JAMES A. E. MULRONEY

The Translation Style of Old Greek Habakkuk

Forschungen
zum Alten Testament 2. Reihe
86

Mohr Siebeck

Forschungen zum Alten Testament
2. Reihe

Herausgegeben von

Konrad Schmid (Zürich) · Mark S. Smith (New York)
Hermann Spieckermann (Göttingen)

86

James A. E. Mulroney

The Translation Style of Old Greek Habakkuk

Methodological Advancement in Interpretative Studies of the Septuagint

Mohr Siebeck

James A. E. Mulroney, born 1977; 2010 MAR, 2011 ThM from Westminster Theological Seminary (Philadelphia); 2015 PhD from the University of Edinburgh; currently lecturer in Old Testament at London Theological Seminary.

e-ISBN PDF 978-3-16-154387-6
ISBN 978-3-16-154386-9
ISSN 1611-4914 (Forschungen zum Alten Testament, 2. Reihe)

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at *http://dnb.dnb.de*.

The book was printed by Laupp & Göbel in Gomaringen on non-aging paper and bound by Buchbinderei Nädele in Nehren.

Printed in Germany.

For April Renée

Preface

This study is a revised version of my doctoral thesis, which I completed at the University of Edinburgh in 2014. Some of this work has already seen publication over the past few years, in the *Journal for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 45 (2012), the *Southeastern Theological Review* 61 (2015), and research presented at a seminar will be in the *XV Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* (SBL Press, 2016). These works have been adapted for this edition, and used with permission.

As happens with a project of this kind, I have many people to thank. I must first thank the administrative and library staff at New College. In particular, the efficiency of the staff to turn around interlibrary loan requests during the period of 2013–14 was of immense help to me.

I am deeply grateful to my supervisor Dr David J. Reimer for his perceptive and incisive critiques of my work, along with encouraging feedback over the years. He has pastored me with his gracious manner. Thank you very much.

The community at New College was very positive and intellectually challenging. I gained much from the discursive and *ad hoc* conversations with peers and teachers. Chats with new friends and old made learning there a memorable and life-changing experience. In addition, opportunities to do study and research at various institutes of learning enriched me and my work immeasurably. The time I spent at Tyndale House, Cambridge in summer 2012 provided another helpful sounding board for analytical thinking in the complex world of biblical studies. I am grateful to Pete Williams for taking the time to read some of my early work, and to Dirk Jongkind for the stimulating and impromptu conversations. And the staff at *La Bibliothèque Oecuménique et Scientifique d'Études Bibliques* helped me with a wealth of resources while I also had the privilege of participating in classes at *L'École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales* during 2012–13. I remember that time fondly.

I wish to express my gratitude to Jim Aitken for the many hours of conversations since my viva, which have been so formative in the preparation of this manuscript. I hope some of his wisdom shines through. I am also thankful to have had so many scholars read my research and/or listen to it at conferences, and to have received helpful critiques along the way. My work has been improved because of the open and positive way by which communities of learning have helped me. Sometimes the smallest conversation or comment made the most difference. My gratitude to: Fred Putnam, Jan Joosten,

Larry Hurtado, Cécile Dogniez, Hermann Spieckermann and Anja Klein (OTSEM), John Lee, Trevor Evans, Sean Adams, Matthew Novenson, Michaël van der Meer, Koert van Bekkum, James Eglinton (ATSF), Adam Eitel and Sandy Finlayson (for always making room for me). I am truly grateful for the tireless work of scholars within the field of Septuagint studies. I have been able to stand upon the shoulders of those who have laboured faithfully before me. And I am thankful that Will Ross cared to read my entire manuscript and offer ways in which it may be improved. Yet, with so much help, I am sure that there are areas where I could have done better; such shortcomings are all mine.

Friends praying for and encouraging me along the way have been of real support. Most of all, I could not have completed this project without the loving and wise support of my wife. What a wonderful journey this is together. You excel them all ὅτι γυνὴ δυνάμεως εἶ σύ!

Soli Deo Gloria

James A. E. Mulroney

Contents

List of Abbreviations

Biblical books and other ancient sources follow the abbreviations laid out in the SBL Handbook of Style, as do the common and technical abbreviations.

α′	Aquila
σ′	Symmachus
θ′	Theodotion
1QpHab	Habakkuk Pesher from Qumran Cave 1
8ḤevXIIgr	Greek version of Habakkuk from Naḥal Ḥever, Cave 8
AB	The Anchor Bible (Commentary)
ABU	Alliance Biblique Universelle (United Bible Society)
AI	Artificial Intelligence
AJBI	Annual of the Japanese Biblical Institute
Akk.	Akkadian (a language of ancient Mesopotamia)
ALHR	American Lectures in the History of Religions
Amb	Ambakoum, Old Greek of Habakkuk
AR	*Archiv für Religionsgeschichte*
AT	Ancien Testament
ATD	Das Alte Testament Deutsch. Neues Göttinger Bibelwerk
BA	*Biblical Archaeologist*
Barb	Barberini version of Habakkuk 3
BBR	*Bulletin for Biblical Research*
BdA	La Bible d'Alexandrie
BDAG	*A Greek English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Edited by Walter Bauer, Frederick W. Danker, William Arndt, and F. Wilbur Gingrich. 3d Ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
BDB	*A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Edited by Francis Brown, Samuel Rolles Driver, and Charles A. Briggs. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907.
BECNT	Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament
BETL	Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium
BFC	La Bible en français courant. Edition révisée. Villiers-le-Bel: Société biblique française, 1997.
BGS	La Biblia griega Septuaginta
BHQ	Biblia Hebraica Quinta
BHS	*Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. Edited by Karl Elliger and Wilhelm Rudolph. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1983.
Bib	*Biblica*
BIOSCS	*Bulletin of the International Organization of Septuagint and Cognate Studies* (now known as JSCS)
BJGS	*Bulletin of Judaeo-Greek Studies*
BQ	*Biblia Qumranica*

Brenton	*The English Translation of The Septuagint Version of the Old Testament*. Sir Lancelot Charles L. Brenton. London: Samuel Bagster and Sons, 1851.
BT	*The Bible Translator*
BTS	Biblical Tools and Studies
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
CAD	*The Assyrian Dictionary of the University of Chicago*. Edited by Leo Oppenheim et al. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1956–
CAT	*Michée, Nahoum, Habacuc, Sophonie*. René Vuilleumier, and Carl A. Keller. 2d ed. Commentaire de l'ancien testament XIb. Genève: Labor et Fides, 1990.
CB	Coniectanea Biblica Old Testament Series
CEB	Common English Bible
chp(s).	chapter(s)
CJB	Complete Jewish Bible Version
CQS	Companion to the Qumran Scrolls
CTAT	*Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament*. Edited by Dominique Barthélemy. 4 vols. Orbis biblicus et orientalis 50.1–4. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982–2005.
DCH	*The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*. Edited by David J. A. Clines. 8 vols. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993–2011.
DJD	Discoveries in the Judean Desert
DJPA	*A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic of the Byzantine Period*. Edited by Michael Sokoloff. Baltimore, Md.: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003.
DNTB	*Dictionary of New Testament Background*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and Stanley E. Porter. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 2000.
DSS	Dead Sea Scrolls
DTS	Descriptive Translation Studies
ESV	English Standard Version
ETL	*Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses*
FAT	Forschungen zum Alten Testament
FOAC	First-Order Acts of Communication
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
G	(Old Greek manuscript[codex] type, note superscript)
G^{A}	Alexandrinus
G^{B}	Vaticanus
G^{L}	Lucianus
G^{Q}	Marchialanus
G^{R}	Veronensis
G^{S}	Sinaiticus
G^{V}	Venetus
$G^{W/*}$	Washintonianus / * redactor's hand
GSB	Genfer Studien Bibel
HALOT	*The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Edited by Ludwig Koehler, and Walter Baumgartner. Leiden: Brill, 1994–2000.
HB	Hebrew Bible
HCSB	Holman Christian Standard Bible
HOAC	High-Order Acts of Communication
HT	Helps for Translators
HTR	*Harvard Theological Review*
HUB	*Annual of the Hebrew University Bible Project*

IDBSup	*The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible: Supplementary Volume*. Edited by K. Crim. Nashville, Tenn., 1976.
IEJ	*Israel Exploration Journal*
ILP	Independent Literary Paradigm
interj.	Interjection
IOSCS	International Organization of Septuagint and Cognate Studies
IP	Interlinear Paradigm
Jastrow	*A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature.* Edited by Marcus Jastrow. London: Luzac, 1903. Repr. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2006.
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JBS	Jerusalem Biblical Studies
JNSL	*Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages*
JSJ	*Journal for the Study of Judaism*
JSCS	*Journal of Septuagint and Cognate Studies*
JSOT	*Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*
JSOTS	*Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series*
JSS	*Journal of Semitic Studies*
JTS	*The Journal of Theological Studies*
KAT	Kommentar zum Alten Testament
KJV	King James/Authorised Version
KR	The manuscripts described in editions of Kennicott and de Rossi
LHB/OTS	Library of Hebrew Bible / Old Testament Studies
LNTS	Library of New Testament Studies
LOAC	Low-Order Acts of Communication
LSV	Louis Segond Version
LSJM	*A Greek-English Lexicon, With a Revised Supplement*. Edited by Henry George Liddell, Robert Scott, Sir Henry Stuart Jones, and Roderick McKenzie. 9 ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
LXX	Pentateuch, Old Greek version of the Torah
LXX.D	*Septuaginta Deutsch. Das griechische Alte Testament in deutscher Übersetzung*. Edited by Eberhard Bons, et al. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2009.
LXX.E	*Septuaginta Deutsch: Erläuterungen und Kommentare zum griechischen Alten Testament. Band 1 und 2*. Edited by Martin Karrer, and Wolfgang Kraus. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2011.
LXX.H	*Einleitung in der Septuaginta. Handbuch zur Septuaginta*. Edited by Siegfried Kreuzer. Munich: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2016.
MUS	Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen
MNTS	McMaster New Testament Studies
MP	Hebrew (MT) Minor Prophets
MS(S)	manuscript(s)
MT	Masoretic Text
MurXII	Hebrew text from Murabba'at, Cave 12
NA	Nestle-Aland Novum Testamentum, all versions
NASB	New American Standard Bible
NET	New English Translation
NETS	*A New English Translation of the Septuagint and the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under That Title*. Edited by Albert Pietersma, and Benjamin G. Wright. New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

NIV	New International Version
NT	New Testament / Nouveau Testament
NTTS	New Testament Tools and Studies
Odes	Book of Odes, ecclesiastical canticles found in $G^{A.R}$
OED	Oxford English Dictionary (online at http://www.oed.com)
OG	Old Greek
OS	Oudtestamentische Studiën
OSB	*The Orthodox Study Bible.* Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2008. Edited by Maximos, Metropolitan, Eugen Pentiuc, Michel Najim, and Jack Norman Sparks.
OT	Old Testament
OTG	Old Testament Guides
OTL	The Old Testament Library
P	Papyri
PHK	Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Gottingen: Philologisch-Historische Klasse
Psh	Peshiṭta
R	Revisor of Greek Habakkuk from Naḥal Ḥever, Cave 8 (8ḤevXIIgr)
RB	*Revue biblique*
RBS	Resources for Biblical Study
RQ	*Revue de Qûmran*
RSV	Revised Standard Version
RT	Relevance Theory
RTP	*Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie*
Rudolph	*Micha, Nahum, Habakuk, Zephanja* and *Haggai, Sacharja, Maleachi*. Wilhelm Rudolph. Kommentar zum Alten Testament. Band 13,2. Edited by Wilhelm Rudolph, Karl Elliger, Franze Hesse and Otto Kaiser. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1977.
SB	Subsidia Biblica
SBG	Studies in Biblical Greek
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature
SBLCP	Society of Biblical Literature Centennial Publications
SCS	Septuagint and Cognate Studies
SCSer	Septuagint Commentary Series
SEÅ	*Svensk exegetisk årsbok*
SGLG	Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker
SL	Source Language
ST	Source Text
STDS	Studies on the Text of the Desert of Judah
STTAASF	Suomalaisen Tiedeakatemian Toimituksia Annales Academiæ Scientiarum Fennicæ
Syr.	Syriac
Tg.	Targum
TL	Target Language
TT	Target Text
TWOT	*Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*. Edited by Laird R. Harris, Gleason L. Archer, Jr., and Bruce K. Waltke. 2 vols. Chicago: Moody Press, 1980.
UBS	United Bible Society (Alliance Biblique Universelle)
v(v).	verse(s)
Vg.	Vulgate
VT	*Vetus Testamentum*
VTG	Vetus Testamentum Graecum cum Variis Lectionibus

VTSup	Supplements to Vetus Testamentum
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
YCS	Yale Classical Studies
ZAW	*Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*
ZNW	*Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche*

Chapter 1

Habakkuk Speaks Greek – Translation, Interpretation and Transformation

1.1 Introduction

> Toute traduction requiert inévitablement une transformation de l'ordre, du rythme et du son de l'original et de plus, cette traduction bonne et poétique nécessite souvent (mais non pas toujours) bien davantage de changement.[1]

It is widely agreed that all translation involves interpretation. Perhaps this is why teachers of Classical Greek have, at one point, turned to a student body and expressed the well-known adage that one has not read Homer until one has read him in Greek. Readers of a foreign language (e.g. Homeric/Classical Greek) tend to read through the paradigm of their own world.[2] Their own cultural idioms, linguistic structures and even metaphors, are the lens through which the text – a verbal expression of a foreign people – is often haplessly read. This process of linguistic interference is quite unintentional.[3] And it is exacerbated when the translation process is confined to a textual form. It affects modern translations of not just the Septuagint but of all literature from a bygone age – true also of the *Septuagint translators*. The further one gets from the original culture the greater the effort to bring over the meaning into a new and

[1] My translation of: "All translation necessarily involves transformation of the order and rhythm and sound of the original, and that good poetic translation often (not always) requires much more transformation." See Burton Raffel, *The Forked Tongue. A Study of the Translation Process* (The Hague; Paris: Mouton, 1971), 100.

[2] Modern Greek students, upon entering into the gymnasium, begin to read the classics of their heritage. Like books from the Loeb Library, they are given the classical text, say Plato, on one page, and a Modern Greek *translation* on the facing page. The difference between the stages of the Greek language is far greater than, for example, between Modern and Jacobean English, so that a translation is required.

[3] For example, students who had to learn Greek in order to read, for example, Homer face this kind of challenge. This is often because they have associated words, syntax, sentence structures, verbal tense/aspect, and so forth, through a formal academic system that is learned by rote, and not derived from cultural immersion. By learning words from glosses, students almost unconsciously associate the gloss meaning as the *real* meaning for every subsequent occurrence of the word. Later readings are often mired by the gloss meaning, which may have no relation to the contextual meaning whatsoever! This is not simply a pedagogic issue.

different one. It is sometimes an insuperable burden for translators working centuries down the road.

This translational complexity does not belie the enterprise of translation, but draws attention to the point that all kinds of interpretations occur during the process of reading and then translating an ancient text. It thus arises within the translation process. Structurally speaking, no literary translation has ever been made that did not require an intermediary to wrestle with the words, clauses, sentences and meaning of the source text (ST). The changes that occur in the *process* of conveying, or bringing forth, the meaning of a ST to a new audience, into a target text (TT), may be called transformational.[4] The translator is an author, or as Eco calls him, a "negotiator,"[5] working in an atmosphere of compromise, choosing which elements of the original to emphasise or even omit. This process of transformation is not located merely in words, something which is also true for the Septuagint, as if a translator moved his eyes across the text, from word to word, translating each one as he best understood it. This sort of atomistic approach in translation studies is unhelpful.[6]

Many years ago Thackeray worked up a number of descriptors to classify the respective styles of the Septuagint. His analysis was mostly concerned with the quality of the Greek. The text was a mixture of literalism (as he may have

[4] The term "transformation" has been used in translation studies for some years. In this study "transformation process" is a noun phrase in reference to this. It is often used in relation to the cognitive aspect of the translational process. There are numerous aspects that inhere the act of making a change; it refers to a human process. Van der Louw's succinct definition is: "Transformations or shifts are changes (linguistic or otherwise) with respect to an invariant core that occur in translation from source text to target text." See Theo A. W. van der Louw, *Transformations in the Septuagint. Towards an Interaction of Septuagint Studies and Translation Studies* (Dudley: Peeters, 2007), 383.

[5] Umberto Eco, *Mouse or Rat? Translation as Negotiation* (London: Phoenix, 2003), 6–7.

[6] Although this approach might occur with students as an academic exercise when first learning a second language later in life, viz. after formative years, it is not good practice. Moreoever, with respect to the Septuagint translators, this approach can be considered in the following two ways. First, as van der Kooij rightly points out, variant readings must be considered within their respective historical and cultural contexts because they are part of a reading tradition: "translations of the biblical books were produced by scholars who were able to read (aloud) and interpret the ancient books; in other words, translations were the work of learned scribes." Scribes knew large sections of their texts very well, and had more than likely committed sections to memory from heart. This is a high-level perspective. Second, on the word-level, scribes would also be keenly aware of their word selections. For example, as Aitken recently argued, the Aquilan choice of σύν for אֶת is not necessarily caused by a hyper-literalistic or morphemic approach. It had a high linguistic register within Homeric Greek, marking it as quality prose, not the other way round. See James K. Aitken, "Lessons for Modern Translation Theory from Aquila and Other Odd Ancient Predecessors," (paper presented at The Signs of the Times Conference, Heythrop College, University of London, 2013).

understood it) and quality Greek. He did not, unfortunately, go to any great length to qualify his specific conclusions, except to explain broad grammatical components of the Septuagint in general.[7] In retrospect, one might say he identified the general nature of the transformations of the texts in question; but this was mostly concerned with understanding the grammatical phenomenon of Koine in light of Classical forms. He called the Twelve (OG Minor Prophets)[8] "indifferent,"[9] by which he meant that there was no specific *style*.

The tendency of the earliest translators to follow, in varying degrees, the word-order of the ST shows something of their appreciation for its nature. Its word-order was obviously important, which is more acutely seen by the fact that they were likely native speakers of Greek and Aramaic (perhaps also Egyptian), not of Hebrew.[10] So decisions to not follow it, even when it was possible in Greek (true also for other linguistic features, i.e. semantics), indicates that the translators were free to do otherwise. Meaning, clarity, and style, including consideration of the literary shape of a section of text, were also attendants upon their decision processes.

There are many factors that make up the translator's style in Ambakoum.[11] What deviates from the predetermined categories of *literalism* is not

---

[7] Although his work regarding the common authorship between the Twelve, Jer α, and Ezekiel α and γ makes some gains in this direction, it does not explain the nature of the changes. See Henry St John Thackeray, "The Greek Translators of the Prophetical Books," *JTS* 4 (1903).

[8] In this study, the abbr. LXX refers to *the OG translation of Torah*, the Pentateuch, something about which Jerome was emphatic (Greenspoon). The use of the abbr. OG (Old Greek) refers to the earliest translation of other books that are in relative continuity with the LXX, e.g. OG Hab would refer to the OG translation that occurred after the LXX in the second century, see n. 11 below. Critically speaking, OG often refers to the eclectic texts from the *Septuaginta-Unternehmen* of Göttingen. Deviations from this general rule are made clear in the study. I will use the term Septuagint in the broadest sense, relating to the body of text as in, for example, Rahlfs-Hanhart. Other abbrs. in relation to this exist and are clearly defined throughout, especially when referring to specific MSS or textual traditions. Also, all dates are B.C.E. unless otherwise noted, and, unless otherwises stated, biblical references are to the Septuagint, not MT – this is sometimes obvious by the reference, e.g. 1 Sam instead of 1 Kgdms. Cf. Leonard J. Greenspoon, "The Use and Abuse of the Term 'LXX' And Related Terminology in Recent Scholarship," *BIOSCS* 20 (1987): 27.

[9] Henry St John Thackeray, *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint. Vol. 1. Introduction, Orthography and Accidence* (Cambridge: University Press, 1909), 13.

[10] See Jan Joosten, *Collected Studies on the Septuagint. From Language to Interpretation and Beyond* (FAT 83; eds. Bernd Janowski, Mark S. Smith, and Hermann Spieckermann; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 32. Also n. 21.

[11] In this study, Ambakoum (Αμβακυμ), abbr. Amb, always refers exclusively to *the OG translation of Hab*, or its literary character/prophet Αμβακυμ. The difference between these two is clear from context, e.g. "Ambakoum suffers at the hands of the unrighteous" refers to the character from the book, not the text. Also, all references that do not reference a specific

necessarily that which is *free*, leaving the latter open to many kinds of speculative definitions. A detailed discussion in this regard is found in chapter two. For the time being, what is key here is that when the Greek is read as a literary artefact on its own, and *then* compared to its Hebrew counterpart, numerous changes appear related to the translational activity. The TT reads well and is a sound and coherent text. Some of the changes in the TT can be explained through common categories of improvisation, e.g. guessing at word meaning. Yet some changes seem to have occurred with a greater degree of intentionality, which implies at least a freer approach to the TT, having its own thematic content and literary patterns. These changes reveal the translator's literary understanding of his TT within the confines of a translational boundary, i.e. the general structure of the ST. An explanation of his style teases out what he understood of his source: its interpretation.

The essential task of the present study is to demonstrate that through an understanding of the translator's style one may then explain in what ways he understood the prophecy of Habakkuk. This approach provides a basis upon which to deduce the translator's theological and exegetical orientation, which is, no less, an expression of that scribal community.

It should be expected that since each book of the Twelve contains different characters, themes and linguistic hurdles, e.g. rare or difficult words, there will be some translational differences even when the same translator is at work. It seems that the translator did not intend to flatten the contours of each book. For example, there is an obvious stylistic variation between the Psalm of Ambakoum (Amb 3:1–19) and the previous two chapters, the former being attributed, for the most part, to the variation that exists with the ST. Moreoever, there is no text in the Twelve that matches the literary composition of the Psalm. Yet the Twelve is all by the same hand, which further proves that Ambakoum may be studied as an individual unit with its own themes and literary structures.[12] The translator was sensitive to the literary sections within the body of his overall text.

In reference to the literary edges mentioned above, there are all kinds of boundaries that the translator of Ambakoum bumped up against. The addition of clauses, for example (aside from points of *Vorlagen*), indicates that such a boundary was not unbreachable. Moreover, modification of broad literary structures, creating contrasts where they hitherto did not exist (2:3–5), or inventing variations out of an apparent love for literary rhetoric (2:6, 9, 12, 15, 19), shows the translator's view of his source text and style. Patterns that occur across sentence and paragraph boundaries also indicate that the translator had

book are in reference to Amb, e.g. 1:17 = Amb 1:17. I think the first English use of this form of the name (Ambacum) was by Brenton.

[12] Moreover, the evidence of the pesherim also indicates that each book could be commentated upon as a distinct unit.

a high-level literary comprehension of his ST – no word-level atomism. He had a pre-existing interpretation of the book before he translated it. Such things are not, however, limited to syntagmatic or paradigmatic correspondences, for they also pertain to semantics. This is more hotly debated.

Translators clearly made mistakes. To err is human. Though, as translators can be shown to have woven some literary flourish into their works, the same can be said of their intentional breach of semantic boundaries. The translator's ability to know whether or not to leave a domain of meaning altogether implies that he saw the text from another point of view, even if, for example, a particular Hebrew word was obscure. Rabassa humorously points this out: "When asked by the evangelist, 'Friend, have you found Jesus?' [The] perfectly logical reply is, '…I didn't know he was lost.'"[13] It is not just a matter of perspective, but how one wishes to take the given question – or read the given word/clause form on the parchment. The answer, if not the question, has to make sense – it has to arise within a certain domain of interpretative acceptability. The translator sought to create texts that spoke with clarity, drawing out the meaning from within his habit of reading.

Sometimes, when a Hebrew word was foggy to the translator he improvised. He made sense of it as best he could. But in the process of doing so he showed his cards. By making sense of the text before him, which included more than just one or two confusing words, scholars today may get a glimpse into how the translator understood his text. It was not always true that the difficult parts of texts were shrouded in misunderstanding. Moreover, when a passage was entirely clear there was a tendency to ensure that it properly connected with the passage in which it was found. Every case differs from one instance to the other. From fairly mundane concerns, such as how to translate a relative particle (3:16), to a complicated concern over the role of the prophet (1:12), different circumstances raised different questions, which yielded differing results.

This point pushes us back into the linguistic struggle between languages. Most notably, there are no word equivalences between languages. A word choice can evoke similar emotions that are perceived differently between languages and cultures, and therefore "only approximates its synonym without ever replacing it."[14] More often it is not the actual source language (SL) or ST that is causing the translator difficulty but his own, the TT. As Raffel explains:

> [L]inguistic knowledge is not the best nor even a good road toward successful translation. The translator's problems are verbal, but it is the words into which he is translating, not those

[13] Gregory Rabassa, "No Two Snowflakes Are Alike: Translation as Metaphor," in *The Craft of Translation* (eds. John Biguenet and Rainer Schulte; Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1989), 12.

[14] John Biguenet and Rainer Schulte, eds., *The Craft of Translation* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1989), xiv.

from which he is taking his leave, that create his problems. What the translator most needs – always given that minimal standard of merely linguistic achievement – is thus the ability to manipulate and mold the receiving rather than the lending tongue.[15]

The trained scribe of Ambakoum then faced the challenge of communicating well, rather than simple conformity to a kind of literalism.

With this goal in mind, there would then have been a high degree of Greek interference as the teaching of the Hebrew Scriptures was carried over into a foreign language – a new culture. At this stage my point is purely linguistic and not ideological. (What theological ideas existed for the translator sat in the background, of course, but are not core to this point.) At each linguistic level the translator had to make decisions that, more often than not, were concerned with effectively presenting and conveying the message of the ST, without too much attrition to the target language (TL). It is also quite likely that more decisional avenues were opened up because of the multi-lingual environment in which the translation came into existence; there was also contemporaneous lingual flux of the TL. Changes were occurring within Hellenistic Greek throughout this period. What might have previously been considered odd – and frankly unacceptable – ended up as not only permissible, but in some instances quite creative.[16] After all, LXX was well received, revealing something of the sociolect of the community in which it was formed. This then lends further credence to the compositional capability of the translator. Incidentally, this point somewhat diminishes concern over how well the translator of Ambakoum knew Hebrew.[17] It would seem he knew more than enough to get the job done, but perhaps not enough to breathe the air of the classical language.

The transformation process, therefore, encompassed a vast array of literary and cultural features, all of which contributed at different levels and stages of the process. Van der Louw's excellent inventory enumerates some of the aspects of the process; as research in the field continues, more items need to be added to the cache. In Ambakoum, some of the translational decisions appear to have been crafted so it spat of Greek literary rhetoric.

This study is concerned with how one may understand some of the textual evidence of the Septuagint. It amounts to working with the lexical data, nature of the syntax, overall shape of the literature in question, content and context. As the SL and TL are non-isomorphic, there is a high degree of transformation. Yet, there is also another layer of analysis that must be considered. In a number

[15] Raffel, *The Forked Tongue*, 105.

[16] See p. 106.

[17] Tov is right that translators did guess at some word meanings, misread others, etc., but the gravity of this is much less significant, which has real implications for using the Septuagint for MT textual criticism. Cf. Emanuel Tov, "Did The Septuagint Translators Always Understand their Hebrew Text?" in *De Septuaginta. Studies in Honour of John William Wevers on his sixty-fifth birthday* (eds. Albert Pietersma and Claude E. Cox; Mississauga: Benben Publications, 1984), 53–70.

of instances in Ambakoum, there are strong linguistic connections that appear to allude to other parts of scripture.[18] Such relationships can be quite tough to pin down, especially for the modern scholar. Quite simply, allusions between collated texts can make sense to one person and not another. It is like seeing faces and shapes in the clouds; a friend says to the other, "Look at that cloud! It looks like an old man's face," and the friend replies, "Where? I don't see it." So it sometimes is with inner-biblical allusions. On this basis, I tread slowly and carefully forward.

Inner-biblical allusions can be found between both MT and OG texts (Septuagintal connections often must be chronologically aligned). This means that an OG text can have allusive qualities to a context of MT, which may also include Septuagintal thematic content in each respect. It is a symbiotic relationship that may exist within a large corpus of literature (HB) and with its translational representative (LXX/OG) by those who know both. So, a multilingual scribe of living and academic languages would have more decisional pathways along which to interpret his text. Knowledge of the Hebrew and Greek texts, in conjunction with a reading tradition of the day, might then affect the transformation process in an unexpected way. For example, consider the relationship between MT Job 19:7 and Amb 1:2. In the latter text, the prophet suffers, which is not true of Hab 1:2:

Hab 1:2	אזעק אליך חמס ולא תושיע
Amb 1:2	*βοήσομαι καὶ πρὸς σὲ ἀδικούμενος καὶ οὐ σώσεις;*
MT Job 19:7	הן אזעק חמס ולא אענה \ אשוע ואין משפט

However, Hab 1:2 has lexica that correspond with the lexica of MT Job 19:7, where Job complains about his suffering. Literarily speaking, Ambakoum suffers, which may be due to both the inner-biblical connection of Hab 1:2 with MT Job 19:7 and also to the immediate context of Amb 1:2 – the lack of justice and deliverance (1:2–4). This connection is also in spite of the differences that exist with OG Job 19:7. Therefore, there is an allusion to the unjust suffering of the righteous in MT Job 19:7 with Amb 1:2.

Allusions are related to conceptual realms, which in this kind of literature are often linked to theological constructs. Of course the scribe had theological ideas, but these were partly shaped by his ST and his religious tradition. There

[18] An allusion can be understood through the recurrence of a general theme that is connected by either the repetition of the same or synonymous lexica (maybe with different vocabulary) that evokes similar ideas in another text that are derived from an earlier one. The sharing of lexica rather than vocabulary (*pace* Stead) gives the author more strength to his argument. Without such, it would seem that only the weight of much circumstantial data can prove a *connected* thematic allusion. Cf. Michael R. Stead, *The Intertextuality of Zechariah 1–8* (LHBOTS 506; eds. Claudia V. Camp and Andrew Mein; New York; London: T&T Clark, 2009), 19–21, 37–9.

really is no evidence to prove that he sought to shape his TT in a way that was alien to the ST. In fact, it is much more likely that he never even considered, especially in the modern sense, any kind of modifications that were not acceptable. This means that there was not, specifically for Ambakoum, a wide-scale attempt to meddle with the teaching of the ST. Baer has helpfully provided three different levels on which translators thought themselves authorised to modify their texts.[19] Ambakoum shows some evidence of these kinds of authorisation. This places the translator of Ambakoum in a tradition very similar to, if not the same as, the tradition expressed by Baer. Therefore, there is no evidence to suggest that the translator integrated alien ideas, a sort of intelligent re-designing of the text and its message.[20]

In sum, the translator of Ambakoum was an astute scribe who knew both Greek, Aramaic, and perhaps also Egyptian,[21] with an academic grasp of Classical Hebrew. He sought to draw out the meaning of his ST without much loss to the communicative quality of the TL, during the process of creating his TT. Chapter two explains that a number of influences may have caused him to make the decisions that he did.

1.2 Provenance of the Old Greek (OG)

As Orlinsky and Bratcher rightly noted, LXX came into existence through linguistic necessity more than anything else.[22] While remaining in the Land would never have truly guarded against inter-lingual diffusion – let alone the natural evolution of any language – the simple nature of the Diaspora, along with the central and governing textual tradition, meant that, at some point, communication in a different language(s) would become a reality. And so it did. The creation of a Greek translation of the Hebrew Scriptures had much to do with the new cultural situation of its hearers, no less its scribal overseers.[23]

---

[19] See p. 36.

[20] Thanks to Peter J. Williams for drawing my attention to this.

[21] The translators were likely native speakers of at least two languages (Aramaic and Greek), perhaps three (Egyptian), cf. Sebastian P. Brock, "The Phenomenon of Biblical Translation in Antiquity," in *Studies in the Septuagint: Origins, Recensions, and Interpretations* (ed. Harry M. Orlinsky; New York: Ktav Publishing, 1974); Jan Joosten, "A Syntactic Aramaism in the LXX: ἰδού in temporal expressions," *JSCS* 45 (2012): 44.

[22] See Harry M. Orlinsky and Robert G. Bratcher, *A History of Bible Translation and the North American Contribution* (SBLCP; eds. Paul J. Achtemeier et al.; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1991), 1–5; Morton Smith, *Palestinian Parties and Politics* (ALHR 9; New York; London: Columbia University Press, 1971), 57–81; Thackeray, *A Grammar of the OT in Greek*, 28–9.

[23] The translation was likely not just for pedagogic or linguistic reasons, but also culturally (politically) necessary. Cf. Tessa Rajak, *Translation and Survival. The Greek*

The necessity of the translational effort further implies the central authority and importance of the textual tradition for its religious adherents.

It is commonly held that LXX was first translated some time in the late third century.[24] On the heels of this came the translation of other significant corpora, which are not necessarily in the order one might expect. This alternate ordering may have indicated priority for a community. This being true, the Twelve was of high priority.[25] It was translated around the same time as Isaiah and the Psalter in the early-to-middle second century.[26] There are no superscripts, notes, marginalia, etc., to indicate precisely when and where the Twelve was translated. It must be derived by other means.

Ambakoum may be dated through a number of different ways.[27] Its place in the unified corpus of the Twelve, which was considered a literary unity as far back as Ben Sira,[28] means that what is true for the Twelve is true of Ambakoum in respect to dating. On the one hand, the translation has to come after LXX, which was created sometime before the second century; yet, on the other hand, it has to have been made before the well-known Levantine redaction (8ḤevXIIgr), mid-to-late in the first century.[29] Hence, it would also be necessary to allow some time for concerns related to this translation to arise before embarking on a revisionary activity, which was not meant to be a new translation.[30] This leaves a period of about 100 years or so in which to place the original translation of Ambakoum.

Working from the belief that Isaiah was perhaps the first prophet to be translated after LXX,[31] we can narrow down a little more on the timing of Ambakoum. There is a number of shared vocabulary between Isaiah, the

---

Bible and the Ancient Jewish Diaspora (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 30–4; John Wm. Wevers, "An Apologia for Septuagint Studies," *BIOSCS* 18 (1985): 16–7; Jennifer M. Dines, *The Septuagint* (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 28–30.

[24] See Marguerite Harl et al., eds., *La Genèse* (BdA 1; Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1994), 7; Gilles Dorival, Marguerite Harl, and Olivier Munnich, *La Bible grecque des Septante* (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1988), 93; John Wm. Wevers, "Barthélemy and Proto-Septuagint Studies," *BIOSCS* 21 (1988): 24; Karen H. Jobes and Moisés Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 2000), 31.

[25] A similar perspective is illustrative from the Qumran community, see Takamitsu Muraoka, "Introduction aux douze petites prophètes," in *Les Douze Prophètes* (trans. Jan Joosten; eds. Marguerite Harl et al.; BdA 23.1; Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2002), ii.

[26] See Dorival, Harl, and Munnich, *La Bible grecque*, 110–2.

[27] Dorival's three points are helpful: first, particular use of vocabulary; second, historical allusions; and, third, the translation procedure. See ibid., 93–4.

[28] See Muraoka, "Introduction aux XII," ii–iii.

[29] This might have been as late as the first-century C.E., cf. James K. Aitken, "The Origins of ΚΑΙ ΓΕ," in *Biblical Greek in Context* (eds. James K. Aitken and T. V. Evans; Leuven: Peeters, 2015).

[30] See Muraoka, "Introduction aux XII," viii.

[31] See Thackeray, "The Greek Translators of the Prophetical Books," 585.

Psalter and the Twelve. This implies some degree of shared ideas, which is particularly true of Ambakoum.[32] Thackeray argued for confluence between Ezek α and γ, in addition to Jer α.[33] All this data does seem to point to, at least, translators working out of the same kinds of thoughts, ideas and stylistic concerns, thus placing them together in either the same school of thought or place – Thackeray called them *les collaborateurs*.[34] Seeligmann also sees some dependence on Isaiah in the work of the Twelve.[35] Therefore, this data, and in agreement with a number of scholars,[36] indicates a date sometime in the early-to-middle part of the second century.[37]

[32] This is evident from: the use of Ἀραβία in 1:8 (see p. 125) and the use of πυξίον in 2:3. In addition, use of the eschatologically charged word συντέλεια, which is used throughout Psalter, is used in the same way within Amb. Schaper is right about the theological connection of this word, but does, however, on tenuous grounds (heavy dependence on one word, βᾶρις, an argument supported by van der Kooij, but rejected recently by Aitken; certain Rabbinic exegetical methods; and an eschatological interpretation of Moab) try to place its translation to somewhere in the Levant. Cf. Joachim Schaper, *Eschatology in the Greek Psalter* (WUNT 76; eds. Martin Hengel and Otfried Hofius; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1995), 34–45; 65–8; Arie van der Kooij, "On the Place of Origin of the Old Greek of Psalms," *VT* 33, no. 1 (1983): 70–1; James K. Aitken, *No Stone Unturned. Greek Inscriptions and Septuagint Vocabulary* (CSHB 5; eds. Anselm C. Hagedorn, Nathan MacDonald, and Stuart Weeks; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2014), 92–5.

[33] See Henry St John Thackeray, "The Greek Translators of Ezekiel," *JTS* 3 (1903): 399; Thackeray, "The Greek Translators of the Prophetical Books," 578.

[34] See Thackeray, "The Greek Translators of the Prophetical Books," 579. Also, cf. Jennifer M. Dines, "The Minor Prophets," in *T&T Companion to the Septuagint* (ed. James K. Aitken; London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015), 241.

[35] See Isaac L. Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah: A Discussion of Its Problems* (Leiden: Brill, 1948), 73. See also p. 125.

[36] See Dorival, Harl, and Munnich, *La Bible grecque*, 93, 111; Dines, *The Septuagint*, 46.

[37] Additional support may also be drawn from Lee's lexical analysis. The dominance of ὁράω (pres.) over βλέπω, and that of βοάω and κράζω, in the Twelve, indicates an early date in the second century. As he postulates, the evidence shows that LXX may, based on the lexical study, be consistently dated to the third century. The use of βλέπω in the poetic texts of the Twelve indicates an early date. See John A. L. Lee, *A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch* (SCS 14; ed. Harry M. Orlinsky; Chico, Cal.: Scholars Press, 1983), 129–44.