

THE BIRTH AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE GREEK BIBLE

Natalio Fernández Marcos

Instituto de Filología-CSIC. Madrid

I. The point of arrival: The Christian Bible

What we now call the Septuagint is the final result of a translation process and new accretion (production) that extended over four centuries plus a debate of three centuries on the authority of some of these books. It is my intention to analyse and describe in this paper this historical process starting by the final product as it appears in the documents of the IVth century CE, and going back to the origins in order to trace the main steps of the process. In this description I will try to carefully distinguish between the factual evidence and the diverse interpretations or reflections of the scholars on such evidence.

I will take as an example of the Christian Bible of the mid fourth century the *codex Vaticanus* (Vatican Library, *Gr.* 1209), the first complete Bible documented in a single volume or codex. As you know this Bible differs from the Hebrew Bible in several aspects: the content and number of the books, the titles of many books, the order and disposition of the books. In contrast with the classical distribution of the Hebrew Bible in the three corpora of *Torah*, *Nebi'im* and *Ketubim*, the Greek Bible divides the material in four sections: Pentateuch, Historical books (Joshua, Judges, Ruth, I-IV Kingdoms, I-II Paralipomena, I-II Ezra), books of Wisdom or Poetical books (Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, Job, Wisdom of Solomon, Wisdom of Sirach, Esther, Judith, Tobit), and Prophetical books (Twelve Prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Baruch, Lamentations, Epistle of Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Daniel)¹. I-IV Maccabees are lacking in *Vaticanus* but they are included in *Codex Alexandrinus* of the Vth century. The collection of Psalms, that includes Ps. 151 (attested in Hebrew with a similar text in Qumran) is followed by a collection of Odes some of them of Christian origin, taken from the New Testament. The relative openness of the Old Testament portion of these oldest codices also corresponds to that of its New

¹ In this order in B and Swete's edition, but not in Rahlfs's edition who places Esther, Judith and Tobit behind I-II Ezra, followed by I-IV Maccabees of A. 1 and 4 Maccabees are extant also in *Codex Sinaiticus*.

Testament: *Sinaiticus* contains the Epistle of Barnabas and Hermas, and *Alexandrinus* 1 and 2 Clement.

It is worth emphasizing that the three most ancient uncials (Vaticanus, Alexandrinus and Sinaiticus) include with *lacunae* the Old and the New Testament, that is, they are Christian Bibles produced in Christian *Scriptoria*, probably in Cesarea, when the new religion has become licit under Constantine (313) and the Church received the support of the State. Moreover, in codex Vaticanus the Prophets are placed just before the New Testament as a kind of bridge between both Testaments as far as the Christian reading of the Old Testament presupposes that the Old Testament, and particularly the Prophets, are a promise and announcement of the coming of Christ and the events narrated in the New Testament.

First of all, I would like to emphasize the external factors that contributed to the production of the Christian Bible, particularly the transition from the scroll to the codex and the generalization of the use of the codex in the fourth century. Political, economic and technological factors have created the favorable conditions for the emergence of the Christian canon in such a way that some scholars have stated that "the canon in this sense is the product of fourth-century technological development" (Kraft 2002, 233). Indeed, in the previous centuries, in Jewish milieu as well as in the Christian tradition the scroll was the common practice in the copying of biblical books. A scroll could include a single book, at the utmost 2/3 small books, but not the whole Bible. All the Jewish biblical papyri, included the Greek fragments discovered in Qumran, and most of the Christian papyri before the 4th century are written in scrolls (Lust, 42; Ulrich, 165-183).

Second, in the fourth century for the first time do we find the name Septuagint ($\omicron\iota\upsilon\epsilon\beta\delta\omicron\mu\eta\nu\kappa\omicron\nu\tau\alpha$) applied to the Christian collection of Jewish Scriptures in Greek translation (Eusebius, *Eccl. History*, 6.16.1) in the context of describing Origen's Hexapla (Sundberg 2002, 71). The references to the seventy of Justin Martyr and other authors before Eusebius (263-339 CE) target apparently to the seventy elders as translators, not to the translation itself. In the West the latin name *Septuaginta* appears also in the fourth century in the writings of Augustin (354-430), concretely in *De civitate Dei* 18.42.

Third, only in the fourth century arises a movement from a loose collection towards a closed canon. As Hahneman concludes "It was not until the second half of the fourth century that the churches agreed in principle to the concept of canon, and

then began finalizing the details or contents of their catalogue of Scriptures" (Hahneman, 415). We should bear in mind that the Greek Church has never officially defined the exact contours of the Old Testament corpus. Christians considered themselves the heirs of the collection of Jewish Scriptures in Greek. But the history of the formation and composition of the Old Testament within the Greek Church remains in the shadow, the point of departure as well as the point of arrival (Junod, 106).

Therefore I will advance first some pages describing the evidence we have of the process of translation and then some remarks on the process of canonization taking into account the books that are quoted as Scripture along the first centuries CE and the fluctuation of this evidence according to the different geographical areas.

2. Back to the origins. The process of translation.

Consequently the Christian Bible was the final stage of the development of a process that paradoxically started in Alexandria as a Jewish translation of the Torah to the Greek under Ptolemy II Philadelphos (285-246 BCE). How do we represent or imagine the origins of the first translation of the Hebrew Bible into Greek conditions several aspects of the further development and transmission of the Greek Bible. Therefore, it seems adequate to advance first which is my position concerning the origins of the Greek Pentateuch in the frame of the various hypothesis adopted by different scholars until now.

I think that in spite of the several legendary elements of the Letter of Aristeas, this document reflects well, although idealised, the atmosphere of the Ptolemaic court, the cultural project of Ptolemy II, and the intellectual milieu around the Library of Alexandria. The translators, no doubt, were intellectual bilingual (or trilingual if we take into account the interference of the Aramaic as spoken language) Jews, with a notable knowledge of both languages and literary traditions. Their frequent actualization of the semi-nomadic world of the Patriarchs (for example, the translation of *'ohel* 'tent' by οἰκὸς "house" instead of the current equivalent *skhnhv* in several passages of Genesis) witness an urban setting. Modern scholarship accepts more and more that the initiative of the translation could come from the monarch with the purpose of including the translation in the *Museum* of Alexandria as a literary work and as a legal document (Harl, 53 ; Dogniez, 1488). But the main motiv for the Jews would be, with the royal support, to make known his brilliant legacy in a clima of

cultural competition with other 'barbarian' peoples struggling for conquest a cultural space in the pervasive spreading of the Greek culture. It would be primarily a question of prestige and only secondarily could the translation be used in the liturgy of the synagogue or as an education's instrument in the school (Honigman). It is true that the Greek Pentateuch is not quoted by the Greek authors until the 1st century CE by Pseudo-Longinus. But taking into account the amount of ancient writings that have been lost it would be hazardous to draw conclusions from an argument *ex silentio* (Kelly) . Moreover, the author of *De sublimitate* quotes the book of Genesis after a quotation of Homer struck by the stylistic force of the biblical language (Léonas, 138-140). It depends on the credit we concede to the ancient sources but several Christian writers confirm that they have seen a copy of the translation in the Alexandrian Library: Justin, *Apologia* I,31,2; Tertulian, *Apolog.* 18; Epiphanius, *De mensuris et pond.* & 3,6; John Chrysostom, *Against the Jews*, states that a copy was preserved in the *Serapaeum*. He pronounced this discourse in 386 and the *Serapaeum* was destroyed in 386 by an order of emperor Theodosius .

This is not the place of debating the different *Sitz im Leben* proposed by scholars for the first translation of the Pentateuch but I mean that the academic, scholarly milieu connected with the Library is the most adequate. The liturgical origin proposed and defended especially by Thackeray in the first part of the 20th century has been nowadays abandoned. Kahle's theory of the Targumic origin has no supporters either, since the Greek translation was conceived and carried out to supplant the Hebrew Bible in the Diaspora, not as an ancillary instrument to understand the Hebrew in the synagogue (Fernández Marcos 1998, 65-74). The same could be said of the dragoman's theory proposed by Rabin and Bickermann. I am not convinced by the modern theory of the paradigm of interlinearity defended mainly by A. Pietersma, which see the school as the most appropriated milieu for the origin of the translation. It could be valid for a translation as that of Aquila but not for the Pentateuch neither for the translation of most part of the Greek Bible. Recently Joosten has defended, based on the language of the Pentateuch, a middle class of a military milieu for the authors of the translation, not an intellectual élite close to the court or the Library. But I hope to be able of criticizing this new theory elsewhere.

The fact is that the internal evidence of the language of the Pentateuch fits well to the language of the papyri of the first part of the 3rd century BCE, that some Jewish-Hellenistic historians as Eupolemus (2nd century BCE) and Demetrius (end of

2nd century BCE) know the Greek Genesis, and the last one agrees with the Chronology of the Septuagint against the Hebrew text (Fernández Marcos 1998, 265-266). Moreover, the most ancient papyrus of the Septuagint with fragments of Deuteronomy, Pap. Rylands 458 = Rahlfs 957, belongs to the first part of the 2nd century BCE, that is, scarcely a century after the production of the Greek Pentateuch.

Beyond the Pentateuch, we have little information concerning the version of the other books, but the completion of the Greek Bible was a far more complicated and longer process in time than it had at first time seemed. It went on for four centuries, if we accept the fact that books such as Ecclesiastes and the Song of Songs were, in all probability, translated in the 1st/second centuries CE. Moreover, chronology, geographical origin and authorship of most of these versions is a question of disagreement among scholars (Fernández Marcos 2002).

The Letter of Aristeas devotes very few paragraphs to the event of the translation (& 301-316) but it insists, however, on the public reading before the Jewish community of Alexandria, the enthusiastic reception by the Jews as well as by the King, the general acclamation, and the pronouncement of a curse against everyone which would add, omit or change anything of the version (& 310-311).

The Letter of Aristeas has been written probably in the second part of the 2nd century BCE. It is an apology in defense of the Septuagint against new attempts to correct or improve the translation. Although the result of the translation, the miraculous agreement among the different translators, and between translation and original is highly idealised, it reflects the high esteem that the Jewish community of Alexandria had for the Greek version of the Pentateuch. Philo in the 1st century CE goes a step further and defends openly the inspiration of the Septuagint placing the translation at the same level as the original Hebrew like two sister Bibles. One may conclude that revelation occurred in two moments of history. In Mount Sinai when God self, through Philo, dictated the Torah to Moses and in Alexandria when the translators, also inspired by God, translated the Torah into Greek. Such are the formulas used by Philo in *Vita Mosis* II, 37 concerning the procedure of the translators enclosed in the Island of Pharos: "as if inspired by the deity, prophesied not some one and others another but all the same names and words, as if an invisible prompter were whispering them to each." Further on he insists that both the original and the translation are like two sisters, moreover, like a single text in the content and in the form, and that the translators are prophets and hierophants like Moses (*Vita Mosis* II,40) .

Christian authors until Jerome (Justin, Epiphanius, Augustine) continue embellishing the legend of Aristeas and accepting, at least tacitly, the inspiration of the Septuagint. The Greek translation of the Septuagint was considered also as providential in the history of humankind inasmuch as it represented a *praeparatio evangelica*, to use Eusebius' expression, that facilitated the expansion of Christianity, like the morning star that announces the sun of justice, like a door towards Jesus. This Christian tradition has been best summarised in Brian Walton's Preface to the London Polyglot (A2). Before the Greek translation, revelation was confined to the people of Israel "qui tanquam ortus conclusus a toto orbe divisus erat." "Appropinquante tamen temporum plenitudine... ante exortum Solis illius justitiae, Vetus Testamentum in Graecum sermonem, qui omnium latissime per orbem eo tempore propagatus erat, per LXXII Interpretes, jussu Ptolemaei Philadelphi Regis Aegypti admirando consilio transferri voluit; quae versio instar stellae matutinae gentes densissimis ignorantiae tenebris immersas ad Evangelium recipiendum paratiores reddidit, cum quae de Christo ab Apostolis promulgata erant a Prophetis in linguam sibi notam transfusis multo antea praedicta fuisse legerent, unde versionem hanc *ostium ad Christum*, non sine causa, appellavit S. Chrysostomus."

But this is not the whole story. In fact, it could be hyperbolically stated that since the day after the translation the Jews were aware of the differences between the Hebrew and the Greek Pentateuch. However, the reactions to this embarrassed situation were twofold: on one side those who opted for the theory of inspiration as we just have seen, a tendency that culminated in Philo of Alexandria, followed in Christian circles by Augustine. But there are traces also of a philological tendency, among the Jews, whose followers tried to correct the Septuagint towards the proto-Masoretic text on the way to standardization. These corrections were carried out in a double direction: towards the Hebrew in order to improve the first translation and make it identical to the Masoretic text; and, toward a better Greek style avoiding the frequent semitisms of the original. The pre-Christian papyri witness both tendencies, which would later lead to the *kaige* revision of the 1st century BCE – 1st century CE on one side and to the Proto-Lucianic revision of the 1st century CE on the other side.

In 130 BCE the author of Ben Sirach's Prologue is also aware of the differences between original and translation. The Prologue can be seen as a possible critic to the author of the Letter of Aristeas who states the exact correspondence between the Hebrew and the Greek Pentateuch: "For what was originally expressed in

Hebrew does not have the same force when translated into another language. Not only that, but even the Law itself, the Prophecies, and the rest of the books differ not a little when read in the original" (Prologue, 21).

In the early stage of the history of the Septuagint, the Qumran discoveries have enriched the evidence and contributed to change some traditional assumptions. First, the Greek Bible was known at Qumran, as witness the fragments of caves 2, 4, 7 and the remains of Nahal Hever and Masada (Ulrich, 165-183; Kraft 2003, and Tov). Not only the Pentateuch but cave 7, which contains only Greek fragments, witness besides a fragment of Exodus, another fragment of the Letter of Jeremiah, a Deuterocanonical/Apocryphal writing absent from the Hebrew Bible. The conclusion is that there was not such opposition between the Palestinian canon and a supposed different Alexandrian canon, an assumption that goes back to the eighteenth century. Second, in Qumran there is a wider corpus of texts than those later accepted by the pharisaic rabbis. Moreover, there was for some books a diversity of texts or the so-called textual pluralism, non a proto-Masoretic text type exclusively. And, what is more important, there have appeared Hebrew texts different from the proto-Masoretic one and which are very close to the Vorlage used by the Septuagint translators. This fact has increased the value of the LXX as witness of a most ancient Hebrew text that has been lost, a witness of the most ancient *hebraica veritas*. Third, the fragments of Dodekapropheton discovered in Nahal Hever, witness to a systematic correction of the Greek Bible towards a Hebrew text very close to the Masoretic, standardized at the end of the 1st century CE. As Sundberg (2002, 90) states: "The *kaige* recension is our best candidate for the Bible of Palestinian, Hellenized Jews." It lies very close in time (50 BCE – 50 CE) and place to the canonization of the Palestinian Jewish Bible. But, in my opinion, it would be to go too far the assertion of A. van der Kooij that "the (pre-*kaige*) LXX is not the first translation of the Hebrew Bible as a complete Bible. (Rather, the first Bible in Greek is the *kaige*-Theodotion version, followed by Aquila and Symmachus)"(van der Kooij 2004, 27). There was the Pentateuch held in great esteem by Jews and non Jews and the translation of the Prophets and most of the Writings which followed before the *kaige*- revision started (Dorival, 83-111).

In 128/129 CE Aquila produces a new version of the Hebrew Bible, that culminates the extreme literal tendency initiated with the *kaige* revision, with a view of superseding the Septuagint, the version used by Christians. Late in the second century Symmachus with the same aim but at the same time struggling to improve the

Greek style in a similar way as the proto-Lucianic revision did, will produce a new version considered in great esteem by the Christian Fathers, particularly Origen, Jerome and Theodoret. The third younger translator, Theodotion, in his version of the 2nd century, in continuity with the *kaige*-revision, removes the additions to Esther but retains the Septuaginta additions to Job and Daniel, absent from the Hebrew Bible (Field I, 791).

3. *The process of canonization.*

In the analysis of the process of canonization it should be taken into account that most of the ancient witnesses concerning the sections of the Bible that are accepted as Scripture, have been interpreted as referring to the Hebrew Bible. Certainly, Hebrew Bible and Greek Bible should not be confounded but, on the other side, they cannot be completely separated in the historical process of canonization. The ancient evidence concerning the authority of Scripture refer always to corpora of books or concrete books, never to the textual forms of those books or the language in which they are written, although tacitly people understand that they are referring to the Hebrew Bible. We shall see that this is not at all evident, for instance in the case of Philo, Josephus or the authors of the New Testament.

To begin with, we have seen that the Letter of Aristeas ca. 130 BCE states that the Greek translation of the Torah was received in the Jewish Community of Alexandria with general acclamation (& 311). At the same time, the translator of Ben Sirach mentions in the Prologue, 21 "the Law, the Prophecies and the rest of the Books." Had the translator in mind the Hebrew original or those same books already translated into Greek? From the context of the Prologue the last option cannot be excluded. Philo in *De Vita Contemplativa*, 25, speaks of the things which the Therapeutae take with him: "Laws, and Oracles given by inspiration through Prophets and Psalms, and the other books whereby knowledge and piety are increased and completed" (Beckwith, 117). The three groups of books correspond closely to those mentioned by Luke 24: 44: "that everything written about me in the law of Moses, the prophets, and the psalms must be fulfilled." And again there are speaking of books or corpora of books not of the language. But I am convinced that Philo as well as the authors of the New Testament are thinking of the Bible in Greek dress not in Hebrew.

What seems clear is that Philo, Luke and Josephus in the famous passage of *Contra Apionem* II, 37-44 with the mention of 22 books according to the letters of the Hebrew alphabet, are thinking of books included in the Hebrew canon, be it in Hebrew or in Greek dress, not of the Deuterocanonical or Apocryphal books. Philo in his works quotes only the Torah as Scripture and the authors of the New Testament and the early Fathers never actually quoted from or ascribe authority to the Deuterocanonical/Apocryphal. At the outmost there are some allusions or occasional correspondence of thought (Beckwith, 387). From the Biblical quotations of the New Testament compared with those of the Qumran documents it can be deduced that both communities had similar preferences for the Psalms, Isaiah and Deuteronomy followed by the other books of the Pentateuch (Barthélemy 1984, 16).

Between the 1st and the 4th century CE there is a gap of information concerning the books of the Greek Bible accepted as Scripture by diverse communities, but it is clear that the Greek Church has never officially defined the canon of books of the Old Testament (Junod, 105; Lust, 42). Traditionally the old theory of the Alexandrian canon wider than the Palestinian one, current since the eighteenth century, was exhibited as explanation of the wider canon of the Christian Bible. The early Church would have been the heir, also in this aspect, of Hellenistic Judaism.. It may be true that early Christianity marches in many ways (or have grown from the matrix of Hellenistic Judaism) on the steps of Hellenistic Judaism, but concerning the canon things have become more complex.

However, the hypothesis of an Hellenistic canon was based on two assumptions which nowadays have been discounted: a) a concept of Hellenistic Judaism as very different from the Palestinian one. New evidence has revealed the strong hellenization of Palestine (Hengel); moreover, the Greek fragments found in Qumran, Nahal Hever and Masada confirm this Hellenization even in Bar Kokbah's times; b) the idea that most of the Deuterocanonical/Apocryphal books had been composed in Greek and in Egyptian ground (sole). This assumption also has been refuted first by the Cairo Genizah findings (1896) of portions of Ecclesiasticus in Hebrew, and, recently by the findings in Masada of more fragments of Ecclesiasticus in Hebrew (Beentjes), and fragments in Hebrew or Aramaic of Tobit and Judith. It is worth emphasizing that when Jerome produced his Latin translation of the Hebrew Bible at the end of the 4th century CE, he mentions in his Prefaces the Hebrew originals of Ecclesiasticus and 1 Maccabees, and Aramaic texts of Tobit and Judith.

But the latter were probably not the originals, since the Aramaic original of Tobit from Qumran is much nearer to the Old Latin than to the Vulgate (Beckwith, 426; Toloni).

The question remains, if Egypt did not create any tradition on an Alexandrian canon, how is to explain the wider Old Testament canon of the Christian Church according to the wider corpora of books attested in the Greek Bible? The answer must come from the sociological and ecclesiastical context. When Christianity arises Judaism was not uniform but plural. Concerning our problem there were the group of the Samaritans that recognised the Pentateuch only, the group of the Pharisees that would recognise with the time the threefold corpus of the *Torah*, *Nebi'im*, *Ketubim*, the group of the Alexandrian Jews that included the Greek Apocrypha and the group of Qumran that may have included as authoritative some of the Pseudepigrapha as 1 Enoch and Jubilees, according to the number of fragments of these books attested in the Judean Desert. The uncertainties of the early Christians in the way of quoting the Deuterocanonical/Apocryphal are only the natural consequence on the uncertainties into which the Church was born. These are reflected in the different lists of books held as canonical or authoritative and especially in the Muratorian Fragment, produced around the middle of the fourth century in the eastern part of the Roman Empire (McDonald/Sanders, 595) which lists the Wisdom of Solomon among the New Testament Scriptures, between the Letters of John and Revelation, a sign that it was not included at that time in the canon of the Old Testament. But as, Beckwith states: "The great difference between the two communities [Jewish and Christian] was that, from the second century onwards, some *Christians* started to treat these books as *Scripture*, to call them Scripture and to quote them with the traditional formulas for quoting Scripture" (Beckwith, 392). This occurred gradually until that the uniform usage of the Church gave reasons for treating the whole LXX as authentic. But "the inclusion of various Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in the canon of the early Christians was not done in any agreed way or at the earliest period, but occurred in Gentile Christianity, after the Church's breach with the Synagogue, among those whose knowledge of the primitive Christian canon was becoming blurred" (Beckwith, 436).

This tradition was strongly supported by the statement of personalities as Origen and Augustin in favour of the Septuagint. Origen in his *Letter to Africanus* 2,5 highly values many of the books associated with the LXX. Concerning the text of Susanna, a supplement of the LXX absent of the Hebrew Bible, he states that in such

cases one should rely on providence and remember that 'Thou shalt not remove the ancient landmarks which thy fathers have set', quoting Proverbs 22:28. Likewise Augustine in *De civitate Dei* XV,42 defends the inspiration of the Septuagint with words very similar to those of Philo: "spiritus enim, qui in prophetis erat, quando illa dixerunt, idem ipse erat etiam in Septuaginta viris, quando illa interpretati sunt."

Paradoxically, Origen, the greatest Christian philolog of Antiquity and auhor of the Hexapla, very aware of the differences existing between the Hebrew and the Greek Bibles, following Justin and Tertullian (for a dossier of the main Greek sources for the canon see Kaestli/Vermelinger, 135-151), opts for a wider text or canon. Not recurring to the miraculous origin of the Septuagint as Philo did, but relying, like Augustin, on the practice and general use of the community of the Church. As Barthélemy comments: "Ce que l' Église dans son ensemble a reconnu comme Écriture Sainte ne peut être rejeté ensuite comme inauthentique par la critique biblique" (Barthélemy 1978a, 119). It would be Jerome the first among the Fathers who a century and half later would reply that the Hebrew text and canon was the norm. In 393 he uses for the first time the expression *hebraica veritas*. His latin version of the Hebrew Scriptures will spread out, not without struggle, in the West, but his strict position of a canon limited to the books found in the Hebrew Scriptures will not succeed.

It is true, we do not know exactly when the Septuagint has existed as a whole. Moreover, we know that from the very moment of its birth, it was submitted to constant revisions and later to the Christian recensions. But we know also that the LXX, in every of its textual forms, has been utilized primarily by the authors of the New Testament and exclusively by the early Christian writers, although they do not shame of recurring to Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion too in their commentaries in order to clarify the meaning of the biblical text. Therefore I would like to conclude with the following suggestion proposed by Barthélemy some years ago, and today more actual than ever, in view on the increasing awareness of the differences between the Hebrew and Greek Bible as two different stages of the Old Testament, not only at the textual but also at the literary level: "Pour clore cet exposé, qu'il me suffise de proposer avec saint Augustin comme forme originale de l'Ancien Testament chrétien une Bible en deux colonnes: l'une contiendrai la Septante des premiers siècles de notre ère, et l'autre le texte hébraïque tel que les scribes d'Israel l'ont canonisé" (Barthélemy 1978a, 126).

Bibliography

- Barthélemy, D. 1978a, "La place de la Septante dans l'Église", in D. Barthélemy, *Études d'histoire du texte de l'Ancien Testament*. OBO 21. Fribourg/Göttingen: Éditions Universitaires/ Vandenhoeck & Rupprecht, 111-126 (first published 1967).
- Barthélemy, D. 1978b, "L'Ancien Testament a mûri à Alexandrie", in *Études d'histoire du texte de l'Ancien Testament*, 127-139 (first published 1965).
- Barthélemy, D. 1984, "L'État de la Bible juive depuis le début de notre ère jusqu'à la deuxième révolte contre Rome (131-135)", in *Le canon de l'Ancien Testament*, 9-45.
- Beckwith, R. 1985, *The Old Testament Canon of the New Testament Church*, London: SPCK.
- Beentjes, P. C. 1997, *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew. A Text Edition of all Extant Hebrew Manuscripts & A Synopsis of all Parallel Hebrew Ben Sira Text*. VT.S 68. Leiden: Brill.
- Dogniez, C. 1998, "Bibelübersetzungen", in RGG⁴, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1487-1491.
- Dorival, G. 1988, "L'achèvement de la Septante dans le Judaïsme. De la faveur au rejet", in M. Harl, G. Dorival, O. Munnich, *La Bible grecque des Septante*, Paris: Cerf, 83-125.
- Fernández Marcos, N. 1998, *Introducción a las versiones griegas de la Biblia*. 2nd edition revised and augmented. TECC 75. Madrid: CSIC.
- Fernández Marcos, N. 2002, "The Other Septuagint: From the Letter of Aristeas to the Letter of Jeremiah", *JNSL* 28 , 27-41.
- Field, F. 1875, *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt I-II*, Oxford = Graz: Hildesheim 1964.
- Hahneman, G. M. 2002, "The Muratorian Fragment and the Origins of the New Testament Canon", in *The Canon Debate*, 405-415.
- Harl, M. 2006, "La Bible est un corpus de textes voyageurs", *Le Monde de la Bible. Naissance de la Bible*, 51-55.
- Hengel, M. 1973, *Judentum und Hellenismus*. 2nd edition. Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck.
- Honigman, S. 2003, *The Septuagint and Homeric Scholarship in Alexandria*, London/New York: Routledge.
- Joosten, J. 2006, "Le milieu producteur du Pentateuque grec", *REJ* 165, 349-361.
- Junod, E. 1984, "La formation et la composition de l'Ancien Testament dans l'Église grecque des quatre premiers siècles", in J.-D. Kaestli and O. Wermelinger (eds.), *Le canon de l'Ancien Testament*, Genève: Labor et Fides.
- Kelly, S. 2005, *The Book of the Lost Books*, London: Viking.
- Kraft, R. A. 2002, "The Codex and Canon Consciousness", in *The Canon Debate*, 229-233.

- Kraft, R. A. 2003, "The 'Textual Mechanics' of Early Jewish LXX/OG Papyri and Fragments", in S. McKendrick and O. O'Sullivan (eds.), *The Bible as Book. The Transmission of the Greek Text*, London: The British Library & Oak Knoll Press 2003, 51-72.
- Léonas, A. 2007, *L'aube des traducteurs. De l'hébreu au grec: traducteurs et lecteurs de la Bible des Septante (IIIe s. av. J.-C. – IVe s. apr. J.-C.)*, Paris: Cerf.
- Lust, J. 2003, "Septuagint and Canon", in J.-M. Auwers and H. J. de Jonge (eds.), *The Biblical Canons*. BETL 163. Leuven: Peeters, 40-55.
- Müller, M., "Graeca sive Hebraica Veritas? The Defence of the Septuagint in the Early Church", *SJOT* 1, 103-124.
- Müller M. 1996, *The First Bible of the Church. A Plea for the Septuagint*. JSOT.S 206. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Pietersma, A. 2002, "New Paradigm for Addressing Old Questions: The Relevance of the Interlinear Model for the Study of the Septuagint," in J. Cook (ed.), *Bible and Computer*, Leiden: Brill, 337-364.
- Sundberg Jr, A. C. 1964, *The Old Testament of the Early Church*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Sundberg Jr, A. C. 2002, "The Septuagint: The Bible of Hellenistic Judaism", in L. M. McDonald and J. A. Sanders (eds.), *The Canon Debate*, Peabody, MA: Hendrickson 2002, 68-90.
- Toloni, G. 2004, *L'originale del libro di Tobia. Studio filologico-linguistico*. TECC 71. Madrid: CSIC.
- Tov, E. 2003, "The Greek Biblical Texts from the Judean Desert", in *The Bible as Book*, 97-122.
- Ulrich, E. 1999, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origin of the Bible*, Leiden/Grand Rapids, MI: Brill/Eerdmans.
- Van der Kooij, A. 1998, *Canonization and Decanonization*, London/Boston/Köln: Brill.
- Van der Kooij, A. 2004, "The Septuagint – the first Translation of the Hebrew Bible?," *BJGS* 34, 27-28.
- Veltri, G. 2006, *Libraries, Translations, and "Canonic" Texts: The Septuagint, Aquila, and Ben Sira in the Jewish and Christian Traditions*. JSJS 109. Leiden: Brill.