typewritten offset, FiM 72,- (The book deals with the rendering of the most common ‘semiprepositions’ into Greek in the LXX. A semipreposition is defined in the BROCKELMANN sense (‘Halbpräpositionen’) as a combination of a preposition and a noun with a prepositional function. The purpose of the study was to investigate the differences of translation technique employed by different translators of the LXX in view of the fact that ‘the’ LXX is not a homogeneous translation but the work of many different translators.

The main body of the work consists of very detailed investigations of the meaning of a large number of semiprepositions, both in Biblical Greek and in the LXX. The Septuagintal usage of semiprepositions is also compared with non-Septuagintal usage in other Koine texts (cf. Appendix pp. 308-352). The author follows the method of her mentor SOISALON-SOININEN in his investigation of the rendering of infinitives in the LXX (1965).

Many of the views of THACKERAY (1909) on the character of the LXX translation are corroborated by this study, while others are criticized. In chapter ten the separate books of the LXX are divided into four categories, indicating the grades of freedom and slavishness of translation techniques in the LXX. The books rendered most freely, in order of freedom or translation, are Esth o', Prv, Ex, Is, Job and Dan o'. The most slavish renderings are found in 2 Esd, Jer, Ez, Jdg A, 4Rg, Jdg B, Lam and Ecl.

It is found that the majority of the Greek equivalents for Hebrew semiprepositions consists of slavish and literal renderings, resulting in unidiomatic and Hebraistic phrases. There are, however, those renderings which are literal but cannot be regarded as Hebraistic, and also others, although few in number, which are free or paraphrasing renderings. In some cases original semiprepositions were translated into Greek by a semipreposition, while in others they were apparently regarded as ordinary prepositions. The rendering of semiprepositions in the LXX presents a comparatively incoherent picture. ‘The same Hebrew semipreposition has been translated in different ways in different books, but variations also appear within the books . . . . .’ (304). Polysemy, syntax and idiom had an effect on the choice of the Greek renderings.

The book is a very important contribution to the study of the LXX. Because of the indices (list of tables of renderings; index of Greek words and phrases and an index of Biblical passages) it is a usable tool for anybody who is interested in the study of detail in the LXX.)

W. S. VORSTER

Michael E. STONE, The Armenian Version of IV Ezra edited and translated (University of Pennsylvania. Armenian Texts and Studies, Supported by the Sarkis Tarzian Fund, Number 1), Scholars Press, Missoula, Montana 1978, xv and 315 p., Member's price $ 7.00. Non-member's price $ 10.50 (This is not the first edition and translation of the Armenian version of IV Ezra, but it is the first to be based on all the available evidence and to
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present it as fully as possible. That is good news. As a witness to the original text, Arm does not rank high among the various translations in which IV Ezra has solely survived, and Stone found nothing to alter the situation in this respect. But this is not to say that Arm is devoid of textual value, and it is of course by itself a worthy and influential piece of early Armenian literature (fifth cent. A.D.?) that deserves to be studied on its own merits. Moreover, Stone feels that the shortcomings of Arm as a witness to the original are not due to the translator(s), but to his or their Vorlage which was a much reworked Greek text. However, all this and the relationship of Arm to the other versions etc. will be set out in full in the forthcoming Textual Commentary on Arm of which the present volume is an integral part.

The first chapter, after duly registering the previous research on the text of IV Ezra Arm, succinctly describes and evaluates the manuscript evidence and sets forth the editorial principles. Stone thinks that he has scared up all the extant copies of the book, twenty-three in number, all of them Bibles if indeed Erevan 1500 may be called a Bible, and only three of them older than the 17th century. He utilized them all, save one in the Kurdish collection at Wichita, Kansas (one wonders what caused Mr. KURDIAN to clamp down on it—Stone inspected it, though, and is satisfied the text is what you may expect from a 17th century Bible). This is less than half of what we have for e.g. the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs or Joseph and Aseneth. The textual history is accordingly less complicated. The mss. separate into two independent families, H (= Erevan 1500, 1271-85 A.D.) and W (= Jerusalem 1558, 1596-1615 A.D.) ψ (= the other 20 mss.). W and ψ are subfamilies sharing a common ancestor which in turn shares a common grandfather with H (cf. stemma on p. 12). "H is the best single witness to the text and W is the best single witness to Wψ" (p. 11). Yet H, which is used here for the first time, is much better than Wψ. Stone therefore takes it as the text of his edition unless Wψ positively prove superior. The second chapter of the present volume then contains a brief presentation of IV Ezra in Armenian literature. The rest is edition. In fact, Stone gives us two editions. First, there is an eclectic one which aims to provide the best attainable text of Arm, presenting all the evidence of H and W and a selection of This is accompanied by the translation on the opposite pages. Then there is a diplomatic edition of or rather of A (= Jerusalem 1933, 1645 A.D.) with the balance of the mss. collated against it.

Read by themselves in their present condensed form, Stone's textual principles and conclusions certainly seem sound. The excellence of H does not come as a surprise. This famous one-volume library copied by Mxitʿar of Ayrivank following the 'Order of the Holy Books' by John the Deacon of Halbat (1044/5-1129 A.D.) is also our best witness to the Testaments and to Joseph and Aseneth (not, perhaps, to the Armenian Philo if Hans Lewy in his edition of the pseudo-Philonic De Jona is right). I am beginning to think that it would be a service to humanity for some Maecenas to sponsor a facsimile edition of this unique codex. I chanced upon a place or two where Stone may have underrated H's tendency toward