IS THERE AN ANTIOCHENE READING OF ISAIAH?

Natalio Fernández Marcos
Centro de Ciencias Humanas y Sociales-CSIC. Madrid
natalio@filol.csic.es

Much has been written on Antioch, the city founded by Seleucus on the river Orontes, second only to Alexandria in importance for the Jewish community in the Hellenistic and Roman period, the first place where the followers of Jesus were called 'Christians' (Acts 11:26).[1] The glory of this city, first as a focus of Hellenism and later as a pole of expansion of early Christianity is paramount. However, in the framework of the history of the Biblical text, when asking for the Antiochene or Lucianic reading, we do not refer only to the city but to the district of the διοίκησις with an ecclesiastical jurisdiction which includes the whole school of the Antiochene Fathers: Diodore and Eustathius, Theodor of Mopsuestia, Theodoret of Cyrrhus and John Chrysostom.

It is my purpose in this contribution to focus on the reading of Isaiah in this geographical area which produced some of the most brilliant and original commentators and exegetes of the Septuagint. After some remarks on the Scripture read by the Antiochene Fathers I will concentrate on the analysis of the Antiochene text commonly used in the public reading of the Bible to conclude with the kind of exegesis and hermeneutics carried out by the authors living in this district, the subject of some relevant monographs written over the last decades.

1. *An Antiochene Canon.*

At the level of the Biblical canon it is worth emphasizing the priority given by the Antiochene Fathers to the Old Testament, as a Christian collection of Jewish Books, christianised mainly through the new hermeneutics. As John Chrysostom states: 'While the books are from them, the treasure of the books now belongs to us; if the text is from them, both text and meaning belong to us.'[2] The priority of the Old Testament is one of the characteristics of the exegesis of Theodoret, who dedicates the largest part of his commentaries to the books of the Hebrew Scriptures in Greek, those inspired if obscure Scriptures, as stated in Isa 29:11: 'and all these things shall be to you as the words of this sealed book.' Another feature of the Antiochene reading is the primacy of the literal, historical sense, while emphasizing the coherence and συμφωνία in the interpretation of the whole Scripture, the Old and New Testament.

It can be deduced from the biblical books quoted in their commentaries, that the local canon of Antioch included 4 Esdras according to the Vulgate, whose chapters 3-14 contain the Apocalypse of Ezra, a Jewish writing of the 1st/2nd century CE. It is generally admitted that there was a Semitic original of this Apocalypse lying behind the lost Greek text. The seventh vision (Chapter 14) gives an extra-biblical account of the loss of the Jewish Scriptures under Manasseh and their recomposition by Ezra. Diodor quotes the story to support his view that the Psalms had to be collected anew and that their titles were not original. Theodoret cites it to defend

---

[1] See the recent monograph of Robert C. Hill, *Reading the Old Testament in Antioch* (Bible in Ancient Christianity 5; Leiden/Boston, 2005); Wayne A. Meeks and Robert L. Wilken, *Jews and Christians in Antioch in the First Four Centuries of the Common Era* (SBL Sources for Biblical Studies 13; Missoula, 1978), and especially A. J. Festugière, *Antioche païenne et chrétienne. Libanius, Chrysostome et les moines de Syrie* (Paris, 1959).
[2] Sermon 2 to Genesis (SC 433.188.1)

the inclusion in the canon of the Song of Songs. Besides the Apocalypse of Ezra, the Antiochene canon includes some of the deutero-canonical and apocryphal/pseudepigraphic books such as Ben Sirach and the Wisdom of Solomon, Baruch (but not the Epistle of Jeremiah) and 1 & 2 Maccabees, Tobit and Judith, while any form of the book of Esther was, apparently, missing.[3] Theodoret refers also, although with less frequency, to 1 and 2 Esdras and to 3 Maccabees. His text of Daniel (in the version of Theodotion) comprises chapters 1-12 plus v. 1 of Bel and the Dragon, but not Susanna, although the story is widely known to the Antiochenes.

The Antiochene Fathers rely on the local form of the Septuagint and do not know the Hebrew. They fail to recognise cases where the translators of the LXX have misread the tense of the Hebrew verbs or vocalized the Hebrew in a different way.[4] This Greek text of the Old Testament, in common use in the church of Antioch, differed significantly from the Greek text used in other churches. It was the *textus receptus* for the Gentile Church of Antioch, quoted in their questions and commentaries as `to; keivmenon`, but never mentioned by the geographical name or under the name of Lucian, due perhaps to the connection of the latter with the Arian heresy. It was recognized as such by Jerome. It was a text which was widespread and which can be seen in the verse-by-verse reading of the commentaries of the Antiochene Fathers. Although the book-by-book identification of the characteristics of such a distinctive text is still in progress, it can be confidently said that it has been identified in the historical books and in the Prophetical and Wisdom books which have appeared until now in the Göttingen maior critical edition.

2. *A different Greek Text*

First of all it should be taken into account that the Antiochene text or recension did not extend to, or at least has not been detected, in all the books of the Old Testament. It has not been found in the Pentateuch nor in the book of Esther. In the Psalms it should be referred to as a Byzantine text rather than as an Antiochene recension. The absence of this recension in corpora such as the Pentateuch or the Psalms is probably due to the constant use of these books in the liturgy and the frequent copying which transformed this text into a kind of standardized Byzantine text. In other books some common characteristics and distinctive features are shared by all the witnesses of the Antiochene text, but it should be stressed that a great fluidity is frequently manifest. The Antiochene text of Samuel-Kings-Chronicles with its homogeneous set of textual and literary features can hardly be compared with the Antiochene text of Psalms. And throughout the Prophetic books, the main characteristics of this recension fall into two categories: certain changes toward the Hebrew text, and a large number of stylistic variants.[5]

Turning to the Antiochene text of Isaiah; besides the critical edition by J. Ziegler[6], two monographs by Ziegler and Seeligmann are particularly relevant.[7] With regard to the changes of the first category, these authors

---

[3] Hill, *Reading the Old Testament*, pp. 23-25.

[4] Hill, *Reading the Old Testament,* pp. 54-61, and N. Fernández Marcos, 'Teodoreto de Ciro y la lengua hebrea,' *Henoch* 9 1987), pp. 39-54. For the book of Isaiah Seeligmann suplies sufficient examples proving that the Lucianic revisor corrected the Old Greek without consultation of the Masoretic text, cf. I. L. Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah. A Discussion of its Problems* (Leiden, 1948), pp. 17-20.

[5] N. Fernández Marcos, 'Some Reflections on the Antiochian Text of the Septuagint,' in Detlef Fraenkel, Udo Quast and John Wm Wevers (eds.), *Studien zur Septuaginta - Robert Hanhart zu Ehren* (MSU 20; Göttingen, 1990), pp. 219-229; *idem,* 'Einführung in den antiochenischen Text der griechischen Bibel in den Samuel- und Königsbüchern (1-4 Kön LXX),' in S. Kreuzer and J. P. Lesch (eds.), *Im Brennpunkt: Die Septuaginta. Studien zur Entstehung und Bedeutung der Griechischen Bibel.* Band 2 (Stuttgart, 2004), pp. 177-213.

[6] J. Ziegler, *Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum. Isaias* (2nd edition. Göttingen, 1967), pp. 83-92.

[7] J. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias* (ATA 12; Münster, 1934), and Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, pp. 16-22.

insist on stressing the fact that for the Antiochene recension, unlike the Hexaplaric, the Hebrew was not the ultimate criterion for the change. In all probability, the Antiochene recension did not use the Hebrew text but the Hexaplaric tradition as a source for the corrections towards the Masoretic text. Although the Antiochene text of Isaiah is closer to the Masoretic text than to the Old Greek, the aim of this recension was not an exact accommodation to the Hebrew at all. Moreover, the common opinion that Lucian had before him complete editions of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion, and that in the Prophets he exploited especially the readings of Symmachus, has to be duly nuanced.[8] Undoubtedly Lucian had access to a larger body of Hexaplaric material than that transmitted by our extant manuscripts. He may have been inspired by all these readings in his search for the exact meaning of the Hebrew text, but, with all this material at hand, he created his own text. Lucian reshaped the text even in disagreement with and against the Hebrew. To get a correct view of the Antiochene recension one has to evaluate not only the Hexaplaric loans but also the rejections of the Hexaplaric material. As Munnich states: 'Au contraire, lorsque l'on considère à la fois les emprunts du recenseur à la recension hexaplaire mais aussi ses refus, on saisit la perspective qui est la sienne: l'établissement d'un texte clair, propre à nourrir la recherche exégètique sur le seul texte grec.'[9]

The rules of classical Greek grammar seem to be of more concern to him. This trend can be perceived in the stylistic changes; in his aim to make clear the text by general additions taken from the context, by parallel passages or familiar expressions; in the frequent addition of pronouns, articles or particles that make explicit the meaning of the phrase, as well as in some Atticizing corrections. It results in an explicit, clear text probably intended for public reading. Some of the frequent exchanges of synonyms are drawn from the three younger translators, but most of them are due to stylistic motivations.

The double readings are another characteristic of this recension. Probably in respect for tradition, Lucian did not erase the old readings, but placed them side by side with the new ones reflecting a more accurate translation from the Hebrew, and coming from the younger revisions or the new translations of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion. In many cases the double readings witness a vocalization different from that of the Masoretic text. In Isaiah the Lucianic readings, far from being purely stylistic improvements, frequently transmit exegetical alterations and additions which supply valuable evidence concerning the ancient interpretation of the Septuagint. From this procedure emerges the paradoxical result that Lucian witnesses a revised, corrected text, and, at the same time, brings a wealth of ancient readings very close to the Old Greek. As Seeligmann states: 'the data available ... would seem to indicate the possibility that the Antiochenic manuscripts which form the foundation of the material qualified as Lucianic, contained certain ancient components that have disappeared from the remainder of the transmitted material.'[10]

It is difficult to represent this process of heterogeneous, sometimes contradictory corrections, as the work of a single author. Moreover, from the agreement of these reading with Josephus and the Old Latin has arisen the question of Proto-Lucian, one of the most vexed problems in Septuagint research.[11] But leaving aside those uncertainties concerning the historical Lucian and his participation in the production of the Antiochene text as well as the present debate on Proto-Lucian, some plausible conclusions can be drawn from the analysis and

---

[8] N. Fernández Marcos, 'On Symmachus and Lucian in Ezekiel,' in F. García Martínez, M. Vervenne (eds.), *Interpreting Translation. Studies on the LXX and Ezekiel in Honour of Johan Lust* (BETL 192; Leuven 2005), pp.151-161.

[9] O. Munnich, 'Le texte lucianique d'Isaïe-Septante,' in García Martínez, Vervenne, *Interpreting Translation*, pp. 269-299, p. 299. 'Chez le recenseur lucianique, l'établissement du text nous a paru intimement lié à un établissement du sens' (*Ibid.,* p. 297).

[10] Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, p. 22.

[11] John W. Wevers, 'Proto-Septuagint Studies,' in *The Seed of Wisdom; Fs. T. S. Meek* (Toronto, 1964), pp. 58-77, p. 69.

evaluation of the text itself. Therefore, I turn now to an analysis of the two last chapters of Isaiah[12] in order to test the main characteristics of this recension described by the above mentioned authors with reference to the *corpus* of the Prophets or to the whole book of Isaiah.

A) In the Antiochene recension, a series of small additions according to the Masoretic text complete the translation of the Old Greek. Some of these additions are registered in the Hexaplaric apparat of Zieglers's edition as material from the "Three," and are reproduced in the first apparat as variants of some Septuagint manuscripts with the indication of their provenance = M (Masoretic Text).[13]

65,1 `jIdouv eijmi]` + `ijdouv eimi,` which reproduces the repetition of the Hebrew: `ynnh ynnh`.

The addition is attested by Theodotion and the Syrohexapla under asterisk.

65,2 `oiJ oujk ejporeuvqhsan oJdw/' ajlhqinh/']` `toi'" poreuomevnoi" oJdw'/ ouj kalh'/`, which is a more literal translation of the Hebrew *Vorlage*.

65,4 `kreva u{eia]` `kreva" u{eion`, in agreement with the singular of M.

65,7 `aujtw'n 2°]` + `ejpi; to; aujtov`, taken from Theodotion in accordance with M: `wdxy`.

65,14 `ejn eujfrosuvnh/]` + `kardiva"`, attested by the three younger translators and M: `bl`.

65,15 `kuvrio"]` + `oJ qeov"`, corresponding to M: `hwhy` in the formula `hwhy ynd)`

65,18 `ejn aujth'/]` + `o{sa ejgw; ktivzw,` attested by Theodotion following M: `)rwb yn) r#).`

65,20 `a[wro"]` + `hJmevrai"` attested by Theodotion and the Syrohexapla according to M.

`eJkatovn 1°]` `prec uiJov"`, attested by Aquila and Theodotion in accordance with M.

Other small interventions to conform the Old Greek to M can be detected also in vv. 19, 23 and 25.

66,3 `movscon]` + `wJ" oJ tuvptwn a[ndra qusiavzwn provbaton`, attested (with variants) by Symmachus and Theodotion in conformity with M: `h#h xbwz #y)-hkm.`

66,9 `tauvthn]` + `kai; ejgw; ouj gennhvsw` in conformity with M: `dylw) )lw`, which is not supported by the Hexaplaric recension.

66,10 `eujfravnqhti]` `eujfravnqhte`, with Aquila, Symmachus = M

`cavrhte]` + `a{ma aujth'/` attested by Theodotion and Syh = M

66,15 `ajposkorakismovn]` + `aujtou'` with the rest of the interpreters and M

66,19 `shmei'a]` `shmei'on` in conformity with the singular of M: `tw).`

The agreement of the Antiochene recension with the "Three" is difficult to evaluate, since one has to rely on fragmentary evidence which has been transmitted in connection with the text of the Septuagint. But in the

---

[12] On the role of these chapters as conclusion of the book of Isaiah, see Marvin A. Sweeney, 'Prophetic Exegesis in Isaiah 65-66,' in Craig C. Broyles & Craig A. Evans (eds.), *Writing & Reading the Scroll of Isaiah. Studies of an Interpretive Tradition* (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 70,1; Leiden, Brill 1997), I, pp. 455-474.
[13] The reading after the bracket corresponds to a good deal of the Antiochene manuscripts. For more precise information the critical apparatus of Ziegler's edition, mentioned in note 6, should be consulted.

light of the above comparison the common opinion of Lucian's preference for Symmachus is not confirmed. Moreover, the results of this comparison should be complemented with other interventions which tend to improve the Greek version quite independently of the Masoretic text. The following examples in the next section supply sufficient proof of this tendency.

B) The reshaping of the text in the Lucianic recension often ignores the Masoretic Hebrew and contains a set of stylistic improvements of different kinds, not always followed systematically. Many of them tend to complete the text or make it more explicit by adding a proper name, the article, the pronoun, an exchange of preposition, an exchange of singular and plural or a simple and composite verb, the juxtaposition of double translations or the exchange of synonyms; a different distribution of the words in order to improve the Greek hyperbaton, etc.

65,2 `prov"]ejpiv`

65,3 `quziavzousin]qumiavzousin`

65,4 `e[sqonte"]ejsqivonte"`. The same correction in 66,17.

    `zwmovn]zwmouv"`

65,6 `ouj]+mhv`

65,7 `ta;" aJmartiva"]`pr`pavsa"`

65,9 `eujlogiva]+kurivou`

65,12 `ejn sfagh'/]`om `ejn`

65,14 `kekravxesqe]kekravxete`

65, 15 `aujtw'/]moi`

65,21 `katafuteuvsousin]futeuvsousin`

65,25 `oujde; mhv]`om `mhv`

    `tw'/ aJgivw/ / mou]`tr

66,1 `katapauvsew"]katoikhvsew"`

66,2 `tou" lovgou" /mou]`tr

66,4 `oujk h[kousan]+mou`

66,8 `ejtevcqh]e[teken`

    `kai; e[teke / Siwn]`tr

66,9 `ejgwv 2º]`post `stei'ran` tr, following a better hyperbaton in Greek

66,10 `penqei'te]ejpenqei'te`

    `ejp jaujth'"]ejp jaujth'/`

66,14 `sebomevnoi"]foboumevnoi"`[14]

66,18 `ta; e[rga et to;n logismovn]`tr

    `e[rcomai sunagagei'n]`tr and pr `kai; ajntapodwvsw aujtoi'" ijdouv`

---

[14] `fobevw` is extensively represented in the Antiochene text of the historical books, while `sevbomai` is absent, see N. Fernández Marcos, Mª. V. Spottorno Díaz-Caro and J. M. Cañas Reíllo, *Índice griego-hebreo del texto antiocheno en los libros históricos.* Volume 1: *Índice general* (Textos y Estudios Cardenal Cisneros 75; Madrid, 2005).

66,19   oi{] ai{, a better construction in agreement with the feminine antecedent ta;" nhvsou".

th;n dovxan / mou] tr

These corrections represent small additions of a possessive pronoun or a noun, the exchange of words and transpositions which taken together improve the style of the Greek and make it more readable for a Hellenistic audience.

C) Another characteristic of Antiochene is the preference for Attic forms over the Hellenistic. All the Lucianic manuscripts for Isaiah usually read the second aorist ei\pon instead of ei\pa, ei\don instead of ei[dosan, kaqei'lon instead of kaqeivlosan, h\lqon instead of h[lqosan. The feeling for the language constitutes the key for these corrections as for other Atticisms found in chapters 65 and 66.

65,1 ei\pa] ei\pon

65,8 oJ rJwvx] (hJ) rJavx

66,12 ajrqhvsontai] ajrqhvsetai

paraklhqhvsontai] paraklhqhvsetai. Both verbs in the singular with a neuter subject in the plural, ta; paidiva.

66,20 ejnevgkaisan] ejnevgkoien, 2nd aorist optative instead of the 1st aorist.

The correction of 65,8 is well documented in the Atticistic Lexica. Photius comments: rJavx qhlukw'": oJ de; rJw;x kai; barbarismo;" kai; soloikismov" ('rJavx is feminine. oJ rJwvx is a barbarism and a solecism').[15] And Phrynicus remarks: hJ rJa;x ejrei'": oJ ga;r rJw;x duvo e[cei aJmarthvmata ('you should say rJavx; since rJwvx has two mistakes'), that is, solecism in gender and barbarism in form.[16] The forms that the Atticists condemned were the forms current at the time, or becoming current, while the forms they recommended were the forms that were falling into disuse. Caragounis has reacted against considering the Atticistic movement as a hindrance to the natural development of Greek, emphasizing the beneficial influence of Atticism for the history of the Greek language. It condemned forms and syntax not witnessed in the best classical authors and preserved the language intact throughout Byzantine and into modern Greek times.[17] This word can be traced up to the modern Greek. As Shipp states:

> JRavx is the Attic form on all evidence. JRwvx was perhaps the Ionic form, as used by Archilochus. It is the LXX form. That it was usual later is shown by Hsch. rJa'ga: h}n hJmei'" rJw'ga. It is also Pontic, which supports Ionic.
> The survival of the two forms in Mod. is one of Hatzidakis' remarkable examples. He states that rw'ga is the form in the Pelop. and islands, ra'ga in some districts of the mainland, e. g. Amphissa, Aetolia, Acarnania Doris, Epirus.[18]

---

[15] *Photii Patriarchae Lexicon. Volumen Alterum* by S. A. Naber. Leiden, 1864-1865 = Amsterdam: Hakkert 1965, p. 128.

[16] *The New Phrynicus, With Introduction and Commentary* by W. Gunion Rutherford. London 1881 = Hildesheim: Georg Olms 1968, pp. 148-149.

[17] Chrys C. Caragounis, *The Development of Greek and the New Testament* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 167; Tübingen, 2004), pp. 122-123.

[18] G. P. Shipp, *Modern Greek Evidence for Ancient Greek Vocabulary* (Sydney, 1979), p. 481, and G. N. Hatzidakis, *Einleitung in die neugriechische Grammatik* (Leipzig, 1892), p. 29.

Through this Atticistic correction one can realize that the reviser(s) of the Antiochene recension shared the concern of the literary authors of their time for the purity of the Greek language, also that of the Septuagint, and that they left sporadic traces of this stylistic fashion in the manuscripts. This part of the verse (Isa 65:8a) in Greek, 'as a grape-stone shall be found in the cluster,' differs from M which states 'as the wine is found in the cluster.'

As with other small revisions it tends to improve the Greek making it more acceptable for public reading.

As is well known, the Antiochene text, which separated from the rest of the Septuagint tradition at an early time, probably in the 1st century CE,[19] preserves a great number of ancient, genuine readings which may represent the Old Greek. In the chapters we have examined there may well be a good example of this. In Isa 65,3 the Septuagint reads: 'This is the people that provokes me continually in my presence; they offer sacrifices in gardens, and burn incense on bricks *to devils, which exist not* (toi'" daimonivoi", a} oujk e[sti).' In this verse the translation of the Old Greek is extremely literal except for the last two words, which are lacking in the Masoretic text, although they may quite well reflect the translation of the first word of v. 4 Myb#yh, which is omitted in the Old Greek of v. 4. But the Greek of v. 3, as it stands, can hardly be a translation of Myb#yh. However, instead of the Greek a} oujk e[sti, the Antiochene tradition transmits a double variant: one part of the manuscripts reads kai; toi'" oijkou'sin and another part kai; toi'" oujk ou\sin. *Pace* Ziegler, it is quite plausible that toi'" oijkou'sin, a literal rendering of Myb#yh, be the original translation, which was corrupted into the secondary variant toi'" oujk ou\sin, and later transformed into the midrashic paraphrase printed by Ziegler toi'" daimonivoi", a} oujk e[stin.[20]Ziegler's discussion focuses on which of the two readings is authentic Lucianic[21]. However, he does not doubt that they are secondary readings 'die den alten Sept.-Text a} oujk e[stin verdrängt haben.' In my opinion the reverse is true: the rest of the variants can best be explained from the original Old Greek toi'" oijkou'sin, transmitted by a part of the Antiochene recension.

In 65,11 two gods are mentioned in the Hebrew text, dg and ynm, the first a Syrian or Nabatean god of good fortune, and the second probably a goddess or personification of Destiny: 'who set a table for Fortune and fill cups of mixed wine for Destiny.' The Old Greek translates the first one by tw'/ daimonivw/, and the second one by th'/ tuvch/, 'they prepare a table for the devil, and fill up a mixture to Fortune.' The Antiochene text alternates both translations and uses th'/ tuvch/ for dg, following the younger translators and tw'/ daivmoni for ynm, probably with a better knowledge of these divinities[22] or taking advantage of the homophonic similarity between ynm and daivmoni.

3. *A different Exegesis*

---

[19] Cf. Sebastian P. Brock, 'A Doublet and its Ramifications,' *Bib* 56 (1975), pp. 550-553.

[20] Seeligmann, *The Septuagint version,* pp. 21 and 30-31.

[21] 'Es kann sein, dass kai toi" oikousin bereits auf Lukian selbst zurückgeht; kai toi" ouk ousin kann auch sekundäre innergriechisch verderbte Lesart sein,' cf. Ziegler, *Isaias*, p. 90.

[22] On the Hellenistic cults to (jAgaqo;") Daivmwn and Tuvch as arbiters of fate, see Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, p. 99.

Seeligmann dedicated chapter four of his excellent monograph to the Greek translation of Isaiah as a document of Jewish-Alexandrian theology. As a matter of fact, he is dealing with the Old Greek as a witness of this Alexandrian theology. Is it possible to go a step further and ask whether the Antiochene text generated in the Antiochene Fathers an exegesis of its own? I have tried to outline the profile of the Antiochene text, different from the Old Greek and closer to the Masoretic text, because it has benefited from Origen's Hexaplaric recension and the philological correction made in Cesarea by Eusebius and Pamphilus, as well as from the readings of the three younger translators. The text has also been adapted for public reading with small additions of names and pronouns, changes of verbs and synonyms and other stylistic improvements which include slight atticisms. It is the ecclesiastical, common text, of the `dioivkhsi"` of Antiochia. From the point of view of the exegesis, can we also speak of a common Antiochene reading of this text, a shared exegesis?

The question cannot be answered without nuances. The Antiochene Fathers share several common features in their hermeneutics and exegeses, as has been pointed out by Schäublin's monograph,[23] and by Simonetti's and Viciano's studies.[24] However, there is not one reading but various readings and exegetical perceptions of the same text. One is the reading of Diodor or Theodore and another, that of Theodoret. Concretely, the exegesis of Theodoret as representative of the Antiochene school has been analyzed by Ashby, Guinot, Childs and Hill.[25]

The Antiochene school is characterized by its criticism of the Alexandrian allegories and its defence of the `qewriva`, the genesis of the spiritual sense from the literal and historical sense. As Schäublin has demonstrated the hermeneutic technique of the school fully relies on the technique used by the ancient grammarians for the interpretation of the classical texts. They received the main impulse to interpret the sacred texts from Greek philology and Rhetoric, and they tried to implement the Aristarchian maxim `{Omhron ejx JOmhvrou safhnivzein,` applied to the Scripture. The Antiochene Fathers are not trained in Hebrew, nor in the Rabbinic tradition and culture, but in the Greek and Christian tradition. The genre of `zhthvmata kai; luvsei"`, *quaestiones* and *responsiones*, was developed in the Hellenistic period and goes back to the Homer exegesis. These trends of the school are best represented in Theodor of Mospuestia's commentary to the Psalms, where he avoids explaining the prophecies as directed to Christ and prefers to interpret them within the framework of the Old Testament. But it can be stated that there is a plural reading of the Old Testament among the Antiochene authors. In recent research, Theodoret is no longer considered as a compiler, but as an original exeget, faithful to the principles of the school which chooses a middle way against the extreme literalism of Theodore. Theodoret is more open to the figurative and typological exegesis than his predecessors Diodore and Theodore; he accepts the historical scope of the prophecy and states that a prophet is quite capable of predicting future events, including the advent of Christ. The distinction between the literal and the figurative interpretation becomes a dynamic one in Theodoret; the figurative or metaphorical (`tropikw'"`) sense extends rather than

---

[23] Christoph Schäublin, *Untersuchungen zu Methode und Herkunft der antiochenischen Exegese* (Theophaneia 23; Köln/Bonn, 1974), and Hill, *Reading the Old Testament*, pp. 135-165.

[24] M. Simonetti, *Lettera e/o Allegoria. Un contributo alla storia dell'esegesi patristica* (Roma, 1985); Alberto Viciano, 'Das formale Verfahren der antiochenischen Schriftauslegung. Ein Forschungsüberblick,' in *Stimuli. Exegese und ihre Hermeneutik in Antike und Christentum. Festchrift für Ernst Dassmann.* G. Schöllgen and C. Scholten (eds.) (Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum. Ergänzungsband 23; Münster, 1996), pp.370-405.

[25] G. W. Ashby, *Theodoret of Cyrrhus as Exegete of the Old Testament* (Grahamstown. South Africa, 1972); Jean-Noel Guinot, *L'exégèse de Theodoret de Cyr* (TH 100. Paris, 1995); Brevard S. Childs, *The Struggle to Understand Isaiah as Christian Scripture* (Grand Rapids. MI/ Cambridge, 2004), pp. 130-148, and Hill, *Reading the Old Testament,* pp. 135-165. See also Charles Kannengiesser, *Handbook of Patristic Exegesis. The Bible in Ancient Christianity*. 2 vols.(Leiden/Boston, 2004).

denies the significance of the literal. He rejects the Jewish, carnal interpretation as well as Theodore's exegesis which is radically literal and is not open to the spiritual sense. As Ashby observes:

> There is a double assumption that events in Hebrew history have a meaning not only within Hebrew annals, but within God's action of revelation, and secondly that events in Hebrew history are set within God's being God, and also within God's being about to be in Christ. This, in Theodoret's terms is *historia* and *theoria*.[26]

According to Vaccari, the Antiochene qewriva presupposes the historical reality of the events described by the biblical author; it embraces simultaneously a second future reality linked to the first, and the relation of the first historical event to the second is that of the sketch to the finished work. The first and less significant event is the vehicle used by the prophet to describe a greater future event in human history.[27]

Theodoret's exegesis, as heir of the tradition of Diodor, Theodore and John Chrysostom, is characterized by his balance. He mediates between the extremes of the Alexandrian allegorical interpreters and the overly literal, historicist interpretation of Theodore of Mopsuestia. For Theodoret the biblical text rests on a historical basis that can be verified by the facts. He underlines the harmony (sumfoniva), and coherence (ajkolouqiva) of the Scripture and, especially, between the Old and New Testaments, emphasizing the unity of the two Testaments; its intent (skopov"), and especially its end (tevlo"). Sometimes the sense of the Scripture is hidden, sealed (cf. Isa 29,11-12), and one has to search for the meaning beyond the appearance of the letter. But he stands in the patristic tradition that Jesus Christ is the key to the understanding of the Old Testament.

His exegesis is fully based on the Antiochene text, to; keivmenon, different from the Hexaplaric and the text of other copies or ajntivgrafa. He recognizes the plural transmission of the Septuagint and frequently quotes, without prejudice, the three younger translators as other forms of translating the original Hebrew. His intention is not to produce a text critical work but to look after the clarity and intelligibility of the biblical text. It is important to realize that Theodoret does not content himself with the Antiochene text, but tries to clarify or control it in different ways. As Guinot remarks:

> Malgré ses insuffisances et ses limites, l'exemplaire biblique de Théodoret devait être, dans une certaine mesure, un exemplaire critique, une manière de Bible glosée, contenant dans ses marges un certain nombre de variantes empruntées aux versions et que ne signalaient pas toujours le commentaire d'Eusèbe.[28]

D) *Conclusions*

In spite of the multiple nuances applicable to each particular author, we can truly talk of an Antiochene reading of Isaiah. Through the biblical quotations of the Antiochene Fathers it had become clear that they used their own canon in this geographical area. They also read the Greek Bible in their own text, a text that should no longer be called Lucianic but Antiochene. The Antiochene authors were aware of the plural transmission of the Septuagint and were able to compare their ecclesiastical text (to; keivmenon) with that of the Hexapla and

---

[26] Ashby, *Theodoret of Cyrrhus*, p. 157.

[27] Alberto Vaccari, 'La qewriva nella scuola esegetica di Antiochia,' *Bib* 1 (1920), pp. 3-36.

[28] Guinot, *L'exégèse*, p. 230.

other manuscripts. They were especially influenced by Origen and Eusebius but they followed their own text which had been created with different recensional criteria. Finally, they shared a set of common exegetical principles, based on the hermeneutics of the Greek grammarians and Homer's exegetes rather than on the Hebrew and the Jewish and Rabbinic traditions.

It should, however, be emphasized that within this common framework there are different degrees in the implementation of these principles. All the authors defend the literal, historical exegesis of the Old Testament, but Theodoret is less radical than Diodor and Theodore in the application of the literal sense. He is more open to apply the figurative or metaphorical sense to the same biblical texts.

Childs detects a certain similarity between Theodoret's exegesis and the Reformers' hermeneutical theory concerning *scriptura sui interpres*; and between Theodoret's and Von Rad's use of typology as an attempt to overcome an impasse between two competing positions: the allegory of the Alexandrians and the historicism of Theodore, and the problem arising from the Enlightenment between faith and history.[29] These simple facts are indicators of the strong impact of the Antiochene reading in the history of exegesis. In this sense the reading of Isaiah may be paradigmatic.

May these notes contribute to honour Arie van der Kooij, an excellent and appreciated scholar, and a loyal friend since our first meeting, many years ago, when we both were young and postgraduate students.

---

[29] Childs, *The Struggle*, pp. 139 and 145.