



HAL
open science

LXX Isaiah among the Other LXX Books: Trajectories and Convergences

Rodrigo Franklin de Sousa

► **To cite this version:**

Rodrigo Franklin de Sousa. LXX Isaiah among the Other LXX Books: Trajectories and Convergences. Mohr Siebeck. Die Septuaginta – Themen, Manuskripte, Wirkungen, pp.350-360, 2020, 978-3-16-157715-4. hal-04181201

HAL Id: hal-04181201

<https://hal.science/hal-04181201>

Submitted on 24 Aug 2023

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Rodrigo Franklin de Sousa

LXX Isaiah among the Other LXX Books

Trajectories and Convergences

1. Introduction

There are different ways in which we can conceive the idea of “LXX Isaiah among the other LXX books”. The first possible approach is chronological. We can think of where Isaiah fits in a timeline of when the different biblical books were translated (we may conceptualize this as a “vertical” or “diachronic” approach). Another possible way of framing the issue is from the standpoint of the unique characteristics of LXX Isaiah in comparison with the other books (which we may think of as a “horizontal” or “synchronic” approach).

LXX Isaiah lends itself well for this kind of study for different reasons. First, there is a somewhat solid consensus regarding its *Vorlage*, generally conceived as close to the MT (although we may detect some possibly interesting variations, as we will see later).¹ There is also considerable stability with respect to the Greek textual tradition. We can also mention a broad consensus regarding some of the basic characteristics of the translation technique, such as its free approach, the quality of the Greek, the attempt to produce an idiomatic translation often at the expense of Hebrew idiom, etc. Yet, there are also widely diverging views regarding specific elements of the translation, as in the case of the discussion around the is-

¹ The identity between the *Vorlage* of LXX Isaiah and a proto-MT Hebrew text is often assumed. While total identity should not be taken for granted, the proximity between the two is a reasonable assumption given our present knowledge of the witnesses of the Hebrew Isaiah in the last centuries before the Common Era. On this issue, see ZIEGLER, “Die Vorlage der Isaias-Septuaginta;” VAN DER KOOIJ, *Textzeugen*; VAN DER KOOIJ, “The Old Greek of Isaiah.” Recent studies of the text of Isaiah in Qumran can help our understanding of the Hebrew text of Isaiah at the time of the LXX translation. Some examples are: HØGENHAVEN, “The First Isaiah Scroll from Qumran (1QIsa);” TOV, “The Text of Isaiah at Qumran;” PARRY and QIMRON (eds.), *The Great Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa^a)*; PULIKOTTIL, *Transmission of Biblical Texts in Qumran*; SWANSON, “The Text of Isaiah at Qumran.” These studies generally point in the direction of an overall stability of the Hebrew text of Isaiah as close to a proto-MT form, yet, they should also make us aware that full identity between the MT and the *Vorlage* of LXX Isaiah is not a given.

sues of “actualizing” interpretation, contextual versus atomistic readings, and the overall picture of the translator as a “scribe”. My contention is that an approach to LXX Isaiah that takes seriously into account the “vertical” and “horizontal” dimensions mentioned above can build from the elements on which there is consensus, helping us to see these elements in a better light and enlightening us regarding the more contentious issues.

2. Some Methodological Considerations

In terms of method, there are two basic approaches available. The first is to begin with a case by case study of places where intertextual echoes are identifiable in LXX Isaiah. These can surface in any attentive continuous reading of the book. In this regard, we can also take as our point of depart studies such as the comprehensive list of examples proposed by Joseph Ziegler² or the catalogue of pluses compiled by Mirjam Van der Worm-Croughs.³

Another possibility is to do a thorough exegetical study of passages in Isaiah that have exact parallels in other books, do the same for the corresponding passages from those books and compare the results. This has the advantage of highlighting the peculiarities of each book, allowing us to see a broad panorama of the LXX in sharper relief. Isaiah has many texts that lend themselves to this kind of study. I am thinking specifically of: Isaiah 2 / Micah 4; Isaiah 7 / 2 Kings 16; Isaiah 36–39 / 2 Kings 18–20; and Isaiah 15–16 / Jeremiah 48 (31 LXX).

This paper illustrates the second approach by means of a comparative reading of Isa 7:1 and 37:8–9 and their corresponding passages in the MT and Greek versions of 2 Kgs 16:5 and 19:8–9. I will use the standard Masoretic and English designation and numbering when I refer to the Hebrew version of Kings, and I will refer to the Greek version as LXX 4 Kingdoms (γδ).

3. Isa 7:1 and 37:8–9 at a Glance

Let us first look closely at LXX Isa 7:1:

MT	LXX
ויהי בימי אחז בן־יותם	Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἀχαζ τοῦ Ἰωαθαμ
בן־עזיהו מלך יהודה	τοῦ υἱοῦ Οἴζιου βασιλέως Ἰουδα
עלה רצין מלך־ארם	ἀνέβη Ραασσων βασιλεὺς Ἀραμ

² ZIEGLER, *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias* (1934).

³ VAN DER VORM-CROUGHS, *The Old Greek of Isaiah* (2014).

ופקח בן-רמליהו מלך-ישראל ירושלם למלחמה עליה ולא יכל להלחם עליה	καὶ Φακее υἱὸς Ρομελίου βασιλεὺς Ἰσραηλ ἐπὶ Ἱερουσαλήμ πολεμῆσαι αὐτήν καὶ οὐκ ἠδυνήθησαν πολιορκῆσαι αὐτήν
--	---

So it was, in the days of Ahaz, son of Jotham, son of Uzziah, king of Judah, went up Rezin, king of Aram, and Pekah, son of Remaliah, king of Israel, (to) Jerusalem for the battle against her, but he could not battle against her	So it was, in the days of Ahaz, (son) of Jotham, the son of Ozias king of Judah, went up Raasson, king of Aram, and Phakee, son of Romelias, king of Israel, <i>against</i> Jerusalem to battle her, and they could not <i>besiege</i> her
---	---

The rendering of 7:1 is overall quite close to the Hebrew reflected in the MT, but there are some subtle differences worthy of comment. First, we note the peculiar syntax of *ירושלם* in the MT, without a preposition or directional marker. If the *Vorlage* of the translator had the same reading, we already have a small sample of his concern with intelligibility over form, in the insertion of a preposition before *Ἱερουσαλήμ*, as this is required by the Greek language. In this case, the addition of *ἐπί* (instead of, for instance, *πρός*) is perfectly adequate, given the context of hostility against Jerusalem.

Another notable difference from the MT is the presence of the plural verbal form *ἠδυνήθησαν* in the last line instead of the difficult MT reading *יכל* (singular). The singular verb in the MT may seem out of place as it refers to two subjects (Rezin and Pekah). So much that the Targum is the only ancient version that seems to support it. The plural reading of the LXX agrees with 1QIsa^a, the Vulgate, and the Peshitta.

While a different *Vorlage* is a good explanation, there is also good reason to see the singular MT reading as original. First, it is coherent with the singular *עלה* earlier in the verse, which has Rezin as its subject. If he is seen as the principal agent of the attack against Jerusalem, the singular form of *יכל* is grammatically justifiable.⁴ Moreover, the use of a singular verb with two subjects is attested elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible, for instance in 1 Sam 18:3.

It is also interesting to see how the Isaiah translator renders the nominal clause *למלחמה* with the infinitive verb *πολεμῆσαι* (“battle, wage war”) and the infinitive construct *להלחם* with the infinitive *πολιορκῆσαι* (“besiege”). It is known that the Isaiah translation often represents words that have the same Hebrew root occurring in proximity with different equivalents (presumably for stylistic reasons). As one would expect, the translator chose a

⁴ DE WAARD, *A Handbook on Isaiah*, 32. Cf. BARTHÉLEMY, *Critique textuelle*, 44–46. The reading in MT fits the context well if Rezin is viewed as the driving force in the undertaking, with Pekah assuming a secondary role, having been coerced to form the coalition. Cf. WILDBERGER, *Isaiah 1–12*, 283.

term he considered idiomatically appropriate, and the choice of *πολιορκεῖν* at this point is significant.

The verb *πολιορκεῖν* normally means “besiege” or “harass” (the latter in a military or socio-political context). In the LXX it is normally the equivalent of the Hebrew term *צור*, as in 2 Sam 20:15, 2 Kgs 18:9, 24:11, Jer 46:1, and Dan 1:1.⁵ Other equivalents are *ᾠχ* (Jdg 2:18), *עצר* (2 Kgs 17:4), and *צוק* (Jer 19:9). It also figures in originally Greek compositions. In 1 Esd 5:69 *πολιορκεῖν* is used of the oppression by the “peoples of the land” against those rebuilding the temple of Jerusalem. In 2 Macc 11:6 it is used with the sense of “besiege”, as it is also the case in 4 Macc 7:4. These examples indicate that *πολιορκεῖν* was a current verb in the vocabulary of Hellenistic Jews to describe political hostility or a military siege.

LXX Isaiah knows the equivalence between *πολιορκεῖν* and *צור*, as in 1:8 the participial form *πολιορκουμένη* is used for *נצורה*. Also, in 27:3 the translator misreads *נצרה* (from *נצר*) as *נצורה* (from *צור*), in the context of an overall deviating rendering that I will not comment here in detail.

There are two uses of the verb *πολιορκεῖν* in the Greek Isaiah that merit greater attention. One is in 9:20 (9:21 in English versions), where the term is added with no Hebrew equivalent in a free rendering that shows that the verb *πολιορκεῖν* is part of the stock vocabulary of the Isaiah translator.

The other case, which particularly interests us in our study, is the use of *πολιορκεῖν* to translate the Hebrew *לחם* in 7:1 and in 37:8–9. *לחם* and its derivatives are consistently rendered by *πολεμεῖν* in LXX Isaiah (19:2; 20:1; 30:32; 63:10). This is also the case elsewhere in the LXX corpus. The use of *πολιορκεῖν* as an equivalent of *לחם* is a peculiar phenomenon of LXX Isaiah 7 and 37. Elsewhere in the LXX, the equivalence is attested only in Joshua 10:29, 33, 34.

In light of our brief remarks on the use of *πολιορκεῖν* in the LXX, it is possible that the choice of the term to translate *לחם* in LXX Isa 7:1 and 37:8–9 was dictated by the contents of the passages, since both chapters 7 and 37 deal with sieges against Jerusalem.

To see this more clearly, we now turn to LXX Isa 37:8–9:

MT	LXX
(verse 8)	
וישב רב־שקה וימצא את־מלך אשור נלחם על־לבנה כי שמע כי נסע מלכיש	<i>καὶ ἀπέστρεψεν Ραψακῆς καὶ κατέλαβεν πολιορκοῦντα τὸν βασιλέα Λομναν καὶ ἤκουσεν βασιλεὺς Ἀσσυρίων ὅτι</i>
And (the) Rabshakeh returned and found the king of Assyria battling against Libnah,	And Rapsakes returned and caught up with the king besieging Lomna:

⁵ Job 17:7 has the remarkable *πεπολιόρχημαι*, reading *צור* instead of MT's *יצרי*.

for he heard that he had departed from Lachish. and the king of the Assyrians heard that

(verse 9)

וישמע על-תרהקה מלך-כוש	ἐξῆλθεν Θαρακα βασιλεὺς Αἰθιοπῶν
לאמר	
יצא להלחם אתו	πολιορκῆσαι αὐτόν
וישמע וישלח	καὶ ἀκούσας ἀπέστρεψεν καὶ ἀπέστειλεν
מלאכים אל-חזקיהו לאמר	ἄγγέλους πρὸς Ἐζεκιαν λέγων

And he heard concerning Tirhaqah king of Cush,	Tharaka, king of the Ethiopians went out
saying,	
“He has come to battle you”	to besiege him.
And he heard, and he sent messengers to Hezekiah, saying:	And hearing it, he turned away, and sent messengers to Ezekias, saying:

The first phrase is quite close to the Hebrew, with the interesting choice of *κατέλαβεν* for *וימצא*, which adds some color and tension to the narrative. After that, there is a significant departure. The first noticeable difference is a minor one, namely the change of the epithet of *מלך כוש* from the direct object of the first phrase to the subject of the second phrase.

The most significant difference between the MT and the LXX of Isaiah 37:8–9 is the one between the direct discourse in the Hebrew, which creates some syntactical and semantic difficulties for the overall understanding of the narrative, and the simpler and smoother account in Greek, containing just the report of what the “king of the Assyrians” heard and did. It is in this context that we find, in verse 8, the rendering of *נלחם* as *πολιορκούντα*, and in verse 9 *הלחם* as *πολιορκῆσαι*, attesting the same lexical equivalence that we saw in 7:1.

Another point that is worthy of note is the difference between the phrase *וישמע וישלח* and the Greek *καὶ ἀκούσας ἀπέστρεψεν καὶ ἀπέστειλεν*. While the aorist *ἀκούσας* represents *וישמע* well and *καὶ ἀπέστειλεν* corresponds to *וישלח*, we note that *ἀπέστρεψεν* has no equivalent term in Hebrew.

4. The Relationship between LXX Isa 7:1 and 2 Kgs 16:5

We now turn to the parallel texts in 2 Kings/4 Kingdoms. Within the limits of this paper, it is not feasible to discuss the entirety of the entire chapters in parallel, so we will just consider the verses where the term “besiege” is used to discuss the interplay between the translation technical study and the comparative study.

Let us look first at 2 Kgs (4 Kgdms) 16:5:

MT	LXX
אז יעלה רצין מלך־ארם ופקח בן־רמליהו מלך־ישראל ירושלם למלחמה ויצרו על־אחז ולא יכלו להלחם	τότε ἀνέβη Ραασσων βασιλεὺς Συρίας καὶ Φακεε υἱὸς Ρομελίου βασιλεὺς Ἰσραὴλ εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ εἰς πόλεμον καὶ ἐπολιόρκουν ἐπὶ Ἀχαζ καὶ οὐκ ἐδύναντο πολεμεῖν
Then Rezin, king of Aram, went up and Pekah, son of Remaliah, king of Israel (to) Jerusalem for the battle and they besieged <i>against</i> Ahaz and they could not battle	Then Raasson, king of Syria, went up and Phakee, son of Romelias, king of Israel towards Jerusalem, towards battle and they were besieging <i>against</i> Ahaz and they could not battle

Isaiah 7 and 2 Kings 16 are not synoptic chapters, yet there is a close textual parallel between Isa 7:1 and 2 Kgs 16:5. The first part of Isa 7:1, namely the contextualization of the following narrative “In the days of Ahaz, son of Jotham, son of Uzziah, king of Aram” has no direct parallel with 2 Kgs 16:5, unless we see it as a broad contextualization within the overall framework of 2 Kgs 16:1–4, but this is the subject of another discussion.

The parallel begins with the notice of the attack of Rezin and Pekah against Ahaz. The Isaiah text opens the phrase directly with the perfect third person singular form *עלה*, whereas in 2 Kings we have the adverbial particle *אז* followed by the imperfect third person singular *יעלה*. The following clause is exactly the same, including the peculiar syntax of *ירושלם* without preposition or directional marker, followed by *להלחם*.

There are three important differences between the two MT's. The first is the presence of *עלה* at the end of the last two parallel clauses of Isa 7:1. The second is the line *ויצרו על־אחז* between these two lines in 2 Kgs 16:5. Finally, there is a difference in the form of the verse *יכל* in the last line, which is singular in Isaiah and plural in 2 Kings.

The relationship between the Hebrew texts of Isaiah and 2 Kings is not the focus of our study.⁶ Rather, we are interested in seeing what we can learn about LXX Isaiah, in terms of its *Vorlage*, translation technique, possible effects the Hebrew text of 2 Kings could have had on the Isaiah translation, and whether there is any link between the Greek textual traditions of both books. We can begin with the latter issue, stating simply that apart from the use of similar transcriptions of personal names and some standard verbal equivalences, we do not find clear traces of a direct relationship between the two Greek texts. This is not surprising, if we accept the view

⁶ WILDBERGER, *Isaiah 1–12*, 283, points out that while Isa. 7:1 can be traced back to 2 Kgs 16:5, there is no need to employ critical tools to establish a text that finds complete agreement in both passages.

that the $\gamma\delta$ section of Kings is a late translation. Thus, there is logically no influence of LXX 4 Kingdoms on LXX Isaiah, but an influence in the inverse sense is at least conceivable.

There seems to be a link, however, between LXX Isaiah and the Hebrew text of 2 Kings. There are two elements that draw our attention. The first is the plural reading $\eta\delta\upsilon\nu\eta\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$ in LXX Isa 7:1. The second is the use of πολιορκεῖν , which is either just a free translation or a representation of צור “besiege”, which appears in the additional clause of 2 Kgs 16:5 but not in the MT of Isaiah.

There are two possible explanations. On the one hand, it is conceivable that the translator had a *Vorlage* that was closer to the MT form of 2 Kgs 16:5 than to the MT of Isaiah. Alternatively, if we concede that the *Vorlage* of the Isaiah translator was similar to MT Isaiah, we can postulate that he was somehow influenced by his knowledge of the Hebrew book of 2 Kings, from which he could have drawn, consciously or unconsciously, a turn of phrase that included the two verbs that finally entered his rendering of Isa 7:1, and which do not figure in MT Isaiah. Thus, we must either conceive a *Vorlage* to LXX Isa 7:1 that is closer to the text currently in MT 2 Kgs 16:5 or, in case the translator had access to Hebrew texts that reflect our MT for both verses, we can imagine that the translator was influenced by his memory of a Hebrew version of 2 Kings when translating Isaiah.

The memory of 2 Kgs 16:5 could have influenced the Isaiah translator beyond the simple choice of vocabulary and affected his understanding of the global sense of the narrative. There is a subtle difference in the way the account of the siege of Ahaz is framed in 2 Kgs 16:5 and Isa 7:1. Both texts narrate how Rezin, king of Syria, and Pekah, king of Israel, formed a coalition to attack Jerusalem. The text of 2 Kings is clear in stating that Rezin and Pekah went against Jerusalem, carried out a siege, but were not able to overthrow Ahaz. However, the Hebrew of Isa 7:1 could indicate that they were not even able to make any active assaults on the city. The Greek could be taken to mean either that there was an unsuccessful siege or that the siege did not even begin to be mounted. If the first is the correct interpretation, this can indicate that the translator’s previous knowledge of the Hebrew text of 2 Kings affected his work.

It is worth noting that the late recensions make two significant changes in the Isaiah text. Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion change the reading of πολιορκῆσαι to πολεμῆσαι , bringing the text closer to the Hebrew. Aquila and Symmachus also change the Isaiah reading from Αραμ to συρίας , bringing the text into alignment with the same tradition to which the Greek version of 2 Kings belongs. This is also a topic for another study.

5. The Relationship between LXX Isa 37:8–9 and 2 Kgs 19:8–9

To understand LXX Isa 37:8–9 further, let us consider the Hebrew and Greek versions of 2 Kings (LXX 4 Kingdoms) 19:8–9:

MT	LXX
(verse 8)	
וישב רב־שקה וימצא את־מלך אשור נלחם על־לבנה כי שמע כי נסע מלכיש	καὶ ἐπέστρεψεν Ραιψακης καὶ εὗρεν τὸν βασιλέα Ἀσσυρίων πολεμοῦντα ἐπὶ Λομνα ὅτι ἤκουσεν ὅτι ἀπῆρεν ἀπὸ Λαχισ
And (the) Rabshakeh returned and found the king of Assyria battling against Libnah, for he heard that he had departed from Lachish.	And Rapsakes returned and found the king of the Assyrians battling against Lomna, for he heard that he had departed from Lachis.
(verse 9)	
וישמע אל־תרהקה מלך־כוש לאמר הנה יצא להלחם אתך וישב וישלח מלאכים אל־חזקיהו לאמר	καὶ ἤκουσεν περὶ Θαρακα βασιλέως Αἰθιοπίων λέγων ἰδοὺ ἐξῆλθεν πολεμεῖν μετὰ σοῦ καὶ ἐπέστρεψεν καὶ ἀπέστειλεν ἀγγέλους πρὸς Εζεκιαν λέγων
And he heard concerning Tirhaqah, king of Cush, saying, “Behold, he has come out to battle with you”. And he returned, and he sent messengers to Hezekiah, saying,	And he heard concerning Tharaka, king of the Ethiopians, saying, “Behold, he has come out to battle with you”. And he returned, and he sent messengers to Ezekias, saying,

2 Kings 18–20 and Isaiah 36–39 are truly synoptic texts. To have a fuller appreciation of their relationship, we would need a full comparative study of the two sections, both in Hebrew and in Greek.⁷ Again, a detailed analysis of the relationship between these sections in Hebrew does not concern us here.⁸ It suffices to note that there are only three differences between the small segments that we are considering, namely Isa 37:8–9 and 2 Kgs 19:8–9. These are: the peculiar use of the preposition **א** instead of **ע** at the beginning of verse 8;⁹ the presence of the interjection **הנה** before **יצא** in 2 Kings; and the difference between the sequences **וישב וישלח** in 2 Kgs

⁷ To date, the most thorough study of LXX Isa 36–39 is HURWITZ, “Septuagint.”

⁸ For in depth studies of the relationship, see GONÇALVES, “2 Rois 18,13–20,19 par Isaïe 36–39;” PERSON, “II Kings 18–20 and Isaiah 36–39;” VAN PEURSEN and TALSTRA, “Computer-Assisted Analysis;” ROOT, “Scribal Error;” ANDERSON, “Rise, Fall, and Renovation.”

⁹ **א** is less commonly used with the sense of “about”, or “concerning” than **ע**. A good example appears in 2 Sam 1:24.

19:9 and *חַשְׁבֵּי שְׁמַע וַיִּשְׁלַח* in Isa 37:9. This last difference is the only one that interests us in the present study.

Apart from similar traditions for the transcriptions of the proper names in Greek, there is no real connection between the different Greek versions.¹⁰ The Greek translation of the section in 2 Kings is very literal and thus different from what we find in the equivalent texts in LXX Isaiah. In this case, naturally the verb *πολιορκεῖν* does not appear, and the forms of *חַל* are translated with the standard equivalent *πολεμεῖν*. Yet, we must pay close attention to the different verb pairs at the end of both sections. In 2 Kgs 19:9, we have the straightforward translation of *חַשְׁבֵּי שְׁמַע וַיִּשְׁלַח* as *καὶ ἐπέστρεψεν καὶ ἀπέστειλεν*. The equivalence between *שׁוּב* and *ἐπιστρέφειν* and between *חַל* and *ἀποστέλλειν* is standard and not particularly significant.

However, the translation of *חַשְׁבֵּי שְׁמַע וַיִּשְׁלַח* in Isa 37:9 is remarkable. We have seen that the Greek Isaiah offers *καὶ ἀκούσας ἀπέστρεψεν καὶ ἀπέστειλεν*, with the notable addition of *ἀπέστρεψεν*, without a Hebrew equivalent. The verb *ἀποστρέφειν* can serve as a representation of *שׁוּב* and this could point in the direction of a *Vorlage* that included this verb (thus being closer to the MT of 2 Kings than to the MT of Isaiah). It could also indicate that the translator was influenced by a reminiscence of the Hebrew text of 2 Kings in producing his rendering. The fact that he uses a different Greek verb from the one used in LXX 4 Kingdoms makes any relationship between the two Greek versions unlikely. The Greek translations seem to be totally independent.

6. Concluding Remarks

Our study began with an observation of the free approach of the translator in LXX Isa 7:1 and 37:8–9, with particular attention to his idiomatically conscious use of the verb *πολιορκεῖν*. This could be a self-sufficient study reinforcing some of our already existing knowledge of the translation technique of LXX Isaiah. But when we took into account the data of the parallel texts in 2 Kgs 16:5 and 19:8–9, we found new elements that helped us to paint a more global picture of LXX Isaiah and see the version in sharper relief. The comparative analyses of the Hebrew texts of both Isaiah and 2 Kings and their treatment in the extant Greek versions enabled us to see new issues and ask new questions.

First, our study enabled us to raise questions regarding whether the translator had a *Vorlage* different from the MT of Isaiah. An important

¹⁰ For a study of personal terminology in the Hebrew version, see THEIS, “Noch ein Namensspiel in der Bibel?”

lesson to learn is that we may have some doubts regarding a full equivalence between his *Vorlage* and the MT. This equivalence cannot be fully taken for granted, even if we do not have the same type of complex textual problems that are known to students of the books of Kingdoms, Jeremiah, or Esther.¹¹

Whether or not we decide in favor of a proto-MT *Vorlage* for Isaiah, our study also offered a glimpse into ways the Hebrew text of other books could have influenced the Isaiah translator. This could contribute to the ongoing discussion about the role of the translator as a scribe and interpreter of sacred scripture and the type of hermeneutical elements that came into play in his endeavor.

The fact that there was no evident trace of any influence of the Greek text of 2 Kings in Isaiah reinforces the consensus that LXX Isaiah is earlier than LXX 4 Kingdoms ($\gamma\delta$). In fact, the evidence of recent comparative studies tends to indicate that LXX Isaiah shows little evidence of an influence of Greek texts other than the Pentateuch, which places it earlier than most other books. The data indicates that the earlier classic studies of Ziegler and Seeligmann are in need of revision.¹²

Another topic for further discussion raised by our study was the independence between the interpretive and textual traditions of the Greek versions of Isaiah and Kings, even if there could have been subsequent attempts at recensions to bring these texts into greater alignment.

In sum, when we move away from an isolated study of LXX Isaiah in itself, and seriously consider it in relation to other versions, particularly those that share parallel texts with it, we can have a sharper and more complex picture of our version. In this sense, we can see LXX Isaiah as a point of confluence and convergence of different trajectories of tradition of translation and interpretation. I argue that the proposed model of study presented in this paper can enrich our knowledge of LXX Isaiah and can also be applied to other versions.

Bibliography

- ANDERSON, JOEL E., "The Rise, Fall, and Renovation of the House of Geseuius: Diachronic Methods, Synchronic Readings, and the Debate over Isaiah 36–39 and 2 Kings 18–20," *CBR* 11 (2013): 147–167.
- BARTHÉLEMY, DOMINIQUE, *Critique textuelle de L'Ancien Testament 2. Isaïe, Jérémie, Lamentations* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986).
- DE WAARD, JAN, *A Handbook on Isaiah* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1997).

¹¹ For a recent assessment of these versions, see TOV, "Three Strange Books."

¹² On this issue, see ZIEGLER, *Untersuchungen*, 103–105, and SEELIGMANN, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah*, 71–76.

- GONÇALVES, FRANCOLINO J., “2 Rois 18,13–20,19 par Isaïe 36–39: encore une fois, lequel des deux livres fut le premier?,” in *Lectures et relectures de la Bible: Festschrift P-M Bogaert*, ed. Jean-Marie Auwers and André Wénin (Leuven: Peeters, 1999), 27–55.
- HØGENHAVEN, JESPER, “The First Isaiah Scroll from Qumran (1QIsa) and the Massoretic Text: Some Reflections with Special Regard to Isaiah 1–12,” *JSOT* 9.28 (1984): 17–35.
- HURWITZ, MARSHALL S., “The Septuagint of Isaiah 36–39 in Relation to that of 1–35, 40–66,” *HUCA* 28 (1957): 75–83.
- PARRY, DONALD W. and QIMRON, ELISHA (eds.), *The Great Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa^a): A New Edition* (Leiden: Brill, 1999).
- PERSON, RAYMOND F., “II Kings 18–20 and Isaiah 36–39: A Text Critical Case Study in the Redaction History of the Book of Isaiah,” *ZAW* 111 (1999): 373–379.
- PULIKOTTIL, PAULSON, *Transmission of Biblical Texts in Qumran: The Case of the Large Isaiah Scroll 1QIsa^a* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001).
- ROOT, BRADLEY, “Scribal Error and the Transmission of 2 Kings 18–20 and Isaiah 36–39,” in *Sacred History, Sacred Literature: Essays on Ancient Israel, the Bible, and Religion in Honor of R. E. Friedman on his Sixtieth Birthday*, ed. Shawna Dolansky (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2008), 51–60.
- SEELIGMANN, ISAAC LEO, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah: a Discussion of its Problems* (Leiden: Brill, 1948).
- SWANSON, DWIGHT D., “The Text of Isaiah at Qumran,” in *Interpreting Isaiah: Issues and Approaches*, ed. David G. Firth and Hugh G. M. Williamson (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2009), 191–212.
- THEIS, CHRISTOFFER, “Noch ein Namensspiel in der Bibel?: zum Namen Tirhaḳah in 2 Kön 19,9 und Jes 37,9,” *BN* 162 (2014): 67–74.
- TOV, EMANUEL, “The Text of Isaiah at Qumran,” in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition*, ed. Craig C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans, vol. 2 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 491–511.
- , “Three Strange Books of the LXX: 1 Kings, Esther, and Daniel Compared with Similar Rewritten Compositions from Qumran and Elsewhere,” in *Die Septuaginta – Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten*, ed. Martin Karrer et al. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 369–393.
- VAN DER KOOIJ, ARIE, “The Old Greek of Isaiah in Relation to the Qumran Texts of Isaiah: Some General Comments,” in *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings*, ed. George J. Brooke and Barnabas Lindars (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 195–213.
- , *Die alten Textzeugen des Jesajabuches* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981).
- VAN DER VORM-CROUGHS, MIRJAM, *The Old Greek of Isaiah: an Analysis of its Pluses and Minuses* (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014).
- VAN PEURSEN, WIDO, and TALSTRA, EEP, “Computer-Assisted Analysis of Parallel Texts in the Bible: the Case of 2 Kings xviii–xix and its Parallels in Isaiah and Chronicles,” *VT* 57 (2007): 45–72.
- WILDBERGER, HANS, *Isaiah 1–12: A Commentary*, trans. Thomas H. Trapp (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991).
- ZIEGLER, JOSEPH, “Die Vorlage der Isaias-Septuaginta (LXX) und die erste Isaias-Rolle von Qumran, 1QIsa,” *JBL* 78 (1959): 34–59.
- , *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1934).