

REPRINTED FROM THE JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW
NEW SERIES
VOLUME XVI, NUMBER 2

TRANSLITERATIONS IN THE GREEK OLD TESTAMENT

BY

PROF. MAX L. MARGOLIS

PHILADELPHIA

THE DROPSIE COLLEGE FOR HEBREW AND COGNATE LEARNING

1925

Bibliothèque Maison de l'Orient



150691

TRANSLITERATIONS IN THE GREEK
OLD TESTAMENT

By MAX L. MARGOLIS, Dropsie College

THE present writer's interest in Greek transliterations of biblical Hebrew words assumed tangible shape in the paper on 'The Pronunciation of the $\aleph\psi$ according to New Hexaplaric Material' which appeared in 1909 (*AJSL* XXVI, 62-70). A year later (see *JQR* N. S. I, 259) I announced that the entire material excerpted from the second column of the Hexapla and consisting of 1200 words was ready for publication. In a paper read at the meeting of the American Oriental Society in Baltimore the same year I summed up the bearings of these transliterations on grammar (see *JAOS* XXXI, vi). I had by that time collected the abundant material found in the Septuagint itself as well as in the later Greek translators and had worked through the Proper Names which led me to the Book of Joshua (see *JQR* as above). The work on the Greek Joshua has occupied me the last fifteen years; the manuscript exhibiting the four principal recensions is ready and a good part of the Prolegomena written; a monograph on Masius has been in the hands of the Editors of the Harvard Theological Series for the last two years. In 1924 I turned over the Hexaplaric material to one of my students, Mr. Ephraim Speiser, who worked it up in the form of a dissertation which is ready for print.

This selfsame material was drawn to the attention of

Professor Franz Wutz in 1921. His publication, which appeared this year,¹ however, deals with the more important transliterations found imbedded in the Septuagint itself and therefore antedating Origen. It will be readily conceded that the two sets of transliterations demand separate treatment. Not only do the older translations represent a different pronunciation and stage of grammar, but their very presence is a problem. It is, of course, not strange at all that familiar terms which were current in Jewish circles required no translation. But when the words are far from being common it becomes difficult to understand why they were retained in transliterated form. Wutz was therefore led to the conclusion, which is nothing short of startling, that the oldest Greek translators, beginning with the Pentateuch, made their version not directly from a Hebrew copy of the Scriptures but from a secondary exemplar in which the entire text was written out in Greek letters. This transliterated text, moreover, was subjected to revision in accordance with the changing notions of Hebrew grammar and traces are still discernible in the earliest manuscripts of the Septuagint.

Let us look at some of the star examples upon which Wutz constructs his theory. Isai. 9.6 (p. 4) the name of the Child (פלא יועץ אל נבור אבי עד שר שלום) is translated: Messenger of great counsel, for I will bring peace upon the rulers and health to him. 'Messenger', i. e. angel, apparently covers אל נבור; the doublet, if it is a doublet, of 'peace' and 'health' may be left to itself; similarly we may abstract from the question whether 'to him' is a free addition or rests on the Hebrew; at all events 'to him' suggests that 'ruler' (in the singular) was intended in the place of 'rulers'. Accordingly, as has long been conjectured

¹ *Die Transkriptionen von der Septuaginta bis zu Hieronymus.* Von Franz Wutz. Lieferung 1. Leipzig 1925. Part II of *Texte und Untersuchungen zur vormasoretischen Grammatik des Hebraischen.* Herausgegeben von PAUL KAHLE.

(so Scholz, 1880), the translator took אבי in the sense of אביא (that is, with the silent א supplied, comp. I Kings 21.29 אבי ketib א ἐπάξω comp. ἄξω here). Wutz, on the other hand, claims that the translator had before him two transliterated texts: (a) αβειε γαρ σαλωμ (corrupted from αβει εδ σαρ σαλωμ), (b) αβειελ(with Λ for Δ) σαρε (this vowel Wutz calls 'Verbindungschirek', old case ending, mistaken by the translator as plural termination, ε=ⲉ, ε, according to Wutz, anciently doing service for ⲉ)σαλωμ. Wutz stresses the preposition 'upon' (ἐπί) which to him must necessarily go back to על (the ελ in (b) which is an inner-Greek corruption from εδ); but in the first instance γγ may just as much lend itself to the rendering 'upon', certainly in the mind of the translator who operated with אבי as a verbal form; secondly, it is conceivable that in the Hebrew copy γγ had been miswritten על. Wutz often enough has no explanation to offer for certain confusions of Greek letters and puts up the question to the Greek palaeographer; similarly, we may put it up to the Hebrew palaeographer to explain how γ could be miswritten as ל. It is ingenious, of course, to account for the inserted γάρ 'for' as a corruption of σαρ; but how could the translator (who was not a mere copyist) acquiesce in a Greek word being imbedded in a transliterated Hebrew text? Such expletives are frequent enough in any book of the Septuagint. There remains but the double rendering of שום. It is, again, ingenious to recur to a duplicate transcriptional text in the one of which, because of the corrupt γαρ, σαλωμ followed immediately. There is brilliancy in all these explanations; but they do not carry conviction, because the ordinary simple explanation does service as well.

The second example (p. 5) is II Chron. 22.9 אבחה (אבחה Wutz is misprint; the participle active of V is

mutakattil) ⚡ *ιατρευόμενον* 'being healed'; Wutz says that the translator found in his transliterated text *μεθχαβας* which had been corrupted from *μεθχαβαε* and which he therefore interpreted as *מתחב*. The change from *ε* to *ς*, so reasons Wutz, is intelligible in uncial Greek, while Hebrew *ס* does not lend itself readily to being miswritten *ש*. The circumstance that *התחב* (*hithpael*) is nowhere met with is of no moment. But where is the necessity of recurring to Greek transliteration? Surely, 'מתחב' (with the stroke of abbreviation, as Perles has taught us; or for that matter without the stroke but with the final letter damaged) could have been read as *מתחבש*. But I really believe that the translator's copy read *מתרפא*, a scribal error due not necessarily to graphic similarity, but rather to absent-mindedness through the influence of the whole context (aberration of the eye to *הרפא* (לה) v. 6).

The third example (p. 62) is Jerem. 31 (48). 5: *מלחח* ⚡ *ἐπλήσθη αλωθ*. Wutz, according to a theory of his which plays a significant part in his general thesis, says that the transliterated *αλωθ* was retained, instead of being translated (but why should it be translated?), because it was faulty (for *αλουωθ*). If the translator knew it to be faulty, he must have had access to a Hebrew copy. However, in the opinion of Wutz, the corrupt *αλωθ* induced the mistranslation *ἐπλήσθη* through the medium of the transliteration *μαλη* meant for *מלחח* but interpreted as the equivalent of *מלח*. But surely a feminine form would have been more appropriate. The simplest explanation is that the translator found in his Hebrew copy *מלח* (with *ח* omitted) which he interpreted as *מלח* (with *ס* omitted). See *ZAW* XXVII, 257f.

The fourth example (*ibid*) is Ps. 9.29: *הצרים* ⚡ *πλούσιοι*. According to Wutz, on the basis of *ασηρειμ* taken (*itacis-*

tically) as *ασειρευμ* אֶשְׂרִים. But the obvious explanation is that the translator read תְּרָצִים, comp. Symmachus Prov. 12.24.

Entirely beside the mark is the fifth example (*ibid*): Nehem. 2.13 עֵין הַתְּנִין Β πηγῆ τῶν σῦκων 'Spring of the Figs', based, according to Wutz, on *αθηνευ* for the original *αθεννευ*. But, surely, הַתְּנִין straight in the Hebrew could have been read הַתְּנִין.

It is therefore, precarious, to say the least, to solve discrepancies between the Greek and the Hebrew on the assumption of a Greek text of transliterated Hebrew. If we were to challenge each single case of those listed on pp. 88–101, we should have to write a book of the size of the present monograph. Even then many a puzzle would remain unsolved. Nevertheless, the work contains useful points. Thus the author lays bare on pp. 12–26 a considerable number of inner-Greek corruptions, some of which at least have hitherto remained unnoticed. Scholars who have operated with the text of the Greek version as if every letter were original and, whensoever a discrepancy with the Hebrew resulted, proceeded to correct the Hebrew on the basis of the supposititious Greek or at least to assume a variant in the Hebrew copy underlying the translation, may penitently confess their error. Those of us who have known better have no reason to be startled.

Here and there a question mark seems in place. Thus e. g. (p. 17) Ps. 74.8 the emendation *κατακαύσωμεν* is graphically unimpeachable; but how can *ἑορταί* (festivals, מועדים) be burned down? Let me also add a few remarks on proper names occurring in Joshua. 16.5 (p. 15) *εροκ* (r. *ερεχ*) for אֶרֶךְ seems to me to go back to אֶרֶךְ, comp. הארכי (v. 2 followed by עטרות). 13.18 (p. 19) *βασαν* for יֵצֶה is error for *ιασαν*; the initial letter may not have been quite legible and so the scribe thought of the more familiar name

Bashan. 21.35 (p. 22) *και σελλα* for *סלל נהלל* goes back to *και <την ν>εελαλ—την* was omitted by scribal contraction, but must have been originally present; hence the omission of the initial *ν*. 13.27 (*ibid*) *και εναδωμε και θβαργαι* for *בית הרם ובעמק בית הרם* is to be reconstructed as *και εν αωμκ (αομκ γ. αεμκ) βαιθαρραν* (with *ρ* corrupted into *γ* and *ν* into *η* (*ει*)=*בית הרן*), comp. Num. 32.36. 19.10 (*ibid.*) it can be shown that *Ⲅ* read *שדוד* for *שריד*. 15.23 (p. 23) *ασοριωναυ* is not *ασορ ισθναυ* but *ασερ (= יחצר) ιθνα(ι)ν*. 19.34 (p. 32) *εναθ* is *εσναθ, εζναθ=אונת*. 18.24 *καραφα και κεφειρα και μονει* is explained by Wutz as *καφαρ* (var. *κεφειρ*) *αμονει* = *כפר העמני*. The matter is not so simple. It requires little ingenuity to observe that in the oldest accessible transcripts of the Greek text the order in the four pairs of names in vv. 25–28, beginning with *באר* and ending with *צלע האלה* (taken as one), was inverted. Thus the ‘unrevised’ (Egyptian) recension reads:

<i>και μασσημα</i>	<i>και βηρων</i>	והמצפה	ובאר
<i>και αμωκη</i>	<i>και <κε>φειρα</i>	והמצה	והכפירה
<i>και καφαν</i>	<i>και νακαν</i>	וירפאל	ורקם
<i>και σεληκαν</i>	<i>και θαρηλα</i>	וצלע האלה	ותראלה

There is prefixed at the beginning *και βηρωθα*, which, however, is omitted in the related *Ⲅ*. Obviously, an interpolation. Note the later form of transliteration: *ε=Ⲅ*; and contrast *βηρων* r. *βηρωθ* (so corrected by Origen, hence he must have had before him this very ‘unrevised’ text which he revised after his wont) = *באר*. The other corruptions are not difficult to correct. R. *και μασσηφα και βηρωθ και αμμωση* (so the Syrian text, which, however, throughout restores the Hebrew order) *και ραφαηλ* (comp. *καφεηλ* of the Syrian text, possibly we should read *ιραφαηλ* or better yet *ιαρφαηλ*) *και ρακαμ και σελ... και θαρηλα*. I do not know for the present how to explain *ηκαν* in *σεληκαν*, though

I have some guesses. The group efjsvz read *σελαλακ* (for *σελαλαφ*, *σελααλφ*). Let me add that, while in the Hexapla Origen wrote *μασσηφα*, *κεφειρα* (so also the Syrian text), *μασσα*, the Tetrapla read *μασφα* (so the Syrian text), *χεφειρα*, *αμσα* (sic); both editions had *ιερφηλ* and *σελα αλφ*. The mixed Constantinopolitan text (ANΘ alii) has such readings as *αμμωσα* and *ιερφαηλ* which cannot have been derived from either Hexapla or Tetrapla, but must go back to another source. That source, I suspect, was the Palestinian *κοινή* upon which, I believe, Theodotion based his revision and which, in the proper names, must have preserved many an original reading of the Septuagint. That element constitutes the great value of the Constantinopolitan recension (see Conybeare in Scrivener-Miller, II, 151) and entitles it to be listed as a recension on a par with the three other recensions (the Egyptian, the Syrian, the Origenic-Eusebian). At any rate the inverted order in vv. 25–28 stands proved for the 'unrevised' text. How is it to be explained? In a paper read before the Society of Biblical Literature at New York in 1921 (see *JBL* XLI, ix) I ventured to suggest that the oldest texts of the Septuagint ascend to an interlinear in which the Greek was written over the Hebrew; the four pairs of names were written each pair (two names) on a line; the subsequent copyists read these names from left to right instead of from right to left. Now the same inversion took place in v. 24 with the first pair. Hence *καραφα* (so, and not *καφαρα*, still in the Hexapla, which continued *και αφνει*, hence Origen omitted *και κεφειρα* and, like Wutz, thought that *καραφα* covered כפר, though he dared not to carry out the emendation *καφαρα* which was left to the Complutensian editor and in his wake to Lagarde to re-write; now Wutz does the same, that is the ingenious, which is again far from the true) which appears as *καραιω* in the Syrian and Constantinopolitan recensions stands for

העפני and should be read *γαφαν* (initial *κα* being duplicated from *και* and *γ* corrupted into *ρ*), while *κεφειρα[και]μονει* = כפר העמני. I leave out the question whether the identification with פנא (ג(ו)פנין, בית), *γαφνα* (so with *a* Onomast. 26,1.2: *ταφνων*), *γο(υ)φνα* is correct. Lonzano, who reads נפנא in Lam. r. (ed. Buber, 24; comp. also 108) identifies it with a village near Bireh. Neubauer, 158: 'Il est possible que Gophna est identifique avec Ophni de la Bible'. Then נפנא would not be the Semitic original, but transliteration of the Greek *γοφνα*; probably it was combined with גפן, hence the interpretation *ἀμπέλως* and the wavering identification with *φάραγξ βότρνος* Onomast. 168, ll. 15-8; but see Buhl, 173; Thomsen, 53; Schlatter, 36. It is significant that both Ⲅ and Origen (*αφνει*) heard עפני; the פ in Ⲅ will then be secondary, due to the labial.

I forbear to incorporate other remarks on Joshua passages because the last example has detained us considerably and, moreover, teaches that suchlike questions cannot be solved *ambulando* and no attempt can be made to deal with critical questions in the Septuagint until the recensions have been ascertained and neatly placed one beside the other. I admit that the problem of transliteration in the Septuagint, where the words should have been translated, or where the transliteration occurs by the side of the translation, still remains. Wutz believes that these transliterations are left over from the transliterated text which served the translator for a basis, in other words, that the transliterations preceded the work of the translators. It is a possible thesis, though, as I said, the principal examples upon which the thesis is founded admit of simpler explanation. If another guess may be ventured, I should say that the transliterated words originally stood in the margin of the translation as it issued from the hands of the translators and were subsequently dragged into the text by copyists

either beside or in the place of the translated words. These marginal notes must have been copied again and again together with the text, and so the corruptions arose. Take for example I Sam. 15.3. It is obvious to me (despite Wutz, p. 42) that [ι]ε(ε)ρειμ, which is also repeated v. 8, was originally a gloss for the textual ἐξολοθρεύσεις which is now misplaced. The translator wrote καὶ ἐξολοθρεύσεις αὐτὸν καὶ πάντα τὰ αὐτοῦ = לְכָל אֲשֶׁר לַיהוָה; he pointed הַחַרְמָה and therefore inserted καί. Because, however, ἐξολοθρεύειν (this the normal rendering) or ἀποκτείνειν (in v. 8) was a free rendering, he added on the margin: ερειμ, the form unencumbered by suffixes (exactly as is our habit today) with the more exact rendering: ἀναθεματιεῖς. Compare with this procedure that of the Revised English Version: in the text: 'utterly destroy' with the margin: 'Heb. devote'. I may substantiate my guess that the Greek Version was equipped with a margin from another quarter. פִּלֵּא אֶת יָדְךָ is rendered by the Revised Version idiomatically: 'consecrate', with the margin: 'Heb. fill the hand'. Now, in the Greek Version throughout the Pentateuch, beginning with the second occurrence of the phrase, the rendering is equally free: τελειοῦν, apparently 'initiate'. But in the first occurrence, Exod. 28. 41 (37), the verb is rendered literally ἐμπιπλᾶν. To my mind the translator wrote here in the text the freer rendering as later on throughout, with the more literal rendering in the margin. Subsequent copyists substituted the margin for the textual reading which has thus disappeared.