests to a Hebrew variant or reflects the exegesis of the translators (see *TCU*, 154–162). A few of the passages in the list belong to this group (note that the list did not intend to reconstruct the Hebrew original from which the LXX was made, but rather to communicate a 'contemporary' Hebrew translation of some points of interest in the LXX).

2.    Gen 1:26 MT    נעשה אדם בצלמנו כדמותנו
       LXX-reconstr.    ποιήσω ἄνθρωπον κατ᾽ εἰκόνα καὶ καθ᾽ ὁμοίωσιν
       (אעשה אדם בצלם ובדמות rabb. list)

5.    Gen 11:7 MT    הבה נרדה ונבלה
       LXX-reconstr.    δεῦτε καὶ καταβὰς συγχέω (הבה ארדה ואבלה list)

In these two instances the translation avoids adopting the plural as in MT. The translator either inserted this alteration on his own initiative, or

he found such a Hebrew text in front of him. It is pertinent to remark here that in *b. San. 38b*, Gen 1:26, 27 and 11:5, 7 are cited together as examples of the use of plural forms in reference to God.

Besides the difference in the person of the verb, an additional difference is noticeable in passage *2*: according to the list, the possessive pronouns in MT are not transmitted in the LXX (בצלם ובדמות as against בצלמנו כדמותנו in MT). This lack is possibly based on an early Hebrew variant, for also in rabbinic literature צלם and דמות are sometimes described in an abstract way, without possessive pronouns or article (note, for example, *Abot* 3:21 חביב אדם שנברא בצלם שנאמר כי בצלם האדם את אלהים עשה). It is also possible that the translator did not represent the pronouns in order to avoid an anthropomorphic description, as elsewhere in the LXX.[28]

According to the list in *Midr. Hagadol* Exod 4:20, the pronouns are lacking in v. 27 of the LXX as well: ויברא אלהים את האדם בצלם ובדמות. If the tradition concerning the Greek translations of v. 26 is correct, it stands to reason that v. 27 was formulated in the same way.

3.　　Gen 2:2　MT　　ויכל אלהים ביום השביעי
　　　　　　　　LXX　　καὶ συνετέλεσεν ὁ θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἕκτῃ
　　　　　　　　(list ויכל ביום הששי)

Ancient as well as modern interpreters were aware of the exegetical difficulty raised by MT, which implies that God worked on the seventh day. This difficulty is eliminated in the LXX. The Greek translation may be based on a Hebrew variant (הששי) also found in SP, but it is equally feasible that the translator changed the content of the verse.

4.　　Gen 5:2　MT　　זכר ונקבה בראם
　　　　　　LXX-reconstr.　　ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτόν
　　　　　　　　(list: זכר ונקבה בראו)

It is hard to know whether the reconstructed translation ἐποίησεν αὐτόν reflects a variant בראו or results from exegesis. Either way, at the base of the translation one should probably posit an understanding which interprets this verse as referring to an androgynous creature as in Gen Rab. 8:10. However, possibly the variant or the tendency lying at the base of the translation did not stem from contextual exegesis, but from syntactical exegesis since the previous verse speaks of the man in the singular, while v. 2 speaks in the plural (ויקרא את שמם אדם ביום הבראם אותם

---

[28] See Fritsch, *The Anti-anthropomorphisms*, 11, n. 6 with reference to omissions of the possessive pronoun in relation to God (LXX Exod 15:7; 23:27; Deut 32:10). In other cases an element is added in the translation between two words in order to tone down an anthropomorphic description.

ויברך). The passage under consideration comes between these two passages and hence it causes no surprise that in some source a variant or an explanation of בראו would develop for MT בראם. The variant ונקביו/ ונקוביו included in many sources of the list apparently reflects a secondary stage in the development of that list.[29]

    9.    Exod 12:40 MT  בני ישראל אשר ישבו) במצרים (שלשים שנה וארבע מאות שנה) (ומושב
         LXX-reconstr.    see the four possible reconstructions on p. 13.

It is unclear whether the difference between MT and the LXX is to be attributed to an exegetical alteration or to a translation of a Hebrew variant like that appearing in SP (בארץ כנע ֺובארץ מצרים) or in *Mek.* (נש֞) במצרים ובארץ כנע ֺובארץ; thus also in *Tan.* with inverted order).

c. *Exegetical translations*

    1.    Gen 1:1 MT    בראשית ברא אלהים
         LXX-reconstr.    ὁ θεὸς ἐποίησεν ἐν ἀρχῇ (list: אלהים ברא בראשית)

The LXX translators often inverted the order of elements whether from syntactical or exegetical considerations. In this instance the inversion can be ascribed to the translator's motivation to begin the translation with ὁ θεός.

d. *Greek equivalents which were misinterpreted by rabbinic tradition as differences between the LXX and the Hebrew text*

In the following four examples the translators chose regular equiv-alents which in rabbinic tradition were misinterpreted as reflecting differences between the LXX and the Hebrew text.

    7.    Gen 49:6 MT    כי באפם הרגו איש וברצנם עקרו שור
         LXX-reconstr.    ... ἐνευροκόπησαν σιτευτόν = list עקרו אבוס ...

σιτευτός (= אבוס) in the LXX was apparently interpreted as an alter-ation of the parallel word in the Hebrew (שור) since it was generally understood as שור = wall (T^O, S, Aquila, Symmachus, V; see also Gen Rab. *ad loc.*). Consequently, according to rabbinic tradition, the LXX

---

[29] A reading נקביו/נקוביו was probably created during the textual transmission of the list (interchange of ה/ו(י) perhaps when it became unclear what the exact difference between LXX and MT was (a similar confusion is reflected in the addition of ולא כתבו בראם in the list, a formula recurring only concerning passage *15*). It appears that נקוביו /נקביו refers to the female orifices of the primeval man who was thus androgynous (see Gen. Rabb. 8:10). Worthy of note is the fact that נקב/נקוב does not appear in any similar meaning in the Bible, and in rabbinic literature it is used only in connection with the male sexual organ.

reflects an alteration, but actually the translation is based on a reading tradition which is also reflected in MT (שׁוֹר).[30]

8.    Exod 4:20 MT    החמר
          LXX    τὰ ὑποζύγια (list נושא(י) בני אדם)

If נושא(י) בני אדם is a faithful translation of the original Greek trans-lation, it may be reconstructed as *ἀνθρωποφόρος or *φοράνθρωπος, though neither of these words is attested in Greek. Apparently in this instance the Hebrew translation in the list is imprecise, meant to emphasize the interpretative dimension of the Greek word. Etymolo-gically the meaning of ὑποζύγιον is a 'yoke (ζυγόν)-bearing animal,' and as such designates various animals. On the other hand, in Egypt its meaning is restricted to 'ass,' or at least this meaning was prevalent there.[31] For this reason חמור is often translated in the LXX by ὑποζύγιον (the equivalent חמור - ὄνος is more frequent in the LXX, with the exception of Exodus in which the passage under consideration appears).[32] We may infer that this use of ὑποζύγιον was unknown in Palestine, so that the sages were puzzled about the use of נושא(י) בני אדם (this is how they understood ὑποζύγιον) and not ὄνος, as usual.

10.    Exod 24:5 MT    נערי (בני ישראל)
          LXX    τοὺς νεανίσκους = list זאטוטי

The equivalent נער - νεανίσκος/νεανίας occurs frequently in the LXX (παιδάριον is more frequent). Therefore the use of νεανίσκος need not have raised any difficulty on the linguistic level, but on the exegetical level it was apparently considered unusual, because these נערים were usually taken to mean 'select men' (see, for example, T^O בכורי and *Zeb.* 115b) and not 'little ones.' Against this background the sages may have

---

[30] The main differences between LXX and MT pertain to אבוס and שׁור. But in the parallel (first) colon שׁור appears in several lists instead of MT's איש (= ἀνθρώπους in LXX). Apparently, שׁור is secondary here and was entered under the influence of שׁור at the end of the verse (where it was replaced by אבוס). It is unlikely that the original list intended to ascribe this variant to the LXX. See also the preceding note.

[31] See the lexicons and particularly MM with examples from papyri of the 3rd century BCE. See especially P. Hib I 73:9 where ὑποζύγιον and ὄνος are synonymous. The Egyptian background of this word was also stressed by A. Wasserstein, "On Donkeys, Wine and the Uses of Textual Criticism: Septuagintal Variants in Jewish Palestine," in: A. Oppenheimer and others (eds.), *The Jews in the Hellenistic-Roman World, Studies in Memory of Menahem Stern* (Jerusalem 1996) 119*–142*, esp. 12*–129*. See further D. Wasserstein, "The Ptolemy and the Hare: Dating an Old Story about the Translation of the Septuagint," *Scripta Classica Israelica* 17 (1998) 77–86.

[32] See also Judg 19:3, 10: חמור - manuscript B: ὄνος; manuscript A: ὑποζύγιον.

thought that the translators replaced נערי with זאטוטי, that is, 'little ones.'[33] The same development took place in passage *11*.

15.    Lev 11:6(5)[34] Deut 14:7 MT        ארנבת

LXX        δασύποδα = list צעירת רגלים = שעירת רגלים

δασύπους appropriately reflects ארנבת[35] and therefore may reflect the original Greek translation cited in the list by means of a literal retranslation of its two elements. Rabbinic tradition emphasizes that the translators avoided writing ארנבת in this place (that is, λαγωόν); it may be that this claim reflects a *post factum* explanation; on the other hand, λαγωόν may also represent the original translation of ארנבת later supplanted by δασύποδα.

---

[33] See Aptowitzer, "Berichte" 2 (1909) 104–106; Geiger, *Urschrift*, 36; Talmon, "Scrolls," 26; Müller, "Nachrichten," 81–83. This word is probably not originally Greek (ζητήτης ; see, e.g. the dictionary of Lewy) because it is hard to know what could be common to נערי and the Greek word (inquirer), and since זאטוט is indeed attested in Hebrew (1QM, 11(7):3: וכול נער זאטוט ואשר לא יבואו למחנותם בצאתם) and in Aramaic (for the data, see S. Krauss, *Griechische und Lateinische Lehnwörter im Talmud, Midrash und Targum* (Berlin 1899); see, e.g., T in Cant 6:5 זאטוטי). This word is apparently derived from זוטא (many manuscripts of *b. Meg.* indeed read זעטוט and not זאטוט as in the printed editions).

Even more has been written concerning ספר זעטוטי, one of the three scrolls found in the temple court according to *y. Taanit* 4:2, 68a; parallels in *Abot de-R. Nathan*, version B, chapter 46; *Sifre* 356 on Deut 33:27; Sop. 6:4. See Talmon, "Scrolls" and the bibliography there. It is unclear what was the character of *Sefer Zaaṭuṭe*. In any case, the passage in rabbinic literature apparently does not touch on passages *10* and *11* in the list. At most, it may be claimed that these two passages do not belong to the list (note that they are lacking in *y. Meg.* and in *Mek.*); however, such a claim is improbable in view of the parallel between זאטוטי in the list and νεανίσκοι in Exod 24:5.

[34] The LXX to Leviticus changes the order of vv. 5 and 6. For the equivalent שפֿ - χοιρογρυλλίος cf. Prov 30:26 (24:61) and Ps 104(103):18.

[35] The word is translated in the Syro-Hexapla of Deut 14:7 by ארנבא (with δασυποδα added in the margin). See A. Vööbus, *The Pentateuch in the Versions of the Syro-Hexapla, A Facsimilie Edition of a Midyat MS. Discovered 1964* (CSCO 369; Louvain 1975).