Often enough the Septuagint version of the Twelve (or Minor) Prophets is difficult to understand, due to the translator’s problems in understanding the Hebrew text he used. As a result, patristic commentators sometimes complained about the difficulties of the Greek text. This paper deals with a few of the ancient commentators’ explicit observations or implicit decisions concerning the book of Micah.

Four running patristic commentaries on the Twelve Prophets are available to us, authored by Theodore of Mopsuestia (370–380), Jerome (393), Cyril of Alexandria (ca 420), and Theodoret of Cyrus (430–433). The first commentary on most of the Twelve Prophets was written by Origen of Alexandria (probably in 245–246), but except for a few fragments its Greek text is lost. However, Jerome drew heavily on Origen’s commentary so that we have a good impression of it. Furthermore, we have Hesychius of Jerusalem’s short notes on the Twelve Prophets (410–450), and a commentary on Hosea, Habakkuk, Jonah, Nahum, and Micah by Theophylact of Achrida (11th century).

Concerning the difficulties of the Septuagint text of Micah, among the ancient authors of the extant running commentaries Theodore is the exception insofar that he does not admit that the Greek text puzzles him.¹ The reason for his silence in this respect must be that he was convinced of the inerrancy of the Septuagint,² so that he was not inclined to acknowledge that the translators produced an imperfect version. Furthermore, when Theodore wrote his Commentary on the Twelve Prophets he was still in his twenties,³ and therefore not a mature exegete who could afford to admit his uncertainty about the meaning of a Biblical passage. His translator, Robert C. Hill, observes that in the case of the nonsense version of Mic 1:14 The-
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¹ In his comments In Amos 6, 9–10, however, Theodore does admit that the passage is very obscure (ἀσάφεια πολλή; ed. SPRENGER, 139, 25–140, 1).
² THEODORE, In Sophoniam 1,4–6; 3,2 (ed. SPRENGER, 283,32–284,11; 295,21–23).
³ HILL, Theodore of Mopsuestia, 2–4; 31.
odore “can only soldier on” and tacitly pretend that he understood the text. Jerome, Cyril, and Theodoret have no problems explicitly admitting the difficulties of the Septuagint version of Micah. In many cases these Fathers make observations about the meaning of a term or the ordering of a sentence that, in their view, was in need of clarification. It is to a few of such observations that I will pay attention, starting with two philological explanations, both of which pertain to rural life. Subsequently, I will deal with twelve of the Fathers’ observations or implicit decisions in matters of syntax and delimitation of the sentences or passages. I will compare the patristic interpretations with a few ancient manuscripts, modern editions, translations, and analyses of the Septuagint, and I will raise the question to which extent it is useful for present-day research of the Septuagint to consult the patristic commentaries.

1. Philological observations

1.1. ὀπωροφυλάκιον (Mic 1:6)

In Mic 1:6a the prophets says in the name of the Lord, “I will make Samaria an orchard-guard’s shed in the field” (NETS). “Orchard-guard’s shed” is the translation of ὀπωροφυλάκιον and corresponds with Muraoka’s dictionary. I will first present the interpretations in the patristic commentaries on Micah. Theodore briefly interprets it, in plural, as “sheds ... for the surveillance of the fruits” (σκηνὰς ... ἐπὶ φυλακῇ τῶν καρπῶν), which implies watchers responsible for the surveillance. Jerome gives the literal translation pomorum custodia, which can mean “protection” or “custody” or “guard-post of the fruits”. In passing he uses the term pomarium as its equivalent; this means orchard or fruit-shed, but in Jerome’s interpretation apparently the sense of orchard is meant. He does not give the impression that this term raises any questions. This is different with Cyril, who gives a more elaborate explanation. It reads, “For some people preserve what grows in the fields by weaving sheds (σκηνάς) and sitting in them, thus
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4 HILL, Theodore of Mopsuestia, 19.
5 THEODORET admits his perplexity concerning Micah only once, on Mic 1:12 (see below), but in the preface to his commentary In Psalmos (PG 80, 860B) he admits in general that the Twelve Prophets are “shrouded in obscurity” (ἀσάφεια); HILL, Theodore of Cyrus, 11.
6 MURAOKA, Greek-English Lexicon, s.v. CF. LUST/EYNIKEL/HAUSPIE, Greek-English Lexicon, s.v., “hut for one who guards a garden or orchard”; MONTANARI, Brill Dictionary, s.v., “orchard guardian’s hut”.
7 THEODORE, In Michaeam 1, 6 (ed. SPRENGER, 193, 27).
8 JEROME, In Michaeam 1, 1, 6–9, 160; 207–208; 211; 232–233 (CCSL 76); see GLARE, Oxford Latin Dictionary, s.v.
warding off all harm from it; but when the fruit is gathered, the guards cease their labor and go off home after upturning their sheds. 9 Theodoret takes ὀπωροφυλάκιον together with the following words “and a planting of a vineyard” and explains that Samaria will turn into a vineyard in which watchers of the vines will set up sheds. 10 I conclude that the explanations in the three Greek commentaries imply that the sheds were not destined for storing the crops but for the watchers who had to protect the crops that were still on the field.

Present-day scholars generally come to the same conclusion. For the Septuagint texts in which the term ὀπωροφυλάκιον is found (Ps 78:1 LXX; Isa 1:8; 24:20; Mic 3:12) the translations read, e.g., “garden-watcher’s hut”, 11 “Wachhütte”, 12 and “Wächterhütte”, 13 but sometimes other meanings of the term are considered as well. Andersen and Freedman translate “fruit shed”. 14 A note to Ps 78:1 in Septuaginta Deutsch says that in Orthodoxy this term is understood as “Gemüselager”. 15 In the comments on Ps 78:1 Eberhard Bons puts that ὀπωροφυλάκιον probably refers to a shed for watching over the crops and vegetables on the field, which leaves room for doubt. 16 Jennifer Dines discusses the possible meanings of ὀπωροφυλάκιον, viz. “fruit store” and “place for garden watchman”, and proposes that here it alludes to the statues of the fertility god Priapus who served as a sort of guardian and scarecrow, 17 an interpretation that Glenny declines. 18 Dines does quote Cyril’s explanation, but does not give him the last word. In spite of the gap of roughly six centuries between the Septuagint translators and Cyril, there may be sufficient cultural continuity between them to give credit to the bishop’s interpretation, given the fact that such sheds are attested even in the first half of the twentieth century, witness the picture of a grape vineyard made by the Old Testament scholar John C. Trevor. 19
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10 Theodoret, In Michaeam I, 6 (PG 81, 1745A).
11 Glenny, Micah, 19; NETS, 797 (Mic 3:12).
12 Septuaginta Deutsch, 833; 1186–1187 (Ps 78:1; Mic 1:6; 3:12).
13 Septuaginta Deutsch, 1231; 1250 (Isa 1:8; 24:20).
14 Andersen/Freedman, Micah, 133.
15 Glenny, Micah, 833.
16 Septuaginta Deutsch. Erläuterungen II, 1728.
17 Dines, “What was an ὈΠΩΡΟΦΥΛΑΚΙΟΝ?”
18 Glenny, Micah, 45–47.
19 In Moldenke, Plants of the Bible, figure 71. Unfortunately the picture is not located.
1.2. Dog’s tooth grass or weed? (Mic 5:7 [6])

The second term to be investigated is found in Mic 5:7 [6], which reads, “And the remnant of Iakob among the nations, in the midst of many peoples, shall be like dew falling from the Lord and like lambs in the grass (ἐπὶ ἄγρωστιν)” (NETS). Can anything be said about the kind of grass that may be meant here? Again, before turning to present-day views, I will present the patristic observations. Theodore and Theodoret only repeat the term ἄγρωστις without any explanation. 20 Jerome translates it by gramen, which means “grass” or “herb”. 21 In his comments on Hosea 10:4 (“judgment will spring up like grass upon a dry clot of a field”, NETS) he had already explained that ἄγρωστις is a herb that resembles reed. It has knots and shoots from which other plants sprout up (alterius herbae seminaria), and if it is not eradicated, it overgrows complete fields. 22 However, in his comments on Mic 5:7 [6] he has nothing particular to say about ἄγρωστις or gramen. 23 Cyril is more elaborate. In his interpretation of Mic 5:7 [6] he characterizes ἄγρωστις as “grass” (βοτάνη), “abundant and ample pasture (νομή)”, “a meadow (πόα) full of flowers”, and as “rich and abundant meadows”. 24 Cyril does not discuss the question whether a particular sort of grass is meant, and his characterizations suggest that he understood the term in a general sense, as a derivation from ἄγρος, ‘field’.

20 THEODORE, In Michaeam 5, 7 (ed. SPRENGER, 221, 11); THEODORET, In Michaeam 5, 7 (PG 81, 1772B).
22 JEROME, In Osee II, x, 3–4, 99–106 (CCSL 76).
23 Cf. JEROME, In Michaeam II, v, 7–14, 332–336 (CCSL 76). In this spiritual interpretation he parallels gramen and herba.
In present-day dictionaries, however, ἄγρωστις is identified as “dog’s tooth grass”, *Cynodon Dactylon*, a translation that found its way to Deut 32:2 in NETS (“let my words come down like dew, like a rainstorm on dog’s tooth grass”), although in Hos 10:4, Isa 9:18 [17], and 37:27 NETS translates “grass” or “wild grass”. In these texts *Septuaginta Deutsch* has “Gras”, “Unkraut”, and “Feldgras”. The identification as “dog’s tooth grass” is based on descriptions by ancient authors who declare that it served as fodder for cattle.

Glenny’s translation of Mic 5:7 [6] reads “grass”, but in his comments he identifies it as dog’s tooth grass.[29] We may note a tension between the precise identification of this kind of grass and Cyril’s broad interpretation in terms of a meadow full of flowers. Likewise, in his commentaries on Hosea 10:4–5 and on Luke 10:1 Cyril conceives ἄγρωστις as a general term for weed.[30] This confirms present-day translations of ἄγρωστις in the Sep-
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25 LIDDELL/SCOTT, Greek-English Lexicon; MONTANARI, Brill Dictionary, and MURAOKA, Greek-English Lexicon, s.v.

26 Cf. DOGNIEZ/HARL, Deutéronome, 322: “l’herbe sauvage”; BONS et al., Osée, 133: “l’herbe”.

27 THEOPHRASTUS (4th–3rd c. BCE), Historia plantarum I, vi, 7; I, vi, 10; IV, vi, 6 (LCL 70); STRABO, Geographia (1st c. BCE – 1st c. CE), IV, I, 7 (LCL 50); DISCORIDES PEDANIUS (1st c. CE), De Materia medica IV, 29 (ed. WEILMANN II, 192); DIODORUS SICULUS (1st c. CE), Bibliotheca historica I.43.1–2 (LCL 279). ARISTOPHANES OF BYZANTION (3rd–2nd BCE), Historiae animalium epitome II, 239 (ed. LAMPROS) and NEPUALIUS, Peri tów kata antipádeiav kai synpádeiav 1 (ed. GEMOLL) say that sick dogs eat ἄγρωστις.

28 AFONIN et al. (eds.). Interactive Agricultural Ecological Atlas (online; accessed 4th July, 2016).

29 GLENNY, Micah, 124.

30 In Osée I, 10, 4–5 (ed. PUSEY, 208,5–10); In Lucam 10, 1 (ed. SICKENBERGER, 99, 11–15).
Patristic Observations on Micah

It is unlikely indeed that the Septuagint translators intended to refer to a particular kind of grass. Therefore it may be doubted that Glenny’s interpretation of the term as “dog’s tooth grass” is to the point, and this also applies to NETS’ translation in Deut 32:2. Likewise, Muraoka’s translation as “dog’s tooth grass” should at least be supplemented with the more general meaning “grass”.

2. Syntactical observations

2.1. Metathesis (Mic 1:12a)

Translated literally, Mic 1:12a reads, “Who began to good things for her who inhabits pains?” (τίς ἤρξατο εἰς ἀγαθὰ κατοικοῦσῃ ὀδύνας;), or in Glenny’s translation, “Who began to act for good to her who dwells among pains?” Theodore only gives the following paraphrase of these words, “It is not possible for those living in pain to have an experience of any good on account of the magnitude of the troubles besetting them.” Jerome and Cyril have another reading that corresponds a little more with the Masoretic text: “Who that inhabits pains began to good things?” or, translated more freely, “Who that dwells in pain began a turn to the good?” Theodore had the same reading as Theodore and modern editions. He observes that these words are said to Jerusalem, but that their syntax is convoluted and very unclear. Therefore he proposes the following metathesis, “Who began a turn to pain for her who dwells in good things?” to which the answer should be, in his view, that it is God, and not a human being, who brings about calamities in order to punish those who live in peace and prosperity. This fits well in the context, for the following words read, “Because bad things have come down from the Lord to the gates of Jerusalem” (Mic 1:12b; NETS). Theodoret’s metathesis was not forgotten, for Theophylact of Achrida reproduced it, although he also presented another interpretation based on the uncorrected text. However, from Ziegler’s

31 Odyssee 6, 90.
32 Thus LUST/EYNikel/Hauspie, Greek-English Lexicon s.v.: “grass, weed”.
33 Theodore, In Michaeam 1, 12 (ed. Sprenger 195, 17–19); translation Hill.
34 Jerome, In Michaeam 1, 1, 10–15, 287 (quis cepit in bonum quae habitat in doloribus? CCSL 76); Cyril, In Michaeam 1, 1, 12–13 (Pusey 618, 13: τίς ἤρξατο εἰς ἀγαθὰ κατοικοῦσα δόνας;). In the Masoretic text (יבי את הקהל יшибת מידות) “she who inhabits” is the subject of the sentence, not an indirect object.
35 Theodoret, In Michaeam 1, 12 (PG 81, 1748BC). His metathesis reads, τίς ἤρξατο εἰς δόνας ἀγαθὰ κατοικοῦσῃ;
36 Theophylact, In Michaeam 1, 12 (PG 126, 1069BC).
critical apparatus we may conclude that Theodoret’s rearrangement did not leave any traces in the transmitted text, whereas the text preferred by Jerome and Cyril did.  

2.2. The glory of daughter Israel (Mic 1:15–16)

In translation, Ziegler’s text of Mic 1:15–16 reads, “Until I lead the heirs to you, inheritance inhabiting [Lachis], as far as Odollam will come the glory of daughter Israel. 16Shave, and cut your hair for your delicate children; broaden your widowhood like an eagle, because they were taken captive from you” (NETS, adapted). Jerome observes that in the Hebrew text the words “the glory of Israel” belong to the preceding passage, whereas in the Septuagint, which reads “the glory of daughter Israel”, they are taken with the following sentence. It appears that, unlike the modern editors, the patristic authors disagree about the position of these words. Brenton, Tischendorf, Swete, Rahlfs, Ziegler, and Glenny are unanimous in connecting “the glory of daughter Israel” with Mic 1:15, so it is not surprising that Giguet, Andersen/Freedman, NETS, and Septuaginta Deutsch follow this attribution. Yet among the ancient commentators they find only Theodoret as their ally. Not only Jerome, but also Cyril, Theodoret, and Theophylact connect these words, in the sense of a vocative, with the following sentence (Mic 1:16). One may wonder what is the relevance of this decision since the Greek text is almost incomprehensible anyway, due to the translator’s trouble with the Hebrew text. What does it mean that “the inheritance that inhabits Lachis will come as far as Odollam”? According to Cyril this refers to the Assyrians who were on the point of taking control of two cities lying at the extremities of the whole country of the Jews. He explains, “For she – apparently the Assyrian authority – will inherit Lachis even though it is highly fortified, and will extend as far as Odollam.” This interpretation betrays his lack of geographical

37 ZIEGLER, Duodecim prophetae, 208, lists Codex Venetus, the minuscule mss. 534, 86c, 91c, and the Coptic mss.

38 JEROME, In Michaem I, 1, 16, 511–517 (CCSL 76); cf. his translation of the Hebrew text in In Michaem I, 1, 15, 282–283, usque Odollam ueniet gloria Israel.

39 TISCHENDORF’s edition is mainly based on Codex Vaticanus, but this manuscript is ambiguous here, for it has a clear high dot before ἡ δόξα τῆς θυγατρὸς Ισραηλ, and a bleached high dot after these words. Apparently, a corrector wanted to relate the words with the following sentence. GLENNY, Micah, 60, neglects this detail of the manuscript.

40 THEODORE, In Michaem 1, 15 (ed. SPRNGER, 196, 14–19).

41 CYRIL, In Michaem I, 1, 16 (ed. PUSEY, 623, 10 – 624, 6).

42 THEODORE, In Michaem 1, 16 (PG 81, 1749C).

43 THEOPHYLACT, In Michaem 1, 16 (PG 126, 1073D).

44 See UTZSCHNEIDER, in Septuaginta Deutsch. Erläuterungen II, 2368.

45 CYRIL, In Michaem I, 1, 14–15 (ed. PUSEY, 622, 18–24); translation HILL.
knowledge, for there were only circa 20 km between Lachis and Odollam. Theodoret may have perceived this mistake, for he only mentions the devastation that will be extended as far as Odollam and Jerusalem, without specifying any distance.\footnote{Theodoret, In Michaeam 1, 14–15 (PG 81, 1749C).}

However this text may have been understood, our present editions and translations do not inform us about the ancient disagreement concerning the syntactical attribution of the words “the glory of daughter Israel”, which in my view deserves to be denoted.

2.3. The assembly of the Lord (Mic 2:5–6a)

A similar divergence can be observed in Mic 2:5–6a. In translation it reads, following Ziegler’s edition, “Therefore there shall not be for you one who casts a cord by lot in the assembly of the Lord. Do not weep with tears, nor let them shed tears over these things.” Again it is Jerome who observes that the words that conclude the passage in Hebrew are the beginning of the subsequent passage in the Septuagint. Here these words in between sentences are “in the assembly of the Lord” (ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ).\footnote{Jerome, In Michaeam I, 2, 1–8, 15; 27–30; 151–152 (CCSL 76).} Jerome admits that the Hebrew text is clearer to him and that the Septuagint is incoherent here, but in his interpretation he still tries to do justice to the Greek version as well.\footnote{Jerome, In Michaeam I, 2, 6–8, 184–196 (CCSL 76).} Jerome’s observation that in the Septuagint the words “in the assembly of the Lord” belong to the following sentence is confirmed by Theodore,\footnote{Theodore, In Michaeam 2, 5–7 (ed. Sprenger, 199, 14).} Cyril,\footnote{Cyril, In Michaeam I, 2, 6–7 (ed. Pusey, 630, 14; 631, 11–12).} Theodoret,\footnote{Theodoret, In Michaeam 2, 6–7 (PG 81, 1752C).} Theophylact,\footnote{Theophylact, In Michaeam 2, 6 (PG 126, 1081C).} and Brenton’s edition. However, the editions by Tischendorf, Swete, Rahlfs, Ziegler, and Glenny, and the translations by Andersen/Freedman, NETS, and Septuaginta Deutsch connect “in the assembly of the Lord” with the preceding words. As for Tischendorf and Glenny this is strange, because Codex Vaticanus clearly has a high dot between ἐν κλήρῳ and ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ, and not between ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ and the subsequent words, which confirms the patristic partition. Among the translators that I consulted, only Brenton and Giguet align with the patristic tradition.\footnote{Brenton: “Weep not with tears in the assembly of the Lord”; Giguet: “Dans l’Église du Seigneur, 6. Ne versez point de larmes.”} Unlike our preceding section, it is not too problematic to give a meaning to the assertion, “Therefore there shall not be for you one who casts a cord by lot in the assembly of the Lord”, which understandably continues the preceding
words, “our fields were divided up”, i.e., by Israel’s enemies (Mic 2:4). Yet I conclude that the attribution of the words ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ κυρίου to the subsequent admonition “Do not weep with tears” should be noted both in editions and in comments on the Septuagint.

2.4. Due to uncleanness (Mic 2:10)

According to Ziegler’s edition, Mic 2:10–11a reads, “Arise, and go, because this rest (ἀνάπαυσις) is not for you, due to uncleanness. You were corrupted with corruption; you were pursued without anyone pursuing” (NETS). It is questionable whether the words “due to uncleanness” (ἕνεκεν ἀκαθαρσίας) should be attributed to the preceding or the following words. Theodore, Jerome, Cyril, Theodoret, and Theophylact connect them with the following words: “Due to uncleanness you were corrupted with corruption.” The editors Brenton, Tischendorf, Swete, Rahlfs, Ziegler, and Glenny, however, attribute them to the preceding words. The Codices Vaticanus and Alexandrinus do not have any punctuation here. The choice of the modern editors is followed by Giguet, Andersen/Freedman, and NETS, but not by Septuaginta Deutsch which relates “Wegen der Unreinheit” with the following words, yet without referring to the patristic tradition. In my view such a reference would have been appropriate.

2.5. A lying spirit (Mic 2:11)

In all editions of the Septuagint Mic 2:11b reads, πνεῦµα ἔστησε (or ἔστησεν) ψεῦδος, which NETS translates as, “A spirit established a lie.” This reading follows the Codices Vaticanus and Alexandrinus and is confirmed by Cyril’s and Theophylact’s Commentaries, but Theodore, Jerome, and Theodoret read πνεῦµα ἔστησε ψευδές, in agreement with Co-
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57 Theodoret, In Michaem 2, 10 (PG 81, 1753B).
58 Theophylact, In Michaem 2, 10 (PG 126, 1088C–1089A).
59 Also Didymus the Blind, In Psalmos 34, 7, 209, 8; 13; 18 (ed. Gronewald, 322–324).
60 In Septuaginta Deutsch. Erläuterungen, II, 2370, Utzschneider only notes that Ziegler’s and Rahlfs’ syntactical attribution of the first three words of Mic 2:11 to v. 10 differs from Codex Vaticanus, but according to my consultation of the manuscript (online) Vaticanus reads a high dot after φθορᾶ.
61 Cyril, In Michaem I, 2, 11; II, 3, 5 (ed. Pusey 639, 12; 647, 15); Theophylact, In Michaem 2, 11 (PG 126, 1092A).
63 Theodoret, In Michaem 2, 11 (PG 81, 1753B; in fact, he reads πνεῦµα γάρ ἔστησε ψευδές).
dex Washington (3rd c.) and many later manuscripts. Jerome observes that according to most expositors πνεῦµα ἔστησε ψευδές means “a lying spirit stood up” (spiritus stetit mendax), but he states that one should conceive these words as “the Spirit made stand the lie” (spiritus statuit mendacium), because the term ψευδές is to be understood as τὸ ψεῦδος, “the lie”. That in Jerome’s understanding the text refers to God’s Spirit who made stand or stopped the lie, appears from his following exposition. Just as doctors set (statuant) a putrid wound and burn it by cauterizing powder, “thus by God’s Spirit he – apparently: God – put an end to falsehood (ita spiritu Dei finem posuit mendacio), so that God’s people should not be overthrown by the words of the false prophets any longer”. Since for “cauterizing” Jerome uses not only a Latin but also a Greek term (cauterio vel puluere καυστικῷ), it is most likely that he borrowed this interpretation from Origen. The expositors to whom Jerome refers may have interpreted these words by aligning them with the πνεῦµα ψευδές that stood up (ἔστη) mentioned in 3 Kgds 22:21–23 and 2 Chr 18:20–22, texts to which Jerome does not refer here. The interpretation of πνεῦµα as the spirit of false prophets comes to light in Theodore’s succinct explanation which reads, “trusting in the deception of the false prophets became the cause of all [this] for you”. This may be the interpretation that Jerome ascribed to “most expositors”. Likewise, Theodoret comments, “the spirit of deceit that speaks in the false prophets imparted to you false (ψευδέξι) prophecies”. We may conclude that they considered ψευδές the direct object, not the adjective to πνεῦµα. Cyril, who reads ψεῦδος, comments that “an evil spirit established falsehood as a snare for Ephraim”. My search in the Thesaurus Linguae Graecae demonstrated that Jerome’s observation on the expositors reading “a lying spirit stood up”, which is syntactically possible, has not been preserved explicitly in other extant Greek works.
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64 See ZIEGLER’s critical apparatus.
68 In his translation of these books Jerome read stetit and spiritus mendax (Vulgata, ed. WEBER).
69 THEODORE, In Michaeam 2, 11 (ed. SPRENGER 201, 8–9); translation HILL, adapted.
70 THEODORET, In Michaeam 2, 11 (PG 81, 1753B); translation HILL.
2.6. Together with all (Mic 2:12)

The common partition of Mic 2:12ab reads, “when Jacob is being gathered, he will be gathered together with all. Receiving I will receive those remaining of Israel” (NETS). Brenton, Tischendorf, Swete, Rahlfs, Ziegler, and Glenny connect “together with all” (σὺν πᾶσιν) with the foregoing words, and they are followed by the translators that I consulted. Theodore, Cyril, Hesychius, and Theophylact share this partition. This ordering seems obvious and correct indeed, but it is not shared unanimously. Jerome first quotes Mic 2:11b–12a, which ends with congregandus congregabitur Iacob. His next lemma reads Cum omnibus suscipiens suscipiam reliquias de Israel (Mic 2:12ab). In his comments he interprets the words cum omnibus as a reference to “the fullness of the gentiles” (Rom 11:25). Only after all gentiles will have believed in Christ, will also the remnant of Israel, mentioned in Mic 2:12, be saved. This exposition has clearly been inspired by Origen, who is, therefore, the first exegete to connect σὺν πᾶσιν with the next words. Most likely, this partition is also followed by Theodoret.

2.7. To know judgment (Mic 3:1)

Generally the words addressed to “the rulers of the house of Jacob and those who are left of the house of Israel”, οὐχ ὑµῖν ἐστὶ τοῦ γνῶναι τὸ κρίµα (Mic 3:1), are understood as a rhetorical question, “is it not for you to know judgment?” (Glenny), or: “Should you not know judgment?” (NETS). Brenton, Tischendorf, Swete, Rahlfs, Ziegler, and Glenny add a question mark to this clause. All translators that I consulted follow these editions in reading a rhetorical question here. This corresponds with the Hebrew text which reads, in the Masoretic version, נָרְחַ, which clearly introduces a question. Among the early Greek commentators Theodoret is the only patristic author who notes explicitly that this clause to is be read...
as a question, κατ’ ἐρώτησιν. In the editions and translations of Theodore’s and Cyril’s Commentaries these words are also printed with a question mark, and their following explanations demonstrate that this choice was most probably correct. The exception in the understanding of this clause is found with Jerome. In his translation of the Hebrew text he is aware that a question is meant, since he translates ἀνέβησιν as numquid: Numquid non uestrum est scire iudicium, “is not it yours to know judgment?” But his translation of the Septuagint version reads, Non uestrum est scire iudicium, and his comments demonstrate that he did not read these words as a rhetorical question. He explains, “you do not deserve to know God’s judgment which is a great abyss, and a crooked mind does not discover the depth of his righteousness. Or how can you know God’s judgment, you who hate the good and seek the evil?” Jerome does not justify his translation and interpretation of this clause as an affirmation and does not explain the difference from the Hebrew text. He may simply have borrowed his interpretation from Origen’s Commentary. In that case it is remarkable that the two expositors who had access to the Hebrew text did not interpret the Septuagint version of Mic 3:1 accordingly, as a rhetorical question. A search in the Thesaurus Linguae Graecae demonstrated that their interpretation in an affirmative sense was not followed by other Greek interpreters.

2.8. The false prophets (Mic 3:7)

In Mic 3:5–6 Micah criticizes the false prophets, and in Mic 3:7ab he announces that they will be put to shame and be scorned. In the following words in Mic 3:7c, however, it is not clear who is the subject. The clause reads, καὶ καταλαλήσουσιν κατ’ αὐτῶν πάντες αὐτοί. NETS translates correctly, “they shall all speak against them”, but who are “they”? Should we assume that the same subject is meant as in the preceding clauses, viz. the ones who see dreams and will be put to shame and the false “diviners”

---

80 Theodore, In Michaeam 3, 1–4 (PG 81, 1756B). Theophylact, In Michaeam 3,1–4 (PG 126, 1097B) also interprets this clause as a question (ἐρωτήσει οὖν, φησί, τοὺς ἄρχοντας).

81 Theodore, In Michaeam 3, 1 (ed. Sprenger 202, 17–22: “You most of all should have discerned what was to be done”; translation Hill); Cyril, In Michaeam I, 3, 1–4 (ed. Pusey 644, 2; 645, 2–20; 11–13: “It is therefore necessary … for you to learn judgment through what will befall you”; translation Hill). John Chrysostom, Hom. in Ioannem 52, 1 (PG 59, 288), quotes ὑμῶν ὑµῶν ἐστὶ τοῦ γνῶναι τὸ κρίμα, apparently as a reproachful question to the Jewish rulers (the variant reading ὑμῶν is confirmed by Savile’s edition, II, 769).

82 Jerome, In Michaeam I, iii, 1–4, 2–3 (CCSL 76).

83 Jerome, In Michaeam I, iii, 1–4, 32–37 (CCSL 76); cf. Mic 3:2. I do not follow (and do not agree with) Cazares’ and Schek’s translation (Commentary, 64).

84 Likewise, Andersen/Freedman, Micah, 358, and Glenny, Micah, 25.
who will be scorned (Mic 3:7ab)? But who, then, is meant by “them”? Is not it more likely that “them” refers to the false prophets that are refuted by other people, even though in this interpretation the subject suddenly diverges from the preceding clauses? In this sense Brenton translates πάντες αὐτοί as “all the people”, Giguet as “tout le monde”, and thus Glenny comments on the text. Only according to Septuaginta Deutsch does πάντες αὐτοί refer to the false prophets: “und sie alle werden sich gegenseitig widersprechen”. This implies that κατ’ αὐτῶν is conceived as κατ’ αὑτῶν, although the breathing in Codex Vaticanus, added later on, reads αὐτῶν (sic). The interpretation that “all people” are meant to be the subject, so that it is they who will speak against the false prophets, is found in Theodore, Jerome, Cyril, Theodoret, and Theophylact. This proves that the interpretation proposed in Septuaginta Deutsch is fully isolated and should be doubted.

2.9. Who is ἐγώ? (Mic 3:8)

The vehement reproach of the false prophets in Mic 3:5–7 is concluded by the observation that “there will be no one listening to them” (Mic 3:7d). In the editions by Brenton, Tischendorf, Swete, Rahlfs, Ziegler, and Glenny, the first words of Mic 3:8 read, ἐὰν μὴ ἐγὼ ἐµπλήσω ἰσχύν ἐν πνεύµατι κυρίου. The translations, however, vary, as the following survey demonstrates:

Brenton: Surely I will strengthen myself with the Spirit of the Lord
Giguet: Pour moi, je me remplirai de force, inspiré par le Seigneur
Andersen/Freedman: However, I shall be filled with strength with the spirit of Kyrios
NETS: Otherwise I will replenish strength in the spirit of the Lord
Glenny: However, I will be full of strength by the spirit of the Lord
LXX.D: es sei denn, ich erfülle (sie [i.e. the false prophets]) mit Stärke im Geiste des Herrn

Only in Septuaginta Deutsch it is clear that the Lord is meant to be the subject of this clause, and in NETS this is possible but not explicated. According to all other translations it is the prophet who speaks about him-

---

85 Glenny, Micah, 82.
86 THEODORE, In Michaeeam 3, 6–7 (Sprenger, 204, 16–17).
87 JEROME, In Michaeeam I, 3, 5–8, 86; 124–125 (CCSL 76).
88 CYRIL, In Michaeeam II, 3, 7 (Pusey, 650, 15–22).
89 THEODORET, In Michaeeam 3, 6–7 (PG 81, 1757A).
90 THEOPHYLACT, In Michaeeam II, 3, 7 (PG 126, 1101AB).
91 In Septuaginta Deutsch. Erläuterungen II, 2371–2372 the translation is justified by a reference to Miriam and Aaron speaking against Moses in Num 12:1–8, but the formulation (‘Es scheint’) betrays the translator’s uncertainty.
92 Translation GLENNY and ANDERSEN/FREEDMAN.
93 See also Septuaginta Deutsch. Erläuterungen II, 2372.
self, which agrees with the Hebrew text. It is remarkable that most translators render the active form ἐµπλήσω, understood as future indicative, in the sense of the middle voice; only NETS and Septuaginta Deutsch respect its active meaning. Septuaginta Deutsch does not translate a future, but apparently parses ἐµπλήσω as an aorist subjunctive because of ἕαν.

Codex Vaticanus has a high dot before ἕαν, and Codex Alexandrinus (which reads ἕαν μὴ ἐµπλήσω ἕγω..., with a large capital E marking a new section) has a considerable space before ἕαν, which demonstrates that according to the copyists a new sentence begins here. The Greek commentators have different variant readings, which confirms that this text was considered difficult. Theodore has the Lucianic reading ἀλλὰ μὴν ἐγὼ ἐνεπλήσθην ἰσχύς ἐν πνεύµατι κυρίου, “but as for me, I was filled with strength in the spirit of the Lord” and conceives Micah as the subject, in contradistinction to the false prophets of the preceding passage.94 Cyril reads, with Codex Alexandrinus, ἕαν μὴ ἐµπλήσω ἐγὼ ἰσχύν ἐν πνεύµατι κυρίου, “unless I, I fill [with] strength by the spirit of the Lord”.95 Cyril’s comments clarify that he conceives the Lord as the subject of this clause. First he distinguishes between the false prophets and those who, inspired by God, tell the truth. Concerning the latter category he observes, “So how, he [i.e. God] asks, could the word of prophecy in some people fail to be false unless I fill them through my spirit (εἰ µὴ ἐµπλήσαιµι διὰ τοῦ ἐµοῦ πνεύµατος) with power and righteousness?”96 Cyril’s aorist optative ἐµπλήσαιµι replaces the aorist subjunctive ἐµπλήσω with ἕαν of the Septuagint text. Hesychius, whose reading of Mic 3:8 has not been transmitted, also interprets ἕγω as God. His scholion reads, “Prophecy is not acceptable unless I fill the speaker with the spirit of the Lord, the Son, [the spirit] of power and justice, that is, righteousness.”97 Theodoret reads ἕγω δὲ ἐνεπλήσθην ἰσχύς ἐν πνεύµατι κυρίου, “but I, I was filled with strength in the spirit of the Lord.” In line with Theodore and contrary to Cyril he interprets these words as a statement of the prophet about himself. He explains that the prophet means, “For I will not dare to perform things similar to those transgressions; but inspired by the grace of the Holy Spirit, and filled with such power, I shall frankly reprimand the people’s impiety.”98 Theophylact reads ἕαν μὴ ἐγὼ ἐµπλήσω ἰσχύν ἐν πνεύµατι κυρίου and con-

---

94 Theodore, In Michaeam 3, 8 (ed. Sprenger, 204, 20–29); translation Hill, adapted.
96 Cyril, In Michaeam II, 3, 8 (ed. Pusey, 651, 1–14); translation Hill, with a minor modification.
97 Hesychius, Scholia in Michaeam 77 (ed. Eriksson, 157).
98 Theodore, In Michaeam 3, 8 (PG 81, 1757AB); my translation.
siders Micah the subject of the clause. In his comments on the Hebrew text Jerome observes that after the passage on the false prophets the prophet speaks about himself, emphasizing that he is inspired by the Holy Spirit. His explanation of the Septuagint text is different. His translation of Mic 3:7d–8a reads, without punctuation, quia non est qui exaudiat eos nisi ego impleuero fortitudinem in spiritum Domini. His comments demonstrate that this means, in Jerome’s own understanding, “for there is no one who listens to them except I [the Lord]. I shall fill [them] with strength through the spirit of the Lord.” This implies that the edition of Jerome’s Commentary should have a full stop after ego, instead of putting a comma after eos and relating nisi me with the following verb impleuero, as the editor Adriaen decided. Another observation is that Cyril may have been inspired by Jerome – or directly by Origen – in conceiving the Lord as the subject of ἐὰν μὴ ἐµπλήσω ἰσχύν.

To conclude, we see that the translation of Septuaginta Deutsch, in which ἐγώ refers to the Lord, has at least three patristic predecessors – Jerome, Cyril, Hesychius, and perhaps Origen –, which deserves to be accounted for.

2.10. And this shall be peace (Mic 5:5 [4])

The promise to Bethlehem that it shall bring forth a ruler who shall restore Israel (Mic 5:2–4 [1–3] is, in most editions, followed by the words, καὶ ἔσται αὕτη εἰρήνη, “and this shall be peace”. This reading is found in Swete, Rahlfis, Ziegler, and Glenny, but since the secondarily supplied breathing and accent of Codex Vaticanus reads ἀυτῇ (sic), Brenton and Tischendorf interpreted this form as αὐτῇ, “for her”: “and she shall have peace”. In that case the feminine αὐτῇ refers to the woman “who is in labour” and “shall bring forth” (Mic 5:3 [2]), and not to Israel (Mic 5:2–3 [1–2]) which is a masculine name. In all editions the reading καὶ ἔσται αὕτη εἰρήνη or καὶ ἔσται αὐτῇ εἰρήνη is printed as the beginning of a new sentence or section which deals with the Assyrians who will invade the country but will be defeated (Mic 5:5–6 [4–5]). In translations this relationship between Mic 5:5a [4a] and the following sentence is confirmed by

---

99 THEOPHYLACT, In Michaem 3, 8 (PG 126, 1101C).
100 JEROME, In Michaem 1, 3, 5–8, 77–79; 100–104 (CCSL 76).
103 GLENNY, Micah, 28, who basically follows Codex Vaticanus, reads ἀυτῇ, and thus does not accept the breathing and accent of the manuscript. On p. 117 he appears not to understand how BRENTON (to whom he erroneously ascribes the reading αὐτῇ) analysed the clause.
104 Cf. e.g. Mic 1:13; 2:12; 3:8; 5:2 [1]; 6:2.
Brenton, Giguet, and Septuaginta Deutsch, but not by NETS and Glen-ny, 105 who consider it the conclusion of the preceding passage on Israel’s new ruler. 106 Theodore, Jerome, and Theodoret read καὶ ἔσται αὐτῇ εἰρήνη and agree that it should be connected with the following announcements about the Assyrians after whose invasion peace will be restored, which Jerome applies to the devil and the peace of Christ. 107 Cyril reads καὶ ἔσται αὐτῇ ἡ εἰρήνη (as in Codex Alexandrinus). Unlike the other three Fathers, he connects these words with the preceding passage, applying them to Christ who brought peace. 108 However, in his following comments on Mic 5:5b–6 [4b–5] he observes that in the Hebrew text the clause “and this shall be peace” is connected with the subsequent words on the Assyrians, which he interprets as Satan and his demons who oppose the Church. He comments that in the end the saints will lead a peaceful (ἡρεμαῖον) life without war thanks to Christ. 109 Cyril may have derived his information about the ordering of the Hebrew text from Jerome’s Commentary, 110 but it is remarkable that in the attribution of the Septuagint version he deviated from the other ancient commentators. Among the modern translators only NETS and Glenny agree with Cyril, apparently unconsciously.

2.11. From the reeds (Mic 6:5)

My investigation of Mic 6:5 will lead us to philology, a textual conjecture, and a syntactical question. First I need to consider its Hebrew text. The NRSV reads, “O my people, remember now what King Balak of Moab devised, what Balaam son of Beor answered him [and what happened] 111 from Shittim to Gilgal, that you may know the saving acts of the Lord.” Shittim was Israel’s last camp before crossing the Jordan, and Gilgal its first camp in Canaan (Josh 2:1; 3:1; 4:19). For “from Shittim” the Septuagint reads ἀπὸ τῶν σχοίνων, which means “from the reeds”. Jerome notes this divergence between the Hebrew text and the Septuagint and observes that the other Greek translators read the Hebrew name Settim. He correctly

---

105 Glenny, Micah, 117.
106 Andersen/Freedman, Micah, 472, print Mic 5:4a [5a] with the subsequent lines, in keeping with their translation of the Hebrew text, but they admit that the words can also be connected with the preceding passage.
110 Thus Jerome, In Michaem II, 5, 5, 192–194 (CCSL 76).
111 The NRSV does not have these brackets; the bracketed words do not have an equivalent in the Masoretic text.
writes that this toponym is homonymic with the trees that grow in the desert of Mount Sinai and that he identifies as *spina alba*, “white thorn-bush”, which is a kind of acacia. Indeed, ἱερὰ ἃσπιόνεια might be interpreted as “the acacias”. However, ἵερονι, reeds, are not acacias. Therefore Jerome thinks that the Septuagint translator originally put ἵερονι, the lentisk or mastic tree, and that later on copyists read ἵερονι instead of ἵερονι, “reeds” instead of “mastic trees”. We may add – what Jerome does not note – that in his time through iotacism the pronunciation of the two terms had become virtually identical. Utzschneider proposes the same conjecture in his comments on *Septuaginta Deutsch*.

Whether one accepts this conjecture or not, for establishing the meaning of ἀπὸ τῶν ἵερονι it is hardly necessary to refer to modern dictionaries and translations of the Septuagint, because in Mic 6:5 this is clear semantically. However, a few questions remain. Is it clear in its context? To which reeds does it refer? How did the ancient commentators understand it? Theodore and Theodoret neglect these questions. Theodoret does not even quote but only paraphrases Mic 6:5, passing over the words “from the reeds to Gilgal”. Commenting on the Hebrew version, Jerome connects these words syntactically with the foregoing clause about Balaam’s answer: “remember ... what Balaam son of Beor answered him [king Balak] from Shittim to Gilgal”. His paraphrase reads that the soothsayer Balaam, who against his will blessed Israel, was “from Shittim to Gilgal looking (*lustrans*) with his eyes over the whole host of Israel, and was moving on (*mutans loca*)”. However, he adds a Jewish interpretation in which the words “from Shittim to Gilgal” are connected with the following clause, “that you might know the righteous acts of the Lord”, from Shittim where the Israelites committed fornication with Moabite women (Num 25:1) to Saul who was anointed in Gilgal (1 Kgdms 10:1, 112

---

114 *Septuaginta Deutsch. Erläuterungen* II, 2376.
115 See Aitken, “ΣΧΟΙΝΟΣ in the Septuagint”, 434, where he discusses Mic 6:5, yet without reference to Jerome’s comments.
Patristic Observations on Micah

8).\(^{120}\) To this historical interpretation Jerome clearly prefers the spiritual exposition based on the Septuagint, which most likely goes back to Origen and is too fanciful to be discussed in this context. In any case, it appears that here Jerome reads the same syntactical connection as in his own understanding of the Hebrew text, so that “from the reeds to Gilgal” is connected with Balaam answering Balak by blessing the Israelites.\(^{121}\)

Apparently Cyril was inspired by Jerome’s (or rather Origen’s) initial interpretation, for he wrote that Balaam “continued blessing everywhere, though moving about (περιθέων) from what was called Reeds, a place in Moab, to the mountains of Gilgal”.\(^{122}\) This implies that he interpreted \(σχοῖνοι\) as Shittim, which may indeed be situated in Moab’s territory. In Hesychius’ interpretation the lemma \(ἀπὸ … Γαλγαλ\) refers to “the places where Balaam, being called to curse, unintentionally pronounced the blessings of Israel”.\(^{123}\) Theophylact also relates the toponyms with Balaam moving from one place to another.\(^{124}\)

In order to make sense of this difficult sentence a few modern translators of the Septuagint added some words, as in the NRSV; Septuaginta Deutsch has, “(Gedenke des Weges) vom Binsenort bis Gilgal”. Glenny reads, “the things that happened from the reeds as far as Galgal”, and clarifies that the words \(ἀπὸ τῶν σχοίνων\) refer to the reeds in the Jordan, and not to the Sea of Reeds that the Israelites passed through at the Exodus (Ex 15:22).\(^{125}\) In conclusion, it is noteworthy that Jerome and Cyril did not feel any need of such an addition. Their interpretation of “from the reeds to Gilgal” as a reference to Balaam moving about, which is shared by Hesychius and Theophylact, seems possible at least. In any case, in line with these ancient authors, but probably without knowing their paraphrases, even some modern translators give a translation without any interpretative clarification.\(^{126}\)

2.12. The voice of the Lord (Mic 6:9ab)

In translation Mic 6:9ab reads, “The voice of the Lord will be invoked for the city, and he shall save those who fear his name” (NETS). Brenton, Swete, Rahlfs, and Ziegler print these words as the beginning of a new

---


\(^{121}\) Jerome, \textit{In Michaem II}, 6, 3–5, 131–173 (CCSL 76).

\(^{122}\) Cyril, \textit{In Michaem 6}, 5 (ed. Pusey, 697, 11–13); translation Hill.


\(^{124}\) Theophylact, \textit{In Michaem 6}, 5 (PG 126, 1149D–1152A).

\(^{125}\) Cf. Glenny, \textit{Micah}, 30; 156. Indeed, in the Septuagint the Sea of Reeds is called the Red Sea (ἔρυθρὰ ἡλασσα, e.g. Ex 10:19); nowhere is the term \(σχοῖνοι\) used for it.

\(^{126}\) Brenton, Giguët, NETS, and Andersen/Freedman, \textit{Micah}, 503.
section, followed by, “Hear, O tribe, and who shall bring order to a city?” (Mic 6:9c; Glenny). This division is also found in Brenton’s translation, Andersen/Freedman,¹²⁷ NETS, and Septuaginta Deutsch,¹²⁸ and agrees with Codex Alexandrinus. In Codex Vaticanus, however, Mic 6:9ab is the conclusion of the preceding words in Mic 6:8 about what the Lord essentially requires from human beings; ἀκούε, “hear”, is put at the beginning of a new section. This division is followed by Glenny.¹²⁹ The four patristic commentators quote Mic 6:9ab as a separate lemma, but their comments demonstrate that they consider these words the conclusion of Mic 6:8, so that Mic 6:9c is the beginning of a new section. Jerome observes explicitly that in Hebrew Mic 6:9ab is the beginning of a new chapter, whereas in the Septuagint it is the conclusion of the preceding section.¹³⁰ This implies that, concerning the position of Mic 6:9ab LXX, the majority of the editions and translations diverge from a broad patristic tradition, although they have Codex Alexandrinus on their side.

3. Conclusion

This paper demonstrates that patristic observations and implicit decisions concerning the meaning, syntax, and delimitation of the Septuagint text of Micah, and consequently of other prophetic books as well, deserve to be consulted and taken into account by scholars who investigate the Greek translation. We saw that in various cases scholars take decisions for their own editions and translations of the text, and about syntax and delimitation of its sentences and sections, apparently without being aware that in fact they take positions in debates that also took place in ancient Christianity. Sometimes a position is taken that deviates from all ancient interpretations. This may be fully justified, for there is no need to share the patristic views in all cases, but it would be recommendable to account for such choices.

¹²⁷ ANDERSEN/FREEDMAN, Micah, 539; in fact, they follow the ordering of the Hebrew text to which they add the Septuagint version.
¹²⁸ GIGUET does not specify whether Mic 6:9ab concludes the previous passage or starts a new section.
¹²⁹ GLENNY, Micah, 171–173. TISCHENDORF’S edition only distinguishes Micah’s seven chapters without marking any sections.
¹³⁰ THEODORE, In Michaeam 6, 9 (ed. SPRENGER, 225, 22–31); JEROME, In Michaeam II, 6, 9, 272–276 (CCSL 76); CYRIL, In Michaeam 6, 9 (ed. PUSEY, 701, 21 – 702, 24); THEODORET, In Michaeam 6, 9 (PG 81, 1777B); also THEOPHYLACT, In Michaeam III, 6, 9 (PG 126, 1153 – 1156A).
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