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PROGRAM FOR THE IOSCS MEETING
IN BOSTON, NOVEMBER 20-23, 1999

Sunday, November 21

1:00-3:30 pm  H-Room 103

Albert Pietersma, University of Toronto, Presiding

Alison Salvesen, Oxford University
Jacob of Edessa’s Version of the Books of Samuel and the Textual Criticism of the Septuagint

Jan Willem Van Henten, University of Amsterdam
The Honorary Decree for Simon the Maccabee (1 Macc 14:25-49) in its Hellenistic Context

Harry F. Van Rooy, Potchefstroom University
The “Syro-Hexaplaric” Headings of the Psalms in Manuscript 1213

Tyler F. Williams, North American Baptist College
Towards a Date for the Greek Psalter

Albert Pietersma, University of Toronto
A Commentary on Greek Psalm 1: An Illustration of the New IOSCS Commentary on the Septuagint

3:45 pm-6:15 pm  H-Room 103

Leonard J. Greenspoon, Creighton University, Presiding

Robert Hiebert, Trinity Western Seminary
Translation Technique in the Septuagint of Genesis and its Implication for the NETS Version
Susan A. Brayford, Centenary College of Louisiana  
*Expanding the Playing Field: The LXX and Cultural Studies*

Sean M. McDonough, Pacific Theological College, Fiji  
*The LXX Translation of Exodus 3:14*

Russell D. Nelson, Concordia University College of Alberta  
*Locating the Old Greek in the Tabernacle Account*

Business Meeting

Monday, November 22

1:00pm-3:30pm  H-Room 103

Sidnie White Crawford, University of Nebraska, Presiding

Karl V. Kutz, Multnomah Bible College  
*The Characterization of Job in the Old Greek*

Frank Shaw, University of Cincinnati  
*The Non-Mystical Use of IoU in Early Judaism: A Background for Understanding its Appearance in 4QLXXLev b*

Bernard M. Levinson, University of Minnesota  
*Text-Criticism, Assyriology, and the History of Interpretation: the Crux of Deuteronomy 13:17a*

Mark A. Christian, Vanderbilt University  
*A Family Crisis? The Effects of Qumran on the Changing Relationship among the Translations*

Michael T. Davis, Princeton Theological Seminary  
*Absalom’s Hair and His Demise: From Implication to Explicit Statement in the Textual Traditions of 2 Samuel 18:9-15*

Programs

Business Meeting


1. The minutes were approved as read.

2. R. Hiebert reported that our account balance as of June 30 was about $3900 in the US account, $1000 in the Canadian, and $10,000 in the NETS account. After paying for the most recent bulletin the account balance is about $2500. He also noted that about $4700 is still owed by members and reminded everyone that those owing over $50 would not receive a bulletin. Rob moved the adoption of the treasurer’s report. Seconded by B. Taylor. Approved.

3. B. Taylor reported on publications:
   b. Books accepted and awaiting final editing, etc.:
      - Kristin de Troyer, The End of the Alpha Text
      - F. Polak and G. Marquis, A Classified Index of the Minuses of the Pentateuch, Part I: Introduction; Part II: The Pentateuch
      - F. W. Knobloch, Hebrew sounds in Greek Script: Transcriptions and Related Phenomena in the Septuagint, with Special Focus on Genesis
   c. There are several possible volumes in the works, and there were some volumes submitted that were not accepted for the SCS series.
   d. The congress volume for Oslo is still being edited. It will take longer than expected because of the increased number of papers, many of which are by graduate students writing for the first time.
   e. Taylor noted that there is no reference to the SCS series on the IOSCS web page and suggested that it would be helpful to provide a list of volumes as well as a link to the SBL page. Moved the adoption of the report. Seconded by P. Gentry. Approved.

4. R. Hiebert reported that an ad hoc committee has been appointed by the executive to explore the possibility of
expanding the bulletin and having it published by an established publisher.

5. B. Wright reported that there would be no recipient of the LXX prize this year.

6. B. Wright moved that the annual general meeting accept the recommendation of the executive committee to proceed with negotiating with a publisher for a companion commentary series for NETS. Seconded by A. Pietersma. Approved.

7. A. Pietersma moved the adoption of the nominating committee report. Seconded by M. Silva. No names were added from the floor. Approved.
- The nominated officers are:
  President: Johan Lust, Leuven
  Vice-President: Benjamin Wright, Lehigh
  Immediate Past President: Leonard J. Greenspoon, Creighton
  Editor: Theodore A. Bergren, Richmond
  Associate Editor: Frederick W. Knobloch, LaSalle
  Treasurer: Robert Hiebert J.V., Trinity Western Seminary
  Secretary: Tim McLay, St. Stephen's University
  SBLSCS Series Editor: Melvin K. H. Peters, Duke
  Past Presidents: John Wm Wevers, Toronto; Albert Pietersma, Toronto; Eugene C. Ulrich, Notre Dame
  Associate Treasurer: Arie van der Kooij, Leiden
  Convener, Administrative Committee, Jan Joosten, Strasbourg

- Members at Large:
  Anneli Aejmelaeus, Goettingen
  Johann Cook, Stellenbosch
  Kristin de Troyer, Claremont
  Natalio Fernandez Marcos, Madrid
  Jan Joosten, Strasbourg
  Robert A.Kraft, Pennsylvania
  Olivier Munnich, Paris
  Takamitsu Muraoka, Leiden
  Moises Silva, Gordon Conwell
  Raija Sollamo, Helsinki
  Emanuel Tov, Jerusalem

8. T. McLay moved that the editorial and administrative committees for NETS be eliminated and that a new editorial committee be created to oversee the continuing work on the publication of NETS. Seconded by A. Pietersma. Approved.

9. Reminder that the next meeting is next November in Nashville in conjunction with SBL, while in 2001 we will meet on Aug. 3-4 in Basel.

Respectfully submitted,
Tim McLay
TREASURER'S REPORT
U.S. DOLLAR ACCOUNT
JULY 1, 1999 - JUNE 30, 2000

Account No. 4507919 - Royal Bank of Canada, Oakville ON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7/1/99</td>
<td>Opening Balance</td>
<td>3888.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/2/99</td>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/19/99</td>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td>74.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/2/99</td>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/18/99</td>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td>325.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/18/99</td>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td>330.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1/99</td>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/21/99</td>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/21/99</td>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>370.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/1/99</td>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/7/99</td>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/7/99</td>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td>140.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/1/99</td>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/15/99</td>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/15/99</td>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td>625.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/1/99</td>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/17/98</td>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td>160.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/17/99</td>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td>265.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/4/00</td>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/19/00</td>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td>172.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/00</td>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/1/00</td>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/1/00</td>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/5/00</td>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td>264.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/26/00</td>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td>80.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Credits: 3066.09

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7/16/99</td>
<td>Postage for mailing of BIOSCS 30</td>
<td>300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/14/99</td>
<td>Reimbursement to former treasurer of personal</td>
<td>600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>funds deposited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/3/99</td>
<td>Rental of room for executive committee meeting</td>
<td>45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in Boston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/21/99</td>
<td>Publication costs for BIOSCS 31</td>
<td>2400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/10/99</td>
<td>Accountant fees</td>
<td>179.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/20/99</td>
<td>Returned item: cheque did not clear</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Debits: 3534.00

Total Balance: 6954.94

BALANCE 6/30/00: 3420.94

Respectfully submitted: Robert J. V. Hiebert
IOSCS Treasurer

Audited: Bruce Guenther
Associated Canadian Theological Schools
A new look

Traditionally the Bulletin has been a relatively informal affair, published and printed wherever its editor has called home. Recently, however, the executive board of the IOSCS (see the inside front cover) has looked into the possibility of having the Bulletin published by a professional publishing house. This could take effect as early as vol. 34 (the next issue). Sic bonum melius fit!

In this issue

The centerpieces of this issue are the long articles by Martha Wade and Robert Hiebert. Wade’s piece is based on a dissertation recently completed at Union Theological Seminary in Virginia, while Hiebert’s article stems from his experiences as translator of Genesis for NETS. Supplementing these are two provocative shorter essays, one an evaluation by two scholars from Macquarie University of an article by Karen Jobes published in vol. 28 of the Bulletin, and the other a note by renowned LXX lexicographer Takamitsu Muraoka. A review of the new Hatch-Redpath by Johann Cook and a web review by associate editor Frederick Knobloch round out the creative contributions in volume 33.

Call for Papers

The heart of the Bulletin is the articles published in each issue. Please consider submitting, and encouraging your students to submit, articles, papers read at conferences, critical notes, and so forth. Essays read at annual meetings of the IOSCS are especially appropriate.

Reviews of Web Sites

In forthcoming issues, we will continue to print reviews of websites that are relevant to Septuagint studies. If you know of a site that should be reviewed, or that you would like to review, please contact the editor (tbergren@richmond.edu). The website review included in this issue clearly illustrates the merits of this endeavor.

Reviews of Software Packages

In the same vein, we would also like to review software packages that are relevant to Septuagint studies. If there is a package that you use regularly and would like to review, please contact the editor.

Books and Book Reviews

Book reviews are solicited. If you have published something in the field, please ask your publisher to send us a copy (the Bulletin’s circulation is 250 scholars and 150 libraries and institutions). If there is a particular book that you would like to review, please contact the editor.

Essay Prize Competition

The International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies is offering an annual prize of $250 to be awarded to an outstanding paper in the field of Septuagint Studies. This field is construed broadly, and a paper may focus on any aspect of the study of the Greek translations of the Jewish Scriptures. The IOSCS wants to encourage the study of these translations by younger scholars, and eligibility is thus limited to advanced graduate students or recent Ph.D. recipients (3 years or less after receiving the degree). The papers will be judged by a committee constituted of IOSCS members, and papers receiving prizes will be published in the following BIOSCS. Depending on its assessments of the papers submitted, the committee may decide not to award the prize in any given year. The deadline for submission is August 31 of each year. Papers should be sent to Benjamin G. Wright, Department of Religion Studies, Maginnes Hall, 9 W. Packer Ave., Lehigh University, Bethlehem, PA 18015.

IOSCS International Meeting in Basel

The International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies will meet this summer in Basel, 3-4 August 2001, before the IOSOT Congress (5-10 August). Accommodation
and booking forms may be obtained from the IOSOT Congress Secretariate:

Basel University, Faculty of Theology
International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament (IOSOT)
XVIIth Congress Basel 2001
Dr. Beat Huwyler, Congress Secretary
Postfach 112, CH-4011 Basel (Suisse)
Tel./Fax: ++61 267 27 96
E-mail: IOSOT2001@ubaclu.unibas.ch

The first session will be a panel discussion presided over by A. Schenker. Its topic will be: "The relation between MT and LXX in literary divergent biblical texts." It will deal with the Hebrew text read by the translator, and with questions concerning the existence or non-existence of Tendenz brought in by the translator. Panel members will be Pierre-Maurice Bogaert, Louvain; Dieter Böhler, Frankfurt; Natalio Fernandez Marcos, Madrid; D. Fraenkel, Göttingen; Johan Lust, Leuven; Olivier Munnich, Paris; and Emanuel Tov, Jerusalem.

Director of the meeting will be IOSCS president Johan Lust:

MAIL: Johan Lust
Faculty of Theology, Dept. of Biblical Studies
St. Michielsstraat, 26
B3000 Leuven, Belgium
EMail: johan.lust@theo.kuleuven.ac.be
fax: 003216323858

Symposium on the Septuagint Psalter

A symposium on the LXX Psalter was held at Münster University in Germany: Der Septuaginta-Psalt der hellenistische Kultur, 5-6 Dec. 2000, with a rather large number of contributors. Direction: Prof. Dr. Erich Zenger. The papers are expected to be published soon. (courtesy Prof. Adrian Schenker).

RECORD OF WORK PUBLISHED OR IN PROGRESS


BORGONovo, Gianantonio. (1) Significato numerico delle cronologie bibliche e rilevanza delle varianti testuali (TM – LXX – SAM), in "Un tempo per nascere e un tempo per morire". Cronologie normative e razionalità della storia


DALEY, Steven. The Textual Background of the Modern English Translations of the Hebrew Bible, Dissertation in progress, Hebrew University (adv. Emanuel Tov).


JOHNSON, Tim. (1) Working on a review for JETS of Invitation to the Septuagint, by Jobes and Silva, due in 2001. (2) Reading a paper at this year's SBL Annual Meeting on Job 40:2 that employs the LXX to interpret the third feminine suffix of the last word in the MT.

JOOSTEN, Jan. (1) "Une théologie de la Septante ? Réflexions méthodologiques sur l'interprétation de la version grecque" Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie 132 (2000), 31-46. (2) The Hosea volume of La Bible d'Alexandrie (vol. 23. 1) is...
almost finished. It should appear in print perhaps in the summer of 2002.


LIM, Timothy. T. H. Lim et al. The Dead Sea Scrolls in their Historical Context (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000).


MURAOKA, Takamitsu. The LXX lexicon project, that of incorporating data from the Pentateuch into my existing lexicon for the Twelve Prophets and making a unified lexicon, is making good progress. The books of Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers are now complete.


ventriloquists" (with Anastasia Maravela-Solbakk), Sefarad 60(2001) (in press).


LXX Symposium Held

A day-long symposium on the Septuagint was held recently at Trinity Western University, on Saturday, March 17, 2001. The program ran as follows:

What Is the LXX?: Cameron Boyd-Taylor (University of Toronto)
The NETS Project and Psalms: Albert Pietersma (University of Toronto)
The LXX and the New Testament: Larry Perkins (ACTS)
The LXX and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Peter Flint (TWU)
Interpretation, Culture, and the LXX of Genesis:
Rob Hiebert (ACTS)
The Relevance of the LXX for the Modern Church:
Karen Jobes (Westmont College)

The Septuagint and Cognate Studies (SCS) Series

With the dissolution of Scholars Press in 1999 there was some concern about the future of the Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series, home to some of the most important books in our field. This series, however, together with the other biblically related projects of Scholars Press, has been taken over by the Society of Biblical Literature, which will carry on these publishing ventures. There follows a listing of SCS series titles to date.

060401 Robert A. Kraft, Septuaginal Lexicography (1975; OP)
060402 N/A
060403 Raymond A. Martin, Syntactical Evidence of Semitic Sources in Greek Documents (1974; OP)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication Date</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Pages</th>
<th>Edition</th>
<th>ISBN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>060414</td>
<td>J. A. L. Lee</td>
<td><em>A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch</em></td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>paper, $18.95</td>
<td>0-89130-576-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>060416</td>
<td>Takamitsu Muraoka</td>
<td><em>A Greek-Hebrew/Aramaic Index to I Esdras</em></td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>paper, $15.95</td>
<td>0-89130-631-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The re-publication of the age-old concordance by Hatch & Redpath has enlarged the usefulness of this already indispensable exegetical tool. The "Introductory Essay", on the relevance of computer-assisted technology, especially for concordancing, by the editors (Emanuel Tov and Robert Kraft) of the well-known CATSS (Computer-Assisted Tools for Septuagint Studies) project, places this publication into the correct perspective for the future, clearly formulated in the paragraph *Moving into the future* (xvii-xviii). Theoretically the computer with the applicable software can execute astonishing analyses. However, there are still teething problems in creating the "ideal" technology and hence we still need a reprinted Hatch-Redpath.

To be sure HR is a useful tool even though it has some inherent flaws and problems. The most serious shortcoming is the fact that the editors did not have access to the textual material that currently is at hand, especially the Dead Sea Scrolls materials. This can naturally not be put on the account of the original editors. This is certainly one of the areas that can be improved upon if this monumental work will ever be reworked.

In the area of Greek manuscripts there have also been marked developments. The Old Greek of the Septuagint prepared by the Göttingen *Septuaginta Unternehmen* is progressing steadily. Many more Greek manuscripts are available than in the working days of Hatch & Redpath. For the purposes of this review I have worked through the LXX of Proverbs and picked up a number of problems which I suspect will also occur in other translated units. These will have to be taken into account by users of this monumental concordance.

I made a list of all the *hapax legomena* in the Greek version of Proverbs. According to Hatch & Redpath (HR) there...
are 161 cases. A number of these are, however, problematic and need to be individually evaluated. For example in 30:16 HR refer to the reading άνδρογυναίος that appears only in ms A. The other mss all read άνδρογυναίος. Clearly a reading error has taken place. It should naturally be removed from the list. However, not all the examples are as evident as this one.

The significance of manuscript evidence is clear from the Greek words άνδρογυναίος (19:15) and άνδρογυναίος, which are both hapax. However, different mss read different words: άνδρογυναίος 19:15 (A, B άνδρογυναίος) “like an effeminate man” is a neologism. άνδρογυναίος “effeminate person” appears in Prov 18:8 (S1 άνδρογυναίος).

HP\(^2\) testifies to both these readings. That these readings were perceived as problematic is underscored by an additional reading in ms 296 in Prov 18:8, άνδρος γυναίκαν. Since this final example is based upon a single ms, one could argue that only the first two examples should be interpreted as hapaxes as correctly done by LEH\(^3\). άποθεματικά is a similar example. It appears in 22:22 but also in 28:24 in some mss (23, 68, 106, 248, 253, 260, 261, 296 and 297). On account of the additional manuscript evidence this verb should perhaps not be taken as a hapax legomenon even though it appears only in two places in some mss. It, of course, still testifies to the creative lexical approach of the translator.

For άδοφος (A, S2:8) HR has a separate entry whereas LEH omit it. In this case HP do refer to mss that have an addition αδοφον και μπουρεί ο. The problem is that this evidence is rather scant; in the case of ms 161 this phrase occurs only in the margin! This is also true of δουλάς in 13:13 which is seen as a hapax by HR. There are two problems concerning this reading. Firstly, it appears in a plus compared to MT, and secondly, no known extant manuscript evidence exists of this reading. HP for one reads δολάς. It is thus possible that HR either had access to other mss or simply made a mistake. The same applies to two further Greek words. Firstly is άρβος (S1) mentioned by HR in connection with άρβολος in 3:10. Again HP has no primary evidence. Secondly, there is κωρίμας, which according to HR is contained in ms S1; however, HP has no textual evidence. As far as άρκον (7:17) goes, HP do testify to the reading in some mss. Rahlf's has ρόκος, which appears in mss A and S2 and also in Mt 4:14. HR's suggestion to take ρόκος as a possible hapax legomenon therefore seems acceptable. The contrary seems to be the case with the reading στομίς that is quoted as appearing in mss A and S by HR in 30:14. HP shows no primary evidence in this regard. It would therefore seem a correct decision by LEH not to refer to this reading at all. The majority of mss read τομίς instead of στομίς. Apparently HR had other mss at their disposal, or they made a mistake.

Both ορεγγαλωδῆς (8:8 S2, R) and στραγγαλωδῆς (8:8 A, B, S1) are attested to by HP, as is the case with σωμάτως (ms A) and σωματικήματι (S2) in 20:1. HP quote ms 149, 260 and 297 as having the reading σωματικήματι in 29:24 contrary to σωματικῆς. According to HR σωματικήματι appears in ms S in Prov 13:20. HP refers to ms 68, 109, 147, 157, 161, 248 and 254 in this regard. However, by far the most mss read σωματικήματι, which is no hapax legomenon. It is clear that these mss will have to be weighed carefully.

HR refers to the verb ὑπεθέακα in Prov 1:23. HP again has no textual evidence; however, Rahlf has a reference in his text-critical apparatus. In this instance however the evidence does not seem to be decisive. Since I could not find the evidence referred to by HR concerning φωναί in 23:29, it should definitely not be interpreted as a hapax.

There are also a number of miscellaneous examples in the list. A difference in interpretation is possible in respect of ἔγορα. HR sees it as a hapax, whereas LEH interpret it as a verbal adjective of ἔγορα. This Greek verb occurs abundantly in the Septuagint. Finally λάθρος appears only in 21:14. HR

---

refer to ms B2 in Wi 1:11 where this reading occurs too. However, LEH, correctly it would seem, deal with λαθραίος in this regard.

As I have demonstrated it is rather difficult to determine whether any given Greek word is a hapax legomenon. An applicable example is the two occurrences of ἐνεργοῦντα in Prov 8:31. Should it be taken as a hapax legomenon? Strictly speaking not, for the technical term refers to a single reading. However, this is the sole appearance of this verb in the whole of the Septuagint! In order to determine whether a word indeed appears only once in the Septuagint it is moreover of critical importance to scrutinize the manuscript evidence in this regard. When it is taken into account the total number of hapax legomena in LXX Proverbs is 153.

From the above discussion it should be evident that HR should be used cautiously by the researcher. Each reference should be checked against the manuscripts. Unfortunately it seems as if HR made use of mss that are unknown, to us at least.

One final development has improved the applicability of this publication, the 4th appendix by Takamitsu Muraoka, the “Hebrew/Aramaic Index”. The author has in his characteristically meticulous manner presented a Semitic index to the LXX. In this index he has endeavored to revise and improve HR where possible. Even though he follows HR largely -- this applies especially to their mode of referencing and mode of vocalizing Semitic words -- he is correctly critical of aspects of their work. He improved on the textual bases used by them, taking into account the Dead Sea Scrolls where necessary and including information from the apocrypha, notably I Esdras. The greatest value of this index is that it puts at the disposal of the researcher all those passages where a specific Semitic word is translated into Greek. The sigla are easy to follow, and I could detect no major slips. This index has gathered the data necessary for serious text-critical, linguistic and exegetical research. It is simply a pleasure and extremely helpful to have all the Greek counterparts of Semitic referents available in one place!


Not only the original persons responsible for HR must be thanked for their meticulous research, but also Muraoka for providing the scholarly community with a much improved tool. I for one am uncertain whether any revision of this monumental work will ever be needed or completed. The computer, as an interactive tool, will put us in a position to ask different questions in order to arrive at different answers. However, in my view we will always need books in their printed format, and HR, in its improved format, even though to be used discerningly, will be with us for a long time to come!

Johann Cook, Department of Ancient Studies, University of Stellenbosch.
Web Review:
Frederick W. Knobloch

The Christian Classics Ethereal Library (CCEL or "Cecil"), based at Calvin College, now contains online digital facsimile editions of a number of works of interest to the Septuagintalist. They include Henry B. Swete, An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek (rev. R. R. Ottley; Cambridge, 1914; reprint Hendrickson, 1989); idem, The Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint (3 vols.; Cambridge, 1887-1905); Lancelot C. L. Brenton, The Septuagint Version of the Old Testament with an English Translation (London, 1870); and F. C. Conybeare and St. George Stock, A Grammar of Septuagint Greek (Boston, 1905; reprint Hendrickson, 1995, but without the indexes and vocabularies added by Hendrickson). Each page of these works is available in three image formats, including high-resolution and printable images. Additionally, a searchable HTML version is available for most of the volumes.

The HTML versions of the books, however, vary widely in their usefulness because they consist mostly of uncorrected OCR output. As might be expected, the English text in a work like Conybeare and Stock, although often serviceable, needs work; and uncorrected Greek text is all but unusable. At this point, CCEL hopes, the reader will step in to help. Readers are encouraged to participate in the online correction and proofreading of the texts, which is done on a volunteer basis, one page at a time, using an "Edit" link available on most HTML pages.

A look at the progress charts available for each work suggests that editing will be a long process for the Septuagint-related volumes; none of the 1140 pages of Brenton have been completed (even with regard to the English), and only a few pages of the front matter of Swete's Introduction have been corrected. But the Septuagint volumes are relatively new to CCEL, and the progress made on other works shows that CCEL's low-cost approach to online publishing can work, if one is not in a hurry. For example, after slightly more than a year online, 63 pages (21%) of J. G. Machen's New Testament Greek for Beginners (N.Y., 1923) have been corrected.

At present, the titles listed above are fully accessible in image form, and are at least partly searchable. Searches are performed from the "About" page, reached via the "Table of Contents" page for each work. Alternatively, it is possible to search all of the works of a particular author from that author's main page. One can search for a word or words in a document, with boolean operators, but searching for phrases is not supported.

CCEL also contains an English HTML version of the Letter of Aristeas (transl. Andrews) from R. H. Charles, The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English, vol. 2 (Oxford, 1913), together with some of the other contents of that volume. In addition to the aforementioned facsimile edition and accompanying scan of Brenton's Septuagint translation, the beginnings of an earlier HTML version of Brenton, based on an 1851 edition and apparently corrected through the book of Genesis, also exists on CCEL, although it is attributed in a few places to Anonymous. Even though this material is not listed under Brenton's name, a search of Brenton's works correctly searches it as well.

CCEL, which contains hundreds of volumes of public domain works that are mostly theological in content, is the brainchild of Calvin College professor Harry Plantinga. "Ethereal" is meant to allude both to the spiritual nature of many of the holdings and to the fact that they exist in the (electronic) ether. The site is located at http://www.ccel.org.

As Unicode versions of the Septuagint and other Greek texts begin to appear on the web, users of Windows 9x who cannot now read or write accented Greek Unicode may benefit from a support page of the Church of Greece at http://www.myriobiblos.gr/support/sup_polytonic.html. For the technophobe, especially, there is a one-click setup program that installs the Athena font and otherwise configures a web browser.
to read Unicode Greek. Unfortunately there is only minimal help on the site for Macintosh users.

Links to the materials mentioned above, and many others, may be found on Joel D. Kalvesmaki's web site, "The Septuagint: Theological and Academic Resources for the Study of the Septuagint and Old Greek Versions." Kalvesmaki, co-moderator of an LXX discussion list and a graduate student at Catholic University of America, has gathered what may be the most comprehensive and up-to-date collection of Septuagint-related web links. His page is organized into the following main divisions and subheadings: texts (Greek; translations; ancient testimonies); secondary literature (introductory; general; theological assessments; book reviews; bibliography); and activities and institutions (mailing [i.e., discussion] lists; academic institutions; translation projects; scholars [including a number of IOSCS notables]; and other Septuagint pages). The site's address is http://arts-sciences.cua.edu/ecs/jdk/LXX/index.htm.
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**A NOTE ON THE SYNTACTIC ANALYSIS OF GREEK TRANSLATIONS AND COMPOSITIONS**

T. P. HUTCHINSON and D. CAIRNS

Department of Psychology, Macquarie University, Sydney, N.S.W. 2109, Australia

Jobes\(^1\) reports 17 numerical characteristics of two Greek translations of Daniel, two Greek translations of Esther, and (using data from Martin\(^2\)) three Greek compositions. Jobes calculated these characteristics from features proposed by Martin to distinguish "translation" Greek from "composition" Greek; she used a normalised scale on which +1 represents translation and -1 represents composition.

The present note examines two issues: whether the two translations of Esther are less similar to each other than are the two translations of Daniel (which is what Jobes claims), and whether the three original Greek compositions do indeed contrast with the four translations.

**Similarities of Two Translations of Daniel, and Similarities of Two Translations of Esther**

At page 34, Jobes claims: "An examination of the two Greek versions of Esther shows that, unlike the profiles of

---


Daniel, they are not similar to each other". We cannot see the basis for this claim, and will give an analysis that suggests that the two translations of Esther are, if anything, more similar to each other than are the two translations of Daniel. (The two translations of Esther are the LXX and the alpha text; the two translations of Daniel are the Old Greek and the Theodotion.)

The first question that arises is what meaning should we give to "similar" — how should we measure similarity? We will suggest two answers to this. ("Similar" is quite a vague word, and the fact that there is more than one interpretation should not be surprising.) The context is that there are 17 numerical characteristics; however, only 14 were measured for both versions of Daniel, and 16 for both versions of Esther.

- **Size of difference**. For each characteristic, calculate the absolute size of the difference between the two translations of Daniel. (The term "absolute size" tells us to ignore whether the difference was positive or negative.) Then average this over the 14 characteristics. Repeat the process for Esther.

- **Correlation of profiles**. For the two translations of Daniel, calculate the correlation between the 14 characteristics. Repeat the process for Esther.

These two summary statistics are, in principle, quite different, and there is no reason to suppose that they will convey the same message. If we imagine listing the 17 characteristics on a graph and plotting two lines, one for each translation of Daniel, then the average absolute difference summarises how far apart the two lines are, whereas the correlation summarises how well the ups and downs of one line (what we have termed the text's "profile") follow the ups and downs of the other line.

**Results**. The starting point for our calculations was, in the case of Daniel, the data in Jobes' Table 1, and, in the case of Esther, the data given in Jobes' Graph 1. (There will have been some loss of accuracy in the calculations for Esther, as Graph 1 gives only one decimal place, whereas Table 1 gives two.) For the two translations of Daniel, the average absolute difference is 0.29, and for the two translations of Esther, it is 0.17. Thus by this interpretation of similarity, the two translations of Esther are more similar to each other. For the two translations of Daniel, the correlation is 0.81, and for the two translations of Esther, it is 0.95. Thus by this interpretation of similarity also, the two translations of Esther are more similar to each other.

**Similarities Between the Seven Texts**

The three compositions considered by Jobes are Polybius, Josephus, and a set of papyri. As with the translations of Esther, it was necessary for the three compositions to read the data from one of Jobes' graphs, Graph 2 in this case. Something else limiting the accuracy of calculations was that Graph 2 shows several values for Polybius and Josephus as being below the -1.5 category, rather than showing them exactly; these were entered into the calculations as -2.56 (Polybius) or -2.58 (Josephus), in order to achieve the respective means of -1.68 and -1.38 that are included on Graph 2. (We have checked, and the overall message of the results we will present is not very sensitive to what values are used.)

From a starting point of several variables having been measured on several objects, *nonmetric multidimensional scaling* is a technique that is commonly used to summarise the similarities between the objects. This technique plots the objects (the texts, in our case) in such a way that they are relatively close together if they are similar, and relatively far apart if they are different. Figure 1 shows the result obtained using the multidimensional scaling program in the SYSTAT statistical software package. (A three-dimensional plot can also be made, but in the case of this dataset, there is little improvement in the fit.) As expected, the four translations cluster close together on this graph. It is unexpected that the papyri are similar to the translations rather than to the other

---


4 *SYSTAT 8.0 Statistics*. Chicago: SPSS.
compositions. Indeed, the three compositions do not seem to form any sort of cluster. (A property of the multidimensional scaling procedure used is that the horizontal and vertical axes in Figure 1 are not meaningful, and they could be rotated if there were any reason to do so; what is important are the relative positions of the texts.)

An alternative way of presenting this information is as a cluster tree (dendrogram): Figure 2, obtained using SYSTAT, shows that the most important groupings of the texts are Josephus and Polybius together, contrasted with the papyri and the translations.

To obtain Figures 1 and 2, we chose to use the correlation between the profiles of two texts as the measure of their similarity. (That is, the ordering of the 21 inter-text distances in Figure 1 is as close as possible, in reverse, to the ordering of the 21 correlations.) This is a common choice with multidimensional scaling. But, as when considering above the similarities of the two translations of Daniel and those of Esther, we might instead choose the average difference between two profiles. Figure 3 shows the result of doing this. Though there is no calculational reason why this should convey the same message as Figure 1, we can see that it almost does — the four translations are close together, and the set of papyri resembles them more than Polybius or Josephus does. (Polybius...
and Josephus should really be further apart from each other than shown in Figure 3. The inaccuracy is a result of Jobes' Graph 2 showing the values of characteristics 4, 5, and 14 merely as below the -1.5 category for both Polybius and Josephus.

Figure 3: Results from multidimensional scaling applied to the average absolute differences between the 17 characteristics of the texts. (Daniel 1 and Daniel 2 refer respectively to the Old Greek and the Theodotion translations, and Esther 1 and Esther 2 refer respectively to the LXX and the alpha text.)

Discussion

It might be asked whether the findings of Figures 1 and 2 can be perceived in the correlations themselves, without needing to use multidimensional scaling. The answer is that with this dataset we are lucky and find this can be done. In the table of correlations (Table 1), we see:

- There are high correlations between the four translations. They average 0.85.
- There are low correlations between the three compositions. They average 0.13.
- There are low correlations between the four translations and both Polybius and Josephus. They average -0.07.
- There are quite high correlations between the four translations and the set of papyri. They average 0.58.

In the case of other datasets it will not necessarily be so easy to see what is going on, and visual summaries like Figures 1 and 2 may prove to be very helpful.

Table 1: Intercorrelations between the profiles of the seven texts. (For key to codes 1-7, see the first column.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Daniel (Old Greek)</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>-27</td>
<td>-05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Daniel (Theodotion)</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Esther (LXX)</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Esther (alpha text)</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Papyri</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Polybius</td>
<td>-31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Josephus</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
other software). Rather, they are genuinely in the data. But it may be asked whether a correlation of profiles is a meaningful and valid way of measuring the distance between two texts. A case could be made against this: the Martin/Jobes procedure results in 17 quantities that are all intended to reflect "composition" versus "translation", and it may be that the individual peculiarities have been eliminated by the normalisation calculations.

Certainly it is easy to imagine how distortions of the correlations might arise. Jobes' normalisation procedure involves comparison of each characteristic of a text with values that are supposed to be typical of translation and composition Greek. If these were chosen poorly for some of the characteristics, spurious correlations would be introduced. However, this would apply to all pairs of correlations, and we doubt whether this mechanism could artificially separate Polybius and Josephus from the other five texts.

We do not have the specialist knowledge needed to properly weigh these considerations, but it is plain that Jobes does consider the 17 quantities to be individually meaningful (see especially pp. 24-28 of her paper), and we are content to accept this.

Summary

We have reanalysed data from Jobes (Bioses, 1995) on characteristics of Greek syntax in seven texts, and have two points to add: (a) the two translations of Esther are very similar to each other, and (b) the set of papyri are more similar to the four translations (of Esther and Daniel) than to the two original compositions (Polybius and Josephus).

How to Analyse and Translate the Idiomatic Phrase יָּרֵא יָּרֵא

Takanitsu Muraoka
Leiden, The Netherlands

How to translate an idiomatic expression in language A into language B is a challenge every translator has to face from time to time. This appears to have been the case with Septuagint translators. In this short study I wish to explore one concrete example of this phenomenon, namely the biblical Hebrew יָּרֵא יָּרֵא, universally agreed to express an intense wish or desire, sometimes unattainable.

On Nu 11.29, "Would that all the LORD's people were prophets," translated in the LXX as τίς δόξη πάντα τών λαῶν τοῦ κυρίου προφήτας, Wevers writes:

The τίς δόξη is a calque for the Hebrew idiom יָּרֵא יָּרֵא expressing a wish, thus "would that ...." The structure only makes sense from the Hebrew point of view, and the Greek can only be understood as expressing a wish: "would that all the Lord's people might be prophets ...." Possibly one could approach the Greek clause by understanding the structure somewhat like: "and someone might set all the people of the Lord as prophets when ...." This at least takes the optative δόξη seriously.¹

Two issues need to be addressed here: 1) Was the idiom correctly understood by various LXX translators? and 2) Was it recognised by them as an idiom at all, namely a linguistic expression the meaning of which as a whole is not

equal to a sum total of the meaning of each of its constituents by itself? Let us look at the entire Hebrew Bible. BDB, under ק (pp. 678b-679a), mentions a total of 21 passages where they have identified this idiom, classified syntactically. I present below all the passages, together with the LXX rendering of them. 2

A) c. acc.
1) Dt 28.67 “If only it were evening! ... If only it were morning!”
   Πῶς ἂν γένοιτο ἑσπέρα; .. Πῶς ἂν γένοιτο προῖ
2) Jb 14.4 “Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean?”
   τίς γὰρ κεκαθαρὸς ἔσται ἀπὸ ρύπου;
3) Ps 14.7 (= 53.7) “O that deliverance for Israel would come from Zion”
   τίς δώσει ἐκ Σιοῦ τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ Ἰσραήλ;
4) ib. 55.7 “O that I had wings like a dove”
   τίς δώσει μοι πτέρυγαν ὁσὲλ περιστερᾶς;
5) Jer 9.1 “O that I had in the desert a traveler’s [sic NRSV!] lodging place”
   τίς δώσῃ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ σταθμὸν ἑσκατον.

B) c. 2 acc.
6) Nu 11.29 “Would that all the LORD’s people were prophets”
   τίς δημάρτυρ τῶν λαῶν τοῦ κυρίου προφῆτας
7) Je 8.23 “O that my head were a spring of water”
   τίς δώσῃ κεφαλῆς μου βάσιν

C) c. acc. + ἢ
8) Ct 8.1 “O that you were like a brother to me”
   τίς δῆλη σε ἀδελφὸν ἐμοῦ
9) Jb 29.2 “Oh, that I were as in the months of old”
   τίς ἂν με θείη κατὰ μήνα ἐμπροσθεν.

D) c. acc. + εἰ
10) Jdg 9.29 “if only this people were under my control”
    τίς δῆλη τῶν λαῶν τούτων ἐν χειρὶ μου
11) Jb 31.35 “Oh, that I had one to hear me”
    τίς δῆλη ἀκουστά μου

E) c. acc. + ἢ
12) Is 27.4 “if it gives me thorns ...”
    τίς με θησαυρὸν φυλάσσειν ...

F) c. inf.
13) Ex 16.3 “if only we had died by the hand of the LORD”
    ὁφελοῦ παθέσθωμεν πληγέντες ὑπὸ κυρίου
14) 2Sm 19.1 “Would I had died.”
    τίς δῆλη τὸν θανάτον μου ..
    Antioch.: τίς δώσῃ μοι πάντας .
15) Jb 11.5 “oh, that God would speak”
    πῶς ἂν ο κύριος λαλῆσαι πρὸς σέ;

G) c. impf.
16) Jb 6.8 “O that I might have my request”
    εἰ γὰρ δῆλη, καὶ ξετοί ἐμοῦ ἐὰν ἔτηρας
17) ib. 14.13 “Oh that you would hide me in Sheol”
    εἰ γὰρ ὁφελοῦ ἐν ἑδύμι ἐμὴ ἑφύλαξας

2 The appended English translation of the Hebrew text is that of the New Revised Standard Version.
In Classical Greek the optative in independent clauses has two uses: optative proper expressing a wish without ἀν and potential with ἀν. Nos. 1, 9, 15, 18 and 19 may be regarded as cases of optativus potentialis. On the other hand, one obviously cannot take nos. 6, 8, 10, 11, 14, and 20 as optative proper, for the wish expressed by such an optative should be that of the speaker. Paul is uttering his wish, not that of the grammatical subject of the optative verbs, when he writes: 1Th 5.23 ἀδικήσατε δὲ γὰρ τὴν ἐρήμου ἡμᾶς ... ἡ ψυχὴ καὶ τὸ σῶμα δέμπτως ... τηρηθεὶς. Likewise, in all of the above examples beginning with τίς δὲν, the wish, if it be such, expressed is that of the speaker. Even if taken as a rhetorical question, none of these utterances can be an expression of the speaker's wish if we retain the interrogative τίς in its ordinary meaning. The only plausible explanation of this striking phenomenon seems to me to assume a mingling of two originally distinct notions, namely that of the genuine interrogative and that of wish, the latter of which could be indicated by the optative. Thus, for instance, in no. 5, one might paraphrase: "I do wish that someone could give me a traveler's lodging-place in the desert. Who could that be?" With one exception -- no. 12 -- the NRSV does not use an English verb which would reflect the Hebrew מֹרֶפֶּה, but instead one of the idiomatic syntagms indicating a wish: mostly "Oh that," but also "If only," "Would," and "Would that." However, in all 21 examples the Hebrew verb in question can be assigned its usual meaning. This is particularly true where it is followed by an indirect object marked by the preposition ἐν (nos. 4, 11) or its equivalent in the form of an object suffix directly attached.

The first example in the Bible, no. 13 (Ex 16.3), was manifestly understood by the translator as optative, as shown by the use of ὁρεία, which is also used at Jb 14.13 (no. 17). Considerable lexical divergence from the Hebrew at nos. 1 and 15 suggests that the Hebrew expression there was identified as idiomatic.

The idiomatic nature of the Hebrew syntagm is at its most obvious when there is a clear breakage between τίς δὲν and what follows, which is the case in the syntagmata G, H, I and J. Note especially no. 17 with ὁρείαν and no. 20 with nothing corresponding in the LXX to τίς. In this respect no. 21 with a consecutive waw is intriguing, where the use of the indicative δώσει is also to be noted, whereas the distribution of the indicative and optative is 6 versus 13.
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4 Wevers' "might set..." indicates an optativus potentialis, which is difficult without ἀν, whereas he states that the Greek text, just as its Hebrew original, indicates a wish.

5 Cp. Brenton's rendering of Jb 6.8 (no. 16): "For oh that he would grant my desire, and my petition might come..." and the Vulgate at Jdg 9.29 (no.10); utinam daret aliquis populum istum sub manu mea.
to the verb (nos. 5, 12). The use of τίθημι instead of the majority equivalent δίδωμι (nos. 9, 12), as well as the use of the future indicative δώσει (nos. 3, 4, 7, 21), indicate that τίθημι retains its basic, more or less literal meaning. In the four cases under (B) and (C) we could assign the Hebrew verb one of its well-established senses, namely “to cause to become, turn into.” In the light of this, those optatives in the syntagm τις ἀν δώσει may also indicate a wish rather than cases of optativo potentialis, representing an infelicitous confusion of the two functions of the optative, though such an assumption is not necessary.

Conclusion

The Biblical Hebrew fossilised expression ἴτας ἢ, which enters a great variety of syntactic structures and is said to express a wish, appears to have been seen by the Septuagint translators as a fixed phrase. In many of its attestations, however, their rendering with τις δώσῃ (optative) or τις δώσει (indicative) is mechanical in its choice of the Greek equivalents. Whilst the use of the optative (of other Greek verbs as well, such as γένοιτο, θεόν, γνώριμα) indicates a wish of the speaker, the use of δίδωμι in the majority of cases strongly suggests that the two Hebrew words of the idiom are not totally devoid of their usual meaning, and the expression ἴτας ἢ as a whole, in many of its occurrences, is capable of non-idiomatic interpretation.

EVALUATING LEXICAL CONSISTENCY IN THE OLD GREEK BIBLE

Martha L. Wade

Lexical consistency or the lack thereof has long been used as one of the main criteria in evaluating the Old Greek translations with regard to the degree of literalness of the translations, the number of translators, and the possibility of producing an accurate retroversion of the Hebrew Vorlage. In this paper I will first survey several studies that have used lexical consistency as one of their main criteria. Next, I will compare the results of different methods of evaluating lexical consistency, using a portion of Exodus. After comparing these results, I will summarize some of the factors that influenced the translator’s lexical decisions in Exodus. I will conclude by identifying some problems of statistical studies of smaller books of the Bible that produce a distorted picture of the nature of the translation. Statistical studies may be useful in some aspects of evaluating translation technique, but a detailed examination of the data in context, as I will show in this brief study, often provides a totally different picture of the translation.

I. LEXICAL CONSISTENCY IN STUDIES OF THE OLD GREEK

Observations about lexical consistency in the Old Greek translation have served as the bases for claims about the theology of the translators, the number of translators involved in the production of a book, estimations of the quality of the translation, support for the possibility of recovering the Hebrew Vorlage through retroversion, and other assorted claims. The importance of lexical consistency is seen in the wide variety of ways that it has been used. This heavy emphasis on lexical consistency may, however, be due to the fact that it is a relatively easy method of evaluating the Old Greek. All that is
required is a concordance\textsuperscript{1} or a computer with the MT/LXX parallel text database\textsuperscript{2} to quickly produce lists of examples of consistency or inconsistency in the translations of specific terms. In this section I will give a brief survey of studies that have used lexical consistency as evidence for their claims about the text.

In Thackeray's examination of the entire corpus of Old Greek scriptures, he clearly explained his methodology and grouped the putative component translations according to the manner in which they translated certain terms or phrases. In choosing this approach he noted that "Vocabulary affords the easiest criterion to begin with: the results which it yields can then be tested by grammatical phenomena."\textsuperscript{3} His classification of the books of the Old Greek translation has, in general, been validated by more recent studies of various aspects of the Old Greek. For Thackeray, however, the changes in lexical equivalents also provided a basis for claims about the theology of the translators. For instance, noting the changes in the translation of the term "servant" he says,

\textit{We cannot fail to note in the LXX renderings a growing tendency to emphasize the distance between God and man. Θεράπων "the confidential attendant" is replaced by οἰκετής (which may include all members of the household and therefore implies close intimacy), then by the more colourless but still familiar μιας, finally by δοῦλος the "bond-servant" without a will of his own.}\textsuperscript{4}

Some of these changes in the choice of lexical equivalents may, however, be the result of the translations being produced over a long span of time. Thus, the differences may reflect a shift in language usage, rather than a changing theology. Three of these terms are used to translate ταπεινός in Exodus 11–13 and will be discussed in a later section of the paper.

Traditionally, lexical consistency or the lack thereof has been one of the criteria for determining whether a book was translated by one or more translators. Early studies by Thackeray, Baab, and others emphasized the different ways that terms were translated and on the basis of the distribution of these terms divided books such as Genesis, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel into two or more parts.\textsuperscript{5} These studies generally made no claims about being complete studies of the vocabulary of the book, but emphasized lexical inconsistency between the parts of a book because they assumed that the translations were basically literal and that one translator would not suddenly switch vocabulary.

In Gooding's study of the tabernacle sections of Exodus, however, lexical inconsistency was seen as one of the defining features of the translator's technique.\textsuperscript{6} Because of the presence of lexical inconsistency throughout Exodus, Gooding claimed that the lexical differences between the two tabernacle accounts were primarily due to the translator's technique rather than the presence of two translators, as had been claimed by Smith, Swete, and others.\textsuperscript{7} Gooding's negative evaluation of lexical inconsistency has in recent times been countered by Leiter, who sees some examples of lexical inconsistency as a positive

\textsuperscript{1} Edwin Hatch and Henry A. Redpath, \textit{A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (Including the Apocryphal Books)} (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Books, 1998).
\textsuperscript{2} This database is commercially available as a module of Accordance, OakTree Software Specialists, Altamonte Springs, Fla., 1997.
\textsuperscript{4} Ibid., 8.
\textsuperscript{5} David W. Gooding, \textit{The Account of the Tabernacle: Translation and Textual Problems of the Greek Exodus}, Texts and Studies: Contributions to Biblical and Patristic Literature, ed. C. H. Dodd, no. 6 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959), 28. Gooding describes the translator's style by pointing to "his disregard for technicalities, his inconsistencies, his inaccuracies" and "his positive errors."
attribute of a translator’s techniques. These techniques are described as assimilation, in which different Hebrew terms are translated by the same Greek term, and dissimilation, in which the same Hebrew term is translated by different Greek terms. Leiter found both of these techniques being used within very short sections of text in which there were no obvious semantic differences. Gooding and Leiter, in contrast to some earlier scholars, agree that translators can sometimes be inconsistent. The difference between Gooding and Leiter is that Gooding referred to this as a sloppy translation technique whereas Leiter described it as a purposeful choice.

Tov, in his study of Jeremiah, did a more complete analysis of the vocabulary than that done by Thackeray. As a result, Tov was able to show that while there was some lexical inconsistency in Jeremiah, Thackeray’s study failed to recognize the importance of the consistency that did exist in many areas of the vocabulary. On the basis of lexical consistency within both parts of Jeremiah, as well as other factors, Tov tried to show that the lexical inconsistency that did exist between the two parts of the book was due to a revision of the second part of the book. Tov also expressed his disagreement with Thackeray’s attitude towards literal translations, as follows:

Further, it seems to us that Thackeray’s group of “literal or unintelligent versions” in which he includes Jer. β is based on a wrong assumption: “literal” versions are not necessarily “unintelligent” and vice versa.

Tov’s more positive attitude towards literal translations is probably due to his interest in textual criticism as is seen in his statement about the value of the LXX, as follows: “For OT scholarship, the main importance of the LXX lies in its Hebrew Vorlage, which at times may be superior to MT.”

Barr’s study on literalness pointed to lexical consistency as one of a set of criteria used in defining the degree of literalness of a translation. His assumption was that all of the Old Greek translations were literal and varied only in the degree of literalness. He also noted that translations could be more or less literal in various aspects of their work. Tov and Wright built on Barr’s study and began to identify features of the translation that could be counted with the help of computer technology. Because of Tov and Wright’s interest in the Hebrew Vorlage, their main reason for producing the statistics was to have an objective measure of the degree of literalness of a translation. The objective measurements could then be used as a basis for generalizations “about the character of the translation,” which “is the only help in evaluating deviations of the LXX.”

Wright’s statistical study was likewise focused on determining the degree to which one can confidently recover the Hebrew Vorlage by retroversion from the Greek. A more literal translation would probably provide a sounder basis for retroversion, so Wright statistically analyzed several aspects of various translations to provide an objective basis for determining how literal a translation was. One criterion he used was lexical consistency. Since his study was based on Sirach, which is only partially extant in Hebrew, his statistical studies of lexical consistency used Greek as their starting point.

---

10 Ibid., 159.
In summary, lexical consistency has long been recognized as a means of evaluating various aspects of the Old Greek translation. The most frequent foci of these studies were the question of the number of translators and the retroversion of the Hebrew Vorlage. The methods used to study lexical consistency have generally been what Tov has called "intuitive description." In the last two decades, however, computer technology has made it possible to analyze large segments of the Old Greek statistically. These statistical analyses reportedly provide an objective analysis. In the next section I will compare the results of a statistical analysis with the actual data in the text.

II. MEASURING LEXICAL CONSISTENCY

The problems involved in defining lexical consistency, along with the variety of terms that have been used to describe this concept, have been discussed by Olofsson. In an extremely literal translation, lexical consistency is manifested by a one-to-one correspondence of Hebrew to Greek terms. Aquila's revision of the Old Greek is often described as a translation with this kind of lexical consistency that is sometimes called "stereotyping." Statistical studies that measure lexical consistency generally are trying to measure the degree to which a one-to-one correspondence is maintained either from Hebrew to Greek or vice versa. In a less literal translation of the Hebrew, on the other hand, lexical consistency is manifested by the degree to which the Old Greek consistently represents the different meanings of the Hebrew terms by repeatedly using the same Greek terms for the same meanings. This difference between the two types of lexical consistency has sometimes been described as pseudo concordance (stereotyping) and real concordance (the consistent representation of semantic concepts). A translation that consistently represents semantic concepts may at times appear to be a "stereotyping" translation if the terms in both languages generally refer to the same concept. Due to the nature of languages and the probability that the concepts referred to by nouns are more likely to coincide, Olofsson suggests that "the consistent rendering of a verb is as a rule a better sign of a literal translation than the stereotype translation of a noun."19

The main purpose of this section is to compare and contrast the results of statistical studies of lexical consistency (pseudo concordance) with a study of nouns and verbs based on the degree to which they consistently represent the meaning of the Hebrew (real concordance). The data used in this study are from the text of Exodus 11–13, an arbitrarily chosen section of the book I am currently concentrating on in my studies.20 The quantity of text was chosen to match that of the book of Ruth, one of the books included in Wright's statistical analysis. Wright notes that most of the books seem to fall into three groupings that generally reflect the categories that have been suggested on other bases by Sollamo, Tov and Wright. They also coincide in general with Thackeray's more intuitive evaluation of the literalness of the translations. This agreement of intuitive and statistical studies seemed to support the general validity of Wright's statistical studies. Wright did, however, note that there were some problems with the categorization of Ruth in that it was among the most consistent translations in terms of "stereotyping tendency" and yet was grouped with much less literal translations in terms of word order. Wright notes several problems that may have affected the percentages in his statistics. These include the presence of words with "a limited number of references.

---

19 Olofsson, "Consistency as a Translation Technique," 20.
20 For this brief study, I followed Wright's methodology and mainly used computer databases for Greek (Rahlfs) and Hebrew (BHS). A more complete study would, of course, have to account for textual variants in both Greek and Hebrew.
possibilities for translation, words that have two or more consistent translations that are determined by context, and different translations that may be due to the forgetfulness of the translator when the examples are separated by a "large amount of intervening text." Wright notes these potential problems, but believes that these factors would not change the overall relationship of one translation to another and therefore would not challenge the general validity of his study.

In my statistical examination of Exodus 11-13 I have followed Wright's methodology in which nouns and verbs were analyzed separately according to their frequency of occurrence. Words that occurred four times or less were not included by Wright. Wright used a range of percentages—60%, 66%, and 75%—in order to evaluate the stereotyping tendency of the translations rather than following Sollamo's arbitrary cut off point of 50%, which he considered to be too low. Tables 1-4 include the data from Exodus 11-13 along with the percentages that Wright found for Qoheleth, Ruth, Job, Numbers, and Amos.

---

22 Ibid., 110.
23 Ibid., 112.
24 Ibid., 99-100.
25 Ibid., 106-8.
Exodus has generally been classified as a relatively free translation that uses “more idiomatic Greek.” It should have fallen into the same basic category as Numbers. In fact, Exodus is considered by some to be an even more free translation than Numbers. These evaluations of Exodus and Numbers are generally based on either grammatical studies or intuition, but it is still striking that a statistical study of a portion of Exodus the size of Ruth would make it appear that this section of Exodus is very literal in the sense that it has a high degree of lexical consistency. Olofsson has noted that statistical analysis of small quantities of data may cause some difficulties.

Certain percentages that seemed to be skewed by lack of data in Wright’s charts were indicated in small notes after the charts. Thus, these difficulties were noted by Wright, but were still dismissed as unimportant for the entire study. For this section of Exodus, the percentage of verbs that occur more than ten times provides an ideal example of the problem. Only four verbs occur ten or more times. Three are in the 75% and up category, and one (ἐάν) is only 55% consistent and thus falls below the 60% and up category. This means that only 75% (three of four) of the verbs that occur ten or more times have a stereotyping tendency of 75% or higher. Wright, however, eliminated the Greek word ἐάν from his study because of the wide variety of terms that it translates. Following this procedure I also eliminated ἐάν and as a result, the percentage for this category of verbs became 100%. Eliminating one word from a small body of data can have dramatic consequences.

Other factors such as the natural fit between certain nouns and verbs can also be a determining factor that especially affects analyses of smaller books or sections of text. Wright believed that this would not seriously affect the results because it would affect all the books, but I believe that this portion of Exodus shows the distortion that can be caused in the percentages, as will be seen in the following section.

Wright’s statistics were based on the Greek because of the focus of his study and his interest in retroversion of the Hebrew Vorlage. Most studies, however, have used Hebrew as their starting point and noted the degree of consistency in the translator’s choices of Greek terms. This going from the Hebrew to the Greek produces slightly lower statistics, especially with the verbs. These percentages may be seen in table 5, which is a composite chart of data similar to that presented in tables 1–4, but which uses Hebrew, rather than Greek, as the starting point. Even with these lower statistical results, Exodus 11–13 appears to be a fairly consistent translation, especially in the translation of nouns.

Table 5. Hebrew to Greek Statistics for Exodus 11–13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>75% &amp; UP</th>
<th>66% &amp; UP</th>
<th>60% &amp; UP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nouns Used between 5 and 9 Times</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nouns Used 10 or More Times</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbs Used between 5 and 9 Times</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbs Used 10 or More Times</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27 In one chart, “Nouns Used between 5 and 9 Times,” Exodus 11–13 and Numbers fall into the same general range in the “75% & Up” category.
29 Olofsson, “Consistency as a Translation Technique,” 18.
30 Ibid., 279 n. 89.
In table 6 I present the "raw data" of the numbers of nouns and verbs that occur in a variety of categories. I have divided the data into common nouns, proper nouns, and verbs that occur 3-4 times, 5-9 times, and 10 or more times. Each of these categories is further subdivided into groups of words that are translated with 100% consistency, words that are translated contextually in a variety of ways, and words that are translated in a variety of ways, but with no obvious contextual basis. The contextual factors observed in Exodus 11-13 will be discussed in the next section of the paper.

In tables 1-4, the verbs and nouns in Exodus 11-13 both appeared to have a high "stereotyping" tendency and the percentages for the verbs were even higher than the percentages for the nouns. An examination of the textual data, however, presents a different picture. A large percentage of both the common and proper nouns was translated with 100% consistency whereas only two verbs were translated with the same degree of consistency. Of the twenty-three Hebrew verbs occurring three or more times in Exodus 11-13, 91% (twenty-one verbs) were translated by two or more different verbs in Greek. Of those twenty-one verbs, the choices made in translating eighteen of the verbs can be explained on the basis of semantic and/or grammatical context. Of the forty-six Hebrew common nouns occurring three or more times in Exodus 11-13, only 41% (nineteen nouns) were translated in two or more different ways. As with the verbs, there was a variety of semantic and grammatical factors that influenced the choice of terms used by the translator. Most variations can be explained with a fair degree of certainty, but no basis has yet been found for four nouns (9% of the total). Proper nouns pose a slightly different problem. Of the six nouns in this category, three are rendered with 100% consistency and each of the remaining three only had a few "exceptions" to the normal rendering. These exceptions will be discussed in the next section of the paper.

When there were multiple ways of translating nouns and verbs, the differences between nouns and verbs again became obvious. Nouns generally used two different translation choices except for two nouns, one of which had three choices and one, four choices. Translation options for verbs, by contrast, tended to increase in direct proportion to the frequency of occurrence. For instance, verbs that occurred 3-4 times used 2-3 different translation options. Verbs that occurred 5-9 times used 2-4 different translation options. Verbs that occurred 10 or more times used 3-5 different translation options.

In frequently used nouns, this portion of Exodus does tend toward a high degree of lexical consistency. An examination of the actual data, however, reveals that the translator was very sensitive to the semantic and grammatical context of each word and as a result varied his translation of certain terms, especially verbs, to fit the context. In the following section I will focus on the types of changes that the translator made as he determined how best to translate the Hebrew terms into Greek.

III. CONTEXTUAL TRANSLATION

An examination of the nouns and verbs that occur three or more times in Exodus 11-13 gives clear evidence of the variety of factors that influenced the translator’s choice. Many of these translation choices occur only once in Exodus 11-13. In order to test my hypotheses about the conditioning factors for these terms, I often expanded my study by examining all the translations of the terms in Exodus. When these examples are helpful for the reader, I have used them to illustrate the translation choices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occurrences</th>
<th>Common Nouns</th>
<th>Proper Nouns</th>
<th>Verbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-4 Times</td>
<td>100% Consistent</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contextual</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Contextual</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9 Times</td>
<td>100% Consistent</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contextual</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Contextual</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Times or More</td>
<td>100% Consistent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contextual</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Contextual</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As noted above, twenty-one of twenty-three verbs were translated by two or more terms. Some of these translation choices are due to the fact that the Hebrew term includes a wider range of meaning than any one Greek term. For instance, the Hebrew verb יָּהַּב is regularly translated by at least six different Greek words in Exodus, three of which occur in Exodus 11–13: ἀποθνῄσκω (Exod 12.33), θανάζ (Exod 12.30), and τελευτάω (Exod 11.5). In Greek, these words can have overlapping meanings as may be seen in Louw and Nida, but in Exodus, the translator(s) appear to have used each of these terms for a distinct aspect of the meaning of the Hebrew word יָּהַּב. The word τελευτάω is used to refer to the event of death. It occurs in factual reporting of what has happened (e.g., Exod 1.6, 7.21, 9.6) and reports of what will happen (e.g., Exod 7.18, 9.4, 11.5). It may also be used to refer to the completed event (21.34, 36) or to advocate that the event should happen (Exod 21.17, 35.2). The word ἀποθνῄσκω, by contrast, focuses on the imminence or certainty of an impending death (e.g., Exod 10.28, 12.33) or the immediacy of a death after an action (Exod 21.12, 20). The contrast between τελευτάω and ἀποθνῄσκω may be seen in Exod 22.9 and Exod 22.13. In Exod 22.9, only the fact of the death is known, but the surrounding events are unknown and the person responsible for the animal does not have to pay restitution. The word τελευτάω is used here since nothing is known about the death, except that the event took place. By contrast, Exod 22.13, which has the identical Hebrew term יָּהַּב, is translated by ἀποθνῄσκω and the person who borrowed the animal has to pay restitution. The implication is that the borrower did something that led to the immediate death of the animal and is thus responsible. This implication is present in both Hebrew and Greek, but the Greek is made explicit through the choice of lexical terms. The final term θανάζ is used to refer to death as a state with its consequent effects. In Exod 4.19, the Old Greek translation includes an exact repetition of the first clause of Exod 2.23 that reports the event of the death of Pharaoh using the term τελευτάω. After this repeated clause, the Hebrew explanatory clause that refers to the state of those who had sought Moses is translated by saying that they had died/were dead, using the term θανάζ. The emphasis on state versus event is also seen in Exod 21.35 where a form of θανάζ is used in contrast to ζώο to refer to the dead bull versus the living bull. All three Greek terms used in Exodus 11–13 translate the same Hebrew term, but the translator has used each to focus on one aspect of death, i.e., the basic event (Exod 11.5), the immediacy of the event (Exod 12.33), or the state of being dead (Exod 12.30).

Grammatical forms of the Hebrew terms may also affect the choice of translation equivalents. It has often been noted that Hiphil forms and infinitive absolutes are sometimes translated by separate lexical items. This is definitely the case in Exodus 11–13. For instance, the Hebrew verb יֵפַש in the Niphal is translated by διψάω, which means to “swear,” as in Exod 13.5, 11, but the Hiphil perfect, when it has a causative meaning, is translated by ὁρκίζω, which means “to cause someone to take an oath,” as in Exod 13.19. The Hiphil infinitive absolute that accompanies this verb is appropriately translated by the dative form of the cognate noun ὁρκός (Exod 13.19).

The translations of יִשְׂרָאֵל are influenced by the nature of the participants in the clause, the grammatical form, and the general context. The Hiphil forms of יִשְׂרָאֵל are translated by ἐξέφρασα, when the object that is being caused to move is an inanimate object (dough—Exod 12.39 or meat—Exod 12.46) and by ἐξέγερσα, when animate beings are being caused to move (Exod 12.17, 42, 51). The Qal forms of יִשְׂרָאֵל, when they refer to the event of “going...
"out," are generally translated by ἐξέρχομαι, since no “causer” is involved in the action (Exod 12.22, 31, 41). When the process or habitual nature of “going out” is the focus then the Qal forms of הָעָל are translated by לקויאך (Exod 13.8). This difference in meaning between ἐξέρχομαι and לקויאך is reinforced by the fact that לקויאך is always used in the present and imperfect tenses in Exodus and ἐξέρχομαι never occurs in these tenses in Exodus. The final Greek word used to translate Qal forms of הָעָל in Exodus 11-13 is εἰσπορεύομαι. This Greek word is generally used to translate forms of the word הָעָל, but it is used to translate הָעָל in Exod 11.4 and in Exod 33.8. This translation is probably used because of the collocational clash that would have been created in Greek by combining a verb with the preposition εἰς, that is, εἰσπορεύομαι, followed by a prepositional phrase that is translated into Greek by εἰς. This conflict is resolved by adapting the directional preposition on the verb to fit the context of the following prepositional phrase so that both the verb and the prepositional phrase refer to going into something, rather than one going “out” and one going “in.” Grammatical structures alone, however, will not explain all translations. In addition, the translator’s understanding of the meaning also affects translation choices, as can be seen by the translation of almost identical phrases in Exod 33.7 and Exod 33.8. The translator knew that Moses went into the tent while the person seeking the Lord only went out of the camp to the tent.33 The translation choices for הָעָל illustrate the wide variety of semantic, grammatical, and contextual factors that influenced the translator. Two of the most frequently used Hebrew verbs were רָאָּה, which in Exodus 11-13 was always translated by λέγω, and פָּרַך, which was always translated in Exodus 11-13 by παρέρ. The word רָאָּה is mainly used to introduce quotations and may refer to other speech events, a function that is likewise found in λέγω. Because of this identity of function between the two words, the translation of רָאָּה was consistent. The verbs פָּרַך and παρέρ also fit together well because both are generic verbs that can be used in a variety of contexts. These two examples again raise the question about the basis for lexical consistency in the translation. Was the translator of Exodus 11-13 consistent because he was translating literally or was he consistent because the semantic functions of the Greek and Hebrew verbs were satisfactory equivalents in the limited context of these three chapters?34 Common nouns, in contrast to verbs, are rendered fairly consistently. Of the nineteen nouns that are translated by more than one term, the choices for fifteen nouns can be explained on the basis of semantic and grammatical factors. The remaining four nouns, however, have no obvious bases for the translation choices, though further study might clarify these choices.

Grammatical structures are often the conditioning factor if both translation choices for a noun are from the same root word and especially if one word is a noun and the other is an adjective. One clear example of this type of grammatical conditioning is the translation of רָאָּה by νόμος and νόμιμος. If רָאָּה is in a phrase with בְּלִשׁ, then רָאָּה will be translated by νόμιμος, which functions as a substantive. If it is not in a phrase with בְּלִשׁ then it will be translated by νόμος. This simple “rule” will explain six of seven occurrences of the term in the book of Exodus. The one exception is Exod 29.9 where רָאָּה has been left out of the translation, possibly because of the grammatical difficulties of the clause or because it was absent in the Vorlage. Another example is the translation of בְּהֵן by πανίπ and πάρειος in Exodus 11-13.35 The most frequent translation of בְּהֵן in Exodus is πανίπ, but when בְּהֵן is found in the phrase בְּהֵן וֶּלֶּו, then the Greek term πάρειος is used to translate בְּהֵן. Several nouns have choices that can be explained on the basis of semantic contexts. For instance, שָׁתִי is translated by ἐκατοντά when it is being used with a distributive function (Exod 11.2; 31.32).

33 In the Old Greek, Exod 33.7 refers to a person that goes out of the camp to the tent, ἐξεπορεύετο εἰς τὴν οἰκην, whereas Exod 33.8 refers to Moses, who goes into the tent, εἰσεπορεύετο Μωυσῆς εἰς τὴν οἰκην.

34 There are other translations of both of these verbs in the rest of Exodus.

35 At least two other nouns are also used to translate בְּהֵן in Exodus. These two additional choices are conditioned by both semantic and grammatical factors.
12.3, 4, 22), by γύς when it is an indefinite referent (Exod 12.44), and by ἄνθρωπος when it refers to a male human (Exod 11.3) or a human in contrast to an animal (Exod 11.7). These, of course, are not the only translations of יִשְׂרָאֵל in Exodus, but they illustrate the kinds of semantic contexts that influence translation choices throughout Exodus.

The noun יִם is likewise translated by a variety of terms. In Exod 11.3 and Exod 12.30, ὅρμων is used to refer to Pharaoh’s officials in the narrative portion of the text. In the quotation in Exod 11.8 Pharaoh’s officials are again referred to by יִם in Hebrew, but in Greek, Moses, who was angry, referred to the officials using the term παῖς when he said that they would come and bow down to him. This shift of terminology accentuates the fact that Moses was not trying to appease Pharaoh and his officials at that point in time. A reader of the Greek would probably have interpreted this to mean that Moses was “speaking down” to the officials. In Exod 12.44, יִם refers to a slave of an Israelite, who may participate with the Israelites in the Passover after being circumcised. For this, the translator has used the term οἰκήτης, as well as another phrase, to translate a complex Hebrew phrase. Finally, when יִם occurs in the phrase יִם יִם יִם יִם (Exod 13.3, 14), it is translated by δοῦλος, which is an appropriate reference to slavery. There are some places, of course, where it is difficult to understand the translator’s choice, but most translations of יִם fall into the expected patterns. 36

36 For a contrastive analysis see Benjamin G. Wright, “Δοῦλος and Παῖς as Translations of יִם: Lexical Equivalences and Conceptual Transformations,” in IX Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Cambridge, 1995, ed. Dirk Böckner and Bernard A. Taylor, Septuagint and Cognate Studies, no. 45 (Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1997), 261-77. Wright points to changes in the use of terms for servants and emphasizes the lack of contrast between some of the terms both in the Old Greek scriptures and later Greek literature. There are, however, several key factors that Wright has not included in his analysis of the contexts in which these terms are used. Wright fails to remember that usages in quotations may be different from those found in narrative texts. He also forgets that sociolinguistic factors are most likely to affect speech, e.g., when speaking to a superior, a person will often refer
to himself by a “lower” term. This does not make the “lower” term synonymous with the “higher” term used in the surrounding narrative, as Wright would have us believe. An example of the effect of a different set of sociolinguistic factors may be seen in a comparison of Exod 11.3 and Exod 11.8, which were discussed above.

37 Olofsson, “Consistency as a Translation Technique,” 17. Olofsson argues that this kind of consistency would occur in both literal and free translations and should not, therefore, be used alone as a basis for determining the literalness of a translation.

38 The Hebrew Vorlage of the Greek could have had this extra element or the translator was so accustomed to various phrases with Pharaoh, his servants and his people that he made this phrase like the other phrases either accidentally or by choice. In any case, the translation choice of a pronoun is controlled by participant referencing and not by any meaning difference.

A high percentage of consistency in the nouns was to be expected because there were many basic words in Hebrew that have seemingly found a “natural rendering that matches the Hebrew counterpart perfectly.” 37 In Exod 11–13 these include such terms as ἀνήρ, γυνή, γάτα, ἄγνωστος, ἱερέας, and ἀνθρώπος. These kinds of nouns when found in the limited context of three chapters are consistently rendered by the translator. In a larger text, which would probably use the terms with a wider range of meanings, I would anticipate that even some of these nouns would be translated by a variety of terms.

Of the six names used in Exod 11–13, three were rendered with 100% consistency, a percentage that was expected since names are not normally affected by the context. Two of the remaining names were “inconsistently” rendered. The title ἴδιος was translated ten times by φαραώ, but the other occurrence of ἴδιος was translated by a pronoun due to the participant referencing preferences of Greek. In Exod 11.3 the translation, in contrast to the known Hebrew texts, includes Pharaoh in the list of people who looked favorably upon Moses. 38 This meant that the next reference to Pharaoh in Greek needed to be a pronoun. Similarly, the name ἴδιος was translated thirty-eight out of forty times by κύριος. Of the remaining two occurrences of ἴδιος, one was “deleted” (i.e., ἴδιος was only referred to by the verb ending in Exod 13.15) and one was translated by κύριος (Exod 13.21). In addition, some of the occurrences of ἴδιος were
translated by longer phrases, such as κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ ὑμῶν, when the words were in the mouth of Pharaoh (Exod 12.31), or κύριος ὁ θεός σου (Exod 13.5), where the added phrase is also found in the Samaritan Pentateuch. Thus, the issue of the Hebrew Vorlage may be a factor in some of these variations in the translation of הָעֵד. Personal names and titles were translated with a high degree of consistency except for the problems caused by the participant referencing needs of Greek and possible differences in the Hebrew Vorlage. The name סַיִּלְךָ, however, did not follow the pattern of the other names. Instead it was translated as Ἑλευστός when it referred to the land and by Ἑλευστός when it referred to the people (Exod 12.30). This difference is one of meaning, but it also may be categorized as a problem of participant referencing, i.e., whether the people or the land is being referred to by סַיִּלְךָ. For instance, the phrase סַיִּלְךָ was translated by παρὰ τῶν Ἑλευστῶν in Exod 12.35, when context required that it refer to people. In Exod 12.39, however, the same phrase was translated by ἐξ Ἑλευστῶν, when it was used with the verb καταστρέφει. Some passages were ambiguous, which meant that the translator had to decide on the appropriate referent before translating. In Exod 11.1, the translator used the term that referred to the land, Ἑλευστός, for the referent that would be struck by God. In most instances where Hebrew had the word סַיִּלְךָ, the translator followed that clue and used the term that referred to land, Ἑλευστός. In Exod 11.3, the Hebrew (MT) specifically says “land of Egypt,” as the location in which Moses became respected, but the Old Greek translation contains the phrase ἐκατέρω τῶν Ἑλευστῶν, which refers to the people of Egypt. This translation may be due to the translator’s choice or to the presence of a different Hebrew Vorlage. Interestingly, some modern functional equivalence translations (CEV, TEV) have made that same decision and refer to the people rather than the land.39 These examples show that the fluctuation between Ἑλευστός and Ἑλευστός is not a case of inconsistency, but may either be a reflection of the translator’s decisions about the referent(s) of the term סַיִּלְךָ or a reflection of a different Hebrew Vorlage.

This examination of some of the vocabulary in Exodus 11–13 shows that the translator was most consistent when translating nouns referring to basic concepts that could be represented by one term in each language. Of the remaining nouns that were translated in a variety of ways, the most frequently encountered conditioning factors were grammatical structures, idiomatic translations of phrases that included the noun, and occasionally actual semantic differences in the meaning of the words in the passage. Verbs, by contrast, tended to be used with a wider range of meanings and as a result most of the translation choices for verbs were the result of trying to convey these semantic differences in Greek. Occasionally, however, collocational clashes and the translator’s understanding of the text play a part in the translation of verbs. Conditioning factors for proper nouns mainly involved participant referencing and possible textual variants rather than the factors seen in the choices for nouns and verbs.

IV. CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

Lexical consistency has been used as a major criterion for determining the degree of literalness of a translation, the number of translators, and the possibility of producing an accurate retroversion of the Hebrew Vorlage. Most studies have defined lexical consistency in terms of the degree to which there is a one-to-one correspondence between the Hebrew and Greek terms in the text. With the advent of computers, it became possible quickly to produce statistical evaluations of the lexical consistency of large quantities of text. By doing this, scholars hoped to provide an objective basis for statements about the degree of literalness of the text. These kinds of statistical studies can be interesting and probably do allow researchers to make accurate statements about broad differences among the individual books within the Septuagint. One problem with these kinds of studies is that they may tend to give false impressions of

the degree of lexical consistency, especially in smaller books such as Ruth. In this study I used Wright's methodology to produce a statistical evaluation of lexical consistency in Exodus 11-13. According to this methodology, Exodus 11-13 was very consistent and generally had percentages close to that of Ruth, whereas percentages lower than Numbers were what I would have expected based on other studies of the translation techniques of Exodus. An examination of the actual vocabulary of Exodus 11-13 within context, however, produced a very different picture. Rather than having a high degree of lexical consistency in both nouns and verbs, it was found that more than a third of the nouns and most of the verbs were translated by a variety of terms. In both categories there were some translations that could have been called arbitrary, but usually the variations in translation were due to semantic and grammatical conditioning factors. Further, it was found that conditioning factors for nouns tended to be more grammatical in nature whereas most of the conditioning factors for verbs were semantic in nature.

In light of the differences in the results of my statistical and contextual study of Exodus 11-13, I would make the following observations. First, as discussed earlier, when analyzing small quantities of data, such as in Exodus 11-13 and Ruth, percentages can be changed greatly by the inclusion or exclusion of one or two words, such as Wright's exclusion of דָּלֵל. Second, some of the most frequently used Hebrew nouns in Exodus 11-13 were ones that have a natural equivalent in Greek. This factor in combination with the small size of the text probably raised the percentages higher than they would normally have been. Third, even if the statistics had not been affected by the two previous factors, I believe that they do not accurately reflect the nature of translation choices in Exodus 11-13. Most of the translation choices in Exodus 11-13 were influenced by semantic and grammatical factors. Rather than being a translation with a high degree of pseudo concordance, Exodus 11-13 illustrates the kinds of translation choices in which there is real concordance, i.e., an attempt to consistently represent the meaning of the Hebrew words in light of other conditioning factors.

40 In Wright's study, Ruth was among the most lexically consistent, but in a brief study of a few of the terms in Ruth I identified some of the same conditioning factors that have been discussed in this study of Exodus 11-13.
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A. INTRODUCTION

The Letter of Aristeas to Philocrates, composed sometime during the second century B.C., and subsequent accounts of the origins of the Septuagint have stressed the remarkable consensus which the translation committee responsible for the Pentateuch of that version, in particular, was able to achieve. Those supervising current translation projects of the Septuagint—e.g., La Bible d'Alexandrie, La Bibbia dei Settanta, and the New English Translation of the Septuagint—can only dream of that level of agreement amongst their co-workers as to how best to render their Vorlage, let alone hope for the kind of critical acclaim that Aristeas reports the version of the seventy received from its first readership. Critical scholarship has, of course, demonstrated that the individual books or sections of the Greek Old Testament canon that are translations from Hebrew or Aramaic originals exhibit idiosyncratic characteristics and cannot, therefore, have been created in quite the manner that the ancient traditions suggest. Yet it is also true that there is a degree of verisimilitude in the legends about the concord amongst Septuagint translators because of the commonalities in translation approach that are evident throughout much of this corpus. That similarity in approach can, no doubt, be attributed, in large measure, to the fact that all of the translated books are versions of Semitic exemplars that were rendered into the same language by co-religionists who, in all likelihood, lived and worked in essentially the same cultural, geographical and temporal context. The fact that these texts are not original Greek compositions but translations, and that those who produced them would have regarded them as sacred scripture, will also have contributed significantly to the way in which they were rendered. Such considerations are aspects of twin problems that Septuagint scholars have been grappling with for some time, i.e., how to conceptualize the relationship between these translations and the Semitic texts on which they were based, on the one hand, and how to characterize the resulting Greek vis-à-vis the Greek spoken in the Hellenistic period when the translation work was done, on the other.

These are obviously important issues with practical implications for those working on the three translation projects mentioned above, inasmuch as all three strive to represent not only the content but also, to one degree or another, the style of the original Septuagint translators. Nevertheless, different conceptual frameworks with respect to the problems articulated above have given rise to distinctive approaches to the task of translating a translation. For example, Marguerite Harl, director of the La Bible d'Alexandrie project, in explaining the decision to "disregard the Hebrew source-text" at the initial stage of preparing "a primary translation of the text, as literary as possible, on the basis of syntactical and lexical usages of the Greek language current in the translators' epoch," summarizes the philosophy of that undertaking as follows:

We are convinced that every act of translating results in a text which receives a new life within the domain of the translation language. We acknowledge the fundamental axiom of linguistics: a text written in any language should be read and analyzed only in the context of this language. It is only after that first part of the task is complete that she and her colleagues resort to the Hebrew to establish the

---


2 See, for example, Takamitsu Muraoka, "Introduction by the Editor," Melbourne Symposium on Septuagint Lexicography, SBLSCS 28 (eds. Claude E. Cox and William Adler; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990), pp. vii-xiv.


4 Harl, "Translating the LXX," p. 33.
divergences from it in the LXX, but with the caveat that "[i]n the absence of the actual Hebrew original [underlying the LXX], the comparison has to be limited to the MT: all one sees as a result is that the LXX text differs from what has become of its Hebrew Vorlage in the Massoretic form." She goes on to argue that it is possible that a good many such divergences are "redactional" in character—by which she seems to mean that they are to be attributed to factors such as the contextual and intertextual interpretative activity of the LXX translator—rather than text based, and that, consequently, the prime focus of any subsequent translation should remain on the Greek text. The implication seems to be that reference to the Hebrew will have the potential of clouding the contemporary translator's judgment with respect to what the LXX translator intended.

There is, of course, a good deal of truth in what Harl says. It is, indeed, important for readers and translators of the LXX to keep in mind that this Greek text is not always semantically equivalent to the underlying Hebrew, a reality that is not taken into account, for example, in some cases when the LXX is cited in A Greek-English Lexicon produced by H. G. Liddell, R. Scott, and H. S. Jones. Furthermore, since every translation represents the first level of interpretation for readers of a text in the receptor language—readers who may well not be conversant with the original language from which the translation has been made—that text will undoubtedly take on a life of its own in the interpretative community in which it circulates.

However, surely it is the task of the translator to seek to represent the intended meaning of the creator of a text rather than to reflect what the interpretative tradition(s) subsequently made of it, as interesting and significant an undertaking as that may be. This is not to suggest that the work of ancient commentators who are much closer to the origins of a text than we are have nothing to contribute to the investigation of originally intended meaning, but it is to acknowledge that not infrequently a distinction is to be made between intended and apprehended meaning. In this regard, what Harl and her colleagues seem to fail to take adequately into account in appealing to "the fundamental axiom of linguistics" mentioned above is that the Septuagint texts are not de novo creations, to which that axiom would quite readily apply, but translations, for which the linguistic and semantic dynamics are considerably different. In the latter case, one cannot objectively determine a translator's intention nor gain the necessary leverage to distinguish between intended and apprehended meaning without taking into account the translation technique of the one who renders the original text into the receptor language. For translators of the LXX translation, that necessitates careful delineation of Hebrew-Greek equivalences and comparative semantic analysis in order to think the translators' thoughts after them, as it were, particularly with respect to the kinds of semantic choices—ranging from contextual to isolate renderings—that they made. This, in fact, constitutes the NETS approach to translation.

Albert Pietersma and Benjamin Wright, co-chairs of the NETS Translation Committee, use the metaphor of an interlinear translation within a Hebrew-Greek diglot to depict the work of those responsible for the majority of the translated texts in the LXX. They maintain that this model best accounts for the stilted Greek "with its strict, often rigid quantitative equivalence to the Hebrew" which characterizes those parts of the LXX. They also state that it provides the theoretical rationale "for the NETS translator to draw on the Hebrew parent text as an arbiter of meaning, when appropriate."

The NETS translator, then, must determine the practical implications of this conceptual framework for the translation enterprise. I propose, in this paper, to reflect on those matters as they apply to my work on Genesis for the NETS project.

---

5Ibid., p. 33.
6Ibid., pp. 33-34.
8"The New English Translation of the Septuagint (NETS)," p. 27.
9Ibid. Pietersma and Wright also say that "in time, the Greek half of the diglot broke loose, circulated separately, and thus established its independence from the Hebrew parent text" (p. 27), thereby acknowledging the distinctions that are to be made between the meaning signified by the LXX translator and that construed by a subsequent interpreter in a given context.
B. LITERALISTIC TRANSLATION

The obvious place to begin a discussion of the interlinear model is with the fact that the translated books of the LXX exhibit, to varying degrees, a literalistic approach to translation. Indeed, F. C. Conybeare and St. George Stock describe the LXX on the whole as "only half a translation—the vocabulary has been changed, but seldom the construction....the vocabulary is Greek and the syntax Hebrew." There are numerous examples of this sort of approach in Genesis. One interesting case involves the reproduction of the Hebrew idiom for expressing someone's age in Genesis 11:10.

MT: שֵׁמֶר יָתֵר עֲשֵׂנֵים יָבֹא
NRSV: Shem was one hundred years old...
LXX: Σήμων ἔκατεν ἑνόν
NETS: Sem was a son of one hundred years...

This is, in fact, the only place in Genesis where this Hebraism occurs. Because the expression is foreign to Greek, the NETS translation is a literal, quantitative rendering that reflects its style as well as its semantic content. Elsewhere in Genesis, the Hebrew age formula is rendered by an appropriate Greek idiom. Thus in 7:6 it is said of Noah that he was שֵׁנֵים יָבֹא, "six hundred years old" (NRSV) in Hebrew, but ἕνων ἐξακοσίων "six hundred years of age" (NETS) in Greek.

There are other types of contexts in which the sort of translationese illustrated above is exhibited. The specification of directions is a case in point. Genesis 14:15, for example, states the following with respect to how far Abram pursues the forces that have taken Lot captive:

MT: אַמַּה יָמִים מֵאֶדְמָקָא מִשְׁרָא בֵּית הָלָל
NRSV: From there he moved on to the hill country on the east of Bethel, and pitched his tent, with Bethel on the west and Ai on the east...
LXX: καὶ ἀπέστη ἐκείνου τοῦ δρόσου κατ’ ἀνατολάς Βαιθήλ, καὶ ἐστηκον ἐκεῖ τὴν σκηνὴν αὐτοῦ, Βαιθήλ κατὰ θέλοντος καὶ ἀγαγὶ κατ’ ἀνατολάς...
NETS: From there he withdrew to the mountain to the east of Baithel, and set up his tent there, with Baithel towards the sea and Haggai to the east...

The equivalent for אַמַּה both times that it occurs in this verse is the Greek idiom κατ’ ἀνατολάς. Because it is not a reproduction of the Hebrew idiom, it is rendered distinctively for NETS, i.e., "to the east." The Hebrew expression מֵאֶדְמָקָא which occurs only in this verse in Genesis is, on the other hand, more literally reproduced in Greek as κατὰ θέλοντος. What is odd

John Wevers suggests that ἐν ἀριστερᾷ "probably means 'towards the north.'" Although that may well have been what the LXX translator understood the Hebrew to mean, his Greek readership would not readily have picked that up apart from knowledge of the Hebrew idiom, judging from the evidence of Greek usage of the lexeme ἀριστεράς prior to the translation of the Septuagint. This Hebrew idiom of direction does not occur elsewhere in Genesis, but everywhere else that the lexeme מֵאֶדְמָקָא appears, the Greek equivalent is likewise ἀριστεράς, denoting "left" rather than one of the points on the compass. Consequently, the NETS version has the former denotation.

In 12:8 there is a curious mixture of idiomatic and literalistic Greek involved in the rendering of directions.

MT: קָדַשׁ לְהַר הָבֵית לָכוֹר יָסַר וּמֵאֶדְמָקָא
NRSV: From there he moved on to the hill country on the east of Bethel, and pitched his tent, with Bethel on the west and Ai on the east...
LXX: καὶ ἀπέστη ἐκείνου τοῦ δρόσου κατ’ ἀνατολάς Βαιθήλ, καὶ ἐστηκον ἐκεῖ τὴν σκηνὴν αὐτοῦ, Βαιθήλ κατὰ θέλοντος καὶ ἀγαγὶ κατ’ ἀνατολάς...
NETS: From there he withdrew to the mountain to the east of Baithel, and set up his tent there, with Baithel towards the sea and Haggai to the east...

The equivalent for קָדַשׁ both times that it occurs in this verse is the Greek idiom κατ’ ἀνατολάς. Because it is not a reproduction of the Hebrew idiom, it is rendered distinctively for NETS, i.e., "to the east." The Hebrew expression מֵאֶדְמָקָא which occurs only in this verse in Genesis is, on the other hand, more literally reproduced in Greek as κατὰ θέλοντος. What is odd

---

10 A Grammar of Septuagint Greek (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1980), §38.
about this rendering is that, whereas in Palestine, west is the seaward direction, i.e., the direction of the Mediterranean Sea, in Egypt, where this translation was produced, that is not the case. The Mediterranean, in fact, represents the northern geographical boundary of the country. Here again, the only way for the Greek reader to associate the sea with west would be via the Hebrew. Thus NETS reproduces the literalism of this Greek rendering.

Another kind of Hebrew idiom that the LXX translator frequently reproduces in rigid fashion is the relative clause. In Hebrew, the relative ים is indeclinable and must therefore be supplemented by a pronoun to determine it. Because the relative in Greek is inflected, a redundancy is created if both the Hebrew relative and the subsequent pronoun are rendered, as is the case in Genesis 19:29:

MT: לָכֶם מָיִם קְפִּים יְמִים לְאָדָם
NRSV: ...when he overthrew the cities in which Lot had settled.
LXX: καὶ οἱ καταστρέφοντα οἱ οὐρανοί τῶν πόλεων, καὶ οἱ κατοίκες οἱ κύριοις Λῶτ.
NETS: ...when the Lord overthrew the cities which Lot used to dwell in.

The awkwardness of the Greek diction is reflected in the NETS version. Thus instead of following the NRSV, which places the preposition "in" before the relative, I have opted for a less elegant reading—which corresponds to colloquial English usage—by ending the clause with the preposition.

A similar situation obtains when the Hebrew relative is supplemented by an adverb of place as, for example, in Genesis 20:13 where Abraham recalls for Abimelech his instructions to Sarah to pose as his sister:

MT: בְּכָל חָוָה שָׁבְתוּת שֵׁם יִהְיֶה לְאָדָם נֶאֶר נְזֵבָה
NRSV: ...at every place to which we come, say of me, He is my brother.

The Greek pleonasm created by the LXX translator, who has rendered both the relative and accompanying adverb, gives rise to an analogous construction in the NETS version.

C. ISOLATE TRANSLATION

A distinctive type of literalistic translation is the isolate, a rendering that is based on the perceived meaning of an individual word "in (virtual) semantic isolation" with etymology playing a key role. An example of this phenomenon involves the rarely attested Hebrew noun מַעֲשֵׂי. It is found a total of three times in the Hebrew Bible, two of those occurrences being in Genesis 7 (verses 4 and 23) and one in Deuteronomy 11:6. In all three cases, the LXX translates with a compound noun based on the root עָמַע, i.e., עָמַעֶה, עָמַעַת, עָמַעַס, respectively. Clearly, each of these renderings represents an attempt to reflect the Hebrew root מַעֲשֵׂי. As is characteristic of isolates, the semantic results are curious. Genesis 7 is part of the flood narrative, and in verse 4 the deity describes what the consequence of his sending the deluge will be:

MT: לָכֶם מָיִם קְפִּים יְמִים לְאָדָם
NRSV: ...when he overthrew the cities in which Lot had settled.
LXX: καὶ οἱ καταστρέφοντα οἱ οὐρανοί τῶν πόλεων, καὶ οἱ κατοίκες οἱ κύριοις Λῶτ.
NETS: ...when the Lord overthrew the cities which Lot used to dwell in.

The awkwardness of the Greek diction is reflected in the NETS version. Thus instead of following the NRSV, which places the preposition "in" before the relative, I have opted for a less elegant reading—which corresponds to colloquial English usage—by ending the clause with the preposition.

A similar situation obtains when the Hebrew relative is supplemented by an adverb of place as, for example, in Genesis 20:13 where Abraham recalls for Abimelech his instructions to Sarah to pose as his sister:

MT: בְּכָל חָוָה שָׁבְתוּת שֵׁם יִהְיֶה לְאָדָם נֶאֶר נְזֵבָה
NRSV: ...at every place to which we come, say of me, He is my brother.

The Greek pleonasm created by the LXX translator, who has rendered both the relative and accompanying adverb, gives rise to an analogous construction in the NETS version.

C. ISOLATE TRANSLATION

A distinctive type of literalistic translation is the isolate, a rendering that is based on the perceived meaning of an individual word "in (virtual) semantic isolation" with etymology playing a key role. An example of this phenomenon involves the rarely attested Hebrew noun מַעֲשֵׂי. It is found a total of three times in the Hebrew Bible, two of those occurrences being in Genesis 7 (verses 4 and 23) and one in Deuteronomy 11:6. In all three cases, the LXX translates with a compound noun based on the root עָמַע, i.e., עָמַעֶה, עָמַעַת, עָמַעַס, respectively. Clearly, each of these renderings represents an attempt to reflect the Hebrew root מַעֲשֵׂי. As is characteristic of isolates, the semantic results are curious. Genesis 7 is part of the flood narrative, and in verse 4 the deity describes what the consequence of his sending the deluge will be:

MT: לָכֶם מָיִים קְפִּים יְמִים לְאָדָם
NRSV: ...when he overthrew the cities in which Lot had settled.
LXX: καὶ οἱ καταστρέφοντα οἱ οὐρανοί τῶν πόλεων, καὶ οἱ κατοίκες οἱ κύριοις Λῶτ.
NETS: ...when the Lord overthrew the cities which Lot used to dwell in.

The Greek pleonasm created by the LXX translator, who has rendered both the relative and accompanying adverb, gives rise to an analogous construction in the NETS version.

C. ISOLATE TRANSLATION

A distinctive type of literalistic translation is the isolate, a rendering that is based on the perceived meaning of an individual word "in (virtual) semantic isolation" with etymology playing a key role. An example of this phenomenon involves the rarely attested Hebrew noun מַעֲשֵׂי. It is found a total of three times in the Hebrew Bible, two of those occurrences being in Genesis 7 (verses 4 and 23) and one in Deuteronomy 11:6. In all three cases, the LXX translates with a compound noun based on the root עָמַע, i.e., עָמַעֶה, עָמַעַת, עָמַעַס, respectively. Clearly, each of these renderings represents an attempt to reflect the Hebrew root מַעֲשֵׂי. As is characteristic of isolates, the semantic results are curious. Genesis 7 is part of the flood narrative, and in verse 4 the deity describes what the consequence of his sending the deluge will be:

MT: לָכֶם מָיִמים קְפִּים יְמִים לְאָדָם
NRSV: ...when he overthrew the cities in which Lot had settled.
LXX: καὶ οἱ καταστρέφοντα οἱ οὐρανοί τῶν πόλεων, καὶ οἱ κατοίκες οἱ κύριοις Λῶτ.
NETS: ...when the Lord overthrew the cities which Lot used to dwell in.

The awkwardness of the Greek diction is reflected in the NETS version. Thus instead of following the NRSV, which places the preposition "in" before the relative, I have opted for a less elegant reading—which corresponds to colloquial English usage—by ending the clause with the preposition.

A similar situation obtains when the Hebrew relative is supplemented by an adverb of place as, for example, in Genesis 20:13 where Abraham recalls for Abimelech his instructions to Sarah to pose as his sister:

MT: בְּכָל חָוָה שָׁבְתוּת שֵׁם יִהְיֶה לְאָדָם נֶאֶר נְזֵבָה
NRSV: ...at every place to which we come, say of me, He is my brother.

13 Similar pleonastic constructions occur in 2:11; 31:13; 33:19; 35:15 (אַל בְּכָל instead of the adverb בְּכָל); 40:3. The adverb is not rendered in 13:3, 14; 19:27; 35:27.
The denotation "rising from bed to go to stool" associated with Hippocrates (v B.C.) and that of "removal, expulsion" linked with Polybius (ii B.C.) will not have been precisely what the LXX translator had in mind when he selected ἐξανάστασις. The same is true of subsequently attested meanings such as "resurrection" in the New Testament and "ornament" in an A.D. Egyptian document. Instead, something more abstract but still related to the basic idea of rising is what will have been intended. The NETS equivalents represent my attempts to convey that sense. In verse 4, I have rendered the relevant phrase "every thing that rises up." In the report in verse 23 which confirms that the promised annihilation did take place, ἀναστάματα is distinguished from its likely synonym ἐξανάστασις in verse 4: "He wiped out every thing that rises" (i.e., "thing that rises" versus "thing that rises up"). From verse 23, it is clear that this expression refers to animate creatures, i.e., living beings that have the capacity to rise or stand, or perhaps, by extension, simply to move:

MT: נבך יְהוָה יְהוָה יְהוָה יְהוָה יְהוָה
NRSV: human beings and animals and creeping things and birds of the air...
LXX: ἄνδροι καὶ κτήσεις καὶ πτησέω καὶ τῶν πετελών τοῦ οὐρανοῦ
NETS: ...from human to domestic animal and creeping things and the birds of the sky...

The interlinear model of translation readily accounts for the existence of isolates and other kinds of literalistic renderings in the LXX. This approach to translation certainly gives readers a sense of the idiom of Scripture in its original form. However, as the preceding examples have shown, it also highlights the importance of the Hebrew Under/age for semantic analysis of the Greek.

20LSJ, s.v. ἐξανάστασις.

D. CONTEXTUALIZATION

At the other end of the continuum from isolates are contextual renderings. In contextual renderings, the semantic ranges of translation units in the receptor language take precedence over their counterparts in the original language, in contrast to calques and isolates which typically embrace semantic components from their counterparts in the original language. It is in situations in which the Hebrew is not the arbiter of meaning for the LXX text—i.e., contextual translations and stereotypes—that the adequacy of the interlinear model to explain the translation approach of the Alexandrian translators might be called into question. That issue will be addressed in the discussion which follows.

A given LXX translator may have produced a contextual translation for any one of a number of reasons. It may have been, for example, that he did not fully understand the original at some point. That appears to have been the case in Genesis 14:14, where Abram's preparations for his pursuit of Lot's captors are described.

MT: נבך יְהוָה יְהוָה יְהוָה יְהוָה יְהוָה
NRSV: ...he led forth his trained men, born in his house, three hundred eighteen of them...
LXX: ἠξίζησεν τοὺς ἰδίους οἰκογενεῖς αὐτοῦ, τρισακοσίων δέκα καὶ ὀκτώ
NETS: ...he counted his own domestics, three hundred eighteen...

One lexeme in this passage that seemed to give the translator trouble was the substantive יְהוָה יְהוָה יְהוָה יְהוָה יְהוָה, which is a hapax legomenon. The substantive is modified by the bound phrase יְהוָה יְהוָה יְהוָה יְהוָה יְהוָה, which the translator rendered capably enough as οἰκογενεῖς, i.e., (slaves) born in the house, domestics. The equivalent chosen for יְהוָה יְהוָה יְהוָה יְהוָה יְהוָה was the adjective τῶν ἱδίων, which, when combined, mutatis mutandis, with the preceding, results in a reading that makes sense in the context, i.e., "his own domestics." The Greek adjective is not, however, the semantic

22LSJ, s.v. οἰκογενεῖς; Wevers, p. 194.
equivalent of the Hebrew substantive which, as a cognate of the verb רָאָה "train up, dedicate," must mean something like "trained one."24

With regard to the verb פָּרַשׁ, the Hiphil preterite of פָּרַשׁ which in this stem denotes "to empty,"25 the LXX translator seems to have misunderstood the idiomatic sense of the Hebrew here that is reflected in the NRSV's "he led forth." Instead, as his choice of the equivalent πρόσφατον "he counted" indicates, he apparently took his cue from the following number to interpret the verb.26

While this passage illustrates the phenomenon of contextualization in which the specific meaning of the original text has not been reproduced in the translation, it seems evident that the LXX translator did not intentionally depart from the Hebrew but did his best to render faithfully what was for him a difficult text. Semantic incongruities of this sort do not, therefore, undermine the interlinear model of translation.

But what about instances in which the translator did intentionally depart from the Hebrew? That is the case in Genesis 22:17 where the LORD makes the following promise to Abraham:

MT: מֹשֶׁה בָּעָל הָאָדָם לָשָׁהוּ נֹשֶׁר הַהַר
NRSV: And your offspring shall possess the gate of their enemies...
LXX: καὶ κληρονομήσει τὸ σπέρμα σου τὰς πόλεις τῶν ὀπανεμεῖν
NETS: ...and your offspring shall inherit the cities of the adversaries...

By rendering רָשָׁה as πόλεις, the translator sensibly interpreted the Hebrew pars pro toto figure for his readership.27

24BDB, s.v. פָּרַשׁ.
25BDB, s.v. פָּרַשׁ. In the only other place in Genesis where this verb occurs (42:35), that is the meaning.
26Wevers, p. 194.
27Wevers, p. 326. The Qal of פָּרַשׁ is consistently rendered as κληρονομέω in Genesis (15:3, 4 [2x], 7, 8, 21:10; 22:17; 24:60; 28:4). The denotations

Similar interpretative strategy is sometimes evident in contexts where the Hebrew narrative depicts aspects of culture that were foreign to the translator and his original readers. An instance of this is found in Genesis 24:22, where the gifts that Abraham's servant gives to Rebekah are described.

MT: מֹשֶׁה בָּעָל הָאָדָם לָשָׁהוּ נֹשֶׁר Hiebert: LXX Genesis
NRSV: And your offspring shall possess the gate of their enemies...
LXX: ἐλεφαντὶς ὁ ἐνθρωπος ἐνώτιτα χρυσὰ ἀνὰ δραχμὰν ὀλίκης
NETS: ...the man took gold earrings, a drachm each in weight...

In this verse, the form of the jewelry involved has undergone metamorphosis at the hands of the LXX translator. Thus the פָּרַשׁ "nose-ring" weighing a נַשְׁלָה, "half shekel" has become ἐνώτιτα "earrings" weighing a δραχμή, "drachm" each. This adaptation was, of course, occasioned by the fact that nose-rings were not part of the fashion scene in third century B.C. Alexandria, and if earrings were to be the substitute in the Greek text, they should come in pairs. There is an interesting correspondence with respect to the weight designation, however, in that the shekel and the didrachm were regarded to be equivalent.28 Consequently, the weight of the nose-ring in the MT corresponds to that of each earring in the LXX.

Genesis 37:28 contains another example of culturally based adaptation. The point at issue here is the price for which Joseph is sold by his brothers to the Ishmaelites.

"acquire, obtain" are attested for Polybius (ii B.C.), though both earlier and later Greek authors tend to use κληρονομέω when the sense of "inherit" is intended (LSJ, s.v.). In the only other place in Genesis that the גָּפֶה root occurs (49:8), the form is also the Qal active participle masculine plural which is used as a substantive. The LXX translator's equivalent there is the plural of ἐξενεος, for which in the NETS version I have retained the NRSV's "enemies."

As it turns out, the average price for a slave in the time and place of the LXX translator was considerably higher than the twenty silver pieces mentioned in the Hebrew text. The intended denomination is undoubtedly the shekel, which was equivalent to the Greek didrachma. Papyrus evidence from iii B.C. indicates that the χρύσος/χρυσός was equivalent to twenty silver drachmas or ten didrachmas. Thus the Greek translator set a price that would have been more in line with the going rate in iii B.C. Alexandrian slave markets.

The preceding examples show how the LXX translator made deliberate, culturally conditioned changes to aspects of the original narrative. At one level, this kind of contextualization represents a measure of independence from the Hebrew that would appear to undermine the concept of interlinearity. However, interlinearity need not imply that a given translator undertook to reproduce the Hebrew idiom at every turn, nor indeed that all the translators related their work to the original in exactly the same way. As intimated earlier, what this model does suggest, however, is that insofar as the translated portions of the LXX are linguistically dependent on the Hebrew, recourse to the Hebrew is necessary for the NETS translator to ascertain the LXX translator's intention. In passages like the ones considered in this section of the paper, where the LXX is not as subservient to the Hebrew as it is elsewhere, cultural and other contextual factors become predominant in the translation process. That being said, it is clear that, in a book like Genesis, creative departures from the Hebrew are the exception, not the rule, and so the interlinear model continues to be the most useful one proposed to date to conceptualize the relationship between the Hebrew original and the LXX translation.

E. HARMONIZATION

There are other factors, besides a translator's misunderstanding of the Hebrew or his concern to communicate across cultural boundaries, that have given rise to instances of divergence from the Hebrew. Sometimes the changes to the original narrative are "corrections" based on logical inferences arising from the translator's reading of the text. Such is the case in Genesis 8:5 which describes the scene as the waters of the flood abate.

The LXX translator has interpreted the verse to mean that the level of the water diminished throughout the whole of the tenth month before it reached the tops of the mountains—i.e., at the beginning of the eleventh—despite the fact that the Hebrew specifies that this took place a month earlier. A similar kind of approach is evident in Genesis 21:16-17 which describes the desperate situation of Hagar and Ishmael in the wilderness after their water has run out.


30Wevers, p. 103.
The translator has changed the subject in the last clause of verse 16 to το παιδίου "the child" based on the fact that the first clause of verse 17 speaks of God's attentiveness to the youngster's voice. A perceived inconsistency is thus eliminated.31

Again, these deliberate alterations by the translator vis-a-vis the original text are accommodated within the overall interlinear model when it is acknowledged that they represent departures from the norm—that being a rather literalistic rendering of the Hebrew.

F. EXPANSION

A final group of cases to be considered in this paper consists of Greek expansions to the Hebrew. I will touch on two types. The first involves intertextual harmonizations. If one compares Genesis 8:1 with 8:19, for example, one notices that the LXX translator's version of the former influences his version of the latter.

Genesis 8:1:

MT: ה' ר اللغphem נוֹחַ וְאֶת כָּל הָאֲדֹנָי יָבֹא יֵתָם וְאֶת כָּל הָאֲדֹנָי יָבֹא יֵתָם
NRSV: But God remembered Noah and all the wild animals and all the domestic animals...
LXX: Καὶ ἐξηράνηθη ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Νοὰ καὶ πάντων τῶν θηρῶν καὶ πάντων τῶν κτηρίων καὶ πάντων τῶν πετεινῶν καὶ πάντων τῶν ἐρπετῶν
NETS: And God remembered Noah, and all the wild animals and all the domestic animals...

Thus whereas the MT mentions הָעַל "the wild animals" and הָאֲדֹנָי "the domestic animals" in verse 1 but refers to θηρίον (every) "animal," κτήριον "creeping thing," and ἐρπετόν "bird" along with ὅσα ἐπηρετήσαν ὅποια "everything that moves on the earth" in verse 19, the LXX makes reference to an identical series of four creatures in the same order in both verses, i.e., θηρίον "wild animal," κτήριον "domestic animal," πετεινὸν "bird," and ἐρπετόν "creeping thing." Though in different sequences, these four types also appear in the LXX of 7:14 and 7:21, with typical Hebrew equivalents occurring in verse 14.32 In 7:21, one of the four Greek terms, ἐρπετόν, has an alternative Hebrew equivalent that is attested elsewhere in Genesis (בְּדֵי).33

This example illustrates interlinearity of a sort that differs from others discussed thus far. It involves the replication of stock phrases in Greek, the textual basis for which is found, not in the passages where those replications occur, but elsewhere in the Hebrew Genesis. So, dependence on the Hebrew is evident in such instances as well, though it is a long distance relationship, so to speak. In the NETS translation, the attempt is made to reproduce those intertextual connections where that is

32τρῆρα τῶν εἰδωλίων τῶν παντῶν καὶ τῶν κτήριων καὶ τῶν πετεινῶν καὶ τῶν ἐρπετῶν
33θηρίον = יָבֹא , κτήριον = בְּדֵי , πετεινὸν = יָבֹא , ἐρπετόν = ὅσα ἐπηρετήσαν
possible. Thus, in the above example, I have changed the NRSV's "animals" in verse 19 to "wild animals" for NETS in order to echo verse 1 where the NRSV reads "wild animals" and where the same Hebrew-Greek equivalence occurs. This adjustment is further legitimated, it seems to me, by the fact that the wild animal - domestic animal distinction is made in both verses in the LXX but not in verse 19 of the MT.

Another type of expansion of the Hebrew narrative in the LXX of Genesis is illustrated in 30:18, which records Leah's explanation for the name that she gives her fifth son.

MT: יְהִי לָהּ לָֽאָדָם שְׁקֵרָה לָֽאָדָם שְׁקֵרָה לָ• נַעֲשָּׁה יְהִי לָֽאָדָם שְׁקֵרָה לָֽאָדָם שְׁקֵרָה לָ

NRSV: Leah said, "God has given me my hire because I gave my maid to my husband"; so she named him Issachar.

LXX: καὶ ἐπέγεν Ἐλεᾶ "Εὐδοκεῖν ὅ θέκες τὸν μισθὸν μου ἀνθίτι, οὖν ἔδωκεν τῷ παιδίσκου τοῦ τῷ ἀνδρὶ μου: καὶ ἐκάλεσεν τὸ δύομα αὐτοῦ Ἰσσαχάρ, ὃ ἐστιν Μισθός.

NETS: Leia said, "God has given me my hire because I gave my maid to my husband"; so she called his name Issachar, which is Hire.

The appended clause ὃ ἐστιν Μισθός is clearly a translator's gloss, introduced so that the Greek reader can appreciate the same kind of word-play involving the reference to Leai's hire of Iakob (µισθόν) and the name that she gives the offspring of that union (Μισθός) as the Hebrew reader can (רָשָׁף, רָשָׁף). This is precisely the sort of thing one would expect of a translator operating on the basis of an interlinear paradigm. NETS translators will, of course, want to represent any such word-plays as well. In this case, therefore, it would not do to render the second instance of µισθός as anything other than "Hire," the NRSV's rendering of רָשָׁף, since the semantic ranges of these two lexemes overlap.

34 Pietersma, Translation Manual, p. 11.
35 Wevers, p. 482.
36 The רָשָׁף = µισθός equivalence is a closed equation in Genesis (15:1; 30:18, 28, 32, 33; 31:8).
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