Appendix B

Apparatus: Hexapla Is. 7:14

HT: הנה עלמה הרה וילדת בן וקראת שמו עמנו אל

LXX: ιδοὺ ἢ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ ἔξει καὶ τέξεται υἱόν καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἐμμανουηλ

α´ ιδοὺ ἢ νεᾶνις ἐν γαστρὶ συλλαμβάνει καὶ τίκτει υἱόν καὶ καλέσεις ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἐμμανουηλ

Wit]: lemma Eus Dem VII,1,32 | ιδοὺ — υἱόν | Ir. apud Eus Hist V,8,10 | Iust Dial 84,3 | ιδοὺ ἢ νεᾶνις Or Cels I,34,22 | ἡ νεᾶνις 710 Tht Isa | συλλαμβάνει 710

Attr. α´] > Or Iust | α´ θ´] Ir.

Var: συλλαμβάνει] ἔξει Iust (λήψεται in 43.8 et al.) Ir. | τίκτει] τέξεται Iust Ir.

NonGr: Filastrius: ecce iuvencula concipiet et pariet filium et nomen eius potens cum hominibus | Hi: π´ adolescetntula

Notes: According to Joseph Reider’s Index, Aquila uses συλλαμβάνω to render הָהָרָה in Job 15.35; Is 33.11, 59.13, and εν γαστρὶ συλλαμβάνω to render הָהָרָה in Is. 7.14. There is no evidence of Aquila using εχω or the simplex λαμβανω to render הָהָרָה. The present tense of Eusebius’ lemma and 710 is probably original to Aquila, since the future tense used in Iust and Ir. is probably borrowed from the LXX. Furthermore, the LXX has translated the Hebrew adjective הָהָרָה and the participle הָהָלָל with verbs in the future tense, while Aquila has probably attempted to translate them more formally with present tense verbs. Iust and Ir. are primarily concerned with the noun νεᾶνις and therefore have borrowed the verbs and their tenses from the LXX (see Th. comment below).

σ´ ιδοὺ ἢ νεᾶνις ἐν γαστρὶ συλλαμβάνει καὶ τίκτει υἱόν καὶ καλέσεις ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἐμμανουηλ

Wit]: lemma Eus Dem VII,1,33 | ιδοὺ ἢ νεᾶνις Or Cels I,34 | ἡ νεᾶνις 710 Tht Isa | συλλαμβάνει 710

1 The format is that of the Hexapla Institute, which uses the abbreviations of the Göttingen Septuaginta.
Attr. σ´] > Or

NonGr: Hi: π´ adolescentula

θ´ ἰδοὺ ἡ νεᾶνις ἐν γαστρὶ ἐξει καὶ τέξεται νίον

Wit] lemma Ir. apud Eus Hist V,8,10 Iust Dial 84,3 (ὕψεται in 43.8 et al.) | ἰδοὺ ἡ νεᾶνις Or Cels I,34,22 | ἡ νεᾶνις 710 Tht Isa

Attr. θ´] > Or Iust | α´ θ´] Ir.

NonGr: Hi: π´ adolescentula

Notes: If our analysis of the Aq. reading was correct, then Ir. is attributing only the noun ἡ νεᾶνις to Aq., since most probably Eus. has preserved the original Aq. reading. However, the question remains whether this reading should be attributed to Th. In Judges 13.3 Field has preserved a Th. reading which has ἔχω ἐν γαστρὶ for παρθένος. This evidence may indicate that Ir. has truly preserved the Th. reading. However, he also attributes it to Aq. because probably the noun ἡ νεᾶνις is common to both. Alternatively, it is possible that the full Th. reading has been lost and all that is represented of Th. in Ir. is ἡ νεᾶνις combined with the lemma of the LXX for the same verse. Because of the incorrect text form of Aq. in Ir., it is most probable that Ir. is not preserving the actual text form of Th., but he is only concerned to show that Th. had ἡ νεᾶνις not παρθένος.