STAFFAN OLOFSSON

# Translation Technique
## and
# Theological Exegesis

*Collected Essays on the Septuagint Version*

## CB

### CONIECTANEA BIBLICA
### OLD TESTAMENT SERIES 57

# Translation Technique and Theological Exegesis

# CB

CONIECTANEA BIBLICA
OLD TESTAMENT SERIES
57

# Translation Technique and Theological Exegesis

## Collected Essays on the Septuagint Version

STAFFAN OLOFSSON

**Table of Contents**

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1. Presentation of the Articles

The present volume reflects Septuagint studies made by the author over more than ten years, but the basic questions are the same; they are especially related to methods for an adequate discussion of theology and translation technique in the LXX version. The articles are thus engaged in a debate concerning important issues that have been in focus among Septuagint scholars at least for the last decades. My participation in the discussion of translation technique and theological exegesis presupposes the works of other LXX scholars whom I pay a tribute. I will give recognition to those who first cleared the terrain. My dependence on other scholars is clearly seen in the footnotes of my articles. Nevertheless, I am solely responsible for the methodological guidelines presented in these articles. Questions about methodology in studies of *Vorlage*, translation technique and of theological exegesis are discussed in nearly all of the articles, especially "The Translation of Jer 2:18 in the Septuagint. Methodical, Linguistic and Theological Aspects", "Consistency as a Translation Technique", "The Crux Interpretum in Ps 2:12", "The Kaige-Group and the Septuagint book of Psalms", "Qumran and LXX", and "Death shall be their Shepherd. An Interpretation of Ps 49:15 in the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint", "Law and Lawbreaking in the LXX Psalms. A Case of Theological Exegesis".

That the articles in many respects interact with my thesis is easily seen already by its title *God is my Rock. A Study of Translation Technique* and *Theological Exegesis*. The basic approach in my dissertation was directed to criteria for developing a methodology for the study of theological exegesis in the Septuagint. It was especially concerned with the question of anti-anthropomorphisms in the LXX Psalms. Although I was critical to most of the proposals of anti-anthropomorphism's in the Psalter, I could with relevant reservations and delimitation's, conclude that the theology of the translator probably played a part in the translation of inanimate metaphorical names or epithets of God in LXX as a whole.

The articles frequently refer to the presentation in the monograph *The LXX Version. A Guide to the Translation Technique of the Septuagint* from 1991. There it is emphasised that the point of departure for a serious study of theological exegesis is the translation technique. The book

contains a systematic description of different translation techniques employed by the LXX translators. When it was published, it was the only modern handbook available that was exclusively directed to the description of translation techniques used in the Septuagint. Furthermore, it included references to most of the relevant scholarly studies in this area. For a modern and more detailed description, see Folker Siegert, "Zwischen Hebräischer Bibel und Altem Testament". *Eine Einführung in die Septuaginta. Institutium Judaicum Delitzschianum, Münsteraner Judaistische Studien* 9, Münster 2001.

The interest in methodological questions concerning the so-called theological exegesis is obvious already in the first of the articles "The Translation of Jer 2:18 in the Septuagint. Methodical, Linguistic and Theological Aspects" from 1988. In that paper, I tried to delineate a sound method for studying theological exegesis, and applied that to a passage where theological exegesis seemed to have played a part (Jer 2:18), but where in the end the importance of another explanation, based on the translation technique, was clearly seen. The study has a broad perspective, since it comprises all kinds of translation technical questions that the translator had to face in order to make his translation. It takes the translator's actual situation seriously and draws its conclusions from a comprehensive study of the different interacting factors. The basic methodological approach can perhaps best be illustrated by a quotation from the article, where I stated:

> If the linguistic and translation technical study could not give an adequate explanation to the translation the possibilities of a theological motivation for the rendering must be investigated. If one does presuppose such a motivation, this ought to be in line with a tendency observed elsewhere in the translation. It should also be set in relation to the conjectured milieu of the translator … The only sound basis for the study of conscious theological exegesis in the Septuagint is to start from the meaning of the text in both MT and LXX and then try to see the interpretation in the LXX from the perspective of the translator. (Olofsson, "Jer 2:18", 200).

Theological influence may have played a part in the renderings of the LXX. However, several possibilities must first be examined before one suggests an influence of theological exegesis in the LXX. It is hardly

probable but, on the other hand, it is not impossible that Γηων is a corruption that has pervaded the whole text tradition, since nearly all transliterations in the Greek manuscript tradition have become corrupted. However, a misreading in copying is not probable, since Σιωρ is never read as Γηων or vice versa in the Septuagint. In this case, the translation technique and the understanding of Γηων as the Nile is a simpler explanation of the rendering in the LXX. There is no need to suggest theological motives behind the counterpart. The only remarkable equivalent in the LXX is the plural of ποταμός as a rendering of the Hebrew נָהָר in the singular. In this case, the translator may imply that both Euphrates and Tigris are representatives for the "land of the two rivers".

In "Consistency as a Translation Technique" from 1992, questions concerning method are again in focus. The point of departure for the article is the criteria for literality presented by J. Barr and E. Tov. Barr's distinction between stereotype translation and consistency in his article "The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations" had stimulated my interest from the outset for the use and the definition of consistency in scholarly works. Tov's statement "The background and the employment of stereotyped renderings needs to be discussed in greater detail" (Tov, "Dimensions", 533 n. 11) is the starting point in my presentation.

Both the definition and the use of "consistency" in translation technical studies of the Septuagint are open to discussion. There exists much terminological confusion, since this feature, apart from consistency, may be labelled "stereotyped representation", "stereotype tendency", "systematic representation", "concordant relationship", "standard equivalents", "verbal linkage" or "representative principle". These terms are often used without distinction to cover both lexical and grammatical consistency, although they as a rule refer to lexical equivalents. However, representative principle only covers consistency in grammatical sense, and verbal consistency (or verbal concordance), and standard equivalents are used only for lexical consistency. Perhaps one could always use the terms lexical consistency and grammatical consistency.

Another problem is that no term exists in the current literature of the LXX studies for an equivalent in Greek that is only employed for a certain Hebrew word. Therefore, the term "reciprocal consistency" is proposed in the article. To use reciprocal consistency makes the description of

different types of consistency easier and it can be of a considerable help in discussing translation technique.

The study takes its point of departure from a common understanding of consistency as a sign of a literal translation but shows that several factors have to be taken into account before one is able to use consistency as a criterion of literality per se. This includes the semantic range of the Hebrew word, the resources and the demands of the target language, the literality of the translation, and the nature of the Hebrew text. Other essential factors for the right evaluation of consistency, although they are not translation technical issues per se, are the translator's knowledge of Hebrew, the frequency and the *Vorlage* of a Hebrew word.

Consistency can only be used as a sign of literality when a translator deliberately used one and the same equivalent, although the outcome was a translation where the nuances of the original were obliterated and the target language was not employed in a natural way. Thus, consistency is only a sign of literality when the translator *deliberately aimed at increased regularity in the choice of equivalents*, although the result was an unidiomatic translation, i.e. "stereotyping". In fact, the essence of stereotyping is not only the translation's lack of semantic accuracy, but also the result of a conscious policy.

Methodologically speaking, consistency can often, with due observance of other factors influencing the evaluation, be employed as a criterion of relative literality, that is, literality between different translations of one and same Hebrew text, but not as a criterion of literality in absolute sense. The discussion of relative literality has implications for the evaluation of other criteria of literality as well. A comparison of literality between different books in the Septuagint is possible if certain precautions are taken. One way to overcome some of the weaknesses in the statistics is to study the different meanings of a word separately and the phrases in which it occur.

The discussion of Ps 2:12 in "The Crux Interpretum in Ps 2:12", originally from 1995, is based on my experience of the translation technique in the LXX Psalms. It focuses on Ps 2:12aα, which is a famous *crux interpretum* in the MT and in the versions. The LXX departs radically from the MT:s נַשְּׁקוּ־בַר, which has often been understood as "kiss the son". Whether the LXX version is based on an interpretation of the MT or on a different *Vorlage* is disputed. In my opinion, the second alternative is to be preferred.

The proposals hitherto suggested concerning the *Vorlage* of δράσσεσθαι are, however, not compatible with the equivalents otherwise employed in the LXX. My reconstruction of the *Vorlage* קִמְצוּ מוּסָר "seize upon instruction" is based on the translation technique in the LXX as a whole. It is thus deeply rooted in the translation technique of the version. However, it presupposes a not attested metaphorical usage, comparable to that of δράσσεσθαι, since קָמַץ only has the meaning "take a handful", "take a pitch" in the Hebrew bible. Thus, the LXX text of Ps 2:12 cannot be explained with reference to MT; rather the MT and the LXX must be understood as two more or less independent textual traditions.

My article ends with a brief discussion concerning the most correct interpretation of the MT, since the traditional translation of the MT "kiss the son" is not supported by the versions and significant syntactical objections can be adduced against it. The most accurate interpretation of the MT is probably "kiss the field", as an act of homage to the king, to which an exact parallel can be found in the Akkadic expression *nasaqu qaqqara* "kiss the ground", which is used for kissing the soil in front of a king or a god to show submission.

"The Septuagint and Earlier Jewish Interpretative Tradition. Especially as Reflected in the Targums" from 1996 gives a perspective on early Jewish interpretation of the Tanak. The relation between the Septuagint and the Targums, as an exponent of an early Palestinian Jewish interpretive tradition, is investigated. On account of the heterogeneous character of the Septuagint translation as well as the Targums, it is impossible to describe the relation between them in a simple way. It is true that they evidence certain similarities as regards interpretation and translation technique, but the explicating additions to a more literally translated Hebrew text typical for the Babylonian Targums and the extremely free and paraphrastic translation with an allegorical rendering typical for the Targums of the *ketuvim* are not at all characteristic of the Old Greek.

It is not impossible that parts of the Septuagint have been influenced by the Targums, since written Targums existed in the last centuries BC and the interpretation behind them may be even older. However, it is more probable that the Septuagint, especially in the original sense of the term, is the origin of, rather than a vehicle of, Jewish interpretive tradition.

The Targums have a goal of their own that is not shared by the LXX version. The Targums' main purposes were to explain the holy text in a language understandable to most people, not just to the learned, and to

some degree to apply the text to the situation of the contemporary readers. Thus, the Targums were always *directly* related to the Hebrew original. Every reading of the Scripture in Hebrew in the synagogue was immediately followed by the oral interpretation by the "meturgeman", an *ad hoc* interpretation, on which the written Targums were based.

On the other hand, the Septuagint, most likely replaced the Hebrew Scripture in Egypt. That especially applies to the reading of the Pentateuch, that is, the original Septuagint. In consequence, the LXX and the Targums have had different functions; the Targums were *directly* related to the Hebrew original, while the Septuagint, at least in the Pentateuch, *replaced* the Hebrew text in the public reading of the Holy Scripture. For the interpretation and the application of the Greek text, one had to rely on allegorical commentaries of a similar type as Philo's bible commentaries. That the LXX had an independent function in Egypt does not exclude that there were tendencies in Palestine to revise the Septuagint so that it reflected the prevalent Hebrew text. In Hellenistic Judaism, on the other hand, the Old Greek was often regarded as an inspired text, and therefore it should not be changed.

The subject of the paper "Studying the Word Order of the Septuagint. Questions and Possibilities" from 1996 is, as is evident from the title, the relation between the MT and the LXX as regards the word order. Most of the LXX books follow the word order of the original closely, but the variations are great. Word order is a very promising field for studying translation technique, since it is one of the main aspects in which "free" translated books of the LXX depart from the literal ones. However, the investigation of the word order in LXX research is problematic. Recording the inversions in the word order of the Psalter and perhaps dividing them into categories is only the beginning of the investigation. The evaluation of translation technique should be based *both* on the Hebrew text, i.e. the *Vorlage*, and the way it was rendered by the translator. Inversion presupposes a relation in word order between a Hebrew and a Greek text, a therefore a comparison must be made between the Old Greek text and its Hebrew *Vorlage.*

This article discusses adequate methods of interpreting the word order in critical interaction with current research. First, one has to ascertain that it is the question of a deliberate change of the Hebrew word order, because to describe the word order as literal presupposes that the translators had alternatives, since the possibility to choose is indispensable

for the understanding of translation technique. Accordingly, particles where the sequence of the elements is predetermined in Greek, e.g. the inversion of postpositive particles as δέ and γάρ, must be treated as a separate category.

The inversions proper have been subdivided into five categories. The most interesting category is the inversion of verbs, nouns, and adjectives, adverbs, and I have presented some examples of these and tried to give guidelines for distinguishing between the different types of inversion, while admitting the uncertainty of the results.

An analysis of word order must always be based on the *Vorlage* of the translation and the Old Greek text. There are three categories of inversions between the MT and Rahlfs' text that ought to be distinguished; those *deriving from the translator*, those depending on *the subsequent transmission-history of the translation* and those based on *a variant Hebrew text*. It is important that one is able to make a distinction between them, since it is only the first category that reflects inversion as a translation technique. The author presents in the article different criteria for distinguishing between them.

The basis for the discussion regarding the relation between the text of the LXX Psalter and the kaige group in "The Kaige-Group and the Septuagint Book of Psalms" from 1997 is certain remarks of D. Barthélemy. He has argued that the LXX text of the Psalter may have had some connection with the kaige group. This is a possible proposal, since it is hardly disputed that the LXX text was subject to revisions in the course of its history, not least since it was frequently used in liturgy. Later on, the relation has been discussed by, among others, H.-J. Venetz, A. van der Kooij, and O. Munnich. It is also true that even though *Psalmi cum Odis* represents a very high standard of scholarship, a more consistent use of translation technique in deciding the Old Greek text as well the detection of new Greek manuscripts as has made it inevitable to suspect the Greek text as well as the Hebrew.

I first discussed the relation between the equivalents in the LXX and Quinta, as a predecessor to the kaige group. It was evident that Quinta retains the vocabulary of the LXX Psalms, even when it departs from the ordinary equivalents in the LXX as a whole. In cases where Quinta has a different counterpart from the LXX Psalms, it often uses the Psalms vocabulary more systematically. Thus, differences in the vocabulary

between the LXX Psalms and Quinta are partly due to a more systematic employment of the Psalter's vocabulary in the revision.

The earlier studies of the relation between the text of the LXX Psalter and the kaige group have only been based on a few characteristics, e.g. יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת rendered by κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων, גַּם by καὶ γάρ, and the use of βᾶρις and πυργόβαρις. This investigation comprises all the relevant terms connected with the kaige group. There is a similarity in the choice of equivalents between the Psalter and the kaige group, although the identical readings only involve some of the characteristics.

Nevertheless, one cannot find any signs at all of a revision of terms where the kaige group differ from the Old Greek. Consequently, in cases where Rahlfs' text displays elements of the kaige group there are no variants, which mirror the Old Greek. I could not find any relevant lexicographical variants in LXX Psalms that reflect this kind of revisionary activity. Thus, if the Old Greek has not been lost, without leaving any trace at all, which I would think is less probable, the equivalents identical with the kaige group are not sign of revision but Old Greek readings.

Thus, the revision has been based on the vocabulary of the original translation of the book of Psalms to a certain extent. In a similar way, the Greek Pentateuch in their choice of vocabulary often influenced later LXX books. A small part of the vocabulary in LXX Psalms was taken over and applied in a more consistent way by the kaige group, especially in cases where it stands in contrast to the vocabulary of the Pentateuch.

The article "Qumran and LXX" from 1998 deals with the relation between Qumran and the Septuagint, which is an interesting and frequently debated topic among scholars. It is undisputable that the scrolls from Qumran have had a great influence on the assessment of the textual history of the Old Testament text, and this applies also to the use of the Septuagint in textual criticism. The differences between the MT and the Septuagint in the Psalter are mostly small details in the text. Thus, one must discuss if it is admissible to reconstruct a *Vorlage* different from MT based on grammatical minutiae. Although the question is occasionally asked, but hardly any definite answers are given, although such retroversions are regularly made in modern editions of the MT, for example, *BHK* and *BHS*.

Although several texts from different manuscripts of the book of Psalms have been found in Qumran, and thus could have been used,

11QPs[a] has the advantage that it appears in a critical edition in contrast to the unedited fragments found in Qumran Cave 4. Furthermore, it is much longer than any of the other Psalm fragments. I have therefore chosen to present LXX readings that are also found in 11QPs[a] as an illustration to questions concerning the *Vorlage* of LXX. I have argued that the text of the LXX Psalms, if it coincides with texts from Qumran, can be adduced as a textual witness even where the differences between the texts are of grammatical nature. Frequently I presuppose a different *Vorlage* behind the variants in LXX, which are supported by 11QPs[a], and often also by one or more of the old versions. Other possibilities cannot of course be ruled out, since agreements in minutiae may be coincidental. Changes in number, differences in pronouns and particles, as well as verbal forms, in relation to MT, could have developed independent of each other, but the presence of Hebrew texts that reflect these differences can hardly be accidental.

In my article, "Death shall be their Shepherd. An Interpretation of Ps 49:15 in MT and LXX" from 2000 I considered the religio-historical context for understanding Ps 49:15, a text that admittedly is hard to interpret. The background for my interpretation of Ps 49 is the myth of Baal and Mot, which presumably was well known in Israel and would immediately be recognised when alluded to.

It is not to shed light on the text neither in the Hebrew nor in the LXX. The psalm is concerned with death in the context of human power and wealth. 49:9-17 in LXX is a description of the fate of the rich and the separation of the rich from his riches. My understanding of the Greek text, which is admittedly uncertain, as are all interpretations, has the advantage that it makes sense of the use of δόξα in vv. 15, 17 and 18, and furthermore, that βοήθεια is interpreted in accordance with the translation of צוּר as a divine epithet otherwise in LXX as a whole. In favour of this understanding, it can also be said that the separation of the riches from the rich and foolish persons is clearly indicated in the close context (for example, vv. 10, 12-13, 16-17).

V. 15 in the LXX version refers to the helpless god of the rich people, who grows old or decays through the lapse of time in Sheol. The god of the rich, who is more or less identical with their riches or desire for riches, was a help to them when they were alive. But now when they are separated "from their glory", that is, "their riches", the god on whom they trusted cannot rescue them from Sheol and is of no help, in contrast to the

God of the psalmist. V. 15 has an ironic twist; the god of riches is a help who turns out to be so vulnerable that he will grow old or will be worn out in Sheol. The contrast between the everlasting power of Yahweh and the transitoriness of his enemies is sometimes described in the Old Testament as a "wearing out". That the "god of the riches" and the riches themselves are separated is a further irony in the text. Associations with a god of riches are natural in a context, where even death is personified as a shepherd. The god of the riches is not as the Lord living forever.

Two alternative interpretations of the Hebrew text are proposed. צוּר as a "rock", refers to a foreign god, a god whom the wicked rich relied on. He shall be consumed in Sheol (or by Sheol) away from his throne. This is in analogy with the use of זְבֻל as the temple of God or gods. In reference to the mythological background of this psalm, this implies that Baal does not return at all from Sheol and he is not enthroned in his זְבֻל. In consequence, contrary to outcome in the myth of Baal and Mot, Mot is eventually victorious, because Baal is not enthroned as king, but decays in Sheol.

Another interpretation, based on צוּר (or צוּרָה) "form", is that it is the bodies of the rich persons that shall be destroyed in Sheol (or that Sheol as the personified Death will destroy their bodies), and thus be separated from בַּעַל זְבֻל, their god. This agrees with the use of mythological material in the Psalms and with the character of זְבֻל in Ugaritic texts. Therefore, God rather than Baal, is the one who has the power to deliver from the sphere of Sheol, that is, he takes the place of Baal as a god of life. He can save the psalmist from Sheol, while Baal cannot deliver his followers, the foolhardy, "who trust in their wealth and boast of the abundance of their riches".

Since the Hebrew may have a veiled reference to the epithet בַּעַל זְבֻל, the meaning of MT could be that the body of the rich person shall waste away in Sheol, separated as he is from his god, "the Prince/Ruler" (זְבֻל I) or "the Heavenly One" (זְבֻל II). The two interpretations can be combined. זְבֻל may refer directly the throne of Baal and at the same time point to the epithet בַּעַל זְבֻל. צוּר can denote בַּעַל זְבֻל, who cannot rescue the rich from Sheol, but is himself consumed by Sheol, away from "his temple" or "his throne", but God is the one who has the power to deliver the righteous from the sphere of Sheol.

The question that I try to answer in "Law and Lawbreaking in the LXX Psalms. A Case of Theological Exegesis" from 2001 is if the renderings in

the book of Psalms reflect a predisposition to give emphasis to the divine law, a tendency that is consistent with a dominant theological development in the translator's milieu. A great effort is laid down in presenting the methodical guidelines on which the study is based, since the outcome of the investigations depends on the criteria used for evaluating the data.

First, I have made a study concerning the Hebrew equivalents for Greek terms relating to "lawlessness", "breaking of the law" and the like in LXX Psalms. Then I took these equivalents as the point of departure and investigated how they were translated. My conclusion was that the widespread use of νόμος with cognates for diverse Hebrew terms point towards an understanding of the wrongdoers in the book of Psalms as persons breaking the law, or being without the law.

The result of my investigation is that the tendency to use Greek terms connected with νόμος is accentuated when the Hebrew terms are taken as point of departure. Thus, the investigations from both angles support that in this case theological exegesis is involved in the translation of the Psalter. Although other LXX translators not seldom understand wrongdoers as lawbreakers this tendency is more emphasised and the choice of counterparts more systematic in the book of Psalms. Consequently, the Psalms translator does not only reflect the theological world of his time, where the law of Moses stands in the centre, but also his own theological preferences. There is perhaps also a chronological factor involved, since some of the vocabulary related to the law are especially frequent in the translation of the Ketuvim and the Apocrypha, and does not occur at all in the Pentateuch. Accordingly, later translations may have been more law oriented than earlier translations.

All the articles are revised and corrected; some are only slightly revised, while others have been revised in a more thorough way. Thus, "The Translation of Jer 2:18 in the Septuagint. Methodical, Linguistic and Theological Aspects", and "The Crux Interpretum in Ps 2:12" are substantially revised in this edition, and "The Kaige-Group and the Septuagint Book of Psalms" is revised and corrected not least based on the criticism in Gentry's article "The Greek Psalter and the καίγε Tradition". Some articles are updated and include discussions of relevant literature that I was not able to incorporate in the original presentation, especially "The Crux Interpretum in Ps 2:12", "The Greek Psalter and the

καίγε Tradition" and "Law and Lawbreaking in the LXX Psalms. A Case of Theological Exegesis".

References to books as well as bible references have been made in a consistent way in the whole book, in contrast to their original appearance. Translation of the Hebrew is as a rule taken from the *NRSV* and the same is true for the abbreviations of the biblical books in the references to bible passages.

The translation of the LXX version of the book of Psalms is from *NETS*, if not otherwise is suggested, but the translation of other passages of the Septuagint is my own. All citations of bible passages in the LXX are based on Rahlfs' text, not the text in Hatch, Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint*, if not otherwise are said explicitly. They are often given according to the numbering of verses in Rahlfs and where they differ from MT, both the numbering in Rahlfs and in the MT is given. When only one number for references in the book of Psalms is used, the numbering is that of the Masoretic text.

I must emphasise that the original name of the article and the heading of the chapters in the book are not always the same. Furthermore, headings are also introduced in the chapters, which were not part of the original articles.

The Hebrew text cited in this study is the Masoretic text. It is the basis for nearly all investigations of the translation technique of the Septuagint. They refer, explicitly or implicitly, to the vocalization and thus to the derivation of the terms by the Masoretes. I have decided to make this state of affairs transparent in my discussion by citing MT, i.e. the fully vocalized Hebrew text of Codex Leningradensis, as point of departure. This does not suggest that I have made a decision regarding the *Vorlage* of the LXX text. However, it makes the basic text, from which deviations are measured, as clear as possible. It is the same point of departure as in works of textual criticism, or in discussions regarding the textual basis of modern translations; they make the vocalized MT the norm for the description of textual variants.

I have used both "LXX" and "Septuagint" in the same sense and for the sake of variation. In a similar way "translation", "rendering", "counterpart", "equivalent" are used intentionally as synonyms.

Many of the articles are based on presentations made at international conferences.

"The Septuagint and Earlier Jewish Interpretative Tradition. Especially as Reflected in the Targums" and "Studying the Word Order of the Septuagint. Questions and Possibilities" are from "The Nordic LXX congress", Helsinki 15-17 August 1994.

"The Kaige-Group and the Septuagint book of Psalms" is from "The IX Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies"*,* Cambridge, Great Britain 15-16 July 1995.

"Qumran and LXX" is from the conference "Qumran between the Old and the New Testaments", 19-22 June 1995, Schæffergården, Denmark.

"Death shall be their Shepherd. An Interpretation of Ps 49:15 in the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint" is from "The International Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature" and "The Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies" 16-21 July 1999, Helsinki/Lahti, Finland.

"Law and Lawbreaking in the LXX Psalms. A Case of Theological Exegesis" is from "Internationales Forschungskolloquium der Septuagintapsalter und die hellenistische Kultur", 5-6 December 2000, Münster, Germany.

I will also give information concerning where the articles were first published.

"The translation of Jer 2:18 in the Septuagint. Methodical, Linguistic and Theological Aspects", *The Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 2 (1988), 169-200.

"Consistency as a Translation Technique", *The Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 6 (1992), 14-30.

"The Crux Interpretum in Ps 2,12", *The Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 9 (1995), 185-99.

"The Septuagint and Earlier Jewish Interpretative Tradition. Especially as Reflected in the Targums", *The Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 10 (1996), 197-216.

"Studying the Word Order of the Septuagint. Questions and Possibilities". *The Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 10 (1996), 217-37. This is, however, a translation of an article in *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok* 58 (1993), "Septuaginta och äldre judisk tolkningstradition", 15-32.

"The Kaige-Group and the Septuagint Book of Psalms", in *IX Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*, Cambridge 1995. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 45, ed. B.A. Taylor, Scholars Press, Atlanta 1997, 189-230.

"Qumran and LXX", *Qumran between the Old and New Testaments*, *JSOTSupplement Series* 290, ed. David J.A. Clines, Philip R. Davies, Sheffield 1998, 232-48.

"Death Shall Be their Shepherd: An interpretation of Ps. 49:15 in The Masoretic and the Septuagint", *The Interpretation of Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity. Studies in Language and Tradition*, ed. Craig A. Evans, *Journal for the Study of Pseudepigrapha*. Supplement Series 33, Sheffield 2000, 75 -105.

"Law and Lawbreaking in the LXX Psalms - A Case of Theological Exegesis", *Der Septuaginta-Psalter: sprachliche und theologische Aspekte,* ed. E. Zenger, Freiburg, *Herders biblische Studien* Bd. 32, Göttingen: Herder, 2001, 291-330.

## 1.2. Theological Exegesis in Scholarly Studies

The discussions in the last decades among Septuagint scholars regarding the evaluation of differences between the Hebrew and the Greek texts have been very intense. The main interest relates to the question if differences between MT and the LXX in a passage depend on the translation technique or theological influences, or a different *Vorlage*. Although some criteria for distinguishing between them are presented, it is seldom possible to offer a final judgement. The data are often complicated and can be interpreted in different ways. Furthermore, it is important that every case is discussed on its own merits.

The Qumran material has lead to an understanding of that a variety of Hebrew texts circulated in the last centuries BC. This suggests a textual solution to some of the differences that earlier often was regarded as depending on the translator. The discovery of the scrolls forced scholars

to admit that the Septuagint can be a reliable witness to a Hebrew text different from the MT. Many emendations based on the Septuagint in the last part of the twentieth century have been verified by the Qumran texts. In fact, the whole procedure of retroversion has a massive support from the Dead Sea Scroll. This is true also for the book of Psalms.

The theology of the Septuagint is an interesting subject, which has been much discussed by Septuagint scholars, not least in recent years, and it stands in a mutual relationship to the translation technical studies. It is influenced by and sometimes corrected by investigations of translation technique. Septuagint scholars have sophistically described the different levels of interpretation. Therefore, a distinction is often made between the translator's or the translators' intention and the unintended reflection of the religious outlook prevalent in his milieu. Methodologically speaking, the translator's rendering is thus distinguished from the possible meaning of the Greek text per se, without reference to the translator. The LXX translation has frequently been interpreted in Antiquity, an interpretation based on the different readers understanding of the text, partly influenced by the theological milieu of the interpreter.

An important question in this regard is if it is possible to discuss the theology of the translator reflected in the ordinary choice of equivalents in the book he translated. Even if this is possible, it must be done with great caution. Consequently, it is easier to detect a theological tendency in a certain book in relation to other books of the LXX than to discuss one book separately. This is especially the case if the choices of equivalents deviate significantly from the interpretation of the same words used in the same meaning in other parts of the LXX. It is mainly in deviations from the translator's ordinary equivalents and in relation to other books in the LXX, that one is able to come to grips with his theology. Nevertheless, there are exceptions, for example, a systematic representation of diverse Hebrew equivalents that accords with a theological tendency in the translator's environment can be studied as a reflection of his own theology.

The translation technique has been in focus in LXX studies; sometimes it has dominated the scene. The interest has repeatedly been related to translation technique as an indication of the literality of the translation and several criteria for literality have been presented. According to J. Barr, indications of literality can be subdivided into lexical and grammatical consistency, one-to-one-relation, word order, semantic accuracy, the quantitative addition, and subtraction of elements

and etymological indication of formal/semantic relationships obtaining in the vocabulary of the original language.

It would of course be an advantage if one were able to combine different aspects of literality in order to give a more or less complete picture of the translation technique of a given book. However, to make a sum out of the statistics, with the intention of comparing the literality of the LXX books, ought in most cases to be avoided. If applied it must be followed by a discussion of the relationship between different aspects of literality and the weaknesses in the statistical material must be brought out. Because a LXX book may be a combination of literal and free aspects of translation and the different aspects of literality can sometimes be adversely, rather than complementary, related to each other. It is especially important that those aspects of literality, which more or less contradict each other, are not combined.

It has been emphasised in recent years, and rightly so, that an exclusive preoccupation with translation technique does not lead to a full understanding of the Septuagint translation and furthermore, that the interpretive dimension of the LXX books is of great interest for comprehending the work of the translator. However, in my opinion, a serious understanding of the translator's theology and the *Vorlage* of the translation are *only* possible after an investigation of the translation technique. If one does not start with the translation technique one could not have a serious discussion of the theology of the translator. However, the translation technique is also the starting point for questions concerning the *Vorlage*. The *Vorlage* on which the translators made their version cannot be detected if you have not studied the technique of this specific translator. In order to retrovert the Greek text to a *Vorlage* different from the MT the technique of the translator is the fundamental issue, although questions concerning the translator's competence and theology are also involved. In fact, the study of the methods of translation in the translation units in the LXX is the pivotal point for the investigation of the *Vorlage* of the translation as well as of the Old Greek (OG).

I hope that my position in the ongoing discussion of translation technique and theological exegesis and my contribution to this debate is evident from the presentation made in this book. I strongly argue that it is not possible to infer the presence of theological exegesis by a divergence between the interpretations of the Hebrew Masoretic text and the Old Greek text. Several factors are mandatory components in the translation process per se, which are more likely reasons behind any difference

between the interpretations of the MT and the LXX. However, if these factors are taken into account I am open towards the possibility that the translator's theology has influenced his exegesis. I thereby exclude the inescapable influence on the translator from his time and his milieu. Every translator is of course a child of his time. In two specific areas I have myself found a deliberate influence from mythological or theological presuppositions probable, one is the use of the myth of Baal and Mot in Ps 49 and the other is the translator's manifest predilection for the law, which is generally more pronounced in the LXX Psalms than in the other books of the LXX.

## 1.3. A Methodology for the Study of Theological Exegesis

The theology of the Septuagint is an interesting subject, which has been much discussed by Septuagint scholars, not least in recent years. However, I would not argue that an independent theology of the Septuagint exists. Rather, the theological influence of the Septuagint mainly consists of a Hellenistic interpretation of the theology of the Hebrew bible. However, since theology was not the primary concern in the Septuagint,[1] the worldwide study of this Greek version, however, has lacked an adequate methodological basis. Not infrequently, the study is made more or less haphazard without considering the situation of the LXX translators and with premature references to later interpretations and traditions.[2] This has occasionally been pointed out,[3] but no comprehensive picture of a more adequate way to study this important field has been presented, as far as I know. One must try to take into account different aspects of the background of the translators and to look closely at the text they had in front of them so that it will be possible to base the methodological suggestions on a firm ground.

My main objective is to emphasise that in order to be able to say something essential about the theological interpretation in the Septuagint one has to investigate the translators' knowledge of Hebrew and all aspects of the way they have translated the Hebrew text. I will try to

---

[1] See e.g. Sollamo, "Significance", 505-06.

[2] An example is the dissertation of H.M. Erwin, *Theological Aspects of the Septuagint of the Book of Psalms* that clearly displays the consequences of the lack of a proper methodology. See, e.g., the justified criticism of this kind of method in Olofsson, *Rock*, 5-9; Wigtil, *Religious Texts*, 24-26.

[3] See, e.g., Allen, *Chronicles 1,* 30-31.

describe the approach with questions to be put to the text, which must be answered before one can continue and treat the complex problems concerning ideology and theology reflected in the Septuagint.[4] These basic presuppositions must always be taken into account when ideological motives as explanations to certain renderings are put forward.

The Greek text per se must first be examined. Therefore, the first question to ask is if the Greek text one uses reflects the Old Greek text. It is essential to use the text of the Old Greek; otherwise, one does not reflect the translator's theology. Can one really take for granted that the Greek text that one employs as ones base text is identical with the Old Greek?[5] To be able to answer the first question it is essential to work with a critical Greek text but one ought also to see if a variant Greek text exists, that could affect the point of departure for the study. Alternative interpretations and variant readings often occur later in the textual history of the Septuagint. As a result, readings from two Greek manuscripts were sometimes combined and glosses from the margin were inserted into the text.[6]

Since recensions of the Septuagint text started at an early date and the recensional work has to some extend affected all known manuscripts of the LXX, it is wise to be cautious.[7] Perhaps the Greek text is influenced by a later revision.[8] In some books, for example codex Vaticanus, the

---

[4] By the term Septuagint, I refer to the original translation, the so-called "Old Greek". It is self-evident that the Old Greek must as far as possible be the basis for a study of the intentions of the translator. See, e.g., Pace, "Daniel", 15.

[5] The LXX scholars nowadays universally accept the existence of one original translation behind the LXX manuscripts. See, e.g., Jellicoe, *Septuagint,* 62; Tov, *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint,* 44; Skehan, "Scrolls", 92; Cross, "History", 283-84; Hovard, "The LXX", 156; Tov, "Alterations", 74-75; Pietersma, "Septuagint Research", 298.

[6] Segert, "Parallelism", 143; Talmon, "Double Readings", 150-51. Especially Lucian's revision was known to be inclusive. *Idem*, 151.

[7] See Tov, *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint,* 40-42; Tov, "Alterations", 75; O'Connell, "Greek Versions", 380.

[8] The recensional work has affected all known manuscripts to a certain degree. See Tov, *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint,* 40-42; Tov, "Alterations", 75; O'Connell, "Greek Versions"*,* 380. The aim of most of the recensions was to harmonise the translation with the Hebrew text in possession of the revisers. See, e.g., Tov, *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint,* 42. Another aspect of the same aspiration was to make the translation an exact reproduction of the Hebrew and to

most important single LXX manuscript, does reflect a later recension and not the Old Greek.[9] Another possibility is that the Greek text has misreadings. Since the manuscripts were repeatedly copied by hand, many passages became corrupt. Both conscious and unconscious corruption has occurred.[10] The corruption of proper names is widespread, because they are easily distorted in the process of copying.[11]

Another essential question is if the LXX text really is a translation of a Hebrew text identical with MT or if it had a different *Vorlage*. For the recognition of passages that are translated from a text different from MT, one has largely to rely on Hebrew text editions and ordinary commentaries, but this *Vorlage* can best be established with the help of the study of translation equivalents.[12]

It is a well-known fact that different Hebrew texts circulated in the pre-Christian era,[13] among them manuscripts more or less identical with the *Vorlage* of the Septuagint.[14] On the other hand, no Hebrew text has been found that exactly reflects the original behind the LXX.[15] The same

---

match the semantic meaning of the separate words. See, e.g., Barr, "Typology", 310-12, 317.

[9] Tov, *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint,* 48 and n. 21; Tov, "Alterations", 75 n. 15; O'Connell, "Greek Versions", 379; Jellicoe, "Kaige-Recension", 21.

[10] See, e.g., Ottley, *Handbook*, 83-88; Barr, *Philology*, 247-48. Many corruptions occurred early, rather than late, in the textual transmission. Swete*, Introduction,* 247-48; Roberts, *Versions*, 177.

[11] Jellicoe, *Septuagint*, 20. It is inevitable that the transcriptions were exposed to the danger of being distorted and all of them became in fact corrupt in some stages of the textual transmission. Tov, "Loan-words", 228; Tov, *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint*, 91. Cf. Swete, *Introduction*, 24-25.

[12] See Tov, *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint*, 50, 52, 62; Pietersma, "Greek Psalter", 60; Hanhart, "Septuagintaforschung", 8. One cannot rely upon the mainly mechanical retroversions in *BHK* and *BHS*. See especially Barthélemy, *Études*, 366-68; Wevers, "Text History", 392-402; Goshen-Gottstein, "Textual Criticism", 383-85; Wevers, "Apologia", 28; Tov, *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint*, 112, 312-14.

[13] See, e.g., Talmon, "Text", 162-63, 198-99; Talmon, "Textual Study", 326; Cross, "Contribution", 81-84; Sanders, "Text and Canon", 377; Tov, "Textual Outlook", 11-27; Tov, *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint,* 274-75.

[14] Tov, *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint,* 260-7l; Gooding, "Stricter Terminology", 18-25.

[15] Tov, "Textual Outlook", 223.

is true for Hebrew texts before the turn of the era generally; not two identical texts of a biblical book have so far turned up among the Qumran manuscripts.[16] Harmonisation's and other adaptations are common not only in translations, but also in the Hebrew manuscripts.[17] Although the question of the *Vorlage* is essential for the interpretation of the text it is usually put after all other possibilities to explain the Greek rendering are exploited and that is for most LXX books a sound method.[18]

If it is reasonable to assume that the LXX has been translated from a text identical with the MT, one asks oneself: what is the interpretation of the Hebrew word or phrase according to modern understanding? Furthermore, how has the translator of the LXX understood the meaning of the word in this context and in other contexts? It is essential not to compare the rendering of the Septuagint directly with the interpretation of the word or phrase in modern lexica, commentaries and translations. Evidently, the translation ought to be judged according to the knowledge or lack of knowledge of the individual translator.[19] The meaning of the LXX text must be based on the translator's interpretation of the words in question in his *Vorlage*.[20]

The LXX translators may have derived the Hebrew word from a different stem. This is especially significant for certain forms of the verb, which were not easily distinguished from each other.[21] They could have

---

[16] See Tov, "Septuagint (Scholarship)", 809. For methodical considerations regarding the evaluation of the relationship between LXX and Hebrew manuscripts, see *idem*, *passim*.

[17] This applies not the least to Samaritanus. Tov, *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint,* 267-71; Tov, "Harmonizations", 13-14; Jellicoe, *Septuagint,* 242-45; Klein, *Textual Criticism,* 16-18; Cross, "History", 297; Cross, *Library,* 172-73, 192-93. But, it also applies to other Hebrew texts. See especially Tov, "Harmonizations", 13-15.

[18] See Barr, *Philology*, 245; Tov, *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint*, 74; Wevers, "Apologia", 29.

[19] Tov, "Septuagint Translators", 53-54; Rabin, "Character", 5.

[20] Tov, "Dimensions", 529-30, 532, 536, 541; Lee, "Equivocal", 104.

[21] See Weissert, "Word-Analysis", 34-36, with examples on 39-44. See also Tov, *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint*, 244, with examples on 245-50. However, in these cases, usually the grammatical form had misled the translator and not the intrinsic difficulty of the meaning per se.

tried to understand the word with the help of its etymology.[22] The notion that the Hebrew stem consisted of three radicals was not self-evident before the Hebrew language was investigated in a scientific way.[23] Therefore, the translators at times derived the word from a bi-radical stem,[24] or interpreted it according to its meaning in Aramaic.[25] Aramaic was probably better known to the translators than Hebrew.[26]

A common reason for an unexpected equivalent is that the sense of the word or construction puzzles the translator in question.[27] His rendering may thus be only a guess from the context. Pure guesses, however, were probably regarded as a last resort by most of the translators. As a rule, they chose other alternatives.[28] One ought also to be aware of that occasionally the translator may have tried to reflect other aspects of the Hebrew instead of giving an exact semantic equivalent.[29]

Another possibility is that the translator is dependent on other translators for his rendering of the term. This is often the case in LXX. Especially the translators of the Pentateuch have clearly influenced the later translators. They now and again used the Pentateuch as a kind of lexicon when they came across difficult words.[30] Nevertheless, the

---

[22] Barr, *Philology,* 253-55; Tov, *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint,* 242. Cf. Barr, "Typology", 318-22.

[23] See Barr, *Philology,* 6l-65, 209-10.

[24] Prijs, *Tradition*, 83 n. 3; Tov, *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint,* 245-47.

[25] Swete, *Introduction,* 319 n. 3; Thackeray, *Grammar,* 28, 34, 36; Wutz, *Transkriptionen,* 150-51; Tov, *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint,* 241 n. 27, 249 n. 33.

[26] Barr, *Philology,* 54-55; Barr, "Typology", 320 n. 1; Rabin, "Character", 20 and n. 74. Sometimes the translator resorted to Aramaic for a kind of etymological exegesis. Tov, *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint*, 241 n. 27, 249.

[27] See especially Tov, "Septuagint Translators", 55-70, where he gives several examples. See also Flashar, "LXX-Psalter", 107-13; Barr, *Philology*, 268.

[28] See Tov, *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint*, 164, 169, with examples 165-70. Cf. Flashar, "LXX-Psalter", 252-53.

[29] See, e.g., Caird, "Homoeophony", 74; Katz, "Recovery", 169; Walters (Katz), *Text*, 175.

[30] Tov, "Impact", 587-88. See also Mozley, *Psalter*, XIII; Swete, *Introduction*, 299-300; Thackeray, *Grammar*, 30; Katz, "Übersetzungstechnik", 267; Katz, "Recovery", 178. It was dealt with in detail in Flashar, "LXX-Psalter", 185-89. For recent affirmations, see Sollamo, *Semiprepositions,* 309; Allen, *Chronicles I,* 23-26; Tov, "Vocabulary of the Septuagint", I; Rabin, "Character", 22.

Pentateuch did not only serve as a lexicon; the dependence also took other forms.[31]

Other important questions in this context are: Does the translator follow a strict method, as for example, consistency in the choice lexical equivalents?[32] He sometimes employed a more generic term, which suited the context,[33] or a favourite word with an indistinct meaning.[34] He on occasion used, with a term coined by Flashar, a *Verlegenheitsübersetzung*, that is, a phrase or an idiomatic expression, which is rendered word by word with the most frequent equivalents for the separate terms, although the significance of the Greek became obscure.[35] It also refers to the use of the standard translation for a word in a context where it has a different meaning. Another technique that may have been used by some translators is the so-called homoeophony, that is, the method to reflect a Hebrew term by a word in Greek that is phonetically similar to it, although it does not have the correct meaning.[36]

Furthermore, hermeneutical techniques used by the Palestinian Jews, which later are employed in the Targums, have influenced the Septuagint to a certain extent.[37] Many of these modes of interpretation can also be

---

[31] Tov, "Impact", 578-86, 588-90.

[32] For the different aspects of translation technique, see especially Barr, "Typology", 305-14; Tov, *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint,* 54-57.

[33] Tov, "Septuagint Translators", 66. Cf. Arieti, "Amos", 347.

[34] See Tov, "Septuagint Translators", 67. For the definition of this term, see Barr, *Philology,* 251-53.

[35] See Rabin, "Character", 224. For this meaning of the term, see Mozley, *Psalter*, XVI. See also Flashar, who underlines the mechanical character of the procedure. Flashar, "LXX-Psalter", 94. Two more possibilities can perhaps be mentioned: that the translator omitted the unknown word, or that he transliterated it. Both of them were employed in the Greek Chronicles. See Allen, *Chronicles 1,* 61-62.

[36] See Caird, "Homoeophony", 74. See also Katz, "Recovery", 169; Katz, *Text,* 175; Barr, "Typology", 319. The term is perhaps not the best. See de Waard, "Homoeophony", 552. At least the frequency and perhaps the existence of this translation technique are now open to question. See the persuasive critique of the best examples of this technique in Barr, "Homoeophony", 1-77. See especially his conclusions on 76-78.

[37] Barnes, "Recovery", 131; Roberts, *Versions,* 185; Orlinsky, "The LXX", 24; Würtwein, *Text,* 72; Barr, "Vocalization", 7-8; Thackeray, *Aspects,* 36-37. See also Marcus, "Jewish and Greek Elements", 227-45.

found among Hellenistic Jews. One can hardly erect a watertight bulkhead between Palestinian and Hellenistic Jewry in this respect.[38]

## 1.4. The Historical Background of the Translators

If one now turns from the translation technique to the translators themselves, one could note that the translators had unvocalized texts as their *Vorlage* and that the vocalization presupposes a traditional understanding of the texts.[39] The knowledge of the structure of the Hebrew language,[40] and the derivation of certain Hebrew grammatical forms, were not impressive, according to our standards, when the translation was carried out.[41] Moreover, Hebrew was probably not the everyday language of the translators. Greek was the dominant language among the Jews in Egypt already when the translation of the Pentateuch was made out and it eventually became even more dominant.[42]

The Septuagint translation, not least the Pentateuch, was a pioneer work. The translators thus had to cope with the basic problems of translation.[43] They did not have any previous model, which they could follow.[44] To a certain extent, the business translators in Alexandria may have inspired them.[45] The type of translation later employed in the

---

[38] See Marcus, "Jewish and Greek Elements", 232; Feldman, "Orthodoxy", 217; Orlinsky, "Holy Writ", 108; Gerhardsson, "Hermeneutic Program", 129.

[39] The vocalization was partly reflected by an early use of *matres lectionis*. Barr, "Vocalization", 1; Tov, *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint*, 159, 161. See also Barr, "Vocalization", 1-5; Martin, *Scribal Character,* 355-62; Barr, *Philology*, 207; Tov, *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint*, 164. See also Revell, "LXX", 43-47.

[40] Barr, *Philology*, 61-65, 209-10; Barr, "Vocalization", 9-10.

[41] Prijs, *Tradition*, 83 n. 3; Tov, *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint*, 244; Weissert, "Word-Analysis", 34-35. See also the examples in Tov, *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint*, 245-50; Weissert, "Word-Analysis", 39-44.

[42] Swete, *lntroduction*, 8-9; Fuchs, *Die Juden,* 120-21; Barr, *Philology*, 208, 268-69.

[43] Rabin, "Character", 20; Heller, "Grenzen", 234; Brock, "Biblical translation in Antiquity", 541-42; Brock, "Septuagint", 12; Lee, *Lexical Study,* 20.

[44] Rabin, "Character", 20-21; Brock, "Septuagint", 12 and n. 4.

[45] Rabin, "Character", 21-25; Lee, *Lexical Study,* 20 n. 33. But, the activity and competence as regards the so-called dragomans was uncertain in pre-Christian time, and very few bilingual documents or translations in Egypt from this time have been found. See e.g. Wright, "Jewish Scriptures", 16-18. See also van der

Targums may have played a certain, even though less significant role.[46] This does not imply that the mode of translation always was a matter of free choice: the lack of knowledge as well as of adequate tools made the carrying out of a good idiomatic translation impossible.[47]

Septuagint books were translated during a long period, probably more than 150 years, and the translators worked primarily independently from each other, even if the later translators could take advantage of the predecessors regarding the interpretation of difficult words.[48] They were probably also without elementary linguistic tools as lexicons, concordances and grammars.[49] The translators did not use footnotes to give alternative interpretations or variant readings. If that kind of information was reflected in the translation, it was by incorporating it in the text itself, for example, through double translations.[50] The diversity in the translation techniques employed indicates the prevalent situation.

The choice of equivalents was of course also dependent on the possibilities of expression in the Greek language, grammatically, as well as semantically.[51] Lexical choices were limited not only by the translation technique but also by the word field of the Greek words.[52] The consequence of the literal translation technique per se and especially the

---

Kooij, "Who are the Translators", 226-29 for differences between the LXX translators and the dragoman.

[46] Churgin, "The Targum", 42-43; Rabin, "Character", 20-21.

[47] Barr, "Typology", 289-90.

[48] Swete, *Introduction*, 290; Thackeray, *Grammar*, VIII, IX, 6-16; Jellicoe, *Septuagint*, 314-18; Roberts, *Versions*, 181; Pietersma, "Septuagint Research", 298 n. 3.

[49] Katz, "Übersetzungstechnik", 267; Tov, "Impact", 587. See also Aejmelaeus, *Parataxis,* 180; Caird, *Language*, 123; Tov, "Septuagint Translators", 54 n. 1. Lexica are only known from a later period. Brock, *Septuagint*, 30 n. 1.

[50] See Orlinsky, "Holy Writ", 104; Talmon, "Double Readings", 151. See also Wutz*, Wege*, 450, with examples on 450-56. It is sometimes built on two different vocalizations. Wutz, *Transkriptionen*, 469.

[51] Heller, "Grenzen", 246-47. Cf. Wevers, "Versions", 14; Wevers, "Apologia", 23-24. The difference in language structure between Hebrew and Greek are outlined in Heller, "Grenzen", 246-48; Wevers, "Versions", 16-19.

[52] Beekman, Callow, *Word of God*, 175-211; Bertram, "Sprachschatz", 87, 88; Wevers, "Text History", 399-400; Barr, *Philology,* 170-73.

stereotype renderings was that the Greek language was maltreated.[53] The lexical resources of the Greek language were thus not fully used, although Greek has a very extensive vocabulary.[54]

## 1.5. Theological Influence in the Choice of Equivalents

Methodologically speaking it is essential to leave all possibilities of interpretation open, in order not to let a specific approach control the investigation. If one set out to discuss, for example, theological aspects of the translation, it is of paramount importance not to try to interpret all renderings that can be explained as theologically motivated in that way, but weigh the probability of this solution against all other possibilities of interpretation.[55]

It is only after these types of investigations have been completed that one can with confidence study theological interpretations in the translation. Trebolle had a good understanding of this state of affairs: "Methodologically speaking, however, an argument based on the formal aspects of a given text should take precedence over an argument based on its possible "Tendencies"... Tendenzkritik is very much exposed to the fantasies and the biases of each exegete".[56]

One is able to trace theological motives for the choice of rendering especially in divergences from the ordinary translation equivalents.[57] It can be the question of certain cultic objects where a neutral translation easily could lead to misinterpretations, as for example, holy trees, and altars.[58] The metaphorical designations of God are a field where theologically motivated deviations from the ordinary equivalents seem to

---

[53] Tov, *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint,* 54-57; Barr, "Typology", 305-14. See also Tov, "Dimensions", 535, and *passim*. Cf. Ottley, *Handbook,* 172; Tov, *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint,* 56.

[54] Tov, *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint,* 55 n. 33.

[55] See Wigtil, *Religious Texts,* 26.

[56] Trebolle, "Redaction", 25.

[57] See, e.g., the discussion in Tov, *The Greek and the Hebrew Bible*, 260-63 and in the chapter "Law and Lawbreaking in the LXX Psalms", *passim*.

[58] See, e.g., Daniel, *Cult,* 13-22; Barr, "Wood"*,* 11-20; Churgin, "Targum", 44-47.

be consistent in the LXX.[59] It is true that the ordinary counterparts to Hebrew words at times may have been chosen because of specific theological presuppositions. However, this is hard to demonstrate with any certainty, at least without a very extensive background material in terms of original Greek texts outside the LXX as well as a profound knowledge of the religious connotations of certain terms in the environment of the translators.

Conjectured theological motives behind certain interpretations must of course be in harmony with the time and the milieu in which the translation was carried out and in which the first readers of the translation lived.[60] A translation never emerges in a social, cultural, or religious vacuum.[61] One can take for granted that the translator without being conscious of it was influenced by the religious situation of his time even for the philological analysis of his text. Especially when he comes across words and expressions where he only has an indistinct notion of the meaning, his interpretations may have been influenced by what was reasonable from a theological point of view. It is probable that he expects some form of theological consistency in the Scriptures.[62]

This type of unconscious theological interpretations is of course an inherent part of the translation process per se and I do not consider it as an example of theological influence on the translation on the part of the translator. I deliberately restrict myself to conscious theological influence in the choice of equivalents. The impact of the translation and its interpretation by later generations are also questions distinct from the one I will discuss. It is obvious that the translation became an important factor in the Hellenization of Judaism, but that was hardly the aim of the translators.

That a rendering deviates from an adequate interpretation or translation from a modern perspective can on no account automatically be used as an argument for postulating theological motives in the translation.

---

[59] See, e.g., Bertram, "Sprachschatz", 93-101. In this case, the arguments for a theological motivation behind the renderings are strong. Olofsson, *Rock*, 149-51 and *passim*.

[60] One of the motives behind the choice of a "theological rendering" was to avoid potential misunderstanding, which was natural in the theological milieu of the readers. Bertram, "Sprachschatz", 100-01 and n. 2; Arieti, "Amos", 340-41, 347.

[61] Würtwein, *Text,* 72-73; Flashar, "LXX-Psalter", 86.

[62] See, e.g., Barr, *Philology,* 282, 285.

On the contrary, it is quite natural that the LXX translators' choice of equivalents deviates from what one would have expected in a modern translation, if one considers the situation of the translators. The nature of the original text, the translators' knowledge of Hebrew and the translation technique adopted can often give a plausible explanation to many for a modern interpreter astonishing renderings.

## 2. Jer 2:18 and Theological Exegesis

### 2.1. The Problem Presented

It is against this background that I will look at a specific text, the LXX translation of Jer 2:18, where a theological interpretation suggests itself. The difference between the text of MT שִׁחוֹר and Γηων in the LXX is the point of departure for this study.

וְעַתָּה מַה־לָּךְ לְדֶרֶךְ מִצְרַיִם לִשְׁתּוֹת מֵי שִׁחוֹר
וּמַה־לָּךְ לְדֶרֶךְ אַשּׁוּר לִשְׁתּוֹת מֵי נָהָר:

*What then do you gain by going to Egypt, to drink the waters of the Nile? Or what do you gain by going to Assyria, to drink the waters of the Euphrates? (NRSV).*[1]

καὶ νῦν τί σοι καὶ τῇ ὁδῷ Αἰγύπτου τοῦ πιεῖν ὕδωρ Γηων καὶ τί σοι καὶ τῇ ὁδῷ Ἀσσυρίων τοῦ πιεῖν ὕδωρ ποταμῶν

*And now what have you to do with the way of Egypt, to drink the water of Geon? And what have you to do with the way of the Assyrians, to drink the waters of the rivers?*

Γηων as the choice of equivalent for שִׁחוֹר may be based on theological exegesis, because Gihon as one of the rivers of Eden often represents the basis of life and fertility on the earth in the Old Testament. Furthermore, גַּן־בְּעֵדֶן "garden in Eden" was rendered by παράδεισον ἐν Εδεμ in the Septuagint. It is thus understood as a park or a garden with fruit trees, i.e. an orchard or a royal park,[2] which gives associations to fruitfulness. Jerusalem and Zion was looked upon as a place to which the peoples gathered and a fountain of life, and Israel as the new Eden.[3] The possibility of a conscious misreading of the Greek text here based on an

---

[1] One could emphasise וְעַתָּה more strongly "and now", since it is an important rhetorical particle, which probably signals a discourse shift from past to present. How is it possible to be an ally with Assyria and Egypt now, with the bitter experiences in the past? Thus, Lundbom, *Jeremiah 1-20,* 272.

[2] See Lee, *Pentateuch,* 53-56.

[3] See, e.g., Westermann, *Genesis 1-11*, 295-96; Gunkel, *Genesis*, 8; Zimmerli, *Ezechiel,* 1192, 1199; Snijders, "נהר", 286. Cf. Isa 2:2-5; 51:3; 55:5; Ezek 36:35; Zech 13:1; 14:8-9, and Joel 4:18.

ideological motive cannot be ruled out, but other, more probable, explanations must first be investigated.

For my purpose, it is important to see how the translators of the Septuagint render geographical terms, not least the translator of Jeremiah. What possibilities did they have at their disposal? Then I will go on to take a look at the context of the text that is the basis for my methodological discussion, Jer 2:18, to see if the translator has a different understanding of the text than that found in modern commentaries and translations. Many of the different possibilities to explain an unusual equivalent in the LXX do of course not apply to this particular rendering, but in a presentation of a new method of this kind I prefer to be comprehensive. It is essential to emphasise that it is a basic rule not to make the investigation with a specific tendency in mind, which in fact could be the directing force in the study and not the text itself. It is then very easy to overlook other important factors in the text.[4]

The Greek text of Jer 2:18 seems to be well attested. The variants are few. The most significant for my purpose is Σιωρ instead of Γηων in the margin of codex Marchalianus, in Syrohexapla, Chrysostomus and in οἱ λοιποι. Can Γηων be an early corruption that has permeated the Greek text tradition? It is hardly probable but, on the other hand, it cannot be ruled out. In fact, nearly all transliterations in the Greek manuscript tradition have become corrupted. The confusion of Γ and Σ is common in the LXX.[5] The same is to a certain extent true for N and P.[6] It is also possible that ר and נ in the Hebrew have been mixed up,[7] but the similarity between these letters seems to be confined to the old script, not to the square script proper.

A corruption of the Greek is, according to Wutz, the best explanation to the LXX text of Jer 2:18.[8] Wutz is unfortunately not reliable what concerns the *Vorlage* and the translation technique of the Septuagint.[9] The

---

[4] See especially Wigtil, *Religious Texts,* 24-26.

[5] See Wutz, *Transkriptionen,* 24-25.

[6] Wutz, *Transkriptionen,* 83-84.

[7] See Wutz, *Transkriptionen,* 83-84, and the table of Alphabets in Gesenius, Kautzsch, *Hebrew Grammar*.

[8] Wutz, *Transkriptionen,* 25.

[9] See, e.g., Walters, *Text,* 134-35, 269. Wutz's methodology seems, with a certain exaggeration, to be built on the presupposition that when a confusion between letters in Greek is possible it has also occurred; *idem*, 134-35.

capriciousness in his emendations can only be matched with the unrestricted way in which he discovers hitherto unknown Hebrew words behind the renderings of the LXX.[10] He has made a whole lexicon of such words, which sometimes are built on a reconstructed Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX.[11] Another obstacle for employing the investigations of Wutz for text-critical purpose depends on his theory that the LXX was translated from a transcribed Hebrew text.

On the other hand, his solutions cannot be dismissed entirely since he has revived certain old emendations of considerable value that had fallen into oblivion.[12] Furthermore, the method of Wutz is far more applicable to the corruption of proper names than to the corruption of ordinary words. In *nomina propria,* the miswriting in the LXX was numerous.[13] Wutz is also unsurpassed as a collector of material concerning the transcription of proper names in the LXX.[14] A misreading in copying is, however, not probable since Σιωρ is never read as Γηων or vice versa in the Septuagint.[15] If confusion of these names were plausible, it would also have occurred in other and contextually more improbable places in the LXX. Further arguments could also be adduced against this explanation, as one will see later in this study.

Nothing indicates that the LXX had a *Vorlage* with גִּיחוֹן here. Neither Hebrew text editions, as *BHK* and *BHS*, nor the ordinary commentaries have suggested a different *Vorlage.* It is also intrinsically improbable. גִּיחוֹן in MT is nearly always the Gihon well in Jerusalem, a reference that clearly is impossible here. גִּיחוֹן as the river of paradise never occurs in MT outside Gen 2.

Now one must take a closer look at the meaning of שִׁחוֹר in MT. With a modern understanding of שִׁחוֹר this term fits well in the context. The exact reference is, however, far from certain. שִׁחוֹר can be used as a name of a watercourse that is the southern borderline against Egypt. This is the case in 1 Chr 13:5 and perhaps Josh 13:3. Note especially the similarity

---

[10] See Wutz, *Wege, passim*; Wutz, *Transkriptionen, passim,* and Wutz, *Psalmen, passim.*

[11] Wutz, *Transkriptionen,* 488-518; Wutz, *Psalmen,* 380-95.

[12] Cf. Walters, *Text,* 269.

[13] Cf. Walters, *Text,* 134-35.

[14] Wutz, *Transkriptionen,* 12-36.

[15] שִׁחוֹר is only in Jer 2:18 rendered by Γηων and גִּיחוֹן is never transcribed as Σιωρ in LXX.

between 1 Kings 8:65; 1 Chr 13:5 and 2 Chr 7:8. Then it is identical with נַחַל מִצְרַיִם, the brook of Egypt. It is clearly the border against Egypt in Num 34:5; Josh 15:4 and it is always used as a borderline to the south, mostly in opposition to the northern borderline, Hamath (1 Kings 8:65; 2 Chr 7: 8. Cf. Num 34:5, 8). In 1 Kings 5:1 נַחַל מִצְרַיִם is employed in connection with Euphrates, but not as the western border. The boundary to the west is in fact אֶרֶץ פְּלִשְׁתִּים. See modern translations, as e.g. *NEB*.[16] The brook of Egypt is also named in Assyrian inscriptions as the border against Egypt.[17]

שִׁחוֹר "river", "canal" mainly refers to the eastern branch of the Nile,[18] but it can also be used for the river as a whole.[19] In Jer 2:18 שִׁחוֹר is a designation for the Nile,[20] and the same is true for Isa 23:3.[21] According to Thompson, שִׁחוֹר is employed in derogatory sense in Jer 2:18, that is, with associations to blackness and soot.[22] Cf. Lam 4:8 שְׁחוֹר "blackness", "soot". The reason for the use of this designation instead of יְאוֹר would then be that the name in itself implies that Egypt could be of no help for Israel. This is even more striking if one takes into account that the Nile could be regarded as a god in Egypt.[23] Even if the suggestion fits well in

---

[16] Cf. Snijders, "נהר", 284.

[17] Na'aman, "Brook of Egypt", 68-74; Na'aman, *Borders*, 248 and n. 20.

[18] See Lundbom, *Jeremiah 1-20,* 273; Lambdin, "Shihor"*,* 328; Kitchen, "River"*,* 354. Cf. Boling, Wright, *Joshua,* 337.

[19] The designation שִׁחוֹר may originally have been an Egyptian word for the Nile, Eising, "יאר", 385, or the annual flood of the Nile, Snijders, "נהר", 281, or the name of the marshlands in the North-eastern delta, Wüst, *Ostjordanland,* 33-34 and n. 113-19. The word means the pond or pool of Horus, Si-hor. Myers, *1 Chronicles*, 101; Rudolph, *Jeremia,* 18.

[20] See Rudolph, *Jeremia,* 18; Giesebrecht, *Jeremia,* 9; Volz, *Jeremia,* 14; Bright, *Jeremiah,* 9; Thompson, *Jeremiah,* 171, 174; Weiser, *Jeremia,* 19 and n. 1; Eising, "יאר", 385; Na'aman, *Borders,* 249 n. 25; Wüst, *Ostjordanland,* 33. Cf. "The Nile" in Holladay, *Jeremiah 1*, 52; Carroll, *Jeremiah,* 127. See also *HALAT* "יאר".

[21] Rudolph, *Jeremia,* 18; Rothstein, Hänel, *Ersten Buch der Chronik,* 255; Na'aman, *Borders,* 249 n. 25. Cf. Wutz, *Wege,* 834, who frankly translates שִׁחוֹר with "Nil". See also Weiser, *Jeremia,* 19, "Nilwasser". In *BDB* even שְׁחוֹר in 1 Chr 13:5 is referred to as the Nile, but that is not probable.

[22] Thompson, *Jeremiah*, 174. This is the interpretation in Vulgate. See McKane, *Jeremiah 1*, 38. See also the lexica, *ad. loc.*

[23] See, e.g., Bergman, "יאר", 386.

the polemical context, it is far from convincing, because the parallel expression נָהָר hardly has such associations. Furthermore, in other places where שִׁחוֹר occurs it clearly has a neutral character. See Josh 13:3; 1 Chr 13:5, and Isa 23:3 in context.

The relation between שִׁחוֹר, נַחַל מִצְרַיִם, and נְהַר מִצְרַיִם in the Hebrew text can be described in the following way. נַחַל מִצְרַיִם, is commonly treated as a designation of wādî ‘el-Arîš, but this identification depends to a high degree on the rendering in the LXX of שִׁחוֹר in Isa 27:12, Ῥινοκορούρα, which was situated at wādî ‘el-Arîš, and on later Jewish tradition.[24] Strong argument could be adduced for an alternative reference, wādî Besor.[25] In the Hellenistic age, and perhaps even earlier, the border against Egypt was nearby wādî ‘el-Arîš. This could easily explain the identification of this wādî with the brook of Egypt.[26] שִׁחוֹר can in some cases refer to the brook of Egypt, in other cases it is clearly to be identified with the Nile, Isa 23:3; Jer 2:18. נְהַר מִצְרַיִם in Gen 15:18 is certainly the Nile.[27]

גִּיחוֹן is the name of a well in Jerusalem, probably the so-called "Virgin well".[28] גִּיחוֹן can be found in 1 Kings 1:33, 38, 45; 2 Chr 32:30; 33:14. The well is mentioned in connection with the coronation of kings in Israel. See e.g. 1 Kings 1:33-35

> *And the king said unto them, Take with you the servants of your lord, and cause Solomon my son to ride upon mine own mule, and bring him down to Gihon: and let Zadok the priest and Nathan the prophet anoint him there king over Israel; and blow ye the trumpet, and say, Long live king Solomon. Then ye shall come up after him, and he shall come and sit upon my throne; for he shall be king in my stead; and I have appointed him to be prince over Israel and over Judah.*

---

[24] See Na'aman, "Brook of Egypt", 74; Bar-Deroma, "River of Egypt", 53-56.

[25] Na'aman, "Brook of Egypt", 74-80.

[26] Na'aman, "Brook of Egypt", 79-80.

[27] See Kitchen, "River", 353-54; Lambdin, "Shihor", 328; Snijders, "גיחון", 283-84. Mihelic is, however, more uncertain. Mihelic, "River", 66; Mihelic, "Brook", 66-67.

[28] See *HALAT,* "גִּיחוֹן". See also Eising, "גיחון", 1008; Barrois, "Gihon", 396; Skinner, *Genesis*, 61.

The designation probably derives from גּוּחַ "bust forth", and depends on the fact that water in a natural way busts from the well a couple of times a day.[29] It is also the name of one of the rivers of paradise, Gen 2:13.

## 2.2. The Translation of שִׁחוֹר in the Septuagint

Now one must go on to see how שִׁחוֹר was understood in the LXX. The overall translation technique in Jeremiah can perhaps be labelled "fairly literal".[30] It must also be laid down that the translator of Jeremiah identifies שִׁחוֹר with גִּיחוֹן.[31] In order to understand this rendering one has to see how other translators have interpreted שִׁחוֹר in the Hebrew text. שִׁחוֹר occurs only in Josh 13:3; 19:26; 23:2-3; 1 Chr 13:5 and Jer 2:18.

First, I will look at Josh 13:2-3 in MT and LXX.

זֹאת הָאָרֶץ הַנִּשְׁאָרֶת כָּל־גְּלִילוֹת הַפְּלִשְׁתִּים וְכָל־הַגְּשׁוּרִי:
מִן־הַשִּׁיחוֹר אֲשֶׁר עַל־פְּנֵי מִצְרַיִם וְעַד גְּבוּל עֶקְרוֹן צָפוֹנָה לַכְּנַעֲנִי תֵּחָשֵׁב

*This is the land that still remains: all the regions of the Philistines, and all those of the Geshurites (from the Shihor, which is east of Egypt, northward to the boundary of Ekron, it is reckoned as Canaanite;* (NRSV).[32]

καὶ αὕτη ἡ γῆ ἡ καταλελειμμένη· ὅρια Φυλιστιιμ, ὁ Γεσιρι καὶ ὁ Χαναναῖος· 3 ἀπὸ τῆς ἀοικήτου τῆς κατὰ πρόσωπον Αἰγύπτου ἕως τῶν ὁρίων Ακκαρων ἐξ εὐωνύμων τῶν Χαναναίων προσλογίζεται

*And this is the land that remains: the territories of the Phylistines, the Gesirites, and the Chananites, from the uninhabited land before Egypt to the borders of Accaron on the left of the Chananites it is reckoned ....* (my own translation)

---

[29] See Barrois, "Gihon", 396; Skinner, *Genesis,* 61; Childs, "Eden", 23.

[30] See, e.g., Giesebrecht, *Jeremia,* XXVI-XXXI; Rudolph, *Jeremia,* XXII. See also Tov, "Notes", 75 n. 13. This may be an indication that extensive rewriting based on theological motives are not to be expected. However, that is probably to say too much. A translation can be literal in many different ways. See Barr, "Typology", *passim.*

[31] This follows from the observation that the original text of the LXX had Γηων and that the translation has MT as its *Vorlage.*

[32] עַל־פְּנֵי, however, here means "angesichts", "gegenüber", not "östlich". See Wüst, *Ostjordanland,* 35 n. 121; Na'aman, *Borders,* 247 n. 18.

It is obvious that the translator of Joshua has misunderstood the Hebrew text in many ways. He translated כָּל־גְּלִילֹות "all the regions" with ὅρια "boundaries, bounds, frontier" or "territories, regions",[33] and seems to have rendered שִׁחֹור with τῆς ἀοικήτου "the uninhabited (land)".[34] Probably he does not recognise that it is the name of a watercourse and he has no idea as to the meaning of the word.[35] That this is the case is also confirmed by the other occurrences of שִׁחֹור. Peshitta leaves it without translation, probably for the same reason.[36] Another possibility can perhaps be mentioned, that the translator translated it on purpose in a very general way, because Josh 13:3 and 1 Chr 13:5 gave different information regarding the position of שִׁחֹור.[37]

The alternative that the Greek is a rendering of a different *Vorlage* cannot explain the other differences from a modern understanding of the Hebrew text and no adequate reconstruction of this *Vorlage* of the LXX has been presented, as far as I know.[38] Steuernagel proposes another *Vorlage* here but he does not give any arguments for his view.[39] It is far from certain that the translator understood שִׁחֹור as the frontier between Israel and Egypt.[40] To separate this שִׁחֹור from the other occurrences and identify it with the Syriac word šahûrtā "rough place", "difficult place" is not convincing.[41]

Wutz suggests that שִׁחֹור was transcribed σειων in the *Vorlage* of the Septuagint, which the translator interpreted as שָׁאן "desolation", "waste". He then compares this translation with the rendering of מְשֹׁאָה in Job 38:27,

---

[33] Lust, Eynikel, Hauspie, *Lexicon,* "ὅριον".

[34] Cf. ἀοίκητος "uninhabited, uninhabitable". Lust, Eynikel, Hauspie, *Lexicon,* "ἀοίκητος". There is some uncertainty involved. Cf. Hatch, Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint,* "ἀοίκητος", which does not give any Hebrew equivalent (HR).

[35] See Boling, Wright, *Joshua,* 337; Lambdin, "Shihor", 328; Wüst, *Ostjordanland,* 36 n. 122.

[36] See Wüst, *Ostjordanland,* 37 n. 128.

[37] Wüst, *Ostjordanland,* 36.

[38] Neither *BHK* nor *BHS* indicates that LXX had a different *Vorlage* here. ἀοίκητος has no counterpart that in any way resembles the wording of MT.

[39] Steuernagel, *Josua,* 200.

[40] See, e.g., Steuernagel, *Josua,* 256. The meaning of the Hebrew text is not indisputable on this point either. Although it does suggest, that שִׁחֹור was outside of Egypt. Wüst, *Ostjordanland,* 35-36.

[41] Wüst, *Ostjordanland,* 37 n. 128.

ἀοίκητος.[42] Apart from the far-fetched idea regarding the transcription, Job 38:27 does not exist in the Old Greek, but is an addition from the Hexapla.[43] Moreover, מְשֹׁאָה is derived from שׁאה "to lay waste", a different stem than שׁאן. The interpretation of Wutz presupposes that the translator sometimes or even regularly derived מְשֹׁאָה from the stem שׁאן. This is something that he does not even try to demonstrate. See, for example, the translation of מְשֹׁאָה by ταλαιπωρία in Job 30:3 and by ἀφανισμός in Zeph 11:15.

Now I will go on to see how the translator of Josh 19:26 interpreted שִׁחוֹר.

וְאַלַמֶּלֶךְ וְעַמְעָד וּמִשְׁאָל וּפָגַע בְּכַרְמֶל הַיָּמָּה וּבְשִׁיחוֹר לִבְנָת

*Allammelech, Amad, and Mishal; on the west it touches Carmel and Shihor-libnath* (*NRSV*).
καὶ Ελιμελεκ καὶ Αμιηλ καὶ Μαασα καὶ συνάψει τῷ Καρμήλῳ κατὰ θάλασσαν καὶ τῷ Σιων καὶ Λαβαναθ
*and Elimelek, and Amiel, and Maasa; on the west it borders on Carmel and Zion and Labanath* (B) (my own translation)
καὶ αμαδ καὶ μασαλ καὶ συνάψει τῷ καρμήλῳ κατὰ θάλασσαν καὶ τῷ σιωρ καὶ λαβαναθ
*and Amad, and Masal; on the west it borders on Carmel and Zior and Labanath* (A) (my own translation)

שִׁחוֹר occurs in Josh 19:26 as part of a place-name Shihor-libnath. In contrast, the LXX translator has, according to Rahlfs (with B), understood שִׁיחוֹר as a separate name and translated it by Σιων. The most probable reason for this counterpart is an interchange of consonants in the presumed Hebrew parent text of the LXX. Shihor-libnath does otherwise never occur in the MT and was thus unknown. This may have paved the way for the conjecture. On the other hand, codex Alexandrinus has Σιωρ. Consequently, שִׁחוֹר here cannot be compared with the term in Josh 13:3; Isa 23:3; 1 Chr 13:5 and Jer 2:18. As it does not refer to שִׁחוֹר proper, but is part of a place-name Shihor-libnath (MT), or is a separate name Σιων or Σιωρ (LXX), within the boundary of the tribe of Asher, it is distinguished from the other occurrences.

---

[42] The suggestion of Wutz is from his *Transkriptionen,* 147. However, שָׁאן should not be interpreted as "desolation", "waste", but rather as "destruction".
[43] See Rahlfs, *Septuaginta, ad. loc.*

Now I will se how the translator of Isaiah 23:2-3 interpreted שָׁחוֹר.

<div dir="rtl">

2 דֹּמּוּ יֹשְׁבֵי אִי סֹחֵר צִידוֹן עֹבֵר יָם מִלְאוּךְ׃

3 וּבְמַיִם רַבִּים זֶרַע שָׁחֹר קְצִיר יְאוֹר תְּבוּאָתָהּ וַתְּהִי סְחַר גּוֹיִם׃

</div>

*Be still, O inhabitants of the coast, O merchants of Sidon, your messengers crossed over the sea and were on the mighty waters; your revenue was the grain of Shihor, the harvest of the Nile; you were the merchant of the nations.* (NRSV).

τίνι ὅμοιοι γεγόνασιν οἱ ἐνοικοῦντες ἐν τῇ νήσῳ μεταβόλοι Φοινίκης διαπερῶντες τὴν θάλασσαν ἐν ὕδατι πολλῷ, σπέρμα μεταβόλων ὡς ἀμητοῦ εἰσφερομένου οἱ μεταβόλοι τῶν ἐθνῶν.

 *Whom are the dwellers on the sea-coast become like, the merchants of Phoenicia, traversing the sea in great waters, a generation of merchants? As when a harvest is gathered in, so are the traders of the nations.* (my own translation)

זֶרַע שָׁחֹר is rendered by σπέρμα μεταβόλων "a generation of merchants" in the LXX. The μεταβόλος is the retailer, the small businessman.[44] The translator has obviously read the Hebrew term as √סחר "merchant", "buying-agent",[45] a term that occurs twice in vv. 2-3.[46] √סחר is also in these cases rendered by μεταβόλος, "merchant".[47] However, it is an unusual translation of √סחר. These are in fact the only cases in the LXX as a whole. In Isa 47:15 it is rendered by μεταβολή "exchange, traffic".[48] Nevertheless, the usual equivalent to √סחר, both in Isaiah and in the rest of the LXX as a whole is ἔμπορος, another Greek term for "merchant, trader".[49] In fact, √סחר is rendered by ἔμπορος in Isa 23:8 and by ἐμπορία "market, trade, business" in 23:18 (2x).[50] ἔμπορος is the real

---

[44] See van der Kooij, "Isaiah 23", 43 and n. 30.

[45] That LXX had a different *Vorlage* can probably be excluded. See, e.g., *BHK, BHS,* and the commentaries of Isaiah.

[46] See, e.g., van der Kooij, *Textzeugen,* 68. That the word is written *defective* may have facilitated the wrong derivation, although one cannot take for granted that it was written likewise in the *Vorlage* of the LXX.

[47] See, e.g., Lust, Eynikel, Hauspie, *Lexicon,* "μεταβόλος".

[48] See, e.g., Lust, Eynikel, Hauspie, *Lexicon,* "μεταβολή".

[49] Lust, Eynikel, Hauspie, *Lexicon,* "ἔμπορος".

[50] Lust, Eynikel, Hauspie, *Lexicon,* "ἐμπορία".

merchant, the trader.[51] The translator emphasises in this context that the merchants, μεταβόλος, of Tyre were dependent on the successful businessmen, ἔμποροι, in Phoenicia.[52]

One could suspect that שַׁחַר was translated by dictation and that the rendering in LXX depends on a mishearing. Nevertheless, the phonetic similarity can be explained easier and with good reason in a different way.[53] The translator may have regarded שַׁחַר as a different spelling of סחר. Similar phenomena do occur in the Hebrew.[54] Probably it is the question of an *al-tigré* interpretation built on sound associations.[55] This kind of interpretation has as one point of departure the translator's problem in understanding the Hebrew text.[56]

The differences in the interpretation do not only affect שָׁחוֹר, but other Hebrew words in Isa 23:2-3 as well. קְצִיר יְאוֹר may have been an early interpretive gloss to זֶרַע שַׁחַר, because זֶרַע is ambiguous.[57] Nevertheless, LXX evidently had the text of MT.[58] That the translator left יְאוֹר תְּבוּאָתָה and וַתְּהִי without counterpart can be given a reasonable explanation.[59] Moreover, the same is true for the rendering of דמו and קְצִיר.[60]

Here a good case could be made for the suggestion that the translator has contemporised the text as a fulfilment of the prophecy of Isaiah. The translator saw the destruction of Carthage in 146 BC as the event

---

[51] Van der Kooij, "Isaiah 23", 43.

[52] See van der Kooij, "Isaiah 23", 43, 49 n. 30, 31.

[53] See Tov, *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint,* 200-03.

[54] See, e.g., Gesenius, Kautzsch, *Hebrew Grammar*, §19.

[55] Van der Kooij, *Textzeugen,* 68. Cf. van der Kooij, "Isaiah 23", 42. Examples of *al-tigré* interpretation can be found also in other places of Isaiah. See van der Kooij, *Textzeugen,* 67-68.

[56] It is generally admitted that this translator's knowledge of Hebrew was poor. See, e.g., Caird, "Homoeophony", 88. Cf. van der Kooij, *Textzeugen,* 66.

[57] It could refer to people as well as to grain. Cf. LXX. See Duhm, *Jesaja,* 167. *BHK* suggests that only יאור is a gloss.

[58] Some commentators regard MT as corrupt and delete יאור and ותהי because of the LXX. See, e.g., Wildberger, *Jesaja*, 855-56, and partly *BHK*. But Cf. *BHS*. However, LXX of Isaiah can only with the outmost caution be used for text critical purposes. See especially van der Kooij, *Textzeugen,* 65. lQIsa^a and 4QIsa^a support MT. See van der Kooij, "Isaiah 23", 42.

[59] See van der Kooij, "Isaiah 23", 39-41, 44-45.

[60] See van der Kooij, "Isaiah 23", 42. זרע has evidently been interpreted in harmony with μεταβόλος.

prophesied of by Isaiah and that has affected his understanding of the text as a whole.[61] Anyhow, it is obvious that the translator was not aware of the right meaning of שַׁחַר.

In the end I will look at the interpretation of שִׁיחוֹר in 1 Chr 13:5.

<div dir="rtl">

וַיַּקְהֵל דָּוִיד אֶת־כָּל־יִשְׂרָאֵל מִן־שִׁיחוֹר מִצְרַיִם וְעַד־לְבוֹא חֲמָת

לְהָבִיא אֶת־אֲרוֹן הָאֱלֹהִים מִקִּרְיַת יְעָרִים:

</div>

*So David assembled all Israel from the Shihor of Egypt to Lebo-hamath, to bring the ark of God from Kiriath-jearim. (NRSV).*[62]

καὶ ἐξεκκλησίασεν Δαυιδ τὸν πάντα Ισραηλ ἀπὸ ὁρίων Αἰγύπτου καὶ ἕως εἰσόδου Ημαθ τοῦ εἰσενέγκαι τὴν κιβωτὸν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκ πόλεως Ιαριμ.

*So David assembled all Israel, from the borders of Egypt to the entrance of Hamath, to carry in the ark of God from the city of Jarim. (my own translation).*

The translator has not understood שִׁיחוֹר as a proper name. Obviously, he has tried to give this word a reasonable interpretation in the context.[63] From this and related passages, he could infer that the text described the whole land of Israel, from the southern border to the northern. The translator could profit from the fact that נַחַל מִצְרַיִם, the frontier against Egypt, and שִׁיחוֹר are interchangeable in two similar texts (1 Kings 8:65 and 1 Chr 13:5), as well as the parallel text in 2 Chr 7:8. The rendering ὁρίων Αἰγύπτου "frontiers of Egypt" may have been a guess from the context. In the choice of equivalent the translator has probably been influenced by texts like 1 Kings 2:46k; 10:26a; 2 Chr 9:26, which have ὁρίων, where MT has the singular form.[64] If he had understood the word he would of course have transcribed it as Σιωρ, or rendered it by a modern

---

[61] See the argument in van der Kooij, "Isaiah 23", and van der Kooij, *Textzeugen,* 66. Cf. the evaluation of Caird, "though he constantly mistranslates ... he frequently does so deliberately". Caird, "Homoeophony", 88.

[62] Wüst suggests that this text presuppose a correction of the position of שִׁיחוֹר given in Josh 13:3. Wüst, *Ostjordanland,* 36, 38 and n. 131.

[63] The difference in the description between Josh 13:3 and here may have paved the way for the employment of this general counterpart. Wüst, *Ostjordanland,* 36.

[64] See Rahlfs, *ad. loc.,* and BHK, BHS.

geographical name.[65] Especially in the prophetic books, it was not uncommon to give well-known places their Greek names.[66] The earlier translations had, as one can see obviously no clear idea as to the reference of the word.

## 2.3. The Translation Technique in Jer 2

Now I will turn again to Jer 2:18. One can see that this translator, like his colleagues, did not know the meaning of שִׁיחוֹר. His translation was made with the help of the context and it was easy for him to draw the right conclusion that the Nile was meant. From the context, it is obvious that שִׁיחוֹר was the name of a watercourse, probably a river that was typical for the country. This is perhaps even stronger emphasised in LXX than in MT. לְדֶרֶךְ מִצְרַיִם has been interpreted as "the way of Egypt", that is, characteristic for the way of life in Egypt. On the other hand, it may be just a stereotype translation that does not imply a specific interpretation.

שִׁיחוֹר stands in parallel to נָהָר in Assyria, that is, the Euphrates.[67] Another question now turns up: If the translator understood שִׁיחוֹר as the Nile, why did he not use his ordinary equivalent of Hebrew יְאוֹר? יְאוֹר is the most common word for the Nile in the MT,[68] but it is not really a proper name,[69] and it is not regarded as such in the LXX. An indication of this state of affairs is that יְאוֹר occurs in the plural.[70] יְאוֹר nearly always has ποταμός as counterpart in the Septuagint.[71] Thus, יְאוֹר is never translated

---

[65] See Redpath, "Geography", *passim*.

[66] Redpath, "Geography", 300-02. This was even more common in the apocryphal books. Cf. Talshir, "1 Esras", 140-42.

[67] See, e.g., Weiser, *Jeremia,* 19 n. 2; Bright, *Jeremiah,* 10; Thompson, *Jeremiah,* 171, 174; Lundbom, *Jeremiah 1-20,* 273.

[68] It occurs 65 times in MT and it always refers to the Nile or branches of this river, except in Dan 12:5, where it is used for Tigris, and Job 28:10*,* where it has the meaning "(water filled) galleries of a mine". See Lisowsky*,* "יאר"; *HALAT,* "יאר"; Eising, "יאר", 385.

[69] See  Eising, "יאר", 385. The word has mostly the definite article. This is always the case in Genesis, Exodus, and Daniel. *Ibid.*

[70] Ex 7:19; 8:1; 2 Kings 19:24; Job 28:10; Ps 78:44; Isa 7:18; 19:6; 33:21; 37:25; Ezek 29:3, 4, 5, 10; 30:12; Nah 3:8. See Lisowsky*,* "יאר"; *HALAT,* "יאר"; Eising, "יאר", 385. None of them have in fact recorded all the occurrences.

[71] Sometimes διῶρυξ "channel" is employed as equivalent. Ex 7:19; 8:1; Isa 33:21. This is also an adequate interpretation. See, e.g., *NRSV*. LXX has ποταμούς, i.e., the plural, at least once when MT has יְאוֹר in a singular form. See

by Νεῖλος, which is a name that was employed already by Hesiod in his *Theogony*.[72] The ordinary equivalent would, however, be impossible here since נָהָר when denoting Euphrates, is always rendered by ποταμός in LXX. נָהָר "river" without explicit reference can also be used of the Nile.[73]

   To translate both שִׁיחוֹר and נָהָר with ποταμός would violate fundamental principles of translation, since variation in the parallelism is strictly adhered to in most LXX books, especially if two different Hebrew words are employed in MT. In, for example, the LXX Psalms, the translator sometimes introduces variation in the translation, even when the same Hebrew word is used twice in the parallelism. Besides, a translation without variation here would really be puzzling for the reader. The translator does not identify שִׁיחוֹר with נַחַל מִצְרַיִם, which could have given him an opportunity to an alternative rendering. נַחַל מִצְרַיִם is usually translated by χείμαρρος Αἰγύπτου "the brook of Egypt".[74] Once it is translated by φάραγξ Αἰγύπτου "the valley of Egypt" or "the ravine of Egypt" (Josh 15:4), and once by Ρινοκορούρα (Isa 27:12).[75] It is to be identified as a town with this name on the border between Israel and Egypt, a town that sometimes belonged to the one and sometimes to the other country.[76] נַחַל מִצְרַיִם is once translated by ποταμός Αἰγύπτου (1 Kings 8:65). The last rendering is an unusual translation of נַחַל in LXX. Rengstorf's suggestion that the equivalent here depends on the fact that ποταμός Αἰγύπτου was a stereotype equivalent for the border against Egypt is wrong.[77] When נַחַל מִצְרַיִם clearly signifies the borderline against Egypt,[78] it is rendered by χειμάρρος Αἰγύπτου. Otherwise ποταμός Αἰγύπτου always refers to the Nile in the LXX.[79]

---

Ezek 29:9. It is, however, not improbable that the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX had the plural form. See *BHK* and *BHS*.

[72] See  Redpath, "Geography", 300.

[73] See  Isa 19:5; Jer 46:7-8; Ezek 32:2, and perhaps also Isa 18:2, 7.

[74] Num 34:5; Josh 15:47; 2 Kings 24:7; 2 Chr 7:8.

[75] See, e.g., Redpath, "Geography", 302.

[76]  See Pape, *Eigennamen*, 1308. Cf. Redpath, "Geography", 302; Na'aman, "Brook of Egypt", 74; Bar-Deroma, "River of Egypt", 53-56.

[77] Rengstorff, "ποταμός", 597. However, see *idem*. n. 16, where he modifies his statement.

[78] Num 34:5; 2 Chr 7:8.

[79] Gen 15:18; Am 8:8; 9:5.

The translators made a distinction between גִּחוֹן (or גִּיחוֹן),[80] a well in Jerusalem, transcribed Γειων, Γιων or Γιον in the LXX,[81] and גִּיחוֹן, the paradise river, which was transcribed Γηων.[82] The LXX in Jer 2:18 has Γηων and refers thus to Gen 2:13.[83] The river גִּיחוֹן is as a rule identified with the Nile in both Jewish and Christian tradition.[84] This may also be the case in Sir 24:27 (37).[85] Another early support for this interpretation is Genesis Apocryphon from Qumran, which was probably written in the first half of the second century BC.[86] In a supplement to Gen 13:17 in Genesis Apocryphon, a description of how Abram obeys the order of God in Gen 13:17, has been inserted. This is a technique of harmonization, which also occurs in other translations and paraphrases.[87] In this supplement גִּיחוֹן is identified with נְהָר מִצְרַיִן "the river of Egypt",[88] which in Hebrew form in MT, נְהָר מִצְרַיִם refers to the Nile.[89] There can be no doubt that the author of the scroll identified נְהָר מִצְרַיִן with the Nile or a part of

---

[80] In 2 Chr 33:14 the well is *plene* written in MT and there thus not distinguished in orthography from the river.

[81] See Hatch, Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint*. Supplement, "Γειων, Γιων, Γιον". In addition, Josephus uses Γειων, but certain manuscripts (V, L) have Γηων. See Schalit, *Flavius Josephus*, 33. It is interesting to see that the Targum has modernised the description by employing שִׁילוֹחָא "Shiloah" in 1 Kings 1:33. Cf. Peshitta. See, e.g., *BHK*.

[82] See Hatch, Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint*. Supplement, "Γηων". Josephus has also Γηων. Rengstorff, *Concordance*. Suppl. I, 35.

[83] See Giesebrecht, *Jeremia*, 9; Skinner, *Genesis*, 61; Eising, "יאר", 385. It is inconceivable that the translator referred to the well in Jerusalem.

[84] See Skinner, *Genesis,* 61; Childs, "Eden", 23. Cf. Procksch, *Genesis,* 26; Westermann, *Genesis,* 297.

[85] It is based on an emendation. See e.g. *NRSV, NAB, NJB*, Gunkel, *Genesis*, 9 and Eising, "יאר", 385. It supported by the close context, Sir 24:24-27 (34-37).

[86] See, e.g., Fitzmyer, *Genesis Apocryphon,* 14-17 and n. 44-51. The manuscript was probably from 50 BC-70 CE. *Idem*, 12-13 n. 34-40. One can, however, not exclude that the Qumran manuscript is the original. *Idem*, 12,16. In that case it could be considerable older.

[87] See Tov, "Harmonizations", 7.

[88] See the text of Genesis Apocryphon. Fitzmyer, *Genesis Apocryphon,* 21:11, 15.

[89] It occurs only in Gen 15:18. See, e.g., Snijders, "נהר", 283. This text is sometimes emended to נחל, in with 2 Kings 24:7, but without sufficient reason. Cf. *BHK*; *BHS*; Fitzmyer, *Genesis Apocryphon,* 131.

the Nile.[90] The Carmon River in 19:11 is probably one of the arms of the Nile, which the author regarded as the borderline against Egypt. The border is later identified with "the River of Egypt", 21:11, or "Gihon", 21:15, 18, in the text of Genesis Apocryphon.[91] This is in line with the description of the river Gihon in the book of Jubilees 8:15, 22.[92] Josephus also identifies גִּיחוֹן with the Nile.[93]

The proposal that גִּיחוֹן refers to the Nile is thus a very early interpretation that is followed in the first half of the second century BC by Sirach and the Genesis Apocryphon, in the last part of the second century by the book of Jubilees and in the beginning of our era by Josephus. The oldest evidence is more or less contemporary with the translation of Jeremiah.[94] The identification of גִּיחוֹן with the Nile is thus in accordance with the meaning of the Hebrew, and supported by old interpretations.

Moreover, כּוּשׁ, which גִּיחוֹן is said to encircle or roam through, is identified with Αἰθιοπία in Gen 2:13.[95] This is also the most common rendering in the LXX.[96] Likewise, Αἰθιοπία is always equivalent to כּוּשׁ.[97] One cannot take for granted that the translators knew of any *exact* location

---

[90] See Avigad, Yadin, *Genesis Apocryphon,* 32; Fitzmyer, *Genesis Apocryphon,* 131-32, 135; Snijders, "נהר", 284, 290.

[91] See Fitzmyer, *Genesis Apocryphon,* 97. Cf. Snijders, "נהר", 290-91.

[92] See Avigad, Yadin, *Genesis Apocryphon,* 32; Fitzmyer, *Genesis Apocryphon,* 135.

[93] Josephus, *Antiquities,* 1.1,3 §39. See Rengstorff, *Concordance.* Suppl. 1, 35; Fitzmyer, *Genesis Apocryphon,* 135.

[94] The LXX translation of Jeremiah is probably from the second century BC.

[95] The rendering "encircle" is open to criticism since סבב often means to "change direction" and the verb can be used for "to roam through a country". See *KBL,* "סבב"; *HALAT,* "סבב". See, e.g., the translation of Gen 2:11, 13 in Mitchell, "Eden"*,* 333, "winding through". Thus, also *JPS, NAB, NIV, NJB*. On the other hand, the verb in qal with an ack. obj. has, according to Lopez, the meaning "umgeben", "umkreisen". See Lopez, "סבב", 734. The same is true for the reference to Gen 2:11, 13 in *KBL, HALAT*.

[96] Redpath, "Geography", 292-93. Cf. Gunkel, *Genesis,* 9. כּוּשׁ and כּוּשִׁי are also rendered by Αἰθίοψ. Hatch, Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint. Supplement*, "Αἰθίοψ".

[97] See Hatch, Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint. Supplement*, "Αἰθιοπία". A few times there are no Hebrew equivalent among the canonical books, Esth 3:12, 13; 8:12; Dan 3:1.

of כּוּשׁ,[98] but this identification supports the suggestion that Γηων is a name of the Nile in Jer 2:18.

It is interesting to see that in the promise to Abram the land should extend "from the River of Egypt to the Great River, the river Euphrates", Gen 15:18 (*NEB*). LXX as a rule clearly distinguishes between נְהַר מִצְרַיִם Gen 15:18, יְאוֹר מִצְרַיִם, Isa 7:18; Am 8:8; 9:5, which both are translated by ποταμός Αἰγύπτου, and נַחַל מִצְרַיִם. The only exception is 1 Kings 8:65.[99] The translators of LXX evidently did not try to harmonise the promise of the land to Abram and Moses, Gen 15:18; Ex 23:31, with the description in Josh 15:4, 47.[100]

Other aspects of the LXX translation of Gen 2:11-14 also support the identification of גִּיחוֹן with the Nile in Jer 2:18. The common opinion among the commentators is that of the four rivers of the paradise חִדֶּקֶל is the same as Τίγρις and פְּרָת is the Εὐφράτης. This is also the interpretation in the LXX. The translator has employed their Greek designations, Τίγρις and Εὐφράτης. Regarding the two other rivers, some commentaries presuppose that they were unknown rivers in the northern Babylonia, mythological entities,[101] and the names are in that case not proper names, but rather appellatives.[102] Others try to identify גִּיחוֹן and שִׁיחוֹר with known rivers. גִּיחוֹן is said to encircle the land of כּוּשׁ, usually regarded as equivalent to Sudan, Ethiopia, or Nubia.[103] The equivalent of

---

[98] Cf. Redpath, "Geography", 292.

[99] נַחַל מִצְרַיִם as a southern borderline is rendered by ποταμός Αἰγύπτου in 1 Kings 8:65. The parallel passage, 2 Chr 7:8, has the expected equivalent, χειμάρρους Αἰγύπτου.

[100] Cf. Snijders, "נהר", 284. However, there may be a different conception involved. Gen 15:18; Ex 23:31, along with Deut 1:7; 11:24; Josh 1:4, reflect, according to Na'aman, the "ideal land" of the Deuteronomists, which was promised in the days to come. Na'aman, *Borders,* 69, 245-46.

[101] See Gunkel, *Genesis,* 9; Westermann, *Genesis,* 296; Eising, "גיחון", 1010.

[102] פִּישׁוֹן is derived from פּוּשׁ "spring forth" and גִּיחוֹן from גוּח "burst forth". See Procksch, *Genesis,* 24; Westermann, *Genesis,* 296; Childs, "Eden", 22; Eising, "גיחון", 1010; Snijders, "נהר", 286. The names are as a matter of fact more suitable for wells than for rivers. Westermann, *Genesis,* 296.

[103] Regarding Sudan, see, e.g., Westermann, *Genesis,* 297-98. A few commentators rather suggest that כּוּשׁ is the land of the Kassites. See, e.g., Speiser, *Genesis*, 20. Cf. Westermann, *Genesis,* 298; Procksch, *Genesis,* 26. Regarding Ethiopia, see Childs, "Eden", 23 and regarding Nubia, see Kitchen, "Cush"*,* 283. Cf. Westermann, *Genesis,* 297-98.

the LXX is as one can see in harmony with this identification.[104] Although no reference of גִּיחוֹן is generally accepted,[105] the Nile is the oldest and most common interpretation.

To locate פִּישׁוֹן is even harder.[106] This river encircles הַחֲוִילָה, which seems to suggest a location in SW Arabia, Gen 10:29, or NE Arabia, 25:18.[107] Primitive Christianity was of the opinion, according to Josephus, that פִּישׁוֹן referred to Ganges.[108]

Many commentators look upon Gen 2:10-14 as a geographical gloss that tries to locate Eden on the map of that time.[109] The LXX interpretation appears to be in line with this point of view, since כּוּשׁ is rendered by Αἰθιοπία in Gen 2:13 and the translator gives the two well-known rivers Euphrat and Tigris their modern names, but that is not the case with גִּיחוֹן and פִּישׁוֹן, which together with חֲוִילָה are transcribed.[110]

The LXX translator usually transliterated the geographical terms, but in certain cases, he employed their Greek names.[111] He seldom used the Greek names in the Pentateuch, which may depend on that the translators followed a scrupulous adherence to the original text of the law.[112] The reverence was presumably less for other parts of the Old Testament.

Another possibility is that the uncertainty regarding the geographical names in the Pentateuch was greater than their counterparts in the rest of the Old Testament. Even today, there is no consensus regarding the identification of many places mentioned in the Bible. When the translator

---

[104] Other Greek designations, which as a rule are employed instead of transcriptions, are Αἴγυπτος and Συρεία/Συρία. Redpath, "Geography", 292-93. See also Hatch, Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint. Supplement*, "Αἴγυπτος, Συρεία (Συρία)".

[105] See, among others, Childs, "Eden", 23; Mitchell, "Eden", 333.

[106] See, e.g., פִּישׁוֹן in *HALAT* "die Identifikation mit einem bestimmten fluß ist kaum möglich u. umstritten", 20. Cf. Westermann, *Genesis,* 298.

[107] Childs, "Eden", 23.

[108] Josephus, *Antiquitates,* 1 §38f. See Procksch, *Genesis,* 26. Other old identifications were mostly confined to Babylonia. Ibid.

[109] See Skinner, *Genesis*, 62; Gunkel, *Genesis*, 9. Cf. Eising, "גיחון", 1010. Westermann is more cautious. Westermann, *Genesis*, 294-95.

[110] חֲוִילָה also occurs in Gen 10:7, 29; 25:18; 1 Sam 15:7; 1 Chr 1:9, 23, where it is also transcribed or has no counterpart, 1 Chr 1:23. פִּישׁוֹן is only employed in Gen 2:11; Sir 24:25 (35). Cf. Skinner, *Genesis,* 59-60.

[111] Redpath, "Geography", 291-92.

[112] Redpath, "Geography", 296-97.

knew what the proper name referred to he could employ the Greek designation, as for example, Τίγρις and Εὐφράτης. The rendering of יְאוֹר shows that this was not always the case. In the prophetical literature, it was more common to employ 'modern' equivalents instead of transcriptions.[113]

## 2.4. The Historical Background of Jer 2

Now I will look at Jer 2:18 in a historical perspective. An early version of Jer 2 may have come into existence early in the ministry of Jeremiah, while Assyria was still at the height of its power, that is, before the death of Ashurbanipal, 627 BC.[114] The final version of chap. 2, however, is of a later date, since v. 16 probably refers to circumstances concerning the death of Josiah.[115] The historical reference in v. 15 is obscure,[116] but the train of thought of vv. 15-16 is clear: Israel is warned not to gain its strength from or live in close relation to Assyria or Egypt.[117] Instead, the Israelites must believe in Yahweh, their God, v. 13. This is a common theme in the prophetical literature, not the least in Jeremiah and Isaiah. The people shall not rely upon human allies, as Egypt or Assyria, but put their confidence in Yahweh and his power.[118] In the historical context, it is probably directed against a confederation with Egypt or Assyria, since

---

[113] Redpath, "Geography", 300, with many examples on 300-02, 305-06. In this perspective the rendering in Jer 2:18 is not exceptional. נוף is translated in 2:16 by its Greek name, Μέμφις.

[114] Bright, *Jeremiah,* 17; Thompson, *Jeremiah,* 172-73. Carroll means that one has no basis for the dating of the chapter. Egypt and Assyria in 2:18 is dressed in stereotypical language, and the text does not reflect a specific historical situation. Carroll, *Jeremiah,* 127-28.

[115] Bright, *Jeremiah,* 17-18; Thompson, *Jeremiah,* 173-74; Holladay, *Jeremiah 1*, 95. Cf. however, Lundbom, who argues that the original meaning of the oracle was that Egypt was an unreliable ally, which would attack Judah. He refers to Isa 30:1-7; Jer 2:36; 37:7; Lam 4:17. However, the oracle took a new meaning after the death of Josiah in 609. Lundbom, *Jeremiah 1-20,* 272. Lundbom argues that the whole chapter may have been written prior to 612. Lundbom, *Jeremiah 1-20,* 274.

[116] Thompson, *Jeremiah,* 173.

[117] See Volz, *Jeremia,* 14; Rudolph, *Jeremia,* 19; McKane, *Jeremiah 1*, 38.

[118] See, e.g., Isa 30:15-18; 31:1. Cf. Isa 36:6, 9; Jer 2:36-37; Ezek 29:16. Bultmann, "ἐλπίς", 520 n. 37, 38. See also Thompson, *Jeremiah,* 174, who refers to Isa 30:1-5.

they were countries that in the past only had caused Israel trouble.[119] Both pro-Egyptian and pro-Assyrian groups had a strong influence on the foreign policy of Israel.[120] The lions in v. 15 refer either to Assyria,[121] or to Egypt or Babylonia.[122] Noph and Tahpanhes in this context represent Egypt. Noph was on the caravan route leading to Palestine.[123] It was probably a residential town of Psammetichus 1 (664-610 BC) during the time of Jeremiah, that is, in the 26th dynasty.[124]

The translator of Jeremiah seems to have understood the text as a whole in the same way. All geographical names in Jer 2, that is, Kittim, Kedar (v. 10), Noph, Tahpanhes (v. 16), Egypt, Assyria, the River =Euphrates (v. 18) are of neutral character in the sense that they are not merely symbols. This does not exclude that some of the proper names had a metaphorical function in the context, that is, Noph and Tahpanhes.[125] In the LXX, the geographical terms are transcribed, with the exception of Noph and Tahpanhes. נֹף is given its Greek counterpart, Μέμφις. Tahpanhes is called Ταφνας. This suggests that the translators correctly

---

[119] Volz, *Jeremia,* 14; McKane, *Jeremiah 1*, 38; Holladay, *Jeremiah 1*, 95; Lundbom, *Jeremiah 1-20,* 272-73. Both pro-Egyptian and pro-Assyrian groups had a strong influence on the foreign policy of Israel. Bright, *Jeremiah,* 14; Weiser, *Jeremiah,* 25; Thompson, *Jeremiah,* 174. The lions in v. 15 either refers to Assyria, Thompson, *Jeremiah,* 173-74; Volz, *Jeremiah,* 21, or to Egypt or Babylonia. Lundbom, *Jeremiah 1-20,* 271, 274. In Jer 4:7 the lion is a metaphor for Babylonia. Lundbom, *Jeremiah 1-20,* 336-37. Noph and Tahpanhes in this context represent Egypt. Noph was on the caravan route leading to Palestine. Lundbom, *Jeremiah 1-20,* 27. It was probably a residential town of Psammetichus 1 (664-610 BC) during the time of Jeremiah, that is, in the 26th dynasty. See, e.g., Kitchen, "Tahpanhes"*,* 1236. The Israelites who fled to Egypt after the murder of Gedaliah, Jer 41, settled in Noph and Tahpanhes, Jer 43:7; 44:1.

[120] Bright, *Jeremiah,* 14; Weiser, *Jeremiah,* 25; Thompson, *Jeremiah,* 174.

[121] Thompson, *Jeremiah,* 173-74; Volz, *Jeremiah,* 21.

[122] Lundbom, *Jeremiah 1-20,* 271, 274. In Jer 4:7 the lion is a metaphor for Babylonia. Lundbom, *Jeremiah 1-20,* 336-37.

[123] Lundbom, *Jeremiah 1-20,* 27.

[124] See, e.g., Kitchen, "Tahpanhes"*,* 1236. The Israelites who fled to Egypt after the murder of Gedaliah, Jer 41, settled in Noph and Tahpanhes, Jer 43:7; 44:1.

[125] See McKane, *Jeremiah 1*, 37.

equated Tahpanhes with the Pelusian Δάφνη, which was mentioned by Herodotus.[126]

It is probable that in this context, neither שִׁחוֹר in MT nor Γηων in LXX are meant to signify the border against Egypt, נַחַל מִצְרַיִם. שִׁחוֹר stands in parallel to נָהָר, that is, the Euphrates. They are rivers characteristic of Egypt and of Assyria. The difference between נַחַל and נָהָר in the Hebrew is also fundamental. נַחַל refers to a wādî, which carries water only in the rainy season, in the winter it has dried up and is equivalent to a valley or rather a glen, while נָהָר is a river with perennial water.[127]

The translators of the LXX as a rule distinguished between נַחַל and נָהָר. נַחַל is mostly translated by χειμάρρους "torrent, brook" (79x),[128] that is, a stream that flows in the winter, or φάραγξ "valley", "ravine" (37x),[129] and sometimes by ποταμός "river, stream" (11x).[130] נָהָר is except in two cases rendered by ποταμός (115x).[131] The translation equivalents of נַחַל may have been chosen depending on which aspect that came to the fore. In that case, the translators have tried to transmit knowledge about, for

---

[126] See Kitchen, "Tahpanhes", 1236; Lambdin, "Tahpanhes", 510; Holladay, *Jeremiah 1*, 94, Cf. McKane, *Jeremiah 1*, 37. The Greek name of the town, Δάφνη, is a case of popular etymology. Lambdin, "Tahpanhes", 510.

[127] Snijders, "נחל", 361-62; Snijders, "נהר", 283; Rengstorff, "ποταμός", 596-97. That is the reason why it is mainly the great rivers as Euphrates, Tigris, and the Nile, which are designated נָהָר in MT. Rengstorff, "ποταμός", 596-97; Snijders, "נהר", 283.

[128] Lust, Eynikel, Hauspie, *Lexicon,* "χειμάρρους". χείμαρρος, χειμάροος or χειμάρρους is "a ravine or narrow valley in which a stream flows during the rainy season, but which is in general dry during the dry season". See Louw & Nida, *Greek-English Lexicon,* "χείμαρρος". The claim in Liddell, Scott, Jones, *Greek-English Lexicon,* "χείμαρρος", referring to Num 34:5, that χειμάρρους by way of exception could be employed for a river is misleading. The lexicon has been lead astray by the wrong translation "river of Egypt" in AV. See Caird, "Lexicon II", 151.

[129] Lust, Eynikel, Hauspie, *Lexicon,* "φάραγξ".

[130] Lust, Eynikel, Hauspie, *Lexicon,* "φάραγξ". For the different equivalents of נַחַל, see Muraoka, *Hebrew/Aramaic Index,* "נחל".

[131] πλήμμυρα Job 40:23, κατακλυσμός Sir 39:22. See Muraoka, *Hebrew/Aramaic Index,* "נהר". But Lisowsky has only 112 examples of נָהָר and *HALAT,* 120, while Snijders has 131 examples. See Lisowsky "נהר"; Snijders, "נהר", 290. Cf. Eising, "יאר", 385. Snijders, "נהר", however, probably includes the Aramaic נְהַר. See Hatch, Redpath, *Concordance to the Septuagint*, "ποταμός".

example, the water level in different seasons of the year that makes one or the other designation most fitting.[132]

It is noteworthy that the stream from the temple well in Ezek 47 that constantly grows, is called ποταμός in Ezek 47:6, 7, 12, probably because of the abundance of water, although MT has נַחַל.[133] The rendering of נַחַל in Josh 13:9, both χειμάρρους and φάραγξ, is obviously well thought out, since it in the first case is the question of a town located at the shore of the brook Arnon and in the other case a town that is placed in the middle of Arnon.[134] Sometimes, the variation appears to be haphazard.[135]

The translator's deficient knowledge of the meaning of the term שִׁחוֹר and the restricted number of translation equivalents available are enough to explain the rendering in Jer 2:18. Certain theological motives need not to be presupposed. The only striking feature in the translation of the LXX, if my interpretation is accepted, is as a matter of fact the plural form of ποταμός as equivalent to the Hebrew נָהָר in singular form,[136] which could suggest that the translator had the rivers of paradise, חִדֶּקֶל and פְּרָת in mind. On the other hand, these ought to have been rendered by Τίγρις and Εὐφράτης if the readers should understand this allusion, since פְּרָת has Εὐφράτης and חִדֶּקֶל has Τίγρις as counterpart in Gen 2:14. חִדֶּקֶל is translated by Τίγρις in Dan 10:4. In Dan Th חִדֶּקֶל is transcribed.[137] This would again be in opposition to the prevalent translation technique in the LXX. נָהָר is as a rule not rendered by Εὐφράτης or Τίγρις, depending on its reference, in the Septuagint. The only exception seems to be Ex 23:31,

---

[132] See Bertram, "Sprachschatz", 89.

[133] See Rengstorff, "ποταμός", 596-97; Grigsby, "John 7:37-39", 105.

[134] See Bertram, "Sprachschatz", 89-90. This town has puzzled many Old Testament scholars. See the discussion in Wüst, *Ostjordanland,* 133-43.

[135] See, e.g., the rendering of נַחַל מִצְרָיִם in Josh 15:4, φάραγξ Αἰγύπτου and 15:47, χειμάρρους Αἰγύπτου.

[136] נָהָר in the singular is generally translated by ποταμός in the singular in LXX, and especially if it refers to a specific river, as Euphrates, Tigris or Jordan. See Lisowsky, "נהר"; Hatch, Redpath, *Concordance to the Septuagint.* Supplement, "Εὐφράτης, Τίγρις".

[137] In Dan Th some Mss rendered it by the "modern" equivalent. See Hatch, Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint. Supplement*, "Τίγρις"; *HALAT,* 920. Both חִדֶּקֶל and פְּרָת, in contrast to נָהָר and יְאוֹר, are regarded as proper names in the LXX.

where the need for clarification is obvious also in MT.[138] The rendering of LXX in Jer 2:18 is perhaps a reflection of the translator's need of completeness, without allusions to the paradise rivers. Why should the translator only mention Euphrates when Tigris is as representative for the "land of the two rivers"? A corruption in the Greek text can probably be excluded, since ποταμός here has no Greek variant.[139] This study leads to a negative conclusion regarding theological motives behind the rendering in LXX of Jer 2:18.[140]

It is not enough to draw conclusions regarding theological motives for a certain translation *only* based on the difference in meaning between the Hebrew text and the LXX and connect it directly with theological speculations or hermeneutics attested later on in the history of interpretation.

It is essential that a sound methodology for the study of theological influences in the Septuagint and other old versions be established. I do hope that this provisional sketch of such a methodology can be of some value for future studies in this important field of research. There are of course cases where theological influence have without doubt played a significant role, but I do think that if this approach is applied one can see that there are several possibilities that must be investigated first if one tries to explain striking rendering in the LXX.

---

[138] Hatch, Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint. Supplement*, "Εὐφράτης". In the Targum נהר is rendered by "the Euphrates" and שִׁחוֹר by "the Nile" in Jer 2:18. See McKane, *Jeremiah 1*, 38.

[139] See Ziegler, *Ieremias, Baruch, Threni, Epistula Ieremiae, ad. loc*.

[140] See, e.g., the treatment of the translator's cultural milieu in 1 Esra. Talshir, "1 Esras".

# 3. Consistency as a Translation Technique

## 3.1. The Problem Presented

This methodological study is written in order to stimulate discussions regarding the advantages and weaknesses in the current methods employed in the study of translation technique. It will also suggest a more exact vocabulary and definition of consistency and make propositions regarding to what degree and in which sense consistency can be employed as a criterion of a literal translation technique.

### 3.1.1. Background

"The background and the employment of stereotyped renderings needs to be discussed in greater detail."[1] This statement of E. Tov is a suitable starting-point for my discussion. It is true that some interesting methodical studies of this technique in LXX and other ancient versions have been carried out. The most comprehensive studies are perhaps those of J. Heller, J. Barr and to a certain extent that of E. Tov.[2] On the other hand, there are important methodological aspects with practical consequences for Septuagint research, which have not been discussed in recent literature, as far as I know. Although some of the observations made here may be of more theoretical than practical nature, they have implications for the study of translation technique of the Septuagint.

### 3.1.2. Terminology

Both the definition of "consistency" and the use of this term in LXX research are open to discussion. First, a certain amount of terminological confusion exists since this feature has been given many different designations. Tov calls it "stereotyped representation",[3] or "consistency",[4]

---

[1] Tov, "Dimensions", 533 n. 11.
[2] See, e.g., Heller, "Grenzen", 234-48; Barr, "Typology", 305-14; Tov, *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint*, 54-57.
[3] Tov, "Dimensions", 533. This term is ultimately derived from Flashar, "LXX-Psalter", 105, who uses the designation "stehenden (stereotypen) Übersetzungen".
[4] Tov, *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint*, 54.

Sollamo "stereotype tendency".[5] Rife speaks about "systematic representation"[6] and Nida about "concordant relationship".[7] Rabin uses "verbal linkage"[8] and Ottley "representative principle".[9] The term "representative principle" covers consistency in the use of grammatical phenomena, especially the representation of tenses.[10] On the other hand, "verbal consistency" or "verbal concordance" is employed only for consistency in the use of lexical equivalents.[11] The same seems to be true for the term "standard equivalents".[12] Otherwise, the terms are used without distinction to cover both lexical and grammatical consistency, although it is mostly the question of lexical equivalents. The choice of a proper term for this translation technique, or better, two different designations, one for grammatical phenomena and one for lexical, would be definite step forward. Perhaps one could use the terms "lexical consistency" and "grammatical consistency".[13] Admittedly, this is a minor problem.

### 3.1.3. Consistency as an aspect of literality

A more serious matter is the employment of consistency per se as a marker of a literalism. It is true that consistency in many cases creates lexical Hebraisms, which are to be regarded as signs of a literal translation.[14] Therefore, consistency is often treated as an aspect literalism,

---

[5] Sollamo, *Semiprepositions*, 13. She employs the term "stereotype" where "in a given book one counterpart covers at least 50 per cent of all translated cases". *Idem*, 13.

[6] Rife, "Mechanics", 246.

[7] Nida, *Science,* 156. In Nida, Taber, *Translation*, 208, the designation "verbal consistency" is employed.

[8] Rabin, "Character", 8.

[9] Ottley, *Handbook,* 121-25. Ottley's view of the translation of tenses anticipates that of Sailhamer. *Idem*, 121-24; Sailhamer, *Ps 3-41*, 213-14.

[10] Ottley, *Handbook*, 121-25.

[11] Nida, Taber, *Translation*, 208. See also *idem*, 14-22.

[12] See Tov, "Dimensions", 533-38.

[13] See now the use of these terms in Wade, "Tabernacle Accounts", chap. 3 and 4.

[14] See, e.g., Tov, "Dimensions", 533, 535. I will use "literality", "literalism", and "literalness" as synonymous terms.

and this is true in many respects.[15] Nevertheless, it is essential to point out the limitations of this understanding.

Tov proposes that one can measure the degree of consistency by employing a statistical approach.[16] One can then speak about "the only rendering", "the main rendering", and so on. This is perfectly true. However, my question is: Is it possible to employ the statistics of consistency in measuring the literality of a translation?[17] Tov seems to advocate this: "The degree of stereotyping apparent in the translation units of the LXX reflects their literalism."[18]

Nevertheless, in my opinion some scholars have rightly emphasised that consistency hardly per se is a criterion of literality.[19] That a methodological problem is involved in the use of consistency as an indication of literalness is implicitly confirmed by Tov when he writes that a "majority of stereotyped renderings do not cover *all* meanings of a given Hebrew word."[20] Another quotation further emphasises the problem.

> Since the consistent representation of Hebrew words by one Greek equivalent often was more important to the translator than contextually plausible renderings, their technique was bound to do injustice to several Greek words. Therefore, the translators frequently used a stereotyped equivalent of a Hebrew word when the meaning of the Hebrew did not suit that of the Greek.[21]

An implication of these statements is that *some* of the stereotyped renderings cover their Hebrew counterparts completely. In fact, "translators achieved a high degree of consistency, not because they were particularly trying to do so, but because a particular word was the really

---

[15] See, e.g., Tov, *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint*, 54-57. Cf. Barr, "Typology", 305-14. Barr has important reservations. *Idem*, 306-07.

[16] See Tov, *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint*, 57 with references.

[17] I of course limit myself to the literality as far as consistency is concerned.

[18] Tov, *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint*, 57. Tov uses "consistency" and "stereotyping" without discrimination. See Tov, *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint*, 54-57.

[19] Sollamo, *Semiprepositions*, 284; Barr, "Typology", 306-07.

[20] Tov, *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint*, 56.

[21] Tov, "Dimensions", 535. Note the use of "also often".

natural one in their language and could be used repeatedly without strain."[22]

## 3.1.4. Important factors for consistency as a sign of literality

I would emphasise that consistent translations that completely cover their Hebrew counterparts must be excluded if consistency should be employed as a criterion of literality.

One of Tov's examples of consistency will make this clear: ἥλιος must, according to Tov's definition, be regarded as a stereotype equivalent to שֶׁמֶשׁ since this Hebrew term is nearly always (131x) rendered by ἥλιος. Only twice a different equivalent occurs, ἔπαλξις "defence, bulwarks, battlements",[23] Isa 54:12, and ἔλεον Ps 83 (84):12. In these cases, the Hebrew word has a different meaning.[24]

Here one may argue that all kinds of translations would have employed ἥλιος as equivalent of שֶׁמֶשׁ, since it is a natural rendering that matches the Hebrew counterpart perfectly, apart from the few occurrences of a different meaning of the Hebrew word. Furthermore, hardly any real Greek synonyms exist, although αἴγλη, ἅλως, αὐγή, φοῖβος, λαμπάς may occasionally be used for the sun. However, only λαμπάς and αὐγή occur in the LXX, even though never with the denotation "sun". Despite the impressing statistics, it is not to be taken for granted that the consistent translation of שֶׁמֶשׁ by ἥλιος should be regarded as a sign of literality since both literal and free translations have employed the same equivalent.[25]

In order to make a right evaluation the phrases in which the Hebrew word occur must also be taken into consideration since the translation of these may differ even though the semantic meaning of both the Hebrew and the Greek word match each other. The force of this example depends on which the natural counterparts are for expressions like בּוֹא שֶׁמֶשׁ(הַ),[26] or

---

[22] Barr, "Typology", 306.

[23] Lust, Eynikel, Hauspie, *Lexicon,* "ἔπαλξις".

[24] See the lexica and commentaries. In Ps 84:12, it is probably employed for a shield as a divine epithet. The meaning "sun-dial" in Isa 38:8 does not seem to have been recognised by the LXX translator.

[25] Tov argues that the lexical choice be expected, but not the frequency. Tov, "Dimensions", 534.

[26] Gen 15:12, 17; 28:11; Ex 17:12; 22:25; Lev 22:7; Deut 16:6; 23:12; 24:13; Josh 8:29; 10:27; 2 Sam 2:24; 3:35; 1 Kings 22:36; Isa 60:20; Jer 15:9; Amos 8:9; Mic 3:6; Eccl 1:5; 2 Chr 18:34.

מְבוֹא (הַ)שֶּׁמֶשׁ,[27] and מִזְרַח (הַ)שֶּׁמֶשׁ.[28] Are they δυσμῶν ἡλιόυ or only δυσμῶν, ἀνατολῶν ἡλίου or ἀνατολῶν?[29] In LXX, the translators employed δυσμῶν ἡλίου rather than δυσμῶν and ἀνατολῶν ἡλίου rather than ἀνατολῶν.[30]

This is an example of a frequently attested Hebrew term, and *frequency* is an important factor in the evaluation of the degree of consistency, at least from a practical point of view. If one employs an equivalent that is used for a certain Hebrew term that occurs only a few times, for example, five times, or even less, it is evident that the use of a single Greek word must be used with great caution as a sign of literalism.[31] A slight alteration in the numbers based on, for example, Greek variants or a different *Vorlage*, would change the figures, and thus the picture of the literal translation technique, drastically. Furthermore, the variations in subject matter, context, and so on in the Hebrew have small chances to balance out each other if the occurrences are few.[32]

Another factor that must be taken into account *is the semantic range of the Hebrew word*, or to put it another way, how many different meanings the word in question has in context, as evidenced by, for example, a standard Hebrew lexicon. If a term with a wide semantic range only had one Greek equivalent, it is more probable that this translation be regarded as a stereotype equivalent than if the word only had one well-defined meaning. For example, it is *a priori* reasonable to assume that the rendering of פָּקַד by a single Greek equivalent is to be treated as a sign of literalism.[33] On the other hand, the consistent employment of σελήνη as a translation of יָרֵחַ is more or less expected in any kind of translation.

---

[27] Deut 11:30; Josh 1:4; 23:4; Zech 8:7; Mal 1:11; Pss 104:19; 113:3.

[28] Num 21:11; Deut 4:41, 47; Josh 1:15; 12:1; 13:5; 19:12, 27, 34; Judg 11:18; 20:43; 21:19; 2 Kings 10:33; Isa 41:25; 45:6; 59:19; Mal 1:11; Pss 50:1; 113:3.

[29] δυσμή is nearly always and ἀνατολή often used in the plural. See, e.g., Blass, Debrunner, *Greek Grammar*, § 141:2. Cf. Liddell, Scott, Jones, *Greek-English Lexicon*, "δυσμή, ἀνατολή". In non-biblical Greek, both of them could be used. *Idem*.

[30] However, ἀνατολῶν ἡλίου sometimes renders מִזְרח (Josh 4:19; 13:8) and sometimes קֶדֶם (Job 1:3; Isa 9:11; 11:14).

[31] Cf. McGregor, *Ezekiel*, 53.

[32] See, e.g., the discussion in McGregor, *Ezekiel*, 53.

[33] This argument presupposes that the translator knew the different meanings of the word.

One further factor ought to also be discussed in this connection*, the resources of the target language*. Along these lines, for example, a Greek word may have existed that matched the Hebrew word in question even though it has an extensive semantic range. Perhaps צְדָקָה can be taken as an example of the first-mentioned situation. This is a Hebrew word with a fairly wide semantic range even though no real consensus regarding the different meanings exists.[34] The sense of the word is also partly tied to the genres of the texts and a chronological aspect is probably also involved.[35] Its basic meaning is conformity to a norm, a custom, or a relationship.[36] Apart from "righteousness, justice", and less common meanings as "legal claims, honesty, truth, godliness, assistance", especially in the Psalter and in Isa 40-66, it is, employed for "victory, salvation and Yahweh's sphere of influence".[37]

The standard equivalent of this Hebrew word is δικαιοσύνη. It is used in 134 out of 157 occurrences of צְדָקָה. A few other equivalents are employed, δίκαιος (5x), δικαίωμα (3x), ἐλεομοσύνη (16x), ἔλεος (3x), ἐυφροσύνη (1x) and κρίμα (2x).[38]

δικαιοσύνη is, just as the Hebrew word, employed of conformity to a norm.[39] One disregards the specific associations of צְדָקָה in the Old Testament related to conformity to Yahweh's will and especially concerned with Yahweh's relation to his people, mostly in a treaty context.[40] Such connotations are hard for any Greek word to reflect, deeply involved as they are in the cultural and religious history of the people of Israel. δικαιοσύνη clearly matches the most frequently attested meanings of צְדָקָה "righteousness, justice". The semantic overlap between the terms in the eyes of the translators was probably great.[41] However, "salvation, victory" are not within the semantic range of the Greek term, and the same is true for "blameless behaviour, assistance". The last-

---

[34] See especially Koch, "צדק", 514-18. Cf. Quell, Schrenk, "δίκη", 197.

[35] Cf. Koch, "צדק", 518-30; Hill, *Meanings,* 98.

[36] Hill, *Meanings*, 84-85, 97. Cf. Quell, Schrenk, "δίκη", 197.

[37] Koch, "צדק", 514-29; Hill, *Meanings*, 89, 91-92, 95-96.

[38] The statistics is built on Santos and thus not completely reliable. However, this hardly affects the argument. See Santos, *Index*.

[39] Cf. Hill, *Meanings*, 99-100, 102.

[40] Cf. Hill, *Meanings*, 85-86, 103.

[41] Cf. Hill, *Meanings*, 104. For the meaning of the Greek term in non-biblical Greek, see especially Quell, Schrenk, "δίκη", 194-95; Hill, *Meanings*, 100-01.

mentioned meanings are more or less covered by ἐλεομοσύνη and ἔλεος with cognates.[42] "Salvation, victory", which are unusual senses that mostly occur in later texts, were probably not known to the translators of LXX,[43] even though ἔλεος at least partly covers the meaning "salvation".[44] This explanation is more probable than that they have disregarded the difference in meaning and automatically employed a consistent equivalent.

Admittedly, it is also possible to stress the differences between δικαιοσύνη and its Hebrew counterpart.[45] But this does not alter the basic issue at stake here, that even if it from the outset may be expected that a Hebrew word with a wide semantic range should have more equivalents than a word with a narrow semantic range, it also depends on the lexical resources of the target language.

The opposite may also apply, that the Greek had no adequate equivalent to a Hebrew word, although the meaning of the word is obvious and well defined. An example is the rendering of the Hebrew words for "locust". Hebrew has 12 terms for different kinds of locusts,[46] while Greek has only a few words that are used as equivalents in the LXX, ἀττέλαβος, βροῦχος.[47] That the LXX translators as a rule rendered אַרְבֶּה, גֹּב, with cognates, as well as חָגָב and יֶלֶק with the generic term ἀκρίς "locust" is hardly a sign of a certain translation technique but may be an indication that few suitable equivalents exist. Therefore, the resources of the target language as regards lexical equivalents cannot be disregarded in an investigation of consistency as a sign of literality.

The resources of the target language have also a grammatical aspect that influences the translation. Consequently, a distinction could be made

---

[42] Hill, *Meanings*, 104 and n. 2; Quell, Schrenk, "δίκη", 198.

[43] Cf. Hill, *Meanings*, 102-04, and 104 and n. 2. The possibility that a later semantic development of the Greek word lead to conformity with the Hebrew in this respect cannot be excluded. See, e.g., Hill, *Meanings*, 109. Perhaps the development in this direction had started at an early date in the translation of the LXX since δικαιοσύνη is equivalent to חֶסֶד in Genesis. See Quell, Schrenk, "δίκη", 197.

[44] Cf. Quell, Schrenk, "δίκη", 197; Hill, *Meanings*, 104 n. 2.

[45] Cf., e.g., Hill, *Meanings*, 103.

[46] Three of them probably refer to successive stages of the immature locust. See Palmoni, "Locust", 145.

[47] ἀττέλεβος only occurs once, Nah 3:17 (rendering אַרְבָּה), but βροῦχος is more common (10x).

between different grammatical categories. Generally speaking, a pronoun is easy to translate in a consistent way from Hebrew to Greek, it is harder with a noun, but a verb is much more complicated to render with a certain equivalent.[48] This means that the consistent translation of a verb is as a rule a better sign of a literal translation than the consistent translation of a noun.

Another factor that is of some significance is the limitations in *on the translator's knowledge of Hebrew*, since it is his understanding of the Hebrew words that must be the point of departure for an investigation of translation technique. In practice, however, it is of course hard to distinguish between sheer ignorance and conscious neglect of the meaning of a word in favour of a technique of stereotyped renderings. That this is not pure theory but has practical implications is evident from the fact that Aquila, despite that he had a better knowledge of Hebrew and Greek than many of the Septuagint translators, more or less consistently used this technique. However, in translations where *marked* divergences in the meaning of a Hebrew word are not reflected in the choice of equivalents and the term or certain meanings of the term seldom occur, the renderings probably depend on the translator's lack of knowledge of Hebrew.[49]

To use the whole of the LXX in the investigation of consistency is also misleading since the LXX is, as is well known, a collection of translations, each with own its distinct vocabulary and translation technique. However, from a methodological point of view consistent renderings that are found in one translation unit are identical with such renderings in the whole of the LXX.[50] Nevertheless, the opposite is of course not true. As a result, one cannot treat inconsistent renderings in LXX as a whole and inconsistent rendering in one translation unit in the same way. A broad spectrum of equivalents in the LXX may be a collection of consistent translations from many different translators. An example of this is the equivalents of יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת, which differ *between* rather than *within* the LXX books.[51] The use of completely different

---

[48] See Heller, "Grenzen", 234-48. For a discussion of these and similar problems in a more comprehensive way, see Wevers, "Text Criticism", 15-19.

[49] See Tov, "Dimensions", 533. This is a common experience in LXX. See Tov, "Septuagint Translators", 55-70. It is in many cases also possible to decide if the individual translator recognised the meaning of a given word or construction.

[50] Tov, "Dimensions", 535.

[51] See, e.g., Dodd, *Bible*, 16-17.

consistent equivalents in various LXX books is, however, rare which shows that there exists continuity in the choice of equivalents in LXX.[52]

It must be emphasised that a translation can be consistent, although it does not reflect the meaning of the word that it renders, according to modern lexica.[53] Consequently, a standard translation of שֶׁמֶשׁ by "star" as well as יָרֵחַ by "sun", though incorrect, would of course be considered a consistent equivalent. This is another aspect of the axiom that it is *the translator's understanding* of the Hebrew, which is the basis for an investigation of translation technique.[54]

I have tried to show that before employing a consistent rendering as a sign of literality in absolute sense several aspects ought to be taken into account: *the semantic range* of the Hebrew word, *the lexical and the grammatical resources* as well as *the demands of the target language*. The *frequency* of the Hebrew term in question and the translators' *knowledge of Hebrew* are also of importance for a right evaluation of literality. To treat consistency generally as a sign of literality is misleading. As a result, consistency cannot be treated statistically as an aspect of literality if one disregards important aspects that can influence the validity of the statistics.

Methodologically speaking, consistency can fairly well be employed as a criterion of literality between different translations into the same target language, e.g. Greek, of one and same Hebrew text, and partly as a criterion of literality when different books of the LXX are compared, but hardly at all as a criterion of literality in absolute sense. This depends on that the evaluation of translation technique must be based *on both* the Hebrew text, that is, the *Vorlage*, and the way it was rendered by the translator.[55]

A comparison of consistency, as well as other aspects of literalism, between different books, is not without problems. In this case, the target language is the same. Thus, one can disregard the word-field of the

---

[52] I think that the magnitude of different stereotyped renderings is somewhat exaggerated by Tov. Cf. Tov, *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint*, 55 "often".

[53] See, e.g., Tov, "Dimensions", 533; Tov, *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint*, 56.

[54] Cf. Tov, "Dimensions", 529-30, 532, 536, 541.

[55] See, e.g., Soisalon-Soininen, "Wiedergabe", 99. See also McGregor, *Ezekiel*, 27-30, where the influence of the context on the evaluation of translation equivalents is discussed with illuminating examples.

language into which the translation is made, but differences between the Hebrew texts in their contexts ought to be taken into consideration. More specific, the use of a term in phrases and idioms, in formulaic or non-formulaic language, as well as the use of a Hebrew word in a poetic text in contrast to a historical description are factors that could affect the reliability of the statistics. Even the genre of the text could affect the choice of translation equivalents.

Another problem is that a text where a Hebrew word is only employed in a specific sense can hardly be adequately compared with a text where the ordinary sense of the word dominates in any translation. The only exceptions are Aquila and some of the recensions of the LXX. If the translation technique differs radically, the comparison can be more or less misleading.

The more of the factors previously mentioned that are constant, the more reliable become the differences in statistical terms. Two translations of a given Hebrew text, to one and same language can adequately be compared as regards the consistency of the equivalents, and statistical differences would then really measure differences of translation technique, presupposing that the translators' knowledge of Hebrew (and Greek) is more or less on the same level.

Nevertheless, in a comparison of less literal translations the above-mentioned factors have a greater effect on the comparison than if two literal translations were compared. One reason for this is that a literal translation is *based on separate words*, whereas a less literal translation can make phrases or even whole verses the point of departure for the translation technique.[56] To study separate words is the usual, but not the only possible, basis for the study of consistency. Statistics built on the study of separate words gives more correct results for literal than paraphrastic translations. To put it another way, the more the translator takes the meaning of the Hebrew and the demands of the target language into account, the more misleading becomes statistics that is built on the rendering of single words, regardless of the context.

The differences in the knowledge of Hebrew among the translators as well as the demands and resources of the target language are partly without influence in a strictly literal translation. In a translation based on stereotyped equivalents can to a certain degree be disregarded, the

---

[56] Cf., e.g., Barr, "Typology", 294, 297.

differences in meaning within the Hebrew word and between the Hebrew word and the Greek equivalent.

I suggest that the aspects that affect the possibility to employ consistency as a sign of literality in absolute terms are the following:

1. *The semantic range of the Hebrew word*
2. *The resources and the demands of the target language*
3. *The genre and other characteristics of the Hebrew text*
4. *The frequency of the Hebrew word*
5. *The translator's knowledge of Hebrew*
6. *The unit on which the translation is based, viz. word, phrase, sentence*
7. *The Vorlage of the Greek word*

However, the translator's knowledge of Hebrew, the unit on which the translation is based, be it word, phrase or sentence and the *Vorlage* of the Greek word, are not translation technical factors per se; although they are important aspects for an understanding of consistency as a translation technique.

One way to study consistency that overcomes some of the weaknesses in an ordinary statistical treatment is to investigate the different meanings of a word separately. In that way, one can eliminate at least the problem with the different semantic range of Hebrew words. This is in line with the approach of the investigators of translation technique of the LXX in Finland, I. Soisalon-Soininen, A. Aejmelaeus, and R. Sollamo. In practice, however, the influence of the semantic range of a word also depends on the translation technique. The more consistent the translator is in the choice of equivalents, the less problem are shaped by the differences in semantic range between the Hebrew words, since they in that case are treated as symbols rather than words in ordinary sense.[57] A translation of Aquila's type, which totally disregards differences in meaning within a word, apart from polysemic or homonymous words,[58] may give an adequate picture of the degree of literality in this respect. This is, however, not the case with the translators of LXX generally.

Nevertheless, even if one takes the different meanings of a word as the point of departure one cannot always give an adequate picture of the literality of the versions. Another factor is also involved, which seldom is

[57] Cf. Tov, "Dimensions", 535, 536.
[58] Cf. Barr, "Typology", 308-10.

taken into account: *the consistency from the viewpoint of the target language.* מְצוּדָה "fortress" as divine epithet in the book of Psalms is an example. It is always rendered by καταφυγή "refuge" (6x) in contrast to the equivalents when the literal meaning of the word is involved. This is a good example of the necessity that separate meanings of a word are taken into consideration when lexical consistency is studied. Here is clearly a case of conscious consistency in the use of translation equivalents. On the other hand, καταφυγή is a translation of מִשְׂגָּב (2x), מַחְסֶה (1x) and מָעוֹן (3x) as divine epithets. It is also once used for מָנוֹס and once for סֵתֶר in connection with God, and once even for מַחְסֶה in literal meaning in LXX Psalms. Even though מְצוּדָה as a divine epithet is consistently rendered, the Greek equivalent is not only counterpart to this Hebrew word, it is also employed for other terms and in that way it is not really a consistent translation.

Another example is עֹשֶׁר "riches". It is a word with a well-defined semantic range and it always has an adequate equivalent, πλοῦτος (44x) "wealth, riches" in LXX as a whole. This is a very good example of a consistent equivalent in LXX with impressive statistics. On the other hand, πλοῦτος is a rendering of nine different Hebrew words, גֵּו, אוֹצָר, גְּדוּלָה, רְכֻלָּה, עֹשֶׁר (with cognates), כָּבוֹד, חַיִל, הָמוֹן, הוֹן and שֶׁפַע. If one *only* takes the Hebrew term as point of departure for the definition of consistency one does not make any distinction between words, which are exclusively, rendered by an equivalent that is not employed for any other word and an equivalent that is used for several Hebrew words. For example, כּוֹבַע,[59] or קוֹבַע "helmet" (variant spelling),[60] is only rendered by περικεφαλαία "covering for the head, helmet" (8x) in LXX and περικεφαλαία is always a translation of כּוֹבַע or קוֹבַע.

A distinction ought to be made here, otherwise the translation of מְצוּדָה as a divine epithet by καταφυγή, עֹשֶׁר by πλοῦτος as well as the rendering of כּוֹבַע by περικεφαλαία must be treated as consistent renderings on the same level, that is, as Hebrew words with only one equivalent. A suitable term, which denotes that the Hebrew word is always rendered by an equivalent in Greek that is never employed for any other Hebrew word, could be "reciprocal consistency" in contrast to "consistency".

---

[59] 1 Sam 17:5; 2 Chr 26:14; Isa 59:17; Jer 46:4; Ezek 27:10; 38:5.
[60] 1 Sam 17:38; Ezek 23:24.

The proposed distinction does not only concern the precision in the definition of consistency it also has a bearing on the evaluation of literality. This is obvious if one displays the consequences in extreme cases of the usual definition of consistency, which is the best way to test the implications of a certain method or definition.

If consistency is defined *only* from the equivalents of the Hebrew term,[61] a translation where nearly all distinctions *within* and *between* words are abolished must be regarded as a "consistent" translation, because semantic accuracy is not part of the definition. A "reciprocally consistent" translation, in my definition, could rub out in extreme cases all the distinctions *within* a Hebrew word, but not between words. If only the usual definition of consistency is employed it is theoretically possible to make a translation of the LXX Psalms with only a few equivalents that would be regarded as consistent if every Hebrew word only had one equivalent, but not if every term was translated by two or three Greek equivalents. This is of course both impossible and absurd, not least since one reason for the introduction of consistent renderings was to improve the semantic accuracy of the translations, even though it seldom turned out that way.[62]

The equivalents of the Greek words as well as the equivalents of the Hebrew ought thus to be taken into account in a comprehensive investigation of consistency. The type of consistency that is a sign of literality is one where the translators *deliberately aimed at increased regularity* in the choice of equivalents, despite that the outcome was a translation where the nuances of the original were rubbed out and the target language was not employed in a natural way. Barr has put forward the term "stereotyping" for this kind of consistency.[63] A good example is the rendering of a word with a wide semantic range, פְּקֻדָּה "guard, administration, vengeance, visitation, fate, mustering, what is stored up"

---

[61] See, e.g., the more or less explicit definition of consistency in Barr, "Typology", 305; Tov, *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint*, 54. Barr discusses a one-to-one relationship in both directions and regards it as a further step in literalism. *Idem*, 311.

[62] Barr, "Typology", 316-17. In technical details of the tabernacle or other words with a limited semantic range, where LXX is inconsistent Aquila is the semantic more accurate translation.

[63] See Barr, "Typology", 310. He clearly distinguishes it from mere consistency. *Idem*, 310-11.

(Holladay), which in Aquila is translated by the more or less synonymous words, ἐπίσκεψις "inspection, visitation" and ἐπισκοπή "watching over, visitation".[64] Cf. LXX where, although the equivalents do not always express the right nuance of the word, far more of the variations of meaning are reflected.[65] When consistency is used as a criterion of literalism, that is, stereotyped consistency, according to my definition, the semantic accuracy cannot be overlooked, since a stereotyped translation consciously ignores the distinctions in meaning within Hebrew words.

Another aspect of stereotyping is the consistent choice of a given equivalent for one Hebrew word and another for a synonymous term. Thus, the consistent use of ἐκκλησία for קָהָל and συναγωγή for עֵדָה in LXX Psalms are not a reflection of distinctions in meaning between either the Hebrew or the Greek words but the result of a conscious stereotyping policy.[66] Consequently, stereotyping refers to the deliberate policy, not only the lack of semantic accuracy.[67]

A consistent rendering, especially in LXX as a whole, is of course often a stereotype, but not by definition. Not even a reciprocally consistent rendering is always a stereotype, in the suggested sense of the word. Reciprocally consistent renderings may also occur in translations that are regarded as less literal, as Symmachus in the book of Psalms.[68] It is true that if a translation has rendered all the Hebrew words in the original in a consistent way it is always the question of a stereotype translation since no languages have the same distribution of semantic elements and consequently words never match each other completely between the languages.

---

[64] See Liddell, Scott, Jones, *Greek-English Lexicon*, "ἐπίσκεψις, ἐπισκοπη". It is true that "what is stored up" (Holladay) or "store" (Lisowsky) is not represented in Aquila, otherwise this translation has one or two examples of at least the main meanings "mustering, office, charge, visitation" (Lisowsky).

[65] ἀριθμός, ἐκδίκησις/ἐκδικήσις, ἐπάγειν, ἐπίσκεψις, ἐπισκοπή, ἐπίσκοπος, ἔργον, θυρωρός, καθιστάναι, μυλών, προστάτης. See Muraoka, *Hebrew/Aramaic Index*, "פקדה".

[66] See the illuminating discussion in Flashar, "Psalter", 101-03. The few exceptions depend on the aim for variation within a verse. *Idem*, 103.

[67] Cf. Barr, "Typology", 310.

[68] See for example ναός as consistent equivalent of הֵיכָל 5:8; 26 (27):4; 44 (45):9; 47 (48):10; 67 (68):30, and הֵיכָל of ναός. The same also applies for אֶרֶץ and γῆ. The statistics is based on the remnants of Symmachus Psalms noted by Busto Saiz, *Simaco*.

## 3.2. Current Methods in the Study of Translation Technique

I will now try to relate these methodological propositions to the kind of scholarly work that tries to estimate the degree of literality in different books of the Septuagint. There is one type of investigations with data based alignment of the Hebrew and Greek texts with E. Tov and G.R. Wright as editors (*CATSS*) going on. These alignments are from time to time used as a basis for investigations of the relative degree of literality in different books or translation units of the LXX.[69] This approach overcomes some of the factors that prevent consistency from being used as a criterion of literality, but not all of them.

Hence, the fact that the statistical figures are more accurate as regards the more literal translations than the more paraphrastic LXX books ought be discussed. That the more freely rendered books of the Septuagint are hard to compare with statistical methods depends on several different factors. The genre and other characteristics of the Hebrew text are in these books far more influential than in other books. Furthermore, the translation is not bound to the word level, sometimes idiomatic expressions are the point of departure for the translator.

Another problem is that the semantic range of the Hebrew word investigated must be taken under consideration. The difficulties based on the semantic range of the Hebrew are to a certain degree overcome when the comparison concerns LXX books with a high degree of stereotyped renderings, since small semantic distinctions between the uses of Hebrew words in different contexts are not taken into consideration in these translations. Accordingly, מוֹעֵד is usually rendered by ἑορτή in Lamentations, whether it refers to the appointed time or to the appointed place. However, the distinction between different meanings in polysemic words is mostly adhered to. Therefore, פַּ֫עַם in the LXX is of course rendered by καιρός (or a synonymous word) where the sense is time and by πούς where it means "sole of the foot".

In a stereotype translation, the equivalents are not seen as expressions of the semantic meaning of the Hebrew terms in context, but rather as symbols for these terms. This makes them very suitable for a comparison of the degree of consistency. Here it could be a great help to use the computer. One advantage with the data-based statistical comparisons made between the LXX books as regards the translation technique is that

---

[69] See, e.g., Tov, Wright, "Criteria", 158-87.

many different aspects of literality could be investigated with results that even though not reliable in detail would give an impression of the general literality of the translation units. However, it is essential that the different aspects of literality, as outlined by J. Barr and E. Tov, be measured separately since they are, as pointed out by Barr, not necessarily interrelated.[70]

The differentiation between various meanings within a word, the use of the term in phrases and so on are taken into consideration in the work of the LXX-scholars from Finland, who form an important centre of LXX research. As a result, the problems created by the nature of the Hebrew text are taken into account. On the other hand, these investigations are confined to the study of one or a few aspects of literality and can hardly be generalised as indications of the overall literality of translation units or even the literality as far as consistency is concerned.

It would of course be an advantage if one were able to combine different aspects of literality to give a more or less complete picture of the translation technique of a given book. However, to make a sum out of the different figures, in order to compare the literality of the LXX books, ought to be avoided. If applied it must be followed by a discussion of the relationship between different aspects of literality and the weaknesses in the statistical material must be brought out clearly. The reasons for this are that a version is as a rule a combination of literal and free aspects of translation and the different aspects of literality could occasionally be adversely, rather than complementary, related to each other. It is especially important that those aspects of literality that more or less contradicts each other are not combined.

This means, for example, that the division of the text into elements or segments and the order of these elements should not be combined with the quantitative addition or subtraction of elements since they are often adversely related. Therefore, if the word order of the original is followed one in many languages *has* to make additions in the translation. Furthermore, if the elements are divided below the word level, which sometimes is the case with Aquila, this technique in itself becomes rather a mode of free translation. The semantic accuracy is contrary to both stereotyping and the etymological indication of relationships in the original language as translation techniques. If the level of the text and the level of the analysis are included in the discussion the translation that

---

[70] Some of them are in fact contradictory. See Barr, "Typology", *passim*.

insists on the written form of the original, which can be regarded as a sign of literality, has more freedom of choice than a translator who follows a reading tradition.[71]

Although the results of the criteria are combined in order to express the literality of different translation units in the study of Tov and Wright, all of the criteria, except two, are exponents of consistency as a translation technique, one concerns the addition of components, and one is rather a criterion of translation Greek. None of them is contradictory.[72]

Perhaps, one could benefit from the advantages of both of these approaches. Hence, the whole semantic range of the Hebrew could be included in a computer-based investigation of the consistency in the use of words and consequently the different meanings of a term could be listed separately. Tags could be introduced that differentiate between meanings of words. Perhaps it is also possible to incorporate a separate study of phrases in a computerised investigation in order to make the results more reliable.

---

[71] See a discussion of these matters in Barr, "Typology".
[72] See Tov, Wright, "Criteria", 158, 185-87.

# 4. The Crux Interpretum in Ps 2:12

## 4.1. The Enigmatic Text of Ps 2:12aα

Ps 2:12aα is a famous *crux interpretum*, both in MT and in the versions. I shall make a survey over the different solutions presented and especially concentrate my efforts on the LXX version, which departs radically from MT, and propose a new explanation of the LXX text. First, one has to present the text of MT and LXX in context (v. 11-12).

עִבְדוּ אֶת־יְהוָה בְּיִרְאָה וְגִילוּ בִּרְעָדָה׃
נַשְּׁקוּ־בַר פֶּן־יֶאֱנַף וְתֹאבְדוּ דֶרֶךְ
כִּי־יִבְעַר כִּמְעַט אַפּוֹ אַשְׁרֵי כָּל־חוֹסֵי בוֹ׃

*Serve the LORD with fear, and rejoice with trembling. Kiss the son, or he will be angry, and you will perish in the way; for his wrath is quickly kindled. Happy are all who take refuge in him.*[1]

δουλεύσατε τῷ κυρίῳ ἐν φόβῳ
καὶ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε αὐτῷ ἐν τρόμῳ.
δράξασθε παιδείας, μήποτε ὀργισθῇ κύριος
καὶ ἀπολεῖσθε ἐξ ὁδοῦ δικαίας.
ὅταν ἐκκαυθῇ ἐν τάχει ὁ θυμὸς αὐτοῦ,
μακάριοι πάντες οἱ πεποιθότες ἐπ᾽ αὐτῷ.

*Serve the Lord with fear, and exult in him with trembling. Seize upon instruction, or the Lord may become angry; and you will perish from the righteous way, when his anger quickly blazes out.*[2] *Happy are all who trust in him.*

נַשְּׁקוּ־בַר פֶּן־יֶאֱנַף in the MT has traditionally been understood as "kiss the son, or he will be angry", and it has δράξασθε παιδείας, μήποτε ὀργισθῇ κύριος "seize upon instruction, or the Lord may become angry" as counterpart in LXX.[3]

---

[1] The wording here is based on the *NRSV*, apart from the conjecture of Bertholet.

[2] "Quickly" or "suddenly".

[3] Or "grasp instruction, so that the Lord will not be angry". One can also emphasise "correction, discipline" in this context, e.g. "Accept his censure, lest the Lord be angry". See Vinck, Contos, *The Septuagint Psalms*. παιδεία can

The problems of MT are especially focused on the meaning of the expression נַשְּׁקוּ־בַר בַּר. is in modern commentaries and translations mostly equated with the Aramaic term בַּר "son", but the old versions only by way of exception recognized this meaning here. There are also strong objections to this interpretation.

בַר "son" is otherwise only employed in Prov 31:2-3 (three times) in MT. The use of this Aramaic word is easier to explain in Prov 31, which is a late text with a foreign background.[4] It is not the Aramaism per se that is difficult,[5] since תְּרֹעֵם "you shall break them" in v. 9 is derived from רָעַע, an Aramaic word, which is used instead of the Hebrew רָצַץ with the same meaning. It is rather the occurrence of בֵּן (v. 7) as well as בַּר (v. 12), both meaning "son" in the same psalm and referring to the same person.[6] That בַּר was employed in order to avoid the dissonance בֶּן פֶּן,[7] is not a convincing argument, since alliteration and assonance are, in contrast to LXX, frequently employed techniques in the Hebrew Psalms. If it would have been regarded as an obstacle to the Hebrew poet it could easily have been avoided by using a suffix, that is, בְּנוֹ, which would have suited the context excellently.[8]

Furthermore, for example, Briggs notes that the definite article is absent,[9] but the absence of the article is hardly significant, since for example, הֹק is not articulated either.[10] The anarthrous noun is often used in poetic language.[11] The argument that בַּר through the expression in v. 7 בְּנִי אַתָּה אֲנִי הַיּוֹם יְלִדְתִּיךָ "you are my son, today I have begotten you" has to a certain extent become a proper name for the anointed one,[12] is not convincing, since then בֵּן should have been employed in v. 12.

---

have the meaning "instruction, guidance" as well as "correction, discipline". See, e.g., Bertram, "παιδεύω", 596:25. Cf. Liddell, Scott, Jones, *Greek-English Lexicon*, "παιδεύω".

[4] Cf., e.g., Kittel, *Psalmen*, 8.

[5] See e.g. Baethgen, *Psalmen*, 6.

[6] See Rowley, "Psalm II", 152; Briggs, *Psalms I*, 23; Kittel, *Psalmen*, 8. For a different evaluation, see Baethgen, *Psalmen*, 7.

[7] Baethgen, "Textkritische Wert", 595.

[8] See, e.g., Herkenne, *Psalmen,* 52.

[9] Briggs, *Psalms I*, 23. Cf. Gesenius, Kautzsch, *Hebrew Grammar,* §126d.

[10] Baethgen, *Psalmen*, 7.

[11] Gesenius, Kautzsch, *Hebrew Grammar,* §126h.

[12] Baethgen, *Psalmen*, 7.

The reference to the king is unexpected in this strophe, since in the preceding and probably in the following text Yahweh himself is referred to. The subject of יְאַנַף in MT is implicit; it can denote either the son (if בַר signifies "son") or Yahweh. It is not probable that בַר is the subject of יְאַנַף, since אַשְׁרֵי כָּל־חוֹסֵי בוֹ can hardly be said of anyone else than Yahweh.[13] Similar phrases always refer to Yahweh in MT, see, for example, Ps 5:12 וְיִשְׂמְחוּ כָל־חוֹסֵי בָךְ "but let all who take refuge in you (scil. God) rejoice". See also Ps 128:1 אַשְׁרֵי כָּל־יְרֵא יְהוָה "happy is everyone who fears the LORD", Isa 30:18 אַשְׁרֵי כָּל־חוֹכֵי לוֹ "blessed are all those who wait for him."[14] The LXX, the Targum, Vulgate, and some Mss of Peshitta have Yahweh as the explicit personal object in v. 12.[15]

On the other hand, there are important structural arguments in support of MT and the interpretation of בַר as "son". Vv. 10-12 comprise a passage in which the earthly rulers are urged to serve God and to pay homage to his king, thus it catches up with as well as counteracts the rulers' rebellion, which was directed against God *and* his anointed (v. 2).[16] According to this explanation, the Lord and his king are directly mentioned in all four strophes of the psalm, vv. 1-3, 4-6, 7-9, 10-12, and in each case the Lord is first alluded to, and then the king.[17]

The equivalents of the versions to this text are diverse. The Targum has a similar understanding as LXX, "receive instruction", and the same is true for αλλος, ἐπιλάβεσθε ἐπιστήμης "grasp knowledge", Symmachus has a different understanding προσκυνήσατε καθαρῶς "worship purely", thus also Hieronymus *adorate pure*, Aquila has καταφιλήσατε

---

[13] Baethgen, *Psalmen*, 7; Briggs, *Psalms I*, 23. A possibility is that the ambiguity is deliberate. The implied subject can be both the Lord and the king on Zion. Thus, Vang, "Ps 2,11-12", 183.

[14] See, e.g., van der Weiden, "Proverbia XIV 32B", 340-42.

[15] See Rowley, "Psalm II", 153. It is probably implicit in the Hebrew and is made explicit in, e.g., the LXX. See Baethgen, *Psalmen*, 7; Rowley, "Psalm II", 153.

[16] See, e.g., Craigie, *Psalms 1-50,* 64; Girard, *Les Psaumes,* 59-62. They are supported by Broyles, *Psalms*, 48; Vang, "Ps 2,11-12", 163-84. Although, we come to different conclusions, in some respects, Vang has written a very stimulating article on the same subject, which was presented in the same edition of *SJOT* as my original article. Vang's contribution will always be taken into account in this chapter.

[17] See Vang, "Ps 2,11-12", 178-79. If "son" is a main theme in the psalm, בֵּן it is reasonable to suggest that it should have been repeated.

ἐκλεκτῶς "kiss excellently". Only Peshitta conforms to the traditional interpretation of MT "kiss the son".[18]

Some scholars propose that the different interpretations in the old versions reveal theological motives, although they admit that the meaning of the Hebrew text is open to discussion. The translator of the LXX Psalms, according to Erwin, avoided a literal rendering of both the concept of "God's son" and the anthropomorphic description of "kissing of the son". Erwin argues that נַשְּׁקוּ־בַר understood as "kiss the son" was to bold an image for the translator, even though the son concept, not even in a Messianic sense, was an insuperable difficulty for him.[19] See also the description by Kittel: "Der Ausdruck enthielte an sich schon einen sehr starken Anthropomorphismus."[20] However, in cases where a paraphrase for the expression "the son(s) of God" can be found in the Septuagint it is translated by ἄγγελος, e.g. בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים translated by οἱ ἄγγελοι τοῦ θεοῦ (Job 1:6; 2:1), or ἄγγελοί μου (38:7). Cf. וַתְּחַסְּרֵהוּ מְּעַט מֵאֱלֹהִים rendered by ἠλάττωσας αὐτὸν βραχύ τι παρ' ἀγγέλους (Ps 8:6). It can hardly be seen as a paraphrase, since nothing is preserved in the meaning of the Hebrew text. Nevertheless, the Septuagint translators were not unfamiliar with a literal translation, e.g. οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ (Gen 6:2, 4). The translator often rendered different kinds of anthropomorphisms in a literal fashion.

That the Peshitta Psalter has a more or less literal rendering of MT, however, arises one's suspicion, since Peshitta is, apart from the Targum, the most anti-anthropomorphic of the old translations of the book of Psalms. The wide range of interpretations, however, may mean nothing more than that the meaning of the Hebrew is uncertain or that some of the versions are based on a different Hebrew text.

Apart from "son" other more or less adequate interpretations of בר in this context occurs, that is, "pure" בַּר II or "purity" בֹּר II.[21] This may

---

[18] See, e.g., Field, *Hexaplorum,* 89. ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι and δράσσεσθαι are close synonyms. See, e.g., Louw & Nida, *Greek-English Lexicon,* 27.32. An alternative reading in the early Peshitta Ms 7a1 seems to reflect the same understanding as the LXX. See Vang, "Ps 2,11-12", 173.

[19] Erwin, *Book of Psalms,* 32-33.

[20] Kittel, *Psalmen,* 12.

[21] See Hossfeld, Zenger, *Psalm 1-50*, 52, who argues that the LXX translator reflects בַּר II "pure" and interprets it with reference to the Torah. He refers to Ps 19:9b מִצְוַת יְהוָה בָּרָה. Cf. also Buhl, *Psalmerne,* 14.

reflect a later interpretation of the LXX text, reading it in light of a prevalent Jewish understanding, but I doubt that it is the meaning intended by the translator. בֹּר II "potash, lye" or בַּר III "grain" are hardly possible interpretations of MT in this context. בֹּר II was not within the reach of the LXX translators. It is rendered by καθαρός and thus interpreted as "pure" in Isa 1:25 and Job 9:30. בַּר III is hardly the interpretation in the Old Greek, since בַּר "crop, grain" has an adequate equivalent in LXX (γένημα, σῖτος). However, later on in the history of Jewish hermeneutics "grain" was used as a metaphor and the phrase in question was in Jewish Midrashs rendered by "sustain yourself with grain", a picture of Torah, as well as of repentance, or "kiss the grain", a metaphor for Israel.[22] Other interpretations are "field, open country" בַּר IV,[23] or "elected".[24]

The equivalents in some of the versions coincide with the meaning of one or the other of these homonyms, for example, the equivalents in Symmachus and Hieronymus are based on בַּר II "pure",[25] and the rendering in Aquila may reflect the sense "elected", understood as an adverb. This is, however, not the case with, for example, LXX.[26] The LXX, Vulgate, the Targum, Amelli's edition of the Old Latin text "*osculate disciplinam*", and a variant in Peshitta have the same understanding "accept instruction", which does not agree with any of the traditional interpretations of the MT. They are evidently dependent on the LXX. If the LXX text should be understood as an interpretation of MT, one would have to suggest that the translator interpreted √ברל as a noun postulated from one of the meanings of √ברל "test, prove".[27]

---

[22] See Oesterley, Box, *Synagogue*, 181; Braude, *The Midrash on Psalms II,* 407, and *idem*, *The Midrash on Psalms I,* 44. Cf. Vang, who suggests that the LXX and the Targum are two Jewish witnesses to the same paraphrastic interpretation of a Hebrew text that denote the Torah. Vang, "Ps 2,11-12", 173.

[23] בַּר IV. See Job 39:4. For commentaries that support this interpretation, see Rowley, "Psalm II", 152.

[24] Zimmerman, "El and Adonai", 192 n. 1. He understands בַּר as a *fa'al* form from בָּרַר "select, choose", an unaugmented form with a passive meaning "chosen one, elected one". See also Fürst, *Handwörterbuch,* 215.

[25] Cf. Gunkel, *Psalmen,* 12. That παιδεία in LXX should be based on בֹּר or some cognate word, with reference to 18:21, 25 (כְּבֹר — καὶ κατὰ τὴν καθαριότητα), is incomprehensible. Regarding this suggestion, see Mozley, *Psalter*, 5.

[26] Rowley, "Psalm II", 152. The evaluation of Bertram that all of the translators, except LXX, presuppose MT, is hardly correct. Bertram, "παιδεύω", 610.

[27] See, e.g., *BDB* 4 "test, prove", which only occurs in Eccl 3:18.

## 4.2. The Greek Text in Light of the Translation Technique

נִשְּׁקוּ in LXX has δράξασθε as counterpart, which either means "take a handful" or in a metaphorical sense "grasp, accept". נָשַׁק I piel "to kiss" was evidently known to the LXX translators. It has φιλεῖν, Gen 29:13, or καταφιλεῖν, 31:28; 32:1; 45:15, as counterpart in LXX. נָשַׁק qal has also φιλεῖν and καταφιλεῖν as main equivalents.

The suggestion that the translator understood נָשַׁק in Ps 2 as "accommodate oneself" in Gen 41:40 or "arm oneself with something", 1 Chr 12:2; 2 Chr 17:17; Ps 78:9, is not self-evident.[28] נָשַׁק is translated by ὑπακούεσθαι in Gen 41:40 (וְעַל־פִּיךָ יִשַּׁק כָּל־עַמִּי – ἐπὶ τῷ στόματί σου ὑπακούσεται πᾶς ὁ λαός μου). It is rather a (good) guess of the meaning in context. However, נֹשְׁקֵי קֶשֶׁת is rendered by τόξον in 1 Chr 12:2 and by τοξότης in 2 Chr 17:17,[29] and by ἐντείνειν in Ps 78:9. נוֹשְׁקֵי רוֹמֵי־קָשֶׁת in Ps 78:9 has ἐντείνοντες καὶ βάλλοντες τόξοις "bending and shooting bows" as counterpart. In these cases the translator probably based his understanding on the noun נֶשֶׁק, which is translated by βέλος, ὅπλον, πόλεμος in LXX. The translator has evidently guessed at the meaning in Ezek 3:13, וְקוֹל כַּנְפֵי הַחַיּוֹת מַשִּׁיקוֹת אִשָּׁה אֶל־אֲחוֹתָהּ "it was the sound of the wings of the living creatures brushing against one another". נָשַׁק hiphil has the meaning "touch closely", but he has πτερύσσεσθαι "flutter, flap the wings" that is based on "the sound of the wings of the living creatures".[30] C. Vang argues that נָשַׁק sometimes may have the meaning "add to, join up with" and that the LXX translator in Ps 2 reflected this sense.[31] The problem with this interesting solution is that no other LXX translator interpreted נָשַׁק in such a way.[32] That הַנֶּשֶׁק הַמְּקֻצָּע is

---

[28] Regarding this proposal, see Buhl, *Psalmerne*, 14; Briggs, *Psalms I*, 23.

[29] נֹשְׁקֵי־קֶשֶׁת וּמָגֵן is aptly rendered by τοξόται καὶ πελτασταὶ.

[30] Lust, Eynikel, Hauspie, *Lexicon,* "πτερύσσομαι". נוֹשְׁקֵי רוֹמֵי־קָשֶׁת in Ps 78:9 has ἐντείνοντες καὶ βάλλοντες τόξοις as counterpart.

[31] See Vang, "Ps 2,11-12", 172 and n. 46.

[32] If the LXX translator of Joel 2:9, with his rendering ἐπιλήμψονται, has derived יָשֹׁקּוּ from נָשַׁק rather than from שָׁקַק this could suggest that the translator of Joel knew of a meaning "take hold of". See Muraoka, *Hebrew/Aramaic Index*, 101, 155. However, Muraoka's evaluation is unexpected, especially since נָשַׁק is otherwise never understood that way in the LXX as a whole. It seems more probable that it is a guess from the context. Note the diverse interpretations of שָׁקַק qal in Hatch, Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint,* "διψᾶν/διψῆν, κενός, καινός, εἰς κένον ἐλπίζειν". See also Muraoka, *Hebrew/Aramaic Index*, 155.

rendered by συναπτούσης τῆς γωνίας in Neh 3:19 is hardly a reflection of נָשַׁק qal,[33] but based on the fact that the translator tried to make head and tails out of a description that he has misunderstood. See e.g. מִנֶּגֶד translated by πύργου. He repaired, according to the translator, "a second section of the tower of ascent, where it meets the corner", instead of "another section opposite the ascent to the armory at the Angle" (*NRSV*). The traditional meanings of נָשַׁק "kiss", and maybe also "be armed" was within the reach of the LXX translators, but the renderings in Gen 41:40 and Ezek 3:13 are guesses from the context.

Even if the LXX translator had known of a meaning "accommodate oneself" of נשק read as qal or he simply guessed at the meaning, the use of δράσσεσθαι is inexplicable, because δράσσεσθαι otherwise only renders קָמַץ qal in MT "take a pinch", "take a handful".[34] The reverse also applies; קָמַץ is always translated by δράσσεσθαι, Lev 2:2; 5:12 (וְקָמַץ — καὶ δραξάμενος); Num 5:26 (וְקָמַץ — καὶ δράξεται).[35] Therefore, δράσσεσθαι is a reciprocally consistent translation of קָמַץ.[36] קָמַץ and δράσσεσθαι are employed as technical terms for a part of a priestly ritual in the canonical books of the LXX, Lev 2:2; 5:12; Num 5:26.

וֶהֱבִיאָהּ אֶל־בְּנֵי אַהֲרֹן הַכֹּהֲנִים וְקָמַץ מִשָּׁם מְלֹא קֻמְצוֹ
מִסָּלְתָּהּ וּמִשַּׁמְנָהּ עַל כָּל־לְבֹנָתָהּ
וְהִקְטִיר הַכֹּהֵן אֶת־אַזְכָּרָתָהּ הַמִּזְבֵּחָה אִשֵּׁה רֵיחַ נִיחֹחַ לַיהוָה:

*and bring it to Aaron's sons the priests. After taking from it a handful of the choice flour and oil, with all of its frankincense, the priest shall turn this token portion into smoke on the altar, an offering by fire of pleasing odor to the LORD. (Lev 2:2)*

וֶהֱבִיאָהּ אֶל־הַכֹּהֵן וְקָמַץ הַכֹּהֵן מִמֶּנָּה מְלוֹא קֻמְצוֹ
אֶת־אַזְכָּרָתָהּ וְהִקְטִיר הַמִּזְבֵּחָה עַל אִשֵּׁי יְהוָה חַטָּאת הִוא:

---

[33] See e.g. Muraoka, *Hebrew/Aramaic Index*, 101.

[34] See the latest edition of HAL.

[35] Even the cognate קֹמֶץ "a pinch", "a handful" is always translated by a cognate of δράσσεσθαι in LXX, δράξ Lev 2:2; 5:12; 6:8, or δράγμα Gen 41:47, both meaning "a handful". This usage is taken over by Aquila.

[36] A reciprocally consistent translation is an equivalent in Greek that is the only counterpart to a certain Hebrew word that is never employed for any other Hebrew term. For the background and the necessity of this term, see chap. 3.

*You shall bring it to the priest, and the priest shall scoop up a handful of it as its memorial portion, and turn this into smoke on the altar, with the offerings by fire to the LORD; it is a sin offering.* (Lev 5:12)

וְקָמַץ הַכֹּהֵן מִן־הַמִּנְחָה אֶת־אַזְכָּרָתָהּ וְהִקְטִיר הַמִּזְבֵּחָה וְאַחַר
יַשְׁקֶה אֶת־הָאִשָּׁה אֶת־הַמָּיִם:

*and the priest shall take a handful of the grain offering, as its memorial portion, and turn it into smoke on the altar, and afterward shall make the woman drink the water.* (Num 5:26)

The metaphorical sense of δράσσεσθαι "catch, grasp", which must reflect the intention of the translator,[37] is in the Bible confined to the Apocrypha in the LXX and to the NT. It occurs in Sir 26:7 βοοζύγιον σαλευόμενον γυνὴ πονηρά, ὁ κρατῶν αὐτῆς ὡς ὁ δρασσόμενος σκορπίου "A bad wife is a chafing yoke; taking hold of her is like grasping a scorpion" and Sir 34:2 ὡς δρασσόμενος σκιᾶς καὶ διώκων ἄνεμον οὕτως ὁ ἐπέχων ἐνυπνίοις "As one who catches at a shadow and pursues the wind, so is anyone who believes in dreams."

However, the metaphorical sense has not replaced the concrete meaning. δράσσεσθαι is evidently used in 2 Macc 4:41 in concrete meaning "take a handful": συνιδόντες δὲ καὶ τὴν ἐπίθεσιν τοῦ Λυσιμάχου συναρπάσαντες οἱ μὲν πέτρους, οἱ δὲ ξύλων πάχη, τινὲς δὲ ἐκ τῆς παρακειμένης σποδοῦ δρασσόμενοι φύρδην ἐνετίνασσον εἰς τοὺς περὶ τὸν Λυσίμαχον "But when the Jews became aware that Lysimachus was attacking them, some picked up stones, some blocks of wood, and others took handfuls of the ashes that were lying around, and threw them in wild confusion at Lysimachus and his men" and in Jdt 13:7 καὶ ἐγγίσασα τῆς κλίνης ἐδράξατο τῆς κόμης τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ καὶ εἶπεν Κραταίωσόν με, κύριε ὁ θεὸς Ισραηλ, ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτῃ "She came close to his bed, took hold of the hair of his head, and said, ´Give me strength today, O Lord God of Israel!´"

δράσσεσθαι only appears in 1 Cor 3:19 in NT, a quotation from Job 5:13. Paul does not follow the Septuagint, which has ὁ καταλαμβάνων σοφοὺς ἐν τῇ φρονήσει "who catches the wise in their wisdom", which renders לֹכֵד חֲכָמִים בְּעָרְמָם "He takes the wise in their own craftiness", while

---

[37] Cf. Helbing, *Die Kasussyntax,* 128.

1 Cor 3:19 reads ὁ δρασσόμενος τοὺς σοφοὺς ἐν τῇ πανουργίᾳ αὐτῶν "He catches the wise in their craftiness".

δράσσεσθαι is a Ionic word, which is employed by, for example, Homerus, Herodotus, Platon. It was not frequent in Koine Greek,[38] even though Josephus often used it.[39] Usually it governs the genitive,[40] but the accusative occurs occasionally.[41] δράσσεσθαι is of course to be understood in a metaphorical sense in Ps 2:12. Although this is probably the earliest attestation of this usage in LXX, there are examples of the metaphorical employment in non-biblical Greek from as early as the third century BC.,[42] but also later on in pre-Christian time.[43] The interpretations that best accord with the use of δράσσεσθαι in Ps 2:12 is "grasp, take to oneself" in a metaphorical sense,[44] or "seize on (words or ideas)",[45] or "take advantage of", "profit by"[46] or perhaps "attain to".[47]

The LXX translator of Proverbs knew perfectly well that בַּר in Aramaic means "son". It only occurs in Prov 31:2 (3x) in Hebrew, where מַה־בְּרִי וּמַה־בַּר־בִּטְנִי וּמֶה בַּר־נְדָרָי "No, my son! No, son of my womb!" is

---

[38] See Liddell, Scott, Jones, *Greek-English Lexicon*, "δράσσομαι"; Helbing, *Kasussyntax*, 128.

[39] *J.W.* 3.385; 4,480; 5.477, 479; 6.161; *Ant.* 14.425; 15.86; 19.309. See Rengstorf, *Concordance,* 524.

[40] Helbing, *Kasussyntax*, 128. This is always the case in Josephus and in LXX, according to BDF §170.2.

[41] Helbing, *Kasussyntax*, 128. Cf. the variant παιδείαν in Ps 2:12. In 1 Cor 3:19 δράσσεσθαι governs the genitive. See also BDF §170(2).

[42] See Demodocus Lyricus in *Anthologia Palatina*, 11.238, Theocritus poeta Bucolicus 30.9, Callimachus, *Epigrammata* 1.14.

[43] Philodemus Philosophus, πέρι ποιμάτων 2.41, Diodorus Siculus 12.67.

[44] E.g. μετὰ τοῦ δράξασθαι τῆς ἀληθείας ἐπὶ τούς τύπους κατεπέσετε, *Chrysostomus Commentary in Gal 3:3*. (10.697A), βουλῆς ἀνωμάλου δραξάμενος, Johannes Damascenus, *passio Artemii* 13 (M.96.1264B).

[45] Didymus Alexandrinus (δράζωνται prob. f.l. for δράξωνται), *De trinitate*, 1.9 (M.39.281c).

[46] δραξάμενοι ... οἱ γραμματεῖς τῆς τοῦ σωτῆρος ἀπουσίας, Victor Antiochenus, *Catena in Mc*. J.A. Cramer, *Catena in Matthaeum et Marcum* (Oxford 1940) 9.16 (p.359.11), Menander Protector, *Excerpta de legationibus Romanorum ad gentes* 19 (p.215.14; M.113.917B), Marcus Diaconus, *Vita Porphyrii Gazenzis* 64.

[47] δραξάμενοι τῶν ὅρων τῆς ζωῆς, Clemens Alexandrinus, *Paedagogus* 1.6 (p. 106.2), v.l. ἀρξάμενοι M. 2.281B.

rendered by τί, τέκνον, τηρήσεις τί ῥήσεις θεοῦ· πρωτογενές, σοὶ λέγω, υἱέ· τί, τέκνον ἐμῆς κοιλίας τί, τέκνον ἐμῶν εὐχῶν.[48] This means that בַּר is once or twice translated by τέκνον and once by υἱός. υἱός also renders בַּר in the Aramaic part of Daniel, since כְּבַר אֱנָשׁ אָתֵה הֲוָה is translated by ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἤρχετο (Dan LXX 7:13), and υἱός is used three times in Dan Th, 3:25 (3:92), וְרֵוֵהּ דִּי רְבִיעָיָא דָּמֵה לְבַר־אֱלָהִין, which is translated by ἡ ὅρασις τοῦ τετάρτου ὁμοία υἱῷ θεοῦ,[49] in 5:22 וְאַנְתְּ בְּרֵהּ בֵּלְשַׁאצַּר is rendered by καὶ σὺ ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ Βαλτασαρ,[50] and in 7:13 כְּבַר אֱנָשׁ אָתֵה הֲוָה is translated by ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενος.

בַּר "pure" is also within the grasp of the translators, although it is not always rendered literally. It is translated by τηλαυγής "radiant" in Ps 18 (19):9, by καθαρός in 23 (24):4, by εὐθύς in 72 (73):1, by ἐκλεκτός in Song 6:9, 10 and by ἄμεμπτος in Job 11:4. The meaning of בַּר in Prov 14:4 is "empty" or "grain".[51] בְּאֵין אֲלָפִים אֵבוּס בָּר "Where there are no oxen, the manger is empty" (*NIV*) or "Where there are no oxen, there is no grain" (*NRSV*) is rendered by οὗ μή εἰσιν βόες, φάτναι καθαραί "Where there are no oxen, the mangers are empty". בַּר in Song 6:9 can be understood as "pure" or as "selected" (= בָּרוּר). Thus, בָּרָה הִיא לְיוֹלַדְתָּהּ "flawless to her that bore her" is translated by ἐκλεκτή ἐστιν τῇ τεκούσῃ αὐτῆς "elected by her that bore her" in LXX. לְשׁוֹן בָּרָה "pure voice" in Sir 40:21 has γλῶσσα ἡδεῖα "pleasant voice" as counterpart. בֹּר "purity" was also recognized. In Job 22:30 it is translated by καθαρός in the Hexaplaric recension, and in Ps 17 (18):21 (= 2 Sam 22:21) as well as in 17 (18):25 (= 2 Sam 22:25) by καθαριότης.

בַּר in the sense "open field" only occurs in Job 39:4. It is not translated in the OG, and the meaning is not recognized in the Hexaplaric recension.[52] Although בַּר in Job 39:4 had no equivalent in OG, this meaning of בַּר in Aramaic was known at least to the translators of Daniel,

---

[48] The LXX text has a dubious relation to the MT which makes it difficult to recognize the equivalents of בַּר.

[49] In LXX it is translated by ὁμοίωμα ἀγγέλου θεοῦ.

[50] The text has no counterpart in LXX.

[51] See, e.g, *HALAT*, "בַּר".

[52] It is probably understood as בַּר "son", since it is translated by γέν(ν)ημα, "offspring". See יַחְלְמוּ בְנֵיהֶם יִרְבּוּ בַבָּר rendered by ἀπορρήξουσιν τὰ τέκνα αὐτῶν, πληθυνθήσονται ἐν γενήματι "Their young will break forth; they will be multiplied with offspring".

since בַּר was rendered by ἄγριος in LXX 2:38 and γῆ in 4:12 (9). It has no counterpart in 4:15 (12), 21 (18), 23 (20) 2x, 25 (22), 32 (29). בַּר was translated by ἄγριος in Theodotion 4:12 (9), 21 (18), 23 (20), 25 (22), 32 (29) and ἀγρός in 2:38. The translation of בַּר by ἔξω in Dan Th 4:15, 23 (12, 20) must be based on a similar understanding. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that most of the meanings of בַּר, were within the reach of the LXX translator of the Psalms, although the knowledge of בַּר "open field" cannot be ascertained. It can hardly be out of lack of knowledge of a certain meaning of the Hebrew term that he chose παιδεία as equivalent. בַּר "son" is never translated by παῖς in LXX. Consequently, it is less probable that Greek παίδεια is a corruption of an original παῖς.[53]

The rendering of נַשְּׁקוּ־בַר by δράξασθε παιδείας does not accord with the usual expedients the translator of the Psalms used when encountering an abstruse and problematic text. He usually employed a stereotype rendering of the word or the phrase in question based upon the equivalents in the Psalter or supported by equivalents previously utilised in the LXX, whether or not they made sense in the context. He sometimes used a generic term, or a favourite word or etymological exegesis, or relied on the sense of the term in Aramaic. A paraphrase was only sporadically employed.[54] The rendering in LXX, δράξασθε παιδείας, does not accord with any of these devices, but must be based on a different *Vorlage*.[55]

This can also be supported by the context. The translation in the LXX makes good sense in the context, which was not usually the case when the translator of the Psalms was confronted with textual or theological

---

[53] The correction to παιδός "lad" instead of παιδείας in Ps 2:12 in Lust, Eynikel, Hauspie, *Lexicon,* "παιδεία" is thus unexpected.

[54] The suggestion by Mozley that the translation of נַשְּׁקוּ by δράξασθε was a paraphrase employing a simpler figure of speech has not much in its favour. Mozley, *Psalter,* 5. See also Robinson who, even though uncertain as to the source of the translation in LXX, suggests that the rendering of נַשְּׁקוּ by δράξασθε is a "reasonable, imaginative transfer of the original meaning". Robinson, "Psalm 2:11-12", 421.

[55] This is more or less admitted by Briggs; even though he does not exclude the possibility that παιδεία can be a paraphrase. Briggs, *Psalms I,* 24. Even Bertram rightly emphasises that there is no explanation to the text in LXX based on the consonants of MT. Bertram, "παιδεύω", 610 n. 81.

difficulties. It catches up with v. 10, where the kings are urged to understand, σύνετε, and to be instructed, παιδεύθητε. The exhortation is repeated in v. 12 with a word of the same stem as παιδεύειν in v. 10, παιδεία, followed by a warning for the consequences if they did not pay heed to the appeal. Words from v. 5 ἐν ὀργῇ αὐτοῦ and ἐν τῷ θυμῷ αὐτοῦ, where the Lord frightens the kings, reappear in v. 12 μήποτε ὀργισθῇ κύριος and ὁ θυμὸς αὐτοῦ.

It is probable that δράξασθε παιδείας is based on a different *Vorlage* and several proposals regarding the *Vorlage* of the LXX have been made.[56] מוּסָר is often given as the equivalent of παιδεία, notwithstanding that παιδεία is not a consistent equivalent of any specific Hebrew word in LXX Psalms. It renders מוּסָר in Ps 49 (50):17. However, it is translated by עֲנָוָה in 17 (18):36 and by טַעַם in 118 (119):66.[57] On the other hand, παιδεία is as a rule a translation of מוּסָר outside the book of Psalms. Furthermore, מוּסָר is mostly rendered by παιδεία. In fact, מוּסָר occurs 51 times in MT and it is at least 42 times translated by παιδεία. Furthermore, the relation between the second half of 17 (18):36 in the LXX and the Hebrew text is problematic. The LXX has added a whole line, which also includes παιδεία, to which there is no corresponding text in MT. The LXX translator must have had a different understanding of the Hebrew text or his rendering is based on a different *Vorlage*. According to *BHK* LXX as well as Theodotion and Peshitta read עֲנֹתְךָ as in 2 Sam 22:36 instead of MT:s עֲנְוֹתְךָ.[58] The rendering of טַעַם by παιδεία 118 (119):66 fits the special meaning of the Hebrew word in this context "perception, sense" fairly well.[59]

מוּסָר is a poetic term, especially rooted in wisdom-literature, which mainly occurs in Job, Jeremiah and Proverbs. It appears as much as 30 times in the book of Proverbs and as a rule with παιδεία as equivalent.[60]

---

[56] See, e.g., Briggs, *Psalms I*, 24; Rowley, "Psalm II", 152.

[57] The equivalent here is questionable. Cf. Hatch, Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint*, "παιδεία", which has ?.

[58] See also Gunkel, *Psalmen*, 72. But √ענה is never rendered by παιδεία in LXX as a whole. That may be the reason why *BHS* is more cautious and has "cf".

[59] The rendering of טַעַם by παιδεία fits the meaning of the Hebrew word in this context fairly well "perception, sense".

[60] It is rendered by παιδεία in Prov 1:2, 7, 8; 3:11; 4:1, 13; 5:12; 6:23; 8:10; 10:17; 12:1; 13:18; 15:5, 10, 32, 33; 16:22; 19:20, 27; 22:15; 23:12, 13; 24:32. In 1:3; 7:22, and 13:24 the LXX translator probably had a different *Vorlage*, 1:3

In Aquila the identification between מוּסָר and παιδεία is complete. One may thus with reasonable certainty conjecture that the *Vorlage* of παιδεία was מוּסָר.

מוּסָר signifies "correction, chastisement, discipline, education, instruction, warning, reminder".[61] Bertram's suggestion that the translator emphasised the intellectual side of מוּסָר, when he rendered the Hebrew term with παιδεία,[62] is open to discussion since both παιδεία and מוּסָר refers to chastisement as well as instruction.[63]

It is no wonder that the suggested *Vorlage* often has reconstructions that include מוּסָר, בְּמוּסָר, הַחֲזִיקוּ,[64] קְחוּ מוּסָר,[65] and נִשְׂאוּ מוּסָר.[66] נִשְׂאוּ מוּסָר has the advantage that is fairly close to the Hebrew text in the MT. Nevertheless, נשׂא in the imperative ought to have been written שְׂאוּ.[67] However, the form נִשְׂאוּ with an abnormal נ can also be found in Ps 10:12, נְשָׂא יָדֶךָ.[68]

Reconstructions of the *Vorlage* of the LXX that do not include the noun מוּסָר sometimes occur. Two of these reconstructions are suggested

---

(סוּר√), 7:22 (מוּסָר), 13:24 (יסר√), and in 8:33; 10:17; 16:17 and 23:23 מוּסָר has no counterpart in LXX. 5:23 and 13:1 are the only places where a different equivalent is employed, ἀπαίδευτος (אֵין מוּסָר) in 5:23 and ὑπήκοος in 13:1. παιδεία is, apart from 17:8 and 25:1, a reciprocal consistent equivalent in Proverbs.

[61] See, e.g., Branson, "יסר, מוסר", 692-97, and Bertram, "παιδεύω", 596:25, 607:35.

[62] Bertram, "παιδεύω", 596:25. See also Lamarche, who argues that παιδεία ought to be understood as instruction rather than rebuke in line with παιδεύθητε in v. 10. Lamarche, "La Septante", 33.

[63] See Branson, "יסר, מוסר", 692-97. מוּסָר may even denote what shall be learned. *Idem*, 693-95.

[64] Graetz, *Psalmen I*, *ad. loc*. The reference is taken from Rowley, "Psalm II".

[65] Wellhausen, *Book of Psalms*, *ad. loc*. The reference is taken from Rowley, "Psalm II".

[66] This is the reconstruction favoured by Rowley. He refers to a suggestion by P.A. Joün. See Rowley, "Psalm II", 152 and n. 5.

[67] See Lev 10:4; Num 1:2; 26:2; Josh 3:6; 4:3; 6:6; Isa 13:2; 40:26; 51:6; Jer 4:6; 6:1; 13:20; 50:2; 51:12, 27; Jonah 1:12; Pss 24:7, 9 (2x); 81:3; 96:8; 134:2; Job 21:3; 1 Chr 16:29.

[68] Gesenius, Kautzsch, *Hebrew Grammar,* §66c, 76b. Cf. נְסָה in 4:7, which is a mere orthographical variation.

by Wutz, נְשׁוּ דוּבְר[69] or נָקְטוּ דֹב.[70] Wutz interprets נשׁו as a form of נִשְׂאוּ. But in his corrigenda he has rather suggested the vocalization נֵשׁ, with reference to the Syriac. He argues that Ps 10:12 is corrupt and the Greek translator with ὑψωθήτω rather reflects תִּנָּשֵׂא.[71] Other reconstructions are שָׁקוּ בְרדּוּת,[72] and נְשׁוּ קְבָל.[73] The difference in graphical appearance between MT and the *Vorlage* of LXX is great in most these proposals. However, one has to realize that MT and LXX are sometimes built on different text traditions, even though LXX mostly has a *Vorlage*, akin to that of MT.

However, there are problems involved in all these proposals; none of the verbs are compatible with the use of the odd term δράσσεσθαι. Furthermore, נָשָׂא מוּסָר does not otherwise occur in MT, and נָשָׂא is mostly rendered by αἴρειν with cognates in LXX as a whole. The ambition that the reconstruction should be as close to the consonants of the MT as possible has influenced the reconstruction. Furthermore, it is not self-evident that נִשְׂאוּ מוּסָר can be translated by "seize upon instruction". However, probably most scholars prefer this reconstruction today. The standard lexicon in Septuagint research, for example, supports it.[74]

The expression לָקַח מוּסָר frequently and חָזַק מוּסָר sporadically appear in wisdom-literature. However, לָקַח מוּסָר is translated either by δέχεσθαι παιδεία,[75] λαμβάνειν παιδεία,[76] ἐπιλαμβάνειν παιδεία,[77] or by

---

[69] Wutz, *Die Psalmen,* 3.

[70] He derives the verb from נקט "ergreifen, halten" in Aramaic. Cf. Rabbinic Hebrew and Arabic. He further refers to the translation of דוּבְר by ἱκανούμενος in Song 7:10 and וְקַטֵּר מֵחָמֵץ תּוֹדָה in Am 4:5, which he emends to נָקְטוּ מֵחָמֵץ תּוֹרָה on the basis of the translation in LXX καὶ ἀνέγνωσαν ἔξω νόμον. But both the reconstruction of the *Vorlage* and the translation of LXX is dubious. Wutz, *Transkriptionen* 263. Cf. *Idem*, 455, 492, 505, 520, 523.

[71] Wutz, *Psalmen*, XLIX.

[72] Herkenne, *Psalmen*, 52-53. He refers to 67 (68):28 Θ and 109 (110):2, and furthermore that √רדה could be rendered by παιδεύειν in Θ and Σ.

[73] Dubarle, "δράξασθε παιδείας", 511-12. The words are from Aramaic and Rabbinic Hebrew. Regarding the meaning, see, e.g., Dalman, *Aramäisch-neuhebräisches Handwörterbuch,* 382.

[74] See Lust, Eynikel, Hauspie, *Lexicon*, "δράσσομαι".

[75] Jer 2:30; 5:3; 7:28; 17:23; Zeph 3:2, 7. The relation to MT is uncertain in Prov 1:3, where לָקַחַת מוּסָר is rendered by δέξασθαί τε στροφὰς λόγων. See, e.g., Hatch, Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint* "παιδεία".

[76] Jer 42 (35):13; Prov 8:10.

[77] Jer 39 (32):33.

ἐκλέγειν παιδεία.[78] In the Psalter לָקַח qal is translated by λαμβάνειν, προσλαμβάνειν, ἀναλαμβάνειν, δέχεσθαι, προσδέχεσθαι, or by ἀντaναιρεῖν.[79] חָזֵק מוּסָר only appears in Prov 4:13, where הַחֲזֵק בַּמּוּסָר is translated by ἐπιλαβοῦ ἐμῆς παιδείας. The use of such a specific term as δράσσεσθαι in Ps 2:12 is striking, since there are several parallels to exhortations in Proverbs that would have suited the context admirably, for example, ἀκούειν παιδεία, φυλάσσειν παιδεία, ἀγαπεῖν παιδεία, and δέχεσθαι παιδεία.[80] A mere guess is to be excluded from the start.

The rendering by αλλος noted by Field, ἐπιλάβεσθε ἐπιστήμης, which cannot be regarded as the OG, would suggest the verb חָזַק hiphil or אָחַז, and thus is close to one of the reconstructions of the *Vorlage* of LXX. חָזַק hiphil or אָחַז are the most common hyponyms of ἐπιλαμβάνειν in LXX and the only ones that occur in LXX Psalms, חָזַק hiphil Ps 34 (35):2 and אָחַז qal 47 (48):7. ἐπιστήμη is an equivalent of √בין, √ידע, √שׂכל as well as of חָכְמָה.[81]

The traditional proposals regarding the *Vorlage* of the verb in LXX have an obvious disadvantage in common. They are based *only* on the meaning of the Greek term, but not correlated with the translation technique in the book of Psalms or in LXX as a whole. The ordinary equivalents in LXX would strongly indicate that the *Vorlage* of LXX was קִמְצוּ מוּסָר.[82] The weakness of this proposal, that the metaphorical usage of

---

[78] Prov 24:32.

[79] λαμβάνειν 14 (15):5; 17 (18):17; 30 (31):14; 48 (49):16, 18; 67 (68):19; 74 (75):3; 108 (109):8, προσλαμβάνειν 72 (73):24, ἀναλαμβάνειν 77 (78):70, δέχεσθαι 49 (50):9, προσδέχεσθαι 6:10, ἀντaναιρεῖν 50 (51):13.

[80] ἀκούειν παιδεια 1:8; 4:1; 19:20, φυλάσσειν παιδεία 10:17; 19:27, ἀγαπεῖν/ἀγαπᾶν παιδεία 12:1, δέχεσθαι παιδεία 16:17.

[81] √בין Ex 36:1; Deut 32:28; Job 12:12; 26:12; 28:12, 28; 38:36; 39:26; Dan (Th) 1:20, √ידע Ex 31:3; 35:31; Num 24:16; Job 21:22 (דַּעַת — σύνεσιν καὶ ἐπιστήμην); 32:6; 36:3; Isa 33:6; Dan (LXX) 1:17; 2:21; 2 Chr 2:11, √שׂכל Job 34:35; Neh 8:8; Jer 3:15, חָכְמָה Ex 36:2; Ezek 28:4, 5, 7, 17.

[82] I have now seen that I was not the first one who has made a similar proposal. That קָמַץ was the *Vorlage* of the Septuagint has in fact been suggested in Sacchi, Chiesa, "Recenti studi di critica", 208-09. However, the reconstruction קִמְצוּ בִינָה is less probable as *Vorlage*, since παιδεία is never a rendering of בִינָה in the Psalter and hardly ever outside the Psalter. It only occurs in Dan 1:20 (LXX), in a phrase that has no similarity whatsoever with Ps 2:12.

קְמַץ is not unambiguously attested in the Bible or in Rabbinic Hebrew,[83] is according to my opinion a less important obstacle than the proposals hitherto formulated. I would suggest that קְמַץ has gone through a similar semantic development as δράσσεσθαι, that is, "take a handful" "take a pitch" → "catch, grasp". Cf., for example, לָכַד niphal "be caught (animals, men), be captured (city)" → "be caught (by a women metaphorically)", Eccl 7:26 וְחוֹטֵא יִלָּכֶד בָּהּ "but the sinner is taken by her", and Prov 6:2 נִלְכַּדְתָּ בְּאִמְרֵי־פִיךָ "caught by the words of your mouth".[84] In fact, it is supported by the use of לָקַח מוּסָר as one of the reconstructions, since לָקַח is often used in concrete sense,[85] as well as in metaphorical sense. The LXX translator may then have read קִמְצוּ מוּסָר and understood קְמַץ in a metaphorical sense or in an ironical way. Cf. קַמְצָן "grasping, greedy" in Rabbinical Hebrew.

## 4.3. The Original Text and the Interpretation of the MT

Several suggestions have been put forward regarding the original text of Ps 2:11-12.[86] The most common solution to the text-critical problem here is the conjecture of Bertholet. He proposed that parts of vv. 11-12 have been inverted with a different word division and then revocalized, that is, he suggests וְנַשְּׁקוּ בְרַגְלָיו בִּרְעָדָה "and with trembling kiss his feet" instead of וְגִילוּ בִּרְעָדָה נַשְּׁקוּ־בַר.[87] This conjecture has been accepted by most scholars, often with a slightly different word order, וּבִרְעָדָה נַשְּׁקוּ בְרַגְלָיו, which is also accepted by Bertholet.[88]

[83] In Rabbinic Hebrew it is mostly used in concrete sense and it denotes "to take the handful of something", e.g., flour, and often, as in Biblical Hebrew, it is a term for a ritual of offering, especially the meal-offering. Lewy, *Wörterbuch*, 1386. Cf. Dalman, *Handwörterbuch*, 382. Cf. קַמְצָא in Rabbinic Hebrew. In piel, it signifies "to scrape off, take off (a share), to scrape together, collect" (Lewy, *Wörterbuch*, 1386) or "to remove", "to pick up", "to gather, to congregate" (Dalman, *Handwörterbuch*, 382).

[84] In fact לְכַד could be the *Vorlage* of LXX with reference to the quotation from Job 5:13 in 1 Cor 3:19, even though this is less probable.

[85] E.g. it refers to פַּת־לֶחֶם (Gen 18:5), בֶּן־בָּקָר (18:7), חֶמְאָה (18:9).

[86] For a survey over the different proposals, see, e.g., *BHK*, *BHS*, Briggs, *Psalms I*; 23-24; Gunkel, *Psalmen*, 12; Rowley, "Psalm II", 152; Kraus, *Psalmen I*, 144; Robinson, "Psalm 2:11-12", 421-22; Anderson, *Book of Psalms*, 69-70; Dahood, *Psalms I*, 13; Craigie, *Psalms 1-50*, 64; Holladay, "Psalm 2:12", 112.

[87] See Bertholet, "Crux interpretum", 58-59.

[88] Bertholet, "Ps 2:11f.", 193.

However, a syntactical objection can be raised against the conjecture of Bertholet; נָשַׁק is construed with לְ rather than with בְּ, when referring directly to a person.[89] When the object of נָשַׁק is not a person it can be construed without preposition, Prov 24:26 (שְׂפָתַיִם יִשָּׁק "he gives a kiss on the lips"), Hos 13:2 (אָדָם עֲגָלִים יִשָּׁקוּן "People are kissing calves!"), Ps 85:11 (צֶדֶק וְשָׁלוֹם נָשָׁקוּ "righteousness and peace will kiss each other"), with לְ Job 31:27 (וַתִּשַּׁק יָדִי לְפִי "my hand has kissed my mouth" (sic), with עַל Gen 41:40 (וְעַל־פִּיךָ יִשַּׁק כָּל־עַמִּי "and the whole people will kiss your mouth", or "and all my people shall order themselves as you command"), but never with בְּ. The same objection can be launched against the interpretation "kiss the son" in MT, since a person as object to נָשַׁק I (qal and piel) is otherwise always joined with לְ in MT.[90] Once the personal object occurs without a preposition, 1 Sam 20:41 (וַיִּשְּׁקוּ אִישׁ אֶת־רֵעֵהוּ "and they kissed each other").

Other, more recent proposals, which are close to the text of MT are נְשֵׁי קֶבֶר "O mortal men"[91] and נֹשֵׁי קֶבֶר "you who forget the grave",[92] apart from the fact that they are not supported by any of the versions, the first presupposes an irregular plural-form of אֱנוֹשׁ, otherwise it must be understood as "O mortal women", and the other is hardly compatible with the general argument in the psalm.[93]

---

[89] See, e.g., Vang, "Ps 2,11-12", 165-66. The reference to the use of בְּ with נֶגַע, אָחַז, דָּבַק is hardly a convincing argument. See Bertholet, "Crux interpretum", 59. Therefore, a minor modification of Bertholet's conjecture to וְנַשְּׁקוּ לְרַגְלָיו בִּרְעָדָה has been suggested by Gunkel, but it makes the emendation less credible. Gunkel, *Psalmen*, 12.

[90] Gen 27:26, 27; 29:11, 13; 31:28; 32:1; 45:15; 48:10; 50:1; Ex 4:27; 18:7; Ruth 1:9, 14; 2 Sam 14:33; 15:5; 19:40; 20:9; 1 Kings 19:18, 20; Prov 7:13. See especially parallels with names of relatives; sons and daughters (Gen 31:28), grandchildren and daughters (Gen 31:55), brothers (45:15), father (50:1), father-in-law (Ex 18:7), father and mother (1 Kings 19:20), mother-in-law (Ruth 1:14). Sometimes the personal object is reflected by a suffix, Gen 33:4; 1 Sam 10:1; Song 1:2; 8:1.

[91] Dahood, *Psalms I*, 13. Dahood has also suggested an alternative vocalization נֹשֵׁי קוֹבֵר "you who forget him who buries". See Holladay, "Psalm 2:12", 112.

[92] Holladay, "Psalm 2:12", 111-12.

[93] Other reconstructions of the original text are נשו־קרב "forget the war!" or נשאו־קרבן "bring gifts!". See Castellino, *Salmi*, 849. A less probable proposal is Pili's fanciful combination of metathesis and abbreviation "and to me, powerful nations, give respect". Pili, "Metatesi", 466-71.

The kissing of the feet was an act of self-humiliation and homage. For example, Sennacherib reports that the kings of Syria and Palestine paid homage to him by bringing gifts and by kissing his feet.[94] The parallels from the Old Testament sometimes adduced (Ps 72:9; Isa 49:23; Mic 7:17) are, however, far from impressive since Mic 7:17 and Ps 72:9 do not refer to the kissing (נָשַׁק) of the feet (רַגְלַיִם) of the king, but the "licking" (לָחַךְ) of the "dust" (עָפָר) in humiliation. Isa 49:23 is a better parallel since the enemies have to "lick the dust of your feet" (וַעֲפַר רַגְלַיִךְ יְלַחֵכוּ), but here it denotes the personified Jerusalem rather than the king!

It has recently been suggested that the text of MT is in order and that the use of בַּר meaning "son" in v. 12 may be explained by the fact that the Lord is addressing foreign rulers and therefore Aramaic is employed instead of Hebrew, whereas בֵּן in v. 7 is used by God speaking to the king.[95] It is possible that the poet deliberately employs a loan word to "make the style come more alive and to increase the consciousness of the exhortation",[96] in other words, to make the scene more dramatic.[97]

However, at least two objections can be raised against this understanding: בַּר "son" is otherwise only employed in Prov 31:2-3, which is not directed to a foreigner, and the technique to use a foreign language in exhortations to foreigners is otherwise not used in the Hebrew Bible. Furthermore, it fails to explain why only one word is written in Aramaic while the rest of the sentence is in Hebrew.

Another possible interpretation of MT is "kiss the ground", as an act of homage to the king.[98] As said earlier, נָשַׁק "kiss" can be construed without preposition, when the object is not a person. בַּר is used in the sense "open field" in Job 39:4, and in the Aramaic parts of Daniel, Dan 2:38; 4:9, 12, 18, 20 (2x), 22, 29. Furthermore, an exact parallel can be found in the Akkadic expression *nasaqu qaqqara* "kiss the ground" or "kiss the field", as an act of reverence for a king or a god.[99] For example,

---

[94] See *ANET,* 287b, and *ANEP*, pl. 351.

[95] Craigie, *Psalms 1-50*, 64.

[96] Vang, "Ps 2,11-12", 181.

[97] Craigie, *Psalms 1-50*, 64.

[98] This suggestion also occurs in several older commentaries to the Psalms, e.g. Buttenwieser, *Psalms*, 793 n. 12. See e.g. Rowley, "Psalm II", 152, for further references. See also the references in Vang, "Ps 2,11-12", 164 n. 7.

[99] See the examples in von Soden, *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch II*, 759. Perhaps בַּר should be explained with reference to the Akkadian *qaqqara*.

"all mankind kisses the ground (in front of Marduk)", "he kissed the ground in front of my messenger", "how PN kissed the ground in front of the messengers of Assurbanipal!"[100] It depicts an anthropomorphic picture of messengers kissing the ground in front of the heavenly king, but it is easier to fit into the description of God in other places, and therefore less offensive than the conjecture of Bertholet. Furthermore, it does not demand a modern conjecture. Although, no exact parallel can be found in the Old Testament, Ps 72:9 and Mic 7:17 are of some importance here, since Mic 7:17 and Ps 72:9 refer to the enemies "licking" of the "dust" in humiliation as a sign of submission. It is also common for persons to bow to the ground in front of Yahweh in obedience, for example "When Abraham's servant heard their words, he bowed himself to the ground before the Lord" (Gen 24:52), "Then Jehoshaphat bowed down with his face to the ground, and all Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem fell down before the Lord, worshiping the Lord" (2 Chr 20:18).

It is perhaps best to regard the texts of MT and LXX as two independent textual traditions, one where the interpretation creates problems and the other where the wording of the *Vorlage* is uncertain. Although the text in MT is probably the more original, *lectio difficilior*, which could be an argument for its priority, can hardly be adduced here, since LXX is not to be understood as a corruption of MT.

---

[100] Regarding these examples, see Brinkman, *The Assyrian Dictionary*, 59. See also "kiss the ground (before the king, my Lord)" with a different wording in Parpola, *Sargon II*, 106.

# 5. The Septuagint and Jewish Interpretive Tradition

## 5.1. The Septuagint and Targumic Tradition

The term Septuagint is used nowadays for a collection of translations and original Greek works written over a period of several hundred years. Consequently, it will not do to speak about the relation between the Septuagint and Jewish interpretive tradition in a simple way. In fact, the translation technique is not at all the same for the entire Septuagint; the methods of translation differ radically among the various books. Certain translations are extremely literal, as for example Lamentations, Ezekiel, Psalms and Jeremiah. Others such as Esther, Job, Proverbs, and Isaiah are considerably freer. Therefore one cannot relate to the Septuagint in the same way as can be done with other Greek translations, as Symmachus, Theodotion and Aquila, each of which displays its own peculiar unity.

A further complication that should also be addressed in this connection is that one must distinguish between the original translation, usually designated as proto-Septuagint or the old Greek text, and the alterations and revisions that the original underwent over the course of time, evident in every single Septuagint manuscript! Usually it is the original that one would like to compare with the Jewish interpretive tradition, which in itself is far from uniform, e.g. the Targums, perhaps the best representative of early Jewish interpretive tradition, have several different anonymous authors.

Finally, yet importantly, one can only determine which interpretive model was being employed when one compares the Septuagint with a Hebrew text. This text is usually the Masoretic text, since it is the only one preserved for the entire Old Testament. Accordingly, one must be open to the possibility that what is taken as a special interpretation merely reflects an alternative Hebrew consonantal text or vocalization. On top of that, the Hebrew texts themselves were influenced in various ways before a more or less exactly authoritative text was fixed; that is to say, even Hebrew manuscripts may have undergone an interpretive process. A good example is the Qumran texts, which contain harmonizing additions.[1]

---

[1] See, e.g., Tov, "Harmonizations". The Masoretic vocalization was certainly also dependent on a reading tradition, which interprets the Hebrew consonantal text

The Septuagint in itself cannot be seen as an expression for any unified interpretive tradition. Nevertheless, is there no uniform feature that causes the books to be included within the same covers? Indeed there is; it is a significant fact that the other translators were influenced by and partially dependent on the translations of the Pentateuch, but this influence has primarily to do with the interpretation of certain difficult words and phrases. Moreover, the translations of the Pentateuch are not themselves homogeneous. Anneli Aejmelaeus, among others, has shown it is probable that at least five different translators were involved in the activity, one for each book.[2]

A certain uniformity also exists in the rendering of central theological terms, like בְּרִית translated by διαθήκη, תּוֹרָה by νόμος, גֵּר by προσήλυτος and שָׁלוֹם translated by εἰρήνη. It is a difficult task to demonstrate dependence on an interpretive tradition merely from the choice of corresponding words. On the other hand, it can hardly be denied that the Septuagint initiates a tradition of interpretation, since the later Greek translations and revisions are as a rule dependent on the Septuagint, as is the case with, among others, Aquila, but even to a certain degree with Symmachus and Theodotion.

One can turn one's attention from individual linguistic expressions and with, for example, Georg Bertram, attempt to demonstrate some form of accent shift in the message as a whole, reflected in the culture and religiosity of a later time. An example is the universalistic stamp that the Old Testament gets, not least from the translation of יהוה with κύριος. Bertram wishes also to emphasise that a change from a relatively large openness toward the secular sphere and Israel's surrounding environment, to a more salvation-minded pietism, marked with eschatological and apocalyptic features, has come to expression in the Septuagint. This, however, is mainly based on an intuitive understanding.[3]

The term interpretive tradition presupposes that an interpretive process has taken place that builds on certain rules for comprehending and applying the Holy Scripture. In and of itself, the tradition implies some form of authorization of Scripture: that the Hebrew text is viewed as an authority. Before an interpretation or rewriting, a writing of the Scriptures

---

and among other things, the Qere/Ketiv variants, just as Sebir points to an effect of interpretation directly reflected in the Masoretic text.

[2] Aejmelaeus, *Parataxis*.

[3] For a summary description, see Olofsson, *LXX Version*, 2 n. 8-13.

must have already taken place. In fact, the demand for interpretation and clarification was made in the texts themselves. This is one of the explanations to the diversity of text-forms in Qumran before an exact text was finally fixed, the end of the first century CE.

We may place the earliest Jewish interpretive activity in Ezra's time, as is often done in the Jewish tradition, or even earlier if one includes revisions of biblical writings in a new social and religious context. The Targums is an early expression of Palestinian Judaism's understanding of the Holy Scripture. They are good representatives of early Palestinian Jewish interpretive tradition, just as the interpretive activity of Hellenistic Judaism is represented by, for example, Philo of Alexandria, whose understanding of the Holy Scripture appears to have been more or less characteristic for the Jews in Egypt.[4] It is true that there is no watertight bulkhead between Judaism in Palestine and Egypt; both the NT and Qumran texts, for example, reflect influence from Hellenistic Judaism, and interpretive principles from Philo and others are found even in the later tradition of Palestinian Judaism. The Jewish heritage was strongly influenced by Hellenism during the final centuries before Christ, and there is a mere difference in accent between Egypt and Palestine in this regard.[5] This is true even though it cannot be denied that the Hellenization of Judaism in certain respects was more thorough in Egypt than in Palestine.[6]

## 5.2. The Background of the Septuagint

Placing the Septuagint in time and space is naturally of importance for being able to determine the influence from Jewish interpretive tradition. Where and when the Septuagint arose are therefore important questions. The Septuagint is the oldest and the most widely distributed translation of the Old Testament in Greek. The name comes from the legendary account

---

[4] On the interpretation of the Holy Scripture from the third century BC and beyond, see, e.g., Walter, "Jewish-Greek Literature", 386-408.

[5] See Olofsson, *LXX Version,* 4 and n. 29.

[6] The Jews were able to go quite far in the acceptance of Hellenistic culture and religion, but it was often done in defence of Judaism; Jewish religion made use of an allegorical interpretation, which could be adapted to various philosophical schools current in the philosophical debates carried on in the blasé metropolitan Alexandria. Hegermann, "The Diaspora", 135-37, 156-58, 161-63. A more detailed description of the Hellenizing process in Egypt can be found in Hengel, "Judaism and Hellenism", 167-206.

of the translation's origin, which one can find in the so-called Letter of Aristeas, one of the pseudepigrapha. In this document, it is told that the translation came about through the initiative of the Egyptian king Ptolemy II Philadelphos, whose reign stretched from 285 to 246 BC. At the king's behest, a delegation of 72 persons, six from each one of the tribes of Israel, were brought from Israel to carry out the translation of the Pentateuch. The members of this delegation were then isolated on the Island of Pharos. Each of the translators worked independently, but they compared their translations and came to agreement on a common wording. After 72 days, the translation was completed. Like this, perfect symmetry characterized the number of translators as well as the length of time.

The Septuagint thus got its name from the number seventy in Latin. The name does not correspond exactly with the information in the Letter of Aristeas,[7] but on the other hand, the letter is a propaganda pamphlet that can be used only to a small extent as a point of departure for a reliable description of the Septuagint's origin. This lack of reliability is marked already through the reference to Israel's twelve tribes and the time required for completing the project: 72 days. In the Letter of Aristeas, only the translation of the Jewish law, the Pentateuch, is described.

Few scholars contest the dating of the translation of the Pentateuch to the time of Ptolemy II. It is it is usually placed at 280-250 BC, which fits well with the notion that the translation was carried out by Jews in Egypt.[8]

---

[7] Both statements are legendary. Presumably, the report of the 72 translators is the older, and "seventy" (*septuaginta*) is a popularization of the title, which is based on the symbolic meaning of the number 70, rather than a pure rounding off. It is symptomatic that 70 elders went up with Moses on Mount Sinai (Ex 24: 1, 9), 70 elders received a portion of God's spirit (Num 11:16-17, 24-25). One may even speculate about a connection with the 70 members of the Sanhedrin. See the discussion in Orlinsky, "Hebrew Text", 537-40. Worth noting in this connection is also that 70 or 72 in Jewish tradition was the number of countries in the world according to Gen 10, and the number could therefore indicate all the languages of the world. See not least of all Schürer, *Jewish People*, 351 and n. 46. Tov notes the possibility that 70 was found in the older version and that 72 was a later improvement. Tov, "The Septuagint", 161. For a recent discussion, see Dorival, "La Bible des Septante", 45-62.

[8] E.g., Aristobulus mentions Ptolemy II as king when the translation was made and the historian Demetrios cites the Pentateuch as early as the last quarter of the third century BC. See, e.g., Hengel, "christliche Schriftensammlung", 237.

Translations of other parts of the Holy Scriptures are of later date. According to the Letter of Aristeas, the project was undertaken because Ptolemy II, with the help of his sharp-witted librarian Demetrius, had discovered that the Jewish law was missing from his well-provisioned library, the most famous library in the world at that time. The origin of the translation then was the need to fill a gap in the royal collection!

The royal initiative has usually been understood as part of the propagandistic goal of the Letter of Aristeas, to make the translation, and the Jewish faith generally, understandable and intellectually acceptable to the intellectual elite. The obvious reason for the translation is then that the Jewish congregation needed a translation for use in the synagogue. But several LXX scholars emphasise that the king's cooperation cannot be ruled out, nor can the fact that the religious authorities in Jerusalem were involved in the undertaking.[9] The largest colony of Jews outside of Palestine was in Egypt. In metropolitan Alexandria, where many scholars wish to place the translation process, probably almost half of the population in the mid-third century BC consisted of people of Jewish heritage.

It is obvious that in so far as the translation was done by Jews it can be described as an early expression of the understanding of the Old Testament in Judaism.[10] Therefore, one has good reason to consider the Septuagint as the first translation of the Pentateuch into another language. It is in many ways a unique translation project, and not just for the Jews; it represents the first time in the Greco-Roman world that a holy writ was translated into Greek. The only forerunners are found in another culture, *viz.* Sumerian religious texts that were early translated into Akkadian.[11]

Some scholars assume that all books belonging to the Palestinian canon had been translated by 132 BC, or possibly by 116 BC. Because Sirach's grandson, in the famous preface to his translation of Sirach's book, mentions in passing that even the law itself, the prophecies, and the rest of the books differ not a little from what was originally expressed, that is, in Hebrew. However, to conclude from the mention of the traditional three-fold division of Holy Scripture in Jewish tradition —

---

[9] Dorival, Harl, Munnich, *Septante*, 57-61; Hegermann, "The Diaspora", 134-35, 155; Hengel, "christliche Schriftensammlung", 236.

[10] Tov, "The Septuagint", 164.

[11] Olofsson, *LXX Version,* 5 and n. 40. See also Hengel, "christliche Schriftensammlung", 240.

Law, Prophets, Writings — that all books in the Palestinian canon had already been translated is hardly immune to objections.[12] In all events, it is clear that certain apocryphal and Deutero-canonical scriptures were translated later. The Septuagint as a whole can scarcely have been completed until after the beginning of the first century CE.

Through various linguistic, cultural, and religious features in the translation, it has been possible to show, among other things, that the Pentateuch was translated in Egypt.[13] Other books could be added here; for example, Gillis Gerleman has pointed out certain terms used in the Books of Chronicles for cult functionaries and civil and military officials with corresponding forms in Egyptian papyri. A typical example is the term διάδοχοι (1 Chr 18:17; 2 Chr 26:11). It is the lowest title in the court hierarchy of the Ptolemaic Egypt, though it later became an honorific term for worthy persons. The term seems to have been in use from the first decades of the second century (the time of Ptolemy V) until about 100 BC. Another example is ὑπομνηματογράφος, a scribe attached to the court at Alexandria. In Egyptian papyri ὑπομνηματογράφος designates one of the royal secretaries in the Ptolemean court.[14] The term is used of Jehoshaphat in a list of King David's civil and military officials in 1 Chr 18:15, and of Joah, Josiah's chancellor, in 2 Chr 34:8. Otherwise, it occurs only in Isa 36:3, 22.[15]

Where the other books were translated is less certain. In *La Bible grecque des septante* the authors attempt to connect the translation of individual books to specific localities,[16] but the results must be considered uncertain. The translation of the Psalter has been associated with Palestine

---

[12] See above all Caird, "Ben Sira". Cf. Hengel, "christliche Schriftensammlung", 257-58.

[13] See, e.g., Morenz, "Spuren", 250-58; Görg, "Ptolemäische Theologie", 208-17.

[14] Gerleman, *Chronicles,* 19 and n. 1. Words for flora and fauna, administration and government, laws and social relationships appear among terms known to be from Egypt. Barr, "Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek", 105. For numerous examples, see Dorival, Harl, Munnich, *Septante,* 55-56.

[15] Gerleman, *Chronicles*, 17-19 with notes.

[16] Thus, the Pentateuch, Judges, 1-2 Samuel, 1-2 Kings, 1-2 Chronicles, 3 Maccabees, Proverbs, Job, Psalms of Solomon, Sirach, the Twelve Prophets, Jeremiah, Baruch, the Letter of Jeremiah, and Ezekiel are all assigned to Egypt, while Ruth, Esther, Ecclesiastes, and Lamentations are placed in Palestine. Dorival, Harl, Munnich, *Septante,* 101-09. Occasionally a scholar names Antioch (2, 4 Maccabees) or Leontopolis (Isaiah) as possible origins. *Idem,* 102-04.

by H.-J. Venetz on the basis of certain vague points of contact with the so-called kaige-recension, which was, according to, the studies of Barthélemy at home in Palestine.[17] Oliver Munnich, on the other hand, has convincingly pointed out the weakness in Venetz' analysis. The not unusual translation of גם as καὶ γάρ (not καίγε) and the occurrence of βαρίς or πυργόβαρις, words that according to Jerome occur only on Palestinian soil, are by themselves not sufficient indicators for connecting the Psalter text with the kaige-recension.[18]

## 5.3. Hermeneutics in Early Jewish Interpretive Tradition

How one should describe the relationship between the Old Greek text and the Jewish interpretive tradition is a debated question. Some scholars believe the translators were professionals without any special theological background; they translated word for word, and their primary models were interpreters from the field of commerce and the like. Consequently, most interpretive additions to the Hebrew text accumulated over the passing of time. Thus, they cannot be considered as features of an original translator's method. Another group of scholars underscores the translators' heavy dependence on Jewish exegesis and they are convinced that the intention of later revisionist activity in the direction of strict literal translation was to remove the signs of early exegesis.[19]

Besides the interpretive methods in the Targums, there were certain rules for the understanding of the Holy Scripture. These were gradually assembled into seven *middôth,* rightly or wrongly attributed to Hillel from the end of the last century BC, into 32 *middôth* attributed to Rabbi Eliezer, and 13 *middôth,* which according to tradition have Rabbi Ishmael of the mid-first century CE as their author.[20] The roots of many of these are presumably very old and go back to a Hellenistic background, but the rules were later Judaized. Points of contact with these rules are found not

---

[17] Venetz, *Quinta*.

[18] See Munnich, "Septante*"*, 80-83. I have not seen the arguments of Schaper supporting Venetz and van der Kooij concerning the Psalter's place of origin. See the reference in Schaper, "Eschatologie", 61 n. 67.

[19] Scholars who can be referred to in this connection are R. Marcus, D.W. Gooding, H. Heater, P.E. Dion. See, e.g., Brewer, *Jewish Exegesis*, 180.

[20] A modern description of these principles of interpretation is given in, e.g., Brewer, *Jewish Exegesis*. For an enumeration of these *middôth* with translation, see *idem,* 226-31.

only in Targums but in Qumran texts as well, and not only n Philo but in the Septuagint, too.[21] Even though it is not difficult to find examples of the fact that interpretations one meets with in later Jewish tradition can be supported from the LXX, it is still only a question of isolated examples, and the individual books clearly distinguish themselves from one another in this respect. In order to understand the Septuagint rightly, one can make good use of knowledge about Jewish interpretive tradition: "we must use all the knowledge we can gain of Jewish exegesis and of Haggadic (or Halachic) comment", as one writer has put it.[22]

This does not imply automatically that the translators of the Septuagint availed themselves of Jewish methods of interpretation, since the Septuagint, and not least the translators of the Pentateuch, operated at a very early stage of Jewish text interpretation. The translation of the Pentateuch was a pioneer work with unexpected influence. To a certain extent, the translators formed later interpretive models through their version of the Bible.

What then, in more concrete terms, is the position of the Septuagint relative to the tradition of Targumic translation? Can the kind of exegesis represented by the Targums have had an influence on the Septuagint translators? Indeed, it is possible that at least the later translators were influenced by Targumic tradition, since the written Targums actually precede the Christian era. Thus, a fragment from a Targum of Job has been found in Cave 11 at Qumran. This Targum has been dated to the end of the first century BC, even though the manuscript was presumably written down around the beginning of our era.[23] A fragment of a Targum of Leviticus from Cave 4, dating from the first century CE, shows that the book of Job held no unique position.[24] The Targums obviously had a double purpose: to explain the Hebrew text in a language understandable to most people, not just to the learned, and to some degree to apply the

---

[21] See, e.g., Brewer, *Jewish Exegesis,* 5, 179, 202, and references.

[22] Barnes, "Recovery", 131. See further Olofsson, LXX *Version,* 4 n. 30, 31.

[23] See, e.g., le Déaut, "The Targumim", 568-69 and the bibliographical references there. Two smaller fragments from a Targum of Job were also discovered in Cave 4. *Idem,* 570.

[24] See le Déaut, "The Targumim", 571 and n. 3. It is not impossible that even the oldest Palestinian Targums, such as Neofiti I, are of pre-Christian origin. Porton, "Midrash", 121.

text to the situation of the contemporary readers. No doubt, the interpretive principles were in themselves sophisticated.[25]

This is definitely not the chief aim for the majority of Septuagint translators, even if both the Septuagint and the Targums obviously have in common certain features of idiomatic translation. This concerns, among other things, the modernizing of place, tribe, and city names, the elucidation of the Hebrew text so as to make implicit information explicit by, for example, supplying personal pronouns, proper nouns, etc.[26] Isa 9:11, where the MT has "the Arameans from the one side and the Philistines from the other", and the Septuagint has "Syria from the one side and the Greeks from the other", is an example." The name of Israel's enemies in the Old Testament period has presumably been altered in order to fit better the situation in Hellenistic times. The translation of Ararat with Armenia in Isa 37:38 is also a clear modernization,[27] and also the rendering of חִדֶּקֶל with Τίγρις and פְּרָת with Εὐφράτης in Gen 2:14. In the Targums this updating is considerably more systematic; for instance, *the genealogy of Noah's sons* in Gen 10 is modernized in all Palestinian Targums and renders the peoples and kingdoms as they were known in the translator's own time, while the Septuagint translator was satisfied with transliteration.

Downplaying of anthropomorphisms is easily found in both the Septuagint and the Targums, but it does not seem to have been a question of a systematic anti-anthropomorphism on theological grounds.[28] The Targums can at times use anthropomorphic language, and that is the case to an even greater degree with the Septuagint.

What one can call "associative translation", where the choice of a corresponding word or phrase is dependent on renderings in similar passages, is a completely natural technique, which even literal translations employ. Sometimes it is a question of so-called harmonizations, that is, identical translations of parallel passages that deviate somewhat from one another in the Hebrew text, or cases where the translator makes use of a similar text in order to clarify a historical or linguistic difficulty.

---

[25] See Alexander, "Jewish Aramaic Translations", 226-28, 248; le Déaut, "The Targumim", 564, 585.

[26] See, e.g., Dorival, Harl, Munnich, *Septante,* 212-13.

[27] Tov, "The Septuagint", 178.

[28] See, e.g., Olofsson, *Rock*, 17-33 with references; Chester, *Divine Revelation*, 371-85.

Harmonization appears to be an exegetical technique common to Hebrew manuscripts, the Septuagint, the Targums, and the Samaritan Pentateuch, among others.[29] An example from the Septuagint is Gen 7:17 where the MT has "The flood continued forty days over the earth", while the Septuagint translator writes "The flood continued for forty days and forty nights over the earth", which is obviously an harmonization with v. 12 "the rain fell on the earth forty days and forty nights." This corresponds with e.g. Rule 17 of Rabbi Eliezer's 32 rules: "A matter which is not clear in its place and is clear in another place", that is, a text whose meaning is not clear in its context may be clarified by another passage".[30] It also corresponds with Rule 8 ("building a family"), which denotes that the meaning of one text can be applied to a similar text or a class of texts, or with Rule 6 of Hillel's seven rules: "Meaning is learned from context", i.e. the meaning may be deduced from nearby texts.[31] An assumption behind most of these rules seems to be the axiom that "text is illuminated by text", a principle which presumably has a long tradition behind it.

There are also some examples of what can be called "converse translation", where the Targum in effect provides an interpretation that is opposite to the meaning of the Hebrew text, either by removing or inserting a negation. Such deviations occur, if there are no simple linguistic explanations, because the literal meaning militates against a theological dogma or because God's reputation is otherwise diminished,[32] for example, Gen 4:14 "I shall be hidden from your face" (*NRSV*), "it is impossible for me to be hidden from your face" (Codex Neofiti I). The probable reason for the translation in the Targum is that God sees everything; how can one be hidden from him. On the other hand, one needs to keep in mind that many of these deviations from the MT may be based on alterations that had already appeared in the Hebrew manuscript the translator had at his disposal.[33] In certain respects, there are obvious similarities between the Septuagint and the Targums, but what can be seen

---

[29] Brewer, *Jewish Exegesis,* 180-81.

[30] See Brewer, *Jewish Exegesis,* 229.

[31] See Brewer, *Jewish Exegesis,* 226.

[32] See Klein, "Converse Translation", 515-37. See also Alexander, "Jewish Aramaic Translations", 226-27; Dorival, Harl Munnich, *Septante,* 57-61; Hegermann, "The Diaspora", 215-16.

[33] See above all, Tov, "Harmonizations".

only sporadically in the LXX is *commonplace* in the Targums, even in the official Babylonian Targums.

From the perspective of translation technique, Targums are best divided into two types: A-type Targums are more or less word for word translations with additional interpretive material, very unevenly distributed. The B-type, on the contrary, are not word for word renderings; the entire translation is paraphrastic, and the interpretation free and allegorising.[34]

One may compare the MT and the LXX at Ex 12:2 with a typical text from two Targums of the A-type, Targum Neofiti I (=TN) and Targum Pseudo-Jonathan (=TPJ). Variations between the texts, as additions, explications, as well as texts built on a different Hebrew *Vorlage*, are written in the cursive.

MT: הַחֹדֶשׁ הַזֶּה לָכֶם רֹאשׁ חֳדָשִׁים רִאשׁוֹן הוּא לָכֶם לְחָדְשֵׁי הַשָּׁנָה
"This month shall be for you the beginning of months; it shall be the first month of the year for you."

LXX: Ὁ μὴν οὗτος ὑμῖν ἀρχὴ μηνῶν, πρῶτός ἐστιν ὑμῖν ἐν τοῖς μησὶν τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ.
"This month shall be for you the beginning of months, first among the year's months shall it be for you."

TN: "This month, *Nisan,* will be for you the beginning of months; it will be the first for you *and for all the beginnings* of the months of the year".[35]

TPJ: "This month will be for you *to establish it as* the beginning of months; *starting from it* you *will begin to count the festivals, appointed times and cycles.* It will be to *you* the first *for the number of the* months of the year."

The specifying or modernizing additions so typical of the Targums are lacking altogether in the LXX. One observes that various additions are

---

[34] Alexander, "Jewish Aramaic Translations", 229-37.
[35] Additions or marked divergences in the interpretation are in italics.

made partly to clarify various things in the two Targums,[36] for example "Nisan" to elucidate "this month", "and for all" to amplify the meaning of "for you". Consider also Deut 32:8:

MT: בְּהַנְחֵל עֶלְיוֹן גּוֹיִם בְּהַפְרִידוֹ בְּנֵי אָדָם יַצֵּב גְּבֻלֹת עַמִּים לְמִסְפַּר בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל
"When the Most High gave the nations their inheritance, when he separated the sons of men, then he fixed the boundaries of the nations according to the number of the *children of Israel*."

LXX: ὅτε διεμέριζεν ὁ ὕψιστος ἔθνη, ὡς διέσπειρεν υἱοὺς Αδαμ, ἔστησεν ὅρια ἐθνῶν κατὰ ἀριθμὸν ἀγγέλων θεοῦ,
"When the Most High divided the nations, when he scattered the sons of Adam, he set the boundaries for the nations according to the number of *God's angels*."

TN: "When the Most High gave inheritance to the nations, when he divided up *the languages of* the sons of men, he established the boundaries of the nations, according to the number of *the tribes of* the children of Israel."

TPJ: "When the Most High gave inheritance *of the world* to the nations, *who came forth from the sons of Noah,* when he divided up *the writings and the languages for* the sons of men, *in the generation of the division,* at that time *he cast the lot with the seventy angels, the princes of the nations, with whom he was revealed to see the city, and* at that time he established the boundaries of the peoples, according to the *total* number of *the seventy persons of* Israel *who went down to Egypt.*"[37]

This is an example of how the Septuagint deviates from the MT, but here the reason seems to be that it has preserved a more original text, "God's angels", while the MT contains a later interpretation, "Israel's children".

---

[36] Both TN and TPJ are dependent on Gen 11:7-8 for their renderings. The 70 angels are already there in TPJ's version of 11:7-8. For the rendering of the text in both Targums, see Chester, *Divine Revelation,* 191.

[37] For the rendering of the Targums, see Chester, *Divine Revelation,* 219. Cf. *idem*, 101-02.

Cf. בְּנֵי אֵל in 4QDeut<sup>q</sup>.[38] One can trace here the clear development from God's sons in Qumran, understood as angels in LXX, to the MT:s "children of Israel", clarified as the tribes of the children in TN, to TPJ where both interpretations are combined and further developed. In this manner, the Targums as usual make clarifying additions "the languages", "the tribes" (TN), "the writings and the languages", "the seventy persons of Israel who went down to Egypt" (TPJ). Textual alterations of theological origin do not seem to be limited to translations; even in Hebrew manuscripts, as in parallel accounts in the MT, theological corrections to the text can be found.[39]

The similarities between the Septuagint and the type-A Targums are considerably greater than those with the type-B Targums, because the LXX translators can modernize, harmonize, clarify, and so on, but they do not allegorize.

Let's look at a text in a strongly allegorizing Targum, Song of Songs, a type usual in the Scriptures, Song 5:16.

MT: חִכּוֹ מַמְתַקִּים וְכֻלּוֹ מַחֲמַדִּים זֶה דוֹדִי וְזֶה רֵעִי בְּנוֹת יְרוּשָׁלָם׃
"*His mouth is pure sweetness, his whole being is desirable. This is my friend, this is my beloved, you daughters of Jerusalem!*"

LXX: φάρυγξ αὐτοῦ γλυκασμοὶ καὶ ὅλος ἐπιθυμία· οὗτος ἀδελφιδός μου, καὶ οὗτος πλησίον μου, θυγατέρες Ιερουσαλημ.
"*His throat is sweet, and he is completely desirable. This is my countryman, and this is my friend, you daughters of Jerusalem!*" (my own translation).

Targum: "*The words of his palate are sweet as honey and all his precepts are more desirable to his sages than gold or silver. This is the praise of God, my beloved, and this is the strength of the might of the Lord, my friend, O you prophets, who prophesy in Jerusalem*".[40]

---

[38] See, e.g., Tov, *Text-Critical Use*, 290; Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, 295-302; Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 69-70 and n. 13.

[39] For several examples, see Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation,* 66-77.

[40] The translation is from Alexander, "Jewish Aramaic Translations", 236.

Here one may note only the individual words that reflect the MT: "sweet", "my beloved", "my friend", "Jerusalem". From the fundamental presupposition that the text is an allegory about God's relation to Israel based on the law, each element in the text is interpreted as a symbol.[41] While there is a very great similarity here with Philo's interpretive method, points of contact with the Septuagint are largely lacking.

If one concentrates on the Septuagint as a whole — insofar as one can even think in terms of such a unity — one can see that it distinguishes itself from both the more literally translated official Babylonian Targums and the more paraphrastic Palestinian. Interpretive additions to the Hebrew text of the sort characteristic for the Babylonian Targums are not at all typical of the Septuagint. In those cases where the Septuagint radically diverges from the MT, it is usually the MT that is the longer text, as, for example, in Jeremiah and Job. The difference in length between the MT and the LXX in the book of Jeremiah has been shown moreover to rest on the fact that the translators of the Septuagint used a shorter, older version,[42] a text that has its nearest counterpart in 4QJer[b].

Not least in the books translated word for word, one now and again meet with a kind of rendering to which Septuagint scholars have given the designation *Verlegenheitsübersetzung*.[43] This can be defined as the translation of an idiom with the most frequently occurring glosses for the individual words, even if it results in the loss of the phrase's correct meaning. It can from time to time also refer to the use of the standard translation for a word in a context where it yields a different meaning. If the translators had consistently followed the translation principles employed by the Targums, there would have been no need of such "desperate translations".

Scarcely tenable is Paul Kahle's view that the present text of the Septuagint represents a recension of earlier translations, a recension that came into being in the same way as did the Targums, that is, through oral translation and exposition of the Hebrew Old Testament in diverse places

---

[41] See Alexander, "Jewish Aramaic Translations", 236.

[42] In the MT the shorter text has obviously been supplied with titles, names, and the like.

[43] See, e.g., Rabin, "Character", 24.

and localities.[44] The same applies to the characterization of the Septuagint as a Targum. In fact, the translation technique in the Septuagint diverges from both the Palestinian and Babylonian Targums.[45]

## 5.4. The Septuagint in Egypt and Palestine

A translation can hardly be done without being preceded by some form of interpretive process. That process can occur on several different levels, the first of which is a purely linguistic interpretation of the text, in the sense that the translator tries to get an understanding of what the various individual words mean in their contexts. It is entirely possible to stop at such an understanding, which is expressed word for word and with a word order that completely follows that of the original, and with the demand that every Hebrew word have a specific corresponding word in the translation. This is possible, but it will hardly yield an understandable text.

It is important in this connection to observe that Jewish tradition is not at all unfamiliar with word for word translation. Not only Aquila produced an example of it. The Septuagint's further fortunes show that the translation was for a long time revised in the direction of what one can call a strictly literal translation of the sort that closely resembles the interlinear translations. Aquila can be seen as the end product in a long process of revision where the so-called kaige recension from the mid-first century CE stands as the middle link. This technique becomes in such cases a straightjacket of sorts that prevents the translation from forming the translator's understanding of the text; but it permits the reader to discern the structure and organization of the Hebrew. This trend was presumably reinforced through the controversy with Christians over the correct interpretation of their common inheritance, the Old Testament, but the tendency was evident at a much earlier stage.

---

[44] For Kahle's theory, see, e.g., Olofsson, *LXX Version,* 40-41. For a detailed presentation of Kahle's theory, see Jellicoe, *Septuagint,* 58-63. The Targum is also always directly dependent on the Hebrew text, which is read first. Consequently, in the synagogue milieu the Targum was completely bound to and presupposed the Hebrew original, which was not the case with the use of the Septuagint in Alexandria. See, e.g., Perrot, "Diaspora hellénistique", 117.

[45] This is readily admitted by, e.g., Roger le Déaut in spite of the similarities between the Targums and the Septuagint to which he draws attention. le Déaut, "La septante, un targum?", 190-95.

Later, official Judaism was (to put it mildly) sceptically disposed toward the Septuagint. The Septuagint's origin could be compared with the breaking of the covenant in Exodus 32: "That day was as difficult for Israel as the day the calf was made, because the Pentateuch could not be translated properly."[46] Generally speaking, translation of the Old Testament was regarded with great misgiving. According to the Talmud, Rabbi Judah bar Ilai, a student of Rabbi Akiba around the end of the first century CE, stands behind the pronouncement that "he who translates a verse literally is a liar and he who adds is a blasphemer."[47]

The strictly literal revisions of the Septuagint arose in Palestine, which was a multi-lingual milieu at the inauguration of our era. Translations and revisions of this type presuppose access to an interpreter in the same way that the "turgeman" or the "meturgeman" in the synagogue worship translated and commented on Hebrew texts that were difficult to understand. These translations and revisions seem to be the product of a bi-lingual community where the original language had cultural and religious prestige.[48]

The translation is relativized in this way, since it mirrors the original exactly: its nature as translation is strongly marked by underscoring its dependence on the original Hebrew text. Here obviously there are tendencies in different directions in Palestine and Egypt. In Palestine the Septuagint was revised so as to reflect as exactly as possible the Hebrew text; in Hellenistic Judaism, on the other hand, the Septuagint, that is, the Old Greek, was regarded as inspired, and therefore beyond criticism.[49] That the Septuagint, that is, the Pentateuch, was considered an inspired translation proceeds at least indirectly from the Letter of Aristeas,[50] or at

---

[46] *Sop*. 1.7. The translation is from Tov, "The Septuagint", 163.

[47] Tosefta, *Meg* 4.41. See also Bab. Talm., *Qidd*, 49a. The translation is from Tal, "Samaritan Targum", 200.

[48] Brock, "Aspects", 74. Greek was the generally dominant language in Egypt among the Jews in the third century, while very few had command of Aramaic and Hebrew, even if Aramaic was more common than Hebrew. See, e.g., Barr, "Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek", 101, 111. A large correspondence written by Jews in Greek has been uncovered in Egypt, but only small amounts of written material in Hebrew or Aramaic. *Idem,* 101-02.

[49] See, for example, Brewer, *Jewish Exegesis,* 224-25; Hengel, "christliche Schriftensammlung", 237-38 n. 163.

[50] Cf, e.g., Hengel, "christliche Schriftensammlung", 237-38.

least as close to it as was possible at that time.[51] The legend of Aristeas presumably reflects an attitude prevailing around 100 BC.[52] The idea is explicit in Philo around the beginning of the present era.[53] He probably put the two versions, the Hebrew and the Greek, on the same level: "They (the Jews of Alexandria) regard them with admiration and respect, like two sisters, or rather, as one and the same work, both in form and substance …".[54]

An inspired text is not *an interpretation*; it requires to *be interpreted*. Paradoxically enough, neither in Palestine nor in Egypt during the first century CE, did the Septuagint function as an interpretation of the law to make it easier for people to understand it, although for a different reason in each case. In Palestine, the people could hardly understand the Septuagint since it was mainly or at least partly known in extremely literal revisions reflecting the exact wording of the Hebrew text. In Egypt, the original Septuagint was regarded as inspired and thus it could not be modernized or harmonized. Here perhaps is to be found part of the explanation for the relatively literal translation technique in the Pentateuch, and in most other books, in comparison with the Targums. Simply put, the Targums had a completely different function in Palestine from what the Septuagint had in Egypt.[55]

The written Targums developed from the oral interpretation, which would always follow the reading of the Scripture in Hebrew. The meturgeman's interpretation immediately followed the Hebrew text.[56] The Septuagint on the contrary, that is, the translation of the Pentateuch, presumably took the place of the Hebrew Scripture reading altogether in Egypt.[57] This explains why occurrences of Targumic additions and

---

[51] See, e.g., Hanhart, "Entstehung der LXX", 155.

[52] See especially Orlinsky, "Hebrew Text", 540-48.

[53] See, e.g., Brewer, *Jewish Exegesis,* 209, 224; Bratcher, *History of Bible Translation*, 2 and n. 3. Later on, especially in Christian tradition, the miraculous character of the Greek translation was emphasised even more. See, e.g., Müller, *Kirkens første Bibel*, 29-84; Hengel, "christliche Schriftensammlung", 182-204.

[54] Philo, *De Vita Mosis*, 2,40.

[55] Cf. Veltri, "περὶ Εβραίων", 126-27.

[56] See, e.g., Alexander, "Jewish Aramaic Translations", 238-40.

[57] Perrot, "Ancient Synagogue", 152. See also Perrot, "Diaspora hellénistique", 120 and n. 25; Veltri, "Targum Aquilas", 108, 113; Veltri, "περὶ Εβραίων", 127. In the Diaspora, Egypt especially, reading must have been simply in Greek, using the text of the Septuagint.  Perrot, "Ancient Synagogue", 155. In fact, the entire

actualisations in the Septuagint as a whole are few. The Septuagint was not used in the synagogue in the same way, as were the Targums; rather, the Septuagint replaced the Hebrew text itself.

If the practice of reading the Torah together with interpreting passages from the prophets were also done from the Septuagint, then this might possibly explain the free translation of, not least of all, Isaiah. The reading of the prophetic texts constituted the interpretation of the Pentateuch and texts from Isaiah dominated the reading of the *haftorot,* in later times anyway.[58] However, whether there took place in Egyptian synagogues in the last centuries BC a systematic reading of both the law and the prophets according to a definite schema, is a disputed point. Possibly the reading was limited to the Pentateuch.[59] The translation of the prophets in the LXX can hardly have come about without some sort of involvement of the religious authorities, all the more so as the reading of both the law and the prophets in the synagogue predates the beginning of the present era. The translation is not seldom described as a semi-official translation.[60]

The Writings in the LXX are if anything a collection of more or less private translations, mostly from Egypt, but partly also from Palestine. This is confirmed, among other things, by the colophon to the book of Esther and the preface to the translation of Sirach. This private nature also comes to expression through the disparate translation methods used. Since they did not make up a part of the regular Sabbath text readings in the synagogue, they had only a marginal role in Jewish worship. The calendar

---

synagogue liturgy was done in Greek. Barr, "Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek", 102, 111. Cf. *M. Megilla* 1,8 and 2,1 where the existence of scrolls written in other languages than Hebrew is mentioned, even though *m. Yad* condemns this practice. *t. Meg* 4,13 asks for the beginning and end of the reading to be in Hebrew. This may presuppose a reading of the Greek scroll. In Mishna, *Meg* 2,1 it is accepted that the mother tongue could be used in the liturgy. Cf. Veltri, "περὶ Ἐβραίων", 126.

[58] See, e.g., the list of *parashot* and *haftorot* in Perrot, "Ancient Synagogue", 14lff. The later portion of the prophets in Jewish tradition was more freely translated than what one now designates as the historical books. le Déaut, "The Targumim", 571, 582. Unfortunately, one does not know how early the reading of the *haftorot* began. See, e.g., Perrot, "Diaspora hellénistique", 116-17.

[59] Perrot, "Ancient Synagogue", 15lf.

[60] Bickerman's theory of purely private translations seems exaggerated. Bickerman, "Notes", 149-78.

of Jewish feasts, with its readings of *megillot* is from a later date and obviously plays no part in the Jewish Diaspora of pre-Christian times.[61]

My hypothesis is that the foremost reason for the kind of translation found represented in the Pentateuch, and partly in the prophets, is that the Septuagint was written to replace the Hebrew as the basic text. This is also the reason that the closest counterpart to the Targums — and not least of all, the Babylonian Targums in the Egyptian Diaspora — is not the Septuagint but Philo's Bible commentaries.[62] It is possible that from the beginning the Targums were more like a commentary or some form of sermonizing, not a translation, not even a paraphrasing or commenting translation.[63] It cannot be ruled out that the reading of the Septuagint text was followed by an allegorical commentary similar in kind to Philo's commentary on the Pentateuch.[64] There is indeed a certain similarity between the pericopes discussed in Philo's *Questions and Answers in Genesis and Exodus* and the treatment in the Babylonian *parashot*.[65] Interpretation of texts, which was exclusively based on the Septuagint as the authoritative text, was concentrated in the Pentateuch; other books were mentioned only sparingly.[66] Accordingly, the Septuagint is no Targum, though it has points of contact with Jewish interpretive tradition. However, in this, it takes more the form of the initiator of, rather than the medium for, that interpretive tradition.

---

[61] The reading of Esther, e.g., did not come about before CE 70. Dorival, Harl, Munnich, *Septante,* 57-61; Hegermann, "The Diaspora", 109.

[62] Although some scholars consider Philo's commentaries as homilies based on a synagogue text, there are nevertheless certain features that speak against such a supposition. See the interesting discussion in Perrot, "Diaspora hellénistique", 126-32.

[63] See, e.g., Perrot, "Ancient Synagogue", 155.

[64] See, e.g., Philo, *De somniis II,* 127-28; Perrot, "Ancient Synagogue", 151-52.

[65] Perrot, "Diaspora hellénistique", 131. In fact, Philo consistently used the Septuagint as the basic text. See, e.g., Brewer, *Jewish Exegesis*, 209.

[66] Brewer, *Jewish Exegesis,* 210.

# 6. Studying the Word Order of the Septuagint

## 6.1. Methodological Preliminaries

The word order of a translation is an essential aspect of literality,[1] but it is perhaps one of the most neglected. But, what does word order signify? The term "word" in "word order" here includes suffixes and conjunctions, which are part of a word in the Hebrew, but reflected by a separate pronoun, conjunction, etc. in the target language.

Most of the LXX books follow the word order of the original closely, but the variations are great. This is probably one of the main aspects in which the "free" translated books of the LXX depart from the literal ones.[2] Consequently, it is a very promising field for studying translation technique. However, one must admit that the study of the word order in the LXX is a complicated issue. Soisalon-Soininen even regards this investigation as one of the most complicated and problematic issues in Septuagint research.[3] Inversion of the word order in LXX can perhaps be defined as "the position of words in the Old Greek in an order that differ from its *Vorlage*". To note the inversions in the word order between the MT and the LXX in, for example, the book of Psalms, i.e. *BHS*, and Rahlfs' text, and dividing them into different categories are far from the end of the investigation, *it is only the beginning*.

Methodologically speaking, the subservience to the word order as a translation technique can be adequately compared when different translations of a certain Hebrew book to the same target language are employed. For example, the differences in the word order between the Old Greek, Symmachus, Aquila, and Quinta in the book of Psalms adequately reflect differences in translation technique between the translations, if small differences in the *Vorlage* are disregarded. However, it cannot serve as a criterion of literality in absolute sense, that is, "in relation to an absolute norm in the form of a strictly literal translation".[4] The evaluation of translation technique must be based on *both* the Hebrew text, that is,

---

[1] See Barr, "Typology", 294; Tov, *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint*, 58. Cf. Rife, "Mechanics", 245; Brock, "Aspects", 81.
[2] Orlinsky, "Holy Writ", 108; Barr, "Typology", 300.
[3] Soisalon-Soininen, "Hebraismenfrage", 47.
[4] Olofsson, "Consistency", 22.

the *Vorlage,* and the way it was rendered by the translator, as strongly emphasised by prof. Soisalon-Soininen.[5]

A comparison of word order, as well as other aspects of literalism, between different LXX books is more problematic. In this case, the target language is the same. Consequently, one can disregard the word-field of the language into which the translation is made, but differences between the Hebrew texts in their contexts ought to be taken into consideration. I have tried to show that certain factors affect the reliability of statistics of consistency as a translation technique, *viz.* the semantic range of the Hebrew words, the resources and the demands of the target language, the literality of the translation and the nature of the Hebrew text.

Certain other factors ought also to be taken into account, that is, the frequency of the Hebrew word, the translator's knowledge of Hebrew, as well as the *Vorlage* of the Hebrew word.[6] Some of these factors can as well be applied to inversion as a translation technique, e.g. the resources and the demands of the target language and the character of the Hebrew text. The literality of the translation can be of certain help for determining if the inversions are based on a different *Vorlage*. The knowledge of Hebrew on the part of the translator can also affect genuine inversions as well as supposed inversions. However, I would suspect that word order in the LXX is a better sign of literality than consistency and therefore the statistics in this regard are probably fairly accurate.[7]

---

[5]   See   Soisalon-Soininen,   "Wiedergabe",   99.   Cf.   Soisalon-Soininen, "Hebraismenfrage", 48.

[6] See chap. 3.

[7] See chap. 3.

## 6.2. Methods for Investigating the Word Order

What is the best way to investigate the word order as a translation technique? Rife exemplifies one way to study the word order by giving criteria for distinguishing common fixed sequences of Semitic word order, which do not correspond to the word order of the Greek language in original Greek texts. Although not all the criteria are equally decisive, because of the richness and development of the Greek language, books translated from a Semitic original evidently differ from books in original Greek.[8] Rife has described some of the most common fixed sequences of the Semitic word order, which do not correspond to the word order of the Greek language in original Greek texts.

*1. No word comes between the article and its noun.*
*2. An adjective always immediately follows its substantive.*
*3. Postpositive conjunctions are not employed.*
*4. A genitive always immediately follows its construct.*
*5. A direct, personal, pronominal object always follows its governing verb.*
*6. A demonstrative pronoun always follows its substantive.*

It is reasonable to assume that any Greek text that consistently reflects these features of Semitic word order ought to be a translation from a Semitic original.[9]

Rife found through a selective investigation that there are significant differences between original Greek and the LXX Greek according to most of these criteria. The article was separated from the noun by a conjunction or an adjective or adjective phrase far more often in an original Greek composition than in the translated books of the LXX. The same is true for the tendency to place the adjective before the noun and the genitive before the substantive it modifies. Regarding the postpositive conjunctions, the variations were as extensive between literary and colloquial Greek as between original Greek and translation Greek.[10]

---

[8] Rife, "Mechanics", 247.
[9] Rife, "Mechanics", 247.
[10] Rife, "Mechanics", 248-49. For the use of the postpositive conjunctions in original Greek, see Blomqvist, *Greek Particles*. See also *idem*, 128-31 regarding the historical development of the position of certain particles.

An indication of translation Greek is the common sequence in Hebrew verb, subject, and object; ancient Greek, on the other hand, showed great variation.[11] Even in this case Rife's admittedly preliminary investigation based on a random sample showed a distinct preference for the Hebrew word order in the translated books of the LXX as against the variety that characterises original Greek compositions.[12] This tendency is, surprisingly enough, especially pronounced in the first four books of the Pentateuch.[13]

Another indication of translation Greek is the position of the enclitic personal pronoun. The pronoun in Attic Greek is usually placed before its noun,[14] while in Hebrew the relation is expressed through a suffix. In Hebrew, it is thus attached to the end of the word in question. According to this criterion, the Psalter is among the most literal books of the LXX.[15]

G. Marquis has made a study of word order in the LXX.[16] I agree with Marquis that to start from the target language and note any deviation from a regular Greek word order is not the best way to study translation technique. One ought rather to make the Hebrew text the starting-point. His own method is to calculate the subservience to the word order of the source and express "the resultant number relative to the total number of verses as a percentage of subservience or non-subservience to the word order of the source".[17] However, these statistics are hardly adequate for the description of the word order as a translation technique.[18]

A few remarks concerning the prerequisites for the investigation are in order. Word order is only suitable as a criterion of translation technique if the target language has a flexible word order, because in that case the word order can be the result of the translator's conscious policy. This is

---

[11] Rife, "Mechanics", 247.

[12] Rife, "Mechanics", 248, 250-51. In fact, original Greek texts very seldom employ the usual Hebrew word order. *Idem*, 250.

[13] Rife, "Mechanics", 250.

[14] Wifstrand, "Personalpronomina", 44.

[15] Wifstrand, "Personalpronomina", 47.

[16] Marquis, "Consistency".

[17] Marquis, "Consistency", 405.

[18] See, e.g., the adequate criticism by Soisalon-Soininen in his article "Hebraismenfrage", 47.

fortunately the case with the Greek language.[19] The word order of the target language must be followed even in the most literal translation. If the order of the target language is fixed the sequence of elements does not indicate a certain translation technique. For example, צמאה נפשי לאל חי (*Vorlage* of LXX) in Ps 42:3a is easily translated by ἐδίψησεν ἡ ψυχή μου πρὸς τὸν θεὸν τὸν ζῶντα in Greek. Nevertheless, in English one has to translate "My soul thirsts for the living God", because "thirsts my soul for God" can only be understood as a question. In this manner, the sequence of the elements in a certain language can radically affect the meaning of the sentence. Certain elements can be fixed for grammatical reasons; for example, the sequence of the elements is in certain cases fixed even in Greek. For example, δέ and γάρ are never placed in first position in a Greek sentence. A sequence that is imperative in Greek can hardly be used as an example of a deviation from the word order of the Hebrew as a translation technique. In other words, to speak about the literality of the word order presupposes that the translators had alternatives. The element of choice is essential in the conception of translation technique.[20]

## 6.3. Inversion, Text or *Vorlage*

I have found 226 cases of a deviating word order between Rahlfs' text and the MT in the Psalms, including conjunctions, particles and so on. This is remarkably few, if one takes into account the scope of the text. On the other hand, the figure is surprisingly high if the translator tried to follow the word order of the original strictly, that is, employ the principle of Aquila in this regard.

The examples of a different word order must be examined in detail, because there are several explanations of this state of affairs that do not presuppose a deliberate change of the Hebrew word order. First, one must discuss particles where the sequence of the elements is fixed in Greek, e.g. ἄρα, οὖν, τε, δέ, γάρ.[21] ἄρα is once inverted in relation to the Hebrew. Furthermore, ἄρα is added 4 times, and it also occurs without being

---

[19] Ottley, *Handbook*, 12; Rife, "Mechanics", 245-47; Barr, "Typology", 295-96. See also Blass, Debrunner, Funk, *Greek Grammar*, §472.

[20] Rife, "Mechanics", 245. See also in this connection Silva, "Bilingualism", 216-17 and n. 52, 53. Although Silva speaks about the style of the language, it can be applied to translation technique as well.

[21] See Moulton, Turner, *Grammar III*, 347.

inverted on 6 occasions. οὖν appears in 10:14, but it is not inverted. τέ can be found inverted once and once it is added. There are at least 17 examples of inversion or transposition with γάρ in the Psalter. γάρ is also frequently added in the translation, at least 28 times. Sometimes it is neither inverted nor added, 5 times. δέ is inverted approximately 78 times, according to Rahlfs' text. δὲ is also frequently added in the translation, approximately 42 times.[22] The abovementioned can hardly be seen as examples of inversion as translation technique. On the other hand, the choice of δέ instead of καί as a rendering of ן includes an element of choice, that is, the translator could have employed καί in all cases,[23] since καί only contains a dependent semantic value. It does not reflect a meaning independent of the context; since the relation is only conveyed by the contents of the clauses, that καί connects. For that reason, the translator *could* have used καί always and left the relation between the clauses unspecified, even though this would result in a less natural Greek text. But if one includes this type of inversions, they must be distinguished from inversions of word order where the choice of order in the target language is more or less free. I will not discuss further these cases of differences in word order but that much can be said that the frequency of the Greek post-position particles δέ and γάρ in relation to καί is rather high in the Psalter, in contrast to the other type of inversions.[24]

How are inversions between the MT and the LXX to be interpreted? Evidently, there are three basic types of explanations in this regard; inversions may be derived from *the translator*, from the subsequent *transmission-history* of the translation or be based on a *variant Hebrew text*. The last two of these explanations cannot of course be used for demonstrating the word order of the LXX as a translation technique, since as Marquis rightly puts it "Differences in word order deriving from a

---

[22] Sporadically it occurs as neither an addition nor an inversion.

[23] For the differences in meaning between καί and δέ, see especially Aejmelaeus, *Parataxis*, 34-36. The frequency of δέ as against καί in ordinary paratactic clauses is in fact of some, even if limited, value for determining the translation technique. *Idem*, 36-42, 183.

[24] It is one of the least literal among the translation units investigated by Tov and Wright. Tov, Wright, "Literalness", 158-87.

variant Hebrew *Vorlage* cannot be taken as demonstrating the translator's freedom, but rather his faithfulness to his variant source."[25]

In fact, minor deviations of the LXX, which can be of translation technical nature, are also represented in ancient Hebrew texts from Qumran.[26] This is not the least the case with inversions. Ancient scribal tradition probably accepted a limited variation of word order in the textual transmission of the Hebrew Bible.[27] The differences in wording did not result from incompetence or negligence.[28] Furthermore, inversion is a widely employed stylistic technique in the composition of the biblical literature.[29] Since repetition is an important aspect of the literary structure of the Hebrew Scriptures,[30] the inversion, which causes movement and variation into the stereotype patterns, is an indispensable element in this structure. In fact, repetition and inversion are complementary principles in the literary composition of the Hebrew Bible.[31] These techniques are reflected, not only in the composition of the Hebrew text, but they have also affected the biblical writings in the diverse forms of textual transmission.[32]

The collection and classification of word order variants make it possible to choose among three explanations. No doubt, most of the inversions in the LXX Psalms mirror translation technique. This certainly remains the best explanation to most of the inversions in the old versions.[33] On the other hand, one may advocate that, far more than often is recognised,[34] textual inversion in the old versions depends on the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the translation.[35] Allen in his translation technical study of the Greek Chronicles is open to the possibility that the Hebrew

---

[25] Marquis, "Word Order"*,* 59-84.

[26] See Tov, *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint*, 218-19; Tov, "Notes", 78-79 n. 25. Cf. Ziegler, "Vorlage", 38-50.

[27] See, e.g., Talmon, "Textual Study", 326; Talmon, "Text", 162-63.

[28] See Talmon, "Textual Study", 326.

[29] Talmon, "Textual Study", 358, 368. See the whole discussion, *idem,* 358-81.

[30] See, e.g., Talmon, "Textual Study", 358, and the references in n. 142-45.

[31] Talmon, "Textual Study", 358.

[32] Talmon, "Textual Study", 358, 368, 380.

[33] Talmon, "Textual Study", 370-71.

[34] Inversion is looked upon as a more or less conscious translation technique. Even if this is true, there are several exceptions to this basic rule.

[35] Talmon, "Textual Study", 370-71, 373-74. See also the examples on 371-78. Cf. the discussion of differences in sequence in Tov, *Data Base*, 42-43.

*Vorlage* caused the inversion of the LXX in relation to MT.[36] This possibility is strengthened when the translation technique as a whole is literal, especially concerning the word order. This seems to be true for the book of Psalms. For example, deviations from the word order of the Hebrew in a highly literal translation are more likely to be based on a different *Vorlage* than in a more free translation, since subservience to the word order of the primary source is a prime characteristic or even the primary characteristic of a literal translation.[37] This does not mean that I concur with the evaluation of G. Marquis that "in a translation shown to be highly literal, any word order-difference – apart from one which cannot be retroverted into grammatical Hebrew – is not only potentially ... but even probably likely to derive from a Hebrew source".[38]

The general literality of the translation can only support a preliminary evaluation. The subservience to the word order of the original must be investigated, since the literality of the version can be based primarily on other aspects of literality, for example consistency, semantic accuracy, one-to-one relation between lexical elements, etymological exegesis. Most elements of literalism can play a comparatively independent role. Some of the criteria for literality are even more or less adversely related.[39] In order to make a more accurate evaluation of the individual case, one could investigate if it would be grammatically possible to follow the word order of the MT and if the Hebrew could accept the word order of the Greek. Furthermore, it would really strengthen the case for a Hebrew *Vorlage* if the Hebrew terms under investigation occurred in the word order of the Greek in other places in the MT.

Thus far, I have discussed the *Vorlage* behind the supposed inversion, which if it is identical with the Greek word order, rules out the use of it as an example of inversion. However, the Hebrew text is but one of the two texts under discussion, the other is of course the Greek text. Since inversion as a translation technique presupposes a relation in word order

---

[36] See Allen, *Greek Chronicles II*, 64-66, 108.

[37] See, e.g., Olofsson, *LXX Version*, 13 and n. 115, 116, 14 and n. 119, 120. See also Marquis, "Word Order", 61 and n. 6.

[38] Marquis, "Word Order", 67. On the other hand, he later on admits that, "In the case of differences revealing the same tendency, the fact that they can be retroverted into more or less grammatical Hebrew may be a matter of coincidence". *Idem*, 69.

[39] See especially the discussion in Barr, "Typology".

between a Hebrew and a Greek text, the best comparison can be made between the Old Greek and it's *Vorlage*. One cannot assume that all changes in Greek texts later on in the transmission history of the LXX have a relation to a Hebrew text. Therefore, both the Hebrew and the Greek text ought to be scrutinised. Just as one cannot presuppose that the *Vorlage* of the LXX Psalms always reflects the word order of the MT, one cannot take for granted that Rahlfs' text always reflects the word order of the Old Greek. The LXX text was probably subject to numerous revisions in the course of its history because of its liturgical use. In the words of Pietersma:

> To be sure, tradition plays a distorting role on any piece of literature handed down from antiquity, but among the books of the LXX this is true to an extraordinary degree for the Psalms. That this should be so might be expected on *a priori* grounds. For most of its life, the Greek Psalter functioned as the Church's liturgical text *par excellence* and so, from ancient times onward, it was copied far more frequently and misconstrued by a larger number of scribes than is true for any other book of the LXX. That texts change in transmission is not a point of contention and that they change more the more they are transmitted is equally true. Accordingly, we might anticipate thick layers of traditional material in the Greek Psalms. Vis-à-vis the rest of the LXX, we may note that the Psalter is extant in well over a thousand Greek manuscripts.[40]

Variants affecting the word order are common in the Psalter and Rahlfs' text is more open to discussion nowadays since some old Mss have been found since Rahlfs' edition appeared.[41] The greatest find since *Psalmi cum Odis* was published is P. Bodmer XXIV (Rahlfs 2110), a manuscript of the 3rd/4th century CE (or even the 2nd century) containing approx. Pss 17—118, a member of Rahlfs' Upper Egyptian text group.[42] Other important Mss are 2149, 2150 from the fourth century CE.[43]

The principles behind Rahlfs' edition are well known. When the three old text families concur, this text is as a rule chosen, even if it does not

---

[40] Pietersma, "P. Bodmer XXIV", 263.

[41] See, e.g., Pietersma, *Two Manuscripts,* 6-15.

[42] See Pietersma, "P. Bodmer XXIV" and Barthélemy, "Papyrus Bodmer XXIV", 106-10, who date it to the 2nd century, that is, as pre-Origen. *Idem* 106-07.

[43] See especially Pietersma, *Two Manuscripts*.

reflect the MT, when the old text families have different texts, the text that reflects the MT is employed. In doubtful cases, the text of Vaticanus is preferred. Rahlfs seems also to have adopted the advice of Helbing to choose the reading of the older Mss, B, and S.[44] But if they are the only support for a reading he chooses to follow the majority of the Mss. This is one side of the text-critical work of Rahlfs. But, he employed essentially two strategies to uncover the OG text of the Psalter. He constantly focused on the Hebrew text and, on the other hand, he traced the evolution of the Greek variant. Rahlfs, with his outstanding qualifications as a textual critic, frequently chose as OG readings that are close to the Hebrew text. Although Rahlfs' text represents a very high standard of scholarship, the new Mss and the more consistent use of translation technique in deciding the OG has made the LXX scholars inclined to the discuss both the Greek and the Hebrew text. Pietersma suggests that, e.g., the variants in 2110 reflecting MT against Rahlfs' text, far more often than recognised represent the OG.[45]

Consequently, when evaluating the inversions between the MT and Rahlfs' Greek text, one must first make it probable that it is the question of an inversion at all and not a secondary Greek text or a Hebrew *Vorlage* that differs from the MT.

### 6.3.1. Different kinds of inversion

Inversions between the MT and the LXX can be subdivided into several categories. I will make a division, apart from the inversion of post-position particles, δέ, γάρ, οὖν, μέν, τέ, ἄρα, into five categories:

*Inversion of other particles*
*Inversion of pronouns reflecting suffixes joined to prepositions*
*Inversion of personal pronouns reflecting a verbal-suffix or a noun-suffix*
*Inversion of independent personal pronouns*
*Inversion of ordinary words, such as verbs, nouns, adjectives, adverbs*

Inversion of particles is common in the Psalter, and they are the work of the translator, rather than reflections of the original text.

Regarding the employment of an inverted position of the personal pronouns Wifstrand has established some rules that may be employed to

---

[44] See for example 3:5 in Rahlfs, *Psalmi*.
[45] Pietersma, "Septuagint Research", 302.

investigate if the inversions depend on the endeavour to conform to stylistic patterns of the Greek language or if they are reflections of a different *Vorlage*. The personal pronouns are the largest group of inversions in LXX Psalms, which is not the obligatory outcome of the structure of the Greek. My own conclusion is that the inversion is mainly of stylistic nature in sentences of this character. If the usage conforms to the structure of the language,[46] or it depends on stylistic considerations,[47] the character and the resources of the Greek can explain most of these inversions.

I will, however, restrict my discussion to the perhaps most interesting category, the inversion of ordinary words, such as verbs, nouns, adjectives, adverbs. I have from the outset at least 45 cases of inversion in this category in the book of Psalms if one only compares Rahlfs' text with MT. I will give examples where a different *Vorlage* is probable or cannot be excluded, cases where a variant rather than Rahlfs' text can reflect the OG, as well as cases where the inversion probably depends on translation technique. One may take for granted that my conclusions are far from certain and perhaps all of my examples may be disputed. Thus, it is a tentative discussion, which shows my way of reasoning.

### 6.3.2. Vorlage

An obvious example that demonstrates a case of different *Vorlage* is the rendering of לְדָוִד מִזְמוֹר in 23 (24):1 and 138 (139):1 by ψαλμὸς τῷ Δαυιδ.

*23 (24):1* לְדָוִד מִזְמוֹר — ψαλμὸς τῷ Δαυιδ τῆς μιᾶς σαββάτων
*138 (139):1* לְדָוִד מִזְמוֹר — ψαλμὸς τῷ Δαυιδ

לְדָוִד מִזְמוֹר — ψαλμὸς τῷ Δαυιδ.
לְדָוִד מִזְמוֹר only occurs in superscriptions,[48] and is always, except here and in 138 (139):1, rendered by τῷ Δαυιδ ψαλμὸς. Thus, one could expect it also in 23 (24):1 and 138 (139):1. The opposite word order, מִזְמוֹר לְדָוִד,

---

[46] This applies to the position of postpositive particles.
[47] In this case, it applies to the position of the personal pronoun in different types of sentences, especially phrases with an emphasised pronoun and phrases with a stress on the predicate, or with a conjunction or a relative pronoun.
[48] Pss 24:1; 40:1; 68:1; 101:1; 109:1; 110:1; 139:1.

also only appears in superscriptions in the Psalter.[49] It is always rendered by ψαλμὸς τῷ δαυιδ. There are no stylistic grounds for the inversion of the word order and the Greek variants that follow the MT in 138 (139):1, L^d A, have no bearing on the Old Greek. Since the translator always followed the word order of the Hebrew when rendering this phrase, the translation here and in 138 (139):1 is obviously based on a *Vorlage* with the word order מִזְמוֹר לְדָוִד.

Another, more disputable example, is 9:37 (10:16).

*9:37 (10:16)* יְהוָה מֶלֶךְ עוֹלָם וָעֶד אָבְדוּ גוֹיִם מֵאַרְצוֹ — βασιλεύσει κύριος εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα καὶ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος. ἀπολεῖσθε ἔθνη ἐκ τῆς γῆς αὐτοῦ

יְהוָה מֶלֶךְ — βασιλεύσει κύριος
Greek variants with the order of the MT are S 1221 La^G Aug Ga Z κύριος βασιλεύσει, and *L* κύριος βασιλεύς.

The word order יְהוָה מֶלֶךְ can be found here and in Ps 29:10. Ps 29 is a fairly close parallel, since יְהוָה מֶלֶךְ לְעוֹלָם is rendered by κύριος βασιλεὺς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, while יְהוָה מֶלֶךְ עוֹלָם וָעֶד in 10:16 is translated by βασιλεύσει κύριος εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα καὶ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος. The order יְהוָה מָלָךְ is more common.[50] It is always rendered by ὁ κύριος ἐβασίλευσεν. Once הַמֶּלֶךְ יְהוָה appears, 98:6, but the syntactic relation between the words is not the same, that is, "the King, the LORD", instead of "the LORD is king" 10:16. Outside the Psalter, a different situation obtains, since מֶלֶךְ יְהוָה, with or without the definite article, appears seven times.[51] The word order of the Hebrew is always followed in the LXX. מָלַךְ יְהוָה occur twice outside the Psalter in the MT, Isa 24:23; Mic 4:7, and it is rendered by βασιλεύσει κύριος. This was probably the *Vorlage* of

---

[49] 3:1; 4:1; 5:1; 6:1; 8:1; 9:1; 12:1; 13:1; 15:1; 19:1; 20:1; 21:1; 22:1; 23:1; 29:1; 31:1; 38:1; 39:1; 41:1; 51:1; 62:1; 63:1; 64:1; 65:1; 108:1; 140:1; 141:1; 143:1.
[50] 93:1; 96:10; 97:1; 99:1.
[51] 2 Sam 24:23; Isa 6:5; Jer 46:18; 48:15; 51:57; Zech 14:16, 17. In the *Vorlage* of the LXX מֶלֶךְ did not occur in Jer 46:18 and מֶלֶךְ יְהוָה is missing in 48:15.

Ps 9:37 (10:16) in the LXX too. The translator read מָלַךְ יְהוָה, instead of יְהוָה מֶלֶךְ.[52] That the Greek variants represent the OG are less probable.

*118 (119):149 קוֹלִי שִׁמְעָה כְחַסְדְּךָ יְהוָה כְּמִשְׁפָּטֶךָ חַיֵּנִי* — τῆς φωνῆς μου ἄκουσον κύριε κατὰ τὸ ἔλεός σου. κατὰ τὸ κρίμα σου ζῆσόν με

כְחַסְדְּךָ יְהוָה — κύριε κατὰ τὸ ἔλεός σου.
Only Ga has the word order of the MT.

כְחַסְדְּךָ יְהוָה does otherwise not occur in the MT, but חַסְדְּךָ יְהוָה appears in Pss 33:22; 94:18; 119:64, rendered by τὸ ἔλεός σου κύριε, חַסְדֶּךָ יְהוָה in 119:41 has the same counterpart. The expression without suffix, חֶסֶד יְהוָה, appears in Pss 33:5; 103:17; 1 Sam 20:14, and חַסְדֵי יְהוָה in Pss 89:2; 107:43; Isa 63:7; Lam 3:22. It is always translated in the order of the Hebrew, but once יְהוָה lack counterpart, 1 Sam 20:14, and once the whole verse is missing in the LXX, Lam 3:22. The LXX translator has a different understanding of the verse than the MT based on the position of κύριος:

*In your steadfast love hear my voice; O LORD, in your justice preserve my life* (MT *NRSV*)
*In your steadfast love hear my voice, O Lord; by your judgment quicken me* (LXX *NETS*)

The interpretation in the LXX is easier to understand if it had the *Vorlage* יְהוָה כְחַסְדְּךָ. The closest parallels to the word order of the suspected *Vorlage* (יְהוָה כְחַסְדְּךָ) reflected in the LXX appears in 119:159 and in 51:3 (with אֱלֹהִים, instead of יְהוָה):

Ps 118 (119):159 יְהוָה כְחַסְדְּךָ חַיֵּנִי — κύριε ἐν τῷ ἐλέει σου ζῆσόν με (LXX perhaps reflects בְחַסְדֶּךָ).
50 (51):3 חָנֵּנִי אֱלֹהִים כְּחַסְדֶּךָ — ἐλέησόν με ὁ θεός κατὰ τὸ μέγα ἔλεός σου

τῆς φωνῆς μου ἄκουσον κύριε κατὰ τὸ ἔλεός σου is probably based on a *Vorlage* with a different word order, קוֹלִי שִׁמְעָה יְהוָה כְחַסְדְּךָ. Peshitta

---

[52] Cf. also יִמְלֹךְ יְהוָה translated by βασιλεύσει κύριος in Ps 146:10.

reflects also this word order (*BHS*). A *Vorlage* with the word order of the LXX is the most probable solution. However, *BHS* hardly ever suggests a different *Vorlage* behind inversions in LXX Psalms. Often one has no access to a Hebrew text that reflects the word order of the Greek. In that case, it is easier for the time being to regard the inversion as a translation technique based on the preferences of the translator, even though the retroversion of the Greek would result in an acceptable Hebrew clause.

### 6.3.3. Text of the Old Greek

Sometimes the inversion does not reflect the Old Greek. Although in some books, for example 1 Samuel, a Ms with word order following the MT is likely to have been influenced by the Hexaplaric recension,[53] this does not seem to be the case in the Psalter, at least to the same degree. For example investigations of Papyrus Bodmer XXIV point to the fact that this important Ms, which is not influenced by the Hexaplaric recension, often follows the MT in grammatical minutiae, and according to Pietersma, at least as regards articulation, repeatedly reflects the OG.[54] "Indeed, in many other cases throughout the Psalter the witness of 2110 ... will bring OG and MT into closer agreement than is evident from Rahlfs' edition."[55] In fact, the order of the MT is also frequently supported by 2110. The following examples show that Rahlfs' text sometimes is secondary when it reflects a word order different from the MT.

   Greek witnesses, a few of them important, contest a number of the inversions and therefore the exact wording of the OG is essential in my analysis. The manuscripts labelled Lucianic by Rahlfs are now also regarded of value in the search for the OG, because 2110 has approximately 230 secondary readings (according to Rahlfs) in common with the Lucianic group (the vulgar text) and approximately 50 with the Lucianic text alone.[56] My suggestion regarding the papyri is that although the Greek text in the papyri are often secondarily corrected to the Hebrew this applies especially to other aspects of literal translation than to the word order. Thus, the old Ms 2110 is sometimes the only support for the word order of MT (44:9; 70:2; 10543), and sometimes this word order is supported by other important witnesses, especially codex Sinaiticus and

---

[53] See, e.g., Johnson, *Hexaplarische Rezension*, 88, 144-45.
[54] Pietersma, "Articulation", 201-02.
[55] Pietersma, "Articulation", 202.
[56] Pietersma, "The Present State", 16.

codex Alexandrinus (82:3; 89:24; 102:2; 102:3). I admit that in a few cases 2110 is also supported by Hexaplaric witnesses when it has the word order of MT (71:17; 86:4; 102:2; 139:7). It is also easy to imagine that a scribe who does not knew Hebrew but is well versed in Greek inadvertently (for stylistic reasons) changed the word order without reference to the Hebrew.

### 6.3.4. Variants that support the word order of MT

10:16 βασιλεύσει κύριος S 1221 La$^G$Aug Ga Z L = MT

70:2 τὸ σῶσαί με κύριον 2110 = MT

71:17 ἐδίδαξάς με· ὁ θεός Sa? La$^G$Aug GaHi 2110 (ο θ. μου α. ε. α μ. L′′, Su except μου) = MT

73:26 ἡ καρδία μου καὶ ἡ σάρξ μου GaHi = MT

89:24 τοὺς ἐχθροὺς αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ S Ga L′′ 1219 = MT

91:6 διαπορευομένου ἐν σκότει L′′ 1219 2020 2105 2106 2110 = MT

97:5 ἐτάκησαν ὡσεὶ κηρὸς S L′′ 1219 2110 = MT

106:7 ἐν τῇ ἐρυθρᾷ θαλάσσῃ GaAug = MT

106:9 τῇ ἐρυθρᾷ θαλάσσῃ GaAug = MT

136:15 εἰς θάλασσαν ἐρυθράν Sa 2017 = MT

139:1 ψαλμὸς τῷ Δαυιδ L$^d$ A = MT

139:7 καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ προσώπου σου ποῦ S La Uulg = MT

139:19 ἁμαρτωλούς ὁ θεός La Ga = MT

146:8 κύριος ἀνορθοῖ κατερραγμένους, κύριος σοφοῖ τυφλούς Ga L′′ 1219$^{s'}$ = MT

*70 (71):17* אֱלֹהִים לִמַּדְתַּנִי מִנְּעוּרָי וְעַד־הֵנָּה אַגִּיד נִפְלְאוֹתֶיךָ — ἐδίδαξάς με ὁ θεός ἐκ νεότητός μου καὶ μέχρι νῦν ἀπαγγελῶ τὰ θαυμάσιά σου

אֱלֹהִים לִמַּדְתַּנִי — ἐδίδαξάς με ὁ θεός

Many Greek variants reflect the MT, ὁ θεός ἐδίδαξάς με (Sa?, La$^G$ Aug Ga Hi), ὁ θεός μού ἁ ἐδίδαξάς με (L′′, Su except μού). They have now the additional support of Papyrus Bodmer XXIV = 2110 (ὁ θς ἐδίδᾰξάς με). Apart from Origenes' text (Ga Hi), the foremost representative of the Upper Egyptian text and some manuscripts of the Western text (La$^G$ Aug) support the order of the MT. This would indicate that the OG did not deviate from the order of the MT. Furthermore, no specific reason for an inversion can be found. The expression does not occur otherwise in the

MT, even though אֶל/אֱלֹהִים and לָמַד appear in juxtaposition in Deut 6:1 (יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם לְלַמֵּד אֶתְכֶם), in Job 21:22 (הַלְאֵל יְלַמֶּד־דָּעַת), and in Isa 48:17 (אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ מְלַמֶּדְךָ). A close parallel can be found in Ps 34:12, where יִרְאַת יְהוָה אֲלַמֶּדְכֶם is translated by ἀκούσατέ μου φόβον κυρίου διδάξω ὑμᾶς. Cf. also Ps 119:12 בָּרוּךְ אַתָּה יְהוָה לַמְּדֵנִי חֻקֶּיךָ rendered by εὐλογητὸς εἶ κύριε δίδαξόν με τὰ δικαιώματά σου where יְהוָה is aligned with בָּרוּךְ אַתָּה rather than with לַמְּדֵנִי.

*90 (91):6* מִדֶּבֶר בָּאֹפֶל יַהֲלֹךְ מִקֶּטֶב יָשׁוּד צָהֳרָיִם — ἀπὸ πράγματος διαπορευομένου ἐν σκότει ἀπὸ συμπτώματος καὶ δαιμονίου μεσημβρινοῦ

בָּאֹפֶל יַהֲלֹךְ — διαπορευομένου ἐν σκότει

בָּאֹפֶל הָלַךְ only appears here in the MT and the phrase is never found in opposite order. Accordingly, the rendering is hardly based on a different *Vorlage*. Cf. Ps 81 (82):5, which has a similar meaning and the same lexical equivalents in the LXX and closely follows the order of the MT, בַּחֲשֵׁכָה יִתְהַלָּכוּ — ἐν σκότει διαπορεύονται. διαπορευομένου ἐν σκότει in Ps 90 (91):6 is transposed in L'' 1219 2020 2105 2106 2110 = MT. This is with good reasons regarded as the Old Greek text by Pietersma.[57] In that case, it is not the question of an inversion, but that the Old Greek closely followed the word order of the Hebrew.

*96 (97):5* הָרִים כַּדּוֹנַג נָמַסּוּ מִלִּפְנֵי יְהוָה מִלִּפְנֵי אֲדוֹן כָּל־הָאָרֶץ — τὰ ὄρη ἐτάκησαν ὡσεὶ κηρὸς ἀπὸ προσώπου κυρίου ἀπὸ προσώπου κυρίου πάσης τῆς γῆς

כַּדּוֹנַג נָמַסּוּ — ἐτάκησαν ὡσεὶ κηρὸς

Similar Greek equivalents for different Hebrew combinations can be found in Mic 1:4; Pss 21 (22):15; 57 (58):9; 67 (68):3. The word order of the Hebrew is always followed, Ps 21 (22):15 כַּדּוֹנַג נָמֵס — ὡσεὶ κηρὸς τηκόμενος, 57 (58):9 כְּמוֹ שַׁבְּלוּל תֶּמֶס — ὡσεὶ κηρὸς ὁ τακεὶς, 67 (68):3, 5 כְּהִמֵּס דּוֹנַג — ὡς τήκεται κηρὸς, Mic 1:4 יִתְבַּקְעוּ כַּדּוֹנַג — τακήσονται ὡς κηρὸς. Cf. also Isa 64:1 כִּקְדֹחַ אֵשׁ הֲמָסִים — ὡς κηρὸς ἀπὸ πυρὸς τήκεται and Judith 16:15 ὡς κηρὸς τακήσονται. In this way, all

---

57 Pietersma, "P. Bodmer XXIV", 277-78.

examples of κηρός in LXX is similar to Ps 96 (97):5. The order of the LXX in Ps 96 (97):5 cannot be an assimilation to the other occurrences of the same expression in the Psalter.

Rahlfs' text is disputed, S *L''* 1219 2110, adhere to the order of MT. Since, S, a member of the Lower Egyptian group, has the inverted order, and that order is now supported by 2110, from the Upper Egyptian text and by *L''*, which perhaps is closer to the OG than Rahlfs admitted,[58] it is probable that the variant reflect the Old Greek. In that case, the word order was not inverted in the Old Greek.

## 6.3.5. Disputable inversions

Some possible inversions in Rahlfs' text can also be shown not to be real inversions, for example, 44 (45):10 בְּכֶתֶם אוֹפִיר "in gold of Ophir" rendered by ἐν ἱματισμῷ διαχρύσῳ "in gold-woven clothing". The unusual composite term διαχρυσίον only occurs here and in 2 Macc 5:2. An inversion is not improbable since χρύσιον is a common equivalent of כֶּתֶם, Job 28:16, 19; Song 5:11; Dan 10:5 (Th), even though it more often renders זָהָב. It is evident that most translators were familiar with the meaning of כֶּתֶם. The deviating renderings of this word in Job 31:24 "precious stone", Isa 13:12 "stone" and Lam 4:1 "silver" do not imply that the translators were ignorant of the meaning of the word, but it is variations imposed by the parallel with זָהָב or פָּז.[59] Even one of the most literal translators of the LXX, as the translator of the book of Lamentations, prefers variation in parallel word pairs, even at the cost of a semantic less correct translation.

אוֹפִיר is otherwise always transliterated in LXX (Gen 10:29; 1 Kings 9:28; 10:11; 22:49; Isa 13:12; Job 22:24 (Hexaplaric addition); 28:16 (Hexaplaric addition); 1 Chr 29:4; 2 Chr 8:18; 9:10). The second occurrence in 1 Kings 10:11 and אוֹפִיר in 1 Chr 1:23 is without Greek counterpart. כֶּתֶם אוֹפִיר twice appears outside the book of Psalms, Isa 13:12, where it is rendered by ὁ λίθος ὁ ἐκ Σουφιρ and in Job 28:16 by χρυσίῳ Ωφιρ.

Briggs argues that LXX read אֵפֶר "covering, attire", as in 1 Kings 20:38, 41.[60] However, אֵפֶר was rendered by τελαμών "bandage" in 1

---

[58] Cf, e.g., Olofsson, *LXX Version*, 80 n. 52, 53.

[59] זָהָב has χρύσιον as stereotype equivalent. Cf. also Albrektson, *Lamentations*, 173.

[60] Briggs, *Book of Psalms I*, 392.

Kings 21 (20):38, 41. If the Hebrew word was unknown to the translator he may have regarded the phrase as synonymous to מִמִּשְׁבְּצוֹת זָהָב in Ps 44 (45):14, which is rendered by ἐν κροσσωτοῖς χρυσοῖς "with golden tassels". In that case, the addition of περιβεβλημένη πεποικιλμένη from v. 14 is more explicable. ἱματισμός cannot be influenced from another translation, since כֶּתֶם is never understood that way in *versiones*. It only occurs once in LXX Psalms, Ps 21 (22):19, as a correct translation of לְבוּשִׁ. A proposal more in line with the translation technique in LXX, could, however, be put forward, the LXX translator read כְּסוּת instead of כֶּתֶם, a transposition and confusion of כ and ס, which is especially understandable if the final form of מ was used. כְּסוּת "covering" often refers to "clothing" and in Ex 21:10 it is rendered by ἱματισμός. In that case, it is not the question of an inversion at all. The equivalent of אוֹפִיר is, however, harder to explain.

עוֹלָה וְכָלִיל "burnt offerings and whole burnt offerings" in 50 (51):21 is rendered by ἀναφορὰν καὶ ὁλοκαυτώματα "offering and whole burnt offerings". ὁλοκαύτωμα is the ordinary rendering of עוֹלָה in LXX Psalms, 19 (20):4; 39 (40):7; 49 (50):8; 50 (51):18; 65 (66):13, 15,[61] while כָּלִיל otherwise does not occur in the Psalter. כָּלִיל is translated by ὁλόκαυτος in Lev 6:16. Otherwise עוֹלָה is translated also by ἀναφορά, θυσία, κάρπωμα, κάρπωσις, ὁλοκάρπωμα, ὁλοκάρπωσις, ὁλοκαύτωμα, ὁλοκαύτωσις and προσφορά in LXX.[62] but when three Hebrew terms for an offering occur in the same context, זֶבַח ,עוֹלָה and כָּלִיל it is hard to find synonymous expressions. עוֹלָה may be rendered by ἀναφορά and כָּלִיל by ὁλοκαύτωμα, probably because they corresponded better to the literal meaning of the words.[63]

---

[61] It is a neologism in LXX. Siegert, *Septuaginta*, 228, 278.

[62] See Muraoka, *Hebrew/Aramaic Index*, 108, 111. Cf. Siegert, *Septuaginta*, 228. Muraoka notes equivalents from 1 Esras not included in Hatch, Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint*. In, e.g., Job a distinction is made between עוֹלָה as a free-offering rendered by θυσία and עוֹלָה as an offering prescribed in the law rendered by κάρπωσις. See Siegert, *Septuaginta*, 229. This distinction is not made in LXX Psalms.

[63] Cf. Siegert, *Septuaginta*, 228. ἀναφορά is a very uncommon term, which, apart from Ps 50 (51):21 only appears in Num 4:19, where it refers to holy objects in the sanctuary. It renders both עֲבֹדָה and מַשָּׂא, according to Siegert, *Septuaginta*, 228-29, but it is also possible that עַל־עֲבֹדָתוֹ is without counterpart. See Muraoka, *Hebrew/Aramaic Index*, 106.

תְּמֹגְגֶנָּה צִמְחָהּ "softening it with showers" in 64 (65):11 is rendered by εὐφρανθήσεται ἀνατέλλουσα "sprouting, it will rejoice". The translation of מוג polel "soften, make dissolve" with εὐφραίνειν is astonishing. But the text is not easy and the translator probably guessed at the meaning. If it is the question of an inversion the translator must have understood צִמְחָהּ as a form of שָׂמַח, which is regularly rendered by εὐφραίνειν in the LXX as a whole. εὐφραίνειν is also as a rule a translation of שָׂמַח in the LXX.[64] However, מוג is never translated by ἀνατέλλειν in the LXX Psalms. ἀνατέλλουσα as equivalent of צִמְחָה is unexpected.[65] צֶמַח as "shower" was not known by the translator. However, the translation accords with the fact that ἀνατέλλειν is a common equivalent of √צמח in other parts of the LXX, not least in the Pentateuch,[66] and צָמַח qal is once rendered by ἀνατέλλειν in the Psalms, 84 (85):12. Perhaps the translator read it as צָמֵחָה.[67]

It is evident that מוג is not understood by the LXX translator.[68] The same is in fact true for the other LXX translators, who have a variety of equivalents, all of them more or less generic.[69] Even where מוג is rendered by τήκειν "melt", viz. Pss 74 (75):4; 106 (107):26; and Ex 15:15, the equivalent is not a sign of a right understanding of the Hebrew term, rather it is the question of guesses from the context. The translation of Ps 64 (65):11-12 in LXX Psalms is a paraphrase with frequent guesses.[70] The translator apparently felt his Hebrew knowledge defective and on that account tried to make head and tail out of the verses. It can hardly be the question of an inversion here or a different *Vorlage*.

---

[64] See Hatch, Redpath, *Concordance to the Septuagint*, "εὐφραίνειν".

[65] See also Hatch, Redpath, *Concordance to the Septuagint*, "ἀνατέλλειν" which has a ? for the equivalent in Ps 64 (65):11.

[66] Gen 2:5; 3:18; 19:25; Lev 13:37; Deut 29:22. See especially Gen 19:25 צֶמַח — τὰ ἀνατέλλοντα.

[67] Baethgen, "Textkritische Wert", 641; Mozley, *Psalter*, 102. ἀνατέλλειν with cognates frequently occurs with reference to vegetation, e.g., Gen 3:18; Jer 23:5; Ezek 16:7; Zech 3:8; Pss 72:7; 92:8. Mozley, *Psalter*, 102.

[68] It is proposed in the alignment of CATSS that the rendering in LXX is based on √ענג, but that is hardly a convincing suggestion.

[69] See Muraoka, *Hebrew/Aramaic Index*. They must have guessed at the meaning. Generic terms are often employed when the translator is at loss of the meaning. See Tov, "Hebrew Text", 66.

[70] Mozley, *Psalter*, XV, 103.

### 6.3.6. Genuine inversions

*Translation technique*

*69 (70):2* אֱלֹהִים לְהַצִּילֵנִי יְהוָה לְעֶזְרָתִי חוּשָׁה — εἰς τὸ σῶσαί με κύριον. Ο θεός, εἰς τὴν βοήθειάν μου πρόσχες

אֱלֹהִים לְהַצִּילֵנִי — εἰς τὸ σῶσαί με κύριον
The appearance of an important variant with the word order of the MT in 69 (70):2, ο θς εις το σωσαι με (2110) may indicate that Rahlfs' text does not reflect the OG. Cf. the parallel in 39 (40):14, where the word order of MT is followed, but אֱלֹהִים is replaced by יְהוָה: יְהוָה לְהַצִּילֵנִי יְהוָה רְצֵה is rendered by εὐδόκησον κύριε τοῦ ῥύσασθαί με κύριε.
However, since this is the only support for the order of MT and יְהוָה as a rule occurs as the A-word in a parallelism,[71] the translator has probably been influenced by this in his translation. See e.g. 18:22, 32, 47; 20:2; 24:5; 31:15; 38:15; 46:8, 12; 69:7; 94:22; 96:4; 104:33; 116:5; 135:2; 146:2, 10; 147:7, 12.


*42 (43):1* שָׁפְטֵנִי אֱלֹהִים וְרִיבָה רִיבִי מִגּוֹי לֹא־חָסִיד מֵאִישׁ־מִרְמָה וְעַוְלָה תְפַלְּטֵנִי —
Κρῖνόν με, ὁ θεός, καὶ δίκασον τὴν δίκην μου ἐξ ἔθνους οὐχ ὁσίου, ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπου ἀδίκου καὶ δολίου ῥῦσαί με.

מִרְמָה וְעַוְלָה — ἀδίκου καὶ δολίου
Tht' follows the word order of the MT δολιου και αδικου, while 2013 has ρυσαι με και δολιου?
מִרְמָה otherwise never appears in conjunction with עַוְלָה. It is certain that an inversion occurs here, since δόλιος is a rendering of מִרְמָה, rather than עַוְלָה. See Pss 5:7; 16 (17):1; 51 (52):6; 108 (109):2. A translation of מִרְמָה by ἄδικος is unique in the LXX as a whole, with the exclusion of Am 8:5. עַוְלָה is not seldom rendered by ἄδικος, especially in the book of Job, e.g. Job 5:16; 6:29. 30; 22:23; 24:20; 27:4; 36:23, but also once outside this book, Zeph 3:5. עַוְלָה occurs 9x in the book of Psalms. It is as a rule rendered by ἀνομία, 36 (37):1; 57 (58):3; 63 (64):7; 88 (89):23; 106 (107):42; 118 (119):3; 124 (125):3, but once by ἀδικία, 91 (92):16 (MT Q). When מִרְמָה is used in conjunction with other nouns it is, except here and in 10:7 וּמִרְמוֹת וָתֹךְ, the last to be mentioned, that is, אִישׁ־דָּמִים וּמִרְמָה

---

[71] There are some exceptions, e.g. 47:6; 55:16; 56:10; 58:6; 70:2, 6; 73:28; 96:5.

אַנְשֵׁי דָמִים וּמִרְמָה 55:12, תֹּךְ וּמִרְמָה 38:13, הַוֹּת וּמִרְמוֹת 36:4, אָוֶן וּמִרְמָה 5:7, חָמָס וּמִרְמָה 109:2, פִּי רָשָׁע וּפִי־מִרְמָה 55:24, Zeph 1:9. Consequently, the position of מִרְמָה in the phrase מִרְמָה וְעוֹלָה is contrary to the usual order. This is the probable reason for the inversion in the LXX. The rearrangement in the LXX could also be based on a formal aspect in the Hebrew, that the terms appear in alphabetical order in the MT and that the LXX translator wanted to reflect the Hebrew *Vorlage* in this respect, and on that account employed an alphabetical arrangement of the co-ordinated words. This is a tendency that perhaps can be observed in the LXX,[72] even though otherwise not in the Psalter.

72 (73):26 כָּלָה שְׁאֵרִי וּלְבָבִי צוּר־לְבָבִי וְחֶלְקִי אֱלֹהִים לְעוֹלָם — ἐξέλιπεν ἡ καρδία μου καὶ ἡ σάρξ μου. ὁ θεὸς τῆς καρδίας μου καὶ ἡ μερίς μου ὁ θεὸς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

שְׁאֵרִי וּלְבָבִי — ἡ καρδία μου καὶ ἡ σάρξ μου.
The phrase does not occur elsewhere in the MT. שְׁאֵר in the sense "flesh, blood-relation, self, food" appears three times in the Psalter, 73:26; 78:20, 27, and 13 times outside the book of Psalms, Ex 21:10; Lev 18:6, 12, 13; 20:19; 21:2; 25:49; Num 27:11; Jer 51:35; Mic 3:2, 3; Prov 5:11; 11:17. It is evidently understood by the translator in Ps 77 (78):26, since he employs σάρξ as counterpart. On the other hand, שְׁאֵר is rendered by τράπεζα in 77 (78):20 (יָכִין שְׁאֵר — ἑτοιμάσαι τράπεζαν). The understanding may be influenced by v. 19 לַעֲרֹךְ שֻׁלְחָן — ἑτοιμάσαι τράπεζαν. However, because of the consistent rendering of שֻׁלְחָן by τράπεζα it is also possible to assume a misreading by the translator. καρδία is always the first to be mentioned, when καρδία and σάρξ occur in conjunction in the Psalter, 83 (84):3 — לִבִּי וּבְשָׂרִי — ἡ καρδία μου καὶ ἡ σάρξ μου. Cf. also Ps 27 (28):7 — בּוֹ בָטַח לִבִּי וְנֶעֱזָרְתִּי וַיַּעֲלֹז לִבִּי — ἐπ᾽ αὐτῷ ἤλπισεν ἡ καρδία μου (לִבִּי) καὶ ἐβοηθήθην καὶ ἀνέθαλεν ἡ σάρξ μου (לִבִּי). This is also common outside the book of Psalms. Cf.
Ezek 11:19 וַהֲסִרֹתִי לֵב הָאֶבֶן מִבְּשָׂרָם — καὶ ἐκσπάσω τὴν καρδίαν τὴν λιθίνην ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτῶν
36:26 וַהֲסִרֹתִי אֶת־לֵב הָאֶבֶן מִבְּשַׂרְכֶם — καὶ ἀφελῶ τὴν καρδίαν τὴν λιθίνην ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν

_____

[72] Muraoka, "Device", 28.

44:7 עַרְלֵי־לֵב וְעַרְלֵי בָשָׂר — ἀπεριτμήτους καρδίᾳ καὶ ἀπεριτμήτους σαρκὶ

44:9 עֶרֶל לֵב וְעֶרֶל בָשָׂר — ἀπερίτμητος καρδίᾳ καὶ ἀπερίτμητος σαρκὶ

Therefore, the inversion in Ps 72 (73):26 has probably been influenced by the usual order of καρδία and σάρξ in the LXX Psalms (see 28:3) and especially by Ps 83 (84):3, where לִבִּי וּבְשָׂרִי is translated by ἡ καρδία μου καὶ ἡ σάρξ μου, which also has the term כָּלָה in common. The variant with the order of the MT in Ga Hi is clearly secondary.

*88 (89):24* וְכַתּוֹתִי מִפָּנָיו צָרָיו וּמְשַׂנְאָיו אֶגּוֹף – καὶ συγκόψω τοὺς ἐχθροὺς αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ καὶ τοὺς μισοῦντας αὐτὸν τροπώσομαι

מִפָּנָיו צָרָיו – τοὺς ἐχθροὺς αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ

I have found one example of a Hebrew text with מִן + פָּנֶה + צָר (although with different suffixes) in the word order of the LXX is found in Isa 64:1: תִּבְעֶה־אֵשׁ לְהוֹדִיעַ שִׁמְךָ לְצָרֶיךָ מִפָּנֶיךָ גּוֹיִם יִרְגָּזוּ translated by καὶ φανερὸν ἔσται τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου ἐν τοῖς ὑπεναντίοις ἀπὸ προσώπου σου ἔθνη ταραχθήσονται. It is hardly a close parallel since מִפָּנֶיךָ refers to גּוֹיִם יִרְגָּזוּ.

The word order of the Greek with ἐχθρός + suffix + ἀπὸ προσώπου + suffix is, however, common in LXX. See Num 32:21; Deut 6:19; 23:15; 2 Sam 7:9; 1 Chr 17:8.

ἐκτριβῇ ὁ ἐχθρὸς αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ (Num 32:21)
ἐκδιώξαι πάντας τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου πρὸ προσώπου σου (Deut 6:19)
καὶ παραδοῦναι τὸν ἐχθρόν σου πρὸ προσώπου σου (Deut 23:15)
καὶ ἐξωλέθρευσα πάντας τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ἀπὸ προσώπου σου (2 Sam 7:9)
καὶ ἐξωλέθρευσα πάντας τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ἀπὸ προσώπου σου (1 Chr 17:8)

The word order here has several parallels in the Geek bible and it is likely that the translator was influenced by the texts from the Pentateuch (Num 32:21; Deut 6:19; 23:15). Since Ps 89:24 explicitly refers to God's promise to David in 2 Sam 7:9 = 1 Chr 17:8, though not with the exact

text of 2 Sam, it makes the choice of the inverted word order even more natural. The Greek variants with the Hebrew word order S Ga *L´* are probably adjustments to the MT.

*86 (87):6-7*   וְשָׁרִים סֶלָה: יֻלַּד־שָׁם זֶה עַמִּים בִּכְתוֹב יִסְפֹּר יְהוָה — κύριος διηγήσεται ἐν γραφῇ λαῶν καὶ ἀρχόντων τούτων τῶν γεγενημένων ἐν αὐτῇ διάψαλμα

The translator has evidently read עַמִּים וְשָׁרִים and thus moved וְשָׁרִים read as וְשָׁרִים from v. 7 to a position after עַמִּים in v. 6, that is, עַמִּים וְשָׁרִים.[73] However, the position of וְשָׁרִים is hardly based on a different *Vorlage*. Rather it is the question of a pseudo-variant. זֶה must have been understood as a distributive singular or a plural.[74] Furthermore, the translator probably read יְסַפֵּר and בִּכְתָב.[75] סָפַר qal seldom occurs in the Psalter and it is misunderstood in 55 (56):9 and adequately rendered by ἐξαριθμείν in 138 (139):18, but סָפַר piel "make known, proclaim, report, tell" is mostly rendered by διηγεῖσθαι in the book of Psalms.[76] Other equivalents occur, e.g. ἀναγγέλλειν with cognates, ἀπαγγέλλειν, διαγγέλλειν, but also ἐκδιηγεῖσθαι and προστίθημι. כְּתָב is rendered by γραφή in Ezek 13:9; Ezra 2:62; 7:64; 1 Chr 28:19; 2 Chr 2:10, and in 35:4.

*95 (96):2* יְשׁוּעָתוֹ מִיּוֹם־לְיוֹם בַּשְּׂרוּ — εὐαγγελίζεσθε ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας τὸ σωτήριον αὐτοῦ

מִיּוֹם־לְיוֹם — ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας
מִיּוֹם־לְיוֹם only occurs here and in Esth 3:7, where it has the same counterpart. The translator probably understood מִיּוֹם־לְיוֹם as synonymous with יוֹם יוֹם, which is translated by ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας in Ps 60 (61):9, but יוֹם יוֹם was also rendered by ἡμέραν καθ᾽ ἡμέραν 67 (68):20. Cf. 60 (61):7 עַל־יְמֵי יָמִים — ἡμέρας ἐφ᾽ ἡμέρας, 18 (19):3 לְיוֹם יוֹם — ἡμέρα τῇ

---

[73] Cf. Mozley, *Psalter*, 140; Briggs, *Psalms II*, 243.

[74] Mozley, *Psalter*, 140; Briggs, *Psalms II*, 242.

[75] For יְסַפֵּר, see Mozley, *The Psalter*, 140, and for בִּכְתָב, see *BHS*.

[76] 9:2; 18 (19):2; 21 (22):23; 25 (26):7; 47 (48):14; 49 (50):16; 63 (64):6; 65 (66):16; 72 (73):15; 74 (75):2; 77 (78):3; 144 (145):6.

ἡμέρα. Different Hebrew expressions are translated by ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας in LXX as a whole, יוֹם יוֹם (Gen 39:10; Isa 58:2), מִיּוֹם אֶל יוֹם (Num 30:15), מִיּוֹם־לְיוֹם (Esth 3:7), לְעֶת־יוֹם בְּיוֹם (1 Chr 12:23), and לְיוֹם בְּיוֹם (2 Chr 24:11). The meaning of the Hebrew and the Greek are the same "day after day" or "for a long time".[77] The reason for the probable inversion is thus the interpretation of an uncommon expression, מִיּוֹם־לְיוֹם, in the Hebrew text.

*104 (105):12* בִּהְיוֹתָם מְתֵי מִסְפָּר כִּמְעַט וְגָרִים בָּהּ — ἐν τῷ εἶναι αὐτοὺς ἀριθμῷ βραχεῖς ὀλιγοστοὺς καὶ παροίκους ἐν αὐτῇ

מְתֵי מִסְפָּר כִּמְעַט — ἀριθμῷ βραχεῖς ὀλιγοστοὺς
מְתֵי מִסְפָּר כִּמְעַט "few in number, of little account" is translated by ἀριθμῷ βραχεῖς ὀλιγοστοὺς "few in number, of very little account". The inversion here has no Greek variants, noted in Rahlfs. מִסְפָּר is as a rule rendered by ἀριθμός in LXX Psalms, Pss 39 (40):13; 103 (104):25; 104 (105):12: 34; 146 (147):4, 5, and מְתִים by ὀλίγος Ps 16 (17):14 and βραχύς 104 (105):12, once it is rendered by ἐχθρός 16:13 (17:14) and once it has the equivalent συνέδριον 25 (26):4. כִּמְעַט is translated by ἐν τάχει Ps 2:12, παρὰ μικρὸν 72 (73):2, ἐν τῷ μηδενὶ ἂν 80 (81):15, παρὰ βραχὺ 93 (94):17; 118 (119):87. The equivalent here may have been influenced by the counterpart in Deut 26:5; 28:62, where בִּמְתֵי מְעָט is translated by ἐν ἀριθμῷ βραχεῖ. The passages from Deuteronomy, Deut 26:5; 28:62, allude to God's promise to the patriarchs, that Israel shall became a "great nation", "numerous as the stars in heaven" and Ps 105:12 occurs in a context where "the covenant that he made with Abraham" (105:9) is explicitly mentioned. However, the renderings of מְתֵי מִסְפָּר in Gen 34:30; Deut 4:27; Jer 44:28; 1 Chr 16:19 follow the word order of the MT. Although 1 Chr 16:19 is an exact parallel to Ps 104 (105):12, the translations partly diverge. בִּהְיוֹתְכֶם מְתֵי מִסְפָּר כִּמְעַט וְגָרִים בָּהּ is translated by ἐν τῷ γενέσθαι αὐτοὺς ὀλιγοστοὺς ἀριθμῷ ὡς ἐσμικρύνθησαν αἰ παρῴκησαν ἐν αὐτῇ 1 Chr 16:19.

---

[77] Cf. Louw & Nida, *Greek-English Lexicon,* "ἡμέρα", where it is emphasised that ἡμέρα ἐξ ἡμέρας (literally 'day out of day') is an idiom for a relatively long period of time. It can be translated "for a long time, for quite a while, day after day." See Gen 39:10; Num 30:15; 1 Chr 12:23; 2 Chr 24:11; Esth 3:7; Pss 60:9; 95:2; Isa 58:2; Sir 5:7.

מְתֵי מִסְפָּר — ὀλιγοστός εἰμι ἐν ἀριθμῷ (Gen 34:30)

מְתֵי מִסְפָּר — ὀλίγοι ἀριθμῷ (Deut 4:27)

מְתֵי מִסְפָּר — ὀλίγοι ἀριθμῷ (Jer 44:24)

מְתֵי מִסְפָּר — ὀλιγοστοὺς ἀριθμῷ (1 Chr 16:19)

*105 (106):7* לֹא זָכְרוּ אֶת־רֹב חֲסָדֶיךָ וַיַּמְרוּ עַל־יָם בְּיַם־סוּף — οὐκ ἐμνήσθησαν τοῦ πλήθους τοῦ ἐλέους σου καὶ παρεπίκραναν ἀναβαίνοντες[78] ἐν τῇ ἐρυθρᾷ θαλάσσῃ (בְּיַם־סוּף — ἐν τῇ ἐρυθρᾷ θαλάσσῃ)

*105 (106):9* וַיִּגְעַר בְּיַם־סוּף וַיֶּחֱרָב וַיּוֹלִיכֵם בַּתְּהֹמוֹת כַּמִּדְבָּר — καὶ ἐπετίμησεν τῇ ἐρυθρᾷ θαλάσσῃ, καὶ ἐξηράνθη, καὶ ὡδήγησεν αὐτοὺς ἐν ἀβύσσῳ ὡς ἐν ἐρήμῳ· (בְּיַם־סוּף — τῇ ἐρυθρᾷ θαλάσσῃ)

Ga Aug Greek variants which follow MT.

*135 (136):13* לְגֹזֵר יַם־סוּף לִגְזָרִים כִּי לְעוֹלָם חַסְדּוֹ — τῷ καταδιελόντι τὴν ἐρυθρὰν θάλασσαν εἰς διαιρέσεις, ὅτι εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ, (יַם־סוּף — τὴν ἐρυθρὰν θάλασσαν)

The rendering of יַם־סוּף in Pss 105 (106):7, 9; 135 (136):13 exhibit an inverted word order, while 105 (106):22 (עַל־יַם־סוּף — ἐπὶ θαλάσσης ἐρυθρᾶς) and 135 (136):15 (בְּיַם־סוּף — εἰς θάλασσαν ἐρυθρά) follow the word order in the MT. The use of inverted word order is evidently based on LXX translation of the Pentateuch and Joshua, that is, the choice of counterparts in Ex 10:19; 13:18; 15:4; 23:31; Deut 1:40; Josh 2:10; 4:23.

εἰς τὴν ἐρυθρὰν θάλασσαν (Ex 10:19; 13:18)
ἐν ἐρυθρᾷ θαλάσσῃ (Ex 15:4)
ἀπὸ τῆς ἐρυθρᾶς θαλάσσης (Ex 23:31)
τὴν ἐπὶ τῆς ἐρυθρᾶς θαλάσσης (Deut 1:40)
κατεξήρανεν … τὴν ἐρυθρὰν θάλασσαν (Josh 2:10)
καθάπερ ἐποίησεν … τὴν ἐρυθρὰν θάλασσαν (Josh 4:23)

Ps 135 (136) recounts the deliverance from Egypt and the use of the equivalent employed in Ex 15:4 is therefore expected. On the other hand, the order of the MT is as common as the inverted order in the LXX and

---

[78] ἀναβαίνοντες reflects עֹלִים, rather than the MT:s עַל־יָם. See, e.g., *BHS*, Mozley, *Psalter*, 160.

Greek variants are frequent.[79] Perhaps stylistic variation in one and the same psalm can account for the use in Ps 135 of both τὴν ἐρυθρὰν θάλασσαν (135:13) and εἰς θάλασσαν ἐρυθράν (135:15), and in Ps 105 of both τῇ ἐρυθρᾷ θαλάσσῃ (105:7, 9) and ἐπὶ θαλάσσης ἐρυθρᾶς (105:22). The translator felt free to use both of the counterparts found in the Pentateuch.

לָעַד לְעוֹלָם 148:6 — εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα καὶ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος

לָעַד is probably rendered by εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος and לְעוֹלָם by εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα if the translator employed the usual equivalents for eternity in LXX, since לָעַד is as a rule translated by εἰς αἰῶνα αἰῶνος or εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος in LXX Psalms, 18 (19):10; 20 (21):7; 21 (22):27; 36 (37):29; 60 (61):9; 88 (89):30; 110 (111):3, 8, 10; 111 (112):3, 9, and לְעוֹלָם nearly always by εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.[80] LXX Psalms thus follows an interesting translation principle. The difference between the two terms for "eternity" is not reflected in the choice of lexical equivalents, but rather in the employment of an expanded expression for one of the words. Since both עַד and עוֹלָם are as a rule translated by αἰών with cognates in LXX *in toto*, one has to express the difference in some other way. This unusual way of treating the terms for eternity is hardly a heritage from the kind of αἰών theology that was widespread in Alexandria, as e.g. R. Kittel suggests.[81] The dissimilarity is probably based on the origin of the two terms. עַד was from the beginning looked upon as a term for an infinite future,[82] עוֹלָם was less directed to the idea of eternal time,[83] and especially

---

[79] יַם־סוּף occurs inverted in LXX, Ex 10:19; 13:18; 15:4; 23:31; Deut 1:40; Josh 2:10; 4:23; 1 Kings 9:26; Pss 105 (106):7, 9; 135 (136):13, but in the order of the MT in Ex 15:22; Num 14:25; 21:4; 33:10, 11; Deut 2:1; 11:4; Josh 24:6; Judg 11:16; Pss 105 (106):22; 135 (136):15; Neh 9:9. In Jer 49:21 LXX has no counterpart to סוּף.

[80] Cf. however, לָעַד לְעוֹלָם translated by εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος 110 (111):8.

[81] Sasse, "αἰών", 200.

[82] Sasse, "αἰών", 200. Cf. *KBL*, *HALAT*. See also Haag, "עד", 1066-67, 1072-73.

[83] See *KBL*, "עד"; *HALAT*, "עד". It rather signified "a long time, a long duration" and at least etymologically "the hidden time or the distant time". Sasse, "αἰών", 199-200. It refers to a time that belongs to the remote and inscrutable past or future. The chronological distant is relative rather than absolute. Sasse, "αἰών", 199-200.

so in later Hebrew, even though עוֹלָם still has a temporal significance.[84] עַד was the strongest term for an infinite future. This may be the reason why עַד is translated by the most emphatic expression and not עוֹלָם.[85] The motive for the inversion is evidently to harmonize with the common expression עוֹלָם וָעֶד (לְ), which is more or less restricted to the Psalms, 9:6; 10:16; 21:5; 45:7, 18; 48:15; 52:10; 104:5; 119:44; 145, 1, 2, 21. Otherwise it only occurs in Ex 15:18; Mic 4:5 and Dan 12:3 where this translation model is not followed; Ex 15:18 τὸν αἰῶνα καὶ ἐπ᾽ αἰῶνα καὶ ἔτι, Mic 4:5 εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα καὶ ἐπέκεινα, Dan 12:3 εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος. It is sometimes, against the rule, rendered by εἰς αἰῶνα αἰῶνος 20 (21):5,[86] εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος 44 (45):7; 103 (104):5, but mainly by εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα καὶ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος, 9:6, 9:37 (10:16); 44 (45):18; 47 (48):15; 51 (52):10; 118 (119):44; 144 (145):1, 2, 21. Since the translator of LXX Psalms did not follow the equivalents in the Pentateuch, the liturgical synagogue language may partly have influenced his counterparts.

Even though most of the inversions collected probably mirror the Old Greek, to a significant degree Rahlfs' text is not an adequate reflection of the Old Greek nor is MT a reflection of the *Vorlage* of the Septuagint. Consequently, sometimes a different *Vorlage* can be proposed and in other cases an altered Old Greek text can be made probable. Furthermore, some of the suggested cases cannot be regarded as inversions.

It is possible to look at particular words or elements and see if they often occur in inversions, but I doubt the possibility to draw any more significant conclusions regarding the translation technique from that approach. It is for example, common that κύριος or θεός are inverted in

---

[84] Sasse, "αἰών", 202-07. See, e.g., Eccl 3:11. *Idem,* 204 n. 21. Here it should perhaps be translated "the time of the world". However, the interpretation is not easy and different suggestions exist. See especially Fabry, "עולם", 433-34. Cf. Preuß, "עולם", 1156. Later on, in after-exilic time and especially in apocalyptic texts and in Rabbinic Hebrew it acquired the meaning "world". Sasse, "αἰών", 204; Preuß, "עולם", 1153. The same evolution can be seen concerning αἰών (Sasse, "αἰών", 202-04), which in apocalyptic writings is used for the present and the coming age. *Idem,* 204-07.

[85] See Sasse, "αἰών", 200 and n. 8.

[86] It is contested by several manuscripts, which have the expected εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα καὶ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος.

the book of Psalms, the same is to a lesser degree true for ψυχή and βασιλεύς. However, these words cannot be isolated, one has rather to scrutinise in which phrases they occur in Greek literature and so on, but that is far beyond the scope of this preliminary investigation. That οὐ occurs three times inverted in the Psalter, 16 (17):1 בְּלֹא — οὐκ ἐν, 73 (74):9 וְלֹא־אִתָּנוּ — καὶ ἡμᾶς οὐ, and 118 (119):3 אַף לֹא — οὐ γὰρ, does not help us to understand in which combinations words were inverted. The same is true for the fact that ἄνθρωπος, seems to have been inverted twice: 55 (56):12 עָלֵינוּ אָדָם לִי — μοι ἄνθρωπος, 123 (124):2 — ἀνθρώπους ἐφ᾽ ἡμᾶς.

The tendency, which was noted by Marquis and which he regarded as depending on the Greek language and style, to place the verb after its subject or object is not prominent in the Psalter,[87] even though some examples may be noted, for example, 103 (104):17 בְּרוֹשִׁים בֵּיתָהּ translated by ἡ οἰκία ἡγεῖται αὐτῶν, and 145 (146):8 פֹּקֵחַ עִוְרִים translated by ἀνορθοῖ κατερραγμένους. In fact, the opposite order occur far more frequently among the inversions:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 10 (11):5 | צַדִּיק יִבְחָן | ἐξετάζει τὸν δίκαιον |
| 32 (33):16 | הַמֶּלֶךְ נוֹשָׁע | σῴζεται βασιλεὺς |
| 41 (42):2 | כְּאַיָּל תַּעֲרֹג | ὃν τρόπον ἐπιποθεῖ ἡ ἔλαφος |
| 41 (42):2 | נַפְשִׁי תַעֲרֹג | ἐπιποθεῖ ἡ ψυχή μου |
| 43 (44):9 | לְעוֹלָם נוֹדֶה | ἐξομολογησόμεθα εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα |
| | | (suspected different *Vorlage*) |
| 68 (69):5 | מַצְמִיתַי אֹיְבַי | οἱ ἐχθροί μου οἱ ἐκδιώκοντές με |
| 73 (74):1 | אֱלֹהִים זָנַחְתָּ | ἀπώσω ὁ θεός |
| 85 (86):4 | נַפְשִׁי אֶשָּׂא | ἦρα τὴν ψυχήν μου |
| | | (suspected different *Vorlage* or Greek text) |
| 101 (102):3 | יְהוָה שִׁמְעָה | εἰσάκουσον κύριε |
| | | (suspected different Greek text). |

The following table includes all the passages discussed in this chapter. The explanations in the table as regard the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Septuagint and the text of the Old Greek are of course to be regarded as tentative.

---

[87] Marquis, "Word Order".

## 6.3.7. Table of genuine inversions

43:1 עולה מרמה ἀδίκου καὶ δολίου

70:2 אלהים להצילני ... εἰς τὸ σῶσαί με ... ὁ θεός

87:6f זה ילד שם סלה ושרים καὶ ἀρχόντων τούτων τῶν γεγενημένων ἐν αὐτῇ διάψαλμα (*pseudo-variant*)

89:24 מפניו צריו τοὺς ἐχθροὺς αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ

96:2 מיום ליום ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας

105:12 מתי מספר ἀριθμῷ βραχεῖς

106:7 בים סוף ἐν τῇ ἐρυθρᾷ θαλάσσῃ

106:9 וַהבים סוף ἐρυθρᾷ θαλάσσῃ

136:13 ים סוף τὴν ἐρυθρὰν θάλασσαν

148:6 לעד לעולם εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα καὶ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος

## 6.3.8. Vorlage or Old Greek

10:16 יהוה מלך βασιλεύσει κύριος (מָלַךְ יְהוָה)

24:1 לדוד ψαλμὸς τῷ δαυιδ (מזמור לדוד)

71:17 אלהים למדתני ἐδίδαξάς με ὁ θεός (OG ὁ θεὸς ἐδίδαξάς με)

91:6 באפל יהלך διαπορευομένου ἐν σκότει (OG ἐν σκότει διαπορευομένου)

97:5 כדונג נמסו ἐτάκησαν ὡσεὶ κηρὸς (OG ὡσεὶ κηρὸς ἐτάκησαν)

119:149 כחסדך יהוה κύριε κατὰ τὸ ἔλεός σου (יהוה כחסדך)

139:1 לדוד מזמור ψαλμὸς τῷ δαυιδ (מזמור לדוד)

## 6.3.9. Suspected inversions which are not inversions proper

45:10 בכתם אופיר ἐν ἱματισμῷ διαχρύσῳ

65:11 תמגגנה צמחה εὐφρανθήσεται ἀνατέλλουσα

The numbering of the bible references follows the MT.

# 7. Kaige Group and the Septuagint Book of Psalms

## 7.1. Translation Philosophy and the Septuagint Translators

The earliest translators of the Septuagint seem to have been working in an *ad hoc* fashion, at least in relation to a literal translation, since they were lacking any real precedent they produced somewhat uneven renderings, somewhere between the rather free and the literal. Cicero made a distinction between literary and non-literary translation and thus between a literary translator (or *expositor*) and a non-literary (or *interpres*). According to him, official texts, not least legal and business documents should receive a strictly literal translation, while literary texts could be rendered in a freer way.[1]

However, the discussion of translation philosophy did not start with Cicero. The distinction between literary and non-literary translation may already have been operative at the time of the translation of the Pentateuch.[2] In this manner, a fairly literal translation technique was used in the Septuagint Pentateuch (even though the Pentateuch cannot be treated as a unit as regards the translation technique),[3] which could be looked upon as both a legal and a literary work.[4] One must not presuppose a conscious adoption of a more specific translation philosophy, apart from the choice between a literal and a free translation.

The translation of the Pentateuch seems to have had some sort of authority, since the subsequent translators were often drawing on the Greek Pentateuch for their choice of Greek equivalents,[5] and they usually aim at a more systematic rendering, as well as a more literal one.[6] Thus,

---

[1] Cf. *De optimo genere oratorum* §14, *De finibus* 3.15. See, e.g., Brock, "Aspects", 69. See further Adler, "Ad Verbum", 321-25.

[2] See, e.g., Brock, "Phenomenon", 20; Brock, "Aspects", 69; Brock, "To Revise", 310, 325. Regarding the different attitudes reflected in the work of the *expositor* and the *interpres*, see further *idem*, 310-14.

[3] Different translators probably rendered the five books. See, e.g., Aejmelaeus, *Parataxis*, 175-76, 175 n. 2, and there are in fact considerable variations between them regarding the technique employed. *Idem*, 176-81.

[4] Brock, "Aspects", 71-72.

[5] See, e.g., Olofsson, *LXX Version*, 26-28.

[6] Brock, "To Revise", 325-26.

the translator of some of the later books of the Septuagint consciously sees himself in the role of an *interpres*, a literal translator, rather than that of an expositor and this is true to an even greater degree for the revisers of the LXX.

In some Palestinian circles, the need to "correct" the earlier versions, in order to bring them closer to the wording of the Hebrew of their days, could be seen as early as by the end of the second century BC. This work of correction was probably unsystematic as well as sporadic in the beginning, later on, however, this revision process became more systematic. This applies to the techniques developed, as well as to the extent to which these techniques were applied, evidently ranging over many, if not all, books in the Septuagint. The revision works that can be evidenced today, as early fragments or as texts incorporated into the later Mss of the Septuagint, are but defective witnesses to a number of attempts to correct the Old Greek text.[7]

The earlier endeavours at revision were sometimes based on the vocabulary and experience of the translators of the later books of the Septuagint while subsequent "correctors" mainly based their work upon that of their predecessors. There are tendencies in different directions in Palestine and Egypt. Contemporary with the revision activity in Palestine was the reaction of Diaspora Judaism, which had no interest in revision of the original translations. In order to counter the arguments of the Palestinian "correctors" the Old Greek Pentateuch was in the letter of Aristeas provided with a highly respectable pedigree and the affirmation that the translators had followed the ideal of literal translation.

Later on, when it was evident that the translation differed not only from the Hebrew, but also was not consistent as regards the translation technique, the Septuagint was boldly put on a par with the Hebrew original.[8] It was regarded as divinely inspired, as evidenced by, e.g. Philo "they became as it were possessed, and, under inspiration, wrote, not each several scribe something different, but the same word for word as though dictated to each by an invisible prompter."[9] Accordingly, in Palestine the

---

[7] Brock, "To Revise", 301.

[8] "They (the Jews of Alexandria) regard them with admiration and respect, like two sisters, or rather, as one and the same work, both in form and substance...". Philo, *De Vita Mosis*, 2,40.

[9] *De Vita Mosis*, 2,37-38. Later on, especially in Christian tradition, the miraculous character of the Greek translation was emphasised even more. See,

Septuagint was revised so as to reflect as exactly as possible the Hebrew text; in Hellenistic Judaism, on the other hand, the Septuagint Pentateuch was regarded as inspired, and therefore as beyond criticism,[10] which seems to be hinted at already in the Letter of Aristeas,[11] presumably reflecting an attitude prevailing around 100 BC.[12]

At least after the destruction of the Second Temple, the course undertaken by literalist revisers was carried to its logical conclusion: no translation at all, however, literal, could do justice to the original language of revelation. The Hebrew of the Scriptures was regarded as having a sacred character, which obviated the possibility of any translation carrying authority independent of the Hebrew original.[13] Consequently, the extremely literal revisions only had meaning in relation to the Hebrew text. These translations and revisions presuppose access to a Hebrew text or an interpreter in the same way that the "meturgeman" in the synagogue worship translated and commented on Hebrew texts. These extremely literal translations and revisions seem to be the product of a bi-lingual community where the original language had cultural and religious prestige.[14] The subordinate position of the translations was at the same time a great advantage, because it implied that translations could also function as commentaries.[15]

Therefore, the same attitude probably resulted in two different types of translation, the literal revisions of the LXX and the Targums. In the latter case, the subordinate character of the translations was made plain to everyone by the fact that they were read aloud in the synagogue, a verse (or a group of verses) at a time, after the Hebrew. This explains why the Targums in contrast to the other ancient versions, are highly interpretative

---

e.g., Müller, *Kirkens første Bibel*, 29-84; Hengel, "christliche Schriftensammlung", 182-204.

[10] See, e.g., Brewer, *Jewish Exegesis*, 224-25; Hengel, "christliche Schriftensammlung", 237-38 n. 163.

[11] Cf., e.g., Hengel, "christliche Schriftensammlung", 237-38.

[12] See especially Orlinsky, "Hebrew Text", 540-48.

[13] Cf. Brock, "To Revise", 321.

[14] Brock, "Aspects", 74.

[15] Cf. Brock, "To Revise", 321, 327. In fact, "the translator could legitimately combine the role of *expositor* with that of *interpres*, in contrast to the Septuagint "revisers" who will have seen themselves solely as *interpretes*." Brock, "To Revise", 327.

in character (even in the case of the seemingly very literal Onkelos and Jonathan). In the words of Brock:

> The sacralization of the Hebrew original, with the concomitant denial of the possibility of independent authoritative translations neatly countered Philo's position, which was presumably that of much of the Diaspora, but by the mid second century this no longer mattered in Egypt since the Egyptian Diaspora seems to have suffered virtually total eclipse after the revolts of the early second century AD.[16]

Later in the history of Judaism, it is easy to quote examples of a highly suspicious attitude towards any translation of the Hebrew Scriptures, in as much as translation of the scriptures was regarded with great misgiving. According to the Talmud, Rabbi Judah bar Ilai, a student of Rabbi Akiba around the end of the first century CE, stands behind the pronouncement that "he who translates a verse literally is a liar and he who adds is a blasphemer."[17]

## 7.2. The Kaige Group

In the specialised field of LXX studies attempts to discern different revisions or recensions during the transmission history of the Old Testament in Greek are numerous, since it is obvious that the revision activity on the Septuagint started earlier and was more thorough than many scholars presumed. Some sort of revisionary activity, often called "kaige recension" or "kaige group", was highlighted by the publication of Pere Dominique Barthélemy's *Les Devanciers d'Aquila* in 1963. This epoch-making study had a highly stimulating impact on the current climate of LXX studies.

The revision, which was by now exemplified by the XII Prophets fragment from Nahal Hever, was fairly systematic and extensive. The culmination of this process of "correction" was Aquila's translation or revision from the second century CE.[18] Aquila stands in the end of a long

---

[16] Brock, "To Revise", 327.

[17] Tosefta, *Meg* 4.41. See also Bab. Talm, *Qidd*, 49a. The translation is from Tal, "Samaritan Targum", 200.

[18] It is customary in recent handbooks of the LXX to regard Aquila as a revision of LXX, but the differences are so marked that it may as well be regarded as a

process of revision, where the kaige group, from the last part of the first century BC, stands as a middle link.[19] According to Barthélemy, the revisional activity was based on the rules of interpretation postulated by the rabbis in the first part of the first century BC.[20] The revisions discussed here had two specific goals, one is to adjust the translation to different forms of the Hebrew text, the other to make it in every aspect a literal rendering of the Hebrew that reflects the exact wording and order of the Hebrew original.

Barthélemy collected several characteristic traits that disclose the revisional activity, from the Twelve Prophets scroll from Nahal Hever but supported it by the equivalents in different Mss of the LXX, known to contain the same kind of revisionary activity. One should not understand the revisionary activity as a systematic revision of monolithical character. Rather it is part of more general activity for bringing the LXX translation closer to literal reproduction of the exact wording of the Hebrew text. The primary, distinctive characteristic of this group is, to quote Barthélemy, "la traduction de גַּם par καίγη jointe à la non-traduction de אֶת par σύν".[21] Additionally, eight further criteria were adduced in exemplification of this recension.[22]

The basis for the discussion regarding the relation between the text of the LXX Psalter and the kaige group is some hints by Barthélemy, where he suggests that the LXX Psalms has some connection with a preliminary stage of the kaige group or at least have been translated in a milieu that also characterises the book of Psalms. He especially refers to the translation of גַּם by καὶ γάρ.[23]

Furthermore, not only Theodotion in the Psalms, but also Quinta belonged, according to Barthélemy, to the kaige group.[24] Venetz has

---

translation, even though not independent of the choice of vocabulary in LXX. See, e.g., the outcome of the investigation of Grabbe, "Greek Minor Versions", 516-17.

[19] The scroll is placed in the late first century BC rather than in the first part of the first century CE. See the final edition of the scroll by E. Tov in *DJD* 8, 25-26.

[20] Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, 4-10. Cf. the adequate criticism of this suggestion in Munnich, "Contribution", 205-18 and Gentry, "Greek Job", 417-18, 496.

[21] Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, X.

[22] Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, 48-80.

[23] See especially Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, 47.

[24] Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, 47.

further developed the arguments. He regards Quinta as reflecting a later, more elaborated phase, in the revisional chain, closer to Aquila.[25] He has thoroughly compared Quinta and the terminology of the kaige group and he stresses the affinity between the two "kein Zweifel besteht an der Zuhörigkeit der Quinta des Psalteriums zur Gruppe καίγε".[26] He further emphasises the affinity between LXX Psalms and the hermeneutics behind the kaige group,[27] which according to him are a reflection of the Palestinian background of the translation.[28] Or in the words of Venetz "Der wesentliche Unterschied zwischen der καίγε-Gruppe und dem LXX-text des Psalteriums ist also darin zu suchen, daß die καίγε-Gruppe einen Typ palästinensischer Rezension an nicht palästinensischen griechischen Texten darstellt, währenddem der palästinensische Charakter des griechischen Psalters nicht so sehr rezensionell als ursprünglich ist."[29]

In his discussion of the relation between the kaige group and specific passages, Venetz often includes equivalents from LXX Psalms, and states "Es wird auffallen, wie viel Gemeinsamkeiten das LXX-Psalterium mit dem Vokabular dieser Gruppe hat."[30] He is neither the only one nor the first who has pointed out the affinity between certain equivalents in LXX Psalms and in the kaige group.[31] I will further on explore this supposed connection between LXX Psalms and the kaige group, but first one must try to make plain possible interpretations of this state of affairs.

How can one prove that a certain text was influenced by revisionary activity? Must one for example presuppose a strict consistency in the equivalents chosen? The words of Bodine can be quoted in this connection "It must be emphasised again that absolute consistency is not a prerequisite for the recognition of a genuinely characteristic reading. What is required, rather, is sufficient consistency to indicate a trend."[32] Several reasons for this evaluation can be put forward:

---

[25] Venetz, *Quinta*, 90.

[26] Venetz, *Quinta,* 72.

[27] Venetz, *Quinta,* 72-84, especially 80.

[28] Venetz, *Quinta,* 72-84, especially 83-84.

[29] Venetz, *Quinta,* 84.

[30] Venetz, *Quinta,* 58-59. See also n. 48 where he, with reservations, ties at least parts of LXX Psalms to the kaige group.

[31] See e.g. Munnich, "Contribution", 206.

[32] Bodine, *Judges,* 57 n. 2.

1) Texts that more or less exactly reflect the revision are not absolutely concordant, e.g. the XII prophets scroll.
2) The conventionally used term "kaige-recension" might imply a specific unified systematic revision made at a certain point of time, but it is better to use the term for a group of revisers.[33]
3) The LXX Mss themselves may be only partly influenced by the revisional activity.

It must, however, be emphasised that even a more or less systematic use of a characteristic trait in the book of Psalms by the kaige group can be interpreted as reflecting the Old Greek. The revision may have been partly based on the vocabulary of the book of Psalms, in a similar way as later LXX books were often drawing on the Greek Pentateuch for their choice of vocabulary.[34] Furthermore, ordinary Old Greek renderings ought to be found in old Mss if Rahlfs' text was influenced by the kaige group, if not the Old Greek has been lost altogether.

The Psalter is distinguished among the Writings, the third group in the Hebrew canon, as "the one book in this category which the translators treated with respect."[35] "Fairly literal" seems to be a general label to which many scholars can subscribe. J. Barr characterises the translator as "normally a fairly sober and literal worker",[36] and A. Pietersma, regards the version as "a fairly literal translation of the Hebrew".[37]

Similarities between LXX Psalms and the kaige group that are disclosed by Barthélemy; the translation of יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת by κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων, of שׁוֹפָר by σάλπιγγος κερατίνης, the common rendering of גַּם by καὶ γὰρ and the use of βάρις and πυργόβαρις are seen by Munnich as original traits in LXX Psalms, which are taken up by the revisers of the kaige group.[38] This is exactly the outcome of this investigation.

That the revision in some cases has been based on the vocabulary of the book of Psalms does not imply that the translator of LXX Psalms was

---

[33] See, e.g., Gentry, *Greek Job*, 389-90.

[34] See e.g., Munnich, "Septante", 85-89; Munnich, "Contribution", 217-18. This distinction is not really made in Barthélemy, *Devanciers*. See the criticism in Munnich, "Contribution", e.g., 194, 201-02.

[35] Jellicoe, *Septuagint*, 66. Cf. Thackeray, *Jewish Worship,* 12-13.

[36] Barr, *Philology,* 249.

[37] Pietersma, "David", 214-15.

[38] For the similarities with the kaige group, see Munnich, "Septante", 86-87.

in any way connected with the kaige group. Munnich's evaluation was based on a few characteristics, which also could be disputed, e.g. the rendering of שׁוֹפָר by σάλπιγγος κερατίνης in 98:6. As could be seen later, there are several significant correspondences between LXX Psalms and the kaige group, which he has not used for his evaluation.

## 7.3. The Use of Equivalents in Quinta and in the Septuagint

First, I will take some examples of the relation between the equivalents in LXX and in Quinta. Quinta as a rule maintains the vocabulary of LXX Psalms, even in cases where the counterparts depart from ordinary equivalents in LXX as a whole.[39] Furthermore, where Quinta has a different equivalent from LXX Psalms it often employs the vocabulary of the Psalter in a more systematic way. Accordingly, the differences in the choice of vocabulary between LXX Psalms and Quinta may partly be explained by a more systematic usage of the vocabulary in LXX by the revision. See the following examples.

*18:36* וְעֵנְוַתְךָ 𝔊 καὶ ἡ παιδεία σου ε´ καὶ ἡ πραΰτης σου
עֲנָוָה in 18:36 is rendered by παιδεία in LXX and by πραΰς in Quinta. Since עֲנָוָה otherwise only occurs in 45:5 translated by πραΰς, and √ענו mostly has πραΰς or πραΰτης as equivalents in the Psalter, and παιδεία otherwise never renders √ענו, but rather מוּסָר, the choice of equivalent in Quinta makes a more consistent use of the ordinary counterparts in the Psalms.[40]

*30:2 MT* דִלִּיתָנִי וְלֹא־שִׂמַּחְתָּ אֹיְבַי לִי 𝔊 ὑπέλαβές με ε´ ἐξείλω με
דִלִּיתָנִי in 30:2 is rendered by ὑπέλαβές με in LXX and ἐξείλω με in Quinta. Even though the semantic meaning of the Hebrew term is one

---

[39] See, e.g., Venetz, *Quinta*, 13-17. The basis for the revision is, according to Venetz, probably an LXX-text close to the so-called Upper-Egyptian text. *Idem*, 18-19. The revision of Quinta has several other objectives, *viz.* reflecting the exact semantic meaning or grammatical construction of the words in question and adhering to a Hebrew text, which sometimes departed from the *Vorlage* of LXX. See, e.g., Venetz, *Quinta*, 21-46.
[40] Mozley, less convincingly, suggests that the rendering of ענותך in 18:36 in LXX is based on a different vocalization עִנּוֹתְךָ. Mozley, *Psalter*, 33.

reason for the choice of vocabulary in Quinta, he employs a phrase that is common in LXX Psalms, ἐξαιρεῖν με.[41]

*30:8 MT הֶעֱמַדְתָּה 𝔊 παρέσχου ε´ ἔστησας*

עָמַד hiphil is in Ps 30:8 translated by παρέχειν in LXX and by ἱστάναι, ἱστᾶν in Quinta, Aquila, and Symmachus. Quinta only adheres to the ordinary equivalent for עָמַד hiphil in LXX Psalms, ἱστάναι, ἱστᾶν.[42] παρέχειν, apart from here, never renders עָמַד in LXX as whole. In fact, the same Hebrew as in 30:8 occurs in 31:9, הֶעֱמַדְתָּ, rendered by ἔστησας in the LXX.

*30:11 MT שְׁמַע־יְהוָה 𝔊 ἤκουσεν κύριος ε´ εἰσάκουσον κύριος*

The rendering of שָׁמַע by εἰσακούειν in Quinta, rather than by ἀκούειν in LXX, reflects the ordinary equivalent of שָׁמַע in LXX Psalms, especially in the imperative, as is evident from the examples below:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 4:2 | וּשְׁמַע תְּפִלָּתִי | καὶ εἰσάκουσον τῆς προσευχῆς μου |
| 17:1 | שִׁמְעָה יְהוָה צֶדֶק | εἰσάκουσον κύριε τῆς δικαιοσύνης μου |
| 17:6 | שְׁמַע אִמְרָתִי | καὶ εἰσάκουσον τῶν ῥημάτων μου |
| 27:7 | שְׁמַע־יְהוָה קוֹלִי | εἰσάκουσον κύριε τῆς φωνῆς μου |
| 28:2 | שְׁמַע קוֹל תַּחֲנוּנַי | Εἰσάκουσον, ὁ θεός, τῆς φωνῆς μου |
| 39:13 | שִׁמְעָה־תְפִלָּתִי יְהוָה | εἰσάκουσον τῆς προσευχῆς μου κύριε |
| 54:4 | אֱלֹהִים שְׁמַע תְּפִלָּתִי | ὁ θεός εἰσάκουσον τῆς προσευχῆς μου |
| 61:2 | שִׁמְעָה אֱלֹהִים רִנָּתִי | εἰσάκουσον ὁ θεός τῆς δεήσεώς μου |
| 64:2 | שְׁמַע־אֱלֹהִים קוֹלִי | εἰσάκουσον ὁ θεός τῆς φωνῆς μου |
| 84:9 | יְהוָה ... שִׁמְעָה תְפִלָּתִי | κύριε ... εἰσάκουσον τῆς προσευχῆς μου |
| 102:2 | יְהוָה שִׁמְעָה תְפִלָּתִי | Εἰσάκουσον, κύριε, τῆς προσευχῆς μου |
| 143:1 | יְהוָה שְׁמַע תְּפִלָּתִי | Εἰσάκουσον, κύριε, τῆς προσευχῆς μου |

The translator has, apart from here and 119:49, always employed the imperative of εἰσακούειν or ἐπακούειν as a rendering of שָׁמַע when the prayers are directed to God.[43]

---

[41] 31:2 (probably without counterpart in MT); 31:3; 59:2; 71:2; 119:153; 140:2, 5; 143:9; 144:7, 11. Cf., e.g., ἐξελοῦ 64:2, ἐξελοῦμαί σε 50:15, ἐξελοῦμαι 91:15 for different Hebrew counterparts, חָלַץ (50:15 and 91:15), and נָצַל (64:2).

[42] 18:34; 31:9; 105:10; 107:25; 148:6.

[43] See, e.g., Venetz, *Quinta,* 52. Thus, שמע is rendered by εἰσάκουσον in 4:2; 17:1, 6; 27:7; 28:2; 54:4; 39:13; 61:2; 64:2; 84:9; 102:2; 143:1. In 81:9 שְׁמַע is

*35:1 MT* רִיבָה יְהוָה אֶת־יְרִיבַי ⅏ δίκασον κύριε τοὺς ἀδικοῦντάς με
ε´ δίκασον κύριε τὴν δίκην μου
Quinta adheres to the equivalent of similar phrases in LXX. Cf.

| 43:1 | וְרִיבָה רִיבִי | καὶ δίκασον τὴν δίκην μου |
|------|------|------|
| 74:22 | רִיבָה רִיבֶךָ | δίκασον τὴν δίκην σου |

His rendering may reflect a different *Vorlage*, see pc Mss ⅏ רִיבִי, and then
it closely follows the ordinary choice of counterpart in LXX Psalms.

*35:22 MT* אַל־תִּרְחַק ⅏ μὴ ἀποστῇς ε´ μὴ μακρύνῃς
√רחק is mainly rendered by μακρύνειν with cognates in LXX Psalms,[44]
and μακρύνειν is with only some more or less dubious exceptions a
translation of רָחַק in the Psalms, *viz.* כָּלָא 40:12, אָרַךְ 129:3[45] and מֶשֶׁךְ
"Meshech" 120:5.[46] √רחק in the phrase אַל־תִּרְחַק is sometimes translated by
ἀφιστᾶν (22:12; 35:22; 38:22).[47] The counterpart in Quinta μὴ
μακρύνῃς, on the other hand, adheres to other equivalents of the phrase
אַל־תִּרְחַק (22:20; 71:12), and to the ordinary rendering of √רחק in LXX
Psalms. One may take for granted that Quinta had μὴ μακρύνῃς in 22:12
and 38:22.

| 22:12 | אַל־תִּרְחַק מִמֶּנִּי | μὴ ἀποστῇς ἀπ᾽ ἐμοῦ |
|------|------|------|
| 22:20 | יְהוָה אַל־תִּרְחָק אֱיָלוּתִי | κύριε, μὴ μακρύνῃς τὴν βοήθειάν |
| 35:22 | אֲדֹנָי אַל־תִּרְחַק מִמֶּנִּי | κύριε, μὴ ἀποστῇς ἀπ᾽ ἐμοῦ· |
| 38:22 | אֱלֹהַי אַל־תִּרְחַק מִמֶּנִּי | ὁ θεός μου, μὴ ἀποστῇς ἀπ᾽ ἐμοῦ· |
| 71:12 | אֱלֹהִים אַל־תִּרְחַק מִמֶּנִּי | ὁ θεός, μὴ μακρύνῃς ἀπ᾽ ἐμοῦ· μου |

---

translated by ἄκουσον, but it is directed to Israel rather than God. Even when
they appear in juxtaposition, they have the same Greek equivalent.
[44] 10:1; 22:2, 20; 38:12; 55:8; 56:1; 65:6; 71:12; 88:9, 19; 109:17; 119:150, 155;
138:6; 139:2.
[45] According to, e.g., Briggs it is a corrupt text. See Briggs, *Psalms II*, 463.
[46] "Meshech" is a people or a country in eastern Anatolia near the Black Sea. The
equivalent is denoted by + in Hatch, Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint*,
"μακρύνειν". The LXX translator may have read it as מָשַׁךְ "pull, drag". E.g.,
Mozley suggests מֶשֶׁךְ as the *Vorlage* of LXX. Mozley, *Psalter*, 173.
[47] ἀφιστᾶν is mostly a translation of סור in hiphil in the Psalms, but sometimes of
רָחַק in qal and sporadically of אָמַד and סוג qal, niphal.

*35:28 MT* תְּהִלָּה *𝔊 ἔπαινος ε´ αἴνεσις*

תְּהִלָּה can be found 57 times in the Old Testament as a whole, but in the book of Psalms the term only turns up 30 times. Thus, more than half of the occurrences in MT is confined to the book of Psalms. The preference for αἴνεσις as a rendering of תְּהִלָּה is especially conspicuous in LXX Psalms. It occurs 21x,[48] while ὕμνος appears 5x,[49] and ὕμνησις once, 71:6. ἔπαινος, apart from 35:28, only appears in 22:4, 26. αἴνεσις has תְּהִלָּה as counterpart only 4 times outside the Psalter.[50] Furthermore, ἔπαινος is never used as an equivalent for תְּהִלָּה outside the Psalter. The systematisation of the existing translation equivalents in LXX Psalms is even more pronounced in this case, since Aquila and Symmachus have different counterparts, Aquila ὕμνησις and Symmachus ὕμνος.

*46:1 MT* שִׁיר *𝔊 ψαλμός ε´ ᾠδή*

שִׁיר is here rendered by ψαλμός, contrary to the usual counterpart, ᾠδή. In fact, שִׁיר is apart from here and 48:1 always translated by ᾠδή (35x) or ᾆσμα (5x) in LXX Psalms, according to Rahlfs' text.[51] Probably one should propose a different *Vorlage*, at least in 48:1 (שִׁיר מִזְמוֹר — ψαλμὸς ᾠδῆς), since שִׁיר מִזְמוֹר is otherwise always translated by ᾠδὴ ψαλμοῦ,[52] and מִזְמוֹר שִׁיר by ψαλμὸς ᾠδῆς.[53] Otherwise, the rendering in Quinta adheres to the ordinary equivalent in LXX Psalms, ᾠδή.

*46:3 MT* וּבְמוֹט הָרִים *𝔊 καὶ μετατίθεσθαι ὄρη ε´ καὶ σαλεύεσθαι ὄρη*
*46:7 MT* מָטוּ מַמְלָכוֹת *𝔊 ἔκλιναν βασιλεῖαι ε´ ἐσαλεύθησαν βασιλεῖαι*

מוֹט qal is in 46:3 rendered by μετατιθέναι and in 46:7 by κλίνειν. In both cases, Quinta has the equivalent σαλεύειν, which is the ordinary counterpart in LXX Psalms. σαλεύειν and the cognate σάλος in fact always, apart from the two passages under discussion, render מוֹט in qal or מוֹט as a noun.[54] The same is nearly true for מוֹט in niphal, which apart

---

[48] 9:15; 33:1; 34:2; 48:11; 51:17; 66:2, 8; 71:8, 14; 78:4; 79:13; 102:22; 106:2, 12, 47; 109:1; 111:10; 145:1, 21; 147:1; 149:1.

[49] 40:4; 65:2; 100:4; 119:171; 148:14.

[50] 1 Chr 16:35; Neh 9:5; Hab 3:3, and Jer 33:9.

[51] σάρξ in 28:7 evidently reflects the *Vorlage* בָּשָׂר.

[52] 66:1; 83:1; 88:1; 108:1.

[53] 30:1; 67:1; 68:1; 87:1; 92:1.

[54] מוֹט in qal translated by σαλεύειν 38:17; 60:4; 94:18, and מוֹט by σάλος 55:23; 66:9; 121:3.

from 104:5 κλίνειν, 62:7 μεταναστεύειν and 140:11 (Q) πίπτειν, has σαλεύειν as counterpart.[55] σαλεύειν is the ordinary rendering in the LXX as a whole. μετατιθέναι otherwise never occurs as equivalent of מוט in the LXX and κλίνειν very seldom.[56] Other old versions depart from the renderings in Quinta, e.g. Aquila has σφάλλειν, Symmachus κλίνειν.

*46:7 MT* תָּמוּג אָרֶץ 𝔊 ἐσαλεύθη ἡ γῆ ε´ τακήσεται ἡ γῆ
מוג is rendered by σαλεύειν in LXX and by τήκειν in Quinta. Quinta adheres to the ordinary rendering of √מוג in the LXX Psalms. See Ps 75:4 נְמֹגִים אָרֶץ — ἐτάκη ἡ γῆ, 107:26 נַפְשָׁם בְּרָעָה תִתְמוֹגָג — ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτῶν ἐν κακοῖς ἐτήκετο. εὐφρανθήσεται in Ps 66:11 is based on a different *Vorlage* (√ענג).

*61:5 MT* אֶחֱסֶה בְסֵתֶר 𝔊 σκεπασθήσομαι ἐν σκέπῃ ε´ ἐλπίσω ἐν σκέπῃ
חָסָה in 61:5 is rendered by σκεπάζειν in LXX and by ἐλπίζειν in Quinta. חָסָה is mostly translated by ἐλπίζειν (20x),[57] but sometimes by πείθειν (4x) in LXX.[58] σκεπάζειν only occurs here as equivalent to חָסָה in the Psalter, and only in Isa 30:2 in LXX outside the Psalms.[59] Furthermore, אֶחֱסֶה also appears in 18:3 rendered by καὶ ἐλπιῶ ἐπ᾽ in LXX. Thus, Quinta, in contrast to LXX, employs the ordinary rendering of חָסָה in the Psalter.[60] Cf. the counterpart of the following phrases:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 36:8 | בְּצֵל כְּנָפֶיךָ יֶחֱסָיוּן | ἐν σκέπῃ τῶν πτερύγων σου ἐλπιοῦσιν |
| 57:2 | וּבְצֵל־כְּנָפֶיךָ אֶחֱסֶה | καὶ ἐν τῇ σκιᾷ τῶν πτερύγων σου ἐλπιῶ |
| 61:5 | אֶחֱסֶה בְסֵתֶר כְּנָפֶיךָ | σκεπασθήσομαι ἐν σκέπῃ τῶν πτερύγων σου |

---

[55] 10:6; 13:5; 15:5; 16:8; 17:5; 21:8; 30:7; 46:6; 62:3; 82:5; 93:1; 96:10; 112:6; 125:1.

[56] Apart from here only only occurs in Ps 104:5 (מוט niphal). The reference to Isa 24:20 in Hatch, Redpatch, *A Concordance to the Septuagint*, "κλίνειν", is not correct.

[57] 5:12; 7:2; 16:1; 17:7; 18:3, 31; 25:20; 31:2, 20; 34:9, 23; 36:8; 37:40; 57:2; 64:11; 71:1; 91:4; 118:9; 141:8; 144:2. In 91:14 חָשַׁק is rendered by ἤλπισεν, which may suggest a *Vorlage* חָסָה. See, e.g., Mozley, *Psalter*, 147.

[58] πείθειν 2:12; 11:1; 57:2; 118:8.

[59] וְלַחֲסוֹת בְּצֵל is translated by καὶ σκεπασθῆναι.

[60] See, e.g., Venetz, *Quinta,* 54.

*89:44 MT* הֲקֵימֹתוֹ 𝔖 ἀντελάβου αὐτοῦ ε´ ἔστησας αὐτοῦ

קוּם hiphil is otherwise never rendered by ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι in LXX as a whole. It is, apart from 107:29 (ἐπιτάσσειν) and 113:7 (ἐγείρειν), always translated by ἱστᾶν with cognates in LXX Psalms, ἱστᾶν 40:3; 119:38, ἀνιστᾶν 41:11; 78:5. Thus, Quinta has used an equivalent that is in line with the translation technique in LXX Psalms. Both Aquila and Symmachus employ a form of ἱστᾶν here.

Since it is easy to find examples to the contrary, I will not at all suggest that the differences in the choice of vocabulary in Quinta is always explained by a more systematic use of the vocabulary of the Psalter. See e.g. the translation of בֶּאֱמוּנָתִי in 89:34 in LXX by ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ μου, and in Quinta by ἐν τῇ πίστει μου, where apart from 33:4, אֱמוּנָה is always translated by ἀλήθεια in LXX Psalms,[61] and the rendering in Quinta of מָאַס by ἐγκαταλείπειν in 89:39. Isa 41:9 seems to be the only passage in LXX where this word appears as equivalent of מָאַס.

## 7.4. The Septuagint Psalms Kaige and Group Characteristics

A systematic study regarding the similarities and the differences between the characteristics of the kaige group and LXX Psalms is as far as I know largely lacking.[62] Gentry rightly emphasises, the need for a contrastive as well as comparative study of renderings in the Greek Psalter with all equivalencies in the καίγε group. I have tried to make such an analysis in this chapter, where I have compared the LXX text in the Psalter with all or nearly all of the characteristics proposed concerning the kaige group.[63]

In the evaluation of these characteristics, one may consent with P.J. Gentry in his critical assessment that for different reasons "most of the patterns gathered post-Barthélemy are of little value".[64] On the other hand, his denial that common equivalents in LXX can be used as criterion for

---

[61] On the other hand, πίστις has as a rule √אמן as counterpart in LXX.

[62] Cf., however, Munnich, "Contribution", *passim* and the far-reaching comparison between the LXX Psalter and Aquila, the XII Prophets Scroll and the asterisked material in LXX Job in Gentry, *Greek Job*, 419-93.

[63] The equivalents in this chapters are based on the Rahlfs' minor edition (Handausgabe), unless otherwise stated.

[64] Gentry, *Greek Job*, 402-03.

the kaige group is not self-evident.[65] Since the kaige group is some sort of revisionary activity of the LXX text, it is not based only on a completely new set of equivalents; it rather employs many of the existing equivalents in LXX more consistently. Although I sometimes give expression to doubts regarding the validity a certain characteristic, a critical evaluation of the validity of each suggested trait of the kaige group is beyond the scope of this presentation. The result of the study is therefore dependent on in what sense the characteristics investigated really are typical for the revisionary activity by the kaige group. Since this is a complicated issue, where different opinions can be found, I have refrained from a serious discussion in this chapter, even though I make some passing remarks regarding individual characteristics.[66]

The characteristics described by Barthélemy, which are based on a comprehensive comparison material, and not only the scroll from Nahal Hever, are in the following divided into characteristics that identify members of the kaige group (core patterns) and traits that show these members to be precursors of Aquila (precursor patterns).[67]

### 7.4.1. Core patterns

וְגַם/גַם translated by καίγη. In the OG diverse equivalents can be found, often καὶ. גַם is mainly rendered by καὶ γὰρ and καί in the Psalter,[68] but also by τε, ἔτι δὲ καὶ, ἕως, διὰ τοῦτο, ἀλλ᾽ ἢ, ὅτι,[69] וְגַם by ἔτι δὲ καὶ, καί,[70] and הֲגַם is translated by μὴ καὶ.[71]

---

[65] E.g. √חכם — σοφ-, בֵּין — ἀνὰ μέσον, בְּתוֹךְ — ἐν μέσῳ, √עבד — δουλ-, פָּנַע — συναντᾶν/ἀπαντᾶν, רָעָה — πονηρία, √טוב — ἀγαθός with cognates. Gentry, *Greek Job*, 412-15.

[66] Regarding the need for such a critical analysis, see e.g. Gentry, *Greek Job*, 497.

[67] Cf. Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, and Gentry, *Greek Job*, 390.

[68] καὶ γὰρ 19:12; 25:3; 37:25; 41:10; 71:22; 83:9; 84:4, 7; 85:13; 119:23, 24; 129:2; 139:10, καὶ 19:14; 38:11; 49:3; 95:9; 107:5; 132:12; 137:1. גַם once occurs without equivalent 118:11.

[69] τε 49:3, ἔτι δὲ καὶ 71:24, ἕως 14:3; 53:4, διὰ τοῦτο 52:7, ἀλλ᾽ ἢ 133:1, ὅτι 139:12, כִּי גַם by ἐὰν γὰρ καὶ 23:4, and גַם occurs without equivalent in 118:11.

[70] ἔτι δὲ καὶ 8:8, καί 71:18; 78:21; 84:3; 148:12.

[71] 78:20.

אִישׁ as a distributive pronoun is in kaige group rendered by ἀνήρ. The typical OG rendering is ἕκαστος. אִישׁ occurs in the Psalter as an distributive pronoun in 12:3 and 62:13 and on both occasions it is rendered by ἕκαστος, 12:3 אִישׁ אֶת־רֵעֵהוּ — ἕκαστος πρὸς τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ, and 62:13 כִּי־אַתָּה תְשַׁלֵּם לְאִישׁ כְּמַעֲשֵׂהוּ — ὅτι σὺ ἀποδώσεις ἑκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ.

The semipreposition מֵעַל is in the kaige group rendered by ἐπάνωθεν or ἀπάνωθεν, while it in the OG is translated by ἀπό or ἐπάνω. The following equivalents can be found in LXX Psalms, ἀπό, ἄνω, ὑπεράνω and ἐπάνω.[72]

The rendering of נצב/יצב by στηλοῦν, in contrast to the use of ἱστάναι in the OG, is a sign of the kaige group. The choice of vocabulary is probably based on the translation of מַצֵּבָה by στήλη in the OG. However, this characteristic is dubious as a sign of the kaige group, according to Bodine, since it sometimes does not appear in the kaige material.[73] Furthermore, there are several cases where it occurs in non-kaige texts.[74] The equivalents in the Psalter is far from systematic, יצב in hithpael is rendered by the composites παριστάναι, or συμπαριστάναι, or by διαμένειν, while נצב in niphal has ἱστάναι, as well as παριστάναι, διαμένειν and ζῆν as equivalents. נצב in hiphil is translated by βεβαιοῦν, ποιεῖν and ἱστάναι.[75]

One of the most clearly demarcated features of the kaige group is the restriction of OG σάλπιγξ to Hebrew חֲצֹצְרָה and the introduction of κερατίνη to represent שׁוֹפָר. In OG σάλπιγξ is used for שׁוֹפָר as well as חֲצֹצְרָה. שׁוֹפָר occurs 4 times in the Psalter, translated by σάλπιγξ (47:6;

---

[72] ἀπό 39:11; 119:22, ἄνω 50:4, ὑπεράνω 148:4, ἐπάνω 108:5. 50:4 (מֵעַל) is rather a combination of the preposition מִן and the substantive עַל rather than the combination of two prepositions, but the difference is trivial.

[73] See Bodine, *Judges,* 13 and n. 29-30.

[74] Bodine, *Judges,* 13 and n. 31-33.

[75] יצב in hithpael is rendered by παριστάναι 2:2; 36:5, συμπαριστάναι 94:16, διαμένειν 5:6, נצב in niphal by ἱστάναι 82:1, παριστάναι 45:10, διαμένειν 119:89, ζῆν 39:6 (כָל־אָדָם נִצָּב is rendered by πᾶς ἄνθρωπος ζῶν), נצב in hiphil by βεβαιοῦν 41:13, ποιεῖν 74:17, ἱστάναι 78:13.

81:4; 150:3), or σάλπιγγος κερατίνης (98:6), and חֲצֹצְרָה occurs once; בַּחֲצֹצְרוֹת in 98:6 is translated by ἐν σάλπιγξιν ἐλαταῖς.

The emphasis on the non-temporal character of the Hebrew אֵין by using οὐκ ἔστιν in the present tense even in the midst in a series of aorists is a sign of the kaige group.[76] The Rabbis behind the kaige group believed, according to Barthélemy, that אֵין was non-temporal.[77] In the Psalms אֵין is not seldom rendered by οὐκ εἶναι in the present in a context with verbs in the aorist.[78] On the other hand, most of them are adequate equivalents in their contexts. There are some exceptions, e.g. 69:3 "I was stuck (ἐνεπάγην) in deep mire, where there is no foothold (καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ὑπόστασις) I came (ἦλθον) into the depths of the sea, and a tempest overwhelmed me (κατεπόντισέν με)". Cf. also 38:11; 40:13; 55:20.[79] Other equivalents sporadically appear, οὐδὲ εἶναι, οὐ, οὐδε, μηδέ, οὐχ ἔχειν, ὀλίγον, alpha privative, οὐθέν, μὴ ὑπάρχειν, οὐ μὴ ὑπάρχειν, οὐχ ὑπάρχειν, οὐκέτι, μὴ ὑπάρχειν, οὐ μὴ εὑρίσκειν, μὴ εἶναι.[80]

---

[76] The new presentation of אֵין translated by οὐκ ἔστιν is directly dependent on Gentry's article "The Greek Psalter and the καίγε Tradition", 88-92. My discussion of the translation of אֵין in my article was far from satisfying and did not take account of all the passages. The only deviations from Gentry's statistics are that I have included passages where the *Vorlage* of LXX probably had אֵין and the few cases where Rahlfs' minor edition and Rahlfs' *Psalmi* disagree. I have, for reason of consistency with the other criteria, chosen to follow Rahlfs' minor edition, but also noted the variants in Rahlfs, *Psalmi*.

[77] Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, 65-68.

[78] The context here refers to the same verse. See 10:4; 14:1 (2x); 14:3 (2x); 22:12; 32:9; 34:10; 38:11; 40:6; 40:13; 53:2; 53:4 (2x); 55:20; 69:3; 71:11; 74:9; 142:5 (2x). The lexical counterpart οὐκ ἔστιν (in varying tenses) can be found in 3:3; 5:10; 6:6; 10:4; 14:1 (2x), 3 (2x); 18:42; 19:4, 7; 22:12; 32:9; 34:10; 36:2; 37:36; 38:4 (2x), 8, 11; 40:6, 13; 53:2 (2x), 4 (2x); 55:20; 69:3; 71:11; 73:4, 5; 74:9; 79:3; 86:8 (2x); 104:25; 105:34, 37; 107:12; 119:165; 139:4; 142:5 (2x); 144:14; 145:3; 146:3; 147:5. It occurs two times more in the *Vorlage* of LXX in 14:1, 3, since οὐκ ἔστιν in LXX there reflects אֵין (MT -). וְאֵין in 104:25 is translated by ὧν οὐκ ἔστιν and in 146:3 שֶׁאֵין לוֹ is translated by οἷς οὐκ ἔστιν.

[79] Cf. 14:5; 18:42; 37:36; 44:13; 53:6; 79:3; 105:34; 105:37; 107:12; 142:5, where the imperfect is used.

[80] οὐδὲ εἶναι 32:2; 135:17 (אֵין־יֵשׁ), οὐ 33:16, οὐδε 19:4; 144:14 (2x), μηδέ 7:3, οὐχ ἔχειν 38:15, ὀλίγον 73:2, alpha privative 88:5, οὐθέν 39:6, μὴ ὑπάρχειν 104:35, οὐ μὴ ὑπάρχειν 37:10; 59:14, οὐχ ὑπάρχειν 69:21; 72:12; 103:16,

According to Bodine, it may be a genuine characteristic of the kaige group. But, there are some cases in the kaige-sections where it is not revised and thus the characteristic is not consistent in the kaige-material.[81]

אָנֹכִי is translated by ἐγώ εἰμι in the kaige group, and אֲנִי by ἐγώ. In the OG ἐγώ is as a rule used for אָנֹכִי as well as אֲנִי. ἐγώ εἰμι was treated as unit in the kaige group and could even serve as the subject of a finite verb. אָנֹכִי is in the Psalter mostly translated by ἐγώ εἰμι, but εἰμι ἐγώ, ἐγὼ γάρ εἰμι, ἐγώ, ἐγώ δε, and εἰμι also occur.[82] Furthermore, אֲנִי is mainly translated by ἐγώ,[83] sometimes by ἐγώ εἰμι or εἰμι ἐγώ, εἰμι, ἐγὼ δὲ, ἤμην, μου, ἐμοῦ, ἐμοὶ, εἰμι ἐγώ (וַאֲנִי), κἀγώ (twice reflecting וַאֲנִי and once אַף־אֲנִי).[84]

The elimination of the OG historical present in favour of the aorist for the Hebrew converted prefix tense in narration. Since narration in the strict sense of the word hardly occurs in the Psalter, it has no relevance for this study. This characteristic, which is typical for historical texts, only seldom occurs in the kaige group.[85]

---

οὐκέτι μὴ ὑπάρχειν 39:14, οὐ μὴ εὑρίσκειν 37:10, μὴ εἶναι 50:22. A *Vorlage* with אַיִן is probable in 7:3 μὴ ὄντος, 14:1, οὐκ ἔιναι, 3 οὐκ ἔιναι, 56:8 τοῦ μηθενὸς (MT אָוֶן). Regarding 56:8, see *Muraoka, Hebrew/Aramaic Index*, s.v. אָוֶן. The text of Rahlfs' *Handausgabe* in 39:14 is supported by Bʹ R, but οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ ὑπάρχειν by 2013 Laʹ Aʹʹ (=Rahlfs, *Psalmi*). A variant in 50:22 has οὐ μὴ εἶναι R L ʹ 55. Cf. also οὐ μὴ ὑπάρξωσιν S Lᵃ Rahlfs *Handausgabe*, οὐ μὴ ὑπάρξουσιν B R ^Lb(sil)He* 1219' (Rahlfs, *Psalmi*), 59:14

[81] Bodine, *Judges,* 15 and n. 49.

[82] ἐγώ εἰμι 22:7; 39:13; 46:11; 109:22; 119:19, εἰμι ἐγώ 50:7; 141:10, ἐγὼ γάρ εἰμι 81:11, but also by ἐγώ 75:4; 119:141, 162, ἐγώ δε 104:34, εἰμι 91:15.

[83] 2:6, 7; 3:6; 5:8; 13:6; 17:4, 6; 26:1, 11; 27:3; 30:7; 31:7, 15, 23; 35:13; 38:14, 18; 39:5, 11; 41:5; 45:2; 51:5; 52:10; 55:24; 59:17; 69:14; 70:6; 71:14, 22; 73:22, 23; 75:3, 10; 82:6; 86:2; 102:12; 109:4, 25; 116:11, 16 (2x); 119:67, 87; 135:5.

[84] ἐγώ εἰμι 35:3; 119:63, εἰμι ἐγώ 25:16; 40:18; 69:30 (וַאֲנִי); 86:1; 88:16; 119:94, 125; 143:12, εἰμι 6:3, ἐγὼ δὲ 17:15; 55:17; 56:4; 116:10; 119:69, 70, 78, ἐμός 120:7, μου 89:48, ἐμοῦ 41:13; 73:2, ἐμοὶ 73:28, κἀγώ (וַאֲנִי) 88:14; 118:7, and אַף־אֲנִי translated by κἀγώ 89:28.

[85] Bodine, *Judges*, 14.

### 7.4.2. Precursor patterns

The rendering of גְּדוּד "band, troop" by μονόζωνος "lightly armed",[86] in contrast to the usage of various equivalents in the OG, e.g. πειρατήριον, πειρατής, σύστρεμμα, δύναμις, is characteristic for the kaige group. Cf. Aquila εὔζωνος. גְּדוּד "band, troop" only occurs in Ps 18:30, where it is rendered by ἀπὸ πειρατηρίου. LXX probably reflects גֶּדֶר. See *BHS*. גְּדוּד "ridge" in 65:11 is translated by γένημα.

The translation of יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת by κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων, in contrast to the ordinary rendering in OG κύριος παντοκράτωρ or κύριος Σαβαωθ (only Isaiah, 1 Sam). Aquila, however, has κύριος τῶν στρατιῶν. יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת or אֲדֹנָי צְבָאוֹת is translated by κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων in LXX Psalms. In fact, צָבָא in titles of Yahweh, be it יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת, יְהוָה־אֱלֹהִים צְבָאוֹת, יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי צְבָאוֹת, אֱלֹהִים צְבָאוֹת, אֲדֹנָי יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת is on every occasion rendered by δύναμις.[87] Furthermore, צְבָא is consistently translated by δύναμις in the Psalter, whether or not it refers to Yahweh.

אֵל is translated by ἰσχυρός, in contrast to the ordinary rendering in OG, θεός. ἰσχυρός is also used in Aquila. 7:12 is, however, the only case where ἰσχυρός translates אֵל in the OG of Psalms.[88] אֵל is nearly always rendered by θεός in LXX Psalms (71x), whether it refers to the God of Israel or to other gods. However, once it has κύριος as equivalent, 16:1.[89]

In the kaige group ἐνώπιον is reserved for לִפְנֵי, while ἔναντι, with cognates, is used for נֶגֶד. נֶגֶד in OG has diverse equivalents, ἐνώπιον as well as ἔναντι with cognates, e.g. ἐναντίον, ἐξ ἐναντίας, ἀπέναντι, κατέναντι. Aquila employs κατέναντι. נֶגֶד, לְנֶגֶד and מִנֶּגֶד is mainly rendered by ἔναντι with cognates in LXX Psalms, ἔναντι, κατέναντι,

---

[86] Lust, Eynikel, Hauspie, *Lexicon,* "μονόζωνος".

[87] יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת Pss 24:10; 46:8, 12; 48:9; 69:7; 84:2, 4, 13, אֲדֹנָי יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת 69:7, יְהוָה־אֱלֹהִים צְבָאוֹת 59:6; 80:5, 20; 84:9; 89:9, אֱלֹהִים צְבָאוֹת 80:8, 15.

[88] Some Mss have ἰσχυρός in 42:3.

[89] Although it is not suggested in *BHS*, it may very well reflect a Hebrew יהוה in 16:1. אֵל has no counterpart in 52:3, where חֶסֶד אֵל is rendered by ἀνομίαν, and perhaps not in 42:3, where לְאֵל חָי לֵאלֹהִים is rendered by πρὸς τὸν θεὸν τὸν ζῶντα. In 29:1 it is once misunderstood as אַיִל "ram" and translated by κριός as well as by θεός (double-translation), in 90:2 it has μή as equivalent, reflecting אַל, and in 102:25 μοί reflects אֵלִי.

κατεναντίον, ἀπέναντι, ἐξ ἐναντίας, ἐναντίον.[90] However, it is also translated by ἐνώπιον, ἀπὸ προσώπου and προ.[91] The textual witnesses, however, often oscillate between the two Greek prepositions ἐνώπιον and ἐναντίον.[92] לִפְנֵי is mainly rendered by ἐναντίον, ἐνώπιον and κατὰ πρόσωπον in LXX Psalms.[93] Sporadically other renderings can be found, πρὸ προσώπου 96:13 πρὸ 72:5, 17, ἔμπροσθεν 105:17, and it has no counterpart in 98:9.

עַל־כֵּן and עַל זֹאת is translated by διὰ τοῦτο by the kaige group, and by ἔνεκεν τούτο in the OG. עַל־כֵּן is always translated by διὰ τοῦτο in the book of Psalms,[94] while עַל זֹאת only appears in 32:6, where it is translated by ὑπὲρ ταύτης.

לְעוֹלָם is translated by εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα in the kaige group. לְעוֹלָם is extremely frequent in the Hebrew bible, where it occurs 160 times, and in the book of Psalms alone 99 times.[95] It is nearly always translated by εἰς

---

[90] ἔναντι 109:15, κατέναντι/κατεναντίον 5:6; 26:3; 44:16, ἀπέναντι 36:2, ἐξ ἐναντίας 23:5; 38:12, ἐναντίον 31:20; 38:10; 39:2; 52:11; 69:20; 78:12; 88:2; 89:37; 101:7; 116:18; 119:46, 168; 138:1; 109:1. In 14:3 LXX has ἀπέναντι, probably reflecting לְנֶגֶד, and in 77:3 LXX has ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ, probably reflecting נֶגְדּה, in contrast to MT:s נֶגְרָה. In 116:14 it has no counterpart in LXX.

[91] ἐνώπιον 16:8; 18:13, 23, 25; 22:26; 38:18; 39:6; 50:8; 51:5; 54:5; 86:14; 90:8, ἀπὸ προσώπου 10:5; 31:23, and πρό 101:3. LXX has ἐνώπιόν σου in 56:9 suggesting the *Vorlage* נֹאדֶךָ instead of MT:s בְנֹאדֶךָ.

[92] See the comments in Rahlfs, *Psalmi* to 21:26. ἐνώπιον occurs approximately 540x in LXX and in 107 of them the word is contested. Cf. Johannessohn, *Präpositionen,* 194. For the variation between these two words, see also Johannessohn, *Präpositionen*, 192, 196. See also Pietersma, *Manuscripts*, 40-43.

[93] ἐναντίον 34:1; 80:3; 95:6; 102:1; 106:46; 116:9, ἐνώπιον 56:14; 61:8; 68:4, 8; 69:23; 98:6, κατὰ πρόσωπον 35:5; 83:14; 147:17.

[94] 1:5; 18:50; 25:8; 42:7; 45:3, 8, 18; 46:3; 110:7; 119:104, 127, 128, 129.

[95] 5:12; 9:6, 8; 12:8; 15:5; 29:10; 30:7, 13; 31:2; 33:11; 37:18, 27, 28; 41:13; 44:9; 45:3, 18; 49:9, 12; 52:11; 55:23; 71:1; 72:17, 19; 73:26; 75:10; 77:8; 78:69; 79:13; 81:16; 85:6; 86:12; 89:29, 37, 53; 92:9; 100:5; 102:13; 103:9; 104:31; 105:8; 106:1; 107:1; 110:4; 111:5, 8, 9; 112:6; 117:2; 118:1, 2, 3, 4, 29; 119:44, 89, 93, 98, 111, 112, 142, 144, 152, 160; 125:1; 135:13; 136:1-26; 138:8; 145:1, 2, 21; 146:6, 10; 148:6.

τὸν αἰῶνα in the Psalter. There are a few variations, which evidently are based on a different *Vorlage*.[96]

Where אָסַף in the OG is translated by ἐκλείπειν it is in the kaige group revised to συνάγειν. Bodine argues that the characteristic of Barthélemy could be enlarged as to include the revision to συνάγειν from various OG renderings.[97] אָסַף in niphal is always translated by συνάγειν in the book of Psalms.[98] אָסַף qal has, however, almost a new equivalent in every occurrence, συναπολλύναι, προσλαμβάνειν, συνάγειν, καταπαύειν, ἀνταναιρεῖν.[99] συνάγειν is also the most frequent rendering outside the book of Psalms. συνάγειν is counterpart to as many as 50 different Hebrew words in LXX as a whole. It may thus be regarded as a favourite word in LXX.

חוּץ is in the kaige group as a rule rendered by ἔξοδος. OG often uses ὁδός as equivalent. הוּץ occurs four times in the book of Psalms.[100] It has various counterparts, πλατεῖα, ἔξω, as well as ἔξοδος.[101]

הֲדָרָה, הָדָר is in the kaige group as a rule rendered by εὐπρέπεια, in contrast to the employment of various equivalents in the OG, e.g. δόξα, εὐπρέπεια, μεγαλοπρέπεια, κάλλος. הָדָר is in the Psalter as a rule rendered by μεγαλοπρέπεια, but sporadically by τιμή, κάλλος, ὡραιότης, εὐπρέπεια, λαμπρότης, δόξα.[102]

---

[96] לְעוֹלָם has the counterpart εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας in Ps 72:17, evidently reflecting לְעוֹלָמִים, since לְעוֹלָמִים is translated that way in 77:8. לְעוֹלָם in 37:27 has εἰς αἰῶνα αἰῶνος as equivalent, which if the text of Rahlfs is correct, perhaps reflects לְעוֹלָם וָעֶד. Thus, *BHS*. לְעוֹלָם וָעֶד and עוֹלָם וָעֶד is as a rule rendered by εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα καὶ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος or εἰς αἰῶνα αἰῶνος with or without the article in the Psalms. In 136:26 εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα reflects לְעוֹלָם.

[97] Bodine, *Judges*, 19 and n. 89-96.

[98] 35:15 (2x); 47:10; 104:22.

[99] συναπολλύναι 26:9, προσλαμβάνειν 27:10, συνάγειν 39:7; 50:5, καταπαύειν 85:4, ἀνταναιρεῖν 104:29.

[100] 18:43; 31:12; 41:7; 144:13.

[101] πλατεῖα 18:43, ἔξω 31:12; 41:7, ἔξοδος 144:13.

[102] τιμή 8:6, μεγαλοπρέπεια 21:6; 29:4; 111:3; 145:5, 12, κάλλος 30:8 (MT לְהַרְרִי LXX τῷ κάλλει μου = לַהֲדָרִי); 45:4, ὡραιότης 96:6, εὐπρέπεια 104:1, λαμπρότης 110:3, δόξα 149:9. In 45:5 וַהֲדָרְךָ is rendered by καὶ ἔντεινον (*Vorlage*?) and in 90:16 וַהֲדָרְךָ is translated by καὶ ὁδήγησον (=וְהַדְרֵךְ, cf. 25:5).

Apart from Barthélemy, several scholars have suggested new characteristics of the kaige group. Most of these patterns are of little value and sometimes the evidence for them is scanty. Occasionally they may represent the OG rather than the kaige group.[103]

Preceding the work of Barthélemy, Thackeray had already identified some characteristics of the kaige group in two sections of Samuel-Kings, most of them has been included among the criteria of Barthélemy but not all. The following characteristics are mainly based on the revision in Samuel-Kings.[104]

יַעַן אֲשֶׁר translated by ἀνθ᾽ ὧν ὅσα. In the book of Psalms יַעַן אֲשֶׁר occurs once translated by ἀνθ᾽ ὧν, 109:16.

The translation of different Hebrew terms by ἡνίκα.[105] ἡνίκα only occurs once in the Psalter, 51:2 where it translates כַּאֲשֶׁר.

Michel Smith has proposed that hiphil of יָרָה "to teach" in the kaige group is rendered by φωτίζειν.[106] There are some inconsistencies in the usage but φωτίζειν is preferred in the kaige group.[107] OG has a varied rendering in LXX but mostly συμβιβάζειν.[108] יָרָה hiphil "to teach" is in LXX Psalms mainly translated by νομοθετεῖν, but συμβιβάζειν, and ὁδηγεῖν sometimes occur.[109]

---

הֲדָרָה in MT has αὐλή as equivalent in 29:2; 96:9. It probably reflects חָצֵר or it is misunderstood.

[103] For a critical description, see Gentry, *Greek Job*, 402-03.

[104] See Thackeray, *Worship*, and Thackeray, "Four Books of Kings".

[105] See especially Bodine, *Judges*, 17 and n. 76-78. It is hardly a sign of the kaige group generally.

[106] See Smith, "*kaige* Recension", 443-45.

[107] Cf. Bodine, *Judges*, 20 with notes.

[108] Quinta has, as could be expected φωτίζειν in 32:8, conforming to the equivalent in the kaige group.

[109] νομοθετεῖν 25:8, 12; 27:11; 119:33, 102, συμβιβάζειν 32:8, ὁδηγεῖν 45:5; 86:11. Twice יָרָה hiphil occurs in the meaning "to shoot" 64:5, 8 rendered by κατατοξεύειν.

Shenkel has proposed several new characteristics in his investigation of Samuel-Kings.

The translation of בְּעֵינֵי by ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς, whether the object is Yahweh or not, is according to Shenkel a distinctive feature of the kaige group in Samuel-Kings.[110] The OG avoided the literal rendering of this semipreposition when the explicit subject was Yahweh and seldom used it when the subject was Yahweh evidenced by a suffix. In both cases ἐνώπιον or ἐναντίον was used instead. בְּעֵינֵי referring to Yahweh is in the Psalms rendered by ἐνώπιον, ἐναντίον, or by ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς.[111] בְּעֵינֵי is in other cases as a rule translated by ἐνώπιον, or by ἐναντίον in the Psalms, while a literal rendering appears three times.[112]

In the kaige group there is a inclination for the use of θυσιάζειν rather than θύειν as equivalent of זָבַח, probably because זֶבַח is rendered by θυσία and מִזְבֵּח by θυσιαστήριον in LXX. זָבַח occurs 8 times in qal in the Psalter, and it is always translated by θύειν,[113] and never by θυσιάζειν.

רָדַף is in the kaige group rendered by διώκειν, revising the common OG rendering, καταδιώκειν. רָדַף occurs 20 times in the Psalms and it is as a rule translated by καταδιώκειν, but sporadically by διώκειν and ἐκδιώκειν.[114]

שַׂר (הַ)צָּבָא is rendered by ἄρχων τῆς δυνάμεων in the kaige group, while the common OG form is ἀρχιστράτηγος. The phrase does not occur in

---

[110] See Shenkel, *Greek Text of Kings*. In the book of Judges, the literal translation is never used when Yahweh is the explicit object only when he is referred to by a suffix.

[111] ἐνώπιον 51:6; 72:14, ἐναντίον 116:15, ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς 90:4. בְּעֵינֵי is translated by ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς in 91:8 and 118:23 even though it does not refer to Yahweh.

[112] ἐνώπιον 15:4; 36:3; 51:6; 72:14, ἐναντίον 73:16; 116:15, a literal rendering 90:4; 91:8; 118:23.

[113] 4:6; 27:6; 50:14; 54:8; 106:37; 107:22; 116:17. θυσία in 50:23 reflects זֶבַח, rather than MT:s זֹבֵח. Once זָבַח occurs in piel, 106:38, rendered by θύειν.

[114] καταδιώκειν 7:6; 18:38; 23:6; 31:16; 35:3, 6; 38:21; 69:27; 71:11; 83:16; 109:16; 119:84, 86, 150, 161; 142:7; 143:3, διώκειν 7:2; 34:15, ἐκδιώκειν 119:157. καταδιώκειν occurs without counterpart in 143:1, probably reflecting רָדַף.

the Psalter. Even though, שַׂר is always rendered by ἄρχων.[115] ἄρχων is also a common equivalent of other Hebrew words as well, e.g. רֹאשׁ, רֹזֵן, נָסִיךְ, נָדִיב and מָשַׁל.[116]

√חכם is in the kaige group translated by a form of the root σοφ- rather than the root φρον-, which dominates in the OG. חָכַם occurs twice in piel, and once in hiphil in the book of Psalms rendered by σοφίζειν.[117] It once appears in pual participle translated by σοφός.[118] חָכְמָה is always translated by σοφία,[119] and חָכָם is rendered by σοφός.[120] The equivalence is, however, very common in LXX as a whole, it appears in 139 out of 171 occurrences, according to Hatch-Redpath, and therefore it could be questioned as a characteristic of the kaige group.[121]

חָרַשׁ is in the kaige group rendered by κωφεύειν, and חָשָׁה by σιωπᾶν. In the Old Greek, σιωπᾶν was employed for both. חָרַשׁ qal "to be deaf" has παρασιωπᾶν and σιγᾶν as equivalents. חָרַשׁ hiphil by σιγᾶν, שׁ "deaf" by κωφός in LXX Psalms.[122] חָשָׁה only occurs three times in the Psalter, rendered by παρασιωπᾶν and by σιγᾶν.[123]

הָרָה is in the kaige group rendered by ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχειν/λαμβάνειν. The OG equivalent is said to be συλλαμβάνειν. הָרָה only occurs once in the Psalter (qal) 7:15, where it is translated by συλλαμβάνειν. Bodine has some doubts regarding the validity of this characteristic since the phrase

---

[115] 45:17; 68:26, 28 (3x); 82:7; 105:22; 119:23, 161; 148:11. The *Vorlage* of LXX in 68:26 was שָׂרִים instead of MT:s שָׁרִים.

[116] רֹזֵן 2:2, רֹאשׁ 24:7, 9, נָדִיב 47:10; 83:12; 107:40; 113:8 (2x); 118:9; 146:3, נָסִיךְ 83:12, מָשַׁל 105:20, 21.

[117] חָכַם piel 105:22; 119:98, hiphil, 19:8.

[118] 58:6.

[119] 37:30; 49:4; 51:8; 90:12; 104:24; 107:27; 111:10.

[120] 49:11; 107:43.

[121] See Gentry, *Greek Job*, 412.

[122] חָרַשׁ qal rendered by παρασιωπᾶν 28:1; 35:22; 39:13; 50:3; 109:1, σιγᾶν 83:2, חָרַשׁ hiphil by σιγᾶν 32:3; 50:21, חֵרֵשׁ κωφός 38:14; 58:5. חָרַשׁ qal "to plough" is in 129:3 translated by τεκταίνειν חָרְשׁוּ חֹרְשִׁים — ἐτέκταινον οἱ ἁμαρτωλοί (*Vorlage* = רְשָׁעִים). The evidence is rather weak for using this as a characteristic of the kaige group. Cf. Gentry, *Greek Job*, 412.

[123] 28:1 παρασιωπᾶν, 39:3; 107:29 σιγᾶν.

ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχειν/λαμβάνειν is common in OG rendering Hebrew perfects, participles or adjectives, but not imperfects.[124]

Kevin O'Connell has in his study of the Theodotionic material in the book of Exodus discussed some renderings, which he argues have connection with the kaige group. They may be used as characteristics of the kaige group, since in the words of O'Connell "Theodotion's version in Exodus is an integral part of the general ΚΑΙΓΕ recension identified by Barthélemy",[125] but he admits that "the presence of one or another equivalent from the foregoing list would not be sufficient to mark a text as Theodotionic or ΚΑΙΓΕ."[126] Bodine also uses several of these renderings as characteristics of the kaige group.

בֵּין translated by ἀνὰ μέσον. בֵּין is always translated by ἀνὰ μέσον or μέσος in LXX Psalms.[127]

בְּקֶרֶב translated by ἐν μέσῳ. In the OG it is often rendered by ἐν. בְּקֶרֶב is mainly translated by ἐν μέσῳ in the book of Psalms, but also by εἰς μέσον, ἐντός, ἐν, ἐν τοῖς ἐγκάτοις, εἰς τὰ ἔγκατα, and τῇ καρδίᾳ.[128]

חָזַק piel translated by ἐνισχύειν. It occurs twice in LXX Psalms, translated by κραταιοῦν and ἐνισχύειν.[129]

The consistent translation of חֶרֶב by ῥομφαία, where OG has ῥομφαία or μάχαιρα or other equivalents. Aquila and Symmachus have ῥομφαία. ῥομφαία is, however, also a common equivalent in OG. חֶרֶב occurs 18

---

[124] Bodine, *Judges,* 24.

[125] O'Connell, *Exodus,* 293.

[126] O'Connell, *Exodus*, 290-91.

[127] ἀνὰ μέσον 68:14; 104:10, μέσος 104:12. According to Gentry, this equivalence cannot mark relationship to the kaige group because it is regularly employed in LXX. Gentry, *Greek Job*, 412.

[128] ἐν μέσῳ 46:6; 48:10; 55:11, 16; 74:4, 12; 82:1; 101:2, 7; 110:2; 138:7, εἰς μέσον 78:28, ἐντός 39:4, 109:22, ἐν 55:5, ἐν τοῖς ἐγκάτοις 51:12, εἰς τὰ ἔγκατα 109:18, τῇ καρδίᾳ 62:5; 94:19. See also בְּקֶרֶב לִבִּי — ἐν ἑαυτῷ 36:2. In 55:12 בְּקֶרֶב has no counterpart in LXX.

[129] κραταιοῦν 64:6, ἐνισχύειν 147:13.

times in the book of Psalms,[130] and it is always, with one exception, rendered by ῥομφαία. In Ps 57:5 it is translated by μάχαιρα. It occurs in a sentence where חֶרֶב is a metaphor, בְּנֵי־אָדָם שִׁנֵּיהֶם חֲנִית וְחִצִּים וּלְשׁוֹנָם חֶרֶב חַדָּה which has υἱοὶ ἀνθρώπων, οἱ ὀδόντες αὐτῶν ὅπλον καὶ βέλη, καὶ ἡ γλῶσσα αὐτῶν μάχαιρα ὀξεῖα as counterpart. It is hard to see a reason for the choice of equivalent here, since μάχαιρα as well as ῥομφαία signifies a literal sword.[131]

חָתָן translated by νυμφίος and חֹתֵן by γαμβρός. חָתָן once appears in the book of Psalms, and it has νυμφίος as counterpart.[132]

√עבד rendered by δουλ-. עֶבֶד is nearly always translated by δοῦλος in LXX Psalms.[133] A few times παῖς is employed.[134] עֲבֹדָה is rendered by δουλεία, ἐργασία.[135] עָבַד qal is as a rule rendered by δουλεύειν, but once by προσκυνεῖν.[136]

O´Connell has also presented several new characteristics, most of them do not occur in the Psalter.[137]

אֹהֶל translated by σκέπη and מִשְׁכָּן by σκηνή in Exodus. In the OG σκηνή is frequently counterpart to אֹהֶל as well as מִשְׁכָּן. In the book of Psalms מִשְׁכָּן

---

[130] 7:13; 17:13; 22:21; 37:14, 15; 44:4, 7; 45:4; 57:5; 59:8; 63:11; 64:4; 76:4; 78:62, 64; 89:44; 144:10; 149:6.

[131] It may have been influenced by Isa 49:2, where חֶרֶב חַדָּה also appears translated by μάχαιρα ὀξεῖα rather than Ezek 5:1, where it has ῥομφαία ὀξεῖα as counterpart.

[132] 19:6.

[133] 19:12, 14; 27:9; 31:17; 34:23; 35:27; 36:1; 69:37; 78:70; 79:2, 10; 80:5 (MT עַמֶּךָ LXX עַבְדְּךָ); 86:2, 4; 89:4, 21, 40, 51; 90:13, 16; 102:15, 29; 105:6, 17, 25, 26, 42; 109:28; 116:16 (2x); 119:17, 23, 38, 49, 65, 76, 84, 91, 122, 124, 125, 135, 140, 176; 123:2; 132:10; 134:1; 135:1, 9, 14; 136:22; 143:2, 12; 144:10.

[134] 18:1; 69:18; 86:16; 113:1.

[135] δουλεία 104:14, ἐργασία 104:23.

[136] δουλεύειν 2:11; 18:44; 22:31; 72:11; 81:7 (MT תַּעֲבֹרְנָה LXX תַּעַבְדֶנָּה); 100:2; 102:23; 106:36, προσκυνεῖν 97:7. This characteristic is partly disputed by Bodine with good arguments. Bodine, *Judges*, 27-28. See also Gentry, *Greek Job*, 413.

[137] O'Connell, *Exodus*, 286-90.

is nearly always rendered by σκήνωμα (10x).[138] אֹהֶל is also mostly translated by σκήνωμα,[139] sometimes by σκηνή,[140] but never by σκέπη! The translator does not distinguish between אֹהֶל and מִשְׁכָּן.

אִלֵּם translated by μογίλαλος. אִלֵּם occurs once in the book of Psalms, rendered by ἄλαλος.[141]

יָרֹה qal translated by τοξεύειν. יָרָה appears in Ps 11:2 and 64:5 with κατατοξεύειν as equivalent.

מְעִיל translated by ἐπενδύτης or ἐπιδύτης. In OG various equivalents are employed, e.g. ἐπενδύτης, διπλοῖς, ποδήρης. מְעִיל occurs once in the book of Psalms, where it is rendered by διπλοῖς.[142]

מִשְׁבְּצוֹת translated by συνεσφιγμένοι or συνεσφραγισμένοι. מִשְׁבְּצוֹת is rendered by κροσσωτός in Ps 45:14. The word κροσσωτός "tasseled, fringed" appears only here and in Ex 28:14 (2x). There it, however, is the counterpart of שַׁרְשְׁרֹת.

עֲבֹת or עֲבֹתֹת translated by ἁλυσιδωτός, ἁλύσεις. In the Psalter עֲבֹתֹת/עֲבֹת is translated by ζυγός and αὐχήν.[143]

שָׁלַם piel translated by ἀποτιννύειν. שָׁלַם piel is mainly rendered by ἀνταποδιδόναι, ἀποδιδόναι, and sporadically by ἀποτίνειν, and it once appears without counterpart in LXX Psalms.[144]

---

[138] 26:8; 43:3; 46:5; 49:12; 74:7; 78:28; 84:2; 87:2; 132:5, 7. Only once מִשְׁכָּן is translated by σκηνή, 78:60. σκήνωμα appears 78 times in LXX. It is common in the books of Samuel and 1 and 2 Kings, but also in 2 Chronicles. As a rule it is a translation of אֹהֶל.

[139] 15:1; 19:5; 52:7; 61:5; 69:26; 78:51, 55, 60, 67; 83:7; 84:11; 91:10; 106:25; 120:5; 132:3.

[140] 27:5, 6; 118:15.

[141] 38:14.

[142] 109:29.

[143] עֲבֹתֹת/עֲבֹת is translated by ζυγός 2:3 and αὐχήν 129:4.

[144] ἀνταποδιδόναι 31:24; 35:12; 38:21; 41:11; 137:8, ἀποδιδόναι 22:26; 50:14; 56:13; 61:9; 62:13; 66:13; 76:12; 116:18, ἀποτίνειν 37:21. In 116:14 it appears without counterpart in LXX. שָׁלַם pual occurs in 65:2 and is rendered by ἀποδιδόναι.

Greenspoon has also put forward some characteristics for the kaige group.[145]

בְּתוֹךְ translated by ἐν μέσῳ. בְּתוֹךְ is mainly translated by ἐν μέσῳ, sporadically by ἐκ μέσου, and διὰ μέσου. But it is also rendered by ἐν and by εἰς.[146] According to Gentry, this counterpart cannot mark relationship to the kaige group because it is the ordinary equivalent in LXX.[147]

The translation of רַק by πλήν. רַק occurs twice in the Psalter, always rendered by πλήν.[148]

עָוֺן translated by ἀνομία. עָוֺן is often in LXX Psalms rendered by ἀνομία,[149] and sometimes by ἁμαρτία, ἀσέβεια, ἀδικία, πτωχεία.[150] Several other Hebrew terms also have ἀνομία as counterpart, אָוֶן, עָוֶל, בְּלִיַּעַל, שֶׁקֶר, עָתָק, עֹצֶב, הַוָּה, רֶשַׁע, חָמָס, זִמָּה, עַוְלָה. ἀνομία is in fact to be regarded as a favourite word in the Psalter.

Bodine based his study of the kaige group in the book of Judges and he has proposed a whole range of new characteristics for this revision.[151]

√גלה in the sense "going into exile" rendered by ἀποικίζειν or ἀποικία, rather than μετοικίζειν, μετοικία. In the book of Psalms the verb does

---

[145] See Greenspoon, *Book of Joshua*.

[146] ἐν μέσῳ 22:15, 23; 40:9; 68:26; 109:30; 116:19; 135:9; 137:2, ἐκ μέσου 57:5, διὰ μέσου 136:14, ἐν 40:11; 143:4 (בְּתוֹכִי — ἐν ἐμοὶ), εἰς 57:7 (בְּתוֹכָהּ — εἰς αὐτόν).

[147] Gentry, *Greek Job*, 412-13.

[148] 32:6; 91:8.

[149] 18:24; 32:5 (2x); 36:3; 38:5, 19; 39:12; 40:13; 49:6; 51:4, 7, 11; 59:5; 65:4; 69:28 (2x); 79:8; 85:3; 90:8; 103:3, 10; 106:43; 107:17; 109:14; 129:3 (MT Q לַעֲוֺנוֹתָם K לְמַעֲנוֹתָם LXX לְמַעֲנוֹתָם?); 130:3, 8.

[150] ἁμαρτία 25:11; 32:2; 78:38; 89:33, ἀσέβεια 32:5, ἀδικία 73:7. ἀδικία αὐτῶν in 73:7 is based on the *Vorlage* עֲוֺנָמוֹ instead of MT:s עֵינָמוֹ. πτωχεία in 31:11 may reflect עֳנִי instead of MT:s עֲוֺנִי. עָנִי is rendered by πτωχεία in 44:25; 88:10; 107:10, 41.

[151] Bodine, *Judges*, 47-66.

not appear in this meaning but rather in the sense "to uncover, to reveal" and the noun גּוּלָה not at all.

√טוב is translated by ἀγαθός with cognates. ἀγαθός with cognates is, however, also the most frequent rendering of √טוב in the OG. In the book of Psalms ἀγαθός dominates the equivalents of טוֹב or טוֹבָה,[152] even though χρηστός is also a common equivalent,[153] and the same is true for χρηστότης.[154] Other equivalents sporadically appear, κρείσσων, καλός, καλῶς, ἀγαθωσύνη, and δικαιοσύνη.[155] טוּב is rendered by χρηστότης, ἀγαθός.[156]

√ישׁר translated by εὐθύς with cognates. εὐθύς with cognates is also the most frequent rendering of √ישׁר in the OG. In this manner, the kaige group has given a greater consistency to the OG reading, which was already, the most common. √ישׁר is in the book of Psalms as a rule rendered by εὐθύς with cognates, εὐθύς,[157] εὐθής,[158] εὐθύτης,[159] but also by κατορθοῦν,[160] and κατευθύνειν.[161]

---

[152] 4:7; 16:2; 25:13; 34:11, 13, 15; 36:5; 37:27; 38:21; 39:3; 45:2; 53:2, 4; 54:8; 73:1, 28; 84:12; 86:17; 92:2; 103:5; 107:9; 109:5; 111:10; 118:1, 8, 9, 29; 119:71, 72, 122; 122:9; 125:4; 135:3; 143:10; 147:1.

[153] 25:8; 34:9; 52:11; 69:17; 86:5; 100:5; 106:1; 107:1; 109:21; 112:5; 119:39, 68; 136:1; 145:9.

[154] 14:1, 3; 21:4; 37:3; 65:12; 68:11; 85:13; 104:28; 106:5; 119:65, 66, 68 (MT וּבְטוֹב LXX וּמֵטִיב).

[155] κρείσσων 23:6; 37:16; 63:4; 84:11, καλός 35:12; 133:1, καλῶς 128:2, ἀγαθωσύνη 52:5, δικαιοσύνη 38:21.

[156] χρηστότης 25:7; 31:20; 145:7, ἀγαθός 27:13; 65:5; 128:5. Small variations with preposition and the like are not noted.

[157] יָשָׁר 7:11; 11:2; 19:9; 32:11; 33:1; 36:11; 37:14; 49:15; 64:11; 94:15; 97:11; 107:7, 42; 111:1; 112:2, 4; 125:4; 140:14 יֶשֶׁר 25:21, מִישׁוֹר 27:11; 143:10, מֵישָׁרִים 58:2.

[158] יָשָׁר 25:8; 33:4; 92:16; 119:137.

[159] יָשָׁר 11:7; 37:37; 111:8, יֹשֶׁר 119:7, מִישׁוֹר 26:12; 45:7; 67:5, מֵישָׁרִים 9:9; 17:2; 75:3; 96:10; 98:9; 99:4.

[160] יָשַׁר piel 119:128.

[161] יָשַׁר hiphil 5:9.

לִין translated by αὐλίζειν. לִין occurs 6 times in LXX Psalms, 5 times in qal and once in hithpael.[162] It is always rendered by αὐλίζειν.[163] Sometimes the equivalent in LXX is based on a different *Vorlage* (בַּל־יָלִין is translated by οὐ συνῆκεν in 49:13, reflecting לֹא יָבִין or בַּל יָבִין), and in 59:16 MT:s וַיָּלִינוּ is rendered by καὶ γογγύσουσιν, that is understood as לוּן hiphil "to grumble" (vocalized as וְיַלִּינוּ).[164]

נָצַל translated by ῥύεσθαι.[165] נצל niphal occurs in 33:16; 69:15, always rendered by σώζειν, נָצַל hiphil occurs 43 times and it is mostly rendered by ῥύεσθαι (34x),[166] but occasionally by σώζειν (4x),[167] or ἐξαιρεῖν (4x),[168] and once by περιαιρεῖν 119:43. ῥύεσθαι dominates the equivalents in the book of Psalms, while outside the Psalter ἐξαιρεῖν is the most common equivalent (76x).[169]

שׁוּב qal translated by ἐπιστρέφειν. It is mostly rendered by ἐπιστρέφειν (31x), or ἀποστρέφειν (10x), but also by πάλιν, ἀθετεῖν, and by

---

[162] Qal 25:13; 30:6; 49:13; 55:8; 59:16, hithpael 91:1.

[163] 25:13; 30:6; 55:8; 91:1.

[164] בַּל־יָלִין is rendered by οὐ συνῆκεν in 49:13, reflecting לֹא יָבִין or בַּל יָבִין, and וַיָּלִינוּ by καὶ γογγύσουσιν in 59:16, that is, understood as לוּן hiphil "to grumble" (vocalized as וְיַלִּינוּ). Greenspoon and Ulrich also mention this characteristic. See further Ulrich, *Samuel and Josephus*, and Greenspoon, *Joshua*. Gentry emphasises that it is not unique for the kaige group, which is of course true. Gentry, *Greek Job*, 413. On the other hand, since the kaige group is a revision of LXX it is not based on a wholly new set of equivalents, but on a more consistent use of the existing equivalents in LXX. See, e.g., Munnich, "Contribution", 218.

[165] Greenspoon and Ulrich also mention this characteristic. See further Ulrich, *Samuel and Josephus* and Greenspoon, *Joshua*.

[166] 7:2; 18:1, 18, 49; 22:21; 25:20; 31:16; 33:19; 34:5, 18, 20; 35:10; 39:9; 40:14; 50:22; 51:16; 54:9; 56:14; 59:3; 71:2, 11; 72:12; 79:9; 82:4; 86:13; 91:3; 97:10; 106:43; 107:6; 109:21; 119:170; 120:2; 142:7; 144:7. In 18:20 ῥύεσθαι occurs without counterpart in MT reflecting נָצַל.

[167] 7:3; 22:9; 69:15; 70:2.

[168] 31:3; 59:2; 143:9; 144:11.

[169] נצל hiphil is outside the Psalter rendered by ῥύεσθαι (50x), σῶζειν (11x) and ἐξαιρεῖν (76x), according to Hatch, Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint*, "ῥύεσθαι, σῶζειν, ἐξαιρεῖν".

κατοικεῖν.[170] However, στρέφωιν and ἐπιστρέφειν are also common equivalents in LXX as a whole. שוב (in all conjugations) is mainly rendered by compounds of στρέφωιν, especially ἐπιστρέφειν (357x), ἀποστρέφειν (270x) and ἀναστρέφειν (65x).[171] The differences between the three seem to be more or less arbitrary within a book, but one can find a preference for one or the other of these compounds in LXX books. The translator of the book of Psalms showed a preference for ἐπιστρέφειν.

לֹא אָבָה translated by (ἐ)θέλειν. לֹא אָבָה once occurs in the Psalter, 81:12, and is there rendered by οὐ προσέχειν.

גִּבּוֹר translated by δυνατός.[172] גִּבּוֹר is mainly rendered by δυνατός and occasionally by γίγας.[173]
The following characteristics are restricted to the book of Judges and thus may be of only minor relevance for the book of Psalms.[174]

אָבָה translated by εὐδοκεῖν. אָבָה only occurs once and it is translated by προσέχειν in LXX.[175]

אוּר translated by διαφαύσκειν. אוּר hiphil "to enlighten, to illuminate, to give light" in the Psalter is mainly rendered by φωτίζειν, and ἐπιφαίνειν, and sometimes by φαίνειν. אוּר niphal is translated by φωτίζειν.[176]

---

[170] ἐπιστρέφειν 6:5; 7:8, 13, 17; 14:7; 22:28; 51:15; 53:7; 56:10; 59:7, 15; 60:2; 71:20; 73:10; 78:34, 39, 41; 80:15; 85:5, 7, 9; 90:3, 13; 94:15; 104:9, 29; 116:7; 119:79; 126:1, 4; 146:4, ἀποστρέφειν 6:11; 9:4, 18; 18:38; 35:13; 54:7 (K); 70:4; 74:21; 85:2; 132:10, πάλιν 71:20, ἀθετεῖν 132:11. κατοικεῖν 23:6 is based on different text. MT has וְשַׁבְתִּי and LXX has καὶ τὸ κατοικεῖν με = וְשִׁבְתִּי, from √ישב.

[171] See Holladay, *šûbh,* 20.

[172] See Bodine, "Judges", 52 n. 3.

[173] δυνατός 24:8 (2x); 45:4; 52:3; 78:65; 89:20; 103:20; 112:2; 120:4; 127:4, γίγας 33:16 and 19:6. In 45:6 δυνατός in LXX evidently reflects גִּבּוֹר in the *Vorlage* of the LXX-Psalms.

[174] Bodine, *Judges,* 67-91.

[175] 81:12.

[176] φωτίζειν 13:4; 18:29; 19:9; 105:39; 119:130; 139:12, ἐπιφαίνειν 31:17; 67:2; 80:4, 8, 20; 118:27; 119:135, φαίνειν 77:19; 97:4, and אור niphal φωτίζειν 76:5.

בּוֹא hiphil translated by φέρειν or εἰσφέρειν. בּוֹא hiphil occurs 8 times in the Psalter, and it has different equivalents on nearly every occurrence, εἰσάγειν, φέρειν, ἄγειν, λαμβάνειν, εἴσοδος, ἔρχεσθαι, πεδᾶν.[177]

צָעַק or זָעַק translated by βοᾶν. Both זָעַק and צָעַק are translated by κράζειν in the Psalter.[178]

חָרָה אַף translated by ὀργίζεσθαι θυμός. חָרָה אַף appears twice in the Psalter, both times translated by ὀργίζεσθαι θυμός.[179]

לָחַם niphal rendered by παρατάσσειν. לָחַם niphal appears only once and it is translated by πολεμεῖν.[180]

מִלְחָמָה translated by παράταξις. מִלְחָמָה is as a rule rendered by πόλεμος except once where πολεμεῖν is used.[181]

לִקְרַאת rendered by εἰς συνάντησιν. The avoidance of the OG εἰς ἀπάντησιν as equivalent of לִקְרַאת is already by Barthélemy regarded as characteristic of the kaige group. לִקְרַאת occurs twice in the Psalter, translated by ἐξ ἐναντίας and εἰς συνάντησιν.[182]

נָתַץ translated by καθαιρεῖν. נָתַץ only occurs twice in the Psalter, rendered by καθαιρεῖν, and by συνθλᾶν.[183]

---

[177] εἰσάγειν 66:11; 78:54, φέρειν 78:29, ἄγειν 43:3, λαμβάνειν 78:71, εἴσοδος 74:5, ἔρχεσθαι = qal 105:40, πεδᾶν 90:12. πεδᾶν otherwise always renders √אסר in LXX Psalms, e.g., 68:7; 69:34; 79:11. Hatch, Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint*, "πεδᾶν" has †. Perhaps the *Vorlage* in 90:12 was וְּנָכֵא. Mozley, *Psalter*, 145.

[178] זָעַק 22:6; 107:13, 19; 142:2, 6, צָעַק 34:18; 77:2; 88:2; 107:6, 28.

[179] 106:40 and 124:3.

[180] 109:3.

[181] πόλεμος 18:35, 40; 24:8; 27:3; 46:10; 76:4; 89:44; 140:3; 144:1, πολεμεῖν 120:7.

[182] ἐξ ἐναντίας 35:3, εἰς συνάντησιν 59:5.

[183] 52:7 καθαιρεῖν, 58:7 συνθλᾶν.

רָעָה translated by πονηρία. רָעָה "evil, wickedness" occurs 35 times in the Psalms, 24x translated by κακός,[184] and 3x by κακία,[185] 5x by πονηρός,[186] and sporadically it is rendered by εὐδοκία, θλῖψις, and ἀδικία.[187]

J.A. Grindel has presented a characteristic of the kaige group, that is, נֵצַח rendered by νῖκος.[188] לָנֶצַח is always and נֵצַח usually rendered by εἰς τέλος in LXX Psalms,[189] but נֵצַח is also translated by αἰών.[190] Since נֵצַח rendered by νῖκος hardly occurs in the OG it may be considered as an obvious sign of revisionary activity.[191]

Tov has, with due caution, suggested that transliteration of an unknown word is a characteristic of the kaige-revision. In LXX Psalms, few unknown words are transliterated.[192] One may perhaps mention 74:15, where MT has נַהֲרוֹת אֵיתָן "ever-flowing streams" rendered by ποταμοὺς Ηθαμ. Otherwise the transliterations are expected, τῷ Ιδιθουν, Μαελεθ, Σηλωμ, μαννα and αλληλουια.[193]

βάρις and πυργόβαρις are according to Venetz and van der Kooij characteristic renderings of the kaige group, although they also occur in the so-called καὶ γάρ-group of which the book of Psalms is an exponent.

---

[184] 15:3; 21:12; 27:5; 28:3; 34:20; 35:4, 26; 38:13, 21; 40:13, 15; 41:2, 8; 70:3; 71:13, 24; 88:4; 90:15; 91:10; 107:26, 39; 109:5; 140:3; 141:5.

[185] 50:19; 52:3; 107:34.

[186] 34:22; 35:12; 37:19; 55:16; 94:23.

[187] εὐδοκία 141:5 (=as if from Aram. √רעה), θλῖψις 34:20, and ἀδικία 140:3.

[188] Grindel, "Kaige Recension", 499-513.

[189] לָנֶצַח 9:7, 19; 10:11; 44:24; 49:10; 52:7; 68:17; 74:1, 10, 19; 77:9; 79:5; 89:47; 103:9, נֵצַח 13:2; 16:11; 74:3.

[190] 49:20. εἰς τέλος occurs as equivalent also in LXX outside the Psalter, but it is restricted to the book of Job, 14:20; 20:7; 23:7.

[191] Cf. Gentry, *Greek Job*, 412. As expected Quinta adheres to the equivalent in the kaige group and changes εἰς τέλος to εἰς νῖκος in 49:10, but εἰς τέλος remains in 89:47. לַמְנַצֵּחַ in 31:1; 36:1; 46:1; 49:1 is rendered by τῷ νικοποιῶ.

[192] Tov, "Transliterations", 82-85.

[193] לִידִיתוּן — τῷ Ιδιθουν 39:1; 77:1, מָחֲלַת — Μαελεθ 53:1; 88:1, שִׁלֹו — Σηλωμ 78:60, מָן — μαννα 78:24 and הַלְלוּיָה or הַלְלוּ־יָהּ — αλληλουια 104:35; 106:1, 48; 111:1; 112:1; 113:1, 9; 115:18; 116:19; 117:2; 135:1; 146:1; 147:1; 148:1; 149:1; 150:1, 6. הַלְלוּ־יָהּ occurs without Greek counterpart in 105:45; 146:10; 147:20; 148:14; 149:9 and αλληλουια without counterpart in MT, 116:10; 119:1; 147:12.

Although not a specific characteristic of the kaige group they argue that it links the LXX Psalms with a Palestinian hermeneutic tradition.[194] βάρις sometimes appears in the LXX Psalter, 48:4, 14; 45:9, and πυργόβαρις once, 122:7.[195] שֵׁן הֵיכְלֵי has βάρεων ἐλεφαντίνων "ivory palaces" as counterpart in 45:9. βάρις is, however, an unique translation of הֵיכָל. הֵיכָל is, according to HR, rendered by ναός (50x) or οἶκος (16x) and הֵיכָל is, except in Ps 45:9, always translated by ναός in the Psalter.[196] βάρις is otherwise an equivalent of אַרְמוֹן, and בִּירָה, and πυργόβαρις once renders אַרְמוֹן in LXX as a whole.[197]

I will also mention examples, which with some reservations are taken up by Venetz as signs of the kaige group.

Venetz argues that καταποντίζειν as a rendering of בלע√ is a sign of the kaige group. καταποντίζειν occurs in the Palestinian recension of 2 Sam 20:19, 20, and Lam 2:2, 5 (2x). In the LXX Psalms בלע√ is mainly rendered by καταπίνειν, sometimes by ταράσσειν, καταποντίζειν or by καταποντισμός.[198] καταποντίζειν is also used for שָׁטַף in Ps 69:16.

עָטָה translated by περιβάλλειν. עָטָה qal is often rendered by περιβάλλειν and occasionally by ἀναβάλλειν in LXX Psalms.[199] Furthermore, עָטָה hiphil is translated by καταχεῖν and δίδωμι.[200]

---

[194] Venetz, *Quinta*, 80-84; van der Kooij, "Origin", 70-71. The place of origin of the book of Psalms remains uncertain. The arguments for a Palestinian provenance are not decisive. See, e.g., Olofsson, *LXX Version*, 54.

[195] βάρις is more common in variant readings. See Venetz, *Quinta*, 81; Munnich, "Septante", 81 n. 8.

[196] 5:8; 11:4; 18:7; 27:4; 29:9; 45:16; 48:10; 65:5; 68:30; 79:1; 138:2; 144:12.

[197] אַרְמוֹן 2 Chr 36:19; Pss 48:4, 14; Lam 2:5, 7, בְּרָה Ezra 6:2. πυργόβαρις renders אַרְמוֹן in Ps 122:7.

[198] καταπίνειν 35:25; 106:17; 107:27; 124:3, ταράσσειν 21:10, καταποντίζειν 55:10; 69:16, καταποντισμός 52:6. One might separate בלע "to swallow", 21:10; 35:25; 69:16; 106:17; 124:3, from בלע "to confuse", 55:10; 107:27, but this distinction was not presupposed by the translator.

[199] περιβάλλειν 71:13; 109:19, 29, ἀναβάλλειν 104:2. Munnich polemicizes against the rendering of בָּלַע and עָטָה being characteristics of the kaige group. Venetz, *Quinta*, 70-71; Munnich, "Septante", 76-77. עָטָה qal is rendered by περιβάλλειν in texts which none has suggested are influenced by the kaige group, *viz.* Lev 13:45 and Isa 59:17.

√סתר translated by ἀποκρυφ- is related to the kaige group.[201] סָתַר niphal in the LXX Psalms is rendered by κρύπτειν, ἀποκρύπτειν, κρύφιος, and ἀποστρέφειν,[202] and סָתַר hiphil by ἀποστρέφειν, ἀποκρύπτειν, κατακρύπτειν, and σκεπάζειν.[203] סָתַר hiphil predominantly occurs in the phrase הִסְתִּיר פָּנִים (מִן), and it is always rendered by ἀποστρέφειν πρόσωπον.[204]

√דמם or √דמה translated by σιωπᾶν is related to the kaige group. The translation of דוּמִיָה by σιωπή is mentioned by Venetz in this connection.[205] In the Psalter דָּמַם qal is rendered by κατανύσσεσθαι, ὑποτάσσειν, κατάγειν.[206] II דמה niphal "to be silenced" is understood as I דמה "to resemble" and the like in LXX Psalms.[207] דוּמִיָה in the book of Psalms is rendered by ἄνοια, by ταπεινοῦν, by ὑποτάσσειν and by πρέπειν.[208]

√שׁחת translated by διαφθορά is related to the kaige group. In LXX Psalms שַׁחַת is mainly rendered by διαφθορά, sometimes by καταφθορά, by φθορά and by βόθρος.[209] But διαφθορά is also the usual translation of

---

[200] καταχεῖν 89:46, δίδωμι 84:7.

[201] Venetz, *Quinta*, 60-61.

[202] κρύπτειν 38:10; 55:13, ἀποκρύπτειν 19:7, κρύφιος 19:13, ἀποστρέφειν 89:47 (it may reflect סָתַר hiphil). See Muraoka, *Hebrew/Aramaic Index*, 106.

[203] ἀποστρέφειν 10:11; 13:2; 22:25; 27:9; 30:8; 44:25; 51:11; 69:18; 88:15; 102:3; 104:29; 143:7, ἀποκρύπτειν 119:19, κατακρύπτειν 31:21, σκεπάζειν 17:8; 27:5; 64:3.

[204] 10:11; 13:2; 22:25; 27:9; 30:8; 44:25; 51:11; 69:18; 88:15; 102:3; 104:29; 143:7.

[205] Venetz, *Quinta*, 61-62.

[206] κατανύσσεσθαι 4:5; 30:13; 35:15, ὑποτάσσειν 37:7; 62:6 (= *Vorlage* √רדד?), κατάγειν 31:18 (= *Vorlage* √ירד?). יִדְמוּ is translated by καὶ καταχθείησαν reflecting וְיוֹרְדוּ? Thus, *BHS*. In 131:2 דמם polel דוֹמַמְתִּי is translated by ἀλλὰ ὕψωσα, i.e. probably reflecting וְרוֹמַמְתִּי. See e.g. *BHS*.

[207] See 49:13, 21, which is translated by ὁμοιοῦν. Cf. I דמה qal Pss 89:7; 102:7; 144:4 ὁμοιοῦν.

[208] ἄνοια 22:3, ταπεινοῦν 39:3, ὑποτάσσειν 62:2 (= *Vorlage* √רדד?) and πρέπειν 65:2.

[209] διαφθορά 9:16; 16:10; 30:10; 35:7; 55:24, καταφθορά 49:10, φθορά 103:4, βόθρος 7:16; 94:13.

שַׁחַת in LXX as a whole. διαφθορά occurs, according to HR, 8x, θάνατος 5x, βόθρος 3x and ἀπώλεια 3x. Other equivalents only occur once.

ἐξυπνίζειν, mainly rendering יקץ, קוץ, is related to the kaige group.[210] It once occurs in the LXX Psalms rendered by ἐξεγείρειν.[211]

It cannot be disputed that some characteristics of the kaige group dominate the equivalents in LXX Psalms, *viz.* יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת with variations translated by κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων, בֵּין by ἀνὰ μέσον, √ישר by εὐθύς with cognates, לין by αὐλίζειν, אָסַף niphal by συνάγειν, √חכם by σοφ-, חֶרֶב by ῥομφαία, √עבד by δουλ-, גִּבּוֹר by δυνατός, לְעוֹלָם by εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, חָתָן by νυμφίος, and חָרָה אַף translated by ὀργίζεσθαι θυμός. However, no equivalents from the core pattern were characteristic of the LXX Psalms, only some terms from the precursor pattern, יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת rendered by κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων, עַל־כֵּן by διὰ τοῦτο, לְעוֹלָם by εἰς τὸν, and אָסַף niphal translated by συνάγειν. The evaluation of the investigation thus to some extent depends on the validity of post-Barthelemy characteristics.

There are no signs at all of revision in the cases where the equivalents match the kaige group. Consequently, no systematic set of variants that could reflect OG renderings where Rahlfs' text corresponds to characteristics of the kaige group could be traced.[212] In fact, no significant lexicographical variants at all were found in this material.[213] Accordingly, if the OG has not been lost altogether, which I would regard as less probable, the traits identical with the equivalents from the kaige group reflect the vocabulary of the original translator of the Psalms. Rather than a reflection of a Palestinian mode of interpretation or influenced by the kaige group, some equivalents in the LXX of Psalms are picked up by the revisors, who used them in a more systematic way. Then the revision has been partly based on the vocabulary of the book of Psalms, in a similar way as later LXX books were often drawing on the Greek Pentateuch for

---

[210] Venetz, *Quinta*, 67-68.

[211] 78:65.

[212] Cf., e.g., the remark in O'Connell, *Exodus*, 291.

[213] This evaluation is based on the variants collected in Rahlfs, *Psalmi*. Some characteristics have also been compared with the variants in the edition of Holmes, Parsons, *Vetus Testamentum Graecum*, with the same result.

their choice of vocabulary. Thus the LXX Psalms was in certain respects regarded as a model for the kaige group.

   This understanding is strengthened by the fact that the rendering in the book of Psalms, where the kaige group uses it, often stands in contrast to the vocabulary of the Pentateuch. The Psalter seems in these cases to have taken over the function of the Pentateuch, since the vocabulary of the Psalter rather than that of the Pentateuch are employed, e.g. √יׁשר translated by εὐθύς with cognates (Pentateuch יָׁשֵר mainly ἀρεστός), לין by αὐλίζειν (Pentateuch as a rule κοιμᾶν), חֶרֶב by ῥομφαία (Pentateuch different equivalents, mainly φόνος, μάχαιρα, πόλεμος), גִּבּוֹר by δυνατός (Pentateuch mainly γίγας, once ἰσχυρός), לְעוֹלָם by εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα (Pentateuch often εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, but also other variants with αἰῶν), and אָסַף niphal translated by συνάγειν. Sometimes אָסַף niphal is rendered by συνάγειν in Genesis, but in the other books of the Pentateuch this is never the case. Other characteristics do not occur in the Pentateuch, e.g. יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת. Apart from the similarities mentioned above, several characteristics are often employed in LXX Psalms, הוּי rendered by ἔξοδος, חָזַק piel by ἐνισχύειν, √טוב by ἀγαθός with cognates, יַעַן אֲׁשֶר by ἀνθ᾽ ὧν ὅσα, לִקְרַאת by εἰς συνάντησιν, נֶגֶד by ἔναντι with cognates, נָצַל by ῥύεσθαι, נָתַן by καθαιρεῖν, עַל־כֵּן and עַל זאת by διὰ τοῦτο, רַק by πλήν, and שׁוב qal rendered by ἐπιστρέφειν.

## 7.5. Summary of the Result

### 7.5.1. Characteristics presented by Barthélemy

*Core pattern*
*Not consistent or mainly not consistent with the kaige group*
אֵין translated by οὐκ ἔστιν in the present tense in a context with aorists (οὐκ ἔστιν in present tense with aorists in the same verse 20x, but only in a few cases the rendering is less adequate in context). The full statistics of אֵין translated by οὐκ ἔστιν is as follows (οὐκ εἶναι 47x, οὐκ ἔστιν 38x, οὐκ εἰσίν 2x, οὐκ ἦν 7x), οὐδὲ εἶναι 2x (אֵין־יֵׁש 1x, וְאֵין 1x, both present tense), οὐ 1x, οὐδὲ 3x (וְאֵין), μηδέ 1x (וְאֵין), οὐχ ἔχειν 1x, ὀλίγον 1x, alpha privative 1x, οὐθέν 1x, μὴ ὑπάρχειν 1x (present infinitive), οὐ μὴ ὑπάρχειν 2x (aorist subjunctive 2x), οὐχ ὑπάρχειν 3x (aorist 1x, imperfect 1x, future indicative 1x), οὐκέτι μὴ ὑπάρχειν 1x (aorist subjunctive), οὐ μὴ εὑρίσκειν 1x, μὴ εἶναι 1x (aorist subjunctive), and

מֵאַיִן translated by πόθεν 1x. Some cases where a *Vorlage* with אַיִן is probable, μὴ ὄντος 1x (MT -), οὐκ ἔιναι 2x (MT –), τοῦ μηθενὸς 1x (MT אָוֶן).

וְגַם/גַם translated by καίγη (גַם — καὶ γάρ 13x, καί 7x, τε 1x, ἔτι δὲ καί 1x, ἕως 2x, διὰ τοῦτο 1x, ἀλλ᾽ ἤ 1x, ὅτι 1x, וְגַם — καί 4x, ἔτι δὲ καί 1x, הֲגַם — μὴ καί 1x, גַם כִּי — ἐὰν γὰρ καί 1x, once גַם occurs without equivalent)

אִישׁ as an distributive pronoun translated by ἀνήρ (ἕκαστος 2x)

מֵעַל translated by ἐπάνωθεν or ἀπάνωθεν (ἀπό 2x, ἄνω 1x, ὑπεράνω 1x, ἐπάνω 1x)

נָצַב/יָצַב translated by στηλοῦν (יָצַב hithpael παριστάναι 2x, συμπαριστάναι 1x, διαμένειν 1x, נָצַב niphal ἱστάναι 1x, παριστάναι 1x, διαμένειν 1x, ζῆν 1x, נצב hiphil βεβαιοῦν 1x, ποιεῖν 1x, ἱστάναι 1x)

חֲצֹצְרָה translated by σάλπιγξ and שׁוֹפָר by κερατίνη (שׁוֹפָר — σάλπιγξ 3x, σάλπιγγος κερατίνης 1x, חֲצֹצְרָה — σάλπιγξιν ἐλαταῖς 1x)

אָנֹכִי translated by ἐγώ εἰμι and אֲנִי by ἐγώ (אָנֹכִי ἐγώ εἰμι 5x, εἰμι ἐγώ 2x, ἐγὼ γάρ εἰμι 1x, ἐγώ 3x, ἐγώ δε 1x, εἰμι 1x, אֲנִי by ἐγώ 43x, ἐγώ εἰμι 2x, εἰμι ἐγώ 8x, εἰμι 1x, ἐγὼ δέ 7x, ἤμην 1x, μου 1x, ἐμοῦ δὲ 2x, ἐμοὶ δὲ 1x, εἰμι ἐγώ 1x, κἀγώ 3x, twice reflecting וְאֲנִי and once אַף־אָנִי)

*Precursor pattern*
*Consistent with or nearly consistent with the kaige group*
יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת alone or in different combinations translated by κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων (יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων 13x. אֲדֹנָי צְבָאוֹת is also rendered by κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων 1x, and אֱלֹהִים צְבָאוֹת by ὁ θεὸς τῶν δυνάμεων 1x)

עַל־כֵּן and עַל זֹאת translated by διὰ τοῦτο, and in OG by ἕνεκεν τοῦτο (עַל־כֵּן διὰ τοῦτο 13x, עַל זֹאת ὑπὲρ ταύτης 1x)

לְעוֹלָם translated by εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα (εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα approximately 99x, incl. 1x *Vorlage*)

אָסַף translated by συνάγειν (אָסַף niphal συνάγειν 4x, אָסַף qal συναπολλύναι 1x, προσλαμβάνειν 1x, συνάγειν 2x, καταπαύειν 1x, ἀνταναιρεῖν 1x)

*Partly consistent with the kaige group*
נֶגֶד translated by ἔναντι with cognates and לִפְנֵי translated by ἐνώπιον. נֶגֶד translated by ἔναντι with cognates (ἔναντι 1x, κατέναντι/κατεναντίον 3x, ἀπέναντι 2x, incl. 1x *Vorlage*, ἐξ ἐναντίας 2x, ἐναντίον 14x incl. 1x *Vorlage*, ἐνώπιον 13x incl. 1x *Vorlage*, ἀπὸ προσώπου 2x, πρό 1x and once it appears without counterpart in LXX). לִפְנֵי translated by ἐνώπιον (ἐναντίον 6x, ἐνώπιον 5x, κατὰ πρόσωπον 4x, πρὸ 2x, πρὸ προσώπου 1x, ἔμπροσθεν 1x and once it occurs without counterpart)

הוּץ translated by ἔξοδος (πλατεῖα 1x, ἔξω 2x, ἔξοδος 1x)
*Not consistent or mainly not consistent with the kaige group*
גְּדוּד translated by μονόζωνος (ἀπὸ πειρατηρίου 1x. LXX probably reflects גָּדַר. See *BHS*)

אֵל translated by ἰσχυρός (θεός 71x, ἰσχυρός 1x, κύριος 1x or *Vorlage*. Twice it has no counterpart and three times it is based on a different *Vorlage*)

הָדָר, הֲדָרָה translated by εὐπρέπεια (τιμή 1x, μεγαλοπρέπεια 5x, κάλλος 2x incl. 1x *Vorlage*, ὡραιότης 1x, εὐπρέπεια 1x, λαμπρότης 1x, δόξα 1x, הֲדָרָה αὐλή 2x = חָצֵר or misunderstanding. Twice הָדָר is rendered with a verb, suggesting a different *Vorlage*)

## 7.5.2. Post-Barthélemy characteristics

*Consistent with or nearly consistent with the kaige group*
בֵּין translated by ἀνὰ μέσον (ἀνὰ μέσον 2x, μέσος 1x)

בְּתוֹךְ translated by ἐν μέσῳ (ἐν μέσῳ 8x, ἐκ μέσου 1x, διὰ μέσου 1x, ἐν 2x, εἰς 1x)

גִּבּוֹר translated by δυνατός (δυνατός 11x, incl. 1x *Vorlage*, γίγας 2x)

√חכם translated by a form of the root σοφ- rather than the root φρον-, which dominates in the OG (חָכַם piel σοφίζειν 2x, hiphil 1x, pual σοφός, חָכְמָה σοφία 7x, חָכָם σοφός 2x)

חֶרֶב translated by ῥομφαία (ῥομφαία 17x, μάχαιρα 1x)

חָרָה אַף translated by ὀργίζεσθαι θυμός in Judges (ὀργίζεσθαι θυμός 2x)

חָתָן translated by νυμφίος and חֹתֵן by γαμβρός (חָתָן νυμφίος 1x)

√ישׁר translated by εὐθύς with cognates (יָשָׁר εὐθύς 18x, εὐθής 4x, εὐθύτης 3x, יֹשֶׁר εὐθύς 1x, εὐθύτης 1x, מִישׁוֹר εὐθύς 2x, εὐθύτης 3x, מֵישָׁרִים εὐθύς 1x, εὐθύτης 6x, יָשַׁר piel κατορθοῦν 1x, hiphil κατευθύνειν 1x)

לִין translated by αὐλίζειν (לִין qal αὐλίζειν 3x, hithpael 1x. Twice LXX reflects a different *Vorlage*, once בִּין and once לוּן hiphil "to grumble").

רַק translated by πλήν (πλήν 2x)


*Partly consistent with the kaige group*
חָזַק piel translated by ἐνισχύειν (ἐνισχύειν 1x, κραταιοῦν 1x)

√טוב translated by ἀγαθός with cognates (טוֹב ἀγαθός 35x, χρηστός 14x, χρηστότης 12x incl. 1x *Vorlage*, κρείσσων 4x, καλός 2x, καλῶς 1x, ἀγαθωσύνη 1x and δικαιοσύνη 1x, טוּב χρηστότης 3x, ἀγαθός 3x). I have a separate entry for κρείσσων as in HR, although it can be regarded as a comparative of ἀγαθός.

יַעַן אֲשֶׁר translated by ἀνθ᾽ ὧν ὅσα (ἀνθ᾽ ὧν 1x)

לִקְרַאת translated by εἰς συνάντησιν in Judges (ἐξ ἐναντίας 1x, εἰς συνάντησιν 1x)

נָצַל translated by ῥύεσθαι (נצל niphal σῶζειν 2x, נצל hiphil ῥύεσθαι 35x incl. 1x *Vorlage*, σῶζειν 4x, ἐξαιρεῖν 4x, περιαιρεῖν 1x)

נָתַץ translated by καθαιρεῖν in Judges (καθαιρεῖν 1x, συνθλᾶν 1x)

√עבד translated by δουλ- (עֶבֶד δοῦλος 54x incl. 1x *Vorlage*, παῖς 4x, עֲבֹדָה δουλεία 1x, ἐργασία 1x, עָבַד qal δουλεύειν 8x incl. 1x *Vorlage*, προσκυνεῖν 1x)

עָוֹן translated by עָוֹן (ἀνομία 27x incl. 1x *Vorlage*, ἁμαρτία 4x, ἀσέβεια 1x, ἀδικία *Vorlage* 1x)

שׁוּב qal translated by ἐπιστρέφειν (ἐπιστρέφειν 31x, ἀποστρέφειν 10x, πάλιν 1x, ἀθετεῖν 1x, κατοικεῖν 1x *Vorlage*)

*Not consistent or mainly not consistent with the kaige group*
אָבָה translated by εὐδοκεῖν in Judges (προσέχειν 1x)

אֹהֶל translated by σκέπη and מִשְׁכָּן by σκηνή (מִשְׁכָּן σκήνωμα 10x, σκηνή 1x, אֹהֶל σκήνωμα 15x, σκηνή 3x)

אוּר translated by διαφαύσκειν in Judges (אוּר hiphil φωτίζειν 6x, ἐπιφαίνειν 7x, φαίνειν 2x, אוּר niphal φωτίζειν 1x)

אִלֵּם translated by μογίλαλος (ἄλαλος 1x)

בּוֹא hiphil translated by φέρειν or εἰσφέρειν in Judges (εἰσάγειν 2x, φέρειν 1x, ἄγειν 1x, λαμβάνειν 1x, εἴσοδος 1x, ἔρχεσθαι = qal 1x, πεδᾶν 1x)

בְּעֵינֵי translated by ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς whether or not Yahweh is the object (בְּעֵינֵי with Yahweh as explicit or implicit object ἐνώπιον 2x, ἐναντίον 1x, ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς 1x, Yahweh neither explicit nor implicit object ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς 2x, ἐνώπιον 2x, ἐναντίον 1x)

בְּקֶרֶב translated by ἐν μέσῳ (ἐν μέσῳ 11x, εἰς μέσον 1x, ἐντός 2x, ἐν 2x, ἐν τοῖς ἐγκάτοις 1x, εἰς τὰ ἔγκατα 1x, τῇ καρδίᾳ 2x. בְּקֶרֶב לִבִּי — ἐν ἑαυτῷ 1x. Once בְּקֶרֶב has no counterpart in LXX)

הָרָה translated by ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχειν/λαμβάνειν in Judges (συλλαμβάνειν 1x)

זָבַח translated by θυσιάζειν rather than θύειν (זָבַח qal θύειν 7x, θυσία in 50:23 reflects זֶבַח, rather than MT:s זֹבֵחַ, זָבַח piel θύειν 1x)

חָרֵשׁ translated by κωφεύειν and חָשָׁה by σιωπᾶν (חָרֵשׁ qal παρασιωπᾶν 5x, σιγᾶν 1x, hiphil σιγᾶν 2x, חֵרֵשׁ "deaf" κωφός 2x. חָשָׁה παρασιωπᾶν 1x, σιγᾶν 1x)

יָרָה hiphil "to teach" translated by φωτίζειν (νομοθετεῖν 5x, συμβιβάζειν 1x, ὁδηγεῖν 2x)

יָרָה qal translated by τοξεύειν (κατατοξεύειν 2x)

לֹא אָבָה translated by (ἐ)θέλειν in Judges (οὐ προσέχειν 1x)

לָחַם niphal translated by παρατάσσειν in Judges (πολεμεῖν 1x)

מִלְחָמָה translated by παράταξις in Judges (πόλεμος 9x, πολεμεῖν 1x)

מְעִיל translated by ἐπενδύτης or ἐπιδύτης (διπλοΐς 1x)

מִשְׁבְּצוֹת translated by συνεσφιγμένοι or συνεσραγισμένοι (κροσσωτός 1x)

נֶצַח translated by νῖκος (לָנֶצַח εἰς τέλος 14x, נֶצַח εἰς τέλος 3x, αἰών 1x)

עֲבֹת or עֲבֹתֹת translated by ἁλυσιδωτός, ἁλύσεις (ζυγός 1x, πυκάζειν 1x, עֲבֹת αὐχήν 1x)

צָעַק or זָעַק translated by βοᾶν in Judges (זָעַק κράζειν 5x, צָעַק κράζειν 5x)

רָדַף translated by διώκειν (καταδιώκειν 18x incl. 1x *Vorlage*, διώκειν 2x, ἐκδιώκειν 1x)

רָעָה translated by *πονηρία* in Judges (κακός 24x, κακία 3x, πονηρός 5x, θλίψις 1x, ἀδικία 1x, εὐδοκία 1x probably from Aramaic)

שׁלם piel translated by *ἀποτιννύειν* (שׁלם piel ἀνταποδιδόναι 5x, ἀποδιδόναι 8x, ἀποτίνειν 1x, once it appears without counterpart in LXX. שָׁלֵם qal ἀνταποδιδόναι, שֻׁלַּם pual ἀποδιδόναι 1x)

The use of *ἡνίκα* (ἡνίκα 1x translating כַּאֲשֶׁר)

*Transliterations of unknown words*
(נַהֲרוֹת אֵיתָן — ποταμοὺς ηθαμ 1x?)

*The following characteristics may have a connection with the kaige group*
√בלע translated by *καταποντίζειν* (καταπίνειν 4x, καταποντίζειν 2x, καταποντισμός 1x, ταράσσειν 1x)

√דמם or √דמה translated by *σιωπᾶν* and דוּמִיָה by *σιωπή* (דָּמַם qal κατανύσσεσθαι 3x, ὑποτάσσειν 2x, κατάγειν 1x, a different *Vorlage* is suspected behind ὑποτάσσειν 1x and κατάγειν 1x, דוּמִיָה ἄνοια 1x, ταπεινοῦν 1x, ὑποτάσσειν 1x (= *Vorlage* √רדד?), πρέπειν 1x. דָּמַם polel ὑψοῦν (=*Vorlage* רום) 1x, √דמה ἀνόητος and ὁμοιοῦν (double translation) 2x, ὁμοιοῦν 3x)

√סתר translated by *ἀποκρυφ-* (סָתַר niphal κρύπτειν 2x, ἀποκρύπτειν 1x (or reflecting סָתַר hiphil), κρύφιος 1x, ἀποστρέφειν 1x (=*Vorlage*), סָתַר hiphil ἀποστρέφειν 12x, κατακρύπτειν 1x, ἀποκρύπτειν 1x, σκεπάζειν 3x)

עָטָה translated by *περιβάλλειν* (עָטָה qal περιβάλλειν 3x, ἀναβάλλειν 1x, עָטָה hiphil δίδωμι 1x, καταχεῖν 1x)

√שׁחת translated by *διαφθορά* (שַׁחַת διαφθορά 5x, καταφθορά 1x, φθορά 1x, βόθρος 2x)

*βάρις* and *πυργόβαρις* (βάρις הֵיכָל 1x, אַרְמוֹן 2x, πυργόβαρις אַרְמוֹן 1x)

# 8. Texts from Qumran and the Septuagint

## 8.1. *Vorlage* Versus Translation Technique

The relation between Qumran and the Septuagint often discussed among LXX scholars. Thus, different aspects of this relation have been treated on many occasions.[1] Questions related to the Septuagint as a translation, especially questions of translation technique have an obvious bearing on the relation to the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the translation. Because in order to say something specific about the translation technique one has to recognize which Hebrew text, the translators had in front of them. However, it is also the other way around; the *Vorlage* on which the translators made their version cannot be detected if you have not studied the technique of this specific translator.[2] I would in fact emphasise that the translation technique is the starting point for questions concerning the *Vorlage*.[3]

In order to retrovert the Greek text to a *Vorlage* different from the MT, one must pose questions concerning the competence, theology, and technique of the translator. For example: what is his knowledge of Hebrew and how did he interpret specific words? Did he choose freely between different Greek synonyms in the rendering of a Hebrew word? How closely did he reflect the grammatical choices in the Hebrew text? Did he, as a rule, follow the word order of his *Vorlage* or was he independent from it? What was his relation to his *Vorlage* as regards the number of words, that is, the so-called one-to-one relation? How did he

---

[1] One may, for example, mention the international symposium on the Septuagint and its Relation to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings in Manchester 30th of July to 2nd of August 1990.

[2] See the discussion in Olofsson, *The LXX Version*, 65-70.

[3] By translation technique I only refer to the way the translator rendered his Hebrew *Vorlage*. Thus, the term does not imply any conscious philosophy of translation. On the other hand, translation technique cannot be discussed in isolation from questions regarding the translators' background, theology, and competence. Most of the translators of the Old Greek did not have a conscious theory of translation that they applied in their work. The Septuagint was after all a pioneer work of huge dimensions without precedent in the Greek world. See, e.g., the description in Olofsson, *LXX Version*, 5-6.

translate idiomatic phrases? Did he try to reflect the etymology of the Hebrew words?[4] One only has to look at modern translations in order to see different modes of translation exemplified. Nevertheless, while the translation techniques within modern translations are consistent, this is not at all the case with the LXX. Rather, the Septuagint can be described as a combination of all different kinds of translations and paraphrases, from the literal to the paraphrastic. Consequently, the experience from one translation unit, usually a book, cannot be applied to any other unit in the LXX. In fact, the study of the methods of translation in the translation units in the LXX is the pivotal point not only for the *Vorlage* of the translation but also as regards the Old Greek, that is, the original translation.[5] See, for example, Pietersma who emphasises, "the ever present need for the critic to be thoroughly acquainted with the style and translation techniques of the translator whose work he is attempting to reconstruct".[6]

Other versions, and especially Hebrew texts, deriving from around the turn of the Christian era or earlier, can confirm the suggestion of a different *Vorlage* from MT already suspected by the investigation of the translation technique, and they may indicate by themselves differences in *Vorlage*, which could otherwise easily be understood as expressions of interpretation or translation technique. The Hebrew text behind the LXX is of great importance for all works of textual criticism, which is clearly shown by e.g. the text-critical choices in modern Bible translations. In fact, LXX is the most important single source for textual emendations in the critical editions of the Hebrew bible as well as in the modern translations.

Furthermore, the Qumran biblical texts have a bearing on the question of the *Vorlage* of the LXX. Few will deny that the Dead Sea Scrolls have had a tremendous impact on the evaluation of the textual history of the Old Testament text, not least the relation between the Septuagint and its

---

[4] For the typology of the literal translation technique, see especially Barr, "Typology", and Tov, *The Text-Critical Use,* 57-60.

[5] See, e.g., the method of A. Pietersma used in his discussions of the Old Greek in the Psalter. See, e.g., the following articles of Pietersma, "P.Bodmer XXIV", 262-86; "David in the Greek Psalms", 213-26; "Proto-Lucian and the Greek Psalter", 66-72; "The Greek Psalter", 60-69; *Two Manuscripts of the Greek Psalter*"; "Articulation in the Greek Psalms", 184-202.

[6] Pietersma, "Greek Psalter", 60.

Hebrew *Vorlage*.[7] Scholars, like J. Wellhausen and G.R. Driver, from the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, emphasised the value of the Septuagint for textual criticism of the Hebrew text, circumstances after World War I, however, favoured scholars with a more negative attitude toward the Septuagint vis-à-vis the received Hebrew text. However, the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls in the 1940s forced scholars "to turn back to the Septuagint as a reliable witness to the Hebrew text whence it derived".[8] Of course, many mistakes were made. For example, "much uncritical enthusiasm was expressed for the Septuagint text of Isaiah and its alleged derivation from a Hebrew text virtually identical with that of the first, complete Isaiah Scroll (designated 1QIs[a]) when it was made public first in part and then in whole".[9] Nevertheless, as a whole, many emendations based on the Septuagint in the last part of the twentieth century have been verified by the Qumran texts. In fact, the whole procedure of retroversion has received a massive support from the Dead Sea Scrolls.[10] This is true also for the book of Psalms.

The choice regarding the texts to be discussed is mainly based on my own interest in the book of Psalms, but I also think that Qumran Psalter Mss can easily demonstrate the importance of Qumran Mss. The variation between LXX and MT in the book of Psalms is especially related to details, thus illustrating the ordinary situation in this regard; most Qumran scrolls are close or fairly close to MT. Jeremiah, where LXX is one sixth shorter than MT and has a different arrangement of the overall composition, is an exception rather than the rule. LXX is in this case to be regarded as an edition of the book, prior to the more expanded edition in MT. This can be illustrated by Qumran material, since 4QJer[b] supports the short edition of LXX, while 4QJer[a,c] reflects the expanded edition. Consequently, the revised form found in MT is at least from 200 BC, the date of 4QJer[a].[11]

---

[7] See, e.g., Tov, "Contribution", 12-13.

[8] Orlinsky, "Hebrew Text", 552.

[9] Orlinsky, "Hebrew Text", 552.

[10] Tov, "Contribution", 12-13.

[11] Regarding the date of 4QJer[a], see, e.g., Tov, "4QJer[a]", 8.

## 8.2. 11QPs^a and the *Vorlage* of the Septuagint

### 8.2.1. Methodological discussion

I have chosen to present LXX readings, which are also found in 11QPs^a as an illustration to questions concerning the *Vorlage* of LXX.[12] The choice of 11QPs^a is perhaps somewhat arbitrary, since at least 36 fragments from different Mss of the book of Psalms have been found in Qumran.[13] Arguments in favour of the use of 11QPs^a are, however, easy to find. It is presented in a critical edition in the DJD series,[14] and is of a substantial size, in contrast to the small, unedited, fragments found in Qumran Cave 4. 11QPs^a is, according to Sanders, to be dated from the first half of the first century CE.[15] Even though, in my view, 11QPs^a is not really contemporary with the *Vorlage* of LXX Psalms, it is earlier than all the extant LXX Mss of the Psalter. It is difficult to give an exact date for the LXX translation; I myself would favour a date in the second century BC.[16]

The authors of *La Bible greque des septante* attempted to connect the translation of individual books to specific localities,[17] but the result must be considered uncertain. The translation of the Psalter has been associated with Palestine by H.-J. Venetz on the basis of certain points of contact with the so-called kaige-group, which has been shown, through the studies of Barthélemy, to be at home in Palestine.[18] Oliver Munnich, on the other hand, has convincingly pointed out the weakness in Venetz's analysis.

---

[12] Cf. also Cook, "11QPs-a", 107-30.

[13] VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today*, 30.

[14] Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll*.

[15] Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll*.

[16] Regarding the date of the translation of the book of Psalms, an early date in the second century BC seems to be favoured in, e.g., Dorival, Harl, Munnich, *Septante,* 111; Munnich, "Septante", 75-89; Schaper, "Eschatologie", 60-61, while A. van der Kooij argues for a date in the first century BC in his article "Origin", 73.

[17] Thus, the Pentateuch, Judges, 1-2 Samuel, 1-2 Kings, 1-2 Chronicles, 3 Maccabees, Proverbs, Job, Psalms of Solomon, Sirach, the Twelve Prophets, Jeremiah, Baruch, the Letter of Jeremiah, and Ezekiel are all assigned to Egypt, while Ruth, Esther, Ecclesiastes, and Lamentations are placed in Palestine. Dorival, Harl, Munnich, *Septante,* 101-09. Occasionally a scholar names Antioch (2 Macc and 4 Macc) or Leontopolis (Isaiah) as possible origins. *Idem*, 102-04.

[18] Venetz, *Quinta*.

The not infrequent translation of נַם as καὶ γάρ (not καίγε) and the occurrence of βαρίς or πυργόβαρις, words that, according to Jerome, occur only on Palestinian soil, are by themselves not sufficient indicators for connecting the Psalter text with the kaige-group.[19] Nevertheless, a Palestinian locale for the translation is possible.

If the translation uses a Palestinian hermeneutic tradition, or was at home in Palestine, this would strengthen the employment of elements in 11QPs[a] reflecting the *Vorlage* of LXX Psalms on certain points. No LXX texts from the Psalter have been detected in Qumran, even though Mss from the Pentateuch as well as a fragment from the epistle of Jeremiah were found in Cave 4 in Qumran. Furthermore, a steadily increasing number of Hebrew Mss from Qumran have been discovered. None of them is identical, and they contain variations of the kind one easily finds in the old versions of the Old Testament, not least LXX. This has enhanced the probability that small deviations from MT in LXX reflect Hebrew texts that differ from MT rather than illustrate the theology or interpretation of the translator. See the evaluation of R. Hanhart, who emphasises that "As a matter of first principle the Greek translation must be considered as a faithful rendering of the original as far as content and form is concerned, a rendering exact even in grammatical and syntactical details like those involving parataxis, the article and the pronouns".[20] This is not least the case for a book as literal as LXX Psalms. For example, Galen Marquis has in an article even argued that when it is possible to retrovert an inverted phrase in LXX Psalms it could be used as an indication of a *Vorlage* with the word order of the Greek text, since the deviations from the word order of the Hebrew in LXX are few in the Psalter.[21] That is perhaps to go too far, but I have argued in chapter 3 in this volume, that some of the inversions in LXX Psalms in fact reflect a different Hebrew *Vorlage*.

I am not primarily interested in text-critical decisions regarding the oldest text, rather my question relates to where LXX can be adduced as a textual witness at all, that is, reflects a text variant from MT. My question is: When is one allowed to reconstruct a *Vorlage* different from MT based

---

[19] See Munnich, "Septante*"*, 80-83. I have not seen the arguments of J. Schaper supporting Venetz and van der Kooij concerning the origin of the Psalter. See the reference in Schaper, "Der Septuaginta-Psalter", 61 n. 67.

[20] Hanhart, "Earlier Tradition", 33, 341.

[21] Marquis, "Word Order"*,* 67.

on grammatical minutiae?[22] This is a question sometimes posed in LXX literature, but no definite answers seem to be found.[23] Actually, such retroversions are made in modern editions of the MT (*BHK, BHS, HUB, Biblia Quinta*). Moreover, the question is whether retroversions can be based on interpretation and translation technique alone, or whether they ought to be supported by Hebrew text material or at least by *versiones*.

I will not take up the questions regarding the understanding of 11QPs[a] as an edition of the Hebrew Psalter, different from the one in MT, or as a liturgical composition, since I am dealing with differences in detail rather than with composition. The overall composition may have a bearing on the evaluation that certain details in LXX different from MT are based on a *Vorlage* identical with 11QPs[a].

Of course, I am aware of the uncertainty concerning the Old Greek text, especially since there are no pre-Christian Mss to the Septuagint book of Psalms, but one can at least take for granted that such a text has existed.[24] My discussion is based on Rahlfs' text in the Göttingen edition (*Psalmi cum Odis*) and the text of MT according to *BHS*. Therefore, as a matter of convention, MT is used as the basis of the comparison. Even though Rahlfs' text cannot be equated with the Old Greek, it is an eclectic text based on the experiences of the eminent LXX scholar. New Mss, which were not at Rahlfs' disposal, have turned up, the most important being perhaps 2149, 2150, 2110.[25] Investigations of translation technique have also yielded some significant results that could be used for new evaluations concerning the OG. But I would rather argue that it is best for the time being to understand the critical text one finds in the Göttingen edition as not far from the OG. New textual finds can of course change the picture considerably. That I am inclined to presuppose a different *Vorlage*

---

[22] In fact, it is harder to know when to retrovert from LXX than to decide the exact wording of the retroversion. See, e.g., Tov, *The Septuagint*, 73.

[23] See, e.g., Tov, *The Septuagint*, 114-16.

[24] See, e.g., Munnich, "Septante originelle", 406-16.

[25] P. Bodmer XXIV (Rahlfs 2110) is a manuscript of the third or fourth century CE (or even second century) containing approximately Pss 17—118, and a member of Rahlfs' Upper Egyptian text group and in fact a better witness to the Upper Egyptian text than the Mss which Rahlfs had at his disposal. See Barthélemy, "Papyrus Bodmer XXIV", 106-10; Pietersma, "P.Bodmer XXIV", 265. Other important Mss are 2149, 2150 from the fourth century CE. See further Pietersma, *Two Manuscripts*.

behind a variant in LXX that is supported by 11QPs[a], and by old versions, is easily seen in my comments to the concrete texts.[26] However, since any agreement in grammatical minutiae can be a coincidence one cannot discard other interpretations. The small contextual differences from MT, such as differences in number, pronouns, particles, and verbal forms, which the two sources sometimes have in common, could have developed independently.

Regarding the use of 11QPs[a] as the basis for retroversions, a question of principle could be addressed. Must a Hebrew text in its overall composition and in textual details be closer to LXX than to MT to be used as *Vorlage* of LXX variants? It is my belief that not only "septuagintal scrolls", that is, scrolls which are closer to LXX than to any other textual tradition, can be used for supporting a *Vorlage* of LXX differing from MT. Furthermore, the term "septuagintal scroll" is confusing, since LXX as a whole is not based on a Hebrew text with specific textual characteristics.[27] In order to ascertain the closeness of a certain Qumran scroll to a LXX book one must also be clear over the methodology of such an evaluation. In the words of E. Tov:

> As a rule, the determining of the relation between the LXX and the scrolls does not take into consideration the originality of the readings ... if the LXX and a scroll agree in a presumed common secondary reading (often an error), such an agreement may point to a very close connection between the two ... With regard to the shared original readings, if two texts share a reading which probably is original, while the corrupted reading is found in another source, the closeness reflected by the presumably original shared reading is less significant, since it is natural for any two texts to share original readings.[28]

---

[26] Cf. in this connection the comment of J. Barr: "it remains the general probability that, where there are textual variations, one of which provides a direct and fairly literal path from the original to the translated text, while the other can only be a free, indirect or dubiously related connection, the direct path does result from literal translation". Barr, "Typology", 285. Regarding the suggestion of a different *Vorlage* from MT in LXX Psalms in general terms, see Flint, *Dead Sea Psalms Scroll*, 236, 249.

[27] Tov, "Contribution", 40-42.

[28] Tov, "Contribution", 24-25.

Even though the verdict that a certain reading is original is far from certain one could propose that at least the following variants in my material common to LXX and 11QPs^a are original readings: Pss 145:5, 13. Cf. also 119:49 and 145:15, where limited support from 11QPs^a can be found.

The book of Psalms in the Septuagint version is in many respects a strictly literal translation. Consequently, the possibility for differences reflecting a Hebrew text is much greater in this book than in e.g. Isaiah. I will give some examples of deviations from MT in 11QPs^a, which are reflected in the Septuagint version, complemented by a few facts and my own evaluation. The translation of MT is mainly taken from *NRSV* and the translation of LXX is from *NETS*. These translations are idiomatic rather than literal, although the differences between MT and LXX under discussion are clearly marked; they are in the cursive.

## 8.2.2. Quantitative differences

*Ps 145:13*

מַלְכוּתְךָ מַלְכוּת כָּל־עֹלָמִים וּמֶמְשֶׁלְתְּךָ בְּכָל־דּוֹר וָדֹר׃

Your kingdom is an everlasting kingdom,
and your dominion endures throughout all generations.

ἡ βασιλεία σου βασιλεία πάντων τῶν αἰώνων,
καὶ ἡ δεσποτεία σου ἐν πάσῃ γενεᾷ καὶ γενεᾷ.
πιστὸς κύριος ἐν τοῖς λόγοις αὐτοῦ
καὶ ὅσιος ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ἔργοις αὐτοῦ.

Your kingdom is a kingdom of all the ages,
and your dominion endures in every generation upon generation
*The Lord is faithful in his words,*
*and devout in all his deeds.*

וָדֹר MT ’A Θ Σ E′ ϛ′, + בכל מעשיו וחסיד בדבריו אלוהים נאמן 11QPs^a. See also LXX Vulg PR (= *Le psautier romain* ... ed. Dom Robert Weber, 1953) Syr (= *The Peshitta Psalter*, ed. by William Emery Barnes).[29]

The נ-strophe in this acrostic psalm is missing in MT, but it is present in 11QPs^a and in the old versions. The *Vorlage* of LXX is reconstructed as

---

[29] The נ-strophe is also found in Ms 142 in Kennicott, but it is probably based on a retranslation from the Greek. For this suggestion, I am indebted to Professor E. Tov. κύριος in LXX reflects יהוה rather than אלהים.

נֶאֱמָן יְהוָה בְּכָל־דְּבָרָיו וְחָסִיד בְּכָל־מַעֲשָׂיו, both in *BHK* and *BHS*, and regarded as the original Hebrew text. But the first בְּכָל was hardly in the *Vorlage* of LXX, although NETS translates "The Lord is faithful in all his words".

*Comment*: The rendering in LXX is evidently based on a *Vorlage* identical with 11QPs[a], except for the name of God (יְהוָה).

*Ps 119:68*

טוֹב־אַתָּה וּמֵטִיב לַמְּדֵנִי חֻקֶּיךָ:
You are good and do good;
teach me your statutes.
χρηστὸς εἶ σύ, *κύριε*, καὶ ἐν τῇ χρηστότητί σου
δίδαξόν με τὰ δικαιώματά σου.
You are kind, *O Lord*, and in your kindness
teach me your statutes.
> MT, κύριε LXX אדוני 11QPs[a] PR, Syr

In *BHS* it is noted that LXX and Peshitta support κύριε, while it is not even mentioned in *BHK*. There are no specific reasons for introducing it into the LXX text. No other occurrences of the phrase טוֹב־אַתָּה appear in the Psalms and where it can be found,[30] it is not followed by אֲדֹנָי or יְהוָה. In fact, neither טוֹב אַתָּה יְהוָה nor טוֹב אַתָּה אֲדֹנָי occur in MT. κύριε is missing in Sa Ga Aug[uar]. אֲדֹנָי is supported by Peshitta and *Le Psautier romain*. The existence of אדוני in 11QPs[a] mirrors the Hebrew *Vorlage* of LXX.[31] Although making implicit participators explicit is a common translation technique,[32] it seldom occurs in the book of Psalms.[33] The LXX Psalms is

---

[30] Judg 11:25; 1 Sam 29:6, 9.

[31] See, e.g., Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, 234.

[32] See, e.g., the examples adduced by Jan de Waard concerning Ruth in "Greek Translators of Ruth", 499-515.

[33] κύριος could perhaps be regarded as an exception to this rule since it occurs more than 30 times in the Psalter without counterpart in MT, 2:12; 5:11; 7:7; 22:32; 25:21; 31:20; 35:18, 23; 40:17; 44:27; 48:12; 51:20; 55:24; 79:9; 80:8; 84:6; 88:3; 94:19; 97:10; 98:1; 102:26; 103:11; 119:7, 68, 85, 93, 97, 168; 136:23; 138:1; 139:13; 142:8; 143:8; 145:13; 147:1. Some texts are disputed, perhaps the Old Greek was identical with MT in, e.g., 87 (88):3; 93 (94):19; 118 (119):7. See Pietersma, "P.Bod. XXIV", 283. In most cases, however, I would argue that a different *Vorlage* is reflected.

a very literal translation, not least as concerns quantitative relations, and if one has found a Hebrew text with this variant, it is probably the *Vorlage* of LXX.

*Comment*: The rendering in LXX is evidently based on a *Vorlage* including אדוני (= 11QPs^a) or יהוה.

### 8.2.3. Conjunctions

*Ps 139:19*

אִם־תִּקְטֹל אֱלוֹהַּ רָשָׁע וְאַנְשֵׁי דָמִים סוּרוּ מֶנִּי׃

O that you would kill the wicked, O God,
and that the bloodthirsty would depart from me —

ἐὰν ἀποκτείνῃς ἁμαρτωλούς, ὁ θεός,
ἄνδρες αἱμάτων, ἐκκλίνατε ἀπ᾽ ἐμοῦ.

If only you would kill sinners, O God;
O men of blood, depart from me!

וְאַנְשֵׁי MT, ἄνδρες LXX אנשי 11QPs^a Σ PR PIH (= *Sancti Hieronymi Psalterium Iuxta Hebraeos*, ed. Dom Henri Sainte Marie, 1954)

In *BHK* אַנְשֵׁי is suggested as the *Vorlage* of LXX Symmachus and Hieronymus. Cf. *BHS om cop*.

*Comment*: The rendering in LXX is probably based on a *Vorlage* identical with 11QPs^a אנשי.

### 8.2.4. Lexical deviations

*Ps 129:3*

עַל־גַּבִּי חָרְשׁוּ חֹרְשִׁים הֶאֱרִיכוּ לְמַעֲנוֹתָם׃

The plowers plowed on my back;
they made their furrows long."

ἐπὶ τοῦ νώτου μου ἐτέκταινον οἱ ἁμαρτωλοί,
ἐμάκρυναν τὴν ἀνομίαν αὐτῶν·

The *sinners* were practicing their skill on my back;
they prolonged their lawlessness."

חֹרְשִׁים MT, οἱ ἁμαρτωλοί LXX רשעים 11QPs^a᾽A Σ et rel Vulg PR

לְמַעֲנוֹתָם is probably read as לַעֲוֹנוֹתָם in LXX (*BHS*). חָרַשׁ qal in the meaning in literal sense "plough" is common,[34] and less so in niphal.[35] It is usually understood by the translators; it is rendered by ἀροτριᾶν,[36] καταδαμᾶν.[37] Occasionally it is translated by ἀλοητός "threshing, threshing-season".[38] Sometimes I חָרַשׁ is interpreted as "to be silent", that is, as II חָרַשׁ and rendered by παρασιωπᾶν.[39] It is true that חָרַשׁ is occasionally misunderstood, but most of the LXX translators were familiar with חָרַשׁ in the meaning "to plough".

In *BHS* LXX is retroverted to הָרְשָׁעִים. In *BHK*, it is not even registered!

*Comment*: The rendering in LXX is evidently based on a *Vorlage* identical with 11QPs^a רשעים or with the suggested *Vorlage* in *BHS* הָרְשָׁעִים.

## 8.2.5. *Grammatical differences*

### 8.2.6. *Numerus and suffixes*

*Ps 119:49*

זְכֹר־דָּבָר לְעַבְדֶּךָ עַל אֲשֶׁר יִחַלְתָּנִי׃

Remember *a word* to your servant
in which you have made me to hope.

Μνήσθητι τὸν λόγον σου τῷ δούλῳ σου, ᾧ ἐπήλπισάς με.

Remember *your word* to your slave,
by which you buoyed me with hope.

דָּבָר MT ʼA PIH Targ (cf Vulg), τοὺς λόγους σου LXX^luc Θ Oʹ, דבריכה 11QPs^a, τὸν λόγον σου LXX דברך Vulg PR Syr

---

[34] Deut 22:10; Judg 14:18; 1 Sam 8:12; 1 Kings 19:19; Isa 28:24; Hos 10:11, 13; Am 6:12; 9:13; Job 1:14; Ps 129:3; Prov 20:4.

[35] Jer 26:18; Mic 3:12.

[36] Deut 22:10; 1 Kings 19:19; Job 1:14; 4:8; Isa 28:24; Jer 26:18; Mic 3:12. Codex Vaticanus has ἀροτριᾶν in Judg 14:18.

[37] Judg 14:18.

[38] Am 9:13. See Lust, Eynikel, Hauspie, *Lexicon,* "ἀλοητός". In 1 Sam 8:12 and Prov 20:4 the rendering is based on a different *Vorlage*, but it never has ἁμαρτωλός as equivalent.

[39] Hos 10:11, 13, and Am 6:12.

Most modern versions make the same change as a translation technique, e.g. *NRSV* "your word to your servant". But see, for example, Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, 235-36.

*Comment*: The LXX may reflect a *Vorlage* דברך, while 11QPsª evidences a variant with a second sing suffix with "word" in the plural, דבריכה, which is reflected by some Lucianic Mss *L* Tht.

*Ps 132:18*

אוֹיְבָיו אַלְבִּישׁ בֹּשֶׁת וְעָלָיו יָצִיץ נִזְרֹו׃

His enemies I will clothe with disgrace,
but on him, *his crown* will gleam (lit. flourish)."

τοὺς ἐχθροὺς αὐτοῦ ἐνδύσω αἰσχύνην,
ἐπὶ δὲ αὐτὸν ἐξανθήσει τὸ ἁγίασμά μου.

His enemies I will clothe with disgrace,
but on him *my sanctity* will blossom."

נִזְרֹו MT, τὸ ἁγίασμά μου (נִזְרִי) LXX Vulg PR Syr. 11QPsª may reflect MT נזרו, but ו is uncertain.

LXX and Peshitta are retroverted to נִזְרִי in *BHK*.[40] Cf. Ps 89:40 נִזְרֹו — τὸ ἁγίασμα αὐτοῦ. ἁγίασμα with cognates is otherwise mainly a rendering of קדשׁ√ with cognates in LXX Psalms.[41] *BHS* notes that LXX and Peshitta have a suffix in first sing rather than third sing in MT.

*Comment*: The LXX may reflect a *Vorlage* נזרי that is also supported by Peshitta. The reading in 11QPsª is uncertain.

*Ps 125:4*

הֵיטִיבָה יְהוָה לַטּוֹבִים וְלִישָׁרִים בְּלִבּוֹתָם׃

Do good, O LORD, to those who are good,
and to those who are upright *in their hearts*!

ἀγάθυνον, κύριε, τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς
καὶ τοῖς εὐθέσι τῇ καρδίᾳ·

---

[40] See also Mozley, *Psalter*.
[41] 73:17; 74:7; 78:54, 69; 93:5; 96:6; 114:2. There are some exceptions, נָוֶה – ἁγιαστήριον 83:13, עֹז – ἁγίασμα 132:8.

Do good, O Lord, to those who are good,
and to those who are upright *in heart*.

בְּלִבּוֹתָם MT, τῇ καρδίᾳ LXX בלב 11QPsᵃ 4QPsᵉ LXX Lat.[42]

The phrase לִישָׁרִים בְּלֵב, with or without suffix, is not evidenced otherwise by the Hebrew Bible, but לְיִשְׁרֵי־לֵב is translated by τοῖς εὐθέσι τῇ καρδίᾳ,[43] or τοὺς εὐθεῖς τῇ καρδίᾳ.[44] In *BHK*, *BHS* no proposal of a different *Vorlage* is made.

*Comment*: The translator has been influenced by the renderings of the phrase elsewhere in the Psalter or the equivalent reflects a different *Vorlage*, בלב, evidenced by 11QPsᵃ and 4QPsᵉ.

*Ps 119:105*
נֵר־לְרַגְלִי דְבָרֶךָ וְאוֹר לִנְתִיבָתִי
Your word is a lamp to my feet
and a light to *my path*.
λύχνος τοῖς ποσίν μου ὁ λόγος σου
καὶ φῶς ταῖς τρίβοις μου.
Your word is a lamp to my feet
and a light to *my paths*.

לִנְתִיבָתִי MT, LXX ταῖς τρίβοις μου לנתיבותי 11QPsᵃ LXX Vulg PR Syr

In *BHK* LXX and Peshitta is retroverted to לִנְתִיבוֹתַי, and in *BHS* the plural of LXX and Peshitta is noted. נְתִיבָה occurs once more in the book of Psalms, 142:4. Here it is also rendered by plural in LXX (נְתִיבָתִי – τὰς τρίβους μου). However, the cognate נָתִיב is always translated by τρίβος.[45] Sometimes נְתִיבָה in the singular is rendered by the plural also

---

[42] See Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, 233.

[43] Pss 36:11; 97:11.

[44] Ps 11:2. לְבָרֵי לֵבָב in 73:1 is also rendered by τοῖς εὐθέσι τῇ καρδίᾳ.

[45] Pss 78:50; 119:35.

outside the Psalter.[46] The closest parallel is Job 30:13 (נְתִיבָתִי – τρίβοι μου).

*Comment*: The LXX is probably reflecting a *Vorlage* נתיבותי evidenced by 11QPs[a].

*Ps 142:5*

הַבֵּיט יָמִין וּרְאֵה וְאֵין־לִי מַכִּיר
אָבַד מָנוֹס מִמֶּנִּי אֵין דּוֹרֵשׁ לְנַפְשִׁי:

*Look* on my right hand *and see* —
there is no one who takes notice of me;
no refuge remains to me,
no one cares for me.

κατενόουν εἰς τὰ δεξιὰ καὶ ἐπέβλεπον,
ὅτι οὐκ ἦν ὁ ἐπιγινώσκων με·
ἀπώλετο φυγὴ ἀπ᾽ ἐμοῦ,
καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ ἐκζητῶν τὴν ψυχήν μου.

*I would look* to my right and *would observe*
that there was no one who recognized me;
escape vanished from me;
and no one sought out my soul.

הַבֵּיט יָמִין וּרְאֵה MT, κατενόουν εἰς τὰ δεξιὰ καὶ ἐπέβλεπον LXX
אביטה ימין ואראה 11QPs[a] Vulg PR Targ Syr

Without reference to 11QPs[a] *versiones* could be interpreted as reflecting a translation technique similar to that of *NRSV,* "I look to the right and see". No proposal regarding a different *Vorlage* is made in *BHK* or *BHS*. אביטה is otherwise translated by κατανοήσω in LXX Psalms.[47] Cohortatives are sometimes rendered by indicatives in active voice in LXX Psalms.[48] ראה qal is, however, otherwise never translated by ἐπιβλέπειν. ראה qal (87x) is as a rule translated by ἰδεῖν (50x), and every now and then by ὁρᾶν

---

[46] Job 30:13; Prov 1:15. In Prov 12:28 it seems to have μνησικάκων as counterpart. MT could be interpreted as a defective written plural in Pss 119:105; 142:4; Job 30:13; Prov 1:15.

[47] 118 (119):15, 18.

[48] For example, 13:6; 20 (21):14; 26 (27):6; 31 (32):8; 38 (39):2; 49 (50):21; 50 (51):18; 53 (54):8; 54 (55):7, 18; 60 (61):5.

(16x), and occasionally by βλέπειν (4x) and ἐπιδεῖν (4x). ἐπιβλέπειν is mainly the equivalent of נבט hiphil and פנה in LXX Psalms. The equivalent here is unique in the Psalms, although it at times can be found outside the book of Psalms.[49] ואראה has probably been understood as qal rather than niphal imperfect consecutive in LXX.

*Comment*: The LXX is probably reflecting a *Vorlage* אביטה ימין ואראה evidenced by 11QPs[a].

*Ps 144:5*
יְהוָה הַט־שָׁמֶיךָ וְתֵרֵד גַּע בֶּהָרִים וְיֶעֱשָׁנוּ׃
Bow your heavens, O LORD, and *you shall come down*;
touch the mountains so that they smoke.
κύριε, κλῖνον οὐρανούς σου *καὶ κατάβηθι*,
ἅψαι τῶν ὀρέων, καὶ καπνισθήσονται·
Tilt your heavens, O Lord, *and come down*;
touch the mountains and they will smoke.

וְתֵרֵד MT, καὶ κατάβηθι LXX וְרֵד 11QPs[a] Vulg PR.

κατάβηθι only occurs here in the book of Psalms, but κατάβηθι in other parts of the LXX is nearly always a rendering of qal imperative of ירד in LXX.[50] Without reference to 11QPs[a], the choice of counterpart in LXX could be regarded as a translation technique similar to that of *NRSV*: "and come down". No proposal regarding a different *Vorlage* is made in *BHK* or *BHS*.

*Comment*: The LXX probably reflects a *Vorlage* ורד evidenced by 11QPs[a].

---

[49] E.g. 1 Sam 1:11; 9:16; Prov 24:32; Hab 3:6; Jer 4:23, 25.
[50] Gen 45:9; Ex 19:24; 32:7; Deut 9:12; Judg 7:9, 10; 1 Sam 23:4; 2 Sam 11:8; 1 Kings 18:44; 21:18; 2 Kings 1:9, 11, 15; Isa 47:1; Jer 22:1; 31 (48):18. In Jer 18:2 καὶ κατάβηθι corresponds to וְיָרַדְתָּ and in Ezek 32:21 to יְרֵדוּ. In Ezek 31:18 וְהוֹרַדְתָּ has a double translation: it seems to be rendered by κατάβηθι καὶ καταβιβάσθητι and in 32:21 יְרֵדוּ is translated by κατάβηθι. In Ex 32:34 and 2 Kings 9:32 κατάβηθι occurs without corresponding text in MT.

*8.2.7. Verb/Noun*

*Ps 145:5*

הֲדַר כְּבוֹד הוֹדֶךָ וְדִבְרֵי נִפְלְאוֹתֶיךָ אָשִׂיחָה׃

On the glorious splendor of your majesty,

and on your wondrous works, I will meditate.

τὴν μεγαλοπρέπειαν τῆς δόξης τῆς ἁγιωσύνης σου λαλήσουσιν

καὶ τὰ θαυμάσιά σου διηγήσονται.

Of the glorious majesty of your holiness *they shall speak*,

and your wondrous works they shall recount.

וְדִבְרֵי MT, LXX λαλήσουσιν LXX ידברו 11QPs[a] Vulg PR

That λαλήσουσιν reflects יְדַבְּרוּ is suggested in *BHK* and *BHS* with reference to LXX and Peshitta.[51] λαλήσουσιν except once,[52] translates יְדַבְּרוּ in LXX Psalms.[53] The conjunction could reflect a Hebrew י as is evident from 11QPs[a]. דִּבְרֵי occurs 11x in the Psalter,[54] and it is otherwise rendered by λόγος or ῥῆμα.[55] The difference between י and ו in the Qumran scrolls generally is so small that they were seldom copied accurately.

*Comment*: The LXX is probably reflecting a *Vorlage* with ידברו evidenced by 11QPs[a].

*8.2.8. Personal pronouns*

*Ps 145:16*

פּוֹתֵחַ אֶת־יָדֶךָ וּמַשְׂבִּיעַ לְכָל־חַי רָצוֹן׃

*Opening* your hand,

satisfying the desire of every living thing.

ἀνοίγεις σὺ τὴν χεῖρά σου

καὶ ἐμπιπλᾷς πᾶν ζῷον εὐδοκίας.

*You open* your hand,

and satisfy every living thing with good pleasure.

---

[51] See also, e.g., Mozley, *Psalter*, 188.

[52] 94:4 (יֹאמְרוּ).

[53] 94:4 first occurrence; 115:5; 135:16; 145:5, 11.

[54] 7:1; 18:1; 22:2; 35:20; 36:4; 52:6; 65:4; 105:27; 109:3; 137:3; 145:5.

[55] λόγος 7:1; 18:1; 22:2; 65:4; 105:27; 109:3; 137:3, ῥῆμα 36:4; 52:6. In 35:20 δόλους probably reflects דִּבְרֵי מִרְמָה.

> MT, LXX σὺ LXX את אתה 11QPsᵃ Vulg PR Syr

The rendering in LXX may be a reflection of a translation technique similar to that of *NRSV* "You open your hand". 11QPsᵃ has את אתה but it is more probable that LXX reflect אַתָּה־יָדְךָ (*BHK*) or אַתָּ יָדֶךָ (*BHS*) and the vocalization פָּתַחְתָּ. See e.g. 39 (40):6 רַבּוֹת עָשִׂיתָ אַתָּה – πολλὰ ἐποίησας σύ.

*Comment*: The translation in the LXX is probably based on a *Vorlage* including אתה as in 11QPsᵃ.

Deviations with וְ can reflect a *Vorlage* different from MT
See the following examples from 11QPsᵃ

| | |
|---|---|
| Ps 102:27 | כַּלְּבוּשׁ, LXX καὶ ὡσεὶ περιβόλαιον וכלבוש 11QPsᵃ LXX Lat Syr. (*BHS* 𝕲 σ´ 𝕾 pr cop). καὶ is missing in Laᴳ. |
| Ps 119:163 | תּוֹרָתֶךָ, LXX τὸν δὲ νόμον σου ותורתך 11QPsᵃ (*BHS* pc Mss 𝕲𝕾 ׳וְתוֹ) |
| Ps 122:7 | שַׁלְוָה, LXX καὶ εὐθηνία ושלוה 11QPsᵃ (*BHK* LXX וְשַׁלְוָה, *BHS* nonn Mss 𝕲𝕾 ׳וְשַׁ) |
| Ps 135:18 | כֹּל, LXX καὶ πάντες וכל 11QPsᵃ Ken LXX Vulg PR Syr (*BHK* Mss וְכֹל, *BHS* nonn Mss 𝕲𝕾𝕾 וְכֹל) |
| Ps 139:19 | וְאַנְשֵׁי, LXX ἄνδρες אנשי 11QPsᵃ LXX Σ PR PIH (*BHK* > וְ 𝕲, Hier, *BHS* 𝕲 σ´ Hier om copula) |
| Ps 145:5 | נִפְלְאוֹתֶיךָ, LXX καὶ τὰ θαυμάσιά σου ונפלאותיכה 11QPsᵃ LXX Vulg PR |

Although *BHS* is generally more reluctant than *BHK* to retranslate from the LXX deviations in relation to MT, small differences as regards singular and plural, omission or addition of conjunctions are, as one can see, often noted as *Vorlage* variants in *BHS* in the book of Psalms. 11QPsᵃ has sometimes confirmed proposals made in *BHS* regarding a different *Vorlage*, and, furthermore, Qumran texts has made it probable that other differences, which are not recorded in *BHK* or *BHS* are based on the Hebrew *Vorlage*, rather than on the translation technique. Of course, this cannot be generalized to suggest that most differences in any other book are based on the Hebrew.

# 9. Death Shall Be Their Shepherd (Ps 49:15)

## 9.1. Introduction of Ps 49

Psalm 49 belongs to the category of wisdom psalms. In most wisdom psalms the general themes of morality based on wisdom tradition are developed (for example Ps 1). Ps 49, on the other hand, is concerned with a single but problematic issue, defined in v. 5 as a מָשָׁל "proverb, wisdom saying" and as a חִידָה "riddle",[1] or a "hard or perplexing question".[2]

אַטֶּה לְמָשָׁל אָזְנִי אֶפְתַּח בְּכִנּוֹר חִידָתִי
*I will incline my ear to a proverb;*
*I will solve my riddle to the music of the harp.*

Even the text of some parts of this psalm can be characterized as a riddle, which is far from easy to solve. What is the perplexing question, what is the riddle in this text? It is death, "death in the context of human power and wealth".[3]

   This psalm reflects a kind of wisdom literature containing works that explore "the difficult intellectual and theological issues raised in moral wisdom",[4] in contrast to a category in which the moral essence of wisdom tradition is expressed in a didactic form, for example, the book of Proverbs.[5] Psalm 49 has some similarity with the critical wisdom; the kind of wisdom literature best represented by themes from the books of Job and Ecclesiastes as well as by other wisdom psalms. The closest parallel is perhaps Job 21:7-15, where the empirical problem of the apparent success

---

[1] See, for example, Judg 14:12, "Samson said to them, 'Let me now put a riddle (חִידָה) to you; if you can explain it to me, within the seven days of the feast, and find it out, then I will give you thirty linen garments and thirty festal garments'.

[2] See 1 Kings 10:1 "When the queen of Sheba heard of the fame of Solomon (fame due to the name of the Lord), she came to test him with hard questions" (בְּחִידוֹת).

[3] Craigie, *Psalms 1-50*, 358. I am much indebted to Craigie for the overall characterization of the psalm.

[4] Craigie, *Psalms 1-50*, 358.

[5] Craigie, *Psalms 1-50*, 358. Thus, it is far away from the kind of riddle posed by Samson in the book of Judges. See n. 1.

and prosperity of the wicked and rich is raised, even though the same problem is also urgent in some other wisdom psalms, for example, Ps 73.

Ps 49 appears to be a late psalm, certainly postexilic and perhaps late postexilic. It may very well be one of the latest poems in the book of Psalms.[6] This has some bearing on the interpretation of the verse under consideration. The intellectual milieu appears to be one of critical discussion, perhaps related to certain closed circles of the Temple hierarchy.[7] The Temple theologians seem to be close to the *anawim*, *"*the poor*",*[8] people who regarded themselves as persecuted by rich and influential people, but who had their security in God and expected help from him.[9] Thus, rich people are looked upon with great suspicion and even contempt. There are some parallels to this attitude in the book of Psalms, but even more so in certain books, which belong to the intertestamental literature.

The psalm begins with an introduction (vv. 2-5), which is addressed to all, although the specific addressees are probably those who are poor and afflicted. Two main sections of the psalm follow: (a) vv. 6-13, which is concerned with the limitations of wealth; and (b) vv. 14-21, which is related to the destinies of the rich and the poor. Both of them conclude with a refrain (vv. 13, 21). The two refrains are similar, but they are not identical, MT has לוּן in v. 13, and בִין in v. 21.[10] The refrains give expression to the essence of wisdom on the problem at hand.[11]

The section 49:14-21 is concerned with "The folly of confidence in wealth". The wisdom teacher turns his attention to the way of life of wealthy persons. Their quest for wealth as a safeguard against death is revealed as folly. The most common interpretation of 49:15 in MT is that the rich people have no hope of escaping from death, since death (not

---

[6] See, e.g., Anderson, *Psalms,* 373. Casetti suggests that it belongs to the first part of the fourth century. Casetti, *Leben*, 285. See also the discussion on 283-85.

[7] See, e.g., Casetti, *Leben*, 281-83.

[8] Kraus, *Psalmen,* 519. This influence depends, according to Hossfeld, Zenger, on a late redaction of the psalm. Hossfeld, Zenger, *Psalm 1-50*, 300.

[9] For a discussion of the *anawim* , see especially Kraus, *Psalmen*, 108-11.

[10] Most modern translations emend to לוֹן with a few Mss in v. 21. See, e.g., *NRSV*, "Man does not remain through the night, he is like the beasts that perish" (vv. 13, 21). But the distinction is probably original. See, e.g., Craigie, *Psalms 1-50*, 358.

[11] See, e.g., Craigie, *Psalms 1-50*, 358; Anderson, *Psalms*, 374.

Yahweh) will be their shepherd and Sheol will consume them. In contrast to this, the fate of the psalmist is presented; God will ransom his soul from Sheol.

## 9.2. Philological Analysis Versus Theological Exegesis

So much for the introduction of Ps 49. I will now turn to methodological presuppositions in interpreting the LXX version, and especially discuss the relation between philological analysis and the so-called theological exegesis. It cannot be excluded that even in the philological analysis of the Hebrew the translator was, without being aware of it, influenced by the religious milieu of his time as well as by his own religious convictions.[12] Particularly when he came across words and expressions that he only vaguely comprehended, his choice of equivalents may have been affected by what he regarded as a reasonable interpretation from a theological point of view. This type of theological influence is more or less inherent in the translation process per se and I do not regard it as manifest theological exegesis, which is reflected in the choice of equivalents, that is, cases where the translation is more influenced by the theology of the translator than by the meaning of the words in their context. It is, of course, a complicated or perhaps impossible task to distinguish between conscious theological exegesis and mere theological influence, since it presupposes discernment of the translator's intentions.[13]

A monograph of Joachim Schaper, *Eschatology in the Greek Psalter*, deals with some important aspects of the interpretive character of LXX Psalms.[14] Discussion concerning the method of dealing with and describing the interpretive character of LXX texts are always of great interest. Schaper is certainly right in his basic supposition that an exclusive preoccupation with translation technique does not lead to a full

---

[12] See the competent methodological discussion by Rösel in *Genesis-Septuaginta*, 16-24. I will use "the translator of the Psalms" in the singular and this is the accepted view; the LXX Psalms appears to be the work of a single translator, because no significant differences in the vocabulary or style within the Psalter can be seen. See, e.g., Soffer, "Anthropomorphisms", 417. But, the proposal of Schaper is in fact also possible. He suggests that it was a joint enterprise. Schaper, *Eschatology*, 33.

[13] See Olofsson, *Rock*, 11-12.

[14] Regarding the use of the expression "interpretative character", see Wevers, "Interpretative Character", 84-108.

understanding of the Septuagint translation and, furthermore, that the interpretive dimension of the book of Psalms is an interesting area of research. Certainly, LXX can be studied as a document in its own right, a document that in some respects reflects its own cultural and historical milieu.[15] On the other hand, I disagree with him, in his criticism of the methods of other Septuagint scholars. In particular, his criticism of the method of scholars dealing with translation technique, not least the so-called Finnish school, misses the point. His description implies that the underlying proposition of these scholars is that the translator is not "in any way … influenced by his religious and general cultural environment".[16] Such statements blur necessary distinctions. Furthermore, when Schaper's own method is applied to specific texts in the Psalter the result is far from convincing.

I will thus try to make clear my own methodological presuppositions. The fact that the translator is influenced by the interpretation prevalent in his lifetime and by his cultural and religious environment does not mean that a modern scholar is entitled to suggest that the translator engages in theological exegesis. Differences between the meaning of the MT and the Greek translation and the use of certain Greek terms in Jewish interpretations of the Hebrew Bible may not have been based on conscious interpretation. That is especially the case if the passages under discussion are in line with the translation equivalents otherwise used by this translator or other translators in the LXX.[17] Accordingly, if the choice

---

[15] For a stimulating discussion concerning the method of dealing with the interpretative character of the LXX, a discussion that takes the translation technique as the point of departure, see Boyd-Taylor, "A Place in the Sun", 71-105.

[16] Schaper, *Eschatology*, 21. See also his description on 16, 136. Perhaps the Finnish scholars simply do not address the question because the main object of their translation technical studies is the groundwork for the preparation of a description of the syntax of the Septuagint.

[17] Rösel makes an effort to understand the Greek equivalents from more or less contemporary Greek texts. He is to be commended for his well-informed discussion and his reluctance to suggest that his interpretation is the only one possible. Nevertheless, his work also shows that it is a precarious task to suggest an adequate background for the choice of equivalents. See, e.g., the relevant criticism of Rösel, *Genesis-Septuaginta*, as regards terminological connections with Timaeus of Plato and the interpretation of Gen 1-2 with reference to the

of the Greek future for the Hebrew present tense (a standard counterpart in the Septuagint Psalms) in one passage implies eschatological expectations, this cannot be demonstrated by the choice of tense, since the same interpretation ought then to be applied to the other passages as well.[18]

In my view, what is essential and what I have tried to make clear on several occasions is that it is only after an investigation of the translation technique, the competence of the translator, the *Vorlage* of his translation, that one is in a position to discuss theological influences seriously.[19] Albert Pietersma describes a similar methodological approach in a more eloquent way in his review of Joachim Schaper's monograph, *Eschatology in the Greek Psalter*. He emphasises that if one picks out standard equations in the LXX it is "not acceptable methodologically, that one (or several) instances be given special treatment and be elevated to a higher level of interpretation … in distinction from the more mundane text-criticism".[20]

My methodological proposals do not presuppose that the theological convictions of the Septuagint translator, whose work I investigate, have not affected his translation in any way. They only suggest that in order to make that proposition probable one has first to look at other possibilities of interpretation, since theological exegesis is not the primary aim of a translator. I think that this applies to most of the translators of the LXX, but in any case, it certainly applies to the translator of the book of Psalms.

The burden of proof is therefore on the scholar who advocates that an understanding of the translator of the Hebrew text at variance with the translation of the same or a similar Hebrew text in a modern translation is based on the theological *Tendenz* of the translator. For that reason "The exegete of the Greek thus needs to *prove* that the translation says something other than the original".[21] One can perhaps make some

---

exegesis by Philo in van der Kooij, "Review of Rösel, *Genesis-Septuaginta*", 458. See also Hanhart, "Earlier Tradition", 351.

[18] See, e.g., Rösel, *Genesis-Septuaginta*, 19, who says that "Standardübersetzungen im Normalfall nicht theologisch auszuwerten sind" and Knuth, *Psalm 6,* 386.

[19] See the discussion in Olofsson, *Rock*, 5-9. See, e.g., also Rösel, *Genesis-Septuaginta*, 21-23 and Boyd-Taylor, "A Place in the Sun", 71-105.

[20] Pietersma, "Review of Schaper, *Eschatology*", 187.

[21] Pietersma, "Review of Schaper, *Eschatology*", 187.

qualifications. The exegete needs to *prove* that the translation says something that differs from the translator's philological understanding of the *Vorlage* in front of him.

This kind of method is not negative *a priori* towards any suggestion that theological expectations of the translator influenced his translations, far from it.[22] Theological influences can perhaps be illustrated by the translator of the book of Isaiah, but in a literalist translation like the book of Psalms one must be very cautious not to indulge in speculations that are contrary to the whole attitude of this translator.[23]

It is not easy to picture a translator who at the same time is extremely careful to follow the very order of the words in his Hebrew *Vorlage,* who employs stereotype lexical equivalents, and at the same time propose that he is involved in a theological rewriting of the Hebrew Psalter. I admit that it is possible to combine a literal rendering with interpretive additions in the translation, since this can be seen in some of the Targums, but in that case the *Tendenz* is very easy to recognize. The translator of the LXX Psalms, however, does not seem to have much in common with the *Targum of Psalms*.[24] One the other hand, the choice of equivalents in the LXX Psalter and other versions of the Psalms may, sometimes have inspired the Targumic tradition.[25]

The reluctance to posit a theological motivation for the ordinary choice of equivalents in LXX is based on the generally accepted criticism of the methods of *TWNT*,[26] where the Greek words often are given meanings, which are not rooted in the context of the given word, but the meaning of the word in other contexts.[27] There is therefore every reason to

---

[22] See, e.g., the discussion in Olofsson, *LXX Version*, 1-5.

[23] A simple question of Satterthwaite in his otherwise positive review of Schaper's work is right to the point "Given the kind of document the LXX Psalms is, then, how accurately can we define its theological outlook and, hence, its place among emergent theologies of the period?" Satterthwaite, "Review of Schaper, *Eschatology*", 286.

[24] Apart from that, the *Targum of Psalms* is not really the best comparison text, since it is late.

[25] See, e.g., Brown, "Loan-Words", 194-216.

[26] See especially Tov, "Verhältnis", 237-50. See also Hanhart, "Jüdische Tradition", 288-89; Hanhart, "Earlier Tradition", 341-45.

[27] This is in line with the understanding of Rösel, *Genesis-Septuaginta*, 22-24. That is why he stresses that the connotations of the Greek words must be investigated with great care and precision.

show great care and only present an interpretation of the Greek that is in accordance with the exact wording in the context and with the Hebrew *Vorlage*. In any case, it is much better to err on this side, that is, to be overcautious, rather than turn directly from the Greek word in LXX to uses of this word in other literary or cultural contexts. Furthermore, the groundwork done in translation technique may later on be used for relevant discussions concerning the interpretive character of the Septuagint.

Admittedly, the Greek text in itself might, for the reader who is not acquainted with the Hebrew, lead to interpretations that were prevalent in his time and in his milieu even though they do not reflect the intention of the translator. The interpretation of the ordinary reader is, contrary to that of the translator, not an interpretation of a Hebrew text but only of the Greek translation.[28] One ought to base the understanding of the translator's exegesis of the Hebrew text on what he intended and disregard the fact that the Greek text in itself creates a potential for different interpretations. Of course, I admit the difficulties with the expression "the intention of the translators", but I prefer to use it in any case. Because it makes the distinction easier between the understanding of the Greek in relation to its *Vorlage* and all other interpretations of the Greek text that are possible if it is looked upon as a document in its own right and not a translation.[29] By the term "intention" I by no means intend to engage in some sort of psycho-linguistic analysis. What one has, in the best case, is the text of the translator.[30]

At the same time, the possibility that the theological outlook of the translator guided his interpretation is of course much greater in places

---

[28] See especially Tov, "Three Dimensions", 529-30, 532, 536, 541, and the discussion in Olofsson, *LXX Version*, 39-40.

[29] See, e.g., Tov, "Three Dimensions", 529-32, 540-44 and the discussion in Olofsson, *LXX Version*, 39-40.

[30] See Boyd-Taylor, "A Place in the Sun", 91 n. 40. See also. H.C. Knuth, who in his investigation of the interpretation of Ps 6 always makes a distinction between the interpretation of the readers of the LXX and the intention of the translator. For example, he remarks concerning the rendering of לַמְנַצֵּחַ by εἰς τὸ τέλος that "Man kann von der Wortbedeutung τέλος aus und ebenso von der Phrase εἰς τὸ τέλος keinerlei Rückschlüsse darauf ziehen, was die Übersetzer mit diesen Wörtern im Sinne hatten oder unbewußt in den Text eintrugen. Das wäre alles Spekulation". Knuth, *Psalm 6*, 388.

where the Hebrew is corrupt or very opaque, even for the modern exegete.[31] When the translator has gone as far as he can with the help of his basic understanding of the Hebrew words he will probably try to make some sense out of the text. In that perspective, one must take into account the cultural and religious milieu in which the psalm was composed and the milieu in which the translator lived in order to suggest theological tendencies and implications.

## 9.3. Analysis of Ps 49:15 in the MT and in the Septuagint

Now I will turn to the passage that is the object of my presentation. The most problematic text in the psalm is v. 15. Kraus's description may stand as an exponent for the opinion of most scholars: "Der Text in 15 ist heillos verderbt. Nur die ersten Worte sind – versuchsweise – rekonstruerbar".[32] Compare with this quotation of A.A. Anderson: "The text of this verse is rather corrupt, especially the second half".[33] With this state of affairs in mind, I will not try to advocate a plausible original text nor a wholesale interpretation of the text in MT, but rather make some suggestions concerning possible interpretations of certain words in MT. My main object is, however, to try to comprehend how the LXX translator understood the Hebrew text.

First, I will present the text of v. 15 in MT:

כַּצֹּאן לִשְׁאוֹל שַׁתּוּ מָוֶת יִרְעֵם וַיִּרְדּוּ בָם יְשָׁרִים לַבֹּקֶר
וְצִירָם (K) וְצוּרָם (Q) לְבַלּוֹת שְׁאוֹל מִזְּבֻל לוֹ:

It is very hard to translate without emendations. A tentative translation, including alternative meanings suggested by modern scholars, could be as follows.

---

[31] In this regard I agree with Schaper. See, e.g., Schaper, *Eschatology,* 136-37. See also Boyd-Taylor, "A Place in the Sun", 73 n. 4, who suggests that "it is best to begin by examining localized perturbations in the translator's method".

[32] Kraus, *Psalmen*, 517. In English, "The text in v. 15 is irreparably corrupt. Only the first words can tentatively be reconstructed".

[33] Anderson, *Psalms* I, 378.

*Like sheep they are appointed to Sheol; Death shall shepherd them.*[34] *The upright shall have dominion over them in the morning, and their form/idol (K) form/rock (Q) shall be consumed in Sheol away from his/its palatial abode.*[35]

My interest in this verse is partly based on the existence of the word צוּר (Q), which *could* be a metaphorical epithet for the God of Israel or a foreign god, even though it is mostly understood as a term for "figure, form". This is a complicated passage, since I am uncertain if צוּר is to be regarded as a divine epithet here and, furthermore, because of the text-critical decision involved, that is, the distinction between K and Q.[36]

   The rendering of this verse in LXX is as a whole in accord with the choice of equivalents in other parts of LXX Psalms, thus the literalistic approach of the translator as well as his standard equivalents are followed.

---

[34] Concerning "appointed" see, e.g., Raabe, *Psalm Structures*, 74. Craigie suggests instead, with reference to Ugaritic, "shipped" (*Psalms 1-50*, 356-57). See also van Selms, "Yammu's Dethronement", 266, who suggests "like sheep they are dragged to the nether-world".

[35] Instead of "shall have dominion over them", Raabe has the translation, "will trample upon them in the morning" (Raabe, *Psalm Structures*, 74). It is based on the use of רדה in Mal 3:21. Raabe regards שְׁאוֹל as subject of the clause and suggests that זְבֻל refers to the palatial abode of שְׁאוֹל, "Their form is for consumption by Sheol from its palatial abode" (*Psalm Structures,* 70, 76-77). This is an interesting suggestion, which presupposes that Sheol is to be understood as a god with a זְבֻל "palatial abode". One may object "no deity Sheol has ever been attested" (Barstad, "SHEOL", col. 1455). However, Raabe argues for a parallel between שְׁאוֹל and מָוֶת here. It is the palatial abode of Sheol/Death. Raabe, *Psalm Structures*, 77. See also the interpretation of de Moor, "New Alphabetic Texts", 187 n. 148 "and their form will be devoured, Sheol will dominate it". Another suggestion worth mentioning is, "so that his habitation does not exist any more". See König, *Historisch-kritisches Lehrgebäude,* §406p. The term of Raabe, "palatial abode" is better than the simple "habitation", since it is not an ordinary "habitation". Raabe, *Psalm Structures,* 77. See Smith, "זבל", 1074. Another rendering is "lofty abode". See Craigie, *Psalms 1-50*, 356. The meaning "princely estate" from Ugaritic is suggested in, e.g., Barr, *Philology,* 326. זְבֻל has also been interpreted as a name of a god. See later on in this chapter.

[36] I refrained from discussing the passage in my thesis, because the commentaries as a rule understood צוּר as "form", rather than "rock". See the comment in Schaper, *Eschatology*, 61 n. 241.

That צוּר has βοήθεια as counterpart is an exception to the literal translation, but, on the other hand, it is in line with the translator's equivalents for metaphorical divine epithets. In this case, it is a so-called alternative rendering.[37]

Most modern translations presuppose certain emendations and are thereby able to give the text an adequate meaning. Thus, for example, *NRSV*: "Like sheep they are appointed for Sheol; Death shall be their shepherd; straight to the grave they descend, and their form shall waste away; Sheol shall be their home" is probably based on the Hebrew text וַיִּרְדּוּ בָם יְשָׁרִים לַבֹּקֶר וְיֵרְדוּ בְמֵישָׁרִים לַקֶּבֶר instead of the text of MT. Furthermore, it evidently suggests מִזְּבֻל, "home, habitation", instead of מִזְּבֻל, and לָמוֹ rather than לוֹ. Other modern translations have different renderings.

*Like sheep they are herded into Sheol, where death will be their shepherd. Straight to the grave they descend, where their form will waste away, Sheol will be their palace* (*NAB*)

*They are penned in Sheol like sheep, Death will lead them to pasture, and those who are honest will rule over them. In the morning all trace of them will be gone, Sheol will be their home* (*NJB*)

*Like sheep they head for Sheol; with death as their shepherd, they go straight down to the grave. Their bodies, stripped of all honour, waste away in Sheol.* (*REB*)

The translation of LXX is as follows

ὡς πρόβατα ἐν ᾅδῃ ἔθεντο, θάνατος ποιμανεῖ αὐτούς·
καὶ κατακυριεύσουσιν αὐτῶν οἱ εὐθεῖς τὸ πρωί,
καὶ ἡ βοήθεια αὐτῶν παλαιωθήσεται ἐν τῷ ᾅδῃ ἐκ τῆς δόξης αὐτῶν. (Rahlfs' text, except ποιμανεῖ from 2110)

*"Like sheep they were placed in Hades; Death shall be their shepherd; and the upright shall have dominion over them at dawn; and help for them will grow old in Hades, away from their glory".*[38]

---

[37] See, e.g., Olofsson, *Rock*, 44-45.
[38] See, e.g., Boyd-Taylor, "A Place in the Sun", 85.

The support for the future, ποιμανεῖ, in 2110 as well as the translation of aspect-tense in LXX Psalms, suggest that ποιμανεῖ, rather than ποιμαίνει, is the Old Greek.[39]

The picture in the text is not that of rich persons who are regarded as sheep ready for slaughter. It is rather the question of the shepherd, who is usually employed as a metaphor of protection and safety, who is now, as in Ps 2:9 and Mic 5:5, used ironically as a metaphor of death. Death, which was the very thing that the shepherd should protect his sheep against, is described as a shepherd. It is not Yahweh who is their shepherd (cf. Ps 23), or their king, but Death.[40] This shepherd does not help them to "lie down in green pastures" (Ps 23:2), but he leads them right down to Sheol. Therefore, irony seems very much to be at play here.[41]

צֹאן "sheep" appears 16 times in the book of Psalms. It is always translated by πρόβατα.[42] The rendering in LXX here is as a whole in accord with the choice of equivalents in other parts of LXX Psalms. כַּצֹּאן is translated by ὡς πρόβατα: thus the collective צֹאן has an equivalent in the plural. The LXX translator recognized that צֹאן is used here as a collective term. שְׁאוֹל is invariably rendered by ᾅδης in LXX Psalms,[43] and it is a consistent equivalent in LXX as a whole.[44]

שַׁתּוּ is derived from שָׁתַת by the Masoretes. שָׁתַת in MT is probably understood as a by-form of שִׁית,[45] but with intransitive meaning "sit down, encamp",[46] or rather, "to be set" or "to be appointed".[47] The translator renders שַׁתּוּ by ἔθεντο (thus also Aquila), that is, he regards it as a form of שִׁית. This means either that the Masoretic tradition of שָׁתַת and שִׁית as two

---

[39] See the argumentation in Pietersma, "P. Bodmer XXIV", 275 and the positive evaluation of this proposal by Schaper, *Eschatology*, 62 n. 245.

[40] See especially the discussion in Casetti, *Leben*, 128-32.

[41] See now Hossfeld, Zenger, *Psalm 1-50*, 306.

[42] 44:12, 23; 49:15; 65:14; 74:1; 77:21; 78:52, 70; 79:13; 80:2; 95:7; 100:3; 107:41; 114:4, 6; 144:13.

[43] See 6:6; 9:18; 16:10; 18:6; 30:4; 31:18; 49:15 (2x), 16; 55:16; 86:13; 88:4; 89:49; 116:3; 139:8; 141:7.

[44] It is sporadically rendered by θάνατος outside the book of Psalms (2 Sam 22:6; Prov 23:14).

[45] The possibility of an intransitive force of שִׁית, שָׁתַת seems to be confirmed by Casetti. See Casetti, *Leben*, 118-19 n. 186-87.

[46] See, e.g., Buhl, *Psalmerne*, 332.

[47] See, e.g., Raabe, *Psalm Structures*, 74.

variants with the same meaning was also known for the translator or that he read שָׁתוּ.[48] The same translation also occurs in Ps 73:9 (שַׁתּוּ, ἔθεντο).[49] θάνατος is a standard equivalent of מָוֶת in LXX Psalms as well as in the rest of the LXX.

רָעָה is always, except in 80:14, translated with ποιμαίνειν in LXX Psalms.[50] In 45 out 47 occurrences, where ποιμαίνειν has a Hebrew *Vorlage* it renders רָעָה. The only exceptions are Pss 2:9 and 48:15.[51]

וַיִּרְדּוּ בָם יְשָׁרִים לַבֹּקֶר is regarded as corrupt by most modern scholars.[52] However, וַיִּרְדּוּ בָם is adequately translated with καὶ κατακυριεύσουσιν αὐτῶν. וַיִּרְדּוּ is a form of רָדָה qal, but it is often emended to וְיֵרְדוּ, that is, it is based on √ירד.[53] This is only a question of pointing. The translator of the Psalter followed in any case the Masoretes and derived the consonantal text of MT from רָדָה.[54] He had an adequate understanding of the meaning of the word רָדָה. According to Raabe, רָדָה has here the meaning "to tread, to trample", with reference to Mal 3:21.[55]

יְשָׁרִים is literally rendered by οἱ εὐθεῖς.[56] εὐθύς with cognates, that is, εὐθύς,[57] εὐθής,[58] εὐθύτης,[59] are the most frequent renderings of √ישר in

---

[48] See, e.g., Kittel, *Psalmen*, 181; Briggs, *Psalms* I, 413.

[49] See, e.g., Buhl, *Psalmerne*, 332.

[50] 23:1; 28:9; 37:3; 49:15; 78:71, 72; 80:2.

[51] 2:9 (רעע), 48:15 (נהג).

[52] See, e.g., Kraus, *Psalmen*, 517; Anderson, *Psalms*, 374, 379.

[53] This emendation is mentioned in *BHS* and followed by, e.g., Thomas, *Revised Psalter*, 18.

[54] רָדָה qal is always translated by κατακυριεύειν in the Psalter, 49:15; 72:8; 110:2. He wrongly derives רֵדֶם from √רדם rather than from √רדה in 68:28. The translator of the Psalter thus did not employ the equivalent used in Genesis, ἄρχειν, Gen 1:26, 28, but a term which renders the synonymous כָּבַשׁ in Gen 1:28 וְכִבְשֻׁהָ וּרְדוּ, καὶ κατακυριεύσατε αὐτῆς καὶ ἄρχετε.

[55] See Raabe, *Psalm Structures,* 74.

[56] In modern translations or commentaries בָם יְשָׁרִים is often emended to בְּמֵישָׁרִים (see, e.g., Thomas, *Revised Psalter*, 18), or בַּמֵּישָׁרִים (*BHS*), or בְּבָרָם (*BHS*).

[57] יָשָׁר 7:11; 11:2; 19:9; 32:11; 33:1; 36:11; 37:14; 49:15; 64:11; 94:15; 97:11; 107:7, 42; 111:1; 112:2, 4; 125:4; 140:14, יֹשֶׁר 25:21, מִישׁוֹר 27:11; 143:10, מֵישָׁרִים 58:2.

[58] יָשָׁר 25:8; 33:4; 92:16; 119:137.

[59] יָשָׁר 11:7; 37:37; 111:8, יֹשֶׁר 119:7, מִישׁוֹר 26:12; 45:7; 67:5, מֵישָׁרִים 9:9; 17:2; 75:3; 96:10; 98:9; 99:4.

LXX as a whole and in the book of Psalms, although κατορθοῦν,[60] and κατεύθυνον,[61] sometimes occur. לַבֹּקֶר has εἰς τὸ πρωί as counterpart in LXX.[62] לַבֹּקֶר is always rendered by different constructions with πρωί in LXX as a whole.[63]

The LXX text seems so far to be a literal translation of a Hebrew text akin to MT without a specific interpretation being pin-pointed. It is in fact as difficult to understand as the Hebrew.

It is very hard, to say the least, to make a reasonable interpretation of וַיִּרְדּוּ בָם יְשָׁרִים לַבֹּקֶר.[64] Ziegler has pointed out that the morning is the "proper time for divine help in the Old Testament" in order to make some sense out of MT.[65] Ziegler's thesis was anticipated by H. Gunkel and F. Notscher. The idea that God helps "in the morning" is "clothed either in the form of a statement of faith or of a prayer of confidence in the Psalms and in Psalm-like songs of the OT".[66] Even so, it is not at all a certain interpretation, since the word "help" only occurs in Ps 46:6 of the Bible passages under consideration.[67] However, the morning can perhaps also be understood as the time for the administration of justice, perhaps implying that the righteous rule over the wicked.[68]

---

[60] 119:128 (יָשַׁר piel).

[61] 5:9 (יָשַׁר hiphil).

[62] לַבֹּקֶר in Ps 49:15 is often emended to, e.g., לַקֶּבֶר "to the grave" (see, e.g., Thomas, *Revised Psalter*, 18) or לִרְקֹב "to rot" (both emendations are mentioned in *BHS*).

[63] (εἰς) τὸ πρωὶ, Pss 30:6; 49:15; 59:17, πρωίας 130:6, (εἰς) τὸ πρωὶ Ex 34:2; 34:25; Deut 16:4; Jer 21:12; Amos 4:4; 5:8; Zeph 3:3; Ezra 3:3; 16:40; 2 Chr 2:3. וְלַבֹּקֶר לַבֹּקֶר in 1 Chr 9:27 is rendered by τὸ πρωὶ πρωὶ. The plural form לַבְּקָרִים is in Psalms rendered by εἰς τὰς πρωίας Pss 73:14; 101:8. In Job 7:18 it is adequately rendered by ἕως τὸ πρωὶ but in Lam. 3:23 has no counterpart in LXX. Isa 33:2 εἰς ἀπώλειαν must be built on a different *Vorlage*.

[64] For different solutions, including emendations, see, e.g., Raabe, *Psalm Structures,* 74-76.

[65] Ziegler, "Die Hilfe Gottes", 282. This concept does not belong in the realm of the philological "meanings". See Delekat, *Asylie,* 9. It is thus not an attempt to interpret the meaning of בֹּקֶר as such, but to explain how it is used in certain contexts.

[66] See Barth, "בקר", 226. Barth is here quoting from Ziegler, "Hilfe", 281.

[67] See Barth, "בקר", 227.

[68] See, e.g., Schaper, *Eschatology*, 60. It is in fact only Jer 21:12 and Ps 101:8 that can be interpreted in this way.

Others suggest that there is a connection between Israel's historical experiences and the help of God "in the morning", e.g. the liberation of Jerusalem in 701 BC (2 Kings 19:35; Isa 37:36), and the miracle at the Red Sea (Ex 14:30).[69] However, the help in fact occurred during the night (בַּלַּיְלָה הַהוּא), before the dawn, and what happens in the morning (בַּבֹּקֶר) is that the Israelites recognize that the Assyrians "were all dead bodies" (2 Kings 19:35 = Isa 37:36). Furthermore, the other passages that were put forward as an argument in favour of the motif of "help in the morning" (1 Sam 11:1-13; 2 Chr 20:1-30; 2 Kings 3:9-20) are unsatisfactory, because 1 Sam 11:9 do not employ the phrase בַּבֹּקֶר but only מָחָר "tomorrow". In 1 Sam 11:9 the rescue comes in the middle of the day:[70] "Tomorrow, by the time the sun is hot, you shall have deliverance" (1 Sam 11:9). 2 Kings 3:20 and 2 Chr 20:20 both use בַּבֹּקֶר "in the morning". It is specified as בַּבֹּקֶר כַּעֲלוֹת הַמִּנְחָה (2 Kings 3:20; 2 Chr 20:20) and as וַיַּשְׁכִּימוּ בַבֹּקֶר (2 Kings 3:22). Furthermore, in Ps 49:15 pictures a different situation, it is the upright, who will rule over or trample on the rich and wealthy, not God who will intervene on behalf of the upright.

An interpretation of the passage based on the expectation of eschatological judgment is not probable in this psalm, and would be without parallel in the Old Testament.[71] A more adequate explanation of MT seems to be that the upright will trample upon the graves of the wicked, with reference to Mal 3:21: "And you shall tread down the wicked, for they will be ashes under the soles of your feet, on the day when I act, says the LORD of hosts.[72] The wicked become corpses and these corpses (in their graves) are trampled upon by the righteous. It is also in line with v. 20 that the wicked "will go to the generation of his fathers, who will never more see the light". On the other hand, the use of

---

[69] This is suggested by Barth, "בקר", 228.

[70] The criticism is based on the discussion in Barth, "בקר", 228.

[71] See, e.g., Schaper, *Eschatology*, 60, with references. Jer 21:12 and Ps 101:8 mentioned by Schaper have no reference whatsoever to an eschatological judgment.

[72] But there is in fact the verb עָסַס and not רָדָה employed. Cf., however, Hossfeld, Zenger, *Psalm 1-50*, 306, who suggests an eschatological interpretation based on the same passage.

רָדָה in the Old Testament rather supports the meaning "rule, dominate",[73] and the supposed meaning "tread, trample" occurs only in one disputed passage, Joel 4:13 "Go in, tread, for the wine press is full". רְדוּ otherwise only appears in MT as the imperative of ירד.[74]

The temporal phrase לַבֹּקֶר "in the morning" may refer to בַּל־יָלִין "do not remain through the night" in v. 13. Since the wicked, that is, the rich, "do not remain through the night", the righteous will triumph over them "in the morning". This would be more in line with the passages that refer to "the morning" as the time of reversal "from suffering to good fortune and vindication".[75] Note that MT explicitly says that the fact that "Mortals cannot abide in their pomp; they are like the animals that perish" refers to those who have foolish confidence, that is, the wicked rich, not to the wise, even though they will also die (v. 11), and that it is these rich who like sheep are appointed for Sheol (v. 15).

One of the most crucial words to interpret in this verse is צִיר (K), צוּר (Q). The meaning of צִיר is probably "idol",[76] but it can also be understood as "form, figure" or "pangs".[77] However, as a matter of fact, the only place, apart from here, where צִיר *IV* in *HALAT* occurs, Isa 45:16, it refers to an "idol". The text reads חָרָשֵׁי צִירִים "the makers of idols". It is not used

---

[73] Gen 1:26, 28; Lev 25:43, 46, 53; 26:17; Num 24:19; Judg 14:9; 1 Kings 5:4, 30; 9:23; Isa 14:2, 6; Ezek 29:15; 34:4; Pss 68:28; 72:8; 110:2; Lam 1:13; Neh 9:28; 2 Chr 8:10.

[74] Gen 42:2; Judg 7:24; 1 Sam 6:21; 15:6; Am 6:2; 2 Chr 20:16.

[75] Raabe, *Psalm Structures,* 75. Raabe mentions a different explanation of MT "they will rule over them, being docile, in the morning", where Sheol and Death is the subject of the plural verb. He, however, does not find it satisfactory. See Raabe, *Psalm Structures,* 75-76.

[76] See, e.g., Baethgen, *Psalmen*, 144. Since צִיר in the sense of "idol" only occurs here (K) and in Isa 45:16 it is not probable that the translator of the LXX knew of a Hebrew word צִיר "idol". צִירִים in Isa 45:16 seems to be translated with νῆσοι "islands" in the LXX, i.e. צִירִים is understood as אִיִּים. חָרָשֵׁי צִירִים was an expression that the translator evidently failed to understand, since the translation ἐγκαινίζεσθε πρός με, νῆσοι is *verbatim* the same as the counterpart of 41:1 הַחֲרִישׁוּ אֵלַי אִיִּים. The words from 41:1 are thus repeated literally in 45:16. See Seeligmann, *Isaiah*, 117. According to Baethgen, *Psalmen*, 144, the equivalents in Aquila, Hieronymus, the *Targum* and Peshitta are based on צִיר "Bild, Götzenbild" = "idol".

[77] See especially Raabe, *Psalm Structures*, 76.

as an ordinary term for "form, figure" in the Old Testament.[78] Even צוּר can be translated "form", if it is derived from צוּרָה "form" (in some lexica = צוּר III), but it can also be interpreted as צוּר "rock".[79]

There are thus two main explanations of צוּר (Q), צִיר (K). One could argue that the Masoretic text reflects an alternation between צוּר "rock", as a metaphorical designation for God or a foreign god, and צִיר "idol". The *Kethiv* form "idol" could also be easily explained as an explication of צוּר as referring to a foreign god. Thus, the textual transmission goes from the old (perhaps original) ironic *Qere* form צוּר, which is easy to misinterpret as denoting God, to the univocal צִיר "idol".[80] It is hard to give a reason for the opposite direction. This understanding is in any case the best background for the equivalents used by Greek translators. The reference of Q צוּר, used as a divine epithet in Casetti, is perhaps to be accepted,[81] but צוּר denotes "the god of the rich", rather than to the "God of Israel", with reference to the ironic use of צוּר for "foreign gods" in Deut 32:30-31.[82] "Their rock" may then be understood as "their god". Furthermore, the use of the suffix in 3rd person plural, that is, צוּרָם, is typical for the mocking of idols.[83]

---

[78] See, e.g., Casetti, *Leben*, 142.

[79] צוּרָה "form, figure" is also extremely uncertain. It only occurs three times in one verse, Ezek 43:11. Whether this is the original text is doubtful in all of the cases. See, e.g., *HALAT*, "צורה", 954, and Zimmerli, *Ezekiel* 2, 410-11, who sticks to MT only on the first occurrence.

[80] See also Casetti, *Leben*, 145. I admit that צוּרָם and צִירָם could be two synonyms for "form", even though it is not very likely.

[81] Casetti, *Leben*, 144-45 n. 239-41.

[82] See Olofsson, *Rock*, 39-40. The foreign god (MT) or gods (LXX) evidently refers to Baal and the local forms of worship related to different epithets of Baal. This is suggested by the use of the imagery of abundance and fertility here. Accordingly, where צוּר occurs denoting a foreign god it refers to Baal.

[83] See especially the use of גִּלּוּל, a derogative word for "idol", with suffixes in second and third plural in Ezekiel. See Preuß, "גלולים", 4. It has even been suggested that צוּרָם refers to riches. See Wutz, *Psalmen,* 125. See also Wutz, *Wege*, 981. He proposed that צוּרָם is identical with צְרֹרָם "ihr Beutel = your purse". Casetti is negative toward this understanding, at least as an interpretation of MT. Casetti, *Leben*, 143. Furthermore, it is admittedly an interpretation without counterpart in the Hebrew Bible.

*How could one have routed a thousand, and two put a myriad to flight, unless their Rock (צוּרָם) had sold them, the LORD had given them up? Indeed their rock (צוּרָם) is not as our Rock (צוּרֵנוּ); our enemies are fools.*[84] (Deut 32:30-31).

The interpretation of Casetti must convey וְצוּרָם as a kind of parenthesis "submissive (are they) in the morning — and their Rock? (He is prepared) to wear down Sheol, from the dwelling place that he has?!"[85] Furthermore, it hardly makes sense in the context.[86] The antecedent of the suffix of צוּרָם is obviously the wicked mentioned in v. 14. In fact, third plural suffixes always refer to the wicked (i.e. the rich) in the psalm, e.g. "their wealth", "their riches", "their graves", "their homes", "their dwelling places", "their own", "their pomp", "their lot", "their shepherd", "their home", "their houses", "their wealth", "their lifetime", "their ancestors". These arrogant rich are godless persons who only trust themselves and their wealth, not in God as the Rock.

The interpretation of צוּר or צִיר in the sense of "figure, form" is probably the best understanding of the text of MT, but it is easier if certain emendations are made.[87] This meaning was, however, not within the reach of the early translators, apart from Aquila. The Greek versions may be a translation of Q, but with two different interpretations, the translation of Aquila, χαρακτήρ, is probably based on צוּר III "form",[88] while the counterparts of LXX βοήθεια, Symmachus κρατερός,[89] and perhaps

---

[84] *NRSV* does not follow MT, but reads אֱוִילִים. The meaning of MT is uncertain.

[85] "Gefügig (sind sie) am Morgen — und ihr Fels? (Er soll bereit sein) die Scheol zu zermürben, von der Wohnung aus, die er hat?!" Casetti, *Leben*, 294. Casetti understands it in a pessimistic way. God should intervene from his lofty abode, but he does not. But see now Hossfeld, Zenger, *Psalm 1-50*, 303, who seems to prefer to read the Qere, contrary to EÜ, "Und ihr Fels (ist da), die Scheol zu verderben von seiner Wohnung bzw. seinem Palast her".

[86] See Raabe, *Psalm Structures*, 77. Casetti's interpretation is based on his understanding that vv. 11-15 forms an original pessimistic psalm. For a similar understanding, see Hossfeld, Zenger, *Psalm 1-50*, 300.

[87] Regarding possible emendations, see Raabe, *Psalm Structures*, 76-77.

[88] It is hardly based on צִיר "idol" as suggested by Baethgen, *Psalmen*, 144.

[89] צוּר is rendered by κραταιός in Pss 18:32, 47 and by κραταίωμα (retranslation from Syriac) in Ps 62:3. See Busto Saiz, *Simaco,* 537. See Olofsson, *Rock*, 130-31.

Quinta ἡ ἰσχύς,[90] are best understood as an epithet of God or a foreign god.[91] צור is also supported by Origenes transcription of the Hebrew text ουσουραμ (= Q וְצוּרָם), Psalterium Romanum and Psalterium Gallicanum *et auxilium eorum*.[92] Consequently, the understanding of צור as a metaphorical epithet of God or a foreign god is in any case an early interpretation of this passage.

The counterpart in LXX, ἡ βοήθεια αὐτῶν, clearly points to the *Qere* form צור in the sense "rock", rather than to ציר ('idol" or "form"), since צור as an epithet of God is as a rule translated by θεός (13x) or βοηθός (4x) in the Psalter. Furthermore, βοήθεια once renders צר, which was read as צור and regarded as a metaphor by the translator, because he did not recognize the meaning "edge (of a sword)", 89:44. He probably understood it as a divine epithet,[93] since βοήθεια is a fairly common equivalent of metaphorical divine epithets in the book of Psalms as well as in other parts of the LXX.[94] θεός is not used in Ps 48 (49):15, probably because it would imply a reference to Yahweh, and furthermore θεός renders אֱלֹהִים in v. 16.[95]

An analysis that is in many respects easier, but linguistically less probable from the point of view of the Greek, moreover less probable with

---

[90] Quinta has as a rule στερεός as equivalent of צור as a divine epithet in the book of Psalms. Consequently, it has at least an equivalent with a similar meaning. See, e.g., Olofsson, *Rock*, 130-31.

[91] See, e.g., Estin, *Psautiers,* 97; Casetti, *Leben*, 144-46. For the renderings of צור as a divine epithet in LXX and in the Greek versions, see Olofsson, *Rock*, 35-42, 128-33 and the table on 155. That Q is the basis for the translation in LXX is also confirmed by Briggs, *Psalms I*, 414; Mozley, *Psalter*, 86; Buhl, *Psalmerne*, 330; Wutz, *Psalmen*, 123, 125; Wutz, *Transkriptionen,* 185.

[92] Casetti, *Leben*, 144.

[93] See Olofsson, *Rock*, 36 n. 8-9. In this case, Boyd-Taylor has no warrant for his proposal that "the translator of the Greek Psalter exhibits no tendency to allegorize this particular item". Boyd-Taylor, "A Place in the Sun", 85 n. 32. He certainly refrained from a literal translation, and he always did it! Therefore, the suggestion that he translates a different *Vorlage* in this case is out of the question. See also Casetti, *Leben*, 144-45 n. 239.

[94] See, e.g., Olofsson, *Rock*, 81-84, 155-56. See also Casetti, *Leben*, 144-45 n. 239-41.

[95] The translator of the Psalter did not use θεός, but *always* chooses an alternative rendering when θεός occurs as a rendering of אֱלֹהִים or אֵל in the close context. See Olofsson, *Rock*, 44-45.

reference to צוּר as an epithet of God or a foreign god in the Hebrew, is that ἡ βοήθεια αὐτῶν should be construed with ἐκ τῆς δόξης αὐτῶν. Thus, "the help that they had from their glory *will grow old",* that is, slowly disappears in Sheol. In that case ἡ βοήθεια ἐκ τῆς δόξης αὐτῶν παλαιωθήσεται ἐν τῷ ᾅδῃ would have been the natural counterpart.

בלה forms a common Semitic root. Outside the Hebrew, one can find it as a noun as well as a verb both in Akkadian and in the later stages of Babylonian and Assyrian, in the sense "to die out (go out of use), to waste away (perish), to be in a condition of non-existence".[96] In the earliest texts in which בָּלָה is found in MT it is employed as a verb as well as an adjective and it has the meaning "something that is ordinarily used daily which has become worn out, fragile, by time and use, and can hardly continue to be used even if it is repaired".[97] The text displays a fairly common theme, the contrast between the power of Yahweh and the transitoriness of his enemies; they wear out (בָּלָה) like a garment, (e.g. Isa 50:9; 51:6; Ps 102:27; Job 13:28).

*It is the Lord GOD who helps me; who will declare me guilty? All of them will wear out like a garment* (כַּבֶּגֶד יִבְלוּ) *the moth will eat them up* (Isa 50:9).

*Lift up your eyes to the heavens, and look at the earth beneath; for the heavens will vanish like smoke, the earth will wear out like a garment* (כַּבֶּגֶד תִּבְלֶה), *and those who live on it will die like gnats; but my salvation will be forever, and my deliverance will never be ended* (Isa 51:6).

*They will perish, but you endure; they will all wear out like a garment* (כַּבֶּגֶד יִבְלוּ). *You change them like clothing, and they pass away* (Ps 102:27).

*One wastes away* (יִבְלֶה) *like a rotten thing, like a garment* (כְּבֶגֶד) *that is moth-eaten* (Job 13:28).

For a similar picture, but without the term בָּלָה, see Isa 51:8:

---

[96] Gamberoni, "בלה", 128.
[97] Gamberoni, "בלה", 128.

*For the moth will eat them up like a garment (כַּבֶּגֶד), and the worm will eat them like wool; but my deliverance will be for ever, and my salvation to all generations.*

For a close parallel in a mythological context, but with the use of בלע piel, see Isa 25:7-8:

*He will swallow up death (בִּלַּע הַמָּוֶת) for ever. Then the Lord GOD will wipe away the tears from all faces, and the disgrace of his people he will take away from all the earth; for the LORD has spoken.*[98]

בָּלָה is also used in laments and wisdom texts to describe the most severe distress of the worshipper or death as the general fate of man, Ps 32:3, Lam 3:4; Sir 14:17.

*While I kept silence, my body wasted away (בָּלוּ) through my groaning all day long.* (Ps 32:3)

*He has made my flesh and my skin waste away (בִּלָּה), and broken my bones* (Lam 3:4).

*All living beings become old (יִבְלֶה) like a garment, for the decree from of old is, "You must die!"* (Sir 14:17).

לְבַלּוֹת has παλαιωθήσεται as counterpart in Ps 49:15. The future passive of παλαιοῦν, παλαιωθήσεται, used by the LXX translator, refers to "decay through lapse of time",[99] and is thus an almost exact equivalent to the Hebrew. It sometimes denotes the dead.[100] בָּלָה in piel is mostly understood in an active sense "to wear something out".[101] It is an

---

[98] Raabe's statement, with reference to Delitzsch, that the destruction of Sheol is a notion never found in the Hebrew Bible is doubtful. Raabe, *Psalm Structures*, 77.

[99] Liddell, Scott, Jones, *Greek-English Lexicon*, "παλαιόω".

[100] See, e.g., οἱ παλαιούμενοι νεκροί. Aristoteles, Metaphysics, 390ᵃ22.

[101] See Wutz, *Wege*, 347, where it is suggested that לְבַלּוֹת is to be understood as לְסַלּוֹת "um aufzuwägen".

uncommon term; it only occurs here in the Psalms, but also in other books.[102]

בָּלָה qal occurs 11 times in MT and it is mostly rendered by παλαιοῦν,[103] and always so in the Psalter, 32:3 (בָּלוּ עֲצָמָי, ἐπαλαιώθη τὰ ὀστᾶ μου) and 102:27 (כַּבֶּגֶד יִבְלוּ, ὡς ἱμάτιον παλαιωθήσονται).[104] The translator may have read qal here, as do many modern scholars.[105] παλαιοῦν is otherwise used for נָבֵל and עָתַק.[106]

According to Tov, the choice of παλαιοῦν for בָּלָה is a reflection of the dependence on the Pentateuch. He refers to Deut 8:4; 29:4.[107] This is perhaps an example of dependence on the Pentateuch, but בָּלָה qal occurs four times in the Pentateuch, Deut 8:4; 18:12; 29:4 (2x), and it is in Deut 8:4 rendered with κατατρίβειν and the same is true for the second occurrence of בָּלָה in Deut 29:4.[108] Furthermore, both παλαιοῦν and κατατρίβειν are good semantic equivalents.

שְׁאוֹל has ἐν τῷ ᾄδῃ as equivalent. Wutz maintains that LXX has בַּשְׁאוֹל as *Vorlage*,[109] but this is far from certain, the preposition בְּ is

---

[102] It is otherwise found in Isa 65:22; Job 21:13 (K); Lam 3:4; 1 Chr 17:9. It is rendered by παλαιοῦν in Isa 65:22; Lam 3:4 and by ταπεινοῦν in 1 Chr 17:9. In Job 21:13 LXX is based on the *Qere* כָּלָה.

[103] Deut 29:4 (the first occurrence); Josh 9:13; Neh 9:21; Isa 50:9; 51:6; Job 13:28; Pss 32:3; 102:27. The only exceptions in MT are Deut 8:4, 29:4 (the second occurrence) with κατατρίβειν and Gen 18:12, where LXX reads בְּלֹתִי. Cf. also Ps 91 (92):11 בַלֹּתִי, καὶ τὸ γῆράς μου which reflects (וּ)בְלֹתִי. See e.g. *BHS*, Mozley, *Psalter*, Muraoka, *Hebrew/Aramaic Index*, 27. In Nah 2:1 בְּלִיַּעַל is rendered by παλαίωσιν, i.e. derived from בָּלָה. See e.g. Muraoka, *Hebrew/Aramaic Index*, 27.

[104] Accordingly, the suggestion by Wutz that LXX reflects יבל√ is unfounded. Wutz, *Transkriptionen*, 185. See also 204. Wutz suggests a different vocalization in LXX, i.e. יְבַלֶּה or יָבוֹל (Wutz, *Psalmen*, 123, 125), or יֻבַל (Wutz, *Transkriptionen*, 185).

[105] See, e.g., Aquila κατατρίψαι and Symmachus παλαιώσει, which reflect the active force of MT.

[106] עָתַק 6:8 and נָבֵל 18:46.

[107] See Tov, "Impact", 586.

[108] (אַחֲרֵי) בְלֹתִי in Gen 18:12 is understood as בִּלְתִּי and thus translated by (οὔπω) μέν μοι.

[109] Wutz, *Transkriptionen*, 185. Wutz, who suggests a totally different text based on LXX and the Targum, does however, not regard this as the original Hebrew text. See Wutz, *Transkriptionen*, 185, 515.

sometimes made explicit, even in a book as literal as the Psalms.[110] The LXX translator probably misunderstands the Hebrew text, but his analysis conforms to the thought in the psalm about power and wealth. See, for example, vv. 7-8, 11-12, 16, 17-18. Boyd-Taylor argues that the translator in effect transforms a teleological image in the Hebrew into a spatial one and thereby gives the fate of the foolish rich a more concrete expression.[111] However, a spatial interpretation of MT is not uncommon.

מִזְּבֻל לוֹ in MT has ἐκ τῆς δόξης αὐτῶν as counterpart.[112] The translator has connected v. 15 with v. 18, where לֹא־יֵרֵד אַחֲרָיו כְּבוֹדוֹ is translated literally by οὐδὲ συγκαταβήσεται αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα αὐτοῦ.[113] ἡ δόξα refers to "the riches", which is clearly the denotation of the parallels in v. 17. All commentators agree that כָּבוֹד in vv. 17-18 in MT denotes the wealth of the rich men,[114] and this is the case in LXX too, but if that is the case why should not δόξα in v. 15 have the same reference? Furthermore, the statement in v. 15, ἐκ τῆς δόξης αὐτῶν, must suggest that they or their god have been separated from the riches, that is, it refers to the different destinies of the riches and the rich. This interpretation is in line with the context.[115] Their wealth is of no use to them in Sheol, since they have to leave it behind. See v. 10, "When we look at the wise, they die; fool and dolt perish together and leave their wealth (חֵילָם, τὸν πλοῦτον αὐτῶν) to others". See also Job 21:21 for a similar thought: "For what do

---

[110] See 9:12 יֹשֵׁב צִיּוֹן translated by τῷ κατοικοῦντι ἐν σιων, 24:8 יְהוָה גִּבּוֹר מִלְחָמָה by κύριος δυνατὸς ἐν πολέμῳ, 65:5 יִשְׁכֹּן חֲצֵרֶיךָ by κατασκηνώσει ἐν ταῖς αὐλαῖς σου, 138:3 תַּרְהִבֵנִי בְנַפְשִׁי עֹז by πολυωρήσεις με ἐν ψυχῇ μου ἐν δυνάμει. 9:12 and 24:8 can also be described as a way of reflecting a construct relationship.

[111] Boyd-Taylor, "A Place in the Sun", 83.

[112] Some scholars vocalize מַזְּבֻל "habitation", i.e. "Sheol is for him/her (the form) habitation". However, it is doubtful if such a word exists. See, e.g., Baethgen, *Psalmen*, 144; Casetti, *Leben*, 149. It is not included in *HALAT* or *KBL*.

[113] Thus, Mozley, *Psalter*, 86. Wutz suggests a different *Vorlage* מִגָּדְלָמוֹ from גָּדֵל "greatness", with negative connotation, "arrogance", as in Isa 9:8; 10:12. Wutz, *Psalmen*, 123, 125; Wutz, *Transkriptionen*, 185. See also Wutz, *Wege*, 347, 981, where he proposed that the *Vorlage* of the rendering in LXX is מִזְּבֵל, from זבל pual, "wertlos, schlaff sein", with reference to Arab. *dbl*. Neither of these interpretations is probable.

[114] It is in fact even rendered by "wealth" in *NRSV*.

[115] See Mozley, who suggests that it is a guess from the end of v. 18. Mozley, *Psalter*, 86.

they care for their household after them, when the number of their months is cut off?".

LXX has, contrary to MT, established a conscious terminological connection between v. 15 and vv. 17-18, since זְבֻל is rendered by ἡ δόξα just as כָּבוֹד. It is probable that δόξα in v. 15 denotes the riches, and thus it is synonymous with the reference of ἡ δόξα in vv. 17-18,[116] where it is clearly stated, "Do not be afraid when some become rich, when the wealth of their houses increases. For *when they die they will carry nothing away; their wealth will not go down after them*".

μὴ φοβοῦ, ὅταν πλουτήσῃ ἄνθρωπος
καὶ ὅταν πληθυνθῇ ἡ δόξα (כָּבוֹד) τοῦ οἴκου αὐτοῦ·
ὅτι οὐκ ἐν τῷ ἀποθνήσκειν αὐτὸν λήμψεται τὰ πάντα,
οὐδὲ συγκαταβήσεται αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα (כָּבוֹד) αὐτοῦ.

זְבֻל, which has the denotations "exalted dwelling (of God), the place of the moon, a temple for Yahweh" in the Hebrew bible,[117] is loosely rendered also in 2 Chr 6:2 by ἅγιος and in Hab 3:11 by τάξις. Only in Isa 63:15, where the translator is firmly guided by the context, an adequate understanding can be found: וּרְאֵה מִזְּבֻל קָדְשֶׁךָ, καὶ ἰδὲ ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ ἁγίου σου.[118]

זְבֻל has been interpreted as referring to "arrogated divinity, the exalted status that the wicked delight to claim for themselves through lavish buildings".[119] This is not far from the interpretation of the word by the LXX translator, but that the translator reflected this meaning by the rendering of זְבֻל by δόξα is partly undermined by the fact the other LXX translators hardly had an adequate understanding of the term, when not guided by the context. Of course, the distinction between riches and

---

[116] This in fact is a common denotation of δόξα in LXX. See Gen 31:1, 16; 1 Kings 3:13; 1 Chr 29:28; 2 Chr 1:11, 12; 17:5; 18:1; 32:27; Esth: 5:11; Pss 45:14; 112:3; Prov 3:16; 8:18; 11:16; Eccl 6:2; Isa 66:12; Hag 2:7.

[117] Holladay, *Lexicon,* "זְבֻל". Note the rendering of זְבֻל in Symmachus, מִזְּבֻל לוֹ, ἀπὸ τῆς οἰκήσεως τῆς ἐντίμου αὐτῶν.

[118] 1 Kings 8:13 have no counterpart in Rahlfs. However, 8:53 reflects 8:13 in MT and there זְבֻל is rendered by ἐκπρεπής.

[119] Gamberoni, "זבל", 31. He refers to passages of a similar kind of arrogance in Ezek 28:1-19, esp. 2-9, 12-13, 18; Am 3:15; 5:11; Mic 2:2, 4; Isa 14:13-15; 22:15-19; Jer 51:53; Ps 73:9.

exalted status based on the wealth of the rich and arrogant divinity is not great in this context, it reflects the attitude prevailing in this psalm. The same is true for the possibility that the rendering in LXX reflects the meanings mentioned in KB: "princedom" (זְבֻל I) or "elevated place" (זְבֻל II).[120] The understanding of זְבֻל and perhaps the use of δόξα in the LXX preclude such an interpretation.

The most common analysis of מִן in מִזְּבֻל לוֹ is "away from" and this is probably the interpretation in the LXX too.[121] The denotation of לוֹ in לוֹ מִזְּבֻל is probably צוּר, while the explicit reference of αὐτῶν is rather ἄφρων καὶ ἄνους "The fool and the stupid" in v. 11, who are implicit in vv. 12-14. Thus, the suffix refers to the rich in the LXX. Either the LXX translator tried to get some sense out of MT or he was reading לְמוֹ.[122] "The fool and the stupid" are persons who are rich but do not realize that they have no help of their riches in Sheol, that is, their riches cannot help them to be delivered from death. The rich is more or less identical with "the godless" in this psalm. This interpretation is also in accord with v. 16 in MT and LXX, where there is a marked contrast between the fate of the godless (reading לְמוֹ) in v. 15 and the righteous psalmist in v. 16.

The rendering of זְבֻל by δόξα is thus a contextual rendering that depends on the translator's lack of knowledge as to the meaning of the Hebrew word. His analysis is based on the fact that he understood the reference of זְבֻל as the same as that of חַיִל and עֹשֶׁר in v. 7, חַיִל in v. 11, יְקָר in v. 13, עָשַׁר hiphil in v. 17 and כָּבוֹד in vv. 17, 18, and that is also true for הַכֹּל in v. 18, which refers to the riches in v. 17. Even though it is a contextual reading, it is not an adequate interpretation of MT, since זְבֻל otherwise always denotes the habitation of God or gods in the Old Testament (1 Kings 8:13; Isa 63:15; Hab 3:11; 2 Chr 6:2). In that case, the LXX version ought to be interpreted "and their help (= god) shall waste away in Hades far away from their glory (= riches)". "Their help" in LXX

---

[120] See also Schaper, *Eschatology*, 61.

[121] See G.V. Smith, who emphasises that, "the word stands in contrast to Sheol, the place of the wicked" (Smith, "זבל", 1074). According to König מִן ought to be understood "sodass nicht vorhanden ist". König, *Historisch-kritisches Lehrgebäude*, §406p. See Lev 26:43; Isa 10:18; 23:1; 62:10; Jer 10:14; 15:19; 33:21; 51:17; Ezek 12:19; 25:9; 32:15; Hos 9:11, 12; Hag 1:10; Zech 7:14; 9:8(Q); Prov 1:33; Job 21:9; 34:30; 1 Chr 4:10. It is in that case identical in meaning with מֵאֵין, e.g., Isa 5:9.

[122] See Briggs, *Psalms I*, 414.

is the god of riches, who is consumed in Sheol or by Sheol. The god of riches who was such a help to them when they were alive, but now when they are separated from their riches the god on whom they trusted is of no help in Sheol. The crux with this explanation is that the help of the rich and foolish men is not otherwise mentioned in the context and that the helper, that is, the god of the rich, is consumed in Sheol has no direct parallel in the Hebrew Old Testament. On the other hand, the contrast between the power of Yahweh and the transitoriness of his opponents is described in other places of the Old Testament with the same terminology.[123]

If צוּר is a divine epithet even in MT, as I have made plausible, and refers to a foreign god, that is, a god opposed to Yahweh, the meaning of the Hebrew would be that "their Rock, (that is, the god whom the rich persons relied on) shall be consumed in Sheol, away from his habitation".[124] Some other proposals concerning the meaning or the reference of זְבֻל would make this proposal even more fitting, for example, "temple", "elevated place", "throne", "lofty abode", "princedom" (that is, his high position).[125] This could be seen as a counterpart to the separation between the rich person and their riches, which is firmly anchored in the context. In fact, the whole section 49:9-17 is a description of the fate of the rich and the separation of the rich from his riches. See especially v. 10, "When we look at the wise, they die; fool and dolt perish together and *leave their wealth to others*"; vv. 12-13, "Mortals *cannot abide in their pomp*, they are like the animals that perish. Such is the fate of the foolhardy, the end of those who are pleased with their lot"; vv. 16-17, "Do not be afraid when some become rich, when the wealth of their houses increases. For *when they die they will carry nothing away; their wealth will not go down after them*" (my italics). Furthermore, this interpretation could be an analogy to זְבֻל which refers to the temple of Yahweh (1 Kings 8:13; 2 Chr 6:2), or to God's heavenly habitation (Isa 63:15) and conforms to the use of זְבֻל as the place of the sun and the moon, in a context where they are regarded as gods opposed to Yahweh (Hab

---

[123] E.g., Isa 50:9; 51:6; Ps 102:27; Job 13:28.

[124] An alternative translation "is for consumption by Sheol".

[125] The basic meaning of זְבֻל is "exalted, high, magnificent". Smith, "זבל", 1074.

3:11).[126] זְבֻל is sometimes used in an ironical way with the denotation "temple", as in rabbinical Hebrew (see Dalman).[127]

An alternative interpretation of the Hebrew text could be mentioned in this connection, an explanation that is in line with the mythological imagery here. The noun זבל stands in Ugaritic texts in apposition before compound terms for various gods and as a genitive epithet of the divine throne. It may also occur as a theophoric element in two personal names, one Phoenician and one Punic. As a stereotyped epithet of the gods and as a designation of their "majesty", זבל signals the honour of the pantheon.[128] On that account, the Old Testament theologians can use it in a derogative sense. In MT, it once occurs in a mythological context, symbolizing the realms of the gods, that is, the sun and moon, in a context where they are enemies of Yahweh (Hab 3:11).[129]

The mythological associations may be further strengthened by the fact that זבל occurs in combination with בַּעַל in Ugaritic texts as *zbl b'l 'rs*, "the sovereign Lord of the earth" or rather "the prince of the underworld".[130] It is the king whom no other can stand above, the one who gives substance to all living creatures. When his return to the earth is announced people begin to dream of oil and honey, the symbols of abundance.[131] I do not suggest that the reference is directly to this epithet, although it makes sense in the context. But since בַּעַל זְבֻל seems to be associated with richness and abundance in the Ugaritic texts, especially in regard to the nature,[132] it cannot be excluded that there is a veiled allusion here to this god.[133]

---

[126] Cf. זבל defined as a "dwelling place of deities or demons". Clines, *Classical Hebrew*, "זְבֻל". זְבֻל not seldom occurs in Qumran texts, e.g. 1QS 10:3; 4Q408 1:5; 1QM 12:1, 1QH 3:34, 4QShirShabb[d] 1.1:41; 4QShirShabb[f] 81:2.

[127] That the meaning "princely estate" from Ugaritic is supported by δόξα in LXX is suggested in Barr, *Philology*, 326, with reference to a suggestion by G.R. Driver. In MT זְבֻל refers to the temple in 1 Kings 8:13 (= 2 Chr 6:2) and to God's heavenly habitation in Isa 63:15.

[128] Gamberoni, "זבל", 30.

[129] Gamberoni, "זבל", 31.

[130] See Dietrich, Loretz, "b'l arṣ", 392. See also Herrmann, "Baal Zebub", 295; Smith, "זבל", 1074.

[131] de Moor, "בעל", 187-88.

[132] de Moor, "בעל", 188.

[133] See especially Bordreuil, "Psaume 49:15", 96-98. This interpretation is not dependent on the understanding of Bordreuil that מ in מִזְּבֻל לֹו refers to the

If זְבֻל is understood as a god here the interpretation of the name is much disputed. Bordreuil suggests "Prince" or perhaps "Sovereign" with reference to the meaning in Ugaritic.[134] The use in Old Testament, where it denotes the temple or the heavenly abode, has a counterpart both in Ugarit and in Qumran.[135] Hence, בַּעַל זְבֻל may allude to זְבֻל as the exalted dwelling of the heavenly Baal. This is perhaps more in line with the date of the psalm, since the chief rival of Yahweh in the Hellenistic period was the heavenly Baal-Shamen.[136] The character and appearance of Baal-Shamen were subject to change "In the beginning he is a sort of high-ranked weathergod … Later on he develops many more solar features".[137] Epithets such as "Lord of the heavens and the earth" and "Lord of the world" were given to him.

It cannot be excluded that the Hebrew contains a veiled reference to בַּעַל זְבֻל, as a god of prosperity or as the prince of the underworld or as the god of heaven. The name Baal and his worship were as a rule looked upon with aversion and Baal was often referred to in pejorative terms in the Old Testament or his name was simply ignored.[138] The meaning of MT would in that case be that "the form (that is, the body) of the rich person shall waste away in Sheol away from his god, "the Prince/Ruler" (of the underworld) or "the Heavenly One".

---

interrogative pronoun "who", i.e. "who is the sovereign of it (=i.e. Sheol). He assumes that it was written defective and therefore misunderstood by the Masoretes as מִן. He refers to a parallel in Ps 12:5 מִי אָדוֹן לָנוּ "who is our master?". His suggestion may have some support from v. 16, where it is emphasised that God has the power to release from Sheol: אַךְ־אֱלֹהִים יִפְדֶּה נַפְשִׁי מִיַּד־שְׁאוֹל "But God will ransom my soul from the power of Sheol".

[134] Bordreuil, "mizzēbul lô", 94-96, 97. See, e.g., Albright, "Zabul Yam", who suggests "prince" or "the elevated one". The reference is taken from Herrmann, "Baal Zebub", col. 295. "Prince" is the most common interpretation. See, e.g., Cooper, "Divine Names", 355, 364 and Knutson, "Divine Names", 499, an interpretation that has been included in *HALAT*. "His Highness" was proposed in de Moor, "New Alphabetic Texts", 188 and "ruler" in Handy, "*mlkm*", 59. However, this suggestion seems in fact only to be based on the verb זבל II in KBL, with the meaning "rule", but with a question mark appended. In fact, זבל II is dropped in *HALAT*!

[135] 1QM 12:1-2; 1QS 10:3; 1QpHab 3:34.

[136] See especially Lewis, "Beelzebul", 639.

[137] Röllig, "Baal-Shamen", 287.

[138] Mulder, "בעל", 193, 196-97, 200.

The two interpretations could be combined; since צוּר in Deuteronomy 32 refers to Baal and this could be case here to. It would be an interesting case of irony here if בַּעַל זְבֻל "Baal the Prince" (זְבֻל I) or "Baal of the elevated place", that is, of heaven, (זְבֻל II), the one who ought to have the power to save the rich from Sheol, is himself consumed by Sheol, far away from "his elevated place, his throne", that is, זְבֻל II. זְבֻל in the psalm then denotes the temple or the throne of Baal and at the same time points to the epithet בַּעַל זְבֻל. This is partly in accordance with the Ugaritic myth, but in the myth Baal is ultimately rescued by his sister Anat. Thus, Baal, contrary to the description in the Ugaritic myth, does not return from the underworld and is not enthroned on Mt Ṣafān.[139] בַּעַל זְבֻל only appears as בַּעַל זְבוּב "Lord of the flies" in the Old Testament,[140] but this seems to be a deliberate distortion of בַּעַל זְבֻל or זְבֻל בַּעַל.[141] This enhances the probability of an ironic use of זְבֻל in this text.

*But* (אַךְ) *God will ransom my soul from the power (lit. hands) of Sheol, for he will receive me* (יִקָּחֵנִי) (49:16 MT)
*But* (πλήν) *God will ransom my soul from the power (lit. hands) of Sheol, when he receives me* (λαμβάνῃ με) (48:16 LXX)

---

[139] See, e.g., de Moor, "בעל",  190. Mot overcomes Baal and Baal has to descend into the underworld, Mot's domain. Baal is thus reported dead, although he later on defeats Mot and is enthroned on Mount Ṣafān. This enthronement was probably celebrated. See, e.g., Healey, "MOT", 1124, 1172; de Moor, "בעל", 190. Several Old Testament passages can perhaps be understood with reference to the epithets and mythology of בַּעַל and מוּת. Healey, "Mot", 1128-31; Mulder, "בעל", 192-99. I admit that the personification may be "purely poetical" and that "any attempt to go beyond the texts and ask whether these texts ultimately go back to mythological descriptions is bound to end up as sheer speculations". Barstad, "SHEOL", col. 1454. Nevertheless, some of the textual emendations and interpretations of this verse by scholars are in fact more speculative. See especially Casetti, *Leben*, 117-52 with footnotes for references.

[140] 2 Kings 1:2-3, 6, 16.

[141] Mulder, "בעל", 194; Maier II, "BAAL-ZEBUB", 554; Dietrich, Loretz, "b'l arṣ", 392; Lewis, "Beelzebul", 639. See also Forster, "Βεεζεβούλ", 605-06 and n. 4 and *HALAT*. For further references, see Herrmann, "Baal Zebub", col. 295.

בַּעַל זְבֻל is probably a god who is part of the cult of the dead, a cult which was strongly forbidden in the law of Moses. Consequently, it cannot be excluded that there is a negative reference to the cult of the dead here. Dietrich, Loretz, "b'l arṣ", 392 and n. 9.

אַךְ has various equivalents in LXX Psalms, but πλήν is the most common rendering. Consequently, it emphasises the contrast between v. 15 and v. 16. At the same time it may be directed against Baal, who himself is consumed by Sheol or in Sheol. It is God who will ransom from the dead. He is the one who has the power over life, not "Baal the Prince" or "the heavenly Baal".

כִּי יִקָּחֵנִי is translated by ὅταν λαμβάνη με. כִּי is thus here, contrary to what one would have expected,[142] understood in its temporal meaning here "when he receives me". לָקַח is as a rule translated by λαμβάνειν in LXX as a whole. However, the meaning of לָקַח in this context is disputed. Casetti without hesitation understands it as a "translation (to heaven)".[143] The equivalent in LXX does not reveal any specific interpretation of לָקַח. If the translator understood it as a "translation" to heaven, he might have employed the *terminus technicus* for this experience, μεθιστάναι, which is used for the translation of Enoch in Gen 5:24:[144]

*Enoch walked with God; then he was no more* (וְאֵינֶנּוּ), *because God took him* (לָקַח אֹתוֹ)
*Enoch pleased God and he was not found* (οὐχ ηὑρίσκετο), *because God took him up* (μετέθηκεν αὐτὸν)

See also the allusion to this verse in Sir 44:16 "Enoch pleased the Lord, and was taken up (μετετέθη), an example of repentance to all generations".

The Hebrew may refer to the redemption from death in this very late psalm. Cf. A.A. Anderson, who writes in his commentary: "Therefore it seems that either the Psalmist believed that he would not see Sheol (or

---

[142] כִּי is seldom interpreted as a temporal conjunction in LXX Psalms, only 16 times, whereof 5 times in Ps 49. See 2:12; 37:24; 49:11, 16, 17 (2x), 19; 58:11; 71:23, 24; 75:3; 102:1; 119:32, 171; 120:7; 127:5. Cf. also ἕως οὗ 142:8. As a rule it is rendered by ὅτι (more than 400x).

[143] Casetti, *Leben*, 222-30. Thus, also, e.g., Dahood, *Psalms 1-50*, 301.

[144] On the other hand, לָקַח is rendered by λαμβάνειν in 2 Kings 2:3, 5, where a similar experience is recorded. Whether v. 16 in MT is to be understood with reference to Gen 5:24 is disputed. See, e.g., Loretz, "Psalm 49", 207 n. 110. For different interpretations of v. 16, see *idem*, 208 n. 111 and Kraus, *Psalmen*, 522-23.

death) at all … or he hoped that, having died, he would be raised to life again to enjoy the fellowship with God".[145] Nevertheless, it is hard to say if it refers to a life with God or a continued life on earth. This is true for the Hebrew as well as the Greek.

The interpretation of the psalm must then be seen in relation to the cultural and religious environment in which it was written and in which the translator lived. That the psalm is one of the latest psalms in the Psalter makes it easier to propose connections with Jewish intertestamental literature. Furthermore, even though it is hard to be specific, the translation of the book of Psalms is, according to many scholars, to be placed in the middle of the second century BC, other scholars suggest the first century BC.[146]

In some circles of Judaism, the rich were looked upon with suspicion; they are more or less regarded as sinners and their wealth created at the expense of the poor and righteous of the people. This is, for example, the case in *1 Enoch* (Ethiopian Enoch). This book is patently difficult to date, but all of the books, except book 2, could in fact be pre-Christian. They may date back to the second century BC.[147] The righteous love God rather than earthly possessions (108:7), they stand opposed to the rich and powerful, who trust in dishonestly won money and property (4:6, 8; 97:8), who exploit their position with injustice and violence (94:6-11; 96:4-8). In the hereafter, when the position will be reversed (94:10; 96:8), the rich will lament, "Our souls are sated with the unrighteous mammon, but this does not prevent us from plunging into the flames of hell" (63:10).[148] Compare 1 Enoch 94:7-8 "those who acquire gold and silver will quickly

---

[145] Anderson, *Psalms*, 379. See also Kraus, *Psalmen*, 522-23.

[146] An early date from the second century BC seems to be favoured in, e.g., Dorival, Harl, Munnich, *Septante,* 111. The second century BC, without being more specific, is also suggested in Munnich, "le groupe *kaige*", 75-89 and the second half of the second century BC in Schaper, "Der Septuaginta-Psalter", 61 and in Schaper, *Eschatology*, 45. The reception history also points to a date in the second century BC. See, e.g., Boyd-Taylor, "A Place in the Sun", 72 and n. 3. A. van der Kooij argues for a date in the first century BC in his article "Origin", 73. However, the reasons for a dating in the first century are not convincing.

[147] See Sparks*, The Apocryphal Old Testament*, 173-77.

[148] Hauck, "μαμωνᾶς", 389. Cf. also the translation in Sparks, *The Apocryphal Old Testament*, 246 "Our souls are sated with possessions gained through iniquity, but they do not prevent our going down into the flames of the torment of Sheol".

be destroyed in the judgement. Woe to you, you rich, for you have trusted in your riches, but from your riches you will depart, for you did not remember the Most High in the days of your riches".[149] The same attitude is easily seen in the NT. Compare Luke 12:15: "And he said to them, Take care! Be on your guard against all kinds of greed; for one's life does not consist in the abundance of possessions."

The idea of the impure, the dishonest and worldly, is sometimes personified and connected with the word מָמוֹן. Consequently, μαμωνᾶς is personified as a rival lord in Luke 16:13 "You cannot serve God and wealth" (μαμωνᾶς). מָמוֹן only occurs in Sir 31 (34):8 in the Old Testament, including the Apocrypha, where it is rendered by χρυσίον, "gold": "Blessed is the rich person who is found blameless, and who does not go after gold (ὀπίσω χρυσίου)".

One can say with confidence that the basic thrust of this late wisdom psalm is in line with attitudes reflected in Jewish intertestamental literature, including the personification of wealth.

---

[149] Sparks, *The Apocryphal Old Testament*, 296-97.

# 10. Law and Lawbreaking in the Septuagint Psalms

## 10.1. Methodological Presuppositions

Since there is much confusion regarding the so-called theological exegesis in the LXX, I will first try to clarify my position. I will make it clear what I am referring to when I discuss theological exegesis, and give a comprehensive description of the methodological background for my presentation.

The first choice one has to make as concerns theological exegesis is to decide if the interpretation concerns the intention of the translator or the translators or if it applies to the fact that the translator is reflecting, without being aware of it, the religious outlook prevalent in his milieu. A second choice concerns if it can be applied to the Greek text per se, without reference to the translator(s). Henceforth I will employ the term "translator", but with that term, I will not exclude the possibility that the translation of the Psalms was a joint enterprise.[1]

I would thus argue that it is important to first pose the question on which level one is discussing theological exegesis. Otherwise, there can be misunderstandings because of confusion of ideas.[2] One way to understand theological exegesis is to define it as the conscious choice made by the translator in order to reflect his religious convictions. The translation is more influenced by the translator's religious outlook than by the philological, or shall I say, semantic interpretation of the Hebrew word in question. This way I prefer to use the term "theological exegesis".

However, I acknowledge it is also possible to understand theological exegesis as a kind of influence that is not intended by the translator, an influence based on the fact that he is born in a certain time and shares the world-view and the religious outlook of that time and that environment.[3] This influence could also be termed theological exegesis. I fully admit that one cannot escape this kind of influence, being both a human being

---

[1] Schaper, *Eschatology*, 33.
[2] See, e.g., the discussion in Tov, "Three Dimensions". See also Flashar, "LXX-Psalter", 90-91.
[3] One could describe this mode of translation as "contextual and socio-linguistic oriented, considerate of the religious climate of the community". Aejmelaeus, "Faith, Hope and Interpretation", 376.

and a translator. With this definition, it is hard to separate the theological exegesis from the linguistic understanding of the translator.

However, one can also take a step further and interpret the Greek text per se without reference to the translator. One can then ask the questions: What possibilities of interpretation have been opened by this translation? Furthermore, how has this translation been interpreted later on in the history of interpretation, based on the different readers' understanding of the text, partly influenced by the theological milieu of the reader / interpreter? And lastly, how has this translation affected the milieu in which it was read? If one chooses s to discuss the *text* of the Psalms as a translation rather than try to comprehend factors involved in the exegesis of the translator, one is able to have a much freer discussion concerning the possibilities to read the Greek text. In that case, it is better in a presentation of theology to employ terms as "match" or "correspond to" rather than "translate" as regards "writing about LXX equivalents to the MT".[4] Therefore, the investigation has not the ambition to represent directly the translator's exegesis of his Hebrew *Vorlage*. This is a cautious approach and no doubt essential for the freedom of discussion, since it opens up the possibility to refer to the exegesis disclosed in the translation, without being bound to qualify it as the translator's exegesis. One is thereby able to choose a presentation with the focus on the *translation* rather than the *translator*. However, this does not make it possible to discuss the equivalents apart from the Hebrew *Vorlage*.

The reason for my choice of definition of theological exegesis, that it primarily refers to the translator's conscious analysis, is that otherwise one should not employ the word "exegesis". Exegesis in general can be interpreted as an intentional act of interpreting; it reflects options that the translator had at his disposal. Then it can hardly be used for an interpretation that is only a reflection of the time and the environment in which the translator lived. I admit that "the intention of the translator" is a cumbersome term. One can of course not probe into the mind of the translator, his mind one cannot ponder, and the method can only be based on the kind of translation that he actually made, that is, his translation technique.[5] Furthermore, I do not intend to suggest that the translator in

---

[4] Ekblad, Jr., *Isaiah's Servant Poems*, 31.

[5] See also the evaluation of E. Tov, that "LXX lexicology must concentrate on the intentions of the translators, mainly by an analysis of the translation technique employed." Tov, "Three Dimensions", 532.

every detail had a consciously adopted plan with principles he would apply in his translation. The translation of the book of Psalms may partly have been literal for the practical reasons that it was easiest way to make a translation and partly as means to reflect the actual wording of the Hebrew *Vorlage*.

The principal angle of approach in my study of theological exegesis is based on the craft of the translator and what he may have intended with his rendering. It is *his exegesis* that I will try to understand. Consequently, the following methodical perspectives, which I will try to delineate, are to be understood in this context. These strictures are thus not at all applicable to an investigation of possible readings of the Greek text or to an investigation of the religious influence exercised by the LXX version as it was read and interpreted repeatedly. This kind of investigation of the reception and reading of the Greek text is of great interest and I have no objections whatsoever to it.[6] Cf. Aejmelaeus who criticizes scholars to read too much into the LXX-text. She emphasises that LXX scholars often gives the Septuagint translation some sort of maximal interpretation, while they give the Hebrew text a minimal interpretation.

> Bei der Bewertung der Leistung der Septuaginta-Übersetzers wird of eine Maximalauslegung vertreten, wobei in den Wortlaut der Septuaginta mehr als notwendig hineingelesen wird … Der Hebräische Text wird dagegen in Minimalauslegung nach seinem ursprünglichsten, fast etymologischen Sinn gelesen, ohne danach zu fragen, welche Konnotationen mit den Worten verbunden wurden, insbesondere in der Zeit der Übersetzung.[7]

Nevertheless, the question posed in my heading is to be understood in the context of the translator's handicraft, much like the situation for a modern translator of the Hebrew Bible.

It has been emphasised in recent years that an exclusive preoccupation with translation technique does not lead to a full understanding of the Septuagint translation and furthermore, that the interpretive dimension of the LXX books is of great interest for comprehending the work of the translator. It is often suggested that the Septuagint should be studied as a

---

[6] See e.g. Aejmelaeus, "Von Sprache zur Theologie", 47-48.
[7] Aejmelaeus, "Von Sprache zur Theologie", 47.

document in its own right, a document that in some respects reflects its own cultural and historical milieu. I fully agree.

However, when one has the ambition to describe the so-called intention of the translator and the kind of influence reflected in the translation from his religious environment and his theology one has to take full account of the complicated factors affecting the work of any translator. Nevertheless, this kind of study is not at all hampered by the investigation of the translation technique. On the contrary, a serious understanding of the translator's theology is *only* possible after an investigation of the translation technique, the competence of the translator and the *Vorlage* of his translation.[8] This is especially important in a literal translation like the book of Psalms. One must seriously try to understand his work as a translator and be very cautious not to indulge into speculations that are contrary to the attitude of the translator. When one discusses Greek equivalents and sentences in the Septuagint, that are not adequate equivalents of the vocalized Hebrew Masoretic text, one must as a prerogative take into account the textual basis of the translation and all the necessary decisions that the translator *had* to make in order to make a translation of the Scriptures at all.

First, none of the two texts that are compared can be taken for granted, one is not per se the actual *Vorlage* of the Greek text, and the other is not in every detail the *Old Greek text*. One cannot just take the Greek text of the Göttingen Septuagint as an unbreakable constant and even less regard the vocalized or unvocalized Masoretic text as the *Vorlage* of the LXX.[9] In this case, the *Vorlage* of the LXX Psalms is in fact close to the Masoretic text, and the deviations are often easy to recognise. As regards the Greek text, the differences do not influence the overall result of the study because of the sheer number of occurrences of most of the Greek terms investigated in this study. Furthermore, with my definition it is hardly adequate to compare the interpretation reflected in the LXX directly with the understanding of the Hebrew term in question in our modern lexica. I simply don't know if the translator had access to

---

[8] See the discussion in Olofsson, *God is my Rock*, 5-9. See also Rösel, *Genesis-Septuaginta*, 21-23 and Boyd-Taylor, "A Place in the Sun", 71-105.

[9] I have not been able to take into account the complicated discussions concerning to which degree the LXX texts are the products of revisionary activity, apart from noting the texts in Job based on Hexaplaric revision, according to the texts of Ziegler and Rahlfs.

any lexicon at all. Furthermore, it is obvious is that he definitely did not have access to the scholarship and exact definitions reflected in the modern lexica, which are the outcome of a development and refinement during more than 2000 years. What one *does* know is that the text of his *Vorlage* was hand-written, and that one has no ability to check the standard of the text or the handwriting, furthermore, one *does* know that this text was not vocalized.

The only possible way to come to terms with these factors is by an investigation of the Greek text. The quality of the translator's grammatical knowledge and his knowledge of Hebrew is a matter of dispute that cannot be settled without an extensive investigation into the equivalents chosen in the LXX text. Some scholars emphasise that the translator was well acquainted with the Hebrew language. Thus, for example, Soffer writes concerning the translator that he seems to have had "a very good knowledge of the Hebrew language".[10] Baethgen is more cautious

> Die grammatischen Kenntnisse des Uebersetzers müssen, wenn man die Schwierigkeiten in Betracht zieht, mit denen er zu kämpfen hat, trotz der hin und wieder hervorgetretenen Verlegenheit und Unsicherheit, recht bedeutende genannt werden.[11]

The opposite opinion is represented by, for example, H.B. Swete who argues that the translator of the Psalter "shew obvious signs of incompetence".[12] One must also take into account, that it is hardly self-evident that he tied the Hebrew consonants read in his *Vorlage* to the same root as the one that is referred to in the lexica employed by the modern exegete. On top of that, one has to consider the possibility that he interpreted the Hebrew terms from his acquaintance with Aramaic, which probably was his mother tongue rather than Hebrew, regardless if he made his translation in Israel or in Egypt. As Flashar says: "er hatte diese Sprache gelernt und beherrschte sie nur als eine Fremde."[13]

These are serious problems. However, some of the Hebrew words under discussion are common words where it is possible to see that the translators in the LXX had an understanding of the words not deviating to

---

[10] Soffer, "Anthropomorphisms", 417.
[11] Baethgen, "Textkritische Wert", 416.
[12] Swete, *Introduction*, 315-16.
[13] Flashar, "LXX-Psalter", 113.

far from the understanding nowadays. In this case, the sheer number of occurrences of most of the Greek words under investigation makes the differences less disturbing. Furthermore, that several uncommon words, which the translator probably did not fully understand, were translated by one and the same Greek word can be used as evidence for his theology.

These are all aspects in the situation of the translator that heavily affect the exact wording and the interpretation in the translation. Furthermore, these aspects are all an integrated part of the translation process. They are indispensable in the translation craft, that is, the translation cannot possibly be carried out, if not the LXX translator had made these decisions.

We often describe translation as part in a kind of communication process. This train of thought can be applied to the translation of the Holy Scriptures as well. Nevertheless, one must concede, that the actual LXX translation of some books in the Hebrew Bible, not to speak of some of its revisions, is made in such a way as to impair the probability that the best available communication of the "message" of the Scriptures was intended. The word-for-word translation made in, for example, the book of Psalms does not suggest that communication was the prime goal of the translator. Perhaps his focus was on the transfer of more or less exact equivalents to every separate word in the Hebrew Psalter, as he understood it. I admit that he took some liberties as regards consistency as a translation technique, both as regards grammatical and lexical equivalents. Nevertheless, his policy in this regard is traceable, at least to a certain extent. It is also possible to see a dependence on the interpretation in the Pentateuch, with the consequence that the equivalent chosen in the book of Psalms sometimes is based on the authority of a previous translation unit rather than the religious train of thought of the translator.

My main point is that the theological interest of the translator, even though the religious environment of course influenced his translation, is far from being the first solution to suggest when one encounters differences in interpretation between the LXX and a modern translation or a modern lexicon. The translation can hardly be adequately interpreted without first making the hazardous work on discussing the obligatory variables of the translation craft. The discussion of the theological exegesis would also be much easier if one had more knowledge of the translator's personality: his education, religious background, his upbringing, his training, or if one knew at least where he made his

translation and when. What one *does* have, however, is something at least close to the actual translation that left the hands of the translator.

Therefore, it is important to distinguish between the semantic meaning of the Hebrew text according to a modern understanding, the theology of the translator, and the different interpretations that are possible if one takes the equivalents chosen in the translation as the point of departure. This is not least the case in a methodological discussion of the translator's theology reflected in the Septuagint version of the book of Psalms. Some Hebrew words in context are more open than others to be understood in terms of the translator's own theological outlook. Therefore, terms that the translator himself would admit that he does not understand can more easily be coloured by his outlook. Furthermore, the use of certain Greek words may facilitate that the readers of the translation understood them in terms of their own theological bias.[14]

Now let us turn to the translation technique disclosed in the book of Psalms. The translation has in general a tendency to make stereotype renderings that tend to emphasise one particular aspect of the Hebrew word, often they reflect the most dominant meaning of the Hebrew terms.[15] Therefore, the different nuances of the Hebrew words are seldom reflected accurately.[16] These stereotype renderings are sometimes taken over from the translation of the Pentateuch, but a certain liberty that may reflect theological predilections are probably to be seen. The main technique is the mechanical translation of stereotypes, but within this dominant technique, the context as well as favourite themes in the theological world of the translator has affected the rendering.

It is possible to discuss the theology of the translator as reflected in the ordinary choice of equivalents in the book he translated, but it must be done with great caution.[17]

---

[14] It is easy to see that my methodological procedure has a similar approch as the valuable systematic description of method in Austermann, *Nomos*, 32-40.

[15] See, e.g., Flashar, "LXX-Psalter".

[16] This use of the Greek word as a "symbol" of a Hebrew counterpart is described as the second dimension of a word in LXX. See Tov, "Three Dimensions", 532-40.

[17] The reluctance to posit a theological motivation for the ordinary choice of equivalents in LXX is based on the generally accepted criticism of the methods applied in *ThWNT*. See especially Tov, "Die Septuaginta", 237-50. See also Hanhart, *Jüdische Tradition*, 288-89; Hanhart, "Earlier Tradition", 341-45.

Consequently, it is mainly in deviations from the ordinary equivalents of the translator and in relation to other books in the LXX, that one is able to come to grips with the attitude of the translator. Usage by later interpreters of the LXX text can be to a certain help too, especially since it may reveal possibilities of understanding the text, utilising the semantic possibilities of the Greek words and interpret them in relation to their own thought world. It is, however, important not to take for granted that this reflects the analysis of the actual translator or translators of the Psalter.

Flashar has an interesting discussion concerning theological aspects of the LXX Psalms. This applies not least to the preference for the law and for using terms that define words for sin and sinners as people who break the law. His main arguments rest on statistics, which show that words related to the law are used for a large number of Hebrew terms that hardly have specific associations to the law. As a result, νόμος with cognates are used as favourite words by the translator and therefore his theological world, where the law of Moses stands in the centre, seems to have influenced his choice of vocabulary. The translator in his translation obviously preferred to define sin as breaking of the law, even in cases where that understanding is not especially emphasised in the Hebrew word he translated. Flashar proposes that the choice of equivalents is based on a theological predilection that reflects a tendency towards the divine law as the focus of the religion, a tendency that may correspond to a dominant theological trend in the milieu of the translator.[18]

It is an absolute requirement that theological tendencies must be supported by empirical material based on statistics regarding the choice of equivalents. Furthermore, it is not uncommon that Hebrew words are understood differently from what is the case in a modern lexicon and Flashar takes into consideration the translator's knowledge of Hebrew and his linguistic understanding of the Hebrew terms in context.

---

[18] This is an interesting suggestion, which also has been taken up by and taken as a fact by Sailhamer. Sailhamer, *Ps 3-41*, 222-23. For a more general discussion, see Prijs, *Jüdische Tradition*, 62-67. Regarding the understanding of the central place of the law in post-exilic Judaism, see, e.g., Gutbrod, Kleinknecht, "νόμος", 1047-54. Austermann seems to be stricter than I have been in the application of theological exegesis, since he on the one hand, argues for a "theologische Hochschätzung" of the Torah in LXX Psalms, which is congruent with theological trends in the milieu of the translator, but not "eine religiös motivierte eigenwillige Nomisierung des Psalters". Austermann, *Nomos*, 179.

It is easier to detect a theological tendency in one book in relation to other books of the LXX than to focus only on the book of Psalms. This is especially the case if the choice of equivalents deviates significantly from the interpretation of the same words used in the same meaning in other parts of the LXX.[19] As a result, one should not discuss theological tendencies in a certain LXX book separately; in any case, it strengthens the argument if the book in question has a pattern that significantly deviates from the most common equivalents in LXX as a whole. The study ought to include an investigation concerning the relation between the meaning of the Hebrew equivalents to words relating to νόμος in LXX Psalms. To look upon it from the point of view of the Greek is only one side of the investigation. It is also of importance to detect it from the viewpoint of the Hebrew in order to see the distribution between the Hebrew words in different books, to separate between different meanings of these words. For detecting theological exegesis it is essential that the Greek equivalents do not only reflect the specific lexical meaning of the Hebrew word in context or that the Hebrew term in question seldom appears in the book and thus the use of term may be at random. This makes it easier to understand if the comparison really reflects differences in theological outlook.

This kind of methodological questions is not really reflected in Flashar's study, even though he discusses the important problem that the Greek terms in question render many different Hebrew equivalents whose semantic meanings are not captured exactly. Furthermore, another important methodological presupposition is that when using statistics concerning the use of words related to the law, not least νόμος with cognates, is that the statistics are complete. The main point is: "Do all equivalents in the Psalter point in the same direction, and can deviations from the established pattern be easily explained"?

## 10.2. The Approach of the Study

After these methodical preliminaries, I will shortly present the question posed in the title. The point of departure is the discussion concerning the so-called νόμος-theology in LXX Psalms especially by Martin Flashar. The translator of the book of Psalms, according to Flashar, choose to define sin as breaking of the law, even in cases where that understanding

---

[19] The same train of thought is also applicable to different forms of translation techniques. See the methodological discussion in chap. 3.

is not especially emphasised in the Hebrew word he translated. However, is this to be understood as the translator's linguistic understanding of these terms or ought it to reflect a theological outlook?

My study is of course not a repetition of Flashar's investigation. To deepen the understanding the study does not investigate the LXX Psalms separately, but also tries to see if the translation has equivalents that significantly deviate from the most common equivalents in LXX as a whole. Some Greek words that do not occur in Flashar's investigation are also included in order to make the statistics complete. Furthermore, the Hebrew equivalents of νόμος and words relating to νόμος in LXX Psalms and in LXX as a whole are studied.

## 10.3. Translation Technique from the Viewpoint of the Greek

First, I will follow in the footsteps of Flashar and make a study of my own concerning the Hebrew equivalents for Greek terms relating to "lawlessness", "breaking of the law" and the like in LXX Psalms. The investigation is based on Rahlfs' text, which was not yet produced when Flashar wrote his article, but Flashar also takes into consideration the text-critical questions regarding the Greek text so there are no obvious differences.

The following Greek terms related to the law were discussed by Flashar, νόμος, ἀνομία, ἄνομος, παράνομος, παρανομεῖν and νομοθετεῖν. The statistics of Flashar can be completed with other terms that relate to the law and occur in the Psalter, παρανομία "lawlessness", ἀνόμημα "lawlessness, wickedness", νομοθέτης "lawgiver", νόμιμος "what is right and fair, ordinance, statute, commandment of the law". Some other terms that cannot be found in LXX Psalms are taken up for the sake of comparison, νομίμως "lawfully", νομοθεσία "giving of the law", νομοφύλαξ "observer of the law", νομοθέσμως "according to the law", νομικός "according to the law", ἔννομος "he who remains within the law, according to the law", παρανόμως "unlawfully, wickedly".[20]

The meaning of the Greek terms in the eyes of the translator is a complicated issue. Flashar understands ἀνομία, as well as the other terms

---

[20] Austermann has made an examination of nearly all of the terms discussed here, but it was not available to me when I wrote the original article. Austermann, *Nomos*, 174-203. In this revised version I have discussed the outcome of Austermann's study.

under discussion, with reference to the Mosaic law.[21] This is open to discussion, since, for example, ἀνομία can also be understood as "wrong-doing": "In general there is no direct connection with the law, at any rate not to any fundamentally greater degree than is true of the Old Testament concept of sin generally, which is of course, oriented to the commandment of God."[22] This applies also more or less to most of the other cognates of νόμος, ἄνομος, παράνομος, παρανομεῖν, παρανομία, ἀνόμημα, νομοθετεῖν, νόμιμος, νομοθεσία, νομικός.[23] On the other hand, the basic assumption of Flashar probably applies to the general understanding in a Jewish religious context at the time of the translation.[24]

Flashar emphasises that several Hebrew terms are translated by ἀνομία "lawlessness" in the LXX Psalms. In fact, the most common word for "sin" in the book of Psalms, apart from ἀδικία, is ἀνομία, not ἀσέβεια or ἁμαρτία. ἀνομία is hardly an adequate reflection of the meaning of most of the Hebrew terms in question.[25] This is evident when one takes a closer look at these terms: אָוֶן "iniquity, lie, nothingness",[26] עָוֶל "injustice",[27] עַוְלָה "iniquity" or "perversity, wickedness",[28] עָוֹן "missing of the target, sin",[29] זִמָּה "wickedness, lewdness",[30] חָמָס "violence, wrong, bloodshed, unrighteousness, wickedness",[31] רֶשַׁע "wrong, wickedness",[32] פֶּשַׁע "transgression" or "offences, rebellion, crime(s), legal offence,

---

[21] See Flashar, "LXX-Psalter", 169-74.

[22] Gutbrod, Kleinknecht, "νόμος", 1085.

[23] See, e.g., Gutbrod, Kleinknecht, "νόμος", 1086-91. See also Austermann, who speaks about e.g. ἀνομία as an example of equivalents "mit relativ hohen semantischen Allgemeinheitsgrad". Austermann, *Nomos*, 203 and *passim*.

[24] The translation has been dated from 150 to 50 BC. I would prefer a date in the second century BC. Olofsson, "Death shall be their Shepherd", 103 n. 123.

[25] See Flashar, "LXX-Psalter", 169-74.

[26] 5:6; 6:9; 14:4; 36:4, 5, 13; 41:7; 53:5; 55:4, 11; 59:3, 6; 64:3; 92:8, 10; 94:4, 16; 23; 101:8; 119:133; 125:5; 141:4, 9.

[27] 53:2.

[28] 37:1; 58:3; 64:7; 89:23; 107:42; 119:3; 125:3.

[29] 18:24; 32:5 (2x); 36:3; 38:5, 19; 39:12; 40:13; 49:6; 51:4, 7, 11; 59:5; 65:4; 69:28 (2x); 79:8; 85:3; 90:8; 103:3, 10; 106:43; 107:17; 109:14; 129:3 (MT Q לַעֲוֺנוֹתָם LXX לְמַעֲנוֹתָם K לְמַעֲנִיתָם (?); 130:3, 8.

[30] 26:10 and 119:150.

[31] 55:10; 74:20.

[32] 5:5; 45:8.

personal offence, guilt, wrong(s), property offence, penalty",[33] הַוָּה "disaster, destruction",[34] עֹצֶב "hardship, pain, distress" and "idol",[35] עָתָק "old, hard, stubborn, arrogant, insolent",[36] שֶׁקֶר "deception, falsehood, pretence, deceit, fraud",[37] בַּלָּהָה "terror, dreadful event, calamity, destruction",[38] and finally בְּלִיַּעַל "worthlessness, nothingness, worthless, wickedness".[39] Flashar admits that sometimes the translator hardly had an adequate understanding of the meaning of the Hebrew terms in context, but that only makes the choice of ἀνομία even more telling. ἀνομία is thus to be regarded as a favourite word in the Psalter and favourite words often reflects the theology of the translator.[40] To use ἀνομία for several unrelated Hebrew terms must also be seen as a deviation from lexical consistency, which is very common translation technique in the LXX Psalms.

I will look more closely at the equivalents of ἀνομία, which is perhaps the most illuminating example of theological exegesis. In order to give a picture of the use of ἀνομία in context in the LXX Psalms I have included an appendix. The appendix is based on the Flashar's interpretation of ἀνομία in LXX Psalms, thus with reference to the law and in the meaning, "against the law", rather than "without the law or a law".[41] This is translated by different forms of the term "lawless" to highlight the differences between the Hebrew and the Greek.

ἀνομία is an extremely frequent term in LXX as a whole, with 224 occurrences. It is very common in certain LXX books. It appears 80 times in the book of Psalms, 49 in Ezekiel, 24 in Isaiah and 10 times in Job. On the other hand, it seldom occurs in the Pentateuch and in the Apocrypha.

---

[33] 32:1, 5; 39:9; 51:5; 59:4; 89:33; 103:12; 107:17.

[34] 57:2; 94:20.

[35] 139:24.

[36] 31:19.

[37] 7:15.

[38] 73:19.

[39] 18:5. These equivalents are also mentioned in e.g. Flashar, "LXX-Psalter", 169.

[40] The term is used for Greek words that render several different Hebrew equivalents whose semantic meanings are not captured. Sollamo has another definition. She employs "favourite renderings" for Greek terms that are one of the main equivalents of a certain Hebrew word. It must be a term that covers at least 50% of the occurrences of the Hebrew word. Sollamo, *Semiprepositions*, 13.

[41] See Gutbrod, Kleinknecht, "νόμος", 1085, and Flashar, "LXX-Psalter", 169, 172-73.

ἀνομία also has various Hebrew equivalents outside the book of Psalms, equivalents that do not always fit the meaning of ἀνομία, not seldom the same terms as used in the book of Psalms, for example, Isaiah has עָוֹן, פֶּשַׁע, אָוֶן, חָמָס, שֶׁקֶר, Ezekiel עָוֶל, עָוֹן, זִמָּה, חָמָס, רֶשַׁע and Job has עָוֹן, פֶּשַׁע, אָוֶן.[42] Sometimes similar terms are employed, for example, רִשְׁעָה "guilt, wickedness" in Isaiah and Ezekiel, instead of רֶשַׁע in the Psalms. In consequence, the equivalents of ἀνομία may point to an inclination to use terms for lawlessness in other books as well as in the book of Psalms. However, no other book can be compared with the book of Psalms as regards the extent of this counterpart. On the other hand, in order to paint a more adequate picture one must also investigate the Hebrew equivalents of all the Greek terms in question.

ἄνομος can be found 4 times in the book of Psalms rendering different Hebrew equivalents in every case, פֶּשַׁע "a revolting man, a sinner", הֹלֵל "a mad person" or "an arrogant, boastful person", רֶשַׁע, and once it occurs without Hebrew equivalent.[43] This equivalent is used regularly in other parts of the LXX. ἄνομος occurs as much as 102 times in LXX as whole, according to the text of Rahlfs,[44] although it does not appear in the Pentateuch. ἄνομος is very common in the Apocrypha, and Pseudepigrapha, 27 times, not least 1 Macc (9x),[45] 3 Macc (4x),[46] Odes of Solomon (2x),[47] Wisdom (3x),[48] Sirach (6x),[49] the Psalms of Solomon (2x),[50] but also in the canonical Writings in strict sense. Thus, it frequently

---

[42] Since the LXX of Ezekiel evidently includes two or three translation units, either with two different translators or different revisions, the use of ἀνομία cannot be properly evaluated without considering the textual history. See, e.g., McGregor, *Ezekiel*, 5-19, 193-99.

[43] 51:15 פֶּשַׁע, 73:3 הֹלֵל, 104:35 רֶשַׁע. It is probably not correct that it renders אָוֶן in 64:3 as presupposed by Flashar. The text of Rahlfs has ἀνομία. It occurs without Hebrew equivalent in 37:28.

[44] It occurs 107-108 times according to Hatch, Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint*, "ἄνομος".

[45] 1 Macc 2:44; 3:5, 6; 7:5; 9:23, 58, 69; 11:25; 14:14.

[46] 3 Macc 1:27; 6:4, 9, 12.

[47] Odes 4:13; 7:32.

[48] Wis 4:6; 15:17; 17:2.

[49] Sir 16:4; 21:9; 34:18; 39:24; 40:10; 49:3.

[50] Pss. Sol. 17:11, 18.

appears in Prov (8x),[51] Job (10x),[52] Isaiah (20x),[53] Ezekiel (15x).[54] Sporadically it can be found in other books.[55] The same Hebrew equivalents that are used in the Psalter are often employed in other LXX books, for example, פֶּשַׁע, עָוֹן.[56] One of them is in fact the dominant hyponym in LXX, רָשָׁע.[57] There may be a chronological component in the choice of vocabulary here, since ἄνομος mostly occurs in the prophets, wisdom literature and in the Apocrypha. The books of the prophets are probably translated later than the Pentateuch, the wisdom books later than the Prophets, and the Apocryphal books are of course translated even after that.

παράνομος "lawless, wrongdoer" occurs 8 times in LXX Psalms.[58] It has 6 Hebrew hyponyms, בְּלִיַּעַל, הֹלֵל, זֵד, סַעֵף, פֶּשַׁע, פָּשַׁע qal participle.[59] παράνομος is common in other parts of the LXX. It can be found 70x in LXX as a whole, thereof 46 times in the canonical Writings,[60] and 24

---

[51] Prov 1:19; 10:2; 12:3; 14:16; 21:18; 27:21; 28:10; 29:27.

[52] Job 5:22; 11:11, 14; 12:5; 19:29; 27:4; 34:8, 17, 22; 35:14.

[53] Isa 1:4, 25, 28, 31; 3:11; 9:14, 16; 10:6; 13:11; 29:20; 31:6; 32:6, 7; 33:14; 48:8; 53:12; 55:7; 57:3, 4; 66:3.

[54] Ezek 3:18 (3x), 19 (2x); 5:6; 7:11; 13:22; 18:20, 21, 23, 24, 27; 21:8, 9, 30, 34; 33:8.

[55] 1 Sam 24:14; 1 Kings 8:32; 2 Chr 6:23; 24:7; Esth 14:15; Mic 6:10 (2x), 11; Hab 3:13; Mal 3:15, 18, 19, 21; Dan (LXX) 3:32; 13:35; Dan (Th) 12:10 (2x).

[56] פשע Isa 48:8; 53:12, עָוֹן Job 19:29.

[57] 1 Sam 24:14; 1 Kings 8:32; 2 Chr 16:23; Prov 21:18; 29:27; Mic 6:10; Hab 3:15; Mal 3:18; Isa 3:11; Ezek 3:18 (3x), 19; 13:22, 20, 21, 23, 24, 27; 21:8, 9, 30, 34; 33:8.

[58] 5:6; 36:2; 37:38; 41:9; 86:14; 101:3; 119:85, 113.

[59] בְּלִיַּעַל 41:9; 101:3, הֹלֵל 5:6, זֵד 86:14; 119:85, סַעֵף 119:113, פֶּשַׁע 36:2, פָּשַׁע qal participle 37:38. Muraoka suggests a different vocalization of the *Vorlage* in 36:2, i.e. פָּשַׁע qal. Muraoka, *Hebrew/Aramaic Index*, 122. פֶּשַׁע is otherwise not rendered by terms which refers to persons in LXX Psalms.

[60] Deut 13:14; Judg 19:22; 2 Sam 16:7; 20:1; 23:5; 1 Kings 21:10, 13; 2 Chr 13:7; Pss 5:6; 36:2; 37:38; 41:9; 86:14; 101:3; 119:85, 113; Prov 1:18; 2:22; 3:32; 4:14, 17; 6:12; 10:5; 11:6, 30; 12:2; 13:2; 14:9; 16:29; 17:4; 19:11; 21:24; 22:12, 14; 23:28; 25:19; 26:3; 28:17; 29:4, 12, 18; Job 17:8; 20:5; 27:7; Dan 13:28, 32.

times in the Apocrypha.[61] In this case, the word appears in the Pentateuch, although only once.[62] It is used most frequently in wisdom literature and in the Apocrypha. The choice of παράνομος as a rendering of בְּלִיַּעַל, clearly matches the employment in the Pentateuch and the Deuteronomistic history.[63] But הָלַל, סֵעֵף and זֵד are otherwise never rendered by παράνομος and √פשע only once.[64] It is not possible to evaluate the translation of זֵד with παράνομος since זֵד mostly,[65] and סֵעֵף only, occur in the book of Psalms in MT as a whole.[66] סֵעֵף "divided" here occurs in plural and probably denotes "double-minded persons" (*NRSV*). Hence even in cases where the meaning of the Hebrew did not justify παράνομος and other translators did not employ it, the translator of the book of Psalms used it, and thus obviously preferred to relate them to a term for "lawless".

παρανομεῖν "to act contrary to the law" occurs 5 times in the book of Psalms,[67] relating to four different Hebrew counterparts, עָלַם niphal "to be hidden", הָלַל qal "to be mad, to boast", מְעֻוָּל "act wrongly", לִיץ hiphil "mock, ridicule".[68] παρανομεῖν appears 11 times in the LXX. It most frequently occurs in the book of Psalms and in the 4 Maccabees.[69] It has of course no hyponyms in 4 Maccabees, but in Job 34:18 it is a translation of בְּלִיַּעַל. Even though it is hard to compare these books, at least one Hebrew

---

[61] 1 Macc 1:11, 34; 10:61; 11:21; 2 Macc 4:11, 14; 6:21; 8:4; 13:7; 3 Macc 2:17; 5:27; 4 Macc 9:4; Wis 3:16; Pss Sol. 4:9, 11, 19, 23; 12:0, 1 (2x), 3, 4; 14:6; 17:24.

[62] Deut 13:14.

[63] Deut 13:14; Judg 19:22; 20:13 (B); 2 Sam 16:7; 20:1; 23:6; 1 Kings 21:10, 13; 2 Chr 13:7.

[64] Prov 19:11.

[65] Pss 19:14; 86:14; 119:21, 51, 69, 78, 85, 122. It also appears in Isa 13:11; Jer 43:2; Mal 3:15, 19; Prov 21:24.

[66] 119:113.

[67] 26:4; 71:4; 75:5 (2x); 119:51. παρανομεῖν is often used in the sense "to transgress a law or established ordinance", but has also the more general meaning "offend". See, e.g., Gutbrod, Kleinknecht, "νόμος", 1091.

[68] עָלַם niphal 26:4, הָלַל qal 75:5 (2x), מְעֻוָּל 71:4, לִיץ hiphil 119:51. The *Vorlage* of Ps 26:4 is, however, contested in Muraoka, *Hebrew/Aramaic Index*, 111. See also the suggestion of a different *Vorlage* מְעוּלִים, based on Ps 71:4.

[69] 4 Macc 5:17, 20, 27; 8:14; Pss 26:4; 71:4; 75:5 (2x); 119:51. It can also be found in Job 34:18 and in Pss. Sol. 16:8.

counterpart that is employed for a cognate Greek word can be found outside the Psalter.

νομοθετεῖν "to receive the law" appears 11x in LXX as a whole. It mostly occurs in the Psalter (7x) and only twice in the Pentateuch.[70] In the book of Psalms νομοθετεῖν translated ירה hiphil "to teach".[71] Otherwise, νομοθετεῖν only occurs once in 2 and 4 Maccabees.[72]

Flashar has made an interesting case for the influence of the translator's theology as regards his understanding of the law. He is right that the choice of Greek equivalents that relate to the law often is striking, and a philological explanation is hardly relevant. On the other hand, the Greek equivalents under discussion can only partly be used in order to describe the book of Psalms as deviating from the usual understanding in the LXX. Rather the interpretation that different forms of sin refer to the breaking of the law seems to be common throughout the LXX. Hence, when one sees it from the point of view of the Greek the Hebrew counterparts to many terms for law breaking have a semantic meaning deviating from the meaning of the Hebrew words in context. The LXX translators repeatedly understood sin with reference to the laws and regulations in general and especially the law of Moses. This is especially manifest in the book of Psalms, but this understanding can quite often also be found in other parts of the LXX.

Flashar based his investigation only on terms, which occur in the Psalter, but he could perhaps have included some more terms that can be found in the Psalter, that is, παρανομία, ἀνόμημα and νομοθέτης. The other terms, νόμιμος, νομίμως, νομοθεσία, νομοφύλαξ, νομοθέσμως, νομικός, παρανόμως, ἔννομος, ἐννόμως are incorporated for the sake of comparison. Why did the LXX translator not choose to employ these terms?

---

[70] Pss 25:8, 12; 27:11; 84:7; 119:33, 102, 104; Ex 24:12; Deut 17:10. The occurrence in 119:104 is within parenthesis in Rahlfs' text and has no counterpart in the Hebrew.

[71] 25:8, 12; 27:11; 119:33, 102.

[72] 2 Macc 3:15, 4 Macc 5:25.

παρανομία "lawlessness, wrongdoing" appears only once in the book of Psalms, Ps 37:7 rendering מְזִמָּה, otherwise it occurs only in Proverbs, in 4 Maccabees, and in the Psalms of Solomon.[73] Thus, there are no common hyponyms here.

ἀνόμημα "lawlessness, wickedness" occurs 15 times in LXX as whole. It appears once in the Psalter rendering פֶּשַׁע "transgression".[74] Otherwise, it has several Hebrew equivalents. Neither of them occurs more than three times. ἀνόμημα has the equivalents עָוֹן, זִמָּה, בְּלִיַּעַל, נְבָלָה "outrage", חַטָּאת, תּוֹעֵבָה "abomination", תִּפְלָה "folly", פֶּשַׁע.[75]

νομοθέτης appears in Ps 9:21 rendering מוֹרָה "fear", probably reflecting the vocalization מוֹרֶה "teacher", and in 84:7 translating מוֹרֶה "the early rain".[76] νομοθέτης does not occur otherwise in the LXX.[77]

νομίμως, as well as νομοθεσία, νομοφύλαξ and ἔννομος can only be found in the Apocrypha.[78] ἐννόμως occurs once in the preface to Sirach

---

[73] עָוֹן Prov 5:22, עָצֵל 10:26, 4 Macc 2:11; 4:19: 5:13; 9:3, and Pss. Sol 4:1, 12; 8:9; 17:20. The passage from 2 Maccabees 3:4 noted in Hatch, Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint* "παρανομία" is not included the text of Rahlfs.

[74] 51:3.

[75] עָוֹן Lev 17:16; Lam 5:7; Ezek 16:49, זִמָּה Lev 20:14, בְּלִיַּעַל Deut 15:9, נְבָלָה Josh 7:15, חַטָּאת Josh 24:19, פֶּשַׁע 1 Sam 25:28; Ezek 39:24, תִּפְלָה Jer 23:13, תּוֹעֵבָה Ezek 16:50. ἀνόμημα also appears in Wis 1:9; 3:14; 4:20.

[76] Ps 84:7 is, according to Flashar, an adequate rendering of the Hebrew. Flashar, "LXX-Psalter", 169. But מוֹרֶה ought to be understood as "the early rain, the autumn rain" (see, e.g., *JPS, NASB, NIV, NJB, NRSV, TEV*).

[77] מוֹרֶה "teacher" only appears four times in the MT, Isa 30:20 (2x); Job 36:22; Prov 5:13, and only once is the meaning recognized by a LXX translator, in Prov 5:13, where it stands in parallel to למד piel participle. מוֹרַי is rendered by παιδεύοντός με.

[78] νομίμως 4 Macc 6:18, νομοθεσία 2 Macc 6:23; 4 Macc 5:35; 17:16, νομοφύλαξ 4 Macc 15:32, ἔννομος Sir 0:10.

and once in the canonical books.[79] νομοθέσμως occurs once,[80] and παρανόμως twice in the canonical books.[81]

What can be of interest is why the translator did not choose to employ these terms. One reason may be that they are, apart from νόμιμος and ἔννομος, not common words in Koine Greek, and they were perhaps not in use when LXX Psalms was translated. Even so, they do not contribute much to the discussion. The extensive use of νόμος with cognates probably reflects the preference for regarding the offenders in the book of Psalms as persons breaking the law, or being without the law, that is, heathens. Perhaps a chronological/temporal aspect is also involved. The parts of the LXX books that were translated later, thus show a greater proportion of νόμος with cognates translating different words for offenders. However, such a suggestion depends to a high degree on when different books in the LXX were translated and that is not always easy to determine. On the other hand, it is indisputable that the Pentateuch was translated as the first part of the Scriptures. Therefore, some of the Greek words seem to be more used in the later translated books of the LXX, that is, they seldom occurs in the Pentateuch, but often appear in the third part of the Hebrew Scriptures, and in the Apocrypha in general. This applies to ἄνομος, παράνομος, παρανομεῖν, παρανομία, νομοθετεῖν and partly to ἀνομία and ἄνομος,[82] but not at all to νόμος, νόμιμος or to ἀνόμημα. The terms νομίμως, νομοθεσία, νομοφύλαξ, νομικός and ἔννομος are restricted to the Apocrypha.

The equivalents of ἀνομία pointed to an inclination to use terms for lawlessness in other books as well as in the book of Psalms. The same is more or less true for the other Greek terms investigated. The Greek terms chosen suggest that LXX Psalms had a manifest predilection for the law, but there is at least one indication to the contrary, that is, the word νόμιμος, which occurs 73 times in LXX. This word is in fact frequently

---

[79] ἐννόμως Sir 0:35 and Prov 31:25 (26) rendering תּוֹרָה. There was probably some sort of a double translation where תּוֹרָה is also rendered by νομοθέσμως in v. 28.

[80] Prov 31:28. It has no Hebrew counterpart in MT. See the previous footnote.

[81] Job 34:20 and Prov 21:27. The equivalent in Job 34:20 seems to be אָבִיר? and in Prov 21:27 זִמָּה.

[82] ἀνομία and ἄνομος frequently occurs in the prophets.

used in the Pentateuch (40x), not least Exodus (7x),[83] and Leviticus (25x),[84] and Numbers (7x),[85] and is fairly common in the Apocrypha,[86] but it does not occur at all in the LXX Psalms. Furthermore, it renders, apart from דָּת "law" once in the book of Daniel (Th), חֹק "statute, ordinance, prescription, legal right, privilege",[87] חֻקָּה with the same meaning,[88] and תּוֹרָה.[89] These are words often employed in the Psalter, תּוֹרָה (36x), חֹק (30x), חֻקָּה (3x). νόμιμος "ordinance, statute" nearly always refers to the "commandment of the law".[90] It would have suited an emphasis on the law of Moses and it would have been consonant with the employment in the Pentateuch. Both חֹק and חֻקָּה are used in the Psalter "as terms for specific expressions of Yahweh's will".[91] The reason for the non-employment of νόμιμος can hardly be that it went out of use later in Greek, since it occurs in the Apocrypha. Nevertheless, a central term related to the divine law is completely absent in the LXX Psalms. Furthermore, the hyponyms of νόμιμος in the Pentateuch are also frequently employed in the Psalter. On the other hand, the Hebrew counterparts are fairly close to the meaning of νόμιμος.

One could argue that δικαίωμα and πρόσταγμα replaced νόμιμος in book of Psalms, since they are common equivalents of חֹק. Up to now I have used νόμος with cognates in order to show that the LXX Psalms has a predilection for the juridical aspect of the religion, and that keeping the law and breaking the law are especially emphasised. Now the use of πρόσταγμα and δικαίωμα is to be evaluated theologically in relation to

---

[83] Ex 12:14, 17, 24; 27:21; 28:43; 29:28; 30:21.

[84] Lev 3:17; 6:11; 7:34, 36; 10:9, 11, 13 (2x), 14 (2x), 15; 16:29, 31, 34; 17:7; 18:3, 26, 30; 20:23; 23:14, 21, 31, 41; 24:3, 9.

[85] Num 10:8; 18:8, 11, 19, 23; 19:10, 21.

[86] 1 Macc 1:14, 42, 44; 3:21, 29; 6:59 (2x); 2 Macc 4:11; 11:24; 3 Macc 1:3; 3:2; 4 Macc 5:36; 7:15; 15:10.

[87] Ex 12:24; 29:28; 30:21; Lev 6:11; 7:34; 10:11, 13 (2x), 14 (2x), 15; 24:9; Num 18:8, 11, 19; Ezek 16:27; 20:18; Mic 7:11; Zech 1:6; Mal 3:7.

[88] Ex 12:14, 17; 27:21; 28:43; Lev 3:17; 7:36; 10:9; 16:29, 31, 34; 17:7; 18:3, 26, 30; 20:23; 23:14, 21, 31, 41; 24:3; Num 10:8; 18:23; 19:10, 21; Jer 10:3; Ezek 5:6 (2x), 7; 18:19. In 1 Esdr 1:46; Esth 16:19, and Mic 6:15 it appears without Hebrew counterpart.

[89] Gen 26:5; Prov 3:1; Hos 8:12; Jer 33 (26):4; Ezek 43:11; 44:5, 24.

[90] Gutbrod, Kleinknecht, "νόμος", 1089. In fact, νόμιμος is in the Pentateuch always used for the divine laws, rites and regulations.

[91] Ringgren, "חקק", 146.

the use of νόμιμος. Both of them are as a rule employed with reference to the divine law. On the other hand, it is difficult to draw any distinctions between them in this regard. Since חֹק is a word that as a rule is employed in connection with Yahweh, one may say that the renderings πρόσταγμα and νόμιμος in LXX is a lexicalization of a common meaning of the Hebrew word in context. It is not correct that δικαίωμα and πρόσταγμα replaced νόμιμος in book of Psalms because they frequently occur in the Pentateuch, δικαίωμα (42x),[92] and πρόσταγμα (31x),[93] as well as in other LXX books. They are not at all words that are more or less restricted to the book of Psalms. It is thus not a solution to the non-occurrence of νόμιμος that the translator of the book of Psalms has employed δικαίωμα and πρόσταγμα instead of νόμιμος. In fact, δικαίωμα and νόμιμος often occur together,[94] and the same is true for νόμιμος and πρόσταγμα.[95] Sometimes all of them, πρόσταγμα, δικαίωμα and νόμιμος, appear in the same context.[96]

## 10.4. Translation Technique from the Viewpoint of the Hebrew

If one now turns to the Hebrew terms that were translated by Greek words for breaking the law and so on in LXX Psalms, one may see how the translators of the LXX understood these terms.

The terms investigated are הַוָּה, רֶשַׁע, חָמָס, זִמָּה, פֶּשַׁע, פֹּשֵׁעַ, עָוֹן, עַוְלָה, אָוֶן, תּוֹרָה, חֻקָּה/חֹק, לִיץ hiphil, עוּל hiphil, עָלַם niphal, זֵד, הֵלֶל, בְּלִיַּעַל, שֶׁקֶר, עָתָק, עֹצֶב and דָּת.

We may begin with the rendering of the basic word for the law, תּוֹרָה. תּוֹרָה is as a rule rendered by νόμος "law" in LXX as a whole. This is always

---

[92] Gen 26:5; Ex 15:25, 26; 21:1, 9, 31; 24:3; Lev 25:18; Num 15:16; 27:11; 30:17; 31:21; 35:29; 36:13; Deut 4:1, 5, 6, 8, 14, 40, 45; 5:1, 31; 6:1, 2, 4, 17, 20, 24; 7:11, 12; 8:11; 10:13; 11:1; 17:19; 26:16, 17; 27:10; 28:45; 30:10,16; 33:10.

[93] Gen 24:50; 26:5; 47:26; Ex 18:16, 20; 20:6; Lev 4:2; 18:4, 5, 26, 30; 19:37; 20:8, 22; 24:12; 26:3, 14, 43, 46; Num 9:18 (2x), 20, 23 (2x); 33:38; 36:5; Deut 5:10; 11:32; 12:1; 15:2; 19:4.

[94] Gen 26:5; Ezek 5:6 (2x); 7; 20:18; 43:11; 44:24.

[95] Gen 26:5; Lev 18:26, 30; Ezek 43:11; 44:5, 24.

[96] Gen 26:5; Ezek 43:11; 44:24.

the case in the book of Psalms, (36x).[97] νόμος often occurs in the Pentateuch, 69x, except in Genesis, and in e.g. Joshua, (9x), 2 Kings (9x), 2 Chr (15x), Ezra (10), Nehemiah (20), Esth (12x), Prov (12x). It is frequent in the Apocrypha, 1 Macc (28x), 2 Macc (28x), 3 Macc (8x), 4 Macc (38x). Wisdom (10x), Sirach (30x), 1 Ezra (23x). Apart from νόμος it is sporadically translated by διαγραφή, διαθήκη, ἐντολή, ἐξηγορία, θεσμός, νόμιμος, νομοθέσμως, πρόσταγμα, βίβλος, ἐννόμως and δευτερονόμιον (מִשְׁנֶה תּוֹרָה).[98] This kind of stereotypical rendering wipes out some of nuances of the Hebrew term. That תּוֹרָה is as a rule rendered by νόμος, with cognates, a stereotyped equivalent, may suggest an understanding of the Hebrew term that does not recognise all its nuances.[99] The other equivalents only occur sporadically and do not alter the impression that the semantic meaning of the term is narrowed. In this way, the meaning "teaching, instruction" is not at all recognised by the translators in the LXX. This is also true for the translator of the book of Psalms.[100] This is a common observation and it may partly be based on the fact that the meaning "law" of תּוֹרָה clearly dominates in post-exilic time in Judaism.[101]

אָוֶן "iniquity, lie, nothingness" occurs 28x in the book of Psalms.[102] It mostly has ἀνομία as counterpart, but also ἀδικία, πόνος, and μηδείς.[103]

---

[97] 1:2 (2x); 19:8; 37:31; 40:9; 78:1, 5, 10; 89:31; 94:12; 105:45; 119:1, 18, 29, 34, 44, 51, 53, 55, 61, 70, 72, 77, 85, 92, 97, 109, 113, 126, 136, 142, 150, 153, 163, 165, 174. Apart from this νόμος twice occurs in the LXX Psalms, 119:57 (דְּבָר) and 130:5, where תּוֹרֵא in MT corresponds to τοῦ νόμου σου, either rendering תּוֹרָתֶךָ or תּוֹרָה with the personal pronoun added.

[98] The equivalents βιβλίον (βυβλίον), λόγος, νομόθεσμος, τάξις noted in Hatch, Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint* are hardly correct. See Muraoka, *Hebrew/Aramaic Index*, 157. Furthermore, according to Muraoka, *Hebrew/Aramaic Index*, 157, תּוֹרָה appears as equivalent to ἐντολή, βίβλος and ἐννόμως, in contrast to Hatch, Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint*.

[99] Regarding the meaning and use of Torah, see Gutbrod, Kleinknecht, "νόμος", 1046-50.

[100] See Flashar, "LXX-Psalter", 165-68.

[101] See, e.g., Gutbrod, Kleinknecht, "νόμος", 1043-47.

[102] 5:6; 6:9; 7:15; 10:7; 14:4; 28:3; 36:4, 5, 13; 41:7; 53:5; 55:4, 11; 56:8; 59:3, 6; 64:3; 66:18; 90:10; 92:8, 10; 94:4, 16; 101:8; 119:133; 125:5; 141:4, 9.

[103] ἀνομία 5:6; 6:9; 14:4; 36:4, 5, 13; 41:7; 53:5; 55:4, 11; 59:3, 6; 64:3; 92:8, 10; 94:4, 16; 101:8; 119:133; 125:5; 141:4, 9, ἀδικία 7:15; 28:3; 66:18. It is rendered

If examples where the translators conjectured the meaning "pain, labour, toil" are excluded,[104] the dominance of ἀνομία is even more striking. Outside the book of Psalms, אָוֶן appears 53x.[105] While אָוֶן is as a rule translated by ἀνομία in the book of Psalms, this is seldom the case outside the Psalter.[106] Twice it is rendered by the cognate ἄνομος.[107] Austermann proposes an explanation for this state of affairs, that אָוֶן was hardly ever employed in the Pentateuch, and that the translator regarded אָוֶן as a synonym to עָוֹן or perhaps even as a different spelling of עָוֹן.[108] I have argued for a similar analysis of דִּבָּה and דְּכָא in the Psalms, but in that case דִּבָּה was limited to the Psalms, and could thus be regarded as poetic variant of דְּכָא. Furthermore, it has the same meaning as דְּכָא. Therefore, the understanding of the translator is identical with the modern lexica. This is not the case as regards אָוֶן and עָוֹן. They have few equivalents in common in books where they both occur often, e.g. Isaiah, Hosea, and Job. Accordingly, ἁμαρτία is the most common equivalent of עָוֹן in Isaiah,[109] but it never renders אָוֶן, in Hosea עָוֹן is always rendered by

---

by πόνος in 10:7; 90:10. It is thus understood as אוֹן "pain, labour, toil, pain", which is sometimes rendered by πόνος, 78:51; 105:36. He probably vocalized it as אוֹן, or the translation may depend on the combination עָמָל וָאָוֶן translated by κόπος καὶ πόνος, which only occurs here in MT. אָוֶן is then understood as a synonymous word to עָמָל. μηδείς in 56:8 reflects אַיִן.

[104] 10:7; 90:10.

[105] Num 23:21; Josh 7:2; 18:12; 1 Sam 13:5; 14:23; 15:23; Isa 1:13; 10:1; 29:20; 31:2; 32:6; 41:29; 55:7; 58:9; 59:4, 6, 7; 66:3; Jer 4:15; Ezek 11:2; Hos 4:15; 5:8; 6:8; 10:5, 8; 12:12; Amos 1:5; 5:5; Mic 2:1; Hab 1:3; 3:7; Zech 10:2; Job 4:8; 5:6; 11:11, 14; 15:35; 22:15; 31:3; 34:8, 22, 36; 36:10, 21; Prov 6:12, 18; 10:29; 12:21; 17:4; 19:28; 21:15; 22:8; 30:20. Some occurrences are disputed in textual criticism or appear in obscure contexts, Isa 41:29; Hos 12:12; Hab 3:7. Bernhardt, "אוֹן", 141. Job 22:15; 31:3, and 36:10 have a revised text as counterpart in LXX.

[106] In fact, one can only find three occurrences, Job 31:3; Isa 59:4, 6. Furthermore, Job 31:3 is a Hexaplaric addition based on Symmachus.

[107] Job 34:8, 22.

[108] Austermann, *Nomos*, 183.

[109] 1:4; 13:11; 14:21; 22:14; 30:13; 33:24; 40:2; 50:1; 53:5, 6, 11; 57:17; 59:3; 64:6, 8; 65:7. אָוֶן is rendered by νηστεία 1:13, πονηρία 10:1, κακία 29:20, μάταια 31:2; 32:6, ἄνομος 55:7, ἀνομία 59:4, 6, γογγυσμός 58:9, ἄφρον 59:7. מְבֹרָךְ אָוֶן is rendered by ὡς βλάσφημος 66:3 and אָוֶן has no counterpart in 41:29.

ἀδικία but אָוֶן never.[110] In Job אָוֶן and עָוֹן have more equivalents in common, but they occur only sporadically, e.g. ἀνομία, ἄνομος.[111] Since other LXX translators distinguished between אָוֶן and עָוֹן and ἀνομία is a common rendering of equivalents with diverse meanings, a linguistic explanation to the translation in LXX Psalms is hardly sufficient. אָוֶן only occurs once in the Pentateuch, Num 23:21, where it is translated by μόχθος, that is, understood as אוֹן "pain, labour, toil".

Some additional facts can be added that supports the suggestion of a theological influence, thus פֹּעֲלֵי אָוֶן frequently appears in MT, not least in the book of Psalms, but also in other books. It can be found 16x in the Psalter.[112] It is nearly always rendered by οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι τὴν ἀνομίαν, with or without the definite article, in the Psalter.[113] It only occurs seven times in the other parts of the LXX,[114] apart from the Psalter. It never has the same lexical equivalents as in the LXX Psalms.[115] The rendering in the book of Psalms is based on a specific understanding of the פֹּעֲלֵי אָוֶן, that is, they are regarded as breakers of the law, which may reflect a theological tradition. This may also be true for the book of Job, where a counterpart related to νόμος is employed three times (one in a Hexaplaric addition), but not in any other book. Consequently, there seems to be a preference for an emphasis on the פֹּעֲלֵי אָוֶן as the breakers of the law in the book of Psalms and in the book of Job, in contrast to the other books of the LXX.

The basic meaning of עול√ is violation of justice or violation of the law.[116] Hence, the etymology corresponds well to the meaning of the Greek equivalents in the book of Psalms. On the other hand, עֺולָה is as a rule

---

[110] 4:8; 5:5; 7:1; 8:13; 9:7, 9; 10:10; 12:9; 13:12; 14:2, 3. אָוֶן is transcribed in Hos 4:15; 5:8; 10:5, 8, rendered by ματαία in 6:8, and by μὴ ἔστιν in 12:12.

[111] ἀνομία rendering אָוֶן 31:3, עָוֹן 10:6, 14; 20:27; 31:28, ἄνομος rendering אָוֶן 11:14; 34:8, 22, עָוֹן 19:29.

[112] 5:6; 6:9; 14:4; 28:3; 36:13; 53:5; 59:3; 64:3; 92:8, 10; 94:4, 16; 101:8; 125:5 (פֹּעֲלֵי הָאָוֶן); 141:4, 9.

[113] In Ps 28:3 it is in fact translated by ἐργαζομένων ἀδικίαν.

[114] Isa 31:2; Hos 6:8; Job 31:3; 34:8, 22; Prov 10:29; 21:15.

[115] In Prov 10:29 לְפֹעֲלֵי אָוֶן is translated by τοῖς ἐργαζομένοις κακά, in 21:15 the same combination is rendered by παρὰ κακούργοις, and in Job 31:3 לְפֹעֲלֵי אָוֶן is translated by τοῖς ποιοῦσιν ἀνομίαν (Hexaplaric addition). פֹּעֲלֵי אָוֶן is translated by ματαία in Isa 31:2, in Hosea 6:8 by ἐργαζομένη μάταια, in Job 34:8 by ποιούντων τὰ ἄνομα, and in 34:22 by τοὺς ποιοῦντας τὰ ἄνομα.

[116] Baker, "עול", 342.

used in the sense "iniquity" or "perversity, wickedness" in LXX.[117] It occurs 9 times in the book of Psalms and it is mostly rendered by ἀνομία, and sporadically by ἀδικία, ἄδικος.[118] That it is as a rule translated by ἀνομία, stands in contrast to the usual equivalents outside the book of Psalms, ἀδικία, ἄδικος, ἀδίκημα, φαῦλος, ἄνομος.[119] עַוְלָה does not occur in the Pentateuch.

The translation of עַוְלָה by ἀνομία may be based on a theological reflection on the nature of sin. The translator understands sin as "breaking of the divine law".[120] This is supported by the fact that several Hebrew terms are translated by ἀνομία in LXX Psalms, which is thus to be regarded as a favourite word in the Psalter.[121] The reason for the choice of equivalent is hardly that the translator did not knew the meaning of the Hebrew term, but that he preferred an equivalent that reflected the understanding of sin among the Jews in the diaspora.

עָוֶל in the sense of "unjust, injustice" appears 3x in LXX Psalms. It is twice rendered by ἀδικία, and once by ἀνομία.[122] עָוֶל can otherwise be

---

[117] Baker, "עול", 342.

[118] ἀνομία 37:1; 58:3; 64:7; 89:23; 107:42; 119:3; 125:3, ἀδικία 92:16 (Q), ἄδικος 43:1 (inverted).

[119] ἀδικία 2 Sam 3:34; 7:10; Isa 59:3; 61:8; Hos 10:13; Mic 3:10; Hab 2:12; Zeph 3:13; Mal 2:6; Job 11:14?; 15:16; 1 Chr 17:9; 2 Chr 19:7, ἀδίκημα Ezek 28:15, ἄδικος Zeph 3:5; Job 5:16; 6:29; 6:30; 22:23; 36:23, φαῦλος Prov 22:8, ἄνομος Job 27:4, ἀνίατος? Job 24:20, and in Job 13:7 it has no counterpart. ἀσέβεια occurs, according to Muraoka, as equivalent in Prov 1:16, but עַוְלָה does not exist in this verse. Muraoka, *Hebrew/Aramaic Index,* 108.

[120] See Flashar, "LXX-Psalter", 169. Austermann argues that it is the rendering of פֹּעֲלֵי עַוְלָה read as פָּעֲלוּ עַוְלָה in Ps 119:3 (and understood in analogy with פֹּעֲלֵי אָוֶן and therefore translated by οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι τὴν ἀνομίαν) that is the basis for the choice of equivalent in LXX Psalms generally. Austermann, *Nomos*, 185-86. He notes the contrast between vv. 1-2 and v. 3, and the law context. This is true, but it is more reasonable to assume that the translator chose his counterpart to עַוְלָה already at its first occurrence, and it occurs several times before Ps 119, viz. 37:1; 58:3; 64:7; 89:23; 107:42.

[121] See, e.g., Flashar, "LXX-Psalter", 169. The term is used for Greek words that render several different Hebrew equivalents whose semantic meaning is not captured. These words often reflect the theology of the translator.

[122] ἀδικία 7:4; 82:2, ἀνομία 53:2.

found 18x outside the Psalter.[123] The rendering ἀνομία in LXX Psalms has a counterpart in Ezekiel.[124] Otherwise, terms with no *direct* reference to the law are employed, ἀδικία, ἄδικος, ταράσσειν τὸ δίκαιον, παράπτωμα, and πλημμέλημα.[125] עָוֶל occurs four times in the Pentateuch three times translated by ἄδικος and once by ἀδικία.[126] Thus, the translator was not dependent on any counterpart in the Pentateuch. The translation ἀνομία occurs in one out of three occurrences in the Psalter, in contrast to two examples out of 21 outside the Psalms.[127]

עָוֹן "missing of the target, sin" is more or less stereotypically rendered by ἀνομία in LXX Psalms,[128] even though it now and then is translated by ἁμαρτία, ἀσέβεια, πτωχεία, and ἀδικία.[129] Furthermore, perhaps Flashar is right when he advocates that ἁμαρτία, in contrast to ἀνομία, is used in cases where עָוֹן refers to the Jewish people and not the heathens.[130] When ἀνομία denotes someone regarded as righteous it occurs in a

---

[123] Lev 19:15, 35; Deut 25:16; 32:4; Jer 2:5; Ezek 3:20; 18:8, 24, 26 (2x); 28:18; 33:13 (2x), 15, 18; Job 34:10, 32; Prov 29:27. Job 34:32 has a revised text as counterpart in LXX.

[124] See Ezek 33:13, 18.

[125] ἄδικος Lev 19:15, 35; Deut 25:16; Ezek 33:15; Prov 29:27, ἀδικία Deut 32:4; Ezek 18:8, 24; 28:18; 33:13; Job 34:32, πλημμέλημα Jer 2:5, παράπτωμα Ezek 3:20; 18:26 (2x), ταράσσειν τὸ δίκαιον (for מֵעָוֶל) Job 34:10.

[126] ἄδικος Lev 19:15, 35; Deut 25:16, and ἀδικία Deut 32:4.

[127] עול as a verb "act wrongly" appears twice in the MT, Ps 71:4 and Isa 26:10. In Ps 71:4 מְעַוֵּל is rendered by παρανομοῦντος and in Isa 26:10 יְעַוֵּל has the equivalent οὐ μὴ ποιήσῃ ἀρθήτω ὁ ἀσεβής, but the counterpart in LXX is questionable. Perhaps יְעַוֵּל is rendered by ὁ ἀσεβής. οὐ μὴ ποιήσῃ is the counterpart according to Hatch, Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint,* "ποιεῖν". Regarding ὁ ἀσεβής, see, e.g., Muraoka, *Hebrew/Aramaic Index*, 108.

[128] 18:24; 32:5 (2x); 36:3; 38:5, 19; 39:12; 40:13; 49:6; 51:4, 7, 11; 59:5; 65:4; 69:28 (2x); 79:8; 85:3; 90:8; 103:3, 10; 106:43; 107:17; 109:14; 129:3 (MT Q לַעֲוֹנוֹתָם K לְמַעֲנוֹתָם LXX?); 130:3, 8.

[129] ἁμαρτία 25:11; 32:2; 78:38; 89:33, ἀσέβεια 32:5, πτωχεία 107:41, ἀδικία 73:7. ἀδικία is based on the *Vorlage* עֲוֹנָמוֹ instead of MT עֵינָמוֹ in 73:7. πτωχεία in 31:11 may reflect עוֹנִי instead of עֲוֹנִי (MT). Note that עָנִי is rendered by πτωχεία in 44:25; 88:10; 107:10, 41. See also Austermann, *Nomos*, 181-82 n. 197-200; Austermann, "ἀνομία", 109 n. 29-32.

[130] This is evidently the case in 25:11; 32:2; 78:38; 89:33. See Flashar, "LXX-Psalter", 171-72.

prayer or in a wish that he will not commit ἀνομία. Therefore, a reason for the non-use of ἀνομία can be found. עָוֹן translated by ἀνομία is sometimes regarded as a sign of the kaige group,[131] but in the book of Psalms it is the kaige group that has been influenced by the choice of counterpart in the book of Psalms.[132] Even though עָוֹן frequently is rendered by ἀνομία in LXX outside the Psalter, approximately 40x, ἁμαρτία is an even more common equivalent. עָוֹן occurs 42 times in the Pentateuch, but words related to νόμος is neither in the Pentateuch as a whole nor in any of its books the dominant rendering of עָוֹן. It is translated by ἁμαρτία (26x), ἀνομία (7x), ἀδικία (4x), ἁμάρτημα (2x), ἀνόμημα (1x) and αἰτία (1x).[133] Consequently, although it cannot be excluded that the equivalent in the book of Psalms is dependent on the choice of counterpart in the Pentateuch,[134] the main rendering, ἁμαρτία would have been an even better choice.

פֶּשַׁע has a fairly wide semantic range. It refers to "offences, rebellion, crime(s), legal offence, personal offence, guilt, wrong(s), property offence, penalty".[135] It occurs 14x in the Psalter.[136] It is as a rule rendered by ἀνομία, but sometimes by ἀσέβεια, ἁμαρτία, ἄγνοια, παράνομος

---

[131] See chap. 7.

[132] See chap. 7.

[133] ἁμαρτία Gen 15:16; Ex 20:5; 28:43; Ex 34:9; Lev 5:1, 17; 7:18; 10:17; 19:8; 20:17, 19; 26:39, 40 (2x), 41; Num 5:15, 31 (2x); 14:18, 19, 34; 15:31; 18:1 (2x); 30:16; Deut 5:9, ἀνομία Gen 19:15; Ex 34:7 (2x); Lev 16:21; 22:16; 26:43; Num 14:18, ἀδικία Gen 44:16; Lev 16:22; 18:25; Deut 19:15, ἁμάρτημα Ex 28:38; Num 18:23, ἀνόμημα Lev 17:16, αἰτία Gen 4:13. In Lev 26:39 once occurs without counterpart. The rendering of עָוֹן by ἀνομία is thus not the main rendering in the Pentateuch and I am reluctant to characterize it as "traditionell und konventionell". Austermann, *Nomos*, 182. However, it can hardly be excluded that the translator in his rendering of עָוֹן and חַטָּאת, but not פֶּשַׁע, was dependent on the choice of counterpart in the central theological declaration in Ex 34:7, where נֹשֵׂא עָוֹן וָפֶשַׁע וְחַטָּאָה is rendered by ἀφαιρῶν ἀνομίας καὶ ἀδικίας καὶ ἁμαρτίας.

[134] Thus, Austermann, *Nomos*, 182. However, apart from Gen 19:15, ἀνομία appears in a law context, and thus the counterpart is contextually adequate.

[135] See, e.g., Carpenter, Grisanti, "פשע", 706.

[136] 5:11; 19:14; 25:7; 32:1, 5; 36:2; 39:9; 51:3, 5; 59:4; 65:4; 89:33; 103:12; 107:17.

and ἀνόμημα.[137] Accordingly, the most common equivalent clearly refers to the law. פֶּשַׁע can be found 79x outside the Psalter. Although ἀνομία not seldom appears, it is far from being the most common counterpart, and its occurrences are concentrated to the book of Isaiah,[138] and the book of Job.[139] It is the dominant counterpart of פֶּשַׁע in the book of Isaiah, since it can perhaps be found in 8 out of 11 occurrences of פֶּשַׁע,[140] in Job it occurs in 4 out of 10 occurrences.[141] פֶּשַׁע appears 9 times in the Pentateuch,[142] rendered by ἀδικία, ἀδίκημα, ἁμάρτημα and ὑποστέλλειν.[143] Consequently, the translator was not dependent on any equivalent in the Pentateuch. The common parallel between ἀνομία and ἁμαρτία may have made the choice of counterpart easier, as suggested by Austermann, since פֶּשַׁע time and again appears in parallel with חַטָּאת or חֲטָאָה,[144] translated by ἀνομία and ἁμαρτία and this parallel have counterparts outside the Psalter.[145] However, ἀσέβεια and ἁμαρτία as a rendering of פֶּשַׁע in parallel with חַטָּאת or חַטָּאת is as common and could easily have been employed.[146]

The participle of the verb פָּשַׁע, פֹּשֵׁעַ "a revolting man, a sinner", occurs twice in the Psalter, rendered by παράνομος and ἄνομος.[147] It appears 9x outside the Psalter and where it is has the sense of a noun it is translated by ἄνομος, πλανᾶν, παραβαίνειν, ἀφιστάναι, ἀσεβής and by

---

[137] ἀνομία 32:1, 5; 39:9; 51:5; 59:4; 89:33; 103:12; 107:17, ἀσέβεια 5:11; 65:4, ἁμαρτία 19:14, ἄγνοια 25:7, παράνομος 36:2, ἀνόμημα 51:3. παράνομος in 36:2 may reflect a different vocalization, פֹּשֵׁעַ. See e.g. *BHS*, Austermann, "ἀνομία", 121 n. 55.

[138] Isa 24:20; 43:25; 44:22; 50:1; 53:5, 8; 59:12 (2x).

[139] Job 7:21; 8:4; 14:17.

[140] ἀνομία Isa 24:20?; 43:25; 44:22; 50:1; 53:5, 8; 59:12 (2x), ἀπώλεια 57:4, ἁμάρτημα 58:1, ἀσέβεια 59:20.

[141] ἀνομία occurs in Job 7:21; 8:4; 14:17?; 34:37, and other equivalents in 31:33; 33:9; 34:6; 35:6; 36:9 (Hexaplaric addition). In 13:23 ἀνομία has no counterpart.

[142] Gen 31:36; 50:17 (2x); Ex 22:8; 23:21; 34:7; Lev 16:16, 21; Num 14:18.

[143] ἀδικία Gen 50:17; Ex 34:7; Lev 16:21; Num 14:18, ἀδίκημα Ex 22:8; Lev 16:16, ἁμάρτημα Gen 31:36, ὑποστέλλειν Ex 23:21.

[144] Pss 32:1, 5; 51:5; 59:4.

[145] E.g. Isa 44:22; 59:12; Job 13:23. See Austermann, *Nomos*, 187. Cf. also ἀνομία and ἁμάρτημα Ισα 58:1.

[146] Am 5:12; Mic 1:5, 13; 3:8; 6:7.

[147] Ps 37:38 παράνομος, 51:15 ἄνομος.

ἁμαρτία.[148] פֶּשַׁע is thus always rendered by a term for breaking the law in the Psalter, παράνομος and ἄνομος. Even though it is often rendered by ἄνομος in Isaiah, that is, three out of six occurrences, it has other counterparts in Hosea and Daniel (Th). פֶּשַׁע is never found in the Pentateuch. The same is true for עֶצֶב and עַוְלָה ,עָתָק ,הַוָּה.

חַטָּאת "sin, sin-offering" does not occur rendered by a Greek term for breaking the law in the book of Psalms, but it does so in fact in Josh 24:19 (ἀνόμημα). עָוֹן, פֶּשַׁע and חַטָּאת often occurs together,[149] as a comprehensive description of sin.[150] עָוֹן has diverse equivalents, and many related to "breaking of the law", and the same is true for פֶּשַׁע, but חַטָּאת is always translated by ἁμαρτία in the book of Psalms.[151] The same is true for חֵמְא.[152] Flashar's study seems to imply that חַטָּאת was regarded as an offence of less proportions; thus it repeatedly denotes the Israelites, which could be regarded as sinners but not really as law-breakers.[153]

זִמָּה "wickedness, lewdness" only occurs twice in the Psalter and it is always rendered by ἀνομία.[154] זִמָּה appears 27 times outside the book of Psalms and it has diverse equivalents, ἀνόμημα, ἀνομία, ἄνομος, ἀνόσιος, ἀσέβεια, ἀπαλλοτρίωσις, ἀσεβεῖν, ἀσέβημα, ἀφροσύνη, καὶ τί, βρόμος, παρανόμως, θυμὸς ὀργῆς ἀκατάσχετος.[155] Although

---

[148] ἄνομος Isa 1:28; 48:8; 53:12, πλανᾶν participle Isa 46:8, παραβαίνειν participle Isa 66:24, ἀφιστάναι participle Ezek 20:38, ἀσεβής Hos 14:10, and ἁμαρτία Isa 53:12; Dan 8:23 (Th). LXX has perhaps an inversion in Ezek 20:38. In that case פֶּשַׁע is rendered by ἀσεβής as in Hos 14:10.

[149] Ex 34:7; Lev 16:21; Job 13:23; Ps 32:5; Isa 59:12; Ezek 21:29; Dan 9:24.

[150] See, e.g., Carpenter, Grisanti, "פשע", 706.

[151] 25:7, 18; 32:5; 38:4, 19; 51:4, 5; 59:4, 13; 79:9; 85:3; 109:14.

[152] 51:7, 11; 103:10.

[153] Flashar, "LXX-Psalter", 169-72.

[154] 26:10 and 119:150. The exact meaning in 119:150 may be "(wicked) plan, device". Steingrimsson, "זמם", 89. The same meaning appears in Job 17:11; Isa 32:7; Prov 10:23; 21:27; 24:9. The cognate מְזִמָּה can refer to positive as well as negative plans. Steingrimsson, "זמם", 89. It thus refers to the plans of God in Job 42:2. *Idem*, 88. In fact even זִמָּה may once be employed in a positive sense, Job 17:11. Hartley, "זמם", 1113.

[155] ἀσέβημα Lev 18:17, ἀνόμημα Lev 20:14, ἄνομος Isa 32:7, ἀπαλλοτρίωσις Jer 13:27, ἀσεβεῖν Ezek 16:27, ἀσέβεια 16:43, 58; 22:11; 23:27, 29, 35, 48 (2x), 49, ἀνόσιος Ezek 22:9, 11, ἀνομία Lev 19:29; 20:14; Ezek 23:21, 44, Hos 6:9,

words related to νόμος occur, ἀνομία, ἀνόμημα, παρανόμως, ἄνομος,[156] they never appear in the same context as is the case in the book of Psalms.[157] זִמָּה occurs three times in the Pentateuch,[158] and is twice rendered by ἀνομία.[159] Consequently, there seems to be a predilection for the understanding of זִמָּה as "lawlessness" in the Psalter, in contrast to most of the other books in LXX. Counterparts related to the law occasionally occur in Ezekiel and Proverbs and often in Leviticus and always in Isaiah.

חָמָס has a wide extent of semantic meanings "violence, wrong, bloodshed, unrighteousness, wickedness".[160] It frequently refers to the "cold-blooded and unscrupulous infringement of the personal rights of others, motivated by greed and hate and often making use of physical violence and brutality".[161] Nevertheless, חָמָס time and again occurs in a law context. It is sometimes used for the breaking of the ANE family law, false testimony or false accusation, and transgression in relation to the marital

---

καὶ τί or without counterpart in Ezek 24:13, ἐν βρόμῳ (זִמָּתִי) Job 17:11, κακός Prov 10:23, παρανόμως Prov 21:27 (בְּזִמָּה), ἀποθνῄσκειν 24:9. ἀφροσύνη in Judg 20:6 is a rendering of זִמָּה וּנְבָלָה or זִמָּה is without counterpart. βδέλυγμα in Hatch, Redpath and Muraoka, *Hebrew/Aramaic Index,* 44 is not correct, it refers to מְזִמָּה in Jer 11:15 (HR 215c). זִמָּה seems to have θυμὸς ὀργῆς ἀκατάσχετος as counterpart in Job 31:11. It is not mentioned in Muraoka, *Hebrew/Aramaic Index,* 44.

[156] ἀνομία Lev 19:29; 20:14; Hos 6:9; Ezek 23:21, 44, ἀνόμημα Lev 20:14, παρανόμως Prov 21:27 (בְּזִמָּה), ἄνομος Isa 32:7. See also Austermann, "ἀνομία", 114; Austermann, *Nomos,* 184 n. 208, who has the same references. However, Ezek 23:44 is not included, and ἀνομία in Ezek 23:36 renders תּוֹעֵבָה.

[157] The crimes in Lev 19:29; 20:14 are sexual offences, and they are not reflected in either Ps 26:10 or 119:150. In Hos 6:9 it refers to murder. Although the translator may have been influenced by the equivalent in Lev 19:29; 20:14.

[158] Lev 18:17; 19:29; 20:14.

[159] ἀνομία 19:29; 20:14. Cf. Austermann, *Nomos,* 184-85; Austermann, "ἀνομία", 114.

[160] See, e.g., Swart, van Dam, "חמס", 177. See the variety of synonyms in parallel. Haag, "חמס", 480-81.

[161] Haag, "חמס", 482. On that account it is not astonishing that חָמָס always refer to man, except in Job 19:7, where it is used of God. Haag, "חמס", 481.

law.[162] That it is employed in a law-context is especially common in the
book of Psalms. It is often associated with "the false accusation that
demands the life of the innocent".[163] Therefore it is not unreasonable to
expect that חָמָס is translated by ἀνομία in the Psalter, but this is seldom
the case. חָמָס occurs 14 times in the Psalms, and twice it is rendered by
ἀνομία.[164] Otherwise, חָמָס has ἄδικος, ἀδικία and ἀσέβεια as
counterpart.[165] חָמָס appears 46 times outside the Psalter,[166] but it is seldom
rendered by ἀνομία, or by the cognates ἄνομος and παράνομος.[167] It is
often translated by ἀσέβεια (10x), ἀδικία (8x) and ἄδικος (4x),
sporadically by cognates, ἀδικεῖν and ἀδίκημα. A few other equivalents
are found once or twice, ἀθεσία, ἁμαρτωλός, ἀπειθής, ἀπώλεια,
ἀσεβής, μόχθος, ὄνειδος, ψευδής.[168] It occurs six times in the
Pentateuch,[169] rendered by ἀδικία, ἀδικεῖν, ἄδικος.[170]

The rendering in LXX Psalms is thus in line with the choice of
counterpart outside the Psalter, in as much as ἀνομία seldom occurs, only

---

[162] Family law (Gen 16:5), false testimony or false accusation (Ex 23:1; Deut
19:16; Ps 58:3), transgression in relation to the marital law (Mal 2:16). Swart, van
Dam, "חמס", 178-79. See Haag, "חמס", 483-84. See also Isa 59:6; 60:18; Jer 6:7;
20:8; Ezek 7:11; Jer 20:8; Hab 1:2; Job 19:7.

[163] Haag, "חמס", 483.

[164] ἀνομία 55:10; 74:20. It is hard to see a reason for the use of ἀνομία in 55:10,
although the suggestion that assonance played a part is possible. See Austermann,
*Nomos*, 190; Austermann, "ἀνομία", 126-27. An influence from the immediate
context is harder to defend. Although, אָוֶן is in v. 11, as usual translated by
ἀνομία, both renderings are unexpected in the context. Cf. Austermann, *Nomos*,
190; Austermann, "ἀνομία", 126.

[165] ἄδικος 18:49; 25:19; 35:11; 140:2, 5, 12, ἀδικία 7:17; 11:5; 27:12; 58:3;
72:14, ἀσέβεια 73:6.

[166] Gen 6:11, 13; 16:5; 49:5; Ex 23:1; Deut 19:16; Judg 9:24; 2 Sam 22:3, 49; Isa
53:9; 59:6; 60:18; Jer 6:7; 20:8; 51:35, 46; Ezek 7:11, 23; 8:17; 12:19; 28:16;
45:9; Joel 4:19; Am 3:10; 6:3; Ob 1:10; Jon 3:8; Mic 6:12; Hab 1:2, 3, 9; 2:8, 17
(2x); Zeph 1:9; Mal 2:16; Job 16:17; 19:7; Prov 3:31; 4:17; 10:6, 11; 13:2; 16:29;
26:6; 1 Chr 12:18.

[167] ἀνομία Isa 53:9; Ezek 7:23; 8:17; 28:16, παράνομος Prov 4:17; 16:29,
ἄνομος Sir 49:3.

[168] The equivalents ἀπειθής and ψευδής are not mentioned in to Hatch, Redpath,
*A Concordance to the Septuagint*. But see Muraoka, *Hebrew/Aramaic Index*.

[169] Gen 6:11, 13; 16:5; 49:5; Ex 23:1; Deut 19:16.

[170] ἀδικία Gen 6:11, 13; 49:5, ἀδικεῖν 16:5, ἄδικος Ex 23:1; Deut 19:16.

once in Isaiah and three times in Ezekiel. The cognates παράνομος are also only sporadically used. On the other hand, if ἄδικος and ἀδικία, concepts that in a more indirect manner can be linked to the law, are included, the understanding of חָמָס as referring to the violation of ethical principles and the like are in line with the rendering in the book of Psalms. Furthermore, since ἀσέβεια and ἀδικία are the most common equivalents outside the Psalter the association with physical violence and brutality seems to have been played down. In fact, "Hellenistic Jews heard less of brutality and killing in *hms* than of injustice and disobedience to the law".[171]

רֶשַׁע occurs 6 times in the Psalter. It is twice rendered by ἀνομία. It is also rendered by ἁμαρτία, ἁμαρτωλός.[172] רֶשַׁע appears 24 times outside the Psalter,[173] and it has several equivalents, ἀδικία, ἁμάρτημα, ἀσέβεια, ἀσεβεῖν, ἀσέβημα, ἀσεβής, κακός, κακοποιεῖν, πλημμέλεια, but also ἀνομία, ἄνομος.[174] ἁμαρτία and ἁμαρτωλός do not occur at all. רֶשַׁע can only be found once in the Pentateuch, Deut 9:27, where it is rendered by ἀσέβημα. Thus, ἀνομία is more common as equivalent of רֶשַׁע in the book of Psalms than in other parts of the LXX, with the exclusion of Ezekiel.

הַוָּה II is in modern lexica understood as "disaster, destruction". However, it does have a certain relation to the ordinances of God. It is "usually connected with men who are unfaithful and rebellious against God, who are not willing to adapt themselves to the good ordinances of God, but pervert the right according to their evil desires".[175] It occurs 8 times in the

---

[171] Haag, "חמס", 481.

[172] ἀνομία 5:5; 45:8, ἁμαρτία 10:15; 141:4, ἁμαρτωλός, 84:11; 125:3. The rendering in 45:8 is, however, a reading contested by 2013' A, which has ἀδικία.

[173] Deut 9:27; 1 Sam 24:14; Isa 58:4, 6; Jer 14:20; Ezek 3:19; 7:11; 31:11; 33:12; Hos 10:13; Mic 6:10, 11; Job 34:8, 10; 35:8; Prov 4:17; 8:7; 10:2; 12:3; 16:12; Eccl 3:16 (2x); 7:25; 8:8.

[174] ἀνομία renders רֶשַׁע in Ezek 3:19; 33:12. ἀνομία also occurs in Deut 9:5 in A, but B has ἀσέβεια (=Rahlfs) and in Mic 6:10 ἀνομία A, B has ἄνομος (=Rahlfs), ἄνομος Mic 6:11, Ezek 7:11. Cf. also the use of ἀνομία rendering רִשְׁעָה in Isa 9:17; Ezek 18:20, 27; 33:19; Zech 5:8; Mal 1:4.

[175] Erlandsson, "הוה", 357. It refers to inordinate desire as well as its consequences, i.e. falsehood, perversity, deception, misfortune. *Idem*, 357.

book of Psalms. It is twice rendered by ἀνομία.[176] Otherwise, it has the following equivalents, μάταιος "idle, empty", ματαιότης "emptiness, futility", ἀδικία, ταραχώδης "terrifying".[177] It does not occur in the Pentateuch.

Outside the Psalter הַוָּה II occurs 5 times.[178] הַוָּה II is thus concentrated to in the book of Psalms, but it also appears in Job and Proverbs. It belongs exclusively to a poetic context. The LXX translators hardly made a distinction between הַוָּה I "caprice, inordinate desire",[179] and הַוָּה II. They are rendered by καταθύμιος, ζωή, ἀπώλεια, ὀδύνη, μελετᾶν?, ἐκδύειν?, ψευδής and by αἰσχύνη.[180] It is easy to see that there are problems regarding the meaning of הַוָּה as well as the correct identification of הַוָּה I and II.[181] However, the inclination for ἀνομία in the Psalter is without precedent in LXX as a whole. Probably there are problems in the right understanding of the word, but that does not retract from the fact that

---

[176] ἀνομία 57:2; 94:20. ἀνομία in 94:20 may be based on the parallel with חֹק, and further supported by the fact that ἀνομία appears three times in the context, vv. 4, 16, 23. Cf. also Austermann, *Nomos*, 191. In 50:21 הֱיוֹת is rendered by ἀνομία evidently reflecting הַוּוֹת. See e.g. Austermann, *Nomos*, 191.

[177] μάταιος 5:10, ματαιότης 38:13; 52:9, ἀδικία 52:4; 55:12, ταραχώδης 91:3. μάταιος in 5:10 has † in Hatch, Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint*, "μάταιος". That הַוּוֹת is rendered by ἡ ἀνομία is, according to Prijs, an expression of a theological emphasis on the Torah. Cf. also 94:20. Prijs, *Jüdische Tradition*, 62. For other examples, see Prijs, *Jüdische Tradition*, 62-67.

[178] Job 6:2 (Q); 6:30; 30:13; Prov 17:4; 19:13.

[179] Mic 7:3; Prov 10:3; 11:6.

[180] הַוָּה I is rendered by καταθύμιος Mic 7:3, ζωή? Prov 10:3, and by ἀπώλεια 11:6, and הַוָּה II is rendered by ὀδύνη Job 6:2 (Q), μελετᾶν? 6:30, ἐκδύειν? 30:13, ψευδής Prov 17:4, and by αἰσχύνη 19:13.

[181] Thus, a word for "shame, disgrace, ignominy", αἰσχύνη, renders הַוָּה II in Prov 19:13, and a term for "destruction, annihilation", ἀπώλεια, renders הַוָּה I in Prov 11:6. αἰσχύνη is regarded as an implausible equivalent by Muraoka, but he has not suggested an alternative. Muraoka, *Hebrew/Aramaic Index*, 40. ἀπώλεια is noted by † in Hatch, Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint,* "ἀπώλεια". Most of the other equivalents are questionable, μελετᾶν in 6:30 is referred to בִּין in Hatch, Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint*, "μελετᾶν" and σύνεσις is noted by †. Admittedly, ζωή and ἐκδύειν are also questionable (noted by † in Hatch, Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint*) and that is perhaps the reason why Muraoka does not take account of any of them. That ψευδής in Job 30:13 is not included by Muraoka depends on that it is not noted in Hatch, Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint*, "ψευδής". Muraoka, *Hebrew/Aramaic Index*, 40.

it has diverse equivalents outside the Psalter and none of them has any reference to violation of the law or breaking of ethical or other moral principles.

עֹצֶב only appears three times in the MT.[182] It has the sense of "hardship, pain, distress" in Isa 14:3; 1 Chr 4:9.[183] In Ps 139:24 it is of uncertain meaning,[184] and rendered by ἀνομία. It has a semantic adequate rendering in Isa 14:3 ὀδύνη, that is, a term for "pain, sorrow".[185] The counterpart ιγαβης in 1 Chr 4:9 seems to be some sort of transcription, probably based on metathesis, which may imply that the translator did not know the meaning of the word.[186] It is probable, as Austermann argues, that the Psalms translator did not understand the word either. He may also have based his rendering of דֶּרֶךְ־עֹצֶב on the similar phrase in 107:17, where מִדֶּרֶךְ פִּשְׁעָם is translated by ἐξ ὁδοῦ ἀνομίας αὐτῶν, but the parallel in 119:29, where דֶּרֶךְ־שֶׁקֶר is rendered by ὁδὸν ἀδικίας, is even closer.[187]

עָתָק "old, hard, stubborn, arrogant",[188] appears 3 times in the Psalter and it is once rendered by ἀνομία, and twice by ἀδικία.[189] It "carries connotations of hardened, crusty, stubborn, or arrogant sayings".[190] Outside the Psalter, it can only be found once,[191] and there it has μεγαλορρημοσύνη "boasting" as counterpart. Accordingly, the rendering

---

[182] Isa 14:3; 1 Chr 4:9; Ps 139:24. If עֹצֶב in the sense of "idol" is included, it occurs also in Isa 48:5, rendered by εἴδωλον.

[183] Fretheim, "עצב", 482.

[184] See Fretheim, "עצב", 483. A. Graupner suggests that the vocalization עֹצֶב in MT is pejorative and that it has the same meaning as עָצָב. Graupner, "עצב", 302.

[185] LXX translates √עצב with different equivalents, which either reflects עצב I or עצב II. Meyers, "עצב", 301. Cf. also the cognate עֶצֶב that always occurs in poetry. It refers to pain-inducing, laborious activity, and once to offending speech, Prov 15:1. Fretheim, "עצב", 483.

[186] ιγαβης, apart from here, only appears in 1 Chr 2:55 in Alexandrinus (ιαβες in Vaticanus) in the LXX as a whole.

[187] Austermann, "ἀνομία", 128; Austermann, *Nomos*, 190.

[188] Smith, Wegner, "עתק", 569; Schmoldt, "עתק", 488. עָתָק is only found in cultic language. Schmoldt, "עתק", 488.

[189] ἀνομία occurs in 31:19 and ἀδικία in 75:6; 94:4.

[190] Smith, Wegner, "עתק", 570. Ps 75:6 refers to speaking with a stiff neck. *Idem*, 570.

[191] 1 Sam 2:3.

of the term in the Psalter deviates from the understanding in modern lexica, as well as in the LXX of 1 Samuel. Either it reflects the linguistic analysis of the translator or it is a theological rendering. The proposal of Austermann that the translator used a generic term to catch the meaning of an unknown word is probably true, but when favourite words as ἀνομία and ἀδικία are employed, the suggestion of a theological bias is also high.[192]

שֶׁקֶר appears 22 times in the Psalter.[193] It refers mainly to "deception, falsehood, pretence, deceit, fraud".[194] Common equivalents of שֶׁקֶר in the book of Psalms are ἀδικία, ἄδικος, as well as ἀδίκως. Sometimes it is rendered by δόλιος and ψευδής. Once it is rendered by ἀνομία according to Rahlfs' text.[195]

שֶׁקֶר can be found 91 times outside the book of Psalms.[196] There seems in fact to be a different understanding of the word in the Psalter in relation to LXX in general. שֶׁקֶר is, apart from Isa 59:3, never rendered by ἀνομία, and only once by ἄνομος, Isa 57:4, not even ἀδικία, even though שֶׁקֶר is once rendered by ἀδικεῖν, Gen 21:23. The cognates of ἀδικία, ἄδικος and ἀδίκως, are common equivalents of שֶׁקֶר, ἄδικος (25x), ἀδίκως (6x), but it often has more adequate equivalents as ψευδής (38x) and ψεῦδος

---

[192] Austermann, "ἀνομία", 130; Austermann, *Nomos*, 192.

[193] 7:15; 27:12; 31:19; 33:17; 35:19; 38:20; 52:5; 63:12; 69:5; 101:7; 109:2; 119:29, 69, 78, 86, 104, 118, 128, 163; 120:2; 144:8, 11.

[194] See, e.g., Carpenter, Grisanti, "שקר", 247.

[195] ἀδικία 52:5; 119:29, 69, 104, 163; 144:8, 11, ἄδικος 27:12; 63:12; 101:7; 119:118, 128; 120:2, ἀδίκως 35:19; 38:20; 69:5; 119:78, 86, δόλιος 31:19; 109:2, ψευδής 33:17, ἀνομία 7:15. The rendering ἀνομία is, however, contested by ἀδικία. B' 1219 has ἀδικία as a rendering of שֶׁקֶר and ἀνομία as a rendering of אָוֶן. Austermann does not include שֶׁקֶר in his otherwise comprehensive description of Hebrew words translated by ἀνομία. Austermann, "ἀνομία", 109-31; Austermann, *Nomos*, 180-92.

[196] Ex 5:9; 20:16; 23:7; Lev 5:22, 24; 19:12; Deut 19:18 (2x); 1 Sam 25:21; 2 Sam 18:13; 1 Kings 22:22, 23; 2 Kings 9:12; Isa 9:14; 28:15; 32:7; 44:20; 57:4; 59:3, 13; Jer 3:10, 23; 5:2, 31; 6:13; 7:4, 8, 9; 8:8 (2x), 10; 9:2, 4; 10:14; 13:25; 14:14; 16:19; 20:6; 23:14, 25, 26, 32 (2x); 27:10, 14, 15, 16; 28:15; 29:9, 21, 23, 31; 37:14; 40:16; 43:2; 51:17; Ezek 13:22; Hos 7:1; Mic 2:11; 6:12; Hab 2:18; Zech 5:4; 8:17; 10:2; 13:3; Mal 3:5; Job 13:4; 36:4; Prov 6:17, 19; 10:18; 11:18; 12:17, 19, 22; 13:5; 14:5; 17:4, 7; 19:5, 9; 20:17; 21:6; 25:14, 18; 26:28; 29:12; 31:30; 2 Chr 18:21, 22.

(14x). It appears eight times in the Pentateuch, translated mainly by ἄδικος but other equivalents occur as well, κενός, ψευδής, ἀδίκως.[197]

בַּלָּהָה "terror, dreadful event, calamity, destruction" occurs once in the Psalter, translated by ἀνομία Ps 73:19. Otherwise, it appears nine times in MT. It has various equivalents, mainly ὀδύνη and ἀπώλεια, but also πένθος, αἰτία, and ταραχή.[198] Consequently, at least, in LXX Ezekiel the meaning of the word was known. Austermann argues that the unknown word בַּלָּהָה was based on the common derivation with בְּלִיַּעַל.[199] This is possible, but since בַּלָּהָה and בְּלִיַּעַל apart from Job, never occurs in the same book in LXX it may be unique for the book of Psalms. In Job, however, בְּלִיַּעַל is rendered by παρανομεῖν while בַּלָּהָה is translated by ὀδύνη, αἰτία and ταραχή.[200]

בְּלִיַּעַל "worthlessness, nothingness, worthless" can be found three times in the Psalter.[201] It is always rendered by terms that refer to the law, that is, παράνομος and ἀνομία.[202] It is a common word outside the book of Psalms, where it can be found 24 times.[203] It once has ἀνομία as counterpart, 2 Sam 22:5. This is not astonishing since it is a parallel text to Ps 18:5. It is probable that there has been some kind a revision work in order to harmonise these passages. On the other hand, παράνομος is a common equivalent of בְּלִיַּעַל and once of בֶּן-בְּלִיַּעַל.[204] παρανομεῖν as well as ἀνόμημα "lawless action" appears once.[205] The other equivalents do

---

[197] ἄδικος Ex 23:7; 19:12; Deut 19:18 (2x), κενός Ex 5:9, ψευδής Ex 20:16, ἀδίκως Lev 5:22, 24.

[198] ὀδύνη Job 18:11; 27:20; 30:15, ἀπώλεια Ezek 26:21; 27:36; 28:19, πένθος Isa 17:14, αἰτία Job 18:14, ταραχή 24:17. πένθος and αἰτία is not included in Muraoka, *Hebrew/Aramaic Index*, 27.

[199] Austermann, *Nomos*, 201.

[200] בְּלִיַּעַל παρανομεῖν Job 34:18, בַּלָּהָה ὀδύνη 18:11; 27:20; 30:15, αἰτία 18:14, ταραχή 24:17 (Th).

[201] Wegner, "בלה", 661.

[202] παράνομος 41:9; 101:3, ἀνομία 18:5.

[203] Deut 13:14; 15:9; Judg 19:22; 20:13 (A); 1 Sam 1:16; 2:12; 10:27; 25:17, 25; 30:22; 2 Sam 16:7; 20:1; 22:5; 23:6; 1 Kings 21:10, 13 (2x); Nah 1:11; 2:1; Job 34:18; Prov 6:12; 16:27; 19:28; 2 Chr 13:7.

[204] בְּלִיַּעַל Judg 19:22 (B); 20:13 (B); 2 Sam 16:7; 20:1; 23:6; 1 Kings 21:10, 13; 2 Chr 13:7, בֶּן-בְּלִיַּעַל Deut 13:14.

[205] παρανομεῖν Job 34:18, ἀνόμημα Deut 15:9.

not specifically refer to the breaking of the law, ἁμαρτωλός, ἀποστασία, ἀσεβής (בֶּן־בְּלִיַּעַל), ἄφρων, ἐναντίος, λοιμός. The choice of counterpart in LXX Psalms may have been based on Deut 13:14; 15:9 in the Pentateuch.[206] However, even though the interpretation of בְּלִיַּעַל as a law-breaker occurs already in Deuteronomy,[207] where בְּלִיַּעַל occurs twice, the exclusive use of παράνομος and ἀνομία in LXX Psalms definitely deviates from what can be seen in the other books of the LXX. Furthermore, the choice of παράνομος in Deut 13:14; Judg 19:22; 20:13; 2 Sam 16:7; 20:1; 23:6; 1 Kings 21:10, 13; 2 Chr 13:7, even though it is not reflecting the modern understanding of the word, it is an understandable interpretation, but παράνομος in Pss 41:9; 101:3, and ἀνομία in 18:5 are hardly adequate interpretations.

הלל III qal "to be mad" or "boast" qal only appears in the Psalter.[208] הלל occurs as a participle and in the imperfect.[209] It is always rendered by terms that relate to breaking of the law, παράνομος, παρανομεῖν in the present tense and ἄνομος.[210] Accordingly, although the translator probably did not know the meaning of the word and thus this may be his philological understanding, it is in line with his preference for interpreting sinners and evil men as lawbreakers. The LXX translators probably knew the meaning of ההל I "shine" (Isa 13:10; Job 29:3; 31:26; 41:10) and definitely of הלל II "praise" *passim*.

---

[206] See e.g. Austermann, *Nomos*, 201, 205.

[207] Apart from that it does not occur in the Pentateuch.

[208] 5:6; 73:3; 75:5 (2x); 102:9.

[209] Participle 5:6; 73:3; 75:5; 102:9, imperfect 75:5.

[210] παράνομος 5:6, παρανομεῖν 75:5 (2x), ἄνομος 73:3. ἐπαινεῖν in 102:9 reflects הלל "to praise". Regarding the rendering of הלל III qal, see Austermann, *Nomos*, 197, 199, 200. Austermann's interpretation is based on the internal consistency in the Psalms for the equivalents of הלל III, רֶשַׁע and אָוֶן, since they often occur in the same context. Apart from הלל III and אָוֶן in 5:6 and רֶשַׁע and אָוֶן in 140 (141):4 they never appear in the same verse. That רֶשַׁע is rendered by ἁμαρτία in 140 (141):4 does not accord with Austermann's supposition. Twice the verb רשע is used in combination with הלל III, 72 (73):5; 74 (75):5, translated by ἁμαρτωλός and ἁμαρτάνειν. Furthermore, his conclusions can be seen as a circle-reasoning as regards the question of theological exegesis, since the question why the translator chose equivalents connected with νόμος for הלל III, אָוֶן and רֶשַׁע in the first place is not answered.

זֵד "insolent, presumptuous" appears 13x in LXX, whereof 8x in the Psalter.[211] Although it has diverse equivalents, ἀλλότριος, παράνομος, ὑπερήφανος, in the book of Psalms,[212] a correct interpretation is often reflected. Even though it is twice rendered by παράνομος, once the rendering accords more or less with the context.[213] The semantic correct equivalent ὑπερήφανος is the most common counterpart. זֵד was otherwise seldom understood by the LXX translators.[214] Outside the book of Psalms זֵד is once rendered by a word related to the law, ἄνομος (Isa 13:1).

עָלַם niphal "to be hidden", in form of the participle "hypocrite", once appears in the Psalter, rendered by παρανομεῖν (Ps 26:4). Austermann explains the translation in Ps 26:4 with the lack of equivalents for the four synonymous Hebrew terms for evidoers (רְשָׁעִים, קְהַל מְרֵעִים, נַעֲלָמִים, מְתֵי־שָׁוְא) in this context (Ps 26:4-5), and by the fact that עָלַם niphal is uncommon in the Psalms and that the translator seems to regard עלם as synonymous with the nouns עָוֶל, עַוְלָה and עול qal and piel.[215] However, if the translator had access to other LXX translations he should have no problem to employ a more adequate equivalent. עָלַם niphal occurs 10x outside the book of Psalms.[216] It is as a rule rendered by λανθάνειν, but also by παρορᾶν, ὑπερορᾶν, and παρέρχεσθαι.[217] In the Pentateuch, it is always rendered by λανθάνειν.[218]

---

[211] Pss 19:14; 86:14; 119:21, 51, 69, 78, 85, 122; Isa 13:11; Jer 43:2; Mal 3:15, 19; Prov 21:24.

[212] ἀλλότριος 19:14, παράνομος 86:14; 119:85, ὑπερήφανος 119:21, 51, 69, 78, 122. Ps 19:14, where מִזֵּד is rendered by ἀπὸ ἀλλοτρίων, reflects a different *Vorlage*, מִזָּרִים. See, for example, 54:5 and 86:14. The same is probably true for Mal 3:15 ἀλλότριος and 3:19 ἀλλογενής.

[213] 119:85. זֵד "[the arrogant](#)" (*NRSV*) stands in parallel to אֲשֶׁר לֹא כְתוֹרָתֶךָ "who are not in accord with your law" interpreted as "but not so your law, O Lord" in LXX.

[214] The only more or less correct rendering θρασύς "insolent, arrogant" occurs in Prov 21:24. Otherwise, it is translated by ἄνομος in Isa 13:11, ἀλλότριος Mal 3:15, ἀλλογενής 3:19. It has no counterpart in Jer 43:2.

[215] Austermann, *Nomos*, 199.

[216] Lev 4:13; 5:2, 3, 4; Num 5:13; 1 Kings 10:3; Nah 3:11; Job 28:21; Eccl 12:14; 2 Chr 9:2.

[217] λανθάνειν Lev 4:13, 5:3, 4; Num 5:13; Job 28:21, παρορᾶν 1 Kings 10:3; Eccl 12:14, ὑπερορᾶν Nah 3:11, παρέρχεσθαι 2 Chr 9:2. וְנֶעְלְמָה מֵעֵינִי in Job

לִיץ hiphil "mock, ridicule", as participle "interpreter" appears 7 times in LXX, whereof once in the Psalter.[219] The explanation of παρανομεῖν in Ps 119:51 put forward by Austermann is plausible, that the translator was not familiar with the meaning of the word and translated with help from the second half of the verse, which clearly refers to the law.[220] In two passages it is rendered by words that refer to the law, παρανομεῖν Ps 119:51 and παράνομος Prov 14:9.[221] It is also rendered by ἑρμενευτής, ἄρχων, ἀφικνεῖσθαι, θανατηφόρος and πρεσβευτής.[222] When it once occurs in the Pentateuch it is translated by ἑρμενευτής, Gen 42:23.

ירה hiphil "to teach" occurs 8 times in the book of Psalms.[223] It is mainly translated by νομοθετεῖν, but it also has the equivalents ὁδηγεῖν and συμβιβάζειν.[224] ὁδηγεῖν and συμβιβάζειν reveal that the translator knew the meaning of ירה hiphil "to teach".[225] The participle of ירה hiphil "to rain" (or the noun מוֹרֶה) "the early rain" is also translated by νομοθετεῖν.[226] ירה hiphil appears at least 60x in LXX as a whole, ירה hiphil I "to teach" 47x, ירה hiphil II "to shoot, throw" 13x, ירה hiphil III "to rain" 1x, and it has a variety of equivalents, covering different aspects

---

28:21 is rendered by λέληθεν (i.e. λανθάνειν). עָלַם niphal does not seem to have an equivalent in Lev 5:2.

[218] Lev 4:13; 5:3, 4; Num 5:13. In Lev 5:2 it has no counterpart.

[219] Gen 42:23; Isa 43:27; Job 16:20; 33:23; Ps 119:51; Prov 14:9; 2 Chr 32:31. לִיץ could be interpreted as qal or and hiphil in Prov 3:34; 14:9; 19:28. I have understood it as qal in Prov 3:34 ἀντιτάσσεσθαι and 19:28 καθυβρίζειν and as hiphil in 14:9 παράνομος.

[220] Austermann, *Nomos*, 201-02.

[221] The equivalent here is questionable. See, for example, *BHS*.

[222] ἑρμενευτής Gen 42:23, ἄρχων Isa 43:27, ἀφικνεῖσθαι Job 16:20, θανατηφόρος 33:23, πρεσβευτής 2 Chr 32:31. The equivalent in Job 16:20 is questionable. Hatch, Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint* has †. The same is true for ἄρχων in Isa 43:7. See Muraoka, *Hebrew/Aramaic Index*, 74. The equivalents noted in Muraoka, *Hebrew/Aramaic Index*, 74, are partly different from the ones I have found.

[223] 25:8, 12; 27:11; 32:8; 45:5; 86:11; 119:33, 102.

[224] νομοθετεῖν 25:8, 12; 27:11; 119:33, 102, ὁδηγεῖν 45:5; 86:11, συμβιβάζειν 32:8.

[225] Flashar, "LXX-Psalter", 169 and n. 1, 180 and n. 43, 45, and 181.

[226] 84:7.

of the verb.[227] Nevertheless, νομοθετεῖν, apart from the book of Psalms, only occurs twice in MT.[228] ירה hiphil "to teach" appears 12 times in the Pentateuch and is rendered by συμβιβάζειν, but also νομοθετεῖν, συναντᾶν, δεικνύειν, προβιβάζειν, ἐξηγεῖσθαι, ἀναγγέλλειν, δηλοῦν and once it occurs without counterpart.[229] Although the choice of counterpart in LXX Psalms have probably been influenced by the translation of ירה hiphil "to teach" by νομοθετεῖν in Ex 24:12; Deut 17:10,[230] other equivalents are in majority in the Pentateuch.

In the LXX Psalms חֻקָּה is rendered by δικαίωμα,[231] and חֹק by δικαίωμα (24x) and πρόσταγμα (6x).[232] חֹק is always translated by δικαίωμα, when it appears in the plural, but by πρόσταγμα, when a singular form is used in the Hebrew.[233] חֻקָּה and חֹק as legal terms are mainly translated by νόμιμος, δικαίωμα and πρόσταγμα, and rarely by νόμος and ἐντολή in LXX as a whole.[234] חֹק occurs 47x and חֻקָּה 56x in the Pentateuch. חֹק is mainly rendered by δικαίωμα, but νόμιμος is also common, followed by πρόσταγμα. When it comes to חֻקָּה it is the other way around, νόμιμος is the main equivalent, followed by δικαίωμα, but νόμος and πρόσταγμα are also fairly frequent. The LXX translators have not always tried to distinguish between חֹק as prescription and as "right and privilege", since

---

[227] See, e.g., Muraoka, *Hebrew/Aramaic Index*, 65.

[228] Ex 24:12; Deut 17:10.

[229] συμβιβάζειν Ex 4:12, 15; Lev 10:11, νομοθετεῖν 24:12; Deut 17:10, συναντᾶν Gen 46:28, δεικνύειν Ex 15:25, προβιβάζειν Ex 35:34, ἐξηγεῖσθαι Lev 14:57, ἀναγγέλλειν Deut 24:8, δηλοῦν 33:10. It occurs without counterpart in Lev 17:11. συναντᾶν in Gen 46:28 is not mentioned in Muraoka, *Hebrew/Aramaic Index*, 65. It is noted by † in Hatch, Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint*. However, it is a contextually plausible rendering. See e.g. *NAB* "that he might meet him".

[230] See e.g. Austermann, *Nomos*, 178, 205.

[231] 18:23; 89:32; 119:16.

[232] δικαίωμα 50:16; 105:45; 119:5, 8, 12, 23, 26, 33, 48, 54, 64, 68, 71, 80, 83, 112, 117, 118, 124, 135, 145, 155, 171; 147:19, πρόσταγμα 2:7; 81:5; 94:20; 99:7; 105:10; 148:6. In 74:11 the LXX translator has read Qere חֵיקְךָ.

[233] See Pietersma, "P. Bodmer XXIV", 266-67.

[234] Ringgren, "חקק", 147.

where חֹק is used in the sense "prescription" δικαίωμα or νόμιμος are never used.[235]

דָּת "law" (both Hebrew and Aramaic) can be found 36 times in MT.[236] Apart from once in the Pentateuch (Q), it only appears in Esther, Ezra and Daniel. The counterpart in Ezra is always (6x), and in Esther often νόμος (7x) and νόμος is sometimes found in Dan LXX (1x), and Dan Th (2x). Other equivalents are γνώμη, γράφειν, δόγμα, δογματίζειν, ἔκθεμα, νόμιμος, νόμισμα, ὁρισμός, πρόσταγμα.[237]

The outcome of the investigation when the Hebrew terms are taken as point of departure is that the tendency towards a specific preference for words related to the law in LXX Psalms in relation to the LXX books is further emphasised. For example, אָוֶן "iniquity, lie, nothingness" is more or less stereotypically translated by ἀνομία. This stands in contrast to the renderings outside the Psalter. עַוְלָה is stereotypically rendered by ἀνομία, which do not correspond to the usual equivalents outside the book of Psalms. עָוֹן is mostly translated by ἀνομία in LXX Psalms, and sometimes by ἁμαρτία. Even though עָוֹן is frequently rendered by ἀνομία in other LXX books, ἁμαρτία is an even more common equivalent. פֶּשַׁע is nearly always rendered by terms related to the law, especially ἀνομία but also by παράνομος and ἀνόμημα. In this case, ἀνομία is also a dominant equivalent in the book of Isaiah and it can frequently be found in the book of Job, but otherwise it seldom occurs. The rendering of פֶּשַׁע with παράνομος and ἄνομος in the Psalter is also striking. It is otherwise only in the book of Isaiah that a term related to the law, ἄνομος, often occurs. זִמָּה is always translated by ἀνομία in the Psalter.

---

[235] See, e.g., Gen 47:26 πρόσταγμα, Isa 5:14 διαλείπειν, 10:1 הַחֹקְקִים חִקְקֵי־אָוֶן – τοῖς γράφουσιν πονηρίαν, Ps 2:7 πρόσταγμα. In Prov 8:29 it has no equivalent. Where חֹק refers to a religious due, right or privilege, the equivalents often reflect the adequate nuance, Gen 47:22 δόμα, Ex 29:28 νόμιμος. Regarding the connotation of חֹק in different contexts, see, e.g., Victor, "A Note on חֹק", 358-61.

[236] Deut 33:2 (Q); Esth 1:8, 13, 15, 19; 2:8, 12; 3:8 (2x), 14, 15; 4:3, 8, 11, 16; 8:13, 14, 17; 9:1, 13, 14; Dan 2:9, 13, 15; 6:6, 9, 13, 16; 7:25; Ezra 7:12, 14, 21, 25, 26 (2x); 8:36. Deut 33:2 has אֵשְׁדָּת (K) "lightning" or אֵשׁ דָּת (Q) "the fire of the law"?, which is translated by ἄγγελοι in the LXX.

[237] Muraoka, *Hebrew/Aramaic Index*, 39.

Even though terms for breaking the law rendering זִמָּה is fairly common in LXX, especially παρανόμως, there seems to be a predilection for the understanding of זִמָּה as "lawlessness" in the Psalter, in contrast to the other books in LXX. The rendering of חָמָס mainly by ἄδικος and ἀδικία, and seldom by ἀνομία, is, however, unexpected, even though it is in line with the equivalents outside the Psalter. However, the dominant counterpart ἀσέβεια in LXX is only once found in the Psalter. Words related to the breaking of the law are more common as equivalent of רֶשַׁע in the book of Psalms than in other parts of the LXX, with the exclusion of Ezekiel. שֶׁקֶר is only once translated by ἀνομία otherwise by ἀδικία, ἄδικος, and ἀδίκως, and sometimes by δόλιος and ψευδή. בְּלִיַּעַל is always translated by terms that refer to the law in the book of Psalms, that is, παράνομος and ἀνομία, but παράνομος is a common equivalent of בְּלִיַּעַל, also in the Deuteronomistic history.

The other Hebrew terms are words that seldom appear in LXX Psalms. It is easy to see that there are problems regarding the meaning of הַוָּה as well as the correct identification of it. Regardless of that the predilection for ἀνομία as equivalent in the Psalter is without precedent in LXX as a whole, since the use of terms for "lawlessness" rendering הַוָּה can only be found in the Psalter. The same is true for עָצֵב in Ps 139:24, which stands in contrast to the semantic adequate rendering ὀδύνη in Isa 14:3. The only occurrence apart from these are 1 Chr 4:9, where the word is misunderstood and on that account transcribed. That עָתָק is once translated by ἀνομία, and twice by ἀδικία may be a coincidence. הלל III occurs only in the book of Psalms and it is always rendered by terms that relate to breaking of the law. The rendering of זֵד is less convincing since, even though it twice is translated by a word related to the law in the Psalter, ὑπερήφανος is the most common equivalent. עָלַם niphal is, even though it only occurs once in the Psalter, rendered by παρανομεῖν, and the same is true for לִיץ hiphil. They are otherwise never understood with reference to the law in LXX.

Words related to the law are used in the LXX Psalms for general or specific Hebrew terms that are devoid of specific law associations. In this way, one can find a predilection for terms that relate to people who break the law to translate words for sin and sinners. Flashar seems to be correct in his suggestion that many renderings in the book of Psalms reflect an inclination towards the divine law as the focus of the religion, a tendency that may correspond to a dominant theological trend in the milieu of the translator.

This is partly identical with the outcome of the study of Austermann, and partly in contradistinction to it. He writes:

> PsLXX charakterisiert bei seiner Wiedergabe ausdrücklich und nachdrücklich *Fehlverhalten als Gesetzwidrigkeit, Übeltäter als Gesetzesgegner* und *Gott als Gesetzgeber* und *Gesetzesausleger* … Diese explikativen Aspekte spiegeln über die grundlegend bewahrende Haltung von PsLXX hinaus und zugleich im Einklang mit ihr sein Verständnis der Tora.[238]

On the other hand, he understands the suggestion that the translator reflects an inclination towards the divine law as the focus of the religion, as an interpretation based only on a reading of the LXX Psalter as a document of its own, and not as a reflection of its character as a translation. In his own words:

> PsLXXs Übersetzung spiegelt nicht etwa einen angeblichen Nomismus oder nomisierende Umdeutungsabsichten, sondern beruht auf einer konservativen und bewahrenden Interpretation der torabezogenen Texte in den hebräischen Psalmen.[239]

However, Austermann sometimes seems to give hints of cases where the translator does not work solely as a translator:

> Wo PsLXX sich darauf beschränkt, wie ein Übersetzer und als ein Übersetzer zu arbeiten, der seine Vorlage wort- und sinngetreu wiedergibt, sind Schlüsse auf ein spezifisches Toraverständnis oder auf eine besondere Gesetzestheologie nicht angebracht.[240]

Austermann gives interesting and plausible explanations to several choices of words connected with the law.[241] But even if the explanations are possible in many of the cases, why should nearly all unexpected choices of equivalents for sin and bad behaviour in the Hebrew be translated by words connected with νόμος? This is not solely a conservative interpretation, but clearly reflects a tendency, which cannot

---

[238] Austermann, *Nomos*, 208. See also Austermann, "Psalm 119", 345.
[239] Austermann, *Nomos*, 209.
[240] Austermann, "Psalm 119", 336.
[241] Austermann, *Nomos*, 174-203.

*only* be explained by necessary steps taken by the translator as part of his translation work.

There is one more question to discuss in this context. If the LXX translator only reflects the theological world-view in his own time, where the law of Moses stands in the centre, could it be regarded as a kind of theological exegesis? Does his choice of equivalents really reflect his own theological preferences? However, in this case the influence from dominant features in the religious milieu of his time seems to be more emphasised by this translator than by any of his predecessors and contemporaries. Consequently, it is not probable that the translator only reflects the theology of his time. In that case, the differences in relation to other LXX translators should have been less conspicuous. Perhaps the main difference in understanding between Austermann and me as regards theological influences can be expressed in the last words in his article "So viel – or sollte ich besser sagen, so wenig? – verrät die Wiedergabe von Psalm 119 über die Gesetzestheologie des Übersetzers".[242] Perhaps I would put my emphasis on "so viel" where I guess that Austermann rather opts for "so wenig". This evaluation must be seen in relation to fact that otherwise it is hard to see theological tendencies reflected in the translation. Thus, a theological interpretation of this kind is unexpected and therefore important.

The text of the LXX Psalms in general has a tendency to employ stereotype renderings. If the equivalents in LXX Psalms only mirrored a philological translation one would have expected a more consistent rendering of the Hebrew words, or that different nuances of the words are reflected. Another explanation can also be excluded, that all renderings can be explained by the fact that the translator is affected by the equivalents of the Pentateuch translation, as is common in the book of Psalms. That תּוֹרָה is as a rule translated by νόμος in the Pentateuch and in LXX as a whole is of course reflected in the book of Psalms. Otherwise, it is hard to see that the translator of the LXX Psalms has based his renderings on the Pentateuch. Consequently, apart from e.g. זִמָּה and בְּלִיַּעַל one cannot say that the renderings in LXX Psalms can be explained by an influence from the Pentateuch translated into Greek.[243]

---

[242] Austermann, "Psalm 119", 345.

[243] I am a bit more sceptical than Austermann as regards the influence from the Pentateuch. See Austermann, "Psalm 119", 344, and Austermann, *Nomos*, 205, 208.

There are some possible explanations, which do not imply a theological interpretation, *viz.* that the Hebrew words under investigation are used in a different way in the book of Psalms, as regards the actual phrases in which the separate words are used, or that the word field of the Greek term has influenced the translation. A systematic difference of this kind that would alter the conclusions is not probable and I have partly considered stereotype phrases. It is, however, a fact that many of the Hebrew words mostly or exclusively occur in poetic texts or in prophetic texts, for example, אָוֶן is a word restricted to poetic texts. One must also admit that the translation of word pairs may have affected the choice of equivalents, since one cannot translate two synonyms in parallelism by the same Greek word.[244] E.g. ἁμαρτία frequently occurs in parallel with ἀνομία.[245] The parallelism may suggest that the two words were regarded as synonyms by the translator, but that conclusion implies that he had a similar understanding of parallelism as modern scholars, but this one cannot take for granted. It was common in Jewish hermeneutics to understand the two parallel lines in a verse as expressing two different things.

The study could have comprised all the Hebrew words that occur in the same word field as the Hebrew equivalents to terms relating to νόμος and their equivalents in LXX Psalms, that is, terms that refer to sinners generally and to laws and regulations. It is hard to say how this would have affected the conclusions.

Some more objections can be launched against my result of this study. The investigation could be widened to take account of Greek words that are not related to νόμος, but have connotations with the Mosaic law. However, to decide what to include and what to exclude depends on the associations of the Greek words in the milieu of the translator and the problems in this regard are formidable.

The word πρόσταγμα is a good example. חֹק corresponds to πρόσταγμα in many contexts, where חֹק is employed in the general sense "law, order, rule, prescription". πρόσταγμα is an exclusive word, a word that as a rule is employed for divine laws and regulations in the LXX. Consequently, the LXX translators, not least the translator of the Psalter, often employed a term that specifically relates to divine laws and

---

[244] See e.g. the interesting discussion in this connection in Austermann, *Nomos*, 186-88.

[245] 32:1, 5; 38:19; 51:4, 5, 7, 11; 85:3; 89:33; 103:10; 109:14.

regulations in the Greek. It could be argued that it is a choice of a specific term that more or less adequately renders the meaning of the Hebrew in context, but it is possible to see it as a narrowing of the Hebrew term based on a predilection for the Mosaic law. I hope that this study can be complemented by these kinds of investigations later on by me or by others.


## 10.5. The equivalents of ἀνομία in the Septuagint Psalms

Several Hebrew terms in the book of Psalms are translated by ἀνομία. They are mostly terms that do not wholly reflect the semantic meaning of the Greek word. The same is true as regarding the *Vorlage* for other Greeks words related to the law, ἄνομος, παράνομος, παρανομεῖν, παρανομία, νομοθετεῖν, ἀνόμημα, παρανομία, ἀνόμημα, νομοθέτης, νόμιμος. In order to give a comprehensive view of my investigation I will present the LXX text where ἀνομία is included as an example, stereotypically translated by "lawlessness" with cognates in the LXX Psalms and give a fairly literal translation of the Hebrew (*NRSV*), together with the Hebrew equivalents of the Greek word in question. The Hebrew terms are אָוֶן "iniquity, lie, nothingness", עָוֶל "injustice", עַוְלָה "iniquity, perversity, wickedness", עָוֹן "missing of the target, sin", זִמָּה "wickedness, lewdness", חָמָס "violence, wrong, bloodshed, unrighteousness, wickedness" רֶשַׁע "wrong, wickedness", פֶּשַׁע "offences, rebellion, crime(s), legal offence, personal offence, guilt, wrong(s), property offence, penalty", הַוָּה "disaster, destruction", עֹצֶב "hardship, pain, distress" and "idol", עָתָק "old, hard, stubborn, arrogant, insolent", שֶׁקֶר "deception, falsehood, pretence, deceit, fraud", and בְּלִיַּעַל "worthlessness, nothingness, worthless, wickedness". The Hebrew equivalents here are given translations mainly taken from *TDOT* and *NIDOTTE*, translations that have the ambition to capture the different meanings of the Hebrew terms in question.


In cases where emendations in *NRSV* concern the words under discussion, they are also noted. The same is true for more or less obvious cases where the rendering in the LXX is based on a different Hebrew *Vorlage*. The references are those in the MT.

| Translation of Hebrew | Greek with translation |
|---|---|
| 5:5 For you are not a God who delights in *wickedness* (רֶשַׁע); evil will not sojourn with you | Ὅτι οὐχὶ θεὸς θέλων ἀνομίαν (*lawlessness*) σὺ εἶ οὐδὲ παροικήσει σοι πονηρευόμενος |
| 5:6 *The boastful* (הוֹלְלִים) will not stand before your eyes; you hate *all evildoers* (כָל־פֹּעֲלֵי אָוֶן) | οὐ διαμενοῦσιν παράνομοι (*the lawless*) κατέναντι τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν σου, ἐμίσησας πάντας τοὺς ἐργαζομένους τὴν ἀνομίαν (*all who practice lawlessness*) |
| 6:9 Depart from me, *all you workers of evil* (כָל־פֹּעֲלֵי אָוֶן), for the LORD has heard the sound of my weeping | οὐ διαμενοῦσιν παράνομοι (*the lawless*) κατέναντι τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν σου, ἐμίσησας πάντας τοὺς ἐργαζομένους τὴν ἀνομίαν (*all the lawless persons*) |
| 7:15 Behold, the wicked man conceives evil, and is pregnant with mischief, and brings forth *lies* (אָוֶן) | ἰδοὺ ὠδίνησεν ἀδικίαν συνέλαβεν πόνον καὶ ἔτεκεν ἀνομίαν (*lawlessness*) |
| 14:4 Have they no knowledge, *all the evildoers* (כָל־פֹּעֲלֵי אָוֶן) who eat up my people as they eat bread, and do not call upon the LORD? | οὐχὶ γνώσονται πάντες οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι τὴν ἀνομίαν (*all the lawless persons*) οἱ κατεσθίοντες τὸν λαόν μου βρώσει ἄρτου τὸν κύριον οὐκ ἐπεκαλέσαντο; |
| 18:5 The cords of death encompassed me; *the torrents of perdition* (נַחֲלֵי בְלִיַּעַל) assailed me | περιέσχον με ὠδῖνες θανάτου καὶ χείμαρροι ἀνομίας (*torrents of lawlessness*) ἐξετάραξάν με |
| 18:24 I was blameless before him, and I kept myself *from guilt* (מֵעֲוֹנִי) | καὶ ἔσομαι ἄμωμος μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ καὶ φυλάξομαι ἀπὸ τῆς ἀνομίας μου (*from my lawlessness*) |
| 26:10 those in whose hands are *evil devices* (זִמָּה), and whose right hands are full of bribes | ὧν ἐν χερσὶν ἀνομίαι (*lawlessness*) ἡ δεξιὰ αὐτῶν ἐπλήσθη δώρων |
| 31:19 Let the lying lips be stilled that speak *insolently* (עָתָק) against the righteous with pride and contempt | ἄλαλα γενηθήτω τὰ χείλη τὰ δόλια τὰ λαλοῦντα κατὰ τοῦ δικαίου ἀνομίαν (*lawlessness*) ἐν ὑπερηφανίᾳ καὶ ἐξουδενώσει |
| 32:1 Happy are those whose *transgression* (פֶּשַׁע) is forgiven, whose sin is covered | μακάριοι ὧν ἀφέθησαν αἱ ἀνομίαι (*the lawlessness*) καὶ ὧν ἐπεκαλύφθησαν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι |

| *Translation of Hebrew* | *Greek with translation* |
|---|---|
| 32:5 Then I acknowledged my sin to you, and I did not hide *my iniquity* (עֲוֺנִי); I said, "I will confess *my transgressions* (פְּשָׁעַי) to the LORD" | τὴν ἁμαρτίαν μου ἐγνώρισα καὶ τὴν ἀνομίαν μου (*my lawlessness*) οὐκ ἐκάλυψα εἶπα ἐξαγορεύσω κατ᾽ ἐμοῦ τὴν ἀνομίαν μου (*my lawlessness*) τῷ κυρίῳ |
| 36:3 For they flatter themselves in their own eyes that *their iniquity* (עֲוֺנוֹ) cannot be found out and hated | ὅτι ἐδόλωσεν ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ τοῦ εὑρεῖν τὴν ἀνομίαν αὐτοῦ (*his lawlessness*) καὶ μισῆσαι |
| 36:4 The words of their mouths are *mischief* (אָוֶן) and deceit; they have ceased to act wisely and do good | τὰ ῥήματα τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ ἀνομία (*lawlessness*) καὶ δόλος οὐκ ἐβουλήθη συνιέναι τοῦ ἀγαθῦναι |
| 36:5 They plot *mischief* (אָוֶן) while on their beds; they are set on a way that is not good; they do not reject evil | ἀνομίαν (*lawlessness*) διελογίσατο ἐπὶ τῆς κοίτης αὐτοῦ παρέστη πάσῃ ὁδῷ οὐκ ἀγαθῇ τῇ δὲ κακίᾳ οὐ προσώχθισεν |
| 36:13 There *the evildoers* (פֹּעֲלֵי אָוֶן) lie prostrate, they are thrust down, unable to rise | ἐκεῖ ἔπεσον οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι τὴν ἀνομίαν (*the lawless persons*) ἐξώσθησαν καὶ οὐ μὴ δύνωνται στῆναι |
| 37:1 Do not fret because of the wicked; do not be envious *of wrongdoers* (בְּעֹשֵׂי עַוְלָה)! | μὴ παραζήλου ἐν πονηρευομένοις μηδὲ ζήλου τοὺς ποιοῦντας τὴν ἀνομίαν (*those that do lawlessness*) |
| 38:5 For *my iniquities* (עֲוֺנֹתַי) have gone over my head; they weigh like a burden too heavy for me | ὅτι αἱ ἀνομίαι μου (*my lawlessness*) ὑπερῆραν τὴν κεφαλήν μου ὡσεὶ φορτίον βαρὺ ἐβαρύνθησαν ἐπ᾽ ἐμέ |
| 38:19 I confess *my iniquity* (עֲוֺנִי), I am sorry for my sin | ὅτι τὴν ἀνομίαν μου (*my lawlessness*) ἐγὼ ἀναγγελῶ καὶ μεριμνήσω ὑπὲρ τῆς ἁμαρτίας μου |
| 39:12 You chastise mortals in punishment for *sin* (עָוֺן), consuming like a moth what is dear to them; surely everyone is a mere breath | ἐν ἐλεγμοῖς ὑπὲρ ἀνομίας (*lawlessness*) ἐπαίδευσας ἄνθρωπον καὶ ἐξέτηξας ὡς ἀράχνην τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ πλὴν μάτην ταράσσεται πᾶς ἄνθρωπος |
| 40:13 For evils have encompassed me without number; *my iniquities* (עֲוֺנֹתַי) have overtaken me | ὅτι περιέσχον με κακά ὧν οὐκ ἔστιν ἀριθμός κατέλαβόν με αἱ ἀνομίαι μου (*my lawlessness*) |

| *Translation of Hebrew* | *Greek with translation* |
|---|---|
| 41:7 And when they come to see me, they utter empty words, while their hearts gather *mischief* (אָוֶן); when they go out, they tell it abroad | καὶ εἰ εἰσεπορεύετο τοῦ ἰδεῖν μάτην ἐλάλει ἡ καρδία αὐτοῦ συνήγαγεν ἀνομίαν ἑαυτῷ (*lawlessness to himself*) ἐξεπορεύετο ἔξω καὶ ἐλάλει |
| 45:8 you love righteousness and hate *wickedness* (רֶשַׁע) | ἠγάπησας δικαιοσύνην καὶ ἐμίσησας ἀνομίαν (*lawlessness*) |
| 49:6 Why should I fear in times of trouble, when *the iniquity* (עָוֹן) of *my persecutors* (עֲקֵבַי, MT עֲקֵבַי) surrounds me | ἵνα τί φοβοῦμαι ἐν ἡμέρᾳ πονηρᾷ ἡ ἀνομία (*the lawlessness*) τῆς πτέρνης μου κυκλώσει με |
| 50:21 These things you have done and I have been silent; you thought *that I was* (הֱיוֹת־אֶהְיֶה) one just like yourself | ταῦτα ἐποίησας καὶ ἐσίγησα ὑπέλαβες ἀνομίαν (*lawlessness* probably הַוֹּת) ὅτι ἔσομαί σοι ὅμοιος |
| 51:4 Wash me thoroughly *from my iniquity* (מֵעֲוֹנִי), and cleanse me from my sin | ἐπὶ πλεῖον πλῦνόν με ἀπὸ τῆς ἀνομίας μου (*from my lawlessness*) καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας μου καθάρισόν με |
| 51:5 For I know *my transgressions* (פְשָׁעַי), and my sin is ever before me | ὅτι τὴν ἀνομίαν μου (*my lawlessness*) ἐγὼ γινώσκω καὶ ἡ ἁμαρτία μου ἐνώπιόν μού ἐστιν διὰ παντός |
| 51:7 Indeed, I was born *guilty* (בְּעָוֹן), a sinner when my mother conceived me | ἰδοὺ γὰρ ἐν ἀνομίαις (*with lawlessness*) συνελήμφθην καὶ ἐν ἁμαρτίαις ἐκίσσησέν με ἡ μήτηρ μου |
| 51:11 Hide thy face from my sins, and blot out *all my iniquitie*s (כָל־עֲוֹנֹתַי) | ἀπόστρεψον τὸ πρόσωπόν σου ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν μου καὶ πάσας τὰς ἀνομίας μου (*all my lawlessness*) ἐξάλειψον |
| 53:2 They are corrupt, they commit *abominable acts* (עָוֶל); there is no one who does good | διεφθάρησαν καὶ ἐβδελύχθησαν ἐν ἀνομίαις (*lawlessness*) οὐκ ἔστιν ποιῶν ἀγαθόν |
| 53:5 Have they no knowledge, *those evildoers* (כָל־פֹּעֲלֵי אָוֶן), who eat up my people as they eat bread, and do not call upon God? | οὐχὶ γνώσονται πάντες οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι τὴν ἀνομίαν (*all those lawless persons*) οἱ ἔσθοντες τὸν λαόν μου βρώσει ἄρτου τὸν θεὸν οὐκ ἐπεκαλέσαντο; |

| *Translation of Hebrew* | *Greek with translation* |
|---|---|
| 55:4 For they bring *trouble* (אָוֶן) upon me, and in anger they cherish enmity against me | ὅτι ἐξέκλιναν ἐπ᾽ ἐμὲ ἀνομίαν (*lawlessness*) καὶ ἐν ὀργῇ ἐνεκότουν μοι |
| 55:10 Confuse, O Lord, confound their speech; for I see *violence* (חָמָס) and strife in the city | καταπόντισον κύριε καὶ καταδίελε τὰς γλώσσας αὐτῶν ὅτι εἶδον ἀνομίαν (*lawlessness*) καὶ ἀντιλογίαν ἐν τῇ πόλει |
| 55:11 Day and night they go around it on its walls, and *iniquity* (אָוֶן) and trouble are within it | ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτὸς κυκλώσει αὐτὴν ἐπὶ τὰ τείχη αὐτῆς ἀνομία (*lawlessness*) καὶ κόπος ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῆς |
| 57:2 Be merciful to me, O God, be merciful to me, for in you my soul takes refuge; in the shadow of your wings I will take refuge, until *the destroying storms* (הַוּוֹת) pass by | ἐλέησόν με ὁ θεός ἐλέησόν με ὅτι ἐπὶ σοὶ πέποιθεν ἡ ψυχή μου καὶ ἐν τῇ σκιᾷ τῶν πτερύγων σου ἐλπιῶ ἕως οὗ παρέλθῃ ἡ ἀνομία (*the lawlessness*) |
| 58:3 No, in your hearts you devise *wrongs* (עוֹלֹת); your hands deal out violence on earth | καὶ γὰρ ἐν καρδίᾳ ἀνομίας (*lawlessness*) ἐργάζεσθε ἐν τῇ γῇ ἀδικίαν αἱ χεῖρες ὑμῶν συμπλέκουσιν |
| 59:3 Deliver me *from those who work evil* (מִפֹּעֲלֵי אָוֶן); from the bloodthirsty save me | ῥῦσαί με ἐκ τῶν ἐργαζομένων τὴν ἀνομίαν (*from the lawless persons*) καὶ ἐξ ἀνδρῶν αἱμάτων σῶσόν με |
| 59:4 Even now they lie in wait for my life; the mighty stir up strife against me. For no *transgression* (פֶּשַׁע) or sin *of mine*, O LORD | ὅτι ἰδοὺ ἐθήρευσαν τὴν ψυχήν μου ἐπέθεντο ἐπ᾽ ἐμὲ κραταιοί οὔτε ἡ ἀνομία μου (*my lawlessness*) οὔτε ἡ ἁμαρτία μου κύριε |
| 59:5 for no *fault* (עָוֹן) of mine, they run and make ready | ἄνευ ἀνομίας (*lawlessness*) ἔδραμον καὶ κατεύθυναν |
| 64:3 Hide me from the secret plots of the wicked, from the scheming of *evildoers* (פֹּעֲלֵי אָוֶן) | ἐσκέπασάς με ἀπὸ συστροφῆς πονηρευομένων ἀπὸ πλήθους ἐργαζομένων τὴν ἀνομίαν (*lawless persons*) |
| 64:7 Who can search out our *crimes* (עוֹלֹת)? We have thought out a cunningly conceived plot." For the human heart and mind are deep. | ἐξηρεύνησαν ἀνομίας (*lawless deeds*) ἐξέλιπον ἐξερευνῶντες ἐξερευνήσει. προσελεύσεται ἄνθρωπος, καὶ καρδία βαθεῖα |

| Translation of Hebrew | Greek with translation |
|---|---|
| 69:28 Add *guilt to their guilt*; (עָוֹן עַל־עֲוֹנָם); may they have no acquittal from you | πρόσθες ἀνομίαν ἐπὶ τὴν ἀνομίαν αὐτῶν (*lawlessness upon their lawlessness*) καὶ μὴ εἰσελθέτωσαν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ σου |
| 73:19 How they are destroyed in a moment, swept away utterly by *terrors*! (בַּלָּהוֹת) | πῶς ἐγένοντο εἰς ἐρήμωσιν ἐξάπινα ἐξέλιπον ἀπώλοντο διὰ τὴν ἀνομίαν αὐτῶν (*their lawlessness*) |
| 74:20 Have regard for your covenant, for the dark places of the land are full of the haunts of *violence* (חָמָס) | ἐπίβλεψον εἰς τὴν διαθήκην σου ὅτι ἐπληρώθησαν οἱ ἐσκοτισμένοι τῆς γῆς οἴκων ἀνομιῶν (*lawlessness*) |
| 79:8 Do not remember against us *the iniquities* (עֲוֹנֹת) of our ancestors; let your compassion come speedily to meet us, for we are brought very low | μὴ μνησθῇς ἡμῶν ἀνομιῶν (*lawlessness*) ἀρχαίων ταχὺ προκαταλαβέτωσαν ἡμᾶς οἱ οἰκτιρμοί σου ὅτι ἐπτωχεύσαμεν σφόδρα |
| 85:3 You forgave *the iniquity* (עָוֹן) of your people; you pardoned all their sin | ἀφῆκας τὰς ἀνομίας (*the lawlessness*) τῷ λαῷ σου ἐκάλυψας πάσας τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν |
| 89:23 The enemy shall not outwit him, *the wicked* (וּבֶן־עַוְלָה) shall not humble him | οὐκ ὠφελήσει ἐχθρὸς ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ υἱὸς ἀνομίας (*and a son of lawlessness*) οὐ προσθήσει τοῦ κακῶσαι αὐτόν |
| 89:33 then I will punish *their transgression* (פִּשְׁעָם) with the rod and their iniquity with scourges | ἐπισκέψομαι ἐν ῥάβδῳ τὰς ἀνομίας αὐτῶν (*their lawlessness*) καὶ ἐν μάστιξιν τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν |
| 90:8 You have set *our iniquities* (עֲוֹנֹתֵינוּ) before you, our secret sins in the light of your countenance | ἔθου τὰς ἀνομίας ἡμῶν (*our lawlessness*) ἐνώπιόν σου ὁ αἰὼν ἡμῶν εἰς φωτισμὸν τοῦ προσώπου σου |
| 92:8 though the wicked sprout like grass and *all evildoers* (כָּל־פֹּעֲלֵי אָוֶן) flourish, they are doomed to destruction forever | ἐν τῷ ἀνατεῖλαι τοὺς ἁμαρτωλοὺς ὡς χόρτον καὶ διέκυψαν πάντες οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι τὴν ἀνομίαν (*all the lawless persons*) ὅπως ἂν ἐξολεθρευθῶσιν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος |

| *Translation of Hebrew* | *Greek with translation* |
|---|---|
| 92:10 For your enemies, O LORD, for your enemies shall perish; *all evildoers* (כָּל־פֹּעֲלֵי אָוֶן) shall be scattered | ὅτι ἰδοὺ οἱ ἐχθροί σου ἀπολοῦνται καὶ διασκορπισθήσονται πάντες οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι τὴν ἀνομίαν (*all the lawless persons*) |
| 94:4 They pour out their arrogant words, *all the evildoers* (אָוֶן כָּל־פֹּעֲלֵי) boast | φθέγξονται καὶ λαλήσουσιν ἀδικίαν λαλήσουσιν πάντες οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι τὴν ἀνομίαν (*all the lawless persons*) |
| Who stands up for me against *evildoers* (פֹּעֲלֵי אָוֶן)? | τίς συμπαραστήσεταί μοι ἐπὶ ἐργαζομένους τὴν ἀνομίαν; (*lawless persons*) |
| 94:20 Can *wicked rulers* (כִּסֵּא הַוּוֹת) be allied with you, those who contrive mischief by statute? | μὴ συμπροσέσται σοι θρόνος ἀνομίας (*lawless thrones*) ὁ πλάσσων κόπον ἐπὶ προστάγματι; |
| 94:23 He will repay them for *their iniquity* (אֶת־אוֹנָם) and wipe them out for their wickedness; the LORD our God will wipe them out | καὶ ἀποδώσει αὐτοῖς τὴν ἀνομίαν αὐτῶν (*their lawlessness*) καὶ κατὰ τὴν πονηρίαν αὐτῶν ἀφανιεῖ αὐτοὺς κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν |
| 101:8 Morning by morning I will destroy all the wicked in the land, cutting off *all evildoers* (כָּל־פֹּעֲלֵי אָוֶן) from the city of the LORD | εἰς τὰς πρωίας ἀπέκτεννον πάντας τοὺς ἁμαρτωλοὺς τῆς γῆς τοῦ ἐξολεθρεῦσαι ἐκ πόλεως κυρίου πάντας τοὺς ἐργαζομένους τὴν ἀνομίαν (*all the lawless persons*) |
| 103:3 who forgives *all your iniquity* (לְכָל־עֲוֹנֵכִי), who heals all your diseases | τὸν εὐιλατεύοντα πάσαις ταῖς ἀνομίαις σου (*all your lawlessness*) τὸν ἰώμενον πάσας τὰς νόσους σου |
| 103:10 He does not deal with us according to our sins, nor repay us *according to our iniquities* (כַּעֲוֹנֹתֵינוּ) | οὐ κατὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν ἐποίησεν ἡμῖν οὐδὲ κατὰ τὰς ἀνομίας ἡμῶν (*according to our lawlessness*) ἀνταπέδωκεν ἡμῖν |
| 103:12 as far as the east is from the west, so far he removes *our transgressions* (אֶת־פְּשָׁעֵינוּ) from us | καθ᾽ ὅσον ἀπέχουσιν ἀνατολαὶ ἀπὸ δυσμῶν ἐμάκρυνεν ἀφ᾽ ἡμῶν τὰς ἀνομίας ἡμῶν (*our lawlessness*) |
| 106:43 but they were rebellious in their purposes, and were brought low *through their iniquity* (בַּעֲוֹנָם) | αὐτοὶ δὲ παρεπίκραναν αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ βουλῇ αὐτῶν καὶ ἐταπεινώθησαν ἐν ταῖς ἀνομίαις αὐτῶν (*through their lawlessness*) |

| *Translation of Hebrew* | *Greek with translation* |
|---|---|
| 107:17 Some were sick *through their sinful ways* (מִדֶּרֶךְ פִּשְׁעָם), *and because of their iniquities* (וּמֵעֲוֹנֹתֵיהֶם) endured affliction | ἀντελάβετο αὐτῶν ἐξ ὁδοῦ ἀνομίας αὐτῶν (*through their lawless ways*) διὰ γὰρ τὰς ἀνομίας αὐτῶν (*because of their lawlessness*) ἐταπεινώθησαν |
| 107:42 The upright see it and are glad; *and all wickedness* (וְכָל־עַוְלָה) stops its mouth | ὄψονται εὐθεῖς καὶ εὐφρανθήσονται καὶ πᾶσα ἀνομία (*and all lawlessness*) ἐμφράξει τὸ στόμα αὐτῆς |
| 109:14 May *the iniquity* (עֲוֹן) of his father be remembered before the LORD, and do not let the sin of his mother be blotted out | ὄψονται εὐθεῖς καὶ εὐφρανθήσονται καὶ πᾶσα ἀνομία (*and all lawlessness*) ἐμφράξει τὸ στόμα αὐτῆς |
| 109:14 May *the iniquity* (עֲוֹן) of his father be remembered before the LORD, and do not let the sin of his mother be blotted out | ἀναμνησθείη ἡ ἀνομία (*the lawlessness*) τῶν πατέρων αὐτοῦ ἔναντι κυρίου καὶ ἡ ἁμαρτία τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ μὴ ἐξαλειφθείη |
| 119:3 who also *do no wrong* (פָּעֲלוּ עַוְלָה), but walk in his ways | οὐ γὰρ οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι τὴν ἀνομίαν (*the lawless persons*) ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτοῦ ἐπορεύθησαν |
| 119:133 Keep my steps steady according to your promise, and never let *iniquity* (כָל־אָוֶן) have dominion over me | τὰ διαβήματά μου κατεύθυνον κατὰ τὸ λόγιόν σου καὶ μὴ κατακυριευσάτω μου πᾶσα ἀνομία (*any lawlessness*) |
| 119:150 Those who persecute me with *evil purpose* (זִמָּה) draw near; they are far from your law | προσήγγισαν οἱ καταδιώκοντές με ἀνομίᾳ (*with lawlessness*) ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ νόμου σου ἐμακρύνθησαν |
| 125:3 For the scepter of wickedness shall not rest on the land allotted to the righteous, so that the righteous might not stretch out their hands *to do wrong* (בְּעַוְלָתָם) | ὅτι οὐκ ἀφήσει τὴν ῥάβδον τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν ἐπὶ τὸν κλῆρον τῶν δικαίων ὅπως ἂν μὴ ἐκτείνωσιν οἱ δίκαιοι ἐν ἀνομίᾳ (*in lawlessness*) χεῖρας αὐτῶν |
| 125:5 But those who turn aside to their own crooked ways the LORD will lead away with *evildoers* (הָאָוֶן אֶת־פֹּעֲלֵי)! | τοὺς δὲ ἐκκλίνοντας εἰς τὰς στραγγαλιὰς ἀπάξει κύριος μετὰ τῶν ἐργαζομένων τὴν ἀνομίαν (*the lawless persons*) |
| 129:3 The plowers plowed on my back; they made *their furrows* (MT לְמַעֲנוֹתָם K) long | ἐπὶ τοῦ νώτου μου ἐτέκταινον οἱ ἁμαρτωλοί ἐμάκρυναν τὴν ἀνομίαν αὐτῶν (*their lawlessness* לַעֲוֹנוֹתָם or simply a guess) |

| *Translation of Hebrew* | *Greek with translation* |
|---|---|
| 130:3 If you, O LORD, should mark *iniquities* (עֲוֺנוֹת), Lord, who could stand? | ἐὰν ἀνομίας ( *lawlessness*) παρατηρήσῃ κύριε κύριε τίς ὑποστήσεται |
| 130:8 It is he who will redeem Israel *from all its iniquities* (מִכֹּל עֲוֺנֹתָיו) | καὶ αὐτὸς λυτρώσεται τὸν Ισραηλ ἐκ πασῶν τῶν ἀνομιῶν αὐτοῦ (*from all its lawlessness*) |
| 139:24 See if there is *any wicked way* (דֶּרֶךְ־עֹצֶב) in me, and lead me in the way everlasting | καὶ ἰδὲ εἰ ὁδὸς ἀνομίας (*a lawless way*) ἐν ἐμοί καὶ ὁδήγησόν με ἐν ὁδῷ αἰωνίᾳ |
| 141:4 Do not turn my heart to any evil, to busy myself with wicked deeds *in company with those who work iniquity*; (אֶת־אִישִׁים פֹּעֲלֵי־אָוֶן) | μὴ ἐκκλίνῃς τὴν καρδίαν μου εἰς λόγους πονηρίας τοῦ προφασίζεσθαι προφάσεις ἐν ἁμαρτίαις σὺν ἀνθρώποις ἐργαζομένοις ἀνομίαν (*in company with lawless persons*) |
| 141:9 Keep me from the trap that they have laid for me, and from the snares of *evildoers* (פֹּעֲלֵי אָוֶן) | φύλαξόν με ἀπὸ παγίδος ἧς συνεστήσαντό μοι καὶ ἀπὸ σκανδάλων τῶν ἐργαζομένων τὴν ἀνομίαν (*the lawless persons*) |

# Bibliography

Adler, W. "*Ad Verbum* or *Ad Sensum*. The Christianization of a Latin Translation Formula in the Fourth Century". *Pursuing the Text. Studies in Honour of Ben Zion Wacholder on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*. ed. J.C. Reeves, J. Lampen. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament. Supplement Series 184. Sheffield, 1994: 321-25.

Aejmelaeus, A. "Faith, Hope and Interpretation: A Lexical Study and Syntactical Study of the Semantic Field of Hope in the Greek Psalter". *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, and the Septuagint. Presented to Eugene Ulrich*. Leiden, Boston, 2006: 360-76.

_____. *Parataxis in the Septuagint. A Study of the Renderings of the Hebrew Coordinate Clauses in the Greek Pentateuch*. Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae. Dissertationes Humanarum Litterarum 31. Helsinki, 1982.

_____. "Von Sprache zur Theologie: Methodologische Überlegungen zur Theologie der Septuaginta". *The Septuagint and Messianism*. Ed. M.A. Knibb, Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 195. Leuven, 2006: 21-48.

Albrektson, B. *Studies in the Text and Theology of the Book of Lamentations*. Studia Theologica Lundensia 21. Lund, 1963.

Albright, W.F. "Zabul Yam and Thapit Nahar in the Combat between Baal and the Sea". *Journal of Palestine Oriental Society* 16 (1936): 17-20.

Alexander, P.S. "Jewish Aramaic Translations of Hebrew Scriptures". *Mikra*: 217-53.

Allen, L.C. *The Greek Chronicles. The Relation of the Septuagint of I and 11 Chronicles to the Massoretic Text.* 2 vols. *Part 1: The Translator's Craft.* Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 25. Leiden, 1974.

_____. *The Greek Chronicles. The Relation of the Septuagint of I and II Chronicles to the Massoretic Text. Part II: Textual Criticism.* Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 27. Leiden, 1974.

Anderson, A.A. *The Book of Psalms.* 2 vols. New Century Bible. London, 1972.

Arieti, J.A. "The Vocabulary of Septuagint Amos". *Journal of Biblical Literature* 93 (1974): 338-47.

Austermann, F. "ἀνομία im Septuaginta-Psalter: Ein Beitrag zum Verhältnis Von Übersetzungsweise und Theologie". *Helsinki Perspectives.* Ed. R. Sollamo. Göttingen, 2001: 99-137.

_____. *Von der Tora zum Nomos. Untersuchungen zur Übersetzungsweise und Interpretation im Septuaginta-Psalter.* Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens 27. Göttingen, 2003.

_____. "Von der Tora im hebräischen Psalm 119 zum Nomos im griechischen

Psalm 118. Was die Wiedergabe über die Gesetzestheologie des Übersetzers verrät und was nicht". *Der Septuaginta-Psalter*: 331-47.

Avigad, N., Yadin, Y. *A Genesis Apocryphon.* Jerusalem, 1956.

Baethgen, F. *Psalmen.* 3th, 4th ed. 2 vols. Handbuch zum Alten Testament 2/2. Göttingen, 1904.

_____. "Der Textkritische Wert der Alten Übersetzungen zu den Psalmen". *Jahrbücher für Protestantische Theologie* 8 (1882): 405-, 593-.

Baker, D.W. "עול". *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis* 3: 342-44.

Bar-Deroma, H. "The River of Egypt (Nahal misraim)". *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 92 (1960): 53-56.

Barnes, W.E. "The Recovery of the Septuagint". *Journal of Theological Studies* 36 (1935): 123-31.

_____.

Barnes, W.E. Ed. *The Peshitta Psalter*: *according to the west Syrian text edited with an apparatus criticus*. Cambridge, 1904.

Barr, J. *Comparative Philology and the Text of the OT.* Oxford, 1968.

_____. "Doubts about Homoeophony in the Septuagint". *Textus* 12 (1985): 1-77.

_____. "Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek in the Hellenistic Age". *The Cambridge History of Judaism, vol 2. The Hellenistic Age.* Edited by W.D. Davies. Cambridge, 1989: 79-114.

_____. "Seeing the Wood for the Trees? An Enigmatic Ancient Translation". *Journal of Semitic Studies* 13 (1968): 11-20.

_____. "The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations". Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens 15. Göttingen, 1979: 279-325.

_____. "Vocalization and the Analysis of Hebrew among the Ancient Translators". Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 16 (1967): 1-11.

Barrois, B.A. "Gihon". *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* 2: 396

Barstad, H.M. "Sheol". *Deities and Demons*: 1455.

Barth, C. "בקר". *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament* 2: 217-28.

Barthélemy, D. *Les Devanciers d'Aquila.* Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 10. Leiden, 1963.

_____. *Études d'histoire du texte de l'Ancien Testament*. Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 21. Göttingen, 1978.

_____. "Le Psautier grec et le Papyrus Bodmer XXIV". *Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie* 3rd series 19 (1969): 106-10.

Beck, J.A. *Translators as Storytellers. A Study in Septuagint Translation Technique.* Studies in Biblical Literature 25. New York, 2000.

Beekman, J., Callow, J. *Translating the Word of God. With Scripture and Topical Indexes.* Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1974.

Bergman, J. "יאר". *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament* 3: 386.

Bernhardt, K.H. "אוֹן". *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament* 1: 140-47.

Bertholet, A. "Eine crux interpretum". *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 38 (1908): 58-59.

_____. "Nochmals zu Ps 2:11f". *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 38 (1908): 193.

Bertram, G. "παιδεύω". *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* 5: 596-624.

_____. "Der Sprachschatz der Septuaginta und der des hebräischen Alten Testaments". *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 57 (1939): 93-101.

Bickerman, E.J. "Some Notes on the Translation of the Septuagint". *A Marx Jubilee Volume*. Edited by S. Lieberman. New York, 1950: 149-78.

Blass, F., Debrunner, A., Funk, R.W. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Chicago, London, 1961.

Blomqvist, J. *Greek Particles in Hellenistic Prose.* Lund, 1969.

Bodine, W.R. *The Greek Text of Judges: Recensional Developments.* Harvard Semitic Monographs 23. Chico, California, 1980.

Boling, R.G., Wright, G.E. *Joshua.* The Anchor Bible 6. New York, 1982.

Bordreuil, P. "mizzēbul lô: à propos de Psaume 49:15". *Ascribe to the Lord. Biblical and Other Studies in Memory of Peter C. Craigie*. Edited by L.M. Eslinger, P.C. Craigie, G. Taylor. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament. Supplement Series 67. Sheffield, 1988: 96-98.

Botterweck, G.J., Ringgren, H., Fabry, H-J. Eds. *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids, Mich. 1974-

_____. Ringgren, H. Eds. *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament.* Stuttgart, 1970-.

Boyd-Taylor, C. "A Place in the Sun. The Interpretative Significance of LXX-Psalm 18:5c". *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 31 (1998): 71-105.

Branson, R.D. "מוסר, יסר". *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament* 3: 692-97.

Bratcher, R.G. *A History of Bible Translation and the North American Contribution.* Atlanta, 1991.

Braude, W.G. *The Midrash on Psalms*. 2 vols. Yale Judaica Series 13. New Haven, 1959.

Brewer, D.I. *Techniques and Assumptions in Jewish Exegesis before 70 CE.* Tübingen, 1992.

Briggs, A. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Psalms.* 2 vols. The International Critical Commentary 1. Edinburgh, 1906.

Bright, J. *Jeremiah.* The Anchor Bible 21. New York, 1965.

Brinkman, J.A. et al. Eds *The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago* 11/2. Chicago, Illinois, 1980.

Brock, S.P. "Aspects of Translation Technique in Antiquity". *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 20 (1979): 69-87.

_____. "The Phenomenon of Biblical Translation in Antiquity". *Alta: The University of Birmingham Review* 2:8 (1969): 541-71.

_____. "The Phenomenon of the Septuagint". *The Witness of Tradition. Papers read at the joint British-Dutch Old Testament Conference held at Woudschoten 1970.* Old Testament Studies 17. Leiden, 1972: 11-36.

_____. "To Revise or not to Revise: Attitudes to Jewish Bible Translation". *Septuagint Scrolls and Cognate Writings* 33: 301-38.

Brooke, G.J., Lindars, B. Eds. *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings. Papers Presented to the International Symposium on the Septuagint and Its Relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings*. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 33. Manchester, 1990.

Brown, F., Driver, S.R., Briggs, C.A., *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Oxford, 1977.

Brown, J.P. "The Septuagint as a Source of Loan-Words in the Targums". *Biblica* 70 (1989): 194-216.

Buhl, F. *Psalmerne, oversatte og fortolkade af Frants Buhl.* Copenhagen, 1900.

Bultmann, R. "ἐλπις". *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* 11: 515-20.

Buttenwieser, M. *The Psalms. Chronologically Treated with a New Translation.* Chicago, Illinois, 1938.

Buttrick, G.A. Ed. *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*. New York, Nashville, 1962.

Caird, G.B. "Ben Sira and the Dating of the Septuagint". *Papers presented to the Fifth International Congress on Biblical Studies held at Oxford 1973*. Edited by E.A. Livingstone. Studia Evangelica 7. Berlin, 1982: 95-100.

_____. "Homoeophony in the Septuagint". *Jews, Greeks and Christians, Religious Cultures in Late Antiquity. Essays in Honor of W.D. Davies*. Edited by R. Hamerton-Kelly and R. Scroggs. Leiden, 1976: 74-88.

_____. "Towards a Lexicon of the Septuagint II". *Septuagintal Lexicography*. Rev. ed. by R.A. Kraft. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 1. Missoula, Montana, 1972: 110-32.

Carpenter, E., Grisanti, M.A. "פשע". *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis* 3: 706-10.

_____. "שקר". *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis* 4: 247.

Carroll, R.P. *Jeremiah: a Commentary.* Old Testament Library. London, 1986.

Casetti, P. *Gibt es ein Leben vor dem Tod? Eine Auslegung von Psalm 49.* Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 44. Göttingen, 1982.

Casetti, P., Keel, O., Schenker, A. Eds. *Mélanges Dominique Barthélemy: études bibliques offertes à l'occasion de son 60e anniversaire*. Orbis Biblicus et

Orientalis 38. Fribourg-Göttingen, 1981.

Castellino, G. *Libro dei Salmi.* La Sacra Bibbia. 3rd ed. Torino, Marietti, 1965.

Chester, A. *Divine Revelation and Divine Titles in the Pentateuchal Targumim.* Tübingen, 1986.

Childs, B.S. "Eden, Garden of". *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* 2, 23.

Churgin, P. "The Targum and the Septuagint". *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures* 50 (1933-34): 41-65.

Clines, D.J.A. *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew.* 2 vols. Sheffield, 1993.

Cook, J. "On the Relationship between 11QPs-a and the Septuagint on the Basis of the Computerized Data Base". *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings*: 107-30.

Cooper, A. "Divine Names and Epithets in the Ugaritic Texts". *Ras Shamra Parallels III*. Analecta Orientalia 51. Rome, 1981: 333-469.

Craigie, P.C. *Psalms 1-50.* Word Biblical Commentary 19. Waco, 1983.

Crim, K. Ed. *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. Supplement.* Abington/Nashville, 1962.

Cross, F.M. *The Ancient Library of Qumran & Modern Biblical Studies.* 2 ed. New York, 1961.

_____. "The History of the Biblical Text in the Light of the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert". *Harvard Theological Review* 57 (1964): 281-99.

_____. "The Contribution of the Qumran Discoveries to the Study of the Biblical Text". *Israel Exploration Journal* 16 (1966): 81-95.

Dahood, M. *Psalms 1-50.* The Anchor Bible 16. Garden City, NY, 1966.

Dalman, H. *Aramäisch-neuhebräisches Handwörterbuch zu Targum, Talmud und Midrasch.* 3 ed. Göttingen, 1938.

Daniel, S. *Recherces sur le vocabulaire du culte dans la Septante.* Études et commentaires 61. Paris, 1966.

_____. "בעל". *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament* 2: 181-200.

Delekat, L. *Asylie und Schutzorakel am Zionheiligtum. Eine Untersuchung zu den privaten Feindpsalmen.* Leiden, 1967.

Dietrich, M., Loretz, O. "Die Baʿal-titel bʿl arṣ und aliy qrdm". *Ugarit-Forschungen* 12 (1980): 391-93.

Dodd, C.H. *The Bible and the Greeks.* London, 1934.

Dorival, G., Harl, M., Munnich, O. *La Bible Grecque des Septante.* Paris, 1988.

_____. "La Bible des Septante: 70 ou 72 traducteurs?". *Tradition of the Text:* 45-62.

dos Santos, E.C. *An Expanded Hebrew Index for the Hatch-Redpath Concordance to the Septuagint.* Jerusalem, 1973.

Dubarle, A.M. "δράξασθε παιδεία". *Revue Biblique* 62 (1955): 511-12.

Eising, H. "גיחון", *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament* 1: 1008-101.

_____. Bergman, J. "יאר". *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament* 3: 385-90.

Ekblad Jr., E.R. *Isaiah's Servant Poems According to the Septuagint. An Exegetical and Theological Study.* Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 23. Leuven, 1999.

Erlandsson, S. "הוה", *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament* 3: 356-58.

Erwin, H.M. *Theological Aspects of the Septuagint of the Book of Psalms.* Princeton, New Jersey, 1962.

Estin, C. *Les Psautiers de Jérôme. A la lumière des traductions juives antérieures.* Collectanea Biblica Latina 15. Rome, 1984.

Fabry, H-J. "עולם". *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament* 4: 433-34.

Feldman, L.H. "The Orthodoxy of the Jews in Hellenistic Egypt". *Jewish Social Studies* 22 (1960): 215-37.

Field, F. *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt; sive veterum interpretum graecorum in totum vetus testamentum fragmenta.* 2 vols. Oxford, 1867, 1874. Reprint. Hildesheim, 1964.

Fishbane, M. *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel.* Oxford, 1985.

Fitzmyer, J.A. *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1. A Commentary*, Biblia et Orientalia 18. Rome, 1966.

Flashar, M. "Exegetische Studien zum LXX-Psalter". *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 32 (1912): 81-116, 161-89, 241-68.

Flint, P.W. *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls and the Book of Psalms.* Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 17. Leiden, 1997.

Forster, W. "Βεεζεβούλ". *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* 1: 605-06.

Freedman, D.N., Herion, G.A, Beck, A.B. Eds. *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. 6 vols. New York et al, 1992.

Fretheim, T.E. "עצב". *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis* 3: 482-83.

Fuchs, L. *Die Juden Aegyptens in ptolemäischer und römischer Zeit.* Wien, 1924.

Fürst, J. *Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament.* 2 ed. Leipzig, 1863.

Gamberoni, J. "בלה". *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament* 2: 128-31.

_____. "זבל". *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament* 4:29-31.

van Gemeren, W.A. Ed. *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis,* vols. 1-5. Cumbria, 1997.

Gentry, P.J. *The Asterisked Materials in the Greek Job*. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 38. Atlanta, Georgia, 1995.

_____. "The Greek Psalter and the καίγε Tradition", *The Old Greek Psalter*: 74-97.

Gerhardsson, B. "The Hermeneutic Program in Matthew 22:37-40". *Jews, Greeks and Christians. Religious Cultures in Late Antiquity. Essays in Honor of W.D. Davies*. Edited by R. Hamerton-Kelly and R. Scroggs. Leiden, 1976: 129-50.

Gerleman, G. *Studies in the Septuagint 2: The Book of Chronicles.* Lunds

Universitets Årsskrift 1, 43, 3. Lund, 1946.

Gesenius, W., Kautzsch, E., Cowley, A.E. *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar as edited and enlarged by the late E. Kautzsch*. Second English edition. Oxford, 1910.

Giesebrecht, F. *Das Buch Jeremia übersetzt und erklärt.* 2 ed. Handkommentar zum Alten Testament 3:2. Göttingen, 1907.

Girard, M. *Les Psaumes. Analyse structurelle et interprétation.* Recherches. Nouvelle série. Montreal, Paris, 1984.

Gooding, D.W. "An Appeal for a Stricter Terminology in the Textual Criticism of the Old Testament". *Journal of Semitic Studies* 21 (1976): 15-25.

Goshen-Gottstein, M.H. "The Textual Criticism of the Old Testament: Rise, Decline, Rebirth". *Journal of Biblical Literature* 102 (1983): 365-99.

Grabbe, Lester L. "The Translation Technique of the Greek Minor Versions : Translations or Revisions". *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings*. Atlanta, 1992: 505-56.

Graetz, H. *Kritischer Kommentar zu den Psalmen I.* 2 vols. Breslau, 1882.

Graupner, A. "עצב". *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament* 6: 301-05.

Greenspoon, L.J. *Textual Studies in the Book of Joshua*. Harvard Semitic Monographs 28. Chico, 1983.

Grigsby, B.H. "If Any Man Thirsts... Observations on the Rabbinic Background of John 7,37-39". *Biblica* 67 (1986): 301-05.

Gunkel, H. *Genesis.* Handkommentar zum Alten Testament 1:1. Göttingen, 1901.

_____. *Die Psalmen.* 4 ed. Göttinger Handkommentar zum Alten Testament 2/2. Göttingen, 1926.

Gutbrod, W., Kleinknecht, H. "νόμος", *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* 4: 1022-91.

Görg, M. "Ptolemäische Theologie in der Septuaginta". *Kairos* 20 (1978): 208-17.

Haag, H. "חמס". *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament* 4: 478-87.

_____. "עד". *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*: 456-62.

Handy, T.L.K. "A Solution for many *mlkm*". *Ugarit-Forschungen* 20 (1988): 57-59.

Hanhart, R. "Fragen um die Entstehung der LXX". *Vetus Testamentum* 12 (1962): 139-62.

_____. "Jüdische Tradition und christliche Interpretation. Zur Geschichte der Septuagintaforschung in Göttingen". *Kerygma und Logos. Festschrift C. Andresen*. Edited by A.M. Ritter. Göttingen, 1979: 280-97.

_____. "Zum gegenwärtigen Stand der Septuagintaforschung". *De Septuaginta*: 3-18.

_____. "The Translation of the Septuagint in Light of Earlier Tradition and Subsequent Influences". *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings*: 339-79.

Harrison, R.K. *Introduction to the Old Testament.* Grand Rapids, Michigan, l969.

Hartley, J.E. "נחם". *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis* 2: 1112-13.

Hatch, E., Redpath, H.A.A. *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the other Greek Versions of the OT (including the Apocryphal Books).* Reprint of *Graz,* 1954. Oxford, 1892-1906.

Hauck, F. "μαμωνᾶς". *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* 4: 388-90.

Healey, J.F. "Mot". *Deities and Demons*: 1122-32.

Hegermann, H. "The Diaspora in the Hellenistic Age". *The Cambridge History of Judaism* 2. Cambridge, 1989: 115-66.

Helbing, R. *Die Kasussyntax der Verba bei den Septuaginta. Ein Beitrag zur Hebraismenfrage und zur Syntax der κοινη.* Göttingen, 1928.

Heller, J. "Grenzen sprachlicher Entsprechung der LXX. Ein Beitrag zur Übersetzungstechnik der LXX auf dem Gebiet der Flexionskategorien". *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung* 15 (1969): 234-48.

Hengel, M., Schwemer, A. Eds. *Die Septuaginta zwischen Judentum und Christentum*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 72. Tübingen, 1994.

_____. "Die Septuaginta als „christliche Schriftensammlung", ihre Vorgeschichte und das Problem ihres Kanons". *Die Septuaginta*: 182-204.

_____. "The Interpretation of Judaism and Hellenism in the Pre-Maccabean Period". *The Cambridge History of Judaism* 2. *The Hellenistic Age.* Cambridge, 1989: 167-206.

Herkenne, H. *Das Buch der Psalmen übersetzt und erklärt.* Die Heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments 5/2. Bonn, 1936.

Herrmann, W. "Baal Zebub". *Deities and Demons*: 293-96.

Hill, D. *Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings: Studies in the Semantics of Soteriological Terms.* Cambridge, 1967.

Holladay, W.L. *A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon.* Leiden, 1971.

_____. *Jeremiah 1*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia, 1986.

_____. *The Root šûbh in the Old Testament*. Leiden, 1958.

_____. "A New Proposal for the Crux in Psalm 2:12". *Vetus Testamentum* 28 (1978): 110.

Holmes, R., Parsons, J. *Bible: Vetus Testamentum Græcum cum variis lectionibus*. 4/5 vols. Oxford, 1798–1827.

Hossfeld, F.-L., Zenger, E. *Die Psalmen 1-50.* Die Neue Echter-Bibel 29. Würzburg, 1993.

Hovard, G. "The LXX: A Review of Recent Studies". *Restoration Quarterly* 13 (1970): 154-63.

Jellicoe, S. "Some Reflections on the Kaige-Recension". *Vetus Testamentum* 23 (1973): 15-24.

_____. *The Septuagint and Modern Study.* Oxford, 1968.

Johannessohn, M. *Der Gebrauch der Präpositionen in der Septuaginta.* Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens 3:3. Berlin, 1925.

Johnson, B. *Die Hexaplarische Rezension des 1. Samuelbuches der Septuaginta.* Studia Theologica Lundensia 22. Lund, 1963.

Josephus, F. *The Antiquities of the Jews.* Reprint of 1961. Translated by H.S:t.J. Thackeray. 9 vols. The Loeb Classical Library, 1961.

Kitchen, K.A. "Egypt, River of". *The New Bible Commentary.* Edited by D. Guthrie and J.A. Motyer. London, 1970: 354.

Kitchen, K.A. "Kush". *The New Bible Commentary.* Edited by D. Guthrie and J.A. Motyer. London, 1970: 283.

_____. "Tahpanhes". *The New Bible Commentary.* Edited by D. Guthrie and J.A. Motyer. London, 1970: 1236.

Kittel, R. *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen und das alte Testament.* Stuttgart, 1924.

Kittel, D.R. *Die Psalmen.* 5, 6 ed. Kommentar zum Alten Testament 13. Leipzig, Erlangen, 1929.

Kittel, G., Gerhard, F., Bromiley, G.W., Pitken, R.E. Eds. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament.* Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1972-.

Kittel, G., Gerhard, F. Eds. *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament.* Stuttgart, 1933-1979.

Klein, M.L. "Converse Translation. A Targumic Technique". *Biblica* 57 (1976): 515-37.

Klein, R.W. *Textual Criticism of the Old Testament.* Philadelphia, 1974.

Knuth, H.C. *Zur Auslegungsgeschichte von Psalm 6.* Beiträge zur Geschichte der biblischen Exegese 11. Tübingen, 1971.

Knutson, B. "Divine Names and Epithets in the Akkadian Texts". *Ras Shamra Parallels* 3. *The Texts from Ugarit and the Hebrew Bible.* Edited by S. Rummel. Analecta Orientalia 51. Rome, 1981: 471-500.

Koch, K. "צדק". *Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament.* Edited by E. Jenni and C. Westermann. Gütersloh, 1993: 507-30.

van der Kooij, A. *Die Alten Textzeugen des Jesajabuches. Ein Beitrag zur Text geschichte des Alten Testaments.* Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 35. Fribourg, Göttingen, 1981.

_____. "Perspectives on the Study of the Septuagint: Who are the Translators?" *Perspectives in the Study of the Old Testament and Early Judaism: A Symposium in Honour of Adam S. van der Woude on the Occasion of his 70th Birthday.* Eds. F.G. Martínez and E. Noort, Leiden, 1998: 214-48.

_____. "On the Place of Origin of the Old Greek of Psalms". *Vetus Testamentum* 33 (1983): 67-74.

_____. "Review of Rösel, Genesis-Septuaginta". *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 54:3-4 (1997): 456-59.

_____. "A Short Commentary on Some Verses of the Old Greek of Isaiah 23".

*Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 15 (1982): 36-50.

Kraus, H.-J. *Psalmen I.* 2 vols. Biblischer Kommentar. Altes Testament 15. Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1978.

Koehler, L., Baumgartner, W., Richardson. J. *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Leiden, 1994-2000.

_____. *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti libros*. Leiden, 1985.

Kuntzmann, R., Schlosser, J. Eds. *Études sur le judaïsme hellénistique*. Lectio divina 119. Paris, 1984.

König, E. *Historisch-kritisches Lehrgebäude der hebräischen Sprache.* Leipzig, 1881-1897.

Lamarche, P. "La Septante". *Le monde grec ancien et la Bible. Bible de tous les temps* 1. Edited by C. Mondésert. Bible de tous les temps 1. Paris, 1984: 19-35.

Lambdin, T.O. "Shihor". *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* 4: 328.

_____. "Tahpanhes". *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* 4: 510.

le Déaut, R. "La septante, un targum?". *Études sur le judaïsme hellénistique*: 147-95.

_____. "The Targumim". *The Cambridge History of Judaism* 2. Cambridge, 1989: 563-90.

Lee, J.A.L. "Equivocal and Stereotyped Renderings in the LXX". *Revue Biblique* 87 (1980): 104-17.

_____. *A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch.* Septuagint and Cognate Studies 14. Chico, Mass. 1983.

Lewis, T.J. "Beelzebul". *The Anchor Bible Dictionary* 1: 639.

Lewy, L. *Wörterbuch über die Talmudim und Midraschim.* 2 ed. 4 vols. 1924. Reprinted Darmstadt, 1963.

Liddell, H.G., Scott, H., Jones, H.S. *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 9th ed. Incl. a suppl. by E.A. Barber. Oxford, 1968.

Lisowsky, G. Rost, L. *Konkordanz zum hebräischen Alten Testament*, 2:e Aufl. Stuttgart, 1958.

Lopez, G. "סבב". *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament* 5: 730-44.

Loretz, O. "Ugaritisches und Judisches: Weisheit und Tot in Psalm 49. Stil contra parallelismus membrorum". *Ugarit-Forschungen* 17 (1985): 189-212.

Louw, P., Nida, E.A., Smith, R.B., Munson, K.A. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament based on Semantic Domains.* 2 ed. New York, 1988, 1989.

Lundbom, J. *Jeremiah 1-20.* The Anchor Bible 21 A. New York, 1999.

Lust, J., Eynikel, E., Hauspie, K. *A Greek English Lexicon of the Septuagint.* 2 vols. Stuttgart, 1992-1996.

Maier II, W.A. "Baal-Zebub". *The Anchor Bible Dictionary* 1: 554.

Marcos, N.F. Ed. *La Septuaginta en la Investigación contemporánea: V congreso*

*de la IOSCS.* Textos y Estudios del Seminario Filologico 'Cardenal Cisneros' de la Biblia Poliglota Matritense de l'Instituto 'Arias Montano' 34. Madrid, 1985.

Marcus, R. "Jewish and Greek Elements in the LXX". *Louis Ginzberg Jubilee Volume. On the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday*. New York, 1945: 227-45.

Marquis, G. "Consistency of Lexical Equivalents as a Criterion for the Evaluation of Translation Technique as Exemplified in the LXX of Ezekiel". *VI Congress of the for Septuagint and Cognate Studies Jerusalem 1986*. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 23. Atlanta, Georgia, 1987: 405-24.

_____. "Word Order as a Criterion for the Evaluation of Translation Technique and the Evaluation of Word-Order Variants as Exemplified in LXX-Ezekiel". *Textus* 13 (1986): 59-84.

Martin, M. *The Scribal Character of the Dead Sea Scrolls 1.* Bibliothèque du Muséon 44. Louvain, 1958.

McGregor, L.J. *The Greek Text of Ezekiel. An Examination of Its Homogeneity.* Septuagint and Cognate Studies 18. Atlanta, Georgia, 1985.

McKane, W.A. *Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Jeremiah.* The International Critical Commentary 1. Edinburgh, 1986.

Meyers, C. "עצב". *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament* 6: 298-301.

Mihelic, J.A. "Egypt, Brook of". *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* 2: 66-67.

_____. "Egypt, River of". *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* 2: 66.

Mitchell, T.C. "Eden, Garden of". *The New Bible Commentary*. Edited by D. Guthrie and J.A. Motyer. London, 1970: 333.

de Moor, J.C. "בַּעַל", *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament* 2: 187-88.

_____. "Studies in the New Alphabetic Texts from Ras Shamra I". *Ugarit-Forschungen* 1 (1969): 167-88.

Morenz, S. "Ägyptische Spuren in der Septuaginta". *Mullus. Festschrift T. Klausner*. Münster W, 1964: 250-58.

Mozley, F.W. *The Psalter of the Church. The Psalms Compared with the Hebrew, with Various Notes.* Cambridge, 1905.

Mulder, M.J. "בעל". *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament* 2: 192-200.

Mulder, M.J., Sysling, H. Eds. *Mikra. Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*. Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum. Section 2. The Literature of the Jewish people in the Period of the Second Temple and the Talmud. Vol. 1. Assen/Maastricht. Philadelphia, 1988.

Munnich, O. "Contribution à l'étude de la première révision de la Septante". *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt*. Teil II 20:1. *Principat.*

New York, 1987: 190-220.

_____. "Indices d'une Septante originelle dans le Psautier Grec". *Biblica* 63 (1982): 406-16.

_____. "La Septante des Psaumes et le groupe kaige". *Vetus Testamentum* 33 (1983): 75-89.

Muraoka, T. *Hebrew/Aramaic Index to the Septuagint.* Grand Rapids, Mich., 1998.

_____. "Literary Device in the Septuagint". *Textus* 8 (1973): 20-30.

Myers, J.M. *1 Chronicles.* Garden City. New York, 1965.

Müller, M. *Kirkens første bibel. Hebraica sive Graeca veritas?* Frederiksberg, 1994.

Na'aman, N. *Borders and Districts in Biblical Historiography. Seven Studies in Biblical Geographical Lists.* Jerusalem Biblical Studies 4. Jerusalem, 1986.

_____. "The Brook of Egypt and Assyrian Policy on the Border of Egypt". *Tel Aviv* 6 (1979): 68-90.

Nida, E.A., Taber, C.R. *The Theory and Practice of Translation.* Helps for Translators 8. Prepared under the Auspices of the United Bible Societies. Leiden, 1974.

_____. *Toward a Science of Translating.* Leiden, 1964.

Norton, G.J., Pisano, S. Eds. *Tradition of the Text. Studies offered to Dominique Barthélemy in Celebration of his 70th Birthday*. Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 109. Göttingen, 1991.

O'Connell, K.G. "Greek Versions (minor)". *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. Supplement*: 377-81.

_____. *The Theodotionic Revision of the Book of Exodus. A Contribution to the Study of the Early History of the Transmission of the Old Testament in Greek.* Harvard Semitic Monographs 3. Cambridge, Ma. 1972.

Oesterley, W.O.E., Box, G.H. *The Religion and Worship of the Synagogue.* 2 rev. ed. New York, London, 1911.

Olofsson, S. "Consistency as a Translation Technique". *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 6 (1992): 14-30.

_____. *God is my Rock: A Study of Translation Technique and Theological Exegesis in the Septuagint.* Coniectanea Biblica. Old Testament Series 31. Stockholm, 1990.

_____. *The LXX Version. A Guide to the Translation Technique of the LXX.* Coniectanea Biblica. Old Testament Series 30. Stockholm, 1990.

Orlinsky, H.M. "The LXX: its Use in Textual Criticism". *Biblical Archaeologist* 9 (1946): 22-34.

_____. "The Septuagint and its Hebrew Text". *The Cambridge History of Judaism vol 2. The Hellenistic Age*. Cambridge, 1989: 534-62.

_____. "The Septuagint as Holy Writ and the Philosophy of the Translators".

*Hebrew Union College Annual* 46 (1975): 89-114.

Ottley, R.R. *A Handbook to the Septuagint.* Leiden, 1929.

Pace, S. "The Stratiography of the Text of Daniel and the Question of Theological Tendenz in the Old Greek". *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 17 (1984): 15-35.

Palmoni, Y. "Locust". *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* 3: 145.

Pape, W. *Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen. Handwörterbuch der griechischen Sprache III.* 3 ed. Braunschweig, 1863-1870.

Parpola, S. *The Correspondance of Sargon II. Part 1 Letters from Assyria and the West.* State Archives of Assyria 1. Helsinkii, 1987.

Perrot, C. "La lecture de la diaspora hellénistique". *Études sur le judaisme hellénistique*: 109-32.

_____. "Reading of the Bible in the Ancient Synagogue". *Mikra*: 137-59.

Pietersma, A. "Articulation in the Greek Psalms: The Evidence of Papyrus Bodmer XXIV". *Tradition of the Text*: 184-202.

_____. "David in the Greek Psalms". *Vetus Testamentum* 30 (1980): 213-26.

_____. *Eschatology in the Greek Psalter.* Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2:76. Tübingen, 1995.

_____. "The Greek Psalter. A Question of Methodology and Syntax". *Vetus Testamentum* 26 (1976): 60-69.

_____. *Two Manuscripts of the Greek Psalter in the Chester Beatty Library.* Analecta Biblica 77. Rome, 1978.

_____. "The Present State of the Critical Text of the Greek Psalter". *Der Septuaginta-Psalter und seine Tochterübersetzungen*. Ed. Anneli Aejmelaeus, Udo Quast. Göttingen, 2000: 12-32.

_____. "Proto-Lucian and the Greek Psalter". *Vetus Testamentum* 28 (1978): 66-72.

_____. "Ra 2110 (P. Bodmer XXIV) and the Text of the Greek Psalter". *Studien zur Septuaginta - Robert Hanhart zu Ehren*. Edited by D. Fraenkel, U. Quast, J.W. Wevers. *Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens* 20. Göttingen, 1990: 262-86.

_____. "Review of Schaper, *Eschatology*". *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 54 (1997): 185-90.

_____. "Septuagint Research: A Plea for a Return to Basic Issues". *Vetus Testamentum* 35 (1985): 296-311.

_____. *Septuaginta Id Est Vetus Testamentum Graece Iuxta LXX Interpretes.* 2 vols. Stuttgart, 1935.

_____. "Text and Canon: Old Testament and New". *Mélanges Dominique Barthélemy*: 374-94.

Pietersma, A., Cox, C. Eds. *De Septuaginta. Studies in Honour of John William Wevers on his Sixty-fifth Birthday*. Missisauga, Ontario, 1984.

Pili, P. "Possibili casi di metatesi in Genesi 49,10 e Salmo 2,11b-12a".

*Augustinianum* 15:3 (1975): 457-71.

Porton, G. "Midrash: Palestinian Jews and the Hebrew Bible in the Greco-Roman Period". *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt.* Teil II 19:2. Berlin, New York, 1979: 104-38.

Preuß, H.D. "גלולים". *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament* 3: 1-5.

_____. "עולם". *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament* 5: 1144-59.

Prijs, L. *Jüdische Tradition in der Septuaginta.* Leiden, 1948.

Pritchard, J.B. Ed. *The Ancient Near East in Pictures*. Princeton, 1969.

_____. *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. Princeton, 1969.

Procksch, O. *Die Genesis übersetzt und erklärt.* Kommentar zum Alten Testament 1. Leipzig, 1913.

Quell, G., Schrenk, G. "δίκη". *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* 2: 174-225.

Raabe, P.R. *Psalm Structures. A Study of Psalms with Refrains.* Journal for the Study of the Old Testament. Supplement Series 104. Sheffield, 1990.

Rabin, C. "The Translation Process and the Character of the Septuagint". *Textus* 6 (1968): 1-26.

Rahlfs, A. *Psalmi cum Odis.* Septuaginta, Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum 10. Göttingen, 1931.

_____. *Septuaginta: id est, Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes*. Stuttgart, 1935.

Redpath, H.A. "The Geography of the Septuagint". *The American Journal of Theology* 7 (1903): 289-307.

Rengstorf, K.H. *A Complete Concordance to Flavious Josephus.* Leiden, 1973.

Revell, E.J. "LXX and MT: Aspects of Relationship". *De Septuaginta*: 43-47.

Rife, J.M. "The Mechanics of Translation Greek". *Journal of Biblical Literature* 52 (1933): 244-52.

Ringgren, H. "חקק". *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament* 5: 139-47.

Roberts, B.J. *The Old Testament Text and Versions. The Hebrew Text in Transmission and the History of the Ancient Versions.* Cardiff, 1951.

Robinson, A. "Deliberate but Misguided Haplography Explains Psalm 2:11-12". *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 89 (1977): 421-22.

Rothstein, J.W., Hänel, J. *Kommentar zum ersten Buch der Chronik.* Kommentar zum Alten Testament 18:2. Leipzig ,1927.

Rowley, H.H. "The Text and Structure of Psalm II". *Journal of Theological Studies* 42 (1941): 143-54.

Rudolph, W. *Jeremia.* verbess. Aufl. Handbuch zum Alten Testament 3. Tübingen, 1968.

Röllig, W. "Baal-Shamen". *Deities and Demons*. 1995: 283-88.

Rösel, M. *Übersetzung als Vollendung der Auslegung. Studien zur Genesis-*

*Septuaginta*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 223. Berlin, New York, 1994.

Sacchi, P., Chiesa, B. "La Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia e recenti studidi critica del testo dell'Antico Testamento ebraico". *Henoch* 2 (1980): 201-20.

Sailhamer, J.H. *The Translational Technique of the Greek Septuagint for the Greek verbs and Participles in Ps 3-41*. Los Angeles, 1981.

Saiz, B. *La traducción de Simaco en el libro de los Salmos*. Textos y Estudios "Cardenal Cisneros" 22. Madrid, 1978.

Sanders, J.A. *The Psalms Scroll from Qumran Cave 11*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 4. Oxford, 1965.

Sasse, H. "αἰών". *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum zum Neuen Testament* 1: 197-209.

Satterthwaite, P.E. "Review of Schaper, *Eschatology*". *Vetus Testamentum* 49 (1998): 284-86.

Schaper, J. "Der Septuaginta-Psalter als Dokument jüdischer Eschatologie". *Die Septuaginta*: 38-61.

Schmoldt, H. "עתק". *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament* 6: 487-89.

Schrenk, G. "ἐντέλλομαι, ἐντολή". *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* 2: 544-56.

Schürer, E. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* 2. Edited by G. Vermes, F. Millar, and M. Goodman. Revised ed. Edinburgh, 1979.

Seeligmann, I.L. *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah. A Discussion of its Problems.* Mededelingen En Verhandelingen Van Het Vooraziatisch-Egyptisch Genootschap "Ex Oriente Lux" 9. Leiden, 1948.

Segert, St. "Hebrew Poetic Parallelism as Reflected in the Septuagint". *La Septuaginta*: 133-48.

van Selms, A. "Yammu´s Dethronement by Baal. An Attempt to Reconstruct Texts UT 129, 137 and 68". *Ugarit-Forschungen* 2 (1970): 251-68.

Shenkel, D. *Chronology and Recensional Development in the Greek Text of Kings*. Harvard Semitic Monographs 1. Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1968.

Siegert, F. *Zwischen Hebräischer Bibel und Altem Testament. Eine Einführung in die Septuaginta*. Institutum Judaicum Delitzschianum. Münsteraner Judaistische Studien 9. Münster, 2001.

Silva, M. "Bilingualism and the Character of Palestinian Greek". *Biblica* 61 (1980): 198-219.

Skehan, P.W. "The Biblical Scrolls from Qumran and the Text of the Old Testament". *Biblical Archaeologist* 25 (1965): 87-100.

_____. "Qumran and Old Testament Criticism". *Qumran. Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu*. Edited by M. Delcor. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 46. Paris, Louvain, 1978: 163-82.

Skinner, J.A. *Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Genesis.* 2 ed. The International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh, 1930.

Smith, G.V. "זבל". *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis* 3: 1074-75.

Smith, G.V., Wegner, P.D. "עתק". *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis* 3: 569-70.

Smith, M. "Another Criterion for the *kaige* Recension". *Biblica* 48 (1967): 443-45.

Snijders, L.A. "נהר". *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament* 5: 281-91.

Soffer, A. "The Treatment of Anthropomorphisms and Anthropopathisms in the Septuagint of Psalms". *Hebrew Union College Annual* 38 (1957): 85-107.

Soisalon-Soininen, I. "Die Wiedergabe einigen hebräischer, mit der Präposition be ausgedrückter Zeitangaben der Septuaginta". *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute* 11 (1978): 138-46.

_____. "Zurück zur Hebraismenfrage". *Studien zur Septuaginta. Robert Hanhart zu Ehren*. Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens 20. Edited by D. Fraenkel, U. Quast, and J.W. Wevers. Göttingen, 1990: 35-51.

Sollamo, R. *Renderings of Hebrew Semiprepositions in the Septuagint.* Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae. Dissertationes Humanarum Litterarum 19. Helsinki, 1979.

_____. "The Significance of Septuagint Studies". *Emanuel. Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by S.M. Paul, R.A. Kraft, L.H. Schiffman, W.W. Fields. Leiden, Boston, 2000: 497-512.

Sparks, H.F.D. *The Apocryphal Old Testament.* Translated by M.A. Knibb. Oxford, 1984.

Speiser, E.A. *Genesis.* The Anchor Bible 1. New York, 1964.

Steingrimsson, S. "זמם". *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament* 4: 87-90.

Steuernagel, C. *Das Buch Josua übersetzt und erklärt.* 2 ed. Göttinger Handkommentar zum Alten Testament 1:3:2. Göttingen, 1923.

Swart, I., van Dam, C. "חמס". *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis* 2: 177-80.

Swete, H.B. *An Introduction to the OT in Greek.* Cambridge, 1900.

Tal, A. "The Samaritan Targum of the Pentateuch". *Mikra*: 189-216.

Talmon, S. "Double Readings in the Massoretic Text". *Textus* 1 (1960): 144-84.

_____. "The Old Testament Text". *The Cambridge History of the Bible, vol 1. From the Beginnings to Jerome*. Edited by P.R. Ackroyd and C.F. Evans. Cambridge, 1970: 159-99.

_____. "The Textual Study of the Bible - A New Outlook". *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*. Edited by F.M. Cross and S. Talmon. Cambridge, Mass. London, 1975: 321-400.

Talshir, Z. "The Milieu of 1 Esras in the Light of its Vocabulary". *De Septuaginta*: 129-47.

Thackeray, H.S:t.J. *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek According to the LXX. 1. lntroduction, Orthography and Accidence.* Cambridge, 1909.

_____. "The Greek Translators of the Four Books of Kings". *Journal of Theological Studies* 8 (1906-1907): 262-78.

_____. *The LXX and Jewish Worship*. London, 1921.

_____. *Some Aspects of the Greek Old Testament.* London, 1927.

Thomas, D.W. *The Text of the Revised Psalter.* London, 1963.

Thompson, J.A. *The Book of Jeremiah.* NICOT. Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1980.

van der Toorn, K., Becking, P.B., van der Horst, W. Eds. *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*. New York, 1995.

Tov, E. "4QJer[a] - A Preliminary Edition". *Textus* 17 (1994): 1-41.

_____. *A Computerized Data Base for Septuagint Studies. The Parallel Aligned Text of the Greek and Hebrew Bible.* Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint Studies 2. Stellenbosch, 1986.

_____. "The Contribution of the Qumran Scrolls to the Understanding of the LXX". *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings*: 11-47.

_____. "Three Dimensions of LXX Words". *Revue Biblique* 83 (1976): 529-44.

_____. "Exegetical Notes on the Hebrew Vorlage of the LXX of Jeremiah 27 (34)". *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 91 (1979): 73-93.

_____. *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever (8HevVIIgr)*. The Seiyal Collection 11. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 8. Oxford, 1990.

_____. "The Impact of the LXX Translation of the Pentateuch on the Translation of the Other Books". *Mélanges Dominique Barthélemy*: 577-92.

_____. "Loan-words, Homophony and Transliterations in the Septuagint". *Biblica* 60 (1979): 216-36.

_____. "A Modern Textual Outlook Based on the Qumran Scrolls". *Hebrew Union College Annual* 53 (1982): 11-27.

_____. "The Nature and Background of Harmonizations in Biblical Manuscripts". *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 31 (1985): 3-29.

_____. "The Rabbinic Tradition Concerning the 'Alterations' Inserted into the Greek Pentateuch and their Relation to the Original Text of the LXX". *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period* 15 (1984): 65-89.

_____. "The Septuagint". *Mikra*: 161-88.

_____. "Septuagint Translators". *De Septuaginta*: 55-70.

_____. "Did the Septuagint Translators Always Understand their Hebrew Text". *De Septuaginta*: 53-70.

_____. "Die Septuaginta in ihrem theologischen und traditionsgeschichtlichen

Verhältnis zur hebräischen Bibel". *Mitte der Schrift? Ein jüdisch-christliches Gespräch. Texts der Berner Symposions vom 6.-12 januar 1985*. Edited by M. Klopfenstein. Judaica et Christiana 11. Bern, Frankfurt, New York, Paris, 1987: 237-68.

_____. "Studies in the Vocabulary of the Septuagint - The Relation between the Vocabulary and Translation Technique". *Tarbiz* 47. English summary (1978): I-II.

_____. *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*. Jerusalem Biblical Studies 3. Jerusalem, 1981.

Tov, E., Wright, B.G. "Computer-Assisted Study of the Criteria for Assessing the Literalness of Translation Units in the LXX". *Textus* 12 (1985): 158-87.

Trebolle, J. "Redaction, Recension, and Midrash in the Book of Kings". *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 15 (1982): 12-35.

Turner, N. Moulton, J.H. *A Grammar of New Testament Greek* 3. *Syntax*. Edinburgh, 1963.

Ulrich, E.C. *The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus*. Harvard Semitic Monographs 19. Missoula, Montana, Göttingen, 1978.

VanderKam, J.C. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today*. Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1994.

Vang, C. "Ps 2,11-12 – A New Look at an Old Crux Interpretum". *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 9 (1995): 163-84.

Veltri, G. "Der griechische Targum Aquilas". *Die Septuaginta*: 92-115

Venetz, H.-J. *Die Quinta des Psalteriums. Ein Beitrag zur Septuaginta- und Hexaplaforschung*. Hildesheim, 1974.

Victor, P. "A Note on חק in the Old Testament". *Vetus Testamentum* 16 (1966): 358-61.

de Vinck, J.M., L.C. Contos. *The Psalms translated from the Greek Septuagint*. Allendale NJ 1993.

Volz, P. *Der Prophet Jeremia übersetzt und erklärt*. Kommentar zum Alten Testament 10. Leipzig, Erlangen, 1922.

de Waard, J. "Homophony in the Septuagint". *Biblica* 62 (1981): 551-61.

_____. "Translation Techniques Used by the Greek Translators of Ruth". *Biblica* 54 (1973): 499-515.

Wade, M.L. *Consistency of Translation Techniques in the Tabernacle Accounts of Exodus in the Old Greek*. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 32. Leiden, Boston, 2003.

Walter, N. "Jewish-Greek Literature of the Greek Period". *The Cambridge History of Judaism*. Cambridge, 1989: 385-408.

Walters (Katz), P. "The Recovery of the Original LXX - A Study in the History of Transmission and Textual Criticism". *Actes du Ier Congrés de la fédération internationales des associations d'études classiques 1950*. Paris, 1951: 165-82.

_____. *The Text of the Septuagint. Its Corruptions and their Emendation.* Cambridge, 1973.

_____. "Zur Übersetzungstechnik der Septuaginta". *Welt des Orients* 2:3 (1956): 267-73.

Weber, R. Ed. *Le Psautier romain et les autres anciens Psautiers latins.* Collectanea biblica latina 10. Roma, 1953

van der Weiden, W. A. "Proverbia XIV 32B". *Vetus Testamentum* 20 (1970): 340-42.

Wegner, P.D. "בלה". *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis* 1: 660-62.

Weiser, A. *Der Prophet Jeremia.* Das Alte Testament Deutsch 20. Göttingen, 1959.

Weissert, D. "Alexandrian Analogical Word-Analysis and Septuagint Translation Techniques". *Textus* 8 (1973): 31-44.

Wellhausen, J. *The Book of Psalms in Hebrew.* English translation. New York, 1895.

_____. "Die Novelle 146 περὶ Ἑβραίων". *Die Septuaginta*: 116-30.

Westermann, C. *Genesis 1-11.* Biblischer Kommentar. Altes Testament 1:1. Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1974.

Wevers, J.W. "An Apologia for Septuagint Studies". *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 18 (1985): 16-38.

_____. "The Interpretative Character and Significance of the Septuagint Version". *The Hebrew Bible/Old Testament - The History of Its Interpretation* 1. *From the Beginning to the Middle Ages, part 1: Antiquity.* Edited by M. Sæbø, C. Brekelmans, M. Haran. Göttingen, 1996: 84-108.

_____. "Text History and Text Criticism of the Septuagint". *Göttingen Congress Volume 1977.* Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 29. Leiden, 1978: 392-402.

_____. "The Use of the Versions for Text Criticism: The Septuagint". *La Septuaginta*: 15-24.

Wifstrand, A. "Die Stellung der enklitischen Personalpronomina bei der Septuaginta". *Årsberättelse för Kungliga Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet i Lund*. Lund, 1949-1950: 44-70.

Wigtil, D.N. *The Translation of Religious Texts in the Greco-Roman World.* Dissertation in partial fulfilment of the requirement for the Degree of Doctor in Philosophy. University of Minnesota, 1980.

Wildberger, H. *Jesaia.* Biblischer Kommentar. Altes Testament 10:1-3. Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1972-1982.

von Soden, W. *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch* 2. Wiesbaden, 1972.

Wright, B.G. "The Jewish Scriptures in Greek. The Septuagint in the Context of Ancient Translation Activity". *Biblical Translation in Context.* Edited by

F.W. Knobloch. Studies and Texts in Jewish History and Culture 10. Maryland, 2002: 3-18.

Würtwein, E. *Der Text des Alten Testaments. Eine Einführung in die Biblia Hebraica.* 4 ed. Stuttgart, 1973.

Wüst, M. *Untersuchungen zu den siedlungsgeographischen Texten des Alten Testaments 1. Ostjordanland.* Beihefte zum Tubinger Atlas des Vorderen Orients 9. Reihe B. Wiesbaden, 1975.

Wutz, F.X. *Die Psalmen textkritisch untersucht.* München, 1925.

_____. *Systematische Wege von der Septuaginta zum hebräischen Urtext.* Eichstätter Studien 1:1. Stuttgart, 1937.

_____. *Die Transkriptionen von der Septuaginta bis zu Hieronymus.* Zweite Folge. Lieferung 1-2, Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten (und Neuen) Testament 9. Stuttgart, 1925-1933.

Zenger, E. Ed. *Der Septuaginta-Psalter: sprachliche und theologische Aspekte.* *Herders Biblische Studien.* Freiburg, Göttingen, 2001.

Ziegler, J. "Die Hilfe Gottes ´am Morgen´". *Bonner Biblische Beiträge* 1 (1950): 281-88.

_____. *Ieremias, Baruch, Threni, Epistula Ieremiae.* Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum 15. Göttingen, 1957.

_____. "Die Vorlage der Isaias-Septuaginta (LXX) und die erste Isaias-Rolle von Qumran (1QIs-a)". *Journal of Biblical Literature* 78 (1959): 38-50.

Zimmerli, W. *Ezechiel.* Biblischer Kommentar. Altes Testament 13:1. Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1969.

_____. *Ezekiel 2. A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel. Chapters 25-48.* Eds. P.D. Hanson, L.J. Greenspoon. Translated by J.D. Martin. Hermeneia. Philadelphia, 1983.

Zimmerman, F. "El and Adonai". *Vetus Testamentum* 12 (1962): 190-95.

*Translation Technique and Theological Exegesis:*
*Collected Essays on the Septuagint Version*
by Staffan Olofsson

This cogent collection of essays reflects Olofsson's Septuagint studies throughout the course of more than a decade, addressing methods for productive discussion of theology and translation technique in the Septuagint. The book displays the author's engagement in debates among scholars surrounding the Septuagint in the modern era. Olofsson responds to the notion that an exclusive preoccupation with translation technique does not lead to a full understanding of the Septuagint translation; he concedes this but argues that exploring translation technique is the necessary foundation for a serious discussion of the theology of the translator(s) and the Vorlage. In addition to the theological assumptions of the Septuagint translators, Olofsson's concerns in the essays herein include but are not limited to anti-anthropomorphism in the Psalms, Jewish interpretive tradition, Septuagint word order, Qumran texts, and law in the Septuagint Psalms. All of the essays are revised and corrected; some now include discussions of relevant literature that Olofsson was not able to incorporate in the original presentations. Throughout the work, Olofsson takes into account the contributions of fellow researchers on the Septuagint, bringing his unique perspectives to bear on a variegated and broad corpus of research literature.